

The Text of Philo's *De Decalogo*¹

James R. Royse

The treatise *De Decalogo* is very well attested, being contained in twenty-two Greek manuscripts as well as in the Armenian version. However, instead of attempting some kind of overview of these textual witnesses or the various textual problems, I will concentrate here on a very valuable witness that is largely unknown: Vaticanus gr. 316. This manuscript, designated R by PCW, is a palimpsest from around 900, which was dismembered in the thirteenth century and re-used for various comments on Aristotle's works. Originally this was an extensive collection of Philonic works, written on large folios in two columns. Large portions of the original ms. have been lost, but the surviving folios contain the complete text of *Decal.*, as well as *Spec.* 1, and portions of *Spec.* 2, *Migr.*, *Ios.*, and *Mos.* 1.² However, although the presence of Philonic works was noted a few times during the nineteenth century, R escaped the notice of Cohn and Wendland until after their work on PCW 4. As a result it is not cited in PCW 4, where Cohn edits *Decal.* So the still-standard critical edition of Philo's works that have been preserved in Greek presents to the reader a text of *Decal.* with an apparatus in which R is absent.

Now, once Cohn found R, he did try to correct this absence. For one thing, the reader is informed about the existence of R in the preface to PCW 5, although the notice is very brief, and as far as the text of *Decal.* is concerned does not do much more than refer to Cohn's article on R. But even that article, devoted to this very valuable manuscript, gives less than a page to the readings of R in *Decal.* A detailed look at the readings that Cohn presents there will be given below, but we will see that what Cohn cites is in fact a very limited selection. This selection, although very limited, nevertheless shows that R contains some very interesting readings, including (as it seems) some correct readings not found elsewhere. But Cohn does not give any further attention to R in *Decal.*

Readings from R cited by Cohn

¹ Presented to the Philo of Alexandria Section at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in San Diego, November 25, 2014.

² See PCW 5:v-vi.

a) shared errors:

- §62 τὸ ἴσον ἀποδιδόντες M (PCW) : τῶν ἴσων μεταδιδόντες R ceteri
 §112 ἔχοντες Arm (PCW) : μέλλοντες R ceteri
 §171 παρακαταθηκῶν Arm (PCW) : παρακαταθήκαις R ceteri

b) unique errors:

- §128 μοιχίδιοι ceteri (PCW) : μοιχιμαῖοι R
 §156 ἀγάλματα ceteri (PCW) : ἅ ἦν ἀγάλματα R
 §177 αἶρηται ceteri (PCW) : ὀρᾶ R

c) good or noteworthy readings:

- §5 ἀνισότητος R (PCW, conī. Mangey) : ἀνοσιότητος ceteri Arm³
 §8 φύσει ceteri Arm (PCW) : φύσει πατρός R
 §13 πόλιν ceteri : πόλεις R Arm (Mangey)
 §31 κατακεκλιμένος ceteri : κατακλινόμενος R Arm⁴
 §36 ἀπορήσαι GH² (PCW) : ἀπορήσαι MFH¹ : ἀπορήσοι AP (Mangey) : διαπορήσαι R
 §64 καθό ceteri (PCW) : πρὸς ὃ M : παρόσον R
 §88 ἐγὼ μὲν γε Cohn (PCW) : ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ M : ἐγὼ μὲν ceteri : ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν R⁵
 §89 ἐπεὶ R (PCW, = Arm) : ἐπὶ M : om. ceteri
 §96 τῆς κατὰ θεὸν νουμηνίας ceteri Arm (PCW) : τῆς κατὰ σελήνην νεομηνίας R (= Cohn)

³ PCW does not cite Arm here. In fact, the Armenian reads *anaržanut'iwñ*, which corresponds (according to NB 1:116A) to ἀνάξιον, ἀπαξία, indignitas. The term corresponding to ἀνισότης is *anzugut'iwñ* (NB 1:146B), as seen at *Spec.* 1.121; *Contempl.* 70; *QG* 2:14; *QE* 1:6 (see Petit's note), 2:64. On the other hand, ἀνοσιότης does not occur in Philo. However, ὀσιότης does, and it is rendered by *aržanut'iwñ* (see NB 1: 357C, where no Greek is given, but a reference to *aržanaworut'iwñ* at *Decal.* 110, 119; and by *aržanawor* at *Spec.* 1.304; but by *aržanaworut'iwñ* (NB 1:357A gives ἀξιότης) at *Spec.* 1.154; *Abr.* 198, 208; by *aržanaworut'iwñ ew srbut'iwñ* at *Abr.* 172. Given these equivalents, we can see that *anaržanut'iwñ* (in Armenian the prefix *an-* functions like the *ἀ-*privative in Greek) at *Decal.* 5 must represent ἀνοσιότητος. (It is curious that none of these Armenian words is cited by Marcus in his index.)

⁴ PCW does not cite Arm here, but the form *ankolmanelov* seems to reflect a present participle.

⁵ In PCW Cohn places "(Arm?)" after the reading of M. Indeed, it seems that the Armenian *vasn zi* would most likely reflect the Greek γάρ, as at *Prov.* 2.30.

1904)⁶

§138 ἱερώτερον R v (PCW) : ἱερώτατον ceteri D arm has srbagoyñ terunean.

§147–48 ἀσθενήσαντες

Cohn does not mention this, but in fact almost all of these readings are to be found within very limited areas of R. To understand this, we need to visualize how the original manuscript of Philonic works was re-used for the Aristotelian works. An original large folio was turned at a right angle and folded in half in order to form a double folio (i.e., four pages). Four of these double folios were then gathered into a quaternion, and the scribe wrote on each of the resulting sixteen pages. Since the original folios had been turned sideways, the upper writing was perpendicular to the lower writing. Thus, when we look at the resulting manuscript, the upper writing on a page covers the lower writing on either the top half or the bottom half of one of the original folios (each written in two columns, recall). Now, in between the two pages that were formed from one side of an original folio is a small area where the new double folio was folded in half. Let me call this area the “fold” of the original folio. This area was not written over. And thus the writing in these folds is often quite clearly readable. Unfortunately, on occasion even here the writing has faded badly and is difficult to read,⁷ and sometimes a line (in each column) that was exactly at the line of the fold has been obscured. But in general the text here, which consists of perhaps four or five lines in each of the two columns, is more or less completely legible.

Now, almost all of Cohn’s readings are from these folds. He has thus selected his examples from the most legible portions of R. Given that his focus was on the portions of *Spec.* preserved in R, this was no doubt a reasonable procedure. But we should keep this in mind when thinking about the significance of his examples. He finds these readings by looking at perhaps 15% or so of the text. We could plausibly estimate that many further readings in his three categories are to be found in the entire text of R—if, that is, we could read them.

Let me also note here that the ms. is currently arranged in an unusual state. In 1904 the later binding of the ms. was removed, so that the original large folios can be seen in their entirety.⁸ These folios are not bound together, but rather each one is separately attached at a narrow end (i.e., the original top end or bottom end) to a binding. However, these folios are not arranged according to the order of the Philonic works,

⁶ Cohn reports R as reading *νοῦμηνίας* with the rest of the mss. That is most likely what Philo wrote, but in fact R has *νεομημίας*. Note that PCW prints the form *νεομημία* at *Somn.* 2.257, 257. Elsewhere (fourteen occurrences in *Spec.* 1–2) PCW prints the form *νοῦμηνία*, but Cohn notes at *Spec.* 1.181 that R has *νεομηνία*, and at *Spec.* 2.41 that F has *νεομηνία*.

⁷ I note, e.g., that at f. 17^r/24^v B, the letters in the fold are very faint (to non-existent).

⁸ See Mercati, “Appunti,” 544 n. 2.

but according to the later writing. Now, making specific references to these original folios is a bit complicated. The foliation was made on the “new” folios,⁹ which contain the upper writing, and each of the “old” folios, which contain the lower writing, consists of two of those folios. And, of course, a page is one side of a folio. For example, the original first page of *Decal.* is now found across the “new” pages that are numbered 42^v and 47^r; thus that original first page is designated 42^v/47^r. And there are two columns on that page. Unfortunately, as a result of the dismemberment of the original ms. and the re-ordering of the folios, nothing remains of the original order. The second page of *Decal.* is 37^r/36^v. Fortunately, Mercati (in the Vatican catalogue, discussed below) provides a thorough listing of which Philonic texts are at which locations.

Before turning to my own work on R, let me return to the literature. The diligent student of Philo will, of course, follow the leads provided in the prefaces to the various volumes of PCW, and thus will learn of Cohn’s article. The diligent student will also, of course, follow the leads found in the various bibliographies. Now, as it turns out, Goodhart and Goodenough refer at the end of their listing of Vaticanus gr. 316 (their item 107) to Cohn’s article, which is more fully cited as their item 858. Of course, they could have easily followed their practice elsewhere and also referred to the discussion in PCW 5, although (again) the diligent student will have found that anyway. But they do not refer to another item of interest, namely their item 864, which is an article by Mercati devoted to R. It would have been helpful if Goodhart and Goodenough had provided the information that the “Vatican palimpsest” discussed by Mercati is indeed Vaticanus gr. 316, although perhaps anyone actually pursuing these leads would have already figured that out. In fact, Mercati’s article is a very valuable contribution to our knowledge of R in two respects. First, he devotes attention to a reconstruction of the contents of the various Philonic works that are found in the lower writing of R. And second, he discusses several dozen readings in R from *Spec.* 1, where Mercati’s reading of R differs from that found in PCW 5. These remarks are of considerable importance, but at no point does Mercati give information about R’s witness to *Decal.* Thus I will not give further attention to it on this occasion.

However, not to be found in Goodhart and Goodenough (or elsewhere in the literature on Philo, I believe) is another important work by Mercati, which is properly speaking a codicological study, but which provides some important textual information. This is the catalogue of the Vatican Greek mss. 1–329, published in 1923 by Mercati and Pio Franchi de’ Cavalieri.¹⁰ The entry on Vaticanus gr. 316 was written by Mercati, and is unusually extensive and thorough. Now, I do not suppose that very many of even the most diligent students of Philo consider the manuscript catalogues of the world to be relevant reading. And in fact usually one will find nothing of textual interest beyond what Cohn and Wendland have already furnished,

⁹ Due to an error in the foliation, between f. 91 and f. 92 there are two further folios, numbered 91A and 91B.

¹⁰ In his article Mercati says at the beginning that that study arose from his work on the then forthcoming catalogue.

namely the date and contents of the manuscript. But Mercati's entry on R is a vivid exception to this general practice. Mercati not only describes very thoroughly both the upper and lower texts, but presents a very detailed listing of which Philonic texts occur on which pages. And he identifies these texts by reference to the Cohn-Wendland edition by giving, for each original page three texts for orientation: the first word or two or three of column A (i.e., the first words of the page), the first word or two or three of column B, and the last word or two or three of column B (i.e., the last words of the page). Now, this is a fairly minimal amount of text, amounting to a half dozen or so words on each page. And most of the time the words are simply what one finds in Cohn-Wendland, and so serve to confirm, let us say, the wisdom of Cohn's editorial choices (since they are supported by R), as well as also the reliability of the textual tradition found in R. However, here are there Mercati presents among these little bits of text a word or two where R differs from the Cohn-Wendland text. And of course these are of very great interest.

Below you will find a complete listing of these places, but let me first note how much attention Mercati evidently gave to this manuscript in order to list these identifications. Some of the words are more or less easily readable, but in general considerable study is required to provide these words. Sometimes indeed it takes a while even to find the last line of a column. Of course, the first line is usually readily found. But finding the line is only the beginning. And remember that these texts at the beginnings and ends of columns are almost always obscured (more or less) by the upper writing. (The only exception here is that sometimes the upper writing will be slightly lower on the page than the top lines of the lower writing.)

The results of this patient research are as follows, where I list only the places that disagree with the text of PCW:

- | | |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| §14 | εὐτρεπίζονται : εὐτρεπίζοντες R H |
| §27 | καί : om. R*, corr. al. man. |
| §32 | εις ἐκκλησίαν : ἐν ἐκκλησία R APFG : om. H
Mercati notes only ἐκκλησία, but in fact ἐν is fairly clear also. |
| §32 | πατήρ : πρῶτος R
This must be considered another unique error. |
| §34 | καί : γάρ R |
| §76 | χειροκμήτων : χειροτμήτων R M
I am unable to confirm this; the entire page (17 ^v /24 ^r) is very faint. |
| §90 | εἶτα πρὸς ᾧ : εἶτα ᾧ πρὸς R
I was unable to see the ᾧ here; obviously this would be another unique error. |
| §100 | πράξεων ἐν ἑξαήμερον PCW (Christophorson [Mangey]) : πράξεων ἐν ἑξάμετρον
ceteri : πράξεων <ἐξ>ᾶς μέτρον R Arm |

This is surely the most interesting of these readings. Note that the *μετρον* of R is found also in the other mss. Note further that, as Mercati states, the first two letters of *εξας* are not visible, but the space fits perfectly. Since the Armenian corresponds precisely, this is likely to be what Philo wrote.

§140 προσεξεργάζονται MG : προσεπεξεργάζονται R ceteri : προσεπεξάργονται N

§157 τίνα : τινας R

§169 δέ : δ' AP : om. R

Although not cited in PCW, the Armenian also lacks a connective here.

§178 χρῆσθαι : χρήσασθαι R

§178 τῷ δὲ μεγάλῳ : μοις. τῷ δὲ μεγάλῳ R

This is according to Mercati. It's unclear what this word ending in *μοις* might be, and I am unable to confirm this reading.

Finally, let me report briefly on some further readings that I noticed during my study of R, which was far from complete or systematic. Again, I ignore the many readings where R supports the text of PCW or agrees with other mss. cited in the apparatus.

title λόγων R Cohn : λογίων FGH (R confirms Cohn's conjecture.)

§2 τί δὴ ποτε : τί δὴ ποτ' οὖν R : διὰ τί H

§10 τοῦ μέλλοντος ceteri : τοὺς μέλλοντας R^{vid} Arm

R clearly has *τους*. But the ending on the participle is not clear.

§20 ἀρτίων καὶ περιττῶν καὶ ἀρτιοπερίττων ἀρτίων : ἀρτίων R*, corr. scribe

The omission by a scribal leap was corrected by the scribe by adding the omitted words at the end of the line.

§24 εἰκότως ἂν τις θαυμάσειε MAP : εἰκότως ἂν τις θαυμάσαι FGH : ἂν τις θαυμάσαι εἰκότως R

§28 καὶ μὲν δὴ τὸν κύβον, τὸν ὀκτώ, ὃς ἐστὶν ἰσάκις ἴσος ἰσάκις : om. R

§30 πρὸς τι, ποιεῖν, πάσχειν, ἔχειν, κεῖσθαι : πρὸς τι, ποῦ, πότε, ποιεῖν, πάσχειν, ἔχειν, κεῖσθαι M : πρὸς τι, ποιεῖν, πάσχειν, ἔχειν, κεῖσθαι, ποῦ, πότε R

§30 τὰ ὧν ceteri Arm : τὰ δ' ὧν R

§30 χρόνον καὶ τόπον : χρόνος καὶ τόπος R

§36 ἀπορήσαι GH² : ἀπορήσαι MFH¹ : ἀπορήσοι AP : διαπορήσαι R

§41 ἐπιγραψάμενοι : ἐπιγραφόμενοι R

§41 ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων : ἀνθρώπων ἀπάντων R : ἀπάντων M

§43 τινα ἑαυτοῦ : τινας τῶν ἑαυτοῦ R

- §49 ἐν ψυχῇ : ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ R
- §51 τοὺς ἐπὶ μέρους : τοὺς ἐφημέρους R
- §91 εἰ καὶ μὴ : εἰ μὴ καὶ R
- §95 ὡς αἰεὶ : ὡς D^R : om. R
- §98 προφυλακὴν ceteri F^{corr} : προσφυλακὴν R F* : φυλακὴν AP
- §101 ἃ χρῆ : om. R
- §106 προστάττεται PCW (Cohn con.) R^{vid} (-|ται at least) Arm : πρὸς τὰ πέντε MAFHN :
 πρὸς τὰ ἕτερα πέντε G : πρὸς (τὰ πέντε . . . περιεχούση om.) P
 After his conjecture Cohn writes: “(sic Arm ut vid.)” I think there can be little doubt that the Armenian translator saw προστάττεται or something very similar. (Certainly it is not rendering anything like πρὸς τὰ πέντε.) The Armenian has *hramayael linin*, and the *linin* indicates a passive form. Marcus does not list the verb, but it (in its aorist form) occurs twice in *Prov.*: at 2.26 for ἐκέλευσε, and at 2.27 for προσέταξεν.
- §121 ἀναγραφάμενος : ἀναγράμας R
- §139 μὲν et δὲ : om. et μὲν R
- §140 γράφειν H : ἀναγράφειν R ceteri D Nicet.
 Cohn cites the Armenian as supporting the reading of H. It is true that the Armenian has the simple verb *grel* here. But that verb can perfectly well render compounds of γράφω. At *QG* 4.99 we find *nkare ew gre* for ἐγγαφούσης. At *QE* 2.2 we find *gre* for ὑπογράφω (or ἐπιγράφω).¹¹ At *QG* 4.168 we find *tam zink ‘n* for a metaphorical use of ἀναγράφω. *Prov.* 2.28: *i miasin grem* for συγγράφω, where the prefix is expressed. (Colson, followed by the Philo Index, has ἀναγράφω.) Looking just at *Decal.*: *Decal.* 1, 121, 131, 165, 169: *grem* for ἀναγράφω. *Decal.* 97: *i girs* for ἀναγραφείς. *Decal.* 154: *gcem* for ἀναγράφω. For γράφω, *grem* at *Decal.* 47, 132.
- §143 ὀφθαλμοὺς φῶς : φῶς ὀφθαλμοὺς R
- §152 ἀλλοτριοῦνται : ἀπαλλοτριοῦνται R
 The Armenian has *awtaranam*, for which NB (2:1029B) cites ἀλλοτριόμαι, ἀπαλλοτριόμαι, etc. Now, ἀπαλλοτριόμαι does not occur in Philo, while the simple form occurs 33 times. (And at none of those places is the compound form cited as a variant reading.)
- §155 εἷς ὁ : ὁ R : ὡς Arm
 R has here omitted εἷς at a line break: βασιλευς | ο.

¹¹ See Petit's note, though.

- §160 δράγμα : τὰ δράγματα R
It would be fairly easy for the plural to have been altered from:
ΠΡΟΦΕΡΕΤΑΙ ΤΑ ΔΡΑΓΜΑΤΑ ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ to
ΠΡΟΦΕΡΕΤΑΙ ΔΡΑΓΜΑ ΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ
- §161 ἐπτά : ἕξ R

Although some of R's readings are certainly mistaken, other readings seem to preserve a superior text. The age and quality of R's text make it all the more regrettable that its witness was not included in the apparatus to PCW 4, and that much of its text is to be recovered only with great difficulty, while some portions seem to be beyond recovery at all.

Appendix

The treatise *De Decalogo* is very well attested. Twenty-one Greek manuscripts contain *Decal.*, plus the Armenian version, and there are various collections of excerpts:

- Monacensis gr. 459 (= PCW A)
- Palatinus gr. 183
- Vaticanus gr. 380
- Coislinianus 43
- Matritensis Bibliothecae Academiae Historicae 9/2175
- Marcianus gr. 41
- Marcianus gr. 40 (= PCW H)
- Ottobonianus gr. 48
- Parisinus gr. 434
- Petropolitanus Acad. Scient. XX Aa 1 (= PCW P)
- Oxoniensis Collegii Novi 143
- Laurentianus Pluteus 85.10 (= PCW F)
- Vaticanus gr. 379
- Laurentianus Pluteus 69.11
- Vaticanus Palatinus 152
- Laurentianus conv. soppr. 107
- Laurentianus Pluteus 10.20 (= PCW M)
- Vaticanus Palatinus 248 (= PCW G)
- Vindobonensis theol. gr. 29
- Vaticanus gr. 316
- Neapolitanus II C 32 (= PCW N)

THE TEXT OF PHILO'S *DE DECALOGO*

Various collections of extracts are cited in PCW:

Vindobonensis hist. gr. 67

Nicetas, catena in Luke

Maximus

Antonius

Baroccianus 143

Sacra parallela mss.