School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1411955

Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors

Volume III

Aristobulos

Carl R. Holladay

The Library
of the
School of Theology
at Claremont

1325 North College Avenue
Claremont, CA 91711-3199
1/800-626-7820

FRAGMENTS FROM HELLENISTIC JEWISH AUTHORS

SBL

Society of Biblical Literature

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS
PSEUDEPIGRAPHA SERIES

edited by
Martha Himmelfarb

Texts and Translations 39
Pseudepigrapha Series 13

FRAGMENTS FROM HELLENISTIC JEWISH AUTHORS
VOLUME III
ARISTOBULUS

BS
1197
.F68
1983
v.3

Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors

Volume III

Aristobulus

by
Carl R. Holladay

Scholars Press
Atlanta, Georgia

Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors

Volume III

Aristobulus

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOG
AT CLAREMONT
California

by
Carl R. Holladay

© 1995
Society of Biblical Literature

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish authors.

(Texts and translations, 0145–3203 ; no. 20, 30, 39 Pseudepigrapha series, 0145–3238 ; no. 10, 12, 13)
English and Greek.
Includes bibliographies.
Contents: v. 1. Historians—v. 2. Poets— v. 3. Aristobulus.
1. Bible. O.T. History of Biblical events. 2. Greek literature, Hellenistic—Jewish authors. 3. Greek literature, Hellenistic—Translations into English.
I. Holladay, Carl R. II. Series: Texts and translations; 20, etc.
III. Series: Texts and translations.
Pseudepigrapha series ; no. 10, etc.
BA1197.F68 1983 880.8'08924'009015 79-18090
ISBN 0-891-30349-9 (pbk. : v. 1)
ISBN 1-55540-317-4 (v. 2 : alk. paper)
ISBN 1-55540-318-2 (pbk. : v. 2: alk. paper)
ISBN 0-7885-0119-4 (hard : v. 3)

Printed in the United States of America
on acid-free paper



To Abe Malherbe

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE.....ix

INTRODUCTION.....1

Manuscripts.....1
Symbols Used in Apparatus Criticus.....4
Abbreviations Used in Apparatus Criticus.....5
Bibliography—Sources for the Fragments.....7
Bibliography—General.....17
Bibliography—Abbreviations.....38
Other Abbreviations.....41

ARISTOBULUS.....43

Introduction.....43
Notes to Introduction.....76
Bibliography—Aristobulus.....97
Index to Editions and Translations.....107
Testimonia.....114
Fragments—Texts and Translations.....127
Fragment 1.....128
Fragment 2.....134
Fragment 3.....150
Fragment 4.....162
Fragment 5.....176
Annotations.....198

INDICES.....242

PREFACE

This third volume of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* contains the extant fragments of Aristobulus, the earliest known Jewish philosopher. I had intended to include with this volume the pseudo-Orphic material and the pseudonymous Greek poets, but because of the size of this volume these will be treated in subsequent volumes. A comprehensive index to all the volumes will be included in the final volume.

Several persons have been unusually helpful in the preparation of this manuscript, but none more than Nikolaus Walter whose *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos* (1964) still remains the definitive work in the field. He very generously supplied me with the preparatory notes and early drafts of his own edition of these fragments begun in the late 1960's. He has cooperated with me at every stage of my work, giving freely of both his time and resources. Especially memorable are the visits to his home in Naumburg/Saale in both 1991 and 1995 when I not only enjoyed the hospitality of his family, but also consulted with him on many text-critical and other interpretive questions. These consultations have been invaluable.

Once again, Pieter van der Horst has been a willing, and, as always, resourceful reader. Many parts of the manuscript are more accurate because of him. I am also indebted to Martha Himmelfarb, the series editor, for her careful reading of the manuscript and many helpful suggestions.

Many years ago in a seminar devoted to these texts at Yale, Ben Fiore prepared the initial translation of the texts from Eusebius. This has provided the basis for my translation, although I have made many changes. Like all students of Aristobulus, we have relied heavily on Gifford. Numerous Emory graduate students have assisted at various stages, especially Boyd Whaley, Steve Pattison, and John Cook. Ron Heine, Director of the Institut zur Erforschung des Urchristentums in Tübingen, has also assisted me on a number of technical points, including translation.

Portions of the manuscript were presented before the Philo Group at the 1993 SBL Annual Meeting in Washington, D.C. It also served as the basis for a lecture at Bar Ilan University in Tel Aviv (Ramat Gan) in

1995. I am grateful to Greg Sterling and Al Baumgarten respectively, both for the invitations that made these forums for discussion possible and their assistance with various technical questions.

The bulk of this work was completed during two periods of leave from Candler School of Theology at Emory University—the first, in 1990–91, under the deanship of Jim L. Waits, and the second, in 1994–95, under his successor, Kevin LaGree. I gratefully acknowledge their support of this research.

The completion of this project was made possible by a Fulbright grant that supported my research at Eberhard-Karls Universität in Tübingen during the 1994–95 academic year. I wish to thank the Fulbright Commission for its support of this project, and the members of the Commission staff in Bonn for their efforts in making my stay in Germany both productive and enjoyable.

In Tübingen, I owe a special debt of gratitude to Martin Hengel who has enthusiastically supported this project. No one will be surprised that he has been generous with his time and knowledge. Marianne Hengel has also afforded many occasions of hospitality that have made our stays in Tübingen memorable. I also thank Peter Stuhlmacher, my host for the year in Tübingen, who made available to me the considerable resources of the Theologicum, most notably a place to work in the "Direktor's Villa." To the Kolbs and Moltmanns I also owe a word of thanks for their own special forms of hospitality extended to my family and me.

Finally, I wish to thank the Akademie-Verlag in Berlin for permission to reprint the various GCS texts.

Tübingen
June 30, 1995

INTRODUCTION

The introduction to the first volume of *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors* still serves to set these fragments in their historical context. It also treats the history of the transmission of the texts, in particular the textual history of Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*, in which most of these fragments are preserved. Other text-critical matters are also dealt with there.

The following sections describing the manuscripts, text-critical sigla, and text-critical abbreviations have been adapted from the first two volumes to fit the contents of this volume. The bibliographies from the first two volumes, both the Bibliography of Sources as well as the General Bibliography, have been repeated here, but modified, supplemented, and updated. The abbreviation lists have been modified only slightly, but expanded to include additional items and authors referred to in this volume, especially in the apparatus criticus.

Manuscripts

The primary source for the fragments of Aristobulus is Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*, although Frg. 1 is supplied by Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica*. Several of the fragments, or portions thereof, are also found in Clement *Protrepticus* and *Stromateis*. Since these are the texts most frequently referred to in the apparatus criticus, the pertinent manuscript evidence for these authors is listed below:

1. Clement *Protrepticus*

M Mutinensis III D 7 (now No. 126), 10th–11th cent.
P Parisinus graecus 451, 914 CE
P* Original reading in P; corresponds to other MSS
P^{1} First hand (Baanes) in P
P^{2} Second hand (Arethas) in P
P^{3} Later hand in P; e.g. the writer of marginal notes

(See Stählin & Treu, GCS 12 [=56], vol. 1, p. 2; Mondésert, SC 2, p. 45.)

2. Clement *Stromateis*

L Laurentianus V 3, 11th cent.
L^{1} The original scribe who corrected many mistakes

L^2-L^3 Two younger hands who corrected many mistakes

Ath Cod. Athous (Codex Lawra B 113), 11th cent.

(See Stählin-Früchtel, GCS 15 [=52], vol. 2, pp. vii–xv and xvii.)

3. Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica*

Manuscripts

A Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1430, 11th cent.
  a Rome, Vaticana 399, copy of A
T Florence, Laurentiana 70, 7, 11th cent.
E Florence, Laurentiana 70, 20, 11th cent.
R Moscow, Bibliothek des H. Synod 50, 12th cent.
B Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1431, 11th–12th cent.
  b Venice, Marciana 339, copy of B
  β Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1432, copy of B
D Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale 1433, 11th–12th cent.
M Venice, Marciana 338, 12th–13th cent.
Π Text of the Greek manuscripts

The following sigla and abbreviations are used by Schwartz:

1 First hand (the original scribe ?)
c Old but distinctive correctors of the scribe
r Later correctors
m In the margin

Translations

Λ Rufinus
Σ Syriac translation (Wright and M'Lean, *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius in Syriac*, Cambridge, 1898; German translation by Nestle, TU, n.f. 6.2, Leipzig, 1901)
  Σ^a Manuscript in St. Petersburg
  Σ^b London, British Museum Add. 14639
  Σ^{arm} Armenian translation of the Syriac translation (Venice, 1877)
  Σ^e Excerpts, cf. Wright and M'Lean, p. VII.

(See E. Schwartz, ed., *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte*. Kleine Ausgabe. 2. Aufl. p. vi.)

4. Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*

A Parisinus graecus 451, 914 CE
B Parisinus graecus 465, 13th cent. (3rd quarter)
C Parisinus graecus 466, 16th cent.
D Parisinus graecus 467, 16th cent. (older than E)
E Parisinus graecus 468, 16th cent.
F Laurentianus Plut. VI 6, 15th cent.
G Laurentianus VI 9, 1344 CE
H Marcianus graecus 343, 11th cent.
I Marcianus graecus 341, 15th cent.
j Marcianus graecus 342, 1470 CE
N Neapolitanus graecus II AA 16, 15th cent.
O Bononiensis Univ. 3643, end of 13th cent.
V Batopedianus 180, 1335 CE

(See Mras, GCS 43.1 [=8.1], vol. 1, pp. XIII–LVIII, esp. p. LIX.)

5. In the apparatus criticus for Frg. 4.5 (pp. 164–71), and the annotations pertaining to this section (esp. n. 103), several additional witnesses are referred to. Since they have particular applicability to the Pseudo-Orpheus text, the full manuscript evidence for them, as well as a complete listing of abbreviations, is given in *FHJA* 4. To assist the reader in this section, we note the following abbreviations:

Cyr.	Cyril of Alexandria *Contra Iulianum*
EusA	Sections in *P.E.* where Eusebius quotes Aristobulus
EusC	Sections in *P.E.* where Eusebius quotes Clement
Ps.-J. *Coh.*	Pseudo-Justin *Cohortatio ad Graecos*
Ps.-J. *Mon.*	Pseudo-Justin *De Monarchia*
Theos. Tub.	Theosophia Tubingensis
Thdrt.	Theodoret *Graecarum Affectionum Curatio*

Symbols Used in Apparatus Criticus

< >	Conjectural addition (omitted in all MSS)
{ }	Conjectural deletion
[ ]	Lacuna(e) resulting from physical damage (full stops may be used to represent letter-spaces)
⟦ ⟧	Scribal deletion or erasure
` ´	Scribal correction
⌞ ⌟	Non-conjectural lacuna(e), that is, lacuna(e) whose content is known or can be supplied from another source (full stops may be used to represent letter-spaces)
†	Editorial indication of corruption in the text (corrupt phrase enclosed by † †; corrupt word preceded immediately by †)
α̣β̣γ̣δ̣	Letters deciphered with uncertainty
x	Stands in letter-space left by erasure
:	Separates variants within a variation unit; also stands after the unit from the text that introduces the variation unit
|	Separates variation units
?	Indicates editorial uncertainty
(!)	= (sic)
( )	Encloses parenthetical remarks
1 2 3	Designates first, second, third correctors (i.e., B^1, B^2 = B corrected by the original scribe, by the second hand, etc.)
.	Letter absent in MS(S)
*	Beside MS = original MS or MS before correction

(See M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* [Stuttgart: Teubner, 1973] 80–81.)

Abbreviations Used in Apparatus Criticus

abbrev.	=	*abbreviavit*
ac	=	*ante correctionem*
add.	=	*addidit*
aspir.	=	*aspiratus*
c	=	*correctores priores*
cett.	=	*ceteri*
cf.	=	*confer*
cj.	=	*conjecit*
cod.	=	*codex*
codd.	=	*codices*
corr.	=	*correxit*
del.	=	*delevit*
ditt.	=	dittography
ed(d).	=	*editio/-nes; editor/-es*
ed. pr.	=	*editio princeps*
emend.	=	*emendavit*
et al.	=	*et alii*
fort.	=	*fortasse*
frg(s).	=	fragment(s)
κτλ.	=	*καὶ τὰ λοιπά*
lac.	=	*lacuna*
lin.	=	line(s)
m.	=	*manus*
mg./marg.	=	*in margine*
MS(S)	=	manuscript(s)
mut.	=	*mutavit* or *mutilatus*
n/not.	=	note(s)
om.	=	*omisit*
p(p).	=	page(s)
par.	=	paragraph(s)
pc	=	*post correctionem*
praef.	=	*praefatio*
r	=	*correctores recentiores*
ras.	=	*rasura*
rec.(recc.)	=	*recentior*(*es*)

rest.	=	*restituit*
sq(q).	=	*sequens(-entes)*
ss	=	*supra scripsit*
superscr.	=	*superscripsit*
s.v.	=	*sub voce* (*verbo*)
transp.	=	*transposuit*
x	=	*rasura*
v.l.	=	*varia lectio*

(See Association Internationale des Etudes Byzantines, *Bulletin d'Information et de Coordination* 4 [1968] 24–31; also B. Aland, et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece* [27th ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1993] 776–79; H. P. Rüger, *An English Key to the Latin Words and Abbreviations and the Symbols of BIBLIA HEBRAICA SUTTGARTENSIA* [Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1981]).

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SOURCES

I. Collections of the Fragments.

A. Texts.

Müller, C. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum.* Paris, 1841–72. 5 vols. (=Müll., *FHG*)

Fragments of Alexander Polyhistor contained in vol. 3 (1849), pp. 206–44. Fragments "concerning the Jews," Nos. 3–24, arranged in the order in which they occur in *P.E.*, Bk. 9. Reprints Greek text and Latin translation from Gaisford.

Freudenthal, J. *Hellenistische Studien. Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdäischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke.* Breslau: H. Skutsch, 1874–75. 2 vols. (=Freu.)

Bulk of the work (vol. 2) devoted to detailed analysis and discussion based on Freudenthal's pioneering research on these authors. Miscellaneous notes, especially text critical, pp. 199–218. Freudenthal's text, with critical apparatus, pp. 219–36.

Stearns, W. N. *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908. (=Stearns)

Includes texts of most of the authors; reprints Heinichen's text; no translation. Introduction and fairly extensive notes of limited value.

Jacoby, F. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker.* Leiden: Brill, 1954–69. 3 vols. in 16 parts. (=Jac., *FGrH*)

The Jewish "historical texts" are contained in Teil III C, Band 2 (1958, repr. 1969), Nos. 722–37, pp. 666–713. Extensive critical apparatus at bottom of each page. For texts taken from *P.E.*, Jacoby uses Mras's text as a basis, but makes a few changes based on Freudenthal.

Denis, A. M. *Fragmenta pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca una cum historicorum et auctorum Judaeorum hellenistarum fragmentis* (published with M. Black, *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*). Leiden: Brill, 1970. (=Denis, *Frag.*)

The most comprehensive collection of fragmentary Hellenistic Jewish authors to date. Useful introduction, texts (pp. 61–228), minimal critical apparatus, indices of biblical references, ancient and modern authors. Useful introductory material and extensive bibliography of each author provided in Denis, *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'ancien testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1970. (=Denis, *Intro.*)

Bombelli, L. *I frammenti degli storici giudaico-ellenistici*. Genoa: Universita di Genova, dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni, 1986. (=Bombelli, *Frammenti*)

B. Translations.

English:

Charlesworth, J. H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85. (=Charlesworth, *OTP*)

German:

Riessler, P. *Altjüdisches Schrifttum ausserhalb der Bibel*. Augsburg: B. Filser, 1908; Heidelberg: F. H. Kerle, 1928; 2. Aufl. (unaltered), 1966. (=Riessler)

First comprehensive collection of pseudepigrapha in German. Arranged alphabetically by author and/or title. Notes, pp. 1266–1339.

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Historiker," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 1, "Historische und legendarische Erzählungen," Lfg. 2 (2. Aufl.; Gütersloh, 1980) 91–163. (=Walter, JSHRZ [1,2])

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Exegeten: Aristobulos, Demetrios, Aristeas," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 3, "Unterweisung in lehrhafter Form," Lfg. 2 (2. Aufl.; Gütersloh, 1980) 257–99. (=Walter, JSHRZ [3,2])

Vogt, E. "Tragiker Ezechiel," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 4,

"Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 113–33. (=Vogt, JSHRZ [4,3])

Walter, N. "Fragmente jüdisch-hellenistischer Epik: Philon, Theodotos," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 4, "Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 135–71. (=Walter, JSHRZ [4,3])

Walter, N. "Pseudepigraphische jüdisch-hellenistische Dichtung: Pseudo-Phokylides, Pseudo-Orpheus, Gefälschte Verse auf Namen griechischer Dichter," in W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., *Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, Bd. 4, "Poetische Schriften," Lfg. 3 (Gütersloh, 1983) 173–278. (=Walter, JSHRZ [4,3])

II. Individual Authors.

A. Eusebius, *Praeparatio Evangelica.*

Texts.

Stephanus, R. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis libri XV.* Paris, 1544. (=Estienne, Etienne, Stephens, Steph.)

The earliest edition of the Greek text of *P.E.* Based on MSS D & E. The page numbers of this edition appear in the margins of some subsequent editions.

Vigerus, F. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae Palaestinae episcopi Praeparatio Evangelica.* Paris, 1628. (=Viger, Vigier, Viguier, Vig.)

Contains text expertly revised by Viger, also his fresh Latin translation and annotations. His re-division of the chapters was adopted by later editions, especially Mras. The page numbers of this edition, with the additional a-d division, appeared in the margins of most subsequent editions, and became the most widely used system of reference.

Heinichen, F. A. *Eusebii Pamphili Praeparationis Evangelicae libri XV.* Leipzig, 1842–43. 2 vols. (=Hein.)

Reprints Greek text based on Stephanus and Viger. Underneath the text are printed Viger's critical notes, including textual notes, parallel references, explanations. Indices of authors, topics, and Greek words.

Gaisford, T. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV.* Oxford, 1843. 4 vols. (=Gais.)

Contains text revised by Gaisford, with full critical apparatus and Viger's Latin translation on each page. Vol. 4 contains Viger's notes (pp. 148–338), two appendices, one on Aristobulus by L. C. Valckenaer (pp. 339–451), another on the Orphic fragments by P. Wesseling (pp. 452–58), as well as indices of authors, biblical passages, names and subjects.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca* (21): *Eusebius Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopus* (3): *Praeparatio Evangelica.* Paris, 1857. (=*PG* 21)

Prints Viger's Greek text, notes, and Latin translation on each page. Greek and Latin in parallel columns. Appendices (cols. 1457–1666) contain notes by Seguier whose French translation of *P.E.* appeared in 1846. Indices of authors, names, and subjects.

Dindorf, W. *Eusebii Caesariensis Opera.* Teubner. Leipzig, 1867. 2 vols. (=Dind.)

Greek text based on previous editions, but advances earlier work. No critical apparatus and no annotations as announced in preface (pp. iv and xxiv–xxv). Indices of authors, biblical passages, and Viger's index of names and subjects.

Gifford, E. H. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationes Libri XV.* Oxford, 1903. 4 vols. in 5 parts. (=Giff.)

Greek text based on entirely new collation of MSS; used MS O for the first time. Significant advance over previous work. Vols. 1 & 2 contain Greek text with critical apparatus at bottom of each page; vol. 2 contains index of authors, biblical references, names and subjects based on Greek text. Vol. 3 (in two parts) contains English translation. Part 2 contains index based on English translation. Vol. 4 contains notes in English and index of Greek words.

Mras, K. *Die Praeparatio Evangelica.* Bd. 8, *Eusebius Werke.* Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller (=GCS), 43. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1954–56. 2 vols. (=Mras)

Standard Greek text of *P.E.* now in use. Based on collation of all available MSS and takes into account all previous editions. Corrects previous work. Introduction in vol. 1 (pp. xiii–lx) provides description of textual history, manuscript witnesses, editions, and introductory material to *P.E.* Extensive critical apparatus at bottom of each page. Extensive indices, including biblical passages, Christian and non-Christian authors, other works of Eusebius, names and subjects. Especially helpful Greek index including Greek terms as well as matters of Greek grammar and style.

des Places, E., J. Sirinelli, G. Schroeder, et al. *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique.* Sources chrétiennes (=SC), ed. C. Mondésert. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1974–.

Nine volumes have appeared to date: Book 1 (No. 206), Books 2–3 (No. 228), Books 4–5.17 (No. 262), Books 5.18–6 (No. 266), Book 7 (No. 215), Books 8–10 (No. 369), Book 11 (No. 292), Books 12–13 (No. 307), and Books 14–15 (No. 338). Various translators and contributors. Reprints Mras's text with facing French translation. Abbreviated critical apparatus at bottom of each page prepared by des Places. Vol. 1 contains useful introduction to *P.E.* and extensive commentary on Book 1 (pp. 212–323). Other volumes contain introductory material and notes.

Translations.

English:

Gifford, E. H. *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationes.* Oxford, 1903. Vol. 3 (Parts 1 & 2). See entry above.

French:

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca* 21: *Préparation évangélique; Démonstration évangélique.* Paris, 1843. 2 vols.

Séguier de Saint-Brisson (Marquis Nicolas-Maximilien-Sidoine). *Eusèbe Pamphile. La préparation évangélique. . . avec des notes critiques, historiques, et philologiques.* Paris: Gaume frères, 1846. 2 vols.

des Places, E., et al. *Eusèbe de Césarée. La préparation évangélique.* SC, 206, 215, 228, 262, 266, 292, 307, 338, 369. Paris, 1974 –. Books 1–15. See entry above.

Italian:

Tramezzino, Michele. *Evsebio Pamphilo Della preparatione euangelica*. Venice, 1550.

Latin:

Trapezunt, G. von. *Eusebium Pamphili de evangelica praeparatione latinum ex graeco beatissime pater iussu tuo effecti* . . . . Venice, 1470. Subsequent editions in 1473, 1480, 1497, 1500, 1501, 1522. (=George of Trebizond/Trepizond)

The first Latin translation of *P.E.*, based primarily on MS I.

Vigerus, F. *Eusebii Pamphili Caesareae Palaestinae episcopi Praeparatio Evangelica*. Paris, 1628. See entry above.

Viger's Latin translation appears in Gaisford, Müller, *FHG*, and Migne (*PG*).

B. Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica.*

Texts.

Stephanus, R. *Ecclesiasticae historiae Eusebii Pamphili libri X. Eiusdem de Vita Constantini libri V. Socratis libri VII. Theodoriti episcopi Cyrensis libri V. Collectaneorum ex Historia eccles. Theodori Lectoris libri II. Hermii Sozomeni libri IX. Evagrii libri VI.* Paris, 1544.

Valesius, Henricus. *Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem. Eiusdem de Vita imp. Constantini libri IV, quibus subjicitur Oratio Constantini ad sanctos et Panegyricus Eusebii. Henricus Valesius graecum textum collatis IV mss. codicibus emendavit, latine vertit et adnotationibus illustravit.* Paris, 1659. (=Henri de Valois)

Subsequent editions of Valesius' edition of Eusebius *Historia* were published in 1672 and 1677, but the most notable in Cambridge in 1720; also contained his edition of Socrates, Sozomen, and the other Greek historians.

Heinichen, F. A. *Eusebii Pamphili Historiae ecclesiasticae libri x, ex nova recognitione cum aliorum ac suis prolegomenis, integro Henrici Valesii commentario, selectis Readingi, Strothii*

aliorumque virorum doctissimorum observationibus edidit, suas animadversiones et excursus, indices. . . . Leipzig, 1827–28. 3 vols.

Burton, Edward. *Eusebii Pamphili Historiae ecclesiasticae libri decem, ad codices manuscriptos recensuit Eduardus Burton.* . . . Oxford, 1838. 2 vols.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca* (20): *Eusebius Pamphili Caesariensis Episcopus Historia Ecclesiastica.* Paris, 1857. cols. 45–906.

Reprints Valesius' 1720 edition.

Schwartz, E. *Eusebius Werke, Bd. 9: Die Kirchengeschichte.* GCS, 9. Leipzig, 1903–9. 3 vols. Vols. 1 & 2: texts; Vol. 3: introductions and indices.

Also contains Latin translation of Rufinus, edited by T. Mommsen.

Schwartz, E. *Eusebius Kirchengeschichte.* Kleine Ausgabe. 5. Aufl., unveränderter Nachdruck der 2. durchgesehenen Aufl. Leipzig, 1955.

Grapin, E. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique. Texte grec et trad. française.* Paris, 1905–13. 3 vols.

Lake, K. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History.* Loeb Classical Library (=LCL). London, 1926, 1932. 2 vols. Reprints GCS text.

Bardy, G. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique.* SC, 31 (1952), 41 (1955), 55 (1958). Paris, 1952–58. 3 vols.

Translations.

English:

Crusé, C. F. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphilus.* Translated from Greek with notes selected from the edition of Valesius. London, 1889.

McGiffert, A. C. *Later Post-Nicene Fathers.* Series 2. London, 1890. 1.73–387.

Lawlor, H. J., and J. E. L. Oulton. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History*. London, 1927–28. 2 vols.

Lake, K. *Eusebius. The Ecclesiastical History*. LCL. London, 1926, 1932. 2 vols. Vol. 2 reprints Oulton's translation.

French:

Seissel, C. *L'histoire ecclesiastique*. Paris, 1532.

Grapin, E. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*. Paris, 1905–13. 3 vols. See entry above.

Bardy, G. *Eusèbe de Césarée. Histoire ecclésiastique*. Sources chrétiennes, 31, 41, 55. Paris, 1952, 1955, 1958. 3 vols. See entry above.

German:

Hedio, Caspar. *Chronica, das ist: wahrhaftige Beschreibunge aller alten christlichen Kirchen; zum ersten, die hist. eccles. Eusebii Pamphili Caesariensis, Eilff Bücher;* et al. Frankfort-Main, 1582.

Stigloher, M. *Des Eusebius Pamphili zehn Bücher der Kirchengeschichte, nach dem Urtexte übersetzt*. TU, 21, Hft. 2. Leipzig, 1901.

Häuser, P. *Des Eusebius Pamphili. . .Kirchengeschichte aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*. Bibliothek der Kirchenväter, 2. Reihe (=BKV^2), 1. Munich, 1932.

Latin:

Rufinus, Tyrannius. *Ecclesiastica historia.*

According to Fabricius, Rufinus' Latin translation was first published in 1476 at Rome. *Bibliothèque Nationale*, however, lists other editions: Strassburg, ca. 1475–80; also Utrecht, 1474; Rome, 1476; Mantua, 1479; Strassburg, 1500.

Valesius, Henricus. *Eusebii Pamphili Ecclesiasticae historiae libri decem*. . . . Paris, 1659. See entry above.

Important subsequent edition in 1720.

Mommsen, T. *Eusebius Pamphili. Werke, Bd. 9: Die Kirchengeschichte. Die latinische Übersetzung des Rufinus.* Leipzig, 1903–9. 3 vols. Vol. 1 & 2: text; Vol. 3: introductions and indices.

C. Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus, Paedagogus, & Stromateis.*

Texts.

Sylburg, F. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera Quae Exstant.* Hieronymus Commelinus, 1592.

Migne, J. P. *Patrologia Graeca: Clemens Alexandrinus* (8–9). Paris, 1857. *Protrepticus*, 1.49–246; *Paedagogus*, 1.247–684; *Stromata I–IV*, 1.685–1382; *Stromata V–VIII*, 2.9–602.

Dindorf. W. *Clementis Alexandrini Opera.* Oxford, 1869. 4 vols. *Protrepticus*, 1.1–123; *Paedagogus*, 1.124–409; *Stromata I–IV*, 2.1–417; *Stromata V–VIII*, 3.1–378; Annotations, 4.1–461.

Stählin, O., L. Früchtel, and U. Treu. *Clemens Alexandrinus* GCS. 3 Bde. Berlin, 1909–72. (Bd. I: GCS 12 [=56], 3. Aufl., hrsg. U. Treu, 1972; Bd. II: GCS 15 [=52], 4. Aufl., hrsg. L. Früchtel, 1985; Bd. III: GCS 17 [=17²], 2. Aufl., hrsg. L. Früchtel & U. Treu, 1970). *Protrepticus*, 1.3–86; *Paedagogus*, 1.89–292; *Stromata I–VI*, 2.3–518; *Stromata VII–VIII*, 3.3–102.

Mondésert, C., et al. *Clément d'Alexandrie*. SC. 8 vols. Paris, 1944–81. C. Mondésert & A. Plassart, *Protreptique* (No. 2, 2ᵉ ed., 1949); C. Mondésert & M. Caster, *Les Stromates I* (No. 30, 1951); P. T. Camelot & C. Mondésert, *Les Stromates II* (No. 38, 1954); H. I. Marrou & M. Harl, *Le Pédagogue I* (No. 70, 1960); C. Mondésert & H. I. Marrou, *Le Pédagogue II* (No. 108, 1965); C. Mondésert & H.-I. Marrou, *Le Pédagogue III* (No. 158, 1970); A. Le Boulluec & P. Voulet, *Les Stromates V* (et commentaire) (Nos. 278–79, 1981).

Translations.

English:

Wilson, W. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Edinburgh, 1867–97. American edition: Grand Rapids, 1962 (repr.) 2.165–605.

French:

Mondésert, C., et al. *Clement d'Alexandrie*. SC. See entry above.

German:

Stählin, O. *Des Clemens von Alexandreia ausgewählte Schriften aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*. BKV^2, Nos. 7, 8, 17, 19, 20. Munich, 1934–38. 5 vols.

Overbeck, F. *Titus Flavius Klemens von Alexandria: Die Teppiche (Stromateis)*. Ed. C. A. Bernoulli & L. Früchtel. Basel, 1936.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

This bibliography serves as general bibliography for this volume, corresponding to the bibliography in *FHJA* 1.8–46 and the updated bibliography in *FHJA* 2.25–43. While many of the entries are the same, new items have been added. Some of the entries from volumes 1 & 2 have been revised.

Adler, W. *Time Immemorial: Archaic History and Its Sources in Christian Chronography From Julius Africanus to George Syncellus*. Dumbarton Oaks Studies, no. 26. Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Research Library and Collection, 1989.
(=Adler, *Archaic History*).

Arnim, J. von, ed. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905. Reprint. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1964.
(=*SVF*).

Attridge, H. W., and R. A. Oden, Jr. *Philo of Byblos. The Phoenician History: Introduction, Critical Text, Translation, Notes*. CBQMS, 9. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
(=Attridge & Oden, *Philo of Byblos*).

Baron, S. W. *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*. 18 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America; New York: Columbia University Press, 1952–83. Vols. 1 ("Ancient Times," Part 1) and 2 ("Ancient Times," Part 2), 2d ed., rev. and enl. New York: Columbia University Press, 1952. Reprint. 1953.
(=Baron, *History*).

Beloch, K. J. *Griechische Geschichte*. 2d ed. 4 vols. in 8. Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1912–27.
(=Beloch, *Geschichte*).

Bergk, T. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*. Edited by G. Hinrichs, et al. 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1872–87. Vol. 5: Index by R. Peppmüller & W. Hahn, 1894.
(=Bergk, *Literaturgeschichte*).

Bernfeld, S. *Die jüdische Literatur. Erster Teil: Bibel, Apokryphen und jüdisch-hellenistisches Schrifttum*. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1921. Esp. pp. 178–94 (Chap. 9, "Die jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur").
(=Bernfeld, *Bibel*).

Bernhardy, G. *Grundriss der griechischen Litteratur*. 3d and 4th ed. 2 vols. in 3 parts. Halle: E. Anton, 1876–80 (Vol. 1, 4th ed., 1876; Vol.2.1, 3d ed., 1877; Vol. 2.2, 3d ed., 1880). Esp. 1.498–577 ("Vierte Periode: Von Alexander dem Grossen bis zur Römischen Kaiserherrschaft").
(=Bernhardy, *Grundriss*).

Bickerman, E. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. SJLA, 32. Translated by H. R. Moehring from 1937 German edition. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
(=Bickerman, *Maccabees*).

———. *The Jews in the Greek Age*. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 1988.
(=Bickerman, *Jews*).

———. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. 3 parts (vols.). AGJU, 9, parts 1–3. Leiden: Brill, 1976, 1980, 1986.
(=Bickerman, *Studies*).

Bombelli, L. *I Frammenti degli storici giudaico-ellenistici*. Pubblicazioni del dipartimento di archeologia, filologia classica e loro tradizioni, n. s., 103. Genoa: Universita di Genova, 1986.
(=Bombelli, *Frammenti*).

Bousset, W. *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom: Literarische Untersuchungen zu Philo und Clemens von Alexandria, Justin und Irenäus*. FRLANT, n.s., 6. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1915. Reprint. Hildesheim and New York: G. Olms, 1975.
(=Bousset, *Schulbetrieb*).

Bousset, W., and H. Gressmann. *Die Religion des Judentums im spät-hellenistischen Zeitalter*. 4th ed. HNT, 21. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1966. (The text of the 4th ed. is identical to the 1926 3d ed. which was newly revised by Gressmann; the 4th ed. contains an appendix with additional literature.).
(=Bousset & Gressmann, *RJ*).

Braun, M. *History and Romance in Graeco-Oriental Literature*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1938.
(=Braun, *History and Romance*).

Bréhier, E. *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie*. 3d ed. Etudes de philosophie médiévale, 8. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1950.
(=Bréhier, *Philon*).

Büchler, A. *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden im II. Makkabäerbuche und in der verwandten jüdisch-hellenistischen Litteratur*. Vienna: Hölder, 1899. Reprint. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1975.
(=Büchler, *Tobiaden*).

Cardauns, B. "Juden und Spartaner, zur hellenistisch-jüdischer Literatur," *Hermes* 95 (1967) 317–24.
(=Cardauns, "Juden und Spartaner").

Cerfaux, L. "Influence des mystères sur le judaïsme alexandrin avant Philon," in *Recueil Lucien Cerfaux, Etudes d'Exégèse et d'Histoire Religieuse de M. Cerfaux*. 2 vols. BETL, 6 & 7. Gembloux: Editions J. Duculot, 1954. 1.65–112. (Originally appeared in *Le Muséon* 37 [1924] 29–88).
(=Cerfaux, "Mystères").

Charlesworth, J. H. *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research*. SBLSCS, 7. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1976. With a Supplement. SBLSCS, 7S. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1981.
(=Charlesworth, *PAMR* and *PAMRS*).

———, ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983–85. Vol. 1: "Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments" (1983); Vol. 2: "Expansions of the 'Old Testament' and Legends, Wisdom and Philosophical Literature, Prayers, Psalms, and Odes, Fragments of Lost Judeo-Hellenistic Works" (1985).
(=Charlesworth, *OTP*).

Christ, W. *Philologische Studien zu Clemens Alexandrinus*. Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologischen Classe der königlich Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vol. 21, part 3. Munich: Akademie Verlag, 1901. 455–528.
(=Christ, *Philologische Studien*).

Cobet, C. G. "Διορθωτικὰ εἰς τὰ τοῦ Κλήμεντος τοῦ Ἀλεξανδρέως," Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς (ἐκδ. ὑπὸ Κ. Σ. Κόντου) 1 (1866–67) 166–97, 201–87, 425–534.
(=Cobet, Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς).

Cohn, L, I. Heinemann, M. Adler, and W. Theiler. *Philo von Alexandria. Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. 7 vols. 2d ed. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1962–64.
(=Cohn, Heinemann, Adler, Theiler, *Philos Werke*).

Collins, J. J. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad, 1983.
(=Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*).

Conzelmann, H. *Heiden—Juden—Christen: Auseinandersetzungen in der Literatur der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*. BHT, 62. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1981.
(=Conzelmann, *HJC*).

Couat, A. *Alexandrian Poetry under the First Three Ptolemies—324–222 BC with a supplementary chapter by E. Cahen*. Translated by J.

Loeb. London: William Heinemann; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1931.
(=Couat, *Alexandrian Poetry*).

Dähne, A. F. *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*. 1 vol. with 2 parts. Halle: Verlag der Buchhandlung des Waisenhauses, 1834. Esp. 1.1–97 ("Darstellung der Entstehungsgründe einer Religionsphilosophie unter den alexandrinischen Juden. Deren Charakter und Entwickelungsgang im Allgemeinen"); 2.73–112 ("Aristobulus"), 199–203 ("Philo's Gedicht über Jerusalem und Ezechiel's Tragödie" and "Artapan"), 204–37 ("Von einigen Ueberresten der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie in angeblichen Stellen älterer heidnischer Geschichtschreiber und Dichter").
(=Dähne, *Geschichtliche*).

Dalbert, P. *Die Theologie der hellenistisch-jüdischen Missionsliteratur unter Ausschluss von Philo und Josephus*. Hamburg-Volksdorf: Herbert Reich, 1954.
(=Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*).

Delitzsch, F. *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poësie vom Abschluss der heiligen Schriften Alten Bundes bis auf die neueste Zeit*. Leipzig: K. Tauchnitz, 1836.
(=Delitzsch, *Geschichte*).

Delling, G. "Perspektiven der Erforschung des hellenistischen Judentums," *HUCA* 45 (1974) 133–76.
(=Delling, "Perspektiven").

———, ed. *Bibliographie zur jüdisch-hellenistischen und intertestamentarischen Literatur, 1900–1970*. 2d ed. TU, 106^2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975.
(=Delling, *Bibliographie*).

Denis, A.-M. *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'ancien testament*. SVTP, 1. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
(=Denis, *Introduction*).

de Rossi, Azariah (see Rossi)

Diels, H., and W. Kranz. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch*. 10th ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1960–61.
(=Diels–Kranz, *Vorsokr.*, or D.–K.).

Dihle, A. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*. Kröners Taschenausgabe, vol. 199. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1967. Esp. 410–19 (Chap. 25, "Jüdische Literatur").
(=Dihle, *Griechische*).

Dittenberger, W. *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. 4th ed. Reprint of 3d ed. Leipzig, 1915–24. 4 vols. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1960.
(=*SIG*).

Doran, R. "The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus," *ANRW Teil II: Principat* 20.1 (1987) 246–97.
(=Doran, "Historians").

Drummond, J. *Philo Judaeus: The Jewish Alexandrian Philosophy in Its Development and Completion*. 2 vols. London, 1888. Reprint. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969.
(=Drummond, *Philo*).

Dubnow, S. *Weltgeschichte des jüdischen Volkes von seinen Uranfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. 3d ed. 10 vols. Translated (from Russian) by A. Steinberg. Berlin: Jüdischer Verlag, 1925–29. *Orientalische Periode* (Vols. 1–3). Vol. 2, *Die alte Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes* (1925).
(=Dubnow, *Geschichte*).

———. *History of the Jews*. Translated from Russian by M. Spiegel. 5 vols. South Brunswick, N.J.: Thomas Yoseloff, 1967–73. Vol. 1: *From the Beginning to Early Christianity* (1967), translated from the 4th revised edition, vols. 1–2; Vol. 2: *From the Roman Empire to the Early Medieval Period* (1967), translated from the 4th revised edition, vols. 3–4.
(=Dubnov, *History*).

Eichhorn, J. G. *Allgemeine Bibliothek der biblischen Litteratur*. 10 vols. Leipzig: Weidmann, 1787–1800.
(=Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*).

Elter, A. *De Gnomologiorum Graecorum historia atque origine: Commentatio*. 9 parts and 2 supplements. Bonn: University Press (C. Georgi), 1893–97. Esp. parts 5–9, 1894–95; also supplements in 1894 (corollarium Eusebianum) and 1897 (ramenta).
(=Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*).

Erbse, H. *Fragmente griechischer Theosophien: Herausgegeben und quellenkritisch untersucht*. Hamburger Arbeiten zur Altertumswissenschaft, 4. Hamburg: Hansischer Gildenverlag, 1941.
(=Erbse, *Theosophien*).

Ewald, H. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 3d ed. 7 vols. Göttingen: Dieterichsche Buchhandlung, 1864–68. Vol. 4, *Geschichte Ezra's und der Heiligherrschaft in Israel bis Christus* ("Dritte Wendung: die Heiligherrschaft"). Göttingen, 1864. Esp. 4.331–40 ("Der judäische Hellenismos"); also 4.303–331. English translation: *The History of Israel*. Edited and translated by R. Martineau, J. E. Carpenter, and J. F. Smith. 8 vols. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1878–86.

Esp. 5.223–492 ("The Hagiocracy under the Greeks and Maccabees, down to the Omnipotence of Rome").
(=Ewald, *Geschichte* or *History*).

Fabricius, J. A. *Bibliotheca Graeca sive Notitia scriptorum veterum Graecorum*. Edited by G. C. Harles. 4th ed. 12 vols. (with index). Hamburg: C. E. Bohn, 1790–1838.
(=Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*).

Feldmann, L. H. "Hellenistic Judaism," in *The New Encyclopaedia Britannica* 22 (1985) 410–16.
(=Feldman, "Hellenistic Judaism").

Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. Esp. 1.54–92, 281–301, 495–511, 674–716 (Chap. 10, sect. 5, "Secondary Literature, Greek, Egyptian, and Jewish") and corresponding notes in vol. 2.
(=Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*).

Freudenthal, J. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke: Abhandlung, Anmerkungen und griechischer Text*. Hellenistische Studien, parts 1 (1874, pp. 1–104) & 2 (1875, pp. 105–239).Jahresbericht des jüdisch-theologischen Seminars "Fraenkel'scher Stiftung." Breslau: H. Skutsch, 1874 & 1875. (Hellenistische Studien, Part 3: *Der Platoniker Albinos und der falsche Alkinoos* [=pp. 241–327]. Berlin: S. Calvary, 1879).
(=Freu./Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*).

Friedländer, M. *Geschichte der jüdischen Apologetik als Vorgeschichte des Christenthums*. Zürich: C. Schmidt, 1903.
(=Friedländer, *Geschichte*).

Fürst, J. *Bibliotheca Judaica. Bibliographisches Handbuch der gesammten jüdischen Literatur mit Einschluss der Schriften über Juden und Judenthum und einer Geschichte der jüdischen Bibliographie*. 3 parts. Leipzig, 1849–63. Reprint. 2 vols. with 3 parts (vol. 1: parts 1 & 2; vol. 2: part 3). Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1960.
(=Fürst, *Bibliotheca*).

Gager, J. *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism*. SBLMS, 16. New York: Abingdon, 1972.
(=Gager, *Moses*).

Geffcken, J. *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1907. Reprint. Hildesheim and New York: G. Olms, 1974.
(=Geffcken, *Apologeten*).

Gelzer, H. *Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie*. 2 vols. (Vol. 1: Die Chronographie des Julius Africanus; Vol. 2:

Nachfolger des Julius Africanus). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1880–85. (=Gelzer, *Sextus*).

Georgi, D. *Die Gegner des Paulus im 2. Korintherbrief: Studien zur religiösen Propaganda in der Spätantike*. WMANT, 11. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1964. English translation: *The Opponents of Paul in Second Corinthians*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. (=Georgi, *Gegner* or *Opponents*).

Gfrörer, A. F. *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie, oder vom Einflusse der jüdisch-ägyptischen Schule auf die Lehre des neuen Testaments*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart's Verlagshandlung, 1831. The work is comprised of two parts published in two separate volumes, both of which comprise the "first volume" of Gfrörer's *Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums*. Since the treatment of Philo is a two-volume work, it is referred to here as *Philo* 1 & 2. (=Gfrörer, *Philo*).

Ginzberg, L. *The Legends of the Jews*. 7 vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1909–38. (=Ginzberg, *Legends*).

Goodenough, E. R. *By Light, Light: The Mystic Gospel of Hellenistic Judaism*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1935. Reprint. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1969. (=Goodenough, *Light*).

———. *Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman World*. 13 vols. New York: Bollingen Foundation, 1953–68. (=Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols*).

Gordon, C. H. "Homer and the Bible: The Origin and Character of East Mediterranean Literature," *HUCA* 26 (1955) 43–108. (=Gordon, "Homer").

Graetz, H. *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 11 vols. Vol. 3, *Geschichte der Judäer von dem Tode Juda Makkabis bis zum Untergange des judäischen Staates*. 5th ed. Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1905–6. (The 5th ed. of vol. 3 was published in two parts [1:1905; 2:1906], but the page numbering is continuous.) Esp. pp. 24–49 ("Der judäische Alexandrinismus"), 369–425 ("Ausbreitung des judäischen Stammes und der judäischen Lehre"), 577–99 (Note 2, "Die Entstehung der Septuaginta und der Aristeasbrief"), 599–631 (Note 3, "Die judäisch-hellenistische Literatur"), 673–87 (Note 10, "Das Sendschreiben der Palästinenser an die ägyptisch-judäischen Gemeinden wegen der Feier der Tempelweihe"), 800–5 (Note 25, "Philo und seine Schriften").
(=Graetz, *Geschichte*).

———. *History of the Jews*. 6 vols. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1891–98. Reprint. 1946. This English edition is a translation of the eleven-volume German ed., but omits the footnotes. (=Graetz, *History*).

Gutman, Y. *The Beginnings of Jewish-Hellenistic Literature* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1958–63.
(=Gutman, *Beginnings*).

Gutschmid, A. *Kleine Schriften*. Edited by F. Rühl. 5 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1889–94.
(=Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*).

Hadas, M. *Aristeas to Philocrates. Letter of Aristeas*. New York: Harper (for Dropsie College), 1951.
(=Hadas, *Aristeas*).

———. *Hellenistic Culture: Fusion and Diffusion*. New York: Norton, 1959.
(=Hadas, *Hellenistic Culture*).

Harnack, A. *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*. 2 parts in 3 vols. Part 1 (1893): *Die Überlieferung und der Bestand der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*; Part 2: *Die Chronologie*; vol. 1 (1897): bis Irenaeus; vol. 2 (1904): von Irenaeus bis Eusebius. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1893–1904.
(=Harnack, *Geschichte*).

———. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1962.
(=Harnack, *Mission*).

Hegermann, H. "Das hellenistische Judentum," in *Umwelt des Urchristentums*. Edited by J. Leipoldt and W. Grundmann. 4th ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1975–76. Esp. 1.292–345.
(=Hegermann, *Umwelt*).

Heinisch, P. *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese (Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria)*. ATAbh, 1.1/2. Münster: Aschendorf, 1908.
(=Heinisch, *Einfluss Philos*).

Hengel, M. "Anonymität, Pseudepigraphie und 'Literarische Fälschung' in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur," in *Pseudepigrapha I*. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 18. Vandoeuvres-Genève: Fondation Hardt, 1972. 229–329.
(=Hengel, "Anonymität").

———. *Jews, Greeks, and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the Pre-Christian Period*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
(=Hengel, *Aspects*).

———. *Judentum und Hellenismus. Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr.* WUNT, 10. 3d ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1988. English translation: *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in Their Encounter in Palestine During the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
(=Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* or *Judaism and Hellenism*).

Herriot, E. *Philon le juif: Essai sur l'école juive d'Alexandrie*. Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1898.
(=Herriot, *Philon*).

Herzfeld, L. *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten*. 3 vols. Vol. 1, Braunschweig: G. Westermann, 1847. Reprint. Nordhausen: A. Büchting, 1855; Vol. 2, Nordhausen: A. Büchting, 1855; Vol. 3, Nordhausen: A. Büchting, 1857.
(=Herzfeld, *Geschichte*).

Vol. 1 treats the Babylonian and Persian periods; Vol. 2 treats the Jews under Seleucid rule and the Maccabean period (til 133 BCE); Vol. 3 contains misc. discussions, esp. notes and excursuses on different aspects of the period (see esp. pp. 436–579 on Egyptian Judaism). Vol. 3 also contains an index to all three volumes, and designates the first volume as "A," i.e. the earlier history, volume 2 as "I"and volume 3 as "II."

Each volume appears under the above title. Apparently by the end of the work, Herzfeld decided to include all three volumes under the title: *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael von Vollendung des zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten.* A rather confusing arrangement resulted: the comprehensive title *Vollendung* is divided into two parts: Part 1 consists of the first two volumes of *Zerstörung*; Part 2 consists of the third volume of excurses. Thus *Vollendung*, Vol. 1 =*Zerstörung*, Vols. 1 & 2; *Vollendung*, Vol. 2 =*Zerstörung*, Vol. 3.

Herzfeld also published a condensed one-volume version of the above three-volume work, under the title: L. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael von der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mackabäers Schimon zum hohen Priester und Fürsten, aus seinem dreibändigen Werke des gleichen Titels kürzer dargestellt und überarbeitet*. Leipzig: O. Leiner, 1870.

Hody, H. *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, versionibus Graecis, et Latina Vulgata*. 4 books in one volume. Oxford, 1705. Esp. pp. 1–89 (Bk. 1) and 97–110 (Bk. 2).
(=Hody, *Bibliorum*).

Holladay, C. R. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume I: Historians*. SBLTT, 20; Pseudepigrapha, 10. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983.
(=Holladay, *FHJA* 1).

———. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors. Volume II: Poets. The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian*. SBLTT, 30; Pseudepigrapha, 12. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.
(=Holladay, *FHJA* 2).

———. *THEIOS ANER in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology*. SBLDS, 40. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
(=Holladay, *THEIOS ANER*).

Holtzmann, O. "Das Ende des jüdischen Staatswesens und die Entstehung des Christenthums," in B. Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. 2 vols. Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1887–88. 2.271–674.
(=Holtzmann, "Das Ende").

Horst, P. W. van der. "The Interpretation of the Bible by the Minor Hellenistic Jewish Authors," in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Edited by M. J. Mulder. Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988. 519–46.
(=van der Horst, "Interpretation").

———. *Joods-hellenistische poëzie: de fragmenten der gedichten van Ezechiël Tragicus, Philo Epicus en Theodotus, en de vervalste dichter-citaten*. Na de Schriften: Na-bijbelse joodse en christelijke geschriften in Nederlandse vertaling, no. 3. Edited by T. Baarda, et al. Kampen: Uitgeversmaatschappij J. H. Kok, 1987.
(=van der Horst, *JHP*).

———. *Hellenism–Judaism–Christianity. Essays on Their Interaction*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1994.
(=van der Horst, *HJC*).

Jackson, F. J. Foakes, and K. Lake. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920–33.
(=Jackson & Lake, *Beginnings*).

Jacobson, H. *The EXAGOGE of Ezekiel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
(=Jacobson, *Ezekiel*).

Jeremias, J. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period*. London: SCM, 1969.
(=Jeremias, *Jerusalem*).

Joël, M. *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte zu Anfang des zweiten christlichen Jahrhunderts mit Berücksichtigung der angrenzenden Zeiten.* Part 1: Der Talmud und die griechische Sprache; Aristobul; die Gnosis; Part 2: Der Konflikt des Heidentums mit dem Christentum in seinen Folgen für das Judentum. Breslau, 1880–83. Reprint. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1971.
(=Joël, *Blicke*).

Jones, A. H. M. *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*. 2d ed. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1971.
(=Jones, *Cities*).

Juster, J. *Les Juifs dans l'empire romain, leur condition juridique, économique et sociale*. 2 vols. Paris: P. Geuthner, 1914.
(=Juster, *Juifs*).

Kahana, A. הספרים החיצונים לתורה לנביאים לכתובים ושאר ספרים חיצונים (=*Has-sefārīm ha-ḥiṣōnīm le-Tōrāh, li-nbī'īm, li-ktūbīm ū-še'ār sefārīm ḥiṣōnīm*). 2 vols. with two parts in each volume. Tel-Aviv: Masada, 1956.
(=Kahana, *Sefarim*).

Kannicht, R., and B. Snell, eds. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Vol. 2. Fragmenta adespota; testimonia volumini 1 addenda; indices ad volumina 1 et 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1981.
(=Kannicht & Snell, *TrGF*).

Karpeles, G. *Geschichte der jüdischen Literatur*. 2 vols. Berlin: R. Oppenheim, 1886. Esp. 1.135–262 ("Zweite Periode: Die jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur").
(=Karpeles, *Geschichte*).

Kippenberg, H. G. *Garizim und Synagoge: Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur samaritanischen Religion der aramäischen Periode*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, 30. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971.
(=Kippenberg, *Garizim*).

Kirk, G. S., J. E. Raven, and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers: A Critical History with a Selection of Texts*. 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
(=Kirk, Raven, & Schofield, *Presocratic*).

Klauck, H.-J. *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. NTAbh, n.s., 13. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978.
(=Klauck, *Allegorie*).

Knaack, G. "Alexandrinische Litteratur," PW 1 (1894) cols. 1399–1407.
(=Knaack, "Alexandrinische Litteratur").

Küchler, M. *Frühjüdische Weisheitstraditionen: Zum Fortgang weisheitlichen Denkens im Bereich des frühjüdischen Jahweglaubens*. OBO, 26. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Freiburg Schweiz: Universitätsverlag, 1979.
(=Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*).

Laqueur, R. "Griechische Urkunden in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur," *Historische Zeitschrift* 136 (1927) 229–52.
(=Laqueur, "Urkunden").

Lesky, A. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 3d ed. Bern and Munich: Francke Verlag, 1971. Esp. pp. 894–902 (Chap. 6, sect. 11, "Jüdisch-hellenistisches Schrifttum"). English translation: *A History of Greek Literature*. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966. 799–806.
(=Lesky, *Geschichte* or *History*).

Lieberman, S. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*. Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary, 18. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1962.
(=Lieberman, *Hellenism*).

Lloyd-Jones, H. "A Hellenistic Miscellany," *Studi Italiani Filologia Classica* 77 (3d ser.) 2 (1984) 52–72.
(=Lloyd-Jones, "Miscellany").

Lloyd-Jones, H., and P. Parsons, eds. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. Indices by H.-G. Nesselrath. Texte und Kommentare (edited by O. Gigon, et al.), vol. 11. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1983.
(=Lloyd-Jones & Parsons, *Supp. Hell.* or *SH*).

Lobeck, C. A. *Aglaophamus sive De theologiae mysticae Graecorum causis. Libri tres. . . poetarum Orphicorum dispersas reliquias*. 3 books in 2 vols. Königsberg: Bornträger Fratres, 1829. Reprint. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1961.
(=Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*).

Lumbroso, G. *L'Egitto dei Greci e dei Romani*. 2d ed. Rome: Ermanno Loescher, 1895.
(=Lumbroso, *L'Egitto*).

Lutterbeck, J. A. B. *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe, oder Untersuchungen über das Zeitalter der Religionswende, die Vorstufen des Christenthums und die erste Gestaltung desselben*. 2 vols. Mainz: F. Kupferberg, 1852.
(Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*).

Mahaffy, J. P. *Greek Life and Thought from the Age of Alexander to the Roman Conquest*. 2d ed. New York: Macmillan, 1896. Reprint. New York: Arno Press, 1976.
(=Mahaffy, *Greek Life*).

Maier, J., and J. Schreiner, eds. *Literatur und Religion des Frühjudentums: Eine Einführung*. Würzburg: Echter; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1973.
(=Maier & Schreiner, *Literatur*).

Marcus, R. "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," in *The Jewish People—Past and Present*, edited by S. W. Baron, et al. 4 vols. New York: Jewish Encyclopedia Handbooks-Central Yiddish Culture Organization, 1946–55 (Vol. 3: 1952). 3.40–53.
(=Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature [1952]").

———. "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," in *The Jews—Their History, Culture, and Religion*, edited by L. Finkelstein. 3d ed. 2 vols. New York: Harper, 1960. 2.1077–1115.
(=Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature [1960]").

Meeks, W. A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. NovTSup, 14. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
(=Meeks, *Prophet-King*).

Mendels, D. *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century* BC *Claims to the Holy Land*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum, 15. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1987.
(=Mendels, *Land of Israel*).

Momigliano, A. *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975. German translation: *Hochkulturen im Hellenismus: Die Begegnung der Griechen mit Kelten, Juden, Römern und Persern*. Beck'sche Schwarze Reihe, vol. 190. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1979.
(=Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom* or *Hochkulturen*).

Müller, J. G. *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift Gegen den Apion. Text und Erklärung*. Basel: Bahnmaier's Verlag (C. Detloff), 1877.
(=Müller, *Apion*).

Neumark, D. *Geschichte der jüdischen Philosophie des Mittelalters nach Problemen dargestellt*. 3 vols. with 4 parts (books): Vol. 1: Books 1 & 2; Vol. 2: Book 3, Part 1; Vol. 3: Book 3, Part 2. Berlin: Reimer, 1907–28. (Vol. 1, 1907; Vol. 2, 1910; Vol. 3, 1928). Esp. 2(3.1). 294–473 (treatment of Jewish Greek literature).
(=Neumark, *Geschichte*).

Nicholai, R. *Geschichte der neugriechischen Literatur*. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876.
(=Nicholai, *Geschichte*).

———. *Griechische Literaturgeschichte in neuer Bearbeitung*. 3 vols. Magdeburg: Heinrichshofensche Buchhandlung, 1873–78. 2.80–81.
(=Nicholai, *Griechische*).

Nilsson, M. P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. HAW 5.2.2. 2 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1961–67. Vol. 1, 3d ed., 1967; Vol. 2, 2d ed., 1961.
(=Nilsson, *Geschichte*).

Nock, A. D. *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*. 2 vols. Edited by Z. Stewart. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
(=Nock, *Essays*).

Pépin, J. *Mythe et allégorie. Les origines grecques et les contestations judéo-chrétiennes*. 2d ed. Paris: Etudes Augustiniennes, 1976.
(=Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*).

Peterson, E. ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ. *Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. FRLANT, 41. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1926.
(=Peterson, ΕΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ).

Pfeiffer, R. H. *History of New Testament Times With An Introduction to the Apocrypha*. London: A. & C. Black, 1963. 197–230.
(=Pfeiffer, *History*).

Philippson, L. M. *Ezechiel des jüdischen Trauerspieldichters Auszug aus Ägypten und Philo des Älteren Jerusalem*. Berlin: J. A. List, 1830.
(=Philippson, *Ezechiel/Philo*).

Powell, J. U. *Collectanea Alexandrina*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1925.
(=Powell, *Coll. Alex.* or *CA*).

Praechter, *Philosophie* (see Ueberweg, *Geschichte*)

Quasten, J. *Patrology*. 3 vols. Utrecht and Antwerp: Spectrum; Westminster, Md.: Newman, 1950–60; vol. 4, A. Di Berardino, et al., eds. Westminster, Md.: Christian Classics, 1991.
(=Quasten, *Patrology*).

Radice, R., and D. T. Runia. *Philo of Alexandria: An Annotated Bibliography 1937–1986*. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae*, 8. Leiden and New York: Brill, 1988.
(=Radice & Runia, *Philo*).

Reinach, T. *Flavius Josèphe. Contre Apion*. Text and annotations by Reinach; translation by L. Blum. Collection des Universités de France. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1930.
(=Reinach, *Josèphe, Apion*).

———. *Textes d'auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaisme*. Publications de la société des études juives. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1895.
(=Reinach, *Textes*).

Renan, E. *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*. 5 vols. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1887–93. (Vol. 4, published in 1893, includes books 7 ["La judée

sous la domination perse"] and 8 ["Les juifs sous la domination grecque"]. The *Histoire* is printed as Vol. 6 in *Oeuvres complètes de Ernest Renan*, edited by H. Psichari. Paris: Calmann-Lévy, 1947–61 (Vol. 6: 1953).
(=Renan, *Histoire*).

Rohde, E. *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen.* 9th and 10th ed. 2 vols. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1925.
(=Rohde, *Psyche*).

Rossi, Azariah ben Moses de(i). ספר מאור עינים =*Liber Me'or Eynayim iuxta editionem principem Mantuanam editus.* (Also includes מצרף לכסף =*Liber Mazref la-Kesef et carmina liturgica eiusdem auctoris*.) Edited by David Cassel. Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1867. (Earlier published in Vilnius, 1866 [*Me'or Eynayim*] & 1864[*Mazref*]; *Me'or Eynayim* was first published in 1574 at Ferrara.)
(=Rossi, *Me'or Eynayim*).

Routh, M. J. *Reliquiae sacrae: sive auctorum fere jam perditorum secundi tertiique saeculi post Christum natum quae supersunt.* 5 vols. Oxford: University Press, 1846–48.
(=Routh, *Reliquiae sacrae*).

Runia, D. T. *Philo in Early Christian Literature. A Survey.* Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
(=Runia, *Philo*).

Safrai, S., and M. Stern, with D. Flusser and W. C. van Unnik. *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions.* 2 vols. (=Section 1 of CRINT). Assen: Van Gorcum, 1974.
(=Safrai & Stern, *Jewish People*).

Schalit, A., ed. *The World History of the Jewish People.* First Series. *Ancient Times.* Vol. 6: *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 BCE to 67 BCE.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers, 1972.
(=Schalit, *Hellenistic Age*).

Schlatter, A. *Geschichte Israels von Alexander dem Grossen bis Hadrian.* 3d ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1925. Reprint. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1972.
(=Schlatter, *Geschichte*).

———. *Das neu gefundene hebräische Stück des Sirach. Der Glossator des griechischen Sirach und seine Stellung in der Geschichte der jüdischen Theologie.* BFCT, 1.5/6. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1897.
(=Schlatter, *Sirach*).

Schmid, W., and O. Stählin. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. HAW, 7.2.1 & 2. 6th ed. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1920–24. Reprint. 1959–61.
(=Schmid–Stählin, *Geschichte*).

Schubert, K. *Die Religion des nachbiblischen Judentums*. Freiburg and Vienna: Herder, 1955. Esp. 13–25, 80–97.
(=Schubert, *Judentums*).

Schürer, E. *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1960. Reprint of Vol. 1: 1901 (3d and 4th ed.); Vol. 2: 1907 (4th ed.); Vol. 3: 1909 (4th ed.).
(=Schürer, *Geschichte*).

———. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Revised and edited by G. Vermes, F. Millar, M. Black, P. Vermes, and M. Goodman. 3 vols., with vol. 3 published in 2 parts as separate volumes. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1973–87. Vol. 1: 1973; Vol. 2: 1979; Vol. 3(1): 1986; Vol. 3(2): 1987.
(=Schürer, *History*).

———. *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*. New York: Schocken Books, 1972.
(=Schürer, *Literature*).

Siegert, F. *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten: Ps.-Philon, "Über Jona," "Über Simson," und Über die Gottesbezeichnung, 'wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer'". I: Übersetzung aus dem Armenischen und sprachliche Erläuterungen*. WUNT, 20. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.
(=Siegert, *Predigten*).

———. *Drei hellenistisch-jüdische Predigten: Ps.-Philon, "Über Jona," "Über Jona" (Fragment) und "Über Simson." II: Kommentar nebst Beobachtungen zur hellenistischen Vorgeschichte der Bibelhermeneutik*. WUNT, 61. Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
(=Siegert, *Predigten: Kommentar*).

Siegfried, C. "Der jüdische Hellenismus: Ein Rückblick auf seine geschichtliche Entwickelung mit Beziehung auf die neuesten Forschungen innerhalb seines Gebietes," *ZWT* 18 (1875) 465–89.
(=Siegfried, "Der jüdische Hellenismus").

———. *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des alten Testaments*. Jena, 1875. Reprint. Amsterdam: Philo Press, 1970.
(=Siegfried, *Philo*).

Simon, R. *Histoire critique du Vieux Testament*. Paris, 1680; Rotterdam: Reinier Leers, 1685.
(=Simon, *Histoire*).

Smallwood, E. M. *The Jews Under Roman Rule From Pompey to Diocletian*. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
(=Smallwood, *Jews*).

Smyth, H. W. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1956.
(=Smyth, *Greek Grammar*).

Snell, B. *Scenes from Greek Drama*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1964; German translation: *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1971 (with additional material not included in English edition).
(=Snell, *Scenes* or *Szenen*).

———, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Vol. 1. Didascaliae tragicae; Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum; Testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1986.
(=Snell, *TrGF*).

Snell, B., and Kannicht, R., eds. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Vol. 2. See under Kannicht.

Stählin, O. "Die hellenistisch-jüdische Litteratur," in *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. HAW 7.2.1. 6th ed. 2 vols. Edited by W. Schmid and O. Stählin. Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1920. Reprint. 1959. 2,1.535–656.
(=Schmid–Stählin, *Geschichte*).

Stearns, W. N. *Fragments from Graeco-Jewish Writers*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1908.
(=Stearns, *Fragments*).

Stein, E. "Alttestamentliche Bibelkritik in der späthellenistischen Literatur," *Collectanea Theologica, Societatis Theologorum Polonorum* 16 (1935) 38–83.
(=Stein, "Bibelkritik").

———. "Pierwsi apologeci hellenistyczno-zydowscy" (="The First Hellenistic-Jewish Apologists"), *Eos* 37 (1936) 458–80; 38 (1937) 73–93, 210–23, 470–91.
(=Stein, "Apologists").

Stern, M. *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. 3 vols. Vol. 1: *From Herodotus to Plutarch*; Vol. 2: *From Tacitus to Simplicius*; Vol. 3: *Appendixes & Indexes*. Jerusalem: The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974–84.
(=Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors*, or *GLAJJ*).

Stöckl, A. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. 3d ed. Edited by G. Weingärtner. Mainz: F. Kirchheim, 1919.
(=Stöckl, *Grundriss*).

Stone, M. E., ed. *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. CRINT, Vol. 2 of Section 2 "The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud." Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
(=Stone, *Jewish Writings*).

Susemihl, F. *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*. 2 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1891–92. Esp. 2.601–56.
(=Susemihl, *Geschichte*).

Swete, H. B. *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902. Reprint. New York: KTAV, 1968.
(=Swete, *Introduction*).

Tcherikover, V. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1959.
(=Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*).

———. "Jewish Apologetic Literature Reconsidered," *Eos: Commentarii Societatis Philologae Polonorum* (*Symbolae Raphaeli Taubenschlag Dedicatae,* III) 48:3 (1956) 169–93. Based on an earlier article originally published in Hebrew in *Commentationes Judaico-Hellenisticae (In Memoriam Iohannis Lewy)*. Jerusalem, 1949.
(=Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature").

Tcherikover, V., & A. Fuks. *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, The Hebrew University; Cambridge, Mass.; Harvard University Press. 3 vols. 1957–64.
(=*CPJ*).

Thraede, K. "Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich)," *RAC* 5 (1962) 1191–1278.
(=Thraede, "Erfinder").

———. "Das Lob des Erfinders. Bemerkungen zur Analyse der Heuremata-Kataloge," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, n.s. 105 (1962) 158–86.
(=Thraede, "Das Lob").

Thyen, H. *Der Stil der jüdisch-hellenistischen Homilie*. FRLANT, n.s., 47. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1955.
(=Thyen, *Homilie*).

Tiede, D. L. *The Charismatic Figure as Miracle Worker*. SBLDS, 1. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1972.
(=Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*).

Ueberweg, F. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. 12th ed. Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1926–51. 13th ed. unchanged reprint of 12th ed. Tübingen: Wissenschaftliche Buchgemeinschaft (since 1955 Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, Darmstadt), 1951–53. Part 1 (= Vol. 1): Die Philosophie des Altertums, edited by K. Praechter. Berlin, 1926. Esp. §73, pp. 566–78 ("Die jüdisch-hellenistische Philosophie").
(=Ueberweg, *Geschichte*).

Vaillant, V. *De historicis qui ante Josephum Judaicas res scripsere, nempe Aristea, Demetrio, Hecataeo Abderita, Cleodemo, Artapano, Justo Tiberiensi, Cornelio Alexandro Polyhistore, disputationem proponebat facultati litterorum Pariensi*. Paris: Firmin Didot Fratres, 1851.
(=Vaillant, *Historicis*).

Valckenaer, L. C. *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo; philosopho peripatetico Alexandrino*. Edited by J. Luzac. Leiden: S. & J. Luchtmans, 1806. Includes as an appendix (pp. 127–36) P. Wesseling's essay on the Orphic fragments and Aristobulus. Both reprinted in T. Gaisford, *Eusebii Pamphili Evangelicae Praeparationis Libri XV* (Oxford: University Press, 1843) 4.339–451 (Valckenaer), 452–58 (Wesseling), with original pagination in margin.
(=Valckenaer, *Aristobulo* or *Diatribe de Aristobulo*).

Volkmann, R. "Alexandriner," PW 1 (1842–64) 743–53.
(=Volkmann, "Alexandriner").

Wacholder, B. Z. "Biblical Chronology in the Hellenistic World Chronicles," *HTR* 61 (1968) 451–81.
(=Wacholder, "Biblical Chronology").

———. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. HUCM, 3. Cincinnati and New York: Hebrew Union College and Jewish Institute of Religion, 1974.
(=Wacholder, *Eupolemus*).

———. "How Long Did Abram Stay in Egypt? A Study in Hellenistic, Qumran, and Rabbinic Chronography," *HUCA* 35 (1964) 43–56.
(=Wacholder, "Abram").

———. "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments on the Life of Abraham," *HUCA* 34 (1963) 83–113.
(=Wacholder, "Pseudo-Eupolemus' Two Greek Fragments").

Walter, N. "Frühe Begegnungen zwischen jüdischem Glauben und hellenistischer Bildung in Alexandrien," in *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte der Alten Welt*. Edited by E. C. Welskopf. Vol. 1, *Alter Orient und Griechenland*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964. 367–78.
(=Walter, "Begegnungen").

———. "Jewish-Greek Literature of the Greek Period," in W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein, eds., *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Volume 2: The Hellenistic Age. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989. 385–408, 684–86.
(=Walter, "Jewish-Greek Literature").

———. "Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien (unter Ausschluß der Historiker)," in *ANRW Teil II: Principat* 20.1. Edited by W. Haase and H. Temporini. Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 1987. 67–120.
(=Walter, "Literatur").

———. *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos: Untersuchungen zu seinen Fragmenten und zu pseudepigraphischen Resten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. TU, 86. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964. See reviews by E. Lohse, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 516–17; V. Hamp, *BZ* 11 (1967) 283–84; H. Hegermann, *TLZ* 92 (1967) 505–7; A. Nomachi, "Aristobulos and Philo," *Journal of Classical Studies* (Japan) 15 (1967) 86–97.
(=Walter, *Aristobulos* or *Thoraausleger*).

———. *Untersuchungen zu den Fragmenten der jüdisch-hellenistischen Historiker*. Habilitationsschrift (unpublished), Halle, 1967–68.
(=Walter, *Untersuchungen*).

Wendland, P. *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum*. 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1972 (=1912³).
(=Wendland, *HRK*).

———. "A. Elter, *De gnomologiorum graecorum historia atque origine*," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898) 445–49.
(=Wendland, Review of Elter).

Willrich, H. *Judaica: Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1900.
(=Willrich, *Judaica*).

———. *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1895.
(=Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*).

———. *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur*. FRLANT, 38 (=n.s. 21). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924.
(=Willrich, *Urkundenfälschung*).

Wobbermin, G. *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Urchristentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen*. Berlin: E. Ebering, 1896.
(=Wobbermin, *Studien*).

Wolfson, H. A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam.* 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.
(=Wolfson, *Philo*).

Zeegers-Vander Vorst, N. *Les citations des poètes grecs chez les apologistes chrétiens du IIe siècle.* Recueil de travaux d'histoire et de philologie, 4e série, Fasc. 47. Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1972.
(=Zeegers-Vander Vorst, *Les citations*).

Zeller, E. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. 7th ed. (reprint of 6th ed.). 3 parts in 6 vols. Leipzig: O. R. Reisland, 1921–23. (1.1: 1923 [7th ed.; reprint of 6th ed.]; 1.2: 1922 [6th ed.]; 2.1: 1922 [5th ed.]; 2.2: 1921 [4th ed.]; 3.1: 1923 [5th ed.; reprint of 4th ed.]; 3.2: 1923 [5th ed.]). Esp. 3.2, pp. 261–98 (section on Jewish Greek Philosophy; 3d ed., pp. 242–77).
(=Zeller, *Philosophie*).

———. *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*. Trans. O. J. Reichel. London: Longmans, Green, & Co., 1870.
(=Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*).

Ziegler, K. *Das hellenistische Epos. Ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung*. 2d ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1966.
(=Ziegler, *Epos*).

BIBLIOGRAPHY ABBREVIATIONS

ABD	*Anchor Bible Dictionary*
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJP	*American Journal of Philology*
ANCL	Ante-Nicene Christian Library
ANET	J. B. Pritchard, ed., *Ancient Near Eastern Texts*
ANF	The Ante-Nicene Fathers
ANRW	W. Haase and H. Temporini, eds., *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*
AnthGr	*Anthologia Graeca*
APOT	R. H. Charles, ed., *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*
ATAbh	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
BAGD	W. Bauer, W. F. Arndt, F. W. Gingrich, and F. W. Danker, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*
BDB	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie
BHH	B. Reicke and L. Rost, eds., *Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch*
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie
BJRL	*Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*
BKV	O. Stählin, et al., eds., Bibliothek der Kirchenväter
BZ	*Biblische Zeitschrift*
BZAW	Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
BZNW	Beihefte zur *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
CA	J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*
CAC	Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum Saeculi Secundi
CAH	*Cambridge Ancient History*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly—Monograph Series
CIJ	*Corpus Inscriptionum Judaicarum*
Coll. Alex.	J. U. Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina*
CPJ	V. Tcherikover & A. Fuks, *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*

CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad novum testamentum
CSHB	*Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae*
DB	*Dictionnaire de la Bible*
EHBS	Ἐπετηρὶς τῆς Ἑταιρείας Βυζαντινῶν Σπουδαιῶν = *Annuaire de l'Association d'Etudes Byzantines*
EHR	*English Historical Review*
EncJud	*Encyclopaedia Judaica*
ETL	*Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses*
FGrH	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*
FHG	C. Müller, *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*
FHJA	C. R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
GCS	Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten Jahrhunderte
GLAJJ	M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*
HAW	Handbuch der Altertums Wissenschaft
HDB	J. Hastings, ed., *Dictionary of the Bible*
HERE	J. Hastings, ed., *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*
HJC	H. Conzelmann, *Heiden—Juden—Christen*
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament
HRK	P. Wendland, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum*
HUCA	*Hebrew Union College Annual*
HUCM	Monographs of the Hebrew Union College
IDB	*Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*
JAC	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum
JAOS	*Journal of the American Oriental Society*
JE	*Jewish Encyclopedia*
JEA	*Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*
JHP	P. W. van der Horst, *Joods-hellenistische poëzie*
JNES	*Journal of Near Eastern Studies*
JSHRZ	W. G. Kümmel, et al., eds., Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
JSJ	*Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period*
JSS	*Journal of Semitic Studies*
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
KP	*Der Kleine Pauly*
LAW	*Lexikon der Alten Welt* (Zürich/Stuttgart: Artemis, 1965)
LCL	Loeb Classical Library

LPNF	Later Post-Nicene Fathers
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon with Supplement*
LTK	*Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*
MGWJ	*Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums*
NJKA	*Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum*
NTAbh	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
NPNF	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OCD	*Oxford Classical Dictionary*
ODCC	*Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 2d ed., 1974
OGIS	W. Dittenberger, ed., *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*
OTP	J. H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*
PAAJR	*Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research*
PAMR	J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research* (1976)
PAMRS	J. H. Charlesworth, *The Pseudepigrapha and Modern Research with Supplement* (1981)
PG	J. Migne, *Patrologia graeca*
PL	J. Migne, *Patrologia latina*
PW	Pauly-Wissowa, *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*
RAC	*Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*
RE	J. J. Herzog and G. L. Plitt, eds., 2d ed.; A. Hauck, ed., 3d ed., *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*
RealEncJud	J. Hamburger, ed., *Real-Encyclopädie des Judentums*
RGG	*Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*
RheinMus	*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*
RHPR	*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*
RHR	*Revue de l'histoire des religions*
RJ	W. Bousset and H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSCS	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	SBL Seminar Papers

SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SEG	*Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*
SH	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, eds., *Supplementum Hellenisticum*
SIG	W. Dittenberger, ed., *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
ST	*Studia theologica*
Supp. Hell.	H. Lloyd-Jones and P. Parsons, eds., *Supplementum Hellenisticum*
SVF	H. von Arnim, ed., *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*
ThĒE	A. Martinos, ed., *Thrēskeutikē kai Ēthikē Egkuklopaideia* (*Theological and Ethical Encyclopedia*). 12 vols. Athens, 1962-68.
TLZ	*Theologische Literaturzeitung*
TrGF	B. Snell and R. Kannicht, eds., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*
TRu	*Theologische Rundschau*
TSK	*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
TWNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*
VC	*Vigiliae christianae*
VT	*Vetus Testamentum*
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungun zum Neuen Testament
ZAW	*Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*
ZPE	*Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*
ZTK	*Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*
ZWT	*Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*

Other Abbreviations

Abbreviations throughout the work, for the most part, conform to those suggested in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* "Instructions for Contributors" (cf. American Academy of Religion/Society of Biblical Literature *Membership Directory and Handbook 1993*, 383-400). For the classical authors and sources, abbreviations in Liddell-Scott-Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon with Supplement* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) and Lewis and Short, *A Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1879; repr. 1969) have

been used, with some minor modifications for the sake of clarity. The most frequently cited sources are abbreviated as follows:

Ag. Ap.	Josephus *Against Apion*
Ant.	Josephus *Antiquities*
H.E./ *Hist. eccl.*	Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica*
J.W.	Josephus *Jewish War*
P.E.	Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica*
Protr.	Clement *Protrepticus*
Strom.	Clement *Stromateis*

The names of persons frequently referred to, usually editors, are abbreviated as follows:

Denis	A.-M. Denis
Dind.	Dindorf (of whom there are several; see Bibliography of Sources for the Collection)
Dübner	F. Dübner
Freu.	J. Freudenthal
Gais.	T. Gaisford
Giff.	E. H. Gifford
Hein.	F. A. Heinichen
Horst	P. W. van der Horst
Jac.	F. Jacoby
Jacobson	H. Jacobson
Kuiper	K. Kuiper
Lloyd-Jones	H. Lloyd-Jones
Ludwich	A. Ludwich
Mras	K. Mras
Müll.	C. Müller (=K. Müller)
Parsons	P. Parsons
Phil./ Philippson	L. M. Philippson
Riessler	P. Riessler
Snell	B. Snell
Stearns	W. N. Stearns
Steph.	R. Stephanus/Estienne/Etienne/Stephens
Strugnell	J. Strugnell
Sylburg	F. Sylburg
Vig.	F. Viger/Vigerus/Vigier/Viguier
Walter	N. Walter
Wieneke	J. Wieneke
Wilam.	Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (see Stählin-Früchtel, GCS 15 (=52), vol. 2, p. 2)

ARISTOBULUS

Scarcely has a figure so little known proved so persistently controversial as the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus. Even in antiquity there was confusion about his date, achievements, and reputation. So conflicting is the testimony about him that modern scholars have doubted his existence; proposed dates for him ranging from the second century BCE to the third century CE; variously identified him as pagan, Jewish, and Christian; suggested as possible provenances Alexandria, Jerusalem, Caesarea Philippi, and Cyprus; suggested him as the founder of the community of the Therapeutae; and proposed him as the author of *Epistle of Aristeas*, Wisdom of Solomon, and Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo*.

Even though only five relatively brief excerpts from his writings survive, they have been remarkably provocative. Not only do they illustrate an unusual blend of interests, they also provide valuable testimony for a number of important topics, including LXX origins (and the related question of how to assess *Epistle of Aristeas*), Philonic studies, the Greek gnomological tradition, Jewish pseudepigraphy, Jewish hermeneutics (especially allegorical exegesis), as well as the history of Egyptian Jewry.

The Fragments[1]

Excerpts attributed to Aristobulus are preserved by Clement of Alexandria (d. ca. 215), Anatolius (d. ca. 282), and Eusebius of Caesarea (d. ca. 339).

Clement. Two fragments expressly attributed to Aristobulus are quoted by Clement:

(1) a portion of Frg. 2 (§§13b–15a; also 16a) concerning God's descent at Sinai, which is understood allegorically as pervasive divine power (Frg. 2a=*Strom.* 6.3.32.3–33.1; cf. T 5);

(2) a portion of Frg. 3 (§§11.3–12.1), which asserts Plato's dependence on Moses and the existence of early Greek translations of the Hexateuch (Frg. 3a=*Strom.* 1.22.150.1–3; cf. T 3). This fragment is later quoted by Eusebius and attributed to Clement in *P.E.* 9.6.6–8 (=Frg. 3a[1]).

Several other unattributed passages are either quoted, alluded to, or echoed by Clement:

(1) Frg. 3b (*Strom.* 1.22.148.1)—the tradition relating to the translation of the LXX (*P.E.* 13.12.2=Frg. 3.2);

(2) Frg. 4a (*Strom.* 5.14.99.3)—Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato's dependence on Moses (*P.E.* 13.12.4=Frg. 4.4); this passage is also quoted and attributed to Clement by Eusebius in *P.E.* 13.13.21;

(3) Frg. 4 (*P.E.* 13.12.5=Frg. 4.5—scattered quotations of Ps.-Orpheus; the patristic evidence from Clement is provided in *FHJA* 4.114–27);

(4) Frg. 4b (*Protr.* 7.73.2a)—Aratus' testimony concerning the pervasiveness of God's power and lines cited from *Phaenomena* (*P.E.* 13.12.7a=Frg. 4.6);

(5) Frg. 4c (*Strom.* 5.14.101.4b)—the reference to Zeus (*P.E.* 13.12.7b=Frg. 4.7);

(6) Frg. 5a (*Strom.* 6.16.137.4–138.4)—comments about the Sabbath (*P.E.* 13.12.9–12=Frg. 5.9–12);

(7) Frg. 5b (*Strom.* 6.16.141.7b–142.1)—comments about God's "resting," signifying that God arranged the cosmic order once and for all (*P.E.* 13.12.11=Frg. 5.11);

(8) Frg. 5c (*Strom.* 6.16.142.4b [+144.3])—the claim that the "principle of seven" extends to plants and animals (*P.E.* 13.12.13=Frg. 5.13);

(9) Frg. 5d (*Strom.* 5.14.107.1–4[+ 108.1])—the Sabbath as sacred, supported by testimony from Hesiod, Homer, and Callimachus (*P.E.* 13.12.13–16=Frg. 5.13–16); this passage is also quoted and attributed to Clement by Eusebius in *P.E.* 13.13.34–35a.

Anatolius. One fragment (Frg. 1), which deals with astronomical observations relating to the observance of Passover, is preserved by Anatolius, bishop of Laodicea, in his work Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα, which is no longer extant. Anatolius' quotation is preserved in Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.14–19. The statement attributed to Aristobulus by Anatolius (§§17–18) is possibly a paraphrase.

Eusebius. Four fragments (Frgs. 2–5) expressly attributed to Aristobulus are quoted by Eusebius in two sections of *P.E.*:

(1) Frg. 2, which provides an allegorical explanation for biblical anthropomorphisms, occurs as a single quotation in *P.E.* 8.9.38–10.18a.

(2) Frgs. 3–5 occur in a single section (*P.E.* 13.11.3–12.16), although Eusebius says that he omitted intervening material between Frgs. 3 & 4 (Frg. 4.3) and Frgs. 4 & 5 (Frg. 5.9). A portion of Frg. 5 (5.10–11a),

also attributed to Aristobulus, is quoted earlier in *P.E.* 7.13.7–14.1 (=Frg. 5e). These three fragments, all probably taken from the "first book" (*Strom.* 1.22.150.1–3=Frg. 3a), treat respectively the Greeks' derivation of their wisdom from the Jews (and the required early Greek translation of the Hexateuch); Greek dependence on Jewish tradition as reflected in Orpheus and Aratus; and the philosophical respectability of the Sabbath as attested by Hesiod, Homer, and Linus.

Eusebius appears to quote these fragments directly from Aristobulus' own work, but he also knows Aristobulus via Clement. In Frg. 5.16 he refers to Clement's testimony relating to Aristobulus, and in some cases (Frgs. 3a[1], 4a, and 5d) he transmits Clement's quotations of Aristobulus. Eusebius' quotations encompass all of the aforementioned fragments from Clement. While Eusebius' quotations adhere more closely to Aristobulus' original text, Clement's are more paraphrastic and reflect stylistic improvements.

The Tradition About Aristobulus

2 Maccabees 1:10. The earliest testimony to a Jewish figure named Aristobulus occurs in the epistolary prescript of the letter from Palestinian Jews to Egyptian Jews in 2 Macc 1:10–2:18 (cf. T 1). The letter is likely a forgery composed ca. 60 BCE, although it is arguably authentic and has been dated as early as ca. 164 BCE.[2] If the early date is correct, the letter serves as contemporary testimony linking Aristobulus to the time of Judas Maccabaeus. If the later date is correct, the letter shows that Aristobulus' reputation as a highly regarded Alexandrian Jew was still intact after a hundred years. In neither case, especially the former, should we imagine that Aristobulus is a fictive addressee nor that he is wrongly situated. Addressing such a letter to a historical figure appropriately dated would seem to be the minimal requirement for credibility.

The prescript describes Aristobulus as a member "of the family of the anointed priests," a "teacher of Ptolemy the king" and connected with "the Jews in Egypt." The author of the letter clearly envisions him as a prominent figure—someone with impeccable religious credentials who has sufficient stature to be considered King Ptolemy's "teacher" and rank as co-addressee with all Egyptian Jews. From the context of the letter, and 2 Maccabees as a whole, the time period envisioned is shortly after the Maccabean revolt. Thus, even though "Ptolemy the king" is not further identified in the prescript, the informed reader is expected to think of

Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 BCE). As much as this brief prescript tells us, however, it does not attribute any writings to Aristobulus; nor would we expect it to do so.

This slender portrait in 2 Macc 1:10 probably has a historical core, even if we entertain doubts about Aristobulus' priestly descent[3] and his status as King Ptolemy's teacher. Most likely, the latter claim does not mean that Aristobulus was the king's tutor, but rather that he became regarded as the king's "teacher" in a more loosely understood literary sense because he had written a work addressed to the king.[4]

Clement. The earliest mention of a Jewish *author* named Aristobulus occurs in Clement (T 3=Frg. 3a; T 4; cf. T 2 and T 5=Frg. 2a), and it is Clement who first identifies him as the figure mentioned in 2 Macc 1:10 (T 4). Oddly enough, however, Clement neither mentions Aristobulus' priestly descent nor his connection with Egyptian Jewry. Even though Clement does not identify Aristobulus as King Ptolemy's teacher, he does add further details to the tradition.

First, he makes explicit the connection the author of the letter expected the reader to draw, namely, that Aristobulus was a contemporary of Ptolemy VI Philometor (T 3=Frg. 3a; similarly, T 4, if emended).

Second, he provides information about the nature and extent of Aristobulus' writings: there were *βιβλία ἱκανά* (T 4), probably a single work with many volumes ("thick volumes," Bickerman). He quotes from "the first book" (T 3), which probably suggests that he had direct access to the work; if not, at least to an epitome that identified the various divisions of the work. The work was addressed to King Ptolemy (T 3) and sought to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jews (T 2) and the derivation of Greek (Peripatetic) philosophy from the Bible (T 4). The fragments quoted by Clement characterize Aristobulus' work as allegorical interpretation (T 5=Frg. 2a, esp. §4 *τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ κατὰ τὴν γραφὴν ἀλληγορία*). Clement also knew that, in addition to the more well-known tradition concerning the translation of the LXX (Frg. 3b), this work referred to early Greek translations of the Bible known by Pythagoras and Plato (Frg. 3a). He expressed doubts about neither tradition. He knew some version of Aristobulus' Orphic poem and clearly knew the traditions about the Sabbath and the number seven reported by Aristobulus (Frg. 5).

Third, Clement identifies Aristobulus' philosophical approach as Peripatetic (T 2; also T 4 and T 13).

Eusebius. In his testimony concerning Aristobulus, Eusebius is clearly dependent in certain respects on Clement. He quotes portions of Aristobulus that are preserved in Clement (Frgs. 4a and 5d; also the Orphic poem in Frg. 4) and also acknowledges Clement as his source in one instance (Frg. 3a[1]; also cf. Frg. 5.16). Eusebius' description of Aristobulus also suggests that he is dependent on Clement's testimony, e.g., in identifying him as the person mentioned in 2 Macc 1:10 (T 12=Frg. 2 §9.38; cf. T 4), in characterizing him as a Peripatetic (T 12=Frg. 2 §9.38; T 14=Frg. 3, §11.3 Title; esp. T 13), in naming Philometor as the Ptolemy to whom Aristobulus' work is addressed (Frg. 3a[1], *P.E.* 9.6.6=*Strom.* 1.22.150.1), and perhaps in his descriptions of the content and extent of the work (T 8, T 10, T 11, T 12, and T 14).

Eusebius also preserves material from Aristobulus' work that is not found in Clement. Naturally this means that Eusebius either knew Aristobulus through some other secondary source or that he had direct access to his work. Since there is no clear evidence of the former, the latter is more likely. But as is the case with Clement, it is difficult to tell whether Eusebius might have had access to the entire work or only selections.

From the fragments of Aristobulus quoted by Eusebius, it is also clear that, without having recourse to Clement, he could have concluded that Aristobulus was a Peripatetic (Frg. 5.10); that in his work he addressed one of the early Ptolemies (Frg. 3.2; cf. Frg. 2.1); and that the work was primarily allegorical exegesis of the biblical text designed to show that Greek philosophers and poets had borrowed from Moses (esp. Frgs. 2, 3, and 4). Even so, it appears that what Eusebius knew about the figure Aristobulus is largely derived from Clement. Like Clement, Eusebius mentions neither Aristobulus' priestly descent nor his status as King Ptolemy's teacher. Thus we can think of the testimony of 2 Maccabees, Clement, and Eusebius as a single tradition.

Anatolius. Compared with the relative uniformity of the 2 Maccabees–Clement–Eusebius tradition, the testimony of Anatolius represents a somewhat divergent tradition and illustrates the kind of confusion that existed in antiquity regarding the date and reputation of Aristobulus. Like his counterparts, Anatolius also knows Aristobulus as an author of "commentaries on the law of Moses" (T 7=Frg. 1.16). As to Aristobulus' date, Anatolius cites him as an "earlier authority" (*καὶ τῶν ἔτι παλαιοτέρων*, Frg. 1.16) than Philo and Josephus (and Musaeus) and

links him with the translation of the Greek Bible under the auspices of Ptolemy I Soter and Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Thus it is to "these same kings" that his scholarly work is dedicated, not "King Ptolemy" or "Ptolemy Philometor." Rather than identifying Aristobulus as a Peripatetic philosopher, Anatolius names him as one of the seventy translators. The only indication that Anatolius might have known 2 Macc 1:10 is his apparent knowledge of Aristobulus' reputation as a "teacher." He makes no mention of his priestly descent. Although he refers to Aristobulus' exegetical interpretations of Exodus, he makes no mention of his allegorical approach to Scripture. He concentrates instead on Aristobulus' astronomical observations relating to the observance of Passover.

Since Eusebius cites this testimony from Anatolius, which contradicts his own later testimony about Aristobulus in *P.E.* (see annotations n. 15), it most likely represents an independent tradition. In spite of the conflicting elements, certain features correspond to the 2 Maccabees–Clement–Eusebius tradition: Aristobulus, a prominent Jewish scholar, author of a multi-volume exegetical work on the Pentateuch (Exodus) dedicated to (one of) the Ptolemies and written to explain questions arising from the text.

Origen and other witnesses. Other witnesses to the Aristobulus tradition appear to derive from these two traditions. Sozomen depends on Anatolius (T 7a), and the testimony in Eusebius–Jerome's *Chronicon* (T 8) is perpetuated in subsequent versions of the *Chronicon* (T 8a, T 8b, T 8c). Jerome's testimony (T 9a) derives from Eusebius (T 9), as does the testimony in the Tübingen Theosophy (T 14a).

The one possible exception might be Origen (T 6) who in his testimony concerning Aristobulus mentions neither 2 Maccabees nor Clement. His testimony confirms important features of the tradition: (a) that Aristobulus was "still earlier" than Philo; (b) that he was an author of "writings" containing allegorical interpretation of the law; and (c) that they were of sufficient sophistication and stylistic merit to impress educated Greek readers. Yet each of these items he could easily have derived from Clement, and there is nothing to suggest that he derived his knowledge of Aristobulus either directly or from sources other than Clement.

Summary. From what appear to be two independent traditions, then, the ancient portrait of Aristobulus is relatively uniform in identifying him as a prominent Jewish figure who flourished in Ptolemaic Egypt and wrote

exegetical works on the Pentateuch that employed allegorical methods of interpretation and treated philosophical topics.

This tradition notwithstanding, Aristobulus' status as an early representative of Hellenistic Judaism has been contested in almost every respect: his ethnic identity, his early dating (in the Ptolemaic period), and the genuineness of the writings ascribed to him.

The Case Against Authenticity

Doubts. As early as the seventeenth century, questions were raised about the ancient testimony concerning Aristobulus as it related to LXX origins.[5] In 1685 Humphrey Hody, who later became Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford, published his *Contra historiam Aristeae de LXX interpretibus dissertatio* in which he raised serious objections against the ancient Aristobulus tradition. That same year, Richard Simon independently expressed similar doubts, which Hody subsequently noted in his 1705 edition.[6]

Hody. In response to earlier scholars, such as Walton, who had defended the reliability of the account of LXX origins in *Epistle of Aristeas*, Hody sought to demonstrate its spuriousness. Scholars had argued that the *Epistle of Aristeas* account was reliable because a similar (independent) account had been earlier reported by Aristobulus. To contest this, Hody felt constrained to show not only that Aristobulus was actually later than *Epistle of Aristeas*, but that he simply perpetuated its fantastic story of LXX origins.

According to Hody, Aristobulus' testimony cannot be used to support the reliability of the *Epistle of Aristeas* account because it too was suspect.[7] He first examined Aristobulus' report that Demetrius of Phalerum supervised the LXX translation under Philadelphus.[8] Noting that it conflicts with Hermippus' report (Diog. Laert. 5.78) of the enmity between Demetrius and Philadelphus, he insisted that it could not have been written during the reign of Philometor (as Clement claims), when their mutual hostility still would have been well known. Moreover, the disparities within the patristic evidence concerning the Ptolemy under which Aristobulus lived also suggested composition at a much later date when these things would have been easily confused.

As a second line of argument, Hody noted the failure of Jewish and Christian authors, especially Josephus, to mention the writings of Aristobulus prior to the time of Clement.[9]

The evidence is best explained, according to Hody, if one concedes that no "Aristobulus the Jew, teacher of King Ptolemy" ever existed; that the commentaries on the Pentateuch attributed to him and preserved in fragmentary form in Clement and Eusebius were actually dependent on *Epistle of Aristeas*, and like the latter work were forgeries that originated during the Christian era; that the letter in 2 Maccabees is a forgery; and that there is no reason to link the addressee of the 2 Maccabees letter with the later Jewish author to whom commentaries are attributed.[10] Consequently, Hody concluded that the Aristobulus commentaries originated shortly before the time of Clement in the late second century.[11] He did concede, on the basis of the testimony of Cyril of Alexandria,[12] that there might have been a *pagan* Peripatetic philosopher named Aristobulus, along with the Jewish exegete "Aristobulus," but that Clement and Eusebius confused them.[13]

The doubts raised by Simon and Hody began a tradition of skepticism that proved to be widely influential.

Eichhorn. In 1793 Eichhorn provided a detailed treatment of the question, complete with Greek texts of the fragments and testimonia, as well as a rehearsal of Hody's objections to authenticity. On the basis of this thorough analysis, he adopted the Simon–Hody position.[14]

Lobeck. With the work of Lobeck (1829), the case against Aristobulus edges forward.[15] Like Simon and Hody, Lobeck regarded the fragments attributed to Aristobulus as pseudonymous, but he came to this conclusion based on his analysis of the Orphic poem preserved in Aristobulus. Since Aristobulus' longer version of the poem contains verses not found in Clement, Lobeck insisted (on the assumption that if Clement had known them he would have used them) that it could not have been known to Clement. Instead, the poem, and consequently the Aristobulus writings themselves, must have been composed later than Clement by a Jewish or Christian author between the time of Clement and Eusebius.[16] It should be noted that in making this argument, Lobeck overlooked the critical fact that four times Clement cites Aristobulus by name, and several other times quotes anonymously the very Aristobulus who presumably postdated him! But this only comes to light in the subsequent debate.

Graetz. During the nineteenth century, the Simon–Hody–Lobeck synthesis received wider coverage. In 1878 Graetz, acknowledging the work of these predecessors, formulated a modified position.[17] From 2 Macc 1:10 he concluded that a Jew named Aristobulus flourished during

the reign of Ptolemy VII and served as his teacher. At a later date, ca. 50–70 CE, a Jewish author writing under the name of this earlier figure, produced a work that drew on *Epistle of Aristeas* and Philo, and was set during the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor because of the latter's well known philo-Semitic policies.

Joël. In roughly the same period, Joël (1880–83) extended the debate, acknowledging his debt to Eichhorn as well as Simon, Hody, and Lobeck.[18] Besides rehearsing earlier arguments, he further developed Lobeck's argument for a late date of the Orphic poem.

Kuenen and Drummond. During this time, the case against Aristobulus was also stated by Kuenen (1869–70)[19] and Drummond (1888),[20] but towards the end of the century significant steps were taken by Elter, Wendland, and Willrich.

Elter. As part of his more extensive investigation of the Greek gnomological tradition, Elter (1894–95) built on the previous work of Lobeck and gave detailed attention to the Orphic materials, as well as the other poetic verses attributed to various Greek poets. It was in this connection that he found it necessary to treat Aristobulus.[21]

Like Hody, Elter believed that Aristobulus was dependent on *Epistle of Aristeas*,[22] and he adduced specific parallels to support his argument.[23] He argued, for example, that if *Epistle of Aristeas* had been later than Aristobulus, it would have developed further Aristobulus' claim that there had been earlier translations of the Bible into Greek.

Elter agreed with Lobeck that the Orphic poem preserved by Aristobulus, and therefore Aristobulus himself, must have postdated Clement. He also agreed, initially at least, that the "Aristobulus" who composed the fragments preserved in Clement and Eusebius was a Christian author who lived between the time of Clement and Eusebius.[24] He later conceded, however, that the author of the Aristobulus fragments might have been Jewish, though still late, i.e., a contemporary of Clement.[25]

In addition, Elter insisted that the argument found in Aristobulus that Greeks derived their wisdom from the Jews is late and is not found as early as the Ptolemaic period.[26]

Yet Elter advanced the work of Lobeck in some important respects. First, he argued (in response to Valckenaer, who is treated below) that Aristobulus had nothing to do with the composition of the numerous verses attributed to various Greek poets, but that they were composed for a separate gnomologion.[27] Second, acknowledging the critical importance

of the Orphic poem preserved in Aristobulus, he developed an elaborate theory of its textual history, thereby giving more detailed attention to Aristobulus. In this connection, he distinguished between two "Aristobulus" editors of the Orphic poem.[28] Third, he analyzed similarities between Philo and Aristobulus to demonstrate the latter's dependence on the former, thus providing additional support for Lobeck's view that the Aristobulus fragments were composed by a Christian author.[29]

Wendland. Operating within Elter's framework, Wendland (at Elter's invitation) investigated the relationship between Aristobulus and Philo much more thoroughly.[30] On the basis of his detailed examination of relevant parallels, Wendland argued that the Aristobulus fragments were composed by a Christian author imitating Philo in the second or third century. According to Wendland, this Christian forger made little direct use of Philo, but instead depended heavily on a compendium of Philonic texts that was probably composed by an earlier Christian author.[31]

In his review of Elter, Wendland succinctly summarized the arguments against authenticity that had accumulated through the nineteenth century.[32]

(1) The presence of the problematic Orphic poem quoted by Aristobulus. This had several sub-elements:

(a) The philosophical syncretism reflected in the Orphic poem suggests a later period (e.g., late first century BCE), not the second century BCE.

(b) Its lack of mention prior to Clement (and Pseudo-Justin) points to a late composition. Had the poem originated as early as the mid-second century BCE, it is not likely to have been neglected by both Jewish and Christian writers, especially given its intrinsic appeal and potential usefulness for apologetic purposes.

(c) If the poem is a late composition, Aristobulus must be assigned a late date accordingly.

(2) The implausibility of this literary strategy within the early Ptolemaic period. It is not likely that a Jewish author in the early second century BCE would have written a work in the form of a dialogue between himself and King Ptolemy concerning questions of Jewish law which contained fabricated quotations attributed to well known Greek authors. Such a fantastic literary strategy is only conceivable at a time far removed from the actual historical period.[33]

(3) The anachronistic use of the argument that Greek philosophers and poets derived their wisdom from the Bible. Aristobulus' use of this argu-

ment is not conceivable at such an early period. It is not used by *Epistle of Aristeas* or other Hellenistic Jews before Philo, who provides a weakly formulated version of the argument. It is only later Christian authors who provide a fully developed form of the argument.[34]

(4) Their literary dependence on Philo. Comparison of relevant parallel passages suggests that the Aristobulus fragments are best understood if their heavy dependence on Philo is recognized. In fact, only by presupposing the comprehensive Philonic system is it possible to understand many of the sketchy, and otherwise inexplicable, features of Aristobulus.[35] Accordingly, this requires a reappraisal of Philo who, on this showing, is not simply an epigone standing at the end of a long period of development within Jewish Hellenistic philosophy but rather must be seen as a much more original figure.

Wendland argued that were it not for the mention of an Aristobulus in 2 Macc 1:10, there would have been no basis for later Christian authors to assign the fragments to "Aristobulus, the Jewish Peripatetic philosopher." For him, it was more plausible to believe that no such Jewish author existed at that period.

He thus proposed the following reconstruction: *Epistle of Aristeas* should be dated sometime after the mid-second century BCE; the Greek poetic verses were forged by Pseudo-Hecataeus in the second century CE, and were afterwards quoted by Pseudo-Justin and the Christian forger "Aristobulus."

Willrich. In his 1895 discussion of the origin of the LXX, Willrich briefly treated Aristobulus.[36] But rather than simply repeating the previous arguments, he raised at least one new question: the difficulty of squaring the information about Aristobulus in 2 Macc 1:10 with Oniad traditions, especially the report that Onias IV fled to Egypt from Palestine in the 160's. He also took up previous objections but pressed them more forcefully. As to the silence of Josephus, he simply found it incredible that the author of *Against Apion*, after extensive research to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish tradition and the dependence of Greek wisdom on Jewish wisdom, would not have known about a prominent Alexandrian Jewish author who had given attention precisely to this theme. Moreover, he insisted that the pseudonymous Greek verses quoted by "Pseudo-Aristobulus" were inescapably problematic and were probably derived from Pseudo-Hecataeus. Accordingly, Willrich thought "Pseudo-

Aristobulus" was a contemporary of Philo of Alexandria and that he flourished in Jerusalem sometime in the first century CE.

Conclusion of the nineteenth century. By the end of the nineteenth century, Cohn (1897), noting the previous work of Elter and Joël, confidently concluded that Aristobulus can be struck from the list of Hellenistic Jewish authors.[37] But the modified positions of Graetz, and to some extent Willrich, influenced Bousset, whose views represented a mediating position for the twentieth century. In 1897, unable to accept Elter's late date, Bousset nevertheless accepted the force of Willrich's arguments and proposed a date between 100 BCE and the time of Philo, most likely during the Roman period.[38] A similar position appeared in Gercke's PW article (1895), where he proposed a date not much later than 100 BCE, probably in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor II Lathyrus (117–81 BCE) whose father had stimulated Homeric studies.[39]

Twentieth century. Doubts about Aristobulus continued into the twentieth century. In his work on Philo, Bréhier followed Elter and Wendland, insisting that the Aristobulus fragments are not authentic but reflect imprecise, clumsy dependence on Philo.[40] In his commentary on *Epistle of Aristeas*, Hadas (1951) regarded Aristobulus as a Jewish philosopher, but was inclined to assign him a later (unspecified) date.[41] In his edition of *Contra Celsum* (1953), Chadwick expressed caution about the authenticity of the fragments.[42] In half a dozen lines, Sandmel largely dismissed the question.[43] As late as 1967 Schneider could speak of "pseudo-Aristobulischen Fragmenten," yet date them in the second century BCE.[44]

The Case for Authenticity

Valckenaer. Apart from scholars in the seventeenth century (and earlier) who defended the testimony of Aristobulus, usually in connection with discussions of *Epistle of Aristeas* and the LXX, it is Valckenaer who championed the cause of Aristobulus in the nineteenth century. In his *Diatribe de Aristobulo Judaeo*, posthumously published under the editorship of his son-in-law J. Luzac in 1806, he took up the arguments of Simon and Hody.[45]

Valckenaer's work is especially significant because of its singular focus on Aristobulus. Whereas previous treatments dealt with Aristobulus as a subchapter in the history of the LXX and the debate about the authenticity of *Epistle of Aristeas*, Valckenaer gave a detailed response to the earlier arguments of Scaliger, Simon, Hody, and others, relating spe-

cifically to Aristobulus. His approach was consistently philological, and his text-critical analysis yielded some significant emendations, often in response to objections raised by his predecessors. For example, in response to Hody's criticism pertaining to discrepancies in Clement about the Ptolemy under whom Aristobulus lived, Valckenaer argued that the reference in *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4) is a later gloss, since it conflicts with most of the other testimonies placing Aristobulus in the reign of Philometor.[46]

Generally speaking, his approach was to contest Hody's overly skeptical reading of the evidence and respond by offering alternative interpretations of the evidence or noting flaws in his argumentation. Like Hody he conceded the historical tenuousness of much that the fragments report, but he drew less radical conclusions. Valckenaer admitted, for example, that the testimony of Anatolius has some fundamental flaws, yet he insisted that it nevertheless constitutes reliable evidence for the early existence of the tradition reporting the translation of the LXX.[47] Similarly, he admitted the historical difficulty in Aristobulus' report (in Frg. 2.2) concerning Demetrius of Phalerum and Philadelphus, but rather than concluding that it was based on the fictional *Epistle of Aristeas*, and thus worthless, he suggested a harmonizing solution explaining the Hermippus passage (Diog. Laert. 5.78): the reference might be to the early part of Philadelphus' reign before Demetrius fell out of favor with the king. In addition, he argued that Demetrius, while certainly not the librarian at Alexandria, was nevertheless known for his interest in scholarship and his contacts with the Ptolemaic court and might well have suggested the idea of the library during the last years of Ptolemy I Soter's reign.[48]

The basic elements of his position are summarized early in the work.[49] After noting the objections of previous scholars, including Scaliger, Hody, Simon, and Anton van Dale, he sided with Fabricius in identifying Aristobulus as a Jewish Peripatetic philosopher who flourished under Ptolemy VI Philometor, and defended the genuineness of the writings attributed to him by Clement and Eusebius.

Other features of his position may also be noted:

(1) As for the silence of Jewish and Christian witnesses about Aristobulus, Valckenaer insists that such silence proves nothing: Philo is not wont to mention his predecessors by name and Josephus does not mention his predecessor Philo.[50]

(2) Whereas Hody dismisses 2 Macc 1:10 as useless testimony, Valckenaer regards it as reliable evidence for dating Aristobulus during

the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor.[51] He insists that the situation envisioned in the epistolary prescript as well as in the fragments themselves is historically plausible; that the addressee of 2 Macc 1:10 can be identified with the author of the fragments; that the letter scarcely points to the time of a later Ptolemy, e.g., Physcon, because of the latter's known antipathy to the Jews; and that both letters in 2 Maccabees 1–2 are genuine.

(3) He proposes that Aristobulus (or one of his Jewish contemporaries), in order to support his argument that Greeks derived their wisdom from the Jews,[52] composed the poetic verses attributed to the Greek poets, including the final redaction of the Orphic poem.[53] In this way, Valckenaer clears the church fathers (most notably Justin and Eusebius) of forgery charges. Yet he also insists that Aristobulus' forgeries of such texts were not unusual, when compared with other Jewish writings of the period. He cited numerous examples among the apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and canonical biblical books, as well from other Hellenistic Jewish writings of the period, e.g. the Solomon–Vaphres correspondence in Eupolemus.[54]

(4) He consistently argues that the church fathers—Eusebius, but especially Clement, and even Anatolius—made direct use of Aristobulus' writings.[55] This becomes an important argument against a late date.

(5) With respect to the Orphic material, Valckenaer distinguishes between the earliest version of the poem, which is found in Pseudo-Justin, and the later redaction found in Eusebius. He argues that the former is actually a Pythagorean piece and that Aristobulus is only responsible for later redactional changes and expansion of the poem. Valckenaer goes ahead to suggest that Clement knew the longer redacted version in Aristobulus, but suppressed the parts that mentioned Moses and the importance of the Torah and would, therefore, have been unbelievable to his readers.[56]

(6) In dealing with Aristobulus' testimony concerning the LXX, Valckenaer disputes Hody's claim that Aristobulus simply drew on *Epistle of Aristeas* and Philo.[57]

Successors to Valckenaer. Because of its thoroughness and overall appeal, Valckenaer's defense of the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments dominated the nineteenth century both as a reference point for loyalists and a foil for antagonists.

Gfrörer and Dähne. Aristobulus obviously figures centrally in nineteenth century studies on Philo and Hellenistic Jewish philosophy in

Alexandria. In his work on Philo (1831), Gfrörer mentioned Hody's work but found Valckenaer's arguments more convincing.[58] Consequently, he saw Aristobulus as an early exponent of Alexandrian theosophy who anticipated Philo in important respects.[59] In a similar vein, Dähne (1834) sided with Valckenaer against Hody. Although he did not regard Aristobulus as evidence of profound philosophical thinking within early Hellenistic Jewish philosophy, neither did he dismiss him as a useless, negligible forger.[60]

Zeller. A respected voice in the nineteenth century (and through the subsequent editions of his magisterial *Philosophie* in the twentieth century) is that of Zeller, who acknowledged the seminal role of Hody's work and the impressive list of his followers.[61] Nevertheless, giving detailed responses to the stock objections, he argued for the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments and proposed a date ca. 150 BCE. In his assessment of Aristobulus, Zeller was neither as glowing as Gfrörer and Dähne nor as negative as Wendland. He especially responded to Graetz's objections, e.g., that Aristobulus' reference to Demetrius and Philadelphus must imply dependence on *Epistle of Aristeas*, and that Aristobulus would not have used the eponym Philadelphus.

Other proponents of the nineteenth century. In 1869–70 Binde dated Aristobulus under Philometor and accepted the authenticity of the fragments assigned to him.[62] Freudenthal (1874–75)[63] and Susemihl (1891–92)[64] added their voices, and in 1898 Herriot called Aristobulus "le premier type complet du philosophe judéo-alexandrin."[65]

Schürer. Doubtless the most influential voice added to the chorus was that of Schürer whose *Lehrbuch* appeared in 1874.[66] Here he accepted Valckenaer's arguments against Hody and Lobeck, and even after the work of Elter and Wendland near the turn of the century, he remained convinced of the authenticity of the fragments, insisting that they derived from a Jewish author during the time of Philometor. In addition, he proposed that the poetic forgeries derived from Pseudo-Hecataeus *On Abraham.* He also responded to Elter's arguments concerning the presumed lateness of the Orphic materials (and the implied late date for Aristobulus), and the presumed lateness of the argument that Greeks derived their wisdom from the Jews.[67]

Twentieth century. The appearance of Elter and Wendland's work at the turn of the century underscored the importance of the issues relating to

the presence of the Orphic and pseudonymous poetry within Aristobulus. Their work also required that serious attention be given to Aristobulus' relationship to Philo. In direct response, Stein (1929) argued for the priority of Aristobulus over Philo.[68] Keller's Bonn dissertation, completed in 1948 but representing earlier work done around 1920, examined the linguistic evidence and its significance for dating. His examination of Aristobulus' language and style revealed marked similarities with Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, and papyri from the Ptolemaic period.[69]

Walter. Far and away the most definitive case in behalf of authenticity is Walter's 1964 dissertation *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*.[70] The most comprehensive treatment of the question since Valckenaer, this work concentrated on Aristobulus (pp. 1–171) and included a twenty-page appendix on the "Sabbath verses." Half of the first section (pp. 35–124) gave focused attention to the question of the authenticity of the fragments. Here Walter methodically examined the issues that had accumulated since Hody: (1) the likelihood of Aristobulus' having lived during the reign of Philometor; (2) the possible educational status of Aristobulus in the second century BCE; (3) the apologetic tendency in Aristobulus, namely, whether the argument that Greeks derived their wisdom from the Jews was current in the early Ptolemaic period; (4) the silence of Jewish and Christian witnesses prior to Clement; (5) Aristobulus' relationship to other authors, especially Philo, (6) Pseudo-Hecataeus, and (7) *Epistle of Aristeas*; (8) the presence of the Pseudo-Orphic verses in Aristobulus and their relationship to the question of authenticity; (9) the possibility of an editorial reworking of Aristobulus after the time of Clement and the possibility of a post-Philonic/Jewish or a post-Clementine/Christian forgery of the Aristobulus fragments.

What resulted from this study was a penetrating analysis of each of the objections against authenticity and a thoroughly informed interpretation of Aristobulus within the context of Ptolemaic Egypt (pp. 124–49). Walter analyzed and evaluated Aristobulus' hermeneutical work as it related to methods of interpreting ancient texts current within Ptolemaic Alexandria. He gave special attention to the debate between the Pergamum school (e.g., Crates), which employed Stoic allegory for interpreting Homer, and the Alexandrian school (e.g., Aristarchus), which emphasized a more "literal" text-critical, grammatical approach that eschewed allegorical interpretations. Walter plausibly suggested that Aristobulus' exegetical work reflected familiarity with these debates within Alexandrian intellectual circles and perhaps even some level of participation in them.

Walter also sought to evaluate the distinctive features of Aristobulus' hermeneutical achievement both in terms of his Jewish heritage and his indebtedness to Hellenistic philosophy. While identifying Stoic elements in both Aristobulus' approach and outlook, he was careful to distinguish fundamental differences; consequently, he judged him "Stoic" in a more nuanced sense than previous interpreters had done. Walter's concern here was to describe, as precisely as possible, Aristobulus' peculiar hermeneutical task. He concluded that it was "apologetic" in two directions: (a) inwardly, that is, justifying to his Jewish colleagues the importance of understanding Greek philosophy and how it can be correlated plausibly with the biblical tradition; and (b) outwardly, that is, convincing non-Jewish Greeks that Torah-based faith had fundamental resonance with the best of the Greek philosophical tradition; indeed, that the latter ultimately derived from the former.

Walter rightly showed that Aristobulus' faith had a clearly defined profile that could be seen both in his methods of interpretation and in the convictions that emerge from his exegetical explanations. Though indebted to Stoic thought, his view of God remained fundamentally different from Stoic theologies.

In a similar vein, Walter was also careful to emphasize that Aristobulus' hermeneutical approach was not exclusively allegorical; rather, the fragments suggest that he had other concerns and employed other approaches in interpreting Scripture. These he designated as "philosophic-hellenistic midrash," using a variation of Freudenthal's term. This broader set of concerns he saw especially in Frgs. 1 and 5. In the former, Aristobulus is preoccupied with astronomical questions relating to Passover observance and shows no interest in allegorical interpretation. The latter, on the other hand, reveals his interest in cosmological speculation as seen in his appropriation of elements of Stoic cosmology and Pythagorean number speculation. Here too the discussion is devoid of allegory.

Having placed Aristobulus within the larger context of Jewish Alexandrian exegesis, Walter was convinced that he stood at the beginning of the tradition of Alexandrian Jewish allegorical exegesis that eventually reached full bloom in Philo. He saw intermediate stages within this tradition represented by *Epistle of Aristeas* and Wisdom of Solomon. Wendland notwithstanding, Walter insisted that Aristobulus' exegetical approach, when compared with Philo, is far less developed and therefore much earlier. He noted, for example, that the elaborate technical terminol-

ogy for allegorical exegesis that abounds in Philo is absent in Aristobulus, as well as the twofold sense of Scripture that becomes axiomatic with Philo. Moreover, Philo's appropriation of Stoic methods reflects a later stage of Stoic exegesis than was available in the mid-second century BCE.

In order to evaluate Aristobulus properly, Walter insisted on a "de-Philonizing" of Aristobulus. By this he meant that Aristobulus must not always be read through a Philonic lens; instead, Aristobulus and Philo should be read on their own terms and evaluated in their own right. When this is done, Philo would not be seen simply as an epigone who transmitted in more fully developed form a tradition that originated earlier with Aristobulus, but neither would he be seen as a seminal hermeneutical figure without predecessors. To be sure, Aristobulus preceded Philo but just as surely they also drew on a common tradition: each appropriated Alexandrian traditions in different ways, thereby reflecting different stages of development within that tradition.

Equally important was Walter's separate treatment of the pseudonymous Greek verses, especially as they relate to Pseudo-Hecataeus (pp. 172–201), and his even more detailed treatment of the Pseudo-Orphic verses (pp. 202–61). Here Walter accepted Elter's conclusion that Aristobulus was not responsible for the composition of either set of verses; thus, each cluster of verses requires investigation in its own right. He accepted the position articulated earlier in various forms, that when Aristobulus included the Sabbath verses in his work, he drew on florilegia that had been prepared by earlier Jewish interpreters.

In his analysis of the Pseudo-Orphic materials, Walter made an important advance on earlier scholarship. He accepted the theoretical framework of Elter's overall scheme but rejected most of his detailed theory of textual history, most notably its late dating. In contrast to Elter's elaborately conceived recensional theory, Walter employed a five-stage recensional history of the Pseudo-Orphic poem. Unlike Elter, he dated the first three stages (Recensions A, B, and X) early, but like Elter he dated Recension C between the time of Clement and Eusebius. In this way he could explain Clement's omission of the "Moses" verses in Recension C: they are absent because they were composed later. Eusebius was able to quote the longer version of the poem since it was composed prior to his time. This means, of course, that the longer version of the poem now found in Aristobulus was inserted *after the time of Clement and prior to its quotation by Eusebius*. This became one of the most questionable parts of Walter's overall thesis. To allow for this later insertion, Walter raised the pos-

sibility that another Orphic poem had originally been quoted by Aristobulus. In this way, Walter was able to retain an early date for Aristobulus during the Ptolemaic period and at the same time account for Clement's apparent ignorance of the longer Aristobulus version of the poem.

Though controversial, this element of Walter's thesis is important to note. On the one hand, he took seriously the complexity of the Pseudo-Orpheus textual tradition and tried to give an adequate account of the various dimensions, or interpretive layers, within the history of the tradition: i.e., the "Abraham" and "Moses" Jewish redactions, as well as Stoic and Christian redactional elements. He thereby avoided the facile explanation that the long version of the poem that finally appears in Aristobulus is a smooth, coherent work and that all of its elements can be easily accounted for within the setting of Ptolemaic Egypt in the early to mid-second century BCE. On the other hand, he was unwilling to accept Valckenaer's simple solution that Aristobulus himself composed the verses (along with the other pseudonymous verses). Stylistic differences between these verses and the Aristobulus fragments, as well as material differences between the outlook of the verses and that of Aristobulus, made it impossible for Walter to attribute their authorship to Aristobulus. In addition, Walter insisted that the context of the Orphic verses in Aristobulus is not easily correlated with the context in which Frg. 4 is found in Eusebius.

In assessing Walter's overall contribution to the history of scholarship on Aristobulus, several things can be noted:

(1) the thoroughness with which he attended to the previous scholarship on the question, and his consequent appreciation for the number and complexity of issues involved;

(2) his methodical analysis of the previous objections and his consistently convincing refutation;

(3) his informed treatment of the various traditions (Peripatetic, Stoic, Pythagorean, etc.) whose influence was discernible within the Aristobulus fragments, and his refusal to blend them uncritically;

(4) the overall cogency of his interpretation of Aristobulus as a Jewish exegete who flourished during the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor.

Walter's Legacy. For these reasons, Walter's investigation effectively resolved the authenticity question for many scholars. Subsequent work on Aristobulus inevitably took note of his work and usually agreed. In the first edition of Hengel's *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1969), Walter's argu-

ments for the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments were noted as convincing and served as the basis for an extended treatment of Aristobulus' views on wisdom and creation and their relation to wisdom speculation within the context of Jewish and Hellenistic thought.[71] Denis (1970), noting Walter's convincing arguments, dated Aristobulus in the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor I but allowed for a date as late as Philometor II (117–81 BCE).[72] Fraser (1972), also acknowledging the persuasiveness of Walter's treatment though differing in his assessment of the relative degree of Stoic influence detectable in Aristobulus, accepted the authenticity of the fragments and dated Aristobulus in the time of Philometor.[73] Even with this early dating of Aristobulus, Fraser remained convinced that *Epistle of Aristeas* was used as a source by Aristobulus.[74] In the same year, Tiede wrote that "the earlier scholarly arguments for the priority of Philo to Aristobulus" had been "laid to rest by Walter."[75] In 1983 J. J. Collins assumed the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments without even mentioning the previous debate, accepting a date in the reign of Philometor and treating him as "a major figure in the history of Hellenistic Judaism."[76] Walter's position was also noted and accepted by A. Y. Collins in her 1985 treatment of Aristobulus in Charlesworth's *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*.[77] The English edition of Schürer's *History* (1986) retained his longstanding conviction of a date during the reign of Philometor, but noted in particular the confirming work of Walter.[78]

In spite of the seminal work of Simon and Hody, and the forceful expansion of their arguments by Lobeck, Elter, and Wendland, the last three centuries have seen the weight of opinion shift in the direction of Valckenaer and Walter.[79]

Objections Concerning Authenticity

In the history of scholarship on Aristobulus, a number of considerations have emerged that relate primarily to authenticity but affect a wider range of questions.[80] Three types of arguments have emerged: (1) the silence of the tradition prior to Clement; (2) arguments relating to literary dependence, with specific reference to *Epistle of Aristeas*, Philo, and Pseudo-Hecataeus; and (3) arguments of historical anachronism, with specific reference to (a) testimony concerning the LXX, (b) the priority/dependence topos, (c) the presumed lateness of the Orphic poem, (d) the use of forged Greek verses in addressing Ptolemy, (e) Aristobulus' social status, (f) plausibility of the literary strategy, and (g) the use of the epithet Philadelphus.

(1) ***Silence of the tradition.*** Is it probable that a Jewish figure so distinguished as Aristobulus, whose writings addressed topics directly relevant to later Jewish and Christian apologists, would have gone unmentioned until the time of Clement?[81] As noted earlier, Willrich calls special attention to the silence of Josephus. Given Josephus' explicit apologetic interests, his knowledge of Jewish history, and his special concern for the relationship between Judaism and Hellenism, Willrich finds it inconceivable that a figure of such presumed importance as Aristobulus would have been unknown to him; or, if known, ignored.[82]

Naturally the testimony of 2 Macc 1:10 becomes an important consideration in this argument, since it would be an early reference to Aristobulus. But its importance can be downplayed either by denying that the addressee is the Jewish philosopher Aristobulus or by noting that the prescript attributes no writings to him.

Such arguments from silence can hardly be definitive, given the vagaries of ancient authors' literary preferences and the accidental character of historical preservation.[83] The reasons for neglecting to mention previous writers are legion. For example, preference for atticizing styles in first and second CE authors could result in neglect of earlier Hellenistic writers.[84]

As for Josephus himself, with minor exceptions, he neglects to quote the Hellenistic Jewish historians who were preserved in Alexander Polyhistor's Περὶ Ἰουδαίων; in fact, he does not appear to know the latter work.[85] From another source he mentions Demetrius, Philo (Epicus), and Eupolemus (who he thinks are Greek authors!), but nowhere quotes their writings (cf. *Ag. Ap.* 1.218). The one exception is Josephus' quotation of the fragment from Cleodemus Malchus (*Ant.* 1.15.1 §§239–41), which Eusebius quotes (*P.E.* 9.20.2–4), acknowledging Josephus as his source. If anything, the work of these authors would have been more useful to Josephus than the writings of Aristobulus, yet he appears largely ignorant of them.

Only once does Josephus mention his predecessor Philo (*Ant.* 18.8.1 §259) and only in connection with his embassy to Rome on behalf of the Alexandrian Jewish community. Even though Josephus regarded him as "no novice in philosophy," he does not quote from any of his extensive corpus of writings. This is in keeping with his tendency not to mention Jewish sources on which he relies, e.g., 1 Maccabees.[86]

Because of certain similarities between sections of Josephus and the Aristobulus fragments, there is an outside chance that Josephus actually

drew on Aristobulus' writings without acknowledging the source.[87] But it is perhaps not remarkable that a work from Alexandria would be unknown to an author who flourished in Palestine and Rome.[88]

As for Philo's failure to mention Aristobulus, such an omission is in keeping with his general policy of referring to his predecessors anonymously.[89]

(2) ***Arguments relating to literary dependence.***

(a) ***Epistle of Aristeas.*** One of the earliest arguments against the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments was the claim that their reference to the translation of the Torah at the initiative of Philadelphus and under the supervision of Demetrius of Phalerum (*P.E.* 13.12.2=Frg. 3.2; cf. *Ep. Arist.* 9–51, 120–27, 172–81, 301–22), and to an earlier translation that would have been available to Plato and Pythagoras (*P.E.* 13.12.1= Frg. 3.1; cf. *Ep. Arist.* 30), must have derived from *Epistle of Aristeas*.[90]

While comparisons between *Epistle of Aristeas* and Aristobulus initially stemmed from their common interest in the LXX, other similarities have been noted.[91] These include:

(1) similarity of literary genre and situation: philosophical instruction addressed to a king dealing with questions arising from the biblical text; cf. Frg. 2 §10.1 and *Ep. Arist.* 176, 187–294 (see annotations n. 27);

(2) similar use of allegorical interpretation; cf. Frg. 2 generally, esp. 2.2–3; Frg. 4.3; Frg. 5.9, 12; *Ep. Arist.* 121–71; similarity of terminology, e.g., *μυθῶδες* (Frg. 2.2; *Ep. Arist.* 168, 322; see annotations n. 32.); *φυσικῶς* (cf. Frg. 2.2; *Ep. Arist.* 143, 171);

(3) similar terminology, e.g., *διαλήψεις ὅσιαι* (Frg. 4.8; *Ep. Arist.* 234; also 235); reference to *εὐσέβεια*, *δικαιοσύνη*, and *ἐγκράτεια* (Frg. 4.8; *Ep. Arist.* 131, 278);

(4) similar theological outlook, e.g., the pervasiveness of the power of God (Frg. 4.7; *Ep. Arist.* 132).

These similarities are too numerous and too striking to ignore. A certain similarity of form is reinforced by the numerous material similarities and common concerns, most notably their common use of the LXX tradition. If literary dependence must be posited, it is more likely that *Epistle of Aristeas* depended on Aristobulus than vice versa. When the various points of similarity are compared, generally speaking, the form of each tradition in Aristobulus is less developed than its counterpart in *Epistle of Aristeas*. For example, the form of allegory in Aristobulus

appears more primitive than the moralizing allegory in *Epistle of Aristeas*, and the version of the LXX tradition appears similarly primitive when compared with the more fully developed version in *Epistle of Aristeas*. It should also be noted that the references found relatively close together in Aristobulus are scattered throughout *Epistle of Aristeas*, and this suggests the latter's dependence on the former rather than vice versa. With respect to Aristobulus' description of Demetrius of Phalerum (Frg. 3.2), even though the passage appears truncated, Aristobulus does not make the mistake of identifying Demetrius as the librarian of Alexandria as *Ep. Arist.* 9 does. This is the kind of claim that is more credible the later it is.

Because of the inherent difficulties of establishing literary dependence, especially when it involves comparing literary fragments with a complete document, the least problematic explanation with respect to the LXX accounts is that Aristobulus and *Epistle of Aristeas* make different use of a common tradition, or simply preserve two different forms of that tradition.[92] The other similarities can be explained as the result of composition in roughly the same period in Alexandria.

(b) ***Philo.*** Although Aristobulus' relationship to Philo is mentioned early in the debate,[93] the question is taken up by Elter[94] and examined in detail by Wendland.[95] As noted earlier, on the basis of his investigation, Wendland concludes that the author of the Aristobulus fragments depended on Philo, although probably indirectly.

Such dependence is denied by Stein who makes several counter arguments, which he supports by analyzing several sets of parallel passages.[96] First, compared with Philo, Aristobulus' form of allegory is quite primitive and does not go beyond Palestinian, anti-anthropomorphic allegory. Second, Aristobulus makes no attempt to explain why anthropomorphisms are used in the Bible. By contrast, Philo is the first to argue that they have pedagogical value. Had Aristobulus been aware of this argument, most likely he would have made use of it in a writing addressed to Ptolemy explaining the presence of anthropomorphisms in the Bible. Third, Philo's view of the Logos, especially its relation to divine powers, is not found in Aristobulus. If the Logos theory found in Philo is pre-Philonic, this would make Aristobulus even earlier.

Walter supplements Stein with an even more detailed comparative analysis.[97] Walter sharply questions Wendland's assumption that Aristobulus can only be understood if one presupposes an earlier Philonic system. He also faults Wendland's corresponding tendency to read

Aristobulus only in terms of the ways he has failed to understand Philo! By contrast, Walter insists that every instance of detailed comparison only proves how much more developed and nuanced Philo's thought is.

Among the considerations he offers, the following can be noted:

(1) Philo's view of Scripture's twofold meaning is absent in Aristobulus.

(2) The ethical-psychological form of interpretation that is pervasive in Philo does not occur in Aristobulus. By contrast, Aristobulus deals with passages which, when read literally, are philosophically objectionable, e.g., anthropomorphic expressions that seem to convey a philosophically unacceptable view of God. Rather than developing an elaborate ethical-psychological allegory, Aristobulus responds that Moses did not intend for such expressions to be taken literally, but that the reader must recognize their "expanded" sense.

(3) The absence in Aristobulus of significant technical terminology used in connection with allegorical interpretation suggests that he stands much earlier in the tradition than Philo who makes abundant use of such terminology.

(4) The presence of similar themes in Aristobulus and Philo is best explained if the two figures are seen as belonging to a common tradition which Aristobulus earlier represents partially and Philo later represents much more fully.[98]

(c) ***Pseudo-Hecataeus.*** By arguing that the whole compositional history of Pseudo-Orpheus took place during the Christian era, Elter proposes that at one stage (between Pseudo-Justin and Clement) the Orphic poem underwent editorial expansion by two "Pseudo-Hecataean" editors who added the Abraham material to the poem. At a subsequent stage (between Clement and Eusebius), he suggests, it underwent further editorial expansion at the hands of two "Aristobulus" editors who added the Moses portions. Thus "Pseudo-Hecataeus" preceded "Pseudo-Aristobulus" in the textual history.[99]

In response to Elter, Schürer develops an alternative proposal to explain the textual history of Pseudo-Orpheus.[100] Rather than accepting Elter's view of a linear genealogical relationship between the various recensions of the Orphic poem, Schürer proposes that the three versions of the poem found in Pseudo-Justin, Clement, and Eusebius all derive from a common source: Pseudo-Hecataeus. Because the Jewish pseudonymous work *On Abraham* attributed to Hecataeus of Abdera contains a Jewish

pseudonymous quotation attributed to Sophocles, Schürer thinks the work might have contained other pseudonymous Jewish compositions, either quotations from other pseudonymous poets or the Orphic verses. Thus, like Elter, Schürer is willing to include a "Pseudo-Hecataeus" stage in the tradition-history of the Orphic verses, but he places it at a much earlier date.[101] In fact, he ascribes to Pseudo-Hecataeus a single work that encompassed both *On the Jews* and *On Abraham*, which he dates in the late third century BCE on the grounds that it is the work referred to in *Ep. Arist.* 31, which he dates ca. 200 BCE.[102]

Thus, the scheme of literary relationship envisioned by Schürer is Pseudo-Hecataeus (late third cent. BCE), *Epistle of Aristeas* (ca. 200 BCE), and Aristobulus (ca. 170–150 BCE).

Also dissatisfied with Elter's proposal, Bousset adopts Schürer's scheme, but is convinced by Willrich[103] that Pseudo-Hecataeus must be dated ca. 100 BCE.[104] Accordingly, he shifts the date of Aristobulus forward to the Roman period.[105]

In developing his scheme of literary relationships, Schürer makes two critically important assumptions: (a) that *Ep. Arist.* 31 refers to Pseudo-Hecataeus' work *On Abraham*, and (b) that the Pseudo-Sophocles quotation implied the presence of other pseudonymous Greek verses and other verses cited by Aristobulus, including the "Sabbath" verses and the Orphic poem.[106] If this scheme is correct, then Aristobulus might have used *Epistle of Aristeas* directly or, alternatively, he might have drawn on Pseudo-Hecataeus independently as a source for the pseudonymous materials he quotes.[107] But this is a highly conjectural set of connections, and there is not enough similarity between Aristobulus and the extant fragments attributed to Pseudo-Hecataeus to posit such dependence.[108]

(3) ***Historical anachronisms.*** Several elements in the Aristobulus fragments have been thought to suggest a period later than the reign of Philometor.

(a) ***Reports concerning the LXX.*** Early in the debate concerning authenticity, Aristobulus' reports concerning the translation of the Bible into Greek were seen as problematic in two respects: first, the claim that portions of the Pentateuch had been translated prior to the time of Alexander and the Persians (Frg. 3.1), and second, the claim that the complete translation of the Torah occurred under Philadelphus and that Demetrius of Phalerum had supervised the project (Frg. 3.2).

Critics argued that since the enmity between Philadelphus and Demetrius reported by Hermippus (Diog. Laert. 5.78) was well known in antiquity, not only was Aristobulus' report itself inaccurate but it is also implausible to think that such a blatant error would have been included in a work composed less than a century later. Such a mistake must point to a later period.[109]

Some defenders of Aristobulus were convinced by Valckenaer that Demetrius might well have played an influential role in the translation project during the last two years of Ptolemy I Soter's reign, when Philadelphus was co-regent, or that he might have done so prior to his fall from favor and banishment. But such explanations are predicated on the assumption that Aristobulus intends to give a historical report. At the level of popular tradition, a connection between Philometor and Demetrius is certainly conceivable in the mid-second century BCE.

In this connection should also be mentioned the report in Anatolius ap. *H.E.* 7.32.16 (T 7) that identifies Aristobulus as one of the seventy translators of the Greek Bible and thereby places him during the time of Philadelphus. While Anatolius attributes this report to Aristobulus himself, it is worth asking how it originated. Aristobulus is not mentioned among the translators named in *Ep. Arist.* 47–50. It is perhaps the kind of mistake Anatolius himself might have made based on a hurried reading of Aristobulus Frg. 3.2. Or, more likely, it is a tradition older than *Epistle of Aristeas* that originated in connection with the Aristobulus fragments.

(b) ***The priority/dependence topos.*** As early as Eichhorn, scholars regarded the argument that Greek philosophers and poets derived their wisdom from the Bible as late, asserting that it was not found as early as the mid-second century BCE.[110] According to Graetz, the presence of the argument in Aristobulus is a sure sign of his Christian identity.[111] According to Elter, the argument is found in only minimal, undeveloped form in Philo, but occurs in Aristobulus in a much more blatant, fully developed form; thus Philo is early, Aristobulus late.[112]

During the course of the debate, many examples to the contrary have been adduced. Numerous instances of the priority/dependence topos have been found in other Jewish authors from roughly the same period, e.g., Artapanus, Eupolemus, and Pseudo-Eupolemus. It is also found, in various forms and to various degrees, among pagan authors even earlier, most notably, Megasthenes (ca. 300 BCE) and Hermippus of Smyrna (ca. 200 BCE).[113] The topos occurs several times in Philo *Qu. Gen.*, which is now widely regarded as an authentic Philonic tractate.

(c) ***The presence of the Orphic poem.*** As early as Eichhorn, Aristobulus' quotation of the Orphic poem was seen as an indication of his late date.[114] The presence of the poem in Aristobulus figures prominently in Lobeck's discussion, which concentrates on the poem's textual history.[115] Lobeck's observations are developed further by Joël,[116] but Elter's extended treatment gives the problem special visibility.[117]

The basic problem stems from the fact that the poem exists in at least three early recensions, all of them different—Pseudo-Justin, Clement, and Eusebius. Moreover, the version of the poem attributed to Aristobulus in Eusebius, the longest of the three, contains verses found in neither of the other two recensions—material unaccountably absent, especially in Clement, since it would have served his apologetic purposes so well. It was thus concluded that Aristobulus' version of the poem, and, by implication, Aristobulus himself, must have postdated Clement.

Lobeck already recognizes the various recensions of the poem, but it is Elter who attempts to give precision to its textual history. Even though his elaborate sixteen-stage theory of the poem's tradition history did not convince many scholars, his fundamental scheme of evolutionary development won favor. Elter's late dating of the entire redactional history of the poem did not win acceptance, but it continued to be defended by Wendland and a few other followers of his general position. Perhaps the single most debated item is the dating of the compositional history, especially Recension C, the version of the poem in Aristobulus.

At least two approaches have been taken. One, exemplified by J. J. Collins, is to maintain an early dating for Aristobulus (mid-second century BCE) and argue that Aristobulus' version of the poem (Recension C) is even earlier; thus, that it contains no elements that require a dating past the mid-second century BCE. Another approach is to maintain an early date for Aristobulus but insist that he quoted an earlier version of the poem different from the one that finally appears in Eusebius. This approach responds to the problem Elter sees so clearly, yet it is not bound by his radical conclusions regarding date. Adopting the second approach, Walter thus maintains an early date for Aristobulus and suggests that Recension C was produced between the time of Clement and Eusebius. Thus he proposes that Aristobulus quoted another Orphic poem at that point in the text, and in the subsequent history of transmission, Recension C was substituted. Schürer produces a variation of the second approach: Aristobulus is dated early and thought to have likely quoted one of the earlier versions of the poem, either Recension A or B; then, in the sub-

sequent history of the text, the form of the poem in Eusebius becomes expanded.

The long debate concerning the Orphic poem and its relation to Aristobulus has made several things clear. First, Lobeck's conclusion that Aristobulus postdated Clement is unacceptable, since Clement himself twice quotes material explicitly attributed to Aristobulus.[118] Second, the various recensions of the Orphic poem can be explained using a developmental scheme that makes sense of the complex textual history and accounts for the distinctive historical, literary, and theological features in the various recensions. Third, recognition of the recensional history makes it possible to separate the history of the Orphic poem itself from the question of Aristobulus' date and the authenticity of the fragments attributed to him. Broad consensus has emerged with respect to the latter even though there is still broad disagreement about the former. Fourth, the debate has succeeded in isolating features of the poem in its various recensions that merit further examination. For example, Wendland's insistence that the philosophical syncretism reflected in the poem suggests a late first century BCE dating dovetails with some of Walter's observations about similarities between certain features of the poem and Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo*. These correlations still deserve further study.[119]

(d) ***The use of forged Greek verses in addressing Ptolemy.*** As just noted, the ostensibly late date of the Orphic poem appeared to require a late date for Aristobulus. But it occurred in Aristobulus alongside other verses that were seen to be equally problematic. The set of pseudonymous verses relating to the number seven, which were attributed to Hesiod, Homer, and Linus (Frg. 5), were also thought to require a late date but for a different reason. It was argued that a Jewish author in a work addressed to Ptolemy VI Philometor would not have used quotations attributed to well known Greek poets whose pseudonymous character could so readily have been identified. This would have been especially problematic if, as Valckenaer suggests, Aristobulus himself composed the verses.[120] Such activity, it was argued, could only be envisioned at a much later period.[121]

To be sure, with the exception of one verse taken from Hesiod (Frg. 5.13) and the lines taken from Aratus *Phaenomena* (Frg. 4.6), the verses are pseudonymous. But it is now recognized that the production and use of such verses must be seen against the background of both the Greek and Jewish tradition of pseudepigraphy. The practice of ascribing poetic

verses, or tracing certain traditions and customs, to such figures as Orpheus is already noted by Herodotus and Aristotle.[122] Thus it is not at all unlikely that Pythagorean florilegia containing verses on a single theme, e.g., the number seven, might have been used within Jewish circles prior to the time of Aristobulus.[123] Jewish pseudepigraphy was also a well established tradition by the second century BCE.[124] The presence of the Pseudo-Sophocles quotation in Pseudo-Hecataeus *On Abraham* suggests the likelihood that florilegia containing both genuine and spurious quotations were produced and collected by Jewish authors at this period, or earlier.[125]

(e) ***Aristobulus' social status.*** It has also been objected that the image of Aristobulus as Ptolemy's teacher that is preserved in the tradition (T 1), as well as the social situation envisioned in the fragments, does not fit the period of Ptolemy VI Philometor.[126] This objection has had several components, or at least has taken different forms. It has been proposed that the level of education and social status seen in Aristobulus would not have been possible so early in the Ptolemaic period.[127] Willrich finds it especially unlikely that a Jew of priestly descent could have been so thoroughly Hellenized, especially in light of the conflict between the Oniads and Tobiads during the Maccabean period.[128] But, in light of Philometor's favorable attitudes towards Jews, and the improved social standing that had occurred within Alexandrian Jewry by this time, an educated Jew of philosophical bent was not an unlikely possibility.[129] How to envision the relationship between such a figure and Philometor is more difficult to decide. Tcherikover's suggestion that Aristobulus might have served as Philometor's adviser for Jewish affairs is plausible, considering the extent of his interaction with Jewish constituencies during his reign.[130]

(f) ***Plausibility of the literary strategy.*** A somewhat related objection, although not strictly speaking a presumed anachronism, is the unlikelihood that a Ptolemaic king would have known, much less been interested in, the contents of the Torah, and that he would have put exegetical and philosophical questions to a Jewish teacher.[131]

This objection misses the mark because it fails to recognize that the dialogue between Ptolemy and Aristobulus is a literary strategy adopted by the author rather than an attempt at historical description.[132] Nor is addressing such a work to a king unimaginable. Bickerman cites as a parallel the example of Archimedes' mathematical work addressed to King Gelon of Syracuse.[133]

(g) ***The use of the epithet Philadelphus.*** Graetz argues that Aristobulus' use of the "ironic nickname" Philadelphus (Frg. 3.2) would have been an inappropriate way to refer to Philometor's ancestor.[134] But, as Zeller replies, Φιλάδελφος was an honorary epithet used by Ptolemaic kings and queens, and its fully acceptable use is documented in numerous examples.[135]

Summary. Even apart from the material arguments is the question of motive. It is especially difficult to explain why an author writing in the Christian era would draft a document set in the mid-Ptolemaic period.[136] Such a setting makes sense only during the last century and a half of the Ptolemaic era.

The long debate concerning authenticity has provided a useful forum in which to test the validity of the various arguments. It can now be seen that in many instances the opponents of authenticity based their arguments on inaccurate information or drew the wrong conclusions from correct information. But the debate has been useful in increasing our understanding of Aristobulus' historical situation as well as his writings themselves.

The Author

Several elements of Aristobulus' image as a historical figure emerge.

Peripatetic philosopher. One persistent feature of the Aristobulus tradition is the image of him as a philosopher belonging to the Peripatetic school.[137] The designation "Peripatetic" appears for the first time in Clement, but it is not certain if it originated with him. He possibly received this designation, as well as his designation of Philo as a Pythagorean, from a tradition developed earlier in Alexandria. Subsequent uses of the phrase, especially by Eusebius, appear to be derived from Clement (cf. T 13).

Within the Aristobulus tradition, the designation "Peripatetic" probably derives from his own reference to the "Peripatetic school" as the source for the "wisdom as lamp" metaphor (Frg. 5.10=*P.E.* 13.12.10). This, combined with the explicit interests of the fragments, doubtless made the designation seem appropriate.

The designation "Ptolemy's teacher" (2 Macc 1:10=T 1) does not appear to have a primarily philosophical connotation, nor to be directly related to his designation "Peripatetic philosopher."[138] It is more closely related to Anatolius' testimony concerning his renown, presumably as a "teacher," along with the two Agathobuli (T 7). Although Anatolius' inclu-

sion of him among the seventy translators of the Greek Bible represents a confused appropriation of the LXX legend, it does reinforce what is otherwise clear from the fragments and known from the tradition: that Aristobulus was a scholarly exegete.

The designation "Peripatetic" is now generally recognized as an inappropriate designation for Aristobulus, that is, if it implies that he was a member of the Aristotelian school in Alexandria. The fragments themselves show very little identifiably Peripatetic influence,[139] but Clement's use of the label appears to be quite loose: Aristobulus is a Peripatetic in the same sense that Philo is a Pythagorean. In addition to the question whether the Peripatetic school as such existed in Alexandria at the time,[140] there is also uncertainty about how the term was actually used and what it signified during this period.[141]

But even if the term is not strictly accurate as a way to designate Aristobulus, taken with other related evidence it does attest his philosophical standing. And in this respect, the two traditions of "philosopher" and "teacher" appear to merge, at least in the sense that independently they confirm the same historical reality.

Philosophical outlook. His outlook is commonly said to be eclectic because of the wide range of philosophical interests reflected in the fragments, even as brief as they are.[142]

Stoic influence seems evident in his use of allegory, even if in his interpretation of Aratus his hermeneutical sympathies appear closer to the Alexandrians rather than the Pergamenes. Nevertheless, his use of what appears to have been the stock Stoic definition of wisdom (Frg. 5.12), his reference to the pervasive power of God (Frg. 4.7), his inclusion of lines from Aratus (Frg. 4.6), and perhaps his reference to "the inherent law of nature" (Frg. 5.12) are enough to indicate Stoic influence. There are also elements in the Orphic poem that reflect a Stoicizing tendency, but it is best not to attribute these to Aristobulus himself.[143] But even with these indications of Stoic influence, the fragments reflect important differences from a Stoic outlook.[144]

There can be little doubt that his preoccupation with the number seven and his reflections on the significance of the Sabbath in Frg. 5 reflect dependence on Pythagorean traditions, whether directly or indirectly.[145]

Cynic influence has been detected in the way he connects the nature of cosmic being with the unity of the Deity, as well as in his use of allegory.[146]

Jewish identity. Even though earlier scholars proposed a Christian, and occasionally, a pagan identity,[147] the subject matter of the fragments, as well as numerous indications within the fragments themselves, clearly indicate that the author is Jewish.[148] This is confirmed by the tradition.[149]

Priestly descent. The testimony in 2 Macc 1:10 that Aristobulus stems from a priestly family is not transmitted in the later tradition. Goldstein has observed that his interest in calculating the date of the Passover (Frg. 1) and Sabbath speculations (Frg. 5) may point to priestly interests.[150]

The Work

The various descriptions of Aristobulus' work within the tradition confirm what is clear from the fragments themselves: that the work consisted of exegetical discussions of the Torah.[151]

The work appears to have been written in the form of a dialogue between Aristobulus and Ptolemy, in which Aristobulus answers the king's questions.[152] The focus of the exegetical treatment was Genesis and Exodus, Deuteronomy to some extent, and possibly other parts of the Bible.[153] Whether the work was a verse-by-verse commentary on the biblical text or more of a thematic treatment of the Mosaic law is not certain.[154] Depending on how one interprets Clement's description of the work as *βιβλία ἱκανά*, Aristobulus either wrote an extended, multi-volume work, or several separate works; probably, the former.[155]

From Aristobulus' own statements, it seems clear that the work was intended, at least in part, to show that Greek philosophers and poets like Pythagoras and Plato owed some debt to the Bible.[156] This same purpose is attributed to him in the tradition.[157] But his purpose seems to have been broader than this. He was certainly trying to correlate Greek wisdom with the biblical tradition, and in doing so establish the legitimacy of allegorical interpretation, perhaps against "anxiously conservative" literalists.[158] Walter is more nearly correct in suggesting that Aristobulus' aim was "to show that the Torah, properly (i.e., allegorically) understood, can be intelligible to educated Greeks."[159]

Date

In spite of the conflicting evidence among the patristic witnesses and the long controversy concerning authenticity, Aristobulus' work can confidently be dated to the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (180–145 BCE).[160] His use of the Greek version of the Pentateuch places his work after the

LXX, and his probable reference to Proverbs 8 might require a later date, depending on how early a Greek translation of other portions of the Bible was available. Gercke suggests that the "Philometor" to whom Aristobulus addressed his work was actually Ptolemy IX Soter II (Lathyrus) Philometor II (116–107 and 88–80 BCE), and that this was later misunderstood to refer to Ptolemy VI Philometor I.[161] But because of Ptolemy IX's inimical stance towards Jews, it is most unlikely that a work cast as a friendly dialogue between a monarch and sage would have been addressed to him.[162]

Thus it is quite conceivable that Aristobulus, ca. 176–170, when Philometor was sole ruler, yet still a young boy (10 years old), composed an exegetical work on the Bible dedicated to the young king.[163] Since it was a literary commonplace to address literary works to the reigning sovereign, Aristobulus could have done so quite credibly, without thinking for a moment that the work would actually be read by the sovereign. Yet, in doing so, he could quite plausibly consider himself "instructing" the king, especially since the latter was a young boy; or, if he did not self-consciously do so, others could plausibly so construe his work. At a later date (either by 164 BCE, or even 124 BCE, if the date in 2 Macc 1:9 applies to the second rather than the first letter), he might well have become prominent enough within Alexandrian Jewry for his name to be included as the recipient of a letter from the Jewish community in Jerusalem. Even if the letter in 2 Macc 1:10–2:18 was a fictional composition dated ca. 60 BCE, as seems likely, this does not require a later date for Aristobulus. What is critical here is not the *actual* situation of the composer of the letter, but the *fictive* situation envisioned, which in this case is the period shortly after the Maccabean revolt, and whether it would have been credible to imagine Aristobulus as a representative of the Jewish community in Alexandria at that time.

Provenance

Although it has been suggested that Aristobulus flourished in places as varied as Cyprus[164] and Jerusalem,[165] an Alexandrian provenance is the most likely setting for him and is favored by most scholars. The designation "Aristobulus of Panaeas" clearly results from Rufinus' misunderstanding of the textual tradition, and it should not be used.[166]

INTRODUCTION: NOTES

1. My numbering of the fragments, as well as the form of citing parallel versions of the fragments, conforms for the most part to the system employed by Walter and discussed in *Thoraausleger*, 7–9, especially 7 n. 2. As he indicates, the system of numbering and citing the fragments is based on the system of numbering found in Eusebius, *P.E.*

This system has become relatively standardized. Even so, in the scholarly literature there is still considerable variation in the numbering system and the forms of citation. I have sought to report these in the section, Index to Editions and Translations (see below, pp. 107–13).

The basic numbering of Frgs. 1–5 used here conforms to Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 7. There is some slight variation in the limits of each fragment. In Frg. 1, for example, a more extensive quotation is given from *H.E.* 7.32 in order to provide the larger context. Frgs. 2 & 3 are similarly extended.

My numbering of the fragments for the quotations from Clement generally conforms to Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 8. The two major exceptions are my Frgs. 3a[1] and 5e. Frg. 3a[1] is the section from *P.E.* 9.6.6–8 where Eusebius quotes *Stromateis* 1.22.150.1–3 (=Frg. 3a). In presenting Frg. 3, I have printed Frg. 3a in a parallel column to assist the reader in comparing what Eusebius attributes to Aristobulus with what Clement attributes to Aristobulus. But at the end of the Frg. 3 section, I have also presented Frgs. 3a and 3a[1] in parallel columns to allow comparative readings of Clement's text and Eusebius' quotation of the same text.

Even though there are other instances where Eusebius quotes Clement (Frgs. 4a, 4c, and 5d), I have not given parallel versions of these. I have indicated, however, in both the Index to Editions and Translations, and also at the appropriate points in the presentation of the text, where these occur.

Another difference from Walter is my Frg. 5e, where Eusebius, earlier in *P.E.* 7.13.7–14.1, gives a parallel account of a portion of Frg. 5 (*P.E.* 13.12.10–11a). This also seemed to warrant a separate presentation.

Because the system of numbering is based on the book division and paragraph number in the corresponding text in Eusebius, whether *H.E.* or *P.E.*, the result is a slightly awkward form of citation. Thus, "Frg. 1.16" does not imply that there are sixteen paragraphs in the Frg. 1 but rather that *H.E.* 7.32.16 is being referred to. Similarly, in Frg. 2, in order to refer to the first section, *P.E.* 8.9.38, or even *P.E.* 8.10.1, I cite the reference as "Frg. 2 §9.38" and "Frg. 2 §10.1," or perhaps for the latter simply "Frg. 2.1," since it is not otherwise easily misunderstood. It is for

this reason that Walter and other scholars working with these texts will usually cite the fragment number and then give the corresponding reference in Eusebius in parenthesis. Naturally, this results in long, somewhat clumsy reference citations, but it is nevertheless the tradition that has developed.

In presenting the text, I have provided the standard paragraph divisions, as well as the older section numbers from Viger, in the inner margins of both the Greek and English pages. This has been done in order to facilitate the tracing of references even when the reader may be using material that employs a more archaic form of citation or one that does not conform to the numbering system established by Walter.

2. Like the first letter (2 Macc 1:1–9), the second letter (1:10–2:18) is generally regarded as a later addition to the main body of the work (2:19–15:39). Whereas the first letter is generally dated ca. 124–123 BCE, the date of the second letter is more widely disputed. Based on comparisons of the form of greeting in v. 10b (*χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν*) with other epistolary formulae of the period, Bickerman, "Festbrief," *ZNW* 32 (1933) 233–54, dates the letter ca. 60 BCE. While acknowledging that the central portion of the letter is late (1:18b–2:5), Momigliano, *Classical Philology* 70 (1975) 81–88 (also cf. Momigliano, *Hochkulturen*, 125, dating the second letter ca. 164) and Bunge, *Untersuchungen* (1971), 32–152, regard the remaining portions (1:10b–18a and 2:16–18) as an authentic letter from 164 BCE.

The later dating is accepted by Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 17; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.100, 110; 2.69 n. 340); Wolff, *Jeremia*, 20–26. Wacholder, *HUCA* (1978), 89–133, assigns the entire letter to 164 BCE. An early date is also defended by Goldstein, *II Maccabees*.

On the authenticity of the letter, see Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1,3), 199–202; Schürer, *History*, 3(1).533–34, and 537 (bibliography); Goldstein, *II Maccabees* (AB 41A), 157–68, 540–45, esp. 164–66 for rebuttal of Bickerman, with listing and discussion of relevant epistolographical parallels. Also, see Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.630–31 n. 51, and Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 6–11.

3. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 163, especially emphasizes the difficulty of squaring the information about Aristobulus in 2 Macc 1:10 with what we know about the high priest Onias IV who fled to Egypt ca. 163.

His priestly status is not referred to again in the later tradition (see discussion below concerning the tradition), but neither is it contested. In terms of the contents of the fragments, his explicit interest in correctly determining the date of Passover as well as traditions pertaining to the

proper significance of the Sabbath might suggest priestly interests; so, Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 168.

On his priestly descent, see discussion below, n. 149.

4. See Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2.106–7 n. 378; Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 168.

Naturally the credibility of such a claim must be weighed in light of the status and social situation of Alexandrian Jews during the Ptolemaic period; on which, see Tcherikover & Fuks, *CPJ* (1957) 1.1–47; Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization*, 269–87; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.54–58, 83–85, 688–89; Smallwood, *Jews*, 220–55, esp. 220–35.

5. For the earlier debate, especially as it relates to *Ep. Arist.*, see S. Jellicoe, *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 31–32, with additional bibliography; earlier, Fabricius and Harles, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, vol. 3, bk. 3, ch. 2 (=ch. 8), pp. 469–70; Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.73 n. 1, 80 n. 17; Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 1.6–7.

6. Simon, *Histoire*, Bk. 2, ch. 2, p. 189: "Le Livre d'Aristobule, Juif & Philosophe Peripateticien, où il est rapporté qu'avant Alexandre la Loi de Moïse avoit été traduite en Grec, & que les Philosophes Grecs avoient emprunté beaucoup de choses des Hebreux, n'a pas davantage d'autorité que celui d'Aristée, & plusieurs autres dont Joseph & Eusebe ont fait mention." In Bk. 3, ch. 23, pp. 499–501, he challenges Walton's appeal to various ancient authorities, including *Ep. Arist.* and Aristobulus: "Mais comme il a esté dêja remarqué ailleurs, le Livre d'Aristée est un Ouvrage supposé par d'anciens Juifs Hellenistes, & qu'on ne peut lire, sans y appercevoir des marques evidentes de cette supposition. Les Livres d'Aristobule & de quelques autres anciens Auteurs qui ont écrit si favorablement des Juifs, ont aussi été supposés. A quoi l'on peut ajoûter, que Walton confond ici cet Aristobule avec un autre Aristobule dont il est parlé au Livre 2. des Maccabées" (499).

In his *De Bibliorum Textibus* (Oxford, 1705), whose Book I is a revised and enlarged version of his earlier *Contra historiam Aristeae*, Hody happily notes the doubts expressed by Simon (54).

7. *Bibliorum*, 50.

8. *Bibliorum*, 49–50.

9. *Bibliorum*, 53; in n. 3 Hody notes Voss's response to the argument about the silence of Jewish and Christian authors prior to Clement.

10. *Bibliorum*, 52: "Sane nullum unquam exstitisse *Aristobulum Judaeum, Praeceptorem Ptolemaei Regis*, et Epistolam supradictam, qua illius fit mentio, fictitiam esse, mihi facile persuadeo. Neque alia de causa videtur *Commentariorum* Auctor eos edidisse sub persona talis *Aristobuli*, quam quod talis mentionem in Epistola praedicta (i.e. 2 Macc 1:10) repererat." Also, see p. 53.

11. *Bibliorum*, 53.

12. *Contra Iulianum* 4, p. 134, ed. Aubert/Spanheim. Cf. T 15.

13. *Bibliorum*, 54 n. 2.

14. Eichhorn, *Bibliothek* (1787–1800), vol. 5 (1793), pp. 247, 253–98.

15. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1(2).438–65.

16. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1(2).447–48: "Quos versus quum omiserit Clemens, ignorasse existimandus est haec posteriorum veteratorum additamenta. In universum igitur sic contendo, Justiniano fragmento omnium brevissimo primigeniam carminis Orphici, qualis quidem illis temporibus fuit, formam repraesentari; novae interpolationis specimen praebere exemplum Clementis, quod Justiniano copiosius est, Aristobuleo adstrictius; novissimae ac gravissimae auctorem esse Aristobulum illum, quem Eusebius introduxit, hominem sive Judaeum sive Christianum, Clementis certe temporibus posteriorem."

17. Graetz, *MGWJ* (1878) 103–9; a more fully elaborated position appears in his *Geschichte* (5th ed., 1905–6), 3.622–30.

18. Joël, *Blicke*, 1.77–100; 2.177–80.

19. Kuenen, *Godsdienst* (1869–70), 2.398, 433–36.

20. Drummond, *Philo* (1888), 1.169, 242–55, especially influenced by Graetz.

21. Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, parts 5–9 (*de Aristobulo Iudaeo* 1–5), cols. 149–255.

22. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 212–19.

23. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 217–18.

24. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 172–73.

25. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 184.

26. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 219–39.

27. This had already been denied by Boeckh; see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 26 n. 2. This separation of the investigation of the pseudonymous Greek poets from that of the Orphic poem represents a significant advance. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 210.

28. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 180–82. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 210.

29. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 219–30.

30. The results of Wendland's investigation are incorporated into Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 229–34.

31. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 116–17. See Wendland, in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, 2.3; Wendland also expresses this view in Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 229–34.

Wendland accepts Elter's contention that the author of the Aristobulus fragments was a Christian author, although like Hody he dates him slightly earlier toward the end of the second century CE.

32. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1898) 448–49; these became available to English speaking readers in *JE* 2 (1902) 97–98.

33. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 208.

34. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 210–30.

35. This position is fully argued by Wendland himself in Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 229–34.

36. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen* (1895), 162–68.

37. Cohn, *MGWJ* (1897), 288 n. 1: "Auch Aristobul ist aus der Reihe der jüdisch-hellenistischen Schriftsteller endgültig zu streichen." Similarly, in *NJKA* (1898) 522–23, Cohn accepts Elter's (and Wendland's) arguments over against Valckenaer.

38. Bousset, *RE* (1897), 48–49; also in the widely read *RJ* (1st ed., 1903), 28–29.

39. Gercke, PW (1895) 2(1).918–20; he also notes that Philometor II Lathyrus was later called Philadelphus, which could possibly account for Anatolius' ascribing him to the period of Soter and Philadelphus (Frg. 1) and the presence of the reading in MS L for *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4) dating him to the time of Philadelphus. Gercke also suggests either an Egyptian or Cypriot provenance and denies Aristobulus' dependence on *Ep. Arist.*

40. Bréhier, *Philon* (3d. ed., 1950), 46–49.

41. Hadas, *Aristeas*, 26–27.

42. H. Chadwick, *Contra Celsum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1953; repr. 1965, 1980), 226 n. 1. See note 70 below for Chadwick's subsequent assessment.

43. Sandmel, *IDB* (1962) 1.221.

44. C. Schneider, *Kulturgeschichte des Hellenismus* (Munich, 1967), 1.891; ap. Walter, JSHRZ, 264 n. 10.

For other examples in this same tradition, see Winer, in Ersch and Gruber *Eyncyclopädie* (1820), 266; Bergk, *Literaturgeschichte* 4 (1887) 534–35: late 1st cent. BCE (beginning of reign of Augustus, prior to Philo); Renan, *Histoire* (1893) 4.249; Heinemann, *MGWJ* (1929), 432: no earlier than 1st cent. BCE, but before Philo; Meyer, *LAW* (1965) 306: 1st cent BCE; Murray, *JTS* (1967) 339 n. 1; Loeb, *Grande Encyclopédie* (n.d.), 921, apparently.

45. The work was published in Leiden by S. & J. Luchtmans. It included as an appendix P. Wesseling's essay on the Orphic fragments and Aristobulus, which appears nowhere else. Both are reprinted in Gaisford's edition of Eusebius *Praeparatio Evangelica* (1843), 4.339–451, with the original pagination printed in the margin. For a detailed summary and critical review of the work, see Gabler, *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur* 5 (1810) 183–209.

46. *Aristobulo*, §11, pp. 29–32; Gaisford 4.367–70; for examples, see Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.81.

47. *Aristobulo*, §9, pp. 24–27; Gaisford 4.363–65.

48. *Aristobulo*, §§18–19, pp. 52–58; Gaisford 4.388–93.

49. *Aristobulo*, §7, pp. 18–22; Gaisford 4.358–61.

50. *Aristobulo*, §8, pp. 22–24; Gaisford 4.361–63. Here Valckenaer echoes responses already made to Hody by G. I. Voss, *De Historicis Graecis* (Leipzig, 1838) 1.89–90, and others, which Hody himself acknowledges; see *Bibliorum*, 53 n. 3. But cf. Josephus *Ant.* 18.8.1 §259, and the discussion below concerning the silence of the tradition; also, see below n. 86.

51. *Aristobulo*, §§13–14, pp. 35–44; Gaisford 4.372–81.

52. *Aristobulo*, §3, p. 10; Gaisford 4.350–51.

53. *Aristobulo*, §§21–28, pp. 61–89, esp. 79, 85; Gaisford 4.396–419, esp. 411, 417. Consequently, other writings were attributed to Aristobulus; e.g., Lutterbeck attributed Wisdom of Solomon to Aristobulus; Conybeare and Stock attributed *Ep. Arist.* and the Aristobulus fragments to the same author. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 26 n. 2.

54. *Aristobulo*, §6, pp. 17–18; Gaisford 4.356–58. The apologetic element in Valckenaer's argument is worth noting. He defends the Christian authors by clearing them of charges of forgery, thereby transferring these charges to Jewish authors, especially Aristobulus.

55. *Aristobulo*, §§3–4, pp. 8–13; Gaisford 4.349–53; cf. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 121.

56. *Aristobulo*, §5, pp. 13–14, §24, pp. 74–75; Gaisford 4.353–54; 406–7; see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 208.

57. *Aristobulo*, §17, pp. 49–52; Gaisford 4.385–88.

58. Gfrörer, *Philo* (1831) 2.71–121.

59. It should be noted that in his evaluation of Aristobulus, Gfrörer draws heavily on the Orphic verses, attributing the views expressed in them to Aristobulus himself. See the critique of this approach in Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 115 n. 1.

60. Dähne, *Geschichtliche* (1834), 73–112.

61. Zeller, *Philosophie* (7th ed., 1921–23), 3(2).277–85.

62. Binde, *Aristobulische Studien* (1869–70), 1.22.

63. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1874–75), 166–69.

64. Susemihl, *Geschichte* (1891–92), 2.629–34.

65. Herriot, *Philon* (1898), 78.

66. The second edition appeared in 1886–90 under the title *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, with subsequent editions appearing in the twentieth century. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 2 n. 5.

67. *Geschichte*, 3.517–19.

68. Stein, *Exegese* (1929), 6–11; "Bibelkritik" (1935), 39.

69. Keller, *De Aristobulo* (1948), 79.

70. *Thoraausleger* was completed in 1961 as a dissertation at Halle with G. Delling and subsequently published in 1964. Walter's findings are summarized in "Anfänge," *Helikon* 3 (1963) 353–72. For reviews of *Thoraausleger*, see E. Lohse, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 516–17; V. Hamp, *BZ* 11 (1967) 283–84; H. Hegermann, *TLZ* 92 (1967) 505–7; also, H. Chadwick, "St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria," *BJRL* 48.2 (1966) 291 n. 1, ". . . N. Walter who has given the final *coup de grâce* to the mistaken thesis of Elter and Wendland. . . ." See n. 24 above.

71. A second, expanded edition of *Judentum und Hellenismus* appeared in 1973 and served as the basis for John Bowden's 1974 English translation; see *Judaism and Hellenism*, esp. 1.163–69. Meanwhile, Hengel adopted Walter's views of Pseudo-Orpheus and the pseudonymous Greek poets, with some modifications, in "Anonymität" (1972), 292–94.

72. Denis, *Introduction* (1970), 277–83.

73. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (1972), 1.694–96; 2.963–70 nn. 103–4.

74. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.694.

75. *Charismatic Figure* (1972), 140.

76. *Athens and Jerusalem* (1983), 175–78.

77. *OTP* 2 (1985), 832.

78. Schürer, *History* (1986), 3(1).583.

79. Apart from those already mentioned, within the encyclopedia tradition the following may be noted: Teuffel, PW 1,2 (2d ed., 1866) 1600; Hundhausen, *Kirchenlexikon* 1 (1886) 1300–1303; Levesque, *DB* 1 (1895) 964–65; Hamburger, *RealEncJud* Abt. 3, Suppl. 1 (1896) 23–26, a middle position, with qualifications; Fiebig, *RGG* 1 (1909) 685; idem, *RGG* 1 (1927) 526; Heller, *EncJud* 3 (1929) 321–24; Baur, *LTK* 1 (1930) 646–47; Ehrlich, *LTK* 1 (1957) 853; Lohse, *RGG* 1 (1957) 597; Altmann, *Ency. Brit.* 2 (1963) 387; Iōannidēs, *ThĒE* 3 (1963) 140; Gutmann, *EncJud* 3 (1971) 443–45; Wegenast, *KP* 5 (1975) 1577.

Among historical and literary treatments, as well as individual treatments of various kinds, the following may be included: Herzfeld, *Geschichte* (1847–57), 3.564–66; Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 1.397; Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum* (1857), 838; Ewald, *Geschichte* 4 (1864) 335–38; Heinze, *Lehre* (1872), 185–92, presumably; Siegfried, "Der jüdische Hellenismus" (1875), 480; idem, *Philo* (1875), 24; Karpeles, *Geschichte* (1886), 1.241–45; Holtzmann, "Das Ende" (1887–88), 2.345–46; Schlatter, *Sirach* (1897), 163; Clemen, *TSK* (1902) 684: agrees with Schürer's defense of Aristobulus' authenticity; Friedländer, *Geschichte* (1903), 28–31; Heinisch, *Einfluss Philos* (1908) 16–20, apparently; Neumark, *Geschichte* (1910), 2(3.1).386–90; Stöckl, *Grundriss* (1919), 92; Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte* (1920–24; repr. 1959–61), 2(1).603–4; Bernfeld, *Bibel* (1921), 178–79; Dubnow, *Geschichte* 2 (1925) 221–22; Schlatter, *Geschichte* (1925), 81–90, 406–7 n. 96; Praechter, *Philosophie* (1926), 570–71; Momigliano, "Aristea" (1932) 164–66; Goodenough, *Light* (1935), 277 n. 67a, cautiously; Goppelt, *Typos* (1939), 62–64; Baron, *History* 1 (1952) 196, with some qualification; Schubert, *Judentums* (1955), 18; Kahana, *Sefarim* (1956), 2(1).176–77; Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature" (1956), 176; Bickerman, *PAAJR* (1959), 3; Hanson, *Allegory and Event* (1959), 41: before 100 BCE (*Ep. Arist.*); Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature" (1960), 1103–5; Kraft, *Kirchenväter* (1966), 86–91; Dihle, *Griechische* (1967), 416; Lesky, *Geschichte* (1971), 898; Hegermann, in Maier & Schreiner, *Literatur* (1973), 172–73, 341–44; Kraus Reggiani, "Aristobulo" (1973), 163–64; Momigliano, *Hochkulturen* (1975), 138–39; Charlesworth, *PAMRS* (1976, 1981), 81–82; Pépin, *Mythe et Allégorie* (1976), 226; Klauck, *Allegorie* (1978), 92–94; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen* (1979), 125–27; Sabugal, "Aristóbulo" (1979), 196; Conzelmann, *HJC* (1981), 153–55; Eyselein, "Mythen" (1982), 49–50; Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti" (1982), 91–97; Borgen, "Philo and His Predecessors," in Stone, *Jewish Writings* (1984), 274–79; Bickerman, *Jews* (1988), 101, 228–31; Kuhn,

Offenbarungsstimmen (1989), 144; Walter, "Jewish-Greek Literature," in *Cambridge History of Judaism* (1989), 389–91.

80. These objections are periodically summarized and expanded. See Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5 (1793), 253–98; Hamburger, *RealEncJud* (1896), 3, suppl. 1.26; Bousset, *RE* (1897), 48–49; Wendland, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1898), 448–49; Schürer, *Geschichte* (1901–1907), 3.517–21; Heller, *EncJud* (1929), 324; Walter, *Thoraausleger* (1964), 35–123; Denis, *Introduction* (1970), 281–82; Schürer, *History* (1973–87), 3(1).583–86; Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti" (1982), 91–97.

81. For statements of the argument, see Simon, *Histoire*, Bk. 2, ch. 2, p. 189; Bk. 2, ch. 23, p. 499; Hody, *Bibliorum*, 53 n. 3; Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5.260, 264–65; Joël, *Blicke*, 2.84–90, who especially presses the argument; Drummond, *Philo*, 1.244–45; Cohn, *NJKA*, 522–23; see responses by Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, §8, pp. 22–24 (Gaisford 4.361–63); Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.84–85; Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 1.7–8; Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).277–78 n. 2, with detailed response; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 52–58; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.517; idem, *History*, 3(1).584.

82. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 164.

83. Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).277 n. 2, observes that the well-known and highly influential Φυσικῶν δόξαι by Theophrastus (ca. 370–288/5 BCE) is not explicitly cited before the second century CE.

84. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 52 n. 3.

85. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 53 nn. 1 and 2. This is a disputed point. Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).278: ". . . so gut Josephus den Alexander Polyhistor, welchen er öfters benützt hat, nur Einmal (*Ant.* 1.15) nennt," noting Freudenthal, 1.33. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 55 n. 1, notes the debate.

86. So, Freudenthal, 2.171. See Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).278 n. 2.

87. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 55–56, esp. n. 1, noting similarities between the Aristobulus fragments and *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 §165; 2.36–39 §255–86. See annotations, nn. 68, 78, 82, 99.

88. Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).277–78.

89. Cf. *V. Contempl.* 3 §29.

90. Argued by Simon, *Histoire*, Bk. 2, ch. 2, p. 189; Bk. 3, ch. 23, p. 499 (see Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.80 n.17); Hody, *Bibliorum*, 50; Graetz, *MGWJ* (1878) 104–5; Drummond, *Philo*, 1.247, 249–50; Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 217–18; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 165–66; idem, *Judaica*, 110; Bousset, *RE*, 49; idem, *TRu* (1902) 183 n. 4; idem, *RJ*, 28; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.611; also argued by Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.694, 696; 2.964 n. 103, 970 n. 121, who thinks that Aristobulus' explicit linkage of Demetrius of Phalerum to Philadelphus in connection with the translation project could only have derived from *Ep. Arist.* He also finds it easier to account for Aristobulus' strategy as prompted by the banquet scene in *Ep. Arist.* He does not, however, use the priority of *Ep. Arist.* to question the authenticity of the Aristobulus fragments. Instead, he dates Aristobulus during the reign of Philometor and *Ep. Arist.* slightly earlier.

On the other side, Gercke, PW (1895), 918–20, argues that *Ep. Arist.* drew from Aristobulus (which is denied by Motzo [1915]; see Hadas, *Aristeas*, 27). Aristobulus' dependence on *Ep. Arist.* is refuted by Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 88–103. Rather than arguing for *Ep. Arist.*'s strict dependence on Aristobulus, Walter thinks they drew on the core legend but appropriated it in different ways. Momigliano, "Aristea," 164–66 and *Hochkulturen*, 139, thinks Aristobulus preceded *Ep. Arist.*; similarly, Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II," 135: "Aristobulus, the literary predecessor of Aristeas"; also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.68, 164; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.425, argues for *Ep. Arist.*'s dependence on Aristobulus, the reverse of the position he takes at 3.611.

91. See Stein, *Exegese*, 11; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 88–103; esp. the detailed listing of parallels in H. G. Meecham, *The Letter of Aristeas: A Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1935) 324–27.

92. Schürer, *History*, 3(1).680 n. 281.

93. Hody, *Bibliorum*, 53 n. 3; Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 95; Gaisford 4.425. Graetz, *MGWJ* (1878) 107–8, in discussing the priority/dependence topos, says that Aristobulus must have written later than Philo.

94. Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 219–30.

95. Wendland, in Elter *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 229–34; also see *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898) 448–49.

96. Stein, *Exegese* (1929), 7–11, noting the earlier response by Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 95; Gaisford 4.425.

97. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 58–86; his findings are summarized in JSHRZ (3,2), 265–66. Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," 1104, notes the hazard of comparing the fragmentary remains of Aristobulus with the extensive Philonic corpus.

98. For the relevant Philonic parallels as they relate to specific passages in Aristobulus, see the following annotations: nn. 23 (technical terminology for allegory); 29 (anthropomorphisms); 31 (φυσικῶς); 32 (μυθῶδες); 40 (the hand of God); 44 (μεταφέρω); 46, 57, and 59 (Sinai descent); 91 (God's creative acts); 93 (Logos); 94 (God's word as act); 108 (the pervasive God); 118 (virtues); 123 (the number seven); 128 (preexistent Wisdom); 135 (God's definitive arrangement of the world at creation); 138 (God's creation of time); 139 (God's sustaining work); 142 (sevenfold principle); 144 (Stoic definition of wisdom).

Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.95, thinks Aristobulus preceded Philo.

It should be noted that an important element in the debate concerning the literary relationship between Aristobulus and Philo is the difference it makes in assessing Philo's position within Hellenistic Judaism: whether he was a mere epigone or the seminal figure. Even though this way of posing the question may not allow for other possibilities, the issue was succinctly stated by Wendland, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898) 448: "Wir sehen dann Philo nicht mehr als Epigonen einer im Grunde schon Jahrhunderte vor ihm fertigen jüdisch-hellenistischen Philosophie an, müssen vielmehr die meisten Gedanken des Aristobul als von Philo entlehnt betrachten." Similarly, Bréhier, *Philon*, 49: "Faut-il conclure avec Elter qui, sans nier les allégoristes antérieurs, soutient que le philonisme est dans l'histoire des idées juives une apparition sans précédent, que tout chez lui, procédé et système, vient de sa personnalité."

99. Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 177–87.

100. *Geschichte*, 3.601.

101. This position is revised in Schürer, *History*, 3(1).665: ". . . there is no reason to suppose that this version (Recension A) was the work of Pseudo-Hecataeus just because Pseudo-Hecataeus wrote about Abraham and quoted one of the forged verses of Sophocles."

102. *Geschichte*, 3.605–8; see Holladay, *FHJA* 1.283.

103. *Juden und Griechen*, 165–66.

104. *RE*, 49.

105. *RJ*, 29.

106. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 87–88.

107. This is the position argued by Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.596–97; Bousset, *RJ*, 25; Stählin in Schmid–Stählin, 2(1).604 n. 5. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 88 n. 3.

108. See generally, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 86–88; also, Collins, *OTP*, 2.835. Wendland, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 449, sharply contests Schürer's reconstruction, insisting instead (with Elter) that the collection of forged verses is the work of a second century Christian apologist. Similarly, *JE*, 98.

109. Scaliger, *In Chron. Euseb.*, 132 (N. 1734); Simon, *Histoire*, Bk. 2, ch. 2, pp. 189–91; Hody, *Bibliorum*, 49–50; Graetz, *MGWJ* (1878), 103–4; *Geschichte*, 3.628; Joël, *Blicke* (1880–83), 2.84; Drummond, *Philo*, 1.234–35, 246–47; Bousset, *RE*, 49.
See responses defending Aristobulus by Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, §§18–19, pp. 52–58; Gaisford 4.388–93; accepted by Gfrörer, *Philo*, 2.73–74, 115–18; Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 86–89.

110. Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5.259–60, 266–67.

111. *MGWJ* (1878) 107–8; also *Geschichte*, 3.627. Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.385–86 n. 5, comments on the relatively undeveloped form of the argument in Philo, which would imply that the more explicit, highly developed form in Aristobulus was correspondingly late. Joël, *Blicke*, 1.88, especially emphasizes the use of the theme by early Christian apologists.

112. Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 219–39; similarly, Wendland, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* (1898), 448; Drummond, *Philo* (1888), 1.248–49, 251; Cohn, *NJKA* (1898), 522; see annotations, n. 36.

113. See annotations, n. 36, with references and additional bibliography. The argument is examined in detail by Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 43–51.

114. Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5.268–69, noting the earlier mention of the argument by Eschenbach.

115. Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 438–48, esp. 448.

116. Joël, *Blicke*, 2.90–99.

117. Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 152–87.

118. *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (T 3); 6.3.32.5 (T 5). In two other instances, he quotes material that occurs in Aristobulus in the very context of the poetic verses (*Strom.* 5.14.101.4; *Protr.* 7.73.2).

119. For a detailed discussion of the problem, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 103–15; also Holladay, *FHJA* 4.87 n. 96.

120. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, §5, pp. 13–16; Gaisford 4.353–56; also, see Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 399.

121. Drummond, *Philo* (1888), 1.243–44; Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, 216; Cohn, *NJKA* (1898), 522. The objection is also noted and answered by Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.516–17.

122. On the practice of poetic pseudepigraphy as early as the 6th century BCE, see Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 399; it is recognized, e.g., in Aristotle *De an.* 1.5.410b28 (ὁ ἐν τοῖς Ὀρφικοῖς ἔπεσι καλουμένοις λόγος); Cicero *De nat. deor.* 1.38.107–8; similarly, the pseudepigraphic tradition as it relates to Musaeus is reflected in Pausanius *Attica* 1.22.7. Also, cf. Herodotus 2.81.

123. On the tradition of pseudepigraphy and the use of such florilegia within Pythagorean circles, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 166 n. 1. Also, see annotations, nn. 76, 154, 155, 157, 165.

124. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, §6, pp. 17–18; Gaisford 4.356–58, lists various examples of Jewish pseudepigraphy. Since his time, the number of examples from apocalyptic literature has increased dramatically.

125. Schürer, *History*, 3(1).657–58. On Pseudo-Hecataeus, see Holladay, *FHJA* 1.277–335; also Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.516–17; *History*, 3(1).583–84. Herriot, *Philon* (1898), 78, agrees with Schürer that Aristobulus probably drew on an earlier compilation and cited the texts in good faith. Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).279 n. 2, also exonerates Aristobulus by noting that the forgeries were not likely his own but were derived from someone else.

126. For general treatment of this objection, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 35–40.

127. Bousset, *RE*, 48–49; *RJ*, 29. See Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.519–20.

128. *Juden und Griechen*, 163.

129. On Philometor's philo-Semitic policies, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 38–39; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.83–84, 299–300; on the improved social status of Jews in Ptolemaic Alexandria, see Tcherikover, *CPJ*, 1.20–21; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.131, 144–45; also Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.695–96.

130. Tcherikover, *CPJ*, 1.20 n. 51.

131. Drummond, *Philo*, 1.245–46; Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.628.

132. So, Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).279 n. 2.

133. Bickerman, *Jews*, 228.

134. The phrase is used in the first edition of his *Geschichte*, 3.486; also mentioned by Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 1.28, and Bousset, *RE*, 49. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 25 n. 1.

135. Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).281 n. 2. Among the several examples he cites is the inscription mentioned by Droysen in which Ptolemy II gives this name to his sister and consort Arsinoe. In two Cyprus inscriptions from the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes (d. ca. 221 BCE), his parents (Ptolemy II and Arsinoe) are referred to as *θεοὶ φιλάδελφοι*. As Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 25 n. 1, notes, by the third edition of his *Geschichte*, Graetz had dropped the argument.

136. See Schürer, *History*, 3(1).586.

137. He is called *Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Περιπατητικός* (*Strom.* 1.15.72.4=T 2), and in *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4) his association with Peripatetic philosophy is implied. Clement's designation of him as *Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Περιπατητικός* is referred to by Eusebius in *P.E.* 9.6.6 (T 13). The same designation is used by Eusebius himself: "Aristobulus natione Iudaeus peripateticus philosophus" (*Chron.* 151 Olymp.=T 8); *Ἀριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος* (*Chron. Pasch.*=T 8b; also T 8a); *ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος . . .Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ*

περιπατητικός (*P.E.* 13.12 Title=T 14); similarly, Theosophia Tubingensis=T 14a (Ἀριστόβουλος, ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος). In *P.E.* 8.9.38 (T 12), Eusebius reports: ὁ δὲ Ἀριστόβουλος καὶ τῆς κατ' Ἀριστοτέλην φιλοσοφίας πρὸς τῇ πατρίῳ μετειληχώς.

In other instances, he is described as a philosopher or sage without reference to any specific philosophical school: ἄλλος Ἑβραίων σοφὸς ἀνήρ (P.E. 7.13.7=T 10) and ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος (*P.E.* 13.11.3= T 14).

For a discussion of Aristobulus as a Peripatetic, see annotations, n. 24; also, Runia, "Clement," *VC*, 8–10.

138. For the tradition of a philosopher teaching his lore to a monarch, see Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 169.

139. See annotations, n. 125.

140. Schürer, *History*, 3(1).583.

141. Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.629 n. 47; also see annotations, n. 125.

142. Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.515–16; idem, *History*, 3(1).583. On his philosophical outlook generally, see Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.629–30; Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).283–85; Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.22–33; Schlatter, *Sirach*, 163–91; idem, *Geschichte*, 81–90; Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 262–63; idem, "Jewish-Greek Literature," *Cambridge History of Judaism*, 390. Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 2.965 n. 108, thinks Walter "exaggerate(s) the likelihood of Aristobulus' familiarity with contemporary pagan (particularly Stoic) philological activity."

143. On the Stoic features of the Orphic poem, see Heinze, *Lehre*, 187–88.

144. Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.629–30; Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).283–84. Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 262–63, especially emphasizes Stoic influence.

145. On his relation to Pythagorean traditions, see Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).285; esp. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 73, 166–71.

146. Gutmann, *EncJud* 3 (1971) 444.

147. Hody, *Bibliorum*, 54 n. 2. The suggestion that there was a pagan Peripatetic philosopher named Aristobulus was based on the testimony of Cyril of Alexandria *Contra Iulianum* 4.134 (*PG* 76, col. 705 C), where

Cyril draws on Clement *Strom.* 1.15.71.5 and 1.15.72.1–4 and attributes a quotation from Megasthenes and the sentences that follow in Clement to an Aristobulus mentioned earlier. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 8–9; Schürer, *History* 3(1).581; also, cf. T 15.

148. Schürer, *Geschichte* 3.521; idem, *History* 3(1).586, lists the numerous "we-passages" that point to his unmistakable Jewish identity: Frg. 3.1 (*P.E.* 13.12.1)—"our legislation" (*τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ*); Frg. 3.8 (*P.E.* 13.12.8)—"our traditions" (*πολλὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας*); Frg. 3.11 (*P.E.* 13.12.11)—Solomon "one of our ancestors" (*τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων τις*); Frg. 3.13 (*P.E.* 13.12.13)—from "our books" (*ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων βιβλίων*); Frg. 2.1 (*P.E.* 8.10.1)—"in our law" (*διὰ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν*); Frg. 2.3 (*P.E.* 8.10.3)—"our lawgiver Moses" (*ὁ νομοθέτης ἡμῶν Μωσῆς*); Frg. 2.8 (*P.E.* 8.10.8)—"through our law" (*διὰ τῆς νομοθεσίας*).

149. In 2 Macc 1:10 Aristobulus is said to be of priestly descent, and in the letter he is addressed as an Egyptian Jew. In *Strom.* 1.15.72.4 (T 2) Clement includes him among Jewish witnesses attesting the antiquity of Judaism. Anatolius ap. Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.16 (T 7) includes him among Jewish witnesses who antedated Philo, Josephus, and Musaeus. In Eusebius-Jerome *Chron.* 151 Olymp. (T 8) he is called the "Jewish Peripatetic philosopher" (also T 8a, 8b, 8c). Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7 (T 9), citing Clement, includes Aristobulus with Philo, Josephus, Demetrius, and Eupolemus, calling them "Jewish writers" (*Ἰουδαίων συγγραφέων*). Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7 (T 10) calls him "another wise man of the Hebrews" (*ἄλλος Ἑβραίων σοφὸς ἀνήρ*). Eusebius *P.E.* 8.8.56 (T 11) refers to Eleazar (the high priest in *Ep. Arist.*) and Aristobulus as "men originally of Hebrew descent" (*ἀνδρῶν τὸ μὲν γένος Ἑβραίων*). Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12 Title (T 14) calls him "Aristobulus . . . of the Hebrews Before Us" (*ὁ πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐξ Ἑβραίων Ἀριστόβουλος*); similarly, Theosophia Tubingensis 10 (T 14a): "the Peripatetic philosopher of the Hebrews" (*Ἀριστόβουλος, ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος*).

150. Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 168. See Willrich, *Juden and Griechen*, 163, who notes the difficulty of this tradition as it relates to the Oniads.

151. Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7 (T 10): "interpretation of the holy laws" (*τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων. . . ἑρμηνείαν*); Eusebius-Jerome *Chron.* Olymp. 151 (T 8): "commentaries explaining the law of Moses" (explanationum in Moysen commentarios); Anonymous Matritensis (T 8a): "Explanations of Mosaic Scripture" (*ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωσέως γραφῆς*); similarly, Chronicon Paschale (T 8b) *ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωϋσέως γραφῆς*); Anatolius ap.

Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.16 (T 7): "commentaries on the Law of Moses" (*βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ* Μωϋσέως *νόμου*); Eusebius *P.E.* 13.11.3–12 Title (T 14): "From the Addresses of Aristobulus to King Ptolemy" (*ἐκ τῶν* Ἀριστοβούλου *βασιλεῖ* Πτολεμαίῳ *προσπεφωνημένων*).

152. This certainly seems to have been true of the material in Frgs. 2–5. Whether the astronomical calculations in Frg. 1 belong to the same type of work is not clear. Cf. *P.E.* 8.10.1=Frg. 2.1; also, *P.E.* 13.11.3 (Title), which characterizes the work as "Addresses of Aristobulus to King Ptolemy"; also Frg. 1 (*H.E.* 7.32.17) refers to Aristobulus' treatment of "questions relating to the Book of Exodus." For examples of the king's being addressed directly, see *P.E.* 8.10.7 (Frg. 2.7) and *P.E.* 13.12.2 (Frg. 3.2).

153. The work contains one (possible) reference to Prov 8:22–31 (*P.E.* 13.12.11=Frg. 5.11). See annotations, n. 128.

154. Herriot, *Philon*, 67, thinks it was a thematic treatment; similarly, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 31. Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.513–14, doubts that the work was in the nature of an actual commentary, but rather a freer treatment of the contents of the Pentateuch that dealt with philosophical topics. Consequently, Schürer thinks it was not analogous to Philo's allegorical commentary but much closer to his systematic treatment of the Mosaic law.

155. *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4). So, Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.631 n. 53.

It is clear that the exegetical work on the Torah had several books; so, Clement, *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (T 3), which refers to the "first book" addressed to Philometor (*ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ*). Also, Anatolius ap. Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.16 (T 7) refers to "his commentaries on the law of Moses" (*βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ* Μωυσέως *νόμου*) dedicated to the first two Ptolemies; similarly, Eusebius (Jerome) *Chron.* 151 Olymp. (T 8): "explanationum in Moysen commentarios"; similarly, T 8a and 8b (*ἐξηγήσεις τῆς* Μωσέως *γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν*). Cf. Eusebius *P.E.* 8.8.56 (T 11), referring to the "narratives of Eleazar and Aristobulus" (*τὰς* Ἐλεαζάρου *καὶ* Ἀριστοβούλου *διηγήσεις*); Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12 Title (T 14) refers to "the addresses of Aristobulus to King Ptolemy" (*ἐκ τῶν* Ἀριστοβούλου *βασιλεῖ* Πτολεμαίῳ *προσπεφωνημένων*).

In spite of the apparent size of the work, as confirmed by a marginal gloss in the Florentine MS of Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* (16th cent.), only fragments survive. Rossi, *Me'or Eynayim*, 146, however, reports the existence of a large Aristobulus manuscript (100 chapters) in the Florence library and in the Benedictine monastery in Mantua; see

Gutmann, *EncJud* (1971) 3.443; Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.473 n. * (noting Rossi's report that one of the members of the order had said that this work was much more excellent than Philo's writings); Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.521–22.

Might these be other writings, e.g., Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo*, that were attributed to Aristobulus? Cf. Ravaisson's suggestion reported in Herriot, *Philon*, 77–78.

156. In Frg. 2.4 (*P.E.* 8.10.4) he reports that (Greek) philosophers and poets have "taken from him (Moses) significant seeds of inspiration"; similarly, Frg. 3.1 (*P.E.* 13.12.1); Frg. 4.4 (*P.E.* 13.12.4).

157. Clement *Strom.* 1.22.150.1–3 (Frg. 3a=Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6–8; parallel to *P.E.* 13.12.1–3): Aristobulus claims that Plato and Pythagoras borrowed ideas from Moses. In *Strom.* 1.15.72.4 (T 2) Clement describes Aristobulus (and Philo) as demonstrating the greater antiquity of Jewish "philosophy" over that of the Greeks. *Strom.* 5.14.97 (T 4) implies that Aristobulus' purpose was to show that Peripatetic philosophy was derived from Moses and the prophets. Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7 (T 9), quoting Clement, says that Aristobulus, along with other Jewish writers, including Philo, Josephus, Demetrius, and Eupolemus, argued for the higher antiquity of Moses and the Jewish race over the Greeks; similarly Jerome *De vir. illus.* 38 (T 9a). According to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12 Title (T 14), Aristobulus showed that "the Greeks borrowed from the philosophy of the Hebrews." Theosophia Tubingensis 10 (T 14a) says that Aristobulus "confirmed that the Greek (theosophy) had originated with Hebrew theosophy."

158. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.164.

159. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 27–28.

160. According to Clement *Strom* 1.22.150.1 (T 3), Aristobulus' "first book" was addressed to Philometor. This passage from Clement is also quoted by Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6 (=Frg. 3a[1]). In Clement, *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4) MS L reports that Aristobulus lived in the time of Philadelphus, but Stählin's emendation Φιλομήτορα correctly conforms the text to Clement's earlier reference placing Aristobulus in the time of Philometor (*Strom.* 1.22.150.1=T 3). See Schürer, 3(1).580 n. 86 (cf. Denis, 278 n. 31).

A period in the Ptolemaic era seems implied by Origen *Cels.* 4.51 (T 6), which reports that Aristobulus was "still earlier" than Philo. A date prior to the early first century CE is implied by Anatolius ap. Eusebius

H.E. 7.32.16 (T 7), who cites Aristobulus as an "older witness" antedating Philo, Josephus, and Musaeus. But he goes on to identify Aristobulus as one of the seventy translators of the LXX and dates him in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (contradicting Clement [T 3] who dates him in time of Philometor).

A dating under Philometor accepts at face value Aristobulus' statement in Frg. 3.2 *(P.E.* 13.12.2) that Philadelphus was the "ancestor" of the Ptolemy whom he addresses. Eusebius' statement in *P.E.* 9.6.6 (T 13), which says that Aristobulus addressed his work to Philometor, is a quotation from Clement. Although it has no independent value, it does confirm Eusebius' agreement with Clement's testimony. Eusebius' dependence on Clement probably influences his statement in Eusebius-Jerome *Chron.* 151 Olymp. (T 8), which refers to commentaries interpreting the Law of Moses addressed to "Ptolemy Philometor"; similarly T 8b and 8c. Other statements by Eusebius are more general, referring only to "the reign of the Ptolemies" or "King Ptolemy": Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7 (T 10) says Aristobulus "flourished during the reign of the Ptolemies" (*κατὰ τὴν τῶν Πτολεμαίων ἀκμάσας ἡγεμονίαν*), and in fact addressed "Ptolemy himself" (*αὐτῷ Πτολεμαίῳ*); Eusebius *P.E.* 8.8.56 (T 11) mentions Aristobulus, along with Eleazar, dating both "in the time of the Ptolemies" (*τὸν δὲ χρόνον κατὰ τοὺς Πτολεμαίων χρόνους*); Eusebius *P.E.* 8.9.38 (T 12) mentions Aristobulus' work "dedicated to King Ptolemy" (*ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τὸν βασιλέα συγγράμματι*). The king is also addressed in *P.E.* 8.10.1; 13.12.2. In T 12 Eusebius also identifies Aristobulus as the one mentioned in 2 Macc 1:10. Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12 Title (T 14) mentions Aristobulus' addresses to "King Ptolemy"; similarly, Theosophia Tubingensis 10 reports that he "addressed Ptolemy." In Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.2 (Frg. 3.2), Aristobulus himself says that Ptolemy II Philadelphus is the "ancestor" of the king he addresses in his work.

161. Gercke, PW 2.1 (1895) 919. This suggestion would also possibly explain other features of the tradition. Since Ptolemy IX was sometimes referred to as Philadelphus, the reference to *Φιλάδελφος* in MS L in *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (T 4) could conceivably be a correct reference. Accordingly, it would not contradict Clement's identification of the Ptolemy as Philometor in *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (T 3). It would not, however, explain Anatolius' placement of Aristobulus during the reign of Philadelphus, since that is clearly a reference to Ptolemy II Philadelphus (T 7).

162. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 22–23.

163. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2.106 n. 378.

164. Gercke, PW 2.1 (1895), 919.

165. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 167.

166. Wendland, *JE* (1902), 2.97–98; Momigliano, *Hochkulturen*, 114. See annotations, n. 14; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 21 n. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Altmann, A. "Aristobulus," *Encyclopaedia Britannica* 2 (1963) 387.

Angelino, C., D. Valesini and E. Salvaneschi (eds.). "I frammenti di Aristobulo," in Σύγκρισις: *Testi e studi di storia e filosofia del linguaggio religioso*. Genoa. 2 (1983) 41-87. Contains introduction, translation, notes, and index of biblical passages.

Baron, *History*, 1.196, 204, 207.

Baur, L. "Aristobul," *LTK* 1 (1930) 646–47.

Bergk, *Literaturgeschichte*, 4 (1887) 534–35.

Bernfeld, *Bibel*, 178–79.

Bernhardy, *Grundriss*, 1.532–33.

Bickerman, *Jews*, 14, 79, 98, 101, 190, 225–31, 260, 265, 281, 289, 291, 295, 303.

———, "Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas," *ZNW* 29 (1930) 280–98 (revised and expanded in Bickerman, *Studies*, 1.109–36).

———, "The Septuagint as a Translation," *PAAJR* 28 (1959) 1–39 (=Bickerman, *Studies*, 1.167–200), esp. 3 n. 3, 4.

Binde, R. *Aristobulische Studien I–II.* Programm des Königlichen Evangelischen Gymnasiums zu Gross-Glogau. Glogau: E. Mosche, 1869–70. Part 1 (1869), pp. 1–29; Part 2 (1870), pp. 1–33.
(=Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*).

Borgen, P. "Philo and His Predecessor Aristobulus," in Stone, *Jewish Writings*, 274–79; also see 182, 233, 271, 282, 299 in the same volume.
(=Borgen, "Philo," *Jewish Writings*).

Bousset, W. "Aristobul," *RE* ^{3} 2 (1897) 48–49.

———, "Neueste Forschungen auf dem Gebiet der religiösen Litteratur des Spätjudentums, 4: Die jüdisch-alexandrinische Litteratur," *TRu* 5 (1902) 175–88.

———, *Schulbetrieb*, 8–14.

Bousset & Gressmann, *RJ*, 25 n. 1, 28–29, 32, 73, 187 (?), 192, 345, 359 n. 2.

Bréhier, *Philon*, 45–61, esp. 46–49, 61.

Brucker, J. *Historia critica philosophiae a mundi incunabulis ad nostram usque aetatem deducta*. 6 vols. Leipzig: B. Christoph, 1742–67. 2 (1742) 698–703.

Cerfaux, "Mystères," 71–81.

Charlesworth, *PAMRS*, 81–82.

Christ, *Philologische Studien*, 464, 475.

Clemen, C. Review of Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3d ed. In *TSK* 75 (1902) 666–85, esp. 684.

Cobet, Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς, 173–77, 454, 521, 524.
Cohn, L. "Philo von Alexandrien," *NJKA* 1 (1898) 514–40, esp. 522–23.
———, Review of T. Reinach, *Textes d' auteurs grecs et romains relatifs au judaisme*, *MGWJ* [41] n.s. 5 (1897) 285–88, esp. 288 n. 1.
Collins, A. Y. "Aristobulus," *OTP* 2 (1985) 831–42.
Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 17, 57 n. 96, 82, 98 n. 95, 175–78, 180, 191–92 nn. 1–12, 197, 200, 204, 205, 206.
Coman, J. "Utilisation des Stromates de Clément d'Alexandrie par Eusèbe de Césarée dans la Préparation Evangélique," *Überlieferungs-geschichtliche Untersuchungen*, ed. F. Paschke. TU, 125. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1981. 115-34.
Conzelmann, *HJC*, 153–55.
———, "φῶς," *TWNT* 9 (1973) 317 (§2).
Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.73–112 (entire section on Aristobulus), but also 1.55–56, 78, 88 n. 76, 217 n. 176; 2.4 n. 4.
Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 102–6.
Delitzsch, *Geschichte*, 25 n. 2, 26, 134 n. 1, 210–11.
Delling, *Bibliographie*, 53–55.
———, "Perspektiven," 162.
Denis, *Introduction*, 277–83.
de Rossi (see Rossi).
Dihle, *Griechische*, 416.
Dindorf, W. "Über eine angebliche Handschrift des Aristobulos," *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* 97 [38] (1868) 411 (=*Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 40 [1868] 411).
Döllinger, J. J. I. *Heidenthum und Judenthum: Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christenthums*. Regensburg: G. J. Manz, 1857. 837–38.
Dörrie, H. "Zur Methodik antiker Exegese," *ZNW* 65 (1974) 121–38.
Drummond, *Philo*, 1.242–55; also see 1.150, 169, 234, 237.
Dubnow, *Geschichte*, 2 (1925) 221–22.
Dubnov, *History*, 1 (1967) 618–19.
Ehrlich, E. L. "Aristobulos," *LTK* 1 (1957) 853.
Eichhorn, *Bibliothek*, 5 (1793) 247, 253–98.
Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, parts 5–9 [*de Aristobulo Iudaeo* 1–5] (1894–95) cols. 149–255. (Part 9, cols. 229–34 contain remarks by P. Wendland. Part 10, "Ramenta" [1897] contains addenda. For Wendland's review of Elter, see below under Wendland.)
Ewald, *Geschichte*, 4 (1864) 335–38.
———, *History*, 5.259–60, 357, 488.
Eyselein, K. "Kosmogonische Mythen im Unterricht der Oberstufe," *Der altsprachliche Unterricht* 25:6 (1982) 39–51, esp. 49–50.
Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, 1 (1790) 164; 3 (1793) 469–70, 659.

Fairweather, W. *The Background of the Gospels, or Judaism in the Period Between the Old and New Testaments*. The Twentieth Series of the Cunningham Lectures. 2d ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, Ltd., 1911. 7, 320, 331–37, 349, 351, 418.
Feldmann, "Hellenistic Judaism," 414.
Fiebig, P. "Aristobul," *RGG* 1 (1909) 685 and *RGG* [2] 1 (1927) 526.
Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.84, 694–96, 713; 2.963–70, esp. nn. 103 & 104.
Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, 166–69.
Friedländer, *Geschichte*, 28–31.
Fürst, *Bibliotheca*, 1 (1849) 53–54.
Gabler, J. Review of Valckenaer. See entry below on Valckenaer.
Geffcken, *Apologeten*, xvi n. 3.
Georgi, *Gegner*, 55, 73–76, 135, 144 n. 3, 154 n. 1, 156–57, 172–73.
———, *Opponents*, 43, 77 n. 142, 79 n. 163, 116–17, 179 n. 31, 201 n. 271, 206 n. 320.
Gercke, A. "Aristobulos (15)," PW 2.1 [3] (1895) 918–20.
Gfrörer, *Philo*, 2.71–121.
Goodenough, *Light*, 277–82, 296.
Goppelt, L. *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. BFCT, 2d series: Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien, 43. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939. Reprint. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1966 (with "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus"). 62–64.
Goulet, R. "Aristoboulos," *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*. Paris: Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1989. 1.379–80 (No. 364).
———. *La Philosophie de Moïse. Essai de reconstitution d'un commentaire philosophique préphilonien du Pentateuque*. Histoire des doctrines de l'Antiquité classique, 11. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin, 1987. 532–41, esp. 534–35.
Graetz, H. "Der angebliche judäische Peripatetiker Aristobulos and seine Schriften," *MGWJ* [27] n.s. 10 (1878) 49–60, 97–109.
———, *Geschichte*, 3.35, 385–86 n. 5, 581–82, 622–30, 677.
Gutman, *Beginnings*, 1.186–220, 276–86.
Gutmann, J. "Aristobulus of Paneas," *EncJud* 3 (1971) 443–45.
Hadas, *Aristeas*, 26–27, 73, 102 n. 16, 220 n. 171.
Hamburger, J. "Aristobulus," *RealEncJud*, Abteilung 3, Supplement 1, A-Z. Leipzig: K. F. Koehler, 1896. 23–26.
Hamp, V. Review of Walter, *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulos*, *BZ* 11 (1967) 283–84.
Haneberg, D. B. von. *Geschichte der biblischen Offenbarung als Einleitung in's alte und neue Testament*. 4th ed. Regensburg: G. J. Manz, 1876. 495–96, 513.

Hanson, R. P. C. *Allegory and Event: A Study of the Sources and Significance of Origen's Interpretation of Scripture*. London: SCM, 1959. 39–44, 51 n. 2, 54–55, 60, 62, 63, 222 n. 10, 223, 362.

Hegermann, H. "Griechisch-jüdisches Schrifttum," in Maier & Schreiner, *Literatur* (part 2, Sprache and Gestalt der frühjüdischen Literatur), 163–80, esp. 167, 172–73.
(=Hegermann, *Literatur*).

———, "Das griechischsprechende Judentum," in Maier & Schreiner, *Literatur* (part 4, Religiöse Gruppierungen und Tendenzen in der Diaspora), 328–52, esp. 341–44.

———, *Umwelt*, 1.324–25.

———, Review of Walter, *Thoraausleger*, *TLZ* 92 (1967) 505–7.

Heinemann, I. "Die Allegoristik der hellenistischen Juden ausser Philon," *Mnemosyne* (Series 4) 5 (1952) 130–38.
(=Heinemann, "Allegoristik").

———, "Hellenistica," *MGWJ* [73] n.s. 37 (1929) 425–43.

———, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung*. Breslau: M. & H. Marcus, 1929–32. Reprint. Hildesheim: G. Olms, 1962. 112 n. 1, 120 n. 4.
(=Heinemann, *Bildung*).

Heinisch, *Einfluss Philos*, 16–20.

Heinze, M. *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie*. Oldenburg, 1872. Reprint. Aalen: Scientia, 1961. 173–203, esp. 185–92.
(=Heinze, *Lehre*).

Heller, J. "Aristobul," *EncJud* 3 (1929) 321–24.

Hengel, "Anonymität," 292–94.

———, *Judaism and Hellenism*, **1**.69–70, 75, 90, 98, 130, 149, 163–69, 170, 174, 224, 230, 245, 249, 252, 263, 265, 311; **2**.52 n. 149, 81 n. 94, 88 n. 174, 90 n. 207, 99 n. 306, 105–10 nn. 373–406, 112 n. 424, 152 n. 768, 158 n. 813, 174 n. 40, 176 n. 55.

———, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, esp. 294–307; also, see 129, 139, 166, 183, 221 n. 93, 239, 248 n. 205, 268, 279 n. 299, 309, 311 n. 410, 317, 407, 417 n. 702, 420–21, 429 n. 745, 449, 456, 460, 478, 483, 566.

Herriot, *Philon*, 56, 66–78.

Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3 (1857) 467, 473–81, 534–37 (28th excursus), 540, 564–68 (30th excursus), 573.

Hody, *Bibliorum*, Bk. 1, ch. 9, pp. 49–55.

Hoek, A. van de Bunt-van den. "Aristobulos, Acts, Theophilus, Clement Making Use of Aratus' *Phainomena*: A Peregrination." *Bijdragen* 41 (1980) 290–99.

———, *Clement of Alexandria and His Use of Philo in the Stromateis. An Early Christian Reshaping of a Jewish Model*. Supplements to *Vigiliae christianae*, 3. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
(=Hoek, *Clement*).

Holladay, "Aristobulus," *ABD* 1 (1992) 383–84.
Holtzmann, "Das Ende," 2.345–46.
Hundhausen, J. "Aristobulus," *Wetzer und Welte's Kirchenlexikon, oder Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie und ihrer Hülfswissenschaften*. 2d ed. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1886. 1.1300–1303.
Iōannidēs, B. Ch. "Aristoboulos," *ThĒE* 3 (1963) 140 (in Greek).
Joël, *Blicke*, 1.77–100 ("Excurs I: Aristobul"); 2.177–80.
Kahana, *Sefārīm*, 2(1).176–77.
Karpeles, *Geschichte*, 1.241–45.
Keller, R. *De Aristobulo Judaeo*. Diss., Bonn, 1948 [1920]. 84 pp.
(=Keller, *De Aristobulo*).
Klauck, *Allegorie*, 92–94, 232 n. 227.
Klijn, A. F. J. "A Library of Scriptures in Jerusalem," *Studia Codicologica*. TU 124. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1977. 265–72, esp. 267–68.
Kraft, H. *Die Kirchenväter bis zum Konzil von Nicäa*. Sammlung Dieterich, 312. Bremen: C. Schünemann, 1966. 86–91.
Kraus Reggiani, C. "Aristobulo e l'esegesi allegorica dell' Antico Testamento nell' ambito, del giudaismo ellenistico," *Rivista di Filologia edi Istruzione Classica* 101 (1973) 162–85.
(=Kraus Reggiani, "Aristobulo").
———, "I frammenti di Aristobulo, esegeta biblico," *Bollettino dei Classici* [Series 3] 3 (1982) 87–134.
(=Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti").
Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen*, 36, 45, 57–58, 125–27, 130–31, 210, 421 n. 29, 422.
Kuenen, A. *De Godsdienst van Israël tot den Ondergang van den Joodschen Staat*. 2 vols. Haarlem: A. C. Kruseman, 1869–70. 2.393, 398, 433–40.
(=Kuenen, *Godsdienst*).
Kuhn, P. *Offenbarungsstimmen im Antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen zur Bat Qol und verwandten Phänomenen*. Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 20. Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1989. 144–49.
(=Kuhn, *Offenbarungsstimmen*).
Leipoldt, J. and S. Morenz, *Heilige Schriften: Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt*. Leipzig: Harrassowitz 1953. 139 n. 53.
Lesky, *Geschichte*, 898; *History*, 802.
Levesque, E. "Aristobule (1)," *DB* 1/1 (1895) 964–65.
Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1(2).438–65.
Loeb, I. "Aristobule," *La Grande Encyclopédie* 3 (n.d.) 921.
Lohse, E. "Aristobul," *RGG* ^{3} 1 (1957) 597.
———. Review of Walter, *Thoraausleger*, *Gnomon* 37 (1965) 516–17.

Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 1.113, 397–402, 407–8.
Marcus, R. "Hellenistic Jewish Literature (1960)," 1103–5.
Martín, J. P. *Filón de Alejandría y la génesis de la cultura occidental*. Buenos Aires: Depalma, 1986. Oriente-Occidente, 4. Review: W. Wiefel, *ThLZ* 113 (1988) 24–25.
———. "Fragmentos de Aristóbulo, el primer filósofo del Judaismo. Introducción, traducción, y commentarios." *Oriente-Occidente* 3 (Buenos Aires: Ediciones de la Universidad del Salvador, 1982) 65–95.
———. "L'interpretazione allegorica nella *Lettera di Barnaba* e nel giudaismo alessandrino," *Studi Storico-Religiosi* 6 (1982) 173–83.
Mayer, G. "Exegese," *RAC* 6 (1966) 1194–1217, esp. "Exegese II (Judentum: Hellenistisch-jüdische Literatur)," 1203–8 (Aristobulos, 1203–4).
Meyer, R. "Aristobulos (2)," *LAW* (1965) 306.
Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom*, 84, 93, 103-4, 115-16, 120.
———, *Hochkulturen*, 105, 114, 125, 138–39, 143.
———, "Per la data e la caratteristica della lettera di Aristea," *Aegyptus* 12 (1932) 161–72, esp. 164–66.
(=Momigliano, "Aristea").
Mras, K. "Ein Vorwort zur neuen Eusebiusausgabe (mit Ausblicken auf die spätere Gräcität)," *RheinMus* n.s. 92 (1944) 217–36, esp. 221–22.
Murray, O. "Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship," *JTS* 18 (1967) 337–71, esp. 339 n. 1.
Nauck, W. "Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede," *ZThK* 53 (1956) 11–52.
Nestle, E. "Zum Zeugnis des Aristobul über die Septuaginta," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 287–88.
Neumark, *Geschichte*, 2(3.1) [1910] 386–90.
Nomachi, A. "Aristobulos and Philo, with special reference to ἑβδομάς," *Journal of Classical Studies* 15 (1967) 86–97 (in Japanese).
Pépin, *Mythe et allégorie*, part 2 (215–44), ch. 2 (221–44), esp. 223 n. 5, 226, 232 n. 36, 460 n. 67.
Praechter, *Philosophie*, 567–68, 570–71.
(=Ueberweg, *Geschichte*).
Radice, R. *La filosofia di Aristobulo e i suoi nessi con il* De Mundo *attribuito ad Aristotele*. Temi metafisici e problemi del pensiero antico. Studi e testi, 33. Centro di richerche di metafisica. Milan: Vita e Pensiero, 1994.
(=Radice, *Aristobulo*).
Renan, *Histoire*, 4 (1893) 248–51=(*Oeuvres*, 6.1155–56).
Roscher, W. H. "Zur Bedeutung der Siebenzahl im Kultus und Mythus der Griechen," *Philologus: Zeitschrift für das classische Alterthum* 60 n.s. 14 (1901) 360-73.
(= Roscher, 1901).

———. *Die enneadischen und hebdomadischen Fristen und Wochen der ältesten Griechen. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Chronologie und Zahlenmystik*. Abhandlungen der königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Classe. Vol. 21, No. 4. Leipzig: Teubner, 1903.
(=Roscher, 1903).

———. *Die Sieben- und Neunzahl im Kultus und Mythus der Griechen*. Abhandlungen der königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Classe. Vol. 24, No. 1. Leipzig: Teubner, 1904.
(=Roscher, 1904).

———. *Die Hebdomadenlehren der griechischen Philosophen und Ärzte*. Abhandlungen der königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Classe. Vol. 24, No. 6. Leipzig: Teubner, 1906.
(=Roscher, 1906).

———. *Die hippokratische Schrift von der Siebenzahl und ihr Verhältnis zum Altpythagoreismus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der ältesten Philosophie und Geographie*. Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Sächsichen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philologisch-historische Classe. Vol. 71, No. 5. Leipzig: Teubner, 1919.
(=Roscher, 1919).

Rossi, *Me'or Eynayim*, 146, 154.

Runia, *Philo*, 91, 113, 136, 159, 233.

———, "Why Does Clement of Alexandria Call Philo 'The Pythagorean'?" *VC* 49 (1995) 1–22, esp. 8–10.

Sabugal, S. "La exégesis bíblica de Aristóbulo y del seudo-Aristeas," *Revista Agustiniana de Espiritualidad* 20:61–62 (1979) 195–202.

Sandelin, K.-G. "Zwei kurze Studien zum alexandrinischen Judentum," *ST* 31 (1977) 147–52.

Sandmel, S. "Aristobulus (1)," *IDB* 1 (1962) 221.

Schaller, J. B. *Gen. 1.2 im antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen über Verwendung und Deutung der Schöpfungsaussagen von Gen. 1.2 im antiken Judentum*. Ph.D. diss., Göttingen, 1961. 73–74, 211.

Schenkl, H. "Ein spätrömischer Dichter und sein Glaubensbekenntnis," *RheinMus* n.s. 66 (1911) 393–416, esp. 400–403.

Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 33, 67, 71, 81–90, 201, 406–8 nn. 96–99, 426 n. 190.

———, *Sirach*, 163–89.

———, *Zur Topographie und Geschichte Palästinas*. Calw and Stuttgart: Verlag der Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1893. 328–32.

Schmid–Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).603–6.

Schubert, *Judentums*, 18, 21, 23, 81.
Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.425–26, 512–22.
———, *History*, 3(1).475–76, 579–87.
Siegfried, "Der jüdische Hellenismus," 474, 480, 481, 486.
———, *Philo*, 24–25.
Simon, *Histoire*, Bk. 2, chap. 2, p. 189; also Bk. 3, chap. 23, pp. 499–501.
Sowers, S. G. *The Hermeneutics of Philo and Hebrews*. Richmond: John Knox Press; Zürich: EVG-Verlag, 1965. 17.
Starobinski-Safran, E. "Sabbats, années sabbatiques et jubilés. Réflexions sur l'exégèse juive et chrétienne de Lévitique 25," in *Mélanges Esther Bréguet*. Geneva: Typopress SA, 1975. 37–45.
Stearns, *Fragments*, 77–91.
Stein, E. *Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandreia*. BZAW, 51. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1929. 6–11.
(=Stein, *Exegese*).
———, "Bibelkritik," 39–40.
Stöckl, *Grundriss*, 92.
Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 1.8, 378, 379 n. 9; 2.605 n. 8, 606 n. 10, 629–34, 635 n. 60, 645 n. 65, 676.
Tcherikover, "Jewish Apologetic Literature," 176–77, 180, 187.
———, *CPJ* 1.20 (n. 51) and 37.
Teuffel, W. S. "Aristobulus (11)," PW 1,2 (2d ed., 1866) 1600.
Thraede, K. "Erfinder II," *RAC* 5 (1962) 1191–1278, esp. 1242–46.
Thyen, *Homilie*, 80 n. 136.
Tiede, *Charismatic Figure*, 140–46.
Tramontano, R. *La lettera di Aristea a Filocratio, Introduzione testo versione e commento*. Naples: Ufficio Succursale della Civilta Cattolica in Napoli, 1931. 166*–170*, 31 n. on §16.
Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I. *Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte*. Akadémiai Kiadó: Budapest, 1966. Trans. from Hungarian by Géza Engl. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1966. 400, 403–52, esp. 410-11.
Ueberweg, *Geschichte*, 1 (1926) 567, 568, 570–71.
Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*. See review (probably by Gabler himself) of Valckenaer in J. P. Gabler (ed.), *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur* 5 (1810) 183–209.
Walter, N. "Anfänge alexandrinisch-jüdischer Bibelauslegung bei Aristobulos," *Helikon* 3 (1963) 353–72.
(=Walter, "Anfänge").
———, "Begegnungen," 369–73.
———, "Jewish-Greek Literature," 389–91.

———, JSHRZ 3.2 (1980, 2d ed.) 261–79.
———, "Literatur," 79–83.
———, *Thoraausleger*.
Wegenast, K. "Aristobulos (8)," *KP* 5 (1975) 1577.
Wendland, P. "Aristobulus of Paneas," *JE* 2 (1902) 97–98.
———. "A. Elter, *De gnomologiorum graecorum historia atque origine*," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 7 (1898) 445–49.
———. Letter to A. Elter in Elter, *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*, part 9 (1895) 229–34.
———, "Der Aristeasbrief," in Kautzsch, *Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen*, 2.1–30, esp. 3–4.
Wesseling(ius), P. *Lectio publica de fragmento Orphei. . .; de Aristobulo Iudaeo, de versione Graeca V. T. nulla ante Septuaginta etc.* Appendix to Valckenaer, *Aristobulo* (see above), 127–36. Reprinted in Gaisford, *Eusebius P.E.*, 4.452–58.
(=Wessling, *Aristobulo*).
Westcott, B. F. "Aristobulus," *Dictionary of the Bible*, Edited by William Smith. Hartford, 1868; Boston, 1888. 1.158.
Willrich, *Judaica*, 46, 109–10, 116, 122, 133–35.
———, *Juden und Griechen*, 162–68.
Winer, J. G. B. "Aristobulus," in J. S. Ersch and J. G. Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyclopädie der Wissenschaften und Künste* 5:1 (1820) 266.
Wobbermin, *Studien*, 129–43.
Wolff, C. *Jeremia im Frühjudentum und Urchristentum*. TU, 118. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1976. 20–26, 79–83.
Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.22, 95, 141, 337–38, 344–45, 350.
Yarbro, A., and D. Fraikin. "The Fragments of Aristobulus." Unpublished seminar paper. Harvard New Testament Seminar. May 28, 1970. 53 pp.
Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).277–85 (3d ed., 257–64).
Zuntz, G. "Aristeas Studies II: Aristeas on the translation of the Torah," *JSS* 4 (1959) 109–26; repr. in *Opuscula Selecta*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1972. 126–43, esp. 135.
(=Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II").

Select Bibliography on Orphica

Elter, A. *Gnomologiorum Graecorum*. Parts 5 (1894), 154–78 & 6 (1894), 177–84.
Georgi, *Gegner*, 73–76.
Holladay, *FHJA 4: Orphica*.
LaFargue, M. "The Jewish Orpheus," in *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*. SBLSP, 14. 2 vols. Edited by P. Achtemeier. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1978. 2.137–44.

———, "Orphica," *OTP* 2 (1985) 795–801.
Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1.438–48.

Select Bibliography on 2 Maccabees

Bickerman, E. "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. 1,1–9)," *ZNW* 32 (1933) 233–54 (=Bickerman, *Studies*, 2.136–58).
Bunge, J-C. *Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Makkabäerbuch.* Diss. phil. Bonn, 1971. 32–152.
Doran, R. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. CBQMS, 12; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981.
(=Doran, *Temple Propaganda*).
Goldstein, *II Maccabees*. Anchor Bible 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1984. 154–88, 540–45.
(=Goldstein, *II Maccabees*).
Habicht, C. *2. Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ, 1.3. 2d ed. Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1979. 199–202.
Momigliano, A. "The Second Book of Maccabees," *Classical Philology* 70 (1975) 81–88.
Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 238–40; also see 4–5, 7, 39 n. 38, 52, 56 n. 121, 59, 68, 262.
———, "The Letter from Judah Maccabee to Aristobulus: Is 2 Maccabees 1:10b–2:18 Authentic?" *HUCA* 49 (1978) 89–133.

Select Bibliography on Pythagoreanism

Burkert, W. "Hellenistische Pseudopythagorica," *Philologus* 105 (1961) 16–43, 226–46, esp. 17–28 on the Letter of Lysis to Hipparchus.
———. *Lore and Science in Ancient Pythagoreanism.* Trans. E. L. Minar, Jr. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
(=Burkert, *Lore and Science*).
Frank, E. *Plato und die sogenannten Pythagoreer*. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1923.
(=Frank, *Plato*).
Thesleff, H. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Humaniora 24.3; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1961.
(=Thesleff, *Introduction*).
———. *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis, Ser. A, Humaniora 30.1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965.
(=Thesleff, *Texts*).

INDEX TO EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

Fragment One

Source: Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.16–18.

Greek Text Used: Schwartz, GCS (9.2), p. 722, line 13–p. 726, line 1.

Editions: Migne, *PG* 20.728C–29A; Schwartz, GCS (9.2), 722–26; Lake, LCL, 2.234–36; Bardy (SC, 41), 226–27; Denis, 227–28 (=Frg. 3).

Translations:

English: A. C. McGiffert, LPNF, 1.319 (with notes); S. D. Salmond, ANCL 14.413–15; Lawlor–Oulton, 1.248–49; Oulton, LCL, 2.235–37; A. Y. Collins, *OTP*, 2.837.

French: Bardy (SC, 41), 226–27.

German: Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 269–70 (=Frg. 1).

Italian: Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti," 98; Valesini, "Frammenti," 61–62 (=Frg. 3); Radice, *Aristobulo*, 174–75 (=Frg. 1).

Fragment Two

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 8.9.38–10.18a.

Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 221–22; Vig., 375c–78b.

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,1) 8.1, p. 451, line 11–p. 454, line 8.

Editions: Steph., 221–22; Vig., 375c–78b; Hein., 1.393–95; Gais., 2.290–96 (notes, 4.230); Migne, *PG* 21.636B–40B (notes, 1546–47); Dind., 1.437–40; Giff., 1.478–81 (notes, 4.270–71); Stearns, 84–89 (=Frg. 3); Mras, GCS (43,1) 8.1, 451–54; Denis, 217–21 (=Frg. 1); Schroeder & des Places (SC, 369), 114–23.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.406–9; A. Y. Collins, *OTP*, 2.837–39.

French: Schroeder & des Places (SC, 369), 114–23.

German: Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.475–76; Riessler, 179–81 (=Frg. 1); notes, 1275–76; Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 270–73 (=Frg. 2).

Italian: Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti," 100–102; Valesini, "Frammenti," 47–52 (=Frg. 1); Radice, *Aristobulo*, 176–85 (=Frg. 2).

Spanish: Martin, "Fragmentos," 73–75.

Fragment 2a (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 8.10.12b–16a)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 6.3.32.3–33.1.

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 447, lines 6–18.

Editions: Dind., 3.154 (notes, 4.378); Migne, *PG* 9.249B–52A (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 447; Denis, 219–20 (=Frg. 1, parallel to *P.E.* 8.10.12b–15a).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.487.
French: SC, not yet published.
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.258–59.

Fragment Three

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 13.11.3–12.2.

Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 388; Vig., 663d–64b.

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, p. 190, line 12–p. 191, line 7.

Editions: Steph., 388; Vig., 663d–64b; Hein., 2.254; Gais., 3.310–11 (notes, 4.292); Migne, *PG* 21.1096D–97B (notes, 1629); Dind., 2.190–91; Giff., 2.258–59 (notes 4.444–45); Stearns, 78 (=Frg. 1); Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, 190–91; Denis, 221–22 (=Frg. 2); des Places (SC, 307), 308–13.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.718; A. Y. Collins, *OTP*, 2.839.
French: des Places (SC, 307), 308–13.
German: Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.473–75; Riessler, 181–82 (=Frg. 2.1–6); notes, 1276; Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 273–74.
Italian: Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti," 108; Valesini, "Frammenti," 53–54 (=Frg. 2); Radice, *Aristobulo*, 186–89 (=Frg. 3).
Spanish: Martin, "Fragmentos," 75–76.

Fragment 3a (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.1)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 1.22.150.1–3.

Greek Text Used: Stählin-Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 92, line 27–p. 93, line 10.

Editions: Dind., 2.121 (notes, 4.225); Migne, *PG* 8.893A–B (with notes); Caster (SC, 30), 152; Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 92–93; Denis (om.).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.334.
French: Caster (SC, 30), 153.
German: Stählin (BKV^2), 3.125–26.

Fragment 3a[1] (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.1)

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6–8.

Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 241; Vig., 410d–11a.

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,1), 8.1, p. 493, lines 7–18.

Editions: Steph., 241; Vig., 410d–11a; Hein., 2.11; Gais., 2.356–57 (notes, 4.239); Migne, *PG* 21.693B–C; Dind., 1.476; Giff., 1.519–20 (notes, 4.290); Stearns (om.); Mras, GCS (43,1) 8.1, 493; Denis (om.); des Places (SC, 369), 210.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.442.
French: des Places (SC, 369), 211.
German: see Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 273–74.

Fragment 3b (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.2)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 1.22.148.1.

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 92, lines 4–10.

Editions: Dind., 2.120 (notes, 4.225); Migne, *PG* 8.889C–92A (with notes); Caster (SC, 30), 151; Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 92; Denis, 222 (=Frg. 2, parallel to *P.E.*13.12.2).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.334.
French: Caster (SC, 30), 152.
German: Stählin (BKV^2), 3.124.

Fragment Four

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.3–8.

Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 388–90; Vig., 664b–67a.

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, p. 191, line 8–p. 195, line 11.

Editions: Steph., 388–90; Vig., 664b–67a; Hein., 2.254–58; Gais., 3.311–15 (notes, 4.292–94); Migne, *PG* 21.1097B–1101B (notes, 1629–31); Dind., 2.191–93; Giff., 2.259–61 (notes, 4.445–47); Stearns, 78–79 (=Frg. 1, om. *P.E.* 13.12.5–6); Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, 191–95; Denis, 222–23 (=Frg. 2, om. *P.E.* 13.12.5); des Places (SC, 307), 312–19.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.718–20; A. Y. Collins, *OTP*, 2.840–41.
French: des Places (SC, 307), 312–19; Seegers-Vander Vorst, "Les Versions," 478–80 (13.12.5=Ps.-Orpheus).
German: Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.473–74; Riessler, 182–84 (=Frg. 2.7–66); notes, 1276 ; Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 274–76 (om. *P.E.* 13.12.5).
Italian: Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti," 112–15; Valesini, "Frammenti," 54–56 (=Frg. 2); Radice, *Aristobulo*, 190–201 (=Frg. 4).
Spanish: Martin, "Fragmentos," 76–77.

Fragment 4a (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.4)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 5.14.99.3 (also quoted by Eusebius in *P.E.* 13.13.21).

Greek Text Used: Stählin-Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 392, lines 2–6.

Editions: Dind., 3.79; Migne, *PG* 9.149A (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 392; Denis, 223 (=Frg. 2, parallel to *P.E.* 13.12.4); Le Boulluec (SC, 278), 188.

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.468.
French: Le Boulluec (SC, 278), 189.
German: Stählin (BKV^2), 4.202–3.

Fragment 4b (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.7a; also cf. 13.12.4)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Protrepticus* 7.73.2a.

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Treu, GCS (56), p. 55, lines 20–21.

Editions: Dind., 1.79; Migne, *PG* 8.180B (with notes); Mondésert (SC, 2^2), 138; Stählin–Treu, GCS (56) 55; Denis (om.).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.192.
French: Mondésert (SC, 2^2), 138.
German: Stählin (BKV^2), 1.149.

Fragment 4c (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.7b)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 5.14.101.4b (also quoted by Eusebius in *P.E.* 13.13.26).

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 394, lines 19–20.

Editions: Dind., 3.82; Migne, *PG* 9.153A (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 394; Denis (om.); LeBoulluec (SC, 278), 194.

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.468.
French: Le Boulluec (SC, 278), 195.
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.205.

Fragment Five

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.9–16.

Reference Number in *P.E.*: Steph., 390–91; Vig., 667a–68c.

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, p. 195, line 12–p. 197, line 17.

Editions: Steph., 390–91; Vig., 667a–68c; Hein., 2.258–59; Gais., 3.315–18 (notes, 4.294); Migne, *PG* 21.1101B–4B (notes, 1631–33); Dind., 2.193–95; Giff., 2.261–63 (notes, 4.447–49); Stearns, 81–84 (=Frg. 2); Mras, GCS (43,2) 8.2, 195–97; Denis, 224–26 (=Frg. 2); des Places (SC, 307), 320–35.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.720–22; A. Y. Collins, *OTP*, 2.841–42.
French: des Places (SC, 307), 320–35.
German: Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.474–75; Riessler, 184–85 (=Frg. 2.67–87); notes, 1276; Walter (JSHRZ, 3,2), 276–79.
Italian: Kraus Reggiani, "Frammenti," 120–22; Valesini, "Frammenti," 56–60 (=Frg. 2); Radice, *Aristobulo*, 202–11 (=Frg. 5).
Spanish: Martin, "Fragmentos," 77–78.

Fragment 5a (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.9–11a & 12b)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 6.16.137.4–138.4.

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 501, line 20–p. 502, line 11.

Editions: Dind., 3.226 (notes, 4.406); Migne, *PG* 9.364A–B (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 501–2; Denis, 224 (=Frg. 2, parallel to *P.E.* 13.12.9–12a).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.512.
French: SC not yet published
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.332–33.

Fragment 5b (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.11b)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 6.16.141.7b–142.1.

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 504, lines 2–7.

Editions: Dind., 3.229; Migne, *PG* 9.369B (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 504; Denis, 225 (=Frg. 2, supplement parallel to *P.E.* 13.12.11b).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.513.
French: SC not yet published
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.335–36.

Fragment 5c (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.13a)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 6.16.142.4b [+144.3].

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 504, lines 17–18; p. 505, lines 11–12.

Editions: Dind., 3.229 & 230 (notes, 4.409 & 410); Migne, *PG* 9. 369C & 373A (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 504 & 505; Denis, 225 (=Frg. 2, supplement parallel to *P.E.* 13.12. 13a).

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.513.
French: SC not yet published.
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.336.

Fragment 5d (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.13–16)

Source: Clement of Alexandria *Stromateis* 5.14.107.1–4 [+108.1] (also quoted by Eusebius in *P.E.* 13.13.34–35a).

Greek Text Used: Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52), p. 397, line 18–p. 398, line 17.

Editions: Dind., 3.86–88 (notes, 4.371–72); Migne, *PG* 9.161B–64A (with notes); Stählin–Früchtel, GCS (52) 397–98; Denis, 225–26 (=Frg. 2, parallel to *P.E.* 13.12.13b–16); Le Boulluec (SC, 278), 202.

Translations:

English: Wilson (ANF), 2.469–70.
French: Le Boulluec (SC, 278), 203.
German: Stählin (BKV²), 4.209–10.

Fragment 5e (Parallel reference to Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.10–11a)

Source: Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7–14.1

Greek Text Used: Mras, GCS (43,1) 8.1, p. 390, lines 9–18.

Editions: Steph., 190–91; Vig., 323d–24b; Hein. 1.341; Gais., 2.184–85; Migne, *PG* 21.548 (note, 1535); Dind., 1.374; Giff., 1.413–14 (notes, 4.238–39); Stearns (om.); Mras, GCS (43,1) 8.1, 390; Denis (om.); Schroeder & des Places (SC, 215), 234–37.

Translations:

English: Giff., 3.350.

French: Schroeder & des Places (SC, 215), 234–37.

TESTIMONIA

T 1

2 Macc 1:10 (ed. W. Kappler and R. Hanhart [Göttingen LXX, 9], 48; LXX Rahlfs, 1.1100) *Οἱ ἐν Ἰεροσολύμοις καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ ἡ γερουσία καὶ Ἰούδας Ἀριστοβούλῳ διδασκάλῳ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ βασιλέως, ὄντι δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῶν χριστῶν ἱερέων γένους, καὶ τοῖς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Ἰουδαίοις χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν.*

---

3 *χριστῶν*: *χριστιανων* 58: *χρηστων* 107–(671) 236 55 311 | om. *ἱερέων* 46–52

NRSV: The people of Jerusalem and of Judea and the senate and Judas,

To Aristobulus, who is of the family of the anointed priests, teacher of King Ptolemy, and to the Jews in Egypt,

Greetings, and good health.

T 2

Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.15.72.4 (Stählin [GCS 15 (52)], 2.46,15–19=Jacoby, *FGrH* 737 No. 9, vol. 3c2, p. 704) *τούτων ἁπάντων πρεσβύτατον μακρῷ τὸ Ἰουδαίων γένος, καὶ τὴν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς φιλοσοφίαν ἔγγραπτον γενομένην προκατάρξαι τῆς παρ᾽ Ἕλλησι φιλοσοφίας διὰ πολλῶν ὁ Πυθαγόρειος ὑποδείκνυσι Φίλων, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος ὁ Περιπατητικὸς καὶ ἄλλοι πλείους, ἵνα μὴ κατ᾽ ὄνομα ἐπιὼν διατρίβω.*

---

2 Ἰουδαίων Wendland: *ἰουδαῖον* L | 4 *πυθαγόριος* L |

ANCL 4 (Clement, vol. 1).399 (W. Wilson): Of all these (native countries of various authors previously referred to), by far the oldest is the Jewish race; and that their philosophy committed to writing has the precedence of philosophy among the Greeks, the Pythagorean Philo shows at large; and, besides him, Aristobulus the Peripatetic, and several others, not to waste time, in going over them by name.

T 3

Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (Stählin [GCS 15(52)], 2.92,27–93,1)=Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6 (Mras [GCS, 43,1], 1.493,9–10) Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· (Frg. 3a follows. Cf. T 10 [9]).

For apparatus criticus, see Frg. 3a.

Frg. 3a: And Aristobulus, in his first book addressed to Philometor, writes in these words. . . .

T 4

Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.14.97.7 (Stählin [GCS 15(52)], 2.390,14–18=Jacoby, *FGrH* 737 No. 10, vol. 3c2, p. 704) Ἀριστοβούλῳ δὲ τῷ κατὰ Πτολεμαῖον γεγονότι τὸν Φιλάδελφον, οὗ μέμνηται ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν Μακκαβαϊκῶν ἐπιτομήν, βιβλία γέγονεν ἱκανά, δι' ὧν ἀποδείκνυσι τὴν Περιπατητικὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἔκ τε τοῦ κατὰ Μωυσέα νόμου καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἠρτῆσθαι προφητῶν.

1-3 τῷ — ἐπιτομήν: {τῷ — ἐπιτομήν } Valckenaer | 2 Φιλάδελφον L: Φιλομήτορα Stählin ex *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (T 3) | 3 γέγονεν (cf. *Strom.* 6.4.37.3) Sylburg: γεγονέναι L: πεπόνηται Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 30 (=Gais. 4.368) |

ANCL 12 (Clement, vol. 2).279 (W. Wilson): And by Aristobulus, who lived in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who is mentioned by the composer of the epitome of the books of the Maccabees, there were abundant books ("thick volumes" Bickerman) to show that the Peripatetic philosophy was derived from the law of Moses and from the other prophets.

T 5

Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 6.3.32.5 (Stählin [GCS 15 (52)], 2.447,12–13, quoting Aristobulus ap. Eusebius, *P.E.* 8.10.14) *πλὴν "ἐωράθη τὸ πῦρ," ὥς φησιν Ἀριστόβουλος, "παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους μυριάδων οὐκ ἔλασσον ἑκατόν. . . ."*

Frg. 2a: "But the fire was seen," as Aristobulus says, "while the whole multitude, amounting to not less than a million. . . ."

T 6 (5)

Origen *Cels.* 4.51 (Koetschau [GCS], 1.324,6–18) *Δοκεῖ δέ μοι καὶ ἀκηκοέναι* (viz., Celsus) *ὅτι ἐστὶ συγγράμματα περιέχοντα τὰς τοῦ νόμου ἀλληγορίας, ἅπερ εἰ ἀνεγνώκει, οὐκ ἂν ἔλεγεν· "αἱ γοῦν δοκούσαι περὶ αὐτῶν ἀλληγορίαι γεγράφθαι πολὺ τῶν μύθων αἰσχίους εἰσὶ καὶ ἀτοπώτεραι, τὰ μηδαμῆ μηδαμῶς ἁρμοσθῆναι δυνάμενα θαυμαστῇ τινι καὶ παντάπασιν ἀναισθήτῳ μωρίᾳ συνάπτουσαι." ἔοικε δὲ περὶ τῶν Φίλωνος συγγραμμάτων ταῦτα λέγειν ἢ καὶ τῶν ἔτι ἀρχαιοτέρων, ὁποῖά ἐστι τὰ Ἀριστοβούλου. στοχάζομαι δὲ τὸν Κέλσον μὴ ἀνεγνωκέναι τὰ βιβλία, ἐπεὶ πολλαχοῦ οὕτως ἐπιτετεῦχθαί μοι φαίνεται, ὥστε αἱρεθῆναι ἂν καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἕλλησι φιλοσοφοῦντας ἀπὸ τῶν λεγομένων· ἐν οἷς οὐ μόνον φράσις ἐξήσκηται ἀλλὰ καὶ νοήματα καὶ δόγματα καὶ ἡ χρῆσις τῶν, ὡς οἴεται, ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν μύθων ὁ Κέλσος.*

H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum*, 226: He (Celsus) seems to me to have heard also that there are treatises containing allegories of the law. But if he had read them he would not have said: "At any rate, the allegories which seem to have been written about them are far more shameful and preposterous than the myths, since they connect with some amazing and utterly senseless folly ideas which cannot by any means be made to fit." He appears by this to mean the works of Philo or even writers still earlier such as the writings of Aristobulus. But I hazard the guess that Celsus has not read the books, for I think that in many places they are so successful that even Greek philosophers would have been won over by what they say. Not only have they an attractive style; but they also discuss ideas and doctrines, making use of the "myths" (as Celsus regards them) in the scriptures.

T 7 (6)

Anatolius Περὶ τοῦ πάσχα apud Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.16 (Schwartz [GCS, 9], 722,27–724,6) *ἔστιν δ' οὐχ ἡμέτερος οὗτος ὁ λόγος, Ἰουδαίοις δὲ ἐγινώσκετο τοῖς πάλαι καὶ πρὸ Χριστοῦ ἐφυλάττετό τε πρὸς αὐτῶν μάλιστα· μαθεῖν δ' ἔστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Φίλωνος Ἰωσήπου Μουσαίου λεγομένων, καὶ οὐ μόνων τούτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἔτι παλαιοτέρων ἀμφοτέρων Ἀγαθοβούλων, τῶν ἐπίκλην διδασκάλων Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ πάνυ, ὃς ἐν τοῖς ὁ κατειλεγμένος τοῖς τὰς ἱερὰς καὶ θείας Ἑβραίων ἑρμηνεύσασι γραφὰς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ καὶ τῷ τούτου πατρί, καὶ βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωυσέως νόμου τοῖς αὐτοῖς προσεφώνησεν βασιλεῦσιν.* (Frg. 1 follows.)

For apparatus criticus, see Frg. 1.

Frg. 1: And this is not merely our position, but it was known to the Jews long ago, even before Christ, and was vigorously defended by them. This is known not only from what was said by Philo, Josephus, and Musaeus, but also by those even older, namely, the two Agathobuli, who are surnamed "the teachers," and the renowned Aristobulus. The latter was numbered among the seventy who translated the sacred and divine scriptures of the Hebrews for Ptolemy Philadelphus and his father; and he dedicated his commentaries on the law of Moses to the same kings.

T 7a (6a)

Sozomen *H.E.* 7.18.7 (Bidez and Hansen [GCS, 50], 328,9–15) *ἐμοὶ δὲ θαυμάζειν ἔπεισι τοῦδε τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ τῶν ἑπομένων αὐτῷ, ὅτι τάδε ἐνεωτέρισαν, Ἑβραίων τῶν πάλαι, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Εὐσέβιος ὑπὸ μάρτυσι Φίλωνί τε καὶ Ἰωσήπῳ καὶ Ἀριστοβούλῳ καὶ ἑτέροις πλείστοις, μετὰ ἐαρινὴν ἰσημερίαν τὰ διαβατήρια θυόντων, ἡλίου τὸ πρῶτον δωδεκατημόριον τμῆμα ὁδεύοντος, ὃ κριὸν Ἕλληνες καλοῦσιν, ἐν διαμέτρῳ δὲ τῆς σελήνης τεσσαρεσκαιδεκαταίας τὴν πορείαν ποιουμένης.*

NPNF 2.389 (C. D. Hartranft): I am, for my own part, astonished that Sabbatius and his followers attempted to introduce this innovation. The ancient Hebrews, as is related by Eusebius (*H.E.* 7.32.16) on the testi-

mony of Philo, Josephus, Aristobulus, and several others, offered the sacrifices after the vernal equinox, when the sun is in the first sign of the zodiac, called by the Greeks the Ram, and when the moon is in the opposite quarter of the heavens, and in the fourteenth day of her age.

T 7b (6b)

Anatolius apud Rufinus *H.E.* 7.32.16 [-19] (Mommsen apud Schwartz [GCS, 9.2], 723,21-725,6 [-17]) Sed nec a nobis primis exordium sumit haec ratio: antiquis Iudaeis fuisse conprobata demonstratur et ante adventum Christi observata, sicut evidenter edocet Filo et Ioseppus. sed et horum antiquiores Agathobulus et ab eo eruditus Aristobulus ex Paneada, qui unus ex illis septuaginta senioribus fuit, qui missi fuerant a pontificibus ad Ptolemaeum regem Hebraeorum libros interpretari in Graecum sermonem, quique multa ex traditionibus Moysei proponenti regi percontantique responderant, [(17) ipsi ergo cum quaestiones Exodi exponerent, dixerunt pascha non prius esse immolandum, quam aequinoctium vernale transiret. Aristobulus vero etiam hoc addit in die paschae non solum observandum esse, ut sol aequinoctium vernale transcendat, verum et luna. (18) cum enim duo sint aequinoctia, inquit, veris et autumni aequis spatiis dirempta et quarta decima die mensis primi sit statuta sollemnitas post vesperam, quando luna soli obposita e regione deprehenditur, sicut etiam oculis probare licet, invenitur utique vernalis aequinoctii partem sol obtinens, luna vero e contrario autumnalis. (19) legi in eorum libris et alia multa de his validissimis adsertionibus exposita, quae evidenter ostendant paschae sollemnitatem omni genere post aequinoctium celebrandam.]

For apparatus criticus, see Frg. 1.

Frg. 1:(16) But this explanation does not originate with us: it is shown to have been established by the ancient Jews and noted before the coming of Christ, even as Philo and Josephus clearly teach. But even more ancient than these were Agathobulus and, after him, the learned Aristobulus of Paneas. Aristobulus was one of those seventy elders who had been sent by the high priest to King Ptolemy to translate the books of the Hebrews into the Greek language, and who answered from the traditions of Moses the many things proposed and asked about by the king. [(17) When these (seventy elders), then, explained the questions relating to the Book of

Exodus, they said that Passover is not to be sacrificed before the vernal equinox has elapsed. But Aristobulus also adds this on the time of Passover: It is to be observed not only when the sun is passing through the vernal equinox, but the moon as well. (18) For since, he says, there are two equinoxes, i.e., in the spring and autumn, which are separated by equal intervals, the festival of Passover has been set on the fourteenth day of the first month, after evening. At this time the moon is detected in a position opposite the sun, as one can even prove with the eyes. The sun, that is to say, is found occupying the position of the vernal equinox, but the moon, by contrast, that of the autumnal equinox. (19) I have also read in their books many other things set forth by them as absolutely certain claims, which clearly show that the feast of Passover is in every respect observed after the equinox.]

T 7c (6c)

Liber Anatholi de ratione paschali 2 (ed. B. Krusch, *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie*, Leipzig, 1880, 311–27; on pp. 318–19 are given the variants against Rufinus for T 7b(6b): 2 monstratur | 3 Josephus | 4 eorum | Arestobulus | Spaniada | 5 fuerunt | 6 Tholemeum | interpretare | 7 Grecum | Moysi | 8 percunctantique | responderunt | [questiones | 11–12 verum etiam et | 13 derempta | 14 depraehenditur | 16–19 (=§19) legi — celebrandum *om.*]

T 8 (7)

Eusebius (Jerome) *Chronica*, 151 Olymp., anno Abr. 1841 (=176 BCE) (Helm, Eusebius [GCS 7,1], 139,2–6) Aristobulus natione Iudaeus peripateticus philosophus agnoscitur. Qui ad Philometorem Ptolemaeum explanationum in Moysen commentarios scripsit.

———

Aristobulus, a Peripatetic philosopher of the Jewish nation, became known. He wrote commentaries addressed to Ptolemy Philometor explaining the law of Moses.

(On T 8[7], see Bickerman, *PAAJR*, 3 n. 3.)

T 8a (7a)

Anonymus Matritensis (A. Bauer [Leipzig, 1909], 41,10–13; cf. Helm, Eusebius–Jerome (GCS 47 [24 & 34], 2d ed., 7.377,24–25) *ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ χρόνοις Ἀριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο, ὃς καὶ τῷ Φιλομήτορι Πτολεμαίῳ ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωσέως γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν.*

---

2 Ἰουδαῖος and 3 Μωσέως Bauer incorrectly emends to Ιουδαίο<ι>ς and Μω<ϋ>σέως.

And in his (Philometor's) times, Aristobulus, a Jewish Peripatetic philosopher, became known, who also dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor (his) "Explanations of Mosaic Scripture."

T 8b (7b)

Chronicon Paschale p. 178 C (Rader, 418; L. Dindorf, 337,17–19=*PG* 92, col. 437 C) *Ἀριστόβουλος Ἰουδαῖος περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐγνωρίζετο, ὃς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλομήτορι ἐξηγήσεις τῆς Μωϋσέως γραφῆς ἀνέθηκεν.*

(In Dindorf, and in the parallel column in PG 92, the following Latin is given: Aristobulus Judaeus Peripateticus Philosophus florebat, qui Ptolemaeo Philometori enarrationes suas in Mosis libros dicavit.)

Aristobulus, a Jewish Peripatetic philosopher, became known. He dedicated to Ptolemy Philometor (his) "Explanations of Mosaic Scripture."

T 8c (7c)

Dionysius Telmaharensis (Siegfried and Gelzer, 36; cf. Helm, Eusebius–Jerome *Chron.* [GCS 47 (24 & 34), 2d ed., 7.377,25–26]) Aristobulus Iudaeus philosophus tunc floruit.

Aristobulus, a Jewish philosopher, flourished at that time.

T 9 (8)

Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7 (Schwartz, GCS [GCS 9,2], 548,10–15) *μνημονεύει τε* (viz., Clement) *τοῦ πρὸς Ἕλληνας Τατιανοῦ λόγου καὶ Κασσιανοῦ ὡς καὶ αὐτοῦ χρονογραφίαν πεποιημένου, ἔτι μὴν Φίλωνος καὶ Ἀριστοβούλου Ἰωσήπου τε καὶ Δημητρίου καὶ Εὐπολέμου, Ἰουδαίων συγγραφέων, ὡς ἂν τούτων ἁπάντων ἐγγράφως πρεσβύτερον τῆς παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἀρχαιογονίας Μωυσέα τε καὶ τὸ Ἰουδαίων γένος ἀποδειξάντων.*

Lawlor and Oulton, 1.188: . . . and he (Clement) mentions Tatian's book *Against the Greeks*, and Cassian, since he also had composed a chronography, and moreover Philo and Aristobulus and Josephus and Demetrius and Eupolemus, Jewish writers, in that they would show, all of them, in writing, that Moses and the Jewish race went back further in their origins than the Greeks.

T 9a (8a)

Jerome *De vir. ill.* 38 (E. C. Richardson, *TU* 14,1a, 27,8–14) Meminit autem (viz., Clement) in stromatibus suis voluminis Tatiani adversum gentes, de quo supra diximus, et Cassiani cuiusdam *χρονογραφίας*, quod opusculum invenire non potui. Nec non de Iudaeis Aristobulum quendam et Demetrium et Eupolemum, scriptores adversum gentes, refert, qui in similitudinem Iosephi *ἀρχαιολογίαν* Moysi et Iudaicae gentis adseruerint.

---

6 *ἀρχαιολογίαν*: a few MSS read *ἀρχαιογονίαν* (cf. Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7, T 9[8] above). This alternate reading is given in G. Herding (ed.), Jerome *De vir. ill.* 38 (Leipzig, 1879; Teubner), app. crit. on 31,29; also, see his preface, p. xxiv, on line 29: *ἀρχεογονιαν* Moyseos (A.: *αργαιογονιαν* Moysi). As Walter comments (in an unpublished note), "The reading *ἀρχαιογονίαν* is certainly correct. The reading *ἀρχαιολογίαν*, which is read by Herding and Richardson, probably originated through association with Josephus' work by the same title. Or, perhaps Jerome wrote it incorrectly, and a copyist later corrected it to conform to Eusebius *H.E.* 6.13.7 (=T9[8])."

Text of Jerome according to Herding [Teubner], 31,23–30: Meminit autem in stromatibus suis Tatiani adversum gentes, de quo supra diximus, et Cassiani, cuiusdam *χρονογραφίας*, quod opusculum invenire non potui. Nec non de Iudaeis Aristobulum quendam et Demetrium et Eupolemum, scriptores adversum gentes, refert, qui in similitudinem Iosephi *ἀρχαιολογίαν* Moysi et Iudaicae gentis asseruerint.

NPNF 3.371 (E. C. Richardson): He (Clement) also mentions in his volumes of *Stromateis* the work of Tatian *Against the Nations* which we mentioned above and a *Chronography* of one Cassianus, a work which I have not been able to find. He also mentioned certain Jewish writers against the nations, one Aristobulus and Demetrius and Eupolemus who after the example of Josephus asserted the primacy of Moses and the Jewish people.

T 9b (8b)

"Sophronius" 38 (Gebhardt, *TU* 14,1b, 29,24–30,3)=T 9a in Greek translation (*ἀρχαιογονία* instead of *ἀρχαιολογία*)

T 10 (9)

Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7 (Mras [GCS, 43,1], 390,9–12) *καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἄλλος Ἑβραίων σοφὸς ἀνήρ, κατὰ τὴν τῶν Πτολεμαίων ἀκμάσας ἡγεμονίαν, κυροῖ τὸ δόγμα ὡς πάτριον, αὐτῷ Πτολεμαίῳ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων προσφωνῶν ἑρμηνείαν, ἐν ᾗ τάδε φησί· μεταφέροιτο— προειρημένῳ.* (Cf. Frg. 5e).

Frg. 5e: And Aristobulus, another wise man of the Hebrews, who flourished during the reign of the Ptolemies, confirms the doctrine (of the Logos) as ancestral, speaking to Ptolemy himself concerning the interpretation of our holy laws; he speaks as follows. . . .

T 11 (10)

Eusebius *P.E.* 8.8.56 (Mras [GCS, 43,1], 443,11–14) *περὶ δὲ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ* (viz., Moses) *τεθεῖσι νόμοις ἐπεσκιασμένης καὶ ἀλληγορικῆς θεωρίας πολλὰ ἔχων εἰπεῖν ἐπαρκεῖν ἡγοῦμαι τὰς Ἐλεαζάρου καὶ Ἀριστοβούλου διηγήσεις, ἀνδρῶν τὸ μὲν γένος Ἑβραίων ἀνέκαθεν, τὸν δὲ χρόνον κατὰ τοὺς Πτολεμαίων χρόνους διαπρεψάντων.*

---

2 *ἐπεσκιασμένης καὶ* I: om. BON | 3 *ἀπαρκεῖν* I | 3–5 *καὶ—διαπρεψάντων* om. B | 4 *Ἀριστοβόλου* O | *ἀνδρῶν—γένος* IN: om. O | *Ἑβραίων* hic I: ante *ἀνδρῶν* ND | 5 *Πτολεμαίων* Valckenaer, 28 (=Gais. 4.366) with reference to *P.E.* 7.13.7 (=T 10[9]): *Πτολεμαίου* ION |

Gifford, *P.E.* 3(1).400: (These are the statements of Josephus concerning the political constitution of the Jews established by Moses.) But with regard to the allegorical meaning shadowed out in the laws enacted by him, though I might say much, I think it sufficient to mention the narratives of Eleazar and Aristobulus, men originally of Hebrew descent and, as to date, distinguished in the time of the Ptolemies.

T 12 (11)

Eusebius *P.E.* 8.9.38–10.1 Title (Mras [GCS, 43,1], 451,5–12) *ὁ δὲ Ἀριστόβουλος καὶ τῆς κατ' Ἀριστοτέλην φιλοσοφίας πρὸς τῇ πατρίῳ μετειληχώς, ὁποῖα περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς βίβλοις φερομένων ὡς περὶ θεοῦ μελῶν διῆλθεν ἐπακοῦσαι καιρός· οὗτος δ'* (*αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος, οὗ καὶ ἡ δευτέρα τῶν* Μακκαβαίων *ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βίβλου μνημονεύει*) *ἐν τῷ πρὸς* Πτολεμαῖον *τὸν βασιλέα συγγράμματι τοῦτον καὶ αὐτὸς διασαφεῖ τὸν τρόπον·*

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΟΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΩΝ ΩΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΜΕΛΩΝ

(Frg. 2 follows)

For app. crit., see Frg. 2.

Frg. 2 §9.38–10.1: Now it is time to listen to Aristobulus, the very one who had participated in the study of Aristotelian philosophy in addition to that of his own people—to what sorts of things he recounted concerning the references in the sacred books relating to God's limbs. (He is the one mentioned at the beginning of the Second Book of Maccabees.) And in his work dedicated to King Ptolemy, he himself also explains this method:

Aristobulus' Remarks Concerning the Things That Are Named as Being God's Limbs:

T 13 (12)

Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6a (Mras [GCS, 43,1], 493,7–8) Ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις ὁ Κλήμης Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ καὶ Νουμηνίου τοῦ Πυθαγορείου μνημονεύει λέγων (=T 3, followed by *Strom.* 1.22.150.1–3 [Frg. 3a]).

---

2 ὁ Κλήμης | 3 μέμνηται B |

Frg. 3a[1]: Moreover, in addition to these, Clement recalls Aristobulus the Peripatetic and Numenius the Pythagorean, saying. . . .

T 14 (13)

Eusebius *P.E.* 13.11.3–12 Title (Mras [GCS, 43,2], 190, 12–17) παραθήσω δὲ πρώτου Ἀριστοβούλου, τοῦ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλοσόφου, τὰς οὕτως ἐχούσας φωνάς· ΟΠΩΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΡΟ ΗΜΩΝ ΕΞ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ Ο ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΕΚ ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡ' ΕΒΡΑΙΟΙΣ ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΩΜΟΛΟΓΕΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ ΩΡΜΗΣΘΑΙ· ΕΚ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΩΙ ΠΡΟΣΠΕΦΩΝΗΜΕΝΩΝ

(Frgs. 3–5 follow)

For app. crit., see Frg. 3.

Frg. 3: And I will quote first the words of the Hebrew philosopher Aristobulus, which are as follows: *How Aristobulus the Peripatetic, of the Hebrews Before Us, Also Shows That the Greeks Borrowed From the Philosophy of the Hebrews; From the Addresses of Aristobulus to King Ptolemy*:

T 14a (13a)

Theosophia Tubingensis 10 (Erbse, 168,26–30) *Ὅτι Ἀριστόβουλος, ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος, ἐπιστέλλων Πτολεμαίῳ συνωμολόγησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς θεοσοφίας τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ὡρμῆσθαι· "φανερὸν γάρ ἐστιν, ὅτι κατηκολούθησεν ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καί δῆλός ἐστι περιειργασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ."* (Frg. 3.1–2 = Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.1a).

Aristobulus, the Peripatetic philosopher of the Hebrews, in addressing Ptolemy, confirmed that the Greek (theosophy) had begun from the Hebraic theosophy: "For it is clear that Plato followed the tradition of the law that we use, and he obviously worked through each of the details expressed in it."

[T 15]

Cyril of Alexandria *Contra Iulianum* 4.134 (PG 76, 705 C) *Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ οὕτω πού φησιν ὁ περιπατητικός· Ἅπαντα μέντοι τὰ περὶ φύσεως εἰρημένα παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, λέγεται καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἔξω τῆς Ἑλλάδος φιλοσοφοῦσι, τὰ μὲν παὶ Ἰνδοῖς ὑπὸ τῶν Βραχμαίων, τὰ δὲ ἐν τῇ Συρίᾳ ὑπὸ τῶν καλουμένων Ἰουδαίων. Ἱστόρηται δὲ κἀκεῖνο· Ἵππην γὰρ δή φασι τὴν Χείρωνος τοῦ Κενταύρου θυγατέρα συνοικισθεῖσαν Αἰόλῳ φιλοσοφίαν ἀυτὸν διδάξαι τὴν φυσικὴν, ὥσπερ τινὰ κλῆρον πατρῷον λαχοῦσαν τὴν ἐπιστήμην.*

And thus Aristobulus the Peripatetic says somewhere: "All the opinions expressed by the ancients about nature are found also among the philosophers outside Greece, some among the Indian Brahmans, and others in Syria among those called Jews." And he relates as follows: "For he says Hippa, the daughter of Cheiron the Centaur, being married to Aeolus, taught him natural philosophy, as if someone obtained knowledge as hereditary allotment."

Here Cyril wrongly attributes to Aristobulus a passage that is ascribed to Megasthenes in Clement *Stromateis* 1.15.72.5 (cf. *FGrH* 3c.715, Frg. 3;

also Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.46, No. 14, from which the first part of the translation above is taken; also cf. T 2 above, which occurs just before this passage.). For the second part of the text, see Clement *Stromateis* 1.15.73.3–6.

This list of testimonia is derived from Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 9, but Walter does not include T 5 (*Strom.* 6.3.32.5). Accordingly, my numbering of the testimonia through T 5 corresponds with Walter's numbering; thereafter, Walter's numbering is given in parentheses. Also, see Keller, 2–5.

THE FRAGMENTS

Fragment One (Anatolius Περὶ τοῦ Πάσχα, ap. Eusebius *H.E.* 7.32.14–19)

Ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοῦ πάσχα Ἀνατολίου κανόνων

(14) "Ἔχει τοίνυν ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ ἔτει τὴν νουμηνίαν τοῦ **14**
πρώτου μηνός, ἥτις ἀπάσης ἐστὶν ἀρχὴ τῆς ἐννεακαι-
δεκαετηρίδος, τὴν κατ᾽ Αἰγυπτίους μὲν Φαμενὼθ κς΄,
κατὰ δὲ τοὺς Μακεδόνων μῆνας Δύστρου κβ΄, ὡς δ᾽ ἂν
εἴποιεν Ῥωμαῖοι, πρὸ ια΄ Καλανδῶν Ἀπριλίων. (15) **15**
εὑρίσκεται δὲ ὁ ἥλιος ἐν τῇ προκειμένῃ Φαμενὼθ κς΄ οὐ
μόνον ἐπιβὰς τοῦ πρώτου τμήματος, ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη καὶ
τετάρτην ἡμέραν ἐν αὐτῷ διαπορευόμενος. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ
τμῆμα πρῶτον δωδεκατημόριον καὶ ἰσημερινὸν καὶ μηνῶν
ἀρχὴν καὶ κεφαλὴν τοῦ κύκλου καὶ ἄφεσιν τοῦ τῶν
πλανητῶν δρόμου καλεῖν εἰώθασιν, τὸ δὲ πρὸ τούτου
μηνῶν ἔσχατον καὶ τμῆμα δωδέκατον καὶ τελευταῖον
δωδεκατημόριον καὶ τέλος τῆς τῶν πλανητῶν περιόδου·
δι᾽ ὃ καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ τιθεμένους τὸν πρῶτον μῆνα καὶ
τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην τοῦ πάσχα κατ᾽ αὐτὴν λαμβά-
νοντας οὐ μικρῶς οὐδ᾽ ὡς ἔτυχεν ἁμαρτάνειν φαμέν.
(16) ἔστιν δ᾽ οὐχ ἡμέτερος οὗτος ὁ λόγος, Ἰουδαίοις δὲ **16**
ἐγινώσκετο τοῖς πάλαι καὶ πρὸ Χριστοῦ ἐφυλάττετό τε
πρὸς αὐτῶν μάλιστα· μαθεῖν δ᾽ ἔστιν ἐκ τῶν ὑπὸ Φίλω-

ATERBDMΣ^{arm} Rufinus (=Ruf.)

4 τὴν AT^{c}ERM: τῆσ T^{1}BD | κς΄ BDM: ἕκτη καὶ εἰκάδι ATER | 5 κβ΄ BDM: δευτέρα καὶ εἰκάσ T^{1}E: δευτέρα καὶ εἰκάδι AT^{r}R | 6 εἴποιεν AT(per rasuram)BDM: εἴποιμεν T^{1}ER | ια΄ BM: ιδ΄ D: ἕνδεκα ATER | 7 δὲ om. M | κς΄ BDM: ἕκτη καὶ εἰκάδι ATER | 16 κατ᾽ αὐτὴν: κατὰ τὴν <τούτου νουμηνίαν> cj. Schwartz | 18 οὗτος om. D^{1} add. D^{c} | 19 τε om. B, Ruf. | 20 μάλιστα μαθεῖν δ᾽ TERBDM: μάλιστά τε μαθεῖν AΣ^{arm} |

Fragment One

From the Pascal Canons of Anatolius[1]

14 (14) "There is then in the first year the new moon of the first month, which is the beginning of every cycle of nineteen years,[2] on the twenty-sixth day of the Egyptian Phamenoth;[3] but according to the months of the Macedonians, the twenty-second day of Dystrus,[4] or, as the Romans would say, the eleventh before the Kalends of April.

15 (15) On the said twenty-sixth of Phamenoth, the sun is found not only entered on the first sector,[5] but already passing through the fourth day in it.[6] They are accustomed to call this sector the first dodecatomorion,[7] and the equinox,[8] and the beginning of months, and the head of the cycle, and the starting point of the planetary circuit. But they call the one preceding this the last of months, and the twelfth sector, and the final dodecatomorion, and the end of the planetary circuit. Wherefore we maintain that those who place the first month in it, and determine by it the fourteenth of the Pass-

16 over, commit no slight or common blunder.[9] (16) And this is not merely our position, but it was known to the Jews long ago, even before Christ, and was vigorously defended by them. This is known not only from what was said by Philo,[10]

Fragment One (Anatolius, ap. *H.E.* 7.32 cont.)

νος Ἰωσήπου Μουσαίου λεγομένων, καὶ οὐ μόνων τούτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἔτι παλαιοτέρων ἀμφοτέρων Ἀγαθοβούλων, τῶν ἐπίκλην διδασκάλων Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ πάνυ, ὃς ἐν τοῖς ο΄ κατειλεγμένος τοῖς τὰς ἱερὰς καὶ θείας Ἑβραίων ἑρμηνεύσασι γραφὰς Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ Φιλαδέλφῳ καὶ τῷ τούτου πατρί, καὶ βίβλους ἐξηγητικὰς τοῦ Μωυσέως νόμου τοῖς αὐτοῖς προσεφώνησεν βασιλεῦσιν. (17) *οὗτοι τὰ ζητούμενα κατὰ τὴν Ἔξοδον ἐπιλύοντες,* **17** *φασὶ δεῖν τὰ διαβατήρια θύειν ἐπ᾽ ἴσης ἅπαντας μετὰ ἰσημερίαν ἐαρινήν, μεσοῦντος τοῦ πρώτου μηνός· τοῦτο δὲ εὑρίσκεσθαι, τὸ πρῶτον τμῆμα τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ, ἢ ὥς τινες αὐτῶν ὠνόμασαν, ζῳοφόρου κύκλου διεξιόντος ἡλίου. ὁ δὲ Ἀριστόβουλος προστίθησιν ὡς εἴη ἐξ ἀνάγκης τῇ τῶν διαβατηρίων ἑορτῇ μὴ μόνον τὸν ἥλιον ἰσημερινὸν διαπορεύεσθαι τμῆμα, καὶ τὴν σελήνην δέ.* (18) *τῶν γὰρ ἰσημερινῶν τμημάτων ὄντων δύο, τοῦ μὲν* **18** *ἐαρινοῦ, τοῦ δὲ μετοπωρινοῦ, καὶ διαμετρούντων ἄλληλα δοθείσης τε τῆς τῶν διαβατηρίων ἡμέρας τῇ τεσσαρεσ-*

ATERBDMΣ^{arm} Rufinus (=Ruf.)

21 *μουσέου* BDM | *μόνων* B: *μονχν* E^{1ac}: *μονον* E^{1} | 22–23 *παλαιοτέρων—διδασκάλων*: *παλαιοτέρων Ἀριστοβούλου καὶ Ἀγαθοβούλου, ἀμφοτέρων ἐπίκλην διδασκάλων* Graetz *MGWJ* (1878) 101 | 22–23 *Agathobulus* Ruf. | 23 *τῶν* AT^{1}BDM: *τὸ* T^{r}(per rasuram)ER | *τοῦ πάνυ* Gr MSS: *ex Paneada* Ruf.: *from the city of Penada* Σ^{arm} | 25 *ἑβραίων* ATER: *τὰσ ἑβραίων* BDM | 27 *τοῖς* om. BD | 29 *θύειν*: *λύειν* R | *ἅπαντεσ* BD | 31–32 *ἡλιακοῦ—διεξιόντος* om. Σ^{arm} | 31 *ἢ* om. M | 32 *αὐτῶν* TERBDM: *αὐτὸν* A | *ζωηφόρου* M | 35 *ἰσημερινὸν* ATERM: *τὸ ἰσημερινὸν* BD | *καὶ—δέ*: *ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν σελήνην αὐτήν* T^{r}R | 35–36 *καὶ τὴν—τμημάτων* sive *τμημα—* om. Σ^{arm} | 37 *ἄλληλα*: *ἀλλήλοισ* T^{r}R |

Fragment One (cont.)

Josephus,[11] and Musaeus,[12] but also by those even older, namely, the two Agathobuli,[13] who are surnamed 'the teachers,' and the renowned Aristobulus.[14] The latter was numbered among the seventy who translated the sacred and divine scriptures of the Hebrews for Ptolemy Philadelphus and his father;[15] and he dedicated his commentaries on the
17 law of Moses to the same kings.[16] (17) When these[17] explain the questions relating to the Book of Exodus, they say that all are required to sacrifice the passover in the same manner after the vernal equinox, in the middle of the first month;[18] but this is found to occur when the sun passes through the first sector of the solar, or as some of them have called it, the zodiacal cycle.[19] But Aristobulus adds that, at the time of the feast of Passover,[20] of necessity this would be when not only the sun is passing through an equinoctial sector, but the
18 moon as well.[21] (18) For, since there are two equinoctial sectors, the vernal and the autumnal, and since they diametrically oppose each other, and since the day of Passover has

Fragment One (Anatolius, ap. *H.E.* 7.32 cont.)

καιδεκάτῃ τοῦ μηνὸς μεθ᾽ ἑσπέραν, ἐνστήξεται μὲν ἡ σελήνη τὴν ἐναντίαν καὶ διάμετρον τῷ ἡλίῳ στάσιν, ὥσπερ οὖν ἔξεστιν ἐν ταῖς πανσελήνοις ὁρᾶν, ἔσονται δὲ ὃ μὲν κατὰ τὸ ἐαρινὸν ἰσημερινόν, ὁ ἥλιος, τμῆμα, ἢ δὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης κατὰ τὸ φθινοπωρινὸν ἰσημερινόν, ἡ σελήνη. (19) οἶδα πλεῖστα καὶ ἄλλα πρὸς αὐτῶν λεγόμενα, τοῦτο μὲν πιθανά, τοῦτο δὲ κατὰ τὰς κυριακὰς ἀποδείξεις προϊόντα, δι᾽ ὧν παριστάνειν πειρῶνται τὴν τοῦ πάσχα καὶ τῶν ἀζύμων ἑορτὴν δεῖν πάντως μετ᾽ ἰσημερίαν ἄγεσθαι· παρίημι δὲ τὰς τοιαύτας τῶν ἀποδείξεων ὕλας ἀπαιτῶν ὧν περιῄρηται μὲν τὸ ἐπὶ τῷ Μωυσέως νόμῳ κάλυμμα. . . .” **19**

ATERBDMΣ^{arm} Rufinus (=Ruf.)

39 *τοῦ μηνὸς*: *τοῦ μηνὸσ τοῦ πρώτου* T^{r}: *τοῦ πρώτου μηνὸσ* R | *ἐνστήξεται* T^{c}E^{1}RBDM: *ἐστήξεται* AT^{1},E(per rasuram) | *μὲν*: *μὲν καὶ* T^{ac}: *μὲν* (*καὶ* del.) T^{pc} | 42 *ἰσημερινὸν ἐαρινὸν* D | 43 *φθινοπωρινὸν ἰσημερινὸν* AT^{r}ER: *φθινοπωρινὸν ἰσημερινὴ* M: *φθινώπωρον ἰσημερινὸν* T^{1}: *μεθ᾽ ὀπωρινὸν* B^{ac}: *μετ᾽ ὀπωρινὸν* B^{1}: *ἰσημερινὸν* B$^{c\ mg}$: *μετοπωρινὸν* (*τ* in rasura D^{r}) *ἰσημερινὸν* D | 44 *καὶ ἄλλα* om. B $^{1:}$ add. B$^{c\ mg}$ | *αὐτῶν*: *αὐτῶ* M | 45 *κυριολογικὰς* Anatolius | 47 *πάντωσ* om. T^{1}: del. T$^{c\ mg}$ | 49 *ὕλασ ἀπαιτῶν* AT^{1}R: *ὕλασ ἀπαιτῶν ὑμᾶσ* T^{r} (del. T^{c}) E: *ὕμᾶσ ἀπαιτῶν ὕλασ* M: *ὕλασ ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν* BD: *ἀπαιτῶν ὧν* corrupt. Schwartz | 49 *τῶ* TERDM: *τοῦ* A: om. B |

Fragment One (cont.)

been assigned to the fourteenth of the month after evening, the moon will take a position diametrically opposite the sun, just as one is thus permitted to see it at times of full moon; and the one, the sun, will be in the sector of the vernal equinox, while the other, the moon, will of necessity be in the
19 sector of the autumnal equinox. (19) I know many other statements of theirs, some of them probable, others advanced as absolute proofs, by which they try to prove that the feast of Passover and of Unleavened Bread must by all means be held after the equinox. But I refrain from demanding this sort of demonstration for matters from which the veil of the Mosaic law has been removed. . . .”

Fragment Two (Eusebius *P.E.* 8.9.38–10.18a)

(9.38) Ταῦτα μὲν ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τοῖς ἤκουσιν ὡς **9.38**
αὐτὸν Ἕλλησι περὶ τῆς ἀλληγορουμένης ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς
νόμοις ἰδέας διεστείλατο, ὡς ἂν μέλλουσι ταῖς ἐκδοθη-
σομέναις περιτεύξεσθαι τῶν γραφῶν ἑρμηνείαις. ὁ δὲ *375d*
5 Ἀριστόβουλος καὶ τῆς κατ' Ἀριστοτέλην φιλοσοφίας
πρὸς τῷ πατρίῳ μετειληχώς, ὁποῖα περὶ τῶν ἐν ταῖς
ἱεραῖς βίβλοις φερομένων ὡς περὶ θεοῦ μελῶν διῆλθεν
ἐπακοῦσαι καιρός· οὗτος δ' (αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος, οὗ καὶ ἡ
δευτέρα τῶν Μακκαβαίων ἐν ἀρχῇ τῆς βίβλου μνημο-
10 νεύει) ἐν τῷ πρὸς Πτολεμαῖον τὸν βασιλέα συγγράμματι
τοῦτον καὶ αὐτὸς διασαφεῖ τὸν τρόπον·

ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΥ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΩΝ ΟΝΟΜΑΖΟΜΕΝΩΝ
ΩΣ ΘΕΟΥ ΜΕΛΩΝ *376a*

(10.1) | "Πλὴν ἱκανῶς εἰρημένων πρὸς τὰ προκεί- **10.1**
15 μενα ζητήματα ἐπεφώνησας καὶ σύ, βασιλεῦ, διότι
σημαίνεται διὰ τοῦ νόμου τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν καὶ χεῖρες καὶ
βραχίων καὶ πρόσωπον καὶ πόδες καὶ περίπατος ἐπὶ τῆς
θείας δυνάμεως· ἃ τεύξεται λόγου καθήκοντος καὶ οὐκ *376b*

BION(D)

3 *διεστείλατο* I: ante 1 *τοῖς* BON | *ὡς ἂν* I: *πῶς* BON | *ἐν ταῖς* B | 4 *περιτεύξεσθαι—ἑρμηνείαις* I: *αὐτῶν ἑρμ. περιτεύξεσθαι* BN: *πρὸς αὐτῶν ἑρμηνείαις ἐπιτεύξεσθαι* O | 6–8 *ἐν—ἐπακοῦσαι* I: *ἐμφερουμένων τοῦ θεοῦ μελῶν ἐν ταῖς ἱερ. β. διασαφῆσαι* BON | 8 *οὗτος δ'* Vig.: *οὗτος δ' ἐστὶν* BN: *δ' οὗτος ἐστὶν* O: *οὗτος δ' ἦν* I (*δ'* et *η* partim in ras. I^1) | *αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος* I: om. BON | 8–10 ( ) Mras | 8-9 *ὁ δεύτερος* ND | 9 *ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ* ND | 9–10 *μνημονεύει* I: *μέμνηται* BON | 10–11 *ἐν—τρόπον* I: om. BON | 12–13 ΑΡΙΣ.—ΜΕΛΩΝ BON: om. I | 16 *νόμου τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν* I: *παρ' ἡμῖν νόμου* BON |

Fragment Two[22]

9.38 (9.38) And since the Greeks who had come to the high priest were likely to encounter the published translations of the scriptures, he pronounced to them these things concerning the ideas expressed allegorically[23] in the sacred laws. Now it is time to listen to Aristobulus, the very one who had participated in the study of Aristotelian philosophy[24] in addition to that of his own people—to what sorts of things he recounted concerning references in the sacred books relating to God's limbs. (He is the one mentioned at the beginning of the Second Book of Maccabees.)[25] And in his work dedicated to King Ptolemy,[26] he himself also explains this method.

Aristobulus' Remarks Concerning the Things That Are Named as Being God's Limbs

10.1 (10.1) "However, after we had said enough in reply to the questions set before us,[27] you also called out, Your Majesty, (asking) why throughout our Law hands, arm, visage, feet, and ability to walk are used as signifiers[28] for the divine power.[29] Now these passages will find a proper explanation and will not contradict in any way what we said

Fragment Two (*P.E.* 8.10 cont.)

ἀντιδοξήσει τοῖς προειρημένοις ὑφ' ἡμῶν οὐδέν. (2) 2
παρακαλέσαι δέ σε βούλομαι πρὸς τὸ φυσικῶς λαμβά-
νειν τὰς ἐκδοχὰς καὶ τὴν ἁρμόζουσαν ἔννοιαν περὶ θεοῦ
κρατεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἐκπίπτειν εἰς τὸ μυθῶδες καὶ ἀνθρώπινον
κατάστημα. (3) πολλαχῶς γὰρ ὃ βούλεται λέγειν ὁ 3
νομοθέτης ἡμῶν Μωσῆς ἐφ' ἑτέρων πραγμάτων λόγους
ποιούμενος (λέγω δὲ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν), φυσικὰς
διαθέσεις ἀπαγγέλλει καὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων κατα-
σκευάς. (4) οἷς μὲν οὖν πάρεστι τὸ καλῶς νοεῖν, 4
θαυμάζουσι τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν σοφίαν καὶ τὸ θεῖον πνεῦμα, 376c
καθ' ὃ καὶ προφήτης ἀνακεκήρυκται· ὧν εἰσιν οἱ προειρη-
μένοι φιλόσοφοι καὶ πλείονες ἕτεροι καὶ ποιηταὶ παρ'
αὐτοῦ μεγάλας ἀφορμὰς εἰληφότες, καθὸ καὶ θαυμάζον-
ται. (5) τοῖς δὲ μὴ μετέχουσι δυνάμεως καὶ συνέσεως, 5
ἀλλὰ τῷ γραπτῷ μόνον προσκειμένοις οὐ φαίνεται
μεγαλεῖόν τι διασαφῶν. (6) ἄρξομαι δὲ λαμβάνειν καθ' 6
ἕκαστον σημαινόμενον, καθ' ὅσον ἂν ὦ δυνατός. εἰ δὲ μὴ 376d
τεύξομαι τοῦ πράγματος μηδὲ πείσω, μὴ τῷ νομοθέτῃ
προσάψῃς τὴν ἀλογίαν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ τῷ μὴ δυναμένῳ διαι-
ρεῖσθαι τὰ ἐκείνῳ νενοημένα. (7) χεῖρες μὲν οὖν νοοῦνται 7

BION(D)

22–23 *μυθῶδες — κατάστημα* BON: *μυθῶδες παράστημα καὶ ἀνθρώπινον* I | 26 *ἀπαγγέλλει* I^1 (λ^2 in ras.; *ει* corr.) O: *ἀπαγγέλει* $BI^{ac}N$ | 32 *δυνάμεως καὶ* BON: om. I | 33 *μόνω* O^{ac}: *μόνον* O^1 | 35 *σημαινόμενον* I: *σημαίνων* BON | *καθ' ὅσον ἂν* I: *καθὼς* (om. *ἂν*) BON | 36 *τοῦ πράγματος* I: *τἀληθοῦς* ON: *τἀληθεῖ* B | 36–38 *μὴ — νενοημένα* I: *οὐ τοῦ νομοθέτου, ἀλλ' ἐμοῦ ὁ μῶμος τοῦ ἀτονοῦντος περὶ τὸ ἀληθές* BON | 38–39 *προδήλως νοοῦνται* B |

Fragment Two (cont.)

2 before. (2) I want to urge you to accept the interpretations[30] in their 'natural' sense[31] and grasp a fitting conception about God, and not lapse into a mythical,[32] popular[33] way of think-
3 ing. (3) For what our lawgiver Moses wishes to say, he does so at many levels, using words that appear to have other referents (I mean, to things that can be seen); yet in doing so he actually speaks about 'natural'[34] conditions and structures
4 of a higher order. (4) Consequently, those who have keen intellectual powers are amazed at his wisdom and inspired spirit, in virtue of which he has also been proclaimed a prophet.[35] Included among these are the philosophers mentioned above, and many others, as well as poets, who have taken from him significant seeds of inspiration, so that they
5 too are admired.[36] (5) But to those who do not share in this power of comprehension, but cling to the letter only,[37] he does not appear to convey anything in an expanded sense.[38]
6 (6) So I will begin to take up in order each thing signified, insofar as I can. But if I shall fall short of the truth, and not be convincing, do not attribute the faulty reasoning to the lawgiver but to me and my inability to express distinctly the
7 things which he thought out.[39] (7) As to hands, then, clearly

Fragment Two (*P.E.* 8.10 cont.)

προδήλως καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῶν κοινότερον. ὅταν γὰρ δυνάμεις ἐξαποστέλλῃς σὺ βασιλεὺς ὤν, βουλόμενός τι κατεργάσασθαι, λέγομεν· μεγάλην χεῖρα ἔχει ὁ βασιλεύς, φερομένων τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐπὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἣν ἔχεις. (8) ἐπισημαίνεται δὲ τοῦτο καὶ διὰ τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῶν λέγων ὁ Μωσῆς οὕτως· ''Εν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐξήγαγεν ὁ θεός σε ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.' καὶ πάλιν εἰρηκέναι αὐτῷ φησι τὸν θεόν· ''Αποστελῶ τὴν χεῖρά μου καὶ πατάξω τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους.' καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ γεγονότος θανάτου τῶν κτηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων φησὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων λέγων· | ''Ιδοὺ χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπέσται ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσί σου καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις θάνατος μέγας,' ὥστε δηλοῦσθαι τὰς χεῖρας ἐπὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι θεοῦ· καὶ γὰρ ἔστι μεταφέροντας νοῆσαι τὴν πᾶσαν ἰσχὺν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν εἶναι. (9) διόπερ καλῶς ὁ νομοθέτης ἐπὶ τὸ μεγαλεῖον μετενήνοχε, λέγων τὰς συντελείας χείρας εἶναι θεοῦ. στάσις δὲ θεία καλῶς ἂν λέγοιτο κατὰ τὸ μεγαλεῖον ἡ τοῦ κόσμου κατα-

8 9 377a

BION(D)

39 προδήλως <ὡς> Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 70 (=Gais. 4.403–404) | 42 ἐπὶ—ἔχεις I: ἐφ' ἣν ἔχει (!) δύναμιν BON | 43 ἡμῶν I: om. BON | 44 λέγων ὁ Μωσῆς I: ὁ Μωσῆς λέγων BON | 45–46 εἰρηκέναι — 'Αποστελῶ I: 'Αποστελῶ φησὶν ὁ θεός BON | 46 'Αποστελῶ: καὶ ἐκτείνας LXX (cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 70 [=Gais. 4.404.]) cf. n. 42 | 47–48 γεγονότος — λέγων I: τῶν κτηνῶν θανάτου φησὶν ὁ Μωσῆς τῷ Φαραῶ B: τῶν κτ. θαν. φησὶ τῷ Φ. ὁ Μωσῆς ON (Μωυσῆς ND) | 49 ἐπέσται I LXX (cf. n. 43): ἔσται BON | 50–51 δηλοῦσθαι — θεοῦ I: αἱ χεῖρες ἐπὶ δυνάμεως νοοῦνται θεοῦ BON | 52 μεταφέροντας I: om. BON | 53–55 διόπερ—θεοῦ IN: om. BO | 56 τὸ om. O |

Fragment Two (cont.)

they are thought of, even by us, in a more general way. For whenever you, as king, dispatch forces with the intention of accomplishing something, we say, 'The king has a mighty hand.' And those that hear this refer it to the power that you
8 possess.[40] (8) Now Moses also indicates this through our law when he speaks to this effect: 'God led you out of Egypt with a mighty hand.'[41] And again, 'I will extend my hand,' the Lord says to him, 'and will strike the Egyptians.'[42] And on the death of the cattle and of the other beasts, Moses said to the king of the Egyptians, 'Behold, the hand of the Lord shall be upon your cattle, and death shall be widespread in your fields.'[43] Consequently, the hands are thought of in terms of the power of God. For truly, it is possible to think metaphorically that all men's strength and activities are in
9 their hands.[44] (9) Thus, quite appropriately has the lawgiver spoken metaphorically in an expanded sense[45] in saying that the accomplishments of God are his hands. And the divine 'standing,' understood in this expanded sense, might well be

Fragment Two (*P.E.* 8.10 cont.)

σκευή. (10) καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ πάντων ὁ θεός, καὶ πάνθ' ὑποτέ- **10**
τακται καὶ στάσιν εἴληφεν· ὥστε τοὺς ἀνθρώπους κατα-
λαμβάνειν ἀκίνητα εἶναι ταῦτα. λέγω δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον, *377b*
ὡς οὐδέποτε γέγονεν οὐρανὸς γῆ, γῆ δ' οὐρανός, οὐδ'
ἥλιος σελήνη λάμπουσα, οὐδὲ σελήνη πάλιν ἥλιος, οὐδὲ
ποταμοὶ θάλασσα, οὐδὲ θάλασσα ποταμοί. (11) καὶ **11**
πάλιν ἐπὶ τῶν ζῴων ὁ αὐτός ἐστι λόγος. οὐ γὰρ ἄνθρω-
πος ἔσται θηρίον οὐδὲ θηρίον ἄνθρωπος. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν
λοιπῶν δὲ ταὐτὸν ὑπάρχει φυτῶν τε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων·
ἀμετάβλητα μέν ἐστι, τὰς αὐτὰς δ' ἐν αὑτοῖς τροπὰς
λαμβάνει καὶ φθοράς. (12) ἡ στάσις οὖν ἡ θεία κατὰ **12**
ταῦτα ἂν λέγοιτο, πάντων ὑποκειμένων τῷ θεῷ. *377c*

Fragment 2a (Clement *Stromateis* 6.3.32.3–33.1)

(3) Πῶς δὲ ἔτι ἀπιστή- **3**
σουσιν Ἕλληνες τῇ θείᾳ
ἐπιφανείᾳ περὶ τὸ ὄρος
τὸ Σινᾶ, ὀπηνίκα πῦρ μὲν
ἐφλέγετο, μηδὲν κατανα-
λίσκον τῶν φυομένων
κατὰ τὸ ὄρος, σαλπίγγων

BION(D)

57–59 καὶ[1] — ταῦτα om. B | 62 θάλασσα[1]: θάλασσαι I | 62–63 οὐδὲ — πάλιν I: οὐδ' ἀνάπαλιν. καὶ BON | 63 ἐστι I: om. BON | 64–65 ἐπὶ τῶν λοιπῶν — ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων I: ἐπὶ τῶν φυτῶν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων BON | 66 αὐτοῖς Mras: αὑτοῖς BION |

Fragment Two (cont.)

10 called the constitution of the cosmos.[46] (10) For truly, God is over all and everything is subordinate to him and has received its standing from him, so that men understand these things to be unmoveable. Now I mean something like this—that never has heaven become earth nor earth heaven. Sun has never become the shining moon, nor the moon the sun,
11 nor rivers the sea, nor the sea rivers. (11) And again, with regard to living beings the principle[47] is the same. For man will not be a wild animal, nor a wild animal a man. And the same holds true for the remaining things, trees and the rest. They are unchangeable, and within their respective groups
12 they experience the same patterns of change and decay.[48] (12) In the case of the aforementioned, then, the 'standing' might be called the standing of God, since all things are subject to God.

Fragment 2a[49]

3 (3) How then shall the Greeks any longer disbelieve the divine appearance on Mount Sinai, when the fire burned, consuming none of the things that grew on the mount; and the sound of trumpets issued forth,

Fragment Two (cont.)
(*P.E.* 8.10)

λέγεται δὲ καὶ κατάβα- **12**
σις ἐπὶ τὸ ὄρος θεία
γεγονέναι διὰ τῆς γρα-
φῆς τοῦ νόμου, καθ' ὃν
ἐνομοθέτει καιρόν, ἵνα
πάντες θεωρήσωσι τὴν
ἐνέργειαν τοῦ θεοῦ.
κατάβασις γὰρ αὕτη
σαφής ἐστι· καὶ περὶ
τούτων οὖν οὕτως ἄν τις
ἐξηγήσαιτο, βουλόμενος
συντηρεῖν τὸν περὶ θεοῦ
λόγον. (13) δηλοῦται γὰρ **13**
ὡς 'τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυ-
ρι,' καθώς φησιν ἡ νομο-
θεσία, διὰ τὸ τὸν θεὸν

Fragment 2a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.3.32.3–4)

τε ἦχος ἐφέρετο ἄνευ
ὀργάνων ἐμπνεόμενος;
(4) ἐκείνη γὰρ ἡ λεγο- **4**
μένη κατάβασις ἐπὶ τὸ
ὄρος θεοῦ ἐπίφασίς ἐστι
θείας δυνάμεως ἐπὶ
πάντα τὸν κόσμον διηκού-
σης καὶ κηρυττούσης τὸ
φῶς τὸ ἀπρόσιτον. τοι-
αύτη γὰρ ἡ κατὰ τὴν
γραφὴν ἀλληγορία.

Eusebius BION(D)

78 *καὶ* I: om. BON | 82 *ἐνομοθέτει* BIO: *ἐνομοθετήθη* N: *ἐνομοθέτησε* D | 85 *αὕτη* I^{ac}: *αὔτη* I^{1} | 87 *οὕτως* BIO(et D): om. N | 87–90 *ἄν — λόγον* I: *ἐρεῖ τις* BON | 92–93 *ἡ νομοθεσία* BO^{1}N: *ὁ νομοθέτης* IO^{ac} |

Clement L

80 *ἐπίφασίς* Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 71 (=Gais. 4.404): *ἐπίβασίς* L |

Fragment Two (cont.)

12 In the book of the Law, it is said that at the time when God was giving the law, a divine descent onto the mountain took place, so that all might see the active power of God.[50] This descent is manifest; and anyone who wants to preserve what is said about God would explain these accounts in the fol-
13 lowing way. (13) It is declared that 'the mountain was alight with fire,'[51] as our law code says, because of God's

Fragment 2a (cont.)

blown without instru-
4 ments? (4) For that which is called the descent on the mount of God is the advent of divine power, pervading the whole world, and proclaiming "the light that is inaccessible" (1 Timothy 6:16). For such is the allegory, according to the Scripture.

Fragment Two (cont.)
(*P.E.* 8.10)

καταβεβηκέναι σαλπίγγων τε φωνὰς καὶ τὸ πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἀνυποστάτως εἶναι. (14) τοῦ γὰρ **14** παντὸς πλήθους μυριάδων οὐκ ἔλαττον ἑκατόν, χωρὶς τῶν ἀφηλίκων, *377d* ἐκκλησιαζομένων κυκλόθεν τοῦ ὄρους, οὐκ ἔλασσον ἡμερῶν πέντε οὔσης τῆς περιόδου περὶ αὐτό, κατὰ πάντα τόπον τῆς ὁρασεως πασιν αυτοις κυκλόθεν, ὡς ἦσαν παρεμβεβληκότες, τὸ πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἐθεωρεῖτο· (15) ὥστε τὴν **15** κατάβασιν μὴ τοπικὴν εἶναι· πάντη γὰρ ὁ θεός ἐστιν. ἀλλὰ τὴν τοῦ

Fragment 2a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.3.32.5–33.1)

(5)πλὴν ‘ἐωράθη τὸ πῦρ,’ **5**
ὥς φησιν Ἀριστόβουλος,
‘παντὸς τοῦ πλήθους
μυριάδων οὐκ ἔλασσον
ἑκατόν, χωρὶς τῶν ἀφηλίκων, ἐκκλησιαζόντων
κύκλῳ τοῦ ὄρους, οὐχ
ἧττον ἡμερῶν πέντε τῆς
περιόδου τυγχανούσης
περὶ τὸ ὄρος. (33.1) κατὰ **33.1**
παντα τοινυν τοπον της
ὁράσεως πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς
κυκλόθεν, ὡς ἂν παρεμβεβληκόσι, τὸ πῦρ φλεγόμενον ἐθεωρεῖτο, ὥστε
τὴν κατάβασιν μὴ τοπικὴν γεγονέναι· πάντῃ
γὰρ ὁ θεός ἐστιν.’

Eusebius BION(D)

99 ἔλαττον BION, Mras: ἔλασσον Walter ex Clem. | ἑκατόν: ἑκαστόν O | 102–134 οὐκ — ἁπάντων om. B | 112 πάντη I (cf. Clem. lin. 112): πανταχοῦ ON |

Clement L

98 <ὑπὸ> παντὸς Mayor ap. Stählin | 103 πέντε: ε΄ L | 112 πάντῃ Sylburg ap. Stählin: παντὶ L |

Fragment Two (cont.)

descent. There were the voices of trumpets and the fire blazing beyond all
14 power to resist it.[52] (14) And the number of the entire throng was no less than a million,[53] not counting those outside the prescribed age.[54] They were called to assembly from all around the mountain (the circuit of the mountain took no less **33.1** than five days) and the blazing fire was observed by them from every vantage point, as they were encamped around
15 it.[55] (15) As a result, the descent was not local, for God is everywhere. And as for the force of the fire,

Fragment 2a (cont.)

5 (5) "But the fire was seen," as Aristobulus says, "while the whole multitude, amounting to not less than a million, besides those under age, were congregated around the mountain, the circuit of the mountain not being less than five days' journey. (33.1) Over the whole place of the vision the burning fire was seen by them all encamped as it were around; so that the descent was not local. For God is everywhere."

Fragment Two (cont.)
(*P.E.* 8.10)

πυρὸς δύναμιν, παρὰ πάντα θαυμάσιον ὑπάρχουσαν διὰ τὸ πάντ᾽ ἀναλίσκειν, ἔδειξε φλεγομένην ἀνυποστάτως, μηδὲν δ᾽ ἐξαναλίσκουσαν, εἰ μὴ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δυναμικὸν αὐτῇ προσείη. | (16) τῶν γὰρ φυομένων κατὰ τὸ ὄρος, τόπων φλεγομένων σφοδρῶς, οὐδὲν ἐξανάλωσεν, ἀλλ᾽ ἔμεινε τῶν ἁπάντων ἡ χλόη πυρὸς ἄθικτος, σαλπίγγων τε φωναὶ σφοδρότερον συνηκούοντο σὺν τῇ του πυρὸς ἀστραπηδὸν ἐκφάνσει, μὴ προκειμένων ὀργάνων τοιούτων μηδὲ τοῦ φωνήσοντος, ἀλλὰ

Fragment 2a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.3.32.3)

16 [(3) Πῶς δὲ ἔτι ἀπιστήσουσιν Ἕλληνες τῇ θείᾳ **378a** ἐπιφανείᾳ περὶ τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινᾶ, ὁπηνίκα πῦρ μὲν ἐφλέγετο, μηδὲν κατανάλισκον τῶν φυομένων κατὰ τὸ ὄρος, σαλπίγγων τε ἦχος ἐφέρετο ἄνευ ὀργάνων ἐμπνεόμενος;] **3**

Eusebius BION(D)

117 verba *οὐκ ἂν* ante *ἔδειξε* add. Vig. (not.); cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 71 (=Gais. 4.405) | 119–121 *εἰ — προσείη* IN: om. O | 122–124 *κατὰ — φλεγομένων* I (cf. Clem., lin. 127): *ἐν τῷ ὄρει ἐκείνῳ ἀναλισκομένων* ON (*ἐξαναλισκομένων* ND) | 124-125 *ἐξανάλωσεν* I: *ἀνάλωσεν* ON | 130-131 *ἐκφάνσει* I: *ἐκφαύσει* O(corr. ?)GN | 133 *φωνήσοντος* ION, Mras: *φωνήσαντος* cett. edd. (cf. Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 454, lin. 3 app. crit.) |

Fragment Two (cont.)

which is exceedingly marvellous because it consumes everything, he showed that it burned irresistibly and actually consumed nothing, which would not have happened unless a divine power had

16 been in it.[56] (16) For, though the place burned furiously, the fire consumed none of the things growing on the mountain, but the fresh green of all the plants remained untouched by the fire. The voices of the trumpets sounded more vehemently together with the lightning-like illumination of the fire, although there were no such instruments ready at hand, nor anyone playing

Fragment 2a (cont.)

3 [(3) How then shall the Greeks any longer disbelieve the divine appearance on Mount Sinai, when the fire burned, consuming none of the things that grew on the mount; and the sound of trumpets issued forth, blown without instruments?]

Fragment Two (*P.E.* 8.10 cont.)

θείᾳ κατασκευῇ γινομένων ἁπάντων· (17) *ὥστε σαφὲς* **17**
135 *εἶναι διὰ ταῦτα τὴν κατάβασιν τὴν θείαν γεγονέναι, διὰ*
τὸ τοὺς συνορῶντας ἐκφαντικῶς ἕκαστα καταλαμβάνειν,
μήτε τὸ πῦρ κεκαυκός, ὡς προείρηται, μηδὲν μήτε τὰς ***378b***
τῶν σαλπίγγων φωνὰς δι᾽ ἀνθρωπίνης ἐνεργείας ἢ
κατασκευῆς ὀργάνων γίνεσθαι, τὸν δὲ θεὸν ἄνευ τινὸς
140 *δεικνύναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ διὰ πάντων μεγαλειότητα.”*
(18) Ταῦτα καὶ ὁ ᾽Αριστόβουλος. **18**

BION(D)

134 *ἁπάντων* I: *πάντων* ON | 137 *μηδὲν μήτε*: *μηθὲν μηδὲ* I | 138 *τῶν* om. ND | 140 *τὴν ἑαυτοῦ* IN: om. BO | 141 *καὶ* I: om. BON |

Fragment Two (cont.)

17 them, but everything came to be by divine provision.[57] (17) So then it is clear that the descent of God took place for these reasons: so that those looking on together might grasp what was really being revealed[58] in each of these events—not simply for them to see the fire that kept burning, as mentioned previously, nor for them to hear the sounds of trumpets that occurred without human activity or any actual instruments, but for them to understand that God, without any human assistance, was demonstrating his own greatness in all of these things."[59]

18 (18) This, then, is the testimony of Aristobulus.

Fragment Three (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.11.3b–12.2 = *P.E.* 9.6.6–8, Frg. 3a[1]; cf. p. 158)

(11.3b) *παραθήσω δὲ* **3**
πρώτου Ἀριστοβούλου,
τοῦ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλο-
σόφου, τὰς οὕτως
ἐχούσας φωνάς·

ΟΠΩΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΠΡΟ *663d*
ΗΜΩΝ ΕΞ ΕΒΡΑΙΩΝ
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΣ Ο
ΠΕΡΙΠΑΤΗΤΙΚΟΣ ΕΚ
ΤΗΣ ΠΑΡ' ΕΒΡΑΙΟΙΣ
ΦΙΛΟΣΟΦΙΑΣ ΩΜΟΛΟ-
ΓΕΙ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ
ΩΡΜΗΣΘΑΙ· ΕΚ ΤΩΝ
ΑΡΙΣΤΟΒΟΥΛΟΥ
ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ ΠΤΟΛΕΜΑΙΩΙ
ΠΡΟΣΠΕΦΩΝΗΜΕΝΩΝ

Fragment 3a (Clement *Stromateis* 1.22.150.1–3)

(1) *Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ* **1**
ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς
τὸν Φιλομήτορα κατὰ
λέξιν γράφει·

Eusebius BION(D)

5 *φωνὰς θετέον* B | 6-16 ΟΠΩΣ — ΠΡΟΣΠΕΦΗΜΕΝΩΝ BION | 6 *καὶ ὁ* BN: *καὶ* IO (titulum in praefatione ad *P.E.* 13: *καὶ ὁ* IO: *καὶ* BN; cf. Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 164, lin. 5) | 7 *ἐξ Ἑβραίων* B: om. ION (titulum in praefatione ad *P.E.* 13: *ἐξ Ἑβραίων* IO: *παρ' Ἑβραίων* ND; cf. Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 164, lin. 5) | 11–12 *ὡμολογεῖ*: *ὁμολογεῖ* MSS in praefatione ad *P.E.* 13; cf. Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 164, lin. 6. |

Clement L

2 *τῶν*: *τῷ* L (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 7) |

Fragment Three[60]

11.3 (11.3) And I will quote first the words of the Hebrew philosopher Aristobulus, which are as follows:

How Aristobulus the Peripatetic,[63] Of the Hebrews Before Us, Also Shows That the Greeks Borrowed From the Philosophy of the Hebrews;[64] From the Addresses of Aristobulus to King Ptolemy:[65]

Fragment 3a[61]

1 (1) And Aristobulus, in his first book[62] addressed to Philometor, writes in these words:

Fragment Three (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

(12.1) "Φανερὸν ὅτι κατηκολούθησεν ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ | φανερός ἐστι 664a περιειργασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ. διηρμήνευται γὰρ πρὸ Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως δι' ἑτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύ-

Fragment 3a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 1.22.150)

"κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ, καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιειργασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. (2) διηρμήνευται δὲ πρὸ Δημητρίου ὑφ' ἑτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου {καὶ} Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων 2

Eusebius BION(D)

17 *φανερὸν*: *φανερὸν γάρ ἐστιν* Theos. Tub. | 17–43 *φανερὸν—κατεχώρισεν* ‖ Clem. *Strom.* 1.22.150.1–3 etiam ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.6–8 (Mras, GCS 43.1, p. 493, lin. 11–18). See Frg. 3a Supplement, lines 9–35 | 17–18 *Φανερὸν — κατηκολούθησεν*: Κατηκολούθηκε δὲ Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.6 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 9–10) | 20 *φανερός*: *δῆλός* Theos. Tub. | 22 *αὐτῇ λεγομένων* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.6 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 14) | 23 *γὰρ*: *δὲ* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.7 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 15) Cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 48–49 (=Gais. 4.384–85). | *πρὸ*: *πρὸς* B | 23–25 *Δημητρίου — ἑτέρων* om. Valckenaer, 48–49 (=Gais. 4.384–85) | 24 *τοῦ Φαληρέως* om. Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.7 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 16) | 24–25 *δι' ἑτέρων*: *ὑφ' ἑτέρων* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.7 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 16) | 27-29 *τὴν ἐξαγωγὴν τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*: *τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγὴν* B, Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.7 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 19–20) |

Clement L

20 *περιειργασάμενος* L (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 12–13) | 22–23 *διειρμήνευται* L (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 15) | 24 *ἑτέρου* L (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 16) |

Fragment Three (cont.)

12.1 (12.1) "It is clear that Plato followed[66] the tradition of the law[67] that we use and he is conspicuous for having worked through each of the details contained in it.[68] For before Demetrius of Phalerum,[70] before the dominion of Alexander and the Persians,[71] others had translated accounts of the events[72] surrounding the exodus from Egypt of

Fragment 3a (cont.)

"And Plato followed the tradition of the law that we use, and he is conspicuous for having worked through each of the details expressed in it.

2 (2) And before Demetrius,[69] before the dominion of Alexander {and} the Persians, others had translated accounts of the events surrounding the exodus from Egypt of the Hebrews, our coun-

Fragment Three (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

πτου τῶν Ἑβραίων, ἡμετέ-
ρων δὲ πολιτῶν, καὶ ἡ
τῶν γεγονότων ἁπάντων
αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ
κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ
τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας
ἐπεξήγησις, ὡς εὔδηλον
εἶναι τὸν προειρημένον
φιλόσοφον εἰληφέναι
πολλά· γέγονε γὰρ
πολυμαθής, καθὼς καὶ
Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν
παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας εἰς **664b**
τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματο-
ποιίαν κατεχώρισεν.

Fragment 3a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 1.22.150)

τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶν
καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων
ἁπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφά-
νεια καὶ κράτησις τῆς
χώρας καὶ τῆς ὅλης
νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις·
(3) ὥστε εὔδηλον εἶναι 3
τὸν προειρημένον
φιλόσοφον εἰληφέναι
πολλά (γέγονε γὰρ
πολυμαθής), καθὼς καὶ
Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν
παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας εἰς
τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματο-
ποιίαν."

Fragment 3b (Clement
Strom. 1.22.148.1)

(1) Καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ 1
τῶν χρόνων διαφόρως
πολλοῖς ἱστορηθέντα καὶ

Eusebius BION(D)

29-30 ἡμετέρων δὲ: τῶν ἡμετέρων Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.7 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 21-22) | 33 κράτησις: κατάσχεσις B | 35 ἐπεξήγησις: ἐξήγησις B | ὡς: ὥστε Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.8 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 27) | 36-37 προειρ. — φιλόσοφον: Πλάτωνα B | 38-39 γέγονε — πολυμαθής om. B | 43 κατεχώρισεν BIN: κατεχώρησεν O: om. Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.8 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 35) |

Fragment Three (cont.)

1 the Hebrews, our countrymen,[73] and the disclosure to them of all the things that had happened as well as their domination of the land, and the detailed account of the entire law,[75] so that it is very clear that the aforementioned philosopher had taken over many ideas; for he was very learned, just as Pythagoras,[76] having borrowed many of the things in our traditions, found room for them in his own doctrinal system.[78]

Fragment 3a (cont.)

trymen,[74] and the disclosure to them of all the things that had happened as well as their domination of the land, and the detailed account of the

3 entire law; (3) thus, it is very clear that the aforementioned philosopher had taken over many ideas (for he was very learned), just as Pythagoras, having transferred many things from our traditions into his own doctrinal system."[77]

Fragment 3b[79]

1 (1) And so much concerning the details respecting dates, as stated

Fragment Three (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

(2) ἡ δ' ὅλη ἑρμηνεία τῶν διὰ τοῦ νόμου πάντων ἐπὶ τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Φιλαδέλφου βασιλέως, σοῦ δὲ προγόνου, προσενεγκαμένου μείζονα φιλοτιμίαν, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως πραγματευσαμένου τὰ περὶ τούτων."

Fragment 3b (cont.)
(*Strom.* 1.22.148)

πρὸς ἡμῶν ἐκτεθέντα ὧδε ἐχέτω, ἑρμηνευθῆναι δὲ τὰς γραφὰς τάς τε τοῦ νόμου καὶ τὰς προφητικὰς ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἑβραίων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶττάν φασιν ἐπὶ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Λάγου ἢ ὥς τινες ἐπὶ τοῦ Φιλαδέλφου ἐπικληθέντος, τὴν μεγίστην φιλοτιμίαν εἰς τοῦτο προσενεγκαμένου, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως {καὶ} τὰ περὶ τὴν ἑρμηνείαν ἀκριβῶς πραγματευσαμένου.

Eusebius BION(D)

47–56 ἡ — τούτων om. Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 9.6.6–9 (cf. Frg. 3a Supplement, lin. 35) | 51–52 προσενεγκαμένον Hody, *Bibliorum*, p. 48 |

Clement L

61 {καὶ} Stählin ex Aristobulo ap. Euseb. On καὶ, see E. Nestle, *ZAW* 26 (1906) 287–88. |

Fragment Three (cont.)

2 (2) But the complete translation of everything in the law occurred at the time of the king surnamed Philadelphus,[81] your ancestor, who brought great zeal to this undertaking,[82] while Demetrius of Phalerum attended to matters relating to these things."[85]

Fragment 3b (cont.)

1 variously by many, and set down by us; it is said that the Scriptures both of the law and the prophets[80] were translated from the dialect of the Hebrews into the Greek language in the reign of Ptolemy the son of Lagus,[83] or, according to some,[84] in the time of Ptolemy surnamed Philadelphus, when Demetrius of Phalerum brought to this task the greatest zeal, {and} attended to the matters of translation with painstaking accuracy.

Fragment 3a Supplement
(Clement *Stromateis* 1.22.
150.1–3)

(1) Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· "κατηκολούθηκε δὲ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ, καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιειργασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. (2) διηρμήνευται δὲ πρὸ Δημητρίου ὑφ' ἑτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου {καὶ} Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν

Fragment 3a[1]
(Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6–8)

(6) Ἔτι πρὸς τούτοις **6**
ὁ Κλήμης Ἀριστοβούλου ***410d***
τοῦ Περιπατητικοῦ καὶ
Νουμηνίου τοῦ Πυθαγορείου μνημονεύει λέγων·
"Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἐν **1**
τῷ πρώτῳ τῶν πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· 'Κατηκολούθηκε δὲ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιειργασμένος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. (7) **7**
διηρμήνευται δὲ πρὸ Δημητρίου ὑφ' ἑτέρων, πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν | ***411a***

Clement L

7 τῶν: τῷ L (cf. Frg. 3, lin. 2) | 12–13 περιεργασάμενος L (cf. Frg. 3, lin. 21) | 15 διειρμήνευται L (cf. Frg. 3, lin. 22 & 23) | 16 ἑτέρου L (cf. Frg. 3, lin. 24–25) |

Eusebius BION

2 ὁ Κλήμης om. B | 5 μέμνηται B | 6 δὲ om. B | 7 τὸν om. B |

Fragment 3a Supplement

Fragment 3a[1] [86]

6 (6) Moreover, in addition to these, Clement recalls Aristobulus the Peripatetic[87] and Numenius the Pythagorean, saying:

1 (1) And Aristobulus, in his first book addressed to Philometor, writes in these words: "And Plato followed the tradition of the law that we use, and he is conspicuous for having worked through each of the details

2 expressed in it. (2) And before Demetrius, before the dominion of Alexander {and} the Persians,

"And Aristobulus in his first book addressed to Philometor, writes in these words: 'And Plato followed the tradition of the law that we use, and he is conspicuous for having worked through each of the details

7 expressed in it. (7) And before Demetrius, before the dominion of Alexander and the Persians,

Fragment 3a Supplement (cont.) (*Strom.* 1.22.150)

ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγὴν 2
τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέ-
ρων πολιτῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν
γεγονότων ἁπάντων
αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ
κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ
τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας
ἐπεξήγησις· (3) ὥστε 3
εὔδηλον εἶναι τὸν προει-
ρημένον φιλόσοφον εἰλη-
φέναι πολλά (γέγονε
γὰρ πολυμαθής), καθὼς
καὶ Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ
τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν μετε-
νέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
δογματοποιίαν."

Fragment 3a[1] (cont.) (*P.E.* 9.6)

ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγὴν 7
τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέ- 411a
ρων πολιτῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν
γεγονότων ἁπάντων
αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια καὶ
κράτησις τῆς χώρας καὶ
τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας
ἐπεξήγησις. (8) ὥστε 8
εὔδηλον εἶναι τὸν προει-
ρημένον φιλόσοφον εἰλη-
φέναι πολλά· γέγονε
γὰρ πολυμαθὴς καθὼς
καὶ Πυθαγόρας, πολλὰ
τῶν παρ᾽ ἡμῖν μετε-
νέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ
δογματοποιίαν.'"

Eusebius BION

27–35 *ὥστε — δογματ.* om. B | 33–34 *μετενεγκὼν* I (cf. Frg. 3, lin. 41) |

Fragment 3a Supplement (cont.)

2 others had translated accounts of the events surrounding the exodus from Egypt of the Hebrews, our countrymen, and the disclosure to them of all the things that had happened as well as their domination of the land, and the detailed account of the entire law;
3 (3) thus, it is very clear that the aforementioned philosopher had taken over many ideas (for he was very learned), just as Pythagoras, having transferred many things from our traditions into his own doctrinal system."

Fragment 3a[1] (cont.)

7 others had translated accounts of the events surrounding the exodus from Egypt of the Hebrews, our countrymen, and the disclosure to them of all the things that had happened as well as their domination of the land, and the detailed account of the entire law;
8 (8) thus, it is very clear that the aforementioned philosopher had taken over many ideas; for he was very learned, just as Pythagoras, having transferred many things from our traditions into his own doctrinal system.'"[88]

Fragment Four (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.3–8)

(12.3) Εἶτα μεταξύ τινα εἰπὼν ἐπιφέρει λέγων· 3

"Δεῖ γὰρ λαμβάνειν τὴν θείαν φωνὴν οὐ ῥητὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἔργων κατασκευάς, καθὼς καὶ διὰ τῆς νομοθεσίας ἡμῖν ὅλην τὴν γένεσιν τοῦ κόσμου θεοῦ λόγους εἴρηκεν ὁ Μωσῆς. συνεχῶς γάρ φησιν ἐφ' ἑκάστου· 'καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ ἐγένετο.'

Fragment 4a
(Clement *Stromateis* 5.14.99.3 = *P.E.* 13.13.21)

(4) δοκοῦσι δέ μοι **4**
περιειργασμένοι πάντα **644c**
κατηκολουθηκέναι τούτῳ
Πυθαγόρας τε καὶ
Σωκράτης καὶ Πλάτων
λέγοντες ἀκούειν φωνῆς
θεοῦ, τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν
ὅλων συνθεωροῦντες
ἀκριβῶς ὑπὸ θεοῦ γεγο-
νυῖαν καὶ συνεχομένην
ἀδιαλείπτως. ἔτι δὲ καὶ

(99.3) "καὶ τὸ σύνολον **3**
Πυθαγόρας καὶ
Σωκράτης καὶ Πλάτων,
λέγοντες ἀκούειν φωνῆς
θεοῦ, τὴν κατασκευὴν τῶν
ὅλων θεωροῦντες ἀκριβῶς
ὑπὸ θεοῦ γεγονυῖαν καὶ
συνεχομένην ἀδιαλεί-
πτως, ἀκηκόασι {γὰρ} τοῦ

Eusebius BION(D)

1 ἐπιφέρει λέγων: ἐπιφέρει λόγων (!) ND: ἐπιλέγει B | 5–6 ἐφ' ἑκάστου om. B | 6 καὶ ἐγένετο om. B | 7 δέ: τέ ND | 14 συνθεωροῦντα B |

Clement L

17 {γὰρ} Stählin |

Fragment Four[89]

3 (12.3) Then, after some intervening remarks, he resumes with the following words:

"For it is necessary to understand the divine 'voice'[90] not in the sense of spoken language but in the sense of creative acts,[91] just as Moses in our lawcode has said that the entire beginning of the world was accomplished through[92] God's words.[93] For invariably he says in each instance, 'And God spoke, and it came to be.'[94]

Fragment 4a[95]

4 (4) Now since Pythagoras,[96] Socrates, and Plato[97] investigated everything thoroughly,[98] they seem to me to have followed[99] him in saying that they hear God's voice by reflecting on the cosmic order as something carefully created by God and permanently held together by him.[100]

3 (99.3) "And, in general, Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato say that they hear God's voice by reflecting on the cosmic order as something carefully created by God and permanently held together by him. For they heard Moses say, 'He spoke, and it came to be,' there-

Fragment Four (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

ὈΟρφεὺς ἐν ποιήμασι τῶν **4**
κατὰ τὸν Ἱερὸν Λόγον
αὐτῷ λεγομένων οὕτως
ἐκτίθεται περὶ τοῦ δια-
κρατεῖσθαι θείᾳ δυνάμει
τὰ πάντα καὶ γενητὰ
ὑπάρχειν καὶ ἐπὶ πάντων
εἶναι τὸν θεόν. λέγει δ'
οὕτως·

Fragment 4a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 5.14.99)

Μωυσέως λέγοντος **3**
'εἶπεν, καὶ ἐγένετο,' τὸν
λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ ἔργον
εἶναι διαγράφοντος."

(5) φθέγξομαι οἷς θέμις ἐστί, θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε **5**
βέβηλοι, **664d**
φεύγοντες δικαίων θεσμούς, θείοιο τιθέντος
πᾶσιν ὁμοῦ· σὺ δ' ἄκουε, φαεσφόρου ἔκγονε Μήνης
Μουσαῖ'. ἐξενέπω γὰρ ἀληθέα· μηδέ σε τὰ πρὶν
ἐν στήθεσσι φανέντα φίλης αἰῶνος ἀμέρσῃ,
εἰς δὲ λόγον θεῖον βλέψας τούτῳ προσέδρευε,
ἰθύνων κραδίης νοερὸν κύτος· εὖ δ' ἐπίβαινε
ἀτραπιτοῦ, μοῦνον δ' ἐσόρα κόσμοιο τυπωτὴν

Eusebius BION(D)

18–20 ἐν — λεγομένων om. B | 22 θείᾳ δυνάμει: δυνάμει θεία B | 23 γενητὰ: γεννητὸν (!) O | 29–30 τιθέντος πᾶσιν ὁμοῦ BIOND^{1} (πάντες ὁμῶς Ps.-J. *Coh.*, Clem. *Protr.*, Cyr.): τεθέντος πᾶσι νόμου D^{4}, Steph. (see Wesseling, *Aristobulo*, 132 [=Gais. 4.455]) | 30 ἔκγονε B: ἔγγονε ION | 31 Μουσαῖε B I(post γὰρ) ON | ἐξενέπω I^{ac}ND^{1}: ἐξεννέπω BI^{1}O: ἐξερέω D$^{4\ mg}$ (Ps.-J. *Coh.* et *Mon.*, Clem. *Protr.*, Cyr.), Steph. | 32 ἐν om. I | στήθεσι B | 33–36 εἰς—ἀθάνατον =Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.123.1 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.50 (see Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 1–4) ‖ *Protr.* 7.74.4. |

Fragment Four (cont.)

4 Moreover, Orpheus,[101] in verses taken from the collection of sayings attributed to him entitled 'Concerning the Holy Word,' also expounds in this way about everything being governed by the power of God, about the origin of what has come to be, and about God's being over everything. He says as follows:[103]

Fragment 4a (cont.)

3 by delineating that the word of God was an act."[102]

5 (5) I will speak to those to whom it is permitted, but, you
uninitiated, shut the doors,
Since you flee the ordinances of the just, since God has
laid them down
For all at once. But listen, Musaeus, you descendant of
the light-bearing moon,
For I will declare the truth. And do not let the former
Imaginings of your hearts deprive you of a pleasant life.
But once you have seen into the divine word, stay close
to it,
Guiding aright the heart, the intelligent vessel of the
mind. Walk unwaveringly upon
The path, and look only toward the immortal one who
molds the universe.

Fragment Four (*P.E.* 13.12 cont.)

| ἀθάνατον. παλαιὸς δὲ λόγος περὶ τοῦδε 5
φαείνει· 665a
Εἷς ἔστ᾽ αὐτοτελής, αὐτοῦ δ᾽ ὕπο πάντα τελεῖται,
ἐν δ᾽ αὐτοῖς αὐτὸς περινίσσεται, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν
40 εἰσοράᾳ ψυχὴν θνητῶν, νῷ δ᾽ εἰσοράαται.
αὐτὸς δ᾽ ἐξ ἀγαθῶν θνητοῖς κακὸν οὐκ ἐπιτέλλει
ἀνθρώποις· αὐτῷ δὲ χάρις καὶ μῖσος ὀπηδεῖ·
καὶ πόλεμος καὶ λοιμὸς ἰδ᾽ ἄλγεα δακρυόεντα·
οὐδέ τίς ἐσθ᾽ ἕτερος. σὺ δέ κεν ῥέα πάντ᾽ 665b
45 ἐσορήσω,
αἴ κεν ἴδῃς αὐτόν· πρὶν δή ποτε δεῦρ᾽ ἐπὶ γαῖαν,
τέκνον ἐμόν, δείξω σοι, ὀπηνίκα {τὰ} δέρκομαι αὐτοῦ
ἴχνια καὶ χεῖρα στιβαρὴν κρατεροῖο θεοῖο.
αὐτὸν δ᾽ οὐχ ὁρόω· περὶ γὰρ νέφος ἐστήρικται
50 λοιπὸν ἐμοί· ᾽στᾶσιν δὲ δεκάπτυχον ἀνθρώποισιν. 665c

BION(D)

36–47 παλαιὸς—σοι om. B | 38 αὐτοτελής Clem. *Strom.* 78, Thdrt.: αὐτογενής Ps.-J. *Coh.* et *Mon.*, Clem. *Protr.*, Cyr. | 39 περινίσ(σ)εται Clem. *Protr.*, Cyr. (EPF), Thdrt: περιγί(γ)νεται Ps.-J. *Coh.* et *Mon.*, Cyr. (MNF$^{2\ mg}$ CVB) | 40 ψυχὴν I: ψυχῶν ON: om. Ps.-J., Clem., Cyr., Thdrt. | νῷ Steph.: νόῳ MSS: νοῖ ? Mras | 41–43 αὐτὸς — δακρυόεντα Cf. Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.126.5 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.53 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 223, lin. 6–7) | 42 αὐτῷ D: αὐτὼ I: αὐτὸς ON: αὐτοῖς Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* ex Theos. Tub. | χάρις Steph.: χάριν MSS: κ᾽ Ἔρις Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta* ex Theos. Tub. (τ᾽ ἔρις K. Schenkl) | 43 πόλεμος et λοιμὸς Steph., Mras: πόλεμον et λοιμὸν IO(λοιμῶν) N | 45 ἐσορήσω Mras: ἐσόρησο MSS: ἐσορήσαις Steph.: ἐσαθρήσαις Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1.442 | 47 ὀπηνίκα Steph.: ὀπηνίκα τὰ MSS | 48 κρατεροῖο B: κραταιοῖο ION | 49 ὁρόω ex ὁράω B^1 | 50 λοιπὸν: λεπτὸν Lobeck, *Aglaophamus*, 1.442 | ᾽στᾶσιν (=ἐστᾶσιν, νέφος subj.) Mras: στᾶσιν BI(στάσιν)ON: πᾶσιν Hermann ap. Mras | δεκάπτυχον: δέκα πτυχαὶ Steph. |

Fragment Four (cont.)

An ancient saying sheds light on this matter:
'There is one who is complete in himself, but all things are
completed by him,
And he himself moves about in them. No mortal
Casts an eye on him; rather, he is beheld by the mind.'
He himself springs from the good and does not enjoin evil
On mortal men. Grace and hate accompany him,
As well as war, plague, and tearful sufferings.
And there is no other God. You would easily have a vision
of all things
If you saw him at that time, once in the past, here on earth.
My child, I will show you when I see his
Footsteps and the strong hand of the mighty God.
But I do not see him, for in my way a residual, encircling
cloud has been fixed
And ten layers of obscurity stand over men's vision.

Fragment Four (*P.E.* 13.12 cont.)

οὐ γάρ κέν τις ἴδοι θνητῶν μερόπων κραίνοντα, 5
εἰ μὴ μουνογενής τις ἀπορρὼξ φύλου ἄνωθεν
Χαλδαίων· ἵδρις γὰρ ἔην ἄστροιο πορείης
καὶ σφαίρης κίνημ᾽ ἀμφὶ χθόνα ὡς περιτέλλει
κυκλοτερές τ᾽ ἐν ἴσῳ, κατὰ δὲ σφέτερον κνώδακα.
πνεύματα δ᾽ ἠνιοχεῖ περί τ᾽ ἠέρα καὶ περὶ χεῦμα 665d
νάματος· ἐκφαίνει δὲ πυρὸς σέλας ἰφιγενήτου.
αὐτὸς δὴ μέγαν αὖθις ἐπ᾽ οὐρανὸν ἐστήρικται
χρυσέῳ εἰνὶ θρόνῳ· γαίη δ᾽ ὑπὸ ποσσὶ βέβηκε·
χεῖρα δὲ δεξιτερὴν ἐπὶ τέρμασιν ᾽Ωκεανοῖο
ἐκτέτακεν· ὀρέων δὲ τρέμει βάσις ἔνδοθι θυμῷ
οὐδὲ φέρειν δύναται κρατερὸν μένος. ἔστι δὲ
πάντως

BION(D)

51 *θνητὸν* B | 52–56 *εἰ — χεῦμα*=Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.123.2 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.50 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 8–12) | 54 *κίνημα* MSS | 55 *κυκλοτερές* IN Clem. *Strom.* 123 et EusC (ION; cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.50, Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 11): *κυκλοτερὴς* (hic) BO | *τ᾽* Mras: *γ᾽* D: om. BION: *τε* post *ἴσῳ* Clem. *Strom.* 123 et EusC (ION; cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.50, Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 11) | *ἐν ἴσῳ* IN, Clem. *Strom.* 123 et EusC (ION; cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.50, Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 11): *ἐν ἐείσω* (hic) BO | 56 *περὶ*^{2} om. O | 57 *σέλας* Steph.: *σέλας τάδε* IN(*τάδ᾽*): *ἐλάτα δὲ* BO | *ἰφιγενήτου* Steph.: *ἰφιγενηθῆ* I: *ἶφι γεννηθῆ* B(*ἴφι*)O: *ἴφι γενήθη* ND | 58–65 *αὐτὸς — τελευτήν*= Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.124.1 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.51 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 15–21) | 59 *εἰνὶ* BION$^{2\ mg}$ D^1 (*ἐνὶ* D^{ac}): *ἐνὶ* N^1: *ἐνὶ* N^2 | 59–61 *γαίη — ἐκτέτακεν* Cf. Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.127.2 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.54 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 223, lin. 13–14); also cf. *Strom.* 5.14.124.1 | 59 *γαίης δ᾽ ἐπὶ* Ps.-J. *Coh.* et *Mon.* | 61 *δὲ* B, Thdrt.: *τε* IO: om. ND | 63 *πάντως* Steph.: *πάντων* MSS: *πάντη* Clem. *Strom.* 124 et EusC (cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.51, Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 19), Thdrt. |

Fragment Four (cont.)

No mortal man would have seen the Lord and ruler
Except a certain person, an only son, by descent an offshoot
Of the Chaldean race. For he knew the procession of the sun
And the movement around the earth of the sphere, turning on its own axis
As it completes the circuit, an even circle.
He holds the reins of the winds in their flight over sky and watery stream,
And a flame of mighty fire flashes forth.
There, to be sure, God himself is established firm over the vast heaven
On a golden throne, and earth is under his feet.
He has stretched out his right hand upon the ends of the ocean,
And the base of the mountains trembles furiously within,
Nor can it endure his mighty force.

Fragment Four (*P.E.* 13.12 cont.)

| αὐτὸς ἐπουράνιος καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ πάντα τελευτᾷ, **5**
ἀρχὴν αὐτὸς ἔχων καὶ μέσσην ἠδὲ τελευτήν, ***666a***
ὡς λόγος ἀρχαίων, ὡς ὑδογενὴς διέταξεν,
ἐκ θεόθεν γνώμῃσι λαβὼν κατὰ δίπλακα θεσμόν.
ἄλλως οὐ θεμιτὸν δὲ λέγειν· τρομέω δέ γε γυῖα,
ἐν νόῳ· ἐξ ὑπάτου κραίνει περὶ πάντ᾽ ἐνὶ τάξει.
ὦ τέκνον, σὺ δὲ τοῖσι νόοισι πελάζευ, γλώσσης ***666b***
εὖ μάλ᾽ ἐπικρατέων, στέρνοισι δὲ ἔνθεο φήμην.
(6) καὶ Ἄρατος δὲ περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν φησιν οὕτως· **6**
Ἐκ θεοῦ ἀρχώμεσθα, τὸν οὐδέποτ᾽ ἄνδρες ἐῶσιν
ἄρρητον· μεσταὶ δὲ θεοῦ πᾶσαι μὲν ἀγυιαί,
πᾶσαι δ᾽ ἀνθρώπων ἀγοραί, μεστὴ δὲ θάλασσα
καὶ λιμένες, πάντη δὲ θεοῦ κεχρήμεθα πάντες.
τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν· ὁ δ᾽ ἤπιος ἀνθρώποισι ***666c***
δεξιὰ σημαίνει, λαοὺς δ᾽ ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει
μιμνήσκων βιότοιο· λέγει δ᾽ ὅτε βῶλος ἀρίστη

BION(D)

65 *μέσσην* N^2, Mras: *μέσ(σ)ην* Thdrt. (BMV LCS): *μέσσον* ION^1: *μέσον* $BD^*(\sigma^2$ add. D^1 ?); cf. Clem. *Strom.* 124 et EusC (ION; cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.51, Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 21) | 66 *ὑδογενὴς* Scaliger (cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 75 [=Gais. 4.407–408] et Wesseling, *Aristobulo*, 133–34 [=Gais. 4.456]): *ὑλογενὴς* BION | 67 *γνώμῃσι* BO: *γνώμοσι* IN | 68–69 *ἄλλως — κραίνει* = Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.124.1 ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.51 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 221, lin. 22–23) | 68–71 *ἄλλως—φήμην* om. B | 70 *πελάζεο* Steph. | *γλώσσης* Dind. (*γλώσσην* Steph.): *μηδ᾽ ἄπο γε* ION | 71 *μάλα* I | 73 *θεοῦ*: *Διος* Aratus *Phaen.*; et Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.101.2 | *θεοῦ δὲ* B | *ἀρχώμεσθα* ND: *ἀρχώμεθα* IO: *ἀρχόμεθα* B | *ἐῶσιν*: *ἐῶμεν* Aratus *Phaen.* | 74 *μεσταὶ*: *μεστὸν* O | *θεοῦ*: *Διὸς* Aratus *Phaen.*; et Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.101.2 | 75 *δ᾽*: *δὲ* I | 76 *θεοῦ*: *Διὸς* Aratus *Phaen.*; et Clem. *Strom.* 5.14.101.2 | 77 *ἐσμέν*: *εἰμέν* Aratus *Phaen.* | 77–79 *ἀνθρώποισι — λέγει* rest. O^y (cf. *FHJA* 1.10) | 78 *ἔργον*: *ἔργα* I | 79–97 *λέγει — αἵρεσις* om. B | 79 *ὅτε*: *ὅτε καὶ* I |

Fragment Four (cont.)

5 But he himself is in every way heavenly, and brings everything on earth to fulfillment,
Because he controls their beginning, middle, and end.
So the word of the ancients, so the one born in the water set it forth,
After receiving the teaching from God in statements on the two-tablet law.
It is forbidden to speak in any other way; and, indeed, I am trembling in body
And soul. From the heights he rules over all in order.
But you, O child, draw near with your mind, after gaining full mastery over your tongue, and
Lay this account in your heart.

6 (6) And Aratus[104] has this to say about the same subject:
Let us start with God, and may men never leave him
Without mention. But all the streets are full of God
And all market-places of men; the sea is full
And the harbors, and all of us need God in every way.[105]
For we are his offspring[106] and the gentle God
Shows men signs of good fortune. He stirs people to work,
Reminding them of the means of living. He says when the best clod of earth

Fragment Four (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12 cont.)

βουσί τε καὶ μακέλῃσι, λέγει δ᾽ ὅτε δεξιαὶ ὧραι καὶ φυτὰ γυρῶσαι καὶ σπέρματα πάντα βαλέσθαι. **6**

Fragment 4b (Clement *Protrepticus* 7.73.2a)

(7) σαφῶς οἴομαι δεδεῖ- 7 χθαι διότι διὰ πάντων 666d ἐστὶν ἡ δύναμις τοῦ θεοῦ.

(73.2a) Ἄρατος μὲν οὖν διὰ πάντων τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ θεοῦ διήκειν νοεῖ. . . . **2a**

Fragment 4c (Clement *Stromateis* 5.14.101.4b = *P.E.* 13.13.26)

καθὼς δὲ δεῖ, σεσημάγ- καμεν περιαιροῦντες τὸν διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων Δία καὶ Ζῆνα· τὸ γὰρ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν ἐπὶ θεὸν ἀναπέμπεται, διόπερ οὕτως ἡμῖν εἴρηται. οὐκ ἀπεοικότως οὖν τοῖς ἐπεζητημένοις προενη- νέγμεθα ταῦτα.

(101.4b) ὁ γὰρ διὰ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ καταλογάδην συγγραμμάτων ᾀδόμενος Ζεὺς τὴν ἔννοιαν ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν ἀναφέρει. **4b**

Eusebius BION(D)

80 τε om. I | 80–81 καὶ — γυρῶσαι om. ND | 83 διότι (=ὅτι, cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 12.46.5 [Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 135, lin. 22] [ὅτι Plato *Resp.* 588b–589b]): ὅτι Steph. | 85–86 σεσημάγκαμεν Mras: σεσημάνκαμεν (!) IOD: σεσημάναμεν N | 92 ἀπεοικότος I | 93 ἐπεζητημένοις ON: ἐπιζητουμένοις I |

Fragment Four (cont.)

6 Should be given over to oxen and mattocks. He says
when seasons are favorable
To plant a circle of trees and to sow the various seeds.

Fragment 4b[107]

7 (7) I think it has been demonstrated clearly that the power of God permeates all things.[108]

2a (73.2a) Now therefore Aratus considers that the power of God extends through all things. . . .[109]

Fragment 4c[110]

4b (101.4b) For the Zeus celebrated in poems and prose compositions leads the mind up to God.

And as was necessary, we have signified this[111] by removing the divine names Δίς and Ζεύς used throughout the verses;[112] for their inherent meaning relates to God,[113] and for this reason we have expressed it this way. We have presented these things therefore in a way not unsuited to the things being discussed.[114]

Fragment Four (*P.E.* 13.12 cont.)

95 (8) *πᾶσι γὰρ τοῖς φιλοσόφοις ὁμολογεῖται διότι δεῖ περὶ* **8**
θεοῦ διαλήψεις ὁσίας ἔχειν, ὃ μάλιστα παρακελεύεται
καλῶς ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς αἵρεσις. ἡ δὲ τοῦ νόμου κατασκευὴ
πᾶσα τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς | περὶ εὐσεβείας τέτακται καὶ **667a**
δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἀγαθῶν τῶν
100 *κατὰ ἀλήθειαν.*"

BION(D)

95 *διότι* (ita 83): *ὅτι* Steph. | 97–98 *ἡ*^{2} — *τοῦ*: *ὁ δὲ νόμος ὁ* B | 98–99 *καὶ ἐγκρ. καὶ δικ.* B | 100 *κατ'* O |

Fragment Four (cont.)

8 (8) All philosophers agree that it is necessary to hold devout convictions about God,[115] something which our school[116] prescribes particularly well.[117] And the whole structure of our law has been drawn up with concern for piety, justice, self-control, and other qualities that are truly good."[118]

Fragment Five (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.9–16)

(12.9) Τούτοις ἐξῆς μεθ' **9**
ἕτερα ἐπιλέγει· ***667a***
"'Εχομένως δ'
ἐστὶν ὡς ὁ θεός, <ὃς>
τὸν ὅλον κόσμον κατε-
σκεύακε, καὶ δέδωκεν
ἀνάπαυσιν ἡμῖν, διὰ τὸ
κακόπαθον εἶναι πᾶσι τὴν
βιοτήν, ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν,

Fragment 5a (Clement, *Stromateis* 6.16.137.4–138.4)

(4) τρίτος δέ ἐστι λόγος ὁ **4**
μηνύων γεγονέναι πρὸς
τοῦ θεοῦ τὸν κόσμον καὶ
δεδωκέναι ἀνάπαυσιν
ἡμῖν ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν διὰ
τὴν κατὰ τὸν βίον κακο-
πάθειαν· θεὸς γὰρ ἄκμη-
τός τε καὶ ἀπαθὴς καὶ
ἀπροσδεής, ἀναπαύλης
δὲ ἡμεῖς οἱ σαρκοφο-
ροῦντες δεόμεθα. (138.1) **138.1**
ἡ ἑβδόμη τοίνυν ἡμέρα
ἀνάπαυσις κηρύσσεται,
ἀποχὴ κακῶν ἑτοιμά-
ζουσα τὴν ἀρχέγονον
ἡμέραν τὴν τῷ ὄντι ἀνά-

Eusebius BION(D)

1–2 Τούτοις — ἐπιλέγει om. B | 3–4 δ' ἐστὶν: γάρ ἐστιν B | 4 θεὸς <ὃς> Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 88 (=Gais. 4.419) | 5–6 κατεσκεύακε IN: κατεσκεύασεν B: κατεσκευασε O | 6 δέδωκα B | 8–9 κακόπ. — βιοτήν: κακοπαθὲς τῆς βιοτῆς B | 9 τὴν ἑβδόμην B: <τὴν> ἑβδόμην Walter | 9 ἡμέραν om. B |

Clement L

3 τρίτος: τέταρτος Sylburg, Mayor ap. Stählin: γ´ L^{1mg} |

Fragment Five[119]

9 (12.9) Next after these statements, with other remarks intervening, he adds:

"Following on this is the fact that God, who made and furnished the whole universe, also gave us as a day of rest—because of the toilsome life everyone has—the seventh day,[121]

Fragment 5a[120]

4 (137.4) And the third word is that which intimates that the world was created by God, and that He gave us the seventh day as a day of rest because of the toil and stress there is in life. For whereas God neither gets weary, nor experiences suffering and want, we fleshly creatures need

138.1 rest. (138.1) The seventh day, therefore, is proclaimed a rest, as a means of getting relief from ills, preparing for the Primal Day, our true

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

ἥ δὴ καὶ πρώτη φυσικῶς **9**
ἂν λέγοιτο φωτὸς γένε-
σις, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα
συνθεωρεῖται.

(10) μεταφέροιτο δ' ἂν τὸ **10**
αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας·
τὸ γὰρ πᾶν φῶς ἐστιν ἐξ

Fragment 5a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.16.138)

παυσιν ἡμῶν, ἥ δὴ καὶ
πρώτη τῷ ὄντι φωτὸς
γένεσις, ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντα
συνθεωρεῖται καὶ πάντα
κληρονομεῖται. (2) ἐκ **2**
ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας ἡ
πρώτη σοφία καὶ ἡ γνῶ-
σις ἡμῖν ἐλλάμπεται· τὸ
γὰρ φῶς τῆς ἀληθείας
φῶς ἀληθές, ἄσκιον,
ἀμερῶς μεριζόμενον
πνεῦμα κυρίου εἰς τοὺς
διὰ πίστεως ἡγιασμέ-
νους, λαμπτῆρος ἐπέχον,
τάξιν εἰς τὴν τῶν ὄντων
ἐπίγνωσιν.

Eusebius BION(D)

19 ἥ δὴ κ.τ.λ. cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 89–92 (=Gais. 4.420–22) | 35 *P.E.* 13.12.10-11a=*P.E.* 7.13.7-14=Frg. 5e; see p. 196.

Clement L

19 ἥ L^{ac}: ἣν L^{3}: τὴν Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 89 (=Gais. 4.420) | 20–21 πρώτη—γένεσις Stählin (ex Aristobulo): πρώτην — γένεσιν L | 26 ἡμῖν Stählin: ἡμᾶς L | ἐλλάμπει Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 89 (=Gais. 4.420) |

Fragment Five (cont.)

but which, in a deeper sense,[122] might also be called first, that is, the beginning of light through which all things are seen together.[123]

Fragment 5a (cont.)

rest; which, in truth, is also the first, that is, the beginning of light through which all things are seen together and through which all things are
2 acquired. (2) From this day the first wisdom and knowledge illuminate us. For the light of truth—a true light, casting no shadow, indivisibly apportioned to all—is the Spirit of the Lord for those who are sanctified through faith, occupying the position of a lamp for the purpose of obtaining knowledge of things as they really are.

10 (10)[124] And the same thing could be applied metaphorically to wisdom as well, for all light issues

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

αὐτῆς. καί τινες εἰρή- **10**
κασι τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως **667b**
ὄντες <τῆς> ἐκ τοῦ
Περιπάτου λαμπτῆρος
αὐτὴν ἔχειν τάξιν· ἀκο-
λουθοῦντες γὰρ αὐτῇ
συνεχῶς ἀτάραχοι κατα-
στήσονται δι' ὅλου τοῦ
βίου. (11) σαφέστερον δὲ **11**
καὶ κάλλιον τῶν ἡμετέ-
ρων προγόνων τις εἶπε
Σολομῶν αὐτὴν πρὸ
οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρ-
χειν· τὸ δὴ σύμφωνόν
ἐστι τῷ προειρημένῳ.

Fragment 5a (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.16.138)

(3) ἀκολουθοῦντες οὖν **3**
αὐτῷ δι' ὅλου τοῦ βίου
ἀπαθεῖς καθιστάμεθα, τὸ
δέ ἐστιν ἀναπαύσασθαι.

(4) διὸ καὶ Σολομὼν πρὸ **4a**
οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς καὶ
πάντων τῶν ὄντων τῷ
παντοκράτορι γεγονέναι
τὴν σοφίαν λέγει, (cont.
below after Frg. 5b, p. 184)

Eusebius BION(D)

38 *διὸ καί τινες* Euseb. *P.E.* 7.14.1 BION. Cf. Frg. 5e, lin. 170–171 | 39–40 *ἐκ — ὄντες* om. B | 40 <*τῆς*> Steph., Mras: om. BION et *P.E.* 7.14.1 BION (cf. Frg. 5e, lin. 172) | *ἐκ* om. *P.E.* 7.14.1 BION (cf. Frg. 5e, lin. 173) | 42 *αὐτὴν*: *αὐτὸν* O | 43 *αὐτῇ*: *αὐτὴν* B | 46–74 *σαφέστερον — αὐτοῖς*: *εἴρηκε γὰρ Σολομῶν. ἐν ἓξ ἡμέραις φησὶ πεποίκε* B | 49–50 *αὐτὴν—γῆς*: *πρὸ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς αὐτὴν* Euseb. *P.E.* 7.14.1 (cf. Frg. 5e, lin. 181–182 | 49 *πρὸ*: *πρὸς* I | 51 *δὴ* IN: *δὲ* OG |

Fragment Five (cont.)

10 from it. And some members of the Peripatetic school have said that it occupies the position of a lamp;[125] for, by following it continually, they will remain undisturbed their
11 entire life.[126] (11) But Solomon, one of our ancestors,[127] said more clearly and more eloquently that it was there before heaven and earth.[128] And this is actually in harmony with what was said above.[129]

Fragment 5a (cont.)

3 (3) By following Him, therefore, our entire life, we become impassible, and this is to rest.

4a (4) Wherefore Solomon also says, that before heaven and earth, and all existences, Wisdom had arisen in the Almighty; (cont. below after Frg. 5b, p. 185)

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

τὸ δὲ διασαφούμενον διὰ **11**
τῆς νομοθεσίας ἀποπε-
παυκέναι τὸν θεὸν ἐν
αὐτῇ, τοῦτο οὐχ, ὥς τινες
ὑπολαμβάνουσι, μηκέτι
ποιεῖν τι τὸν θεὸν καθέ-
στηκεν,

ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ καταπε- **667c**
παυκέναι τὴν τάξιν
αὐτῶν οὕτως εἰς πάντα
τὸν χρόνον τεταχέναι.

(12) σημαίνει γὰρ ὡς ἐν **12**
ἓξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησε τόν
τε οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν

Fragment 5b (Clement
Strom. 6.16.141.7b – 142.1)

(7b) οὐ τοίνυν, ὥσπερ **7b**
τινὲς ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὴν
ἀνάπαυσιν τοῦ θεοῦ,
πέπαυται ποιῶν ὁ θεός·
ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὤν, εἰ παύ-
σεταί ποτε ἀγαθοεργῶν,
καὶ τοῦ θεὸς εἶναι παύ-
σεται, ὅπερ οὐδὲ εἰπεῖν
θέμις. (142.1) ἔστιν δ' **142.1**
οὖν καταπεπαυκέναι τὸ
τὴν τάξιν τῶν γενομένων
εἰς πάντα χρόνον ἀπα-
ραβάτως φυλάσσεσθαι
τεταχέναι καὶ τῆς πα-
λαιᾶς ἀταξίας ἕκαστον
τῶν κτισμάτων καταπε-
παυκέναι·

Eusebius BION(D)

64 τὴν ἀταξίαν καὶ ante τὴν τάξιν cj. Stählin (Clem. GCS 2, p. 504, app. crit., nn. ad lin. 2–7) | 71 ὡς IO (etiam D): om. N |

Clement L

65 εἰς: <ὡς> εἰς Schwartz ap. Stählin |

Fragment Five (cont.)

11 Now, as for what is shown plainly[131] in our code of laws, namely, that God 'ceased'[132] working on the seventh day,[133] this does not, as some suppose, substantiate the view that God no longer does anything,

but rather means that once he had 'ceased' the arrangement of his works,[134] that they were thus arranged for all time.[135]

12 (12) For it[136] signifies that 'in six days he made both the heaven, the earth, and

Fragment 5b[130]

7b (7b) Thus God's resting does not imply, as some suppose, that God ceased from activity; for, being good, if He should ever cease from doing good, then would He cease being God, which is sacrilege even to say.

142.1 (142.1) His having "ceased" is, therefore, that he had arranged to preserve intact for all time the original arrangement of the created order, and that each of the things created had "ceased" being part of the primordial chaos.

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς, **12**
ἵνα τοὺς χρόνους δηλώσῃ
καὶ τὴν τάξιν προείπῃ τί
τίνος προτερεῖ. τάξας
γάρ, οὕτως αὐτὰ συνέχει
καὶ μεταποιεῖ. διασεσά-
φηκε δ' ἡμῖν αὐτὴν ἔννο-
μον ἕνεκεν σημείου τοῦ
περὶ ἡμᾶς ἑβδόμου λόγου
καθεστῶτος, ἐν ᾧ γνῶσιν
ἔχομεν ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ
θείων πραγμάτων.

Fragment 5a (cont.)
Strom. 6.16.138)

(cont. from p. 180)
ἧς ἡ μέθεξις (ἡ κατὰ **4b**
δύναμιν, οὐ κατ' οὐσίαν
λέγω) θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπί-
νων καταληπτικῶς ἐπι-
στήμονα εἶναι διδάσκει.

Fragment 5c (Clement
Stromateis 6.16.142.4b
[+144.3])

(13) δι' ἑβδομάδων δὲ καὶ **13**
πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κυκλεῖται
τῶν ζῳογονουμένων καὶ **667d**
τῶν φυομένων ἁπάντων·

(4b) Ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἐν ἑβδο- **4b**
μάσι πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κυκλεῖ-
ται τῶν ζῳογονουμένων καὶ
τῶν φυομένων ἁπάντων.

Eusebius BION(D)

79 ante μεταποιεῖ verbum οὐ add. Steph. et Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 95 (=Gais. 4.425); vitiose, cf. Philo, *Leg. All.* 1.5–7 et Mras, *RheinMus*, n.s. 92 (1944) 221–22 (cf. Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 196, app. crit.) | 79–85 διασεσ. — πραγμάτων om. B | 81 ἕνεκε O | 82 λόγου IN: om. O (cf. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 98–101 [=Gais. 4.427–31]) | 90 (et 102–103) ἁπάντων om. B |

Fragment Five (cont.)

12 and everything in them,'[137] that he might show the times and proclaim the order by which one thing precedes another.[138] For, once he arranged all things, he thus holds them together and presides over their movements.[139] Our law code[140] has clearly shown us that the seventh day is an inherent law of nature[141] that serves as a symbol of the sevenfold principle established all around us[142] through which we have knowledge of things both human and divine.[144]

Fragment 5a (cont.)

(cont. from p. 181)

4b and participation in this Wisdom—supernatural wisdom, I mean, not natural wisdom—[143]teaches us to know by apprehension things divine and human.[145]

Fragment 5c[146]

13 (13) And indeed all the world comprising all animal and plant life as well revolves through periods of seven;[147]

4b (4b) Now indeed all the world comprising all animal and plant life as well revolves through periods of seven.

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

95

(13) [δι᾽ ἑβδομάδων δὲ
καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος κυκλεῖ-
ται τῶν ζῳογονουμένων
καὶ τῶν φυομένων ἁπάν-
των·] τῷ δὲ σάββατον
αὐτὴν προσαγορεύεσθαι
διερμηνεύεται ἀνάπαυσις

Fragment 5c (cont.)
(*Strom.* 6.16.144.3)

. . . . (144.3) τάς τε τῶν ἡλικιῶν μεταβολὰς κατὰ ἑβδομάδα γίνεσθαι Σόλωνος αἱ ἐλεγεῖαι δηλοῦσιν ὧδέ πως· **3**

Fragment 5d (Clement *Stromateis* 5.14.107.1–4 [+108.1]= *P.E.* 13.13.34 – 35a)

(1) Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἑβδόμην ἱερὰν οὐ μόνον οἱ Ἑβραῖοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ Ἕλληνες ἴσασι, καθ᾽ ἣν ὁ πᾶς κόσμος κυκλεῖται **1**

13 667d τῶν ζωογονουμένων καὶ φυομένων ἁπάντων.

Eusebius BION(D)

103 τῷ Vig., Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 106 (=Gais. 4.434–35): τὸ BION | δὲ: δὴ Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 106 (=Gais. 4.435) | 105 <δ> διερμ. Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 106 (=Gais. 4.435) |

Clement L

96–155 || Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34–35a |

Fragment Five (cont.)

13 (13) [And indeed all the world comprising all animal and plant life as well revolves through periods of seven;] but that the seventh day is called the Sabbath means that it is

Fragment 5c (cont.)

3 . . . . (144.3) And that the changes in the periods of life take place by sevens, the *Elegies* of Solon so teach. . . .[148]

Fragment 5d[149]

1 (1) But not only the Hebrews but also the Greeks recognize the seventh day as sacred, as the day around which the whole world of all animal and plant life revolve.

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

οὖσα. διασαφεῖ δὲ καὶ **13**
Ὅμηρος καὶ Ἡσίοδος,
μετειληφότες ἐκ τῶν
ἡμετέρων βιβλίων ἱερὰν
εἶναι. Ἡσίοδος μὲν **110**
οὕτως·
πρῶτον ἔνη τετράς τε καὶ
ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ·
καὶ πάλιν λέγει·
ἑβδομάτη δ' αὖτις λαμ- **115**
πρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο.
(14) Ὅμηρος δὲ οὕτω **14**
λέγει·
ἑβδομάτη δ' ἤπειτα κατή-
λυθεν, ἱερὸν ἦμαρ· **120**

Fragment 5d (cont.)
(*Strom.* 5.14.107)

(2) Ἡσίοδος μὲν <οὖν> **2**
οὕτως περὶ αὐτῆς λέγει·
πρῶτον ἔνη τετράς τε καὶ
ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ.
καὶ πάλιν·
ἑβδομάτῃ δ' αὖθις λαμ-
πρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο.
(3) Ὅμηρος δέ· **3**
ἑβδομάτῃ δ' ἤπειτα κατή-
λυθεν ἱερὸν ἦμαρ.

Eusebius BION(D)

106 δὲ καὶ: δ' B | 108–109 μετειλ. — βιβλ. om. B | 110 εἶναι ταύτην B | 112 ἔνη N: ἕνη I: ἕνι BO | 114 λέγει om. B | 115 ἑβδομάτῃ Stählin | 116 ἠελίοιο: ἠέλοιο B | 117-118 Ὅμηρος — λέγει: καὶ Ὅμηρος B |

Clement L

110 <οὖν> Stählin ex Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 BION (GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 9). Cf. Dindorf, Clem. *Strom.* 3.86. | 111 οὕτω ex Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 BION (GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 9). Cf. Dindorf, Clem. *Strom.* 3.86. | 112 ἔνη Stählin (cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34): μὲν οὖν L | 113 ἑβδόμη Stählin (cf. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34): ἕβδομον L |

Fragment Five (cont.)

13 a day of rest.[150] Homer and Hesiod, who took their information from our books,[151] plainly show that the seventh day is holy.[152] Hesiod has this to say:

Of old, the first, the
fourth, and the seventh,
each a holy day;[153]

And again he says,

The seventh day, more-
over, is the bright light
of the sun.[154]

14 (14) Homer puts it this way,

Then came the seventh
day, a holy day.[155]

Fragment 5d (cont.)

2 (2) Hesiod thus says of it:

Of old, the first, the
fourth, and the seventh,
each a holy day;

And again:

And on the seventh day,
moreover, is the bright
light of the sun.

3 (3) And Homer:

And on the seventh day,
then came the holy day.

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

| *καὶ πάλιν·*

ἕβδομον ἦμαρ ἔην καὶ τῷ
τετέλεστο ἅπαντα

καί·

ἑβδομάτῃ δ' ἠοῖ λίπομεν
ῥόον ἐξ'Αχέροντος.

(15) *τοῦτο δὴ σημαίνων,*
ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν
λήθης καὶ κακίας ἐν τῷ
κατὰ ἀλήθειαν ἑβδόμῳ
λόγῳ καταλιμπάνεται τὰ
προειρημένα καὶ γνῶσιν
ἀληθείας λαμβάνομεν,
καθὼς προείρηται.

Fragment 5d (cont.)
(*Strom.* 5.14.107)

καί· **3**

ἑβδόμη ἦν ἱερή.

668a *καὶ πάλιν·*

ἕβδομον ἦμαρ ἔην, καὶ τῷ
τετέλεστο ἅπαντα.

καὶ αὖθις·

ἑβδομάτῃ δ' ἠοῖ λίπομεν
ῥόον ἐξ 'Αχέροντος.

Eusebius BION(D)

123–136 *καὶ — προείρηται* om. B | 124 *ἕβδομον*: *τέτρατον* Hom. *Od.* 5.262 | 127 *δ' ἠοῖ* Clem.: *δή* (*δὴ*) *οἱ* ION (cf. Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 [Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 20] *δή οἱ* O: *δόονα* I: om. BND) | 130 *κατὰ τὴν* O | 132 *κατ'* O | 133 *λόγῳ*: *λόγῳ <ἀνάγεται ἡ ψυχὴ καὶ>* Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.17 | 134 *προειρημένα*: *προῃρημένα* Vig.^{mg}, Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.17 |

Clement L

124 *ἔην*, Stählin | 127 *λίπομεν* Stählin ex Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 (GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 20): *λείπομεν* L |

Fragment Five (cont.)

and again,

It was the seventh day,
and on it everything was
completed.[157]

and,

And on the seventh
morning, we left the
stream of Acheron.[158]

15 (15) And by this he[159] signifies that from the state in which the soul experiences forgetfulness and wickedness, through the principle of seven by which truth comes, the aforementioned faults are left behind and we receive knowledge of the truth, just as was said before.[160]

Fragment 5d (cont.)

3 and:

The seventh day was
holy.[156]

and again:

It was the seventh day,
and on it everything was
completed.

and again:

And on the seventh
morning, we left the
stream of Acheron.

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

(16) *Λίνος δέ φησιν οὕτως·*

ἑβδομάτῃ δ' ἠοῖ τετελεσμένα πάντα τέτυκται·

καὶ πάλιν·

ἑβδόμη εἰν ἀγαθοῖς καὶ ἑβδόμη ἐστὶ γενέθλη

καὶ·

ἑβδόμη ἐν πρώτοισι καὶ ἑβδόμη ἐστὶ τελείη

<καί·>

ἑπτὰ δὲ πάντα τέτυκται

ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστεροέντι,

Fragment 5d (cont.)
(*Strom.* 5.14.107)

(4) *ναὶ μὴν καὶ Καλλίμαχος ὁ ποιητὴς γράφει·* **4**

ἑβδομάτῃ δ' ἠοῖ καί οἱ τετύκοντο ἅπαντα. **668b**

καὶ πάλιν·

ἑβδόμη εἰν ἀγαθοῖσ<ι> καὶ ἑβδόμη ἐστὶ γενέθλη.

καὶ·

ἑβδόμη ἐν πρώτοισι{ν} καὶ ἑβδόμη ἐστὶ τελείη.

καὶ·

ἑπτὰ δὲ πάντα τέτυκτο

ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστεροέντι

Eusebius BION(D)

137 *Λίνος*: Καλλίμαχος Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 21) | 139 δ' *ἠοῖ* Clem.: *δή* (*δὴ*) *οἱ* ION: *οἱ* B (cf. Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 [Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 22] δ' *ἦν* IO: om. BN) | 139–140 *τετελ. — τέτυκται*: *καὶ οἱ ἐτέτυκτο ἅπαντα* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 210, lin. 22) | 140 *τέτυκτο* Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 118 (=Gais. 4.445) | 142 *καὶ* om. B | 144–146 *καὶ — τελείη* om. B | 147 *καί* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 (Mras, GCS 43.2, p. 211, lin 5): hic om. MSS: *<καί>* Walter |

Clement L

139 *ἑβδομάτη δ<ὴ ἔ>ην, καί οἱ* Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 164 n. 2. | 145 *πρώτοισι{ν}* Stählin (ex Aristobulo [*P.E.* 13.12.16] et Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 [GCS 43.2, p. 211, lin. 4]) | 146 *τελείη* L: *τελείᾳ* Clem. ap. Euseb. *P.E.* 13.13.34 (GCS 43.2, p. 211, lin. 4). Cf. Dindorf, Clem. *Strom.* 3.88. | 149 *ἀστερόεντι* Stählin |

Fragment Five (cont.)

16 (16) Now Linus[161] has this to say,

And on the seventh
morning all things were
made complete.[163]

and again:

The seventh day is
auspicious, indeed the
seventh is the day of
birth;[165]

and:

Seventh is among the
prime numbers, and
seventh is perfect;[166]

<and:>

Now all seven heavenly
bodies were made in the
starry heaven,

Fragment 5d (cont.)

4 (4) Yes, and what's more, Callimachus[162] the poet also writes:

And on the seventh
morning they had done
all things.[164]

and again:

The seventh day is
auspicious, indeed the
seventh is the day of
birth.

and:

Seventh is among the
prime numbers, and
seventh is perfect.

and:

Now all seven heavenly
bodies were made in
the starry heaven,

Fragment Five (cont.)
(*P.E.* 13.12)

ἐν κύκλοισι φανέντ᾽ ἐπι-
τελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς."
Τὰ μὲν οὖν Ἀριστοβού-
λου τοιαῦτα. ὁποῖα δὲ
καὶ Κλήμεντι περὶ τῆς
αὐτῆς εἴρηται ὑποθέ-
σεως, γνοίης ἂν διὰ
τούτων·

Fragment 5d (cont.)
(*Strom.* 5.14.107.4 – 108.1)

16 ἐν κύκλοισι φανέντα ἐπι-
τελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς.
668c (108.1) ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ **108.1**
Σόλωνος ἐλεγεῖαι σφό-
δρα τὴν ἑβδομάδα ἐκθει-
άζουσιν.

Eusebius BION(D)

150–51 *ἐπιτελουμένοις* B | 152–153 Τὰ — *τοιαῦτα* om. B | 152 *οὖν* om. ND | *περὶ* Ἀριστ. I | 154 Κλήμης B | 155 *εἴρηκεν* B | 156–157 *γν.* — *τούτων*: *ἴδωμεν* B |

Clement L

150–51 *ἐπὶ τελλομένοις* Schneider ap. Stählin | *ἐπιτελλομένοις ἐνιαυτοῖς*: *περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν* Bentley ap. Stählin. Cf. Dindorf, Clem. *Strom.* 3.88. |

Fragment Five (cont.)

16 Shining in their annually designated orbits."[167]

So much then for these statements of Aristobulus. And what sort of things were stated by Clement on this same subject you might well know through these quotations.

Fragment 5d (cont.)

Shining in their annually designated orbits.

108.1 (108.1) But the *Elegies* of Solon, too, attribute great divinity to the seventh day.[168]

Fragment Five (Eusebius *P.E.* 13.12.10–11a)

(10) *μεταφέροιτο δ' ἂν τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας· τὸ γὰρ πᾶν φῶς ἐστιν ἐξ αὐτῆς. καί τινες εἰρηκασι τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως ὄντες <τῆς> ἐκ τοῦ Περιπάτου λαμπτῆρος αὐτὴν ἔχειν τάξιν· ἀκολουθοῦντες γὰρ αὐτῇ συνεχῶς ἀτάραχοι καταστήσονται δἰ ὅλου τοῦ βίου.* (11) *σαφέστερον δὲ καὶ κάλλιον τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων τις εἶπε Σολομῶν αὐτὴν πρὸ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς ὑπάρχειν· τὸ δὴ σύμφωνόν ἐστι τῷ προειρημένῳ.*

Fragment 5e (Eusebius *P.E.* 7.13.7–14.1)

(13.7) *καὶ Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἄλλος Ἑβραίων σοφὸς ἀνήρ, κατὰ τὴν τῶν Πτολεμαίων ἀκμάσας ἡγεμονίαν, κυροῖ τὸ δόγμα ὡς πάτριον, αὐτῷ Πτολεμαίῳ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων προσφωνῶν ἑρμηνείαν, ἐν ᾗ τάδε φησί·*

(14.1) *"Μεταφέροιτο δ' ἂν τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς σοφίας· τὸ γὰρ πᾶν φῶς ἐστιν ἐξ αὐτῆς. διὸ καί τινες εἰρηκασι τῶν ἐκ τῆς αἱρέσεως ὄντες τοῦ Περιπάτου λαμπτῆρος αὐτὴν ἔχειν τάξιν. ἀκολουθοῦντες γὰρ αὐτῇ συνεχῶς, ἀτάραχοι καταστήσονται δἰ ὅλου τοῦ βίου. σαφέστερον δὲ καὶ κάλλιον τῶν ἡμετέρων προγόνων τις εἶπε Σολομῶν, πρὸ οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς αὐτὴν ὑπάρχειν· τὸ δὲ σύμφωνόν ἐστι τῷ προειρημένῳ."*

Fragment Five

Fragment 5e[169]

7 (13.7) And Aristobulus, another wise man of the Hebrews, who flourished during the reign of the Ptolemies, confirms the doctrine as ancestral, speaking to Ptolemy himself concerning the translation of our holy laws; he speaks as follows:

10 (10) And the same thing could be applied metaphorically to wisdom as well, for all light issues from it. And some members of the Peripatetic school[170] have said that it occupies the position of a lamp; for, by following it continually, they will remain imperturbable their entire life. (11)
11 But Solomon, one of our ancestors, said more clearly and more eloquently that it was there before heaven and earth. And this is actually in harmony with what was said above.

1 (14.1) "And the same thing could be applied metaphorically to wisdom as well, for all light issues from it. And some members of the Peripatetic school have said that it occupies the position of a lamp; for, by following it continually, they will remain imperturbable their entire life. But Solomon, one of our ancestors, said more clearly and more eloquently that it was there before heaven and earth. And this is actually in harmony with what was said above."

ANNOTATIONS

1. To illustrate the erudition of Anatolius, founder of a school of Aristotelian philosophy in his native Alexandria who was appointed bishop-coadjutor of Caesarea Maritima and later bishop of Laodicea (d. ca. 282), Eusebius cites an excerpt from his work *On the Passover* (*H.E.* 7.32.14–19). With its emphasis on determining the proper time for the observance of Passover, the excerpt may suggest that Anatolius supported the Quartodeciman position that Easter should coincide with the Jewish Passover, and thus be celebrated on whatever day of the week the 14th of Nisan occurred, instead of the following Sunday, which became the more common practice. So, Walter, JSHRZ (3,2) 269 n. 16a; Collins, *OTP* 2.837 n. a. On the Paschal controversy generally, see B. J. Kidd, *A History of the Church to A.D. 461* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922) 376–78; H. Chadwick, *The Early Church* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1967) 84–85; W. H. C. Frend, *The Rise of Christianity* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1984) 341–43.

To support his argument that Passover should be observed after the vernal equinox, Anatolius adduces the testimony of earlier Jewish writers, especially Aristobulus. The extent to which Aristobulus is directly quoted by Anatolius is not clear: perhaps §17a, almost certainly §17b, and most likely §18.

The excerpt quoted in *H.E.* 7.32.14–19 is repeated (except for §19) in "Liber Anatoli De ratione paschali," a work preserved in Latin and now generally regarded as a sixth-century pseudonymous work. See A. Anscombe, "The Paschal Canon Attributed to Anatolius of Laodicea," *EHR* 10 (1895) 515–35; C. H. Turner, "The Paschal Canon of 'Anatolius of Laodicea'," *EHR* 19 (1895) 699–710; but cf. T. Nicklin, "The Date and Origin of Pseudo-Anatolius 'de ratione paschali'," *Journal of Philology* 28 (1903) 137–51, who dates the work ca. 300 and its Latin translation ca. 410; also, McGiffert, NPNF 1 (1890) 319 n. 21. For the text of "Liber Anatoli," see Migne *PG* 10.209–32; also the English translation by S. D. Salmond in ANCL 14 ("The Writings of Methodius, etc."), 410–27.

On Anatolius, see F. Hultsch, "Anatolius (15)," PW 1,2[2] (1894) 2073–74; Harnack, *Geschichte*, 1.436–37; 2(2).52, 75–79; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962) 2.227–30; *ODCC* (1974) 50; *Dictionary of Christian Biography* 1 (1877) 111.

On questions of calendar and chronology, see esp. S. Poznański, "Calendar (Jewish)," *HERE* 3 (1910) 117–24; F. H. Colson, *The Week: An Essay on the Origin and Development of the Seven-Day Cycle* (Cam-

bridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926); J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964); E. Bickerman, *Chronology of the Ancient World* (rev. ed.; London: Thames and Hudson, 1980); E. Schwartz, "Christliche und jüdische Ostertafeln," *Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* (Phil.-hist. Klasse) n.s. 8 (1905) 1–197; also M. Friedländer, "Calendar," *JE* 3 (1902) 501–8; C. Adler, "Calendar, History of," *JE* 3 (1902) 498–501; S. J. DeVries, "Calendar," *IDB* 1 (1962) 483–88.

On ancient conceptions of astronomy, see F. R. Hodson, ed., *The Place of Astronomy in the Ancient World* (London: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 1974), esp. 5–65; W. Gundel and H. G. Gundel, *Astrologoumena: Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte* (Part 6; Sudhoffs Archiv. Vierteljahrsschrift für Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften der Pharmazie und der Mathematik; Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1966); also T. L. Heath, *Greek Astronomy* (New York: E. P. Dutton; London: J. M. Dent, 1932); G. E. R. Lloyd, *Greek Science After Aristotle* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1973) 53–74; O. Neugebauer, "The History of Ancient Astronomy: Problems and Methods," *JNES* 4 (1945) 1–38; B. R. Goldstein and A. C. Bowen, "On Early Hellenistic Astronomy: Timocharis and the First Callippic Calendar," *Centaurus* 32 (1989) 272–93; T. Barton, *Ancient Astrology* (London/New York: Routledge, 1994).

The translation of Frg. 1 is based on those of McGiffert (NPNF 1.319), Salmond (ANCL 14.413–15), and Lawler-Oulton, 1.248–49.

2. Anatolius appears to be the first Christian author to have adopted the nineteen-year intercalary cycle in which an extra lunar month was added to the regular twelve-month cycle seven times within a nineteen-year period.

Any effort to develop a luni-solar calendar must deal with the eleven-day discrepancy between the length of a solar year (approximately 365 days) and twelve lunar months (approximately 354 days). This led inevitably to the development of intercalary cycles in which lunar months were correlated with solar years over a several-year period. Especially satisfactory was the nineteen-year cycle generally attributed to Meton in Greece ca. 432 BCE, though likely of earlier Babylonian origin (Fingean, *Handbook*, 30–31, §53; Bickerman, *Chronology*, 23–24). According to this scheme, within a nineteen-year period, an extra lunar month is added to seven of the years (e.g., years 3, 6, 8, 11, 14, 17 and 19; see Poznański, 120; Bickerman, *Chronology*, 24). This resulting 235-month period (6939.69 days) corresponds quite closely to nineteen solar years (6939.60 days). Consequently, the Metonic intercalary cycle was adopted

in Alexandria and later achieved widespread use in the Church as the basis for calculating the date of Easter.

On the various multi-year cycles, see T. L. Heath, *Aristarchus of Samos* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913) 284–97; O. Neugebauer, *The Exact Sciences in Antiquity* (2d ed.; New York: Dover, 1969) 7–8, 102; G. E. R. Lloyd, *Magic, Reason, and Experience* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979) 171–72. On the adoption of the nineteen-year cycle by the Church, see J. B. Lightfoot, "Eusebius of Caesarea," *Dictionary of Christian Biography* 2 (1880) 308–48, esp. 313–14; Kidd, *History of the Church*, 378; Lawlor and Oulton, *Eusebius*, 2.262 n. on 13. On the Jewish use of the nineteen-year cycle, see Poznański, 117, 120, 122.

3. I.e., March 22. Phamenoth, the seventh month in the Alexandrian calendar, began on February 25. See McGiffert, NPNF 1 (1890) 319 n. 22; also, Bickerman, *Chronology*, 48.

4. Also, March 22, since the Macedonian month of Dystrus corresponds to March in the Julian calendar (see Finegan, *Handbook*, p. 69, table 25). However, cf. Josephus *Ant.* 3.4.6 §311, where the Macedonian month Xanthicus is correlated with Nisan (and the Egyptian month of Pharmuthi); similarly, *Ant.* 3.10.5 §248. On the variations within the Macedonian calendar and its various correlations with other calendars, see Finegan, *Handbook*, 59–73, §§117–38, esp. p. 73, §138; also Schwartz, "Ostertafeln," 141–42; Bickerman, *Chronology*, 20, 48; McGiffert, NPNF 1 (1890) 319 n. 23.

5. Here *τμῆμα* is consistently translated "sector," though in some instances it might just as well be rendered "segment," or even "sign" (of the zodiac). On *τμήματα* (along with *μέρη, τομαὶ ιβ΄*) as alternative expressions for *δωδεκατημόρια*, see H. G. Gundel and R. Böker, *Zodiakos: Der Tierkreis in der antiken Literatur und Kunst* (Munich: A. Druckenmüller, 1972; =art. "Zodiakos," PW 2d ser. 10A [1972] 462–709), esp. col. 467.

6. I.e., March 22 occurs on the fourth day after the equinox.

7. On the use of *δωδεκατημόριον* with reference to the zodiac, see Hipparchus 2.1.7 (ed. Manitius [Teubner]); Geminus 1.1,4 al. (ed. Manitius [Teubner]); Ptolemy *Tetr.* 2.11 §94 etc. (ed. Robbins [LCL, with *Manetho*]). See LSJ s.v. *δωδεκατημόριον*. On the zodiac, see Gundel and Böker, *Zodiakos* (see n. 5 above); Bickerman, *Chronology*, 56–58 and literature cited on p. 103 n. 46; Finegan, *Handbook*, 20–21, §§35–36.

8. On the equinox as the beginning of the zodiac cycle, cf. Ptolemy *Tetr.* 2.11 §94.

9. Perhaps Anatolius refers here to the Jewish practice, which apparently developed after the Roman capture of Jerusalem in 135 CE, of celebrating Passover on the 14th of Nisan regardless of whether it preceded or followed the vernal equinox, which would account for Constantine's observation that the Jews "sometimes celebrate the Passover twice in the same year." See Kidd, *History of the Church*, 377–78; also, Schwartz, "Ostertafeln," 138.

10. Cf. *Qu. Ex.* 1.1 (discussion in Schwartz, "Ostertafeln," 139–41); *V. Mos.* 2.41 §222; *Spec. leg.* 2.28 §§151–52; *Opif.* 39 §116; *Decal.* 30 §161.

11. Cf. *Ant.* .1.3.3 §§80–81; 2.14.6 §§311–14; 3.10.5 §248; 11.4.8 §§109–10; also 3.8.4 §201. Also, see the discussion in Schwartz, "Ostertafeln," 141–42.

12. This reference to Musaeus is puzzling. Ordinarily, it would refer to the figure associated with Orpheus, either as his son or disciple, but Anatolius here claims to be adducing testimony from "Jews of long ago," which clearly implies that Musaeus is a Jewish writer worth mentioning alongside Philo and Josephus. Perhaps it is a reference to a Jewish pseudonymous work attributed to Musaeus. See Collins, *OTP* 2.837 n. b; also, McGiffert, NPNF 1.319 n. 26; Lawlor and Oulton, *Eusebius* 2.262 n. on 16.

13. The identity of the "two Agathobuli" is also unclear. In his *Chron.* Eusebius refers to a philosopher named Agathobulus who flourished in the time of Hadrian but he seems an unlikely referent not only because he is later but also because not one but two figures, perhaps a father and son, are envisioned here.

An intriguing solution is proposed by Graetz, "Aristobulos," *MGWJ* 27 (1878) 101–2 n. 2, who suggests that the text originally read ". . . but also by those even older (witnesses) Aristobulus and Agathobulus, both of whom were surnamed teachers. Now the renowned Aristobulus, who was numbered among the seventy . . . dedicated his commentaries. . . ." (cf. app. crit.). Graetz further proposes that the two names refer to the same person (as, e.g., Epicurus' brother who was called both Agathobulus and Aristobulus; see "Agathobulos [2]," PW 1 [1893] 746; "Aristobulos [16]," PW 3 [1895] 920), that Anatolius mistakenly concluded that two persons were being referred to, and that since Aristobulus was known as

"the teacher" (of Philometor), he concluded that the epithet applied to both persons! Similarly, Rufinus: sed et horum antiquiores Agathobulus et ab eo eruditus Aristobulus ex Paneada (T 7b).

Hody, *Bibliorum*, 51 n. 1: *παλαιοτέρων ἀμφοτέρων, Ἀγαθοβούλου τοῦ ἐπίκλην διδασκάλου, καὶ Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ ἀπὸ πανεάδος*. This is Scaliger's emendation; so, Valckenaer, 25 (Gaisford 4.364).

On the passage generally, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 21 n. 5; also, S. D. Salmond, ANCL 14 (1869) 414 nn. 2 and 3.

14. Rufinus understands *τοῦ πάνυ* as a geographical designation, thus renders it "ex Paneada," i.e., from the city of Paneas (later, Caesarea Philippi); similarly, the Armenian Syriac "from the city of Penada." See LSJ s.v. *πάνυ* II.

On the text-critical problem, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 21 n. 4.

In my translation, I follow the suggestion of Lawlor and Oulton, *Eusebius*, 1.249 n. 2, that Anatolius intends to cite three separate authorities: the two Agathobuli and Aristobulus. A straightforward rendering of the preceding clause would be ". . . and not only these (Philo, Josephus, Musaeus), but also both Agathobuli, who are even more ancient, and surnamed the teachers of the renowned Aristobulus." But in what follows Aristobulus functions as a separate, if not the primary, witness. Similarly, Collins, *OTP* 2.837.

Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 9 n. 2, refers to the report in *Liber Anatholi De ratione paschali*, a forgery stemming from the British Isles ca. 600 CE (see n. 1 above); see B. Krusch (ed.), *Studien zur christlich-mittelalterlichen Chronologie* (Leipzig, 1880) 311–27, esp. 318–19 for this text. For *τοῦ πάνυ* MS S reads *ex Paneade*, while MS C reads *ex Spaniada*.

Also, see Hody, *Bibliorum*, 51–52.

15. Here Aristobulus is placed by Anatolius at a considerably earlier period than he is in Frg. 3.2, where Aristobulus refers to Philadelphus as the "ancestor" of the Ptolemy whom he addresses. Nor is an Aristobulus listed among the names of the seventy-two translators in *Ep. Arist.* 47–50. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 19–21.

16. Whether the astronomical observations relating to Passover attributed to Aristobulus in §§17–18 derive from these "exegetical books" on the Law of Moses is not clear.

17. I.e., all the writers previously referred to (see references above in nn. 10–11).

18. Cf. Exod 12:1–28, esp. vv. 6, 18.

19. It is not clear whether this is Anatolius' own comment, or whether he is paraphrasing the position of the aforementioned Jewish writers. The phrase used here is standard terminology for the zodiac; see Gundel and Böker, *Zodiakos*, 465–68.

20. The expression *ἡ τῶν διαβατηρίων ἑορτή* (also cf. Frg. 1, lines 29 and 38) is an unusual way to refer to the feast of Passover, which is earlier designated by the more common expression *πάσχα* (line 16; also line 47). The term *διαβατήρια* ordinarily designates offerings made before crossing a border or river (LSJ s.v. *διαβατήρια*). Apart from its usage here, it first occurs with reference to the Passover in Philo (*Spec. leg.* 2.11 §41; 2.27 §§145, 147; 2.28 §150; *V. Mos.* 2.41 §§224, 226; 2.42 §228; 2.43 §233; cf. *Leg. alleg.* 3.52 §154; *Sacr.* 17 §63; *Migr.* 5 §25; *Qu. Ex.* 1.4), which Heinemann (*Philos Werke* 2.146 n. 2; *Bildung*, 120) sees as evidence of Aristobulus' dependence on Philo. But since Aristobulus anticipates Philo in other respects, he probably does so here as well. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 85–86; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 269 n. 17b; Yarbro & Fraikin, 21. On Philo's use of *διαβατήρια*, see Philo, LCL, vol. 7, p. 394 n. a; p. 627 n. on §145.

21. It is difficult to determine the significance of this observation attributed to Aristobulus. It may be that, influenced by scientific, astronomical traditions current in Alexandria at the time, he is attempting to render more precisely (than his Jewish predecessors) the astronomical conditions at which Passover occurs. His purpose may also be apologetic. Noting that the observance of Passover coincides with a peculiar alignment of the sun and moon may be intended to show that this is more than a mere national religious observance, but rather an event of cosmic significance that has received nature's own confirmation. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 138; idem, JSHRZ (3,2) 269 n. 17a; also Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.166.

In either case, it represents an early (perhaps the earliest) instance where the date of Passover is explicitly linked with the vernal equinox. This has the practical effect of limiting the ambiguity of the biblical prescription. See J. B. Segal, "Intercalation and the Hebrew Calendar," *VT* 7 (1957) 250–307, who observes, "In the Bible (Deut 16:1–8; Exod 13:3–4; 23:15; 34:18) the date of Passover is never given by its relation to the spring equinox—although the festival is intimately connected with that point in the seasonal year—because it was not possible in those days to fix the equinox with sufficient precision" (300).

22. Whereas *P.E.* 9 consists largely of testimony from non-Jewish authors illustrating their knowledge and high regard for the "Jewish philosophy," *P.E.* 8 cites Jewish testimony on different aspects of the Mosaic law. First, to explain how the Jewish Scriptures became known among the Greeks, Eusebius reports the account of its translation in *Ep. Arist.* (8.2–5). Then, turning to the Jewish form of political government and civil legislation, he cites testimony from Philo and Josephus (8.6–8). This leads to a discussion of the allegorical interpretation of the Mosaic legislation, on which *Ep. Arist.* (8.9) and Aristobulus (8.10) are cited. Following this occurs a discussion of the philosophic life, evidently intended for a more selective group capable of interpreting Scripture in a non-literal sense. This consists of testimony about the Essenes from Philo (8.11–12). Finally, he treats Jewish belief concerning creation (8.13) and providence (8.14).

Thus, this passage (*P.E.* 8.10), along with *Ep. Arist.* 128–71 (*P.E.* 8.9), serves as part of the larger argument in *P.E.* 8 that the Mosaic legislation, understood literally (8.6–8), adequately serves the majority of Jews, but understood allegorically, also accommodates those who wish to lead a more reflective, philosophic life (e.g., the Essenes, 8.11–12). The Law's capacity to accommodate both groups effectively commends it, as does its teaching on creation (8.13) and providence (8.14). Its broad appeal was both enabled and confirmed by its translation into Greek (8.2–5).

The translation of Frgs. 2–5 is a reworked version of a translation initially prepared by Ben Fiore that was based on Gifford. I have also relied heavily on Collins's translation in *OTP*. In the notes, I have referred to particular instances where her translation has been adopted.

23. As Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 60, 136, observes, Aristobulus himself (at least in the extant fragments) does not employ the technical term ἀλληγορία, the related term τροπικῶς, or their cognates. On the use of ἀλληγορία and its cognates in antiquity, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 60 n. 5; also see *Thoraausleger*, 136 for a discussion of other terminology, e.g., ὑπόνοια, related to allegorical interpretation; also, Klauck, *Allegorie*, 92 n. 286. For allegory within Hellenistic Judaism, see Heinemann, "Allegoristik," 130–38, esp. 133–35. On Stoic allegory, see Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics*, 334–49. P. Kuhn, *Offenbarungsstimmen*, 147, prefers to call Aristobulus' method metaphorical rather than allegorical.

24. In the title of Frg. 3 (*P.E.* 13.11.3) Eusebius uses the more specific designation Peripatetic to refer to Aristobulus; similarly, in his

Hieronymi Chronicon, 151 Olymp.=176 BCE (Helm, [GCS 7,1], p. 139,1–5): "Aristobulus natione Iudaeus peripateticus philosophus agnoscitur. Qui ad Philometorem Ptolemaeum explanationum in Moysen commentarios scripsit." This designation first occurs in Clement (*Strom.* 1.15.72.4; cf. Eusebius *P.E.* 9.6.6 [=Aristobulus Frg. 3a[1]]), who used such designations to enhance the authority of the sources he cites. (In this same passage he also identifies Philo of Alexandria as Πυθαγόρειος; similarly, *Strom.* 2.19.100.3. On Pythagorean influence on Philo, see Heinemann, *Bildung*, 110–12, 140–42. On Clement's designation of Philo as a Pythagorean, see Runia, "Clement," *VC*, 1–22.)

Because of this designation within the tradition, scholars identified Aristobulus as a follower of the Peripatetic school (so, Valckenaer; also Schlatter, *Sirach*, 166). Zeller, *Philosophie*, 283 n. 5, understands Aristobulus' reference to "members of the Peripatetic school" (Frg. 5.10, lines 38–41, *P.E.* 13.12.10=Frg. 5e, *P.E.* 7.14.1) as self-referential (similarly, *Strom.* 5.14.97.7); similarly, though with some qualification, Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 2.629 n. 46. Accordingly, Aristobulus' reference to ἡ καθ' ἡμᾶς αἵρεσις (Frg. 4.8, line 97, *P.E.* 13.12.8) has been taken as a reference to the Peripatetic school (e.g., Valckenaer, 67–68).

There is good reason, however, to doubt the appropriateness of this designation. In the extant fragments, Aristobulus does not explicitly use the term as a self-designation. As already noted, he does refer to the Peripatetic school, but, as Susemihl observes, he appears to do so in a way that suggests that he himself is *not* a member. The tradition, especially as it appears in Eusebius *Chronica* and *P.E.*, stems from Clement, but Clement's designating Philo as a Pythagorean makes it impossible to take seriously his claim that Aristobulus was a Peripatetic. Rather than trying to identify him with a specific philosophical tradition, it is better to describe his philosophical interests as eclectic. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 10–13, esp. 12–13; also, Graetz, *MGWJ* (1878) 107; Gercke, 919–20; Ehrlich, 853; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.514–16; idem, *History*, 3(1).583, noting the absence of a formal Peripatetic school in Alexandria during this period; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.695, detects only minimal traces of Peripatetic influence in Aristobulus, and even less dependence on Stoic allegory. Runia, "Clement," *VC*, 10, however, thinks he was called a Peripatetic "on account of an *affinity* that he had with Peripatetic thought."

The term may be an appropriate designation in a more general sense. As Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2.106 n. 375, notes, "The name did not necessarily mean membership of the Aristotelian school in Alexandria of the third to first centuries BC, but also 'a literary historian, a biographer or perhaps even a scientific writer . . . who presented an artistic

popular account.'" His interest in astronomy and the calendar, as seen in Frg. 1, would reflect his scientific interests.

25. 2 Macc 1:10.

26. Probably Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 BCE). So, Clement *Strom.* 1.22.150.1 (Frg. 3a). See Frg. 3.2 (*P.E.* 13.12.2) and n. 15 above.

On the form of address, cf. Plutarch *Adv. Col.* 1107E, in which the writing of the Epicurean Colotes is addressed to Πτολεμαίῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 24 n. 1. On the Jewish use of eponyms in addressing kings, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 24 n. 3.

27. Because of the similarity of the question-and-answer format to *Ep. Arist.* 176, 187–294, Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.694, thinks Aristobulus was influenced by *Ep. Arist.*

28. On σημαίνω as a technical term used in allegorical interpretation, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 136; also used in Frg. 5.15, line 129 (*P.E.* 13.12.15); Frg. 2.6, line 35 (*P.E.* 8.10.6); cf. Frg. 2.8, line 43 (*P.E.* 8.10.8); also Frg. 4.11, lines 85–86 (*P.E.* 13.12.7). On σημαίνω, see Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II," 134–35. Other terms similarly used include ἀπαγγελλειν (Frg. 2.3, *P.E.* 8.10.3) and διασαφεῖν (Frg. 2.5, *P.E.* 8.10.5; Frg. 5.11, *P.E.* 13.12.11).

29. Cf. Frg. 4.3 (*P.E.* 13.12.3). Cf. Frg. 2.1–5 with Philo *Deus immut.* 13–14 §§60–64, where anthropomorphic expressions are explained as benefiting duller interpreters but conveying deeper meaning to more gifted, perceptive interpreters. Similarly, *Som.* 1.40 §§234–37. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 81, sees this as evidence of their dependence on a common school tradition. For bibliography on interpretation of anthropomorphisms, see Borgen, "Philo," *Jewish Writings*, 278 n. 280.

30. Here ἐκδοχάς probably refers to the anthropomorphic expressions mentioned in Frg. 2.1, though conceivably Aristobulus' own explanations are in view. The reverse is suggested by Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 270 n. 2a.

31. For the lack of a better term, "natural" is used here to render φυσικῶς, not in the sense of "literal" or "ordinary," but rather in the sense that it "conforms to the true nature of things." Hence, Collins, *OTP* 2.838, "according to the laws of nature," or n. a, "in a way corresponding to reality." Perhaps "philosophical," or even "ontological," would suitably capture the sense in that they suggest a more basic, "essential"

level of reality. Cf. Frg. 5.9, line 19 (*P.E.* 13.12.9); also *Ep. Arist.* 143, 171; Philo *Post. C.* 17 §60; 24 §85; 40 §135; also *φυσικῶς* is contrasted with *ἠθικῶς* in *Leg. all.* 1.13 §39; 2.4 §12; for *φυσικοὶ ἄνδρες*, see Philo *Post. C.* 2 §7; *Abr.* 20 §99, on which see Heinemann, "Hellenistica," *MGWJ* (1929) 433. For a distinction between "what is expressed" (*ἑρμηνεία*) and "the essential bearing of the matters conveyed by words" (*αἱ τῶν διερμηνευομένων φύσεις πραγμάτων*), see *Migr.* 2–3 §12–13. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 136 n. 2.

Even though I render *φυσικῶς* as "'natural sense'," my translation recognizes the point made by Heinze, 186, that *φυσικῶς* here means "allegorically" and that *τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν* is a technical expression referring to the visible word while *φυσικαὶ διαθέσεις* and *κατασκευαὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων* refer to realities that relate to the *φυσικὸς λόγος*. Allegorical interpretation thus enables the perceptive reader to recognize the ostensible reference to images from the visible world yet penetrate to the other, deeper reality of *φύσις*. Similarly, H. Leisegang, in L. Cohn and I. Heinemann, *Philos Werke*, 4.6 n. 2; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 59 n. 3; also 136, esp. n. 2; also, see D. M. Hay, "Philo's References to Other Allegorists," *Studia Philonica* 6 (1979–80) 41–75, esp. 67 n. 34.

On the distinction between Aristobulus' use of *φυσικῶς* and the Stoic understanding of *φυσικός*, see Walter, *Thoraausleger* 60 n. 2; 135–36.

32. For *μυθῶδες*, see Ps.-Plutarch *De Homero* 2.6.1, 6.3, 114.3 (ed. Kindstrand [Teubner]); Cornutus *De nat. deor.* 35 (ed. Lang [Teubner]) *μυθικῶς*; see G. Stählin, "*μῦθος*," *TDNT* 4 (1967) 762–95, esp. 771–81; *Ep. Arist.* 168, 322; Philo *Leg. alleg.* 2.7 §19; *Post. C.* 1 §2; *Deus immut.* 12 §§57–59. Walter *Thoraausleger* 135 n. 4; also 59–60, 100, 141–42.

33. Literally, "human," but understood here in the sense of "all too human," or in a way that typifies the majority, thus unreflective, unphilosophical; perhaps, "anthropomorphic." Cf. Philo *Post. C.* 1 §§1–4.

34. Perhaps, "invisible," i.e., those unseen realities that pertain to *φύσις*.

35. Deut 18:18; 34:10; Wis 11:1; Philo *V. Mos.* 2.35–50 §§187–287.

36. On Greeks' borrowing from Moses, cf. Frg. 3.1 (Plato and Pythagoras), Frg. 4.4 (Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato), Frg. 4.4b–6 (Orpheus and Aratus), Frg. 5.13–16 (Hesiod, Homer, and Linus); also T 2 and 4.

For the argument that the Greeks derived their wisdom from the Jews, cf. Eupolemus Frg. 1 (*FHJA* 1.112–13); Artapanus Frg. 3.4 (*FHJA* 1.208–209); also cf. Frg. 2.2–3 (*FHJA* 1.206–209); Pseudo-Eupolemus Frg. 1.3–4 and 8 (*FHJA* 1.170–75); Philo *Leg. all.* 1.33 §108; *Spec. leg.* 4.10 §61; *Heres* 43 §214; *Qu. Gen.* 2.6; 3.5; 4.152; also 4.167; *Aet.* 5 §17–19; Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 §§162–65; 2.36–39 §§255–86, esp. 2.39 §281; also 2.16 §168; cf. *Ag. Ap.* 1.31 §§279–80; 2.15 §§151–56 (antiquity of Moses); *Ant.* 1.3 (prologue) §15 (antiquity of Moses); 1.7.1 §155 (Moses the first to articulate monotheism).

For similar occurrences of the argument, or a related connection, among pagan writers, cf. Megasthenes ap. Clement *Strom.* 1.15.72.5 (ca. 300 BCE; Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.46, No. 14), noting that Greek philosophical opinions concerning nature are found earlier among Indian Brahmans and Jewish-Syrian philosophers; Hermippus of Smyrna ap. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 §§162–65 (ca. 200 BCE; Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.95–96, Nos. 25 & 26), noting Pythagoras' dependence on the Jews and Thracians (cf. Origen's reference to Hermippus' claim in *Cels.* 1.15); also, for Jews portrayed as philosophers, cf. Theophrastus (Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.10, No. 4,7); Clearchus of Soli ap. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 §§176–83 (Stern, *GLAJJ* 1.49–50, No. 15,14–18); Herriot, *Philon*, 74–75, also notes Antonius Diogenes, prior to Lucian, (ca. 35 BCE–150 CE), ap. Porphyry *VP* 11 (ed. des Places [Budé]), reporting that Pythagoras had derived his wisdom from Egyptians, Arabs, Chaldeans, and Hebrews; Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 1.400, notes traditions trying to demonstrate the Syrian, or Jewish, origin of Pythagoras, including Hermippus ap. Origen *Cels.* 1.15 (cited above) and Iamblichus *VP* 3–4 (eds. Deubner & Klein [Teubner]).

For the tracing of Greek wisdom and practices to oriental sources, especially Egypt, cf. Herodotus 2.81, tracing Orphic traditions to Egypt; Diod. Sic. 4.25.3; Orph. *Argonautica* 101–3 (ed. Hermann, *Orphica*), claiming that Orpheus originated in Egypt and there developed mystical and priestly practices. See Wolfson, *Philo*, 1.141, noting references on the Egyptian origin of Greek wisdom: Diod. Sic. 1.96–98 (an especially important and extensive passage); Plutarch *De Is. et Os.* 354E.

Several of the aforementioned references to Philo are noted by Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.385–86 n. 5, who regards them as a relatively undeveloped form of the argument. In *MGWJ* (1878) 107–8, Graetz notes the occurrences in *Qu. Gen.*, but regards the work as pseudonymous and thus the references as non-Philonic. In response to Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 219–39, Stein, *Exegese* (1929), 10–11 n. 1, insists that Philo frequently makes use of the argument. Herriot, *Philon*, 74–75, cites a number of references from pagan authors and also examples from the modern period. Drummond, *Philo*, 1.248, acknowledges its use by Philo "with some modera-

tion" but notes its use in Aristobulus "in its most developed and most fraudulent form." Similarly, Cohn, *NJKA* (1898), 522, minimizes its use by Philo.

Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe* (1852), 1.400, places Aristobulus' claim about the priority of Jewish wisdom, and the derivation of Greek wisdom from it, against the broader tradition of tracing Greek wisdom to Egyptian origins; similarly, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 45–46; also, see Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).277–80; Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.518–19 and 519 n. 58; idem, *History*, 3(1).585; Thraede, "Erfinder II," *RAC* 5 (1962) 1244–45; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 43–51, esp. 45–46; 56 n. 1; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 265; Momigliano, *Alien Wisdom*, 83–87; Holladay, *FHJA*, 1.137 n. 5; 232 n. 45 (on the Egyptian origin of Greek wisdom via Orpheus); Klauck, *Allegorie*, 93 esp. nn. 290–91; Küchler, *Weisheitstraditionen* (1979), 125–27, esp. 127 n. 37; Borgen, "Aristobulus," 274–79, esp. 275 n. 253; Bickerman, *Jews* (1988), 230.

37. For references to literalist interpreters in Philo, see *Som.* 1.17 §102; *Conf.* 38 §190; *Deus immut.* 11 §52; 14 §§63–69. See Hay, "Philo's References," (n. 31 above), 66 n. 31; J. Pépin, "Remarques sur la théorie de l'exégèse allégorique chez Philo," in *Philon d'Alexandrie* (Lyon 11–15 Septembre 1966: Colloques nationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Paris, 1967) 131–67.

38. In Aristobulus *τὸ μεγαλεῖον* is a hermeneutical technical term signifying a "greater," i.e., allegorical sense. The term suggests that there is an additional sense beyond the literal, hence our translation "expanded sense." Similarly, in Frg. 2.9, lines 54 and 56. Collins, *OTP* 2.838: "elevated." See Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 271 n. 5a; Klauck, *Allegorie*, 92 n. 286. On *διασαφεῖν* as a technical term used in connection with allegorical interpretation, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 136; also cf. Frg. 5.11, lines 46 and 54 (*P.E.* 13.12.11).

39. For a similar disclaimer, cf. Sirach prologue.

40. For the hand as representing activity, cf. Philo *Spec. leg.* 4.26 §138; *Leg. alleg.* 2.22 §89; also *Som.* 2.30 §200. Wendland ap. Elter, 230–31; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 61–62.

41. LXX Exod 13:9 *ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ κραταιᾷ ἐξήγαγέν σε κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*. Cf. Deut 7:8.

42. LXX Exod 3:20 *καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα πατάξω τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς θαυμασίοις μου, οἷς ποιήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἐξαποστελεῖ ὑμᾶς.*

43. LXX Exod 9:3 *ἰδοὺ χεὶρ κυρίου ἐπέσται ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσίν σου τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πεδίοις, ἔν τε τοῖς ἵπποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις καὶ ταῖς καμήλοις καὶ βουσὶν καὶ προβάτοις, θάνατος μέγας σφόδρα.*

44. For *μεταφέρω* as "employ a metaphor," or "extend the meaning," cf. Aristotle *EN* 9.5.3.1167a10 (LSJ s.v. *μεταφέρω* 3). In *Spec. leg.* 4.26 §138 Philo uses *σύμβολον* and *σημεῖον*; also *Leg. alleg.* 2.22 §89.

Also, cf. Philo *Mut.* 21 §98; Stein, *Exegese*, 8–9.

45. See n. 38 above.

46. Exod 17:6; 24:10; on Exod 17:6, see Philo *Som.* 1.41 §241; 2.32 §§219–22; on Gen 28:13, see *Som.* 1.25 §§158–59. See Stein, *Exegese*, 9; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 63; JSHRZ (3,2) 272 n. 9b; Siegert, *Predigten: Kommentar*, 204.

47. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 72, n. 1, proposes that λόγος might possibly be rendered "law of nature."

48. Cf. Frg. 5.12 (*P.E.* 13.12.12). Cf. 1 Cor 15:38–41.

49. In *Strom.* 6.2 Clement resumes his argument that Greeks plagiarized the Jewish tradition. Having cited numerous examples of Greeks' stealing from each other, in 6.3 Clement cites instances of miraculous events reported by the Greeks that reflect dependence on Jewish traditions. Given their acceptance of such miraculous traditions, Clement argues for the credibility of the Sinai theophany, which, he insists, becomes even more persuasive when understood allegorically. It is in this context that Aristobulus' interpretation of the event is referred to.

The translation is that of Wilson, ANF 2.487, with slight modification.

50. The following passages are explained: Exod 19:16–25; 20:18–21; 24:15–18. For terminology relating to *κατάβασις*, cf. Exod 19:11, 18, 20; 24:16.

For discussion of the passage, see Sandelin, "Studien," *ST* 13 (1977) 147–49, emphasizing, against Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 63–64, that Aristobulus' explanation here constitutes an allegorical interpretation.

51. LXX Deut 5:23 *καὶ τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ*. Also, cf. 9:15; similarly 4:11 *καὶ τὸ ὄρος ἐκαίετο πυρὶ ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. Also, cf. Exod 19:18; 24:17.

52. LXX Exod 19:16 *φωνὴ τῆς σάλπιγγος ἤχει μέγα* (also v. 19; 20:18); LXX Exod 24:17 *ὡσεί πῦρ φλέγον*. Images from the story of the

burning bush (Exod 3:1–6) are also recalled: Exod 3:2 *ἐν φλογὶ πυρός*; *ἀνυποστάτως* possibly renders *ὁ δὲ βάτος οὐ κατεκαίετο*. Aristobulus does not doubt the reality of the flaming fire as Philo does in *Qu. Ex.* 2.47. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 64. On *ἀνυποστάτως* (here and line 118), and its possible relationship to Posidonius, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 83–84. On this passage's influence on Clement, see Hoek, *Clement*, 198.

53. On the size of the crowd, cf. Exod 12:37 (600,000 men, excluding children; similarly, Num 11:21) and Num 1:46 (603,550 men, twenty years and older; cf. Num 26:51); cf. Philo *Spec. leg.* 2.27 §146 (2,000,000 men and women).

54. *Ἀφήλικες* can designate those "beyond youth," i.e., the "elderly" (Herodotus 3.14 *ἄνδρα ἀπηλικέστερον*, "a man past his prime"), but also the young, especially "minors," "infants" (*POxy.* 487.5, of persons about 25 years old); here, probably "minors" or "the young"; so, LSJ s.v. *ἀφῆλιξ*, noting this passage and citing Phrynichus Comicus 67 *ἦσαν δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες <ἓξ> ἀφήλικες* (J. M. Edmonds, *Fragments of Attic Comedy* [Leiden, 1957] 1.470–71). Collins, *OTP*, 2.839: "not counting minors," alternatively "not counting the elderly." LXX Exod 12:37 *πλὴν τῆς ἀποσκευῆς*. As Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 272 n. 14c, notes, *ἀφήλικες* probably refers to those who were unarmed; nevertheless, he appears to have included women among the "million."

55. Cf. Exod 20:18, 21; Deut 4:11–12; 5:22–25.

56. The image of the burning bush in Exod 3:2–3 now becomes more explicit (*μηδὲν δ' ἐξαναλίσκουσαν*) and is developed more fully in §16. Cf. §13 above.

57. Cf. Philo *Decal.* 9 §§33–35. Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 232; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 64.

58. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 83–84, challenges Pohlenz's contention that *ἐκφαντικῶς* reflects dependence on Posidonius.

59. Cf. Philo's remarks concerning God's descent on Sinai in *Qu. Ex.* 2.45; also *Conf.* 27 §§134–40 on Gen 11:5. Stein, *Exegese*, 9; Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 231; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 64.

60. This passage is the first of three excerpts from Aristobulus (comprising Frgs. 3, 4, and 5 respectively) that occur in the first part of *P.E.*

13 (1–13) in which Eusebius identifies points of agreement between Plato and Moses. With extensive quotations, Eusebius illustrates such matters as Plato's critique of the Greek theologians, his belief in God's goodness and integrity, and the importance he attached to ethical values. To show that his is not a selective reading of Plato, Eusebius cites Aristobulus (13.12) and Clement (13.13), both of whom claim not only that there are fundamental agreements between Moses and the Greeks, but also that the latter plagiarized the former.

61. Having argued in ch. 21 for the antiquity of the Jewish tradition, Clement discusses in ch. 22 the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures. After a brief summary of the story reported in *Ep. Arist.* (=Frg. 3b), he cites Aristobulus' claim that Plato drew from the Mosaic law. Since this would obviously presuppose a Greek translation much earlier than the Ptolemaic period, it is then claimed that such a translation had been made prior to the time of Alexander the Great and the Persians.

Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 407–8 n. 97, thinks Frg. 3a likely represents a more authentic version of Aristobulus than Eusebius. See n. 69 below. Also, see Schlatter, *Topographie*, 328–32; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 20 n. 2; 97–99.

The translation of Frg. 3a is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.334, but modified considerably.

62. Cf. T 4, Clement, *Stromateis* 5.14.97.7, which refers to Aristobulus' *βιβλία ἱκανά*.

63. On Aristobulus as a Peripatetic, see n. 24 above.

64. On Moses as the inventor of philosophy, cf. Artapanus Frg. 3.4 (*FHJA* 1.209, 233 n. 47); also Eupolemus Frg. 1 (*FHJA* 1.113). Also, cf. Artapanus Frg. 1.1; 2.2–3 (*FHJA* 1.204–207); Pseudo-Eupolemus Frg. 1.3, 8 (*FHJA* 1.170–71, 174–75, 180 n. 12). On the originators of philosophy, cf. Diog. Laert. 1.1–15.

Also, see n. 36 above.

65. Ptolemy VI Philometor, according to Frg. 3a (*Strom.* 1.22.150.1). See nn. 15 and 26 above.

The title (lines 6–16) serves as the basis for Tübingen Theosophy §10: *Ὅτι Ἀριστόβουλος, ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων περιπατητικὸς φιλόσοφος, ἐπιστέλλων Πτολεμαίῳ συνωμολόγησεν ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραϊκῆς θεοσοφίας τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν ὡρμῆσθαι·* (T 14a). The remainder of §10b is a slightly modified form of lines 17–22 (*P.E.* 13.12.1a). Cf. app. crit. See Erbse, *Theosophien*, 168; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 9 n. 3.

66. *κατηκολούθησεν*. Cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.36–39 §§255–86. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1.

67. On *νομοθεσία*, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 32 n. 1.

68. Frg. 4.4 (*P.E.* 13.12.4); Frg. 2.4 (*P.E.* 8.10.4). Cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.36 §§256–57; also 2.16 §168; 2.38 §281. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1.

69. One reason for Schlatter's view that Frg. 3a represents a more authentic version of Aristobulus is this unelaborated reference to Demetrius, which he thinks was originally a reference to Demetrius the Chronographer; accordingly, he believes that the original form of the Aristobulus fragment did not refer to earlier translations of the Torah, but writings retelling or explaining the Torah. In his view, the addition *τοῦ Φαληρέως* in Eusebius represents a later redaction that linked Aristobulus more closely with the LXX legend and thus referred to earlier translations of the Torah. See Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 407–8 n. 97.

70. A follower of Aristotle taught by Theophrastus, Demetrius of Phalerum (ca. 350–280 BCE) promoted Peripatetic philosophy not only through his considerable political achievements as an Athenian statesman but also possibly through an influential role in advising Ptolemy I Soter (ca. 297) to found the museum and library at Alexandria. An effective orator and author of several unoriginal works, he died in disgrace under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-246 BCE).

It is only in connection with the translation of the LXX, a tradition ultimately traceable to *Ep. Arist.* (or, perhaps Aristobulus), that he is identified as librarian at Alexandria under Ptolemy II Philadelphus (cf. the omission of this accomplishment in Diog. Laert. 5.75–85). The historicity of this report is now widely disputed. It is doubtful that he ever held the post of librarian, especially under Philadelphus who banished him from Alexandria. How the tradition arose is variously explained. Schlatter, *Geschichte*, 76 (following Graetz, *MGWJ* 25 [1876] 306–7), thinks the reference to Demetrius of Phalerum resulted from confusion with Demetrius the Chronographer (see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 97–98). Much more probable is the proposal by Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 89–90 n. 3, that Demetrius' efforts in developing laws for the Egyptians (Aelianus *VH* 3.17 [ed. Hercher (Teubner)] *καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ δὲ συνὼν τῷ Πτολεμαίῳ νομοθεσίας ἦρξε*) and his recommendation that Ptolemy I Soter collect and read books on kingship (Plutarch *Reg. et imper. apophth.* 189D) provided the historical core. Thus an Alexandrian Jewish pseudepigrapher could credibly claim that Demetrius sparked Ptolemy's interest in obtaining a

translation of the Jewish law code, as well as identify him as librarian at Alexandria. Setting the story in the reign of Philadelphus instead of Soter might have resulted either from confusion or from an independent tradition dating the Greek translation of the Law to his reign.

Cf. esp. Diog. Laert. 5.75–85; also, see E. Martini, "Demetrios (85)," PW 4 (1901) 2817–41; F. Wehrli, "Demetrios von Phaleron," PW Suppl. 11 (1968) 514–22; E. Bayer, *Demetrios Phalereus der Athener* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 36; Stuttgart and Berlin: W. Kohlhammer, 1942; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1969) 103–8, 109–16; F. Wehrli, *Demetrios von Phaleron*, in *Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar* (Basel: B. Schwabe, 1949); W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens* (London: Macmillan, 1911) 38–94; S. Dow and A. H. Travis, "Demetrios of Phaleron and His Lawgiving," *Hesperia* 12 (1943) 144–65; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 89 n. 3; Fraser, *Ptolemaic Alexandria*, 1.314–15, 321–22, 689–90; 2.957 n. 74; *OCD*, 325.

For an earlier treatment of the LXX tradition as it relates to Aristobulus, see Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.535–37; also Schürer, *Geschichte*, 3.424–25.

71. The MS tradition of Eusebius envisions two reference points: the invasion of Egypt by Alexander the Great (332 BCE) and the earlier invasion by Artaxerxes III (343 BCE), or perhaps by Cambyses (525 BCE). The latter would render more plausible Aristobulus' claim that Jewish traditions were known to Plato (ca. 429–347 BCE) and Pythagoras (6th cent. BCE). So, Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3(2).280 n. 2. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf's conjectural deletion of *καί* (read in Stählin) is accepted by Riessler, 181: ". . . und vor der Herrschaft Alexanders über die Perser." According to Riessler, 1276 n. 12.2, "'und' beruht wohl auf Mißverständnis einer Abkürzung des Artikels vor Perser." But Walter, JSHRZ (3,2) 273 n. 1c, contests this on the grounds that Alexander's defeat of the Persians in 331–330 BCE would not have the same referential value for Ptolemy VI Philometor as would Artaxerxes' invasion of Egypt in 343 BCE. It is defended as genuine by Gfrörer, *Philo*, 2.113; also, Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 1.24. Although Valckenaer, 48–49 (=Gaisford 4.384–85) thinks the sentence is corrupt (he deletes *Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως δι' ἑτέρων*), he retains *καί*. Similarly, Viger (*PG* 21.1098: "ante Demetrium adeoque ante Alexandri ac Persarum imperium").

Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 89–90, attributes the reference to Persian rule to Aristobulus himself as a way of buttressing the argument for the Greek philosophers' dependence on the Jews.

See Willrich, *Judaica*, 110–11; Denis, *Introduction*, 279 n. 37. For Plato and Pythagoras' visiting Egypt, see Diod. Sic. 1.96.2.

72. On the debate whether earlier translations of the Law are referred to in *Ep. Arist.* 30, see Hadas, *Aristeas*, p. 110, n. on §30; *OTP* 2.14 n. e; also cf. *Ep. Arist.* 314; Collins, *Athens and Jerusalem*, 85.

Schlatter understands *διερμηνεύειν* not in the sense of "translate" but "retell"; accordingly, he thinks Aristobulus refers not to previous translations but to previous writings, e.g., Demetrius the Chronographer, that rehearsed the contents of the Torah and mediated knowledge of Jewish traditions to non-Jewish readers. In an earlier version of his position, he holds that a post-Clementine editor, influenced by *Ep. Arist.*, changed Demetrius (the Chronographer) to Demetrius of Phalerum and added the passage about the translation of the LXX under Philadelphus. But since *Strom.* 1.22.148.1b (Frg. 3b) proves that Clement already knew the *Ep. Arist.* tradition (*ἢ ὥς τινες*), Schlatter modifies his view. Even though he modifies his position, he still denies that Aristobulus refers to previous translations. His position was worked out in response to Graetz, *Geschichte*, 3.622–30, who, in arguing that Aristobulus was a later forgery, insists that *ἑρμηνεία*, *ἐξηγήσεις*, and *βίβλοι ἐξηγητικαί* referred to the translation of the Torah.

In any case, because of the clearly apologetic tone of the passage, it cannot be taken seriously as evidence for reconstructing LXX origins. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 45 n. 1.

On *διερμηνεύειν* as "translate," cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 2.6 §§31, 34; *Ep. Arist.* 309–10.

73. Valckenaer, 48 (=Gaisford 4.384), makes the improbable suggestion that this is perhaps a reference to Ezekiel the Tragedian's account of the exodus.

74. Clement's version of Frg. 3, lines 27–30 is one of several examples of his stylistic improvement of the version of Aristobulus found in Eusebius. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 118.

75. The above summary appears to include Exodus (*τὴν ἐξαγωγήν*), Joshua (*κράτησις τῆς χώρας*), and Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy (probably all envisioned in *τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις*). Genesis is not explicitly referred to, unless it is implicit in *νομοθεσία* (so, Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 2.74, noting *P.E.* 8.10.13; followed by Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 1.23; see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 32 n. 1). Since cosmogony would have figured centrally in comparisons between Moses and Plato, Valckenaer, 48 (=Gaisford 4.384), proposes that the reference to Genesis, e.g., *ἥ τε γένεσις τοῦ κόσμου*, has dropped out. As Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 89 n. 1; idem, JSHRZ (3,2) 274, n. 1d, notes, Aristobulus apparently envisions translated excerpts from Exodus through Joshua.

76. As Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 157 n. 4, observes, there is no clear evidence that Aristobulus has first-hand acquaintance with the works of Pythagoras; he rather appears to have depended on a Jewish predecessor who had direct knowledge of Pythagorean number speculation. Cf. Frg. 4.4 (*P.E.* 13.12.4); also n. 154 below.

77. On Clement's omission of *κατεχώρισεν*, and its effect on the preceding syntax, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 118, noting Mras, *RheinMus* n.s. 92 (1944) 221. Walter thinks *γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθής* is parenthetical in Aristobulus, but serves as the main clause in Clement. The Greek text is presented here as it is found in Mras and Stählin respectively.

78. Frg. 4.4 (*P.E.* 13.12.4); Frg. 2.4 (*P.E.* 8.10.4). Also, cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 §§162–65; 2.16 §168. See Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, 165–66; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1. On the priority/dependence motif, see n. 36 above.

δογματοποιΐα. In the patristic period, the term comes to mean "a fabrication of doctrine," in reference to heresies. Cf. Gregory of Nyssa *V. Mos.* (*PG* 44.332A); *Apoll.* 37 (*PG* 45.1208C); *Eun.* 3 (Jaeger, *Contra Eunomium Libri* [Berlin, 1921] 2.5,18); Eustratius *V. Eutych.* 30 (*PG* 86.2309A); 36 (*PG* 86.2316C); V. Max. 29 (*PG* 90.97D). See Lampe, *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, s.v. *δογματοποιΐα*; also Herriot, *Philon*, 72 n. 1.

79. See n. 61 above on Frg. 3a. Even though Aristobulus is not mentioned by name in Frg. 3b, he appears to be Clement's source. See Valckenaer, 69–73 (=Gaisford 4.402–406); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 106. This is disputed by Joël, *Blicke*, 1.97–99.

The translation is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.334.

80. In *Ep. Arist.* 3, 309, the translation is confined to the law. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 31 n. 1.

81. Ptolemy II Philadelphus ruled 285–246 BCE (exclusively from 283–282). On his relationship to Demetrius of Phalerum, see n. 70 above.

This use of the eponym Philadelphus contrasts with Frg. 2, line 10, where no eponym is mentioned when Aristobulus' work is said to have been dedicated to "Ptolemy the king." But since "Philadelphus" was introduced in the 2d cent. BCE not as a cultname but as a form of differentiation, its use by Jews (e.g., Philo *V. Mos.* 2.5 §§29–30; Josephus *Ant.* 12.2.1 §11; 12.2.15 §118; *Ag. Ap.* 2.4 §45) is quite acceptable. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 25, esp. n. 1, for discussion of the question as it relates to the debate concerning the authenticity of the fragments.

82. For the motif of attending to careful translation, cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.4 §46; Sirach prologue; also cf. Josephus *Ant.* 1.3 (prologue) §10; *Ep. Arist.* 317 (and 29). Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1.

On Demetrius of Phalerum, see n. 70 above.

83. I.e., Ptolemy I Soter (ca. 367/6–283 or 282 BCE), who ruled ca. 323–285.

84. Apparently a reference to Aristobulus, rather than to *Ep. Arist.* See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 98; also n. 70 above.

85. Nestle, "Zum Zeugnis des Aristobul über die Septuaginta," *ZAW* 26 (1906) 287–88, proposes that *καί* in Clement be deleted and that Ptolemy be taken as the subject of the previous clause *τὴν—προσενεγκαμένου*. This would bring Clement into conformity with Eusebius who assigns the responsibility for initiating the project to Philadelphus and supervising the project to Demetrius.

Because the sentence in Frg. 3.2 (*P.E.* 13.12.2) lacks a main verb, it appears that Eusebius ended the quotation in mid-sentence. Consequently, it is not clear how Aristobulus actually described Demetrius' role in the translation project. See Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 274 n. 2b.

Cf. Frg. 1.16 (Anatolius ap. *H.E.* 7.32.16), where Demetrius goes unmentioned.

86. In *P.E.* 9, Eusebius adduces "illustrious Greeks [who] have not been unacquainted with the affairs of the Hebrews." After quoting excerpts from Theophrastus (as preserved in Porphyry, 9.2–3), Hecataeus of Abdera (9.4), and Clearchus (9.5), Eusebius gives several excerpts from Clement (9.6) where Greek authors favorably mention Jews.

87. On Aristobulus as a Peripatetic, see n. 24 above.

88. On Clement's omission of *κατεχώρισεν*, cf. Frg. 3.1 (*P.E.* 13.12.1), and n. 77 above.

89. For the context of Frg. 4, see n. 60 above. How much material intervened between Frgs. 3 and 4 is not known. Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 274 n. 3b raises the possibility that Frg. 2, which occurs earlier in *P.E.* (Book 8), might have stood between Frgs. 3 & 4 in the original work of Aristobulus. In this case, the reference in Frg. 2.4 to philosophers and poets who had depended on Moses would recall the material in Frg. 3 and anticipate similar material in Frg. 4.4–8 and Frg. 5.

Though Frg. 4 claims that Greek philosophers such as Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato depended on Moses, it gives primary attention to Pseudo-Orpheus and Aratus.

90. LXX Exod 20:18; Deut 4:12, 33; 5:23–26. Aristobulus' discussion of the divine voice may be prompted by the remarks at the end of Frg. 2. So, Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 274 n. 3b. On *θεία φωνή*, see Kuhn, *Offenbarungsstimmen*, 145–49; also O. Betz, *TWNT* 9 (1973) 273–74, noting *θεία φωνή* in Oenomaus of Gadara ap. Eusebius *P.E.* 5.28.2, and *ἡ φωνὴ τοῦ θεοῦ* in Aelius Aristides *Or.* 45.11 (ed. Dindorf), or *Or.* 39 (ed. Behr, *Opera*); also cf. *θείη ὀμφή* in Homer *Il.* 2.41. Also, on this passage, see Siegert, *Predigten: Kommentar*, 304 n. 14.

91. "Creative acts" renders the difficult phrase *ἔργων κατασκευάς*, literally "constructions of works," i.e., constructive activities. Since the phrase is being contrasted with *ῥητὸν λόγον*, perhaps *κατασκευή* should be understood in a rhetorical sense (LSJ s.v. *κατασκευή* VI), thus "not spoken word (oral delivery) but artistic capacities (acts of preparation, composition, or arrangement)." Cf. Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Comp.* 16 (LCL, *Critical Essays*, 2.114); also *Comp.* 1 (LCL, *Critical Essays*, 2.18); *Pomp.* 2 (LCL, *Critical Essays*, 2.362–63); Strabo 1.2.6; Philodemus *Rh.* col. 18, lines 2–3 (ed. Sudhaus [Teubner] 1.199); Collins, *OTP* 2.840: "the establishment of things."

Cf. Philo *Migr.* 9 §§48–49 on Deut 4:12.

92. Perhaps, "consisted of."

93. On *λόγος θεοῦ*, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 81, esp. n. 3, who denies (against Schlatter and Dalbert) that a hypostatized Logos is found in Aristobulus, as later occurs, e.g., in Philo; similarly, Heinze, *Lehre*, 191.

94. LXX Gen 1:3, 6, 9, 14, 20, 24.

On God's word as act, cf. Philo *Decal.* 11 §47; *Opif.* 3 §13; *Sacr.* 18 §65; *Som.* 1.31 §182; *V. Mos.* 1.51 §283. Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 232, adduces these passages as proof of Aristobulus' dependence on Philo. Against this, Stein, *Exegese*, 9, noting the similarity, argues for the priority of Aristobulus. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 65, argues for their dependence on a common school tradition.

Also cf. LXX Sir 42:15 *ἐν λόγοις κυρίου τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ.*

95. This fragment from *Strom.* occurs as part of the lengthy section (ch. 14) devoted to the theme of Greek plagiarism of the Jews.

Immediately preceding is a comparison of Matt 5:37; James 5:12 and Plato *Tht.* 151D, and Matt 5:33–36 and Plato *Leg.* 11.917C. After this, Clement argues that the Genesis story of man's being formed from the dust has its counterpart in statements found in Homer, Callimachus, and Hesiod.

Even though Aristobulus is not mentioned by name, he appears to be Clement's source. So, Valckenaer, 69–73 (=Gaisford 4.402–6); also, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 106, esp. n. 4. This is disputed by Joël, *Blicke*, 1.97–99.

Stählin-Früchtel (GCS) accept Valckenaer's judgment and print the statement in quotation marks. The translation of Frg. 4a is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.468.

96. On Aristobulus' likely indirect knowledge of Pythagoras, see n. 76 above; also, cf. Frg. 3.1 (*P.E.* 13.12.1); also Frg. 5.13 (*P.E.* 13.12.13) and n. 154 below.

97. Cf. Frg. 2.4 (*P.E.* 8.10.4); also n. 36 above.

98. *περιειργασμένοι*. Cf. Frg. 3.1, line 21 (*P.E.* 13.12.1). Also, cf. Julian *Or.* 7.217C *ἀλλὰ τὰ λεληθότα περιεργάζεσθαι*; Eunapius *Hist.* Frg. 57 (ed. L. Dindorf, *Historici Graeci Minores* [Teubner] 1.250,4); *περίεργος*, of an inquiring mind, cf. Aristotle *Resp.* 21.480b27; Herodianus 4.12.3 (ed. Stavenhagen [Teubner]).

99. Cf. Frg. 3.1a (*P.E.* 13.12.1a); also cf. Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.36–39 §§255–86. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1.

100. Plato *Ti.* 47A–E; *Ap.* 31D; *Thg.* 128D. On *συνέχειν* as an indication of Stoic influence, see Heinze, *Lehre*, 187.

101. Cf. Frg. 2.4; see n. 36 above; also, cf. Frg. 1.16 and n. 12 above.

For a discussion of the problematic form of the title of the work, see C. Riedweg, *Jüdisch-hellenistische Imitation eines orphischen Hieros Logos. Beobachtungen zu OF 245 und 247 (sog. Testament des Orpheus)* (Classica Monacensia: Münchener Studien zur Klassischen Philologie, 9. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag, 1993) 44–45.

102. Cf. Frg. 4.3b above (*P.E.* 13.12.3b); also n. 94 above.

103. The following poem attributed to Orpheus is treated extensively in a separate volume, *FHJA* 4.

The version of the poem preserved in Eusebius is one of several forms of the poem quoted by early Christian authors, most notably Pseudo-Justin and Clement. Portions are also quoted by Cyril of Alexandria and Theodoret, but these are clearly derived from earlier Christian witnesses. A full version of the poem is quoted in the fifth-century work Tübingen Theosophy, but it represents a compilation of all the previous patristic witnesses.

The version of the poem found in Eusebius corresponds, for the most part, to Recension C of Pseudo-Orpheus. Walter, however, argues that Recension C does not date to the time of Aristobulus but originated after the time of Clement since certain portions of the poem, especially the "Moses" sections, are not mentioned by Clement. Moreover, he insists that the poem does not fit the context. First, in Aristobulus' introductory remarks, the source of the poem is said to be the Orphic collection Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι, yet the quoted poem belongs to a collection designated Διαθῆκαι. Second, the poem is cited to illustrate (or prove) that God creates and sustains the world, but other themes, especially God's oneness, transcendence, and inscrutability, are more dominant. Third, Aristobulus (in Frg. 4.7) claims to have removed the name Ζεύς throughout the verses, but in the quoted poem there is no clear evidence that this occurred.

For these reasons, Walter thinks that Aristobulus quoted here another Orphic poem that would satisfy the aforementioned expectations: taken from the Ἱεροὶ Λόγοι, especially emphasizing God's role as creator and sustainer of the universe, and originally employing the name Ζεύς in several places. As possibilities, he suggests (from O. Kern *Orphicorum Fragmenta* [Berlin, 1922], pp. 140–248) Frg. 168 (pp. 201–2) or Frg. 169,1–5 (p. 207); or, from another poem, Frg. 298 (p. 311).

While Walter's analysis rightly recognizes serious difficulties within the text, his solution may be too radical. If one concedes that Aristobulus cited the wrong source (and given the fluidity of the Orphic tradition, the titles of the collections may not have been as precise as we think), it is conceivable that he quoted an earlier recension of the poem, especially Recension A (a possibility left open by Walter), but perhaps Recension B. While it is true that both focus on God's oneness and inscrutability, some reference is made to God's creative and sustaining role. Also, Zeus is mentioned in Recension A (v 24).

See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 202–61; JSHRZ (3,2), 275, n. 5a.

For commentary, see esp. the commentary on Recension C in *FHJA* 4.

On Clement's likely familiarity with the Orpheus and Aratus passages in Aristobulus, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 108.

104. Aratus, from Soli in Cilicia (ca. 315–240/239 BCE), learned Stoicism from Zeno at Athens and later became poet in the Macedonian

court (and for a time the Seleucid court). His most celebrated poem, *Phaenomena*, which treats astronomical topics dealt with by Eudoxus of Cnidus, reflects a thoroughly Stoic outlook.

The nine lines cited by Aristobulus are taken from the opening section of the poem, the proem to Zeus (vv. 1–18).

See E. Maass, *Arati Phaenomena* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1893; 2d ed., 1955); *Commentariorum in Aratum Reliquiae* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1898; repr. 1958); J. Martin, *Aratus: Phaenomena* (text, commentary, and translation; Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1956); A. W. Mair and G. R. Mair, *Callimachus, Lycophron, Aratus* (LCL, 1921) 185–299 (G. R. Mair's Aratus); G. Knaack, "Aratos (6)," PW 2 (1896) 391–99; *OCD*, 92.

As Aristobulus indicates in §7 below, all references to Ζεύς and Δίς (lines 73, 74, 76) are changed to θεός. Cf. app. crit.

On Stoic influence on Aratus, see Schmid–Stählin, *Geschichte*, 2(1).163; Nilsson, *Geschichte*, 2(2).397–98; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 11 n. 3.

As Hoek, "Aristobulos," *Bijdragen*, 290–99, notes, in quoting Aratus *Phaenom.*, Aristobulus stands at the beginning of a tradition that was variously appropriated by subsequent Christian writers.

105. Or, "we consult God's oracles everywhere"; or, reading θεῷ instead of θεοῦ, "and we have familiar intercourse with God everywhere." So, Collins, *OTP*, 2.841 n. f.

106. Cf. Acts 17:28.

107. In *Protrepticus* 7 Clement cites numerous examples to show that Greek poets bear testimony to the truth.

On Clement's dependence on Aristobulus, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 106–8, 121. This is the only instance in the *Protrepticus* where Clement has used Aristobulus. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 108 n. 2.

The translation is that of Wilson in ANF 2.192.

108. Cf. *Ep. Arist.* 132; Philo *Post. C.* 5 §14. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 100–101, 107 n. 1.

On the divine pervading the cosmos, see K. Praechter, *Die Philosophie des Altertums* (12th ed.; Berlin: Mittler, 1926) 419–20; Wendland, *HRK*, 110–11; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 11 n. 4.

On the Stoic expression "the power of God pervading all things," cf. Philo *Conf.* 33 §170; *V. Mos.* 2.26 §133; Diog. Laert. 7.147 (=*SVF* 2.1021) *καὶ τὸ μέρος αὐτοῦ τὸ διῆκον διὰ πάντων*. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 107 n. 1.

On the similarity with Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo* 6.397b–401a, cf. Herriot, *Philon*, 77–78, who suggests Aristobulus as its possible author! For an extensive treatment of the similarities between Aristobulus and *De mundo*, see Radice, *Aristobulo*.

109. The lines that follow are Aratus *Phaen.* 13–15.

110. For the general context of *Strom.* 5.14, see n. 95 above on the context of Frg. 4a. This fragment occurs within a discussion of the power and creative activity of God.

On Clement's dependence on Aristobulus, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 107–8, 121.

The translation is that of Wilson in ANF 2.468.

111. Or, perhaps, "as the sense required," or "as the occasion demanded." Since *σημαίνω* is a technical hermeneutical term, it might appropriately be rendered "we have given the true sense." So, Collins, *OTP*, 2.841. Zuntz, "Aristeas Studies II," 135, understands *σημαίνω* as "write," thus "hence I have written as required, eliminating the poetical (fiction) Zeus." P. W. van der Horst, *ANRW* II.18.2 (1989) 1454, "We have given the true sense, as one must, by removing the name Zeus throughout the verses."

112. The statement appears to apply to both the Orpheus and Aratus passages, although clear evidence of the name changes is seen only in the Aratus passage (lines 73, 74, 76—all of which involve the stem *Δίς*, not *Ζεῦς*; see Keller, *De Aristobulo*, 81–82). Because no comparable changes are evident in the Orpheus passage, Walter thinks another Orphic text which contained the name Zeus originally stood in its place. It is conceivable, however, that Aristobulus has in mind the omission of the line referring to Zeus in Recension A (v. 24). Or, Aristobulus' claim would be plausible if, as Keller, *De Aristobulo*, 82, suggests, Recension A were the text originally cited, although it too employs the term *Δίς*, not *Ζεῦς*. See nn. 104–5 above. See the discussion in Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 110–15; also 140–41.

On the similar use of Zeus in *Ep. Arist.* 16, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 101–2; Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 217.

On this passage, see P. W. van der Horst, "The Altar of the 'Unknown God' in Athens (Acts 17:23) and the Cult of 'Unknown Gods' in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods," *ANRW* II.18.2 (Berlin-New York, 1989) 1426–56, esp. 1453–54; reprinted in Horst, *HJC*; see esp. pp. 198–99.

113. Literally, "for the point (τὸ) of their meaning sends (our thoughts) upward toward God." Collins, *OTP*, 2.841, "For their (the verses') intention refers to God. . . ." The sense seems to be that even though the divine names Dis and Zeus (or the verses containing them) are false labels, their ultimate referent is (the true) God. Hence Aristobulus is justified in the name changes.

114. Here we adopt Collins's translation (*OTP* 2.841), which effectively renders the litotes *οὐκ ἀπεοικότως*. Cf. Thucydides 6.55.2; also, 1.73.1; 2.8.1; 8.68.4; Porphyry *Abst.* 1.46 (ed. Nauck [Teubner]); Dio Chrys. *Or.* 12.35; 31.116. If *οὐκ ἀπεοικότως* is taken in a technical sense, then Aristobulus would be claiming to have applied the appropriate hermeneutical rules in getting at the true meaning of the passages he has quoted.

115. Cf. *Ep. Arist.* 234 (*διαλήψεως ὁσίας*) and 235. Also, Josephus *Ag. Ap.* 2.36–39 §§255–86, esp. §§256, 281; also 2.16 §168. On *διαλήψεις ὅσιαι*, cf. Polybius *Hist.* 6.56.6 and 12. See Valckenaer, 45, 67 n. 11 (=Gaisford 4.381–82; 400–401 n. l); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 56 n. 1; 101, esp. n. 1.

116. Here *αἵρεσις* appears to refer to Judaism, or perhaps the Jewish Alexandrian philosophical school (Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.5, 7), rather than the Peripatetic school. See n. 24 above; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 12 n. 7; Wendland, *JE*, 97; Collins, *OTP*, 2.834 n. 17.

117. Cf. *Ep. Arist.* 235; also 234. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 100.

118. Cf. *Ep. Arist.* 131 (*εὐσέβεια, δικαιοσύνη*), 278 (*ἐγκράτεια, δικαιοσύνη*); also Acts 24:25. Also, cf. Philo *Prob.* 12 §83. See Valckenaer, 88 (=Gaisford 4.418–19); Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 232; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 65, 100–101. Cf. Tit 2:12; also, see W. Foerster, "*εὐσεβής*, etc.," *TDNT* 7 (1971) 175–85, esp. 176, 181; Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 276 n. 8a.

On the identification of the virtues and the good in Stoic ethics, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 11 n. 5.

119. For the context, see n. 60 above. How much material intervened between Frgs. 4 and 5 is not known. Aristobulus argues that the high regard for the seventh day reflected in passages attributed to Homer, Hesiod, and Linos is traceable to Moses.

For discussion of Frg. 5 generally, see Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.8–18; Schlatter, *Sirach*, 163–76; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 150–71.

On the suggestion that Frg. 5 is a form of commentary on Gen 2:2–3, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 30–31.

120. Along with Frgs. 5b and 5c, this fragment is found in *Strom* 6.16.137–144. In none of them does Clement mention Aristobulus as his source, although this is likely. See Valckenaer, 69–73 (=Gaisford 4.402–6); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 106 n. 4; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 276 n. 9a; though, cf. Joël, *Blicke*, 1.97–99.

Frg. 5a occurs in Clement's discussion of the Decalogue. It is obviously a treatment of the fourth commandment, but it is the "third word" that is discussed. It is preceded by a discussion which appears to combine the second and third commandments. It is followed by a discussion of the fifth commandment, "Honor thy father and mother."

The translation is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.512.

121. Gen 2:2–3; Exod 20:8–11; 23:12; 31:12–17; Deut 5:12–15. Also, cf. *Jub.* 2:17–20; Philo *Spec. leg.* 2.15–18 §§56–85. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 65–66.

122. I.e., "according to the true nature of reality"; perhaps, "philosophically," or even "allegorically." Cf. Frg. 2.2 (*P.E.* 8.10.2) and n. 31 above. It should be noted that Clement substitutes *τῷ ὄντι* for *φυσικῶς*.

123. With these remarks, Aristobulus links the creation of light (Gen 1:3–5) with the biblical tradition (see n. 121 above) in which the seventh day is established as a day of rest. His remarks appear to presuppose some numerological tradition in which "seven" and "one" are identified (cf. Philo *Post. C.* 18 §64; *Decal.* 21 §102; *Deus immut.* 3 §11; *Leg. alleg.* 1.5 §15 [noting the Pythagorean background]), but here he gives further warrant for this claim: "the 'seventh' is 'first' in the sense that it is a 'beginning.'" (In Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.7 §§17–18, there occurs a moralizing interpretation of Gen 2:3 in which the seventh day is associated with the beginning of "that most brilliant and truly divine light of virtue.")

φωτὸς γένεσις. The seventh day understood as the "beginning of light through which all things are seen together," i.e. "fully comprehended," perhaps reflects the Pythagorean identification of "seven" with *νοῦς* and *φῶς*. Cf. Philolaus 44[32] A 12 D.-K. *νοῦν δὲ καὶ ὑγείαν καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεγόμενον φῶς ἐν ἑβδομάδι* (on which, see Frank, *Plato*, 324–25). Thus "seven" is the point at which true understanding (of the universe) and the full light (of knowledge) is possible. Similarly, cf. Philo *Opif.* 7–8 §§29–31, for light as the "seventh in order" (of creation) enabling knowledge of the divine Logos.

But there is an additional link between "light" and "knowledge" or "wisdom": even though light was created on the first day, true light, i.e., full knowledge (wisdom), was not possible until the seventh day when it became possible for God to view creation comprehensively. It should be noted, however, that God's seeing is not among the list of anthropomorphisms in Frg. 2 (*P.E.* 8.10.1–17). Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 66 n. 4.

For similar association of light with wisdom and knowledge, cf. Philo *Migr.* 8 §§39–42; *Spec. leg.* 1.52 §288; in Philo *Decal.* 20 §97, God contemplates the whole creation on the seventh day, thus making it a suitable day for the study of wisdom; similarly, in *Spec. leg.* 2.15 §59, seven is the "light of six" (*φῶς ἑξάδος*), "revealing as completed what six has produced."

On wisdom associated with Primal Light, cf. Wis 7:22–26, esp. v. 26, and Philo *Opif.* 8 §31; see Borgen, "Philo," *Jewish Writings*, 276. Also, cf. LXX Sir 48:1; also, see Klauck, *Allegorie*, 232 n. 227, who notes 2 Pet 1:19.

Although the language of the seventh day as "the birthday of the world" (*ἡ γενέθλιος τοῦ κόσμου*) is not explicit here, it is possibly implicit in the phrase *φωτὸς γένεσις* and probably is in view in the quotation attributed to Linus that occurs in Frg. 5.16, lines 142–43 (*P.E.* 13.12.16); see n. 165 below. The tradition frequently occurs in Philo (e.g., *Spec. leg.* 1.35 §170; 2.15 §59; 2.16 §70; *Opif.* 30 §89; *V. Mos.* 1.37 §207; 2.39 §210). See Heinemann, *Bildung*, 112; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 66.

It may be that the identification of the seventh day with the first day in Aristobulus presupposes the tradition underlying the second verse attributed to Linus, viz., that the seventh day (of the month) is the birthday of Apollo (see n. 165 below). Given the association of Apollo with the sun, it is conceivable that the "seventh," i.e., the "first," could be said to be the "beginning of light."

For "seven" possibly (depending on whether *θεός* or *ἑβδομάς* is the subject of the sentence) understood as "the leader and ruler of all things" and identified as "one," cf. Philolaus 44[32] B 20 D.-K. (*ἡ ἑβδομὰς . . .*) *ἔστι γὰρ ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἄρχων ἁπάντων, θεός, εἷς, ἀεὶ ὤν, μόνιμος, ἀκίνητος, αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ὅμοιος, ἕτερος τῶν ἄλλων.* The passage is attributed to the 5th century Pythagorean Philolaus by Philo (*Opif.* 33 §100), but its genuineness is contested (D.-K., "zweifelhaft"). Even so, its association with Pythagorean circles is clear. On its genuineness, see Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokr.* 1.416 n. 23; Frank, *Plato*, 324–35, who defends its genuineness; Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 249 n. 51; Thesleff, *Introduction*, 104 n. 1; idem, *Texts*, Onatas, No. 2 (p. 140,21–22); idem, *Texts*, 151 n. 8. On whether *θεός* or *ἑβδομάς* is the subject, see Diels-Kranz, *Vorsokr.*, 1.416 n. 23 (*ἑβδομάς*); Thesleff, *Introduction* 104 n. 1 (*θεός*). See Roscher, 1906, 38–39; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 161 n. 7.

These numerous points of contact between Philo and Aristobulus are cited by Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 232, as evidence of Aristobulus' dependence on Philo, but Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 65–66, convincingly shows that Philo's exposition is consistently more fully elaborated, and therefore later.

On the Pythagorean background, esp. of the Linus quotation, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 66 n. 2, 160–62; also, see n. 161 below. On number symbolism in Pythagorean thought, especially "seven," see Roscher, 1906, 24–43; also, generally, Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 465–82.

Cf. *Barn.* 15.1–9, and see Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, 381–85; also W. Rordorf, *Der Sonntag. Geschichte des Ruhe-und Gottesdiensttages im ältesten Christentum* (ATANT, 43; Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1962); Martin, "Barnaba," *Storico-Religiosi* (1982) 176 n. 17.

124. §§10–11a are also quoted in *P.E.* 7.14.1. Cf. Frg. 5e at the end of this section, pp. 196-97.

125. On the Peripatetic origin of the image of wisdom as a lamp, or the source of light, perhaps Aristobulus has in mind passages on the illuminating nature of knowledge, or the proverb "What the eye is to the body, the mind is to the soul." Cf. Aristotle *Top.* 1.17.108a11 *ὡς ὄψις ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ, νοῦς ἐν ψυχῇ*; EN 1.6.12.1096b28 *ὡς γὰρ ἐν σώματι ὄψις, ἐν ψυχῇ νοῦς*; *Rhet.* 3.10.7.1411b (in a discussion of metaphors) *καὶ ὅτι τὸν νοῦν ὁ θεὸς φῶς ἀνῆψεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἄμφω γὰρ δηλοῖ τι.* The saying is also referred to in Philo *Deus immut.* 10 §§45–46; *Sobr.* 1 §§4–5; *Opif.* 17 §53; also, cf. Stob. *Flor.* §13 (ed. Meineke). In Aristotle *De anima* 3.5.430a17 *νοῦς* is compared with *φῶς*. Possibly in view is Aristotle's discussion of *σοφία* in *EN* 6.7.1–7.1141a9–1141b24; also, 6.6.1–2.1140b30–1141a9.

Similar sentiments are reflected in Pythagorean sources, specifically passages (probably from the 3d century BCE) attributed to the 4th century Pythagorean Archytas. Cf. Ps.-Archytas, *περὶ σοφίας*, No. 1 (Thesleff, *Texts*, 43,24–44,3 = Iamblichus *Protr.* [ed. Pistelli (Teubner)]): *τοσοῦτον διαφέρει σοφία ἐν πάντεσσι τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις πραγμάτεσσιν, ὅσον ὄψις μὲν αἰσθασίων σώματος, νόος δὲ ψυχᾶς, ἄλιος δὲ ἄστρων. . . .* Also, No. 4 (Thesleff, *Texts*, 44,25–26 = Iamblichus *Protr.* [ed. Pistelli (Teubner)]): *οὕτω γὰρ ἔχει σοφία περὶ πάντα τὰ ἐόντα ὡς ὄψις περὶ πάντα τὰ ὁρατά.* Also, cf. No. 10 (Thesleff, *Texts*, 13,26–29 = Stob. *Flor.* §81 [ed. Meineke]); also, the speech attributed to Archytas in Cicero *Sen.* 12.41, in which it is said that too much pleasure renders rational thought impossible and "turns the light of the soul into utter darkness" (omne animi lumen exstingueret).

Cf. Wis 7:26.

See Valckenaer 68 n. 12 (=Gaisford 4.401–402 n. m); Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 232–33; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 32 n. 2, 66–67; also Borgen, "Philo," *Jewish Writings*, 276 n. 265, noting Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1.166–69; S. Aalen, *Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis' im Alten Testament, im Spätjudentum und im Rabbinismus* (Oslo: Dybwad, 1951) 175–77; Billerbeck, *Kommentar*, 4.960–62.

On Aristobulus as a Peripatetic, see n. 24 above.

126. Ἀταραξία figures prominently in Sceptic, Epicurean, and Stoic ethics. Cf. Epicurus *Ep.* 3.128 (ed. Usener [Teubner]) *τὴν <τῆς ψυχῆς> ἀταραξίαν, ἐπεὶ τοῦτο τοῦ μακαρίως ζῆν ἐστι τέλος*; also *Ep.* 1.53, 80; also, cf. 1.82; 2.85, 96; Diog. Laert. 10.144 (K.D. 17). For Pyrrhon, cf. Diog. Laert. 9.107; Sext. Emp. *Pyr.* 1.29. It is not ordinarily associated with Peripatetic ethics; though, cf. Aristotle *EN* 3.8.15.1117a19, 9.1.1117a31; 4.5.3.1125b34; also *EN* 2.3.5.1104b24. Also, see Keller, *De Aristobulo*, 56, who notes Epicurus *Ep.* 1.53 (ed. Usener); Diod. Sic. 25.1; Epictetus *Diss.* 4.8.31; 2 Macc 11:23.

See Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, 448, 496; C. Bailey, *The Greek Atomists and Epicurus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1928) 482–528; A. J. Festugière, *Epicurus and His Gods* (trans. C. W. Chilton; Oxford: Blackwells, 1955), ix, xi, 32–33, 39, 83, esp. 84–87 on the differences in the Sceptic, Epicurean, and Stoic views of *ἀταραξία*. Also, see P. Wilpert, "Ataraxie," *RAC* 1 (1950) 844–54, esp. 844–47; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 11 n.2; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 276 n. 10b.

127. This is one of several indications that Aristobulus is Jewish. See notes to introduction, n. 148; also, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 13; Schürer, *Geschichte* 3.521.

128. Presumably a reference to Prov 8:22–31, though perhaps Wis 6:22; 9:9. Similarly, Sir 1:1–10; 24:1–7; Philo *Ebr.* 8 §31. See Heinze, *Lehre*, 190–91, against Dähne, *Geschichtliche*, 107, who sees wisdom here as a hypostatized, separate divine power; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 32 n. 2, 66–67; Schubert, *Judentums*, 16–17; Herzfeld, *Geschichte*, 3.480.

Similarities with Wisdom of Solomon prompt Lutterbeck, *Lehrbegriffe*, 407–8, to propose Aristobulus as its author. While this is doubtful, there are nevertheless some noticeable similarities: wisdom before creation (Wis 6:22; 9:9; cf. 10:1; Frg. 5.11); beginning, middle, and end formula (Wis 7:18; Frg. 4.5, line 65; cf. *FHJA* 4, commentary on Recension B, v. 40; also cf. Wis 14:27); wisdom as source of light (Wis 7:26; Frg. 5.10); astronomical interests (Wis 7:17–22; Frg. 4.5, esp. lines 53–56 [Orphic poem]); pervasive divine power (Wis 7:24; Frg. 4.7); virtues (Wis 8:7;

Frg. 4.8); interpretive (allegorical ?) skill (Wis 8:8; Frg. 2.2–6); creation by God's word(s) (Wis 9:1; cf. 18:15; Frg. 4.3); definition of knowledge (Wis 9:11; Frg. 5.12); Moses as prophet (Wis 11:1; Frg. 2.4); hands as God's power (Wis 11:17; cf. 11:21; 16:16 Frg. 2.8); importance of "number" in God's creation (Wis 11:20; Frg. 5, esp. 5.12); God as source of evil (Wis 12:10; Frg. 4.5, line 41 [Orphic poem; cf. *FHJA* 4, commentary on Recension A, vv. 14 & 16]); God's holding all things together (Wis 1:7; Frg. 4.4). If knowledge of what is "secret and manifest" in Wis 7:21 refers to interpretive skill, i.e., ability to see literal and figurative meaning of a text, this should be compared with Frg. 2.2–5.

129. I.e., the claim that Wisdom is the source of light, which implies its priority to what was created on the first day (§§9b–10a).

130. This fragment is part of Clement's discussion of the fourth commandment. See n. 120 above on the context of Frg. 5a. The translation is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.513.

131. On *τὸ διασαφούμενον* as a technical term in allegorical interpretation, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 136; also cf. Frg. 2.5 (*P.E.* 8.10.5) and see n. 38 above.

132. In the following translation, "cease" is given in quotation marks because it appears to function as a midrashic lemma that ties the exegetical remarks together.

133. Cf. Gen 2:2. The antecedent of *ἐν αὐτῇ* is supplied here by the earlier reference to *ἑβδόμην ἡμέραν* in Frg. 5.9, line 9 (*P.E.* 13.12.9; also line 19). Admittedly, after the intervening material on wisdom, it is a slightly awkward way of resuming the discussion of the "seventh day." The awkwardness is also reflected in the absence of a clear antecedent for *αὐτῶν* in line 65 (see below n. 134). Conceivably, a sentence roughly resembling *Strom.* 6.16.142.1b has dropped out. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 67–68; JSHRZ (3,2), 276 n. 11c.

134. Literally, "their arrangement" (*τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν*), with *αὐτῶν* having no clear antecedent (see n. 133 above). Instead of *αὐτῶν*, Clement reads *τῶν γενομένων*. Mras, GCS (43,2) 196 n. on line 3, proposes "heaven and earth." Cf. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 67 n. 3, 67–68. Conceivably some intervening material has dropped out; so, Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 276, n. 11c.

135. Cf. Philo *Opif.* 7 §§27–28; *Leg. alleg.* 1.3 §§5–7. Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 233; Stein, *Exegese*, 10; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 67.

136. I.e., the Mosaic legislation (*νομοθεσία*); cf. Frg. 5.11, line 55.

137. A partial quotation of LXX Exod 20:11a *ἐν γὰρ ἓξ ἡμέραις ἐποίησεν κύριος τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὴν θάλασσαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ.*

138. Gen 1:14–18. The sense seems to be that through the six-day creation, he established (made known) time divisions, such as day and night, and determined the order of the days, or perhaps the order of solar and lunar movements. Borgen, "Philo," *Jewish Writings*, 276: "(established) the course of time." Or perhaps, this is an ambiguous, undeveloped statement of the position more fully elaborated in Philo that "time" did not precede creation. Cf. *Leg. alleg.* 1.8 §20; *Opif.* 7 §26; *Sacr.* 18 §68. See references cited in n. 135 above.

139. Or, "having given orderly arrangement to the universe, he sustains this order and controls the movements of the heavenly bodies."

The addition of *οὐ* before *μεταποιεῖ* (lit., "alter," "remodel") in line 79 (by Stephanus, followed by Valckenaer, *Aristobulo*, 95 [=Gaisford 4.425]) attempts to make §12a consistent with §11b. Mras, however, thinks the emendation unnecessary since the reading of the MS tradition can be understood as emphasizing God's continued creative activity even after the initial ordering of things, as, e.g., Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.2–3 §§5–7; *Cher.* 26 §87. See Stein, *Exegese*, 10. For a similar use of *συνέχειν*, cf. *Sacr.* 8 §40; *Heres* 6 §23. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 67 n. 2; idem, JSHRZ (3,2) 277 n. 12c; also Mras, "Ein Vorwort," *RheinMus* n.s. 92 (1944) 221–22; Schlatter, *Sirach*, 171–73.

In spite of certain similarities in emphasis between Aristobulus and Philo, important distinctions remain; see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 68 n. 2, who criticizes Wendland, Bousset, and Schlatter for their tendency to attribute Philonic notions, e.g., the timelessness of creation, to Aristobulus.

Cf. Frg. 2.11 (*P.E.* 8.10.11).

140. The subject may very well be "God," the subject of the verbs immediately preceding. But here, as earlier with *σημαίνει* (line 71), Aristobulus seems to be making a claim about the law rather than God.

141. Ordinarily, ἔννομος is rendered "ordained by law," "lawful," "legal" (LSJ s.v.); Collins, *OTP*, 2.842: "legally binding"; Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 277: "gesetzlich." But rather than emphasizing that the seventh day is legally prescribed in the sense that God ordered its observance, the point rather seems to be that it is a law of nature that was established at the outset of creation; hence, a "custom" inherent in the natural order.

142. This translation follows Walter's suggestion that the passage should be understood within the context of Stoic cosmology rather than Stoic anthropology or psychology; thus λόγος as "cosmic law" rather than "reason," one of the eight faculties of the soul. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 68–71 (following Binde, *Aristobulische Studien*, 2.14–16); idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 277 n. 12d. Wendland ap. Elter, *Gnomologiorum*, 233, sees it as evidence of Aristobulus' dependence on Philo. On ἕβδομος λόγος, cf. also Frg. 5.15, lines 132–33 (*P.E.* 13.12.15) and n. 160 below.

Alternatively, the passage might be rendered ". . . has clearly shown us that the seventh day is . . . a sign of reason, the seventh (faculty) placed in us, through which we know things human and divine." So, Mras, GCS (43,2) 196 n. 7: "zum Zeichen unserer siebenten Fähigkeit (Vermögens), nämlich der Vernunft," noting "stoische Achtteilung der Seele, das ἡγεμονικόν ist unter Weglassung des σπερματικόν oder γόνιμον der siebente Teil." This interpretation is supported by appealing to a similar understanding in Philo *Abr.* 5 §§28–30; *Heres* 45 §225, and esp. LXX Sir 17:5 Ἔλαβον χρῆσιν τῶν πέντε τοῦ κυρίου ἐνεργημάτων, ἕκτον δὲ νοῦν αὐτοῖς ἐδωρήσατο μερίζων, καὶ τὸν ἕβδομον λόγον ἑρμηνέα τῶν ἐνεργημάτων αὐτοῦ.

For the eight-part (or, seven-part) soul in Philo, cf. *Opif.* 40 §117; *Leg. alleg.* 1.4 §11; *Det.* 46 §168; *Agr.* 7 §30; *Heres* 48 §232; *Qu. Gen.* 1.75; also, cf. *T. Reub.* 2:3–3:8. On the Stoic understanding of the eight-part soul, cf. Diog. Laert. 7.110, 157 (=*SVF* 2.828); esp. Porphyry *De anima* ap. Stob. *Ecl.* 1.41.25 (ed. Meineke [Teubner]) (=*SVF* 2.830), where ἡγεμονικόν encompasses the seven other faculties of the soul (corresponding to λόγος in Philo); generally, *SVF* 2.827–33; see Zeller, *Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, 201–3, and 74–91 on Stoic epistemology; see generally, Valckenaer, 97–101 (=Gaisford 4.427–31); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 69 n. 1,

This latter tradition of interpretation, going back as far as Valckenaer, with many later proponents (Schlatter, *Sirach* 163–71, esp. 165–68; idem, *Geschichte* 85 and 86–87; Zeller, *Philosophie*, 3[2].285; Dalbert, *Missionsliteratur*, 105–6), understands the phrase against the background of Stoic psychology (e.g., Mras, mentioned above), thus holding that

ἕβδομος λόγος should be rendered "seventh (faculty of) reason." Gfrörer, *Philo*, 2.99–102, adopts a mediating view: after noting similarities with the Stoic sevenfold division of the soul, he finally decides that ἕβδομος λόγος refers not to "human reason," but to "die heilige Weltkraft der Sieben," i.e., wisdom, the "beginning of light" (102).

Walter takes issue with this view, arguing that in spite of similar passages in Philo and Sir 17:5, it cannot be supported from the text of Aristobulus itself. Regardless of how this particular phrase is interpreted, Walter insists (against Wendland) that it does not prove Aristobulus' dependence on Philo, but only shows that both could have drawn on Stoic traditions and adapted them to their own use.

In developing the "cosmic" interpretation, Walter examines the uses of λόγος in Aristobulus. He observes that it is used by him nowhere else in the sense of "mind" or "reason," but rather in the Stoic sense of "rule," "natural law" in Frg. 2.11 (*P.E.* 8.10.11; see H. Kleinknecht, "λόγος, etc." *TDNT* 4 [1967] 84–85). Taking λόγος in this sense, Walter understands ἕβδομος λόγος as "Siebenergesetzmäßigkeit, hebdomadische Struktur" (*Thoraausleger*, 74), thus renders the phrase ". . .as a sign relating to the sevenfold regularity ruling over us" ("zum Zeichen für die in Beziehung auf uns [=über uns] waltende Siebenergesetzmäßigkeit"). On the use of ἕβδομος instead of ἑβδομαδικός, cf. Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.7 §§17–18; *Hypoth.* 8.7.20); see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 74–75, esp. 74 n. 3.

Accordingly, the next phrase would be taken to mean that this cosmic principle, not the human faculty of reason (the usual interpretation), is the means by which we gain (ordered, comprehensive) knowledge about (the essence of) things both human and divine. It is thus this sevenfold (cosmic) structure that is the basic principle of all things. Since that which relates human beings to this underlying reality is the number seven, God introduced the sabbath. Perceptive observers who recognize it as a day signifying "the light of wisdom" can thereby gain insight into the underlying principles that actually hold the cosmos together. The sabbath thus becomes the epistemological key by which one gains true knowledge of the cosmos.

Though differing somewhat from Walter's rendering, Binde's translation (*Aristobulische Studien*, 2.16) also reflects the "cosmic" interpretation: "(Gott) hat uns diesen (den 7. Tag) gesetzlich angewiesen zu einem mahnenden Zeichen der in uns vorhandenen, auf das Siebenverhältniss sich gründenden Vernunft, durch welche wir die Erkenntniss menschlicher und göttlicher Dinge haben."

Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," 1105: "This He has made clear to us in the Law in order that we may have the principle of the number seven before us, and through this have knowledge of things human and divine."

For detailed treatment of the passage, and the related passage in Frg. 5.15 (*P.E.* 13.12.15), see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 68–81. Also, see n. 160 below.

143. The contrast here appears to be between pre-existent Wisdom (§4a) and our ordinary human wisdom. The phrase *ἡ κατὰ δύναμιν* perhaps suggests "wisdom associated with the divine power," or even "spiritual wisdom," if *δύναμις* has some association with *πνεῦμα*. Hence our rendering "supernatural." The phrase *κατ᾽ οὐσίαν* suggests wisdom that comes naturally.

144. This definition of wisdom is Stoic. Cf. Sext. Emp. *Math.* 9.125 (=*SVF* 2.1017) *σοφία, ἐπιστήμη οὖσα θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπείων πραγμάτων*; also, Aëtius *Placita* 1. Prooem. 2 (=*SVF* 2.35) *οἱ μὲν οὖν Στωϊκοὶ ἔφασαν τὴν μὲν σοφίαν εἶναι θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων ἐπιστήμην*. Similarly, Sext. Emp. *Math.* 9.13 (=*SVF* 2.36); also, Dio Chrys. *Or.* 69.4 (=*SVF* 3.584); Diog. Laert. 7.92.

It also occurs in some later Pythagorean sources, esp. the Letter of Lysis to Hipparchus §3 (Thesleff, *Texts*, 112,14–15=Hercher, *Epistolographi Graeci* 602,21 and Iamblichus *VP* 76 [ed. Deubner (Teubner)]) *ἀλλὰ θείων τε καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἧς ἐπιστάμων*. Thesleff, *Introduction*, 115, dates the letter in the late 3d or early 2d century BCE. Burkert, *Philologus* 105 (1961) 23, regards the Stoic definition of wisdom in the letter as a sure sign of its pseudonymity. Accordingly, he assigns it a date in the late 3d century and suggests that it was written to introduce the Pythagorean *Hypomnemata*; also, see Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 459 n. 63; Thesleff, *Texts*, 111 n. 14. This Pythagorean connection possibly reinforces the suggestion by Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 167, that a Pythagorean florilegium served as a source for §12b. Also, cf. Archytas ap. Stob. *Flor.* 1.77 (ed. Meineke [Teubner]).

Also, cf. Cicero, *Off.* 2.2.5 Sapientia autem est . . . rerum divinarum et humanarum causarumque, quibus eae res continentur, scientia; similarly, *Off.* 1.43.153; *Tusc.* 4.26.57; 5.3.7; *Fin.* 2.12.37; also, Seneca *Ep.* 89.5; Quintilian 1.10.5; 12.2.8; Apuleius *De dog. Plat.* 2.6.228 (ed. Thomas [Teubner]); Maximus of Tyre 26.1 (ed. Hobein [Teubner], 308, 19–309,3; references in Hobein, who regards it as a Pythagorean definition); Ps.-Plutarch *De Homero* 2.92 (ed. Kindstrand [Teubner]); Galen *Phil. hist.* 5; Alcinous *Intr. in Platonem* 1 (ed. Hermann, *Plato* [Teubner] 6.152,4–5; references in J. Whittaker, *Alcinoos* [Budé] 73–74 n. 5). Also, cf. Plato *Resp.* 6.486A and 10.598E; *Leg.* 1.631B; *Symp.* 186B.

In Jewish sources, cf. 4 Macc 1:16; Philo *Congr.* 14 §79; *Qu. Gen.* 1.6; 3.43.

In Christian sources, cf. Clement of Alexandria *Paed.* 2.2.25.3 (references in Stählin and Treu, GCS, 171 n. on 17); *Strom.* 1.5.30.1, 6.35.3, 28.177.1–2; 4.6.40.3, 26.163.4; 6.7.54.1, 16.133.5, 17.160.2; 7.12.70.5; Origen *Cel.* 3.72; *Hom. in Jerem.* 8.2 (Jer 10:12–14). See Hoek, *Clement*, 31 n. 42.

Heinemann, *MGWJ* 73 (1929) 425–43, esp. 432, sees Aristobulus' adoption of this Stoic definition of philosophy as evidence for dating him in the 1st cent. BCE. Apparently none of the 30+ examples of the definition he collected were dated before the first century BCE. But if Burkert and Thesleff are correct to date the Letter of Lysis to Hipparchus in the late 3d or early 2d century BCE, Heinemann's argument is thereby weakened. Such a late date is contested by Walter, *Thoraauseger*, 84–85.

The view of natural theology expressed here reflects Stoic influence and anticipates similar understanding in Philo. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 232 n. 1; also 11 n. 4. Cf. Wis 13:1–9; Rom 1:20.

145. In Aristobulus the Wisdom motif is introduced as a minor digression in the discussion of the seventh day. Clement, by contrast, develops the Wisdom motif without reference to the sabbath, and as a result, attributes to Wisdom the epistemological function that Aristobulus assigns the sabbath, or sevenfold principle. Why this shift occurs is not clear. Most likely, Clement, like modern interpreters, found Aristobulus' statement about the sevenfold principle difficult to comprehend.

146. This fragment is part of Clement's discussion of the fourth commandment. On the broader context, see n. 120 above on the context of Frg. 5a. On Clement's dependence on Aristobulus, see Hoek, *Clement*, 203.

The translation is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.513–14.

147. Or, "series of sevens"; so, Collins, *OTP*, 2.842. §13a serves as a natural extension of §12b: not only does the sevenfold principle of regularity serve as the means through which one gains knowledge about the human and divine realms, but about the natural order (animal and plant life) as well. Its epistemological scope is comprehensive. On the Pythagorean background, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 73, esp. nn. 4 & 5, 164, 167, who suggests a Pythagorean florilegium as a source.

Marcus, "Hellenistic Jewish Literature," 1105: "the whole world of things that are born and grow. . . ."

148. See n. 168 below.

149. For the general context of *Strom.* 5.14, see n. 95 above on Frg. 4a. This fragment occurs in the lengthy section (5.14) where Clement cites numerous examples to show that Greeks plagiarized the Jews. Its immediate context is a treatment of the Greeks' reverence for the seventh day, said to be derived from the Jews. It is preceded by a comparison of Greek and Jewish notions of sleeping and death; it is followed by passages from the Bible and Plato pertaining to the suffering of the righteous (Wis 2:12=Isa 3:10; Plato *Resp.* 2.361E–362A).

Strom. 5.14.107.1–108.1 is later quoted in *P.E.* 13.13.34–35a. On Clement's dependence on Aristobulus, see Hoek, *Clement*, 203.

The translation of Frg. 5d is based on that of Wilson in ANF 2.469–70.

150. Because this sentence interrupts the train of thought and is absent in Clement, it is regarded as a gloss by Walter, *Thoraaausleger,* 73–74; also JSHRZ (3,2), 277 n. 13b. Since the "rest" motif is mentioned in Frg. 5.9, line 7 (*P.E.* 13.12.9), Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 74 n. 2, suggests that it might have originally belonged at the beginning of the fragment.

151. Cf. Frg. 2.4 (*P.E.* 8.10.4). See n. 36 above.

152. On the quotations from Homer and Hesiod, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 150–66, esp. 151–58; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 255–56, 271–73.

153. The line is taken from Hesiod *Op.* 770, which refers to the seventh day of the month, the day of Apollo, not the seventh day of the week. The statement occurs within the larger section (765–821) which discusses the significance of various days of the month.

For the seventh day of the month as the birthday of Apollo, cf. Diog. Laert. 3.2; Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 717D; for "seven" as the number of Apollo, cf. Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 738D; for the "sacred seven of Apollo," cf. Plutarch *De E ap. Delph.* 391F.

On the use of the number seven in the cult of Apollo, see Roscher, 1901; 1904, pp. 4–19; S. Eitrem, "Hebdome," PW 7 (1912) 2579.

See generally, Valckenaer, 113–16 (=Gaisford 4.441–44); Wesseling, 135 (=Gaisford 4.457–58); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 155; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 277 n. 13c.

154. This line is not found in Hesiod. Cf. Hesiod, Frg. 273 (271) in *Hesiodi Carmina* (ed. Rzach [Teubner], 413); also, Hesiod, LCL, Doubtful Fragments, pp. 282–83, Frg. 7, with the notation that this line may originally have been read after *Op.* 771.

The latter half of the verse appears based on Homer *Il.* 1.605 λαμπρὸν φάος ἠελίοιο, but there are some Hesiodic echoes. The sun is designated φαεσίμβροτος in Hesiod *Thg.* 958 (cf. Homer *Od.* 10.138, 191) and φαέθων in *Thg.* 760 (cf. Homer *Il.* 11.735; *Od.* 5.479 al.).

As before, Pythagorean echoes are heard in the verse. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 156–58, observes that in neither Homer nor Hesiod is any explicit connection made between the number seven and the light of the sun. He also notes its similarity to the statement attributed to Philolaus, the earliest systematizer of Pythagorean philosophy (5th cent. BCE), who explicitly connects φῶς with the number seven. Cf. Philolaus 44[32] A 12 D.-K. *νοῦν δὲ καὶ ὑγείαν καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεγόμενον φῶς ἐν ἑβδομάδι.* See the discussion in Roscher, 1906, 29–30; Frank, *Plato*, 325; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 156 n. 3.

As Walter further observes, explicitly making the passage relate to the seventh *day* need not have occurred (only) within Jewish circles, but could have been done by Greeks seeking to correlate Pythagorean number speculation with the references in Hesiod *Op.* 765–821 relating to the significance of certain days. On the significance of seven-day periods within Greek circles, e.g., in the Apollo cult, and among Orphics and Pythagoreans, see Roscher, 1901; 1903, 4–19; 1906, 18–43; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 156 n. 4.

As Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 157 n. 1, observes, the use of the nominative ἑβδομάτη in the version of the line Aristobulus quotes (as opposed to the dative ἑβδομάτῃ read by Stählin), if anything, makes the connection more explicit, especially since the sentence lacks a verb.

In any case, Walter insists that there is no compelling reason to think that Aristobulus himself composed the verse, nor even that he drew directly on Pythagorean sources. It is rather more likely that he drew on his Jewish predecessors who had already become familiar with Pythagorean teaching and had begun to assimilate certain aspects of it, especially number speculation, into their own system of thought. See note 76 above.

See generally, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 156–58; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 277 n. 13d; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 271 n. g; Valckenaer, 122 (=Gaisford 4.448–49); Attridge, *OTP*, 2.823 n. c.

155. This verse is unattested in Homer, though cf. *Od.* 12.399=15.477. For ἱερὸν ἦμαρ, cf. *Il.* 8.66=*Od.* 9.56.

See Valckenaer, 121–22 (=Gaisford 4.447–49); Wesseling, 135 (=Gaisford 4.457); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 155. Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 277 n. 13d, also thinks Aristobulus found the verse in a Pythagorean florilegium that had been reworked by a Jewish editor.

For seven-day periods in Homer, cf. *Od.* 10.81; 14.252; also 12.399=15.477. So, Roscher, 1903, 46–47, 60; 1906, 8–10, 217–19; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 154 n. 1.

156. This additional verse, which is absent in Frg. 5.14 (*P.E.* 13.12.14), does occur in the section of *Strom.* 5.107 that is quoted in *P.E.* 13.34. It is unattested in Homer. Perhaps it was a marginal gloss in the text used by Clement and served to indicate the overall theme of the section; so, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 165, who thinks it belongs with the following group of verses attributed to Linus; also, see JSHRZ (4,3), 272 n. k.

Cf. Philo *Mut.* 44 §260 *ἐν ἱερᾷ ἑβδόμῃ*; Hesiod *Op.* 770 *καὶ ἑβδόμη ἱερὸν ἦμαρ*.

157. This verse, which recalls Gen. 2:2–3, is based on Homer *Od.* 5.262 *τέτρατον ἦμαρ ἔην, καὶ τῷ τετέλεστο ἅπαντα*. Even though Aristobulus reads *ἕβδομον*, it is clear from *Od.* 5.263 *τῷ δ' ἄρα πέμπτῳ*. . . that *τέτρατον* was the original reading.

See Valckenaer, 122 (=Gaisford 4.448–449); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 154–55; also, Cobet, *Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς* 1 (1866–67) 176–77. Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. 14c, thinks the change in Aristobulus results from an earlier Jewish reworking of the Pythagoras florilegium previously mentioned. See n. 155 above; also n. 163 below.

158. This verse is not found in Homer but probably recalls the passage about Odysseus' journey to Hades in *Od.* 10.513; also 11.636–40 and 12.1–7. It does not appear to be a Jewish composition; so, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 151–52; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. 14d; also, see van der Horst, *JHP*, 83–85.

For discussion of the verse, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 75–78, 151–54.

159. I.e., Homer.

160. This translation follows the suggestion of Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 75–78 (detailed treatment of the numerous difficulties of this text); idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278, that *ἕβδομος λόγος* (as earlier in Frg. 5.12, line 82) should be understood in a cosmic rather than psychological sense. Accordingly, *ἕβδομος λόγος* is the sevenfold principle, or as Walter renders it "the sevenfold principle of (cosmic) regularity" ("Siebenergesetzmäßigkeit"), through which one gains true knowledge of God. Thus, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 77, explains, ". . . Aristobulos habe sagen wollen, daß nur die kosmische Siebenerstruktur als Symbol des gottgesetzten Guten

das Böse der menschlichen Seele überwinden kann (bzw. den Menschen zur Preisgabe des Bösen in seiner Seele befähigt) und daß diese Überwindung mit der Einsicht in das Wesen der göttlichen Hebdomadenordnung alles Seins Hand in Hand geht (vermittelt bzw. offenbart wird diese Einsicht, wie oben gesagt, dadurch, daß Gott jeden Siebenten Tag zum Tag der *θεωρία* bestimmt hat)." Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 78–81, argues further that this interpretation is supported by Philo *Leg. alleg.* 1.6–8 §§16–19, and notes that the whole section (*Leg. alleg.* 1.2–8 §§2–20) is thematically related to Frg. 5.9–16 (*P.E.* 13.12.9–16).

The alternative rendering would yield something like: "And by this he (Homer) signifies that from the state in which the soul experiences forgetfulness and wickedness, through the seventh (faculty of the soul), reason, by which truth comes, the aforementioned faults (forgetfulness and wickedness) are left behind, and we receive knowledge of the truth, just as was said before." Collins, *OTP*, 2.842, seems to incline towards the latter: ". . . by means of the sevenfold principle (n. m, "reason") in accordance with the truth. . . ." Gifford, 3(2).722: "By which he means, that after the soul's forgetfulness and vice have been left, the things it chose before (*προῃρημένα*; cf. app. crit.) are abandoned on the true seventh which is reason, and we receive the knowledge of truth. . . ."

If *προειρημένα* is understood to refer to "forgetfulness and wickedness," Viger's emendation *προῃρημένα* is unnecessary. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 153–4 n. 4; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278, n. 15b.

161. Linus is an obscure figure in Greek antiquity. Apparently the term *λίνος* originally referred to a dirge (Homer *Il.* 18.570), but a person by this same name was variously identified as the son of Apollo and Psamathe, the son of Amphimarus and Urania, and finally as Heracles' music teacher. In each version of the story, Linus comes to a bad end. Cf. *OCD*, 611.

In a manner reminiscent of Orphic traditions (cf., e.g., Diog. Laert. 1.4–5, where Linus and Orpheus are mentioned together), attributing verses to the legendary figure Linus doubtless served to underscore their remote origin as well as their association with quasi-philosophical, speculative traditions. The choice of such a name makes it unlikely that the attribution originally occurred in Jewish circles (Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 1.379 n. 9; 2.633 n. 56; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 159).

According to Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 159, a Pythagorean setting for the verses is more likely because of close similarities with Pythagorean cosmic speculations and the attribution to Linus of thirteen verses from a book entitled *Περὶ φύσεως κόσμου* (Stob. *Ecl.* 1.10.5 [ed. Meineke (Teubner)]); see Wesseling, 135 [Gaisford 4.457]; Susemihl, *Geschichte*, 1.378–79 n. 9; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 159 n. 4.

For similar associations of Linus with cosmogonic speculation, cf. Diog. Laert. 1.4, where Linus is said to have composed a poem about the creation of the world and the courses of the sun and moon; Ps.-Iamblichus *Theol. arith.* §50 (eds. de Falco & Klein [Teubner]) *διὸ καὶ Λίνος ὁ θεολόγος ἐν τῷ* Πρὸς Ὑμέναιον *δευτέρῳ θεολογικῷ φαίνεται λέγων· "τέσσαρες ἀρχαὶ ἅπασι τρισσοῖς δεσμοῖς κρατοῦνται"*; Damascius (Neo-Platonist, 5th–6th cent. CE) *Dub. et solut.* §25, p. 64 (ed. Ruelle, vol. 1, p. 45,12–13) *οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἕν τι, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἕν· ὡς Λίνός τε ἔλεγε καὶ Πυθαγόρας* (probably recalling the verses attributed to Linus in Stobaeus); also §27, p. 67 (ed. Ruelle, vol. 1, p. 48,13–14). Also, cf. Origen *Cels.* 1.16, where Celsus mentions Linus first in a list of "ancient and wise men," followed by Musaeus, Orpheus, Pherecydes, Zoroaster the Persian, and Pythagoras.

On the Linus quotations generally, see Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 150–66, esp. 158–66; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278–79; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 255–56, 272–73. On Linus, see W. Kroll, "Linos," PW 13 (1927) 715–17.

162. Clement probably attributes the following verses to the more well-known 3d century poet Callimachus because the legendary name Linus would appear less credible to discerning readers (cf. Origen *Cels.* 1.16 and n. 161 above). See Valckenaer, 124–25 (=Gaisford 4.450–51); Christ, *Philologische Studien*, 465 n. 4. Graetz, MGWJ 27 (1878) 58–59 and Schlatter, *Sirach*, 170–71, propose that the verses were also attributed to Callimachus by Aristobulus, but this is unlikely. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 158 n. 1; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. 16a.

163. This verse is most likely a Jewish composition based on Gen 2:2–3. It appears to be a conflation of the first half of the third Homeric verse (line 127 above) and the second half of the second Homeric verse (line 125 above). Perhaps it was the same editor who altered *τέτρατον* to *ἕβδομον* in the second Homeric verse (line 124); see n. 157 above. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 164–65; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. 16b; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 272 nn. o and p; Collins, *OTP*, 2.842 n. p.

164. Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 164 n. 2, proposes, on the basis of the reading in MSS IO (*δ' ἦν*) in Eusebius' quotation of Clement in *P.E.* 13.13.34 (cf. app. crit.), that Clement's version of the verse be emended to read: *ἑβδομάτη δ<ὴ ἔ>ην, καί οἱ. . . .*

For the second part of the verse, cf. the second verse attributed to Homer (lines 124–125 above).

165. *εἰν ἀγαθοῖς*, literally, "in good things," but here understood as "for good things," i.e., "bodes well." Collins, *OTP*, 2.842: "of good qual-

ity." In the next phrase, it is possible to take γενέθλη in the sense of "birth," or "generation" (LSJ s.v.); so, Stählin, *Clemens*, BKV, 210: "Trefflicher Art ist der siebente Tag und das siebte Geschlecht auch"; also, Collins, *OTP*, 2.842 n. q: "the seventh day and the seventh birth are good."

The translation here follows Walter in understanding γενέθλη as the equivalent of τὰ γενέθλια, "birthday." In the Pythagorean gnomologion, the reference would most likely be to the seventh day of the month as the birthday of Apollo (see n. 153 above). Various epithets applied to Apollo signify the connection: ἑβδομαγέτης (Aeschylus *Th.* 800); ἑβδομαγενής (Plutarch *Quaest. conv.* 717D); ἑβδόμειος (*IG* 2.1653). See Jessen, "Hebdomeios," PW 7 (1912) 2579; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 161 n. 3; Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 474 n. 54.

Accordingly, it would be celebrated as an auspicious day. Thus the verse might be paraphrased: "The seventh day (of the month) is an auspicious day; indeed, the seventh is the (day of) birth (of Apollo)." Given the associations of Apollo with the sun, it could easily be construed allegorically to mean that the seventh day (of the month or week) was the day whent light originated (cf. above Frg. 5.9, lines 20–21).

At a later stage of interpretation, when the text was appropriated by Jewish redactors, it could have been (made) compatible with the Jewish tradition that the Sabbath was the "birthday of the world" (γενέθλιος κόσμου). See n. 123 above for references in Philo.

This interpretation follows the analysis in Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 65–66, 160–62; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. c.; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 272 n. q. On the Sabbath as the birthday of the world, cf. Frg. 5.9, lines 19–22 (*P.E.* 13.12.9); see n. 123 above.

Valckenaer, 124 (=Gaisford 4.450–51), posits a Jewish origin for this verse, but Walter's analysis which envisions two separate stages—an earlier Pythagorean stage and a later Jewish appropriation (and reinterpretation) of the verse—is more plausible; also, see Valckenaer, 119–20 (=Gaisford 4.446–47); Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 160 n. 3.

166. The translation follows Collins, *OTP*, 2.842. For "prime numbers" (πρῶτοι ἀριθμοί), cf. Euclid 7 *Def.* 11 & 12 (ed. Stamatis [Teubner]); see LSJ s.v. πρότερος B.I.3.c.

Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 162, who finds no evidence in the verse to suggest that it was a Jewish composition, understands this verse in the context of the day of Apollo (see n. 165 above), hence "der Siebente Tag ist einer der wichtigsten Tage." So, Walter, JSHRZ (3,2), 278: "Vordersten Rangs ist der siebente Tag—er steht auch am Ende"; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 272: "Der siebente (Tag) ist unter den ersten—der siebente ist auch vollkommen."

For ἐν πρώτοις meaning "among the first or foremost," cf. Homer *Il.* 19.424; Isaeus 7.40 (ed. Thalheim [Teubner]); Herodotus 8.69; Plato, *Rsp.* 7.522C (LSJ s.v. πρότερος B.I.1 and 3).

The latter half of the verse is problematic because "seven" appears not to have been regarded as perfect within Pythagorean circles, certainly not in the way "ten" was (contra Valckenaer, 124 [=Gaisford 4.450]). Cf. Philolaus 44[32] A 13 D.-K. ἔστι δὲ τὰ δέκα τέλειος <ἀριθμός>; see C. A. Huffman, *Philolaus of Croton. Pythagorean and Presocratic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 359–60. Also, cf. Aristotle *Metaph.* 1.5.3.986a10; also, Philo *Opif.* 37 §107; *Leg. alleg.* 1.7 §18; *Post. C.* 50 §173. See Frank, *Plato*, 314; Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 467–68.

On the significance attached to the number "seven" in Pythagorean thought, see Roscher, 1906, 24–43, 142–56; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 73 n. 4; 162, esp. n. 2, 166–71; Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 467, 470, 475; Goodman in Schürer, *History* 3(1).670 n. 264.

For the number "seven" in Philo, cf. *Opif.* 30–43 §§90–128, esp. 41 §§120–23; *Leg. alleg.* 1.4–5 §§8–15; *Spec. leg.* 2.15 §57–59.

167. The seven "planets" according to the ancient view were (according to their distance from the earth) the moon, Mercury, Venus, the sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn. Cf. Plato *Tim.* 38C; though, cf. *Resp.* 10.616D–E (an eighth whorl consisting of the fixed stars).

These two verses exhibit no clear signs of Jewish composition. The term τεύχω is not the usual Hellenistic-Jewish word for God's creative activity (cf. *FHJA* 2.177 n. 86), and it also occurs in non-Jewish Orphic texts, e.g. Kern, *Orphicorum Fragmenta*, Frg. 21 (cf. *FHJA* 4, commentary on Recension A, v. 10; Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 163 n. 4). Nor do the verses explicitly mention the seventh day. They rather reflect Pythagorean teaching about the seven planets and the harmony of the spheres. So, Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 163–64; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 278 n. 16d; idem, JSHRZ (4,3), 273 n. r.

On Pythagorean views of the planets and the harmony of the spheres, see Roscher, 1906, 30–31, 156–75; W. Gundel & H. Gundel, "Planeten," PW 20 (1950) 2017–2185, esp. 2044–45, 2053–57; Boll, "Hebdomas," PW 7 (1912) 2547–78, esp. 2566–70; Burkert, *Lore and Science*, 299–368. On the cult of the seven planets, see Roscher, 1904, 51–53; also, Huffman, *Philolaus*, 231–88, esp. 279–83.

On the correspondence of the menorah to the seven planets, cf. Philo *V. Mos.* 2.21 §§102–3; *Heres* 44–45 §§219–25; Josephus *Ant.* 3.6.7 §146; 3.7.7 §182.

168. Solon Frg. 19 (27) in *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* (ed. E. Diehl; fasc. 1: Poetae elegiaci; 3d ed., 1949; [Teubner]) pp. 38–39). Since the eighteen verses of Solon are cited in *Strom.* 6.144.4–6, close to where Clement had quoted Aristobulus (6.137–42), Walter suggests the possibility that Aristobulus knew the poem by Solon. They are also cited in Philo *Opif.* 35 §104. See Walter, *Thoraausleger*, 168–69; idem, JSHRZ (3,2), 279 n. 16e.

169. In *P.E.* 7.12 Eusebius cites biblical passages to illustrate Jewish belief in the "second Being and power of God," which is variously designated "divine Word" and "divine Wisdom and Power." He provides further support for his claim by citing non-biblical testimony, most notably Philo (7.13) and Aristobulus (7.14).

170. On Aristobulus as a Peripatetic, see n. 24 above.

SUBJECT AND NAME INDEX

Abbreviations
authors/editors, 42
bibliography, 38–41
patristic witnesses, 3
text-critical, 4–6
works frequently cited, 42
Agathobuli, the two, 72, 201 n. 13, 202 n. 14
Agathobulus, 201 n. 13
Alexander Polyhistor, 63
Alexandrian Jews, social status, 78 n. 4, 90 n. 129
Alexandria, provenance of Aristobulus, 75
Allegoria, cognate terms, 204 n. 23
Allegorical exegesis, 47
Allegory
as described by Aristobulus, 204 n. 23
"expanded sense," 206 n. 31, 209 n. 38
in Aristobulus, 66
in Aristobulus and *Ep. Arist.*, 64–65
in Bible, 204 n. 22
"metaphor," 210 n. 44
"natural" meaning, 206 n. 31
Stoic, 58, 204 n. 23
technical terms, 87 n. 98, 204 n. 23, 206 n. 28, 224 n. 122, 228 n. 131
value of, 204, n. 22
Anatolius, 68, 73, 81 n. 39, **198 n. 1** (including bibliography); testimony re Aristobulus, 44, **47—48**, 55, 72, 117–19 (T 7, 7a, 7b 7c, texts)
Annotations to Fragments, 198–241
Anonymous Matritensis, testimony re Aristobulus, 120 (T 8a, text)
Anthropomorphisms, 44, 87 n. 98, 207 n. 33 (anthropomorphic way of thinking to be avoided), 206 n. 29 (value of), 209 n. 40 (hand of God), 210–11 nn. 50–54 (descent of God), 218 n. 90 (God's voice)
Apollo, day of, 239 n. 166
Apollo, & the number seven, 234 n. 153, 239 n. 165
Aratus of Soli, 44, 73, **220–21 n. 104**, 221 n. 104 (bibliog.)
Aratus, passage cited by Aristobulus, 222 n. 112
Aratus *Phaenomena*, 70, 221 n. 104, 222 n. 109
Archimedes, 71
Archytas, Pseudo-, 226 n. 125
Aristarchus, 58
Aristeas, Ep. 49–50, 51, 53, 54, 58, 59, 62, 64–65, 68; dependence on Aristobulus, 86 n. 90 (scholars supporting); similarities with Aristobulus, 64–65
Aristobulus
addressee of 2 Macc 1:10, **45–46**, 47, 77 n. 2
allegorical exegesis, 59, 60
apologetic task, 59
as author of commentaries, 47
as author of *Ep. Arist.*, 82 n. 53
as author of Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo*, 222 n. 108
as author of pseudonymous Greek verses, 70, 89 n. 120
as author of Wisdom of Solomon, 82 n. 53, 227 n. 128
as high priest, 45–46, 47
as one of LXX translators, 68
as pagan, 74, 91 n. 147
as Peripatetic, 47, 48, 61, 72–73, 90 n. 137 (list of references), **204–6 n. 24**
as "teacher," 48
authenticity arguments, 52–53
authenticity debate, 49–72
bibliography, 97–106
changes in Aratus passage, 222 n. 112
Cynic influence on, 73

Aristobulus (cont.)
date, 74–75
dependence on *Ep. Arist.*, 86 n. 90 (scholars supporting)
ethnic identity, 74
fragment numbering, 76 n. 1
Hesiod quotations, 234 n. 152
Homer quotations, 234 n. 152, 236 n. 157
Jewish identity, 74, 92 n. 148 ("we passages"), 92 n. 149 (references in the tradition), 227 n. 127
language for allegory, 204 n. 23
Linus quotations, 238 n. 161
literary purpose: Greek dependence on Jews, 94 n. 157
Logos in, 231 n. 142
LXX, 62
LXX translation reports, 67
number speculation, 224–6 n. 123
"of Panaeas," 75
one of LXX translators, 73, 95 n. 160, 202 n. 15
Orphic poem cited, 219–20 n. 103
pagan Peripatetic philosopher, 91 n. 147
patristic evidence, 43–45
Peripatetic influence on, 73
Philometor's adviser, 71
philosophical outlook, 72–73, 91 n. 142, 205 n. 24 (eclectic)
priestly descent, 71, 74, 92 n. 149
priestly status, 77 n. 3
provenance, 75
pseudonymous Greek verses in, 89 n. 125
Ptolemy's teacher, 71, 72, 78 n. 4
Pythagorean influence, 61, 73
relation to *Ep. Arist.*, 62, 64–65, 78 n. 5, 86 nn. 90–91
relation to Josephus, 63–64, 85 n. 87
relation to Philo, 52, 53, 58, 59–60, 62, 65–66, 80 n. 35, 86 nn. 93 & 95, 87 n. 96, 87 n. 98 (list of parallel passages), 203 n. 20, 206 n. 29, 208–9 n. 26, 218 n. 94, 226 n. 123, 229 n. 139, 231 n. 142
relation to Ps.-Aristotle *De mundo*, 70, 222 n. 108
relation to Pythagoreanism, 216 n. 76, 219 n. 96, 224 n. 123, 226 n. 123, 235 n. 154
relation to Stoics, 91 n. 142
relation to Wisdom of Solomon, 227–28 n. 128 (list of similarities)
Sabbath interpretation, 224 n. 123
similarities with *Ep. Arist.*, 64–65, 86 n. 91
social status, 62, 71, 90 nn. 126–30
source for Clement, 216 n. 79, 219 n. 95, 221 n. 107, 222 n. 110, 224 n. 120, 241 n. 168
Stoic influence on, 59, 61, 62, 73, 219 n. 100
testimony of 2 Macc 1:10, 45
testimony of Analolius, 44, 47–48
testimony of Clement, 43, 46
testimony of Eusebius, 44–45, 47–48
testimony of Origen, 48
"we passages," 92 n. 148
wisdom and creation, 62
writings, 46
writings, addressee, 94 n. 160
writings, commentary or thematic treatment, 93 n. 154
writings, description in the tradition, 92–93, n. 151, 93 n. 155 (list of references)
writings, dialogue with king, 93 n. 152
writings, extent of, 74, 93 n. 155
writings, fragment numbering, 76 n. 1
writings, Frg. 1, 128–33
writings, Frg. 2, 134–49
writings, Frg. 3, 150–61
writings, Frg. 4, 162–75
writings, Frg. 5, 176–97

Aristobulus (cont.)
writings, genre, 93 n. 152, 206 n. 27 (Q. & A. format)
writings, intervening material between fragments, 217 n. 89, 223 n. 119, 228 n. 134
writings, title of work, 219 n. 101
"Zeus" reference changed to "God," 221 n. 104
Astronomy, ancient conceptions, 199 n. 1
Ataraxia, 227 n. 126
Authenticity
Historical anachronisms:
(a) Reports concerning LXX, 67–68;
(b) Priority/dependence topos, 68;
(c) Presence of Orphic poem, 69–70;
(d) Use of forged Greek verses in addressing Ptolemy, 70–71;
(e) Aristobulus' social status, 71;
(f) Plausibility of literary strategy, 71;
(g) Use of epithet Philadelphus, 72
literary dependence, 64–67
presence of Orphic poem, 89 nn. 114–19
R. Simon, 78 n. 6
scholars affirming, 84 n. 79
scholars denying, 81 n. 44
scholars noting historical anachronisms, 88 n. 109
scholars summarizing objections, 85 n. 80
silence of the tradition, 62, 63–64
social status of Aristobulus, 71, 90 nn. 126–30
Bible, early Greek translations, 46, 64, 67, 212 n. 61, 214 n. 71, 215 n. 72
Bibliography
Aristobulus, 97–105
General, 17–37
Orphica, 105—6
Pythagoreanism, 106
Second Maccabees, 106
Sources, 7–16
Burning bush, 211 n. 56
Calendar and chronology, bibliog., 198–99 nn. 1-2
Calendar, luni-solar, 199 n. 2; Macedonian, 200 n. 4
Callimachus, 238 n. 162
Careful translation motif, 217 n. 82
"Cease," of God, 228 n. 132
Chronicon Paschale, testimony re Aristobulus, 120 (T 8b, text)
Clearchus of Soli, 208 n. 26
Clement of Alexandria, stylistic improvement of Aristobulus, 215 n. 74; testimony re Aristobulus, **43–44**, **46**, 114–16 (testimonia, T 2–5 texts); use of Aristobulus as source, 216 n. 79, 219 n. 95, 221 n. 107, 222 n. 110, 224 n. 120, 241 n. 168
Context (literary) of fragments::
Frg. 1, 198 n. 1
Frg. 2, 204 n. 22
Frg. 2a, 210 n. 49
Frg. 3, 211 n. 60
Frg. $3a^1$, 217 n. 86
Frg. 3a, 212 n. 61
Frg. 3b, 216 n. 79
Frg. 4, 217 n. 89
Frg. 4a, 218 n. 95
Frg. 4b, 221 n. 107
Frg. 4c, 222 n. 110
Frg. 5, 223 n. 119
Frg. 5a, 224 n. 120
Frg. 5b, 228 n. 130
Frg. 5c, 233, n. 146
Frg. 5d, 234, n. 149
Frg. 5e, 241 n. 169
Cosmogonic speculation, and Linus, 238 n. 161
Cosmogony, 215 n. 75
Crates, 58
Creation, 229 n. 139
Creation, timelessness of, 229 n. 139

Cyprus, possible provenance of Aristobulus, 75, 81 n. 39
Cyril of Alexandria, *Contra Iulianum*, 91 n. 147; testimony re Aristobulus, 125 (T 15, text)
Demetrius of Phalerum, 49, 55, 64, 65, 67, 86 n. 90, **213–14 n. 70** (with bibliog.), 213 n. 69, 215 n. 72, 216 n. 81, 217 n. 85
Demetrius the Chronographer, 213 n. 69, 215 n. 72
Dionysius Telmaharensis, testimony re Aristobulus, 120 (T 8c, text)
Dogmatopoiia, 216 n. 78
Dystrus, 200 n. 4
Ennomos, 230 n. 241
Eponyms, in addressing kings, 206 n. 26
Equinox, vernal, 198 n. 1, 201 n. 9, 203 n. 21
Eusebius, testimony re Aristobulus, **44–45**, **47**, 119 (T 8, text), 121 (T 9, text), 122–24 (T10–14, texts)
"Expanded sense," 206 n. 31
Ezekiel the Tragedian, 215 n. 73
Fabricius, 55
Florilegia, Pythagorean, 89 n. 123, 235 n. 155, 236 n. 157
Frg. 5, commentary on Gen 2:2–3, 224 n. 119
Gelon, King of Syracuse, 71
Greek dependence on Jews, 44, 52, 58, 68, 74, 94 n. 156, **207–9 n. 26**, 212 n. 61, 214 n. 71, 217 n. 86, 217–18 n. 89, 234 n. 149
Greek plagiarism of Jews, 210 n. 49, 211–12 n. 60
Greek poets, pseudonymous, 51, 53, 58, 60, 62, 67, 70–71, 80 n. 27, 88 n. 108, 89 n. 120
Greek wisdom, Egyptian origins, 208–9 n. 26
Hairesis, 205 n. 24, 223 n. 116
Hand, representing activity, 209 n. 40
Hecataeus, Pseudo-, 53, 57, 58, 60, 62, 66–67 (& Orphic poem), 71, 87 nn. 101 & 107, 89 n. 125
Hermippus of Smyrna, 49, 55, 68, 208 n. 26
Hesiod, Pseudo-, 234 n. 154
Hesiod, quotations in Aristobulus, 234 n. 152
Hesiod, "seven" verses, 70
Homer, Pseudo-, 235 n. 155, 236 nn. 156 & 158, 238 n. 163
Homer, quotations in Aristobulus, 234 n. 152
Index to Editions and Translations, 107–113
Intercalary cycle, 199 n. 2
Introduction to Aristobulus, 43–75
Invasions of Egypt, 214 n. 71
Jerome, testimony re Aristobulus, 119 (T 8, text), 121–22 (T 9a, text)
Jerusalem, provenance of Aristobulus, 75
Josephus, knowledge of Alexander Polyhistor, 63, 85 n. 85
Josephus, literary predecessors, 63; mention of Philo, 63; use of sources, 63, 85 n. 85
Letter of Second Maccabees 1:10–2:18, 77 n. 2
Light, primal, 225 n. 123; wisdom and knowledge, 225 n. 123
Linus, 225 n. 123, 236 n. 156, **237–8 n. 161**, 238 n. 162 (& Callimachus); cosmogonic speculation, 238 n. 161; "seven" verses, 70
Literalist interpreters in Philo, 209 n. 37
Logos, as cosmic law, 230 n. 142; hypostatized, 218 n. 93; use in Aristobulus, 231 n. 142
Luni-solar calendar, 199 n. 2
Lysis, Letter of, to Hipparchus, 232 n. 144
Manuscripts
Clement *Protr.*, 1

Clement *Strom.*, 1–2
Eusebius *H.E.*, 2
Eusebius *P.E.*, 3
Megasthenes, 68, 92 n. 147, 208 n. 26
Menorah, and seven planets, 241 n. 167
Metapherō, 210 n. 44
Meton, 199 n. 2
Metonic intercalary cycle, 199 n. 2
"midrash, philosophic-hellenistic," 59
Moses, inventor of philosophy, 212 n. 64
Musaeus, Jewish writer (?), 201 n. 12
Mythikos, 207 n. 32
Nisan, 200 n. 4
Notes to Introduction, 76–96
Numbering of fragments, 76 n. 1
Number speculation, 224–6 n. 123
Numbers, prime, 239 n. 166
Number symbolism in Pythagoreanism, 226 n. 123
Oniads, 53, 71, 77 n. 3, 92 n. 150
Origen, testimony re Aristobulus, **48**, 116 (T 6, text)
Orpheus, and Linus, 237 n. 161
Orpheus, Pseudo-, 51–52, 56, 58, 60–61, 61 (Walter's treatment of), 62, 66, 69–70, 79 n. 16, **219–20 n. 103**
Orphica, bibliography, 105–6
Panaeas, 202 n. 14
Paschal contoversy, 198 n. 1
Passover, 44, 203 n. 20; cosmic significance, 203 n. 21; determining date, 77 n. 3, 198 n. 1, 201 n. 9, 202 n. 16, 203 n. 21; in Philo, 203 n. 20; terminology, 203 n. 20
Peripatetic, Aristobulus as, **204 n. 24**; designation for Aristobulus, 72–73; list of references re Aristobulus, 90 n. 137; meaning in Hellenistic period, 72, 205–6 n. 24; school, 205 n. 24, 223 n. 116; wisdom as lamp, 226–7 n. 125
Phamenoth, 200 n. 3
Pharmuthi, 200 n. 4
Philadelphus, eponym, 72, 90 nn. 134–35, 216 n. 81
Philo of Alexandria
anthropomorphisms, 206 n. 29
as Pythagorean, 72–73, 205 n. 24
eight-part soul, 230 n. 142
God's descent on Sinai, 211 n. 59
literalist interpreters in, 209 n. 37
mention of predecessors, 55
relation to Aristobulus, 52, 53, 58, 59–60, 62, 65–66, 80 n. 35, 86 nn. 93 & 95, 87 n. 96, 87 n. 98 (list of parallel passages), 203 n. 20, 206 n. 29, 208–9 n. 26, 218 n. 94, 226 n. 123, 229 n. 139, 231 n. 142
sabbath as "birthday of world," 225 n. 123
twofold sense of Scripture, 60, 66
use of priority/dependence topos, 68
Philolaus, 225 n. 123, 235 n. 154, 240 n. 166
Physikos, 64, 87 n. 98, **206–7 n. 31**, 224 n. 122
Plagiarism, of Jews by Greek, 218 n. 95, 234 n. 149
Planets, 240 n. 167; seven, and menorah, 241 n. 167
Plausibility of literary strategy, 71
Poetic pseudepigraphy, 89 n. 122
Posidonius, 211 n. 58
Primal light, 225 n. 123
Prime numbers, 239 n. 166
Priority/dependence topos, 62, 68 (in Philo, in Jewish & Greek writers), 86 n. 93, 88 nn. 110–12, 94 n. 157 (Aristobulus' literary purpose, list of references), **207–9 n. 26**, 208 n. 26 (among Jewish and pagan writers, & in Philo), 217 n. 86, 234 n. 149,
Proverbs 8:22–31, 227 n. 128
Proverbs 8, 75
Pseudepigraphy, 71, 89 n. 124; poetic, 89 n. 122
Pseudo-Aristotle *De mundo*, 70, 94 n. 155

Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 57, 62, 67, 81 n. 39, 95 nn. 160–61, 202 n. 15, 213 n. 70, 216 n. 81
Ptolemy I Soter, 217 n. 83
Ptolemy VI Philometor, 46, 47, 55, 56, 61, 62, 70, 71, 74, 94 n. 160 (addressee of Aristobulus' work), 206 n. 26, 212 n. 65
Pythagoras, 208 n. 26 (relation to Egypt), 216 n. 76, 219 n. 96
Pythagorean, epithet for Philo, 72
Pythagorean florilegia, 71, 89 n. 123, 235 n. 155, 236 n. 157
Pythagoreanism
and Judaism, 235 n. 154
bibliography, 106
cosmic speculation, 237 n. 161
harmony of spheres, 240 n. 167
number seven in, 224–25 n. 123
number speculation, 59, 235 n. 154
number symbolism, 226 n. 123
number ten, 240 n. 166
setting for Linus verses, 237 n. 161, 239 n. 165
seven planets, 240 n. 167
traditions, 59
"wisdom as lamp," 226 n. 125
wisdom definition, 232 n. 144
Quartodeciman controversy, 198 n. 1
"Rest" motif, 234 n. 150
"Resting," God's, 44
Rufinus, 202 n. 14; testimony re Aristobulus, 118–19 (T 7b, text)
Sabbath, 44
and creation of light, 224 n. 123
and wisdom, 225 n. 123
"birthday of world," 225 n. 123 (in Philo), 239 n. 165
epistemological key to knowledge of cosmos, 231 n. 142
philosophical significance, **224–6 n. 123**
sign of "sevenfold cosmic principle," **230–32 n. 142**
"Sabbath verses," 58, 60, 70
School, Judaism as philosophical, 223 n.116
Second Maccabees 1:10–2:18, letter, 77 n. 2
Second Maccabees 1:10, testimony re Aristobulus, **45–46**, 47, 48, 53, 55, 63, 74, 79 n. 10 (Hody's view), 92 n. 149, 114 (T 1, text)
Second Maccabees, bibliography, 106
Sēmainō, 206 n. 28, 222 n. 111 (technical hermeneutical term)
Septuagint, origins, 215 n. 72; translation, 213 n. 70; translation of, in Aristobulus, 67, 216 n. 80
Seven
and Apollo, 234 n. 153
as "ruler, leader," 225 n. 123
in Philo, 240 n. 166
in Pythagoreanism, 224 n. 123, 225 n. 123, 240 n. 166, 240 n. 167 (seven planets)
planets, 240 n. 167
principle of, 44
significance of, **224–6 n. 123**, 235 n. 154
the number, 71
Seven-day periods, in Homer, 236 n. 155
Sevenfold principle of cosmic regularity, 233 n. 147, 236 n. 160
Seventh day, and Apollo, 239 n. 165; birthday of Apollo, 234 n. 153; day of Apollo, 234 n. 153
Sigla, text-critical, 4
Silence, argument from, 58, 78 n. 9
Silence of the tradition, scholars stating argument, 85 n. 81
Solon, 241 n. 168
Sophocles, Pseudo-, 67, 71
Sophronius, testimony re Aristobulus, 122 (T 9b, text)

Soul, eight-part, 230 n. 142
Sozomen, testimony re Aristobulus, 117 (T 7a, text)
Spheres, harmony of, in Pythagoreanism, 240 n. 167
Stoicism
allegory, 204 n. 23, 205 n. 24
anthropology, 280 n. 142
cosmology, 230 n. 142
epistemology, 230 n. 142
ethics, 223 n. 118
influence on Aristobulus, 73, 219 n. 100
definition of philosophy, 233 n. 144
divine pervading cosmos, 221 n. 108
eight-part soul, 230, n. 142
in Aratus, 221 n. 104
in Orphic poem, 91 nn. 143–44
reason, one of eight faculties of soul, 230 n. 142
wisdom, definition of, **232–33 n. 144**
Ten, in Pythagoreanism, 240 n. 166
Testimonia, 114–26
Theology, natural, 233 n. 144
Theophrastus, 85 n. 83, 208 n. 26
Time, created by God, 229 n. 138
Tübingen Theosophy, 212 n. 65
Tübingen Theosophy, testimony re Aristobulus, 125 (T 14a, text)
Virtues, Jewish emphasis on, 223 n. 118
"We passages," 92 n. 148
Wisdom
and Sabbath, 225 n. 123
as lamp, 72, **226–7 n. 125**
epistemological key to cosmic knowledge, 233 n. 145
hypostatized, 227 n. 128
Jewish definition, 232 n. 144
pre-existent, 232 n. 143
source of light, 228 n. 129
Stoic definition, 73, **232–33 n. 144**
Wisdom of Solomon, relation to Aristobulus, **227–28 n. 128** (list of similarities)
Word of God, as act, 218 n. 94
Xanthicus, 200 n. 4
Zeus, 44, 220 n. 103, 221 n. 104, 222 n. 112; in *Ep. Arist.*, 222 n. 112; name changed to "God," 222 n. 112; significance of name, 223 n. 113
Zodiac, 200 nn. 5 & 7, 201 n. 8, 203 n. 19

MODERN AUTHOR INDEX

Adler, C., 199 n. 1
Adler, M., 19
Adler, W., 17
Altmann, A., 97
Angelino, C., 97
Anscombe, A., 198 n. 1
Arnim, J. von, 17
Attridge, H. W., 17
Bailey, C., 227 n. 126
Bardenhewer, 198 n. 1
Bardy, G., 13, 14
Baron, S. W., 17, 97
Barton, T., 199 n. 1
Baur, L., 97
Bayer, E., 214 n. 70
Beloch, K. J., 17
Bergk, T., 17, 97
Bernfeld, S., 17, 97
Bernhardy, G., 18, 97
Betz, O., 218 n. 90
Bickerman, 106
Bickerman, E., 18, 71, 77 n. 2 (re 2 Macc 1:10 letter), 97, 106, 199 n. 1
Binde, R., 57, 97
Böker, R., 200 n. 5
Bombelli, L., 8, 18
Borgen, P., 97
Bousset, W., 18, 54, 67, 80 n. 38, 97
Bowen, A. C., 199 n. 1
Braun, M., 18
Bréhier, E., 18, 54, 97
Brucker, J., 97
Büchler, A., 18
Bunge, J.-C., 106
Burkert, W., 106
Burton, E., 13
Cardauns, B., 19
Cerfaux, L., 19, 97
Chadwick, H., 54,, 81 n. 42, 83 n. 70, 198 n. 1
Charlesworth, J. H., 8, 19, 97
Christ, W., 19, 97
Clemen, C., 97
Cobet, C. G., 19, 98
Cohn, L., 19, 54, 80 n. 37, 98
Collins, A. Y., 62, 98
Collins, J. J., 19, 62, 69, 98
Colson, F. H., 198 n. 1
Coman, J., 98
Conybeare and Stock, 82 n. 53
Conzemann, H., 19, 98
Couat, A., 19
Crusé, C. F., 13
Dähne, A. F., 20, **56–57**, 98
Dalbert, P., 20, 98
Dale, A. von, 55
Delitzsch, F., 20, 98
Delling, G., 20, 98
Denis, A.-M., 7–8, 20, 62, 98
de Rossi, A., 20
des Places, E., 11
de Valois, H., 12
DeVries, S. J., 199 n. 1
Diels, H., 20
Dihle, A., 20, 98
Dindorf, W., 10, 15, 98
Dittenberger, W., 21
Döllinger, J. J. I., 98
Doran, R., 21, 106
Dörrie, H., 98
Dow, S., 214 n. 70
Drummond, J., 21, **51**, 98
Dubnow (Dubnov), S., 21, 98
Edmonds, J. M., 211 n. 54
Ehrlich, 98
Eichhorn, J. G., 21, **50**, 68, 69, 98
Elter, A., 21, **51–52**, 60, 65, 66 (theory of Ps.-Orpheus tradition), 68, 69 (re Ps.-Orpheus tradition), 98, 105
Erbse, H., 21

Ewald, H., 21–22, 98
Eyselein, K., 98
Fabricius, J. A., 22, 98
Fairweather, W. 99
Feldmann, L. H., 22, 99
Ferguson, W. S., 214 n. 70
Fiebig, P., 99
Finegan, J., 199 n. 1
Foakes-Jackson, F. J., 26
Fraikin, D., 105
Frank, E., 106
Fraser, P. M., 22, 62, 99
Frend, W. H. C., 198 n. 1
Freudenthal, J., 7, 22, 57, 99
Friedländer, M., 22, 99, 199 n. 1
Früchtel, L., 15
Fuks, A., 34
Fürst, J., 22, 99
Gabler, J., 81 n. 45 (review of Valckenaer), 99
Gager, J., 22
Gaisford, T., 10
Geffcken, J. 22, 99
Gelzer, H., 22–23
Georgi, D., 23, 99, 105
Gercke, A., 54, 75, 81 n. 39 (Cyprus provenance), 99
Gfrörer, A. F., 23, **56–57**, 82 n. 59, 99
Gifford, E. H., 10, 11
Ginzberg, L., 23
Goldstein, B. R., 199 n. 1
Goldstein, J. A., 106
Goodenough, E. R., 23, 99
Goppelt, L., 99
Gordon, C. H., 23
Goulet, R., 99
Graetz, H. 23–24, **50-51**, 68, 72, 99, 208 n. 26 (Philo's use of priority/dependence topos)
Grapin, E., 13, 14
Gressmann, H., 18, 97
Gundel, H. G., 199 n. 1, 200 n. 5
Gundel, W., 199 n. 1
Gutmann, J., 99
Gutman, Y., 24, 99
Gutschmid, A., 24
Habicht, C., 106
Hadas, M., 24, 54, 99
Hamburger, J., 99
Hamp, V., 99
Haneberg, D. B. von, 99
Hanson, R. P. C., 100
Harnack, A., 24
Häuser, P., 14
Hay, D. M., 207 n. 31
Heath, T. L., 199 n. 1, 200 n. 2
Hedio, C., 14
Hegermann, H., 24, 100
Heinemann, I., 19, 100
Heinichen, F. A., 9, 12–13
Heinisch, P., 24, 100
Heinze, M., 100
Heller, J., 100
Hengel, M., 24–25, 61, 83 n. 71 (*Judentum u. Hellenismus*), 100
Herriot, E., 25, 57, 100, 222 n. 108
Herzfeld, L., 25, 100
Hodson, F. R., 199 n. 1
Hody, H., 25, **49–50**, 78 n. 6, 79 n. 10, 100
Hody, H., & R. Simon, 78 n. 4
Hoek, A. van de Bunt-van den, 100
Holladay, C. R., 26, 101, 105
Holtzmann, O., 26, 101
Horst, P. W. van der, 26, 222 n. 112 (Acts 17:23)
Huffman, C. A., 240 n. 166
Hultsch, F., 198 n. 1
Hundhausen, J., 101
Iōannidēs, B. Ch., 101
Jackson, F. J. Foakes, 26
Jacobson, H., 26
Jacoby, F., 7
Jellicoe, S., 78 n. 5

Jeremias, J., 26
Joël, M., 27, **51**, 69, 101
Jones, A. H. M., 27
Juster, J., 27
Kahana, A., 27, 101
Kannicht, R., 27
Karpeles, G., 27, 101
Keller, R., 58, 101
Kidd, B. J., 198 n. 1
Kippenberg, H. G., 27
Kirk, G. S., 27
Klauck, H.-J., 27, 101
Klijn, A. F. J., 101
Knaack, G., 27, 221 n. 104
Kraft, H., 101
Kranz, W., 20
Kraus Reggiani, C., 101
Küchler, M., 28, 101
Kuenen, A., **51**, 101
Kuhn, P., 101
LaFargue, M., 105
Lake, K., 13, 14, 26
Laqueur, R., 28
Lawlor, H. J., 14
Leipoldt, J., 101
Lesky, A., 28, 101
Levesque, E., 101
Lieberman, S., 28
Lightfoot, J. B., 200 n. 2
Lloyd, G. E. R., 199 n. 1, 200 n. 2
Lloyd-Jones, H., 28
Lobeck, C. A., 28, **50**, 69-70, 79 n. 16 (Aristobulus postdates Clement), 101, 106
Loeb, I., 101
Lohse, E., 101
Lumbroso, G., 28
Lutterbeck, J. A. B., 28, 82 n. 53 (Aristobulus, author of Wis Sol), 102, 227 n. 128
Luzac, J., 54
Maass, E., 221 n. 104
Mahaffy, J. P., 28
Maier, J., 29
Mair, A. W., 221 n. 104
Mair, G. R., 221 n. 104
Marcus, R., 29, 102
Martini, E., 214 n. 70
Martin, J. (*Aratus*), 221 n. 104
Martín, J. P., 102
Mayer, G., 102
McGiffert, A. C., 13
Meecham, H. G., 86 n. 91
Meeks, W. A., 29
Mendels, D., 29
Meyer, R., 102
Migne, J. P., 10, 11, 13, 15
Momigliano, A., 29, 77 n. 2 (re 2 Macc letter), 102, 106
Mommsen, T., 15
Mondésert, C., 11, 15, 16
Morenz, S., 101
Mras, K., 10–11, 102
Müller, C, 7
Müller, J. G., 29
Murray, O., 102
Nauck, W., 102
Nestle, E., 102, 217 n. 85
Neugebauer, O., 199 n. 1, 200 n. 2
Neumark, D., 29, 102
Nicholai, R., 29
Nicklin, T., 198 n. 1
Nilsson, M. P., 30
Nock, A. D., 30
Nomachi, A., 102
Oden, R. A., Jr., 17
Oulton, J. E. L., 14
Overbeck, F., 16
Parsons, P., 28
Pépin, J., 30, 102, 209 n. 37
Peterson, E., 30
Pfeiffer, R. H., 30
Philippson, L. M., 30
Powell, J. U., 30

Poznański, S., 198 n. 1
Praechter, K., 30, 102
Quasten, J., 30
Radice, R., 30, 102
Raven, J., 27
Reinach, T., 30
Renan, E., 30, 102
Riedweg, C., 219 n. 101
Riessler, P., 8
Rohde, E., 31
Rordorf, W., 226 n. 123
Roscher, W. H., 102–3
Rossi, A. de, 20, 31, 93 n. 155, 103
Routh, M. J., 31
Runia, D. T., 30, 31, 103
Sabugal, S., 103
Safrai, S., 31
Salvaneschi, E., 97
Sandelin, K.-G., 103
Sandmel, S., 54, 103
Scaliger, J. J., 54
Schalit, A., 31
Schaller, J. B., 103
Schenkl, H., 103
Schlatter, A., 31, 103, 213 n. 69, 215 n. 72
Schmid-Stählin, 32, 103
Schmid, W., 32
Schneider, C., 54
Schofield, M., 27
Schreiner, J., 29
Schroeder, G., 11
Schubert, K., 32, 104
Schürer, E., 32, **57**, 62, 66–67, 69 (re Ps.-Orpheus), 83 n. 66, 104
Schwartz, E., 13, 199 n. 1
Segal, J. B., 203 n. 21
Séguier, 11
Seissel, C., 14
Siegert, F., 32
Siegfried, C., 32, 104
Simon, R., 32, 49, 78 n. 5, 104
Sirinelli, J., 11
Smallwood, E. M., 33
Smyth, H. W., 33
Snell, B., 27, 33
Sowers, S. G., 104
Stählin, O., 15, 16, 32, 33
Starobinski-Safran, E., 104
Stearns, W. N., 7, 33, 104
Stein, E., 33, 58, 65, 87 (arguments re Aristobulus and Philo), 104, 218 n. 94
Stephanus, R., 9, 12
Stern, M., 31, 33
Stigloher, M., 14
Stöckl, A., 34, 104
Stone, M. E., 34
Susemihl, F., 34, 57, 104
Swete, H. B., 34
Sylburg, F., 15
Tcherikover, V., 34, 71, 104
Teuffel, W. S., 104
Theiler, W., 19
Thesleff, H., 106, 232 n. 144, 226 n. 125
Thraede, K., 34, 104
Thyen, H., 34, 104
Tiede, D. L., 34, 62, 104
Tramezzino, M., 12
Tramontano, R., 104
Trapezunt, G., 12
Travis, A. H., 214 n. 70
Trencsényi-Waldapfel, I., 104
Treu, U., 15
Turner, C. H., 198 n. 1
Ueberweg, F., 35, 104
Vaillant, V., 35
Valckenaer, L. C., 35, 51, **54–56**, 61, 68, 70, 81 n. 45 (*De Aristobulo*), 81–82, nn. 45–57, 82 n. 54 (apologetic argument vindicating Christian authors), 104
Valesini, D., 97
Valesius, H., 12, 14
Viger(us), F., 9, 12, 77 (section numbers)

Vogt, E., 8–9
Volkmann, R., 35
Wacholder, B. Z., 35, 106
Walter, N., 8–9, 35–36, **58–62**, 65–66, 69
(views on Ps.-Orpheus), 74, 83 n. 70
(*Thoraausleger*, list of reviews), 87 n. 97 (arguments re Aristobulus and Philo), 104, 220 n. 103 (Orphic poem in Aristobulus), 104–5
Wegenast, K., 105
Wehrli, F., 214 n. 70
Wendland, P., 36, **52–53**, 59, 65–66, 69–70, 80 nn. 30-31, 86 n. 95 (Aristobulus' dependence on Philo), 105, 218 n. 94, 226 n. 123,
Wesseling, P., 35, 81 n. 45 (essay on Orphic frgs.), 105
Westcott, B. F., 105
Willrich, H., 36, **53–54**, 63, 67, 71, 77 n. 3 (Aristobulus & Oniads), 105
Wilpert, P., 227 n. 126
Wilson, W., 16
Winer, J. G. B., 105
Wobbermin, G., 36, 105
Wolff, C., 105
Wolfson, H. A., 37, 105
Yarbro, A., 105
Zeegers-Vander Vorst, N., 37
Zeller, E., 37, **57**, 72, 105
Ziegler, K., 37
Zuntz, G., 105

GREEK TERMS DISCUSSED

ἀγαθόν, τὸ, 238–39 n. 165
αἵρεσις, 205 n. 24, 223 n. 116
ἀλληγορία, 204 n. 23
ἀνάπαυσις, 234 n. 150
ἀνθρώπινος, 207 n. 33
ἀνυποστάτως, 211 n. 52
ἀπαγγέλλω, 206 n. 28
ἀπεοικότως, 223 n. 114
ἀριθμοί, 239 n. 165
ἀταραξία, **227 n. 126**
ἀφῆλιξ, ἀφήλικες, 211 n. 54
βιβλία ἱκανά, 46, 74, 212 n. 62
βίβλοι ἐξηγητικαί, 215 n. 72
γενέθλη, 239 n. 165
γενέθλιος, 225 n. 123, 239 n. 165
διαβατήρια, 203 n. 20
διαλήψεις ὅσιαι, 64, 223 n. 115
διασαφέω, 206 n. 28, 209 n. 38, 228 n. 131
διερμηνεύω, **215 n. 72**
δικαιοσύνη, 64, 223 n. 118
διοικέω, 221 n. 108
Δίς, 221 n. 104, 222 n. 112
δογματοποιΐα, 216 n. 78
δύναμις, 232 n. 143
δύναμις θεοῦ, 221 n. 108
δωδεκατημόρια, 200 n. 5
δωδεκατημόριον, 200 n. 7
ἑβδομάς, ἑβδόματος, ἕβδομος, κτλ. **224–26 n. 123**, 228 n. 133, 230–32 n. 142, 231 n. 142 (*λόγος*), 233 n. 147, 234 n. 153, 235 n. 154, 236 n. 156, **236–37 n. 160** (*λόγος*), 238 n. 163, 238–39 n. 165, 239–40 n. 166
ἐγκράτεια, 64, 223 n. 118
ἐκδοχή, 206 n. 30
ἔννομος, 230 n. 141
ἐξήγησις, 215 n. 72
ἑορτή, 203 n. 20
ἐπιφάνεια, 207 n. 31
ἔργον, 218 n. 94
ἑρμηνεία, 207 n. 31, 215 n. 72
εὐσέβεια, 64, 223 n. 118
Ζεύς, 221 n. 104, 222 n. 112
ἡγεμονικόν, τὸ, 230 n. 142
ἠθικῶς, 207 n. 31
ἦμαρ, 235 n. 155
θεία φωνή, 218 n. 90
θεός, 221 n. 104
ἱερὸν ἦμαρ, 235 n. 155, 236 n. 156
ἱερὸς λόγος, 219 n. 101
κατάβασις, 210 n. 50
κατακολουθέω, 213 n. 66
κατασκευαὶ μεγάλων πραγμάτων, 207 n. 31
κατασκευή, 218 n. 91
καταχωρίζω, 216 n. 77, 217 n. 88
λαμπρός, 235 n. 154
λαμπτήρ (σοφία), **226–27 n. 125**
λίνος, 237 n. 161
λόγος, 210 n. 47, 218 n. 91, **230–32 n. 142**, 231 n. 142 (*ἕβδομος*), **236–37 n. 160** (*ἕβδομος*)
λόγος θεοῦ, 218 nn. 93 & 94
μεγαλεῖον, τὸ, 209 n. 38
μέρη, 200 n. 5
μεταποιέω, 229 n. 139
μεταφέρω, 87 n. 98, 210 n. 44
μυθικῶς, 207 n. 32
μυθῶδες, 64, 87 n. 98, 207 n. 32
νομοθεσία, 215 n. 75, 229 n. 136
νοῦς, 224 n. 123, 226–27 n. 125
ὅσιος, 223 n. 115
πάσχα, 203 n. 20
παύω, 228 n. 132
περιεργάζομαι, 219 n. 98
Περιπατητικός, 90 n. 137, **204–6 n. 24**
πνεῦμα, 232 n. 143

προεῖπον, 237 n. 160
πρότερος, 240 n. 166
πρῶτοι ἀριθμοί, 239 n. 166
Πυθαγόρειος, 205 n. 24
ῥητός, 218 n. 91
σημαίνω, 206 n. 28, 222 n. 111
σημεῖον, 210 n. 44
σοφία, **223–24 n. 123**, **226–27 n. 125**, **232–33 n. 144** (Stoic definition)
σύμβολον, 210 n. 44
συνέχω, 219 n. 100, 229 n. 139
τάξις, 228 n. 134
τέτταρες κτλ., 236 n. 157, 238 n. 163
τεύχω, 240 n. 167
τμῆμα, 200 n. 5
τομαὶ ιβ΄, 200 n. 5
τροπικῶς, 204 n. 23
ὑγιαίνειν, 77 n. 2
ὑπόνοια, 204 n. 23
φαέθω, 235 n. 154
φαεσίμβροτος, 235 n. 154
Φιλάδελφος, 72, 95 n. 161
φυσικαὶ διαθέσεις, 207 n. 31, 207 n. 34
φυσικοὶ ἄνδρες, 207 n. 31
Φυσικῶν δόξαι, 85 n. 83
φυσικῶς, 64, 87 n. 98, **206–7 n. 31**, 224 n. 122
φωνή, 218 n. 90
φωτὸς γένεσις, 224–25 n. 123
φῶς, **223–24 n. 123**, 235 n. 154
χαίρειν, 77 n. 2
ψυχή, 230–32 n. 142

449883
THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

0000083

BS
1197
F68
1968
v.3

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA
91711

449883

DEMCO

TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS 39
PSEUDEPIGRAPHA SERIES 13

SOCIETY OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE 1995