

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

paratively useless knowledge *about* books. I could wish that there were not so many *Bibleworms* in the Church, men who know all about the Bible except its saving contents, to whom it is a word indeed, but not the word of life. If we are to taste the power of the word, "the power of God unto salvation," we must be doers of the word, and not simply hearers of it; for only thus can we be blessed in all our doing.¹

S. Cox.

UPON PHILO'S TEXT OF THE SEPTUAGINT.

A GREAT importance attaches to the citations from the Septuagint which lie embedded in the text of Philo, because we have no other witness to the text, as it stood at the beginning of the first century, at once so copious and ancient. Yet there are reasons why we should accept their evidence with great caution: for, firstly, citations from the biblical text are often made from memory only, and are therefore made inaccurately; secondly, an author is likely to curtail and—not in a bad sense of course—garble the text he quotes according to the requirements of his theme; and, lastly, citations from the Bible were the first things to be corrupted by the zeal of copyists, eager to conform them to a received contemporary form of the text with which they were familiar. In the case of Philo, the difficulty is enhanced by our want of a really critical text. Nevertheless the critical apparatus of Dr. Holmes' great edition of the Septuagint shows how much use may and should be made of Philonean citations.

In the year 1826, about the time of the completion of Holmes' edition, there was issued from the Armenian

¹ The concluding lecture of this set has already appeared in *THE EXPOSITOR* (vol. v., second series); see an article entitled "The Christian Ritualism," and based on James i. 27.

press at Venice the commentary of Philo upon Genesis and Exodus, preserved alone in Armenian. In this work, called from its method, *Quæstiones et Solutiones in Genesin et Exodum*, our author takes verse after verse *seriatim* of whole chapters of these books, cites in the *quæstio* whatever of the verse requires to be commented upon, and in the subjoined *solutio* gives that commentary. It is clear then that Philo wrote this commentary with a text of the Septuagint lying open before him, and we may therefore rely on the citations given in the successive *quæstiones* as free from the perversions of mere memory. The *quæstiones* are 636 in number, and contain substantial portions of about 500 verses of Genesis and Exodus.

The value of the Armenian version again as a witness to Philo's own text depends on its age, its fidelity, and the state of preservation in which we have it. Can we be sure, it may be asked, that, even if it be ancient, yet the translator did not render the biblical citations in the words of the Armenian Vulgate; and even if that doubt be removed, that Armenian copyists have not vitiated the text by so conforming it? For a full discussion of these points I may refer my reader to Father Aucher's Latin prefaces to his translations of the treatises on Providence and of the *Quæstiones*, of which prefaces the pertinent portions are reprinted in the Leipsic edition of Philo's works. Aucher points out that numerous citations of this Armenian version are already found in the writings of Moses of Chorene, of St. Elisæus, B. Mambreus, and of other writers of the middle of the fifth century, writers who were themselves the translators of the Scriptures into Armenian. If the Armenian Philo was already widely read in the middle of the fifth century, we may safely put back the date of the version to the beginning of that century; and having been made earlier than the Armenian Vulgate, the biblical citations in it can obviously not follow

that version. Nor do the scribes seem to have been active in conforming them at a later date, for a comparison of them with the Armenian Bible reveals at once their entire independence. The printed Armenian text of Philo is based on a carefully written codex of the thirteenth century. There is no way of deciding how long before the year 400 had been written out the particular text of Philo which the Armenian translator used; but in any case we may be sure that so early as the year 400 the copyists had not had much time to vitiate that text by conforming it to the revised Septuagintal texts of Lucian, Hesychius, or Origen. The object of these recensions was to conform the Greek text to the Hebrew text of the third century A.D. Philo himself did not know enough Hebrew to make corrections in the text of his Septuagint; therefore more value attaches to his citations than even to those of Josephus.

In the following pages I give a literal rendering back into Greek of the Armenian text of the *Questiones*, a task of little difficulty on account of the fidelity of the version, of which the Armenian editor writes very truly as follows: "Hæret pede presso Græco textui; nec auctoris sui sensum exhibet tantum, sed ipsa pæne verba enumerat, ita ut haikanæ sint voces, eæque elegantissimæ, phrasis vero atque constructio omnino Græca . . . ita verba singula singulis respondere deprehendes, ut omne in id studium suum contulisse interpres apertissime patefiat." Some of the *questiones* hardly reflect any portion at all of the biblical text, and are therefore omitted in the following. Whenever the Armenian citation agrees with the form in which it is given in other works of Philo and in Greek, we may be sure that we have recovered the passage as it was really read in Philo's Septuagint. Where our present Greek text of Philo varies from the Armenian, the weight of the evidence is of course in favour of the latter, which represents a Greek text seven or eight centuries older than

any we possess. Where the *questio* affords no good ground for suspecting that the text of Philo's Septuagint differed from the text of Tischendorf (*editio sexta*, 1880), I simply give it without comment. I also notice when a passage is cited differently in other parts of Philo of which the original Greek is left us. Where a variant from the text of Tischendorf is also found in sources brought together in Holmes' critical apparatus, I quote the latter. In many cases it is such coincidence with other sources which alone assures us that a variant implied by the Armenian really stood in Philo's Septuagint, and is not merely due to the exigences of quotation—due to title, as for the sake of brevity I phrase it. It has not seemed to me to be enough to merely notice the variations from Tischendorf's text, for the actual variations can be better judged of, and their true value more clearly discerned, if the whole evidence is put before the reader; if, that is to say, the points of agreement as well as the points of disagreement are all brought together into one conspectus. I have accordingly put back into Greek *all* the *questiones* which echo the text of the Septuagint, and not merely those which contain variants.

In the following pages the words "Philo in," "Philo supplies," "Philo omits," etc., mean simply that in Mangey's text of Philo as reprinted (*editio stereotypa*) at Leipsic, a passage is read in such and such a manner, and not that Philo himself so wrote it. For not only have copyists corrupted the text of Philo, but the printed editions do not give us fairly even what the MSS. contain; as witness Mangey's reading of Genesis iii. 24 in i. 138. The numerals i. 138, etc., refer to volume and page of Mangey's edition; the letters L.A., D.M.O., etc., to the Latin titles of Philo's works. Tisch. = Tischendorf's sixth edition of the Septuagint. "Holmes' notes" is a reference to Robert Holmes' critical apparatus.

QUÆSTIONES IN GENESIN.

Qu. 1. Chap. ii. 4. Διὰ τί τὴν κοσμοποιίαν ἐννοούμενος καὶ λογιζόμενος φησιν αὐτῇ ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὅτε ἐγένετο;

So Philo in D.M.O. i. 30; but in L.A. i. 47 ἐγένοντο for ἐγένετο.

Qu. 2. Chap. ii. 5. Τί ἐστί, καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς πᾶν χλωρὸν ἀγροῦ πρὸ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ πάντα χόρτον πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατεῖλαι;

The omission after θεὸς of τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ is due to title, as is also the omission of ἀγροῦ after χόρτον; for in L.A. i. 47 Philo supplies these words. But κύριος was omitted before ὁ θεὸς in Philo's LXX.; for the following sources also omit it (Holmes): X., 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 25, 31, 37, 61, 73, 75-79, 82, 83, 106, 108, 127, 128, 129, 131, 134; Compl. Philo i. 47, 237, *alibi*, Chrys. iv. 92; Cyr. Al. Arm. ed., etc.

Qu. 3. Chap. ii. 6. τί ἐστί, πηγὴ ἀνέβαινεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐπότιζε πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον γῆς;

Omission of δέ after πηγὴ and of τῆς before γῆς due to title; for in other citations D.P.C. i. 249 and D.P. i. 573, Philo supplies them. In citing this verse in D.M.O. i. 31 Philo has πρόσωπον αὐτῆς, a device of citation.

Qu. 4. Chap. ii. 7 and chap. i. 27. τί ἐστί πλασθεὶς ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τί τι διαφέρει ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα γενόμενος;

In citing chap. ii. 7, in D.M.O. i. 32, in Q.D.P. i. 207, Philo omits τὸν before ἄνθρωπον; but the above title implies that he had it in his text.

Qu. 5. Chap. ii. 7. Διὰ τί εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμφυσησάι λέγεται τὴν ζωὴν;

The changed order of words, and use of ζωὴν for πνοὴν ζωῆς are devices of citation. Holmes does not notice that Philo in his frequent citations of this verse has sometimes πνοὴν, sometimes, but less often, πνεῦμα.

Qu. 6. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ὁ θεὸς λέγεται φυτεῦσαι παράδεισον, καὶ τί τι, καὶ τί ἐστὶν ὁ παράδεισος;

Qu. 7. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ἐν Ἀδὴν κατὰ ἀνατολάς φυτεῦειν λέγεται τὸν παράδεισον;

Qu. 8. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ παραδεισῷ τίθησι τὸν πλασθέντα ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ' οὐ τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα;

Qu. 9. Chap. ii. 9. Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ, φησί, πᾶν ξύλον ὄραϊον εἰς ὄρασιν καὶ καλὸν εἰς βρῶσιν;

Qu. 10. Chap. ii. 9. Τί ἐστί τῆς ζωῆς ξύλον; καὶ διὰ τί ἐν μύσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου;

Qu. 11. Chap. ii. 9. Τί ἐστί ξύλον τοῦ εἶδέναι γνωστὸν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ;

Qu. 12. Chap. ii. 10. Τίς ὁ ποταμὸς ὃς ἐξ Ἐδὲν ἐξεπορεύετο ἐξ οὗ ὁ παραδεισὸς ποτίζεται, καὶ τέσσαρες ἀφορίζονται ποταμοί, Φισῶν καὶ Γεῶν καὶ Τίγρις καὶ Ἐφράτης ;

Here ἐξεπορεύετο seems to belong, not to title, but to text, for Holmes notes as follows: ἐκπορεύεται] ἐπορεύετο, 72, egrediebatur, Hier. in ls.; prodiebat, et exiit, Aug.

In L.A. i. 56 Philo cites the names as Φεισῶν and Γεῶν. The form *Gehon* may be due to the Version, as it is used also in the Arm. Vulg. The form Ἐφράτης probably stood in Philo's text, for it cannot be due to the Version, since the Armenian name for the river Euphrates is Aradsani, which is even used in the Arm. Comm. *ad locum* and in Qu. 13.

Qu. 13. Chap. ii. 11-14. Διὰ τί Εὐφράτην μόνον οὐ τοπογραφεῖ, τὸν δὲ Φισῶν ὅτι κυκλοῖ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν τὴν Εὐλάτ τὸν δὲ Γεῶν ὅτι κυκλοῖ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Αἰθιοπίας, τὸν δὲ Τίγριν ὅτι πορεύεται κατέναντι τῆς Ἀσσυρίας ;

In L.A. i. 56 Philo cites vers. 13, 14 more precisely, and has τὴν γῆν Εὐλάτ, . . . Γεῶν ὅτος κυκλοῖ, which is not really confirmed by this title; then ὁ Τίγρις ὅτος ὁ πορευόμενος, which is confirmed; and, lastly, κατέναντι Ἀσσυρίων.

Holmes notes that for *προπορευόμενος* is read *πορευόμενος* in 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 25, 32, 37, and other codd., Compl., Alex. Cat. Nic., Theoph. 98, Epiiph. ii. 61, Anast. Ms. Aug., Copt., Arab. 1, 2, Arm. 1, 2, Arm. ed. And for Ἀσσυρίων is read Ἀσσυρίας in 128, Arm. 1, 2, Arm. ed. But I believe it to be a mere device of rendering in the above title.

Qu. 14. Chap. ii. 15. Διὰ τί τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἕνεκα δυοῖν τίθεται, τοῦ ἐργάζεσθαι καὶ τοῦ φυλάσσειν ; (The rest of the title does not in any way bear on text of LXX.)

Philo cites ver. 15 twice in L.A. i. 53 and 61, and each time reads ἐποίησε for ἔπλασε and omits τῆς τρυφῆς after παραδείσῳ. It is certain therefore that τῆς τρυφῆς was not in Philo's text. Holmes notes thus: τῆς τρυφ.] omit III., X., 68, 72, 120, 129. Aldine, Philo, Theoph. 98, Anast. Ms. Orig. iii. 131. Ambr., Arab. 3, Aug. habet sub χ in charact. minor Alex.

Qu. 15. Chap. ii. 16, 17. Διὰ τί ὅτε ἐντέλλεται φαγεῖν ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παράδεισῳ ἐνικῶς λέγει, φαγῆ ὅτε δὲ παραιτεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γνωρίζοντος καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν, πληθυντικῶς λέγει, οὐ φάγεσθε ἢ γὰρ ἂν ἡμερᾶ φάγητε ἀποθανεῖσθε ;

Philo cites ver. 16 in L.A. 161 and 163. In the former place he has ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ εἶδῆται γνωστὸν καλοῦ κ. π.; in latter ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ξύλου γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν. Aucher's Latin, "ex ligno notitiam dante boni et mali," is exact. It is probable that Philo's text varied, in a way which it is difficult to fix precisely, from our own.

Qu. 16. Chap. ii. 17. Τί ἐστι, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε ;

Qu. 17. Chap. ii. 18. Διὰ τί φησίν, οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον ποιήσωμεν αὐτῷ βοηθὸν κατ' αὐτόν ;

Qu. 18. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τί πρότερον εἰπὼν, ποιήσωμεν βοηθὸν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ θηρία πλάττει καὶ θρέμματα ;

In the commentary subjoined *θηρία καὶ πετεινά* is implied.

Qu. 19. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τί πάλιν νῦν πλάττεται θηρία καὶ πετεινά. καὶ γὰρ ἐδηλώθη ἡ γένεσις αὐτῶν πρότερον ἐν τῇ ἕξαημερίᾳ ;

Qu. 20. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τί πάντα τὰ ζῶα ἄγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀδάμ (οἱ ἄνθρωπον), ἵνα ὀνόματα θῆ ἑαυτοῖς ;

Qu. 21. Chap. ii. 19. Τί ἐστίν, ἤγαγεν τὰ ζῶα πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ ἰδεῖν τί καλέσει αὐτὰ ; οὐ γὰρ ἐνδοιάζει ὁ θεός ;

Qu. 22. Chap. ii. 19. Τί ἐστι, πάσῃ ὃ ἐὰν ἐκάλεσεν ψυχῇ ζώσῃ, τοῦτο ὄνομα αὐτῷ ;

The omission after *ἐκάλεσεν* of *αὐτὸ Ἀδὰμ* must be due to title, since Philo in his citation of verse in L.A. i. 68 supplies the words. The title seems corrupt.

Qu. 23. Chap. ii. 20. Τί ἐστι, τῷ Ἀδὰμ οὐχ εἰρέθη βοηθὸς ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ;

Qu. 24. Chap. ii. 21. Τί ἐστι, καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ἕκστασιν ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀδὰμ καὶ ἕπνωσε ;

Philo supplies *ὁ θεός* after *ἐπέβαλεν* in his citation in L.A. i. 72.

Qu. 25. Chap. ii. 21, 22. Τί ἐστίν ἡ πλευρὰ ἣν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ γηγενοῦς, καὶ διὰ τί πλευρὰν εἰς γυναικα πλάσσει ;

The variations are obviously due to the title only.

Qu. 26. Chap. ii. 22. Διὰ τί τὴν εἰκόνα (οἱ τὸ σχῆμα) τῆς γυναικὸς οἰκοδόμημα καλεῖ ;

Qu. 27 contains no citation.

Qu. 28. Chap. ii. 23. Διὰ τί ἰδὼν ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πλάσμα τῆς γυναικὸς ἐπιφημίξει· τοῦτο νῦν ὁστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὁστέων μου καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς μου· αὐτὴ κληθήσεται γυνή, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς ἐλήφθη ;

In the citation of this verse in L. A. i. 74 *καὶ* is added before *κληθήσεται*, but this title proves that Philo's text agreed with Tischendorf's. Holmes also notes that Philo *l. c.* adds *αὐτῇ* after *ἐλήφθη*. This is not so.

Qu. 29. Chap. ii. 24. Διὰ τί φησι, ἔνεκα τούτου καταλείψει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὸς τὴν γυναικα καὶ ἔσονται δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν ;

Here *αὐτοῦ* is omitted twice, after *πατέρα* and after *γυναικα*, and *οἱ* before *δύο*.

In the Greek of this *quæstio* and part of *solutio* as preserved in Dam. Par. 748 (see Mangey ii. 654, Rendel Harris, *Fragments*, p. 14), *αὐτοῦ* is read both after *μητέρα* and after *γυναῖκα*, but not after *πατέρα*. But *οἱ* is omitted as in the Armenian. Philo cites the verse again in L.A. i. 75, omitting *αὐτοῦ* after both *πατέρα* and *μητέρα*, but adding it after *γυναῖκα*, and also reading *οἱ δύο*, which is also read in the echo of the passage in i. 272, *ἐγένοντο γὰρ οἱ δύο εἰς σ. μ.*

We may infer therefore that in Philo's LXX. *δύο* was read, not *οἱ δύο*; that *αὐτοῦ* was omitted after both *πατέρα* and *μητέρα*, and probably after *γυναῖκα* as well. Cp. Mt. 19. 5 and Eph. 5. 31 with Tischendorf's note.

Qu. 30. Chap. iii. 1. Διὰ τί οἱ δύο, ὃ τε γηγενῆς καὶ ἡ γυνῆ γυμνοὶ λέγονται εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ἡσχύοντο ;

Philo in the citation of this verse, L.A. ii. 75, adds *αὐτοῦ* after *γυνῆ*; so its omission may be due to the title. It should be noticed that in the above title *οἱ δύο* and not *δύο* alone is rendered in the Armenian.

Qu. 31. Διὰ τί πάντων τῶν θηρίων φρονιμώτατον τὸν ὄφιν εἰσάγει ;

The variation of order is part of the title. Philo cites the verse twice in L.A. 76, 79 without variant.

Qu. 32. Chap. iii. 1. Εἰ τρόπον ἀνθρώπου εἶπεν ὁ ὄφιν ;

Qu. 33. Chap. iii. 1. Διὰ τί τῇ γυναικί διαλέγεται ὁ ὄφιν ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ ἀνδρὶ ;

Qu. 34. Chap. iii. 1 and chap. ii. 16. Διὰ τί ψεύδεται ὁ ὄφιν λέγων εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς οὐ μὴ φάγητε ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου· ἐξ ἐναντίας γὰρ εἶπεν, ἀπὸ παντὸς ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ φαγεῖν, πλὴν ἀπὸ ἐνός.

The variations are due to title.

Qu. 35. Chap. iii. 3. Διὰ τί ἐντεταμένον μὴ φαγεῖν μόνον ἀφ' ἐνὸς φυτοῦ προστίθησιν ἡ γυνῆ καὶ τὸ αὐτῷ ἐγγίξω, λέγουσα εἶπεν οὐ φάγεσθε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ μὴ ἄψησθε αὐτοῦ ;

Qu. 36. Chap. iii. 5. Τί ἐστίν, ἔσεσθε ὡς θεοί, γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν ;

Philo nowhere else cites this verse. The variant *γινώσκειν* is not found in the Greek codd. The Arm. Vulgate has the same reading as our title, on which account I hesitate to set it down as a mere device of rendering.

Qu. 37. Chap. iii. 6. Διὰ τί ἡ γυνῆ πρῶτον ἔλαβε τὸ ξύλον καὶ ἔφαγε ἀπὸ τοῦ κάρπου καὶ ἔπειτα καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ λαβών ;

Qu. 38. Chap. iii. 6. Τί ἐστίν, καὶ ἔδωκε τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ' αὐτῆς ;

Here *καὶ* is omitted after *ἔδωκε*. Holmes notes the same omission in VI., 79, 135, Arab. 4, Latini omnes. The Arm. Vulg. also omits *καὶ* here.

Qu. 39. Chap. iii. 7. Τί ἐστι, διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ τῶν δύο;

Qu. 40. Chap. iii. 7. Τί ἐστιν ἔγνωσαν ὅτι γυμνοὶ ἦσαν;

Qu. 41. Chap. iii. 7. Διὰ τί συκῆς φύλλα ῥάπτουσι καὶ περιζώματα

Qu. 42. Chap. iii. 8. Τί ἐστὶν ἡ φωνὴ ἧς ἤκουσαν, περιπάτου θεοῦ; πότερον λόγων ἢ καὶ ποδῶν ἰαχή; πότερον δὲ περιπατεῖ ὁ θεός;

περιπάτου for *περιπατοῦντος* seems to be a mere device of rendering.

Qu. 43. Chap. iii. 8. Διὰ τί ὅτε κρύπτονται ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐ πρώτη ἡ γυνή . . . φησὶ γάρ ἐκρύβησαν, (ῥ ὁ τε) Ἀδάμ καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ;

It cannot be safely inferred that *ὁ τε* was absent from the Greek original of this title, the more so as in L.A. i. 87 the verse is thus given: *καὶ ἐκρύβη ὁ τε Ἀδάμ, κ.τ.λ.*, where the singular *ἐκρύβη* is noticeable. The particle *τε* before *καὶ* is habitually omitted by Armenian translators of the fifth century, a circumstance overlooked by the author of the Armenian collation printed in Holmes' critical apparatus.

Qu. 44. Chap. iii. 8. Διὰ τί κρύπτονται οὐκ ἄλλοθί που, ἀλλὰ ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ παραδείσου;

Qu. 45. Chap. iii. 9. Διὰ τί ἐρωτᾷ τὸν Ἀδάμ ὁ τὰ πάντα εἰδώς, ποῦ εἶ; καὶ διὰ τί οὐ καὶ τὴν γυναικά;

Qu. 46. Chap. iii. 12. Διὰ τί ὁ ἄνθρωπός φησι ἡ γυνὴ ἔδωκέ μοι ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, καὶ ἔφαγον ἡ δὲ γυνή, ὁ ὄφεις οὐκ ἔδωκεν, ἀλλὰ ἠπάτησέ με καὶ ἔφαγον;

In L.A. i. 98 the ver. 12 is given in full as in Tisch.; ver. 13 is cited in L.A. i. 99 thus: *καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεὸς τῇ γυναικί: τί τοῦτο ἐποίησας; καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ὄφεις ἠπάτησέ με, καὶ ἔφαγον. . . .* Holmes *ad loc.* notes that Philo omits *ἡ γυνή* after *εἶπεν*, but the Armenian *quæstio* contradicts this inference. On the other hand, the *quæstio* makes the addition before *ἠπάτησέ με* of *οὐκ ἔδωκεν, ἀλλά*—an addition obviously due to title.

Qu. 47 does not bear on the text of the LXX.

Qu. 48. Chap. iii. 14. Διὰ τί τῷ ὄφει αὐτῇ ἡ κατάρα ἐπὶ τῷ στήθει καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ πορεύεσθαι καὶ γῆν φαγεῖν καὶ ἔχθραν ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν γυναικά;

Here *σον* is omitted after *στήθει*. Philo elsewhere cites the verse, i. 100, i. 118, i. 446, always omitting *σον*, as to which we may therefore believe that it did not stand in Philo's LXX. It is omitted (*vide* Holmes) in VI. 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 25, 31, 37, 38, 59, 61, 73, 74, 79, 82, 106, 107, 108, 135; Compl., Cat. Nic., Theoph. *l.c.*, Chrys. iv., 142, Severian. in Auct. PP. 286; Serapion in Cat. Nic. 92, Procop. MS.; Theodoret. I, 1107; Arm. 2, Arm. ed. Lucif. Cal.

Qu. 49. Chap. iii. 16. Διὰ τί ἡ κατάρα τῇ γυναικί, εἰς πλήθος

λυπῶν καὶ στεναγμῶν καὶ ἐν λύπῃ τέκειν καὶ ἀποστροφή πρὸς τὸν ἀνδρὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ κυριεύσθαι ;

Here *λύπη* for *λύπαις* has support from Theoph. 99, Andr. Cret. in Auct. PP. ed. Combeffis, p. 231; Arm. 2, Arm. ed., Cyprian, and other sources, for which see Holmes *ad loc.* ἐν *λύπαις* however is given in Philo, L.A. i. 130: "ἐν *λύπαις* τέξῃ τέκνα." The citations in Philo, i. 126, 131 of the rest of the passage agree with Tisch.

Qu. 50. Chap. iii. 17, 18, 19. Διὰ τί . . . ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γῆ ἕνεκά σου· ἐν λύπῃ φαγῆ αὐτήν, ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους ἀνατελεῖ σοι καὶ φαγῆ τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἀγροῦ· ἐν ἰδρωτί τοῦ προσώπου σου φαγῆ τὸν ἄρτον σου ;

Here *ἕνεκά σου* must be part of title only, and in L.A. i. 136 ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σου is given. *λύπη* however is read in L.A. i. 136, and therefore stood in Philo's LXX. Holmes' apparatus shows that the same ancient authorities read ἐν *λύπη* here who read it in ver. 16.

Qu. 51. Chap. iii. 19. Τί ἐστι, ἕως τοῦ ἀποστρέψαι σε εἰς τὴν γῆν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήφθης· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ γῆς μόνον ἐπλάσθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ πνεύματος ;

Qu. 52. Chap. iii. 20. Διὰ τί ὁ γηγενὴς τὴν γυναικὰ καλεῖ ζώην· καλεῖ δὲ ὅτι μήτηρ εἶ πάντων ζώντων ;

One Arm. Codex reads *ἐστι* for *εἶ*. In Philo, Q.B.D.H. i. 480, the citation runs thus: ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδάμ θρομα γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ ζώην, ὅτι αὐτὴ μήτηρ πάντων τῶν ζώντων. We may infer that *ζώην* stood in Philo's LXX. So Anastas. MS. *vitam* Hier.

Qu. 53. Chap. iii. 21. Διὰ τί ὁ θεὸς χιτῶνας δερματίνους ποιεῖ τῷ Ἀδάμ καὶ τῇ γυναικί, καὶ ἐνδύει αὐτούς ;

We cannot safely infer that Philo read ὁ θεός and not κύριος ὁ θεός, though some sources omit κύριος.

Qu. 54. Chap. iii. 22. Τίσι φησι, Ἰδοὺ γέγονεν Ἀδὴμ ὡς εἰς ἡμῶν, τοῦ γινώσκειν καλὸν καὶ πονηρόν ;

The passage is cited in same form in D.G.L. i. 430. We may conclude that γέγονεν Ἀδάμ stood in Philo's LXX. The same order is read in Holmes 79, Method. ap. Epiph. i. 547, Anastas. MS., Theodoret. i. 55. It cannot be certainly inferred that *ἐξ* was absent before ἡμῶν in the Greek original of this *quaestio*; it might or might not be. I have therefore followed the citation given in i. 430 and omitted it.

Qu. 55. Chap. iii. 22. Τί ἐστι, μή ποτε ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα λαβῆ ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς, φάγη καὶ ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα· οὐ γὰρ ἐνδοιασμος οὐδὲ φθόνος περὶ θεόν ;

Here *ἐκτενας τ. χ. λαβῆ* instead of *ἐκτείνῃ τ. χ. καὶ λ.* may be due to title.

But not so omission of αὐτοῦ after τὴν χεῖρα, for it is omitted by the same

authorities for the most part which earlier in the verse transpose Ἀδάμ γέγονεν, namely Method. *l.c.*, Epiph. i. 595, Anastas. MS.; also by Orig. i. 246, and the foll. codd. III., X., 18, 19, 55, 59, 64, 71, 108, 134, 135. It was therefore probably absent from Philo's LXX.

The omission of καί before φάγη is found also in Arm. Vulgate, and does not appear to be merely due to title. Perhaps the Arm. implies ζήση rather than ζήσεται. ζήση is read in Theodoret, ii. 397, Aug.

Qu. 56. Chap. iii. 53. Διὰ τί νῦν ἐκάλεσεν τὸν παράδεισον τὴν τρυφῆς (but one good MS. has τῆς τρυφῆς) ὅτε τὸν ἀνδρὰ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐξαπέστειλεν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐργάζεσθαι γῆν ἐξ ἧς ἐλήφθη;

The passage is also cited more accurately in L.A. i. 63.

Qu. 57. Chap. iii. 24. Διὰ τί ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδείσου κατοικίζει τὰ χερουβίμ, καὶ τὴν φλογίνην ῥομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσειν τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς;

Here τὰ χερουβίμ is object of κατοικίζει, and αὐτόν is omitted, as also the words τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ ἔταξε. In the D.C. i. 138 (Mangey's ed.) this verse is quoted as in Tisch., except for the omission of αὐτόν. Holmes notes that αὐτόν is omitted in 75. Copt., Arab. 3. Arm. 2, Arm. ed. Hieron.; that τῆς τρυφῆς is omitted in VI., Arm. 2. Lastly, in regard to καὶ ἔταξε, Holmes has the following sagacious note: "Omit Philo i. 138, in ed. ante-Mang. Forte Philo, in suo τῶν ὁ codice, non habuit καὶ ἔταξε hic, ut nec αὐτόν supra: atque adeo τὰ χερουβίμ ad κατέκτισεν essent referenda. Favent ipsius verba, τὰ χερουβίμ ἀντικρὸ τοῦ παραδείσου τὴν οἴκησιν ἴσχει. Forte καὶ ἔταξεν fuit alia lectio pro καὶ κατέκτισεν, ex marg. in textum inducta." The Arm. Philo makes it certain that the passage stood in Philo's LXX. as Holmes suggests: κατέκτισεν ἀπέν. τοῦ παραδ. τὰ χερ., κ.τ.λ.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.