Philo of Alexandria's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment

Society of Biblical Literature

Studia Philonica Monographs

General Editor
Thomas H. Tobin, S.J.

Number 6
Philo of Alexandria's Exposition
of the Tenth Commandment

PHILO OF ALEXANDRIA'S EXPOSITION OF THE TENTH COMMANDMENT

Hans Svebakken

Society of Biblical Literature
Atlanta

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Philo, of Alexandria.
[De Decalogo. Selections. English]
Philo of Alexandria's exposition on the Tenth Commandment / by Hans Svebakken.
pages. cm. — (Studia philonica monographs ; 6)
ISBN 978-1-58983-618-1 (paper binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-792-8 (hardcover binding : alk. paper) — ISBN 978-1-58983-619-8 (electronic format)
1. Ten commandments—Covetousness—Early works to 1800. I. Svebakken, Hans. II. Title.
BV4710.P4513 2012
296.3'6—dc23

2012034228

Printed on acid-free, recycled paper conforming to ANSI/NISO Z39.48-1992 (R1997) and ISO 9706:1994 standards for paper permanence.

STUDIA PHILONICA MONOGRAPHS

Studies In Hellenistic Judaism

The Studia Philonica Monographs series accepts monographs in the area of Hellenistic Judaism, with special emphasis on Philo and his *Umwelt*. Proposals for books in this series should be sent to the Editor: Prof. Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., Theology Department, Loyola University Chicago, 1032 W. Sheridan Road, Chicago IL 60660-1537, U.S.A; Email: ttobin@luc.edu.

Written with the financial support of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (N.W.O.)

Published with the financial support of the
Prof. dr. C. J. de Vogel Foundation

Behold me daring, not only to read the sacred messages of Moses, but also in my love of knowledge to peer into each of them and unfold and reveal what is not known to the multitude.

Philo of Alexandria, *De specialibus legibus* 3.6

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study grew out of a doctoral seminar in Hellenistic Judaism offered by Thomas Tobin, S.J., at Loyola University Chicago. In that seminar, he sparked my interest in Philo—then he helped to shape some of the ensuing ideas into a dissertation, completed in 2009 under his direction and appearing here in a revised and updated form. At every critical juncture of this extensive project, his expert guidance steered me toward a better outcome. My debt of gratitude has now come full circle, since he became the editor of Studia Philonica Monographs shortly after this volume was accepted for publication, helping me to finish at last the study he helped to begin.

Of course, I have many others to thank for helping me with this project. The faculties of Classical Studies and Theology at Loyola generously gave me years of support, training, and encouragement. In particular, I want to thank Robert Di Vito (Theology) and James Keenan (Classical Studies), readers of my dissertation, along with two professors no longer at Loyola, David E. Aune and John L. White. Among Loyola's staff, I want to thank the theology department's Catherine Wolf and Marianne Wolfe, along with the staff at Cudahy Library's interlibrary loan office. Gregory Sterling of Yale Divinity School first read my dissertation on behalf of Studia Philonica Monographs. I want to thank him for his encouraging remarks, for his helpful suggestions and corrigenda, and for recommending my work for publication. In addition, I want to thank both Leigh Andersen, Managing Editor of SBL Publications, for her friendly and accommodating supervision of this project, and Gonni Runia, for formatting the manuscript for publication. In the final stages before publication, Joseph Latham and Cambry Pardee provided valuable assistance (with the indexing and proofreading respectively), and I owe both of them a word of thanks. Finally, I want to thank the Arthur J. Schmitt Foundation for funding my first year of dissertation research through the Schmitt Dissertation Fellowship.

I have a large extended family, and each member—in his or her own way—deserves a personal word of thanks, but for brevity's sake I'll mention here only my family of origin. My brother, Pete, and sister, Khris, never questioned my choice of a meandering academic career, and I appreciate their confidence. My father, Gene, gave me invaluable support in my student days and encouraged me with his questions about Philo. My mother, Kay, gave me a gift of love that continues to shape my life. Although she did

not live to see this fruit of my graduate school labors, I can well imagine her happy words and congratulations.

Three people inspire everything that I do. My wife, Mary Jane, graciously welcomed Philo into our lives and supported this project in every possible way. I cannot begin to express the value of her unfailing encouragement. Our son, Elias, arrived as I was completing chapter four of the dissertation. Our daughter, Annabeth, arrived as I was preparing this manuscript for publication. They have brought us extraordinary joy, and I hope that they know (if they happen to be reading this someday) just how much they are loved.

This has been a long journey, and I consider its completion a great blessing. Unsure of how to express my deepest sense of gratitude, I'll let Philo have the last word, in honor of our many hours together: "It is for God to give benefits and for mortals to give thanks, since they have nothing else to give in return" (*Plant.* 130).

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of primary sources are those of *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. Patrick H. Alexander et al.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), with the following exceptions:

Primary Sources

Colson	English trans. of *Spec.* 4 by F. H. Colson in vol. 8 of *Philo*. Translated by F. H. Colson et al. 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
Didask.	*Didaskalikos* by Alcinous. English trans. cited by ch. and sec. in *The Handbook of Platonism*. Translated with intro. and comm. by John Dillon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993. Gk. text cited in brackets by p. [ed. Hermann, 1853] and line in *Enseignement des doctrines de Platon*. Edited with intro. and comm. by John Whittaker. Translated by Pierre Louis. 2d ed. Paris: Belles Lettres, 2002 (e.g., *Didask.* 32.4 [186.14–18]).
DL	Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925.
Eclog.	*Eclogae Physicae et Ethicae* by Ioannes Stobaeus. Cited by p. and line in vol. 2 of Ioannes Stobaeus. *Anthologii libri duo priores*. 2 vols. Edited by Curt Wachsmuth. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884.
ESE	*Epitome of Stoic Ethics* by Arius Didymus. Cited by sec. in *Epitome of Stoic Ethics*. Edited by Arthur J. Pomeroy. Texts and Translations 44. Greco-Roman Series 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999.
Heinemann	German trans. of *Spec.* 4 by Isaak Heinemann in vol. 2 of *Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by L. Cohn, I. Heinemann, et al. 7 vols. Breslau, Berlin 1909–1964.
LS	A. A. Long and D. N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. Cited by section number and text letter (e.g., 25B).
Mazz.	Claudio Mazzarelli, "Raccolta e interpretazione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti del medioplatonico Eudoro di

	Alessandria: Parte prima: Testo e traduzione delle testimonianze e dei frammenti sicuri," *Rivista di filosofia neo-scolastica* 77 (1985): 197–209. Cited by fragment number and line (e.g., 1.10).
Mosès	French trans. of *Spec.* 4 by André Mosès in vol. 25 of *Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*. Edited by R. Arnaldez, J. Pouilloux, C. Mondésert. Paris, 1961–92.
PAPM	*Les œuvres de Philon d'Alexandrie*. French translation under the general editorship of R. Arnaldez, J. Pouilloux, C. Mondésert. Paris, 1961–92.
PCH	*Philo von Alexandria: Die Werke in deutscher Übersetzung*. Edited by L. Cohn, I. Heinemann, et al. 7 vols. Breslau, Berlin 1909–1964.
PCW	*Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Edited by L. Cohn, P. Wendland, S. Reiter. 6 vols. Berlin ,1896–1915.
Petit	*Philon d'Alexandrie: Quæstiones: Fragmenta Græca*. Edited and translated by Françoise Petit. Les œvres de Philon d'Alexandrie 33. Paris: Cerf, 1978.
PHP	*De Placitis Hippocratis et Platonis* by Galen. Cited by bk., ch., and sec. in *On the Doctrines of Hippocrates and Plato*. Edited and trans. with comm. by Phillip De Lacy. 3 vols. 2d ed. Corpus Medicorum Graecorum 5.4.1.2. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1980–84.
PLCL	*Philo in Ten Volumes (and Two Supplementary Volumes)*. Translated by F. H. Colson, G. H. Whitaker (and R. Marcus). 12 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1929–1962.
Ps.-Andr.	Pseudo-Andronicus, Περὶ παθῶν. Cited by p. and line in A. Gilbert-Thirry. *Pseudo-Andronicus de Rhodes «ΠΕΡΙ ΠΑΘΩΝ»: Edition critique du texte grec et de la traduction latine médiévale*. Corpus latinum commentariorum in Aristotelem graecorum. Supp. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1977.
Ps.-Arch.	Pseudo-Archytas, *On Moral Education*. Cited by p. [ed. Thesleff, 1965] and line in *Pseudopythagorica Ethica: I trattati morali di Archita, Metopo, Teage, Eurifamo*. Edited and translated by Bruno Centrone. Elenchos 17. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1990.

Ps.-Metop. Pseudo-Metopus, *On Virtue*. Cited by p. [ed. Thesleff, 1965] and line in *Pseudopythagorica Ethica: I trattati morali di Archita, Metopo, Teage, Eurifamo*. Edited and translated by Bruno Centrone. Elenchos 17. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1990.

Ps.-Theag. Pseudo-Theages, *On Virtue*. Cited by p. [ed. Thesleff, 1965] and line in *Pseudopythagorica Ethica: I trattati morali di Archita, Metopo, Teage, Eurifamo*. Edited and translated by Bruno Centrone. Elenchos 17. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1990.

SVF *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*. H. von Arnim. 4 vols. Leipzig, 1903–1924. Cited by vol., p., and line (e.g., III 113, 15).

TL Timaeus of Locri, *On the Nature of the World and the Soul*. Cited by paragraph in *Timaios of Locri*, On the Nature of the World and the Soul. Edited and trans. with notes by Thomas H. Tobin. Texts and Translations 26. Greco-Roman Religion Series 8. Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1985.

Troph.[B] Περὶ τροφῆς[B] by Musonius Rufus. Cited by p. and line in Cora E. Lutz. *Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates*. Yale Classical Studies 10. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1947.

Secondary Sources

AB Anchor Bible

ABD *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by D. N. Freedman. 6 vols. New York, 1992.

ACPQ *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*

AJP *American Journal of Philology*

ALGHJ Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums

AMMTC Ancient Mediterranean and Medieval Texts and Contexts

AMP Ancient and Medieval Philosophy

ANRW *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Edited by H. Temporini and W. Haase. Berlin, 1972—

AP *Ancient Philosophy*

ARGU Arbeiten zur Religion und Geschichte des Urchristentums

ASE *Annali di storia dell'esegesi*

ASNSP *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*

ASR *Annali di scienze religiose*

BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BEATAJ	Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum
BEHE	Bibliotheque de l'Ecole des hautes études
BICSSup	Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies: Supplements
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies
BThSt	Biblisch-Theologische Studien
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQ	*Catholic Biblical Quarterly*
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series
CCWJCW	Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200
CEC	Collection d'études classiques
CJA	Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity
CQ	*Classical Quarterly*
CR	*Classical Review*
CRINT	Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CS	Collected Studies
CSCP	Cornell Studies in Classical Philology
CSP	Cornell Studies in Philosophy
CUAPS	Catholic University of America Patristic Studies
CWS	Classics of Western Spirituality. New York, 1978—
DCLY	Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook
ELA	Études de littérature ancienne
EP	Études platoniciennes
EPM	Études de philosophie médiévale
ETL	*Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*
ETR	*Études théologiques et religieuses*
EUSLR	Emory University Studies in Law and Religion
FIOTL	Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature
FJCD	Forschungen zum jüdisch-christlichen Dialog
GRBS	*Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*
GRRS	Greco-Roman Religion Series
HBS	Herders Biblische Studien
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society. Anthony W. Bulloch, Erich S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and Andrew F. Stewart, general editors.
HPhQ	*History of Philosophy Quarterly*
HSCP	*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*
HTR	*Harvard Theological Review*

JACE	Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband
JBL	*Journal of Biblical Literature*
JHS	*Journal of Hellenic Studies*
JJML	*Journal of Jewish Music and Liturgy*
JJS	*Journal of Jewish Studies*
JLAS	*Jewish Law Association Studies*
JSH	*Journal of Sport History*
JSHRZ	*Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*
JSNT	*Journal for the Study of the New Testament*
JSPSup	Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series
JTS	*Journal of Theological Studies*
LTE	Library of Theological Ethics
MCL	Martin Classical Lectures
MScRel	*Mélanges de science religieuse*
MdB	*Le monde de la Bible*
MP	*Museum Patavinum*
NAWG	*Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*
NovT	*Novum Testamentum*
NovTSup	Supplements to Novum Testamentum
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OPM	Oxford Philosophical Monographs
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
PA	Philosophia Antiqua
PASSV	*Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume*
PBACAP	*Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*
Ph&PhenR	*Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*
PhilSup	*Philologus: Supplementband*
PHR	*Problèmes d'histoire des religions*
REG	*Revue des études grecques*
REL	*Revue des études latines*
RKAM	Religion und Kultur der alten Mittelmeerwelt in Parallel forschungen
RM	*Review of Metaphysics*
RMCS	Routledge Monographs in Classical Studies
RSR	*Recherches de science religieuse*
RTL	*Revue théologique de Louvain*
SA	Studia Anselmiana
SAP	Studien zur antiken Philosophie
SBLTT	Society of Biblical Literature Texts and Translations

SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
ScEs	*Science et esprit*
SCHNT	Studia ad corpus hellenisticum Novi Testamenti
ScrTh	*Scripta Theologica*
SF	*Studi filosofici*
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
SJPh	*Southern Journal of Philosophy*
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SO	*Symbolae Osloenses*
SPh	*Studia Philonica*
SPhA	*Studia Philonica Annual*
SPhA	Studies in Philo of Alexandria
SPhAMA	Studies in Philo of Alexandria and Mediterranean Antiquity
SSEJC	Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity
STA	Studia et Testimonia Antiqua
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
TDNT	*Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by G. Kittel and G. Friedrich. Translated by G. W. Bromily. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, 1964–1976.
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
TSHP	New Synthese Historical Library: Texts and Studies in the History of Philosophy
TSP	Trivium: Special Publications
TUGAL	Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur
VC	*Vigiliae Christianae*
VCSup	Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WS	*Wiener Studien: Zeitschrift für Klassische Philologie und Patristik*
WS	World Spirituality: An Encyclopedic History of the Religious Quest
WTS	Wijsgerige Teksten en Studies
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZNW	*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche*

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The Septuagint version of Exodus 20:17, translated literally, reads as follows:

> You shall not desire your neighbor's wife. You shall not desire your neighbor's house, nor his field, nor his male servant, nor his female servant, nor his ox, nor his beast of burden, nor any of his flock, nor anything that is your neighbor's.[1]

This is the last of the Ten Commandments,[2] and although Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 B.C.E.–50 C.E.) must have known the full biblical version,[3] he cites the Tenth Commandment simply as "You shall not desire" (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις), indicating that in his view the principle concern of this Commandment is desire itself (ἐπιθυμία), not desire's object.[4]

---

[1] My translation of LXX Exod 20:17 [=LXX Deut 5:21 verbatim]: οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου. οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου οὔτε τὸν ἀγρὸν αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ οὔτε τὴν παιδίσκην αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ βοὸς αὐτοῦ οὔτε τοῦ ὑποζυγίου αὐτοῦ οὔτε παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ οὔτε ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν. For details on the text of Exod 20:17, including ancient versions, see Innocent Himbaza, *Le Décalogue et l'histoire du texte: Etudes des formes textuelles du Décalogue et leurs implications dans l'histoire du texte de l'Ancien Testament* (OBO 207; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2004), 155–65 (cf. 68–72).

[2] The Ten Commandments appear first in Exod 20:1–17 (cf. Deut 5:1–21) *spoken* by God and so become known as the "ten words," or in modern usage the "Decalogue" (N.B. LXX Deut 10:4: τοὺς δέκα λόγους). Philo often refers to them as οἱ δέκα λόγοι (e.g., *Decal.* 154, *Spec.* 1.1) or δέκα λόγια (e.g., *Decal.* 36, *Spec.* 3.7).

[3] Philo used the LXX, not the Hebrew Bible (see Valentin Nikiprowetzky, *Le commentaire de l'écriture chez Philon d'Alexandrie: Son caractère et sa portée, observations philologiques* [ALGHJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1977], 50–96, esp. 51–52). No evidence for an abbreviated version of the Tenth Commandment exists in the MS tradition of the LXX. On the LXX Pentateuch, see the introductory essays in *Le Pentateuque d'Alexandrie: Text grec et traduction* (ed. Cécile Dogniez and Marguerite Harl; Bible d'Alexandrie; Paris: Cerf, 2001), 31–130, including David Runia, "Philon d'Alexandrie devant le Pentateuque," 99–105.

[4] In *Spec.* 4.78, Philo cites the Tenth Commandment as an abbreviated, two-word prohibition: "Let us turn now to the last of the Ten Words (δέκα λογίων) … 'You shall not desire' (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις)" (my translation; unless otherwise noted, all translations of Philo's writings are from PLCL.) In *Decal.* 142, he clearly has this abbreviated version in mind: "Finally, he places a prohibition on desiring (τελευταῖον δ'ἐπιθυμεῖν ἀπαγορεύει), knowing that desire (τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν) is crafty and treacherous (νεωτεροποιὸν καὶ ἐπίβουλον)" (my translation). (Cf. *Decal.* 173: πέμπτον [of the second tablet] δὲ <u>τὸ ἀνεῖργον</u> τὴν τῶν ἀδικημάτων πηγήν, <u>ἐπιθυμίαν</u>; *Her.* 173: ἡ δ'ἑτέρα πεντάς ἐστιν <u>ἀπαγόρευσις</u> μοιχείας, ἀνδροφονίας, κλοπῆς, ψευδομαρτυρίας, <u>ἐπιθυμίας</u>.) In his discussion of the Tenth Commandment (*Decal.* 142–153, 173–174; *Spec.* 4.78b–131), Philo mentions none

This monograph explains in detail Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment. As an introduction, this chapter (1) situates Philo's exposition within his larger corpus of works, (2) summarizes the nature and content of the exposition, (3) explains the value of the exposition, (4) reviews prior research, and (5) outlines the plan of the monograph.

Philo's Commentary on Mosaic Legislation

Philo describes the contents of the Pentateuch as a sequence of three topics: creation, history, and legislation.[5] In a series of works known collectively as the Exposition of the Law, he offers an exegesis of the Pentateuch using these topics as his basic outline.[6] The Exposition begins with a treatise on the creation of the world (*De opificio mundi*), continues with a set of

---

of the prohibited objects of desire listed in the LXX version (οἰκία, ἀγρός, παῖς, παιδίσκη, βοῦς, ὑποζύγιον, κτῆνος), with the exception of γυνή, which appears once in a list that includes also "reputation" (δόξα) and categorically "anything else that produces pleasure" (τινος ἄλλου τῶν ἡδονὴν ἀπεργαζομένων) (*Decal.* 151). Similarly, πλησίος, an essential element of the LXX version (τοῦ πλησίον σου … ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν), appears only once (*Spec.* 4.93), and there it involves Platonic psychology: the θυμός, or spirited part of the soul, is a "neighbor" to the λόγος, or rational part.

[5] "The oracles delivered through the prophet Moses are of three kinds (τρεῖς ἰδέας). The first deals with the creation of the world (τὴν μὲν περὶ κοσμοποιίας), the second with history (τὴν δὲ ἱστορικήν) and the third with legislation (τὴν δὲ τρίτην νομοθετικήν)" (*Praem.* 1). The same classification appears in *Mos.* 2.46–47, although Philo initially identifies only *two* parts: (1) the historical part (ἱστορικὸν μέρος), which he subdivides into two sections dealing respectively with the creation of the world (κόσμου γενέσεως) and genealogy (γενεαλογικοῦ), and (2) the part dealing with commands and prohibitions (περὶ προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις). The part dealing with commands and prohibitions corresponds to the third topic in *Praem.* 1, while the subdivisions of the first part correspond to the first two topics in *Praem.*1. (On the relation between γενεαλογικός and ἱστορικός, see F. H. Colson's note on *Mos.* 2.47 in PLCL 6, 606; also PLCL 8, 313, n. a.) On the correlation of *Praem.* 1 and *Mos.* 2.46–47, see also Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (ed. M. E. Stone; vol. 2 of *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple and the Talmud*; CRINT 2; Assen: Van Gorcum, 1984), 233–82, 234, n. 5; Richard Hecht, "Preliminary Issues in the Analysis of Philo's *De Specialibus Legibus*," *SPh* 5 (1978): 1–55, 3; Leopold Cohn, "Einteilung und Chronologie der Schriften Philos," *PhilSup* 7 (1899): 387–436, 405–06.

[6] On the Exposition of the Law see Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria—A Systematic Philosopher or an Eclectic Editor? An Examination of his *Exposition of the Laws of Moses*," *SO* 71 (1996): 115–34; also Jenny Morris, "The Jewish Philosopher Philo," in Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135): A New English Version Revised and Edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman* (vol. 3, part 2; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 809–89, 840–54.

treatises on the patriarchs (*De Abrahamo* and *De Iosepho*),[7] and ends with a set of treatises on Mosaic legislation (*De decalogo*, *De specialibus legibus* 1–4, and *De virtutibus*).[8] This last set dealing with legislation consists thematically of only two parts, despite its formal division into six treatises: the first comprises *De decalogo* and practically all of *De specialibus legibus* (1.1–4.132), the second comprises the remainder of *De specialibus legibus* (4.133–238) and *De virtutibus*.[9] In both parts, Philo cites then analyzes laws, noting mostly their literal bearing on practical and ethical matters.[10] But the real

---

[7] See Cristina Termini, "The Historical Part of the Pentateuch According to Philo of Alexandria: Biography, Genealogy, and the Philosophical Meaning of the Patriarchal Lives," in *History and Identity: How Israel's Later Authors Viewed Its Earlier History* (ed. Núria Calduch-Benages and Jan Liesen; DCLY 2006; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 265–95. Originally, the set included treatises also on Isaac and Jacob (see *Ios.* 1), which are now lost. Most assign these treatises to the "history" portion of the creation-history-legislation triad of *Praem.* 1 (e.g., Borgen, "Philo," 237–38). Some, however, assign them to the legislative portion, based on Philo's claim that the patriarchs themselves represent unwritten counterparts to the written laws he begins to consider in *De decalogo* (see *Abr.* 3–4). The historical portion, in this configuration, consists of Philo's Allegorical Commentary, a separate series of treatises covering most of Genesis (on which see Borgen, "Philo," 243–44; Morris, "Philo," 830–40). Valentin Nikiprowetzky, for example, holds this view: see PAPM 23, 13, and *Commentaire*, 234–35, n. 217. But if the correlation of *Praem.* 1 and *Mos.* 2.46–47 is correct, the legislative portion mentioned in *Praem.* 1 corresponds explicitly to "commands and prohibitions" in *Mos.* 2.46 and cannot reasonably include the lives of the patriarchs. For other problems with this view, see Cohn, "Einteilung und Chronologie," 406, n. 23; cf. Morris, "Philo," 845–46, n. 134.

[8] Another treatise, *De praemiis et poenis*, immediately follows *De virtutibus* and concludes the Exposition. In *Praem.* 2–3, Philo states that he has fully discussed (i.e., finished) the legislative section in the preceding treatises and is moving on to a new topic: "the rewards and punishments which the good and the bad have respectively to expect." *De praemiis et poenis* thus forms a fitting conclusion to the Exposition, insofar as the stipulated rewards and punishments are contingent on observance of the laws. But it does not form part of the legislative section proper, because it does not deal with the laws themselves. Philo's treatise on Moses, *De vita Mosis* 1–2, is closely connected with, but not part of, the Exposition (see Erwin R. Goodenough, "Philo's Exposition of the Law and His *De Vita Mosis*," *HTR* 26 [1933]: 109–25).

[9] Philo makes an explicit transition from one major topic to another in *Spec.* 4.132–34. For division of the same material into the same two parts, see points B and C on Peder Borgen's outline of the Exposition ("Philosopher or Editor," 118).

[10] In *Decal.* 1 Philo announces that his investigation of the written laws will not neglect allegorical interpretations, when they are warranted, and indeed it does not (e.g., *Spec.* 2.29–31). Nevertheless, Philo's legal commentary tends to avoid allegory, in some instances offering only a literal treatment of laws read allegorically in the Allegorical Commentary (see Colson, PLCL 7, xiii, n. c, and Isaak Heinemann, PCH 2, 4, n. 1, for examples, such as *Ebr.* 14–95 vs. *Spec.* 2.232 on Deut 21:18–21). Samuel Sandmel ("Philo Judaeus: An Introduction to the Man, His Writings, and His Significance," *ANRW* 21.1:3–46, 10) thus goes too far in saying: "The treatises in [the 'Exposition of the Law'] are no less allegorical than those in the 'Allegory of the Law.'"

commentary on Mosaic legislation in Philo's Exposition is the first part (*Decal.* 1–*Spec.* 4.132), which he frames as a unified, systematic, and comprehensive exposition of Mosaic commands and prohibitions, using an organizational scheme based on the Ten Commandments.[11]

For Philo, the Ten Commandments are absolutely preeminent, and *their* arrangement and content determine the overall arrangement and content of his legal commentary in *Decal.* 1–*Spec.* 4.132.[12] To establish their importance, Philo begins his systematic study of Mosaic legislation with a distinction between two categories of law:

> I will proceed to describe the laws (τοὺς νόμους) themselves in order, with this necessary statement by way of introduction, that some of them (οὓς μέν) God judged fit to deliver in His own person alone without employing any other, and some (οὓς δέ) through His prophet Moses whom He chose as of all men the best suited to be the revealer of verities. Now we find that those

---

[11] *Praem.* 2 suggests that part one (*Decal.* 1–*Spec.* 4.132) represents, from Philo's perspective, the Pentateuch's "legislative part" proper (thus Borgen, "Philosopher or Editor," 132–33; cf. Borgen, "Philo," 239–40). Part two (*Spec.* 4.133–238 and *Virt.*) has a different organizational scheme (categorization by *virtues*, not *Commandments* [see *Spec.* 4.133–35]) and is secondary to part one in terms of both length and design. Part one is roughly three times as large (ca. 277 vs. ca. 95 pages in PCW); but, more importantly, part one represents Philo's principal effort to organize all Mosaic precepts into a single logical system (on which see esp. Yehoshua Amir, "The Decalogue According to Philo," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition* [ed. B.-Z. Segal and G. Levi; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990], 121–60, 128–30; idem, "Philon und die jüdische Wirklichkeit seiner Zeit," in *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien* [FJCD 5; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983], 3–51, esp. 42–44 [="Das System der Gebote"]). In this respect, part two serves as a catchall, accommodating laws that do not fit neatly into Philo's primary scheme (see Amir, "Decalogue," 127; Morris, "Philo," 851).

[12] On the Decalogue in Philo, see esp. Amir, "Decalogue"; also Ulrich Kellermann, "Der Dekalog in den Schriften des Frühjudentums: Ein Überblick," in *Weisheit, Ethos, und Gebot* (ed. H. G. Reventlow; BThSt 43; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001), 147–226, esp. 161–70 [="Philo von Alexandria und der Dekalog"]; Paul Kuntz, "Philo Judaeus: A Decalogue in the Balance," in *The Ten Commandments in History: Mosaic Paradigms for a Well-Ordered Society* (ed. Thomas d'Evelyn; EUSLR; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 11–26; Miguel Lluch Baixauli, "El tratado de Filón sobre el Decálogo," *ScrTh* 29 (1997): 415–41; André Myre, "La loi et le Pentateuque selon Philon d'Alexandrie," *ScEs* 25 (1973): 209–25, 222–24; Samuel Sandmel, "Confrontation of Greek and Jewish Ethics: Philo: *De Decalogo*," in *Judaism and Ethics* (ed. Daniel J. Silver; New York: Ktav, 1970), 163–76. On the Decalogue as an organizational scheme, see Hecht, "Preliminary Issues," 3–17; for the scheme's presence in *Decal.* and *Spec.* see Borgen, "Philosopher or Editor," 123–28; for details of the scheme see Daniel Jastram, "Philo's Concept of Generic Virtue" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wisconsin—Madison, 1989), 30–35, and Cristina Termini, "Taxonomy of Biblical Laws and φιλοτεχνία in Philo: A Comparison with Josephus and Cicero," *SPhA* 16 (2004): 1–29, esp. 1–10.

> which He gave in His own person and by His own mouth alone are[13] (συμβέβηκε) both laws and heads summarizing the particular laws (καὶ νόμους … καὶ νόμων τῶν ἐν μέρει κεφάλαια), but those in which He spoke through the prophet all belong to the former class. (*Decal.* 18–19)

Two key traits set the Ten Commandments apart. First, God delivered them personally to the Israelites without a human mediator.[14] Second, each of the Ten Commandments has a unique dual significance: like any law, it stands on its own as a distinct ethical imperative, but it also functions as the "head" (κεφάλαιον) or "summary" of an entire category of particular laws (νόμων τῶν ἐν μέρει).[15]

In Philo's view, God delivered each of the Ten Commandments "in the form of a summary,"[16] stating succinctly what Moses spells out at length by means of additional laws found elsewhere in the Pentateuch.[17] These other laws form a distinct set of subsidiary precepts, which—despite their

---

[13] Substituting "are" (συμβέβηκε) for Colson's "include," which does not properly emphasize the dual nature of each Commandment. Cf. Nikiprowetzky, PAPM 23 ("sont non seulement des lois, mais aussi les principes qui commandent le détail des lois particulières"); Treitel, PCH 1 ("sind zugleich Gesetze und Grundprinzipien"); Francesca Calabi, *Filone di Alessandria,* De Decalogo (Philosophica 24; Pisa: ETS, 2005) ("sono leggi e principi delle leggi particolari").

[14] E.g., *Spec.* 2.189. Philo rejects an anthropomorphic concept of God speaking to the Israelites, developing instead the notion of a miraculous "divine voice" created especially for the occasion (*Decal.* 32–35; for analysis see Amir, "Decalogue," 135–48; also Reinhard Weber, *Das "Gesetz" bei Philon von Alexandrien und Flavius Josephus: Studien zum Verständnis und zur Funktion der Thora bei den beiden Hauptzeugen des hellenistischen Judentums* (ARGU 11; Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 2001), 68–77.

[15] E.g., *Decal.* 154: "[W]e must not forget that the Ten Words (οἱ δέκα λόγοι) are summaries of the special laws (κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσὶ τῶν ἐν εἴδει) which are recorded in the Sacred Books and run through the whole of the legislation" (substituting "Words" [λόγοι] for Colson's "Covenants"). Thus the title of *De decalogo*: περὶ τῶν δέκα λόγων, οἳ κεφάλαια νόμων εἰσίν. On κεφάλαιον, see Termini, "Taxonomy," 5–6.

[16] κεφαλαιώδει τύπῳ (*Spec.* 4.78; also *Decal.* 168); cf. *Gaius* 178–79: "We determined to give Gaius a document, presenting in a summarized form (κεφαλαιώδη τύπον) the story of our sufferings and our claims. This document was practically an epitome (ἐπιτομή) of a longer supplication which we had sent to him a short time before through the hands of King Agrippa."

[17] E.g., *Decal.* 175: "For it was in accordance with His nature that the pronouncements in which the special laws were summed up (κεφάλαια μὲν τῶν ἐν εἴδει νόμων) should be given by Him in His own person, but the particular laws (νόμους δὲ τοὺς ἐν τῷ μέρει) by the mouth of the most perfect of the prophets whom He selected for his merits and having filled him with the divine spirit, chose him to be the interpreter of His sacred utterances." Cf. *Congr.* 120, where these ten are "general heads (γενικὰ κεφάλαια), embracing the vast multitude of particular laws (τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀπείρων νόμων), the roots (ῥίζαι), the sources (ἀρχαί), the perennial fountains of ordinances (πηγαὶ ἀέναοι διαταγμάτων) containing commandments positive and prohibitive (προστάξεις καὶ ἀπαγορεύσεις περιεχόντων) for the profit of those who follow them."

individual variety—all express in some way the moral essence of their respective summary Commandment. Philo characterizes this unique relationship of particular law(s) to summary Commandment in a variety of ways. In terms of status, the particular laws are all subordinate to their respective "heads," as Philo's use of ὑπό ("under") and related compounds clearly indicates.[18] In terms of function, they all "refer to" (ἀναφέρεσθαι; ἀναφορὰν λαμβάνειν) a single summary command, serving or promoting its moral purpose in some way.[19] But in abstract terms, Philo envisions the relationship between summary Commandment and particular law(s) as that of genus to species.[20]

The treatises *De decalogo* and *De specialibus legibus* represent, at least in part, Philo's painstaking and systematic attempt to illustrate this genus-species relationship. His treatise on the Ten Commandments deals with the ten genera, expounding each of the Commandments in sequence (*Decal.* 50–153) and introducing the idea of their summary function (*Decal.* 154–75).[21] His treatise on the particular laws (*De specialibus legibus*) again expounds the ten genera, in even greater depth, but goes on to identify and comment on their respective species. The Pentateuch itself never uses a genus-species taxonomy to organize precepts systematically, so Philo must

---

[18] For the particular laws as simply "under" (ὑπό) their respective heads, see *Decal.* 170; as "arranged under" (ὑποτάσσεσθαι), see *Decal.* 168, 171; as "falling under" (ὑποπίπτειν), see *Decal.* 174 (cf. ὑποστέλλειν in *Decal.* 157, *Spec.* 4.1, and *Spec.* 4.132).

[19] E.g., *Spec.* 2.223: "I have now completed the discussion of the number seven [i.e., the fourth "head" (cf. *Spec.* 2.39)] and of matters connected with days and months and years that have reference to that number (τῶν εἰς αὐτὴν ἀναφερομένων)." *Spec.* 2.242: "I have gone through the five heads of laws (κεφάλαια νόμων) that belong to the first table, along with whatever particular laws have reference to each of them (ὅσα τῶν κατὰ μέρος εἰς ἕκαστον ἐλάμβανε τὴν ἀναφοράν)" (my translation). Cf. *Leg.* 2.102: "This is practically the summation (τὸ κεφάλαιον) of the whole Song [of Moses], to which every other part refers (ἐφ'ὃ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ἀναφέρεται)" (my translation). In *Hist. eccl.* 2.18.5, Eusebius refers to *De specialibus legibus* as Περὶ τῶν ἀναφερομένων ἐν εἴδει νόμων εἰς τὰ συντείνοντα κεφάλαια τῶν δέκα λόγων α β γ δ.

[20] The δέκα λόγοι are τά … γένη τῶν ἐν εἴδει νόμων (*Spec.* 1.1; *Spec.* 3.125: τὰ γένη τῶν ἐν εἴδει νόμων) and thus "generic" (*Congr.* 120: γενικὰ κεφάλαια; *Her.* 167: τῶν γενικῶν δέκα νόμων; *Her.* 173: γενικοί … κανόνες). On this as a *legal* taxonomy in Philo, see esp. Jastram, "Generic Virtue," 30–35. Jastram's remarks situate the legal taxonomy in the context of Philo's broader application(s) of the genus-species concept (see his chapter one, "Theory of Genus, Species, and Particular," 10–72). Termini, "Taxonomy," argues that Philo's application of a genus-species taxonomy to Mosaic legislation is radically innovative, although his interest in the systematic organization of legal materials reflects contemporary trends in Roman jurisprudence.

[21] Philo first treats introductory questions such as why God delivered the Ten Commandments in the desert (§§2–17), why there were ten (§§20–31), what voice announced the Commandments (§§32–35), and why the form of address was second-person singular (§§36–43).

construct the system himself. In other words, *Philo* must match species with genera, indicating which laws belong with which of the Ten Commandments.[22] When his work is finished, he leaves no doubt as to his purpose:

> For if we are right in describing the main heads delivered by the voice of God as generic laws (κεφάλαια γένη νόμων), and all particular laws of which Moses was the spokesman as dependent species (εἴδη), for accurate apprehension free from confusion scientific study was needed, with the aid of which I have assigned and attached to each of the genera what was appropriate to them throughout the whole legislation (ἑκάστῳ τῶν γενῶν ἐξ ἁπάσης τῆς νομοθεσίας τὰ οἰκεῖα προσένειμα καὶ προσέφυσα). (*Spec.* 4.132)[23]

The scope of Philo's project is immense: considering each of the generic summaries in turn, he has scoured the Pentateuch in search of corresponding specific precepts. In this respect, *De specialibus legibus* complements *De decalogo* by presenting for each Commandment subsidiary laws that reflect its moral essence.[24]

---

[22] Despite disagreement over the originality of Philo's use of the Decalogue as a comprehensive taxonomic framework, consensus holds that Philo at least did the work of matching species with genera, justifying the study of *Philo's* view of the Tenth Commandment. In other words, it seems that *Philo* decided which laws logically pertain to the Tenth Commandment, according to *his* understanding of that Commandment. For a minimalist position, which concedes the originality of Philo's genus-species matching but otherwise attributes his basic taxonomy to traditional (rabbinic) Judaism, see Naomi Cohen, *Philo Judaeus: His Universe of Discourse* (BEATAJ 24; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1995), 72–85, esp. 84–85. (On Philo's understanding of the Decalogue in relation to rabbinic tradition, see esp. Hecht, "Preliminary Issues," 3–17.) For a more generous position, which sees Philo as an innovator not only in his assignment of species to genus but also in his granting of a special inclusive status to the Decalogue, see Termini, "Taxonomy." Borgen, "Philosopher or Editor," 126, has an intermediate position, which nevertheless approximates Cohen's: "Philo seems to develop in a more systematic fashion a notion also found in Palestinian tradition, that the Decalogue contained *in nuce* all the commandments of the Mosaic laws. Thus, Philo has a Jewish concept as organizing principle, but he has developed it into a broader systematic rewriting than found elsewhere in the contemporary Jewish sources."

[23] Substituting "genera" (γενῶν) for Colson's "heads." On this passage, see also Termini, "Taxonomy," 8. Cf. *Spec.* 3.7: "Since out of the ten oracles which God gave forth Himself without a spokesman or interpreter, we have spoken of five, namely those graven on the first table, and also of all the particular laws which had reference to these, and our present duty is to couple them with those of the second table as well as we can, I will again endeavour to fit the special laws into each of the genera (πειράσομαι πάλιν καθ'ἕκαστον τῶν γενῶν ἐφαρμόζειν τοὺς ἐν εἴδει νόμους)" (substituting "genera" [γενῶν] for Colson's "heads").

[24] Cf. Morris on *De specialibus legibus* ("Philo," 847–48): "In this work Philo makes an extremely interesting attempt to bring the Mosaic special laws into a systematic arrangement according to the ten rubrics of the Decalogue."

For the most part, Philo follows a rigid ten-point outline in both *De decalogo* and *De specialibus legibus*, introducing each Commandment, saying what he wants to say, then moving on to the next.[25] As a result, both treatises contain a series of self-contained text units, each devoted essentially to *one* of the Ten Commandments. So Philo's commentary on a particular Commandment consists of the material from two complementary text units—one in *De decalogo* and a corresponding unit in *De specialibus legibus*—dealing with both the Commandment itself (the genus) and the subordinate laws (the species).[26]

Philo's Exposition of the Tenth Commandment

Decal. 142–53 and *Spec.* 4.78b–131 contain Philo's commentary on the Tenth Commandment, which he reads as a two-word prohibition, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.[27] Philo abbreviates the Septuagint version, which lists various objects of desire: a neighbor's wife, house, field, etc.[28] Although he never explains or justifies this abbreviation, it makes good sense in light of his overall treatment of the Ten Commandments, especially his view of the last five as a pentad of basic prohibitions governing human affairs.[29] Superficially, the abbreviation accomplishes a stylistic leveling, bringing the Tenth Commandment into line with the four other basic prohibitions: οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, and οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις—the last of which is itself an abbreviation of the Ninth Commandment.[30] More

---

[25] Structural outlines of the treatises reveal Philo's straightforward sequential movement through the list of Ten Commandments. For an outline of *De decalogo*, see Borgen, "Philosopher or Editor," 124–25. For an outline of the four books of *De specialibus legibus*, see Heinemann, PCH 2, 8–13 (although, as Heinemann's outline indicates, Philo in effect treats the First and Second Commandments as a single unit).

[26] For a schematic correlation of material from *De decalogo* and *De specialibus legibus*, see the outline of the Sixth through Tenth Commandments in André Mosès, PAPM 25, 15–16.

[27] On οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις as Philo's version of the Tenth Commandment, see above, n. 4.

[28] LXX Exod 20:17 [=LXX Deut 5:21], on which see above, n. 1.

[29] E.g., *Decal.* 121: ἀπαγορεύσεις τῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους. In Philo's view, these five prohibitions are comprehensive: "These are general rules forbidding practically all sins (οὗτοι γενικοὶ σχεδὸν πάντων ἁμαρτημάτων εἰσὶ κανόνες), and to them the specific sins may in each case be referred (ἐφ'οὓς ἕκαστον ἀναφέρεσθαι τῶν ἐν εἴδει συμβέβηκεν)" (*Her* 173). For the division of the Ten Commandments into pentads, see esp. *Decal.* 50–51 (also *Her.* 168).

[30] N.B. Philo's citation of οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις (*Spec.* 4.41; cf. *Decal* 172: τέταρτον δὲ [κεφάλαιον] τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ ψευδομαρτυρεῖν) compared with Exod 20:16 [=Deut 5:20]: οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις κατὰ τοῦ πλησίον σου μαρτυρίαν ψευδῆ. For the other prohibitions, whose simple two-word expressions Philo adopts verbatim, see Exod 20:13–15 [=Deut

importantly, however, a *specific* formulation of the Tenth Commandment would contradict Philo's claim that the Commandments are comprehensive, generic summaries—or, as with οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, generic *prohibitions*. In his system of thought, limiting the scope of the Tenth Commandment to specific objects would blur the distinction between genus and species. Rather than a summary, the Commandment would read more like a short list of "particular laws."[31] Philo does consider various objects of desire, but only as concrete illustrations of the nature and function of desire *itself*, not restrictions on the Commandment's proscriptive *range* of objects.[32]

The first unit of commentary, *Decal.* 142–53, is the last installment in his initial survey of the Ten Commandments (*Decal.* 50–153). Focusing on what the prohibition entails, this unit contains a sketch of the nature, mechanics, and potentially disastrous effects of desire, framed initially (§§142–46) as a review of the four cardinal πάθη: pleasure (ἡδονή), grief (λύπη), fear (φόβος), and desire (ἐπιθυμία).[33] (*Decal.* 173–74 briefly restates the ill effects

---

5:17–19]. Cf. Rom 13:9 (Codex Sinaiticus): οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ κλέψεις, οὐ ψευδομαρτυρήσεις, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.

[31] Although the LXX version does include a general prohibition of ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν, it never loses the fundamental specification τοῦ πλησίον σου. In its full LXX formulation, the Commandment does not proscribe, for example, the desire for a house per se, only the desire for a specific *type* of house—viz., the house of a neighbor.

[32] For example, in *Spec.* 4.86–91 Philo wants to illustrate how desire "produces a change for the worse in all which it attacks" (§86) by listing various aims of desire and the respective vices associated with those aims. The aims are all quite general: "money" (χρήματα), "reputation" (δόξα), "power" (ἀρχή), "physical beauty" (σώματος κάλλος), "the tongue" (γλῶττα) (i.e., desire to speak or keep silent), "the belly" (γαστήρ) (i.e., desire for food and drink).

[33] On πάθος as a philosophical term, see in general F. E. Peters, *Greek Philosophical Terms: A Historical Lexicon* (New York: New York University Press, 1967), 152–55. The term πάθος essentially denotes something that happens *to* someone (i.e., an experience one undergoes), so "passion" bears literally the sense of its cognate "passive" despite its often active sense. (For an ancient [Platonic] discussion of active and passive connotations of πάθος, see Galen, *PHP* VI 1.5–23; cf. Martin Elsky [trans.], "Erich Auerbach, '*Passio* as Passion' ['*Passio* als Leidenshaft']" *Criticism* 43 [2001]: 288–308.) As a term of moral psychology, πάθος refers to an experience undergone in one's soul; for example, the experience ("passion," "feeling," "emotion") of fear. Ancient moral philosophers proposed various definitions for both πάθος per se and the individual πάθη, along with various strategies for how best to manage passion(s). On management, see, for example, Martha Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (3d ed.; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009). On the four cardinal πάθη see Simo Knuuttila and Juha Sihvola, "How the Philosophical Analysis of the Emotions Was Introduced," in *The Emotions in Hellenistic Philosophy* (ed. J. Sihvola and T. Engberg-Pedersen; TSHP 46; Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998), 1–19, esp. 14–16. For an explanation of the Stoic view of πάθος over against the Platonic-Aristotelian view, see Michael Frede, "The Stoic Doctrine of the Affections of the Soul," in *The Norms of Nature: Studies in Hellenistic Ethics* (ed. Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker; Cambridge: Cambridge

of desire, then previews *De specialibus legibus* by noting the existence of "many ordinances which come under this head," without identifying any of those ordinances.) The second unit of commentary, *Spec.* 4.78b–131, represents the exposition proper, since it contains Philo's comprehensive treatment of *both* οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις *and* the corresponding subordinate laws.[34] Again he covers the nature, mechanics, and effects of desire, as in the first unit, but in much greater depth (*Spec.* 4.78b–94). Then, in keeping with his overarching program for *De decalogo* and *De specialibus legibus*, Philo cites and expounds the Mosaic dietary laws, which he considers the "particular laws" belonging under the rubric οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (*Spec.* 4.95–131). The two units of commentary together amount to 351 lines of Greek text in PCW, with the exposition proper (*Spec.* 4.78b–131) amounting to 298 lines, all devoted to Philo's understanding of the Tenth Commandment. In sheer quantity, Philo's exposition of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις stands on a par with some of

---

University Press, 1986), 93–110. On Philo's concept of emotion(s), see David Charles Aune, "Mastery of the Passions: Philo, 4 Maccabees and Earliest Christianity," in *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Wendy E. Helleman; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994), 125-58, esp. 125–34; John Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (rev. ed.; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), 151–52; Petra von Gemünden, "La culture des passions à l'époque du Nouveau Testament: Une contribution théologique et psychologique," *ETR* 70 (1995): 335–48, esp. 339–42; Margaret Graver, "Philo of Alexandria and the Origins of the Stoic ΠΡΟΠΑΘΕΙΑΙ," in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy* (ed. Francesca Alesse; SPhA 5; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 197–221; repr. from *Phronesis* 44 (1999): 300–25; Carlos Lévy, "Philon d'Alexandrie et les passions," in *Réceptions antiques: Lecture, transmission, appropriation intellectuelle* (ed. Lætitia Ciccolini et al.; ELA 16; Paris: Éditions Rue d'Ulm, 2006), 27–41; idem, "Philo's Ethics," in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 146–71, esp. 154–64 [="The Passions"]; Salvatore Lilla, *Clement of Alexandria: A Study in Christian Platonism and Gnosticism* (OTM; London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 84–92, esp. 92; Max Pohlenz, *Philon von Alexandreia* (*NAWG* 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1942), 457–61; David Runia, *Philo of Alexandria and the* Timaeus *of Plato* (PA 44 ; Leiden: Brill, 1986), 299–301; Helmut Schmidt, *Die Anthropologie Philons von Alexandreia* (Würzburg: Konrad Triltsch, 1933), 86–101 [="Die Lehre vom Pathos"]; Michel Spanneut, "*Apatheia* ancienne, *apatheia* chrétienne. I[ère] partie: *L'apatheia* ancienne," *ANRW* 36.7: 4641–4717, 4701–04; Walther Völker, *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit* (TUGAL 49.1; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrich, 1938), 80–95; David Winston, "Philo's Ethical Theory," *ANRW* 21.1:372–416, 400–05; idem, "Philo of Alexandria on the Rational and Irrational Emotions," in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought* (ed. John T. Fitzgerald; RMCS; New York: Routledge, 2008), 201–20.

[34] Because it amounts to a self-contained treatise, the unit *Spec.* 4.79–135 receives its own title "*De concupiscentia*" in some MSS (see PCW 5, xiv, xxvi), and, as Colson notes (PLCL 8, 56, n. 1), Cohn "here begins a fresh numeration of chapters." Older studies sometimes refer to *Spec.* 4.79–135 using the Latin title and Cohn's fresh numeration (e.g., Emile Bréhier, *Les idées philosophiques et religieuses de Philon d'Alexandrie* [EPM 8; 3d ed.; Paris: J. Vrin, 1950], 253).

his independent treatises—for example, *De gigantibus* (320 lines in PCW). The importance of this exposition, however, lies in the material itself, first in its own right but also in its relation to other first-century treatments of the Tenth Commandment and key topics in Philo's ethical theory.

The Value of Philo's Exposition

As a substantive, detailed analysis of the Tenth Commandment from arguably the best representative of Hellenistic Judaism in antiquity, Philo's exposition of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις deserves a complete study in and of itself. In his exposition, he considers in depth both the Tenth Commandment and the dietary laws that for him reflect its moral essence, so a careful reading should answer two fundamental questions:

> 1. In Philo's view, *what* does the Tenth Commandment prohibit? (All desire? A certain type? What type?)
>
> 2. In Philo's view, *how* is the Tenth Commandment observed? (What are the mechanics of its observance? What role do the dietary laws play in its observance?)

Answering these specific questions helps to illuminate general aspects of Philo's fusion of Judaism and Hellenism. For example, how does a first-century Jew, who is also an accomplished student of Greek philosophy, make sense of the Decalogue's prohibition of *desire* (ἐπιθυμία), an emotion that Greek philosophers studied at length? And how does an obscure set of dietary regulations, which often placed observant Jews at odds with the broader culture, become the centerpiece of Moses' philosophically astute training program for managing desire? [35] Philo's exposition speaks to these and other issues.

---

[35] For general considerations of the Jewish dietary laws in Philo's day, see, for example, John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 434–37 [="Separatism at Meals"]; Christoph Heil, *Die Ablehnung der Speisegebote durch Paulus: Zur Frage nach der Stellung des Apostels zum Gesetz* (BBB 96; Weinheim: Beltz Athenäum, 1994), 23–123, esp. 39–99 [="Die Speisegebote im Frühjudentum"]; Hermut Löhr, "Speisenfrage und Tora im Judentum des Zweiten Tempels und im entstehenden Christentum," *ZNW* 94 (2003): 17–37; E. P. Sanders, "Purity, Food and Offerings in the Greek-Speaking Diaspora," in *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah: Five Studies* (London: SCM Press, 1990), 255–308, 272–83 [="Food"]. On Philo and the dietary laws, see Mireille Hadas-Lebel, *Philon d'Alexandrie: Un penseur en diaspora* (Paris: Fayard, 2003), 159–62 [="Les lois alimentaires"]; Richard D. Hecht, "Patterns of Exegesis in Philo's Interpretation of Leviticus," *SPh* 6 (1979–1980): 77–155,

But Philo's work also bears importance for the comparative assessment of a broader first-century interest in the Tenth Commandment attested elsewhere by two of Philo's contemporaries, Paul and the author of 4 Maccabees.[36] All three authors cite abbreviated Greek versions of the Tenth Commandment and consider its moral significance.[37] Such an interest in οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις makes sense in light of a number of ancient perspectives on ἐπιθυμία: for example, Judeo-Christian speculations regarding ἐπιθυμία as the root of all sin.[38] But it also makes sense in light of

---

esp. 108–15; Isaak Heinemann, *Philons griechische und jüdische Bildung: Kulturvergleichende Untersuchungen zu Philons Darstellung der jüdischen Gesetze* (Breslau: Marcus, 1932; repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962), 155–66; Walter Houston, "Towards an Integrated Reading of the Dietary Laws of Leviticus," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* (ed. R. Rendtorff and R. Kugler; VTSup 93; FIOTL 3; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 142–61, esp. 144–47; Alan Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity* (BJS 161; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 67–71 [="Dietary Laws"]; James N. Rhodes, "Diet and Desire: The Logic of the Dietary Laws according to Philo," *ETL* 79 (2003): 122–33; Cristina Termini, "Philo's Thought within the Context of Middle Judaism," in *The Cambridge Companion to Philo* (ed. Adam Kamesar; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 95–123, esp. 119–21 [="The Dietary Laws"] (cf. Katell Berthelot, "L'interprétation symbolique des lois alimentaires dans la *Lettre d'Aristée*. Une influence pythagoricienne," *JJS* 52 [2001]: 253–68; Robert M. Grant, "Dietary Laws among Pythagoreans, Jews, and Christians," *HTR* 73 [1980]: 299–310; James N. Rhodes, "Diet as Morality: Tracing an Exegetical Tradition" [M. A. thesis; Catholic University of America, 2000]; Abraham Terian, "Some Stock Arguments for the Magnanimity of the Law in Hellenistic Jewish Apologetics," *JLAS* 1 [1985]: 141–49; Giovanni Maria Vian, "Purità e culto nell'esegesi giudaico-ellenistica," *ASE* 13 [1996]: 67–84, esp. 78–80). On Philo's commitment to literal observance of Mosaic legislation (including dietary laws), see *Migr.* 89–93.

[36] See Romans 7:7–25 and 4 Maccabees 2:4–6. Although the exact dates of the relevant texts cannot be determined, their sequence *can*. The absolute terminus ad quem for Philo's exposition is his death, which by general consensus is hardly later than 50 C.E. (Peder Borgen, "Philo of Alexandria," *ABD* 5:333–42, 333). Paul's letter to the Romans dates from between 55 and 60 C.E. (Joseph Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 33; New York: Doubleday, 1993], 85–88). 4 Maccabees dates from near the end of the first century C.E. (Hans-Josef Klauck, *4. Makkabäerbuch* [*JSHRZ* 3.1; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1989], 668–69).

[37] Paul's version, like Philo's, is οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (Rom 7:7; cf. Rom 13:9). 4 Maccabees has a longer, more specific version, οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν γυναῖκα τοῦ πλησίον σου οὐδὲ ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν (2:5), but the context suggests a comprehensive scope (N.B. πάσης ἐπιθυμίας in 2:4; and esp. μὴ ἐπιθυμεῖν εἴρηκεν ἡμᾶς ὁ νόμος in 2:6).

[38] E.g., *Apoc. Mos.* 19.3: ἐπιθυμία γάρ ἐστι πάσης ἁμαρτίας (ed. Jan Dochhorn, *Die Apokalypse des Mose: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar* [TSAJ 106; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005]; some MSS: ἐπιθυμία γάρ ἐστι κεφαλὴ πάσης ἁμαρτίας [idem, 331]); Jas 1:14–15: esp. ἡ ἐπιθυμία συλλαβοῦσα τίκτει ἁμαρτίαν; Philo himself identifies ἐπιθυμία as the source of all evils (ἀπάντων πηγὴ τῶν κακῶν) in *Spec.* 4.84–85 (cf. *Decal.* 173: τὴν τῶν ἀδικημάτων πηγήν, ἐπιθυμίαν). For consideration of such texts and their relation to exegetical traditions construing the disobedience of Adam and Eve as a violation of the Tenth Commandment, see Jan Dochhorn, "Röm 7,7 und das zehnte Gebot: Ein Beitrag

Greco-Roman *philosophical* speculations regarding the function and malfunction of ἐπιθυμία, one of the four cardinal πάθη, whose ill effects are counteracted by ἐγκράτεια.[39] In any case, a full comparative assessment of these three treatments of the Tenth Commandment and their relation to broader trends in biblical exegesis and ethical reflection requires a proper understanding of *Philo's* treatment—which is by far the most elaborate of the three.

Finally, a comprehensive investigation of Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment promises a better understanding of key topics in Philo's ethical theory, which can in turn illuminate broader trends in Middle-Platonic ethical theory.[40] For example, Philo grounds his exposition in

---

zur Schriftauslegung und zur jüdischen Vorgeschichte des Paulus," *ZNW* 100 (2009): 59–77, esp. 63–65. On such texts considered as a possible basis for Paul's reflection on οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, see J. A. Ziesler, "The Role of the Tenth Commandment in Romans 7," *JSNT* 33 (1988): 41–56, 47. Regardless of the knowledge Philo had of traditions construing ἐπιθυμία as the root of all sin, he frames his discourse on ἐπιθυμία in distinctly *philosophical* terms. Although he considers ἐπιθυμία a source of wrongdoing (*Spec.* 4.84–85; *Decal.* 173), he does *not* think in terms of "sin" (the term ἁμαρτία appears nowhere in his exposition). Instead, he thinks in terms of πάθος (e.g., *Spec.* 4.79), choosing a technical term from moral philosophy.

[39] On considerations of the Tenth Commandment in light of *philosophical* concerns, see esp. Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in Its Contexts: The Argument of Romans* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2004), 229–32. Tobin concludes that Philo, Paul, and the author of 4 Maccabees reflect "broader discussions within Hellenistic Judaism about the function of the law in relation to theories about the nature of the passions, particularly desire, in Greco-Roman philosophy" (232); see also Petra von Gemünden, "Der Affekt der ἐπιθυμία und der νόμος: Affektkontrolle und soziale Identitätsbildung im 4. Makkabäerbuch mit einem Ausblick auf den Römerbrief," in *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag* (ed. Dieter Sänger and Matthias Konradt; NTOA / SUNT 57; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2006), 55–74; Stanley Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 2003), 524–50, 531–34 [="Judaism as a School for Self-Mastery"] (cf. Stanley Stowers, *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles* [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994], 58–65); Emma Wasserman, *The Death of the Soul in Romans 7: Sin, Death, and the Law in Light of Hellenistic Moral Psychology* (WUNT 256; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 105–06.

[40] On the fundamentally Platonic orientation of Philo's thought, see esp. Thomas H. Billings, *The Platonism of Philo Judaeus* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1919; repr., New York: Garland, 1979), made more useful by A. C. Geljon and D. T. Runia, "An *Index Locorum* to Billings," *SPhA* 7 (1995): 169–85. On Philo as a *Middle* Platonist, see esp. Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 139–83; also "Special Section: Philo and Middle Platonism," *SPhA* 5 (1993): 95–155. In terms of contemporary Middle-Platonic moral psychology, Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment qualifies him as a "*de facto* Middle Platonist," one of the six positions outlined in David Runia's typological spectrum ("Was Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited," *SPhA* [1993]:

theoretical overviews of the πάθη, using a variety of technical terms and concepts.[41] He clearly intends to establish first a working model of ἐπιθυμία as πάθος and then use it to inform his discussion of the prohibition οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. Because Philo is a Middle Platonist, his exposition offers valuable insight into the elements of a Middle-Platonic theory of the "passions," insofar as it deals with *passionate desire*.[42] The concept of self-control (ἐγκράτεια) also bears directly on Philo's understanding of the Tenth Commandment.[43] When he begins his survey of the "particular laws," *species* of the genus οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, Philo cites the law of first fruits (Exod 23:19; Deut 18:4), which in his view exists "for the practice of self-control" (πρὸς ἄσκησιν … ἐγκρατείας).[44] This phrase suggests not only the importance of

---

112–140, 125): "he does not belong to the school, but has a philosophical stance which is fundamentally Platonist and might well make him welcome in such circles."

[41] See esp. *Decal.* 142–46; *Spec.* 4.79.

[42] Simply put, Philo's exposition reflects a Middle-Platonic theory of the passions, insofar as it combines a fundamentally Platonic psychology (esp. *Spec.* 4.92–94) with Stoic technical definitions of passion(s) (esp. *Spec.* 4.79; cf. *Decal.* 142)—a combination evident in other Middle-Platonic texts (e.g., *Didask.* 32.1 [185.26]: κίνησις ἄλογος ψυχῆς [cf. DL 7.110]). Middle Platonists rework these Stoic definitions, enabling them to describe psychological phenomena whose existence "orthodox" (i.e., Chrysippean) Stoicism would deny (e.g., non-rational parts of the soul in conflict with a rational part). Evidence in Philo's exposition for this sort of reinvention exists but has not been properly assessed. For example, Philo in *Spec.* 4.79 adds to the Stoic definition of passion as "excessive impulse" (πλεονάζουσα ὁρμή; e.g., DL 7.110 [=*SVF* I 50, 23]; *ESE* 10 [=*SVF* III 92, 11]; *PHP* IV 2.8 [=*SVF* III 113, 15]) the qualifier "unmeasured" (ἄμετρος), which is unattested in the Stoic sources and indicates a failure to limit the *quantitative* force of a non-rational impulse—a notion incompatible with the Stoic understanding of impulse as a form of rational assent (on which see Brad Inwood, *Ethics and Human Action in Early Stoicism* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1985], esp. chs. 3 and 5, N.B. 167–68 on "excessive impulse": "no aspect of the theory [Stoic psychology] … admits of the sort of variation of degree which would be needed for a more familiar quantitative sense of 'excessive'.").

[43] For the term, see *Spec.* 4.97, 99, 101, 112 [bis], 124. For explicit connection of ἐγκράτεια with the Tenth Commandment, see, for example, vol. 2 of Harry Austryn Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (2 vols; 2d rev. print.; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1948), 235–36; also Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," 532. For general considerations of ἐγκράτεια in Philo, see esp. Maren Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture* (TSAJ 86; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 75–110 [="Jewish Values: Religion and Self-Restraint"], esp. 94–110; also Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," 531–34 (cf. Stowers, *Romans*, 58–65).

[44] *Spec.* 4.99. Philo twice lists ἐγκράτεια as one of many different kinds of ἄσκησις (*Leg.* 3.18; *Her.* 253). Pierre Hadot uses Philo's two lists as a basis for his discussion of different "spiritual" exercises in antiquity, by which he means exercises of Greco-Roman philosophers pertaining to the soul, not exercises practiced in a religious setting (Pierre Hadot, "Spiritual Exercises," in *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault* [ed., intro. Arnold I. Davidson; trans. Michael Case; Malden, Mass.: Blackwell, 1995], 81–125, 84).

ἐγκράτεια, but also the relevance of another ethical concept, ἄσκησις—specifically, how Mosaic laws regarding food and drink function as *practice* in the cultivation of self-control.[45] Understanding Philo's exposition involves the clarification of these and other topics.

Even an introductory survey of the nature and content of Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment commends it to further study, and Philo facilitates such study by neatly packaging his material: the structural layout of his broader Exposition of the Law makes his exposition of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις a complete text in and of itself. Earlier studies of Philo have touched on this text in a variety of ways, from a variety of perspectives, with a variety of results.

History of Research

Had Philo chosen to publish his exposition of the Tenth Commandment as an independent work, it surely by now would have received more attention. But to date no comprehensive study of this important treatise exists, one that deals exclusively with Philo's view of the Tenth Commandment in light of *his* agenda *his* interests, *his* organization of the material, and *his* understanding of the relevant topics—one that clearly and adequately answers the two fundamental questions of *what* οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις actually prohibits and *how* to observe the injunction. Translators of the relevant units (*Decal.* 142–53, 173–74 and *Spec.* 4.78b–131) offer general remarks on Philo's interpretation of the Tenth Commandment, along with commentary on specific passages, but the scope of their work is too broad and too sketchy to treat those units—especially the exposition proper (*Spec.* 4.78b–131)—in sufficient depth.[46] Similarly, a number of works whose aims

---

[45] In regard to Philo's usage, the term ἄσκησις has little to do with modern terms such as "ascetic" or "asceticism," whose connotations derive mostly from Christian monasticism. The Greek term has no intrinsic association with religious practice (see Hermigild Dressler, *The Usage of 'Ασκέω and Its Cognates in Greek Documents to 100 A.D.* [CUAPS 78; Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1947]). For Philo, ἄσκησις pertains mainly to moral philosophy, as one of three ways to acquire virtue: nature, instruction, and *practice* (e.g., *Abr.* 52); see Ellen Birnbaum, "Exegetical Building Blocks in Philo's Interpretation of the Patriarchs," in *From Judaism to Christianity: Tradition and Transition: A* Festschrift *for Thomas H. Tobin, S.J., on the Occasion of His Sixty-fifth Birthday* (ed. Patricia Walters; NovTSup 136; Leiden: Brill, 2010), 69–92.

[46] For translations of the *De decalogo* units (§§142–53, §§173–74), see Leopold Treitel, PCH 1 (1909); F. H. Colson, PLCL 7 (1937); Valentin Nikiprowetzky, PAPM 23 (1965); Francesca Calabi, *Filone*, Decalogo (2005); cf. Ronald Williamson, *Jews in the Hellenistic World: Philo* (CCWJCW 1.2; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 255–78. For the exposition proper (*Spec.* 4.78b–131), see Isaak Heinemann, PCH 2 (1910); F. H. Colson, PLCL 8 (1939); and André Mosès, PAPM 25 (1970).

lie elsewhere offer incidental, often helpful, remarks on Philo's view of the Tenth Commandment, but never in an effort to explain it in full.[47] In fact, only two works offer sustained treatments of the Tenth Commandment in Philo, and neither satisfies the need for a comprehensive study.

Harry A. Wolfson

In an extensive work on Philo, Harry Wolfson devotes part of a chapter on ethics to a study of the Tenth Commandment.[48] The title of his brief analysis, "The Virtue of the Control of Desire," reflects a broader aim on Wolfson's part to explore the relationship between law and virtue, especially *where* and *how* Philo's understanding of Mosaic law incorporates terms and concepts derived from Greek ethical theory.[49] He does not intend to provide a comprehensive analysis of the contents of Philo's

---

[47] For example, Amir, "Decalogue," 158–59; Klaus Berger, *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu* (WMANT 40.1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1972), 346–48; Erwin Goodenough, *The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), 207–08; Houston, "Dietary Laws," 144–47; Kellermann, "Dekalog," 168; Hermann Lichtenberger, *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7* (WUNT 164; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 246–50; Lluch Baixauli, "Decálogo," 436–38; William Loader, "The Decalogue" in *The Septuagint, Sexuality, and the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 5–25, 12–1–4; Anita Méasson, *Du char ailé de Zeus à l'Arche d'Alliance: Images et mythes platoniciens chez Philon d'Alexandrie* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1987), 154; Thomas E. Phillips, "Revisiting Philo: Discussions of Wealth and Poverty in Philo's Ethical Discourse," *JSNT* 83 (2001): 111–21, 114–15; Alexander Rofé, "The Tenth Commandment in the Light of Four Deuteronomic Laws," in *The Ten Commandments in History and Tradition* (ed. B.-Z. Segal and G. Levi; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1990), 45–65, 48–49; Torrey Seland, "The Moderate Life of the Christian *paroikoi*: A Philonic Reading of 1 Pet 2:11," in *Philo und das Neue Testament* (WUNT 172; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 241–64, 259–63; Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," 531–34 (cf. Stowers, *Romans*, 58–65); Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 231–32; Wasserman, *Death of the Soul*, 105–06.

[48] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:225–37.

[49] Before his discussion of the Tenth Commandment, Wolfson deals with the topics "'Under the Law' and 'In Accordance with Nature'" (165–200) and "Commandments and Virtues" (200–225). In his discussion of the Tenth Commandment, Wolfson also considers relevant material from "native Jewish literature" (226), including the topics of regulating emotion (226–29) and the evil *yetser* (230–31). Despite arguable (and isolated) rabbinic parallels adduced by Wolfson (cf. Joel Marcus, "The Evil Inclination in the Epistle of James," *CBQ* 44 [1982]: 606–21, 613–15), the moral theory informing Philo's exposition of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις—*taken as a whole*—undoubtedly derives from Greek philosophy. On the regulation of desire in Rabbinic Judaism, see esp. Jonathan Wyn Schofer, *The Making of a Sage: A Study in Rabbinic Ethics* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2005); also Bernard S. Jackson, "Liability for Mere Intention in Early Jewish Law," in *Essays in Jewish and Comparative Legal History* (ed. Jacob Neusner; SJLA 10; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 202–34.

exposition. Instead, as part of a sweeping effort to reconstruct Philo's system of thought, he considers the significance within that system of a moral imperative aimed not at action(s) but at "pure emotion."[50] Although limited, Wolfson's treatment nevertheless includes substantive claims about Philo's interpretation of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.

Wofson's most valuable contribution comes at the end of his analysis, where he recognizes the central importance of ἐγκράτεια in Philo's overall understanding of the Tenth Commandment.[51] In particular, he recognizes that "[t]he negative tenth commandment is … a command to control one's desire."[52] In other words, the negative prohibition implies a positive command to cultivate the virtue of ἐγκράτεια, which—as Wolfson notes—is "the positive term … by which the control of excessive desire is to be described."[53] But because his interests lie elsewhere, he only considers *that* this is true, not *how* this is true. He never answers the basic question of how someone observes the Tenth Commandment or how it in fact promotes ἐγκράτεια. Wolfson also realizes that, for Philo, *other* Mosaic laws work along with the Tenth Commandment to promote ἐγκράτεια.[54] But he never mentions the dietary laws, let alone explains how—in Philo's view—they pertain to οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις. In this respect Wolfson's treatment, even where it does correctly characterize Philo's view of the Tenth Commandment, remains sketchy.

Although valuable for its emphasis on ἐγκράτεια, Wolfson's study misconstrues Philo's view of what the Commandment prohibits. He makes the unfounded assumption that Philo, with the Septuagint version in mind, understands the Tenth Commandment to be a prohibition *only* of desire for what belongs to another person.[55] Wolfson does not acknowledge the generalizing effect of Philo's abbreviated οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, choosing instead to retain the Septuagint version's specification "of your neighbor" (τοῦ πλησίον σου).[56] He admits that this specification does not appear in Philo's commentary but assumes it nevertheless:

---

[50] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:225.

[51] Stowers (e.g., "Paul and Self-Mastery," 532) similarly notes the importance of ἐγκράτεια for Philo's understanding of the Tenth Commandment.

[52] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:235.

[53] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:235. Wolfson refers to the concept of ἐγκράτεια found in *Eth. eud.* 1223 b 11–14) (e.g., ἐγκρατεύεται δ'ὅταν πράττῃ παρὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν κατὰ τὸν λογισμόν).

[54] "It is the virtue of 'continence' … that is taught by the tenth commandment as well as by all those special laws of which the purpose, as seen by [Philo], is to teach the control of desire" (Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:236).

[55] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:228–29.

[56] Wolfson takes this in its most general sense of ὅσα τῷ πλησίον σού ἐστιν, as the LXX version stipulates. He cites and disagrees with Colson, whose assessment is correct:

> Though Philo speaks of desire in general, that is, of a desire for what we have not, and not of a desire for that which belongs to somebody else, still his discussion, in so far as it is a commentary upon the commandment, implies that the desire of which he speaks is that desire which the commandment explicitly describes as a desire for that which belongs to another person. (Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:228)[57]

The only evidence Wolfson offers in support of this view involves Philo's first example of an object of desire, money (χρήματα).[58] He argues that, although Philo does not specify the money's source:

> the subsequent statement that a desire for money leads to robbery and purse-cutting and house-breaking makes it quite evident that the desire for money spoken of was not a desire for money in general but rather for the money in the pocket or the purse or the house of one particular person. (Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:228)

But Wolfson fails to cite the entire passage, which goes on to associate the desire for money also with, for example, receiving bribes (δωροδοκίαις), which clearly involves greed per se and not desire for the money "of one particular person." Moreover, the other objects of desire on Philo's list, none of which Wolfson mentions, hardly make sense when construed strictly as belonging to another person. This is especially true in the case of desires for food and drink, which are, for Philo, governed by the Tenth Commandment's particular laws.[59]

Wolfson's study suffers also from an outdated conception of Philo's relationship to Greek philosophy. As he investigates select details of Philo's "homily on the evils of desire," Wolfson considers Philo an eclectic who adopts any number of different philosophical positions ad hoc. Wolfson suggests that in most of his analysis of ἐπιθυμία Philo chooses a Stoic

---

"The words 'thy neighbour's,' which are repeated so emphatically in the tenth commandment, as we have it and Philo also had it in the LXX, receive little attention from him" (PLCL 8, x).

[57] Also 2:229: "It is exactly the latter kind of desire, the desire for that which belongs to somebody else, that the tenth commandment as a law, and not a mere moral maxim, legally prohibits, according to Philo …." Ibid.: "In his discussion of the legal prohibition not to desire that which belongs to one's neighbor, a prohibition, as we have said, of a mere desire for that which belongs to one's neighbor."

[58] *Spec.* 4.87: "If the desire is directed to money it makes men thieves and cut-purses, footpads, burglars, guilty of defaulting to their creditors, repudiating deposits, receiving bribes, robbing temples and of all similar actions."

[59] On Philo's association of the Tenth Commandment with dietary laws, Amir notes: "This association of ideas is possible only if the Commandment is shorn of its concluding words, 'anything that is your neighbor's.' For after all, kashrut has nothing to do with issues of ownership, of 'mine and thine.' An animal is not forbidden as food because it is stolen goods" ("Decalogue," 159).

position, but "[w]henever forced by certain native Jewish presuppositions, he departs from the Stoics and follows some other philosopher or presents a new view of his own."[60] Wolfson is correct, generally speaking, when he matches various terms and concepts in Philo's commentary with the same terms and concepts in sources known to be, for example, Stoic.[61] But he gives the misleading impression that Philo freely vacillates from one philosophical *opinion* to another with no underlying commitment to one philosophical *orientation* over another. Philo's "eclectic" philosophical mix is instead best understood as a reflection of his Middle Platonism—without this insight, Wolfson's study cannot provide an adequate understanding of Philo's philosophical perspective.[62]

In sum, Wolfson offers a substantial discussion of the Tenth Commandment in Philo, but one whose breadth and depth are severely limited due to the relatively minor role it plays within a much larger and more broadly oriented work. His answer to the question of *what*, in Philo's view, the Tenth Commandment prohibits is incorrect, since he limits the scope of ἐπιθυμία to only desire for what belongs to another person. Nor does he answer the question of *how* someone observes the Tenth Commandment, although he provides the proper context for an answer—namely, the acquisition, development, and exercise of ἐγκράτεια. Finally, his comments on the nature and function of ἐπιθυμία, although helpful at times, do not represent Philo's relationship with Greek philosophy properly.

---

[60] Wolfson, *Philo*, 2:231. Wolfson initially emphasizes Stoic provenance: e.g., 2:230: "It is the Stoics … whom Philo follows here in the external formulation of his views." Ibid.: "He similarly follows the Stoics …."

[61] E.g., Wolfson cites *SVF* for definitions of emotion comparable to *Spec.* 4.79, but he fails to note the significance of the non-Stoic ἄμετρος in Philo's definition (see above, n. 42).

[62] Cf. Dillon, *Middle Platonists*, 182: "My chief thesis (as against such an authority as H. A. Wolfson, for example) is that Philo was not so much constructing for himself an eclectic synthesis of all Greek philosophy, from the Presocratics to Posidonius, as essentially adapting contemporary Alexandrian Platonism, which was itself heavily influenced by Stoicism and Pythagoreanism, to his own exegetical purposes." For a fuller, yet still concise, statement of this position, in which Dillon rejects the misconceptions of (1) Philo as an "eclectic" who (2) merely uses philosophical *language* to serve exegetical aims, see his preface to *Philo of Alexandria:* The Contemplative Life, The Giants, *and Selections* (trans. and intro. David Winston; CWS; Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist, 1981), xii–xiii. See also David Winston's introduction (idem, 1–37), in which he accepts Philo's views as "Middle Platonist, that is, a highly Stoicized form of Platonism, streaked with Neopythagorean concerns" (3). In general, see John M. Dillon and A. A. Long, eds., *The Question of "Eclecticism": Studies in Later Greek Philosophy* (HCS 3; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988).

Kathy L. Gaca

In *The Making of Fornication*, Kathy Gaca includes a chapter on Philo that deals in part with his understanding of the abbreviated Tenth Commandment.[63] While the broad scope of her work precludes an exhaustive treatment of Philo's exposition, Gaca nevertheless presents a sustained and virtually self-contained study of Philo's interpretation of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, offering summary conclusions and a bold thesis about Philo's notion of forbidden desire.[64] Taking all three of the relevant text units into account (*Decal.* 142–53, 173–74; *Spec.* 4.78b–131), she addresses not only the question of *what*, in Philo's view, the Commandment prohibits, but also *how* someone observes the Commandment, including an explanation of how the dietary laws promote its observance.[65] In one important general respect Gaca's work breaks new ground and sets a worthy standard: in her consideration of Philo's view of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, she takes seriously the idea that he is a Middle Platonist, consistently bearing in mind his debt to Plato and his acceptance of Platonic doctrines pertinent to an analysis of ἐπιθυμία.[66] But in her analysis of Philo's view, Gaca misconstrues the

---

[63] Chapter seven, "Philo's Reproductive City of God," in *The Making of Fornication: Eros, Ethics, and Political Reform in Greek Philosophy and Early Christianity* (HCS 40; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003), 190–217. Pages 193–99 deal directly with the Tenth Commandment.

[64] See esp. her section titled "Philo's Revolutionary Conception of Forbidden Desire" (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 194–204). The aim of her book is "to resolve an important philosophical and historical problem about the making of sexual morality in Western culture: Do the patristic sexual rules of second-century Christianity differ notably from the Greek philosophical sexual principles that the patristic writers used to help formulate their own? Alternatively, are these Christian rules in unison with the Greek philosophical basis that they claim to have" (1). Her interest in Philo lies mainly in his contribution to the sexual ethics of "Christian Platonism" (see 193–94, along with her study of Clement of Alexandria in 247–72).

[65] Gaca does not quote Philo at length, but she does refer to passages from all three units of his exposition, indicating her awareness of the extent of his treatment. Her references take into account esp. *Decal.* 142, 173–174 and *Spec.* 4.78, 85, 87–96, 100–118.

[66] On Gaca's concept of Philo as a "Jewish Middle Platonist," see *Making of Fornication*, 191, n. 2. Although her *conclusions* are problematic, Gaca's *approach* is commendable in several respects. For example, she brings a Platonic psychological model to bear on the textual data of Philo's exposition, relating his discussion of ἐπιθυμία to Plato's theory that there is in the soul a distinct, non-rational source of ἐπιθυμία—i.e., [τὸ] ἀλόγιστόν τε καὶ ἐπιθυμητικόν [εἶδος] (*Resp.* 439 D; N.B. *Spec.* 4.92–94 [cf. *Tim.* 70 D–E]). Moreover, she notes key implications of Plato's theory, such as the moral agent's inability to remove appetitive ἐπιθυμία entirely and the consequent importance of *moderation* (e.g., *Making of Fornication*, 197). Gaca also understands that Philo's Middle Platonism involves the reinvention of Stoic terms and definitions: "The Stoic definitions of the passions that Philo uses are thus like a label that at first glance looks Stoic,

textual data, misreading a number of passages and failing to mention others that would readily disprove her claims.[67] For this reason, and because her study proposes a definitive—but incorrect—account of how Philo understands the Tenth Commandment, it deserves a detailed review.

Stated in its broadest terms, Gaca's thesis is that Philo's explanation of the abbreviated Tenth Commandment combines two elements into one innovative "Jewish Middle Platonist notion of forbidden desire"—namely, (1) "the Hellenistic Jewish concern about the desire (ἐπιθυμία) to disobey God's laws" and (2) "the Middle Platonist problem of excessive physical appetites (ἐπιθυμίαι) for the pleasures of food, drink, and especially sexual activity, contrary to reason's judicious sense of moderation."[68] What this means is that Philo follows a broader exegetical trend within Hellenistic Judaism to treat the Tenth Commandment as an abbreviated, two-word prohibition (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις), but he does *not* follow the standard line of interpretation, which takes the prohibition to mean "that it is wrong or sinful even to desire to act contrary to God's will."[69] Instead, Philo follows

---

but the contents have changed" (201). Gaca's understanding of exactly *how* Philo changes the contents is problematic, but this statement as such is correct.

[67] Cf. David Runia's review of *The Making of Fornication* in *SPhA* 17 (2005): 237–43, esp. 241–43. Runia's summary assessment of Gaca's study includes a caveat: "[B]ecause its method of analyzing and interpreting texts is flawed, it is to be used with caution" (243).

[68] See Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 194–95. Stated differently: "He reinterprets Platonic appetition—and sexual desire foremost—in light of the Hellenistic Jewish prohibition against the desire (ἐπιθυμία) to disobey God's will" (197). Gaca frames her thesis as a matter of sexual ethics: "Philo's sexual principles are part of an innovative agenda for social order that borrows from Plato and the Pentateuch, makes sense only in relation to both, and yet represents neither without noteworthy transformation. This is especially true for Philo's reinterpretation of the problems Plato sees with sexual desire, which Philo presents in his take on the aphoristic version of the Tenth Commandment: 'You will not desire' (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις). In Philo's synthesis, forbidden desire (ἐπιθυμία) in the Hellenistic Jewish sense, which signifies any inclination to defy God's will, becomes primarily sexual in light of Plato's conviction that uncontrolled desire (ἐπιθυμία) for sexual pleasure is the single biggest source of individual and social corruption" (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 193).

[69] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 153. See 153–54 for Gaca's idea of a "Hellenistic Jewish variant on the Septuagint Tenth Commandment." In her discussion of Philo, Gaca speaks of "the Hellenistic Jewish Tenth Commandment in its two more traditional forms," by which she means (a) the LXX version itself (Exod 20:17 [=Deut 5:21]) and (b) the abbreviated version οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, which omits the list of direct objects (198). She believes that Paul and Philo's citations of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις serve as evidence for a hypothetical *tertium quid*—namely, an exegetical tradition that *influenced* these two authors. Her supposition involves first the claim that prior to Philo, who in fact offers the earliest extant citation of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις (see above, n. 36), one or more unidentified Hellenistic Jewish exegetes chose to make an abbreviated Tenth Commandment

Plato's conviction that uncontrolled appetitive desire, especially sexual desire, corrupts individuals and societies, and for this reason he interprets οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις as a divine injunction to control appetitive, especially sexual, desire.

This last idea, that Philo's Tenth Commandment deals especially with sexual desire, deserves careful attention, since it in effect answers the question of *what* the Commandment prohibits. Ultimately, this idea derives from a reasonable but false assumption on Gaca's part that Philo imports without modification a certain concept of desire found in Plato's writings—a concept she outlines in an earlier chapter of her study.[70] Taken for granted, this assumption drives an almost syllogistic logic that informs much of what Gaca has to say about Philo's view of the Tenth Commandment: (a) when Plato thinks of ἐπιθυμία and its dangerous propensity for excess, he has in mind physical appetites, *especially* the sexual appetite; (b) when Philo thinks of the Commandment οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, he has in mind Plato's concept of ἐπιθυμία and its dangerous propensity for excess, therefore (c) Philo has in mind physical appetites, *especially* the sexual appetite. A number of sweeping claims ensue:

> Philo reinterprets this commandment in a Platonic spirit that is very much in keeping with "nothing in excess," as though οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις meant "you will restrain your physical appetites from becoming excessive," the sexual

their object of inquiry. This is of course plausible, but the alternate supposition that Philo himself was the first to cite and interpret οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις is equally plausible and less speculative. After all, his is the most extensive extant commentary on the abbreviated version and—contingent on unknown facts regarding the publication of his Exposition of the Law—is as likely as any to have been the seminal work. Be that as it may, Gaca goes on to attribute a standard line of interpretation to this already hypothetical exegetical tradition. Οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, the "newer prohibition" offered by the tradition, means "that it is wrong or sinful even to desire to act contrary to God's will" (153). Gaca's view problematically requires Philo to creatively modify a tradition for which no evidence exists, at least in terms of an extant text that cites οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, then explicitly offers the interpretive conclusion "that it is wrong or sinful even to desire to act contrary to God's will." (On 152 Gaca cites "a broader Hellenistic Jewish and early Christian trend that stresses the danger of rebellious impulses very stringently"; but this broader trend—even if it did exist—does not constitute evidence for the exegetical trend that Gaca posits.)

[70] See Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 26–41, esp. 32–33. The accuracy of Gaca's reading of Plato on this point bears less importance than the question of what *Philo* has to say about desire in his exposition of the Tenth Commandment. Even if she has correctly understood Plato's concept of appetitive desire, this concept must not serve *automatically* as the interpretive lens for Philo's understanding of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, without proof that Philo too is employing the same concept. This is especially true if Philo, as Gaca admits, is a Middle Platonist, which implies that he would have employed "Platonic" concepts that had been modified in significant respects in light of philosophical developments postdating Plato.

> appetite especially. By οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις in this sense, God too teaches the Platonic doctrine that depravity is grounded primarily in the unrestrained sexual appetite and its progeny of vices. (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 196)

Or similarly:

> In God's social order these iniquities would become a thing of the past, so long as the people heed the commandment οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις by getting their appetitive urges under control, especially sexual desire. (Ibid.)[71]

Gaca frames these statements carefully, avoiding the claim that οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις deals *exclusively* with sexual desire. She does, after all, understand that the basic operation of the Platonic ἐπιθυμητικόν involves desires also for food and drink.[72] But in some instances there is no clear acknowledgement of the relevance of non-sexual desire(s) within the Commandment's purview: "Philo's Tenth Commandment is innovative as a Decalogue rule because it valorizes sexual desire as the main source of all wickedness."[73] In other instances, particularly in concluding summaries of her argument, there is no indication that anything *but* sexual desire lies within the proscriptive range of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις:

> Though Philo supports Plato's argument that uncontrolled sexual desire is the primary and most incorrigible source of all vices, he identifies the Hellenistic Jewish notion of desiring to disobey God (ἐπιθυμία) *with the Platonic sexual appetite* (ἐπιθυμία). (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 297; emphasis added)[74]

---

[71] The "iniquities" Gaca has in mind appear in *Republic* 575 B. In her view, Philo cites this passage in *Spec.* 4.87 (certainly an allusion, but Philo's χρεωκοπίαις τε καὶ παρακαταθηκῶν ἀρνήσεσι has no parallel in the *Republic* passage) to illustrate "proliferating vices that he attributes to breaking his version of the Tenth Commandment" (196). But in *Spec.* 4.87, Philo explicitly considers desire directed at "money" (χρήματα), not sexual or even appetitive desire per se. Plato *does* consider χρήματα an object of appetitive desire (see *Resp.* 580 E), but Philo's inclusion of other objects of ἐπιθυμία, like "reputation" (δόξα), which Plato does *not* associate with appetitive desire, proves that ἐπιθυμία in his exposition must be conceived more broadly.

[72] E.g., Plato cites thirst to illustrate the distinction between rational and appetitive elements within the soul (see *Resp.* 439 A–E; cf. 437 D: "'[S]hall we say that the desires (ἐπιθυμιῶν) constitute a class and that the most conspicuous members of that class are what we call thirst and hunger?' 'We shall,' said he" [trans. Paul Shorey; unless otherwise noted, all translations of Plato's writings are from LCL]).

[73] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 198. Also: " Philo's version of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, however, prohibits unrestrained sexual desire as the primary religious defiance and corruption in the city of God" (ibid.).

[74] Cf. idem, 216, where Philo is said to identify "*the Platonic notion of sexual desire* (ἐπιθυμία) with the Hellenistic Jewish concern about the inherently wrongful impulse (ἐπιθυμία) to transgress God's laws. He makes this identification most notably through his Jewish Middle Platonist explanation of the commandment against forbidden desire (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις)" (emphasis added). Also idem, 23: "[Plato] would have needed an

Gaca clearly has an answer to the question of what Philo's Tenth Commandment prohibits. Although she ostensibly points to "excessive appetitive desire," she in fact has *sexual* desire in mind.[75]

But the idea that Philo's concept of desire in his exposition is exclusively—or even primarily—sexual is incorrect, since Philo associates οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις with a generic desire involving any number of different objects, none of which figures more prominently than another in the Commandment's theoretically limitless proscriptive range.[76] In fact, the idea that οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις deals with a *specific* desire of any type undermines Philo's concept of the Ten Commandments as generic summaries.[77] Philo's commentary consistently reflects his underlying belief in a prohibition of desire able to subsume any and all specific types. For example, in *Spec.* 4.80 Philo identifies this most troublesome passion simply as "desire of what we have not" (ἐπιθυμία τῶν ἀπόντων).[78] When Philo goes on to

---

interpreter to understand how the problems that he associates with uncontrolled sexual desire were written into the Tenth Commandment that Philo and Clement produced."

[75] This exclusive focus is confirmed by Gaca's construal of the Mosaic dietary laws, which in her view do not ultimately regulate appetitive desires for food and drink, but instead target the Tenth Commandment's real concern—*sexual* desire: "Philo regards Moses' dietary laws as the one sure regimen that reduces sexual desire and thereby subdues its offspring of vices" (*Making of Fornication*, 196).

[76] On this point commentators generally agree, with the exception of Gaca. For example, Colson (PLCL 7, 76, n. c): "Philo extends the meaning of the word from covetousness of what is another's to desire in general"; Mosès (PAPM 25, 17, n.1): Philo's version of the Tenth Commandment "n'admet pas de contenu veritable, puisque le désir est lui-même coupe de tout objet précis"; Williamson (*Philo*, 267): "Philo … extends the meaning of a desire to include its most general sense." Even Wolfson (*Philo*, 2:228), who needlessly specifies "desire for that which belongs to another person," nevertheless acknowledges that "Philo speaks of desire in general, that is, of a desire for what we have not." On the concept of generic desire, note esp. *Migr.* 155: "It is this mixed multitude which takes delight not in a few species of desire only (μὴ μόνον ὀλίγοις εἴδεσιν ἐπιθυμίας), but claims to leave out nothing at all, that it may follow after desire's entire genus (ὅλον δι'ὅλων τὸ γένος), including all its species" (substituting "desire" [ἐπιθυμία] and "desire's" [ἐπιθυμίας] for Colson's "lusting" and "lust's").

[77] N.B. *Spec.* 4.78b: "Let us move on to the last of the Ten Words (δέκα λογίων), delivered like each of the others in the form of a summary (κεφαλαιώδει τύπῳ καθάπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον): 'You shall not desire' (οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις)" (my translation). Note also the following descriptions of the Ten Commandments: *Her.* 167: τῶν γενικῶν δέκα νόμων; *Her.* 173: γενικοί … κανόνες; *Congr.* 120: γενικὰ κεφάλαια.

[78] Philo's immediate specification of "things which seem good, though they are not truly good" (ὅσα τῷ δοκεῖν ἀγαθῶν, πρὸς ἀλήθειαν οὐκ ὄντων) mitigates the generic sense of ἐπιθυμία somewhat but still allows for most any particular ostensible "good" (cf. *Decal.* 146: ἔννοιαν ἀγαθοῦ μὴ παρόντος). When Philo turns to the Tenth Commandment's particular laws (dietary laws) he singles out the desire for food and drink, but in a *paradigmatic* (not absolute) sense (see *Spec.* 4.96).

associate this desire with specific aims, he is merely illustrating its troublesome nature, noting that it creates a savage hunger and thirst in people, "but not for something to fill the void in their bellies—they hunger for money, fame, power, shapely bodies, or any of the countless other things that seem to them enviable and worth a struggle" (*Spec.* 4.82; my translation).[79] As this list indicates, sexual desire is not foremost in Philo's mind, nor even appetitive desire per se.[80] At most, sexual desire forms a part, but only a small part, of Philo's overall concept of desire with respect to the Tenth Commandment.[81] Not only do Philo's words fail to support the claim that οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις targets sexual desire—they positively refute it.

---

[79] Cf. *Spec.* 4.86–91.

[80] In fact, Gaca's proposal that ἐπιθυμία in Philo's exposition refers specifically to Platonic appetitive desire (a function of τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν) collapses with the mention in *Spec.* 4.82 of δόξα (cf. §88) and ἡγεμονία (cf. ἀρχή in §89)—which Plato identifies as ambitions of the *spirited* part of the soul, τὸ θυμοειδές; e.g., *Resp.* 581 A–B: "'[D]o we not say that [τὸ θυμοειδές] is wholly set on predominance (τὸ κρατεῖν) and victory (νικᾶν) and good repute (εὐδοκιμεῖν)?' 'Yes indeed.' 'And might we not appropriately designate it as the ambitious part (φιλόνικον) and that which is covetous of honour (φιλότιμον)?' 'Most appropriately.'" (On τὸ θυμοειδές see John M. Cooper, "Plato's Theory of Human Motivation," in *Reason and Emotion: Essays on Ancient Moral Psychology and Ethical Theory* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999], 118–37, esp. 130–36; repr. from *HPhQ* 1 [1984].) On Philo's concept of desire, Schmidt, *Anthropologie*, 92–93, notes: "Als Gegenstand des Begehrens werden fast durchweg die Strebungen, die Platon von dem zweiten und dritten Sellenteil aussagt, zusammengefaßt." This conflation of τὸ ἐπιθυμητικόν and τὸ θυμοειδές makes sense in light of Middle-Platonic moral psychology, which was influenced by Aristotle's concept of ἐπιθυμία and θυμός as two types of ὄρεξις, both belonging to a single faculty of the soul, the ὀρεκτικόν (see P. A. Vander Waerdt: "The Peripatetic Interpretation of Plato's Tripartite Psychology," *GRBS* 26 [1985]: 283–302 and "Peripatetic Soul-Division, Posidonius, and Middle Platonic Moral Psychology," *GRBS* 26 [1985]: 373–94; cf. Charles Kahn, "Plato's Theory of Desire," *RM* 41 [1987]: 77–103, 78–80).

[81] The passage in Philo's exposition that pertains to sexual desire appears in *Spec.* 4.89: "If the object [of desire] is bodily beauty they are seducers (φθορεῖς), adulterers (μοιχούς), pederasts (παιδεραστάς), cultivators of incontinence and lewdness (ἀκολασίας καὶ λαγνείας), as though these worst of evils were the best of blessings." In *Decal.* 168–69, Philo has in mind the very same types of immoral sexual behavior, but he is commenting on a different Commandment, the κεφάλαιον τὸ κατὰ μοιχῶν, "under which come many enactments against seducers (φθορέων) and pederasty (παιδεραστῶν), against dissolute living (τῶν λαγνίστερον βιούντων) and indulgence in lawless and licentious forms of intercourse (ὁμιλίαις τε καὶ μίξεσιν ἐκνόμοις καὶ ἀκολάστοις)." The lack of commentary on sexual matters in Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment is best explained by his having already dealt with such matters in his exposition of the Sixth Commandment, which governs the obviously sexual transgression of adultery. The preeminence of the Sixth Commandment, not the Tenth, in Philo's consideration of sexual ethics is correctly noted by Baudouin Decharneux, "Interdits sexuels dans l'œuvre de Philon d'Alexandrie dit 'Le Juif,'" *Religion et tabou*

So where and how does Gaca find textual support for her idea that the desire proscribed by Philo's Tenth Commandment is primarily sexual? She asserts that "Philo accepts Plato's theory of the irrational physical appetites *as well as his position that the sexual appetite is the most domineering and recalcitrant of the lot*" (emphasis added), citing *Spec.* 4.92–94 to support her claim:[82]

> Finally, they determined that desire must reside in the area around the navel known as the "diaphragm" (ἐπιθυμίᾳ δὲ [ἀπένειμαν] τὸν περὶ τὸν ὀμφαλὸν καὶ τὸ καλούμενον διάφραγμα χῶρον). Since desire has the least to do with reason (λογισμοῦ), it clearly must reside as far as possible from reason's royal domain—practically at the outskirts. Naturally, the pasture of this most insatiable and licentious of beasts (ἀπληστότατον καὶ ἀκολαστότατον … θρεμμάτων) is the area of the body associated with primal drives for food and sex (τροφαί τε καὶ ὀχεῖαι). (*Spec.* 4.93–94)[83]

Philo clearly marks in this passage the Platonic ἐπιθυμητικόν as the seat of primal drives for food and sex, but this is ultimately nothing more than an endorsement of Plato's tripartite psychology.[84] By itself, this passage does not prove that Philo saw οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις primarily as a restriction of sexual desire. In fact, not one of the passages Gaca cites reflects a special emphasis on *sexual* appetite in Philo's exposition. She claims that "Philo fully agrees with Plato" that:

> The combined sexual appetite and reproductive urge, when fattened and left to their own devices, are the main root of depraved minds and social mores because they stimulate a proliferation of other passions. (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 195)

To support this claim, she cites *Spec.* 4.85 as follows: "Sexual eros is 'the passion at the origin of wrongdoing' (ἀρχέκακον πάθος) (*Spec* 4.85)."[85] But a fuller citation shows that Gaca misreads Philo's statement:

---

sexuel (ed. Jacques Marx; *PHR* 1; Bruxelles: Editions de l'Université de Bruxelles, 1990), 17–31, esp. 18–25.

[82] See Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 195. Presumably, *Spec.* 4.92–94 is the textual evidence Gaca has in mind, since it is the only passage she cites in the paragraph other than *Decal* 173–74, which proves only that "appetites are an unavoidable part of our human and animal nature."

[83] My translation. Cf. *Tim.* 70 D–71 A; on the relation of *Spec.* 4.92–94 to the *Timaeus* passage, see Runia, *Philo and the* Timaeus, 304.

[84] N.B. λόγος, θυμός, and ἐπιθυμία in *Spec.* 4.92. Gaca rightly suggests Philo's endorsement here of "Plato's theory of the irrational physical appetites" (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 195), but Philo says nothing about "[Plato's] position that the sexual appetite is the most domineering and recalcitrant of the lot." Gaca assumes that a reference to the Platonic ἐπιθυμητικόν and its characteristic appetites proves ipso facto that Philo holds a highly sexualized concept of ἐπιθυμία throughout his exposition.

[85] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 195.

> For the passion to which the name of originator of evil can truly be given is desire (τό … ἀρχέκακον πάθος ἐστιν ἐπιθυμία), of which one and that the smallest fruit the passion of love (ἧς ἓν τὸ βραχύτατον ἔγγονον, ἔρως) has not only once but often in the past filled the whole world with countless calamities (ἀμυθήτων … συμφορῶν) …. (*Spec.* 4.85)

The ἀρχέκακον πάθος in this passage is clearly ἐπιθυμία (desire involving *any* object), not "sexual eros" as Gaca states.[86] Philo does identify ἔρως as an "offspring" (ἔγγονον) of ἐπιθυμία, but nothing in the passage requires even *this* word to have a sexual connotation.[87] Gaca also misconstrues the phrase ἀπάντων πηγὴ τῶν κακῶν (*Spec.* 4.84), which she cites four times. Here Philo does indeed identify ἐπιθυμία as "the fountain of all evils," but in light of *Spec.* 4.82 (esp. ἄλλων ἀμυθήτων) it *must* be understood as desire involving any number of possible objects—*not* sexual desire, or even appetitive desire per se. Gaca first misunderstands the sense when she states that "physical appetition in general" (ἐπιθυμία) is "the origin of all wrongdoing,"[88] then she provides in each subsequent reference to *Spec.* 4.84 a different rendering of ἐπιθυμία:

---

[86] Cf. Méasson, *Char ailé*, 154: "Philon analyse d'abord le désir en lui-même et, *sans reference à aucun objet*, le définit: ἀρχέκακον πάθος, «la passion qui est le principe du mal» (§ 85)" (emphasis added).

[87] *Spec.* 4.85 in its entirety shows that the "calamities" (συμφορῶν) Philo has in mind mainly involve warfare, which of course *can* result from sexual ἔρως (e.g., the Trojan war, noted by Colson in regard to *Spec.* 4.85 [PLCL 8, 61, n. b]), but obviously *need* not. *Decal.* 152–53 also mentions "calamities" (συμφορῶν) involving warfare and attributes all wars (πόλεμοι πάντες) to *desire* (ἐπιθυμία): for money (χρημάτων), glory (δόξης), or pleasure (ἡδονῆς) (cf. esp. *Phaed.* 66 C). In general, Gaca fails to note that ἔρως in Philo's exposition is not inherently sexual (e.g., *Decal.* 151: χρημάτων ἔρως). Gaca seems to limit the scope of ἔρως, by definition, to sexual desire alone: "Uncontrolled sexual desire, or eros, is especially problematic for Philo and his predecessor Plato" (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 195). This is surprising, since Gaca in an earlier chapter on Platonic desire emphatically notes the difference between "sexual appetite" and "Platonic eros" (see *Making of Fornication*, 36–39). On ἔρως in Plato, including its orientation in theory toward *any* object, see David M. Halperin, "Platonic *Erôs* and What Men Call Love," *AP* 5 (1985): 161–204. Gaca faults Halperin's study for "diminish[ing] the opposition" between eros and sexual desire (*Making of Fornication*, 38, n. 53), when in fact he clearly and carefully notes the difference (Halperin, "Platonic *Erôs*," 170–76). Her citation of Halperin, intended to prove his conflation of eros and *sexual* appetite for *sexual* pleasure, fails to take into account his explicit distinction between the terms "appetite" and "desire" (see Halperin, "Platonic *Erôs*," 170). For the generic Platonic notion of ἔρως, see esp. *Symp.* 205 D, which defines ἔρως as πᾶσα ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιθυμία.

[88] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 198.

- "sexual and other appetition" (ἐπιθυμία) is "the origin of all wrongdoing"[89]
- "innate sexual desire" (ἐπιθυμία) is "the origin of wrongdoing"[90]
- "eros" (ἐπιθυμία) is "the origin of wrongdoing"[91]

The same word, from the same passage, receives a progressively more sexual connotation in the course of Gaca's study, without justification or explanation. Gaca can produce no clear evidence for an especially sexual connotation of ἐπιθυμία in Philo's exposition because no such evidence exists. Moreover, the principal evidence she cites (three times) from elsewhere in Philo's writings, *Opif.* 151–52, is inconclusive.[92] Although this passage does deal with sexual attraction, it has little to say about the kind of ἐπιθυμία Philo envisions when commenting on the Tenth Commandment.[93] In fact, this passage does not even contain the word ἐπιθυμία, contrary to Gaca's original citation:

> "The irrational appetite" (ἐπιθυμία), and the sexual appetite in particular, "is the beginning of wrongs and violations of the Law" (*Opif* 151–2).[94]

The relevant section reads in full:

> And this desire begat likewise bodily pleasure (ὁ δὲ πόθος οὗτος καὶ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων ἡδονὴν ἐγέννησεν), that pleasure which is the beginning of wrongs and violation[s] of law (ἥτις ἐστὶν ἀδικημάτων καὶ παρανομημάτων ἀρχή) …. (*Opif.* 152)[95]

Clearly, the passage states that "bodily pleasure" (τὴν τῶν σωμάτων ἡδονήν), and not "irrational appetite" (ἐπιθυμία), is ἀδικημάτων καὶ παρανομημάτων

---

[89] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 198: "Philo, however, differs dramatically from Plato by insisting that sexual and other appetition is a 'great and excessive wickedness, truly the origin of all wrongdoing'" (*Spec* 4.84).

[90] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 200: "For Philo, however, the 'origin of wrongdoing' and 'of violation of the Law' (*Spec* 4.84, *Opif* 151–2) is innate sexual desire and its tendency to excessive pleasure …."

[91] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 216: "In support of Plato's political theory, Philo formulates a distinctively Jewish Platonist position that sexual desire is the primary root of rebellion against God. As he phrases this idea, eros is the 'origin of wrongdoing' and 'of violation of the Law'" (*Spec* 4.84, *Opif* 151–2).

[92] See Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 198, 200, and 216.

[93] As part of his commentary on Genesis 1–3, Philo considers the nature and consequences of sexual ἔρως between Adam and Eve.

[94] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 198.

[95] The "desire" mentioned here is πόθος, which—like ἔρως, also in *Opif.* 152—need not have a sexual connotation, although it clearly does in this case (cf. *Opif.* 5: ἔρωτι καὶ πόθῳ σοφίας; *Ebr.* 21: πόθος ἀρετῆς; *Fug.* 164: πόθον ἐπιστήμης; *Decal.* 148: πόθῳ τοῦ τρανωθῆναι ταῖς ἀκοαῖς τὸν ἦχον).

ἀρχή.[96] The pleasure (ἡδονή) mentioned here arguably involves sexual ἐπιθυμία, but the word ἐπιθυμία simply does not appear, and applying this passage to Philo's commentary on the Tenth Commandment is unwarranted. Gaca is unable, with this or any other passage, to demonstrate that Philo sees οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις mainly as a proscription of sexual desire, or that he anywhere in his exposition singles out sexual desire as especially problematic over against any other type.

Because her study misidentifies *what* the Commandment prohibits, its explanation of *how* someone observes the Commandment, particularly the role played by the dietary laws, is also incorrect. According to Gaca, and in keeping with her overall emphasis, the dietary laws for Philo ultimately target sexual desire.[97] Since a dangerous causal link exists between unrestrained eating and unrestrained sexual desire (which in turn causes a proliferation of other vices), dietary laws that restrict food intake restrict also sexual desire and thus limit the vice associated with sexual excess.[98] But nowhere in Philo's discussion of the dietary laws (*Spec.* 4.96–131) is sexual desire mentioned, much less cited as the ultimate concern. This again calls into question Gaca's treatment of Philo's text—*what* does she claim to find

---

[96] Philo's comments in this passage reflect a much broader consideration, attested throughout his works, of pleasure (ἡδονή) as a moral danger. On Philo's view of pleasure, see esp. Alain Le Boulluec, "La place des concepts philosophiques dans la réflexion de Philon sur le plaisir," in *Philon d'Alexandrie et le langage de la philosophie: Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre d'études sur la philosophie hellénistique et romaine de l'Université de Paris XII-Val de Marne, Créteil, Fontenay, Paris, 26–28 octobre 1995* (ed. Carlos Lévy; Turnhout: Brepolis, 1998), 129–52; also Peter Booth, "The Voice of the Serpent: Philo's Epicureanism," in *Hellenization Revisited: Shaping a Christian Response within the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Wendy E. Helleman; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1994), 159–72; Francesca Calabi, "Il serpente e il cavaliere: Piacere e 'sophrosyne' in Filone di Alessandria" *ASR* 8 (2003): 199–215; Schmidt, *Anthropologie*, 92–93; Graziano Ranocchia, "Moses against the Egyptian: The Anti-Epicurean Polemic in Philo," in *Philo of Alexandria and Post-Aristotelian Philosophy* (ed. Francesca Alesse; SPhA 5; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 75–102, esp. 88–100; Winston, "Philo on the Emotions," 206.

[97] "Restricting diet is an important part of taming sexual desire for both Philo and Plato. Philo regards Moses' dietary laws as the one sure regimen that reduces sexual desire and thereby subdues its offspring of vices" (Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 196).

[98] Gaca elsewhere makes the connection between food and sexual desire without explicitly mentioning dietary laws: "Human beings must keep their appetites under rational guard by curbing their wild sexual desire through restricting the intake of food and drink" (*Making of Fornication,* 195). Also: "Sexual eros on Plato's view comes into its own as a raging tyrant once surplus nutriment fuels its voracity. The combined sexual appetite and reproductive urge, when fattened and left to their own devices, are the main root of depraved minds and social mores because they stimulate a proliferation of other passions. Philo fully agrees with Plato on this matter" (ibid.).

and *where*. She refers to *Spec.* 4.96, where Philo states the rationale of the dietary laws from Moses' perspective, but she misinterprets his statement:

> Moses thus "began to train and chastise the appetite centered on the belly" (*Spec* 4.96), because he knew God's people needed to put their "love-mad" sexual behavior on the right kind of diet (*Spec* 3.9–10).[99]

According to *Philo*, the reason Moses focused on training the desire "whose field of activity is the belly" (τὴν περὶ γαστέρα πραγματευομένην ἐπιθυμίαν) is so that "the other forms (τὰς ἄλλας) will cease to run riot as before and will be restrained by having learnt that their senior and as it were the leader of their company (τὴν πρεσβυτάτην καὶ ὡς ἡγεμονίδα) is obedient to the laws of temperance" (*Spec.* 4.96). The desire for food and drink is preeminent and serves as a "paradigmatic instruction" (παραδειγματικῇ διδασκαλίᾳ in *Spec.* 4.96), whose training applies to *any other form of desire*, including—but certainly neither limited nor especially pertinent to—sexual desire. Gaca omits the second half of Philo's sentence in *Spec.* 4.96, which contains *his* understanding of the rationale for training dietary desires, and substitutes a different rationale based on a passage from a different treatise, which has no direct application to Philo's discussion of the Tenth Commandment.[100] As for prohibited animals, Gaca understands Philo to say that Moses "knew that the prohibited types of animal flesh, such as pork, are particularly laced with an aphrodisiac surplus (*Spec* 4.100–18)."[101] But Philo says nothing of the sort in *Spec.* 4.100–18. He does say that Moses prohibited animals "whose flesh is the finest and fattest, thus titillating and exciting the malignant foe pleasure (τὴν ἐπίβουλον ἡδονήν) … knowing that they set a trap for the most slavish of the senses, the taste (γεῦσιν), and produce gluttony, an evil very dangerous both to soul and body" (*Spec.* 4.100).[102] Without exploring here the full import of this statement for Philo's understanding of the dietary laws, it is enough to note that the sensory pleasure involved is gustatory, not sexual.[103] Gaca notes also Philo's

---

[99] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 196.

[100] Philo's comments in *Spec.* 3.9–10 pertain, as he explicitly states, to the *Sixth* Commandment (not the Tenth), the first in the second table (see *Spec.* 3.7–8).

[101] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 196. Gaca essentially considers only Philo's discussion of prohibited animals (*Spec.* 4.100–18), leaving out *Spec.* 4.119–31, which also treats particular laws falling under the rubric οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις.

[102] Presumably, this is the passage Gaca has in mind, since Philo immediately gives the example of pork in *Spec.* 4.101 and Gaca mentions pork explicitly when citing this passage.

[103] In any case, the context suggests that Philo's interest is in Moses' proscriptive cultivation of self-control (N.B. *Spec.* 4.101: πρός … ἐγράτειαν), not the avoidance of "aphrodisiac surplus." Isaak Heinemann, commenting on this passage, correctly notes

summary statement concerning Moses' prohibition of various animals, that "by this as by the withdrawal of fuel from a fire he creates an extinguisher to desire (σβέσιν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας)" (*Spec.* 4.118).[104] But this has no explicit bearing on sexual desire, unless the term ἐπιθυμία is presumed to have an especially sexual connotation in *Spec.* 4.96–131, which it does not. In fact, due to an overemphasis on sexual desire, Gaca overlooks the fundamental role of the dietary laws from Philo's perspective, which is to promote self-control (ἐγράτεια)—initially with respect to desire(s) for food and drink, but ultimately with respect to desires of any type.[105]

Despite their respective contributions, the studies of Wolfson and Gaca, along with other shorter, incidental treatments of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις, fail to answer with sufficient depth or accuracy the fundamental questions surrounding Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment. As a result, this important element of Philo's thought remains obscure.

Plan of the Monograph

Chapters two and three of this monograph do not deal directly with Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment. Instead, they offer an introductory survey of terms and concepts that Philo uses in that exposition, situating his moral psychology within the philosophical context of Middle Platonism.[106] Chapter two treats Philo's concept of desire (ἐπιθυμία), including explanations of its source, nature, function, and problematic *malfunction*. Chapter three treats Philo's concept of self-

this interest on Philo's part: "Nach SpL. IV 100 ff. will Moses durch seine Speisegesetze vor allem zur Selbstbeherrschung anregen; daher sind gerade besonders wohlschmeckende Tiere verboten, wie das Schwein" (*Bildung*, 163).

[104] Gaca, *Making of Fornication*, 196.

[105] Other considerations of Philo and the dietary laws emphasize the importance of ἐγράτεια to various extents without finding any special concern with *sexual* desire: e.g., Norman Bentwich, *Philo-Judaeus of Alexandria* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America, 1910), 123–24; Peder Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time* (NovTSup 86; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 168–69; Hadas-Lebel, *Philon*, 159–62; Hecht, "Patterns of Exegesis," 108–15; Heinemann, *Bildung*, 155–66; Houston, "Dietary Laws," 144–47; Mendelson, *Philo's Jewish Identity*, 67–71; Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity*, 105–06; Rhodes, "Diet and Desire"; Karl Olav Sandnes, *Belly and Body in the Pauline Epistles* (SNTSMS 120; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 128–29; Termini, "Philo's Thought," 119–21; Vian, "Purità e culto," 78–80.

[106] Without assuming or suggesting that Philo intends to write as a systematic philosopher, chapters two and three nevertheless demonstrate the existence of coherent strands of thought running throughout his works. Multiple attestation confirms the reliability of these strands as accurate representations of Philo's Middle-Platonic convictions regarding ἐπιθυμία and other concepts.

control (ἐγκράτεια), including explanations of its nature, its acquisition through ἄσκησις, and its role in the proper management of desire. With this conceptual backdrop in place, Philo's exposition of οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις emerges more clearly as a coherent, representative statement of his ethical theory.

Chapter four focuses on *Spec.* 4.78b–131, Philo's exposition of the Tenth Commandment (although *Decal.* 142–53 and *Decal.* 173–74 receive consideration in connection with relevant sections of the exposition proper). Along with introductory matters, an outline of Philo's exposition, a fresh translation of the PCW text, and notes on select passages, chapter four comments on each distinct unit of text. This commentary, however, does not treat all aspects of the text equally and so does not serve as a commentary in the traditional sense. Instead, it is focused and thematic, explaining how Philo uses the conceptual nexus of ἐπιθυμία, ἐγκράτεια, and ἄσκησις as an overarching expository agenda for his work.

Chapter five summarizes the results of the monograph by providing direct, concise answers to the basic questions regarding Philo's exposition:

> 1. In Philo's view, *what* does the Tenth Commandment prohibit? (All desire? A certain type? What type?)
>
> 2. In Philo's view, *how* is the Tenth Commandment observed? (What are the mechanics of its observance? What role do the dietary laws play in its observance?)

Chapter five also suggests lines of further research based on the results of this study.