Spring 1970

A resolution of the political activities of Philo with the politico-messianic ideas expressed in his works

Leonard Jay Greenspoon

A RESOLUTION OF THE POLITICAL ACTIVITIES OF PHILO WITH THE POLITICO-MESSIANIC IDEAS EXPRESSED IN HIS WORKS

BY

LEONARD JAY GREENSPOON

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

JUNE 1970

APPROVED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ANCIENT LANGUAGES

S. Frederic Johansen
DIRECTOR

Joseph S. White

Talbot H. Sellers

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The study of ancient literature and society is a dynamic one. As each age brings its unique experience and understanding to this study, new explanations, interpretations and insights are developed. However, each age also tends to impose its own likes and dislikes on works and events of a prior time, with the result that the same personality, event, or piece of literature may be praised in one age and damned in the next, interpreted in one way in a particular century and in quite the opposite way in succeeding ones, adopted as its own by one society and shunned by another.

We may use the Jewish writer Philo as our example of the varying manner in which an ancient author is viewed. For many centuries Philo was judged a renegade by his fellow Jews and as an early coreligionist by many Christians. He was thought to have owed little debt to Judaism on the one hand, and to the Greek world on the other. Philo has also suffered gross and intentional misinterpretation at the hands of anti-Semitic scholars.

In this long and varied history some attention was given to the political and Messianic content of Philo's vast corpus, with the general conclusion being that neither of these two areas was of real concern to Philo. This view was first challenged during the first quarter of the twentieth century by Erwin R. Goodenough, whose interpretation of

Philo led to the conclusion that the writings of Philo contain a number of passages with political and/or Messianic overtones. Further, Goodenough challenged the previous judgment of Philo as a man whose entrance into political life came only late in life. We base many of our arguments on the conclusions reached by Goodenough and on the acceptance of his interpretation of a number of passages in Philo.

Our fundamental thesis is that Philo's aim in attempting to secure citizenship for the Jews of his community was the eventual overthrow of Roman rule. This would not appear to be the most direct method by which to secure this aim or the most apparent explanation for such an attempt. However, an understanding of Philo's political and Messianic ideas and their resolution with his known and assumed political activities leads to the conclusion that this was indeed Philo's aim and method.

Chapter one introduces into our argument a number of necessary elements. In the first section the history of Palestine is traced from the arrival of the Romans to the period just prior to 66 A.D. The causes for the friction between the Jews and the Romans are developed. Even the numerous concessions granted to the Jews by the Hellenistic world could not make up for the insults to their religious sensibilities which the Jews suffered, or felt that they suffered, at the hands of the pagans. The development of opposition to Roman rule is outlined. The political and Messianic elements in such opposition were rarely, if ever, separated. Messianic figures promising political and religious freedom sprang up in every section of Palestine from the very beginning of the first century A.D. This opposition, while it had at its base many of the same yearnings that are found in Philo, must be contrasted in its methods with those adopted by Philo. Still, this section makes it clear that political

activity with Messianic overtones was common at Philo's time.

The second section of Chapter one traces the history of the Jews in Egypt, especially Alexandria, from the beginning of the Hellenistic period to the 'pogrom' in Alexandria in 38 A.D. The causes for the Greek hatred of the Jews are explained and also the relations of the Jews with the Egyptian kings before the arrival of the Romans. The Jewish position under the Ptolemies was generally superior to that which they held under the Romans, even though the latter profited from extensive Jewish support when they first came into Egypt.

The insecurity of the Jews under Roman rule was clearly demonstrated during the riots in Alexandria in 38, in which the anti-Jewish Greeks were supported by the Roman governor of Egypt. The attempt by Gaius to introduce his statue into the Temple at Jerusalem furnished further evidence of this insecurity.

During this period Philo led a delegation to Gaius. These events form the subject matter of Philo's two historical works In Flaccum and Legatio ad Gaium. Jewish rights were later confirmed under Claudius, but the Jews were permanently barred from obtaining citizenship. However, the attempt by Philo was prior to the decisive edict under Claudius. The Appendix dealing with the argument over Jewish citizenship in Alexandria is most important, for if the contention that the Jews were citizens of Alexandria prior to 38 is left unchallenged, then it would be impossible to argue that Philo was seeking citizenship through his embassy.

The first half of Chapter two develops the argument by including within it evidence of Philo's entry into political life at an early age and documentation of Philo's very active interest in the practical politics of his age. The second part of Chapter 2 outlines the basic Messianic

concepts, both Jewish and pagan, of Philo's time and discusses the passages in which Philo makes reference to the Messiah and/or the Messianic Age.

In the first two chapters we construct a base on which to proceed. The third chapter develops the idea that Philo's ideal was the individual possessing an interest in both the pursuit of learning and participation in practical politics, and that Philo strove to be such an individual. What then was the aim of Philo's political involvement? The aim, drawn from his writings, is clearly the eventual overthrow of Roman domination. However, much Philo was influenced by the same Messianic and political thought that was having its effect on Palestine, he did not favor the direct action of the Jews of Palestine, at least at that time. Philo introduced into his opposition the element of moral and spiritual strength as necessarily precedent to any political show of strength.

In this chapter the various elements of Philo are united. While many of his ideas were very much in accord with the writings, both Jewish and pagan, of his and prior ages, the totality of his work and efforts sets him apart.

CHAPTER I

JEWS AND GENTILES IN JUDEA AND EGYPT

Section One: Palestine from 63 B.C. to 60 A.D.

The history of Palestine from 63 B.C. to 60 A.D. is inexorably tied to that of the world as a whole. All of the great actors on the world's stage played their parts in Palestine's theater as well. Rome's leaders--republican and imperial--Roman governors, Roman procurators, and Roman adventurers all had a hand in shaping the course of Palestine's history.

When Pompey entered Palestine to settle intra-family squabbling over succession to the leadership of the Jews, he placed this territory under the general control of the Roman governor of Syria. During his stay in Jerusalem in 63 B.C., Pompey entered the Most Holy Place of the Temple, an area reserved exclusively for the high priest. Yet, he did not appropriate any of the Temple treasury, or attempt to interfere with Jewish worship or ritual.[1] Not so M. Licinius Crassus, who in 54 plundered the treasury of the Temple.[2]

As a reward for the aid which the Jews gave to Julius Caesar in his Egyptian campaign, jurisdiction over all Jewish matters was conceded to them. In 45 B.C., Hyrcanus II, who had been appointed leader of Judea two years before, was able to win further concessions from Caesar, which

---

[1]Josephus, Jewish Antiquities XIV, 69-76; The Jewish War I, 152-157.

[2]Antiq. XIV, 105-109; War I, 179.

were affirmed by the Senate after his death. Caesar also showed favor to Jews living outside Palestine.[3] The death of Caesar, as Suetonius reports it, was considered a great loss by the Jews.[4]

The arrival of C. Cassius in 43 marked a period of economic repression, as he extorted 700 talents from the Jews.[5] Cities unable to pay their allotment saw their inhabitants enslaved.[6] The Idumean Antipater and his son Herod, who before had worked to cultivate Caesar's favor, worked toward the same purpose with Cassius.[7]

The policy of M. Antony toward Judea was based purely on convenience. He freed those citizens, whom the rapacity of Cassius had doomed to slavery.[8] On the other hand, he imposed high taxes on Palestine to support his various enterprises.[9]

Herod was declared king of Judea by the Roman Senate in 40 B.C., after he had traveled to Rome and secured the support of Antony and Octavian.[10] Herod, however, was not able to take possession of his kingdom for three years.

At the time Herod was named king, the Parthians, who had set up the Hasmonean Antigonus as king, dominated Palestine.[11] Even after the Parthians were driven out by a legate of Antony, Ventidius, Antigonus remained on the throne of Judea.[12] Finally in 37 B.C., Herod, aided by the

---

[3] Antiq. XIV, 190-222. [4] Suetonius, Caesar 84.

[5] Antiq. XIV, 272; War I, 220. [6] Antiq. XIV, 274-275; War I, 221-222.

[7] Antiq. XIV, 273-274; War I, 221. [8] Antiq. XIV, 304-305, 314-322.

[9] Appian, Roman Civil Wars V, 7. [10] Antiq. XIV, 377-389; War I, 280-285

[11] Antiq. XIV, 330-369; War I, 248-273.

[12] Antiq. XIV, 392-393; War I, 288-289.

forces of the Romans, beseiged and defeated Antigonus at Jerusalem.[13] In this way Herod took actual possession of this kingdom and simultaneously brought to an end the rule of the Hasmonean dynasty.[14]

The Idumean nation, from which Herod came, had been conquered by the Jewish king John Hyrcanus in c. 125 B.C., and this same king had forced the Jewish religion on the inhabitants of Idumea.[15] According to Josephus, Herod's family was a noble one,[16] while Julius Africanus states that Herod's father had been taken from the Temple of Apollo at Ascalon by a band of Idumean raiders and raised as one of them.[17] Both sources do agree on Idumean descent.

As time passed, the Idumeans came to regard themselves as full Jews, although many other Jews did not.[18] Antigonus, in terming Herod a ἡμιιουδαῖος,[19] probably reflected the thinking of most Jews at the time of Herod's accession to the throne.

However, a story was circulated by Nicolaus of Damascus, a member of Herod's court, that Herod's family was actually a Jewish one, whose ancestors were among the leading Jews who returned from Babylon.[20] No credence can be given to this story, since it is at variance with all other

---

[13] Antiq. XIV, 465-491, XV, 5-10; War I, 343-357. [14] Antiq. XIV, 491.

[15] Antiq. XIII, 257, XV, 254; War I, 63 (but no reference in War to his judaizing of the Idumeans).

[16] Antiq. XIV, 8; War I, 123.

[17] Julius Africanus, Epist. ad Aristidem ap. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. I, 7.11.

[18] Antiq. XIII, 258; War IV, 270-282. [19] Antiq. XIV, 403.

[20] Antiq. XIV, 9.

available information.[21] Nicolaus may have wanted to flatter Herod with such a story, or Herod himself may have used Nicolaus to spread the story in order to win over some who opposed him because of his Idumean descent.[22]

Herod was strongly imbued with the spirit of the Hellenistic tradition, and he sought to introduce many Hellenistic institutions into Judea. Opposition to this policy was often raised by the people, who were under the influence of a powerful Pharisaic national movement. Therefore, Herod often showed deference to the wishes of the Pharisees. This is not to say that Herod suppressed to any great degree his desire to build a great kingdom along the lines of contemporary pagan ones, and therefore he never approached the ideal that the Pharisees set before him.

His building program required huge sums of money, which were obtained through increasingly unpopular and heavy taxes. Further opposition developed among the Pharisees, who saw in Herod a king who did not have the 'right' to rule over the Jews, for the Romans and not G-d had given his kingdom to him.

As early in his reign as 25 B.C., a plot to assassinate Herod was formulated, only to fail when the conspiracy was betrayed.[24] Another method of opposition was adopted by some Pharisees who refused to swear an oath of allegiance to Herod or the emperor.[25]

---

[21]Emil Schurer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, I, 314.

[22]The former reason is given by Josephus himself in Antiq. XIV, 9. The latter opinion is that of Mary Smallwood in her edition of Philo's Legatio ad Gaium, 293.

[23]Schurer, op. cit., I, 443-445. [24]Antiq. XV, 280-289.

[25]Antiq. XV, 368-369 (for oath to Herod); Antiq. XVII, 41-42 (for oath to Augustus).

In order to hold the people in check, Herod made use of increasingly repressive measures.[26] At the same time he added further fuel to the fires of opposition by his introduction of competitive games, not only at Caesarea, but even at Jerusalem.[27] These were considered by many Jews as serious offenses against the Mosaic Law and were condemned as such.[28]

When, in the closing days of the reign of Herod, it became apparent that he wasn't going to recover from a serious illness, a group of Jews took a dangerous step to express their hatred of him. Led by two rabbis, Judas and Matthias, this band of Jews tore down the golden eagle which Herod had placed on the Temple at Jerusalem.[29] Weak though he was, Herod condemned the leaders of this plot to be burned alive.[30] Josephus records that Herod ordered the most distinguished leaders of the Jews to be killed when he died, so that there would be mourning at his death.[31] This order was not carried out.[32]

Herod's death in 4 B.C. created a power vacuum which was filled by a series of rebellions. Archelaus, named chief heir in Herod's will, was called on by the people to punish those who had advised Herod to murder the two rabbis, who had reacted strongly when they received news that Herod lay near death. Violence followed, during which a detachment of Archelaus' troops was routed by the populace. Only a general attack

---

[26] Antiq. XV, 291-296, 365-367.

[27] Antiq. XVI, 136-138, War I, 415 (at Caesarea); Antiq. XV, 267-268 (at Jerusalem).

[28] Antiq. XV, 274-276. [29] Antiq. XVII, 149-157; War I, 648-652.

[30] Antiq. XVII, 158-167; War I, 653-655.

[31] Antiq. XVII, 179; War I, 659-661.

[32] Antiq. XVII, 193; War I, 666.

of the army brought an end to this rebellion, with great loss of life.[33]

As Archelaus left for Rome to press his claims for the kingship, another revolt occurred, which was put down by the Syrian governor Varus.[34] When Sabinus, sent by Augustus as procurator to Palestine, oppressed the Jews, another tumult resulted, which the Romans again crushed. Sabinus took the opportunity to steal 400 talents from the Temple treasury.[35]

After the initial success of Sabinus the rebellion spread throughout the nation. In Jerusalem itself the Jewish rebels, strengthened by a group of soldiers who had served under Herod, beseiged Sabinus and his forces in the Palace of Herod.[36] In the neighborhood of Sepphoris in Galilee, Judas, son of Ezechias, gathered a number of armed men around himself. His aim may have been to obtain the royal crown for himself. Indeed, such was the aim of one Simon, an ex-slave of Herod's, who collected a band of men in the Perea and had himself proclaimed king. His dreams of glory were quickly ended by a detachment of Roman soldiers, who defeated his band and put him to death.[37] Another individual who is said to have claimed the royal crown at about the same time was Athronges, an ex-shepherd.[38]

In short, this was a period of general rebellion, with each seeking what was to his own greatest advantage. The one common aim, to which all the people seemed to be working, was the liberation at all cost of

---

[33] Antiq. XVII, 206-218; War II, 4-13.

[34] Antiq. XVII, 250-251; War II, 39-40.

[35] Antiq. XVII, 252-264; War II, 41-50.

[36] Antiq. XVII, 265-268; War II, 51-54.

[37] Antiq. XVII, 271-276; War II, 56-59.

[38] Antiq. XVII, 278-284; War II, 60-65.

Palestine from Roman power.[39]

Varus quickly returned and sent Sabinus out of the country. Of the Jewish rebels, at least 2000 were crucified. The city of Sepphoris was burned and its inhabitants sold into slavery. Nevertheless, he treated the mass of rebels with a fair amount of clemency.[40]

The scene shifts to Rome, where all three claimants to Herod's vacated throne, Antipas, Philip, as well as Archelaus, were attempting to obtain Augustus' support.[41] The Jewish people sent their own delegation, which urged that none of the Herodians be appointed king; rather, that the Jews be allowed to live according to their own laws under Roman suzerainty.[42] Augustus, however, chose to disregard the pleas of the Jews, and he divided Herod's kingdom between his three sons.[43]

Between 4 B.C. and 41 A.D., Palestine was ruled as three separate entities. One section, under the control of Philip from 4 B.C. to 34 A.D., was given to King Agrippa I in 37. Another section, made up of Galilee and the Perea, was controlled by Herod Agrippa during almost this entire period. The third territory, which included Judea proper (with Samaria and Idumea), was under the power of Roman procurators, who began arriving in 6 A.D. after the removal of Archelaus. Of these, only Philip earned a reputation as a fair and peaceful king.[44]

Herod Antipas offended orthodox sensibilities when he constructed his new capital of Tiberias in 19 A.D., on the site of a former burying-ground. Such a location was uninhabitable for Jews who continued to

---

[39]Schurer, op. cit., II, 4. [40]Antiq. XVII, 286-298; War II, 66-79.

[41]Antiq. XVII, 219-249, 299-317; War II, 20-38, 80-92.

[42]Antiq. XVII, 299-314; War II, 80-92.

[43]Antiq. XVII, 318-320; War II, 93-97. [44]Antiq. XVIII, 106-107.

observe ceremonial impurity upon contact with a grave.[45]

Far better known and of more significance are the relations between Herod (Antipas) and both John the Baptist and Jesus. Each of these carried on at least part of their activities in the territory of Herod. Josephus records that John attracted a large crowd by preaching piety and righteousness. Hearing of this, Herod feared that John might use his great influence to raise a rebellion, and he thought it best to get rid of him right away. Accordingly, at his command John was put to death.[46]

It is quite likely that Josephus has correctly identified the grounds for Herod's fear of John as a fear of political trouble. The excitement that John produced, while it may have been primarily of a religious nature, was not lacking a political element, especially as most Jews did not separate their religious and political longings.[47]

Still, there is the possibility that the Gospel writers are correct in stating that Herod had John killed because of the latter's opposition to Herod's marriage to his sister-in-law Herodias.[48] The Gospel account also includes such details as the long imprisonment of John and the dancing of Salome.[49]

Although Jesus had begun his preaching before John died, Herod did not learn of his deeds until after the death of John. Herod feared that John himself had returned to continue his work. This time Herod

---

[45]Antiq. XVIII, 36-38. (For laws concerning such impurity, Numbers XIX, 11-16.)

[46]Antiq. XVIII, 116-119.

[47]Schurer, op. cit., II, 24-25; Louis H. Feldman, editor, Works of Josephus, IX (Loeb edition), 83.

[48]Matthew XIV, 3-5; Mark VI, 17-18; Luke III, 19.

[49]Matthew XIV, 6-12; Mark VI, 19-29; Luke III, 20.

[50]Matthew XIV, 1-2; Mark VI, 14-16; Luke IX, 7-9.

attempted to silence his enemy not by force, but by persuading him to leave his territory voluntarily, but Jesus replied that he would not leave until he had completed his work there.[51] Later Jesus did leave Galilee and proceed to Jerusalem and his death. Antipas met Jesus there shortly before his crucifixion.[52]

The area of chief activity, however, was to be Judea itself, which at the beginning of this period was under the control of Archelaus. However so intolerable was his reign that an embassy of Jews and Samaritans succeeded in having him removed from power to banishment in 6 A.D.[53] This removal led to the arrival of the procurators.

These procurators were from the equestrian order, and upon their arrival there occurred fundamental changes in conditions in Judea. Herod and his successors, as friendly as they were to the Romans, still had a basic understanding of and respect for the Jewish way of life. They prudently avoided major religious confrontations. The Romans, however, almost completely lacked such an appreciation. They could not understand the ardor of the Pharisees, who would willingly submit to the sword for the preservation of certain rites and ceremonies. Even such seemingly inoffensive administrative actions as the taking of a census were seen by many Jews as an encroachment on their sacred rights. Such a census was proposed at the very beginning of the reign of the procurators; the situation was bound to get worse as the years went by. Those very Jews who at first welcomed the procurators grew to believe that such power was irreconcilable with the principle of theocracy.

---

[51] Luke XIII, 31-32. (These verses have been interpreted in this manner by many expositors. Schurer, op. cit., II, 29.)

[52] Luke XXIII, 7-12. [53] Antiq. XVII, 342-348; War II, 111-113.

Under these circumstances mutual and genuine good will was never fully attained. Although the leaders of Rome, excepting Gaius, were generally willing to make concessions to the Judeans, the procurators, with whom the Jews had daily contact, rarely adopted so conciliatory a mood. In fact, the bureaucrats, inflated as they were by a sense of their own importance, eventually drove the burdened and oppressed people into a war whose only result could be annihilation.[54]

Further adding to the anger of the average Jew was the fact that many of the customs-gatherers, such as the two recorded in the Book of Luke, were Jewish and appeared to be gaining their wealth through collaboration with the Romans.[55] This was particularly true as the rates for such customs were often indefinite, providing numerous opportunities for the tax-gatherer to enrich himself at the expense of others.[56]

On the other hand, numerous incidents indicate that Roman official not only tolerated, but actually protected Jewish worship when it suited the purpose of the Romans. For example, the Syrian governor Petronius ordered the city council of the city of Dora to remove a statue of the emperor that had been placed in the synagogue there.[57] A soldier who had been seen tearing up a Torah scroll was put to death by the procurator Cumanus.[58] Important Romans even presented gifts to the Temple at Jerusalem and offered sacrifices there. Augustus and Livia are reported to have sent brazen wine vessels and other gifts to the Temple,[59]

---

[54]Schurer, op. cit., II, 42-43.

[55]Luke XIX, 2. (For the identification of these men as Jews, Schurer, op. cit., II, 70.)

[56]Schurer, op. cit., II, 71. [57]Antiq. XIX, 300-311.

[58]Antiq. XX, 113-117; War II, 228-231.

[59]War V, 562-563; Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 319.

and in 15 B.C. Marcus Agrippa visited Jerusalem, at which time he won the crowds over by offering a sacrifice at the Temple.[60]

Exceptional steps were sometimes taken by the Romans to respect the Jewish prohibition against graven images. For example, coinage struck in Judea was without the image of the emperor.[61] The Roman governor Vitellius so desired not to offend the Jews that he had his troops march around Judea, rather than have them enter Jewish lands bearing standards upon which the emperor's picture was shown. At this time he also went to Jerusalem and sacrificed at the Temple.[62] On another occasion Pontius Pilate sought to disregard this prohibition and introduce into Jerusalem standards bearing the emperor's likeness. The firm opposition of the Jews forced him to withdraw them hastily.[63]

It might appear that the Jews had scant grounds for complaint. However, neither the justice and tolerance of the official Roman policy nor the occasional acts of concession on the part of a governor or procurator could obliterate the fact that in general the bureaucrats on the local level were neither so understanding nor fair-minded.

We shall see that, as the years passed, it became increasingly more difficult for the Jews to accept being ruled, as opposed to their ruling in accordance with the lofty ideals of the Chosen People concept. Such was the popular sentiment. A possible alternate conclusion--that the Roman rule, though pagan, was divinely sent and ought thus to be obeyed--fell into increasing disfavor.[64]

Into this picture the entrance of a militant element should not be

---

[60] Legatio 294-297. [61] Schurer, op. cit., II, 77.

[62] Antiq. XVIII, 121-122. [63] Antiq. XVIII, 55-59; War II, 169-174.

[64] Schurer, op. cit., II, 79.

surprising. As early as the arrival of the first procurator in 6 A.D. and the proposal for a census, individuals and small groups began to preach revolution in the name of religion. The leader of these early activities was Judas of Gamala, who is usually identified with that Judas who took part in the disturbances after Herod's death.[65] Although such revolutionists were not initially successful, they eventually succeeded in founding a strict fanatical party among the Pharisees. These early groups and their successors are generally identified with the Zealots. They were unwilling to submit quietly while waiting for the Messianic hope to be fulfilled through divine means. Rather, they wanted to move actively toward the fulfillment of the Messianic hope by armed opposition to the Romans. Though a small minority at first, the Zealots became increasingly more important in the following years.[66]

There were seven procurators in Judea between 6 A.D. and 41, of whom the most important was Pontius Pilate, who governed from 26 to 36. Philo includes a general description of his base character in his Legatio.[67]

His attempts to introduce certain standards into Jerusalem have been mentioned above. At this point we may add to that account details of the Jewish opposition to the plan. The people poured into Caesarea to protest this plan, and even when surrounded by menacing troops they remained steadfast in their opposition. Under such circumstances Pilate had no choice but to yield to Jewish sensibilities in this matter.[68]

Later Pilate set up in Jerusalem votive shields to Tiberius, on

---

[65] Antiq. XVIII, 1-10, 23-25, XX, 102; War II, 117-118. (For the identification of this Judas with the earlier leader of the same name, Schurer, op. cit., II, 80.)

[66] Schurer, op. cit., II, 80-81. [67] Legatio 301-303.

[68] Antiq. XVIII, 57-59; War II, 171-174.

which the emperor's name was written. Even this would not be tolerated by the people, who successfully petitioned Tiberius for their removal. Tiberius saw clearly that Pilate's primary motive in setting up the shields was to provoke the Jews and not to honor him.[69]

Further opposition developed when Pilate expropriated money from the treasury of the Temple to build an aqueduct. Crowds of protesting Jews surrounded him in Jerusalem, as they had done before at Caesarea. Pilate, having been forewarned, had ordered soldiers dressed like civilians to mix with the crowd. At a certain moment they took out the clubs they had concealed and began to beat the crowd mercilessly. Many were killed before the demonstrators were dispersed.[70]

The New Testament bears witness to other popular uprisings during the time of Pilate. According to the narrative of Luke, Pilate had a number of persons from Galilee killed while they were offering sacrifices at the Temple in Jerusalem.[71] An insurrection and charge of murder is associated with the name Barabbas.[72]

Pilate's downfall came when he had a number of Samaritans senselessly slaughtered. The Samaritans believed that on Mount Gerizim the sacred utensils of the Temple had been buried since the time of Moses. In the year 35 a Samaritan gathered a crowd together and was preparing to lead them in the ascent of Mount Gerizim to view these utensils, when troops of Herod arrived. Some of the Samaritans were killed and others put into prison.[73] Obviously Pilate attached some political importance

---

[69]Legatio 299-305. [70]Antiq. XVIII, 60-62; War II, 175-177.

[71]Luke XIII, 1. [72]Mark XV, 7; Luke XXIII, 18-19.

[73]Antiq. XVIII, 85-87. (For this belief among the Samaritans, Feldman, op. cit., 61-62.)

to the gathering, while the Samaritans said that they had gathered for no revolutionary purpose. At this point the Samaritans sought redress from Vitellius, the governor of Syria. Vitellius intervened and removed Pilate.[74]

This Vitellius, who was governor from 35 to 37, distinguished himself as a friend to the Jews on numerous occasions. Reference has already been made to the care with which he observed the Jewish prohibition against graven images. In addition, Vitellius also won favor with the Jews by remitting a market tax in Jerusalem and by restoring to the custody of the Jews the vestments of the high priest.[75]

In the year 41, Herod Agrippa, a grandson of Herod the Great, obtained the kingship over most of Palestine. Agrippa was three-quarters Idumean and only one-quarter Jewish by descent, that one quarter being his paternal grandmother Mariamme, granddaughter of the Hasmonean Hyrcanus.[76] Notwithstanding his descent, his reign was viewed as a golden age for Judaism.[77] The most important of his activities on behalf of the Jews will be discussed below. He adopted a hostile attitude toward the early Christians and pagans.[78]

The account of his death in 44 is most interesting. Both Josephus and the New Testament have recorded his death.[79] In both sources, Caesarea is the place of his death, Agrippa is dressed in royal robes, the crowds

---

[74]Antiq. XVIII, 88-89. [75]Antiq. XVIII, 90, XV, 405.

[76]Smallwood, op. cit., 292-293. [77]Antiq. XIX, 328-334.

[78]Acts XII, 1-19 (for attitude toward Christians); Antiq. XIX, 356-358. (The rejoicing at Agrippa's death by those soldiers in the Josephus citation has been taken as evidence of this. Schurer, op. cit., II, 160.)

[79]Antiq. XIX, 343-352; Acts XII, 19-23.

flatter him, and he dies suddenly. In Acts, Agrippa is killed by an angel of G-d, when he allows himself to be carried away by the shouts of the crowd who declare that his is the voice of a god. In Josephus, the crowds address him as a god, and Agrippa allows them to do so. In this account, an owl appears as the sign of the imminent death of Agrippa.

Between the death of Agrippa in 44 and the commencement of hostilities in 66 there were seven procurators over the Jews. None of them fully appreciated the necessity of respecting certain Jewish peculiarities and sensibilities.[80] On a whole, these procurators were far more ruthless and cruel than those who preceded Agrippa, and their unbinding and short-sighted policies provoked the Jews even more because they could remember the comparatively popular and free reign of Agrippa.

An incident of major importance occurred during the period of the first post-Agrippan procurator, Cuspius Fadus. A man named Theudas, claiming to be a prophet, led a large number of his followers down to the Jordan River, whose waters would part, he promised, at his command. His purpose was clear, at least to Fadus, who saw this as a first step in an attempt by Theudas to convince the people of the divine nature of his proposed contest with Rome. Before Theudas could test his powers, the troops of Fadus attacked Theudas' band, killing many. Theudas himself was decapitated and his head sent to Jerusalem.[81] It would appear obvious that there was a popular yearning for some sort of Messianic figure to lead the people against their common enemy, Rome.

Under Tiberius Alexander, the nephew of Philo and the next procurator,

---

[80]Schurer, op. cit., II, 166-167.

[81]Antiq. XX, 97-98. (For the interpretation of the motives of Theudas and Fadus, Schurer, op. cit., II, 168. Theudas is also mentioned in Acts V, 36.)

two sons of Judas of Gamala, James and Simon, were crucified. The action was taken on the grounds that they were contemplating action similar to that of their father.[82]

Although the times of the first two procurators were not without difficulties, they were later viewed as calm in comparison with the years that followed.[83] Three major outbreaks marked the period of the third procurator Ventidius Cumanus (48-52).

The first incident occurred when a Roman soldier grossly insulted a crowd of Jews who had gathered in Jerusalem during the Passover season. Cumanus tried unsuccessfully to calm down the Jews, finally resorting to armed force. Josephus estimates that perhaps as many as 30,000 were killed in the crush which took place as the people tried to escape.[84]

Reference has already been made to the second event, at which time Cumanus sentenced to death a soldier charged with tearing up a Torah scroll.

Cumanus' behavior in the last incident cost him his position as procurator. When some Galilean Jews were murdered in a Samaritan village and Cumanus, having been bribed by the Samaritans, refused to take any action, a group of Jews decided to take matters into their own hands. Under the leadership of two zealous Jews, Alexander and Eleazar, a large number of armed men attacked Samaria, killing many. Subsequently, Cumanus and his forces attacked this Jewish band, inflicting heavy casualties and taking others prisoners. A temporary truce was arranged by some of the leading Jews in Jerusalem. Both sides, Jewish and Samaritan,

---

[82] Antiq. XX, 102. (For the interpretation of motives, Schurer, op. cit., II, 170.)

[83] War II, 220. [84] Antiq. XX, 105-112; War II, 223-227.

then sent embassies to the Syrian governor, Ummidius Quadratus. As a result of his own investigations, some of the Jews and Samaritans responsible for the troubles were killed, but the leaders on both sides, along with Cumanus, were sent for judgment to Rome.[85] At Rome the emperor Claudius decided in favor of the Jews and had the Samaritan leaders executed. Cumanus was exiled.[86]

It has been said that the term of the next procurator, Felix (52-60), marks the turning point in the drama which was to conclude with the great rebellion.[87] Therefore, it is fitting that we close this section with him, for with Felix the die is cast and open rebellion becomes only a matter of time.

We have Tacitus as witness to the cruelty with which Felix managed his province.[88] It would appear that the activities of the Zealots increased, perhaps as a result of the cruelty of Felix. He made a determined attempt to rid himself of their menace and succeeded in capturing a leading figure among them, Eleazar. He, together with those of his followers whom Felix captured, was sent to Rome for punishment.[89]

There arose at this point another group, the Sicarii, who received their name from the daggers (sicae) with which they were armed. The two accounts of their activities in Josephus differ in some significant ways. In one place Josephus says that Felix himself sometimes hired these sicarii to assassinate his own enemies. Such is said to have been the fate of the high priest Jonathan.[90] In the other account the sicarii

---

[85] Antiq. XX, 118-133; War II, 232-244.

[86] Antiq. XX, 134-136; War II, 245-246.

[87] Schürer, op. cit., II, 174. [88] Tacitus, History V, 9.

[89] Antiq. XX, 160-161; War II, 253. [90] Antiq. XX, 162-166

are viewed as a distinct and new group. There is no mention of their being paid to assassinate anyone, but there is great emphasis on the panic they caused by their assassinations. Here, also, they are credited with the murder of Jonathan and many others.[91]

In addition to the sicarii, there appeared a growing number of self-proclaimed prophets, who claimed as their divine mission the deliverance of the Jews.[92] This deliverance can only be understood as a movement away from the rule of Rome to the promised freedom of the kingdom of G-d.

The most famous of these religious figures with a Messianic character was an Egyptian referred to in Josephus and Acts.[93] Josephus states that this Egyptian had gathered around him a large crowd with which he was going to climb the Mount of Olives. There he would command the walls of Jerusalem to fall. Then, his followers could enter Jerusalem, overpower the Romans, and seize control of the government with him as leader. Felix stopped the Egyptian before he could begin, with many being killed or imprisoned. The Egyptian escaped, and many may have hoped for his return.[93] Such action by Felix does not seem to have stopped Jewish activity, for Josephus records an increased number of anti-Roman actions on the part of the Jews. There may also have been a joining of forces between the Jewish leaders whose activities were primarily political and those who claimed for themselves a prophetic mission.[94]

---

[91] War II, 254-257. [92] Antiq. XX, 167-168; War II, 258-260.

[93] Antiq. XX, 169-172; War II, 261-263; Acts XXI, 38. (That the Egyptian's return was hoped for is based on an interpretation of the verse in Acts. Schurer, op. cit., 180.)

[94] Antiq. XX, 172; War II, 264-265.

Section Two: Egypt from the Beginning of the Hellenistic Age to 38 A.D.

The purpose of this section is to trace the historical development of the Jewish community in Egypt, particularly in Alexandria, from the time of Alexander the Great's arrival in Egypt in 332/331 B.C. to 38 A.D., the year of the great 'pogrom' of Alexandria. Special emphasis is placed on the relations between the Jewish and Greek residents of Egypt and the gradual worsening of their relations under Roman domination. An appendix will deal with the vexing problem of Jewish citizenship in Alexandria.

Josephus states that Jews formed an element of the population of Alexandria from its foundation by Alexander,[95] but there is substantial evidence to the contrary. In effect, Josephus says that the first migration of Jews to Egypt in the Hellenistic period can be dated to the time of Alexander himself, and that Alexander gave these Jews certain rights. Our discussion will show that literary and historical sources do not substantiate this claim, but that it can be explained as an apology on the part of Josephus.

The two most important sources for the Hellenistic period in Egypt, Aristeas and Hecataeus, say nothing of a Jewish migration under Alexander. Aristeas, who made use of the work of Hecataeus, refers to Jewish migrations before Alexander and after him, but dates none to the time of Alexander.[96] While Josephus uses Hecataeus as a source and cites him as evidence of other benefactions to the Jews on the part of Alexander,[97] he does not do so in respect to Alexander's reported settling of the Jews in

---

[95]Josephus, Against Apion II, 35-42; War II, 487.

[96]Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, 272.

[97]cA. II, 43.

Alexandria.

Josephus states that the Jews received civic rights from Alexander in return for the help they gave him in his battle to conquer Egypt.[98] However, Alexander had no need to resort to arms, for the Egyptians gladly welcomed him in preference to the rule of the Persians.[99] Josephus further states that Alexander marked out a certain section of the city for Jewish habitation,[100] while in truth Alexander's founding of the city was limited to approval of only its general plan and would not have included any such detail.[101]

We can find an apologetic basis for this story in its aim to raise the prestige of the Jews in the eyes of the Greeks. The story would show that the Jews were to be numbered along with the Greeks as the conquerors of Egypt and not lumped together with the lowly Egyptian natives as the conquered.[102]

Extracts from a Jewish legend for the foundation of Alexandria are preserved in the "Alexander Romance" ascribed to Callisthenes. This story, which includes the detail of Alexander's marking off the Jewish section for the worship of G-d, may have been composed in the first century A.D.[103] This legend and the story related in Josephus may have had a common source.

While we cannot accept the story of Josephus concerning the arrival of the Jews during the time of Alexander, we can find an account of the earliest migration of the Jews into Egypt during the Hellenistic period in Aristeas, where it is stated that 100,000 Jewish captives were brought

---

[98] cA. II, 35, 42; War II, 487. [99] Tcherikover, op. cit., 4, 321.

[100] cA. II, 35. [101] Tcherikover, op. cit., 513.

[102] Ibid., 321-322. [103] Ibid., 512-513.

to Egypt at the time of Ptolemy I (323-283). Of this number, 30,000 were men of military age and these were placed in fortresses, while the rest were reduced to slavery. The number of captives is undoubtedly exaggerated, but the historical fact of a large forced migration of Jews to Egypt under Ptolemy I remains established.[104]

Under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (283-246), son of the previously mentioned ruler, those Egyptian Jews who had been slaves were set free.[105] This may be taken as evidence of the growing importance of the Jewish community and its close relationship and cooperation with the ruling family.[106]

From the Ptolemaic period we have no documented evidence of any organized anti-Semitic activity,[107] although certain Egyptians, among them Manetho, did write attacks against the Jews.[108] Manetho was an Egyptian priest under Ptolemy II, and these priests were most eager to balance the unfavorable picture given of the Egyptians in the Biblical version of the Exodus with an Egyptian story equally unfavorable to the Jews. This is the nature of the anti-Semitic attack of Manetho, who probably collected legends that had been circulated for many years to give the

---

[104]Aristeas 12-14. (Cited in Tcherikover, op. cit., 272-273 and H. Idris Bell, Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt, 32. Antiq. XII, 7-8 and cA. II, 44 are dependent on these sections of Aristeas, H. St. J. Thackeray, editor, Works of Josephus, I [Loeb Edition], 310.)

[105]Aristeas 22-24. (Cited in Tcherikover, op. cit., 273-274. Josephus gives the same information in cA. II, 45 and Antiq. XII, 11 and 24-33. This latter citation includes the text of Ptolemy's decree, found also in Aristeas.)

[106]Tcherikover, op. cit., 274.

[107]Bell, op. cit., 39, where he defines anti-Semitism as "hostility to the Jews as Jews, whether on religious or social grounds . . ."

[108]Extracts from the work of Manetho are found in cA. I, 73-102 and 228-253.

Egyptians' side of the story. The aim of this account was to show that the Jews had been a mob of lepers and had been expelled from Egypt after having ruled it brutally for 13 years.[109] This book is generally considered the first literary expression of anti-Semitism.[110]

There are, in addition, stories relating anti-Jewish acts by two of the Ptolemies. The third Book of Maccabees attributes such an act to Ptolemy IV Philopator (221-205). After he was denied entrance into the Holy of Holies of the Temple at Jerusalem, Ptolemy returned to Egypt and began to vent his anger by persecuting the Jews of Alexandria. When these Jews refused to obey his order that they worship Dionysus, he drove a number of elephants against them. The elephants, however, turned and attacked Ptolemy's own soldiers. Seeing this, he repented and granted special protection to the Jews.[111] Josephus tells a similar story concerning Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II.[112] It appears that this story has more historical value as it relates to the later Ptolemy,[113] for, as we shall see, he did have probable reasons for disliking the Jews. The author of III Maccabees probably adopted the story to his own propagandist purposes, sometime in the early first century A.D.[114] Both writers state that the Jews of Alexandria continued to celebrate such a deliverance with a feast.[115] Thus it would appear that some truth is

---

[109]Tcherikover, op. cit., 363. [110]Ibid., 273, 363-364.

[111]This story, found in III Maccabees V-VI, is summarized in Tcherikover, op. cit., 274-275, and Bell, op. cit., 39.

[112]cA. II, 53-55.

[113]Tcherikover, op. cit., 275, 282; Bell, op. cit., 40; Thackeray, op. cit., 314-315.

[114]Bell, op. cit., 40; Tcherikover, op. cit., 275.

[115]III Maccabees VI, 36; cA. II, 55.

contained in these stories, at least to the extent that at some time during the reign of the Ptolemies the Jewish community had been in grave danger.[116]

Generally, however, the relations of the Jews with the Ptolemies were harmonious. In fact, on several occasions Jews took part in the dynastic quarrels which characterized the Ptolemaic royal house.

This was particularly true under Ptolemy VI Philometor (181-145) and his immediate successors. A certain Onias, who fled from Jerusalem, came to Egypt and built a temple at Leontopolis.[117] However, his activities in the field of politics were of even more significance. He rose to a position of great prominence in the government under Philometor and his wife Cleopatra II.[118]

After Ptolemy's death Onias assumed the even more important role of protector for the widowed Cleopatra II against the designs of both Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, brother of the dead king, and the rebellious populace of Alexandria. At one point Onias entered Alexandria at the head of a large force to suppress the uprising.[119] Eventually Euergetes did become king (145-116), and it is at this point that the story of his oppression of the Jews becomes comprehensible.

Later, however, Euergetes married Cleopatra II, and in the resulting era of good feelings the Jews, along with other former enemies, were probably pardoned. Thus a deliverance was effected, as the story related.[120]

---

[116] Bell, op. cit., 40.

[117] Antiq. XII, 387-388, XIII, 62-73, 285, XX, 235-237; War I, 33, VII, 421-432.

[118] cA. II, 49. [119] cA. II, 49-52.

[120] Tcherikover, op. cit., 282.

Jewish influence with the Ptolemies continued in the reign of Cleopatra III (116-102), in the person of two sons of Onias, Helkias and Hananiah. Cleopatra was struggling with her son Ptolemy IX Lathyrus, and Helkias and Hananiah were her generals. When Lathyrus had to evacuate Alexandria and go to Cyprus, almost all of the queen's supporters went over to her son's side.[121] Only the Jews remained loyal to her "because their citizens Helkias and Hananiah were held in very high esteem by the queen."[122] This incident shows again the importance of the Jews of Egypt and the close ties between them and the Ptolemies.[123] Later, Hananiah advised the queen that she would make enemies of all the Jews of Egypt, if she did any harm to the Jewish king Alexander Jannaeus.[124]

Favors granted by the victorious Ptolemies to their Jewish supporters may have caused some resentment among the Greeks of Alexandria, but there is no reliable evidence of any pattern of persecution against the Jews.[125] Any troubles that may have existed are to be considered as political and not directly racial.[126]

The entry of the Romans into Egypt, the aid given them by the Jews, and the subsequent rewards bestowed on the Jews were among the chief elements that gradually stirred burning embers into a raging fire. In 55 B.C., the Jews came to the aid of the Roman general Gabinius, who entered Egypt to restore to the throne Ptolemy XII, a king favored by the Roman Senate.[127] Later, in 48 B.C., when Julius Caesar was beseiged at Alexandria, a Jewish force that was supposed to resist those bringing aid

---

[121] Antiq. XIII, 284-287. [122] Strabo, ap. Antiq. XIII, 287.

[123] Tcherikover, op. cit., 283. [124] Antiq. XIII, 354-355.

[125] Herbert Box, In Flaccum, xviii-xix. [126] Bell, op. cit., 40.

[127] Antiq. XIV, 98-99; War I, 175.

to Caesar was persuaded instead to help them.[128] In both cases the individual who persuaded the Jewish forces to support the Roman cause, was Antipater, father of Herod the Great.

The Greeks of Alexandria were undoubtedly humiliated to see their great city now ruled by the Romans. Their feelings toward the Jews must also have been bitter, for it was especially through the help of these people that Rome was able to gain dominance in Egypt. The Greeks were further angered when Augustus confirmed all of the rights of the Jewish residents of Alexandria and established their Senate (gerusia), while he refused to grant to the city of Alexandria its requested senate.[129] Thus it was that the Greek residents of Alexandria were particularly hospitable to Germanicus, though a Roman, in 19 A.D., when he came to their city to distribute grain and excluded the Jews from a share.[130]

All of these factors led to the development of a patriotic Egyptian literature, generally known as the "Acts of the Pagan Martyrs." These 'Acts,' though composed at a later period, refer to the years under discussion. They describe, among other events, the trials of various Alexandrians for disloyalty to Rome. Generally, they are anti-Jewish in sentiment, since it was much safer to attack the Romans through the Jews, regarded as their proteges, than to challenge Rome directly.[131]

Although the Jews were not citizens of Alexandria,[132] they nevertheless had a number of privileges of their own, which in some ways gave

---

[128] Antiq. XIV, 131-132; War I, 190.

[129] Philo, In Flaccum 74; Antiq. XIX, 282-283, 289. Also, Bell, op. cit., 41.

[130] Tacitus, Annales II, 59; cA. II, 63-64.

[131] Cambridge Ancient History, X, 308-309; Box, op. cit., xvi-xviii; Bell, op. cit., 41.

[132] See Appendix I.

them a position superior to that of the citizen body of Alexandria. The question arises as to what status these Jews had.

In order to understand the position of the Jews, we must first look into the juridical organization of Ptolemaic subjects in general. The Ptolemies, a conquering foreign dynasty, found in Egypt various groups of people. They brought and invited in other such groups. With so many groups there was no universal status or one citizenship. Each group had a differing status, depending on its particular history in Egypt. Such groups having the same national origin naturally came together and formed corporations or πολιτεύματα. Such groups retained much of their identity. They might also continue to practice some of the laws of their countries of origin and receive new privileges from the rulers. Corporations from Macedonia and Greece, among others, are recorded. Other immigrants were forced into Egypt and lived according to the rights given them.[133]

Into this general scheme fell the Jews, who were granted the right to live in accordance with and under the provisions of their own laws.[134] Many other groups were given similar privileges.[135] This grant to the Jews guaranteed them the internal autonomy of their community in respect to religious and social affairs. This autonomy did not extend to political matters.[136]

Still the Jewish community did enjoy complete freedom in all matters

---

[133]Box, op. cit., xxii-xxiii.

[134]Tcherikover, op. cit., 300-301, who draws the conclusion that these rights were given to the Jewish communities in Egypt by analogy with the letters of Antiochus III to Ptolemy (Antiq. XII, 138-144) and to Zeuxis (Antiq. XII, 148-153).

[135]Box, op. cit., xxii-xxiii; Tcherikover, op. cit., 301.

[136]Tcherikover, op. cit., 301.

of religious observance and law.[137] Strabo gives some details of the structure of the Jewish community in Alexandria: "And an ethnarch of their own has been installed, who governs the people and adjudicates suits and supervises contracts and ordinances, just as if he were the head of a sovereign state."[138] From this it can be seen that the Jews had the right to construct their synagogues, maintain an independent system of courts, educate their youth, and establish their own institutions and official posts.[139]

Augustus changed this structure to the extent that in 30 B.C., he substituted for the single ethnarch a body of elders (the gerusia).[140] Like its prototype in Jerusalem, this council had 71 members. Within the limits stated above these men had control over the Jewish community. The Jewish community, either under an ethnarch or a gerusia, appeared little different from other πολιτεύματα, but from an internal point of view it resembled nothing so much as an autonomous Greek polis.[141]

Over the years privileges and prerogatives were occasionally granted to the Jewish community or a segment of it. In the course of time these customs became accepted as having a legal force, even though this was not strictly true.[142] Such a situation was bound to create anomalies that could be seized upon by opponents of the Jews, if the enmity between the Jews and Greeks worsened and a propitious occasion arose.

---

[137] Ibid., 301.

[138] Strabo, ap. Antiq. XIV, 117. (For translation, Ralph Marcus, editor, Works of Josephus, VII [Loeb edition], 509.

[139] Tcherikover, op. cit., 301-302. [140] Philo, In Flaccum 74.

[141] Tcherikover, op. cit., 302. (Box, op. cit., xxiii-xxix, for a general discussion of the Jewish community in Alexandria.)

[142] Box, op. cit., xxix-xxx, xl.

At this point may be introduced some ancillary questions. Although the Jewish community in Alexandria was by far the largest and most influential, it was by no means the only one. The tax-receipts of the second century B.C. from the Theban district include a number issued by Jewish tax-collectors. In Roman times and earlier there was a sizable Jewish element at Apollonopolis Magna (modern Edfû). Oxyrhynchus also had a large population. In the Fayyûm or Arsinoite nome, there were also many Jews. They were found in several communities of this nome: Alexandrou Nesos and Arsinoe, the capital city of the nome.[143]

There were also many Jews in the Delta. The Antonine Itinerary mentions a Vicus Judaeorum. Outside of Alexandria, the best known Jewish settlement in the Delta was at or near Leontopolis. The site is now called Tell-el-Yahudiyeh, Arabic for "The Mound of the Jews."[144] It has been said that the Jews were found everywhere in Egypt "from the Ladder of Libya to the frontiers of Ethiopia."[145]

It is necessary to dispel the conception that some scholars have of a ghetto in Alexandria. While it is probably true that at first the Jews settled in a particular quarter of the city, the fourth, it would be incorrect to refer to this as a ghetto. The term ghetto, in its medieval and modern usage, carries with it the idea of forcible segregation of the Jews and cutting them off from the general life of the community. No such intent is evidenced in Alexandria. Rather, the Jews inhabited a specific quarter because their way of life was so different from that of their Greek and Hellenized neighbors.[146] The Jews of

---

[143]Bell, op. cit., 33-35. [144]Ibid., 35.

[145]Philo, In Flaccum 43. [146]Bell, op. cit., 36.

Alexandria were probably never assigned a particular quarter,[147] but may themselves have made such a decision. In either case the Jews of Alexandria, like those of other places, wanted to live near each other to create the proper atmosphere for the traditional way of living.[148]

However, they were not confined to this district. Philo states that in his time the Jews occupied the greater part of two quarters and that synagogues were found in all five quarters of the city.[149] It was not until the fateful year 38 that the suggestion of segregating the Jews into a ghetto was made.[150]

There is no evidence to indicate any limitations on the professions that the Jewish residents of Alexandria could follow. Jews appear in all types of occupations from soldiers and officials in government posts to shepherds, craftsmen, traders and sailors.[151]

Attention must be paid to the Jewish role in tax-collecting, and commercial and economic enterprises. There were a number of Jews engaged in the collecting of petty customs, and such collectors were a source of universal criticism. It is hard to tell why so many Jews were found in these posts, for they were not particularly profitable.[152]

Jews also played an important role in commerce, and some became quite wealthy.[153] Jews were also moneylenders. A papyrus from 41 A.D.

---

[147]As Josephus says in War II, 488 (where the Ptolemies are said to have assigned a particular quarter to the Jews) and cA. II, 35 (where the assigning is credited to Alexander).

[148]Tcherikover, op. cit., 304-305.

[149]Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 132; In Flaccum 55.

[150]Bell, op. cit., 36 (based on Philo, In Flaccum 55). [151]Ibid., 42.

[152]For examples of the popular attitude toward tax-collectors, Philo, De Specialibus Legibus I, 143, II, 90-95, III, 157-168; Luke XIX, 2-7

[153]The brother of Philo, Alexander, may be cited in this respect.

is unique in its warning: "like every one else, do you too beware of the Jews" in borrowing money.[154] Since, however, this document was written during that period when Jewish-Greek relations were most strained, it is difficult to give an exact interpretation to it. At the very least, it does clearly indicate that Jews were engaged in the profession of lending money at interest.[155]

The Jews of the upper class were not characteristic of Jews in the Diaspora.[156] Evidence for this can be found in the many citations in which the Jews are derided for their poverty.[157] In any event, Jewish wealth was never a source of criticism for anti-Semitic writers.[158]

Bell concludes that in Alexandria the wealth of the Jews was not one of the factors that led to their persecution.[159] On a more general note is the statement of Tcherikover that from an economic point of view the Jews differed in no way from their neighbors.[160]

A number of factors indicate that there was a significant rift in the Jewish community on religious beliefs and practices.[161] While one faction undoubtedly remained strict in its observance of the Mosaic Law, many Jews in Egypt, living as they did in a pagan environment and out of immediate touch with Jerusalem, showed laxity in their observance. Claudius, in his letter to the Alexandrians in 41 A.D. (which is discussed in other contexts at appropriate points), refers to the Jews'

---

[154]Tcherikover, op. cit., 339; Bell, op. cit., 42.

[155]Tcherikover, op. cit., 339-340; Bell, op. cit., 42.

[156]Tcherikover, op. cit., 340; Bell, op. cit., 42.

[157]For example, cA. II, 33; Juvenal, Satires III, 14-16; Martial, Epigrammata XII, 57.

[158]Tcherikover, op. cit., 340. [159]Bell, op. cit., 42.

[160]Tcherikover, op. cit., 343. [161]Bell, op. cit., 42.

sending two embassies to him. From this fact and from the presumed request of one of these two groups for admission into the games of the city, it seems clear that representatives of both the more observant group and of the more Hellenized Jews had been sent to Claudius.[162] In one respect the Jews of Alexandria differed from their brethren in Palestine in that Greek served the former as their chief language, and many had little or no knowledge of the Semitic languages, Hebrew and Aramaic.[163]

Our consideration of the history and development of the Jewish community in Egypt and particularly in Alexandria has shown that hostility between the Jews and Greeks was gradually worsening in the period just before the Roman domination of that country, and that this process was greatly accelerated during the early years of the principate. There is left to consider exactly what each party to the conflict hoped to gain.

Both the Jews and the Greeks sought to strengthen their position, and the ambiguities inherent in the Jewish position in the city afforded material for both sides. The Jews sought to have legalized the whole trend toward unification of the Jewish community internally and externally toward increasing participation in rights strictly belonging to the citizen body of Alexandria. The Jews could point to the fact that many non-Jews had been admitted illegally into the citizen body.[164] Claudius in his letter affirms that many had been wrongly enrolled as citizens.[165]

---

[162]Bell, op. cit., 43-44; Box, op. cit., xxix-xxx. (This letter of Claudius was first published by H. I. Bell in Jews and Christians in Egypt, 1924. The lines of Claudius' letter referred to here are 88-93.)

[163]Tcherikover, op. cit., 347; Bell, op. cit., 44.

[164]Box, op. cit., xxix-xxx.

[165]Lines 52-57 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians.

To the Alexandrians these same anomalies in the Jewish status provided additional ammunition for their attack against the Jews. They could surely collect evidence that the Jews were exceeding in one way or another the rights given them, that all Jews were enjoying rights originally bestowed on only a few, and that no evidence existed that the Jews really were entitled to benefit from this or that privilege.[166]

This, then, was the situation in Alexandria in 38 A.D. Only one spark was needed to ignite the fire; that spark was to be the accession of Gaius to the throne.

---

[166]Box, op. cit., xxix-xxx. That such a policy was practiced against the Jews can be seen in Philo, In Flaccum 24 (according to the interpretation of Box, op. cit., xl).

Section Three: Gaius, Claudius, and the Jews

As tense and serious as the situation in Alexandria was in the years immediately preceding 38 A.D., the discord between the Jews and Greeks might never have broken out into open conflict had it not been for certain events in Rome. The accession to the throne of Gaius in 37 A.D. was at first viewed as the dawn of a new and brighter era for the Roman Empire.[167] However, soon after the illness which struck him during his first year as emperor, the voices of hope were replaced by the prophets of doom. Many in the Empire feared for their very lives, as the character of the mad Gaius evidenced itself.[168]

One such individual was A. Avillius Flaccus, who had been appointed prefect of Egypt by Tiberius in 32 A.D.[169] That Flaccus administered his province ably and fairly during the first five years of his tenure is admitted even by his archenemy Philo.[170] However, Flaccus had, or at least felt he had, real reason to fear Gaius. Flaccus had been a friend of Gemellus, Gaius' co-regent, and Macro, the praetorian prefect. As these and others fell one by one victim to the madness of Gaius, Flaccus grew increasingly concerned about his own welfare.[171]

Into this situation stepped the Greek protagonists Dionysius, Isidorus, and Lampo.[172] Although the last two had been personal enemies

---

[167] *Leg.* 8-13. The Jews of Alexandria offered sacrifices at his accession, *Leg.* 356.

[168] *Leg.* 23-73. (Others who write of Gaius' madness include Josephus, *Antiq.* XIX, 1-2; Dio Cassius LIX, 29.1; Tacitus, *Annales* XI, 3; Suetonius, *Caligula* 22; Seneca, *Ad S. de Constantia Sapientis* XVIII, 1.)

[169] *Flacc.* 2, 8. [170] *Ibid.*, 1-8.

[171] *Flacc.* 9-16. (For death of Gemellus, *Flacc.* 10-11, *Leg.* 23-31; for death of Macro, *Flacc.* 11-15, *Leg.* 32-61.)

[172] *Flacc.* 20.

of Flaccus,[173] they were all now willing to promise that the city of Alexandria would intercede with Gaius on Flaccus' behalf.[174] For their service they exacted from Flaccus the promise that he would support them against the Jews in the latter's attempt to gain full citizenship of Alexandria. Flaccus agreed.[175]

The attack against the Jews was not pressed by force in the beginning, but rather by legal means. We have seen that many anomalies existed in the area of Jewish rights. Over the centuries rights legally granted to the Jews and those merely assumed by them had become practically indistinguishable. Now, as legal cases were brought before Flaccus to which one or more Jews were a party, he ruled invalid all rights of the Jews except those for which a legal basis could be determined.[176] Although he may have been correct in a strict legal sense, he was going against four centuries of custom, which had sanctioned many extralegal privileges of the Jews. Such action must have been considered as anti-Jewish.

It was not early summer of 38. Precisely at this time, when relations between the Jewish and Greek residents of Alexandria were rapidly deteriorating, there arrived in the city Herod Agrippa. A grandson of Herod the Great and close friend of Gaius, Agrippa had been awarded a

---

[173] Flacc. 128-134 (on the previous activities of Lampo); Flacc. 135-145 (on the prior activities of Isidorus against Flaccus).

[174] Flacc. 17-24.

[175] Flacc. 23-24. (What the Greeks sought in their request that Flaccus surrender and sacrifice the Jews was a ruling by him that would permanently destroy any hopes the Jews had of becoming citizens and limit them to only those rights to which they could prove they were entitled. Box, op. cit., xxxviii-xxxix.)

[176] Flacc. 24. (According to the interpretation of Box, op. cit., xl.)

kingdom in Palestine and was on his way to take control of it.[177] His arrival was looked upon by the Jews as a signal for rejoicing, for they felt themselves in need of a powerful ally.[178] Not only was Flaccus pursuing the policy mentioned above, but the Jews also had reason to believe that Flaccus had not forwarded, as promised, a resolution by the Jewish community to Gaius upon his accession to the throne.[179]

With these fears in mind, the Jews persuaded Agrippa to make a show of power and, hopefully, to help the Jews regain the ground they were losing.[180] However, the effect was quite the opposite, as the infuriated Alexandrians made a public mockery of Agrippa and his entourage. Flaccus took no action against them.[181]

The Alexandrian leaders soon realized that such actions against a favorite of Gaius were bound to have serious repercussions. In order to divert the emperor's attention from the previous events and to put the Jews in a less favorable position, they attempted to introduce images of Gaius into the synagogues, an action which the Jews resisted as best they could.[182] After all, previous emperors, knowing that the Jews forbade

---

[177] Flacc. 25-28. (Josephus makes no mention of this visit in his discussion of Agrippa's trip to Judea in 38. Antiq. XIII, 238-239; War II, 181. He does make passing reference to such a visit in Antiq. XVIII, 179. The reign and death of Agrippa was discussed above.)

[178] Flacc. 30, 103, and the subsequent reaction of the Alexandrians to his visit (Flacc. 29-40) have been interpreted to show that, although Agrippa apparently desired that his visit should excite no interest (Flacc. 25-28), he was persuaded by the Jews of Alexandria to help them, and that he did so through some sort of public display of power. (Box, op. cit., xl-xli; CAH, X, 310; F. H. Colson, editor, Philo, IX /Loeb edition/, 318-319.)

[179] Flacc. 97-103. [180] See above, 178.

[181] Flacc. 29-40. [182] Flacc. 41-52.

graven images, had exempted the Jews from such a form of worship.[183]

There followed a short period of general turmoil, during which Flaccus published the edict that the Greek leaders had demanded. Henceforth, the Jews could retain only those rights which rested on a firm and undisputed basis.[184] The mobs interpreted this edict as giving them power to move the Jews by force back to the quarter in which they had originally settled.[185]

The situation passed from turmoil into slaughter, as Jews suffered all kinds of indignities and many met brutal deaths.[186] The Alexandrian leaders may well have been surprised by the violent emotions they had unleashed.[187]

Only the arrest and eventual exile and death of Flaccus calmed the situation. Agrippa had a hand in Flaccus' downfall, but the strongest accusations against him came from the very men, Isidorus and Lampo, who had persuaded Flaccus to adopt his ultimately fatal course of action.[188]

Our primary source for all of the events thus far related is Philo's In Flaccum, although his other major historical work, Legatio ad Gaium, does refer briefly, and with some differences, to many of the same incidents.[189] The historicity of Philo's account of the events of 38 has

---

[183] Leg. 152-161 (for a praise of Augustus and Tiberius and their attitude toward the Jews).

[184] Flacc. 54. (According to the interpretation of Box, op. cit., xliv, such was the legal meaning of the edict.)

[185] Flacc. 55-57. (The interpretation of the motives of the crowd, Box, op. cit., xliv-xlv.)

[186] Flacc. 58-96. [187] Box, op. cit., xlvii. [188] Flacc. 104-191.

[189] Leg. 114-165. There are significant differences in the two accounts. While in Flacc. 41-52 the desecration of the synagogue precedes the violence against the Jews, in Leg. 132-136 such action follows the 'pogrom.'

However, the chief difference in the two accounts involves the motivation for the actions of the Alexandrians. Leg. 115-120 states that

never seriously been challenged, except for that long section dealing with the last part of Flaccus' life,[190] a section which is filled with echoes from the Bible and theological teachings.[191]

After Flaccus' arrest and the arrival of a new prefect, some semblance of order was restored to Alexandria. Although the Jewish community recovered to some extent, the situation was still tense and the outcome was far from certain.[192]

At this point each of the rival factions, Jewish and Greek, appointed an embassy of five leaders to go to Italy and obtain from Gaius a ruling

---

Gaius had already begun to pursue an anti-Semitic course prior to 38 because the Jews were the only people unwilling to accept his self-deification (details of which are found in Leg. 74-113). The Greeks of Alexandria, perceiving this hostility of Gaius toward the Jews, used such hostility as a pretext for their attack of the Jews. Thus the Greeks feared no punishment for their actions (Leg. 133).

In Flaccum, as seen above, it is Flaccus who merits criticism as the individual most responsible for the anti-Jewish actions of the mobs. In this account there is no mention made of any particular policy of Gaius against the Jews.

Which chronology, then, is correct? It is generally agreed that the hostility of Gaius toward the Jews was a result, not a cause, of the riots in Alexandria. (Theodor Mommsen, ap. Mary Smallwood, op. cit., 206-207). Gaius saw the Jewish opposition to the introduction of his images into the synagogues, and this was probably the first incident that singled the Jews out as a people deserving of punishment from his point of view. (Mary Smallwood, op. cit., 206-207.) Therefore, the chronology as recorded in In Flaccum is probably correct.

Josephus devotes one sentence, Antiq. XVIII, 257, to this struggle in Alexandria.

[190] Flacc. 151-191.

[191] Box, op. cit., xlvii-xlviii. (An example of the Biblical echoes in this account is 176-177, where Philo may have had in mind the story of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel IV, 31-37. Perhaps the best example of a theological teaching contained in this account is the last sentence of In Flaccum, 191.)

[192] Leg. 356. The Jews of Alexandria sacrificed a hecatomb after Gaius' successful campaign in Germany in 39. (This is interpreted by Box, op. cit., xlviii-xlix, as an indication that some degree of prosperity had returned to the Jewish community in Alexandria.)

favorable to their respective position.[193] The two issues at stake were (a) freedom of worship for the Jews according to their own laws and (b) the legal status of the Jews at Alexandria.[194] Philo was the head of the Jewish delegation, and his narrative Legatio forms our principal source for the embassy to Gaius.[195]

Shortly after their arrival the Jews first met Gaius.[196] This was probably in the year 40, although it may have been a year earlier.[197] When Gaius again summoned the Jewish embassy before him, he at first paid no attention to their arguments and finally dismissed them as a foolish people.[198] Philo does not relate any further decision that may have been rendered by Gaius.

However, between the time of the first meeting with Gaius and their final audience with him, there occurred an event which threatened the Jews far more than the struggles at Alexandria and filled the Jewish delegation with more apprehension. About two-fifths of the present text of

---

[193] Antiq. XVIII, 257 (where Josephus says that each delegation had three members). But Philo (Leg. 370) says that the Jewish delegation numbered five. The report of Philo, being firsthand, is to be favored. (Feldman, op. cit., 153.)

[194] Box, op. cit., xlix-l. (The religious aspects of the Jewish claims are contained in the letter of Agrippa, reproduced in Leg. 276-329. The political issues are referred to in Leg. 178, 194, 349. Box states that what the Jews laid claim to was the full citizenship of Alexandria.)

[195] Josephus, Antiq. XVIII, 259, names Philo as the head of the Jewish delegation.

[196] Leg. 181-183.

[197] CAH, X, 662. (Colson, op. cit., X, xxvii-xxxi, argues for 39 as the year of this meeting.)

[198] Leg. 349-367. (Antiq. XVIII, 259-260 appears to be referring to this meeting, even though in Josephus it is placed before the incident concerning the erection of Gaius' statue.)

Legatio is taken up with the story of this event.[199]

In the early summer of 40 Gaius heard from Herennius Capito, procurator of Jamnia in Judea, that the Jews had torn down an altar which the non-Jewish inhabitants of that city had built for him. Enraged, Gaius ordered the Roman governor of Syria, P. Petronius, to introduce a colossal statue of himself into the Temple at Jerusalem.[200] Such an attempt to desecrate the Temple could only be met with the fiercest opposition of the Jews, and Petronius was wise enough to understand this. Petronius tried to persuade the vast assembly of Jews who had gathered in Jerusalem, prepared to die rather than to allow what was to them the ultimate sacrilege, to agree to the introduction of the statue.[201]

Failing this, Petronius did succeed in averting the virtual genocide which was certain to follow had he immediately implemented Gaius' order. Gaius relented somewhat, and an urgent appeal from Agrippa finally moved him to drop his plans.[202] Nevertheless, Philo states that Gaius was contemplating further steps against the Jews.[203] The murder of Gaius in 41 saved Petronius and undoubtedly also saved the Jews from further repressions and discrimination from Gaius.[204]

The news of the death of Gaius must have been received in Alexandria sometime in February of that year.[205] The departure of Gaius and accession of Claudius could have been seen by the Jews only as a favorable turn of events, and they immediately sought to regain through force what they

---

[199] Leg. 184-338. (This incident is also related by Josephus, Antiq. XVIII, 261-309; War II, 184-203; By Tacitus, History V, 9.)

[200] Leg. 188, 197-206. [201] Leg. 207-242. [202] Leg. 243-333.

[203] Leg. 334-338. [204] Antiq. XVIII, 304-309; War II, 203.

[205] Box, op. cit., 1.

had lost previously.[206]

Claudius, hearing of the outbreak, ordered its suppression,[207] but at the same time issued an edict that the Jews of Alexandria were to enjoy all rights that they had possessed prior to Gaius' principate. Claudius also disassociated himself from the former emperor's anti-Jewish policies. Both parties to the present conflict were warned against any renewal of fighting.[208]

This edict was followed by another granting to world Jewry the same rights enjoyed by the Jews of Alexandria. In this same edict Claudius commands the Jews to respect the religious beliefs of other peoples.[209] Our sole source for these documents is Josephus.

At this point each of the rival groups in Alexandria again sought to gain the decisive advantage over the other by dispatching an embassy to Rome. The Jews and Greeks alike felt that they could permanently damage the strength of their opponents by convincing Claudius that the fault for the recent disturbances lay with the rival faction.[210] While Claudius responded to some questions brought to him by the embassies, he informed them that more delicate matters would be dealt with after he had consulted with his advisers. These included the determination of who was at fault in the recent disturbances and what status the Jews should have.[211]

This, then, is the background of the famous letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, to which reference has already been made in connection

---

[206] Antiq. XIX, 278. [207] Antiq. XIX, 279. [208] Antiq. XIX, 279-285.

[209] Antiq. XIX, 286-291. [210] Box, op. cit., li-lii.

[211] There are no contemporary references outside of the Letter of Claudius to this embassy, but internal evidence yields a wealth of information. From lines 73-76 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians, it is clear that Claudius was at that point referring to matters about which he had previously deferred giving an opinion.

with the varying degrees of religious observance in the Diaspora. As will be noted in Appendix I, Claudius ended any hopes for full citizenship that the Jews still retained, but guaranteed them all the rights that they had previously possessed.[212] At the same time he sternly forbade the entrance into Alexandria of Jews from Syria or other areas of Egypt.[213]

The Jewish question in Alexandria was still not firmly settled, as can be deduced from a fragment of the 'Acts of the Pagan Martyrs.' In 53 Isidorus and Lampo complained before Claudius that the Jews were a menace to the peace of the world. That they failed to win their case is clear from a later fragment referring to the execution of the two Greek leaders.[114]

---

[212]Lines 82-95 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians.

[213]Lines 96-100 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians.

[214]Box, op. cit., liii; CAH, X, 311-312.

CHAPTER II

POLITICS, MESSIANISM, AND PHILO

Section One: Politics

The political activity and controversies that raged in the Palestine-Egypt area during the time of Philo drew many individuals into the arena of public life. As diverse as they were in background, motives, and ultimate contributions, still they were all attracted to that arena from which a few returned victorious, more, deeply battered, while most failed to return at all.

The exact opposite course was followed by such groups as the Essenes,[1] who refused to live in large cities and established their communities in smaller towns, and the Therapeutae, who withdrew from the cities and towns to live in isolated, rigidly controlled communities.[2] Philo writes the following about the motives of the Therapeutae:

> And they do not migrate into another city like the unfortunate or worthless slaves who demand to be sold by their owners and so procure a change of masters but not freedom. For every city, even the best governed, is full of turmoils and disturbances innumberable which no one could endure who has ever been even once under the guidance of wisdom.

---

[1]The Essenes are described by Josephus in Jewish Antiquities XIII, 172, XV, 371 (where they are compared to the Pythagoreans), XVIII, 18-22; The Jewish War II, 119-161. Philo describes them in Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit 75-91, Hypothetica XI, 1-18.

[2]Philo devotes an entire book, De Vita Contemplativa, to the Therapeutae.

> Instead of this they pass their days outside the walls pursuing solitude in gardens or lonely bits of country, not from any acquired habit of misanthropical bitterness but because they know how unprofitable and mischievous are associations with persons of dissimilar character.[3]

Undoubtedly the majority of people at that time, as in all other times, gave little thought to political or philosophical speculations, for they were so concerned with earning a daily living and providing for their families that little time was left for the abstract or elevated.

The responses of each of these three groups--the politically motivated, the ascetics, and the uncommitted majority--to the problems of the day were quite dissimilar, while the aspirations of all three were probably remarkably similar. However, only those aspirations which have been recorded can now be considered.

A question arises as to which of these groups Philo belonged. The very fact that Philo's works are extant precludes his having belonged to the third group. The prevailing opinion through the first quarter of the twentieth century tended to place Philo in the second group, at least to the extent that no great importance was attached to his political writings. The view of Emile Bréhier (Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie, first published in 1925) can be cited as typical of this attitude.[4]

The chief exponent in challenging the prevailing opinion has been

---

[3]Cont. 19-20.

[4]Emile Bréhier, Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie, 13-34. (Bréhier's contention, briefly stated, is that Philo had very little, if any interest in the practical political problems of his day.)

Erwin R. Goodenough, who has written extensively on Philo.[5] Goodenough argues, on the basis of Philo's selection to the leadership of the embassy to Gaius, that Philo was a man to whom an interest in the politics of the day was most important.[6] This is not to say that Philo was not a significant philosopher in matters completely out of the realm of politics. Rather, it is an attempt to place emphasis on an aspect of his life that has been too long ignored. Many, including Mary Smallwood in her edition of Legatio ad Gaium, have felt that there is considerable validity to this basic argument of Goodenough.[7]

That Philo was no stranger to politics can be adduced from passages both in Philo and in Josephus. The following had, before Goodenough, been taken to mean that Philo's entry into public life began with the embassy to Gaius:

> There was once a time when by devoting myself to philosophy and to contemplation of the world and its parts I achieved the enjoyment of that Mind which is truly beautiful, desirable, and blessed; for I lived in constant communion with sacred words and teachings, in which I greedily and insatiably rejoiced. No base or wordly thoughts occurred to me, nor did I crawl for glory, wealth, or bodily comfort, but I seemed ever to be borne aloft in the heights in a rapture of soul, and to accompany sun, moon, and all heaven and the universe in their revolutions. Then, ah, then peeping downwards from the etherial heights and directing the eye of my intelligence as from a watch-tower, I regarded the untold spectacle of all earthly things, and reckoned myself happy at having forcibly escaped the

---

[5]The following may be cited as representative of Goodenough's writing on Philo specifically and Hellenistic Judaism in general: De Specialibus Legibus, The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt (1929); By Light, Light; the Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism (1935); The Politics of Philo Judaeus (1938); Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (1953-1958); An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (1962); "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis" Harvard Theological Review XXVI; "Philo and Public Life" Journal of Egyptian Archaeology XII.

[6]Goodenough, "Philo and Public Life," JEA, XII, 77; The Politics of Philo Judaeus, 2.

[7]Mary Smallwood, op. cit., 250.

calamities of mortal life.

> And yet there lurked near me that most grievous of evils, Envy, with its hatred of all that is fair (ὁ μισόκαλος φθόνος), which suddenly fell upon me, and did not cease forcibly dragging upon me until it had hurled me down into the vast sea of political cares (μέγα πέλαγος τῶν ἐν πολιτείᾳ φροντίδων), where I am still tossed about and unable even so much as to rise to the surface. But though I groan at my fate, I still struggle on, for I have, implanted in my soul from early youth, a desire for education which ever has pity and compassion upon me, and lifts me up and elevates me. This it is by which I can sometimes raise my head, and by which, though their penetration is dimmed by the mists of alien concerns, I can yet cast about in some measure with the eyes of my soul upon my surroundings, while I long to suck in life pure and unmixed with evils. And if unexpectedly there is quiet and calm in the political tumults, I emerge from the waves winged though unable to fly, but am blown along by the breezes of understanding (ἐπιστήμη), which often persuades me to run away as it were for a holiday with her from my pitiless masters, who are not only men, but also the great variety of practical affairs which are deluged upon me from without like a torrent. Still, even in such a condition, I ought to thank G-d that while I am inundated I am not sucked down into the depths. Rather, though in despair of any good hope I had considered the eyes of my soul to be incapacitated, now I open them and am flooded with the light of wisdom, so that I am not abandoned for the whole of my life to darkness. And so, behold, I dare not only read the sacred expositions of Moses, but even, with a passion for understanding, I venture to examine each detail, and to disclose and publish what is not known to the multitude.[8]

Goodenough found several difficulties in the accepted interpretation of this passage. Philo states that he was an old man c. 40 A.D.[9] However, Goodenough understands Philo to be speaking here of an interruption that occurred many years before. Therefore, this could not be a reference to a single interruption near the end of his life. It appears from this passage that Philo turned to writing after he was forced to enter public life. It would be impossible to assign to the period after 38 all of Philo's vast corpus, especially when we consider that the time he had for

---

[8]Philo, De Specialibus Legibus III, 1-6. (The translation is that of Goodenough.)

[9]Philo, Leg. 1.

such writing was limited by his political activities.[10]

Thus it becomes clear from this passage that Philo's entry into the political arena came many years before the embassy. A passage in Josephus, describing Philo as τὰ πάντα ἔνδοξος , leads to the possible conclusion that Philo was known for activities outside of the philosophical realm.[11]

Further, Philo came from a wealthy and politically active family, as his brother Alexander was alabarch of Alexandria and his nephew Ti. Julius Alexander rose to great prominence in the Roman bureaucratic system. Goodenough is able to say that Philo's main career was in public service and was based on the belief that his leadership was needed by the Jewish people.[12]

If politics played such an important role in Philo's life, why haven't large numbers of passages been discovered previously to substantiate this? The answer to this question would appear to rest on an adequate appreciation of the political realities of Philo's time. It was not an age when one could speak openly on delicate matters. This was true for all, but especially for a Jew like Philo, who realized that the Jewish position throughout the civilized world was always in danger of compromise. It was necessary to speak, and speak he did, but Philo realized that different approaches had to be taken according to the prospective audience he was addressing.[13] One must be more circumspect when writing for a potentially hostile gentile audience than would be

---

[10]Goodenough, "Philo and Public Life," JEA, XII, 78-79.

[11]Antiq. XVIII, 259 (according to the interpretation of Goodenough, "Philo and Public Life," JEA 77, and Mary Smallwood, op. cit., 250).

[12]Goodenough, Politics, 68. [13]Ibid., 4-7.

necessary when composing for the gentile who had a benevolent attitude toward Judaism. Moreover, Philo could express himself fully even on the most inflammatory issues to his co-religionists provided that others who read these passages found them completely innocent. So, Goodenough concludes, we do find a number of references to political matters, but often the most significant of these, having been composed for Philo's closest associates, confuse and mislead the modern reader as much as they probably did the ancient one.[14]

Utilizing these assumptions, Goodenough is able to reconcile some passages of Philo that had previously been considered enigmas. One pertinent example concerns the story of Joseph. In two different places extensive reference is made to Joseph. Among the collection known as the "Allegory" is De Somniis. In the first and second books of De Somniis, Joseph is seen as the archetype of a Roman ruler and is attacked as such.[15] However, another group of books, the "Exposition," contains De Josepho, in which Joseph is exalted as a magnanimous and irreproachable ruler of Egypt.[16] These two views, seemingly irreconcilable, are easily understood if one accepts the premise that each was written for a different audience. Tucked away in the "Allegory," a deep and philosophical tract intended exclusively for the educated Jew, a criticism of the Roman ruler would almost certainly go unnoticed by any casual reader. On the other hand, the "Exposition" was written for a general audience for whom prudence suggests a different tact be used. Joseph here stands for an

---

[14] Loc. cit.

[15] Among numerous references may be cited De Somniis II 15-16, 47, 78-79.

[16] The following may be cited as representative: De Josepho 6, 37-40, 86-87.

idealized ruler, and Philo wants to impress upon the pagan reader the fact that Judaism early produced an example of such a ruler.[17]

In documenting further Philo's interest in politics we shall first consider his philosophical work and conclude with the works written with political controversies more clearly in mind. It should be noted that Philo never praised Roman rule, finding that of the Ptolemies to have been much more satisfactory to the Jews.[18] The Jewish state, founded by Moses, began in moderation, with Moses himself setting the example.[19] How unlike this were Roman rulers, especially Gaius. At least two attacks of a general nature against the Romans appear in De Somniis:

> What is the use of providing an unstinted number of silver and gold goblets, except for the gratification of great arrogance (τῦφος) and empty opinion which is always swinging to and fro? And when some people are crowned they are not satisfied with a fragrant garland of laurel, or ivy, or violets, or lilies, or roses, or of any sort of green bough or flower, for they pass by the gifts which G-d has given them in the seasons of the year, and shamelessly put golden wreaths on their heads, the heaviest sort of burden, in the middle of the crowded market place. Can we think that they are anything else than slaves of empty opinion, although they say that they are not only free men but are even the rulers over many other people?[20]

> Are there not certain men who are more savage and treacherous than boars, snakes, and asps, men whose treachery and hostility can be escaped only by by mollifying and propitiating them? So for example Abraham the wise man did obeisance to the sons of Chet (whose name means those who "disperse"), because the emergency convinced him he must do so.[21]

In addition to these general criticisms of the Romans, Philo also registered a number of specific ones. The tax-collectors were outrageous.[22]

---

[17]Goodenough, op. cit., 21-63. [18]Philo, De Vita Mosis II, 28-30.

[19]De Vita Mosis I, 148, 150, 152, II, 12-14. [20]De Somniis II, 61-62.

[21]De Somniis II, 89.

[22]De Specialibus Legibus I, 143, II, 90-95; III, 157-168.

Even a good ruler could not stop the evil prefect from carrying out his deceits.[23]

The same assumption made in connection with the "Exposition" also holds true for In Flaccum; namely, that it was written for a gentile audience.[24] The Roman prefect Flaccus is attacked explicitly and openly by Philo. Undoubtedly such a direct attack on a person of prominence could only have been attempted after Flaccus' downfall and disgrace. The apparent message of this, as well as of Legatio, in which Gaius becomes the archetypal villain, is that the Jews are the 'chosen' and protected people of G-d, who will destroy all that harm his people. In the same way the fall of Sejanus is explained.[25] Goodenough has suggested that beyond this, Philo wrote In Flaccum to be presented to the new prefect not only as an explanation of the recent disturbances, but also as a 'lesson' on practical politics that the prudent prefect would be ill-advised to ignore.[26]

A similar purpose may be ascribed to Legatio ad Gaium. In this case the message is meant for the emperor. The ruler must treat the Jews with respect or dire consequences are inevitable. Philo does not dare, as confident as he may be of Claudius' good will toward the Jews, to suggest precepts himself, but rather he uses Macro as the vehicle for

---

[23]Philo, In Flaccum 105. [24]Goodenough, op. cit., 10.

[25]This statement is a conjecture based on two factors. The closing sentence of In Flaccum (191) is as follows: τοιαῦτα καὶ Φλάκκος ἐπαθε γενόμενος ἀψευδεστάτη πίστις τοῦ μὴ ἀπεστερῆσθαι τὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἐπικουρίας τῆς ἐκ θεοῦ. _____ appears to have the meaning of also, and this has been interpreted as a possible reference to Sejanus. Secondly, most scholars feel that a portion of In Flaccum is missing. Since Sejanus is referred to in the opening sentence of In Flaccum, the missing section, or a part of it, may well have recounted the deeds and eventual fall of Sejanus. (F. H. Colson, editor, Philo, IX [Loeb edition], 295, 403.)

[26]Goodenough, op. cit., 10-12.

expressing himself.[27]

It is true that in Legatio Philo praises Augustus and Tiberius. This praise, however, makes it clear that Philo would never have conceded divinity to any Roman ruler (a crucial point in the encounter with Gaius), and that the Jews would gladly sacrifice for the emperor, but never to him.[28] In each case praise of these two emperors, as well as of others like Marcus Agrippa, Petronius, and Julia, is measured in proportion to the degree that each showed favor to the Jews.[29]

There are broad hints throughout the two treatises of the power of the Jews, should they ever join together in opposition to Rome.[30] (It was unquestionably a similar confidence that led to the revolt in Palestine only a quarter of a century later.)[31] Again Philo would never have dared express such sentiments in his own words and thus uses Agrippa and Petronius to this purpose.[32]

Mary Smallwood finds an additional example of possible involvement by Philo in political life. A letter written by Agrippa to Gaius concerning the latter's planned reprisals against the Jews of Palestine for the incident at Jamnia is given in Legatio 276-329. It is probably not a verbatim copy of Agrippa's letter, but certainly the main ideas of the original are incorporated in it. Miss Smallwood has suggested that Philo had a hand in writing the letter, at least those portions dealing

---

[27]As, for example, Leg. 43-51. (For a statement of the purpose of Legatio, Goodenough, op. cit., 19.

[28]Leg. 136-161 (for praise of two emperors); Leg. 349-367, especially 357 (for an account of the meeting with Gaius).

[29]Leg. 291, 294-297 (for Agrippa), 243-245 (for Petronius), 291, 319-320 (for Julia).

[30]Leg. 214-217, 281-282; Flacc. 43. [31]Goodenough, op. cit., 19-20.

[32]Leg. 214-217 (for Petronius), 281-282 (for Agrippa).

in detail with considerations shown the Jews under previous emperors.[33]

In summary, it is apparent to Goodenough that the author of Legatio and In Flaccum was a politician of practical experience who spoke of politics knowledgeably.[34] The method adopted by Philo to express his political ideas varied according to the intended audience, but it must now be apparent that his interest in politics was real, his views important, his experience significant.

It is equally clear that his attitude was one of unfailing opposition to the Romans. They could be useful only when they acted as divine agents to avenge the Jews (even Gaius could be used by G-d for this purpose), and a Roman was to be praised only to the degree that he showed favor to the Jews.

We set out at the beginning of this section to indicate that Philo did have experience and interest in politics. His political theory, especially concerning the ideal state and its ruler, seems to us to take on more meaning if placed in the next section on the Messiah. An interpretation of Philo's goals and his success at reaching them will be included in the next chapter.

33Smallwood, op. cit., 292. 34Goodenough, op. cit., 20.

Section Two: Messianism

A curiosity about the ultimate purpose and achievements of each man individually and mankind as a whole has probably marked man since his beginnings. One road that such speculation takes is the attempt to determine what fate awaits us after life, and very often a Messiah figure is introduced into such attempts. Certainly such a figure has its roots in man's earliest abstractions. However, it would appear that credit must be given to the Hebrews and then the Jews for having incorporated this concept into our heritage.

In this section we will consider first the general trend of Jewish Messianic thought up to and including Philo's time. Then attention will be given to the popularity of the Messianic hope, both in the Greco-Roman world generally and in Judaism specifically. It will then be possible to explore the Messianic tendencies that are found in Philo. While the significance of individual passages will be noted, a consideration of the overall Messianism of Philo, and particularly its relation to his political ideals and activities, will be deferred to the last chapter.

The trend of Messianic thought in Judaism prior to 66 A.D. is generally divided into two periods, the older and the newer. The older view, which had its origin in the hope of a future nation to be ruled by a Davidic king, is expressed in the writings of the older prophets.[35] In keeping with the general political and social changes during the second century B.C., the Messianic tradition changed slowly but perceptively, beginning with the Book of Daniel.[36] While variation in prescribed actions could not be tolerated in Judaism, more latitude was allowed in the

---

[35]Emil Schurer, op. cit., IV, 128-130. [36]Loc. cit.

area of faith, and in no aspect of faith did this latitude produce as much divergency of opinion as in Messianic beliefs and expectations.[37]

Nevertheless, Schurer has noted four characteristics which illustrate the difference between the older and the newer, essentially post-canonical, views on the Messiah.[38]

First, the Messianic frame of reference extended slowly from the nation Israel to the entire world. This enlargement was partly due to the rise of universal monarchies on earth and partly to the expanded concept of G-d, who rules over the whole world, not just over the Jews.

Simultaneous with this development came the increased individual hope for the future, as each person began to feel a more personal relationship between G-d and himself. This hope manifested itself in the belief in resurrection, variously seen as a resurrection only of the good and as a universal resurrection for reward and punishment.

The third characteristic change came as the hope for the future became more and more transcendent. The older view confined matters to present circumstances. As time passed, the hope arose little by little for a future world in contrast to the present one. In accordance with this view some felt that G-d had given the present world to evil powers, while he awaited the future world to set up his kingdom. In short, the future would be infinitely different from, and consequently better than, the present.

The final change came as the Messianic hope, like all religious thought in Judaism, slowly evolved into dogma in the hands of the scribes. However, even they could not render such ideas stagnant or binding, and there were always opposing Messianic beliefs existing side-by-side.

---

[37] Loc. cit. [38] Ibid., 130-135.

Even though the effects of political, social, and religious change were great, the old Messianic yearning, simply expressed, was probably that most commonly expressed.[39]

We pass from this consideration to a statement of the basic outline of doctrine concerning the Messianic Age that was current at the time of Philo.[40] It should be noted that all of these are found in no one ancient source, for there was a wide difference of opinion concerning both the details and the basic chronology of the expected future. (Generally no specific reference will be given to sources other than Philo.)

I. THE LAST TRIBULATION AND PERPLEXITY. It was generally held that a period of particular trouble would immediately precede the commencement of the age of happiness. This period would be characterized by omens, wars, disorder, and sinfulness of every variety.

II. ELIJAH AS FORERUNNER. Elijah's return would serve to prepare the world for the arrival of the Messiah.

III. APPEARING OF MESSIAH. Generally speaking pre-Christian documents picture the Messiah as arriving before and for the purpose of the overthrow of the powers of evil.[41] The development of the character of the Messiah is very interesting. At first, the hope was confined to a desire for the return of the Davidic line to the kingdom. As time passed, however, the same factors that combined to make the general hope for the future more transcendent had the same effect on the desire for the Messiah.

---

[39] Ibid., 136.

[40] Ibid., 154-187. (The discussion that follows is based on Schurer's outline of the Messianic tradition in Philo's time, as contained in the pages listed. We feel that it is unnecessary to cite specific page references for each point given.)

[41] As, for example, Philo, De Praemiis et Poenis 95.

In most sources the Messiah retained his humanity, but was thought to have received special powers and gifts from G-d. A few sources, on the other hand, see the Messiah as superhuman. The appearance of the Messiah is represented as sudden, and he was to be known by his performance of miracles.

IV. LAST ATTACK OF HOSTILE POWERS. After the appearance of the Messiah, all the forces of evil will gather to mount a decisive campaign against him.

V. DESTRUCTION OF HOSTILE POWERS. This destruction, led by the Messiah, may take two forms: (1) a violent and destructive war, or (2) solely through words spoken by the Messiah. (A later idea, first developed in the Babylonian Talmud, ascribed to a second and subordinate Messiah, "Messiah ben Joseph," the duty of leading the destruction.)[42] In any case, the Messianic Age cannot commence until the world is rid of the ungodly.

VI. RENOVATION OF JERUSALEM. In its simplest form this view embraces the purification of the Jerusalem of this world. Later elaboration introduced the concept of a heavenly Jerusalem that will descend during the Messianic Age.

VII. GATHERING OF THE DISPERSED. It was only logical to believe that those who were away from Palestine would return to partake in the happiness of the Messianic Age.[43]

VIII. THE KINGDOM OF GLORY IN PALESTINE. The Messiah will be the king of the Messianic kingdom, but over all will be G-d, who will at last exercise his full powers, after having temporarily punished his people for their sins by allowing pagans to rule over them. Although Palestine is to be

---

[42]In a passage of Babylonian Talmud, Sukka 52[a]. (Schurer is the source for this reference.)

[43]Philo, Praem. 165.

the center of the kingdom, it will in truth have no boundaries, but include all lands and peoples. Some will come into the kingdom voluntarily, seeing the glory of the pious.[44]

The Messianic Age will be free from war,[45] formerly wild animals will live in harmony with man, prosperity will reign, and all will toil tirelessly.[46] In this connection it would appear that the external blessings of the Messianic kingdom would constitute the desired reversal of all the sufferings and tribulations that troubled human experience.

The externals are complemented by the virtuous and noble character of the kingdom's inhabitants. G-d's name is to be sanctified and the law to be observed. Even the dead among the Israelites are to be allowed to enjoy the kingdom. Usually the kingdom is regarded as the ultimate and eternal divine achievement. Some, however, regarded the Messianic kingdom as only a preliminary stage to an even higher goal.

IX. RENOVATION OF THE WORLD. The renovation of heaven and earth is assigned to the Messianic period when it is viewed as eternal and future, but assigned to its conclusion when the Messianic Age is viewed as of limited duration and part of the present world. The former view was the older, while the latter view gained dominance in later Jewish thought.

X. THE GENERAL RESURRECTION. This is to take place before the last judgment and was a firmly established belief in Pharisaism. The Sadducees denied resurrection, while the Alexandrians chose instead to teach immortality of the soul. An intermediate stage between death and resurrection was generally accepted. As stated above, there was a profound divergency of opinion concerning who would be resurrected and for

---

[44] Praem. 93, 97, 164. [45] Praem. 92-93.

[46] Praem. 85-91 (concerning animals), 98-107 (on general prosperity of the Messianic kingdom).

what purpose. The oldest belief was that of a resurrection of the just only, but the extension to a general resurrection was widespread later.

XI. THE LAST JUDGMENT. ETERNAL SALVATION AND CONDEMNATION. The good among the Israelites were assured a place in the kingdom, but all sinners were excluded. The ungodly were consigned to Gehenna, where damnation was generally regarded as eternal. Of course, the just were to find everlasting happiness and peace in the Messianic kingdom.

This then is the general nature of the tradition that had been and was being formulated at the time of Philo. How widespread was the Messianic belief among the Jews, and furthermore, among the pagan populace that formed the vast majority of the inhabitants of Philo's world?

To answer the second half of the question first: among the successive dominant world powers there appeared general political optimism, accompanied by the hope of an approaching age of peace and prosperity.[47] Greco-Roman Messianism is nowhere more poetically expressed than in the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil, written about 40 B.C. In this regard there were two forces at work in pagan literature. The dominant mythological precepts held that the Golden Age had been under Kronos and that successive ages had seen a gradual deterioration of the human lot.[48] However, such an age was not merely a thing of the past, e.g., Stoic philosophy held a popular notion that all that was would be repeated sometime in the future.[49] The belief referred to above in connection with the imminent Golden Age is

---

[47]Salo Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews, I, 208.

[48]From among numerous sources may be cited the following: Hesiod, Op. et Dies 109-201; Ovid, Metam. I, 89-150; Seneca, Octavia 391-435; Plato Polit. 271c-272d; Virgil, Georg. I, 121-159, II, 536-540; Aeneid VIII, 319-327.

[49]The following may be cited as representative of this view: Virgil, Ecl. IV; Aen. VI, 792-795.

closely related to the Stoic precept, for many saw the end of one world-cycle and the beginning of another in the near future, which would accordingly produce another Golden Age.

A less popular, but also current idea held that man's history showed a progressive movement from savagery to civilization.[50] In any case, it cannot be denied that a general and genuine interest in the Golden or Messianic Age existed among the pagan majority at this time.

What of the Jews? It may be stated as a well-documented fact that Messianism was widespread among the Jews of Philo's time. In fact, the vast majority of Jews, in accordance with the Messianic precepts set out above, regarded the Diaspora as a temporary situation, which would be remedied by the advent of the Messianic Age.[51]

We find abundant evidence of such Messianic hopes both in the literature and in the activities of Jews during this time.[52] Such a hope took

---

[50]This idea is expressed in the following works: Plato, Protag. 320c-323a; Laws III, 676 ff.; Lucretius V, 925-end; Horace, Sat. I, 3.99-106.

[51]Harry Wolfson, Philo; Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, II, 402.

[52]The following is a list of Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical works in which there are Messianic ideas. The first seven are books of the Apocrypha; the remaining works are found in the Pseudepigrapha: Wisdom of Ben-Sira (composed c. 190-170 B.C.), I Maccabees (c. 130-110 B.C.), II Maccabees (c. 70 B.C.), Judith (c. 130-110 B.C.), Tobit (c. 130-110 B.C.), Baruch (130 B.C., 90 A.D.), Wisdom of Solomon (c. 70-50 B.C.), "Ethiopic" Book of Enoch (110 B.C., 68 B.C.), Book of Jubilees (c. 100-90 B.C.), Testament of the Twelve Tribes (110-70 B.C.), Psalms of Solomon (c. 45 B.C.), Assumption of Moses (4-6 A.D.), Syriac Book of Baruch (70-80 A.D.), Pseudepigraphic (Fourth) Book of Ezra (c. 90-100 A.D.), Biblical Antiquities (c. 110-130 A.D.), Sibylline Oracles (II, 140 B.C., III, 27 B.C., IV, 80 A.D., V, 70-80 A.D., 120-130 A.D.), Greek Book of Baruch (c. 150 A.D.), Slavonic Book of Enoch (c. 30-40 A.D.). From Joseph Klausner, The Messianic Idea in Israel, pp. 246-386.

many forms, as each person shaped the tradition according to his own dreams.[53]

The political upheavals which became commonplace in Palestine during the first sixty years of the first century A.D. were almost always politico-religious in nature. These disturbances have been related in chapter one.

We also find much impressive evidence as to Messianism among the Jews by looking at the Gospel accounts in the New Testament. There it becomes evident that Jesus, far from kindling a new spirit, fell heir to an already established tradition.[54] Thus when Jesus acknowledged that he was Messiah, his hearers had a clear frame of reference for what his words signified.[55]

The degree to which Messianism infused this age with its spirit is often measured by the extent to which Messianism influenced Philo. Schurer, as well as others, notes that it is surprising to see the traditional and nationalistic Messianic hopes so often in the works of the moralistic Philo.[56] Often Philo's commentaries on the Pentateuch led him to an amplification of Messianic hopes.[57]

First, the nature of the Messiah in Philo ought to be discerned. As Wolfson points out, the term Messiah is absent from Philo.[58] However, this fact usually is not taken to mean that Philo had no interest in the nature of the Messiah. Schurer, Goodenough, and Wolfson are united in

---

[53]Baron, op. cit., 223-224.

[54]Matthew XI, 3; Luke VII, 19 (which both contain this question of John: "Are you he who is to come, or shall we look for another?"). Matt. XXI; Mark XI; Luke XIX; John XII (which describe Jesus' entry into Jerusalem).

[55]Matt. XVI, 13-23; Mark VIII, 27-33; Luke IX, 18-22 (which all contain the confession of Peter).

[56]Schurer, op. cit., IV, 146. [57]Wolfson, op. cit., II, 407.

[58]Ibid., 407, 413-414.

their agreement that Philo is referring to a personal Messiah in the following passage:[59]

> For "there shall come forth a man," says the oracle, and leading his host to war he will subdue great and populous nations, because God has sent to his aid the reinforcement which befits the godly, and that is dauntless courage of soul and all-powerful strength of body, either of which strikes fear into the enemy and the two if united are quite irresistible.[60]

Another passage pictures the Jews coming together at the beginning of the Messianic age "ξεναγούμενος πρός τινος θειοτέρας ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην ὄψεως, ἀδήλου μὲν ἑτέροις, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς ἀναθωμένοις ἐμφανοῦς."[61] The first portion of this has been variously translated as "guided by some vision, more divine than it is compatible with its being of the nature of man" or "led by a Divine superhuman appearance."[62] Schurer holds that the underlined phrase cannot refer to the figure of the Messiah, but rather to a sign similar to that which guided the Hebrews during the Exodus in the desert.[63] Wolfson lists among three possible explanations the identification of the phrase with the Messiah.[64] For Goodenough there is no doubt that reference is being made to the Messiah.[65]

Goodenough finds a further and more extensive discussion of the nature of the Messiah in De Somniis. The first part of this passage, in

---

[59]For Schurer, op. cit., IV, 148; for Goodenough, op. cit., 115; for Wolfson, op. cit., II, 414.

[60]Praem. 95. [61]Praem. 165.

[62]The first translation is that of Wolfson, op. cit., II, 414; the second is that of Schurer, op. cit., IV, 147.

[63]Schurer, op. cit., IV, 147. [64]Wolfson, op. cit., II, 414-415.

[65]Goodenough, op. cit., 117.

[66]De Somniis II, 61-64. (This passage is discussed in Goodenough, op. cit., 24-27).

which Philo attacks the Romans as slaves of empty opinion, has already been quoted. The passage continues as follows:

> The day will pass before I have given the sum of the corruptions of human life, and indeed why need we dwell at length upon them? Who has not heard of such men or seen them? Who has not constant experience of them, is not used to them? So that the Holy Word very aptly calls "addition" the man who is an enemy of humility (ἀτυφία), and comrade of arrogance (τῦφος). For just as, to the great detriment of proper growth, there come out on trees superfluous growths, which farmers take down and prune away in their care for what is necessary, so the false man full of arrogance grows out as a sucker (παρανέβλαστεν) upon the true life that is characterized by humility, and no husbandman has been found to this day to cut off this injurious growth at the very roots.[67]

The significance of Goodenough's identification of this Husbandman with a militant Messiah, who will appear to hack off the evil roots of society, will be discussed in the last chapter. The language used here by Philo is quite similar to that found in several Gospel passages.[68]

In Describing the Golden Age Philo states that the Gentiles will not dare challenge the Jews when they see that the latter are in alliance with τοῦ δικαίου .[69] Since the genitive singular could be either masculine or neuter, it cannot be stated with certainty that Philo means the just one or Messiah (ὁ δικαῖος) and not the more general justice (τὸ δίκαιον).[70] Still, the interpretation which sees this word as referring to the Messiah is possible.

Thus, even without using the term Messiah, Philo leaves little doubt about his personal belief in such a figure. There is some confusion whether the Messiah will resort to arms to subdue his enemies or whether the godless without force will recognize his superiority and the superior

---

[67] De Somniis II, 63-64. (The translation is that of Goodenough.)

[68] Matt. III, 10; Luke III, 9. [69] Praem. 93.

[70] Goodenough, op. cit., 115.

virtue of him and his people.[71] Perhaps such apparent confusion is meant to convey the idea that a combination of the two will be necessary or that only physical force will convince some among the foes of the Jews.

The coming of the Messianic Age, however, will depend on more than the appearance of an individual, for the Jews, especially their leaders, must sincerely repent of their past sins.[72] Moreover, G-d will permit the Golden Age to commence because of the piety and prayers of the Patriarchs.[73]

The nature of the Messianic kingdom according to Philo can best be seen by quoting some of the passages in which he paints the picture of its happiness and glories:

> When that time comes I believe that bears and lions and panthers and the Indian animals, elephants and tigers, and all others whose vigor and power are invincible, will change their life of solitariness and isolation for one of companionship, and gradually in imitation of the gregarious creatures show themselves tame when brought face to face with mankind.[74]

> The second blessing is wealth which necessarily follows peace and settled authority . . . For there is a divine promise that on those who keep the sacred ordinances Heaven will shower timely rains, and on the earth will bear abundance of every kind of food, the lowlands of sown grain, the highlands of tree fruits, and no season will be left without some measure of beneficence, but so continuous will be the succession of the gifts of G-d "that the reaping will overtake the vintage and the vintage the seed time."[75]

> For prosperity will attend you in everything both in the city and in the country; in the city by offices, honors and reputations through justice well administered, through policy well considered, through words and deeds directed to serve the common weal: in the land by the fertility both of the necessaries, corn, wine and oil, and the means of enjoyable life, that is by the numberless kinds of tree fruits, and also by the fruitful multiplying of oxen and goats and other cattle.[76]

But someone may say, what profit is there in all this to one

---

[71] Praem. 93, 95, 164. [72] Praem. 163, 167. [73] Praem. 166.

[74] Praem. 89. [75] Praem. 98, 101. [76] Praem. 107.

> who is not going to leave behind him heirs and successors? And therefore he crowns his boons by saying that no man shall be childless and no woman barren, but all the true servants of G-d will fulfil the law of nature for the procreation of children . . . And none of those who conform to the laws will die an early death or be cut short, or denied any stage of life that G-d has assigned to the human race, but each will rise as by stepping-stones from infancy through the successive terms appointed to each age, fulfilling its allotted tale until he reaches the last, the neighbor of death or rather immortality, and passes from that truly goodly old age to leave a great house of goodly children to fill his place.[77]

> So much for the external blessings promised, victories over enemies, successes in wars, establishments of peace and abundant supplies of the good things of peace, honors and offices and the eulogies accompanying the successful, who receive praise from the lips of all, friends and enemies, praises prompted by goodwill in the one case and by fear in the other. But we must also speak of a more personal matter, the blessings bestowed on the body. He promises that those who take pains to cultivate virtue and set the holy laws before them to guide them in all that they do or say in their private or in their public capacity will receive as well the gift of complete freedom from disease, and if some infirmity should befall them it will not do them injury . . . Health will be followed by efficiency of the senses and the perfection and completeness of every part so that without impediment they may render each the services for which it was made.[78]

In summary:

> When they have arrived, the cities which but now lay in ruins will be cities once more; the desolate land will be inhabited; the barren will change into fruitfulness; all the prosperity of their fathers and ancestors will seem a tiny fragment, so lavish will be the abundant riches in their possession, which flowing from the gracious bounties of G-d as from a perennial fountain will bring to each individually and to all in common a deep stream of wealth leaving no room for envy.[79]

As has been seen, most of those conditions envisioned by Philo as characteristic of the Messianic Age were commonly regarded by other writers in the same way. The age that is to come will surpass any age yet experienced by man in infinite glory and splendor.

What is essential is that such an age was not an unattainable goal

---

[77] Praem. 108, 110. [78] Praem. 118-119. [79] Praem. 168.

to Philo. Such a hope can perhaps best be explained by the following formula: someday the splendor (σεμνότης) will bring in humility (αἰδώς), impressiveness (δεινότης) will bring fear (φοβός), benefaction (εὐεργεσία) will bring good will (εὔνοια).[80]

Philo does not limit himself to the above explanation of the phenomena involved in the Messianic Age. We have seen that a tenet of Stoicism held that all of natural history moved in cycles and that the theory could also be applied to events within the human experience. Philo, perhaps bearing this theory in mind, lists the great earthly kingdoms that have risen to great power, only to suffer equally pronounced declines.[81] To Philo, this is evidence of the great cyclical movement of the Logos, which may be considered as divine law.[82]

Yet, Philo omits Rome from his list of earthly kingdoms.[83] The reason can hardly be that he believes in the eternity of the Roman state. Rather, that caution which marked his political statements must also be recognized as the underlying cause for this omission. It must follow, according to the logic of this pattern, that Rome will suffer the same inglorious end as all other pagan kingdoms.[84] Only a direct action by G-d to assert his own rule over the world can bring this cycle to an end, a direct action which can only be understood as the establishment of the Messianic kingdom. So, says Goodenough, Philo is justifying and formulating the Jewish Messianic hopes in terms of Greek philosophy.[85] Philo seems to be saying that he might accept Roman rule for a time,

---

[80] Praem. 97. [81] Quod Deus Immutabilis Sit 173-175. [82] Immut. 176.

[83] Goodenough, op. cit., 78. (Wolfson, op. cit., II, 420, for another discussion of this passage.)

[84] Loc. cit. [85] Loc. cit.

for this must in the future meet the same fate as Greece, Macedonia, and other states.

At this point the very fundamental differences should be considered which existed between the Jewish and the Stoic ideal of the Messianic Age. For while they might appear on the surface to be similar, a closer examination reveals that such similarities only serve to conceal the marked and essential points of diversity. [86]

There is to be, in the Stoic ideal, a complete melting away of states, with no distinction of race or creed.[87] The Jewish ideal does not necessitate such an amalgamation, and in fact such statements as the well-known prophecy of Isaiah: "Nations shall not lift up sword against nation," assume the continuation of separate national entities.[88] While the Jewish hope also saw an end to distinctions of race and creed, it substituted for the many beliefs one--Judaism--which would become the universal religion.[89]

Further, pagan historians began to see in the Roman state the completion of the highest ideal, of which the beginning was the empire founded by Alexander.[90] No more proof need be adduced to show that Philo's attitude was the exact opposite.

A comparison between Philo and Polybius serves to illustrate further the nature of the difference that existed between the Jew and the pagan.

---

[86] Wolfson, op. cit., II, 421.

[87] For example, Plutarch, De Alexandri Magni Fortuna aut Virtute I, 6.

[88] Isaiah II, 4; also Micah IV, 3. (A similar idea is also found in Daniel VII, 14 and Sibylline Oracles III, 751-758. The same idea is implied in Philo's description of the Messianic kingdom, as in Praem. 93-95.)

[89] De Vita Mosis II, 14 (on the eternal nature of the Mosaic Law), II, 44 (which expresses the idea that all nations will turn to honoring Jewish laws alone).

[90] Strabo, Geography I, 4.9; Polybius, Histories I, 2.7, VIII 2.3-4.

According to Philo, the source of all change is the unlimited divinity of of G-d, not the immutable fortune described by Polybius.[91] In Philo's view perfection must be conceded not to Rome, but to a future state.[92]

In the doctrine of Polybius, governments will never remain stable, so that even the best, after a period of ascendancy, must yield to a less desirable regime.[93] But Philo makes his Messianic kingdom an eternal one, since this is in accordance with the plan of G-d. Finally, as stated above, many nations, not just one, will exist according to Philo, perhaps along the line of the many communities in Alexandria.[94]

There remains to consider the question whether the Messianic Age formed an integral and therefore an essential part of Philo's thinking. The older view, again expressed by Brehier, pictured Philo as doing little more than paying lip service to traditional beliefs.[95] However, taking into consideration the mass of evidence, Goodenough feels that it is impossible to separate the Messianic hope from other aspects that make up the essence of Philo's thinking.[96]

---

[91]Wolfson, op. cit., II, 421-422.

[92]For Polybius' view, I, 4.5 (and citations referred to in 90).

[93]Wolfson, op. cit., II, 424.

[94]Ibid., 425-426 (for suggestion of comparison with Alexandria).

[95]Brehier, op. cit.4. Also James Drummond, Philo Judaeus, or the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion, II, 322.

[96]Goodenough, op. cit., 115-119.

CHAPTER III

THE RESOLUTION

In this chapter it is necessary to resolve the politico-Messianic ideas expressed by Philo with his known or assumed activities in the political arena. In this regard it must be conceded that we can point with certainty to only one event in Philo's political life, that event being his leadership of the delegation of Alexandrian Jews to Gaius. However, it is our contention that the assumption of this duty by Philo was the culmination, rather than the beginning, of his political activity.

It would be impossible to make such a resolution without first understanding the factors which led Philo into a life of politics. We have indicated that Philo's interest in politics was probably not confined to a single event or to his old age.

One reason for such interest has been noted in the fact that Philo came from a prominent family which produced at least two well-known leaders, his brother and nephew. However, such an explanation would hardly be sufficient to justify the activities of a complex man such as Philo. We expect and indeed find more philosophical and religious motivations for his political interest.

Reference has already been made to the passage in which Philo seems to complain of the fact that he cannot devote his full energies and

attention to the contemplative life.[1] In another passage Philo concludes that forsaking the life of the city does not necessarily lead him to a greater understanding or insight:

> For many a time have I myself forsaken friends and kinsfolk and country and come into a wilderness, to give my attention to some subject demanding contemplation, and derived no advantage from doing so, but my mind scattered or bitten by passion has gone off to matters of the contrary kind. Sometimes, on the other hand, amid a vast throng I have a collected mind. God has dispersed the crowd that besets the soul and taught me that a favorable and unfavorable condition are not brought about by difference of place, but by God who moves and leads the car of the soul in whatever way he pleases.[2]

These two passages are characteristic and indicate that there cannot be one simple answer about the attitude of Philo to the relative value of the civic versus the ascetic life. Like all people, Philo was mastered by his diverse emotions rather than master of them. However, sufficient evidence can be gathered to show that on certain points Philo's attitude was consistent.

First of all, Philo, in agreement with the statements of many Greek philosophers, feels that man is by nature a gregarious animal. He states these ideas in the following manner:

> For nature, who created man the most civilized of animals to be gregarious and sociable, has called him to show fellowship and a spirit of partnership by endowing him with reason, the bond which leads to harmony and reciprocity of feeling.[3]

The man who hopes to enter into the contemplative life must first equip himself to face the problems of this world:

---

[1]Philo, De Specialibus Legibus III, 1-6.

[2]Philo, Legum Allegoria II, 85.

[3]Philo, De Decalogo 132.

> State business is an object of ridicule to you people. Perhaps you have never discovered how serviceable a thing it is. Begin, then, by getting some exercise and practice in the business of life both private and public; and when by means of the sister virtues, household-management and statesmanship, you have become masters in each domain, enter now, as more than qualified to do so, on your migration to a different and more excellent way of life. For the practical comes before the contemplative life; it is a sort of prelude to a more advanced contest; and it is well to have fought it out first. By taking this course you will avoid the imputation of shrinking from it through sheer laziness.[4]

What of those who separate themselves? Philo had tried such a life and apparently found in unsatisfactory.[5] He must have been acquainted with a number of such groups, and he saw that some who belonged to them were abandoning a society which they professed to despise, but secretly coveted. He describes such people in the following passage:

> Truth would therefore rightly find fault with those who without full consideration give up the business and financial side of a citizen's life, and say that they have conceived a contempt for fame and pleasure. For they do not despise these things, they are practicing an imposture. Their dirty bodies and gloomy faces, the rigor and squalor of their pinched life, are so many baits to lead others to regard them as lovers of orderliness and temperance and endurance. But they are unable to deceive the more sharp-sighted, who peer inside and refuse to be taken in by what meets the eye. For they thrust this back as mere screening of quite different things, and get a view of the true nature of the things concealed within, which, if they are beautiful, they admire, but if ugly, ridicule and loathe them for their hypocrisy.[6]

Philo further points out that those who chose the ascetic life could not fulfill all of their religious obligations, for half of Jewish law, in the manner of the Ten Commandments, concerns one's relations with his

---

[4]Philo, De Fuga et Inventione 35-36.

[5]Such an inference can be drawn from LA II, 85. Philo may well have spent time with the Therapeutae. At least, he devotes an entire book (De Vita Contemplativa) to them.

[6]Fug. 33-34.

fellow man. The person who separated himself from society as a whole could not fulfill these 'practical' commandments and thus did not fully practice his religion.[7]

The philosopher cannot allow himself to be drawn in by the crowd to the exclusion of his intellectual pursuits.[8] On the other hand, he cannot consider that he has achieved all that he is capable of unless he puts to practical use the precepts of his philosophy or religion. The practical must precede the theoretical. As Philo states:

> It is a vital matter that those who venture to make the claims of God their aim and study should first have fully met those of men; for it is sheer folly to suppose that you will reach the greater while you are incapable of mastering the lesser. Therefore first make yourselves familiar with virtue as exercised in our dealings with men, to the end that you may be introduced to that also which has to do with our relation to God.[9]

In contrast to these passages are those in which Philo speaks most critically of the politician and his world.[10] The person who is concerned with the loftier precepts is shown to be infinitely superior to the one whose sole interest lies in public affairs.[11]

That Philo vacillated between the life of the recluse and that of the man concerned with the affairs of his fellow man cannot be denied. Nor was Philo unique in his uncertainty, for it was characteristic of his age.[12] When Philo speaks with admiration of the life of the recluse, he is undoubtedly giving vent to his very real frustrations in the political

---

[7] De Specialibus Legibus II, 63-64.

[8] De Specialibus Legibus III, 1-6. [9] Fug. 38.

[10] Cf. Chapter 2 for discussion of Joseph as the archetype of a Roman ruler in De Somniis.

[11] This idea is developed below in the discussion of the four classes into which men are divided.

[12] Goodenough, op. cit., 73-74.

arena.

Goodenough has concluded that Philo's more usual, and therefore dominant, attitude was that which called for involvement in the affairs of one's fellow man.[13] Philo knew that it was necessary for him to continue his contemplation of the divine, but not as an end unto itself. Rather, only that person who could reach the heights was truly qualified to help others strive for a better life and peace on earth.

Philo was able to fashion his ideal out of a resolution of the two possibilities. This was done through his oft-used method allegory. Man is the child of two parents:

> I suggest, then, that the father is reason, masculine, perfect, right reason and the mother the lower learning of the schools, with its regular course or round of instruction. These two stand to us in the relation of parents to children, and it is good and profitable to obey them.
>
> Now right reason, the father, bids us follow in the steps of nature and pursue truth in her naked and undisguised form. Education, the mother, bids us give ear to rules laid down by human ordinance, rules which have been made in different cities and countries and nations by those who first embraced the apparent in preference to the true.[14]

Mankind is then divided into four classes, with those who obey both parents being placed into one class. Another class includes those who obey neither parent, while the other two classes are made up of those who obey either the father or the mother to the exclusion of the other parent. Philo concludes that those who obey both parents are unquestionably the best, while those who obey neither parent must be rated as lawless and base.[15]

Philo writes the following about those who obey both parents:

---

[13] Ibid., 74. [14] Philo, De Ebrietate 33-34. [15] Ebr. 35.

> Let us then speak next of those who are the enemies of these last, but have given due honor to both education and right reason, of whom those who attach themselves to one parent only were but half-hearted followers in virtue. This fourth class are valiant guardians of the laws which their father, right reason, has laid down, and faithful stewards of the customs which their mother, instruction, has introduced. Their father, right reason, has taught them to honor the Father of them all; their mother, instruction, has taught them not to make light of those principles which are laid down by convention and accepted everywhere.[16]

Of those who are obedient to neither parent, Philo says:

> But the son who is at enmity with both his parents is shown to us by Moses, when he represents him as saying, "I know not the Lord and I do not send Israel forth." Such a one, we may expect, will oppose both what right reason rules to be our duty to God and what training and education establish for our dealings with the world of creation; and thus he will work universal confusion. The human race has never purged itself of the wickedness which is unmixed with good, and there are still those whose will and purpose is to do no action whatever that can tend to piety or human fellowship, who on the contrary keep company with impiety and godlessness, and also keep no faith with their fellows. And there are the chief pests which haunt cities, controlling or, to speak more truly, upsetting private and public life with their restless intrigues.[17]

Then Philo remarks that of those in the latter classes, the ones who obey only the father are superior to those whose exclusive obedience is to the mother.[18]

In the former group are the priests:

> But there are also some who despise the mother's bidding, but cling with all their might to the father's word, and these right reason has judged worthy of the highest honor, the priesthood . . . For they into whose charge the work of prayer and sacrifice and all the worship of the temple was given, are actually--strange paradox--homicides, fratricides, slayers of the bodies which are nearest and dearest to them, though they should have come to their office, pure in themselves and in the lineage, having no contact with any pollution even involuntary, far less voluntary . . . What, then, can we say but that such as these are condemned by the rules that obtain among men, for they have for their accuser their mother, custom, the politician and the demagogue, but are acquitted by the laws of nature, for they have the support of their father, right reason?[19]

---

[16] *Ebr.* 80-81. [17] *Ebr.* 77-79. [18] *Ebr.* 35. [19] *Ebr.* 65-66, 68.

In the latter group are politicians:

> This last kind which loves the mother, which bows down to the opinions of the multitude and undergoes all manner of transformations in conformity with the ever-varying aspirations of human life, like the Egyptian Proteus, whose true form remained a matter of uncertainty through his power to become everything in the universe, is most clearly typified by Jethro. Jethro is a compound of vanity, closely corresponding with a city or commonwealth peopled by a promiscuous horde, who swing to and fro as their idle opinions carry them. See how he deals with Moses. He in his wisdom was recalling the whole people of the soul to piety . . . And then comes forward Jethro the seeming wise, who has never learnt the secrets of the divine blessings, but his concern has been with little else than things human and corruptible. He plays the demagogue, and the laws which he lays down contradict the laws of nature; for his eyes are fixed on semblance, while they relate to real existence. Yet even on him Moses has compassion, and pities him for his great delusion; he feels that he should teach him a better lesson, and persuade him to depart from his empty opinions and follow truth stedfastly.[20]

Thus the priest is reckoned better than the politician in the usual sense of the word, for the politician is often tempted to consider only the problems of this world to the exclusion of the more esoteric. Philo uses this allegory another time and draws the same conclusions about the four classes of men.[21]

Philo, in committing himself to an involvement in the practical world around him, was striving to place himself in the first or superior group of those who were obedient to both parents, those who both followed the laws of nature and worked within the framework of man's experience. Such a person would be fulfilling all of the commandments, for both theoretical

---

[20] Ebr. 36-38.

[21] De Decalogo 107-110. (This allegory appears to have been based on an interpretation of Proverbs VIII, 1. The rabbinic interpretation is as follows: "My son, hear the instructions of thy father and forsake not the laws of thy mother." The rabbis explain that the father represents G-d, and the mother, the community of Israel. This is quite similar to the explanation of Philo. However, the distinctions drawn in Philo are Greek, in harmony with two fragments ascribed to Archytas. Goodenough, op. cit., 75.)

and practical considerations would be met. The truly wise man must be able to move freely from the discussion of the theoretical to the application of the practical.[22]

He must on occasion flee from the pressures and passions of the crowded city life, but this could be effected inwardly and have as its result better service to one's society.[23] As Philo writes:

> But there are others who live on in their homes with their bodies worn to a thread by long sickness or the burden of old age, yet healthy and youthful in the better part of the soul, brimful of highmindedness and staunchest valor. They never even dream of touching weapons of defense, but render the highest service to the commonwealth by the excellent advice which they put forward, and guided by unflinching and unswerving consideration of what is profitable, restore what had broken down in the personal life of each individual and in the public life of their country, these then who train themselves in wisdom cultivate the true courage.[24]

To summarize, we can say that Philo had devised a scale by which to measure the relative value of a particular mode of living. At the bottom was placed the individual who was completely devoid of any sense of spiritual or social obligation. Above him was the politician, who at least had a sense of civic or social responsibility. Still higher could be placed the one who obeyed the father exclusively. The supreme satisfaction could be experienced only by the individual who moved on both the practical and the theoretical levels. This was the ideal that Philo set before him, and thus it was incumbent upon him to combine obedience to the mother with obedience to the father to achieve a full life. Such a person could best lead men, and, in fact, he was obligated to utilize his knowledge of natural law to ameliorate the society of man.

---

[22] Ebr. 91-92. [23] LA II, 85; De Specialibus Legibus III, 1-6.

[24] Philo, De Virtutibus 3-4.

This ideal is also integrated into Philo's Messianic beliefs. Reference was made to this fact when we noted that Philo envisioned a repentance of all Jews, but especially their leaders, as a prelude to the Messianic Age.[25] We can expand this idea by numbering among the Jewish leaders those who, like Philo, were in positions of political importance. The idea of repentance can also be expanded to embrace the concept of transformation, for these Jewish political leaders had to be transformed from the usual politicians who owed exclusive allegiance to the mother into that class "who after much toil have been able to pass from the pathless wild to the road which has no other goal but to find favor with G-d."[26] The Messianic Age depended for its arrival on many factors, such as divine mercy and the intervention of the Patriarchs.[27] However, even these factors were not available to the Jews until their leaders were transformed and definitely committed to the contemplation of the theoretical, as well as the carrying out of the practical.

Only as the leaders of the Jews moved into the 'highest class' could the Messianic Age be expected. Philo committed himself to an attempt to be just that kind of leader. He could not expect to accomplish everything himself; he could set the example for others to follow. When enough of the Jewish leaders had achieved this transformation, then there was hope for the arrival of the Messianic kingdom. If he could remain a true son of both parents, surely others could do the same, and therein lay his hope for a better future.[28]

---

[25]Philo, De Praemiis et Poenis 163, 167.

[26]Goodenough, op. cit., 117-118. (The quotation is from Philo, Praem. 167.)

[27]Praem. 166. [28]Cf. Goodenough, op. cit., 118.

At this point we may summarize the chief characteristics of the political and Messianic hopes of Philo and show their mutual dependence.

It has been shown that Philo was unalterably opposed to Roman rule. It was true that some Romans showed a proper regard for the Jews, but even then there was no guarantee of the preservation of the religion so long as Rome ruled the Jews. Philo must have had ample proof of the misuse of power on the part of the Romans even before the great struggle under Flaccus. A good emperor could not oversee every activity of his empire, and even a good governor could be turned against the Jews to save his own life.[29]

What then was the proper way for a Jewish leader to deal with the Romans? One would not attempt to match his strength with that of a wild boar. The knowledgeable person, awaiting a propitious moment, would calm down the charging animal rather than risk inflaming him to make his final and deadly charge.[30] In the same way one would not openly oppose the massive power of the Romans. Roman power, like that of a wild animal, must be propitiated and softened if one did not want to risk the destruction of his people. This was the stance adopted by Philo. This did not mean, however, that he was any more comfortable in this situation than would be the man who had to deal constantly with untamed animals.[31]

The Messianic view of Philo at first seems to be far removed from his political thinking. A Messiah is to come, and a great age of plenty is to be enjoyed by those who are true to the Law. The figure of a personal Messiah is present in Philo, although the term Messiah is not. Rome

---

[29]Cf. Chapter 2. [30]Philo, De Somnlis II, 87.

[31]Goodenough, op. cit., 6-7.

certainly was not the awaited kingdom, nor could divinity, even to the slightest degree, be attributed to any leader of the Roman Empire. In no way could the Jews accept a Roman as the Messianic ideal they so fervently longed for.[32]

It is in this context that a connection can be made between the political and the Messianic ideas; for the Messiah was not a purely spiritual concept in Philo, but rather a combination of spiritual and political yearnings. In fact, this spiritual-political dualism had been characteristic of the Messianic concept almost from its inception. For example, Moses, who was exalted as the first deliverer of the Jewish people, embodied both spiritual and political characteristics. He was not only 'sage,' but also 'warrior.' The attributes connected with the former title were, to be sure, his principal ones, but those associated with the latter were not lacking.[33] Joseph Klausner writes:

> Moses, the great deliverer from the Egyptian bondage, functioning in the dual role of military leader and prophet-lawgiver, is the prototype of the conception that was to develop and achieve splendid embodiment in the form of a Messiah who is both king and redeemer.[34]

The true prototype of the Messiah was David:

> Yet this fact alone, that popular imagination expanded and exalted this national hero not only as king possessing outstanding political talents but also as the possessor of superior religio-ethical qualities--this fact alone proves that undoubtedly David was a man of the very highest attainments . . . Outstanding political abilities together with these religio-ethical qualities made David the <u>authentic</u> prototype of the redeemer and the founder of that ruling family one of whose descendants the Messiah must be.[35]

Similarly this dualism was generally found in the figure of a personal

---

[32]Cf. Chapter 2.

[33]Joseph Klausner, <u>op. cit.</u>, 15-17.

[34]<u>Ibid.</u>, 400.

[35]<u>Ibid.</u>, 19-21.

Messiah.[36] It must be conceded that the politico-national aspects of Jewish Messianism never came to the fore in Jewish thought before the destruction of the Second Temple to the extent that they did afterward.[37] Nevertheless, there is ample evidence, and Philo can be cited here, to show that even in the period prior to the great revolt, the Messiah was thought of as the redeemer who would use violence if necessary to destroy the enemies of the Jews.[38] Klausner is surprised to find the deeply spiritual Philo including these bellicose aspects in his description of the Messiah.[39]

Now we can see that the hope Philo had of a better future for the Jewish people was centered on the Messiah. As we have noted, the arrival of the Messiah was dependent on the transformation of the Jewish political leaders to a stage of contemplation of both the theoretical and the practical.

However, this was not all. We have seen that the might of the Romans had to be propitiated for the time being, but that Philo was never reconciled to it. Therefore, when the opportunity arose, there should be no delay in attacking and destroying the enemy. In this regard, Goodenough remarks that Philo was not only waiting for the Husbandman to come and swing the axe, but that he would swing an axe with him.[40]

Thus we can safely say that Philo, while not openly and actively opposing Roman rule with force, was preparing the way in his writings for such opposition when the proper moment came. It would seem that Philo did not view his time as the correct one for such a revolt, for the

---

[36] Ibid., 392. [37] Ibid., 394. [38] Cf. Chapter 2.

[39] Klausner, op. cit., 493, 523.

[40] Goodenough, op. cit., 25. (For the reference to the Husbandman, De Somniis II, 63-64.)

spiritual transformation which had to precede the political one had not yet taken place.

This, then, is the crucial point. Neither Philo nor any other Jewish leader could have hoped to convince the Jewish people that they could defeat the Roman army through the force of arms alone. It was folly to think that any group, basing its expectations for success solely on military strength, could defeat the Romans. So it was with the Jews. Their hope lay not in arming themselves with war machines in an attempt to match the power of Rome. Rather, their only hope lay in arming themselves morally and spiritually for a battle they could not lose when so equipped.[41]

Jewish history was full of stories about the defeat of far larger pagan forces by a smaller but devout group of Jews.[42] Just as the previous threats had been smaller, so the victories of the Jews over them had been only temporal. Now the pagans were brought together, with Rome symbolizing all they stood for. This time the victory of the Jews would be complete, and in its aftermath would be established the Messianic kingdom. Only a Jewish force committed to G-d could defeat the Romans. The Jews would still have to fight and sustain great losses, but they would win and the rewards would be worth more than the misery they endured.

This then was the message and the purpose of all of Philo's political activities. Some may find in Philo's leading of the embassy to Gaius an

---

[41]The disciples of Hillel reasoned in a similar fashion when they rejected the activities of the Zealots. The study of the Law was viewed as the sole means by which the Jews could recover after their defeat. The activities of these men do not indicate a pro-Roman bias on their part, but rather a realization that true and lasting independence would never be achieved by the Jews, if they did not study and observe the Law. Klausner, op. cit., 393-394.

[42]For example, Philo, Legatio 196; Exodus XIV-XV, Judges VII, 1-23; I Samuel XVII, 41-49; II Kings XIX, 32-36. Two other examples are the deliverances brought about by the Maccabees and by Esther.

attempt by him to get into the system which he professed to despise, to obtain citizenship at the cost of forsaking his religion. The procuring of citizenship was undoubtedly the goal of some Alexandrian Jews,[43] though the motives of each individual differed significantly. While there were those who wanted to get into the system and were willing to pay the price of losing their Jewish identity, Philo cannot possibly be counted in their number.

If Philo, for any reason, wanted to obtain citizenship in Alexandria for the Jews, it was only so that in a then stabilized situation his people could turn more of their attention to achieving that arming of the soul which would one day, perhaps soon, be necessary. Philo would certainly have compromised his Judaism on no essential point in order to gain the citizenship of Alexandria. However, if such citizenship could be obtained without paying too high a price and if the situation would then give the Jews greater opportunity in which to develop spiritually, then the attempt was worthwhile. Moreover, the very fact that Philo acted as he did with steadfastness and courage was bound to strengthen the spirits of others who might someday be faced with a similar danger.

---

[43]Cf. Chapter I and Appendix I.

APPENDIX I

JEWS AND ALEXANDRIAN CITIZENSHIP

For many years there was considerable debate whether the Jews as a whole were citizens of Alexandria. Certainly Josephus makes this statement.[1] Even those who found fault with Josephus' statements admitted the possibility that individual Jews could become citizens, but Josephus refers to the Jewish community as a whole.

The question appears, however, to have been settled by the publication in 1924 by H. I. Bell of a letter by Claudius to the Alexandrians. Claudius refers to the Jews as 'profiting by what they possess and enjoying in a city not their own (ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ πόλει) an abundance of bounteous wealth.[2] Thus, the implication here is very strong that the Jews were outside the citizen body. Further, Box finds in Philo's Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit[3] an argument which implies that there was a distinction between the Jews in Alexandria and those who were citizens of Alexandria.[4]

Box suggests that Josephus' statement may be explained by the false assumption that all Alexandrian Jews had privileges equal to those of the

---

[1] Antiq. XII, 8, 121, XIV, 188; War II, 487-488; cA. II, 35.

[2] Lines 94-95 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians.

[3] Philo, Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit, 34.

[4] Box, op. cit., xxii.

Macedonians and the equally false assumption that the term 'Macedonian' equaled Greek equaled Alexandrian. As it was, the Macedonians, or an important group of them, did stand outside the citizen body.[5]

Mention has been made of the fact that Jews as individuals could become full citizens of a Greek city. However, this was by no means easy. As formal as religion had become, it was still at the very heart of a city's life. Participation in the multitude of sacrifices, gymnastic festivals, oaths, prayers and libations would have been impossible for any Jew who adhered to a strict observance of the Law.[6]

It is true that generous concessions were made to Jews by rulers throughout the Hellenistic world. Both Roman and Hellenist monarchies granted substantial privileges to the Jews.[7] It is also true, as has been mentioned, that some Jews in the Diaspora had grown rather lax in their observance of the Law. It is certain that individual Jews did in fact become citizens of Greek cities. Still, the mass of evidence does not substantiate Josephus' claim that the whole Jewish community in Alexandria acquired citizenship.

Whatever hope the Jews, or a segment of them, had entertained concerning their admission into the citizen body of Alexandria was ended by Claudius' letter, for he guaranteed to the Jews all privileges that they had rightfully and truly been granted in the past, but no others.[8]

---

[5] Ibid., xxiii.

[6] Bell, Cults and Creeds, 37.

[7] Ibid., 37-38.

[8] Lines 82-95 of Claudius' letter in Bell, Jews and Christians.

APPENDIX II

THE WORKS OF PHILO

(The following is a complete list of the works of Philo with their Latin titles. The first Roman numeral in parenthesis refers to the volume of the Loeb edition in which the work appears. The second Roman numeral refers to the volume in the Cohn-Wendland edition of Philo. The abbreviations are for the most part those of Erwin R. Goodenough, and they are also used in our footnotes.)

Abr.	De Abrahamo (VI; IV)
Aet.	De Aeternitate Mundi (IX; VI)
Agr.	De Agricultura (III; II)
Cher.	De Cherubim (II; I)
Conf.	De Confusione Linguarum (IV; II)
Cong.	De Congressu Eruditionis Gratia (IV; III)
Cont.	De Vita Contemplativa (IX; VI)
Decal.	De Decalogo (VII; IV)
Det.	Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat (II; I)
Ebr.	De Ebrietate (III; II)
Flacc.	In Flaccum (IX; VI)
Fug.	De Fuga et Inventione (V; III)
Gig.	De Gigantibus (II; II)
Heres	Quis Rerum Divinarum Heres (IV; III)

Hyp.	Hypothetica (IX)
Immut.	Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis (III; II)
Jos.	De Josepho (VI; IV)
LA	Legum Allegoria (I; I)
Leg.	Legatio ad Gaium (X; VI)
Mig.	De Migratione Abrahami (IV; II)
Mos.	De Vita Mosis (VI; IV)
Mut.	De Mutatione Nominum (V; III)
Opif.	De Opificio Mundi (I; I)
Plant.	De Plantatione (III; II)
Post.	De Posteritate Caini (II; II)
Praem.	De Praemiis et Poenis (VIII; V)
Prob.	Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit (IX; VI)
Provid.	De Providentia (IX)
QE	Qaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum (Supplement II)
QG	Quaestiones et Solutiones in Genesin (Supplement I)
Sac.	De Sacrificiis Abelis et Caini (II; I)
Sob.	De Sobrietate (III; II)
Som.	De Somniis (V; III)
Spec.	De Specialibus Legibus (VII, VIII; V)
Virt.	De Virtutibus (VIII; V)

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ancient

(Texts, translations, and commentaries)

Appianus. The Civil Wars, vol. IV. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Horace White. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1913.

Eusebius. Historia Ecclesiastica, vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Kirsopp Lake. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.

Josephus. Against Apion. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1926.

_____. Jewish Antiquities, vols. IV-IX. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray, Ralph Marcus, and Louis H. Feldman. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1930-1965.

_____. The Jewish War, vols. II-III. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1927-1928.

The Holy Bible. The Oxford Annotated Bible, Revised Standard Version. Edited by Herbert G. May and Bruce M. Metzger. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.

Philo. De Decalogo. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1937.

_____. De Ebrietate. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

_____. De Fuga et Inventione. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1934.

_____. De Josepho. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935.

_____. De Praemiis et Poenis. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1939.

_____. De Somniis. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1934.

_____. De Specialibus Legibus. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1937-1939.

_____. De Vita Contemplativa. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.

_____. De Vita Mosis. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1935.

_____. Hypothetica. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.

_____. In Flaccum. Edited by Herbert Box. Oxford: University Press, 1939.

_____. In Flaccum. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.

_____. Philonis Alexandrini Legatio Ad Gaium. Edited by Mary Smallwood. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.

_____. Legatio ad Gaium. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1962.

_____. Legum Allegoria. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1929.

_____. Quod Deus Immutabilis Sit. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1930.

_____. Quod Omnis Probus Liber Sit. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1941.

_____. Philonis Alexandrini Opera Quae Supersunt, in six volumes. Edited by Leopoldus Cohn and Paulus Wendland. Berlin: Georgii Reimeri, 1896-1915.

Plutarch. De Alexandrini Magni Fortuna aut Virtute. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Frank Cole Babbitt. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Polybius. Histories, vols. I and III. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by W. R. Paton. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1923-1954.

Suetonius. Lives of the Caesars, vol. I. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Library, 1944.

Tacitus. Annales, vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by John Jackson. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931.

_____. The Histories, vol. II. Loeb Classical Library. Translated by Clifford H. Moore. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931.

Modern Sources

(Books and Articles)

Baron, Salo. A Social and Religious History of the Jews, vol. I. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.

Bréhier, Emile. Les Idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1950.

Bell, H. Idris. Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Liverpool: The University Press, 1953.

_____. Jews and Christians in Egypt. London, 1924.

Cambridge Ancient History, vol. X. Edited by S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth. Cambridge: The University Press, 1952.

Drummond, James. Philo Judaeus, or the Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in its Development and Completion. London: Williams and Norgate, 1888.

Goodenough, Erwin R. An Introduction to Philo Judaeus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940.

_____. "Philo and Public Life." Journal of Egyptian Archaeology, XII, pp. 77-79.

_____. "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His De Vita Mosis." Harvard Theological Review, XXVI, pp. 109-125.

_____. The Politics of Philo Judaeus. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1938.

The Jewish Encyclopedia. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1909.

Klausner, Joseph. The Messianic Idea in Israel. Translated by W. F. Steinspring. New York: Macmillan Company, 1955.

Rowley, H. H. The Relevance of Apocalyptic. New York: Association Press, 1964.

Schurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ vols. I, II, and IV. Translated by John Macpherson, Sophia Taylor, and Peter Christie. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, n.d.

Tcherikover, Victor. Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society or America, 1961.

Wolfson, Harry. Philo; Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam, vol. II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1947.

VITA

Leonard Jay Greenspoon was born December 5, 1945, in Richmond, Virginia. He was educated in the public schools in Richmond and was graduated from Thomas Jefferson High School in June, 1963. He received instruction in the Jewish religion and Hebrew at the religious school of Temple Beth-El in Richmond.

Mr. Greenspoon entered the University of Richmond in September, 1963. While there he attained the following honors: Intermediate Honors, Phi Beta Kappa, Omicron Delta Kappa, Eta Sigma Phi, and Pi Delta Epsilon. He was enrolled in courses at Harvard University during the summers of 1965 and 1967. Mr. Greenspoon spent the summer of 1966 in Italy and Greece and studied at the Rome division of the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart.

Mr. Greenspoon was graduated from the University of Richmond third in his class in June, 1967. He majored in Latin. He was awarded the following competitive fellowships: Woodrow Wilson, Danforth, and Fulbright. He attended a seminar for new Danforth fellows in August, 1967, in Illinois. In September, 1967, Mr. Greenspoon left for Italy, where he spent the academic year 1967-1968 studying on a Fulbright grant. He attended classes at the University of Rome and traveled throughout Italy and Germany.

Mr. Greenspoon returned from Italy in June, 1968, and was married to the former Eliska Morsel in August of that year. He has taught social studies on the sixth and seventh grade level at Barnetts Elementary School

in Charles City County, Virginia, since September, 1968. During this period he was also enrolled at the Graduate School of the University of Richmond in the Department of Ancient Languages.

Few men achieve anything of value without the aid and support of others. This is especially true in the field of education, where those who teach have it in their power to open up new vistas for their students through inspired and inspiring teaching or to close potentially interesting avenues by uninspired and uninspiring teaching. Mr. Greenspoon is grateful that it has been his happy good fortune to have been taught almost always by teachers of the first group. The Department of Ancient Languages may have been small in some respects, but well-endowed with professors who went out of their way to make the Classics a way of life for him. Special thanks should be given to the chairman of the Department, Dr. Talbot R. Selby, whose advice, guidance, and, above all, friendship have been a source of strength for seven years. Each professor has contributed much to Mr. Greenspoon's growth in this field and to each he is much endebted: Professors Barthelmess and Catlin (in undergraduate and graduate school) and Professors White and Johanson (in graduate school). Dr. Johanson's role as director of this thesis was, of course, crucial to its successful completion.

This paper would never have been written had it not been for the many sacrifices made by Mr. Greenspoon's wife, Ellie. On many occasions she was forced to change her plans and rearrange her activities to suit his schedule of work on this paper. At the very moment when success seemed farthest away, her confidence in his abilities offered the strength needed to complete this work.