The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Conybeare's Edition of Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa Philo. About the Contemplative Life, or the fourth book of the treatise concerning Virtues*. Critically edited with a Defence of its Genuineness, by Fred. C. Conybeare, M.A. 8vo. Clarendon Press. 14s.

A. E. Brooke

The Classical Review / Volume 10 / Issue 05 / June 1896, pp 262 - 263

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00204186, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00204186

How to cite this article:

A. E. Brooke (1896). Review of Alison Butler 'Victorian Occultism and the Making of Modern Magic: Invoking Tradition' The Classical Review, 10, pp 262-263 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00204186

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

CONYBEARE'S EDITION OF PHILO'S *DE VITA CONTEMPLATIVA*.

Philo. About the Contemplative Life, or the fourth book of the treatise concerning Virtues. Critically edited with 'a Defence of its Genuineness, by FRED. C. CONYBEARE, M.A. 8vo. Clarendon Press, 14s.

THE literary history of the *De Vita Contemplativa* is of peculiar interest. The treatise has given rise to the most extraordinary controversies; and the amount of misplaced ingenuity which has been devoted to attacking or defending its genuineness is almost unparalleled. In all probability we owe the preservation of all Philo's extant works to one of the most stupid mistakes which Eusebius ever made; and the theory of the spuriousness of the treatise has been widely accepted on a far less tenable hypothesis than the original blunder of Eusebius. When once Eusebius had established the theory that Philo in this treatise was describing Christian monastic institutions of the first century, monks were always ready to transcribe the works of so useful an apologist. But strange as the mistake of Eusebius may seem, the theory that we have here the work of a third century Christian apologist of monasticism, anxious to shelter himself under the great name of Philo, which he never uses, is even more surprising.

Until the appearance of Mr. Conybeare's edition there had been for some time a lull in the controversies connected with the book. He has again taken up the cudgels on behalf of its genuineness; and a new period in the struggle has been opened. Whether he has proved his case or not may be an open question, but he has certainly dealt very damaging blows to some theories about the book which have been accepted by the majority of critics with greater readiness than wisdom. In especial he has earned the gratitude of all students of Philo by the vigorous attack which he has made on the over credulous acceptance of the theory of Lucius. There is always a danger of really good critics accepting the results obtained by critical processes apparently analogous to their own, without examining with sufficient care whether the work has been equally well done. In future, if we refuse to accept the treatise as a genuine work of Philo, we shall certainly require some better reasons for doing so than Lucius has given us.

Mr. Conybeare's edition consists of an introduction, containing a description of the MSS., and a discussion of their relations to each other and to the Armenian and Latin versions, as well as to the extracts found in the history of Eusebius; and a revised text, with fairly full critical apparatus, and very full testimonia, which afford perhaps the strongest proof which Mr. Conybeare offers of the genuineness of the work. This is followed by the complete text of the Armenian version, published here for the first time, the Latin version, and the Eusebian extracts; an elaborate commentary, and a very long defence of the genuineness of the treatise.

Mr. Conybeare's most important contribution to our knowledge of the text is the evidence of the Armenian, which he gives in full in his critical notes. On the ground that a lacuna (483, 18) common to all the extant Greek MSS. and the Latin version is not found in the Armenian, Mr. Conybeare has treated this version as an independent witness; and has formed his text on the principle that any reading found in the Armenian and one Greek MS. must have been the reading of the common ancestor of the Armenian and all other extant authorities, except perhaps the Eusebian extracts. On the whole his estimate of the importance of the Armenian seems to be justified, so far as one can judge from a hurried examination of the text. In some places it alone has preserved the true reading; and the readings supported by it and only one or two Greek MSS. stand the test of internal probability. He has however perhaps not made sufficient allowance for the possibility of later mixture. But in most places he has apparently chosen the right reading. His treatment of the text of the Eusebian extracts is less satisfactory. It would have been better if his critical apparatus had been constructed on a more systematic method generally: and from the irregularity with which the reading of the Eusebian extracts are sometimes given and sometimes omitted we are led to wonder whether the readings of the Greek MSS. have been recorded with sufficient regularity. In some places it seems probable that the Armenian and the Greek MSS. have common errors from which the text of the MS. used by Eusebius must have been free. His treatment of the text of 483, 41-48 (ἡ δὲ

ἐξήγησις—κατιδούσα) is very unsatisfactory. His remarks on the passage are divided between the introduction, the commentary, and the section containing the complete text of the Eusebian extracts. Between the printing of the text and of the commentary Mr. Conybeare seems to have changed his mind. It would have been far more satisfactory if he had stated his opinion in one place, and without hesitation. The true text must probably be gathered from various sources. It must have run somewhat as follows: ἡ δὲ ἐξήγησις τῶν ἱερῶν γραμμάτων γίνεται δι' ὑπονοῶν ἐν ἀλληγορίαις, ἀπαντα γὰρ ἡ νομοθεσία δοκεῖ τοῖς ἀνδράσι τούτοις εὐκέναι ζῶν καὶ σῶμα μὲν ἔχειν τὰς ῥήτας διατάξεις, ψυχὴν δὲ τὸν ἐναποκείμενον ταῖς λέξεσιν ἀόρατον νοῦν ᾧ ἐνῆρξαστο ἡ λογικὴ ψυχὴ διαφερόντως τὰ οἰκία αὐτῇ θεωρεῖν, ὥστερ διὰ κατόπτρου τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐξάισια κάλλη νοημάτων ἐμφαινόμενα κατιδούσα κ.τ.λ. Here the αὐτῇ and ἐμφαινόμενα are supported by the Eusebian text alone. The passage is also interesting for the light which it throws on the text of Eusebius. It affords one of the many instances where the Syriac translation of Eusebius (as Mr. McLean, of Christ's College, Cambridge, has kindly informed me) supports the readings of the group *GHO* against the MSS. which Heinichen unfortunately followed in his edition. Other examples might be added to show that, though Mr. Conybeare has done much for the text of the treatise, his results cannot be regarded as final.

The excursus on the authorship contains a great deal of valuable work, though the arrangement leaves something to be desired. Two of the most interesting parts of it are the section in which Mr. Conybeare tries to show that Eusebius probably used the copy of the *De Vita* which Origen had formerly possessed, and the section in which he argues with greater success that the treatise may have formed part of Philo's larger apologetic work on behalf of the Jews. The former theory is ingenious, but it is rather unfortun-

ate that a place has been given to it which suggests that it is an important part of the argument for the genuineness of the treatise. Mr. Conybeare has certainly not *proved* his point. The reconstruction of Philo's apologetic work is very plausible.

Mr. Conybeare has massed together a great many arguments, out of which it would be possible to make a very strong case for the genuineness of the *De Vita*. We cannot help thinking that a shorter statement, arranged with more regard to logical demonstration, would have been more useful. But his treatment of Lucius and Graetz, if unnecessarily rough, is certainly valuable. He has at any rate shown that they have been guilty of a great deal that is ridiculous. And he has made out a case for a reconsideration of the question of the Philonic authorship unprejudiced by the acceptance of theories which have been too readily taken on trust. It would be easy to point out a good many minor defects, his treatment of textual and palaeographical questions shows several, but Mr. Conybeare's book is the most important contribution to the study of Philo that has appeared for some time.

In conclusion it may be well to call attention to two important reviews of the book which Schürer has published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for July 20 and November 9, 1895. The second is in part a reply to a criticism of his earlier review by Prof. Drummond in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, October, 1895. Schürer retains his former view that the treatise is not the work of Philo. As he only touches a few of the questions raised by Mr. Conybeare's book, it is to be hoped that he will some time treat the question as a whole. Dr. Wendland has also discussed the question in the *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, (xxii. pp. 693-772). He defends the Philonic authorship on much the same grounds as Mr. Conybeare, but in a clearer and more systematic form.

A. E. BROOKE.

SCRIVENER'S INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Scrivener's Introduction to the Criticism of the New Testament. Edited by the Rev. EDWARD MILLER. George Bell and Sons. 2 vols. 32s.

No one would deny that Mr. Miller's edition of Scrivener is a work of considerable value.

It contains a short account of nearly everything that the student of the text of the Greek Testament can require as general prolegomena, and many facts that cannot be found conveniently elsewhere. Especially is this the case with the section which deals with the Egyptian versions, where