

Dear colleagues in the Philo of Alexandria seminar,

As in previous volumes of the Philo of Alexandria Commentary series, I will start my work on *De Cherubim* with a general introduction, which will deal with questions, such as the place of the treatise in the Philonic corpus, the title of the work, the genre, the text, the structure and main themes of the treatise, the exegetical organization and the use of the bible, the influence on later authors, and previous scholarship including bibliography. In addition, I will explain the methods that I used for translating and writing the commentary. All of this is planned but not written - yet !

The current presentation is a first draft of a detailed commentary on the paragraphs 1-10, which form a small unit in the overall composition of *De Cherubim*. As in other parts of the Allegorical Commentary, Philo starts his treatise with a biblical text, which in this case is taken from Gen 3:24. This primary biblical text consists of two independent clauses, and the first (Gen 3:24a) is the basis for the initial unit of Cher. 1-10. Philo continues with the second clause (Gen 3:24b) in Cher. 11-39 and follows up with Gen 4:1-2 in Cher. 40-130, the remainder of the treatise. These three parts based on the Genesis texts define the fault lines of the treatise. Many other subdivisions can be created, and various editors and translators have done so, f. e. Colson creates 30 subdivisions and Radice counts 36. Others, such as Cazeaux, Cohn, and Gorez have fewer units, see the overview below.

#### Overview of units in *De Cherubim* (§§ 1-39)

Cazeaux	Cohn	Colson	Gorz	Radice
1-10	1-2	1-10	1-10	1-2
	3-10			3
				4-8
				9-10
11-20	11-20	11-20	11-20	11-13
				14-17
				18-20
21-39	21-24	21-24	21-26	21-24
	25-26	25-26		25-26
	27-30	27-30	27-30	27-30

Cazeaux	Cohn	Colson	Gorez	Radice
	31-39	31-32 33-38 39	31-39	31-34 35-39

**Overview of units in *De Cherubim* (§§ 40-130)**

Cazeaux	Cohn	Colson	Gorez	Radice
40-52	40-52	40-52	40-44 45-52	40-42 43-47 48-50 51-52
53-56	53-57	53-55	53-56	53-55 56-57
57-64	58-66	56-64	57-64	58-60 61-64
65-77	67-73	65-66 67-71	65-71	65-66 67-70
78-82	74-82 83-86	72-74 74-76 77 78-83	72-83	71-73 74-76 77-83
83-87 88-90 91-97	87-90 91-100	84-90 91-97	84-97	84-86 87-90 91-93 94-97
98-107 108-123	101-107 108-112	98-105 106-107 108-113	98-112	98-100 101-105 106-112

Cazeaux	Cohn	Colson	Gorez	Radice
	113-123	113-114 114-115 116-117 118-119 120-121 121-123	113-123	113-115 116-119 120-123
124-130	124-130	124-127 128-130	124-130	124-130

Cazeaux: Jacques Cazeaux, *L'épée du logos et le soleil de midi*. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient, 1983.

Cohn: Leopold Cohn, *Die Werke Philos von Alexandria in deutscher Übersetzung*, Bd. 3. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1919.

Colson: F. H. Colson, Philo, *On the Cherubim*, LCL 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Gorez: J. Gorez: *De Cherubim: Introduction, traduction et notes*, PAPM 3. Paris: Cerf, 1963.

Radice: *Filone di Alessandria. Tutti i trattati del Commentario allegorico alla Bibbia*, a cura di Roberto Radice; presentazione di Giovanni Reale; monografia introduttiva di Giovanni Reale e Roberto Radice; con la collaborazione di Clara Kraus Reggiani e Claudio Mazzarelli. Milano: Bompiani, 2005.

### Summary of Cher. 1-10

After quoting the biblical text: **“and he (God) cast out Adam and settled (him) facing the garden of pleasure...”** (Gen 3:24a), Philo starts his first paragraphs with a reflection on the difference between “sending out” and “casting out,” devising a strong contrast between the two verbs. Strikingly, Adam thereafter disappears from Philo’s further elaborations on the theme, and he turns instead to Hagar, another famous exile. Philo

alludes to secondary biblical texts connected with the Hagar and Sarah story and to his allegory of Hagar and Sarah as preparatory training versus knowledge and wisdom, but he does not fully develop this theme here, probably because his focus was on the theme “sending out” and “casting out.”

In his typical fashion, Philo then digresses to other figures, such as Abraham, and ventures out to ethical and etymological elaborations. He lingers on these patriarchal names, developing etymologies, which seem to direct and guide the allegorical interpretations. Philo also touches on patriarchs and matriarchs as representations of virtuous life and speculates about specific virtues derived from generic virtue. For Philo, paradise represents the place of virtue *par excellence*, and the four rivers flowing out of Eden (Gen 2:10) form an important image of the individual virtues; the number four conveniently matches the four main virtues: prudence, wisdom, temperance, and courage. At the end of a long detour about the differences between “sending out” and “casting out” and the allegorizations of the patriarchal names, Philo returns in Cher. 10 to Adam, with whom he had started his treatise.

N.B. I would like to emphasize that this is the beginning of my commentary – it is very much a work in progress. The format will be adapted along the way. My working method is primarily from comparisons within the Philonic corpus and from linguistic observations. Only sporadically so far did I incorporate bibliographic references. I have not worked on the *Nachleben* yet, and I have not yet compared the passages with the QG, all of which I intend to do systematically at a later stage.

Annewies van den Hoek, October 26, 2017