

The Text of Philo's *De plantatione*¹ (Preliminary Draft)

James R. Royle

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.² (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 Λευιτικῆ (1:333 n. m): "Nescio annon Autor σφάλματος μνημονικοῦ sit reus, locus enim citatus exstat Exod. xix. 20." However, Exod 19:20 reads ἐκάλεσεν κύριος Μωυσην. 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 ὕμνοις λέγων ὧδε: "ὁ φυτεύων οὓς οὐκ ἀκούει; ὁ πλάσσων ὀφθαλμούς οὐκ ἐπιβλέπει." For the final two words the LXX has οὐ κατανοεῖ. The Hebrew verb is כָּרַךְ, which Aquila translates by ἐπιβλέπω at five places.³ Following Barthélemy one should edit οὐ κατανοεῖ against the mss.⁴ Moreover, where the LXX has τὸ οὓς and τὸν ὀφθαλμόν, Philo has the anarthrous οὓς and ὀφθαλμούς. 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: κατανοέω), 91:8 (90:8 LXX: κατανοέω), 102:20 (101:20 LXX: ἐπιβλέπω); Isa 63:15 (LXX: ἐπιστρέπω).

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 Thus, it seems likely that Philo had the readings of the LXX, which have been replaced by the readings of Aquila.⁵

§47: The citation of Exod 15:17–18 has been retouched at three places:

LXX	Aquila
κληρονομίας Wendland (PCW)	κληροδοσίας codd.
εἰς ἔτοιμον κατοικητήριόν σου G	ἔδρασμα εἰς καθέδραν σου ceteri
κύριε (prim.) G	κυρίου MUFH
ὃ ἠτοίμασαν αἱ G	ἤδρασαν ceteri

In the following text Philo cites various portions of the biblical text, and the retouching continues in §54:

κληρονομίας UH	κληροδοσίας MGF
----------------	-----------------

However, a different biblical text, Num 18:20, is cited at §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,⁶ 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 §47.⁷ Barthélemy finds yet another place where the retouching has occurred: *Her.* 162. At the citation of Deut 25:13–16 there, Pap reads ἐν κλήρῳ, with the LXX, while all the other mss. have κληροδοσίαν.

But let us return to the reading κυρίου for κύριε. Barthélemy states that this shows that the retoucher's text of Aquila preserved the Tetragrammaton rather than translating it.⁸ Might not this mistake have been Philo's? (See further on xxx.)

⁵ There is a complication at the second place. Instead of τὸν ὀφθαλμόν BS have ὀφθαλμούς, and R has τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς. Did Philo simply follow a text of the LXX that agreed with BS?

⁶ A few read κληρονομίας or κληρονομίαν.

⁷ Barthélemy, 50 n. 8: “Dans le deuxième cas [i.e., *Plant.* 63], Wendland, ne disposant pas de témoin non retouché, a eu tort de conserver cette leçon dont Mangey se défiait déjà.”

⁸ Barthélemy, 54.

§1 and §140: “ἤρξατο Νῶε ἄνθρωπος εἶναι γεωργὸς γῆς καὶ ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα” (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 πνοὴν 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 θεός for ἐνεφύσησεν, but correctly notes that he has the latter word at *Leg.* 1.31 and *Her.* 56. However, at *Her.* 56 PCW prints: “ἐνεφύσησε” γάρ φησιν “ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὄλων εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.” 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 θεός “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς,” and
 “ἐνεφύσησε” γάρ φησιν ὁ ποιητὴς τῶν ὄλων “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνοὴν ζωῆς, καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ
 ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.”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 ἐνεφύσησε at *Opif.* 134; *Leg.* 3.161; *Det.* 80; *Somn.* 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 θεός 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: “ἐνεφύσησε” γάρ “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πνεῦμα ζωῆς” ὁ θεός, “καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.”

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; *Somn.* 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: “ἐνεφύσησε” γάρ “εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ” πνεῦμα “ζωῆς” ὁ θεός, “καὶ ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχὴν ζῶσαν.” 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 ἐνέπνευσε, ὁ θεός, or ὁ ποιητῆς 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 θεὸς παράδεισον ἐν Ἐδέμ κατὰ ἀνατολάς, καὶ ἔθετο ἐκεῖ τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὃν ἐπλασεν” (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:

μοι κύριος	A M pm (Göttingen LXX)
κύριος μοι	D 961 rell (= MT)

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 diple 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 diple 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.”

κύριος εμοι	911 Philo Chrysostom
κύριος	54
κύριος μου	569 458

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: οὔτος γὰρ “ράβδους ἐλέπισε λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισύρων τὸ χλωρόν” (Gen 30:37). But here again the quotation marks are placed incorrectly. The Göttingen LXX has καὶ ἐλέπισεν αὐτάς Ἰακώβ λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισύρων τὸ χλωρόν, and cites Philo as having ῥάβδους ἐλέπισε for ἐλέπισεν αὐτάς.¹⁵ However, rather than seeing a textual variation here, we should simply edit: οὔτος γὰρ ῥάβδους ἐλέπισε “λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισύρων τὸ χλωρόν.” Or, perhaps we could print: οὔτος γὰρ ῥάβδους “ἐλέπισε . . . λεπίσματα λευκὰ περισύρων 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 ἔπιε τοῦ οἴνου . . .” (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 יָזָ.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 εἶδε παίζοντα μετὰ Ῥεβέκκας 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 παίζοντα μετὰ Ῥεβέκκας 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 εἶδε “παίζοντα μετὰ Ῥεβέκκας τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ.”

On the citation of Gen 21:33:

¹⁵ It seems inconsistent that the Göttingen LXX notes that a Philo ms. has ἐξέλειψε, 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.

¹⁸ Peter Katz, *Philo's Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1950), 32.

In the Göttingen LXX this verse reads: καὶ ἐφύτευσεν Ἀβραὰμ ἄρουραν ἐπὶ τῷ φρέατι τοῦ ὄρκου, καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο ἐκεῖ τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰώνιος. (This is a fairly literal translation of the MT: לְשָׂרְעֵי עֹלָם אֵל יְהוָה, מִשָּׂרְעֵי יִקְרָא אֲרָרָה. 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: εὐθέως τοίνυν ὁ σοφὸς Ἀβραὰμ λέγεται φυτεῦσαι ἄρουραν ἐπὶ τῷ φρέατι τοῦ ὄρκου καὶ ἐπικαλέσαι τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰώνιος. (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, λέγει· 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.”¹⁹ 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 αἰώνιος, Philo's mss. have τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰωνίου. Mangey, following his conviction that Philo used the LXX,²⁰ simply emended the reading of the mss. to agree with the LXX.²¹ 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 αἰωνίου 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 θεὸς αἰώνιος 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 αἰωνίου. 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 αἰώνιος. 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.”

²¹ Mangey 1742 1:340 n. s: “Melius θεὸς αἰώνιος. Ita Textus sacer & Philo ipse infra p. 226 [= Mangey 1:342].”

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 θεὸς 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 ὄνομα κυρίου θεοῦ αἰωνίου, and translates: “nomen aeterni Dei Domini.” Mangey (1:340) has ὄνομα κυρίου, θεοῦ αἰωνίου, and has the same translation.

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

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

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

Moreover, here both Turnebus and Mangey place a comma after ὄνομα, so that κύριος ὁ θεὸς 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 ὑφηγήσεται· “ἐπεκάλεσε” γὰρ “τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου θεὸς αἰώνιος.”²³ At least, this is the text as printed by Wendland. However, we see from the apparatus that the mss. read κύριος ὁ θεὸς 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 κυρίου.

Now, it would seem that at §85 the reading θεὸς 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 ὁ before θεός 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 ὁ θεὸς ὁ αἰώνιος, which is found in τ³⁷⁰ (= 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 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: ἐπεκάλεσε τὸ ὄνομα יהוה θεὸς 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: ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕCETOONOMA יהוה ΘEOCAIΩNIOC.) Philo would then have had to make a decision about whether to render the Tetragrammaton as κύριος or κυρίου. Presumably his choice of κυρίου (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: ΕΠΕΚΑΛΕCETOONOMAKYPIOYΘEOCAIΩNIOC.) 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 θεὸς 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, בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ, 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.”

2. Philo on an Ambiguity in the Biblical Text.

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

²⁴ “Philo, Κύριος, and the Tetragrammaton,” *SPhA* 3 (1991): 167–83.

not quite the correct term, since commas would not have been written. Thus, Colson and Whitaker’s “the former punctuation” for τὸ πρότερον σημαϊνόμενον should rather be “the former meaning.” Cf. Heine-mann’s “Nach 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 ἐκκρισις) or ἐκ κρίσεως (“of judgment”). What Philo writes is edited as ἡ γὰρ προσηγορία τῆς Μαδιὰμ μεταληφθεῖσα ἐκ κρίσεως ὀνομάζεται, but this already takes the term in the second sense. The ambiguity becomes clearer when we note that Philo would have written ΕΚΚΡΙΣΕΩΣ, 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 τῷ codd. : πρὸ τοῦ Markland Wendland

§16: ἀπειργάζετο R Markland : ἀνειργάζετο codd., εἰργάζετο E

§45: τιθέναι : τεθῆναι Markland Wendland

§46: τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰς ἰλεως καὶ ἡμέρους δυνάμεις codd. : τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος καὶ τὰς ἰλεως αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡμέρους δυνάμεις Markland : τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος καὶ τὰς ἰλεως καὶ ἡμέρους αὐτοῦ δυνάμεις Cohn

§54: κληροδοτεῖν μὲν : κληροδοτεῖν μὲν <γὰρ> Markland Wendland

§58: ὁ ὄξυωπέστατα Markland Wendland : δς ὄξυωπέστατα MGUF : ὡς ὄξυωπέστατα H

§67: νῦν codd. : οὔν Markland Cohn

§71: κτήματα τῶν Markland Wendland : κτημάτων MF : κτήματα GUH

§91: ὅθεν ὄντως MGHUF (ὄντων L) Pouilloux : ὅθεν τῶν ὄντως Mang. R: ὁ τῶν ὄντως Markland : τῶν ὄντως Cols. Colson incorrectly ascribes his conjecture to Mangey, perhaps misinterpreting PCW’s

²⁵ “Jeremiah Markland’s Contribution to the Textual Criticism of Philo,” *SPhA* 16 (2004): 50–60.

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

§114: ταῦτα : ταύτη Markland Wendland

§127: λόγος codd. : λόγος ὅς Markland Colson-Whitaker

§129: δὲ codd. N : δὴ Markland Wendland (in text)

§132: καὶ θαυμαστὸν ἠγεῖσθαι codd. : καὶ delendum Markland Wendland

§160: χαίροντες MGF : χαίροντες UH. Mangey printed χαίροντες with no note, but Markland conjectured χαίνοντες.

§162: The construction σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς καθηράμενοι, τὰ μὲν λουτροῖς, τὰ δὲ νόμων καὶ παιδείας ὀρθῆς ρεύμασι, 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 ἐπιδεδόκασιν, τὰ μὲν ἡδοναῖς, τὰς δὲ τῷ παρανομεῖν καὶ ἀνοσιουργεῖν, and *Spec.* 2.214: σώματα καὶ ψυχὰς ἀναχέουσαι, τὰ μὲν τῷ ἀβροδιαίτῳ, τὰς δὲ τῷ φιλοσοφεῖν. This change of τὰ to τὰς seems to me to be one of the most convincing conjectures. Note, further, that Mangey (1:729) proposed to write σώματά τε, which Markland glossed with “Recte.”

§166: οὐδὲν MGUF : οὐδ' ἐν H : οὐδ' ἂν Markland Cohn (in PCW text)

§170: ἐμπρεπὲς Wendland : εὐπρεπὲς Clem., ἐμπρέπει codd. Mangey cites the passage from Clement in a note, and Markland there corrects εὐπρεπὲς to ἐμπ-. But he does not comment on the word in Philo's text.

§170: ὠφέλειαν codd. : ἀγέλειαν Mangey. Markland notes on Mangey's conjecture: “Recte.”

§172: οἶδεν MGUF (Markland) : εἶδεν H (Mangey text)

§176: παρακατάθοιτο, <τῷ δὲ ἀστείῳ παρακατατίθεται> Wendland : παρακατάθοιτο, <τῷ δὲ ἀστείῳ εὐλόγως> Markland, παρακατάθοιτο, <τῷ δὲ σοφῷ παρακατατίθενται> 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, viro autem bono committit; ergo vir bonus ebrius 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. ὁ, ἡ, τό, 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.