

SBL Philo of Alexandria Seminar  
Theme: Philo's *De decalogo*  
Nov. 25, 2014, San Diego, CA

## THE ARMENIAN TEXTUAL TRADITION OF PHILO'S *DE DECALOGO*

### Abraham Terian

*De decalogo* has an odd place in the Armenian manuscript tradition of the Philonic corpus. Throughout, the treatise is imbedded in Book III of *De specialibus legibus*, between §§7 and 8, preceded not only by *Spec.* 3.1-7 (the significant autobiographical passage, well known to Philonists) but also — and more immediately — by a page-long fragment on the decal. The latter, conceivably a loose folio and possibly a remnant of Philo's lost treatise *Peri arithmōn (De numeris)*,<sup>1</sup> was placed immediately before *De decalogo* — obviously on the basis of the decadal association. As with the placement of the folio on the decal, the placement of *De decalogo* in Book III of *De specialibus legibus* is not altogether arbitrary. After all, the “special laws” in four books are structured around the Ten Commandments. Both of these placements clearly suggest that the archetype of the Armenian manuscripts (if not the Greek codex of the translator(s) — as we shall see) had a folio beginning with *De decalogo*. By the same token, also Book III of *De specialibus legibus* must have begun with a new folio which ended with §7, further suggesting that this folio was also loose at one time. Moreover, the Armenian text of *Spec.* 3.8 begins with the words of the sixth commandment, the first of the second table or set of five: «οὐ μοιχεύσεις» (“You shall not commit adultery”; Arm. *oç' šnayc'es*), and omits the preceding sentence (ἐν δὲ τῇ δευτέρῃ δέλτῳ πρῶτον γράμμα τοῦτ' ἐστίν, “The first commandment in the second table, that is to say...”). It is plausible to suppose that the omission of the Greek line is due to its being the bottom line of the folio (*verso*) which began with Book III of *De specialibus legibus (recto)*, and thus suffered an inevitable consequence of the detachment. I thus think that the Greek codex in the hands of the Armenian translator(s) (or perhaps its exemplar) had a number of loose and misplaced folia right where *De decalogo* was imbedded. Obviously, the disheveled Greek codex also had a number of missing folia, but this fact does not provide a plausible explanation for all the missing parts of the Armenian version of *De specialibus legibus* which is comprised of nearly intact units.<sup>2</sup>

The Armenian manuscript tradition of Philo's works shows — and that quite early in its development — a repeated attempt at rectifying the discernible problem at this juncture. At one time the title of *De decalogo* came to replace the title of *De specialibus*

---

<sup>1</sup> Abraham Terian, “A Philonic Fragment on the Decal,” in Frederick E. Greenspahn, Earle Hilgert, and Burton L. Mack, eds., *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*, Scholars Press Homage Series 9 (Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1984), pp. 173–182.

<sup>2</sup> Arm. has the following parts: *Spec.* 1.79–161: the complete section on laws pertaining to priests; 285–345: the complete section on the maintenance of the altar and the spiritual lessons thereof — through the end; 3.1–64: nearly all the laws pertaining to the sixth commandment, on adultery, which end with *Spec.* 3.82. The missing part of this last unit (§§65–82) is — by the same count of folia length — the exact equivalent to two folia (each side of a folio corresponding to a full page in PLCL). Here I wish to correct an inadvertent mistake in the introduction to my translation of *De animalibus*, where I had *Spec.* 3.1–63 (p. 6).

*legibus* (at *Spec.* 3.1). At another time, *De decalogo* became the title of *Spec.* 3.8-64. The latter is explicable by the fact that treatises were concluded with the commonplace scribal (or authorial) marking of a work's end by repeating its title. In this case, "Here ends *De decalogo*." The words "here ends" (if used) were dropped and the title was stuck to what followed.<sup>3</sup> It will therefore be somewhat wrong to say that the Armenian version of *De decalogo* bears no title; its title has drifted both ways to where it does not belong — albeit not far removed in either direction. I cannot help but make a pun on the way *Spec.* 3.8 begins with its acquired title in Armenian: "You shall not commit adultery" — as though it expresses disapproval of the "adulterated" (re)arrangement within the Armenian corpus at this juncture, where *De decalogo* has become part of the textual flow of *Spec.* 3.

To be sure, in a comparative textual study of Philo's works (here assessing the Greek variants of *De decalogo* vis-à-vis readings of its sixth-century Armenian translation) the authorial Greek necessarily commands the benefit of the doubt — but not always. After all, the Armenian version has its own textual merits by virtue of its antiquity, its Greek *vorlage* being older than the extant Greek manuscripts and in many ways comparable to the text once possessed by Eusebius of Caesarea.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, the syntactical peculiarity of the Armenian translation — that as a rule it follows the Greek syntax, an anomaly in Armenian — allows it to serve as a valuable control when ascertaining some questionable readings in the Greek text of Philo.<sup>5</sup>

Thanks to Zarbhanalian's edition of the Armenian text of Philo's works the Greek of which is extant,<sup>6</sup> Cohn was able to note several of its variants and to incorporate a few of its readings in his critical edition of the Greek text (PCW). A brief statement is necessary here on the *codex optimus* used by Zarbhanalian for the Armenian edition: Venetian Mekhitarist ms 1040, copied in 1296 for the Cilician King Het'um II (reigned 1289-1293, 1295-1297). This is the same manuscript used earlier in the nineteenth

---

<sup>3</sup> Both of these replacements of the title appear in [Garegin] Zarbhanalian's edition of Philo's works the Greek of which is extant: *P'iloni Hebrayec'woy čark' t'argmanealk' i nakhneac' meroc' oroc' Hellen bñagirk' hasin ar mez* (Works of Philo Judaeus, translated by our ancestors, the Greek originals of which have come down to us) (Venice: Mekhitarist Press, 1892), pp. 220 and 268.

<sup>4</sup> The textual histories of the respective versions have been discussed previously. See David T. Runia, *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*, CRINT III.3 (Assen: Van Gorcum / Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp. 16-31; Abraham Terian, "Notes on the Transmission of the Philonic Corpus," *SPhA* 6 (1994) 91-95; both concluding that the line of transmission of which Eusebius is a witness may not have been exclusive. Maurizio Olivieri points to a common ancestor: "Philo's *De Providentia*: A Work between Two Traditions," in Sara Mancini Lombardi and Paola Pontani, eds., *Studies on the Ancient Armenian Version of Philo's Works*, Studies in Philo of Alexandria 6 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2011), pp. 87-124.

<sup>5</sup> For a discussion of this feature see Abraham Terian, *Philonis Alexandrini De Animalibus*, Studies in Hellenistic Judaism, Supplements to Studia Philonica 1 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981), pp. 9-14, 58-59; repeated in idem, *Alexander*, PAM 36, pp. 23-29, 78-79). Cf. idem, "The Hellenizing School: Its Time, Place, and Scope of Activities Reconsidered," in Nina G. Garsoïan, Thomas F. Mathews, and Robert W. Thomson, eds., *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period* (*Dumbarton Oaks Symposium*, 1980) (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks, 1982), pp. 175-186.

<sup>6</sup> Zarbhanalian, ed., *P'iloni Hebrayec'woy čark'*, pp. 223-267 for *De decalogo*. The volume was prepared upon Frederick C. Conybeare's request, for use in his edition of *Philo about the Contemplative Life, or the Fourth Book of the Treatise Concerning Virtues* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895; repr. New York: Garland, 1987). Conybeare used three other manuscripts: Erevan, Matenadaran no. 2100 (formerly Eĵmiacian no. 2049.5), dated 1325, his B; no. 2057 (formerly Eĵmiacian no. 2046.2), dated 1328, his C; and the Venetian Mekhitarists' no. 1334, from early 14th century, his D.

century by Aucher for the edition of Philo's works extant in Armenian only.<sup>7</sup> A royal manuscript in every sense of the word, its text — though not altogether free of inner-Armenian errors — surpasses that of all other known Armenian manuscripts of Philo except for those known to have been copied most likely from the same exemplar but not with the same exactitude. The Armenian-Venetian editors respectively used one other codex at their monastery on the Isle of San Lazzaro: ms 1334, from early 14th century,<sup>8</sup> to which they simply referred as “the other” when citing its rare variants. There's no critical text of the Armenian *corpus Philoneum*. More often than not, known attempts to critically emend the text of the *codex optimus* have only compounded the perceived errors.<sup>9</sup>

I turn now to the way Cohn treated the Armenian variants he observed in *De decalogo* — alongside the Greek variants in the *apparatus criticus* of his edition.<sup>10</sup> For my assignment, I checked the some 170 references made there to the variant readings in the Armenian version. The least significant and highly questionable variants observed by him are those of particles, both adverbial and conjunctive. The extraordinary number of Greek particles and the almost countless nuances created by their combinations are difficult to trace in the Armenian version where they are variously rendered with fewer particles and at times with added conjunctions. (To be added to this difficulty is the imaginable early Greek text of Philo, in uncial letters with no spacing between words and few — if any — accents, breathings, punctuation marks, etc.). Nearly a fourth of the indicated variants fall into this category.<sup>11</sup> Here the Armenian is of little or no help since a given Armenian particle stands for a number of Greek equivalents, and vice versa — albeit to a lesser extent. Furthermore, it is with such use that the translator(s) took most liberties in their otherwise rigidly interlinear translation, and ever so often omitted particles.<sup>12</sup> I think Cohn was ill advised by those who helped him in this area of Armenian equivalents.<sup>13</sup>

There is no absolute way to determine from the Armenian whether the Greek had γάρ or οὖν, whether ὅτι or ὅτε, whether ὡς, ὥστε, or ὥσπερ; or whether the translator

<sup>7</sup> Johannes B. Aucher (Mkrtič' Awgerian), *Philonis Judaei sermones tres hactenus inediti, I. et II. De Providentia et III. De Animalibus* (Venetiis: Typis coenobi p. Armenorum in insula s. Lazari, 1822; *idem, Philonis Judaei paralipomena armena: Libri videlicet quatuor in Genesin [sic], libri duo in Exodum, sermo unus de Sampsonem, alter de Jona, tertius de tribus angelis Abraamo apparentibus* (Venetiis: Typis coenobi p. Armenorum in insula s. Lazari, 1826). Aucher's work was done upon C. E. Richter's urging, whose 1828-1830 *Philonis Iudaei opera omnia* in 8 vols. (Leipzig: E. B. Schwicker) incorporated Aucher's Latin translation, the first as vol. 8 and the second as vol. 7.

<sup>8</sup> For a description of these and other Armenian manuscripts containing certain works of Philo, see my introduction to *De Animalibus*, pp. 14-21; *Alexander*, PAM 36, pp. 30-35.

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Maurizio Olivieri, *Il secondo libro del De Providentia di Philone Alessandrino: I frammenti greci e la traduzione armena*. Diss. Università degli Studi di Bologna, 1999-2000, pp. 102-227 — besides earlier textual studies by Conybeare (*Contempl.*) and Lewy (the pseudo-Philonian *De Jona*).

<sup>10</sup> PCW 4.269-307.

<sup>11</sup> See the following: 272.22 (§20); 273.5<sup>2</sup> (§21); 277.7 (§38); 277.13 (§39); 279.10 (§46); 280.19 (§50); 281.20 (§57); 282.8 (§58); 284.19 (§69); 284.25 (§71); 286.10 (§77); 288.8 (§86); 289.1 (§87); 290.15 (§94); 292.17 (§102); 293.1 (§104); 293.14 (107); 297.21 (§127); 298.19 (§132); 300.8 (§140); 301.14 (§144); 303.12<sup>2</sup> (§155); 303.24 (§158). See also those in the following note.

<sup>12</sup> Arm. omits δ', 270.7 (§5); 280.18 (§50); 286.5 (§76); δὴ, 287.1 (§80); γάρ, 271.7 (§12); καὶ, 272.20 (§19); 282.22 (§62); 290.15<sup>1</sup> (§94); οὖν, 285.14 (§74); 288.4 (§85); τε, 284.10 (§67); τ, 286.9 (§76).

<sup>13</sup> In his reading of the Armenian text Cohn probably had the help of the Mekhitarist philologists at either of their monasteries, in Venice and Vienna.

was looking at  $\eta$  (disjunctive) or  $\hat{\eta}$  (asseverative). In one case, e.g., where the Greek has  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  and the Armenian  $զի տ' ԷբԷտ$  (*zi t' ēpēt*), the Armenian variant in Cohn's *apparatus* is arbitrarily indicated as  $\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  (289.1 [§87]). There can hardly be any doubt that the translator read  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  and rendered it accurately. However, had there been no Greek text here, there would have been no way of arriving at  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$  from the Arm.  $զի տ' ԷբԷտ$  (*zi t' ēpēt*). Elsewhere in the Philonic corpus  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$  is rendered as  $զի ԷբԷ$  (*zi et' ē*, as in *Abr.* 197), which is also the equivalent to  $\epsilon\iota, \epsilon\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ , and  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\tau\epsilon\omicron$ . As for Arm.  $զի$  (*zi*) in the Philonic corpus, as elsewhere, it is equivalent to  $\acute{\iota}\nu\alpha, \acute{\omega}\varsigma, \acute{\iota}$   $\omicron\tau\iota$ , etc. Another related and equally ubiquitous particle,  $քաւիզի$  (*k' anzi*), is the equivalent to  $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho, \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\grave{\alpha} \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho, \delta\iota\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota, \acute{\omicron}\tau\iota, \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu, \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\nu, \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\nu$ , etc. (and to many more when combined with  $\epsilon\iota$  [*ew*], Gk.  $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ ). At 292.17 (§102),  $քաւիզի$  (*k' anzi*) is arbitrarily given the equivalency of  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \delta\grave{\epsilon}$  and cited as a variant of  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ , and at 297.21 (§127) given the equivalency of  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$  and cited as a variant of  $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\nu$ . One will have to take “with a pinch of salt” most of Cohn's Greek equivalents to Armenian particles. As for the contribution of the Armenian particles to such text-critical comparison, it is miniscule at best.

As for the remaining variants, some substantive, I have divided them into six categories, as follows — in descending order of priority:

1. Where the Armenian reading alone is preferred.
2. Where the Armenian agrees with ms M against the rest of the witnesses.
3. Where the Armenian is decisive in determining a favored reading.
4. Where the Armenian is cited simply as another witness among those rejected.
5. Where the Armenian stands alone at times as an odd or corrupt reading.
6. Where the Armenian reading is erroneously indicated.

### ***1. Where the Armenian reading alone is preferred***

Cohn's fascination with the Armenian text stems from its textual proximity to Monacensis gr. 459, his preferred manuscript (A).<sup>14</sup> Were it not for this textual affinity, we would have seen many more citations of Armenian variants in his *apparatus*. Only once he rejects a variant reading common only to A and Arm. (275.8 [§30]). Some of his few adoptions of readings peculiar to the Armenian text seem to have been conditioned in part by Mangey's earlier use of the Armenian version (as noted in the *apparatus*).

271.10 (§13 πόλις); 276.19 (§35 προὔπαντώσα); 289.8 (§89 ἐπεῖ); 297.7 (§123 τοῦ); 297.20 (§126 τὸν<sup>1</sup>); 298.21 (§133 ἀγιώτερον); 300.11 (§140 τούτοις); 301.3 (§142 ἐπιθυμείν); 306.11 (§171 παρακαταθηκῶν); 306.22 (§174 ἐνδεχομένων); 307.9 (§177 φόβῳ).

### ***2. Where the Armenian agrees with ms M against the rest of the witnesses***

Most of the adopted readings based on the witness of the Armenian text are in instances where it agrees with Laurentianus X 20 (M),<sup>15</sup> a text constituting its own family, yet having much in common with “Family A” headed by Cohn's lead ms A. On the affinities between M and the Armenian version Cohn has this to say: “Among the better

<sup>14</sup> For a description of this ms see PCW 1. iv-vii; G-G p. 139 (no. 35). For Cohn's assessment of the *versio Armenia* see PCW 1. l.ii-lvi.

<sup>15</sup> For a description of this ms see PCW 1. xxxi; G-G p. 149 (no. 100).

codices mention must be made of Codex M which, although infected with many errors, is quite often closely related to the Armenian version or alone supplies the authentic text.”<sup>16</sup> Based on this single Greek witness and the *versio Armenia* there are twenty-six adopted readings. In two instances the adopted reading is based on the witness of G (Vaticano-Palatinus gr. 248) and Arm.; once each on the witness of H (Venetus gr. 40) and N (Neopolitanus II C 32 [excerpta]) with Arm.; four times on Arm. and the *Sacra Parallela* (D); and once on Arm. and v (lectio vulgata).

With M 275.17 (§31); 275.20 (32); 276.3 (§33); 276.15 (§35); 277.1 (§37); 279.8 (§46); 279.16 (§47); 281.20 (§57); 282.2 (§58); 282.8 (§59); 283.4, 8 (§63); 283.13 (§64); 285.5 (§71); 286.9 (§76); 286.15 (§77); 286.22 (§79); 287.2-3, 3 (§80); 288.13 (§87); 289.11 (§89); 289.14 (§90); 290.2 (§91); 293.9 (§106); 293.14 (§107); 294.9 (§111).

With G 303.24 (§158); 304.1 (§158).

With H 300.14 (§140).

With N 301.7 (§142).

With D<sup>R</sup> 290.18-19 (§94); 300.13-14 (§140); 300.14 (§140); 300.18 (§141).

With v 300.2 (§138).

### **3. Where the Armenian is decisive in determining a favored reading**

Where there are conflicting readings among the witnesses, the *versio Armenia* ever so often helps tip the balance in favor of the reading adopted into the text. Sometimes the mere proximity of an Armenian reading has been enough to help emend the Greek text, as at 287.17 (§82), where the pl. inst. *սնոսւուոց* (*snotwoc*; cf. sing. *սնոսւոյ*, *snotwoy*) along with the pl. inst. *ματᾶιους* of a single Greek witness (H=Venetus gr. 40) enables Cohn to emend the reading to the sing. inst. *ματᾶίω*.

273.9-10 (§21); 275.17 (§31); 275.20 (§32); 276.3 (§33); 276.15 (§35); 277.1 (§37); 279.8, 11<sup>2</sup> (§46); 281.14 (§56); 281.20 (§57); 282.2 (§58); 282.8 (§59); 282.14 (§60); 282.23 (§62); 283.1 (§62); 283.4, 8 (§63); 283.13 (§64); 285.5 (§71); 286.15 (§76); 286.22 (§79); 287.2-3 (§80); 287.3 (§80); 287.17 (§82); 304.14 (§160).

### **4. Where the Armenian is cited simply as another witness among those rejected**

These include instances where the Armenian is rejected with all other witnesses in favor of an emendation (usually by Mangey, followed by Cohn). Here too are instances where the Armenian variant differs from rejected others and is akin to the preferred reading; e.g., at 295.4 (§114) Arm. has the pl. *γίνεσθαι* instead of the sing. *γίνεσθε*, which suggests the possibility of a translational error. Elsewhere, the rejected reading (including the Armenian variant) is equally suited to the context as, e.g., the singular *τὸ ἀποκθόμενον* at 298.1-2 (§127).

275.14 (§31); 280.6 (§50); 281.12 (§55); 284.7<sup>2</sup> (§66); 285.22 (§74); 286.5 (§76 with all others); 287.2 (§80); 291.22 (§99); 292.3 (§100); 293.8-9 (§106); 293.10 (§106); 294.5-6

<sup>16</sup> “*Meliorem quam ceteri codices memoriam codex M prae se fert, qui, quamvis multis vitiis infectus sit, sepissime tamen vel cum versione Armenia coniunctus vel solus genuinam scripturam suppeditavit*” (PCW 4. xxxi-ii).

(110); 294.18 (§113); 295.4 (§114); 295.12-13 (§115); 296.14 (§120); 298.1-2 (§127); 298.20 (§133); 300.18 (§141); 302.20 (§150); 307.4 (§176).

### **5. Where the Armenian stands alone at times as an odd or corrupt reading**

These do not always indicate corruption in the Greek exemplar but, more often than not, the translator's errors (rarely an inner-Armenian corruption); e.g., translating *ὁμοίω* wrongly, as if it were *ὁμοιότατι* (§104); *δίκαια* as if it were *δικαιώματα* (§107), the singular as plural and vice versa. However, certain rejections of the Armenian variants seem to be arbitrary, as some of the examples given below illustrate. Some rejections are puzzling; e.g., the rejected addition of the word "Mosaic" in "There is an account recorded in the Mosaic story of the Creation..." (§97).

The following convey a great deal: 269.6 (§1 has *ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ συντάξει* for *ἐν ταῖς προτέραις συντάξεσι*); 269.16 (§4 has *ἀφ' οὗ* for *οὖν*); 270.8 (§5 adds *πρῶτον*); 270.24 (§10 has *τοὺς μέλλοντας* for *τοῦ μέλλοντος*); 271.19 (§14 has *εὐ ἀσκηθέντας* for *ἐνασκηθέντας*); 272.1 (§16 om. *ἡμέρων* due to *homoioarcton*); 273.12-13 (§21 transp.); 275.2 (§29 transp.); 276.23 (§36 om. *οὐ φονεύσεις* due to *homoioarcton*); 279.11 (§46, adds *αὐτοῖς*); 279.14 (§47 om. *ὄρατῆν δὲ ὡς*); 279.18 (§48 om. *καὶ*); 280.4 (§50 see discussion below); 281.14 (§56 om. *τῷ λόγῳ*); 281.15 (§56 corrupt. *διχῆ* to *δύο*); 282.11 (§60 add. *ἄνθρωποι*); 283.3 (§63 om. *στομάργῳ*); 283.15 (§64 om. *θεραπεία*); 285.18 (§74 om. *μήτε δρῶντες* due to *homoioarcton* / *homoioarcton*); 290.16 (§94 om. *οὔτε μητρὸς* due to *homoioarcton* / *homoioarcton*); 291.3 (§95 see discussion below); 291.10 (§97 adds *Μωυσέως*); 291.15 (§98 om. *ἡμέραις*); 292.3 (§100 om. *ἐν*); 292.21 (§103 has *ἦ* for *ἦν*); 292.25 (§104 has *ὁμοιότατι* for *ὁμοίω*); 293.2 (§104 om. *καὶ ἔτι*); 293.11 (§107 has *δικαιώματα* for *δίκαια*); 294.7 (§110 corrupt. *πρωτεία* to *πρεσβεία*); 294.20 (§113 transp.); 295.3 (§113 om. *ἐλπίδα*); 295.16 (§117 has *ἡμεροῦντες* for *ἡρεμοῦντες*); 295.17-18 (§117 has *ἐπελαφρίζοντες* for *ἐπελαφριζόμενοι*); 297.3 (§122 add. *μεγίστας*); 297.6 (§123 transp.); 298.16 (§132 has *ζῶων* for *ζῶον*); 300.2 (§138 has *κόσμῳ* for *βίῳ*); 300.12 (§140 corrupt. *ἀδικεῖσθαι* to *ἐλέγχεσθαι*); 300.14 (§140 corrupt. *ψήφους* to *γνώμας*); 300.16 (§141 has *μετὰ* for *πρὸ*); 301.7 (§142 om. *μόνη*); 302.5 (§148 adds *εἰς*); 302.15 (§150 has *ἐπανεμόμενα* for *ἐπιθέοντα*); 303.10 (§155 om. *τῶν*); 303.18 (§156 om. *καὶ θεογονίαν* due to *homoioarcton*); 304.1 (§159 has *ἐβδομάδα* for *ἐβδόμην*); 304.7 (§159 om. *αὐτῶν*); 304.15 (§161 adds *καὶ τὰς*); 304.16 (§161 om. *δυσὶν* due to *homoioarcton*); 304.21 (§161 om. *ιεράν* due to *homoioarcton*);<sup>17</sup> 305.6 (§163 om. *χρησάμενας*); 305.17<sup>2</sup> (§167 twice om. *εἰς*); 306.16 (§172 om. *νόμοι*); 306.16 (§172 has *προσηκόντως* for *προσήκοντες*); 306.17 (§173 has *ἀνείργειν* for *ἀνείργον*); 307.2-3 (§175 has *ἀναπλάσας* for *ἀναπλήσας*).

### **6. Where the Armenian reading is erroneously indicated**

It is not always feasible to determine with absolute certainty questionable readings in the Greek text of Philo by simply retranslating the Armenian, even when one is guided by its prevalent Greek syntax and equipped with Greek-Armenian and Armenian-Greek word-indices or concordances based on works of Philo which survive in

<sup>17</sup> For a different explanation of this omission, see Paola Pontani, "Saying (Almost) the Same Thing. On Some Relevant Differences Between Greek-language Originals and Their Armenian Translations," in Mancini Lombardi and Pontani, eds., *Studies on the Ancient Armenian Version of Philo's Works*, p. 143.

both languages. Far more problematic are the attempts at retrospective translation with intent to reconstruct out of the Armenian text even a portion of a Philonic work the Greek of which is lost.<sup>18</sup> Dictionary-based methods have their limitations, especially when a single Armenian word renders a number of Greek synonyms and vice versa. I will illustrate this kind of difficulty here with just one expanded example from *De decalogo*. At §95 (PCW 4.291.3) Cohn notes that the Armenian has *էքուիզօւն* for *κολάζειν*. The Armenian verb is *ի բաց իլիլ* (*i bac' xlel*, “to prune”; “to cut out”; “to root out”; etc.) an infinitive agreeing with the *κολάζειν*. The same verb (*ի բաց իլիլ*) is used in *Decal.* 12 as an equivalent to *ὑπεξαίρειν*, a verb found also in *Decal.* 150, but there the Armenian has *զաւեալ ի բաց* (*zateal i bac'*). Moreover, the same verb (*ի բաց իլիլ*) is used in *Decal.* 126 for the verbal adjective *ἀνάστατος* (“driven out [from one’s house]” or “ravaged”; cf. *ἀναστατόω*). Without resorting to the implications of the use of *κολάζω* in *Spec.* 1.316 and 3.11<sup>19</sup> (*κολαστέον* in both, twice read as a verbal adj. by the translator, rendering it uniformly as *սատակելի*, *satakeli*), suffice to say that the Armenian has an accurate rendering of *κολάζειν* in *Decal.* 95 and need not be classified as a variant. As for *էքուիզօւն*, the synonymous equivalent conjectured by Cohn, purportedly the word behind the Armenian, it does not occur anywhere in the works of Philo. More examples follow.

275.7-8 (§30): *τὰ ὧν οὐκ ἄνευ <πάντα>, χρόνον καὶ τόπον* (text, emended by Cohn, following Mangey), with “... *ἄνευ χρόνου καὶ τόπου* A Arm” in the *apparatus*. Actually, Arm. has *τὰ ὧν οὐκ ἄνευ ἀχρόνου καὶ ἀτόπου* (cf. *յիւրց ոչ է ւնիժաւնիւսիկ ի ւնիւտիլի*). It reduces the improper preposition *ἄνευ*, used with the redundant yet usual *οὐκ* and genitive adjectives,<sup>20</sup> to a simple preposition (*յ-* prefix) and seems to favor its meaning of “besides” over “without”; thus, “... besides those existences that are neither timeless nor placeless” (speaking of the last two of the ten categories of existence).

279.7 (§123) unnecessarily brackets *τοῦ* in the text, the inclusion of which seems to be justified by the Armenian only.

280.4 (§50) wrongly indicates the omission of *προτέρα*, which appears as a corruption in the text, corresponding to *εἰς* (cf. *ւի [լի ւի հնգեալի]*).

290.20 (§95) wrongly indicates the omission of *τὸ μὲν πρῶτον*, which appears earlier in the sentence, in a rare instance where the translator deviates from the Greek syntax (cf. *իսկ սս զաւազիւն*).

<sup>18</sup> An excellent study by Romano Sgarbi, *Problemi linguistici e di critica del testo nel De vita contemplativa di Filone alla luce della versione armena*, Memorie, Istituto Lombardo — Classe Lettere, vol. 40 fasc. 1 (Milan: Istituto Lombardo, 1992), shows how, if one were to translate the Armenian *De vita contemplativa* literally and apart from the Greek, the resultant translation would be considerably different from a literal translation of the Greek. See also his “Philo’s Stylemes vs. Armenian Translation Stylemes,” in Mancini Lombardi and Paola Pontani, eds., *Studies on the Ancient Armenian Version of Philo’s Works*, pp. 147-154.

<sup>19</sup> Parts of *Spec.* 1-4 where the same verb recurs (at *Spec.* 1.54; 2.37, 137, 232, 245, 246; 3.149, 152, 154, 156; 4.2) are not part of the Armenian *corpus Philoneum* (see above, n. 2).

<sup>20</sup> On the grammatical correctness of such uses see Herbert W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, rev. by Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956), §§1700, 2753.

292.3 (§100) Arm. should be grouped with all the witnesses' reading: ἑξάμετρον, in favor of Mangey's emendation to ἑξαήμερον.

296.1-2 (§117) wrongly indicates the omission of καὶ λαβόντες αὐτὸ καὶ ἀνταποδιδόντες (cf. և ընդունելով զայս և փոխանակ հաստիցանելով).

297.1 (§121) wrongly indicating μεγίστων as the reading, when it is μεγίστον, in keeping with the Greek text (cf. մեծ).

300.2 (§138) wondering (with a question mark) whether the Armenian agrees with ἱερώτερον (adopted reading on the basis of *lectio vulgata* [v]) or, as it does, with ἱερώτατον of the rejected Greek witnesses altogether — including the *Sacra Parallela* (D).

301.14 (§144) unnecessarily brackets καὶ in the text, the inclusion of which seems to be justified by the Armenian only.

302.5 (§148); 305,17<sup>2</sup> (§167) unnecessarily notes the addition of εἰς in one and the repeated omission of εἰς in the other. The prepositional use of εἰς is wanting in Armenian (ի, յ- when prefixed to a word beginning with a vowel), often implied by ellipsis. Note the Armenian text's omission of εἰς at 303.24 (§158, not noticed by Cohn).

In instances where the Armenian reading stands alone, it seldom provides a convincing or preferred reading to emend the Greek; but where the latter's reading is called into question, there we stand to benefit from the Armenian version. Still, one has to look outside Cohn's *apparatus* for further merits of the Armenian text, in at least two areas: (a) Where an Armenian reading could be decisive either on its own or alongside certain Greek witnesses — somehow overlooked by Cohn;<sup>21</sup> and (b) Where the Armenian agrees with the received Greek text and helps make a better sense when the latter appears to be somewhat incomprehensible (even though the Armenian abounds in incomprehension especially when considered apart from the Greek). These desiderata are beyond the limits of this paper.

---

<sup>21</sup> Textual questions raised by Colson (PLCL 7) and Nikiprowetzky (PAPM 23) deserve special attention.