

Thesis for Graduation

Hebrew Union College

Philo as Exegete.

Frederick Gohn B.A.

Cincinnati, O.

May 8, 1896.

To
My Friend ^{and} Teacher
Rev. Morris Sessler
This Thesis
Is Gratefully Inscribed.

Preface.

We shall confine ourselves in these pages to an exclusive study of Philo as Exegete, touching only incidentally, as occasion may require, upon his importance as philosopher, moralist, historian, or other phases of his many-sided activity. We shall endeavor to obtain a clear insight into his peculiar method of interpreting the Sacred Scriptures, to understand its distinctive character, to inquire into the causes that produced it, and to as-

certain the results to which it lead.

In the study and preparation of our subject we have derived valuable assistance from Joel's "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie," Drummond's "Philo Judaeus, the Jewish Alexandrian Philosopher," Schürer's "Geschichte der jüdischen Völker im Zeitalter Jesu Christi," Frankel's "Ueber Palästinische und Alexandrinische Schriftforschung," and Jeller's "Philosophie der Griechen."

Besides ~~these~~ principal authorities we have also consulted the following; - Hamburger's "Real En-

cyclopedies; "Encyclopedia Britannica";
 Ritter's "Philos und die Halacha"; Holz-
 mann's "Neutestamentliche Gese-
 schichte"; Montefiore's "Flouilegium
 Philonis" in "Jewish Quarterly Review";
 also Drummond's review of L. F. Co-
 nybeare's "De Vita Contemplativa" in
 same periodical; Ueberweg's "Gesch-
 ichte der Philosophie"; Windelband's
 "History of Philosophy"; Kuno Fischer's
 "History of Modern Philosophy"; Erd-
 mann's "History of Philosophy"; Myer's
 "Outlines of Ancient History"; Pohl's
 "Lecnon and Text of Old Testament";
 Josephus' "Antiquities of the Jews".

Other authors, incidentally referred to, have been given due credit in the foot-notes.

For the main material elaborated in these pages, we are almost wholly indebted to Philo himself. His complete works, with the exception of a few treatises accessible only in the Greek or Latin, have been thoroughly read and carefully studied by us, and have been made the chief basis of our entire presentation. We have followed Drummond's method, in letting Philo, wherever possible, speak for himself.

The treatment, we believe, is in many respects entirely original. What others have been content to set forth only in a general way, we have treated more in detail. The examples and illustrations are all our own.

Though much of the same ground is covered by Frankel, perhaps even in a similar manner, our own work had been independently done before that scholar's excellent monograph was put into our hands.

Siegfried's famous book "Philo

als Ausleger des Alten Testaments", could not be secured until too late to be available. Moreover, as its subject was identical with our own we preferred not to consult it at all.

We are, of course, conscious of the fact that its existence makes our own feeble effort quite superfluous. Yet in apology it may be said, that this production has a special 'raison d'être' of its own! "Norunt initiati!"

Pluto's assuring words have been our constant encouragement,

"It is well to be content if by assiduity in investigation it is granted to thee to arrive at a correct conception of the objects of thy search."^[29]

And this contentment will be complete if only a charitable criticism will withhold those dreadful, dampening words of Horace "Parturient montes, nascitur ridiculus mus!"

Note. The references, unless otherwise stated in the notes, are to the volume and page of Yonge's English translation of Philo in the

"Bohn's Ecclesiastical Library" edition.

[A. D. Yonge, B. A., 4 Vols., London, 1854-55]

This translation is based on the text of Mangey. It has been used by us as most easily accessible and most generally serviceable.

For treatises omitted in Yonge's translation, and especially for references and comparison with Greek text, we have used the Leipzig stereotyped edition, which is also based on Mangey. [4 Vols.

Leipzig, 1851-53, Caroli Tanchnitii.]

Frederick Bohn.

Cincinnati,

May 8, 1896.

Table of Contents

Chap. I. Occupation, Writings, and Publication of the Exegete. pp. 1-19

Chap. II. General Scope, Method, and Character of Exegesis. pp. 20-37

Chap. III. Allegorical Exegesis. Its Origin and Character. pp. 37-56.

Chap. IV. Its Method. pp. 56-93.

Chap. V. Its Causes. pp. 93-117.

Chap. VI. Philo's Attitude towards the Literal. pp. 117-142.

Chapter I.

"Occupation, Writings, and Public of the Exegete."

Philo's activity as Exegete was developed in connection with his labors of expounding and interpreting the Sacred Writings of his people. The circumstances under which he produced his works are quite peculiar and perhaps unique. As far as we can make out from the scant biographical notices in Josephus, Eusebius, Jerome, etc., and from occasional references to himself contained in his own writings, Philo was neither Rabbi, nor teacher, nor in

as Myrus, however, alludes to him as 'a famous Rabbi!' 'Outline of Ancient History' p. 44.

any capacity, public or private, that would naturally cause him to be engaged in literary occupations, or that would prompt the production of such writings. It is true that in such a cultured and intellectual centre as his own Alexandria (4¹⁰³)^{or} public lectures were delivered almost every day on various subjects, especially on philosophy and ethics (4¹¹⁹) in the famous museum built for that purpose by the first of the Alexandrian Diadochae, the magnificent Ptolemy Soter. These lectures Philo frequently attended (1⁴⁶⁹) and he

αὐτὴν ἡμετέραν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν' (Leg. ad Caj. 22)

has even left us an interesting and amusing description of the manner in which one of them was received by the populace, (2¹⁷⁰) but nowhere are we informed or led to infer that Philo himself ever availed himself of the privilege, which was probably free to all, of lecturing there. By his own express statement we learn that he was actively engaged in political and state of-fairs, (3²⁰⁴) and he complains severely of the arduous duties these imposed upon him, bitterly lamenting that they destroyed his leisure and affor-

ded him but little or no time to devote to study. (3⁰⁰) Thus his life was more that of the practical citizen than of the professional scholar or public teacher.

What, then, was the cause of his great and extended literary labors? Principally and primarily his exceeding fondness for intellectual pursuits. (3³⁰) From his earliest youth he was thoroughly imbued with a passionate love of learning and with an incessant and insatiable thirst for knowledge. (3⁰⁰) Though he belonged to one of the richest and most

aristocratic^a families of Alexandria, his brother^b Alexander holding the responsible position of Alabarch, (Jos. Ant. xiii. 8; xix. 5; xx. 5²) he did not care for wealth, or glory, or sensual enjoyments (1¹⁰⁷) but his greatest delights were those of the intellect (3³⁹³) He was a born student, and loved solitude and quiet study. (2⁴⁰⁰⁻⁷¹⁴) He was especially fond of speculation, (2⁵⁹) so that when not engaged in public duties his usual employment was that of writing and expounding the doctrines of philosophy. (2⁵) Thus it was no external occasion, but his intellectual

a. According to Jerome (De Vir. Illus. c. 11) he was of priestly descent, "de genere sacerdotum".

b. According to Geller, following Ewald, he was his nephew. Geller "Phil. de Gr." Vol. II p. 293, noted.

fastest, his scholarly instincts, and his philosophical proclivities that impelled him to authorship.

Of Philo's numerous writings there does not yet exist a completely genuine or satisfactory edition. That of Mangey (Thomas Mangey, London, 1742) still remains the most valuable and the most reliable. Aucher's translations into Latin, from the Armenian version of the fifth century, were published at Venice in 1822 and 1826. ("Quaestiones et solutiones" and "De Providentia") Greek additions were made later by Mai, Grossman, and Tischendorf;

and 'Fragments' excerpted from the Church Fathers, Eusebius, John of Damascus, etc, and from older authors, have been collected and published by Harris. (J. R. Harris, Cambridge 1886)

Besides the writings that have come down to us there were many others which have been lost. Philo himself alludes to, or expressly mentions, the titles of some that are no longer extant; e.g. two commentaries 'On Testaments,' (2nd) a treatise 'On Numbers,' (3) and special treatises on 'Isaac' and 'Jacob' corresponding to the one

on 'Abraham' (2⁴⁵³) Of the works that have been preserved, some have been pronounced by scholars^a to be spurious, notably the treatises 'De Vita Contemplativa'^b and 'De Mundo'.

For a full list and discussion of Philo's writings the reader is referred to Schürer's excellent work, Vol. II. pp. 831-884. We shall mention here, following Schürer, only three principal works on the Pentateuch;—

- 1) Questions and Solutions, 2) Allegories of the Sacred Laws, 3) An Exposition of the Mosaic Legislation.

These are of special importance for

a. Grotius, Huet, Huet, Lucian, etc.
 b. B. F. Cornyhere has recently reasserted and attempted to prove the genuineness of the 'De Vit. Cont.' See 'Jewish Quarterly Review'. See further, J. Drummond's review of this in same periodical, Nov. 1895.

our study of Philo as exegete, as they are concerned with an exposition of the Sacred Scriptures and most clearly and completely reveal his peculiar method of interpreting and explaining them.

But for whom did Philo write? We cannot properly comprehend the essential character of his exegesis, or the causes that produced it, without first knowing who constituted his public.

The frequent use of apostrophes, where Philo addresses himself in such phrases as 'O my mind' (1⁶⁴. 244, 2⁷³) 'O my soul' (1³⁶⁵. 2⁹²) etc., at times leads

us to suspect that he was his own
 public, and that his writings, or at
 least large parts of them, were mere-
 ly written soliloquies and medita-
 tions, composed for his own enjoy-
 ment and self-edification. But these
 expressions occur also in the third
 person: - 'O soul' (2³⁹⁵) 'O souls' (2³²⁶) 'O man'
 (3²⁷⁴) 'O good man' (2¹¹³) 'O my friend' (1^{378.400})
 'My good friend' (4²³²) etc. which proves,
 as we should of course suspect,
 that Philo also wrote for others.
 Sometimes the names of the partic-
 ular individuals are expressly
 mentioned. Thus the whole treatise

'Quod Amnis Probus Liber' is addressed to one 'Theodotus' (3rd); and the famous description of the embassy to Cajus (Legatio ad Cajum), if not directly addressed to Cajus, was yet expressly meant for him; and was written with the hope or at least the possibility that the emperor himself might have occasion to peruse it. (4th) But in general, his writings are addressed to that larger number to whom, in one passage, he refers as 'the multitude' (2⁴²⁶) Did these consist of Jews or Gentiles?

Now it is Holtzmann's opinion

a) Philo himself was leader of this embassy to Cajus, on behalf of the persecuted Alexandrian Jews. For particulars, see 4th 5. Cf. Jos. Ant. XVIII: 6.
 b) The exclamations 'O Cajus' (4th 112), 'O master' (4th 146) may be but instances of apostrophe which is a peculiarity of his style. Cf. 'O winter' (1st) 'O prophet' (1st)
 c) As the whole style (pseudo-speeches and Agrippa's letter to Cajus) and tendency prove.

that Philo, like the Palestinian rabbis, reckoned mostly upon Jewish readers. He claims that they alone would be edified by hearing of God's protection over Israel, or feel interested in any allegorical exegesis of the Law, since this might be beneficial to them in affording a new understanding of the old Biblical text, whereas to a heathen it would hardly be of any value.^a He is supported in this view by many passages, where Philo indeed seems to have only Jewish readers in mind. Such expressions as 'we' (1⁷¹³)

^a O. Holtzmann "Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte" in Grundriss der Theol. Wissens II: 2 p. 35.

'our people', 'our national customs', 'our
ancient laws', 'us' etc. (1.³²², 2.^{174. 306}, 4.^{79. 82})

seem to imply that he is addressing
those of his own race and religion.

Not necessarily, however. for some of the
passages just referred to are in them-
selves ambiguous, and undecided.

as Philo may indeed be speaking of
his people, but not directly to them. In 4.⁸²

however, it is evident that he is address-
ing his co-religionists, for having
just been speaking of the Jews and the
plots of persecution formed against them
he suddenly alludes to them in the
second person, addressing them as 'you'.

Undoubtedly a large number of his
works^a were composed expressly for
Jews, and some of them may even
have been delivered orally before them
in the form of sermons or of lectures.
In the city of Alexandria there was
a large number of Jews, who had
been induced to settle there by Alexan-
der where the city was first founded.
Philo gives their number, together with
that of the adjacent Jewish population
of Egypt, as in the neighborhood of
one million^(4th). He mentions their syna-
gogues^(4th) and houses of prayer^(3rd) of
which he says there were a great many

a. 'In Flaccum', 'Legibus Allegoribus' etc. See Schiim I⁷⁰⁵

b. See note on p. Cf. also 2nd 'allegorical speaking'.

c. 'Many myriads', Philo says! There is a great ex-
aggeration as all Alexandria had but 300,000 free
men. See Encyc. Brit. 'Alexandria'. According to
him were settled there. Cf. Letter of Ari-

in every section of the city. (4¹²⁴) and he even describes their Sabbath afternoon assemblies (3¹¹⁹. 4^{167. 217}) at which, he tells us, it was the custom for some priest, or elder, or learned man to read and interpret the Scriptures, to deliver discourses on all the virtues, and to impart to the assembly useful and wholesome instruction. (3¹²⁹) It is not improbable, therefore, though nowhere explicitly stated, that some of Philo's ^{own} writings were produced for, or in connection with, those weekly religious gatherings of his people.^a

But that Philo wrote also for non-Jews

a. This would explain the homiletical character of so much of Philo's works. Some of his treatises are written in the style of regular sermons. They are based on a Biblical text (3²⁰¹) which he logically develops in the treatment of a definite religious theme, with exhortations (1⁴⁰⁰⁻⁴⁹⁹. 64) pointing of moral (1⁵¹⁻⁵¹⁶) and closing prayer (1¹⁰⁷⁻⁵⁰⁰) in the style of a regular preacher. (3¹²⁹) He even closes with ברך נחמה, ברך טוב, as in the Mishnah! (1⁵⁰⁰)

is evident. Such expressions as "praise
 worship due to the gods" (1^{346.213}) or calling
 the stars 'visible gods' (1⁵⁵), 'gods that move
 in heaven' (4³⁰⁵) etc, would hardly be used
 in addressing Jews. From the general
 style and tendency of large portions of
 his work, especially the three treatises
 on the 'Life of Moses' and the numerous
 treatises on the 'Special Laws'; where the
 style is popular and literal, and the
 tendency is to represent the Mosaic laws
 as the wisest and most humane, we
 are compelled to conclude, with Schürer^b
 that they were intended for non-Jews,
 and that, too, for a large, and extensive,

a. Here Holtzmann's criticism would not be
 applicable. Cf. *supra* p. 12

b. Schürer I⁷⁴⁶

and continually increasing circle of readers. (3rd)

Thus it is clear that Philo wrote for both Jews and Greeks, addressing himself and adapting his writings now to the one, now to the other, and sometimes indifferently to both. His public comprised, in general, the cultured and intellectual element of the population of Alexandria, for only such could understand or feel interested in his philosophical doctrines, or even properly appreciate his constant references and allusions to the philosophers, poets and authors of classic

a. As, for instance, the treatises 'In Placcum' and 'Legatio ad Cajum'

Greek literature.^a

There were some things, however, which Philo thought ought not to be divulged to 'the multitude' (4²⁵⁷), and which were meant only for the 'initiated' few (1¹⁶⁷), who were older men (1²³⁹), of superior moral and intellectual culture (3⁵⁰⁷ 4²⁵⁵), and therefore properly prepared to understand such 'mysteries' (4^{245, 255}). Many of his allegorical explanations, constituting a sort of esoteric doctrine of the meaning of some passages of Scripture, were intended only for this select circle of the 'initiated'. They are not, however, assigned

^a Philo possessed a very wide and extensive knowledge of Greek literature. He constantly refers to such writers as Plato (1⁵ 3⁵⁰¹) Homer (2³⁷ 3³⁷⁹) Hesiod . . . Pindar (4⁵³) Eschylus (3⁵³) Euripides (3⁵¹¹) Sophocles (3⁵²⁰) etc, and was greatly indebted to them in his own charming and graceful style, and even for

to special treatises, but are incorporated with the rest of his works, interspersed here and there among his general writings.

It was in connection with the production of all these writings for the mixed and heterogeneous public of Alexandria that Philo's activity as exegete displayed itself, and his peculiar exegesis of the Scriptures was developed. We are now prepared for a more special study of this exegesis itself, its scope, method, causes and results, to which we shall address ourselves in the following chapters.

Chapter II.

General Scope, Method^a and Character of Exegesis

Philo's exegesis of Sacred Scriptures is limited to the Pentateuch.^a On it he bases all his explanations, and from it he deduces all his views. The other books that compose the Old Testament are indeed frequently referred to and constantly quoted from, which helps us to estimate the extent of the canon^b in Philo's times; but very rarely, and only incidentally, is any exegetical explanation of a non-Pentateuchal verse offered. (2^{31-367, 393}) Though Philo admitted the inspired character of all the Biblical writings (2³⁷), respec-

a. Philo is the first to expressly mention the five-fold division of the $\alpha\gamma\gamma\alpha\varsigma$ (2³¹⁶)

b. Cf. Dillmann's 'Genesis' Introd. p. 24.
c. Philo quotes from Sam. Kings, Ps., Prov. Job, Isaiah, Jer. Zach., Eze., Chronicles. Cf. Buhl's Canon p. 70. T. p. 15

ially those of the prophet Jeremiah, whom he greatly venerated (1¹¹³),^a yet to him, also, as to the ancient Rabbis, the Pentateuch was of the first importance and of the highest authority. ^b Moses was not only inspired by heaven (2¹¹⁴ 3¹¹⁴) and the most perfect of the prophets (3¹¹⁴) but the greatest most perfect and holiest man that ever lived (1⁴⁷³ 3¹¹⁴) who had attained to the very summits of philosophy (1²).

Philo's exegesis rests throughout upon the Greek version of the Hebrew Scriptures, upon the famous Septuagint translation, supposed to have been completed in Alexandria at least two centuries

a. The reason is given by Ritter Philo u. d. Halacha p. 222
 b. See Dr. Wies's 'Pronaos' p. 17

before, in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The reason for this is not, as Frankel^c maintains, that Philo knew no Hebrew, and consequently could not avail himself of the original text of the Bible; but that the Greek translation, being in the vernacular, was more easily accessible to the general reader, and therefore better suited to Philo's purpose, since, as we have seen,^d his public consisted not only of Jews, but also of Gentiles who were, of course, unacquainted with the Hebrew. The Septuagint translation was widely known^(3rd) even beyond the limits of Alexandria.

a. Philo repeats, with additions of his own, the well-known legendary account of the origin of the Septuagint contained in the letter of Aristion^(3rd) Cf. B. n. l. p. 110.
 b. J. Frankel "Ueber Phil. u. Alex. Schriftforschung" p. 25 ff.
 c. Philo IV. l. 70 ff. d. S. l. 16

and was universally admired and esteemed. Philo tells us that the anniversary of its translation was annually celebrated by a solemn festival, held on the island of Pharos which lay in the harbor outside of Alexandria (4²³). It was attended not only by Jews but also by peoples of other nations, even from across the seas (4²⁴). By Philo, moreover, the Greek text was revered as of equal authority and holiness with the Hebrew original. The inspiration of the Bible extended to the Septuagint as well, and Philo calls its translators not mere interpreters but even hierophants and prophets (4²⁵).

who were imbued with the most pure spirit of Moses. So thoroughly does Philo rely upon it, that he not only follows it in its variations from the Hebrew text (e.g. Gen. 5²² [4³²⁷], Ex. 1⁹ [2⁵⁵], Gen. 2¹⁷ [1⁷⁶], Gen. 31¹³ [2³³²]), but he attaches the greatest significance to every word², every syllable (2⁵⁴), every letter (2²⁵⁰ 4⁴⁴⁹) of the Greek, even going so far as to base his arguments in support of views advanced on peculiarities of Greek syntax (1⁸⁴ 370-1. 4⁴⁵⁰⁻⁷) and upon etymologies^a of Greek words.^b

Philo's method of exposition is not uniform. It varies in the differ-

a. These etymologies, generally specious, occur very frequently in Philo. See 1⁹ 69. 156. 1⁴⁴⁹ 2⁹⁸ 141 etc., etc.

b. Variations even from the LXX are, however, not wanting. See 2³²³ on Gen. 28¹³

ent writings, being influenced, no doubt, by the character of those to whom they were addressed. Sometimes it is in the nature of 1) a running commentary^a to the text of Scripture. This is the case with his largest and most important work, the so-called 'Allegories of the Sacred Laws' (De Legibus Allegoribus) which Holtzmann is probably correct in thinking was written especially for Jews. Under this general title are to be included, probably, all the minor treatises found in the first and second volumes of Yonge's translation. Philo takes each

a. Not, however, like Rashi's in the form of concise annotations & succinct explanations, but connected and in good literary forms.

b. Important for establishing his philosophical views, and as best revealing his peculiar allegorical exegesis.

c. For list see Index to each volume.

verse 'in regular order' (1³⁴⁰. 2⁴⁵³), beginning with Gen. 1. makes it the basis of his remarks, and deduces therefrom, as its proper exegetical explanation, his own philosophical, moral and religious views. As in the Rabbinic Midrash, other verses are quoted from different parts of the Bible in support or corroboration of his opinions. In this way he gives, in an easy, graceful literary style, a complete, systematic exposition of the whole book of Genesis, hardly omitting a single verse.^a

Sometimes his exposition is catechetical,

a. Frankel gives the list of verses as follows - Gen. 1 to 18¹⁸, and Gen. 28¹⁰ to end of chapter. p. 33.

in the form of question and answer.

This is the case with the so-called 'Questions and Solutions' (*Quaestiones et Solutiones*) which embraces the greater part of both Genesis and Exodus.^a The exact meaning of the verse to be explained, is inquired into, questions and difficulties arising in connection therewith are propounded, and the exposition proceeds systematically in the form of answer and solution. Here the references to other parts of the Bible are less frequent.

Besides commenting upon or explaining particular individual verses,

a. Gengen's translation *Volte* extends only through Gen. 17.²⁷ For remainder of Genesis, and questions & solutions to Exodus see Leipzig stereotyped edition, Vol. IV.

Phil's exposition also takes the form of
 3) complete literary treatises on special subjects.^a These treatises are a) historical, such as the three treatises on the 'Life of Moses'; b) legal, such as the various treatises giving an exposition of the Mosaiic legislation ('Ten Commandments', 'Special Laws', etc.) and c) ethical, on such topics as 'Justice', 'Courage', 'Humility', 'Repentance', 'Nobility', etc.^b They are based on the narrative and laws contained in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy, of which they are a free yet faithful reproduction. The passages from Genesis are also in

a. Originally, perhaps, under one title (3⁴⁵⁷) See Schürer.

b. See Index & Vol. III.

ted (3^{573.519} etc.), they together constitute a most complete exposition of the whole of the Pentateuch.

Of Philo's works, two are in the Platonic form of dialogues, the 'De Providentia' and the 'De Animalibus'. These, though very important as sources for Philo's theological and philosophical views, are of no value for our study of Philo as exegete, since they are not concerned with any exposition of the Biblical text. For the same reason, the treatises 'In Flaccum' and 'Legatio ad Cajum', though extremely valuable as historical sources, throw no light upon his exegesis.

In his exegesis of the Pentateuch, Philo generally adheres strictly to his text, reverencing, as we have seen, every most minute particular. Sometimes, however, he permits himself slight changes, not indeed as affecting the actual letter, but in the construction which he puts upon words and sentences, in the change of breathings and of accents, and even in the omission of single words. For example, the two verses Gen. 19²⁰ and Gen. 50¹⁹, which the LXX, agreeing with the Hebrew text, takes as interrogative sentences, Philo wilfully regards as declarative, thereby completely alter-

ing their meaning. Thus "Is it not a little one?" - referring to Gosh. becomes "It is not a little one" (2³⁰) and Joseph's words to his brothers "Am I in the place of God?" are taken to mean "I am in the place of God" (2⁵⁰) - both verses being thus made to convey exactly the opposite meaning. In Lev. 16, which describes the entering of the High Priest into the Holy of Holies, the Greek translation of the Hebrew $\text{וְכָל אָדָם לֹא יִהְיֶה}$ is $\text{καὶ πᾶς ἄνθρωπος οὐκ ἔσται}$. Here Philo makes ἄνθρωπος the predicate instead of the subject, thus obtaining the peculiar and wholly different sense that the High Priest, is not a

man (2³⁷). By changing the breathing of αἰὼς from smooth to rough in Sen. 4⁷ the verse is made to mean that Cain rose up and killed himself (αἰὼς) (1¹⁷).

By altering the accent on the interrogative particle ποῦ, in Sen. 3⁹ the verse is made to give a different meaning (1¹⁸).

In quoting Ex. 3¹⁴ he omits the word κύπλος which the Greek has uniformly for πλῆ, though in this case the meaning of the verse is not so seriously affected (2⁴⁰). But with these few slight exceptions, his exposition is generally founded on a close adherence to the actual text. He does not employ such artificial

methods of changing its literal reading as the *אגל חקרי* or *סוכין* of the Palestinian Rabbis, but is content to abide by the exact reading of the Scriptures, however far from literal his interpretation thereof may be.

Philo's exegesis proceeds throughout upon the conscious assumption, often and clearly expressed, of a two-fold meaning of the Sacred Scriptures (2⁴¹⁷); - one exoteric, corresponding to the actual, literal interpretation of the text, - the other esoteric, following from its figurative, symbolical and allegorical explanation. Besides the 'plain' (2^{63.444}), 'distinct' (1^{46.2317}),

a. Of course the Greek text, being furnished with vowels, would hardly admit of this as does the unvocalized Hebrew.

b. Cf. the *פסוק* and *דבר* of the Talmud. See Mielzner's

'open' (2⁴²⁶) meaning of the Scriptures, there is also an 'inner' (4³⁵⁷), 'hidden' (4³⁴⁹) (2³⁰), 'mystical' (2³¹⁷, 3²³⁵) meaning. The first he terms the 'physical' (4³⁵²), the latter the 'spiritual' (2⁴⁴⁴) and 'moral' (1⁶⁴, 4³⁵²).

Both interpretations are constantly employed throughout, even to the same Scriptural passage (1⁵⁰, 2^{419.420.426.430.444.475}

4^{349.351.356.359}). Sometimes the explanation is partly literal, partly figurative (1⁶⁴). Often the literal and allegorical are so mingled, as to render it extremely difficult to determine Philo's precise meaning.^a This is especially the case with all those passages where the Bible speaks

a. See Drummond's 'Philo' Vol II, p. 67 and especially p. 106 B.

of angels, which Philo allegorizes into *logoi* or divine powers, and where the presentation is so confused that scholars find it exceedingly difficult to decide whether or not Philo regarded these *logoi* as actual beings or personalities according to the literal understanding of the passages (2²⁹⁹. 318-322. 426 etc.). In general it may be said that both the literal and allegorical interpretations are indifferently retained.^a

Yet Philo rated the allegorical above the literal. He considered it the 'better' explanation (1⁴⁰), and the 'true' way of understanding the Scriptures (1²⁹⁷). He even

a. See Gräber, Dähne, and Jeller's views as given by Drummond Vol. II, pp. 106 B and pp. 222 B.

b. We shall discuss Philo's attitude towards the literal more fully in a separate chapter. See Ch. II.

goes so far as to regard it as the 'real' meaning, and in one place where he has allegorized the building of Noah's ark, however artificial his method, he does not hesitate to call it the 'more natural' (4³⁴⁰. - 2^{41-166. 326}. 4^{311. 403}).

Hence it is, that in Philo's exegesis of the Scriptures, the allegorical method of interpretation plays so important a part, predominating in most of his writings, and in some of them, particularly the 'Allegoriae & the Sacred Laws' being almost exclusively employed. What this peculiar method was, how it arose, why he employed

it, and to what results it lead, we shall now consider in the following pages.

Chapter III.

Allegorical Exegesis Its Origin^{and} Character.

The allegorical method of interpretation was not original or new with Philo, though in him it reached its highest classical development. It seems to have been employed first among the Greeks, by the Sophists, more extensively by the Stoics, and finally even by Plato, in their attempts to save the credit of the myths and fables of the old popu-

lar religion. To the Jewish Alexandrians it was also known long before the time of Philo. Traces of its influence are already discernible in the translation of the Septuagint;^a and the Jewish philosopher Aristobolus, Philo's predecessor, had applied it, in his commentary on the Pentateuch, to the removal of anthropomorphisms. According to the 'De Vita Contemplativa,' the Therapeutae, a peculiar Jewish religious sect akin to, if not actually identical with, the Essenes, were supposed to have in their possession writings of ancient men who had left behind them many memorials

a. Drummond Vol. I. p. 18. Geller Vol. III p. 303

b. Frankel p. 248. Not, however, to so complete a degree as Döhne maintains. Cf. Frankel, Geller and Windelband.

c. For a complete description of this interesting sect

of the allegorical system of writing and explanation (4³). Thus we see that in Plato's time the way of allegorical interpretation had already been paved.

Yet Plato refers to it as a new and hitherto untravelled path (3⁵⁰⁷), which seems to imply that only in his time was it coming to be more widely and more generally employed. Plato says that it was dear to men versed in natural philosophy (1²⁴⁶) who interpreted allegorically with no inconsiderable ingenuity and propriety (2⁷⁷⁹). It seems therefore to have been common among a certain class of men or 'school of expositors'^a who, as Plato says,

a. Drummond Vol. I. p. 20 calls attention to II. Somnion 20. ἡμῖν τοῖς ἀλlegορικοῖς, with us the allegorizers.

ment from the letter to the spirit (2nd) especially was it used by the Therapeutae, who daily, from morning to evening, devoted themselves to studying the Sacred Scriptures, and who investigated them allegorically, since they looked upon their literal expression as symbols of some secret meaning of nature (4th 18).

But this allegorical method, even in Philo's time, was not so widely prevalent among the Alexandrian Jews as is sometimes imagined. From Philo's own writings we have abundant evidence that it was not universally

accepted as legitimate or even regarded with favor. On the contrary it encountered considerable opposition and ridicule (4⁴⁰). Philo, who was its champion, has often to contend against and reply to those persons who 'superficially reject all explanations other than the explicitly literal' (2³¹³), who laugh at all figurative meanings (2⁴⁷⁴), ridiculing such investigations as wrong, as rather demonstrating a cavilling spirit than being productive of any good. (2³⁹⁶) And that these ~~these~~ persons who thus opposed the allegorical method were by no means few in number is evident

from the fact that it was just the multitude (2⁹⁷) who demanded literal explanations. The number of those who went from the letter to the spirit must have been comparatively small.

They constituted a coterie apart, a select circle of the initiated (1^{105, 147} 2³²⁶). They were men of superior education and mental endowment (3⁵⁰⁷), of whom Philo says, that they placed the objects of the intellect above those perceptible by the outward senses (2⁷³⁷).^a

Philo himself had a special predilection for allegory (1⁴²³), which explains its constant and extensive use.

a. Cf. *supra* p. 18.

ployment by him and its preponderating
 influence on his Scriptural exegesis. Al-
 legory he had characterized as 'the na-
 ture that loves to hide itself' (2²¹);
 and as such it was especially 'dear'
 to him from that natural love of
 more remote and laborious know-
 ledge which is accustomed to seek what
 is obscure before, and in preference to,
 what is evident (3¹²⁴). Indeed, it was a
 regular principle with Philo which
 he had adopted from the ancient
 Pythagoreans, and which possessed
 for him, as he says, almost equal
 weight with a divine oracle, not to

proceed by the plain ordinary road,
 but departing from the common opin-
 ions of men to cut out a new and hith-
 erto untravelled path (3rd). This allegor-
 ical method he defends against all
 scorners and detractors, whom he calls
 persons of rash and inconsiderate dis-
 positions (2nd), utterly destitute of educa-
 tion (3rd), who are afflicted with the in-
 curable disease of pride of language
 and quibbling expressions and jing-
 ling tricks of manners, measuring
 sanctity and holiness by no other
 standard (1st). They, he says, are not able
 to discern that light which is appre-

visible only by the intellect, by reason of
 the weakness of the eyes of their soul,
 which are by nature easily dazzled
 by too much brightness, as naturally
 happens to men who live in night
 and darkness (3⁵⁰⁷). Their mental vis-
 ion is affected (1²⁴⁷), and they blame
 what ought not to be blamed (2⁷⁷). The
 curiosity of those who investigate the ex-
 act meaning of the Scriptures ought not
 to be condemned; rather ought we to blame
 the indolence of those who do not apply
 themselves to investigate such matters.
 (2³⁹⁰) Moses himself sanctioned and en-
 couraged the allegorical method, Philo

maintains, - though he fails to produce any particular verse to substantiate his claim (2^{326, 328}). He has only praise and admiration for its excellencies (4th), and paints its beauties in the most glowing terms (2³²⁶⁻⁷). He advocates the benefit of allegorical study (2³⁹⁶), and warmly recommends its cultivation (1st), earnestly urging those who are initiated to be unwearied in their efforts until they have introduced others into the secret light of the Sacred Scriptures, and displayed to them the hidden things therein contained (2³²⁶). True to his own preaching, with ardent love

Philo applies himself to investigate each separate command of Moses, and to endeavor to reveal and to explain to all who wish to understand them, things concerning them which are not known to the multitude (3³⁰⁶). And in so doing the allegorical method receives, under his hand, its completest classical development, and Philo becomes its ablest, and most renowned and important representative.

In employing this allegorical method were there any fixed rules by which Philo was governed, corresponding to the hermeneutical laws of the Patristic

Rabbis? Were there any definite principles according to which his exegesis proceeded? Philo, indeed, speaks expressly of 'rules' (2³⁷⁶.3²³⁵), and 'laws' (2¹⁵².313.410), of allegorical interpretation, and even of an allegorical 'system' of writing and explanation (4¹), but nowhere in his works are any of these rules or laws clearly apparent, not to speak of being enunciated or receiving precise formulation like the seven hermeneutical laws of Hillel, or the later thirteen of Rabbi Ishmael.^a Indeed, it has even been doubted^b whether any definite principles of exegesis were consciously employed by Philo.

a. See Michener's 'Introd. to Philo' pp. 123-124.

b. Frankel. p. 33

From the general consistency and uniformity in the allegorical explanations given to the same person, country, object, etc., mentioned in Scripture, we seem obliged obliged to conclude that there must have been some sort of system, though hardly such 'a good system of laws and stability' as Plato himself fondly imagined (L^{152}), or of such 'regularity' as Drummond, following Siegfried, seems to think.^a

The use of symbols, though generally consistent, is by no means always uniform. The same words are sometimes differently symbolized, & may stand

a. Vol. I, p. 20. In note at bottom of page. Drummond refers to Siegfried, who, he says, has set forth and illustrated these laws. As stated in Preface, I have not consulted Siegfried, which probably explains the fact that I differ from him here.
 b. Cf. interpretation of Gen. 12' on L^{73} w. same on L^{49} .

for several different things; or may even typify the exact opposite.^b This criticism must have been brought forward already in Philo's time, for in one of the 'Fragments' he especially replies to it as follows: 'Those men who apply themselves to the study of the Holy Scriptures ought not to cavil and quibble at syllables, but ought first to look at the spirit and meaning of the nouns and verbs used; for it often happens that the same expressions are applied to different things at different times; and, on the contrary, opposite expressions are at different times applied

- a. E.g. 'furnace' = 1) Nature, 2) human life (4⁴²)
 'sun' = 1) God, 2) human mind, 3) divine word (2³⁷)
 'fountain' has five different meanings (2²³⁹)
 b. 'Joseph' = 'continence' (1⁷⁰), but also 'luxury' (2²⁵²⁻²⁵⁵)!

to the same thing with perfect consistency (4²³³). Nor is there any fixed or specific method of eliciting the proper understanding of a verse in Scripture. Often it is merely a matter of divine inspiration (1¹⁰²), taking God for its leader and guide (4⁴⁴⁵). The same verse, too, may have different explanations, all of them, apparently, of equal value. Thus Philo gives three different ways of interpreting Gen. 3²⁴. According to the first, the verse describes the revolutions of the celestial spheres, one cherub symbolizing the outward circle of fixed stars, and the other the inner sphere of

the seven planets, while the flaming
 sword indicates the eternal motion of the
 entire heavens. According to the second ex-
 planation the cherubim are the two
 hemispheres, and the sword is the sun
 that revolves around them; while ac-
 cording to the third train of reasoning,
 which Philo considered the more ingenious,
 the cherubim typify the two supreme
 and primary powers of God: - goodness
 and authority, - and the sword between
 them is emblematic of the Logos, or rea-
 son which unites them. (1¹¹⁰⁻²). So, too,
 Gen. 3^d admits of being allegorically in-
 terpreted in many ways, either as 1) assigns

ing a special location to God, 2) as a re-
proof for vice and evil, or 3) as showing
the confused and agitated state of soul
of the wicked man. (1¹²⁴). Thus we see that
there was no one precise, exclusive
interpretation of a word, verse, or pas-
sage.

Neither is Philo always certain that
the meaning he has given is the correct
one. It is often only ventured, given as
doubtful, and is introduced by some
such halting expression as 'perhaps'
(1⁴²⁷ 2⁸¹ 4^{290.293.417} & freq.), 'it is possible' (4³¹¹), 'and
imagine' (2¹³²), 'it appears to me' (1⁴⁷⁴ 4⁷¹⁰), etc.
So little was the allegorical explanation

anything fixed or certain, that it is expressly stated as a 'conjecture' (1¹⁰⁰), and offered merely as an 'opinion' (4^{221. 362}), concerning which different individuals may have different views, 'some' thinking one way (1²⁹⁵ 2¹⁵⁰ 4³¹⁵), 'others' another (2³¹⁷).

Thus it is evident that the allegorical method of interpretation, far from conforming to strict rules or constituting a settled system, was quite arbitrary in character and lead to dissimilar and uncertain results. What Philo is pleased to call the 'spirit and meaning' (4²⁵³) of the language of Scripture,

was a thing indefinite, fluctuating and differently determined. It did not really depend upon the language at all, however speciously it pretended to be derived therefrom. It ^{did} not really proceed from the text, but sometimes even in spite of the text.^a It was wholly external and foreign to the text, and ~~had~~ therefore to be read into it; and then it could only be read out again by the purely artificial method of allegorical interpretation.

But though there are thus no precise rules governing the allegorical exegesis of the Scriptures, the general methods resorted

a. See *infra* p. 87.

to for extracting from them the desired meaning be clearly revealed and open before us. These we shall now describe in the following chapter.

Chapter IV.

Its Method.

There were several methods which Philo employed of eliciting from the plain, unmistakable text of the Scriptures, the wholly different meanings which he nevertheless desired to discover in them. The first and most important, and that which is most frequently and extensively made use

of by him is the method of-

A Symbolization

Everything in Scripture is symbolized into something else which it resembles, or is supposed to resemble, in form, character, properties, circumstances, activities, or other points of comparison. Thus 1) common nouns are made symbolical of different objects, individuals, or qualities. The 'sun' is likened to 'God', because, as is proved by Ps. 27: 'God is light' (2¹⁰⁷⁻⁴)^a - or to the 'human mind', whose powers, like the beams of the sun, extend over everything (2^{30v. 147}) - or, again, to the 'divine word or Logos' which assists

a. This corresponds exactly to the Midrashic method of citing Scriptural verses.

Eg.

"מורה זו חיים שבאמר" עץ חיים היא וגו'

This basis is in Biblical verses runs throughout.

and protect the virtuous. (2³⁰) Heaven symbolizes 'mind', since natures comprehensible only by the intellect are in heaven; while earth typifies 'sensation' which has a corporeal and earthy constitution. (1²) The 'river' of Ps. 65¹⁰ denotes the 'divine word' which also is full, no part being empty or desolate, is widely diffused, raised on high and ever-flowing (2³⁶). For similar reasons, too, 'speech' in general is usually compared to a 'river'. (2³⁰ & freq.) 'Man' is the 'mind', which is the most important part of man, and 'woman' is 'the outward sense', which is as dependent upon mind as is woman upon man. (1⁹ & passim) The

'serpent' represents 'pleasure' (1³⁷). As the motion of the serpent has many windings as is varied, so also is pleasure. It folds itself around man in five different ways, - seeing, hearing, tasting, smelling and touching (1³⁸). The 'flood' is the symbol of spiritual dissolution. (4³⁹). The 'heifer', 'ram' and 'goat' of the Levitical legislation signify the 'soul', 'sense' and 'speech' respectively (2⁴⁰), while the 'high priest' is the 'reason' or 'Logos' (2⁴¹). The 'turtle-dove' and 'pigeon' symbolize divine and human wisdom, both being winged and accustomed to soar on high, and still as different from

one another as genus from species, or copy from model; for divine wisdom is fond of lonely places and loves solitude (concerned with God alone), like the turtle-dove, while human wisdom, like the pigeon, is quiet and tame and gregarious haunting the cities of men and rejoicing in its abode among mortals (2¹¹⁸). The sweet spices of Ex. 30³⁴ 'stacte, onycha, galbanum, and frankincense' are the four cosmic elements 'water, earth, air and fire' (2¹³²).

In the same manner 2) proper noises are also symbolized. 'Egypt' is the 'body' (2⁷⁶ 4²³) and its 'passions' (2¹⁷⁴),

'Lanaan' is 'wickedness'; 'Eden' is 'lux-
 ury' (1^{63. 272}). The 'river' that waters Para-
 dise is 'generic virtue' and the four streams
 that separate themselves from it, the Pi-
 shon, Gihon, Tigris and Euphrates are
 the four cardinal virtues 'prudence,
 courage, temperance and justice' (1^{64. 3}, 4²⁷²).
 The five Sodomitic cities are a figu-
 rative representation of the five out-
 ward senses (2⁴²⁶). The persons of Old
 Testament history became the sym-
 bols of abstract qualities or states of
 the soul. 'Enosh' is 'hope' (2³⁷⁸), 'Enoch' is
 'repentance' (2³⁸⁹), 'Noah' is 'justice' (2⁴⁰⁰) 'Lamech'
 is 'self-loving opinion'; 'Abel' is 'God-loving'.

'spirit' (1²⁴⁹). 'Israh' is not a man, but
 'a principle' - 'the Socratic principle of
 self-knowledge' (2³⁰⁴). Likewise 'Abraham',
 'Isaac', and 'Jacob' are not individuals
 but 'laws' (2⁴⁰²), living, unwritten,
 and rational laws (2³⁷⁶⁻⁷, 3¹⁸⁶). They typ-
 ify respectively 'instruction', 'holiness',
 and the 'practice of virtue' (2²⁴⁰). Esau is
 'ignorance', 'Ismael' = 'receptical and
 disputative sophistry' (2²³⁷), 'Joseph' =
 'continence' (1¹⁷⁰) and also 'luxury' (2²⁵⁷⁻²⁵⁸).
 'Sarah', 'Rebecca', 'Leah' and 'Zipporah' are
 all different types of virtue. 'Sarah' is
 'virtue in general' (2¹⁶⁴), 'Rebecca' = 'per-
 severance' (1¹³¹, 2⁰⁷), 'Leah' = 'meekness, furnishing

virtue' (about to succumb: 1^{105}). 'Gipporali':
 'aspiring virtue' (1^{105}). 'Rachel': strange to say,
 represents the irrational part of the soul
 (2^{102}), and the 'daughters of Laban' are
 the 'arts and sciences of the soul' (1^{102})!
 'Hagar' symbolizes 'the encyclical branches
 of learning' (2^{109}), viz: 'grammar including
 poetry and history, geometry and rhet-
 oric' (2^{112}), which are the handmaids to
 'philosophy' (for which also 'Sarah' stands)
 just as philosophy itself is but the
 handmaid to 'wisdom', typified in
 'Abraham' (2^{113})

3) The Pythagorean mode of ex-
 plaining numbers symbolically

plays a prominent part in Philo's exegesis. Their mystical properties are investigated, and applied to an understanding of the Scriptures. Thus the odd number represents the male, the even the female. From the union of two, the first of the even numbers, and three, which Philo calls the first of the males, is formed the first perfect number, six^b, according to which the world, the most perfect of created things was made. (1^a). The unit 'one' represents the single nature of the incorporeal world (1^a). 'Two' is an image of matter, since it can be divided and dissected like matter (1⁵³).

a The unit 'one' is probably indeterminate.
 b. By multiplication

'Three' is an image of a solid, which can be divided according to a three-fold division (length, breadth, and thickness?) (1⁵³). 'Four' symbolizes 'justice and equality'; being produced by the same number, 'two'; either doubled or squared (1¹³).^a 'Five' typifies 'animals' whose characteristic differentia are the five senses (1⁷); or 'sensation' in general (1⁴¹²⁻³). 'Six' typifies 'mortal beings', being produced by the union of the male 'three' and female 'two'; while 'seven' not being produced by any number, since it is prime, typifies the blessed and immortal beings (1⁵³).

^a $2+2$ or 2×2 'equal on all sides' (1¹³)

and the 'divine races' (1⁵⁶). Following Pythagoras, Philo makes the number seven also a likeness of 'God', since like it He is 'one, eternal, lasting immovable, self-sufficient, and different from all other beings' (1²⁹). He speaks of the infinite number of beauties which may be extracted from a careful contemplation of the number seven (3²⁰⁵). It stands for

- 1) uprightness, since the upright or right-angled legs of the right-angled triangle together equal seven.^a (1²³)
- 2) the perfecting power of Nature, as seen in the improvement of all terrestrial

a. Philo must refer to the Pythagorean right-angled triangle , the legs of which $4 + 3 = 7$

al things as well as in the periodical changes of the moon (1³²) or in the growth of man from infancy to old age which ten^a or seven^b periods of seven years each (1³¹). Its nature extends over every visible essence, reaching to both heaven and earth (1³³); viz:- the heaven girdled with seven circles (1³⁴) the seven planets with their corresponding hosts of fixed stars (1³⁵) the constellation Ursa Major and the band of the Pleiades, - each consisting of seven stars; - our soul with its seven divisions of five senses, vocal and generative organs; - or the interior

a. According to Solon

b. According to Hippocrates. Cf. Seven Ages of Shakespeare, "As You Like It" Act II, Scen. 7.

and exterior arrangement of our bodies; the visible being: head, chest, belly, two arms and two legs, - the entrails being stomach, heart, lungs, spleen, liver, and two kidneys (35). Likewise the head has seven divisions, two eyes, two ears, two nostrils and a mouth (ibid). And so Philo continues to give numerous other examples of things that exhibit the nature of the number seven. 'Kini' is fertility, and the 'perfect number ten', so-called because it is made up of the first four numbers, $1+2+3+4=10$ (340), is

holiness'. From their union results
innety, the age at which Sarah
gave birth, which is therefore the
symbol of 'the sacred birth' (4th). In
this curious and to us fantastic
way Philo utilizes even the num-
bers of Scripture to derive from them
his allegorical explanations.

Besides this principal method
of symbolization, there is also an-
other, in some respects akin to the
first, which is extensively used
by Philo - viz; that of deriving
the meaning of a verse or
passage which he is explain-

(Gen. 40¹⁵), are 'those who leave the objects of the outward senses and go over to those of the intellect' - for 'Hebrew' interpreted, means 'one who passes over' עבר (2⁷) The 'Amorites' are 'talkers' (2¹⁵³) or 'discourses which prevail over us by reason of their plausibility' - evidently deriving the idea from the Hebrew word 'אמר' = 'to speak' (2¹⁵⁰⁻¹⁵¹) Methuselah means 'the smothering forth of death' - where the etymology is plainly מת שלח (1²⁹⁶). Nachor is 'rest from light' - נוח אור - and his concubine Ruma is 'she who sees something' - רואה מה - which teaches

that to have light in the mind, or
 knowledge, is good; but cessation
 from light, not putting one's
 knowledge to practice, is bad, of no
 advantage whatsoever (2¹⁶⁶). 'Baulpor'
 he interprets 'opposite above the mouth
 the skin' - ב על פה עור -, making it refer
 to the mind's being overwhelmed
 and sunk or swallowed into the low-
 est depth (2²⁵⁹). 'Levi' equals 'to me' לוי (1⁴²⁹).
 'Calet' = 'whole heart' כל לב (2²⁶²). 'Dam-
 esek' = 'blood from a sack' דם מסק (2¹⁰⁴),
 'Benjamin' = 'son of days' בן ימים (2²⁵²),
 'Kudesh' = 'holy' קדוש (2²³⁹. 4²³⁷), 'Bethuel' =
 'daughter of God' בת אל (2²⁰⁴), 'Penel' = 'past

moral case of God' אל רעה. (2²⁵), Mount'=
 'of a father', מאב (2³⁵), Hain' = 'hot', חם.
 (4³⁵), Shechem' = 'shoulder', שכם. (1²⁴), Je-
 rusalem' = 'sight of peace' יראת שלום (2³⁷),
 'Leah' = 'watered' or 'drunk' שורה (4³²⁵⁻⁶), 'Shin'=
 'wall, direction' שור (2²³⁵), 'Enoch' = 'thy
 grace', חנך. (2²⁹⁵), 'Hannah' = 'her grace' חנה
 (1³⁴⁴), 'Leah' = 'married' (2⁷⁵) - לאה. 'Rachel' =
 'sight of profane', רואה חול, (2¹⁶³), 'Billah' =
 'swallowing', בלע. (2¹⁰¹), 'Pinchas' = 'biting
 of mouth' פי נחש (2²⁰⁰), etc., etc., - all of
 which etymologies Philo applies to
 an elucidation of the meaning of the
 verses in which they occur, in accordance
 with the ideas which he has read into them.

Very similar to this method of etymologizing proper names, is still another which is occasionally resorted to in Philo's exegesis, viz:

C. Punning

or playing upon the Greek words of his text. These words suggest to him, or are supposed to be etymologically related to, others - always only Greek words - of a similar sound, by means of which he obtains the thought or idea which he wishes to discover in them, in order to assist or confirm his explanation of a given word or

passage. Thus in contradistinction to the incorporeal world God called the firmament οὐρανός, either because it is the 'ὄρος' or 'boundary' of everything, or because it was the first created of all things 'visible' or 'ὁρατός' (from ὁράω = to see) [Mund. Opif. 10]^a

(17). The number seven ἑπτά shows by its etymology that it is a sacred number; and this can be seen still better from its Latin equivalent 'septem' - both of which words Plato derives from ἁγρός or ἁγασμός = 'sacred, venerable'. [M.O. 42] (17). Men first sacrificed before drinking wine, since the word

a. Consult Greek text here.

'to be drunk' = μεθύειν, certainly comes
 from μετὰ τὸ θύειν; = after sacrificing
 [Plant. Nov 39] (1⁴⁴⁹). That sleep 'ὑπνος'
 relaxes, is shown by its connection
 with 'ὑφίπμι' = to relax' [Leg. All. 67] (1¹⁵⁰).
 Κύριος 'Lord' denotes 'authority' being
 derived from κύρος; but Δεσπότης 'Mas-
 ter' being derived not only from
 δεσμός = chain, but also 'δέος = fear',
 denotes, in addition to 'Lord' also
 'one that is to be feared' [Quint. Dial. 6]
 (2⁹⁴). Στακτὴ suggests σταγόμενος - drops,
 and therefore symbolizes 'water' [Ibid 4]
 (2¹³²). Leukis, Λεΐα, is loved by Juno, be-
 cause she represents the Λεΐα or smooth

motion of the healthful body, or of
 the just and virtuous soul [De Congr.
 Emd. Seal. 63 (2¹⁶³) The goat $\alpha\iota\gamma$ typifies
 water, since it drinks and rushes
 $\alpha\gamma\omega$ or $\alpha\iota\omega\omega$ [Quar. it Foll 3 (4⁴⁰⁹)

D. The Precise Phraseology

of the Scriptures offend Philo a very
 wide field for allegorical explan-
 ations. He takes advantage of every
 seemingly superfluous word, all-
 pleonastic or redundant phrases,
 synonymms, repetitions, or omis-
 sion of words, every variation in
 the form or order of expression or
 departures from the usual style.

and even ambiguities of the text.
 - to build thereon some important
 fact and thus derive from the
exact language of the Scripture
 the hidden truths which it wi-
 dently intended by this means to
 teach. In this way he explains, -

1) superfluous words, e.g. Gen. 2²³: 'This
 is now bone of my bone, &c.' Why does
 Adam add 'now'? The explanation is
 - 'External sensation', for which 'bone'
 is the symbol, exists now, having
 its existence solely with reference to
 the present moment, since it can-
 not experience either the past or the

future (1^a): and in the last part of the same verse 'she shall be called woman' αὐτὴ καλεῖσθαι etc. - why is the subject αὐτὴ^a expressed? It is to show that there is also this second kind of sensation, which is not derived from the mind, like the former, but is coeval with it (ibid.).

Gen. 15¹⁰: 'And he divided them in the midst' - Why is 'in the midst' added? To teach that God alone is perfect justice (2nd).
 Gen. 48¹⁵: 'ὁ θεὸς. ὃς ἐνυρέστησάν σε πατέρες μου ἐν ὄπλῳ αὐτοῦ'^b - What practical difference does the addition of ἐν ὄπλῳ αὐτοῦ make? It emphasizes that con-

a. It might have been omitted in the Greek.

b. The English translation does not exactly reproduce the Greek which here follows the Hebrew idiom אשׁר - לַפָּנִים

duct pleasing before God, must include internal as well as external morality. (2⁴⁶).

Gen. 16: 'Sarai, Abram's wife, bare him no children?' Why is it said 'him'? Had she borne at all? - Wisdom (Sarai) indeed brings forth a sort of inferior wisdom, which attains completion into full virtue (Abraham) only after connection with the encyclical branches of instruction (Hagar) (2^{102, 103})

Gen. 15: 'ἐξήγαγον αὐτὸν ἐξ ἐμοῦ' Here ἐξ ἐμοῦ is not only superfluous, but ridiculous, for how can one be 'lead

out 'e'ow? Only if it refers to the
disposition of the soul (2¹⁰⁹).

The superfluous phrase in 2³⁰ is al-
so allegorized.

2) double expression. Gen. 2¹⁷: 'Dara'ow
an o'ar-to-be' a) by this double form,
'you shall die the death?' - Death is
of two kinds, a) physical death of the
body, b) spiritual death of soul to
virtue (1⁷⁹) So likewise in Ex. 21¹³: 'Dara
ow Dara o'ar-to-be' shows on consid-
eration that there are two kinds of
dying, one on life - that of the wicked
man, though he arrive at ex-
treme old age; - the other never, the

a. Musesen the Hebrew

b.

מות תמות

מות יומת

immortality of the good, though
physically dead (2²⁰⁵).

Sen. 2¹⁶: What is the special force of
(ps)woc in (ps)woc pap? ^a "You shall
eat by eating!" It refers to wasteful who
wasteful strength and vigor by slow-
ly, wasting the food (1¹⁷); or to a more
than passive, but a special and active
serving of one's parents or of God (1¹⁸).

3) repetitions Lev. 18⁶: The repetition
ἀνδρώνος, ἀνδρώνος (18⁶ W & W & X) is a
sign that he refers here to the real
man, husband of one, whom
Diogenes met in a dream of one a
man at, repeating (1³³⁹).

a. Akelun is 5000 5000

4) redundancy Gen. 1²⁶: Why is 'in his likeness' added, after he has already said 'in his image'^a? To prove that the mind (symbolized by man) is an accurate impression of God, having a clear and evident resemblance in form (1²⁰).

5) conciseness Gen. 39¹: 'In the house' - Why does he not specify in whose house? Because it here refers neither to that of Joseph nor of Potiphar, Potiphar's wife, but to the soul (1¹¹).

6) variations in form of expressions.

Gen. 2¹⁷ (according to the LXX, not however according to the Heb.)^b uses the plural

a The text, however, is 'in our image' etc.
b. There is another instance where Philo follows the LXX in its variation from the Hebrew. See *subra* p. 24

'φαρσοθε, φάρητε': 'ye etc., - in threatening
 evil, whereas the preceding verse, in
 bestowing good, employs the singular
 - though in both cases the same
 lesson is intended. - We must
 therefore say that the good and just
 and faithful are but few, but the
 bad and those addicted to wicked-
 ness are innumerable and beyond
 all computation (1⁷⁰)

Lev. 5⁵: says with regard to the lamb 57
 If his hand be not strong enough
 whence with regard to the birds in
 v. 11 the expression is varied. If his
 hand cannot find. This shows

that it requires great strength to get rid of errors of the mind (= lamb), but not to check the errors of words (= birds) (2²⁸⁸).

Gen. 28¹²? Why is God called 'Lord' and 'God' of Abraham, and only 'God' of Isaac? - Now 'God' typifies 'beneficence' and 'Lord': 'authority' and it is not good that these should be mixed in self-taught knowledge (Isaac) (2³²⁵⁻⁶).

Again, in same verse, why does he not also add 'thy father' to Isaac as he did to Abraham? - Because virtue derived by practice (Jacob) is

a. Here Philo seems to follow Hebrew text! - for my LXX (Van Ess 1855) reads differently, omitting אֱלֹהִים!

b. This is a case where synonyms furnish him different meanings. 1⁹⁸³. 2³²⁶ Cf. 1³²³⁻⁴

is the offspring of that derived by learning (Abraham), and is therefore connected with the latter (2³²⁷).

7) precision in expression. Gen. 4¹²: "He shall cultivate the earth; not 'he shall become a farmer'; - for farming is an art requiring skill, and Cain here represents those unskilled and worthless people who can do nothing well, except by chance (2³²⁸)".
 Gen. 11⁷: "Let us confound their language". Confound shows that this refers to the destruction of wickedness, for if it referred to the origin of language God would have used a more ap-

appropriate expression such as ~~to~~ 'dissect'
'divide', 'distinguish' - but not 'con-
found' (2⁴¹).

Gen. 46⁴: 'I (God) will go down with
thee'. He does not say 'Thou shalt
go down with me'; for rest, calm-
ness and stability are the attributes
of God, but changeability is charac-
teristic of a created being (1²⁹)^a

Gen 1²⁶: 'He created them' - not 'him',
to show that both, though of une-
qual strength, are most perfectly
equal for nature's principal pur-
pose - the generation of a third be-
ing like themselves (2¹²⁵).

a. This is an instance of a meaning be-
ing derived in spite of the text - referred to
above. Supra p. 55.

Ex. 20¹⁸: Why 'saw' and not 'heard'?

Because God did not speak, but an exceedingly brilliant ray of virtue is here meant (2⁵³).

For other instances see 2³¹³. 345⁴ 350⁴ etc.

8) Ambiguity of expression Gen. 6¹² κατ-

έφθειρε πάντα σαρξ τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ. Ought it not to be αὐτῆς, referring to σαρξ which is feminine, instead of αὐτοῦ?

'All flesh had corrupted its way'?

No, for it refers ^{to} God. It is this way the flesh endeavors to injure and to corrupt. (1^{370B}).

Gen. 31¹³: 'ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῷ πνεύματι θεοῦ' which the LXX has for 'אל ביד אל' is translated 'the God

in the place of God: Are there, then,
two Gods? No, there is only one true
God ($\delta\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$); the absence of the article
in $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\tilde{\upsilon}$ (not $\tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{o}\tilde{\upsilon}$) shows that
the latter refers to His most ancient
Word or $\acute{\alpha}\log\omicron\varsigma$ (2³³⁹⁻⁴⁰).

Lev. 19²⁰ is also ambiguous to Philo (1⁴²⁹).

9) order of words. Noah is men-
tioned as tenth in succession from
Adam in the genealogy of Gen. 5³²,
which clearly shows that as the
decade is the most perfect bounda-
ry and end of the numbers which
proceed onward from the unit,
so also being first in the soul.

(which Noah symbolized) is the perfection and true end of human actions (2¹⁷⁵⁻⁶).

Gen. 8¹⁶⁻¹⁸. From the variation in the order of the names of Noah's family, Philo sees the intimation that in the order in which they entered the propagation of seed was taken away, but by the order of their egress he implies the continuance of the process of generation (4³⁷⁸⁻⁹).

10) juxtaposition of verses is also utilized by Philo. After previously mentioning with respect to Enosh (Gen 4²⁶) that 'he hoped^a to call upon

a. Philo again follows the LXX variant.

the name of the Lord his God; Moses
 adds (Gen. 5') 'This is the book of the gen-
 eration of men' - showing with per-
 fect correctness that man is the
 only creature with a good hope (1st).

By thus noting and emphasizing
 the exact phraseology, ^{and} the precise
 form and order of expression, Phi-
 lo was enabled to derive very con-
 siderable assistance for an allego-
 rical presentation of the meaning
 of Scripture.

Besides these various methods
 of allegorical exegesis, which we
 have here described at sufficient

length and in considerable detail, we need only mention, in conclusion, two others which Philo occasionally, though very rarely resorted to, viz; - introducing E. slight changes in the literal reading of his text, and E. altering the grammatical construction of sentences. As we have already referred to and illustrated these in a previous chapter,^a we shall not again discuss them here.

By all these various expedients, symbolizing, etymologizing, word-play, turning to account the precise

a. Supra ch. II pp. 30^{ss}

phrasology and order of the language of Scripture, and even altering the text and constructions. Philo eminently succeeded in extracting from the Bible the allegorical meanings which he sought to find therein.

Chap. V.

Its Causes

It need hardly be said that by such purely artificial methods of exegesis the original meaning of the Scriptures, if not totally effaced, was at least altogether lost sight of. They were made to con-

tain ideas and teachings wholly foreign to their context, which their original authors had never thought of or imagined. - To use a phrase characteristically Philonic - 'even in a dream' (3⁴⁶⁴ & *perim.*) Through Philo's peculiar exegesis, as if by some magic touch, the Pentateuch was made to teach Plato's idealism with its doctrine of two worlds, to give a complete exposition of the Pythagorean number-mysticism, a presentation of the Stoic system of ethics, scientific explanations of the origin of sensation and the theory

a. Cf. the proverb Ἡ Πλάτων φιλονίξει, ἡ Φίλων πλάτωνίζει found in Jerome, Photius and Suidas. See *Encyc. Britt. Article 'Philo'*.

of knowledge, Plato's own peculiar doctrine of the Logos, - in a word, all of Plato's various views and opinions, scientific, philosophical, theological, ethical and religious, which constituted his eclectic mode of thought so characteristic of the period in which he lived.

How shall we explain such peculiar exegesis, such purely artificial and unnatural interpretation so wholly at variance with the plain, unmistakable, and comparatively clear meaning of the text?

The allegorical method of exegesis

was a product of the time, called forth by the special circumstances of the age, by the character and beliefs of that important period in the world's history when Jew met Greek, when Oriental and Hellenic wisdom met and mingled in the active, eager, thronging life of the cultured commercial city - Alexandria in Egypt. It was an age profoundly religious. The Greek mind and intellect had long ago attained their richest and ripest development in the philosophical thought of a

Socrates, a Plato, and especially an Aristotle. Yet men were dissatisfied with the results of Greek philosophy. They longed for something higher and better. They craved for spiritual truth. Stoicism, Epicureanism, Scepticism, and even Eclecticism - all the phases that marked the later stages of Greek thought - failed to satisfy them, to offer them that certainty which they could no longer find in Greek philosophy. Where was truth?

Truth must exist somewhere, or there would not be this restless

inner craving for it. Truth was
in the past! - and so men began
 to reverence the past, to look to it
 for wisdom and salvation. The
 poets, authors and sages of an-
 tiquity were venerated, their wri-
 tings regarded as the sum and
 essence of all knowledge and
 truth. Homer, Socrates, Plato, Pyth-
 agoras, Jesus, and all the great men
 who had lived in the past were
 'divine' and 'holy,' and their pro-
 ductions, also, 'sacred' and 'divine'.
 Especially was this the case with
 the Hebrew Bible, with which the

cultured world had recently become acquainted through its translation into the language of the Hellenes. This book, among the Jews, had long enjoyed a singular pre-eminence as a product of divine wisdom, inspired and infallible, - and now this belief was only heightened and intensified, owing to the particularly religious character of the age. The Bible was looked upon as the very highest authority, the essence of all wisdom, the source of all truth.

Especially did Philo, as a Jew, believe this. To him the Bible was a product of the highest inspiration, the work of God Himself. It contained truly divine laws (3⁷⁰), unalloyed laws of truth (1²⁷³), directly given to man by God (4¹⁴⁷, 3¹⁷⁴). Its writers and authors were divinely inspired prophets (2¹⁴⁴, 4¹³⁶) and their utterances 'oracles' (1⁴²³, 3¹⁷⁴, 143, 4¹⁴⁷). The prophets say nothing of their own (2¹⁴⁰); they are mere interpreters of God (3¹⁹⁰, 366, 469), mere instruments in His hand, mouthpieces and organs of His will and wisdom (2¹⁴⁰, 3¹⁹⁰, 366). The greatest of these was Moses,

the most perfect and holy of all the prophets (¹276.472), whom God had filled with His divine spirit and appointed interpreter of His holy oracles. (³174.2154.3114). Moses was so wholly possessed by inspiration (³135) as to predict not only the future of the whole nation Israel and of each particular tribe, but even what should happen to himself after death and the precise manner of his burial (³136). By all means we must consider the Holy Scriptures infallible" (⁴290.1205). This infallibility, as we have already seen, extends even to the LXX translation, and Philo very

a. In this Philo even goes beyond the Palestinian Rabbin, who ascribed the last eight verses of Deut. harmonistically, to Joshua.
See Baba Bathra 14 b.

naively yet in all seriousness, tells of the sudden violent death of "an ungodly and impious man" whom he had, once mocking and ridiculing, its complete inspiration even in some trifling particular (2²⁵⁰), - so thoroughly did Philo believe in its divine character and infallibility.

Now the Bible contained many things that were evidently inconsistent with its inspired character. Philo recognized its deficiencies, - its inconsistencies (4³²⁴), its anachronisms (2⁸⁰), and even its contradictions (1²⁴¹⁻²^a). He fully admitted that according to

a. It matters not if these are not in all cases the same as found by modern Biblical criticism. The principle remains the same.

its literal sense the Bible contained much that was obscure,^a perplexing (2²⁴⁶) inconsistent (1⁴³⁹) deficient in truth (1²⁸⁶), false (1²⁹⁷), fabulous (1³⁹⁴, 1⁴⁵⁵⁻⁷), unreasonable (1²⁶⁵, 2¹³⁰) and even senseless (1⁴⁰⁹), and absurd (2³⁰⁷). Anthropomorphisms and anthropopathies, so frequent in the Bible, he declared to be incurable folly, utterly destructive of all piety and religious feeling (1⁴²³, 3³⁵⁵, 2²⁸⁻⁹). The double accounts in Genesis, likewise, did not escape his attention (1⁵³⁻⁴, 4²⁹⁰⁻⁴), and the two names for God אֱלֹהִים and יְהוָה, in their Greek rendering θεός and Δεσπότης (4³⁵⁷ ^{passim}), interested him to a degree that is

a. See *supra* Chap. IV under 8) - p. 88

truly remarkable (4³⁵⁷).

Now many of the anthropomorphisms were indeed explained away in a manner very similar to the principle of Rabbi Oshmael רבדה תורה כלשון בני אדם.^a Such language is used 'in relation to man' (4³¹³). Owing to our weak and mortal nature, we can conceive God only in terms of ourselves, and therefore we attribute to him human parts and passions (2²¹. 1²²⁹) They are meant for our instruction (2²¹. 4³⁰²) In fact, this is the only way that foolish persons, whose minds are of a dull or sluggish character, can

^a See Milgrom's 'Introd. to Talm.' p. 126.

at all be benefited, or brought to obey
 the moral law. (2³⁴⁰⁻¹ / 355) In this way
 Philo made allowance for the an-
 thropomorphisms in the Bible.^a But
 in order to rid himself of the graver
 inconsistencies and contradictions al-
 luded to above, which seemed ser-
 viously to challenge the infallibility
 of Scripture, he was obliged to have
 recourse to the system of allegorical
 interpretation. (1⁴²³⁻⁴²⁴ 2⁴²⁰)^b This alone,
 in his opinion, would preserve the
 divine unity and harmony of the sa-
 cred Scriptures, whereas by any other
 mode of exposition would appear inter-

^a Though Philo is not explicitly allegorized, (1^{357. 423} etc.)
^b For examples of harmonical exegesis on this
 see 4^{293. 321. 357. 435}, / 84. 505-8. 513, 2⁴²⁵⁻⁶ etc.

ly inconsistent and absurd (4^{908-9}).

But there was still another reason which necessitated the employment of allegory. Philo believed, not only that the Bible was inspired and therefore infallible and perfect, but also that it contained the essence of all truth, the highest and purest wisdom. (Was there any testimony more trustworthy than that of Moses? (2^{209}) Moses had attained to the very summits of philosophy, and had learned from the teacher of God the most numerous and important of the principles of Nature (1^3). He was the highest per-

fection of wisdom (1³⁷²). All that the
 Greeks had ever taught was long
 ago known to Moses, and could be
 found written on the sacred pillars.
 (2³²⁸) Indeed they were greatly indebted
 to Moses for their knowledge, and
 had derived much of their wisdom
 from his holy writings. The Mo-
 rian laws had penetrated the whole
 habitable world from one extremi-
 ty to the other, and had attracted
 and influenced all nations, both
 barbarians and Greeks (3⁷⁵). Heracli-
 tus, for example, only followed the
 doctrine of Moses (1⁴⁰). In the leading

principle of his whole philosophy he
 merely made use of an ancient discove-
 ry of Moses (2¹²⁵). Zeno, too, the great found-
 er of the Stoic school of philosophy, ap-
 pears to have drawn at least one of his
 maxims, as it were, from the fountain
 of the legislation of the Jews (3³⁷⁸⁻⁹). And
 even some of the law-givers among
 the Greeks, who had established
 very wise regulations, had merely
 transferred and transcribed some of
 the laws from the two tables of
 Moses (3³⁶⁹) Of these admirable and in-
 comparable and most desirable laws
 (3⁸³) every individual and particular

one aims at the harmony of the universe, and corresponds to the law of the eternal nature (3⁸⁶). They are truly divine, enacted with the seal of nature herself (3⁷⁰). Therefore Philo undertook to show their complete harmony with the science and philosophy of the time. The Scriptures are thoroughly scientific in spirit (4⁷⁰⁹). They constitute the first principle of natural science (4³⁵⁶)—nay, like a stream, they themselves irrigate the sciences (1³²²). So Philo believed not only that the Bible was the source of all ancient wisdom, but that it also contained

the scientific teachings and philosophical views prevailing in his own day.

Now the literal reading of the Scripture evidently could not support such a belief. The Bible, on the face of it, contained nothing of this sort. It certainly did not teach the philosophy of Heraclitus, Plato's idealism, the Pythagorean mysticism, or the Stoic asceticism. On the contrary, it taught much that was directly opposed to them. The creation of the world in time (1st), and its antiquity (4th), woman's creation from a rib of man (1st).

etc. were ideas wholly at variance with the scientific theories of the time. The Bible made no mention of the four elements of Empedocles, of the *pneuma* of the Stoics, of Aristotle's eternity of matter, or of the *Logos* of Heraclitus; and the general character of its ethics certainly differed widely from the neo-Pythagorean or Stoic asceticism^a. Yet all of these elements contributed largely to the eclectic character of Philo's thought, and he could reconcile them with, or deduce them from, the statements of Scripture only by means of the allegorical method of interpre-

a. See H. H. Mayer's 'Hedonism in Bible and Talmud', Part I.

tation. This, according to Frankel, was the chief impelling motive of Philo's exegesis.^a

The deeply felt religious need of the time referred to above, was another cause which stimulated the employment of allegory. Philo's was a nature devoutly religious, and of great moral earnestness. Not content with the ethical and religious teachings already contained in the Bible, his religious feeling must needs seek out more and deeper moral meanings (1st. 4³⁰⁻²). Like the exiled Duke in Shakspeare's "As You Like It" Philo

a. Frankel p. 27.

finds a lesson in everything (1^{276. 513¹⁴⁵}),
 - sermons, not included in stones, but
 in the most unimportant statements
 of Scripture, however, non-ethical in
 character, which have no bearing, di-
 rectly or indirectly, on religion, and
 which contain in themselves no
 inteling of a moral meaning (2³⁷⁹
 1¹⁸⁹ 2²⁰³ 400. 276). But Philo is a great pre-
 cher and is always moralizing (1^{51. 64}
 106. 7. 195. 199. 400. 514-5 3^{125. 277. 442.}) To satisfy
 his religious needs, everything in
Scripture is spiritualized, and this,
 consciously or unconsciously, promp-
 ted the employment of allegory.

Thus for all those reasons to vindicate the inspired character of the Bible, to harmonize its teachings with the results of science, and to satisfy his own religious needs, Philo had recourse to allegory.

But was he not conscious of the artificiality of his method? Was he not aware that the Scriptures did not really contain all that he credited them with? And was he not therefore intentionally falsifying the plain meaning of the text? Away! Let not such an idea ever enter your mind!" as Philo himself

would have said in a similar case.

(3¹⁴³) Philo's lofty moral character absolutely forbids our imputing to him any but the most upright of motives, and precludes even the suspicion of conscious or intentional fraud. Philo honestly and sincerely believed that he was giving a true and faithful interpretation of Scripture. He emphatically repudiates the thought that the explanations he has given may perhaps be fables of his own invention: 'This is the doctrine of Moses, not mine!' (1^o)
 These statements are the oracle writ-

a. B. also 2³²⁸ "Away with such a notion!"

ten on the sacred pillars' (2³⁴). He real-
 ly believed that 'nearly all, or, at all
 events, the greater part of the law
 was full of allegories' (2⁴⁵⁷). The Scrip-
 tures themselves conduct us towards
 and instigate us to, the pursuit of
 allegory (1⁴²³). Like the Palestinian
 Rabbis, his views were the essentials,
 his manner of basing them was of
 minor consideration; and if he em-
 ployed allegory for this purpose it
 was done purely instinctively, and
 for reasons, as we have explained in
 this chapter, which had their real and ulti-
 mate ground in the special char-

acter, circumstances, and requirements of the age in which he lived.

Chap. VI

Philo's Attitude Towards the Literal

But if Philo thus explained the true meaning away allegorically, how much of the Scriptures did he believe literally? Did he accept the literal statement at all, or was it wholly effaced through the employment of allegory? What was Philo's attitude towards the literal?

Now it must be understood at the outset that the allegorical ~~intense~~

pretation, though almost everywhere deduced, does not, however, do away with the literal meaning of a verse or passage. Thus Philo says that although the seventh day is a lesson to teach us the power of the uncreated God, it does not follow that on that account we may abrogate the laws which are established respecting it. Nor does it follow because the feast is the symbol of the joy of the soul and its gratitude towards God, that we are to repudiate the assemblies ordained at the periodical seasons of the year;

nor because the rite of circumcision
is an emblem of the excision of
pleasure and of all the passions,
and of the destruction of that im-
pious opinion, according to which
the mind has imagined itself to be
by itself competent to produce offspring,
does it follow that we are to annul
the law which has been enacted a-
bout circumcision. For we ought to
attend to both classes of things, ap-
plying ourselves to an accurate in-
vestigation of invisible things,
and also to an irreproachable obser-
vance of those laws which are noto-

vious' (2⁶³). This is quite in accord with the Talmudic principle

"אין המקרא יוצא מיד פשוטו", 'the natural sense of a passage must not be lost sight of' (Sabbath 63a, Yebamoth 11b; 24a)

In Philo's exegesis, therefore, the literal exists side by side with the allegorical, and has full validity. The literal ~~existent~~ is continually spoken of as 'plain' (2⁶³) (4⁴⁰²) 'open', 'explicit', 'obvious', as 'admitting of no doubt or difficulty' (4³⁶⁸), exceedingly clear, requiring no investigation or explanation' (4^{402-406. 432, 508}) - and is in almost all cases allow-

ed to stand, and accepted as a matter of course.

The treatises on 'Abraham' and 'Joseph' and the 'Questions and Solutions' dealing with the stories in Genesis, prove conclusively that Philo accepted these Scriptural accounts literally, and regarded them, for the most part, as absolutely historical. In narrating the wonderful adventures of Joseph, he takes occasion to remark that 'these things really did come to pass, and similar things often will happen when it seems good to God (2⁴⁷⁰). Heaven be-

lieved that the three angels entered
 the tent of Abraham, and actually
 partook of his hospitality (2⁴⁹). though
 he admitted that the proceeding
 was wholly miraculous (2⁴²). How-
 ever, Philo believed in miracles, for
 he often says expressly 'All things
 are possible to God' (1¹². 2⁴²). The destruc-
 tion of Sodom and Gomorrah he re-
 garded as an historical event, and,
 as a positive proof of its occurrence,
 he refers to the smoke which, he says,
 is still emitted, and the sulphur
 which men dig up there to this day;
 while the ancient fertility of the land

is seen in the little city which still exists there, and which is very populous, and very fertile in grass, corn and every kind of fruit (2⁴²⁵).

In reproducing the Biblical Tales, he is wholly faithful to the facts as narrated in the Scriptures. These stories are very appreciatively and charmingly rendered. Yet Philo does not hesitate to add occasional embellishments and artistic touches of his own, which, however, do not mar their original meaning.^a

He appreciated the full beauty and value of the Mosaic laws, and admired

a. See especially 'De Josephi', 'De Abrahami' and the three treatises on 'Vita Mosi'.

their exceeding gentleness and hu-
 manity ($3^{274} \cdot 434 \cdot 5 \cdot 439$), and the great
 advantages to be derived from their
 observance (3^{428}) The enthusiasm
 and love with which he expounds
 them in the treatise on the 'Spe-
 cial Laws', and with which he re-
 commends them to all men,
 shows that he himself had indeed
 'more than tasted of this sacred
 code of laws with only the edges of
 his lips' - as Philo puts it - but had
 'feasted and revelled in its most
 sweet and beautiful doctrines' (3^{434})
 His exposition of them is almost

wholly literal.^a

Philo constantly quotes the literal in support or corroboration of his allegorical explanations. He appeals to it as the 'express words' (2^{145.290}), which are engraven on the Sacred Scriptures as on a pillar (2¹⁴⁵).

Thus, he confirms the allegorical interpretation of Num. 14⁹ that God stands aloof from the sinners, but walks among those souls that cultivate virtue, by citing Lev. 20¹² "I will walk among you, and I will be your God" (2²⁹⁰). That the sun is a symbol for God, is

a. See Vol. III, passim. For exceptions see infra p. 140

proven by the first verse of the twenty-seventh Psalm, "The Lord is my light and my salvation" (2³⁰⁸). That God alone can discern the motives and intentions of the heart, is very aptly witnessed by the verse which even the modern preacher can do no better than use for the same purpose, "הַסֵּתֵרוֹת לַיהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ. וְהַנִּגְלוֹת לָנוּ וּלְבָנֵינוּ וְגו'"
 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but the things that are revealed belong unto us and our children'; etc (Deut. 29²⁷). Similar reference to other verses in the Bible on which he bases or establishes

his views give certain evidence of the fact, that Philo knew how to value the literal statements of Scripture.

Not only did Philo understand and accept the literal, but his ex-
egesis of particular verses in a non-
allegorical manner, is often sur-
prising and quite remarkable. For
example, he shows very correctly how
the future tense 'I will show thee' in
Gen. 12, reveals Abraham's faith and
trust in God (2nd) He calls atten-
tion to the exact force of ἐκίσκουσθε
(Heb. וַיִּשְׁמַע); he hearkened; (Gen. 16th)

showing that it not only expresses 'hearing' but also indicates approving of, and being influenced by what one hears' (2¹⁷). He notices the precise language used in Gen 7², and calls attention to the special emphasis to be laid upon the words 'in this generation' (4³⁵). His remark that of the three angels who appeared to Abraham the one that did not visit Sodom & Gomorrah was Sod Himself, bears an astonishing resemblance to the modern critical interpretation & understanding of the pas-

sage (2⁴²⁵). Still more remarkable is his exegesis of "אֵהְיֶה אִשְׁרָא אֵהְיֶה" (Ex. 3¹⁴), which is almost identical, in its results at least, with the grammatico-exegetical opinion that construes it as an *idem per idem* construction (2^{240. 340}).^a

On the other hand, Plutarch's exegesis of the literal is often very peculiar and even fantastic. For example, - The expression 'in his mind' (which the LXX has, ἐν τῷ Νοεῖ αὐτοῦ, for the Heb. יִבְלַב (Gen. 17¹)), he construes as representing that the doubt which Abraham entertained

a. M. Margolis' 'Notes on Jeremiah'.

This remarkable interpretation may, however, be due solely to the LXX translation of the verse, "Ἐγὼ εἶπα ὁ ὢρ"! Cf. LXX ad loc.

was only of short duration, passing away as quickly as the motion of the mind (2²⁷³). Gen. 1²⁶ Philo takes even too literally, stating that the 'us', 'Let us make man; points to the fact of there having been several creators in conjunction with God. though the real cause why the all-powerful God should require the assistance of others for the creation of so short-lived and frail a creature as man, is a mystery, known to God alone (1²⁰-1²⁰⁸).

In the last example Philo evidently adhered to the literal somewhat

too closely. However, he does not always, as in this case, fail to recognize what is merely a peculiarity of the style. For example, he makes due allowance for rhetorical language and for poetical expression (1²⁶¹ 2³⁸⁷)

From the above exposition it will be sufficiently plain that in Philo's exegesis the literal was by no means disregarded or neglected, but had full force and validity beside the allegorical.

Nevertheless the literal was considered to be inferior and subor-

clinate to the allegorical. Even
 when Plato has explained a verse
 or passage according to its literal
 meaning, he is dissatisfied and
 impatient until he has also
 given its allegorical explanation^(2⁴²⁰).
 He regarded the literal as only half-
 sufficient. From the plain and easy
 interpretation of a passage we must
 proceed onward to the figurative
 way of looking at it (2⁴¹) The lit-
 eral, at best, is only the foundation
 upon which the rest of the building
 must be erected according to the
 rules of that wise architect, allegory.^(2⁴³⁶)

The literal sustains the same relation to the allegorical as does the body to the soul ($2^{64.4444^{18.252}}$), - and what an inferior rank it must then have held in Plato's estimation may be inferred from the degrading epithets which he applied to the body. The body is a 'base and polluted prison house' (2^{44}), 'a sepulchre' (*De Justitia* 38),^a and 'in its own nature, dead' (1^{125}). The Egyptian disposition is branded as an atheistical one because it values the things of the earth above the things of heaven, and the body

above the soul (2²³¹).

The allegorical alone gives the real meaning (4³¹⁹⁻⁴⁰³, 2¹⁶⁶⁻³²⁶) The mere words of the Scriptures are, as it were, but shadows of bodies, while the meanings which are apparent to investigation^a beneath them are the real things to be pondered upon (2³⁷) They present the pure facts in their incorporeal and naked state (2⁴⁴). The allegorical method is 'the true way of this business' (1²⁴⁷), and those who are eager for truth must investigate the mystical meaning concealed

as here we have the exact equivalent ~~of~~ the Talmudic word **שורש**!

beneath the verbal symbols in accordance with the rules of allegory (3²³⁵).

Philo even goes so far as to openly oppose the literal, and, in some instances, to reject it altogether.

There were many statements of Scripture that Philo did not believe, and he did not hesitate to express his unbelief in the most unambiguous and emphatic terms. For example, in reference to God's planting the garden of Eden, he boldly states that no trees of life or knowledge have ever at any previous time

appeared upon the earth, nor is it likely that any will appear hereafter. Such statements appear to him to be dictated by a philosophy which is symbolical rather than strictly accurate (1⁴⁶). To believe that God cultivates the land and plants paradises is fabulous nonsense, and it is even impious to entertain such a thought (1⁴⁷). But Philo is much more radical than this in his opposition to Scripture. He openly denies 'creatio ex nihilo'! There was an existing essence which God employed in creation (1⁴⁸). He rejects

the orthodox view of historical creation and is therefore opposed to chronological dating from the reputed antiquity of the world (4²⁴⁶).

It would be a sign of great simplicity, he observes, to think that the world was created in six days, or that it was created at all in time; for time is dependent upon the motion of the heavenly bodies, and must, therefore, be posterior to the world (1¹¹¹). It does not therefore surprise us at all, that Philo declares the literal statements of woman's creation from a rib of man

to be 'fabulous' (1⁶⁰) or the transformation of Lot's wife into a pillar of salt, as also a 'fable' (2²⁹). He seems a trifle too severe, however, in his condemnation of those who believe the historical genealogy of the descendants of Manasseh (I Chron 7¹⁴), for he politely characterizes them as out of their senses (2¹⁶⁶).

The literal statements even where it is not 'fabulous', often cause him great perplexity, and is rejected by him on that account - as, for example, the release of the fugitives on the death of the high-

priest. Owing to the difference in the ages of the high-priests, unequal punishments would be imposed for the same offense; - and Philo finds the only escape from this difficulty by denying that the high-priest referred to is a man and by allegorizing him into the Logos of God (2¹⁶). Again, the literal often appears to be unreasonable. To imagine that Moses, the friend of God, should be forbidden to enter the promised land, but that a race of slaves should have the country assigned to them, Philo declares to be a piece of

inconsiderate folly (2⁵²).

Even the Levitical laws, though usually interpreted and accepted literally, are sometimes rejected as inconsistent or even senseless. Thus Philo finds it necessary to allegorize Lev. 19²³, which enjoins the ערלח פרי for the first three years (1⁷²⁹). He sees no reason in the law which pronounces the camel to be an unclean beast because it chews the cud and does not part the hoof - unless interpreted allegorically (1⁷³⁴⁻⁵).

Sometimes Philo opposes the literal where it is entirely unobjectiona-

ble merely, it would seem, for the sake
 of the allegorical (2^{328.348.303.304.168. 4⁴¹⁷}) Even
 such a humane law as Ex. 22²⁶ which
 forbids the holding over night of the
 poor man's garment taken in
 pledge, Philo objected to in the literal.
 He considers it a notion of men who
 have not the least conception or com-
 prehension of the virtue of the Al-
 mighty God to call Him merciful (v. 27)
 with respect to so trivial a matter as
 that of a garment not being restor-
 ed to the debtor by the lender. The law-
 giver would not have displayed
 such earnestness about a garment,

- and Philo reasons quite at length to prove that the verses can be understood properly only by looking at the allegorical meaning^a.

Our investigation of Philo's attitude towards the literal thus reveals the fact that though the literal is generally appreciated, understood, accepted and even explained, Philo preferred the allegorical, and did not hesitate to openly denounce and reject the literal for various considerations that all but commanded him to forsake the strict letter of what is written^a.