

The Text of Philo's *De mutatione nominum*

James R. Royse

Philo of Alexandria's treatise *De mutatione nominum* was edited by Wendland (in the Cohn-Wendland edition) on the basis of only two mss.: A, i.e., Monacensis gr. 459, and B, i.e., Marcianus gr. Z. 41 (=366).¹ To this evidence is added some important citations from manuscripts of the *Sacra parallela*.² But A and B provide the sole evidence for most of the treatise. These two mss. belong to the same family of inferior witnesses,³ and this narrow manuscript base provides many opportunities for conjectures, both those of Wendland and those of other scholars (Cohn, Mangey, and Markland).⁴ Some of these are printed by Wendland, and many more are included in the apparatus for consideration. However, the treatise is preserved in other mss. Indeed, three of these, Cantabrigiensis Collegii S. Trinitatis B.9.6, Oxoniensis Collegii Novi 143, and Coislinianus 43, were used by Mangey,⁵ and are occasionally cited by Wendland from Mangey. At three places their readings even find their way into Wendland's text.

It thus seemed to me a worthwhile task to look at those three mss. more systematically to see if there might be further readings of interest to be found. Accordingly, I examined the three in Cambridge, Oxford, and Paris, and took digital photographs of the pages that contain *De mutatione nominum*. And I found many further readings. But I regret to say that none seems to be worthy of textual consideration.

Let me introduce sigla for the three further manuscripts:

C (Cambridge)	Cantabrigiensis Collegii S. Trinitatis B.9.6
O (Oxford)	Oxoniensis Collegii Novi 143
P (Paris)	Coislinianus 43

¹ The signatures of the Venice mss. have been shifted, and what was called simply "gr. 41" is now called (not so simply) "gr. Z. 41 (= 366)."

² See PCW 3:xvii-xviii.

³ See PCW 1:iv-xi.

⁴ Colson states (PLCL 5:140): "The MS. authority for this treatise seems to be unusually weak. Wendland found only two MSS. of any antiquity (A and B), both of them according to him of the same (and inferior) family."

⁵ Colson, PLCL 5:140-41, says that Mangey used the Oxford and Cambridge mss., overlooking his use of the Paris ms.

These are all late: C is dated to the 15th or 16th century, O is from 1533 C.E., and P is from the mid-16th century.⁶

Now, in fact, I also found on further investigation that Cohn and Wendland had briefly discussed all three, and provided good reasons for excluding them from systematic citation in the apparatus. My own study gives no reason to question their judgment. (I note that Conybeare also investigated all three in connection with his edition of *De vita contemplativa*.⁷)

Cohn and Wendland excluded P from consideration since they believed that it was a copy of Vaticanus gr. 380, which was in turn copied from Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 183, which itself was a copy of Monacensis gr. 459, their ms. A, which was used in the edition.⁸ Naturally, a copy of a copy of a copy of A could hardly contain genuine readings not found in A. (Or could it? I will return to this issue.)

O is described by Cohn as a mixture of H and B, and *Mut.* is taken from the latter.⁹ Cohn here follows his earlier discussions of this ms.¹⁰ We can thus exclude this copy of B.

Finally, C was briefly discussed by Cohn in 1899 and judged to be of no value.¹¹ It was, further,

⁶ P was copied by Jacob Diassorinus, who died in 1563. See Cohn at PCW I:viii, and his article cited there, “Konstantin Palaeokappa und Jakob Diassorinus,” in *Philologische Abhandlungen: Martin Hertz zum siebzigsten Geburtstage von ehemaligen Schülern dargebracht* (Berlin: Wilhel Hertz, 1888), 123–43, here 137–39 on Jacob’s life.

⁷ Frederic C. Conybeare, *Philo About the Contemplative Life* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895). The textual relationships are, of course, different for that treatise. Conybeare places O (his D) and P (his E) within a group β , which includes both B (Conybeare’s B also) and A (his M); see *Contemplative Life*, 3, and also 6: “Within the group β [Cohn’s family B] the New College MS. D is, it would seem, practically copied from B.” But he goes on to say: “In a few passages, however, . . . , D and M have retained the peculiar corruption of the family, while B and E are free from it, having probably been corrected. D has often been corrected from MSS. of other families.” C (his L) he places within a group γ (*ibid.*, 4).

⁸ See PCW I:vii, which refers to Wendland, *Neu entdeckte Fragmente Philos* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1891), 126 n. 2 (–127), who there supplies additional precision to the comments by Cohn, ed., *Philonis Alexandrini libellus de opificio mundi* (Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner, 1889), xi–xv. See also Cohn, “Die Philo-Handschriften in Oxford und Paris,” *Philologus* 51 (1892): 266–75, here 274.

⁹ PCW I:xix.

¹⁰ See *Philonis Alexandrini libellus de opificio mundi* (Breslau: Wilhelm Koebner, 1889), xiii, where he is speaking in particular of the witness to *Opif.*, and “Die Philo-Handschriften,” 272, saying that “die Hdschr. im ganzen für den kritischen Apparat entbehrt werden kann.”

¹¹ Cohn, *Libellus*, xxx–xxxI, says: “codicem *Cantabrigiensem Collegii S. Trinitatis B. 9. 6* (chart., forma maxima, saec. XVI) nuper, dum Cantabrigiae moror, inspexi et pretii nullius esse statim cognovi. scriptus est manu neglegentissima, librarius

collated by Colson, “but without any results to speak of” (PLCL 5:141).

In the light of such rejection, it would seem that we can safely ignore C, O, and P. It may nevertheless be puzzling that even a few readings from them have found their way into the apparatus of PCW. Indeed, Wendland addresses this issue, suggesting that the readings adopted by him at §§7, 14, and 81 have arisen by conjecture.¹² That is, at such places a scribe (or perhaps some learned reader or corrector) has departed from the (corrupted) reading of the exemplar in such a way as to agree with what Philo in fact had written. This is what Cohn and Wendland, like Mangey and others before them, do (or at least try to do) throughout their critical edition.

However, an examination of these mss. at least allows us to give a little more precision about what has happened within the textual transmission. And so let us look at the eight places where Wendland refers to manuscripts other than A and B in the apparatus of PCW 3, including the three (§§7, 14, 81) where readings from them are adopted into the critical text.

1. §2: *προκοπής* : ante *προκοπής* ras. 3 litt. in B, καὶ ex Coisl. 43 add. Mang.

P (f. 26^v) reads simply καὶ *προκοπής*. It is tempting to think that we have here a remnant of what was originally in B, but has there been erased.

2. §7: *αἰσθητὸν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν* : γὰρ ex Coisl. 43 et codice Oxon, Coll. Novi 143 Mang. : οὖν AB

O (f. 220^v) indeed reads *αἰσθητὸν γὰρ*. The text of P (f. 26^v) has *αἰσθητὸν οὖν*, just as in A and B, but there is a marginal note: ἴσως γὰρ.

duobus exemplis videtur usus esse, quorum alterum codex classis *b* (vel fortasse ipsa editio princeps), alterum codex classis *a* fuit: sequitur enim modo hanc modo illam memoriam, saepe simul utramque recepit vel supra versum vel in margine ea quae primo scripserat corrigendo. margines codicis permultis observationibus emendationibus coniecturis completi sunt adscriptis a diversis manibus: videlicet longo temporum decursu codicem multi homines tractaverunt; quibus non dubito quin adnumerandus sit Ioannes Christopherson, qui altera parte saeculi XVI socius fuit Collegii S. Trinitatis. non mirum igitur quod Mangey saepe easdem lectiones huic codici simul et Christophersono adscribit.”

¹² PCW 3:xviii: “nullum fructum ex collatione aliorum librorum redundaturum esse etiam inde didici, quod quae p. 157,11 Mangeio auctore ex Oxon. Coll. Novi 143 et Coislino, p. 159,10 171,4 ex Coislino recepi (cf. etiam adnotationes ad 174,19. 200,20), ita comparata sunt, ut facile coniectura inveniri possent. et in Coislino, quae est eius vilitas descripti ex Vaticano 380, hoc necessario statuendum est, nisi forte Mangey in notis erravit.”

3. §14: κατὰ τὰς ἐμὰς εὐφημίας : κατὰ Coisl. (v. Mang.) : καὶ AB, om. D

The text of P (f. 27^r) has καὶ τὰς, as in AB, but again there is a marginal note: ἴσως κατὰ τὰς.

Note that in §13, Mangey has restored θνητὴν for ὀνητὴν. P (f. 27^r) has ὀνητὴν in the text, but with the marginal note: ἴσως θνητὴν.

4. §39: μὴ ἐμοὶ μόνω : ἐμοὶ μόνω D : μόνω ἐμοὶ AB; μόνον ex Cantabrigiensi Coll. S. Trin. B. 9. 6

Wendland follows the word order found in the *Sacra parallela* (I wonder about that choice, by the way). Mangey prints μόνω ἐμοὶ, but then adds in a note: “MS. Trin. μόνον, & sic scribe.” Indeed C does have μόνον here (f. 480^r). And interestingly enough, μόνον is also the original reading in O (f. 222^v), although there it seems to be nothing more than a momentary slip by the scribe. In any case, it is corrected to μόνω ἐμοὶ in the scribe’s usual fashion. Dots are placed under the letters to be deleted (ον), and the letter to be substituted (ω) is added above the line.

5. §81: διὰ τί; ὅτι ὁ μὲν : ὅτι ex Coisl. 43 Mang. : om. AB

Mangey cites this reading, and adds: “Idque postulat sensus.” It certainly seems to be established Philonic usage to begin the reply to διὰ τί; with ὅτι. Of course, for precisely that reason an alert scribe (or reader or corrector of an ancestor) could have been tempted to insert that word. And in P (f. 31^v) it is again a marginal note in which we find this reading; the text omits it. And there is a further note a few lines down: where the text has ἀπονητι, the marginal note corrects to the spelling ἀπονητι (the reading of AB). The learned annotator thus misses Mangey’s correction to ἀκονητι, which is accepted by Wendland.

6. §102: τὰ δεύτερα : δευτερεῖα Cantabr. Coll. S. Trin (Mang.), fort. recte

I note that P (f. 33^r) has δευτερέα. And it seems to me that that was the original reading of C (f. 484^v). The word ends the line, and the final α (along with the acute accent) was written above the line, perhaps in order to avoid extending the word farther into the right margin. But then the supralinear writing was crossed through, and τ̄α was added to form δευτερεῖα. (Some other sequence is certainly possible.) In any case, the resulting reading is clearly δευτερεῖα.

7. §208: τοῦτό φασι : τουτό] αὐτοῦς ex codice Oxon. Coll. Nov. 143 Mang.

In fact, O (f. 232^v) has τοῦτο φασι, thus agreeing with AB except for the negligible matter of the accentuation. (Same in P f. 41^r and C f. 492^r.) It thus seems that this “reading” is nothing more than a very peculiar error by Mangey’s collator.

8. §253: ἐπινεύειν θεῶ : θεῶ scripsi : θεοῦ AB, θεὸν Cantabrig. Coll. S. Trin. B. 9. 6, τε coni. Mang.

C (f. 495^r) indeed has ἐπινεύειν θεὸν (with the final word written as a *nomen sacrum*).

The details here provide a few insights into the transmission of this treatise, but confirm the judgment of Cohn and Wendland that C, O, and P have no independent value, and that systematically citing them within the apparatus would be an unnecessary complication.

Finally, at four places in *Mut.* Wendland refers to the 1640 Paris edition of Philo’s works, which combines the earlier editions of Turnebus and Hoeschel (see PCW 1:lxiv), and in which *Mut.* occupies pp. 1044–84. At those four places the edition provides marginal readings:

§165: “ed. Paris. in mg.” = p. 1070.

§165: “ed. Paris. in mg.” = p. 1070.

§186: “ed. Par. in mg.” = p. 1073.

§220: “in mg. ed. Par.” = p. 1079.

Wendland adopts all but the first one into his text. However, it seems unclear to whom the credit for these conjectures should go.