

A D Macdonald

Moore Theological College

In and Out of Egypt

The Conceptual Location of Ancient Alexandria, and a Paradox for Alexandrian Judaism?

The great Mediterranean city of Alexandria was the seat of Ptolemaic and then Roman power throughout the land of Egypt. But was Alexandria itself considered part of Egypt? During the mid-twentieth century, scholars of documentary sources argued that Alexandria was distinct from Egypt. Others have argued against that firm distinction. Despite the increased abundance of and access to ancient documentary sources since the middle of the twentieth century, there has been no substantial survey of this material seeking to understand either Alexandria's conceptual inclusion or exclusion from Egypt in antiquity.

The question of Alexandria's conceptual location bears broader implications for the study of Egyptian Judaism. Given the immense significance of the exodus story for the Jewish tradition, there seems to be, as Paul McKechnie notes, 'an easily discerned paradox in Jews living in Egypt'.¹ Was this paradox discerned by Jews living in Egypt during Hellenistic or Roman

¹ McKechnie 2008, 236.

times? Although this question concerns Egypt at large rather than Alexandria specifically, it intersects with the matter of conceptual location. The literary sources for Judaism in Alexandria are more substantial than those for Judaism elsewhere in Egypt. If Alexandrian Jews thought they were *in* Egypt, the literature of Alexandrian Judaism is the first place we might expect to find evidence for or against the discernment and mitigation of the paradox.²

The present paper explores in two parts the two issues raised above. The first part revisits the conceptual relationship of Alexandria to Egypt by conducting a brief yet broad survey of ancient sources from the founding of Alexandria (c. 331 BCE to 300 CE). Particular attention is paid to Jewish perspectives, given our focus on Alexandrian Judaism and Egyptian Judaism more broadly. The second part of the paper turns to the ‘paradox’ of Egyptian Judaism, sketching the background to this paradox in Jewish tradition before considering the strength of the evidence for the recognition and mitigation of the paradox in antiquity.

The location of Alexandria

Was Alexandria in Egypt? Official documents call the city *Alexandria ad Aegyptum*.³ Although Fritz Schulz (1943) proposed translating this formula as Alexandria *in* Egypt, Harold Idris Bell decisively refuted that claim three years later with a brief survey of examples demonstrating that the formula means Alexandria *by* or *near* Egypt.⁴ Noting that some third century inscriptions speak of Alexandria *in* Egypt, Peter Marshall Fraser then suggested that a change in the city’s status led to it being considered *near* Egypt from around the second century BCE.⁵

² This is not to say that non-Alexandrian or non-literary sources are of lesser value for the question. On the contrary, the final paragraph recognises that further inquiry beyond the scope of this paper will be necessary even to properly interpret the results of the present study.

³ See discussion beginning on page 3.

⁴ Schulz 1943, 58; Bell 1946, 130–32.

⁵ Fraser 1972, 107–109; cf. Fraser 1949, 56.

Thus understood, Alexandria was distinct from Egypt throughout most of the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

Subsequently, many have argued against a sharp separation between Alexandria and Egypt. They suggest that Alexandria was in many respects an Egyptian city, despite the name formula and the distinction implied by the sources surveyed by Bell and Fraser.⁶ Whether emphasising or minimising the distinction, scholars have rarely discussed the sources containing either the name formula or other language bearing upon the conceptual relation of Alexandria to Egypt.⁷ We now enjoy easier access to a wider range of such evidence than Bell and Fraser. A new survey to confirm, update, or qualify Bell's and Fraser's conclusions is overdue.⁸ To this we now turn, considering first Graeco-Roman perspectives in documentary and literary sources before turning to the Jewish perspectives of the Rabbis, Josephus, Philo, and others.

Graeco-Roman perspectives: papyri and inscriptions

Documentary sources show that Alexandria was often considered proximate to Egypt but not within Egypt. Some sixteen Latin papyri or epigraphs from the period considered in this study refer to *Alexandreae ad Aegyptum* ('Alexandria by Egypt').⁹ The Greek formula with equivalent meaning, Ἀλεξανδρεία τῆ πρὸς Αἰγύπτῳ (lit. 'Alexandria toward Egypt'), appears

⁶ Some do not interact with Bell or Fraser (e.g. Bagnall 1988; Manning 2010). Some (e.g. Kasher 1985, 171; Fernández 2013, 346–48; Chistalev 2014) cite them but emphasise aspects of inclusion. Others emphasise the distinctiveness of Alexandria; Haas 1997, 7 claimed that 'most papyrologists consider Alexandria as somehow separate from Egypt.' For this perspective see also Green 1996, 3–4; Lewis 1986, 9, and (to a lesser extent) Bowman 1986, 204–205.

⁷ Works addressing Egyptian Judaism sometimes say nothing of the name formula (e.g. Tcherikover 1966; Smallwood 1981; Modrzejewski 1995; Barclay 1996).

⁸ Chistalev 2014 explores distinction and inclusion, but only from Roman literary perspectives. Daris 1990 uses papyri in examining Egyptian attitudes to Alexandria, but focuses on positivity and negativity rather than inclusion and exclusion.

⁹ Sometimes abbreviated. SB 16.12609, IEph 4112, W.Chr. 463, PSI 9.1026, W.Chr. 212, P.Mich. 3.166, BGU 7.1692, P.Mich. 3.169, BGU 7.1693, BGU 7.1695, BGU 7.1694, ChLA 18.662, P.Oxy. 6.894, SB 3.6223, ChLA 10.416, P.Oxy. 31.2565.

in six papyri and inscriptions.¹⁰ These Greek and Latin documents include birth certificates, a soldier's testament, a debt notice, and a record of a *cursus honorum*. Use of the formula in such documents suggests that it was official administrative terminology, indicating that Alexandria was legally separate from Egypt.

Conceptual exclusion also appears without that formula. There are instances of Alexandria τὴν κατ' Αἴγυπτον ('down from Egypt' or 'against Egypt') and *Alexandria cat Aegipto* (the same Greek formula transcribed in Latin characters), as well as Alexandria ἐπὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ('upon Egypt') — all formulae implying proximity not inclusion.¹¹ A distinction is implied when Roman prefects are called rulers of 'Alexandria and Egypt' (OGIS 654, P.Giss.Univ. 5.46).¹² The same distinction appears in other spheres — especially judicial and cultic — when Alexandria is named alongside Egypt as if it were a separate jurisdiction.¹³ SEG 53.1355 lists *pankration* victors in Alexandria separately from victors in Egypt. M.Chr. 188 says people in Egypt celebrate the new moon festival at a different time to people in Alexandria. The brothers of P.Oxy. 4.727 sent an agent into Egypt to manage their affairs while they attended to legal matters in Alexandria, and an Alexandrian official can go 'out into Egypt' from the city (M.Chr. 91).¹⁴

On the other hand, there is some documentary evidence which hints at conceptual inclusion. A Delian inscription (IG 4.4.588) from the third century BCE refers to someone from 'Egyptian Alexandria' (Ἀλεξανδρεῖαι τῆς Αἰγύπτου). Two Delphian inscriptions from that same century

¹⁰ SEG 41.1407, P.Horak 13, BGU 13.2244, P.Oxy. 6.899, W.Chr. 115, P.Oxy. 1.35. Schulz 1943, 58 proposed translating both formulae as 'Alexandria in Egypt.'

¹¹ IMT 1146; *AE* (1912) 211; SB 14.11935.

¹² P.Giss.Univ. 5.46 is from the *Acts of the Alexandrian Martyrs*, and could also be counted as literature. Musurillo 1961, 6–10.

¹³ IG 4.1600; *JRS* 2 (1912) 99.31; Corinth 8.1.80; SB 12.11236; SPP 22.66; IGUR 1.62; IK Knidos 1.31 (Knidos and Delphi); TAM 5.3.1498; IEph 3042.

¹⁴ Bell 1946 proposed two more examples of distinction. One (M.Chr. 96) falls outside the period considered here. I do not find the other (BGU 4.1059; P.Frei. 2.8) compelling.

(Syll. 404, 585) mention Alexandrians ‘from’ (ἀπό) Egypt. A first century memorial from Alexandria calls the city ‘Macedonian Alexandria of Egypt’ (Bernand, *Inscr. Metr.* 19).¹⁵ References to the prefect as ruler of ‘Alexandria and Egypt’ are the exception rather than the rule: most documents call him ruler ‘of Egypt’, placing Alexandria implicitly within Egypt.¹⁶

Graeco-Roman perspectives: literature

The Greek formula meaning ‘Alexandria near Egypt’ occasionally appears in literary sources. The earliest example is in Hypsicles’ *Anaphoricus* (line 63). Thereafter it occurs five times in Strabo and once each in Ptolemaeus, Phlegon, Pseudo-Clement, and Porphyry.¹⁷ The phrase *Alexandria ad Aegyptum* does not, to my knowledge, appear anywhere in Latin literature. In addition, Alexandria is sometimes distinguished from Egypt without the technical formula. Phlegon mentions Ἀλεξανδρεία τῆ κατ’ Αἴγυπτον (‘down from Egypt’ or ‘against Egypt’: *Mir.* 26.1). Polybius mentions ‘Alexandria and the whole of Egypt’ (29.27.12), and records that Antiochus IV was once lord ‘of Egypt and nearly of Alexandria itself’ (29.2.1).¹⁸ Julius Caesar claims that Pompey sought to occupy ‘Alexandria and Egypt’ (3.104.1), and the *Alexandrian War* says Caesar controlled ‘Egypt and Alexandria’ (33.1). The hero of *Ephesiaca* travels to ‘Egypt and Alexandria’ (5.2.2) whilst Ampelius records the distance of a sanctuary ‘from Egypt and Alexandria’ (2.1). Cicero pairs Alexandria alongside ‘Egypt’, ‘all Egypt’, and ‘the rest of Egypt’, and similar distinctions are found in Galen and Porphyry.¹⁹

One could also describe Alexandria and Egypt as different locations with respect to travel.

¹⁵ See Bernand 1969.

¹⁶ Well over one hundred documents refer to a prefect of Egypt (not ‘Alexandria and Egypt’), including documents from Alexandria and documents containing the formula *Alexandria ad Aegyptum*. See BGU 7.1691–1694, W.Chr. 212, P.Oxy. 6.894, P.Oxy. 31.2565, SB 3.6223, I.Alex.Imp. 3, I.Alex.Imp. 18, I.Alex.Imp. 102.

¹⁷ Strabo *Geogr.* 1.1.2, 1.3.17; 2.5.40; 5.1.7; 16.2.5; Ptol. *Pseph* (Heiberg 1907, 160, l. 21); Phlegon *Mir.* 26.1; *Homil. Clem.* 2.22.3; Porph. *Chron.* frag. 7.11.

¹⁸ Emphasis of ‘nearly’ is mine.

¹⁹ Cic. *Fam.* 1.7.4; *Leg. ag.* 2.41; *Att.* 2.5.1; Porph. *Chron.* frag. 7.1; Kühn 1821–33, vol. 12 p. 177, l. 5; vol. 17b, p.155, l. 2; p. 182, line 7.

Philostratus has Apollonius tiring of Alexandria and so departing *into* Egypt and Ethiopia (5.43). *The Oracle of the Potter* implies a similar notion. When the foreigners ruling from ‘the city being built’ (the Macedonians in Alexandria) suffer retribution for their wickedness, the cult images in the city will be returned ‘to Egypt’ (P2 1.34–35; P3 2.58).²⁰

In contrast to these hints of conceptual exclusion, a considerable number of literary passages place Alexandria within Egypt. Livy thrice mentions ‘Alexandria in Egypt’, once as a source of scallops, once in measuring a distance, and once referring to the residence of Macedonians.²¹ After a summary treatment of Egypt, Strabo’s detailed discussion thereof begins with Alexandria, ‘the largest and most important part of this subject’ (17.1.5–6). Several accounts of Alexandria’s founding specify that it was built *in* Egypt rather than just *near* Egypt.²² Bell is right in noting that references to ‘Alexandria in Egypt’ often emphasise geographical (rather than political) realities, but this does not discount them as evidence that Alexandria could be considered part of Egypt.²³

Some texts use the broad term ‘Egypt’ when speaking specifically of Alexandria, implying that Alexandria fits under the rubric of Egypt. Dio (57.19.6) says the prefect’s post (in Alexandria) was in Egypt. Strabo and Pliny describe journeys to or from Alexandria as journeys to or from Egypt.²⁴ Antiochus IV besieged Alexandria during a campaign against ‘Egypt’.²⁵ When a Ptolemaic general returns to ‘Egypt’ (Diod. Sic. 19.79.1–4), it is safe to assume he returns to Alexandria. Caesar advocated going ‘to Egypt’ in response to an Alexandrian revolt, and Cicero says Antony’s journey from Alexandria to Gaul was a journey from Egypt.²⁶ Pompey’s

²⁰ P1 = P.Graf. 29787; P2 = P.Rainer 19813; P3 = P.Oxy. 22.2332. Koenen 1968, 178–209.

²¹ Livy 8.24.1–2.

²² Arr. *Anab.* 5.5; Livy 8.24.1–2; Pliny *HN.* 5.62; 7.125; 13.69; Vitruvius 2.0.4; Diod. Sic. 17.52.

²³ Bell 1946, 131.

²⁴ Strabo *Geogr.* 17.1.12; Pliny *HN.* 5.34.128; 6.101–102.

²⁵ Zonaras 9.25, quoting Dio book 20.

²⁶ Suet. *Iul.* 11.1; Cic. *Phil.* 2.48.

flight to Alexandria is called a flight to Egypt, and the subsequent war in Alexandria could be called a conflict in Egypt.²⁷ Gellius (*NA* 7.17.3) reports that many books acquired by the Ptolemies ‘in Egypt’ — that is, in Alexandria — were destroyed in that conflict. Antony’s return from Armenia ‘to Egypt’ (Cass. Dio 49.40.2–3) is a return to Cleopatra in Alexandria. Gregory Thaumaturgus (*Orat. paneg.* 5) says Origen was ‘from Egypt, from the city of Alexandria’, and Origen casts leaving Alexandria as leaving Egypt (*Comm. Jo.* 6). Most writers identify the prefect as governor of Egypt, not ‘Alexandria and Egypt’, confirming that Alexandria could be included within the conceptual domain of Egypt.²⁸

The Oracle of the Potter also allows a degree of conceptual inclusion. The desolation of Alexandria is predicted as the fulfilment of an oracle declared to Bacharis by a lamb (P2 1.20; P3 2.33–34) — an oracle mentioned briefly by other sources.²⁹ The only text outlining the content of such an oracle is *The Oracle of the Lamb*, a Demotic papyrus from the Augustan era.³⁰ Therein a lamb prophesies the invasion of Egypt by a foreign power. If this resembles the oracle known to the author of *The Oracle of the Potter*, then that author sees Alexandria’s desolation as the fulfilment of prophecy against *Egypt*. This implies conceptual inclusion.³¹

Jewish perspectives: Rabbinic literature

Our survey of Jewish tradition begins with the Rabbis. Some Rabbinic texts date from within the period addressed in this paper, and those compiled after 300 CE (such as the Babylonian Talmud) may contain traditions from earlier eras. The Babylonian Talmud consistently

²⁷ Livy, *Per.* 112; Vell. Pat. 2.53.1–2; Flor. 2.13.

²⁸ Jördens 2012, 56. For the prefect ‘of Egypt’ see: Strabo 17.53; Plin. *HN.* 6.35.181, Sen. *QNat.* 41.2.13, Plin. *Ep.* 10.7, Suet. *Aug.* 66.1, Tac. *Ann.* 13.22, Cass. Dio 51.17. See further references in Reinmuth 1967, 75–128.

²⁹ Eusebius and Synkellos preserve Manetho’s note that a lamb spoke during the reign of Bocchoris. Manetho frags. 64–65(b), LCL 350, 156–66. Aelian (*NA* 12.3) and Pseudo-Plutarch (Crusius 1887, 12, no. 21) may depend on Manetho.

³⁰ The Pharaoh here is Amenophis not Bacharis/Bocchoris.

³¹ This may also appear in Christian additions to 4 Ezra, probably from the late third century. The plague on Egypt in 15:12 is probably that which afflicted Alexandria during Gallienus’ reign.

portrays Alexandria as *in* Egypt. It maintains that Onias built an altar in Alexandria, and considers that altar the fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy (19.19) of an altar in Egypt.³² It also suggests that Alexandria had a grand synagogue that was destroyed because the Jews living there had defied the injunction of Deuteronomy 17:16.³³ The city is regularly called 'Alexandria in Egypt' (אלכסנדרי של מצרים).³⁴

Earlier Rabbinic texts are less clear. The Mishnah does not place Onias' altar in Alexandria (*m.Men.* 13.10), so it is not Egyptian *and* Alexandrian. Neither the Mishnah nor the Jerusalem Talmud mention 'Alexandria in Egypt'.³⁵ But the Jerusalem Talmud does frame the destruction of Alexandria's synagogue as a penalty for returning to Egypt (*y.Sukkah* 55a). The Rabbis of the fourth or fifth century thus did not exempt Alexandrian Jews from the paradox of Egyptian Judaism.

The Tosefta may sometimes name Alexandria by reference to Egypt, but the manuscripts differ. Some instances refer simply to Alexandria, while others speak of Alexandria 'of' Egypt' (של מצרים; likely denoting conceptual inclusion, thus 'in Egypt') or else Alexandria 'which is in Egypt' (שבמצרים).³⁶ The instances are as follows:

³² *b.Men.* 109b.14, 109b.16, 110a. Onias' temple was not in Alexandria (*B.J.* 7.10.2–3 §421–432 and *A.J.* 13.3.1–3 §62–73). The Rabbi's association of Onias' temple with Isaiah 19:19 derives from Josephus; see part two of the paper below.

³³ *b.Suk.* 51b. This passage (anachronistically) attributes the destruction to Alexander the Great. Further discussion of Onias' temple in part two below.

³⁴ *b.Yoma* 38a.2, 38a.7, 38a.10; *b.Ket.* 25a.8; *b.Sot.* 47a.12; *b.Git.* 57b.9; *b.Sanh.* 33a.9, 67b.18, 93a.8, 107b.12 (twice), 111a.7; *b.Men.* 109b.14, 109b.16, 110a.1; *b.Bek.* 28b.13.

³⁵ See especially *m.Bek* 4.4; *b.Bek.* 28b.13, reading 'Alexandria' where *b.Sanh.* 33a.9, 93a.8 read 'Alexandria in Egypt.'

³⁶ There are also discrepancies or errors in the spelling of 'Alexandria': see especially the Vienna and London versions of *t.Sukkah* 4.6 (Zuckerman, 198) in the table provided.

	Vienna	Erfurt	London	Geniza frags.
<i>t.Yoma 2.4</i> (Zuckerman p. 183)	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria מאלכסנדריא	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria which is in Egypt מאלכסנדריא שבמצרים
<i>t.Yoma 2.5</i> (Zuckerman p. 184)	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria מאלכסנדריא	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria which is in Egypt מאלכסנדריא שבמצרים
<i>t.Yoma 2.6</i> (Zuckerman p. 184)	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria מאלכסנדריא	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים
<i>t.Sukkah 4.6</i> (Zuckerman p. 198)	Alexandria of/in Egypt אכסנדריא של מצרים	Alexandria אלכסנדריא	Alexandria אכסנדרייה	-
<i>t.Arakhin 2.3</i> (Zuckerman p. 544)	from Alexandria of/in Egypt מאלכסנדריא של מצרים	-	-	-

Table 1: survey of instances in Rabbinic literature.

For none of these passages is there unanimous evidence of conceptual inclusion. Erfurt never names Alexandria with reference to Egypt. London (where it survives) agrees with Vienna three times and differs once: both manuscripts hint toward conceptual inclusion. One passage in the Geniza fragments agrees with London and Vienna in mentioning Alexandria ‘of’ or ‘in’ Egypt, while two other instances express the same concept with the alternative phrase ‘Alexandria which is in Egypt’. Without further text-critical study, this tabulation of results cannot justify any firm conclusions about the way Alexandria was understood in relation to Egypt in the earliest stages of Rabbinic tradition. It is only safe to say that the original Tosefta was likely located Alexandria within Egypt — but even that may postdate 300 CE and thus fall

outside the primary focal area of this study. Later Rabbinic sources seem to favour conceptual inclusion, but it is not clear whether that perspective was an early phenomenon or a late development. The Rabbinic sources may hint toward conceptual inclusion, but they cannot show whether many — or indeed any — Jews in the ancient world perceived Alexandria as within Egypt.

Jewish Perspectives: Josephus

Although not himself Alexandrian, Josephus engages with Alexandrian interlocutors (such as Apion and Manetho) and affairs — especially the riot of 38 CE. In doing so he speaks of ‘Egyptians’ and ‘Alexandrians’ as separate groups. But these terms do not imply a sharp geopolitical distinction between Egypt and Alexandria. ‘Alexandrian’ denotes civic affiliation while ‘Egyptian’ denotes ethnicity, and applies to those ethnic Egyptians living in Alexandria.³⁷ In insisting that Apion was born in Egypt and *not* Alexandria, Josephus does posit a geographical distinction, which he employs in service of a discourse surrounding ethnicity.³⁸ Nonetheless this is a hint of conceptual exclusion, and such hints occur elsewhere as well. Josephus’ references to a governor of ‘Egypt and Alexandria’ (*B.J.* 4.10.6 §616) and to Jews in ‘Alexandria and Egypt and Cyprus’ (*A.J.* 13.10.4 §284–85) imply a formal distinction between Alexandria and Egypt. He describes Antiochus advancing on Alexandria after he has seized Egypt (*A.J.* 12.5.2 §244–45), and recounts revolutionaries fleeing Alexandria *into* Egypt (*B.J.* 7.10.1 §416).

On the other hand, Josephus’ language sometimes favours conceptual inclusion. He refers once to ‘Alexandria in Egypt’ (*B.J.* 7.1.1 §409), but never to ‘Alexandria near Egypt’. Onias visits Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II ‘in Egypt’, Gabinius went ‘to Egypt’ to reinstate Ptolemy XI, and

³⁷ For ‘Alexandrian’ as a civic designation see *B.J.* 2.18.7 §490; *A.J.* 19.5.2 §284; *Ap.* 2.5 §50.

³⁸ *Ap.* 33–34, 41–42.

Alexandra Maccabee planned to go ‘to Egypt’ for refuge with Cleopatra VII.³⁹ Called ‘to Egypt’ to meet Ptolemy V, Joseph Tobiad went to Alexandria (*A.J.* 12.4.2 §166) where he met other ambassadors who had come ‘to Egypt’ (*A.J.* 12.4.2 §179). Poison administered to Pheroras was acquired in Alexandria, and on that basis was considered to be ‘from Egypt’ (*B.J.* 1.30.5 §592, 1.30.7 §598). Describing Jewish migration under the early Ptolemies, Josephus refers simply to Egypt when Alexandria was certainly the primary destination.⁴⁰ In all these instances, Alexandria is implicitly included within Egypt.

Jewish perspectives: Philo

As an Alexandrian Jew, Philo is especially important for this study. He refers frequently to Egypt while commenting on the Pentateuch, and speaks of Alexandria especially in his treatises on Flaccus and the embassy to Gaius. Philo may imply conceptual inclusion when he twice uses the formula ‘Alexandria near Egypt’.⁴¹ Philo is positive about Jewish presence in Alexandria: he seeks to have Jews recognised as Alexandrians and he considers Alexandria a great city, a ‘fatherland’ to Jews and ‘our Alexandria’.⁴² He is happy to call Alexandria home, but he may not be content to call *Egypt* home. He depicts Egypt negatively as representing the body, sense, and passions — things to be shunned in pursuit of the divine and rational.⁴³ Positivity towards Alexandria and negativity towards Egypt may imply a conceptual separation.

Other clues point towards conceptual inclusion. Flaccus appears as ‘ruler of the country’ who

³⁹ *B.J.* 20.10.3 §236; *A.J.* 13.13.3 §358; *A.J.* 14.6.2 §98; *B.J.* 1.8.7 §175; *A.J.* 15.3.2 §45–47.

⁴⁰ *Ap.* 1.22 §186; *A.J.* 12.1.1 §9–10.

⁴¹ *Prob.* 125, *Legat.* 250.

⁴² *Legat.* 150, 194 cf. *Flacc.* 46; Pearce 1998, 79–105, here 99–104.

⁴³ Pearce 1998, 89–91; Pearce 2007, 81–127, especially 89–91. Examples include *Philo Agr.* 64, 88; *Conf.* 81; *Congr.* 85; *Det.* 38; *Ebr.* 208; *Fug.* 124–125; *Jos.* 151, 254; *Leg.* 3.94, 3.175; *Migr.* 14, 23, 151, 154, 160, 202; *Mut.* 90; *Post.* 62, 155–56.

knew that ‘Alexandria and all Egypt’ contained both Jews and Egyptians (*Flacc.* 43): Alexandria is distinguished from Egypt, but both are within Flaccus’ country (χώρα).⁴⁴ Philo calls Flaccus ‘governor of the country’ three more times, and once ‘governor of Egypt and neighbouring Libya’.⁴⁵ Here authority over Egypt implicitly includes authority over Alexandria. The same is implied in Philo’s statement that Alexandrians did not tamper with synagogues while Augustus ruled Egypt (*Legat.* 148). Gaius’ desire to visit Egypt because he loved Alexandria (*Legat.* 338) also places Alexandria within Egypt. Philo reveals that Alexandrian Jews could know their city to be *ad Aegyptum* (‘by Egypt’) without sharply excluding it from Egypt.

Jewish perspectives: other texts

Several other Jewish texts (including some from Alexandria) furnish relevant material. 4Q248, frag. 1, describes Antiochus IV turning away from Alexandria and coming ‘to Egypt’ (למצרים), implying a degree of distinction.⁴⁶ The Apocalypse of Elijah, on the other hand, mentions the ‘metropolis by the sea’ while outlining judgements brought upon Egypt.⁴⁷ In *3 Maccabees*, a Jewish priest in Alexandria describes the exodus Pharaoh as ‘former ruler of this Egypt’, suggesting Alexandria is in Egypt. There are several relevant passages within the Alexandrian material in the *Sibylline Oracles*. Book five lists Alexandria among Egyptian cities and considers a prophecy against Alexandria to be addressed to Egypt.⁴⁸ Books eleven and twelve call it a city ‘of Egypt’.⁴⁹ The *Letter of Aristeas* (*Let. Arist.* 4) speaks of Jews taken ‘to Egypt’ when ‘this city’ and ‘the land of Egypt’ were conquered. This seems to imply a distinction

⁴⁴ Philo uses χώρα differently at *Flacc.* 2 and 74; there, Alexandria and χώρα might be two components within Egypt.

⁴⁵ *Flacc.* 31, 128, 152; *Legat.* 132.

⁴⁶ ‘Alexandria’ is lost, but supplied from context.

⁴⁷ Apoc. El. (C) 2.8, 15.

⁴⁸ *Sib. Or.* 5.88–89, 111–12. For textual history see Felder 2002, 363–85.

⁴⁹ *Sib. Or.* 11.219–21; 12.232–35. Regarding dates of composition see Collins 1983, 317–472, here 430–32, 443.

between Alexandria and Egypt, but elsewhere (*Let. Arist.* 13, 35) Jews brought ‘to Egypt’ include some taken to Alexandria.⁵⁰ When a (fictional) letter in *3 Maccabees* and the translator of Ben Sira speak of coming to Egypt, they both mean Alexandria in particular.⁵¹ These texts largely imply conceptual inclusion.

Synthesis

The above survey of Graeco-Roman and Jewish sources reveals a conflicted picture. The ancient imagination could understand Alexandria as within Egypt *or* as excluded from it. Both perspectives appear in Greek sources and Latin sources, in documents and literature (and various genres thereof), in Alexandrian and non-Alexandrian sources, and in works by Jewish and non-Jewish authors.

This ambiguity is somewhat unsurprising, given the nature of administration in Egypt and Alexandria. As seen above, there was some distinction between Alexandria and Egypt as administrative jurisdictions. Local variation existed between all of Egypt’s administrative districts and Alexandria may have been a particularly unique case, but it nonetheless operated within the normal systems of centralised Egyptian government (Ptolemaic or Roman). Alexandria had the same currency, taxes, and laws as the rest of Egypt. Alexandrian courts handled cases from all of Egypt, and the privileges of Alexandrian citizens were recognised throughout the country. So there *was* a conceptual distinction, but there was also a significant degree of administrative unity. Thus it is no surprise to find that people — including Alexandrian (and other) Jews — could coherently speak of Alexandria as within or outside of Egypt.⁵² Some sources and authors are ambiguous or inconsistent, and the majority of sources

⁵⁰ Confirmed by *Let. Aris.* 22, which states that captives went to city and country.

⁵¹ *Sir.* 0.25; *3 Macc.* 3.20–21.

⁵² There might be discernible general patterns regarding the use of inclusive or exclusive language. For example, officials and lawmakers may tend toward the technical terminology and the exclusion it implies while private

mentioning Alexandria give no clue either way. This indicates that scholars cannot assume that either conceptual exclusion or conceptual inclusion was a ‘default’ perspective in the ancient imagination, Jewish or otherwise.

The Paradox of Egyptian Judaism?

Egypt was home to a substantial minority of Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. There was some Jewish presence in previous eras. The biblical book of Jeremiah recounts the migration of a Jewish contingent to Egypt (against the prophet’s command) around the same time Psammetichus had Jews garrisoned in Elephantine. A Jewish military settlement at Elephantine is also known from the Elephantine papyri of the fifth century BCE. There was, however, a marked increase in Jewish migration to Egypt after Ptolemy I took control of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia at the end of the fourth century BCE. Ptolemy I had many Jews forcibly relocated to Egypt as soldiers and slaves, largely in Alexandria but also in regional Egypt. Alongside forced migration and the slave trade, economic migration and flight from turbulent events in Judaea contributed to a large and growing Jewish population in Egypt — especially Alexandria — from the early Ptolemaic era.⁵³ Thereafter documentary sources reveal Jews were present throughout the country at every level of society from slaves and wet nurses to generals and philosophers.⁵⁴

This Jewish presence might be thought problematic in light of biblical tradition. The exodus story defined Israel as a people who came *out* from Egypt. The wilderness generation was rebuked for desiring to return there.⁵⁵ Such a return is prohibited in Deuteronomy 17:16, and

individuals may tend toward conceptual inclusion. Yet these are at best general patterns; no such taxonomy can perfectly account for the variation and ambiguity (and perhaps indifference) in the evidence.

⁵³ Barclay 1996, 21–22, 27–29; Kasher 1985, 2–3, 9–10.

⁵⁴ For the socio-economic diversity of Egyptian Jews see Tcherikover 1957, 48–55 and Smallwood 1981, 20–27.

⁵⁵ Numbers 11:4–20.

described in Deuteronomy 28:68 as a journey that ought never be made: when the journey *is* made, this will be a judgement upon Israel. The prophets likewise portray the future return to Egypt as a judgement upon the people. They depict Egypt negatively, and speak against those who would turn there for security.⁵⁶ In short, biblical texts present a negative view of Egypt and Jewish migration thereto. Bezalel Bar-Kochva goes so far as to suggest that these texts amount to ‘explicit biblical prohibition and warnings not to emigrate to Egypt’.⁵⁷ And yet there were many Jews in Egypt and especially Alexandria, not always against their will.

How did Jews living in Alexandria (and the rest of Egypt) reconcile themselves to the so-called ‘easily discerned paradox’ of Egyptian Judaism? Since the sources for Alexandrian Judaism are relatively fulsome compared with those for Judaism in the rest of Egypt, and since this paper is interested in the implications of the conceptual location of Alexandria for this question, the discussion below focuses especially on the Jews of Alexandria. We turn now to consider whether the paradox was in fact discerned in antiquity. If it was, is there evidence for ways the paradox was mitigated or managed in the outlook of Alexandrian Jews? If it was not, why not? In discussing these issues we will also consider how the conceptual location of Alexandria in relation to Egypt may inform, or indeed complicate, our conclusions.

Of all the texts considered above in the study of Alexandria’s conceptual location, only the two Talmuds overtly articulate the view that Jewish residence in Alexandria was problematic. They claim that such residence defied the Deuteronomic prohibition against returning to Egypt.⁵⁸ It is conceivable that this perspective was a Rabbinic innovation, a creative explanation (making use of scripture) for the absence of a great Alexandrian Synagogue. Even if that was the case, that the Rabbis drew these connections renders it plausible that others in a previous era may

⁵⁶ For example Jeremiah 42–44; Isaiah 30:2–3; 31:1; 36:6; cf. Ezekiel 17:15; 29:1–16; Hosea 8:13; 11:5

⁵⁷ Bar-Kochva 1997, 79 cf. 234–236.

⁵⁸ See l.c. above; *y.Sukkah* 55a; *b.Suk.* 51b.

have done likewise. This, however, is speculation. The Rabbinic texts provide no positive proof that the paradox was discerned in an earlier period. Since no earlier text acknowledges the paradox in such overt terms, we must consider whether the paradox was *not* discerned before the Rabbinic period — and if not, why that was the case.

First, is it possible that the paradox was not discerned (or else was deliberately avoided) on account of the conceptual exclusion of Alexandria from Egypt? If Alexandria were considered *near* Egypt rather than *in* Egypt, any perceived prohibition against Egyptian residence would presumably not apply to residents of Alexandria. Although the survey above demonstrated that it was possible to think of Alexandria in such terms, it also showed that Alexandria was often framed as part of Egypt. Jews, including Alexandrian Jews, also commonly articulated that perspective. It is unlikely that they would do so if the legitimacy of Alexandrian Judaism rested upon firmly excluding Alexandria from Egypt. A cursory recognition that Alexandria was formally *ad Aegyptum* ('by Egypt') therefore does not accurately summarise the complexity of Alexandria's conceptualisation, and cannot justify the dismissal of the paradox as irrelevant to Alexandria.

Alternatively, might Jews who considered themselves to be living in Egypt fail to discern a paradox due to ignorance of biblical prohibitions against residing in Egypt? Although the biblical literacy of most Alexandrian Jews is difficult to ascertain, few could be ignorant of the exodus story. The exodus was recounted and evoked frequently in biblical and extrabiblical tradition. The continued observance of an annual Passover in Alexandria and the extant works of Alexandrian Judaism — Philo, *Wisdom of Solomon* and *Exagoge*, for example — suggest that interest in the exodus was alive and well in Alexandria. Since Alexandria was probably the central location for the translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek, it is implausible that all Alexandrian Jews were entirely ignorant of prophetic passages such as Jeremiah 42–44, let

alone Pentateuchal texts like Deuteronomy 17:16 and 28:68. The notion that ignorance of tradition prevented Alexandrian Jews from discerning the paradox of Egyptian residence is not credible.

The preceding conclusions do not prove that Alexandrian Jews *did* discern the supposed paradox of Jewish residence in Egypt. They show only that if the paradox went unnoticed, that was probably *not* because the Jews were unaware of the relevant biblical traditions nor because they considered themselves outside of Egypt. Instead, we should consider other factors that might have nullified the paradox for an Alexandrian Jewish outlook, whether deliberately (the paradox being perceived and consciously mitigated) or otherwise (the paradox being never discerned). These may be as simple as taking that the prohibitions and negative attitudes were limited to particular times or events, or as subtle as allegorising that the exodus had no bearing upon physical location. The rest of this paper is dedicated to evaluating a range of such possibilities through discussion of the texts in which they might appear.

One possibility to consider is that the negative biblical stance toward Egypt might have been constrained or counteracted by something else in scripture or tradition that lent legitimacy to Alexandrian Judaism. There is one very clear context where this phenomenon occurs: Josephus preserves letters wherein the priest Onias supposedly seeks and receives Ptolemaic permission to build a Jewish temple in Egypt.⁵⁹ The request, the grant, and Josephus' framing all claim that this attempt was justified by Onias on the basis of Isaiah 19:19: 'there will be an altar to the Lord in the middle of the land of Egypt.'

These letters are undoubtedly inauthentic, but they preserve one early attitude towards Onias' Egyptian temple. The Ptolemies are framed as benefactors, granting Onias' request. But they

⁵⁹ Josephus *A.J.* 13.3.1–2 at §61, §68, §71. Whether Onias III or Onias IV was responsible for the temple is a topic of some dispute. Due to the immediate purposes and scope of this study, it will not be discussed.

also express some reservations about whether Onias' God would actually be pleased with a temple built in that location. The perspective of the letters, then, seems simultaneously pro-Ptolemaic and anti-Oniad.⁶⁰ The pro-Ptolemaic stance suggests an Alexandrian origin, so these letters are best taken to preserve an Alexandrian Jewish assessment of Onias' Egyptian temple project. If so, there were Alexandrian Jews among those who questioned the legitimacy of a temple in Egypt. On the other hand, Onias (and presumably his supporters) resided in Alexandria prior to relocating to the temple site. Alexandrian Jews appear to have been divided over the validity of the temple.

To complicate things further, this does not reveal what Onias' supporters or their critics thought about *living* in Alexandria. The debate was as much about the uniqueness of the Jerusalem temple as it was about the Egyptian locus of the new temple.⁶¹ Onias' supporters might feel their residence in Egypt was valid in accordance with their temple, but did Onias' critics feel a need to justify their dwelling there? There is no extant evidence that they did so in the same direct manner as the defenders of Onias' temple. It is conceivable, however, that Alexandrian texts may employ subtler strategies to defend the legitimacy of Egyptian residence against a perceived challenge. It is to that possibility that we now turn.

In the *Letter of Aristeas*, exodus motifs are appropriated to tell a 'non-exodus' story.⁶² In Exodus, Israel is freed from slavery to an oppressive Pharaoh who hindered right worship. Leaving Egypt, they received the law and built the tabernacle. The *Letter of Aristeas* also depicts Jewish slaves being freed and receiving the law (translated into Greek). But instead of leaving Egypt, in this instance they are allowed to remain in Egypt, blessed by the leaders of the Jerusalem temple (and implicitly by God) and under the benefaction of an Egyptian king

⁶⁰ Taylor 1998, 306.

⁶¹ Josephus also reports that Alexandrian Jews rejected the legitimacy of Samaritan temples: *A.J.* 13.3.4 §74–79.

⁶² Honigman 2003, 37–63; Hacham 2005, 1–20; McKechnie 2008.

who honours their worship and wisdom. The *Letter of Aristeas* thus authorises and legitimises Greek-speaking Judaism in Alexandria and, potentially, beyond. On the basis of this tradition, any apparent prohibition against Egyptian residence might be considered inapplicable or superseded, at least in Alexandria.

Although this tradition seems capable of defusing the paradox, at no point does the *Letter of Aristeas* indicate that Jewish residence in Alexandria or Egypt would otherwise be problematic. The author may have had other reasons, unrelated to the paradox in question, to promote the legitimacy of Alexandrian Judaism. If Jews felt the paradox of Egyptian residence in Egypt, the story recounted in the *Letter of Aristeas* could nullify that paradox, at least in Alexandria. But that text cannot itself prove that they actually discerned the paradox, and there is no external evidence that the *Letter of Aristeas* was consciously put to that use by Alexandrian or other Egyptian Jews.

A different route to affirming the positivity of Jewish presence in Egypt occurs in Artapanus. Some of Israel's fathers — Abraham, Joseph, and Moses — appear as benefactors of Egypt, responsible for the best of Egyptian culture and technology. This identifies a longstanding and positive precedent for Jews dwelling in Egypt. Whether Artapanus spoke primarily to a Jewish or a non-Jewish audience, the positive precedent serves to lend legitimacy to his contemporary Egyptian Judaism. If Israel's heroes could live in Egypt, any apparent prohibition must be less than universal in scope. It is impossible to know how Artapanus interpreted the traditions that could ostensibly problematise Egyptian Judaism. Was his affirming stance enabled, for example, by the same interpretative flexibility that allowed him to credit Moses with the initiation of Egyptian animal cults?⁶³ Or would more conservative exegetes share Artapanus' conviction (against the Rabbis) that the prohibition's scope was limited such that Egyptian

⁶³ Eusebius *Praep. evang.* 9.27.4.

residence could be positive? Whatever may be the case, Artapanus' presentation of positive Jewish heritage in Egypt amounts to an implicit defence of legitimate Jewish residence rather than a concession that such dwelling is paradoxical or problematic.

Jonathan Trotter argues that a similar legitimising move occurs in *3 Maccabees*.⁶⁴ As in the *Letter of Aristeas*, the plight and deliverance of Alexandrian Jews in *3 Maccabees* evokes the exodus story. The Jews had been slaves (2.28–29 cf. 7.5), they are subject to hard labour (4.14), and Ptolemy IV fears that they might unite with his enemies (3.24–26). They cry out to God (4.2–3; 5.7–9) and recall their previous deliverance (the exodus) from a 'former ruler of this Egypt' (6.4).⁶⁵ The king's attempt to eliminate them results in the destruction of his army (5.47; 6.21). When Ptolemy IV has the Jews released, he characterises them as a people who have long provided stability to Egypt and its government (6.26–28). Although similar to the *Letter of Aristeas* in its paradigmatic use of the exodus story, its implicit defence of Jewish legitimacy resembles that of Artapanus, acknowledging (through Ptolemy IV) a positive precedent for Jewish presence in Egypt.

While the texts discussed above affirm in various ways the legitimacy of Alexandrian or Egyptian Judaism, other sources may attest readings of the exodus story that do not demand a negative view of geopolitical Egypt or residence therein. If the exodus story was taken to be primarily concerned with something other than national Israel's physical departure from Egypt, it might have been possible both to affirm the enduring significance of the exodus and to justify

⁶⁴ Trotter 2018, 91–122, at 111–19.

⁶⁵ In using elements of Eleazar's prayer in *3 Maccabees* 6.4 and 6.15 (which cites Leviticus 26:44) to argue that *3 Maccabees* deliberately parallels the exodus, Trotter would do well to acknowledge that Eleazar's prayer recalls several other instances of deliverance as well. Since it recalls a number of stories, the prayer itself is not strong evidence for a particular analogy between the situation in Alexandria and any one of those stories. The exodus paradigm does exist in *3 Maccabees*, but more care is warranted in specifying where and how it is seen. See Trotter 2018, 112–15.

living in Egypt (whether implicitly or deliberately). This possibility will be tested by an examination of *Wisdom of Solomon* and Philo.

Wisdom recounts the history of Israel through the exodus and wilderness period, stressing the justice and good order worked by divine wisdom in the course of these events. *Wisdom* places the blessings bestowed upon Israel in a stark contrast to the retribution meted out against wicked Egypt; each is a fitting outcome that matches the nature and behaviour of its subjects.⁶⁶ This justice is built into the fabric of the world such that the same natural elements and creatures work favourably for the righteous and bring disaster for the wicked.⁶⁷ Indeed the nature of the disaster befits the nature of the wickedness: ‘the things someone sins by, by those they are punished’.⁶⁸

In *Wisdom*’s account of the exodus, neither Egypt nor Israel nor their respective leaders are ever named. It speaks instead of ‘holy ones’ or ‘the righteous’ on one side and ‘the ungodly’ or ‘enemies’ (of the righteous) on the other. National and ethnic labels are withheld to show that divine favour and disapprobation are rendered according to moral — not first ethnic or geopolitical — criteria.⁶⁹ Israel is not saved simply because it is Israel, but because it is righteous. Egypt is punished not for being Egypt per se, but for its wickedness.⁷⁰ The exodus is still foundational for the character and identity of Israel, but its central emphasis is based on the demonstration of Israel’s righteousness rather than the departure from the land of Egypt. Read this way, the exodus demands righteous living and worship whilst condemning wickedness and idolatry; it does not necessarily follow that the faithful Jew must depart

⁶⁶ Cheon 1997, 112.

⁶⁷ For example see *Wisdom* 11.5–8; 16.24.

⁶⁸ *Wisdom* 11.16. See also 17.2; 18.5–6. Cheon 1997, 116–118.

⁶⁹ Enns 1997, 140, 147–148.

⁷⁰ Linebaugh 2013, 78–79; Collins 1977, 121–42.

physically from Egypt.⁷¹ As such, the ‘easily discerned’ paradox may not apply for Jews in Egypt — perhaps like the author of *Wisdom* — who seek to live righteously there.

On the other hand, it is not at all obvious that the author of *Wisdom* had this purpose in mind. The emphasis on righteousness and wickedness serves to establish an ordered rationale for the events of the literal exodus and thereby to affirm the universality of divine providence and wisdom.⁷² As such, *Wisdom* does not express any clear stance on the particular issue of the viability of Jewish residence in Alexandria. One can imagine a reader of *Wisdom* finding resources therein to minimise the paradox (if perceived), but such reception of *Wisdom* is unattested.

Philo’s symbolising hermeneutic is also relevant to this strategy of re-framing the exodus. Philo read the Pentateuch allegorically, seeing spiritual meanings behind the literal meanings of scripture.⁷³ He took Egypt as a symbol for the body and its passions, and thus took the exodus to represent the righteous soul’s departure from enslavement to bodily passions.⁷⁴ The true significance of the exodus was not in geographical migration but in spiritual progress. This might suggest that location is irrelevant. Thus René Bloch contends that ‘for Philo... such a symbolic (instead of a literal) reading of the Exodus also permitted him to keep the Exodus under control, so to speak, and to stay in Egypt’.⁷⁵

But this is too simplistic: Philo did read symbolically, but not *instead of* reading literally. The *Life of Moses* reveals that he considered the literal exodus important in Jewish history and heritage. Moreover, it is unlike Philo to use symbolic readings to negate literal meanings. On

⁷¹ For this perspective see Cheon 1997, 110.

⁷² Barclay 2015, 204; cf. Enns 1997, 147–48.

⁷³ Note also that Philo’s *Life of Moses* stresses Moses’ benefaction in Egypt in a similar manner to Artapanus.

⁷⁴ See especially *Migration* 14, but also *Prelim. Studies* 164; *Posterity* 155–57; *Drunkenness* 124; *Worse* 93–95; cf. Bloch 2015, 360–61.

⁷⁵ Bloch 2015, 357–364, here 361. Bloch claims that Philo was ‘very much in Egypt’ but does not address the complexity of the evidence (362).

the contrary, he criticises those who use allegory to justify neglect of the law (*Abr.* 89–93). For Philo, symbolic readings illuminate the rationale behind scripture and provide more reason — not less — to observe the law. He is unlikely to think a symbolic reading of Deuteronomy 17:16 (*Agr.* 84–89) diminished the force of its prohibition. Moreover, Philo applied his symbolising hermeneutic everywhere in the Pentateuch, so a symbolic reading of the exodus does not emerge from a specific need to reduce the force of an exodus-induced paradox. Moreover, as explored in the first part of this paper, Philo’s relationship to Egypt was more complex than Bloch allows. Hermeneutics that re-frame the exodus in non-geographical terms might allow Jews like Philo or other allegorists to reduce the tension of living in Egypt — or perhaps contribute to the paradox going unnoticed. Yet this too is speculative and more complex than Bloch suggests.

Having searched the literature of Alexandrian Judaism for evidence of the discernment or nullification (deliberate or otherwise) of the ‘easily discerned paradox in Jews living in Egypt’, what conclusions emerge? The Alexandrian sources never acknowledge the tension as overtly as the Rabbis do. The paradox cannot be dismissed on the basis of Jewish ignorance or the conceptual exclusion of Alexandria from Egypt. Onias’ temple was defended by appeal to scripture, but there is no evidence for any such direct justification of residence in Alexandria. There are features in various Alexandrian texts that could plausibly have some part in reducing the force of the paradox: The *Letter of Aristeas* affirms the legitimacy of Alexandrian Judaism, *Artapanus* and *3 Maccabees* present a precedent of positive Jewish presence in Egypt, and *Wisdom* and Philo re-frame the exodus to emphasise moral or spiritual rather than geopolitical meaning. Yet none of these are much more than speculation; they do not constitute proof that the paradox was discerned and actively mitigated. Nor do they justify any confident conclusion that such attitudes prevented the discernment of the paradox.

The inconclusiveness of these findings warrants both further investigation and greater caution going forward. The first part of this study shows, through an updated survey of the sources, that both conceptual inclusion and conceptual exclusion of Alexandria are well attested. Neither perspective can be assumed as the default position of every author or text. In future scholarship, the inclusion or exclusion of Alexandria must be a matter for argumentation rather than assumption. The second part of the study has evaluated several ways the supposedly ‘easily discerned paradox’ might have been nullified, deliberately or otherwise. Although some of these are plausible, all are speculative. Future scholarship should be wary of asserting these theories unless further evidence can be advanced.

The limited scope of the present study leaves more to be addressed in understanding the perspectives of Egyptian Judaism. In particular, further study might fruitfully consider non-Alexandrian and non-literary sources. In particular, this may include further attention to Onias and his temple, the Jewish settlement at Elephantine, Jerusalem-oriented prayer houses throughout Egypt, expectations that Egyptian Jews should travel to Jerusalem for festivals (as per Zechariah 14:18–19), and accounts of Jewish sojourn in Egypt, such as that of Jesus’ family in Matthew 2:13–21. Further inquiry holds promise for clarifying the plausibility, effect and significance of the attitudes explored in the second half of this study.

Bibliography

- Bar-Kochva, B. 1997. *Pseudo-Hecataeus on the Jews: Legitimising the Jewish Diaspora*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Barclay, JMG. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Barclay, JMG. 2015. *Paul and the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Bell, HI. 1946. 'Alexandria ad Aegyptum'. *JRS* 36:130–32.
- Bernand, É. 1969. *Inscriptions métriques de l'Égypte gréco-romaine: Recherches sur la poésie épigrammatique des grecs en Égypte*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Bloch, R. 2015. 'Leaving Home: Philo of Alexandria on the Exodus'. In *Israel's Exodus in Transdisciplinary Perspective*, eds. TE Levy, T Schneider, and WHC Propp, 357–364. Switzerland: Springer International.
- Bowman, AK. 1986. *Egypt After the Pharaohs 332 BC–AD 642: From Alexander to the Arab Conquest*. London: Guild Publishing.
- Cheon, S. 1997. *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon: A Study in Biblical Interpretation*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Chistalev, MS. 'Alexandria ad Aegyptum/in Aegypto: о некоторых аспектах восприятия города римскими авторами в середине I в. до н.э. – начале II в. н.э.'. In *ПОЛИТИЧЕСКАЯ ЖИЗНЬ ЗАПАДНОЙ ЕВРОПЫ: античность, средние века, новое и новейшее время*, ed. AP Панов, 106–117. Nizhny Novgorod: Arzamas Branch, Nizhny Novgorod State University.

- Collins, JJ. 1977. 'Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age'. *HR* 17:121–42.
- Collins, JJ. 1983. 'Sibylline Oracles (Second Century B.C.–Seventh Century A.D.)'. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, vol. 1, ed. JH Charlesworth, 317–472. New York: Doubleday.
- Crusius, O, ed. 1887. *Plutarchi de proverbii Alexandrinorum: Libellus Ineditus*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Daris, S. 1990. 'Alessandria d'Egitto: un Mito?'. *Paideia* 45:105–120.
- Enns, PE. 1997. *Exodus Retold: Ancient Exegesis of the Departure from Egypt in Wis 10:15–21 and 19:1–9*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Felder, S. 2002. 'What is the Fifth Sibylline Oracle'. *JSJ* 334:363–85.
- Fernández, RG. 2013. 'Domo Alexandria cat(a) Aegipto(n). Otra peculiaridad de la ciudad que estaba en Egipto'. *Myrtia* 28:343–54.
- Fraser, PM. 1949. 'Alexandria ad Aegyptum Again'. *JRS* 39.1–2:56.
- Fraser, PM. 1972. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Green, P. 1996. 'Alexander's Alexandria'. In *Alexandria and Alexandrianism: Papers delivered at a Symposium Organised by The J. Paul Getty Museum and The Getty Centre for the History of Art and the Humanities and Held at the Museum April 22–25, 1993*, ed. K Hamma, 3–25. California: The J. Paul Getty Museum.
- Haas, C. 1997. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

- Hacham, N. 2005. 'The Letter of Aristeas: A New Exodus Story?'. *JSJ* 36.1:1–20.
- Heiberg, JL, ed. 1907. *Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae exstant omnia*, vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Honigman, S. *The Septuagint and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria: A Study in the Narrative of the Letter of Aristeas*. London: Routledge.
- Jördens, A. 2012. 'Government, Taxation, and Law'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Roman Egypt*, ed. C Riggs, 56–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kasher, A. 1985. *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Koenen, L. 1968. 'Prophezeiung des Töpfers'. *ZPE* 2:178–209.
- Kühn, KG, ed. 1821–33. *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, 20 vols. Leipzig: Teubner: Knobloch.
- Lewis, N. 1986. *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Linebaugh, JA. 2013. *God, Grace, and Righteousness in Wisdom of Solomon and Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Leiden: Brill.
- Manning, JG. *The Last Pharaohs: Egypt Under the Ptolemies, 305–30 BC*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- McKechnie, P. 2008. 'Ptolemy Philadelphus: A New Moses'. In *Ptolemy II Philadelphus and his World*, eds. P McKechnie and P Guillaume, 233–246. Leiden: Brill.
- Modrzejewski, JM. 1995. *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

- Musurillo, H. 1961. *Acta Alexandrinorum*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Pearce, S. 1998. 'Belonging and Not Belonging: Local Perspectives in Philo of Alexandria'. In *Jewish Local Patriotism and Self-Identification in the Graeco-Roman Period*, eds. S Jones and S Pearce, 79–105. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pearce, S. 2007. *The Land of the Body: Studies in Philo's Representation of Egypt*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Reinmuth, OW. 1967. 'A Working List of the Prefects of Egypt 30 B.C. to 299 A.D'. *BASP* 4.4:75–128.
- Schulz, F. 1943. 'Roman Registers of Births and Birth Certificates: Part II'. *JRS* 33: 55–64.
- Smallwood, EM. 1981. *The Jews Under Roman Rule From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in Political Relations*. Leiden: Brill.
- Taylor, JE. 1998. 'A Second Temple in Egypt: The Evidence for the Zadokite Temple of Onias'. *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period* 29.3:297–321.
- Tcherikover, VA. 1966. *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Trotter, J. 2018. 'The Homeland and the Legitimation of the Diaspora: Egyptian Jewish Origin Stories in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods'. *JSP* 28.2:91–122.
- Zuckermann, M. 1882. *Tosephta*. Pasewalk: Trier.