
Translation of the description of the life of the Therapeutae in Contempl., reprinted from Hans Lewy, Philo: Philosophical Writings (see R-R 3002, 3009), without any comment or discussion as part of a special issue of Parabola dedicated to ‘Solitude and Community’. (RMB)


The interpretation of this verse has played a central role in the marriage of Hebrew thought and Greek philosophy, with Philo taking on the role of matchmaker. What is meant by the ‘image’-character of man? In the Bible and in Jewish thought it may refer to man’s body, but by Philo’s time this was seen as philosophically naive. It had to refer to man’s rational nature. Man is created as image of God ‘according to the Logos’, i.e. the Logos preserves the gulf between God and man. This points to a basic difference between Hebraic and Hellenic culture. Philo’s explanation of the plural in Gen. 1:26 also reveals

* This bibliography has been prepared by the members of International Philo Bibliography Project, under the directorship of D. T. Runia (Leiden). The principles on which the annotated bibliography is based have been outlined in SPhA 2 (1990) 141–142, and are largely based on those used to compile the ‘mother work’, R-R. One significant alteration is that all language restrictions have been abandoned. The division of the work this year has been as follows: material in English and Dutch by D. T. Runia (DTR) and R. M. van den Berg (RMB); in French, German, and Italian by R. Radice (RR); in Spanish and Portuguese by J. P. Martín (JPM); in Scandinavian languages by K. G. Sandelin (KGS). Other scholars who have given valuable assistance are P. Borgen, P. W. van der Horst, H. J. de Jonge, A. Mendelson, G. Sterling, D. Winston. The bibliography is inevitably incomplete, because much work on Philo is tucked away in monographs and articles, the title of which does not mention his name. Scholars are encouraged to get in touch with the bibliographical team if they spot omissions (addresses below in ‘Notes on contributors’).
both Greek and Jewish thought. 'If Philo must fit the story of man's creation to blend with his philosophical substructure of Platonism, he also adjusts his Platonism to fit his Hebraic notion of an unknowable God (18).' (DTR)


Barker's central claim in this book is that pre-Christian Judaism was not monotheistic and that the roots of Christian Trinitarian theology lie in a pre-Christian Palestinian belief about angels, a belief derived from the ancient religion of Israel in which there was a High God and several Sons of God. Yahweh was a Son of God. Jesus was a manifestation of Jahweh. Philo is discussed as evidence for the not so rigid monotheistic character of pre-Christian Judaism. Philo's concept of Logos is interpreted as a second god. Philo's Logos is not an importation from Hellenistic philosophy into Jewish philosophy, but a translation of a Jewish concept already existing into the vocabulary of Greek philosophy. The Logos can be thus identified with Yahweh (RMB)


Philo's account of Moses' education and flight from Egypt in Mos. is briefly discussed as one example of how the figure of Moses had to be manipulated so that it could be taken up as a living and relevant part of Jewish and Christian religion. (DTR)


In this extensive article Bayer distinguishes three main tendencies in the reception of Philo in the literature of the High Middle Ages, closely connected with the Gnostic and Catharist movement of the age: (1) Recognition of Philo as auctoritas of a Neoplatonic-Gnostic religious way of life (esp. in the Contempl. and Prob.) which transmits Pythagorean and Stoic wisdom. (2) Incorporation of Philonic material in Neoplatonic oriented literature of the educated, especially female, aristocracy, e.g. the conception of the world in which necessitas rules as a machina mundi and the idea that apatheia and contemplative catharsis lead to salvation of the self. (3) A counter-reaction of more orthodox authors who fulminate against this Catharist Philo-Schwärmerei, beginning with an account from William of Newburgh about the synod and inquisition of heretics in Oxford (1161–66). One of the weapons of the official church in this confrontation was Pseudo-Philo. It should be noted that the basis of this reconstruction is formed not by named references to Philo, but by various motifs shared by Philo's writings and medieval documents. Moreover it is worth noting that the author inclines to the view that the chief Philonic documents Contempl. and Prob. in fact were forged by 3rd cent. Gnostic or Manichean circles on the basis of genuine Philonic diction (251). (RMB-DTR)

The chief theme of the dissertation is why and how being a Jew is important to Philo. It asks how Philo evaluates the importance of being a Jew in relation to (1) the potentially universal goal of 'seeing' God and (2) Biblical claims that God chose the particular nation Israel as His special people. What emerges is a balancing act between the two poles of his particular Jewish loyalties and his universal spiritual strivings. To Philo, 'seeing' God is the philosopher's goal. Since he explains that 'Israel' means 'one who sees God,' 'Israel' can represent those who achieve this goal. 'Israel,' however, is also the name of the Biblical patriarch and nation and their Jewish descendants whom God chose to participate in His covenant. The study focuses upon how Philo understands the relationship between 'Israel' and the Jews. Using word studies and exegetical analyses, the dissertation examines how and where Philo employs the words 'Israel,' 'Jews,' and related terms; how he interprets Biblical verses depicting a special relationship between God and the nation Israel; how he thinks the Jews are distinct from other nations; and how he regards proselytes and their relationship to Jews and 'Israel.' The dissertation shows that in Philo's works one may distinguish between 'Israel,' a loosely defined entity that sees God, and the Jews, the real historical nation that believes in and worships Him by following special laws. While membership in 'Israel' appears open to anyone spiritually capable of seeing God, membership in the Jewish nation is open to anyone who chooses to believe in and worship God and join the Jewish community. For Philo, then, being a Jew does not necessarily signify that one can 'see God' nor that one belongs to a historically 'chosen' people. Rather it signifies, among other things, that one belongs by birth or choice to the only nation dedicated to serving God, on behalf of all humankind. (DTR; based on summary in DA 54-01A, p. 213)

C. BLÖNNIGEN, Der griechische Ursprung der jüdisch-hellenistischen Allegorese und ihre Rezeption in der alexandrinischen Patristik, Europäische Hochschulschriften Reihe XV: Klassische Sprachen und Literaturen 59 (Frankfurt etc. 1992).

The task of this dissertation submitted to the Justus–Liebig University Giessen in 1991–92 is to examine the influence of the Hellenistic-Jewish method of allegory on the Alexandrian church fathers Clement and Origen. The author expresses dissatisfaction with the results of research so far, which has been theologically biased, pays too little attention to the common intellectual background of all three Alexandrians, and also is vague about the precise relation between Clement and Origen. Blönnigen argues that the agreements between Hellenistic allegorical aims and methods and the procedures of the Alexandrians is much greater than has so far been recognized, as is indicated by their common apologetic motivation and the prominence of ethical aims. The originally separate traditions of ethical allegory and typological biblical interpretation are brought together for the first time by Clement, who profoundly christianizes what he takes over from Philo, but is unable to free himself from specific Philonic examples. But he does make the way free for Origen to take over the allegorical method without slavishly following Philo in its application to biblical interpretation. This understanding of Philo's influence via the intermediation of Clement can explain why Origen uses the same method, but seldom shows a direct debt to his Jewish predecessor. In his long chapter on Philo (70-137) the author first presents an outline of his thought, then turns to his views on myth and biblical hermeneutics. Philo's allegorical method is hierarchical, culminating in ethical allegory, as developed above all in his interpretation of the Patriarchs. In the equally long chapters on Clement and Origen constant reference is made to the Philonic background. The book has only a index of ancient names and a limited subject index. (DTR)

We include this work even though in it Philo is conspicuous by his absence (and the author does not indicate why he falls outside its scope). But since this valuable instrument of research collects all the general presentations of Judaism as it was in the period of 300 BCE to 200 CE (cf. the 1991 monograph by the same author, *SPhA* 6 (1994) 123), necessarily many of these works will be of value for Philonic research. The individual entries, however, are not annotated, so the user is only given a first orientation. (DTR)


The Jewish motif of the creation by God *ex nihilo* is an important landmark in the history of the imagination, the subject of this study. Philo’s important contribution is to combine this Jewish belief in a creating God with Greek philosophy (esp. Plato) that had hitherto rejected the idea of a creation *ex nihilo*. He thus founded a new discipline, theology, and stimulated Christianity to play a leading role in the discovery of man’s creative power. (RMB)


A general presentation of Philo in his historical context, which sees him as the peak of the Alexandrian Jewish literary development. Philo represents a Judaism, which had an interest in infiltrating and conquering its non-Jewish environment, but which itself stood on the verge of being vanquished by the ideas and values of this environment. After a short account of the importance of Philo for NT studies, the article ends with a list of Philo’s works. (KGS)


Informative encyclopedia presentation of Philo under the following headings: A. The Man and his Family; B. Philo’s writings (with some criticisms of the conventional division); C. Philo and the Jewish Community of Alexandria; D. Philo as Biblical Exegete; E. Central Ideas and Perspective; F. The significance of Philo. A bibliography of almost two columns completes the entry. We note also the entry by the same scholar, ‘Judaism in Egypt, vol. 3, 1061-1072, in which Philo is the chief source for the Roman period (1068-1072). (DTR)

The article focuses on eschatological statements in the works on Philo. In *Mos.* 1.289–291 the prophecy of Balaam in Num 24:1–9 is paraphrased by Philo in a way, which shows that he sees in the Biblical words a prophecy which is going to be fulfilled much later than in the times of Moses. In his reflections on future events Philo develops an eschatology which entails 'the realization of the universal aspect of Moses' kingship and the universal role of the Hebrew nation (342)'. The universal realization of Moses' kingship will be accomplished in the future by 'a man' who will be emperor of many nations, and will continue Moses' work and bring it to its complete fulfilment. In *Praem.* 95 the 'man' is also seen as the commander-in-chief in the eschatological war. In substance this figure for Philo is the Messiah, although he does not use the term. Texts analyzed closely in the article are *Mos.* 1. 289–91, *Praem.* 79, 93–97, 163–72. (KGS)


Having sketched in the historical perspective, Borgen first delineates relations between Jews and non-Jews, pointing various sources of tension. Then he explores the interaction that took place between the two groups. Philo is capable of both sharp criticism of certain practices and generous acknowledgements of debts he has incurred. In his works Philo also reveals tensions within the Jewish community. Finally Borgen briefly notes eschatological views in the community, and argues that these aspirations led to disastrous destruction of Egyptian and Alexandrian Jewry in 117 AD. (DTR)

D. Boyarin, ‘This we know to be the Carnal Israel’, *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1992) 474–505, esp. 474–480.

The author opposes the tradition of literal interpretation of the Scripture by the Rabbis to that of allegorical interpretation by Philo, Paul and the Fathers. It is argued that for both parties the theory of language and that of the body coincide. The allegorical reading practice is founded on a binary opposition in which the meaning as a disembodied substance exists prior to its incarnation in language, just as in the anthropology of Philo, Paul and their Christian intellectual descendants spirit precedes and is primary over the body (this is illustrated by a discussion of Philo's interpretation of the anthropogony at 477–480). The rabbinical tradition on the other hand resists this Platonic dualism in which body/language is subordinate to spirit/meaning. In this view body and spirit, language and meaning are inseparably bound together. (RMB)


Companion piece to the preceding study, the focus now being less on hermeneutical questions and more on the differences in evaluating the body and its sexuality between the Philonic-Pauline-Christian and the Rabbinic traditions (note that the dividing-line is not Jewish-Christian). Boyarin again uses the creation of man and woman as his chief example. Philo and the Fathers interpret the first creation in Gen. 1 in terms of a spiritual androgyne, whereas the Rabbis interpret it in terms of a corporeal androgyne. (DTR)
F. E. Brenk, 'Darkly beyond the Glass: Middle Platonism and the Vision of the Soul', in S. Gersh and C. Kannengiesser (edd.), Platonism in Late Antiquity, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 8 (Notre Dame 1992) 39–60, esp. 46–51.

Philo’s statement on man’s knowledge of God frequently leave us baffled: is he speaking about this world or the next, and does he mean complete knowledge of God, or just an intellectual visions. He shares these ambiguities with (near)-contemporary Middle Platonists. (DTR)


The aim of the study is to describe and evaluate the methods of biblical exegesis practised before the fall of Jerusalem. Philo is examined in part II as belonging to the group of contemporaries of the scribes (others are the various biblical texts, the Dorshe Reshumot and Dorshe Hamurot, Josephus, Qumran). Philo is taken as representative of exegetical techniques practised in Alexandria. Brewer gives a brief treatment of the various issues related to Philo’s exegesis: his use of allegory, the nature of the allegorical rules, the origin of his exegetical techniques, his knowledge of Hebrew, his acquaintance with Palestinian halachic traditions. The source of his allegorical method is Greek, but his methods of minute examination of the text has Jewish (but possibly also Greek) roots. The main assumption underlying Philo’s exegesis is that the whole of Scripture is inspired prophecy, and that its interpretation and translation must also be equally inspired (208). This ‘inspirational’ assumption is shared with the other contemporaries of scribes mentioned above. It is to be contrasted with the ‘Nomological’ approach practised by the scribes. After 70 CE the distinction between these two approaches to scripture starts to become blurred. (DTR)


In Philo and in the Greek XII Prophets fragments there is evidence of two completely different and conflicting attitudes to biblical translation, the point at issue being: ‘do the original Greek translations require revision or not?’ (DTR)


The author’s general aim is not so much to give a conceptual history of hermeneutics for its own sake, but one from which literary criticism may benefit. Within this scope Philo’s allegorical mode of interpretation is discussed in terms of ‘radical interpretation’, a concept based on Quine’s ‘radical translation’, meaning the redescription in one’s own language of sentences from an alien system of concepts and beliefs. The lesson
that we may learn from Philo is that hermeneutics is never less than the living of the contemplative life to its proper end. (RMB)


Brief (and limited) discussion of Philo’s interpretation of the role of women, emphasizing his relation to Gnostic thought. It is furnished as background to an exegesis of the text in 1 Timothy which is used more than any other to disbar women from proclaiming the Gospel (11). (DTR)


Important study on the tradition of ancient allegorical interpretation, begun as a Yale dissertation (see *SPhA* 3 (1991) 355). The study consists of an Introduction and four chapters. In the introduction Dawson makes clear that he wishes to interpret the practice of allegory from a broad perspective, looking not only at its theoretical aspects, but also at the way it functions in a social and cultural context. In the first chapter the Hellenistic background is investigated. The three remaining chapters focus on Philo, Valentinus and Clement respectively. These three figures are seen as representing three different ways of using allegory. Philo uses allegory to rewrite the Mosaic text, claiming that the divinely inspired text represents the totality of authentic wisdom. In Valentinus the Gnostic myth is allegorized so that it becomes the interior vision of the interpreter. Clement is closer to Philo, but locates in the text above all the divine Voice identified with Christ the Logos. The chapter on Philo covers a broad range of hermeneutical issues, concentrating especially on the view of language presupposed by his readings of scripture and how scripture forms the lens through which the whole of Philo’s social and cultural reality is viewed and interpreted (a process which Dawson labels ‘reinscription’). See further the review in *SPhA* 6 (1994) 199–203. (DTR)


This volume follows the same formula as the three earlier volumes published in the series (cf. R-R 8620, *SPhA* 3 (1991) 358, 4 (1992) 107). Philo’s interpretations of the LXX translation of Deuteronomy are cited on numerous occasions in the notes. In the Introduction the authors note that Philo’s manner of reading the book is quite striking, particularly because he gives a privileged status to selected texts, which are cited in the course of interpreting other biblical lemmata. (DTR)


Some introductory remarks on Philo and his value for New Testament studies. (DTR)

Philonic evidence is frequently appealed to in defence of the view that Judaism in the Hellenistic-Roman period (323 BCE to 133 CE) actively attempted to recruit adherents. Indeed the text at Spec. 2.62 suggest that synagogues will have attracted large numbers of members of the non-Jewish population. (DTR)


A positive evaluation of the OT concept of ‘stranger’ is found in two Jewish groups who live outside their land, whether in the sense that they had abandoned their original theological culture, or because they became different on account of religious and geographical factors. One of these groups can be recognized in the radical Judaism of the community of Qumran. The other group is located in Diaspora Judaism and has as its most important representative Philo. This group has in common that it existed in an hostile and alien environment and that it found its own existential situation represented in the category of the ‘stranger’. In Philo’s case the metaphor is expressed in three different forms. (1) Being a stranger occurs in confrontation with the world though being a fellow-citizen of God. This is the status of the sage, finding its foundation from a theological point of view in the absolute autonomy and independence of God. (2) Being a stranger indicates the sojourn in the encyclopedic studies, as preparation for the ascent to the vision of God. (3) A final interpretation of ‘stranger’ has as its basis a dualistic cosmological vision (heaven/earth) and attributes to the wise man an affinity to the heavens and an alienation towards the earthly region. (RR)


The first collection of Theophrastus’ fragments since Wimmer (1854–62) and a landmark in Theophrastean studies, it includes a text and translation of Aet. 117–149 as Fr. 184. A series of commentaries based on this collection is promised by the same team. (DTR)


For the contributions on Philo and Judaism in Egypt see above under the name of their author, P. Borgen. Some other contributions dwell on the role of Philo, notably the article ‘Logos’ by T. H. Tobin (4.350–351). But the tendency to divide subjects into sections on OT and NT respectively means that coverage of Hellenistic Judaism is rather spotty. (DTR)


Philo attributes a universal significance to the observance of the Sabbath as a day of rest, study and thanksgiving. In the many passages in his work that provide information
on how the day should be and was observed, Philo does not distinguish between scriptural precepts, halachic tradition and ancient customs. Gilat suggests that where his views contradict the Halacha, they may go back to an ancient halachic tradition. Historic sources confirm some of the prohibitions that Philo records, e.g. appearing in court on the Sabbath. (DTR)


The thesis analyses the involvement of non-Jews (the so-called ‘God-fearers’) in ancient Jewish communities. All the relevant evidence is examined (including Philo), and each text is regarded as an independent witness to the phenomenon. (DTR; based on summary in DA 54-01A, p. 210).


Critolaus used the metaphor of a balance to argue that the goods of excellence outweighs external and bodily goods (cf. Cicero Tusc. 5.51, Fin. 5.92). Two passages in Philo, Her. 45–46 and Fug. 151, use the same metaphor in a similar context. Can the passages be explained through Philo’s own idiosyncratic use of metaphor, or is there a debt to Critolaus? Glucker opts for the latter alternative, and uses the Philonic text to make some observations on what may have been Critolaus’ original Greek terminology. (DTR)


Philo is a key witness in the argument that first-century Jews, in contrast to the early church, did not engage in active proselytizing or missionary activities. (DTR)


In spite of the risks involved (his date is late, i.e. post-Ptolemaic, and his works are mainly exegetical) Philo’s writings can offer us a valuable example of a firm and subtle ethnical strategy as it emerges in his dealings with Jews, Greeks, and Egyptians. Goudriaan first examines the various ethnic categories used by Philo to name and describe these groups. He then asks how Philo puts them to use. The opposition between Jews and other people is pervasive throughout all his works, even though he lacks the equivalent of the Hebrew distinction am–goyim. Philo avoids making a direct opposition between Jews and Greeks, no doubt on account of his high respect for Hellenic culture. On the other hand, he is highly negative towards the Egyptians. So it may be concluded that universalism and ethnocentrism exist side by side. The remainder of the article discusses how this ethnical strategy should be considered against the background of the events of 38 AD. Differing strategies may have led to ethnic friction. Philo no doubt regarded the anti-Semites as Egyptians, whereas they saw themselves as Hellenes.
This friction, however, is not enough to explain the violence that took place. Goudriaan suggests that a process of 'ethnic incorporation' had taken place, i.e. the society is divided along ethnic lines, between Jews and non-Jews, 'us' and 'them'.


This two volume work is meant as a handbook for students of the history and religion of the Judaism during the Second Temple period and for scholars working in a adjoining disciplines. Philo is mainly treated as a major original source. See especially pp. 372–374 (a short introduction on life and work of Philo), pp. 395–397 (Philo on the gilded shields episode under the reign of Pilate), pp. 399–409 (Philo as a source for the contemporary troubles of the Alexandrian community), pp. 492–499 (Philo on the Essene community and the Therapeutae). See further the review in this volume. (RMB)

P. GRAFFIGNA, Filone di Alessandria La vita contemplativa, Opuscula 47 (Genoa 1992).

The study comprises an extensive bibliography relevant to this treatise, a brief introduction—in which the two main problems of the work are presented, the dating and the identity of the Therapeutae—, an Italian translation with the Greek text opposite (with an apparatus criticus allowing comparison of the more important modern critical editions), a detailed commentary (pp. 93–164) and a series of appendices gathered together under the title of Prospectives, devoted to a number of major themes of Contempl.: the banquet, the ἄνθρωπος, and sobria ebrietās. In sum we have here an important and comprehensive contribution, valuable especially for the translation—the first into modern Italian—and for the accurate and well-documented commentary. (RR)


The author does not analyse all the passages in the Philonic corpus in which the term φαντασία appears, but only those passages in which it reveals new elements of significance in comparison with customary usage. On the basis of this analysis she concludes that φαντασία always indicates functions related to appearance (dreams, visions etc.) and that, in this perspective, a distinction must be made between φαντασία-vision and ἵδεω-representation. (RR)


Though the discussion on Philo, which focuses on the relation between Torah and natural law, is confined to but a single page, we include it in our bibliography because Green is a leading exponent of modern Jewish theology and the fact that he draws attention to Philo’s contribution to Judaism is significant. See further the article of David Winston earlier in this volume and esp. pp. 141–142. (DTR)

For Philo Balaam symbolizes the base, negative traits of religion. He was not a prophet, only a wizard. (RMB)


Græsholt sets out to draw a picture of what Jewish identity was like in Alexandria on base of Philo’s writings. The Jews tended to be exclusive because of their particular customs (monotheism, circumcision, Sabbath, festivals and temple-worship, dietary laws and marriage). On the other hand Philo undertakes the task of universalising the message of the Torah. But this universalism has its limits when we examine his attitude towards other peoples. The way he portrays Egyptians is so negative that it may be described as ‘racist’ (110). (RMB)


Reprint of the London 1909 publication (= G-G 630) of this brief introduction to Philo’s thought written from a theosophical perspective. (DTR)


The aim of the article is to draw attention to problematic aspects of Philo’s account of the Therapeutae. Clearly it is meant to be an account of an ideal community, but its ideals are only partly shared by Philo himself. For example both its asceticism and the equal status accorded to women are foreign to Philo’s own thought. But since his purpose is apologetic, he is not at all interested in criticizing them, or even in evaluating their particular form of Judaism. At the same time he is very reticent about describing their doctrines. It is possible that they had eschatological ideas, perhaps of the ‘realized’ sort with which Philo would not at all have been in agreement. Hay ends his article with two brief sentences that neatly summarize his provocative thesis: ‘He writes in praise of their way of life. He does not encourage investigation of their ideas (683).’ (DTR)


A brief article in response to the claim by David Runia in *SPhA* 2 (1990) 135–136 that the novelist Heliodorus was the only pagan of whom we can say beyond all doubt that he had read Philo. The report of the church historian Socrates that Heliodorus wrote his erotic novel during his youth and later became a bishop should not be interpreted to mean that he was first a pagan and then converted to Christianity. Parallels with other writers show that he could easily have been a Christian all along. (DTR)

Justin Martyr, especially in his Dialogue with Trypho, often makes use of the concept of the divine Logos (identified with Christ) in an almost certainly Philonic significance. The author reaches this conclusion on the basis of a number of clear indications: (1) The analogous interpretation by both exegetes of the passage in Genesis 18, located both in Dial. 56–59 and in Abr. 110ff.; (2) the plurality of names attributed to the Logos; (3) the assimilation of the Logos to Sophia; (3) the conception of the Logos as 'second god'; (4) the method of argumentation. (RR)


When Philo touches on the subject of healing, he is primarily concerned with healing of the soul. He shows himself indebted to his Greek philosophical background when he portrays the way to full spiritual health as the overcoming of the passions and the acquisition of virtue. At the same time he also preserves both the central teaching of the Hebrew Bible that God alone is the healer of the sicknesses of soul and body. Philo’s world view has no room for evil spirits as the cause of illness. Illness that cannot be explained by sin is part of God’s plan for perfecting man or the world. Finally, because God’s providence is frequently expressed through mediators, Philo has no difficulty in seeing medical remedies and physicians as ways in which God ministers healing. (RMB)


Why does the LXX translated the words of the Hebrew Bible in Ex. 22:27 ‘you shall not revile God’ as ‘you shall not revile the gods’? Philo is the first author who explicitly interprets the verse in QE 2.5. If the Jews refrain from negative language about pagan gods, this may have the positive consequence that pagans may come to praise the only true God. A similar interpretation is found in Josephus, but is not taken over in the early Christian tradition. For an English version of this article see SPhA 5 (1993) 1–8. (DTR)


In examination of the Neoplatonic doctrine of the ineffability (apophasia) of God the author distinguishes between two traditions, the Philonic and the Plotinian. Philo’s ineffability is rather elastic, since he has to conceal the Platonic and Jewish supreme entity. This results in an important difference between the creating activity of his God and that of Plotinus. Whereas the Plotinian, impersonal One creates out of spontaneous necessity, the Philonic personal God wills to create. (RMB)
H.-J. Klauck (ed.), *Monotheismus und Christologie: zur Gottesfrage im
hellenistischen Judentum und im Urchristentum*, Quaestiones Disputatae
138 (Freiburg 1992).

This volume publishes the papers presented at a conference of German-speaking
Catholic New Testament scholars held on 18-22 March 1991. It brings together a number
of contributions that focus on early Christian theology, and in particular on the problem
of the relation between theology and christology and the influence of Jewish mono-
theistic theology on this question. See also the review of D. Zeller in *SPhA* 5 (1993) 242–
245. The contributions of Hofrichter, Sellin and Theobald are summarized individually
in this bibliography. (RR)

R. S. Kraemer, *Her Share of the Blessings: Women's Religions among

Philo's account of the Theapeutrides allows a more substantial glimpse into the
religious lives of a handful of women. They form a select group because they are literate.
Their childlessness was central to their choice of the contemplative life, and may have
gone against social norms and expectations. Kraemer ends her brief discussion by citing
Goodenough's interpretation of *QG* 4.145 in terms of a union with the eternally virginal
universal spirit. (DTR)

P. V. Legarth, *Guds tempel. Tempelsymbolisme og kristologi hos Ignatius
af Antiokia* [In Danish = *God's Temple: Temple Symbolism and Christology in
Ignatius of Antioch*] (Ârhus 1992), esp. 38–43.

Under the rubric Philo and Josephus (I 5) the author points out that the temple cult
and the priesthood play important roles in the writings of Philo. The priesthood is
either idealized or it is spiritualized like the idea of the temple. Man's mind can be seen
as the temple of God. Philo never reflects on the new temple nor does he see the Messiah
as a temple-builder although he may refer to Zach. 6:12 (cf. *Conf.* 62f.). (KGS)

C. Lévy, *Cicero Academicus: recherches sur les Académiques et sur la philo-
sophie cicéronienne*, Collection de l'École Française de Rome 162 (Rome

In the course of this massive French *thèse d'état*, which has as its main subject Cicero's
relation to the sceptical movement (*avant la lettre*) of the New Academy, the author
frequently refers to Philo and, especially in the last two sections on Ethics and Physics,
makes a number of extended comparisons between Philo and the Roman statesman. For
more details see the review elsewhere in this volume. (DTR)

C. Lévy, 'Le concept de doxa des Stoïciens à Philon d’Alexandrie: essai
d’étude diachronique', in J. Brunswig and M. Nussbaum (edd.),
*Passions and Perceptions: Proceedings of the Fifth Symposium Hellenisticum*
About a third of this wide-ranging article concentrates on Philo. Somewhat defensively the author argues that Philo’s complex thought can offer illumination in the area of history of philosophy. The main theme is the psychology (and not the epistemology) of opinion (doxa). The Stoics depart from earlier tradition (esp. Plato) in arguing that in a rational world nothing need impede the sage from reaching full knowledge and thus leaving the world of doxa behind altogether. In this perspective it can be argued that the New Academy in their psychology make a partial return to Plato. Not that they have a positive psychology, but they do make a link between the world and the soul. The world is full of darkness, and as such is the object of the soul’s doxa. Arcesilaus and his followers thus banish light from the world. It is Middle Platonism’s achievement to bring the light back and rescue the Platonist tradition from the cave. Here Philo becomes a witness. Lévy first discusses the way Philo appropriates Stoic psychology, but reworks it into a dualism quite foreign to Stoic ideas. Is it possible to offer a Philonic psychology which is not just a collection of topoi chosen in order to correspond to this or that aspect of scripture? It is argued that Philo’s pronouncements make more sense if they are seen as a development of the New Academy in the light of a new transcendental perspective, which allows a certain rehabilitation of opinion. Of this the complex figure of Joseph is a symbol. Lévy especially concentrates on the text at Somn. 2.15, in which Joseph is presented as the ‘image of a heterogeneous and mixed opinion’. The four categories that the allegorical explanation reveals are related to the division of the Stoic soul, but they are transformed in a way that is interesting for the psychology of Middle Platonism. Joseph symbolizes the ‘mixed soul’, a concept that reappears in Albinus and Apuleius. (DTR)


Philonic evidence, particularly about the practices of the Therapeutae, is used to cast doubt on widely-held scholarly assumptions about biblical and Jewish sabbath observance. (DTR)


Repeats the main thesis of the author’s article in VC 39 (1985) 131–156 (= R-R 8530) on a Middle Platonist cento of themes from Pythagoras, Plato, Empedocles and Heraclitus, which forms a crucial component of Philo’s doctrine of the soul. The church father Hippolytus uses similar material in his attack on non-orthodox Christian thinkers, whom he accuses of being dependent on Greek philosophers for their heretical ideas. (DTR)


In the commentary on the fragments of Valentinus many references to Philonic writings are given—esp. to Opif. These serve to clarify the text, but are not the specific object of discussion. (DTR)

The author questions the view of Naomi G. Cohen that ἀγγέλευσις νόμος has a Jewish connotation and that Philo intended anything other than the general, Greek sense of the term. He concludes that the terms ἀγγέλευσις νόμος and ἀγγέλευσις ἰθος were used in three ways; (1) unwritten law as eternal law (2) unwritten law as custom (3) unwritten custom as Jewish custom. The last category should not be viewed as halakhah. The term ἱθος does not have the force of oral law, but rather the binding force of tradition. (RMB)


This article examines in five sections D. T. Runia’s monograph Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato (cf. R-R 8656). After a brief presentation (a) of book’s content, the author notes its significance (b) for the history of Platonism in its turn from Academic to dogmatic philosophy in the first two centuries of our era. Three observations on Runia’s thesis follow. Philo’s predecessor Aristobulus (c), who testifies to an early comparison of Genesis with Plato, was insufficiently considered. It is also argued (d) that there is a problem in the use of authors from the 2nd century ce, in that the Middle Platonist philosophers are used as witnesses for the antecedents of Philo, whereas the Christian authors of the same period are regarded as dependent on him. Finally (e) the article suggests that Numenius, Celsus, Galen and perhaps other pagan philosophers of the 2nd century may more greatly indebted to Philo for than the book allows for. (JPM)


The author cited various Philonic passages to show a Jewish-Hellenistic tradition reflected by Theophilus of Antioch. This tradition illuminate the Ad Autolycum christology, in the sense that Logos and Sophia do not refer to Christ, even though the texts of 1 Cor. 1:24 and John 1:1–14 are cited and commented on. The author’s intentions reflect a sapiential triadic theology, closest to the Philonic tradition. (JPM)


Comments on Mos. 2.39, where Philo uses geometry as the perfect language pattern, because each thing belongs to one sign and each sign to one thing, as is recommended by proposition 3.325 of Wittgenstein’s Tractatus. God is to be regarded as the perfect geometer, because he produced at the same time signs, meanings and things. Moses is then the real philosopher. The Bible and the World are perfect orders, produced by God. Both of them can be decoded by rules. In human activity the geometer represents divine semiotic perfection, as is also found in Adam and Moses. (JPM)

P. A. Meijer, Plotinus On the Good or the One (Enneads VI.9), Amsterdam Classical Monographs 1 (Amsterdam 1992), esp. 326–328.
In his examination of the historical background of Plotinus' teachings on the unification of the mystic's self with the One, Meijer argues that there are not only differences, but also 'astonishing similarities'. Attention is drawn especially to two aspects of Philonic ecstasy: the arrival of the divine light that inspires the soul to prophecies and the mystic's ascend to God. But in Philo there is no complete union. Meijer argues for a common background, but we cannot prove historical connections. It is possible that Numenius could have formed a link between the two. (RMB)


A paper presented at the Sixth International Conference of the International Society of Neoplatonic Studies held at the University of Oklahoma in 1984, but only now published. Mortley attempts to account for the enigmatic statement in the Gospel of Truth by invoking Philo and esp. the passage at Conf. 145 where the Logos is called the Name of God. He also argues that the version of the treatise found at Nag Hammadi contains a response to Arianism, i.e. that it was revised, and that the revisor made use of Philonic ideas. In an afterword M. Tardieu expresses agreement that the passage represents a Gnostic response to the Arian debate. (DTR)

M. NIEHOFF, The Figure of Joseph in Post-Biblical Jewish Literature, Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 16 (Leiden 1992), esp. 54–83.

Philo is the first and indeed only complete treatment of the Joseph story. For the biographical moulding of the story Philo was inspired by his Greek background. The biblical figure is reshaped in accordance with Philo's concepts of both 'allegorical' and 'political' biography. Those passages which Philo himself introduces as allegorical incorporate diverse philosophical material on the role of the politician. Here the biblical story tends to recede into the background. Philo presents an idealised image of Joseph and accommodates the biblical material to his preconceived ideals of political personalities. He also presents him as an ideal Hebrew in Egypt, i.e. topical and exegetical aspects are blended, and Philo's ambivalence to Egypt comes to the fore. (RMB)


Basing her thesis on years of concentrated research, Petit argues that the Catena in Genesim is not a collaborative and cumulative work, but basically the compilation of a single redactor. She has now commenced to produce the first edition that integrates the various manuscript traditions. The first three chapters contain four Philonic texts. Further details are given in the review in SPhA 5 (1993) 229–232. (DTR)

Where did Philo derive his knowledge of the sect of the Essenes from? Certainly he may have been indebted to his older contemporary Nicholas of Damascus. Another possibility is that he may have been dependent on oral traditions from Palestine, as is suggested by comparison of his material with what we find in both Talmudic texts and the Dead Sea scrolls themselves. This material points to an identification of the Essenes with the inhabitants of Qumran. Philo may also have put together his account on the basis of what he heard about important Essene personages. At the end of the article Petit raises the question of personal contact. The suggestion of a prolonged contact with the sect is considered unlikely, though the possibility that Philo paid a short visit to the sect during his pilgrimage to Jerusalem is considered a possibility. This would explain the fact that the picture of the Essenes in the Hypoth., a work edited at the end of his life, includes extra details not found in Prob., a work of Philo’s youth. (RMB)


The second edition only differs from the first (Leiden 1988) in that a second Preface consisting of two pages has been added. It lists a number of corrigenda, but not omissions, which will be added in a subsequent volume planned for the end of this decade.


Even though Philo expresses outrage and condemnation at the practices of exposure of infants and infanticide, his discussions on them may imply that they took place in his community. From these passages it may be concluded that (a) many people did consider exposure of infants to be a lesser evil than infanticide, and (b) Philo’s intended audience of his writings were men. (RMB)


By studying the ways the Diaspora community appropriated the Hellenistic vision of the oikoumene in order to lay claim to their status as God’s elect, the author hopes to come to a better understanding of how a Diaspora Jew like Paul could combine a universalistic gentile mission with an appeal to a rather narrow slice of Jewish tradition. Philo is one of the members of the Diaspora community to whom attention is given. It is argued that he neither wanted to forsake his Jewishness, nor did he want to withdraw in a cultural ghetto and thus withdraw himself from the oikoumene. This explains his criticism of both rigorous interpreters of the Scripture and those who neglected the letter of the law. (RMB)

Since all sources for the observance of Sukkot in this period are studied, this means that Philo too is included. (DTR; based on summary in DA 54-01A, p. 215)


A review article on Royse’s important study noticed in last year’s bibliography, p. 137. Before outlining the contribution made by this study, the article first examines the question of how much has survived of what we know Philo to have written. It is concluded that only about half remains in the original Greek. Of the half that is lost about a third remains in the Armenian tradition. (DTR)


An index of references to later usage of Philo’s writings given in the apparatus testimoniorn of Cohn-Wendland’s great critical edition of Philo. These are confined to Josephus and the Patristic tradition. References to the Catenae and Florilegia are not included. An index of this kind is missing in Leisegang’s indices that form volume 7 of the edition (1926–1930). (DTR)


The starting-point of the article is a Philonic passage, Plant. 127–131, in which Philo exploits the characteristic phraseology used in Plato’s Timaeus to describe the excellence of the cosmos. Similar adaptation is found in Plutarch and Plotinus. The article goes on to analyse this phraseology in Plato himself, concentrating especially on his use of the superlative. The key to Plato’s language of excellence is his rationalist conviction that the cosmos cannot be better than it is. At the end of the article a brief return is made to the passages in Philo, Plutarch and Plotinus with which it started. Philo’s approach is very different from that of Plato. For him God is no philosophical abstraction, but rather the supreme Being whom man must worship in love or in fear. (DTR)


Examines those passages in the church fathers in which Philo is associated with Christian heresy. Gregory of Nyssa in two texts accuses the Neo-Arian Eunomius of filching material from Philo. In two passages in Ambrose we can see that he is wary of taking over expressions from Philo that might be understood as favouring heresy. There is, however, no evidence connecting Philo with the ‘archheretic’ Arius himself. (DTR)

Status quaestionis on the relationship between Philo and Origen. A full list of sixteen passages is given in which Origen refers to Philo, either explicitly by name or by implication in anonymous references. Much detailed work remains to be done on the extent to which Origen was indebted to his reading of Philo and the way he adapted exegetical and theological themes of his predecessor. It is apparent that Origen regards him as a honoured member in a long line of inspired exeges. For this reason he gave him an place in his library, which ultimately resulted in the preservation of the corpus Philonicum. (DTR)


The main question addressed in the inaugural lecture is whether it can be said that Philo played a significant or even a decisive role in the development of Christian thought. It begins with an exegesis by Augustine of Ex. 3:14–15, in which a distinction is made between the two divine pronouncements 'I am he who is' (v. 14) and 'I am the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob' (v. 15). The only other example of this distinction is to be found in a number of Philonic texts. Was Augustine indebted to Philo? A difficulty in answering the main question posed in the lecture is the tension between a historical and a systematic approach. Moreover Philo is only the most important representative of a wider Hellenistic-Jewish tradition. It is suggested that we should speak of Philonism rather than just Philonic thought. Four important sources of influence are then outlined in order of increasing importance: the origin of dogmatism, the origin of the allegorical method, the choice of the Platonist paradigm for the interpretation of Moses, the localization of insights from the Greek philosophical tradition in the authoritative words of scripture. The choice fell on Platonism because it was best able to give systematic expression to the conviction of God’s faithfulness and his transcendence. The lecture concludes with a discussion of related passages in Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, before returning to Augustine. The precise relation between Philo’s and Augustine’s use of the theme is difficult to pin down, but the common element does illustrate the importance of Philonism for Christian thought. See further the article by the same author elsewhere in this volume, which is for the most part based on his inaugural lecture. (DTR)


At the end of his homilies on the Hexaemeron Basil briefly examines the text describing the creation of man (Gen. 1:26) and immediately launches into a polemic against a Jewish thinker who asserts that God uses a plural verb because he was conversing with himself. It has been thought that Basil has Philo in mind here, but it is shown that this cannot be the case. The Jew is a collective figure, representing Jewish exeges opposed to Christian interpretations which read the presence of the Logos or the Trinity into the Mosaic creation account. In the final part of the article it is shown that Basil’s account was familiar to Isidore of Pelusium. But this church father adopts a different attitude, defending Philo from attack. The reasons for this move are strategic. Philo can be used as ammunition in discussions with contemporary Jews. (DTR)

The chief purpose of the paper is to draw attention to a special form of vocabulary that passes via Philo into Patristic texts. It concerns compound words taken over or even coined by Philo in order to express particular aspects of his exegetical and apologetic activity. A list of such words is given, followed by a detailed analysis of one example, the rare term ὁγαλματοφορεῖν, 'to be an image-bearer'. The term occurs in some 10 patristic texts. The most interesting occurrence is perhaps in the treatise On the Resurrection attributed to the apologist Athenagoras, but of disputed authenticity. It is argued that the presence of the term in this work supports the view that the work is later than the 2nd century, and thus not by Athenagoras. (DTR)


Bibliography of Philonic studies primarily for the year 1989 (72 items), with addenda for 1987 (1 item) and 1988 (8 items). (DTR)


In this volume of collected essays which focuses inter alia on the development of Judaism in the second Temple period, we note: (1) in the introductory chapter 'On the Jewish Background of Christianity' a discussion of Philo and esp. Migr. 89–93 under the heading 'undermining the Law: in the Hellenistic Diaspora'; (2) an English version of the article earlier published in Hebrew on 'Pilate’s Suspension from Office' (see R-R 8245), in which it is argued Josephus made use of Philo’s Legatio ad Gaium. (DTR)


In many respects Philo is a paradigm figure, because he was the first to put forward with lucidity the dilemma what is implicit in every discourse on God, namely the necessity of speaking about that which is in the category of ineffable substance (17). From this are derived consequences of considerable theological importance, such as negative theology, the symbolic use of divine names, analogical thought, metaphorical (but not mythical) language, and so on. But also consequences of philosophical and exegetical importance make their presence felt (which turn Philo’s thought into a bridge between the Old Testament and Stoic and Middle Platonist philosophy), as well as those of a mystical-religious character (connected with the theology of the Logos). Sellin distinguishes two methods of approaching Philo’s evidence: one is to regard the Alexandrian as a quarry of information; the other takes the form of a lectio continua that concentrates on the writer and his work in synchronic unity. In this perspective the substantial diver-
sity in Philo's theology comes to the fore, the result of the exegetical and non-systematic nature of his treatises. There is, however, a third approach which leads to a 'deeper level of the text' less confused than what appears on the surface, namely the existentially determined level of Philonic piety. The analysis of this deep level leads the author to embark on the first part of his article (19–26), entitled 'the God of the philosophers', followed by the second on the existential roots of Philo's thought (26–28), 'the God of the Old Testament'. To these are added a third section dedicated to the ἄνθρωπος θεός (man of God) as Logos (29–34) and a fourth which draws consequences of Philo's theology and Logos-doctrine for the Christology of the New Testament (34–40). (RR)


The study examines difficult passages of the Philonic treatise and discusses the reconstruction of the text on the part of modern editors (Conybeare, Cohn-Reiter, Colson, and finally the French edition of the CERF). Making extensive use of the Armenian version, which is particularly faithful to the original Greek (as is characteristic of many other similar products of the so-called Hellenistic school of Armenian translators), the author not only demonstrates that textual corruptions penetrated into the manuscript tradition very early in its transmission, but also contributes to their removal. The study takes great care to demonstrate the various degrees of fidelity to the Greek text shown by the Armenian translation. It increases our knowledge of technical aspects of this process by making precise remarks and giving copious discussions of an inter-linguistic nature. (RR)


This study is the sequel to the translation of the same Ps.Philonic texts presented in volume I (= R-R 2051). Siegert gives a full commentary, preceded by two introductory chapters which place them in their Jewish and Hellenistic settings (1–91) and followed by a final chapter containing a theological appreciation (293–319). The importance of these texts for our knowledge of Hellenistic Judaism cannot be overestimated, because they are the only surviving examples of what might be called Hellenistic-Jewish homilies or, more accurately, logoi, no doubt pronounced in the Alexandrian synagogue. Siegert argues that their literary origin is to be sought in the Greek educational system and its focus on the exegesis of Homer. They are to be dated to the first century CE. The study also contains numerous excursus and discussions of detailed questions relating to Philo and his intellectual milieu. (DTR)


Reading Philo's De Vita Moysis within the framework of Jauss' theory of reception, the author confronts Philo's text with the anti-Jewish account of Moses found in Josephus' Contra Apion. It is concluded that some explicitly anti-Jewish themes in first century
Alexandrian narratives represent part of the literary horizon of Philo’s work. In addition, Philo’s Moses narrative reinscribes, transforms, and finally provides a rationale for Scripture’s decidedly hostile view of the Egyptians. (RMB)


The article attempts to examine the question of Philo’s view on the temporal or non-temporal creation of the universe in the light of a systematic reconstruction of the Middle Platonist tradition. Firstly the various positions put forward by Philo’s modern interpreters (Wolfson, Baltes, Sorabji, Weiss, Winston, Runia) are outlined. The greatest difficulty encountered is the presence of discordant notes in the Philonic corpus, which have to be accounted for. Sterling then moves on to the philosophical tradition, presenting the contributions of Plato, Aristotle and Theophrastus, the Old Academy, the Middle Platonists (including Eudorus and Alcinous). Finally he returns to Philo and re-examines the texts, with particular emphasis on Opif. 7-12, Aet. 13-19, Prov. 1.7. He concludes that Philo inherits the figurative interpretation prominent in many Middle Platonist authors. The evidence of the Philonic texts points to the conclusion that he held a view of creatio aeterna. This also explains problems in our interpretation of Opif. All temporal distinctions in the biblical account of creation are meant didactically, i.e. to show that the universe is not autonomous, but dependent on a Supreme being. This is Philo’s understanding of creation. (DTR)

A. TERIAN, Quaestiones et Solutiones in Exodum I et II e versione armenica et fragmenta graeca, Les Œuvres de Philon d’Alexandrie 34c (Paris 1992).

As we read in a brief Avant-Propos by Jean Pouilleux, this is the thirty-sixth and final volume of the Lyon French translation project, which commenced in 1961 under the leadership of R. Arnaldez, C. Mondésert and Pouilleux himself (cf. R-R 2201-2234, and SPbA 3 (1991) 351). Terian presents a French translation directly from the Armenian, with Aucher’s Latin translation on the left page opposite. The introduction consists of three parts: (1) various comments on the treatise and its tradition, with special reference to the place of the surviving chapters in the original six books; (2) a longer discussion on the place of the work in the Philonic corpus as a whole, arguing that it is probably the oldest of Philo’s bible commentaries; (3) a short resumé of the contents of the work and an even shorter indication of the riches of symbolism contained in its exegesis. The work is concluded with the Greek text of 2.62-68 (not included in Petit’s collection of fragments (= vol. 33) published in 1978 because strictly speaking it is not a fragment) and various complementary notes and indices. (DTR)


Especially from the terminological point of view (i.e. the ‘Gesprächssituation’), the Prologue to John’s Gospel gains in clarity if it is considered in the light of Jewish-
Alexandrian culture, and particularly with reference to the figure of the Philonic Logos, which basically has a mediating function (between God’s transcendence and the world) and is directly connected with the doctrine of creation. (RR)


Analysing interpretations of the creation of the world given in Philo’s in De Opificio Mundi (esp. in 15–35 and 129–130), Tobin reaches three tentative conclusions. (1) Philo was part of a larger tradition of Hellenistic Jewish biblical interpretation. The text was not interpreted simply by itself but within the context of a larger exegetical tradition. (2) The interpretations were not made in a cavalier fashion, but based on a close reading of the biblical text. For each detail of the interpretations a justification is given, based on noting a particular element in the biblical text. (3) These interpretations have been clearly influenced by the thought of Plato’s Timaeus and its reinterpretation in Middle Platonism. The five central teachings of Moses outlined at the treatise’s conclusion are certainly indebted to Plato’s Timaeus. But it would be difficult to claim that they represent views that are not in harmony with the biblical account of creation. (RMB)


A learned general introduction to Philo’s least well known work. The author gives an account of their textual tradition, literary form and exegetical method, followed by a brief survey of various exegetical themes covered in the course of the six (or eight) books. The final pages are devoted to some concluding remarks. It is argued that Philo is engaged in a constant dialectic between the literal and the allegorical meaning. Though preference is given to the literal meaning, the exegesis is consistent with his other works. The text contains important hermeneutic developments and enjoyed considerable success in the Christian world, a fact which guaranteed their (partial) survival. (DTR)


The question that this dissertation attempts to answer is why Philo casts his Quaestiones, a work that covers substantially the same ground as his Allegorical Commentaries, in a genre that is so radically different. The thesis proposed is that the Quaestiones were composed as an independent commentary intended for a quite different audience, namely the general reading public of Alexandrian Jewry. The first half of the study examines the use of the genre of the ζητήματα και λόγας by Greek and Hellenistic-Jewish authors. Commentaries using this genre were primarily intended for a more general public. The second half consists of two synoptic studies, comparing the parallel treatments of the creation account (Gen. 2–3) and the episode of the giants (Gen. 6) in both the Quaestiones and the Allegorical Commentary. It is shown that the former were not written as preparatory notes for the latter. They also demonstrate a greater tolerance towards myths, which may also imply a less sophisticated audience. (DTR; based on summary in DA 54-05A, p. 1839)

Examining Runia’s hypothesis of a theological exploitation of the grammatical/rhetorical term κατάχρησις by Philo (in the article summarized in SPhA 3 (1991) 365), Whitaker argues that even if Philo (or others) had exploited this term theologically (which he thinks Philo did not do), Philo must soon have realized that such exploitation could be achieved only by redefining the term whenever it occurred with a meaning different from that commonly accepted. As a result the adepts of negative theology refrain from using this term in such a new, theological sense. Whitaker discusses various Philonic passages adduced by Runia in his article, and concludes the article with an analysis of some further texts in the Middle and Neoplatonist tradition which reinforce his view. (RMB)


Chapter four, which has the title ‘Philo and the proselytes’, is the subject of this summary. It was earlier published in a similar form in 1991 (see below in the Addenda). Many commentators on Philo, including Arnaldez and Nikiprowetzky, had showed no hesitation in attributing to him the role of a missionary of the Jewish religion. This does not, however, in the view of Will correspond to the truth, not only because the texts of Philo do not support it, but also because ‘missionary preaching is as foreign to Philo’s thought as it is to the biblical tradition which is his point of departure (99)’. Those passages which appear to have an apologetic intention are in fact not directed to pagans for the purpose of converting them, but rather to apostates in order to lead them back to the faith. Whereas for a Jew apostasy is a most serious sin, the conversion to Judaism of a pagan is an act of divine grace, on which man can exercise no influence. (RR)


Philo, following Middle Platonic and Neopythagorean traditions about the transcendent character of God, held that it is impossible to know the essence of God. As a result God is, amongst other things, apathes, without irrational impulses of any kind. How then are we to account for passages in Scripture that seems to ascribe passions to God? Philo, it is argued, turns to the Stoic concept of eupatheia for a way out. His doctrine of the eupatheiai is, however, not purely Stoic. This is shown by the fact that he ascribes pity (eleos) to God, a divine attribute in the Jewish tradition, but not at all in the tradition of the Old Stoa. (RMB)


The article examines Philo’s use of the term Χαλδαῖοι. Three basic meanings are found: (1) a designation for astronomical studies and their practitioners; (2) a geographical
term for inhabitants of Mesopotamia; (3) a designation for the Hebrew language or members of the Hebrew race. The author pursues the use of these three designations in the Philonic corpus and discovers that the third meaning is never found in the Allegorical Commentary. Various explanations for this phenomenon are suggested. Wong himself favours a chronological approach. As a result of his trip to Rome, Philo will have grown more sensitive to the negative associations the name 'Chaldaioi' had for Romans, who used it as a synonym for 'astrologers' and saw astrology as a potential source of rebellion. Given the whole affair of the anti-Jewish riots in Alexandria, Philo, who had hitherto used 'Chaldaioi' as a synonym for 'Hebrews', from then on avoided calling Hebrews by this term, fearing it might suggest that the Hebrews were troublesome. (RMB)

Addenda 1989–91


An abbreviated version of the article with a slightly different title published in the Earle Hilgert Festschrift [= SPhA 3 (1991) on pp. 135–150. See the summary at SPhA 6 (1994) 122. (DTR)


This brief article gives a synoptic view of Philo’s attitude to and use of rhetoric. It is for Philo much more than the simple art of speaking well or of persuasion. It has a vital role in interpreting and giving expression to divine wisdom. Here a central text is on the role of Aaron beside Moses in Det. 38–40. Philo’s works also reveal his complete familiarity with the technical aspects of rhetoric as a τέχνη. Alexandre illustrates this with a brief analysis of Post. 110–111. (DTR)


As part of his comprehensive analysis of interpretative traditions concerning the tabernacle the author devotes a brief section to Philo, in conjunction with the Wisdom of Solomon and Josephus. A useful table is given on p. 60 outlining the similarities and differences between Philo and Josephus in their cosmological interpretation. Both allegorical and ‘literal’ interpretations are discussed in a rather superficial manner. (DTR)


Kerkhoff examines the twofold notion of kairos as constructed by Philo from two different traditions, that of the rational kairos and that of the irrational kairos. Philo
distinguishes between a real atemporal kairos that accompanies or is identified with God and a temporal kairos which is portrayed as an anti-God. The first kairos is related to the well-being of the soul, the second kairos to worldly luck. In the last section of this paper the author argues that Philo is guilty of a ‘vrai scandale herméneutique’ by interpreting the same kairos at one time as God and at another time as anti-God. (RMB)


In Basil’s account of the heavenly ascent of the soul in contemplation before attaining to God in the first chapter of De fide, there are not only Plotinian, but also Platonic, Philonic and Hermetic echoes. Particular attention is paid to Basil’s use of philosophical attributes to describe the divine nature. (DTR)


Brief introductory remarks on the Latin translations of Contempl., QG IV and Ps. Philo LAB and on modern editions of these texts, followed by comments on the syntax of various passages and on the translator’s unusual vocabulary. (DTR)

A. M. MAZZANTI, L’uomo nella cultura religiosa del tardo-antico: tra etica e ontologia, Cristianesimo antico e medievale 3 (Bologna 1990), esp. 3–52.

The theme chosen for extended study by Mazzanti is that of man as μεθόριος (‘border-dweller’). It is developed in accordance with the various stages of Philonic thought in the following sequence. (1) The term μεθόριος has in the first place an ontological sphere of reference (9ff.), describing man as partly earthly substance and partly divine spirit. This structure is dependent on the moment of creation in which the foundations of his ethically mediate position are laid, i.e. the fact that he can turn to good and to evil. Mazzanti then examines the concept of creation in Opif. (19ff.), in Leg. (27ff.), and in other Philonic works (31ff.). In this analysis a prominent role is played by the helpers of God in the act of creation, i.e. the potencies (35ff.). From the anthropological viewpoint a consequence of the interrelation of ontology and ethics in the creative act is found in the negative interpretation of sexual duality which the author interprets (in chap. 4, pp. 39ff.) in all its various aspects: anthropological, ethical, eschatological, physiological, institutional (i.e. in marriage). In the second part of the book (53ff.) the thematics of Philonic anthropology are developed in a piece of comparative historical research, which examines in turn Plutarch (57–60), Origen (61–66), the Asclepius (67), and is concluded with a general evaluation of the term μεθόριος as found in all the authors examined. (RR)


This study, written just before the author’s death in 1983, aims not only to discuss Philo’s interpretation of the Jews’ wanderings in the desert after the Exodus, but also to
ascertain the meaning of the desert to Philo’s contemporaries, esp. the Therapeuta and Essenes. To Philo the desert is partly a horrific place, full with hardships and dangers and therefore a fitting place for the rebellious Jews of the Exodus to be punished by God. On the other hand the desert is also a most excellent place for the Jews to be initiated in the divine philosophy. It is where they receive the divine Laws that would enable them to live well. The Exodus into the desert means a breaking away from the civilised, luxurious life that distracts the human mind from God and thus offers the Jewish community the possibility to approach God, a mystical experience both for the community as a whole and for the individual. This also applies to the Therapeuta and Essenes of Philo’s own days. To them, the desert is no longer a solitary and horrible place, but a place of joy because it removes all opportunities for self-love that may intervene between man and God. (RMB)


Will attacks the view that Philo was a propagandist of Judaism, aiming at the conversion of the gentiles. It is argued that Philo thought it useless to try to convert them because their conversion is a matter of the divine Providence, not of human effort. The author especially concentrates on Mos. 2.17-31, the account of the translation of the Septuagint. Ever since G. F. Moore this text is quoted as a testimony of the success of Jewish missionary activities. Will shows that this passage is in fact evidence in favour of his view. When Philo is addressing the gentiles his aim is not that of the missionary, but an apologetic one. Philo was no missionary to the gentiles; instead he had an internal mission: the salvation of those Jews who had abandoned their ancestral faith under the pressure of the Hellenistic world. All passages interpreted as aimed at a pagan public could perhaps better as addressing these Jewish apostates. See also the summary of the chapter of the book by Will and Orrieux given under the entries for 1992. (RMB)
SUPPLEMENT

A Provisional Bibliography 1993–95

The user of this supplementary bibliography of very recent articles on Philo is once again reminded that it will doubtless contain inaccuracies and red herrings, because it is not in all cases based on autopsy. It is merely meant as a service to the reader. Scholars who are disturbed by omissions or keen to have their own work on Philo listed are strongly encouraged to take up contact with the bibliography’s compilers (addresses in the section Notes on contributors).
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