

SBL Annual Meeting Atlanta 2015

Philo of Alexandria Seminar

Albert Geljon & David Runia

## PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA *DE PLANTATIONE* §§46–58

### TRANSLATION

*d. Moses prays that Israel be planted in paradise (§§46–58)*

(§46) Such were the trees that the One who only is wise fixed with their roots in rational souls. Moses, however, takes pity on those who had been transferred from the paradise of the virtues and calls upon the sovereign might of God himself and his merciful and gentle Powers to plant the men of vision in the very place from which the earthly intellect Adam had been exiled. (§47) For he states: **Bring them in and plant them on the mountain of your inheritance, in a ready dwelling place that you have produced, Lord, a holy precinct, Lord, that your hands have made ready. The Lord reigning as king for an age and an age and beyond.**<sup>1</sup>

(§48) In the clearest fashion he has understood like no other that by laying down the seeds and roots of all things God has caused the greatest plant of all, this cosmos, to spring up. In the actual words of the song he appears to hint at it, calling it a **mountain of inheritance**, since what comes into being is the possession and allotment<sup>i</sup> that belongs most properly to its maker. (§49) He prays, therefore, that we be planted in this place, not so that we become irrational and unrestrained in our natures, but that we follow the governance of the most perfect One and imitate his constant and unswerving course, and so have a life that is well-controlled and without stumbling. For as the first thinkers have

---

<sup>1</sup> Exod 15:17–18. Literal rendering for final words required for §53.

said, to be able to live in accordance with nature is the end-point of felicity. (§50) Moreover, what is said next is in harmony with what was laid down earlier,<sup>2</sup> namely that the cosmos is God's house in the sense-perceptible realm, well-prepared and **ready** for him, *produced* and not, as some have thought, ungenerated; that it is a **holy precinct**, a reflection as it were of what is holy, the copy of an archetype, since what is beautiful for sense-perception is an image of what is beautiful for thought; and that *it has been made ready by the hands of God*, his cosmos-making Powers. (§51) But to ensure that no one should suppose that the maker is in need of anything that has come into being, he adds the most necessary utterance: **reigning as king for an age and an age and beyond**. It is right and just that a king is in need of nothing, but that his subjects are in need of their king for everything.

(§52) Some have said that God's allotment both is and is said to be the good, and that Moses now prays that its use and enjoyment be made available. For he says, **bring us in<sup>ii</sup>** like children just beginning to learn through the doctrines and principles of wisdom and do not leave us ungrounded,<sup>iii</sup> but **plant** us in a lofty and heavenly logos. (§53) For this is the completely **ready inheritance** and the fully available *house*, a most suitable dwelling-place **which you have produced as something holy**. For you, Master, are the maker of good and holy things, just as the perishable realm of becoming in its turn is the maker of what is evil and defiled. **Be king** of the suppliant soul **for an infinite age** and do not leave it for an instant without a leader. For being continuously in your service is not only better than freedom, but also than possessing the greatest authority.

(§54) Many readers might ask the question what the meaning is of the words **on the mountain of your inheritance**.<sup>iv</sup> It is necessary that God should give inheritances, but that he should receive them might be unreasonable, since all things are his possession. (§55) But perhaps this is meant to apply to those who have him as their Master on account of a special affinity, as in the case of kings who rule over all their subjects but do this to a particular degree over the members of their household, whose services they are accustomed to using for the care of the body and the other practicalities of living. (§56) These kings are masters over all the property in the land, even that which private citizens

---

<sup>2</sup> For the biblical references in §§50–54 see Exod 15:17–18 quoted above in §47.

seem to control. But they are regarded as possessing only what they entrust to supervisors and managers. These are the properties from which they collect their yearly income and to which they often go for purposes of relaxation and enjoyment, when they set aside the weighty burden of the responsibilities they have for the state and their kingship. These are the properties in their possession that are called 'royal.' (§57) Indeed the silver and gold and all other valuable objects that are stored up as treasures by the subjects actually belong to the rulers rather than those who possess them. Nevertheless one speaks of the private treasuries of the kings, in which those who have been appointed collectors<sup>v</sup> of tribute deposit the revenues from the land. (§58) Do not be surprised, therefore, if the sacred band of wise souls is said to be the special *allotment*<sup>3</sup> of God the sovereign ruler who has obtained power over all things, the band which has vision of the sharpest kind, utilizing the flawless and pure eye of the mind, which never closes but sees with a overt and penetrating gaze.

---

<sup>i</sup> In what follows we translate κλήρος with 'allotment' and μερίς with 'portion'. Both terms occur in Deut 10:9 quoted in §63. A drawback is that this rendering of κλήρος does not make apparent the link with κληρονομία, which we translate as 'inheritance.'

<sup>ii</sup> Note that the verb εἰσάγω in the biblical text means 'bring into,' but also 'introduce', 'apprentice'.

<sup>iii</sup> Or 'unlettered' (ἀστοιχείουτοι). στοιχεῖα can mean either 'letters' or 'first principles'.

<sup>iv</sup> The biblical text has the word κληρονομία, which means 'inheritance.' It is linked to κλήρος, which means both 'inheritance' and 'portion,' 'lot'. Both meanings are relevant to the explanation that follows.

<sup>v</sup> Because at other places Philo uses ἐκλογεύς (*Abr.* 288; *Ios.* 135; *Spec.* 1.143, 2.93, 3.159; *Legat.* 199), Cohn (PCW 2.xxxiv) suggests to change the manuscript reading of ἐκλογισταί, which is very rare, into ἐκλογεῖς (Wendland 1897, 499).

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Exod 15:17 and anticipating Deut 10:9 quoted in §63.

## COMMENTARY

1. Title of the work
2. Introduction to chapter one
3. Commentary §§46–58

### Bibliography

- a. Editions of Philo *De plantatione*
- b. Modern literature

### 1. Title of the work

In antiquity books were usually written on papyrus or parchment. Living in the papyrus producing land of Egypt, Philo will have certainly written his treatises on rolls of papyrus. The length and height of a papyrus roll vary according to needs. The treatise *De Plantatione*, consisting in 887 lines of text in the edition by Wendland, would have occupied a roll of three or four meters in length. This can be concluded from the fact that Plato's *Symposium*, a work twice the length of *Plant.*, is written on a papyrus roll of seven meters in length (*P.Oxy.* 843; on *P.Oxy.* see Grenfell and Hunt 1908, 243–244; for papyrus rolls see Van Groningen 1967, 20–23; Reynolds and Wilson 1974, 2). Philo's *De Agricultura* is as long as *Plant.* and it is very likely that the two treatises *Agr.* and *Plant.*, which in fact form a single work, are written down on one papyrus roll.

The treatise *On Planting* is entitled *περὶ φυτουργίας Νῶε τὸ δεύτερον* in most manuscripts and this title is printed by P. Wendland in his edition (1897) and in the Loeb edition by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker (1930). This surely means that *Agr.* must be considered as book one. However, it has as title *περὶ γεωργίας* in the manuscripts. The close connection between *Agr.* and *Plant.* also appears from the opening sentence of *Plant.*, where Philo refers back to the previous treatise ('In the previous book'). The church father Eusebius regards the two works as two books of one work, since he refers to *Agr.* with the words *ἐν τῷ περὶ γεωργίας προτέρῳ* (*Praep. ev.* 7.13.3), and his quotation from *Plant.* 8–10 is introduced with the words *ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ* (*Praep. ev.* 7.13.4). This may imply

the title Περὶ γεωργίας for *Plant*. Furthermore, in his catalogue of Philonic writings he lists ‘two treatises on cultivation’ (τὰ περὶ γεωργίας δύο, *Hist. eccl.* 2.18.2, cf. Jerome *Vir. ill.* 11: *de agricultura duo*). In the manuscripts, however, the title περὶ γεωργίας (*On Cultivation*) is only used for *Agr.*, whereas *Plant.* is entitled περὶ φυτουργίας Νῶε τὸ δεύτερον (*On the planting of Noah Book II*). Wendland (PCW 2.xxiv–xxv) argues that the original title of *Plant.* was περὶ γεωργίας β’, remarking that Philo uses the terms φυτουργία and γεωργία interchangeably. He also refers to *Plant.* 139–140, where Philo, rounding off the first part of the treatise, writes that he has discussed the most ancient and sacred form of cultivation (γεωργία), practiced by the Cause, and the cultivation that comes next. Thereafter, Philo announces the second part: let us examine the viticulture (ἀμπελουργική) practiced by Noah, which is a specific form of the skill of cultivation. Wendland’s conclusion that the original title of *Plant.* was περὶ γεωργίας β’ may be right, since it agrees with the testimonies of Eusebius and Jerome. It is possible that the manuscripts have borrowed their title περὶ φυτουργία from the last sentence of *Agr.*: τὰ δὲ περὶ φυτουργίας εἰρημμένα αὐτοῦ λέγωμεν αὐθις.

For our commentary on this work we have decided to retain the conventional name as it is given in the manuscripts and has been accepted in Philonic scholarship since the Renaissance. There is little to be gained by taking over the name as reported by Eusebius, even if it is likely to be closer to what Philo actually wrote.

The Latin translation *De plantatione* was made by Sigismund Gelenius for his translation of Philo’s writings in Latin, which was published in 1554 in Lyon. The Latin title is commonly used since, and was rendered in English as *Concerning Noah’s work as a planter* in the translations by C.D. Young (1854) and Colson & Whitaker (1930). We use the title *On Planting*.

The title περὶ γεωργίας and its Latin rendering *De agricultura* were current book titles in antiquity. Aristotle (*Pol.* 1.4, 1259b40–a2) remarks that Charitides of Paros and Apollodorus of Lemnos have written about ‘ordinary farming and tree farming (περὶ γεωργίας καὶ ψιλῆς καὶ πεφυτευμένης). This distinction is similar to the difference between *Agr.* and *Plant.* The Roman writer Cato published a treatise entitled *De agricultura*. By way of contrast we have not found ancient treatises entitled *De plantatione*. The titles of the

two works on plants by Theophrastus come closest: Περὶ φυτικῶν αἰτιῶν (*On the causes of plants*) and Περὶ φυτῶν ἱστορία (*Enquiry into plants*). Some of the technical terms that Theophrastus uses are also found in Philo's *Agr.* and *Plant.* In modern times the title is used in a metaphorical way, just as Philo did. The Dutch theologian Gijsbertus Voetius (1589–1676), professor at the University of Utrecht, wrote a booklet *De Plantatione Ecclesiarum*, which is devoted to the Christian mission. In 1731 the Swedish writer Tobias Björk published a monograph on the Lutheran Church in America entitled *De Plantatione ecclesiae svecanae in America*. The labor of Christian missionaries to found new churches and to spread the Christian faith is compared with planting trees and cultivating new offshoots.

## 2. Introduction to chapter one (§§1–72)

We have already observed that the treatise *Plant.* is closely linked with the previous treatise *De agricultura*, as appears from the first sentence. In fact, *Plant* and *Agr.* are two treatises forming together one single work. In §1 Philo writes that in the previous book he has discussed cultivation generally, and now wishes to deal with viticulture in particular, because Noah was not only a cultivator but also a viticulturist, as is said in Gen 9:20. Gen 9:20–21 forms the main biblical lemma in *Agr.*, *Plant.* and the next treatise *De Ebrietate*. The translation of the biblical text in the LXX runs as follow:

[20] And Noah began to be a human being who cultivates the earth, and he planted a vineyard. [21] And he drank some of the wine, and he became drunk and he was stripped naked in his house. (tr. NETS altered)

Here Philo quotes verse 20 only, but at the beginning of *Agr.* he had also cited verse 21, omitting the expression 'and he was stripped naked'. In §140 Philo cites verse 20 and 21 until the words 'and he became drunk'. Remarkably, however, he begins *Ebr.* without quoting the biblical verse, which nevertheless represents its main biblical lemma.

*Plant.* is thus a sequel to *Agr.*, in which Philo explains the cultivation by Noah in an allegorical way as the cultivation practiced by the soul. Like a cultivator one should cut away and destroy the trees and shoots of passions and vices, and plant virtues. Noah, the cultivator who cultivates with knowledge and skill, is placed opposite to Cain, who was

working the earth, i.e. he loves the earthly body and the bodily passions only. The words ‘Noah *began* to be a cultivator’ indicate that Noah only begins but never reaches the end, because he has not gained complete possession of the knowledge of the cultivation of the soul. As a result Noah, representing the man of progress, does not reach perfection.

In *Plant.* no attention is paid to the figure of Noah. He is only mentioned in connection with the main biblical lemma in §1 and §140. But in the first part of the treatise the focus is on the verb φυτεύω (to plant) without any reference to the planting of a vineyard. The verb φυτεύω and the synonymous καταφυτεύω, which is rarely used before the LXX, occur ten times in the Pentateuch. The occurrences are listed in the following overview, where in the final column the place is indicated in which Philo refers to the verse. The MBL (Gen 9:20) is not listed.

ΦΥΤΕΥΩ:

Gen 2:8	God planted a garden of Eden	<i>Plant.</i> 32
Gen 21:33	Abraham planted a ploughed field	<i>Plant.</i> 73
Deut 16:21	prohibition to plant for oneself a grove beside the altar of the Lord	<i>Leg.</i> 1.48–51
Deut 20:6	he who planted a vineyard and has not had enjoyment is exempt from military service	<i>Agr.</i> 158
Deut 28:30	curse by God: you shall plant a vineyard and not harvest it	<i>Praem.</i> 128
Deut 28:39	curse by God: you shall plant and work a vineyard but you shall not drink the vine	<i>Praem.</i> 128

ΚΑΤΑΦΥΤΕΥΩ:

Ex 15:17	Moses' prayer: Israel may be planted	<i>Plant.</i> 47
Lev 19:23	prescript on planting trees in the promised country	<i>Plant.</i> 95
Deut 6:11	God's promise to provide vineyards and olive groves that you did not plant	<i>Deus</i> 95–96, <i>Fug.</i> 175–176

It is fascinating to observe that Philo utilizes every one of these texts in his treatises. In *Plant.* all the occurrences in Genesis, Exodus and Leviticus are discussed. His use of the terminology commences in *Leg.* 1.48–49, where he discusses the prohibition to plant a grove given in Deut 16:21. Connecting this verse with Gen 2:8, he poses the question why it is forbidden for us to plant a grove, while God plants the garden. He explains that it befits God to plant and to build virtues in the soul. When God sows and plants good qualities in the soul, the mind that says ‘I plant’ is guilty of impiety. Philo urges the mind not to plant by itself, when God is the planter. But if one does position plants in the soul, one should only do this fruit-bearing plants. This allegorical interpretation of God sowing and planting virtues is also found in *Plant.* (see §37).

The next occurrence of planting is in *Agr.* 158, where it is part of an allegorical exegesis of Deut 20:5–7. These verses contain the prescription that three categories of men are exempted from military service: (1) those who built a new house but had not dedicate it; (2) those who planted a vinyard and has not had enjoyment from it; (3) those who became engaged to a woman but has not yet taken her. In his allegory Philo regards the last category as representing those who just begin on the way to perfection. The person who planted a vineyard is he who makes progress towards perfection. Just as it is the vitner's concern that he vines grow, so it is the lover of learning's concern that the doctrines of practical wisdom make the lengthiest advance. Finally, the construction of a house relates to perfection. All these persons, beginners, those making progress and those who have reached perfection, should not wage war against the sophists. They will certainly be captured, because they are noy trained well in the sophistical tricks.

Generally, this allegorical reading of planting is very well comparable to the interpretation in *Plant.* Planting is explained in an ethical framework and it relates to making progress on the road to perfection and virtue. The explanation in *Plant.* 98 is close to the allegory in *Agr.* :

whenever it (=the intellect) sets out upon the road of moral insight and it enters into its doctrines and runs with them all, it begins to cultivate the domesticated kind of tree bearing tame fruits instead that untamed kind of tree, impassibility instead of passions, knowledge instead of ignorance and good things instead of evil.

The same allegorical reading is found in *Fug.* 175–176, where Philo explains Deut 6:10–11:

And it shall be, whenever the Lord your God brings you into the land that he swore to your fathers (...) to give you large and fine cities that you did not build, houses full of all sorts of goods that you dit not fill, dug cisterns that you did not dig out, vineyards and olive groves that you did not plant. (tr. NETS)

In the interpretation these verses refer to the many good things given to human beings. The cities are a symbol of the generic virtues and the specific virtues are represented by the houses. The cisterns are likened with gifted souls, who recieve wisdom; vineyards and olive groves symbolize progress, growth and yield of fruits. The contemplative life is the fruit of knowlegde, achieving unmixed joy as from wine. The same verses from Deut are

also dealt with in *Deus* 94–96 in general along the same lines. The cities and the houses represent the generic and specific virtues. The cisterns are the prizes ready to be won without toil and they are filled with heavenly water. The virtues cause perfect joy for the soul, shining with the light of truth. Symbol of joy is the vineyard, and symbol of the light is the olive grove.

Finally, in the Exposition of the Law Philo offers a literal reading of the destroying of the vineyards (Deut 20:30, 39; *Praem.* 128). The context is formed by a discussion of the curse which consists in famine.

The entire long chapter §§1–72 can be divided into two subchapters. In the first of these (§§1–27) God is presented as the great planter of the cosmos and its inhabitants, and the cosmos is described as the greatest plant. The idea of God creating the cosmos like a planter who cultivates a plant does not have a biblical basis. By way of contrast, this entire section can to a considerable extent be regarded as inspired by and adapted from Plato. We can especially find many borrowings from Plato's *Timaeus*, for instance the idea of human being as a heavenly plant, the notion that creation by God consists in producing order out of disorder, and that the cosmos has been made from all the four elements, without leaving any part outside. Philo himself alludes to Plato with the expression 'as the ancient saying goes' (§17). See Runia 1986, 389–392, who aptly calls this passage 'the phyto-cosmological excursus' (though of course on the context of this treatise it is not really an excursus). Further details are given in the detailed comments.

Philo's description of the cosmos as a plant is discussed by the German scholar Ursula Früchtel in her monograph on cosmological representations in Philo (1968, 53–68). She retraces Philo's view back to the Stoic philosopher Posidonius, following the once fashionable practice of observing traces of Posidonian influence everywhere in the philosophy of the first centuries BCE and CE. She refers, for instance, to the Stoic division of philosophy into physics, ethics and logic; physics is compared to a plant or a tree, ethics to the fruit, and logic to a protecting fence. This image is also found in Philo's *Agr.* 14. Früchtel (54) argues that Philo follows the same scheme in *Plant.* In §§1–72 he discusses physics; in §§73–92 he deals with logic, i.e. the fence; in §§93–138 he treats ethics, viz. the daily duties. She does, however, not make clear in which way logic is discussed in §§73–92,

and how the planting of a plot of land by Abraham is related to logic. In her argumentation she also remarks that Posidonius compares the cosmos to a plant. The cosmos is a unified whole, which is compared to a tree or a living being (Sextus Empiricus *Math* 9.78–79). [Is this in fact a Posidonian fragment, for example in Theiler?] When she discusses Philo's idea of the Logos as a bond of the universe, she supposes that he bases himself on Posidonius' theory of *syndesmos*, which seems to appear in Seneca *Naturales quaestiones* 2.21 and 24 (58). However, Früchtel's discussion and Posidonian interpretation of *Plant.* is not satisfactory. As Runia (1986, 391 n.137) argues, virtually none of the Posidonian passages to which she refers is found in the collection of the fragments of Posidonius by L. Edelstein and I.G. Kidd. Furthermore, in her argumentation she involves passages from *Mos.* without making clear in which way *Mos.* is related to the cosmological account in *Plant.*

Having dealt with the creation of the cosmos, the greatest plant, by God the in Part 1A, Philo next discusses the formation of the parts of the human being in the second subchapter §§28–72, Part 1B. The relation of these two subchapters can be regarded as that between the cosmos as macrocosm and the human being as microcosm, a familiar device in Greek philosophy. In this part too the several faculties of the human being are also represented as plants. The treatment in Part 1B centers on the allegorical interpretation of two secondary biblical verses or lemmata (SBL) about planting carried out by God:

- (1) Gen 2:8: 'And the Lord God planted a paradise in Eden toward the East.
- (2) Exod 15:17–18: 'Lead them in, and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance, in your prepared dwelling place that you made, O Lord, a holy precinct, O Lord, that your hands prepared. The Lord, ruling for ever and ever and beyond.

(tr. NETS; slightly altered)

For both verses the mode of transition is verbal through the verb (κατα)φυτεύω. After the discussion of the planting of Eden (§§32–45), Philo offers an elaborated exegesis of Exod 15:17–18, which covers most of Part 1B (§§46–72). From these verses he picks up the word 'inheritance' (κληρονομία) and equates it with 'lot' (κληρος) and 'portion' (μέρις). This forms the trigger to quote four other verses in which the words 'lot' and/or 'portion' appear (Deut 32:7–9, Lev 16:8, Deut 10:9 and Num 18:20) in order to illustrate and elucidate the

interpretation of the Exodus text. These verses, by means of which he thus amplifies the secondary biblical lemma, can be named tertiary biblical lemmata (TBL).

The verbal coherence between the several biblical verses can be seen in the following scheme:

MBL Gen 9:20 ἤρξατο Νῶε ἄνθρωπος γεωργός γῆς καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελώνα.

SBL Exod 15:17–18 εἰσαγαγὼν καταφύτευσον αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος κληρονομίας σου εἰς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου ὃ κατειργάσω, κύριε, ἁγίασμα, κύριε, ὃ ἠτοίμασαν αἱ χεῖρές σου. κύριος βασιλεύων τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι. (§47)

TBL Deut 32:7–9 ἐπερώτησον τὸν πατέρα σου, καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ σοι, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους σου, καὶ ἐροῦσίν σοι. ὅτε διεμέριζεν ὁ ὕψιστος ἔθνη, ὡς διέσπειρεν υἱοὺς Ἀδάμ ἔστησεν ὄρια ἔθνων κατὰ ἀριθμὸν ἀγγέλων θεοῦ, καὶ ἐγενήθη μερὶς κυρίου λαὸς αὐτοῦ [Ἰακωβ, σχοίνισμα κληρονομίας αὐτοῦ] Ἰσραηλ. (§59)

Note: the words between brackets are not cited by Philo, but they may well have been in his mind.

TBL Lev 16:8 δύο χιμάρους κλήρον ἕνα τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ κλήρον ἕνα τῷ ἀποπομπαίῳ. (§61)

TBL Deut 10:9 οὐκ ἔστιν τοῖς Λευίταις μερὶς καὶ κλήρος ἐν τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς αὐτῶν· κύριος αὐτὸς κλήρος αὐτοῦ. (§63)

TBL Num 18:20 ἐγὼ μερὶς σου καὶ κληρονομία. (§63)

Note: the verses are quoted here according to the LXX; sometimes Philo quotes them differently.

An interesting parallel to Philo's image of God as planter is found in the Platonist Numenius, who probably lived in the second century CE. (For an overview of Numenius' thought see Dillon 1996, 361–378; the parallel has been observed by Francesca Calabi in an unpublished lecture in Yale in 2013). Numenius was interested in Jewish traditions and it is very likely that he was acquainted with Philo's writings. Since only fragments of his works have been preserved it is difficult to establish the relationship between Philo and Numenius exactly (see Runia 1993, 8–9). Numenius distinguishes between a first god, the good and one, being absolute, and a second god, the demiurge. The first god is the father of the creator god (fr.12, 21). The first god will be standing still, whereas the second god is in motion (fr. 15). In fr. 13 he sketches the Philonic image: the first god has the same relation with the demiurge as a cultivator (γεωργός) with the planter (ὁ φυτεύων). The former sows the seeds of every soul into all things which partake in him; the lawgiver plants and distributes and transplants into each of us what has first been sown by the first god.

Indeed, this is a striking parallel with Philo's picture of God as planter, but in Philo it is God the creator who is called a planter on the basis of scriptural verses as Gen 2:8 and Ex 15:17. Furthermore, in *Agr.* Philo does not refer to God as cultivator, as Numenius does, but applies the image to the human intellect that has to destroy passions like a good cultivator (*Agr.* 8–19).

### 3. Commentary §§46–58

#### d. *Moses prays that Israel be planted in paradise* (§§46–58)

##### *Analysis/General Comments*

After the discussion of God's planting of the paradise Philo now proceeds to deal with another biblical text in which God is presented as planter, Exod 15:17–18. This text is part of Moses' song to God after the destruction of Pharaoh's army in the Red Sea. At the end of this song Moses prays that Israel may be planted on the mountain of God's inheritance. These verses, which are a secondary biblical lemma, are connected with the main biblical lemma by means of the verb *φύτεύω* (to plant). In the next two sections (§§59–61; 62–72) Philo goes on to explain Moses' words by quoting and discussing other biblical texts that are related to the Exodus text. In this way the explanation of Exod 15:17–18 becomes lengthy and extensive, continuing all the way to §58.

In a translation of the LXX Exod 15:17–18 reads as follows:

[17] Lead them in, and plant them in the mountain of your inheritance, in your prepared dwelling place that you made, O Lord, a holy precinct, O Lord, that your hands prepared.

[18] The Lord, ruling forever and ever and beyond. (tr. NETS)

The passage can be subdivided into four subsections:

- (1) Philo rounds off the discussion of the paradise and announces Moses' prayer that the men of vision may be planted in the place from which Adam has been exiled, that is the paradise. He quotes Exod 15:17–18 in full (§§46–47).

- (2) Next he offers his own exegesis of Moses' prayer. The mountain of God's inheritance (*κληρονομία*) is the cosmos because what comes into being is the allotment (*κληρος*) of its maker. Philo makes use of the several meanings of the noun *κληρος*, which means 'inheritance' but also 'allotment'. The prayer has an ethical aspect. It is a wish to be planted in the cosmos in order to live in a rational way, by which the irrational passions are controlled. According to Philo this is expressed by the Stoic saying 'living in accordance with nature'. At the same time the cosmos is God's house in a visible form, it has been made by God's hands, that is by his cosmos-making powers. Philo interprets the final words in Moses' prayer 'the Lord, ruling for ever' as meaning that God the maker is in need of nothing (§§48–51).
- (3) Philo also refers to an interpretation of other allegorists who say that God's allotment is the good and that Moses prays for enjoyment of the good. The wish to be led in Moses' prayer is taken to refer to being taught the doctrines of wisdom. The mountain is a symbol of a lofty and heavenly logos (§§52–53).
- (4) Having given a general account of the allegorical exegesis of the text Philo proceeds to discuss a particular question about the meaning of the words 'the mountain of God's inheritance', which a reader may pose. One can only receive something that one does not have and because God possesses all things he cannot receive inheritances. In presenting his solution to this problem Philo refers to the situation of kings, who are in fact rulers of all their subjects but especially rule over the members of their household. Furthermore, factually they are the possessors of all the properties in their country, but are regarded as the possessors only of the properties that are called royal (§§54–58).

In this section and the next two sections (§§59–61, 62–72) the noun *κληρος* plays a key role, appearing totally 14 times in §§48–72. Primarily the word *κληρος* means 'lot' (e.g., Lev 16:9, 10; Num 26:55), and derived therefrom 'that which is assigned by lot, allotment (of land)' (for instance Num 16:14, 26:62, 36:3, 9). Generally, it can indicate a piece of land, but also an inheritance. Inheritance can also be referred to with the cognate *κληρονομία*. In the Pentateuch *κληρος* is combined with *μερίς* (part, portion), Deut 10:9, 12:12, 14:27, 29, 18:1.

Especially the tribe of the Levites is presented as part and allotment of the Lord (Deut 10:9, 18:2). In Philo's exegesis in §§48–72 all the several meanings of κλῆρος are involved and he clearly associates κλῆρος with κληρονομία and μερίς, seeing these terms as synonyms. See LSJ s.v. κλῆρος; Faivre 2006, esp. 75.

In the allegorical exegesis God's inheritance turns out to be the wise persons who see and know God. A key role in the explanation is the etymology of Israel as 'he who sees God', and bases thereon Philo makes the following line of thought: Israel and the Levites are God's inheritance/portion; Israel refers to those who see God; God's inheritance consists in persons who see God, that is the wise persons who have knowledge of God and see him with the eyes of the mind. See also comment at §58 ('which has ... sharpest kind').

#### *Detailed comments*

(1) §46. *Such were ... been exiled.* Philo begins with a sentence that has a structural role and in which he refers back to the theme of the previous section (the planting of paradise) and announces themes that will be clarified in the exegesis. He also mentions Adam which again appears in the TBL in the next section (§59).

*the One who only is wise.* See §38 and comment ad loc.

*rational souls.* See comment at §18.

*the paradise of virtues.* Philo refers back to his interpretation of the paradise as a garden of virtues (§37) which he offers in *Cher.* 10 and *Conf.* 6 as well.

*calls upon.* Philo sees Moses' words as a prayer, see comment at §90 ('vows').

*merciful and gentle Powers.* Moses calls upon God's merciful powers because the human being has been exiled from the paradise of virtue and in order to become virtuous the help of God is required. The transcendent God does not have contact with his creation directly, but the divine powers function as intermediaries between God and the created world. Moses calls upon the merciful powers, that God may show mercy by means of his merciful and gentle powers. At the same time Philo anticipates the notion of Israel as a suppliant nation. He also refers to God's merciful power in *Migr.* 124; *Fug.* 95; *Mut.* 129; *Somn.* 2.265, 292; *Mos.* 1.185; *Spec.* 1.229, 265, 294, 2.15. Starting point for the merciful power

may be the mercy of God in the LXX (Exod 32:12; Num 14:20 (cf. *Migr.* 122); Deut 21:8). See further comment at §86 ('the powers').

*the men of vision.* Usually explaining Israel as 'one that sees God, Philo here primarily has in mind the people of Israel (cf., for instance *Leg.* 2.34, 3.186, 212; *Sacr.* 134; *Post.* 63, 92). But at the same time the expression 'men of vision' can refer to wise persons or philosophers, who know God and see him with the eyes of the mind. For Philo seeing God is the ultimate aim in life. Later on in §58 he describes Israel as the sacred band of wise souls, which has vision of the sharpest kind. Philo's interpretation of Israel as 'seeing God', which underlines Israel's ability to see God, indicates the prominence which Israel has in his thought. For Israel as seeing God see Birnbaum 1996, 61–77; for the notion of seeing God see further comment at §58 ('which has vision of the sharpest kind').

*the earthly ... been exiled.* In Gen 3:23–24 it is told that Adam has been driven out from the paradise. In general, Philo explains Adam as mind (§42; *Leg.* 1.90, 92, 3.50, 185; *Cher.* 10, 57). Here Adam represents the mind with is combined with the earthly body (cf. *Leg.* 1.88). In §24 and in *Leg.* 1.55 Adam is presented as migrating from paradise, but here and elsewhere Adam's departure is an expulsion, *Cher.* 2; *Post.* 10.

§47. *Bring them ... and beyond.* An exact word for word quotation of Exod 15:17–18. The manuscripts read ὄρος κληροδοσίας, which has been changed by Wendland into ὄρος κληρονομίας, the reading of the LXX. The emendation is made more plausible by the fact that in §48 he repeats the words ὄρος κληρονομίας in his commentary.

(2) §48. *laying down ... and roots.* The roots are also mentioned in §§2 and 5 but the seeds have not been mentioned earlier. Philo pictures the same imagery of planting and sowing in the parallel exegesis in *Congr.* 56. See further below 'Parallel exegesis'.

*God has caused.* For God's as αἴτιος, cf. §20 and comment ad loc ('the Cause').

*the greatest plant.* Philo returns to the cosmos as (the greatest and most fertile) plant which was introduced at the beginning of the treatise; see §§2 and 4.

*the song.* Employing the word ᾠσμα Philo refers to the song of Moses in *Leg.* 2.102; *Ebr.* 111; *Conf.* 35. The singing of the song is discussed in *Agr.* 79–82, where Philo presents it as a

hymn of thanksgiving. For this and other songs see Leonhardt 2001, 162–167; for the terminology Lattke 1990, 129–132.

*to hint.* The verb αινίττομαι is usually employed by Philo to present an allegorical interpretation, *Cher.* 21, 60; *Det.* 178; *Post.* 18; *Deus* 21; *Agr.* 95, 110. It was a technical term, also used by other allegorists as Cornutus (1.4, 7.2, 17.6 etc.) and Heraclitus (5.8, 39.6, 60.3). See Struck 2004, 142–161.

*mounain of inheritance.* This is the only place where Philo interprets ‘mountain’ as the cosmos. In *Her.* 177 he interprets two mountains (Deut 27:12–13) as a symbol of two kinds.

*the possession and allotment.* Philo interprets the word κληρονομία from the Exodus text as κλήρος (allotment) and associates it with possession (κτήμα) since that which is allotted to someone is also his possession.

*its maker.* The title πεποιηκώς (maker; the one who has made) has been derived from the verb ποιέω (to make) used in Gen 1:1. It is also applied in §130; *Leg.* 1.24; *Ebr.* 30; *Migr.* 135; *Her.* 156, 119; *Fug.* 95 etc. In §51 Philo employs ποιητής.

§49. *irrational.* Moses prays that Israel may be planted in the paradise of virtue and follow God. Because following God and being virtuous consists in, among other things, liberating oneself from irrational passions, Philo introduces the passions in Moses’ prayer. For irrational passion(s) cf., for instance, *Leg.* 1.100; *Cher.* 12; *Sacr.* 80; *Det.* 46; *Post.* 46, 73; *Migr.* 26; *Her.* 109, 192. At *Agr.* 88 he offers the Stoic definition of passion as ‘the irrational, uncontrolled and disobedient motion in the soul’ (Diogenes Laertius 7.110). In §43 the passions are presented as wild beasts, see comment ad loc.

*unrestrained.* The adjective ἀφηνιαστής means ‘without reins, rebellious’ and fits well Philo’s usual imagery of the passions as a horse that has to be checked by means of bridle and reins, cf. for instance *Leg.* 1.99. Philo is the first extant author to record the word and after him it occurs almost exclusively in the church fathers. It can thus be called a *verbum philonicum*. It occurs 17 times in his writings, for instance *Leg.* 3.136; *Sacr.* 45; *Agr.* 84; *Ebr.* 111. Within the same imagery he employs the cognate verb ἀφηνιάζω (refuse to obey the reins, to be rebellious), e.g., in *Leg.* 1.73, 95, 2.104, 3.128, 193; *Sacr.* 105; *Agr.* 74; *Ebr.* 15; *Migr.* 62; *Her.* 245; *Congr.* 118; *Mut.* 115. For *verba philonica* see the Introduction.

*follow the ... perfect One.* These words remind us of the expression ‘following God’ which Philo often uses (*Migr.* 131, 173; *Abr.* 60, 204; *Decal.* 98, 100; *Spec.* 4.187; *Praem.* 98), sometimes also within the context of the straight course of virtue (*Migr.* 146). Following God was the Pythagorean goal in life (Iamblichus *The Life of Pythagoras* 86). In *Migr.* 128 he connects it with the Stoic aim of life ‘to live according to nature’, a motto to which he refers a few lines later. With the word ‘governance’ (διοίκησις) Philo refers to God’s ruling and ordering of the world, *Mos.* 2.148; *Spec.* 4.187; *Prov.* 2.54; *Aet.* 83. The word has a Stoic background (*SVF* 3. 945; Diogenes Laertius 7.88 quoted below (‘the first ... of felicity’). For God as most perfect cf. *Cher.* 86; *Spec.* 1.18; in §91 God is called the most perfect cause.

*well-controlled.* Philo here uses the adjective σώφρων which is akin to σωφροσύνη, (moderation), one of the four cardinal virtues. It is the task of moderation to fight against passions and to control them (*Leg.* 2.79, 105). For the four cardinal virtues see comment on §41 (‘wisdom’).

*without stumbling.* Philo often sketches the image of the road of virtue on which one can stumble and fall, for instance in the previous treatise, *Agr.* 101, 177. This picture is intertwined with the imagery of runners: imitating good runners, Abraham finishes the race of life without stumbling (*Migr.* 133). No human being is able to run the course of life from birth to death without stumbling (*Deus* 75). The soul can have a safe journey through practices of excellence (*Agr.* 101). See also §37 and comment (‘the one of its paths’).

*the first ...of felicity.* Philo here refers to the Stoic rule of living according to nature, which he also quotes in *Migr.* 128. Diogenes Laertius (7.87–88) reports on this as follows:

This is why Zeno was the first (in his treatise *On the Nature of Man*) to designate as the end ‘life in agreement with nature’, which is the same as a virtuous life, virtue being the goal towards which nature guides us. [...] Again living virtuously is equivalent to living in accordance with experience of the actual course of nature, [...]. (88) And this very thing constitutes the virtue of the happy man and the smooth current of life, when all actions promote the harmony of the spirit dwelling in the individual man with the will of him who orders (διοικητής, cf. διοίκησις in §49) the universe. (tr. LCL)

Philo will agree with this Stoic view to a great extent. At more places he refers to the idea of living according to nature, but for him nature is a description of God himself (*Leg.* 3.110;

*Det.* 52; *Ebr.* 24, 34; *Conf.* 32; *Her.* 95; *Abr.* 6). In *Migr.* 128 he explains living in agreement with nature as following God. The ‘smooth current of life’ in Diogenes’ report resembles Philo’s ‘life without stumbling’. He also shares the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια, that is to be completely free of passions (*Leg.* 3.129–131), but in sharp contrast with the Stoics he believes that the victory over the passions is a gift of grace given by God, see Völker 1938, 264–268. On the frequent equivalence of God and nature in Philo’s writings see Nikprowetzky 1977, 126–131.

*felicity.* See comment on §37 (‘perfect felicity’).

§50. *is in harmony.* Philo is fond of the verb συνᾶδω, which he employs 29 times. By way of comparison Plato employs it five times, Dionysius of Halicarnassus six times, and Polybius only once. The verb is used within the context of harmony of interpretation in §§ 113, 138; *Deus* 133; *Sobr.* 65; *Fug.* 18; *Opif.* 133.

*the cosmos is God’s house.* The idea that the cosmos is God’s house visible through the senses occurs also in *Post.* 5; *Somn.* 1.185; *Spec.* 1.66.

*not ... ungenerated.* That the world has been made by God and is not ungenerated is an essential belief for Philo (*Opif.* 7, 9, 171; see comments in Runia 2001, 112–113; *Fug.* 12). Because he attributes the view that the world is ungenerated and indestructible to Aristotle (*Aet.* 10; see Runia 1981, 125–126), he might here have Aristotle and his followers in mind. But there reference could also be more general. It is after all a very common doxographical theme; see for example *Ebr.* 199.

*a reflection.* The noun ἀπαύγασμα is a Hellenistic word, appearing for the first time in the LXX, Wis 7:26. Philo employs it three times, *Opif.* 146: the human mind is a reflection of God, cf. *Spec.* 4.123. The word here refers to the cosmos and is an explication of ἁγίασμα in the biblical text. Maybe Philo sees the sensible cosmos as a reflection of the intelligible cosmos, just as the human mind is a reflection of God. Reflection needs something else that reflects and therefore it fits well Philo’s dualistic view of creation. The expression ‘reflection of what is holy’ is equivalent to ‘copy of an archetype’. See further next comment.

*the copy of an archetype.* Because Philo interprets the mountain as cosmos, he sees in the biblical text a reference to the creation of the cosmos and hence he indicates shortly

his view on creation. Following Plato (*Tim.* 29–30), Philo thinks that the sense-perceptible and corporeal world is copy of the intelligible and incorporeal world, which thus functions as a pattern or archetype (*Conf.* 172; *Migr.* 103; *Her.* 75; *Opif.* 16–25). Both the copy and its model are presented as beautiful. The expression ‘copy of an archetype’ also occurs in *Leg.* 1.43, 45; *Post.* 105; *Migr.* 12; *Her.* 127; *Congr.* 8; see further Dillon 1996, 158–160; Runia 1986, 158–171 (92–93 on this text), 2001, 132–155.

*what is beautiful for sense-perception.* On the one hand Philo has in mind the sentence in the creation account in Gen: ‘God saw that it was beautiful’ (Gen 1:4, 8, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25), on the other he is influenced by Plato’s philosophy in which beautiful things in the corporeal world are seen as copies of the intelligible idea of the beautiful. Cf. *Cher.* 86: the beautiful things in the world could never be beautiful, if they were not made in the image of the archetype, which is truly beautiful.

*hands of God.* By interpreting God’s hands as his cosmos-making powers Philo explains away the anthropomorphic expression. He frequently stresses that God is not a human being and has no a human shape (*Conf.* 98). See comment at §35 (‘God in human form’). The association of God’s hand with his powers is also found in *Somn.* 2.265, where Philo speaks of the merciful hand and power of God, cf. *Mos.* 2.291: Moses was buried not by mortal hands but by immortal powers.

*his cosmos-making Powers.* In creating the cosmos God had made use of his creative power as an instrument, whose source is that which is truly good (*Opif.* 21 (see comments in Runia 2001, 143–144); *Her.* 160, referring to Gen 1:31). Therefore this power is also called goodness (*Cher.* 27) and is described as beneficent and bountiful (*QG* 1.57). God’s cosmos-making power is an example for parents to bring forth children (*Her.* 172; *Spec.* 2.225). Philo usually presents God’s creative power together with the ruling or royal power as the two most high powers of God (*Leg.* 1.95–96; *Cher.* 37; *Sacr.* 59). Philo would be struck by the occurrence of κύριος (Lord) in the text, because, as he himself remarks in §86, in the creation account the term God (θεός) is utilised and he connects θεός with the creative power. He is, however, silent about the question why the text has κύριος and not θεός. See further comments on §46 (‘merciful and gentle powers’), §86 (‘the powers’).

§51. *the maker*. Philo frequently refers to God as ποιητής (maker), §53, 68, 127; *Det.* 86, 124, 155; *Deus* 34, in many cases combined with ‘father’ (e.g., *Post.* 175; *Conf.* 144, 170; *Her.* 98, 200, 236—based on Plato *Tim.* 28c), but Philo has also in mind the use of the verb ποιέω in the creation account in Genesis to describe God’s creative act. In §48 God is called ὁ πεποιηκώς. See Runia 1986, 108–111.

*is in need of anything*. The thought that God needs nothing is also expressed in §35; *Leg.* 3.181; *Cher.* 44; *Det.* 54; *Deus* 7.

*reigning as ... and beyond*. The quotation repeats Exod 15:18 exactly, except that the first word ‘Lord’ is left out.

*a king*. For God as king, see comment at §14 (‘king’).

*his subjects are in need*. Cf. §14: angels report to the king what his subjects are in need of.

(3) §52. *Some have said*. Philo here refers to other allegorists without identifying them, using a rather vague reference. The same way of reference to the allegorical exegesis of others is found in *Leg.* 1.59; *Her.* 280; *Mut.* 141–142; *Somn.* 1.118. Nothing is known about who these exegetical colleagues are. David Hay (1979–80) suggests that this alternative allegorical exegesis of the mountain as the lofty and heavenly logos or doctrine anticipates Philo’s doctrine of the divine Logos. He also refers to *Somn.* 1.118–119, where Philo reporting the interpretation of others speaks of a divine Logos that inspires Jacob. In §74 there is another general reference to other allegorists. For Philo’s references to other allegorists, see Hay 1979–80.

*use and enjoyment*. See the comment on §34.

*bring us in*. The verb εισάγω, which occurs in the biblical text, means ‘bring in’ but also ‘introduce to, instruct’. It is clear that Philo also has the latter meaning in his mind. In the same way the term ὁ εισαγόμενος refers to one who begins to learn, a pupil (§99; *Sacr.* 64, 65), while an introductory manual is called an εισαγωγή. Within this context the comparison with children (‘like children’) is appropriate. The same meaning in *Leg.* 1.52 (εἰσάγω εἰς τὴν ἀρετήν), 1.54 (εἰσάγω εἰς τὰ δόγματα), 3.92; *Agr.* 44.

*the doctrines ... of wisdom.* Philo also refers to the doctrines and principles of wisdom (σοφία δόγματα και θεωρήματα) in *Det.* 66; *Abr.* 220 and *Spec.* 4.107.

*ungrounded.* The adjective ἀστοιχειώτος, which means ‘without elementary principle’ or ‘unlettered’ is very rare. According to the TLG it appears four times in Greek literature, two occurrences being in the lexica by Hesychius and Suda. Cyrillus of Alexandria uses it in combination with σκληρός (hard; *In Oseam* 2.3; pag. 47, l.18 ed. Pusey). In *Her.* 102 Philo speaks of a στοιχειώδης εισαγωγή, an elementary introduction.

*the lofty and heavenly Logos.* In this interpretation, ascribed to others, the mountain of inheritance is seen as the lofty and heavenly Logos. Being planted in the Logos means that one knows that God is leader and master, the cause of good things. The soul has to serve him, and service of God is, as Philo explains later on, better than freedom. Because the Logos leads to knowledge of the heavenly God, it can be called heavenly. In *Sacr.* 86 Philo refers to the manna from heaven as the heavenly logos or doctrine of virtue. He explains that the manna has to be crushed and ground in order that knowledge becomes firmer.

§53. *This is ... something holy.* This sentence is full of references to the biblical text Exod 15:17.

*the fully available house.* Philo replaces κατοικητήριον, which is a typical LXX term, by the more common noun οἶκος (house). The description ‘fully available’ is based on the adjective ‘ready’ in the biblical text.

*a most suitable dwelling place.* With these words Philo describes the ready dwelling place, replacing the LXX term κατοικητήριον with the Hellenistic word ἐνδιαίτημα (Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.37.1, 2.32), which is also found in §33.

*as something holy.* The uncommon LXX term ἁγίασμα from Exodus is replaced by the more usual adjective ἅγιος.

*For you.* Using the technique of apostrophe, Philo addresses God directly, inspired by the invocation of the Lord in the Exodus text. The direct addressing of God as master is also found in *Leg.* 3.10; *Her.* 27; *Mos.* 2.239; *Spec.* 2.219. For Philo’s use of apostrophe see comment at §72 (‘you slanderers’).

*Master.* The addressing of God as king is based on the term κύριος (Lord) in the biblical text. For God as master, cf. §91; *Leg.* 1.96, 2.83, 104, 3.9; *Cher.* 107; *Sacr.* 58; *Her.* 107. In Gen 15:2, 8 Abraham calls God master; in the LXX Wis 6:7, 8:3; 2 Macc 5:17.

*the maker ... holy things.* For Philo it is an important doctrine that God is the cause of good and noble things only and he regularly refers to it, §72, 91; *Sacr.* 40; *Deus* 87; *Agr.* 129, 173; *Conf.* 180; *Fug.* 70. *Mut.* 32.

*the perishable realm of becoming.* The realm of becoming (γένεσις) is seen as a source of evil and is contrary to God, the ungenerated (ἀγένητος; cf. §22). The world of becoming is subject to change, passes away, perishes and never continues in the same state (*Somn.* 2.290; *Post.* 29). For the opposition between the world of becoming and God, cf. §61; *Leg.* 3.7; *Post.* 172; *Gig.* 42; *Her.* 206; *Somn.* 2.231, 290. The expression φθαρτὴ γένεσις occurs also in *Ebr.* 73, 208.

*the suppliant soul.* The notion of suppliant souls plays an important role in Philo's thought. Generally, a suppliant soul takes refuge with God and is his servant and worshipper. In Egypt the Israelites were strangers and guests, suppliants and settlers, who take refuge with God, the protector of strangers and suppliants (*Mos.* 1.36). Philo pictures the image of the suppliant soul that travels on the royal highway of God. This road is wisdom by which suppliant souls can escape to God (*Deus* 160, cf. *Post.* 31). A soul that sets aside bodily pleasures becomes a perfect suppliant and worshipper of God (*Det.* 160). Suppliants are those who love excellence of character (*Virt.* 79). Biblical characters are examples of suppliants. Abel seems to be dead but he is alive because he is found acting as God's suppliant (*Det.* 70). Tamar lived in a city full of gods but when she saw the truth she became pious and regarded her life as the service and supplication of the one Cause (*Virt.* 221, cf. *Spec.* 1.209). Especially the tribe of Levi is the suppliant of God, as Philo discusses later on (§63), see note ad loc. The notion of suppliants has partly its background in the Greco-roman world, where strangers and homicides were able to take refuge in a temple and become suppliants of Zeus Hiketesios (*Od.* 9.270, 13.213; *Hdt.* 2.113). See further Nikiprowetzky 1996, 11–43, who discusses Philo's description of the community of the Therapeutae in *Contempl.* Living in service of God, they are suppliants, as the Levites are,

*for an infinite age.* The expression τὸν ἄπειρον αἰῶνα is Philo's rewording of τὸν αἰῶνα καὶ ἐπ' αἰῶνα καὶ ἔτι from the Exodus text. As Heleen Keizer (1999, 212) indicates before Philo the phrase τὸν ἄπειρον αἰῶνα occurs only once in a fragment from Aristotle (*Eudemus* fr. 6 Ross), where it means 'all, endless, time'. It has the same sense in the passage here. She concludes that for Philo the biblical word αἰών refers to the time that is correlated with the created world (244) and not as it is usually taken to 'eternity'. Hence our translation of the biblical text using this term.

*without a leader.* The adjective ἀνηγεμόνευτος is found in Philo for the first time. It also occurs in *Somn.* 2.286 and can be seen as a *verbum philonicum*. For *verba philonica* see Introduction.

*For being ... greatest authority.* The idea that the service of (or bondage to) God is better than freedom is also expressed in *Cher.* 107; *Somn.* 2.100; *Spec.* 1.57. The thought is put into words expressively in *Her.* 7:

And so when else should the slave of God open his mouth freely to Him who is the ruler and master both of himself and of the all, save when he is pure from sin and the judgements of his conscience are loyal to his master, when he feels more joy at being the servant of God than if he had been king of all the human race and assumed an uncontested sovereignty over land and sea alike? (tr. LCL)

*being continuously in your service.* Philo employs the expression ἡ ἀδιάστατος παρά σοι δουλεία. The adjective ἀδιάστατος is rarely found before Philo (Antiphon the Sophist, fr. 24 DK), but Philo very often uses it, frequently combined with the synonymous συνεχής, for instance *Leg.* 3.92; *Det.* 48; *Post.* 12; *Abr.* 154; *Mos.* 2.55. The adverb ἀδιαστάτως is found in §89.

(4) §54. *ask the question.* By these words Philo introduces a problem or a question (ζήτημα) raised by the biblical text. Similar phrases are found in *Leg.* 1.33, 1.48, 1.91, 2.103; *Deus* 122. It appears also in a fragment by the Hellenistic Jewish historian Demetrius (3rd century BCE; fr. 5 = Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 9.29.16), and so most likely indicates a common technique in Alexandrian exegesis. Philo's method here resembles the genre of zetema, in which a question is raised and answer is given, just as Philo employs in his *Quaestiones et*

*solutiones in Genesim* and *In Exodum*. The use of this genre by Demetrius is discussed by Niehoff 2011, 38–57.

**give inheritances.** The verb κληροδοτέω is found for the first time in the LXX, Ps 77:55; 2 Esd 9:12; Sir 17:11. Philo uses it four times (*Sacr.* 19; *Sobr.* 21; *Spec.* 2.119).

**receive them.** The verb κληρονομέω is inspired here by the noun κληρονομία in the Exodus text.

**all things are his possession.** The notion that all things are God's possession is important in Philo's thought, cf. §130; *Leg.* 3.32, 3.78, 3.195; *Cher.* 71, 124; *Ebr.* 107; *Her.* 103, 118). In his allegorical exegesis Philo explains the name Cain as meaning 'possession' and Cain represents the foolish mind that thinks that all things are his own possession, instead of thinking that all things are God's possession (*Cher.* 65; *Sacr.* 2, 72; *Det.*32).

§55. **affinity.** The noun οικείωσις denotes the affinity and kinship of the human being with God, as can be seen in *Somn.* 2.231, where Philo writes about the high priest: he is God's minister, assimilated (οικειούμενος) through his mortal aspect to creation, through his immortal aspect to the uncreated One. Cf. *Cher.* 18; *Post.* 135; *Opif.* 146. His use here may be inspired by the image of God as master ruling over the members of his household (οικέτης; cf. the noun οἶκος in the biblical text). Philo does not accept the Stoic notion of οικείωσις, which indicates the natural affinity of human beings with themselves. In his thought the term comes close to the Middle Platonic idea of ὁμοίωσις τῷ θεῷ. See Lévy 1998, who discusses our passage on 162–163.

**members of their household.** In the comparison that Philo uses the king is God, and the members of his household (οικέται) may in the first place implicitly refer to the Levites, who are special ministers of God and have the Lord as their allotment, as is told in Deut 10:9 and Num 18:20. This allotment is discussed in the next section (§§62–72). In the second place the wise souls who serve God and of whom Philo speaks later on (§58) may also be seen as members of God's household.

**the care of the body.** The expression ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἐπιμέλεια occurs also in *Legat.* 250.

§56. **the kings are masters.** Philo reflects the situation in Egypt under the Ptolemies, in which the king was regarded as the possessor of the all the land, see Huss 2011, 263–270.

After Rome has annexed Egypt, a reform of the land tenure system took place. Royal land became public land, but was still called βασιλική γῆ, see Blouin 2012, 23–26.

*managers.* In Ptolemaic Egypt the ἐπιμελητής was an official who was working on finance and among other things looked after the leasing out of royal land and cared for the income. See Huss 2011, 73–76. Although land reform took place at the beginning of Roman rule, Ptolemaic terminology was retained (Blouin 2012, 24) and plausibly ἐπιμεληταί were still working in Philo's time.

*relaxation and enjoyment.* The collocation ἄνεσις καὶ εὐθυμία is also found in §166; in §34 he uses the combination enjoyment and use; see comment ad loc.

*the weighty burden.* Philo likes the saying τὸ βαρύτατον ἄχθος, cf. *Gig.* 16; *Deus* 2, 15; *Agr.* 49; *Migr.* 145; *Somn.* 1.110, 2.26; *Abr.* 14; *Spec.* 3.160; *Mos.* 1.231.

§57. *are stored up as treasures.* The verb θησαυροφυλακέω, that Philo uses 11 times (*Post.* 62; *Migr.* 160, 204; *Somn.* 2.46; *Spec.* 2.92; *Virt.* 90, 140; *Prob.* 76), appears before him in Diodorus Siculus (19.15.5) only. The composite verb is typically Philonic.

*collectors of tribute.* In Roman Egypt the burden of taxation was very high and collectors of taxes had a bad reputation. Philo himself witnessed the use of violence by a collector of taxes:

An example of this was given a little time ago in our own district by a person who was appointed to serve as a collector of taxes. When some of his debtors whose default was clearly due to poverty took flight in fear of the fatal consequences of his vengeance, he carried off by force their womenfolk and children and parents and their other relatives and beat and subjected them to every kind of outrage (...) (*Spec.* 3.159; tr. LCL)

Lewis (1983, 159–176) discusses Roman taxation in Egypt with a reference to Philo's text from *Spec.* Philo's picture is confirmed by other documents.

§58. *Do not be surprised.* The same verbal phrase is also met with in *Conf.* 167; *Migr.* 4; *Mut.* 256; *Somn.* 1.73, 2.183; *Abr.* 75.

*the sacred band.* The noun θίασος is generally used in a religious context, referring to a band of persons who devote themselves to the worship of a god. See further comment at §14.

*is said ... the allotment.* Philo here anticipates the quotation from Deut 10:9 in §63: the Lord himself will be the allotment of the tribe of Levi. There is a verbal connection with Exod 15:17-18, the biblical lemma of this section, by means of the word κληῆρος (allotment) in Deut 10:9 and κληρονομία (inheritance) in Exod 15:17.

*the sovereign ruler.* For this title of God see comment at §33.

*which has vision of the sharpest kind.* It is the wise person, who sees God with the eyes of his understanding (*Post.* 18; *Deus* 3; *Abr.* 84), since fools are blind or dim-sighted (*Migr.* 38). Philo describes philosophy as the desire to see God and his Word (*Conf.* 97). The seeing of God is a mental seeing and the vision of God consists in knowing him (*Leg.* 2.81), as is set out in *Mut.* 6:

And so when you hear that God was seen by man (Gen 17:1), you must think that this takes place without the light which the senses know, for what belongs to mind can be apprehended only by the mental powers. (tr. LCL)

For the seeing of God, cf., for instance, *Sacr.* 60; *Det.* 30, 86; *Ebr.* 83; *Conf.* 105; *Migr.* 201; *Fug.* 141; *Mut.* 7, 201, 203; *Somn.* 1.117, 1.238, 1.240. To see God is especially a characteristic of the people of Israel, whose name Philo explains as ‘seeing God’, e.g. *Leg.* 1.34, 3.15, 172, 186, 212; *Sacr.* 134; *Post.* 63, 92; *Sobr.* 13; *Conf.* 92. In Deut 32:9, quoted later on in §59, the people of Israel are called the Lord’s portion and within Israel the tribe of Levi has a special place, elected for the service of God and therefore also God’s portion (Deut 10:9, §63). In §46 he refers to Israel as οἱ ὄρατικοί (men of vision). See Birnbaum 1996, 65–72. The adjective ὀξυωπής (sharp-sighted) is rarely used before Philo (e.g. Aristotle, *Hist. an.* 1.10, 492a9, 9.34, 620a2, referring to the eyes of animals), but Philo employs it 17 times. It occurs within the same context of seeing God with the eyes of the mind in *Sobr.* 4; *Conf.* 92; *Congr.* 84; *Migr.* 46, 77, 222; *Spec.* 1.259. For the seeing of God see Völker 1938, 281–287; Birnbaum 1996, 77–90; Bradshaw 1998; Mackie 2009, 2012.

*eye of the mind.* This expression using the term δῖανοια is borrowed from Plato (*Symp.* 291a3) and occurs also in §169; *Post.* 18, 167; *Somn.* 1.199; *Opif.* 71; *Ios.* 106; *Spec.* 3.2. Philo more frequently speaks of the eye(s) of the soul, §22 and comment ad loc. See Billings 1919, 66.

*which never ... penetrating gaze.* An earnest call for keeping open the eyes is formulated in *Migr.* 222, where Philo speaks to the mind directly:

O mind, be never weakly and slacken, but even if it seems hard to observe, open that what sees in yourself, look to the inside and behold what really is more accurately, and never close your eyes willingly or unwillingly; sleep is a blind thing, as wakefulness is a thing of sharp sight (ὀξυωπές).

*penetrating.* Philo is the first attested user of the adjective εὐθυτενής (straight), *Agr.* 101; *Ebr.* 182; *Migr.* 133; *Ios.* 147; *Mos.* 2.253; *Praem.* 148.

### *Parallel exegesis*

Moses' prayer in Exod 15 is also discussed in *Congr.* 56–58, where Philo's starting-point is Gen 36:12: Timna, the concubine of Eliphaz, bore Amalek to Eliphaz. In his allegorical reading Amalek refers to the unreasoning impulse of passion. The name Amalek means 'people licking up', because passions licks up and destroys all that stands in its way. Philo explains the name Eliphaz as 'God has dispersed me', because passion is born, when God disperses and scatters the soul. Now Philo brings in Moses' prayer and interprets Israel as the mind that sees God. God plants the mind that sees God as a branch of noble birth, stretching its roots into eternity and giving it fruitfulness for the acquisition and enjoyment of virtues. Moses prays that the divine offshoots may be not be for one day but immortal and age-long. On the other hand God banishes the godless souls far away from himself and scatters them to the place of pleasures and desires. Next Philo quotes from Deut 32:8 'when he scattered the sons of Adam', a verse that Philo also quotes in the next section in *Plant.* This verse here is verbally linked with the interpretation of Eliphaz as 'God has dispersed me'

### *Nachleben*

Exod 15:17–18 is seldom referred to by the church fathers but Origen discusses the verses in *Hom. Exod.* 6.10–13. His Christian exegesis, in which for instance the holy precinct indicates the Lord's reincarnation, does not show Philonic influence. By the same token in his *Homilies on Jeremiah* the mountain is explained as Christ (18.5).

## Bibliography

### (a) Editions of Philo *De plantatione*

Wendland, P. 1897. Φίλωνος Περὶ φυτουργίας in L. Cohn, P. Wendland, and S. Reiter (edd.), *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Berlin: George Reimer, 1896–1915; reprinted Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962. Vol. 2, pages 133–169. (= PCW).

Heinemann, I. 1923. In L. Cohn, I. Heinemann and W. Theiler, *Philo von Alexandria: die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. 7 vols. Breslau: Marcus Verlag 1909–38 (6 volumes), Berlin: De Gruyter 1964 (vol. 7). Vol. 4, pages 147–187(= PCH).

Whitaker, G.H. 1930. In F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker (and R. Marcus). *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge Mass.: Heinemann, 1929–1962. Vol. 3, pages 205–305 (=PLCL).

Pouilloux, J. 1963. *Philon d'Alexandrie. De plantatione*. Les Œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie. Edited by R. Arnaldez, C. Mondésert and J. Pouilloux. Vol. 10. Paris: Cerf.

### (b) Modern literature

Billings, T. H. 1919. *The Platonism of Philo Judaeus*, Diss. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Birnbaum, E. 1996. *The place of Judaism in Philo's Thought. Israel, Jews and Proselytes*. Studia Philonica Monographs 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Blouin, K. 2012. Between Water and Sand. Agriculture and Husbandry. Pages 22–37 in *The Oxford Handbook of Egypt*. Edited by C. Riggs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bradshaw, D. 1998. The Vision of God in Philo of Alexandria. *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 72:483–500.

Dillon, J.M. 1996. *The Middle Platonists: a Study of Platonism 80 B. C. to A.D. 220*. London: Duckworth. Revised edition with a new afterword.

Faivre, A. 2006. Kleros. *RAC* 21:65–96.

Grenfell, B.P. and Hunt, A.S. 1908. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* Part V. London: The British Academy.

- Groningen, B.A. van. 1967. *Short Manual of Greek Palaeography*. Leiden: Sijthoff.
- Hay, D. M. 1979–80. Philo's References to Other Allegorists. *SPh* 6:41–75.
- Huss, W. 2011. *Die Verwaltung des Ptolemaïischen Reichs*. Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 104. München: Beck.
- Keizer, H.M. 1999. *Life Time Entirety. A Study of ΑΙΩΝ in Greek Literature and Philosophy, the Septuagint and Philo*. Diss. Amsterdam.
- Lattke, M. 1991. *Hymnus. Materialien zu einer Geschichte der antiken Hymnologie*. Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus 19. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Leonhardt, J. 2001. *Jewish Worship in Philo of Alexandria*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 84. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lévy, C. 1998. Le problème de l'*oikeiôsis* chez Philon. Pages 153–164 in *Philon d'Alexandrie et le langage de la philosophie*. Edited by C. Lévy. Monothéismes et philosophie. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Lewis, N. 1983. *Life in Egypt under Roman Rule*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Niehoff, M.R. 2011. *Jewish exegesis and Homeric scholarship in Alexandria*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nikiprowetzky, N. 1996. *Études Philoniennes*. Paris: Cerf.
- Mackie, S.D. 2009. Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: The Logos, the Powers, or the Existent One? *SPhA* 21:25–47.
- 2012. Seeing God in Philo of Alexandria: Means, Methods, and Mysticism. *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 43:147–79.
- Reynolds, L. D. and Wilson, N. G. 1968, 1974<sup>2</sup>. *Scribes and Scholars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Runia, D. T. 1981. Philo's *De Aeternitate mundi*: the Problem of its Interpretation. *VC* 35:105–151.
- 1986. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. 2nd ed. *Philosophia Antiqua* 44. Leiden: Brill.
- 1993. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: a Survey*. CRINT III 3. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Struck, P. 2004. *The birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*.

Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Völker, W. 1938. *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien: eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 49.1. Leipzig: Hinrich.

Wendland, P. 1897. Kritische und exegetische Bemerkungen zu Philo. *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* N.F. 52:465–504.

Wolfson, H.A. 1947. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.