

THE PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA
SCRIPTURE INDEX

STUDIA PHILONICA MONOGRAPHS

Editor
Michael B. Cover

Number 9



THE PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA SCRIPTURE INDEX

Sean A. Adams and Zanne Domoney-Lyttle



SBL PRESS

Atlanta

Copyright © 2023 by Sean A. Adams and Zanne Domoney-Lyttle

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2023942610

Contents

Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	xi
Introduction.....	1

Scriptural Citations and Allusions in Philo's Treatises

<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin et Exodum</i>	13
<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesin 1–4</i>	13
<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum 1–2</i>	21
The Allegorical Commentary	23
<i>Legum allegoriae 1–3</i>	23
<i>De cherubim</i>	28
<i>De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i>	29
<i>Quod deterius potiori insidiari soleat</i>	30
<i>De posteritate Caini</i>	32
<i>De gigantibus</i>	34
<i>Quod Deus sit immutabilis</i>	34
<i>De agricultura</i>	36
<i>De plantatione</i>	37
<i>De ebrietate</i>	38
<i>De sobrietate</i>	39
<i>De confusione linguarum</i>	40
<i>De migratione Abrahami</i>	42
<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit</i>	44
<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>	46
<i>De fuga et inventione</i>	48
<i>De mutatione nominum</i>	50
<i>De Deo</i>	53

<i>De somniis</i> 1–2	53
The Exposition of the Law.....	57
<i>De vita Mosis</i> 1–2	57
<i>De opificio mundi</i>	62
<i>De Abrahamo</i>	63
<i>De Iosepho</i>	64
<i>De decalogo</i>	67
<i>De specialibus legibus</i> 1–4	68
<i>De virtutibus</i>	78
<i>De praemiis et poenis</i>	79
The Philosophical Treatises.....	81
<i>Quod omnis probus liber sit</i>	81
<i>De providentia</i> 1–2	81
<i>De animalibus</i>	82
<i>De aeternitate mundi</i>	82
<i>De numeris</i>	82
The Apologetic and Historical Treatises.....	82
<i>De vita contemplativa</i>	82
<i>Hypothetica</i>	82
<i>In Flaccum</i>	83
<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>	83

Scripture Index

Genesis	85
Exodus	108
Leviticus	120
Numbers	126
Deuteronomy	132
Joshua	139
Judges	139
1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel)	139
3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)	140
4 Kingdoms (2 Kings)	140
1 Chronicles	140
2 Chronicles	140

Esther	140
Job	140
Psalms	140
Proverbs	141
Ecclesiastes	141
Isaiah	141
Jeremiah	142
Ezekiel	142
Daniel	142
Hosea	142
Zechariah	142
Wisdom of Solomon	142
Sirach	143
Bibliography	145

Acknowledgments

Some colleagues have assisted in the creation of this index by making comments or giving us access to current work. We would like to thank William D. Ashworth, Adam Kamesar, Justin Rogers, James R. Royse, Gary Edward Schnittjer, Joan E. Taylor, and Abraham Terian. Substantial feedback was given by the *Studia Philonica* series editors, especially Michael Cover, Gregory E. Sterling, and David T. Runia. Their comments have made substantial improvement to this project.

We dedicate this book to our nieces and nephews, who bring us joy:

Elizabeth Alexandria Adams
Ethan James Adams

and

Willow Anja Tunnock
Jack Paul Crawford
Nell Zanne Law-Lyttle

Abbreviations

Philonic Works

<i>Abr.</i>	<i>De Abrahamo</i>
<i>Aet.</i>	<i>De aeternitate mundi</i>
<i>Agr.</i>	<i>De agricultura</i>
<i>Anim.</i>	<i>De animalibus</i>
<i>Cher.</i>	<i>De cherubim</i>
<i>Conf.</i>	<i>De confusione linguarum</i>
<i>Congr.</i>	<i>De congressu eruditionis gratia</i>
<i>Contempl.</i>	<i>De vita contemplativa</i>
<i>Decal.</i>	<i>De decalogo</i>
<i>Deo</i>	<i>De Deo</i>
<i>Det.</i>	<i>Quod deterius potiori insidior soleat</i>
<i>Deus</i>	<i>Quod Deus sit immutabilis</i>
<i>Ebr.</i>	<i>De ebrietate</i>
<i>Flacc.</i>	<i>In Flaccum</i>
<i>Fug.</i>	<i>De fuga et inventione</i>
<i>Gig.</i>	<i>De gigantibus</i>
<i>Her.</i>	<i>Quis rerum divinarum heres sit</i>
<i>Hypoth.</i>	<i>Hypothetica</i>
<i>Ios.</i>	<i>De Iosepho</i>
<i>Leg.</i>	<i>Legum allegoriae</i>
<i>Legat.</i>	<i>Legatio ad Gaium</i>
<i>Migr.</i>	<i>De migratione Abrahami</i>
<i>Mos.</i>	<i>De vita Mosis</i>
<i>Mut.</i>	<i>De mutatione nominum</i>
<i>Opif.</i>	<i>De opificio mundi</i>
<i>Plant.</i>	<i>De plantatione</i>
<i>Post.</i>	<i>De posteritate Caini</i>
<i>Praem.</i>	<i>De praemiis et poenis</i>

<i>Prob.</i>	<i>Quod omnis probus liber sit</i>
<i>Prov.</i>	<i>De providentia</i>
<i>QE</i>	<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Exodum</i>
<i>QG</i>	<i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim</i>
<i>Sacr.</i>	<i>De sacrificiis Abelis et Caini</i>
<i>Sobr.</i>	<i>De sobrietate</i>
<i>Somn.</i>	<i>De somniis</i>
<i>Spec.</i>	<i>De specialibus legibus</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	<i>De virtutibus</i>

Other Primary Resources

<i>De or.</i>	Cicero, <i>De oratore</i>
<i>Inst.</i>	Quintilian, <i>Institutio oratoria</i>
<i>Prog.</i>	Theon, <i>Progymnasmata</i>

Secondary Resources

ALGHJ	Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums
CCS	Cambridge Classical Studies
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum: Series Graeca
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios bíblicos</i>
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FR(H)	fragment from James Rendel Harris, <i>Fragments of Philo Judeaus</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886.
FR(L)	fragment from Hans Lewy, "Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius: Mit einem Anhang; Neugefundene griechische Philonfragmente." <i>SPAW</i> 4 (1932): 23–84.
FR(P)	fragment from Françoise Petit, <i>Quaestiones et solutiones in Genesim et in Exodum, Fragmenta Graeca: Introduction, texte critique et notes</i> , PAPM 33. Paris: Cerf, 1978.
FR(M)	fragment from Ralph Marcus, ed. and trans., <i>Questions on Exodus</i> , LCL 401. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953.
JAJSup	Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements

JSJSup	Supplements to Journal for the Study of Judaism
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LES	Penner, Ken M., ed. <i>The Lexham English Septuagint</i> . Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2019.
NETS	Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint</i> . Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NIV	New International Version
NRSVue	New Revised Standard Version, Updated Edition
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
PACS	Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series
PAPM	<i>Les oeuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie</i> . French edition and translation under the general editorship of Roger Arnaldez, Jean Pouilloux, and Claude Mondésert. Paris: Cerf, 1961–1992.
<i>Phil</i>	<i>Philologus</i>
PLCLSup	supplement volumes to Francis H. Colson, George H. Whitaker, and Ralph Marcus, trans. and eds., <i>Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)</i> . LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
SBB	Stuttgarter biblische Beiträge
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SPAW	<i>Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften</i>
SPhA	Studies in Philo of Alexandria
SPhiloA	<i>Studia Philonica Annual</i>
SVTG	Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum
<i>Text</i>	<i>Textus</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>

Introduction

This *instrumentum* is an index of identified allusions to and citations of Scripture in the extant corpus of Philo of Alexandria. Components of this work have been undertaken previously by scholars, particularly J. W. Earp, in the Loeb Classical Library; Jean Allenbach and his colleagues, as a supplement to *Biblia Patristica*; and Hans Leisegang, in volume 7 of the critical edition published by de Gruyter.¹ We appreciate their work and have drawn from their scholarship. In previous indices, Philo's scriptural references have been organized by biblical book, and although this organizational structure is useful, it does not allow for the study of Philo's engagement with Scripture in individual treatises or to interrogate how intertexts are collected and grouped by Philo. For this reason, in this study we provide two indices. The first is structured on Philo's treatises

1. J. W. Earp, "Indices to Volumes I–X," in *Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*, ed. Francis H. Colson, George H. Whitaker, and Ralph Marcus, 12 vols., LCL (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962), 10:189–520; Jean Allenbach et al., eds., *Biblia Patristica: Supplément, Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1982). See Hans Leisegang, *Indices ad Philonis Alexandrini opera*, vol. 7 of *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1926), 29–43; Günter Mayer, *Index Philoneus* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974). One of the earliest collections is Herbert Edward Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture: Or, the Quotations of Philo from the Books of the Old Testament, with Introduction and Notes* (London: MacMillan, 1895). On the problems of index making, see Wolfgang Reister, "Zur Problematik eines Philo-Index," *ZRGG* 27 (1975): 166–68.

We have taken as our starting point Allenbach's index and are deeply indebted to him and his team. However, we have also evaluated each entry to determine its veracity and have added new entries identified by us and other scholars. We have also added references to *De animalibus*, which were not included in Allenbach's study. These are taken from Abraham Terian, *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus: The Armenian Text with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism 1 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981). We also note that no allusions or citations have been found in *De numeris*.

and organized by corpus (*Quaestiones et solutiones*, Allegorical Commentary, Exposition of the Law, and Philosophical/Historical Works), and the second is organized by biblical book.² We hope that having two different arrangements will facilitate the study of Philo not only in identifying which passages are referenced but also how they are grouped together and arranged in the construction of each treatise.

There are some important limitations to this work. First, we do not engage with the *catenae* or the *florilegia*.³ Second, we did not provide references to works wrongfully attributed to Philo, such as the Latin *Liber antiquitatum biblicarum* and the Armenian sermons *De Sampson* and *De Jona*.⁴ Third, we limit our study to the critical edition of Philo and do not specifically evaluate the manuscripts. This final decision, we think, has a minimal impact for this project but is important to take into account as the diversity of manuscripts and their impact on readers is becoming more recognized in scholarship.⁵

2. We have also included allusions found in Philo's fragments edited by Harris, Lewy, Petit, and Marcus: James Rendel Harris, *Fragments of Philo Judeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1886); Hans Lewy, "Neue Philontexte in der Überarbeitung des Ambrosius: Mit einem Anhang; Neu gefundene griechische Philonfragmente," *SPAW* 4 (1932): 23–84; Françoise Petit, *Quaestiones in Genesim et in Exodum, Fragmenta Graeca: Introduction, texte critique et notes*, PAPM 33 (Paris: Cerf, 1978); Ralph Marcus, ed. and trans., *Questions on Exodus*, LCL 401 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), 234–37. Fragments from each are marked in the indices by FR(H), FR(L), FR(P), and FR(M), respectively, and use the edition or page number and line of the respective work.

3. On which, see James R. Royse, *The Spurious Texts of Philo of Alexandria: A Study of Textual Transmission and Corruption with Indexes to the Major Collections of Greek Fragments*, ALGHJ 22 (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 14–25 and 26–58, respectively. For a critical edition, see Françoise Petit, *Catena Sinaïtica*, vol. 1 of *Catena Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, 2 vols., CCSG 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1977).

4. See Pierre-Maurice Bogaert, Charles Perrot, Jacques Cazeaux, and Daniel J. Harrington, *Les Antiquités Bibliques*, 2 vols., SC 229–230 (Paris: Cerf, 1976); Johann Baptist Aucher, *Philonis Judaei paralipomena Armena: Libri videlicet quatuor in Genesin; Libri duo in Exodum; Sermo unus de Sampson, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus* (Venice: Lazari, 1826).

5. Sean A. Adams, "Treatise Order in the Greek Codices of Philo of Alexandria: Lists, *Pinakes*, and Manuscripts," *SPhiloA* 34 (2022): 1–31; see also James R. Royse, "The Biblical Quotations in the Coptos Papyrus of Philo," *SPhiloA* 28 (2016): 49–76. For the critical editions of the Greek, see Leopold Cohn, Paul Wendland, and Siegfried Reiter, eds., *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*, 6 vols. (Berlin: Reimer,

An index appears deceptively straightforward, but there are many theoretical decisions that need to be made in its creation. For example, to which biblical text does Philo allude, and what referencing system should we employ? Given that Philo made almost exclusive use of Greek Scripture, we have decided to use Septuagint references rather than those assigned to the Hebrew.⁶ As a result, some of the references below do not align with chapter and verse numbers in English translations (e.g., NIV, NRSVue). For most of the biblical books, including the Pentateuch, the chapter and verse numbers are identical. However, there are some sections of Exodus, Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, and Psalms that are markedly different. We encourage readers to keep this in mind when using this tool.⁷

Which Greek text(s) Philo had access to further complicates this study.⁸ Although he cites Greek Scripture, Philo's quotations do not always align with those found in modern critical editions. The foundational work in this regard is *Philo's Bible*, in which Peter Katz identifies "aberrant" readings in Philo, the consistency of which suggests that Philo had an alternate form of the Pentateuch.⁹ More recently, Gregory Sterling has returned to the question of Philo's Septuagint text; taking *Legum allegoriae* as his test corpus, he argues that Philo knew a different, freer version of the Septuagint than that reconstructed by John W. Wevers.¹⁰ Although we are not

1896–1915); Leopold Cohn et al., eds., *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*, 7 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1909–1964).

6. In some places the allusion is not found in the LXX but in the Hebrew. We have signaled this with [MT].

7. For a complete list of differences, see appendix B (pp. 265–68) in *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014). For those who do not read Greek, we suggest the use of an English translation of the Septuagint in which the Septuagint verse numbering is retained (e.g., LES or NETS).

8. For a summary of the modern debate over septuagintal origins and revisions, see Emanuel Tov, "The Septuagint," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, ed. Martin Jan Mulder, CRINT 2.1 (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1988), 161–88.

9. Peter Katz, *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Biblical Quotations in Some Philonic Writings and Its Place in the Textual History of the Greek Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 96.

10. Gregory E. Sterling, "Which Version of the Greek Bible Did Philo Read?," in *Pentateuchal Traditions in the Late Second Temple Period: Proceedings of the International Workshop in Tokyo, August 28–31, 2007*, ed. Akio Moriya and Gohei Hata, JSJSup 158 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 89–127; Olivier Munnich, "Les retouches faites aux lemmes bibliques dans le Commentaire allégorique de Philon d'Alexandrie: Bilan et

able to reconstruct Philo's scriptural text with certainty, we can say with confidence that he does not always choose to quote the Septuagint exactly. In other words, Philo felt free to make changes to the scriptural text (e.g., omitting words, changing word order) in order to suit his exegetical purpose. Subsequent studies have sought to identify specific recensions expressed in surviving Philonic texts.¹¹ Although this is a valid line of scholarly inquiry, it does not feature in the indices. Ultimately, we took the Göttingen Septuagint volumes, including their references to manuscript variants, as our primary point of comparison and depended on Rahlfs-Hanhart's *Septuaginta* for books not yet published in that series, such as 1–4 Kingdoms.¹²

Another decision that needed to be made was the criteria by which we would identify quotations of Scripture. Definitions of and criteria for determining quotations vary among scholars.¹³ Our intention in this study

proposition,” in *Les études philoniennes: Regards sur cinquante ans de recherche (1967–2017)*, ed. Olivier Munnich and Sébastien Morlet, SPHa 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2021), 137–83. John W. Wevers is responsible for editing the Greek Pentateuch for the Göttingen series. For Genesis, see John W. Wevers, ed., *Genesis*, SVTG 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974).

11. E.g., Paul Wendland, “Zu Philos Schrift *de posteritate Caini* (nebst Bemerkungen zur Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta),” *Phil* 57 (1898): 248–88, especially 284–87 (Lucianic); Dominique Barthélemy, “Est-ce Hoshaya Rabba qui censura le ‘Commentaire allégorique’? A partir des retouches faites aux citations bibliques, étude sur la tradition textuelle du Commentaire Allégorique de Philon,” in *Philon d’Alexandrie: Lyon 11–15 Septembre 1966, colloques nationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique*, ed. Roger Arnaldez, Claude Mondésert, and Jean Pouilloux (Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1967), 45–78, repr. in Dominique Barthélemy, *Études d’histoire du texte de l’Ancient Testament*, OBO 21 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 140–73, with additional notes on 390–91.

12. For a recent summary of this series and a discussion on its future, see Felix Albrecht, “Report on the Göttingen Septuagint,” *Text* 29 (2020): 201–20. See also Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart, eds., *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006).

13. Jacques T. A. G. M. van Ruiten, “Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund von Apocalypse 6:12–17,” *EstBib* 53 (1995): 243–44 (minimum two words); Beate Kowalski, *Die Rezeption des Propheten Ezechiel in der Offenbarung des Johannes*, SBB 52 (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2004), 61–62 (two words minimum, except for *hapax legomena* between the citing and anterior texts); Armin Lange and Matthias Weigold, *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*, JAJSup 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011), 25 (minimum three words).

For an important differentiation and comparison of shared versus nonshared lan-

is not to contribute to this debate but to identify places in Philo's corpus where he clearly cites the biblical text. In what follows we have marked with an asterisk (*) instances where Philo signals that he is drawing from Scripture and/or when there are, at a minimum, two words from the source text cited together in Philo's text.¹⁴ Placing a word limit on Philo's citations is problematic because he regularly uses one Greek word to refer-

guage, see Jeffery M. Leonard, "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case," *JBL* 127 (2008): 241–65. Important discussions are currently being undertaken on the nature of paraphrase and intertextuality, including one's ability to differentiate paraphrase and citation. See, for example, Maren R. Niehoff, *Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 38–57; Richard A. Zaleski, "Both Literal and Allegorical: Paraphrastic Biblical Exegesis in Gregory of Nyssa's and Philo of Alexandria's *Lives of Moses*" (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 2020), 33–58. Paraphrase also constituted an important element in literary education. For examples, see Cicero, *De or.* 1.154; Theon, *Prog.* 1, 15; Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.9.2–3. See also Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, CCS (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 202–26.

14. To be clear, these two Greek words need to match exactly with the source text (as reconstructed) and do not include lexical variations (such as paraphrase). The two words include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and some particles (e.g., prepositions and negations) but not articles or conjunctions. References that lack an asterisk include instances where there are one or zero words/lexemes from the source text.

The two-word criterion is primarily for Philo's Greek texts. For texts extant primarily or exclusively in Armenian (i.e., *QG*, *QE*, *De Deo*, *De animalibus*), we have depended on quotation indications from the translators. For Philo's use of titles for scriptural books, including the Pentateuch (*Aet.* 19), see Helmut Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften bei Philo von Alexandrien*, 2nd ed., TVG Monographien und Studienbücher 340 (Giessen: Brunnen, 1992), 73–74, 136–37, preceded by B. Pick, "Philo's Canon of the Old Testament and His Mode of Quoting the Alexandrian Version," *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* 4 (1884): 126–43. For example, to reference the Psalms, Philo identifies them as "Hymns" (e.g., ἐν ὕμνοις εἶρηται or ἐν ὕμνοις λέγεται; see *Conf.* 52; *Migr.* 157; *Fug.* 59). See also Christiane Böhm, *Die Rezeption der Psalmen in den Qumranschriften, bei Philo von Alexandria und im Corpus Paulinum*, WUNT 2/437 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 100–103. In the index we note instances where Philo references the book as a whole with the entry "title."

Philo's citation practice assumes that his readers are acquainted with the Pentateuch. Rarely is the name of Moses mentioned prior to a citation or allusion, but most citations are simply introduced by the words "he says" or "it is said," if they are introduced at all. In contrast, Philo introduces the author of the Psalms as a "divinely inspired man" (ὁ θεσπέσιος ἀνὴρ, *Plant.* 29; cf. *Spec.* 1.8) and "a member of the sacred band of Moses" (ὁ τοῦ Μωυσεως δὴ θιασώτης, *Plant.* 39). See Jutta Leonhardt, *Jewish*

ence a passage (e.g., referencing Jer 3:4 in *Cher.* 51 through the mention of *παρθενία*). Indeed, there are many instances in Philo's corpus in which he is clearly drawing upon and/or citing a biblical text but in a way that disperses words from his source text, namely using two or more words but separating them. A good example is Philo's use of Gen 11:30 in *Mut.* 143. Although there is a clear signal for the reader ("the Scriptures introducing...") and two words are cited (*Σάρρα ... στειῖρα*), we have not marked this as a citation because the words are separated. This lack of citation mark is not meant to imply that Philo did not intentionally draw from Gen 11:30 or that he did not signal his use to his reader. Rather, the complexity of citation and determining its limitation is challenging. Setting the bar at two consecutive words is not ideal, but we thought that a consistent criterion was preferable to not having one.¹⁵

One challenge for anyone considering Philo's engagement with Scripture is ambiguity. This is a substantial issue for any intertextual endeavor, especially when discussing Jewish Scripture, as many verses in the Pentateuch are similar, sometimes identical.¹⁶ For example, in *Agr.* 82 Philo quotes a phrase from Exodus, but the same words are found in Exod 15:1 and 15:21.¹⁷

Worship in Philo of Alexandria, TSAJ 84 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 148–49; David T. Runia, "Philo's Reading of the Psalms," *SPhiloA* 13 (2001): 111–12.

Philo also uses genre expectations as a means of signaling quotations, specifically the practice of introducing a lemma at the beginning of a commentary. For example, in *Leg.* 1.1 Philo does not introduce the initial citation of Gen 2:1. Similarly, *Leg.* 1.2 does not introduce the citation of Gen 2:2. Rather, the citation is formally signaled by the genre of the text and the silences around the citation's borders. For a discussion of ancient commentaries, see Sean A. Adams, *Greek Genres and Jewish Authors: Negotiating Literary Culture in the Greco-Roman Era* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020), 92–110.

15. Our decision to mark citations with an asterisk is not meant to elevate citation over other forms of intertextuality (e.g., allusion, paraphrase, rewriting), nor does it imply that allusion is the norm for Philo. Rather, the use of the asterisk for citations is for convenience; there are fewer citations than allusions.

16. E.g., the Ten Commandments in Deut 5:6–21 and Exod 20:1–17. Another example is Isa 48:22 and 57:21, the words of which are cited in *Mut.* 169. Here Naomi Cohen has rightly argued that Isa 57:21 is to be preferred as the likely source, but we have included both for consistency. See Naomi G. Cohen, *Philo's Scriptures: Citations from the Prophets and Writings; Evidence for a Haftarah Cycle in Second Temple Judaism*, JJSJSup 123 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 84–85.

17. This overlap is not noted by Colson. Geljon and Runia note it in Philo's dif-

Agr. 82

ἔστι δὲ τοιοῦσδε· ἄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται· ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν·

It is of this sort: “Let us sing unto the Lord, for gloriously he has been glorified; horse and rider he threw into the sea.”

Exod 15:1

τότε ᾄσεν Μωυσῆς καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ τὴν ᾠδὴν ταύτην τῷ θεῷ καὶ εἶπαν λέγοντες ἄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται· ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν·

The Moses and the sons of Israel sang this song to God and said, “Let us sing unto the Lord, for gloriously he has been glorified; horse and rider he threw into the sea.”

Exod 15:21

ἐξῆρχεν δὲ αὐτῶν Μαριάμ λέγουσα ἄσωμεν τῷ κυρίῳ, ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται· ἵππον καὶ ἀναβάτην ἔρριψεν εἰς θάλασσαν·

And Miriam took their lead, saying “Let us sing unto the Lord, for gloriously he has been glorified; horse and rider he threw into the sea.”

This lexical overlap poses a challenge for scholars seeking to tally the number of allusions and citations within an author’s corpus. Another example is the substantial overlap between Exod 31:2–4 and 35:30–31, the former of which is cited (almost) exactly by Philo (*Gig.* 23, 27, and 47; *Plant.* 26–27). The way that Allenbach treats this overlap implies that there are two quotations rather than one. This practice creates a numerical problem for modern scholars but was not an issue for ancient authors.

ferentiation in *Agr.* 80 and their translation on *Agr.* 82 but not in the commentary on that verse. See Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria, On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 177. In *Agr.* 82, Philo assigns the song to both choirs, which minimizes the ambiguity of reference and indicates his intention to reference both verses, a “double reference.” The hymn is also referenced in *Leg.* 2.102 (although this passage specifically mentions Moses, which would incline the reader to identify Exod 15:1 as the text alluded to and so resolve the possible ambiguity) and *Somn.* 2.269 (which makes no specification and so has maximum ambiguity). Another example is the overlap between Lev 17:11 and 14 (ἡ γὰρ ψυχὴ πάσης σαρκὸς αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐστίν), cited in *Det.* 80. Here Philo marks the ambiguity of his reference with the adverb *πολλαχοῦ*.

Rather, it is a distinctive element of intertextual signaling that an author could exploit.¹⁸ The way that our first index is organized allows for multiple citations/allusions to be grouped in order to show the possible impact of Philo's compositional practice. In the second index, the overlap will appear as separate entries. This could lead to errors when attempting to tally the number of times Philo cites or alludes to a specific biblical book (discussed below).¹⁹

Sometimes Philo uses legal phrases from the Pentateuch that could activate a number of intertextual passages. For example, in *Leg.* 1.107 Philo states that Moses "says 'by death dying'" (λέγει θανάτω ἀποθανεῖν), a phrase that does not specifically align with any phrase in the Pentateuch but is a variant of the Greek rendering of a Hebrew infinitive absolute. The discussion is in the context of Gen 2:17 (θανάτω ἀποθανεῖσθε) but could be thought to include similar renderings, such as θανάτω θανατούσθω (Exod 21:12 and *passim*). In these cases, we have limited our index to only the first reference (Gen 2:17) because of contextual constraints and the closer similarity of language. However, we recognize that additional connections could be made by readers both modern and ancient.

The nature of Philo's use of Scripture is complex, and identifying allusions can be challenging. For instance, should one identify a scriptural allusion in a passage when Philo makes an allusion to Scripture on that topic in a different treatise? A concrete example of this is Philo's declaration in *Virt.* 6 that the virtuous person will be supplied with the "wealth of nature" (τῆς φύσεως ... πλοῦτον). In this section there is not a clear allusion to Scripture. However, in his parallel discussion in *Somn.* 1.124–226, Philo explicitly alludes to Gen 28:20. The attentive reader of Philo (cf. *Virt.* 17) will make this connection, but it might not be clear from the localized context. To avoid overcomplication, we decided not to pursue or include serial allusions/citations in this project. The interconnectivity of Philo's corpus, however, lends itself to seeing such connections, and through subsequent studies new allusions can be added to this tool.

18. See Don Fowler, "On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies," *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 39 (1997): 13–34, esp. 16 and the possibility of one-to-one or one-to-many intertextual connections.

19. E.g., Gregory E. Sterling, "The People of the Covenant or the People of God: Exodus in Philo of Alexandria," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Thomas B. Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr, VTSup 164 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 404–39, esp. 412.

Another challenge of indicating passages alluded to and cited is specificity. In the following lists we provide the full range of verses when a whole story is referenced as well as specific verses referenced or quoted. Indeed, Philo does not need to use many words to create a textual connection but can refer to an event or story in a single word. Both specificity and generality can be present in a section. For example, in *Det.* 14 Philo references Abraham's defeat of the kings (Gen 14:1–16) but specifically discusses Abraham's three-hundred-plus servants (14:14). As a result, the entry in the first index reads: Gen 14:1–16, 14. Both entries are included in the second index, resulting in an inflated number of citations/allusions attributed to each book.

We decided to be inclusive in two other regards. First, passages that contain allusions to or citations of Scripture but are thought by scholars to be interpolations into Philo's text are included but placed in square brackets (e.g., *Virt.* 208, Gen 27:[16], [23]). Second, we have kept references to Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon in the index.²⁰ Scholars have rightfully identified content or contextual overlap, but we are not always convinced that Philo alluded to them intentionally. Nevertheless, we retain them in order to facilitate subsequent research and have not made localized judgments.

Although we think this volume makes an important contribution, we recognize that this index is an artificial separation of Philo's intertextual practices. We would posit that Philo was an equally close reader of all texts and did not differentiate his citation and allusion practices based on the sacredness of the text under consideration. However, this is not part of the argument of this work. Rather, this index can contribute to the debate by making comparisons more accessible. As a result, the fullest picture of Philo's practice of allusions and citations necessitates the combination of this index with those produced by others on Philo's use of "secular" or nonscriptural texts.²¹ Accordingly, we direct the reader to use this index in conjunction with those of his nonscriptural texts.

20. For other possible parallels to the deuterocanonical books, derived from the edition of Thomas Mangey, see Ryle, *Philo and Holy Scripture*, 303–5. See also Thomas Mangey, *Philonis Judaei opera quae reperiri potuerunt omnia*, 2 vols. (London: William Humphrey, 1742).

21. See Earp, "Indices," 269–433 (index of names) and 434–86 (translators' notes); Leisegang, *Indices*, 3–26 (*index nominum*); David Lincicum, "A Preliminary Index to Philo's Non-biblical Citations and Allusions," *SPhiloA* 25 (2013): 139–67;

Overall, we have identified 2,203 citations and 5,628 allusions, for a total of 7,831 intertextual biblical references (see table 1). These numbers are a fair representation, although one should recognize several caveats. First, allusions and citations are based on their placement within Philo's treatises and are constrained by modern section breaks. As a result, if an allusion is situated on both sides of a break, it is counted twice. Second, as discussed above, this number is inflated, since a word or phrase can activate multiple source texts. Third, these numbers differ, sometimes substantially, from previous tallies due to the adoption of different approaches. For example, Allenbach's index identifies 4,303 intertextual connections for Genesis, 1,755 for Exodus, 737 for Leviticus, 586 for Numbers, and 834 for Deuteronomy.²² Allenbach's higher tally is a result of listing multiple allusions/citations for a Philonic section. Such additional information can be helpful, especially for Philo scholars, but it does raise the question of where the influence of an allusion ends and where a second allusion begins. We are not convinced that such a level of granularity was present in Philo's compositional awareness. As a result, we identify only passages in which an allusion/citation occurs. Another factor for higher tallies is that Allenbach regularly has two entries for allusions from *QG* and *QE* due to multiple extant versions. This also results in a higher number of references in these treatises. Our decisions result in a decrease in the number of Philo's references to Genesis and Exodus, especially because multiple instances were found in Philo's *QG* and *QE*. On the other hand, the number of explicit links to Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy—works for which Philo did not compose a questions-and-answers treatise—are slightly higher in this index than Allenbach's. The reason for this is not clear, although it is likely to be because scholars continue to identify new possible allusions, and these have been incorporated in this index.

A second difference between this work and Allenbach's is that we combine ranges of allusions into one entry. To illustrate: Allenbach iden-

Erkki Koskeniemi, *Greek Writers and Philosophers in Philo and Josephus: A Study of Their Secular Education and Educational Ideals*, SPhA 9 (Leiden: Brill, 2019); James R. Royle, "Some Overlooked Classical References in Philo," *SPhiloA* 32 (2020): 249–55.

22. These tallies from Allenbach et al. were provided by Gregory E. Sterling, "When the Beginning Is the End: The Place of Genesis in the Commentaries of Philo of Alexandria," in *The Book of Genesis: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*, ed. Craig A. Evans, Joel N. Lohr, and David L. Petersen, VTSup 152 (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 436–38; and Sterling, "People of the Covenant," 410.

tifies allusions to Gen 1:1, 2, and 3 in *Opif.* 29. We agree, but instead of having these as three separate entries we combine them into one entry: Gen 1:1–3.²³ Given that Philo’s Bible did not have the verse differentiations common today, we think that a range sufficiently communicates the content without inflating the numbers.

Table 1: Quotations and Allusions in Philo’s Corpus

	Quotations	Allusions	Total
Genesis	1,297	2,399	3,696
Exodus	413	1,191	1,604
Leviticus	119	644	763
Numbers	128	517	645
Deuteronomy	188	672	860
Joshua ²⁴	0	4	4
Judges	1	5	6
1 Kingdoms	12	21	33
3 Kingdoms	1	6	7
4 Kingdoms	0	2	2
1 Chronicles	0	16	16
2 Chronicles	0	2	2
Esther	0	1	1
Job	1	6	7
Psalms ²⁵	21	30	51

23. In contrast, when completing our scriptural index, we did not condense the Philonic ranges but gave them separately. This was primarily to allow for the differentiation between citation and allusion. For example, there are allusions to Gen 2:8 identified in *Leg.* 1.45 and 1.46 but a citation in *Leg.* 1.47. An entry of *Leg.* 1.45–47 would not allow for differentiation, so we decided to leave all identifications as individual entries.

24. For nonpentateuchal citations, see Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften*, 134–37.

25. For other tallies of Psalms quotations in Philo, see Runia, “Philo’s Reading of the Psalms,” 104–9, who counts twenty citations of Psalms (two are combined in *Migr.* 157); Böhm, *Die Rezeption der Psalmen*, 86–91.

	Quotations	Allusions	Total
Proverbs	5	22	27
Ecclesiastes	0	2	2
Isaiah	8	17	25
Jeremiah	5	16	21
Ezekiel	0	7	7
Daniel ²⁶	0	1	1
Hosea	3	4	7
Zechariah	1	1	2
Wisdom of Solomon	0	32	32
Sirach	0	10	10
Total	2,203 ²⁷	5,628	7,831

26. This allusion is cautiously proposed by Van der Horst, who recognizes that this would be the only identified allusion to Daniel in Philo's corpus. See Pieter Willem van der Horst, *Philo's Flaccus: The First Pogrom; Translation, Introduction, and Commentary*, PACS 2 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 239.

27. Compare with 1,161 biblical citations in Philo according to Burkhardt, *Die Inspiration heiliger Schriften*, 134.