The Text of Philo’s *De plantatione* (Preliminary Draft)

James R. Royse

1. Philo’s Biblical Citations.

Let us begin by looking at the places where Barthélemy, in his very perceptive article, argued that readings derived from Aquila’s Greek translation found their way into the manuscripts of Philo. (Naturally, the context here is that Philo knew his biblical text from the LXX translation.) Barthélemy identifies many such readings throughout the treatises of Philo.

§26: Mangey somehow overlooks the true source of the biblical quotation, stating on Λευιτικη (1:333 n. m): “Nescio annon Autor σφάλματος μνημονικοθ sit reus, locus enim citatus exstat Exod. xix. 20.” However, Exod 19:20 reads ἐκάλεσεν κύριος Μωυσῆν. Thus, Mangey concludes that Philo’s ms. read ἀνεκάλεσεν there, stating on the preceding ἀνακεκλήσεται (1:333 n. l): “In Exod. ix. 20. [sic, for xix. 20.] quo alluditur à Nostro, hodie scribitur ἐκάλεσεν. Atqui Philonem ἀνεκάλεσεν in suo Codice legisse, ex hoc loco constat.” In fact, Philo seems not to cite Exod 19:20 anywhere, and given Philo’s explicit reference there is no doubt that here he is citing Lev 1:1.

§29: Philo cites Ps 93:9 (94:9 MT), which is printed in PCW as: ἐν οὐνόις λέγων ὁδε: “ὅ φυτεύων οὖς οὐκ ἀκούει; ὁ πλάσσων ὁφθαλμούς οὐκ ἐπιβλέψει.” For the final two words the LXX has οὐ κατανοεῖ. The Hebrew verb is מָהָר, which Aquila translates by ἐπιβλέπω at five places. Following Barthélemy one should edit οὐ κατανοεῖ against the mss. Moreover, where the LXX has τὸ οὖς and τὸν ὁφθαλμόν, Philo has the anarthrous οὖς and ὁφθαλμούς. The MT also has these nouns (both in the singular) without articles.

1 Presented to the Philo of Alexandria Section at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Atlanta, November 23, 2015.

2 See Barthélemy.

3 These are 1 Sam 2:32 (1 Reg 2:32 LXX: ἐπιβλέπω); Ps 10:14 (9:35 LXX: κατανοεῖ), 91:8 (90:8 LXX: κατανοεῖ), 102:20 (101:20 LXX: ἐπιβλέπω); Isa 63:15 (LXX: ἐπιστρέψο). 

4 Barthélemy, 51 n. 7: “Ici encore, toute la tradition textuelle étant retouchée, Wendland a introduit à tort cette leçon dans son texte.”
Barthélemy notes that Aquila suppresses articles that are missing in Hebrew. Thus, it seems likely that Philo had the readings of the LXX, which have been replaced by the readings of Aquila.\footnote{There is a complication at the second place. Instead of τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν BS have ὀφθαλμοῦς, and R has τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦς. Did Philo simply follow a text of the LXX that agreed with BS?}

\section*{§47: The citation of Exod 15:17–18 has been retouched at three places:}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{LXX} & \textbf{Aquila} \\
κληρονομιάς Wendland (PCW) & κληροδοσίας codd. \\
eῖς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου G & ἕδρασια εἰς καθόδραν σου ceteri \\
κύριε (prim.) G & κυρίον MUFH \\
ὁ ἠτοίμασαν αἰ G & ἠδρασαν ceteri
\end{tabular}

In the following text Philo cites various portions of the biblical text, and the retouching continues in \section*{§54:}

κληρονομιάς UH κληροδοσίας MGF

However, a different biblical text, Num 18:20, is cited at \section*{§63}, which reads in all the mss. and in PCW: ἐγὼ μερίς σου καὶ κληροδοσία. Now, Mangey conjectured κληρονομία here, and this is surely correct. The LXX witnesses are unanimous in supporting κληρονομία,\footnote{A few read κληρονομαῖς or κληρονομίαν.} and so the reading in the Philonic mss. is again a reading of Aquila, as Barthélemy notes, and Wendland should have restored κληρονομία as he did at \section*{§47}.\footnote{Barthélemy, 50 n. 8: “Dans le deuxième cas [i.e., \textit{Plant.} 63], Wendland, ne disposant pas de témoin non retouché, a eu tort de conserver cette leçon dont Mangey se défiait déjà.”} Barthélemy finds yet another place where the retouching has occurred: \textit{Her.} 162. At the citation of Deut 25:13–16 there, Pap reads ἐν κλήρῳ, with the LXX, while all the other mss. have κληροδοσίανες.

But let us return to the reading κυρίον for κύριε. Barthélemy states that this shows that the retoucher’s text of Aquila preserved the Tetragrammaton rather than translating it.\footnote{Barthélemy, 54.} Might not this mistake have been Philo’s? (See further on xxx.)
§1 and §140: “ήρέξατο Νόε ἀνθρώπος εἶναι γεωργός γῆς καὶ ἐφότευσεν ἄμπελώνα” (Gen 9:20). I have elsewhere discussed Philo’s various citations of this verse, and concluded that Philo has added εἶναι as a stylistic addition.⁹

§19: PCW prints: “ἐνέπνευσε” γάρ φησιν “ὁ θεὸς εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν ζωῆς” (Gen 2:7). And the same placement of quotation marks is found in PLCL, PCH, and PAPM. The Göttingen LXX accordingly cites Philo as having here ἐνέπνευσε ὁ θεὸς for ἐνεφόσησεν, but correctly notes that he has the latter word at Leg. 1.31 and Her. 56. However, at Her. 56 PCW prints: “ἐνεφόσησε” γάρ φησιν “ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὀλὸν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν ζώσαν.” Here PCH and PAPM follow PCW’s placement of quotation marks, but PLCL correctly moves “the Maker of all” outside the quotation of Gen 2:7. In fact, of course, the quotation marks are incorrectly placed in PCW at both Plant. 19 and Her. 56. These should be edited as:

ἐνέπνευσε γάρ φησιν ὁ θεὸς “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν ζωῆς,” and
“ἐνεφόσησε” γάρ φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὀλὸν “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοήν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν ζώσαν.”¹⁰

---

⁹ See my “Some Observations on the Biblical Text in Philo’s De agricultura,” SPhA 22 (2010): 112. The addition of εἶναι (not found in the LXX mss., and not supported by the Hebrew) before γεωργός is also found at Agr. 20 and 125, while at Agr. 1 Philo adds εἶναι after γῆς.

¹⁰ Philo also quotes ἐνεφόσησε at Opif. 134; Leg. 3.161; Det. 80; Somm. 1.34; QG 2.59. Note that at Leg. 3.161 PCW also place the quotation marks incorrectly so as to include both γάρ and ὁ θεὸς in the citation. (Here PLCL and PAPM follow PCW; PCH correctly places “denn” outside the citation but incorrectly includes “Gott.”) What should be edited at Leg. 3.161 is: “ἐνεφόσησε” γάρ “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ζωῆς” ὁ θεὸς, “καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν.”

A different issue is the presence of πνεῦμα ζωῆς here and at Det. 80 instead of πνοὴν ζωῆς, as found in all the LXX mss. and in Philo at Opif. 134; Leg. 1.31; Plant. 19; Her. 56; Somm. 1.34; QG 2.59 (this Greek fragment, found in Mangey 2:668, was identified by Aucher). The Göttingen LXX does not even cite πνοὴν ζωῆς from the two passages in Philo, although Brooke and McLean do have the notation “Phil 2/7” (evidently ignoring QG 2.59, as does Ryle also). I would not propose that one edit: “ἐνεφόσησε” γάρ “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ” πνεῦμα “ζωῆς” ὁ θεὸς, “καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζώσαν.” Rather, either we suppose that Philo actually wrote πνεῦμα by mistake or deliberately as a stylistic “improvement,” or we suppose that Philo consistently wrote πνοὴν ζωῆς everywhere and that πνεῦμα is a textual corruption. Certainly the latter hypothesis is suggested by Philo’s explicit comment at Leg. 1.42 that the text uses “πνοὴν but not πνεῦμα.”
One must keep in mind that quotation marks were not available at the time of Philo, and that what we see in modern editions are the work of the editors.¹¹ We can of course reasonably presume that Philo made the conceptual distinction between a literal citation of the biblical text and a paraphrase, and between the actual words of the biblical text and his own introductory or clarificatory words. But all the evidence indicates that at his time the explicit marking of quotations would not have occurred.¹² Naturally, there is from time to time doubt about what Philo’s biblical text was. But there is no reason to suppose that Philo thought of himself as quoting Gen 2:7 with the words ἐνέπνεσε, ὁ θεός, or ὁ ποιητής τῶν ὄλων. At such places editors and translators have to make decisions about whether and where to place quotation marks, and those decisions should follow our best knowledge about what Philo would have considered to be the literal words of the biblical text.

§32: “ἐφύτευσεν ὁ θεός παράδεισον ἐν Ἕδημ κατὰ ἀνατολάς, καὶ ἔθετο ἐκεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὅν ἐπλα- σέν” (Gen 2:8). The Göttingen LXX prints κύριος ὁ θεός for ὁ θεός, but Philo has ὁ θεός alone also at Leg. 1.41, 1.43; Conf. 61; QG 1.6 (as it seems).¹³ The absence of κύριος is attested widely.¹⁴

§90: “καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐμοὶ εἰς θεόν” (Gen 28:21). The LXX tradition is divided:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A M pm (Göttingen LXX)</th>
<th>D 961 rell (= MT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>κύριος μοι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μοι κύριος</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹¹ At best this work can be seen as reflecting later practice in mss. E.g., medieval mss. may indicate quotations by various devices such as the use of different ink. Within the tradition of Philonic mss., we see already in the third-century Coptos Papyrus (PCW’s Pap = Parisinus supp. gr. 1120) the use of diples in the margin to indicate quotations. But this usage seems not to be entirely consistent, and in any case does not have the precision of our quotation marks. At most the presence of diples would show that a citation is present on specific lines, but would not show precisely where the citation began and ended. Furthermore, it seems extremely unlikely that Philo himself would have used such a method.

¹² Katz frequently comments on the need for more accuracy in the placing of quotation marks; see, e.g., Philo’s Bible, 32, on PCW’s text of Agr. 12, where the quotation marks give an incorrect impression of Philo’s citation of Deut 20:20. (On this see also my “Some Observations on the Biblical Text in Philo’s De agricultura,” 115.) Nikiprowetzky, “Philo’s Citations of and Allusions to the Bible in the De gigantibus and Quod Deus,” in Winston and Dillon, 105, also notes that quotation marks are frequently misplaced; see further his comments at 110, 112, 113, 117, 118.

¹³ The Göttingen LXX cites Leg. 1.41; Plant. 32; Conf. 61.

¹⁴ Wevers, Notes, 25–26: “A popular tradition omits κύριος in line with the surrounding verses which both lack a rendering for MT’s יהוה.”
Philo’s reading is also found in 911, from the late III. cent.; so, it seems likely that Philo is here a witness to an ancient stream of LXX tradition.

§110: PCW prints: οὗτος γὰρ ἔλεπισε λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισσόρων τὸ χλωρόν" (Gen 30:37). But here again the quotation marks are placed incorrectly. The Göttingen LXX has καὶ ἔλεπισεν αὐτάς Ιακόβ λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισσόρων τὸ χλωρόν, and cites Philo as having ῥάβδους ἔλεπισε for ἔλεπισεν αὐτάς.15 However, rather than seeing a textual variation here, we should simply edit: οὗτος γὰρ ῥάβδους ἔλεπισε “λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισσόρων τὸ χλωρόν.” Or, perhaps we could print: οὗτος γὰρ ῥάβδους “ἔλεπισε . . . λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισσόρων τὸ χλωρόν.” Naturally, Philo did not have ellipsis points at his disposal either, but often seems to have written with such a device in mind.16

§140: “. . . καὶ ἐπεὶ τοῦ οἶνου . . .” (Gen 9:21). As also discussed elsewhere, Philo has here (and also at Agr. 1 and QG 2.68) omitted ἐκ before τοῦ οἴνου, which is found in all the LXX mss., and which reflects the Hebrew נ.17 Katz correctly states that “πίνειν ἐκ was awkward Greek to Philo who set it right with a light touch.”18

§169: PCW prints: τὸν Ἰσαὰκ εἴδε παῖζοντα μετὰ Ἄρεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ (Gen 26:8). Here PCW neglects quotation marks that are justified. (PCH marks a quotation, but not PLCL or PAPM.) The Göttingen LXX has: εἶδεν τὸν Ἰσαὰκ παῖζοντα μετὰ Ἄρεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ, with only some minor variations. Rather than ignoring the verbatim citation here or considering that Philo has transposed the biblical text, one should edit: τὸν Ἰσαὰκ εἴδε “παῖζοντα μετὰ Ἄρεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.”

On the citation of Gen 21:33:

15 It seems inconsistent that the Göttingen LXX notes that a Philo ms. has ἔξελπισε, but not that a Philo ms. agrees with 71’ in having λεπτά for λευκά.
16 See my forthcoming article, “Continued Quotations in Philo of Alexandria.”
17 Ibid., 113–15. Let me correct an observation at p. 114 n. 13 there: the Göttingen LXX mistakenly says that ἐκ is omitted in the apparatus of Agr. 1 (not of Plant. 140), whereas in fact it is omitted in the text of Agr. 1.
In the Göttingen LXX this verse reads: καὶ ἔφυσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἄρουραν ἐπὶ τῷ φρέατι τοῦ ὀρκοῦ, καὶ ἐπικαλέσατο ἐκεῖ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιος. (This is a fairly literal translation of the MT: יִשָּׁעַר לָשֵׁן כֹּ֣רָא הַזָּמָ֔ן בָּהֶם בְּשָׁם יְהֹוָ֖ה אֶל֖וֹ. However, the Hebrew omits the name of Abraham, and this omission is found in family n of the LXX mss. See also note at end.) Now, Philo cites the entire verse at Plant. §73, where the mss. present: εὐθεῖας τοῖνος ὁ σοφὸς Ἀβραὰμ λέγεται φυτεύσαι ἄρουραν ἐπὶ τῷ φρέατι τοῦ ὀρκοῦ καὶ ἐπικαλέσαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιον. (The only textual variation is that FH read Ἀβραὰμ.) Now, first of all it is clear that Philo has here shifted the construction so that instead of having a direct quotation (introduced as, for example, λέγειν κτλ.), we find indirect discourse: “Then at once the wise man Abraham is said to plant a hide of land at the well of the oath, and to invoke the name of the Lord God eternal.” Although the name of Abraham is moved forward, I suppose that Philo found it in his text of the LXX, and indeed that the only changes that he made were that move and the shift of the verbs from finite forms to infinitives.

However, that leaves us with the discrepancy at the end of the verse. Where the LXX (as printed, at least) has τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιον, Philo’s mss. have τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιον. Mangey, following his conviction that Philo used the LXX, simply emended the reading of the mss. to agree with the LXX. While, as a general rule, I approve of this practice, there are here some complications.

What has happened in the Philo mss. is that θεοῦ αἰῶνιον is an assimilation to the genitive case found in the preceding word, κυρίου. That Philo wrote the nominative is confirmed by the citation at §85 (to be discussed immediately below) and the reference to θεοῦ αἰῶνιος at §89; at each of these places the nominative is transmitted uniformly.

On the other hand, the Loeb edition follows the manuscripts in printing κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιον. This departure from the text of PCW is noted, but no reason is given. At §85 the Loeb accepts the text of PCW: κυρίου θεοῦ αἰῶνιον. But the English is virtually the same at both places; at §73 we find “the Name of the Lord as God eternal,” while at §85 there is “the Name of the Lord, as God eternal.” This is remarkably similar to the French version, which follows Wendland’s Greek at both places and reads: “le nom du Seigneur comme Dieu éternel,” and then “le nom du Seigneur comme le Dieu éternel.” The subtle differences of a comma in the English and the definite article in the French seem to be simply the whims of the translators.

19 I have here slightly modified the translation by Colson and Whitaker (PLCL 3:251). Indeed, the three translations into English, French (Pouilloux), and German (Heinemann) seem to me not quite to capture the oratio obliqua of Philo’s presentation.

20 Mangey 1742, 1:43 n. b: “LXX Interpretes quos ubique sequitur Philo.”

On the other hand, the German version, also following PCW, has: “den Namen des Herrn ewiger Gott” at both places. At least this reflects the nominative case of θεός αἰώνιος, although I would think that German syntax requires that “ewiger Gott” be put in quotation marks as a name.

At §73 Turnebus (p. 224) has ὅνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰώνιου, and translates: “nomen aeterni Dei Domini.” Mangey (1:340) has ὅνομα κυρίου, θεοῦ αἰώνιου, and has the same translation.

At §85 both Turnebus (p. 226) and Mangey (1:342) omit τό before ὅνομα (with no note). Wendland prints it with no note, and xxx.

At §85 Turnebus places a comma after ὅνομα, and translates: “nomen hoc, Dominus Deus aeternus.”

At §85 Mangey again places a comma after ὅνομα, and translates: “nomen Dominus Deus aeternus.”

Moreover, here both Turnebus and Mangey place a comma after ὅνομα, so that κύριος θεοῦ αἰώνιος would seem to be viewed as the name itself.22

Now, let us turn to the later citation at §85. Here Philo makes a more straightforward direct citation: τίς οὖν ὁ καρπὸς αὐτοῦ, αὐτὸς ψηφίζεται: “ἐπέκάλεσεν” γὰρ “τὸ ὅνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰώνιος.”23 At least, this is the text as printed by Wendland. However, we see from the apparatus that the mss. read κύριος θεοῦ αἰώνιος. Curiously enough, Mangey did not reconcile the two citations (despite referring at the first to the second). Rather, in his long note to the second he says on κύριος: “Textus κυρίου. Sed sic videtur Noster notanter scribere.” He follows this with some citations illustrating Philo’s frequent distinction between κύριος and θεός, but I do not see the relevance to the variation between κύριος and κυρίος.

Now, it would seem that at §85 the reading θεοῦ αἰώνιος is assured by the unanimity of the mss. here and also at §89, as well as overwhelming evidence in the LXX tradition (all except Arab Arm mss). Furthermore, it is virtually certain that the article ὅ before θεοῦ in the Philo mss. is a mere slip. It is not present at §73, and within the LXX tradition it is found only in the reading ὅ θεος ὁ αἰώνιος, which is found in t370 (= six minuscules).

By the way, using the online images I can at least confirm that PCW correctly reports the readings of the two Florence mss., Laurentianus pluteus 10.20 (M) and Laurentianus pluteus 85.10 (F), at these places.

---

22 This is clearly reflected in the translation of Turnebus, “inuocauit enim nomen hoc, Dominus Deus aeternus,” while Mangey has “invocavit enim nomen Dominus Deus aeternus.”

23 Wendland carefully places the quotation marks so as to remove from the quotation itself the conjunction γὰρ, which of course relates the quotation to the context. Colson and Whitaker correspondingly place their “for” before the quotation proper (although they add an extraneous “‘tis said”). However, Pouilloux places “en effet” (which must render ἐπεκάλεσε γὰρ) inside the quotation marks, while Heinemann places “nannte ja” (rendering ἐπεκάλεσε γὰρ) before his quotation marks. Both these latter readings fail to place the quotation marks with the precision that Wendland as well as Colson and Whitaker do.
A final note on this issue. Many years ago I argued that Philo’s biblical mss. in fact would have written the Tetragrammaton instead of the translation κύριος that is now found in the bulk of our (much later) mss. of the LXX. 24 On that theory Philo would have seen in his scroll (or scrolls) of the LXX of Gen 21:33: ἐκαλεσε τὸ ὄνομα ὡς θεός αἰώνιος, or perhaps a similar text with the Tetragrammaton written in paleo-Hebraic letters. (More precisely, given the writing conventions of the time, Philo would have seen something like: ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΣΥΝΟΜΑΘΕΟCAΙΩΝΙΟ.) Philo would then have had to make a decision about whether to render the Tetragrammaton as κύριος or κυρίου. Presumably his choice of κύριου (if that is what he wrote) reflects the reading tradition that he was familiar with. (Again, of course, what Philo actually wrote would have been: ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕΣΕΣΥΝΟΜΑΚΥΡΙΟΥΘΕΟCAΙΩΝΙΟ.) And it is this text with the genitive that he then comments on.

However, noting that the mss. of Philo read κύριος at §85, we see that there is another possibility, namely that Philo interpreted the Tetragrammaton otherwise and wrote τὸ ὄνομα κύριος θεός αἰώνιος at both §73 and §85. The tradition of the LXX understood the Tetragrammaton as a genitive, and so the mss. of Philo were altered to that “standard” reading at §73, but Philo’s original nominative survived at §85. (This, of course, requires emending the manuscripts to read κύριος at the former place, rather than emending to read κυρίου at the latter place.) Now, it seems to me that in fact the nominative would give a plausible sense (at least in Philo’s eyes) at §85: Abraham invoked the name “Lord God eternal.” Here we have the two titles (“Lord” and “God”) of the two chief powers of God. Or perhaps, with an eye to what Philo says at §89, we should consider the names to be “Lord” and “God eternal.” Of course, the addition of “eternal” to a name of God is unusual in any case; this is the unique place in the Pentateuch, and elsewhere there are only a few examples in Isaiah and Daniel. Philo attempts to explain this unusual usage at §89.

Let me note also that the final words of the MT, בֵּן הָיָה אֱלֹהִים וּלְבָנָה, while usually rendered “on the name of the Lord God eternal” or the like, could be interpreted as “on the name of the Lord, God eternal,” or “on the name, Lord God eternal.”


Plant. 113: Philo explicitly notes that Lev 19:23 is ambiguous, since it can be divided into two clauses in two different ways. See the discussion in David Dawson, Allegorical Readers, 102–3, and Maren R. Niehoff, Jewish Exegesis and Homeric Scholarship in Alexandria (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 139, who comments: “Philo is the first extant Bible scholar to have discussed a problem of punctuation, thus sharing another important concern of Homeric scholarship.” Of course, “punctuation” is

not quite the correct term, since commas would not have been written. Thus, Colson and Whitaker’s “the former punctuation” for τὸ πρότερον σημαινόμενον should rather be “the former meaning.” Cf. Heine-mann’s “Nacht der ersten Bedeutung” (PCH 4:174), and Pouilloux’s “Dans la première acception” (PAPM 10:77). Nevertheless, Philo and others were able to see that a sentence could be read in the two different ways that we now mark with different placements of a comma. Another example is found at Mut. 106–10, where Philo gives two interpretations of “midian,” namely as either ἐκκρίσεως (“of sifting,” the genitive of ἐκκρίσις) or ἐκ κρίσεως (“of judgment”). What Philo writes is edited as ἡ γὰρ προσηγορια τῆς Μαδιὰ μεταληθῆσα ἐκ κρίσεως ὁνομάζεται, but this already takes the term in the second sense. The ambiguity becomes clearer when we note that Philo would have written ΕΚΚΡΙΩΣΕΩΣ, and the same format would have occurred in his onomastical source.

3. Some Conjectures.

As I have discussed in an earlier article, the scholar Jeremiah Markland made many conjectures to the text of Philo, which are found as marginalia in his personal copies of the editions of Turnebus and Mangey, now preserved in the British Library.25 These are occasionally reported in the apparatus of PCW. However, in looking over the pages of Markland’s copy of Mangey’s edition, I have noted that several of Markland’s conjectures have found their way into the edition and even into the text of Cohn and Wendland, but without any attribution to Markland. These and a few others of note are:

§15: πρὸς τὸ codd. : πρὸ τοῦ Markland Wendland
§16: ἀπαργάζετο R Markland : ἀνειργάζετο codd., εἰργάζετο E
§45: τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ζειωσι καὶ ημέρους δυνάμεις codd. : τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος καὶ τὰς ζειωσι αὐτοῦ καὶ ημέρους δυνάμεις Markland : τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος καὶ τὰς ζειωσι καὶ ημέρους αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις Cohn
§54: κληροδοτεῖν μὲν : κληροδοτεῖν μὲν <γὰρ> Markland Wendland
§58: ὁ ἐξωοπέστατα Markland Wendland : ὁς ἐξωοπέστατα MGUF : ὁς ἐξωοπέστατα H
§67: νόν codd. : οὖν Markland Cohn
§71: κτήματα τῶν Markland Wendland : κτήματων MF : κτήματα GUH

apparatus. Moreover, Mangey has a comma after ἀνελληλπῶς and a period after εὐδαμονοῦσι. Markland changes the comma into a semicolon, which is what Wendland prints (without comment). Colson follows Mangey in having a comma after ἀνελληλπῶς, but then Colson puts a question mark after εὐδαμονοῦσι, incorrectly attributing that as well to Mangey. Pouilloux follows the text of PCW (although he accepts Colson’s characterization of Mangey’s conjecture).

§114: ταύτα : ταύτη Markland Wendland
§127: λόγος codd. : λόγος ὡς Markland Colson-Whitaker
§129: δὲ codd. N : δὴ Markland Wendland (in text)
§132: καί θεωματὸν ἦγεσαθα codd. : καὶ delendum Markland Wendland
§160: χαίροντες MGF : χαίροντες UH. Mangey printed χαίροντες with no note, but Markland conjectured χαίροντες.

§162: The construction σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς καθηράμενοι, τὰ μὲν λοιπῶρας, τὰ δὲ νόμων καὶ παιδείας ὀρθῆς ρέουσαι, is in fact ungrammatical. The first τὰ refers correctly to σώματα, but the second τὰ refers (or should refer) to ψυχὰς.26 Markland adjusts the grammar by proposing τὰς δὲ νόμων κτλ. Very close parallels are found at Mos. 2.301: τὰ τε σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἐπιδεδώκασι, τὰ μὲν ἡδονὲς, τὰς δὲ τῷ παρανομένῳ καὶ ἀνοσιοργεῖν, and Spec. 2.214: σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς ἀναξέουσαι, τὰ μὲν τῷ ἀβροδιαίτῳ, τὰς δὲ τῷ φιλόσοφοι. This change of τὰ to τὰ seems to me to be one of the most convincing conjectures. Note, further, that Mangey (1:729) proposed to write σώματα τα, which Markland glossed with “Recte.”

§166: οὐδὲν MGUF : οὐδ’ ἐν H : οὐδ’ ὁν Markland Cohn (in PCW text)
§170: ἐμπρεπές Wendland : εὔπρεπές Clem., εἰμπρέπει codd. Mangey cites the passage from Clement in a note, and Markland there corrects εὔπρεπές to ἐμπρ. But he does not comment on the word in Philo’s text.


§172: οἶδεν MGUF (Markland) : οἶδεν H (Mangey text)
§176: παρακατάθοιτο, ἄστειον παρακατάθηται> Wendland : παρακατάθοιτο, ἄστειον εὐλόγως> Markland, παρακατάθοιτο, <τὸ δὲ ἀστεῖον παρακατάθηται> Arnim. Markland says “Argumentum claudicat,” and refers to the final lines of Plant. In fact, as Arnim (Quellenstudien zu Philo, 135–36) notes, Seneca (Epistola 83) cites the complete form of this argument from Zeno (SVF 229): “ebrio secretum sermonem nemo committit, vire autem bono committit; ergo vir bonus ebrios non erit.” And from that Arnim made his restoration. But I do not understand why Arnim alters the occurrences of the verb and the adjective, which are both the same in Seneca. Thus, Wendland’s form appears more justified. Moreover, Arnim (135) states of the text of Philo as found in the mss.: “Der Unsinn ist wohl nicht auf Textverderbnis,

26 That is, this is not a construction where τὰ μὲν . . . τὰ δὲ is used to mean, “on the one hand . . . on the other hand,” as in LSJ, s.v. ἄ, ἰ, το, A.VIII.4; see Smyth, Grammar, §1111.
sondern auf Flüchtigkeit des Excerptors zurückzuführen.” But this seems unlikely to me. However negligent Philo might have been, he would have had the sense of the passage clearly in mind, while the two occurrences of very similar verb forms could have easily caused a scribe to skip a few words.

It is puzzling to me that Wendland would have misattributed so many of these conjectures. In working with the apparatus of PCW I have found the work of Cohn and Wendland to be meticulous, with rare lapses. Of course, we might have here the phenomenon of great minds thinking alike, where Cohn or Wendland independently thought of a conjecture that had already occurred to Markland. But Cohn and Wendland were certainly aware that Markland had made such conjectures, and the number of such places tempts me to think that perhaps there was some confusion in the notes of Cohn and Wendland, so that conjectures that they had found in Markland’s copy of Mangey were somehow entered into their apparatus under their own names. In any case, these provide yet further examples of Markland’s contributions to the text of Philo.