ON THE TEXT OF MAXIMUS TYRIUS

THE present paper consists of emendations in the text of Maximus Tyrius. For convenience in citing the text I shall refer by page and line to Hobein's edition.[1]

All the known codices of Maximus, as M. Mutschmann[2] and F. Schulte[3] have shown, most probably (many say certainly) derive from the *Parisinus* 1962 which belongs to the tenth or the eleventh century.[4] In Hobein's edition and in the present paper the codex is indicated by the letter R.

On p. 97, 1–2 R (Hob.) offers τὸ διὰ μέσου πολλῷ τῷ θνητῷ πρὸς τὸ ἀθάνατον διετειχίσθη which is meaningless. With some of the *apographa* and the older editors we should read τῷ διὰ μέσου πολλῷ τὸ θνητὸν πρὸς τὸ ἀθάνατον διετειχίσθη κτλ. I suspect that τὸ θνητόν (nom. subject of διετειχίσθη) became τῷ θνητῷ on account of the preceding dative πολλῷ. Then, because there was no subject (nominative) left for διετειχίσθη, the original τῷ (in line 1) was changed to τό (τὸ διὰ μέσου being taken as subject of the verb). The meaning of the passage is that if there were no δαίμονες, humans would be utterly barred from any communication with god because of the great gap which exists between them, mortals, and the immortal god. But the δαίμονες, bridging the gap between the two, afford communication just as an interpreter achieves communication between Greeks and barbarians by translating from Greek to a barbaric language and vice versa (p. 97, 1–12). For a parallel meaning and construction of διατειχίζω cf. Lucian, *de hist. conscr.* 7 : οὐ στενῷ τῷ ἰσθμῷ . . . διατετείχισται ἡ ἱστορία πρὸς τὸ ἐγκώμιον.

p. 97, 6–11. R (Hob. Dübn.) offers καθάπερ . . . οὕτω δ᾽ ἂν καὶ τὸ δαιμόνων γένος ἐπίμικτον νοεῖται. Cod. Arlen. (Heins. Dav. Duk.) gives δ᾽ αὖ (*pro* δ᾽ ἄν). Now ἄν + pres. indic. in a main clause is offensive. Although δ᾽ αὖ *pro* δ᾽ ἄν does not seem altogether impossible, the following stylistic observation points eloquently to a more probable conjecture. In the text of Maximus καθάπερ . . . οὕτως appears six times *always* in one of the following two sequences : (*a*) καθάπερ . . . οὕτω καί (pp. 43, 11 ff. ; 47, 5 ff. ; 264, 4 ff. ; 457, 17 ff.) (*b*) καθάπερ . . . οὕτως ἀμέλει καί (pp. 246, 14 ff. ; 479, 12 ff.). I believe that on p. 97, 6–11 we should emend καθάπερ . . . οὕτω⟨ς⟩ ἀμ⟨έλει⟩ καί (or, less probably καθάπερ . . . οὕτω [δ᾽ ἂν] καί). In further support of this emendation I wish to draw attention to the following seven instances of οὕτως ἀμέλει (six are parallel to the construction καθάπερ . . . οὕτως ἀμέλει, except that instead of καθάπερ we have ὥσπερ or ὡς) : pp. 20, 3 ; 66, 5 ; 137, 3 ; 364, 7 ; 372, 8–9 (in these five instances ὥσπερ precedes) ; 466, 18 (with preceding ὡς) ; 434, 19.

p. 138, 3. R gives ἐφη (*sic*), codd. Pacc. Arlen. followed by older editors ἔπου. Schenkl, Hob. conjectured ἔφες. I propose ἐφέ⟨που⟩ τῷ λόγῳ which has a parallel on p. 325, 6 λέγοντι ἐφέπου. Maximus never uses ἔφες or any other form of the aor. ἐφῆκα, but this may be accidental. However, the meaning 'follow', ἐφέ⟨που⟩, rather than 'yield', ἔφες, is more appropriate in this place

[1] H. Hobein, *Maximus Tyrius* (Lips., Teubn., 1910).

[2] H. Mutschmann, 'Die Überlieferungs-geschichte des Maximus Tyrius', *Rh. Mus.* lxviii (1913), 560–83. His stemma, ibid. 583.

[3] F. Schulte, *De Maximi Tyrii codicibus*, *Dissertatio Inauguralis* (Götting., 1915), 1–76. His stemma, ibid. 73.

[4] A description of R may conveniently be found in the above-mentioned edition by Hobein, *praef.*, pp. xxi–xxxii.

where motion forward is metaphorically expressed; cf. ἐφίκηται (line 6) and the almost certain emendation of ἐρήσεται to ἡγήσεται (line 4) proposed by Reiske and accepted by Dübn. From any viewpoint ἐφέ⟨που⟩ seems superior to ἔφες.

p. 166, 10. R (edd.) gives νεὼς ὁλκάδος. Maximus has nowhere else used ναῦς ὁλκάς but only ὁλκάς (183, 15; 9, 4; 353, 19; 106, 11; 355, 7, 16; 340, 10). Since in addition I find no examples of ναῦς ὁλκάς in LSJ or in Stephanus, I believe that νεώς should be deleted. Reiske has proposed ⟨δίκην⟩ νεὼς ὁλκάδος or ⟨νὴ Δία⟩ νεὼς ὁλκάδος. I take νεώς as either a gloss on ὁλκάδος or as the wrong correction of a corrupt δίκην (or of whatever other word stood in this place). In support of Reiske's ⟨δίκην⟩ I wish to note that this adverb is very common in Maximus (cf. pp. 12, 8; 61, 1; 113, 7; 117, 19; 363, 10; 364, 2, 12, 13; 420, 15; 428, 10; 436, 3; 467, 18, 19, 20; 477, 12).[1] Further I believe that Reiske's emendation and punctuation (followed by Dübn.) κοινωνίαν ⟨καὶ⟩ πολιτείαν. ὁρᾷς κτλ. is correct.[2] Hobein's text, κοινωνίαν. Πολιτείαν ὁρᾷς κτλ. seems to me to be faulty. The point of the example of the ὁλκάς is not to establish that the βίος of men is πολιτικὸς βίος but that it is 'unstable'. And Reiske's sequence κοινωνίαν ⟨καὶ⟩ πολιτείαν in addition to making good sense also finds a parallel (in reverse order) on p. 482, 14 πολιτείας μέτοχον, κοινωνίας ἐρῶσαν. Finally with some of the apographa and the older editors I think that on p. 166, 11 we should write περαιούμενον (sc. τὸν βίον), not περαιούμενος (sc. σύ), the reading of R (Hob.). The point Maximus makes is that the ἀνθρώπινος βίος in general is as uncertain as a ὁλκάς crossing a great sea. It is beside his immediate point that the person he addresses, being an ἄνθρωπος, also crosses such a sea. The emendation of Dav. περαιουμένης makes good sense. But on account of the following αὐτήν (sc. τὴν ὁλκάδα) it seems unlikely that an original περαιουμένης would have ended as περαιούμενον or περαιούμενος. The opposite would have been more likely. So it seems that the ο at the end of περαιούμενο- is original.

p. 212, 6. R (Hob.) gives ὥστε εἰκός, which is offensive. Reiske, Dübn. proposed ὥσγε εἰκός, but Maximus nowhere else uses ὥσγε (or ὥς γε) εἰκός. We should write with confidence ὡς τὸ εἰκός (cf. pp. 185, 11; 201, 16).

p. 254, 7. R gives ἔτλης ἐν νεκροῦ. Older editors deleted ἐν. Hob. proposed ἐν νεκροῦ ⟨νεκροῦ⟩. I believe that we should emend ἐν to καί 'even'. AI may be corrupted to N. Furthermore, K, with its vertical bar lost, may be read as C, and CN leads easily to the conjecture ἐν.

p. 284, 8. R (Hob.) offers γεωργίας· ταῦτα κτλ. This is nonsensical Greek. Heins. proposes γεωργήσας ταῦτα, Markl. γεωργοῦσι ταῦτα, Schenkl γεωργοὶ δ' εἰς ταῦτα. I agree with Meiser's emendation γεωργεῖ ταῦτα except that I prefer γεωργεῖ δὲ ταῦτα (with δέ additivum) which offers a smoother transition. The -ΑC of γεωργίας I consider the product of a corrupt ΔΕ. What may have

---

[1] In Maximus the adv. δίκην precedes its case only once, p. 12, 8 δίκην χοροῦ. It is then possible that νεώς is a gloss on ὁλκάδος and we should write [νεὼς] ὁλκάδος ⟨δίκην⟩. One might suggest that νεώς ought only to be deleted without any further addition. In such a case we would construe ὁλκάδος sc. βίον. But ὁλκάδος sc. βίον either as prosopopoeia of ὁλκάς (= the life of ὁλκάς) or in the sense of βίος ἐν ὁλκάδι (= βίος ναυτῶν κ.τ.ὅ.) is not very likely to represent the original text.

Such prosopopoeia, apart from being far-fetched in prose, finds no parallel in Maximus (and I have checked all instances of βίος, ὁλκάς, and ναῦς). On the other hand βίος ὁλκάδος = βίος ἐν ὁλκάδι = βίος ναυτῶν is not very meaningful, because it exemplifies 'human life' with an example of human life (βίος ναυτῶν is an εἶδος of human life).

[2] For ὁρᾷς as first word after a full stop cf. pp. 92, 4; 152, 18; 163, 7; 302, 18; 349, 9; 380, 5; 478, 4; 481, 3.

happened is that a corrupt *ΔE* in *ΓΕΩΡΓΕΙΔΕ* occasioned the reading *ΓΕΩΡ-ΓΕΙΑC*, which was corrected to γεωργίας.

p. 294, 1. R and the edd. give ἐρώμεθα ἑκάτερον. The reading ἐρώμεθα is very awkward. From what follows it is clear that Maximus does not ask ἑκάτερον (the warrior and the peasant) about their wisdom but judges it by observing their activities. Heins. proposed ὁρώμεθα, Meiser ἐρευνώμεθα, neither one of which is supported by the usage of Maximus. I believe that we should emend with confidence to ⟨θ⟩ε⟨α⟩σώμεθα ἑκάτερον. Cf. p. 174, 12 φέρε χωρὶς ἑκάτερον θεασώμεθα; p. 291, 7 θεασώμεθα ἀπό (with Scaliger, Heins., ὑπό R (Hob.)) τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἑκάτερον; also cf. pp. 76, 17; 100, 4; 148, 12; 227, 13; 257, 3; 289, 1; 290, 3; 291, 9.

p. 323, 11. R (Hob.) gives οὕτω μοι δοκεῖς καλεῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ καὶ ἥλιον καλεῖς τὴν ἐξ ἡλίου αὐγήν. The indicative καλεῖς whether pres. or fut. is both contrary to classical Greek usage, in which the imperf. or aor. indic., or the optat., is expected after ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ, and also contrary to the usage of Maximus. Dübn. conjectured καλοῖς or καλοίης. I propose the imperf. indic. ⟨ἐ⟩κάλεις. The construction is οὕτω μοι δοκεῖς καλεῖν, ὥσπερ ἂν (sc. ἐδόκεις) εἰ καὶ ἥλιον ⟨ἐ⟩κάλεις τὴν ἐξ ἡλίου αὐγήν. Maximus uses the imperf. indic. in the two other passages in which ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ occurs, pp. 143, 13 and 439, 2.

p. 374, 13. R (Hob.) gives ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν τότε πόνους ὁρᾷς. Most of the *apographa* followed by Heins. Dav. Duk. Dübn. give ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν τοὺς τότε πόνους ὁρᾷς. The τότε is idle if not wholly meaningless and in my opinion it is the product of misreading τούς written in capital letters, i.e. *TOYC* > *TOTE*. The letters *T* and *Y* are frequently confused and so *TOYC* read as *TOTC* may easily give rise to *TOTE* (cf. 389, 2 where with some of the *apographa* and Markl., Dübn. we should confidently write τοῦ *pro* τότ' (Hobein's defence of τότ' is outrageous) and also p. 408, 18, where with Mutschmann and Schulte we should most probably correct the *hapax* καρνερία to καρτερία (in both cases we have confusion between *T* and *Y*). What is obviously missing is the article τούς (cf. p. 374, 14 τὰς Ἡρακλέους ἡδονάς) which by conjecture entered the text before τότε in many of the *apographa*. We should unhesitatingly read ἀλλὰ σὺ μὲν τοὺς πόνους ὁρᾷς.

p. 386, 7–8. R gives παρὰ δὲ Κόννου ἑταίραν (line 7) and παρὰ δὲ Μελησίου [η *correctum ex ι pr. m.*] ᾠδήν. Dav. observes: '. . . *Conni lenonis aut cantoris Melesiae nulla, quod sciam, superest apud veteres memoria.*' Maximus refers to the well-known musician Κόννος on p. 441, 12, παρὰ δὲ Κόννου τὰ μουσικά. Since there is no Κόννος who is known as a πορνοβοσκός, but whereas there is a musician of that name known from different sources and mentioned elsewhere by Maximus on p. 441, it is reasonably certain that the Κόννος on p. 386 is the musician. Most probably, then, on p. 386 Κόννου must refer to ᾠδήν. Heins., keeping ᾠδήν after Μελησίου, emends ἑταίραν to κιθάραν. However, ἑταίραν is needed in this passage, the theme of which is ἡδονή (cf. p. 370, 3–4 τράπεζαι Σικελικαί, καὶ ὀρχήσεις Συβαριτικαί, καὶ ἑταῖραι Κορίνθιαι; p. 390, 2–4 ἄφελε τὴν γαστρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν . . . ἄφελε τὴν αἰδοίων ἐπιθυμίαν). Something also may be said in favour of the objection of Dav., who observes: '. . . *κιθαρῳδίαν non κιθάραν, a citharoedo petere debuit; nullam voluptatem secum fert cithara, nisi praesto sint artifices manus . . .*' Hob. (following Pacc.) emends Μελησίου to Μιλησίου and transposes the proper names, i.e. παρὰ δὲ Μιλησίου ἑταίραν (line 7) and παρὰ δὲ Κόννου ᾠδήν. I am inclined to keep the proper names in their manuscript position and transpose only the *nomina appellativa*, i.e. παρὰ δὲ Κόννου ᾠδήν (line 7) and παρὰ

δὲ Μελησίου ἑταίραν. In my opinion ἑταίραν fits better at the end of the sequence by forming the natural *summit* of ἡδονή. Notice that on p. 370, 3–4 we have the sequence τράπεζαι, ὀρχήσεις . . . ἑταῖραι (food . . . dancing . . . sex) which, with my transposition, would also be achieved on p. 386, 6–8, where we would have ὄψον . . . οἶνον (corresponding to τράπεζαι on p. 370), ᾠδήν (corresponding to ὀρχήσεις on p. 370), ἑταίραν (corresponding to ἑταῖραι on p. 370). Notice also that on p. 390, 2–4 the αἰδοίων ἐπιθυμία is mentioned after γαστρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν, i.e., the sequence is first food and drink, then sex. The same sequence is found in Plu. *De virt. mor.* 445 f τὸ φαγεῖν, τὸ πιεῖν, τὸ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης τυγχάνειν. What caused the transposition of ᾠδήν and ἑταίραν? Perhaps someone, etymologizing Μελησίας fancifully (corrected in R from Μελισίας and so perhaps written as Μελισίας in the manuscript from which R was copied) from μέλος (μελισμός, μέλισμα), thought that it would be more elegant to have ᾠδήν refer to Μελησίας. Such a person surely did not know that Κόννος was a musician nor had he yet read p. 441 where Maximus explicitly states that Κόννος is a musician. The moment ᾠδήν was referred to Μελησίας, the obvious alternative was to refer ἑταίραν to Κόννος. I know of no procurer (or musician) by the name of Μελησίας (or Μελισίας or Μιλήσιος) mentioned elsewhere.

p. 427, 18–20. R (Hob.) gives πρᾶγμα . . . ἐγγύς πού τινος τῆς χρείας ἀρετῆς, which is indefensible for two reasons: (*a*) χρείας is meaningless in the context of lines 12 ff., (*b*) τινος τῆς is illogical—as Markl. observed, we can read either τινος (deleting τῆς) or τῆς (deleting τινος) but hardly τινος τῆς—i.e. χρείας, or whatever other noun we suggest in its place, is either indefinite (= τινος χρείας) or definite (= τῆς χρείας) but hardly indefinite–definite (= τινος τῆς χρείας). Dav. corrected χρείας to θείας (a most attractive emendation from the point of meaning and the *ductus litterarum*, and accepted by Markl. Dübn. Hahn), and deleted τῆς to retain τινος. Hahn kept τῆς before θείας and conjectured γένος *pro* τινος. Meiser conjectured τινος θεσπεσίας. With Markl. Dübn. and Hahn I accept as certain the emendation of χρείας to θείας proposed by Dav. In my opinion a damaged (θ)είας became χρείας by the influence of χρείαν in line 19. I keep τῆς before θείας and instead of τινος I propose τεῖνον (neut. part.) agreeing with πρᾶγμα of line 18. It is hard to see how τῆς would have appeared after τινος, or τινος before τῆς, without some manuscript authority. Under the circumstances it is far more probable that one of the two words is a product of corruption than of addition. Consequently deletion here seems unwise. The expression ἐγγὺς . . . τεῖνον τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς finds a parallel on p. 125, 11 ἐγγύτατα . . . τείνει μανίας (cf. also Pl. *Phd.* 65 a ἐγγὺς . . . τείνειν τοῦ τεθνάναι). The point made by ἐγγὺς . . . τεῖνον τῆς θείας ἀρετῆς is that by being ἄνθρωποι ἀγαθοί we come close to θεία ἀρετή.

p. 432, 18–19. R (edd.) offers κεράσας τῇ τυραννίδι ἔρωτα, Σμερδίου καὶ Κλεοβούλου κόμην, καὶ αὐλοὺς Βαθύλλου, καὶ ᾠδὴν Ἰωνικήν. Markl. rightly suspected αὐλούς. Bathyllus is not a flute-player but a παιδικά, as are Smerdias and Cleobulus. And since the last two are praised for their beauty, one would naturally expect that Bathyllus, too, ought to be praised for his beauty. Indeed, elsewhere in Maximus, p. 233, 2–4, where the three παιδικά are mentioned again, Smerdias is praised for his hair, Cleobulus for his eyes, and Bathyllus for the bloom of his youth, μεστὰ δὲ αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Ἀνακρέοντος] τὰ ᾄσματα τῆς Σμέρδιος κόμης, καὶ τῶν Κλεοβούλου ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ τῆς Βαθύλλου ὥρας. Markl. proposed κάλλος for αὐλούς. In my opinion the correct emendation for αὐλούς is most likely to be found on p. 233, 2–4. Comparing p. 432, 18–19 with p. 233,

2–4 we find close similarities. (*a*) In both passages the three παιδικά are mentioned; (*b*) in both passages the names of these three παιδικά are arranged in the same sequence (Smerdias, Cleobulus, Bathyllus); (*c*) in both passages the element κόμη occurs which is attributed on p. 233 to Smerdias only, and on p. 432 to Smerdias and Cleobulus jointly. Since the element αὐλούς, which occurs in only one of the two passages, is unsatisfactory, it is obvious that the words ὥραν or ὀφθαλμούς of the other passage are worth considering as probable emendations for αὐλούς. For if the two passages in their present state agree in three points, and if αὐλούς is a corruption, it is *a priori* probable that the two passages were originally in agreement on four points and that the fourth point lurks under αὐλούς. Both ὥραν and ὀφθαλμούς are suitable in meaning as substitutes for αὐλούς. I suspect that αὐλούς entered the text either because of αὐλός and αὐλῷ (p. 432, 13 and 15), or because of the following καὶ ᾠδὴν ᾿Ιωνικήν, which easily brings to mind 'flute' (cf. p. 430, 13 ὁ αὐλὸς ἠνάγκαζεν ᾿Ιώνων). Thus on p. 432, 18–19 I suggest κεράσας τῇ τυραννίδι ἔρωτα, Σμερδίου καὶ Κλεοβούλου κόμην, καὶ ὥραν [or ⟨ὀφθ⟩αλμούς] Βαθύλλου. The correction to ⟨ὀφθ⟩αλμούς is supported by the *ductus litterarum*, the correction to ὥραν by the fact that on p. 233, 4 Βάθυλλος is praised for his ὥραν. It is difficult to decide which of the two corrections is more likely the hand of Maximus. I shall venture to choose ὥραν.

p. 439, 21. R gives ἠπιστεῖτο δὲ αὐτῷ οὐχ ἡ σοφία. Codd. Pacc. and Arlen. followed by the older editors omit οὐχ. Hobein for no good reason prints οὐχί (*pro* οὐχ ἡ), Dav. proposed οὖν (for οὐχ) and Markl. writes δοκησισοφία. The context clearly shows that οὐχ is contrary to the author's meaning. Maximus says that at the beginning Aristeas' wisdom was doubted by people because Aristeas μηδένα αὐτῆς (= τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σοφίας) διδάσκαλον προύφερεν. This becomes even more obvious by what follows on p. 440, 2; πρὸς (= against) οὖν δὴ τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπιστίαν κτλ. I believe that we should delete οὐχ. The appearance of οὐχ seems to me to have occurred as follows: Before R existed, someone who wished to suggest αὐτοῦ *pro* αὐτῷ wrote OY above Ω(I) (= AYTΩ(I)). Then

AYTΩ(I) H COΦIA was understood as αὐτῷ οὐ(χ) ἡ σοφία, so that οὐ entered the text as οὐχ. The reading αὐτοῦ *pro* αὐτῷ may have been suggested by a parallel on p. 406, 7 ἀπιστεῖται αὐτοῦ ἡ ἀκρίβεια, but it may also have stemmatic value. I cannot decide whether we should write αὐτοῦ *pro* αὐτῷ. It seems that αὐτῷ is the *lectio difficilior* and consequently preferable.

Marquette University, Wis., U.S.A.　　　　　　GEORGE LEONIDAS KONIARIS