

## New and Neglected Readings from *De sacrificiis* and Other Works of Philo<sup>†</sup>

James R. Roysse

Various sources for the text of Philo have been either inadequately edited or overlooked more or less completely. This paper will report on some discoveries found in various manuscripts. First, the Coptos Papyrus of Philo, which contains *De sacrificiis* and *Quis heres*, contains many superior readings that were not reported in the 1893 edition by Scheil and thus are also not found in the Cohn-Wendland edition. Second, there are some fragments from an otherwise unknown work that are found in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Philo; these have been edited, but have been neglected because they were edited after the Cohn-Wendland edition. Third, a few Greek fragments from *De providentia* 1, otherwise completely unknown in Greek (even to Eusebius), are found in the *Commentary on the Hexaemeron* by Pseudo-Eustathius. The printed text of the latter work, and thus of the Philo fragments, may be improved by a study of the manuscripts of Pseudo-Eustathius. Fourth, improvements to the text of the Greek fragments from *De providentia* 2 that are quoted by Eusebius may be made from the manuscripts of the Armenian version of *De providentia*.

### A. The Coptos Papyrus

The most extensive papyrus manuscript of Philo is a codex that was discovered in Coptos in 1889, and published by Vincent Scheil in 1893.<sup>1</sup> This manuscript, now in Paris as Parisinus suppl. gr. 1120/1,<sup>2</sup> was dated by Scheil to the sixth century, but the consensus nowadays is that it dates to the third century. It contains two books, *Quis heres* and *De sacrificiis*, which are preserved on 89 pages (paginated by the scribe), consisting of 44 folios (thus pages 1–88) and a final page (89), which is attached to the inside back cover. This codex is famous among papyrologists for being, as it seems, the oldest book that was discovered with

---

<sup>†</sup>Presented to the Philo of Alexandria Seminar at the annual meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature in Denver, November 19, 2018.

<sup>1</sup> "Deux traités de Philon," in *Mémoires publiés par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire* 9.2 (Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1893).

<sup>2</sup> Suppl. gr. 1120/2 is the designation of the remains of a New Testament codex, known as  $\mathfrak{P}^4$ , which was found within the Philo codex. There is a vast literature on  $\mathfrak{P}^4$  and its relation to the Philo codex. See, most recently, the excellent discussion of the relation between  $\mathfrak{P}^4$  and the Philo codex by Brent Nongbri, *God's Library: The Archaeology of the Earliest Christian Manuscripts* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2018), 247–68.

its original cover intact. All the pages have suffered some damage, but more than half of the original text has survived on every page, and many of the pages are quite well preserved.

As a result we are able to read most of the text of those two books in a form that is close to a millennium earlier than what we see in the other manuscripts of Philo. Cohn and Wendland correctly judged the text of Pap, as they designate it, to be much superior to that found elsewhere.<sup>3</sup> Of course, the scribe of Pap does make errors, but over and over again it presents readings that are clearly better than what the other manuscripts contain. It is a reasonable deduction that the early papyri of the other works of Philo would be similarly superior to what we find in the medieval manuscripts. Unfortunately, the text of Pap has been reported very inadequately. For their citations of Pap Cohn and Wendland did not examine the manuscript itself, but rather relied on Scheil's edition. And they did this despite many obvious inadequacies in Scheil's edition. Indeed, on occasion Cohn and Wendland were able to correct Scheil's transcription from the published plates of two pages.<sup>4</sup> And they were able to make some corrections to Scheil's work by having a papyrologist, Carl Kalbfleisch, examine the codex in Paris.<sup>5</sup> But Kalbfleisch's work was very limited. Several years ago, I happened to spend some time with Pap, and immediately saw that Scheil's transcription of the text was frequently incorrect, and thus that the report of the text in Cohn and Wendland was often in error. Further examination has reinforced this view, and for the last couple of years I have been making regular trips to Paris in order to prepare a new edition, which I hope may appear next year.

As a preliminary report on my findings I wrote an article a couple of years ago on one aspect of the superiority of the text found in Pap, namely its text of Philo's biblical citations.<sup>6</sup> This is an area that has interested me very much for years, and it turns out that it is a place where Pap is especially valuable. This was evident from Scheil's transcription, and Cohn and Wendland correctly judged that Pap's readings often preserved Philo's citations where the other manuscripts had been corrupted. In particular, the readings found in Pap often agree with the LXX where the other manuscripts have readings that have been influenced by the text of Aquila. Thus, Pap serves as a crucial piece of evidence for the view, held by Mangey, by Cohn and Wendland, and by Katz, to mention only the most celebrated scholars, that Philo's biblical text

---

<sup>3</sup> Cohn states (PCW 1:xlvi): "papyrus integritate et praestantia scripturae . . . omnes codices Philonis longe superat."

<sup>4</sup> At the two occurrences of Ἐξαγωγή as the name of the book of Exodus at *Her.* 14 and 251, Scheil erroneously reported ἐξάρω and ἐξάτω, respectively. At the latter place Wendland relies on Kalbfleisch's examination to state that Pap has ἐξαγω(γην); see PCW 3:xi (at the top, on "57,13"). But at the former place Wendland corrected Scheil from the plate; in the apparatus Wendland states: "ἐξαγ(ωγῆ) Pap (cf. tabulam phototypicam apud Scheilium, qui non recte legit ἐξάρω)." It is thus surprising that Cohn and Wendland did not look at the papyrus itself in order to clarify and correct Scheil's report.

<sup>5</sup> See PCW 3:ix–xi.

<sup>6</sup> "The Biblical Quotations in the Coptos Papyrus of Philo," *SPhiloA* 28 (2016): 49–76.

was (at least in general) that of the LXX, and that divergences from the LXX were (at least in general) the results of corruptions of one sort or another.

However, Pap provides many more superior readings. I will refer to my forthcoming edition for full details, but here is a very small sample of some places where the reading of Pap is misreported. Let me begin with some readings in *De sacrificiis*, which illustrate the sorts of problems that occur throughout Scheil's edition and throughout the reports on Pap that are found in PCW. (In referring to Pap I cite the page number, the column, and the line.)

*Sacr.* 4 (Pap 56B28): Pap has *απαλλληλων* (*sic*, with three lambdas in a row), although Scheil edits *ἀλλήλων* without *ἀπ*, and even calls attention to the usual reading in his notes. This is one of many places that show that Scheil, having made his transcript, did not look at the papyrus again to check the alleged discrepancies with the usual text.

*Sacr.* 13 (Pap 58B26): Pap has omitted *εικοτων δε και πιθανων ηρτημενοις* by a leap: *ενειλημμενοις εικοτων . . . ηρτημενοις*. Scheil notes this omission, but Cohn fails to record it.

*Sacr.* 29 (Pap 62B22): Scheil reports (and confirms in a note) that Pap omits *δε* after *ωτα*. And PCW thus cites Pap for the omission. Yet Pap has *ωτα δε* at the end of the line.

*Sacr.* 29 (Pap 62B23): Scheil reports *φθεγξαμενη*, as the other mss. have, but Pap's erroneous *φραξαμενη* is perfectly clear.

*Sacr.* 32 (Pap 63B9–10): By a scribal leap from *αναρμοctoc αμικctoc* to *εχθεctmoc αργαλεctoc* (slightly more than one line), Scheil omits *αμικctoc δυςχρηctoc εχθεctmoc*, and explicitly refers to the alleged omission in a note. Cohn thus reports the omission. However, Pap has the words (writing *εχθεctmoc* for *εκθεctmoc*).

*Sacr.* 32 (Pap 63B10): Scheil reports *ακροχολoc*, for which Cohn reports no variation. But in fact Pap reads *ακραχολoc*, as does the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus (*P.Oxy.* 1173, f. 9<sup>r</sup> l. 9). And the spelling with *ακρα-* is also found at *Ebr.* 223 in GU and printed by Wendland, whereas *ακρο-* is found in FH.<sup>7</sup> At *Somn.* 2.192 Wendland prints *ακρο-* on the authority of A, the sole ms. there. But *ακρα-* is the correct form (see LSJ s.v., note), and the support from the two papyri at *Sacr.* 32 shows, I believe, that it was Philo's spelling. Thus, GU are correct at *Ebr.* 223, and *ακρα-* should be edited also at *Somn.* 2.192 against the slender ms. evidence.

The notes by Kalbfleisch on readings in *De sacrificiis* are found at PCW 3:ix–x n. 1. (One might wonder how many scholars who study the text of *De sacrificiis* as found in PCW 1 have looked at that long footnote in PCW 3.) Here are a few places that Kalbfleisch reports on.

---

<sup>7</sup> Another portion of the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, edited as PSI 11.1207 f. 1<sup>v</sup> l. 3, contains *Ebr.* 223, but breaks off at *α[κρ...*

*Sacr.* 13 (58B28): Scheil reports Pap as having θνητῶν, and then gives the presumably correct reading in the apparatus: τὴν τῶν. But in fact Pap reads την τῶν, thus agreeing with UFD. Scheil’s report is cited by Cohn at PCW 1:xlili, but is corrected by Kalbfleisch as reported in PCW 3:ix n. 1 (–x).

*Sacr.* 27 (62A18–21): Scheil prints εὐκολία διορθώσις, and in a note explicitly indicates that αἰδῶς — προκοπή is missing. Nevertheless, as Kalbfleisch (PCW 3:ix–x n. 1) verified, those words are clearly present in the codex. What happened is that Scheil himself skipped from εὐκολία αἰ at the end of l. 18 to προκοπή διορ at the end of l. 21, where we have only the similarity of λι and Δι as the causal factor. Evidently, having made his transcript, Scheil did not then return to check its correctness after writing his textual notes.

*Sacr.* 6 (57A13): Scheil prints συνυφανται with no brackets. Cohn, in his apparatus, where he edited συνυφαντο, simply cites συνυφανται as the reading of Pap. Evidently he had doubts about this, and asked Kalbfleisch to confirm it. The report (PCW 3:ix–x n. 1) was: “συνυ . . . nec plura legi possunt (συνύφανται Scheil).” Now, what Kalbfleisch reports is indeed what one can see on p. 57: ψυχῆι συνυ | [ . . . . . ] προκτιθεται κτλ., where the missing beginning of the line would contain around 6 letters. However, when we take into account the detached piece 59.1 (found on p. 59 but actually belonging with p. 57), we can read with virtual certainty what Scheil reports: συνυ | φανται.<sup>8</sup> No doubt Kalbfleisch did not have the time to attempt to identify all the various stray pieces of the codex, and contented himself with what was immediately readable on the main portions of the various pages. Often that would be sufficient, but not here. So Scheil’s report was correct, and thus what we find in PCW 1 is correct, but the “correction” by Kalbfleisch as reported in PCW 3 is mistaken.

*Sacr.* 97 (80B27): Scheil has represented the contents of Pap very inaccurately. He prints τροπον προσαγη δη το θεου, which is the reading of Mangey with the addition of δη. Scheil then adds “Om δη” in his notes, indicating that Pap departs from the usual reading at that point. In fact, though, Pap originally had merely τροπον το  $\overline{\theta\upsilon}$ , and the second hand has added αγη above the line between τροπον and το. Scheil evidently misread the added word, ΔΓΗ, as ΔΗ. (In ΔΓΗ the first letter is, naturally enough, similar to a Δ, and the Γ was taken by Scheil to be a connecting line between λ and Η. Indeed, the letters are written more or less continuously.) Moreover, as usual, he fails to note that the word is by the second hand. But Scheil inexplicably also misrepresents Pap as having the verb προσαγη. Now, Cohn, relying on Scheil, prints τρόπον προσάγης, τὸ θεοῦ, and writes in his apparatus: “προσάγης scripsi: προσαγη δη Pap, ἄγη UF, προσάγη

---

<sup>8</sup> The only very slight doubt concerns the last letter. What immediately follows is illegible, and all we see is the vertical stroke. This could theoretically be the left vertical of a η. But the space before the following ΠΡΟC is already very tight, and of course συνυφανταν would be nonsensical. We should thus conclude that Pap read συνυφανται.

ceteri.” The textual evidence at *προσαγωγῆς* is though actually seen to be: om. Pap\*, ἄγη Pap<sup>man 2</sup> UF, *προσάγη* ceteri.

*Sacr.* 136 (89B5–6): Scheil prints [κατα]γνίξεσθαι, as the other mss. have (except that Scheil, by a sound error by a French speaker, writes *κατα* for *καθα*), and then has in a note: “Pap. καταγιξεσθαι.” Overlooking the brackets in the transcription (which are not in the note) Cohn reports that Pap reads *καταγιξεσθαι*. But in fact *θα* is visible at the end of the line, and so it had *καθαγιξεσθαι*, as Mangey conjectured. Presumably Scheil intended to write *καθα* both in his transcription and in his note, but by the sound error wrote *κατα*. However, if we are to trust his brackets in the transcription, he did not see any of the prefix at the end of l. 5.

Let me turn from *De sacrificiis* to some places in *Quis heres*.

*Her.* 2: This is not really a “reading,” but rather an editorial issue. In dealing with Philo (and other ancient authors) one has to keep in mind that until well into the Christian era texts were written (at least in general) without accents or breathings or punctuation. Of course, the accents and breathings were pronounced, and sentences were understood to be statements or questions or commands or exclamations; but there was no written indication of these matters. This would have been true of the rolls of the various books of the LXX that Philo was reading and commenting on, and also of Philo’s own books. Eventually all these books were provided with such reading aids, and presumably the decisions by later scribes and editors were correct for the most part. However, in considering Philo’s comments on the LXX, there is no guarantee that Philo’s own interpretation was the same as what we now find in our printed editions.

Now, in *Her.* 2 Philo quotes Gen 15:1–3. As was observed by Wendland and others before him, we can see that Pap has correctly preserved the words of the LXX, which were (as seems clear) quoted by Philo, while the other manuscripts have been corrupted in various ways. Of course, what Pap actually preserves here are the words in the sense of the letters of the words, written without accents or breathings or punctuation. And that corresponds to what Philo would have found in his roll of Genesis and to what Philo would have written in his original copy (no doubt a roll also) of *Quis heres*. In the usual editions of the LXX, Gen 15:3 what Abraham says is written as a statement: *καὶ εἶπεν Ἀβραμ, Ἐπειδὴ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ δὲ οἰκογενῆς μου κληρονομήσει με*. But in fact at *Her.* 65, as Marguerite Harl observes,<sup>9</sup> Philo makes clear that he considers this to be a question rather than a statement. Thus, according to Philo’s understanding this line of the LXX should be written as: *Ἐπειδὴ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ δὲ οἰκογενῆς μου κληρονομήσει με*; Indeed, I believe that we can see that Philo reveals this understanding already at *Her.* 2. The construction there is *πυνθάνεται φάσκων . . . καὶ πάλιν . . .* Colson translates this as “he answers with

---

<sup>9</sup> See her comments in PAM 15:166–67 n. 2 and 196–97 n. 3; nevertheless in her Greek text she prints a period at the end of *Her.* 2.

the question . . . . And again he says . . . .” This presents Abraham as first asking a question and then saying something. And this interpretation, of course, accords with the punctuation that Colson found in his copy of the LXX. But Philo does not add “he says.” What Philo writes can be more literally translated as “he questions saying . . . and again . . . .” We do not have a break between questioning and stating; rather we have two parts of the questioning. In fact, matters are more complicated. What Philo quotes from Genesis has four clauses:

1. Δέσποτα, τί μοι δώσεις;
2. ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος;
3. ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μασεκ τῆς οἰκογενοῦς μου, οὗτος Δαμασκὸς Ἐλιέζερ.
4. ἐπειδὴ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ δὲ οἰκογενής μου κληρονομήσει με;

We can see from *Her.* 34 that the second clause is also a question. And so we have three clauses of the questioning. I believe, though, that the third clause must be understood as a statement; thus, its presence in the midst of sentences that Philo took to be questions is a bit awkward. In any case, what all this means is that the first, second, and fourth clauses should all be construed as questions. And there is a further little twist. Pap omits the δέ in the fourth clause, as Wendland notes, adding that Cohn approves of that omission. Indeed, since Pap shows itself to be preserving Philo’s words much more accurately than do the other mss. in this opening portion of *Quis heres*, it is plausible that it is correct here also. And perhaps its omission, found within the LXX in 72 44-125 Aeth Co, goes along with construing this fourth clause as a question. If that is so, then *Her.* 2 should be edited as follows:

ἐπειδὴ γὰρ θεσπισθέντος ὁ σοφὸς ἤκουσε λογίου τοιούτου· “ὁ μισθὸς σου πολὺς ἔσται σφόδρα”, πυνθάνεται φάσκων· “δέσποτα, τί μοι δώσεις; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος; ὁ δὲ υἱὸς Μασεκ τῆς οἰκογενοῦς μου οὗτος Δαμασκὸς Ἐλιέζερ”, καὶ πάλιν “ἐπειδὴ ἐμοὶ οὐκ ἔδωκας σπέρμα, ὁ οἰκογενής μου κληρονομήσει με;”

In any case, the three semicolons should be there to show that Philo understood those three clauses to be questions.

*Her.* 23 (4A31): Mangey had already conjectured δεμιοc in place of δεcποτηc, as found in the mss. known to him. Scheil transcribes δεcμων, and Wendland took that as supporting Mangey’s conjecture (see PCW 3:viii [i.e., “7,8”] and apparatus ad loc.). In fact, though, Pap has δεμιοc, precisely as Mangey conjectured. The word is at the end of l. 31, and what Scheil evidently took to be the supralinear stroke denoting final -v is in fact a slightly raised c with the upper part extended. The final vowel is clearly o, written a bit

smaller than usual, rather than  $\omega$ . Presumably the scribe wrote the word in this way in order to save a little space, since the line is slightly longer than the norm.

*Her.* 63 (10A5): Scheil edits  $\delta\iota\epsilon\rho\mu\eta\nu\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}[\omicron\nu$ , but in fact Pap reads  $\delta\iota\epsilon\rho\epsilon\upsilon\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\omicron[\nu$ , as Wendland conjectured.

*Her.* 145 (23A32): Scheil reports  $\kappa\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu$ , but in fact Pap has  $\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\omicron\nu$ , thus confirming Mangey's conjecture, which is followed by Wendland.

*Her.* 154 (25A4): Scheil's transcription incorrectly omits  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , which is clearly visible. The other mss. omit  $\gamma\alpha\rho$ , but Wendland added it by conjecture.

*Her.* 175 (28B27): Pap has  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\ \nu\omicron\theta\omicron\iota$  where the other mss. have  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu$ . Wendland does not report that Mangey had already conjectured  $\tau\omicron\nu\ \pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$ .

*Her.* 225 (37A30): Scheil omits  $\omicron$ , as do the other mss. But Pap clearly has  $\omicron$ , confirming Wendland's conjecture.

*Her.* 262 (45A13): Except for Pap the mss. have  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota$ , which was edited by Wendland, who notes that Cohn conjectured  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ . Scheil explicitly says that Pap has  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ , as is reported by Wendland. But in fact Pap reads  $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ , thus confirming the conjecture of Cohn.

## B. The Oxyrhynchus Papyrus

This is a third-century codex, the fragments of which have been published in several places: *P.Oxy.* 9.1173 + *P.Oxy.* 11.1356 + *P.Oxy.* 18.2158 + *P.Oxy.* 82.5291 + *PSI* 11.1207 + *P.Haun.* 8. For a reconstruction of its contents see my "The Oxyrhynchus Papyrus of Philo," *BASP* 17 (1980): 155–65.

*Ebr.* 2: Philo refers here to those who have made the Great Vow, as found in Num 6:2ff:  $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\nu}$   $\epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\zeta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ . What seems not to have been noticed, apart from the edition of *P.Haun.* 8, f. 2<sup>r</sup> l. 11, is that the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus reads:  $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\nu}\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\zeta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ . I think that there can be little doubt that this is what Philo wrote. In the first place, the papyrus is a millennium or so older than the manuscripts cited in PCW. Second, of course, the omission of  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu$  could have occurred by a scribal leap:  $\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\iota\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\tilde{\nu}\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\ \mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\chi\eta\nu\ \epsilon\upsilon\zeta\acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota$ . The addition of the word, on the other hand, would seem to be unmotivated. Note that Philo similarly uses  $\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta$  with reference to the vow at *Agr.* 175, but not at *Leg.* 1.17, *Deus* 87, *Fug.* 115, or *Spec.* 1.247.

Let us return to *De sacrificiis*. Both the Coptos Papyrus and the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus contained *De sacrificiis*, and although much more text remains in the Coptos Papyrus, there are places where the two papyri overlap. Here is one that is of interest.

*Sacr.* 31 (Pap 63A33): Philo here speaks of pleasure "sweetening" her discourse. The term edited by Wendland is  $\epsilon\phi\eta\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\sigma\alpha$ , and the apparatus reports that UFN have  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\eta\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\sigma\alpha$ . (The two words seem basi-

cally synonymous.) Now, from this negative apparatus one could reasonably infer that the other mss., namely MAGHP and Pap, have the reading of the text. But this is one of many places where such an inference about Pap would be problematic. In fact, Scheil transcribes [ἐφη]δύνασα, as was found in Mangey. And indeed, Pap has a small lacuna precisely at that prefix. However, ἀφηδύνασα is also found in the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus (*P. Oxy.* 1173, f. 9<sup>v</sup> l. 2). In light of the latter witness, I hesitantly suggest that Pap also read ἀφηδύνασα. At *Plant.* 159 all the mss. read ἀφηδύνοντες, while at *Fug.* 139 G has ἀφηδύνουσα but H has ἐφηδύνουσα, which is printed by Mangey and PCW. It is possible that Philo, like Plutarch, used both words. But, given the reading of the Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, it seems to me more likely that Philo used ἀφηδύνω at all three places.

### C. *De providentia* 1

The Armenian translation of Philo includes a work on *De Providentia* in two books. There is some debate about whether what has been preserved has suffered some revision beyond the errors that inevitably occur in textual transmission. But scholars are agreed that what is preserved in Armenian is a substantially accurate representation of a two-volume work by Philo. However, the two books have had different fates. Eusebius quotes extensively from what is found as the second book in Armenian, and there are also a few very brief fragments in various florilegia. However, Eusebius did not know, it seems, of the first book, since he classifies *De providentia* among the μονόβιβλα. And his quotations are said to be simply from Philo's Περὶ προνοίας, whereas for the other books preserved in more than one book he typically provides the number of the book as well.

But it turns out that quite a few remnants of *Prov.* 1, as well as of *De animalibus* and a few other books of Philo, are found within a *Commentary on the Hexaemeron*, which is incorrectly attributed to Eustathius of Alexandria. In a recent article I have discussed this source and the history of the recognition that it contains citations from Philo.<sup>10</sup> Let me here call attention to one very interesting place, namely *Prov.* 1.72, which I discuss there. In the Armenian version this section begins, according to Aucher's Latin rendering: "Ecce enim statuas videntes, statuarium intelligimus."<sup>11</sup> Now, as discovered by Friedrich Zoepfl and then independently by Ludwig Früchtel in his unpublished edition of the Greek fragments of Philo, the Greek of these words is found (more or less) in Ps.Eustathius (PG 737B15–C1): αὐτίκα γοῶν ἀνδριαντοποιοῦ ἔννοιαν λαμβάνομεν. Zoepfl merely noted the correspondence. However, on the basis of the Greek in

---

<sup>10</sup> See "Fragments of Philo of Alexandria Preserved in Pseudo-Eustathius," *SPhiloA* 30 (2018): 1–14. Here I have adapted and even repeated some words of that article.

<sup>11</sup> Hadas-Lebel (*De providentia*, 187) translates this as: "A la vue d'une statue nous pensons au sculpteur."



PG and of Aucher's Latin, Früchtel edited: αὐτίκα γοῦν <ἀνδριάντα μὲν βλέψαντες> ἀνδριαντοποιῶ ἔννοιαν λαμβάνομεν. Früchtel thus supposes a straightforward scribal leap (ανδριαντα . . . ανδριαντοποιου), and fits the Latin reasonably well. (Früchtel does, somewhat gratuitously, add μὲν, which would not be expressed in the Armenian in any case, although probably Früchtel would not have known that.)

However, we can attempt to improve upon Früchtel's text in several ways. First, we can look at the Armenian itself (rather than Aucher's Latin version). Second, we can examine the Armenian mss., rather than being content with Aucher's printed text. And third, we can look at the Greek mss. of Ps.Eustathius. (What we find in PG is a reprint of an edition of 1629.)

In fact, there are (at least) twenty-three manuscripts in libraries of Western Europe that contain Ps.Eustathius, and at PG 737B15–C1 all but one of them in fact read: αὐτίκα γοῦν ἀνδριάντα θεασάμενοι ἀνδριαντοποιῶ ἔννοιαν λαμβάνομεν.<sup>12</sup> We have here the confirmation of Früchtel's conjecture ἀνδριάντα, as well as the discovery that Ps.Eustathius (and thus also, as seems likely, Philo) wrote θεασάμενοι rather than βλέψαντες. And there is no support for adding μὲν. In any case, this reading of Ps.Eustathius produces a (more or less) perfect match with the Armenian, and so this Greek can be viewed as a genuine fragment of Philo, now recovered for the first time in its entirety.<sup>13</sup> Of course, one should also look beyond Aucher's printed text, and examine the manuscripts of the Armenian version. In fact, I have examined six of the most important ones (Venice 1040; Jerusalem 333; Yerevan Matenadaran 1500, 2057, 2100, 2104), and can report that they show no fluctuation at this passage.<sup>14</sup>

#### D. *De providentia* 2

As noted earlier, in his *Praeparatio evangelica* Eusebius of Caesarea makes extensive quotations from the Greek of Philo's *De providentia* 2. Editors of Philo have taken these quotations from the various editions of Eusebius: Mangey in 1742 (*Opera* 2:625–47); Aucher in 1822 (*Sermones tres*) as an accompaniment to his edition of the Armenian translation of the entire work; Colson in 1941 (PLCL 9:454–506); and

---

<sup>12</sup> There are a few textual variations here and there. E.g., Parisinus gr. 1335 has αὐτήκα as well as ἀνδριάντος for ἀνδριαντοποιῶ;

<sup>13</sup> I say "more or less" since the correspondence between αὐτίκα γοῦν and *ard aha* is not quite as certain as we might like. Marcus, "Index," does not cite *aha*, and for *ard* he has "οὔν 9 exx. μὲν οὔν 2 exx. γοῦν 2 exx. misc. c. 10 exx." Also, *ard* for γοῦν occurs at *Prov.* 2.103. For *aha* one finds ἰδοῦ and ἤδη in Gabriēl Awetik'eān, Χαῖαtur Siwrmēlean, and Mkrtič Awgerean [Baptista Aucher], *Nor baṛgirk' haykazeān lezui* [New Dictionary of the Armenian Language] (2 vols.; Venice: San Lazzaro Press, 1836–1837; reprinted: Yerevan: Yerevan University Press, 1979–1981), 1:28B. Of course, complete certainty is not to be found in textual matters. Perhaps one should not consider the first two words as being part of the fragment.

<sup>14</sup> The choice of these six is made on the basis of the analysis by Terian, *De animalibus*, 21–25; *Alexander*, 36–39.

finally Hadas-Lebel in 1973 (PAPM 35). The editions of Eusebius that lie at the source of what we find in the literature on Philo have shifted over the years, ending with the authoritative edition by Karl Mras in 1954–1956 (GCS), which was utilized by Hadas-Lebel. Yet at no place do we find what can really be considered a critical edition of these Greek fragments of Philo. What is required, of course, is to use both the excerpts from Eusebius (and a few citations found in florilegia) along with the Armenian, which is an independent witness. From the Greek evidence and the Armenian evidence we can, in principle, reconstruct the state of Philo’s text in an early ancestor of both, which is likely to be as close as we can get to Philo’s own words. But Mras gives little attention to the Armenian, and is in any case dependent on Aucher’s Latin version of the Armenian. The problem is twofold: what Eusebius actually wrote may be found anywhere among the Greek mss. of his work, and what the Armenian translators actually wrote may be found anywhere among the Armenian mss. of the translation. And so one needs to examine both the Greek mss. of Eusebius and the Armenian mss. of the translation. Mras presents the Greek evidence in excellent fashion. (In going over his evidence I have found only a few minor slips.) But of course there is no critical edition of the Armenian translation. My plan is to produce a bilingual edition of these Greek fragments, in the format of my critical edition of *QE* 2.62–68 that was published several years ago.<sup>15</sup> In particular, my plan is to cite systematically the Greek mss. of Eusebius, with some slight revisions of the apparatus found in Mras, as well as six important Armenian mss.: Venice 1040 (the foundation of Aucher’s edition), Erevan 1500, 2057, 2100, 2104, and Jerusalem 333.<sup>16</sup>

Now, in fact a very similar project was undertaken by Maurizio Olivieri in his dissertation at Bologna, and I regret that this important work has not been published.<sup>17</sup> However, as is inevitable, I have some disagreements with Olivieri about details of the work, and so plan to continue with my own project in any case.

Let me note a very small sample of what can be obtained by a more thorough examination of the manuscript evidence in both Greek and Armenian.

*Prov.* 2.15: Eusebius himself (as seems clear) has deleted some words of Philo as not quite appropriate as a preparation for the Gospel. After referring to God as the father of the world, Philo adds: “and therefore in the greatest of poets, Homer, Zeus is called the father of gods and men.” This is Colson’s rendering from Aucher’s Latin version of the Armenian. We can, of course, attempt to reconstruct the Greek from the Armenian. Here are three such attempts:

---

<sup>15</sup> “Philo of Alexandria, Quaestiones in Exodum 2.62–68: Critical Edition,” *SPhiloA* 24 (2012): 1–68.

<sup>16</sup> These are the six mss. cited by Abraham Terian as the “principal mss.” for *De animalibus*; see his *Alexander* (PAPM 36, 1988).

<sup>17</sup> *Il secondo libro del De providentia di Filone Alessandrino: I frammenti greci e la traduzione armena* (Dissertation, University of Bologna, 1999–2000).

διὸ παρὰ τῷ μεγίστῳ καὶ δοκιμωτάτῳ ποιητῶν Ὀμήρῳ  
 πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε κέκληται Ζεὺς Wendland  
 διόπερ κατὰ τὸν δοκιμώτατον καὶ ἐπαινετώτατον τῶν ποιητῶν Ὀμηρον  
 “πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε” κέκληται Ζεὺς Olivieri  
 ὅθεν καὶ παρὰ τῷ δοκιμωτάτῳ τῶν ποιητῶν Ὀμήρῳ  
 “πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε” κέκληται Ζεὺς Royse

*Prov. 2.15*: A minor point: The mss. of Eusebius are divided between τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον (I) and τὸν δ'αὐτὸν τρόπον (ON) The reading without δ' is found in Colson and Hadas-Lebel. But no one seems to have noted that the reading of I, without δέ, is supported by the Armenian. Indeed, Hadas-Lebel and Olivieri do not even cite this variation. This is one of many places where the Greek ms. I and the Armenian agree.

*Prov. 2.15*: At the end of this section Colson has κόσμον. But the Armenian has “house” (Aucher’s Latin has *domum*). In fact, Mras adopts the reading οἶκον, citing for it in his apparatus I and N<sup>c</sup> (man<sup>1</sup>) as well as the Armenian. Here again we have the agreement of a portion of the Greek evidence with the Armenian.

*Prov. 2.16*: This is a more interesting place. Where Eusebius has κρίσεως ἀληθοῦς Aucher’s Armenian has merely Ի ճշմարտութեան (i *čsmartut'enēn*) = “from the truth.” Olivieri accordingly cites the Armenian as having ἀληθείας where Eusebius has κρίσεως ἀληθοῦς. However, in fact Jer. 333 reads here Ի ճշմարտութեան (i *čsmarit'entrut'enēn*), which precisely renders Eusebius’s Greek, except for placing the adjective first. The corruption from this reading to the reading found in Aucher was by the omission of some letters that almost amounts to a leap: from Ի ճշմարտութեան (i *čsmarit'entrut'enēn*) to Ի ճշմարտութեան (i *čsmaritrut'enēn*), which then would have been “corrected” to Ի ճշմարտութեան (i *čsmartut'enēn*). Olivieri does not cite this reading of Jer. 333 in his Armenian apparatus (p. 143).