

Philo's Scriptures:  
Citations from  
the Prophets  
and Writings

*Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle  
in Second Temple Judaism*

NAOMI G. COHEN

SUPPLEMENTS TO THE JOURNAL FOR THE STUDY OF JUDAISM [123]

BRILL

Philo's Scriptures:  
Citations from the Prophets and Writings

Supplements  
to the  
Journal for the Study  
of Judaism

*Editor*

John J. Collins  
The Divinity School, Yale University

*Associate Editors*

Florentino García Martínez  
Qumran Institute, University of Groningen

Hindy Najman  
Department of Near and Middle Eastern Civilizations,  
University of Toronto

*Advisory Board*

J. DUHAIME – A. HILHORST – P.W. VAN DER HORST  
A. KLOSTERGAARD PETERSEN – M.A. KNIBB  
J.T.A.G.M. VAN RUITEN – J.SIEVERS – G. STEMBERGER  
E.J.C. TIGCHELAAR – J. TROMP

VOLUME 123

# Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings

Evidence for a *Haftarah* Cycle  
in Second Temple Judaism

*By*  
Naomi G. Cohen



BRILL

LEIDEN • BOSTON  
2007

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

**Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data**

Cohen, Naomi G.

Philo's scriptures : citations from the Prophets and Writings : evidence for a Haftarah cycle in Second Temple Judaism / by Naomi G. Cohen.

p. cm. — (Supplements to the Journal for the study of Judaism, ISSN 1384-2161)

Includes bibliographical references and index

ISBN 978-90-04-16312-6 (hardback : alk. paper)

1. Philo, of Alexandria. 2. Bible. O.T.—Criticism, interpretation, etc. 3. Haftarat—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title. II. Series.

BS1161.P5C64 2007

224'.06092—dc22

2007038152

ISSN: 1384-2161

ISBN: 987 90 04 16312 6

Copyright 2007 by Koninklijke Brill NV, Leiden, The Netherlands.  
Koninklijke Brill NV incorporates the imprints Brill, Hotei Publishing,  
IDC Publishers, Martinus Nijhoff Publishers and VSP.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill NV provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA.

Fees are subject to change.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS

*To our grandchildren  
Yonatan & his wife Alona, Avishai, Roni & her husband Etan,  
Neria, Sraya and Yigal*

*and to our daughter, their mother  
Eliraz Haya Cohen-Kraus*

*With abiding love and pride*



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Note to the Reader (Explanatory Observations) .....	ix
Preface .....	xi
Chapter One: The Man Philo as a Product of his Time .....	1
Chapter Two: How Philo Quotes the Pentateuch .....	25
Chapter Three: A Traditional <i>Haftarah</i> Cycle .....	55
Chapter Four: Citations from the Latter Prophets .....	71
Chapter Five: Citations from the Former Prophets and Chronicles .....	103
Chapter Six: Citations from the Book of Psalms .....	139
Chapter Seven: Citations from the Books of Proverbs and Job.....	157
Chapter Eight: The Allegorical Circle of Moses .....	175
Endnotes .....	199
Endnote A: Pantokrator (Παντοκράτορας) and Lord of Hosts (Κύριος Σαβαωθ) .....	199
Endnote B: Philo and the Contemporary Italian Rite .....	199
Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD) in the Septuagint, Philo, and in Rabbinic Midrash .....	201
Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the books of Judges and Kings .....	204
Endnote E: 'To Look' and 'To See' (βλέπειν / ὄρᾶν).....	204
Endnote F: Ps. 46(45):5 (V Somn. 2.246) and Zohar ii 63b and 98b.....	208
Endnote G: A Possible Allusion / Echo of Prov. 8:22–23 in VIII Virt. 62 .....	209
Endnote H: The 'Jewish' connotation of the terms Πρόσταγμα, Προστάξις, and Προστάξεις και Άπαγορεύσεις and Εντολή in Philo .....	209
Endnote I: The Use of the Word Πρωτίστης in Philo .....	214
Endnote J: The Cultural Norms of Translators and the Words They Choose .....	217



Appendix 1. Prov. 8:22–23 in Philo and in Genesis Rabbah.....	219
Appendix 2. Charts of Philo’s Citations from the Prophets and Writings .....	231
Bibliography .....	241
Index of Modern Authors .....	251
General Index .....	253
Index of Sources .....	263

NOTE TO THE READER  
(EXPLANATORY OBSERVATIONS)

When quoting from Philo's works, I have prefixed the number of the volume of the *Loeb Classical Library* (PLCL). This greatly facilitates each quote's location and identifies at a glance to which part of Philo's *oeuvre* it belongs—whether to the allegorical, historical, Laws, etc. Thus: IV *Conf.* 149 refers to *Conf.* 149 which is found in volume IV of PLCL, and thus indicates that the quote is part of the allegorical commentary.

MT (Massoretic Text) is the term used to indicate Hebrew Scripture, even though scholarship has identified minor differences between the MT and the ancient Hebrew text.

The Pentateuch refers to the Five Books of Moses, while the terms Bible and Scripture are used for *all* the books of the Hebrew Bible.

When the context requires the use of the Hebrew form of the Tetragrammaton, it is transcribed as ה - ו - ה - ם and sometimes as ם.

*Haftarah*, pl. *Haftarot*, are the passages read from the Prophets following the weekly Torah reading (the *Parashah*). They usually bear an associative relation to the Torah reading, but exceptions are made for special Sabbaths.

The term "Palestinian" is used in such contexts as Palestinian Midrash and Palestinian Talmud (= Jerusalem Talmud), because this has long been the standard terminology.

The translations used are: PLCL for Philo; The King James Version (KJV) and/or the Jewish Publication Society (JPS) for Scripture; Herbert Danby, *Mishnah* (Oxford 1933); and the Soncino translations for the Talmud and Midrash Rabbah. However, I have occasionally altered them and sometimes provided my own translation.



## PREFACE

*A new paradigm for addressing old questions:  
But “There are those who are so scrupulously  
afraid of doing wrong that they seldom venture  
to do anything.”*

(Vauvenargues)<sup>1</sup>

The points of departure in any field of scholarly research are implicit assumptions that are taken to be axiomatic. They last for a long time. But with the entrance of a different type of scholar who has a different horizon of knowledge and different preconceptions, as well as a somewhat different combination of scholarly expertise, the axiomatic nature of these assumptions erodes. And as more and more information emerges to the contrary, the assumptions finally collapse and a new *Gestalt* (= pattern) becomes standard in its turn. More often than not, this takes several generations, but eventually it happens.

This is in line with the thinking of Thomas Kuhn, who has described the shift of scientific paradigms (models), pointing out how new data that speak against the model accumulate. These data are initially explained away *ad hoc*, and suddenly, based on the same forces as a religious revival (thus not being based upon rational thinking), the paradigm changes.<sup>2</sup>

Philonic research is no different. With a few notable exceptions, the typical Philonic scholar was for a very long time a committed Christian, and often a theologian. He also had an excellent grounding in classical Greek language and literature, as well as in the works of the ancient

---

<sup>1</sup> French moralist and essayist (1715–1747), friend of Mirabeau and Voltaire, from his *Maximes*.

<sup>2</sup> This was pointed out long ago by Thomas Kuhn in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago 1970), 43–51. However, might I suggest that what, apparently for lack of a better suggestion, he has attributed to the same forces as a religious revival, is provided here with a rational explanation.

philosophical schools. And not surprisingly, these scholars found in Philo what their training prepared them to look for.<sup>3</sup>

With the entrance of a different type of scholar into the field, one whose formative years were spent in an atmosphere pervaded by an existential commitment to Judaism, a hitherto neglected aspect of Philo's works began to take its rightful place.<sup>4</sup> Among others, such illustrious figures of the first half of the last century as Yizhak (Isaac) Heinemann,<sup>5</sup> Edmund Stein,<sup>6</sup> H.A. Wolfson<sup>7</sup> and Samuel Belkin<sup>8</sup> were responsible for a change in the direction of Philonic studies, opening up new vistas. After them, the field was no longer the same, for as it was astutely noted long ago, "people accept only those ideas for which their previous development has prepared their minds"—and scholars are no exception.<sup>9</sup>

But while an increasing number of scholars of the first rank, both Jewish and non-Jewish,<sup>10</sup> have turned to the study of the Jewish side of Philo and have thereby introduced radical changes in the scope of

---

<sup>3</sup> For a survey of different evaluations of Philo, see E. Hilgert, "Philo Judaeus et Alexandrinus: The State of the Problem," in *The School of Moses: Studies in Philo and Hellenistic Religion; in memory of Horst R. Moehring*, ed. John Peter Kenney, Brown Judaic studies 304. Studia Philonica Monographs 1 (Atlanta 1995).

<sup>4</sup> Actually there were important forerunners in the 19th century such as e.g. Z. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig 1841), and *Ueber den Einfluss der palästinischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik* (Leipzig 1851) Z. [= Frankel, *Einfluss* (1851)], and B. Ritter, *Philo und die Halacha* (Leipzig 1879). But as the saying goes, a few birds do not usher in the spring.

<sup>5</sup> Yizhak (Isaac) Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (1931–1933) [= Heinemann, *Bildung*], as well as his earlier "Die Lehre von ungeschriebenen Gesetz im jüdischen Schriftum," *HUCA* 4 (1927), 149–171 [Heinemann, "Die Lehre"].

<sup>6</sup> "Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria," *BZAW* 51 (1929), and "Philo und der Midrash," *BZAW Beihefte* 57 (1931).

<sup>7</sup> Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, 2 volumes (Cambridge, Mass. 1948) [= Wolfson, *Philo*].

<sup>8</sup> See Samuel Belkin, *Philo and the Oral Law: the Philonic interpretation of biblical law in relation to the Palestinian Halakah* (Cambridge, Mass. 1940, repr. New York 1968, 1970); and also *המדרש הנעלם ומקורותיו במדרשים האלכסנדרוניים הקדומים* [= "The Midrash Ha Ne'elam of the Zohar and its Sources in Ancient Alexandrian Literature"], Sura 3 (Jerusalem 1957–1958), 25–92, as well as *The Midrash of Philo / מדרש פילון / The Oldest Recorded Midrash Written in Alexandria by Philo (c. 20 BCE – 45 CE) before the Formulation of Tannaitic Literature*. Vol. I: *Genesis II–XVII...* ed. E. Hurvitz (New York 1989).

<sup>9</sup> See Elias Bickerman, *The Jews in the Greek Age* (Harvard 1988), 305 where this is quoted in the name of the 18th century Italian jurist and philosopher Giovanni Battista Vico, author of *Principii d'una scienza nova*.

<sup>10</sup> See Peder Borgen's "Philo of Alexandria: A critical and syncretical survey of research since World War II," *ANWR* II/21.2 (*Religion. Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer Zeit: Philon und Josephus*, ed. W. Haase [Berlin–New York 1984]), 98–154, and most

the field, the old underlying axiomatic assumptions have till now still remained the default point of departure. For by and large, one is still expected to *prove* the nature and the centrality of Philo's Jewish frame of reference before proceeding to explain the particular thought pattern or particular passage in question in the light of it.

I am convinced that in the wake of the increased acceptance of the understanding of Philo as first and foremost a loyal Jew, the time is ripe for a new *Gestalt* to become the standard one in Philonic research. This does not mean that the former understanding of Philo should be completely superseded. Indeed, it contains much that remains indispensable to the proper understanding of his works. But the time has come for a more balanced frame of reference, with the old and the new complementing each other.

The present book assumes Philo's Jewish frame of reference as a given, and proceeds immediately with its specific research agenda, that of studying the citations from the Prophets and Writings. It does not find it necessary to first validate the thesis that the Jewish component is often the major factor for understanding many of the details in Philo's writings. The question posed is not, "How Jewish is Philo?" but rather, "How can we understand Philo's writings, given his Jewishness as a self-evident axiomatic assumption?"

As in my preceding book,<sup>11</sup> the methodology of my research procedure has been to read a limited portion of Philo's writings in depth—in the present case, Philo's citations from Scripture that do not appear in the Pentateuch. Each citation is examined from every conceivable vantage point, including, but not limited to, references to Jewish and other sources. The initial object was to achieve insights respecting how and why Philo came to use each non-pentateuchal citation, and whenever possible, to understand its place in the overall tapestry of the Philonic composition in which it is found. This methodology provides a research agenda dictated by the Philonic text rather than by contemporary concerns. It thus helps avoid the pitfalls of much research in the humanities and social sciences—that of posing questions that are unrelated to the concerns of the ancient author.

---

particularly Borgen's own *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (Leiden 1997) (NTS 86).

<sup>11</sup> Naomi Cohen, *Philo Judaeus—His Universe of Discourse*, (Frankfurt a.m. 1995) [= Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*].

*Overview of the book*

Since the purpose of the book is, as its title suggests, a thorough research into all of the citations and references in the works of Philo Judaeus that are not found in the Pentateuch, I have postponed for another time many interesting yet unrelated insights.<sup>12</sup> I think that accounting for the appearance of *all* of the citations and references to the Prophets and Writings is of paramount significance.

**Chapter One** presents background material that contributes to the understanding of Philo the man as a product of his time and place. It discusses such matters as Jewish knowledge among Alexandrian Jews, commitment to Judaism in Alexandria, the language of Philo's sources, non-pentateuchal Scripture in Philo, the use of rabbinic evidence in research on Philo, and finally some remarks respecting the chronology of Philo's writings and the audience to whom they are addressed.

**Chapter Two** surveys how Philo quotes the Pentateuch. With very few exceptions, he does not use the names of the discrete books, Genesis, Exodus, etc., but quotes the Pentateuch as a unit, by such names as Holy Scripture. The rare exceptions are explained. This places in context the fact that with a single exception, the citations from the Latter Prophets are identified by the generic term, "Prophets," rather than as "Isaiah," "Jeremiah," etc.

**Chapter Three** shows that Philo's citations from the Latter Prophets apparently indicate that the recitation of the *Haftarah* Cycle now current between the 17th of Tammuz until the Day of Atonement was already, at the very least, on the way to becoming customary in the Alexandria of his day.

**Chapter Four** contains an in-depth study of *all* of Philo's citations from, and/or possible allusions to, material from the Latter Prophets.<sup>13</sup> In each instance, an explanation for its appearance is suggested and interesting insights are noted.

**Chapter Five** studies the citations from the Former Prophets. Some are found to be no more than mistaken identifications. The study clearly shows that not only was Philo's text the Septuagint, but that

---

<sup>12</sup> I have, however, included some Endnotes that elucidate tangential matters related to the relevant texts, as well as an Appendix that illustrates a significant example of Hebrew/Aramaic and Hellenistic/Jewish midrashic interaction.

<sup>13</sup> The passages already discussed in Chapter Three are examined here in greater detail.

even the allegorical constructions are sometimes *dependent on the wording of the Septuagint text* in places where it differs from the MT. I also found that they reflect his use both of literary sources at least sometimes translated from a Hebrew/Aramaic original, and a lexicon of the *entire Bible* in the Greek language, which has been shown by my predecessors to be based upon the Hebrew text. All of this indicates a lively interest in the Alexandrian Jewish community in Scripture as a whole, and not merely in the Pentateuch. These works would not have been composed, or translated from Hebrew/Aramaic, were there not a readership for them, and obviously, the translations reflect Palestinian/Diaspora cultural interaction.

**Chapter Six** examines Philo's citations from the Book of Psalms. Approximately twenty verses belonging to sixteen different Psalms have been quoted, paraphrased, or echoed in eighteen different *loci* in Philo's *oeuvre*. This is the largest number of citations from any single book outside of the Pentateuch. For Philo, the Book of Psalms (which he called "Hymns") was a single conceptual unit that completed the trilogy: *Pentateuch, Hymns, and Prophets*, while the remaining Writings (*Hagiographa*) were apparently considered holy miscellanies.

**Chapter Seven** discusses the citations from the Book of Proverbs, as well as the single citation from the Book of Job. Except for those from Psalms (Hymns), these are the *only* citations from what we today call the Writings.

**Chapter Eight**, the concluding chapter, builds upon what has preceded it. The hypothesis of an allegorical circle, composed of teachers, scholars, and pupils (or disciples), who were devoted to radical philosophical allegorization, first and foremost of the Pentateuch, but also of the rest of Scripture, is the result of my endeavor to elucidate otherwise unexplained phenomena connected with the citations from the Prophets and Writings in Philo's *oeuvre*. The chapter presents evidence that suggests that Philo enthusiastically participated in such a circle, but that later a rift developed between Philo and its other members, and their ways parted.

\*

Some of the research for this book was undertaken when I enjoyed a research grant (no. 2118) from the Israel Science Foundation. Except for parts of the first three chapters, the contents of the book appear here in print for the first time. A version of part of the first chapter



was included in my article, “The Prophetic Books of Alexandria: The Evidence from Philo Judaeus,” which appeared in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak (Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 427; formerly *JSTOT Supplement Series*; NY–London 2006, and now part of the Continuum International Publishing Group), 166–193. Chapter Two is largely based on my article “The Names of the Separate Books of the Pentateuch in Philo’s Writings,” which appeared in the *Festschrift for David Winston = Studia Philonica Annual—Studies in Hellenistic Judaism IX* (1997), ed. David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling (*Brown Judaic Studies* 312; Atlanta, Georgia), 54–78. Chapter Three is a revised version of “Earliest Evidence of the Haftarah Cycle for the Sabbaths between ו”ז בתמוז and סוכות in Philo,” *JJS* 48/2 (Autumn 1997), 225–249. I first proposed the thesis in a paper delivered at the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University, and in an abbreviated form at the 12th World Congress of Jewish Studies (Jerusalem 1998).

\*

What remains are the pleasurable obligations of expressing appreciation: to John Collins, the general editor of the Supplements of the *Journal for the Study of Judaism*, not only for accepting the book for publication, but also for keeping it properly focused; to Hindy Najman, the associate editor, who has been most helpful and encouraging in the final stages of the book’s preparation. Special thanks also go to Rabbi Ze’ev Gotthold, Michael Mach, and Sam Silverman, who were kind enough to read the manuscript and make valuable suggestions. Thank you also, Eva Mroczek and Kathleen Gibbons, University of Toronto graduate students, Hava Korzakova who assisted in copy editing, as well as Fern Seckbach who prepared the indices and Irene Lancaster, who read the proofs.

The friendly prodding of my good friend for many, many years, Jenny Michael, has given me the impetus to finally conclude the book. Last but not least, I want to thank my esteemed husband, Chief Rabbi Shear-Yashuv Cohen, who in spite of his manifold responsibilities, has provided me with the emotional support to persevere in this endeavor.

I am glad to be able to offer this product of years of intensive research, which I hope will be considered a significant contribution both to the study of Philo Judaeus, for whom matters of the spirit were paramount, and to the history of Jewish liturgy, which also has

a spiritual dimension. At the same time, the realization that side by side with spiritual progeny, I have been blessed with descendants who continue in the traditions of their ancestors, following in the ways of their grandparents and their great-grandparents, provides a parallel strong feeling of fulfillment. Together, they are vital links in the eternal chain. May it never be broken. It is to them, Yonatan and his wife Alona, Avishai, Roni, Neriah, Seraya and Yig'al, and to their mother, our beloved daughter, Eliraz Haya Cohen-Kraus, that I dedicate the book.

Naomi G. Cohen  
Haifa, Israel  
April 2007 (Nissan 5767)



## CHAPTER ONE

### THE MAN PHILO AS A PRODUCT OF HIS TIME

*The problem with finding simple solutions to difficult problems is that the reader remains unaware how much labor and creative thought has been involved.*

(Anonymous)

While it has long been recognized that quotations, paraphrases and allusions from the Pentateuch are the very warp upon which Philo has woven the woof of his homiletic tapestry, there is less awareness that the number of references or allusions to the rest of the Bible in his writings is so very small.

Indeed, although even a relatively superficial reading of Philo shows without a vestige of a doubt that Philo was very much at home with the text of the Pentateuch, including a wide range of exegetical material that was mostly, but not only, of an allegorical nature,<sup>1</sup> this can hardly be stated in respect to the other parts of the Bible. One is hard pressed to explain this, and one is forced to wonder what the reason could possibly be for what at first glance seems to be a most strange phenomenon—that a personality as erudite and devoted to Scripture as Philo did not address a broader range of biblical works than is evident in his extant writings.

The results of the present study indicate that the major texts *treated* by Philo are confined to those with which his readers would have been familiar from their worship, including Psalms.<sup>2</sup> Philo devotes his

---

<sup>1</sup> See e.g. David M. Hay, "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," *StPhA* 6 (1979–1980), 41–75, and idem, "References to other Exegetes," in *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, ed. Hay (*BJS* 232, Atlanta 1991), 81–97. Also, Burton L. Mack, "Exegetical Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism," *StPhA* 3 (1974–1975), 71–112, and idem, "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria," *ANRW* 2.21.1 (1984), 221–271, [Mack, "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions," *ANRW* 1984].

<sup>2</sup> See David Runia, "Philo's reading of the Psalms," *StPhA* XIII (2001), 102–121 [Runia, "Philo's reading"], and also Yizhak (Isaac) Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (1931–1933), and perhaps "Die Lehre von ungeschriebenen Gesetz

attention to the liturgical texts, using lexicographic aids and midrashic commentaries that must have been at his disposal.<sup>3</sup>

That Philo *chose* to devote himself exclusively to works directly related to the Synagogue liturgy is not surprising, for these must have been the works that interested the educated and religiously committed members of the Alexandrian Jewish community who in my view were his major potential audience.

Philo's writings belong neither to the genre of academic scholarship<sup>4</sup> nor to abstruse philosophical musing, and as just noted, he must have been addressing an audience familiar with the underlying texts that he uses. Otherwise, they would not have found significance in his attaching philosophical and other doctrines to these texts. On the face of it, he must have been writing for the educated element of the contemporary Jewish community who found intellectual and emotional satisfaction in the weaving of their Hellenistic frames of reference into those traditional Jewish texts to which Philo encouraged them to be unconditionally committed.

At the same time, this does not prove that he was acquainted with no more than what was used in the Synagogue. Nor does the fact that Philo's rare references to other biblical books fail to reflect the scriptural context from which the references are culled necessarily indicate anything significant in this respect. As is obvious to anyone reading Philo, this is his usual way of treating the biblical text; let it be pointed out in passing that it is also in line with the usual manner of traditional rabbinic midrash.<sup>5</sup>

There is, however, what I consider a more intriguing question: What has evoked Philo's use of each specific non-pentateuchal quotation? This I think is the true dilemma, and it has indeed proven to be a fruitful avenue of research.

---

im jüdischen Schriftum," *HUCA* IV (1927), 149–171 as well. Psalms were of course an integral part of the liturgy of the Synagogue. Whether or not every one of the Psalms referred to by Philo was used in communal prayer, the Book of Psalms would most naturally have been familiar to him from its liturgical role. Note, too, that there is no evidence that he used any non-canonical Psalms.

<sup>3</sup> These are discussed *inter alia*, in Chapter Five, and at the end of Chapter Seven.

<sup>4</sup> Whatever that might have been in Philo's day.

<sup>5</sup> A single example: the identification by rabbinic midrash of Pinchas and Eliyahu, see e.g. *Yalkut Shime'oni, Parashat Pinchas*, 771, "R. Shime'on b. Lakish said, 'Pinchas is Eliyahu' ..."; see also *Pirkei d'R. Eliezer*, Higger edition, chapter 46; Eshkol edition (Jerusalem 1973), chapter 47.

*Jewish knowledge among Alexandrian Jews—  
the evidence from IV Maccabees*

We know for certain that long before Philo's day not only the Pentateuch, but also the Prophets and other holy writings were available in Greek. The same is true respecting much of what we today subsume under the umbrella of 'Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,' even though, in the vast majority of cases, the dates of their authorship and/or of their translation into Greek are at best conjectural.<sup>6</sup> We are therefore justified in taking it for granted that Jewish works written in Greek, which included a large library of translations from the Hebrew, were available to Alexandrian Jewry, and that what has survived is clearly no more than the tip of the iceberg.<sup>7</sup> And although books at the time were of course copied by hand, this does not mean that they were beyond the means of the educated class. There is thus no reason to suppose that non-pentateuchal Scripture was not widely available. The infrequency of its use in the literature of the period *that has survived*, including, but not exclusively, Philo's works, must be due to other reasons.

Following is a glimpse of the sort of Jewish knowledge that the author of IV Maccabees assumed was widely available in, at the very least, the erudite upper strata of the Greek-speaking Diaspora community. IV Maccabees is in a sense a companion piece to Philo, since it is similar in language, philosophical approach, and cultural horizons. Whether or not its author lived in Alexandria, belonging as they both did to that part of Hellenistic Jewry that had an excellent Greek *paideia* and at the same time retained a deep commitment to Judaism, Philo would have found him to be a congenial soul. The work is something between a religious historical novel and a moral discourse, and hence can be taken to unconsciously mirror contemporary social norms.

---

<sup>6</sup> The very survival of many of these works, whether or not their original language was Greek, is only thanks to their having survived in Greek. Tobit, Judith, most of the books of Enoch and of Baruch, and the Books of Maccabees are all cases in point, as are the additions to Daniel. The same is true even of Ben-Sira, whose Hebrew original was discovered in the Cairo Geniza only in modern times. One is tempted to compare this with the situation today where almost all of the classical Jewish sources have been rendered from Hebrew and Aramaic into English.

<sup>7</sup> Although this is somewhat later, it is worth noting that Justin Martyr (2nd century CE), when giving an account of the Septuagint in his *First Apology*, § 30–31, states that it was available in every Jewish community in the Empire. Even if this is an exaggeration, it remains indicative.

A passage in the closing chapter of IV Maccabees indicates what its author considered to be the type of traditional scriptural knowledge that ‘everyone’ would have had. I refer to the homily placed in the mouth of the mother of the martyred ‘seven sons’—though of course the author of IV Maccabees has penned it.

While it is undoubtedly an idealized picture of a Jewish family, it is realistic insofar as it replicates the strict sequestration of the family’s women-folk from the men that was taken for granted in upper-class, traditional, ‘respectable’ Hellenistic society. It also takes for granted that the transfer of Jewish knowledge was from *father* to *sons*, with the mother evidently not taking an active part.<sup>8</sup> One reads in IV Macc. 18:6 ff.:<sup>9</sup>

(6) Now these are the words that the mother of the seven sons, the righteous woman, spake to her children: (7) I was a pure maiden, and I left not my father’s house (ὑπερέβην πατρικὸν οἶκον)... (9) I lived with my husband during the days of my prime (ἀμῆς); but when they (*my sons*) were grown up, their father died. Happy was he, for he lived a life blessed with children, and he never knew the pain of their loss.

(10) While he was yet with you (ὑμῖν),<sup>10</sup> he taught you (ἐδίδασκεν ὑμᾶς) the *Law and the Prophets* (τὸν νόμον καὶ τοὺς προφήτας). (11) He *read* to you (ἀνεγίνωσκέν ὑμῖν) the slaying of Abel by Cain (Ἀβελ ὑπὸ Καὶν), and of Isaac (Ἰσαακ) who was brought as a whole burnt-offering, and the (account of) Joseph (Ἰωσήφ) in prison. (12) And he told you (ἔλεγεν δὲ ὑμῖν) about Phineas (Φινεες) the zealot, and he taught you (ἐδίδασκέν ὑμᾶς) (about) Ananias (Ἀνανιαν), Azarias (Ἀζαριαν), and Mishael (Μισαηλ)<sup>11</sup> in the fire. (13) And he also glorified Daniel (ἐδόξαζεν Δανιηλ) in the den of lions, whom he pronounced happy; (14) and he called to your mind

---

<sup>8</sup> See the footnote below that points out that ‘you’ (= the sons), rather than ‘us’ (which would include the mother, who is the speaker), is presented as the subject (the addressee) of the teaching, and this remains so even should one accept the v. l. in verses 10 and 11 (see below). This is the case *pace* its translator, Townshend, in R.H. Charles in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Volume 2 (Oxford 1913) [= Charles, *APOT* 1913].

<sup>9</sup> While the translation is by and large that of Townshend, in Charles, *APOT*, I have taken the liberty of altering it in a few places, noting the Greek text where I have done so.

<sup>10</sup> Though the Apparatus Criticus notes that ms. A has ἡμῶν (us) in verses 10 and 11, there is no such notation respecting the other instances where the text has the Greek for ‘you’ (the sons) and not ‘us’ (which would include the mother).

<sup>11</sup> The order of their names here differs from that found in Scripture (both MT and Septuagint), which have Ananias (Ἀνανιαν), Mishael (Μισαηλ) and Azarias (Ἀζαριαν)—perhaps reflecting the author’s dependence on his memory, which would again be evidence of familiarity. See more on this below.

(ὑπεμίμησεν δὲ ὑμᾶς) the word (γραφήν)<sup>12</sup> of Isaiah, “Yea even though thou pass through fire, the flame shall not hurt thee” (Κἂν διὰ πυρὸς διέλθῃς, φλόξ οὐ κατακαύσει σε).<sup>13</sup> (15) He chanted to you the hymn of David (τὸν ὑμνογράφον<sup>14</sup> ἐμελῶδει ὑμῖν Δαυὶδ) that said, “Many are the afflictions of the just.”<sup>15</sup> (16) He cited the Solomonic proverb to you (ἐπαρομιάζεν ὑμῖν), “It is a tree of life to them that *do His will*” (Ξύλον ζωῆς ἔστιν τοῖς ποιῶσιν αὐτοῦ τὸ θέλημα).<sup>16</sup> (17) He confirmed (ἐπιστοποιεῖ) the words of Ezekiel, “Shall these dry bones live?” (εἰ ζήσεται τὰ ὄστα τὰ ξηρὰ ταῦτά).<sup>17</sup> (18) For he forgot not the song that Moses taught, which teaches, “I will slay and will make alive.”<sup>18</sup> “This is your life and the length of your days.”<sup>19</sup>

The units mentioned in this passage are the ‘Torah’ and the ‘Prophets,’ in which latter rubric everything besides the Pentateuch has apparently been subsumed—viz. not only the quotations from Isaiah and Ezekiel, but also the stories found in the Book of Daniel, as well as a Hymn, and a quotation from Proverbs.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>12</sup> The standard meaning of the word γραφή in the NT is a quotation from Scripture.

<sup>13</sup> This is clearly a paraphrase of Isa. 43:2, Septuagint: καὶ ἔαν διέλθῃς διὰ πυρὸς..., φλόξ οὐ κατακαύσει σε.

<sup>14</sup> The Greek word ὑμνογράφον is found in Jewish literature only here and in Philo II *Gig.* 17. I am working on an article provisionally entitled “The Seder Eve in Philo’s Writings” in which I argue that the word refers to a hymnbook used for liturgical purposes that contained biblical Psalms and perhaps other relevant hymns as well, rather than to the biblical Book of Psalms *per se*.

<sup>15</sup> This is an exact quotation of Sept. Ps. 33:20 πολλὰ αἰ θλίψεις τῶν δικαίων.

<sup>16</sup> This is a paraphrase of Prov. 3:18 Ξύλον ζωῆς ἔστι πᾶσι τοῖς ἀντεχομένοις αὐτῆς = MT: הִיא עֵץ חַיִּים לְמַחְיִים בָּהּ. (“She/the Torah, is a tree of life **to those who hold her**”). See *Philo Judaeus*, Ch. Seven/1, 179–189 for the equation of ‘Wisdom’ = Σοφία (*Sophia*) / חכמה / Torah. IV Macc. 18:16 has taken the phrase “to those *who hold her* = *Torah*” to mean “to them that *do His (God’s) will*,” which must of course have been its *peshat* (the traditional manner of understanding the verse. See *Philo Judaeus* Ch. Two/2 Section 7: “The Meaning of the Term τὸ ὀητόν in Philo”). The verse is recited in the Synagogue at the time of the regular liturgical Torah reading when the Torah Scroll is raised for all to see.

<sup>17</sup> Septuagint Ez. 37:3 reads: εἰ ζήσεται τὰ ὄστα ταῦτά. This verse is found in the *Haftarah* for the intermediate Sabbath of Passover. A *Haftarah* is the reading from the Prophets that follows the pentateuchal portion read on Sabbath morning.

<sup>18</sup> The quotation is found in the pentateuchal reading *Ha’azinu*, Deut. 32:39 MT: אֲנִי אֵמִית וְאַחִיהַּ, מִחַצְתֵּי וְאֲנִי אֲרַפֵּא.

<sup>19</sup> This is the last verse of *Nitsavim*, Deut. 30:20 MT: כִּי הִיא חַיִּךְ וְאַרְךְ יְמֶיךָ.

<sup>20</sup> The material is mentioned by the author of IV Maccabees in the order appropriate for making his point.



All of these stories and quotations would have of course been familiar to anyone educated as a traditional Jew *in Judea*. Most significant is that here they are mentioned by the highly Hellenized author of IV Maccabees as things that he assumed to be part and parcel of the Jewish *paideia in the Greek-speaking Diaspora*, at the very least for those raised in a ‘good Jewish family.’ This includes even the story of Daniel and his three friends, whose provenance was from the Eastern Diaspora.

There are indications that these and the remaining references to non-pentateuchal Scripture in IV Maccabees stemmed from *Scripture as a living tradition* rather than from the Bible as a text. While there is not very much to go on, contributing to this hypothesis is the consideration that Daniel and his friends, who are mentioned twice more in the book, are identified in Chapter 13:9 as “the three children at the *Assyrian* (sic!) court” (τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσσυρίας νεανίσκους)—not Babylonian, as in Scripture. And in both Chapter 16:21, which mentions Daniel (Δανιηλ) as having been thrown to the lions, and his three friends Ananias (Ανανιαν), Azarias (Αζαριαν), and Mishael (Μισσηλ) as being thrust into the burning furnace, as well as in Chapter 18, the order of the names of the friends mentioned differs from their order in both the MT and the Septuagint.

Finally, IV Macc. 3:6–16 includes a modernized/hellenized version of II Sam. 23:13–17 (and I Chron. 11:15–19), ‘David’s thirst.’ Though it is still recognizably related to the story in Scripture, it differs from it in many respects. At the very least, we must postulate a literary base of ‘Re-written Scripture.’ In fact, one can find support for this in the different order in which the three ‘friends’ are mentioned. In both the MT and the Septuagint which here remains faithful to it, the order of the names of the ‘friends’ is alphabetical according to the Hebrew alphabet (א, ב, ג). But while in IV Maccabees the order is also alphabetical, it is according to the Greek alphabet: A, A, M!

\*

One final point: While there is no concrete evidence that the author of IV Maccabees was familiar with the rest of the non-pentateuchal books, a negative conclusion is hardly justifiable on the basis of their absence from the work. In the extant Hellenistic Jewish literature as a whole, including Philo, the rarity of the appearance of non-pentateuchal Scripture can probably best be explained simply because the context of their

writings did not call for such quotations, rather than because their authors were unfamiliar with non-pentateuchal books.<sup>21</sup>

\*

*Commitment to Judaism in Alexandria—the evidence from Philo*

While sweeping generalizations of any sort are always perilous, I think we can safely state that, as has so often been pointed out, 'Judaism' neither is, nor ever was, a monolithic belief system and/or behavior pattern. The entire gamut of Jewish belief, acculturation to the surrounding Hellenistic-Roman norms of language, education, and life-style was found *both* in Judea, *and* in Alexandria in Philo's day—albeit with different features represented in different proportions.<sup>22</sup>

In Judea, there were, side by side with Hillel and Shammai and their colleagues and followers, also the highly hellenized, and even Romanized, Judean aristocracy,<sup>23</sup> as well as apocalyptic, mystic, and other elements—and what was probably the largest element, the 'simple' masses (*Amei ha'aretz*). And likewise, in Alexandria there was an entire array of people with whom Philo argues vehemently in his writings.<sup>24</sup> And here too, the overwhelming mass of Jews almost certainly

---

<sup>21</sup> The converse is true as well. Thus, Josephus' *Antiquities of the Jews* does contain a copious amount of material directly related to the non-pentateuchal portions of Scripture, including even some of the apocryphal additions. The reason for this is clearly that they were relevant to the subject matter with which he was dealing. Hence, while the fact that the *Antiquities of the Jews* contains a lengthy description of the events of Purim is clear evidence for knowledge on Josephus' part of the Book of Esther, the converse is problematic. The fact that neither Philo, nor very many other Hellenistic authors, mention either Purim or the Book of Esther cannot be taken as proof that it was unknown to them—just that it was not relevant to the subjects of their extant writings. Respecting the Dead Sea Scrolls the matter is probably somewhat more complex, but this does not concern us here.

<sup>22</sup> See Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism I* (London/Philadelphia 1974), German original 1969, rev. and enlarged 1973 [= Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*], and for a different, though not necessarily mutually exclusive approach, see Alan Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 161 (Atlanta 1988) [= Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity*], as well as my review of it in *StPhA* IV (1992), 164–168.

<sup>23</sup> Priestly and royal, but obviously not confined to them. Notice e.g. that the apostle Mark (according to Acts) bore a Roman, not a Greek name, something that indicates a high degree of identification with the ruling power on the part of his parents. According to the NT his family had a large house in Jerusalem, implying wealth.

<sup>24</sup> See on the one hand, *IV Migr.* 89–93 where Philo inveighs against the 'extreme allegorists,' and on the other, his attacks upon the 'literalists,' in e.g. *VIII Spec.* 4.143–

did not give deep or abiding thought to any of this, but simply lived out their lives with different degrees of attachment to their Jewish heritage and ‘observance of the ancestral customs.’

Further, the complexity of the picture is heightened by the fact that the different ideological and sociological circles did not live in isolation from each other. Lacking serious indications to the contrary, one must suppose that, as in Judea, they functioned together in Alexandria as well, although, as is only natural, very likely *in ongoing and lively disharmony*.

Philo’s own kin illustrate this coexistence. On the one hand, there was of course Philo, for whom ‘life according to the customs and rules of one’s ancestors’<sup>25</sup> was both meaningful and mandatory. On the other hand, there were his brother’s children—one of whom married into the family of the ‘seedy aristocracy’ of the Herodian Hasmonians,<sup>26</sup> who did not live anything that even resembled a traditional Jewish life. Another, Tiberius Alexander, Philo’s nephew, rose very high on the Roman political ladder, at the same time abandoning all commitment to Judaism.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, Philo describes a similar range of Jewish observance as that with which we are familiar today. In illustration, I quote his description in VII *Spec. Leg.* 1.186:

When the third special season has come, in the seventh month at the autumnal equinox, there is held at its outset the sacred-month-day also called ‘Trumpet Day’ (σαλπίγγων)...<sup>28</sup> On the tenth day is the Fast,<sup>29</sup> which is carefully observed not only by the zealous for *piety and holiness* (εὐσεβείας καὶ ὁσιότητος)<sup>30</sup> but also by those who never act religiously (εὐαγῆς οὐδὲν δοῦνται) in the rest of their life.

---

150, and particularly §146–147. See also my remarks in *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Nine/1, 242–249, and particularly 247–250.

<sup>25</sup> See *Philo Judaeus*, 242 ff. et passim.

<sup>26</sup> For interesting details, see my “Agrippa I and *de Specialibus Legibus IV* 151–159,” *StPhA* II (1990), 72–85 [= Cohen, ‘Agrippa’], particularly 76 ff. and n. 15. Philo’s nephew Marcus was the *first husband* of the young Berenice, Agrippa’s daughter—a marriage between wealth and aristocracy—something not unknown at all times.

<sup>27</sup> See e.g. E.G. Turner, “Tiberius Iulius Alexander,” *Journal of Roman Studies* 44 (1954), 54–64.

<sup>28</sup> יום תרועה = Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year, when the *Shofar* is sounded.

<sup>29</sup> *Vi*z. The Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur).

<sup>30</sup> As I have shown in *Philo Judaeus*, the connotation of the term ‘*piety and holiness*’ (εὐσεβεία καὶ ὁσιότης) in a context such as this is ‘observance of the traditional commandments’; see Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, 98, 219 and 247–248.

Apparently, then as now, the Day of Atonement had special significance even for the non-observant Jew, who, as Philo puts it, on that day acted like those 'zealous for piety and holiness.'

\*

When we seek to classify the different components of this ideological crazy-quilt of which Philo was a leading intellectual and political force and in ongoing interaction, we find that the expected categories are hardly appropriate. Those who understood Scripture literally included both people committed to the strict observance of what was traditionally considered to be obligatory for a law-abiding Jew, *as well as those who, for the very reason that they understood Scripture literally*, found themselves unable to accept Scripture as being relevant to them. For the former, the recognition or rejection of the literal meaning of the scriptural text more often than not depended on the context, not on the commitment, or lack thereof, to the practical observance of commandments.

Neither was there a meeting of minds at the other end of the exegetical scale among those who looked upon the Bible as a platform for allegorical constructions. Here too the division regarding a commitment to the actual performance of the biblical commandments was not between the literalists and the allegorists. They both considered the allegorical explanation of Scripture to be its soul, or at the very least, food for our soul. But while some of them made light of the literal meaning, others recognized the validity of the 'simple meaning' of Scripture, and of the obligation to practice the commandments, even while they received their 'meaningfulness,' their relevance, from the allegorical and symbolic explanations.<sup>31</sup>

None of this follows a clear divide, either in Alexandria or in Judea, with those preserving the literal meaning being equated with the traditionalists vis-à-vis the allegorists. One of the most striking examples of how inappropriate such a classification can be is that in rabbinic circles an allegorical explanation of *Shir ha-Shirim* (the Song of Songs) has from ancient times been considered the 'normative,' or 'traditional' connotation; even to the extent of rejecting the outright its literal

---

<sup>31</sup> IV *Migr.* 89ff. demonstrates that the allegorical explanation might be agreed upon, even while there was disagreement as to whether there was a need to preserve the 'simple' meaning.

meaning.<sup>32</sup> Though, of course, the nature of the allegory is entirely different from that typical of Philo.

\*

On a different note, while there is no general consensus as to the extent that the *Politeuma* of the Alexandrian Jewish community enjoyed a semi-autonomous self-government that included autonomous law-courts in Philo's day, in any event we can learn precious little about this from Philo's VII–VIII *Spec.* 1–4. For, as has long ago been pointed out, by and large the statements made there by Philo “reflect neither a *halakhic* tradition nor the practice of Jewish jurisprudence in Alexandria; he is simply trying to justify that which is given in the Scriptures in terms of Hellenistic conceptuality.”<sup>33</sup>

#### *Philo's Use of Non-Pentateuchal Scripture*

Since most of Philo's writings are either allegorical exegeses of the Pentateuch or otherwise directly related to the Pentateuch, it is hardly surprising to discover that, as David Runia has noted,<sup>34</sup> the majority of the rare quotations from non-pentateuchal Scripture are ancillary to the major midrashic allegorical thread that was firmly rooted in the text of the Pentateuch. He has pointed out that they appear on a secondary level, either as further illustration of the major thought, or as tangential to it. They bring an additional contribution to the main subject treated, but do not determine its direction. The results of the present study confirm this.

At the same time, this by itself neither proves, nor disproves Philo's familiarity with non-pentateuchal Scripture. For, *mutatis mutandis*, even references to the Pentateuch are virtually absent from Philo's short philosophical treatises—something that is usually explained by the hypothesis that they were early works, and it has even been argued on these grounds that they are spurious.

<sup>32</sup> See e.g. Mishnah Yadayim 3:5.

<sup>33</sup> Quoted from the review of Valentin Nikiprowetzky, “Note sur l'interprétation littérale de la loi et sur l'angéologie chez Philon d'Alexandrie,” *Mélanges André Neher* (Paris 1975), 181–190, in *SPh* 4, 103 (the journal that preceded the *StPhA*).

<sup>34</sup> See David Runia, “Philo's reading of the Psalms,” *StPhA* XIII (2001), 102–121 [Runia, “Philo's reading”].

However, referring to Runia once again,<sup>35</sup> while the hypothesis that these were youthful works is “contradicted by various details in the works themselves,” actually neither of these suggestions is necessary, for the absence of quotations from the Pentateuch in these works is caused by their “*difference in method and purpose*.” And similarly, while his classic Greek *paideia* is of course very evident, only now and again does Philo quote or directly refer to classical Greek literature.<sup>36</sup>

If we accept the hypothesis that Philo’s intention when composing the allegorical treatises was to write a philosophical/ethical allegorical commentary to those biblical books that were familiar to his readership from liturgical practice, it did not call for extensive use of non-pentateuchal material. Hence this need not by itself indicate that Philo was unfamiliar with the non-pentateuchal books.<sup>37</sup>

\*

It is important to bear in mind that our conclusions concerning the manner of Philo’s use of secondary sources result from our study of idiosyncratic material, and are therefore not necessarily valid to the same degree with respect to his remaining writings. Still, much can be learned from the close reading of the Philonic passages containing non-pentateuchal scriptural quotations and references. Following are several of the most significant observations.

Philo’s quotations from the Latter Prophets provide very early evidence that the recitation of the specific *Haftarot* now current between the 17th of Tammuz until after the Day of Atonement was already practiced in the Alexandria of his day.<sup>38</sup> The fact that a reasonable explanation is offered for how the rest of Philo’s quotations from the Latter Prophets came to be quoted by Philo strengthens this hypothesis.

---

<sup>35</sup> See Runia, “Philo, Alexandrian and Jew,” in his collected studies, *Exegesis and Philosophy, Studies on Philo of Alexandria*, 1990, 1–18 [Runia, “Philo, Alexandrian and Jew” 1990]. The quotations are from p. 7.

<sup>36</sup> Though I have not attempted to count Philo’s explicit references to classical Greek literature, I rather doubt that their number is greater than his references to non-pentateuchal Scripture.

<sup>37</sup> They are found almost exclusively in Books II–V of the volumes of the PLCL and in the *Quaestiones*.

<sup>38</sup> Chapter Three is a longer and somewhat revised version of my article, “Earliest Evidence of the *Haftarah* Cycle for the Sabbaths between בַּתְּמוּזׁ וְי״ז בְּסוּכּוֹת in Philo,” *JJS* (Fall 1997), 225–249 [= Cohen, “*Haftarah* Cycle” *JJS* 1997].

The study of Philo's quotations from the Former Prophets has also proven fruitful. For it shows not merely that Philo's text was the Septuagint, something that is hardly a new discovery, but also that *sometimes even Philo's explanations are dependent on the wording of the Septuagint text where it differs from the MT*. This provides much needed additional firm evidence for the existence of *an independent hermeneutic tradition* that arose in the Greek-speaking Diaspora.

Some of these quotations also reveal the existence in Alexandria of dictionaries and lexicons of Scripture *that were based upon the MT*, but written in Greek (or at the very least translated into Greek), that included not only the Pentateuch but all of Scripture. This indicates a lively interest in Scripture as a whole, for were there not a readership that used these lexicons, they would not have been written or translated. Translations reflect, of course, an ongoing Palestinian / Diaspora cultural interaction.

Unexpected insights are revealed by the study of Philo's quotations from Psalms and Proverbs. Though there are other quotes that will be discussed in their proper place, I will here mention only the one that was triggered by the mention of 'Moses' in the *incipit* to three of the Psalms. I hope that I shall succeed in convincing my readers that the use of such an *incipit* in Philo's writings refers to what, following Philo's own lead, I shall term the 'The Allegorical Circle of Moses.' This was a confraternity composed of teachers and pupils (or disciples) that was devoted to the radical philosophical allegorization of Scripture. Also, again following the clear lead of Philo, this confraternity had a separate esoteric department that specialized in the radical philosophical allegorization of the prophetic books. And while Philo could not but have been a long-standing member of the confraternity as a whole, the 'The Allegorical Circle of Moses,' as I have called it in the title of the last chapter, refers to those engaged in the esoteric allegorical exegesis of the non-pentateuchal books of Scripture.

\*

These and other aspects of our findings are not meant to replace the present understanding of Philo's *oeuvre*. But I do suggest that they enhance our understanding of the *Sitz im Leben*, the frames of reference, within which his works were written. The central foci are found to have been the Synagogue and its liturgy, as well as an institutionalized form of radical allegorical exegesis current in Alexandria in the first century CE.

*Concerning the sources used by Philo*

While no writer is entirely independent of what went before him, in the ancient world the unacknowledged and even somewhat indiscriminate copying from one's predecessors was taken for granted.<sup>39</sup> Hence, the originality of an author must be judged in terms of how successfully this material has been woven into a new and meaningful composition. It would probably even have been considered a serious shortcoming if authors such as Philo had not made generous use of such material. His contemporaries expected the extensive paraphrasing of sources and even the quoting of them verbatim.<sup>40</sup>

As today, a thesaurus, a concordance, dictionaries, and midrashic compendia are part of the active library of scholars and rabbis of undisputed eminence. The stature of the writer depends on the extent to which the materials thus garnered are not simply piled one upon the other, but inlaid into a preconceived and meaningful composition.

One may take it for granted that Philo made free and extensive use of any literary sources and lexicographic aids that were available to him, and that these included translations of Judeo-Aramaic midrashic material. Nor would Philo have been expected to quote authors by name, since they had long become 'common property.' And even respecting the classical Greek texts, while Philo's writings frequently reflect their contents, he only rarely makes any explicit identification, nor does he follow them slavishly.

For example, again following Runia, "Philo's dependence on the *Timaeus* of Plato, in which the divine demiurge contemplates a pre-existent intelligible model, is apparent."<sup>41</sup> But as he points out, there is an important difference. For while Philo uses the Platonic image that he probably assumed was recognized by his readers, unlike Plato, for whom the ideas are quite independent of any deity for their existence, Philo "locates the plan, which is equivalent to the Platonic world of ideas, in God or his Logos."<sup>42</sup> He has 'naturalized' the well-known

---

<sup>39</sup> Even in rabbinic sources, this was often done without mentioning the name of the original tradent, but only that of the last sage in the line of tradition.

<sup>40</sup> Cf., e.g., the writings of Herodotus, Pliny, Cicero and Josephus.

<sup>41</sup> Runia, "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew" 1990, 9 and 11. See also Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, and before him, W. Theiler, "Philo von Alexandria und der Hellenisierte Timaeus, *Philomates*," *Studies and Essays in the Humanities in memory of P. Merlan*, ed. R.B. Palmer and R. Hammerton-Kelly (The Hague 1971), 25-35.

<sup>42</sup> Runia, "Philo, Alexandrian and Jew" 1990, *ibid.*



Platonic conception into his Jewish frame of reference. Another implicit echo of Plato is the fact that “Philo denotes God both with the biblical personal masculine  $\acute{o}$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$  and the philosophical abstract neuter  $\tau\acute{o}$   $\acute{\omega}\nu$ ,” something that is greatly facilitated by the fact that in the genitive and dative cases, they are indistinguishable.<sup>43</sup>

Similarly, the integration of quotations from Proverbs concerning the father/mother dichotomy into his own composition illustrates the above with respect to Jewish sources. For while, as will be seen below, one can state with a reasonable degree of certainty that Philo’s quotations from Proverbs stem from a literary source,<sup>44</sup> Philo has used them to enrich the fabric of his own message.

\*

Of course the proposition that Philo used lexicographic aids written in Greek for his ‘etymologies’ of Hebrew names in the Pentateuch is not new, since over forty years ago Yehoshua Amir published an article that argued for a written source for at least one of these ‘etymologies.’<sup>45</sup> Somewhat later, David Rokeah argued that certain corrupt transcriptions of Hebrew names in an onomastic fragment from Oxyrhynchus indicates, or at least makes it very likely, that such an onomasticon of ‘etymologies’ of Biblical names existed in Philo’s day as well, and that it would have been available to Philo.<sup>46</sup>

More recently, Lester Grabbe has made a comprehensive study of the ‘etymologies’ of Hebrew names in Philo,<sup>47</sup> and he too concluded

---

<sup>43</sup> *id.*, 11.

<sup>44</sup> Whether a lexicon arranged by subject or a homiletic work.

<sup>45</sup> Yehoshua Amir, “פירושי שמות עבריים אצל פילון” (= “Explanation of Hebrew Names in Philo”), *Tarbiz* 31 (1961–1962), 297 [Amir, *Hebrew Names in Philo*]; English trans. in Appendix 2, in Lester Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation—The Hebrew Names in Philo*, published as Brown Judaic Studies 115 (Atlanta 1988) [= Grabbe, *Etymology*]. Amir argues there that in view of the fact that elsewhere he uses the Attic dialect, since here in II *Sacr.* 50, Philo alters the Attic form of  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\tau\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  to  $\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\sigma\acute{o}\varsigma$  when interpreting the Hebrew name of Jethro, this betrays the influence of a written source. At the time of its original publication, H. D. Mantel argued against this thesis in *Tarbiz* 32 (1962–1963), 98–99, 395, but several years later J.G. Kahn, *Tarbiz* 34 (1965), 337–345 wrote supporting Amir’s conclusions.

<sup>46</sup> David Rokeah, “A New Onomasticon Fragment from Oxyrhynchus and Philo’s Etymologies,” *JThS* n. s. 19/1 (1968), 70–82 [= Rokeah, “New Onomasticon”].

<sup>47</sup> *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation—The Hebrew Names in Philo*, Brown Judaic Studies 115 (Atlanta 1988) [Grabbe, *Etymology* 1988]. The book is valuable, even though it could have taken more account of the fact that knowledge of the Greek language and

that they must have derived from an onomasticon that used the Hebrew text, but itself was written in Greek.<sup>48</sup> Grabbe points out that Philo's etymologies of *Greek words* are clearly different from his etymologizing of *biblical names*,<sup>49</sup> and that these latter are "generally marked off by two linguistic features: (1) an etymological or interpretative formula, usually some form of *hermeneuein*; [and] (2) a definition which clearly connects with the name at the Semitic level... [italics mine]." He further notes that "there are no instances of the use of *hermeneuein* for Greek etymologies."<sup>50</sup>

I checked several dozen more or less random instances where Philo has used some form of the word ἐρμηνεύειν.<sup>51</sup> Without exception, the term has indeed introduced the 'interpretation' of scriptural proper names *in the form in which they are found in the Hebrew text*<sup>52</sup> and, often, they

---

Hellenistic frames of reference hardly stopped at the borders of the land of Judea. That Hellenism was very much present in Judea from early times has been cogently argued at length by Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism* (London/Philadelphia 1974) [= Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*]. And even the Septuagint is a case in point, reflecting, as it almost certainly does, the Judean 'upper-crust,' since there is every reason to suppose that its translators did in fact come from Judea. See my article, "The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristeas: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition," *JSS* 15 (1985), 32–64. And consider another small but significant detail: the very Greek name of the second Sage listed in the first chapter of the *Sayings of the Fathers* (Mishnah Avot 1:3, Antigonus). It is neither a theophoric name, nor one more or less homophonic with a popular Hebrew name, nor does it translate a Hebrew name—these being the types of names that were by and large the Greek names most popular among Jews.

<sup>48</sup> The opposing view that Philo's 'etymologies' of the biblical names reflect his unmediated access to the Hebrew text is expressed by Chava Schur, *Etymologies of Hebrew Names in Philo's Allegorical Exegesis* [מדרשי השמות העבריים בפרשנות האלגורית של פילון], Ph.D. Dissertation (Tel-Aviv 1991) [= Schur, *Etymologies*]. However, this view is not generally accepted, and, as will become clear as we proceed, neither do I subscribe to it, for the phenomenon is more satisfactorily explained by Grabbe's hypothesis, or, probably most likely, by the possibility that Philo had such a work in translation. For a discussion of this subject whose point of departure is Philo's etymology for "Israel," see Ellen Birnbaum, *The Place of Judaism in Philo's Thought: Israel, Jews, and Proselytes*, Brown Judaic Studies 290; Studia Philonica Monographs 2 (Atlanta 1996) [Birnbaum, *Place of Judaism*], 67 ff. It also contains a copious bibliography.

<sup>49</sup> Grabbe, *Etymology*, 118.

<sup>50</sup> *Op. cit.*, 44.

<sup>51</sup> Not surprisingly, these instances are found almost exclusively in the allegorical parts of Philo's *oeuvre*, viz. from the beginning of the *Leg. All.* through 2 *Somn.* and in the *Quaest.* Whether the *Quaestiones* should be placed at the beginning or the end of the list of Philo's writings is irrelevant for our present concerns.

<sup>52</sup> I checked and found that this is so with respect to all the instances of the appearance of the term in IV *Conf.*—viz. § 65, § 79, § 123, § 130, and § 159, and the same is true with respect to the dozens of other instances that I checked from other books of Philo's *oeuvre*.

have even used only *part* of the Hebrew word. This strongly supports Grabbe's thesis, that, at least for Philo, the word ἑρμηνεύειν (*hermeneueîn*) functioned as a technical term that indicated *a traditional midrashic rendition*, and informed Philo's readers that the ensuing midrashic etymologies had been culled *from a traditional source*. Might I suggest that Philo may have even intended thereby to accentuate the Jewish component of his writing?

\*

At the same time it is perhaps well to mention that since these etymologies were avowedly midrashic, there is no place for the criticism expressed by some scholars that they are quite fanciful. Of course they are. But their frame of reference is not the search for philological origin but rather spiritual or psychological truth, and so they are not 'mistaken' or 'false.'<sup>53</sup> For example, when Philo states in *IV Conf.* 79, Ἐφρών, ὃς ἐρμηνεύεται χουῖς, he is offering a midrashic exegesis of the Hebrew name: עפרון. He relates to the first three letters עפר = soil, dust of the earth = χουῖς, in order to betoken the mundane nature of Ephron, in contrast to that of Abraham, for whom the soul is paramount.

The Hebrew/Aramaic source of the tradition behind these 'etymologies' is obvious since in most instances their point of departure is the fanciful exegesis of the *Hebrew form* of the name,<sup>54</sup> and I repeat: one must not lose sight of the fact that the thrust of the message is edification—not philology.<sup>55</sup>

\*

---

<sup>53</sup> One example of this sort of criticism is the one made long ago by Edmund Stein, "Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria," *ZAW* Beihefte 57 (Giessen 1931), 50: "Nicht nur die Etymologie selbst ist grösstenteils sprachlich falsch, sondern schon der Ausgangspunkt des Etymologisierens ist ein falscher." (Mentioned in Schur, *Etymologies*, 252).

<sup>54</sup> I do not recall specific examples in rabbinic midrash identical with those found in Philo. But, though it is not exactly the same, cf. e.g. *Leviticus Rabbah*, *Parashah* 23:11 (18:3) where Boaz (בועז) is homiletically identified with Prov. 24:5 on the basis of the homiletic 'similarity' between this proper name בועז and the word Be'Oz (בעוז) (in Proverbs); and similarly in *Ruth Rabbah*, at the very end of *Parashah Vav*, IV (to Ruth 3:13).

<sup>55</sup> This remains so even if, as was common in the ancient world, and not only there, one subscribes to the belief that there is a connection between one's given name and the development of one's personality.

The hundreds of instances of midrashic exegesis of *the Hebrew form* of the scriptural proper names on Philo's part need not imply any knowledge of Hebrew. For as I have already pointed out,<sup>56</sup> during the period of the Second Commonwealth, translation of writings from the Hebrew/Aramaic linguistic sphere of influence, into Greek must have been the rule rather than the exception. The reader may recall the statement made by the translator into Greek of Ben Sira in his short introductory remarks that he was convinced that there was a potential readership awaiting the work; that he has made the translation "for them who in the land of their sojourning desire to be lovers of learning" (τοῖς ἐν τῇ παροικίᾳ βουλομένοις φιλομαθεῖν).<sup>57</sup> In fact, as we have already pointed out at the beginning of the chapter, with the exception of Scripture and *halakhic* works whose redaction is of course much later, most of what has survived from ancient times is due to its having been rendered into Greek from a Semitic original and disseminated in translation.

Even midrashic constructions that are an integral part of rabbinic midrash may have originated in a Hellenistic-Jewish *milieu* very early—long before Philo was born. As Louis Ginzberg pointed out long ago,<sup>58</sup> ideas and constructions in rabbinic midrash that have obviously been influenced by Hellenism need not be of late vintage. It is in this light that one must consider the likelihood that some of Philo's Hellenistic-Jewish exegeses, as well as what, for lack of a better term, I call traditional rabbinic midrashic ideas, may well have flowed from a common fount that was fed by contributions from both Hebrew/Aramaic and Judeo-Greek sources.<sup>59</sup>

Sometimes the ultimate origin of the midrashic thread is evident, while sometimes it can at most be conjectured. Nor can one speak of a single direction. Homiletic traditions went back and forth, and input from the Hellenistic world was absorbed and became an integral part of what later became the rabbinic world.

---

<sup>56</sup> Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, 16 ff.

<sup>57</sup> Trans. quoted from R.H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1913), 2 volumes, [Charles, *APOT*], Vol. I, 317.

<sup>58</sup> In his introduction to the notes to the first two volumes of his *Legends of the Jews*, 7 volumes (volumes 1–4 contain the legends, and volumes 5–7 contain the notes), translated from the German (1909–1938, repr. Philadelphia 1985).

<sup>59</sup> See my remarks in *Philo Judaeus*, Ch. I, sections 6 and 7, 25–31. Note the parallel to the remark found in Mishnah, Rosh Hashanah 3:8 (to Num. 21:8): "But could the serpent slay or the serpent keep alive!—It is rather to teach..." in the *Wisdom of Solomon*

\*

Midrashic interaction of various sorts, including midrashic etymologies, could hardly have been a one-way street. This is illustrated by the following example of the use of Greek words in a rabbinic midrashic context. This is a ‘mirror image’ of the etymologies of the biblical names in Philo. What comes to my mind is the Midrash to Ecclesiastes (*Qohelet Rabbah*) (Vilna), *Parashah Aleph*, ד'ה ב ד"א דברי, where several ‘etymologies’ of proper names are discussed.<sup>60</sup> We read there:

ד"א דברי קהלת בן דוד, שלשה נביאים ע"י שהיה נבואתן דברי קנרתין נתלת נבואתן בעצמן, ואלו הן דברי קהלת, דברי עמוס (עמוס א'), דברי ירמיהו (ירמיה א'), ולמה נקרא שמו ירמיה שבימיו נעשה ירושלים אירמיאה, עמוס, למה נקרא שמו עמוס א"ר פנחס שהיה עמוס בלשונו, אמרו אנשי דורו הניח הקב"ה את כל בריותיו ולא השרה שכנתו אלא על הדין קטיע, לישנא פסילוסא [מגמגם], קהלת, למה נקרא שמו קהלת שהיו דבריו נאמרין בהקהל, על שם שאמר (מלכים א' ח') אז יקהל שלמה...

2. THE WORDS OF KOHELETH, THE SON OF DAVID: There were three prophets to whom, because it consisted of words of reproach, their prophecy was attributed personally, viz. *The words of Koheleth*, *The words of Amos* (Amos 1:1), and *The words of Jeremiah* (Jer. 1:1). Why was Jeremiah's name so called? Because in his days Jerusalem became a desolation (*eremiah*). Why was Amos's name so called? R. Pinehas said: Because he was heavy (*amus*) of tongue. His contemporaries exclaimed, ‘The Holy One, blessed be He, passed over all His creatures and only caused His *Shechinah* to alight upon this stammerer, this tongueless person!’ Why was Koheleth's name so called? Because his words were uttered in public (*hakhel*), as it is stated, *Then Solomon assembled (yakhel) the elders of Israel* (1 Kings 8:1)...

Here the ‘etymology’ of the prophet Jeremiah's name is a fanciful play on *the Greek form* of the prophet's name: Ἰερεμίας. The similar sounding Greek word ἡ ἐρημία, which means ‘wilderness, desolate,’ is offered in ‘explanation’ of the prophet's name, Jeremiah: “for in his day Jerusalem became *desolate*.” Likewise the word פסילוסא = ψελλός, which in Greek means ‘faltering in speech,’ is used in the context of the midrashic rendition of the name of the prophet Amos. These midrashic etymologies reflect a Greek-speaking *milieu* for the *ultimate* origin of the midrash, and they illustrate the absence of an effective language barrier between Semitic and Greek midrashic creativity.

16:6–7. For another unnoticed example of such a phenomenon see Naomi G. Cohen, “*Taryag* and the Noahide Commandments,” *JJS* 43/1, particularly 55–57.

<sup>60</sup> While the date of *Qohelet Rabbah* is considered to be relatively late, at least parts

\*

Finally, as I have shown at some length in my *Philo Judaeus*, the term τὸ ἑτητὸν when used by Philo means ‘traditional’ rather than ‘literal’ meaning—what in Hebrew would be termed *peshat*—which of course reflects familiarity with traditional sources, whether in their original Hebrew/Aramaic or in Greek translation. I repeat, the relevant question is whether the Philonic composition in which this material has been included is merely a collection, or whether the material collected by Philo from other sources serves as ‘inlays’ whose object is to enhance the intellectual and aesthetic quality of the composition, and the work in its entirety constitutes an integrated philosophic-homiletic composition that expresses Philo’s own particular world-view. I am of the view that the latter is the case.

*The use of rabbinic sources in the study of Philo*

Before proceeding to the next chapter, a few words are in order regarding my use of rabbinic sources in the context of the study of Philo. While one need hardly reiterate that the redaction of the rabbinic sources occurred hundreds of years after Philo, this does not rule out the possibility, and even the likelihood, that they reflect earlier traditions, and that, if used properly, much information can be gleaned from them relevant even to Philo’s day.

This needs to be stated because of a radical methodology that until recently has been in vogue and was for long the accepted ‘truth.’ It was considered axiomatic in much of main stream scholarship that the classic rabbinic sources were tendentious fictional compositions, ‘fabricated’ by the *hakhamim* in order to provide historic depth for their views. Hence, it was argued that they could not be relied upon for information preceding the time of their redaction.<sup>61</sup>

The more conservative approach, to which I subscribe, assumes the personal integrity of the rabbinic tradents of the Mishnah and

---

of it are found in earlier sources, see *Vayikra Rabbah* 10, and *Pesikta d’Rav Kahana* (Mandelbaum) Ch. 16. In any event this is meant as no more than illustration.

<sup>61</sup> Jacob Neusner has stated this in his many books almost as a postulate. For an early example see Jacob Neusner, “The Rabbinical Tradition, about the Pharisees before 70,” *JJS* 22 (1971), 1–18; repr. in *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art* (Leiden 1975), 73–89 [= Neusner, *Early Rabbinic Judaism*].

the Talmud. Of course, this does not mean that every attribution in rabbinic sources is historically accurate, and at times one wonders whether a particular statement was meant to be taken literally and at face value. But it does presume that the tradents of a tradition were committed to what they thought to be its accurate transmission.

Supporting this assumption is the fact that the Talmud itself has a critical approach to the identity of the person quoted as being the tradent of a tradition, and sometimes suggests that the identification is mistaken, proposing that it be replaced by a different name. It is often critical about the accuracy of the wording of a tradition and/or of its ascription to the particular Sage in whose name it is quoted.

In view of this, as well as the fact that the Sages clearly valued the exact preservation of the chain of tradition, a research methodology whereby anything that cannot be proven is suspect is, in my opinion, itself suspect. It is far better, in my view, to take advantage of any information that can be gleaned from the rabbinic sources, of course contingent upon its careful and sophisticated application.

Following is a single example of what I consider to be a nuanced exploitation of a much later rabbinic source as evidence for the popularity, almost certainly already in Philo's day, of Psalm 23, which begins: "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want" (MT: ה' רועי לא אחסר).

The *Beraitha* in BT *Pesahim* 118a suggests that this Psalm be read on Passover eve in fulfillment of the injunction in Mishnah *Pesahim* 10:7: "[Over] a fourth [cup] he completes the *Hallel*, and says after it the Benediction over song (i. e. ברכת השיר)." Then the Talmud text comments:

*Tanu Rabbanan*: At the fourth, he concludes the *Hallel* and recites the 'Great *Hallel*,' this is the view of Rabbi Tarfon.

Others say:<sup>62</sup> "The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want" (Psalm 23:1).

The introductory formula here, *Tanu Rabbanan*, indicates a *Tana'itic* source. As I have shown at some length in my *Philo Judaeus*,<sup>63</sup> the

<sup>62</sup> In the present context it doesn't matter whether or not, as is sometimes the case, the locution "others say" (אחרים אומרים) is a *pseudonym* for Rabbi Meir (see BT Horayot 13a). Aaron Hyman, *Toldoth Tannaim Ve'Amoraim* (Jerusalem 1964), 3 vol. [= Hyman, *Toldoth Tannaim Ve'Amoraim*], notes, s.v. אחרים, that such an identification is not to be taken as a general rule since R. Meir and אחרים are found to be of differing opinions in BT Sota 12a.

<sup>63</sup> Chapter Two / 1: Palestinian/Diaspora Midrashic Tradition, 37 ff.

mention of a name, in this case that of R. Tarfon, is not to be taken as indicating the author of the opinion expressed, but only the time frame of *the immediate discussion*, and the name of *its immediate tradent*. This must be the standard assumption respecting the statement that “Rabbi ‘so and so’ said.” It is just that, neither more nor less, and does not imply that it originated with the individual in whose name it is quoted. What is stated is merely that he *said* it, *not* that it originated with him.

In this case, the tradition introduced with “others say” is relevant to our discussion about the early liturgical use of Psalm 23. What has been stated here is that R. Tarfon was of the view of the Sages that was the majority opinion and is the one followed today, that one should recite the ‘Great Hallel’ at the Passover Seder. At the same time we are justified in concluding that the tradition introduced with “others say,” that one should recite, “The Lord is my shepherd” (Psalm 23) at the Passover Seder rather than the ‘Great Hallel,’ represented an existing custom that had sufficient weight of tradition behind it to warrant a mention.

\*

*The chronology of Philo’s writings  
and the audience to whom they are addressed*

I am familiar with what may well still be the reigning hypothesis, whose first known proponent was Azariah de Rossi,<sup>64</sup> that different portions of Philo’s writings were directed to different audiences. However, I have preferred the approach of Nikiprowetzky, who is of the view that most of Philo’s writings belong to the category of biblical exegesis, the corollary of which is that they are by and large aimed at encouraging culturally Hellenized Jews who had not yet abandoned their loyalty to Judaism to remain firm in their commitment.<sup>65</sup> For me it is self-evident that from the viewpoint of potential interest on the part of a readership, Philo’s works must have been aimed first and foremost at a Jewish audience. Only they would have understood them. They

---

<sup>64</sup> An article describing de Rossi’s abiding influence on our understanding of Philo is scheduled to appear in a coming issue of *Tradition*, the journal of the Rabbinical Council of America.

<sup>65</sup> See Nikiprowetzky, *Commentaire*, who in this respect returns to the view of Adrien Turnébe (1552).



could hardly have been relevant to anyone not already committed to the sacred nature of Jewish Scripture.

The vast majority of Philo's extant works belong to two series, both of which consist of biblical commentary. There are the *Quaestiones*, which read more like an anthology or notes than a literary composition, and are found in PLCL Supplements, Vols I and II. The other, far larger, more complex and highly stylized work that comprises Books I–VIII in the PLCL edition may be regarded as Philo's *magnum opus*, written over a period of time and reflecting different stages in his life. As already mentioned, this series could not but have been addressed to an educated and sophisticated *Jewish readership*.

True, not all of Philo's works fit into the scheme of biblical exegesis. Two books are devoted entirely to current events, albeit retaining a tangibly religious flavor,<sup>66</sup> and several philosophical compositions usually included in his *oeuvre* (in PLCL, Vol. IX) contain little or no Jewish content, and for this as well as other reasons, are considered by some to be spurious.

According to this hypothesis, Philo's *magnum opus* begins with the exposition of the first chapters of Genesis, where 'the creation of the Cosmos' is described in philosophic terms.<sup>67</sup> He then proceeds, with the different compositions leading into each other, as he advances from philosophy, to ethical/philosophical allegory, through historical biography, to the *Halakhic* writings, ending with the book entitled *Rewards and Punishments*. Whether or not Philo had this plan before him when he started writing, or whether the exigencies of his own life dictated it, is not clear. In any event, towards the end he must have been a man of mature years who had experienced much in life. Over the years, he had intellectual/theosophical experiences, some of which he describes, and some of which can only be conjectured. These were capped by untoward traumatic political developments, which he had vividly portrayed in both *Flaccus* and the *Embassy to Gaius*. One gets the feeling that the

---

<sup>66</sup> *Flaccus* in Vol. IX, and *Embassy to Gaius* in Vol. X of PLCL. Respecting the latter, see my, "Agrippa I and *de Specialibus Legibus IV* 151–159," *StPhA II* (1990), 72–85 [= Cohen, 'Agrippa' *StPhA II*].

<sup>67</sup> I am fully aware of the reigning theory that I *Opif.* is a separate composition not connected with the rest, but I think that the hypothesis now presented provides a more holistic approach. Cogent arguments can be made for both views, and neither can be proven. Colson, in his introduction to volume VI of PLCL, ix, fn. a, notes that "if *De Op.* begins the Exposition, it (also) serves the same purpose for the Commentary which begins with Gen. ii, 1, and seems to assume that the story of Creation has been adequately dealt with."

later books of this exegetical *opus* represent more than anything else the 'realization' that, to quote Qoh. 12:13, "Now that all has been heard; here is the conclusion of the matter: Fear God and keep His commandments."



## CHAPTER TWO

### HOW PHILO QUOTES THE PENTATEUCH<sup>1</sup>

It is not often noticed that although Philo uses a wide variety of terms when referring to the Bible as a whole—e.g. ἱεροῖ Βίβλοι, ἱεροῖ γράφαι, ἱεροῖ νόμοι, ἱερὸς λόγος, ὁ νόμος, νομοθεσία (= ‘The Holy Books,’ ‘The Holy Writings,’ ‘The Holy Laws,’ ‘The Holy Dictum,’ ‘The Law,’ ‘Legislation’), specific books of the Pentateuch are hardly ever used to identify biblical citations and allusions. The title Genesis is found in at most only *four places* (and two of these will shortly be seen to be cases of mistaken identity, and one is in a book whose ascription to Philo is not certain), the Book of Exodus is identified by name in only *four instances*—and even then it is called Exagoge, and not Exodus (its title in the Septuagint). The Book of Leviticus is mentioned by name only *three times*, the name Deuteronomy appears only *twice*, and Numbers is *not mentioned* at all.<sup>2</sup>

This is all the more surprising in view of the fact that Philo quotes or refers to discrete passages from the Pentateuch hundreds, probably thousands of times, either in the form of a direct citation of the Septuagint text as we have it, or, at the very least, a close paraphrase of it. What is even more difficult to account for than the rarity of these names is what seems to be the entirely arbitrary use of a specific appellation for a specific pentateuchal book in those few instances where this occurs.

In each specific case I have sought to determine, first, whether the word in question is really the proper name of a biblical book, and in

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a somewhat revised version of the article, “The Names of the Separate Books of the Pentateuch in Philo’s Writings,” which appeared in the *Festschrift for David Winston = Studia Philonica Annual—Studies in Hellenistic Judaism IX*, ed. David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling, (*Brown Judaic Studies 312*), (Atlanta 1997), 54–78.

<sup>2</sup> I have used Günter Mayer’s *Index Philoneus* (Berlin, New York 1974) for the location of the standard Biblical names. For the identification of potential instances of names other than these, I have been largely dependent upon personal recollection aided by Colson’s comments, *passim*, and particularly Vol. X, 249, n. a.

those instances where this proves to be the case, what it is in the specific context that has mandated that the pentateuchal book be referred to by name.

I have also considered and offered an explanation for Philo's use of the alternative title *Exagoge* for the book of Exodus, and carefully considered such words as Πρωτορεπτικός (λογός) and Παράινεσις, as well as the term Επινομιά (*Epinomis*), which scholarship has in my view mistakenly understood to be synonyms for Deuteronomy.<sup>3</sup>

### *Genesis (Γένεσις)*

Although virtually the entire contents of the Philonic treatises printed in the first five and a half books in the Loeb Classical Library edition are philosophical/midrashic hermeneutic, i.e. midrashic expansions which either quote from the Book of Genesis or make clear allusion to the text, the use of the proper noun Γένεσις (= Genesis)—which is the name used by the Septuagint for *Sefer Bereishit*—is found at the very most in four passages: VI<sup>4</sup> *Abr.* 1, II *Post.* 127 and III *Sobr.* 50 and IX *Aet.* 19.

VI *Abr.* 1–2 reads:

- (1) The first of the five books in which the Holy Laws (τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων) are written is called and entitled Genesis (Γένεσις) from the genesis of the world (ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου γενέσεως), which it contains at its beginning. It takes this name, even though it embraces countless other matters ...
- (2)... since some of these things are parts of the world, and others events which befall it ... he dedicated the entire book to it.

Unlike the current traditional Hebrew names of the books of the Pentateuch which merely adopt the first significant word of the text as a title: *Bereishit*, *Shemot*, etc., the Septuagint titles reflect the books' contents.<sup>5</sup> Since Philo at this point discusses the connection between the

---

<sup>3</sup> See e.g. Earp's Index of scriptural passages in Philo's writings, PLCL, vol. X, 249, note a (to Deuteronomy).

<sup>4</sup> The roman numerals to the left of the title refer to the volume of the Loeb edition. Although these are not usually part of citations, I have introduced them because I have found them to be very helpful in making an immediate rough identification, and presume that most readers will find the same to be the case.

<sup>5</sup> One cannot determine whether the Septuagint titles are translations of already existing Hebrew names or the other way around. While the entitling of books by their *incipit* is very ancient, at the same time both types of names are represented in the classic rabbinical sources. For parallels to the Septuagintal titles see Meg. 3:5 for

title of the book of Genesis (= Γένεσις) and its contents, which encompasses much more than the ‘creation,’ he could hardly have avoided mentioning its name.

The context explains its use for “the first of the five books in which the Holy Laws are written” in spite of the fact that the book “also embraces countless other matters” (*id.*). It is not used here to identify the venue of a citation.

Respecting IX *Aet.* 19: even though there are differences of opinion respecting the ascription of *Aet.* to Philo, in any event the reason for the appearance here of the title Genesis (Γένεσις) is similar to that in the preceding instance. In both it is mandated by the context which denotes Genesis as the opening book of the Bible that begins with an account of creation.

IX *Aet.* 19 reads:

(19) But however this may be, that the world is created is most clearly stated by Hesiod;<sup>6</sup> and long before Hesiod, Moses the lawgiver of the Jews (ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων νομοθέτης) said in Holy Books (ἐν ἱεραῖς βίβλοις) that it was created and imperishable. These are five, the first of which he called Genesis (Γένεσις), which he opens thus: ‘In the beginning God made the heaven and the earth. The earth was invisible and shapeless (Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν. ἡ δὲ γῆ ἦν ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος).’<sup>7</sup>

Note that even in these instances, the overall frame of reference is not the individual *Chumash* (one of the five books),<sup>8</sup> but the Pentateuch as a unit. In VI *Abr.* 1 it is written: “five books in which The Holy Laws (τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων) are written” and in IX *Aet.* 19, “Holy Books (ἱεραῖς βίβλοις).”

---

*Tōrat Kohanim* (“priestly law” = Leviticus), Yoma 7:1, Sotah 7:7 for the title *Chumash Hapekudim* (= Numbers), and *Sifre Deut.* 160 for *Mishneh Tōrah* (= Deuteronomy).

<sup>6</sup> Hesiod has also been quoted earlier in section 17: “First Chaos was, and then broad-breasted earth, safe dwelling-place for all evermore” (*Theogony* 116f.).

<sup>7</sup> This is an exact citation of the Septuagint’s opening verse, which differs slightly from the MT.

<sup>8</sup> For want of a parallel term in English, I shall henceforth use the Hebrew term *Chumash*, to express the idea of one of the five books of the Pentateuch.

II *Post.* 127 (= Gen. 2:4–6) and III *Sobr.* 50 (= Gen. 2:4, 4:7)

I think that a careful look at the passages II *Post.* 127 and III *Sobr.* 50 will show that though at first sight they appear to mention the first book of the Bible, this is most likely a mistake.

II *Post.* 125–127 uses the word γενέσις in the context of an allegorical rendition of Gen. 2:6. When this Philonic passage is juxtaposed with I *Opif.* 129, where Philo has rendered Gen. 2:4–5 allegorically, it becomes evident that the reference in both passages is to Gen. 2:4, which states: “This is the book of the *genesis* of heaven and earth. ...” (Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος<sup>9</sup> γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς κτλ.).

Philo writes in I *Opif.* 129:

(129) *In his concluding summary of the story of creation he says* (Ἐπιλογιζόμενος δὲ τὴν κοσμοποιίαν κεφαλαιώδει τύπῳ φησίν): “This is the book of the *genesis* of heaven and earth, when they came into being, in the day in which God made the heaven and the earth...” (Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὅτε ἐγένετο, ἢ ἡμέρα ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν) (= Septuagint Gen. 2:4).

Similarly, in II *Post.* 125–127, which is an allegorical rendering of the words ‘*face* of the earth,’ which appear two verses further on in the same biblical passage—*viz.* in Gen. 2:6—the reference is also to Gen. 2:4.

(125) As then, the seeds and plants in the earth, when watered, grow and sprout and are prolific in *producing fruit* (καρπῶν γενέσις)... so the soul, as is evident, when it is fostered with a fresh stream of wisdom shoots up and improves. (126) ...Would not everyone say that *each of the senses is watered from the mind as from a spring* ...

(127) Therefore it is said respecting *creation* (Διὸ καὶ ἐν γενέσει λέγεται) “A spring went up out of the earth and watered all the *face* of the earth (Gen. 2:6).” For since Nature allotted the *face to the senses* ... the spring that rises from the dominant faculty (the mind)... conveys the powers they need to each of the organs of sense. It is in this way that the word of God waters the virtues; for the word of God is the source and spring of noble conduct ...

The passage is a metaphorical exercise: Philo takes the image ‘waters the *face* of the earth’ to refer to the watering of the soul by ‘a sweet

<sup>9</sup> The Septuagint has ἡ βίβλος here in Gen. 2:4 (which is not found in the MT), thus enhancing the parallel between it and Gen. 5:1: “*the book of the genesis* of men,” both of which are rendered by the Septuagint as Αὕτη ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως κτλ.—*viz.* MT *toledoth* is rendered by the Septuagint as γένεσις.

spring of Wisdom (= *Torah*?). Just as the organs of sense (found on the human *face* ~ *face* of the earth) are watered from the mind as from an earthly spring, the Word of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγος) (= *Torah*?) waters the Virtues.

III *Sobr.* 50 (= Gen. 2:4, 4:7) reads:

And a similar lesson is contained in an even more striking form in the excellent *account of the creation of the world* (περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς γενέσεως). It is said to the wicked: O man, ‘thou hast sinned, be still’ (ἡμαρτεες, ἡσύχασσον = Gen. 4:7).<sup>10</sup>

In an endnote to III *Sobr.* 50<sup>11</sup> Colson defends his preservation of the ms. reading against Wendland’s suggested textual emendation, in which context he also justifies his translation of the word γένεσις here as ‘the Book of Genesis.’ “It is natural enough,” he writes, “that as the preceding citations come from Exodus and Leviticus, Philo should want to indicate that this comes from Genesis ... and *the expression is not impossible* [italics mine].” It seems to me that the contrary is the case, for the fact that the preceding citations come from Exodus and Leviticus but *have not been so identified* strongly militates against this assumption.

In sum, except in the one or possibly two instances where the context mandates it, Philo has not identified the book of Genesis by name.

### *Exagoge* (Ἐξαγωγή)

Although Philo uses the Septuagint’s term for the books of Genesis, Leviticus, and Deuteronomy,<sup>12</sup> in the four instances in which The Book of Exodus is mentioned, IV *Migr.* 14, IV *Her.* 14, 251, and V *Somm.* 1.117, he has replaced the Septuagint’s title for the *Chumash* of *Shemot*, Ἐξοδος (*Exodus*), by the term Ἐξαγωγή (*Exagoge*).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The somewhat strange word combination ἡμαρτεες, ἡσύχασσον found here and in Septuagint: Gen. 4:7 is also found in V *Mut.* 195; and cf. also III *Agr.* 127 and I *Suppl. QG* 1.64–65 for citations from the beginning of Gen. 4:7 according to this idiosyncratic rendering of the Septuagint.

<sup>11</sup> PLCL vol. II, 511.

<sup>12</sup> Though its contents are of course referred to often, the specific name of the book of Numbers is not mentioned even once.

<sup>13</sup> Neither the usual Hebrew name *Sefer Shemot*, nor a Hebrew form of the Septuagint title, Exodus (i.e. the Hebrew equivalent: *Yetsiat Mitsrayim*), is found in the early rabbinic sources.



IV *Migr.* 14Respecting IV *Migr.* 14:

(14) Right well, then, did the holy guide (ἱεροφάντης = Moses) entitle one entire holy book of the Torah (νομοθεσίας), *Exagoge*, ‘Leading Out’ (ὅλην ἱερὸν βίβλον Ἐξαγωγήν), this name being found appropriate to the oracles contained in it, for ... he contemplates the task of taking out all the population of the soul right away from Egypt, the body ...

Like in *Abr.* 1 and in *Aet.* 19, where the name *Genesis* is mentioned because it is the proper name itself which is the subject under discussion, *mutatis mutandis* the same is the case in IV *Migr.* 14. Indeed, although biblical citations are generously sprinkled both in the preceding and in the ensuing sections, including citations from the book of Exodus, this is the *only mention* in IV *Migr.* of the proper name of *any* one of the specific books of the *Chumash*, and even in this very section the term Νομοθεσία (*Nomothesia*) = ‘The Code of Law’—a common locution of Philo’s for the Pentateuch—is used to refer to the Bible.

IV *Her.* 14 and V *Somn.* 1.117 (= Ex. 14:14–15 and 10:23)

The tragedy written by the Hellenistic Jewish tragedian Ezekiel, which was called *Exagoge*,<sup>14</sup> deals with the story of the Exodus. It must have been part and parcel of the cultural baggage of the Jews in the Greek-speaking world, as is evidenced by the fact that both Clement and Eusebius have quoted from it.<sup>15</sup>

It is most intriguing to discover that the biblical citations in IV *Her.* 14 and V *Somn.* 1.117—which Philo identifies as being found in the *Exagoge*—have a rhythmic cadence, perhaps not exactly iambic trimeter, but nevertheless a pronounced rhythm, and as Gutman has noted, the

<sup>14</sup> This is the original title, used by both Alexander Polyhistor (c. 100 – c. 40 BCE) and by the second century Church Father, Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 1.23.155f.), as well as by Eusebius (*Praep.* 9.29; 4.12–15). This is noted by Pieter W. van der Horst, “Moses’ Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist,” *JJS* 34 (1983), 21–29:21, and Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, Vol. II (1989), 304 and notes. I mention this because it has been argued that the title was not original but that of the editors of the fragments.

<sup>15</sup> Ezekiel’s tragedy *Exagoge* is also extensively quoted by Eusebius (*Praep. Ev.* 9:16–37)—thanks to which extensive fragments have survived. See Charlesworth, *OTP*, Vol. 2, 803–807, Holladay, *op. cit.*, and Howard Jacobsen, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

standard canons of Greek poetic meter have often been dealt with cavalierly by Ezekiel in the Tragedy.<sup>16</sup>

That these citations are also almost verbatim renditions of the Septuagint text need not weigh against an hypothesis that Philo is alluding to Ezekiel's tragedy, since in his introduction to the fragments in Charlesworth's edition, Robertson has pointed out that "striking parallels have long been noted between certain elements of Ezekiel's text and the Septuagint text of Exodus..."<sup>17</sup>

Also, while the Philonic citations are almost verbatim from the Septuagint, *the minor changes found in Philo's text improve the rhythmic cadence*. But lest I be misunderstood, let me stress that I do not suggest that Philo knew these citations only from the drama, but rather that his readers would have found this identification to be particularly meaningful, even while both he and his readers would also be aware that the citations are biblical.

IV *Her.* 14 (= Ex. 14:14-15) reads:

κύριος πολεμήσει ὑπερ ὑμῶν, καὶ ὑμεῖς σιγήσετε  
 (= 'The Lord will war for you and ye shall be silent')  
 καὶ εἶπε | κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν. τί βοᾷς πρὸς μέ<sup>18</sup>  
 (= And he said: 'What is it that thou shoutest to me?')

V *Somm.* 1.117 (= Ex. 10:23) reads:

τοῖς γὰρ υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ φῶς ἦν ἐν πάσαν οἷς κατεγίνοντο<sup>19</sup>  
 (= 'For the children of Israel there was light in *all* their dwellings').

While the extant fragments of Ezekiel's tragedy do not contain these lines, they are after all no more than fragments. The fragments make no mention of the Epiphany at Sinai which from a Jewish frame of reference could hardly but have been part of the drama, and would be its most fitting climax.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>16</sup> See Yehoshua Gutman, *Hasifrut Hayehudit Hahelenistit* (Hebrew; Mossad Bialik 1963) Vol. II, 147, n. \*.

<sup>17</sup> See R.G. Robertson, in Charlesworth, *OTP*, Vol. II, 805 top and *ibid.* n. 8.

<sup>18</sup> The Septuagint is here almost identical. The only variation is, Philo: καὶ εἶπε; Septuagint: εἶπεν δέ. The MT is also similar.

<sup>19</sup> In contrast to MT which has: "And to *all* the children of Israel their was light in their dwellings"—without the second 'all,' Philo's citation also has the 'all,' before 'their dwellings' like in the Septuagint (= *πάσι δὲ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ ἦν φῶς ἐν πάσιν, οἷς κατεγίνοντο*).

<sup>20</sup> Whether or not the scene with the phoenix is the final scene of the drama (see Robertson in Charlesworth, 818 n. t3), it may well have been a reference to the present troubled condition of the people. But this does not date the drama, for the perception of

Support for the hypothesis that the association on the part of Philo and his contemporary readers of the name *Exagoge* with the title of the drama of that name may be found in the fact that both IV *Her.* 14 and V *Somm.* 1.117 reflect a frame of reference which includes the world of Greek tragedy. In IV *Her.* 5 (which precedes by only a few sections the passage containing the citation identified as coming ‘from *Exagoge*’), there is a direct citation of two lines from what Philo has called the ‘comic poet’ (= Menander); and similarly, in V *Somm.* 1.154 (coming not much after V *Somm.* 1.117) there is a citation from Euripides’ *Ion*.

But the questions remain: Why was the term *Exagoge* used by Ezekiel rather than the Septuagint’s Ἔξοδος (Exodus), and even more germane, why did Philo use it, rather than the Septuagintal name, even in the two instances where the reference made was certainly unrelated to Ezekiel’s tragedy?

Perhaps the solution is to be found with the help of section 1452b (beg. of ch. 12) of Aristotle’s *Poetics*, from which it is clear that Ἔξοδος (*Exodos*) was a technical term associated with the stage. We read there: “A tragedy has the following parts: Prologue, Episode, Exode (Ἔξοδος), and a choral portion.” Since both Philo and his contemporary readers were theater-goers, the word *Exodos* probably had for them the highly inappropriate association of exiting from the stage, rather than exiting from Egypt. Perhaps the name Exodus<sup>21</sup> could be used comfortably only when there was no congruence between full participation in Hellenistic cultural life and the use of the Septuagint—which was clearly not the case for Philo and his contemporary readers.

At the same time Ezekiel’s tragedy may well have been such an integral part of the cultural baggage of Alexandrian Jewry that its title became an alternative location for the Book of Exodus in Alexandrian Greco-Jewish parlance. Whether or not all of the specific citations were actually found in the tragedy and quoted by Philo from there, the popularity of the Hellenistic composition, combined with the problematic nature of the Septuagint title (Ἔξοδος), go a long way to solving the enigma of Philo’s use of the name *Exagoge*, rather than Exodus.

---

the present as being difficult is perennial. Sinai has perhaps been ‘previewed’ in Moses’ dream as recounted by Demetrius—Charlesworth II, 811–812 (= ll. 68–82)—but there is a conflation of motifs reminiscent of several different biblical narratives, and the very reading of the word Sinai is problematic.

<sup>21</sup> This is of course the English spelling for the Septuagint’s Ἔξοδος.

Finally, in addition to this, it is perhaps also worth noting that another of the connotations of the Greek word Ἔξοδος is “a marching out, a military expedition,”<sup>22</sup> and Philo everywhere exhibits a distinct reticence in regard to this facet of the biblical Exodus.<sup>23</sup>

#### IV *Her.* 251 (= Ex. 19:18)

The text contains a series of citations from the Pentateuch, all of which refer to ‘ecstasy’ (ἔκστασις).<sup>24</sup> The reference to Exodus reads:<sup>25</sup>

(251) ... and in *Exagoge* respecting *the convocation*: ‘And the mountain,’ he said, ‘Sinai, was all covered with smoke, because God had descended upon it in fire, and the smoke rose like the vapour of a furnace, and *the whole people were in a great ecstasy*’ (Ex. 19:18).<sup>26</sup>

(251) καὶ ἐν Ἐξαγωγῇ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν: “τὸ γὰρ ὄρος,” φησί “τὸ Σινὰ ἐκαπνίζετο ὅλον διὰ τὸ καταβηγῆναι τὸν θεὸν ἐπ’ αὐτὸ ἐν πυρὶ, καὶ ἀνέβαινεν ὁ καπνὸς ὡσεὶ ἀτμίς καμίνου. καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα.”

It was necessary for Philo to indicate that the reference here is part of the account in the Book of Exodus and not that found in Deuteronomy because the verb ἐξίστημι ἢ ἐξέστη (which is taken by Philo to be a verbal form of the noun ἔκστασις = *ecstasy*), appears only in the version of the epiphany found in Exodus.<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> E.g. in *Herod.* 9:19 et passim; see LSJ, s.v. 2.

<sup>23</sup> A most striking example of this is his metaphorical exegesis of Ex. 12:17 that states: “Celebrate the Feast of Unleavened Bread, because it was on this very day that I brought your forces (צבאותיכם) out of Egypt.” In *QE* 1:21 the word τὴν δύναμιν (= MT צבאותיכם) is disassociated from its natural meaning in the context, where it presumably meant “military might,” and instead there is the “traditional meaning” (= τὸ ῥητόν): “the godly piety of the seeing nation.” On this see my *Philo Judaeus*, 70 and 310.

<sup>24</sup> The citations identified as coming from Leviticus and *Epinomis* will be discussed below in their appropriate place.

<sup>25</sup> The Septuagint (the differences from the Philonic text are bracketed): τὸ [δὲ] (γὰρ) ὄρος τὸ Σινὰ ἐκαπνίζετο ὅλον διὰ τὸ καταβηγῆναι [ἐπ’ αὐτὸ τὸν θεὸν (different order)] ἐν πυρὶ, καὶ ἀνέβαινεν ὁ καπνὸς [ὡς καπνὸς] (ὡσεὶ ἀτμίς) καμίνου. καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα. Here too Philo has followed the Septuagint: καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα (= and the whole *people* trembled violently), for the MT has ויחרד כל ההר מאד (= and the whole *mountain* trembled violently); and cf. also above in the note to *V. Somn.* I 117, where Philo also follows the Septuagint and not the MT.

<sup>26</sup> Ex. 19:16 MT: ויחרד כל העם אשר במחנה (= the entire people who were *in the camp*). But Philo and the Septuagint both clearly refer to Ex. 19:18 which describe the people “on the mountain.”

<sup>27</sup> At the same time, by using the word *Convocation* (ἐκκλησία), the technical term for the epiphany at Sinai in Deuteronomy, Philo has allusively associated the version in Deuteronomy with that of Exodus, for it is used in this context in Deuteronomy (but

*Leviticus (Λευιτικός)*

Philo has identified three citations as coming from Leviticus (Λευιτικός, in Hebrew known as the book of *Vayikrah*): I *Leg.* 2.105, III *Plant.* 26, and IV *Her.* 251. Like the foregoing, the specific name of the Book of Leviticus is mentioned only when it was vital to identify the exact location of the text that is referred to.

In I *Leg.* 2.105 (= Lev. 11.21) we read:

(105) Now the Sacred Word in Leviticus *exhorts* them (παραινεί μέντοι ὁ ἱερός λόγος ἐν Λευιτικῷ) *to feed* ‘on creeping things that go upon all four, which have legs above their feet, so as to leap with them’ (ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρπετῶν, ἃ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τεσσάρων, ἃ ἔχει σκέλη ἀνώτερον τῶν ποδῶν, ὥστε πηδᾶν ἐν αὐτοῖς) (Lev. 11.21).<sup>28</sup> ... the nature that is in conflict with pleasure, must be wholesome and full of nourishment.

Lev. 11.21 is also referred to in IV *Her.* 239 but without its specific provenience being noted, and it is also alluded to (though not quoted) in VIII *Spec.* 4.114 and in I *Opif.* 163ff. Since the allegorical conceptualization is the same in all four passages—viz. the ability to rise above base pleasure—one can hardly avoid wondering why Philo found it necessary to state that it is from Leviticus only in I *Leg.* 2.105.

In contrast to Philo’s other allusions to Lev. 11.21, only in I *Leg.* 2.105 is mention made of actual eating. I suggest that this is why Philo has here pinpointed the Holy Word in Leviticus (ὁ ἱερός λόγος ἐν Λευιτικῷ) as *exhorting* (παραινεί) the *feeding* upon these ‘creeping things,’ for whereas the parallel passage in Deut. 14:19 contains a sweeping generic categorical prohibition: “All winged swarming things (= כל שרץ העוף) are unclean unto you; they shall not be eaten,” here in Lev. 11.21 an exception is made respecting several kinds of ‘winged creeping things’ (= שרץ העוף).

---

not in Exodus). It is found there three times as part of the phrase “in the Day of the Convocation (at Horeb/the Mount)”—viz. in Deut. 4:10, 8:16: ἐν χωρηβ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἐκκλησίας; and id. 9:10: ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἡμέρᾳ ἐκκλησίας) and elsewhere in Deuteronomy as a technical term to refer to “the Congregation (of Israel)” (Deut. 23:2–3, 31:30).

<sup>28</sup> Besides Philo’s omission of the words τῶν πετεινῶν (= ‘winged’) in the Septuagint verse, which he mentions when he refers to this verse in IV *Quis Rerum* 239, there is very little difference between the Philonic quote and the Septuagint. Words found in the Septuagint but not in Philo are placed in square brackets, while the alternate readings found in Philo are included in round brackets. Septuagint Lev. 11:21 reads: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα φάγεσθε (paraphrase of: παραινεί ... σιτεισθαι) ἀπὸ τῶν ἐρπετῶν [τῶν πετεινῶν], ἃ πορεύεται ἐπὶ τεσσάρ[α] (ων), ἃ ἔχει σκέλη ἀνώτερον τῶν ποδῶν [αὐτοῦ], (ὥστε) πηδᾶν ἐν αὐτοῖς [ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς].

III *Plant.* 26–27 (= Lev. 1.1) reads:

(26) Accordingly, Moses, the keeper and guardian of the mysteries of the Existent One, will be one called above (*ἀνακεκλήσεται*); for it is said in the Book of Leviticus, ‘He called Moses up above (Lev. 1.1)’ (*ἀνεκάλεσε Μωϋσῆν*). One called up above will Bezeleel also be, ... For him also does God call up above (*ἀνακαλεῖ*) for the construction and overseeing of the sacred works (Exod. 31.2ff. and Exod. 35:30).

(27) But while Bezeleel shall carry off the lower honours conferred by the call above, Moses the all-wise shall bear away the primary honours. For the former fashions the shadows ... Moses on the other hand obtained the office of producing not shadows but the actual archetype of the several objects.

The passage gives a midrashic rendering of the word *ἀνακαλέω* used by the Septuagint in connection with both Moses and Bezeleel who together are its subject. Both are represented as artificers: Bezeleel of ‘the shadows’<sup>29</sup> (= the natural objects) and Moses of the ‘archetypes.’<sup>30</sup>

Since Bezeleel is mentioned in the Pentateuch only in connection with the construction of the Tabernacle and its appurtenances (Exod. 31–37), the specific allusion to him would have been readily identified by Philo’s readership, while Moses is mentioned by name in the Pentateuch hundreds of times, but *only here* in Lev. 1:1 is the verb *ἀνακαλέω* used in connection with him. Had the exact location of the allusion to Moses not been noted, the reader would hardly have been able to spot the reference, but once it was identified as coming from the Book of Leviticus, it would have been recognized immediately, since this verb (*ἀνακαλέω*) is *the first significant word of the Book of Leviticus*.

IV *Her.* 251 (= Lev. 9:24) reads:

(251) Also in *Leviticus* at the completion of the sacrifices on the eighth day, when ‘fire came out from heaven and devoured what was on the altar, both the whole burnt offerings and the fats’ it is said immediately, ‘and all the people saw and were in an ecstasy (*καὶ εἶδεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐξέστη*),<sup>31</sup> and fell upon their faces’ (Lev. 9:24); a natural consequence, for

<sup>29</sup> A play on the name in Hebrew *בצלאל* is rendered as meaning *בצל* = ‘in the shadow’ + *אל* = ‘the Lord.’

<sup>30</sup> In addition to these three instances—the one in connection with Moses (Lev. 1:1), and the two in connection with Bezeleel (Ex. 31:2 and 35:30), there are only three other instances using this word in the Septuagint—Num. 1:17, 10:2, and Josh. 4:4—none of which are relevant to the present context. For midrashic renderings by Philo similar to the one here, see: I *Leg. All.* 3.95–102 and II *Gig.* 23, and also V *Somm.* 1.206 (although there the homiletical web does not include the word *ἀνακαλέω*).

<sup>31</sup> Septuagint: *ἐξέστη*; MT: *ויררו*.

an ‘ecstasy’ (ἔκστασις) in this sense produces great agitation and terrible consternation.

This instance is found in the list of examples from different parts of the Pentateuch of various kinds of ‘ecstasy,’ which has already been mentioned in connection with the name *Exagoge*. Because the citation of Lev. 9:24 follows immediately upon the example identified as coming from a specific work, *Exagoge*, Philo may have considered it necessary to make it clear that the two examples stem from different works<sup>32</sup>—particularly because of their great similarity: ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς (Ex.)—πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐξέστη (Lev.).

#### *Numbers (Ἀριθμοῖ)*

Although material from the Book of Numbers is quoted or referred to by Philo hundreds of times, neither the name Ἀριθμοῖ, as it is called in the Septuagint, or, to the best of my knowledge, any other name, is used by Philo to identify it. Apparently, no occasion arose which called for this.

#### *Deuteronomy (Δευτερονομίον)*

The name used by the Septuagint for the fifth book of the Pentateuch, Deuteronomy (Δευτερονομίον) is found in Philo’s works twice—in I *Leg.* 3:174, and in III *Quod Deus* 50.

The verses quoted in these texts, Deut. 8:3 and 30:15, 19 respectively, were popular maxims—so popular that they have left their mark as maxims both in rabbinic midrash and in early Christian literature. Their value as popular sayings was of course enhanced by an awareness that they were also biblical citations, and so their identification as being found in Deuteronomy may even have been part of the way they were normally quoted.

---

<sup>32</sup> This consideration is not relevant for the ensuing citation because it is from Genesis, the ‘home text.’ IV *Quis Rerum* 251–258 will be examined as a unit below in connection with the discussion of the name *Epinomis*.

I *Leg.* 3.174 (= Deut. 8:3)

The Philonic pericope which commences in section 162 is an allegorical rendition of Exodus 16:4–16 that construes Manna as God’s ῥῆμα (‘thing’). There is a play on words: *Manna* = ‘bread’ (ἄρτος) is taken by Philo to be figuratively synonymous with ῥῆμα (‘thing’) and λόγος (‘word’). First citing Exodus 16:15 in the name of ‘the hierophant and prophet Moses,’ Philo then quotes Deut. 8:3 (I *Leg.* 3.174), explicitly identifying it as coming from the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>33</sup> Deut. 8:3 functions here as a proof text for what has gone before, that *Manna* is God’s ‘Word.’

The most relevant part of I *Leg.* 3.171–174 reads:

(173) ... For it is taught by the hierophant and prophet Moses ... “This (*viz.* the *Manna*) is the bread” (οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἄρτος) (Ex. 16:15), the sustenance which God has given to the soul, his *rhema* (ῥῆμα)<sup>34</sup> and his *logos* (λόγος) “this is the bread which He hath given us to eat, this is the *rhema*” (οὗτός ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν δέδωκεν ἡμῖν φαγεῖν, τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα) (Ex. 16:15 (end)—16 (beg).)<sup>35</sup>

(174) Similarly, in *Deuteronomy* he says: “And He afflicted thee and made thee weak by hunger, and fed thee with Manna (τὸ μάννα), which thy fathers knew not, that He might proclaim to thee, that not on bread alone shall man live, but on every *rhema* (ῥῆμα) that goeth forth through the mouth of God (ὅτι οὐκ ἐπ’ ἄρτω μόνῳ ζήσεται ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι (τῷ) ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ) (Deut. 8:3).”

This midrashic rendering must have been a matter of virtual consensus, for Deut. 8:3 is similarly understood in such diverse texts as Matt. 4:4 and Sifre Deut. 48, as referring to spiritual, rather than bodily, sustenance. Matt. 4:4 quotes this verse in Jesus’ name where it is placed in apposition to bodily food. We read there:<sup>36</sup>

(1) Then Jesus was led by the Spirit into the desert to be tempted by the devil. (2) After fasting forty days and forty nights, he was hungry. (3) The

<sup>33</sup> It is again quoted in 176 without further identification.

<sup>34</sup> Perhaps: thing, concretization.

<sup>35</sup> This is a virtually verbatim quote of Septuagint Exodus 16:15 (end)—16 (beg.): “(15) ... Οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος, ὃν δέδωκεν ἡμῖν κύριος τοῦ φαγεῖν. (16) τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ συνέταξε κύριος ...” (which was also quoted shortly before this in section 169, but the book of Exodus is not named there by Philo).

<sup>36</sup> The text of the citation in Philo and Matt. is identical, which mitigates against the “correction” (the addition of (τῷ)) suggested by Colson to bring Philo’s text to accord with that found in the Septuagint.



tempter came to him and said, “If you are the Son of God, tell these stones to become bread.” (4) Jesus answered, “It is written: ‘Man does not live on bread alone, but on every *rhema* that comes from the mouth of God’ (ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ) (Deut. 8:3).”

Likewise, though the specific meaning given differs most markedly, *Sifre Deut.* 48 also understands the connotation of this verse spiritually:<sup>37</sup>

*Pisqa* 48: Another teaching concerning the verse, “If then you faithfully keep all this instruction” (Deut. 11.22) ... Scripture has said not only ‘this instruction’ but *all this instruction*. Study, exegesis, laws and lore. For so Scripture says, “Man does not live by bread alone” (Deut. 8:3); this refers to exegesis (= midrash); “... but by everything that comes out of the mouth of the Lord” (*ibid.*); this refers to laws and lore (= *halakha* and *haggadah*).

The midrashic configuration in the three sources is identical: *Manna* is spiritual, rather than bodily, sustenance. While the biblical verse invites such a midrashic rendering, it remains significant that it has in fact been so rendered in such divergent sources.<sup>38</sup>

At III *Quod Deus* 50 the Philonic text reads:

(50) And therefore we have an oracle of this kind recorded in *Deuteronomy*. “Behold, I have set before thy face life and death, good and evil; choose life” (Deut. 30:15, 19).

The citation from Deuteronomy is not a single verse, and not even, as above in I Leg. 3:173, the end of one and the beginning of the next verse. Instead, it is a tacking together of two not entirely adjacent biblical phrases, specifically, the combination of parts of Deut. 30:15 and 19. This lends additional support to the thesis that, as in the previous instance, it too was a popular maxim.

Indeed, it is found both in early Christian and in rabbinic tradition. For example, the opening of the *Didache*, whose prototype is considered to have stemmed from pre-Christian Jewish circles, states: “There are two ways, one of life, the other of death. ...”<sup>39</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Besides the fact that I have not preserved the outline form, I have used Jacob Neusner’s translation of *Sifre to Deuteronomy* (Atlanta 1987), Vol. I, 161.

<sup>38</sup> See in this connection Peder Borgen, *Bread from Heaven. An Exegetical Study of the Concept of Manna in the Gospel of John and the Writings of Philo* (NT.S 10, Leiden 1981) [Borgen, Manna 1981].

<sup>39</sup> *The Apostolic Fathers* (Loeb ed. 1925) ed. and trans. Kirsopp Lake, Vol. I.

Likewise, Sifre Deut. (Finkelstein ed.) *Parashat Re'eh* 53 reads:<sup>40</sup>

*Pisqa* 53: ...Why is this passage stated? The reason is that, since it is said, "Life and death I have placed before you, the way of life and the way of death" (Deut. 30:19); perhaps the Israelites might say, 'Since the Omnipresent has placed before us two ways, "the way of life and the way of death," let us go in whichever way we choose.' Accordingly, Scripture says, "Choose life" (*ibid.*).

Philo has here used this well-known 'saying' from Deut. 30:15,19 as a biblical 'proof-text' for the idea which he has just expressed, using a Stoic frame of reference, that though mankind is a free agent when it comes to choosing between good and evil, it should choose the good, thereby providing it with its Jewish underpinning.

#### *Other words thought to refer to Deuteronomy*

It is upon this backdrop that one needs to reconsider what is today the default assumption in the world of scholarship, *viz.*: the thesis that some of the instances of the words Προτρεπτικός (λογός) and Παράεισις, as well as the term Επινομής (*Epinomis*), were used by Philo as alternate names for the book of Deuteronomy.<sup>41</sup>

The following analysis shows that the words Προτρεπτικός (λογός) and Παράεισις, were in fact technical terms in the taxonomy of the contents of the Pentateuch, and that the term Προτρεπτικός (*Protreptikos*) was apparently also the name of a popular anthology whose contents were of the sort suggested by its title, and that the last term, Ἐπινομής (*Epinomis*), was the name of a compendium, and was *not* a synonym for Deuteronomy.

#### προτρεπτικός (*Protreptikos*)

In addition to the passages III *Agr.* 78, 172, V *Fuga* 142, 170, V *Mut.* 42, 236, and VIII *Virt.* 47, in which Colson has more or less equated the term προτρεπτικός (*Protreptikos*) with Deuteronomy, it is also found

---

<sup>40</sup> Trans. from Neusner, *op. cit.* The Hebrew text reads: למה נאמר? לפי שנאמר "החיים" (דברים ל:ט); שמא יאמרו ישראל הואיל ונתן המקום לפנינו שני והמות נתני לפניך, הברכה והקללה" (דברים ל:ט); שמא יאמרו ישראל הואיל ונתן המקום לפנינו שני דרכים דרך חיים ודרך מות; גלך באיו מהם שנרצה, תלמוד לומר: "ובחרת בחיים" (שם) ...

<sup>41</sup> See e.g. Earp's Index, PLCL, *op. cit.*

in I *Leg.* 1.83 and in II *Det.* 11 where it has been rendered in its usual dictionary connotation: ‘exhortations, hortatory discourse.’ We will quote these first.

I *Leg.* 1.83 reads:

For how shall the keen endeavorer read without eyes; how shall he hear *the words of exhortation* (τῶν προτρεπτικῶν λόγων) without ears?

Similarly, II *Det.* 11 reads:

And indeed *the hortatory discourse* (ὁ γε προτρεπτικός λόγος) of the father puts no compulsion on thee, so that you may follow the better course of your own free will and self-bidden.

In these two passages the term is used as an adjective modifying the word λόγος—*viz.* προτρεπτικῶν λόγων and προτρεπτικός λόγος respectively—the connotation being *hortatory discourse*. Perhaps the fact that elsewhere the definite article sometimes introduces the term *Protrep-tikos*—thus indicating that what is being referred to is a proper noun—is what has led to what I am convinced is a mistaken assumption: that the word is a synonym for Deuteronomy.<sup>42</sup>

What now follows is a survey of the remaining seven instances of the term *Protrep-tikos* (Προτρεπτικός) in Philo’s works which have been identified by Colson and others as alternate names for Deuteronomy, although it has long been recognized that two of them do not even refer to a passage from Deuteronomy and, as we shall see shortly, two more of these seven relate primarily to material from the book of Leviticus rather than Deuteronomy. The order in which the material is discussed is dictated by the argument.

### VIII *Virt.* 47

Therefore he says in *The Exhortations* (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς): If you follow righteousness and holiness and the remaining virtues, you will live a life free from war. ...

Deuteronomy 28 and Leviticus 26 are parallel, but not identical versions of the ‘Blessings and Curses.’ The footnotes in the Loeb edition have cited as the parallel the curses in Deuteronomy rather than the closer parallel in Leviticus, presumably because it has been taken for granted that the term *Protrep-tikos* is a synonym for Deuteronomy. But

<sup>42</sup> This identification then led the Loeb edition to regularly render the definite article “the” (τοῖς) in the Philonic text as the personal pronoun “his” (*viz.* Moses).

this has, so to speak, harnessed the cart before the horse. Even Colson in his note *ad loc.*,<sup>43</sup> while he writes that the reference in VIII *Virt.* 47 is “a loose paraphrase of Deuteronomy 28:1,2 and 7,” has also noted that “the promise of peace belongs rather to Leviticus 26:5.” He further directs the reader to V *Fuga* 170, where even he has identified the citation as coming from Leviticus (see discussion which follows immediately).

### V *Fuga* 170

What is being discussed in V *Fug.* 170 is what the taxonomical classification of the passage under consideration should be. It commences with a citation from *The Exhortations* (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς) which is found in Lev. 25:11 (*sic!*):

(170) For it is said in *The Exhortations* (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς), “Ye shall not sow, nor shall ye reap its growths that come up of themselves” (Lev. 25:11).

Then, after explaining that natural growths need no human attention, Philo remarks in 171 that:

(171) His (Moses’) words are not those of *exhortation* (οὐ προτρέπει δὲ), but rather of statement (μᾶλλον ἢ γνώμην). For were he exhorting he would have said, ‘do not sow,’ ‘do not reap’. ...

The suggestion made in the note in PLCL *ad loc.* that Philo may have *mistakenly* ascribed this reference to the book of Deuteronomy is bizarre, for it is evident to anyone familiar with Philo’s writings that his control of the contents of the Pentateuch was phenomenal. The instances just studied, where Philo has differentiated between parallel traditions found in different pentateuchal books, clearly illustrates this. It is therefore far more reasonable to postulate our own imperfect understanding of the Philonic text than that Philo has made such a glaring error.

Philo made no such error. Philo has identified the citation as being found in ‘*The Exhortations*’ (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς)—and the context indicates this to be the name of an anthology of passages which belong to this taxonomical category. Philo has found this fact to be surprising because, as he explains, in his opinion it belongs to a different category, that of ‘*a statement*’ and not ‘*an exhortation*.’

<sup>43</sup> PLCL VIII, 192–193.

III *Agr.* 78

Likewise in III *Agr.* 78 the term ἐν προτρεπτικοῖς obviously means: ‘in hortatory discourse’, for ‘do not fear’ is an *exhortation*, since one cannot *command* not to fear—and note the absence of the definite article:

(78) This is why Moses says in *hortatory discourse* (ἐν προτρεπτικοῖς): “If you go to war against your enemies and see horse and rider and much people, *do not fear* for the Lord God is with you” (Deut. 20:1).<sup>44</sup>

III *Agr.* 172

This is an explicit reference to ‘advice’ found in a work called *Exhortations*:

Moreover, in *The Exhortations* he *advises* (κάν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς μέντοι παρανεῖ) those who have obtained possession of good things in great measure, not to inscribe themselves as authors of the wealth, but rather, “to remember God Who giveth strength to acquire power” (Deut. 8:18).

Note that when in I *Leg.* 3.174 (discussed above) Philo wished to identify the specific venue of Deut. 8:3, a verse coming from this very same Deuteronomic pericope—*viz.* “Not by bread alone shall man live, but on every word (*rhema*) that goeth forth from the mouth of God”—he did so by stating that it comes from *Deuteronomy* (not by any other name).

V *Fuga* 142

Clearly, V *Fug.* 142 should also be understood in this manner:

(142) This promise also is included in *The Exhortations* (ἐν τοῖς προτρεπτικοῖς) “You shall turn back to the Lord your God, and shall find Him, when you seek after Him, with all your heart, and with all your soul (Deut. 4:29).”

---

<sup>44</sup> Following is the Septuagint verse with the part not quoted by Philo placed in square brackets: Ἐάν δὲ ἐξέλθῃς εἰς πόλεμον ἐπ[ὶ τοὺς] ἐχθρούς σου καὶ ἴδῃς ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην καὶ λαὸν πλείονά [σου], οὐ φοβηθήσῃ [ἀπ’ αὐτῶν], ὅτι κύριος ὁ θεός [σου] μετὰ σοῦ [ὁ ἀναβιβάσας σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου]. Note how, by omitting the Septuagint’s ‘from them,’ Philo stresses the ‘do not fear,’ and note also in passing that as usual Philo has omitted any unnecessary reference to the Exodus from Egypt as an historical event.

V *Mut.* 42

This is part of a passage which homiletically expounds the difference between the phrases ‘before Him’ and ‘to Him.’ Philo uses examples from *the oracles*, from *prayer* and from *the exhortations* (ἐν τοῖς προτροπευτικοῖς). It is obvious from the juxtaposition of the terms: *oracles*, *prayers* and *exhortations* that this too is a taxonomical category. While the oracles and the prayers are found in Genesis, this does not make the terms synonymous with the Greek name Genesis. We read there:

(39) ... But there are others who ... are both eminent in the practice of piety and do not despise human things. This is attested by *the oracles* (μάγιστρος δ’ οἱ χρησιμοί) in which it is said to Abraham directly from God (ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ), “Be well pleasing before Me (εὐαρέσκει ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ) (Gen. 17:1).”<sup>45</sup>

(41) And therefore the Practiser in his prayer (εὐχόμενος) will show us the same truth. “The God,” he says, “to whom my fathers were well pleasing,” and adds “before Him” (Gen. 48:15)<sup>46</sup> to show us the difference in fact between being pleasing ‘to Him’ and ‘before Him.’ The latter embraces both kinds of well pleasing, the former is confined to one only.

(42) And so Moses in *the exhortations*, advises saying (ἐν τοῖς προτροπευτικοῖς παραινεῖ λέγων): “Thou shalt do what is well pleasing before the Lord thy God (τὸ εὐάρεστον ποιήσεις ἐνώπιον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου)” (Deut. 12:28),<sup>47</sup> meaning do such things as shall be worthy to appear before God...

Finally, in V *Mut.* 236ff. which paraphrases Deut. 30:12ff., though he probably did not thereby relinquish the identification with Deuteronomy, even Colson has translated the Greek: ἐν τοῖς προτροπευτικοῖς as “in his (i.e. Moses’) *Exhortations*.”

(236) Why then there should be three ways of repentance is worth inquiry. Misdeeds and good deeds virtually always fall into three classes: thought, words, deeds. And therefore in *the exhortations* (κὰν τοῖς προτροπευτικοῖς) Moses, when he is shewing that the acquisition of the good is neither impossible nor hard to pursue, (237) says, “You need not fly up to heaven nor go to the ends of earth and sea to lay hold of it ...” (Deut. 30:12ff.).

<sup>45</sup> Septuagint Gen. 17:1: εὐαρέσκει ἐναντίον ἐμοῦ.

<sup>46</sup> Septuagint Gen. 48:15: ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ | ἐνώπιον.

<sup>47</sup> This is a fairly close paraphrase of Septuagint Deut. 12:28: ἐὰν ποιήσεις τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ ἀρεστὸν κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου. The replacing of Septuagint: ἐναντίον by ἐνώπιον has occurred in all three citations (see preceding notes).

In sum: there is neither need nor justification for understanding the word *Protreptikos* (Προτρεπτικός) as a synonym for Deuteronomy. This is a taxonomical category, which in Hebrew is called תוכחה, and may also have been the name of an anthology containing passages of exhortation (תוכחה). While some of the passages mentioned as belonging to this category are in fact found in the Book of Deuteronomy, this is merely because much of Deuteronomy is made up of exhortations (תוכחות), not because the term is an alternative name for Deuteronomy.

### Παράνεσις (Parainesis)

The term *Parainesis* (Παράνεσις) in III *Agr.* 84 and VIII *Spec.* 4.131 has also been taken to be an alternative appellation for Deuteronomy.<sup>48</sup>

III *Agr.* 84 reads:

(84) Right well does the Lawgiver teach in *the recommendations* (ἐν ταῖς παρανεύσεσιν) not to choose a horse-rearer<sup>49</sup> to be a ruler ... He says the following: “Thou mayest not appoint over thyself etc.” (Deut. 17:15–16).

VIII *Spec.* 4.131 reads:

(131) And therefore Moses said most excellently in *the recommendations* (ἐν ταῖς παρανεύσεσι): “Let not every man do as he sees fit (οὐ ποιήσει ἕκαστος τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ) (Deut. 12:8),”<sup>50</sup> which is equivalent to, “No one may submit to his own lust (μηδεὶς τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ τῇ αὐτοῦ χαρίζεσθω).”<sup>51</sup>

A consideration of these two passages bearing in mind the use of the word elsewhere in Philo shows that the term *parainesis* is also a taxonomical category and not a synonym for Deuteronomy.

<sup>48</sup> PLCL III, 150, n.a.: “Another of Philo’s names for Deuteronomy,” and *id.* vol. VIII, 90, n. a., which refers the reader to the note to *Agr.* 84; and here too Colson has as a result rendered the introductory definite article as ‘his.’

<sup>49</sup> Explained in the continuation, in 88: “... he is not talking in this passage about a cavalry force ... He is speaking about that irrational and unmeasured and unruly movement in the soul to check which is in her interest...”

<sup>50</sup> Septuagint Deut. 12:8: οὐ ποιήσετε πάντα, ... ἕκαστος τὸ ἀρεστὸν ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ.

<sup>51</sup> This is not a biblical citation, but it may possibly be a classical allusion; cf. e.g. Sophocles, *Electra* 331: θυμῷ χαρίζεσθαι κενά. The idea is the same.

I *Leg.* 1.93ff. reads:

(93) There is a difference between these *three*—injunction, prohibition, *command and recommendation* (πρόσταξις, ἀπαγόρευσις, ἐντολή<sup>52</sup> καὶ παραινέσις)...<sup>53</sup>

(95) Quite naturally, then does God give the *commandments and recommendations* (ἐντέλλεται καὶ παραινεῖ) to the earthly man who is neither bad nor good, but midway between these...

The words in this passage are clearly taxonomical categories, and the same is true for IV *Conf.* 59 which also has the combination of ‘commandments and recommendations,’ using the word λόγοι (literally, ‘words,’ and cf. similarly in the word *Decalogue*) instead of ἐντολαί for ‘commandments’:

(59) ... Divine commandments and holy recommendations (λόγοις θείοις καὶ ἱεραῖς παραινέσεσι).

VII *Spec.* 1.299 and *Virt.* 70 combine ὑποθήκαι<sup>54</sup> καὶ παραινέσεις to mean ‘counsel and recommend’:

VII *Spec.* 1.299 reads:

(299) These and similar injunctions to piety are given in the Law in the form of direct commands and prohibitions (προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις). *Others* which have now to be described are of the nature of homilies giving *councils and recommendations* (ὑποθήκας καὶ παραινέσεις).

VIII *Virt.* 70 reads similarly:

(70) ... by looking to Moses as their archetype and model, none would grudge giving good advice (βουλευμάτων ἀγαθῶν) to their successors, but all would train and school their souls with *councils and recommendations* (ὑποθήκας καὶ παραινέσεις)...

<sup>52</sup> For the use of the word ἐντολή as a technical term for Torah commandments (*mitsvot*) see the Synagogue inscription of Theodotus in Jerusalem, discussed by P. Jean-Babstite Frey, *CIJ* (Rome 1952) [= *CIJ*], II 1404. Lea Roth-Gerson, *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz Israel* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1987), and also in my own *Philo Judaeus*, 221–222. See also Saul Lieberman, *Texts and Studies*, *Ἐντολαί*.

<sup>53</sup> Either the words ‘injunction-prohibition’ or ‘command and recommendation’ are parts of a single conceptual unit, for it is stated that there are *three* categories, and there are four words. Hence two terms must belong to a single category, forming a hendiadys. Note that the first pair parallels the rabbinic dichotomy of positive and negative commandments.

<sup>54</sup> The word ὑποθήκη is found in Philo’s writings four times in the sense of ‘suggestion, council, warning’ (rather than in its better known connotation as ‘pledge, deposit, mortgage’). In addition to VIII *Spec.* 1:299 and VIII *Virt.* 70, where it is used together with παραινέσεις, it is found in VII *Spec.* 3:29 (in the context of the “Holy Laws,”—ἱεροῦς νόμους) and in V *Somn.* 2:73. It is found neither in the Septuagint nor in the NT.



Most clear cut of all is the statement in X *Legat.* 70:

(70) For in their thoughtlessness they gave the name of *commanding* to *recommendation* (ἐκάλουν γὰρ οἱ ἀνεξέταστοι τὴν παραίνεσιν πρόσταξιν)...

Clearly, the term *Parainesis* (Παραινέσις) is also a taxonomical category meaning ‘recommendation’ sometimes used in apposition to *commands*, *commandments*—ἐντολαί, λόγοις θείοις, ἐπιτάγματα—and sometimes in combination with ὑποθήκαι as a hendiadys.

### Ἐπινομίς (Epinomis)

Except for the (Pseudo) Platonic book of this name, the term *Epinomis* (Ἐπινομίς) is not used in any extant ancient sources except for Philo’s writings, where it is found in three separate contexts (a total of four different instances)—viz. IV *Her.* 162, *Her.* 250 and VIII *Spec.* 4.160, 164. I hope to devote a separate study to a detailed discussion of its connotation in VIII *Spec.* 4.151ff. (including 160–169), in which I will argue that Philo is not simply making an embroidered idealization of the Mosaic injunctions in these passages, but that they reflect the authentic reality in which Philo lived and wrote. Here, I shall confine myself to a presentation of the major outlines of the argument respecting the term *Epinomis*.

We have found that neither *Protrepitkos* (Προτρεπτικός), nor *Parainesis* (Παραινέσις) were alternate names for the Book of Deuteronomy, and also—since the title *Exagoge* is always used *instead of* the name Exodus, *not in addition to it*—that Philo has not used more than a single name for any of the books of the Pentateuch. In the light of this, it is surprising to find that Colson and Whitaker, the translators of the Loeb edition of Philo’s works, have taken it for granted in their rendering of IV *Her.* 162 and IV *Her.* 250 that *Epinomis* is an alternative name for Deuteronomy.

It is true that some reservations regarding this assumption seem to have eventually arisen in Colson’s mind, for in VIII *Spec.* 4.160 and in VIII *Spec.* 164 he did not render the term Ἐπινομίς explicitly as Deuteronomy, but rather, in section 160, as ‘this *sequel* to the laws,’ and in section 164 as ‘the book of the *Sequel* to the law’ (italics mine)—and has even alternated between a small and a capital letter (= *s/S-equal*). This indicates that he was not entirely certain whether or not the word should be considered a proper noun. Nevertheless, Colson also apparently continued to bow to what he must have believed to be

scholarly consensus, for in an endnote (to *Spec.* 4.160) he wrote: “Philo has used this name for Deuteronomy in *Her.* 162, 250. As so applied it is not quoted from any other ancient writer, and if the application is due to him it is a reasonable supposition that it is modelled on the pseudo-Platonic treatise of that name.”<sup>55</sup>

In VIII *Spec.* 4.160–169 the term *Epinomis* (Ἐπινομίς)—which in this context is obviously a translation of the Septuagint’s τὸ δευτερονόμιον τοῦτο (MT = *Mishneh ha-Torah hazoth*)—is described as a book ‘which embraces all the laws in a sort of summary form (κεφαλαιώδη)’:

(160) From the day that he (= the king) enters upon his office he (= the lawgiver) bids him write out with his own hand the *Epinomis* (τὴν Ἐπινομίδα) which embraces all the laws in a sort of summary form (κεφαλαιώδη).

Is there any reason to understand the composition to be other than what Philo has said it is, *viz.* a rather short *Chrestomathy* of important and central Biblical passages containing the laws? This is all the more likely since, although in rabbinic sources Deuteronomy is referred to both by the term *Devarim* and *Mishneh Torah*,<sup>56</sup> it is not taken for granted that the term *Mishneh Torah* in the context of Deut. 17:18–19 and elsewhere necessarily means Deuteronomy (the 5th book of the Pentateuch), and various suggestions respecting its contents are made.<sup>57</sup>

Similarly, Philo’s second mention of *Epinomis* in this section, *id.* 164, describes the *Epinomis* as the king’s ensign of sovereignty, in lieu of the more usual scepter. He states there:

(164) Now other kings carry rods in their hands as scepters but my scepter is the Book of the *Epinomis* (ἡ βίβλος τῆς Ἐπινομίδος) ... an ensign of sovereignty...

<sup>55</sup> PLCL VIII, 436.

<sup>56</sup> Deuteronomy is of course a literal translation of the words *Mishneh Torah*—and see note 5 above.

<sup>57</sup> Perhaps the one closest to Philo’s statement is the view of Sa’adya Gaon that it contained only selected commandments. This is mentioned by the traditional medieval biblical commentator *Radak* (= R. David Kimhi) in his comment to the words *Mishneh Torah Moshe* in Joshua MT 8:32, which is the only other instance in the entire Bible where the term *Mishneh Torah* is found—*viz.* at Joshua MT 8:32 (Septuagint 9:2c): *Mishneh Torah Moshe* (Septuagint: τὸ δευτερονόμιον, νόμιον Μωϋσῆ). For other suggestions cf. also the rendering of *Targum Yonathan* to Deut. 17:18 ית פרשא אורייתא הדא = this biblical portion, and Onkelos ית פתשגן אורייתא הדא = the repetition, copy, abstract (so Jastrow, *Dict.*, *s.v.* where the reference is to Onkelos here) of this biblical portion; and the *Tosafists* (in a comment to the relevant verses in *Parashat Shofetim*—*viz.* Deut. 17:14ff.) write that the ‘king’s book’ contained no more than the Decalogue. See Gershon Arieli, *Torath Hamelekh, A Commentary to Maimonides’ Laws of Kings* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1958), p. 72, for discussion from a rabbinic frame of reference.

This too conforms to the rabbinic understanding of the biblical prescription that “it should be with him at all times,” for Mishnah Sanh. 2:4 states:<sup>58</sup>

He must write out a scroll of the Law for himself; when he goes forth to battle he shall take it forth with him, and when he returns he shall bring it back with him; when he sits in judgement it shall be with him, and when he reclines to eat,<sup>59</sup> it shall be before him...

and this stricture is taken literally in the discussion to this Mishnah in BT Sanh. 21b. An opinion is even expressed that it should be made in the form of a talisman and hung on the king’s arm:<sup>60</sup>

And he shall write him the repetition of this law (= *Mishneh ha-Torah hazoth*) (Deut. 17:18): i.e. he shall write himself two copies,<sup>61</sup> one which goes in and out with him and the other to be placed in his treasure house. The former, which is to go in and out with him, he shall write in the form of an amulet<sup>62</sup> and fasten it to his arm...

This accords with the Philonic description in the passage just quoted of the *Epinomis* as the king’s ensign of sovereignty, in lieu of the more usual scepter. Thus, while the conceptual frames of reference differ, and with this the specific details, nevertheless there appears to be a surprisingly high degree of congruence between what Philo has written in VIII *Spec.* 4.160–169 and rabbinic tradition respecting the *Mishneh Torah* of the king—that it was a short work containing selections of pivotal biblical passages, which the king had with him at all times—and when we turn to the two remaining instances where the word *Epinomis* appears in Philo’s works, we find that while they do not support it, they also do not run counter to this hypothesis.

IV *Her.* 162 reads:

(162) Inequality is the mother of the twins, foreign and civil war, just as its opposite is the mother of peace. Moses presents most clearly his glorification of justice and his censure of injustice, when he says, “ye shall

---

<sup>58</sup> Trans. Danby (slightly modified).

<sup>59</sup> The Hebrew word is the technical term: **מָסַב** *maysayv* (cf. Mishnah Pesahim 10:1 “even the poorest man in Israel must not eat [on the night of Passover] until he reclines”)—which is an allusion to the Roman custom of reclining when eating. Note in passing that while the question about reclining is not found in the version of the *Ma Nishtana* (The Four Questions recited at the Passover Seder) in Mishnah Pesahim 10:4, it is included by Maimonides.

<sup>60</sup> Trans. according to the Soncino ed., slightly modified.

<sup>61</sup> MT *Mishneh* is here taken to mean ‘double, two.’

<sup>62</sup> Rashi: in miniscule.

do nothing unjust in judgement, in measures, in weights, in balances; your balances shall be just, your weights just and your measures just and your quart just (Lev. 19:35,36)” and in *Epinomis* (καὶ ἐν Ἐπινομίδι) “There shall not be in thy bag divers weights, great and small: there shall not be in thy house divers measures, great and small. A true and a just weight thou shalt have, that thy days may be long in the land, which the Lord thy God gives thee in inheritance, because every one who doeth these things is an abomination to the Lord, every one who doeth injustice (Deut. 25:13–16). (163) So then the God who loves justice, hates and abominates injustice, the source of faction and evil (στάσεως καὶ κακῶν ἀρχήν).”

Philo’s identification in IV *Her.* 162 of the citation from Deut. 25:13–16 as being found ‘in *Epinomis*’ separates it from its parallel in Lev. 19:35–36, which has just been quoted immediately before it *without* its specific provenance having been mentioned.

Since here Philo could just as well have have written, as he often did elsewhere, something like ‘and Moses also states...,’ I would like to suggest that he has chosen to identify this citation as being found in the *Epinomis*, the ‘King’s Book,’ because of the ‘political’ thrust of the passage; for Philo has included the citation here in the frame of reference of ‘foreign and civil war’—that foreign and civil war are the result of disregarding the commandments found in Lev. 19:35–36 and Deut. 25:13–16. Is it mere chance that in V *Somn.* 2.193ff., where the context is the individual, not the ‘body politic,’ this same biblical passage (Deut. 25:13–15) is cited without further identification (as coming from a specific book), biblical or other?<sup>63</sup>

Rabbinic midrash also projects the same political message in a passage which associates Deut. 25:13–16 with *Parashat Amalek* which follows upon it immediately in Deut. 25:17–19. I quote the version of the midrash as it appears in *Pesikta de’ Rav Kahana*, which is one of the oldest of the homiletic midrashim.<sup>64</sup> The relevant part of *Pisqa* 3.4.3–4 reads:

...Said R. Levi: So Moses gave an indication to Israel in the Torah: You will not have in your bag a large stone and a small one, you will not have in your house two epha-measures, one large and one small (Deut.

<sup>63</sup> As for IX *Hypoth.* 7.8 and VIII *Spec.* 4.193ff., they are both really references to Lev. 19:35–36.

<sup>64</sup> Translation according to Jacob Neusner, *Pesikta de Rab Kahana* (Atlanta, Georgia 1987), Vol. I, 36, slightly modified according to the Hebrew text of Bernard Mandelbaum, *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* (New York 1987, 2nd ed.), Vol. I, 43. Cf. similarly in *Tanhum* (Buber), *Ki Tetsa* 8:8, *R. Berechiah*, and also Ruth Rabba, *Parashah* 1, *Oy lo ledor*.

25:13–14). If you have done so, know that the government is going to come and declare war against that generation. What verse of Scripture so indicates? All that do such things, even all that do unrighteously, are an abomination to the Lord (ibid. v. 16). And what is written immediately following? Remember what Amalek did to you (ibid. v. 17).

#### IV *Her.* 250

The remaining instance, IV *Her.* 250, is the first of the examples of the various types of ‘ecstasy’ (ἔκστασις) listed in this pericope. The passage was mentioned above in connection with the names *Exagoge* and *Leviticus*, which are also mentioned in it. While Philo has not here identified the specific location of the citations from Genesis, presumably because this is the ‘home text,’ the exact location of the other citations is mentioned and that in Deut. 28:28–29 is referred to as ‘written in the curses found in *Epinomis*.’<sup>65</sup>

The Philonic passage reads almost like an excerpt from a lexicon, albeit paraphrased and reworded to fit the context—which would go a long way towards explaining the mention here of the venue of the citations found in it from specific books—but this aspect of Philonic research is outside the parameters of the present study. I shall now confine myself to quoting the passage as a unity in order to provide the reader with an integrated overview of it.

---

<sup>65</sup> This is an eminently appropriate passage to be included in a document of the sort described by Philo as the *Epinomis*. These “curses” were part of the readings at the *Hakhel* ceremony of the *sabbatical year* according to Mishnah Sotah 7:8: “And he reads from the beginning of Deuteronomy to the *Shema* (Deut. 1:1–6:3; this includes the Decalogue) and the *Shema* (Deut. 6:4–9), *Ye shall hearken* (Deut. 11:13–21 = the second paragraph of the *Shema*), *Thou shalt surely tithe* (Deut. 14:22–29), *When thou has made an end of tithing* (Deut. 26:12–15), and the *Parashah* of the king (Deut. 17:14–20), and the *Blessings and Curses* (Deut. 28:1–69).” [Eng. trans. Danby, somewhat revised. The source for *Blessings and Curses* is given as Deut. 28:1–69 by Bertenuro and Kahati, *ad loc.*, and *not* Deut. 27:15–26 as noted by Danby, which latter portion has only curses (and no blessings)]. I am not arguing that the contents of the *Epinomis* (the *Mishneh Torah* of Deut. 17:18) was identical with the tradition relayed in the Mishnah with respect to the readings at *Haqhel*—and indeed Deut. 25:13–15, quoted in *Quis Rerum* 162 as being found in the *Epinomis*, is absent from the list of the *Haqhel* readings. I do however think that a high degree of congruence can be assumed, and that since in the Second Temple period there was a tendency to revive ancient forms, there is nothing inherently unlikely about the preservation of such an ancient tradition as the actual writing of a *Mishneh Torah* on the king’s part, provided it was not a very long ‘book.’

IV *Her.* 249–258 states:

(249) “About sunset,” it continues, “an *ecstasy* (ἔκστασις) fell upon Abraham and lo a great dark terror falls upon him” (Gen. 15:12). Now *ecstasy* (ἔκστασις) is sometimes a mad frenzy, producing mental delusion ... Sometimes it is extreme amazement at the events which so often happen suddenly and unexpectedly. Sometimes it is passivity of mind... and the best form of all is the divine possession and frenzy (ἔνθεος κατοκωγή τε καὶ μανία)<sup>66</sup> to which the prophets as a class are subject.

(250) The first is mentioned in the curses written in *Epinomis* (ἐν ταῖς ἐν Ἐπινομίδι γραφείσιν), where he says that madness and loss of sight and ‘ecstasy’ of mind (παράπληξιαν γὰρ φησι καὶ ἄορασίαν καὶ ἔκστασιν διανοίας) (Deut. 28:28) will overtake the impious, so that they shall differ in nought from blind men groping at noonday as in deep darkness (ὡς μηδὲν διοίσειν τυφλῶν ἐν μεσημβρία καθάπερ ἐν βαθεί σκότῳ ψηλαφόντων) (Deut. 28:29).<sup>67</sup>

(251) The second are in many places ... Isaac was astonished with a great ecstasy ... (Gen. 27:33); and respecting Jacob when he disbelieved those who told him that “Joseph lives and is ruler over all Egypt,” his mind, we are told, “was in a state of *ecstasy* (ἐξέστη ... τῆ διανοίᾳ),<sup>68</sup> for he did not believe them” (Gen. 45:26);

and in *Exagoge* respecting the assemblage: “And the mountain,” he said, “Sinai, was all covered with smoke, because God had descended upon it in fire, and the smoke rose like the vapour of a furnace, and the whole people were in a great ecstasy” (καὶ ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα)<sup>69</sup> (Ex. 19:18);

and also in *Leviticus* at the completion of the sacrifices on the eighth day, when ‘fire came out from heaven and devoured what was on the altar, both the whole burnt offerings and the fats’ it is said immediately, ‘and all the people saw and were in an *ecstasy* (καὶ εἶδε πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐξέστη),<sup>70</sup> and fell upon their faces’ (Lev. 9:24): a natural consequence, for an *ecstasy* (ἔκστασις) in this sense produces great agitation and terrible consternation.

(252–256) (*tangential discourse irrelevant to our present concerns*)

<sup>66</sup> Colson, in the app. *ad loc.* 574, notes that the word combination κατοκωγή τε καὶ μανία also appears in *Phaedrus* 244E and 245A.

<sup>67</sup> Septuagint: (28) ...παράπληξιαν καὶ ἄορασίαν καὶ ἐκστασίαν διανοίας. (29) καὶ ἔστη ψηλαφόντων μεσημβρίας, ὡσεὶ ψηλαφήσαι ὁ τυφλὸς ἐν τῷ σκότει ... Colson has noted the general similarity in thought with Deut. 28:28–29.

<sup>68</sup> Septuagint: ἐξέστη ἢ διάνοια Ἰακωβ; MT: ריפו לבו.

<sup>69</sup> Septuagint: ἐξέστη πᾶς ὁ λαὸς σφόδρα (= the entire people); MT: ויהרר כל ההר = ‘the entire mountain.’

<sup>70</sup> Septuagint: καὶ εἶδεν πᾶς ὁ λαὸς καὶ ἐξέστη; MT: ויררו.

(257) We have the third sort in the philosophical comment to the creation of the woman. “God cast,” he said, “an ‘ecstasy’ (ἔκστασις) on Adam, and he slept” (Gen. 2:21)...

(258) The fourth kind of ecstasy we find in the passage under present consideration. “About sunset an ‘ecstasy’ (ἔκστασις) fell upon Abraham” (Gen. 15:12).

We should note, finally, that were *Epinomis* (Ἐπινομίς) considered an alternative appellation for Deuteronomy, there would be at the very least six instances of a title mentioned by Philo for the book of Deuteronomy, which is more than the number of instances of the use of a proper name on his part for any of the other *chumashim* of the Pentateuch. This is not very likely.<sup>71</sup>

Be that as it may, the Greek name used here by Philo, *Epinomis*, may well have been one more example of a Philonic *tour de force* which in this case combined the Platonic association<sup>72</sup> with a literal rendering of the term *Mishneh Torah* (משנה = ἐπι, and תורה = Νομίς). Whether it was in fact Philo who coined the term, or whether it was part of the current Judeo-Greek vocabulary, important though this may be in a different context, is immaterial for us at present.

#### *Overall summary of our findings*

We not only can, but must conclude that although Philo was familiar with the separate names of the Pentateuchal books, that it was *the Pentateuch as a whole* which served as his conceptual unit, as his point of reference. It is clear that he was familiar with the separate books of the Pentateuch, but individual passages were not looked upon by him as belonging specifically to one or another of the pentateuchal books, but to the Pentateuch as a whole, and the free association between widely separated passages is therefore not surprising.

It is suggested that Philo’s use of the Greek term *Exagoge* for the second book of the Pentateuch rather than the Septuagintal title Exodus may perhaps be explained in light of the fact that the word Ἔξοδος (*Exodos*) was a technical term associated with the ‘exodus’ from the stage (see Aristotle’s *Poetics*). In circles where there was a high degree

<sup>71</sup> Were the *Protrepitkos* and *Parainesis* included in the count, there would be fourteen instances—which of course flies in the face of all probability.

<sup>72</sup> See Colson, PLCL VIII, 436 (cited above).

of congruence between full participation in contemporary Hellenistic cultural life and the use of the Septuagint, this may very well have caused the term Exodus to be considered problematic. And we further noted that the term Ἔξοδος (*Exodus*) was used by Herodotus and others for military expeditions—an association which would surely have been uncongenial to Philo and to the contemporary Alexandrian Jewish community.

The terms *Protreptikos* (Προτροπετικός), and *Parainesis* (Παραίνεσις) were shown to have been taxonomical categories and not alternative titles for Deuteronomy.

Last but not least, while we do not know whether it was Philo who coined the term, or whether it was part of his Judeo-Greek lexicon, in any event the term *Epinomis*—and it was the need to clarify the connotation of this term which originally triggered the entire study presented here—was found to be the title of a work which in VIII *Spec.* 4.160–169 is described as “*embracing all the laws in a sort of summary form* (κεφαλαιώδη).” It was not a synonym for Deuteronomy.





## CHAPTER THREE

### A TRADITIONAL HAFTARAH CYCLE<sup>1</sup>

The object of the present chapter is to show the overwhelming degree of correlation between Philo's rare citations from the Prophets and the traditional *Haftarah* string 'Admonition, Consolation, and Repentance' (פורענותא, נחמה ותשובה). These are the *Haftarot* recited between the 17th of *Tammuz* and the Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur)—at least according to the Ashkenazi and Sephardi (but not the Italian) rites.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Explanation of Relevant Dates in the Jewish Calendar*

[The terms explained: *Rosh Hodesh*; Three weeks of Admonition that include the 17th of *Tammuz*, *Shabbat Hazon*, and the 9th of *Av*; Seven Sabbaths of Consolation and three weeks of Repentance that include: *Rosh Hashanah* (the New Year), *Shabbat Shuva* and *Yom Kippur* (the Day of Atonement)]

---

<sup>1</sup> This is a revised and slightly corrected version of my article, "Earliest Evidence of the *Haftarah* Cycle for the Sabbaths between ב"ז בתמוז and ט"ו בכסלו in Philo," *JJS* 48/2 (Autumn 1997), 225–249 [Cohen, 'Haftarah Cycle' *JJS* 1997]. The thesis was first proposed by me in a paper delivered as a Guest Lecturer at the Bernard Revel Graduate School of Yeshiva University under the auspices of the Rabbi Gilbert Klaperman Symposium Fund, and in a much abbreviated form at the *12th World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem 1998), see Proceedings. And see also some preliminary remarks in Cohen, *Philo Judaicus*, Endnote J: "Philo and *Haftarot*," 303–305.

<sup>2</sup> The *Haftarot* are usually topically related to the weekly reading from the Pentateuch, with the exception of special periods such as this one. The period under consideration (that between the 17th of *Tammuz*, till after the Day of Atonement), has three Sabbaths of Admonition, seven of Consolation, and three of Repentance. A table listing the readings of all the major rites customary today is found in the *Encyclopedia Judaica*, vol. 15, s.v. *Torah, Reading of*, 1250–1251; also the *Talmudic Encyclopedia* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1947 and ongoing) vol. 10 (1961), s.v. *Haftarah*. There is a very detailed chart at the end of volume 10 respecting different customs including relatively local ones. It also includes the *incipit* of the *Haftarot*. At the end of many standard Hebrew Bibles published in Israel, there is also a list of the *Haftarot*.

*Rosh Hodesh*: The Jewish calendar is a lunar one, and the beginning of the Lunar month is called *Rosh Hodesh*, the beginning of the month.

The three weeks of Admonition commemorate the siege of Jerusalem and the destruction of the First (and later also the Second) Temple. They begin and end with fast days: the 17th of Tammuz and the 9th of Av.<sup>3</sup> The intermediate Sabbath before the fast of the 9th day of Av is called *Shabbat Hazon* after the opening words of its *Haftarah*—Isa. 1:1 “The vision (*Hazon*) of Isaiah.”

Seven weeks of Consolation follow immediately upon the 9th of Av. They commence with *Shabbat Nahamu*, so called because of the *incipit* of its *Haftarah*—Isa. 40:1. They celebrate the return to Zion from the Babylonian Exile and the rebuilding of the Temple in the wake of the Cyrus declaration (See II Chron. 36:22–23 and Ez. 1:1–4).

The Ten Days of Repentance follow immediately. This period begins with Rosh Hashanah (the New Year).<sup>4</sup> It includes *Shabbat Shuva*, so called after the opening words of its *Haftarah*: Hos. 14:2 “Return (*Shuva*), O Israel.” This is the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah (New Year) and Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), the most solemn day of the year.

\*

Although our knowledge of the history of Jewish liturgical practices has advanced significantly, far more remains buried in the seemingly impenetrable mists of antiquity. Until now the *Pesikta d’Rav Kahana*,<sup>5</sup> whose redaction scholarly consensus places, at the very earliest, *several*

---

<sup>3</sup> These fasts are already attested in Zech. 8:19: MT: צום הרביעי: צום חמשי: צום השביעי: צום העשירי יהיה לבית יהודה לששון ולשמחה ולמעדים טובים (both KJV and JPS: “Thus saith the Lord of Hosts: The fast of the fourth (month), and the fast of the fifth, and the fast of the seventh, and the fast of the tenth, shall be to the house of Judah joy and gladness”). See further below, n. 45.

<sup>4</sup> Although this is not its biblical name, for in the Pentateuch it is referred to as *יום תרועה* ... *מקרא-קדש* (a day of “holy convocation” and “a day of blowing the horn”) (Num. 29:1).

<sup>5</sup> See Bernard Mandelbaum, *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* [פסיקתא דרב כהנא, דוב מנדלבוים] Vol. I (New York 1987), Introduction.

*hundred years after Philo*,<sup>6</sup> has been the earliest evidence for this *Haftarah* Cycle.<sup>7</sup>

Our findings respecting Philo's citations from the Latter Prophets provides hitherto unnoticed evidence for the existence, already in Philo's day, of at least the beginnings of this cycle—thus antedating the *Pesikta*, and of course the BT as well, by centuries. And while the NT contains the earliest explicit mention of the custom of reading *Haftarot* after the Torah reading,<sup>8</sup> it is not clear from there whether, or

---

<sup>6</sup> See Ismar Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (English trans. *JPS & JTS* 1993; original German appeared in 1913), Hebrew trans. by Yehoshua Amir, revised and updated by Joseph Heinemann (1972). The English translation was made from the Hebrew revised version. On p. 145 Elbogen writes that “A fixed cycle of *Haftarot* was formed for the Sabbaths between the 17th of Tammuz and Tabernacles; ... [the cycle] must have been compiled in ancient times, because the *Pesikta midrashim* were organized around it...” And in *id.* n. 13 he writes that “Zunz fixes the date of the composition of the *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* at ca. 700”. The reference to Yom Tov Lipmann (Leopold) Zunz, *הדרשות בישראל והשתלשלותן ההיסטורית* [Heb. trans. of *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt* (1892<sup>2</sup>, first ed. 1832) by M.A. Zak, edited and updated by H. Albeck] (Jerusalem 1974). But Joseph Heinemann in his notes to Elbogen, *op.cit.*, adds that today an early date is accepted for the redaction of *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* (which midrashically expounds these *Haftarot*)—some dating them as early as the fifth century CE; cf. also M. Margolies's introduction to Lev. R. xiii, and Ben-Zion Wacholder, in his Prolegomenon to the 1971 edition of Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue*, (New York 1940), xxiv–xxv, ascribes the origin to Amoraic times.

<sup>7</sup> The *Tosafot* to BT *Meg.* 31b *incipit* ראש, also recognizes the *Pesikta d'Rav Kahana* as the earliest evidence for this *Haftarah* cycle. And BT Megillah 31a–b itself, which is presumably later than the *Pesikta*, refers to several *Haftarot* that contain citations used by Philo. Though they are mentioned in BT Megillah only by key words (that are not necessarily the *Haftarah's incipit*) this is the way that the Talmud identifies them.

Found there are: the *Haftarah* for *Rosh Hashanah* (ISam. 1:1–2:10), quoted by Philo in III *Quod Deus* 5–15, III *Ebr.* 143–152 and V *Mut.* 139, 143 and V *Som.* 1.254, and the *Haftarah* for Yom Kippur (Isa. 57:14–58:14) quoted by him in V *Mut.* 169. BT Megillah also mentions the *Haftarah* for *Rosh Hodesh* when it falls on a Sabbath (Isa. 66), a possible allusion to which is found in Philo (IV *Conf.* 98). Finally, that for *Rosh Hodesh Av* when it falls on a Sabbath (Isa. 1:1–27) is referred to there in the context of the discussion of the reading of the *Haftarah* for any *Rosh Hodesh* that falls on a Sabbath. Today this *Haftarah*, which is quoted from in I *Suppl. QG* 2.43, is recited on the Sabbath before the 9th of Av (*Shabbat Hazon*). There are also other *Haftarot* mentioned in BT Megillah 31a–b and also in Toseftah Megillah 4(3):1–4 of which Philo makes no mention.

<sup>8</sup> See e.g. Acts 13:15 and Luke 4:17. In Luke 4:17 the venue is Nazareth, and so is not necessarily indicative of the Diaspora. However, a very similar description is found in Acts 13:15, where the reference is to Pisidian Antioch. Like today, a homily was apparently customary after the reading of the Torah and Prophets, for one reads there, “After the reading of the Law and the Prophets, the synagogue rulers sent word to them saying, ‘Brothers, if you have a message of encouragement (λόγος παρακλήσεως) for the people, please speak.’” I do not know whether additional insights may be gained by

perhaps to what extent, the passages alluded to there were considered traditional pericopes.

\*

Philo was an elder statesman during the reign of the Emperor Caligula. Hence, he was a perhaps slightly younger contemporary of Hillel and Shammai as well as of Jesus, and thus lived more than a generation before the destruction of the Second Temple.<sup>9</sup> Consequently, this finding is indeed significant, for even though it does not necessarily mean that these *Haftarot* were already standardized, it does point to the likelihood that more than just a beginning had already been made in this direction.

Elsewhere we have argued that in liturgical matters the Sages by and large edited and standardized what had already become customary.<sup>10</sup> It now appears that, at least in this respect, *even* in the Greek-speaking Diaspora the process of liturgical standardization was apparently in a far more advanced stage at the turn of the first millennium than is generally assumed.

Ben-Zion Wacholder noted long ago that many of the selections of this *Haftarah* string “were identical for both Palestine and Babylonia,” and he explained this as “seeming to indicate that they originated when there existed a free interchange between the two centers, i.e. in

---

studying the citations and references to the Prophets in the NT together with those found in Philo and rabbinic midrashic literature.

<sup>9</sup> The only hard evidence we have for dating Philo’s life is that according both to his own description as well as that of Josephus, he was one of the members of the Alexandrian Jewish delegation to Caligula, which *prima facie* dates him as just suggested. Even should Kraft’s proposal to date Philo’s chronology somewhat later be correct, the difference is hardly significant to our concerns here. (See Robert A. Kraft, “Philo and the Sabbath Crisis: Alexandrian Jewish Politics and the Dating of Philo’s Works,” in *The Future Of Early Christianity: Essays In Honor of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson, et al.) (Minneapolis 1991), 131–141, and also, “Tiberius Julius Alexander and the Crisis in Alexandria according to Josephus,” in *Of Scribes And Scrolls: Studies On The Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, And Christian Origins, presented to John Strugnell on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, ed. Harold W. Attridge et al., College Theological Society Resources in Religion 5 (New York 1991), 175–184.

<sup>10</sup> See my article “*Shime’on Ha-pakuli hisdir yod-heth berakhoth*,” *Tarbiz* 52/4 (Tammuz-Elul 1983), 547–555. Likewise, David J. Halperin, *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen 1988), 18, argues in a similar vein respecting the *Haftarah* for Shavuot (The Feast of Weeks).

Amoraic times.”<sup>11</sup> I suggest that this occurred not, as Wacholder proposed, in Amoraic times, but further back, hidden in the seemingly impenetrable mists of antiquity. Indeed, over eighty years ago H. St. John Thackeray found evidence of the ‘Consolation’ part of this *Haftarah* cycle in the book of *Baruch*.<sup>12</sup> Elbogen considered this a “brilliant conjecture [which] he did not succeed in proving,”<sup>13</sup> but the present study may mandate a renewed consideration of Thackeray’s hypothesis.

\*

Following are two charts that contain *all* the citations and allusions from the Latter Prophets that scholarship has identified, whether justifiably or not, as having been referred to by Philo. They provide a synoptic presentation of the striking congruence between Philo’s rare citations from the Latter Prophets and this *Haftarah* cycle. Indeed, it is evident from an even cursory glance that *nine* out of the all-told twelve citations from the Latter Prophets are found in this *Haftarah* string.<sup>14</sup> This, as I have already suggested,<sup>15</sup> points to Philo’s familiarity with them because in his day they already were the customary reading for these special Sabbaths.

**Chart I** provides much relevant information at a glance. It is arranged according to the discrete prophetic books, subdivided into three sub-headings: a) the citations from the Latter Prophets<sup>16</sup> found in *Haf-*

---

<sup>11</sup> See his Prolegomenon, *op. cit.*, where we read, “During the Amoraic period, however, ... some selections were assigned independent significance. The Prophetic selections for the three Sabbaths before the Fast Day of Ninth of Ab and the seven weeks thereafter related to the periods of mourning and consolation rather than to the weekly pericopes of the Torah. The selections from Jeremiah and Isaiah for these Sabbaths were identical for both Palestine and Babylonia, which seems to indicate that they originated when there existed a free interchange between the two centers, i.e. in Amoraic times....”

<sup>12</sup> See H. St. John Thackeray, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (London 1923), pp. 100ff., and his comments respecting I Bar. 4:5 – 5:9.

<sup>13</sup> See Elbogen, *Jewish Liturgy, op. cit.*, 425, n. 13 in the Eng. trans., and in the Hebrew edition, 133ff. and note 13 on 431. The note in the Hebrew edition includes a survey of what was at the time the latest relevant scholarship.

<sup>14</sup> Though belonging to the Former rather than the Latter Prophets, ISam. 1:1–2:10 is also included here in the context of listing the contents of this *Haftarah* string, since it is the reading for the first day of Rosh Hashanah in all current rites. It is discussed in more detail in Chapter Five, devoted to the Former Prophets.

<sup>15</sup> Cohen, “*Haftarah* Cycle,” *JJS* 1997.

<sup>16</sup> I have also included here the mention of ISam. 1:1–2:10 (citations from which

*tarot*, b) citations *not found* in any current *Haftarah* and finally, c) instances noted by Colson and Earp that I have found to be not more than possible allusions or outright mistaken identifications.<sup>17</sup>

I have chosen to quote the verses in Hebrew in this chart rather than in Greek, even though, as I have shown in the chapter on the Former Prophets, I do not think that there can remain any vestige of a doubt that Philo's Scripture *was* the Septuagint (and not the MT). I have done this so that at least those familiar with the *Haftarah* from their recitation in the Synagogue will immediately recognize them.<sup>18</sup> The chart lists the exact parameters both of the *Haftarah* and of the relevant Torah reading.<sup>19</sup> It also notes the formula used by Philo when introducing the verse quoted.

Chart II lists the Philonic passages *according to the order of their appearance in Philo's oeuvre* in the Loeb edition, thus providing a concise overview of their place in Philo's writings. While I am aware that some believe that the order in the Loeb edition is of limited chronological value, it remains very useful in terms of a typological overview of the Scriptural citations in the Philonic corpus, not to mention the fact that it greatly facilitates finding them. In any event, the vast majority of them stem from Books II–V and *QG*.

---

are found in III *Quod Deus* 5–15, III *Ebr.* 143–152, V *Mut.* 143 and VIII *Praem.* 158–159), because this is the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah. It is discussed in Chapter Five: Former Prophets.

<sup>17</sup> The reasoning behind these conclusions are presented in Chapter Four: Citations from the Latter Prophets.

<sup>18</sup> In the charts in the next chapter the verses are cited in the form quoted by Philo, as well as how they are found in the Septuagint, in Hebrew, and in English translation.

<sup>19</sup> Respecting the probability of the existence of the Annual Cycle of Torah reading side by side with the triennial cycle already in Philo's day, see Ezra Fleischer's article, "קריאה חד-שנתית ותלת-שנתית בתורה בבית הכנסת הקדום" ["Annual and Triennial Reading of the Bible in the Old Synagogue"] *Tarbiz* 61/1 (Oct–Dec 1991), 25–44; Eng. summary II–III. Although Fleischer by and large dates the Torah reading cycles (both triennial and annual) to Tannaitic times (and thus still somewhat later than Philo), he notes there that Philo's *Quaest.* appears to reflect the use of the annual cycle not only in Babylon—see *id.*, 30 n. 15, and Ralph Marcus' introduction to his translation of Philo, I Suppl. *QG*, PLCL 1953, xiii–xv.

\*

*Chart I: Philo's references to the Latter Prophets  
in the order of their appearance in Scripture*

(Verbatim citations from the Prophets are listed first, with the possible allusions and mistaken identifications listed separately at the end of each of each biblical book so that they do not confuse the picture.)

*Isaiah*

There are five more or less verbatim citations from the book of Isaiah and four or five possible allusions and/or mistaken identifications.<sup>20</sup> While Philo introduces all of the verbatim citations as coming from 'the Prophets' or a similar locution, those passages that have been noted by Earp and/or Colson that contain no more than *echoes* of words or ideas found in Isaiah (but are not citations) have not been identified by Philo in this manner.

Citations found in Haftarat

1. Isa. 1:9 (I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 2.43) <i>'by some prophet who was a disciple and friend of Moses'</i> <sup>22</sup>	MT: חֲבֵרֵי יְיָ צְבָאוֹת הוֹתִיר לָנוּ שְׂרִיד כְּמַעֲט כֶּסֶדֶם הֵיוּ לְעַמְרָה דְּמִינוּ <sup>21</sup> In all the current rites the verse is found in the <i>Haftarah</i> to <i>Shabbat Hazon</i> which is the Sabbath immediately preceding the <i>9th of Av</i> (Deut. 1:1–3:22 / Isa. 1:1–27; Yem. adds v. 31) <sup>23</sup>
---	--

<sup>20</sup> Since he did not survey the *Quaestiones*, Earp has not noted the passages in *QG* and *QE*. Though I have found them on my own, they are listed by Helmut Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften bei Philon von Alexandrien* (Giessen/Basel 1988), particularly 132–149, which I saw only at the close of my research, in which I have been engaged for many years.

<sup>21</sup> The English translation of the reference from the Armenian is: "If Almighty God had not left us a seed, we should have become like the blind and barren' ... And blindness and barrenness are called in the ancestral language of the Chaldeans, Sodom and Gomorrah." But since the Greek original of *QG* has not survived, one cannot really compare this with the MT and the Septuagint: *καὶ μὴ κύστος σαβαωθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὀμώθημεν.*

<sup>22</sup> This locution will be referred to and discussed in both the next and the final chapter.

<sup>23</sup> In BT Megilla 31a it is mentioned as the *Haftarah* recited when *Rosh Hodesh Av* falls on a Shabbat.



2. Isa. 50:4 (IV <i>Her.</i> 25) 'prophesied to me'	אד' יי נתן לי לשון למודים לדעת לעות את יעף דבר Found in the <i>Haftarah</i> reading to <i>Parashat Ekev</i> which is the second of the 'Sabbaths of Consolation' (after the 9th of Av) in all rites (= Deut. 7:12–11:25 / Isa. 49:14–51:3).
3. Isa. 51:2 (I Suppl. <i>QG</i> II 26) 'the prophet has said somewhere'	הביטו אל אברהם אביכם ואל שרה תחוללכם כי אחד קראתיו This verse too, is found in the <i>Haftarah</i> reading to <i>Parashat Ekev</i> (Deut. 7:12–11:25 / Isa. 49:14–51:3).
4. Isa. 57:21 (not <i>id.</i> 48:22) <sup>24</sup> (V <i>Mut.</i> 169) 'the orations of the prophets proclaim'	57:21 = אין שלום אמר אלהי לרשעים This verse is found in the <i>Haftarah</i> reading for the morning of the <i>Day of Atonement</i> in all rites (Isa. 57:14 – 58:14).

#### Citation not found in any current *Haftarah*

5. Isa. 5:7 (V <i>Somm.</i> 2.172 ff.) 'the witness of one of the ancient prophets, who under inspiration said'	כרם ה' צבאות בית ישראל The verse is part of the "Song of the Vineyard" = שירת הכרם that begins: אשריה נא לידידי שירת דודי לכרמו וכו'. It is NOT FOUND in any of the presently customary <i>Haftarot</i> . <sup>25</sup>
--	--

#### Possible allusions and mistaken identifications

1. Isa. 6:9 (I <i>Leg. All.</i> 2.69)	שמעו שמוע ואל תבינו וראו ראה ואל תדעו (Earp notes this, but Philo's statement is hardly even an echo of the verse from Isaiah) <sup>26</sup>
--	---

<sup>24</sup> The reason why I identify this citation with Isa. 57:21 rather than with Isa. 48:22 (suggested by Earp's Index in vol. X and Colson in PLCL *ad loc.*) is explained below *ad loc.* in Chapter Four.

<sup>25</sup> In Chapter Four, I suggest that this may have also once been a *Haftarah* and that it was later omitted because of the central place that it came to have in the Christian polemic against Judaism. See the lengthy discussion there.

2. Isa. 11:6–9 (VIII <i>Praem.</i> 87) (not identified as a citation)	וגר זאב עם כבש ונמר ומרי יהדיו  Though Philo does not identify this allusion as a citation, in any event Isaiah 10:32 – 12:6 (in which 11:6–9 is found) is the <i>Haftarah</i> reading for the 8th day of Passover (in the Diaspora) in all rites. <sup>27</sup>
3. Isa. 48:22 (V <i>Mut.</i> 169)  <i>‘it is celebrated in prophetic speech’</i> <sup>29</sup>	אין שלום אמר ה' לרשעים  Mistaken identification <sup>28</sup>
4. Isa. 54:1 (VIII <i>Praem.</i> 158–159) <i>‘says the prophet’</i>	רני עקרה לא ילדה ... רבים בני שוממה ...  Colson cites this verse from Isaiah as the relevant parallel to Philo <i>ad loc.</i> : “For she that is desolate” (ἡ γὰρ ἔρημος), <i>says the prophet</i> (φησιν ὁ προφήτης) “will have children many and fine” (εὐτεκνος τε καὶ πολύπαις). But see I Sam. 2:5 <i>עד עקרה ילדה שבעה</i> (“Yea the barren hath borne seven ...”), which is found in the <i>Haftarah</i> to Rosh Hashanah. <sup>30</sup>
5. Isa. 66:1 (IV <i>Conf.</i> 98) (not identified as a citation)	השמים כסאי והארץ הדום רגלי  May perhaps be an association with the opening verse of the <i>Haftarah</i> customary in all rites when <i>Shabbat</i> and <i>Rosh Hodesh</i> come together (Isa. 66:1–24). <sup>31</sup>

<sup>26</sup> See discussion *ad loc.* in Chapter Four.

<sup>27</sup> Since the vision of an idyllic future when animals will no longer harm either each other, or mankind, was a common *topos* in the ancient world, this is probably no more than an echo of this *Haftarah*. For discussion, *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>28</sup> See discussion, *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>29</sup> ἐν προφητικαῖς ᾄδεται γήσσει. See *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>30</sup> See discussion, *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>31</sup> Philo writes here: IV *Conf.* 98, “But when he (Moses, i.e. in the Pentateuch) speaks of the world of our senses as *God’s footstool* (ὑποπόδιον θεοῦ) (*cf.* Isa. 66:1), it is for these reasons...” See lengthy discussion *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

*Jeremiah*

There are three citations from Jeremiah: Jer. 2:13 (V *Fug.* 197), Jer. 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49–51), and Jer. 15:10 (IV *Conf.* 44). Two out of three of these citations appear in *Haftarot* for the three Sabbaths of Admonition.

Citations found in *Haftarot*

1. Jer. 2:13 (V <i>Fuga</i> 197) <i>'the mouth of the prophets'</i>	אותי עזבו מקור מים חיים לחצב להם בארות בארת ושברים אשר לא יכלו המים Found in the <i>Haftarah</i> to <i>Parashat Mas'ai</i> (Num. 33–36 / Jer. 2:4–28; 3:4) which is read on the second Sabbath of <i>Admonition</i> that precedes the 9th of Av. <sup>32</sup>
2. Jer. 3:4 (II <i>Cher.</i> 49) <i>'the prophet Jeremiah'</i>	הלא מעתה קראת(י) לי, אבי, אלוף נעורי אתה This is the closing verse (added) to the Ashkenazi <i>Haftarah</i> to <i>Parashat Mas'ai</i> —which, as has just been noted, is the reading common to the Ashke- nazi, Sephardi and Yemenite rites for the second Sabbath of <i>Admonition</i> , which precedes the 9th of Av. <sup>33</sup>

Citation not found in *Haftarot*

3. Jer. 15:10 (IV <i>Conf.</i> 44)  <i>'a member of the prophetic circle'</i>	אוי לי אמי כי ילדתי איש ריב ואיש מדון לכל הארץ לא נשיתי ולא נשו בי כלה מקללוני NOT FOUND in any of the customary <i>Haftarot</i> . <sup>34</sup>
--	--

<sup>32</sup> Philo's citation follows the reading in the Septuagint almost exactly (which differs slightly from the MT): ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγήν ζωῆς, καὶ ὄρουσαν ἑαυτοῖς λάγκους συντετρομμένους, οἳ οὐ δύνησονται ὑδῶρ συνέχειν. See discussion *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>33</sup> See *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>34</sup> See *ibid.*, *ad loc.*, and also final chapter.

## Possible Allusion

---

4. Jer. 2:3 (VIII <i>Spec.</i> 4:180) 'as Moses tells us'	קדש ישראל לה' ראשית תבואתה An echo of Jer. 2:3 is found in the <i>Haftarah</i> now customary for the Sabbath after the 17th of Tammuz (Jer. 1:1–2:3), but see discussion to Isa. 5:7. <sup>35</sup> Philo's allusion is actually an echo of Deut. 32:9 (found in <i>Ha'azinu</i> = the Torah portion for <i>Shabbat Shuva</i> , the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur).
---	---

---

*The Minor Prophets**Hosea*

## Citations found in Haftarat

All three references to Hosea in Philo's writings are found in the same *Haftarah* reading—that for *Shabbat Shuva* (Hos. 14:2–10), *viz.* the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur (The Day of Atonement), so called because of the *Haftarah's* *incipit*: *Shuva Yisrael* in all present rites. They are all introduced by some variation of the formula: "a prophet says"—*viz.* III *Plant.* 138: 'the oracle given by one of the prophets,' V *Mut.* 139ff.: 'as an oracle given by a prophet's mouth,' and Suppl. II *QE* II 76: 'as some prophet says.' And this is also the *Haftarah* for *Mincha* (the afternoon prayer) on the 9th of Av, in the Sephardi, Yemenite, and Italian rites.

---

1. Hos. 14:6 <sup>36</sup> (II Suppl. <i>QE</i> II 76) 'some prophet says'	יפרה כשושנה Found in the <i>Haftarah</i> reading to <i>Shabbat Shuva</i> = Hos. 14:2–10 (recited between Rosh Hashanah and The Day of Atonement) in all current rites.
--	---

---

<sup>35</sup> See *ibid.*, *ad loc.*

<sup>36</sup> The correct verse is Hos. 14:6 (and not verse 5 as Marcus has mistakenly noted in PLCL, *ad loc.*).

---

2.	Hos. 14:9–10 (III <i>Plant.</i> 138) <i>‘the oracle given by one of the prophets’</i>	ממני פריך נמצא. (9) מי חכם ויבן אלה, נבון וידעם (10) Same as the preceding entry
3.	Hos. 14:9–10 (V <i>Mut.</i> 139) <i>‘an oracle given by a prophet’s mouth’</i>	Same as the preceding entry

---

### *Zechariah*

Citation is not found in any current Haftarah

1.	Zech. 6:12 (IV <i>Conf.</i> 62) <i>‘an oracle from the lips of one of the disciples of Moses’</i>	הנה איש, צמח שמו NOT FOUND in any of the customary <i>Haftarot</i> . <sup>37</sup>
----	---	---

### *Chart II: References to the Latter Prophets in the order of their appearance in Philo’s oeuvre*

(The chart lists the Philonic passages *according to the order of their appearance in Philo* in the Loeb edition. The citations from *Haftarot* other than those belonging to the Cycle are placed in square brackets [ ]. The two scriptural citations from the Latter Prophets *not found in any Haftarah* current today are bracketed thus: { }, and bear the notation “NO” next to them.)<sup>38</sup>

### *Latter Prophets*

II <i>Cher.</i> 49 (Jer. 3:4)	The second week of Admonition
III <i>Plant.</i> 138 (Hos.14:9–10)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>
{IV <i>Conf.</i> 44 (Jer. 15:10)	NO}
[IV <i>Conf.</i> 62 (Zech. 6:12)	[in <i>triennial</i> to Lev. 5:1 ff.]

<sup>37</sup> This citation is treated both in the next and in the final chapter.

<sup>38</sup> All of the bracketed references, [ ] and { }, will be discussed in Chapter Four, where it is seen that even several of these citations from the Latter Prophets are echoes of *Haftarah* readings.

IV <i>Quis Rer.</i> 25 (Isa. 50:4)	The second week of Consolation
V <i>Fuga</i> 197 (Jer. 2:13)	The second week of Admonition
V <i>Mut.</i> 139 (Hos.14:9–10)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>
V <i>Mut.</i> 169 (Isa. 57:21)	Day of Atonement
{V <i>Somm.</i> 2.172 ff. (Isa. 5:7)	NO} <sup>39</sup>
I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 2.26 (Isa. 51:2)	The second week of Consolation
I Suppl. <i>QE</i> 2.43 (Isa. 1:9)	<i>Shabbat Hazon</i>
II Suppl. <i>QE</i> 2.76 (Hos. 14:6)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>

## Possible allusion

- [IV Conf. 98 (Isa. 66:1) (in *Haftarah* to *Shabbat* and *Rosh Hodesh*)]  
 [VIII *Praem.* 87 (Isa. 11:6–9) (in *Haftarah* to 8th day of Passover in the Diaspora)]

## Mistaken identifications

- VIII *Praem.* 158–159 (Isa. 54:1)<sup>40</sup>  
 VIII *Spec.* 4:180 (Jer. 2:3)<sup>41</sup>

## Citations from the Former Prophets in a Haftarah: ISam. 1:1–2:5

III <i>Quod Deus</i> 5–15 (ISam.1:11, 2:5)	first day of <i>Rosh Hashanah</i>
III <i>Ebr.</i> 143–152 (ISam.1:11,14,15)	first day of <i>Rosh Hashanah</i>
V <i>Mut.</i> 143 (ISam. 2:5)	first day of <i>Rosh Hashanah</i>
V <i>Somm.</i> 1.254 (ISam. 1:11)	first day of <i>Rosh Hashanah</i>
VIII <i>Praem.</i> 158–159 (ISam. 2:5)	first day of <i>Rosh Hashanah</i>

*Summing up*

It is certainly striking that the overwhelming majority of Philo's citations from the Latter Prophets are found in one or another of the *Haftarah* belonging to the 'Admonition, Consolation and Repentance' *Haftarah*

<sup>39</sup> See discussion *ad loc.* in the next chapter.

<sup>40</sup> While at first sight this seems to be an allusion to the *Haftarah* to the fifth week of Consolation (in the cycle current today), it is in any event not a citation, but at most an allusion that is far more likely to reflect ISam. 2:5: "Yea the barren hath borne seven ..." See discussion in Chapter Four, *ad loc.*

<sup>41</sup> As will be shown in Chapter Four, the echo is far more likely to have been of Deut. 32:9. Also, even though Jer. 2:3 is found in the *Haftarah* now customary for the Sabbath following the 17th of Tammuz, the *Haftarah* may very well have been from Isaiah in Philo's day. See also discussion *ibid.* to Isa. 5:7.

*tarah* cycle. For of the all-told twelve different citations from the Latter Prophets in Philo's *oeuvre*, at least nine are found in one or another of the *Haftarot* of the *Haftarah* cycle that begins with the 17th of Tammuz and ends after Yom Kippur.

As will be seen in the next chapter, even one of the remaining citations (Isa. 5:7) may also have been found in a *Haftarah* that was once customary, but replaced because of the part that this pericope came to play in the Jewish-Christian polemic. And citations from the *Haftarah* to the first day of Rosh Hashanah, ISam. 1:1–2:10 from the Former Prophets (not counted in the list of citations from the Latter Prophets), are also found in five different Philonic passages.<sup>42</sup>

In Philo's writings, there are citations from at least two out of three of the 'Haftarot of Admonition' (Jer. 2:13, 3:4; and perhaps even the third, Isa. 5:7), and there are two citations from the 'Haftarot of Consolation' (both of which are found in the *Haftarah* to *Parashat Ekev*: Isa. 50:4 and 51:2). And as will be seen in the next chapter, the original custom may well have been a return to the regular *Haftarot*, beginning with the fourth *Parashah*.<sup>43</sup>

Apparently, *all* of the 'Haftarot of Repentance' are represented. There is a citation from the *Haftarah* for *the first day* of Rosh Hashanah, from that for *Shabbat Shuva*, and that for the morning of Yom Kippur. Hence it may well be significant that there is *no citation, or even allusion*, in Philo's works to a citation from a *Haftarah* for the second day of Rosh Hashanah, which is observed today even in Israel where the second (Diaspora) day of the other holidays is not. The biblical injunction mentions only one day (Lev. 23:24, Num. 29:1). Could this be an indication that it was not observed in Alexandria at the time of Philo?<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> And even though not all of the possible allusions (not citations) are likely to have been a reality, it remains worth observing that even some of these are found in what today are *Haftarot*— though not necessarily from this cycle. This probably reflects the popularity of these passages. Isa. 11:6–9 is in the *Haftarah* that is recited on the 8th day of Passover (in the Diaspora), Isa. 54:1 (VIII *Praem.* 158–159) is found in the *Haftarah* of what today is the 5th of the 'Sabbaths of Consolation' (except for the Italian rite), Isa. 66:1 (IV *Conf.* 98) is found in the *Haftarah* when Shabbat and *Rosh Hodesh* coincide, and Jer. 2:3 (VIII *Spec.* 4.180) is also found in the first of the three *Haftarot* preceding the 9th of Av as recited today.

<sup>43</sup> See Endnote B: Philo and the contemporary Italian Rite. Although Colson (*ad loc.*) identifies an allusion to Isa. 54:1 in VIII *Praem.* 157–158, which would make this an echo of the *Haftarah* to the fifth Sabbath of Consolation, the allusion there is actually an echo of ISam. 2:5 that is found in the *Haftarah* to Rosh Hashanah—See Chapter Four, *ad loc.*

<sup>44</sup> The celebration of a second day for Rosh Hashanah is distinct from the second

Be that as it may, such an overwhelming degree of correlation between the verses quoted by Philo and the *Haftarot* between the 17th of Tammuz till after the Day of Atonement, which placed the historical memory of the trauma of the destruction of the First Temple<sup>45</sup> as an integral part of the call to repentance, cannot but be significant. Can there remain any doubt about the existence of at least the beginnings of this cycle of *Haftarot* long before the destruction of the Second Temple?

---

day of the Diaspora in connection with the other holidays. We have no way of knowing what the actual practice was in Alexandria, or even in the Land of Israel in Philo's day. Hence, even though this is hardly hard evidence for one day, it is nevertheless a valuable beginning. The Talmud informs us that the receipt by the Sanhedrin of witnesses who had seen the new moon determined the date of the holiday. Obviously, the determination of the first day of the month was particularly acute for Rosh Hashanah, since it falls on the *first* day of the seventh month. The Rabbinic sources respecting the second day of Rosh Hashana (BT *Eruvin* 39ff. and JT, end of Chapter Three) are less than clear as to what actually happened in Philo's day, even in Judea. One can hardly suppose that there was no calendar for practical purposes. This is evident even from Neh. 7:72–8:2. May I suggest that what may have been involved was a formal liturgical matter that was preserved and followed as long as it was possible to do so.

<sup>45</sup> Zech. 7:5 mentions the fasts of the fifth and seventh months, those commemorating the destruction of the First Temple and the assassination of Gedaliah, son of Ahikam, whom the king of Babylon had appointed to rule Judea immediately after the destruction of the Temple and the exile of King Yehoyahin of the House of David. Zech. 8:19 refers to the fasts of the 4th, 5th, 7th, and 10th months (the 17th of Tammuz, the 9–10th of Av, Tishre [Fast of Gedaliah], and the 10th of Teveth respectively). See also Jer. 52:4–14; 40:1–3, as well as the parallel in II Kings 25.





## CHAPTER FOUR

### CITATIONS FROM THE LATTER PROPHETS

The previous chapter was devoted primarily to the presentation of the striking congruence between the specific prophetic passages quoted by Philo and the *Haftarah* Cycle which takes place between the 17th of Tammuz and the Day of Atonement. As I have already mentioned, it was this discovery that served as the catalyst for my study of the remaining non-pentateuchal scriptural references in Philo.

The present chapter is devoted to understanding, in as much depth as I can, each of Philo's citations from the Latter Prophets, including those already discussed in Chapter Three: A Traditional *Haftarah* Cycle. I began to do this because I felt that I would be able to significantly buttress the hypothesis that the congruence between Philo's citations from the Latter Prophets and these *Haftarot* was more than mere chance if I could account for *all*, or at the very least, almost all, of Philo's rare references to the Prophets. In the event, I think that the results by themselves are not less important.

Even though, as will be seen as we proceed, some of the references listed by Colson and Earp turn out to be cases of mistaken identification, I have included *all* of the instances that have been considered by scholarship to stem from the Latter Prophets, since this had to be proven in each instance. They are organized according to the order of their appearance in Scripture, as this greatly facilitates reference to the material. In this chapter, what has until now been stated dogmatically is explained and clarified.

While I have endeavored to keep repetitions to a minimum, at the same time, in the interest of placing before the reader as complete a picture as possible at a glance, I have not been able to avoid repeating some of what has already been discussed in Chapter Three: A Traditional *Haftarah* Cycle.

*Isaiah*

Four out of the five certain citations from Isaiah are found in one of the special *Haftarot* of ‘Admonition, Consolation, and Repentance’ recited between the 17th of Tammuz and Yom Kippur (The Day of Atonement). It is suggested that the fifth (Isa. 5:7) may also very well have once been a *Haftarah* that was later omitted because of the use that was made of it by the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Several of the *Haftarot* reflected by the non-pentateuchal citations in Philo are referred to in the *locus classicus* of the discussion of this subject in the Talmud: BT Megillah 31a–32b.<sup>2</sup> Mentioned there are *inter alia* the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Hazon* (the Sabbath preceding the 9th of Av) that contains Isa. 1:9, Isa. 57:21 is part of the *Haftarah* to the Day of Atonement, Isa. 66:1 when a *Rosh Hodesh* falls on a Sabbath, and also ISam.1:1–2:5 (Hannah) the *Haftarah* to Rosh Hashanah. This further supports the hypothesis that the major source for Philo’s references to the Latter Prophets was the *Haftarah* readings for these special Sabbaths.

All of the certain citations are identified by Philo as coming ‘from one of the prophets’ *et sim.*: I Suppl. *QG* 2.43 (Isa. 1:9) = ‘by some prophet who was a disciple and friend of Moses’; V *Somn.* 2.172 ff. (Isa. 5:7) = ‘the witness of one of the ancient prophets, who under inspiration said’; IV *Quis Rerum* 25 (Isa. 50:4) = ‘prophesied to me’;<sup>3</sup> I Suppl. *QG* 2.26 (Isa. 51:2) = ‘the prophet has said somewhere’; V *Mut.* 169 (Isa. 57:21) = ‘the orations of the prophets

---

<sup>1</sup> I found that even the possible allusions to verses from Isaiah call special *Haftarot* to mind.

<sup>2</sup> Proof that the verses listed in BT Megillah 31a–b to identify the *Haftarot* are not meant to indicate their *incipit*, but the *significant verse which typically connects the Haftarah reading with the occasion*, is that the *Haftarah* that is to be read on the Sabbath when the new moon and the Sabbath coincide is identified as Isa. 66:23: והיה מדי הרש בהדרשׁו. Since this is the next to last verse not only of chapter 66, but also of the entire Book of Isaiah, it could not possibly indicate the beginning of the *Haftarah*, and must be an allusion to the associative verse. Similarly, the *Haftarah* to Rosh Hashanah is identified there simply as: ומפטירין בהנה. The evidence from the Babylonian Talmud is valuable as additional, relatively early evidence, even while the *Pesikta de Rav Kahana* is almost certainly earlier, and composed in Palestine. And further the *Tosafists* (who are from the Late Middle Ages), *ad loc.* in BT Megilla 31b state that they follow the custom of the *Pesikta*.

<sup>3</sup> I have noted below, *ad loc.* that this is obscured in the English of the Loeb edition, where θεσπιζω, which of course means ‘prophesy,’ is rendered as “For Thou hast vouchsafed to bid me.”

*proclaim.*<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, the Philonic passages that at most contain echoes of *Haftarot* generally do not explicitly refer to the allusion as a reference from a prophet.<sup>5</sup> These echoes were probably so familiar that the association may not always have been entirely conscious on Philo's part. Noteworthy also is the fact that both in IV *Quis Rerum* 25 (Isa. 50:4) as well as in V *Mut.* 169 (Isa. 57:21) it is clear that Philo is following the Septuagint and not the MT.

Isa. 1:9 (I Suppl. *QG* 2.43)

NOTE: Isa. 1:9 opens the current *Haftarah* reading to *Shabbat Hazon* (the Sabbath of Admonition immediately preceding the 9th of Av) (Deut. 1:1–3:22 / Isa. 1:1–27; Yem. 1:1–31.)

(43) ...Wherefore the following statement *was given as law*<sup>6</sup> by some prophet who was a disciple and friend of Moses: "If Almighty God<sup>7</sup> had not left us a seed, we should have become like the blind and barren," (cf. Isa. 1:9) so as not to know the good and not be able to beget offspring. And blindness and barrenness are called in the ancestral language of the Chaldeans, 'Sodom' and 'Gomorrhah.'<sup>8</sup>

Since what we have here is the Armenian translation of the Greek original, circumspection is in order regarding the placing of too much weight upon stylistic matters in this passage. The only thing that seems certain is that Isa. 1:9 is indeed quoted here.

I nevertheless juxtapose what is quoted here in the name of Philo with the Septuagint, the MT, and KJV. Here in Philo the citation from Isa. 1:9 is given according to the connotation of its *peshat*,<sup>9</sup> which is brought immediately after the verse itself.

<sup>4</sup> The reason why this verse is to be preferred over Isa. 48:22 (suggested by Earp and Colson) is explained below in the discussion to that section.

<sup>5</sup> The only probable exception to this of which I am aware is VIII *Praem.* 158–159, where ISam. 1:1–2:10 (rather than Isa. 54:1) is introduced by the words "says the prophet."

<sup>6</sup> For the sake of convenience I have preserved Ralph Marcus' translation of the Armenian in PLCL. At the same time, note that PLCL I Suppl., 122 n. b (*ad loc.*) reads: ὁδε ὁ λόγος ἐνομοθετήθη, and I am convinced that a more appropriate rendering is "the Torah ordains that."

<sup>7</sup> See Endnote A: *Pantokrator* (παντοκράτορος) and *Lord of Hosts* (κύριος σαβαωθ) (comment to Isa. 1:9 in I Suppl. *QG* 2.43, and Isa. 5:7 in V *Somm.* 2.172 ff.).

<sup>8</sup> Marcus notes *ad loc.*, 122, n. g, that the idea that Sodom means blinding is repeated in V *Somm.* 2:191–192, where Deut. 22:32–33 is the biblical reference.

<sup>9</sup> See *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Two/2 section 7), 65–71, where it is shown that although it is often assumed otherwise, neither the rabbinic term *peshat* (פֶּשֶׁט) nor the

Philo (English rendition of Armenian): If Almighty God had not left us a seed, we should have become like the blind and barren.

Septuagint: καὶ μὴ κύριος σαβαωθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα, ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν καὶ ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὠμώθημεν.

MT: לולי יי צבאות הותיר לני שריד כמעט כסדם היינו לעמרה דמינו

KJV: Except the Lord of hosts<sup>10</sup> had left unto us a very small remnant, we should have been as Sodom, and we should have been like unto Gomorrah.

The translation: “the following statement *was given as law* by some prophet who was a disciple and friend of Moses” is apparently a free rendering of something. For prophets other than Moses do not deliver laws, either in Scripture, in Philo’s works, or in rabbinic tradition. And besides, while a prophet could of course be a ‘disciple’ of Moses, he could not possibly be a ‘friend’ of his. This cannot possibly be a literal translation. A ‘disciple’ yes, but not a ‘friend.’ The locution, ‘a disciple of Moses’ will be discussed in the final chapter.

Isa. 5:7 (V *Somm.* 2.172 ff.)

NOTE: It is NOT FOUND in any of the current *Haftarot*

XXVI (172) This vine of which we could take but a part, men aptly liken to gladness, and in this I have *the witness of one of the ancient prophets, who under inspiration said*: “The vineyard of the Lord Almighty is the house of Israel (ἀμπελῶν κυρίου παντοκράτορος οἴκος τοῦ Ἰσραήλ)” (Isa. 5:7).<sup>11</sup>

Philo cites the verse verbatim, except that like in Isa. 1:9 (just discussed), here too he has substituted the Greek word παντοκράτορος (*Pantokratoros*) for the Septuagint’s transliteration of: צבאות ה' Κύριος Σαβαωθ (*Kurios Sabaoth*).

---

Greek τὸ ὀνόματι mean ‘literal meaning.’ Their connotation is a ‘traditional rendition’—which is sometimes quite different. Perhaps the most famous example is the rabbinic *peshat* (understanding) of the Biblical statement: “eye for an eye” (Ex. 21:24 and Lev. 24:20), which is understood by the Rabbis as “the *monetary value* of an eye for an eye.” See e. g. Raphael Loewe, “The ‘Plain’ Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis,” *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies in London* I (1964), 140–185, (particularly 158ff. and 181–182).

<sup>10</sup> See Endnote A: *Pantokrator* (Παντοκράτορος) and *Lord of Hosts* (Κύριος Σαβαωθ), *op.cit.*

<sup>11</sup> MT: כרם יי צבאות בית ישראל

Isa. 5:7, which Philo introduces by the words: *the witness of one of the ancient prophets, who under inspiration said*, is very often quoted in rabbinic midrash in the same connotation as here—to metaphorically identify Israel with the vine. This use of the verse was apparently common knowledge—like the equation of water with Torah discussed below.<sup>12</sup> Though there are over two dozen instances of this use in rabbinic midrash, a single example will I think suffice to illustrate what I have in mind. Exodus Rabbah (Vilna), *Parashah* 34 *incipit*: **ג. ד' א' ועשו**.

The Holy One Blessed be He said to Israel, “You are my flock and I your shepherd,” as it is said (Ps. 80:2), “Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel” ... “You are a vineyard,” as it is said (Isa. 5:7). “For the vineyard of the Lord of Hosts is the house of Israel.”

אמר הקב"ה לישראל אתם צאני ואני רועה... שנאמר (תהלים פ:ב) רועה ישראל האזינה... אתם כרם, שנא' (ישעיה ה) כי כרם ה' צנאות בית ישראל...

This verse (Isa. 5:7) is part of the Parable of the Vineyard, which is paraphrased in Mk. 12:1 ff.<sup>13</sup>

Mk. 12:1–9: A certain man planted a vineyard and set a hedge about it...  
(9) What shall therefore the lord of the vineyard do? He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.

While Scripture, and the Prophets in particular, are often quoted and/or alluded to in the NT,<sup>14</sup> this parable achieved a particularly prominent place in Christian supercessionism. Joel Marcus, in his article entitled, “The Intertextual Polemic of the Markan Vineyard Parable,”<sup>15</sup> suggests that this occurred in the traumatic aftermath of the destruction of the Temple (216–217). And he writes further, “the ‘Markan Parable of the Vineyard’ is a thoroughly polemical *re-reading* (italics mine) of the Isaian vineyard song which inverts the standard Jewish understanding of the

<sup>12</sup> See below, to Jer. 2:13 (V *Fuga* 197).

<sup>13</sup> There are parallels to this in Matt. (21:33 ff.) and Luke (20:9 ff.).

<sup>14</sup> A study of the citations from the Prophets in the NT upon the backdrop of the *Haftarot* may be instructive. As a start, note that that Isa. 1:9 (found in the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Hazon* and in Philo: ISuppl. *QG* 2.43) is quoted in Ro. 9:29. Citations from Isa. 40:1 ff., the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Nahamu* (The Sabbath of Consolation), though not found in Philo, are found in Matt. 3:1, Mk. 1:3, Luke 3:4, and 1 Pet. 1:24–25. These are merely two random examples, pointing to a familiarity with the traditional *Haftarah* in broad circles in Judea.

<sup>15</sup> It appeared in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa (Cambridge 1998), 210–227 [= Marcus, Joel, “Markan Vineyard Parable” 1998], and in more detail, idem, “The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark,” *JBL* 111 (1992), 441–462 [= Marcus, “The Jewish War” *JBL* 111 (1992)].

scriptural passage...” (p. 221), and shortly thereafter, he continues in the same vein that “the reuse of Isaiah 5 in Mark 12, then illustrates how highly charged the inheritance dispute between Jews and Christians became in the first century.”

Thus, already in the days of the Sanhedrin at Yavneh, it came to be used in Christian polemic in support of the argument that the *Ecclesia*, the Church, had replaced *Knesseth Yisrael* (the congregation of Israel). In view of this, perhaps one ought not rule out the possibility that, like Philo’s other citations from the Prophets, the citation from the ‘Parable of the Vineyard’ had also once been found in a customary *Haftarah*, but was at a later time replaced by a different one, because of its prominence in the *Verus Israel* polemic.

Such a hypothetical chain of events is similar to what happened respecting the daily recitation of the Decalogue, which used to be part of the *Shema* lection. The discontinuance of the daily recitation of the Decalogue in the context of the Judeo-Christian polemic is recorded in BT Berakhot 12a, where it is explained as having occurred **מפני תרעומת המינים**.<sup>16</sup> Had the Talmud not related this, we would have been hard put to explain the appearance of the Decalogue in the Qumran phylacteries when they were discovered.<sup>17</sup>

Isa. 6:9 (I *Leg. All.* 2:69)

NOTE: The identification is mistaken, for there is no real parallel.

(69) Do you not observe that the mind which thinks that it exercises itself, is often found to be without mental power... There are times when seeing we see not and hearing hear not, whenever the mind, breaking off its attention for a moment, is brought to bear on some other mental object.

<sup>16</sup> The other Talmudic reference, Mishnah Tamid 5:1, refers explicitly to activity in the Temple, not to prayer activity elsewhere. Meir Bar-Ilan, “Are Tamid and Middoth Polemical Tractates?” (Hebrew) = [“האם מסכתות תמיד ומדותהן תעודות פולמוסיות?”], *Sidra* (1989), 27–40, has argued for an early date for the tractate, on the grounds that he finds it to be a polemic against the Qumran *halakha*.

<sup>17</sup> It, as well as other additional sections from the Pentateuch, are found there together with the *Shema* and the other passages found in our *Tefillin* (Phylacteries). See Yiga’el Yadin, “Tefillin (Phylacteries) from Qumran [XQ Phyl 1–4]” (Hebrew and English; Jerusalem 1969) (translated from an article in *Eretz-Israel* Vol. 9, *The W.F. Albright Volume*, 60–83).

Earp, in his index, identifies this with Isa. 6:9, in my view mistakenly. For we read there:

(9) ויאמר, לך ואמרת לעם הזה: שמעו שמוע ואל תבינו, וראו ראו ואל תדעו.  
(10) השמן לב העם הזה, ואזניו הכבד, ועיניו השע פן יראה בעיניו ובאזניו ישמע  
ולבבו יבין ושב ורפא לו.

KJV: (9) And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not.<sup>18</sup> (10) Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and return,<sup>19</sup> and be healed.

Although they both refer to ‘seeing—not seeing,’ and ‘hearing—not hearing,’ the two contexts are entirely different. The statement in Philo is no more than a psychological commonplace.

Isa. 11:6–9 (VIII *Praem.* 87): WOLF AND LAMB (Echo?)

NOTE: Isa. 10:32 – 12:6 (in which 11:6–9 is found) is the *Haftarah* reading for the 8th day of Passover (in the Diaspora) in all rites. We do not know whether the second day of the holidays was kept in the Alexandrian Diaspora in Philo’s day.

(87) For this is the one war where no quarter or truce is possible, *as wolves to sheep* (ὡς λύκοις πρὸς ἄρνες), so *all wild beasts both on land and water are at war with all men*. ... (88) Would that ... we might be able to see that day when *savage creatures become tame and gentle* (ἐν ᾧ χειροσθήθη ποτὲ γενήσεται τὰ ἀτίθασα)... (89) When that time comes I believe that “*bears and lions and panthers ... and tigers ... will change their life ... show themselves tame.*”

Colson, in his footnote *ad loc.* associates this with Isa. 11:6–9. True, it immediately calls to mind Isa. 11:6–9:<sup>20</sup>

And the wolf shall dwell with the lamb (λύκος μετὰ ἄρνος), and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them... (= MT: וגר זאב עם כבש ונמר ומרי יהדיי)

<sup>18</sup> JPS: “And He said, ‘Go and tell this people: Be ever hearing, but never understanding; be ever seeing, but never perceiving...’”

<sup>19</sup> So JPS. KJV = ‘convert.’

<sup>20</sup> So Colson, note a, *ad loc.*, in PLCL VIII, 364–365, and endnote 455–456 where he also mentions Hos. 2:18: “I will make for them in that day a covenant with the wild beasts of the field, and the birds of heaven, and the reptiles of the earth...,” and Job: 5:23, “the savage beasts shall be at peace with them” (*viz.* with the righteous). Note also Heinemann’s reference to the *Sibylline Oracles* III 788.



However, Philo does not identify this as a citation (which he almost always does when he quotes from the Latter Prophets). Nor is the echo necessarily a conscious one, and in any event, it almost certainly was not the only appropriate association. In spite of the similarities, I very much doubt that this was Philo's major association. For a vision of an idyllic future when natural enmities will cease and animals will no longer harm either each other or humanity was a common *topos* in the ancient world. See for example, Aristophanes' *Peace* 1075:

It does not please the blessed gods that we should stop the war *until the wolf uniteth with the sheep* (πρὶν λύκος οἶν ἕμεναυτοῖ).

One immediately thinks of the well-known similarities between Virgil's *Fourth Eclogue* and Isa. 11:6–9—both of which contain the vision of the birth of a messianic child who will usher in a golden age of peace together with the idea that in the idyllic future animals will live at peace with each other.<sup>21</sup> And even in the *Eclogue* itself these are not the only examples; cf. line 22: *nec magnos metuent armenta leones* (“herds will not fear huge lions”).

The mention in Virgil's *Georgics* 2:151 ff. of the absence of lions and tigers, *at rabidae tigres absunt et saeva leonum semina*, reminds one of Philo's dream of the change in the nature of “bears and lions and panthers ... and tigers,” etc. which is found only two sections after this in VIII *Praem.* § 89. Further, mention may also be made of such classic authors as Theocritus, *Herakl. (Buc.)* 86 ff. (4th cent. BCE), who juxtaposes a wolf and a deer, and Horace's *Epodes* 16:51 ff. (1st cent. BCE) that also contains the motive of the absence of wild animals.

In view of all this I think that it is clear that the similarity between Philo and this passage in Isaiah, the image of ‘wolf and sheep’ living in harmony, and the members of the animal world as no longer at strife with one another, are expressions of the proverbial dream for a messianic future. This messianic dream was apparently a part of the *Zeitgeist*—a dream common both to Philo's Jewish and to his Hellenistic cultural heritage.

One last word respecting the pseudepigraphic ‘Jewish’ Sibylline Oracles that circulated in the Jewish community in Philo's day and that also contain this image. For we read in III 788 ff.:

(788) Wolves and lambs will eat grass together in the mountains.  
(789) Leopards will feed together with kids.

<sup>21</sup> See Eduard Norden, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Stuttgart 1958, first ed. 1924), 51–52.

- (790) Roving bears will spend the night together with calves.  
 (792) ...and mere infant children will lead them.

These same images are clearly found here, but I doubt very much whether this had any impact on Philo. For while the influence of Hellenistic-Roman literature and philosophy are very much in evidence in Philo's writings, as is that of philosophical mysticism, the same can hardly be said for apocalyptic thought. I can think of no Philonic passage that has even the slightest whiff of the flavor of apocalyptic. The closest one gets to this is the last part of VIII *Praem.* But this is messianic, not apocalyptic. It is thus far more likely that the Sybilline Oracles and Philo reflect the same universal messianic dream—independently of each other.

Isa. 48:22 (V *Mut.* 169)

NOTE: This is a mistaken identification.

And to none of the wicked is rejoicing permitted, as indeed in *prophetic words it is chanted* (ἐν προφητικαῖς ᾄδεται ῥήσοι): “*Rejoicing is not for the impious, said God* (χαίρειν οὐκ ἔστι τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν, εἶπεν ὁ θεός)” (Isa. 57:21).

Why the citation here is a reference to Isa. 57:21 rather than to the almost identical Isa. 48:22 is explained below in the discussion *ad loc.* to Isa. 57:21.<sup>22</sup>

Isa. 50:4 (IV *Quis Rerum* 25)

NOTE: The verse is found in the *Haftarah* reading to *Parashat Ekev* (Deut. 7:12–11:25 / Isa. 49:14–51:3) in all rites. It is the second of the *Sabbaths of Consolation* (after the 9th of *Av*).

Thou hast *prophesied to me* (ἐθέσπισάς μοι), to have no fear. “Thou hast given me a tongue of instruction that I should know when to speak (σύ μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας ἔδωκας τοῦ γνῶναι ἡνίκα δεῖ φθέγγασθαι)” (Isa. 50:4).

<sup>22</sup> Respecting Isa. 48:22, Wacholder, in his Prolegomenon to the 1971 edition of Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (New York 1940), chart, lxvi–lxvii, speculates that Isa. 48:14ff. was the *Haftarah* to Deut. 30:11ff. in the triennial cycle—which in the annual cycle is part of the *Parashah* פָּרָשָׁה נַצְבִּימָה that immediately precedes Rosh Hashanah.

The verse quoted is introduced by ‘*prophesied to me*’ (ἐθέσπισάς μου), since the verb (θεσπίζω) means ‘to prophesy.’<sup>23</sup> Philo’s wording: γλῶσσαν παιδείας τοῦ γνῶναι is an only slightly paraphrased version of the Septuagint’s Isa. 50:4.<sup>24</sup> And even though Philo has replaced the Septuagint’s εἰπεῖν λόγον (MT דבר יהע) by φθέγξασθαι which gives a clearer meaning, a comparison of Philo’s citation with the relevant lemma of the MT and the Septuagint (which differ from each other here), shows Philo’s dependence upon the Septuagint.

Septuagint: δίδωσίν μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας // τοῦ γνῶναι... ἡνίκα δεῖ // εἰπεῖν λόγον.

Philo: σύ μοι γλῶσσαν παιδείας ἔδωκας//τοῦ γνῶναι ἡνίκα δεῖ // φθέγξασθαι.

MT: ... נתן לי לשון למודים לדעת לעות את-יע-דבר.

KJV: ...hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to *him that is weary*.

Isa. 51:2 (I *Suppl. QG* 2.26)

NOTE: This verse is also found in the *Haftarah* reading to *Parashat Ekev* (Deut. 7:12–11:25 / Isa. 49:14–51:3) in all rites. It is the second of the *Sabbaths of Consolation* (after the 9th of Av).

But when there is concord, one household is described, after one eldest person, and all (the others) depend on him like the branches which grow out of a tree, or like the fruits of a plant which do not fall off. And *the prophet has said somewhere*: “Look at Abraham your father and at Sarah who travelled with you,” which shows very clearly that there was only one root...

The citation is introduced by the words: *the prophet has said somewhere*. As is evident from the juxtaposition of the MT and the Septuagint, they are both close to Philo’s rendering, but again, it must be borne in mind that our text is no more than an English translation of an Armenian translation of the original Greek. In any event, following are the MT and the Septuagint.

<sup>23</sup> This is obscured in the English of the Loeb edition, where the word θεσπίζω is rendered as “For Thou hast vouchsafed to bid me.”

<sup>24</sup> Colson, in an endnote *ad loc.* (567), notes that this was first pointed out by J. Cohn.

MT: הביטו אל אברהם אביכם ואל שרה תחוללכם כי אחד קראתיו.

Septuagint: ἐμβλέψατε εἰς Ἀβραάμ τὸν πατέρα ὑμῶν καὶ εἰς Σαρῶν τὴν ὠδίνωουσάν ὑμᾶς. ὅτι εἶς ἦν...

KJV: Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bore you: for I called him alone...

Isa. 54:1 (VIII *Praem.* 157–159) (probably a mistaken allusion)

NOTE: Isa. 54:1–10 is the *Haftarah* reading to *Parashah Ki-Tetzei* (Deut. 21:10–25:19 / Isa. 54:1–10)—the fifth of the seven *Sabbaths of Consolation* (after the 9th of Av) according to the Ashkenazi, Sephardi and Yemenite rites, but *not* the Italian rite.<sup>25</sup> However, this is probably primarily an echo of ISam. 1:1–2:10, which is the *Haftarah* reading for the first day of Rosh Hashanah in all of the major rites.

(157) ...And when she [the land of Israel] looks around and sees none of the destroyers of her former pride and high name, sees her marketplaces ... full of tranquility, peace, and justice, she will renew her youth and bloom during *the festal seasons of the sacred sevens*...

(158) Then, like a fond mother she will pity the sons and daughters whom she has lost ... Young once more she will be fruitful and bear a blameless generation to redress the one that went before. “For she that is desolate (ἡ γὰρ ἔρημος),” *says the prophet* (φησὶν ὁ προφήτης), “will have children many and fine (εὐτεκνος τε καὶ πολύπαις)” (ISam. 2:5 rather than Isa. 54:1), a saying that is also an allegory of the history of the soul...

(159) For when the soul is ‘many,’ full that is of passions and vices... she is feeble and sick... but when she has become barren and ceases to produce these children...

Found, as it is, in the closing chapter of Philo’s *magnum opus*, the citation is indeed eminently suitable to the message of consolation here, which waxes eloquent with a messianic vision of the future. And in view of Philo’s reference to it by the words: ‘*says the prophet*,’ Colson has identified it as a reference to Isa. 54:1.<sup>26</sup>

Nevertheless, I am convinced that this is mistaken, for ISam. 2:5, found in the *Haftarah* for Rosh Hashanah, is much closer. It could also be introduced as the words of ‘the prophet.’ Following is their juxtaposition:

<sup>25</sup> Isa. 54:1–55:3 or 8, is also the *Haftarah* to *Parashat Noah* in the Ashkenazi, Italian and Yemenite rites, and Isa. 54:1–10 in the Sephardi rite.

<sup>26</sup> In his note a, *ad loc.* in PLCL to VIII *Praem.* 158 (413).

Philo VIII *Praem.* 158–159: ἡ γὰρ ἔρημος... εὐτεκνος τε καὶ πολὺπαις

Septuagint: Isa. 54:1: στεῖρα ἢ οὐ τίκτουσα ... πολλὰ τὰ τέκνα τῆς ἐρήμου  
...

MT: ... רביים בני שוממה ... רני עקרה לא ילדה

KJV: Sing O barren, thou *that* didst not bear... thou that didst not travail with child: for more *are* the children of the desolate...

ISam. 2:5: ὅτι στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠσθένησεν

MT: עד עקרה ילדה שבעה, ורבת בנים אמללה

KJV: So that the barren hath borne seven, and she that hath many children is waxed feeble.

The importance of the determination that the echo is from ISam. 2:5, the *Haftarah* for Rosh Hashanah, rather than from Isa. 54:1, is similar to the importance noted below, of determining that it is not Isa. 48:14, but rather Isa. 57:21 to which Philo is referring. In both cases the positively identified *Haftarot* are those of the Sabbaths of Repentance, of the High Holidays—*viz.* those of Rosh Hashanah and the Day of Atonement respectively, rather than those for the fifth and seventh Sabbaths of Consolation. In the custom of the Italian rite, the special readings for the Sabbaths of Consolation are only for the month of Av after which they return to the regular *Haftarot*, until the ‘Sabbaths of Repentance,’ and this rite sometimes preserves very ancient traditions.<sup>27</sup>

Further, as Colson himself has pointed out in his very next note,<sup>28</sup> “the allegory of the soul (here) is more concerned with ISam. 2:5.” Although ISam. 1:1–2:10 is discussed at length in the next chapter,<sup>29</sup> it will be well to alert the reader already here to the affinity between the allegory in VIII *Praem.*, and the allegory in the Philonic passages that contain a citation from ISam. 1:1–2:10.

Note too that the number seven mentioned in VIII *Praem.* 157 (τοὺς τῶν ἡμερῶν ἑβδομάδων καιροὺς ἑορτώδεις) was considered a sacred number both in the ancient world in general and of course in Judaism—where it is associated with the seven days of creation as well as the Sabbath day (both in the Decalogue and elsewhere), and Philo is full of praise for the number seven in very many passages.<sup>30</sup>

<sup>27</sup> See Endnote B: Philo and the contemporary Italian Rite.

<sup>28</sup> *Ad loc.*, 414 n. a.

<sup>29</sup> Chapter Five: Citations from the Former Prophets.

<sup>30</sup> This is found in each of the different types of his writings: I *Opif.* 89–128 has a

III *Quod Deus* 5–15 (I Sam. 2:5)

(10) Indeed of the nature of the soul beloved of God no clearer evidence can we have than ... the words, “the barren hath borne seven, but she that had many children languished” (I Sam. 2:5) ...<sup>31</sup> (14) And when she says “that she who had many children languishes,” her words are as clear as they are true. For when the soul that is one, departs from the one and is in travail with many ... and then weighed down and sore pressed by the multitude of children that cling to her ... she languishes utterly. (15) She brings forth the desires of which the eyes and the ears are the channels ... she grows faint ...

V *Mut.* 143<sup>32</sup> (I Sam. 2:5)

(143) ... *But as for the soul*, which is sterilized to wickedness and unfruitful of the endless host of passions and vices, scarce any prosper in childbirth as she. For she bears offspring worthy of love, even *the number seven* according to the hymn sung (κατὰ τὸ ᾄδόμενον ᾄσμα)... which says, “The barren (στειρά) hath borne seven, but she that is much in children hath languished (ἡσθῆνησε)” (I Sam. 2:5)... (144) ...the word ‘barren’ she applies to the mind which ... holds fast to the ‘seventh’ and the supreme peace that it gives.

The similarities are evident from even a cursory glance. And the number seven that is related to in *Praem.* is found in I Sam. 2:5, but not in Isa. 54:1. The encomium on the number seven begins in *Praem.* §155 with the seven days of creation, the Sabbath day, the Sabbatical year of the fields, and culminates with the ‘seventh month.’

The locution: “...the festal seasons of *the sacred seven*” (τοὺς τῶν ἱερῶν ἑβδομάδων καιροὺς ἑορτώδεις) found at the end of *Praem.* §157 almost certainly refers to the *seventh month* of the Jewish calendar year<sup>33</sup>—the month that contains the Festivals of Rosh Hashanah, Yom Kippur and

---

long excursus on the special properties of the number seven that even includes a citation from Solon and Hippocrates (*id.* §104–105). And so too e.g. I *Leg. All.* 1.15, VI *Mos.* 2.209, VII *Spec.* 2.156 (which even has the similar word combination τῆς ἱεράς ἑβδομάδος), and the Greek fragment quoted in fn. f, of Suppl. II *QE* Ex. 2:46: ἡ ἱεροτάτη φύσις τῆς ἑβδομάδος. For Aristoboulos, see Horst R. Moehring, “Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria,” in *The school of Moses: studies in Philo and Hellenistic religion: in memory of Horst R. Moehring*, ed. John Peter Kenney (Atlanta 1995).

<sup>31</sup> The wording very closely follows the Septuagint, which differs from the MT.

<sup>32</sup> Only a few sections before this, in §139, Philo has quoted Hos. 14:9–10 which is part of the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Shuva* (the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and the Day of Atonement).

<sup>33</sup> There are several ‘New Years’ in the Jewish calendar—while one of them begins to count the years in Nisan, in the Spring, another begins “in the seventh month,” in

the Feast of Booths—and is elsewhere called by him ἱεροσημία (holy month).<sup>34</sup>

Even the *Torah reading* for Rosh Hashanah in the Palestinian rite stressed the *seventh month*. Mishnah Megillah 3:5 states: And at the beginning of the year one reads, In the *seventh month*, on the first day of the month: בראש השנה (קורין) בחדש השביעי באחד לחדש (Lev. 23:24). As already noted, this is ISam. 1:1–2:20, in which the verse ISam. 2:5 is found, and this is the *Haftarah* for Rosh Hashanah, the first festival of the ‘sacred *seventh month*.’

Hence, while it is true, as Colson has suggested, that Philo’s words: ἡ γὰρ ἔρημος... εὐτεκνος τε καὶ πολύπαις do call to mind Isa. 54:1,<sup>35</sup> the correct reference is clearly ISam. 2:5 ὅτι στεῖρα ἔτεκεν ἑπτὰ, καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἠσθένησεν = MT: ורבת בניים, ילדה שבעה, עד עקרה ילדה אבילה, “Yea the barren hath borne *seven*...”<sup>36</sup>

Isa. 57:21 (V *Mut.* 169)

NOTE: Isa. 57:21 is found in the *Haftarah* reading for the morning of the Day of Atonement in all current rites (Isa. 57:14–58:14).

(169) And to none of the wicked is rejoicing permitted, as indeed *in prophetic words it is chanted* (ἐν προφητικαῖς ἄδεται ῥήσσει): ‘Rejoicing is not for the impious, said God (χαίρειν οὐκ ἔστι τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν, εἶπεν ὁ θεός)’ (Isa. 57:21).

Although the verb ἄδεται might *prima facie* be taken as pointing to the Book of Psalms, the word ἀείδω is also a poetic locution for εἰπών, and can mean ‘chant.’ While Isa. 57:21 and 48:22<sup>37</sup> are similar, Isa. 48:22 has λέγει κύριος, while both Philo and the Septuagint in Isa. 57:21 read εἶπεν (κύριος) ὁ θεός. Hence the latter is to be preferred, particularly in view of the fact that this use of the epithet θεός for אלהים is in line with the regular rendition of MT אלהים as θεός and MT Tetragrammaton

---

Tishre, in the Fall. Thus Nissan is the first month of the year—which makes Tishre the seventh month. (See Lev. 16:29, and Mishnah Rosh Hashanah 1:1).

<sup>34</sup> Cf. in VII *Dec.* 159, VII *Spec.* 1.186, VII *Spec.* 2.188. True, as Colson’s remarks in the appendix on 613–614 to VII *Dec.* 159, this is a Greek term for the period during which the great Greek festivals were held and hostilities suspended. This, then, is yet another example of the adoption of Greek terminology which Philo metamorphoses to refer to something very Jewish. See *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter VII, 178–224.

<sup>35</sup> See above for explanation.

<sup>36</sup> Isa. 54:1 does not have this association.

<sup>37</sup> The verse suggested by Earp and Colson is 48:22.

as κύριος in both the Septuagint and in Philo, *which is the reverse of the rabbinic exegesis of these Divine names*.<sup>38</sup>

Philo (169): χείρειν οὐκ ἔστι τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν, εἶπεν ὁ θεός

Septuagint (57:21): οὐκ ἔστιν χείρειν τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν, εἶπεν (κύριος) ὁ θεός<sup>39</sup>

MT (57:21): (θεός) אין שלום אמר אלה-י לרשעים

Septuagint (48:22): οὐκ ἔστιν χείρειν τοῖς ἀσεβέσιν, λέγει κύριος

MT (48:22): (κύριος) אין שלום אמר י-ה-ו-ה לרשעים

Relevant to our present concerns is the fact that Isa. 57:21 is found in the *Haftarah* reading for the morning of the Day of Atonement in all current rites (Isa. 57:14 – 58:14).

Isa. 66:1 (IV Conf. 98) GOD'S FOOTSTOOL (possible allusion)

NOTE: The verse: השמים כסאי והארץ הדום רגלי is the opening line of the *Haftarah* (Isa. 66:1–24) when *Shabbat* and *Rosh Hodesh* come together in all of the major contemporary rites.

XXI (98) But when he (Moses) speaks of the world of our senses as *God's footstool* (ὑποπόδιον θεοῦ) (*cf.* Isa. 66:1), it is for these reasons...

IV Conf. 98 is a direct continuation of the discussion begun in IV Conf. 96 of Ex. 24:10, “and they saw the God of Israel; and under His feet was something like a pavement made of sapphire stone” (MT: ויראו את (10) אלהי ישראל ותחת רגליו כמעשה לבנת הספיר.)

Philo's use of the locution: ὑποπόδιον θεοῦ (*God's footstool*) in IV Conf. 98 brings to mind Isa. 66:1 (where these words are found in the Septuagint) in association with this Biblical verse.<sup>40</sup>

The exegetical, ideological, and conceptual difficulties presented by the statement in MT Ex. 24:10, that they “saw the God of Israel,” are obvious, and there was surely an awareness of them in Hellenistic-Roman times. The Septuagint already renders MT Ex. 24:10 ויראו את אלהי ישראל (*and they saw the God of Israel*) by the words: καὶ εἶδεν τὸν

<sup>38</sup> Several examples of this are, e.g. Ex. Rabbah, 3.6: “R. Abba b. Memel said”; and *Tanhuma* (printed edition), Exodus 20. See Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD) in the Septuagint, Philo, and Rabbinic Midrash.

<sup>39</sup> Some mss. have εἶπεν ὁ θεός, exactly like Philo and the MT (see immediately following).

<sup>40</sup> Although Colson, *ad loc.*, takes no note of any association here with Isa. 66:1, the passage is listed in Earp's index.



**τόπον**, οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (and they saw *the place upon which* the Lord of Israel stood). And *Targum Onkelos*<sup>41</sup> has also related to the problem by rendering the verse as: יקר אלהא דישראל וכו'—*viz.* the word יקר ('Glory' or 'Greatness') is added before the Divinity (יקר אלהא דישראל) in order to negate the idea that God can be seen.

However, while the Septuagint has rendered the second lemma of the Hebrew verse Ex. 24:10, MT תחת רגליו כמעשה לבנת הספיר as τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὡσεὶ ἔργον πλίνθου σαπφείρου..., Philo has used the word found in Isa. 66:1 (but not in the Septuagint to Ex. 24:10), ὑποπόδιον (footstool), which he identifies as—τὸν δὲ αἰσθητὸν κόσμον, “the world of our senses,” which appears only in Isa. 66:1.

The juxtaposition of both of these texts will make the point clear:

Septuagint (Ex. 24:10): καὶ εἶδεν τὸν τόπον, οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ (= and they saw *the place upon which* the Lord of Israel stood)

Septuagint (Isa. 66:1): Οὗτος λέγει κύριος Ὁ οὐρανὸς μοι θρόνος, ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου (= Thus saith the Lord: The heaven is my throne, and the earth is my *footstool*).

Philo XXI (98): But when he (Moses) speaks of the world of our senses (τὸν δὲ αἰσθητὸν κόσμον) as *God's footstool* (ὑποπόδιον θεοῦ)...

He has thereby implicitly associated the contents of the verse, Isa. 66:1, with the text in Ex. 24:10—for only in Isa. 66:1 is this word used in Scripture in the same connotation as here in Philo = ‘the mundane world.’<sup>42</sup>

At the same time, this need not have been a textual association on Philo's own part, for Ex. 24:10 was certainly already normally read in terms of Isa. 66:1. This is evident from the fact that the *Targum Onkelos* renders MT: תחת רגליו (under His feet), as תחת כרסא יקרה (under *His Throne of Glory*);<sup>43</sup> and since Hellenistic Jewry could hardly have been any less sensitive than the author of the targum to such an anthropomorphism, Philo's statement that Moses speaks of the world

<sup>41</sup> Targum means translation. From ancient times the Sabbath pentateuchal reading was “translated” verse by verse at its public reading. Except for its avoidance of anthropomorphisms, *Targum Onkelos* was a fairly literal rendering of the Pentateuch into the Aramaic vernacular, and is the oldest extant work of this sort, considered by many scholars to have been contemporary with Rabban Gamliel and Philo. In Talmudic sources Onkelos as well as Aquila, which latter made a literal translation of the Torah into Greek a century later, are often confused. See Zunz-Albeck, *Derashot*, 35 ff.

<sup>42</sup> The word appears elsewhere in the Septuagint only as referring to Zion—*viz.* in Ps. 98(99):5, Ps. 109(110):1, and in Lam. 2:1.

<sup>43</sup> Z. Frankel, *Einfluss* (1851), 84, has long ago noted this.

of our senses as *God's footstool* (ὑποπόδιον θεοῦ), must have been the “traditional exegesis” (τὸ ῥητόν)<sup>44</sup>—viz. the way Ex. 24:10 τὰ ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ was understood in both rabbinic and hellenistic exegesis.

### *Jeremiah*

Two of the three citations from Jeremiah—Jer. 2:13 (V *Fuga* 197) and 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49)<sup>45</sup>—are found in the *Haftarah* to *Parashat Mas'ai* (Num. 33–36 / Jer. 2:4–28; 3:4), which is read on the second of the three Sabbaths of Admonition which precede the 9th of Av (*Shabbat Hazon*, that is the third Shabbat). The third citation, Jer. 15:10, is alluded to in IV *Conf.* 44 in the name of “a member of the prophetic circle.”<sup>46</sup> And finally, there may be an allusion to Jer. 2:3 in VIII *Spec.* 4.180—and that is all.

Jer. 2:3 (VIII *Spec.* 4.180) possible allusion to “Israel is God's First Fruits”

NOTE: Jer. 2:3 is the closing verse of what *today* is the *Haftarah* for *Parashat Matot*, that is, the first of the Sabbaths of Admonition (Deut. 30:1–32:42 / Jer. 1:1–2:3), except in the Italian rite.

I do not think that it has heretofore been noticed that *Spec.* 4:180 may contain an echo—though definitely not a citation—of Jer. 2:3.<sup>47</sup>

(180) Nevertheless, as Moses tells us, the orphan-like desolate state of His people is always an object of pity and compassion to the Ruler of the Universe, *whose portion it is* (ὃ προσκεκλήρωται), because it has been set apart out of the whole human race, *as a kind of first fruits* to the Maker and Father (οἷά τις ἀπαρχὴ τῶ ποιητῆ καὶ πατρὶ).

Although Philo introduces this by the words *Moses tells us*, only the first part of the idea expressed here: ὃ **προσκεκλήρωται**... (“whose portion it is...”) is found in Deut. 32:9 (Septuagint: καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰακωβ, σχοίνισμα **κληρονομίας** αὐτοῦ Ἰσραηλ) (MT: כִּי לֶחֶם בָּרֶבֶב יִקְרָא עָמוֹ, הֵן) The idea expressed in the second half: οἷά τις **ἀπαρχὴ** τῶ ποιητῆ καὶ πατρὶ, is completed by Septuagint Jer. 2:3 that

<sup>44</sup> For an explanation why the word τὸ ῥητόν should be understood in this manner rather than as ‘in the literal sense,’ see my *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Two, section 7, 65 ff.

<sup>45</sup> Jer. 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49) is the *only instance* in Philo’s entire *oeuvre* where the name of one of the Latter Prophets is mentioned in the introduction to the citation.

<sup>46</sup> We shall return to this locution in the final chapter.

<sup>47</sup> It has not been noted in any of the published indices (see above).

Israel is “a kind of first fruits.” The Septuagint to Jer. 2:3 reads: ἄγιος Ἰσραηλ τῷ κυρίῳ ἀρχὴ γεινημάτων αὐτοῦ (MT: קדש ישראל לה' ראשית תבואתה) viz. “Israel is the Lord’s hallowed portion, the first fruits of His harvest.”

Both associations (Deut. 32:9 and Jer. 2:3) would very likely have been part of Philo’s cultural baggage. Deut. 32:9 is found in the Torah reading for *Shabbat Shuva* (the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur),<sup>48</sup> while Jer. 2:3 is the final verse of the *Haftarah* to *Parashat Matot* (Jer. 1:1–2:3), the first of the three Sabbaths of ‘Admonition’ that precede the 9th of Av, in the Ashekenazi, Sephardi and Yemenite rites.<sup>49</sup>

### Jer. 2:13 (V *Fuga* 197)

NOTE: Jer. 2:13 is found in the same *Haftarah* as that which contains the citation brought in II *Cher.* 49 (*Parashat Mas’ai* [Num. 33–36 / Jer. 2:4–28; 3:4 considered below]—viz. the *Haftarah* read on the Shabbat preceding *Shabbat Hazon*, the second of the three Sabbaths of Admonition, which precede 9th of Av.

XXVI (197) And now we have to speak of the supreme and most excellent spring, which the Father of All *declared by the mouth of the prophets*. For He said: “Me they forsook, a spring of life, and dug for themselves broken cisterns, which shall fail to hold water” (ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ὤρυσαν ἑαυτοῖς λάκκους συντετριμμένους, οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται συσχεῖν ὕδωρ) (Jer. 2:13).<sup>50</sup>

V *Fuga* 197 introduces Jer. 2:13 by the words: *declared by the mouth of the prophets*. It contains the equation of water with *Sophia* = ‘Torah’—an ancient traditionally Jewish image. It is found not only in Philo, for the equation of water/Torah/wisdom was a commonly held conception that is also found in Ben Sira, in the Dead Sea Scrolls and of course in rabbinic tradition.<sup>51</sup> Following are two citations from non-rabbinic

<sup>48</sup> This is not so if there is a Sabbath between The Day of Atonement and Sukkot (The Feast of Booths).

<sup>49</sup> In the Sephardi and Italian rites, it is also read as the *Haftarah* to *Shemoth*. See above in the discussion to Isa. 5:7.

<sup>50</sup> Philo here follows the Septuagint closely, even while it does not differ significantly from the MT: ἐμὲ ἐγκατέλιπον πηγὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ὤρυσαν ἑαυτοῖς λάκκους συντετριμμένους, οἳ οὐ δυνήσονται ὕδωρ συνέχειν (MT: אותי עזבו מקור מים חיים להצב להם בארות בארות לא יכלו המים) (נשברים אשר לא יכלו המים)

<sup>51</sup> See e.g. the allegorical use of Isa. 55:1: “Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye for water;” which is taken for granted to refer to the Torah in BT Baba Kamma 17a and Ta’anit 7a. There are many other examples.

Jewish sources *exempla gratia*.<sup>52</sup> The Damascus Document VI 3–4, which of course antedates Philo considerably, contains the explicit statement:

...היא התורה (4) ... ויהפוררו את הבאר (3)

(3) and they dug the well... (4) The Well is the Law...

A second, not often noticed example is I Bar. 3:12–13,<sup>53</sup> where the Torah is called: τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας = ‘the spring of wisdom’ in a context in which it clearly means the Torah:

I Bar. 3:9 Ἄκουε, Ἰσραηλ, ἐντολάς<sup>54</sup> ζωῆς... (12) ἐγκατέλιπες τὴν πηγὴν τῆς σοφίας. (13) τῇ ὁδῷ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰ ἐπορεύθης, κατόκεις ἄν ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸν αἰῶνα.

(9) Hear, O Israel, the commandments of life... (12) Thou hast forsaken the fountain of wisdom. (13) For if thou hadst walked in the way of God, thou shouldst have dwelt in peace for ever.

V *Fuga* 197 further states that the ultimate source, the ‘chiefest spring (of Torah),’ is God Himself. A similar idea is expressed earlier, in 97 ff. Likewise, the ‘Divine Logos’ (λόγος θεῖος) is described as ‘the fountain of wisdom’ (ὁς σοφίας ἐστὶ πηγὴ), from which the other attributes of God emanate in a descending order, to be approached at the level of the capability of the human vessel approaching the Godhead. As is so often his wont, Philo has used a well-known image to express the mystical relation between God, Torah and Israel.

Jer. 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49)

NOTE: Jer. 3:4 is the closing verse which is added to the Ashkenazi reading of the *Haftarah* to *Parashat Mas’ai* (Num. 33–36 / Jer. 2:4–28; 3:4— which is otherwise common to the Ashkenazi, Sephardi and Yemenite rites). This *Haftarah* is recited on the Sabbath preceding *Shabbat Hazon*— *viz.* on the second of the three Sabbaths of Admonition.

Although I am aware of the views to the contrary, I consider Philo’s I *Opif.* the opening, and VIII *Praem.* the closing books of what was

<sup>52</sup> Further discussion of this, including additional parallels from rabbinic midrash, Ben Sira and the Dead Sea Scrolls, may be found in Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, particularly 160–164 and 214 n. 29.

<sup>53</sup> Whatever the date of its composition may be, it is in any event part of the ancient Jewish literature.

<sup>54</sup> This is often used in Judeo-Greek for Torah commandments. See the Theodotus inscription quoted in *Philo Judaeus*, 221–222 and n. 41 there, for bibliography.

apparently Philo's *magnum opus*.<sup>55</sup> This work, whose point of departure throughout is the Pentateuch, proceeds from a primarily philosophic universe of discourse (*Opif.* at the beginning of PLCL volume I), to an allegorical (*Leg. All.* I–III—*Somn.* found in PLCL volumes I–V), to a biographical (PLCL volume VI) and, finally, *halakhic* stance (volumes VII–VIII). And the traditionally Jewish components become ever more pervasive as it proceeds.

But however one decides to consider the relation between the different Philonic 'books,' II *Cher.*, in which Jer. 3:4 is found (II *Cher.* 49), follows immediately upon the first allegorical works, with the majority of this facet of Philo's writings still before it. This is relevant because the citation of Jer. 3:4 in II *Cher.* 49 is *the first* reference in Philo's writings to *any* of the non-pentateuchal biblical books. And it is *the only instance* where the prophet is quoted by name, rather than simply by the generic term, 'one of the prophets' *et sim.* We read there:

(49) I myself was initiated under Moses the God-beloved into his *greater mysteries*, (παρὰ Μωυσεῖ τῷ θεοφιλεῖ μνηθεὶς τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια) yet when I saw the *prophet Jeremiah* and knew him (ὅμως αὐθις Ἰερεμίαν τὸν προφήτην ἰδὸν καὶ γνούς) to be not only himself enlightened (ὄτι οὐ μόνον μύστης ἐστίν), but a worthy minister of the holy secrets (ἀλλὰ καὶ ἱεροφάντης ἱκανός), I was not slow to become his disciple (οὐκ ὠκνησα φοιτῆσαι πρὸς αὐτόν).

*He, out of his manifold inspiration gave forth an oracle* (ἐνθουσιῶν χρησιμόν τινα ἐξεῖπεν) spoken in the person of God to Virtue the all-peaceful. "Didst thou not call upon Me as *thy house, thy father* and *the husband of thy virginity?*" (οὐχ ὡς οἶκόν με ἐκάλεσας καὶ πατέρα καὶ ἄνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου) (Jer. 3:4)."

There is here a great deal of textual confusion.

MT: הלא מעתה קראתני לי, אבי, אלוף נעורי אתה.

Septuagint: οὐχ ὡς οἶκόν με ἐκάλεσας καὶ πατέρα καὶ ἄρχηγόν τῆς παρθενίας σου.

Philo: οὐχ ὡς οἶκόν με ἐκάλεσας καὶ πατέρα καὶ ἄνδρα τῆς παρθενίας σου.

<sup>55</sup> On the subject of the chronological order of Philo's writings, as I have noted in my remarks in *Philo Judaeus, op.cit.*, 31, and particularly n. 61, this accords with the view of Nikiprowetzky, *Commentaire*, 181–202, as well as *id.* 'L'exégèse,' *RHPhR* 53 (1973), 309–329, (reviewed *SP* 4, 101–103) where it is noted that this is a return to the view of Adrien Turnébe (1552). In any event, all parts of this work speak to an audience that is versed in Jewish lore, who would enjoy the intellectual underpinning of an already existing commitment to things Jewish, and the chronological placing of *Opif.* is irrelevant to our present concerns.

The MT has no parallel to the Septuagint's: ὡς οἶκον με (which is found in Philo), while Philo reads ἄνδρα rather than the Septuagint's reading ἀρχηγόν—both presumably reflecting MT's הַיְלֵא. Jeremiah is described here in glowing terms as a purveyor of mystic lore. The Torah is termed 'the greater mysteries' (τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια), and Jeremiah is referred to as a μύστης and ἱεροφάντης. Because of the complexity of the matter, this aspect of the passage must be deferred.

Here we can do no more than state that in spite of their vastly different cultural frames of reference, an underlying conceptual parallel is, I am convinced, discernible between the images in II *Cher.* 49 and *Zohar* III 31a, both of which include 'house,' which, as I have pointed out, is missing from the MT.<sup>56</sup>

Jer. 15:10 (IV *Conf.* 44) (probably from a literary source)

NOTE: I have NOT FOUND this verse in any of the customary *Hafarot*.

The first thing that strikes the reader is the introduction of the citation from Jeremiah 15:10 in IV *Conf.* 44 by the unusual locution: *a member of the prophetic circle, who, possessed by divine inspiration spoke thus.* We read there:

(44) The truth of my words is attested first by the consciousness of every virtue-lover, which feels what I have described, and secondly *by a member of the prophetic circle (τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ), who possessed by divine inspiration spoke thus: (ὅς καταπνευσθεὶς ἐνθουσιῶν ἀνεφθέγγετο)*<sup>57</sup> "O my mother, how great didst though bear me, a man of combat and a man of displeasure in all the earth! I did not owe, nor did they owe to me, nor did my strength fail from their curses" (Jer. 15:10).

<sup>56</sup> See my article, "Philo's *Cher.* 40–52, *Zohar* III 31a, and BT Hag. 16a," *JJS* 57/2 (Autumn 2006). For a short discussion of Samuel Belkin's pioneering work in this area and my remarks respecting Werblowsky's scathing critique of it, see my *Philo Judaeus*, 4–8.

<sup>57</sup> While the word χοροῦ alone is found fifty-four times, and the combination θείου χοροῦ is found seven times, nevertheless τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ is a *hapax legomenon* in Philo. Nor is the locution τοῦ προφητικοῦ χοροῦ (without the θιασώτης) or θιασώτης χοροῦ found anywhere else in his writings either. Note also that though Colson's translation in PLCL *ad loc.* implies a prophecy, actually the term ἀνεφθέγγετο does not necessarily mean any more than 'speak aloud, recite, proclaim,' cf. above III *Plant* 39.3 "...a member indeed of Moses' fellowship... *spake aloud in hymns of praise*" (ὁ τοῦ Μουσεῶς δὴ θιασώτης... ἐν ὕμνοῖς ἀνεφθέγγετο) and addressing his own mind cried "Delight in the Lord" (= Ps. 37(36):4). See also the final chapter of this book.

Another unusual feature of the passage is that, in contrast to the overwhelming majority of Philo's citations from Scripture, it differs markedly from the Septuagint text, and is closer to that of the MT.

Philo: ὦ μητερ, ἠλίκων με ἔτεκες, ἄνθρωπον μάχης καὶ **ἄνθρωπον** ἀηδίας πάσης τῆς γῆς; οὐκ ὠφείλεις, οὐδὲ ὠφέλησάν μοι, οὐδὲ ἡ ἰσχὺς μου ἐξέλιπεν ἀπὸ καταρῶν αὐτῶν.

Septuagint: Οἱμοὶ ἐγὼ μητερ, ὡς τίνα με ἔτεκες, **ἄνδρα** δικαζόμενον καὶ διακρινόμενον πάσῃ τῇ γῆ; οὔτε ὠφέλησα, οὔτε ὠφέλησέν με, οὐδεὶς. ἡ ἰσχὺς μου ἐξέλιπεν ἐν τοῖς καταρωμένοις με.

MT: אוי לי אמי כי ילדתני איש ריב ואיש מדון לכל הארץ לא נשיתי ולא נשו בי כלל מקלנוני

The citation is part of the exegesis of the biblical narrative in Genesis as an allegory of the soul. Following is a schematic outline of that part of IV *Conf.* that is relevant to our present concerns, including in each instance the extent that Philo's text is similar to the Septuagint:

- §1 IV *Conf.* begins with an almost **exact citation** of **Gen. 11:1–9**
- §39–40 Introduction to the allegory + **Ps. 31:1** “Let their cunning become speechless”  
(the citation in Philo **differs significantly** from the Septuagint)
- §41 **Gen. 42:11** “We are all sons of one ‘man’” = the Word of the Eternal  
(**verbatim**)
- §43 Word of the Eternal equated with ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος (= right reason)
- §44 **Jer. 15:10** (This is the citation under discussion. It **differs significantly** from the Septuagint and appears to be a free translation from the Hebrew. The citation is explained in §49–51 as a reference to the battle that the good soul wages with the bad.)
- §50 **Num. 16:15** (**almost exact citation** (Septuagint), that differs here from the MT)
- §52 **Ps. 80:7** (similar but **not identical** with the Septuagint text)
- §56 **Ex. 24:11** (**verbatim**)
- §58 **Ex. 19:8** (**verbatim**)
- §60 **Gen. 11:2** (alludes back to the beginning of the book) (**verbatim** Septuagint except that Philo changes the arrangement of the words in order to emphasize the words ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν, in order to expound them as a reference to the ‘rising’ (ἀνατολή) of virtues or their opposites in the soul.)

- § 61 **Gen. 2:8** (**verbatim** except that Philo has ὁ Θεός, while the Septuagint and MT have κύριος ὁ θεός). The words κατὰ ἀνατολᾶς (towards sunrise / ἀνατολή) that are found in the text are expounded to indicate the ‘rising’ of the virtues in the soul.
- § 62 **Zech. 6:12** (**Septuagint-dependent** since ἀνατολή is hardly a likely rendition of the MT – כִּמְצָא but it is **not entirely verbatim**: Septuagint: Ἴδου ἀνὴρ Ἀνατολή ὄνομα αὐτοῦ; Philo: ἴδου ἀνθρώπος ὃ ὄνομα ἀνατολή; MT: הנה איש, צמח שמו)

Thus, we see that Philo begins in §39–§40 with a free translation of Ps. 31:1: “Let their cunning become speechless”—a general introduction to the passage as a whole that parries the sophistry of the sophists. While it would be interesting to try to discover the background for this rejoinder, it is beyond the confines of the present research.

The main thread of the passage is devoted to expounding the biblical narrative as an allegory of the soul. It is introduced in §41 by the citation of Gen. 42:11 **quoted verbatim**, “We are all sons of one *man* ...”—a thread that is followed through in §147 as well, the significant word being ‘ἄνθρωπος’ = ‘*man*,’ allegorically taken to indicate ‘the *Word* of the Eternal’ (τοῦ αἰδίου λόγος).

In §43 Philo equates ‘the *Word* of the Eternal’ (τοῦ αἰδίου λόγος), with ‘right reason’ (ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος). For while the word *Anthropos* (man) is most often used by Philo as a common noun, in some passages, like here, the term ἄνθρωπος (θεοῦ) is used as a synonym for the Logos. Here the statement made by Jacob’s sons, “We are all the sons of one man” (Gen. 42:11), takes ‘Man’ as a synonym for the Logos.

Even though this is a subject for a different study, note in passing the somewhat parallel image in BT Sanhedrin 93a (the emphasis is mine):

והנה איש רכב ... (זכריה א:ה) ואין איש אלא הקב"ה שנאמר, ה' איש מלחמה, ה' שמו (שמות טו:ג.)

R. Johanan said: What is meant by, *I saw by night, and behold a man riding* (Zech. 1:8)? What means... ‘*but behold: A man riding?*’ **Man can refer to none but the Holy One, blessed be He**, as it is written, ‘*The Lord is a Man of war: the Lord is His name* (Ex. 15:3).”

And cf. also id. 96b:

אמר עולה: עמון ומואב שיבבי בישי דירושלים הו, כיון דשמעניהו לנביאי דקא מתנבא לחורבנא דירושלם, שלהו לנבוכדנצר: פוק ותא... 'כי אין האיש בביתו הלך בדרך מרחוק (משלי ז:ט)' ואין איש אלא הקב"ה שנאמר ה' איש מלחמה (שמות טו:ג.)



Ulla said: Ammon and Moab were evil neighbors of Jerusalem. When they heard the prophets predicting the destruction of Jerusalem, they sent to Nebuchadnezzar: Leave [thy country] and come hither ... *‘for the man is not at home* (Prov. 7:19)’ and there is no *man* but the Holy One, blessed be He, as it is written *‘The Lord is a man of war* (Ex. 15:3).<sup>58</sup>

Within the context of this thread that is firmly anchored in the text of the Pentateuch, §44 Philo gives the citation from Jer. 15:10 in the name of a member of the prophetic circle. And it too, like the citation from Ps. 31:3, but unlike the citations from the Pentateuch, is a free translation that is far from identical to the Septuagint.

In §49–§51 Philo explains Jer. 15:10 as referring to the battle that the good soul wages with the bad soul. In §50 he quotes from Num. 15:16 virtually verbatim, changing only the form of the verb to fit the context. Immediately following this, in §52, Philo paraphrases rather than quotes yet another non-pentateuchal text, Ps. (79)80:7, “God has set us up as an adversary to our neighbors,” which relates to Jer. 15:10. Then, in §55–§59, Num. 31:49, Ex. 24:11 and Ex. 19:8<sup>59</sup> are, like most of Philo’s citations from the Pentateuch, quoted virtually verbatim.

After this, in §60–61, Philo quotes Gen. 11:2,<sup>60</sup> thereby coming full circle, for Gen. 11:1–9 were quoted in the introduction to the book as a whole. It reads:

(60) Now those who conspired for iniquities, “moved,” we are told, “from the ‘east’ (or ‘rising’ [ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν]) and found a plain in the land of Shinar and dwelt there (Gen. 11.2).” How true to nature for there are two kinds of ‘rising’ (ἀνατολή) in the soul, the better and the worse...

This, together with the citation of Gen. 11:2 in §61, provides the denouement (finale) to the allegory of the struggle of the soul.

(61) We have an example of the former (the better) in these words: “And God (θεός)<sup>61</sup> planted a garden in Eden towards the sun-rise (ἀνατολή)” (Gen. 2:8). That garden was... of heavenly virtues, which out of His own incorporeal light, the Planter brought to their rising (ἀνέτειλεν).

This completes the allegory that was introduced in §44 in the name of ‘a chorister of the prophetic circle.’

<sup>58</sup> Cf. also e.g. BT Sotah 42b, 48:1, and somewhat similar to this is the midrashic rendering of *Aluf*—for which see the preliminary remarks in the section above devoted to Jer. 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49).

<sup>59</sup> This is a reference to the famous **נעשה ונשמע**.

<sup>60</sup> In a manner very similar to the Septuagint, though not identical to it.

<sup>61</sup> Philo: θεός, Septuagint: κύριος θεός, MT: יהוה-יהוה אלהים. See Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD) in the Septuagint, Philo, and Rabbinic Midrash.

\*

Although §62–§63 adds an additional dimension to the concept of ‘rising’ in connection with the virtues, it is a distinct tradition and has an introductory formula of its own. Philo appends it to the preceding homily—to provide a picturesque addition. For at the beginning of the very next paragraph Philo writes:

(62) I have heard also, an oracle from the lips of one of one of the disciples of Moses (τῶν Μουσειῶς ἐταίρων τινός)...

This introduces the citation of Zech. 6:12, “Behold a *man* whose name is Rising,”<sup>62</sup> and as in Jer. 15:10, it replaces the Septuagint’s ἀνὴρ by ἄνθρωπος, presumably because of the requirement of the allegorical exegesis.<sup>63</sup> And here as well, it is expounded as in Jer. 15:10—taking ἄνθρωπος (‘man’) as a synonym for the ‘Word of the Eternal.’

Note too, that there is also a certain similarity between the rabbinic midrashic *proem* and this part of IV *Conf.* The classic midrashic *proem* begins with a citation from Psalms or another non-pentateuchal book of Scripture and then, using citations from the Bible, Prophets, and Writings as stepping stones, it wends its way, eventually returning to the citation at the beginning of the passage that was in fact its point of departure. It often concludes with another citation from the Prophets as well.<sup>64</sup>

One can, I suggest, discern a rough outline<sup>65</sup> of this here in Philo, for we find in this order, Ps. 31:1, Gen. 42:11 (“We are all sons of one man”), Jer. 15:10, Num. 15:16, Ps. 80:7, Num. 31:49, Ex. 24:11, Ex. 19:8, Gen. 11:2 and Gen. 2:8, and finally, the afterthought from Zech. 6:12. Though of course this form is found only much later, there is no reason to rule out the possibility, and perhaps even the likelihood, that at least

<sup>62</sup> See below, *ad loc.* for the main discussion of Zech. 6:12.

<sup>63</sup> For something analogous, though not the same, see also above, II *Cher.* 49, where for the Septuagint’s Jer. 3:4 καὶ ἀρχηγόν, Philo has ἀνδρα (= MT: אֱלֹהֵי נְעוּרַי) presumably because this is also what was needed for the allegory.

<sup>64</sup> See *E7* vol. 11, s.v. Midrash, 1510 where we read that the midrashist starts from “a verse from another source... (usually the Writings) and connecting it with the chief verse of the homily, the proem concluding with the verse with which the homily itself begins.” An example of this literary form familiar to many of my readers is the beginning of Gen. Rabbah 1:1. It commences with a citation from Prov. 8:30, continues with Num. 11:12, Lam. 4:5, Nah. 3:8 and then at last arrives at the beginning of the Book of Genesis, Gen. 1:1, “In the beginning God created,” and this in turn is finally rounded out by Prov. 8:22 (הִנֵּנִי קִנְיֵי רֵאשִׁית דְּרִכְתִּי).

<sup>65</sup> Even in the classic midrash the form is not strictly kept.

a *proto-form* of the classic midrashic *proem* was already found in Philo's day.

Finally, unlike most of Philo's citations from the Pentateuch that are most often verbatim Septuagint, or at least remain very close to it, in this pericope the non-pentateuchal citations quoted in the passage introduced as stemming from *a member of the prophetic circle* are not dependent upon the Septuagint, but rather appear to have been transcribed directly from the Hebrew.

This suggests that the pericope that contains Jer. 15:10, which was introduced as *coming from one of the prophetic circle*, is indeed based upon a midrashic source that had been translated from Hebrew/Aramaic, not unlike Ben Sira, I Mac. and similar works. And to this, Philo has added, this time in the name of *one of Moses' disciples*, the midrashic vignette that quotes and allegorically renders a verse from the Book of Zechariah, to be discussed shortly, under its own entry.<sup>66</sup> Here we will no more than note that though there are fewer than 50 non-pentateuchal citations in Philo's entire *oeuvre*, there are *four citations* from non-pentateuchal scripture here in less than 25 sections.

#### THE MINOR PROPHETS

From the so-called Minor Prophets, only Hosea and Zechariah are quoted: Hosea three times, two of which are the same verse cited in different contexts and Zechariah is mentioned once. The citations from Hosea are identified as coming from *one of the prophets*, while the sole citation from Zechariah is introduced as *an oracle from the lips of one of the disciples of Moses*.

#### *Hosea*

NOTE: All three references are found in Hos. 14:2–10, which is the *Haftarah* reading in all present rites for *Shabbat Shuva*, the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur (The Day of Atonement), so called, because of the chapter's *incipit*: *Shuva Yisrael*.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>66</sup> See below s.v. for remarks on Zechariah.

<sup>67</sup> In the Ashkenazi rite Hos. 14:6 is also found in the *Haftarah* to *Vayetsah* (of the Book of Genesis): Hos. 12:13–14:9. And in the Sephardi, Yemenite, and Italian rites it is the *Haftarah* for Mincha on the Fast day of the 9th of Av (which serves as the turning point

Although Philo refers to material from Hosea in three different passages, all of the verses quoted are from Hos. 14:2–10, which is the *Haftarah* reading for *Shabbat Shuva* in all of the present rites. They are introduced by some variation of the formula *a prophet says*—*viz.* III *Plant.* 138: *the oracle given by one of the prophets*, V *Mut.* 139 ff.: *as an oracle given by a prophet's mouth*, and Suppl. II *QE* II 76: *as some prophet says*. And Philo's statement at the beginning of V *Mut.* 139 (introducing Hos. 14:9–10), is a personal one: *I remember too*—and it fits in well with the thesis that he was familiar with the citations from the *Haftarah* readings.

Hos. 14:9–10 is cited in both III *Plant.* 138 and in V *Mut.* 139 to warn that esoteric lore may be shared only with those with the sophistication to appreciate its message and to understand it, and V *Mut.* 137–139 further warns against its being misconstrued by 'the superstitious.'<sup>68</sup> I record the relevant texts with little or no comment since they speak for themselves.

Hos. 14:9–10 (III *Plant.* 138 and V *Mut.* 139)

III *Plant.* 137–138 reads:

(137) Now, whereas fruits borne by trees are called products of the persons who own them, the fruit of instruction and good sense... belongs, as Moses says, to no other than to the Ruler of all (πανηγυμόνος). For after the words, "His products" (Lev. 19:25), he adds, "I am the Lord your God" (ibid.),<sup>69</sup> affording most clear proof that He to whom the product and the fruit of the soul pertains is One, even God.

(138) In harmony with this is the oracle given by one of the prophets: "From Me is thy fruit found. Whoso is wise, he shall understand these things; he who understands shall know them" (MT: ממני פריך נמצא. (9) מי חכם ויבן אלה, נבון וידעם. (10)) (Hos. 14:10). For not everybody, but only the wise man knows, Whose is the fruit of intelligence.

---

of the *Haftarah* series after which come the *Haftarot* of Consolation).

<sup>68</sup> Cf. likewise I *Leg. All.* 3.218–219 where too *the initiate* is addressed. These passages are discussed in Cohen, "The Mystery Terminology in Philo," in *Philo and das Neue Testament; Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum, May 1–4, 2003*; Herausgegeben von Roland Deines und Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2004), 173–187.

<sup>69</sup> This is an allegorization of Lev. 19:25: "But in the fifth year may ye eat of the fruit thereof, that it may yield unto you more richly the increase thereof: I am the Lord your God." MT: ובשנה החמישית תאכלו את פריי, להוסיף לכם תבואתו, אני יי אלהיכם. Septuagint: ἐν δὲ τῷ ἔτει τῷ πέμπτῳ φάγεσθε τὸν καρπὸν, πρὸσθεμα ὑμῖν τὰ γενήματα αὐτοῦ; ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν.

In V *Mut.* 137–140 we read:

(137) So, too, the wisdom (φρόνησις), which as in motherhood brought forth the nature of the self-taught, declares that God had begotten it. For when the child is born she says with pride, “The Lord has made laughter for me” (Gen. 21:6). That is the same as saying: He formed, He wrought, He begot, Isaac; since Isaac and laughter are the same.

(138) *But this saying is not for all to hear, so strongly does the evil tide of superstition flow in our minds...* And therefore she adds, “Whoever shall hear will rejoice with me” (Gen. 21:6), as though there were *few whose ears are opened* and pricked up to receive these holy words, which teach us that to sow and beget the excellent is the peculiar task of God alone. *To this lesson all the others are deaf.*

(139) I remember too an oracle given by a prophet’s mouth in words of fire, which runs thus: “*From Me is thy fruit found. Whoso is wise, he shall understand these things; he who understands shall know them*” (Hos. 14:9 ff.)...

(140) For all that is good in the range of existing things or rather the whole heaven and universe is in very truth God’s fruit, the inseparable growth, as it were, of the tree of His eternal and never-fading nature. *And to know and confess such things is for the wise and understanding, not for men of no account.*

Hos. 14:6 (II Suppl. *QE* 2.76)

II Suppl. *QE* II 76 also uses a citation found in this *Haftarah*, viz. Hos. 14:6, in order to symbolically express the thought that, although Israel is presently experiencing bad times, in due course its past glory will return and it will come again into its own.

(76) (Ex. 25:32 MT *id.* 33) Why are there, on each of the three branches, bowls modeled into the form of seeds and buds and lilies? ... The lily has a certain contrariety to other flowers, for... the lily (buds) with the coming of summer, when other (flowers) wither... For (other flowers) blossom when they are irrigated by streams of water, but the lily (blossoms) ... when the sun is flaming-hot.

Wherefore *some prophet says* that the contemplative nation<sup>70</sup> shall blossom like the lily, (Hos. 14:6)<sup>71</sup> indicating that it does not enjoy prosperity at the same time (as other nations) but that at the time when others have

<sup>70</sup> As Marcus notes, *ad loc.* (126 n. h): τὸ ὀρατικὸν (οἱ θεωρητικὸν) γένος are terms used to refer to Israel.

<sup>71</sup> This is the correct reference and not, as Marcus has mistakenly noted, *ad loc.*, verse 5. I have not been able to locate the reference to Ezekiel that he mentions in his note there.

passed their prime, (Israel) begins (to flower) without the things it ought to have for its flowering, without water, when the sun is flaming, and is not to be compared with what is usual.

### *Zechariah*

Zech. 6:12 (IV *Conf.* 62–63)

NOTE: NOT FOUND in any of the customary *Haftarot*.<sup>72</sup>

As I have already noted in connection with the discussion of Jer. 15:10, even though the passage containing the citation from Zechariah follows immediately upon the passage containing the three other non-pentateuchal citations, and is even related to it in content, Philo explicitly informs the reader that it comes from a different source. And it is found that just as there were clear traces of the Hebrew/Aramaic origin of the preceding source, there can be no doubt that here the point of departure for the exegesis is the Septuagint, and not the Hebrew.

But before turning to the passage itself, a few remarks are necessary in order for it to be correctly understood. First, Colson's translation of the word *logion* (λόγιον) as 'oracle' is mistaken, and it is an example of how the Christian prism through which Philo is often read can do violence to the simple meaning of the text. For although in the NT the word *logion* (λόγιον) appears four times in the connotation 'oracle',<sup>73</sup> even in Acts 18:24 the adjective is used to describe "an eloquent man and mighty in Scriptures" (ΚJV) (ἀνὴρ λόγιος... δυνατὸς ὢν ἐν ταῖς γραφαῖς)—also an appropriate description of the man in whose name Philo quotes the midrashic vignette in § 62–§ 63.

I checked the connotation of the word *logion* (λόγιον) in four other philonic passages—in III *Sacr.* 50, that is the instance of the word that is found immediately preceding § 62; in the other two instances of the word that are found in IV *Conf.*, *viz.* in § 81 and § 166 and also

---

<sup>72</sup> At the same time note that the key word Ἀνατολή ('rising') does appear in the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Hannukah* (Zech. 2:14–4:7) as well as that for Num. 8:12 (בְּהַעֲלֹתְךָ). The relevant verse in Zech. 3:8 reads: ἴδου ἐγὼ ἄγω τὸν δοῦλον μου Ἀνατολήν. Also, Wacholder, Prolegomena to Mann, *op. cit.*, lvi–lvii (+li) notes that Zech. 5:3–6:19 is attested as the *Haftarah* to Lev. 5:1 in Geniza fragments of triennial *Haftarot* collections scattered among major libraries in the world, and see also Büchler, as quoted by Mann, *The Bible in the Old Synagogue*, 571, nn. 158–159, and cf. also, id., "The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle," *JQR (O.S.)* 5 (1893), 420–468; 6 (1894), 1–73.

<sup>73</sup> Acts 7:38, Rom. 3:2, Hebr. 5:12, and IPet. 4:11.

the first instance in the ensuing book IV *Migr.* 27. I found that the term ‘allegorical *peshat*’ fits the context in all of them. For it is not the scriptural citation *per se* that is indicated in all of these passages, but like in classic rabbinic midrash, *mutatis mutandis*, the *lemma* from Scripture is brought to introduce the exegesis. In Philo too, the scriptural citation serves as the point of departure for the allegorical meaning provided.<sup>74</sup>

\*

Second, whether or not the suggested translation of IV *Conf.* 62–63 is correct in all its details, it is clear that Philo here describes God’s effluence. Because this raises the image in the mind of today’s reader of what in Christianity expresses the relationship between Jesus and God, it is important to note that Philo stresses that this son does not have a corporeal nature. The word ‘son’ is used in the passage as a manner of speech, in the same way as the word ‘Father’ is used for God.<sup>75</sup> Philo states:

(62) I have heard also *an oracle*<sup>76</sup> *from the lips of one of the disciples of Moses*, which runs thus (ἤκουσα μέντοι καὶ τῶν Μουσεῶς ἑταίρων τινὸς ἀποφθεγξαμένου τοιόνδε λόγιον): “Behold a man whose name is ‘Rising’ (ἴδου ἀνὴρ Ἀνατολή ὄνομα αὐτῷ)” (Zech. 6:12), strangest of titles, surely, if you think that a being composed of body and soul is described. But if it is that incorporeal something, undifferentiated from the Divine Image (τὸν ἀσώματον ἐκεῖνον, θείας ἀδιαφοροῦντα εἰκόνας),<sup>77</sup> you will agree that the name ‘Rising,’ assigned to him, is most appropriate.

(63) For he is the eldest son, whom the Father of All raised up, whom He elsewhere calls ‘firstborn,’ and though begotten, imitating the ways of the Father (μυμούμενος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁδοῦς), molded the patterns, by looking at His paradigmatic archetypes (πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα ἐκεῖνου βλέπων ἐμόρφου τὰ εἶδη).

The allegory in this passage does not fit the word in the MT and would be extremely puzzling if it were taken as an exegesis of the Hebrew word **תְּמַח** (*tsemakh*), for this means ‘a growth or a sprout,’ and only by a

<sup>74</sup> And see also Liddel & Scott, s.v. *λόγιος* where the first two connotations suggested are “I. 1. versed in tales and stories, 2. generally learned, erudite. II. skilled in words, eloquent.” Only in III is the connotation ‘oracular’ suggested.

<sup>75</sup> See also above to Isa. 5:7.

<sup>76</sup> So Colson in PLCL. My suggestion, which I now proceed to explain, is ‘an allegorical *peshat*.’

<sup>77</sup> Soon after this, in *id.* 81, the virtues are identified as ἀδιαφορούσας λόγων θείων.





citation, Jer. 15:10 in IV *Conf.* §44, was found to have been culled from a Hebrew/Aramaic allegorical midrashic source used in Greek translation.<sup>81</sup>

It is worth remarking that immediately following this, Philo offers an additional allegorical midrashic vignette from a different source, one whose point of departure must have been the Septuagint text.<sup>82</sup> This provides insight respecting the manner of Philo's use of different sources. We do not find slavish dependence upon a single source. He began by using a Hebrew/Aramaic midrashic composition that he found in Greek translation, and then appended a midrashic insight, one whose point of departure is the Septuagint. This was not merely an exercise in 'copying and pasting' material culled from different places. The material has been integrated and joined almost seamlessly to become part of Philo's very own composition.

Finally, for the sake of completeness, it should be noted that the only other citations from the Latter Prophets found in Philo are those from Hosea and Zechariah, which are found in the *Haftarah* to *Shabbat Shuva* (the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and the Day of Atonement).<sup>83</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> This is evident because, while the citations from the Pentateuch are by and large, as is usual with Philo, faithful to the Septuagint, several of the citations from non-pentateuchal books—the two from Psalms and the one from the Latter Prophets—are free renderings of the Hebrew text. This would naturally result if the translator knew the Pentateuch virtually by heart, but rendered the citations from the other parts of Scripture without referring to the text.

<sup>82</sup> Why this must have been so has been explained above.

<sup>83</sup> In line with this is the fact that even six of the Philonic passages containing references to the Former Prophets are also found in this *Haftarah* cycle. For more detail see the next chapter.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### CITATIONS FROM THE FORMER PROPHETS AND CHRONICLES

The first thing that strikes the eye when addressing the citations and/or allusions to the Former Prophets in Philo's writings is how very few they are. The present chapter discusses and provides explanations for *every one* of them. In this process, new insights of a more general nature have also revealed themselves, since, as we have already seen in the preceding chapters, a careful study of exceptions often brings facets to light that would not otherwise have become evident.

The study of the citations from the Former Prophets found in Philo's works shows that not only is the Septuagint the text that is quoted, but that it is also the *Septuagint text* that serves as *the point of departure for the accompanying exegesis*. This of course provides additional proof of the existence in Alexandria of *original midrashic activity in Greek*. This also demonstrates Philo's use of a scriptural lexicon that included not only the Pentateuch, but also Scripture as a whole, of the type that David Rokeah,<sup>1</sup> Yehoshua Amir,<sup>2</sup> and Lester Grabbe<sup>3</sup> have shown to have existed. Whether Greek was their original language or these writings were translations of Hebrew/Aramaic originals, Philo used them in Greek. The citations from the Former Prophets also provide evidence for Philo's use of written midrashic works.

\*

The following chart provides an overview of all the verses that scholarship has identified as references to the Former Prophets and Chronicles. The chart serves both as a point of departure for the reader, and a summary of the conclusions reached, which are noted in square brackets next to each entry. It has been compiled almost, but not entirely, on the basis of Earp's index in PLCL vol. x, 259ff. However, since as

---

<sup>1</sup> Rokeah, "New Onomasticon" (1968).

<sup>2</sup> Amir, "Hebrew Names" (1961–1962).

<sup>3</sup> Grabbe, *Etymology* (1988).

we have already noted, his index includes the references to literature mentioned in the footnotes in PLCL, the number of actual scriptural references in Philo's works is significantly smaller than appears at first sight.<sup>4</sup>

### CHART

#### *Joshua*

Josh. 1:5 (IV *Conf.* 166) [Mistaken Identification—should be Deut. 31:6]

#### *Judges*

Judg. 8:9 (IV *Conf.* 128–132) [Lexicon/Concordance of Scripture]

#### *I Samuel*

**ISam. 1:1–2:10** = the *Haftarah* to *Rosh Hashanah*<sup>5</sup> (III *Quod Deus* 5–15, III *Ebr.* 143–152, V *Mut.* 143–144, V *Somm.* 1.254, I Suppl. *QG* 4.138) [Allegorical Tradition]

**ISam. 9:8–9** = “for he that is now called a prophet was before-time called a Seer” (III *Quod Deus* 139, IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, I Suppl. *QG* 4.138) [Allegorical Tradition]

**ISam. 10:22–23** = Saul's anointment by Samuel (IV *Migr.* 196–197) [Allegorical Tradition]

#### *I and II Kings*

The Royal Books (= Kgs.) (IV *Conf.* 149) [Scriptural Lexicon, Mistaken identification]

IKgs. 15:11 (IV *Conf.* 149) [Mistaken Identification]

<sup>4</sup> I have added Suppl. I *QG* 1.86 (II Kgs. 2.11–12) which has been identified by Runia in “Secondary Texts in Philo's *Quaestiones*,” David M. Hay, ed., *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, (Atlanta 1991), [= Runia, “Secondary Texts”], particularly 52, 72, 79. *QG* A 2.4 (IKgs. 8:6), and *Hypoth.* (IKgs. 6) are listed by Allenbach *et al.* in *BPSuppl.* (Index of Biblical passages found in Philo), but I have not succeeded in locating them.

<sup>5</sup> While some aspects will be touched upon here, this will be discussed at greater length in the ensuing chapter that refers to the *Haftarah Series*.

II Kgs. 18:3 (IV *Conf.* 149) [Mistaken Identification]  
 I Kgs. 17:18 (III *Quod Deus* 136–138) [Allegorical Tradition]  
 (Suppl. I *QG* 1.86) [Allusion, no citation]

### *I Chronicles*

I Chron. 7:14 (IV *Congr.* 43) [Mistaken Identification]

### *Cases of Mistaken Identification*

The first thing that must be done is to winnow out those entries that prove to be cases of erroneous identification on the part of modern scholarship. The references found to have been cases of mistaken identification are: Josh. 1:5 (IV *Conf.* 166); I Kgs. 15:11 and II Kgs. 18:3 (IV *Conf.* 149), and I Chron. 7:14 (IV *Congr.* 43).

### *Joshua*

Although both Earp,<sup>6</sup> and Colson in the running text of the translation<sup>7</sup> identify the citation in IV *Conf.* 166 with Josh. 1:5, this is mistaken.

Josh. 1:5 (IV *Conf.* 166)<sup>8</sup>

(166) And therefore, the merciful God has delivered an oracle (διόπερ λόγιον τοῦ Ἰεω θεοῦ... ὑπογράφων) of loving kindness, which has a message of good hope to the lovers of discipline. It is to this purport: “I will not let thee go nor will I abandon thee” (Josh. 1:5). For when the bonds of the soul which held it fast are loosened, there follows the greatest of disasters, even to be abandoned by God who has encircled all things with the adamantine chains of His Potencies (ὅς τοῖς ὅλοις δεσμοῦς τὰς ἑαυτοῦ δυνάμεις περιῆψεν ἀρρήκτους) and willed that thus bound tight and fast they should never be loosed.

<sup>6</sup> In his Scripture Index to Philo’s works PLCL vol. X.

<sup>7</sup> *Ad loc.* PLCL IV, 101.

<sup>8</sup> The translation is quoted verbatim from Colson, PLCL, including the ascription to Josh. 1:5.

True, a verse very similar to that cited here does appear in Josh. 1:5, and it is even part of the *Haftarah* reading for the final portion of the Book of Deuteronomy in virtually all current rites (הואת הברכה).<sup>9</sup> At the same time, as their juxtaposition clearly shows, the citation in Philo is almost verbatim Deut. 31:6, while it is only a somewhat free paraphrase of that found in Joshua. The only thing in Josh. 1:5 that is closer to the reference in Philo, is that like in Philo, it is in the first person while Deut. 31:6 is in the third.

Septuagint (Josh. 1:5): οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψω σε οὐδὲ ὑπερόψομαι σε

Septuagint (Deut. 31:6): οὐ μὴ σε ἀνή οὔτε μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπη.

Philo IV *Conf.* 166: οὐ μὴ σε ἀνω οὐδὲ οὐ μὴ σε ἐγκαταλίπω

MT (Josh. 1:5): לא ארפך ולא אעזבך

MT (Deut. 31:6): לא ירפך ולא יעזבך

This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that the pentateuchal citations given by Philo immediately preceding and immediately following this verse are quoted virtually verbatim from the Septuagint.<sup>10</sup> If, but only if, this citation comes from Deut. 31:6 is this the case here, for as just noted, it is no more than a paraphrase of Josh. 1:5.

Further, this is also reflected in the way the citation is introduced. For as we have already shown, while *the Pentateuch as a whole* serves as his frame of reference,<sup>11</sup> when Philo quotes from other parts of the Bible, he usually identifies the specific scriptural venue.<sup>12</sup> For example: in IV *Conf.* 128 Judg. 8:9 is identified as coming from *The Book of Judgments*.<sup>13</sup> But here, the Book of Joshua is neither mentioned by name, nor is it alluded to in any other manner. This is even more striking, since Philo does mention Joshua by name in both historical and allegorical contexts. In VI *Mos.* 1.216 (Ex. 17:9) and in VIII *Virt.* 55–56, 66–69 (Num. 27:15–23), he refers to him as an historical person. And the

<sup>9</sup> Ashkenazi and Ital. Josh. 1:1–18, Sef. id. 1:1–9, Yem. id. 1:1–9, 6:27.

<sup>10</sup> This is the case immediately preceding the passage, in IV *Conf.* 160 (Ex. 21:14), 162 (Gen. 11:6), and 165 (Gen. 4:13), and the same is true for sections 168 (Gen. 11:7), 169 (Gen. 1:26 and Gen. 3:22) following it. Even the reference in section 167 is the exact converse of what is expressed negatively in Num. 19:15. Philo writes there: πάνθῳ ὄσα δεσμῷ καταδέδεται, καθαρὰ ἔστιν, which is the mirror image of the Septuagint: πάν ... ὄσα οὐχὶ δεσμὸν καταδέδεται ἐπὶ αὐτῷ, ἀκάθαρτα ἔστιν, MT: וכל כלי פתוח אשר אין צמיד פתיל עליו טמא הוא.

<sup>11</sup> See Chapter Two: How Philo quotes the Pentateuch.

<sup>12</sup> This will become evident as we proceed.

<sup>13</sup> This is found less than forty sections before this.

proper name 'Joshua' was used by Philo as the point of departure for allegorical or symbolical exegesis in III *Ebr.* 96–98 (Ex. 32:17–19), V *Mut.* 121 (Num. 13:17), and II Suppl. *QE* 2.43 (Septuagint Ex. 24:13). In the light of all these considerations, the identification of this citation as Josh. 1:5 rather than Deut. 31:6 is clearly mistaken.<sup>14</sup>

### *Kings*

IKgs. 15:11 and IIKgs. 18:3 (IV *Conf.* 149)

*Pace* both Earp, in his Index in PLCL vol. X, and Colson, in the running text, the association of Philo's general term *Books of Royalty* (βασιλικαῖς βίβλοις) in IV *Conf.* 149 with IKgs. 15:11 and IIKgs. 18:3 because of the reference in these verses to descendants of King David, is clearly mistaken. Philo does not refer here to any specific *locus*, but merely to *Books of Royalty* (βασιλικαῖς βίβλοις) as a unit.<sup>15</sup>

True, David is called 'the father' of King Asa in IKgs. 15:11, and of King Hezekiah in 2Kgs. 18:1–3. And both of them, as Philo mentions here, lived and flourished long after David's lifetime. But the same is equally true for the kings Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amazia, Jotham, Ahaz and Josiah, all of whom are also mentioned in the scriptural Book(s) of Kings.<sup>16</sup> And they, too, as Philo has written here, "lived and flourished many generations afterwards, though in David's lifetime probably not even their great-grandparents had been born" (IV *Conf.* 149).

Though more could and should be said about this, here we will merely point out that the very spelling of King David's name in IV *Conf.* 149 is an indication that Philo has here used a literary source. For, unless there is a reason for doing otherwise, Philo's references to Scripture regularly follow the spelling of the proper names in the Septuagint. But here this *hapax legomenon*, this sole mention of David by name in Philo's entire *oeuvre*, uses the spelling Δαβίδ rather than

<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, one need not rule out all associative connection with the Book of Joshua on Philo's part. For Josh. 1:5 is found in the *Haftarah* recited on *Simhat Torah*—the *Haftarah* to the closing *Parashah* of the Pentateuch ( *חזאת הברכה* Deut. 33:1–34:12) in all current rites; and it is even found in the *Haftarah* for Deut. 33:1ff. in the Triennial cycle; see *EJ* 15, s.v. "Triennial Cycle," chart on 1387–1388.

<sup>15</sup> The different names used by Philo for the Books of Kings are discussed in Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the Books of Judges and Kings, p. 204ff.

<sup>16</sup> See IKgs. 15:3,11,24; 22:51; IIKgs. 14:3; 15:38; 16:2; 18:3; 22:2, and Jehoshaphat, Ahaz, Hezekiah and Josiah are also so termed in IIChron. 17:3; 28:1; 29:2; 34:2,3.

the spelling found in the Septuagint: Δαυιδ. And since Δαβιδ is the spelling used in the New Testament as well, where the name is found frequently,<sup>17</sup> it *prima facie* here reflects the use of a source written in a ‘modern’ orthography.

*IChronicles*

IChron. 7:14 (IV *Congr.* 43)

Philo states here:

(43) We read, “The sons of Manasseh were those whom the Syrian concubine bore to him, Machir, and Machir begat Gilead” (λέγεται γὰρ: ἐγένοντο υἱοὶ Μανασσῆ, οὓς ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακὴ ἡ Σύρα, τὸν Μαχείρ. Μαχείρ δὲ ἐγέννησε τὸν Γαλαάδ). (Gen. 46:20).

In the footnote to IV *Congr.* 43 Colson remarks that “this verse is not found here in the Hebrew [*viz.* Gen. 46:20], but the substance of it appears in both Hebrew and LXX in IChron. 7:14.” While this is true, at the same time, the parallel in IChron. 7:14 belongs to the study of the Septuagint text, not to that of Philo, since Philo’s citation is an almost verbatim citation of the Septuagint for Gen. 46:20: ἐγένοντο δὲ υἱοὶ Μανασση, οὓς ἔτεκεν αὐτῷ ἡ παλλακὴ ἡ Σύρα, τὸν Μαχείρ. Μαχείρ δὲ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Γαλααδ—and, as will become evident in what follows immediately, Philo used the Septuagint *exclusively*.

*Philo’s Exegesis is sometimes based on the Septuagint Text*

That Philo’s citations of Scripture are according to the Septuagint (and not the MT) is today generally accepted. But not only are the citations themselves from the Septuagint. Philo’s comments on them are sometimes dependent upon idiosyncrasies of the Septuagint text (which

---

<sup>17</sup> This is the case in e.g. Mat. 1:1,6,17, Mark 2:25, 10:47, 48, Luke 1:27,32,69, John 7:42, Acts 1:16, 2:25, 29,34, Rom. 1:3, 4:6, 2Tim. 2:8, Hebr. 4:7 and Rev. 3:7 *et al.* In Josephus the regular spelling is Δαυίδης, which is found 290 times throughout his writings, including *Ap.* and *Wars*, while the spelling Δαβιδ is found there only 29 times—and all of these are in the first six books of *Antiquities*. Respecting stylistic idiosyncrasies in *Ant. I–VI*, see my first published scholarly article: “Is Josephus’ Treatment of the Scriptural Narrative Similar Throughout the *Antiquities I–XI?*,” *JQR* 54/4 (April 1964), 311–332.

differs in these details from the MT). While the present examination is confined to Philo's citations from ISam. 1:1–2:10 (III *Quod Deus* 6, 10, III *Ebr.* 143, 146, 149 and V *Mut.* 143–144) and ISam. 10:22–23 (IV *Migr.* 196–197)—whose major thrust is also ‘the Samuel character’,<sup>18</sup> this phenomenon is by no means limited to these passages. But it is particularly significant because it provides firm evidence of independent exegetical creativity in Greek in Alexandria.<sup>19</sup>

*ISamuel 1:1–2:10*

As has been noted above in the chapter on the *Haftarah* Cycle, today this is the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah in all rites.

III *Quod Deus* 6 quotes ISam. 1:11<sup>20</sup>

MT: נתתו ליה = “I give him unto the Lord”

Philo: δίδωμι σοι αὐτὸν δοτόν = “I give him to Thee as a gift”

Septuagint: δώσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιόν σου δοτόν = “I give him to Thee as a gift”

Philo and the Septuagint both have the word δοτόν = ‘as a gift,’ in common, for which there is no parallel in the MT. And it is on this word, δοτόν = ‘as a gift,’ that Philo’s comment depends:

(6) For she speaks in the first book of Kings in this wise, “I give him to Thee as a gift” (δοτόν) (ISam. 1:11), that is, “who is a gift” (δοτόν ὄντα), and so “I gave him who has been given” (τὸν δεδομένον δίδωμι).

<sup>18</sup> They are studied in more detail below, in the part of the chapter devoted to Philo’s use of a contemporary allegorical source. The only other citations from the Book of Samuel in Philo are ISam. 1:15, which is virtually identical in both the Septuagint and the MT, and so is irrelevant to our concerns at this point, and ISam. 9:9, which is discussed below.

<sup>19</sup> Wolfson, *Philo*, Vol. I, 88ff. has indeed noted that sometimes Philo used the Septuagint text as his point of departure for his exegesis, but he did not draw the same conclusions as here. The dilemma that this posed for him was whether this ruled out Philo’s knowledge of Hebrew.

<sup>20</sup> Colson, following Wendland, gives the reference as ISam. 1:28 in III *Quod.* 6, but this is corrected in Vol. V, 605 (in his endnote to *Somm.* 1:254).



III *Ebr.* 143 also quotes ISam. 1:11

Philo and Septuagint: οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίνεται

(“drink wine or intoxicating liquor”)

MT: contains no parallel here for these words

Philo bases his comments on these words that are *not found here* in the MT.<sup>21</sup>

III *Ebr.* 146 quotes ISam. 1:14

In the MT Eli speaks to Hannah directly, but in the Septuagint Eli’s servant is the speaker. Philo’s midrashic remark, *ad loc.*, “‘Boy,’ not meaning a single boy, but everyone whose age is ripe for restlessness and defiance...” depends on the Septuagint’s reading.<sup>22</sup>

Philo: ὑπὸ παιδάριου τινός... (“by a boy”)

Septuagint: τὸ παιδάριον Ηλι (“By Eli’s ‘boy servant’”)

MT: ויאמר אליה עלי (“and Eli said to her”)

III *Quod Deus* 10 and V *Mut.* 143 quote ISam. 2:5

Philo: ἡ δὲ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησε

Septuagint: καὶ ἡ πολλὴ ἐν τέκνοις ἡσθένησεν

<sup>21</sup> The MT has merely וְהָיָה צְבָאוֹת וְכֹוּר וְתַאמְרָה, ה' צבאות וכו' (“And she vowed a vow, and said: ‘O Lord of Hosts’ ...”), but the Septuagint brings this as: καὶ ἠϋξάτο εὐχὴν κυρίῳ λέγουσα, Ἀδωνα κύριε ελωαι σαβωθ, after which, in the continuation of the verse it adds the detail: καὶ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίνεται (“drink wine or intoxicating liquor”), that, while found elsewhere in the Scriptural narrative, is not found in the MT at this point. Following is a fuller citation of the MT and Septuagint texts:

MT: ותדר נדר ותאמר, ה' צבאות אם ראה תראה בעני אמתך וזכרתי ולא תשכח את אמתך, ונתת לאמתך ורע אנשים ונתתיו לה' כל ימי חייו ומורה לא יעלה על ראשו.

Septuagint: καὶ ἠϋξάτο εὐχὴν κυρίῳ λέγουσα, Ἀδωνα κύριε ελωαι σαβωθ, ἐὰν ἐπιβλέπων ἐπιβλέψῃς ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης σου, καὶ μνησθῆς μου καὶ ὄψῃ τῇ δούλῃ σου σπέρμα ἀνδρῶν, καὶ δώσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιόν σου δοτὸν ἕως ἡμέρας θανάτου αὐτοῦ, καὶ οἶνον καὶ μέθυσμα οὐ πίνεται, καὶ σίδηρος οὐκ ἀναβήσεται ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

<sup>22</sup> The remainder of Philo’s citation is also verbatim Septuagint, for both Philo and the Septuagint have: Ἔως πότε μεθυσθήσῃ; περιελοῦ τὸν οἶνόν σου. (But the Septuagint does not differ here from the MT: עַד מַתִּי תִשְׁכַּחֲרִין, הַסִּירִי אֶת יַיִן מֵעַלֶיךָ; KJV and JPS: “How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee.”)

(“but she that had many children hath languished”)

MT: **ורבת בנים אמללה**, “and she that has had many sons is wretched”

(**האמללה** and ἡσθένησε[v] are not synonymous)

Not only are the words **אמללה** and ἡσθένησε[v] *not* synonymous, but also, while the virtual identity here between Philo’s text and the Septuagint is obvious, the significant difference from the MT is equally evident. Here, too, the point of departure for Philo’s exegesis is the Septuagint text, as is clear from his comments shortly after this, in *Quod Deus* 14 ff.

(14) And when she says that she who had many children languishes (ἄσθενεῖν)... For when the soul... is in travail with many... she languishes (ἐξασθενεῖ) utterly. (15) She brings forth the desires... and thus under the crushing load... she grows faint and dropping her hands in weakness (ὑπ’ ἄσθενείας) gives up the fight.

*ISamuel 10:22–23*

IV *Migr.* 196–197 (ISam. 10:22–23)

Although the MT, the Septuagint and Philo are almost identical, Philo’s allegorical exegesis is dependent upon the slight difference, the singular form of the verbs in the Septuagint, that differs here from the plural of the MT. For it is the taking of Saul from the ‘vessels’ by Samuel (sing.), that provides the basis for Philo’s allegory.<sup>23</sup>

MT ISam. 10:23: **וירוצו, ויקחהו משם** (plural)

(KJV and JPS = And they ran and fetched him thence)

Septuagint ISam. 10:23: ἔδραμεν καὶ λαμβάνει αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν (sing.)

(= he ran thither and took him thence)

Philo IV *Migr.* 197: ἐπιδραμὸν, λαμβάνει αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν (sing.)

(Philo = “he [the Samuel character] ran thither and took him thence”  
[= from amidst the vessels/σχεύεσι = body and sense perception])

\*

<sup>23</sup> A more detailed discussion of the passage is found below in the context of the discussion of Philo’s Use of Contemporary Sources.

In sum, in all of the Philonic passages that deal specifically with ‘the Samuel character,’ Philo’s midrashic exegesis relies upon the Septuagint and *not* the MT. Clearly, for him, *this* was the Holy Scripture. And except for ISam. 1:15 where the Septuagint does not differ from the MT, and 1 Sam. 9:8–9, which will be treated below, together with IKgs. 17:10,18 in III *Quod Deus* 133–139, these are the only citations from the Book of Samuel found in Philo.

It follows of necessity that if, as will be shown, Philo used an allegorical source for his exegesis of the *Haftarah*, this work must have originated in the Greek-speaking Diaspora for whom the Septuagint *was* Scripture. And hence, this reflects the existence of an exegetical tradition *that arose and developed in the Greek-speaking Diaspora*.<sup>24</sup>

### *Philo’s Use of Contemporary Sources*

We now turn to the evidence that these citations provide for Philo’s use of contemporary written sources, not only a homiletical lexicon of proper names in Scripture, but also both a concordance and a written allegorical tradition, whose language was Greek. The passages studied are Judg. 8:9 (IV *Conf.* 128–130), ISam. 1:1–2:10 (III *Quod Deus* 5–15, III *Ebr.* 143–152, V *Mut.* 143–144, V *Somn.* 1 253–256, and probably VIII *Praem.* § 159–§ 160 as well), ISam. 10:22–23 (IV *Migr.* 191–195, 196–197), IKgs. 17:18 and ISam. 9:8–9 (*Quod Deus* 136–139), as well as ISam. 9:8–9 alone (in IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and I *Suppl. QG* 4.138). I repeat, these are the *only* passages in Philo that contain citations from the Former Prophets.

\*

### *Judges*

Judg. 8:9 (IV *Conf.* 128–130)

A careful study of the single allusion on Philo’s part to ‘The Book of Judgments’ (ἐν τῇ τῶν κριμάτων βίβλῳ), as Philo calls what we know

---

<sup>24</sup> See also my remarks in *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter II: Palestinian/Diaspora Midrashic Tradition, 37–71 and particularly 59–61.

under the title Book of Judges,<sup>25</sup> points to Philo's use of a *scriptural concordance written in Greek*, but based and arranged according to the *Hebrew forms* of the words. This is in line with the hypothesis that has been cogently argued by Amir, Rokeah and Grabbe,<sup>26</sup> that Philo indeed had such an hermeneutic aid at his disposal.

The point of departure for the allegorical exegesis in IV *Conf.* 128–130, where the citation from the Book of Judges is found, is Gen. 11:4 “Let us build ourselves a city and tower (πύργον) whose head shall reach to heaven”—*viz.* the description of the Tower of Babel. Following are the relevant parts of the passage that contains the reference to Judg. 8:9.<sup>27</sup>

(122) Is not Cain... in a sense raising a building of created and mortal things to subvert those to which has fallen the honour to be the work of a diviner architect? ...

(128) Having received from their father, self-love as their portion, (Cain's) children are eager to add to it (the tower) and raise it heaven high, until Justice (Δίκη), who loves virtue and hates evil, appears and razes to the ground the cities which they fortified to menace the unhappy soul and the tower (τὸ πύργον) whose name is explained in the Book of Judgments (ἐν τῇ τῶν κριμάτων ἀναγραφομένη βίβλῳ).

(129) That name is in the Hebrew tongue Penu'el, but in our own,<sup>28</sup> ‘turning from God’ (ἀποστροφή θεοῦ). For the stronghold, which was built through persuasiveness of argument, was built solely for the purpose of diverting and deflecting the mind from honouring God. And what could be more wrong (ἀδικώτερον) than this?

(130) But there stands ready armed for the destruction of this stronghold he who fights against wrongdoing (ὁ πειρατὴς τῆς ἀδικίας) and ever breathes slaughter against it, whom the Hebrews call Gideon, which interpreted (ἐρμηνεύεται) means ‘trial’ (πειρατήριον).<sup>29</sup> “Gideon swore,”

<sup>25</sup> The titles Book of Judgments (ἐν τῇ τῶν κριμάτων ἀναγραφομένη βίβλῳ) and Books of Royalty (τῶν ἐν βασιλικαῖς ἱεροφαντηθέντων) are found in close proximity—in IV *Conf.* 128 and 149 respectively. See Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the Books of Judges and Kings, p. 204.

<sup>26</sup> See notes 2, 3, and 4 above.

<sup>27</sup> The translation is based on that found in PLCL but is somewhat altered.

<sup>28</sup> Note that Philo contrasts Hebrew with “our own tongue”: for him, Greek.

<sup>29</sup> When translated, as I have done here, as a typically Philonic play on words, the meaning of the section becomes clear, for the word πειρατήριον can mean: a trial, a temptation, a pirates' nest, or a gang of brigands. However, I have not understood how PLCL has rendered the section: “(130) ...the robber who despoils wrongdoing and ever breathes slaughter against her, whom the Hebrews call Gideon, which is interpreted the ‘Robbers' Hold’...”

we read, “to the men of Penu’el saying: When I return with peace I will demolish this tower” (τὸ πύργον) (Judg. 8:9).

The problems that require solution are: Why, in view of the extreme rarity of Philonic citations from non-pentateuchal Scripture, has Philo chosen this particular reference from the Book of Judges? Even more puzzling is how Penu’el, the name of a fortress at the ford of the river Yabbok, located at the entrance to the land of Canaan, came to be associated by Philo with the Tower of Babel in Babylon (mentioned in Gen. 11:1–9). Finally, how has the Gideon of chapter 8 in the book of Judges *become* “he who fights against wrongdoing” (ὁ πειρατής τῆς ἀδικίας)?

These questions are all the more intriguing, because the classic mid-rashic and rabbinic sources are of no help to us whilst neither *Targum Onkelos*, nor *Targum Yonathan (Yerushalmi)*, nor *Rashi*, nor *Ramban*, nor *Ibn-Ezra*, nor *Sforno*, nor *Bereishit Rabbah* intimate anything of the sort.

In the final analysis, even in the natural sciences the ‘proof’ of any hypothesis is very rarely more than the fact that it happens to provide the most satisfactory explanation for a combination of puzzling phenomena. Therefore, if we succeed in providing a reasonable explanation for all of these phenomena simultaneously, this can be considered as at least interim proof, for it will have satisfactorily explained the many perplexing aspects of this passage.

\*

Philo identifies Judg. 8:9 not by the name the biblical book bears in the Septuagint, but as coming from the *Book of Judgments* (= ἐν τῇ τῶν κομμάτων ἀναγραφομένη βίβλῳ). The Philonic citation varies only very slightly from the reading of this verse in the Septuagint—Philo’s citation being a combination of mss. A and B of the Septuagint which themselves are very close to each other.

MT (Judg. 8:9): ויאמר גם לאנשי פנואל לאמר, בשובי בשלום אתך את המגדל הזה

Septuagint A<sup>30</sup> (Judg. 8:9): (καὶ εἶπεν) τοῖς ἀνδράσιν Φανουὴλ λέγων ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἐπιστροφῆν με μετὰ εἰρήνης κατασκάψω τὸν πύργον τοῦτον.

Septuagint B<sup>31</sup> 8:9: καὶ εἶπεν Γεδεων πρὸς ἀνδρας Φανουηλ Ἐν ἐπιστροφῆ μου μετ’ εἰρήνης τὸν πύργον τοῦτον κατασκάψω.

<sup>30</sup> This is the reading of the Codex Alexandrinus.

<sup>31</sup> This is the reading of the Codex Vaticanus.

[Trans. of Septuagint—A: And Gideon replied (B: And he said) to the men of Penu'el, “Upon my return with peace, I will demolish this tower”]

Philo *Conf.* 130: (ὄμοσε Γεδεὼν) τοῖς ἀνδράσι Φανουηλ λέγων ὅτι ἐν τῷ με ἐπιστρέφειν μετ' εἰρήνης τὸν πύργον τούτον κατασκάψω.

[Trans. of Philo: (Gideon swore, we read) to the men of Penu'el saying, “When I return with peace I will demolish this tower” (= Judg. 8:9).]

The key to the enigma is the word מגדל (*migdal*) = πύργος (*purgos*) = tower. Virtually *all* the instances of Philo's use of the word πύργος (*purgos*) = tower are found in midrashic/allegorical expositions relating to the Tower of Babel.<sup>32</sup>

This is so in II *Post Caini* 53, in V *Somn.* 2.284ff., and it is of course also the case here in IV *Conf.* 130. Indeed, the entire book of IV *Conf.* weaves an allegorical tapestry onto the frame of Gen. 11:1–9,—the *locus classicus* in the Bible for the Tower of Babel. It would therefore be most natural for Philo to understand πύργος (*purgos*) = ‘tower’ as a proper noun = ‘The Tower’—and to treat the word ‘tower’ in Scripture to be a synonym and alternate locution for the Tower of Babel.

My hypothesis is that Philo has here used a concordance of the Septuagint, where, shortly after the appearance of the word πύργος (*purgos*) = ‘tower’ (MT מגדל = tower) in Gen. 11:1–9, comes Judg. 8:9, the only instance between them being Gen. 35:21, where the proper name *Migdal-Eder* (ויט אהלה מהלאה למגדל-עדר) is rendered: ἔπηξεν τὴν σκιήν αὐτοῦ ἐπέκεινα τοῦ πύργου Γαδεο, taking MT) מגדל (*Migdal*) that is part of the place-name *Migdal-Eder*, as a separate word, and understanding it as a common noun: πύργος (*purgos*) = ‘tower.’ More likely is the possibility that Philo used a concordance based on the MT (but translated into Greek), where *the very next instance* after Gen. 11:1–9

<sup>32</sup> The single exception is VIII *Spec.* 4.229, which alludes to the prohibition in Deut. 20:19ff.: cut down fruit trees, but only those “that you know are not fruit trees, and use them to build siege works until the city at war with you falls.” Philo has ‘actualized’ the biblical description of siege practice, writing: “But as to the trees which have never had or have lost the power to bear fruit and all the wild type, there should be no stinting in cutting them down at will for siege works and... constructing ladders and *wooden towers* (πύργων)...” Dr. Hava Korzakova has pointed out in an oral communication that while this may well be an ‘actualization,’ it is not a ‘modernization,’ since the siege towers were in fact made of wood, as one sees on ancient frescoes. She has further pointed out that the Trojan horse of the ancient Greeks may also have been conceived with such siege towers in mind, since they looked somewhat like a horse. Note that the description of the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans also reflects the wooden construction of the siege towers, since Josephus relates that the besieged would make forays and burn them.

(the Tower of Babel) of the word מגדל *migdal*) = ‘tower,’ as a common noun and not a place name, is Judg. 8:9 in connection with Penu’el (= Φανουηλ). Either way, Philo could easily have understood the proper name Penu’el in Judg. 8:9 as a synonym for מגדל (*migdal*) = tower and, in consequence, for the Tower of Babel. The hypothesis that Philo used such a concordance thus resolves the enigma of how Philo came to quote Judg. 8:9.

Likewise, the solution to the remaining dilemma: How Gideon of the Book of Judges became both “he who fights against wrongdoing” (ὁ πειρατής τῆς ἀδικίας) and, at the same time “Trial” (πειρατήριον), reflects the use of a homiletical lexicon of the sort described above—one that homiletically renders the Hebrew form of the proper names in Scripture.<sup>33</sup>

The literal ‘translation’ of the Hebrew proper noun גִּדְעוֹן (Gideon, Judg. 8:9) is<sup>34</sup> עוֹן + גִּדְעוֹן = he who cuts down sin.<sup>35</sup> Philo first writes: ὁ πειρατής τῆς ἀδικίας = “he who fights against wrongdoing,” and then, following immediately upon this, he reiterates the same midrashic etymology in a more polished form as “trial” (πειρατήριον).<sup>36</sup>

The rendering of גִּדְעוֹן first as “he who fights against wrongdoing” (ὁ πειρατής τῆς ἀδικίας), and then as “trial” (πειρατήριον), need not evince surprise. For repetition in a more polished form is sometimes a function of translation from another language. First, the literal translation is given, and then it is polished into an idiomatic construction.<sup>37</sup> While I tend to suppose that such a lexicon might well contain both of these options, it is also possible that Philo himself was responsible. Either way, this hardly matters for the present purpose.

\*

<sup>33</sup> As noted above, it must have been one *based* on a Hebrew text virtually identical with the MT, but translated into (or composed in) Greek.

<sup>34</sup> Note that the Septuagint’s rendering of MT Gen. 49:9: גִּדְעוֹן יְגוּדוּ is πειρατήριον πειρατεύσαι αὐτον, thus also taking the word גִּדְעוֹן (Gad) as if it were גִּדְעוֹן = ‘to cut down.’ But whether or not גִּדְעוֹן and גִּדְעוֹן in fact followed each other in an etymological lexicon is not important to our present concerns.

<sup>35</sup> This interpretation brings to mind MT Judg. 6:32 where Gideon is also called יְרוּבְעֵל, understood as יְרוּ = ‘he who fells (the idol of the god) Ba’al.’

<sup>36</sup> This is similar to the many Philonic etymologies introduced by ἐξημενεύειν, whose thrust was not philological but ethical.

<sup>37</sup> See note above to ‘trial’ (πειρατήριον) for why it can be a synonym.

To recapitulate: The Philonic passage should, I suggest, be understood as follows: Section 122 has introduced Cain, “as founding a *city* (Gen. 4:17)... and thus in a sense raising a building of created and mortal things to subvert those... (that are) the work of a more Divine architect,” and then, in section 128, Philo writes that, “...(Cain’s) children desire to *add to it and raise it* (viz. *the tower of Babel*) *heaven high*,<sup>38</sup> until Justice (δικη)... razes... the *tower* whose name is *explained in the Book of Judgments* (= Book of Judges) (ἐν τῇ τῶν κριμάτων ἀναγραφομένῃ βίβλῳ)” ... *Penu’el* etc.

Sections §129–130 then render the names *Penu’el* and *Gideon* of Judg. 8:9 according to midrashic etymologies based upon their *Hebrew* forms. פְּנֹאֵל (*Penu’el*) is taken to mean, ‘turning from God’ (ἀποστροφή θεοῦ),<sup>39</sup> and גִּדְעוֹן (*Gideon*), as ‘he who fights against wrongdoing’ (ὁ πειρατής τῆς ἀδικίας)—which ‘etymology’ is refined, and repeated as ‘trial’ (πειρατήριον).

All the information required is found in this one verse (Judg. 8:9) with the help of the aids suggested. Hence, there is no need to suppose that it was culled from an extensive literary source. And last but not least: it is not necessary to assume that the equation of *Penu’el* with the Tower of Babel was the result of an unfortunate or inadvertent misunderstanding. Philo notoriously disregards the context whenever he wishes to embed material into his allegorical web. And similarly, rabbinic midrash also frequently transfers elements from their original context to another one, even while in the second context they are entirely irrelevant from the standpoint of the ‘plain’ sense of Scripture. This is done when it is found to be useful for purveying the message at hand.

### *Samuel*

ISam. 1:1–2:10 (Haftarah for Rosh Hashanah)

We now turn to the consideration of Philo’s allegorical rendition of ISam. 1:1–2:10. This is the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah.<sup>40</sup> Material found in ISam. 1:1–2:10 is quoted in III *Quod Deus* 5–

<sup>38</sup> See Gen. 11:1–9.

<sup>39</sup> It is to be stressed that the identification is not geographical, but rather constitutes an allegorical midrashic detail which enriches the larger allegorical tapestry.

<sup>40</sup> The central idea in the *Haftarah* is, as usual, related to the Torah reading for the



15, III *Ebr.* 143–152, V *Mut.* 143–144, V *Somn.* 1.254, and VIII *Praem.* 159–160 probably belongs here as well.<sup>41</sup> I shall treat these passages together, for what is missing in one is found in another, and together they become a coherent whole.

In III *Quod Deus* 5–15, ISam. 1:11 and ISam. 2:5 are quoted and alluded to as coming from *The First Book Of Kings*.<sup>42</sup> In III *Ebr.* 143, the next passage that refers to material from the book of Samuel (ISam. 1:11,14,15), the identification is by the use of the locution, *Samuel the greatest of kings and prophets*. V *Mut.* 143 introduces ISam. 2:5 as *A hymn sung by Hannah*, and finally, Hannah is called *a prophetess and mother of a prophet* in V *Somn.* 1.254, which passage also contains an additional reference to ISam. 1:11. The fact that the first mention is explicitly identified as coming from *The First Book of Kings*, while in the other instances the protagonists are identified without explicit mention of the biblical book, suggests that they all belong to the same source.

The passages fit together and complete each other, and Philo has either made use of an existing allegorical tradition in the different contexts, or perhaps it was his very own. In any event, in view of the fact that the very allegorical constructs are dependent upon the Septuagint, and as we proceed additional considerations will also be found to point in this direction, to the extent that there was an underlying source, it must have been composed in Greek.

Since ISam. 1:1–2:10 is the *Haftarah* reading for *Rosh Hashanah* in all current rites, such a mystical allegorical exposition readily fits into the same frame of reference whereby The Song of Songs, which is read in the Synagogue on *Shavuot* (Feast of Pentecost, חג השבועות) was from early times understood as a mystical allegory.<sup>43</sup> Though of course

---

day: Gen. 21:1–34, “(1) And the Lord remembered Sarah... (2) And Sarah conceived ...” (JPS translation). As I noted above towards the end of Chapter Three, although Philo quotes verses from the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah, from that for *Shabbat Shuva*, and that for Yom Kippur, there is no citation or even any allusion to the *Haftarah* for the second day of Rosh Hashanah. This suggests that the second day of Rosh Hashanah may not have been celebrated in Alexandria in Philo’s day.

<sup>41</sup> The reference in VIII *Praem.* 159–160 has already been discussed in connection with Isa. 54:1, where it was shown that that the correct reference is almost certainly ISam. 2:5.

<sup>42</sup> This is the name for the book given in the Septuagint.

<sup>43</sup> Since Mishnah Yad. 3:5 includes *inter alia* R. Akiva’s vehement defense of the Song of Songs, its allegorization could not be later than the first century CE. According to Midrash Shir ha-Shirim (which is of course much later, but contains much early material), the book is read as an allegory of the love between God and *Knesseth Yisrael* (the people of Israel). In Christian tradition, it is understood allegorically as well.

very different in both subject and manner of presentation, as in the traditional allegorization of The Song of Songs, here too, Philo presents the biblical characters as typological symbols, in this case in order to describe the soul's path to the Divine.

\*

What follows presents the allegory of the *Haftarah* to Rosh Hashanah in outline, by means of short pertinent excerpts from Philo.<sup>44</sup> The path to the Divine is charted in III *Quod Deus* 5–15. It states that the road that brings us to ‘God possession’ leads away from the senses. In addition, the passage also stresses the number seven, which represents the heavenly sphere as being paramount “in the harmony of the universe and in the thoughts of the virtuous soul.”<sup>45</sup> We read:

### III *Quod Deus* 5–15 (ISam. 1:11 and 2:5)

(5) He finds a disciple and successor in Hannah, the gift of the wisdom of God, for the name Hannah, interpreted (ἐξουηνεύεται), is ‘her grace.’<sup>46</sup> She received the divine seed and became pregnant.<sup>47</sup> And when she had reached the consummation of her travail, and had brought forth the type of character which has its appointed place in God’s order, which she named Samuel—a name which interpreted (ἐξουηνευσθεις) means ‘appointed to God’ (τεταγμένος θεῷ)<sup>48</sup>—she took him and rendered him in due payment to the Giver, (δίδωσι τῷ δόντι)...

<sup>44</sup> Unless otherwise noted, the citations embedded in the Philonic text are either verbatim renderings of the Septuagint, or very close paraphrases.

<sup>45</sup> As has been pointed out by Colson, in his note *ad loc.* Philo has explained this in greater detail in I *All.* 1.2–16. The significance of the number seven is one of the important building blocks in Philo’s thought. See on this in Chapter Four, s. v. Isa. 54:1.

<sup>46</sup> Hebrew חנה: הַחַן שֶׁלָּהּ. It is well to remind the reader that, as already noted above, Philo found these etymologies ready at hand in a work based upon the Hebrew text, which he used in Greek—this latter being either its original language, or else, like Ben Sira, IMacc. et al., the lexicon was a translation from a Hebrew original. See also above, Chapter One, where I noted that Grabbe has shown that Philo used the word ἐξουηνεύειν to introduce the ‘etymologies’ of names in Scripture, but not Greek words, for which a different term is used.

<sup>47</sup> The metaphor of the ‘Divine impregnation’ of the purified soul/mind described here by Philo must have been congenial to developing Christian thought even while it differs in crucial respects. Of course, here in Philo it is used in a symbolic allegorical connotation that could hardly have been intended to be taken literally. For other examples, see e.g. I *Leg. All.* 180–181, II *Cher.* 43ff. and II *Suppl.* QF 2.3.

<sup>48</sup> The Hebrew שמואל is midrashically rendered as if it were שמו אל with a *sin* (ש),

(6) For she speaks in the First Book of Kings (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν βασιλειῶν)<sup>49</sup> in this wise, ‘I give him, a gift to Thee’ (δίδωμι σοι αὐτὸν δοτόν) (ISam. 1:11), that is ‘who is a gift,’ (τῷ δοτόν ὄντα) and so ‘I give him who has been given’ (τὸν δεδομένον δίδωμι).<sup>50</sup> This agrees with the most sacred ordinance of Moses, ‘My gifts, My offerings, My fruits ye shall observe to bring to Me’: τὰ δῶρά μου, δόματά μου, καρπώματά μου διατηρήσετε προσφέρειν ἔμοι (Num. 28:2).<sup>51</sup>

(7) For to whom should we make thank-offering save to God? ...

(10) Indeed of the nature of the soul beloved of God no clearer evidence can we have than that hymn of Hannah which contains the words, ‘the barren hath borne seven, but she that had many children languished’ (ISam. 2:5)...<sup>52</sup>

(14) And when she says ‘that she who had many children languishes,’ her words are as clear as they are true. For when the soul that is one, departs from the one and is in travail with many ... and then weighed down and sore pressed by the multitude of children that cling to her ... she languishes utterly. She brings forth the desires of which the eyes and the ears are the channels... she is pregnant with the lusts of the belly and those who have their seat below it...<sup>53</sup>

### III *Ebr.* 143–152 (ISam. 1:11,14,15)

The second passage, III *Ebr.* 143 ff., conceives Samuel “(144) ...not as a living compound of soul and body, but as a mind which rejoices in the service and worship of God....” It states that:

(145) ...without divine grace it is impossible either to leave the ranks of mortality or to stay forever among the immortal. Now when grace fills

---

which is of course not the etymology given in the Biblical text, but a somewhat fanciful midrashic exegesis of the *Hebrew form* of the name...

<sup>49</sup> See Endnote D: Philo’s Terminology for the Books of Judges and Kings, p. 204.

<sup>50</sup> While, as has already been noted, this is not an entirely exact citation, it is obviously an allusion to Septuagint (ISam. 1:11): καὶ δώσω αὐτὸν ἐνώπιον σου δοτόν ... For the MT has only: כָּל יָמֵי חַיָּי וְנָתַתִּיו לֵה', without the ‘as a gift.’ Also, as noted above, the reference here is to ISam. 1:11 and not to verse 28 as given in PLCL *ad loc.*, but corrected in Vol. V, 605 in the endnote to *Somm.* 1:254.

<sup>51</sup> This is a verbatim citation of the Septuagint: Τὰ δῶρά μου, δόματά μου, καρπώματά μου [εἰς δόμην εὐδοκίας] διατηρήσετε προσφέρειν ἔμοι... The verse is found in the pentateuchal passage called *Parashat ha-Tamid* (Num. 28:1–8) that contains the instructions for the *Tamid* sacrifice (offered twice daily in the Temple)—and which today is recited every morning in lieu of the actual ritual (MT Num. 28:2 reads: אֵת קַרְבְּנֵי לַחֲמִי לֵאשֵׁי רִיחַ נִחַיָּח תִּשְׁמְרוּ לַהֲקָרִיב לִי בַמּוֹעֵד)

<sup>52</sup> The wording is very close to the Septuagint (which differs from the MT).

<sup>53</sup> The soul’s travail is represented here as struggling against the seductions and enticements of the senses.

the soul... (146) ...it is possessed... (147) For with the God-possessed not only is the soul wont to be stirred and goaded as it were into ecstasy, but the body also is flushed and fiery, warmed by overflowing joy within... (152) ...the mind, which has drunk deep of abstinence unmixed, becomes a libation which is poured out to God. ...so that it shall touch the bounds of the All, and hasten to that glorious and loveliest of Visions—the Vision of the Uncreated.

Thus we read (at greater length):

(143) Therefore Samuel too, the greatest of kings and prophets, “will never,” as the Holy Word (ὁ ἱερός λόγος) tells us, “drink wine or intoxicating liquor, till his dying day” (ISam. 1:11)...<sup>54</sup>

(144) Now probably there was an actual man called Samuel; but we conceive of him, not as a living compound of soul and body, but as a mind which rejoices in the service and worship of God and that only. For interpreted (ἐρμηνεύεται) his name means ‘appointed to God’ (τεταγμένος θεῷ)...<sup>55</sup>

(145) His mother is Hannah, whose name means in our language, ‘grace’ ...<sup>56</sup>

(146) Now when grace fills the soul, that soul thereby rejoices and smiles and dances, for it is possessed and inspired, so that to many not so enthused, it may seem to be drunken, crazy and beside itself. And therefore she is addressed by a ‘boy’ (παιδαρίου τινός),<sup>57</sup> not meaning a single boy, but everyone whose age is ripe for restlessness and defiance and mockery of excellence, in these words: “How long wilt thou be drunken? Put away thy wine from thee” (ISam. 1:14)...

(149) Fitly then, does she answer ... “A woman of the hard day (σκληρὰ ἡμέρα), I have drunk no wine or strong drink, and I will pour out my soul before the Lord” (ISam. 1:15)...<sup>58</sup>

(150) First, we see, she calls herself ‘hard day’ (σκληρὰ ἡμέρα) (ISam. 1:15), for ...to every fool the way to virtue seems rough and painful and ill to tread...

---

<sup>54</sup> As already pointed out above, there is no mention in MT ISam. 1:11 of refraining from wine or intoxicating liquor: וּגְתַתִּי לֶהּ כָּל יַמֵּי חַיָּי וּמוֹרָה לֹא יַעֲלֶה עָלַי רֵאשׁוֹ. It is, however, found in MT Num. 6:1–5 even before the prohibition to cut the hair, both of which are considered to be an integral part of the Nazirite vow.

<sup>55</sup> Here, too, Hebrew שְׂמוּאֵל is ‘explained’ as שְׂמוּ אֵל with a *sin* (ש).

<sup>56</sup> Hebrew הַחַן שְׁלֵהּ; see above.

<sup>57</sup> As I noted above, there is no equivalent in the MT for the Septuagint’s τὸ παιδάριον. Nevertheless, the allegory is dependent on the word.

<sup>58</sup> Philo and the Septuagint are virtually the same, and they both also render MT: קֶשֶׁת רוּחַ as σκληρὰ ἡμέρα.

(152) ...What else was meant by the words, “I will pour out my soul before the Lord” (ISam. 1:15), but that I will consecrate it all to Him, I will loosen all the chains that bound it tight, which the empty aims and desires of mortal life had fastened upon it; I will send it abroad, extend and diffuse it, so that it shall touch the bounds of the All, and hasten to that most glorious and loveliest of visions—the vision of the Uncreated?<sup>59</sup>

V *Mut.* 143<sup>60</sup> (ISam. 2:5)

In V *Mut.* 143–144 it is stated that while “(143)...it is not the nature of a barren woman to bear... the soul which is sterilized to wickedness and unfruitful of the endless host of passions and vices... bears offspring worthy of love, even the number seven... (144) holds fast to the ‘seventh’ and the supreme peace which it gives.” The passage reads:

(143) Again, some ask whether the barren (στεῖρα)<sup>61</sup> can bear children, since the oracles (οἱ χρησμοὶ) earlier describe Sarah as barren (στεῖραν) and now admit that she will become a mother. Our answer to this must be that it is not in the nature of a barren woman (στεῖρα) to bear, any more than of the blind to see or of the deaf to hear.

But as for the soul, which is sterilized to wickedness and unfruitful of the endless host of passions and vices, scarce any prosper in childbirth as she. For she bears offspring worthy of love, even the number seven according to the hymn sung (κατὰ τὸ ἠδόμενον ᾄσμα) by Hannah,<sup>62</sup> that is, grace, which says, ‘The barren (στεῖρα) hath borne seven, but she that is much in children hath languished (ἠσθένησε)’ (ISam. 2:5).

(144) ...but the word ‘barren’ she applies to the mind which ...holds fast to the ‘seventh’ and the supreme peace which it gives.

V *Somn.* 1.252–256 (ISam. 1:11)

Finally, this passage can serve as a summary of the previous three passages, since it reviews, in outline, the major points that have been made.

<sup>59</sup> Note the mystic allegorical conceptualization.

<sup>60</sup> Only a few sections before this, in V *Mut.* 139, Philo has quoted Hos. 14:9–10, which is part of the *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Shuva* (the Sabbath between Rosh Hashanah and the Day of Atonement)—another indication that these citations belong to the exegesis of the liturgical readings of the High Holidays.

<sup>61</sup> Nikiprowetsky’s article “STEIRA, STERRA, POLLH et l’exégèse de Sam. 2:5 chez Philon d’Alexandrie,” *Sileno* 3 (1977), 149–185, repr. 1996, 171–197, has been cited for this passage. I have not succeeded in locating it.

<sup>62</sup> Note in passing that neither the MT nor the Septuagint states that Hannah composed the hymn; only that *she sang it*.

V *Somn.* 1 252–256 (with deletions) reads:

(252) ... Now a vow is in the fullest sense a dedication, seeing that a man is said to give a gift to God when he renders not only his possessions but himself, the possessor of them.

(253) For he says, ‘He shall be holy that lets the locks of the hair of his head grow long’ (Num. 6:5), that is, the man who has made the vow; and if he is holy, he is nothing else than a dedicated offering, seeing that he no more comes in contact with anything unhallowed and profane.

(254) What I say is vouched for by that prophetess and mother of a prophet, Hannah (προφήτις καὶ προφητοτόκος, Ἄννα) whose name is in our tongue ‘grace’ (χάρις). For she says that she is giving a gift to the Holy One, her son Samuel (ISam. 1:11), not meaning a human being but rather an inspired temper possessed by a God-sent frenzy. And ‘Samuel’ means ‘appointed to God.’ ...

(256) For so shalt thou be able also to return to thy father’s house, and be quit of that long endless distress which besets thee in a foreign land.<sup>63</sup>

We read here that Hannah (= ‘grace’) “...says that she is giving as a gift to the Holy One *her son Samuel, not meaning a human being*, but rather an inspired temper possessed by a God-sent frenzy...” This leads up to V *Somn.* 1.256 (found nearly at the close of V *Somn.* 1) that states: “(256) For so shalt thou be able also to return to thy father’s house, and be quit of that long endless distress which besets thee in a foreign land.” In contexts such as these, ‘foreign land’ means the world of the senses, in contrast to the true abode of the soul.<sup>64</sup>

In sum: All of these passages that quote verses from the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah, whether taken together or separately, treat the *Haftarah* as an allegory of the soul. And, as we shall see in what follows, we may add to this the passage in IV *Migr.* 191–195, 196–197 that quotes ISam. 10:22–23, for it apparently belongs to the same allegory, and it is to this that we now turn.

\*

<sup>63</sup> I.e. the world of the senses.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. the similar thought in IV *Conf.* §77–§78 where Philo states that for the wise, heaven is home, and this world ‘a foreign land.’ It is quoted at the end of my article, “Agrippa I and *De specialibus legibus* IV 151–159,” *StPhA* II (1990), 84–85, in illustration of the intertwining of spiritual/theological messages and current events in Philo’s writings.

ISam. 10:22–23 (IV *Migr.* 191–195, 196–197)

IV *Migr.* 191–197 is the *only* other citation from the Book of Samuel in Philo, except for ISam. 9:9, which will be discussed together with the citation from IKgs. 17:10,18 in III *Quod Deus* 136–139 (immediately after the present passage). Though IV *Migr.* 191–197 describes Saul’s anointment as king by Samuel, it is Samuel, not Saul, who has the leading role. And hence its discussion belongs here together with ISam. 1:1–2:10 (the *Haftarah* of the first day of Rosh Hashanah), where, as we have just seen, the protagonist is the ‘Samuel character.’<sup>65</sup> For this is the *only* mention of Saul by Philo, and he has not even etymologized his name. Saul is clearly not a ‘stand alone’ personality for Philo, but is discussed in the framework of the Samuel allegory.

Philo defined Samuel in III *Ebr.* 143–152 as “a mind that rejoices in the service and worship of God and that only.” Here in IV *Migr.* 191–197, with the help of the ‘Saul personality’, Philo charts the path to the Divine, the path to the mystical intoxication of the soul.

The proper noun *Haran* is midrashically associated with the Hebrew word חור = hole, *viz.* the crevices of the eyes, ears etc.—the vessels of sense perception. And like elsewhere in Philo’s writings, here too *Haran* represents the sphere of sense,<sup>66</sup> the bodily abode of the soul, which must be transcended in the process of striving to “arrive at the contemplation of Him that IS.”<sup>67</sup>

The word in the scriptural citation in § 197 that links ISam. 10:22–23 to the allegorical thread of the pericope is τὸ σκεῦος (= vessel). And although this is not the regular connotation of τὸ σκεῦος, here Philo renders it as if it were a synonym for τὸ ἄγγειον to refer to ‘the body and the senses’—as the *vessel* containing the soul.

The word ἄγγειος for the human body and its cavities, as well as metaphorically for the body as the vessel of the soul, is found in good and even classical Greek,<sup>68</sup> and a clear example of Philo’s use of the word τὸ ἄγγειον in this connotation is e.g. IV *Congr.* 21:

<sup>65</sup> It is also possible that these verses may have been part of the *Haftarah* reading for *Parashat Shofetim* in Philo’s day. On this see Endnote B: Philo and the Contemporary Italian Rite, p. 199 ff.

<sup>66</sup> See Earp’s Index of Names, PLCL vol. x, 320–321.

<sup>67</sup> See end of IV *Migr.* 195 (quoted shortly).

<sup>68</sup> See LSJ s.v. τὸ ἄγγειον II, where it is noted that in addition to its more general uses, it is also used metaphorically to refer to the body as the vessel of the soul; *inter alia*,

Sense being the bodily part (σωματοειδέστερον) of the soul, it is riveted to the vessel (ἀγγεῖον) of the soul as a whole, and this soul-vessel (τὸ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀγγεῖον) is symbolically called Egypt.

In contrast to this, of the fifteen times (in about ten different passages) that σκεῦος appears in Philo's writings, only here is it used as a synonym for ἀγγεῖος, as 'vessel of the soul.' However, we do find the word τὸ σκεῦος in the NT in a somewhat similar connotation—in Acts 9:15 referring to Hanan the High Priest as a 'chosen vessel,' in 2 Cor. 4:7 symbolically of the human body, in I Thess. 4:4 body (or sexual organ<sup>2</sup>), and in IPeter 3:7 for wife, as a 'weaker vessel.'<sup>69</sup> Thus, though in classical Greek the words are not synonymous, in Philo's day their contemporary usage was close enough for them to be associated with each other in an allegorical exegetical text, if this was required for the allegory.

With this as introduction, we turn to IV *Migr* 191, which introduces the subject of the passage.

(191) For when the mind, possessed by some philosophical principle (τῶν κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν καταχθεις θεωρημάτων), is drawn by it, it follows this, and needs must be oblivious of other things, of all the concerns of the cumbersome body. And if the senses are a hindrance to the exact contemplation of the spiritual object (πρὸς τὴν ἀκριβῆ θεῶν τοῦ νοητοῦ), those who find happiness in contemplation (τοῖς φιλοθεάμοισι) are at pains to crush their attack; ...that no object of sense-perception may bedim the eye of the soul (τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα), to which God has given the power to look at things spiritual (ᾧ νοητὰ βλέπειν)...

The 'eye of the soul' (τὸ ψυχῆς ὄμμα) is here represented as "looking at things grasped by the mind" (ᾧ νοητὰ βλέπειν), as a stage in the perception of their inner meaning (ὄραῖν).<sup>70</sup>

The passage continues:

(193) For our mind (ἡμέτερος νοῦς) has not created the body, but it is the workmanship of Another; hence it is contained in the body as in a vessel (ὡς ἐν ἀγγεῖον τῷ σώματι)...

---

HP *Morb.* 4.37 (= Hippocrates, 5th cent. BCE, Περὶ Νοῦσων), Aristotle, *HA* (= *Historia Animalium*) 521b6, *PA* (= *Partibus Animalibus*) 680b33, and *M. Ant.* (= *Marcus Antoninus*) 3.3 for the body itself.

<sup>69</sup> But while ἀγγεῖος is also found in Mat. 25:4, and in a *var. lect.* to Mat. 13:48, there, it does not have this connotation.

<sup>70</sup> The difference between βλέπειν 'to look at' and ὄραῖν 'to see, to perceive, to envision' in the Philonic passages quoting ISam. 9:9 (III *Quod Deus* 139, IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and I Suppl. *QG* 4.138) is discussed in Endnote E: 'To Look' and 'To See' (βλέπειν / ὄραῖν), p. 204ff.



(195) ...For it is impossible that the mind whose course still lies in the sensible rather than the mental should arrive at the contemplation of Him that IS (πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ὄντος ἐλθεῖν ἐπίσχεψιν).

I am convinced that this is the central idea of the allegorical interpretation of ISam. 10:22–23, and it is repeated in 196–197 which quotes ISam. 10:22–3. But while 193 and 197 have ὡς ἐν ἀγγείῳ τῷ σώματι and τοῖς ἀγγείοις τῆς ψυχῆς, 196 uses the term σκεύειον, because this is the word found in the Septuagint of ISam. 10:23; and in order to fit the allegory, the σκεύειον of the Septuagint is understood as ἀγγείοις.

XXXVI (196) This is why the character appointed to the highest post in God's service, who is called 'Samuel,' does not set forth the duties of kingship to Saul while still lingering amid the baggage (vessels) (ἐν τοῖς σκεύειον), but when he has drawn him out thence. For he inquires of the L-d whether the man is still on his way hither, and the Divine reply is, "Lo, he hath hidden himself among the baggage (vessels) (ἰδοὺ αὐτὸς κέκρυπται ἐν τοῖς σκεύειον) (ISam. 10:22)."<sup>71</sup>

(197) What then does it become the recipient of this answer to do... save to draw him forth with all haste? So we read, "he ran thither and taketh him thence" (ἐπιδραμών, λαμβάνει αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν) (ISam. 10:23),<sup>72</sup> because, while lingering amid such vessels of the soul (τοῖς ἀγγείοις τῆς ψυχῆς), in body and sense perception (σώματι καὶ αἰσθήσει), he was not competent to listen to the principles and rules of kingship (τῶν τῆς βασιλείας δογμάτων καὶ νόμων)<sup>73</sup>—and we pronounce wisdom (σοφίαν) to be kingship, for we pronounce the wise man to be king...<sup>74</sup> No wonder, then, that the associate of knowledge deems it necessary to quit also the country of sense perception called Haran.

In sum, although the ordinary connotation of the term τό σκεῦος is 'baggage,' for purposes of allegorical exegesis it is used here as a synonym for τὸ ἀγγεῖον to indicate the body as the 'vessel' of the soul

<sup>71</sup> This is an almost exact replica of the Septuagint.

<sup>72</sup> This is very close to the Septuagint text: ἔδραμεν καὶ λαμβάνει αὐτὸν ἐκεῖθεν.

<sup>73</sup> In Judeo-Greek the connotation of the words δογμάτων καὶ νόμων would be something like 'Torah statutes and ordinances.' See the lengthy discussion in *Philo Judaeus*, of the words δόγμα, νόμος and σοφία. In IV *Migr.* 89–94 (only about a hundred sections before the present passage), Philo has unequivocally expressed his commitment to practicing the Commandments.

<sup>74</sup> The association of the wise man with royalty is of course an echo of the Platonic adage that equated philosophers and kings.

and for the orifices of the senses. And even though the citation from the Septuagint has ἐν τοῖς σκεύεσι, Philo's allegorical exegesis of it uses the more correct term τοῖς ἀγγείοις.

\*

*The Midrashic Etymologies of the Names Hannah and Samuel*

The texts of the Philonic passages that contain citations from ISam. 1:1–2:10 (the *Haftarah* for the first day of Rosh Hashanah) have been quoted above at some length. For the sake of completeness, I here bring the following merely in illustration of Philo's use of a homiletic etymological lexicon in these passages (III *Quod Deus* 5–15, III *Ebr.* 143–152, V *Mut.* 143–144 and V *Somm.* 1.254).

The midrashic etymology of the Hebrew name הַנָּח (Hannah = Ἄννα) is found in III *Quod Deus* 5—viz. Ἄννα ... ἐρμηνεύεται γὰρ χάρις ἀντῆς (“the name *Hannah* ‘midrashically interpreted’ is ‘her grace’”). III *Ebr.* 145 and V *Somm.* 1.254 contain an identical or very similar statement. The first letters of the Hebrew name הַנָּח are הַח, which means ‘grace,’ and the suffix הַ adds the meaning of ‘her’ = ‘her grace.’ The vocalization is of course changed—a common practice in this sort of midrashic exegesis.

Similarly, the Hebrew name שְׁמוּאֵל (*Samuel* = Σαμουήλ) is midrashically interpreted in III *Quod Deus* 5: Σαμουήλ—καλεῖται δὲ ἐρμηνευθεῖς τεταγμένος θεῷ (“Samuel, a name which being interpreted means ‘appointed to God’”), which is paralleled in similar, though not identical language in III *Ebr.* 144 and V *Somm.* 1.254. As already noted, this midrashic ‘etymology’ divides the name into two words as ‘God,’ and ‘put him’: אֵל + שָׁמוּ, and the vocalization of the *shin* is changed to a *sin* (ש), i.e., ‘God put (or appointed) him.’ And since this midrashic exegesis could hardly have been meant to supersede the explanation of the name given by Scripture, its purpose could not but have been to add an additional ethical midrashic dimension.

\*

*Kings*

IKings. 17:10,18 and ISam. 9:8–9

III *Quod Deus* 136–139 (= IKgs. 17:10,18 and also ISam. 9:8–9)

This passage contains the reference to IKgs. 17:10,18, as well as the first allusion to ISam. 9:8–9.<sup>75</sup> The treatise as a whole is devoted to the discussion of Gen. 6:4–12, while the references to IKgs. 17:18 and to ISam. 9:8–9 (in § 136–139) appear within the framework of the pericope 122–139. I suggest that a careful reading of this passage points to Philo’s having made use here too of a literary source which he incorporated to enrich his own unique composition. In order to help the reader follow the argument, I shall begin with a summary of the major points, before discussing the material in detail.

Gen. 6:11 introduces the pericope 122–139, and Gen. 6:12 introduces the next pericope that begins in section 140. Both of these verses are virtually verbatim citations from the Septuagint, but the Scriptural citations in the intervening sections (123–139), including even those from the Pentateuch, are paraphrases, free citations, albeit some closer than others, and some no more than references. This suggests that Philo has culled the intervening sections from a literary source containing the main facets of the allegory that he adapted to enrich his composition, for the major thrust of the passage remains very Philonic.

The major factors supporting this hypothesis are, first, that in contrast to the verses of the ‘framework,’ the verses in the allegory do not follow the Septuagint text and are closer to the MT. Such a phenomenon could well have come about if the translator of the source from a Hebrew/Aramaic original translated the verses on his own, without reference to the Septuagint;<sup>76</sup> and the idiosyncratic vocabulary of the passage lends support to this proposal.

Second, in view of the undisputed fact that Philo’s major frame of reference is the Pentateuch, the juxtaposition of the widow from IKgs. 17:18 to the Pentateuchal Tamar would be expected, but here it is

<sup>75</sup> ISam. 9:8–9 is also found three more times elsewhere—in IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and in I *Suppl. QG* 4.138. See Endnote E: “‘To Look’ and ‘To See’ (βλέπων / ὄραν).”

<sup>76</sup> Anyone who has ever engaged in translating material that contains biblical citations from English to Hebrew will be familiar with the temptation not to bother to look up the Hebrew text.

Tamar of Gen. 38:11 who is compared with the widow in IKgs. 17:18. This suggests a source whose point of departure was the prophetic book, and not the other way around.

Finally, the explanation that accompanies the citation of IKgs. 17:18 reflects the very Jewish concept that it is the *awareness* of a sin that makes one culpable,<sup>77</sup> which differs markedly from the tragic Greek concept, that the evil act itself has its own inexorable consequences for the perpetrator.<sup>78</sup>

To complete the picture, though this is not relevant to the above argument, note that this, the first appearance of the reference to ISam. 9:8–9, is almost mandated here.<sup>79</sup> For it explains the equation of ‘man of God’ and ‘prophet’ in IKgs. 18:18—a locution that must have appeared strange to one whose major frame of reference is the Pentateuch.

\*

With this as an introductory ‘road map,’ we are now prepared to turn to the nuanced reading of III *Quod Deus* 122–139. While some of what follows is perforce repetitious, here, what has just been stated categorically, is placed in context. As just noted, the treatise III *Quod Deus* in its entirety is devoted to the discussion of Gen. 6:4–12, while the reference to IKgs. 17:18 that includes Philo’s first reference to ISam. 9:8–9 is found in 136–139, which commences with the citation of Gen. 6:11:

XXVI (122) We may properly ask why, directly after the recital of Noah’s perfection in virtues, we are told, “the earth was corrupt before the Lord, and filled with iniquity” (Gen. 6:11) (ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἀδικίας)? But it should not be difficult to find a solution, except perhaps for one very lacking *paideia*.

Gen. 6:11 introduces the pericope §122–139 and Gen. 6:12 introduces the next pericope (§140 ff.). Not surprisingly, both of these citations from the Pentateuch are almost verbatim Septuagint:

<sup>77</sup> When the Temple stood one was obligated to bring a sin offering *only after* becoming aware of the sin, and hence if a person became aware of several sins at once, he was liable to only one sin offering.

<sup>78</sup> This is the tragic concept at the base of such Greek tragedies as Sophocles’ *Antigone* and *Oedipus Rex*.

<sup>79</sup> There are three more instances: IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and in I *Suppl. QG* 4.138.

Gen. 6:11 (*Quod Deus 122*)

Philo: ἐφθάρη ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἀδικίας

Septuagint: ἐφθάρη δὲ ἡ γῆ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐπλήσθη ἡ γῆ ἀδικίας

(trans.: the earth was corrupt<sup>80</sup> before the Lord, and filled with iniquity)

MT: ותשחת הארץ לפני האלהים ותמלא הארץ חמס

(the earth was corrupt before God, and the earth was filled with violence)

Gen. 6:12 (*Quod Deus 140*)

Philo: κατεφθαρμένη, ὅτι κατέφθειρε πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς

Septuagint: κατεφθαρμένη, ὅτι κατέφθειρεν πᾶσα σὰρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς (trans.: it was destroyed because all flesh destroyed his way upon the earth)

MT: נשחתה, כי השחית כל בשר את דרכו על הארץ

(trans.: it was corrupt, for all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth)

In striking contrast to this, the Scriptural citations in the intervening sections (123–139), both those from the Former Prophets (IKgs. 17:18, and ISam. 9:9), but also including even those from the Pentateuch (*viz.* from Leviticus, respecting leprosy in III *Quod Deus* 123–127), are paraphrases, and sometimes no more than references. This, together with several additional indications, has led me to conclude that the intervening sections are based on a literary source, one that was probably a translation into Greek of a Hebrew/Aramaic original, providing Philo with additional color for his own exposition. Following is my reading of the relevant material.

Immediately after the citation from Gen. 6:11 in 122, Philo presents the leitmotiv of the next 16 sections in 123: that ‘the birth of noble practices is the death of the base’:

(123) We should say then that when the incorruptible element takes its rise in the soul, the mortal is forthwith corrupted. For the birth of noble practices is the death of the base, for when the light shines, the darkness disappears...<sup>81</sup>

<sup>80</sup> The Hebrew root *חָח* and its Greek translation mean both ‘corrupt’ and ‘destroy.’ The same root is used in Gen. 6:11 and 12 in both the Septuagint and the MT.

<sup>81</sup> The italicized words are echoed in §135.

To illustrate this, Philo gives an allegorical rendering of the biblical injunctions concerning the priestly review of leprosy—*viz.* Lev. 13:14–15 (section 124ff.) and Lev. 13:11–13 (section 127), paraphrasing, not quoting the text,<sup>82</sup> and in the denouement in 133–135 it is stressed that *it is the awareness of sin that causes one to be culpable.*

(133) Now, whether in the plain and literal sense of the ordinance these things are consistent with each other is a matter for those who are used to such questions and find pleasure in them. But we must say positively that no two things can be more consistent with each other than that, when the priest has entered, the belongings of the house are defiled.

(134) For so long as the Divine Reason (ὁ θεῖος λόγος) has not come into our soul (εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν), as to some dwelling place (ἑστίαν), all its entire works are free from guilt... There is pardon for those whose sin (ἁμαρτανουσιν) is due to ignorance, because they have no experience to tell them what they should do. For they do not even conceive of their deeds as sins (ἁμαρτημάτων)...

(135) But when the true priest, Conviction (ἔλεγχος), enters us, like a pure ray of light...<sup>83</sup> we see in their real value the unholy thoughts... and the guilty and blameworthy actions to which we laid our hands (ἐνεχειροῦσιν) ... that he may see the soul's house (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς οἰκίαν) in its natural bare condition...

Note the idiosyncratic vocabulary. There is the relatively uncommon word ἑστία in 134 for house, instead of the far more usual terms οἶκια and οἶκος. Although the word ἑστία is found elsewhere in Philo—cf. e.g. VIII *Virt.* 73, "...earth and heaven, one the hearth (ἑστίαν) of mortals, the other the house (οἶκον) of immortals"<sup>84</sup>—it is found only thirteen times in Philo's writings, while the word οἰκία is found 236 times, and οἶκος 136 times.<sup>85</sup> Here in III *Quod Deus* 134 the different word does not indicate a different connotation, for it is no more than an elegant synonym for οἰκία, since in the very next section (135) the word οἰκίαν (and not ἑστία) is used for 'the soul's house' (τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς οἰκίαν).

<sup>82</sup> The same is true for Lev. 14:35–36 in §131.

<sup>83</sup> Note that this is a repetition of the statement in §123, "For the birth of noble practices is the death of the base, for when the light shines, the darkness disappears..."

<sup>84</sup> The goddess Ἑστία is mentioned in the allegory in II *Cher.* 26 where her name is 'etymologically' derived from ἑστῶσα παγιῶς = 'standing firm.' It is noted in Oskar Seyffert, *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, rev. and ed. by Nettleship, Henry and Sandys, J.E. (NY 1956), s.v. *Hestia*, 293, that this 'etymology' is in line with the "view that afterwards became current under the influence of philosophers and mystics" that in addition to her functions as guardian of the hearth and home, "she was regarded as personifying the earth, as the fixed center of the world."

<sup>85</sup> According to Borgen, Fuglseth and Skarsten, *The Philo Index* (Trondheim 1997).

The word ἐνεχειροῦσιν found in 135 is a *hapax legomenon*, and it is unusual not only in Philo. It does not appear at all in LSJ.<sup>86</sup> Could this be a literal translation of the Hebrew idiom יד תלת? Yet another *hapax legomenon* is the word combination θείαν γονήν (Divine impregnation) found in 137. The idea of God's impregnating the soul with virtues is common enough in Philo's writings.<sup>87</sup> But this particular word combination appears only twice in Philo: here in the singular form, and once more in the plural—in III *Quod Deus* 5: θείας γονᾶς. This latter passage (III *Quod Deus* 5–15) contains a citation from the *Haftarah* to Rosh Hashanah (ISam. 1:1–2:10), in regard to which we have suggested that it too shows signs of the use of a translated source.

\*

To return to the Philonic text here: The 'natural bare condition,' the divorce from the passions, the emptying of the soul of the unholy thoughts and blameworthy actions referred to in 135, is described immediately after this, in 136–139, as the state of 'being widowed of the passions.' And the citation of IKgs. 17:18 that is given at this point<sup>88</sup> highlights the central idea of the entire pericope: that it is the *awareness* of sin that makes a person culpable. It is stated there:

XXIX (136) We have a parallel to this, in the woman in The (Books of) Kings (ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις)<sup>89</sup> who discourses with the prophet. She is a widow (χήρα), not in our sense of the word, when the wife has lost (ἐθήμη γένηται) her husband, but because she is widowed (χηρεύειν)<sup>90</sup> of the passions that corrupt and maltreat the mind...

<sup>86</sup> The *only* result of a search with the TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) is the single instance in Libanius, a rhetor and sophist (4th cent. CE): Or 59.6.14 εἰ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν ἐνεχειροῦμεν ἡμέρα μᾶ μετρεῖν.

<sup>87</sup> The metaphor of the 'Divine impregnation' of the purified soul/mind described here by Philo must have been congenial to developing Christian thought even while it differs in crucial respects. Of course, here in Philo it is used in a symbolic allegorical connotation that could hardly have been intended to be taken literally. For other examples, see e.g. I *Leg. All.* 180–181, II *Cher.* 43ff. and II *Suppl. QE* 2.3.

<sup>88</sup> Colson also refers to IKgs. 17:10 as part of Philo's scriptural source, because it mentions the meeting between the prophet (Elijah) and the widow. The verse reads: "So he (Elijah) arose and went to Zarephath; and when he came to the gate of the city, behold, a widow was there gathering sticks; and he called to her, and said: 'Fetch me, I pray thee, a little water in a vessel, that I may drink.'" I have not included it because Philo neither mentions, nor even alludes to, any of this.

<sup>89</sup> See also Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the Books of Judges and Kings, p. 204.

<sup>90</sup> Philo uses this word to indicate any married woman who has lost her husband, whether a widow, or one who has been divorced.

Then comes yet another indication that what we have here is the incorporation of a literary source, for although Philo's main frame of reference throughout is, without any vestige of a doubt, the pentateuchal narrative, here the pentateuchal Tamar is associated with the widow in 'The (Books of) Kings' (ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις), rather than the other way around.

(136) ... like Tamar (in the books) of Moses (παρὰ Μωϋσῆ).<sup>91</sup>

(137) Tamar was bidden to remain a widow (χιρρευούση) in the house of her father, her one and only saviour (Gen. 38:11) for whose sake she has left forever the intercourse and society of mortals and remained desolate and widowed of human pleasures (ἡρήμωται μὲν καὶ κεχιρευκεν ἀνθρωπίνων ἡδονῶν).

Thus, she receives the Divine impregnation (παραδέχεται δὲ θεῖαν γο-νὴν), and, being filled with the seeds of virtue, bears them in her womb (καὶ πληρουμένη τῶν ἀρετῆς σπερμάτων κυοφορεῖ) and is in travail with noble actions. And when she has brought them to the birth, she wins the mead of conquest over her adversaries, and is enrolled as victor with the palm as the symbol of her victory. For Tamar is by interpretation a palm (Θαμαρ γὰρ ἐρμηνεύεται φοῖνιξ).<sup>92</sup>

The idea expressed here, the divorce of the God-seeking soul from the passions of the physical world, is of course exceedingly Philonic, and one has not fathomed Philo's thought unless one is aware how central it is. And Philo has time and again allegorized the widow (χήρα) to express the idea that the feminine—*viz.* the inferior—soul can be 'redeemed' by divorcing itself from 'physical converse,' i.e., the life of the body and passions.<sup>93</sup> This he sometimes even defined as the re-achievement of 'virginity.' Following is an instance from II Suppl. *QE* 2.3 where the terms 'virgin' and 'widow' are identified with each other:

<sup>91</sup> This is not the same as the locution 'a disciple of Moses'; see further in the final chapter.

<sup>92</sup> And note in passing that the etymological remark respecting Tamar's name, that φοῖνιξ means a palm, must be a Philonic aside. For it would have been meaningful only to a Greek speaking audience since, although the Hebrew word 'Tamar' does in fact translate into Φοῖνιξ (= palm) in Greek, the Hebrew word 'Tamar' does not have the association that Φοῖνιξ has in Greek, and to some extent in English as well: a badge of victory—cf. e.g. Arist. MM 1196a, 36, and Plu. 2.723b, et al.—which is eminently appropriate here.

<sup>93</sup> Although the word χήρα is here and elsewhere understood in a positive connotation, in other contexts Philo uses it in a negative valence—cf. e.g. I *All.* 2.63, II *Det.* 147, V *Fuga* 114 (= 'separation from Virtue').



(3) ...But when souls become divinely inspired, from (being) women they become virgins, throwing off the womanly corruptions which are (found) in sense perception and passion. Moreover, they follow after and pursue the genuine and unmated virgin, the veritable wisdom of God. And so, rightly do such souls<sup>94</sup> become widows (and are orphaned of mortal things), and acquire for themselves and have as husband 'the right law of nature'<sup>95</sup> with which they live.

\*

At this point, Colson has artificially smoothed out what he conceived to be the lack of transition, with the addition: "To return to the Book of Kings," but this is unnecessary since, for Philo, 'Tamar' in Genesis and 'the widow' in Kings were typologically identical. Hence, it is only natural for Philo to return directly to IKgs. 17:18:

(138) Every mind that is on the way to be widowed and empty of evil (χήρα καὶ ἐρημη κακῶν) says to the prophet, "O man of God (ἄνθρωπε τοῦ θεοῦ), thou hast come in to remind me of my iniquity and my sin (τὸ ἀδίκημά μου καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτημὰ μου) (IKgs. 17:18)."<sup>96</sup>

For he, the God-inspired (ὁ ἐνθους οὔτος), who is mastered by celestial yearning (κατεσχημένος ἐξ ἔρωτος ὀλυμπίου),<sup>97</sup> stirred to its very depth by the irresistible goads of God-sent frenzy (τῆς θεοφορήτου μανίας) that enter the soul, creating a memory of past iniquities and sins (ἀδικημάτων καὶ ἁμαρτημάτων ἀρχαίων)... turns therefrom with loathing for all it has engendered, and follows the guidance of that reason which is the interpreter and prophet of God (οἷς δ' ὑφηγεῖται ὁ ἐρμηνεύς τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος καὶ προφήτης ἐπιηται).

<sup>94</sup> According to Marcus, notes b and d, *ad loc.*, while the Armenian has 'mind,' the Greek fragment has the more appropriate 'soul.' The Greek fragment reads: κατὰ λόγον οὖν αἱ τοιαῦτα ψυχαὶ χηρεύουσιν, ἄνδρα τὸν τῆς φύσεως ὀρθὸν νόμον προσσυμβιοῦσιν (from Colson, PLCL II Suppl., 39, note d *ad loc.*).

<sup>95</sup> In light of the considerations presented in my *Philo Judaeus*, 122 n. 30 and *passim*, the words I have put in single citation marks were likely to have been a Judeo-Greek locution for observance of the Torah.

<sup>96</sup> This is a close, but not an exact citation of both the MT and the Septuagint. While Philo has the two words τὸ ἀδίκημά μου καὶ τὰς ἁμαρτημὰ μου, the Septuagint has only τοῦ ἀναμνήσαι τὰς ἀδικίας μου, and MT only להזכיר את עוֹנֵי.

<sup>97</sup> The word 'Olympian' (ὀλυμπίου) that is used here, is regularly used by Philo as a common adjective (not as a proper noun) to indicate 'celestial,' 'upper region as opposed to earthly,' et sim.; this is the case in some twenty instances. See e.g. in III *Quod Deus* 151, 156, *Plant.* 63, 71, and many more; this is in fact explicitly stated in III *Agr.* 119: "And since nothing sacred is censurable, but wholly of good report, it follows that the only Olympic contest which can be rightly called sacred is not the one which the



reference to Moses as a prophet. On the contrary, in V *Mut.* 25ff. it serves as the key term for a homily to the effect that the good man is ‘God’s man,’ while in V *Mut.* 125 it is used for a facet of Moses’ personality *that is contrasted with the prophetic aspects of Moses*—and so is specifically *other* than his mantle of prophecy:

XXII (125) The chief of the prophets (τὸν δὲ ἀρχιπροφήτην) proves to have many names. When he interprets and teaches the oracles vouchsafed to him he is called Moses; when he prays and blesses the people, he is a Man of God (ἄνθρωπος θεοῦ)... (Deut. 33:1)

The allusion to ISam. 9:8–9 as a way of solving this problem is very fitting, for the relevant part of the verse reads:

JPS: (8) ...to the man of God... (9) ...for he that is now called a *prophet* was before-time called a *seer*.

MT: ...נתתי לאיש האלהים... כי לנביא היום יקרא לפנים הראה... (8)

Septuagint: (8) ...τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ... (9) ...ὅτι τὸν προφήτην ἐκάλει ὁ λαὸς ἔμπροσθεν Ὁ βλέπων (sic!).

It is this, I suggest, that is referred to here in III *Quod Deus* 139, the first instance of a reference on Philo’s part to ISam. 9:8–9.

(139) For the men of old days called the prophets (προφήτας) sometimes ‘men of God’ (ἄνθρώπους θεοῦ) and sometimes ‘seers’ (ὄρωντας)<sup>101</sup> (ISam. 9:9). ...well suited, the former to their inspiration, the latter to the wide vision of reality that they possessed.

Clearly, here in III *Quod Deus* 138 it is the citation from IKgs. 17:18 (= Septuagint III Kings), where it is stated that the widow addresses the prophet (Elijah) as ‘man of God,’ that triggered the reference to ISam. 9:8–9 in §139. And it is of course not surprising to find that Philo has continued to use it in other contexts as well.<sup>102</sup>

<sup>101</sup> The Greek word used here is ὄρωντας and not the Septuagint’s βλέπων. See also next note.

<sup>102</sup> For a discussion of the remaining three instances, see the Endnote E: ‘To Look’ and ‘To See’ (βλέπειν / ὄραν), p. 204f., which discusses the instances of ISam. 9:8–9 in III *Quod Deus* 139, IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and I Suppl. *QG* 4.138).

*General Summary of the Chapter*

Following are the major conclusions we have reached in the chapter as a whole:

- 1) Several of the passages listed in the standard indices of the scriptural citations in Philo's works were found to be mistaken identifications.
- 2) Examples were shown where the *lemmata* upon which Philo's exegeses depend are part of the Septuagint text, but are not found in the MT, which provides additional evidence for biblical exegesis composed in Alexandria in Greek.
- 3) Philo used both a scriptural concordance (of the entire Bible) and a homiletical lexicon of proper names, as well as allegorical commentaries. There are indications that they were written in Hebrew/Aramaic but have been rendered into Greek.
- 4) The study of the nomenclature used to introduce the scriptural books mentioned in connection with the scriptural references from the Former Prophets indicates that those introduced by names that are not identical with those of the Septuagint—*viz.* Τῶν Κοιμᾶτων and βασιλικαῖς Βίβλοις (= 'Judgments' and 'Royal Books') are reflections of Philo's use of a *scriptural concordance or lexicon*. Those that were found to stem from an allegorical midrashic composition use the same title as the Septuagint: βασιλειῶν.<sup>103</sup>

\*

In sum, the weight of the evidence points both to a lexicon as well as to a written allegorical source that Philo has woven into the fabric of his composition, and it appears that while Philo has read these works in Greek translation, their original language must have been Hebrew or Aramaic. This should not be surprising when one bears in mind that as the introductory remarks of the translator of Ben Sira attest, such activity was very common. Further, ISam. 1:1–2:10 (to which most of these citations belong), is the *Haftarah* for Rosh Hashana in all of the

---

<sup>103</sup> See the Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the Books of Judges and Kings, p. 204.

current rites, and hence the existence of an allegorical commentary for this *Haftarah* reading of the sort suggested would be only natural.

When all is said and done, even these few references to the Former Prophets provide confirmation of the existence of a vibrant Jewish cultural life in the Alexandria of Philo's day. At the same time, even while it is clear that Philo has made use of a variety of aids when writing, it is no less clear that he has skillfully woven the material culled from them into an intricate allegorical web of his own.<sup>104</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> I note in passing that two of the three citations from the Latter Prophets that are not found in one of the *Haftarot* of the *Haftarah Cycle* (*viz.* Jer. 15:10 in IV *Conf.* 44 and Zech. 6:12 in *id.* 60–63), appear in IV *Conf.* This is the same Philonic book that contains idiosyncratic terminology for the books of Judges and Kings—i. e. Τῶν Κριμάτων and βασιλικαῖς Βίβλοις (= ‘Judgments’ and ‘Royal Books’ in § 128 and 149 respectively).

## CHAPTER SIX

### CITATIONS FROM THE BOOK OF PSALMS

After the Pentateuch, the Book of Psalms is the unit Philo quotes most often—approximately 17–18 times.<sup>1</sup> After the Pentateuch, it was undoubtedly the part of Scripture most familiar to him and to his readers. Just like Philo's references to the Pentateuch, the vast majority of his references to Psalms are also virtually verbatim citations from the Septuagint. Of course, as I have shown at quite some length in the chapter devoted to Philo's use of the Former Prophets, for Philo, Scripture *was* the Septuagint.

With a view to presenting the material as concisely and clearly as possible, the data are presented in the form of two somewhat overlapping charts replete with footnotes, following which comes some relevant discussion.

Chart I lists the Psalms according to *the order of their appearance in Philo's oeuvre*. This chart serves as an overview, as well as an index, to facilitate their study in the context of their place in Philo's writings, both relative to each other and in the different types of Philonic composition. The numbering in the left column refers to *the 18 different Philonic passages* that contain material from Psalms. The third column compares the Septuagint and the MT, and includes any significant introductory formulae used by Philo.

Chart II contains most of the remaining pertinent information.<sup>2</sup> Here, the citations are listed in *the order in which they appear in the biblical Book of Psalms*, rather than in the order of the Philonic books (as is the case in Chart I). Hence, while in the first chart the numbering in the first column referred to the different Philonic passages, in this chart this number refers to *the 18 different Psalms* quoted. I have included in the chart the traditional divisions of the Book of Psalms into five books, in

---

<sup>1</sup> The exact number depends on considerations such as how one counts the paraphrases, as well as the appearance of more than one citation from a single Psalm or in a single Philonic section.

<sup>2</sup> Some of it has already been included in Chart I, but its repetition in this different order increases the clarity of the overall picture.

order to show at a glance that this division is irrelevant to the study of Philo's use of Psalms, since citations from all of the five divisions are to be found.<sup>3</sup>

The second column of Chart II reflects the arrangement of the citations in the order of their appearance in the MT, with the location in Philo given underneath, followed by anything idiosyncratic in the introductory lemma.<sup>4</sup> The third column gives the verse as it appears in the MT (first in Hebrew and then in English translation), followed by Philo's text, which is accompanied by a parenthetical comment regarding the degree of congruence between the Philonic and the Septuagint text.

Even though I consider it virtually axiomatic that for Philo the Septuagint *was Scripture*, I have nevertheless chosen to use both the text and the numbering of the MT,<sup>5</sup> because the vast majority of my readers will refer, at least initially, to the MT, whether in Hebrew or in translation into a European language. For the same reason, since some of my readers will be familiar with the source of these citations from their liturgical use, I have placed the MT rather than the Septuagint text at the head of each entry in order to help readers identify the citations.<sup>6</sup> At the same time, I have also noted the degree of congruence between Philo's text and the Septuagint.

In order to achieve maximum focus, the running comments are placed in footnotes to the charts, and the discussions, as well as the major conclusions, appear at the end of the chapter.

---

<sup>3</sup> Book I yields 4 citations, Book II 4, Book III 5, Book IV 3 and Book V 2 = 18. Since the sum total involved is so small, one cannot draw any conclusions from them beyond the simple fact that all of the divisions are represented.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. e.g. no. 2 where column 2 reads: Ps. 27(26):1, V *Somm.* 1.75, Identification: ἐν ὑμνοῖς ᾄδεται.

<sup>5</sup> That of the Septuagint follows in parenthesis. It is usually, but not always, one number less.

<sup>6</sup> A single example: the very first Psalm used by Philo is MT: ה' רועי לא אחסר (= "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want")—an important Psalm in the liturgy of both Christian and Jew. For the translations, I have used either the King James Version (KJV), the New International Version (NIV), or that of the Jewish Publication Society (JPS before new edition of 1985), but have not been consistent in this respect.

*Chart I: The Citations in the order of the Philonic Corpus*

In this chart, the citations from the Book of Psalms are listed according to their appearance in the Philonic corpus. Allusions, but not citations, are identified by a question mark (= ?). The numbers in the first column count the different Philonic loci—not the different Psalms.

1.	II <i>Gig.</i> 17 Ps. 78 (77):49	Septuagint identical with Philo MT: ישלח בם חרון אפו, עברה וזעם וצרה, משלחת אכי רעיםמל Intrd.: παρὰ τῶ ὑμνογράφου... ἐν ᾧσματι τοῦτο
2.	III <i>Quod Deus</i> 74 Ps. 101 (100):1	Septuagint virtually identical with Philo MT: חסד ומשפט אשירה, לך ה' אומרה Intrd.: ὁ ὑμνογράφος (also introduces <i>id.</i> 77 and 82 = no.3 and 4)
3.	III <i>Quod Deus</i> 77–81 Ps. 75 (74):8(9)	Septuagint identical with Philo MT: כי כוס ביד ה' ויין חמר מלא מסך (see number 2)
4.	III <i>Quod Deus</i> 82–84 Ps. 62 (61):12	Septuagint almost identical MT: אחת דבר אלקים, שתים זו שמעתי (see number 2)
5. (?)	III <i>Quod Deus</i> 182 Ps. 91 (90):11	The Philonic wording is a free rendering of Septuagint v. 11 (but it follows neither the Septuagint nor the MT: כי מלאכיו יצוה לך (לשמרך בכל דרכיך). Though not identified by Philo as a citation, it is clearly an echo of this verse
6.	III <i>Agr.</i> 50–54 Ps. 23 (22):1	Septuagint quoted verbatim in both §50 and §52. MT: ה' רעי לא אחסר ("The Lord is my shep- herd," etc.) Intrd.: προσφήτης ... ὁ τὰς ὑμνωδίας ἀναγράφ- ησας, and calls the single chapter τὸ ᾧσμα. <sup>7</sup>
7.	III <i>Plant.</i> 29 Ps. 94 (93):9	Septuagint = a fairly close citation. MT: הנטע און הלא ישמע, אם יצר עין הלא יביט Intrd.: ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀνήρ ἐν ὕμνοις λέγων ᾧδε

<sup>7</sup> It is also quoted in V *Mut.* 115, where it is introduced: ᾄδεται δὲ καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις ᾧσμα τοιοῦτον.



8.	III <i>Plant.</i> 39 Ps. 37 (36):4	Septuagint = κατατύφησον τοῦ κυρίου (a verbatim citation) MT: 'התעננ על ה' Intrd.: ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως δὴ θιασώτης ἐν ὑμνοῦδίας
9.	IV <i>Conf.</i> 39 Ps. 31 (30):19	Septuagint almost identical to MT: תאלמנה שפתי שקר Intrd.: τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων τις ἐν ὑμνοῖς εὐχόμενος
10.	IV <i>Conf.</i> 52ff. Ps. 80 (79):7	Septuagint almost identical <sup>8</sup> MT: תשימו מדרן לשכניו Intrd.: ἐν ὑμνοῖς που λέλεκται
11.	IV <i>Migr.Abr.</i> 157 Ps. 42 (41):4 Ps. 80(79):6	Septuagint almost identical <sup>9</sup> MT: Ps. 42(41):4 ולילה יומם ולילה MT: Ps. 80 (79):6 ותשקמו לחם דמעו, ותשקמו בדםעות שלישי Intrd.: ἐν ὑμνοῖς εἴρηται (and described as an ἄσμα)
12 (?)	IV <i>Her.</i> 290 Ps. 84 (83):11	Septuagint quite different MT: ... מדור באהלי רשע כי טוב יום בהצריך מאלף Intrd.: εἶπε τις προφητικὸς ἀνήρ
13.	V <i>Fuga</i> 59 Ps. 115:17–18 (113:25–26)	Septuagint: somewhat free but still clearly a paraphrase <sup>10</sup> MT: (17) לא המתים יהללו-יה, (18) ואנחנו נברך יה Intrd.: ὡς καὶ ἐν ὑμνοῖς λέγεται
14.	V <i>Mut.</i> 115 Ps. 23 (22):1 <sup>11</sup>	Septuagint: a verbatim rendering. MT: 'ה רעי לא אחסר (= The Lord is my shepherd, etc.) Intrd.: ἄδεται δὲ καὶ ἐν ὑμνοῖς ἄσμα τοιοῦτον

<sup>8</sup> Philo: ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀντιλογίαν τοῖς γείτοσιν ἡμῶν = Septuagint: ἔθου ἡμᾶς εἰς ἀντιλογίαν τοῖς γείτοσιν ἡμῶν; and cf. also no. 11 = IV *Migr.Abr.* 157 where Ps. 80(79):6 (the preceding verse) is quoted.

<sup>9</sup> Ps. 42 (41):4 Philo and Sept: ἐγένετο (= Septuagint: ἐγενήθη μοι) τὰ δάκρυά μοι (= Septuagint: μου) ἄρτος ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός. Ps. 80 (79):6 Septuagint and Philo: ψομειτς ἡμᾶς ἄρτον δακρύων.

<sup>10</sup> See Chart II number 18 for citation.

<sup>11</sup> It is also quoted verbatim in III *Agr.* 50–54 (= number 6 above).

15.	V <i>Somm.</i> 1.75 Ps. 27 (26):1	Septuagint: κύριος γὰρ φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου (verbatim) MT: ה' אורי וישעי Intrd.: ἐν ὕμνοις ᾄδεται
16.	V <i>Somm.</i> 2.242 Ps. 37 (36):4	Septuagint: κατατρώφῃσον τοῦ κυρίου (verbatim) MT: והתענג על ה' (See also no. 7 = <i>Plant.</i> 39) Intrd.: ἐν ὕμνοις ᾄδεται
17.17a	V <i>Somm.</i> 2.245–246 ff. Ps. 65 (64):10 Ps. 46 (45):5	Septuagint: first exact; second similar to Septuagint which differs from MT MT: פלו אלהים מלא מים MT: נהר פלגיו ישמחו עיר אלהים Intrd.: (245) τις τῶν ἐταίρων Μουσέως ἐν ὕμνοις εἶπεν (246) ἔτερον ᾄσμα
18.	VII <i>Dec.</i> 74 Ps. 115:5–8 (113:13–16) also found in Ps. 135 (134):15–18 <sup>14</sup>	Septuagint: a paraphrase. <sup>12</sup> MT: פה להם ולא ידברו וכו' (cf. also VII <i>Spec.</i> 2.256) <sup>13</sup>

<sup>12</sup> See no. 18 (V *Fuga* 59), for another citation from this Psalm—*viz.* 115:17–18 (113:25–26). Philo here: ὀφθαλμοῖς μὴ βλέποντες, ὡς μὴ ἀκούοντες, μυκῆραι μῆτε ἀναπνέοντες μῆτε ὀσφραίνόμενοι, στόματι μὴ φωνοῦντες μηδὲ γευόμενοι, χεροὶ μῆτε λαμβάνοντες μῆτε διδόντες μῆτε δρῶντες, ποσὶ μὴ βαδίζοντες... This is at most an allusion to Septuagint: 113:13–16 (= MT 115: 5–8) στόμα ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσιν, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ὄψονται, (14) ὄτα ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσονται, ὄφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ὀσφρανήσονται, (15) χεῖρας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ψηλαφήσουσιν, πόδας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ περιπατήσουσιν, οὐ φωνήσουσιν ἐν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτῶν. (16) ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς γένοιτο οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς.

<sup>13</sup> Though Earp notes VII *Spec.* 2.255–256, it is not really parallel. See comments to Chart II *ad loc.* (no. 17).

<sup>14</sup> Neither Earp nor Colson have noted this.

*Chart II: Citations in the order of Psalms*

(The citations in this chart are listed in the order in which they appear in the biblical Book of Psalms (not in the order of the Philonic books). Hence, the numbering in the left column of this chart refers to the different Psalms (18) from which Philo has quoted. The number in parentheses in the second column (e.g. Ps. 23 (22):1) refers to the chapter number of the Septuagint.)

## Book I (Ps. 1–41)

1. Ps. 23 (22):1 III <i>Agr.</i> 50,52: Introduction: προφήτης... <sup>15</sup> ὁ τὰς ὑμνοῦδίας ἀναγράψας (+ τὸ ἄσμα) <sup>16</sup>	MT: ה' רועי לא אֶחָסֶר = The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want...  Philo: κύριος ποιμαίνει με, κει οὐδέν με ὑστερήσει Septuagint: κύριος ποιμαίνει με, κει οὐδέν με ὑστερήσει (exact quote)
V <i>Mut.</i> 115: ἄδεται δὲ καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις ἄσμα τοιούτων	
2. Ps. 27 (26):1 V <i>Somm.</i> 1.75	MT: ה' אורי וישעי = The Lord is my light and my salvation...  Identification: ἐν ὑμνοις ἄδεται
	Philo: κύριος γὰρ φωτισμός μου καὶ σωτήρ μου (almost exact quote)
3. Ps. 31 (30):19 IV <i>Conf.</i> 39	MT: (19) תִּלְמַנָּה שְׂפָתַי שָׁקֶר = Let the lying lips be dumb  id.: τῶν Μωυσέ- ως <sup>17</sup> γνωρίμων τις ἐν ὑμνοις εὐχόμενος
	Philo: ἄλαλα γενέσθω τὰ χεῖλη τὰ δόλια Septuagint: ἄλαλα γενηθήτω τὰ χεῖλη τὰ δόλια (almost exact quote)

<sup>15</sup> The appellation προφήτης for the author of a Psalm appears here and in IV *Her.* 290, where it introduces Ps. 84(83):11—below here *ad loc.*, and also below in the final chapter.

<sup>16</sup> The word ἄσμα is also found in §51 and §54, when referring to this Psalm.

<sup>17</sup> Moses is also referred to in the identification of Ps. 37 (36):4 (III *Plant.* 39) and Ps. 65 (64):10 (V *Somm.* 2.245). The possible significance of this is discussed in the final chapter.

---

4.	Ps. 37 (36):4 III <i>Plant.</i> 39:	MT: <b>וְהִתְעַנַּג עַל ה'</b> = So shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord <sup>18</sup>
	ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως <sup>19</sup> δὴ θιασώτης... ἐν ὑμνωδίας ἀνεφθέγγετο	Philo: κατατρύφησον τοῦ κυρίου Septuagint: κατατρύφησον τοῦ κυρίου (exact quote)
	V <i>Somm.</i> 2.242 ἐν ὑμνοῖς ἄδεται	

---

## Book II (Ps. 42–72)

---

5.	Ps. 42 (41):4 IV <i>Migr.</i> 157; (also <i>id.</i> 80 (79):6)	MT: <b>הִיתָה לִי דַמְעָתִי לֶחֶם יוֹמָם וּלְיַלָּה</b> = My tears have been my food day and night
	ἐν ὑμνοῖς εἴρηται (for both verses)	Philo: ἐγένετο τὰ δάκρυά <b>μοι</b> ἄρτος ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός Septuagint: ἐγενήθη μοι τὰ δά- κρυά <b>μου</b> ἄρτος ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός (almost exact quote)
6.	Ps. 46 (45):5 V <i>Somm.</i> 2.246ff. ἔτερον ἕσμα ( <i>id.</i> 2.245 has Ps. 65 (64):10—see <i>infra</i> )	MT: <b>נָהַר פְּלִגְיוֹ שִׁמְחוּ עִיר אֱלֹהִים</b> = There is a river, the streams whereof make glad the city of God
		Philo: τὸ ὄρμημα τοῦ ποταμοῦ εὐφραίνει τὴν πόλιν τοῦ θεοῦ Septuagint: τοῦ ποταμοῦ τὰ ὀρμήματα εὐφραίνουσιν τὴν πόλιν τοῦ θεοῦ (fairly close citation) <sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> This is the correct reference, for although MT Isa. 58:14 (which is the last verse of the Yom Kippur morning *Haftarah*) has **וְאַז תִּתְעַנַּג עַל ה'**, which is very close to Philo's statement here, the *Septuagint* is very different. The *Septuagint* to Isa. 58:14 reads: ἔση πεποιθώς ἐπὶ κύριον, and not as in Philo's text in both III *Plant.* 39 and in V *Somm.* 2.242: κατατρύφησον τοῦ κυρίου (= Ps. 37 (36):4).

<sup>19</sup> See preceding note.

<sup>20</sup> Philo's use of water, mentioned both here in Ps. 46(45):5 and *infra* in Ps. 65(64):10 to represent the Wisdom of the *Theios Logos* (Divine Word), is in line with its use in both rabbinic and extra-rabbinic literature. For a discussion of the use of water as a metaphor for Torah in a variety of Jewish sources see above, to Jer. 2:13 (V *Fuga* 197) in the chapter on the Latter Prophets. See also Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, 160–164, *et passim*. Further, Philo's exegesis of Ps. 46.5 in V *Somm.* 2.245 is somewhat similar to the understanding of this Psalm in the *Zohar*. See Endnote F: Psalm 46 (45):5 (V *Somm.* 2.246) and *Zohar* ii 63b (*Beshalakh*) and 98b, pp. 208–209. See also my article,

7. Ps. 62 (61):12 III <i>Quod Deus</i> 82. καὶ τὸ ἐτέρωθι λεχθὲν	MT: דבַר אֱלֹקִים שְׁתִּים וְשִׁמְעַתִּי = God hath spoken once, twice have I heard this
	Philo: ἄπαξ κύριος ἐλάλησε, δύο ταῦτα ἤγουσα Septuagint: ἄπαξ ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεός, δύο ταῦτα ἤγουσα (Extremely close—difference is in κύριος / θεός exchange) <sup>21</sup>
8. Ps. 65 (64):10 V <i>Somm.</i> 2.245 = τῆς τῶν ἐταίρων Μωυσεώς <sup>23</sup> ἐν ῥυμνοῖς εἶπεν <i>id.</i> 2:246 also quotes Ps. 46 (45):12 ( <i>see above</i> )	MT: פֶּלֶא מַלְאִים מֵיִם = the river of God that is full of water <sup>22</sup>  Philo and Septuagint: ὁ ποταμὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπληρώθη ὑδάτων (identical)

“Philo’s *Cher.* 40–52, *Zohar* III 31a, and *BT Hag.* 16a,” *JJS* 57/2 (Autumn 2006). Note too in passing that V *Somm.* 2.246–248 speaks of “the holy city in which the Sacred Temple (ἅγιος νεώς) is located,” even while there the verse quoted (Ps. 46:5) is rendered allegorically; see also comment to Ps. 65:10 below.

<sup>21</sup> On the use of the titles *Kyrios* (κύριος) and *Theos* (θεός) for the Tetragrammaton and אֱלֹהִים by Philo and the Septuagint, and the role reversal between Philo and rabbinic midrash, see Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD) in the Septuagint, Philo, and in Rabbinic Midrash, p. 201ff. The present instance is an exception, for Philo here has κύριος for MT אֱלֹהִים. But the other Psalms that Philo mentions in close proximity in III *Quod Deus*—Ps. 101 (100): 1 in III *Quod Deus* 74 and Ps. 75 (74):9 and in III *Quod Deus* 77—all accord with the rule, and render MT אֱלֹהִים by θεός. Possibly, what has triggered the exception here is that Philo may have wished to indicate by this that the Creator of the Universe (the Δημιουργός) mentioned in §80 was indeed the Lord (the κύριος) of Israel.

<sup>22</sup> As has just been noted in the comment to Ps. 46 (45):5 (V *Somm.* 2.246), here too in Ps. 65 (V *Somm.* 2.245) Philo understands water allegorically, as “the stream of Wisdom of the Divine Word” (πλήρη τοῦ σοφίας νάματος τὸν θεῖον λόγον διασυνίστησι). This is in line with the usual association of water in rabbinic sources with Wisdom or Torah. However, Ps. 65 was usually understood by them in the more literal sense as rain. See e.g. *BT Ta’anit*, which tractate is devoted largely to prayers for rain, and where three different verses from this chapter are quoted—*viz.* Ps. 65:7 (*BT Ta’anit* 2a, 9b), 65:10 (*id.* 8b) (which is the verse quoted by Philo), and 65:11 (*id.* 6a, 8b); and cf. also *Exodus Rabbah* 25:3; and even *Midrash Shir ha-Shirim* 7.11, although it contains much allegorical material, nevertheless takes 65:10 in its literal sense, as water. For Philo, since he lived in Egypt where the Nile provided the water, prayers for rain would probably not have been part of his frame of reference (cf. *Deut.* 11:10–11).

<sup>23</sup> Moses is also mentioned in the identification of Ps. 31 (30):19 (*IV Conf.* 39) and Ps. 37 (36):4 (*III Plant.* 39). The possible significance of this is discussed at length below.

## Book III (Ps. 73–89)

<p>9. Ps. 75 (74):8 (9) III <i>Quod Deus</i> 77 ἐν ἑτέροις εἰρηται</p> <p>(Also introduces Ps. 101 (100):1 in <i>Quod Deus</i> 74)</p>	<p>MT: כִּי כּוֹס בַּיַּד ה' וַיִּין חֹמֶר מִלֵּא מִסַּךְ = For in the hand of the Lord there is a cup, with foaming wine, full of mixture</p> <p>Philo and Septuagint: ποτήριον ἐν χειρὶ κυρίου, οἴνου ἀκράτου πλήρες κεράσματος (identical citation)</p>
<p>10. Ps. 78 (77):49 II <i>Gig.</i> 17 Identification: παρὰ τῶ ὕμνογράφῳ... ἐν ἄσματι τοῦτὸ</p>	<p>MT: יִשְׁלַח בָּם חֲרוֹן אַפּוֹ, עֲבָרָה וּזְעַם וְצָרָה, מִשְׁלַחַת מִלֵּאכֵי רָעִים = He sent forth upon them the fierce- ness of His anger, wrath and indignation, and trouble, a sending of messengers of evil.</p> <p>Philo and Septuagint: ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοὺς ὄργην θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ, θυμὸν καὶ ὄργην καὶ θλίψιν, ἀποστολήν δι' ἀγγέλων πονηρῶν (identical)</p>
<p>11. Ps. 80 (79):6 IV <i>Migr.</i> 157 (also has Ps. 42 (41):4—<i>vid. supra</i>). Identification: ἐν ὕμνοις εἰρηται</p>	<p>MT: תְּאֵכְלֵתֶם לֶחֶם דְּמַעַת = Thou hast fed them with the bread of tears ...</p> <p>Philo and Septuagint: ψωμιεῖς ἡμᾶς ἄρ- τον δακρῶν (+ Ps. 42:4) (identical)</p>
<p>12. Ps. 80 (79):7 IV <i>Conf.</i> 52 ff.. Identification: ἐν ὕμνοις που λέλεκται</p>	<p>MT: תְּשִׁימוּ מְדוּן לְשִׁכְנֵינוּ = Thou makest us a strife unto our neighbors</p> <p>Philo: ἔθετο ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀντιλογίαν τοῖς γεί- τοσιν ἡμῶν Septuagint: ἔθου ἡμᾶς ὁ θεὸς εἰς ἀντιλογίαν τοῖς γείτοσιν ἡμῶν (almost identical)</p>
<p>13. Ps. 84 (83):11 IV <i>Her.</i> 290 Identification: ὕγιώς εἶπέ τις προφητικῶς<sup>25</sup> ἀνήρ</p>	<p>MT: כִּי טוֹב יוֹם בַּחֲצִירֵךְ מֵאֶלֶי רֶשַׁע = For a day in Thy courts is better than a thousand;<sup>24</sup> (he would rather live a single day with virtue than ten thousand years in the shadow of death)</p>

<sup>24</sup> Philo has here paraphrased the Scriptural text, apparently rendering it according to its “traditional meaning” (τὸ ἠγτόν)—see *Philo Judaeus*, 65 ff.

<sup>25</sup> This is similar to the term προφητικῶς ἀνήρ for the author of a Psalm in the introduction to Ps. 23 (III *Agr.* 50,52)—see above.

---

Philo: τὸ γὰρ εὐήμερον πολυετίας κρείττον  
 ...<sup>26</sup> μίαν γὰρ ἡμέραν ... βούλεσθαι  
 βιώναι μετῶ ἀρετῆς, ἢ μυρία ἔτη ἐν  
 σκιᾷ θανάτου (*very free* paraphrase)  
 Septuagint: ὅτι κρείσσων ἡμέρα μία  
 ἐν ταῖς ἀυλαῖς σου ὑπὲρ χιλιάδας  
 ... μᾶλλον ἢ οἰκεῖν ἐν σκηνώμασιν  
 ἀμαρτωλῶν

---

#### Book IV (Ps. 90–106)

- 
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>14. Ps. 91 (90):11<sup>27</sup><br/>       III <i>Quod Deus</i> 182<br/>       Philo does not identify<br/>       this as a citation; it is<br/>       in fact no more than<br/>       an implied allusion.</p> | <p>MT כִּי מִלְאכָיו יִצוּהוּ לְךָ לְשׁמֶרְךָ בְּכָל דַּרְכֶיךָ<br/>       = For he will give His angels charge<br/>       over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways</p> <p>Philo: ἄγγελος ποδηγετῶν καὶ τὰ<br/>       ἐν ποσὶν ἀναστέλλων, ἵνα ἄπταιστοι<br/>       διὰ λεωφόρου βαίνωμεν τῆς ὁδοῦ<br/>       Septuagint: ὅτι τοῖς ἀγγελοῖς αὐτοῦ ἐντε-<br/>       λείται περὶ σοῦ, τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε ἐν πάσαις<br/>       ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου (Philo's reference is a free<br/>       paraphrase)</p> |
|--|--|
- 

<sup>26</sup> An additional indication that the citation does not derive directly from the Septuagint is the dialectical variation in spelling: κρείττον, with -ττ-, rather than the Septuagint's κρείσσων. This is in line with the views of Lester Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation—The Hebrew Names in Philo* (Atlanta 1988) [Grabbe, *Etymology*], 107–109, as well as Yehoshua Amir, “The Interpretation of Hebrew Names in Philo” (original Hebrew in *Tarbiz* 31 [1961–1962], 297ff.) [= Amir, “Hebrew Names”], English trans. in Appendix 2, in: Grabbe, *Etymology*, 233–235; and also David Rokeah, “A New Onomastic Fragment from Oxhyrhynchus and Philo's Etymologies,” *JThS* n.s. 19/1 (1968), 70–82 [= Rokeah, ‘New Onomasticon’].

<sup>27</sup> Ps. 91 opens: MT ישב בסתר עליון, בצל שדי יתלונן (“He who dwells in the shelter of the Most High, and abidest in the shadow of the Almighty”). BT Shevuot 15b remarks that R. Joshua b. Levi (first half of 3rd century CE) recited verses from this Psalm upon retiring at night, because of what were considered to have been its *apotropaic* (to preserve from evil) qualities. Much later, *Siddur Rav Amram Gaon* and *Abudarham* (medieval sources for the norms of Jewish liturgical practice), note that this Psalm is to be recited on the Sabbath morning at the close of the service. See: D. Goldschmidt, סדר רב עמרם גאון (Jerusalem 1971) [= Goldschmidt, *The Siddur of Rav Amram Gaon*], פא, סט, (= 69, 81), Part I, sections כ, לו; and A.J. Wertheimer, *Abudarham ha-Shalem*, (Jerusalem 1963)<sup>2</sup> [= Wertheimer, *Abudarham*], קפד, קסא, (= 161, 184). Since the basic patterns of Jewish liturgical practice were determined quite early, it may

<p>15. Ps. 94 (93):9<sup>28</sup> III <i>Plant.</i> 29</p> <p>Identification: ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀνήρ<sup>29</sup> ἐν ῥυμοῖς λέγων</p>	<p>MT: הַנֹּטֵעַ אֵזֶן הַלֵּא יִשְׁמַע, אִם יִצַּר עֵינַי הַלֵּא יִבִּיט = He that planted the ear, shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall he not see?</p> <p>Philo: ὁ φυτεύων οὓς οὐκ ἀκούει, ὁ πλάσσων ὀφθαλμοὺς οὐκ ἐπιβλέψει? Septuagint: ὁ φυτεύσας τὸ οὓς οὐχὶ ἀκούει, ἢ ὁ πλάσας τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν οὐ κατανοεῖ? (somewhat free paraphrase)</p>
<p>16. Ps. 101 (100):1 III <i>Quod Deus</i> 74</p> <p>Introduction: ὁ ὑμνωδὸς εἶπε που (Ps. 75 (74):9 and 62 (61): 12 are quoted in <i>id.</i> 77 and 82)</p>	<p>MT: חֶסֶד וּמִשְׁפָּט אֲשִׁירָה = I will sing of mercy and justice</p> <p>Philo: ἔλεον καὶ κρίσιν ἄσομαι σοι Septuagint: Ἐλεος καὶ κρίσιν ἄσομαι σοι (virtually identical)</p>

just possibly have been already, like today, recited at funerals during the carrying of the bier. One has no way of knowing, but, if this were so, then Philo's contemporaries might have been familiar with this Psalm from liturgical practice, which would help explain why Philo does not quote, but merely alludes to it in a free paraphrase. In any event, it is in the closing sections of III *Quod Deus* that the allusion to this verse is found.

<sup>28</sup> Mishnah Tamid 7:4 notes that this Psalm was recited by the Levites in the Temple on the fourth day of the week. Today these Daily Psalms are recited at the close of the morning service in most if not all rites. The co-opting of Temple practices into non-Temple prayer was a process that may have begun well before the destruction of the Temple. Be that as it may, this, the Psalm for the fourth day, is the only one of the seven daily Psalms (24, 48, 82, 94, 81, 93, 92) quoted by Philo.

<sup>29</sup> This appellation is also used elsewhere by Philo: IV *Migr.* 90, VII *Spec.* 1.8, 314, VII *Spec.* 3.178, VIII *Virt.* 8 and VIII *Praem.* 43—but the connotation is not always the same. In IV *Migr.* 90, it refers to the authors or purveyors of the ancient Jewish 'customs' (ἔθεσων), while in VII *Spec.* 3.178 Philo describes θεσπεσίοι ἄνδρες as "men who think that most of the contents of the law book are outward symbols of hidden truths expressing in words what has been left unsaid."



## Book V (Ps. 107–150)

17. Ps. 115:5–8<sup>30</sup> (113:13–16) MT: (ה) פה להם ולא ידברו עינים להם ולא יראו; (ה) אונים להם ולא ישמעו אף להם ולא יריחון; (ז) ידיהם (א) ולא ימישון רגליהם ולא יהלכו לא יהגו בגרונם. (ח) כמוהם יהיו עשיהם כל אשר בטח בהם.  
 (also found in Ps. 135 (134):15–18)  
 VII Dec. 74

(At most an allusion; there is no introductory formula)<sup>31</sup>

(4) Their idols are silver and gold, the work of men's hands. (5) They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they, but they see not; (6) They have ears, but they hear not, noses have they, but they smell not; (7) They have hands, but they handle not, feet have they, but they walk not; Neither speak they with their throat. (8) They that make them shall be like unto them, yea every one that trusteth in them.

Philo: ὀφθαλμοῖς μὴ βλέποντες, ὡςὶ μὴ ἀκούοντες, μυκτῆρσι μῆτε ἀναπνέοντες μῆτε ὀσφραϊνόμενοι, στόματι μὴ φωνοῦντες μηδὲ γευόμενοι, χερσὶ μῆτε λαμβάνοντες μῆτε διδόντες μῆτε δρωῶντες, ποσὶ μὴ βαδιζόντες...

Septuagint: (13) στόμα ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ λαλήσουσιν, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ὄψονται, (14) ὠτα ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ἀκούσονται, ὄντας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ὀσφρανθήσονται, (15) χεῖρας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐκ ψηλαφήσουσιν, πόδας ἔχουσιν καὶ οὐ περιπατήσουσιν, οὐ φωνήσουσιν ἐν τῷ λάρυγγι αὐτῶν. (16) ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς γένοιντο οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ πεποιοῦντες ἐπὶ αὐτοῖς... (Allusion)

<sup>30</sup> Ps. 115 is part of the *Seder Hallel*, which accompanied the offering of the *Korban Pessakh* (= the Passover sacrifice) and the partaking thereof in the Temple in Jerusalem. Mishnah Pesahim 5:7 and BT Pesahim 64a describe the *Hallel* as the musical accompaniment of the Paschal sacrifice. It apparently also served as the musical accompaniment to the other holiday sacrifices as well (not only that of Passover)—see BT Pesahim 95b: "... is it possible that Israel sacrifice their Passover-offerings or take their palm-branches (לולביהן) [on the Feast of Tabernacles] without reciting Hallel?," אפשר ישראל שוחטין את פסחיהן ונוטלין את לולביהן ואין אומרים הלל? There is good reason to believe that the *Hallel* was also recited as a regular part both of the holiday prayers (not in the Temple) and the Passover Seder, both in the Land of Israel and in the Diaspora, even while the Temple still stood.

<sup>31</sup> Earp lists a reference to Ps. 115:8 (113:16) in VII *Spec.* 2.255–256. Colson, *ad loc.*, suggests that the Septuagint rendering of this verse served as the source for

---

18. Ps. 115:17–18 (113:25–26) V <i>Fuga</i> 59	MT: הַיְיָ לֹא יְהַלְלֵהוּ = The dead praise not the Lord
Identification: ὡς καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις λέγεται	Philo: νεκροὶ δ'ὲν, ... οὐκ αἰνέ- σουσι κύριον. Ζώντων γὰρ τὸ ἔργον. Septuagint: οὐχ οἱ νεκροὶ αἰνέσου- σίν σε, κύριε... ἀλλ' ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες... (similar)

---

### *Summary and Conclusions*

Approximately twenty verses belonging to sixteen different Psalms are quoted, paraphrased, or echoed in eighteen different *loci* in Philo's *oeuvre*. This is the largest number of citations from any of the scriptural books now included in the Writings. If the Former and the Latter Prophets are not counted as a single unit, then, besides the Pentateuch, this is the largest number of references from any single part of Scripture. The Psalms are MT Ps. 23 (twice), 27, 31, 37 (twice), 42, 46, 62, 65, 75, 78, 80 (twice but different verses), 84, 91, 94, 101, 115 (twice but different verses).

\*

In the vast majority of instances, when Philo quotes a Psalm more or less verbatim, he prefaces it with a formula such as: παρὰ τῷ ὕμνογράφῳ... ἐν ᾧσιν αὐτοῦ τοῦτο, ὕμνοις ᾄδεται *et sim.*, γνωρίμων τις ἐν ὕμνοις εὐχόμενος, ἐν ἑτέροις εἴρηται, παρὰ τῷ ὕμνογράφῳ... ἐν ᾧσιν αὐτοῦ τοῦτο, ἕτερον ᾧσμα, ᾄδεται δὲ καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις ᾧσμα τοιοῦτον. But the introductory terminology for a free paraphrase is different. For example, the *free paraphrase* in IV *Her.* 290 from Ps. 84 (83):11, is introduced by the statement: εἶπε τις προφητικὸς ἀνὴρ = 'a prophetic man,'<sup>32</sup> and the other two clear

---

Philo's statement that the death penalty is to be invoked against one who makes idols. His argument is that this is implied in the Septuagint rendering of verse 115:8 (113:16): ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς γέγοντο οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ. This appears to me to be somewhat farfetched.

<sup>32</sup> It is as well in this context to bear in mind that the line between prophetic and hymnic composition is far from clear-cut. Ps. 18 is also found virtually verbatim in 2 Sam. 22, and to judge from its contents, the hymn at the beginning of 1 Sam. chapter 2 was recited, not authored, by Hannah.

instances of allusions to psalms (not citations)—that to Ps. 91(90):11 (III *Quod Deus* 182) and that to 115:4–8(113:12–16) (VII *Dec.* 74)—do not have any introductory formula at all.<sup>33</sup>

\*

Regarding the relation between Philo's Book of Psalms and the one with which we are familiar:

- 1) The fact that there are no citations in Philo from either the first or the last twenty Psalms of the Book of Psalms is very likely not significant. For Philo has quoted from fewer than ten percent of the Psalms found in the scriptural Book of Psalms, and so this could well be simply a matter of chance.
- 2) Although the traditional division of the Book of Psalms into five (or four) books was already in place when the Septuagint was translated,<sup>34</sup> and there are at least two citations on Philo's part from every one of the five different divisions, Philo makes no mention of these divisions, and they apparently do not interest him.
- 3) The disproportionately large number of citations from the Book of Psalms explicitly identified by Philo as 'Hymns' supports the conclusion that for Philo this was a single conceptual unit that completed the trilogy: Pentateuch, Hymns, and Prophets (the latter probably including the Former Prophets). The rest of the Writings was presumably subsumed under the rubric of *Holy Miscellanea*.

This is in line with what is found elsewhere in the literature of the first centuries CE, such as Josephus and the New Testament, where the Pentateuch, the Prophets, Hymns, and miscellaneous 'Holy Writings' (= Hagiographa) are also the conceptual units for Scripture.<sup>35</sup>

<sup>33</sup> The only exception I found is III *Agr.* 50, where the first verse of the extremely popular Ps. 23 (22):1 ("The Lord is my shepherd") is quoted *verbatim*, and its author is called "a prophet (προφήτης) who wrote a psalm." Even respecting this instance, a little further on (in III *Agr.* 54) the same citation is identified as ᾠσμα = 'song', and, in V *Mut.* 115, it is identified by the words ἄδεται καὶ ἐν ὑμνοῖς ᾠσμα (= a song in Hymns).

<sup>34</sup> See, *inter alia*, Nahum Sarna's remarks in *EJ* vol. 13, s.v. "Psalms, Book of" particularly 1303–1309, and in *אנציקלופדיה מקראית* vol. 8, s.v. תהלים, 442–443. Of particular interest in this, as well as in other respects, is the Qumran Scroll 11QPs<sup>a</sup>.

<sup>35</sup> I have also been informed by Michael Mach that Moses, the Prophets, and David, play a central place in the religious consciousness in 4Q MMT. This too accords with

Furthermore, it is rarely noticed that in line with this is the verse combination in the *Malkhiot* insert in the *Mussaf Amidah* of Rosh Hashana, which is almost certainly much earlier than is generally assumed.<sup>36</sup> Though the verses quoted are usually identified as coming from the Pentateuch, the Writings, and the Prophets, with no convincing explanation for this order, actually the discrete parts used are the Pentateuch, Psalms,<sup>37</sup> and the Prophets.<sup>38</sup>

\*

How should we look upon the relationship between the scriptural Book of Psalms and the liturgical practices of the Alexandrian Jewish community in light of what we can learn from Philo? There is no reason to suppose that the liturgical practice in Alexandria in Philo's day was very similar to that customary today. At the same time, since I am convinced that the overall outline of some of the most central traditional communal prayer elements were already in place, I decided to see what can be learned from a comparison of the Psalms quoted by Philo with those used today in liturgical contexts.

Several of the citations are from psalms that were very likely well known from their liturgical use already in Philo's day. For example, Philo quotes the beginning of Ps. 23: "The Lord is my shepherd, I

---

the conclusion that the Pentateuch, the Prophets and Psalms were the normal rubrics of Scripture during the late Second Temple Period.

<sup>36</sup> Although it is referred to in the Talmud as the "Teki'oth of the School of Rav" (תקיעתה דבי רב); see e.g. JT Avoda Zara 1:2 39c), as we have pointed out time and again, this actually means no more than that it was recited there—not that it was authored there.

<sup>37</sup> The citations from the Writings are all from Psalms.

<sup>38</sup> This also strengthens the hypothesis that both the basic structure of the *Amidah*, and this prayer rubric that was added to it, were indeed very early, at a time when the Psalms were considered the third unit of Scripture. I have argued the thesis that the overall structure of the *Amidah* prayer was already widespread before Yavneh in (תמוז-אלול תשמ"ג), "שמעון הפקולי הסדיר י"ח ברכות", תרביץ ג' ב/ד, (תמוז-אלול תשמ"ג) [*Shime'on Ha-pikuli hisdir yod-heth berakhoth*," *Tarbiz* 52/4 (Tammuz-Elul 1983), 547–555], and in "מה חידש שמואל הקטן ב'ברכת המינים'?", סיני, צ"ד (ב-), תשרי-חשון תשמ"מ, ג' ז-ע-ג [*What did Shmu'el ha-katan innovate in the Birkhat Haminim?*," *Sinai* 94/a-b (Tishre-Heshvan 1984), 57–70]. This is in line with the work of Joseph Heinemann, **התפילה בתקופת התנאים והאמוראים** [*Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amoraim*] (Jerusalem 1966) [= Heinemann, J. *Prayer*] (There is an updated English translation). For a different view see Ezra Fleischer, "תפלת שמונה עשרה: עיונים באופיה, סדרה, תכנה ומגמותיה," [= "The *Shemone Esre*—Its Character, Internal Order, Contents and Goals"] *Tarbiz* 62/2 Tevet-Adar (1993), 179–223; Engl. summary VI–VII.

shall not want” (MT ה' רועי לא אהסר). A *Baraita* in BT Pesahim 118a suggests that this Psalm be read on the Passover eve in fulfillment of the injunction in Mishnah Pesahim 10:7 “[Over] a fourth [cup] he completes the *Hallel*, and says after it the Benediction over song (i.e. ברכת השיר)”. The Talmud text reads:

*Tanu Rabbanan*: At the fourth, he concludes the *Hallel* and recites the ‘Great *Hallel*,’ this is the view of Rabbi Tarfon. Others say: “The Lord is my shepherd; I shall not want” (Ps. 23:1).

The introductory formula, *Tanu Rabbanan*, indicates a Tana’itic tradition, and as I have already pointed out at some length elsewhere,<sup>39</sup> the mention of an individual’s name, in this case R. Tarfon, does not indicate that he initiated this view, but only that he is its immediate tradent. The fact that this alternate tradition is mentioned tells us it had roots in practice.

Likewise, Ps. 115 in its entirety (entries 17 and 18 in Chart II: Citations in the order of Psalms) is part of the *Seder Hallel*.

But there is far less congruence between the Psalms quoted by Philo and the prayer book of today than I thought would be the case. While the attested popularity of one or another Psalm sometimes reflects a liturgical tradition, this is not always so. In any event, the only citations from Psalms in Philo that I have been able to identify as having an important place in the traditional *Siddur* are from Ps. 23, 27, 94 and 115, and a paraphrase of, or allusion to, Ps. 91.

\*

*List of Philo’s Citations from Psalms found in the contemporary Siddur:*<sup>40</sup>

**Ps. 23** “The Lord is my shepherd” is important not only in the Jewish prayer book, but also among Christians—a fact that supports the hypothesis that it was in regular use before the beginning of Christianity.

<sup>39</sup> See above in Part I Introduction, Chapter One, in the sub-section entitled: *A note respecting the use of rabbinic sources*, which discusses the use of rabbinic material as a source for information respecting Philo’s day, and see also *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Two / 1: Palestinian/Diaspora Midrashic Tradition, 37ff.

<sup>40</sup> Because I have not been able to find a work that lists the Psalms in use today, I have perforce prepared the list upon the basis of personal familiarity. While it is probably not entirely complete, it will have to suffice.

**Ps. 27** is now recited from the beginning of the month of Elul (the month of repentance preceding the High Holidays) till Sukkot.

**Ps. 34** is today found in the first part of the Sabbath morning service (*Shaharit*).

**Ps. 42** is recited daily in the Sephardi rite in the afternoon service (*Minha*). Many phrases from this Psalm are used in the *Lekha Dodi piyyut* that was composed in Safed in the 16th century, and is today recited on Friday evening.

**Ps. 62:** Philo's citation: **אחת דבר אלקים שתיים זו שמעתי** is found in the early classical midrash, as well as in the Zohar (but I do not think that it is found in the prayer book).

**Ps. 78:49:** The verse quoted by Philo in II *Gig.* 17: **ישלח בם חרון אפו, עברה וזעם וצרה, משלחת מלאכים רעים** is found in the Passover Haggadah, albeit in an entirely different context. Verse 38 of this chapter **והוא - רהום יכפר עון** is recited at the very beginning of the Ma'ariv service.

**Ps. 91** is recited on Sabbath morning, at funerals and in the prayer before retiring.

**Ps. 94** was sung in the Temple on the 4th day of the week by the Levites (Mishnah Tamid 7.4) and today it is found in the morning service on Wednesday.

**Ps. 115** is part of the *Hallel*, a collection of Psalms that were recited in the Temple at the time of the offering of the Passover sacrifices and their consumption (see above). Today it is part of the Passover *Seder* service, and is recited in the morning prayers of Passover, Shavu'ot and Sukkot, as well as on Hanukkah and Rosh Hodesh.

It is thus clear that, though several of the Psalms from which Philo has quoted are used today in prayer contexts, one cannot discern a significant congruence between the specific Psalms and present practice.<sup>41</sup> At the same time, even while there is little correspondence between the current liturgical use of specific Psalms and the Psalms from which Philo has quoted, nevertheless the scriptural Book of Psalms, as we know it, apparently had a special degree of holiness for him.

For while he quotes from the canonical Book of Psalms quite frequently, I, at any rate, have been unable to find *recognizable citations* from *any* of the non-canonical or extra-canonical Psalms, whether found at

---

<sup>41</sup> I have found no parallels of any sort in the contemporary liturgy for the remaining Psalms from which Philo has quoted: Psalms 31, 37, 46, 65, 75, 80, 84, and 101.

Qumran or elsewhere.<sup>42</sup> This is so even though Philo has described the Therapeutae, regarding whom he writes that they both chant traditional hymns and *compose* songs and hymns *of their own* to God (ποιούσιν ᾠσματα καὶ ὕμνους εἰς τὸν θεὸν).<sup>43</sup>

In closing, it will be well to quote IX *Flacc.* 121–122 with respect to the general Alexandrian Jewish community. We learn that not only were there “houses of prayer” (προσευχάς), where the community usually worshipped, but also that even when these had been taken from them during the anti-Jewish riots, the people gave thanks to God *by means of the singing of “hymns and odes”* (ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς).

(121) And when they learnt of the arrest (of Flaccus)... with hands outstretched to heaven they sang hymns and led songs of triumph (ὕμνον καὶ παιᾶνας ἐξῆρχον) to God who watches over human affairs... (122) All night long they continued to sing hymns and odes (ὕμνοις καὶ ᾠδαῖς), and at dawn pouring out through the gates they made their way to the parts of the beach<sup>44</sup> near at hand, since their houses of prayer (προσευχάς) had been taken from them...

---

<sup>42</sup> A careful study of this might be useful, but it is beyond the purview of the present research.

<sup>43</sup> See IX *Contemp.* §29 and similarly in id. §80ff. Liturgical composition, *per se*, has continued from earliest times even until the present day—and this includes even the most traditional circles.

<sup>44</sup> It has been suggested that they went down to the beach for reasons related to ritual purity; see Samuel Kraus, *Synagogale Altertümer*, (Berlin 1922, repr. 1966).

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### CITATIONS FROM PROVERBS AND JOB

Philo quotes six verses from the Book of Proverbs in four different passages,<sup>1</sup> and in addition to this, he has a single reference to the Book of Job. With the exception of the Book of Psalms, to which we have devoted a separate chapter, that is all. There are no other citations from the books of the Writings in Philo's work.<sup>2</sup>

#### *Proverbs*

Four of the six citations from the Book of Proverbs<sup>3</sup> appear in a single Philonic book, III *Ebr.* One of these is found in 31 and the other three in 84. In order to understand their place in the Philonic text, I shall discuss these passages within the frame of reference in which they appear.

\*

As I have noted in the conclusion to my *Philo Judaeus*,<sup>4</sup> there is every reason to look upon Philo as a distinguished representative of the contemporary version of what Sanders has termed 'normative Judaism.'<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> A remaining, in my opinion mistaken, possible allusion to one of these verses is discussed in the Endnote G: A Possible Allusion / Echo of Prov. 8:22–23 in VIII *Virt.* 62, p. 209ff.

<sup>2</sup> Nor are any of the Apocrypha or Pseudepigrapha alluded to by Philo. All such instances noted in Earp's index in PLCL are references to remarks in the footnotes of the PLCL edition.

<sup>3</sup> VIII *Virt.* 62, is not counted because, as will be pointed out below, *ad loc.*, unlike the reference to Prov. 8:22–23 in III *Ebr.* §31, this is at most an allusion to the verse, or rather an echo of it, not its citation.

<sup>4</sup> See p. 286, and see *id.*, 274.

<sup>5</sup> E.P. Sanders, *Judaism, Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London/Philadelphia 1992), 48, 450–451, 465 and *passim*. Although the term has been criticized in recent years, and is perhaps no longer in fashion, both its use and its rejection reflect value judgements on how to look upon the different trends in Second Temple Judaism.



It was Philo's constant Herculean endeavor to assign the highest Greek philosophical value to what he considered important in Judaism, aiming thereby to enhance the attractiveness of Judaism in the eyes of his readers.

A good illustration of this methodology is his equation of Torah and the Law of the Cosmos by means of a sophisticated exegesis in *Op.* 2-3:<sup>6</sup>

(2) Moses ... introduced his laws (*νόμοι*) with ... (3) an account of the creation of the world (*κοσμοποιάν*), implying that the world (*κόσμος*) is in harmony with the Law (*νόμος*), and the Law with the world, and that the man who observes the Law is constituted thereby a loyal citizen of the world.

Philo has here used the Greek word *nomos* in one and the same section to mean Law of Moses, i.e. the Torah (*nomos* is the standard Septuagint and Hellenistic-Jewish-Greek term for the same) and the Stoic 'Law of Nature,' leading to the equation of the Torah-abiding man with the Stoic 'citizen of the world!'<sup>7</sup>

In a similar vein, VI *Mos.* 2.47 ff. states:<sup>8</sup>

(47) ... We must now give the reason why he (Moses) began his lawbook with the history, and put the commandments and prohibitions in the second place. ... (48) he wished to show two most essential things: first that the Father and Maker of the world was in the truest sense also its Lawgiver, secondly that *he who would observe the Laws (viz. the nomos)* will (be) gladly accept(ing) the duty of following nature and *liv(ing) in accordance with the ordering of the universe...* (52) *the nature of the particular enactments ... are in agreement with the principles of eternal nature.*<sup>9</sup>

This is a homiletic use of syllogistic reasoning. Hellenistic-Jewish and Hellenistic-philosophical vocabulary is equated in order to make the philosophic conclusion follow upon the Hellenistic-Jewish term. It is standard Philonic practice, and one misses much of what Philo has to say if, when reading his writings, one does not take this stylistic idiosyncrasy into account. For more often than not Philo wished his readers to equate the popular Hellenistic philosophic term or *cliché* with

<sup>6</sup> I have noted the illustrations from I *Op.* 2-3, and VI *Mos.* 2.47 ff. in *Philo Judaeus*, 274, as well as id., "Jewish Dimension," 169-170.

<sup>7</sup> See Diog. Laert. vii 87 and *SVF* i 262 for the Stoic ideas of 'living according to nature' and 'world citizen' (so Colson; *Philo* I, Loeb Classical Library. Appendix, 475. *ad loc.*).

<sup>8</sup> Minor alterations of Colson's rendering are bracketed.

<sup>9</sup> See Wolfson, *Philo* II 192 ff., for discussion in a similar vein, and cf. also Nikiprowetzky, *Comm.*, ch. 5.

its Hellenistic-Jewish homonym. This feature of his work must be borne in mind as we study the citations from Proverbs.

\*

The following sections review the steps whereby, in the treatise under consideration (III *Ebr.*), Philo has used ideas of general cultural significance to further his didactic aim: to show that a life lived according to the precepts of traditional Judaism is the philosophically superior life, at the same time embedding citations from Scripture in the running argument as proof-texts.

When one reads III *Ebr.* with this in mind, an ideological flow becomes discernible, with citations and allusions from both Jewish and Greek literature serving this aim. While I have not attempted to cover either the entire treatise, or all of its many facets, some of the major stepping-stones that lead from a general Hellenistic frame of reference to a specifically Jewish destination are identified.

Philo does not proceed in a straight line, but rather, in the homiletic manner of a spiral, he touches upon themes, and then, returning almost, but not quite, full circle, he reiterates them in a more complex form and from a different frame of reference. In III *Ebr.* §8, Philo recounts “the old story” (ὁ παλαιὸς λόγος)—an allusion to Plato’s *Phaedo* 60b that describes the indissoluble connection between pleasure and pain, that they are “from a single root... yet never sprouting or bearing fruit at the same moment.” It is assumed that this rings a bell with the reader, and its significance is transferred from pleasure and pain to what interests Philo: vice and virtue.

Shortly thereafter, in §13ff., Philo introduces parents as symbols, considering it axiomatic that they instinctively care for their offspring, something that is used elsewhere as an argument for Divine Providence.

(13) ... (the parents) who play the protectors not so much by acquired habit as by nature... Surely, it is the parents... For nature ever instinctively prompts the maker to care for what he has made, and to take thought for its preservation and perpetual maintenance.

In section §14 Philo quotes the pentateuchal proof-text that lies at the base of the entire pericope: that which refers to the disobedient son whom his father and mother are mandated to bring to justice (Deut. 21:18–21). Sections 17–18 closes the first round of the spiral on a distinctly religiously Jewish note:

(17) ...The Law bids us (νόμου κελεύοντος)<sup>10</sup> honor our parents... (18) ...the man who fails to make use of the holy rites (ιερουργίας) and all else that relates to piety (εὐσέβειαν)<sup>11</sup> is disobedient to the commandments which The Law<sup>12</sup> regularly prescribes in these matters (...ἀπειθεῖ προσητάξιεν, ἃς ὁ νόμος εἴωθε περὶ τούτων προσητάττειν)...<sup>13</sup>

### III Ebr. 30–31 (cf. Prov. 8:22–23)

Sections 30–31 introduce the second round of the spiral, again commencing with a universal frame of reference. In § 30, God is described as the ‘father,’ the creator, of the universe (τὸν γοῦν τότε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον δημιουργόν), and the ‘mother’ is represented as the *knowledge possessed by its Maker* (τὴν τοῦ πεποιηκότος ἐπιστήμην). I am convinced that the purpose of the citation of Prov. 8:22–23 at this point is to harmonize the universally accepted ‘truth’ regarding the pre-existence of Sophia (Wisdom), and the normative contemporary Jewish concept of creation—that God is *the sole creator* of everything.

The passage reads:

(30) Now ‘father and mother’ is a phrase that can bear different meanings. For instance, we should rightly say, and without further question, that the Architect (Demiurge) who made this universe (τὸν γοῦν τότε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον δημιουργόν) was at the same time the *father* of what was thus born, whilst its *mother* was the *knowledge possessed by its Maker* (τὴν τοῦ πεποιηκότος ἐπιστήμην), with whom God had union, not as men have it, and begat created being (ἔσπειρε γένεσιν). And she, having received the Divine seed, when her travail was consummated, bore the only beloved son that<sup>14</sup> is apprehended by the senses (αἰσθητὸν υἱόν)—this (ordered) world (τόνδε τὸν κόσμον).

<sup>10</sup> Regarding the standard use of the word νόμος in the singular as the Greek translation for Torah, and in the plural for ‘Torah statutes,’ see Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, particularly 122 n. 30, where I noted *inter alia* that Alan F. Segal pointed out long ago that the original Greek word *nomos* had divine associations even before its Jewish metamorphosis into Torah. See Alan F. Segal, “Torah and *Nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion,” *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 13 (1984), 19–28 (repr. in *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity*, Atlanta 1987), 131–146 [= Segal, *Torah and Nomos*].

<sup>11</sup> See *Philo Judaeus*, 218–219, 247–248, for the identification of the ‘Jewish’ connotation of the word εὐσέβειαν as ‘piety’ in the relevant contexts.

<sup>12</sup> Note the use of the definite article, not ‘law,’ but ‘The Law,’ i.e. the Torah.

<sup>13</sup> For the connotation in Judeo-Greek contexts in Philo of several of the words and word combinations used in III Ebr., see Endnote H: The ‘Jewish’ connotation of the terms Πρόσταγμα, Προσητάξις, and Προσητάξεις καὶ Ἀπαγορεύσεις and Εντολή in Philo, p. 209 ff. (to III Ebr. 17). These are in addition to those discussed in Cohen, *Philo Judaeus*, particularly chapters V and VII.

<sup>14</sup> I have replaced Colson’s “the only beloved son *who* is apprehended by the senses”

(31) Thus Wisdom, at the side of the *Divine Choir* (εἰσάγεται γοῦν παρὰ τινὸν ἐκ τοῦ θείου χοροῦ ἢ Σοφία),<sup>15</sup> is represented as speaking of herself after this manner (περὶ αὐτῆς λέγουσα τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον): ‘*God obtained me first of all his works and founded me before the ages*’ (ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίησάτο με πρωτίστην τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με) (cf. Prov. 8:22-23)...

The phrase ‘the Divine Choir’ (τοῦ θείου χοροῦ) is clearly an echo of Plato’s *Phaedrus* 247a. It is used elsewhere in Philo’s writings as a metaphorical manner of speech, but need not be taken any more literally than his use elsewhere of the word ‘Olympian.’ Like ‘Olympian,’ which has become an adjective without indicating a meaningful reference to the gods on Mt. Olympus, here too this has apparently become a common manner of speech that is not necessarily meant to include the literal contents of the *Phaedrus*.<sup>16</sup>

The juxtaposition of the wording of Prov. 8:22–23 in III *Ebr.* 30–31 and the Septuagint text shows that while the relation between the two is clear, Philo’s wording differs significantly from that of the Septuagint in the first two strophes, and even the third, though very similar, is also not entirely identical. Philo’s citation is much closer to the MT.

MT: מְרֵאשִׁית דְּרַכּוֹ // קִדְמָה מִפְעֵלוֹ מֵאֵו (23) // מְעוֹלָם נִסְכְּתִי מֵרֵאשִׁית (22)

Septuagint: (22) κύριος ἔκτισεν με / ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ / (23) πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με ἐν ἀρχῇ.

---

by the word ‘that.’ “The only beloved son” is here identified as “the (ordered) world” (τόνδε τὸν κόσμον). Colson has pointed out *ad loc.* (PLCL, 334, n. a), that “there is another son not αἰσθητός, i.e. the νοητός κόσμος, cf. III *Quod Deus* 31.”

<sup>15</sup> Colson has rendered this: “Thus in the pages of one of the inspired company.” While I am not sure that my translation is correct, I am convinced that in any event *Sophia* is the subject, and if so, we do not here have an alternative locution for the Book of Proverbs. Below in §84, which passage contains three citations from Proverbs, the Book of Proverbs is called by its Septuagint’s title Παροιμίαι, and in IV *Congr.* 177 the reference is introduced by: ‘...one of Moses’ disciples (*sic!*).’ This locution will be discussed and explained in the concluding chapter.

<sup>16</sup> This is the famous description of the soul striving to reach and remain in the realm of the Divine. Philo also uses the locution ‘the Divine Choir’ (τοῦ θείου χοροῦ) in I *All.* 1.61 line 8, in I *All.* 3.7 line 5, in I *All.* 3.242 line 6, but most of these are hardly direct allusions to *Phaedrus* 247a. There are also V *Fuga* 62 line 6, and similarly in *id.* 74 line 6 (though here the order of the words is reversed: χοροῦ θείου). VII *Spec.* 2.249 line 4 is a slightly free, but nevertheless direct citation: ἔξω θείου χοροῦ βαίνει, and finally IX *Prob.* 13 line 2 contains an exact citation: φθόνος ἔξω θείου χοροῦ ἴσταται. These latter contexts include other classical allusions as well, and in IX *Prob.* 13 line 2 Plato is even mentioned by name. One cannot say very much respecting the allusion in I Suppl. *QG* 2.129, being as it is both puzzling in and of itself, and a translation.

Philo: (22) ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσατό με / πρωτίστην τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων / (23) καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσε με

(trans.: “God obtained me first of all his works and founded me before the ages”)

Whereas the Septuagint renders MT Tetragrammaton (יהוה) here as Κύριος, in accordance with the rule regarding God’s two major epithets, whereby MT אלהים is usually rendered in the Septuagint by the generic term θεός and MT Tetragrammaton by Κύριος (Lord)<sup>17</sup>—though there are exceptions, particularly in the Book of Proverbs. But here, although Philo usually follows the Septuagint text almost verbatim, Philo renders MT Tetragrammaton in Prov. 8:22 as θεός and not as Κύριος (Lord), as would have been expected. This is closer to the midrashic understanding of the Divine appellations in the MT where יהוה is considered to reflect His merciful aspect.<sup>18</sup>

Likewise, Philo’s ἐκτίσατό, rather than the Septuagint’s ἔκτισεν, is closer to MT קני (in Prov. 8:22).<sup>19</sup> Also, although the word ἀρχὴν (and ἐν ἀρχῇ), found in the Septuagint twice in this verse, is a common enough word both in Philo’s writings and in the Septuagint, it has been replaced here in Philo by πρωτίστην, a word that is entirely absent from both the Septuagint and the NT, as well as being rare in Philo’s writings. All of this taken together, I suggest, points to the use of a secondary source translated from a Hebrew/Aramaic original, but by someone whose Greek was good.<sup>20</sup>

Finally, although the similarity between the term ‘architect’ in Philo’s *I Opif.* 17 ff. and in the beginning of Gen. Rabbah has long been noted and discussed,<sup>21</sup> I do not think that the parallels between III *Ebr.* §30–31 and the opening passage of Gen. Rabbah have as yet been seriously

<sup>17</sup> See Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD) in the Septuagint, Philo, and in Rabbinic Midrash p. 201 ff., where I have offered a suggested explanation for Philo’s reversal of the traditional attributes assigned to each of these Divine names in rabbinic midrash. See also *Philo Judaicus*, Endnote H, 298–299.

<sup>18</sup> One must not overlook, however, the fact that it is also the more appropriate appellation in the present context from a Greek frame of reference, since as is pointed out in the Endnote, popular ‘etymology’ associated the title θεός with God’s aspect of creativity (τίθημι), and here the subject is the creation of the world.

<sup>19</sup> Colson remarks that Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, 296, has noted that the form of the verb ἐκτίσατο, the reading here in Philo, is closer to the MT (and Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) than to the Septuagint. So in his endnote to III *Ebr.* 31; PLCL III, 501.

<sup>20</sup> See Endnote I: The term Πρωτίστης in Philo [to Prov. 8:22–23 (III *Ebr.* 31)].

<sup>21</sup> For the similarities and differences between I *Opif.* 17 and the beginning of Gen.

considered. For the major focus in both can be shown to be the resolution of an apparent contradiction between the axiomatic assumption of the pre-existence of Wisdom and her important part in the creation of the world *together with God*, and what was for loyal Jews the equally axiomatic assumption that God alone created the world. The study of these two sources in tandem clearly reflects interaction between the Alexandrian and the Hebrew/Aramaic cultural traditions.<sup>22</sup> But in order to preserve the main thread here, I have placed this in an Appendix.<sup>23</sup>

\*

The next round of the spiral that commences in sections §33–34 redefines the father and the mother as reason and convention respectively. The father is presented as a locution for ‘right reason’ (ὀρθὸν λόγον), and the mother for ‘the lower learning of the schools’ (τὴν ἐγκύκλιον χορείαν τε καὶ παιδείαν), and Philo writes that it is profitable to obey both of them.

Still in the realm of general philosophical conceptualization, Philo represents the father as bidding us to “follow in the footsteps of nature and to pursue truth in her naked and undisguised form.”<sup>24</sup> Meanwhile, the mother, who stands for education (παιδεία), is identified as the one who “bids us give ear to rules laid down by human ordinance, rules which have been made in different cities and countries and nations.” A similar idea is reiterated in sections 64 ff., and yet again in §80 ff.—which latter is the passage that contains the three citations from Proverbs with which Philo completes the move to the realm of contemporary Judaism.

---

Rabbah, see e.g. Moshe Schwabe’s note to §17 (line 6) in the Hebrew translation of *Opif.* by Yitschak Mann (1931); and also, Wolfson, *Philo* I, 243 n. 11.

<sup>22</sup> Another example of a midrashic tradition common to Philo and rabbinic midrash, is found in *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Two. An additional hitherto unnoticed example of a similar phenomenon in an entirely different context is discussed in Cohen, “Taryag and the Noahide Commandments” *JJS* 43/1 (Spring 1992), 46–57, particularly 55–57.

<sup>23</sup> See APPENDIX 1: Prov. 8:22–23 in Philo and in Gen. Rabbah, p. 219f. This is a slightly revised version of a paper I delivered at the World Congress of Jewish Studies in Jerusalem, Summer 2005.

<sup>24</sup> As so often in Philo, this is a *double entendre*. I have pointed out in the context of commenting on *Opif.* 3—see *Philo Judaeus*, 274, and before that in my article, “The Jewish Dimension of Philo’s Judaism,” *JJS* (Oxford) 38/2 (Autumn 1987), 165–186, that

\*

In §80–§84 the universally recognized dichotomy, law and custom, are discussed. Right reason (ὀρθὸς λόγος), the father, instructs us “to honor the Father of the Universe,” and the “Laws which their father, right reason has laid down.” Parallel to this is the sphere of the mother, who is defined as *paideia* (ἡ παιδεία), and is associated with the customary, the customs (τῶν ἐθῶν, τῶν θέσει καὶ νομιζομένων).

XX (80) Let us then speak next of those who... have given due honor to both education and right-reason (παιδείαν δὲ καὶ ὀρθὸν λόγον)... These are valiant guardians of *Laws* (νόμων), which *their father, right reason, has laid down*, (οὗς ὁ πατήρ, ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, ἔθηκεν, ἄριστοι φύλακες), and faithful stewards of *customs* (ἐθῶν), which *instruction, their mother, has introduced* (ἅπερ ἡ παιδεία, μήτηρ αὐτῶν, εἰσηγήσατο).

(81) They are *taught by right reason their father*, (ὕπὸ μὲν ὀρθοῦ λόγου, πατρὸς) *to honor the Father of the universe* and by instruction (παιδείας), the mother, not to make light of those principles which are laid down by convention and accepted everywhere (τῶν θέσει καὶ νομιζομένων παρὰ πᾶσιν εἶναι δικαίων).

The section is couched in general philosophical terms. But since in Philo *nomos* (Law) is both a common noun and a proper noun, it means at one and the same time *both* laws in general, and when the context is appropriate, Torah statutes.<sup>25</sup> It thus automatically links general truths and particular Jewish frames of reference.

Immediately following this, §82–83 introduces the homiletic dichotomy between the two names of the ancestor Jacob, the man of practice, vis-à-vis the higher level reflected by the name ‘Israel,’ that means ‘the vision of God,’ in which context Philo quotes Gen. 32:29 verbatim:<sup>26</sup>

Septuagint and Philo: ὅτι ἐνίσχυσας μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων δυνατός

MT: כִּי שָׂרִית עִם אֱלֹהִים וְעִם אַנְשִׁים וְתוֹכַל

(For thou hast striven with God and with men and hast prevailed)

Now firmly within the Jewish frame of reference, §84 elaborates upon the combination ‘with God and with men’ (μετὰ θεοῦ καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώ-

Philo equates ‘following in the footsteps of nature’ with living in accordance with the precepts of Torah by means of a *tour de force*.

<sup>25</sup> *Supra* the note to III *Ebr.* §17, and see *Philo Judaeus*, particularly 122, note 30.

<sup>26</sup> Colson gives the reference as Gen. 32:28, but it is actually Gen. 32:29 in both the MT and the Septuagint.

πων) in the verse from the Pentateuch by citing Prov. 3:4, which echoes the message of Gen. 32:29, for Prov. 3:4 reads:

MT: ומצא הן ושכל טוב בעיני אלהים ואדם

(KJV So that thou shalt find favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man)

Septuagint: προνοού καλά ἐνώπιον κυρίου<sup>27</sup> καὶ ἀνθρώπων<sup>28</sup>

Philo: προνοούντων καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων

(Let them provide things excellent in the sight of the Lord and men)

As already noted, three of Philo's six citations from Proverbs (3:4, 6:20 and 4:3) appear in this single passage:

(84) Good also, I think, is that saying in Proverbs (ἐν Παρομίαις),<sup>29</sup> *Let them provide things excellent in the sight of the Lord and men* (προνοούντων καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων) (Prov. 3:4), since it is through both of these that the acquisition of excellence is brought to its fullness. For if you have learnt to observe the laws of your father, and not reject the ordinances of your mother (φυλάσσειν νόμους πατρὸς καὶ μὴ ἀπωθεισθαι θεσμούς μητρὸς) (Prov. 6:20),<sup>30</sup> you will not fear to say with pride: *For I too was a son to my father, obedient and loved in the face of my mother* (υἱὸς γὰρ ἐγενόμην κἀγὼ πατρὶ ὑπήκοος καὶ ἀγαπώμενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρὸς) (Prov. 4:3).

The citation of Septuagint Prov. 6:20:<sup>31</sup> explains what these are: “to keep the Laws (of your father), and not reject the traditional customs of your mother.”

<sup>27</sup> The rendition here of MT אלהים by both the Septuagint and Philo as Κύριος rather than as Θεός is an exception to the rule discussed in the Endnote C: The Terms Κύριος and Θεός, where it is shown that the Septuagint, and Philo in its wake, regularly rendered MT אלהים as Θεός and not Κύριος. Perhaps the reason for the exception is the wish to stress that it is the One God and not god as a common noun that is meant.

<sup>28</sup> It is indeed amusing that the word ‘men’ (ἀνθρώπων) in both Gen. 32:29 and in Prov. 3:4 is taken to refer to the mother of Prov. 6:20, since, as this ‘proof-text’ here indicates, *it is she* who stands for the traditional customs current among men. It illustrates how very malleable proof-texts can be when this is required in order to achieve the desired symbolic conceptualization; this remains true even though the word ἀνθρώπων includes womankind. Cf. also a somewhat different transposition of MT אדם (man) to ‘woman’ in *Targum Yonathan* to Isa. 42:13 תפארת אדם, as well as the midrashic rendition in Gen. Rabbah *Parashah* 21, *incipit* על שדה אדם, and similarly *Tanhuma* (Buber), Gen. *Siman* 22 *incipit* [22] הן אדם.

<sup>29</sup> This is also the name for the Book of Proverbs in the Septuagint.

<sup>30</sup> Pace Colson's statement in his endnote, *ad loc.* (503), it is Prov. 6:20 and not Prov. 1:8 that is the correct verse.

<sup>31</sup> See preceding note.



MT: נצר בני מצות אביך, ואל תטש תורת אמך

(KJV: My son, keep thy father's commandment, and forsake not the *law* of thy mother; JPS: the *teaching* of thy mother)

Septuagint: νίε φυλάσσε νόμους πατρὸς σου, καὶ μὴ ἀπόση θεσμούς μητρὸς σου

Philo: φυλάσσειν νόμους πατρὸς καὶ μὴ ἀποθεῖσθαι θεσμούς μητρὸς

(to observe the Laws<sup>32</sup> (= Torah statutes) of your father, and not reject the traditional customs of your mother)

This is rounded out by the verbatim citation from Septuagint Prov. 4:3:

MT: כִּי בֶן הָיִיתִי לְאָבִי, רַךְ וְיָחִיד לְפָנַי אִמִּי

KJV: (For I was my father's son, tender and only beloved in sight of my mother.)<sup>33</sup>

Septuagint and Philo: υἱὸς γὰρ ἐγενόμην κἀγὼ πατρὶ ὑπήκοος, καὶ ἀγαπώμενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρὸς

(For I too became a son obedient to my father, and beloved before the face of my mother.)

With these citations from Proverbs, Philo has come full circle. Beginning with the allusion to Plato's *Phaedo*, and weaving back and forth as do most homiletic compositions, he has arrived at his goal: an exhortation to keep the Torah—both the 'paternal' laws (νόμους πατρὸς) and the 'maternal' customs (θεσμούς μητρὸς) (Prov. 6:20).

In the immediate continuation of § 84 (Ch. XXI), Philo summarizes what has gone before, presenting as the ideal combination, as the two necessary aspects of 'piety' (εὐσεβείας),<sup>34</sup> the combination of the observance of "what is customary (νόμιμα) among mortal men (τὰ παρὰ γενητοῖς)" and the observing of "the laws of the Uncreated" (τοὺς τοῦ ἀγενήτου θεσμούς). He writes:

XXI ye indeed, I would say to such a one, "How could you fail to win affection, if you observe (φυλάττων) what is customary (νόμιμα) among

<sup>32</sup> It is pointed out elsewhere that the 'traditional' understanding of both νόμους and מצות (here read as a plural) are 'commandments,' Torah statutes. It is irrelevant that this may well not have been its original connotation.

<sup>33</sup> JPS: For I was a son unto my father, tender and an only one in the sight of my mother.

<sup>34</sup> Colson has understood the words "in your zeal and passion for piety" (διὸ εὐσεβείας ἔθωτα καὶ ζήλον) as defining "the observance of the laws of the uncreated" (τοὺς τοῦ ἀγενήτου θεσμούς), but the context, and particularly the immediately ensuing allegory, seem to me to indicate that it was meant at the very least as a *double entendre*.

mortal men out of the desire for fellowship,<sup>35</sup> and observe (φυλάττων) the laws of the uncreated (τοῦς τοῦ ἀγενήτου θεομοῦς) out of love and zeal for piety (εὐσεβείας).”

Finally, Philo introduces an allegory in III *Ebr.* 85–87<sup>36</sup> to clinch the thought and set it firmly in the minds of his readers:

(85) And therefore, Moses, God’s interpreter, will use the sacred works that furnished the tabernacle to show us the twofold perfection. For we must not fail to observe that he covers the ark both inside and outside with gold (Ex. 25:10) and gives two robes to the High Priest (Ex. 28:4), and builds two altars, one without for the sacrificial ritual, the other within for burning incense (Ex. 27:1, 30:1). He wished by these symbols to represent the virtues of either kind.

(86) For the wise man must be adorned with the prudence that is more precious than all gold, both in the inward invisible things of the soul and in the outward which are seen by all men...

(87) ...Again, when he stands at the outer, the open and visible altar, the altar of common life will seem to pay much regard to skin and flesh and blood... lest he offend the thousands who, though they assign to the things of the body a value secondary to the things of the soul, yet do hold them to be good. But when he stands at the inner altar, he will deal only with what is bloodless, fleshless, bodiless and is born of reason, which are likened to the incense...

This appears to me to be a clear enough statement of Philo’s approach to the practical observance of the commandments, ‘the skin and flesh and blood’ so to speak: that they are necessary in order to live in a real-life community,<sup>37</sup> but that the understanding of their inner meaning is the true aim.

\*

What remain are the citation of Prov. 3:11–12 in IV *Congr.* 177, and of Prov. 19:14 in I Suppl *QG* 4.129 (Septuagint Prov. 19:14).<sup>38</sup>

<sup>35</sup> Compare this with IV *Migr.* 90ff.

<sup>36</sup> It will be shown in the discussion of the citation from the Book of Job (V *Mut.* 48) that the two were found in the same source.

<sup>37</sup> See also the similar thought expressed in IV *Migr.* 90.

<sup>38</sup> This is not listed in Earp’s Index (PLCL Vol. X) because the index does not include Philo’s *Quaestiones*.

IV *Congr.* 177 (Prov. 3:11–12)

(177) It seems to me that it is from here that one of Moses' disciples (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως) (cites the) entry<sup>39</sup> 'peaceful' (ὄνομα<sup>40</sup> εἰρηνικός),<sup>41</sup> that in [the] ancestral tongue (ὅς πατρίῳ γλώττῃ) is called Salomon (Σαλομών), to say, "My son, despise not the discipline of God (παιδείας θεοῦ), nor faint when thou art rebuked by Him, for whom the Lord loveth He rebukes and scourges every son whom He receiveth" (Prov. 3:11,12).

The beginning of Section 177 presents difficulties in syntax that have been smoothed over by Colson in PLCL, for there is actually no grammatical connective in the Greek text at this point. To fathom the meaning of the passage one must begin with Section 170, where the key word is 'afflict.'

(170) Is it not then with legitimate pride that the prophetic-logos: Moses (ὁ προφήτης λόγος ὄνομα<sup>42</sup> Μωυσῆς) will say: "Thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy God (κύριος ὁ θεός)<sup>43</sup> led thee in the wilderness, that He might *afflict* thee... (Deut. 8:2).

Section §172 provides the connecting link between the 'afflict' of Deut. 8:2 quoted by Philo in §170 and section §177 (which contains the citation from Proverbs) for in §172 it is stated that 'the underlying connotation' (τὰ δι' ὑπονοιῶν σημαινόμενα) of the verse is that 'discipline, admonition and chastening' at God's hands are beneficial:

<sup>39</sup> Literally, ὄνομα = name.

<sup>40</sup> The term ὄνομα is often employed by Philo in conjunction with the symbolic meaning of a word. Cf. *ibid.* §170 "...the prophet-word called Moses (ὁ προφήτης λόγος, ὄνομα Μωυσῆς)," where, like in our passage, it also lacks the definite article. Similar, but not identical is IV *Congr.* §163, also in the same pericope but with the definite article: "For when they had gone out of the passions of Egypt... 'they came to Marah and they could not drink from the water for it was bitter (πικρὸν γὰρ ἦν).' Therefore, *the name* (τὸ ὄνομα) of that place was called bitterness (πικρία)..." And cf. also: III *Plant.* 34: τὸ πρῶτον διαπλασθέντα ἐκ γῆς ὄνομα Ἀδαμ, and IV *Her.* 52: ὁ γήινος νοῦς, ὄνομα Ἀδαμ (while the same statement is made in III *Plant.* 46: ὁ γήινος νοῦς Ἀδαμ—without the ὄνομα).

<sup>41</sup> The words ὄνομα εἰρηνικός in §177 that here introduce the citation, may have been associatively connected with the word εἰρήνης in §176. Note the alliterative association between ὄνομα εἰρηνικός in §177 with εἰρήνης in §176.

<sup>42</sup> See the note to "The *name* 'peaceful' (ὄνομα εἰρηνικός)."

<sup>43</sup> MT יהוה יהוה. The choice of the different Greek titles for God accords with the general rule discussed in Endnote C: The Terms Κύριος and Θεός, p. 201 ff.

(172) Let us not, then, be misled by the actual words, but look at the underlying connotation (τὰ δι' ὑπονοιῶν σημαινόμενα σκοπῶμεν), and say that 'afflicted' (ἐκάκωσε) is equivalent to 'disciplined and admonished and chastened' ..."

And then, after further discussion of this, Philo brings Esau, about whom he writes in §176:

(176) He (God) judges it most profitable for him who chooses war instead of *peace* (εἰρήνης)... that he should obey all the orders that the lover of self-control may impose (ἅπ' ἂν ὁ σωφροσύνης ἐραστής ἐπικελεύσῃ, πᾶσι πειθαρχεῖν).

It is apparently an associative connection between εἰρήνης, the opposite of the the Esau character, and εἰρηνικός (Salomon *sic!*), that is the link with the citation from Prov. 3:11–12 in §177 in the mind of 'one of Moses' pupils' (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως).<sup>44</sup> Philo quotes him as providing an additional appropriate 'proof-text' (Prov. 3:11,12) for the central thought of this pericope, which depends upon the word *afflict* in Deut. 8:2.

\*

The scriptural Book of Proverbs is attributed to Solomon in its *incipit*, and hence at first glance one tends to assume that the mention here of Solomon is a reference to the Book of Proverbs. This may be so, but only indirectly, for here it is not the scriptural book that is so identified, but rather the Greek word εἰρηνικός (peaceful). This is further supported by the fact that *only here* in all of Philo's vast *oeuvre* is Solomon mentioned.

The idiosyncratic transliteration of the proper name as Σαλομών is compatible with the use of a lexicon of the sort suggested by Amir, Rokeah, and Grabbe, as discussed in previous chapters. For here the name is spelled with an *omicron* for the second vowel, a spelling that is not found anywhere else in surviving Hellenistic-Jewish literature. It differs not only from that used in the Septuagint (including the Apocrypha), where Σαλωμων (with an *omega* for the second vowel) is found 345 times. It even differs from the v.l. Σολομων found there twice

---

<sup>44</sup> See the next and final chapter for discussion of the locution 'one of Moses' pupils.'

(which has *omicron*, *omicron* and *omega*), the latter being the spelling used by Josephus, who mentions Σολομων 129 times.<sup>45</sup>

I suggest that the appearance of the proper name in this Philonic passage, and particularly its peculiar spelling, is best explained by the assumption that it reflects an indirect chain of tradition—the intermediary in this instance being ‘one of the pupils of Moses’ (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως). We shall return to this shortly, in the final chapter.

Finally, some of the details point to a source closer to the MT. Following are the MT, the Septuagint and the Philonic citation juxtaposed:

MT: מוסר ה' בני אל תמאס, ואל תקץ בתוכחתו.  
(יב) כי את אשר יאהב ה' יוכיח, וכאב את בן ירצה.

Septuagint Prov. 3:11,12: (11) υἱε, μὴ ὀλιγώρει παιδείας κυρίου, μηδὲ ἐκλύου ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ ἐλεγχόμενος. (12) ὄν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παιδεύει, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὄν παραδέχεται.

Philo IV *Congr.* 177: *παιδείας θεοῦ*, υἱέ, μὴ ὀλιγώρει, καὶ μὴ ἐκλύου ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ *ἐλεγχόμενος*. ὄν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ *κύριος ἐλέγχει*, μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὄν παραδέχεται.

The wording of the beginning of the citation in Philo’s text, *παιδείας θεοῦ*, υἱέ, is closer to the MT than to the Septuagint, since it preserves the order of the words of the MT: *מוסר ה' בני*. Philo’s text also preserves the alliteration in the MT between *בתוכחתו* and *יוכיח* as ἐλεγχόμενος and ἐλέγχει — (for the Septuagint has ἐλεγχόμενος and παιδεύει, although it too has a chiasmic parallel *παιδείας κυρίου—κύριος παιδεύει*).

\*

I Suppl. *QG* 4.129 (Prov. 19:14)

It is hazardous to make any unequivocal statements respecting this entry, since the passage is available to the vast majority of scholars of Philo, including myself, only in an English translation of the Armenian rendition of Philo’s works. It reads:

And be a surety of perseverance (and) endurance to the self-taught man, of whom it is said in Proverbs “From God is woman suited to man” (Prov. 19:14)—not to man, so much as is virtue to reason.

<sup>45</sup> I have found no mention of the name Solomon in the NT.

I will therefore do no more than note that the Septuagint's translation of the word **משכלת** as ἀρμόζεται (fitted) is the one that is reflected in the Armenian version of this passage (in its English translation).<sup>46</sup> For both the Septuagint and the Armenian version of Philo (as it is reflected in the English translation) have taken the subject of MT **משכלת** to be God, and understood it to mean, "It is from God that a woman *is joined (or fitted)* to man." *Targum Yonathan* has also rendered the verse in a similar manner, the relevant part being: **ומן אלקק מתמסרא אתתא לגברא**, which is hardly how we would understand the MT.

Following is a juxtaposition of the versions:

MT: **בית והון נחלת אבות, ומה/אשה משכלת**

Septuagint: οἶκον καὶ ὑπαρξιν μεριζουσιν πατέρες παισίν, παρὰ δὲ Θεοῦ ἀρμόζεται γυνὴ ἀνδρὶ

Philo (Armenian): From God is woman suited to man (Marcus PLCL Engl. trans.)

Targum Yonathan: **ומן אלקק מתמסרא אתתא לגברא**

It is not surprising that the word **משכלת** in MT Prov. 19:14 presented a problem for the translators, for while the masculine form **משכיל** is found in Scripture quite often, the feminine **משכלת** is a *hapax legomenon*.<sup>47</sup>

\*

### *The Book of Job*

The only remaining Philonic citation from non-pentateuchal scripture is a single reference to Job—the allusion to Job 14:4–5 in *V Mut.* 48. Outside of the citations from Psalms and Proverbs, this is the *only* reference to anything in the Writings (**כתובים**) on Philo's part. For a long time I was stymied, for I failed to discover even the faintest of clues as to how Philo came to quote this verse from Job. We read there:

(48) The highest prize of 'well pleasing' may be won by positive well doing, the second, freedom from blame, by avoidance of sin. And yet, perhaps for the creature of mortal kind, the former *is declared by Scripture*

<sup>46</sup> It is hard to know for certain whether this is due to the Armenian translator, the original Philonic text, or the translator into English.

<sup>47</sup> For an interesting aside on this, see Endnote J: The Cultural Norms of Translators and the Words They Choose, p. 217.

(τὸ αὐτὸ γράφεται) to coincide with the latter. *For who, as Job says, is pure from defilement, even if his life be but for one day?* (τίς γάρ καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου, κἄν μία ἡμέρα ἔστιν ἡ ζωή) (cf. Job 14:4-5).

The problems: Although, Noah, Dan(i)el and Job were legendary figures in the Ancient Near East,<sup>48</sup> this does not explain Philo's mention of Job as a familiar figure. Indeed, since he was such a Hellenized Alexandrian Jew, one may well doubt whether the culture of the Ancient Near East was part of his *paideia*. His writings do not reflect such familiarity. The reason why Philo treats Noah at length is that Noah is an important figure in the biblical book of Genesis; Job and Daniel are mentioned by him only here.

We may assume that Philo was not intimately familiar with such traditions even though the *Testament of Job*, which was either written in Greek or translated into Greek, and is usually dated between the first century BCE and the first century CE, may well have been known in Egypt in his day. For as we pointed out above respecting the *Sibylline Oracles*, although they were almost certainly known in contemporary Alexandria, there are no indications of Philo's familiarity with them or with any writings in this genre. The cultural horizons of different circles in the community differed markedly.

Also puzzling is the fact that although Philo usually remains close to the Septuagint text in his citations from Scripture, here his reference to this maxim of general 'wisdom,' though it is resonant of the Septuagint, is not a direct citation. In fact, as one can easily see, the wording is quite different.<sup>49</sup> Following is the juxtaposition of Job 14:4-5 in the MT, the Septuagint, and Philo's paraphrase:

MT: מִי יֵתֵן טְהוֹרַת מַטְמָא לֹא אֶחָד; (5) אִם הֲרוּצִים יִמְיוֹ מִסֵּפֶר הַדְּשִׁיוֹ אֶתְךָ (4)

Septuagint: (4) τίς γάρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἀπὸ ῥύπου; ἀλλῶ οὐθεὶς.

(5) ἔαν μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Philo: τίς γάρ καθαρὸς ἀπὸ ῥύπου // κἄν μία ἡμέρα ἔστιν ἡ ζωή

The study of the passages in which the citations from Proverbs were found has provided the key to this enigma. For III *Ebr.* 80-87, that

<sup>48</sup> They are mentioned in the Ugarit (Ras Shamra) tablets from the 14th century BCE, and there is an echo of this in Ez. 14:14: "Though these three men, Noah, Dan(i)el and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness..."

<sup>49</sup> Nor is the Septuagint a literal translation of the MT, for they too also differ markedly.

contains three of the citations from Proverbs, and V *Mut.* 43–48, which contains the reference to Job 14:4–5, have several things in common.

Not only do both III *Mut.* 43–46 and III *Ebr.* 80–87 present us with an ethical allegory of the Tabernacle and the priestly vestments,<sup>50</sup> but both of them also quote from Gen. 32:29: “Thy name shall not be called Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name, because **thou hast been strong with God and mighty with men.**”<sup>51</sup> What we have here is the same allegory in both passages, but freely sized and fitted to the context in each place.

This is not to say that the Tabernacle and priestly vestments are not described and allegorized elsewhere as well—see e.g. II *Moses* 66–140 (more particularly 94–103, and §109–135), as well as in VII *Spec.* 1.85–96. But in III *Mut.* 43–46 and III *Ebr.* 80–87 there is the same ethical allegory, while in VI *Moses* 2.66–140 and VII *Spec.* 1.85–95, the thrust of the allegory is theological-cosmological.

It is suggested that in view of the similarities between III *Ebr.* 85–87 and V *Mut.* 43–48, they were both found in a midrashic source, and as anyone familiar with Philo’s works is well aware, the same images are often repeated in different contexts, whenever they are appropriate to the thread of his argument.

This enables us to observe how Philo used such sources: he did not merely copy them mechanically. We have seen that he introduces what he finds appropriate to each very different context—with a view to enriching his own composition. I think that we may state with more than a reasonable degree of certainty that the single reference from Job stems from the same literary source as III *Ebr.* 85–87, which he has adapted to the needs of his own composition in each different *locus*.

<sup>50</sup> Colson has noted this in a comment to V *Mut.* 46, 166–167, n. a.

<sup>51</sup> The entire verse is cited in III *Ebr.* §82, but only the part printed in bold type is quoted in V *Mut.* 44.





## CHAPTER EIGHT

### THE ALLEGORICAL CIRCLE OF MOSES

(Who were the θιασώται, ἑταῖροι,  
γνωρίμοι and φοιτήτοι of Moses?)

Of course, many scholars have long thought that Philo's allegorical writings must have had important predecessors, and that his work is part of a tradition of allegorical exegesis of Scripture. This is so even though besides Philo's writings and a few fragments, almost no scriptural exegetical work penned in Greek has survived.

Almost a century ago, Wilhelm Bousset propounded the thesis that Philo was familiar with a school of allegorical exegesis.<sup>1</sup> But although Bousset has had followers, his hypothesis has not been widely accepted because he did not cite explicit references to such an institution.<sup>2</sup> Probably the most that is said today in support of such a thesis is that "Philo's works were probably associated with a school of some sort."<sup>3</sup>

The study of Philo's citations from the non-pentateuchal portions of Scripture has led me to conclude that Philo's allegorical and other exegeses do indeed reflect familiarity with exegetical traditions whose watermark is a combination of Hellenistic philosophical frames of reference and allegorical midrash. But that is not all: my final and most tantalizing finding is the discovery of what, following Philo's own lead, I shall term the 'Allegorical Circle of Moses,' or 'The Confraternity of Moses.'

This was apparently a group of *scholars, teachers, students and disciples* who engaged in esoteric philosophical allegorization of the Pentateuch, with a special branch devoted to Scripture as a whole. As I hope to show in the following pages, Philo explicitly refers to such a 'circle,'

---

<sup>1</sup> Bousset, W., *Jüdisch-christliche Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus*, FRLANT N.F. 6 (Göttingen 1915; repr. Hildesheim 1975).

<sup>2</sup> For a summary critique, see B.L. Mack, "Philo Judaeus and Exegetical Traditions in Alexandria," *ANRW* 2.21.1 (1984), 241–243.

<sup>3</sup> See R.M. Grant, "Theological Education at Alexandria," in B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring (eds.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity* (Philadelphia 1986), 179–180.

‘confraternity,’ or ‘fellowship’ as the source for several of his citations from non-pentateuchal scripture. But I wish to point out before proceeding that the very fact that in these instances Philo has identified his source also indicates that it is *these* particular non-pentateuchal citations that stem from there—and not all of them. I have further found that while at first, and for quite some time, Philo enthusiastically identifies with this circle, he eventually became estranged from it.

All of this is very different from both the old and the more recent hypotheses. For example, Gregory Sterling has suggested “that Philo had a private school in his home or personally owned structure for advanced students which was similar to schools of higher education run by individuals throughout the Greco-Roman world.”<sup>4</sup> As will become obvious as we proceed, this is not at all what I have in mind.<sup>5</sup> What I suggest is Philo’s discovery of and attraction to an existing allegorical circle.

---

<sup>4</sup> Gregory Sterling, “‘The School of Sacred Laws’: The Social Setting of Philo’s Treatises,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (Leiden 1999), 148–164 (150) [= Sterling, *Vig. Chr.* 53]. Nevertheless, Sterling’s article remains valuable, for it not only provides a broad survey of the scholarship on this subject, but also relates to facets of the topic upon which I have not had occasion to touch. Perhaps some of the contours of Sterling’s hypothesis of a private ‘school’ in Philo’s home can be transferred to what I have called ‘The Allegorical Circle of Moses.’ See also, David Runia, “Philo of Alexandria and the Greek *Hairesis*-Model,” in *Vig. Chr.* 53 (Leiden 1999), 117–147. It deals with an aspect of the subject that is only tangentially related to the present chapter.

<sup>5</sup> Nor do I subscribe to the very idiosyncratic thesis of R. Goulet, *La philosophie de Moïse: essai de reconstitution d’un commentaire philosophique préphilonien du Pentateuque*, Histoire des doctrines de l’Antiquité classique 11 (Paris 1987), discussed at some length by David Runia, both in his “Philo, Alexandrian and Jew,” 13–14, as well as in his extensive review in Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: an Annotated Bibliography 1987–1996*, s.v. Goulet (no. 8743 on 38). Though Goulet has not suggested a ‘school,’ I mention his thesis here because it is so diametrically opposed to my own findings. He has suggested that Philo was dependent upon an existing written *allegorical commentary* that presented the Pentateuch in terms of a coherent ‘secular’ allegorical philosophical system, and that Philo studiously engaged in ‘correcting’ it in the direction of his own deeply religious commitment. The present study does not support this. Philo was hardly dependent upon any *single* source, and this is clear enough not only from the present study, but also *inter alia*, from that of T.H. Tobin, *The creation of man: Philo and the history of interpretation*, CBQ,MS 14 (Washington 1983). Likewise, Goulet’s sharp division between philosophical and religious thought is not in line with what one finds in Philo’s writings, where philosophical conceptualization was an integral part of his religious worldview—a single but unequivocal illustration of which is VII *Spec.* 1.344, where belief in the Platonic ideas is characterized as an article of faith. As I have written at the close of my *Philo Judaeus*, 286, the very task that Philo set himself was to assign the highest Greek philosophical value to what he considered most valuable in Judaism.

My conceptual frame of reference is not the Greek philosophical schools, and hence, in order to avoid such an association, I do not call the group a 'school.' While it is closer to the *Beth-Midrash*, I have also rejected this term because of the specific overtones that it too has in the minds of readers. For what I envision is something that is neither of these, but, like so much else respecting Alexandrian Judaism, a transmutation of the original to accord in outward form with what was customary in the Hellenistic society in which it functioned. I have been unable to cull any further information from Philo's writings beyond that it had 'members,' 'students,' 'scholars,' 'disciples,' and 'teachers' (ἑταῖροι, θιασώται, γνωρίμοι and φοιτήτοι). When speaking of this circle, I have found it convenient for the most part to preserve the terminology used in the PLCL translation, and to refer to this group sometimes as a 'confraternity,' sometimes as a 'fellowship,' and often as a 'circle.' In any event, as I understand it, it was not exactly any of these.

The chapter could not even have been conceived, much less written, without the in-depth study of the non-pentateuchal scriptural citations. I would like to stress that the hypothesis proposed is the result of my attempt to explain baffling phenomena that I found in the process of studying the non-pentateuchal citations. I did not start with the hypothesis, but with the unexplained phenomena. It would be very difficult, and at the very least most tedious, to present the hypothesis as a 'stand-alone' composition, without the backdrop of the preceding chapters conveniently available to the reader.

\*

Before commencing, it is important to remind the reader that already in Scripture, the Torah is regularly called 'The Torah of Moses.' This is also true in rabbinic literature, in the NT and elsewhere.<sup>6</sup> A few examples will suffice to illustrate this.

---

<sup>6</sup> See also Amir's article "משה כמחבר התורה אצל פילון" ["Moses as the 'author' of the Law in Philo"], *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* 6.5 (Jerusalem 1980 and 1984), 95–125 and 83–103), subsequently published in German as "Moses als Verfasser der Tora bei Philon," *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandria*, Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog 5 (Neukirchen 1983), 77–105.

## IKgs. 2:3 (KJV)

As it is written in the law of Moses, that thou mayest prosper in all that thou doest, and whithersoever thou turnest thyself.

(ככתוב בתורת משה למען תשכיל את כל אשר תעשה ואת כל אשר תפנה שם. MT)

## Mal. 3:22 (Sept. 3:24; KJV 4:4)

Remember ye the Law of Moses My servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, with the statutes and judgments.

(זכרו תורת משה עבדי אשר צויתי אותו בחרב על כל ישראל חקים ומשפטים. MT)

## Mishnah Yoma 3:8

And thus he used to say: O God, I have committed iniquity, transgressed, and sinned before thee, I and my house, as it is written **in the Law of thy servant Moses**, *For on this day shall Atonement be made for you etc.* (Mishnah, Danby).

שעויתי ושפשעתי ושחטאתי לפניך אני וביתי ככתוב בתורת משה עבדך (ויקרא: MT) ט'ז) כי ביום הזה יכפר עליכם וגו'

## BT Megillah 9a

As it has been taught: It is related of King Ptolemy, that he brought together seventy two elders... and he went into each of them and said to him, 'Translate for me **the Torah of Moses your master...**'

(דתניא: מעשה בתלמי המלך שכינס שבעים ושנים וקנים... ונכנס אצל כל אחד ואחד...—Trans. from Epstein, Soncino) ואמר להם: כתבו לי תורת משה רבכם...

The same locution is also found in other relevant ancient literature, see e.g. NT Luke 2:22, 24:44, John 7:23 and Acts 28:23; III Enoch 48 D 4, Test. Jacob VII 3.

Hence, Philo is entirely within the parameters of 'tradition' when he calls the Torah 'the Torah of Moses.' This means no more than that he, too, unquestionably subscribed to the declaration that to this day is recited in the Synagogue at the time of the Torah reading, as the Scroll of the Pentateuch is raised for all to see:<sup>7</sup>

וזאת התורה אשר שם משה לפני בני ישראל (דברים ד:מד) על פי ה' ביד משה (במדבר ד:לז וט:כג)

<sup>7</sup> This practice, customary in all Orthodox synagogues, is already mentioned in Massekhet Soferim, 14:8 (Higger ed.) where we read:

מיד גולל ספר תורה עד שלשה דפין, ומגביהו ומראה פני כתיבתו לעם העומדים לימינו ולשמאלו, ומחזירו לפניו ולאחריו, שמצוה לכל אנשים ונשים לראות הכתוב ולכרוע ולומר, וזאת התורה אשר שם משה לפני בני ישראל.

This is the Torah, which Moses set before the children of Israel (Deut. 4:44), according to the command of the Lord, by the hand of Moses (Num. 4:37 and 9:23).<sup>8</sup>

\*

The thesis of the present chapter is that the word combination ‘Moses + member, associate, teacher or pupil,’ i.e. Μουσῶς in the gen. singular, together with one or more of the words θιασώτης,<sup>9</sup> ἑταίρος,<sup>10</sup> γνώριμος,<sup>11</sup> or φοιτητής,<sup>12</sup> often, though not always, refers to people belonging to a contemporary exegetical ‘circle,’ ‘confraternity’ or ‘fellowship.’

The question that I have tried to answer is: What is meant by the words ‘a disciple of Moses’ or ‘member of Moses’ fellowship’ *et sim.*? What does this locution mean when Philo uses it? It is clearly not the proper name of one of Philo’s contemporaries, since the only contemporary proper names in any of his writings are those of the protagonists of the events described in the *Leg. ad Gaium* and *In Flaccum*, and the name Alexander, in *Provid.* (if the work is not spurious). And in any event, as I have shown in my studies on Jewish prosopography, the name Moses, as the name of a person other than the Moses of the Pentateuch, is virtually absent from the extant literary or epigraphic material before the Geonic period.<sup>13</sup>

This is one of the considerations that has led me to propose that Philo is referring to a discrete group or community. For in III *Plant.* 39 the individual who quotes from Ps. 37:4 is introduced as a θιασώτης—a ‘member’ (ὁ τοῦ Μουσῆως δὴ θιασώτης), in IV *Conf.* 39, Ps. 31:19, as

---

<sup>8</sup> In prayer contexts combinations of parts of biblical verses are very common. For the history of this combination, as well as different customs, see: **כתבים, אברהם ברלינר** (Jerusalem 1945), Vol. I, 106.

<sup>9</sup> E.g. ὁ τοῦ Μουσῆως δὴ θιασώτης.

<sup>10</sup> E.g. τις τῶν ἑταίρων Μουσῆως.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. τῶν Μουσῆως γνώριμων τις etc.

<sup>12</sup> This word is less certainly idiosyncratic, but I have included it because it often appears in conjunction with one of the others.

<sup>13</sup> See e.g. Cohen, “Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity,” *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Periods* 7/2 (1976), 97–128 [Cohen, “Cultural Indicators”] and “The Names of the Translators in the Letter of Aristaeus: A Study in the Dynamics of Cultural Transition,” *JSS* 15 (1985), 32–64 [Cohen, “Translators”]. The only apparent exception that I have been able to find is the protagonist of the anecdote found in BT Baba Bathra 174b and BT Arakhin 23a, who is called **משה בר עזרא הכהן**, and this is in any event both hundreds of years and hundreds, if not thousands, of kilometers removed from the Alexandria of Philo.

τῶν γνωρίμων τις—one of the teachers or scholars of Moses, and in V *Somn.* 2.245, Ps. 65:10 it is cited by τις τῶν ἐταίρων—a member of a confraternity of Moses.

These words—θιασώτης, γνωρίμος, ἐταίρος—are used elsewhere in the literature of the ancient world as technical terms for a member of a recognized group, a religious guild, a confraternity, and/or a school. I propose that, as with so many other words, these too have acquired a specific meaning from the context in which they are found. When the context indicates this, Philo uses these words to refer to a confraternity, or circle ‘of Moses’ which engaged in the allegorical exegesis of Scripture in Alexandria, even though, as I have already noted, Philo does not provide sufficient information as to how it was organized. But this does not really matter, since the fact that it had *members, students, scholars, disciples* and *teachers* (θιασώται, γνωρίμοι and ἐταίροι) is sufficient for our understanding of its major contours.

In order to clarify how I understand this terminology in the context of Philo’s writings, I offer several examples of a somewhat similar phenomenon today. One might well say that someone is ‘a student of Loyola’ when what is indicated is the university of that name, not Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Jesuit order after whom the school was named, or his writings. And unless the context indicates otherwise, the statement that someone was ‘a student of Yitschak Elchanan’ indicates that he was a student at the rabbinical seminary of that name and not that he was a student or disciple of the renowned R. Yitschak Elchanan Spector of Kovno (1817–1896) after whom it was named. Finally, *mutatis mutandis*, one might refer to someone as a pupil or teacher of ‘Maimonides,’ and here too, it is not the famous scholar that is indicated, but the Jewish High School in Boston of that name. And this remains the case even while *these same people* might also say: ‘It is written in Maimonides’ when referring to the writings of Maimonides. The combination of context and grammatical construction is of course what determines the connotation in any specific instance.

Other superficially similar locutions in Philo’s writings are for the most part not relevant. Thus, the prepositional phrase παρὰ Μωυσεῖ or Μωυσεώς, often, if not always, means either ‘in the Books of Moses’ = Torah (See LSJ s.v. παρὰ B. 4), or ‘the man Moses.’<sup>14</sup> This does not

---

<sup>14</sup> Some examples of the mention of Moses in this other context: I *All.* 3.194, II *Cher.* 56, III *Quod Deus* 108, 136, 148. In II *Gig.* 24 and 47 it refers to Moses, ‘God’s spirit

mean the same thing as the word combination: ‘Moses’ + θιασώτης or γνωρίμων, ἑταίρων (or perhaps φοιτητῶν).<sup>15</sup>

\*

While there are not very many instances of this phrase in Philo’s writings, I have found that five of them introduce citations from non-pentateuchal Scripture, and I do not recall *any* that introduce citations from the Pentateuch. Three of these instances introduce a citation from the Psalms, and one each a citation from the Prophets and Proverbs, I have found several others that do not introduce any citations. I begin the presentation of the details with the Book of Psalms, for it is in connection with these instances that I first became aware of this locution, and sought an explanation for it.

Philo has referred to King David by name only once in his writings,<sup>16</sup> and even this single instance of the mention of David is *not* in connection with the Book of Psalms.<sup>17</sup> This made it even more surprising to find that while David is not mentioned, the name *Moses* appears in the *incipit* of three of Philo’s citations from Psalms—*viz.* III *Plant.* 39 (Ps. 37 (36):4), IV *Conf.* 39 (Ps. 31 (30):19), and V *Somm.* 2.245 (Ps. 65 (64):10).

In III *Plant.* 39 a member of Moses’ fellowship is described as speaking aloud in hymnal-odes:

...a member indeed of Moses’ fellowship... **spake aloud** in hymns of praise (ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως δὴ θιασώτης... ἐν ὑμνοδίας **ἀνεφθέγγετο**) and addressing his own mind (πρὸς τὸν ἴδιον νοῦν φάσκων) cried, “Delight in the Lord” (Ps. 37(36):4)... (κατατρύφησαν τοῦ κυρίου).

---

abided with Moses,’ and in VI *Abr.* 13 it refers to ‘Moses the all-wise.’ I cannot of course relate to all mentions of Moses, of which there are hundreds in Philo’s writings.

<sup>15</sup> Also outside our concerns are instances where the noun θιασώται, but not Moses, is found in this grammatical construction, such as the following: II *Cher.* 85 τοῖς φιλοσοφίας θιασώταις (those who belong to the company of the philosophers), II *Det.* 45: Ἡσαῦ τοῦ κακίας θιασώτου (Esau the votary of wickedness)—contrasted with τὸν ἀρετῆς ἀσκητὴν Ἰακώβ (Jacob the devotee of virtue). And cf. also such instances as V *Fuga* 145 τοὺς Κορὲ θιασώτας (men of Korah’s company), ὁ Λάβαν ἐστὶ θιασώτης (to which company Laban belongs).

<sup>16</sup> As we have already pointed out in the chapter devoted to the Book of Psalms, in the single mention of David in all of his writings, Philo has not even spelled his name in the same manner as the Septuagint (Δαυὶδ), but rather in what was perhaps a more contemporary or dialectic spelling: as Δαβιδ. See above, *ad loc.*

<sup>17</sup> Nor does Philo mention any of the other headings found in our Book of Psalms.



At the same time, somewhat later, the same verse is quoted in V *Somn.* 2.242, where it is introduced simply: “in *Hymns* the singer bids us (ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐν ὕμνοις ἄδεται) ‘Delight in the Lord’ (Ps. 37(36):4)...” (κατατράφησαν τοῦ κύριου).<sup>18</sup>

\*

In IV *Conf.* 39 (Ps. 31(30):19), Philo attributes to a ‘disciple of Moses’ (τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων τις) an emotional bonding with God. He writes:

Now there are many who, though they have not the capacity to demolish ... the plausible arguments of the sophists..., find refuge in the support of Him who alone is wise and beseech Him to become their helper. Such is one of the disciples<sup>19</sup> of Moses who prays thus in *Psalms* saying (τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων τις ἐν ὕμνοις εὐχόμενος εἶπεν): “Let their cunning lips become speechless” (Ps. 31:19).

\*

V *Somn.* 2.245 (Ps. 65(64):10) also contains such a locution—*viz.* ‘one of Moses’ company’ (τις τῶν ἐταίρων Μωυσέως)—in connection with Ps. 65 (64):10, “The river of God is full of water.” And this is so even though in the introductions to the citations from Psalms that Philo has brought just before and just after this instance—*viz.* in V *Somn.* 2.242 (Ps. 37:4), and V *Somn.* 246 (Ps. 46:5)—there is no mention of Moses. But here in V *Somn.* 2.245 Philo states:

It is this Word which one of Moses’ company (τις τῶν ἐταίρων Μωυσέως) compared to a river when *he said* in *Hymns* (ἐν ὕμνοις εἶπεν) “The river of God is full of water” (Ps. 65 (64):10).<sup>20</sup>

The portrayal of the Divine Word as filled by the stream of wisdom, as well as the use of water symbolism in such contexts, is quite common in Philo’s writings. Therefore it is presumably *the allegorical rendition accompanying the citation* that is identified as coming from ‘one of Moses’

<sup>18</sup> In the MT this exclamation is also found in Isa. 58:14, at the close of the *Haftarah* for Yom Kippur, but the Septuagint translation there is different. This is discussed above *ad loc.*

<sup>19</sup> The word γνωρίμιος can apparently mean either ‘teacher’ or ‘disciple’—depending on the context. I have not been able to be consistent.

<sup>20</sup> Unfortunately, the state of the text is deficient here, so that it is difficult to understand its exact purport.

company' (τις τῶν ἐταίρων Μουσέως) and not the image *per se*.<sup>21</sup> And indeed, even while the citation given in the ensuing paragraph (Ps. 46:5) also contains the image of 'river,' it is *without any mention* of its stemming from 'one of Moses' company.'

Before proceeding, it should be stressed that in none of these instances is the member of Moses' 'company,' 'confraternity,' or 'circle' represented as having *authored* the Psalm—only that he *recited* it, or offered an interesting exegesis related to it. The first passage (III *Plant.* 39) has the verb ἀνεφθέγγαστο, and the other two (IV *Conf.* 39 and V *Somm.* 2.245) have εἶπεν. The locution that somebody 'said' something means no more than that it was *stated* by that person—not that it was *authored* by him.<sup>22</sup>

\*

IV *Conf.* §62, comes shortly after IV *Conf.* 39 which quoted Ps. 31:9. It also cites a non-pentateuchal citation in the name of 'one of the members of (the company of) Moses' (τῶν Μουσέως ἐταίρων τινος), but this time the citation is from the Minor Prophets—Zech. 6:12. It is brought in support of the allegory expounded in IV *Conf.* §60 where the word 'rising' (ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν) from Gen. 11:2 has been rendered allegorically and serves as the point of departure for the discussion of the rising of both 'virtue' and 'vice' in the human soul. The allegory is indeed very bold, presenting a trilogy of Father, His First Born, and the archetypal patterns. We read in IV *Conf.* §62:<sup>23</sup>

(62) I have heard also *an oracle from the lips of one of the company of Moses* (τῶν Μουσέως ἐταίρων τινός), which runs thus: "Behold a man whose name is rising (ἀνατολή) (Zech. 6:12)," strangest of titles, surely, if you suppose that a being composed of soul and body is here described. But if you suppose it is that Incorporeal One (ἐξείνιον) who differs not a whit from the divine image... (63) For that man is the eldest son, whom the Father of all raised up. Elsewhere he calls him His first-born, and indeed the son thus begotten followed the ways of his Father, and shaped the different kinds, looking to the archetypal patterns supplied by him (ἐξείνιον).

<sup>21</sup> In the context of the discussion of Zech. 6:12 (IV *Conf.* 62–63) in Chapter Four, I have already pointed out that it is not the scriptural citation *per se* that is indicated, but that, as in classic rabbinic midrash, the *lemma* from Scripture is brought to introduce the exegesis.

<sup>22</sup> See *Philo Judaeus* chapter II/1, 37ff., where it is shown that in rabbinic literature as well, the Hebrew word אמר also means 'said,' not 'authored.'

<sup>23</sup> The citation is discussed in Chapter Four, *ad loc.*

\*

Prov. 3:11,12, which is found in IV *Congr.* 177, is also introduced by such a locution. In spite of the difficulties presented by this passage, it is clear that it is ‘one of Moses’ pupils’ (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως) who gives this citation that is associatively connected with Solomon’s name.<sup>24</sup>

(177) It seems to me that it is from here that one of Moses’ disciples (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως) (brings the) entry ‘peaceful’ (ὄνομα εἰρηνικός),<sup>25</sup> that in [the] ancestral tongue (ὅς πατρίῳ γλώττῃ) is called Salomon (Σαλομών),<sup>26</sup> to say: “My son, despise not the discipline of God (παιδείας θεοῦ), nor faint when thou art rebuked by Him, for whom the Lord loveth He rebukes and scourges every son whom He receiveth” (Prov. 3:11,12).

Here ‘one of the disciples of Moses’ (τις τῶν φοιτητῶν Μωυσέως), not ‘Salomon (*sic!*) the peaceful’ (even while it is from the Proverbs of Solomon that the citation is taken), is said to provide Philo with an additional appropriate ‘proof-text’ for the central thought of the pericope, which depends upon the word *afflict*, quoted in §170 from Deut. 8:2.<sup>27</sup>

\*

In IV *Conf.* 44 the citation from Jeremiah 15:10 is introduced by a very unusual locution that is found only here: *a member of the prophetic circle, who, possessed by divine inspiration, spoke thus.*<sup>28</sup> For while the word χοροῦ alone is found in Philo’s *oeuvre* fifty four times, and the combination θείου χοροῦ is found seven times, the phrase τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ is a *hapax legomenon* in Philo. Nor is the locution τοῦ προφητικοῦ

<sup>24</sup> See above in Chapter Seven for a fuller discussion of the passage.

<sup>25</sup> As noted in Chapter Seven, the beginning of section 177 presents difficulties in syntax that have been smoothed over by Colson in PLCL, for there is actually no grammatical connective in the Greek text at this point.

<sup>26</sup> The term ὄνομα (name) is often employed by Philo in conjunction with the symbolic meaning of a word. Cf. *ibid.* §170 “...the prophet-word, called Moses (ὁ προφήτης λόγος, ὄνομα Μωσῆς),” where, like in our passage, it also lacks the definite article. And see more fully in the note to ὄνομα (IV *Congr.* 177) in Chapter Seven.

<sup>27</sup> This is in line with Runia’s thesis [Runia, “Philo’s reading” 2001] that the non-pentateuchal citations are secondary lemmas that are introduced to support the major line of exegesis of the pentateuchal text.

<sup>28</sup> See above in Chapter Four: The Latter Prophets, *ad loc.*, where the passage is discussed at some length.

χοροῦ (without the θιασώτης), or θιασώτης χοροῦ, found anywhere else in his writings.<sup>29</sup> We read:

(44) The truth of my words is attested first by the consciousness of every virtue-lover, which feels what I have described, and secondly *by a member of the prophetic circle* (τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ), *who possessed by divine inspiration spoke thus*: (ὄς καταπνευσθεὶς ἐνθουσιῶν ἀνεφθέγξατο)<sup>30</sup> “O my mother, how great didst thou bear me, a man of combat and a man of displeasure in all the earth! I did not owe, nor did they owe to me, nor did my strength fail from their curses” (Jer. 15:10).

\*

There is no need to assume that all the instances of this idiosyncratic grammatical construction, *viz.* ‘members of the fellowship of Moses’ (οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται) and similar expressions, must be understood in this connotation. At the same time this seems to be the most likely meaning of many of them, and further, when they *are* understood as referring to such a ‘confraternity,’ they acquire a much richer dimension.

The gamut runs all the way from ‘very likely,’ to ‘not at all likely.’ In II *Det.* 86 ‘The pupils of Moses’ (οἱ Μωυσέως γνώριμοι) appears to be such a reference. The second mention of Moses in this section does not rule out the understanding of ‘the pupils of Moses’ as members of the ‘confraternity.’ As we pointed out above, names and words are used in different connotations even in the very same sentence.

(86) Let not us, then, the pupils of Moses (οἱ Μωυσέως γνώριμοι), be any longer at a loss as to how man came to have a conception of the invisible God. For Moses himself learnt it by a divine communication, and has taught us how it was.

In III *Quod Deus* 120, the locution ‘members of Moses’ fellowship’ (οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται) should very likely also be understood in the manner suggested, and if this is so, then the passage takes on a much richer meaning.

<sup>29</sup> All this is discussed at length *ad loc.*

<sup>30</sup> Note also that, though Colson’s translation in PLCL *ad loc.* implies a prophecy, as has already been noted, the term ἀνεφθέγξατο does not necessarily mean any more than ‘speak aloud, recite, proclaim,’ cf. above III *Plant.* 39.3 “...a member indeed of Moses’ fellowship... *spake aloud in hymns of praise*” (ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως δὴ θιασώτης... ἐν ὑμνοδίας ἀνεφθέγξατο) and addressing his own mind cried “Delight in the Lord” (Ps. 37 (36):4).

(120) ...Joseph who follows in the train of the body and bodily things is still young, even though length of years may have made him gray-headed. For never have there come to his knowledge the thoughts or lessons of riper age, which *those who are members of the fellowship of Moses* (οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται κατασταθέντες) have *learnt*, and found in them a treasure and joy most *profitable to themselves and to those who hold converse with them*.

The biblical Joseph, who is of course young, serves here as an allegorical symbol for the body and bodily things and is equated with immaturity. As I have understood the passage, Philo writes here that even the gray-haired are ‘young’ unless, like “*members of the fellowship of Moses*’ (οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται κατασταθέντες)... *and those who hold converse with them*,” they achieve mature knowledge.

The context points to a fellowship, a circle, or a confraternity, and indeed, even Colson here translates οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται κατασταθέντες as ‘those who are ranked as *members* of the company of Moses.’ Since Philo could hardly have been so naïve as to assign to ‘Jews in general,’ or even to ‘Jews committed to Jewish tradition’ this sort of mature knowledge, the locution “*members of the company of Moses*’ (οἱ Μωυσέως θιασῶται)... *and those who hold converse with them*” presumably refers to a specific group.

IV *Her.* 81(82) is, I think, best understood as an enthusiastic identification on Philo’s part with this circle or confraternity. The context is the allegorical interpretation of the Septuagint’s rendition of Gen. 15:5: ἐξήγαγεν δὲ αὐτὸν ἔξω (And he led him *out, outside*), which does indeed look strange and invites explanation.<sup>31</sup> Philo provides the explanation in the name of ‘*us* the scholars of Moses (τοῖς δὲ Μωυσέως γνωρίμοις ἡμῶν).’<sup>32</sup>

(81–82) But to *us* the scholars of Moses (τοῖς δὲ Μωυσέως γνωρίμοις ἡμῶν) there is nothing conflicting in such phrases...

\*

VI *Mos.* 2.205 also reads like instructions addressed to a specific audience with which Philo is associated, but here one can sense the beginnings of a change in attitude. We read:

<sup>31</sup> The MT reads **וַיִּרְצֵא אֱתוֹ הַחֹרֶבָה**, which hardly calls for this sort of comment.

<sup>32</sup> What is provided is an ethical allegory. While the statements in the ensuing sections §83–§84 refer to the Pentateuch, the repetition there of Moses’ name in the English translation is not paralleled in the Greek text.

(205) No, clearly by ‘god’ he is not here alluding to the Primal God, the Begetter of the Universe, but to the gods of the different cities who are falsely so called... *We must refrain* from speaking insultingly of these, *lest any of Moses’ scholars* (τις τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων) get into the habit of treating lightly the name ‘god’ in general, for it is a title worthy of the highest respect and love.

It is of course not at all surprising that Philo warns against speaking insultingly of the gods of the different cities—including of course those of Alexandria. And although the reason given is a religious one, he could not but have been concerned over such behaviour in terms of Greek-Jewish relations. Philo’s words express the fear that one of ‘Moses’ scholars’ (τις τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων) might behave in this manner, and here too he has used the first person plural: “*We must refrain.*”

One can sense here a faint trace of criticism, and one begins to sense incipient rumblings of reservations on Philo’s part respecting this circle. The former enthusiasm is no longer evident, and in the next relevant passage the ragged edges of a serious rift between Philo and this ‘confraternity’ are unmistakable.

\*

VII *Spec.* 1.319, the first passage in the portion of Philo’s writings that is devoted to ‘The Laws,’<sup>33</sup> uses a locution like the one under present consideration—*viz.* τῶν Μωυσέως φοιτητῶν καὶ γνωρίμων = the ‘*pupils and scholars of Moses.*’ Here, in contrast to the overwhelming majority of passages where Philo has used mystery terminology in a positive manner, in this passage we are treated to a heated tirade against the pagan mysteries.

Of course the subject justifies the negative valence, but one would still have expected a sharp line to be drawn that differentiates the ‘mysteries’ attacked here, from the ‘mysteries’ he discusses elsewhere.<sup>34</sup> But

---

<sup>33</sup> This comprises the following books: *On the Decalogue*, the four books of *The Special Laws* and the ‘books’ appended to them: *On the Virtues (De Virtutibus)* and *On Rewards and Punishments (De Praemiis and Poenis)*.

<sup>34</sup> The only other instance that I found of a negative valence to mysteries on Philo’s part is when he relates a biblical event like Ba’al Peor. See my study, “The Mystery Terminology in Philo,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament* (Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum, May 1–4, 2003), Herausgegeben von Roland Deines und Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr (Tübingen 2004), 173–187 [Cohen, “The Mystery Terminology in Philo” 2004].

there is nothing of the sort. The passage simply proceeds to heatedly inveigh against the pagan myths and their accompanying rites, replete with sarcastic barbs. We read:

(319) Furthermore, he banishes from the sacred legislation (ἐκ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἀναγοῖ νομοθεσίας) the lore of occult rites and mysteries and all such imposture and buffonery. He would not have those bred in such a commonwealth as ours take part in mummeries and clinging to mystic fables, despise the truth and pursue things which have taken night and darkness for their province... Let none, therefore, of *the followers and disciples of Moses* (τῶν Μωυσέως φοιτητῶν καὶ γνωρίμων) either confer or receive initiation to such rites (τελείτω μήτε τελείσθω). For both to teach and to learn (καὶ τὸ διδάσκειν καὶ τὸ μανθάνειν) such rites is no small sacrilege.

One is forced to wonder what has triggered this scathing tirade, this caustic denunciation of all association with the pagan mysteries or anything resembling them, and the unequivocal prohibition of all association with them on the part of *the pupils and scholars of Moses* (τῶν Μωυσέως φοιτητῶν καὶ γνωρίμων) to whom, until now, Philo had related in a positive manner.

At least as striking is the passage's continuation, which contains an even longer and even more heated harangue *against the very idea of secrecy*. This is all the more surprising when one bears in mind that Philo has elsewhere, time and again, warned that care must be taken with regard to divulging esoteric philosophical/allegorical interpretations of Scripture. For here Philo continues immediately:

(320) For tell me, ye mystics, if these things are good and profitable, why do you shut yourselves up in profound darkness and reserve their benefits for three or four alone, when by producing them in the midst of the market-place you might extend them to every man and thus enable all to share in security a better and happier life?

Following 321–322, where Philo lauds the open display of what is profitable to those seeking spiritual advancement, he continues:

(323) Were it not well, then, that *we* should... *display in public* all that is profitable and necessary for the benefit of all those who are worthy (ἀξίους) to use it?

Philo has here attacked not only the secrecy surrounding pagan mysteries. He has also lashed out against secrecy respecting *anything* that can be to the “benefit of all those who are worthy (ἀξίους) to use it.” And this demand is again couched in the first person plural—“that *we* should... display in public all that is profitable and necessary...”

As in the passage just quoted from VI *Mos.* 2.205, here too, the first person is used. And here, too, it acquires a meaningful and convincing setting if we adopt the hypothesis that the passage was first and foremost addressed to a specific and identifiable audience. This audience, I suggest, was made up of the ‘Confraternity of Moses,’ who were engaged in esoteric allegory, and who in §319 are called ‘the followers and disciples of Moses’ (τῶν Μωυσέως φοιτητῶν καὶ γνωρίμων).<sup>35</sup>

\*

How can the contradiction between this tirade against secrecy and Philo’s own utterances elsewhere against divulging sacred lore to the uninitiated be resolved? For the sharpest barb in this passage is indeed aimed at those who keep secret what he considers profitable and necessary for “those who are worthy (ἀξίους) to use it.” Of course, inconsistency often results from using the same approach in entirely different situations, and this may well be part of the explanation. Philo’s warning elsewhere *against* divulging things best kept for the elite few is usually appended to statements of very daring allegory, and should perhaps be understood in those *loci* as a strategy to ward off attack from his more conservative co-religionists.

At the same time, it would hardly be surprising should the members of this confraternity have come to have reservations about accepting this wealthy aristocrat and sharing with him their esoteric knowledge—particularly when he has begun to tell them how to behave. This could easily have triggered the vehemence of Philo’s tirade in VII *Spec.* 1.319ff. against those who keep secret lore for initiates only. For, although the specific occasion in VII *Spec.* 1.319ff. is the denigration of the pagan mystery cults, the wording is general.

It seems that by the time that Philo wrote his *halakhic* works, their ways had parted. In any event, after this, one no longer finds positive references to the ‘pupils,’ ‘scholars,’ ‘teachers,’ or ‘members’ of the con-

---

<sup>35</sup> It is only to be expected that the pagan mysteries would have been attractive to those engaged in mystical speculation, but this is not the same as Goodenough’s hypothesis—that there was an attempt to transform Judaism itself into a ‘mystery religion.’ It is actually its converse. For what Philo is here inveighing against are the attractions of the ‘mystery religions’ themselves. See Erwin R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism* (New Haven 1935; repr. Amsterdam 1969) [Goodenough, *By Light, Light* 1935/1969]. Wolfson, *Philo* Vol. 1, 45ff. and *passim*, has cogently argued against Goodenough’s thesis.



fraternity of Moses (φοιτηταί, γνώριμοι, θιασώται, or ἑταίροι—τῶν Μωυσέως). In several instances, one even finds a substitute locution, one that sets Philo and his *coterie* apart from the members of the ‘confraternity.’

At the very end of the first book of *Spec.*, in VII *Spec.* 1.345, which is found only about twenty sections after VII *Spec.* 1.319–323, mention is made of ‘scholars and disciples,’ but this time they are ‘of the *prophet*<sup>36</sup> Moses,’ and not of the ‘confraternity of Moses.’ We read in § 345:

(345) But *we* the scholars and disciples of *Moses the prophet* (ἡμεῖς γε οἱ φοιτηταί καὶ γνώριμοι τοῦ προφητου Μωυσέως) will not forgo our quest of the Existent... holding that the knowledge of Him is the consummation of happiness...

Philo very rarely refers to Moses by the adjective ‘prophet.’<sup>37</sup> I suggest that here Philo has used the modifying word ‘*prophet*’ for Moses in order to distance his circle from the ‘Confraternity of Moses.’ Here the ‘we’ are ‘the scholars and disciples of *Moses the prophet*.’ As just noted, the reason why Colson’s translation does not reflect this is that he has not translated the word ‘prophet,’ which is found in the Greek.

In VII *Spec.* 2.88 the modifying adjective γνήσιοι = true legitimate, serves the same function. We read here:

(88) But among the followers of Moses (τῶν Μωυσέως ὀμιλητῶν) all who have been his *true* disciples (ὅσοι φοιτηταί γνήσιοι) trained in his excellent institutions from their earliest years (καλοῖς ἐνασκούμενοι νομίμοις ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἐθίζονται)...

The ‘*true* disciples’ (ὅσοι φοιτηταί γνήσιοι) are here implicitly contrasted with those who are not *true* in Philo’s eyes—i. e. the members of the ‘Confraternity of Moses.’ And even the terminology is not the same. For while here Moses and the accompanying word used together with Moses are in the genitive—a different word is used for the members: τῶν Μωυσέως ὀμιλητῶν—ὀμιληταί and not θιασώτης, ἑταίρος, γνώριμος. Philo also adds the adjective ‘*true*’ when he speaks of himself and

<sup>36</sup> The word ‘prophet’ has been overlooked in the translation in PLCL.

<sup>37</sup> The description of Moses as ‘prophet’ is apparently found only five more times in his writings: I *LA* 3.173 (“that is taught by the hierophant and prophet Moses”), VI *Mos.* 2.292 (“Moses, king, lawgiver, high priest, prophet”), VII *Dec.* 18 (“the Laws... some in His own person... and some through His prophet Moses”), VIII *Praem.* 1 (“The oracles delivered through the prophet Moses are of three kinds...”), and IX *Cont.* 64–65 (“...following the truly sacred instructions of the prophet Moses”). While I cannot discuss each instance in detail here, the resulting picture is in line with what is said.

his group: φοιτηταὶ γνήσιοι, rather than members of the ‘Confraternity of Moses.’<sup>38</sup>

\*

Finally, the proposition that locutions such as ‘one of the disciples of Moses’ (τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων τις) refer to a concrete allegorical circle or confraternity, and that Philo’s contact with this group was the source of some of his non-pentateuchal scriptural citations, is strongly supported by the fact that *in every single one* of the five (or possibly six)<sup>39</sup> passages where locutions such as ‘a member of Moses’ fellowship’ is used by Philo in conjunction with a scriptural citation, the scriptural citation *is not* from the Pentateuch (The Books of *Moses*) but *from the non-pentateuchal portions of Scripture*.

Further support of the thesis that these non-pentateuchal citations stem from secondary sources<sup>40</sup> is the consideration that in IV *Conf.*, within the range of fewer than 25 sections, there are *four citations* from non-pentateuchal scripture. Two of them bear the *incipit*: ‘one of the disciples (or teachers) of Moses’—i.e. Ps. 31:19 in section 39 has τῶν Μωυσέως γνωρίμων τις, and in 62, Zech. 6:12 is introduced by τῶν Μωυσέως ἑταίρων τινός. A third, Ps. 80:7, is found in *id.* 52, albeit without this *incipit*, and Jer. 15:10, which appears in 44, is introduced by the similar locution: τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ. The concentration of non-pentateuchal citations here is, by itself, indeed impressive.<sup>41</sup>

<sup>38</sup> However, VII *Spec.* 2.256 (found near the end of the book), judging from the context, should most probably be understood as a reference to any educated Jew, in spite of the somewhat similar locution it contains: “one who had become a disciple of Moses” (μάλιστα φοιτητὴν γενόμενον Μωυσέως). Another passage that may possibly be related to this study, and deserves further treatment, is IX *Cont.* 63–64.

<sup>39</sup> The passage in I Suppl. *QG* 2.43 that quotes Isaiah 1:9 in the name of “some prophet who was a disciple and friend of Moses” can, I think, also best be understood in the light of this hypothesis. But I have refrained from discussing it in the running text as part of the proof, because of the problematic nature of the text. See above, *ad loc.*

<sup>40</sup> On a somewhat different aspect of this subject see Runia, “Secondary Texts in Philo’s *Quaestiones*,” in David. M. Hay, ed., *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria’s Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* (Atlanta 1991).

<sup>41</sup> In addition to this, a bit further on in this same book (IV *Conf.*), one also finds Philo’s single reference to The Book of Judges, Judg. 8:9 in IV *Conf.* 128–130, and, less than twenty sections after this, in IV *Conf.* 149, the reference to the Books of Kings. IV *Conf.* 139 also contains one of the instances of the echo of ISam. 9:9 = הַרְאָה ‘seer.’ In the chapter on the Former Prophets, I have shown that these entries indicate Philo’s use of a lexicographic aid. The ‘legacy’ he received in the ‘Confraternity’ or ‘Allegorical Circle’ may well have included the lexicon. Finally, I refrain from mentioning the

When combined with the introductory formulae of three out of the four, and with the fact that the two citations from the Prophets found here *are exactly the two remaining citations from the Latter Prophets* that are *not* found in the *Haftarah* cycle and have not yet been accounted for, it is even more striking. In short, this hypothesis provides us with the key to the provenience of these remaining two passages from the Latter Prophets.

In Chapter Three, it was shown that nine out of Philo's twelve citations from the Latter Prophets are found in the *Haftarah Cycle* between 17th of Tammuz and the Day of Atonement. An additional instance may very well have once been a *Haftarah* that was later replaced by another because of the polemical use made of it in Christianity.<sup>42</sup> We are thus now able to explain the provenance of the remaining two citations from the Prophets Jer. 15:10 and Zech. 6:12, on the hypothesis that they were a fruit of Philo's contact with the confraternity of Moses.

As we have just seen, both of these citations are found less than twenty sections apart in IV *Conf.* 44–62. IV *Conf.* 44 introduces Jer. 15:10 by the locution: 'a member of the prophetic circle' (τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ), which apparently should be understood as referring to a member of the particular group *within* the 'Confraternity of Moses,' that, if one may judge from this isolated example, engaged in radical ethical exegesis of non-pentateuchal texts.<sup>43</sup> Also, IV *Conf.* 62 identifies Zech. 6:12 as coming 'from the lips of one of the company of Moses' (τῶν Μωυσέως ἑταίρων τινός).

\*

I think that it will not be amiss before closing to take a glance at II *Cher.* 48ff. where Jer. 3:4 is quoted.<sup>44</sup> This is the very first instance in Philo's writings of a non-pentateuchal scriptural citation and is the

---

allusion that appears shortly after this in IV *Conf.* 166, even though both Colson and Earp identified it as a citation from Joshua. For, as I have pointed above in the section devoted to mistaken identifications in Chapter Five, even should Josh. 1:5 have been in the background of Philo's consciousness, the more significant reference is Deut. 31:6.

<sup>42</sup> Regarding this see above *ad loc.* (to Isa. 5:7) in Chapter Four that is devoted to the Latter Prophets. This may even have occurred as late as the Middle Ages.

<sup>43</sup> See above Chapter Four, *ad loc.*

<sup>44</sup> A few remarks about this pericope were made above in Chapter Four, *ad loc.* Further discussion of it is found in the article entitled "Philo's *Cher.* 40–52, *Zohar* III 31a, and BT *Hag.* 16a," *JJS* 57/2 (Autumn 2006).

only instance in Philo's writings of the mention of a 'book prophet' by name. It precedes all of the passages in Philo's writings that contain the introductory formulae: Moses + θιασώτης, or τις τῶν ἑταιρῶν, or τις τῶν γνωρίμων, or τις τῶν φοιτητῶν. It also precedes the locution τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ (member of the prophetic circle) that introduces Jer. 15:10 in IV *Conf.* 44.

Even though the passage lacks the identifying locution 'one of the confraternity of Moses' (ὁ τοῦ Μωυσέως δὴ θιασώτης), or another form of this expression, it cannot but belong within the frame of reference of the prophetic circle of the fellowship of Moses, and it provides us with a tantalizing glimpse of Philo's enthusiasm.

In II *Cher.* 48ff., which quotes Jer. 3:4 (found in the *Haftarah* for the Sabbath preceding 9th of Av), Philo informs his readers that this is his *first contact* with a member of the apparently elite 'prophetic circle' of the confraternity—those who *added* the study of the 'mysteries' contained in the prophetic books to their allegorical study of the 'Torah of Moses.' After recording an extremely daring allegory that uses the image of human procreation to describe God's part in the implantation of virtues in humankind, and warning his readers not to "babble anything of them to the uninitiated," Philo continues:

(48) ...But if you meet with anyone of the initiated, press him closely, cling to him, lest knowing of some still newer secret he hide it from you; stay not till you have learnt its full lesson.

(49) I myself was initiated under Moses, the beloved of God, into the Greater Mysteries (παρὰ Μωυσεῖ τῷ θεοφιλεῖ μνηθεῖς τὰ μεγάλα μυστήρια),<sup>45</sup> yet when I saw Jeremiah the prophet, seeing and realizing that not only was he a mystic but also a worthy minister of holy secrets, I was not slow to become his disciple (φοιτῆσαι)...<sup>46</sup>

One can visualize in one's mind's eye an enraptured Philo who, even though he himself was very much at home in the philosophical exposition of the Pentateuch by the method of allegorical hermeneutic, has just discovered someone from the '*allegorical prophetic circle*' of the confra-

<sup>45</sup> We stated above that the locution that appears here, παρὰ Μωυσεῖ (παρὰ + the dative), is not to be understood as a technical term for the confraternity. Nevertheless, perhaps here, the first time that Philo introduces an allegory based on a non-pentateuchal citation, this *is* in fact what Philo is referring to, or to be more exact, the larger group that engaged in the study of the Pentateuch.

<sup>46</sup> Whether or not this is entirely grammatical, the mystic here must refer to the initiate in §48, who presumably is the person who has 'revealed' the citation from Jeremiah to Philo, together with its allegorical exegesis.

ternity of Moses. This group must have included in their purview not only the Pentateuch, but judging from the context, also esoteric allegorical ‘mysteries’ that used verses from the non-pentateuchal books of Scripture as ‘proof texts.’ As we have already pointed out,<sup>47</sup> this ‘prophetic circle’ is explicitly referred to in IV *Conf.* 44, where Jer. 15:10 is represented as being cited by ‘a member of the prophetic circle’ (καὶ τοῦ προφητικοῦ θιασώτης χοροῦ).<sup>48</sup>

\*

The distribution of the non-pentateuchal citations in Philo’s works, and particularly the identifiable references to this circle in his writings, reveals that, with isolated exceptions,<sup>49</sup> they all belong to the period of the composition of the Philonic books contained in PLCL II–V.<sup>50</sup> We have found indications that during the period to which the writing of the works found in PLCL VI belong,<sup>51</sup> both the confraternity and Philo changed. From the few hints dropped by Philo, the confraternity apparently became radicalized.

It appears that without entirely abandoning the allegorical mode, Philo severed his contact with the confraternity, and heightened his commitment to the dissemination of the practical aspects of being a Jew. In the following stage, he placed a far greater emphasis on the literal approach in the expounding of Scripture. This is clearly reflected in the contents of the books he wrote after the ‘Biographies of the Patriarchs.’ Indeed, Philo introduces this part of his works with the statement in VII *Dec.* 1:

(1) Having related in the preceding treatises the... founders of our nation ... I shall now proceed in due course to give full descriptions of the written laws. And if some allegorical interpretation should appear to underlie them, I shall not fail to state it.

His writings show this change in emphasis, but we can do no more than conjecture how and why this change came about. His rupture with the

<sup>47</sup> In Chapter Four, *ad loc.*

<sup>48</sup> Colson renders these words: ‘A chorister of the prophetic company,’ etc.

<sup>49</sup> For which, in each case, an explanation has been proposed.

<sup>50</sup> This is so with the possible exception of the *Quaestiones*, which I have not attempted to study in depth. I *Leg. All.* I–III apparently precedes this period. They do not contain *any* non-pentateuchal citations, and in any event, have their own special flavor.

<sup>51</sup> The extant titles are *On Abraham*, *On Joseph*, and *On Moses*. I remind the reader that several of these ‘Biographies’ have been lost.

‘Confraternity of Moses,’ while it must have been a significant factor, would hardly have been sufficient in and by itself.

On the basis of the generally accepted chronological scheme for the writing of his *oeuvre*, the storm clouds that became more and more threatening as they darkened the political horizon were probably at least as important a factor in triggering this change. As anyone who has ever been torn between scholarship and communal affairs will understand, when one begins to engage in communal affairs, one becomes ever more enmeshed in day-to-day problems, and it becomes nearly impossible to continue to seriously engage in original scholarship.<sup>52</sup>

Philo has in fact explicitly informed his readers that considerations of this sort were a contributing factor. For in his famous lament at the beginning of VII *Spec.* 3.1–6, which commences: “There was a time when I had leisure for philosophy...”<sup>53</sup> Philo mourns the fact that he has been drawn down from the heady upper realms of abstract thought into the vortex of mundane political concerns. This, he says, has made it impossible for him to continue with the composition of the deftly woven web of ethical and theosophical allegory based upon the Pentateuch, to which the writings found in PLCL II–V belong.

\*

At the same time, it is well to stress that even while a major portion of Philo’s allegorical writings belongs to the period during which he was connected with the ‘Allegorical Circle of Moses,’ this does not indicate, as one might suppose, that these writings are dependent for their major outlines on this or any other single source. On the contrary, the fact that Philo has identified his source for several of the non-pentateuchal citations as coming from a member of this group invites the assumption that the rest of the material did not stem from there.

---

<sup>52</sup> Even if, as I suggested in the first chapter, Philo from the beginning had a *magnum opus* in mind, these factors remain relevant. For his involvement in current events would have aborted any serious continuation of the allegorical composition. Cf. in a similar spirit, BT Sanh. 17a, “Lay upon them public cares, and they will cease [prophesying] of themselves.”

<sup>53</sup> Some scholars have suggested that this is no more than a stylistic mannerism, but I very much doubt this. Not only is there the consideration that were this the case, it would presumably have appeared at the beginning of the change in genre, rather than here, halfway through the *Spec.* Further, in spite of Philo’s undoubtedly flowery style, I am not aware of any other clear instance in his writings of a rhetorical insert of this sort.

A careful reading of his writings that follows the ebb and flow of the different compositions reveals an aesthetically woven mosaic of material culled from both classic Greek and classic Jewish sources. These are like the raisins in the pastry. They are not the pastry itself. To use a different metaphor, Philo has embedded them into his composition in order to enrich the details of his tapestry. But what was uniquely his own, what one cannot take away from him, are its overall contours. This remains very much his unique creation.

### *Closing Remarks*

The present book has carefully studied all the non-pentateuchal citations used by Philo. This fills a long felt *lacuna*. It provides abundant corroboration of the thesis that Philo availed himself of both lexicographic aids and literary midrashic material. Even when, as was sometimes the case, the language of composition was Hebrew/Aramaic, he has used these resources in Greek translation. These findings reflect a lively cultural interaction between the Hebrew/Aramaic culture of Judea and the Greek-speaking Alexandrian Jewish community.

The examination of the specific citations from the Prophets in Philo's *oeuvre* points to the existence, already in Philo's day, of more than just the beginning of the traditional *Haftarah* series for the period between the 17th of Tammuz until after the Day of Atonement.

Finally, the concluding chapter has introduced the reader to a group of *teachers, scholars, students and disciples* who engaged in esoteric philosophic allegorization of the Pentateuch, with a special branch devoted to the remaining books of Scripture. For while seeking to understand several phenomena related to the non-pentateuchal citations that until now lacked a reasonable explanation, I became aware that Philo had identified some of these citations as coming from members of just such an allegorical circle. And then, with this as my point of departure, I found indications both of the moment of Philo's enthusiastic discovery of this group as well as of his growing dissatisfaction and eventual sharp break with it.

\*

Much remains to be done. But as the Latin translation of the famous aphorism attributed to Hippocrates states, "*Ars longa, vita brevis.*" In the

spirit of one of the central *leitmotifs* of the study, I shall conclude with a parallel idea that has been completely integrated into the rabbinic frame of reference, where it is used to refer to Torah study. “Rabbi Tarfon used to say: The day is short, the task is great... You are not obligated to complete the task, but neither are you free to abstain from it” (*Ethics of the Fathers*).





## ENDNOTES

### *Endnote A: Pantokrator (Παντοκράτορος) and Lord of Hosts (Κύριος Σαβαωθ)*

[to Isa. 1:9 (I Suppl. QG 2.43), and Isa. 5:7 (V Somn. 2.172 ff.)]

The Heb. **י צבאות** is regularly rendered by the Septuagint as κύριος σαβαωθ = *Lord of Hosts*. Marcus, in I Suppl. QG 2.44, 122 n. *d* notes that the Armenian OT also has ‘Lord of hosts.’ Hence, the locution here, ‘Almighty God’ in the English translation of the Armenian, which presumably translates Κυρίου Παντοκράτορος (*Pantokrator*), rather than Κύριος Σαβαωθ (*Lord of Hosts*), is noteworthy. The same is true in V Somn. 2.172 ff. where Philo has Κυρίου Παντοκράτορος (*Pantokrator*), rather than the Septuagint’s Κυρίου Σαβαωθ (*Lord of Hosts*).

While Philo may merely have wished to use a more idiomatic Greek locution, I think it likely that he used *Pantokrator* rather than Κύριος Σαβαωθ (*Lord of Hosts*), because he may have had reservations respecting the Divine appellation **י צבאות** (= *Sabaoth* = *Hosts*): the word could easily be misunderstood to mean ‘military forces.’ In II Suppl., QE 1.21 (to Ex. 12:17), Philo has rendered MT **י צבאותיכם** (Septuagint τὴν δύναμιν ὑμῶν), there referring to the Children of Israel, as ‘the godly piety of the seeing nation.’

### *Endnote B: Philo and the Contemporary Italian Rite*

[for Isa. 54:1, ISam. 1:1 – 2:10, and Sam. 10:23]

Three Philonic passages quote verses from the *Haftarot* belonging to the *Haftarot* of Admonition, of the *Haftarah* series attested in the *Pesikta d’Rav Kahana* (see above, Chapter Three), while two cite from the *Haftarah* for the second week of Consolation, and eight quote from those recited on Rosh Hashanah, *Shabbat Shuva*, and Yom Kippur. However, there are no

verses cited from *any* of the intervening *Haftarot*—those from the fourth to the seventh weeks of Consolation.<sup>1</sup>

This may well reflect the custom respecting the *Haftarah* readings of the Italian rite today, where the special readings for the Sabbaths of Consolation are followed only for the month of Av, after which, from the fourth to the seventh week, the readings return to those customary for the regular *Haftarot*—*viz.* until the first of the Sabbaths of Repentance. It has long been recognized that where the Italian liturgical custom differs from that prevalent elsewhere, it often preserves very ancient traditions. According to Büchler, the original *Takkanah* was to end the series of *Haftarot* of Consolation at the end of the month of Av.<sup>2</sup> Thus, in this respect both Philo and the Italian rite reflect the same tradition, which would make the Italian rite very early indeed.

*For ISam. 10:23*

*Parashat Shofetim* is the *fourth* of the Seven Sabbaths of Consolation. As we have just noted, the Italian rite reverts at this point to *Haftarot* related to the weekly Torah reading, returning for the Sabbaths of Repentance to the special *Haftarot*.

Philo assumes that his readers are familiar with the details of the scriptural narrative of ISam. 10:23–24. Is it too daring to suggest that the *Haftarah* for this *Parashah*, which in the *current* Italian rite is ISam. 8:1–22,<sup>3</sup> may once have been longer and included part of chapter 10? It would indeed be eminently suitable as the *Haftarah* for *Parashat Shofetim* (Deut. 16:18 – 21:9) of the Annual Cycle,<sup>4</sup> for this pericope describes the

<sup>1</sup> In my article, “Earliest Evidence of the *Haftarah* Cycle for the Sabbaths between בתמוז and סוכות in Philo,” *JJS* 48/2 (Autumn 1997), 225–249, I noted a reference to the *Haftarah* of the Fifth Week of Consolation—*viz.* Isa. 54:1. There I still followed without question Colson’s identification in his note *ad loc.* to VIII *Praem.* 158–159 of the reference found there (not a citation) with Isa. 54:1, but this is mistaken. As he himself points out in the very next note, “the allegory of the soul (here) is more concerned with ISam. 2:5 (Hannah’s song) ‘yea, the barren hath borne seven; and she that hath many children languisheth. The Lord killeth, and maketh alive,’ a passage quoted to the same effect in *Quod Deus* 10, *De Mut.* 143...” In view of this, the reference noted in my article to the *Haftarah* from the fifth Week of Consolation must be corrected; see discussion in the chapter Latter Prophets—Discussion (to Isa. 54:1).

<sup>2</sup> See the end of Büchler’s article in the *הצפה האנגלי*, Old Series Vol. 6.

<sup>3</sup> See *Talm. Enc.* X s.v. *הפטרה*, 19–20, n. 346. It may perhaps have been used in the Triennial Cycle as well. The list in *EJ* 15, 1387 (s.v. Triennial Cycle) is confused at this point. The listing as it appears is impossible.

<sup>4</sup> As we have pointed out in *Philo Judaeus*, 288–289, Endnote A: Torah Reading

anointing of Saul as king by the prophet Samuel, and the *pentateuchal* reading for this Sabbath includes Deut. 17:14ff.—the *Parashat Hamelekh* which refers to the appointment of a king (שום תשים עליך מלך).

*Endnote C: Κύριος and Θεός (LORD and GOD)  
in the Septuagint, Philo, and in Rabbinic Midrash*

[to Isa. 57:21 (V *Mut.* 169); Jer. 15:10 (IV *Conf.* 44); Ps. 62(61):12 (III *Quod Deus* 82); Prov. 8:22–23 (III *Ebr.* 30–31); and Prov. 3:3 (*Ebr.* 84)]

Rabbinic midrash has regularly assigned God's beneficial attributes of creativity and goodness to the Tetragrammaton (י-ה-ו-ה) and His regal and punitive aspects to the epithet Elohim (אלהים). This is natural, since the proper name, so to speak, for the God of Israel is the Tetragrammaton<sup>5</sup> and His goodness is axiomatic. It is therefore puzzling to find that Philo has reversed these attributes—for he ascribes God's creative and benevolent aspect to the name θεός (*Theos*), and the regal aspect to κύριος (*Kurios*). This has caused great puzzlement for Philonic scholarship. Various not entirely convincing explanations have been suggested for this.<sup>6</sup>

I am convinced that this role reversal on Philo's part respecting the Divine epithets would be an almost unavoidable result of the transfer of an existing Aramaic/Hebrew exegetical tradition regarding the differing aspects of these two Divine epithets, such as the one that is found in rabbinic midrash, directly onto the Greek translation of Scripture. For, since it is forbidden to utter the Tetragrammaton (י-ה-ו-ה) except in very special circumstances, this Most Holy Name is normally articulated as אדני (*Adonai*), a Hebrew word meaning 'Lord, Master.' This word is regularly rendered in the Septuagint as Κύριος, which also means 'Lord,

---

Cycle, there is evidence supporting the hypothesis that the annual cycle was the one current in Alexandria in Philo's day—at the very least as an alternative possibility. And see Marcus' remark in PLCL Suppl. I, *QG* (1953) xiii–xv, where he notes the correspondence between the divisions in *QG* and *QE* and the 'Babylonian' annual cycle.

<sup>5</sup> See Ex. 5:1, 6:2, etc.

<sup>6</sup> See, for example, H.A. Wolfson, *Philo* (Cambridge, Mass. 1948), Vol. I 224–225, and bibliography there, particularly, A. Marmorstein, *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God* (London 1927; repr. 1968), which deals with the treatment of these terms in rabbinic midrash, and remains a classic although it was written so long ago. And see also E.E. Urbach, *The Sages* (Jerusalem 1979<sup>2</sup>). [This is a translation of אפרים אורבך חז"ל: פרקי אמנות ודעות (Jerusalem 1969), where it is in Chapter Three, 29].

Master.<sup>7</sup> Thus Philo must have found the word *κύριος* = ‘Ruler, Master’ in his Greek text where the MT has the Tetragrammaton. And since the word *κύριος* means ‘master, ruler’ in Greek, he would almost inevitably have understood it as referring to God’s regal and punitive aspects.

At the very same time, thanks to the popular etymology of the Greek word *θεός* that translates MT **אלהים** = Elohim, which connected it with the verb *ἔστη* (‘plant, make, establish,’ etc.), this term for God would naturally have been understood by anyone whose mother tongue was Greek, as signifying God’s benevolent aspect of creativity and goodness. Such an identification would be strengthened by the consideration that, in the creation narrative at the beginning of the book of Genesis, *θεός* is the epithet in the Septuagint for Elohim (= **אלהים**).<sup>8</sup>

This explains the role reversal of the two names for God found in Philo *vis-à-vis* rabbinic midrash, for it would have been an almost inevitable result if Hebrew/Aramaic midrashic sources in Greek translation were used together with the Septuagint text. Though I am not sure that this has heretofore been noticed, Philo has in fact informed his readers that this was the reasoning behind his understanding and use of these terms, for he states in III *Plant.* 86:

The titles, then... exhibit the powers of Him that IS; the title ‘Lord’ (*κύριος*) the power in virtue of which He rules, that of ‘God’ (*θεός*) the power in virtue of which He bestows benefits. This is why the name ‘God’ (*θεός*) is employed throughout all the record of Creation given by Moses...

#### COMMENT TO Prov. 3:4 in III *Ebr.* 84:

Philo’s choice of the Divine epithet *κύριος* rather than *θεός* for MT **אלהים** in the citation of Prov. 3:4 in III *Ebr.* 84 is an exception to the rule just examined, that the Septuagint, and Philo in its wake, regularly rendered MT **אלהים** as *Θεός* and not *Κύριος*. While I cannot state categorically why this is so, I suggest the following hypothesis to explain this exception. Prov. 3:4 reads:

<sup>7</sup> See Wolfson, *op. cit.*, 225, n. 41. There are also texts of the Septuagint that bring the Tetragrammaton in ancient Hebrew script, and the generic term *θεός* is also sometimes used by the Septuagint as an alternative locution for MT Tetragrammaton.

<sup>8</sup> This is so in the ensuing chapters of the creation narrative in Genesis as well. Even where the MT has the Tetragrammaton, the Septuagint continues to use *θεός* (*Theos*).

MT: ומצא חן ושכל טוב בעיני אלקים ואדם

(KJV: So shalt thou find favour and good understanding in the sight of God and man)

Septuagint: προνοοῦ καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων

Philo: προνοούντων καλὰ ἐνώπιον κυρίου καὶ ἀνθρώπων

(“Let them provide things excellent *in the sight of the Lord and men*”)

There are two deviations from the manner that the Septuagint, and Philo in its wake, would have been expected to render the verse. **אלהים** has been rendered as κύριος rather than as θεός (θεοί), and **אדם** (man) is given in the plural as ‘men’ = ἀνθρώπων.

While at first glance this latter point hardly seems significant, it is a fact that the biblical adage *as it is now worded in the Septuagint* immediately arouses association with the Greek idiom ‘gods and men.’ The word combination θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων is found several times in Plato’s Symposium, as well as in other ancient Greek writings with which Philo must have been familiar. Philo himself has used this idiom twice, once in IX *Flaccus* 170, as part of a lament by Flaccus after his fall: “possessed as in a Corybantic frenzy... [he] lifted his voice. ‘King of gods and men’ (Βασιλεῦ θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων), he cried...”; and once in VI *Mos.* 238, completing a string of superlatives couched in idiomatic Greek: “And He, the Maker of all, the Father of the Cosmos... the ruler of ‘men and gods’ ....” Such an association on the part of the Septuagint translators would explain both the plural form ‘men’ for the Hebrew singular ‘man,’ as well as the use here of the Tetragrammaton. For the Tetragrammaton makes it clear that the reference is not to ‘gods,’ but to the *only living God*.<sup>9</sup>

I reviewed all of the instances of the use of the Divine epithets Κύριος and Θεός in the first nine chapters of Proverbs (= the first ‘book’). I found that there are twenty instances of such usage, with seven not following the general rule. But *only in Prov. 3:4* has MT **אלהים** become

<sup>9</sup> Note, while the expression **בעיני אלקים ואדם** is found nowhere else either in Scripture or in rabbinic sources except when this verse from Proverbs is quoted as a proof-text, the idiom **אלהים ואנשים** does occasionally appear. It is found twice in Judges chapter 9, and several more times in rabbinic sources, where the verse from Judges is quoted in the context of wine and the happiness it brings: **ויאמרו העצים לגפן לכי (יב) ותאמר להם הגפן החדלתי את תירושי המשמח אלהים ואנשים והלכתי לנוע על העצים.**

Κύριος; in the remaining six instances it is MT Tetragrammaton that is rendered as Θεός (Prov. 1:7; 3:5,7,19,23; 5:21).<sup>10</sup>

*Endnote D: Philo's Terminology for the books of Judges and Kings*

[to Chapter Five: Citations from the Former Prophets—Judg. 9:8, Kings (as a unit), ISam. 1:1–2:10, and IKgs. 17:18]

The title ‘*Books of Royalty*’ = τῶν ἐν βασιλικαῖς βίβλοις in IV *Conf.* 149 (not βασιλειῶν ‘Kings,’ as in III *Quod Deus* 6, and 136), is similar in form to ‘*Book of Judgements*’ (Τῶν Κριμάτων) in IV *Conf.* 128, neither of which are the Septuagint titles used for these books.

On the other hand, III *Quod Deus* 6, which quotes ISam. 1:11 in the context of the allegorical rendition of what is now the *Haftarah* to the first day of Rosh Hashanah, uses the same title as that found in the Septuagint: ‘the first Book of Kings’ (ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν βασιλειῶν). The same is true in III *Quod Deus* 136–139, where IKgs. 17:18 is also identified as being found in the ‘Book of Kings’ = ἐν ταῖς βασιλείαις.

This difference in terminology accords with our findings about the channels through which these citations came to Philo. For those that use the same nomenclature as the Septuagint were found to have stemmed from written allegorical compositions, while the two that refer to the biblical book in an idiosyncratic manner, as Τῶν Κριμάτων (Book of Judgments) and βασιλικαῖς βίβλοις (Books of Royalty) respectively, were found to introduce material from a scriptural concordance based upon the Hebrew text that had been literally translated into Greek.

*Endnote E: ‘To Look’ and ‘To See’ (βλέπειν / ὁρᾶν)*

[ISam. 9:8–9 (III *Quod Deus* 139, IV *Migr.* 38, IV *Her.* 78, and I Suppl. *QG* 4.138)]

Philo refers or alludes to ISam 9:8–9: **כי לנביא היום יקרא לפנים הראה**, in four different passages—in III *Quod Deus* 139, in IV *Migr.* 38, in IV *Her.* 78, and in I Suppl. *QG* 4.138. Sometimes the word used for MT **הראה** is βλέπων (‘looking’), and sometimes it is ὁρῶν (‘seeing’). What

<sup>10</sup> Five of these seven are found in the chapter that contains Prov. 3:4, which is quoted in III *Ebr.* 84.

follows is an attempt to understand Philo's choice of these not entirely synonymous words in each of the different passages.<sup>11</sup>

\*

The centrality for Philo of the concept of 'seeing' (ὄρω) as a metaphor for the highest level of spiritual understanding is beyond question. Indeed, Philo explains the name Israel innumerable times as 'Seer of God': ὄρων θεόν = אל - ישור (from the Hebr. root: שור = 'to look at').<sup>12</sup> And while this is not exactly the same thing, it is hardly mere chance that two of the four passages that allude to the 'Seer' (הראה) of ISam. 9:9 also contain a reference to the name Israel (IV *Migr.* 38 and IV *Her.* 78).<sup>13</sup> The study of these four passages together enables us to observe how Philo has harmonized the Septuagint text to accord with the needs of the argument in each case.<sup>14</sup> Following are the relevant Philonic passages:

### III *Quod Deus* 139 = ὄρωντας

This passage contains the first reference. As noted in Chapter Five, *ad loc.*, the word appears here as part of the discussion of IKgs. 17:18, where it explains the equation found there of 'Man of God' with 'prophet.' The Greek word ὄρωντας that Philo uses here in place of the Septuagint's βλέπων is indeed a more idiomatic choice.

---

<sup>11</sup> While I have found a few exceptions, the rule suggested here seems to be general. At the very least, the study of the different words used in the Philonic references to ISam. 9:8–9 may initiate further study.

<sup>12</sup> For the sake of illustration, I offer one example of this from the beginning of his writings: I *Leg.* 2:34 τοῦ ὄροντος ('the seeing') and two from towards their close: VIII *Praem.* 44 and IX *Gai.* 4 ὄρων θεόν ('he that seeth God'). For a discussion and cataloguing of the dozens of instances, see the Index of Names in PLCL X 333ff., s.v. 'Israel'; and see my remarks in *Philo Judaeus* 157–158 (includes bibliography).

<sup>13</sup> I find no reason to suppose that the provenance of the midrashic etymology of the proper name 'Israel' ישראל as ὄρων θεόν = ישור אל was any different from that of the many other etymologies of proper names in the Bible given by Philo. In all probability, it, too, stems from the same lexicon of midrashic etymologies of proper names in the Pentateuch. But just as with the 'etymologies' of Hannah and Samuel, this does not mean that the elaborate superstructure built upon the 'etymology' need be anything other than original with Philo.

<sup>14</sup> Whether or not this was done consciously in all instances is immaterial. It reflects his Greek *paideia*.



IV *Migr.* 38–39 = βλέποντας

Unlike the preceding instance that was not actually a citation but an allusion, here Philo quotes ISam. 9:9, the only major difference being the change from the Septuagint's singular to the plural.

Philo, IV *Migr.* 38: τοὺς προφήτας ἐκαλοῦν πρότερον τοὺς βλέποντας.

Septuagint, ISam. 9:9: τὸν προφήτην ἐκάλει ὁ λαὸς ἔμπροσθεν Ὁ βλέπων.

The passage reads:

(38) ...and he that sees it [the inner meaning of what he looks at]<sup>15</sup> this is the wise man (ὁ δὲ ὄρων ἐστὶν ὁ σοφός), for fools are blind or dim-sighted. That is why in former times they called the prophets 'those who looked' (τοὺς προφήτας ἐκαλοῦν πρότερον τοὺς βλέποντας) (cf. Septuagint ISam. 9:9).

(39) For the current coin of learning and teaching (τὸ μαθήσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας) from which Jacob took his title is reminded into 'the seeing Israel' (τὸν ὄρωντα Ἰσραήλ). Hereby comes to pass even the seeing (τὸ ὄραν) of The Divine Light, identical with 'knowledge' (ἐπιστήμης) which opens wide the soul's eye, and leads it to apprehensions distinct and brilliant beyond those gained by the ears.

Philo's sensitivity to Greek style must have made him aware that the word in idiomatic Greek for the Septuagint's βλέπω (a Hebraism)<sup>16</sup> is ὄραω. For βλέπω means 'to look,' while it is ὄραω that means 'to see' in the sense of mental sight.<sup>17</sup> Why then, if, as we have just pointed out, in good Greek the word βλέπειν means 'to gaze, look at,' while the correct word for 'to contemplate' is ὄραν, has Philo followed the Septuagint's βλέπειν in IV *Migr.* 38 (βλέποντας) and not used the more appropriate Greek word ὄρωντας, as he has in the preceding passage just quoted?

Perhaps Philo has taken advantage of the Septuagint's Hebraism βλέπων in order to make a midrashic point. Philo's message here is that, in contrast to the fool, the prophet, when he 'looks' (βλέπων) at the physical object, also 'sees' (ὄραν) its inner meaning. For section 38 begins with the contrast between the wise man capable of conceptual 'seeing' (ὁ δὲ ὄρων ἐστὶν ὁ σοφός) and the fool 'who sees but dimly.' Then in section 39 there is a reference to Jacob's metamorphosis from one who

<sup>15</sup> The square brackets contain explanation on my part of the 'it.'

<sup>16</sup> LSJ s.v. βλέπω: 'see, have the power of sight (dist. from ὄρω perceive, be aware of)... the see; Hebraism in LXX I Kgs. 9:9.'

<sup>17</sup> LSJ, s.v. ὄραω III metaph., of mental sight, discern, perceive.

could do no more than ‘hear,’ to ‘the seeing Israel’ (τὸν ὁρῶντα Ἰσραήλ). A somewhat similar point is probably also indicated in IV *Migr.* 191 (to ISam. 10:22–23) where the ‘eye of the soul’ is described as ‘looking’ (βλέπειν) at things grasped by the mind, as a stage in the *perception* of their inner meaning.

IV *Her.* 78 = ὁρῶντας (of prophets)

Support for this suggestion can be found in the third instance, which also makes ‘[him] who knows how to look’ a ‘seer.’

(75) This dedication will be enshrined in the holier of the great sanctuaries. For two such sanctuaries, we feel, exist: one sensible, one mental. This world is the cathedral (τὸ πανθεῖον)<sup>18</sup> of the sense perceived order, the world that the mind discovers of the truly invisible order.

(76) ... “He led him (Abraham) outside and said, ‘Look up into heaven’ (Gen. 15:5)” ... Yes, look up, and thus convict of their errors the multitude of common men, the blind race, which has lost the sight, which it thinks it possesses.

(77) How could it be other than blind, when it prefers bad to good... the mortal to the immortal...

(78) And so it is only the man of worth who (truly) looks (βλέπει), and therefore they of old called the prophets ‘seers’ (τοὺς προφήτας ὀνόμασιν οἱ παλαιοὶ ὁρῶντας) (cf. ISam. 9:9).<sup>19</sup> He who advances ‘outside’ (ἔξω—beyond the confines of the material world) is called not only a ‘seer’ (ὁρῶν), but is further termed ‘seer of God,’ Israel (θεὸν ὁρῶν... Ἰσραήλ).

Here, too, there may well be a play on the word pair βλέπειν / ὁρᾶν. In IV *Her.* 76–77 Philo quotes Gen. 15:5, where God tells Abraham to “*Look up* into the heaven” (ἀναβλεψον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν = βλέπειν). And the ‘looking up’ on Abraham’s part is contrasted with that of the multitude that does not have the ability ‘to look’ (βλέπειν) in this manner, because it “prefers bad to good and the mortal to the immortal.” Section 78 then confirms that “it is only the ‘the man of worth’ who knows how to ‘look’ (μόνος οὖν βλέπει ὁ ἀστέιος),” immediately after which there is a *paraphrase* of ISam. 9:9 which uses the appropriate Greek

<sup>18</sup> Colson has noted that this word is found in Philo’s writings only here and in *Aet.* 10.

<sup>19</sup> Although this, too, is a reference to ISam. 9:9 τὸν προφήτην ἐκάλει ὁ λαὸς ἔμπροσθεν Ὁ βλέπων, it is not a citation, but an allusion to it with βλέπων being replaced by the idiomatic ὁρῶν.

word ὄρων (and not the βλέπειν of the Septuagint) as a ‘proof-text,’ and this is connected with the midrashic exegesis of Israel (θεὸν ὄρων... Ἰσορήλ) = ‘the seer of God,’ which is ever-present in Philo’s writings.

I Suppl. *QG* 4.138 = ὄρων ἢ βλέπων

Finally, in I Suppl. *QG* 4.138, the passage opens with the question: “Why does (Scripture) say ‘Isaac went through the wilderness by the *Well of Seeing*?’” (= Gen. 24:62 Septuagint: τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ὄρασεως, MT: באר להי ראי). It closes with the equation of the terms ‘seeing’ and ‘beholding’ (ὄρων ἢ βλέπων), stating that “every true prophet was called ‘Seer’ or ‘Beholder,’ the name being given in reference to the eye of the soul.” We read there:

(138) (Gen. 24:62) Why does (Scripture) say ‘Isaac went through the wilderness by the *Well of Seeing*’ (Septuagint: τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ὄρασεως, MT: באר להי ראי)? Similarly, every true prophet was called ‘seer’ or ‘beholder’ (ὄρων ἢ βλέπων), the name being given in reference to the eye of the soul.

The reference to ‘the *Well of Seeing*’ (Septuagint: τὸ φρέαρ τῆς ὄρασεως, MT: באר להי ראי) is to Gen. 24:62, while the equation of ὄρων and βλέπων presumably reflects Philo’s familiarity with the Septuagint of I Sam. 9:9. What we may have here is a harmonization between the two.

*Endnote F:* Ps. 46 (45):5 (V *Somn.* 2.246) and *Zohar* ii 63b and 98b

[Ps. 46 (45):5 (V *Somn.* 2.246ff.) and Ps. 65 (64):10 (V *Somn.* 2.245)]

The *Zohar* understands Ps. 46:5—both in II 63b (*Beshalah*) and in II 98b<sup>20</sup>—in a manner similar to that found in Philo in V *Somn.* 2.241–247. It, too, associates Ps. 46:5 with Gen. 2:10, “A river goes out of Eden ...”; and there is also an associative connection with the human heart in *Zohar* II 63b. Though of course everything else is quite different, the ‘building blocks’ as well as the conclusions are very similar.

<sup>20</sup> The references are from: *Sefer Hazohar*, annotated ed. by Reuven Margalioṭ with *Nitsotsai Hazohar* (Jerusalem 1944) [= Margalioṭ, *Zohar*]. See also *Sefer Hazohar*, annotated edition by Rabbi Judah Ashlag, which includes the commentaries, *Hasulam*, and *Mar’oth Hasulam*, et al. [הזוהר, ספר הסולם, מראות עם מסורת הזוהר ועוד פירושי הסולם]. It indicates the pagination of the Margalioṭ edition at the bottom of its pages (Jerusalem 1945 ff.) [= Ashlag, *Zohar*].

One is tempted to suggest that this may point to a midrashic tradition common to both, which contained a similar conceptualization accompanied by the allusion to the same verses—while each developed the common tradition in the manner appropriate to its particular cultural and intellectual frame of reference. In view of the very different milieus of Philo and the *Zohar*, it is only to be expected that the finished products differ markedly. While this deserves further study, it must be deferred to a time when I can complete my research on the ‘mystery terminology’ in Philo.

*Endnote G: A Possible Allusion / Echo of Prov. 8:22–23 in VIII Virt. 62*

[to Chapter Seven: Citations from Proverbs and Job]

*Virt.* 61–62 reads:

(61) It is very right that we should take God for our Judge in all things and particularly in great matters... No matter is greater than sovereignty ... (62) Now Wisdom’s years are from of old, ere not only I, but the whole universe was born, (Σοφίαν δὲ πρεσβυτέραν οὐ μόνον τῆς ἡμῆς γενέσεως ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου παντός οὐσαν). And it is not lawful or possible that any other should judge her save God...

Colson and Earp consider this to be an allusion to Prov. 8:22, but I doubt that the evidence supports this. Unlike in III *Ebr.* 31, where the end of the citation clearly reflects the Septuagint text (Prov. 8:23), VIII *Virt.* 62 is no more than a reiteration of the generally accepted ancient ‘truism’ that was an axiomatic commonplace long before Hellenistic times, that Wisdom (= *Sophia*) preceded the world.<sup>21</sup>

*Endnote H: The ‘Jewish’ connotation of the terms Πρόσταγμα, Προστάξις, Προστάξεις καὶ Ἀπαγορεύσεις and Εντολή in Philo*

[to III *Ebr.* 17]

The thesis that a significant number of the Greek words used by Philo had, in addition to their regular connotation, an idiosyncratic, specif-

<sup>21</sup> Indeed, over a half a century ago W.F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1946), 282–283, pointed out that the Canaanite parallels to this are very clear. For further discussion see Appendix I: “Prov. 8:22–23 in Philo and in Gen. Rabbah, p. 219ff.”

ically Jewish connotation when the context called for it, has already been presented by me at length<sup>22</sup> and need not be repeated here. But since I have done no more than mention the words Πρόσταγμα and Προστάξις, (= ‘ordinance,’ and ‘prescription’) and the word combination Προστάξεις και Ἀπαγορεύσεις in passing,<sup>23</sup> I shall here devote a few more words to them. For these words also have an idiosyncratic Jewish connotation in Jewish contexts: *Prostakseis* (Προστάξεις) refer to (Jewish) religious commandments, and the combination Προστάξεις και Ἀπαγορεύσεις is similar to the *halakhic* concept: ‘commandments and prohibitions.’

The word πρόσταγμα (pl. -ατα) appears quite often in the Septuagint with the connotation of Divine, Mosaic commandments. Hence it is natural for Philo to use it to refer to the Mosaic ‘commands’ or ‘commandments.’ He does so not only when he quotes verbatim from the Pentateuch,<sup>24</sup> but also when paraphrasing it.<sup>25</sup>

One finds the word πρόσταξις in the connotation ‘commands’ in classic Greek sources.<sup>26</sup> In Philo it appears some 68 times, but I have

<sup>22</sup> See *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter Seven, 178–224, and more recently in, “Context and Connotation—Greek Words for Jewish Concepts in Philo,” in *Shem in the Tents of Japhet—Essays in the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*, James L. Kugel, ed., in *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism*, Volume 74 (Leiden 2002), 31–64.

<sup>23</sup> *Philo Judaeus*, 199 n. 64, and in the summary of Judeo-Greek terms, 221.

<sup>24</sup> There are fifteen instances of the word πρόσταγμα listed in the *Philo Index*, to which I have added several more that I have placed in parentheses: I *Op.* 168, I *Leg.* 2:59, II *Sacr.* 72, III *Ebr.* 37 (= Ex. 18:16 and cf. V *Mut.* 104), IV *Her.* 8 (= Gen. 26:5 and cf. VI *Abr.* 275), IV *Congr.* 86 (2×), V *Mut.* 104 (= III *Ebr.* 37—Ex. 18:16), VI *Abr.* 275 (cf. IV *Her.* 8—Gen. 26:5), VI *Mos.* 1:15, VII *Dec.* 132 (= Command of the Decalogue), VIII *Praem.* 79 (§79–80 are quoted in the running text), 98 (“those who follow God and always and everywhere cleave to His commandments” = προσταγμάτων), IX *Prob.* 3 (which may possibly be the only real exception which lends support to the suspicion that the ascription of *Prob.* to Philo may perhaps (as some indeed think) be mistaken. Although Colson does not doubt its genuineness (see his remarks in his introduction to *Prob.*, PLCL IX, 2), he has also noted, *ibid.*, 5, that in striking contrast to most of his other works, this composition contains only five citations from, or even allusions to, the Pentateuch).

<sup>25</sup> Thus while Philo quotes Ex. 18:16 verbatim in III *Ebr.* §37: “when they have a dispute and come to me, I judge between each of them and instruct them in the commandments of God and his Law (τὰ προστάγματα τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τὸν νόμον αὐτοῦ),” in V *Mut.* 104 it is paraphrased. And so too, while IV *Her.* 8 quotes Gen. 26:5 literally, Ἀβρααμ . . . ἐφύλαξεν τὰ προστάγματά μου καὶ τὰς ἐντολάς μου καὶ τὰ δικαιώματά μου καὶ τὰ νόμιά μου (MT ושמר משמרתִי, מצותִי, חקותי ותורתִי), the same biblical text is paraphrased in VI *Abr.* §275 ὅτι τὸν θεῖον νόμον καὶ τὰ θεῖα προστάγματα πάντα ἐποίησεν.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. Plato, *Leges* 631d (pl.) 673c.

been unable to locate it in any other extant Hellenistic Jewish composition.<sup>27</sup> Nor are the words *πρόσταγμα* (pl. -ατα) and *προστάξις* used in the NT—and even when we consider the verb *προστάσσω*, which is used some seven times in the NT, only three of them refer to *Mosaic* commandments.<sup>28</sup> Most interesting of all is that the word combination *Προστάξεις καὶ Ἀπαγορεύσεις* ('commandments and prohibitions') apparently appears only in Philo.<sup>29</sup>

Following are illustrations of what has just been stated categorically—that these words must be understood in Philo as part of a Judeo-Greek vocabulary, *inter alia*, because they are referred to by him as belonging to the category of *Ἐντολαί* (*Entolai*). In Hellenistic Jewish parlance in Philo's day, this term clearly indicates Torah commandments, without the need of a defining adjective. The text of the Theodotus inscription, the earliest dedicatory inscription of a Synagogue found in Judea written in Greek, clearly illustrates this.<sup>30</sup> Since this inscription dates from Herodian times, it is virtually contemporary with Philo. We read there:

“Theodotus the son of Vettenus ... built the Synagogue for the reading of Torah and the study of commandments... (εἰς ἀν[αγν] | ωσ[τ]ν νόμου καὶ εἰς [δ]ιδάχ[η]ν ἐντολῶν...).”

This is its connotation in the Septuagint translation of both the books of the Hebrew Bible as well as the Apocrypha. The following example is even more convincing because it is the result of a misreading.

<sup>27</sup> But the word is attested in this connotation in Patristic literature—which is of course later.

<sup>28</sup> Those referring to matters other than Mosaic 'commands' are: Matt. 1:24: “As the angel of the Lord had bidden him,” 21: “and did as Jesus commanded him,” Acts 10:33: “... now we are all here... to listen to everything the Lord (either God or Jesus) has commanded you to tell us,” Acts 48: “... he (Peter) ordered them to be baptized.”

<sup>29</sup> The combination *πρόσταξις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις* is found in Philo in I *Leg.* 1.93,94, III *Quod Deus* 53 (Mosaic laws dealing with commands and prohibitions), III *Ebr.* 91, *Congr.* 120 (the section is quoted above in the running text), V *Fuga* 100, VI *Mos.* 2.4, 46–47 (also quoted in the running text), 51, VII *Dec.* 176 (refers to the Decalogue), and VIII *Praem.* 299. Many of these passages reflect Philo's use of *double entendre*—his habit of using well-known philosophical associations when referring to something very Jewish. The word *Ἀπαγορεύσεις* by itself means '(Mosaic) Prohibitions' in Philo: VII *Dec.* 51, 121, 170 (the word is used there for the second five of the Ten Commandments in these sections: “Thou shalt not,” etc.), VII *Spec.* 1.23, VIII *Spec.* 4.39, 183 (introduces Septuagint Lev. 19:16).

<sup>30</sup> See Lea Roth-Gerson, *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz Israel* [= Hebrew; *לְאָה רוּט-גֶּרְסוֹן, הַכְּתוּבוֹת הַיוּנָנִית מִבְּתֵי הַכְּנֶסֶת בְּאַרְץ יִשְׂרָאֵל*] (Jerusalem 1987). The inscription is discussed more fully in *Philo Judaeus*, 221–222 and n. 41 where the bibliographic references are given.

The MT and the Septuagint to Ex. 12:17 juxtaposed:

MT: ושמרתם את המצות, כי בעצם היום הזה הוצאתי את צבאותיכם

Septuagint: καὶ φυλάξεσθε τὴν ἐντολὴν ταύτην, κτλ.

While MT has *mazzot* (= unleavened bread), the Septuagint, punctuating the word differently, has read *mitzva* (= **ἐντολή**: commandment).

In a similar vein Ben Sira 1:26 (23) has:

ἐπιθυμήσας σοφίαν διατήρησον **ἐντολάς**<sup>31</sup>

(trans.: If thou desire Wisdom, keep the **commandments**)

And in the Wisdom of Solomon 9:9 we read:

καὶ μετὰ σοῦ ἡ σοφία... καὶ ἐπισταμένη τί ἄρεστόν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖς σου, καὶ τί εὐθές ἐν **ἐντολαῖς** σου

(And with Thee Wisdom... which understandeth what is pleasing in Thine eyes, and what is right according to **Thy commandments**)

\*

With this in mind the reading of VIII *Praem.* 79–80 now takes on a very traditionally Jewish dimension. It reads:

XIV... (79) A clear testimony is recorded in the Holy Scriptures (ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς γράμμασι)... If, he says, you keep the Divine commandments (τάς θείας ἐντολάς) in obedience to His ordinances (τοῖς προστάγμασι)... not merely to hear them, but to carry them out in your life and conduct... (80) For the *commandments* (αἱ προστάξεις) are not too huge and heavy... nor is the good far away either beyond the sea or at the end of the earth ... No, it is close by... (cf. Deut. 30:11–14).

#### *Προστάξεις καὶ Ἀπαγορεύσεις (Commands and Prohibitions)*

Following are several examples from Philo's writings of the word combination *Prostakseis and Apagoreuseis* (προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις) in this connotation. IV *Congr.* 120 refers to the statutes of the Decalogue, and so there can be no doubt but that the 'commands and prohibitions' (προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις) mentioned here are Torah Commandments.

<sup>31</sup> The Hebrew version: משנה צבי סגל, ספר בן-סירא, חכמת חכמה שמר מצוה, is given by Segal, Ben Sira].

(120) ...the Holy Law is summed up by Moses in precepts which are ten in all (δέκα... λόγους). These statutes (θεσμοί) are the general heads, embracing the vast multitude of particular laws (κατὰ μέρος ἀπείρων νόμων γενικά κεφάλαια), the roots, the sources, the perennial fountains of ordinances (διαταγμάτων), (both) **commands and prohibitions** (προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις)...

Likewise in VI *Mos.* 2:46–47 Scripture is described as being divided into two parts, the second of which is “concerned with commands and prohibitions” (τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις). The word combination here can of course hardly mean anything else but ‘positive and negative Torah precepts.’

(46) They (the sacred books themselves - αἱ ἱερώταται βιβλοὶ) consist of two parts: one the historical, the other concerned with **commands and prohibitions** (τὸ δὲ περὶ τὰς προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις)... (47) ...We must now give the reason why he began his law book (νομοθεσίας) with the history, and put the **commands and prohibitions** (τὰ περὶ τὰς προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις) in the second place.

VII *Dec.* 176 defines the Decalogue as “Ten Words or Laws” (λόγους ἢ νόμους) in which context the ‘commands and prohibitions’ (προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις) cannot possibly mean anything other than Torah commandments:

(176) Next let us pass on to give the reason why He expressed the Ten Words or Laws (τοὺς δέκα λόγους ἢ νόμους) in the form of simple commands and prohibitions (ψιλᾶς προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις) without laying down any penalty, as is the way of legislators, against future transgressors.

Finally, VII *Spec.* 1:299 contains a taxonomy of the commandments, dividing them into commands respecting behaviour, and those dealing with the proper attitude of mind. Clearly, the *commands and prohibitions* (κατὰ προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις) here indicate Torah commandments.

(299) These and similar injunctions to piety are given in the Law in the form of direct *commands and prohibitions* (κατὰ προστάξεις και ἀπαγορεύσεις) and what are similar to them. Others... are of the nature of philosophical precepts and exhortations (φιλοσόφους ὑποθήκας<sup>32</sup> και παραινέσεις)...

---

<sup>32</sup> Philo uses the word ὑποθήκη only four times, and in two of them—here in VII *Spec.* 1.299 and in VIII *Virt.* 70—it is found in the combination ὑποθήκη- και παραινέσις. The other two instances are in V *Somn.* 2.73 and VII *Spec.* 3.29, where the context shows that they mean ‘precepts.’ It is also found in Patristic literature with the meaning of ‘precept,’ e.g. Clem. *Paed.* 1.12.



(300)...to love Him and to cling to His commandments (καὶ τῶν ἐντολῶν αὐτοῦ περιέχεσθαι)...<sup>33</sup>

Clearly, in the appropriate Philonic contexts, the words προστάξεις (and sometimes also πρόσταγματα) mean ‘commands’ in the sense of ‘Torah commandments,’ and the word combination προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις refer to ‘positive and negative commandments.’

*Endnote I: The Use of the Word Πρωτίστης in Philo*

[to Prov. 8:22–23 (III *Ebr.* 31)]

Among the other changes in Philo’s citation of Prov. 8:22–23 is the replacing of the Septuagint’s ἀρχὴν by the word πρωτίστην. A survey of the instances of Philo’s use of the word πρωτίστην yields the following: there are only five (or possibly six) instances of the word πρωτίστην in Philo’s writings: I *Leg.* 2.48, *id.* 86, II *Post.* 63, III *Ebr.* 31, VII *Spec.* 1.332, and also IX *Aet.* 17, if it is not spurious. A high level of both literary and philosophical sophistication is evident in all of these passages. Following are the relevant passages accompanied by short comments.

I *Leg.* 2.48–49

(48) If a man have two wives, one of them beloved and one of them hated, and they shall bear children and the first born son (πρωτότοκος) be the son of the hated wife... he shall not be able to give the right of the first-born to the son of the beloved wife... (Deut. 21:15–16): for the first of all and most perfect of all (πρώτιστα γὰρ ἔστι καὶ τελειότατα) are the offspring of the *hated virtue* (= Leah), while the offspring of the *well-loved pleasure* (= Rachel) are last of all (ἔσχατα).

XIV (49) “For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife, and the twain shall be one flesh” (Gen. 2:24). For the sake of sense-perception the Mind, when it has become her slave, abandons both God the Father of the universe, and God’s excellence and wisdom (τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ σοφίαν τοῦ θεοῦ), the Mother of all things, and cleaves to and becomes one with sense-perception.

The passage is one of ethical allegory, and there is a play on the words πρώτιστα and the πρωτότοκος (‘first born’), quoted from Septuagint

<sup>33</sup> As I have shown elsewhere, these ‘philosophical precepts and exhortations’ (φιλοσόφους ὑποθηκὰς καὶ παραινήσεις) must also be understood as technical terms.

Deut. 21:16.<sup>34</sup> The midrashic technique here is similar to that found elsewhere in Philo's writings, and is one which is also quite common in rabbinic midrash—*viz.* the drawing of homiletic conclusions from what appear to be redundancies in the text. Thus Philo has midrashically expounded the word 'νῦν' (now) found in Gen. 2:23 ("This is *now* bone out of my bones and flesh out of my flesh") in I *Leg.* 2.41–42; and similarly in I *Leg.* 2.44, 'αὐτή' is presented as a redundancy in the biblical text that is in need of explanation.

However, the negative valence given by Philo to Rachel as the symbol for things of the flesh is entirely alien to the spirit of rabbinic midrash. It is thus highly unlikely that it arose anywhere else but *within* the frame of reference of Hellenistic Judaism, which adopted the contemporary Greek devaluation of womankind, as well as a negative evaluation of all things of 'the flesh.'

### I *Leg.* 2.86

This passage is less than forty sections after the preceding instance:

(86) ...For the flinty rock (Deut. 8:15) is the Wisdom of God (ἡ σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ), which He marked off from His powers as highest and chiefest (πρωτίστην)... from which he satisfies the thirsty souls that love God...<sup>35</sup> But the primal existence is God (τὸ δὲ γενικώτατόν ἐστιν ὁ θεός), and next to Him is the Word of God (ὁ θεοῦ λόγος), but all other things subsist in word (λόγω) only, but in their active effects (ἔργοις)<sup>36</sup> they are in some cases as good as non-subsisting.

The *Logos* (*Sophia*) is here described as Πρωτίστης—and is considered to be above the rest of the 'Powers' (δυνάμεις), after only God Himself.

### II *Post.* 63

XVIII (63) Accordingly he calls Israel, though younger in age, his 'first-born son' (πρωτόγονον υἱόν) in dignity (Ex. 4:22), making it evident that 'he who sees God'<sup>37</sup>—i. e. the original cause of being—is the recipient of

<sup>34</sup> Here, unlike in III *Ebr.* 31 (Prov. 8:22–23), the word is not a synonym for ἀρχήν.

<sup>35</sup> This equation of Sophia (= Torah) with water is found not only in Philo but also in rabbinic literature and even in Qumran (see *Philo Judaeus*, 160–164, *et passim*).

<sup>36</sup> The λόγος / ἔργος dichotomy is found often in Philo's writings. In rabbinic literature one finds the similar, though not identical למעשה // להלכה (= word and deed, theory and practice).

<sup>37</sup> This is the standard exegesis of the name Israel in Philo—see the remarks in Endnote E, p. 205, particularly note 12 on ISam. 9:9.

honor, as earliest offspring of the Uncreated One (τοῦ ἀγενήτου γέννημα πρῶτιστον)...

In very much the same way as it was associated with πρωτότοκον in I *Leg.* 2.48, here the word πρῶτιστον is associated with the word πρωτόγονον, and in both the ‘parentage’ is allegorical, and entirely divorced from the simple meaning of the biblical text.

### III *Ebr.* 31

The citation from Proverbs that has triggered the survey of Philo’s use of πρωτίστην. *Sophia* is presented here as giving birth to the world. Thus, metaphorically, God is ‘father’ and God’s Wisdom is ‘mother,’ and the world their offspring.

### VII *Spec.* 1.332

In VII *Spec.* 1.332 πρῶτιστον is part of an idiomatic turn of phrase that means ‘earliest childhood’ (πρῶτιστον ἐξ αὐτῶν σαργάνων), a usage unrelated to our present concerns.

(332) ...so too those who know not the one true God... are blind to the most essential reality with which they should have been indoctrinated to the exclusion of or before anything else from the time they were toddlers (πρῶτιστον ἐξ αὐτῶν σαργάνων).

### IX *Aet.* 17

This passage presents the Platonic doctrine that the world was created, but is indestructible. It is not clear whether or not the *Aet.* is spurious. In any event, here the word πρωτίστης appears in a citation from Hesiod’s *Theogony*, thus reflecting the classic literary level of Greek.

(17) First Chaos was (ἦτοι μὲν πρῶτιστα χάος), and then broad-breasted earth,

Safe dwelling place for all for evermore (Hesiod, *Theogony* 116ff.)

*Endnote J: The Cultural Norms of  
Translators and the Words They Choose*

[to Prov. 19:14]

Though this is at best tangential to the present study, I find it intriguing that while *all* the major English translations of Scripture<sup>38</sup> translate MT משכיל (masc.) by the word ‘wise’ (e.g. in Prov. 10:5, 14:35 and 2:17), they also unanimously render the feminine form MT משכלת as ‘prudent.’<sup>39</sup> *Targum Yonathan*, too, writes סוכלתנא for the masculine form משכיל when it is found in the Bible, while in Prov. 19:14, it either has not translated משכלת at all, or else has understood it in a manner similar to that of the Septuagint, ἀμύροζεται, ‘to fit’; for it is rendered as ומן אלקא מתמסרא ומן אלתתא לגברא, with no defining adjective for the woman.

I suggest that this reflects the connection between cultural norms and the words translators choose—in this case ‘wise’ for a man, but only ‘prudent’ for a woman. For besides the difference in gender, the word translated is the same.

---

<sup>38</sup> *Viz.* the King James Version (KJV), the Jewish Publication Society (JPS = US 1917) and the New International Version (NIV = International Bible Society, US 1977/8).

<sup>39</sup> KJV: “Houses and riches are an inheritance from *fathers*; and from the Lord a *prudent* woman.” JPS has: “a *prudent* wife is from the Lord” and NIV renders: “Houses and wealth are inherited from parents, but a *prudent* wife is from the Lord.” Thus this is so even in the NIV, which has modernized some aspects of the KJV and JPS.



## APPENDIX I

### PROV. 8:22–23 IN PHILO AND IN GENESIS RABBAH<sup>1</sup>

Of course, much if not most of the extant rabbinic midrash is neither early, nor necessarily common to Hebrew/Aramaic-speaking and Greek-speaking Jews. The different cultural frames of reference gave birth to significant differences in form, and most importantly, to the questions addressed by the two cultural spheres. At the same time, it is becoming increasingly evident that some homiletic traditions were common to both cultural spheres from very ancient times, each one adapting them to their different needs and intellectual environment.<sup>2</sup>

The question of the ultimate origin of this or that specific tradition—whether it was transplanted from the Aramaic-speaking world *into* that of those who spoke Greek, or the other way around, will in many instances very likely remain unresolved. But the first step is to accept as a working hypothesis that such a common infrastructure existed, and then to learn to recognize indications of it. We will be missing something essential if this avenue of research is not pursued more intensively. For what sometimes at first glance appears to be either a purely Hellenistic or a purely Hebrew/Aramaic frame of reference turns out upon scrutiny to be at most only partly so.<sup>3</sup> There may sometimes have been a process of mutual fructification, with the particular midrash becom-

---

<sup>1</sup> To Chapter Seven.

<sup>2</sup> The discussion of a joint midrashic infrastructure between Philo and rabbinic midrash, including extensive bibliographic notation, may be found in *Philo Judaeus* Chapter II / 1 and 2, 33–71. An example of a late midrash with very early antecedents, pointed out by Geza Vermes, may be found at the end of his “Bible and Midrash,” *Cambridge History of the Bible I* (1970), 119–231: 230–231. I mention it at the end of my article, “Al Taseg Gevul ‘Olim (Peah 5:6, 7:3)” *HUCA* 56, 1985, 145–166. For a parallel between Philo VIII *Spec.* 4.137–139, *Song of Songs Rabbah* 8:6, and BT Shabbat 12a, with respect to the likening of the *Shema* to a ‘seal over one’s heart,’ and the *Tefillin* to the vestments of the High Priest, see *Philo Judaeus, op. cit.*, particularly 140–143. A somewhat different version of this is found in my “Stamped Too with Genuine Seals,” *Classical Studies in Honor of David Sohlberg*, ed. Ranon Katzoff et al. (Bar-Ilan 1996), 153–166, particularly 162–166.

<sup>3</sup> See Louis Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, in the introduction to the notes for the first two volumes. Vol. V, Introd., ix. I have referred to this in my *Philo Judaeus*, 28.

ing nuanced in the process of the transition from one cultural sphere to another. What follows is an example of a midrashic tradition common to both Philo and Gen. Rabbah.

\*

Scholarship has long identified similarities between the descriptions of God's creation of the world in the beginning of Philo's I *Opif.* and that of the human architect in the opening passage of Gen. Rabbah. But while the Platonic 'ideas' lie at the base of the description in I *Opif.* §17 ff.,<sup>4</sup> in Gen. Rabbah there is no reference to the Platonic 'ideas.' The redactor of the midrashic compilation was either entirely unaware of them, or else did not consider them meaningful.

Less often noticed, if at all, are the similarities between this same passage in Gen. Rabbah and Philo's III *Ebr.* 30–31. It is hardly necessary to stress that I do not suggest any direct dependence of the one upon the other. What I do suggest is that both Gen. Rabbah 1 ff. and the beginning of Philo's I *Opif.*, and III *Ebr.* 30–31 are offshoots of the same midrashic tradition, and if we study them together leads to hitherto unrecognized insights.

The terms Demiourgos and Father are used in both I *Opif.* 10 ff. and in III *Ebr.* 30 ff. for the Creator of the Universe:<sup>5</sup>

I *Opif.* §10 ...For as we know, it is both a father's aim in regard of his offspring (καὶ γὰρ πατὴρ ἐκγόνων), and an artificer's in regard of his handiwork (καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν δημιουργηθέντων) to preserve them...

III *Ebr.* §30 ...we should rightly say and without further question that he who made this universe (τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον) was at the same time both the artificer and the father of what was thus born (δημιουργὸν ὁμοῦ καὶ πατέρα εἶναι τοῦ γεγονότος)...

But though both passages relate to the creation of the world, their thrust is very different. I *Opif.* describes biblical creation from within the frame of reference of Platonic cosmology—and more particularly in

---

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. the remarks in the note to §17 (line 6) in the Hebrew translation of I *Opif.*, Yitschak Mann (trans.), notes by Moshe Schwabe (1931); also, Wolfson, *Philo* I 243 n. 11, E.E. Urbach, *The Sages* (Jerusalem 1979<sup>2</sup>), 198–200 [trans. from אפרים א. אורבך, (1969) פרקי אמונות ודעות (ירושלים), 175 ff.], and more recently David Runia, "Polis and megalopolis: Philo and the founding of Alexandria," *Mnemosyne* 42, 398–412: 410–412 (repr. in *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria* (Collected Studies Series: 332 (1990)).

<sup>5</sup> Unless noted otherwise, the citations are verbatim from PLCL.

terms of the Platonic ‘ideas.’ III *Ebr.* 30ff., on the other hand, portrays God (ὁ θεός) as creating the Cosmos by consorting with Knowledge (ἐπιστήμη), which in § 31 is immediately equated with *Sophia* (Wisdom = חכמה).

\*

Before turning to the main part of the discussion of III *Ebr.* 30–31 together with Gen. Rabbah 1ff., let us again quickly review the well-known comparison between I *Opif.* 17ff. and this midrash. We read in Philo’s I *Opif.* § 17–20:

(17) To speak of or conceive that world which consists of ideas as being in some place is illegitimate... When a city is being founded to satisfy the soaring ambition of some king or governor... there comes forward... a trained architect (ἀρχιτεκτονικός)... first sketches **in his own mind** well nigh all the parts of the city that is to be wrought out...

(18) Thus, after having received in his own soul, as it were in wax, the figures of these objects severally, he carries about the image of a city which is the creation of his mind. ...he recalls the images... and like a good craftsman (δημιουργός ἀγαθός), he begins to build the city... keeping his eye upon his pattern (παράδειγμα) and **making the visible and tangible objects correspond in each case to the incorporeal ideas** (ἀσωμάτων ιδεῶν).

(19) Just such must be our thoughts about God. We must suppose that when He was minded to found the one great city, **He conceived beforehand the models** of its parts, and that out of these He constituted and brought to completion **a world discernible only to the mind**, and then, **with that for a pattern** (παράδειγματι), **the world that our senses can perceive.**

(20) As, then, the city which was fashioned beforehand within the mind of the architect held no place in the outer world, but had been engraved in the soul of the artificer as by a seal; even so the universe that consisted of ideas would have no other location than the Divine Reason (τὸν θεῖον λόγον), which was the Author of this ordered frame.

Note in passing that the architect in Philo’s parable is referred to as a “good demiourgos” (δημιουργός ἀγαθός). Could this possibly be an implied *contra* to the gnostic Demiourgos, and hence yet another example of Philo’s penchant for *double entendre*, as well as an implied *contra* to the gnostic demiurge? In any event it is undeniable that the parable calls the architect who is described as building the tangible city in accord with “the incorporeal ideas” inscribed in his soul, a “good



demiourgos” (δημιουργός ἄγαθός)—something that in certain circles in his day was hardly self-evident.

Turning to the second half—the message: While in the first part the king and the architect are discrete people, in the second half God is equated neither with the ‘king’ nor with the ‘architect,’ but with a composite ‘king-architect.’ As king, God is presented as *deciding*, “to found the one great city, the *Megalopolis*, this world of our senses.” At the same time He is described as its architect, who like the architect in the first part of the parable, constructs ‘the world that our senses can perceive’ according to the ‘incorporeal ideas’ that He has, before this, created *in His mind*. For such is the way with parables. The two parts of the parable are not expected to fit each other exactly in all of their details.

\*

Gen. Rabbah 1:1 reads:

בראשית ברא אלקים וגו': ר' הושעיה רבה פתח: (משלי ח:ל) ואהיה אצלו אמון... דבר אחר: אמון - אמן, התורה אומרת: אני הייתי כלי אמנותו של הקב"ה. בנוהג שבעולם: מלך בשר ודם בנוה פלטין, אינו בונה אותה מדעת עצמו אלא מדעת אמן; והאמן אינו בונה אותה מדעת עצמו אלא דפתראות ופנקסאות יש לו... כך היה הקב"ה מביט בתורה ובונה את העולם. והתורה אמרה: 'בראשית ברא אלקים' - ואין 'ראשית' אלא תורה, היאך מה דאת אמר: (משלי ח:כב), ה' קנני ראשית דרכו.

**In the beginning God created:** R. Hoshaya Rabbah opened (his discourse), ואהיה אצלו אמון (Prov. 8:30)... Another explanation: אמון—אמן [= a fanciful play on the word אמון]. The Torah says, ‘I was God’s instrument of craftsmanship’ (כלי אמנותו). In the manner of the world, when a king of flesh and blood builds a palace, he does not build it by himself, but with the help of a master-builder; and the master-builder doesn’t build it by himself, but has rolls and tablets (= plans and descriptions)... So did the Holy One Blessed be He, look at the Torah and build the world. And the Torah said, “In the beginning God created...” (Gen. 1:1). And there is no “beginning” except for Torah, as Scripture says, (trans. JPS) “The Lord made me as the beginning of His way” (Prov. 8:22).<sup>6</sup> (translation of the midrashic passage mine).

The similarity between Philo’s I *Opif.* 17ff. and the midrash at the beginning of Gen. Rabbah is evident. At the same time, there is no

<sup>6</sup> MT: ... (22) ה' קנני ראשית דרכו, קדם מפעליו מאז... (24) באין תהמות חוללתי...

JPS (22): The Lord made me as the beginning of His way... (24) When there were no depths, I was brought forth, the first of His works of old... KJV: The Lord possessed me in the beginning of His way, before the works of old... (24) When there were no depths I was brought forth...

mention, or even clear allusion, in the midrash to the Platonic ideas as a stage in God's creation of the world, nor does Philo cite Prov. 8:22–23 in I *Opif.* But if the 'ideas,' which are so central to the Philonic image in I *Opif.*, do not appear in the rabbinic midrash, what *was* the message that the midrashist wished to convey? Presumably it is found in the citation of Prov. 8:22.

\*

The citation of Prov. 8:22–23 in Gen. Rabbah is usually understood as being given in order to identify Wisdom<sup>7</sup> with Torah, which here is described as serving as the blueprint for the creation of the world. But I have never found this to be an entirely satisfying explanation for the introduction of this citation. While this is an essential part of the picture, I have long intuitively felt that there must be something more. I now suggest that with the help of *Ebr.* 30–31 this 'something more' will come to the fore and provide the reader of the midrash with a far richer dimension.

\*

III *Ebr.* §30–31 is one of the very few passages in Philo's writings that contains a citation from non-pentateuchal Scripture. In his entire *oeuvre* there are only slightly over 40 such citations—and regarding the Writings, if we exclude from the count those from Psalms, we are left with only some five discrete Philonic passages that quote from at most eight different verses.

That is why it is particularly striking that this very same verse is quoted at the beginning of Gen. Rabbah and in III *Ebr.* §30–31. Indeed, the study of these passages in tandem reveals that the primary thrust of the message relayed by the quotation of Prov. 8:22–23 in *both* of these sources is not, as is usually assumed, the equation of Torah and Wisdom. This had long been a truism that hardly required a proof-text. Nor is the point of the passage primarily that God has used Wisdom-Torah as a *blueprint* for the creation of the world. This was done adequately in I *Opif.* 17ff. without citing this verse. However, reading III *Ebr.* §30–31 together with the beginning of Gen. Rabbah demonstrates

---

<sup>7</sup> See Prov. 8:1 for the subject of the chapter: Wisdom.

that in both passages the message relayed by this quotation is that Wisdom, though existing before the world, is *herself* God's creation. While she is a partner in creation, *she herself was created*.

\*

III *Ebr.* §30–§31 is part of a homiletic allegorical discourse on 'parents and children'; it contains one of Philo's many references to the father/mother combination that is the *leitmotiv* of *Ebrietate* as a whole. Section §30 reads:

(30) Now 'father and mother' is a phrase that can bear different meanings. For instance, we should rightly say and without further question, that the Architect (Demiourgos) who made this universe (τὸν γοῦν τόδε τὸ πᾶν ἐργασάμενον δημιουργόν) was at the same time the father of what was thus born, whilst its mother was the knowledge possessed by its Maker (τὴν τοῦ πεποιηκότος ἐπιστήμην), with whom God consorted (ἧ συνὼν ὁ θεὸς) not as men have it (οὐχ ὡς ἄνθρωπος), and begat created being (ἔσπειρε γένεσιν). And she, having received the Divine seed, when her travail was consummated, bore the only beloved son that<sup>8</sup> is apprehended by the senses (αἰσθητὸν υἱόν)—this (ordered) world (τόνδε τὸν κόσμον).

Above and beyond the very daring nature of the image of God's consorting with *Episteme* (ἐπιστήμη) that is shortly thereafter identified with *Wisdom* (Σοφία), *Ebr.* §30–31 both creates and solves an additional and not less serious problem. For when the passage is read through the prism of the axiomatic assumptions of most Jews contemporary with Philo, and not only them, that God, and God *alone* created the entire universe, the status of *Episteme* = *Wisdom* (Σοφία) as a partner in creation is on the face of it problematic. For if Wisdom was considered, so to speak, to have been God's consort in the creation of the world, she must also, of necessity, have preceded its creation.

To avoid misunderstanding, the problem is not the question of 'primeval matter,' but *the apparent incompatibility between the conception of God as the Sole Creator of the universe, and the conception of Wisdom as a pre-existent partner in creation*. This is the problem solved by the citation of Prov. 8:22–23 in both works. III *Ebr.* §31 reads:

---

<sup>8</sup> I have replaced Colson's 'the only beloved son *who* is apprehended by the senses' by '*that*.'

(31) Wisdom is introduced by one of the Divine Choir (εἰσάγεται γοῦν παρά τινι τὸν ἐκ τοῦ θείου χοροῦ ἢ Σοφία), as speaking of herself after this manner (περὶ αὐτῆς λέγουσα τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον): “God *created*<sup>9</sup> me first of all his works and founded me before the ages” (ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσατό με πρωτίστην τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με) (cf. Prov. 8:22–23).

Prov. 8:22–23 here indicates that while on the one hand, in accord with the prevalent theosophical world view, Wisdom was indeed a pre-existent partner to creation, at the same time she too had been created by God. The significance of Prov. 8:22–23 in these passages is now clear.

But before proceeding I wish to show that this in fact is the connotation of Prov. 8:22–23. Following are the relevant verses as they appear in the MT, the Septuagint and Philo.

MT: (22) קָנִי רֵאשִׁית דְּרַכּוֹ, קִדְּמִי מִפְּעֻלּוֹ מֵאֵז (23) מְעוֹלָם נִסְכְּתִי מֵרֵאשִׁית

Septuagint (Prov. 8:22) (22): κύριος ἔκτισεν με, ἀρχὴν ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς ἔργα αὐτοῦ,

(23) πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με ἐν ἀρχῇ.

Philo: (22) ὁ θεὸς ἐκτίσατό με, πρωτίστην τῶν ἑαυτοῦ ἔργων,

(23) καὶ πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐθεμελίωσέ με

(trans.: “God *created me first* of all his works, and founded me before the ages”)

I am of course entirely aware that the Hebrew root קָנָה that appears here in the MT has several connotations—not only to ‘create’ but also to ‘acquire, possess, purchase, make,’ depending on the context. Likewise, the Greek κτίζω, used to translate קָנָה both here in the Septuagint and in Philo, can mean ‘build, found’ and not only ‘create and bring into being’ and likewise the ἐκτίσατό<sup>10</sup> of the Philonic text can also mean ‘acquire.’ Indeed, many distinguished scholars have taken it for granted that ‘acquire’ rather than ‘create’ is the way that the word is to be understood in this scriptural verse. And while JPS renders קָנִי here as ‘made,’ KJV renders it as ‘possessed,’ and not as ‘created.’

<sup>9</sup> The Hebrew word קָנָה has several connotations already in the Bible. See discussion immediately following and also *ad loc.* in Chapter Seven.

<sup>10</sup> In his endnote to III *Ebr.* 31 (PLCL III, 501), Colson remarks that Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, 296, has noted that at least respecting the form of the verb ἐκτίσατο, the reading in Philo is closer to the MT (and Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion) than to the Septuagint. This supports the hypothesis of Philo’s use of a literary source for this passage translated from a Semitic original.

However, in Gen. 14:19 (ברוך אברם לאל עליון קנה שמים וארץ) the Hebrew root קנה, rendered by the Septuagint as ἐκτίσθαι, must mean ‘create,’ not ‘acquire’ or ‘possess.’ The same is the case a little further on in Gen. 14:22: ויאמר אברם אל מלך סדם, הרמתי ידי אל ה', אל עליון קנה שמים וארץ, where it *must* also mean ‘create.’<sup>11</sup> Hence, it is only reasonable to assume that here too this was its connotation, and that this was how both the Septuagint and Philo understood the word.

As Albright long ago wrote, Prov. 8–9 “is now known to be of Canaanite origin since it swarms with words and expressions otherwise found only in such Canaanite texts as the Ugaritic tablets and the Phoenician inscriptions.”<sup>12</sup> But obviously, when these chapters were incorporated in the Book of Proverbs, it was without their Canaanite overtones, and were understood as stating that of all His creation, God *created* Wisdom first. Indeed, the understanding of קנה to mean ‘created’ is explicitly indicated only a few sections later in Gen. Rabbah 1:4, which states:

ששה דברים קדמו לבריאת העולם. יש מהם שנבראו, ויש שעלו במחשבה להבראת. התורה וכסא הכבוד נבראו. תורה מנין, שנאמר (משלי ח:כב) ה' קנני ראשית דרכו קדם מפעלו מאז...

Six things preceded the creation of the world. Some of them were *created* (נבראו) and some of them were conceived in the mind to be *created*. The Torah and the Throne of Glory were created. *Torah*—from whence do we know it? As it is said (Prov. 8:22), “The Lord created me at the beginning of His way, the first of His works of old...” (trans. mine).

And cf. similarly Tanhuma (Warsaw) נשא *Naso*, 11 where this verse is also quoted as a proof-text for the creation of Wisdom/Torah before the rest of the world:

‘(ר’א) ילמדנו רבינו כמה דברים קדמו למעשה בראשית, כך שנו רבותינו, שבעה דברים נבראו עד שלא נברא העולם. אלו הן כסא הכבוד, והתורה... התורה מנין שנאמר (משלי ח:כב) ה' קנני ראשית דרכו קדם מפעלו מאז...

Let our teacher explain: How many things were in existence before the act of creation? Thus our teachers have related: Seven things were created before the creation of the world. They are, The Holy Throne, and the *Torah*... Whence do we know respecting the Torah? As it is said (Prov. 8:22), “The Lord created me at the beginning of His way, the first of His works of old...” (trans. mine).

<sup>11</sup> This has been noted by Matthew Kraus in his review in the *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* (2004.02.17) of Pieter W. van der Horst, *Japheth in the Tents of Shem: Studies on Jewish Hellenism in Antiquity* (Leuven 2002).

<sup>12</sup> William F. Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore 1946), 282–283.

III *Ebr.* 30–31 and the opening midrash of Gen. Rabbah both reflect this understanding of the word קנה in Prov. 8:22 as meaning ‘create.’ But while the axiomatic frame of reference of the readers of Gen. Rabbah made it superfluous to expatiate on this, Philo explicitly states why *Sophia* (Wisdom) had to have been created *before* the Cosmos. For he writes:

... ‘God *created* me first of all his works’ ...for it was necessary that all that came to birth of creation should be younger than the *mother and the nurse of the All* (τῶν ὅλων).

\*

In sum: Philo and the beginning of Genesis Rabbah relate in a similar manner to the same two self-evident truisms that were in need of harmonization: the pre-existence of Wisdom which belonged to the axiomatic frame of reference of any educated person in ancient times, Jewish or pagan; and what was at the very same time also axiomatic for any ideologically committed Jew—the conviction that *everything* was created by God.

It is the apparent incompatibility of these two truisms that both Philo’s III *Ebr.* 31 and Gen. Rabbah 1:1 have addressed by means of their citation of Prov. 8:22–23, understood as stating that Wisdom had been *created* by God *before* she became a partner with Him in the creation of the Cosmos.

\*

Finally, even traces of the sexual-biological metaphor in Philo’s III *Ebr.* is still faintly discernible in the midrashic text at the beginning of Gen. Rabbah. For it too understands the first words of the Book of Genesis, בראשית ברא אלהים, homiletically as meaning: ב’ ראשית ברא אלהים (ב = ‘in’; In the *reishit*, God created the Cosmos)—i.e. that God used ‘*reishit*’ as the matrix in which the world gestated. And this ‘*reishit*’ is equated by the midrash with Torah ( ואין ראשית אלא תורה ).<sup>13</sup>

<sup>13</sup> This is probably most evident in the version of the midrash found in *Yalkut Shimoni, Parashat Bereishit* 2 (Warsaw 1878, repr. Jerusalem 1948):

כך היה הקב"ה מביט בתורה ובורא את העולם והתורה אמרה בראשית בי ראשית ברא אלהים שנאמר בראשית ברא אלהים. ואין ראשית אלא תורה כד"א ה' קני ראשית דרכו.

This image is so jarring to the traditionally attuned ear that it is entirely lost on the vast majority of readers, and conscious awareness of it has vanished. But when the beginning of Gen. Rabbah is read together with III *Ebr.* 30, where God is allegorically described as having ‘converse’ with Wisdom/Torah<sup>14</sup> when creating the world, the contours of this connotation re-emerge.

\*

It is now clear that when the passage from the beginning of Gen. Rabbah is read together with III *Ebr.* §30ff. and I *Opif.* 10ff., shades of hitherto unsuspected facets of meaning again become visible. This is so in spite of the hundreds of years that elapsed between Philo’s writing and the appearance of the earliest rabbinic midrashic compendia that have survived, not to mention their completely different cultural frames of reference.

It is tantalizing to speculate about the relationship between these parallel sources, so far removed from each other in virtually every other respect. The kernel of the midrash may have originated in a Hellenistic venue, where the awareness of both the Platonic ‘ideas’ and the apparent contradiction between these two axioms would have been most acutely felt. Then, when it crossed the language divide, much of the philosophical ballast was abandoned, and today only the desiccated skeleton of the Hellenistic midrash survives in the rabbinic midrash.

The transfer of the Hellenistic midrash to the Hebrew/Aramaic sphere could easily have occurred since, as I have pointed out at some length elsewhere,<sup>15</sup> *Hakhamim* who visited the Diaspora almost certainly brought back to Judea interesting *derashot* that they had heard in the Synagogues and Batei Midrash. They must have been more than happy to enliven their own Sabbath sermons and study sessions with them. And of course, when he was back home in Judea, the *Darshan* (= preacher) felt free to use only that part of the homily that he thought would be relevant to his audience. This midrashic cross-fertilization must have been an ongoing process, and need not have occurred in

---

<sup>14</sup> It was of course a truism long before Philo that Wisdom was to be equated with Torah. See e.g. Ben Sira 24:1–8. This is discussed at some length in my *Philo Judaeus*, 179ff.

<sup>15</sup> See *Philo Judaeus*, Chapter One, sections 6 and 7, 25–31 for a discussion of this type of interaction.

Philo's day. It could have occurred both earlier and later. However, after the destruction of the Hellenistic-Jewish communities and the eclipse of the philosophical dimension in the traditional Jewish world,<sup>16</sup> the form taken by the midrash in the Hebrew/Aramaic cultural sphere became divested of whatever philosophical fragrance it may originally have had. Today, all that remains in Gen. Rabbah of the common midrashic tradition is the identical 'proof-text' from Proverbs. There is no explicit expression of the philosophical problem that it solves, no suggestion of Platonic 'ideas,' and at best only faint traces of the daring image of God's consorting with Wisdom, which is so clearly drawn by Philo.

---

<sup>16</sup> To reappear only many centuries later.





## APPENDIX 2

### TWO CHARTS OF PHILO'S CITATIONS FROM THE PROPHETS AND WRITINGS

Following are two charts.<sup>12</sup> The first chart is based upon *the order in which the citations appear in Scripture*, while the second follows *the order of their appearance* in the *Loeb Classical Library* (= PLCL).<sup>3</sup> In order to focus the emerging picture properly, those verses found to have been mistaken identifications, or no more than possible allusions,<sup>4</sup> have been listed separately at the end of the citations from each book of Scripture.

---

<sup>1</sup> As already stated in the Note to the Reader, the Roman numerals that appear before the Philonic citations refer to the volume in PLCL.

<sup>2</sup> Earp's *Scripture Index* (PLCL vol. X, 259–264) has been most helpful in identifying the relevant passages. However, it could serve as no more than the point of departure, for it brings together in the same list both the citations and/or allusions to Scripture found in Philo's *oeuvre*, and their mention in the notes and appendices of the Loeb edition, which are of course not Philonic at all. The index even contains four pages of references to the New Testament (265–268), as well as several entries that refer to writings usually termed Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (264–265).

Also, Earp, *op. cit.*, indicates neither the nature of each reference, whether it is a quotation, an allusion, or a perceived echo, nor how it has been introduced. These are important considerations in the context of the present study. While there is a list found in *Philonis opera quae supersunt*, ed. L. Cohn, P. Wendland et S. Reiter, I–VII (in vol. VII: Leisegang) (Berlin 1896–1930; repr. 1962ff.), its arrangement requires the use of the German edition. And even Helmut Burkhardt's recent thoroughgoing study, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften bei Philon von Alexandrien* (Giessen/Basle 1988), particularly 132–149, does not deal with the subject discussed in the present study. Note too in passing, that Ralph Marcus's comment appended to *Quaest. in Ex.* 76 (PLCL, Suppl. II, 126), n. i., where he writes that "Philo quotes from Hosea three times, from Isaiah four times (*sic!*), from Jeremiah three times, from Ezekiel twice, from Zecharaiah once" (italics mine) is not entirely accurate. There are actually five citations from Isaiah and I have not succeeded in finding any reference in Philo's works to Ezekiel.

<sup>3</sup> Even if this is of limited chronological value, it provides a typological overview. The overwhelming majority of these citations and references are found in Books II–V and *QG*.

<sup>4</sup> Some of these are found in other *Haftarot* that are not part of this cycle. Isa. 11:6–9 referred to in VIII *Praem.* 87, is found in the *Haftarah* to the 8th Diaspora day of Passover in the Diaspora. Isa. 54:1, reflected in VIII *Praem.* 158–159, is found in the *Haftarah* of the 5th of the Sabbaths of Consolation. Isa. 66:1 of IV *Conf.* 98 is found in the *Haftarah* when Shabbat and *Rosh Hodesh* come together. And Jer. 2:3, which is found in the first of the three *Haftarot* preceding the 9th of Av, could perhaps be identified with the allusion in VIII *Spec.* 4.180, though Deut. 32:9 is closer. At the very least the

I have included both charts because they enhance the accessibility of the material, helping the reader to find exactly what he or she may be looking for. No less important is that together, they also provide a bird's eye view of the place of each reference both in Scripture and in the Philonic *oeuvre*.

CHART I  
PHILO'S REFERENCES TO THE PROPHETS AND WRITINGS  
ACCORDING TO THEIR ORDER OF APPEARANCE IN SCRIPTURE

*Latter Prophets*

With the exception of Jer. 3:4 (in II *Cher.*49), which is Philo's *very first citation to the Prophets and Writings*, none of the Latter Prophets are identified by name. Philo's conceptual units appear to have been the Pentateuch, the Prophets, the Psalms (Hymns), and the rest of the Holy Writings. In this, he is at one with Josephus and the New Testament.

*Isaiah (4 out of 5 are found in the Haftarah series)*

Isa. 1:9 (I Suppl. *QG* 2.43) in *Haftarah* to *Shabbat Hazon*<sup>5</sup> (*Parashat דברים*) that immediately precedes the 9th of Av)

Isa. 5:7 (V *Somn.* 2.172 ff.) is **not found** in any contemporary *Haftarah*<sup>6</sup>

Isa. 50:4 (IV *Quis Rerum* 25) in *Haftarah* to the Second Week of Consolation

Isa. 51:2 (I Suppl. *QG* 4.26) in *Haftarah* to the Second Week of Consolation

Isa. 57:21 (V *Mut.* 169) in *Haftarah* to the Day of Atonement

---

ideas and thought patterns found in these passages must also have been part of Philo's cultural horizon.

<sup>5</sup> If no particular rite is noted, the *Haftarah* mentioned is common to all current rites.

<sup>6</sup> It may perhaps once have been a *Haftarah* belonging to this cycle that was later deleted because of its use by Christians against the Jews. See the discussion *ad loc.*

## Possible allusions

Isa. 11:6–9 (VIII *Praem.* 87) in *Haftarah* to the 8th day of Passover in the Diaspora<sup>7</sup>

Isa. 54:1 (VIII *Praem.* 158–159) in *Haftarah* to 5th Sabbaths of Consolation<sup>8</sup>

Isa. 66:1 (IV *Conf.* 98) in *Haftarah* when Rosh Hodesh<sup>9</sup> falls on the Sabbath.

## Mistaken Identification

Isa. 48:22 (V *Mut.* 169) should be id. 57:21<sup>10</sup>

*Jeremiah* (2 out of 3 are found in *Haftarah* series)

Jer. 2:13 (V *Fuga* 197) in *Haftarah* to the 2nd Sabbath preceding the 9th of Av

Jer. 3:4 (II *Cher.* 49) in *Haftarah* (Ashkenazi) to the 2nd Sabbath preceding the 9th of Av

Jer. 15:10 (IV *Conf.* 44): **not found** in any *Haftarah*

## Possible Echo

Jer. 2:3 (VIII *Spec.* 4.180) in the first *Haftarah* of the series preceding the 9th of Av

*Hosea* (all are found in the *Haftarah* series)

Hos. 14:9–10 (III *Plant.* 139) in *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Shuva* in all rites

Hos. 14:9–10 (V *Mut.* 139) in *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Shuva* in all rites

Hos. 14:6 (II *Suppl. QE* 2.76) in *Haftarah* for *Shabbat Shuva* in all rites<sup>11</sup>

<sup>7</sup> I mention this even though it may not yet have been celebrated in Egypt in Philo's day.

<sup>8</sup> But this is probably an allusion to ISam. 2:5 (the *Haftarah* to the first day of Rosh Hashanah). See discussion *ad loc.* in the chapter on the Latter Prophets.

<sup>9</sup> Rosh Hodesh is the beginning of the (lunar) month in the Jewish calendar and is considered to have a certain degree of sanctity (see BT Arakhin 11b).

<sup>10</sup> This is explained *ad loc.*

<sup>11</sup> In the Ashkenazi rite this is also in the *Haftarah* reading to *Parashah Vayishlahk* in the Book of Genesis (Hos. 12:13 – 14:9).

*Zechariah*

Zech. 6:12 (IV *Conf.* 60–63) **not found** in the annual *Haftarah* cycle<sup>12</sup>

*Former Prophets**Book of Joshua*

Mistaken Identification

Josh. 1:5 (IV *Conf.* 166)

*Book of Judges (called: 'The Book of Judgments')*

Judg. 8:9 (IV *Conf.* 128–130)

*Book of Samuel*

ISam. 1:1–2:10 (quoted as coming from the first Book of Kings)

ISam. 1:11, 2:5 (III *Quod Deus* 5–15) in *Haftarah* to the First Day of Rosh Hashanah

ISam. 1:11 ff. (III *Ebr.* 143–152 and V *Som.* 1.254) found in the *Haftarah* to the First Day of Rosh Hashanah.

ISam. 2:5 (V *Mut.* 143) in *Haftarah* to the First Day of Rosh Hashanah

ISam. 9:9: 'the Seer'

III *Quod Deus* 139 (Follows the reference to I Kings 17:10,18)

IV *Migrat.* 38

IV *Quis Her.* 78

ISam. 10:22–23 (IV *Migr.* 196–197)

---

<sup>12</sup> However, it is found in the *Haftarah* to Lev. 5:1 ff. in the Triennial Cycle. This cycle completes the reading of the Pentateuch in three or three and a half years, not annually, like today. See discussion *ad loc.*

## Probable Allusion

ISam. 2:5 (VIII *Praem.* 158–159)

I and II Kgs. (called: ‘The Books of Kings’)

IKgs. 17:10,18 (III *Quod Deus* 136–139)—also contains the first reference to ISam. 9:9

## Mistaken Identifications

IKgs. 15:11, II Kgs. 18:3 (IV *Conf.* 149)

Philo speaks of the ‘Books of Kings’ as a unit, not to specific verses.

The name Elijah in II Kgs. 2:11 (I Suppl. *QG* 1.86—there is no quotation)

*Psalms (Hymns)*<sup>13</sup>

(The term “ὕμνοι rather than Ψαλμοί is used)

MT:<sup>14</sup> 23, 27, 31, 37 (twice), 42, 46, 62, 65, 75, 80 (twice; two consecutive verses), 84, 91, 94, 101, 115 (twice—different verses). There are 15–17 different verses from 15 different Psalms, which are quoted or closely paraphrased in 17 Philonic passages.

*Remaining Writings**Proverbs*

Prov. 1:8, 3:4, 4:3 (III *Ebr.* 84)—the book is mentioned by name

Prov. 3:11,12 (IV *Congr.* 177)

Prov. 19:14 (I Suppl. *QG* 4.129)

Prov. 8:22–23 (III *Ebr.* 31)

<sup>13</sup> This seems to have been a discrete rubric, distinct from the rest of the Writings.

<sup>14</sup> I have used the MT numbering, since most of those who will look up the references will use either the MT or an English translation of it. The Septuagint numbering is of course regularly one chapter less.

Echo of an idea from Proverbs—not a citation

Prov. 8:22–23 (VIII *Virt.* 62)<sup>15</sup>

### *Job*

Job 14:4–5 (V *Mut.* 48—Job is mentioned by name but not as the title of the book)

### *Chronicles*

Mistaken Identification<sup>16</sup>

I Chron. 7:14 (IV *Congr.* 43)

\*

## CHART II

THE REFERENCES TO THE PROPHETS AND WRITINGS ACCORDING TO THE ORDER OF THEIR APPEARANCE IN PHILO'S OEUVRE (BUT AT THE SAME TIME ARRANGED UNDER THE MAJOR SCRIPTURAL DIVISIONS)

(The citations found in *Haftarot* other than those belonging to the Cycle are placed in square brackets. The Scriptural citations *not found in any Haftarah* are bracketed thus: { } and those from the Latter Prophets not found in the present day *Haftarot* of the *Admonition / Consolation / Repentance Cycle* bear the additional notation 'NO' next to them. Possible allusions and mistaken identifications are listed separately at the end of each division.)

### *Latter Prophets*

II <i>Cher.</i> 49 (Jer. 3:4)	before <i>Shabbat Hazon</i>
III <i>Plant.</i> 138 (Hos. 14:9–10)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>
{IV <i>Conf.</i> 44 (Jer. 15:10)	NO }
[IV <i>Conf.</i> 62 (Zech. 6:12)	<i>Triennial Cycle</i> to Lev. 5:1 ff.]
IV <i>Quis Rer.</i> 25 (Isa. 50:4)	2nd Week of Consolation
V <i>Fuga</i> 197 (Jer. 2:13)	before <i>Shabbat Hazon</i>

<sup>15</sup> However, Prov. 8:22–23 ... קני ראשית דרכו has been quoted in III *Ebr.* 31 (see immediately preceding).

<sup>16</sup> Mentioned by Colson, *ad loc.* in a footnote.

V <i>Mut.</i> 139 (Hos.14:9–10)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>
V <i>Mut.</i> 169 (Isa. 57:21)	Day of Atonement
{V <i>Somn.</i> 2.172 ff. (Isa. 5:7)	NO }
I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 2.26 (Isa. 51:2)	2nd Week of Consolation
I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 2.43 (Isa. 1:9)	<i>Shabbat Hazon</i>
II Suppl. <i>QE</i> 2.76 (Hos. 14:6)	<i>Shabbat Shuva</i>

Allusions and mistaken identifications<sup>17</sup>

- [IV *Conf.* 98 (Isa. 66:1) (found in *Haftarah* to Shabbat and Rosh Hodesh)]
- VIII *Spec.* 4.180 (Jer. 2:3 and/or Deut. 32:9) (in 1st *Haftarah* preced. the 9th of Av)
- [VIII *Praem.* 87 (Isa. 11:6–9) (in *Haftarah* to 8th day of Passover in the Diaspora)]<sup>18</sup>
- VIII *Praem.* 158–159 (Isa. 54:1)<sup>19</sup> (in *Haftarah* to 5th Sabbath of Consolation)

*Former Prophets*

III <i>Quod Deus</i> 5–15 (ISam.1:11, 2:5)	first day of Rosh Hashanah
{III <i>Quod Deus</i> 136–139 (IKgs. 17:10,18)	(also contains next entry)}
{III <i>Quod Deus</i> 139 (ISam. 9:9)	'seer' הַרְאָה }
III <i>Ebr.</i> 143–152 (ISam. 1:11,14,15)	first day of Rosh Hashanah
{IV <i>Conf.</i> 128–130 (Judg. 8:9)	= Gideon גִּדְעוֹן גִּדְעוֹן גִּדְעוֹן }
{IV <i>Conf.</i> 149 (Books of Kings as a whole)	reference is to sons of Psalmist David}
{IV <i>Migr.</i> 38 (ISam. 9:9)	'seer' = הַרְאָה }
{IV <i>Migr.</i> 196 (ISam. 10:22–23)	'Samuel character' }
{IV <i>Quis Rerum</i> 78 (ISam. 9:9)	'seer' = הַרְאָה }
V <i>Mut.</i> 143 (ISam. 2:5)	first day of Rosh Hashanah
V <i>Somn.</i> 1:254 (ISam. 1:11)	first day of Rosh Hashanah

<sup>17</sup> The majority of these instances are, at most, echoes of the verses associated with them and not citations. See the discussions *ad loc.*, including the Endnote: Philo and the Contemporary Italian rite, p. 199.

<sup>18</sup> See note *ad loc.* in first chart.

<sup>19</sup> While it may be an allusion to this verse, it is most probably an allusion to ISam. 2:5, "Yea the barren hath borne seven..." See further below in the discussion *ad loc.*



## Allusions and/or Mistaken Identifications

IV <i>Conf.</i> 149 (IKgs. 15:11, II Kgs. 18:3)	reference to 'Books of Kings' as a unit
IV <i>Conf.</i> 166 (Josh. 1:5)	Simkhat Torah <sup>20</sup>
VIII <i>Praem.</i> 158–159 (ISam. 2:5) <sup>21</sup>	first day of Rosh Hashanah
I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 1.86 (II Kings 2:11) <sup>22</sup>	Elijah
I Suppl. <i>QG</i> 4.138 (ISam. 9:9)	'seer' = <b>הרואה</b>

*Psalms (Hymns)*<sup>23</sup>

- II *Gig.* 17 [Ps. 78 (77):49],  
 III *Quod Deus* 74 [Ps. 101 (100):1], III *Quod Deus* 77–81 [Ps. 75 (74):8(9)],  
 III *Quod Deus* 82–84 [Ps. 62 (61):12], III *Quod Deus* 182 [Ps. 91 (90):11],  
 III *Agr.* 50–54 [Ps. 23 (22):1],  
 III *Plant.* 29 [Ps. 94 (93):9], III *Plant.* 39 [Ps. 37 (36):4],  
 IV *Conf.* 39 [Ps. 31 (30):19], IV *Conf.* 52 ff. [Ps. 80 (79):7],  
 IV *Migr.Abr.* 157 [Ps. 42(41):4, Ps. 80 (79):6], IV *Her.* 290 [Ps. 84 (83):11],  
 V *Fuga* 59 [Ps. 115:17–18, (113:25–26)],  
 V *Mut.* 115 [Ps. 23 (22):11],  
 V *Somn.* 1.75 [Ps. 27 (26):1],  
 V *Somn.* 2.242 [Ps. 37 (36):4], V *Somn.* 2.245–246 ff. [Ps. 65 (64):10, Ps. 46  
 (45):5],  
 VII *Dec.* 74 [Ps. 115:5–8 (113:13–16), and also found in Ps. 135 (134):15–  
 182].

<sup>20</sup> The purported identification in PLCL with Josh. 1:5 is mistaken. See in Chapter Five.

<sup>21</sup> Colson has identified this allusion with Isa. 54:1. But see discussion *ad loc.*

<sup>22</sup> This is mentioned by David Runia, in "Secondary Texts in Philo's *Quaestiones*," David M. Hay, ed., *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus* (Atlanta 1991), [= Runia, "Secondary Texts"], particularly 52, 72, 79.

<sup>23</sup> The citations are identified as coming from the 'Hymns.'

*Remaining Writings**Proverbs*

III *Ebr.* 31 (Prov. 8:22–23)

III *Ebr.* 84 (Prov. 1:8, 3:4, 4:3)—book is mentioned by name

IV *Congr.* 177 (Prov. 3:11,12)

I Suppl. *QG* 4.129 (Prov. 19:14)—book is mentioned by name

Echo of an idea from Proverbs—but not a citation

VIII *Virt.* 62—echo of Prov. 8:22–23<sup>24</sup>

*Job*

14:4–5 (V *Mut.* 48)<sup>25</sup>

*Chronicles*

Mistaken Identification<sup>26</sup>

I Chron. 7:14 (IV *Congr.* 43)

<sup>24</sup> It is quoted in III *Ebr.* 31: ה' קני ראשית דרכו, cited above.

<sup>25</sup> See comment *ad loc.* in Chart I.

<sup>26</sup> Mentioned by Colson, *ad loc.* in a footnote.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

**NOTE:** English translations of the titles of Hebrew works are cited in brackets.

- Albright, William F., *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (Baltimore 1946), 282–283.
- Amir, Yehoshua, "פירושי שמות עבריים אצל פילון" [= "The Interpretation of Hebrew Names in Philo"], *Tarbiz* 31 (1961–1962), 297ff.; English trans. found as Appendix 2, in: Grabbe, *Etymology*, 233–235 [= Amir, "Hebrew Names"].
- , "משה כמחבר התורה אצל פילון", *יהושע עמיר*, [= "Moses as the 'author' of the Law in Philo"], *Proceedings of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities*, 6.5 (Jerusalem 1980, 95–125, 1984, 83–103). (Subsequently published in German as: "Moses als Verfasser der Tora bei Philon," *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien*, Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog 5 (Neukirchen 1983), 77–105.)
- ANRW Hellenistisches Judentum in römischer zeit: Philon und Josephus*, Aufsteig und Niedergang der römischen Welt, II Principat vol. 21, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin, New York 1984) [= *ANRW*].
- Ashlag, Rabbi Judah, ed., *Sefer Hazohar, עם פירוש הסולם, מראות הסולם*, מסורת זוהר ועוד including the commentaries, *Hasulam*, and *Mar'oth Hasulam*, et al. (Jerusalem, 1945 ff.).
- Attridge, Harold W., et al., ed., *Of Scribes And Scrolls: Studies On The Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, And Christian Origins, presented to John Strugnell on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, College Theological Society Resources in Religion 5 (New York 1991).
- Bamberger, B.J., "The Dating of Aggadic Materials," *JBL* 68 (1949), 115–123.
- , "Philo and the Aggadah," *HUCA* 48 (1977), 153–186.
- Bar-Ilan, Meir, "האם מסכתות תמיד ומדות הן תעודות פולמוסיות?" [= "Are Tamid and Middoth Polemical Tractates?"] *Sidra* (ט"ש = 1989), 27–40.
- Barracloough, Ray, "Philo's Politics: Roman Rule and Hellenistic Judaism," *ANRW* II 21.1, 417–553 [for *ANRW* see above, s.v.].
- Baumgarten, Albert I., "Ancient Jewish Sectarianism," *Judaism* (Fall 1998), 387–404.
- Belkin, Samuel, *Philo and the Oral Law: the Philonic interpretation of biblical law in relation to the Palestinian Halakah* (Cambridge, Mass. 1940, repr. New York 1968, 1970).
- Bell, H. Idris, *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (Oxford 1924).
- , "המדרש הנעלם ומקורותיו במדרשים האלכסנדריים הקדומים" [= "The Midrash Ha- Ne'elam of the Zohar and its Sources in Ancient Alexandrian



- , “*Taryag* and the Noahide Commandments,” *JJS* 43/1 (Spring 1992), 46–57.
- , “Context and Connotation: Greek Words for Jewish Concepts in Philo,” in *Shem in the Tents of Japhet: Essays on the Encounter of Judaism and Hellenism*, ed. James L. Kugel (Leiden 2002), 31–61.
- , “The Mystery Terminology in Philo,” in *Philo und das Neue Testament, Internationales Symposium zum Corpus Judaico-Hellenisticum, May 1–4, 2003*; Herausgegeben von Roland Deines und Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr (Tübingen 2004), 173–187.
- , “The Prophetic Books of Alexandria: The Evidence from Philo Judaeus,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak; Library of Hebrew Bible / Old Testament Studies 427; formerly *JSTOT Supplement Series* (New York–London 2006), 166–193.
- , “Philo’s *Cher.* 40–52, *Ẓohar* III 31a, and *BT Hag.* 16a,” *JJS* 57/2 (Autumn 2006).
- Danby, Herbert, *Mishnah* [= English trans.] (Oxford 1933).
- Dillon, John, “The Descent of the Soul in Middle Platonic and Gnostic Theory,” in *The Rediscovery of Gnosticism*, ed. B. Layton, SHR 41, I–II (Leiden 1980/81), 357–364.
- Elbogen, Ismar, *Jewish Liturgy: A Comprehensive History* (English trans. Philadelphia 1993; original German appeared in 1913), Hebr. trans. by Yehoshua Amir, revised and updated by Joseph Heinemann (1972). The English translation was made from the Hebrew revised version.
- Feldman, Louis, ed. with Gohei Hata, *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987).
- Feldman, Louis, *Josephus, with an English translation and notes*, PLCL Vol. IX = *AJ* 18–20 (London 1965).
- Fleischer, Ezra, “קריאה חד-שנתית ותלת-שנתית בתורה בבית הכנסת הקדום” [= “Annual and Triennial Reading of the Bible in the Old Synagogue”] *Tarbiz* 61/1 (October–December 1991), 25–44; Engl. summary II–III.
- , “תפלת שמונה עשרה: עיונים באופיה, סדרה, תכנה ומגמותיה” [= “The *Shemone Esre*—Its Character, Internal Order, Contents and Goals”] *Tarbiz* 62/2 (Tevet-Adar 1993), 179–223; Engl. summary VI–VII.
- Finkelstein, Louis, ed., *Sifre on Deuteronomy, ספרי על ספר דברים* (Berlin 1939, repr. New York 1969).
- Frankel, Zacharias, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta* (Leipzig 1841).
- , *Über den Einfluss der palästinschen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik*, (Leipzig 1851).
- Freedman, H., and Simon, Maurice, edd., *Midrash Rabbah* (Vilna). [English trans.] (Soncino Press 1939, 1961<sup>3</sup>).
- Frey, P. Jean-Baptiste, *CIJ* (Rome 1952) [= *CIJ*]
- Fuks, Alexander, “Notes on the Archives of Nicanor,” *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 5 (1951), 207–216, esp. 214–215 [repr. in *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece* (Jerusalem–Leiden 1984)].
- Ginzberg, Louis, *Legends of the Jews* (Philadelphia 1909–1938, repr. 1985). (See particularly the introduction to the notes for the first two volumes.)

- Goldenberg, R., "The Jewish Sabbath and the Roman World up to the time of Constantine the Great," *ANRW II* 19.1 [for *ANRW* see above, s.v.] (Berlin, New York 1979), 415–422.
- Goldschmidt, E.D., *מקורותיה ותולדותיה, הגדה של פסח, דניאל גולדשמידט*, [= *The Passover Haggadah, its sources and history*] (Jerusalem 1960).
- , *סדר רב עמרם גאון*, [= *The Siddur of Rav Amram Gaon*] (Jerusalem 1971).
- Goldstein, Jonathan, "Creation ex nihilo: Recantations and Restatements," *JJS* 38 (1987): 187–194.
- , "The Origins of the Doctrine of Creation ex Nihilo," *JJS* 35/2 (1984), 127–135.
- Goodenough, Erwin R., *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*, (New Haven 1935; repr. Amsterdam 1969).
- , *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven 1938, repr. Hildesheim 1967). (See particularly Chapter II, Politics in Code, 21–32.)
- Goulet, R., *La philosophie de Moïse: essai de reconstitution d'un commentaire philosophique préphilonien du Pentateuque*, *Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique* 11 (Paris 1987) [review in: Runia et al., *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1987–1996*].
- Grabbe, Lester, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation—The Hebrew Names in Philo*, *Brown Judaic Studies* 115 (Atlanta 1988) [= Grabbe, *Etymology*].
- , "A Response to B.J. Bamberger, 'Philo and the Aggadah,' *HUCA* 48," *StPhA Volume III* [= *Earle Hilgert Festschrift*] (Atlanta 1991), 153–166.
- Grant, R.M., "Theological Education at Alexandria," in B.A. Pearson and J.E. Goehring (edd.), *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, *Studies in Antiquity and Christianity* (Philadelphia 1986).
- Gutman, Yehoshua, *הושע: הספרות היהודית ההלניסטית — היהדות וההלניות בראשית תקופת החשמונאים* [= *Hasifrut Hayehudit Hahelenistith*] (Jerusalem 1963).
- Halperin, David J., *The Faces of the Chariot* (Tübingen 1988).
- Hay, David M., "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," *SPh* 6 (1979–1980), 41–75.
- , *Both Literal and Allegorical: Studies in Philo of Alexandria's Questions and Answers on Genesis and Exodus*, ed. David M. Hay, *BJS* 232 (Atlanta 1991) [= Hay, ed. *Both Literal and Allegorical*].
- , "References to other Exegetes," in Hay, ed., *Both Literal and Allegorical*, 81–97.
- Heinemann, Joseph, *התפילה בתקופת התנאים והאמוראים* [*Prayer in the Period of the Tanna'im and the Amoraim*] (Jerusalem 1966) [= Heinemann, J. *Prayer*] (There is an updated English translation).
- Heinemann, Yizhak (Isaac), "Die Lehre von ungeschriebenen Gesetz im jüdischen Schriftum," *HUCA* 4 (1927), 149–171 [Heinemann, "Die Lehre"].
- , *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung* (1931–1933; 1973<sup>2</sup>) [= Heinemann, *Bildung*].
- Hengel, Martin, *Judaism and Hellenism I* (German original 1969, rev. and enlarged 1973; London/Philadelphia 1974).
- , Hengel, Martin and Lichtenberger, H., "Die Hellenisierung des antiken Judentums als *Praeperation Evangelica*," *Humanistische Bildung*, *Württembergischer Verein der Freunde des humanistischen Gymnasiums* 4 (1981), 1–30, esp. 18–21.

- Higger, Michael (מ. היגער), ed. *Massekhet Soferim* (מסכת סופרים) (New York 1937).
- Hilgert, Earle, "Philo Judaeus et Alexandrinus: The State of the Problem," in *The School of Moses: Studies in Philo and Hellenistic Religion; in memory of Horst R. Moehring*, ed. John Peter Kenney, *Brown Judaic studies* 304. *Studia Philonica Monographs* 1 (Atlanta 1995).
- Holladay, Carl R., *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, Vol. II (1989), 304 and notes.
- Jacob, Bruno, *Auge um Auge, Eine Untersuchung zum Alten und Neuen Testament* (Berlin 1929).
- Jacobsen, Howard, *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge, England 1983).
- Jonas, Hans, *Gnosis und Spätantiker Geist* 2 vol. (Göttingen 1934–1954). Partial Eng. trans. = *The Gnostic Religion* (1958).
- Kahn, J.G., "Did Philo know Hebrew?" [Hebrew כהן-ישר, האם ידע פילון?], *Tarbiz* 34 (1965), 337–345.
- Kallen, Horace M., *The Book of Job as a Greek Tragedy* (New York 1918).
- Kasher, Aryeh, *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Tübingen 1985). [rev. Engl. editon of יהודי מצרים ההלניסטית והרומית במאבקם על זכויותיהם 1978]
- Kenney, John Peter, ed., *The School of Moses: Studies in Philo and Hellenistic Religion; in memory of Horst R. Moehring*, *Brown Judaic studies* 304. *Studia Philonica Monographs* 1 (Atlanta 1995).
- Kraft, Robert A., "Philo and the Sabbath Crisis: Alexandrian Jewish Politics and the Dating of Philo's Works," in *The Future Of Early Christianity: Essays In Honor Of Helmut Koester*, ed. Birger A. Pearson, et al. (Minneapolis 1991), 131–141.
- , "Tiberius Julius Alexander and the Crisis in Alexandria according to Josephus," in *Of Scribes And Scrolls: Studies On The Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, And Christian Origins, presented to John Strugnell on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, ed. Harold W. Attridge, *College Theological Society Resources in Religion* 5 (New York 1991), 175–184.
- Kraus, Samuel, *Synagogale Altertümer* (Berlin 1922, repr. 1966).
- Kugel, James L. *In Potiphar's House: The Interpretive Life of Biblical Texts* (New York 1990), ch. 10.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago 1970), 43–51.
- Lieberman, Saul, *Tosefta Kī-fshuta* VIII, *Order Nashim* (New York 1973) [= Lieberman, *Tosefta Kī-fshuta*].
- Lloyd, Genevieve, *The Man of Reason: Male and Female in Western Philosophy* (Minneapolis 1984, 1993, 1995).
- Loewe, Raphael, "The 'Plain' Meaning of Scripture in Early Jewish Exegesis," *Papers of the Institute of Jewish Studies in London* I (1964), 140–185.
- Mach, Michael, *A study in Jewish Angelology in the Hellenistic-Roman Period* [Heb. מחקרים בתורת המלאכים (אנגלולוגיה) היהודית בתקופה ההלניסטית-רומית], Ph.D. Dissertation (Tel-Aviv 1986).
- Mack, Burton L., "Exegetical Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism: a program for the analysis of the Philonic Corpus," *Sph* 3 (1974–1975), 71–112.
- , "Philo Judaeus and exegetical traditions in Alexandria," *ANRW* 2.21.1 [for *ANRW* see above, s.v.] (1984), 221–271.



- Mandelbaum, Bernard (Dov), ed., *Pesikta de Rav Kahana*, [פסיקתא דרב כהנא] (New York 1987<sup>2</sup>).
- Mann, J., *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue I* (1940; completed by I Sonne, 1996) [= Mann, *The Bible in the Old Synagogue I*]
- , “The Reading of the Law and Prophets in a Triennial Cycle,” *JQR* (O.S.) 5 (1893), 420–468; 6 (1894), 1–73.
- Mantel, H.D., “Did Philo know Hebrew?” [פירושי שמות אצל פילון] *Tarbiz* I 32 (1962–1963), 98–99, 395.
- Marcus, Joel, “The intertextual polemic of the Markan vineyard parable,” in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Early Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Graham N. Stanton, and Guy G. Stroumsa (Cambridge 1998), 210–227 [= Marcus, “Markan vineyard parable”].
- , “The Jewish War and the Sitz im Leben of Mark,” *JBL* 111 (1992) 441–462 [= Marcus, “The Jewish War,” *JBL* 111 (1992)].
- Marcus, Ralph, “A Sixteenth Century Critique of Philo,” *HUCA* 21 (1948), 29–71.
- Marmorstein, A., *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God* (London 1927; repr. 1968) [= Marmorstein, *Old Rabbinic Doctrine*].
- Mason, Hugh J., *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions, A Lexicon and Analysis*, published for The American Society of Papyrologists (Toronto 1974), particularly 34, 52, 119, 144–151 [= Mason, *Greek Terms*].
- Mason, Steven, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees* (Leiden 1991), 230–235, 289–293 [= Mason, *Josephus*].
- May, Gerhard, *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der creatio ex nihilo*, Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte, no. 48 (Berlin, New York 1978), 1–25; (Eng. trans. *Creatio Ex Nihilo: The Doctrine of “Creation Out of Nothing” in Early Christian Thought*; Edinburgh 1994).
- Mendelson, Alan, *Philo’s Jewish Identity*, Brown Judaic Studies 161 (Atlanta 1988).
- Moehring, Horst, R., “Arithmology as an Exegetical Tool in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria,” in *The school of Moses: studies in Philo and Hellenistic religion: in memory of Horst R. Moehring*, ed. John Peter Kenney (Atlanta 1995), Brown Judaic Studies 304.
- Neusner, Jacob, “The Rabbinical Tradition about the Pharisees before 70,” *JJS* 22 (1971), 1–18; repr. in *Early Rabbinic Judaism: Historical Studies in Religion, Literature and Art* (Leiden 1975), 73–89.
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin, *Le Commentaire de l’Ecriture chez Philon d’Alexandrie: son caractère et sa portée; observations philologiques*, *ALGHf* 11 (Leiden 1977) [= Nikiprowetzky, *Commentaire*].
- , “L’exégèse de Philon d’Alexandrie,” *Revue d’Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 53 (1973), 309–329, (reviewed *SPh* 4, 101–103).
- , “Note sur l’interprétation littérale de la loi et sur l’angéologie chez Philon d’Alexandrie,” *Mélanges André Neher* (Paris 1975), 181–190 (Review in *SPh* 4, 103).
- Norden, Eduard, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Stuttgart 1958; first ed. 1924).
- O’Cleirigh, P.M., “The Meaning of Dogma in Origen,” in E.P. Sanders, ed., *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition* (London 1980), 201–216.

- Pearson, B.A., *Philo and the Gnostics on Man and Salvation*, The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Cultures (Berkeley 1977).
- , “Philo, Gnosis and the New Testament,” *The New Testament and Gnosis: Essays in Honour of R. Wilson*, ed. A.H.B. Logan, and A.J.M. Wedderburn (Edinburgh 1983), 73–89.
- , *Gnosticism, Judaism, and Egyptian Christianity* (Minneapolis 1990).
- , (ed.), *The Future Of Early Christianity: Essays In Honor of Helmut Koester* (Minneapolis 1991), 131–141.
- Ritter, B., *Philo und die Halacha* (Leipzig 1879).
- Rokeah, David, “A New Onomasticon Fragment from Oxyrhynchus and Philo’s Etymologies,” *JThS* n. s. 19/1 (1968), 70–82 [= Rokeah, “New Onomasticon”].
- Roth-Gerson, Lea, לאה רוט-גרסון, הכתבות היווניות מבתי הכנסת בארץ ישראל [= *The Greek Inscriptions from the Synagogues in Eretz Israel*] (Jerusalem 1987).
- Runia, David T., *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*, *PhilAnt.* 44 (Leiden 1986).
- , “Polis and megalopolis: Philo and the founding of Alexandria,” *Mnemosyne* 42, 398–412: 410–412; repr. in *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria—Collected Studies Series: 332 VARIORUM* (1990).
- , “Philo, Alexandrian and Jew,” in *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria—Collected Studies Series 332 VARIORUM* (1990), 1–18.
- , “Secondary Texts in Philo’s *Quaestiones*,” in Hay, David M., ed., *Both Literal and Allegorical* (Atlanta 1991).
- , *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey* (Assen/Minneapolis 1993).
- , “Philonic Nomenclature,” *StPhA* VI (1994), 1–27.
- , “Philo’s reading of the Psalms,” *StPhA* XIII (2001), 102–121.
- , “Philo of Alexandria and the Greek *Hairesis*-Model,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (Leiden 1999), 117–147.
- Safrai, Shmuel, העליה לרגל בימי הבית השני [= *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple*] (Tel-Aviv 1965); German trans.: *Die Wallfahrt im Zeitalter des zweiten Tempels* (Neukirchen 1981).
- Salmon, Edward T., *A History of the Roman World from 30 B.C. to A.D. 138* (London 1950).
- Sanders, E.P., *Judaism, Practice and Belief 63 BCE – 66 CE* (London/Philadelphia 1992).
- Scholem, Gershom, *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism* (London 1955).
- Schur, Chava, חוה שור: מדרשי השמות העבריים בפרשנות האלגורית של פילון [= *Etymologies of Hebrew Names in Philo’s Allegorical Exegesis*], Ph.D. Dissertation (Tel-Aviv 1991).
- Schürer, Emil, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (rev. ed. Edinburgh 1973–1987).
- Schwartz, D.R., מלך יהודה האחרון - אגריפס הראשון [= *Agrippa I—The Last King of Judea*] (Jerusalem 1987).
- Segal, Alan F., “Torah and *Nomos* in Recent Scholarly Discussion,” *Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses* 13 (1984), 19–28; repr. in *The Other Judaisms of Late Antiquity* (Atlanta 1987), 131–146.

- Segal, M.H., ed., *The Complete Ben-Sira* [= משה צבי סגל: ספר בן-סירה השלם] (Jerusalem 1972).
- Shoham, Giora S., *The Mytho-Empiricism of Gnosticism: Triumph of the Vanquished* (Brighton, Great Britain–Portland, Oregon 2003).
- Smallwood, Mary, “Philo and Josephus as Historians of the Same Facts,” in Louis Feldman, ed., *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity* (Detroit 1987).
- Stein, Edmund, “Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandria,” *BZAW* 51 (1929).
- , “Philo und der Midrash,” *BZAW* 57 (1931).
- Sterling, Gregory, “‘The School of Sacred Laws’: The Social Setting of Philo’s Treatises,” *Vigiliae Christianae* 53 (Leiden 1999), 148–164.
- Tabory, Yosef, פסח לדורות – פרקים בתולדות ליל הסדר [= *The Passover Ritual Throughout the Generations*], (Hakibutz Hame’uchad 1996).
- Tcherikover, Victor A. together with, Alexander Fuks & Menahem Stern, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum I–III* (Jerusalem 1957–1960, 1964) [= *CPJ*].
- Thackeray, H. St. John, *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship* (Oxford 1923), 100ff.
- Theiler, W., “Philo von Alexandria und der Hellenisierte Timaeus, *Philomates*,” in *Studies and Essays in the Humanities in memory of P. Merlan*, ed. R.B. Palmer and R. Hammerton-Kelly (The Hague 1971), 25–35.
- Tobin, T.H., *The creation of man: Philo and the history of interpretation*, CBQ:MS 14 (Washington 1983).
- , “The Beginning of Philo’s *Legum Allegoriae*,” *StPhA* XII (2000), 29–43.
- Tryphon, Dalia, “קטע ממשנה כעדות למעמדו של המלך אגריפס השני” [= “A Mishnah Fragment as Evidence of the Status of King Agrippa the second”], *Cathedra* 53 (Tishre 1989), 27–48.
- Turner, E.G., “Tiberius Iulius Alexander,” *JRS* 44 (1954), 54–64.
- Urbach, Ephraim E., *The Sages: Their Concepts and Beliefs* (Cambridge, Mass. 1979<sup>2</sup>) [= trans. of *פרקי אמונות ודעות*: ירושלים, חו’ל: פרקי אמונות ודעות] [Urbach, *Sages*].
- Van der Horst, Pieter W., “Moses’ Throne Vision in Ezekiel the Dramatist,” *JJS* 34 (1983), 21–29.
- Wacholder, Ben-Zion, Prolegomenon to the 1971 edition of Jacob Mann, *The Bible as Read and Preached in the Old Synagogue* (first ed. New York 1940).
- Werblowsky, R.J.Z., “Philo and the *Zohar*: A note on the methods of the ‘scienza nuova’ in Jewish Studies,” *JJS* 10 (1959), 25–44, 113–135.
- Wertheimer, A.J., ed., *Abudarham ha-Shalem*, [= *אבודרהם*] (Jerusalem 1963<sup>2</sup>).
- Winston, David, “The Book of Wisdom’s Theory of Cosmogony,” *History of Religions* 11/2 (November 1971), 185–200.
- Wolfson, Harry Austryn, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity and Islam* (Cambridge, Mass. 1948).
- Yadin, Yigael, “Tefillin (Phylacteries) from Qumran [XQ Phyl 1–4],” *Eretz-Israel* 9 = The W.F. Albright Volume, 60–83 (in Hebrew and English) (Jerusalem 1969).
- Zunz, Yom Tov Lipmann (Leopold), הדרשות בישראל והשתלשלותן ההיסטורית [Heb. trans. of *Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden historisch entwickelt* (1892<sup>2</sup>, first ed. 1832) by M.A. Zak, edited and updated by H. Albeck = Zunz-Albeck, *Derashot*] (Jerusalem 1974).

*Bibliographic Surveys*

- Borgen, Peder, "Philo of Alexandria: A Critical Survey of Research since World War II," in Wolfgang Haase, ed., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, (=ANRW), II 21.1 *Religion: Hellenistisches Judentum in Römischer Zeit—Philon und Josephus*, ed. Wolfgang Haase (Berlin, New York 1984), 98–154.
- Feldman, L.H., "Scholarship on Philo and Josephus, 1937–1962," *Studies in Judaica* (New York 1963), 1–26.
- Goodhart, H.L. and Goodenough, Erwin R., "A General Bibliography of Philo Judaeus," in E.R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus, practice and theory* (New Haven 1938; repr. Hildesheim 1967<sup>2</sup>), 125–321.
- Radice, Roberto, and Runia, David, in collaboration with R.A. Bitter, N.G. Cohen, M. Mach, A.P. Runia, D. Satran and D.R. Schwartz, *Philo of Alexandria: An annotated bibliography 1937–1986* (Leiden 1988).
- Runia, David T. with the assistance of Keizer, H.M., and in collaboration with R.M. van den Berg, E. Birnbaum, P.A. Cathey, N.G. Cohen, A.C. Geljon, M.R.J. Hofstede, J.P. Martin, A. Pawlaczyk, R. Radice, J. Riaud, K.-G. Sandelin, D. Satran, D. Zeller, *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1987–1996, with Addenda for 1937–1986* (Leiden 2000).

*Reference Works: Dictionaries, Concordances, Indices, et Sim.*

- Allenbach, J., A. Benoît, D.A. Bertrand, A. Hanriot-Coustet, E. Junod, P. Maraval, A. Pautler, P. Prigent, *Biblia Patristica, Supplement, Index Philon d'Alexandrie*, Centre d'Analyse et de Documentation Patristiques (Paris 1982) [= Allenbach, J., et al.: *BPSuppl.* = Index of Biblical passages found in Philo].
- Borgen, Peder, Kåre Fuglseth, and Roald Skarsten, *The Philo Index: A Complete Greek Word Index to the Writings of Philo of Alexandria, Lemmatised & Computer-Generated* (Trondheim 1997) [Borgen, Fuglseth & Skarsten, *The Philo Index*].
- Earp, J.W., "Scripture Index to Philo," PLCL vol. X, 189–267 [= Earp, Index]
- Even-Shoshan, Abraham, *A New Concordance of the Bible* (Jerusalem 1981).
- Hyman, Aaron, *Toldoth Tannaim Ve'Amoraim*, 3 vol. (Jerusalem 1964).
- Jastrow, Marcus, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, The Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (Berlin 1926) [= Jastrow, *Dict.*].
- Lampe, G.W.H., *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford 1961) [= Lampe, *Patr. Lex.*].
- Liddel & Scott, revised by Jones and McKenzie, et al., *Greek English Lexicon* (Oxford 1940<sup>9</sup>) [= LSJ].
- Mayer, Günter, *Index Philoneus*, (Berlin/New York 1974).
- Morrish, George, *A Concordance of the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, Michigan, orig. published London 1887, repr. 1976).
- Seyffert, Oskar, *Dictionary of Classical Antiquities*, rev. & ed. by Nettleship, Henry, and Sandys, J.E. (New York 1956).
- האנציקלופדיה התלמודית [= The Talmudic Encyclopedia] (Jerusalem 1947ff.).
- Wigram, George V., *The Englishman's Greek Concordance of the New Testament* (first publ. 1839, repr. Grand Rapids, Michigan 1983).

*Electronic Databases*

The Responsa Project (Bar-Ilan University)—CD ROM DATABASE  
Thesaurus Linguae Graecae [= TLG]—CD ROM DATABASE

## INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Albeck, H., 57n6  
 Albright, W.F., 209n, 226n12  
 Amir, Y., 14, 14n45, 57n6, 103n2, 113,  
 148n26, 169, 177n  
 Arieli, G., 47n58  
 Ashlag, Judah, 208n
- Bar-Ilan, M., 76n16  
 Belkin, S., xii, xiin8, 91n56  
 Bickerman, E., xiin9  
 Birnbaum, E., 15n48  
 Borgen, P., xiin10, 38n39, 131n85  
 Bousset, W., 175, 175n1  
 Büchler, A., 99n72, 200, 200n2  
 Burkhardt, H., 61n20, 231n2
- Charles, R.H., 4nn8, 9, 17n57  
 Charlesworth, 30n15, 31, 32n20  
 Cohen, N., xiin11, 5n16, 8nnn, 24,  
 25, 30, 11n38, 15n47, 17nn56,  
 59, 19, 20, 25n1, 33n23, 45n53,  
 55n1, 58n10, 59n15, 73n9, 87n44,  
 89nn52, 54, 90n, 91n56, 97n68,  
 101n79, 112n54, 123n64, 126n73,  
 134n95, 145n20, 147n24, 153n38,  
 154n39, 157, 158n6, 160nn10,  
 11, 13, 162n17, 163nn22, 23, 24,  
 164n25, 176n5, 183n22, 200nn1,  
 4, 187n34, 205n12, 210nn22,  
 23, 211n30, 215n35, 219nn2, 3,  
 228nn14, 15  
 Cohn, J., 80n24  
 Colson, F.H., 22n67, 25n2, 29,  
 37n37, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44n49, 46,  
 51nn67, 68, 52n73, 60, 61, 62n24,  
 63, 68n43, 71, 73n4, 77, 77n20,  
 80n24, 81, 81n26, 82, 84, 84nn34,  
 37, 85n40, 91n57, 99, 100nn76,  
 77, 105, 105n8, 107, 108, 109n20,  
 119n45, 132n88, 134, 134n94,  
 143n14, 150n31, 158nn7, 8, 160–  
 161n14, 161n15, 162n19, 164n26,  
 165n30, 166n34, 168, 173n50,  
 184n25, 185n30, 186, 190, 192n41,  
 194n48, 200n1, 207n18, 209,  
 210n24, 224n8, 225n10, 236n16,  
 238n21, 239n26
- Danby, H., 48n59, 50n
- Earp, J.W., 26n3, 39n42, 60, 61,  
 61n20, 62, 62n24, 71, 73n4, 77,  
 84n37, 85n40, 103, 105, 107,  
 124n66, 143nn13, 14, 150n31,  
 157n2, 167n38, 192n41, 209, 231n2
- Elbogen, I., 57n6, 59, 59n13
- Fleischer, E., 60n19, 153n38  
 Frankel, Z., xiin4, 86n43  
 Frey, J.-B., 45n53  
 Fuglseth, K., 131n85
- Ginzberg, L., 17, 17n58, 219n3  
 Goldschidt, D., 148n27  
 Goodenough, E.R., 189n  
 Goulet, R., 176n5  
 Grabbe, L., 14–15, 16, 14n47,  
 15nn48, 49, 50, 16, 103n3, 113,  
 119n46, 148n26, 169  
 Grant, R.M., 175n3  
 Gutman, Y., 31n16
- Halperin, D.J., 58n10  
 Hay, D.M., 1n1  
 Heinemann, J., xii, xiin5, 1n2, 57n6,  
 77n20, 153n38  
 Hengel, M., 7n22, 15n47  
 Hilgert, E., xiin3  
 Holladay, C.R., 30nn14, 15  
 Hyman, A., 20n62

- Jacobsen, H., 30n15
- Kahn, J.G., 14n45
- Korzakova, H., 115n
- Kraft, R.A., 58n9
- Kraus, M., 226n11
- Kraus, S., 156n44
- Kuhn, T., 11, 11n2
- Lake, K., 38n40
- Lieberman, S., 45n53
- Loewe, R., 74n9
- Mach, M., 152n35
- Mack, B.L., 1m1, 175n2
- Mandelbaum, B., 49n65, 56n5
- Mann, J., 57n6, 163n21
- Mann, Y., 220n4
- Mantel, H.D., 14n45
- Marcus, J., 75, 75n15
- Marcus, R., 60n19, 65n36, 73nn6, 7,  
98nn70, 71, 134n94, 201n4, 231n2
- Margolies, M., 57n6
- Margoliot, R., 208n
- Marmorstein, A., 201n6
- Mayer, G., 25n2
- Mendelson, A., 7n22
- Moehring, H.R., 83n30
- Neusner, J., 19n61, 38n38, 39n41,  
49n65
- Nikiprowetzky, V., 10n33, 21, 21n65,  
90n55, 122n61, 158n9
- Norden, E., 78n
- Ritter, B., xiin4
- Robertson, R.G., 31, 31nn17, 20
- Rokeah, D., 14, 14n46, 103, 103n1,  
113, 148n26, 169
- Roth-Gerson, L., 45n53, 211n30
- Runia, D., 1n2, 10, 10n34, 11, 11n35,  
13, 13nn41, 42, 104n4, 176nn4, 5,  
184n27, 191n40, 220n4, 238n22
- Sanders, E.P., 157n5
- Schur, C., 15n48
- Schwabe, M., 163n21, 220n4
- Segal, A.F., 160n10
- Segal, M.Z., 212n
- Seyffert, O., 131n84
- Skarsten, R., 131n85
- Stein, E., xii, 16n53
- Sterling, G., 176, 176n4
- Thackeray, H.St.John, 59, 59n12
- Theiler, W., 13nn41, 42
- Tobin, T.H., 176n5
- Townshend, R.B., 4nn8, 9
- Turner, E.G., 8n27
- Urbach, E.E., 201n6, 220n4
- van der Horst, P.W., 30n14, 226n11
- Vermes, G., 219n2
- Vico, Giovanni Battista, xiin9
- Wachholder, B.-Z., 57n6, 58–59,  
59n11, 79n, 99n72
- Wendland, 29, 109, 109n20
- Werblowsky, R.J.Z., 9
- Wertheimer, A.J., 148n27
- Whitaker, 46
- Wolfson, H.A., xii, xiin7, 109n19,  
158n9, 163n21, 189n, 201nn6, 7
- Yadin, Y., 76n17
- Zunz-Albeck [L. Zunz], 57n6, 86n41

## GENERAL INDEX

- 'Admonition,' *Haftarot* of . *See*  
*Haftarah Cycle*
- Alexandria, 3, 9  
cultural interaction with Judea,  
15n5, 196  
dictionaries and lexicons of  
Scripture in, 12  
*Haftarot* read in, 11  
independent exegetical creativity  
in Greek in, 109  
institutionalized radical  
allegorical exegesis in, 12  
Jewish cultural life in, 137  
keeping of second day of holidays  
in, 77  
original midrashic activity in  
Greek, 103  
Rosh Hashanah observance in,  
68, 69n44, 118n40.  
*See also* Allegorical Circle of  
Moses
- Alexandrian Jews  
commitment of Judaism among,  
7–9  
gamut of Jewish beliefs among, 7,  
8, 9  
'houses of prayer' of, 156  
Jewish works in Greek available  
to, 3  
Philo's audience, 1, 2, 11, 13,  
16, 21–22, 31, 32, 35, 41,  
90n, 99, 133n92, 158, 159,  
167, 186, 189, 193, 195, 200,  
202  
semi-autonomous self-govern-  
ment, 10  
singing of hymns and odes, 156
- Allegorical Circle of Moses, xv, 12,  
91n57, 175–197  
major contours of, 180 ff.
- Philo's citations from the Latter  
Prophets, 192
- allegory, 117 ff.  
allegorical interpretations,  
divulging, 187 ff.  
allegorical tradition written in  
Greek, 112, 137, 204  
allegorical treatises, Philo's  
intention when composing, 11  
esoteric, 12, 189, 194  
explanation of Scripture through,  
9, 9n, 167
- allegorists, 7n24, 9
- allegorical expositions  
body as the vessel of the soul,  
124–125, 124n65, 126  
Joseph as an allegorical symbol,  
186  
Leprosy, allegorical rendition of  
injunctions concerning, 131  
priestly vestments, ethical  
allegory of, 173  
*Shir ha-Shirim*, 9–10, 118–119,  
118n43
- Amei ha'aretz*, Judean, 7
- Amidah*, basic structure, 153n38
- Ananias, Mishae'l and Azariah,  
different order in MT and Sept.,  
6
- anthropomorphism, 85–87
- Antioch, Pisidian, 57n8
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha,  
translations into Greek of, 3
- Aquila (Bible trans.), 86n41
- aristocracy, Romanized, Judean,  
7
- Armenian translations, 61n21, 73,  
80, 170
- Azariah de Rossi, 21



- I Baruch, 3, 3n6, 59n12, 89n53  
 Ben Sira, 3n6, 88, 96, 119n46, 212, 22814  
 Berenice (Agrippa's daughter), 8n26  
*Bezelel*, 35, 35n29  
 Biblical exegesis  
   Biblical characters as typological symbols, 119  
   Philo's method, 158–159  
   Philo's writings as, 21–22  
*blepōn/orōn* (βλέπων / ὁρῶν): 'to look' and 'to see', 204–208  
*Book of Judgments*—term used by Philo for the Book of Judges, 106, 112–113, 113n25, 114, 137, 138n, 191n41  
*Books of Royalty*—term used by Philo for the Books of Kings, 107, 113n25, 137, 138n, 191n41
- calendar, Jewish, explanation of, 55–56  
 Caligula, Emperor, 58, 58n9  
 Christianity, 118n43, 192  
   allegorization of Song of Songs, 118n43  
   metaphor of 'Divine impregnation', 119n16  
   Psalm 23, 154  
 Christian polemic, 75–76  
   possible former *Haftarah* and, 62n25, 68, 101, 192  
 Chronicles in Philo—erroneous identification, 108  
 Cicero, 13n40  
 citations: formulas used to introduce citations from the 'Prophets', 65, 72–73, 73n5, 74, 75, 80, 81, 88, 95, 96, 97, 151, 192.  
   *See also* Former Prophets; Latter Prophets  
 commandments, 45, 46  
   *commandments and prohibitions*, 145, 158, 210, 211, 211n29, 212–213  
   idiosyncratic Jewish connotation of terms for, 45n54, 209–214  
   observance of, 7n24, 9  
   Philo's commitment to practical observance of, 126n73, 167  
   concordance in Greek, scriptural, 113, 115–116, 137, 204. *See also* dictionaries and lexicons  
 Confraternity of Moses. *See* Allegorical Circle of Moses  
 'Consolation,' *Haftarot* of, *See* *Haftarah cycle*  
 contemporary sources, 109n18, 112–138, 154–156  
 cultural norms determining word choice, 217
- Damascus Document, 89  
 Daniel, Book of, 6, 172, 172n48  
   stories from, in IV Macc., 5  
   dates for Philo's life, 58, 58n9  
 David, King, 181  
   spelling in Philo indicates a literary source, 107–108, 181n16  
 Day of Atonement, 8–9  
 Decalogue in Qumran phylacteries, 76, 76n17  
*Demiourgos*, Good (Δημιουργός ἀγαθός)—term for Creator of the Universe, 220, 221  
 Deuteronomy, Philo's reference to Book of, 36–52  
 dictionaries and lexicons, Greek, 12, 14, 135, 196  
   homiletical lexicon of proper names in Scripture, 112, 116, 137, 169, 205n13  
   Philo's use of, 14, 15, 103, 196n41  
 Divine  
   Choir, 161, 161n16, *see also* 'Olympian'  
   'ecstasy', 33, 35–36, 50, 51–52, 121  
   Effluence, 100–101  
   *Logos*, 89, 145n20, 146n22, 182  
   path to the, 119–120, 124  
   Reason, 131, 221  
*double entendres*, Philo's use of, 163n24, 166n34, 211n29, 221

- Elijah, 135, 135n98  
 and 'man of God', 136
- Embassy to Gaius*, 22, 179
- Entole* (ἐντολή), 209, 211  
*Epinomis* (Ἐπινομίς) as suggested  
 alternative appellation for as  
 Chrestomathy, 47  
 as Deuteronomy, 46–53  
 as ensign of sovereignty, 47–48  
 Platonic associations, 52
- Esau character, 169
- Estia* (Ἑστία) goddess, etymology of  
 name, 131n84
- etymologies of Greek words, 15  
 'etymologies' of Hebrew names,  
 14–17, 14–15n47, 116n36  
 Hebrew/Aramaic sources for,  
 15–16, 16n54  
 homiletical lexicon of proper  
 names in Scripture, 112, 116,  
 119n46, 127  
 midrashic exegesis of the Hebrew  
 form of the scriptural proper  
 names, 17, 117  
 written source for, 14n45
- Euripides, 32
- Exagoge* (Ezekiel the tragedian),  
 30–32, 31n20, 32
- Exagoge* (Ἐξαγωγή), as title for Book  
 of Exodus, 25–26, 29–32, 33, 36,  
 46, 50, 52
- exegesis, Philo's  
 combining philosophical frames  
 of reference and allegorical  
 midrash, 175  
 metaphorical, 28–29, 32n23  
 sometimes based on Septuagint  
 text, 108–112, 109n19
- Exodos*, technical Greek term, 32
- Exodus from Egypt, 42n
- Exodus, Philo's reference to Book of,  
 29–33
- Ezekiel (prophet), in IV Macc., 5
- Ezekiel (tragedian), 30–31
- Father  
 as creator of the universe, 220
- God described as, 160  
 as 'right reason', 163, 164
- Father/mother combination, the  
*leitmotiv* of III *Ebrietas*, 224
- Flaccus*, 22, 179
- Former Prophets, 112  
 chart of references in order of  
 appearance in Philo's oeuvre,  
 237–238  
 chart of references in order of  
 appearance in Scripture,  
 104–105, 234–235  
 erroneous identifications, 105–108
- formulas for introducing citations.  
*See* citations
- Genesis, Philo's reference to Book  
 of, 26–29  
 use of term not as title of Biblical  
 book, 27
- Geniza, Cairo, 3n6, 99n72
- Gideon, 113–114, 113n29, 115, 116,  
 116n35, 117
- God  
 creator and architect of Wisdom,  
 222, 224, 225, 226  
 effluence of, 100–101  
 as 'father', 216  
 footstool of, 85–86  
 as sole creator, 159, 163, 224, 227
- Greek, 113n28, 119n46, 162, 172  
 exegetical creativity in Alexandria  
 in, 109, 137
- Jewish works translated into, 3, 17
- Judeo-Greek terminology. *See also*  
 Judeo-Greek, 84n34
- original midrashic activity in  
 Alexandria in, 103
- sources, Philo's use of in, 88
- Greek names borne by Jews, 15n47
- Haftarah*, *Haftarot*, 55n2, 72, 79n  
 to Deut. 33:1ff., in Triennial  
 cycle, 107n14  
 for fasts, 56, 56n3, 69n45  
 for Hanukkah, 101  
 for intermediate Sabbath of

- Passover, 5n17  
 to Lev. 5:1ff. in the Triennial  
 Cycle, 234n  
 mention of custom of reading, in  
 the New Testament, 57–58  
 for *Parashat Noah*, 81n25  
 for *Parashat Vayetsah*, 96n67  
 for *Parashat Vayishlahk*, 233n11  
 Passover, *Haftarah* reading for 8<sup>th</sup>  
 day (Diaspora), 63, 66, 68n42,  
 77, 231n4, 233  
 as practiced in Alexandria in  
 Philo's day, 11, 59  
 for Shabbat Rosh Hodesh, 57n7,  
 61n23, 63, 66, 72, 85, 231n4,  
 233  
 for *Simhat Torah*, 107n14.  
*Haftarah Cycle* between 17th of  
 Tammuz and the Day of  
 Atonement, 66, 68, 68n42,  
 66, 79, 80, 87, 88, 101, 196, 231n4,  
 233  
 and Philo's citations from the  
 Latter Prophets, 55–69, 72,  
 192, 196  
 dating of, 57–58, 57nn6, 7  
 Day of Atonement, *Haftarah*  
 reading, 62, 66, 84, 85,  
 118n40  
 'Haftarot of Consolation' and Book  
 of Baruch, 59  
 'Haftarot of Consolation' in the  
 Italian rite, 82  
*Parashat Ekev*, *Haftarah* reading,  
 62, 68, 79  
*Parashat Ki-Tetsei*, *Haftarah* reading,  
 80  
*Parashat Mas'ai*, *Haftarah* reading,  
 64, 88, 89, 101  
*Parashat Matot*, *Haftarah* reading, 87,  
 88  
*Parashat Ve-Zot ha-Berakhah Haft.*  
*reading*, 106, 107n14  
 Sabbath after the 17th of  
 Tammuz, *Haftarah*, 65, 67n41  
 Sabbaths of Repentance, *Haftarot*,  
 82  
*Shabbat Hazon*, *Haftarah*, 57n7, 61,  
 66, 72, 73  
*Shabbat Shuva*, *Haftarah*, 65, 66,  
 83n32, 88, 96, 97, 102, 118n40,  
 122n60  
*Hallel*, 20, 21, 150n30, 154  
*Hallel*, *Seder Eve*, 150n30,  
 154  
 Hannah, 72, 110, 118, 123  
*Haqhel* readings, 50n66  
*Haran*, midrashic associations of,  
 124, 126  
 Hebrew/Aramaic  
 and exegetical tradition regarding  
 Divine epithets, 201  
 Philo's access to texts in, 15n48  
 sources translated into Greek,  
 128, 137, 162, 196, 201, 202  
 Hellenistic frames of reference, 2  
 Herodotus, 13n40  
 Homiletic use of syllogistic  
 reasoning 158–159  
 'house', idiosyncratic usage of word,  
 131  
 Hymn(s), 5, 91n57, 118, 122n62,  
 151n32, 156, 181, 182  
 Introductory formulas for Citations;  
*see* Citations  
 Isaiah, 145n18, 182n18  
 Philo's citations of *Haftarah* from,  
 61–63, 72–87, 101  
 'Israel'  
 "Israel as God's first fruits",  
 possible allusion to, 87–88  
 name Israel in Philo, 164, 173,  
 206–207, 215, 215n37  
 Philo's etymology of name, 205,  
 205n13  
 'Seer of God', 205, 207–208  
 Italian rite, *Haftarot*, 65, 81n25, 82,  
 96n67, 106n9, 199–201  
 Jeremiah  
 'etymology' of name, 18  
 idiosyncratic locution introducing  
 citation, 184

- Philo's citations of *Haftarot* from, 64–65, 87–96, 193  
 Philo's description of, 90–91
- Job, 172, 172n48
- Joseph  
 allegory for body, 186  
 equated with immaturity, 186
- Josephus, 7n21, 13n40, 58n9, 108n, 152  
 spelling of Solomon in, 170
- Joshua, references to Book, 104, 105–107, 107n14, 192n41
- Judea, 9, 69n44, 211, 228  
 cultural interaction with  
 Alexandria, 15n5, 196  
 gamut of Jewish belief in, 7–8  
*paedia* of Jews in, 6  
 Septuagint translators, 15n47
- Judeo-Christian polemic  
 resulting possible deletion of  
 a *Haftarah*, 68, 72, 101, 192, 231n6  
 removal of the daily recitation of  
 the Decalogue, 76
- Judeo-Greek, 84n34, 89n54, 126n73, 160n13  
 vocabulary, 52, 53, 211, 126n73
- Judges, Book of. *See Book of Judgments*
- Justin Martyr, on the Septuagint, 3n7
- Kings, First Book of*, in Philo, 118, 133, 137
- knowledge, Jewish, handed from  
 father to son, 4
- Kurios* (κύριος), 74, 201
- Kurios* (κύριος) and *Theos* (θεός)  
 reflecting God's attributes, 84–85, 146, 146n21, 162, 165n27, 201–204, 201n6
- Kurios Sabaoth* (Κύριος Σαβαωθ), *see also* 'Lord of Hosts', 74, 199
- Latter Prophets  
 chart of references in order of  
 appearance in Scripture, 59, 61–66, 232–234
- chart of references in order of  
 appearance in Philo's oeuvre,  
 66–67, 236–237
- formulas that introduce the  
 citations. *See Citations*
- Philo's citations from *Haftarot*, 11, 71–102, 191–192  
*See also* Hosea; Isaiah; Jeremiah;  
 Zechariah
- law and custom, 164–166, 165n28
- Leviticus, Philo's reference to Book  
 of, 33–36
- lexicons. *See dictionaries and  
 lexicons, Greek*
- liturgy, 2, 11, 2n2, 69n45, 148–149n27–28
- logion*, connotation of, 99–100
- logos* (λόγος), 13, 37, 89, 93, 145n20, 146n22, 168, 182, 215
- 'Lord of Hosts' (Κύριος Σαβαωθ),  
 56n3, 73n7, 74, 75, 110n21,  
 199
- magnum opus*, Philo's, 22, 81, 90
- 'Man,' allegorically taken to indicate  
 'the *Word* of the eternal', 93,  
 95
- 'Man of God' equated with prophet,  
 129, 135, 135n100, 136
- 'Manna' as God's *rhema*, 37–38
- Marcus (Philo's nephew), 8n26
- maxims, popular, 36, 38
- Menander, 32
- messianic dream, 77–79, 81
- Midrash, interaction with Hel-  
 lenistic philosophical frames of  
 reference, xv, 13, 14, 14n44, 17–18,  
 196, 215, 209, 219–229
- Minor Prophets, Philo's quotations  
 from, 65–66, 96–101
- Mishneh Torah*  
 as rabbinic reference to  
 Deuteronomy, 47  
 of the king, 48
- mistaken identifications of non-  
 pentateuchal writings in Philo, 25,  
 28, 60, 61, 62–63, 67, 71, 76, 77,

- 79, 81, 104, 105, 107, 137, 192n41, 200n1, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239
- Moses, 144n17, 146n23, 186n32  
disciple of, 96, 100, 161n15, 168, 169, 170, 188  
significance of term, 179–185  
fellowship of. *See* Allegorical Circle of Moses  
in the *incipit* of citations from Psalms, 12, 144n17, 146n23, 161n15, 180, 181–183, 184, 185, 191, 193  
‘man of God’, 135, 136  
not used as contemporary name till Geonic times, 179  
‘prophet’, 37, 136, 168, 190, 190n37
- Mother  
in homily of the martyred ‘seven sons’, 4  
standing for education, 163, 164
- Mysteries, mystery terminology, 90, 91, 187–188, 187n34, 193  
mystical allegory, 12, 118, 122n59, 79, 194  
mysticism and mystics, 124, 189n35, 193, 193n46, 194  
myths, pagan, 188
- ‘Name’, used in conjunction with symbolic meaning of a word, 184n26
- New Testament  
citations from the Prophets in, 75n14  
custom of reading *Haftarot* mentioned in, 57–58
- Ninth of *Av*  
*Haftarah* for *Mincha*, 65, 96n67  
*Haftarot* preceding, 231n4
- Noah, 172, 172n48
- Nomos* (νόμος)  
Torah and, 158, 160n10, 164, 166n32
- non-pentateuchal citations  
and the allegorical circle, 176, 191
- free rendering of Hebrew texts, 92, 102  
identifying venue of, 106  
radical ethical exegesis circle, 192  
sometimes transcribed from the Hebrew, 96
- ‘Numbers’—name of Pentateuchal Book is not mentioned, 36
- ‘Olympian’, used by Philo as a common adjective, 134n97  
Onkelos (Bible trans.), 86n41
- pagan mysteries, 187, 188–189, 189n35
- Palestinian/Diaspora cultural interaction, 12, 196  
palm, as meaning of name of Tamar, 133, 133n92
- Pantokrator* (Παντοκράτορας), 74, 199
- Parable of the Vineyard (Isaiah 5:7), 75–76
- Parainesis* (Παραίνεσις) as alternative appellation for Deuteronomy, 44–46, 52n72, 53
- Parashat ha-Tamid*, 120n51
- Parashat Shofetim*, *Haftarah* of, 124n65, 200–201
- Parents as symbols, 159–166
- ‘Pentateuch’ the unit as Philo’s point of reference, 1, 27, 52, 106, 128, 133, 135n99  
citation of specific books, 25  
‘Numbers’, Book of, not mentioned by name, 25, 29n12  
*Exagoge* as the word used for Exodus, 25, 26, 27–33  
Genesis—the uses of the term, 26–29
- Penu’el*, 113–116, 117
- peshat*, 51n6, 19, 73, 73–74n9  
allegorical, 100, 147n29
- Phaedo* (Plato), 159, 166
- Phaedrus* (Plato), 161
- Philo’s sources, 13–19, 118,

- classic Greek and classic Jewish, 196  
 contemporary, 109n18, 112–138  
 literary, xv, 13, 14, 91, 107, 117, 128, 130, 133, 173, 225n10  
 written allegorical, 112, 137, 204  
 written midrashic, 103, 173  
 Phylacteries, those in Qumran contain Decalogue, 76, 76n17  
 Plato, 13–14, 126n74, 159, 161, 161n16, 216, 220–221, 228  
 plays on words, 37, 113n29, 207  
 Pliny, 13n40  
*Proem*, classic midrashic, 95  
 ‘Prophet’, equated with ‘man of God’, 129, 135, 135n100, 136, 205  
 ‘Prophets’, Scriptural rubric, 5  
 ‘Prophetic Circle’, 64, 87, 91, 94, 96, 184, 185, 192, 193–194  
*prostagma* (πρόσταγμα) idiosyncratic connotation of, in Jewish contexts, 209–214, 210n24  
*prostaxis* (προστάξις), 209–214  
*prostaxis kai apagoreusis* (προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις), 212  
*protisths* (πρωτίστης), use of word in Philo, 214–216  
*protreptikos* (προτρεπτικός), incorrect suggested alternative appellation for Deuteronomy, 39–44, 46, 52n72, 53  
 Proverbs, Book of  
   literary source of Philo’s quotations from, 14  
   quotation in IV Macc., 5  
 Psalms, Book of, 139–156  
   appellation in Psalm 100(101), 149n29  
   Book of Psalms called ‘Hymns’ by Philo, xv, 152, 182  
   called ‘Hymns’ by Philo, 152  
   chart of citations in order of Philo’s oeuvre, 141–143  
   chart of citations in order of Scripture, 144–151  
   citations by Philo compared with current liturgical context, 153–155  
   liturgical role, 2n3  
   Moses, the proper name, in *incipits*, 12, 144n17, 146n23, 161n15, 180, 181–183, 184, 185, 191, 193  
   popularity of Psalm Twenty Three, 20, 21, 147n25, 151, 152n33, 153–154  
 Rabbinic sources, use of, in study of Philo, 19–21. *See also* Sources  
 Rachel, 214, 215  
*reishit* midrashic equation with Torah, 227  
 ‘Repentance’, *Haftarot* of; *See Haftarah Cycle*  
 ‘right reason’, 92, 163, 164  
   equated with ‘the *Word* of the eternal’, 93  
 Rosh Hashanah  
   *haftarah* of, 58–59n14, 61n21, 63, 66, 68, 72, 81, 82, 104, 117, 118–119, 132, 137, 204  
   *Haftarah* of rendered as allegory of the soul, 119–123  
   observance of second day in Alexandria, 68, 68n44, 69, 118n40  
 Sa’adya Gaon, 47n58  
 sacred lore, Philo and divulging of, 188–189  
 Samuel character, 109, 111, 112, 124–126  
   conceptualization of, 120–121, 123, 124  
   midrashic etymology of, 127  
   passages alluding to ‘Seer’, 205  
   Rosh Hashanah *Haftarah*, Philo’s citations from, 104, 109–111, 117–123, 132, 137–138  
   Saul personality in the framework of the Samuel allegory, 124  
 Scriptures

- and the Allegorical Circle of  
Moses, 12, 175–197
- Greek dictionaries and lexicons  
of, based on MT, 12
- homiletical lexicon of proper  
names found in, 112, 116,  
205n13
- Hymns as conceptual unit of, 152
- knowledge of, according to IV  
Macc., 3–7
- Philo's use of non-Pentateuchal  
Scriptures, 10–12, 90
- 'Seer' (see also: *bleipain/ oron*: 'to  
look' and 'to see'), 204–208
- Israel 'means' 'Seer of God', 205
- senses, 119, 120n53
- Haran* sphere of, 124
- world of the, 63n31, 85, 86–87,  
123
- Septuagint
- allegorical constructs dependent  
upon the Septuagint text, 118
- as Philo's Scripture, 12, 60, 73,  
100, 103, 108, 112, 139
- citations in Philo differing from  
text of the, 74, 80, 94, 95, 128,  
145n18, 148n26, 161, 172
- Philo's use of, where differing  
from MT, 12, 33nn25, 26, 27n7,  
29n10, 34n28, 64n32, 83n31,  
111, 121n58
- titles of Pentateuch books in the,  
26, 26n5
- translators of the, 15n47, 101, 203
- seven, the number, 82, 82–83n30,  
83–84, 119, 119n45, 122
- Shema*, in *Haqhel* readings, 50n66
- Shir ha-Shirim*, allegorical interpreta-  
tion of, 9–10, 118–119, 118n43
- Sibylline Oracles*, 77n20, 78–79, 172
- Siddur Rav Amram Gaon*, 148n27
- Sin, culpability and awareness of,  
129, 131–132
- Solomon, idiosyncratic spelling of,  
169–170, 184
- Song of Songs. *See: Shir ha-Shirim*
- Sophia* (Σοφία), 5n16, 88, 161n15, 209,  
215, 216, 221, 223, 224, 225, 227
- as giving birth to the world, 216
- pre-existence of, 160, 163, 209
- See also* Torah; Wisdom
- Soul
- allegorical exegesis of the biblical  
narrative in Genesis, 92–93
- allegory of the *Haftarah* for Rosh  
Hashanah, 117–127
- Divine impregnation of the, 132,  
132n87, 133
- 'eye of the soul', 125, 207
- house of the, 131n84
- 'rising' both of 'virtue' and of  
'vice' in the human, 92–95,  
183
- vessel of the, 124–125, 126
- Symposium (Plato), 203
- Synagogue, 2, 2n2, 16n5
- Tabernacle, 35, 167
- ethical allegory of, 173
- Tamar, 128, 133
- Temple, destruction of, 56, 69,  
69n45, 75
- Testament of Job*, 172
- Tetragrammaton*, 84–85, 162, 201–202,  
201–202n7, 202n8, 203–204
- Theodotus inscription, 211
- Theos* (θεός), 202, 202n8
- Therapeutae*, 156
- Tiberius Alexander, 8
- Timaeus* (Plato), 13
- Tobit, Greek translation of, 3n6
- Torah (see also *Sophia*; Wisdom),  
5n16, 88–89, 226, 228, 228n14
- equated with the Law of the  
Cosmos by Philo, 158
- exhortation to observance, 166
- locution for; see also *Nomos*,  
*Sophia*, Wisdom, 134
- Torah of Moses, 177–179, 193
- Torah reading cycles, 60n19
- Tower of Babel, 113–116
- tower, Philo's treatment of the  
word, 115, 115n32
- trilogy, allegory of a, 183

vine, Israel identified metaphorically  
with, 75  
‘virgin’ the ideal state, see ‘widow’,  
133, 134

water, equated with Torah wisdom,  
88–89, 145, 145n20, 145n20,  
146n22, 182, 215n35

‘widow’  
allegorical meaning, 132, 134  
identified with ‘virgin’, 133,  
134

Wisdom, 28–29, 145n20, 146,  
146n22, 161, 163, 172, 182, 212,  
214, 215n35, 223, 226  
God consorting with, 221, 224,  
229  
as God’s creation, 224, 225, 226  
‘mother’ of the world, 216  
pre-existence of, 160, 163, 209,  
225.  
*See also Sophia*; Torah

Women, portrayal  
as less wise, 217  
in Jewish family, 4  
negative valuation, 215

‘Word of the eternal’  
equated with right reason, 92, 93,  
95

‘Writings’  
chart of references in order of  
appearance in Philo’s oeuvre,  
236–239  
chart of references in order of  
appearance in Scripture,  
235–236  
references to Job, 171–173  
references to Proverbs, 157–171  
References to Psalms, 139–156

*Zohar*, 91, 145n20, 155, 208–209

*Selected Hebrew terms*

הקהל, 50n66  
זהר, 91, 145n20, 155, 208–209  
כתובים *See* ‘Writings’  
מן, 37, 38  
משכלה translation of, 171, 217  
משנה תורה, 47, 48  
עמידה (prayer), 153n38  
פשט, 5n16, 19, 73, 73–74n9, 100,  
147n29  
צמה translation of, 100–101  
קנה different meanings of, 225–226,  
227  
תוכחה, 44





## INDEX OF SOURCES

### A. Philo

#### I *de Opificio Mundi (Opif.)*

3	163n24
10 ff.	220, 228
17	162n21
17 ff.	162, 220, 221, 222, 223
17–20	221
89–128	82n30
104–105	83n30
129	28
163 ff.	34

#### I *Legum Allegoria (Leg. [All.])*

1.2–16	119n45
1.15	83n30
1.83	40
1.93	211n29
1.93 ff.	45
1.94	211n29
1.95	45
2.34	205n12
2.40–49	214
2.41–42	215
2.44	215
2.48	214, 216
2.59	210n24
2.69	62, 76
2.86	214, 215
2.105	34
3.95–102	35n30
3.171–174	37
3.174	36, 37, 42
3.176	37n34
3.218–219	97n68
180–181	119n47, 132n87

#### II *De Cherubim (Cher.)*

85	181n15
----	--------

26	131n84
43 ff.	119n47, 132n87
48 ff.	192, 193
49	64, 66, 87, 87n45, 88, 89, 90, 91, 94n58, 95n63, 101, 232, 233, 236

49–51	64
56	180n

#### II *de Sacrificis Abelis et Caini (Sacr.)*

50	14n45, 45, 99
72	210n24

#### II *Quod Deterius Potiori insidiari soleat (Quod Det.)*

11	40
45	181n15
86	185
147	133n93

#### II *de Posteritate Caini (Post.)*

63	214, 215–216
53	115
125–127	28
127	26, 28

#### II *De Gigantibus (Gig.)*

17	5n14, 141, 147, 155, 238
23	35n30
24	180n
47	180n

#### III *Quod Deus immutabilis sit (Quod Deus)*

5	127, 132
6	204
5–15	57n7, 60n16, 67, 83, 104, 112, 117–118,

	119, 124, 127, 132, 234, 237	III <i>de Plantatione (Plant.)</i>	
6	109	26	34
10	109, 200n1	26-27	35
14ff.	109	29	141, 149, 238
31	161n14	34	168n40
50	36, 38	39	142, 143, 144n17, 145, 145n18, 146n23, 179, 181, 183, 238
53	211n29	39:3	185n30
74	141, 146n21, 147, 149, 238	46	168n40
77	146n21, 147	63	134n97
77-81	141, 238	71	134n97
82	146, 201	86	202
82-84	141, 238	137-138	97
108	180n	138	65, 66, 97, 236
120	185	139	233
122	130		
122-139	129	III <i>De Ebriatate (Ebr.)</i>	
123-127	130	143, 146, 149	
133-139	112	8	159
134	131	17	160n13, 209
135	131, 132	30	220, 221, 228
136	204	30ff.	220, 221, 228
136-138	105, 180n	30-31	160, 161, 162, 201, 220, 221, 223, 224
136-139	112, 128, 204, 235, 237	31	157n3, 162nn19, 20, 209, 214, 215n34, 216, 224-225, 225n10, 227, 235, 236n15, 238, 238n24
138	136	37	210n24
139	136, 136n102, 204, 205, 234, 237	80-87	162, 173
139	104, 125n70, 135, 136	82	173n51
140	130	84	201, 202, 204n, 235, 238
148	180n	85-87	167, 173
151	134n97	91	211n29
156	134n97	96-98	107
182	141, 148, 152, 238	143	109, 110, 118
		143-152	57n7, 60n16, 67, 104, 112, 119, 120, 124, 127, 234, 237
III <i>de Agricultura (Agr.)</i>		144	127
127	29n10	145	127
50	142, 147n25, 152n33	146	109, 110
50-54	141, 142n11, 238	149	109
52	142, 147n25		
54	152n33		
78	39, 42		
84	44		
119	134n97		
172	39, 42		

- III *De Sobrietate (Sobr.)*  
 50 26, 28, 29
- IV *De Confusione Linguarum (Conf.)*  
 I 92  
 39 142, 144, 146n23,  
 179, 181, 182, 183,  
 191, 238  
 39-40 92, 93  
 41 92, 93  
 44 192, 193, 194, 201  
 44-62 192  
 43 92, 93  
 44 64, 66, 87, 91, 92,  
 94, 102, 138,  
 184, 191, 233,  
 236  
 49-51 94  
 50 92, 94  
 52 92, 94, 191  
 52 ff. 142, 147, 238  
 55-59 94  
 56 92  
 58 92  
 59 45  
 60 92, 183  
 60-61 94  
 60-63 138n., 234  
 61 93  
 62 66, 93, 183, 191, 192,  
 236  
 62-63 99, 100, 183n21  
 65 15n52  
 77-78 123n64  
 79 15n52, 16  
 81 99  
 96 85  
 98 57n7, 63, 63n31, 67,  
 68n42, 85, 231n4,  
 233, 237  
 123 15n52  
 128-130 191n41, 234, 237  
 128-132 104, 106, 112, 113,  
 113n25  
 130 15n52, 115  
 139 191n41  
 149 104, 105, 107, 113n25,
- 159 15n52  
 160 106n10  
 166 99, 104, 105, 106,  
 192n41, 234, 238
- IV *de Migrat. Abraham (Migr.)*  
 14 29, 30  
 27 100  
 38 104, 112, 125n70,  
 128n75, 129n79,  
 136n102, 204, 205,  
 206, 238  
 38-39 206  
 89 ff. 9n  
 89-93 7n24  
 89-94 126n73  
 57 142, 142n8  
 90 149n29, 167nn35, 37,  
 238  
 157 142, 142n8, 145, 147  
 191 207  
 191-195 112, 123, 124  
 191-197 124  
 195 124n67  
 196 237  
 196-197 104, 109, 111, 112,  
 123, 124, 234  
 197 111
- IV *Quis Rerum in Divinarum Heres*  
*(Quis Rerum; Her.)*  
 5 32  
 8 210nn24, 25  
 14 29, 30, 31, 32  
 25 62, 72, 73, 79, 232  
 52 168n40  
 76-77 207  
 78 136n102, 104, 112,  
 125n70, 128n75,  
 129n79, 136n102,  
 204, 205, 207, 234,  
 237  
 162 46, 47, 48, 49, 50n.  
 239 34, 34n28, 51  
 249-258 36n. 32, 51

250	46, 47, 50	139 ff.	65, 97
251	29, 33 (Ex. 19:18), 34, 35 (Lev. 9:24)	143	57n7, 59n16, 67, 83, 110, 118, 122, 200n1, 234, 237
290	142, 144n15, 147, 151, 238	143-144	104, 109, 112, 118, 122, 127
<i>IV de Congressu Eruditionis gratia</i> ( <i>Cong.</i> )		169	57n7, 62, 63, 67, 72, 73, 79, 84, 201, 232, 233, 237
21	124		
43	105, 108, 236, 239	195	29n10
86	210n24	236	39
120	211n29, 212	236 ff.	43
163	168n40		
177	161n15, 167, 168, 170, 184, 184n26, 235, 238	<i>V de Somniis (Somn.)</i>	
		1.75	140n4, 143, 144, 238
		1.117	29, 30, 31, 32, 33n25
		1.154	32
		1.206	35n30
		1.252-256	122, 123
		1.254	127, 237
		1.253-256	112
		1.254	67, 104, 118
		1.256	123
		2.73	45n55, 213n
		2.172 ff.	62, 67, 72, 73n7, 74, 199, 232, 237
		2.191-192 ff.	73n8
		2.193 ff.	49
		2.241-247	208
		2.242	143, 145, 145n18, 182, 238
		2.245-246 ff.	143, 144n17, 145n20, 146, 146nn20, 22, 180, 181, 182, 183, 208, 238
		2.284	115
<i>V de Fuga et Inventione (Fuga)</i>		<i>VI De Abrahamo (Abr.)</i>	
18	143n12	1	26, 27, 30
59	142, 151, 238	1-2	26
62	161n16	13	181n14
100	211n29	275	210nn24, 25
114	133n93		
142	39, 42	<i>VI de Vita Mosis (Mos.)</i>	
145	181n15	1.15	210n24
170	41, 42	1.216	106
171	41	2.4	211n29
197	64, 67, 75n12, 87, 88, 89, 101, 145n20, 233, 236		
<i>V de Mutatione Nominum (Mut.)</i>			
25 ff.	135, 136		
42	39, 43		
43-46	173		
43-48	173		
44	173n51		
46	173n50		
48	167n36, 171, 236, 239		
104	210nn24, 25		
115	141n7, 142, 144, 152 n.33, 238		
121	107		
125-128	135, 136		
137-140	83n32, 97, 98		
139	57n7, 66, 67, 97, 122n60, 233, 236		

- 2:46-47 211n29, 213  
 2.47 ff. 158, 158n6  
 2.51 211n29  
 2.205 186, 189  
 2.209 83n30  
 2.292 190n37  
 238 203
- VII *de Decalogo (Dec.)*  
 1 194  
 18 190n37  
 51 211n29  
 74 143, 150, 152, 238  
 121 211n29  
 132 210n24  
 159 84n34  
 170 211n29  
 176 211n29, 213
- VII *de Specialibus Legibus (Spec.)*  
 1.8 149n29  
 1:23 211n29  
 1.85-95 173  
 1.85-96. 173  
 1.186 8, 84n34  
 1.299 45, 45n55, 213-214,  
 213n  
 1.314 149n29  
 1.319 187  
 1.319 ff. 189  
 1.319-323 190  
 1.322 214, 216  
 1.344 176n5  
 2.88 190  
 2.156 83n30  
 2.188 84n34  
 2.249 161n16  
 2.255-256 143n13, 150n31  
 2.256 143, 143n13, 191n38  
 3.1-6 195  
 3.29 213n  
 3.39 45n55  
 3.178 149n29
- VIII *de Specialibus Legibus (Spec.)*  
 4.39 211n29  
 4.114 34
- 4.131 44, 80  
 4.137-139 219n2  
 4.143-150 7-8n24  
 4.151 ff. 46  
 4.160 46, 47  
 4.160-169 46, 47, 53  
 4.164 46, 47  
 4.180 65, 67, 68n42, 87,  
 231n4, 233, 237  
 4.183 211n29  
 4.193 ff. 49n64  
 4.229 115n
- VIII *de Virtutibus (Virt.)*  
 8 149n29  
 47 39, 40, 41  
 55-56 106  
 61-62 209  
 62 157nn1, 3, 209, 236,  
 238  
 66-69 106  
 70 45, 45n55, 213n  
 73 131
- VIII *de Praemiis et Poenis (Praem.)*  
 79  
 1 190n37  
 43 149n29  
 44 205n12  
 79 210n24  
 79-80 212  
 87 63, 67, 77, 231n4,  
 233, 237  
 89 78  
 98 210n24  
 155 83  
 157 83  
 157-159 68n43, 81, 81n26, 82  
 158-159 60n16, 63, 67,  
 68n42, 73n5, 82,  
 200n1, 231n4, 233,  
 235, 237, 238  
 159-160 112, 118, 118n41  
 299 211n29
- IX *Quod Omnis Probus Liber (Prob.)*  
 13 l. 2 161n16

IX *de Vita Contemplativa (Cont.)*

63-64 191n38

64-65 190n37

IX *De aeternitate mundi (Aet.)*

10 207n18

17 214, 216

19 26, 27, 30

IX *Flaccus (Flacc.)*

121-122 156

170 179

IX *Hypothetica (Hypoth.)*

7.8 104n4

7.8 49n64

X *De Legatione ad Gaium (Legat.)*

70 46

I Suppl. *Questiones et Solutiones in Genesin (QG)*

1.64-65 29n10

1.86 104n4, 105, 235

2.26 62, 67, 72, 80, 237

2.43 57n7, 61, 67, 72,  
73, 73n7, 75n14,  
191n39, 199, 232,  
235

2.44 199

4.26 232

4.129 161n16, 167, 170-171,  
235, 2384.138 104, 112, 125n70,  
128n75, 129n79,  
136n102, 204, 208II Suppl. *Questiones et Solutiones in Exodum (QE)*

1.21 33n23, 199

2.3 119n47, 132n87, 133

2.43 107

2.76 65, 67, 97, 98, 237,  
233, 237

## B. The Bible/Jewish Scripture

## Genesis

1:1 95n64

1:26 106n10

2:1-34 118n40

2:3 215

2:4 28, 28n, 29

2:4-6 28

2:6 28

2:8 93, 94, 95

2:10 208

3:22 106n10

4:7 29, 29n10

4:13 106n10

4:17 117

5:1 28n9

6:4-12 129

6:11-12 128, 129, 130, 130n80

11:1-9 92, 94, 114, 115

11:2 92, 94, 95, 183

11:4 113

11:6-7 106n10

14:19 226

14:22 226

15:5 186, 207

17:1 43n46, 43

20:7 135

24:62 208

26:5 210n24

27:33 51, 51n69

32:28 164n26

32:29 164, 164n26, 165,  
165n28, 173

35:21 115

38:11 128, 135

42:11 92, 93, 95

46:20 108

48:15 43, 43n46

49:9 116n34

## Exodus

4:22 215

10:23 30, 31n31

12:17 33n23, 199, 212

14:14-15 30, 31

16:4-16 37

16:15 (end)—16:16 (beg.)		13:17	107
	37, 37 <sup>nn</sup> 33, 36	15:16	94, 95
17:9	106	16:15	92
18:16	210 <sup>nn</sup> 24, 25	19:15	106 <sup>n</sup> 10
19:8	92, 95	27:15—23	106
19:16	33 <sup>n</sup> 26	28:1—8	120 <sup>n</sup> 51
19:18	33, 33 <sup>n</sup> 26, 51, 51 <sup>n</sup> 70	28:2	120, 120 <sup>n</sup> 51
21:14	106 <sup>n</sup> 10	29:1	56 <sup>n</sup> 4, 68
21:24	74 <sup>n</sup> 9	31:49	95
24:10	85, 86, 87	33—36	64, 87, 88, 89, 101
24:11	92, 95		
24:13	107	Deuteronomy	
25:10	167	1:1—3:22	61
25:32	98	1:1—6:3	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
25:33	98	4:10	34 <sup>n</sup> 27
27:1	167	4:29	42
28:4	167	6:4—6:9	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
30:1	167	7:12—11:25	62, 79, 80
31.2 ff.	35, 35 <sup>n</sup> 30	8:2	168, 169, 183
31—37	35	8:3	36, 37, 42
32:17—19	107	8:15	215
35:30	35, 35 <sup>n</sup> 30	8:16	34 <sup>n</sup> 27
		9:10	34 <sup>n</sup> 27
Leviticus		11:10—11	146 <sup>n</sup> 22
1:1	35, 35 <sup>n</sup> 30	11:13—21	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
5:1 ff.	66, 99 <sup>n</sup> 72, 234	12:8	44, 44 <sup>n</sup> 51
9:24	35, 36, 51, 51 <sup>n</sup> 71	12:28	43, 43 <sup>n</sup> 48
11:21	34, 34 <sup>n</sup> 28	14:19	34
13:11—13	131	14:22	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
13:14—15	131	16:15 (end)—16:16 (beg.)	38
14:35—36	131 <sup>n</sup> 82		
16:29	84 <sup>n</sup> 33	16:18—21:9	200
19:16	211 <sup>n</sup> 29	17:14—20	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
19:25	97 <sup>n</sup> 69	17:15—16	44
19:35—36	49, 49 <sup>n</sup> 64	17:18—19	47
23:24	68, 84	20:19 ff.	115 <sup>n</sup>
24:20	74 <sup>n</sup> 9	21:10—25:19	81
25:11	41	21:15—16	214
26	40	21:16	215
26:5	41	21:18—21	159
		22:32—33	73 <sup>n</sup> 8
Numbers		23:2—3	34 <sup>n</sup> 27
1:17	35 <sup>n</sup> 30	25:13—15	49, 50 <sup>n</sup>
6:5	123	25:13—16	49
8:12	99 <sup>n</sup> 72	25:17—19	49
10:2	35 <sup>n</sup> 30	26:12—15	50 <sup>n</sup> 66
11:12	95 <sup>n</sup> 64	28	40, 50 <sup>n</sup> 66



28:1	41		132, 137, 199, 204,
28:2	41		234
28:7	42	1:11	67, 109, 110, 118, 119,
28:28	51, 51n68		120, 120n50, 121,
28:29	50, 51, 51n68		121n50, 122, 123,
30:1-32:42	87		234, 237
30:11 ff.	79n22	1:14	67, 110, 118, 120, 121,
30:11-14	212		237
30:12 ff.	43	1:15	67, 109n18, 112, 118,
30:15, 19	36, 38, 39		120, 121, 122, 237
30:19	39	1:28	108n17
30:20	5n19	2	151n32
31:6	104, 106, 107, 192n41	2:5	63, 67, 68n43, 82,
31:30	34n27		83, 84, 110, 118,
32:9	65, 67n41, 87, 88,		118n41, 119, 122,
	231n4, 237		200n1, 233n8,
32:39	5n18		234, 235, 237,
33:1	135, 136		238
33:1-34:12	107n14	2:15	67, 237n19
		8:1-22	200
Joshua		9:8-9	104, 112, 128, 128n75,
1:1-9	106n9		129, 135, 136, 204,
1:1-18	106n9		205n11
1:5	104, 105, 105n8, 107,	9:9	124, 125n70, 130,
	107n14, 192n41,		191n41, 205, 206,
	234, 238n20		207, 207n19,
4:4	35n30		208, 215n37,
6:27	106n9		234, 235, 237,
8:32	47n58		238
9:2c	47n58	10:22	126
		10:22-23	104, 109, 111, 112,
Judges			123, 124, 126, 207,
6:32	116n35		234, 237
8:9	104, 106, 112, 113,	10:23	111, 126, 199, 200
	114, 115, 116, 117,	10:23-24	200
	191n41, 204, 234,		
	237	II Samuel	
9:12-13	203n9	22	151n32
		23:13-17	6
I Samuel		I Kings	
1:1	204	2:3	178
1:1-2:5	67, 67n2, 72, 81, 84,	6	104n4
	200n1	8:6	104n4
1:1-2:10	57n7, 68, 73n5,	9.9	206n16
	59n14, 16, 68, 81,	15:3	107n16
	82, 104, 109, 112,	15:11	105, 107n16, 235, 238
	117, 118, 124, 127,		

17	135	48:14ff.	79n22
17:10	112, 124, 128, 132, 234, 235, 237	48:22	62, 63, 73n4, 79, 79n22, 84, 84n37, 85, 233
17:18	105, 112, 124, 128, 129, 130, 134, 135, 204, 205, 234, 235, 237	49:14-51:3 50:4	62, 79, 80 62, 67, 68, 72, 73, 79, 80, 232, 236
18:48	129	51:2 52:21 54:1	62, 67, 68, 80, 232 85 67, 68nn42, 43, 73 n, 5, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 84n36, 118n41, 199, 200n1, 231n4, 233, 237, 238n20
<b>II Kings</b>			
2:11	235		
2:11-12	104n4, 238		
14:3	107n16		
15:11	107		
15:38	107n16	54:1-55:3 [or 8]	81n25
16:2	107n16		
18:1-3	107	54:1-10	81, 81n25
18:3	105, 107, 107n16, 235, 238	55:1 57:2	88n51 233
22:2	107n16	57:14-58:14	57n57, 62, 84, 85
22:5	107n16	57:21	62, 62n24, 67, 72, 73, 79, 82, 84, 201, 232, 237
25	69n45		145n18, 182n18
<b>Isaiah</b>			
1:1	56	58:14	145n18, 182n18
1:1-27	57n7, 61, 73	66	57n7
1:1-31	73	66:1	63, 63n31, 67, 68n42, 72, 85, 85n40, 86, 231n4, 233
1:1-3:22	73		
1:9	61, 67, 72, 73, 73n7, 74, 75n14, 191n41, 199, 232, 237	66:23	72n2
1:31	61	<b>Jeremiah</b>	
5	76	1:1-2:3	65, 87, 88
5:7	62, 67, 67n41, 68, 72, 73n7, 74, 75, 88n49, 100, 101, 199, 232, 237	2:3	65, 67, 67n41, 68n42, 87, 88, 231n4, 233, 237
5:12	237	2:4-28	64, 87, 88, 89, 101
6:9	62, 76, 77	2:13	64, 67, 68, 75n12, 87, 88, 101, 145n20, 233, 236
10:32-12:6	63, 77	3:4	64, 66, 68, 87, 87n45, 89, 90, 94n58, 101, 192, 193, 232, 233, 236
11:6-9	63, 67, 68n42, 77, 78, 231n4, 233, 237		
40:1	56	6:12	66
40:1ff.	75n14	15:10	64, 66, 87, 92, 94, 95, 96, 138n, 191,
43:2	5n13		
48:14	82		

	192, 193, 194, 201, 233, 236	27(26) 27(26):1	151, 154, 155, 235 140, 143, 144
40:1-3	69n45	31(30)	151, 235
52:4-14	69n45	31(30):1 31(30):3 31(30):9 31(30):19	92, 95 94 183 142, 144, 146n23, 179, 181, 182, 191, 238
Ezekiel			
1:1-4	56		
14:14	172n48		
37:3	5n17		
Hosea		33(32):20 34(33) 37(36) 37(36):4	5n15 155 151, 235 91n57, 142, 143, 144n17, 145, 145n18, 146n23, 179, 181, 182, 238
2:18	77n20		
12:13-14:9	96n67, 233n11		
14:2	56		
14:2-10	65, 96, 97		
14:6	65, 65n36, 67, 96n67, 98, 233, 237	42(41) 42(41):4	151, 155, 235 142, 142n9, 145, 147, 238
14:9 ff.	98		
14:9-10	66, 67, 83n22, 122n60, 233, 236	46(45) 46(45):5	151, 155, 235 143, 145, 145n20, 146n20, 146n22, 182, 183, 208, 238
Nahum			
3:8	95n64	46(45):12 48(47) 62(61) 62(61):12	146 149n28 151, 155, 235 141, 146, 149, 201, 238
Zechariah			
2:14 - 4:7	99n72, 101		
3:8	99n72, 101		
5:3-6:19	99n72	65(64)	146n22, 151, 155, 235
6:12	66, 93, 95, 99, 100, 101, 101n79, 138n, 183, 183n21, 191, 192, 234, 236	65(64):10	143, 144n17, 145, 146, 146n20, 146n22, 180, 181, 182, 208, 238
7:5	69n45	75(74) 75(74):8(9) 75(74):9 78(77):49 80(79) 80(79):6 80(79):7 82(81) 84(83) 84(83):11	151, 155, 235 141, 147, 238 146n21, 149 141, 151, 147, 155, 238 151, 155, 235 142, 142n9, 147, 238 92, 94, 95, 191, 238 149n28
8:19	56n3, 69n45		
Malachi			
3:22 (24)	178		
Psalms (The numbers in parenthesis refer to the Septuagint.)			
23(22)	20, 21, 147n25, 151, 153, 154, 235		
23(22):1	20, 141, 142, 144, 152n33, 238	91(90)	148n27, 151, 154, 155, 235
24(23)	149n28		

91(90):11	141, 148, 152, 238	8:22	95n64, 162, 223, 225,
92(91)	149n28		227
93(92)	149n28	8:22-23	157n3, 160, 161,
94(93)	149n28, 151, 155,		201, 209, 214,
	235		215n34, 219, 223,
94(93):9	141, 149, 238		224, 225, 227,
98(99):5	86n42		235, 236, 236n15,
101(100)	151, 155, 235		238
101(100):1	141, 146n21, 147,	8:30	95n64
	149	10:5	217
109(110):1	86n42	14:35	217
115(113)	149n28, 151, 154, 155,	19:4	238
	235	19:14	167, 170, 217, 235
115:4-8 (113:12-16)		24:5	16n54
	152		
115:5-8(113:13-16)		Job	
	143, 143n12, 150,	5:23	77n20
	151n31	14:4-5	171, 172, 173, 236,
115:8 (113:16)	150n30		239
115:17-18(113:25-26)		Lamentations	
	142, 143n12, 151,	2:1	86n42
	238	4:5	95n64
118(117)	151n32		
135(134):15-18	143, 149n28, 238	Qohelet	
		12:13	23
Proverbs		Nehemiah	
1:7	204	7:72 - 8:2	69n44
1:8	165n30, 235, 238	I Chron.	
2:17	217	7:14	105, 108, 236, 239
3:3	201	11:15-19	6
3:4	165, 165n28, 202,	II Chron.	
	203, 204n10, 235,	17:3	107n16
	238	28:1	107n16
3:5	204	29:2	107n16
3:7	204	34:2	107n16
3:11	168, 169, 170, 184,	34:3	107n16
	235, 238	36:22-23	56
3:11-12	167, 168, 169		
3:12	168, 169, 170, 184,		
	235, 238		
3:18	5n16		
3:19	204		
3:23	204		
4:3	165, 166, 235, 238		
5:21	204		
6:20	165, 165n30, 166		
8:9	226		

### C. Non-Rabbinic Jewish Sources

#### 1. *Apocrypha and Pseud-epigrapha (listed in alphabetical order)*

I Baruch	
3:12-13	89
4:5 - 5:9	59n12
Ben Sira	
1:26(23)	212
24:1-8	228n14
III Enoch	
48 D4	178
IV Maccabees	
3:6-16	6
13:9	6
18	6
18:6-18	4-5
18: 10	4n8
18:11	4n8
18:16	5n16

Testament of Jacob  
VIII 3 178

Wisdom of Solomon  
9:9 212  
16:6-7 17n59

#### 2. *Damascus Document*

VI 3-4 89

#### 3. *Qumran Scrolls*

II QPs 152n34  
4 Q MMT 152n34

#### 4. *Jewish' Sibylline Oracles*

III 788-792 78-79

#### 5. *Zohar*

ii 63b (Beshalah) 145n20, 208  
ii 98b 145-146n20, 208  
iii 31a 145-146n20, 91n56

#### 6. *Bible Translations, Jewish*

##### *Onkelos*

Exodus 24:10 86  
Deuteronomy 17:18 47n58

##### *Targum Yonathan*

Deut. 17:18 47n58  
Isaiah 42:13 165n28  
Zechariah 6:12 101n79  
Proverbs 19:14 171, 217

### D. The New Testament and Patristic Literature

#### 1. *New Testament*

##### Matthew

1:1 108n17  
1:24 211n28  
3:1 75n14  
4:4 37-38  
13:48 125n69  
21:33 ff. 75n13  
25:4 125n69

##### Mark

1:3 75n14  
12 76  
2:25 108n17  
10:47 108n17  
10:48 108n17  
12:1-9 75

Luke  
 1:27 108n17  
 1:32 108n17  
 1:69 108n17  
 2:22 178  
 3:4 75n14  
 4:17 57n8  
 20:9 ff. 75n13  
 24:44 178

John  
 7:23 178  
 7:42 108n17

Acts  
 1:6 108n17  
 2:25 108n17  
 2:29 108n17  
 2:34 108n17  
 7:38 99n73  
 9:15 125  
 10:33 211n28  
 13:15 57n8  
 18:24 99  
 28:23 178  
 48 211n28

Romans  
 1:3 108n17  
 4:6 108n17  
 3:2 99n73  
 9:29 75n14

2 Corinthians  
 4:7 125

1 Thessalonians  
 4:4 125

2 Timothy  
 2:8 108n17

Hebrews  
 4:7 108n17  
 5:12 99n73

1 Peter  
 1:24–25 75n14  
 3:7 125  
 4:11 99n73

Revelation  
 3:7 108n17

## 2. Patristic Literature

Clement of Alexandria  
*Strom.* 1.23.155 f.  
 30n14

Eusebius  
*Praep.*  
 4.12–15 30n14  
 9:16–37— 30n15  
 9.29 30n14

Justin Martyr  
*First Apology*, §30–31  
 3n7

## E. Rabbinic Literature

### 1. Mishnah

*Pesahim*  
 5:7 150n30  
 10:1 48n60  
 10:4 48n60  
 10:7 20

*Yoma*  
 3:8 178  
 7:1 27n5

*Rosh Hashanah*  
 1:1 84n33  
 3:8 (to Num. 21:8)  
 17n59

*Megillah*  
 3:5 26n5, 84

<i>Sotah</i>		<i>Megillah</i>	
7:7	27n5	9a	178
7:8	50n	31a	61n23
		31a–b	57n7, 72n2
<i>Sanhedrin</i>		31a–32b	72
2:4	48		
		<i>Hagigah</i>	
<i>Avot</i>		16a	91n36
1:3	15n47		
		<i>Sotah</i>	
<i>Tamid</i>		12a	20n62
5:1	76n16	42b	94n58
7:4	149n28, 155		
		<i>Baba Kamma</i>	
<i>Yadayim</i>		17a	88n51
3:5	10n32, 118n43		
		<i>Baba Bathra</i>	
<b>2. Tosefta</b>		174b	179n13
<i>Megillah</i>		<i>Sanhedrin</i>	
4(3):1–4	57n7	17a	195n52
		21b	48
<b>3. Talmud</b>		93a	93
		96b	93
Babylonian Talmud			
		<i>Shevuot</i>	
<i>Berakhot</i>		15b	148n27
12a	76		
		<i>Horayot</i>	
<i>Shabbat</i>		13a	20n62
12a	219n2		
		<i>Arakhin</i>	
<i>Eruvin</i>		11b	233n9
39ff.	69n44	23a	179n13
<i>Pesahim</i>		Jerusalem Talmud	
64a	150n30		
95b	150n30	<i>Avoda Zara</i>	
118a	20, 154	1:2 39c	153n36
<i>Ta'anit</i>		<b>4. Minor Tractatus</b>	
2a	146n22		
7a	88n51	<i>Massekhet Soferim</i>	
8b	146n22	14:8	178n
9b	146n22		

**5. Midrash***Genesis Rabbah*

1:1 95n64, 227  
 1 ff. 220, 221, 222  
 1:4 226

*Exodus Rabbah*

3-6 85n38  
 21, *incipit* על שדה אדם  
 165n28  
 25-3 146n22  
 34 75

*Leviticus Rabbah*

10 18n  
 23:11 (18:3) 16n54

*Song of Songs Rabbah (Shir ha-Shirim Rabbah)*

7:11 146n22  
 8:6 219n2

*Ruth Rabbah*

*Parashah* 1, אוי לדור, 49n65  
 end of *Parashah* Vav, 4 (to Ruth 3:13)  
 16n54

*Qohelet Rabbah*

*Parashah Aleph*, ד"ה ב ד"א דברי, 18

*Pesikta d' Rav Kahana (Mandelbaum)*

*Pisqa* 3.4.3-4 49-50  
 Ch. 16 18n60

*Tanhuma*

Gen. 22 *incipit* [22] הן אדם (Buber)  
 165 n28

*Kū Tēse* 8:8, ר' ברכיה, (Buber)  
 49n65

*Naso* 11 (Warsaw)

226

*Pirkei d'R. Eliezer*

46 (Higger edition); = 47 (Eshkol edition, Jerusalem 1973)  
 2n5

*Sifre Deut.*

48 38  
 53 39  
 160 27n5

*Yalkut Shime'oni*

*Parashat Pinchas*, 771  
 2n5

*Parashat Bereishit* 2

227n13

**6. Miscellaneous**

Tosafot to:  
 BT *Meg.* 31a-b  
 57n7, 72n2

*Radak* (= R. David Kimhi)  
 to Joshua MT 8:32  
 47n58

**F. Classical Sources**

Aristophanes  
*Peace* 1075 78

Aristotle  
*Historia Animalium* 521 b 6  
 125n68  
*De Partibus Animalibus* 680 b 33  
 125n68

MM 1196a, 36  
 133n92  
*Poetics*, section 1452b (beg. of ch. 12)  
 32

Euripides  
*Ion.* 32

Herodotus  
 9:19 33n22



- |                            |             |                               |        |
|----------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| Hesiod                     |             | Pliny                         | 13n40  |
| <i>Theogony</i> 116f.      | 27n6        | Plutarch                      |        |
| Hippocrates                |             | 2.723b                        | 133n92 |
| <i>Morb.</i> 4.37          | 125n68      | Sophocles                     |        |
| Horace                     |             | <i>Electra</i> 331            | 44n52  |
| <i>Epodes</i> 16:51 ff.    | 78          | Theocritus                    |        |
| Libanius                   |             | <i>Herakl. (Buc.)</i> 86 ff.  | 78     |
| Or. 59.6.14                | 132n86      | Virgil                        |        |
| M. Ant. (Marcus Antoninus) |             | <i>Fourth Eclogue</i> line 22 | 78     |
| 68ob33                     | 125n68      | <i>Georgics</i> 2:151 ff.     | 78     |
| Plato                      |             |                               |        |
| <i>Phaedo</i> 60b          | 159         |                               |        |
| <i>Phaedrus</i> 247a       | 161, 161n16 |                               |        |
| <i>Timaeus</i>             | 13          |                               |        |