

The Text of Philo's *De Cherubim*[†]

James R. Royle

1. The Manuscript A

The treatise *De Cherubim* is well-attested within the Greek manuscript tradition, being found in MAPGHUF, although UF end at §84. Cohn finds that the mss. divide into the two groups, MAPGH and UF, with no clear superiority for either group.¹ As I have noted elsewhere, the textual citations in PCW seem to be highly accurate, and I certainly did not undertake a full re-examination of the evidence for this paper. But I did take the opportunity to collate afresh PCW's manuscript A, Monacensis gr. 459, and was thus able to check the accuracy of Cohn's apparatus for that ms. at least. Here are the discrepancies that I found, where the first reading is that of the text of PCW. The reader will note that, in order to have much of anything at all to report under this heading, I have been required to consider the most trivial of differences.

§11 (p. 172 l. 19):	δὲ : δ' A
§48 (p. 181 l. 20):	παραδέχεσθε A ^c : παραδέχεσθαι A*
§48 (p. 182 l. 1):	περιέχεσθε A ^c : περιέχεσθαι A*
§49 (p. 182 l. 6):	ἔξειπεν : ἔξειπε A
§51 (p. 182 ll. 22–23):	παρθενίας : παρθενείας A
§52 (p. 182 l. 25):	οὔν : νοῦν A
§57 (p. 184 l. 7):	συνουσίας ἴσης : συνουσίας A*, ἴσως συνουσίας A ^c
§62 (p. 185 l. 13):	βαθέος A ^c : βαθέως A*
§62 (p. 185 l. 17):	τῶν A ^c : τὰ A*
§62 (p. 185 l. 17):	δὲ prim. : δ' A
§70 (p. 187 l. 17):	πεφύσησαι : πεφύσσησαι A
§75 (p. 188 l. 25):	ἐνενόησε : νενίκησαι A* : νενίκηται A ^c
§78 (p. 189 l. 12):	ἀγεννοῦς A ^c : ἀγενοῦς A*

[†]Presented to the Philo of Alexandria Section at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Boston, November 19, 2017.

¹ PCW 1:lxvii.

§82 (p. 190 l. 9):	μήτε prius : μήτ' A (ante ὄμματι)
§83 (p. 190 l. 16):	ὕπήκοον A ^c : ὑπήχοον A* (?; the original reading is not clear)
§84 (p. 191 l. 1):	προσοίσετε : προσοίσεται A* : προσοίσεται φησιν A ^c
§84 (p. 191 l. 5):	φιλοθεάμονος : φιλοθεάμμονος A
§91 (p. 192 l. 12):	συνεπίσκεψαι A (Cohn reports συνεπισκέψαι)
§92 (p. 192 l. 19):	έκεχειρία A (Cohn reports έκεχειρία)
§92 (p. 192 l. 20):	άπρεπεῖς A (Cohn reports άτρεπεῖς)
§95 (p. 193 l. 11):	καταρρυπαίνεται: καταρυπαίνεται A
§95 (p. 193 l. 11):	οὔτε alt. : οὔτ' A
§105 (p. 195 l. 14):	ἄρρυθμον : ἄρυθμον A
§113 (p. 197 l. 3):	ἐγὼ γοῶν : ἔγω γε οῶν A (Cohn reports ἔγωγ' οῶν)
§116 (p. 197 l. 21):	ὁ παρνοῶν : ὁ γε ἄρα νοῶν A (Cohn reports ὁ γε ἄρα νοῶν)
§129 (p. 200 l. 21):	ἀναδιδακτέον : A* started to write ἀναδιδασ (I believe)

Quite a few of these involve corrections, and it seems that Cohn and Wendland typically just cite the original readings, ignoring corrections completely. Others of these involve very trivial matters (e.g., itacism, elision, or writing two consonants for one), with which Cohn perhaps did not wish to clutter his apparatus. But a few others are errors. At p. 182 l. 25, the reading νοῶν is cited from P; this should be AP. At p. 189 l. 12, the reading ἀγενοῦς is cited from F; this should be AF. At p. 192 l. 19, A has the reading, έκεχειρία, that Cohn prints, allegedly against all the mss. At p. 192 l. 20, A again has the reading, άπρεπεῖς, that Cohn prints. At p. 193 l. 11, A agrees with MG against the text. At p. 195 l. 14, A agrees with MPG against the text.

Of course, nothing here has any consequence for the construction of the text of this book. Perhaps the item of most interest is that A does preserve έκεχειρία at §92, so that reading, suggested already by Markland (see below), is actually found in the mss.

2. Philo's Biblical Citations

Philo begins the treatise with a quotation of Gen 3:24. It is interesting that there is no introductory or concluding phrase (such as “Moses says” or “we find in the holy oracles”) that would tell the reader that this is indeed a quotation. As always we should keep in mind that Philo most likely did not have any device like our quotation marks.² Rather, the reader was expected to know the biblical text so well that it was immedi-

² See my “The Text of Philo's *De plantatione*,” *SPhiloA* 29 (2017).

ately clear that Philo was beginning here with a quotation. In fact, all the surviving books of the Allegorical Commentary from *Legum allegoriae* 1 through *De agricultura* begin with an abrupt quotation.³ It is not until we come to *De plantatione* that Philo begins a treatise with his own words.⁴

Of course, in our modern editions and translations we find quotation marks to indicate (supposedly) the precise beginning and end of a quotation. But we can obtain at least some idea of what an ancient reader would have seen by looking at the Coptos Papyrus of Philo, which contains *Quis heres* and *De sacrificiis*. There we do find the use of the dipole, a mark that looks like >, in the left margin to mark quotations. In fact, the first extant occurrences of dipoles are in the left margin to the quotation from Menander in *Her.* 5, which occurs toward the top of p. 1, col. B, ll. 2–3. Farther down in that column one sees the dipoles used to mark the quotation of Gen 26:3–5 in *Her.* 8, which begins at l. 27 and runs through p. 2, col. A, l. 2. The dipoles toward the end of the quotation are lost in the damaged (or obscured) left margin at the bottom of p. 1 and the top of p. 2. But we see clearly six dipoles. And we can also see the difference in precision that the dipole provides in contrast to our quotation marks. A dipole in the margin to a line at best tells the reader that a quotation is on that line, but not precisely where on that line it might begin or end. In fact, the quotation from Gen 26:3–5 begins with δώσω on l. 26, which is not marked with a dipole at all. At the earlier Menander quotation ll. 2 and 3 are marked, but the quotation begins in the left portion of l. 2 and extends through most of l. 4. Moreover, the use of dipoles in the Coptos Papyrus is far from systematic. If we turn to *De sacrificiis*, we find that the opening quotation of Gen 4:2 in *Sacr.* 1 is not marked with dipoles at all on p. 56, col. A, ll. 1–3.⁵

Of course, the reader of the Allegorical Commentary could reasonably be expected to notice the extended quotations that often begin those books. And there is no problem for the modern editor or translator to place our quotation marks appropriately. But when shorter phrases are quoted, or when biblical phrases are mixed with Philo's own comments, it is sometimes a subtle matter to determine exactly where those marks should be placed.⁶

³ Keep in mind that *Leg.* 1–2 were originally one book (see my “The Text of Philo's *Legum allegoriae*,” *SPhiloA* 12 [2000]), as were *Gig.* and *Deus*. However, the subsequent divisions that resulted in *Leg.* 2 and *Deus* caused those two books also to begin with a biblical citation without further introduction.

⁴ The *De opificio mundi* also begins with Philo's own words, but that book is not part of the Allegorical Commentary.

⁵ The left margin here is not completely intact, but enough of it remains that any original dipoles would, I believe, be visible.

⁶ See examples in my “The Text of Philo's *De plantatione*,” and “21.4 Philo,” in *The Textual History of the Bible*, vol. 1: *The Hebrew Bible*, part 1C: *Writings* (eds. A. Lange and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2016), 741–46.

3. Philo's Citation of Gen 3:24

A very interesting textual problem occurs at the opening quotation of *De Cherubim*. Here Philo quotes Gen 3:24 in a form very similar to that found printed in the Göttingen LXX,⁷ which reads: καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδάμ καὶ κατόκισεν αὐτὸν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ ἔταξεν τὰ χερουβὶμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς. This differs from the MT in two respects, as discussed by Wevers.⁸ First, the LXX has added αὐτόν, so that God places Adam over against Eden, whereas in the MT God places the Cherubim. Second, as a result of that first change, there is no verb governing “Cherubim” and “flaming sword” (which in the MT are marked as objects with *נש*), and so the LXX “gratuitously introduced” (as Wevers says) the phrase καὶ ἔταξε. Now, the quotation in Philo agrees with 75 318 120' 59 730 in lacking αὐτόν.⁹ And this lack creates an awkwardness: Does κατόκισεν govern the preceding Ἀδάμ or the following τὰ Χερουβὶμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην (which ἔταξε must govern in any case)? Cohn apparently chose the former interpretation, which would mean that Adam was placed opposite Eden.¹⁰ But such a meaning goes against *Cher.* 11, where it is the Cherubim and the sword that are placed opposite Eden. To avoid this difficulty Cohn secluded καὶ ἔταξε,¹¹ so that the verb κατόκισεν must govern the following τὰ Χερουβὶμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην. In effect, although not in the printed text, Cohn places a comma after Ἀδάμ, so that the quotation would be understood as:

⁷ That printed edition places the -v emphus. at the end of ἐξέβαλε and ἔταξε, but that is an editorial choice, as is the decision by Cohn to capitalize Χερουβὶμ in contrast to Wevers's decision not to capitalize it.

⁸ See John William Wevers, *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 49–50. The MT reads: :וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱת הָאָדָם וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַחַיָּוִי וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַבְּהֵמָה וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַרְמִישׁ וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיַּעַר וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיַּבֵּשׁ וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיָּם וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הָאָדָם וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַחַיָּוִי וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַבְּהֵמָה וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַרְמִישׁ וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיַּעַר וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיַּבֵּשׁ וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַיָּם וַיִּבְרָא אֱת הַשָּׁמַיִם. On the other hand, some scholars have thought that the LXX reflects a different Hebrew; see Raanan Eichler, “When God Abandoned the Garden of Eden: A Forgotten Reading of Genesis 3:24,” *VT* 65 (2012): 20–32 (here 21, and further references at 21 n. 3). Eichler's “forgotten” reading is not the reading of the LXX, but one found in several Targumim.

⁹ The omission could have occurred by a leap: κατόκισεν αυτον απεναντι.

¹⁰ Of course, given the αὐτόν as found in most LXX witnesses (but not in Philo) this is, it seems, the inevitable interpretation; see Marguerite Harl, *La Bible d'Alexandrie, La Genèse* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1994), 111–12. But that word is not even in the mss. at *Cher.* 1.

¹¹ As justification for this decision, Cohn laconically adds “cf. § 11” in his apparatus. This is elaborated in PLCL (2:8 n. 1 [–9]): “Cohn excludes καὶ ἔταξε on the grounds that though they appear in the text of the LXX., it is assumed in §11 that the Cherubim and not Adam are placed opposite the Garden.” PAPM has a similar comment. Cohn does not mention this passage in his article concerning textual issues in PCW 1: “Kritisch-exegetische Beiträge zu Philo,” *Hermes* 32 (1897): 107–48.

καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδάμ, καὶ κατόκισεν ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς τὰ Χερουβίμ
καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς.

But it is not clear to me why one could not adopt this interpretation while keeping καὶ ἔταξε in the text. We would again have a break after Ἀδάμ, but now we have the compound verb κατόκισεν καὶ ἔταξε governing the following objects, with the adverbial clause appearing between. This is all perhaps awkward, but not (I believe) grammatically impossible. And there is one small piece of evidence that might be taken as indicating that Philo saw καὶ ἔταξε in his biblical text: at *Cher.* 23 Philo speaks of the post (τάξις) which God has appointed (ἔταξεν) the heavenly choir that is symbolized by one of the Cherubim. Such expressions would be natural if Philo had in mind from the biblical text itself that God had appointed the Cherubim. The fact that there is no manuscript evidence at all throughout the LXX tradition for the omission of καὶ ἔταξε from Gen 3:24 requires that the reason to seclude those words be completely convincing.¹²

Now, what seems to have been overlooked (or at least not explicitly brought into the discussion) is the fact that Philo quotes most of this verse in *QG* 1.57, which survives only in Armenian.¹³ Aucher's literal translation reads: "Cur contra paradisum collocat Cherubim, et igneum gladium, qui vertebatur, ad custodiendam viam ligni vitae?" The Armenian can be retroverted precisely as: Διὰ τί ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς κατόκισεν τὰ Χερουβίμ καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς. While Philo has (if we can trust the order of the Armenian) shifted the position of κατόκισεν, this is otherwise a completely literal translation of the latter portion of Gen 3:24,¹⁴ except that the words καὶ ἔταξε are not represented.

Of course, deducing something from silence is always risky. But the evidence of *QG* 1.57 strongly indicates that Philo did not read καὶ ἔταξε in his LXX, despite the presence of those words in all mss. of *Cher.* 1. And the evidence of *Cher.* 1 indicates that he did not find αὐτόν either. If we put those two indica-

¹² It should be observed that, while Philo's omission of αὐτόν is noted in the Göttingen LXX, the (editorial) omission of καὶ ἔταξε is not. I thus wonder whether the Göttingen LXX has chosen not to cite other such indications that those two words were omitted.

¹³ It is thus not cited in the Göttingen LXX.

¹⁴ Perhaps Philo thought that the former portion (i.e., καὶ ἐξέβαλεν τὸν Ἀδάμ) would not have required separate mention since ἐξαπέστειλεν αὐτόν of Gen 3:23 was cited in *QG* 1.56. But in any case, of course, Philo was not required to discuss every word of the biblical text in his *Quaestiones*, and he regularly skips words.

tions together we can infer that Philo's text of Gen 3:24 was a more literal rendering of the MT than what we find in our LXX mss.¹⁵

Naturally, if the words *καὶ ἔταξε* were omitted in Philo's original text of *Cher.* 1, they would have been readily added by scribes, since they are present in all the LXX mss. It is tempting to speculate that Philo here preserves an earlier form of the LXX, i.e., without *αὐτόν* and without *καὶ ἔταξε*. The transition to the usual text would have proceeded in two stages: first, *αὐτόν* was added in order to give a more immediate object of *κατόκισεν*, and then secondly *καὶ ἔταξε* was added in order to have a verb to govern the nouns "Cherubim" and "sword." If Philo saw the usual LXX text but without *αὐτόν*, then perhaps he felt that it was awkward and adjusted the text by omitting *καὶ ἔταξε*. If he saw the usual LXX text (including *αὐτόν*), then his omission of *καὶ ἔταξε* seems completely gratuitous (just as gratuitous as Wevers thought that its addition had been). In either case, his omission of *καὶ ἔταξε* is a more substantial alteration of the biblical text than Philo is usually inclined to make. Indeed, it seems certain that he usually just copied the LXX text as that lay before him. So this remains a perplexing problem.

4. Philo's Citation of Exod 21:5

At *Cher.* 72 Philo quotes and paraphrases Exod 21:5, and then continues with a paraphrase of Exod 21:6. He begins (according to the text in PCW):

“εἰ” γάρ φησιν “ἀποκριθεὶς εἶποι ὁ παῖς ἠγάπηκα τὸν κύριόν μου καὶ τὴν γυναῖκά μου καὶ τὰ παιδιά, οὐκ ἄπειμι ἐλεύθερος.”

But the LXX witnesses are almost unanimous in reading *ἐὰν δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπη ὁ παῖς κτλ.*¹⁶ So Cohn has included too much in the quotation. Rather one should edit:

εἰ γάρ φησιν “ἀποκριθεὶς” εἶποι “ὁ παῖς ἠγάπηκα τὸν κύριόν μου καὶ τὴν γυναῖκά μου καὶ τὰ παιδιά, οὐκ ἄπειμι ἐλεύθερος.”¹⁷

Now, Philo quotes Exod 21:5 at two other places, *Leg.* 3.198 and *Her.* 186. At the latter place Philo interrupts the quotation proper to make his own clarifying insertions:

¹⁵ I would not, of course, infer from this that Philo was here following the Hebrew text against the LXX. But as far as I can tell, this passage has not been brought forward in the discussions about that issue.

¹⁶ Among the minor fluctuations one does not find *ἐὰν* or *εἶπη*.

¹⁷ Having the quotation interrupted by *εἶποι* is awkward, of course.

ὁ λέγων· “ἠγάπηκα τὸν κύριόν μου” (τὸν ἡγεμόνα ἐν ἐμοὶ νοῦν) “καὶ τὴν γυναῖκά μου” (τὴν φίλην καὶ οἰκουρὸν παθῶν αἴσθησιν) “καὶ τὰ παιδιά” (τὰ κακὰ τούτων ἔγγονα) “οὐκ ἄπειμι ἐλεύθερος.”¹⁸

Apart from those insertions, this quotation agrees completely with what Cohn prints at *Cher.* 72. This differs from the text found in the Göttingen LXX in two respects. First, Philo has γυναῖκά μου, where the Göttingen LXX has merely γυναῖκα. But Philo's reading is found in the vast majority of LXX witnesses, while μου is absent in AB and a few others. The pronoun here agrees with the MT, and thus could have been added to the text of Philo as a retouching. But at *Her.* 186 the pronoun is already present in the Coptos Papyrus (PCW's Pap),¹⁹ so that it seems likely that Philo indeed read γυναῖκά μου.

But there are several discrepancies with the LXX and with Philo's two other quotations of this verse. (*Leg.* 3.198 quotes a few words preceding ἠγάπηκα, with which Philo begins both here and at *Cher.* 72.) First, Pap here preserves the order τὸν κύριόν μου, as found at the other two quotations and in the LXX; the other mss. at *Her.* 186 transpose to μου τὸν κύριον.²⁰ Second, at *Leg.* 3.198 the mss. have παιδιά μου, whereas the other two quotations omit μου. There is extensive attestation for μου within the LXX (agreeing with the MT, and of course a natural addition after the two earlier occurrences of the word), but it is omitted in the Göttingen LXX. It thus seems likely that Philo quoted the verse at all three places without this μου, and that it was inserted into the mss. of *Leg.* 3.198, which are not of the best quality.²¹ Third, the final verb presents a serious problem. At *Her.* 186 Pap and the other mss. read ἄπειμι, which is not found among the other LXX witnesses. Now, at *Leg.* 3.198 the Philo mss. have ἀποτρέχω, which is the almost unanimous reading of the LXX witnesses; but, as with the addition of μου discussed earlier, that could well be the intrusion of the usual LXX reading for whatever Philo wrote there. Unfortunately, the evidence at *Cher.* 72 does not provide much clarification. There MAGHP have οὐκεταιμι (with two different accentuations),

¹⁸ I have placed the clarifications in parentheses whereas Cohn simply separates them with commas. And I have added (as in PLCL) the missing final quotation mark.

¹⁹ The quotation occurs at p. 30, col. B, ll. 25–32.

²⁰ There is no support for this order among the LXX witnesses. The Göttingen LXX has misinterpreted Wendland's note (“μου τὸν κύριον codd.”), taking it to mean that the other order has no attestation, and thus cites simply Philo here for μου τὸν κύριον. In fact, both Cohn and Wendland contrast “codd.” with “Pap.” (I don't see that this convention is explained in PCW, and of course Pap is indeed a codex. Nevertheless, the convention is clear.) Further, as the Göttingen LXX notes, the Philo ms. F reads ἠγάπησα, agreeing with five LXX minuscules.

²¹ PCW 1:lxvvi: “in codicibus melioris notae liber deest.”

while UF have οὐκ ἐξελεύσομαι. (This last reading could have resulted from the influence of Aquila.²²) Cohn, with an eye to the reading in *Her.* 186, prints οὐκ ἄπειμι at *Cher.* 72, evidently seeing a confusion of π and τ as the occasion of the readings found in MAGHP. This is certainly plausible, and as already noted we can well suppose that an original οὐκ ἄπειμι would have been replaced by the LXX's ἀποτρέχω at *Leg.* 3.198. So, it seems most likely that Philo wrote οὐκ ἄπειμι at all three places. (Thus, it should be restored by conjecture at *Leg.* 3.198.)

But the problem remains: Where did that reading come from? Since it has left no other trace within the LXX tradition, it seems that Philo substituted it for the LXX's ἀποτρέχω; but why?

5. The Text of *Cher.* 105

The preliminary studies cited here are γραμματική, γεωμετρία, μουσική, and ῥητορική, and the structure of Philo's comment would be smoother if each one was mentioned in its own participial clause: (1) ἐρευνῶσα καὶ μεταδιώκουσα, (2) περιποιῶσα, (3) θεραπεύουσα, (4) ἐξετάζουσα καὶ ἐφαρμόζουσα, περιποιῶσα. But the third clause is of a different pattern, where indeed μουσική is subsumed under γεωμετρία. Mangey suggested altering μουσικῆς ἀστείου to μουσικὴ ἀστεία, thus introducing a more natural symmetry. Although Cohn mentions this in his apparatus, in his discussion he says that this solution “geht nicht an: die Stellung, die das Subject μουσικὴ ἀστεία dann in dem Satze einnehmen würde, wäre zu sonderbar.”²³ Cohn's own solution is to alter the other three nominatives into datives, but he professes dissatisfaction with this proposal as well.²⁴ And I think that perhaps Mangey's suggestion is more promising. Of course, in any case, the position of μουσική in the third clause is strangely different from the other three studies, which begin their clauses. Unless we are prepared to do some more extensive rewriting and move μουσική to the front of its clause, we are stuck with that problem. However, Mangey does not say what should be done with the διά, which (in the transmitted text) governs μουσικῆς ἀστείου. I hesitantly suggest the following. Philo wrote καὶ μελωδία μουσικὴ ἀστεία (in majuscules without spacings or breathings or accents or subscripts). At some point the δια was interpreted as a preposition, and the surrounding words were altered appropriately, so that the text became: καὶ μελεῖ δια μουσικῆς ἀστείου.

6. The Text of *Cher.* 30

²² See Joseph Reider and Nigel Turner, *An Index to Aquila* (Leiden: Brill, 1966). The Göttingen LXX cites a passage in Ambrose and the Coptic as having the same reading.

²³ “Beiträge,” 137. In his copy of Mangey, Jeremiah Markland states: “Recte habet Vulgata.”

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 137–38.

Instead of Cohn's conjecture μέσον for μετά, Colson and Whitaker print μέτρον ὄντα, and refer in their note to a further discussion, which however does not exist.²⁵ In fact, though, this is a very attractive suggestion. Palaeographically the reading of the mss. could have arisen by a little leap: μέτρον ὄντα. This conjecture, assigned to Colson, is adopted by Gorez in the PAPM volume.

But there is another issue here. We are told that the Logos γρή τούτοις παρακολουθεῖν. What does τούτοις refer to? Colson has simply "their." But Gorez makes explicit that the reference is to "majesté et clémence," i.e., μέγεθος and ἡμερότης of §29. While this is possible, and would make τούτοις grammatically appropriate (for a compound of a masculine and a feminine noun), the more natural interpretation, I believe, is that the Logos accompanies the two chief powers of God (cf. *QE* 2.68). This is the interpretation in PCH, which translates τούτοις with "diesen" and then glosses that word with "(Kräften)." The problem here, of course, is that δυνάμεις is feminine. It is possible that Philo lost track of the genders involved, but I think that it is much more likely that Philo wrote ταύταις, and that then a scribe, after seeing ἐν οἷς four times in §29, continued with τούτοις.²⁶

7. Some Further 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.²⁷ His conjectures to *De Cherubim* are occasionally reported in the apparatus of PCW.²⁸ Of course, Mangey himself made many incisive comments on the text, and these are frequently cited in PCW. But there are many more suggestions by Mangey and Markland that have not been reported. There are also valuable observations to be found in the translations into German, English, and French. Here I list a few of these items that seem to be of significance.

§7: The printed text of PCW has πατήρ δὲ τούτου ὁ νοῦς ἐπειλημμένος τοῦ σπουδαίου. Subsequently Cohn (see PCW 1:lxxxiii–lxxxvi) preferred the reading found in Clement, *Strom.* 5.8.7 (648 P.): πατήρ δὲ τούτου ὁ νοῦς ἐξελεγμένος δὲ ὁ τοῦ σπουδαίου. This reading is adopted by PCH, not mentioned in PAPM,

²⁵ PLCL 2:26 n. a, referring to p. 483, where there is no note on this section.

²⁶ As a curiosity I note that Markland has underlined τούτοις, as though he were going to make some comment or suggestion on the word. But there is nothing more.

²⁷ "Jeremiah Markland's Contribution to the Textual Criticism of Philo," *SPhiloA* 16 (2004): 50–60.

²⁸ See at p. 171 l. 24; p. 172 l. 11 and 2; p. 178 l. 20; p. 181 l. 22; p. 182 l. 25; p. 184 l. 18 (bis); p. 196 ll. 15 and 22.

and cited (“perhaps read”) by PLCL, where an apt reference is made to *Gig.* 64. In the edition of Clement, GCS 2:331, reference is made to *Gig.* 64, *Mut.* 69, and *Abr.* 82–83.

§§7–8: Cohn called the passage *ὅταν δὲ ἤδη . . . ἐπικλήσιν Ἴσ μαήλ* a “heillos verderbte Stelle.”²⁹ There and also in PCW Cohn ascribes the conjecture *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀπαθανατίζων . . . μεταδιῶκον* to Markland. However, Mangey himself (1:140 n. 1), while printing *ἐκλιπόντων . . . ἀποθανόντων . . . μεταδιῶκων*, makes the conjecture *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀπιθανὸν [sic] . . . μεταδιῶκων [sic]*, with no indication that this comes from Markland. I presume that what is meant here is *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀποθανὸν . . . μεταδιῶκων*, which is what Whitaker approves in a long note in PLCL (2:482), and which Colson also suggests in his even longer note in PLCL (2:481–82, see 481). In his copy of Mangey, Markland marks the first word with “f. [= fortasse] -λιπὸν,” marks the second with “f. ἀπαθανατίζων” [sic], which presumably is a slip for *ἀπαθανατίζων*,³⁰ and leaves the third unmarked. Finally, in his addenda (1:723), Mangey ascribes to Markland the conjecture *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀπαθανατίζων*, and then adds that for *μεταδιῶκων*: “Scribitur ab eodem [i.e., by Markland] *μεταδιῶκων*.”³¹ I would conclude that Markland first made the conjecture *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀπαθανατίζων . . . μεταδιῶκων*, as Cohn states, but then Mangey revised this (in his note 1:140 n. 1) to *ἐκλιπὸν . . . ἀποθανὸν . . . μεταδιῶκων*. Presumably Mangey did not intend to adopt Markland’s *ἀπαθανατίζων*, since he does not (at 1:723) characterize that suggestion with “recte” or some similar term.

§10: For *καὶ πάντα σοφιστὴν* Mangey conjectured *καὶ παῖδα σοφιστὴν*, and referred to *ὁ σοφιστὴς αὐτῶν υἱὸς* at the end of §8. This is marked with “recte” by Markland, and noted in PLCL (2:14 n. 1), as well as in PAPH (23 n. 3).³²

§13: In order to emend the incongruity of *κλόνον, ἅπερ ἐναντιώτατά ἐστι*, Markland proposed to read *κλόνον, ὅσπερ ἐναντιώτατός ἐστι*. Certainly Wendland’s suggestion to read *σάλον καὶ κλόνον* is more plausible, especially since that phrase occurs at *Cher.* 38 and *Post.* 22. However, there is then no evident cause of the omission of *σάλον καὶ*. On the other hand, the phrase *κλόνον καὶ σάλον* occurs at *Leg.* 2.90, and the

²⁹ “Beiträge,” 130; the full discussion is on 130–31.

³⁰ I have used here the pdfs of Mangey’s edition. The last two letters of *-λιπὸν* are not entirely clear, and the letters *ανατί* are also not entirely clear. But the letters *ζων* at the end are clear. These marginal notes are sometimes difficult to read even on the original in the British Library.

³¹ Here it seems that the accentuation has been altered to *μεταδιῶκων*, presumably by Markland, who has made some other notes on this page.

³² Although I don’t see the relevance of the reference there to *Congr.* 74–75.

omission would be readily explainable from that wording by a scribal leap (homoeoteleuton): λαχοῦσαν κλόνον καὶ σάλον, ἄπερ κτλ. I would thus suggest reading λαχοῦσαν κλόνον <καὶ σάλον>, ἄπερ κτλ.

§19: PCW prints τὸ δὲ στῆναι καὶ ἄτρεπτον κτήσασθαι διάνοιαν ἐγγύς ἐστι βαίνειν θεοῦ δυνάμεως, with only some minor variations. However, in his addenda (2:723) Mangey proposed to read θεοῦ εὐδαιμονίας. He notes that εὐ- of the second word could have been lost in the -ου of the first word, and then from δαιμονίας a scribe would form δυνάμεως. In support of his conjecture he refers to the phrase that soon follows: μὴ λανθανέτω θείας εὐδαιμονίας ἐγγύς ὄν. Markland notes in the margin that one should read εὐδαιμονίας for δυνάμεως, evidently taking that from Mangey's addenda, and then refers to Mangey p. 231 l. 22, which is *Post.* 28: δηλοῖ τὴν περὶ τὸν σπουδαῖον βεβαιοτάτην εὐστάθειαν. Unfortunately, there is no reference to, or even allusion to, happiness in this passage. Nevertheless, it seems to me that Mangey's conjecture here is worthy of consideration; indeed, the notion of the happiness of God seems more closely tied to the words of §§19–20 than does the notion of the power of God.

§25: For ἐτέροις, which is found in all mss. except U (which omits the term altogether), Mangey conjectured πετροῖς, which has found favor with all editors since. On the other hand, Markland conjectured ἐκατέρωσε. But “wings” is appropriate in this allusion to Exod 25:19 (LXX), although the biblical text has πτέρυξ rather than πτέρον. Philo uses πτέρυξ when quoting and directly discussing the biblical text in *QE* 2.65, but in general he prefers πτέρον (seven occurrences) to πτέρυξ (two occurrences).

§29: Mangey printed ἐν ᾧ δὲ ἄρχων with no note. Markland adds in the margin: “f. οἷς, ut ante,” i.e., in the phrase ἐν οἷς ἀγαθός, where οἷς is found in all mss. Markland's conjecture is printed in PCW, on the authority of UFD.

§30: Mangey makes a very interesting conjecture for the opening words, which are printed by him and by PCW as φλογίνη δὲ ῥομφαία, διότι χρὴ κτλ. He writes (1:144 n. d): “Lege φλογίνης ῥομφαίας, ut subintelligatur δέξει τύπον.”³³ Presumably, Mangey intended the emended text to read: φλογίνης δὲ ῥομφαίας κτλ. Markland writes (I believe) “f.” for “fortasse” next to Mangey's note, and this seems to me to be a very attractive suggestion. The address to the mind (ὧ διάνοια) that begins with §29 continues through §31, which consists of the question οὐχ ὀρθῶς ὅτι κτλ. that is directed to the mind. It would thus be reasonable to construe sections 29 and 30 as presenting the two τύποι that the mind is to receive. And it would be per-

³³ He adds: “Vide D. Paul. ep. ad Heb. iv. 12,” where the writer says: Ζῶν γὰρ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἐνεργῆς καὶ τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον καὶ διϊκνούμενος ἄχρι μερισμοῦ ψυχῆς καὶ πνεύματος, ἁρμῶν τε καὶ μυελῶν, καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας.

fectly natural for scribes, who would (of course) have had much more difficulty than Philo to keep track of such an extended construction, to consider φλογίνης δὲ ῥομφαίας as an error for φλογίνη δὲ ῥομφαία, and to simply “correct” it.³⁴

§33: Although Mangey prints αἴσια πάντα, in his addenda (1:723) he prefers αἴσια ἀπαντᾷ. The latter is printed by Cohn, who cites αἴσι’ ἀπαντᾷ in H corr., αἴσια ἄπαντα in MG, and αἴσια πάντα in the other mss. If we ignore the (later) breathings and accents, the reading of the text and the reading found in MG are, of course, the same, while the reading found in H corr. and that found in the other mss. are basically the same, differing from that of the text only in the elision.

§35: Mangey (1:723) approved of Markland’s conjecture of λεχθεῖσαι σου for λέγουσα.

§36: Cohn writes μηδὲ τῆς ἑαυτῶν where the mss. have μηδὲν τῆς ἑαυτῶν. Markland makes the same conjecture in the margin of Mangey’s μηδὲν.

§37: Mangey prints ἐμβαλεῖ γ’ ἡμῖν, for which Markland conjectures ἐμβαλεῖς ἡμῖν. The latter reading is printed by Cohn on the authority of UF.

§35 and §38: Both Mangey and Cohn print ἐξεναντίας, which seems not to be a word.³⁵ At §38 Markland corrects it to ἐξ ἑναντίας, but there is no note at §35. The *Philo Index* has an entry for ἐξεναντίας, where “Cher 35” is the only entry; but under ἑναντίος one finds “Cher 38,” which must refer to ἐξεναντίας there. On the other hand, Günter Mayer in the *Index Philoneus* has no such word as ἐξεναντίας, and cites *Cher.* 35 and 38 under ἑναντίος. The phrase ἐξ ἑναντίας also occurs at *Deus* 79; *Agr.* 93, 174; *Sobr.* 27; *Mos.* 1.115, 270, 2.251; *Spec.* 1.344; *Virt.* 211; *Contempl.* 86; *Aet.* 7, 139; *QG* 1.100 (1b). At all those places (except the last, of course) it is so printed in PCW,³⁶ and also in Mangey, except at *Agr.* 174, where he has ἐξεναντίας, and at *Spec.* 1.344, where he has simply ἑναντίας without ἐξ (as found in H). So the form

³⁴ Note that F reads φλογίνην δὲ ῥομφαν, which could indicate a failure to understand either of the other two constructions. But perhaps the author of that phrase chose the accusative because he took the words to be the object of δέξαι back at the beginning of §29.

³⁵ At least it does not occur in LSJ, while ἐξ ἑναντίας occurs under ἑναντίος II.2. In Henricus Stephanus, ed., *Thesaurus graecae linguae*, vol. 3 (ed. C. B. Hase, G. Dindorf, and L. Dindorf; Paris: Didot, n.d.), 986, s.v. ἑναντίος, it is noted that ἐξ ἑναντίας “et una voce scriptum invenitur.”

³⁶ At *Deus* 74 ἐξεναντίας is a variant reading, and at *Agr.* 174 Wendland prints ἐξ ἑναντίας although all the mss. have ἐξεναντίας.

at *Cher.* 35 and 38 (and at *Agr.* 174 in Mangey) must simply be a slip. Of course, Philo would have written ΕΞΕΝΑΝΤΙΑC for either form. I suppose that one could view this as being simply a matter of orthography, but presumably the editor should be consistent, even if the manuscripts are not.

§41: In a note (1:146 n. a) Mangey preferred ὑπομονή instead of ἐπιμονή, as found in all the mss., referring to Philo's comments at *Plant.* 169 and *Migr.* 208, as well as to Clement.³⁷ And Markland writes "recte" in the margin. It does seem that ὑπομονή accords with Philo's etymology of "Rebecca," as found also at *Congr.* 37 (GF have ἐπιμονή) and *Somn.* 1.46. Throughout *QG* 4.97–188 Philo refers to the meaning of her name, but it is not quite clear what the Greek equivalent is.³⁸ The only Greek fragments that are relevant are at *QG* 4.97, where "Rebecca" is interpreted as ὑπομονή, but those are not explicit citations of Philo. On the other hand, at *Fug.* 45 she is characterized as ἐπιμονή.³⁹ Certainly, it is tempting to make Philo consistent by writing ὑπομονή at both *Cher.* 41 and *Fug.* 45.⁴⁰

§59: For τυγγάνει, as found in MH and in Mangey, Markland conjectures ἐτύγγανεν. Cohn makes the same conjecture, which he prints as his text.

§91: Instead of ἄς δ', as found in MGH and in Mangey, Markland conjectures ἄ δ', seeing that the pronoun in fact agrees with the following ὀλίγα, whereas a scribe was influenced by the preceding ἀποπίας to write the feminine plural. Cohn makes the same conjecture, printing it as his text, and also adding ἄν, which was (it thus seems) omitted by dittography before ἀντί.

§92: Cohn writes ἐκεχειρία as a correction for the reading ἐκκεχειρία as he thought was found in all the mss. and as printed by Mangey. The same correction was made by Markland as a marginal note. (And, as noted above, the reading ἐκεχειρία is in fact found in A.)

§93: Although Cohn prints the last clause of this section as does Mangey, he records the suggestion of Wendland to add τέχνη after προξενούσαι. Colson actually prints the Greek with that addition, and accordingly has "arts" in his translation. On the other hand, PCH has "Künste," even though it is presumably trans-

³⁷ *Strom.* 1.5.31.3 (334 P.). At *Plant.* 169 Wendland refers to Clement, *Paed.* 1.21.3 (111 P.).

³⁸ See Marcus's note at *QG* 4.97 (PLCL Supp 1.381 n. c), and similar notes elsewhere on these sections.

³⁹ As Wendland notes, Mangey (1:552 n. p) says that "[n]onnulli codices" have ὑπομονῆς for ἐπιμονῆς here, although PCW cites no such manuscript.

⁴⁰ On this etymology generally see Lester L. Grabbe, *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo* (BJS 115; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 197, who ignores several of the cited passages in Philo.

lating the text of PCW, and PAPM has “arts” with the Greek of PCW. In fact, the addition of τέχνηαι was already suggested (with “forsan”) by Mangey in his addenda (1:724), although he would put it after αἰ δὲ, and was also proposed (with “f.” = “fortasse”) by Markland, although he inserts it after γαστέρα. But the position proposed by Wendland is palaeographically more plausible, since its omission would be by a straightforward scribal leap (προξενοῦσαι τέχνηαι τὰς), whereas the omission from either Mangey’s or Markland’s position would seem to be unexplained.

§96: Mangey prints κἄν τοιαύταις, but then suggests καίτοι ταύταις in his addenda (1:724). According to Cohn the mss. have καὶ τοιαύταις. Markland suggested καίτοι ταῖς, and Cohn prints the same as his own conjecture.

§97: Mangey prints νοηταὶ δὲ αἰ ἅπασαι, with no note, although according to Cohn the mss. have only ἅπασαι without the article (and presumably δ’ as well). Markland already noted that δ’ ἅπασαι should be read.

§116: For his printed ἐνδιαίτημα (as found in GH, whereas MAP have διαίτημα), Mangey proposed in a note (1:160 n. v) to read κτήμα. Markland improved on this by suggesting ἴδιον κτήμα.⁴¹ This is palaeographically closer to the attested readings (having at any rate δι in common), and so would more easily explain how they arose. Cohn cites “fort. ἴδιον κτήμα” in his apparatus with no mention of Markland. That reading is translated in PCH and PLCL, where the conjecture is ascribed to Cohn. On the other hand, in PAPM the reading διαίτημα is printed with no note. Markland also proposed to read ἐμοῦ for the preceding ἐμόν, but left the second ἐμόν unmarked a few lines below.

§116: Mangey printed the reading of the mss., ὁ πλάνης οἰητικός, where the last word is a *hapax legomenon*, but made two separate conjectures. In his addenda (1:724) Mangey proposed ὁ πλάνης, ὁ οἰητικός, and that reading is printed by Cohn and translated in PCH.⁴² On the other hand, in a note to his text (1:160 n. x), Mangey proposed to read ὁ πλάνης οἰστικός. That reading is adopted by Colson and Gorez, and has the advantage of proposing a word that occurs at eight other places in Philo.

⁴¹ At least that seems to be what he wrote; the *iov* is not clear.

⁴² The ὁ would have been easily omitted by haplography.