

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.

whose ideas are recorded as an appendix to the second, posthumous edition of John Davies's *Maximus*, published in 1740.⁴ J. J. Reiske's edition of 1774–5 and Friedrich Duebner's of 1840 (rev. 1877) also contain valuable material. But the field is by no means yet picked clean: witness most recently the useful articles of Professors Koniaris and Renehan.⁵ I offer the following gleanings of my own.⁶

(1) 2.21.18

(σκήνος)... κεκραμένον μουσικῶς πρὸς τὰ αὐτοῦ ἔργα· φοβερὸν μὲν δειλοῖς, ἡμερον δὲ ἀγαθοῖς, βαδιστικὸν μὲν τῇ φύσει, πτηνὸν δὲ τῷ λόγῳ, νηκτὸν δὲ τέχνῃ, σιτοφάγον καὶ γεωπόνον...

Maximus is here discussing the suitability of the human form as a model for images of the gods. The antithesis *φοβερὸν ... ἀγαθοῖς* is entirely irrelevant to the sense of the passage and breaks in awkwardly between *ἔργα* and *βαδιστικὸν* κτλ. I suggest that the words should be excised, but can offer no definite explanation for their presence. Perhaps an incorporated marginal note by an early reader, citing an apparently parallel passage. But from where?

(2) 2.24.13

δράκων... ἐτρέφετο ἐν χωρίῳ κοίλῳ, ἐν κρημνῷ βαθεῖ, τείχει ὑψηλῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄκρων περιβεβλημένος.

The words *ἐν χωρίῳ κοίλῳ* look like a gloss on *ἐν κρημνῷ βαθεῖ* and should be excised. Compare 7.80.3 (= (6) below).

(3) 3.34.7

(In his own defence, Socrates might have summoned)... μάρτυρας τῶν πλουσίων τινὰς καὶ ἀξιώχρεων ἐν Ἀθηναίοις δικασταῖς...

A little further on, at 3.37.5 and 3.38.19, Maximus uses the phrase Ἀθηναίων δικασταῖς; the same should be read here, -οῖς for -ων being an easy slip between ἐν and δικασταῖς.

(4) 4.45.3

(When we read his myths, we do not have to credit Plato with having seen the rivers of the underworld)... οὐδὲ τὴν Κλωθὴν ἰδεῖν... οὕτε ἐντετυχημένοι...

οὐδὲ... οὕτε is a very dubious sequence. Read instead οὐδὲ... οὐδὲ.

⁴ Further ideas of Markland's – mainly inferior to those he passed for publication – may be seen in his own hand on a copy of Davies's first edition of 1703, now in the British Library (1125 g 11).

⁵ G. L. Koniaris, 'Emendations in the Text of Maximus of Tyre', *RhM* 108 (1965), 353–70; 'On the Text of Maximus Tyrius', *CQ* 20 (1970), 130–4; 'Emendations in Maximus Tyrius', *AJP* 93 (1972), 424–36; 'More Emendations in Maximus Tyrius', *Hermes* 105 (1977), 54–68. R. Renehan, 'Some Passages in Maximus of Tyre', *CPh* 82 (1987), 43–9.

⁶ I am very grateful to Donald Russell for commenting on an earlier draft of this paper and pruning some of its wilder growths. Thanks also to the Editor of *CQ* and its anonymous referee for insisting on improvements to my treatment of 11.139.7.

(5) 5.53.11

...οἱ μὲν ἀπατήσαντες, οἱ δὲ καὶ βιασάμενοι τυχόντες ὧν ἐπεθύμουν, οὐχ ὧν εὔξαντο, ἀνατιθέασιν θεοῖς τὴν δωρεάν, οὐ παρ' ἐκείνων λαβόντες.

The whole point of the argument here is that fools (like Midas in the story with which the lecture started) get what they pray for, and only then realize that they do not want it after all. Read therefore ὧν εὔξαντο, οὐχ ὧν ἐπεθύμουν.

(6) 7.80.3

λοιμὸς ἐμπεσὼν, ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας ἀρξάμενος καὶ καταβὰς διὰ τῆς βασιλέως γῆς καὶ τελευτήσας ἐκεῖ καὶ ἰδρυθεὶς αὐτόθι, ἔφθειρε τὴν πόλιν.

The clause καὶ τελευτήσας ἐκεῖ looks suspiciously like a gloss on καὶ ἰδρυθεὶς αὐτόθι; its presence also spoils an otherwise neat tricolon of participle clauses between λοιμὸς ἐμπεσὼν and ἔφθειρε τὴν πόλιν. It should be removed, like ἐν χωρίῳ κοίλῳ in 2.24.13 (= (2) above).

(7) 7.83.16

ἐν γὰρ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς τότε ἦν που σώματα μυρία... ἐν δεκαέτει χρόνῳ ἐπέβαινον οὐδὲν οὐχ ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς...

Read ἐν <δέ> δεκαέτει κτλ.

(8) 8.88.10

(At the oracle of Lake Avernus an enquirer was met by) ...εἰδωλον... φθεγτικὸν... καὶ μαντικόν· καὶ συγγενόμενον ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐδεῖτο ἀπηλάττετο.

As in the immediately preceding account of the oracle of Trophonius, Maximus directs his audience's attention to the experiences of the enquirer. It is therefore the enquirer, not the prophetic εἰδωλον who makes the natural subject of the verb ἀπηλάττετο; this in turn means that we need συγγενόμενος not συγγενόμενον. Compare also 89.4–5, συγγίγνεσθαι τῷ δαιμονίῳ, where it is again the human enquirer who is the subject of the verb συγγίγνεσθαι.

(9) 8.93.18

...ὦρα σοι καὶ Ὀμήρῳ πολεμεῖν καὶ... καὶ... καὶ... καὶ Σωκράτην δὲ ἔαν.

In itself καὶ... δὲ is a perfectly acceptable combination of particles: see Denniston, *Particles*, pp. 199–203. It is not appropriate here, however, since we require a firm contrast between the last clause of the sentence and what has gone before. Read therefore Σωκράτην δὲ ἔαν. The unwanted καὶ intruded under the influence of the preceding polysyndeton.

(10) 8.96.10

εἰσὶ δ' αὐτῷ φύσεις ἀθάνατοι δευτέραι (Acciaiuoli; δεύτεροι R), οἱ καλούμενοι δεύτεροι...

οἱ καλούμενοι ἀθάνατοι δεύτεροι Acciaiuoli: θεοὶ καλούμενοι δεύτεροι Davies²

The obvious correction is to read δαίμονες for δεύτεροι.

(11) 9.103.4

...γίνεται μεταβολή καὶ πρόσβασις, ποτὲ μὲν τοῦ πυρὸς εἰς ἀέρα κατὰ θερμότητα, ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ ἀέρος εἰς ὕδωρ κατὰ ὑγρότητα.

ποτὲ R: ἀπὸ Stephanus (text)

Pace Stephanus, the better course here is to change ἀπὸ to ποτὲ rather than *vice versa*.

(12) 10.115.3

νόμιζε δὴ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὅψιν τινὰ εἶναι διορατικὴν τῶν ὄντων...

Maximus is drawing a comparison between the way the eye can have its powers of sight impaired by a cataract and the way the mind can have its powers of mental discernment clouded by embodiment. The logic of the comparison, if pressed, would demand that the soul should be said to *have* powers of sight rather than itself to *be* a power of sight; in which case, either καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ or perhaps κἂν τῇ ψυχῇ would be preferable to the paradox. But should the logic be pressed? On balance, I think it should. Maximus is no great logician, but he does tend to be precise, even pedantically so, when it comes to aligning the terms in a complex simile or comparison. See for instance 13.4 (162.1–19), for a characteristic example.

(13) 11.139.7

ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα διαφύην (Shorey: διφυῇ R) ὁρῶ· τοῦ γὰρ νοῦ ὁ μὲν νοεῖν πέφυκεν, καὶ μὴ νοῶν, ὁ δὲ καὶ πέφυκεν· ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος οὕτω τέλειος, ἂν μὴ προσθῇς αὐτῷ τὸ καὶ νοεῖν ἀεί, καὶ πάντα νοεῖν, καὶ μὴ ἄλλοτε ἄλλα· ὥστε εἶη ἂν ἐντελέστατος ὁ νοῶν ἀεὶ καὶ πάντα καὶ ἅμα.

καὶ <νοεῖ καὶ> πέφυκεν Heinsius: καὶ πέφυκεν <καὶ νοεῖ> H (Harl. 5760) post corr.

Maximus is here, in scholastic vein, defining God by the method of διαίρεσις. Festugière, *Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, iv (Paris, 1954), pp. 95ff. (esp. 109–15) points to the close similarity between this passage of *Dialexeis* 11 and chapter 10 of the *Didaskalikos* of Alcinous/Albinus, which itself probably derives from the doxographic work of Areius Didymus (see J. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists* (London, 1977), pp. 269 and 285–6). At the corresponding point in Alcinous, we read: ἐπεὶ δὲ ψυχῆς νοῦς ἀμείνων, νοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἐν δυνάμει ὁ κατ' ἐνέργειαν πάντα νοῶν καὶ ἅμα καὶ ἀεὶ... (*Did.* 10.164.16–18 Hermann). This (ultimately Aristotelian) distinction between potential and active intellect would seem to be part of standard Middle Platonist theology, and one would like to find it in Maximus too, especially as the present passage does show a more than usual dependence on scholastic material. The point was seen both by Heinsius and by the corrector of Harl. 5760 (probably Janus Lascaris, for whom the manuscript was made), but their corrections seem clumsy ('both has the natural capacity and actually thinks'; 'both actually thinks and has the natural capacity'). We would get a neater and more pointed statement if we were to read ὁ δὲ καὶ νοεῖ in place of ὁ δὲ καὶ πέφυκεν ('one of them has the natural capacity for thought even though it does not actually think, the other actually thinks').

(14) 12.157.15

(The good man on trial)... καὶ ἀφαιρουμένων τὰ χρήματα προήσεται ὡς παίγνια καὶ ἀστραγάλους ἀφαιρουμένους...

ἀφαιρουμένοις Markland: τοῖς ἀφαιρουμένοις Reiske

Much the most elegant correction here is to read ἀφαιρούμενος (passive). The imagery here, used also in a similar context in *Dial.* 3.5, derives from the *Gorgias* (521d–522a).

(15) 13.160.15

καὶ δηλαδὴ πᾶσι τοῖς δεομένοις θεσπίζει ὁ θεὸς τὸ ἀληθὲς μαθεῖν, καὶ συμφέρει, κἂν μέλλῃ ὁ μαθὼν ἄδικος ὢν πλεονεκτήσῃν.

κἂν συμφέρει μαθεῖν Heinsius: καὶ τὸ ἀληθὲς μαθεῖν συμφέρει Davies²: μαθεῖν κἂν μὴ συμφέρῃ Markland (BM 1125g11): μαθεῖν δὲ καὶ συμφέρει Reiske: lac. indic. Duebner

None of the alterations so far proposed carries complete conviction, though Markland's comes closest. Donald Russell suggests κἂν μαθεῖν μὴ συμφέρῃ, which improves on Markland's general idea by giving μαθεῖν a more comfortable construction. An alternative line is suggested by an anonymous annotator to the copy of Hobein's edition in the Institute of Classical Studies, London, who transposes καὶ and μαθεῖν, giving a second ironic statement in parallel to δηλαδὴ...ἀληθὲς, rather than another κἂν-clause, parallel to κἂν...πλεονεκτήσῃν. If this latter line of thought is found preferable, one might think of a slightly larger transposition, so as to read καὶ συμφέρει τὸ ἀληθὲς μαθεῖν; but this is perhaps too substantial a rearrangement to be plausible.

(16) 13.163.14

ἤδη δὲ καὶ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου ἡ γνώμη μαντικῇ δηλωτική. πῶς καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἐκατέρα;

ἡ γνώμη <ἡ καὶ ἡ> μαντικῇ Reiske

It is clear from what follows (163.15–164.4) that what Maximus needs to say here is that both γνώμη (human intelligence) and μαντικῇ (divine powers of foresight) can each trespass on what is *prima facie* the other's territory. Reiske was right to posit a lacuna therefore, but it must have contained more than he allowed for. Something like ἡ γνώμη <εἰκαστική, καὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἡ> μαντικῇ δηλωτική; or perhaps more simply <καὶ τοῦ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἡ> μαντικῇ.

(17) 17.208.9

(The Spartans and the chef Mithaecus)... ἐκέλευον αὐτῷ ἐξείναι (Stephanus: ἐξείναι R) τῆς Σπάρτης αὐτίκα μάλ'..., ἐφίεμεν γὰρ ὑπὸ τοῦ πονεῖν δεῖσθαι τροφῆς ἀναγκαίας μᾶλλον ἢ τεχνικῆς...

ἐφιμενούς Reiske: ἐφυσεν Hahn: ἐφασαν Meiser

Again, none of the alterations so far proposed carries conviction. What is required is a verb denoting habit or custom, preferably in the infinitive mood. Perhaps εἰθίσθαι, perhaps εἰωθέναι.

(18) 18.216.5

Κορινθίῳ ἀνδρί, ὄνομα Αἰσχύλῳ, παῖς ἦν Ἀκταίων...

Actaeon in the story is Corinthian Aeschylus' boyfriend, not his son. Read therefore παιδικὰ for παῖς, which cannot itself bear the required sense. Compare also the opening of the following, parallel story of Periander: Περιάνδρῳ τῷ Ἀμβρακιώτῃ τυράννῳ παιδικὰ ἦν... (217.2–3).

(19) 20.254.6

(Darius robs the tomb; cf. Herodotus 1.187)...καὶ τὸν μὲν χρυσὸν οὐχ εὔρεν, ἐπίγραμμα δὲ ἔνδοθεν ἐπὶ τῷ ταφῷ ὃ νεκρὸς λέγει· ὧ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπληστότατε...

The construction here seems very strained. The correction found in the sixteenth-century manuscripts and the *editio princeps*, to ὁ νεκρὸς λέγει, is easier. On the other hand, it is strictly the inscription that 'speaks', not the corpse (cf. Hdt 1.187: καὶ γράμματα λέγοντα τάδε). Therefore delete νεκρός, as an illegitimate anticipation of νεκροῦ below in line 7.

King's College London

M. B. TRAPP

THE EARLY CAREER OF THE *MAGISTER EQUITUM* JACOBUS

Claudian's *carm. min. 50* which is addressed 'In Jacobum Magistrum Equitum' has recently been the subject of a detailed study by J. Vanderspoel.¹ In it he reviews what little we know about the career of Jacobus using as his second source in this matter the letter of Vigilius, bishop of Tridentum, to John Chrysostom, bishop of Constantinople, the heading of which reports that the relics of the martyrs Sininnius, Alexander and Martyrius reached Constantinople 'per Jacobum virum illustrem'.² Whilst I am willing to accept the argument that the relics must have been delivered by about A.D. 400, if not earlier, and that Jacobus received the office of *magister equitum* subsequent to this, I have some misgivings about the treatment afforded the earlier career of Jacobus, and it is to this matter which I wish to draw attention here.

Whereas Vanderspoel is careful to distinguish between the rank attributed to Jacobus in the heading of Vigilius' letter to Chrysostom and the internal evidence of the letter itself in this matter he does not subject *carm. min. 50* to the same scrutiny.³ Nowhere does he explain why within this work entitled 'In Jacobum Magistrum Equitum' Claudian addresses Jacobus as *dux*.⁴ These were two distinct military ranks and some explanation ought to be forthcoming on this point. It seems to me that the most obvious explanation of this discrepancy lies in a distinction between the real and dramatic dates of this work. Claudian is addressing Jacobus at that stage in his career

¹ J. Vanderspoel, 'Claudian, Christ and the Cult of the Saints', *CQ* 36 (1986), 244–55.

² T. Ruinart, *Acta Martyrum* (Ratisbon, 1859), pp. 626–30.

³ J. Vanderspoel, art. cit., p. 248.

⁴ 1.2, 'ne laceres versus, dux Iacobe, meos', repeated again as 1.14. The matter is touched upon by G. Brummer, 'Wer war Jacobus? Zur Deutung von Claudian *C.M.* 50', *BZ* 65 (1972), 339–52, p. 349, but ignored by *PLRE II*, pp. 581–2. T. D. Barnes, 'Late Roman Prosopography: between Theodosius and Justinian', *Phoenix* 37 (1983), 248–70, p. 267 corrects *PLRE II* in the date it attributes to the translation of the relics by Jacobus but fails to tackle the more fundamental problems of Jacobus' rank and the exact nature of the role he played in this translation of relics.