PROLEGOMENA

TO A STUDY OF

PHILO'S MIDRASH

(with emphasis of its use in the Vita Mosis)

- by -

Ernest Conrad

Synopsis of the Rabbinical Thesis Entitled
"Prolegomena to a Study of Philo's Midrash, with special emphasis upon the Vita Mosis"

submitted by Ernst J. Conrad

The introduction of this thesis treats the problem of Hellenistic biography in general and the employment of allegory in particular. Various types of biography are described in the light of Philo's writings, and his intentions and motives are examined. Considerable space is given to a discussion of allegorical exegesis, reasons for its rise, development and utilization in Palestine and Alexandria. The special value of the Vita Mosis as an example par excellence for the Hellenistic bios is pointed out, and, in conclusion, Philo's message to his contemporaries and to our own age is briefly indicated.

The main body of this preliminary attempt at an analysis of Philo's use of Midrash consists of a juxtaposition of thrity-seven selected Midrashim from the Vita Mosis and other Philonic writings that refer to Moses, the law-giver, high-priest, ruler of the people and prophet, and similar material found in the Palestinian Midrash, the Mechilta, Midrash Exodus Rabba, Tanchuma and the Agada of the Talmud. This comparisson serves to demonstrate the apparent difference not only in style and wording, but especially in intellectual approach and philosophical thinking. Thus we obtain a more complete conception of Hellenistic thinking which reached in Philo, the cosmopolitan, its finest expression. We realize the extent of the Greek education which Philo and his generation had perfectly assimilated with their Jewish knowledge and heritage, and which constitutes the basis for the European Jew even of later generations. The interrelation between Hellenistic and Palestinian Midrash is examined in detail, and, upon

rare occasions, a suggestion as to the original source of the passage and its date has been made. Also, the principles of Alexandrian hermeneutics are discussed and frequently referred to.

The conclusion briefly indicates the historical significance of Philo and of the Vita Mosis.

Prolegomena to a Study of Philo's Use of Midrash

I. Introduction

The ultimate purpose of this investigation is a complete commentary on the Vita Mosis with reference to all parallel passages in the writings of Philo and all other post-biblical statements about Moses. Special attention will be called to two objectives, namely, to demonstrate

1. Philo's Greek education. This work alone enables us to consider not only his philosophical system, but also the literary form of the Greek biography, and
2. the utilization of Greek as well as Jewish media of interpretation, with particular emphasis upon the Agadic and allegorical interpretation.

An attempt in this direction has been made repeatedly by scholars who have bestowed much care upon a study of Philo's relations to the Palestinian Agada. But, in most instances, these studies dealt with individual Midrashim, which were taken out of their context and which served to point out single ideas, or one specific type of interpretation. The aim of this inquiry is not to separate the Midrash as a unit, from the work of Philo, but rather to specify its functions within the sphere of biographical literature: whether it is only a secondary embellishment or is essential for its understanding; whether an idea is being developed, or merely being exemplified, respectively, an extraneous idea is being pressed into the Midrash; Whether, finally, and in what manner an idea indigenous to the Midrash is estranged from its original character under Greek influence, or, on the other hand, an originally Greek idea is being transformed in its essence through

assimilation to the Midrash. Furthermore, this study will pose the question, without necessarily arriving at a concrete answer, as to what extent the original source of Philo and the Midrash harmonize, and possibly find the ultimate source of both. While the scarcity of the material that has been preserved from the period of Hellenistic-Jewish literary activity does not permit - and unless new papyri discoveries should shed additional light on that age never will permit definite conclusions - the history of the evolution of certain ideas and their gradual growth, as demonstrated by the examples extant, may serve as an acceptable criterion for an approximate chronological order.

From these introductory remarks it will be readily seen that the employment of Midrash in a biography fulfills another function and is of a different type than in those works which comment systematically on the Bible and which, numerically, constitute the greater part of Philo's literary output. But even within the realm of his preserved biography a fundamental distinction has to be noted, which will become apparent if the life of Mosis is compared with the lives of the Patriarchs. Both groups belong to the species of ethical commentaries to the pentateuch, which consists of many smaller works. But this is the difference! While the remaining ethical commentaries are based upon the act of revelation and endeavor to prove to the reader that all ethical teachings of Greek philosophy were anticipated by the Torah and have actually been derived from it, the biographies of the patriarchs serve to show the existence and function of the nómoi Agraphoi, i. e., the generally recognized ethical norms which are not connected with the act of revelation, as described in the pentateuch. With the aid of the biographies of the patriarchs Philo could illustrate the

effect of these "unwritten laws" in the ideal way of living and exemplify the gradual development of these ideas on well-known examples. These biographies possess a symbolic character. For, if the biblical narrative would be accepted at its face value, Jacob's life would not yield many praiseworthy ethical qualities which could be transformed into a basis for a system of natural morality. The biographical notices concerning Isaac are few and interspersed throughout and would scarcely suffice in quantity for a life-portrait in the manner of Cornelius Nepos. Thus Philo was constrained to treat the lives of the patriarchs metaphorically. Historical actuality has no inherent scientific purpose and is no longer evaluated for its true significance and meaning within its chronological context, and as a political lesson for future generations; it merely serves as a symbol for psychological phenomena and character delineations. We obtain a completely changed patriarch, one no longer made of flesh and blood but one who has lost all traces of reality and has been transmuted into a stereotyped ideal. Yet this should not imply that Philo purposely falsified the account of the pentateuchal narrative. In his orthodoxy he could have easily vied with the strictest followers of rabbinical Judaism at any time. Nor is it correct to accuse him of hypocrisy, charging that he deliberately misinterpreted the scriptural text in accordance with his personal views. For Philo, the biblical narrative and his own symbolic understanding of it were fused into an inseparable unity, and his patriarchs had the same degree of reality for him as, for instance, the divine logos.

The four patriarchs - Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and Joseph - represent four different aspects of the nómoi ágraphoi, each patriarch symbolizing one of these:

1. Abraham - the symbol of the virtue acquired by learning (didaskalikê aretê)
2. Isaac - that of the innate virtue (physikê aretê)

3. Jacob - that of the virtue acquired by practice (asketikè aretè).

These correspond to the three fundamental concepts of Greek ethics: mâthesis, phŷsis and âskesis, through which man may attain the highest goal - virtue itself. This instance clearly indicates the method whereby Philo uses Greek ideas and intellectual concepts. Not only does he attempt to understand biblical personalities in their peculiar historical environment, with the aid of these fundaments, but he introduces them into the philosophical imagination of his time through this allegorical-philo-~~sophical~~ logical re-interpretation. Indirectly, Judaism is thus presented by him as a living and effective substance, and is brought as such into the Hellenistic cultural sphere as a force which legitimately finds its appropriate place in that orbit. Of these three biographies only the one about Abraham is preserved. From it we may draw conclusions with regard to the form and content of the other biographies and Philo's method and approach.

This model biography exhibits the Alexandrian's purposes and thoughts by transforming the patriarch completely into an allegorical symbol, without paying any attention to the historical pertinence. All that remains of the Abraham we know from the Book of Genesis is a Principle surrounded with flesh, a character bare of sentiments and emotions. His general presentation reflects the rational (deistic) ethics of the eighteenth century. But it is through this abstraction that the characterization of the patriarch obtains its universal human appeal, and therein lies its cultural-historical (kulturgeschichtlich) value. Contrast this with the bios of Joseph. The latter serves as an example for that type of virtue which operates within the social and political world (politikè aretè). This virtue is intimately

related to an existing state and its constitution. Thus, its effectiveness is limited to political and national boundaries, in sharp contradistinction from the cosmopolitan ideal of the other patriarchs whose appeal was universalistic. But even in this biography the ethical principle has precedence over the personal, throughout.

The Vita Moses is of a different kind. Not only does the hero chronologically stand between the nómoi ágraphoi and the revelation of the Law at Mount Sinai, but as a legislator, prophet, priest and ruler of the people he is outstanding in a manner unparalleled by any other biblical, or even human figure. This enables Philo to write a truly Hellenistic bios, a literary species, for which he found many examples in the Alexandrian creations of the preceding two centuries. His hero, Moses, is idealized in the manner of the Greek heroes. It is a characteristic of the Greek biography to intersperse and adorn the narrative with speeches of considerable length, wholly imaginery, into which the author instills his own emotions and reflections, sometimes with the aim of injecting a modern note into events of the otherwise unintelligiole and uninteresting past - sometimes endeavoring to admonish his own backsliding and corrupt generation to a better course of conduct, gaining his point by the recognized authority of his hero. Other qualities of this biography are the frequent moralistic reflections and sententiae and the broad and detailed descriptions of scenes already familiar to the reader, from other sources. To maintain the public's continued interest these incidents were "spiced" with freshly invented material which would arise curiosity and stimulate the imagination.

The clearest expression about the nature of his ideal man was given by Philo in this biography. In all Jewish literature we cannot discover

any other production comparable to this Hellenistic specimen of psychological characterization and consummate artistry, moulding form and content into a thing of aesthetic perfection. Here man is seen as a complete whole, not merely as the representative of a single virtue, but in the totality of human relations with God and with one another. The final aim of this form of biography is to delineate a complete, individualized personality, not to inject philosophical ideas into the bios which cannot be deduced from the life, actions or speeches of the hero. This latter method was employed in certain types of Midrashim. Moses is so unique because in him the nômoi Agraphoi and all the laws revealed on Mt. Sinai are no longer two separate concepts, but are blended together. Such perfection and the careful love which the author lavished upon the most minute details of his birth, upbringing, education and intellectual development, result in the portrait of a hero who combines the physical qualifications of a Herakles or Achilleus with the sagacity of Nestor and Teiresias and the purity and devotion of Antigone or Iphigeneia. The bios of such an idealized man was written, as it appears from the foregoing, not primarily for the Hellenistic Jews, though these gladly resorted to this form of educational reading, since Hebraic knowledge was practically non-existent and the biographical material in the Septuagint was scattered over many chapters filled with extraneous and dull subject matter. Besides, how many could afford to purchase the four scrolls of the pentateuch that contained the story of Moses!

Yet the deliberate characterization of Moses as a perfect Greek hero indicates that Philo, consciously or not, addressed himself to Greek readers. For this purpose he so closely adapted the trôpos of the Greek biography

which aimed, as previously stated, to comprehend man as a whole, ethically, intellectually and pragmatically, with words and actions corresponding exactly to one another. It is self-evident that, with these aims in mind, Philo approached his Midrashic sources, and does not lay claim to any originality which would only have detracted from the authority of his Moses, in a particular manner. He could not indiscriminately include in his bios the innumerable stories and anecdotes which were already commonly spread. Carefully he chose from his Palestinian sources, which he knew with the help of translations, for he too was ignorant of the Holy Tongue - or at best, had a very superficial smattering of it. However, it would be erroneous to assume that he relied only on Palestinian Midrashim, which, at that time, were integrated into the Hellenistic sphere of thinking. It is equally certain that he employed a genuine Greek Midrash, the very product of the Alexandrian school of exegesis, that can be traced in the Agada and allegory of his predecessors. The few fragments of the extensive writings of Aristobulos, Artapanos, the letter of Aristeas, of Iason of Cyrene - even certain additions and modifications in the Septuagint itself testify as to the existence of such a Hellenistic Midrash.

The principal distinction between Philo's Midrash and the Agada of the Palestinians is the pre-dominance of the allegorical interpretation in the former and its striking absence in the latter. Nevertheless, instances of allegories can be found interspersed throughout the Agada. First of all, the word "allegory" should be defined, since there are slight differences in definition which could lead to confusion. The Greek noun allegoria is composed of the adjective "állos", (other) and "agoreúo" (to speak in public). It would thus signify a public statement designating something else than the ap-

parent meaning. This basic definition of allegory must be further subdivided, if we are to arrive at the specific meaning of the word as it is currently employed. Three different shadings of allegories can be distinguished: the metaphor, symbolism and pure allegory. The first is merely "the use of a word or phrase literally denoting one kind of object or idea in place of another, by way of suggesting a likeness or analogy between them". Frequently it occurs in etymologies and in comparisons. Symbolism arises when the actually thought meaning of the word is expanded and given a deeper meaning. The "hand" of God thus denotes His strength, etc. Closely related to the symbolic interpretation is the typological, also very common in the Palestinian Midrah. Real events of the scriptural narrative are thought to represent types or substances of later events. In this manner, the ladder (in Jacob's dream) on which angels ascend and descend continuously, is said to refer to the future Temple, where the priests unceasingly offer sacrifices. Finally we obtain the pure allegory, where the actual sense of the word is completely abandoned and replaced with an abstract concept. At that stage the thinking ability must have advanced to the rational level. Ordinarily, pure allegory depends on three conditions: (1) There must be a profound respect for the ancient tradition; (2) intellectual progress must extend to the general population, and (3) this progress has not yet developed into historical-critical thinking. It always occurs when a dicotomy exists between the ideological outlook of the interpreter and the text to be expounded. Thus, in an age when the ancient Greek and Hebrew myths could no longer be accepted at their face content, allegory was needed to spiritualize those

events that were cause for ridicule and derision to a sophisticated generation. Consequently, it was the desire of both peoples to free the deity from sensual, human characteristics. Originally the Jews were content with a metaphorical interpretation of anthropomorphic passages by adding the word "shem" (name), or "k'vod" (glory), before the divine name. Such can be found in many instances in the Septuagint and the early Targumim. But the tremendous development of Jewish thinking during the Hellenistic period would not be satisfied to compromise with its rationalistic principles and world-view. "There being scarcely a people which underwent such powerful religious development and at the same time remained so fervently attached to its venerable traditions as the Jews, allegorism became of necessity a prominent feature in the history of their literature"[2]. That it originally developed among the Stoic exegetes as a literary form, is generally agreed, for the Greeks experienced even greater difficulties than had the Jews, in reconciling the anthropopathic characterizations of Ares, Aphrodite and Thetis with the enlightened agnosticism of the third century, B.C.E. Therefore, Treitel goes too far in denying any Jewish dependence on its Greek models. He states: "Die Allegoristik ist .. auf eigenstem jüdischen Boden gewachsen, ist ein Produkt des im jüdischen Volke lebenden Genius, der dem abstrakten Ausdruck für Dinge, der Abstraktion, das Bild, den bildlichen Ausdruck, vorzieht"[3]. The distinction between a physical-cosmological and an ethical allegory is of Greek origin, and the former does not enjoy popularity among Jewish exegetes. If it occurs - as in the elaborate logos scheme - it is permeated with an ethical undercurrent. There are yet other slight deviations of the Jewish allegorists from their Greek examples[4]. We may safely

assume that because of the incessant interchange of literary productions between Greeks and Jews, the influence was mutual as far as the Hellenistic Jews are concerned.[5]

Among the predecessors of Philo who utilized allegory, three writers can be succinctly traced. First, there is Aristobulos, who identifies Scripture with Aristotelianism and is mainly concerned with the elimination of anthropomorphisms. God's "standing", "descending", "speaking" and "resting" are expounded and occur in a similar meaning in Philo's works. Second, the author of the letter of Aristeas serves as his model, not only in the legend about the origin of the Septuagint translation but also in the symbolic interpretation of the dietary and other laws. Finally, the wisdom of Solomon shows traces of symbolic allegory. Here we meet the serpent which, being the symbol of the devil, tempted Eve, and afterwards death entered the universe. Philo goes further. He considers "ton men ophin hedonen einai" (De agr. 22) as it would be ludicrous to regard the story's literal meaning.

While we find several men who anticipated Philo's use of allegory, it would not be fair to underestimate his own contribution to Alexandrian hermeneutics. For only to him do we owe thanks for having preserved a multitude of examples of the physical as well as the ethical allegory which enable us to penetrate into the thinking of his age. Through his re-interpretation of the book of Genesis the cosmological character of Judaism came to the fore as well as the progress of mankind. From the first triad of Adam, the neutral spirit, Eve - sensuality, and the serpent - lust, man advanced to a second triad consisting of Enosh - hope, Enoch - repentance, and Noah - justice. The highest of these triads was the one of the three patriarchs, previously described. Philo would

have been the last to claim authorship for any of these allegories, and Stein 6.
does well to compare him with Cicero, who certainly was no philosopher and whose historical writings are replete with misunderstandings, and yet his merit is great, because we are indebted to him for an otherwise lost treasure of Greek philosophy.

It was stated that the Palestinian Midrash also, upon occasion, employed the allegoristic method. R. Johanan b. Sakkai, Eleazer of Modin and Akiba b. Joseph were among the Tannaim, of whom such interpretations have been preserved. The latter's explanation of the "Song of Songs" which the rabbis intended to exclude from the canon because of its erotic content (as referring to the relationship between God and his beloved Israel) may be considered the stellar example of Palestinian allegorizing. Akiba, so we learn in T. B. Hagigah 15a, was one of four rabbis who entered the Pardes, i. e., the garden of metaphysical speculation. Three of them were harmed by this advanture, Elisha b. Abuya turned into an Gnostic, ben Soma became demented, ben Azai died prematurely and only Akiba escaped unharmed. In the Zohar, the commentary on the pentateuch which has been accepted as the text-book of Jewish mysticism, the four letters of the word "Pardes" have been utilized as the initials of the four distinctive types of Jewish exegesis. 7. However, these should not be taken as strict categories, because overlapping in some cases cannot be avoided. "P" for p'shat, refers to the simple or literal interpretation; "R" for remez (hint) to the arbitrarily derived, philosophical exegesis; "D", for darush (inquiry), to the meaning arrived by "scientific" investigation - which, however, amounted to nothing else but legendary embellishment of the literal meaning, and finally "S", for sod (secret), - referring to the theosophic-mystical exposition. Allegory, therefore, would be classified either under the second

or under the fourth category. It continued to enjoy popularity throughout the Talmudic period in Palestine and throughout the Middle Ages, and several instances of the late Agada, such as the list of the pre-existent substances in Pirke d'Rabbi Eliezer, the allegorical meaning of the serpent, the distinction between the primeval Adam and the first human being, may be traced back to Philo, though we cannot be certain about the scope of his influence.

One fundamental difference separates the world of Philo and the Palestinian Midrash, and in this respect no mutual influence seems to have been exerted. For the Agada biblical interpretation remains a play with words, in contrast to the Halachic derivations which possessed binding character. For Philo, the allegory as a means of scriptural interpretation is the means by which to attain intellectual and moral perfection, the supposed goal of any human being - but above all, the aspiration of a philosopher. Thus he advances to a pure, spiritual exposition. His basic principle rested upon the inspiration of the Torah, which excluded the presence of the profane. The allegory which in its deepest and finest development recognizes the true import of the message of the Law, whether in its narrative or legal portions, may be termed pneumatic, i.e., the spirit is preceding actuality and is responsible for the existence of these ideas. While Odysseus was interpreted by the Stoic first, as an example of virtue, and only later as its de-humanized symbol, Philo immediately undertook the second step. His mystical - i. e., mainly pneumatic - aspiration to attain perfection is permeated with deep earnestness, his ascent from the lower region of the earth, from the body of the literal meaning of scriptures, to the heavenly heights, to the soul of the allegory, is here called pneumatic. Thus, he assimilates the teachings of Plato, the Stoa and the Neo-Pythagoreans and effects by this amalgamation and also by his logos-doctrine Paulinian Christianity and the Neo-Platonists.

Philo's method and hermeneutics often coincide with the Palestinian school, and it is safe to assume that the rules by which to arrive at an exegesis through combination of words and their respective conclusions, additions, etc., were at home in Palestine and originally were the particular quality of the describing Midrash. The impact of Greek ideas modified even Philo's method, and he, upon occasion, freely supplements the text through religious reflection and theosophic speculation. After all, his aim is not only to interpret the divine Torah in a general, philosophical manner, but is directed at the same time to a practical goal within the Hellenistic world - namely - to overcome the still undercurrent rivalries between Hellenism and Judaism, and to demonstrate, not only their essential compatibility, but their actual identity. He seeks to prove to the Jews whom he wants to preserve for Judaism, that the wisdom of Greece is already contained in the Bible and, furthermore, that this sophia springs from Hebrew Scripture. Therefore, Jews do not have to feel any inferiority or embarrassment about their lack of a philosophic tradition. He who is educated in the Torah, comprehends its higher meaning and faithfully obeys its injunctions, and he who is endeavoring to emulate the virtues represented by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in his own small way, lives a life in perfect accord with Greek teaching. If he abandoned this way of living and thinking he would not only be a traitor toward the House of Israel, but would not fulfill his true function within the Hellenistic cultural orbit, where peoples of different culture, language and religion labored together in harmony and, except for territorial wars that, sub

specie aeternitatis, were of minor extent and consequences, peace.

Philo's message to his Greek neighbors also stresses the essential unity of Judaism and Hellenism. Contrary to the malignant calumnies of jealous Egyptians and the mockeries of Apollonius Molon, there was nothing in the Jewish way of life, in its ideals and aspirations, that would conflict with the customs and ideas of the Greeks. The few areas of tension, such as the local sacrifices to the Greek pantheon, modes of physical education, etc., would be gradually eliminated by mutual tolerance. Indirectly, Philo probably cherished the hope that, under the influence of the Stoics, idolatrous practices would soon be altogether abolished. Thus he felt that his Hellenistic friends should concede to Judaism the prime leadership within its synchretistic culture. We might say that this function of allegory is its especial value as biblical exegesis and way of thinking.

In conclusion, let us attempt to integrate Philo into the complete body of the spiritual and intellectual development of Judaism. While an inseparable component of Jewish tradition, he is as far removed from the religiously productive vigor which found its last and greatest expression in the Book of Job, as from the scholastic Jewish philosophy of the Middle Ages, with its predominantly limited intellectual outlook and its unworldly casuistry. Thus he stands isolated from the main stream of Judaism, which accounts for the fact that we owe the preservation of his works - not to the Jews - but to the Fathers of the Church - as the instance of <u>one</u> service Christianity has rendered to Judaism.

In the following an attempt will be made to analyze Philo's Aggada and allegory in the Vita Mosis and passages in his other writings, with reference to the Bible of Moses and the institutions ordained by him, and to compare it with similar Palestinian Midrashim. This endeavor will bear the form of a philosophical exegesis. Though the material gathered here is not complete, it is hoped that the example will sufficiently demonstrate the intentions of the writer.

PROLEGOMENA TO A STUDY OF PHILO'S MIDRASH

II.

The student of Philo will gain a clearer understanding of the method and message of the Alexandrian when introduced to actual examples of his biblical exegesis. These instances will be compared with similar Midrashic material gathered from Palestinian sources. The Vita Mosis was, together with a few selective passages from other exegetical writings of Philo, primarily chosen as the source of these Midrashim. This was done with the intention to demonstrate the essential differences and similarities on the one example of that biblical personality about whom Philo did not only give a complete biography, but more than that, whose life served him for the composition of a bios in the Hellenistic manner. Here the individual is no longer a reality who lived, accomplished certain deeds, and died, but he is transformed into the prototype of the artist who knows how to live the perfect, the ideal life. His Moses is more than a legislator, king, priest and prophet, though these four qualities would have sufficed to write a thorough account of his life and works; he reached the ideal perfection in each of his various functions, blended together, as it were, into virtue itself. Thus he becomes not only the ideal leader of his own people of Israel, but even the guide for all men who, if they would follow the example of his life and the injunctions contained in his Law, would reach the unique state of perfection and inspiration which Moses attained. For it cannot be overlooked that Philo's writings are addressed to his Greek compatriots in Alexandria who are not yet acquainted with the greatness of the Jewish law-giver and who have not learned to appreciate the ancient

truths that were recognized before the time of the battle of Troy and that are based not upon fancy and child's play, like, for instance, the Egyptian customs, but upon the firm foundation of intellect and reason. Thus Moses assumes an additional position as the outstanding philosopher, whose teachings combine the very choicest that ancient Greece produced. The instances that follow deal with events in Moses' life.[1] Consequently, we shall also meet with Midrashic embellishments pertaining to the passages describing institutions or other biblical personalities figuring in the pentateuch.[2]

I. Philo:
De Vita Mosis I. 9

Now, the child from his very birth had an appearance of more than ordinary goodliness (asteios).[3]

Exodus R. I. 20

In the hour when Moses was born the whole house was filled with light.

Upon the very moment of Moses' birth his extraordinary qualities were apparent, both sources report. But in this respect alone does Philo show similarity to the Palestinian account, and the principal difference of Hellenistic Greek thinking, as characterized by Philo, comes to the fore. The Midrash considers Moses' birth in a supernatural way. Amram's house is filled with a celestial light, the source of which is not visible; thus God must have brought a miracle to pass which discloses the brilliant future for which the infant is destined. This glorious moment is limited to one hour and to one house; one singular incident contingent on space and time.

Not so Philo! While pursuing the same goal of presenting Moses' greatness, he employs different means to appeal to his public. To appeal to the imagination of the Greeks Moses had to possess all the marks of a Greek hero. As Heraïles' birth had been attended by unusual circumstances, so, without forsaking the realm of the rational, Moses' birth and childhood showed occurences beyond the ordinary. Not quite two generations later Luke's gospel reports similar miracles surrounding Jesus' birth at Bethlehem. In Moses' case these were not limited in any way. Everybody, at all times and places, could perceive that Moses was more asteîos than mortals usually are. His splendid virtues did not have to be awakened by others; developed in him, they were apparent from the beginning, although the secular knowledge of music, mathematics and religious symbolism was taught to him by Egyptian instructors,[4] Assyrian teachers taught him astrology and the alphabet and Greek professors the remaining sciences. At that time his mind proved incapable of accepting the falsehoods the sophists tried to convey. For Philo, 'asteîos', which in Latin, is paralleled by 'urbanus', refined, connotes the summary of the best character qualities and is practically synonymous with 'téleios', perfect, also said of Moses. (Quod det. pot. ins. 132)

In depicting the career of Moses from the beginning as the life of a hero, Philo's bios resembles the mythos. As Heraïles did not suffer actual death, but was taken by his father, Zeus, into Heaven, fully purified in body and soul, so Moses' mysterious end brought him lasting immortality. Even Philo's readers must have noticed the similarities between Heraïles, the Greek national hero, and Moses, who in addition possessed the wisest traits of Lykurgos and Solon, the legislators of Sparta and Athens, most renowned cities of Greece. Yet, even their codes, excellent and practicable as they might have been, did not reach the universality and the perfection of the Mosaic law,

just as their authors could not unite in themselves all of Moses' four qualifications.

In comparing these two Midrashim, the question of priority and dependence immediately comes to the mind. The motivation for this exegesis suffices to attempt to find the original source for both Midrashim. In this instance Philo could have taken the Palestinian Midrash as his model. The opposite is quite impossible. For the Midrash offers merely a simple fact, bound up with a limited location, while Philo reinterprets and transforms this incident in the manner of Greek hero tales. Not only is the germ of the material expanded, but a cosmopolitan spirit and world-view has been breathed into it.

Yet it would be erroneous to conclude that Philo immediately depended on Palestinian sources, as has been assumed by Frankel, the pioneer of Jewish Hellenistic studies, C. Siegfried and Jacob Freudenthal. Such is already excluded because of Philo's inability to read or speak Hebrew, as is generally maintained today. For it can be shown that Philo used only the Septuagint, and even here he was none too familiar with the prophets and hagiographa, and that his etymologies were not his own.[5] Thus the inquiry about the priority of exegesis in Philo's writings will lead to the conclusion to be demonstrated in the course of these studies.

1. That there existed a Hellenizing Midrash in Egypt long before Philo's time and that its tradition reached back into the distant past, perhaps to the time when the pentateuchal section of the Septuagint was first translated. Certainly these relations existed at the time when Palestine was a Ptolemaic possession, a period that ended with Antiochos, the Great, defeating Egypt at Paneion, 198, BCE. The migration of Ben Sira's grandson to Egypt and sub-

sequent translation of his sire's book on wisdom also point at the continuous intellectual intercourse long before Philo. Especial mention must be made of Artapanus, a historian who lived in Alexandria in the second century BCE, and who adorned the history of the Jews with many fables, even crediting them with being the originators of Egyptian religion [6] and establishing the 'identity' of the Greek prophet and singer Musaios with Moses. Similarly can we find traces of a Midrashic exegesis in the work of the dramatic poet Ezechiel, who lived about the same time. [7] Further instances may be cited.

2. That therefore the basic question about dependence and mutual influence of the Palestinian and Hellenistic Midrash must be placed into the time before Philo. Thus the task would arise to examine in each instance whether a trace of this particular Midrash can be found in the scattered fragments of the pre-Philonic Hellenistic Jewish literature. The next step would be to establish the relationship of this homily with the Palestinian Midrash. But this is left for the future.

II. De Vita Mosis I.18

As he grew and thrived without a break, and was weaned at an earlier date than they had reckoned .....

Ex. R. I. 26

For he grew in a manner entirely unusual.

About his stature, we learn Talm. Babli Shabb. 92a

Moses was of gargantuan height

B. Ber. 54

Moses was about ten cubits tall.

Both accounts are based on the words "And the child grew", Ex. 2.10. It cannot be assumed, they reason, that such an extraordinary person as Moses should grow up like any other mortal. Yet Philo does not ascribe supernatural external characteristics to Moses, as is done by the Midrash, which, contrary to all scriptural evidence, transforms Moses into a giant, his height matching that of Adam. Moses almost becomes a legendary character, while Philo depicts him as a human being, with an accelerated physical development in infancy; this is quite typical for a Greek biography.

III. De Vita Mosis I. 15

> Therefore, surveying him from head to foot, she approved of his beauty and fine condition. (i.e.Pharaoh's daughter)

I. 9

> Now, the child from his very birth had an appearance of more than ordinary goodliness (cp. No. I.).

I. 18

> He was noble and goodly to look upon.

Ex. R. I. 26

> Whosoever looked at him, could not get himself away from him, and since he was handsome, everybody was eager to have a look at him.

Yalkut 181

> Moses and Aaron can be compared to the Ministering Angels, and the heighth of their bodies to the Cedars of Lebanon, and the apples (galgale) of their eyes are like the globes (galgale) of the sun, and the radiance of their faces like the radiance of the sun.

Moses' physical beauty serves to motivate the affection of Pharaoh's daughter for the exposed infant. Not only she, but every other bystander is entranced by the child's looks. Again the Midrash evidences traces of legendary quality, while Philo's approach is limited to the realm of the rational. He is also influenced by the Greek ideal of kalokagathía, i.e., the beautiful and the good, aesthetics and ethics, are closely associated

in outstanding personalities, as the portrays of Homer's Achilleus, Hektor or Odysseus demonstrate. The beautiful soul, perfect and pure, finds a satisfactory home, while on earth, only in fitting surroundings, and his 'eumorphía' is the necessary counterpart of his being 'aretaion'. Similarly Adam, the ideal prototype of the first man, is also intellectually perfect and of beauteous appearance. But while Moses' spiritual gifts were fully developed at birth, the physical ones, also apparent at birth, underwent growth, though more quickly and prematurely than in the case of other children. Of interest in Josephus' account of Moses' childhood is his Antiquities II.~~9~~231: "And all agree that, in accord with the prediction of God, the grandeur of intellect and contempt of pains, he was the noblest of Hebrews .... And it often happened that persons meeting him as he was carried along the highway turned, attracted by the child's appearance, and neglected their serious affairs to gaze at leisure upon him. Indeed, childish charm so perfect and pure as his held the beholders spell-bound."

While Josephus was a Palestinian by birth, he possessed sufficient Greek education to stress Moses' mental qualities. It is easily possible that the intellectual traits of his Moses rest upon Philo's or other, even earlier Alexandrian exegetes. That Josephus made use of Philo's allegoristic and other interpretation, of many (false) etymologies, of the symbolic explanation of the Tabernacle and the High Priest's garment has been shown by Jacob Freudenthal, in his "Hellenistische Studien" (p.218). Yet, the whole tenor of his narrative, the vivid imagination, describing the marvelling admirers in even greater detail than the Midrash, manifest the Semitic rather than the Hellenic spirit which, at the time of Philo

and Josephus, who lived only a generation and a half later, had lost the gift of true poesy, of word painting and fanciful imagery. Joseph's narrative was probably more effective in the original Aramaic, the language of his native Galilee. To determine the actual priority of the Palestinian or Philonic source for this Midrash is difficult. Josephus' example teaches that the story must have been common knowledge in Palestine during the first century of our era. After the destruction of the nation and the national sanctuary at Jerusalem, the Law,* of which Moses was considered to be the Founder, replaced gradually all other ideals the Jews previously cherished. Thus, Moses' importance increased; the story of his life was embellished with new legends and many old ones were amplified. We may assume that the germ of this Midrash was very old and even preceded Philo's source.

IV.	De Vita Mosis I. 54	Ex. R. I. 32
	Moses .. said (to the shepherds):	He said: "It is customary for men to draw water and for women to water the flock, but here women draw water and men give drink to the flock."
	"The girls are working like young men and do not shirk any of their duties, but you young men really behave girlishly."	

The phrase medèn oknoûsai tôn prakteon is not contained in the Hebrew text and shows all the signs of a typical Hellenistic moralizing sermon for which there is no further basis than Exodus 2. 17:

"And the shepherds approached and drove them (the seven daughters of the Midianite priest) away, and Moses arose, helped them and gave drink to their flock." Such must have been a good occasion, thinks Philo, for

---

* and especially the thriving torah sheb'al peh.

Moses to deliver a rhetorically well-constructed speech on proper manners; the young shepherds, a favorite class for parabels throughout Hellenistic literature, should have known that it is a gentleman's duty to succor a young lady. One is almost attempted to assume from his paternalistic tone of voice, that in contemporary Alexandria, a metropolis with all the comforts and vices of our modern large cities, young men did not always treat their female companions with the proper respect. Anyhow, a good lesson, even a derashah in the proseuchê (Synagogue) on a Sabbath morning, could well be derived from the characteristically laconic scriptural text. The audience would not mind the reproof too much, for it was well disguised under the shepherds' mask. On the other hand, it could not have been considered praiseworthy for a young man who had received training in sports and games, for whom Patrokles and Achilles were prototypes of sportsmanship and manly valor, to be called korikôs, girlish, as these "sissies" were described in the parabel.

In the Midrash of Palestine the moral contrast is hinted at in the words "derech - kên", customarily - but here. The lecture does not become as obvious as in Philo's instance; perhaps it was superfluous to preach such a sermon in Palestine, where men showed great reverence to women; even the exemption of women from religious duties which depend on a specific time of the day should be regarded as an ordinance of deference rather than of disability and never occurs in the realm of ethics. It need not be pointed out how highly the wife was to be honored, and respect to one's mother was commended in the decalogue, et al. This homily is no more than the statement of a general truth, and it is not incumbent to assume with Edmund Stein[9] that the Palestinian version is borrowed from Philo's, just because the above-mentioned phrase "meden oknousai tôn prakteon" is missing in the Hebrew and this type of moral sermon is foreign to Palestine.

It seems that further reasons would have to be adduced to arrive at a conclusion about the interrelation of the two Midrashim. As they read presently, both versions could have descended from a common original that entered the Alexandrian school long before Philo, who merely added another facet, namely, that shirking from one's duties is an improper thing for a true Hellenic (and Jewish) gentleman. A similar oration about propriety is delivered by Joseph to Potiphar's wife in De Iosepho 42f.

V. Moses tends Jethro's flock in preparation to his future task of tending the flock of Israel.

De Vita Mosis I. 62	Exodus R. II.2
The only perfect king is one who is skilled in the knowledge of shepherding, one who has been trained by management of the inferior creatures to manage the superior.	He who knows to tend the flock shall come and tend my people. The Holy One, Blessed be He, does not bestow greatness upon a man, until He has searched him concerning small things. Afterwards He appoints him to greatness.
It is impossible for a man to be initiated into great things before having accomplished small deeds.	

In both instances the specific case is first stated and then the general maxim drawn therefrom. Philo adds an individualistic touch by stressing the education of a leader through zoa, i. e., living creatures; dead matter would be too abstract a medium for the instruction in the art of government. Both conclude that to be a leader in a great cause, one has to undergo testing by accomplishing smaller matters. The Midrash Rabba version puts into God's mouth that Moses should tend the flock as a step towards leadership of Israel; Philo introduces the story with "mot dokeî", "it seems to me",

which would imply that this idea is an original contribution of his.

The thought that shepherding is a good preparatory occupation for a future king is common to Hellenistic as well as Jewish thinking. As pointed out in the previous example, ever since the time of the Sicilian poet Theokritos, who spent several years of his life at Alexandria upon the invitation of King Ptolemy Philadelphos (285-246 B.C.E.), bucolic poetry had become exceedingly popular in the Hellenistic world. Originally restricted to the lower classes, incidents occuring in a shepherd's life were ascribed to other social strata as well, and it was considered fashionable even for the court circles to imitate the life of the herdsmen. Thus, metaphors from the bucolic idiom entered into the every-day speech of the Alexandrian citizen. From here it spread throughout the Mediterranean basin and reached distant Italy, where it served as the prototype for many a poet's lyrical effusions: Catullus, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, and above all, Vergil's "Bucolics" and "Geogics." Thus the example must have been obvious to Philo.

In Jewish literature, too, the supervision of tame animals, rescuing them from wild beasts, leading them through straight and crooked paths to shelter and security, managing their affairs and providing them with their needs, in accordance with the divine plan, was considered excellent training for a ruler. Not in vain is Israel frequently compared with a flock. In psalm 78. 70ff. we read: "He chose David also, His servant. And took him from the sheepfold; From following the ewes that give suck He brought him to be shepherd over Jacob, His people, and Israel, His inheritance. So he shepherded them according to the integrity of his heart; and led them by the skillfulness of his hand." [9] Thus David was transformed into the ideal shepherd, whose scion, in the distant future, would again tend the flock of Israel in perfect faithfulness forever and ever. Ezechiel, in his vision of Judaea

Reconstituta, chapter 34, sharply distinguishes between the faithless and the faithful shepherds. The former, in their selfishness, brought about the ruin of Israel, while the latter, following the model of David, will rule God's people in justice and righteousness. Isaiah, long before Vergil's time, painted an idyllic landscape where wolf and lamb would graze the pastures together, guided by the Messianic shepherd. Yet it would be preposterous to imagine that Vergil was acquainted with the writings of the Jewish eschatologist. Thus, Moses and the Messiah possess many common characteristics, already according to the biblical version. This was intensified in the Palestinian Midrashic literature, the shepherd comparison being a facet of it. We notice in passing that Jesus, a contemporary of Philo, was, as the gospels state, an ideal leader of man in the shepherd pattern, being recognized, at his very birth, by other shepherds as their master.

Thus it would indicate that both Midrashic traditions rested on independent foundations. Stein seems to go too far in his assumption that "auch hier verrät der ganze Gedankengang eine gemeinsame Quelle für Philo und den Midrash. Die rhetorische Ausschmückung lässt auf eine hellenistisch-jüdische Vorlage schliessen."[10] Actually, the rhetoric embellishments prove nothing further than Philo's own dependence on Hellenistic models; for one could not well describe the Palestinian version as overly ornate in expression. If we disregard Philo's "it seems to me" and thus deprive him of the intellectual authorship of this exegesis, we would arrive at a Hellenistic Midrash which, as previously mentioned, existed more than a century and a half before Philo's time and was constantly influenced by Palestinian trends which were conveyed by such teachers as Ben Sira's grandson. At that time, upon the conclusion of canonical wisdom books, the Midrash with generalising tendencies was not foreign to Palestine. In the Aboth de Rabbi Nathan we find: Let a case about a small

matter be as important to you as a case about a big matter. A case in which a sus is involved is just as important as one which involves 100 denars. (X. 22a) As the shepherd tradition is older in Judaism than in Hellenism it would be more probable that this instance is at home in Palestine, came to Egypt at an early age and was clothed in a Hellenistic garment by Philo's precursors before it obtained its present form.

VI. De Vita Mosis I. 28

As for the pleasures that have their seat below, save for the lawful begetting of children, they passed altogether even out of his memory.

Dt. R. XI.[10(to Nu.12.2)

Since the day of the revelation in the bramble bush Moses did not have relations with his wife.

The true prophet must be a paragon of virtue of which moderation is one aspect. Intercourse with women may not serve the satisfaction of bodily desires, according to Jewish teachings, but only to propagate the human race. Moses, in both traditions had to be represented as a model of sexual perfection, but especially so in Alexandria, the seat of much lasciviousness and promiscuity. The perfect nomos, as symbolized by its giver, Moses, offered a just answer to such practices. From the Jewish point of view Moses had already fulfilled his obligation toward his wife, since his son Gershom was born before the experience with the burning bush.

Philo, in his aristocratic elegance, would not use so concrete a phrase as "having intercourse with one's wife". He rather speaks of "hypogastrion hedonon", "substomachial pleasures", as even the very thought of sexual delight is hateful to the enlightened philosopher. His description is very impersonal; the only facet in which he is actually interested - another Hellenistic characteristic - is that Moses' children were "gnesioi", legitimate. Apart from Moses' philosophic egkrateia, self-control and continence, his royal duties and priestly and judicial functions consumed too much of his

energy to spend any time with his wife. Indeed, this was a great sacrifice which could be performed only by the very best of men, for the sake of his people and mankind. In contrast to the Midrash which cites the very moment from which the prophet began to exercise restraint, Philo's account is general; even during adolescence his heros bridled his lust (Ib. par. 25).

The Alexandrian must have thought of Socrates, Pythagoras and Diogenes, all of whom taught abstinence as a great virtue. In the Platonic system the soul soils itself by indulging in bodily pleasures and thus endangers its immanent purity and prospects for a return to its source upon separation from the body in the hour of death. Furthermore, the Stoa, the teachings of which are followed by Philo in the field of ethics, looked askance at any physical indulgence.[11] Seneca says (Ep. 59.2): "Voluptas res infamis." However, the Stoic teachers approved of marriage in accordance with their social ideas." Marriage, in sharp contrast to the school of Epikuros, is enjoined by Zeno. Adultery is strictly forbidden. If Zeno and Chrysippos demanded female companionship for the basis of their ideal state, this referred merely to the ideal type of marriage of their peculiar communal structure.[12] Philo's Jewish pattern was the Essenes, a sect of "philosophers" frequently mentioned. These "neither marry, nor do they desire to keep slaves, as they think the latter practise leads to injustice, and the former brings about quarrels." (Jos. Ant. XVIII.1) In the Bellum Iudaicum Josephus states further (II. 121): "They do not accept for themselves marriage and its consequences". Similar opinions of an ascetic approach to life were held by the Therapeutai, an Egyptian sect, whom Philo held in utmost esteem.

It is plausible that Philo found the homily in existence, but that he transformed its spirit to suit his ideas on sex life. The next example will show that the germ of the Midrash was known in Palestine in Tannaitic times.

VII. Moses' wife was Zipporah, daughter of the Midianite priest. But in Nu. 12, 1, we hear that Miriam and Aaron berated him on account of the "Cushite woman" he had married. Who was this Cushite? Far be it from us to imagine that Moses concluded an intermarriage which was looked down upon by Philo as well as the Palestinians!

We shall now consider an allegorical example, as the context suggests:

Leges Allegoriae II. 67

It was God Himself who wedded to Moses the Ethiopian woman, who stands for resolve unalterable, intense and fixed. For this Moses merits high praise, that he took to him the Ethiopian woman ... For even as in the eye the part that sees is black, so the soul's power of vision has the title of woman of Ethiopia.

Sifré Nu. XIII 1

Was this really a Cushite woman? No, she was a Midianitess, as it states: (Ex.2.16) And the priest of Midian had seven daughters. Then why is she called "Cushite?" As the Cushite's color stands out, so Zipporah's beauty excelled all other women.

Both accounts give an allegorical interpretation of Zipporah. However, there is an essential difference between the Hellenistic and Palestinian version which comes to the fore more clearly in this instance than is generally the case. Stein realized this contrast, but did not recognize all aspects. The Midianite origin of Zipporah is remembered by the Midrash and thus "Kushi" is interpreted beyond the actual meaning of that word during the early Amoraic period, i. e., Ethiopian. This does not imply that the Midrash knew of the Cushanites as a tribe of the Midianites.[13]

Philo is no longer bound to the historical fact of Zipporah's Midianite parentage. His allegorical interpretation is closely connected with the mysterious influences that emanated from the South Country Ethiopia.[14] It was a common Hellenistic idea to admire all those exotic peoples who inhabitated the edges of the world. These nations were said to possess pristine physical, moral and intellectial qualities, through which they were

transformed into mystical entities. Thus Philo greatly admired the Ethiopian woman, who symbolized for him the ever-penetrating eye of the invisible soul. Philo never possessed any historical understanding and, therefore, did not see the anchronism and religious difficulty. While both utilize allegoric methods, the fundamental variance of approach between Philo and the Midrash is thus obvious. The Midrash, still clings closely to the scriptural basis, while Philo's conception rests upon the Hellenistic notion to idealize nations living at the utmost corners of the earth.

No, Moses did not marry an idolatress. Zipporah was a fine and God-fearing person. The Midrash in Sifré continues: "Why are the words 'ishah kushith lakach' repeated? This will teach you: One woman excells in beauty and not in good works, another just vice versa. But the repetition of "lakach" indicates that Zipporah excelled in beauty as well as good works." It appears that Miriam and Aaron protested that Moses neglected his wife, as stated in the above Midrash, and because of their violent and inappropriate manner they brought God's wrath upon themselves. Furthermore, the name "Zipporah" is derived from "Zippor", (bird), and referring to the purifying effect of the bird sacrifices (Lev. 14.4) Zipporah, too, has a cleansing influence upon her environment. Thus, we find in Exodus R. I 32, her name explained: "shetiharah habayith k'zippor", for she brought purity to her home like a bird.

While both exegetes are guided by the same motivation, i.e., to free Moses from the stigma of an intermarriage, their ways are entirely different. The Palestinian Midrash reinterprets the person of Zipporah, who is still a living reality. Not so Philo, who employs allegorial devices to overcome the hurdle. In the Midrash Zipporah is an outstandingly virtuous

person; the attribute "kushi" does no longer signify "black" but rather "beautiful", a symbolic identification. However, it must be admitted that, as the Midrash now stands, Greek traces cannot be eliminated. The very emphasis on the fusion of beauty and good works in Zipporah is Hellenistic, though somewhat diluted by the ritualistic, typically Palestinian interpretation of the name. The latter may yet help us in determining the antiquity of this Midrash. The laws pertaining to purification from leprosy for which the bird sacrifice was required, were abolished, when the temple was destroyed. Therefore, the metaphoric interpretation of the name Zipporah could be properly understood by the populace, for whom Midrashic exegesis was primarily destined, when the purification laws possessed real meaning and binding validity. Thus, the Midrash in its present form would be about contemporary with Philo who died about twenty-five years before the destruction of the Temple.

As for Philo, by means of allegory he transformed Zipporah into intense, unalterable virtue itself which is married to Moses, the "asteîos trópos'. Since this is the first allegorial homily dealt with in this investigation, a few words about the purpose and method of Philo are appropriate, indeed. Already Freudenthal[16] remarked that allegorial interpretation occurs only in such instances where a conflict between the exegete and his text comes to the fore. Thus, Edmund Stein, in his searching and stimulating "Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandrien" also concluded that "Der Ausgangspunkt für einen jeden Versuch, eine alte mythische oder religiöse Überlieferung allegorisch zu deuten, bleibt immer das Bestreben, die alte ehrwürdige Überlieferung mit den neueren Anschauungen in Einklang zu bringen und dadurch in Ehren zu erhalten."[15] There are no traces of allegory to be found in the Septuagint and, therefore, it is safe to assume that this category of exegesis

was not introduced into the Hellenistic synagogue until comparatively recent times, though the Hebrew etymologies which served as the foundation for Philo's allegories were known before his time, as is demonstrated by Stein. Three conditions are necessary for the rise of allegoric exegesis: (1) respect for tradition; (2) intellectual progress, and (3) the progress has not reached the level of historical-critical thinking. These three conditions are apparent, whenever an attempt is made to free the bible from the human traits ascribed to God (anthropomorphisms). An enlightened Greek in Alexandria, for whom the Homeric poems were palatable only in their Stoic reinterpretation would scarcely remain serious, when learning that "God took a stroll in a garden" or "smelled Abel's offering". But not alone for apologetic purposes was such a re-interpretation desirable. The Hellenistic Jews themselves demanded a de-anthropomorphized God-concept, a request which was heeded in parts of the Septuagint which, as any other translation, is really a re-interpretation. However, the action of the translators was not thorough, and many moot questions defied any but allegorical interpretation. In frankness, it must be admitted that this thesis concerning the origin of Alexandrian allegoristic exegesis is contradicted by so profound a Philo scholar as Leopold Treitel. In his opinion, allegories are at home in Judaism itself. They are a product of the genius inherent in the Jewish people which prefers the picture, the expression of imagery, to mere abstract verbalizations, to the abstract per se. This desire to concretize in Philo's instance is complimented by his mystical tendencies which find its outlet in his allegories.[17]

One might ask why, then, do the prophets use metaphors and symbolism and no allegories, if that species of illustration was so indigenous to the

Jewish spirit? True, we find a few scattered allegories in the books of Proverbs (Woman Folly, personified Wisdom) and also in the Agada, if we are willing to call this instance (No. VII) an allegorical interpretation. Also, Siegfried's equation derush - allegory is not correct; "remez", "hint", is the general term in Hebrew for the Alexandrian method. In this Midrash we do not perceive a match between perfection (Moses) and the unchangeable nature that has been tested by fire (Zipporah). But Philo undertook this step, perhaps basing himself on former Hellenistic allegorists, such as Aristobulos. He does not even deny that he follows previous exegetes, does not lay claim to originality. Speaking of his opus "De vita Mosis" he explicitly states (I.4): "I will .... tell the story of Moses as I have learned it, both from the sacred books .... and from some of the elders of the nation; for I always interwove what I was told with what I read, and thus believed myself to have a closer knowledge than others of his life's history". In this particular case we might conclude that an originally Palestinian Midrash was allegorically interpreted in Alexandria and that a tinge of this allegory reflected upon the ancient Midrash and somewhat modified its pristine wording. In conclusion it should be stated that Josephus, in his Antiquities, describes how Moses married the daughter of the King of Abyssinia and by this union saved Egypt from catastrophy.

To return to an Agadic Midrash:

VIII. De Vita Mosis II. 292 (also 66, 71, et al)

Such then was the life, and such was the end of Moses, king, law-giver, high-priest and prophet.

T.B. Zebachim 101b

Our teacher Moses was high-priest and partook of the holy things of Heaven.

Pes. deRabbi Kahana, parshath Parah, p. 38a, ed. Buber

During the forty years when Israel was in the wilder-

(T.B.Zebachim 101b)(concluded)

> ness. Moses did not cease from officiating as High Priest, as it states (Psalm 99.6): Moses and Aaron among His priests, ... Did call upon the Lord, and He answered them.

Moses as an officiating priest appears in the Bible at the installation of Aaron and his family. Nevertheless, Spripture is not specific on this point, and a need was felt for further comment. The Midrash is content with a homily on a psalm verse, with a primarily ritualistic interest. Philo's outlook was again more world-wise. In his bios Moses' qualifications as a king, legislator and prophet may be more significant, but the priestly, i.e., conventional religious aspect, could not be eliminated, if Moses was to vie with the sages of Egypt and Greece. The priests in Egypt officiated also as prophets, i.e., they predicted the future from auguries or oracles. Thus, the words for "priest" and "prophet" are synonymous (Bertholet, Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, vol. VIII, p. 1529), though the meaning of the terms in Hebrew is entirely different. Similarly, in Greece, the Pythia at the Delphian Apollon sanctuary, fulfilled these two functions, as did Kalchas, the seer of the Achaeans, who predicted the sacrifice of Iphigeneia and officiated at Aulis. More pertinent is perhaps the example of Epimenides of Crete, whose message is not mere sooth-saying, but has occasionally a philosophical and ethical import. Of him Plato says (Leges I. 642D): Kleinias, the Cretan, speaks: "You must have heard here the story of the prophet Epimenides, who was of my family, and came to Athens ten years before the Persian war, in accordance with the response of the Oracle, and

offered certain sacrifices which the God commanded." Even he has little in common with the Hebrew prophets, but for want of a better term which the Greeks could comprehend and appreciate the word "prophétes" had to be used. However, Moses was an extraordinary prophet and a High Priest at that, who officiated at the altar of a people "destined to be consecrated above all others to offer prayers forever on behalf of the human race that it may be delivered from evil and participate in what is good". (De V.M.I.149)

IX. Vita Mosis II.291

For when he was already exalted and stood at the very barrier, ready at the signal to direct his upward flight to heaven, the divine spirit fell upon him and he prophesied with discernment while still alive the story of his own death.

T.B. Baba Bathra 15a

Joshua wrote his book and the last eight verses of Deuteronomy.

Another opinion: (from that point on) God dictated and Moses himself wrote it with tears in his eyes.

It has always been difficult for the impartial reader who considered the five books really to have been written by Moses on God's behest to fathom, how Moses could have described his own death. A rational rabbi of the Third Century, C.E. ~~A.D.~~, ventured the daring hypothesis that these last verses of the book of Deuteronomy were actually composed by Joshua, Moses' servant, pupil and successor. But the vast majority of the Jews would not modify their concept of revelation for the sake of these few verses. Thus, Moses sat at the feet of God, just before he was to depart, and, crying bitterly, he completed the holy Torah.

Philo did not object to Moses' reporting his own death. A man who had perfected his intellectual insight could well afford to predict the circumstances of his end. However, for such a sage it was not appropriate to cry like a woman upon the approach of the inevitable. The more emotional Semites

ould not mind weeping and other expressions of joy and sorrow, but for philosopher the example of Socrates was more challenging. That genius lso stood at the barrier, and for a whole day, knowing exactly that at unset he would have to drink the poisoned cup, he discoursed with his isciples on the fate of his immortal soul. Socrates' guilt was small; oses' even more insignificant. Yet he is not afraid of death and does ot regard it as punishment, for he was eager "to leave this mortal life or immortality, summoned thither by the Father Who resolved his two-fold ature of soul and body into a single unity, transforming his whole being into mind, pure as the sunlight." (D.V.M. II.288) Such could have been ritten by Platon.[20.] At the same time Moses preserves all the marks of a Stoic at the hour of death, the ideal of ataxía is personified by him. Just as Seneca would invite his friends to a banquet, dine and converse with them, while preparing poison for complying with Nero's will that he should die, so, while standing at the bálbis, the post marking the line for the race to heaven, Moses gave his last directions to the twelve tribes and discussed his own funeral. Thus dies this truly perfect man. Philo's account is based on a Palestinian source, it would seem, which he reinterpreted completely to suit his environment and please his own taste.

I. De Congressu quaer. erud. gratia 132
Moses is the purest mind
V.M.II.40
The purest of spirits, the spirit of Moses.
Quod det. pot. insidiatur 132
The perfect Aaron replied to the words of the most perfect Moses.
De Conf. Linguarum 106

Μ. ὁ ἄριστος προφήτης

Ex. R. I. 20
"And she saw that he was good"
It is taught. R. Meir says:
Tob (the good one) is his name.
R. Joshiya says: It was Tobya.
Tanchuma to Ex. 4.27,
p. 15, ed. Buber
"Go, to meet Moses in the wilderness". Similarly Scripture states:
(Ps. 85,11)
Mercy and truth are met together,
Righteousness and peace have kissed each other.
Righteousness, that is Moses.
Dr. 33,21: He has done the righteousness of God .... Truth, that is Moses. Nu.12.7: In all my house he is' neëman', trustworthy.

Moses symbolizes various virtues, sometimes perfection itself. While there are few chances in this bios to employ allegory with regard to Moses, occasionally Philo identifies him with perfection of the purest spirit. Thus he included in him the best qualities of the patriarchs and other personalities of the Genesis. The intellectual characteristics are not considered in the Midrash at all, as ethical attributes were evaluated more highly in Palestine than mental.

It is altogether precarious to see an allegorial meaning in this Palestinian passage. The Exodus Rabba "tob" is not the equivalent of "asteîos", as some may think. If that were the case, Moses would be identified with the "good". Here only his name is given, and no deeper meaning should be discovered. The rabbis reasoned that in other biblical verses the name of a person is mentioned, as soon as his birth is reported.[21] (Cp. Gen. 21, 2f; 25, 24 -26 et al). In Moses' instance the name occurs eight verses after his birth is stated and is derived from an Egyptian etymon, because the daughter of Pharaoh was Egyptian. But Moses must have had a Hebrew name; according to tradition, on the eighth day of circumcision the child is to be named, and though Moses was born already circumcised (Ibid) he had to have a Hebrew name. Thus the text suggested the name "Tob". The Tanchuma passage likewise is not pure allegory, as it does not identify 'Emeth' with Moses or even 'Zedek.' The exegete merely wishes to explain which attributes of the psalm verse are applicable to Moses and which to Aaron, and for that he finds another biblical verse as his support. The only hint at allegory can be found in the abstraction "truth" and "righteousness", where the Palestinian source would generally prefer concrete analogies. Both arrived independently at these characteriza-

tions of Moses.

XI. Pharaoh is the symbol for confusion and "scattering".

Leges Allegoriae III. 12 (with reference to revelation)
For this reason Moses also, when he is being established as one standing open before God, avoids Pharaoh, the symbol of dispersion, for he boasts, saying that he knows not God.

De somniis II. 211
(At this board) There is one banqueter only, and yet to him it is a public feast; that reveller is King Pharaoh, who has made dispersion, scattering and the undoing of continence his business, for his name means "scattering".

Midrash Tanchuma to Ex. 7.1 p. 24, ed. Buber

As it says: Behold, I am giving the Pharaoh Hophra, King of Egypt, into the hand of his enemies. (Jer. 44.30)
What does the name Hophra, which has the identical consonants as Pharaoh, indicate? The same as in Nu. 5. 18: And the priest shall set the woman before the Lord, and let the hair of the woman's head go loose, i.e. open up the hair-braids and scatter the hair. (Comm: פרע)

De sacrificio Ab. et Caini 69
Φαραὼ δὲ ὁ σκεδαστὴς τῶν κακῶν

Both versions agree that the title "Pharaoh" signifies "scattering". The Palestinian Midrash arrives at this meaning only after considerable homiletical girations by equating Pharaoh with Hophra, the Egyptian monarch, whose aid Zedekiah had expected in his rebellion against Nebuchadrezzar. Then Pharaoh is derived from the root Phara', to let loose, a hif'il, especially when used with reference to the hair of the head. As hair let loose is dishevelled and disarranged, so is the character of Pharaoh, undetermined, fickle, unreliable. No attempt is made to develop the allegoric germ into a complete allegory.

Philo wanted to find more than a wicked king in Pharaoh. It was one of his general principles first to interpret the text literally and then to look for a deeper meaning. The body-soul relation applies also to his theory of interpretation; yet even if he allegorizes Halachic injunctions, these are not lessened in their value. Philo punctiliously obeys the commandments and condemns those who try to evade adherence to the Law by citing allegorical explanations. Here Pharaoh, King of Egypt, the country which symbolizes the body, is the personification of all sensuous qualities, bare of all mental ambitions, relying on physical strength which even persuades him to deny God's existence. Thus this atheist, who, in addition, bears all the signs of an Epicurean, a philosophical school with which Philo did not sympathize, emits a detrimental influence upon his environment, causes unrest and annoyance to all those who treasure their soul above their body. Moses, persecuted by this tyrannical confusion, thirsts for knowledge and peace which he hopes to find at the well, symbol of the yearning soul. Here Philo's tendency toward mysticism is quite apparent and is exhibited in Moses' desire to retire from the realities of this life to speculate upon the beyond, things good and beautiful which are scattered abroad by Pharaoh.

XII. Leg. alleg. III. 12 f.

"And sat on the well", waiting to see what draught God would send to quench the thirst of his soul in its longing for that which is good. He withdraws to Midian, the place of decision.

Midr. Abkir, ed. Buber (HaSchachar XI, p. 418)

To Ex. 2.19:
The Midrash inquires into the reason for the repetition of the word "dalah".
He draws water for us in this world, and also for the world to come.

The well from which Moses watered the flock of Jethro had to represent more than a source of water for thirsting animals. Both exegetes search for

additional meaning. The Midrash, and it is a very late specimen of that category, transforms it into a fountain that serves the satisfaction of our physical needs in this world and gives us spiritual nourishment in the life everlasting. Water, like bread, becomes synonymous with food, actual and spiritual, and is identified with the purifying power.

Philo's text stresses the contemplative, mystical aspect of Moses' character.[22] In Midian, the desert country, he will make the final decision about the future course of his life, for Philo strongly believes in freedom of choice. His soul also desires the water of purity, but specifically it thirsts for to agathón, the summum bonum. As a philosopher he inquires how to attain to the absolute Good; he hopes to find the answer as well as inner detachment while resting at the well.

The Midrash contains Greek ideas, and the question arises, how did this thought enter into an obscure Agada. This problem has no direct bearing on the issue of interrelation between Philo and this passage. If the trópos regarding the well does not occur in any other Hebrew source, we may safely assume that it is of Greek, although probably not of Philonic, parentage. Of course, we must realize that thoughts travel, even if many centuries are required to popularize certain ideas. Also, it must be constantly kept in mind that our dating of the principal Midrashic collections is based on internal evidence and still rather tenuous. The Midrash Shemoth Rabba, from which most of the Hebrew examples were culled, is, for instance, not a unified collection. Zunz, in his fundamental "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden", dated it in the twelfth century.* Wherever we find an Agada in Exodus Rabba that has no parallel in the Mechilta or other Tannaitic sources, we have a

* while modern scholars assume its completion in the tenth century

span of a millenium for its possible origin. In the course of these centuries the actual method of Midrashic exegesis did not change; the Zohar, with its mystical interpretation, is a product of an even later time which clearly shows neo-Platonic, and perhaps Philonic, direct influences. With this example we conclude the instances that could be well fitted into the plan of a complete bios. Now we shall turn to other material in the Vita Mosis to which Midrashic parallels can be cited.

III.

The following instances are cited further to indicate that an interrelation between Philo and the Midrash actually existed and possibly to point out additional characteristics in either source. But while we are aware of difference in ideology and style, we may not overlook the essential similarities which can be observed poignantly in the system of hermenautical rules common to the Palestinian and to the Hellenistic exegesis. These principles generally agree with those advanced by Hillel and later R. Ishmael with regard to Halachic exegesis. Therefore, this seems an appropriate moment to state these principles of exegesis. Carl Siegfried lists them under the head-line "Principles of Allegory", but these are by no means limited to that specific type of interpretation.

1. Duplication of expression hints at a hidden meaning (Cp. No. XII).
2. A striking phrase in one particular context may be applied to a different passage, retaining the same meaning.
3. Superfluous particles, adverbial additions, repetition of statements in the same passage, all of these indicate a deeper meaning.
4. Change in expression deserves special attention.
5. It is admissible to consider words separated by punctuation or disjunctive accents as forming one phrase. The new interpretation thus obtained is as truly scriptural as the literal explanation, and is just as authoritative.
6. Reasons must be adduced why a certain expression is used and not its more common synonym. (i.e., the difference between "nizzav" and "omed" ad loc. Psalm 82. 1 and Philo's inquiry into the

different shadings of "poimên" and "ktenotrôphos", "shepherd")

7. Combinations through word-play are to be utilized for exegesis.

8. The components of a word may be interpreted individually (i.e., the name Bezalel, "in the shadow of God", an etymology applied also by Philo, "eulogéso te, containing the ideas of "eu", the ever laudable, and "logos", in the Philonic meaning, and thus the expression Gen. 12. 2 does not only imply God's blessing, but "I shall bestow upon you the praiseworthy logos" (De. migr. Abrahami 13).

9. Each word may be expounded according to its varied meanings (topos - מקום may be taken as "place", God Himself, or the "theîos lógos).

10. It is admissible to obtain a new meaning by slight modification within a word. Such changes are introduced in the Agada with the phrase אל תקרי כך אלא כך . Philo alters accents and breathings (spiritus). Cain "apékteinen hautón", and not "autón". (Gen. 4.8.) This method may not be employed for Halachic derivations.

11. An unusual expression is a source for an especial interpretation. It does not state (Gen. I.5.): "And there was evening and there was morning, the first day". Instead, the cardinal number is used: One day, Midrash and Philo notice this peculiarity and comment on this instance.

12. The number of nouns and tense of verbs is carefully watched.

13. The gender of words and presence or absence of the article are important for exegetical purposes.

14. Even a combination of words can be employed with the same meaning in a different context. משפט וצדקה of II. Sam. 7.8 always interpreted as "rule". Philo derives from Psalm 26.1 "The Lord is my light"; that "light"always refers to God. (de somnis I. 13)

15. The position of the verse within the context is noteworthy.

16. Two consecutive verses may yield additional facets, if read together.

17. Omission of expressions or absence of regularly occurring phrases, such as "and he knew his wife" must be commented upon.

18. Striking attributes possess a secret meaning.

19. Numbers, objects and names are to be understood symbolically.

From these three categories Philo obtains his allegories.

Such, then, are the conditions and methods by which the Midrash and Philo expound the biblical text. But now let us return to the main body of this investigation.

XIII. Vita Mosis I. 112

On the text: Exodus 8.15

Then the magicians said unto Pharaoh: This is the finger of God. This refers to the plague of the gnats: So great was its power that all Egypt lost heart and was forced to cry aloud: "This is the finger of God"; for as for His hand, not all the inhabitable world from end to end could stand against it, or rather not even the whole universe.

cp. De Migratione Abrahami 85

The plagues: These events are the Finger of God, and the word "finger" is equivalent to a divine rescript, declaring that sophistry is ever defeated by wisdom, for Scripture, speaking of the Tablets on which the

Ex. R. X.7

2) As soon as they realized that they were not able to produce gnats, they recognized that the deeds were those of God and not of witchcraft. They no longer compared themselves with Moses in producing the plagues. (by saying: "This is the finger of God").

3) In the Passover Haggadah we find:

R. José, the Galilean, says: Whence do we deduce that the Egyptians were smitten with ten plagues in Egypt and at the Red Sea

oracles were engraved, says that they were written by the Finger of God (Ex. 31.18) Wherefore, the sorcerers can no longer stand before Moses, but fall as in a wrestling bout...

with fifty plagues? With regard to the plagues in Egypt Scripture states: And the magicians said to Pharaoh "This is the finger of God". And what does it say about Egypt at the Sea? "And Israel saw the great hand with which the Lord had dealt against the Egyptians..." With one finger ten plagues were brought about in Egypt; at the Sea, therefore, (5 X 10) they were smitten with fifty plagues.

The identical analogy is employed in both cases: a hand which contains five fingers is also five times as powerful. They also agree that in this instance the black magic of the Egyptian soothsayers proved futile, albeit Pharaoh's heart again hardened, and that this was achieved by the finger of God.

But for Philo it was not feasible that this finger could be conceived as an actual part of God's body. Therefore, by way of allegory derived in accord with No. fourteen of the above-cited hermeneutic rules, the finger is re-interpreted to signify "sophistry defeated by wisdom". The soothsayers are compared with the Athenian sophists who also would pervert the truth and bewitch the people with their arts. The hand of God becomes the symbol of His omnipotence, though our two excerpts seem to be independent of the passage cited in the name of R. José and perhaps entirely unrelated. The power of God's hand also assumes a cosmic function; in a flare of negative universalism this hand is said to overpower the entire universe, i.e., it can be a destructive as well as a constructive force and in this resembles the divine logos which, too, is created by the Almighty to produce good or evil through its activities.

It would be presumptuous to ascribe any philosophical motives to the two Midrashim. The first passage is a "p"shat" commentary on the biblical verse

stating why the magicians abandoned their ambition to imitate the miracles performed by Moses upon God's order. Philo, though he does not deny the supernatural character of the plagues, especially those wrought by God Himself, passes over these miracles which to him represent only an aspect of His infinite wisdom and strength. To R. José the plagues meant more. They, for him and his contemporaries, were the living memorial of God's just retribution which is afflicted upon those who harm his people. But ten plagues were insufficient to recompensate for four hundred years of misery and slavery. Even fifty plagues could not placate the fancy of José's colleagues who were sitting at the Seder meal at Bene B'rak discussing the story of the exodus and, as some maintain, making secret plans against the legions of Emperor Hadrian. For this rabbinical conclave took place in the days preceding the Bar Kochba revolt which was to avenge the Jews upon their conquerors and bring them renewed redemption from slavery. Thus the exodus became a very actual experience to José, who revelled in the thought that soon the Romans would be punished by God with plagues like those that befell the Egyptians. No trace of universalism and love for mankind can be discovered in his version, full of the poetic fire of a dejected people. The idea of retribution was equally known to Philo (Cp. Flaccus's miserable fate after he had tried to bring destruction and loss of citizenship to the Jews of Alexandria) but is not emphasized in this instance.

Philo, or his Hellenistic model, lived a century before the Rabbi and thus has priority on the exegetical twist: dáktylos - cheîr = יד אצבע - יד.
We do not even know whether Philo's basis for the interpretation of "hand" is the verse cited by José, Exodus 14. 31, or the comparison was made without any scriptural support in mind. José, on the other hand, might have been familiar

with Philo, for his contemporaries and close friends, Akiba and Elisha b. Abuya were acquainted with Gnostic speculation and theosophy which derived many of its tenets from Philo. But even if the homily is loaned from the Alexandrian orbit, the Palestinian, under the force of historical circumstances transformed the content completely. And again: Would a Palestinian rabbi ever compare the magicians' collapse to a defeat in a wrestling-match, as they are overwhelmed by the finger of God? An additional sign for the Greek spirit of Philo's Midrash is this reference to physical culture which, though found occasionally (the stories about Johanan b. Napcha and Resh Lakish) in the Agada, is intrinsically foreign to it.

XIV. Vita Mosis I. 36	Ex. R. I. 12 (to Ex. 1.14)
They (the Hebrews) carried the materials themselves, day and night, with no shifts to relieve them, no period of rest, not even suffered just to sleep for a bit and then resume their work.	Then he (Pharaoh) commanded that they should not be allowed to sleep in their homes, intending by this to limit their natural increase and reasoning to himself: "If they be not allowed to sleep in their homes, they will not be able to give birth to children."

As if the account of Pharaoh's cruelty and the hardships of the Israelites is not realistic and dramatic enough, both sources embellish the text by painting the most gruesome pictures of Hebrew suffering. Indeed, the description of the Egyptian Forced Labor and the devices employed to destroy the slaves physically and mentally resemble modern conditions in Nazi times. The Midrash is especially concerned about Pharaoh's motive in preventing the Israelites from getting any sleep at home, i. e., from being with their wives. The commandment "Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen.1.28) was the first mitsvah ordained in the Torah and, therefore, of especial significance. Thus, Pharaoh's guilt

and presumption were the more serious, as he impeded the Israelites in fulfilling this sacred duty.

Philo did not stress the propagation of the House of Israel. Himself a bachelor, it would have been hypocrisy for him to complain about this matter, though it affected the ancient Hebrews. Besides, people in Alexandria would have smiled condescendingly at such naivity. However, their sympathy for the sufferers could be aroused by merely depicting the continuous, uninterrupted routine of slave labor day and night. For even the slaves were entitled to leisure and rest in the Greek world, a chance to advance their education and to safeguard their health. The emotional fervor of the Palestinian version is lacking in Philo's, nor is his homily particularly original. There might well have been a common source to both versions.

XV. Vita Mosis I. 98

The water changed into blood:

For the Egyptians believed water to be the original source of the creation of the all, He thought well to summon water first to reprove and admonish its votaries.

Ex. R. 9.9 (to Ex. 7.17)

Why were the waters first smitten, and with blood? Because Pharaoh and the Egyptians worshipped the Nile, and God said: "I will smite their god first, and then his people". I will smite the gods, and their priests will tremble.

Both inquire into the reason why the apparently innocent waters of the Nile were selected to bear the brunt of God's punishment first. Philo considers this plague as a reproach and warning rather than actual retribution, as it is taken by the Midrash. The latter assumes that the water itself is punished for having been the object of Egyptian idolatry. The Nile being worshipped as a deity has to feel the only true God's mighty and avenging arm before the adherents of this cult are taken to task for their guilt. It was common Semitic theory, even in ages

far more remote, that the God of a people was intimately connected with the fate of those whose country he was called to protect. A similar story is told about Pharaoh himself, who, according to Egyptian tradition, was considered a god incarnate. The text: Ex. 8.20. "And there came grievous swarms of flies into the house of Pharaoh". "He was smitten because he was the first to counsel the evil thing, as it says:"And Pharaoh charged all his people,'saying - 'all male children ye shall throw into the river, but the females ye shall leave alive'. And afterwards the swarm penetrated the house of his servants". (Ex. R. XI, 1)

For Philo the water does not suffer direct punishment. It rather serves as the instrument of God's will to bring ultimate punishment upon the Egyptians. For him water is the Egyptian basic source of all existence, the "Urstoff" just as it was the prime element for Thales of Miletus, one of the earliest Greek philosophers. The other three fundamental elements of existence - air, earth and fire - were also employed in reproving Pharaoh, demonstrating to him that the whole universe disassociated itself from his course. Philo does not consider, therefore, the water as a deity which, by its very nature, has been indicted and is condemned, but is held to be merely the ultimate source of the world. Thus he does not openly accuse the Egyptians of worshipping the River. For him the waters have rather a beneficial task: to serve as an admonition for the improvement of the Egyptians which, in the end, does not materialize. The detailed discussion of the four elements again points to Philo's penetration into Greek philosophy. It seems that the Palestinian version preceded Philo's, who in turn reinterpreted the tale about the blood plague in connection with the waters of the Nile in the light of Hellenistic thinking. In idea content the two stay far apart and cannot be compared with one another.

XVI. Vita Mosis I. 83 Ex. R. III. 14 (to Ex. 4.10)

And Moses said unto the Lord: "Oh, Lord, I am not a man of words, neither heretofore, nor since Thou hast spoken unto Thy servant; For I am slow of speech, and of a slow tongue."

For he (Moses) considered that human eloquence compared with God's was dumbness and also, cautious as he was by nature, he shrank from things sublime and judged that matters of such magnitude were not for him.

Moses said to God: "Thou art Lord of the Universe, and dost Thou wish that I should be Thy messenger? Surely, I am not a man of words."
R.Phineas, the Priest, said: "I am not a man of words and there is no place for words here. For the man I am to go to is a slave (a descendent of Ham) and will not accept reproof. I will only go if I can chastise him with suffering.

The Midrash had to inquire why Moses wanted to refuse the mission for which he had been selected. Having had the extraordinary experience of speaking to God face to face and having the Lord reveal to himself as the "I am the one who Is" the incident at the Burning Bush had called him to be a prophet to his people and to Egypt. How could he withdraw from such high purpose without appearing arrogant and rebellious and without incurring the wrath of God?

The first Palestinian instance stresses Moses' innate meekness and modesty. He does not want to accept this appointment, because he cannot conceive that the omnipotent ruler of the world would want such an insufficient representative as His messenger. If a man of eloquence is required to dissuade Pharaoh from his purpose, he would be unqualified. The second version pictures a more determined Moses who, while attempting to withdraw from his task, becomes a cruel, bloodthirsty sadist. No word, he contends, will change the heart of a slave; for the mind of a slave is

dulled and his soul blunted and, unless he feels physical pain, his emotions cannot be stirred. As Ham, because he uncovered his father's nakedness, was to be a servant to his brothers, so Pharaoh, Ham's distant progeny, still betrays slave characteristics and would not listen to words. Phineas, thinking of the Egyptian task-master who was slain by Moses because of his cruelty to a Hebrew, considers Moses capable of actually chastising the King of Egypt.' Again, this desire for vengeance upon Egypt seems to originate from the period of Roman oppression. Phineas wants to sublimate his agony and bitterness by pouring his wrath upon the Egyptian king, the ancient Roman emperor, with the help of the prophet Moses. He would be sure that his audience, as he preached in the synagogue of a Sabbath morning, understood the implication.

It would not have aided Philo's apologetic purpose to depict Pharaoh as a slave in actuality, although allegorically he interprets Pharaoh as the principle of sensuousness and the domination of the body over the soul, i.e. as a slave of the body. Also, Moses could not be shown as an emotional person demanding vengeance, a quality that is far from the thought of a true philosopher, certainly one of the Platonic or Stoic school. The latter placed much more emphasis on oratory, on education in general, and thus Moses pleads incapacity on the ground that, especially after having heard God deliver an address, he realizes his own limitations the more fully. Comparing God's rhetorical perfection with his own impeded speech his inferiority becomes the more obvious. For this reason - which is set forth with sincere modesty - Moses shuns the call that commences his remarkable and unique career. The first Hebrew example, merely an exposition of the text, seems to be the model for Philo and Phineas who injected their personal reaction and the feeling of their environment into their homilies.

XVII. Vita Mosis I. 188

> Anyone who has the gift of keen mental sight may see in this clear signs and tokens of national blessedness. For the nation has twelve tribes each of which, in virtue of its piety, will be represented by the well which supplies piety in perennial streams and noble actions unceasingly, while the heads of the whole nation are seventy, who may properly be compared to the palm, the noblest of trees, excellent both in its appearance and in the fruit which it bears.

Mech. Vayassa', II. 1 (ad Ex. 15.27)

> Eleazar of Modin says: On the day that the Holy One Blessed be He created his universe, he created the twelve wells, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel, and the seventy palms, corresponding to the seventy elders.

The occurrence of specific numbers in Exodus 15. 27 led both sources to speculate on their significance, and the answer is surprisingly obvious. One should assume that these numbers were chosen by the author of the biblical passage himself to correspond to the tribes and elders. For it would be natural that twelve springs would spend sufficient water for more than seventy trees. The Palestinian Tanna, a contemporary of Akiba and José of Galilee, added one facet, namely, that God had decided on these two numbers on the day of creation, i. e., the first day, and that, therefore, the twelve wells and the seventy palm trees fall into the same category as the Paradise, Gehinnom, the Temple, etc., which also were decided upon before God created the species itself, the plants in this case. This Midrash thus indicates that the rabbi had a faint, inconcise recollection of the Platonic doctrine of ideas which we frequently meet in Philo. The idea of a thing existed in God's mind long before He created the actual object, and this doctrine was useful to prove, or at least to postulate, the antiquity of certain institutions which, according to the biblical account, were not as ancient as other, less significant things. Although the rabbi does not state specifically that these numbers and the things to which they correspond symbolize Israel, this idea must have been present in his subconscience, for trees and wells by themselves were surely not important enough

to warrant God's preconceiving before actual creation. But the people of Israel deserved such an honor, for it was to carry the Torah into the world which had been in existence even before the first day. Israel, the rabbi reasoned, who was to suffer so much for God's sake in Egypt as well as in his own time, could well ask for the privilege that the idea of his peoplehood and destiny was determined by God previous to His creation of other matter.

Philo, who was familiar with the early Palestinian form of this Midrash, grasped this opportunity for allegorical interpretation. Wells and palm trees were not significant for Scripture; a deeper meaning was intended to be obtained by speculation. As the well in example XII was transformed into the thirsting soul, so the ever-flowing waters of this spring become the equivalent of the piety of Israel which also never ceases. Correspondingly, Israel ever excells in nobility and righteousness, just as the height and beauty of the palm tree present a fine appearance and its fruit, the date, has a good taste. (Cp. psalm 92, 13f.) Thus the oasis in the desert became to symbolize Israel's blessedness to every traveler who would sense the superiority of the people whose God is the Lord, and again we must remember Philo's apologetic and missionarizing purposes. This aim is achieved more adequately with the help of allegory. Philo had no reason to assume that these symbols were pre-created; he gained his end through allegorical interpretation which, if the instance would permit, was preferable to philosophical argument. It appears that an originally Palestinian germ was reinterpreted by Philo and the Tanna. The latter's version indicates clearly Greek influences, yet in this illustration Philo could have been the mediator only indirectly.

XVIII. Vita Mosis I. 311

Sifre toDt. 20. 14
(also quoted by Rashi)

The text: Nu. 31,17f:

Now therefore kill every male among the little ones (i.e., after the victory over the Midianites, under Phineas), and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women, children, that have not known man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.

They (the Israelites) proceeded to destroy the cities utterly by demolition or fire so that no one could have told that they had ever been inhabited.... But to the boys who were quite young and the maidens they shewed mercy which their tender age secured for them.

"And thou shalt smite all its males". I would understand this to include even the small ones in the midst thereof. Scripture teaches: Only the women, the children, and the beasts. Should this include only female children? You might say that this may be derived from the law that only adult women be put to death. But in this particular instance even adult women are not to be killed. Thus we should understand that the collective "children" also includes male children.

In this instance Philo obviously contradicts the Massorah as well as the Septuagint, for both expressly state that the Israelites were enjoined to kill male children in the Midianite war, together with any woman who had had sexual relations. No doubt, he mitigated the bibligal text purposely for apologetic reasons. His Hellenistic readers would have turned in contempt from a people whose religion demanded such cruelty in war, for Philo failed to cite the more lenient treatment of prisoners recorded in Deuteronomy and used as the basis for the Midrashic explanation. It is also feasible that Philo himself misunderstood the Septuagint; perhaps it would be most accurate to say: Philo wanted to misunderstand this passage and interpreted it accordingly. To lay fire to conquered cities and destroy them utterly was a practise followed in his time. The conquered population was either dispersed or sold into slavery, and the Israelites could not be criticized for their harshness toward adult males who could have rebelled against them.

The Midrash also felt the inherent cruelty in the slaughter of the Midianite children. By equating זכר male, with מטף adults, the commentator tries to exclude the death of male children. His method is forced and casuistic, but indicates the spirit of compassion for a defeated enemy that we find with Saul and Ahab, in spite of orders to destroy the foes. However, the Midrash meant for home consumption is free from apologetic motives, an expression of rabbinical ethics. The re-interpretation of the biblical narrative was thus based on divergent intentions and probably arrived at independently from one another.

XIX. Vita Mosis II. 137

For with spontaneous ardor, at no other bidding than their own, they gave the mirrors which they used in adorning their comely persons, a truly fitting first fruit offering of their modesty and chastity in marriage, and in fact of their beauty of soul.

Tanch, Pekuday to Ex. 38.8

The daughters of Israel had mirrors in their hands into which they looked when adorning themselves. And even these they did not withhold, but brought them as a free-will offering for the sanctuary.

Both want to show the extraordinary willingness of the Hebrew women to present even their most treasured possessions for the erection of the sanctuary. The Midrash stresses this sacrifice, because the women did not possess much more than a few cosmetic articles and whatever the Egyptians had given to them upon their hurried departure from Egypt. The emphasis upon the purpose of the mirrors does not necessarily reflect Hellenistic influence, because the idea that women would beautify themselves with the aid of mirrors was universal in antiquity. Therefore, Philo had to add a new facet; the literal story was too prosaic for the women of Rome and Greece often offered even more to save their country. Thus he stressed the purpose for which this offering was made; a temple, and there was no extraneous pressure brought upon them. They were confident that they would not require mirrors to retain the affection of their husbands; their modesty and integrity assured them their husbands' love. Thus these mirrors are symbols for the beautiful, pure souls which dwell within the Hebrew women. That, to Philo,

represents the great gift which they offered up for the building of the sanctuary. As in the case of Moses, Philo hints at the Greek ideal of kalokagathia, beauty of appearance and character going hand in hand,which is revealed in these women. Also, the moralistic sermon addressed to the ladies of Alexandria is not missing in this allegory. "Follow their example" Philo proclaims, "sacrifice your cosmetics for the sake of the community and rather let your character prove your worth". It is difficult to ascertain how successful Philo's preaching was. He probably found the idea of this Midrash in an older Hellenistic source, which, in turn, is closely related to the original of the Tanchuma version.

XX. Vita Mosis II, 213

Speaking about the man who gathered firewood on the Sabbath; reference is made to the Fourth Commandment.

(These) commands (were) promulgated by God not through His prophet, but by a voice which - paradoxically enough - was visible and aroused the eyes rather than the ears of the bystanders.

Rashi to Ex. 20.15

And all the people were seeing the thunderings:

They were seeing what is to be heard, which is impossible on any other place.

The thunderings: which went forth from the mouth of God all-powerful.

3.

Both are trying to overcome the difficulty of being able to "see voices". The occasion described was an extraordinary moment in the history of Israel, the revelation of Mount Sinai, the only time in the existence of any people that its God would appear before the worshippers. His voice was perceived by all the children of Israel, and Moses' intercession was not needed. For Rashi there was nothing miraculous in this revelation; the only question concerned the wording of the report. The voice of the thunder should be heard; lightning could have been seen, but the expression "baraq" does not occur. As the event transcended the experience of mortals, it made an even more indelible impression in that the

usual order of nature was changed and thunders were perceived with the eye rather than with the ear. This incident happened only on that one day and in one place never to be repeated again.

Philo, no doubt, believed in the reality of the Sinaitic revelation, but had to reinterpret the event to suit his own rationalistic concept of the deity. Fear enters his mind that his sceptical fellow-citizens might doubt his word, and thus he adds parenthetically, "paradoxótaton". In his exegetic work "De migratione Abrahami" he again refers to this occurrence (par. 47): "Whereas the voice of mortal beings is judged by hearing, the sacred oracles intimate that the words of God are seen as light is seen; for we are told that 'all people saw the voice', not that they heard it; for what was happening was not an impact on air made by the organs of mouth and tongue, but virtue shining with intense brilliance, wholly resembling a fountain of reason, and this is also indicated elsewhere in this wise: 'Ye have seen that I have spoken to you out of Heaven', not 'ye heard', for the same cause as before". (Reg. Ex. 20,19) Thus allegory serves once again to overcome a conflict between ancient scriptural tradition and the rational spirit of the Hellenistic world. The divine "voice" is naught but virtue, so perfect and complete that it shines forth and illumines the eye. The Ten Commandments can be reasonably compared with an effulgence of light without its peer in the annals of mental progress, and Philo's interpretation becomes more than a pretty homily on a difficult bible text. In his time the Sabbath commandment was perhaps the only one among the ten, the universal application of which was doubted by the learned men of the period; for a weekly day of rest, as celebrated by the Jews, was unheard of in antiquity. Thus Philo wanted to secure it special recognition and stringent observation among his co-religionists. In his own mind, we may safely suppose, that heavenly voice was one of the many forms of the logos and by no means a mani-

festation of the Ineffable Himself. Does Rashi's ... imply the same idea? Not consciously, but as we know that the mystical exegesis of the Zohar contains many Philonic germs, so did some indirect influence extend to the rabbi of Troyes.

XXI. Vita Mosis II. 243

In the case of the daughters (of Zelophad) His phrase is that the inheritance should be "put around" them, as though it were an external ornament, not a possession by right of kinship inalienable. For what is "put around" does not have an intimate connection with what it adorns, and the ideas of close fitting and union are quite foreign to it.

T. B. Baba Bathra 109b

Discussion on Hebrew terms "..." and "..." and their different connotations.

Rashi ad Nu. 27.7

And thou shalt pass over: The expression "pass over" is used of him who has no son to inherit. Another version: Because the daughter passes the inheritance from tribe to tribe, since her son and husband inherit her.

Both homilies point toward the humanitarian spirit of the Mosaic law, though a slight distinction was drawn between male and female heirs, as manifested in a different Hebrew expression for to "inherit". This is a difference in degree, not evaluation of sexes. Philo shows here his dependence on the Septuagint which translates ... with "peritithemi".[4] To "put around" is not quite the same as to "pass on" or "over". Philo's explanation remains in the realm of philology without attempting a halachic analysis. By using the verb in a purely figurative sense he missed the actual meaning of the sentence. For the possessions inherited by girls are subject to the same regulations as land inherited by male offspring; they had to keep the release year and in case of bankruptcy were reinstated into their rights in the Jubilee year. However, they could not marry out of their tribe. Thus the

ideas of "close-fitting" and "union" actually apply to female heirs as well as to males.

The rabbinical source was primarily interested in the Halachic side of the problem, in the legalistic and limited spirit of the Talmudic age.

XXII. Vita Mosis II. 245	Mishna Baba Bathra 8.1
Philo suggests that, although no specific statement is made, fathers may inherit their sons.	
But since, in the natural order of things, sons are the heirs of their fathers and not fathers of their sons, He left unmentioned this deplorable and sinister possibility, to avoid the idea of a father and mother making profit out of their inconsolable sorrow at the untimely death of their children.	And these are the degrees of those who inherit and may cause to inherit; Father and children, and children and father .....

Among the various grades of relatives whose possessions may be inherited to one another, the Bible is strangely silent about the possibility that children may die before their parents. Since such cases would occur, legal provisions had to be made to suit the occasion. Thus we may conclude that our Mishna dates back rather far, probably to the period when the pentateuch was edited. Philo was acquainted with the law, though his general knowledge of Halacha was none too thorough. While the Talmud is concerned with a detailed analysis of the law discussing all possible nuances, but never transcending its legalistic boundaries, Philo breathes the spirit of humanitarianism. Of course, the Jewish nómos was complete; no possible relation between man and man or man and God was omitted in the bible; but no casuistic turn was

needed to derive this stipulation. This argumentum e silentio is logical and human, besides. The Lawgiver Moses, great friend of mankind as he was, could not conceive of such misfortune for a parent. Philo's moral sensibility and knowledge of psychic reactions speak from the concluding part of the statement. He realized that some parents would be greedy enough to take the property of the deceased as their own and also pointed at the gossiping neighbor, who would ascribe such hateful motives to a bereaved, innocent parent. Not to stimulate such perverse thoughts, Moses purposely evaded mentioning this legal possibility.

XXIII. Vita Mosis I. 282 — Hebrew proverb

Ref. to Balak and Balaam:

> But the king, thinking either to deceive the seer or to move the Deity and drew Him from His firm purpose, led the way to another spot.

> He who changes his location changes his luck.

The Hebrew proverb comes closest to the intention of the biblical narrative, for this was the thought in Balak's mind when (Nu. 23.13) he led the seer to another location. Philo looks for a rational motive in the king's superstitious action: he wanted to deceive the hesitant Balaam. No doubt it was Balak's desire to find a more suitable spot to propitiate the deity and obtain a favorable oracle, and that was his only purpose in placing Balaam in such a position where he could only see a small part of the Israelite camp. The underlying notion is common in antiquity.

XXIV. De Vita Mosis I. 295 - 299

Balaam said: "Now I have suggestions of my own designing", Knowing the one way by which the Hebrews could be overthrown was disobedience, he set himself to lead them, through wantonness and licenticusness, to impiety, through a great sin to a still greater, and put before them the bait of pleasure. "you have in your countrywomen, king", he said, "persons of preeminent beauty. And there is nothing to which a man more easily falls a captive than women's comeliness. If then, you permit the fairest among to prostitute themselves for hire, they will ensnare the younger of their enemies. But you must instruct them not to allow their wooers to enjoy their charms at once. For coyness titillates, and thereby makes the appetites more active, and inflames the passions. And when their lust has them in its grip, there is nothing which they will shrink from doing or suffering. Then, when the lover is in this condition, one of those who are arming to take their prey, should say, with a saucy air: "You must not be permitted to enjoy my favors until you have left the ways of your fathers and become a convert to honoring what I honor. That your conversion is sincere will be clearly proved to me if you are willing to take part in the libations and sacrifices which we offer to idols of stone and wood and the other images." Then, the lover, caught in the meshes of her multiform lures, her beauty and the enticements of her wheedling talk, will not gainsay her, but with his reason trussed and pinioned, will subserve her orders to his sorrow, and be enrolled as a slave of passion.

T. B. Sanh. 106 a

Balaam said thus to Balak: "The God of Israel hates lewdness, and they are very partial to linen. Come, and I will advise you. Build for them tents enclosed by hangings, in which place harlots, old women without, young women within, to sell them linen garments". So, he erected curtained tents from the snowy mountain (Hermon) as far as Beth HaYeshimoth, and placed harlots in them, old women from without, young women from within. And when an Israelite ate, drank and was merry and issued forth for a stroll in the market place, the old women would say to him: "Do you not desire linen garments? The old women offered it at its current value, but the young ones for less. This happened two or three times. After that she would say to him: "You are now like one of the family; sit down and choose for yourself!" Gourds of Ammonite wine lay near her, and at that time Ammonite and heathen wine was not yet forbidden. Said she to him: "Would you like to drink a glass of wine?" Having drunk, his passions were inflamed, and he exclaimed to her: "Yield to me! Thereupon she would bring forth an idol from her bosom and say to him: "Worship this." "But I am a Jew" he protested. "What are you excited about?" she rejoined, "nothing is required but that you should uncover yourself", since he did not know that such was its worship. "Now" said she, "I will not leave you until you have denied the Torah of Moses, your teacher."

Without a question, both versions were based on a common Midrash. The general idea is not contained in the biblical narrative, unless one would equate the story of the Midianite woman† and her Israelite lover†, both of whom were killed by Phineas with this incident. Balaam, whose magic curses are transformed by God into blessings devises a clever scheme by which the Israelites will fall away from serving their God, who insists on strict morality, and will worship idols. For if God notices their idolatry, He will withdraw His protection from them, and the king of Moab will then be able to defeat them without much trouble. The Israelite men, being engaged in warfare, will be missing their regular sex-life, and therefore be easily enticed by Moabite girls who, at the proper moment, will force their lovers to commit idolatry and thus thrust Israel into sin.

Yet we notice some characteristic differences in these two accounts. The Palestinian (or Babylonian) narrative bears all the marks of an oriental harem story, full of color, detail and play of fancy. The realism of the bargaining for the linen, the gradual increasing of the passions through the wine and the stimulation of the senses and the final climax that would lead to the act of idolatry, are pictured with unparalleled literary skill. The incident could be a part of "A Thousand and One Nights" were it not for the reference to the ritualistic injunction concerning heathen wine and for the protest of the lover who, in the midst of a sexual orgy, still would not want to part with monotheism. Thus, it is a typical product of Palestinian Judaism and, as its parallel in Josephus Antiquities IV. 126-140 indicates, must go back into the distant past. Josephus links the Moabites with the Midianites, makes Midianite girls the heroines of the seduction and thus establishes a logical contact with the avenging deed of Phineas. The tenor of his description follows Philo, except for the

† as is done by Josephus,

significant remark made by the enticing girls to their pursuers (IV.137) "Seeing then that ye agree to these conditions, and that ye have customs and a mode of life wholly alien to all mankind, insomuch that your food is of a peculiar sort and your drink is distinct from that of other men, it behoves you, if you would live with us, also to revere our gods!" This emphasis upon the dietary laws is Palestinian; it contains the same implication and reproach that Apion and other Jew-baiters of his day hurled against the Jews - that they were basically an alien people which, through its separatist law-code kept itself aloof from normal social relations with other men. By putting these words into the mouths of the immodest Midianite girls Josephus tries to justify the position of Judaism.

Josephus must have been acquainted with Philo, as the argument, the wording and the underlying ideas show. For Philo, while more prosaic than the Midrash, utilizes many artifices of the Hellenistic erotic novel of which we possess a perfect example in Josephus' account of the Potiphar legend. While Philo, as also shown in this example, considers the events which he recounts, mainly as occasions for ethical and philosophic instruction, he does not retain an attitude hostile toward eroticism. Certainly, in this instance it cannot be said that he "gleichmässig als Theoretiker und als Erzähler den erotischen Effekt aufs ausserste befehdet".[5] It is true, however, that Philo considers this narrative as a vehicle for the Law and its binding force. The lover will sully the purity of his soul by indulging in the sin-provoking and quickly fleeting pleasures of the body, a Stoic thought, which is cloaked in the garment of the Torah, the honor and validity of which are at stake, as well as Israel's integrity. That this type of conversion occurred during Philo's time, and especially in Alexandria, cannot be doubted. For Philo's works show clearly that even in those days the struggle against a predominantly foreign environment was by no means easy. While a cosmopolitan such as he could find the path of adjustment and intellectual integration, leading to a complete assimilation of the Greek spirit with the Hebraic ethos,

many of his contemporaries, including his own nephew Tiberius Alexander, stumbled on the road to an amalgamation of Greek and Jewish ideals. The allurements of full citizenship which implied sharing in the public sacrifices to the Greek deities on the festivals, attendance of the gymnasia without cloths in contradiction to the biblical law, participation in the theatre performances, as actor or spectator were looked upon with disdain by Jewish tradition, caused many weak and opportunistic Jews to abandon their ethnic and religious group. No doubt, often it was the attraction of young women that brought about conversion " אשה יפת תואר" rather than "יפת אשה ויפת תואר" or love for Zeus and Athena. The opposite holds equally true and accounts for the great number of conversions to Judaism which took place about that time (the kingdom of Adiabene) and which, likewise, were partly the result of the mysterious attraction of the Jewish ritual, partly of the increased social intercourse throughout the Hellenistic world, and partly of the intellectual persuasiveness and inherent truth of the Torah.

This Midrash, then, is interpreted by Philo in the manner of a Hellenistic moralist, while the rabbis do not emphasize the obvious lesson to be derived from this incident. In its original form this Midrash must have been very ancient and may possibly be a remnant of those biblical narratives and novelettes that were not accepted by the official redactors of the bible, but were retained in the folk-lore of Palestine and migrated with the Jewish emigrants to Egypt and Babylonia. There it received a "touching up" before being incorporated into the literary output of those Jewries.

XXV. Vita Mosis II. 114

A name which only those whose ears and tongues are purified may hear or speak in the holy place, and no other person, nor in any other place at all.

T. B. Sota 38a (to Nu. 6.23)

"On this wise shall ye bless the children of Israel". "So shall they put My name", and elsewhere it is stated: "to put His name there". (Dt.12.5) As in this second passage it denotes "in the Temple", so also in the former passage it denotes "in the Temple".

By Philo's time the prohibition against pronouncing Yahweh's name was universal. Only on Yom Kippur the High Priest, after having entered the Holiest of Holies, upon fulfilling the atonement rites, was permitted to bless the assembled populace and to utter the Name (M.Yoma 6.2). Philo knew of this custom, as he himself had once made a pilgrimage to Jerusalem; moreover, the Septuagint, as is generally known, had already translated YHWH with "kyrios", which indicated that the translators were aware of the taboo in the third century B. C. E. Yet Philo did not realize that "kyrios" and the tetragrammaton are two designations for the same thing; if he had compared the Septuagint with the original, he would have noticed that YHWH was always thus rendered into Greek in contrast to "Elohim", "theos". This, to some scholars, is an added proof that he knew no Hebrew at all or a mere smattering of it.[6.] While the Talmudic passage limits itself to a statement of a ritualist fact, Philo does not neglect to include the ethical element - that those assembled in the Temple had to be cleansed in body and soul, "ears and tongues" are a pars pro toto homine, before they could be granted the grace to hear the divine name "in holiness and purity". Philo, in this instance, definitely depends on a Palestinian tradition.

XXVI. Vita Mosis II. 147

The calf he purposed to offer to gain remission of sins, showing by this figure that sin is congenital to every created being, even the best, just because they are created. This sin requires prayers and sacrifices to propitiate the Deity, lest His wrath be roused and visited upon them.

Also compare with De mut. nom. I 585M.

There the thought is based on the following argument. All sensuality

Jesus Sirach 25.24

From a woman did sin originate, and because of her we all must die.

IV Esdras 3.20

And yet Thou didst not take away the evil heart ... For the first (primus) Adam, clothing himself with the evil heart, transgressed and was overcome; and likewise all who were born of him.

T.B.Sanh. 105a (to Is.20.26)

Rabbah b. Bar Hana said: The prophet urged Israel: "Return and repent!"

is evil and leads to sin. But as man cannot be free of sensual impressions, sin is innate from birth, and even if man lives for but one day, he is affected by it.

Ginzberg's version of Pirqe d'Rabbi Eliezer 21 (not found in some editions)

Wickedness came into the world with the first being born of woman, Cain, the oldest son of Adam. When God bestowed paradise upon the first pair of mankind, He warned them particularly against carnal intercourse with each other.

They replied: "We cannot. The Tempter (סמאל) rules over us". He said to them: "Curb your evil desires!" They replied: "Let his God teach us!"

Midr. Hagadol I. 68f

The serpent caused Eve to be filled with voluptuousness (זוהמא) for all generations.

Philo is generally regarded as the father of the Original Sin doctrine which plays a powerful part in Paul's theology and has become the centralpoint of Christianity. In our selection he plainly states that sin is innate in man because he was created out of matter, which contains the germs of evil. Prayers and sacrifices have no other purpose but to beseech the Deity for pity and grace so that man may find forgiveness. For Philo this theory was an answer to the problem of theodicy, God's justice, which often rewards the pious with misfortune and permits the wicked to go unpunished. According to him (and as we see.the doctrine was current in Palestine when Sirach's book was written, about 190 BCE) no person, not even the very best, could claim freedom from sin. Sensual desires overcome the choicest spirit, and his soul then loses its pristine purity, wherein he again agrees with Plato.

However, Sirach's notion does not seem to have been accepted by the main stream of Judaism. References to the Original Sin of Adam and Eve, who in turn caused all succeeding generations to follow in the path of sexual passion, are found onlyin the apocrypha, especially in IV Esdras and II Baruch, books

which date from the time following the destruction of the Temple. The first of these was written in Rome, and thus may have been influenced by the then strong Stoic currents. As a matter of fact, it is possible that Sirach himself was acquainted with Greek ideas to the effect that sin is inherited from generation to generation. The serpent as the tempter is an allegorical explanation that also may date from pre-Philonic times. Yet the passage of the Pirqe d'Rabbi Eliezer is definitely late and follows Philo and the apocryphal writings cited above; here neither Adam nor Eve, but Cain is blessed for having brought a congenital sin upon mankind, which is contingent upon the yearning for sex relations.

But this generalization is contrary to the rabbinic norm. As was observed when discussing Moses' marital status, propagation of children was considered a sacred obligation and not essentially evil. This is another clue that this portion of the late rabbinical Midrash, which frequently exhibits Greek ideas, was permeated with ascetic tendencies of the neo-pythagorean school. The only impulse the rabbi cautioned against was the יצר הרע, the evil inclination, which often, but not always, became identified with the sex desire. This is also apparent in this selection from the Talmud, where the "yetzer hara" is described as an influence that prevents man from true repentance. The people's answer "let his God teach us" signifies the belief that God is the ultimate source of the evil inclination and that fighting against it is, therefore, futile; God Himself was responsible for its existence from the beginning and, unless He teaches man how to conquer it, this inclination will continue forever. In this the Midrash agrees with Philo and also Ecclesiastes who sensed this idea in the utterance: (7.20) "For there is not a righteous man upon earth, that doeth good and erreth not". As the Temple was destroyed and sacrifices could no longer

propitiate the deity, prayer alone atoned for the sins of Israel as did sincere repentance. Christianity adopted the second of Philo's suggested remedies against this original and inescapable hamartía; the sacrifice of the lamb Jesus on the cross, which atones (notice the Hellenistic universalistic note) for the sins of the world. Philo's calf is here transformed in acc. with Lev. M into a lamb; his allegory deeply covered up with mystical concepts.

XXVII. Vita Mosis II. 224

In this month, about the fourteenth day, when the disc of the moon is becoming full, is held the commemoration of the crossing, a public festival called in Hebrew Pascha, on which the victims are not brought to the altar by the laity and sacrificed by the priests, but, as commanded by the law, the whole nation acts as priest, each individual bringing what he offers on his own behalf and dealing with it with his own hands.

M. Pes. 5.5.(to Ex. 12.6)

The Passover sacrifice shall be slaughtered in three groups, for it says: And all the assembly of the congregation of Israel shall slaughter it. Kahal, 'edah and Israel.

However, objection is raised toward the practise of Taddeus of Rome who led the Roman congregation in slaughtering goats in place of the traditional Passover sacrifice.

T.B. Pes. 53a, Ber. 19a

This common Halacha is mentioned here only to point out Philo's emphasis on the general application of the Passover service which, unlike the other offerings, was not limited to the priestly cast, but, in the spirit of true democracy, was performed by every member of the people. Philo was greatly interested in stressing democratic institutions in Judaism so as to avoid the impression that the priestly and Levite classes were predominant throughout and the ordinary Israelite merely a secondrate citizen with many religious duties and obligations, but no privileges. Such misconception could be disproved by his participation in one of the holiest rites, the paschal sacrifice offered in memory of the liberation from Egypt and, (so says Philo) while the rabbis are silent, the crossing of the Red Sea. It should be

noted that Philo celebrated Passover on the fourteenth of Nissan, and not on the fifteenth, the date fixed by the Talmud in its decision which of the two conflicting days should initiate the festival week. The citation of the Roman example will demonstrate how this law was obeyed even outside of Palestine, though sacrifices not offered in Jerusalem were generally frowned upon. This took place also in the Onias Temple at Heliopolis, as Philo must have known.

XXVIII. Vita Mosis I. 149

Israel as the priestly people for mankind.

A nation destined to be consecrated above all others to offer prayers forever on behalf of the human race that it may be delivered from evil and participate in what is good.

Gen. R. I. 4

R. Banayah said: The world and the fullness thereof were created only for the sake of the Torah, for it says (Prov. 3.19) The Lord, for the sake of wisdom (Torah), founded the earth.

T.B. Beracheth 12b

Rab said: Whoever has in his power to pray on behalf of his neighbor and fails to do so, is called a sinner.

Philo's universalistic tendencies follow the teachings of Deutero-Isaiah, Zechariah and Malachi, which had been somewhat neglected in the centuries when Judaism developed into its normative form. He was the spokesman of the mission idea which he found in the pentateuch and which is contained in the designation of Israel as the "mamlecheth kohanim" and the "goy kadosh". This mission did not merely consist in the actual conversion of other peoples to the belief in one God - the ruler and creator of the universe - but also in a steady offering of prayer for the gradual improvement of mankind and the elimination of evil. Only for this purpose was Israel chosen above all other peoples, not

as a mark of distinction or a privilege entailing special privileges, but a consecration for service; thus the Jews separated themselves from others, not because of conceit or arrogance, but because the retention of their purity was necessary for the fulfillment of their world-wide task. What other people would have accepted such a call and rendered such a service to humanity? This, Philo would have reasoned, in the light of Hellenistic internationalism, was the mission of Israel.

Owing to the political catastrophies and the resultant economic miseries, the Palestinian Jews did not feel a great love for mankind, as they soon realized the hostility of other peoples to their nation and their religion, which the ancients considered as an inseparable unity. Consequently, we may not be surprised about the absence of universalistic statements in the Palestinian Midrash; Rab's statement is made with reference to an individual, but not to the people of Israel as a whole. Furthermore, he was a Babylonian, and just about this time, when the Arsacide dynasty was replaced by the Sassanide, the Jews and their pagan neighbors enjoyed very friendly relations. Jewish universalism was expressed rather in the reverse, not that Israel was created for the service of mankind, but that the world was created for the sake of Israel or the Torah, which was considered the abstract symbol for the people that kept its commandments and were willing to offer their lives for its perpetuation. This idea helped to sublimate for the depressing humiliation Israel had to endure.

XXIX. Vita Mosis II. 263	Pirqe d'Rabbi Eliezer 3
(The Sabbath) has held the place of honor in nature, not merely from the time when the world was framed, but even before the heaven and all that sense perceives came into being. (echousan... pronomían)	Ten things arose in God's mind (before the second day) Jerusalem, the winds, the patriarchs, the paths of the righteous, hell, the waters of the deluge, the second set of tablets, the Sabbath, the Temple and the Ark, and the light of the future world.

The philosophical mind of Philo could not conceive how the creator would cease from this function of His, which was an integral part of His definition, and the essence of His being. If God should have actually rested (in the manner humans rest from work) He would have been imposed a limitation upon His omnipotence, for He needs no rest, possessing infinite strength, wisdom and omnipresence. Therefore, the idea of the Sabbath was conceived by Him before actual creation. Thus, Philo became the father of Jewish Sabbath mysticism, which rose to full height in the Kabbala.[9] We read in the famous Sabbath poem לכה דודי written in the sixteenth century by the mystic poet, Solomon Alkabez: "(The Sabbath) ordained from on high before the beginning, the end of creation, though first in thought".

The passage from the Midrash is also late in date, but it cannot be derived from Philo with any degree of certainty. It appears to be a play on numbers and words which was also popular in Palestine. Some of the pre-existing phenomena fall into the category of "miracles" - i. e., the waters of the deluge, the tablets and the celestial light in the future world, and were rationalized to have been ordained, before nature began to run its regular course; for the rationalistic critic could not fathom how God could interrupt the law

of nature to permit the occurrence of certain miracles. The thought is an original contribution of Philo and came indirectly into the Palestinian source cited here.

XXX. Vita Mosis II. 88

But, in chosing the materials for the women work, he selected as the best out of a vast number possible four, as equal in number to the elements - earth, water, air, fire - out of which the world was made, and with a definite relation to those elements; .... For it was necessary that in framing a temple of Man's making, dedicated to the Ruler and Father of All, he should take substances like those with which the Ruler made the All.

Tanch. Pekude 2

Hence the Tabernacle in its separate parts also corresponded to the creations of the six days. The two tablets in the Ark corresponding to heaven and earth that had been created on the first day. As the firmament had been created on the second day to divide the waters .. so there was a curtain in the Tabernacle to divide between the holy and the most holy.

3. Laver great sea, plant - table
4. Seven planets - branches of candlestick
5. Birds - Winged Cherubim
6. Man - High Priest.

For both, the Tabernacle, which was erected for the service of the Most High was to symbolize the world[9] even in the materials out of which it was built. Those who, in its precincts, worshipped the maker of the universe should be reminded, wherever they would look, about the marvels of creation.

The only difference consists in the symbols chosen to represent the universe. Philo, following the Greek philosophers, selected the four ousiai, the basic elements out of which all matter is composed. In this passage he clearly rejects ether as the fifth element. He arrives at his interpretation by allegorizing the four colors (purple, dark red, black and scarlet) which are employed for the embroidery of the Tabernacle. This instance well

demonstrates the cosmopolitan viewpoint of the Alexandrian. The Midrash, which probably borrowed this cosmic vision from the Hellenistic orbit, betrays its Hebraic character by selecting its analogies from the creation narrative. Yet even these examples, like the correspondence with the seven arms of the candlestick and the seven planets, cannot deny foreign parentage. Thus we may assume its comparatively late origin.

XXXI. Vita Mosis II. 71, 76

71. While he (Moses) was still staying on the mount, he was being instructed in all the mysteries of his priestly duties, and first among these..the building and furnishing of the sanctuary.

76. So the shape of the model was stamped upon the mind of the prophet, a secretly painted or moulded prototype, produced by immaterial and invisible forms; and then the resulting work was built in accordance with that shape by the artist impressing the stamping upon the material substances required in each case.

Ex. R. 40.2

When Moses visited in heaven, God showed him the Tabernacle, as well as models for all the holy vessels therein. Hence Moses naturally supposed that he was destined to be the builder of the Tabernacle. But he was mistaken, for when he was about to leave Heaven, God said to Moses: Thee have I appointed king, and it does not behoove a king to execute works in person, but to give people directions...

Though Moses first was shown the Tabernacle in its idea-state, he was not to be the actual builder. The Bible, at no place, records such thought in God's mind. But, Philo argued, Moses, the perfect, must have possessed at least the idea of the sanctuary which symbolizes the cosmos. Therefore,

the prototype of the Tabernacle, immaterial and invisible as any of Plato's original ideas, is impressed upon Moses' mind, who, contrary to the Midrash, did not expect to be the actual architect. "Mystagogeîto", he was initiated into the mysteries, as if he were a follower of the secret cults of Cybele or Eleusis; the Midrash would never represent Moses engulfed in mystic speculation. His trip to Mount Sinai and conversation with God were a reality to the Palestinians, the Tabernacle and its construction not being idealized, but were considered as actualities of a none too distant past. A king could not lower himself to carry the stones to the spot where a temple is to be erected, and Moses' prestige would suffer, if he would indulge in physical labor. This latter thought is more Greek than Jewish, for in Palestine manual labor was considered in highest esteem, while in Alexandria slaves were entrusted with such tasks, and it would have been considered degrading for such a personality as Moses to engage in erecting a building. The same Greek trend of thinking is intimated when Moses, speaking to God, is shown the model of the Tabernacle and all its vessels, an instance of the Platonic idea-theory in Palestinian literature. As Exodus Rabba contains some very late Midrashim, we may not be surprised at such influence which may have entered through Philo.

XXXII Vita Mosis I.66

In the midst of the flame was a form of the fairest beauty, unlike any visible object, an image supremely divine in appearance, refulgent with a brighter light than the light of fire. It might be supposed that this was the image of Him that is; but let us rather call it an angel. (Καλείσθω δὲ ἄγγελος)

Ex. R. II.5 (to Ex. 3.2)

R. Johanan said: This refers to Michael....Wherever Michael appears, there is also the glory of the Shechinah. At first an angel acted as intermediary and stood in the center of the fire, and afterwards the Schechinah descended and spoke with him from the midst of the bramble bush.

The obvious anthropomorphism of God's actual appearance in the burning bush caused Philo to resort to his favorite design and interpret the incident allegorically, a symbol for Israel which cannot be consumed by fire and only brings tp the fore its extraordinary beauty. In the latter Midrash the same difficulty was encountered, the archangel Michael appeared first to gain Moses' attention, and the actual conversation was conducted by the Shechinah, the divine omnipresence, which is frequently compared to the logos, especially as far as its functions are concerned. Here too, Philo's aggelos is a manifestation of the logos, the ready messenger of Him that is. R. Johanan and Philo seemed to base their attempts at eliminating the anthropomorphism upon a common source. Siegfried, however, assumed Philo's dependence on a Palestinian Agada.[10] But more about the burning bush!

XXIII. Vita Mosis I. 63ff

69. All this is a description of the nation's condition as it then stood, and we may think of it as a voice proclaiming to the sufferers: "Do not lose heart; your weakness is your strength, which can prick, and thousands will suffer from its wounds. Those who desire to consume you will be your unwilling saviors instead of your destroyers. Your ills will work you no ills. Nay, just when the enemy is surest of ravaging you, your fame will shine forth most gloriously".

Ex. R. II.5

R. Eliezer said: What is the nature of this bramble bush? It is more humble than any other tree, thus also is Israel more humble than any other nation in the world.

R. Johanan said: What is the nature of this bramble bush? Just as one uses it as a hedge for a garden, thus, also, is Israel a hedge for the world.

Why did the Lord show this to Moses? For this reason. Moses was thinking in his heart and said to himself: Perhaps the Egyptians will consume Israel .....

This allegorical sermon on the theme "Israel invincible" occurs in both versions for the same purpose; to encourage those Jews whose loyalties to their faith - because of the unceasing hardships they suffered - were none

too steadfast and who did not feel the great challenge that constituted being a Jew. For while the persecutions in Alexandria under Flaccus probably took place after the Vita Mosis had been written, we need not doubt the existence of a strong, anti-Jewish undercurrent, as appears from repeated and frequently identical literary attacks against them. That the life of the Jews in Palestine from 63 B.C.E. (when it was conquered by Pompey) until the end of the Roman domination (which coincides with Heraclius' defeat through the Khalif Omar in 641 C.E.) was a continuous chain of misery, is too obvious to warrant detailed analysis. Thus, the morale of the oppressed had to be bugyed up, and these Midrashim which were interwoven into the regular Sabbath morning sermon served to strengthen Jewish confidence and power of endurance.

For Philo, the burning bush is not only a symbol of Israel's strength, but also of the promise that its fame and luster will be increased under the impact of the pricking and that its glory will then shine forth to other peoples, who will grasp the skirts of these Jews and follow them. The Palestinians conceive of the same idea in a more poetic manner. R. Johanan's analogy of Israel as a hedge to the world (a fence to protect others from being injured morally, which is yet cursed for the stings it inflicts upon those who try to enter the garden without authorization) speaks of the deep faith of the Palestinian Amora. Israel's suffering is only a temporary - until its task to the other nations is brought to fruition. No fire could consume this bramble bush, this protection of the universe, and if one of the basic elements of the all was incapable of achieving its end, it was not likely that the Egyptians, or any other obstreperous people, would succeed. The homiletical idea may have been conceived independently

by both sources arising from the historical conditions and circumstances of their age. We have no reason to question the authenticity of the Palestinian tradition and assume that these Midrashim are actually older than the rabbis in whose name they were transmitted, which might lead to the conclusion that they were known in Palestine during and before Philo's time.

XXXIV. Vita Mosis I. 141

And the Israelites did this not in avarice, or, as their accusers might say, in covetousness of what belonged to others. No, indeed! In the first place, they were but receiving a bare wage for all their time of service; secondly they were retaliating, not on an equal, but on a lesser scale, for their enslavement.

T. B. Sanh. 91a

Re. Ex. 12.35

The Egyptians appeared in a lawsuit against the Jews before Alexander of Macedon. They pleaded: "Is it not written: 'And they (i.e. Israel) despoiled the Egyptians"? Thereupon Gehiha b.Pesisa said to the Sages: "Permit me to go and plead against them before Alexander. Should they defeat me, then say: "You have merely defeated an ignorant man amongst us", while if I defeat them, say: "The Law of Moses has defeated you." They gave him permission, and he went and pleaded against them. "Whence comes your proof?" asked he. "From the Torah" they replied. "Then I, too will bring you proof from the Torah alone, for it is written: (Ex.12,40) Now the time what the children of Israel dwelt in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years. Pay us for the toil of 600.000 men whom you enslaved for 430 years". Then King Alexander said to them: "Answer him"! "Give us three days time" they begged. So he gave them a respite. They searched, but found no answer. Straightway they fled, leaving behind their sown fields and planted vineyards.

The account of the departure of the Hebrews, as reported in the Book of Exodus, was the main cause for the animosity which the Egyptians felt against the Jews. Thus Manetho, Apion and the rest had been led to falsify the exodus story and to accuse the ancient Hebrews of treachery, leprosy and the most ludicrous forms of religious superstition, as a justification for the actions of Pharaoh. In turn, Jewish apologists tried to nullify the harmful effect of such literary productions by clarifying the biblical narrative and re-interpreting it. The latter method gave rise to an apologetic Midrash such as

Philo's. However, this is a clear, incontrovertible instance of an earlier Hellenistic tradition, for the Egyptian attacks upon the exodus narrative probably commenced soon after the translation of this book into the Greek and necessitated Jewish readiness to contradict such impasses successfully. Indeed, as Zacharias Frankel first noticed, the dramatic poem "Exagoge" by Ezechiel, the Alexandrian tragedian of the second century B.C.E., contains already the explanation that the Hebrews actually did not rob the Egyptians of anything, but merely secured payment fpr their many years of unpaid service. "When you are ready to make your escape, I shall give grace to the people. Women shall receive garments from (the Egyptian)women; men shall carry away all possible ornaments, gold and silver, even raiment; since they have labored for these, they (the Egyptians) shall pay it back to these men as wages." (162-166) Thus we have in this example evidence for Philo's utilization of a previously existing Hellenistic Midrash. His contribution was to add a moralistic note and the thought that the very enslavement of the Hebrews entitled them to recompensation, since the loss of one's freedom, due to no fault of his own, is an insult that must be punished relentlessly. Thus the Egyptians should not complain about the treatment they received from the hands of the Hebrews, for their offense could not be atoned for in any other manner, and the attacks of their descendants upon the Jews as a greedy band of robbers was without foundation.

The Talmudic version of this Midrash occurs in connection with similar stories about other people who accused the Jews before Alexander, a favorite hero of the Midrash. Gebiha b. Pesisa was a convert from paganism who felt

especially qualified to defend the Jews before their accusers. The spirited humor of the narrative, a quality vainly sought in Philo's writings, and the equally charming poetic skill, are typically Palestinian, as is the use of scriptural verses to advance the argument. The apologetic motive is not primarily to invalidate the claims of the Egyptians, but rather to vindicate Judaism before the presence of the world-conquerer. It is difficult to decide whether the germ of the story, namely, that the spoil of the Hebrew was the recompensation to which they were entitled for 430 years of unpaid labor, was an old Palestinian tradition common to both sources, or, as Treitel believes, the apologetic invention of the Alexandrian Jews, from whom it was taken over into the Talmud.

XXV. Vita Mosis II.161

Reg. the Golden Calf:

> The men of unstable nature ... became zealous devotees of Egyptian fables. Then, having fashioned a golden bull, in imitation of the animal held most sacred in that Country, they offered sacrifices which were no sacrifices .....

Tanch. ad Ex. 32.1ff.

> He (Aaron) thrust the gold into the fire, and then the magicians (chartumin) came and did {the casting} with their secret arts.

Both sources try to acquit Aaron from the charge that he was involved in the most despicable type of idolatry and put the blame upon the shoulders of the magicians of Egypt and their corrupting influence. Philo advances a thesis which has been accepted by some modern scholars as well: that the bull represents Apis whom the Egyptians worshipped in that form. The expression "Chartumim" indicates that the Midrash also was of the opinion that the first grievous offense which the Israelites committed following the revelation on Mt. Sinai was a relapse into Egyptian practices, which they had witnessed during the centuries of slavery. However, while Philo bases his reasoning on a scientific fact, ~~while~~ the Midrash arrives at its conclusion by con-

jecture, logical as it is. A further proof of Philo's universal education and penetrating knowledge.

Let us conclude this list of comparable Midrashim by returning to the hero of our investigation, Moses. The following two instances would well have fitted into the biographical portions discussed before, but, owing to an oversight, must be mentioned in this context.

XXXVI. Vita Mosis I. 46

When those in authority who suspected the youth's intentions, knowing that he would remember their wicked actions and take vengeance when the opportunity came, had thus once got a handle, they poured malicious suggestions by the thousands from every side into the open ears of his grandfather Pharaoh, so as to instill the fear that his sovereignty might be taken from him. "He will attack you" they said, "he is highly ambitious. He is always busy with some further project. He is eager to get the kingship before the time comes. He flatters some, threatens others, slays without trials, and treats as outcasts those who are most loyal to you".

Ex. R. I. 26

Moses used to take the crown of Pharaoh and place it upon his own head, as he was destined to do when he became great.- The magicians of Egypt sat there and said to Pharaoh: "We are afraid of him who is taking off your crown and placing it upon his own head, lest he be the one of whom we prophesy that he will take away your kingdom from you." Some of them counselled to slay him, and others to burn him, but Jethro was present among them, and he said to them: "This boy has no sense. However, test him by placing before him a gold vessel and live coal".. The end of the story is known, the gold was to signify Moses' ambition, the coal his innocence. With the help of Gabriel he touched the coal and thus escaped death, though he burned his tongue and became, consequently, slow of speech.

The fear of the Egyptian courtiers that Moses would usurp Pharaoh's throne and that his intentions could be deduced from the manner in which he handled his grandfather's crown are also found in Josephus' Antiquities II. 232-237, which agrees very closely in style and content with the Exodus Rabba passage.

Thus the latter must be at least co-existent with Josephus, but, more probably antedates it and may be safely assumed to have served even as Philo's model. The concluding paragraph of the Midrash was too childish for the Alexandrian to be included in his bios; besides, he realized that the participation of Jethro in the council of Pharaoh was anachronous, and he avoids historical misrepresentation in his exegesis, which is characteristic of the Midrash, whether on purpose or because of lack of historical judgment. From the events that transpired in contemporary Rome under the rule of Tiberius, and later, Caligula, the motives ascribed to Moses by the magicians could be well understood by Philo's readers; the relation between Tiberius and his grand-nephew Caius parallels that of Pharaoh to his grandson. The youth escaped Pharaoh's wrath, according to Philo, by fleeing to Arabia, this passage being an elucidation of the incident of the smiting of the Egyptian task-master. It depicts Moses as a rational person, who, because of the integrity of his heart, flees the court of Pharaoh. (Cp. examples XI and XII).

The Midrash assumes a much younger Moses, a mere child with whom Pharaoh is playing. He, too, faces the hostility of Pharaoh's advisers who interpret his actions as a bad omen. Pharaoh's fears are dispelled by a test which Moses passes miraculously aided by the arch-angel Gabriel, also attesting to this supernatural greatness. Again we notice the Midrashic talent for telling a story, the dramatic picture, intense and emotional, produced before our eyes, an excellent specimen of its kind.

XXXVII. Vita Mosis I. 150

Having received this office, he did not, like some, take pains to exalt his own house, and promote his sons, of whom he had two, to great power, and make them his consorts for the present and his successors for the future.

Ex. R. 2. 6 (to Ex. 3.5)

Moses asked that priests and kings would issue forth from him. The Holy One Blessed be He said to him: "Do not approach any further" as if to say: "Your sons shall not approach you for the priesthood is already set aside for your brother Aaron, and the kingship is assigned to David. Makrivin - bring sacrifice Halom - II. Sam. 7.18 "hither" refers to David

It is a natural ambition for a ruler to have his son ascend the throne and succeed himself. Moses, the ruler of the tribes of Israel, should have been persuaded by this common phenomenon to prepare his two sons for the kingship and priesthood. According to the Midrash, Moses was human enough to ask for such favor. The Midrash did not have to safeguard consistency in its characterization of Moses, for sometimes it depicts him as an ordinary mortal, full of conflicting emotions and human desires, and then again it attributes to him superhuman, almost divine qualities. Philo never deviates from his delineation of Moses' real character. Being morally superior to any other mortal, the ambition for perpetuating the kingship within his own family does not enter his mind. Contrary to the custom of the Ptolemaic and other dynasties, he did not appoint his sons co-regents, anticipating their future succession. The piety and holiness which he observed in his brother's children (V. M. II. 142) could not be found within his own. "Ho teleiótatos ánthropos" does not experience the psychological reactions of an ordinary king or high-priest; he is idealized throughout, the living symbol of virtue itself.

We have presented these examples from the life of Moses and instances dealing with the journey of Israel through the desert, to demonstrate the interrelation between the Palestinian and the Philonic Midrash, emphasizing the difference in intellectual outlook, which was conditioned by its respective environment and historical circumstances. An attempt has been made to trace this relation back to its origin and in some cases to date the Midrash. Special concern has been given to Philo's most typical form of biblical exegesis, the allegory, a kind of interpretation he helped develop and perfect. Whenever Greek philosophical thoughts appear in his version, these have been noted in connection with his ideological system. Thus a few facts stand out as the result of this investigation.

CONCLUSION

Within Philo's writings the Vita Mosis constitutes an exception. It does not belong to the philosophical works, not even, as stated in the introduction, to the type of biography exemplified by that of the patriarchs. Of its kind it is most closely related to the genuine Greek literature, since it is patterned after the model of the Greek biography. It is furthest removed from that way of thinking which, in a sense, might be termed systematical-philosophical, but which, throughout Philo's works, never appears in its pure form. Everywhere it is made subservient to a synchretistic, rather theological, intellectual approach. This fact enables us the more clearly to recognize in the Vita Mosis the specific characteristic of the Greek "Bildungsideal" and of Philo's literary education, which is furnished with living waters from the Greek spirit. From this, a certain inner progress in the presentation of the Agadic, and - even more pronounced - of the allegorical Midrash of Philo, can be proved. Thus, the path would lead from the Vita Mosis to the purely symbolical-allegorical, only so-called, biographies of the patriarchs, and from there to the Legum Allegoriae (just to mention the principal work) and finally to the treatise Perì Kosmopoiías. In the latter, Agada and allegory are found in the most developed manner, to be used as an auxiliary means for the evolution of a cosmological-metaphysical system. The Vita Moses also has the advantage that ethical abstractions are not over-emphasized, but shows most succintly the ideal personality, as envisaged by Philo, which, in a most unique manner, betrays the very double-nature of its author, namely its admixture of Jewish and Hellenistic ideas and of philosophical with theological speculation.

If we direct our attention to the principal issue of Philo's life and work, we must admit that he is closer to the problem with which we have to wrestle in the western world today than the scholastically bound Jewish philosophy of the Middle Ages. It is the problematic issue of a complete, unreserved participation in a universal culture and the attempt to obtain an inner balance of this culture with the ideas and the essence of Judaism. In view of this basic and evolutionary consideration, Philo's importance is much greater - not only in a historical, but also in a contemporary regard - than the actual content of his thinking. The bridge points from him directly, without touching the religious philosophy of the Middle Ages, to Moses Mendelssohn. In this sense he is the first modern Jew exhibiting that peculiar, but characteristic ideality of a rational-cosmological system of thinking. Lifted up into the realm of the heroic, his representative for this way of thinking was Moses.

This contribution is merely a preliminary study of the development of these thoughts contained in the Vita Mosis, which is hereby offered. The writer sincerely hopes, deo volente, to continue these investigations in the manner indicated on page 1, and to ultimately bring this task to its conclusion.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Ch. I. Introduction

1. See Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 5th ed., Springfield, Mass., 1945, p.628

2. Ginzburg, Louis in: Jewish Encyclopedia, New York, 1901, Vol. I, p. 403

3. Treitel, Leopold, Philonische Studien, Breslau, 1915, p. 117

4. For an admirable introduction into the subject, see the monograph of the lamented Edmund Stein, "Die Allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandreia", Giessen, 1929. Further instances of deviations, p. 5f. Stein was one of the 5,700,000 martyrs to die through Nazi hand.

5. Compare: Schürer, Emil - Geschichte d. jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 4th ed., Leipzig, 1909, p. 702, note 22

6. Stein, Edmund - Op. cit. p. 61

7. Stein, Edmund in: Encyclopaedia Iudaica, Berlin, 1928, Vol. II, col. 348

Ch. II.

1. A great deal of intellectual stimulation was derived from Stein, Edmund - Philo und der Midrasch, Giessen, 1931

2. It has been noted that Philo but rarely quoted from the prophets or the Hagiographa. This would indicate his lack of familiarity with those biblical books and possibly their disuse in the Alexandrian Synagogue.

3. The English translation of Philo used throughout is the one of F. H. Colson, in the Loeb Classical Library, published by the Harvard University Press. This translation has been compared with the original Greek text and with the German translation by L. Cohn, Breslau, 1909. The Hebrew text is translated either by the writer or taken from the Soncino Translation of the Midrash Rabba, London, 1935

4. Cp. Acts 7, 22 "And Moses was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians".

5. Stein, Edmund - Die alleg. Exegese, pp. 20-26

6. These are enumerated by Freudenthal, Jacob - Hellenistische Studien, Breslau, 1875, pp. 145, 146

7. Cp. Freyhan, Max - Ezechiel, der Tragiker in: Jahrbuch für Jüd. Geschichte & Literatur 1938, pp. 46-63

8. Stein, Edmund - Philo und der Midrasch, p. 44

(CH. II - concluded)

9. Cp. Psalm 95, 7: For He is our God, and we are the people of His pasture, and the flock of His hand.

10. Stein, Edmund - Op. cit., p. 45

11. Barth, Paul - Die Stoa, 4th ed., Stuttgart, 1922, p. 98

12. Barth, Paul - Ib., p. 106

13. The writer had the opportunity of obtaining the page-proof of: Taeubler, Eugene - Kushan-Rishataim in: HUCA, Vol. XX, 1947

14. Lewy, Hans - Aethiopier und Juden in der antiken Literatur, in: Monatsschrift für die Wiss. d. Jud., Vol. 81, 1937

15. Stein, Edmund - Die Allegorische Exegese, p. 1

16. Freudenthal, Jacob - Op. cit. p. 74

17. Treitel, Leopold - Philonische Studien, Breslau, 1915, p. 117; also: Gesammte Theologie und Philosphie Philo's von Alexandria, Berlin, 1923, pp. 60-69

18. Cp. Bostroem, Gustav - Proverbiastudien, Lund, 1935

19. Siegfried, Karl - Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testamentes, Jena, 1875, p. 281
"Philo dagegen geht auf den Derusch zurück, ihm ist die Allegorie das Wesentliche der Schrift".

20. No doubt, Philo was familiar with Plato's Phaedon.

21. See the comment of Wolf Einhorn (Matharsav) ad locum in Ex. R.

22. Bousset, Wilhelm - Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom, Goettingen, 1915, p. 59
Bousset admits that this allegory is a Philonic contribution, not depending on earlier Hellenistic source.

CH. III

1. Siegfried, Karl - Philo von Alexandria, pp. 168-197

2. Philo did not object to a scientific approach to the Bible. He preceded Wellhausen by more than eighteen hundred years in noticing the essential disagreement of the two creation accounts. Thus, he also noted that the plagues in Exodus varied in degree and were accomplished by different agents: some by Aaron, some by Moses, and some by God Himself. For a comprehensive view of Philo's attitude, see:

   Stein, Edmund - Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik in der Späthellenistischen Literatur, Lwow, 1935

3. Josephus, Antiquities III. 89f. does not pay any attention to the biblical narrative of "seeing"voices.

4. Nu. 27.7b: Kaì perithéseis tòn klêron toû patrós autôn autaîs.

5. Braun, Martin - Griechischer Roman und Hellenistische Geschichtsschreibung, Frankfurt A.M., 1934, p. 66.

6. Siegfried, Karl, also
   Stein, Edmund - Op. cit. 142 ff. Die allegorische Exegese d. Philo, pp. 20-24, where all the arguments for Philo's complete ignorance of the Hebrew tongue are enumerated.

7. II Baruch 54.15 - For though Adam first sinned and brought untimely death upon all, yet of these who were born of him, each one of them has prepared for his own soul torment to come, and again each one of them has chosen for himself glories to come.
   The old Jewish (and Stoic) doctrine of Freedom of Will, even here gains the upper-hand over deterministic notions. The translation of the apocryphal and pseudo-epigraphical passages is that of Charles.

8. Ginzburg, Louis - The Legends of the Jews, Philadelphia, 1925 (1942), Vol. V, p. 111: It may be noted, however, that nowhere in the old rabbinic literature is there to be found a trace of the mystical conception of the Sabbath occurring Philo (ad. loc.) .... It is only in PRE 3 that the Sabbath is counted among the things which existed in the thought of God prior to the creation of the world.

9. Josephus, Ant. III. 180: If one reflects on the construction of the tabernacle and looks at the vestments of the priests and the vessel which we use for the sacred ministry he will discover that our lawgiver was a man of God and that these blasphemous charges brought against us by the rest of men are idle. In fact, every one of these objects is

CH. III (concluded)

9. (concluded) intended to recall and represent the universe, as he will find if he will but consent to examine them without prejudice and with understanding.

Josephus' analogies agree partly with the Midrash (seven candles - seven planets), partly differ (headdress is blue like heaven). Also, the four elements play a part in this allegorical explanation.

The translation used is the one of H. St. J. Thackeray in the edition of the Loeb Classics, New York, 1930, Vol. IV.

10. Siegfried, Karl - Op. cit. p. 146

11. Frankel, Zacharias - in Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, Vol. IV, 1850, p. 108

12. Treitel, Leopold - Philonische Studien, p. 108:
Ich zweifle nicht, dass hier, da es sich um Vorgänge in Ägypten, gleichviel ob ältere oder jüngere, handelt, die Quelle für die gedachte entsprechende Erzählung im Talmud Philo ist oder was vor ihm über dieses Thema in Alexandrien kursierte, worauf schon die Einkleidung in die talmudische Erzählung, die Ägypter mit den Juden darüber rechten lässt, führt, und erklärt dies auch, warum in der talmudischen Relation die Verteidigung einem Ungelehrten, einem sonst unbekannten Gebiha b. Pesisa, übertragen wird.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

In addition to those works referred to in the notes, the following books have been consulted:

Adler, Maximilian	Studien zu Philon von Alexandria, Breslau, 1929
v. Arnim, Hans	Quellenstudien zu Philo von Alexandria, Berlin, 1888
Bousset, Wilhelm	Die Religion des Judentums im Spathellenistischen Zeitalter, 3rd Ed., Tübingen, 1926
Frankel, Zacharias	Über den Einfluss der palästinensischen Exegese auf die alexandrinische Hermeneutik, Leipzig, 1851
Frankel, Zacharias	Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, Leipzig, 1841
Heinemann, Isaak	Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung, Breslau, 1929
Herriot, Edouard	Philon, le Juif, Paris, 1898
Leisegang, Hans	Vol. VII of L. Cohn's and P. Wendland's opera quae supersunt. Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini opera, Berlin, 1926
Massebieau, M. L.	Le classement des oeuvres de Philon, Angers, 1888 (?)