Heraclitus. At 17 (cf. also 5), it could have been pointed out that ὁρθὸς λόγος is Stoic. For 20, cf. the aviary at Plat., Tht. 197 d-e, 198 a, 199 a-b. At 24, ὁρικῶς ...ὑπογραφέσθαι, we have a Philonic combination of two Stoic technical terms, cf., e.g., Diog. Laert. VII 60 (SVF II 225, III Ant. 23). For 34, final sentence, cf. Heracl., Vorsokr. 22 B 43 (102 Marc.) and B 85 (70 Marc.). For 39, cf. Epictetus’ picture of the pseudo-philosopher at Diatr. IV 8. For 50, κατὰ τὰ πάντα καὶ ὠσαύτως, cf. also Aēt. I 27, 5 = SVF I 176. The word μετάρρυσσις (62) in prose is classical if the wording of the decree of Diopeithes ap. Plut., Per. 32 (Vorsokr. 59 A 17) is authentic, as I believe it is. For the topical idea behind 62 cf. Pindar ap. Plat., Tht. 173 e (in the famous so-called excursus).
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The increasing attention that has been paid to the elusive figure of Philo of Alexandria in recent years has led to a steady stream of studies devoted to his writings and thought. If works dealing with introductory and methodological matters are left out of account, we find that these books can be roughly divided into two groups. A number of studies have concentrated on the actual text of Philo’s treatises, deepening our understanding of his intentions in writing them (two outstanding examples recently reviewed in VChr 38 (1984), 209-236). The second group adopts a more synoptic approach. Scholars select an aspect of Philo’s thought and investigate it by examining a diversity of texts drawn from his entire œuvre. It is clearly to the latter group that Mendelson’s study on the role of ἐγκύκλιος παideía in Philo belongs. This compact, elegantly produced monograph represents the mature distillation of research

Mnemosyne, Vol. XXXIX, Fasc. 3-4 (1986)
that began with the preparation of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the University of Chicago in 1971.

The extent to which we should talk of Hellenistic Judaism as a separate group with an identity of its own within Judaism at the beginning of our era remains a hotly debated issue among scholars. But clearly the influence of Greek culture was felt more strongly in Alexandria than anywhere else. Mendelson's primary interest lies in determining Philo's place in Judaism. The encyclical studies—i.e. the school subjects at about our upper secondary level, commonly regarded in the ancient world as preparatory to the study of philosophy—are a valuable test-case. The aim is not to examine Philo's own knowledge of these studies (already dealt with in a number of studies), but rather to "draw out the social, philosophical and theological implications of Philo's position" on their role and proper usage (p. xxv).

The most important result of the investigation is the conclusion that Philo regards the encyclical studies as having an inherent spiritual value in their own right. Indispensable background here is what Mendelson calls "Philo's typology of mankind". In Philo's view God in his graciousness bestows on each person the knowledge appropriate to his or her station and endowment, so that a hierarchy of recipients of knowledge ensues, illustrated by a diversity of biblical personages. Perhaps one should speak of 'hierarchies', for there is considerable variation in Philo's schemata. Our author is convinced, however, that this is mainly a matter of terminology (p. 50 and n. 20), and that the basic schema is tripartite: men of God (Isaac, Moses), men of heaven (Abram/Abraham, Bezalel), men of earth (Nimrod) (cf. Gig. 60 ff.). But there is a dynamic element. By means of παιδεία and φιλοσοφία a man of progress (προχόρητων) such as Abraham can attain the σοφία of the perfect (τέλειος) (hence his change of name). It is particularly the remaining members of the middle group which interest Mendelson. The "class of ordinary men" such as Bezalel remain at the level of the ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία, but draw positive benefit from it, for it enables them to reflect on the wonders of the universe and so gain a knowledge of God at their own level (cf. Leg. 3.99). Thus, in spite of occasional deprecatory remarks, Philo does accord the encyclical a spiritual value of their own. Here lies his contribution to their history, and not so much in his description and use of them individually (the exegetical use of arithmology and certain views on the value and dangers of astronomy are only of marginal interest for the history of the disciplines themselves, p. 24).