

set statim *Robertson*; et statim *F*, en statim *Oudendorp*, ei statim *Jahn*, id statim *Castiglioni*, [et] statim *Roszbach*

This passage describes Venus' grand exit after a conversation with Cupid: she is escorted over the ocean by a retinue of sea-deities. All the interpretations to date take the clause 'ipsum quod incipit velle' as the object of a transitive 'moratur'. Even when *F*'s meaningless reading 'et statim' has been emended in one of the several ways so far proposed,¹ this view of the sentence yields a strange and strained word-order: the subject 'marinum obsequium' comes oddly postponed at the end of the sentence, and the object-clause 'ipsum... velle' is undesirably isolated at the beginning, too far separated from the verb. There is another way to take the sentence and another solution for the nonsensical 'et statim'. Read 'fit statim', and replace the comma after 'praeceperit' with a full stop. This solves the problematic word-order and creates an extra point. 'Ipsum' now moves from being object of 'moratur' to being subject of 'fit' ('the very thing which she just began to wish occurred at once, as if she had long given instructions'), and 'moratur' itself becomes intransitive ('<Her> marine attendance was not long in coming'), a change which stresses the central point of the passage, namely, the extraordinarily swift attendance of Venus' marine retinue, mobilised on her barest thought. The passage thus appeals to the commonplace that 'gods need only wish or think in order to achieve their ends' (so Nisbet and Hubbard on Horace *Odes* 1.12.21, with copious illustration): for another example of this τόπος with the verb 'fit', a passage no doubt known to Apuleius, cf. Petronius 76.8 'cito fit quod di volunt'.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

S. J. HARRISON

¹ Attempts to defend the transmitted 'et statim' (e.g. G. Augello, *Studi Apuleiani* (Palermo, 1977), pp. 105–6) do not convince.

DAMIS THE EPICUREAN

Damis is a character in, and his memoirs the putative source of, Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Many scholars have doubted the existence of these memoirs, some the very existence of the man.¹ Against the latter party Graham Anderson has advanced an ingenious argument, which attempts to prove that the Damis whose existence has been doubted is identical with a bearer of the same name to whom existence has hardly ever been ascribed.² His evidence comprises: (1) Lucian's dialogue *Zeus the Tragedian*, in which a certain Damis appears as the Epicurean tormentor of the popular divinities; (2) a tale now extant in mediaeval Persian, in which a philosopher named Dini performs a similar function; (3) the testimony of Origen that Moiragenes numbered among the men seduced by Apollonius 'the illustrious Euphrates and a certain Epicurean' (*Contra Celsum* 6.41). Between these reports he detects the following parallels:

(1) The gods in Lucian's dialogue resolve to silence Damis; the daemons in the Persian text resolve to silence Dini. Damis is a professing Epicurean, while Dini borrows his logic from the atomists; their victories are equally complete.

(2) Dini joins issue with the daemon Oxfoot on a mountain; Philostratus (*VA* 2.4)

¹ For discussion and bibliography see E. L. Bowie, 'Apollonius of Tyana: Tradition and Reality', *ANRW* II 16.2 (1978), 1652–99; M. Dzielska, *Apollonius of Tyana in Legend and History* (Rome, 1986), pp. 19–49.

² G. Anderson, *Philostratus* (Beckenham, Kent, 1986), pp. 241–57.

relates that Apollonius and Damis met an Empusa in the Caucasus, whom the words of Apollonius put to flight. Dini asserts the sublimity of the purified human intellect, and Philostratus (*VA* 2.5.2), though he makes Damis deny that mountains have any tendency to exalt the mental faculties, ascribes to Apollonius the rejoinder that the pure intellect can soar above the world.

Anderson has thus attempted two identifications, first of the Damis of Lucian with the Dini of an Oriental romance, and then of this composite figure with Apollonius' disciple. His conclusion is that, since Philostratus manifestly does not depend upon Lucian, they must both depend upon a common source, and one which is too early to be entirely inauthentic. It is, however, a difficulty for his thesis that, where Dini and Lucian's Damis match each other most precisely, it is in points that offer no analogue to the Damis of Philostratus, and a Damis who resembled the one in the *Life of Apollonius* would be unlikely to commend himself to Lucian as a paragon of rational incredulity.

Nor can we say that the likeness between the Philostratean Damis and the Dini of romance is too close to be fortuitous. It is not Damis, but his master, who confounds their supernatural assailant in the Caucasus; Damis is anonymous, and does not assume any prominence in a party which consists of more than two. It is not Damis, but his master, who dwells upon the superior capacities of the soul, and his aim is not (as in Dini's speech) to prove the superiority but rather to contrast the one thing needful, the improvement of the soul, with the superfluous elevation of the senses.

The vagaries of folklore might account for the transformation of a Damis into a Dini: they would, however, be no less likely to throw up adventitious similarities as close as those for which Anderson has argued. Where does Moeragenes come into the reckoning, with his 'illustrious Euphrates and a certain Epicurean'?³ Could this Epicurean be Damis, and, if so, why does Philostratus conceal his philosophical allegiance? We know that he professed a high esteem for Damis as a biographer which rendered the pretensions of Moeragenes insupportable:

ἐνέτυχον δὲ καὶ Μαξίμου τοῦ Αἰγυῖως βιβλίῳ...καὶ διαθήκαι δὲ τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ γεγραμμένη...οὐ γὰρ Μοιραγένης γε προσεκτέον βιβλία μὲν συνθέντι ἐς Ἀπολλωνίων τέτταρα, πολλὰ δὲ τῶν περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀγνοήσαντι. (VG 1.3.2).

But here we should observe, that, while he professes to add to him with authority, Philostratus does not assert that Moiragenes said anything which a more judicious historian would unsay.⁴ A portrait may be offensive because the details are wrongly selected, and not only because they are false. The particle γάρ looks back to the enumeration of sources, and the charge against Moeragenes is not that he is a bad source, but that Philostratus (and the judicious reader) cannot remain content with a compilation that is marred by such omissions. We have no reason to think that any

³ On Moeragenes see Bowie (1978), pp. 1674ff. and D. H. Raynor, 'Moeragenes and Philostratus: Two Views of Apollonius of Tyana', *CQ* 34 (1984), 223–8. I agree with Bowie (1978), 1673–80, and with Raynor (1984), against Anderson (1986), pp. 299–300, that Moeragenes himself need not have been a hostile witness; I argue that Philostratus attributes to him omissions rather than lies.

⁴ Anderson (1986), pp. 299–300 suggests that Philostratus charged Moeragenes with inaccuracy because it was politic to conceal the real ground of his distaste, i.e. the animosity of Moeragenes. But: (1) he does not tax Moeragenes with falsehood, and (2) it could only strengthen the case against Moeragenes to prove him guilty of prejudice, with a consequent propensity to error.

episode was excluded by Philostratus merely because he found it in his predecessor: neither Damis nor any other authority is cited at Moeragenes' expense.⁵

Literary motives for the omission are no more cogent: why should the invention of any character necessitate the omission of one already known to his readers, especially where that character, unlike the Philostratean Damis, had made an intellectual surrender which might be turned to good account? Origen writes:

ἔφησεν ἁλῶναι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν Ἀπολλωνίῳ μαγείας οὐκ ἀγενεῖς τινὰς φιλοσόφους ὡς πρὸς γόητα αὐτὸν εἰσελθόντας· ἐν οἷς οἶμαι καὶ περὶ Εὐφράτου <τοῦ> πάννυ διηγήσατο καὶ τινος Ἐπικουρείου.

This implies that his visitors conceived a high esteem for Apollonius, after meeting him if not before.⁶ This 'conquest' was significant enough to be recollected by the Christian apologist, and if, as Origen indicates, Euphrates and the 'Epicurean' were both outstanding figures in the narrative, it is all the more surprising that Philostratus should omit one while giving so large a role to the other. If we suppose that Philostratus found in Moeragenes a(n) (Epicurean) Damis (known to him, perhaps, only from that source) and translated him to his own biography, would it be so remarkable if he had stripped him of his philosophy, like Euphrates,⁷ and (since neither could be retained as an admirer of Apollonian *mageia*) had made of one the most deserving friend of Apollonius, as he made the other his most intriguing foe?

Moeragenes, on this reasonable hypothesis, would lend weight to belief in Damis. While it is hard to believe that works of Damis were in use at this early period,⁸ the chronological errors which betray the hand of Philostratus need not dispel belief in the very existence of his narrator. It would be consonant with the practice of Philostratus in the *Heroicus*, where the source of information is the dead Protesilaus, that he should take a silent character from his sources and advance him as the authority for a new tale.⁹

But do we believe in Damis *the Epicurean*? To decide this, we should need to know whether Origen is reporting or interpreting when he tells us of 'a certain Epicurean'. Does *τινος* represent a lapse of memory or a belief that the man alluded to is already sufficiently known to his opponent?¹⁰ Origen believes, against the evidence,¹¹ that

⁵ See Anderson (1986), p. 163 for the observation that Damis is not invoked to contradict other sources.

⁶ If *ὡς πρὸς γόητα* insinuates that the term was a misnomer and *μαγεία* denotes a more respectable study, then the encounter must be supposed to have changed their minds. *γῳς* is pejorative at *Contra Celsum* 1.71 etc., but at 1.74 and in the *Homily on Numbers* 24.17 Origen speaks of mages with respect. If this distinction is present, however, it must allude to a pagan vindication of Apollonius, which Origen himself does not endorse.

⁷ The Euphrates of Philostratus is the Stoic extolled by Pliny, *Letters* 1.10, and Epictetus, *Discourses* 3.15.1. A similar change in the character of Damis is quite credible: it would not be any more difficult to transform than to invent him, and there may have been very little to transform.

⁸ See the discussions cited in note 1.

⁹ Against Bowie (1978), p. 1663, it seems to me that Protesilaus affords a better analogue than the vintner, who professes (like Philostratus) to be merely the reporter of another man's account. On the authorship of the *Heroicus* see F. Solmsen, 'Some Works of Philostratus the Elder', *TAPA* 71 (1940), 557–69.

¹⁰ Cf. Hebrews 2.6, where David is 'a certain man', and 'certain poets' at Acts 17.28 for Aratus and Cleanthes. In each case the easy solution of the riddle reminds the audience that the speaker has cited one of their own authorities. If Origen believed that he himself had divined the character of Damis, it would mean more to identify the sect than to name the man. The Socratic allusion at *Gorgias* 493a to 'a certain man, Sicilian perhaps or Italian', may not betoken ignorance of the name; cf. also *Phaedrus* 272c.

¹¹ On the Platonism of Celsus see *Contra Celsum* 7.42 etc.; H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra*

Celsus is of the Epicurean party, and would therefore be glad to expose the capitulation of his predecessor to arts which it had always been the dogma and the boast of Epicureans to disdain.

It is Origen's reasons for thinking Celsus an Epicurean that must excite our doubts with regard to Damis. The Epicurean Celsus is known to us from the dedication of Lucian's *Alexander*; for all that Celsus' argument bespeaks a loose adherence to Platonism, this notice was enough to persuade the apologist that he saw behind the mask.¹² In Lucian he would have found the picture of 'Damis' as an habitué of the Garden, and if there was a Damis in Moeragenes, it was clearly in Origen's interest to take him for the same person, since he would know (if only from Lucian's *Alexander* 25) that the Epicureans rivalled even Christians in their mockery of the Apollonian school.

We may conclude that, even if Origen's statements about Moeragenes give some evidence for the existence of a Damis, they do little to corroborate the notion of his being an Epicurean. Postulating Damis as the figure complementary to Euphrates in Moeragenes may relieve us of the need to explain the absence of that figure in Philostratus; but attempts to find more accurate information in the fragment are frustrated by the opacity of our immediate source.

New College, Oxford

M. J. EDWARDS

Celsum (Cambridge, 1965), pp. xxiv–xxvi; J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 400–1.

¹² Lucian's Celsus (*Alexander* 1) is said to be the author of a work against the magicians (*Alexander* 21). Origen's suggestion (*Contra Celsum* 1.68) that the author of the *True Logos* wrote such a book is his sole attempt to fix his identity. Lucian will be the source of his prosopography: had Origen known the writings of this Celsus at first hand he would have cited them.

SOME EMENDATIONS IN THE TEXT OF MAXIMUS OF TYRE, *DIALEXEIS* 1–21 (HOBEIN)

All surviving manuscripts of the *Dialexeis* of Maximus of Tyre descend from the oldest, Parisinus Graecus 1962 (given the *siglum* R in Hobein's Teubner text of 1910). Where they diverge, they do so as a result either of error or of attempts at correction.¹ The history of the conjectural emendation of the *Dialexeis* thus begins with the second oldest manuscript, Vaticanus Graecus 1390 (Hobein's U), which dates from the third quarter of the thirteenth century.² Since that time, the most significant contributions have come from two scholars, one of the fifteenth century and one of the eighteenth: Zanobi Acciaiuoli, librarian at the monastery of San Marco in Florence, many of whose corrections found their way anonymously into the *editio princeps* of 1557 via the manuscript used by Stephanus;³ and Jeremiah Markland,

¹ This truth was first established, independently, by H. Mutschmann ('Die Überlieferungsgeschichte des Maximus Tyrius', *RhM* 56 (1913), 560–83) and, at greater length, F. Schulte (*De Maximi Tyrii codicibus*, diss. Göttingen, 1915). Hobein in his Teubner expressed another view of the tradition, but at the same time followed R down to details of (mis)punctuation and (mis)accentuation: a fine example of discarding one's cake and still getting indigestion.

² The hand is similar to that of Vat. gr. 106 (dated 1251) and Vat. gr. 64, foll. 226–289 (dated 1269).

³ I hope to publish a proper account of Acciaiuoli's extensive philological work on Maximus at a later date.