Greece & Rome, Vol. xliv, No. 2, October 1997

PHILO'S *IN FLACCUM*: ETHNICITY AND SOCIAL SPACE IN ROMAN ALEXANDRIA*

By RICHARD ALSTON

1. *Issues*

Philo's famous account of anti-semitic rioting in Alexandria in A.D. 38, the *In Flaccum*, has frequently been exploited by scholars interested in the legal status of the Jewish community within the city and the issue of the constitution of Alexandria.[1] This legal issue lies near the heart of the dispute which leads to some ancient and most modern accounts tracing the roots of the dispute to the Ptolemaic period.[2] It is notable, however, that the first major attested outbreaks of anti-Jewish feeling considerably post-date the Roman conquest, suggesting that this is a problem of Roman Alexandria with its roots in the Roman administration of the city. Philo also places comparatively little emphasis on legality in the *In Flaccum*. The account of the persecution concentrates rather on the topography of the dispute.[3] The centrality of spatial factors in the *In Flaccum* can be illustrated by comparing the persecution of the Jews and the fall of Flaccus. Flaccus was publicly humiliated through a show trial, through the sale of his property at public action, and on his journey into exile, by the crowds in Italy and Greece who flocked to watch him pass. He was excluded from public space, both from his city by decree of the emperor and from the urban spaces of his island exile, prompted in the latter case by his conscience. Finally, while in isolation, he was attacked and murdered. The Jews were robbed and driven from the streets of their city into exile and deprived of access to the theatre and market. Their leaders were humiliated in the most public places in the city and finally they were attacked in their own homes. Although the parallels are not exact, as can be seen in Table 1, they are explicit and this elaborate structure demonstrates for Philo the justice of God in His persecution of the persecutors.[4]

The buildings of the city were more than a theatrical backdrop: they were, as I hope to show, significant symbols of group identity and by excluding the Jewish community from this urban space, the rioters enforced a particular interpretation of the urban community. I suggest

Table 1: Parallel Stories of Persecution

Reference (*In Flaccum*)	Event in persecution of the Jews	Reference (*In Flaccum*)	Event in persecution of Flaccus
34–40	Pantomime and assault in words.	19–24	Preliminaries.
41	Demonstration in the Gymnasium.		
42–52	Capture of the synagogues.	111–16	Capture of Flaccus.
53–4	Exclusion of Jews from the citizen body.	151	Exile.
55–7	Isolation and looting of Jewish property.	148–150	Loss of property.
58–71	Attacks on Jews in the Greek sector	152–5	Public humiliation
72–85	Attacks on Jews in the *agora* and theatre.	166–8	Exclusion from the *agora*. Flaccus retreats into solitude.
86–94	Attack on the Jewish houses.	186–90	Tortuous death of Flaccus.
95–6	Torture of the women in the theatre.		

that this reflects Philo's view of the issue as being primarily concerned with the identity and culture of the city and the physical integration of the Jewish community.

This issue of the ethnicity of the city had become increasingly problematic following the Roman reorganization of Alexandria and Egypt. The Romans imposed complex status differentials which were loosely based on ethnicity and residence and reinforced by different rates of taxation, so that to be 'Greek' and urban was to be of the highest status while to be 'Egyptian' and rural was to be of the lowest.[5] Roman rule, therefore, associated the city with Hellenism, implicitly questioning the place of the Jewish community. We can only fully understand this process and the impact of the persecution on the Jewish community by investigating the symbolic geography of each space (the gymnasium, the theatre, the street, the district, and the house) within the competing ideologies of the period. By making explicit these ideological disputes,

the *In Flaccum* offers an insight into the changing conceptions of urban identity in an eastern city under Roman rule in the first century A.D.

2. *Preliminaries and the Gymnasium*

The spark for the disturbance was a public demonstration by the Jewish community to celebrate the arrival in the city of Agrippa. Philo rather skates over what exactly happened during the visit and attributes to Agrippa a desire to pass quietly through the city (*In Flaccum* 27).[6] Agrippa, however, landed (*In Flaccum* 27–32) and was proclaimed by the Jewish community as *Marin* (Lord) (*In Flaccum* 36–40).[7] In itself, this was an assertion of ethnicity. It was a communal celebration of a foreign dynasty to which the Jews proclaimed some ill-defined loyalty, probably using an Aramaic title. By occupying the public space of the city through this demonstration, the power of the community was advertised, as well as its essential difference: it was non-Greek and had foci of loyalty other than those of the Greek population.[8]

The reaction of the Greek community was to satirize the Jewish demonstration in a farce enacted in the gymnasium (*In Flaccum* 36–40). This building was one of the largest and most impressive buildings in Alexandria. According to Strabo (17.1.10), the gymnasium was a large and impressive structure, centrally placed within the city and probably Alexandria's most beautiful building.[9] Its topographical centrality suggests that the institution was of some importance within the Ptolemaic city.

The formal relationship between Alexandrian citizenship and membership of the gymnasium is obscure. Claudius confirms that former ephebes were entitled to citizenship (Bell 1924 = *P.Lond.* VI 1912. 52–59). Delia is, however, almost certainly correct to argue that Alexandrian citizenship had only the formal requirement of registration in a deme and tribe,[10] though it may still have been expected that an Alexandrian would perform the *ephebeia* and so membership of the gymnasium could be taken as circumstantial evidence for citizenship. The importance of Alexandrian citizenship under the Ptolemies is unclear, though the continuation of deme organization throughout the period suggests that it had some function.[11] It seems likely that the Jewish community maintained their own internal communal structures, neither needing nor wanting to assimilate to the structures of Greek civic life, which probably had a certain religious element. Philo (*In Flaccum* 80) and Josephus (*B.J.* 7.412) represent the Jewish community as

having a *gerousia*, suggesting a formal civic organization, and a later description of the Great Synagogue in Alexandria suggests an elaborate civic organization in parallel to the organization of the rest of the city.[12] In the Roman period the increased importance of citizenship made defining the citizen body and maintaining its exclusivity crucial issues. Initially, it seems likely that the Jewish community were accepted as part of the Alexandrian community and granted very similar privileges to the Alexandrian Greeks.[13] The Roman authorities seem to have made no effort to reconcile the separate civic organizations.[14]

The situation emerging in the *metropoleis* of Egypt, from where there is no attested Greek-Egyptian ethnic conflict, offers some parallels. In the Early Roman period village gymnasia were closed and gymnasia of the *metropoleis* reformed so that membership became a mark of high status.[15] Although the Romans did not create city councils to aid their administration until the third century A.D. some administrative functions were devolved onto local magistrates who were recruited from the gymnasial group and it seems likely that Alexandria followed this pattern.[16] Potential members of these reformed urban gymnasia had to demonstrate that they were descended from parents of gymnasial status by tracing direct maternal and paternal lines back to the last reform of the gymnasial lists, or to the original membership rolls which were of Augustan date.[17] Membership of the Alexandrian gymnasium was probably regulated in a similar fashion and the regulations were on occasion applied strictly: a soldier whose children were born while he was in service and who were, therefore, technically illegitimate, was stunned to discover that his children would not be admitted to the ephebate even though both he and his wife were of Alexandrian gymnasial status (M.Chr I 372 = *FIRA*²III 19).[18]

In the *metropoleis* a 'Greek' gymnasial elite formed a sub-group within the metropolite 'citizen body'. With the possible and very limited exception of the traditional temples, this group had no independent civic organization. The hierarchy within the community was relatively clear. In Alexandria, the leaders of the gymnasium came to be identified as an elite and the representatives of the city, but their relationship to other ethnic groups is unclear. If we presume that most of the male Greek citizens were also members of the gymnasium, any claim that the gymnasial group represented an elite of the city of Alexandria, rather than the Greek community, becomes less tenable. The issue of the status of the gymnasial leaders and their relationship to the Jewish community and the Roman authorities is the main theme of the *Acta Alexandrini* and

if any of the accounts are to be trusted, led to the deaths of several leaders of the Alexandrian Greek community. Nevertheless, the radical reforms of the gymnasia throughout Egypt, the supervision of gymnasial membership, and the recruitment of local magistrates may have identified the gymnasium with Roman power. In addition, the gymnasium may have been a centre of imperial cult.[19] By enhancing the importance of the members of the gymnasium and using the gymnasial group in urban administration, the Romans elevated a particular community and reinforced or perhaps even created their claim for priority within the city, marginalizing the Jews and other ethnic groups who were (probably) excluded from gymnasium.

3. *The Theatre and the* Demos

Since the gymnasium was essentially 'Greek' space, the first stages of the disturbance, though worrying for the Jewish community and insulting, did not pose a direct threat. The next stage was to seize the theatre in a dawn raid, presumably planned to surprise any official opposition (*In Flaccum* 41). Philo represents the seizure of the theatre as an escalation and we must presume that the theatre had a symbolic meaning different from that of the gymnasium. Alexandrians were charged with being obsessed with theatrical displays (Dio Chrysostom, *Oratio* 32.41) and interest in these matters was not the exclusive preserve of the Greek community: Jews, Greeks, and Egyptians could come together for the shows and Philo was quite comfortable drawing images from athletic contests (*De Agricultura* 112–23; *De Ebrietate* 177).[20] The theatre also served as a meeting place for the Alexandrian *demos* (Jos. *B.J.* 2.491–8). The seizure of the theatre allowed the mob to identify themselves as the Alexandrian *demos*. The wishes of the *demos* could then be expressed through acclamations or votes and be presented to Flaccus. By their demand to be allowed to install statues of the emperors in the synagogues (*In Flaccum* 41), the Alexandrian Greek community claimed authority over all communal space in the city, including that which had been exclusive to the Jews. Flaccus' granting of this request tacitly accepted the claim of the Greek *demos* to control the city, developing the policy which had placed the gymnasial group in control of certain aspects of urban administration.

Flaccus then formally revoked the civic rights of the Jews, declaring the Jews aliens (*In Flaccum* 53–4). The legal position was clarified. Alexandria was to be a Greek city with a citizen body controlling the city

under Roman supervision. The Jewish community had been excluded from the *demos* and were subordinated to it. The Jews were resident aliens and not an equal but separate community within the body of inhabitants of Alexandria.

5. *Districts and Streets*

The Greeks celebrated their control by driving the Jews from all but a small area of the city thereby enforcing a physical separation of the Jews from the main city (*In Flaccum* 55) in parallel to the separation of the Jews from the *demos* by exclusion from the theatre. The limited papyrological and archaeological evidence suggests that this segregation of the Jewish community was a new phenomenon. The evidence from the necropolis at Chatby, which was probably the closest necropolis to the Delta quarter, and from the nearby Hadra and El-Ibrahimiya necropoleis suggests strongly that the population interred there was mixed. Jews and Greeks were buried next to one another, presumably reflecting patterns of residence.[21] The papyrological evidence from the mummy cartonage from Abusir el Malak also mentions a number of Jews and Greeks. Where geographical indicators are given, there is no particular association between the Jews and the Delta quarter (*BGU* IV 1115; 1116; 1151). The different legal and social groups within the city did not form separate residential blocks. There were probably greater concentrations of the Jewish community within specific districts of the city but this was not a legal or complete separation, any more than concentrations of tradesmen of particular types within particular medieval and early modern cities represented their isolation from the wider community. Nevertheless, the riot created two physically distinct urban communities: Alexandrian (Greek) and a related Jewish settlement.

The rhetoric of the Greek element was probably of a restoration of a historic situation. The anti-Semitic Apion claimed that the Jews' rights of residence were restricted to a relatively small sector of the city in the Delta quarter in the north-east of the city where, he alleges, the Jewish settlement was originally situated (Jos. *C.Ap.* 2.33–5; *B.J.* 2.487; 495; *BGU* IV 1151; Strabo 17.1.10).[22] Josephus seems to misunderstand the force of this charge, perhaps deliberately, noting that it was rather a fine residential area (Jos. *C.Ap.* 2.33–4), thereby suggesting that the very quality of the district meant that the Jewish community were integral to the city, but seeming to admit a far greater level of separation than that

described by Philo (*In Flaccum* 55–7). By enforcing what was portrayed as an original separation of the Jewish community, the Greeks emphasized that the Jewish colony was entirely different from the Greek, as similar 'ghettoization' did in later centuries. Thus, the Greeks laid claim to the vast majority of civic space and facilities. This separation was violently enforced and Jews caught in Greek civic space were killed, some even being dragged along the streets of the newly Graecized city, a marking of civic space which was of obvious symbolic significance.

6. *Controlling the Jews: Community and Household*

The next stage of the assault was to extend control over the Jewish community in its newly isolated state. This was achieved by two measures. The first was the arrest and scourging of the leaders of the Jewish community. The means of punishment, scourging in the Egyptian manner rather than the Alexandrian, was a public display of the subordinate position of the Jewish leadership and the assimilation of the Jewish community with that of the Egyptians rather than that of the Alexandrians. The dramatic nature of the punishment is emphasized by the procession of the elders through the *agora* and into the theatre where they were punished before the eyes of the redefined Alexandrian populace (*In Flaccum* 73–81).

The second measure was to attack the houses of the Jewish community. In several works, Philo felt it necessary either to allude to or explain what appears to have been a distinctively Jewish arrangement of the house (*In Flaccum* 89). The pattern described was certainly very different from Roman practice and probably also from that of the Egyptians and Alexandrian Greeks.[23] From the door of the house, the sequence of space was the *pylon* (gatehouse), *auleios* (entrance to the courtyard), the *aule* (courtyard), and the *thalamos* (domestic quarters?). In his *Legum Allegoriarum* (3.40), Philo notes that the *pylon* was the male area. In the *De Specialibus Legibus* (3.169) Philo sets the limits for female access to the various areas of the house as being the *mesaulon* for unmarried women and the *pylon* for married. This suggests that unmarried women were confined to the *thalamos* and *aule* while married women could have the run of the house. In such a pattern, it was probably expected that all the women would withdraw beyond the *auleios*, if strange males entered the house. There was a powerful ideological division between the front and back areas of the house. Philo used this spatial division as a metaphor for the separation of

rational and irrational parts of the soul (*Quaestiones in Genesim* 4.15). The house was a place of seclusion for women. Women's access to public space, the male sphere, was (ideally) strictly controlled.[24] Even the process of visiting the temple was potentially dangerous and Philo advised that women should only make such journeys when the city was quiet and when there was less danger of unwanted social contact (*Spec. Leg.* 3.170). The house was also a place of refuge for men (*Legum Allegoriarum* 3.238–9). It was private space and the security of the house was probably very important for the standing of the family. Philo presents us with an ideal below which many fell, but high-status families probably attempted to secure the house and segregate their women.

The attack on the houses was, therefore, of great symbolic importance. Philo notes how the soldiers rampaged through the houses, terrorizing young women who had previously been kept from the sight of even close relations (*In Flaccum* 89). The seclusion of the house had been breached and what had been most private became public. The soldiers were a symbol that Roman power went beyond the public space of the city and could even reach into the private spaces of the houses. It was a violation of the community. The final stage of the breach of privacy was the dragging of women to the *agora* and to the theatre (*In Flaccum* 95–6). Those who had been kept in private sanctuary were now in public danger.

For the anti-Semites, this was probably the ultimate triumph. The house was an important symbol to the Greek community and may have represented identity and ethnicity. On the 9th of Thoth all Egyptians ate fish in front of their houses (Plutarch, *De Iside et Osiride* 7), a rite which would have marked out those houses at which the ceremony was not performed. The Greek community had lived alongside the Jews and some must have been aware of the status of the Jewish house. They asserted authority in the only space denied them, the Jewish home, Philo's symbol of the soul (*Legum Allegoriarum*, 3.238–9; *Quaestiones in Genesim* 4.15).

7. *Conclusions*

By elevating the gymnasial group, the Romans created the situation whereby this group could dominate the city. The imposition of a Roman ideology which perceived the city as essentially Greek, together with a desire to transfer civic administration to the elite within the city, increased ethnic tensions within Alexandria. The Romans understood

the settlement to be the Greek city of Alexander, representing Hellenism in Egypt and many Greeks will have shared this perception. Non-Greeks were marginal to this 'Greek city' (*P. Lond.* V 1912. 73–104, esp. 95).[25] The development and imposition of this civic identity was given brutal force by events in 38, and similar outbreaks of violence in 66, 116–117, and 215 were concerned with establishing and enforcing this ideology of the exclusively Greek city.[26] The Jews eventually lost this ideological struggle by failing to convince the Romans of the integral position of their community within the city and the Graeco-Roman perception of the city as a bastion of Hellenism in the East was maintained throughout the following centuries.[27]

The Augustan documentary material attests a more complex picture. The editor of the corpus of Jewish papyri could only identify Jews by onomastics (*CPJ* II 145; 146; 147; 148; 149). The content of the papyri seems indistinguishable from those concerning the Greek community.[28] Philo himself is good evidence for the level of Hellenization and integration of the community; Greek-speaking, knowledgeable about Greek culture, but firmly Jewish. For a man who could move smoothly from Platonic to Jewish thought, the paradox of parallel civic organizations within a single topographical unit can have posed few problems. The Jewish representation of the city was of separate communities each integral to the whole, a multi-cultural society in which civic space, facilities, and privileges were shared. This view of the urban community was directly contrary to Roman representations. In spite of Philo's position in society and his proclamations of loyalty to Rome, the *In Flaccum* of necessity presents a voice of opposition to Roman ideology, a position that parallels that of other reluctant rebels of the Early Imperial period. Flaccus' human judge was Gaius but both the *In Flaccum* and the *Legatio ad Gaium* show how much faith could be placed in that emperor. The message of the *In Flaccum*, like that of all Philo's works, is theological: the only defence of the Jews was to rely on God.

NOTES

* This paper was first delivered at a panel of the AAR/SBL/ASOR conference in Philadelphia in November 1995. I would like to thank the organizers of this panel for inviting me and the British Academy Humanities Research Board for an award towards travel expenses.

1. The argument is summarized by E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews under Roman Rule: from Pompey to Diocletian* (Leiden, 1976), 224–50.

2. H. I. Bell, 'Anti-semitism in Alexandria', *JRS* 31 (1941), 1–13, E. G. Turner, 'Tiberius Iulius Alexander', *JRS* 44 (1954), 54–75, Smallwood, op. cit., 224–50 stress possible Late Ptolemaic antecedents for anti-semitism in Alexandria.

3. E. G. Huzar, 'Alexandria ad Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age', *ANRW* II. 10.1 (Berlin and New York, 1988), 619–68 stresses rightly that the city of Alexandria was not central to Philo's work (621). The *In Flaccum* is, however, an important exception.

4. *In Flaccum* 172–4.

5. N. Lewis, *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule* (Oxford, 1983), 18–19.

6. This may reflect an awareness on the part of Agrippa that his presence might ignite pre-existing tensions or a defence against the accusation that Agrippa's actions in the city somehow dishonoured Flaccus.

7. The demonstration in the gymnasium and the 'evil counsel' given to Flaccus would seem only to make sense if Agrippa was received, and unless we envisage that the complaints of the Jewish community against Flaccus were transmitted to Agrippa while his boat was moored in the harbour (*In Flaccum* 103), then we must assume that he landed.

8. Philo claims that the demonstration disturbed Flaccus' equanimity (*In Flaccum* 29–32) which possibly increased his dislike or distrust of the Jewish community.

9. It is possible, though perhaps unlikely, that the *ekklesia* is to be identified with the gymnasium since the 'Donations of Alexandria' was located by Plutarch in the gymnasium (Plut. *Ant.* 54.6) and Dio (49.41) placed it in the *ekklesia*, but I would prefer to associate the *ekklesia* with the theatre.

10. D. Delia, *Alexandrian Citizenship during the Roman Principate* (Atlanta, 1991), 71 is probably right to point out that performing the *ephebeia* in Alexandria was not a necessary qualification for becoming an Alexandrian citizen.

11. Delia, op. cit., 63; P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 38–46.

12. *Jerusalem Talmud, Sukkah* V 55s in A. Kasher, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: the Struggle for Equal Rights* (Tübingen, 1985), 350. The same passage is quoted by D. I. Sly, *Philo's Alexandria* (London and New York, 1996), 43–4. The description of the seating arrangements in the synagogue parallels arrangements in Late Roman theatres. The organization of the workforce into guilds must have paralleled the organization of the pagan population into similar bodies, perhaps associated with temples.

13. Much discussion has centred on a petition from Helenos to the prefect Turranius complaining that he had been registered to pay poll tax (*BGU* IV 1140 = *CPJ* II 151). Kasher, op. cit., 204 n. 59 argues convincingly both that we have a draft petition and that an amendment to the petition to make clear that he was a Jew of Alexandria was probably made by Helenos or his scribe. Helenos was, therefore, not trying to conceal his Jewish identity which suggests that being an Alexandrian Jew did not automatically mean he would have to pay the poll tax. Kasher also dismisses a restoration of the text that provided evidence for Jews performing the *ephebeia*.

14. This seems to be broadly the modern view: Kasher, op. cit., 356–7, cf. 197–204; Delia, op. cit., 27; Bell, *Jews and Christians in Egypt: the Jewish Troubles in Alexandria and the Athanasian Controversy* (London, 1924), 10–21.

15. A. K. Bowman and D. W. Rathbone, 'Cities and Administration in Roman Egypt', *JRS* 82 (1992), 107–27.

16. Bowman and Rathbone, ibid.

17. C. A. Nelson, *Status Declarations in Roman Egypt* (*ASP* 19) (Amsterdam, 1979), 10–25; Bowman and Rathbone, ibid.

18. Alston, *Soldier and Society in Roman Egypt: a Social History* (London and New York, 1995), 54–9.

19. F. Burkhalter, 'Le gymnase d'Alexandrie: centre administratif de la province romaine d'Égypte', *BCH* 116(1992), 345–73; cf. F. K. Yegül, *The Bath-Gymnasium Complex at Sardis* (*Archaeological Exploration of Sardis*, 3) (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 1986).

20. P. M. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (Oxford, 1972), 798–800.

21. W. Horbury and D. Noy, *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge, 1992), xiii–xvi; inscriptions 1; 2; 3; 4; 6; 7; 8; 10 discuss the epigraphic evidence and give a brief summary of the archaeological excavations. See also Fraser, op. cit., 32–4.

22. Fraser, op. cit., 35.

23. Alston, 'Houses and Households in Roman Egypt' in A. Wallace-Hadrill and R. Laurence (edd.), *Domestic Space in the Roman World*, *JRS* Suppl. (Ann Arbor, forthcoming) will discuss the Egyptian house. Unfortunately, the very few Roman houses excavated in Alexandria offer no evidence for the architectural arrangement described by Philo. The houses excavated by the Polish team at Kôm el-Dikka date to the seventh century. It seems likely that the inhabitants were of a fairly

low economic status. See M. Rodziewicz, *Alexandrie III. Les habitations romaines tardives d'Alexandrie à la lumière des fouilles polonaises à Kôm el-Dikka* (Warsaw, 1984).

24. L. J. Archer, *Her Price is Beyond Rubies: the Jewish Woman in Graeco-Roman Palestine, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* Suppl. 60 (Sheffield, 1990), 102 shows that regulations governing movement of women differed according to social class and (114–17) that houses in Palestine had separate apartments for male and female members of the household. Actual behaviour probably differed from these prescriptions. For Philo's attitude and policy towards the women of Alexandria see Sly, *Philo's Perception of Women, Brown Judaic Studies*, 209 (Atlanta, 1990), 195–8.

25. This 'Roman view' of Alexandria was given force by Germanicus during his visit to the city. He opened the granaries to alleviate a threatened famine but refused to feed the Jewish population of the city (Jos. *C. Ap.* 2.63).

26. In 66 the Jews entered the theatre soon after the outbreak of the revolt in Judaea. The Greek community responded by declaring them enemies and driving them from the theatre (Jos. *B.J.* 2.491–8). The attempt of the Jews to enter the theatre suggests that it was not seen as exclusively Greek and at least some of the community continued to see themselves as part of the wider community of Alexandrians. The ethnicity of civic space in Alexandria remained an issue beyond the first century. In 215 Caracalla, posing as the second Alexander, sacked the city and refounded it, having removed all non-Greeks (Dio 78.21–3; HA, *Anton. Caracalla* 6; Herodian 4.9; A. Lukaszewicz, 'Alexandrie sous les Sévères et l'historiographie' in L. Criscuolo and G. Geraci (edd.), *Egitto e storia antica dell' ellenismo all' età araba* [Bologna, 1989], 491–6).

27. This early treatment of Alexandria can be compared with developments in Egypt in later periods: Bell, 'Antinoopolis: a Hadrianic foundation in Egypt', *JRS* 30 (1940), 133–49; Bowman, 'Public buildings in Roman Egypt', *JRA* 5 (1992), 495–503; Alston, 'Ritual and Power in the Romano-Egyptian city' in H. Parkins (ed.), *The Ancient City: Beyond the Consumer Model* (London and New York, forthcoming) and in other areas of the Empire: see A. J. Spawforth and S. Walker, 'The World of the Panhellion I. Athens and Eleusis', *JRS* 75 (1985), 78–104; Spawforth and Walker, 'The World of the Panhellion II. Three Dorian Cities', *JRS* 76 (1986), 88–103; G. M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesus* (London and New York, 1991).

28. C. Balconi, 'Alessandria nell' età Augustea' in *Egitto e Società Antica: Atti del Convegno. Turino 8/9 vi–23/24 xi 1984* (Milan, 1985), 181–96 and W. Schubart, 'Alexandrinische Urkunden aus der Zeit des Augustus', *Archiv.* 5 (1913), 35–131; both point to the integration of the Jewish community.