words these have been placed without citation in an appendix at the end of volume 2 and this is indicated in the introduction. Obvious corruptions which are not the same word, such as יְשִׁירָה and יִשְׁרָה do have separate entries for variants. Theophoric and angelic expressions, which are very interesting to many students of the hekhalot texts, are placed in separate entries. That means that one who is interested in the use of words within them cannot restrict his search to a single entry in the concordance. Moreover, the user must constantly refer back to the Synopsis to see what the alternative readings are.

The basic problem with this concordance is that the 'text' which forms its base is not what most people understand a text to be, and the information which scholars want and need to retrieve for their study cannot be presented within the confines of a printed concordance. The material calls out for a computer text retrieval system in which the researcher can ask for all the occurrences of a given word or word-form, a given expression (theophoric or not), collocates within specified ranges, and even linguistic structures or a restricted set of occurrences.

This concordance has been well constructed. The introduction states very clearly how it is organised, where to look up items, and what criteria were used for including and excluding items. There is very full cross-referencing system for finding items. However, it shows at the same time the restrictions of a printed concordance. An alternative medium would make it possible for the user to restrict or expand the range for questions of the text. Secondly as the textbase is expanded it could be distributed inexpensively with the concordance updated, avoiding the timelag between text edition and concordance which has been inevitable up to now. Without a doubt printed concordances have been extremely valuable to scholars studying texts for centuries, but with present possibilities is this the most useful information retrieval tool for scholars to examine texts?

Harry Gaylord

Folker Siegert, Philon von Alexandrien: Über die Gottesbezeichnung "wohltätig verzehrendes Feuer" (De Deo). Rückübersetzung des Fragments aus dem Armenischen, deutsche Übersetzung und Kommentar (WUZNT, 46), J. C. B. Mohr (Siebeck), Tübingen 1988, viii and 190 pp., cloth DM 89,—.

The parts of the Philonic corpus that have survived in Armenian alone have been the object of renewed interest in recent decades. The late Hans Lewy had planned an edition of this material and prepared himself in Classical Armenian to that purpose. The first fruit of his work was his edition of the pseudo-Philonic De Jona which appeared in 1936¹). Lewy died
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prematurely in 1949, and the second volume of his work, containing his translation and commentary on the De Jona will be published by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. In that volume he presented a partial Greek retroversion of the De Jona, but unfortunately, the card file upon which it was based is not to be found in his literary Nachlasse²). It is impossible to assess LEWY's work until the book is published.

Folker SIEGERT has made a solid and consistent contribution to the study of the corpus of Armenian Philonic and pseudo-Philonic writings. His was the first translation into a modern Western European language of the three (as then considered) pseudo-Philonic writings that had survived in Armenian, but not in their Greek originals, viz. De Sampsone, De Jona, and De Deo³). The book being reviewed here is a further contribution to this study. SIEGERT’S publications combine with the works of the late Charles MERCIER and of Abraham TERIAN to provide us with new insights into the Armenian version of Philo and associated writings⁴).

In his new work, SIEGERT has made a bold attempt to retrovert the De Deo (which he has now moved to the category of a genuine Philonic work) from Armenian into Greek. In view of the formal, “calque-like” technique of the school of translators to which that (those?) of Philo belonged, this is not as unpromising an enterprise as might have been anticipated. He reprinted the Armenian text of the edition of AUCHER, and for the Greek reconstruction he used two chief instruments, MARCUS’ index mentioned in note 2 above, and the Greek equivalents provided by the great Armenian dictionary of 1836-75). Given the imperfection of these instruments, the overall success of the reconstruction, which must be conjectural in good part, should be judged by scholars who specialize in Philonic studies.

The book opens with an Introduction which discusses the authenticity of the text, the methodology of the reconstruction, and the presentation of the Commentary. Then follow the texts, in Armenian, Greek, and German, while the major part of the book is made up of a commentary on the text and a series of Excursuses dealing with specific issues in the thought of Philo arising from this text. A Bibliography and a number of Indexes conclude this work. It is clearly a significant contribution to Philonic studies and to the investigation of the “Hellenophile School” of Armenian translations.

As an arménisant, I would have been happy to see a bi-lingual Armenian Greek wordlist and, even more, an index of Armenian-Greek morphological and syntactical equivalents. Dr. SIEGERT should be encouraged to publish these lists, which he must have assembled in the course of his work, in a form accessible to others. A further remark may be made. This type of study would benefit particularly from the use of a computer. In other languages, translated texts have been aligned with their originals, and bi-lingual lexicons or concordances have been made. The value of