

Karl Ernst Richter's Schwickert Edition: The Art (and Science) of Introducing Philo;
Or, How Not to Analyze a Philonic Treatise

Michael B. Cover

IN THE HISTORY OF PHILONIC EDITIONS, Karl Ernst Richter's *Philonis Iudaei opera omnia* (Leipzig, 1828–1830)¹ represents something of a minor stepping stone between the monumental achievement of Thomas Mangey's 1742 edition and the equally revolutionary modern critical edition of Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland (1896–1915).² Nevertheless, the “Schwickert” edition makes a number of advances on the most immediately preceding Pfeiffer edition (1785–1792), given Richter's ability to draw on the recent editorial work of Angelo Mai (1818) and Johannes B. Aucher (1822/1826).³ Chief among Richter's improvements are the inclusion of two new subtreatises from the second book of *De specialibus legibus*: *De cophini festo* (*On the Feast of the Basket*, *Spec.* 2.215–223), an appendix to Philo's treatment of the fourth commandment; and *De parentibus colendis* (*On Taking Care of Parents*, *Spec.* 2.224–262), Philo's treatment of the fifth commandment and a codicil on the death penalty. Additionally, by including Aucher's Latin translations from the *Sermones Tres Hactenus Inediti* (1822) and the *Paralipomena Armena* (1826), Richter set an important precedent for Philonic scholarship, insinuating that Philo's Greek and Armenian works belonged together—a pattern followed in subsequent Philonic editions (PAPM, PLCL).

But perhaps the most enduring—and also the most problematic—contribution of Richter's edition is his analysis of Philo's treatises into paragraphs (“textum in paragraphos distinximus”), labeled with Roman numbers. These paragraphs—each keyed to a (ca.) one-sentence summary—are cumulatively presented at the beginning of each treatise as an *argumentum* (“summaria singulis libris praeposuimus”). Richter's *summaria* represent the first analytic introductions to individual Philonic treatises—a practice imitated to very good effect, *inter alia*, by F. H. Colson in the PLCL. Yet Richter's analysis of the text into paragraphs—maintained by both the Loeb and Cohn-Wendland editions as roman numerals—while groundbreaking for its time, remains seriously wanting by modern standards, as it fails to comprehend the essentially lemmatic and exegetical character of Philo's major commentary series. After surveying in detail some of the other contributions listed

¹ Carolus Ernestus (Karl Ernst) Richter, *Philonis Iudaei opera omnia*, 8 vols., Bibliotheca sacra; Patrum ecclesiae graecorum 2 (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: E. B. Schwickertus, 1828–1830 [G.-G. 413]).

² Thomas Mangey, Φιλωνος του Ιουδαιου τα ευρισκόμενα ἅπαντα. *Philonis Iudaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, 2 vols. (London: William Bowyer, 1742 [G.-G. 404]); and Leopold Cohn and Paul Wendland, *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, 7 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1896–1930 [G.-G. 431]).

³ August Friedrich Pfeiffer, *Philonis Iudaei opera omnia, graece et latine, ad editionem Thomae Mangey collatis aliquot Mss. edenda curavit*, 5 vols. (Erlangen: Wolfgang Wathler, 1785–1792 [G.-G. 407]); Angelo Mai, SJ, *Philonis Iudaei de cophini festo et de colendis parentibus, cum brevi scripto de Iona* (Milan: Regiis, 1818 [G.-G. 412]); Johann Baptist Aucher, *Philonis Iudaei sermones tres hactenus inediti I. et II. De providentia, et III. De animalibus, ex armena versione antiquissima ab ipso originali textu graeco ad verbum stricte exequetata, nunc primum in Latium fideliter translati* (Venice: S. Lazari, 1822 [G.-G. 440]); idem, *Philonis Iudaei Paralipomena armena* (Venice: S. Lazari, 1826 [G.-G. 441]).

above, this paper will chart Richter’s analytic principles, and consider what, if anything, of enduring value remains in his paragraph divisions.

i. Karl Ernst Richter: A Short Biography⁴

KARL ERNST (CAROLUS ERNESTUS) RICHTER was born on 18 February 1795 in Zwickau, a city in Eastern Saxony, where his father was a teacher. He studied in Leipzig and in 1817 became a teacher in the Gymnasium of the nearby town of Schneeberg, roughly 100 km to the south. In 1819, he returned to his hometown to become the “co-rector” of the Zwickau Lycaeam (Gymnasium). Amongst his pupils was the Romantic pianist and composer, Robert Schumann, whose father August Schumann (a bookseller and publisher in his own right) was a close friend.⁵ In 1822, Richter accepted a call to become deacon at the Lutheran Marienkirche in Zwickau. It was during this ecclesial phase of his life that his chief scholarly work was done: in addition to a biography of August Schumann, Richter published two editions of a word and subject index for Friedrich Thiersch’s *Greek Grammar* (1823, 1828); an *Opera omnia* of Flavius Josephus (1826); and, what interests us most in this seminar, an *Opera omnia* of Philo (1828).⁶ Precisely what led him to these two Hellenistic Greek authors is not clear from his Philonic preface, although his preface to the Josephus volume indicates that he was assigned them as part of the larger *Bibliotheca sacra* series organized in Paris. The volumes were meant to be inexpensive and serviceable for those new to the study of the primary ecclesial sources.⁷ Richter also published, in 1831, his own translation of the New Testament—a text which continued to influence his political and religious thought long after he had left his clerical vocation behind.⁸

During his time as a deacon, Richter seems to have been contemplating a quiet and traditional life of scholarship in the church. History, however, would lead him in more adventuresome directions. Whether it was a crisis of faith, the strong winds of the Enlightenment, the rise of the liberal state in France and America, the blossoming Romantic spirit in eastern Germany, or simply the model of his friend August Schumann, Richter stepped down from his ecclesial vocation in 1829 to pursue two new ventures. First, he founded a bookstore; second, and more decisively, he became the chief editor of a liberal Zwickau periodical called *The Bee* (“die Biene”). Richter found in *The Bee* a venue for airing his more controversial ideas about numerous topics, including the liberal state and labor reform. It was in part the political “sting” of *The Bee* that saw Richter embroiled in a series of violent

⁴ For the majority of these details, see the short biography of E. Herzog, *Chronik der Kreisstadt Zwickau* (1845): 828, note 1. For further biographical sources, see Michael Hammer, “Der Zwickauer Liberale Karl Ernst Richter und die Volksbewegungen in der kleinstaatlichen Revolution 1830/31 in Sachsen,” in *Blätter für deutsche Landesgeschichte* 128 (1992): 179–197, esp. 179, note 3.

⁵ Hammer, “Der Zwickauer Liberale,” 179.

⁶ Carolus Ernestus (Karl Ernst) Richter, *Flavii Josephi Judaei opera omnia*, 6 vols., *Bibliotheca sacra; Patrum ecclesiae graecorum* 1 (Lipsiae [Leipzig]: E. B. Schwickertus, 1826).

⁷ Richter, *Flavii Josephi opera omnia*, viii.

⁸ Herzog, *Chronik der Kreisstadt Zwickau*, 179, note 3.

uprisings in September of the following year (1830).⁹ In 1832, as a result of his continuing popular appeal, Richter was elected “vice mayor” of Zwickau and parliamentary representative (“Landtagsabgeordneter”) of several surrounding smaller towns. In the latter role, he supported the abolition of the feudal system. His failure in these reforms functionally ended his life and career in Zwickau. *The Bee* was banned; Richter became estranged from his family; he sold the *Buchhandlung* and moved to Dresden in 1833, only thence to travel to the United States in order to experience first-hand the kind of liberal state—and especially the inhabitants of such a state—that he had dreamed of bringing about in Saxony.¹⁰ After two years in Baltimore, Richter returned to Europe, where he took up teaching and publishing in Bern, Switzerland. He remained there in voluntary exile until 1848.

During the last phase of Richter’s life (1848–1863),¹¹ he returned to Saxony in an ill-fated attempt to implement his liberal political ideals. Perhaps most prescient of his proposals was the suggestion that the creation of a “Union” of European states, on the model of the United States of America, was the best path toward establishing a lasting “peace” on the continent.¹² He re-established *the Bee* and took up his old role in local government. After a year, however, Richter was banned again from his work in parliament, and spent the rest of his life in increasing poverty and obscurity.

It should be clear from this summary that Richter’s life that his work on Philo was undertaken during its first and most routine phase. Was there any connection between his fledgling labors on Philo and Josephus, and his later more original and controversial positions on the philosophy of education, labor, and the proposal of a “European Union”? While I have yet to discover any explicit reference to either Hellenistic Jewish author in Richter’s political writings,¹³ it is worthy of note that he begins

⁹ Hammer, “Der Zwickauer Liberale,” 179.

¹⁰ Richter (*Reisen nach Nordamerika und zurück in den Jahren 1835 bis 1848. Zugabe: Ein Brief aus Californien von M. A. Richter*, 2 vols. [Leipzig: Kollmann, 1852], 1.1) notes that his journey to America was not on account of wanderlust or emigration, but to experience the Americans themselves in their natural habitat (“Das Ziel meiner Reisesehnsucht waren die Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika, nicht um auszuwandern, sondern um die privaten und öffentlichen Verhältnisse des großartigsten Volkes der Erde in seinem eigenen Lande kennen zu lernen.”)

¹¹ *Sächsische Constitutionelle Zeitung* (2 April 1863).

¹² Richter, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Europa: Andeutungen zur Herstellung eines dauernden Friedens unter den europäischen Staaten* (1859), 4: “Das beste Mittel zur Erreichung dieses Zieles [d.h. der Frieden] ist kein anderes als eine Union aller europäischen Staaten nach denselben Grundsätzen, wonach die Union der Vereinigten Staaten von Nordamerika gebildet ist.” A similar suggestion can be found three quarters of a century earlier in the writings of George Washington and Benjamin Franklin. Richter goes on to note (*Ibid.* 5–6) that what is meant is not a simple adoption of the “form” of American government, but of its inner “Prinzip.” The American “form” of republicanism, in Richter’s eyes, left something to be desired. Not least of its formal defects, according to Richter, was the persistence of slavery in the Southern states—an institution which had already been abolished in England, despite its being a monarchy.

¹³ Richter comes close to mentioning Philo, in his later works, in *Reisen nach Nordamerika*, 2.8, wherein he quotes the *bon mot*: “Wer der griechischen Literatur, besonders der alexandrinischen, mächtig ist, recht gut weiß, wo und wann das Neue Testament geschrieben worden ist” (emphasis added). Cf. *idem*, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 1.vii, wherein Richter urges beginners in theology “ut Philonem praeter ceteros omnes summa diligentia minibus volent...Ex his quoque quivis theologiae vere studiosus, si accurate eos cum libris N. T. et scriptis Patrum contulerit, discet, quis verior sit theologiae nostrae dogmaticae fons, et qua de causa haec a simplicissima illa religione, quam Jesu eiusque discipulis debemus, in multis differat” (emphasis original). See also *Reisen nach Nordamerika*. 1.320, note 1, where Richter mentions the Therapeutae as an early Christian group, which contributed to the confusion of the Sabbath

his late work, *The United States of Europe*, with a reference to the *failed* Roman attempt to unify the continent and the Mediterranean through war and political force.¹⁴ In another late work, *Travels to North America*, Richter praises the 19th century educational system in the United States as better resembling the culture of the Ancient Greek schools (including those of the Pythagoreans, Orphics, Socratics, and Neoplatonists) than its European counterparts. This estimation arises from the role played by the working classes in American education, as well as from its privatization of religious instruction.¹⁵ In assessing this particular mark—that Americans do not enforce religion “from above” through state channels, but leave this up to families and private schools—Richter might well have looked to Philo’s example in Roman Alexandria and his description of the ideal government as δημοκρατία.¹⁶ He does not, however, mention the Alexandrian explicitly in his discussion of American “Sabbath schools,”¹⁷ although he does reference Paul’s private Jewish education in this connection and elsewhere mentions the Therapeutae.¹⁸ Richter’s study of classical antiquity, including the Jewish plight under Gaius and the Flavians, gave him examples of the difficulties involved in brokering a lasting political peace in Europe, as well as a positive vision of authentic education in the liberal state. Further work remains to be done on this topic—alas, not in the present paper.

ii. Overview of the Philo Schwickert Edition and Its Contributions

I move now to an assessment of Richter’s Schwickert edition, looking especially to his primary prefaces to the editions of Josephus and Philo.¹⁹

and the Lord’s Day. His source is obviously not Philo, but as he says, V. Copernicanus, “Entstehung des Christenthums,” 181ff.

¹⁴ Richter, *Die Vereinigten Staaten von Europa*, 5–6. See also idem, *Reisen nach Nordamerika*, 1.170, where Richter attempts to disabuse European readers from imagining the United States as a New Macedonia or a New Rome; it is truly republican, not monarchical. No mention, however, is made to Philo or Josephus in these general anti-typological remarks.

¹⁵ Richter, *Reisen nach Nordamerika*, 1.298–99: “Wer bildete jene moralisch religiösen Vereine, der Pythagoriker, Orphiker, Sokratiker, und Neuplatoniker seit 400 BC nach AD 200? Wer war Sokrates, wer waren die Sophisten, wer waren so viele noch bekannte und unbekannt, um ihre Zeit hochverdiente Philosophen ihrem Gewerbe nach? Handwerker waren sie größtentheils....Was waren Paulus und seine Gehilfen, Apollo von Alexandrien und so viele Andere, die alle, jeder nach seinem Theile, zur Stiftung dieses welthistorischen Vereins beitrugen? Ebenfalls Handwerker.” It is understandable that Philo is not explicitly mentioned in this context, given his aristocratic origins; he is likely in Richter’s thoughts, however, given the Zeitraum and description of philosophers mentioned.

¹⁶ For Philo on “democracy” as a name for the ideal government, see Ray Barraclough, “Philo’s Politics: Roman Rule and Hellenistic Judaism,” *ANRW II* 21.1 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1984), 417–553, esp. 520–23; David T. Runia, “The Idea and the Reality of the City in the Thought of Philo,” *Journal of the History of Ideas* 61 (2000): 361–379, esp. 367.

¹⁷ Richter, *Reisen nach Nordamerika*, 1.300–302.

¹⁸ Richter, *Reisen nach Nordamerika*, 1.309–10. For Richter’s reference to the Therapeutae, see note 13 above.

¹⁹ In addition to the primary prefaces, Richter wrote a secondary preface for his Philonic edition to introduce the Armenian material (see *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 6.246–49). I address this secondary preface in section ii.e below.

a. Size and Description

Richter's *Opera omnia* is comprised of 8 volumes—two volumes more than his earlier edition of Josephus. Each volume is roughly 2 cm in width by 17 cm in height. As Richter mentions in the preface to Josephus,²⁰ these volumes are meant to be affordable and useable, especially for those new to the study of theology and Hellenistic Judaism. It is fitting that the copy of Richter pictured here, which I was able to inspect at the Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek in Münster, was previously owned by the Institute for Mathematical Logic.

b. Improvements to The Greek Text

As Richter himself notes in his preface, he has not offered a new “critical” text of Philo, at least in the strongest Greek sense (κριτικῶς is the only Greek word used in Richter's preface). He has, on the whole, followed the text of Mangey, with which he compared the texts of Pfeiffer (itself following Mangey) and the 1640 Paris “vulgate” edition.²¹ Nevertheless, Richter continues, he has studied Mangey's text assiduously, “so that innumerable errors, with which the first editions are besmirched and which had not even been omitted in the books which Pfeiffer edited, might be purged.”²² Richter further indicates that he carried out this editorial work with the help of two assistants, Masters Lasch and Klotz. According to Leopold Cohn, however, Richter's modest brag still overstates his contribution. “Even if you overlook certain typographical errors and slips of the pen, there is little truth in his claim; for many errors of the previous editions return also in this [Richter] edition.”²³

c. Angelo Mai's 1818 Edition: On The Feast of the Basket and On Taking Care of Parents

If Richter's claim about his editorial improvement of the Philonic text is exaggerated, there can be no quibbling about the import of his next contribution: the inclusion of two new portions of the *De specialibus legibus*. As Richter recounts, he has made use of the recent work of Angelo Mai (Milan, 1818),²⁴ who had discovered in the Florentine library two unknown “opuscula” of Philo: *De cophini festo*, or *On the Feast of the Basket* (*Spec.* 2.215–223), an appendix to Philo's treatment of the fourth commandment; and *De parentibus colendis*, or *On Taking Care of Parents* (*Spec.* 2.224–262).²⁵ Richter highlights the inclusion of these new works on the first page of his preface to signal his pride at this addition.

²⁰ Richter, *Flavii Josephi Judaei opera omnia*, 1.viii: “ut inprimis tironibus theologiae, qui in academiis versantur, illos libros [sc. Josephi et Philonis] viliori pretio formaque commodiori emere liceat.”

²¹ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, vi; C-W 1.lxxix. Alongside the 1742 edition of Mangey, Richter seems to have consulted the 1640 “vulgate” edition of Turnèbe-Hoeschel-Gelen (G.-G. 402).

²² Ibid.: “ut mendis innumeris, quibus pristinae editions scatent...exceptis purgaretur.”

²³ CW 1.lxxix: “quod, si menda typographica et lapsus calami quosdam exceperis, parum vere dictum est, vitia enim pleraque editionum priorum in hac quoque redeunt.” Cohn (ibid.) gives copious examples of infelicities in the Richter edition of *De opificio mundi*, “which are easy to multiply.”

²⁴ See note 3 above.

²⁵ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, v.

The groundbreaking work behind Richter's improvement of the Mangey text had been done a decade earlier by Angelo Mai. Since no other paper in this seminar is to my knowledge devoted to Mai's 1818 edition, it will be beneficial here briefly to recount the history and contents of this work, which after Aucher's publication of Philo's Armenian corpus, represents the second most important Philonic textual discovery of the 19th century.²⁶

Angelo Mai was a Jesuit scholar, who in 1813 had become curator of the Ambrosiana library in Milan. The new position gave him the opportunity to visit various Italian libraries and peruse Byzantine manuscripts in search of lost texts. It was in one such Florentine manuscript, *Laurentianus plut. X, 20*, formerly *Mediceus* (hence abbreviated M),²⁷ that Mai discovered *De cophini festo* and *De parentibus colendis*.

Manuscript M had been known to scholars since the 18th century, when A. Cocchius, a Florentine physician, had been commissioned to collate it with the Turnèbe edition by Mangey in 1733.²⁸ Although the precise circumstances surrounding Cocchius's work remains unknown, it seems that the complete collation never reached Mangey; when one turns to the relevant place in the 1742 edition, *Spec. 2.214* is followed by a chapter break and then resumes with *Spec. 3.1*.²⁹ Although Mangey expected the missing material—or at least *Spec. 2d* (*Spec. 2.224–262*)—to be extant in M and hoped it would be supplied by Cocchius, apparently he never received it and thus did his best on this section working from the Bodleian and Augustanus manuscripts. Thus, at least, Mai himself conjectures at length in his editorial preface to the 1818 edition.³⁰ Mangey seems to have been completely ignorant of *De cophini festo*. Although he did, as Mai himself points out, know verbatim (how?) *Spec. 2.225* (a part of *De parentibus colendis*), the English Philonist suggests that this belongs in the discussion of the fifth commandment in *De decalogo*.³¹ Mai, to the contrary, on the basis of the sequence of M, proposed the insertion of both opuscula in the break between *Spec. 2.214* and *Spec.*

²⁶ So, e.g., CW 1.lxxviii–lxxix. In addition to these two texts, Mai also published a number of other Philonic fragments.

²⁷ For a description of this manuscript and its contents, see G.-G. 100.

²⁸ G.-G. 100 suggests that Cocchius did the collation as early as 1733—nearly a decade before Mangey's edition was published.

²⁹ See Mangey, *Philonis Judaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt*, 2.298–299. Mangey's omission is documented at precisely this page by Mai in his preface to *Philonis Judaei De cophini festo*, 1, note 1: "Huc usque locus extabat in londinensi Philonis edition anni MDCCXLII. T. II p. 298. Sequitur autem ibidem tractatus contra moechos atque homicidas Ἦν ποτε χρόνος ὅτε φιλοσοφία etc" i.e. *Spec. 3.1*.

³⁰ Mai, *Philonis Judaei De cophini festo*, xiv–xv: "Huius universi exemplaris collationem Mangeius a Cocchio expectabat, sed frustra. Quamvis enim Cocchius se hunc codicem anno MDCCXXXIII. manu tractavisse ibidem scriptum reliquerit; tamen (ut omittam fragmentum *de cophini festo*) neque locum *de colendis parentibus*, neque multo prolixiorum *de furto*, reapse in Angliam misisse videtur; quandoquidem Mangeius, ut diximus, et illum se desiderare ait, et hunc e codice bodleiano proferre: promittit autem, siquid e mediceo codice ad manus venerit, in extrema editione se daturum: iam quum nihil eiusmodi postea addiderit, sequitur ut nihil a Cocchio accepisse videatur."

³¹ Mangey, *Philonis Judaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt*, 2.199, note d; Mai, *Philonis Judaei De cophini festo*, 9, note 2.

3.1 at Mangey's p. 2.298.³² Richter's insertion of the two subtreatises at this locus in his 1828 edition followed the judgment of Mai.

d. Aucher's Latin Translations of the Armenian Philo

Of equal or greater moment than the insertion of Mai's two rediscovered Greek opuscula in *De specialibus legibus* is Richter's inclusion of Johann Baptist Aucher's Latin translations of Philo's Armenian works. Aucher, a Mechitarist father, had in the preceding half decade published two volumes of the Armenian Philo, including the Alexander dialogues (1822) and the *Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin et Exodum* (1826), of which Philonic scholars had previously only possessed fragmentary Greek evidence. Clearly, reprinting the Armenian texts would have gone beyond the modest goals of Richter's edition. For this reason, it is telling of both his vision and ambition that Richter decided nonetheless to include a wider range of treatises than Mangey (cf. Pfeiffer, who did not even print in his edition the entire range of the 1742 Greek treatises).

The Armenian treatises included in Latin translation by Richter are: QG 1–2 in volume six; QG 3–4, QE 1–2; Ps.-Philo *De Sampson* and *De Jona*; and the fragment from *De Deo* in volume seven; and the Alexander dialogues, *De providentia* 1–2 and *De animalibus*, in volume eight. Richter inverted the chronological order in which Aucher's publications appeared, placing the contents of the 1826 *Paralipomena armena* (volumes six and seven) before the contents of the 1822 *Tres sermones* (volume 8).

As an introduction to these significant Latin works, Richter wrote a secondary preface, which he situated in the middle of sixth volume after the Greek Philonic fragments.³³ He begins gratuitously by praising again Angelo Mai, whose contribution he ranks—perhaps for not totally objective reasons—as the primary achievement of 19th century Philonism. Richter then moves on to the second-place contributor, Aucher. What the former gave to Philonic scholarship in virtue of his prowess in Greek and Latin letters, the latter has given in his Latin translations of the Armenian.³⁴ As Richter summarily opines: “These [are the accomplishments of] the Italians.”³⁵

Richter's estimation of Aucher's accomplishment, according to his secondary preface, was mixed. While the Mechitarist father had undoubtedly done the scholarly world a service through his accuracy, Richter remained critical of Aucher's Latin as at times too wooden, violating what he calls *latina consuetudo*, or the proprieties of *latinitas*.³⁶ As a result, Richter published a redaction of

³² Mai, *Philonis Judaei De cophini festo*, 1, note 1: “Porro quidquid huic a me editur, id in codice medico inter praedictos editionis londinensis locos [i.e. inter pp. 298 et 299] insertum est.”

³³ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 6.246–49. This secondary preface bears the title: “Philonis Iudaei opera, quae in linguam Armeniam translata restant, latine reddita ab Io. Baptista Aucher.”

³⁴ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 6.246–47.

³⁵ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 6.247: “Haec Itali.” Lit. “These things, Italians [accomplished].”

³⁶ Richter, *Philonis Judaei opera omnia*, 6.247: “quum videremus Aucherum verba Armenia latine bene accurateque quidem expressisse, sed interdum in aperta vitia, quae facerent contra latinam consuetudinem, incidisse....”

Aucher's Latin. To give a sense for these corrections, I present in table one a list of Richter's emendation of Aucher in *QG* 1.1–8.

Table One: Richter's Emendations of Aucher's Latin Philo

	QG	Armenian	Aucher	Richter
1	§1.1	N/A	cum	quum
2	§1.2	N/A	Deus	deus
3	§1.2	ստնէր	fecerit	fecisse eum
4	§1.3	աղբիւրաբար	adinstar fontis	instar fontis
5	§1.3	նշ գամենայն	<i>optime vero dicitur et illud, non totam (terram), sed faciem eius irrigasse.</i>	<i>Optime vero dicitur et illud, (fontem) non totam (terram), sed faciem eius irrigasse.</i>
6	§1.3	զգլխաւորն գառաջնորդական	<i>sicut in animante principem moderatorem (mentem)</i>	<i>sicut in animante principem moderatorem (mentem vel vultum)</i>
7	§1.3	աւգնականութիւն	adjuvamen	adiumentum
8	§1.4	N/A	ac	atque
9	§1.4	N/A	Deo	deo
10	§1.4	եւ խառն էր	<i>ita ut commixtum fuerit</i>	<i>ita ut commixtum esset</i>
11	§1.6	այլեւ երիցազունին	sed quoque maioris	sed maioris quoque
12	§1.6	եւ զգործն	et opera sua	eiusque opera
13	§1.7	իսկ ադին անուն փոխեալ ³⁷	Adin autem nomen interpretatum	Adin (Edem) autem nomen explicatum
14	§1.8	N/A	<i>Nonnulli dixerunt, putantes nempe paradisum hortum esse, quod nimirum quia creatus ille sensibilis est, ergo jure meritoque in sensibilem locum pergit.</i>	<i>Nonnulli dixerunt, quum paradisum hortum esse putarent, quia creatus ille sensibilis sit, ergo eum iure meritoque in sensibilem locum pergere.</i>
15	§1.8	պէտք ուսման եւ վարդապետութեան	opus habens doctrinae ac disciplinae	opus habens doctrina ac disciplina

Richter's emendations of Aucher in these *Quaestiones* fall into five general categories: 1) capitalization or respelling of a single word;³⁸ 2) the use of a synonym in the translation;³⁹ 3) the addition of new parenthetical words to ease reading or provide an alternative interpretation;⁴⁰ 4)

³⁷ NBHL renders փոխեալ as ἀλλάσσω, ἀλοιόω (muto), μεταβάλλω (transmuto, permuto).

³⁸ Table one, numbers 1, 2, 9.

³⁹ Table one, numbers 4, 7, 8, 13.

⁴⁰ Table one, numbers 5, 6, 13.

morphological and stylistic improvements;⁴¹ and 5) the transformation of an original Armenian direct discourse into a Latin indirect discourse with the infinitive.⁴² Richter's corrections seem to have been made almost exclusively for the sake of style and Latinity. His revisions bring the text further from the Armenian *Vorlage*. For example, Richter's rendering in number 11, "sed maioris quoque" instead of "sed quoque majoris," eliminates the syntax of the Armenian conjunction ալլև. Similarly, his opting for the "ablative of separation" (Allen and Greenough §401) in number 15 supplants Aucher's preservation of the Armenian genitives. His retranslations of Armenian direct discourse into Latin indirect discourse read like composition exercises and are equally fastidious; these include Richter's introduction of the subjunctive for dependent clauses in *oratio obliqua*. Given the aims of his edition—to make Philo's writings accessible to a wide readership of beginners—such changes are commendable, even if they miss the nuances of Aucher's contribution. In only one instance, number 10, does Richter's emendation of the Latin perfect ("fuerit") to the imperfect subjunctive ("esset") nudge the Latin closer to the Armenian original imperfect (եր). On the whole, however, Richter gives no sense of having attempted to consult the Armenian original.

e. Richter's Argumenta and Paragraph Numbers

We come now to the perhaps unintentionally most enduring element of the Schwickert edition: its paragraph numbers and their correlative argumenta. All scholars of Philo encounter in the Cohn-Wendland edition a confusing double system of numeration—one Roman, one Arabic. Fewer scholars (until recently, myself included) recognize that the Roman paragraph numbers, introduced by Richter, are keyed in to one-sentence summaries of their contents, which Richter strung together as argumenta at the beginning of each Philonic treatise.

Surveying these argumenta from the horizon of Richter's editorial work, an immediate point of salience emerges: whereas Richter's argumenta in his Josephus edition are written in Greek,⁴³ the argumenta for Philonic treatises were composed in Latin. Richter clarifies his rationale for this extra scholarly labor at several points: he wishes to make Philo's volumes more accessible to the beginning reader. This is because the Alexandrian's works are, in his estimation, the most important comparanda to for students of New Testament and Early Christian theology, which facilitate a grasp of "their true font" even as they evince key differences from "the religion of Jesus."⁴⁴ Richter thus took special care that each treatise of Philo could be surveyed, in case it warranted more detailed study.

Despite the important achievement of rendering the general content of Philo's works accessible to a wider audience, Richter's paragraph numbers and argumenta have serious limitations, both at the level of Philo's works as a whole, as well as at the level of the individual treatise. The problem for the analysis of the *corpus Philonicum* when viewed generally can be illustrated from the data of table two, in which I have tallied, side by side, the number of Richter paragraphs in each treatise from the

⁴¹ Table one, numbers 10, 11, 12, 15.

⁴² Table one, numbers 5, 14.

⁴³ Richter, *Flavii Josephi Judaei opera omnia*, (e.g.) 1.3 and 1.62, for the argumenta of *Ant.* 1 and 2, respectively.

⁴⁴ Richter, see note 13 above. This was a point which he maintained throughout his life, and reiterates in the *Reisen nach Nordamerika*.

first four volumes of his edition (excluding *Spec.*). Alongside these numbers, I have supplied the Cohn-Wendland paragraph numbers, and calculated, in the final column, the average number of CW-Sections per Richter paragraph for each treatise.

Table Two: Selected Richter Paragraphs Compared with Cohn-Wendland Sections

Richter Treatise	Richter Pages	Richter Primary Biblical Lemma	Richter Paragraphs	CW §§	Ratio CW/Richter
<i>Opif.</i>	1.3–4	Gen 1, 1 sqq.	61	172	2.8
<i>Leg. 1</i>	1.59–60	Gen 2, 1 sqq.	33	108	3.2
<i>Leg. 2</i>	1.91–92	<Gen 2,18. 3, 1.>	26	108	4.1
<i>Leg. 3</i>	1.123–126	Gen 3, 8 sqq.	90	253	2.8
<i>Cher.</i>	1.197–198	Gen 3, 24. 4, 1.	35	130	3.7
<i>Sacr.</i>	1.230–231	Gen 4, 2. 3.	40	139	3.4
<i>Det.</i>	1.267–268	Gen 4, 8–16.	48	178	3.7
<i>Post.</i>	2.3–4	Gen 4, 16–26.	54	185	3.4
<i>Gig.</i>	2.50–51	Gen 6, 1–4	15	67	4.4
<i>Deus</i>	2.65–66	Gen 6, 4–12	37	183	4.9
<i>Agr.</i>	2.104–105	Gen 9, 20	40	181	4.5
<i>Plant.</i>	2.143–144	Gen 9, 20	42	177	4.2
<i>Ebr.</i>	2.181–182	Gen 9, 20	53	224	4.2
<i>Sobr.</i>	2.231	none	13	69	5.3
<i>Conf.</i>	2.247–248	Gen 11, 1–9	38	198	5.2
<i>Migr.</i>	2.291–292	Gen 12, 1–6	39	225	5.7
<i>Her.</i>	3.3–4	Gen cap. 15 totum	62	316	5.0
<i>Congr.</i>	3.70–71	Gen 16, 1–6	31	180	5.8
<i>Fug.</i>	3.109–110	Gen 16, 6–14	38	213	5.6
<i>Mut.</i>	3.156–157	Gen 17, 1–22	48	270	5.6
<i>Somn. 1</i>	3.213–214	Gen 28, 12 sqq.	43	256	5.9
<i>Somn. 2</i>	3.268–269	Gen 37 et 41.	45	302	6.7
<i>Abr.</i>	4.3–4	none	46	276	6.0
<i>Jos.</i>	4.59–60	none	44	270	6.1
<i>Mos. 1</i>	4.114–115	none	60	334	5.5
<i>Mos. 2</i> (2.1–66)	4.185	none	12	66	5.5
<i>Mos. 3</i> (2.67–292)	4.199–200	none	39	226	5.7
<i>Decal.</i>	4.246–247	none	33	178	5.3

What is clear from surveying the final column of table two is that ratio of CW sections per Richter paragraph increases throughout the treatises of the Allegorical Commentary. Whereas in the Adam and Cain cycles, there are on average 3.4 or 3.5 Cohn-Wendland sections per Richter paragraph; in the Noah cycle this ratio increases to 4.5; in the Abraham cycle, it rises again to 5.5; and in *De somniis*, the ratio reaches its zenith at 6.3. While mathematically this phenomenon could result either from Richter increasing the length of his paragraphs or from CW gradually adding more sections, given

the law of entropy and Richter's editorial habits the former scenario seems more likely. Richter's practice of giving one-sentence summaries of the main ideas of Philo argument becomes increasingly more difficult as the exegetical complexity of Philo's treatises develops. A procedure which worked in some measure well for *De opificio mundi* or even the *Legum allegoriae* is far less useful when dealing with the "middle" and "longer" treatises of the Allegorical Commentary, such as those in the Noah cycle or *De somniis*.

Both the achievement and limitation of Richter's method comes into sharper focus when we examine in detail his summary of a single treatise. Below I have given as an example a translation of Richter's argumentum for one of Philo's more complex allegorical treatises, *De mutatione nominum*. In addition to the paragraph numbers, which Richter supplies, I provide the CW numbers.

Joy, the best of the good emotions, is provided to Abraham in his one hundredth year of age (Isaac is born), because this number is known for perfection. We often hear that God has not been seen by human beings, lest we should think that <this might be accomplished> by the eyes of the body rather than of the mind; for God is not able to be perceived either by the senses or by a proper name [*nomen proprium*]. Nevertheless, so that human beings might not lack inwardly [*penitus*] a means of addressing Him [*appellatio*], He took care that He might be called God "of the three natures", of which Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob present themselves as signs (I–IV; §§1–38). This God orders us equally to honor Himself and his works, in which consists the totality of virtue (V–VI; §39–53). If we have missed this mark, we may nonetheless hope that God will grant us Himself as lord (the highest good), so long as we have confessed our sins to him. If He has granted this to us, the names of those who have come to their right mind are changed. The lives of Abraham and Sarah (VII–XI; §§54–80) and Jacob (XII et XIII; §§81–87) offer examples of this point. Isaac's name is not changed, because he is a symbol of perfect, self-taught virtue (XIV; §§88–90). The name of Joseph, Psonthom phaneg, is then explained (XV; §§91–96), as are the significances of the name Ephraim and others (XVI; §§97–102); likewise, the name of Raguel <receives> a double <interpretation> (XVII–XX; §§103–120), and the name of Moses a triple <interpretation> (XXI–XXII; §§121–129). Isaac is a symbol of divine Reason, which is rightly called "son of god", whereas the god of Moses is the man (ἀνὴρ) of a virtuous mind, whose symbol is Leah (XXIII–XXIV; §§130–140). It is not many sons, but one son of Sarah whose birth is foretold; for what is beautiful and true is not multiple but one (XXV–XXVI; §§141–147). Nevertheless, Sarah is called the mother of the nations, because virtue is practiced in various and manifold affairs (XXVII; §§148–150); wise kings arise from her, such as proceed from the study of virtue; for only the wise man is a king (XXVIII; §§151–153). By the laughter of Abraham and Sarah, an internal joy is indicated, which we feel beforehand, which the seeds of wisdom and virtue cause to blossom within us (XXIX–XXXII; §§154–174). The fact that Abraham falls on his face indicates that even the wisest human being totters on occasion; for mortals cannot preserve a faith in God that is fixed at every time (XXXIII; §§175–180); human virtue is limping and crippled (XXXIV; §§181–185). Isaac's birth to Abraham when he reached the one-hundredth year of life indicates that the absolute good is born to perfect numbers (XXXV–XXXVII; §§186–209). We ought especially to pray with Abraham that the divine decrees (Ishmael) might always be strong in us (XXXVIII; §§210–215), for by obeying these we will keep our rationality pure (XXXIX–XL; §§216–232). It

is explained, how our faults in thoughts, words, and deeds are to be expiated (XLI–XLIII; §§233–251). It is to be hoped that the self-learned virtue (the son of Sarah), which is the best <kind>, might flourish in our souls; for <this kind of virtue> never varies, but is most thankful to God <XLIV–XLVIII; §§252–270>.

How are we to weigh the contribution of Richter’s argumentum and paragraph numbers at the level of the individual Philonic treatise? Cohn is characteristically negative in his assessment, judging that, contrary to Richter’s claim, the new paragraph numbers do not facilitate reading, but in fact interrupt, obscure, or rupture certain connective ligaments in the Philonic text.⁴⁵

My own estimation is cautiously more mixed. On the one hand, when reading Richter’s argumentum of *De mutatione nominum*, it becomes clear that the paragraph numbers were never meant to function on their own, but are parts of a larger analytical schema. It is remarkable that Richter correctly identifies the first chapter of the treatise—paragraphs I–IV; §§1–38—along the same fault-line as later commentators. An assessment of Richter’s contribution thus cannot rest on the paragraph numbers alone, as Cohn seems to do, but needs to take into account their contextualization within their respective argumenta. Additionally, when reading Richter’s argumentum of *De mutatione nominum*, it is noteworthy that most of the major themes in the treatise are presented clearly. Even certain important rhetorical details, such as the double exegesis of Jethro/Raguel followed by the triple exegesis of Moses (“Raguelis nomen duplex, Moysisque triplex”), which concludes the central chapter of the treatise, feature in the summary.

Looking at Richter’s analysis of the entire treatise, however, further considerations arise. Taking his parentheses in the argumentum as headings, one can ascertain that Richter divided *De mutatione nominum* into roughly twenty-one chapters. The synoptic comparison of his analysis of the treatise alongside those of some modern commentators in table three will give a decidedly mixed view of Richter’s accomplishment.

Table Three: Synopsis of Richter Paragraphs and Modern Analyses

Modern Chapter (Cover)	Richter Paragraph Clusters	Cover	Arnaldez ⁴⁶	Cohn ⁴⁷
1	I (1-6)	1-2	1-2	1-38
		3-10	3-17	
	II (7-14)	11-17	18-38	
	III (15-26)	18-26 (σός)		
	IV (27-38)	27-29 (θεός)		
		30-38 (σός)		

⁴⁵ CW 1.lxxix: “nam paragraphis suis textum interdum omnino depravit, cum sententias artissime inter se conexas discerperet.”

⁴⁶ Roger Arnaldez, *De Mutatione Nominum*, PAPM 18 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1964), esp. 27–30.

⁴⁷ Leopold Cohn, “Über die Namensänderung,” in *Philo von Alexandria: die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. 2nd ed., 7 vols. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962), 6.104-162.

Modern Chapter (Cover)	Richter Paragraph Clusters	Cover	Arnaldez ⁴⁶	Cohn ⁴⁷		
2	V (39-46)	39-53	39-46	39-46		
	VI (47-53)		47-51	47-51a		
			52-53	51b-53		
3	VII (54-56)	54-56	54-57	54-56		
4	VIII (57-62)	57-59	57-59	57-59		
5	IX (63-68)	60-129	60-129	60-129		
	X (69-76)					
	XI (77-80)					
	XII (81-82)					
	XIII (83-87)					
	XIV (88-90)					
	XV (91-96)					
	XVI (97-102)					
	XVII-XX (103-120)					
XXI-XXII (121-129)						
6	XXIII-XXIV (130-140)	130-153	130-147	130-147		
	XXV-XXVI (141-147)					
	XXVII (148-150)				148-150	148-150
	XXVIII (151-153)				151-153	151-153
7	XXIX-XXXII (154-174)	154-174	154-175	154-174		
8	XXXIII (175-180)	175-200	176-200	175-200		
	XXXIV (181-185)					
	XXXV-XXXVII (186-209)					
9	XXXVIII (210-215)	201-251	201-252	201-252		
	XXXIX-XL (216-232)					
	XLI-XLIII (233-251)					
10	XLIV-XLVIII	252-260	252-260	253-260		
11	(252-270)	261-263	261-263	261-262		
				263		
12		264-269	264-269	264-266		
				267-269		
13		270	270	270		

The data of this more detailed analysis in table three reveals the limitations of Richter's analysis. While Richter's first two paragraph clusters align with modern chapters one and two, his subdivisions of these chapters diverge from more recent assessments. Richter's analysis of the remainder of the treatise varies widely from the modern chapter divisions. Richter was clearly a

scholar writing before the exegetical turn in Philonic studies; for this, we should not fault him to greatly, but neither should we follow him uncritically.

Despite the imperfections of his analysis, however, Richter's instinct to provide summarial argumenta was a good one, which has been followed *inter alios* by F. H. Colson in the Loeb edition. Richter's enduring legacy is one which can be embraced with caution. As scholars continue to harvest the fruits of the exegetical turn in Philonic studies, Richter's argumenta remain imperfect reminders that Philo's commentaries are also thematic treatises, whose rhetorical unity or disunity remains an open question.