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Rhetoric for Philo is not merely the art of speaking well or a technique of persuasion. It has a crucial role in the interpretation of wisdom. Philo's method of writing lengthy and complex periods should be seen in the context of ancient rhetoric. Alexandre thus first briefly outlines the theory of the period in Greco-Roman rhetoric. He then proceeds to analyse a number of examples of Philonic periods, dividing them into cola and demonstrating Philo's love for various rhetorical techniques such as the use of isocolic phrases, gradatio, amplificatio. The examples given are Legat. 53-56, Mos. 2.253-255, Flacc. 123-124, Ebr. 157-159. In Philo's rhetoric structure is the key to meaning, but that meaning is placed in the service of the interpretation of scripture. (DTR)


This study examines the use of μετάνοια and cognate terms in the writings of Philo, especially in the tractate On Repentance, a part of the work On the virtues. Philo is almost the only author of Greek philosophy who endorses μετάνοια as a virtue. It is concluded that the aims of this treatise were: (1) to show that repentance as part of Jewish religion is rational and virtuous, in an attempt to enhance adherence to the Law.

The principles on which this 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 deviation is that all language restrictions have been abandoned. The division of the work has been as follows: material in English and Dutch by D. T. Runia (DTR) and R. M. van den Berg (RvdB); in French, German, Italian, Spanish by R. Radice (RR); in Hebrew by D. Satran (DS); 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, K. A. Morland, T. Seland, D. Sly, G. Sterling, T. Seland.

The Studia Philonica Annual 6 (1994) 122-159
among an educated Hellenistic audience and to respond to philosophers who denigrated it; (2) to encourage proselytes to recognize the importance of their conversion, while at the same time urging ethnic Jews to fully accept them. (RvdB)


The author examines the Jewish and Hellenistic Moses-doxa tradition in order to explain the differences that occur between 2 Cor. 3:7, 12–18 and Exod. 34:28–35, paying some attention to Philo, and especially to his De Vita Moses. As various parallels show, Philo and Paul both made use of the same Moses-doxa tradition concerning the prophet’s changed appearance after he had descended from Mt. Sinai. (RvdB)

B. L. BLACKBURN, Theios Anēr and the Markan Miracle Traditions, WUNT 2.36 (Tübingen 1991), esp. 64–69.

In his survey of divine miracle workers of the pre-Christian period the author examines the treatment of Moses by Philo. He refutes the claim that for Philo Moses was a deity, although he admits that Philo saw him as a divine man on more intimate terms with God than the Moses that occurs in Exodus. (RvdB)


To demonstrate the methods of Philo’s exegesis of the Torah, the author discusses his treatment of two themes, memory and virginity. Philo follows the Aristotelian distinction between memory and recollection, but where Aristotle uses these terms for indicating functions of the mind only, Philo extends them to religious concepts used in describing the mind’s path to the mystical encounter with God. In his reflection on virginity Philo accepts the negative perception of sexuality prevalent in Middle Judaism. New, however, is that he sees in virginity, as a part of continence, a way to regain the felicity of Eden. See further the review of this study by D. Winston at SPHA 5 (1993) 233–237. (RvdB)


Comparisons between Philo and John show that John 5:1–18 is a specifically christianized version of a conflict on the sabbath that was also present in the Jewish community in Alexandria. In both Philo and John exegesis of Gen. 2:2–3 plays a central role. (DTR)

In this book, which concentrates on the views of the origin and destination of man as given in Greek pre-philosophical and philosophical thought, a chapter is devoted to Philo. After Philo, his Jewish background and his allegorical mode of interpretation have been introduced, attention is paid to his doctrine of the double creation of both the universe and man and to the destination of man, viz. his return to his divine origin. In order to illustrate the doctrine of the soul's journey, allegorical interpretations of various Pentateuchal passages are listed and briefly discussed. (RvdB)


Disappointly brief and superficial notice on the fate of Philo in the Byzantine period. (DTR)


A modern theological orientation regards inspiration as a veritable dictation by God of the contents of revelation, so that the prophet can be considered as a kind of secretary or as God's quill. This brings inspiration close to mantic, and in a certain sense this association is present in Philo, for it is true that there are a considerable number of passages, e.g. Spec. 1.65 and 4.49.—almost certainly inspired by Plato,—which express the notion of inspiration with concepts and terms derived from the terminology of mantic. Nevertheless this analogy does not go beyond the level of terminology, and is used exclusively to demonstrate the divine origin of Mosaic wisdom. In this sense, the author concludes, Philo cannot be regarded as the spiritual father of the doctrine of the mechanical inspiration of scripture, as he is often regarded. (RR)

C. Carlier, La μητρόπολις chez Philon d'Alexandrie: le concept de colonisation appliqué à la Diaspora juive (Mémoire pour l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Ecole Biblique et Archéologique Française, Jerusalem 1991).

Taking Legat. 281 as starting point, the author presents a detailed study of Philo's use of the terms μητρόπολις and ἁποικία, also comparing it with what is found in the LXX. Behind Philo's seemingly Greek use of the term μητρόπολις lies a resurgence of the problem of the relation between the centre (Jerusalem) and the periphery (Jewish communities in the diaspora, described as ἁποικίαι). On the other hand Philo uses the term πατρίς to describe the city where the Jews live in the diaspora. This usage must be seen as being in opposition to the role of the μητρόπολις. (DTR)


Sketching the main features and significance of mediatorial figures from the second century BC to the first century AD, the author turns to Philo's mediatorial concepts. The most important of these is the Logos which, as a figure separate from God, represents God's activity towards and relation with the world. (RvdB)

The authors reject the widely accepted interpretation of Logion 37 in the Gospel of Thomas as baptismal. In their view the message of the Logion is that encratitism was a requirement for salvation and the return to the pre-lapsarian condition of paradise. To support their alternative interpretation the authors make use of relevant passages in Philo. (RvdB).


In his assessment of the evidence for the historical Jesus, Crossan draws on Philonic material in three contexts. First, he weighs the evidence from Josephus and Philo (Legat.) for the aniconic shields and Caligula's statue (pp. 129-32), preferring the Josephan version where they differ. Second, he uses Philo as a representative of a sapiential understanding of the kingdom of God (pp. 288-89). Third, he draws on the Carabas episode and a governor's attitude toward a criminal condemned to crucifixion during feasts in Flacc. in his treatment of the passion narrative (pp. 380-81, 390-91). (DTR; based on summary supplied by G. Sterling)


This is the second in a projected five-volume presentation of the (Greek) Philonic corpus in modern Hebrew translation. The volume before us in no way departs from the high standard set by its predecessor in the series (see SPhA 2 (1990) 182-184). In accord with the guidelines set forward clearly in the introduction to the series (vol. 1, xxii-xxiii), this volume presents the Hebrew reader with the initial portion of the general Exposition of the Law: De opificio mundi, De Abrahamo, De Iosepho, De Decalogo, and De specialibus legibus 1. This volume is the handiwork of the general editor of the series in conjunction with C. Schur, who contributed the translations of Abr. and Spec. 1. (DS)

E. Dassmann et al., Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Band XV = Lieferungen 113-120 (Stuttgart 1991).

Articles with special sections on Philo are: G. O'Daly, Art. 'Hierarchie', 41-73, esp. 50-51 (hierarchy); A. Lumpe-H. Bietenhard, Art. 'Himmel', 173-212, esp. 196-197 (heaven); J. Engemann, Art. 'Hirt', 577-607, esp. 589 (shepherd); J. Procopé, Art. 'Hochmut', 795-858, esp. 824-825 (pride, arrogance); F. K. Mayr, Art. 'Hören', 1023-1111, esp. 1071-1074 (hearing); A. Dihle-B. Studer-F. Rickert, Art. 'Hoffnung', 1159-1250, esp. 1177-1178 (hope). (DTR)

E. Dassmann et al., Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Lieferung 121 (Stuttgart 1991).

Articles with special sections on Philo are: F.-L. Hossfeld-G. Schöllgen, Art. 'Hohe-
priester' 4–58, esp. 19–23 (High priest); G. J. M. Bartelink, Art. 'Homer' 117–147, esp. 125–126 (Homer). (DTR)


The conception of time appears to be a common element between Aet. and Opif., even if in the two texts the same definition is used in order to reach opposed conclusions (in the one case the eternity of the cosmos, in the other its origin in creation). For Decharneux the difference is to be explained through the differing contexts, abstract and theoretical in Aet., mythical in Opif. (RR)


In his extensive review of Nodet's new edition of the first three books of Josephus' Antiquitates, Feldman argues against the editor that there is more than a coincidental resemblance between the works by Philo and Josephus, listing a large number of parallel passages. (RvdB)


Even if we do not possess sufficient material to define the chronology of the Philonic writings in a precise manner, it can be maintained that the De vita Moysis is a late work. Fendler reaches this conclusion on the basis of a brief but articulated analysis of the treatise from diverse perspectives—linguistic, stylistic, compositional (confirming the division into two books), thematic, and finally from the viewpoint of its origin and the purpose for which it was written. The final part of the discussion (66–68) is devoted to an examination of the relations between Mos. and Mark's Gospel. (RR)


In his introductory chapter the author compares the Dead Sea scroll pesarim, the commentary of the Sifre and those by Philo to each other. Three structural features of Philo's commentaries, shared with the Sifre, distinguish them from the pesarim: (1) their dialectical style; (2) the enchaining of interpretations; (3) multiple interpretations. An important difference between the multiple interpretation of the Sifre and Philo's commentaries, however, is that the first lacks a standard hierarchical plan, in contrast to Philo, for whom the allegorical interpretation is the more important one in comparison with the literal one. (RvdB)

In the course of this comprehensive investigation of rabbinic literature, the author briefly discusses possible connections with Philo’s method. He relies on the study of Heinemann (R-R 5006) and concludes that ‘even if in the general perception of Torah and its exegesis there are qualitative differences between the Jewish-Hellenistic philosopher and the Rabbis, there exists, nevertheless, a proximity in the sort of interpretative questions which they address to the biblical text’ (473). (DS)


In arguing that Izates was a Jew and not a ‘God-fearer’, the author adduces Philo as evidence of a Judaism in which there were Jews who were not circumcised. Passages discussed are Migr. 89–93, QE 2.2. (DTR)


A passage in Book II of the De vita Moysis of Gregory of Nyssa (162ff.), in which it is stated that in order to obtain the visio Dei Moses had to enter into the darkness, certainly has Philonic precedents (Post. 13–16). This would explain the predominantly metaphysical character of the passage. Gregory, however, probably did not receive it directly from Philo, but made use of Clement of Alexandria as intermediary. (RR)


Grabbe notes that the question of the relation between Philo and the Aggada is important, but has never received an adequate treatment. He commends the study of Bamberger (= R-R 7703) for its methodological awareness, as distilled in six cautionary rules. But an analysis of the 41 examples of parallels that Bamberger collected between Philo and the Aggada reveals that he very often transgressed his own rules. Indeed only 6 of the original 41 examples survive as possibly valid, and even these are not compelling. Grabbe concludes the article by adding 4 more rules to Bamberger’s list and briefly making some suggestions for a ‘proper study’. (DTR)


This study undertakes a semantic analysis of the term ἀγαλματοφορεῖν. The term is an original Philonic creation, and it plays an important in his theory of the image. The essay examines the passage where Philo uses this verb, and compares this usage with several other similar terms and phrases in sources close to Philo. On the basis of this examination it is concluded that Philo coined the term to signify that an idea ‘bears form’ in the divine and human intellect. In Philo the specific term ἀγαλμα denotes an idea that reflects a higher model. Together with other phrases such as θεόν περιπέρειν
(Epictetus Diatr. 137.17–18), τὸ θεῖον ἔχειν ἐν νῷ (Zeno, SVF 1.146 (25)), τὸ νῷ ἐνοτκαίν (Porphyry, Ad Marc. 11.20), τὴν εἰκόνα ἔχειν (CH I, Poimandres), ἀγαλματοφορέω constitutes a semantic ‘paratactic’ field, where the terms ἀγαλμα–εἰκόν–τὸ θεῖον and the verbs περιφέρω–φέρω–ἐνοτκαίν can be interchanged. ἀγαλματοφορέω represents a synthesis of that field, unifying the various elements in it. (RR)

J. GRONDIN, Einführung in die philosophische Hermeneutik (Darmstadt 1991), esp. 33-36.

In the context of the history of philosophical hermeneutics attention is drawn to Philo’s allegorical model of interpretation. (RvdB)


Philo’s views on the immutability or mutability of God are examined as part of an investigation into the viability of an incarnational Christology. The author argues that Philo’s adherence to a doctrine of divine immutability (esp. in Deus) must be carefully analysed. It is suggestive, for example, that he never uses the concept of apatheia of God. It is concluded that Philo does not completely absorb the Greek notion of divine immutability and impassibility. The scriptural portrait of God remains dominant. (DTR)


This article approaches Philo’s thought from a broad theological perspective, honouring him for interpreting the Bible for his time, just as we must do for ours. First four methods of biblical interpretation are outlined: allegory, typology, Bultmannian theology, Biblical theology of Sacred History (Heilsgeschichte). In opposition to these theologies the author presents the hermeneutic of Sacred Violence as proposed by R. Girard, which is then related to the Pauline theology of the cross. Hamerton-Kelly concludes that Philo was right to seek the universal meaning of the biblical text, but ‘was wrong to find that meaning in a form of Platonism rather than in the Gospel of the Cross (70).’ (DTR)


First collective study devoted to the subject of Philo’s Quaestiones, based in part on a seminar held in Anaheim in 1985. Individual contributions are summarized under the names of the authors. The volume concludes with a bibliography and four indices. See further the review by S.-K. Wan in this Annual, vol. 5 (1993) 222–227. (DTR)

Collects, analyses, and reflects on those passages in the *Quaestiones* in which Philo refers to other exegetes. Of the 47 references 9 may be purely hypothetical, while another 9 have parallels in other Philonic writings. Some of these are so close that Hay suggests there may not have been a great time gap between the *Quaestiones* and other exegetical works. The last part of the article makes interesting observations on the purpose of the treatises. The actual questions posed may well in many cases have come from previous or contemporary exegetes. Philo does not name them in order to lend his own work greater authority. The very form of the *Quaestiones*, Hay concludes, suggests that Philo saw himself as belonging to a community and succession of exegetes. (DTR)


The evidence on which Hay’s discussion is based on is the collection of all those passages in Philo in which he uses the pronoun ἐγώ and/or the first person singular to describe his own exegetical activity. This yields interesting observations on Philo’s perception of the inspiration he received as exegete and on the potential audience he may have had in mind. Philo may have avoided being specific on the nature of his audience because he expected (or at least hoped) that he would have a wide and continuing audience. (DTR)


Gives a survey of scholarship specifically devoted to the treatise *De virtutibus*. Hilgert first discusses the question of its structure and contents, then lists the mss. in which the treatise is found, followed by an account of printed editions and translations. He concludes with brief references to discussions on the relation between the treatise and Classical thought and New Testament studies. It would seem that much study has been devoted to Philo’s teaching on the virtues, but little to his specific treatise *On the Virtues*. The article concludes with the challenging words: ‘The door of opportunity stands open.’ (DTR)


Gives a thorough survey of the various traditions of the *Quaestiones*. The fragmentary Greek tradition is very complex, and we may be certain that not all fragments have yet been located. The Latin translation has been well edited by F. Petit. In the case of the Armenian translation the lack of a critical edition is keenly felt. Substantial work remains to be done on this tradition, but at least we have good translations. (DTR)

This commentary is a close reading of Suetonius' *Life of Caligula*, which is compared to accounts in other authors, including Philo. (RvdB, based on DA 52-08A, p. 2912)


The article argues that the reports given by Aristobulus, Aristeas and Philo on the translation of the Torah into Greek differ, because the authors adapted the story to their personal situation. Philo’s version, in which it is stated that the translators were under inspiration and that each word was translated literally, has to be understood against the background of his exegetical model. His exegesis was based on the premiss that each word of the Torah was inspired by God, and this had to be case for the Greek translation as well. (RvdB)


Based on research carried out by the author for his Wisconsin Ph.D. (1989), this article tackles the complex but important use that Philo makes of the philosophical terminology of γένος (genus), εἶδος (species) and ἰδέα (form, idea) in his ethical theory in order to describe various aspects of virtue. Two patterns are followed: (1) a simple contrast between generic and specific virtue; (2) a tripartite framework comprising generic virtue, specific virtues, and particular concrete acts of instances of specific virtues. Two key allegorical examples are used for these distinctions, the rivers in Paradise and the Ten Commandments. In two other key passages the genus-species hierarchy is fused with the Platonic forms: the double creation of man, and the change of name from Sarai (perishable virtue) to Sarah (imperishable virtue). Philo regards imperishable virtue (generic and specific) as the archetype of perishable virtue (also generic and specific), thus equating the former in many respects with Platonic forms. This means that the terms ‘generic’ and ‘specific’ receive a double sense: (1) what is more or less general in the classificatory hierarchy of genus, species, particular; (2) what is imperishable or perishable. This duality lies behind Philo’s use of homonymous ethical terms (e.g. prudence can be imperishable or perishable) and the structure of his allegories. (DTR)


This essay is described by the author as a report on work in progress concentrating on chronological clues in Philo’s writings. It is argued that the anonymous authority who tried to destroy the sabbatical tradition mentioned at Somn. 2.125–132 is likely to have been Philo’s nephew Tiberius Julius Alexander. This is an economical hypothesis in two respects. (1) It helps to count for the negative treatment of the figure of Joseph in *Somn.* contrary to the positive depiction of him in other works such as *Ios.* Initially Philo treated Joseph sympathetically, but after the Sabbath crises he made him into a prototype of Alexander. (2) Since the negative Joseph is especially found in the allegorical
treatises and since Alexander was prefect of Egypt in the late sixties, it may be suggested that these treatises were written considerably later than is generally thought, i.e. when Philo was in his seventies or eighties. This is chronologically not impossible. (RvdB)


Examines the role of the high priest in the thought of Philo both from the literal and the allegorical perspective. Though idealized, the high priest is not deprived of his human reality. His most important task is the liturgical act of propitiation on Yom-Kippur. But in Philo’s view the priesthood of the high priest is also combined with the priesthood of the faithful in a movement of interiorization made possible through the doctrine of the logos as human reason related to the divine Logos. The Sage is thus the chief symbol of healing. But this does not mean that the practice of ritual forgiveness as practised by the human high priest becomes spiritually meaningless. (DTR)


Philo makes many references to music throughout his voluminous writings, but these have hitherto received little attention. Though not a professional musician, Philo is well acquainted with the basic facts of music theory and practice. After dealing with examples of musical metaphor, analogy and actual praxis in Philo (the most important is found at Contempl. 64ff.), the author concludes that Philo, unlike later generations, still recognised music as a spiritual force. (RvdB)


Reflections on the curious account given by Philo at Somn. 2.120–121 about Germans living by the sea and trying to keep back the incoming tides with their swords. Philo calls this an action of ‘godlessness’ (δοεθεία). The accusation may in fact have a political rather than a religious background, i.e. these German tribes were godless because they did not accept the Roman order of peace. Philo might have known better if he had read the account of the Germans in Strabo, as derived from Posidonius. (DTR)


Examines the theme of the relation between wisdom and apocalyptic eschatology in Philo’s thought, arguing against the position of P. Borgen in his article “There Shall Come Forth a Man”: Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo’ (published in 1992, but available earlier in typescript). The final words of the article summarize Mack’s thesis trenchantly (39): ‘Philo was a child of wisdom and the diaspora synagogue. He was
hardly a strong candidate for an apocalyptic persuasion. Because he was not, the turn he took with its language in *De praemissis et poenis* is singularly unconvincing. Wisdom in Philo? Yes. Apocalyptic? No.” (DTR)


Dealing with Jewish missionary activity in the Second Temple period, the author pays attention to the propaganda techniques used by Philo, of which his depiction of Moses is perhaps the best example. Notwithstanding Philo’s skill in apologetics, polemics and propaganda, the author concludes that Philo was not so much interested in proselytising gentiles as in bolstering Jewish self-identification. This is shown by the lack of direct speech to gentiles in Philo’s *œuvre*. (RvdB)


The carelessness in swearing oaths and taking vows leading to swift regret at the end of the Second temple period confronted the leaders within Judaism with two problems: (1) which formulae of oaths and vows are binding? (2) how can one gain release from an oath or a vow? The dissertation proposes and defends the independent integrity of the stands on oaths and vows by Philo, Qumran, and the Pharisees. Their positions are compared to that of Jesus. (RvdB, based on DA 54-02A, p. 561)


Martens investigates how Graeco-Roman discussions of ‘higher’ law—viz. the law of nature (*nomos physeos*), the unwritten law (*agrapos nomos*), and the living law (*nomos empsychos*)—influenced or might have influenced Philo and Paul in their attempts to understand the Mosaic law in an Hellenistic environment. Each of these forms of Graeco-Roman law, it is argued, implied a depreciation of the written or civil law. Did Philo, who adopted each of these forms of law, imply such a depreciation of the Mosaic law? The author concludes that for Philo this was not the case. Contrary to Paul, he upheld the Mosaic law. (RvdB, based on DA 54-02A, p. 562)


In facing the problem of the relation between the written law of Moses and the ‘higher’ law, i.e. non-arbitrary law, demanded by Greek philosophy, Philo was confronted by a dilemma. If he accepted the existence of a kind of ‘higher’ law he was in danger of rendering the law of Moses superfluous; if he did not accept its existence the law of Moses would be arbitrary. In an attempt to find a way out, Philo linked together all forms of higher law (the law of nature, the unwritten law, the *nomos empsychos*) so that they almost became one. The law of Moses is then conceived as a ‘true copy’ of this higher law. It helps to guide the weak and the ordinary people who are not by themselves in a position to be an unwritten law or a *nomos empsychos*. In this way the law of Moses is clearly linked with the higher law without becoming superfluous or only of secondary importance. It is a vision of law unique in the ancient world. (RvdB)

An occasional paper presented in the context of the research centre for Hellenistic–Jewish studies in Rome (see SPH A 2 (1990) 228). De fuga is one of Philo’s most systematic treatises because it has a clearly defined didactic-methodological goal. Its function becomes clear if it is read in conjunction with Congr. and Mut. in a sequence which is not only determined by the continuity of the biblical text (Gen. 16:1–6 in Congr., Gen. 16:6–14 in Fug., Gen. 17:1–11 in Mut.), but also by the complementarity of themes dealt with, which are presented as stages in the same formative-educative process, i.e. propaedeutics represented by Abraham, asceticism represented by Jacob, contemplation represented by Isaac. The author emphasizes the great influence that Fug. had in Christian thought, and mentions as concrete example the De doctrina christiana of Augustine. (RR)


The analysis carried out in this article focuses especially on the history of Platonism and Philo’s place therein. Martín holds that the relation between Plato and Philo should be evaluated from at least four points of view: topological (i.e. the citations of Plato found in Philo), epistemological, comparative/historical, and systematic or properly philosophical. In the case of the fourth area, which is particularly broad in its connotations, he intends not to furnish definitive results, but rather simply to indicate some lines of research. His basic thesis is that, ‘just as the Timaeus is central for the theme of creation and the Phaedrus for the doctrine of man, so the Sophist has this place for ontology and dialectic’ (83). A detailed analysis of the Platonic text and the corresponding passages in Philo leads to the conclusion that Philo’s synthesis of the Timaeus and Genesis is systematically incompatible with Plato’s Sophist. This is so because in the latter the Absolute is constituted through a movement of relations between supreme genera, where in the former relations are constituted through the action of an Absolute which is transcendent and inscrutable. (RR)


Argues on the basis on an examination of 14 conceptual pairs of themes that the nucleus of Augustine’s idea of the two cities goes back to Philo. Biblical pairs such as Abel and Cain, Sarah and Hagar etc. are not only related to themselves, but also to the themes of two citzenships and two moral paths in history. Both in Augustine and in Philo there is a tendency to confuse two schemes, that of evil versus good and nature versus grace. Martín declines to answer the question whether there was a direct dependence of Augustine on Philo, but does assert that so far scholarship has not asked the right questions on this issue. (DTR)

It is generally agreed that there is a divergence between Philo and Josephus on the one hand and the Gospel authors on the other in their portrayal of Pontius Pilate. In the view of the author, however, there is no flagrant contradiction between our three sources. Although not specially incompetent and not a monster, Pilate was unable and unwilling to avoid situations of serious friction with the Jews. (RvdB)


A section is devoted to Philo as part of a comprehensive account of the foundations of Western, i.e. Christian, mysticism. Philo is regarded as one of ‘central philosophers whose thought is both representative of the time and also directly relevant to Latin Christian mysticism (35)’ (the others are Plotinus and Proclus). (DTR)


The title of this long and important analysis of the relation between the Quaestiones and the Treatises (i.e. primarily the Allegorical Commentary) is explained through the authors’ conviction that the Treatises have a fully developed dynamic quality which gives them force and movement, whereas the Quaestiones are static and fragmented, like ‘note-cards’. The difference is compared to that between grammar and the style of a masterpiece. Chronological considerations are of secondary importance. It is the literary genre that differentiates them. The authors illustrate their thesis with extensive analyses of Philonic texts which can be subdivided as follows: (a) a profile of QG 1 (including a list of parallel of passages); (b) reflections on the structure of Leg., allowing comparison between the two works; (c) comparison of Leg. 3.75-104 with QG 1.47-48; (d) comparison of QG 1.57-99 with Gig.-Deus; (e) analyses of QG 2-3; (f) extensive analyses of QG 4 (note esp. long passages on §1, 2, 8), including extensive comparison with parallel passages in other Philonic works; (g) brief remarks on QG 5-6 (i.e. 4.71-245 Aucher). The article is concluded with a final analogy. The Quaestiones are not to be viewed as notes containing preliminary materials for a treatise. They are to be compared with a catechism, solid and elementary, allowing the meaning to be preserved and Faith to be guarded. The Treatises in contrast form a theology, more ambitious and more suited for infusing the truth of Reason into the human mind, but at the same time making maximum demands on the reader. The two series are unequal in value, for "‘Philo’ is himself only in the Treatises (225)." (DTR)


A study on Jews in Egypt from the time of Joseph until the 2nd century CE can hardly avoid making frequent reference to Philo, even if in the foreword the author declares that he will place the emphasis on documents less well known than the LXX and Philo. From p. 131 onwards the story of the Jews under Roman rule is told, with interesting information on Philo’s family at 150-151. (DTR)

Philo appears on the stage in at least two works of modern English literature, in Charles Kingsley’s novel Hypatia (1853), and Francis Warner’s play Light Shadows (1979). Mendelson examines the role that Philo plays in both works and draws some conclusions on his role as a Jew. Kingsley uses systematic stereotyping, in which social and theological views coincide. In Warner social stereotyping has disappeared, but Philo and his co-religionists are still regarded as theologically immature. (DTR)


In this book the Philonic references with a few exceptions are confined to Part I: Curse and anathema—the Jewish horizon. After a semantic field analysis of the Pauline passages studied, the author looks for Jewish parallel material which he finds also in Philo’s writings. Lists of the Philonic texts pertaining to the concept of ‘curse’ are given on pp. 347–348, 352–357, 361–62 and 369–70. Praem. 79–172 is analyzed on pp. 49–52. According to the author the paraenetic feature of Deut 27–30, commented upon in the passage, has been sharpened. The aim of the treatise seems to be to exhort the fellow Jews to follow the law ‘in order to prepare for the turning of the ages, with the curse and blessing motif as an important element’ (p. 52). Leg. 3 is basically an exposition of the curses in Gen 3. ‘By relating the curse to pleasure, sense-perception and actions, Philo manages to establish the curses...as exhortations toward covenantal obedience’ (p. 87). Several texts are found in Philo where curse and blessing form antitheses (p. 96–97). Philo also refers to texts (e.g. Gen 12:3) containing promises to the Gentiles (e.g. Migr. 118–126, p. 107). When Philo in Spec. 1.315–318 refers to Deut. 13:1–11 demanding the putting to death of the prophet who propagates apostasy, this killing ‘seems to take the form of lynching’ (p. 135). See further the provisional bibliography 1994 below for the published version of this thesis. (KGS)


Chapter 4 situates Origen within his Greek philosophical context (Plato, Philo). In chapter 5 Origen’s dependence on Philo’s De Somniis is also discussed. (RvdB, based on DA 53-08A, p. 2856)


In his exhaustive study on the sources of Augustine’s doctrine of the two cities Van Oort examines the claim that Augustinus had been influenced in this respect by (Neo)-
Platonism, esp. Philo and Plotinus. It is concluded that there is some superficial resemblance between (Neo)-platonic thought and Augustine. But no parallels are found for the most characteristic elements of Augustine’s doctrine, namely (1) that the two societies are absolutely antithetical, and (2) that they have an origin and a progress in time. Augustine must have derived these elements from another source. (RvdB)


A section is devoted to Philo as part of a comprehensive account of biblical exegesis during the first three centuries of the Church and of Alexandrian exegesis up to the fifth century. (DTR)


Philo plays an extremely important role in the history of the Cain–Abel theme, because through his exegetical commentaries the biblical brothers are transformed into universal rival and contending principles. This approach is followed by Ambrose and Augustine. (DTR)


Radice offers arguments against the conventional view that Philo cannot possibly have played a role in the development of the Middle Platonist doctrine of the ideas as thoughts of God, even though he is the first to record it. He postulates a double Platonist tradition, one purely Greek, the other Jewish-Alexandrian. Philo developed the notion of the ideas as thoughts of God as the result of his exposition of Mosaic thought. His location in Alexandria at the cross-roads of various philosophical tendencies meant that Greek philosophers must have been acquainted with his works, and so he was able to act as a catalyst in the development of Middle Platonist thought. Radice refers for further details to his monograph reviewed by D. Winston in SPhA 4 (1992) 159–164. (DTR)


Various reflections on the portrait of the theoretic or contemplative life of the Therapeutae such as it is presented in Contempl. According to Riaud their perfect way of life represents the goal of philosophy such as Philo conceived it. (DTR)

In chapter 2 the author compares the description of the Tabernacle court and superstructure by Flavius Josephus to, among others, Philo. It is concluded that Josephus shows close acquaintance with Philo's *Life of Moses*. (RvdB, based on DA 53-07A, p. 2504)


Important monograph, produced as part of the preparations for an edition of the Fragments of Philo. Royse sifts out all those fragmentary texts that have been erroneously attributed to Philo in modern scholarship. At the same time he furnishes much valuable information about the transmission of less well-known parts of the Philonic corpus. For a more detailed account of the book's contents the reader is referred to the review article in *SPhA* 4 (1992) 78-86. In an Appendix Royse gives tables for all the major collections of Greek fragments so far published. This has now been complemented by a reverse index in *SPhA* 5 (1993) 156-179. (DTR)


Taking his cue from L. Früchtel, Royse shows that the original Greek text of the passage can be almost entirely reconstructed on the basis of two quotations in the *Sacra Parallela*. On the basis of this text he makes comments on the Armenian translation and argues against Petit that, when Philo states that *τὸ ἐπὶ εἰρήνα* contains the Greek adage *μηδὲν ὤγον* (nothing to excess), he is referring to Mosaic scripture. (DTR)


Printed editions of the LXX, based primarily on Christian mss., render the Tetragrammaton νῖβαθ as κύριος, and νιβαθ as θεός. But evidence of Jewish practice accumulated during the last century indicates that there was considerable variety in the way the Tetragrammaton was dealt with in written form. Royse examines the evidence allowing us to determine what Philo read in his mss. and what he himself wrote, and comes to the following conclusions: (1) in the biblical texts he read the Tetragrammaton was written in palaeo-Hebrew or Aramaic letters and not translated by κύριος; (2) his own written use of κύριος is consistent with having read such texts and having pronounced the Tetragrammaton as κύριος; (3) his remarks at Mos. 2.114 and 2.132 can be explained if we suppose that he saw the Tetragrammaton untranslated in the text he had before him. (DTR)

Compares vocabulary of the novelist with, inter alia, Philo. Finds that it coincides more with Plutarch, Josephus and Philo than with Diodorus of Sicily and Dio of Prusa, the other authors used. This leads to a dating c. 100 AD. (DTR)


Philo's Quaestiones answer exegetical questions posed on Genesis and Exodus taken in the sequence of the biblical text. The paper addresses the question to what extent other biblical texts are referred to in the course of the exegesis (a practice that is fundamental to Philo's method in the Allegorical Commentary). In total 100 examples of such 'secondary texts' are found. These are analysed from various points of view. It is concluded that the use of such texts in the Quaestiones is strictly limited. They are used primarily to illustrate or confirm interpretations that Philo puts forward. For only about two-thirds of the examples parallels can be found elsewhere in the Philonic corpus. This shows that the Quaestiones have an independent position among Philo's writings, and do not have a merely preparatory character. (DTR)


Gives text and translation, together with detailed commentary, of the four letters of the desert father Isidore of Pelusium (370–435) in which Philo is explicitly named (Ep. 2.143, 270, 3.19, 3.81), and also of a fifth letter (4.176), the contents of which is clearly based on Mos. It emerges that Isidore possessed a more than superficial acquaintance with Philo's thought and writings. In two letters Philo's status as a Jew is emphasized. Isidore uses him as an effective weapon in his contest with contemporary Judaism. (DTR)


As everyone knows, Philo gives much valuable information as a witness on the beginnings of Middle Platonism. But did he participate in and contribute to that tradition himself? The paper makes a start on examining the extent to which Philo may have played a role in the development of Neoplatonism. In the first part a status quaestionis is given, particularly on the relation between Philo and Plotinus. In the second part a survey is given on the survival of Philo's writings. The third part concentrates on a specific example, namely the theme of God as ð'ε'σ'τ'ο'ς ('the standing one'). It is argued that Plotinus' use of the concept goes back to Philo probably via Numenius. In conclusion it is asserted that the entire question is very difficult, but that the burden of proof in this
question must lie with those who argue that Philo had no influence on the Neoplatonic tradition whatsoever. (DTR)


How reliable are the texts of Cohn-Wendland and Colson which almost all Philonists use? This question is posed in the case of De virtutibus. This treatise has a complex mss. history. The paper examines the evidence of the direct and indirect tradition, and also looks at the problems surrounding the title and the structure of the work (i.e. which parts did it originally consist of). It is concluded that Philonists may consider themselves fortunate that the job of editing has been competently done, but that there are no grounds for complacency. Serious research cannot just be based on translations, but must take text and critical apparatus into account. (DTR)


The third volume of The Studia Philonica Annual deviates from earlier volumes in that it almost entirely consists of articles written by scholars in honour of Earle Hilgert, former editor of Studia Philonica, who in 1991 retired from his professorship at McCormick Theological Seminary. A photo of the honoree is placed opposite the title page. All but two of the articles focus on Philo, and thus are summarized in this bibliography. (DTR)


Bibliography of Philonic studies primarily for the year 1988 (68 items), with addenda for 1987 (9 items). As the introductory blurb states (347): what ... would be a more suitable way to conclude a Festschrift for Earle Hilgert than with a bibliography of Philonic studies? (DTR)


Pagan religion had an attractive force on many Jews in the Hellenistic and Imperial era. Philo wrestles with the question in several texts. This shows that it was a real problem among Jews in Alexandria. To Philo idolatry is a deification of created things and it is also closely connected with passions. It is dangerous because those who have invented the pagan myths have had the intention to make the God who really exists to be consigned to oblivion. Jews in Alexandria confronted idolatry in several contexts: gymnasia, sportive contests and the theatre. Philo made actualizations of different Biblical passages which gave him the opportunity to take a warning stand against idolatry in its various forms. (KGS)

Extensive use is made of Philonic evidence for the reconstruction of what the author calls ‘common Judaism’, and esp. for the role of diaspora Judaism therein. For further details see the review article by A. Mendelson in this volume. (DTR)


The author concentrates especially on the term σόχυσις (confusion) which Philo deals with in *Conf.* 187 in relation to the biblical episode of the construction of the tower of Babel. The term in question shows a semantic affinity with Sap. 10:5, and particularly with the concept of ὁμόνως πνημίας (the concord of evil). For this reason the σόχυσις of which Philo speaks can be interpreted as the confusion which God arouses in the planning of evil by malevolent men. Such confusion is necessary so that the good will triumph. (RR)


In the chapter on priesthood in the literature outside the New Testament a section is devoted to Philo’s views on priesthood. A distinction is made between Philo’s description of actual priesthood and his symbolic interpretation of it. In his description Philo does not diverge significantly from the Old Testament tradition. In his symbolic interpretation the high priest symbolises the Logos that is the mediator between God and man. The universal priesthood of the people of Israel during the Passover is interpreted as a portrayal of the soul’s progress towards God. This spiritual priesthood requires a spiritual sacrifice in the form of prayer. Although Philo does not discard animal sacrifice, he values prayer as the superior form of sacrifice. (RvdB)


As part of the background to Origen’s views on the life and nature of the stars a short chapter is included on Philo. Scott lists and briefly discusses the more important Philonic passages on his subject. Philo does much to accommodate himself to the prevailing philosophical climate, and so comes close to regarding the stars as divine. ‘He follows the conventions of his day in honouring the stars, but he both too good a Jew and too good a Platonist to take this to its logical consequences (74).’ Differently than Origen, however, Philo does not recognize the possibility of evil in heaven. (DTR)


In aiming to further an understanding of the soteriological significance of the Christ event through a traditio-historical study of Yom Kippur, chapter 2 examines the understanding of Yom Kippur in various Second Temple authors, including Philo. (DTR; based on DA 52-02A p. 569)

A brief introduction to the possibilities that computers offer for studying ancient Greek texts, written at a non-specialist level. For Philonists two aspects are particularly interesting: Skarsten furnishes further information on the KWIC-concordance to Philo’s works being produced in Norway (see further SPHA 2 (1990) 112–115); various examples are given to support his conviction that the work De aeternitate mundi is pseudo-Philonic. The author refers to the unpublished version of his doctoral thesis, which was missed in our earlier bibliographies: Forfatterproblemet ved De aeternitate mundi i Corpus Philonicum (diss. Bergen 1987). (DTR)


In order to investigate and understand some Jewish texts dealing with violence against non-conformers to the Torah, the author applies the model of vigilantism as a heuristic device. The specific texts dealt with are Philo Spec. 1.54–57; 1.315–318, 2-252–254, and the Lukan Acts 6:8ff; 21:15–36 and 23:12–15. The study contains three chapters. In the first it is argued that the selected texts of Philo confirm the hypothesis that, when central aspects of the Jewish constitution were endangered by fellow-Jews, Philo endorsed that they should be taken away on the spot. No court procedures are to be invoked, the zealous persons are to consider themselves as performing all the duties of a court and should kill the perpetrator without further delay. In the second chapter several aspects of the first century Mediterranean world are pointed out as probable bases of plausibility for apostasy and vigilantism. In the third and last chapter, the selected texts from the Acts of the Apostles are investigated and found to provide evidence of zealotic vigilantism in Jerusalem in the first century, and that Stephen and Paul should be considered as victims of such vigilantism. In the cases against both Stephen and Paul Diaspora Jews were involved, increasing the relevance of the Philonic texts. But the scenario in Jerusalem was also heavily influenced by the social situation of the Jews in general and of the Christian Jews in Jerusalem in particular resulting from the growing tendencies of pervasive factionalism. The study has a bibliography, but no indexes. (Abstract supplied by author)


This short article attempts to explain the inconsistency between the depiction of Sarah’s relation to her husband Abraham in Genesis and in 1 Pet 3:6b by the fact that the author, shocked by the behaviour of Sarah, tried to turn her into an ideal Hellenistic wife. The treatment of Sarah by Philo and Josephus is discussed in order to show that this ambiguity of feelings towards Sarah was shared by contemporaries. (RvdB)

To Philo justice (τὸ δίκαιον) is the overarching ethical principle and at the same time identical with God’s covenant. Given the hierarchical view of existence maintained by both Greeks and Jews alike, Philo thinks it δίκαιον when the better rules and the worse is ruled. This principle of justice determines the relations of man to God, man to man and man to nature. The appropriate form of δίκαιοςθένη for a man in his relation to inferior beings is φιλανθρωπία in combination with mercy (τὸ ἔλεος) and pity (τὸ ὀίκτον), unless one has broken the law. Such an action means that one has acted deliberately against the best interest of Israel as God’s covenant people. This helps us to understand Philo’s attitude to women, which seems rather inconsistent at first sight. Women, lacking reason, are inferior to men. As long as they allow to be ruled by men and do not break the law, men should show philanthropy, mercy and pity to them. As soon as women start to be assertive or immodest however, not accepting their inferior role, they should be punished most severely, because they threaten the greater good. (RvdB)


Philo’s perception is included in this survey of references and allusions to the Phineas story, which concentrates on the implications concerning the nature of the offence which triggered Phineas’ heroic reaction. For Philo Phineas and the Midianite women represent moral paradigms of universal significance, i.e. good versus evil. (DTR)


Argues that if we are to understand the raison d’être of the Quaestiones, we have to determine their place within the Philonic corpus and especially their relation to the Allegorical Commentary. Sterling bases his verdict on a detailed examination of the first book of QG, which is compared with the corresponding sections of the Allegorical Commentary. He concludes that the undoubted difference in emphasis between the two is to be explained through the fact that in the Quaestiones Philo wanted to present all the options, where in the Allegorical Commentary he wrote from a definite perspective. This means that the Quaestiones can be regarded as the prolegomena to the Allegoriae, and that they should therefore be intensively used in interpreting the latter. (DTR)


Teleseca examines the text of Fug. 157-160 and the parallel passage of Ambrose, Ep. III (67) 3-7 in order to demonstrate by means of the method of ‘schematic’ analysis the structural analogy that exists between them. On the basis of this confrontation, which takes into account various levels of significance, i.e. biblical/exegetical, symbolic, and theological, it is concluded that Philo, despite appearances to the contrary, was able to express his own doctrinal contributions in a much more ordered way than Ambrose. The same comparison also reveals the remarkable ability of the allegorical method to express new kinds of meaning—in Ambrose’s case in the area of christology—even though it makes use of the same symbolic elements. (RR)

In order to determine the chronology of the Quaestiones within the Philonic corpus it is necessary to make a careful examination of the internal cross-references given by Philo himself. Terian examines such passages, many of which had been adduced by earlier scholars, and concludes that ‘textual arguments that do not allow the Quaestiones to stand at the beginning of Philo’s exegetical commentaries can no longer be maintained. Except for references to the Ἔρημος ἄρημα, Philo is altogether silent in the Quaestiones about his other works. These should thus be regarded as the earliest of his exegetical commentaries (46).’ (DTR)


Eight interpolations in the Armenian text of the Quaestiones in Exodum are identified and analysed. Five of these were already present in the Greek text translated by the Armenian translator. Terian argues that these betray the same hand as three interpolations in the text of De animalibus. This scribe seems to have become frustrated by the extremes of Philo’s allegorical practice, and so from time to time could resist undermining the text he was copying out. (DTR)


Philo uses the term τέλος very extensively in his writings and in a variety of contexts. Two of these can be adduced to illuminate Paul’s usage in Rom. 10:4: (1) the context of metaphors of seeking or striving toward a goal; (2) the context that speaks more specifically about the goal of the Law. (DTR)


Even though the possibility that man has to know, and therefore also to speak, about God is limited in absolute terms, he is at least able to recognize God’s unicity and, in consequence thereof, also his sovereignty. In this description philosophical principles of Platonic and Stoic doctrine are expressed: from Platonism the affirmation that God is cause of good alone; from Stoicism the conception of God as king of the cosmic megalopolis. It is possible to derive from these two philosophical orientations respectively the
transcendent role of God-king and the immanent aspects of his sovereignty. The meeting point of these two tendencies is the Jewish conception of the monarch who shows justice, mercy and solicitude for his subjects. From the theological viewpoint the view is translated into the doctrine of the two powers, one beneficent/creative, the other royal/sovereign (pp. 226ff.). Philo holds that the royalty of God stands at the basis of every form of human monarchy, including the empire of Rome (cf. 241ff.), and also, in particular, the superiority of the wise man, of whom Abraham and Moses are examples (pp. 252ff.). (RR)


The author returns to the subject she dealt with earlier at R-R 8250. Philo has no interest in women as a subject for sustained discussion, yet he expresses his opinions on ‘the female’ at every turn. This depiction owes far more to Greek ideas, mediated through Hellenistic culture, than to the Jewish Scripture he inherited from his ancestors. His views on mind as a male attribute and sense-perception as a female attribute can be traced back to Aristotelian science and Pythagorean dichotomies. Moreover Philo often insults women beyond the needs of the context or describes their positive traits as male rather than female, contradicting the ‘Jewish’ interpretations of these texts. But Philo does assign a positive value to women in his treatment of procreation, and it may be suggested that ‘Philo’s true attitude to women was one of ambivalence —perhaps even cognitive dissonance—rather than the misogyny that seems to inform most of his theoretical statements about the female (50-51).’ (DTR)


The Sabbath functioned for Philo in diverse important theological, cosmological, philosophical, religious and social roles. Weiss collects all the evidence that he can muster in Philo’s writings and discusses it under the headings of (a) the significance of the observance, (b) the significance of the number, and (c) the significance of the Sabbath (i.e. as a period of rest). In the final section nine conclusions are drawn, of which we mention only the last: Philo did not consider the Sabbath ‘a cornerstone of Jewish practice’ (Mendelson). (DTR)


Further material in the on-going discussion on Philo’s relation to the Epistle to the Hebrews. (DTR)


Winston gives a synoptic account of Philo’s views on the origin and status of language. Philo has a general theory of language which is derived from Greek philosophical speculation, but is nonetheless marked by various adaptations made in order to suit it to the scriptural account. Philo thus follows his philosophical master Plato in having a deep distrust of language and the written word. On the other hand his praise of the accuracy of the Septuagint translation seems informed by propagandistic motives. And when he claims that Mosaic names differ in no way from the external object they represent, this can only be read as an exaggerated attempt to emphasize the absolute precision of Mosaic name-making, for this statement clearly transgresses the bounds of his own epistemological principles. (DTR)


The Hebrew expression translated in ἐγό εἰμι ὁ ὄν (Ex. 3:14) certainly did not have a philosophical content in the original biblical version, but simply expressed God’s presence and his freedom. Nevertheless this expression concerning God, when combined with the other divine characteristics of unity, majesty and transcendence, was open to a metaphysical interpretation (in the sense of a spiritual Being who is pure and absolute) which is first historically realized in Philo. Philo deals with this biblical text about thirty times and builds on it a theology with a transcendent orientation. Its principal doctrines are the distinction between the existence of God and his essence, which is unknowable for man, and the theory of the Logos as creator, in which biblical, Stoic and Platonic themes flow together (41ff.). Philo’s contribution, broadly speaking, consisted in the translation of the foundations of the Jewish faith into the dualistic-transcendent ontology of Plato. (RR)


This thesis is devoted to the hapax legomenon in 1 Thess. 4:9 theodidaktoi. Within this scope attention is paid to the use of autodidaktos by Philo. (RvdB, based on DA 53-04C, p. 627)


Frequent reference is made to Philo throughout this massive commentary on an anti-Gnostic document found at Nag Hammadi. Various threads are drawn together in the concluding section at pp. 516–522. The connections of Silvanus with Philo are paralleled in his relation to Clement and Origen, so that one may speak of an ‘Alexandrian’ type of theology. (DTR)
Addenda 1989–90


A comprehensive study on Philo’s rhetorical argumentation and the role that rhetoric plays in the composition of his treatises. In the first part Alexandre gives a full account of the background of rhetorical theory and practice in the Greco-Roman world and of Philo’s own theory of rhetorical argumentation. In the second part he focusses on how these theories are put into practice in Philo’s own writings, organizing his examples under three headings: (a) formal structure of a discourse; (b) structures of a complete argument; (c) rhythmic and periodic structures (for this section see also the 1991 article summarized above). An English summary of the main theses is provided at pp. 339-346. See further the review by J. P. Martin at SPhA 4 (1992) 156–157. (DTR)


The Judaism in the first century AD was diverse. The topic of this essay is an analysis of various practices and views on temple and sabbath which existed in the Alexandrian Jewish community reflected in Philo’s writings. Moreover, an examination of the debate and conflicts on temple and sabbath among Jews in Alexandria may throw light upon similar debates and conflicts reflected in Acts and the Gospel of John. Accordingly, this essay illustrates how debate and conflicts reflected in Philo’s writings can throw light upon aspects of the New Testament, just as the New Testament can illuminate aspects of Philo’s writings. (KGS, based on author’s abstract)


Five of the 28 studies reprinted in this volume refer to Philo in the title: IX (The Transcendence of God in Philo: Some Possible Sources, = R-R 7513); X (Philo and the Stoic Doctrine of Eupatheiai, written in collaboration with A. Terian, = R-R 7713; XI Ganymede as the Logos: Traces of a Forgotten Allegorisation in Philo? = R-R 8011); XVIII Plotinus, Philo and Origen on the Grades of Virtue = R-R 8328); XX (The Theory of Three Classes of Men in Plotinus and in Philo, cf. SPhA 4 (1992) 103). Philo is also mentioned in some other studies; see index p. 3 at the end of the volume. (DTR)


Eschatological pilgrimage in the terminology of this study has to do with the view that on the day of judgment those scattered in exile will return to Zion. The study deals
in particular with the question whether the gentiles that turn to the God of Israel in the end times are fully regarded as proselytes or rather as ‘righteous gentiles’. Two texts by Philo, *Praem.* 164-72 and *Mos.* 2.43-44 are discussed and it is concluded that it is unlikely that Philo’s text provides any solid evidence for a proselyte view of eschatological pilgrimage on the part of gentiles. ‘Language apparently ‘proselyte’ in form is used to describe something closer to ‘righteous gentiles’ in substance (16).’ (RvdB)


In the course of a wide-ranging argument against the existence of communal, fixed prayer prior to age of the Rabbis, the author surveys a range of ancient authors, including Philo, in order to demonstrate that during the period of the Second Temple the synagogue served not as a place of prayer but as a forum for public gathering and for the study of Law. (DS)


There is an undoubted tendency to idealize Rome and its Empire in both Philo and Josephus, even if they give accurate denunciations of abuses that take place (61ff.). This appreciation is due to the realization that Rome’s military and political power, together with its judicial organization, was in a position to guarantee freedom of worship, which in the time of Philo was more important to Jews than political freedom. (RR)


The author examines briefly Philo’s attitude toward language and concludes that he saw human language by its very nature as an obstacle to thought and the multiplicity of languages as yet a further encumbrance. Despite the title of the article, very little space is devoted to the story of Babel and its exegesis. (DS)

Philo's thoughts on the Ideas as God's thoughts need to be included in this survey of the theme in the Greek Church Fathers, the author argues, because he so clearly influenced later developments. A short presentation of Philonic texts is given, with the chief emphasis on Opif. With regard to the sources of Philo's usage, Lilla sees a coalescence of Platonic and Stoic elements which go back to both Antiochus and Posidonius. (DTR)


Somn. 1.30ff is analysed as part of a wide-ranging examination of doxographies on the nature and parts of the soul. Philo used either an academic source or a source of the Placita older than the Vetusta Placita postulated by Diels. (DTR)


Five references to Philo are taken up in this comprehensive bibliography on Pythagoras and Pythagoreanism in the ancient world; see index on p. 378. (DTR)


Although Philo does not possess the concept of the Canon as a technical term with reference to Scripture, there can be no doubt that he regards the Pentateuch as of superior status to the rest of the Hebrew bible, as is evidenced by the fact that of the 1161 citations of the Bible in Philo only 41 do not deal with the Pentateuch. Tied to this is Philo's mechanical conception of prophetic inspiration, in which the personality of the prophet is reduced to zero and he is regarded as nothing but the instrument of God. (RR)


In investigating the differences between the lists of the sons of Jacob/tribes of Israel in the OT, the author also pays attention to other, extra-biblical, sources containing such lists, among which Philo is included. (RvdB, based on DA 51-05A p.1663)


The article concentrates on the final part of the text under discussion: τὰ μὲν γενόμενα ὡς ἔγευμοντα, τὰ δ' ὡς ὑπήκοα καὶ γεννησόμενα. The author's starting point is the emendation of the text suggested by Cohn and the defence of the traditional text by Colson, with which she agrees. Philo's text is then interpreted in the light of his general doctrine of creation, and particularly his view of matter, which sometimes seems to have been created, but at other times pre-exists the same creation process. (RR)

There exists evidence that some Jews did participate in pagan cult during the time of the Greek and the Roman hegemonies in the eastern Mediterranean area. Examples may be shown of clear deviations from the basic Jewish principle not to mingle with heathen devotional activities both inside the Jewish realm (Maccabees) and outside it (papyri and inscriptions). In some instances Jews were forced to join pagan cult, in other cases they did it without external pressure. In Wisdom and in Philo we find a polemical attitude towards such behaviour. Jews were also in a more indirect way brought under pagan influence by athletic contests and theatre, education in the gymnasia and adjustment to architectural and artistic endeavours. (KGS)


Argues that approaches to Paul's Adam Christology in terms of Gnostic or Philonic thought are inadequate. (RvdB, based on DA 51-07A, p. 2427)


'Philo's histories [in Flacc. and Legat.] are frequently quite enjoyably read or heard read, but this enjoyment sometimes results from a willingness to depart from the facts in order to make the story more dramatic. This, apparently, did not bother Philo, because he was out to write enjoyable and didactic historical historical novels (119).' Apologetic aims too frequently interfere with Philo's historiography. (DTR)


The book contains a series of detailed analyses of texts from Antiquity describing the figure of Pontius Pilate. The basic authors analyzed are Philo, Josephus and the writers of the Gospels of the New Testament. The Philonic text given special attention is *Legat.* 298-305. Willert here like in the writings of Josephus detects political as well as religious tendencies. In his book, probably meant for Emperor Claudius, Philo wants to denounce the political order of having a Roman prefect stationed in Palestine. According to Willert neither Tiberius nor Pilate were anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish by principle. In some of their actions disapproved of by the Jews we may see examples of a nascent Emperor-cult instead. (KGS)

Attention is devoted to similarities and differences between the author of the Wisdom of Solomon and Philo on the theme of the sage as mystic. (DTR)


The author claims among other things that the traditions of II Peter and Philo on the doctrine of Scripture are not as different from Paul as is often supposed. (RvdB, based on DA 53-03A, p. 846)


25 textual notes, of which two on Philo. (DTR, based on *APh* 62 (1991) no. 14635)
SUPPLEMENT

A PROVISIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY 1992–94

The user of this supplementary bibliography of very recent articles on Philo is 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.
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D. Boyarin, ‘This we know to be the Carnal Israel’, Critical Inquiry 18 (1992).


D. I. Brewer, Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 C. E., TSAJ 30 (Tübingen 1992), esp. 198–212.


E. Dassmann et al., Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum, Lieferung 122 (Stuttgart 1992).


J. D. Dawson, Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria (Berkeley 1992)

D. Delia, Alexandrian Citizenship During the Roman Principate, American Classical Studies 23 (Atlanta 1992).


R. Feldmeier, Christen als Fremden in 1 Petrusbrief, WUNT 64 (Tübingen 1992).


P. A. MEIJER, *Plotinus On the Good or the One* (*Enneads VI,9*), Amsterdam Classical Monographs 1 (Amsterdam 1992), esp. 326–328.
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