20

Reconciliation in Philo, Josephus, and Paul

Norman H. Young

Senior Lecturer in New Testament, Department of Theology, Avondale College, Cooranbong, NSW, Australia.

My first significant meeting with Professor Bill Shea was when as a visiting professor I taught at the SDA Theological Seminary during the winter quarter of 1980-81. Bill introduced himself to me as the professor who was noted for his bow tie, hard exams, and easy marking. It is a pleasure to offer this paper in honor of this good-natured and distinguished scholar.

Introduction

The coexistence of Philo, Josephus, and Paul. The importance of Philo Judaeus for Pauline studies can hardly be exaggerated. As Henry Chadwick notes, Philo and Paul were two Hellenistic Jews who "fished in the same pool" (1965-66: 292). Philo's career (*ca.* 20 BC–AD 45-50) overlaps the beginning of Paul's ministry. Philo came from a well-to-do family in Alexandria. His Greek is the literary language of a well-educated diasporic Jew. His writings cannot be easily dated, apart from *In Flaccum* and *Legatio ad Gaium*, both of which date after AD 41. Philo provides a crucial example of how a near contemporary of Paul used Greek to communicate Judaism to the Graeco-Roman world. It is therefore surprising that Leon Morris in his noteworthy study of the καταλλαγ-word group ignores the testimony of Philo (1960: 188-192).

Josephus's life (AD 37-100) also overlaped Paul's labors. His writings (AD 75-100) date to shortly after Paul's death. There is some evidence that Josephus became verbally fluent in Greek as he grew up in Palestine (Rajak 1984: 46-64). He later made concerted effort to improved his literary Greek by studying Greek literature, especially the historians (*Jewish Antiquities* 1.7,

8; 20.263; Bilde 1988: 62). As a Palestinian Jew who later functioned on foreign soil using the Greek language, Josephus' life experience parallels Paul's. Josephus is thus another important example of the way in which some Jews used Greek in explaining their faith.[1]

Paul was active as a Christian from *ca.* AD 35 to 67. His birth date is uncertain (*ca.* AD 5-15). Martin Hengel thinks that his proficiency in written Greek points to an upbringing until his youth outside of Palestine (1991: 34, 35), however, present research is tending to support the view that Greek was quite widely spoken in Palestine in the first century AD (Porter 1993: 199-235). Thus W. C. Van Unnik's hypothesis based on Acts 22:3 that Paul was raised in Jerusalem from childhood may not preclude a Palestinian Jew having the ability to use Greek (1973: 259-320). Paul's pronunciation, like Josephus', may have been provincial, but his fluency may still have been impressive (*Jewish Antiquities* 20: 264; 1 Cor 2:4; 2 Cor 10:10; 11:6). We can conclude, then, that these three Jewish authors, Philo, Josephus, and Paul wrote their works in Greek within a narrow period of time from around AD 10 to 95.

The use of the καταλλαγ-group by these three writers occurs as follows: Philo 20 times (verb 6; noun 13; adjective 1); Josephus eight times (verb 6; noun 2); Paul ten times (verb 6; noun 4).

The basic meaning of καταλλάσσω. The basic meaning of καταλλάσσω is to "exchange" or "change." The expanded idea of "reconciliation" is derived from the concept of "change." The simple idea of exchange may be behind the phrase Philo uses in *De Vita Mosis* 2.60 (πρὸς καταλλαγὴν καιρῶν, "towards the change of the seasons"), though the Loeb editor suggests the emendation κατ' ἀλλαγὴν καιρῶν. More to the point is where Philo speaks of Joseph's brothers making a reconciliatory agreement (οἱ μὲν ἀδελφοὶ καταλλακτηρίους ποιήσονται συμβάσεις) with him by changing their hatred to friendship and their malice to affection (τὸ μῖσος εἰς φιλίαν καὶ τὸ κακόνουν εἰς εὔνοιαν μεταβαλόντες; *De Somniis* 2.108).[2] The instrumental participle μεταβαλόντες ("by changing") clarifies what is involved in the process of reconciliation; the word is used again in association with καταλλάσσω (*De Decalogo* 87). Philo also describes reconciliation as changing (μεθορμίζω) from being enemies (οἱ πολέμιοι) to becoming allies (*De Virtute* 154). Μεθορμίζω is a nautical term meaning "to change anchorage," metaphorically it refers to changing from one place or state to another. Thus καταλλάσσω refers to establishing a change in relationships from hostility to peace.

The vocabulary of reconciliation. In Philo and Josephus, the καταλλαγ-cognates are associated with a number of words that indicate the negative aspect in a relationship that must be dealt with in order to restore harmony. Among such words are δυσχεραίνω ("to be annoyed with"), ἔχθρα or ἐχθρός ("enmity," "enemy"), πόλεμος or πολέμιος ("war," "hostile"),

στάσις ("party strife"), κατηγορέω ("to accuse") καταγιγνώσκω ("to condemn"); ἁμαρτάνω ("to err"), κόλασις ("punishment"), ὀργή ("anger"), μέμψις ("complaint"), and χαλεπαίνω ("to be embittered").

On the other hand, the two writers use a series of words that describe both the means of dealing with the estrangement and the resultant amity. Examples of these are ἀμνηστία ("forgetfulness"), χαρίζομαι ("to show kindness"), χάρις ("kindness"), ἐπιείκεια ("clemency"), βελτίωσις ("betterment"), φιλία ("friendship"), εἰρήνη ("peace"), and εὔνοια ("good-will").

A word which Philo frequently conjoins with καταλλάσσω and cognates is σύμβασις, which refers to a treaty or an agreement. Indeed, of the 20 occurrences of the καταλλαγ-group in Philo, eight are associated with σύμβασις and two with ἀσύμβατος ("intransigent").[3] On seven occasions Philo adds the words ἔνσπονδος or σπονδαί to καταλλάσσω.[4] The singular σπονδή means a libation, but the plural form came to refer to a treaty or a truce because such alliances were usually concluded with a libation. Similarly ἔνσπονδος refers to being in alliance or under truce with someone.

The usage with καταλλάσσω of terms related to a truce is no surprise for a word whose milieu is the resolving of hostilities. Philo and Josephus generally address interpersonal conflicts, but the military contexts often surface in their choice of associated terms.

The Parties Involved in Reconciliation

Five uses of καταλλάσσω. In an excellent discussion of the term καταλλάσσω, I. Howard Marshall lists five ways in which the verb is used relative to the parties involved (1990: 258-274). We will use his classification (although relabelled), but since this present study includes the noun, we will ignore the distinction he makes on the basis of the passive, middle, and active voices. This reduces the categories to four as follows:

A. Reconciliation by mediation
B. Reconciliation by initiative
C. Reconciliation by forgiveness
D. Reconciliation by forgiving and removing (*cf.* Marshall 1990: 127)

Reconciliation by mediation. In this method of reconciliation, X persuades Y and Z to give up their mutual anger. A clear example of this type is Philo's narrative concerning the dispute between Lot and Abraham's herdsmen. In an effort to avoid future strife as well as present fictions, Abraham took a position between Lot's and his own herdsmen in order to reconcile the warring factions with conciliatory words (ἀλλ' ἐν μεθορίῳ στὰς συμβατηρίοις λόγοις τοὺς διαφερομένους κατήλλαξεν; Philo, *De Abrahamo* 214).

In Philo's view, if a slave, fleeing from his master's threats, came to a

citizen for protection, he should not be surrendered to the master unless a reconciliation free of deceit and treachery is forthcoming (εἰς ἀδόλους ἐλθὼν καταλλαγὰς τὰς χωρὶς ἐνέδρας; *De Virtute* 124). Clearly the citizen is to act here as a mediator. If his efforts to secure reconciliation between the slave and his master fail, Philo advises that the slave be sold to another master—preferring the risk of a possible evil in an attempt to avoid a known one.

Philo notes that three intercessors mediated the reconciliation of the Israelites to the Father (τρισὶ χρησάμενοι παρακλήτοις τῶν πρὸς πατέρα [Θεὸς] καταλλαγῶν), namely, God's clemency and kindness, the piety of the Patriarchs, and the Israelites' own moral improvement (*De Praemiis et Poenis* 166, 167). Similarly, Josephus uses the noun καταλλάκτης to describe the Israelites' effort to persuade Moses to act as their mediator with God (καὶ [τὸ πλῆθος] τὸν Μωυσῆν παρεκάλει καταλλάκτην αὐτῶν γενέσθαι πρὸς τὸν θεόν; *Jewish Antiquities* 3.315).

Flaccus, the Prefect of Egypt, sent for the city's magistrates, ostensibly for their reconciliation with the rest of the city, though, according to Philo, his real intentions were hostile (ὅσα τῷ δοκεῖν ἐπὶ καταλλαγαῖς πρὸς τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν; *In Flaccum* 77). Flaccus thus feigned to act as a mediator between the estranged parties.

These appear to be all the examples of "reconciliation by mediation" in the writings of Philo and Josephus. It is worth noting that Philo, with one exception, always uses the noun καταλλαγή in the plural form.[5] Stanley Porter, whose study is generally restricted to the verb, suggests multiple reconciliations, but it more likely reflects the dual nature of reconciliation (Porter 1994: 45).

Reconciliation by initiative. The examples in this section are instances where, to use Porter's language, "the subject effects reconciliation (or is reconciled) by persuading a hostile party to give up its anger against the subject" (1964: 17). In other words, X persuades Y to give up Y's anger against X.

Using a domestic image, Philo pictures the soul as a wife deprived of her husband, though not yet divorced from the good (man). By persevering effort, she is able to obtain agreements and reconciliation with her lawful husband, that is, right reason (ἡ χηρεύουσα μὲν μήπω δὲ ἐκβεβλημένη τοῦ καλοῦ ψυχὴ δύναταί πως ἐγκαρτερήσασα τὰς πρὸς τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον τὸν νόμιμον ἄνδρα συμβάσεις καὶ καταλλαγὰς εὑρεῖν).[6]

Philo approves of the biblical injunction to return an enemy's straying beast because he believed that such an act of kindness would, as surely as the shadow follows the body, resolve the enmity (τῆς ἔχθρας διάλυσις; *De Virtute* 118). Being bound by the act of kindness, the enemy is led towards a truce (ἄγεται πρὸς τὸ ἔνσπονδον χάριτι δουλωθείς). Of course the person who returned the beast has demonstrated by that act of kindness that

s/he has already turned her/his mind towards reconciliation (ἤδη πρὸς καταλλαγὰς τὴν δίανοιαν τέτραπται). The subject here initiates the action that leads to reconciliation, which Philo defines as the dissolving of enmity.

Philo wisely thought that quarrels should be conducted with friendship in view. At the very least, even if one is not obliged to do anything for the enemy in the hope of reconciliation (εἰ μέντοι καὶ μηδὲν ὑπὲρ ἐχθροῦ πρακτέον δι' ἐλπίδα καταλλαγῶν), the natural environment does not deserve our hostilities (*De Virtute* 154). This statement is a clear example of "reconciliation by initiative," which presents Philo as something of an environmentalist.

According to Philo, every soul has an accuser (ἔλεγχος), which exhorts it to mend its ways. If the "accuser" succeeds in persuading the soul to change its ways, he rejoices and is reconciled to the soul; but if not, he wars implacably against the soul unceasingly by day and by night (γεγηθὼς καταλλάττεται, μὴ δυνηθεὶς δὲ ἀσπονδεὶ πολεμεῖ μήτε μεθ' ἡμέραν μήτε νύκτωρ ἀφιστάμενος; *De Decalogo* 87). The "monitor" is reconciled by persuading the soul to cease fighting against its admonitions.

In recounting the story of the Levite from Judges 19, Josephus tells us that there were never-ending bickering between the Levite and his wife (μέμψεις συνεχεῖς αὐτοῖς ἐγίνοντο). The wife finally left and returned to her parents. The Levite loved her deeply, so he went to his parents-in-law, and after solving the bickering, he was reconciled to her (διαλυσάμενος τὰς μέμψεις καταλλάττεται πρὸς αὐτήν; *Jewish Antiquities* 5.138). Reconciliation here follows from addressing the cause of the parties' alienation, though the husband, who takes the initiative, did not ever desire the wife's departure.

Josephus writes that the Philistine generals were unhappy with Achish for allowing David to join their forces against the Israelites. They feared that David, an enemy, might use the occasion to become reconciled to his master [Saul] by harming the Philistine force (καὶ γὰρ οὕτω παρέζειν καταλλαγῆναι πρὸς τὸν δεσπότην κακώσαντα τὴν ἡμετέραν δύναμιν; *Jewish Antiquities* 6.353).[7] The assumption is that the subject [David] might overcome Saul's anger by doing an act in his interest, namely, turn against the Philistines.

Reconciliation by forgiveness. In this method of reconciliation, X gives up his own anger against Y. In a metaphorical use of military imagery, Philo speaks of warfare against one's passions: "others to a limited degree mount a war against the passions, but they are reconciled and come to terms with their passions by extending the conciliatory word" (οἱ δὲ βραχέως καὶ οὐ μεγάλως ὁρμῶσιν ἐπι τὸν τῶν παθῶν πόλεμον, ἀλλὰ καταλλάττονται καὶ σπονδὰς πρὸς αὐτὰ τίθενται τὸν συμβατήριον λόγον προτείνοντες; *Legum Allegoriarum* 3.134). Here the subject abandons its own hostility towards the passions.

In Philo's opinion, Flaccus made the politician's worst mistake: he trusted his sworn enemies and repelled his friends, however, the enemies' grudge remained for they pretended by word only to appear to have been reconciled (οἱ δὲ ... τὸ κατηλλάχθαι [a rare example of the perfect infinitive passive] δοκεῖν λόγῳ μόνον ἐπιμορφάσαντες), but their deeds demonstrated otherwise (*In Flaccum* 19). Though in appearances only, the enemies take the initiative in broaching reconciliation.

The king of Egypt, who was apparently angry with his cupbearer, became reconciled to him after a short time (δόξας οἰνοχόῳ δυσχερᾶναι πάλιν οὐκ εἰς μακρὰν καταλλαττόμενος; *De Ebrietate* 208). This was due to the king giving up his anger against the cup-bearer. Even in cases where subjects abandon their anger, reconciliation requires a response. Hence Philo speaks of the cup-bearer having been reconciled (καταλλαγείς), and then promptly forgetting Joseph who had foretold the reconciliation (ὁ ἀρχιοινοχόος ἐκλανθάνεται τοῦ τὰς καταλλαγὰς προειπόντος; *De Josepho* 99).

Philo believed that Pharaoh was able to make reconciliation with the butler, but not the baker, because the former erred in the less serious matter of wine while the latter's sin involved the more important item of bread (πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἀρχιοινοχόον γίνονται καταλλαγαὶ καὶ συμβάσεις ὡς ἂν ἁμαρτόντα περὶ τὸ ἔλαττον μέρος; *De Josepho* 156).

In Philo's account, what moved Joseph to offer reconciliation (συμβάσεις καὶ καταλλαγάς) to his brothers was his love for the family and respect for his father (*De Josepho* 237, 263, 264). Joseph is thus willing to provide amnesty for all that his brothers did to him (ἀμνηστίαν ἁπάντων παρέχω τῶν εἰς ἐμὲ πεπραγμένων; *De Josepho* 237), however, when Jacob dies, the brothers' former fear which they had before the reconciliation (ὃν πρὸ τῶν καταλλαγῶν εἴχετε) is renewed, supposing that Joseph's amnesty (ἀμνεστία) was simply to spare the father grief. Joseph responds by assuring them that he has freely granted them complete release from punishment (τὴν εἰς ἅπαν ἀπαλλαγὴν τῆς κολάσεως ἐχαριζόμην; *De Josepho* 262, 263). He goes so far as to call God as a witness to his conscience that his reconciliation was not false (ὃν [θεὸν] μάρτυρα καλῶ τοῦ συνειδότος ἐπ' ἀψευδέσι καταλλαγαῖς; *De Josepho* 266). Throughout the Joseph story, Philo relates reconciliation to Joseph's surrendering of his own right to be angry with his brothers.

On the basis of Deut 24:1, Philo denounces remarriage to a former wife as adultery. If a wife, after being dismissed, marries another man, and then becomes bereft of her second husband, she cannot reunite with the first husband.[8] If any former husband takes such a woman again as wife he is an adulterer and a panderer (μοιχείαν τε καὶ προαγωγείαν); the subsequent reconciliation with his former wife exposes both of these sins (αἱ γὰρ αὖθις καταλλαγαὶ μηνύματ' εἰσὶ τοῦ ἑκατέρου). Husband and wife are both worthy of death.[9] Presumably in this process, which Philo utterly denounces,

the first husband reverses his previous dismissal of his wife.

Philo makes one metaphorical reference to God in connection with reconciliation. Josephus is more direct (*Jewish Antiquities* 6.143). Samuel beseeches God to be reconciled with Saul (παρακαλεῖν ἤρξατο τὸν θεὸν καταλλάττεσθαι τῷ Σαούλῳ). The reconciliation requires God to abandon his anger (μὴ χαλεπαίνειν), but God is not inclined to grant forgiveness (τὴν συγγνώμην), since it would not be just to forgive sins (ἁμαρτήματα χαρίζεσθαι) on the basis of another's intercession. Reconciliation is again a matter of the subject ceasing to be angry and exercising forgiveness, though in this instance God refuses to do so.

In Josephus' version of the dialogue between the widow of Tekoa and David, the woman says, "be first reconciled to your own son and let your anger toward him cease" (τῷ σαυτοῦ παιδὶ πρῶτον καταλλάγηθι καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ὀργὴν ἄφες; *Jewish Antiquities* 7.184). This is another case where reconciliation is primarily the subject's ability to forgo anger and to offer forgiveness. The initiative of David is preserved by Josephus when he later refers to this event: "as four years had already elapsed after the reconciliation of his father with him" (μετὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καταλλαγὴν τεσσάρων ἐτῶν ἤδη διεληλυθότων).

The emphasis in Artaxerxes' desire to be reconciled to his separated wife, whom he loved dearly, is also on the king's wish to forgive her—a wish frustrated by the non-negotiable nature of Persian law (καταλλαγῆναι μὲν αὐτῇ διὰ τὸν νὸμον οὐκ ἐδύνατο; *Jewish Antiquities* 11.195). The word Josephus uses to describe the queen's separation (διάζευξις) gives an insight into the concept of reconciliation, for it refers to an uncoupling and is the reverse of reconciliation.

The example of Malichus' reconciliation with Antipater is more th subject forgoing duplicity than anger, nevertheless, it belongs under thi heading. Pleading innocence of his intrigue against Antipater, Malichus is reconciled to him and they reach an agreement (καταλλάσσεται πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίπατρον, καὶ συνέβησαν; *Jewish Antiquities* 14.278).

Reconciliation by forgiving and removing: καταλλάσσω in Paul. The method of "reconciliation by forgiving and removing," according to Marshall and Porter, is found only in the writings of the apostle Paul (Marshall 1990: 127, 128; Porter 1994: 15, 16). In this case X removes the cause of his problem with Y, namely, Y's sin.

In Rom 5:8-11, there are a number of terms associated with καταλλάσσω, which are common ground with contexts in Philo and Josephus. Among these are εἰρήνη ("peace"), ἁμαρτωλός ("sinful"), ὀργή ("wrath"), ἐχθρός ("enemy"), and even ἀγάπη ("love").

Paul's argument is *a fortiori* (πολλῷ μᾶλλον). If through the death of Christ we were reconciled to God while we were enemies, we can be more sure of His benign treatment of us in the future now we are His friends. If He did

the big thing of giving His Son in death for enemies, He certainly will not withhold His Son's life from friends. Cranfield quotes Chrysostom to great effect: ὁ γὰρ τὸ μεῖζον τοῖς ἐχθροῖς δεδωκὼς πῶς τὰ ἐλάττονα οὐ δώσει τοῖς φιλοῖς; ("for shall not he who has given the greater thing to his enemies, give the least things to his friends?"; 1975 I: 268).

The aorist passives in Rom 5:10 are not referring to any human action, whether directed to God or to itself (Porter 1994: 160, 161). Romans 5:8-11 fits within the "reconciliation by forgiving and removing category," the τῷ θεῷ (Rom 5:10a) notwithstanding. God (ὁ θεός, Rom 5:9), through His action in Christ, has dealt with human sin. Paul's δικαιωθέντες (Rom 5:1, 9) is the guarantee that God has now in the present time dealt with sin. The interpersonal and reciprocal nature of reconciliation is preserved in Paul's assurance that we have now received reconciliation through Christ (Rom 5:11).

There are two places in Philo and two in Josephus which deal with marital reconciliation and they are relevant to 1 Cor 7:10, 11. In the cases in *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat* 149, *Jewish Antiquities* 5.137 and *Jewish Antiquities* 11.195, the situation appears to be short of divorce and, therefore, from the Jewish point of view, open to reconciliation. That is to say, ἡ χηρεύουσα μὲν μήπω δὲ ἐκβεβλημένη τοῦ καλοῦ ψυχή (*Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat* 149), καταλιποῦσα τὸν ἄνδρα (*Jewish Antiquities* 5.137) and τὴν διάζευξιν (*Jewish Antiquities* 11:195) parallel Paul's γυναῖκα ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς μὴ χωρισθῆναι (1 Cor 7:10). The separation (ἀπαλλαγεῖσα) in *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.31 implies divorce since the woman remarries. Therefore the reconciliation with her former husband is illegitimate and Philo severely condemns it.

The Rabbis understood the law against remarriage to a former husband (Deut 24:1), to be a means of preventing the use of divorce to facilitate wife swapping. This appears to be Philo's view too, hence his pejorative condemnation of the first husband as a pimp (*De Specialibus Legibus* 3.31). Thus Philo and Josephus allow for reconciliation only in cases where the husband and wife have separated, but have not yet formally divorced. Once divorce has occurred, honorable reconciliation is not possible. This appears to be Paul's position too.[10]

The aorist infinitive passive (χωρισθῆναι) follows a verb of "saying", and is used deponently with middle voice, "I say ... that a wife should not separate herself from her husband." The driving force behind the wife's action might be a misunderstanding of the Christian attitude to sex in marriage. She may think that physical desires are inimical to spirituality (Hurd, Jr. 1983: 167, 168; *contra* Dungan 1971: 89-93). The onus for reconciliation thus falls on the wife, presumably either to abandon her view of marital sexuality or to forgo her own anger (Fee 1987: 290-296). Accordingly, this verse is similar to "reconciliation by forgiveness," with this modification: the wife does not

simply accept back the husband with whom she has been angry, but she returns to him.[11]

The uniqueness of 2 Cor 5:18-21 is immediately apparent in that God is the stated subject of both participles in 2 Cor 5:18, 19, and yet the indirect object is the reflexive ἑαυτῷ in both cases. Philo and Josephus prefer πρός with the accusative following καταλλάσσω, though there are several examples of the dative, however, these two writers never have the subject actively reconciling someone or something to himself or herself. In 2 Cor 5:18, 19, God reconciles "us" and "the world" to Himself; such a usage distances Paul from his two fellow Jews.

The method of God's reconciliation is via forgiveness, "by not imputing to them their transgressions" (λογιζόμενος αὐτοῖς τὰ παραπτώματα αὐτῶν, 2 Cor 5:19). The means of the reconciliation was the death of Christ (2 Cor 5:14, 15, 21), which must be assumed to be present in the simple διὰ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 5:18) and ἐν Χριστῷ (2 Cor 5:19). 2 Corinthians 5:19 is probably an imperfect periphrasis, "God, by Christ, was reconciling the world to himself."[12]

The exhortation in 2 Cor 5:20, δεόμεθα ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, καταλλάγητε τῷ θεῷ, is similar to "reconciliation by mediation," but the emphasis on God's prior role places the passage in the "reconciliation by initiative" category. The apostles' ambassadorial appeal, "as though God were entreating through us," illustrates again the reciprocal nature of reconciliation.[13] As Marshall says, "the action is complete only when friendly mutual relations are restored" (1990: 121). Forgiveness always has as its objective the restoration of relationships. This passage is an additional example of "reconciliation by forgiving and removing."

Conclusion

As far as a comparison with Philo and Josephus is concerned, this study concurs with the conclusion of Marshall and Porter. That is, that Paul uses the καταλλαγ-group in a way that is new, a semantic lateral shift. There are clear affinities between the three Jewish authors, but Paul, moved as he was by the saving significance of the death of Christ, gives the term reconciliation a new and unique context. God not only forgives sinners, He also removes the barrier of their sin.

Notes

1. Surprisingly, Steve Mason (1992) gives little attention to the relevance of Josephus' Greek for New Testament usage.

2. *De Somniis* 2.108 is an example of the subject giving up his own anger, for Philo speaks of Joseph's repentance (μετανοία).

3. *Legum Allegoriarum* 3.134; *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat* 149; *De Somniis* 2.108; *De Abrahamo* 214; *De Josepho* 156, 237; *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.31; *De Praemiis et Poenis* 166, 167; and *De Josepho* 156; *In Flaccum* 19.2. Josephus uses the verb συμβαίνω ("to agree with," *Jewish Antiquities* 14.278).

4. *Legum Allegoriarum* 134; *De Ebrietate* 208; *De Josepho* 263; *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.30, 31; *De Virtute* 119, 154; *De Praemiis et Poenis* 166, 167.

5. The one exception is *De Vita Mosis* 60, where either the sense is unusual or the text is corrupt.

6. *Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat* 149. Loeb translates "widowed but not yet cast out," which does not make much sense of the later reconciliation, that is, if the husband is dead. *LSJ* gives "divorce" as one of the meanings of ἐκβάλλω, *cf.* Lev 21:7 (LXX) καὶ γυναῖκα ἐκβεβλημένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς. S. Belkin points out that Philo uses χηρεύω for deprivation by divorce as well as by the death of the husband.

7. The Loeb reads καιρὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ and κακώσαντι. I have taken καταλλαγῆναι as an ingressive aorist infinitive; *cf.* 1 Sam 29:4 (LXX) which uses διαλλάσσω in the same context.

8. Taking ἀπαλλαγεῖσα as dismissal following the issuing of a bill of divorce (*cf. TDNT* I.253). Χηρεύσῃ cannot mean "widowed" here because Philo then says "whether the second husband is alive or dead;" if she were widowed the state of the second husband's health would be obvious.; *cf.* fn 22.

9. *De Specialibus Legibus* 3.31. The Loeb translation "if a man is willing to contract himself to such a woman" is misleading. Philo does not disallow an alliance with a third husband, but to her first husband only (ἀλλὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔνσπονδος μᾶλλον ἢ τῷδε γενέσθω). It is her reconciliation with her first husband after the ending of the second marriage that constitutes the sin for Philo (see L. William Countryman 1989: 37 fn. 29).

10. I do not agree with those commentators who take χωρίζω as a synonym for ἀφίημι, that is, as referring to divorce.

11. For this reason Marshall sees elements of both "reconciliation by initiative" and "reconciliation by forgiveness" (1990: 121).

12. Paul uses periphrastic tenses 24 times, and the imperfect five times if we include 2 Cor 5:19. The only examples besides 2 Cor 5:19 where there are intervening words other than δέ are Col 2:10, 23, which many would not accept as Paul's.

13. The genitive absolute with ὡς is conditional or supposition.

References

Belkin, S.
1940 *Philo and the Oral Law*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Bilde, P.
1988 *Flavius Josephus Between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works and Their Importance*. Sheffield: Journal for the Study of the Old Testament.

Chadwick, H.
1965-66 St. Paul and Philo of Alexandria. *Bulletin, John Rylands Library* 48: 292.

Countryman, W.
1989 *Dirt, Greed & Sex: Sexual Ethics in the New Testament and Their Implication for Today*. London: SCM.

Cranfield, C. E. B.
1975 *The Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

De Abrahamo = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1935 *On Abraham*. Pp. 2-135 in *Philo*, vol. 6. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Decalogo = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1938 *On the Decalogue*. Pp. 3-95 in *Philo*, vol. 7. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Ebrietate = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1930 *On Drunkenness*. Pp. 308-435 in *Philo*, vol. 3. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: Putnam's Sons.

De Josepho = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1935 *On Joseph*. Pp. 138-271 in *Philo*, vol. 6. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Praemiis et Poenis = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1935 *On Rewards and Punishments*. Pp. 309-423 in *Philo*, vol. 8. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Somniis = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1934 *On Dreams, that they are God-sent*. Pp. 285-575 in *Philo*, vol. 5. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: Putnam's Sons.

De Specialibus Legibus = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1938-40 *On the Special Laws*. Pp. 98-209 in *Philo*, vol. 6 and Pp. 3-155 in *Philo*, vol. 8. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Virtute = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1940 *On the Virtues*. Pp. 158-305 in *Philo*, vol. 8. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

De Vita Mosis = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1935 *On Moses I & II*. Pp. 274-595 in *Philo*, vol. 6. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Dungan, D. L.
1971 *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Fee, G. D.
1987 *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Hengel, M.
1991 *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM/TPI.

Hurd, J. C., Jr.
1983 *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. 2nd ed. Macon, GA: Mercer University.

In Flaccum = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1935 *Flaccus*. Pp. 295-403 in *Philo*, vol. 9. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Jewish Antiquities = Josephus, F.
1934 *Jewish Antiquities*, 8 vols. Trans. H. St. J. Thackery and R. Marcus. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Legum Allegoriarum = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1929 *Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis II, III*. Pp. 140-473 in *Philo*, vol. 1. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: Putnam's Sons.

Marshall, I. H.
1990 *Jesus the Saviour: Studies in New Testament Theology*. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity.

Mason, S.
1992 *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Morris, L.
1960 *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross*. 2nd ed. London: Tyndale.

Porter, S. E.
1993 Did Jesus Ever Teach in Greek? *Tyndal Bulletin* 44: 199-235.

1994 Καταλλάσσω in Ancient Greek Literature, with Reference to the Pauline Writings. *Estudios de Filologia Neotestamentaria* 5: 45. Cordoba: Ediciones El Almendro.

Quod Deterius Potiori Insidiari Soleat = Page, T. E.; Capps, E.; and Rouse, W. H. D., eds.
1929 *That the Worse is Wont to Attack*. Pp. 198-319 in *Philo*, vol. 2. The Loeb Classical Library. Trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. New York: Putnam's Sons.

Rajak, T.
1984 *Josephus: The Historian and His society*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Van Unnik, W. C.
1973 Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth. Pp. 259-320 in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. Van Unnik*, vol. 1. Leiden: Brill.