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.

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, *Questiones et Solutiones in Genesin et Exodum*, our author takes verse after verse *seriatim* of whole chapters of these books, cites in the *questio* 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 *questiones* as free from the perversions of mere memory. The *questiones* 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 *Questiones*, 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 Quaestiones, 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 Ææe verba enumerat, ita ut haikanæ sint voces, eæque eligantissimæ, phrasis vero atque constructio omnino Græca . . . ita verba singula singulis respondere deprehendes, ut omne in id studium suum contulisse interpres apertissime patetiat." 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 τὴν κοσμοποίησιν ἐννοουόμενος καὶ λογιζόμενος φησιν' ἡ βίβλος γενέσεως οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς, ὥστε ἐγένετο;

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

Qu. 2. Chap. ii. 5. Τί ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐποίησεν ο θεὸς πᾶν χλωρὸν ἀγρόν πρὸ τοῦ γενέσαι ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ πάντα χόρτον πρὸ τοῦ ἀνατελλαί;

The omission after θεὸς of τῶν οὐρανόν καὶ τῆς γῆς, καὶ is due to title, as is also the omission of ἄγροι after χόρτον; for in L.A. i. 47 Philo supplies these words. But χώρος 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 ἐστι, πηγή ἀνέβαινεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς καὶ ἐποίησε πᾶν τὸ πρόσωπον γῆς;

Omission of δὲ after πηγή 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 αὐτής, a device of citation.

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

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

Qu. 5. Chap. ii. 7. Διὰ τί εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐμφυσήσαι λέγεται τὴν ἐωθήν;

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

Qu. 6. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ο θεὸς λέγεται φυτεύσαι παράδεισον, καὶ τίνι, καὶ τί ἐστιν ὁ παράδεισος;

Qu. 7. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ἐν 'Αδών κατὰ ἀνατολᾶς φυτεύεις λέγεται τὸν παράδεισον;

Qu. 8. Chap. ii. 8. Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ παράδεισῳ τίθησι τῶν πλασθεντα ἄνθρωπον ἀλλ' ὁ τὸν κατ' εἰκόνα;

Qu. 9. Chap. ii. 9. Διὰ τί ἐν τῷ παράδεισῳ, φησί, πᾶν ἐίλου ὠραίον εἰς ὁρασιν καὶ καλὸν εἰς βρώσιν;

Qu. 10. Chap. ii. 9. Τί ἐστι τῆς ἐωθῆς ἐίλου; καὶ διὰ τί ἐν μίσῳ τοῦ παραδείσου;

Qu. 11. Chap. ii. 9. Τί ἐστι ἐίλου τοῦ εἰδέναι γνωστῶν καλοῦ καὶ πονηροῦ;
Qu. 12. Chap. ii. 10. Τής ὁ ποταμὸς δὲ ἐξ Ἁδην ἐξεπορεύετο ἐξ
οὗ ὁ παράδεισος ποτίζεται, καὶ τέσσαρες αὐτοῖς ἔφορίζονται ποταμοὶ, Φεισῶν ἐκ
Γεών καὶ Τύχις καὶ Ἑφράτης;

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

İn L.A. i. 56 Philo cites the names as Φεισῶν and Γεών. The form Gehon may
be due to the Version, as it is used also in the Arm. Vulg. The form Ἑφράτης 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 Ἑφράτης μόνον οὐ ποταμοφαίει,
tόν δὲ Φεισῶν ὅτι κυκλοὶ πάσαν τὴν γῆν τὴν Εὐλάτ τὸν δὲ Γεών ὅτι κυκλόν πάσαν τὴν γῆν Αἴδησιάς, τὸν δὲ Τύχιν ὅτι πορεύεται κατέναντι
τῆς Ἀσυρίας;

In L.A. i. 56 Philo cites vers. 13, 14 more precisely, and has τὴν γῆν Εὐλάτ,
. . . Γεών οὗτος κυκλόν, which is not really confirmed by this title;
then ὁ Τύχις οὗτος ὁ πορευόμενος, which is confirmed; and, lastly, κατέναντι Ἀσυρίων.
Holmes notes that for προπορευόμενος is read πορευόμενος in 14, 15, 16, 18, 19,
25, 32, 37, and other cod.; Compl., Alex. Cat. Nio., Theoph. 98, Epiph. ii.
61, Anastas. Ms. Aug., Copt., Arab. 1, 2, Arm. 1, 2, Arm. ed. And for Ἀσυρίων is read Ἀσυρίας 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 παράδεισῳ ἐνεκα
δυνῶν τίθεται, τοῦ ἐργαζόμενος καὶ τοῦ φιλάσσων; (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
ἐπιστέας and omits τῆς τροφῆς after παραδείσῳ. It is certain therefore that
τῆς τροφῆς was not in Philo's text. Holmes notes thus: τῆς τρωφ. omit
131. Ambr., Arab. 3, Aug. habet sub χ in character. minor Alex.

Qu. 15. Chap. ii. 16, 17. Διὰ τί ὅτε ἐντέλλεται φαγεῖν ἀπὸ παντὸς
ξύλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ ἔνυκα λέγει, φαγῇ ὅτε ὅταν παρασταίπται ἀπὸ
τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ γνωρίζοντος καλὸν καὶ πονηρῶν, πληθυντικῶς λέγει, οὐ
φάγεσθε; ἦ γὰρ ἐν ἑμείς οὐ γίνετε ἀποθανεῖσθε;

Philo cites ver. 16 in L.A. 161 and 163. In the former place he has ἀπὸ ὥς ὑπὸ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ εἰδέται γνωστὸν καλὸν κ. p.; in latter ἀπὸ ὅταν ὥς ξύλωσεν
καλὸν καὶ πονηρῶν. 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 diffic-
ult to fix precisely, from our own.

Qu. 16. Chap. ii. 17. Τί ἐστι, θανάτῳ ἀποθανεῖσθε;
Qu. 17. Chap. ii. 18. Διὰ τὶ φησὶν, οὗ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον μόνον τοιχόμενον αὐτῷ θωσθῶν καὶ αὐτῶν;

Qu. 18. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τὶ πρότερον εἰπών, τοιχόμενον βοηθῶν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ θηρία πλάττει καὶ θρέμματα;

In the commentary subjoined θηρία καὶ πετεινά is implied.

Qu. 19. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τὶ πάντα τὰ ζῶα ἄγει πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ (οὐ ἀνθρώπων), ἕνα ὀνόματα θῃ αὐτῶν;

Qu. 20. Chap. ii. 19. Διὰ τὶ πάντα τὰ ζῶα ἀγεῖ πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ. Ιδεῖν τὶ καλέσει αὐτῷ οὐ γὰρ ἐνδοιάζει θεός;

Qu. 21. Chap. ii. 19. Τὶ ἔστιν, ἦγαγεν τὰ ζῶα πρὸς τὸν Ἀδὰμ. Ιδεῖν τὴν καλέσαν ἄρα τὸ γὰρ ἐνδοιάζει θεός;

Qu. 22. Chap. ii. 19. Τὶ ἔστιν, πάσης ὡς ἐν ἑκάστην ψυχή χώσης, τῶν οἰκομένων αὐτῶν;

The omission after ἑκάστην of αὐτῶν 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. Τὶ ἔστιν, τῷ Ἀδὰμ οὐχ ἐφέθη βοηθὸς ὁμοίος αὐτῷ;

Qu. 24: Chap. ii. 21. Τὶ ἔστι, καὶ ἐπέβαλεν ἑκάστασιν ἐπὶ τῶν Ἀδὰμ καὶ ὑπνώσει;

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

Qu. 25. Chap. ii. 21, 22. Τὶ ἔστιν ἡ πλευρὰ ἤν ἔλαβεν ἀπὸ τοῦ γηγενοῦς, καὶ διὰ τὶ πλευράν εἰς γυναῖκα πλάσσει;

The omission after ἑκάστην of αὐτῶν 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. 26. Chap. ii. 22. Διὰ τὶ τὴν εἰκόνα (οὐ τὸ σχῆμα) τῆς γυναικοῦ εἰκοδόμημα καλεῖ;

Qu. 27 contains no citation.

Qu. 28. Chap. ii. 23. Διὰ τὶ ἵνα τὸ ἄνθρωπος τὸ πλαύσμα τῆς γυναικοῦ ἐπιφημίζει τοῦτο χαὶ ὁστών ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου καὶ σάρκε ἐκ τῆς σαρκοῦ μου αὐτῇ κληθήσεται γυνή, ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἄνθρωπος 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 τὶ φησὶ, ἑνεκα τοῦτον καταλεύσει ἄνθρωπος τῶν πατέρα καὶ τὴν μητέρα, καὶ προσκολληθήσεται πρὶς τὴν γυναίκα καὶ ἐστονται δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν;

Here αὐτῶ is omitted twice, after πατέρα and after γυναίκα, and ϑ before δό.
In the Greek of this question and part of solution as preserved in Dam. Par. 748 (see Mangen ii. 654, Rendel Harris, Fragments, p. 14), αὐτῶ is read both after μνημέα and after γνακέα, but not after πατέα. But οἴ is omitted as in the Armenian. Philo cites the verse again in L.A. i. 75, omitting αὐτῶ after both πατέα and μνημέα, but adding it after γνακέα, and also reading οἴ δῶ, which is also read in the echo of the passage in i. 272, εὔνοουν γὰρ οἱ δῶ εἰς σ. μ.

We may infer therefore that in Philo's LXX. δῶ was read, not οἴ δῶ; that αὐτῶ was omitted after both πατέα and μνημέα, and probably after γνακέα as well. Cp. Mt. 19. 5 and Eph. 5. 31 with Tischendorf's note.

Qu. 30. Chap. iii. 1. Διὰ τί οί δῶ, ὁ τε γυγενής καὶ ἡ γυνὴ γυμνοὶ λέγονται εἶναι καὶ οὐκ ἕσχύνοντο;

Philo in the citation of this verse, L.A. ii. 75, adds αὐτῶ after γυνῇ; so its omission may be due to the title. It should be noticed that in the above title οἴ δῶ and not δῶ alone is rendered in the Armenian.

Qu. 31. Διὰ τί πάντων τῶν θηρῶν φρονιμώτατον τὸν ὁδὸν 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 εἴπεν ὁ ὁδὸς;

Qu. 33. Chap. iii. 1. Διὰ τί τῇ γυναίκι διαλέγεται ὁ ὁδὸς ἅλλ' οὐ τῷ ἀνδρὶ;

Qu. 34. Chap. iii. 1 and chap. ii. 16. Διὰ τί προέδρειν ὁ ὁδὸς λέγων εἴπεν ὁ θεὸς οὐ μὴ φάγῃ ἀπὸ παντὸς ξίλου τοῦ παραδείσου εἰς ἔναντις γὰρ εἴπεν, ἀπὸ παντὸς ξίλου τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ φαγεῖν, πλὴν ἀπὸ ἕνος.

The variations are due to title.

Qu. 35. Chap. iii. 3. Διὰ τὶ ἐντελεμένου μὴ φαγεῖν μόνον ἀφ' ἕνος φυτοῦ προστίθησιν ἡ γυνὴ καὶ τὸ αὐτῷ ἐγγίκειν, λέγουσα εἴπεν οὐ φάγεσθε ἃπ' αὐτῶ, οὔτε μὴ ἄψησθε αὐτῶ;

Qu. 36. Chap. iii. 5. Τί ἐστιν, ἐστεθε ως θεοί, γυνώσκειν καὶ κατον καὶ πονηρῶν;

Philo nowhere else cites this verse. The variant γυνώσκειν 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 τὶ ἡ γυνὴ πρῶτον ἔλαβε τὸ ξύλον καὶ ἔφαγε ἀπὸ τοῦ κάρπου καὶ ἐπετα καὶ ὁ ἀνήρ ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ λαβίων;

Qu. 38. Chap. iii. 6. Τί ἐστι, καὶ ἐδώκε τῷ ἀνδρὶ αὐτῆς μετ' αὐτῆς;

Here καὶ is omitted after ἐδώκε. 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 έστι, διηνοίχθησαν οἱ δόμαλμοι τῶν δύο;
Qu. 40. Chap. iii. 7. Τί έστιν ἐγνωσαν δι' γυμνοὶ ήσαν;
Qu. 41. Chap. iii. 7. Διά τί συκῆς φύλλα ῥάπτουσι καὶ περικόματα
Qu. 42. Chap. iii. 8. Τί έστιν ἡ φωνή ἡ ἡκουσαν, περιστάτω θεοῦ;
πότερον λόγων ἡ καὶ ποιῶν ἱεχή; πότερον δὲ περιστατε ὁ θεὸς;
περιστάτος για περιστάτων seems to be a mere device of rendering.
Qu. 43. Chap. iii. 8. Διὰ τί ιτε κρυύτονται ἀπὸ προσώπον τοῦ
θεοῦ, οὗ πρώτη ἡ γυνὴ . . . φησὶ γὰρ ἐκρύβησαν, (? ὁ τε) ᾿Αδὰμ
καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτῶν;
It cannot be safely inferred that δ 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
δ τε ᾿Αδὰμ, κ.τ.λ., where the singular ἐκρύβη is noticeable. The particle
tε before καὶ is habitually omitted by Armenian translators of the fifth
century, a circumstance overlooked by the author of the Armenian colla-
tion printed in Holmes' critical apparatus.
Qu. 44. Chap. iii. 8. Διὰ τί κρυύτονται οἶκος ἀλλοθεῖ πον, ἀλλὰ ἐν
μέσῳ τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ παραδεισοῦ;
Qu. 45. Chap. iii. 9. Διὰ τί ἐρωτᾷ τὸν ᾿Αδᾶμ ὁ τα πάντα εἴδως,
ποῦ ἐί; καὶ διὰ τί οὐ καὶ τὴν γυναίκα;
Qu. 46. Chap. iii. 12. Διὰ τί ὁ ἀνθρωπός φησὶν ἡ γυνὴ ἐδωκέν μοι
ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, καὶ ἐφαγὼν ἡ δὲ γυνὴ, ὁ ὀφίς οὐκ ἐδωκεν, ἀλλὰ ἡπάτησε
με καὶ ἐφαγὼν;
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 γυναίκι· τί τούτῳ ἐποίησας; καὶ εἶπεν ὁ ὀφίς
ἡπάτησε με, καὶ ἐφαγὼν. . . . Holmes ad loc. notes that Philo omits
ἡ γυνὴ after εἶπεν, but the Armenian quæstio contradicts this inference.
On the other hand, the quæstio makes the addition before ἡπάτησε με of
οὐκ ἐδωκεν, ἀλλὰ—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 ὀφεῖ αὐτῆ ἡ κατάρα· ἐπὶ τῷ
στήθει καὶ τῇ κοιλίᾳ περεύσεσθαι καὶ γῇν φαγεῖν καὶ ἐχθραν ἔχαν πρὸς
τὴν γυναίκα;
Here σοῦ is omitted after στήθει. Philo elsewhere cites the verse, i. 100,
i. 118, i. 446, always omitting σοῦ, 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. M.S.; Theodoret. 1, 1107;
Qu. 49. Chap. iii. 16. Διὰ τί ἡ κατάρα τῇ γυναίκι, εἰς πλήθος
Here ἐν ἑκατέρατος ἡ γη ἕνεκά σου, en luptη phagη aitηn, ἀκάνθας καὶ τρυβλίους ἄνατελεί σου καὶ φαγη τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἄγρου; en ἐδρώτι τοῦ προσώπου σου φαγη τὸν ἄρτον σου;

Here ἑνεκά σου must be part of title only, and in L.A. i. 136 ἐν τοῖς ἐργοῖς σου is given. luptη 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 luptη here who read it in ver. 16.

Qu. 50. Chap. iii. 17, 18, 19. άιά τι . . . ἐπικατάρατος ἡ γη ἕνεκά σου, ἐν λυπη φαγη αιτη, ἀκάνθας καὶ τρυβλίους ἀνατελεί σου καὶ φαγη τὸν χόρτον τοῦ ἄγρου; ἐν ἐδρώτι τοῦ προσώπου σου φαγη τὸν ἄρτον σου;

One Arm. Codex reads ἐστι for εἰς. In Philo, Q.R.D.H. i. 480, the citation runs thus: ἐκάλεσεν Ἀδὰμ ἄνω μηνα γυνακίς αὐτοῦ Ἰωνη, διὸ αὕτη μητήρ πάντων τῶν ἔωντων. We may infer that Ἰωνη stood in Philo's LXX. So Anastas. MS. vitam Hier.

Qu. 52. Chap. iii. 20. Διὰ τι ὁ γηγενής τῆς γυνακίς καλεὶ ζωήν· καλεὶ δὲ ὅτι μήτηρ ἐλ πάντων ζωtón;

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

Qu. 53. Chap. iii. 21. Διὰ τι ὁ θεός χωτῶνς δερματίνους ποιεῖ τῷ Ἀδὰμ καὶ τῇ γυνακί, καὶ ἐνδύει αὐτούς;

The passage is cited in same form in D.G.L. i. 430. We may conclude that γέγονεν Ἀδὰμ 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 εἰς was absent before ημῶν in the Greek original of this questio; it might or might not be. I have therefore followed the citation given in i. 430 and omitted it.

Qu. 54. Chap. iii. 22. Τίσι φορᾶτ Θεοῦ γέγονεν Ἀδὰμ ὡς εἰς ἡμῶν, τοῦ γυναικεῖν καλὸν καὶ πονηρὸν;

Here ἑκτείνας τ. χ. λαβη instead of ἑκτείνῃ τ. χ. καὶ λ. may be due to title. But not so omission of αὐτοῦ after τῆν χεῖρα, for it is omitted by the same vol. iv.
authorities for the most part which earlier in the verse transpose Ἄδμ. γένον, 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 καὶ before φαγετε is found also in Arm. Vulgate, and does not appear to be merely due to title. Perhaps the Arm. implies φαγετε rather than φαγεται. φαγετε is read in Theodoret. ii. 397, Aug.

Qu. 56. Chap. iii. 53. διὰ τί νῦν ἔκάλεσεν τῶν παραδεισεν τῆν τροφῆς (but one good MS. has τῆς τροφῆς) ὅτε τῶν ἄνδρα εἴς αὐτοῦ ἐξαπέστειλεν εἰς αὐτοῦ ἐργάζεσθαι γῆν εἰς ἦς ἐλήφθη;

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

Qu. 57. Chap. iii. 24. διὰ τί ἀπέναντι τοῦ παραδεισεν κατοικίζει τὰ χερουβὶ, καὶ τῆν φλογίνην βομφαίαν τὴν στρεφομένην φυλάσσεις τῆν ὀδον τοῦ ξύλου τῆς ζωῆς;

Here τὰ χερουβὶ is object of κατοικίζει, and αὐτὸν is omitted, as also the words τῆς τροφῆς, καὶ ἐταξε. In the D.C. i. 138 (Mangey's ed.) this verse is quoted as in Tisch., except for the omission of αὐτῶν. Holmes notes that αὐτῶν is omitted in 75. Copt., Arab. 3. Arm. 2, Arm. ed. Hieron.; that τῆς τροφῆς is omitted in VI., Arm. 2. Lastly, in regard to καὶ ἐταξε, Holmes has the following sagacious note: "Omit Philo i. 138, in ed. ante-Mang. Forte Philo, in suo τῶν o codice, non habuit καὶ ἐταξε hic, ut nec αὐτῶν supra: atque adeo τὰ χερουβὶ αὐτ ᾧ κατόκισεν essent referenda. Favent ipsius verba, τὰ χερουβὶ ἀντικρι τοῦ παραδεισου τὴν ὑπήρξαν ἵσχει. Forte καὶ ἐταξεν fuit alia lectio pro καὶ κατόκισεν, ex marg. in textum inducta." The Arm. Philo makes it certain that the passage stood in Philo's LXX. as Holmes suggests: κατόκισεν ἄτεν. τοῦ παραδ. τὰ χερ., κ.τ.λ.
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