would be sufficient to contain God's powers?).[1] On p. 120, in an interesting section on architecture in the Septuagint, κτίσμα αἰῶνος in Sirach 38:34 is translated "fondazione dell'eternità" (foundation or founding of eternity) but interpreted as "sussistenza del mondo" (subsistence of the world); the interpretation is valid; the translation is not, since αἰών in Sirach, and in the Septuagint as a whole, stands for all time concurrent with the created world —κτίσμα αἰῶνος therefore indicating the created world in all its duration.[2]

Two final observations regard more formal aspects. First, the notes in the monograph are particularly readable and uncluttered thanks to the Harvard system of referencing (by author and date), especially in Italy, far from universally applied. Lastly, the indices unfortunately are limited to passages from Philo, the Septuagint, the New Testament, and Greek authors. They do not include proper names, subjects, and Greek terms, which would have been very helpful to further disclose the goldmine represented by De Luca's book (the e-book version in this respect will have the advantage of being wholly searchable).

Heleen Keizer
Monza, Italy

Philo van Alexandrië, *De schepping van de wereld*. Ingeleid, vertaald en toegelicht door Albert-Kees Geljon. Eindhoven: Damon, 2020. 155 pages. ISBN 978.9463402828. € 24,90.

This book contains an annotated Dutch translation of Philo's work *On the Creation of the World* (*De opificio mundi*), an introduction, a translation of Genesis 1–3 according to the Septuagint version, a briefly introduced translation of Ambrose's *Epistle* 43 (or V.29), a bibliography, and indices. It is a privilege that in the present time, characterized by the dominance of the English language in research and teaching, some of Philo's works are made accessible in the language of the Netherlands and the north western half of Belgium. Both for a broader and an academic readership Philo is not an easy

[1] τίς ἂν εἴη ... τόπος ἕτερος, ὃς γένοιτ' ἂν ἱκανος...; translated on p. 71 "what other place ... would there be different from the one that had been generated as adequate...?" (quale altro luogo ... vi sarebbe diverso da quello che fosse stato generato come adatto...?), and on p. 82 "what would have been another place ... that had been generated suitable...?" (quale sarebbe stato altro luogo ... che fosse stato generato idoneo...?). For De Luca, Philo uses here the verb γένοιτο to indicate, like he does elsewhere, that the noetic world is *generated* by God (p. 71 note 40).

[2] I hope to be forgiven for referring to Helena Maria Keizer, *Life Time Entirety: A Study of AIΩN in Greek Literature and Philosophy, the Septuagint and Philo* (diss. Amsterdam 1999; repr. Google Books, 2010), esp. 172–204.

author, and a translation into the native language of students and other interested people is helpful to grasp his interpretation of scripture.

The translator has cut the long and convoluted Greek sentences into shorter parts without doing injustice to the content. This results in a readable translation, which is a fine achievement, given the complicated text that Philo wrote. The annotation refers to many of his other works, to ancient philosophers, and to the Bible, including translations of the relevant passages (except for scripture, the texts of which are widely available).

Philo presented a Platonic interpretation of the creation of the world. He read the creation in six days and the subsequent rest day according to Gen 1:1–2:5a as God's draft of incorporeal, noetic ideas, and in the creation of Paradise and its inhabitants in Gen 2:5b–25 he recognized the subsequent material realization of creation made in keeping with the initial draft. This scheme influenced Christian scholars like Clement, Origen, and Ambrose, which implies that their expositions are incomprehensible without a profound knowledge of their Jewish predecessor. Dr. Geljon declares that for his annotation he drew heavily on David Runia's commentary on the same work, published in the Philo of Alexandria Commentary Series in 2001.

The Introduction is clear and helpful, but it is about these 31 pages that I still have a few critical remarks. Geljon is right in considering the story about Philo's encounter with the apostle Peter in Rome a legend and a fable (pp. 13–14), although he fails to refer to its source; it is found in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Church History* 2.16.2–17.1. Curiously, he omits such a critical assessment when he relates Philo's account of the origin of the Septuagint, which concerns the translators from Jerusalem invited by Ptolemy II. All of them allegedly produced the same Greek translation of the Hebrew books, which was seen as a proof of its divine inspiration (p. 12). To be sure, Geljon ascribes this story to Philo, and one should not assume that he reads it as true history. Because of its fabulous contents, critical readers will not accept it as being historically reliable, but surprisingly an uninformed, uncritical reader is not warned at all that this is a legend.

Another uncritical aspect of the Introduction is found in the references to "the catechetical school" or "the Christian school" in Alexandria with which Pantenus, Clement, and Origen were affiliated (p. 34). Here Geljon follows the frame introduced by Eusebius, *Church History* 5 and 6, who suggestively presents a stable institution of uninterrupted teaching of the Christian faith. However, his idea was capably deconstructed by Annewies van den Hoek and should therefore be represented with utmost caution.[1] To conclude these quibbles, Geljon calls the third-century Caesarean rabbi Hoshaya a friend of

[1] Annewies Van den Hoek, "The 'Catechetical' School of Early Christian Alexandria and Its Philonic Heritage," *HTR* 90 (1997): 59–87.

Origen, for which he refers to Runia's commentary. In keeping with W. Bacher, George Foot Moore, Hans Bietenhard, Nicholas de Lange, and Günter Stemberger, we may consider it likely indeed that Hoshaya and Origen met in Caesarea Maritima when both of them lived there, and that they debated about the interpretation of scripture. There is no ancient source that informs us about their friendship, and as far as I can determine, the five authoritative scholars mentioned above did not speculate about it.

The translation of Ambrose's *Epistle* 43 (or V.29 in Otto Faller's edition, CSEL 82,1), from ca. 387 CE, is included in this volume because it gives a fine example of the reception of Philo by a Christian author. In his work on the creation in six days, the *Hexaemeron*, Ambrose had not discussed the question of why the human being was created last. His former pupil Orontianus had asked him about this, and for his answer Ambrose clearly draws on Philo's treatise *On the Creation of the World*. He explains that, as a good host, God invited his friend when the preparation of the feast was ready. Furthermore, the epistle gives insight into the amalgamation of biblical religion and Platonism, which remained common practice in Christian theology for centuries. Philo was an important link in this connection, as this Dutch translation demonstrates eloquently.

Riemer Roukema
Protestant Theological University
Amsterdam and Groningen