

Wis 19:13-17 and the Civil Rights of the Jews of Alexandria

LUCA MAZZINGHI

1. Introduction

Wisdom 19:13-17 constitutes a pericope which is undoubtedly a little surprising as well as not well known. What does it actually mean to put a passage containing a fierce polemic against the Egyptians, placed in direct comparison with the evil men of Sodom, as almost the conclusion of the book? What motives lie behind this passage?

The aim of my work is twofold: first of all, it is a question of taking up again the examination of this passage, which has been studied only by M. Priotto in a study of 1984, apart from the classic commentaries of Larcher, Winston, Vílchez Líndez and Scarpat.¹ Secondly, after the passage has been situated in the larger context represented by chapter 19 of the Book of Wisdom, it is used to shed light on a particular problem: what does this passage tell us about the difficult problem of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria? Priotto's work has only touched on this question.² It has been gone into more deeply in the commentary of Vílchez Líndez³ which refers to the classic studies on the problem of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria (cf. below).

Let me say at once that it will not be possible to offer anything really new in the exegetical field. In fact, nothing has substantially changed, following the work of Priotto, apart from a few points which I am seeking to highlight. Moreover, as far as the problem of the rights of the Jews of Alexandria is concerned, it is a question, for the most part, of refining several aspects which have already been brought to light in existing work. However, in this type of work it is useful to do a bit of preliminary tidying-up.

Before tackling the topic that most concerns us, that is the problem of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria, we must briefly take stock of the situation with regard to our pericope. Here it is in my own translation:

- 13 The punishments, therefore, did not assail the sinners
without their having had, as omens, the violent thunderbolts,
for they suffered justly because of their wickedness,

1 Cf. WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon*; LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III; VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sapienza*; SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III; and, above all, PRIOTTO, *Il significato* 369-394.

2 Cf. PRIOTTO, *Il significato* 387-9.

3 Cf. VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sapienza* 544-575.

- because they had shown a truly deep hatred towards foreigners (or: towards guests).
- 14 The latter did not receive the unbelievers who were present (or: they did not receive the strangers who arrived;) the former, on the other hand, made slaves of guests who were (their) benefactors.
- 15 And not only that: there will certainly be a visitation on them because they received foreigners with hostility.
- 16 Having welcomed them festively, when they formerly shared their rights, they went on to maltreat them with terrible afflictions.
- 17 Therefore, they were stricken with blindness just as (happened) to those when, at the gate of the just man, wrapped in total darkness, each groped for the door of his home.

Obviously we are not faced here with a text that is immediately comprehensible, not least because of the typical way in which the Book of Wisdom avoids proper names and more precise allusions to events and characters. The general sense of the passage is, however, clear: the Egyptians are compared to the men of Sodom and come out worse. The men of Sodom did not welcome the righteous Lot; the Egyptians, on the other hand, oppressed a people who were already living in their midst and who had been of benefit to them.

Behind this passage lie two important features notable in the Book of Wisdom: the continual reference to biblical texts, re-read *midrashically*, and the attempt to actualise these texts in the context of a totally different world, that of the Hellenistic culture of Alexandria in the first century BC so that one could speak of our book as a Greek *midrash*.

2. Literary Structure and Composition of the Text

2.1 The Problem of chapter 19

Our pericope is situated within a chapter whose structure has proved such a hard nut for the commentators to crack in contrast with other parts of the Book of Wisdom. It is difficult to find agreement.⁴ We should note that the chief disagreements are concentrated on the literary structure of the first twelve verses for which no precise indications exist. All concur in seeing

⁴ Relevant for consultation is OFFERHAUS, *Komposition und Intention* 171-192, especially 335, n. 261. Cf. also BIZZETI, *Il libro della Sapienza* 97-100; GILBERT, *Sagesse de Salomon*, coll. 76-77 (he proposes the division 19:1-9 and 19:10-21, although recognising the absence of precise elements of literary structure), and, again, PRIOTTO, *Il significato*, especially 370, n. 3. Recently, CHEON, *The Exodus* 90-92, has suggested that 19:1-17 be considered an independent literary unit. One must ask, however, if it is permissible to set apart vv. 18-21; cf. *infra*.

verses 13-17, on the one hand, and 18-21, on the other, as two small literary units. The problem is to connect them with the rest of the chapter. Particularly interesting, in the context of a careful examination of the whole book, is Bizetti's proposal which I summarise here:

- the first section of chapter 19 consists of verses 1-5 which function as an introduction.
- Verse 6 forms the title of the following section and is the thematic announcement of the topic of the renewed creation. The section in question consists of verses 7-12, characterised by the inclusio θαλάσσης (vv. 7c and 12) and by the literary centre formed by v. 9. In this way, verses 7-8 would form a first sub-section of 8 stichs (cf. the inclusio εθεωρήθη – θεωρήσαντες) while verses 10-12 form a second sub-section also of 8 stichs (NB the word γένεσις in 10b and 11a). According to Bizetti, the topic of vv. 10-12 is closely linked with the preceding verses.
- A separate section is formed by vv. 13-17, 15 stichs like verses 7-12 and dedicated to the Egypt-Sodom comparison. According to Bizetti, this is the close of the last diptych.
- The chapter closes with vv. 18-21 which take up again in a more general way the discourse on the renewed creation⁵ and form a sort of 'recapitulation' of the book's message. Finally, v. 22 concludes the whole book.

It is about the internal structure of the first twelve verses that the different authors disagree. From Bizetti's analysis there emerges the importance of v. 6 with which a new section is opened and of v. 9 which is at the centre of the literary complex represented by vv. 7-12. Gilbert in particular has insisted many times that v. 9 is the close of the final diptych; and indeed that Wis 19:9 actually forms an important inclusio with 10:21, thus placing the whole of the third part of the book under the theme of praise: in both cases – and only here in the Book of Wisdom – there occurs the verb αινέω.⁶

On the basis of a further proposal of Priotto we can clarify what we have observed so far: the first five verses are developed thematically on the movement from anger (v. 1a) to death (v. 5b), and have the Egyptians for their subject. The following pericope (vv. 6-12) is introduced by v. 6 and, as already noted, centres on v. 9 which is of key importance. The topic is twofold: the holy people and the new creation. The praise of v. 9 thus connects the theme of the crossing of the sea (vv. 7-8) to the recalling of the incident of the quails (vv. 10-12). It is possible to follow Gilbert in making the final diptych close at v. 9. We ought, however, to regard vv. 6-12 as a literary unity. In this way, chapter 19 acquires its internal coherence which can be explained according to the following scheme:

5 Or, as R. Pistone suggests, in his contribution to this volume, 'continuous creation.'

6 GILBERT, *Sagesse de Salomon*, coll. 72f. Cf. also his contribution in this volume.

- vv. 1-5: the Egyptians (theme of punishment)
- vv. 6-12: holy people and renewed creation
- vv. 13-17: the Egyptians compared with the Men of Sodom (theme of punishment)
- vv. 18-21: holy people and renewed creation
- v. 22: conclusion of the whole book

Chapter 19 is thus seen as a coherent whole: to the historic judgement on the ungodly (first section) corresponds the eschatological judgement, symbolised by the episode of the Egyptians and the men of Sodom (third section); to the historical salvation of the Hebrews (second section) corresponds the eschatological salvation which consists of the renewed creation (fourth section).

2.2 Concentric Structure of chapters 16-19

We must not forget another important point for the reading of chapter 19 which here we can only hint at in passing but which was set out in the aforementioned study by Bizzeti and taken up again by me in my *Notte di paura e di luce*.⁷ Chapter 19 is in fact constructed in a constant relationship with chapter 16 and is situated within a concentric structure formed precisely by chapters 16-19. Chapter 16, introducing the themes of food (16:1-4), salvation from death (16:5-14) and manna (16:15-29), prepares the conclusion of chapter 19 where all these themes are taken up again together in the context of a renewed creation which offers men manna, “the ambrosial food” (Wis 19:21).

In chapters 16-19, everything turns on the pericope, 18:1-4, the light of the law which, through Israel, was to be given to the world. Chapter 19 forms in fact the conclusion to the entire Book of Wisdom. Already the ‘to the end’ which opens v. 1 suggests that we find ourselves here faced with a real conclusion. The chapter frequently reprises expressions and themes already encountered in the course of the book: the praise begun at the end of chapter 10 (Wis 10:20) finds, as has been said, its parallel in 19:9. Finally v. 22 closes the whole book under the perspective of praise.

As far as our pericope, Wis 19:13-17, is concerned, it recalls two themes already present precisely in 18:1-4: the cordial welcome of the Hebrews on the part of the Egyptians and their subsequent oppression (and, therefore, the consequent problem of rights), and the blindness of the Egyptians, who are compared with the men of Sodom, which recalls in an antithetical way the light of the law which shines throughout the world. A further link, to which we shall have occasion to allude, is the eschatological perspective which unites both the texts and which characterises the final part of chapter 19, especially Wis 19:18-21.

7 Cf. for the details of this analysis BIZZETI, *Il Libro della Sapienza* 100-104; MAZZINGHI, *Notte di paura e di luce* 219-298, especially 296-297.

2.3 Internal Structure of 19:13-17

The analysis formerly proposed by Priotto⁸ is based, above all, on the alternation of subjects. As already noted, there do not exist, in fact, any more precise literary clues. According to him, then, our pericope can be divided as follows:

- 13ac Egyptians – punishment
- 13d-14 comparison with the men of Sodom
- 15a Egyptians – punishment
- 15b-16 comparison with the men of Sodom
- 17 Men of Sodom – punishment

Priotto observes again how this passage shows itself to have links with 19:1-5. Both passages speak of the attitude of the Egyptians towards the Hebrews (cf. 19:2-3, but also 18:2-3). The exegetical analysis to which we shall shortly turn will show how in reality v. 14 ought to be understood as referring not to the men of Sodom but to the polemical confrontation between the Egyptians and the Hebrews while v. 16 seems to refer again to the Egyptians. Priotto's proposed structure ought then to be modified as follows:

- 13 punishment of the Egyptians
- 14 comparison between the Hebrews and the Egyptians
- 15 punishment (eschatological) of the Egyptians
- 16 comparison between the Hebrews and the Egyptians
- 17 comparison between the Egyptians and the men of Sodom

It is more important for us to answer the question with which we set out: why place this passage at this point in the book? We have gained a preliminary answer from the structural analysis of Wis 19: the theme of the historical judgement of the Egyptians announced in 19:1-5 reaches its climax in the polemical comparison with the men of Sodom and is raised to an eschatological level.⁹

An old and celebrated study by P. Beauchamp¹⁰ serves to flesh out this kind of answer: Wis 19 follows the order of Gen 1 combining its text with the account of the Exodus from Egypt as has been demonstrated more recently by M. Dell'Omo and especially by S. Cheon.¹¹ Thus, in 19:13-17, our author again takes up the theme of light and darkness of which he has not yet spoken in the first twelve verses but to which he had already dedicated the fifth diptych (Wis 17:1-18:4).

8 PRIOTTO, *Il significato* 371-373.

9 Cf. PRIOTTO, *Il significato* 371-377.

10 BEAUCHAMP, *Le salut corporel des justes* 490-526; cf. also VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sapienza* 535.

11 Cf. DELL'OMO, *Creazione* 317-327; also, CHEON, *The Exodus* 89-103, especially the table on p. 99.

These two answers are unquestionably valid. But is it possible to find others? Why on earth is precisely *this* text at the end of the whole book? We shall return to this at the end of our journey. But before entering into the specific theme of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria, some notes relative to the exegesis of our text will help us to frame the question even better.

3. Exegetical Notes

3.1 Hatred towards foreigners (v. 13)

The initial καί both establishes a connection with the preceding material and also emphasises a progression. The understood subject of the whole verse is 'the Egyptians,' here disguised under the term ἁμαρτωλοί. On the latter 'came the punishments.' The term τιμωρία (*hapax* in Wis) indicates a punishment inflicted by a judicial power (cf. the equivalent verb in Wis 12:20 and 18:8) and thus refers to a genuine judicial act of God in the stand-off with Egypt. The plural is actually one of emphasis. The verb ἐπέρχομαι has already been used in Wis 12:27d and 16:4, 5 in the sense of a punishment sent by God on the guilty.

The information contained in 13b, the thunder as a warning of the punishment of the Egyptians, that is to say their drowning in the Red Sea recalled in 19:1-5 is probably a midrashic *relecture* of the text of Exod 14:24 as already happens in Psalm 77:15-20 and in the *Targum Neofiti*, precisely on the text of Exod 14:24.¹² The punishment of the Egyptians has been in some way pre-announced by God. This is in keeping with the theology of the Book of Wisdom which emphasises the divine pedagogy in confrontations with the wicked. On the one hand, they need to know who it is who is smiting them; on the other hand, they ought to have the opportunity to repent. The thunderstorm plays this role.

The second part of v. 13 emphasises the justice of God in making the Egyptians suffer for their wickedness, especially for their hatred of foreigners. The rare verb ἐπιτηδεύω has the sense of busying oneself with something. It often has virtue or vice as its complement. Here the complement is represented by the term μισοξενία which introduces us to a classic theme of anti-Jewish propaganda. The midrashic amplifications to the Exodus account are thus handled according to a criterion of constant actualisation.

The term μισοξενία is a *hapax* in the LXX. It is found as an adjective in a

12 Cf. also PHILO, Vit. Mos. II, 254; JOSEPHUS, Ant. II, 343-344; PRIOTTO, Il significato 383-384; VILCHEZ LINDEZ, Sapienza 536, n. 8; WINSTON, The Wisdom of Solomon 327.

passage of Hecataeus of Abdera: the Jews live a life of hatred to the whole of humanity – ἀπάνθρωπόν τινα καὶ μισόξενον βίον.¹³ Some passages of Josephus, such as Ant. I, 194, employ a vocabulary very close to our passage, precisely à propos of the men of Sodom. We find it again: “We are not inhumane (ἀπάνθρωποι) by nature nor unfriendly to those who are not of our country (ἀλλοτρίους).”¹⁴ In both these cases, Josephus writes in the context of an anti-Jewish polemic. The accusation of being ‘haters of the human race,’ as has been noted, is one of the most repeated refrains in anti-Jewish propaganda. I will mention only the letter of Meno to Hermocrates about a Jew who had not fulfilled his obligations and the writing of a certain Hercules to an official called Ptolemy about the fact that the Jews make the inhabitants of Memphis sick (βδελύσσονται).¹⁵ But here the author of the book turns the accusation normally made against the Hebrews both on its head and against the Egyptians.

The term μισοξενία has in itself a twofold nuance. In the word ξένος there is in fact the sense both of ‘foreigner’ and ‘guest.’ The Book of Wisdom insists above all on this second shade of meaning. This was understood by the Latin version which translates v. 13d as *detestabiliorem inhospitalitatem instituerunt*. Thus the author emphasises the hatred of the Egyptians towards foreigners who at the same time are also guests, something which immediately makes him think of the episode of the men of Sodom to which he alludes in the following verse. Already in the preceding material, the Book of Wisdom had claimed for the Jews the characteristic of φιλανθρωπία, that Hellenistic virtue by which the foreigner becomes the guest, even the benefactor (cf. Wis 19:14b!) and which the Jew of Alexandria claims as his very own characteristic.¹⁶ In such a way, the message of the Book of Wisdom is clear: the Egyptians have hated foreigners who were their guests (that is, they have hated us, the Jews); we, on the other hand, living to the full our φιλανθρωπία, yes a Hellenistic virtue but also the consequence of our faith in the God of Israel who loves everything that exists, have demonstrated that the true enemies of the human race are rather those who accuse us falsely. As we shall see with regard to v. 16, our sage intends above all to direct his polemic at the Greek part of the Alexandrian population but his continual reference to the confrontation between Egyptians and the Israelites (the figure of Moses is very marginal in the book of Wis-

13 Cf. Diod. Sic. 50, 4 = FHG II, 392; 34, 2 = FHG III, 256. Cf. STERN, Greek and Latin Authors 26-30.

14 Ant. VIII, 117.

15 CPJ I, n° 135 and 141; cf. WINSTON, The Wisdom of Solomon 327-329, and STÄHLIN, ‘ξένος’ 1-36, especially 6-7; on the anti-Jewish currents in the Ptolemaic epoch and in a special way on the work of Manetho, cf. AZIZA, L’utilisation 41-65; cf. also MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, Les Juifs d’Égypte 182-219; for a further bibliography, cf. CHEVALIER, L’antisémitisme 195-197.

16 Cf. SPICQ, Notes de lexicographie 922-927.

dom) is intended to be, as in v. 13, an accusation thrown at the Egyptian world in general, which, from the time of Manetho (cf. *supra* n. 14), was characterised by a strong anti-Semitic tendency.

It remains the case, however, that v. 13 witnesses to the self-consciousness of the Jews to be ξένος in Alexandria (cf. further under v. 14b and later on the position of Philo): guest yet nevertheless foreigner. However, in the Book of Wisdom the term ξένος always indicates something mysterious and out of the ordinary (cf. Wis 16:16, the unusual rain: 19:5, a strange death). So, on the one hand, through the words of the book the Jews claim their right not to be hated; on the other hand, they are aware of their special status, of their being, as Wis 18:3 puts it, a ξενιτεία.

Recently, Scarpat has given a completely individual reading to this last-mentioned stich: the 'harmless sun' would be an allusion to the Emperor Octavian as respectful of the rights of the Jews which he had reconfirmed.¹⁷ The expression φίλοτιμου ξενιτείας would then be translated as a foreign land respectful of rights. The author of the Book of Wisdom would thus be appealing to the action of Augustus in order to contest the fact that the inhabitants of Alexandria were intending to deny the Jews the exercise of their rights. Scarpat's reading is suggestive, but the translation of φίλοτιμου ξενιτείας as 'glorious wandering,' referring to the Exodus, which in anti-Jewish versions like that of Manetho was considered a shameful flight, seems more secure to me, as I have shown in the past although then unaware of Scarpat's proposal.¹⁸ Moreover, we must not forget that the Roman world does not come out well from the pages of the Book of Wisdom, and, after the polemic of chapter 14 against the imperial cult, such a positive reference to Octavian Augustus is all the more disputable. In any case, the text of Wis 18:3 remains to confirm that our author is conscious of living in a foreign land and that Egypt and Alexandria cannot, therefore, be considered as the true native-land of Israel. It is in this context that the claim of rights contained in v. 16 will be examined.

3.2 Hebrew benefactors (v. 14)

As read by the majority of commentators, v. 14 would be a sudden allusion to the men of Sodom, that is to those who had not welcomed the strangers (τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας) who arrived (παρόντας; cf. the text of Gen 19:1-3; and, for the men of Sodom, Deut 29:23; Isa 1:9; 13:19; Jer 49:18, 50:40; Lam 4:6; Am 4:11; Zeph 2:9); this is already the tone of a gloss in the Syro-Hexapla which

17 Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 258-264.

18 Cf. MAZZINGHI, *Notte di paura e di luce* 214-217.

refers precisely to Gen 19:1-3.¹⁹ Of the two sins for which the Sodomites came to be condemned, the sexual and the offence against hospitality, the Book of Wisdom would take up here only the second (cf. the text of Ant. I, 194, referred to above), referring thus to the problem of the rights of the Jews of Alexandria.²⁰ Already Larcher noted²¹, however that there is a problem with the active form of τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας, occurring precisely where we would expect a passive. The text would thus signify not only 'strangers' but, in an active sense, 'those who did not wish to be known'.

Here again Scarpat's reading²² is completely different but undoubtedly attractive in its attempt to dissolve the difficulty of v. 14. He refers οἱ μὲν to the Israelites cited in the preceding material and not to the men of Sodom. With οὗτοι δέ, on the other hand, the text would change over to indicate the Egyptians. Thus, in this reading, the Israelites carefully avoided the unbelievers, called exactly that, τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας. Scarpat goes on from this to emend the term παρόντας into παρόντες though without any textual support. According to Scarpat's interpretation, the Israelites, on arriving in Egypt (παρόντες, with the verb πάρεμι taken in its common sense of 'arrive'), bound themselves not to mix with the unbelievers (τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας) and for this reason were considered by them to be haters of the human race. An analogous theme is found in Josephus, Ap. II, 210. The Book of Wisdom would thus be a reply to the accusation of misanthropy, basing the reply on religious motives. I think that Scarpat is right in referring οἱ μὲν to the Israelites and not to the men of Sodom and οὗτοι δέ, on the other hand, to the Egyptians. Furthermore, the taking of τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας in an active sense appears to me wholly correct. The only but grave difficulty in Scarpat's proposal consists in his emendation of παρόντας into παρόντες without any textual support.

An analysis of the use of the verb πάρεμι in the Book of Wisdom shows that it is always used in the sense of 'to be present'. This is the case in 4:2; 9:9; 11:11, 21; 12:19; 13:1; 14:17. Scarpat's reading of 19:14 would be the only case in which the verb πάρεμι would be used in the sense of 'reach,' 'arrive.' If, however, we read the text as given, τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας οὐκ ἔδεχοντο παρόντας,²³ and if we give to the verb πάρεμι its well-attested sense of 'to be present,' we could then understand that the Israelites (οἱ μὲν) did not welcome the unbelievers (τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας) who were there (παρόντας). With τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντας the Egyptians would thus be indicated, that is to say the inhabitants who were there (παρόντας) in place on the arrival of the Hebrews. The Hebrews, in other words, would have separated themselves from the

19 Cf. LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, 1074.

20 Cf. PRIOTTO, *Il significato* 384-386.

21 LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, 1074-1075.

22 SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 321-322.

23 The variant παρίόντας is wholly marginal.

Egyptians purely for religious motives without any hatred entering into their relationship. The Egyptians, on the other hand, had made slaves of their guests (ξένοῦς), guests, moreover, who had been their benefactors.

In v. 14b, the allusion to the Egyptians is clear, and the text lines up the reference to the oppression at the time of the Exodus (cf. Wis 17:1; 18:4) and the allusion to the story of Joseph, the benefactor of Egypt, with the exact situation of the Hebrews of Alexandria. In v. 14, the term εὐεργέτης, applied to the Hebrews, appears with emphasis. But in what sense were they 'benefactors'? The biblical background is that of the whole story of Joseph, but the purpose for which our author has chosen this term is clearly apologetic. As already in Wis 16:2, 11, 24, the term εὐεργέτης and its derivatives were chosen for polemical use contrary to the normal usage of this type of vocabulary. 'Benefactors' in the Alexandrian world are the gods or else the civil authorities.²⁴ In defining themselves as 'benefactors,' in the words of the Book of Wisdom, the Jews are claiming a positive role for themselves in the society in which they live. We should observe here one of the characteristics of the Book of Wisdom: the sincere wish to be integrated and to open dialogue with a different culture, that is the Hellenistic, and at the same time, the awareness of their particular identity and their own faith.

3.3 The Eschatological Punishment of the Egyptians (v. 15)

If we prescind from the textual difficulties,²⁵ v. 15a announces for the Egyptians an ἐπισκοπή, that is a visitation by God, something which elsewhere in the book assumes a punitive aspect (Wis 2:20; 3:7, 13; 4:15; 14:11). What 'visitation' is in question? In view of the explicit reference to the first part of the book, it is easy to think of a visitation of an eschatological character, perhaps the eschatological punishment of the ungodly to which the Book of Wisdom frequently alludes.²⁶ V. 15 is thus a clear indication of the escha-

24 Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 322, and SPICQ, *Notes de lexicographie*, I, 307-313.

25 The text of v. 15a is problematic. Here I take up the proposal of SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 323, who reads ἀλλ' ἦ τις, that is "there will certainly be a visitation for them." For other proposals, cf. the excellent *status quaestionis* in PRIOTTO, *Il significato 377-380*, who proposes to read ἄλλη with the *Vetus Latina* (*et non solum, alius erit respectus illorum*), namely: "there will be another visitation for them"; WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon* 329, proposes this translation: "and that was not the sum of it – indeed their final reckoning is yet to come" (reading ἦ, 'in truth', following Swete); cf. CHEON: "and not only so, but rather some great judgement of them is to come" (*The Exodus* 101, n. 77). Finally, LARCHER prefers to read ἄλλ' ἦ τις, "il y aura une certaine visite pour ceux-là" (*Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, 1077).

26 Thus LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, 1078-1079, but also SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 195-6.

tological background of our text (cf. *infra*, on the theology of this passage).

If we accept this reading, there is no need to refer even v. 15b to the men of Sodom,²⁷ despite the fact that there exist Jewish traditions referring to their inhospitality. V. 15 refers entirely to the Egyptians: the eschatological visitation provided for them is given a new motive in 15b with the theme of the oppression of foreigners, here called *avllotri,ouj*, a very strong term which indicates almost an enemy. The adverb *ἀπεχθῶς*, ‘in a hostile manner,’ is used here polemically: in 3 Macc in fact, words from this root (*ἀπεχθάνεσθαι*, *ἀπέχθεια*, *ἀπεχθές*) are always used with reference to the hatred of the pagans for the Hebrews.²⁸ The verb *προσδέχομαι* recalls, by antithesis, the text of Wis 18:7. The holy people waited for the deliverance of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked. The wicked, on the other hand, ‘waited,’ in a different sense – they lay in wait for the foreigners with hatred.²⁹ In this verse also, therefore, we have the echo of anti-Hebraic attitudes already frequent in Alexandria at the end of the first century BC. The background is still the account of the Exodus, but the perspective is at the same time cast into both the present of the Jews of Alexandria and the future of the eschatological judgement of God on the wicked.

3.4 The Violated Rights (v. 16)

With *οἱ δὲ* the Egyptians continue to be spoken about.³⁰ V. 16a alludes once again to the story of Joseph and, in particular, to the positive welcome which Egypt had kept for Israel (cf. Gen 47:17-20; 47:2-12). The Genesis passages speak of neither feasts nor banquets. Here we encounter one of the midrashic techniques typical of our author – that of exaggeration.³¹ V. 16c, on the other hand, alludes to the oppression of the Hebrews in Egypt just as it is told in the first chapter of Exodus.

The most important expression for us is that of v. 16b, *τῶν αὐτῶν μετεσχηκότας δικαίων*. In this case too, the starting point is provided by the story of Joseph (Gen 45:20). As far as the verb *μετέχω* is concerned, only the context can tell, as in this case, whether the verb refers to juridical or moral matters or is more general.³² In the text of Bell. VII, 44, with regard to the rights of citizenship granted by the successors of Antiochus IV to the Jews of Antioch, Josephus writes: *συνεχώρησαν αὐτοῖς ἐξ ἴσου*

27 One should consult the long discussion in LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, III, 1076-1078.

28 Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 323.

29 For the significance of the word, cf. PLATO, *Leg.* 708a; SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 324.

30 Cf. SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 324.

31 Cf. CHEON, *The Exodus* 101.

32 Cf. SPICQ, *Notes de lexicographie*, II, 555-559.

τῆς πόλεως τοῖς Ἕλλησι μετέχειν. It is precisely this sense that the verb has in our passage. What we need to ask is to what rights (τὰ δίκαια) our author is alluding. Unfortunately, whether in Philo or in Josephus, expressions such as μετέχειν ἀξιῶν (Ap. II, 42), τὰ πολιτικὰ δίκαια (Flacc. 53), close to those used in our text, do not enjoy a uniform sense.³³ Be that as it may, there is in our text the consciousness of being foreigners but also of sharing in common rights. However, the text remains rather vague and only a more careful discussion of the problem would be able to help us to shed some light on it.

3.5 Egyptians and Men of Sodom (v. 17)

Only at this point do we suddenly reach the comparison with the men of Sodom, recalled, as has already been hinted, as a biblical model of inhospitality (cf. what has already been said *à propos* of v. 14) in their relations with the just man, that is with Lot, already called to mind in Wis 10:6-7, again in connection with the flight from a city of the wicked which is then justly destroyed by God.

The blindness which, according to the account of Gen 19 struck the men of Sodom on account of the miraculous actions of the two guests of Lot, is juxtaposed with the blindness of the Egyptians. But when were the Egyptians struck with blindness? The text of Exodus does not mention this, but undoubtedly our author has in mind the blindness caused by the plague of darkness just as it is described in the fifth diptych (Wis 17:1-18:4) which, as has already been said, offers notable links with our pericope. Thus, the condition of ἀορασία in which the Egyptians found themselves is much more than a physical blindness, as was that of the men of Sodom described in the Genesis text. It is rather the condition of the man who has refused the light of the law (cf. Wis 18:4) and therefore finds himself groping in the darkness. So, in the end, the aim of our author is not only to criticize the Egyptians but also to polemicise against the apostate Jews, against the wicked noted as early as the second chapter of our book, those Jews who are blind before the light of the Mosaic Law and so justly afflicted with the punishment of God.

33 Cf. PUCCI BEN ZEEV, *Jewish Rights* 481-482.

4. Notes on the Theological Perspective of Wis 19:13-17³⁴

For a long time, the profound connection existing between the three parts into which the Book of Wisdom is subdivided has escaped the attention of its readers, and this is especially true of the profound connection between the first and third parts of the book. From this point of view, chapter 19 assumes a fundamental importance. If we had only chapters 1-6 before us, the eschatology of Wisdom would appear somewhat vague. Moreover, were we simply to add chapter 7-9 we could affirm that eternal life is the reward of the man who has welcomed the gift of Wisdom. But the insertion of chapter 10, the hinge on which fastens the final part of the book (11-19), introduces overwhelmingly the theme of history. By contrast with apocalyptic,³⁵ in which the eschatology appears to be deeply dehistoricised, the Book of Wisdom, more influenced in this respect by the prophetic theology, above all that of Deutero-Isaiah, emphasizes the connection between historical and eschatological time. The pericope about the Egyptians compared with the Hebrews and the men of Sodom is important in this respect because it provides an extension into the eschatological sphere of the theme of the historical judgement of God on Egypt recounted in 19:1-5.

Chapter 19 has the function of linking history and eschatology by the resumption of a theme common to the whole book, that of the cosmos (cf. in the same key the theme of the manna taken up again in 19:21 right at the close of the book), and by the rereading of the Exodus text of the crossing of the sea and the events connected with it through Genesis spectacles. In Wis 1:13-15, our author had announced his thesis: the creation is a salvific reality and death is no part of God's project. On the contrary, God makes use precisely of the creation in order to fight the wicked (Wis 5:17-20). Now the Exodus antitheses have shown how such a plan of salvation takes place in reality by means of history. The God who creates is the same God who saves.³⁶

Taken in this light, the importance of the contacts indicated above with the Exodus tradition on the one hand and with Genesis 1 on the other stands

34 In addition to the already cited works of BEAUCHAMP, PRIOTTO and DELL'OMO let me record PASSARO, *Escatologia, profezia e apocalittica* 103-117.

35 On the problem of the relationship between the Book of Wisdom and apocalyptic, cf. GILBERT, *Sagesse de Salomon*, col. 114. COLLINS, *Cosmos and Salvation* 121-142 notes how the Book of Wisdom has the cosmological problem in common with apocalyptic: the way of salvation lies in the understanding of the order of the cosmos; however, salvation does not coincide with 'a new creation,' but rather with a renewed creation. There is, therefore, continuity between history and salvation; cf. also his contribution in the present volume. One should also consult my review of the works of S. Cheon and P. Enns in *Bib* 80 (1999) 424-429; cf. also PASSARO, *Escatologia, profezia e apocalittica*, with a fair criticism of the theses of NOBILE, *La thématique eschatologique* 303-312.

36 Cf. VOGELS, *The God* 315-335.

out. "At the moment of the Exodus, the cosmos is arranged into a kind of new creation to ensure both life and the food of immortality to the just."³⁷ Wis 19 replies, therefore, to the question posed in the first part of the book: are the wicked of chapter 2 right when they claim that there is no hope beyond this life?³⁸ Indeed, on the contrary, on what is based the hope of the just which already the reflection on the Exodus has revealed to be rooted in history? To the initial plan of the Creator, hindered by the sin of man, Wis 19 replies with the theme of the renewed creation. Salvation consists, in fact, in bringing the world back to God's original plan. The climax of the solution to the problems posed in the first part of the book is situated exactly in our chapter, the meeting between creation and salvation.

In this way, the pericope of Wis 19:13-17, inserted in the heart of chapter 19, gains a strong theological value. We should note that this value is not restricted to abstract affirmations. The biblical texts employed (for example the story of Joseph and that of the men of Sodom) are actualized in the light of the situation of the Jewish community of Alexandria according to the individual style of the Book of Wisdom. All this sends us once again to the problem of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria which it is now time to address in more detail.

5. The Problem of the Civil Rights of the Jews of Alexandria

5.1 The State of the Question

The commentaries agree in emphasizing how the text of Wis 19:13-17 reflects the polemic of the Jews of Alexandria with regard to civil rights. Priotto dedicates a brief note to this theme, but only Vilchez Líndez goes into it in any depth, especially in the already cited final *excursus* of his book, referring to authors whose works are classic, like Tarn and Tcherikover, and more recent ones like Smallwood and Kasher.³⁹ Before getting down to details as

37 GILBERT, *La rilettura* 135.

38 It can be interesting to observe how chapter 19 takes up again, even verbally, the objections of the ungodly: for them, death is the dissolution of the body, the extinguishing of a spark (NB *οβροθήτοσ* in 2:3); in 19:20, the water has lost its power to extinguish (*οβροτική φύσεωσ*); in Wis 2:5b, there is no return from Hades (*ἀναποδισμός*), while the voyage of the just is a way that is not hindered (*ἀνεμπόδιστος*, cf. 19:7c); cf. also *μαρανόθηραι* and *οὐκ ἐμάρναν*: 2:8 and 19:21.

39 Cf. TARN, *The Hellenistic Civilization* 154-180 and 190-193; CPJ especially I, 2-92; SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule*; KASHER, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, especially 232-261. Cf. also SCHÜRER, *The History of the Jewish People* 126-137; and finally, RAJAK, *Jewish Rights* 19-35. For the *status quaestionis* up to 1989, cf. VILCHEZ LINDEZ, *Sapienza* 544-575.

well as bringing up to date the *status questionis*, which in any case has been done by Vílchez Líndez, it is necessary to make four, rapid, preliminary observations:

a) First of all we must remember the extreme scarcity of sources available to us. With regard to the problem of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria from the Ptolemaic to the beginning of the Roman epoch, the few sources available are the texts of Philo, Josephus (here there have always been problems of credibility), some epigraphic sources like the stele of Berenice and some papyri collected in CPJ among which appears the celebrated letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, already known, moreover, from the version of Josephus.

b) The scarcity of sources afflicts above all the period which interests us, namely the beginning of the Roman epoch. There is a temptation, therefore, to place the Book of Wisdom against the only background which we know a little better, thanks to Philo, the condition of the Jews of Alexandria in the time of Caligula. S. Cheon does this, for example, when he claims that the hostility of the Book of Wisdom to the Egyptians sits badly with the time of Octavian while, in their commentaries, both Scarpat and Winston repeat that Wis 19:13-17 reflects precisely the riots of the time of Caligula, without going much deeper into the question.⁴⁰

c) In the authors who concern themselves in detail with the problem of the juridical status of the Jews of Alexandria and of their struggle for civil rights a constant and inexplicable lack of interest towards the Book of Wisdom is to be observed. Thus, in the works of Smallwood, Kasher and Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev⁴¹ it is not even mentioned. The text of Wis 19:13-17 is only occasionally cited with the exception of the recent work by Barclay⁴² and, obviously, the commentary of Vílchez Líndez which, however, with regard to our passage, does not seem to draw adequate conclusions from the nonetheless careful analysis.

d) Be that as it may, the same Vílchez Líndez is correct when he writes that on this topic "there reigns a great confusion among the authors."⁴³ As we shall see, even the most recent contributions have not succeeded at all in clarifying the question of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria, a ques-

40 Cf. CHEON, *The Exodus* 147-148; WINSTON, *The Wisdom of Solomon* 24-25; SCARPAT, *Libro della Sapienza*, III, 321.

41 Cf. her already cited and, what is more, careful study, *Jewish Rights* and, more recently, her brief note, *New Perspectives on the Jewish-Greek*.

42 BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, especially 60-71.

43 VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sapienza* 572.

tion which must however be addressed if we wish to understand the position of the Book of Wisdom in relation to this problem.

5.2 The Jews, citizens of Alexandria?

A good starting point to introduce the question which interests us is the situation of the Hebrews of Alexandria such as it is summarized by Josephus:

At Alexandria there had been incessant strife between the native inhabitants and the Jewish settlers since the time when Alexander, having received from the Jews very active support against the Egyptians, granted them, as a reward for their assistance, permission to reside in the city on terms of equality with the Greeks (ἐξ ἰσομορίας). This privilege was confirmed by his successors, who, moreover, assigned them a quarter of their own, in order that, through mixing less with aliens, they might be free to observe their rules more strictly: and they were also permitted to take the title of 'Macedonians'. Again, when the Romans took possession of Egypt, neither the first Caesar nor any of his successors would consent to any diminution of the honours conferred on the Jews since the time of Alexander. They were, however, continually coming into collision with the Greeks, and the numerous punishments daily inflicted on the rioters of both parties by the authorities only served to embitter the quarrel.⁴⁴

Leaving out many details which it is not possible to discuss, the information thus summarized by Josephus seems to inform us that, right from the time of Alexander, the Jews of Alexandria enjoyed exactly the same rights as the Greeks and that this privilege, confirmed successively by Caesar and Octavian, would have been the main cause of the clash with the Greek section of the population. From the text of Josephus, however, it appears clearly how the request for a state of separation and, at root, of privilege, on the part of the Jews, was united to the claim of rights. There are two, interrelated points of interest for us with regard to our text of Wis 19:13-17 and they constitute further material for discussion: the existence of tension between the Jews of Alexandria and the rest of the population, and the problem of the rights which the Jews of Alexandria would have enjoyed at the beginning of the Roman period. What rights exactly are we talking about? How far would the Jews of Alexandria have enjoyed any rights, civil rights that is, at the beginning of the Roman period?

As far as the first point is concerned, namely the existence of anti-Jewish tension in Alexandria, it is necessary immediately to recall how already, towards the end of the Ptolemaic epoch, the city had known similar tensions which, in fact, had even older roots. There is, therefore, no need to go as far forward as the time of Caligula in order to date our text.

44 JOSEPHUS, *Bell. II*, 487-9.

As is well known, the Third Book of the Maccabees attributes the first anti-Jewish persecutions to the time of Ptolemy IV Philopator. We have already had occasion to recall the polemical writings of Manetho (cf. *supra*, n. 15), witnesses of a real hostility in relations with the Jews during the Ptolemaic epoch. More precisely, anti-Jewish riots certainly happened in Alexandria in 88 BC and, following the arrival of the Romans, in 55 BC under Gabinius and, a little later, Julius Caesar during his siege at Alexandria, and finally in the time of the wars between Octavian and Cleopatra. In these last examples it was a question of hostility against the Jews who were openly in alliance with the Romans.⁴⁵ Moreover, the policy of the Romans to confirm for the Jewish community of Alexandria a vast series of rights could not turn out to be pleasing to the Greek section of the population. Indeed a privileged foreigner pleases nobody! Alexandria was certainly an open and cosmopolitan city, but certainly not one free from tensions and exclusions.⁴⁶

The real problem, which it is now necessary to address, is represented by the long debate which has arisen around the question of the juridical status of the Jews of Alexandria. In the passage cited above, Josephus seems to be trying to say that the Jews of Alexandria enjoyed the same civil rights as the Greek section of the population and that such rights would have been confirmed to them by the Romans. In the text of Ant. XIV, 188-189, recalling the privileges granted by Octavian (confused by Josephus with Julius Caesar), he writes that, with regard to the Jews, Caesar showed that they were citizens of Alexandria: ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι Ἀλεξανδρέων πολῖταιί εἰσιν. But in what sense is the term πολῖταιί used here? In a technical juridical sense ("citizens who enjoy full rights") or perhaps in the broader and more neutral meaning of "inhabitants of the city"? Or is Josephus perhaps paying deliberately on the ambiguity of the term?⁴⁷

Before looking for an answer to this question, we must recall a famous text of Philo which has become an inescapable point of reference after the studies of Wolfson.⁴⁸ Philo describes the situation of the Hebrews in Egypt at the time of Moses while he really has in mind that of the Hebrews of his own time:

The Jews ...[in Egypt] were strangers...They were, in a sense, suppliants (κέταιί), who had found a sanctuary in the pledged faith of the king and the pity felt for them by the

45 On this aspect, cf. CPJ I, 25; I, n° 141; SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 11; BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora* 35-41.

46 Cf. BARRACLOUGH, *Philo's Politics* 421-429, and again HUZAR, *Alexandria ad Aegyptum* 634-638.

47 Cf. KASHER, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* 17; SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 233 and n. 53; more recently PUCCI BEN ZEEV, *Jewish Rights* 25-31.

48 WOLFSON, *Philo on Jewish Citizenship* 165-168.

inhabitants. For strangers (ξένοι), in my judgement, must be regarded as suppliants of those who receive them, and not only suppliants but settlers (μέτοικοι) and friends who are anxious to obtain equal rights (ισοτιμίαν) with the burgesses (ἀστών) and are near to being citizens (πολίται) because they differ little from the original inhabitants (αὐτόχθονων).⁴⁹

Wolfson claims that this text of Philo is an exact definition of the juridical status of the Jews of Alexandria. Philo would be mentioning here the three classes which made up Alexandrian society at that time: the ἀστοί ('burgesses'), the πολῖται ('citizens') and the λαοί ('natives'), that is the αὐτόχθονες ('original inhabitants'). The Jews, in so far as they were residents (μέτοικοι) and desirous of becoming πολῖται would have found themselves in a intermediate position between the ἀστοί and the λαοί.

Recent studies have contributed to the fine-tuning of Wolfson's interpretation. According to Kasher,⁵⁰ inasmuch as the Jews were πολῖται, they would have found themselves in an intermediate situation between the ἀστοί (namely the αὐτόχθονες, that is the Greeks) and the μέτοικοι, namely the Egyptian population. Kasher's solution, to which we must return in connection with the problem of the Jewish *politeuma*, is that the Jews of Alexandria were considered as πολῖται by Philo because they had their own πολιτεία which consisted in the participation in some common rights and in the possibility of governing themselves according to the ancestral laws. It is in this sense that we must understand the expression ἡ ἡμετέρα πολιτεία used by Philo in Flacc. 53 and Spec. Leg. I, 371. In the text of Flacc. 53 in particular, the words ἡ ἡμετέρα πολιτεία describe a situation of participation in political rights (ἡ μετουσία πολιτικῶν δικαίων) and of respect for the ancestral laws (τὰ πάτρια⁵¹). It remains the case, however, that the writings of Philo always betray an awareness on the part of the Alexandrian Jews of being foreigners received in a country which was not their own but in which they wished to enjoy a series of rights. According to Philo, Flaccus would have defined the Jews as ξένοι and not as ἐπιτίμοι κάτοικοι, that is as 'privileged residents' (Flacc. 54, 172). In any case, not even by Philo were the Jews considered as full-blown citizens, of equal status, equal, that is, with the Greeks, as Josephus seems to make us want to believe perhaps by really playing on the ambiguity of the term πολῖται.

In what sense, therefore, could the Jews be defined as πολῖται of Alexandria? With different nuances, the most recent studies (Smallwood and Kasher in particular) agree in reaffirming the theory of the Jewish *politeuma* of Alexandria on which we must pause for a moment.

49 PHILO, Vit. Mos. I, 34-35.

50 Cf. KASHER, The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt 238-240; also SMALLWOOD, The Jews under Roman Rule 9.

51 On analogous expressions, cf. KASHER, The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt 240, n. 27.

5.3 The Jewish *Politeuma* of Alexandria

The conclusions of Vílchez Líndez represent a kind of shared consensus: at Alexandria, as in other contemporary cities at the beginning of the Roman epoch the Jews would have formed a *politeuma*, that is to say they were Alexandrian only in a broad sense and *πολίται*, citizens, therefore, only in relation to the rights which they enjoyed as members of their own *politeuma*.⁵² A classic definition of *politeuma* is that offered by Smallwood:

A *politeuma* was a recognised, formally constituted corporation of aliens enjoying the right of domicile in a foreign city and forming a separate, semi-autonomous civic body, a city within the city; it had its own constitution and administered its internal affairs as an ethnic unit through officials distinct from and independent of those of the host city. [...] It is probably safe to assume that a *politeuma* was the standard political organisation of all Jewish communities of any size in the East.⁵³

A recent study by Lüderitz has questioned the established consensus.⁵⁴ He observes how already in the Letter of Aristeas (§ 310) the Greek term *politeuma* does not clearly indicate the Jewish community as has always been thought. Moreover, when the term *πολίτης* is used together with *politeuma*, it does not necessarily refer to the members of that same *politeuma* but can simply refer to the citizens of the city in which such a *politeuma* is situated or else to the original citizenship of the members of the *politeuma* itself.⁵⁵

Lüderitz does not accept, however, that the concept of a *politeuma* ought always to be understood in a politico-juridical way although in the end he acknowledges that it becomes difficult not to ascribe to the *politeuma* this kind of characteristic as well.⁵⁶ As far as the existence of Jewish *politeumata* is concerned, Lüderitz is a possibilist with regard to the Jewish *politeuma* of Berenice as “a local peculiarity of the Jewish Diaspora in Cyrenaica,” but adds

52 Cf. VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, *Sapienza* 572: already the works of Tarn and Tcherikover (cf. CPJ I, 7) were pointing in this direction; for more detailed presentations, one should consult the frequently cited works by SMALLWOOD and KASHER (in particular, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* 253-261, on the existence and characteristics of the Jewish *politeuma* of Alexandria); cf. also APPLEBAUM, *The Legal Status* 420-431, and GRABBE, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* 405-409. We must note that it is not rare to find, especially among scholars of Jewish extraction, a touch of nationalism that renders some conclusions suspect; for one criticism of the Hebrew edition (1978) of Kasher's essay, cf. S. J. D. COHEN in: *JQR* 72 (1984) 330-331, who accuses him of 'Israeli Zionism'!

53 SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 225-226.

54 LÜDERITZ, *What is the Politeuma?* 183-225.

55 For a careful philological analysis of the terms, cf. BISCARDI, *Polis, politeia, politeuma* 1201-1215.

56 Cf. LÜDERITZ, *What is the Politeuma?* 221-222; more extreme is the thesis of ZUCKERMAN who thinks of the *politeuma* as a private and voluntary association (*Hellenistic politeumata and the Jews* 171-185).

that “the existence of a Jewish *politeuma* in Alexandria is very uncertain.”⁵⁷

The work of Lüderitz must make us more cautious about generalising over social and political conditions. Just because something is true for the Jews of Berenice, it is not necessarily the same for those of Alexandria. All the same, whatever may have been actual juridical status of the Jews at the beginning of Roman rule, a recent work by Miriam Pucci Ben Zeev has brought to light how at least some fundamental rights were common to a good part of the Jewish communities of the Diaspora at the beginning of the imperial epoch. The right of residence, the right to meet in assembly, the right to follow the Jewish Law, to celebrate their own cult in recognised and protected places, to govern themselves autonomously in internal affairs (cf. the *γερουσία* at Alexandria mentioned in Philo’s texts), including the judicial aspect. At Alexandria, we ought to add the right of not being beaten during a trial. “The Jews seem in effect to have enjoyed both privileges and common rights of the kind of those usually enjoyed by many peoples who lived under Roman government.”⁵⁸ In the Berenice stele in particular (24 AD), there is evidence of the frequent attendance by the Jews of pagan places (such as the amphitheatre where the assembly of the Jewish *politeuma* met) which thus gives away the desire of the Jews for a good level of assimilation although with the separation and the quest for rights above-mentioned. The community at Alexandria cannot have been very different.

The privileges granted to the Jews of Alexandria by the Romans seem, therefore, to be genuine even if we cannot be certain of the existence of a Jewish *politeuma*. The information provided by Josephus about the stele erected by Caesar does not seem, then, to be totally without foundation. Octavian Augustus would have confirmed the Jews of Alexandria in their rights as *πολίται*, in particular that of living according to the ancestral laws, *τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις χρῆσθαι*, of which we have just spoken. During the Ptolemaic epoch, similar rights granted to the Hebrews did not cause excessive problems; to be full-blown citizens of Alexandria was in fact a question of prestige rather than of real benefits.⁵⁹ Things would change rapidly with the arrival of the Romans.

57 LÜDERITZ, *What is the Politeuma?* 222 and 208.

58 PUCCI BEN ZEEV, *Jewish Rights in the Roman World* 481; cf. the list of rights on pp. 374-377; for Berenice, one should consult BOFFO, *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia* 204-216, especially 208-209, n. 8.

59 “To be a citizen of Alexandria was more a question of pride than of a material benefit” (CPJ I, 41).

5.4 The problem of the *laographia*

The institution of the *laographia*, the poll tax imposed by the Romans in Egypt on all those who were not considered *Greek* citizens – an event which we can place probably a little before 24/23 BC, or at any rate a little after the principate of Augustus,⁶⁰ – brought into the open a problem which had been smouldering away for a long time: what was the real juridical position of the Jews of Alexandria? Despite the privileges which had been granted to the Jews, the Romans imposed on them too the *laographia*, thus not considering them citizens of full status. The criterion for exemption from the tax consisted in the right of access to the Gymnasium which later would come to be definitively forbidden to the Jews by Claudius. Already in the time of Octavian, the question of access to the Gymnasium must have been at the centre of attention of the Greek community of Alexandria.⁶¹ However, Octavian's policy towards the Jews appears to be looking in two directions: on the one hand, the Emperor confirmed the rights conceded to the Jews in the past; on the other, he reduced them explicitly to the level of non-citizens, subjecting them to the *laographia*, all this in the service of a more rigorous policy to control the population.⁶²

On this question, it will be useful to cite an undoubtedly extremely interesting papyrus (= CPJ II, 151), which can be dated around 5/4 BC. It concerns the petition directed by a certain Helenos to the Roman prefect C. Turranus. Although very fragmentary, the heart of this petition consists in a request for exemption from the *laographia*, a request which is mentioned

60 Cf. CPJ I, 61; SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 231.

61 Cf. CPJ I, 38-39.59; II, 53; for the question of the access of the Jews of Alexandria to the Gymnasium, cf. KASHER, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* 98, which, in a radical way, excludes the presence of Jews in the Gymnasias of Alexandria during the Roman epoch. There is a *status questionis* in VILCHEZ LINDEZ, *Sapienza* 563-568 which leans towards the views of Kasher. Probably the situation at Alexandria was less clear than Kasher tries to define it; Philo, for example, does not seem so hostile to education in the Gymnasium (cf. *Spec. Leg.* II, 229-230) and precisely the anti-Jewish pamphlets that hale from the *milieu* of the Gymnasium testify how the problem of the access of the Jews to the Gymnasium was really debated. One should consult in the present volume the contribution of M.-F. Baslez and, *infra*, concerning the letter of Helenos who had probably received an education in the Gymnasium (cf. I. 6). WINSTON (*The Wisdom of Solomon* 329) thinks that Wis 19:16 alludes precisely to the problem of the access of the Jews of Alexandria to the Gymnasium. There exist catalogues of ephebes which mention Jewish names; cf. KANT, *Jewish Inscriptions* 691, n. 121.

62 "The more rigorous control of the citizenship inaugurated by Augustus, a control that effectively, aimed at impeding the access of Hellenised Jews, must have been pleasing to the Greeks of Alexandria. The former, by contrast, must have found it difficult to adapt themselves to such rigour as is shown by some petitions in which are glimpsed the preceding abuses and the reluctance to accept the new state of affairs" (MONTEVECCHI, *L'amministrazione dell'Egitto sotto i Giulio-Claudi* 449).

three times in the text (ll. 17, 21, 22). In the beginning, Helenos introduces himself as ἀλεξανδρεὺς but the scribe corrects this appellation into Ἰουδαίου τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρε(ίας). It is difficult to say whether the scribe's correction has to be understood as an act hostile to Helenos or whether it is simply a question of clearing up an ambiguity.⁶³ A. Kasher, consistent with the entire tenor of his work, seeks to read the scribal correction as a clarification, not at all hostile to Helenos. The expression τοῦ ἀπὸ Ἀλεξανδρε(ίας) would simply indicate residence while the mention of Jewish race would indicate the fact that Helenos belonged to the Jewish *politeuma* of Alexandria.

Now Helenos also presents himself as the son of a citizen of Alexandria, perhaps educated in the Gymnasium itself (cf. the mention of παιδεία in l. 6), and he is sure of his citizenship and of the rights enjoyed under the previous prefects (Turranius was the fifth of the series) but he was not in a position to bring forward arguments that might exempt him from the *laographia*. Proof that he was on unsure ground here is the fact that one of the reasons he produced was that of being over 60, something which would exempt him in any case from payment of the tax. Given the negative tone of the petition and the meagre hope that Helenos shows himself to have, it seems more reasonable to suppose that the term ἀλεξανδρεὺς, in an official context, refers to a juridical status of 'citizen' of Alexandria on equal terms with the Greek section, a qualification which evidently did not belong to Helenos and which the scribe, familiar with the law, corrected, affirming that although Helenos considered Alexandria his ἰδία πατρίς, he was in reality a foreign resident, a 'Jew of Alexandria.'

Despite its fragmentary nature and the problems not yet resolved, this document attests nonetheless the existence of a struggle on the part of the Jews for the recognition of their rights – whatever they might have been – with regard to the institution of the *laographia*. It is in this context, typical of the beginning of the principate of Augustus that we must situate our text of Wis 19:13-17.

5.5 Integration or Orthodoxy?

In the light of the observations which we have made, we must exclude from consideration that the struggle of the Jews of Alexandria was a struggle for the recognition of equal rights with the Greek section, something which

63 On this question, cf. the note to the text of the papyrus in CPJ II, 31-32 and again SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 232-233; KASHER, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* 199-207, who criticises the more traditional thesis of EL ABBADI, *The Alexandrian Citizenship* 106-123. For further different positions, one should consult also, MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, *Les Juifs d'Égypte* 226-228.

does not seem to be the case for Philo or even for Josephus, notwithstanding his, perhaps intentional, ambiguity. After the discovery of the Letter of Claudius to the Alexandrians, it is impossible to suppose, in effect, that full citizenship had ever been granted to the Jews of Alexandria even if notable exceptions can be distinguished on an individual level.⁶⁴ The quest for full equality with the Greeks cannot have been very common and must have been viewed by many Jews as a real apostasy. The case of Helenos recalled above constitutes more a claim of exemption from taxes than a seeking of total equality with the Greeks of Alexandria.

The Jews' struggle for *isopoliteia*, therefore, and so the echoes of the question of rights in the Book of Wisdom have to be seen in another perspective. The majority of commentators hold that the Jews of Alexandria were really struggling for the recognition of the rights regarding the Jewish *politeuma*: "There were in fact in Alexandria two parallel citizenships, that of the Greeks and that of the Jews."⁶⁵ Although the idea of the existence of a Jewish *politeuma* must be rethought after the work of Lüderitz, some points can be retained.

The crisis of AD 38 under Caligula would have been regarded either as the sudden loss of the general rights of the Alexandrian Jews or as part of the long dispute over their real status and, in particular, the desire of many Jews to enjoy full civil rights. Flaccus, at least as he is presented by Philo, claimed to be reducing the Jews to the status of foreigners, deprived of rights, comparable to the mass of the people, and able to be expelled at will. Even before this, however, the institution of the *laographia* and the decisions taken by the Romans with regard to access to the Gymnasium had already reshaped the privileges granted by the Romans themselves to the Jews of Alexandria.

In the stele of Augustus, recalled by Josephus (*vide supra*), mention is made of the right of self-government according to the ancestral laws. When a claim of *isopoliteia* is made for the Jews, whether by Philo or by Josephus,⁶⁶ they are *not* intending to seek a juridical status equal to that of the Greeks.

64 For Claudius' letter, cf. CPJ II, 153; "There is no instance, as far as I know, of the granting of 'sympolity' to a non-Greek *politeuma* from a Greek *pólis*" (*ibid.* I, 40, n. 101); cf. also PUCCI BEN ZEEV, Jewish Rights in the Roman World 295-326. For individual Jews who had certainly obtained the Alexandrian citizenship in the Roman period, cf. SMALLWOOD, The Jews under Roman Rule 3-4 and n. 6; BARCLAY, Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora 68; for the question of the access to the Gymnasium, see n. 58.

65 SMALLWOOD, The Jews under Roman Rule 10. Cf. also the conclusions of KASHER, The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt 233-261. These are the conclusions of Tcherikover and Grabbe with small differences of nuance.

66 Cf. Ant. XII, 119; XIX, 230-235 with regard to the edict of Claudius; cf. in particular TROIANI, The *politeia* of Israel in the Graeco-Roman Age 11-22, especially 13-15; PUCCI BEN ZEEV, Jewish Rights in the Roman World 295-326, understands, on the other hand, the *isopoliteia* as an honorific right without any practical significance.

They are seeking rather, as has been said, the possibility of living according to their own laws and, at the same time, of being able to enjoy the peculiar privileges of citizens, first and foremost exemption from the *laographia*; hence the constant reference which they make to 'political rights' although in terms which are often not very clear. In the perspective of Philo and Josephus, the quest for *isopoliteia* has a twofold aim: to express the political loyalty of the Jews towards the πολίς of Alexandria and at the same time to preserve their own individuality and their own laws.

The question of the struggle for civil rights thus leads to a much more profound question: the Jews of Alexandria were fighting at one and the same time both for integration and for the recognition of their own individuality. If the rich and well-to-do Philo undoubtedly feels himself near to the Greeks and vehemently seeks an equality for the Jews of Alexandria with the Greeks, the author of the Third Book of the Maccabees regards the seeking of Alexandrian citizenship or even the seeking of any kind of integration at the social and political level, a betrayal of the true faith made, in that book's language, 'for the belly's sake' (3 Macc 7:11). The Jews are in fact λαὸν ἐν ξένη γῆ ξένον, a strange people in a strange land (3 Macc 6:3).⁶⁷ In 3 Macc 3:3-4, the Jews who are really faithful are those who, although remaining loyal to rulers conduct themselves (πολιτευόμενοι) according to the law of their God and 'for this reason they appeared hateful to some.' In any case, it is clear that full integration with the Greeks, beginning with access to the Gymnasium would have posed insurmountable religious problems to the majority of Jews. Most of the authors who have studied his question have reached similar conclusions which it can be interesting to read once more:

It is, indeed, highly improbable that many Jews in the Roman period (in relation to the Hellenistic epoch we have little information on this question) were interested in obtaining citizenship in the Greek polis of Alexandria, which stood in a relation of almost continual conflict with the Jewish population.⁶⁸

Les Juifs prétendent partager avec les Grecs les bénéfices de ce système de valeurs, mais en reflètent une partie importante qui n'est pas conciliable avec les principes de leur religion. Autrement dit, ils veulent être à la fois 'citoyens' et 'différents' [...].⁶⁹

Is it possible, therefore, to seek integration with the Greek world and at the same time to preserve one's own faith? With different nuances, and often with opposed solutions (Philo and 3 Maccabees are at the two

67 Cf. CPJ I, 75, n. 51. For the problem of the *isopoliteia* in 3 Macc cf. PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, Terzo Libro dei Maccabei 605-609.

68 APPLEBAUM, Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene 182.

69 MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, Les Juifs d'Égypte 198.

extremes), the Jews of Alexandria want to be, at the same time, *citizens* and yet *apart*. The question of the civil rights of the Jews of Alexandria has thus led us to address a much larger question, that of the degree of integration of those same Jews into the civil society of their time. It is against this background that we must now place our text about the Egyptians and the men of Sodom.

6. Wis 19:13-17 and the Problem of Rights

6.1 Between the defence of identity and the claim of civil rights

Among the authors who are concerned with the problem of the juridical status of the Jews of Alexandria and their struggle for civil rights, there is, as has been said, a constant indifference towards the Book of Wisdom. Only occasionally is Wis 19:13-17 cited. It is now a question, therefore, of seeing what this text can tell us with regard to the problem with which we are concerned, and, above all, what significance our passage assumes in the light of the historical context in which it arose which is undoubtedly the time following the institution of the *laographia* by the Roman authorities.⁷⁰

The third part of the Book of Wisdom (Wis 11-19) betrays a very fierce hostility towards the Egyptians which, in our pericope, placed right at the end of the book, reaches a truly dramatic climax. Larcher has provided us with a clear explanation concerning the identity of these Egyptians (whom, however, the Book of Wisdom never calls by name). They are, first of all, the Egyptians of the Book of Exodus and, in second place, the Egyptians of Alexandria, that is the popular element to which the *laographia* had assimilated the Jews and against which much of the anti-idolatrous polemic of the Book of Wisdom is directed. Nevertheless, behind the Egyptians of chapter 19, can unquestionably be seen the Greek element of the population without forgetting, finally, the apostate Jews, namely the ungodly described in the second chapter who wish to live a life of full assimilation with the Greeks.

Some authors such as Tcherikover and, more recently, Barclay consider the Book of Wisdom as fundamentally hostile to the Greek world.⁷¹ They are right in only one detail: the text of Wis 19:13-17, like the passage of Wis

70 Thus already according to LARCHER, *Le Livre de la Sagesse*, I, 159-60; I have already noted in the preceding how the dating proposed by Winston and Scarpat is not at all necessary in the light of Wis 19:13-17.

71 "The search for a way of reconciliation, so typical of Aristeas, is absent in Sap. Sal." (CPJ I, 75, n. 52); cf. also BARCLAY, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora 181-191*.

18:3 already recalled, expresses very well our sage's consciousness of being foreign, as I have noted several times. In one passage of chapter 12 and, nearer to our text, in Wis 19:10, the Israelites are called a 'colony' (ἀποικία in 12:7 and παροικία in 19:10), and, in both cases, this is done in connection with the land of Israel which is, thus, considered the true native land of the Jewish people. Nevertheless, in the Book of Wisdom and, especially in our pericope, we never find the excesses of the Third Book of the Maccabees which sees the very survival of the people in the total separation of Israel from the Greek world and the refusal of any compromise.

The pericope which we have studied reveals a real desire to be integrated, something evident, moreover, in the whole of the Book of Wisdom. But how far ought the integration to go? Although remaining vague, our author, speaking of the Hebrews, refers to 'their rights,' to the rights, that is of the *Egyptians*, evidently those of the Greek part of the population, rights which the Jews would have enjoyed in a past which does not seem to be too remote (Wis 19:16; cf. also *infra*).

In the light of the situation which we have described, it seems difficult, however, to think that our author would have had in mind the fullness of civil rights, a pure and simple equality between the Jews of Alexandria and the Greeks. It is more likely that our author is seeking the confirmation of those rights connected with the practice of the 'ancestral laws' which we have recalled above (cf. the situation of the Jews of Berenice) without forgetting the context set by the imposition of the *laographia* which is certainly also important to our sage. It is perhaps for this reason that he speaks not only of rights but of *their* rights, of the same rights as the Egyptians – that is, let us note once more, the Greeks of Alexandria – rights which the Jews had enjoyed (but in which they no longer shared after the imposition of the *laographia*). The text of v. 16 actually seems to presuppose a situation in the recent past in which rights were recognized and shared, contrasted with the present in which, on the contrary, such rights were trampled on and the Jews were becoming oppressed. All this refers almost inevitably to the situation that had already been created during the reign of Octavian. Our sage can certainly be thinking of the twofold policy of the Emperor which we have mentioned above: referring to the privileges confirmed to his community by the Romans themselves, the Book of Wisdom, striking perhaps a rather negative tone, contests the reduction of the Jews of Alexandria to a multitude deprived of rights. But here we find ourselves far from the sad times of Caligula.

6.2 Wis 19:13-17: what kind of Judaism?

It still remains to complete the reply to one question: why this pericope right at the end of the book? If the reading of the text which has been offered is correct, the Book of Wisdom intends to complete its *relecture* of the Exodus with serious actualisation, referring to the situation of the author's co-religionists. At this point, one must remember something which neither Vilchez Líndez nor Priotto takes into account but which to me appears to be fundamental: the addressees of the Book of Wisdom are not the Greeks of Alexandria, still less the new Roman governors. On the contrary, the book is addressed almost exclusively to the Jews of Alexandria, to a community which has to recognize some problems, not slight, within itself. Wis 19:13-17, then, cannot be understood as a manifesto addressed to the Alexandrian authorities; a pagan reader with our text would have really understood very little.⁷²

If it is true that the Book of Wisdom constitutes a highly unitary work, it is worth the trouble of exploiting this conclusion. The opponents of the Book of Wisdom are first of all the ungodly introduced in the second chapter, the apostate Jews, certainly Jews of the upper class. Our author puts himself clearly on the side of the 'righteous poor man,' oppressed by the ungodly. We know well that in the Jewish community of Alexandria only the wealthiest and most educated classes would be fighting for full integration with the Greeks. Not even Philo reached this far. The greater part of the Jews of Alexandria, however, did not belong to the upper classes.⁷³ Our author is certainly an educated man, well acquainted with the Hellenistic culture but he certainly does not side with the rich and powerful who are constantly criticised in his book.

Placing himself in front of his community, our sage intends to situate himself in the middle ground between a polemical viewpoint such as characterises, for example, the Third Book of the Maccabees, and the openness which will later reflect the thought of Philo. If I had to summarise everything in some kind of slogan, I would say that the attitude defended by the Book of Wisdom with regard to the problem of the rights of the Jews of Alexandria is that of a Judaism which is conscious of its own individuality but which, at the same time, seeks a measure of integration – a Judaism very original but not surprising – part of that Alexandrian Judaism of which Mary Smallwood writes, precisely in relation to the question of rights: "To ask for the advantages of Greek citizenship and then to repudiate some of

72 On the question of the addressees of the Book of Wisdom, cf. MAZZINGHI, *Notte di paura e di luce* 6, n. 23 and 253, n. 133, with bibliography; one can consult the different positions of M.-F. Baslez and J. J. Collins in the present volume.

73 Cf. CPJ II, 3-5, 52 and, more recently, the cited study of PUCCI BEN ZEEV, *New Perspectives*.

its obligations as incompatible with their national religion was to attempt to make the best of both worlds."⁷⁴

Just as in the rest of the book, even in the pericope about the Egyptians and the men of Sodom, our author never yields to the temptation of renouncing his own faith. Even the Egyptians, though unbelievers, have benefited from the presence of the Israelites, and if there is anyone who has hated guests and foreigners, it is in fact they. There is undoubtedly some idealism in this position. What our sage seems to be saying is: we would like to keep our religious identity to the full and at the same time to receive the recognition of the rights belonging to the Greeks in the city. For the Greeks they will thus remain a hated privileged group, as Josephus puts it in the mouth of Apion: "Why then, if they are citizens, do they not worship the same gods as the Alexandrians?"⁷⁵ For the Book of Wisdom, however, it is a question of remaining in good standing with the Greeks, though remaining faithful to the Jewish Law. History has proved our sage wrong. The problem re-arises for believers today in many different, though analogous, forms. Perhaps the idealism of the Book of Wisdom could be better defined as 'faith.'

74 SMALLWOOD, *The Jews under Roman Rule* 14.

75 JOSEPHUS, *Ap. II*, 65.

Bibliography

- APPLEBAUM, S., *Jews and Greeks in Ancient Cyrene*, Leiden 1979.
- APPLEBAUM, S., *The Legal Status of the Jewish Communities in the Diaspora*, in: SAFRAI, S. – STERN, M. (eds.), *The Jewish People in the First Century. Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions* (CRINT I/1), Assen 1974, 435-501.
- AZIZA, C., *L'utilisation polémique du récit de l'Exode chez les écrivains alexandrins (IV^{ème} siècle av. J. C. – I^{er} siècle ap. J. C.)*, in: ANRW 20/1, 41-65.
- BARCLAY, J. M. G., *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora. From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE – 117 CE)*, Edinburgh 1996.
- BARRACLOUGH, R., *Philo's Politics, Roman Rule and Hellenistic Judaism*, in: ANRW 21/1, 417-553.
- BEAUCHAMP, P., *Le salut corporel des justes et la conclusion du livre de la Sagesse: Bib 45 (1964) 490-526*.
- BISCARDI, A., *Polis, politeia, politeuma*, in: GIGANTE, M. ET AL. (eds.), *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia, Napoli 19-26 maggio 1983, III*, Napoli 1984.
- BIZZETI, P., *Il libro della Sapienza. Struttura e genere letterario* (RivBibSuppl. 11), Brescia 1984.
- BOFFO, L., *Iscrizioni greche e latine per lo studio della Bibbia*, Brescia 1994.
- CHEON, S., *The Exodus Story in the Wisdom of Solomon. A Study in Biblical Interpretation* (JSP.SS 23), Sheffield 1997.
- CHEVALIER, Y., *L'antisémitisme*, Paris 1986.
- COLLINS, J. J., *Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age: HR 17 (1977) 121-142*.
- COWEY, J. M. S. - MARESH, K., *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3 - 133/2 v. Chr.)* (P. Pol. Iud.): *Papyri aus den sammlungen von Heidelberg, Köln, München und Wien, Wiesbaden 2001*.
- DELL'OMO, M., *Creazione, storia della salvezza e destino dell'uomo. Il significato e l'attualità spirituale del capitolo 19 della Sapienza: RivBib 37 (1989) 317-327*.
- EL ABBADI, M.A.H., *The Alexandrian Citizenship: JEA 48 (1962) 106-123*.
- GILBERT, M., *Sagesse de Salomon (ou livre de la Sagesse)*, in: DBS XI, coll. 58-119.
- GILBERT, M., *La rilettura di Gen 1-3*, in: ID., *La Sapienza di Salomone*, 2, Roma 1995.
- GRABBE, L., *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian, II*, Minneapolis 1991.
- HUZAR, E. G., *Alexandria ad Aegyptum in the Julio-Claudian Age*, in: ANRW 10/1, 619-668.
- JOSEPHUS, *Antiquities* (Loeb 281), MARCUS, R. (ed.), Harvard 1934.
- JOSEPHUS, *War, I-II*, (Loeb 203), THACKERAY, H. ST. J. (ed.), Harvard 1927.
- JOSEPHUS, *The Life/Against Apion* (Loeb 186), THACKERAY, H. ST. J. (ed.), Harvard 1926.
- KANT, L. H., *Jewish Inscriptions in Greek and Latin*, in: ANRW 20/2, 671-713.
- KASHER, A., *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (TSAJ 7), Tübingen 1985.
- LARCHER, C., *Le Livre de la Sagesse ou la Sagesse de Salomon* (EtB 5), III, Paris 1985.
- LÜDERITZ, G., *What is the Politeuma?*, in: HENTEN, J. W. VAN – HORST, P. W. VAN DER (eds.), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGJU 21), Leiden 1994.
- MAZZINGHI, L., *Notte di paura e di luce. Esegese di Sap 17,1-18, 4* (AnBib 134), Roma 1995.

- MÉLÈZE MODRZEJEWSKI, J., *Les Juifs d'Égypte de Ramsès II à Hadrien*, Paris 1997.
- MONTEVECCHI, O., *L'amministrazione dell'Egitto sotto i Giulio-Claudi*, in: ANRW 10/1, 412-471.
- NOBILE, M., *La thématique eschatologique dans le livre de la Sagesse en relation avec l'apocalyptique*, in: CALDUCH-BENAGES, N. – VERMEYLEN, J. (eds.), *Treasures of Wisdom. Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom. Festschrift M. Gilbert* (BETHL 143), Leuven 1999, 303-312.
- OFFERHAUS, U., *Komposition und Intention der Sapientia Salomonis*, Bonn 1981.
- PASSARO, A., *Escatologia, profezia e apocalittica. Indagine su Sap 19*, in: MANFREDI, S. – PASSARO, A. (eds.), *Abscondita in lucem. Scritti in onore di mons. Benedetto Rocco*, Caltanissetta-Roma 2000, 103-117.
- PASSONI DELL'ACQUA, A., *Terzo Libro dei Maccabei*, in: SACCHI, P. (ed.), *Apocrifi dell'Antico Testamento*, Brescia 2000, 605-609.
- PHILO, *Vit. Mos. I* (LCL 289), COLSON, F. H. (ed.), Harvard 1966.
- PRIOTTO, M., *Il significato del confronto Egitto-Sodoma in Sap 19,13-17*: RivBib 32 (1984) 369-394.
- PUCCI BEN ZEEV, M., *Jewish Rights in the Roman World. The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius* (TSAJ 74), Tübingen 1998.
- PUCCI BEN ZEEV, M., *New Perspectives on the Jewish-Greek Hostilities in Alexandria during the Reign of Emperor Caligula*: JST 21 (2001) 227-235
- RAJAK, T., *Jewish Rights in the Greek Cities under Roman Rule. A new Approach*, in: GREEN, W. S. (ed.), *Studies in Judaism and its Greco-Roman Context* (BJSt 32), Atlanta 1985, 19-35.
- SCARPAT, G., *Libro della Sapienza, III*, Brescia 1999.
- SCHÜRER, E., *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, revised and edited by G. Vermes – F. Millar – M. Goodman, III.1, Edinburgh 1986.
- SMALLWOOD, E. M., *The Jews under Roman Rule. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity* (SJLA 20), Leiden 1981².
- SPICQ, C., *Notes de lexicographie néo-testamentaire, I-II*, Göttingen 1978.
- STÄHLIN, G., 'ξένοϛ', in: ThWNT V 1-36
- STERN, M., *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism, I: From Herodotus to Plutarch*, Jerusalem 1974.
- TARN, W., *The Hellenistic Civilization*, London 1952.
- TROIANI, L., *The politeia of Israel in the Graeco-Roman Age*, in PARENTE, F. – SIEVERS, J. (eds.), *Josephus and the History of the Graeco-Roman Period. Fs. M. Smith* (StPB 41), Leiden-New York-Köln 1994.
- VÍLCHEZ LÍNDEZ, J., *Sapienza*, Roma 1990.
- VOGELS, W., *The God who Creates is the God who Saves: the book of Wisdom's reversal of the biblical pattern*: EeT 22 (1991) 315-335.
- WINSTON, D., *The Wisdom of Solomon* (AncB 43), Garden City, NY 1979.
- WOLFSON, H. A., *Philo on Jewish Citizenship in Alexandria*: JBL 63 (1944) 165-168.
- ZUCKERMAN, C., *Hellenistic politeumata and the Jews. A Reconsideration*, review of Kasher: SCI 88 (1985) 171-185.