

813-15

844-5

1051-2

πλήν R: πλέον Stephanus: πλήν... λόγων del. Markland

Markland's unease is understandable, and he may have been right to suggest excising the words in question; they can be understood well enough as an early reader's intensification of Maximus' point. If they are retained, however, some change is necessary. 'Or rather, none of his contemporaries, *except* for us of later generations' does not make outstandingly good sense. Stephanus' attempt at a remedy still leaves some awkwardness: 'Socrates thought that ... the city of Athens would derive little benefit – or rather that none of his contemporaries would benefit more than us in later generations' – why 'more' rather than 'nearly so much as'? I would suggest that what Maximus actually wrote was *πλὴν ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἔπειτα*, 'none of his contemporaries, *but rather* we in later generations'; the corruption will have arisen when a scribe mistook the conjunction for the preposition. *πλὴν* used so bluntly as a synonym of *ἀλλά* is admittedly a fairly low and late usage (e.g. Luke 23.28, 12.31; Plotinus 1.6.9.43, 2.4.14.27) but this would not be unparalleled in the text of the *Dialexeis* (see e.g. 2.27.7, and for post-classical usages in the *Dialexeis* in general, K. Dürr, 'Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu den Dialexeis des Maximus von Tyrus' (= *Philologus* Supplementband 8 (1899), 1–156), esp. 9ff. and 70ff.).

(2) 22.268.10

τὸ γάρ τοι... ταῦτα μὲν ἐπιθεῖναι ταῖς τραπέζαις..., ἔπαινος δὲ τοὺς δαιτυμόνας ἐν τοσαύταις ἡδοναῖς ἀκρωμένους τοῦ αἰδοῦ σπουδῇ εὐσχήμονά τινα ἔοικεν εὐωχίαν διηγείσθαι ἡμῖν,...

ἔπαινος δὲ R: ἐπαινεῖν ed. pr.

The correction in the *editio princeps* seems along the right lines, but an aorist infinitive is required to parallel *ἐπιθεῖναι*. Read therefore *ἐπαινέσαι* δέ. The loss of *AI* and the change of *E* to *O* in *EPIAINECAIΔE* is easily understood.

(3) 22.269.14

εἰ γάρ τις ἐθέλοι παραβαλεῖν τὴν ἐκ μελῶν ἡδονὴν τῇ τῶν λόγων, εἰκοίαι ἂν ὁ μὲν λόγος σιτίοις, τὸ δὲ μέλος ὀδμαῖς· ὣν τὰ μὲν εἰς ὑποτροφὴν προσφορώτατα, ὀδμὴ δὲ καὶ ἐνοδμὴ κιβδηλότατον ἐν χρήμα καὶ ἐν τροφῇ ἀσθενέστατον.

καὶ ἐνοδμὴ R: καὶ εὐδομῇ Markland | ἐν R del. Schenkl: ἐστι U recc.: ἐν <ἡδονῇ> Hobein

There are three problems with the text transmitted by R, all concerning the second of the two cola in the sentence. (1) The curious *καὶ ἐνοδμὴ* following *ὀδμὴ* δέ: can this really be the adjective *ἐνοδμος*, as at Nicander, *Theriaca* 41, wrongly accented and applied to an odour itself rather than its source? (2) The bare *ἐν* between *κιβδηλότατον* and *χρήμα*. And (3) the imbalance, unusual for Maximus, between the two superlatives *κιβδηλότατον* and *ἐν τροφῇ ἀσθενέστατον*. Starting from the last point, Hobein is surely right that the words *ἐν ἡδονῇ* would be welcome somewhere in the second colon to balance and contrast with *ἐν τροφῇ*. Compare for example *Dial.* 34.393.2, *καὶ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἄπιστος καὶ ἐν εὐτυχίᾳ ἀκροσφαλής*. Hobein's favoured solution, however, though it also neatly accounts for the stray *ἐν*, can offer no explanation for the omission of *ἡδονῇ* at the position chosen for it, and leaves untouched the unsatisfactory *ἐνοδμὴ*. Markland's suggestion, in its turn, tackles the latter with characteristic elegance, but falls short of complete conviction: *εὐδο(σ)μέω* is a rare word, and the qualification that results from its insertion is not obviously essential to Maximus' argument. The simple contrast between smells of any and all kinds on the one hand and solidly nourishing food on the other is enough; we do not positively need the qualification 'even if fragrant'. Besides, Markland's conjecture leaves untouched the imbalance between the two concluding superlatives. As an

alternative, then, to both Hobein and Markland, I would suggest emending ἐνοδμή to ἐν ἡδονῇ (close both in letter-forms and in sound) and accepting Schenkl's deletion of the ἐν before χρήμα, as a confusion arising from the similar syllables on either side of it. We would then have both the comprehensive rejection of mere odour that Maximus' argument requires, and a characteristically balanced antithesis to express it. ὁδμή δὲ καὶ ἐν ἡδονῇ κιβδηλότατον χρήμα καὶ ἐν τροφῇ ἀσθενέστατον: (solid food is unquestionably valuable for the nourishment it provides,) whereas odours are not even reliably pleasant, let alone nourishing.

(4) 22.274.19

τίς ἂν οὖν γένοιτο ψυχαῖς εὐωχία λόγων ταύτης προσηνεστέρα; χαλεπὸν μὲν εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀντιτάξασθαι πολλῶ καὶ γενναίῳ λογοποιῶ, ῥητέον δὲ ὁμῶς ὅτι καλὴ μὲν ὕμῶν ἡ ἁρμονία...

πολλοῖς καὶ γενναίοις λογοποιῶις Meiser

Some change is clearly called for, and Meiser is right to notice the second-person plural following soon after the disputed phrase, but the corruption he posits is an odd one. It is worth considering the possibility that a word has fallen out, and that we should read πολλῶ καὶ γενναίῳ λογοποιῶν < >. As a candidate for the missing word, I would suggest <χορῶ>, which is frequently used as a mannered synonym for 'group' or 'crowd': compare for instance *Dialexeis* 4.51.16 and 17.215.10, or Plato, *Protagoras* 315b.

(5) 25.306.5

ἡδιστον ἦν θέαμα ὁ Ἀχιλλεύς (πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἔμελλεν;), <ἀλλ' add. Renehan> οὐ διὰ τὴν ξάνθην κόμην· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Εὐφορβὸς εὐκόμης ἦν, τῷ δὲ Ἀχιλλεῖ τὸ καλὸν ἡδιστον ἦν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐξαπτόμενον. ἡδιστον ἐν (Davies μὲν R) ποταμοῖς θέαμα ὁ Νεῖλος, ἀλλ' οὐ δι' ἀφθονίαν ὕδατος· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἴστρος εὐρύς (Acciaiuoli: εὐνῶς R): ἀλλὰ ὁ Ἴστρος οὐ γόνιμος, ὁ δὲ Νεῖλος γόνιμος. ἡδιστον θέαμα ὁ Νεῖλος, ἀλλ' οὐ τολμῶ παραπεμφάμενος τὴν ἀρετὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡδονὴν αὐτῷ ἐπιφημίσαι. ἐγὼ καὶ τῶν Φειδίου ἀγαλμάτων αἰσθάνομαι μὲν τῆς ἡδονῆς, ἐπαινῶ δὲ τὴν τέχνην· καὶ τῆς Ὀμήρου ᾠδῆς συνίημι μὲν τῆς ἡδονῆς, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν σεμνοτέρων αὐτῇ ἐπαινῶ.

ὁ Νεῖλος at the beginning of the third sentence here is likely to be corrupt. The logic of this enumeration of parallel cases leads us to expect a new item after the third ἡδιστον, just as new items followed each of the first two. Equally, the parallelism of expression between the cases of Achilles and the Nile ('A is pleasant, but not for quality b, because C too has b; what C lacks, and A possesses, is d') leads us to expect no more about the Nile after the words ὁ δὲ Νεῖλος γόνιμος. What then should be substituted for the second ὁ Νεῖλος? We require the name of a god (θεοῦ), who can plausibly be said both to be the fairest object of contemplation and to possess essential ἀρετή; we might also expect him to be a god who stands to gods in general as Achilles does to heroes and the Nile does to rivers. This last consideration strongly suggests that the true reading is ὁ Ζεὺς. For the idea of Zeus' supreme beauty, compare *Dial.* 11.130.10ff.: καταγέλαστος ἢ ἀπόκρισις, κἂν εἰ μειζόνως χαρ-ακτηρίζοις τὸν Δία, κυανὰς μὲν ὀφρύας, χρυσὰς δὲ χαίτας, ἐλελιζόμενον δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τὸν οὐρανόν. πάντα γὰρ που τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀπορία ὄψεως καὶ ἀσθενεῖα δηλώνουσιν καὶ γνώμης ἀμβλύτητι, ἐφ' ὅσον δύνανται ἕκαστοι ἐξαιρόμενοι τῇ φαντασίᾳ πρὸς τὸ κάλλιστον δοκοῦν <lac. statt. edd.> καὶ φιλόσοφοι καταμαν-τεύονται. Admittedly, the assumption in this further passage is that Zeus' beauty isn't and can't be a literal θέαμα; but then why should not ἡδιστον θέαμα in 25.306.5 too refer to intellectual rather than physical contemplation? Note also that restoring

the name of Zeus to the position suggested provides a bridge to the following sentence: from Zeus himself to the most celebrated sculptor of his image.

(6) 26.319.2

οὗτός σοι πολιτείας τρόπος, οὐκ ἐν Πειραιεὶ πλαττόμενος οὐδὲ ἐν Κρήτῃ νομοθετούμενος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ προφάσει ἥρωικῇ ὑπὸ φιλοσόφου δεικνύμενος, δι' οἰκονομίας ἥρωικῆς.

ἥρωικῇ R: ἥθικῇ Markland: ποιητικῇ Meiser

The subject is Homer's description of the Shield of Achilles. Markland's and Meiser's corrections to ἥρωικῇ are misplaced: Homer *does* exploit a story of heroes to convey his philosophical teaching. The word that needs to be changed is instead ἥρωικῆς at the end of the sentence, and it is there that Meiser's suggestion finds its true home: δι' οἰκονομίας ποιητικῆς – for Homer's philosophical message and his heroic story are indeed 'arranged' in verse.

(7) 28.333.8

εἰ δὲ ἐν τῷ παρόντι διεστασίασται (U: διεστησιαντε R) πρὸς ἐαυτὴν ἢ τέχνην, μήπω σοι τοῦτο θαυμαστόν φανῇ, πρὶν ἂν μοι δείξῃς καὶ τὴν τέχνην μίαν τε οὖσαν καὶ ἡθροισμένην, ἀλλ' οὐ διαλαχούσαν τοῦ σώματος τὰ χωρία ἄλλην ἄλλο τι...

The τέχνην to which Maximus initially refers here is the venerable art of the centaur Chiron that produced health in soul and body simultaneously. This is contrasted with (degenerate) modern medicine, which treats the body in isolation from the soul, and breaks down itself into a further plurality of limited specialisms. Given this line of thought τέχνην in πρὶν ἂν μοι δείξῃς καὶ τὴν τέχνην cannot be right. Read instead καὶ τὴν ἱατρικὴν: 'do not be surprised if Chiron's art has come to be divided in two, given that modern medicine has split into even more segments'. (The alternative, καὶ τὴν <ἱατρικὴν> τέχνην, though possible, sits less well, given that we already have one occurrence of τέχνην, with a different reference, earlier in the sentence.)

(8) 29.343.19

[If people in general did not hope to better their lot by their own efforts, they would all have given up long ago:] οὐ γὰρ ἂν οὔτε οἱ κόλακες πράγματα εἶχον τὰς τῶν πλουσίων (Markland: πλησίων R) ἐπιθυμίας θεραπεύοντες, οὔτε οἱ βωμολοχοὶ τῶν θαμῶν καὶ γελώτων ἐκθηρώμενοι γενέσεις τε καὶ ἀγωγάς,...

τῶν θαμῶν R θυμηδίων vel εὐθυμίων Koniaris

What Maximus must have written is τωθασμῶν.

(9) 30.351.5

τῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ μόνῳ δυσθήρατον τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ δύσληπτον καὶ ἀμφισβητήσιμον, καὶ οὐδεμία πω ἐξεύρηται τέχνη, ὅφ' ἥς παιδευθὲν (Reiske: παιδευθείη R) τοῦτ' ἐπὶ γένος οὐ παρέξει (Reiske: γὰρ ἔξει R) τοῖς σοφισταῖς προφάσεις (Markland: πρόφασιν R) λόγων καὶ διαφωνίας (Markland: διαγωνίας R) καὶ ἐριδος (Markland: οιδας R), οὐδὲ ἀφαιρήσει αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐλπίδα τοῦ τέλους, οὐδὲ προήσεται τὴν σωτηρίαν, ...;

A very corrupt passage, suggesting a badly damaged exemplar or an unsettled scribe (both suggestions that gain force when it is remembered that this *dialexis* stands at the head of the sequence presented in R). My concern here is with the words ἀφαιρήσει αὐτοῦ. If Markland's and Reiske's corrections earlier on in the sentence are even approximately correct, then what is required is a verb in the future tense, with τοῦτ' ἐπὶ γένος as its subject, parallel to παρέξει and προήσεται before and after it, and

meaning ‘lose’ or ‘abandon’. I would suggest ἀφαιρεθήσεται, to replace *both* ἀφαιρήσει *and* αὐτοῦ. But it may be that the truth is buried deeper than this.

(10) 30.358.16

οὐχ ὅρας τοὺς μνηστήρας νεανικαῖς ἡδοναῖς συγγιγνομένους, πίνοντας αἶγας κατέδοντας καὶ σιαλῶν σύων (Koniaris: καὶ παλο cum lacuna R) ἐμπιμπλαμένους καὶ (...lacuna 4–5 litt....) οιακούντας καὶ...

καὶ παλο R a.c. ἀπαλῶν ἐρίφων R p.c. (man. post.)

οιακούντας R a.c. αὐλῶν ἀκούοντας R p.c. (man. post.)

The corrections in R are the work of a relatively late hand (twelfth century?) filling in gaps left by the original scribe; neither has any worth. Professor Koniaris’s alternative for the first, drawn from *Odyssey* 14.81 and *Dialexeis* 14.175.10, is clearly correct. For the latter, I would suggest that the obvious thing for the suitors to be listening to is a bard (the unwilling Phemius). In which case, read ἀοιδοῦ ἀκούοντας.

(11) 32.373.4

...τὴν ἡδονὴν..., ἧς εἵνεκα ἂν τις καὶ θάνατον ἀλλάξαιτο...καὶ ἄλλα μυρία δυσχερῆ. κἂν γὰρ ἄλλο ἄλλω ἐπιτιθῆς (U: ἐπιτι ἧς R) ὄνομα τῆς τούτων ἀσ, Ἀχιλλεῖ μὲν ἀποθνήσκοντι ἐκόντι καὶ τιμωροῦντι ἀποθάνοντι τῷ Πατρόκλῳ φιλίαν, Ἀγαμέμνονι δὲ ἀγρυπνοῦντι...βασιλείαν..., πάντα ταῦτα ἐρεῖς ἡδονῶν ὀνόματα.

ἀσ R a.c. U a.c.: ἀρετῆς R p.c.: ἀξίας U p.c.: αἰτίας I

The scribes of both R and U left lacunae, which other hands later tried to fill. None of their suggestions conveys the right sense for this context. What is logically required is a word for ‘return’: ‘even if you use different words in different cases for the return people get for these toils of theirs, you will still only be using different words for pleasure.’ We should therefore read ἀμοιβῆς, or perhaps ἀλλαγῆς.

(12) 34.398.4

εἴτα ἡδονῆς μὲν ἔσται κόρος, εὐτυχημάτων δὲ οὐκ ἔσται κόρος; εἰς μὲν, οἶμαι, σιτίων καὶ μέθης ἀνιαρότερος.

εἰς μὲν R: ἔστιν Dübner

Some change is certainly needed. Dübner’s suggestion makes acceptable sense, though the change in tense might be felt to jar slightly. As an alternative, I would suggest ἐγὼ μὲν οἶμαι,... – slightly closer to the *paradosis* palaeographically, and also giving a very appropriate sense. For this idiom in the *Dialexeis*, compare 13.159.4 and 15.184.15–16.

(13) 36.413.4

καλεῖ δὴ Ζεὺς Προμηθέα καὶ αὐτῷ προστάττει κατανεῖμαι τῇ γῇ ἀποικίαν, ζῶον ἀπλοῦν, κατὰ μὲν τὴν γνώμην ἐγγύτατα ἡμῖν τοῖς θεοῖς, τὸ δὲ σῶμα αὐτῷ (Markland: αὐτῶν R) ἔστω...

ἀπλοῦν R: ἄπτιλον Reiske: δίπουν Meiser

Reiske and Meiser were right to be suspicious of ἀπλοῦν but their solutions (Reiske’s especially, based on [Plato] *Defin.* 415a) are more ingenious than convincing. I suspect a simple black-for-white error, and would suggest διπλοῦν: man is a two-fold creature, compounded of an earth-bound body and a soul that is close kin to the gods. For the form of expression, compare *Dial.* 26.314.2ff.: ταύτῃ μοι καὶ τὰ Ὀμήρου

σκόπει, ὡς ἔστι χρήμα διπλοῦν, κατὰ μὲν τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐντεταμένον εἰς μύθου σχῆμα, κατὰ δὲ φιλοσοφίαν εἰς ζῆλον ἀρετῆς καὶ ἀληθείας γνώσιν συντεταγμένον.

(14) 37.432.21

τὰ δὲ τούτων ἀρχαιότερα εἰς τί χρὴ λέγειν; Ὅρφεὺς ἐκείνος ἦν μὲν Οἰάγρου παῖς καὶ Καλλιόπης αὐτῆς,...

εἰς τί R: εἶ τι Combes: τί Koniaris

What follows is in fact a rather long discussion of ‘more ancient’ examples, which makes Koniaris’s suggestion of a formula of *praeteritio* inappropriate. Combes is nearer the mark, but the τί still jars. I would suggest instead τὰ δὲ τούτων ἀρχαιότερα ἔτι εἰ χρὴ λέγειν, κτλ.

(15) 37.436.5–6

[Geometry is like Athena’s invention, the ship, which opens a new dimension of experience to previously land-locked humanity.] τοῦτο καὶ περὶ γεωμετρίας λέγει τις θεῶν, ἡ ἐκείνη ἢ θεός, ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ λέγει· “ἐκεῖσε βλέψον...”

λέγει (1) R: λέγοι Markland: λέγει (2) del. Heinsius

Heinsius was right to delete the second λέγει, which is clumsy and superfluous. Even with the deletion, however, the sentence remains somewhat lame: ‘the same can be said about geometry by some god, or that same goddess, Athena.’ We can inject some welcome vigour by changing the punctuation and a couple of accents: ... λέγει – τίς θεῶν; ἡ ἐκείνη ἢ θεός, ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ; – “ἐκεῖσε βλέψον...” – ‘the same can be said about geometry by – which god now? Should it be that same goddess, Athena? – “Look hither...”’. For the form of expression, compare *Dial.* 26.307.7–9 and Plato, *Phaedrus* 236d.

(16) 38.444.7

τὸ θεῖον πάντως ποι τίθεσαι τελεώτατον καὶ αὐταρκέστατον καὶ ἰσχυρότατον·

ποι R: γε Koniaris

A better solution would be που, ‘I assume’, ‘I take it’; Maximus is trying to state an uncontroversial starting-point before the more difficult argument begins. For parallel usages, see for example *Dial.* 11.129.8, 21.260.15, 18.

(17) 39.452.14

ἡ δ’ αὖ νόσος τί ἄλλο ἐστὶν ἢ διάλυσις καὶ ταραχὴ τῆς ἐν σώματι ἐκχειρίας, ἐπειδὴ αὐτὴς συμπεσόντα ἀλλήλοις τὰ τε ὥσπερ ἡρμοσμένα πολεμῇ...;

τὰ τε ὥσπερ ἡρμοσμένα R: τὰ τέωςπερ ἡρμοσμένα U: τὰ τέως προηρμοσμένα Scaliger

Scaliger was nearly right, but there is in fact no need to try and preserve any semblance of the -περ in R’s ὥσπερ. τὰ τέως ἡρμοσμένα gives exactly the sense required, and the residue can be explained as the product of a simple misreading. The scribe responsible saw ΤΕΩΧΗΡΜΟCΜΕΝΑ and took -ΩCΗΡ- for -ΩCΠΕΡ-.

(18) 41.482.5

ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἔδει γῆν γενέσθαι μὲν ἔγκαρπον καὶ ζωοτρόφον καὶ πολυθρέμωνα, ἔχειν δὲ ἐν αὐτῇ κακὰ ἔνδον καθεργμένα, ἐξεληλαμένα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, εἰς τὸν δεῦρο (Markland: δεύτερον R) τόπον ἐμίγη. θεὸς δὲ πολλὰς καὶ παντοδαπὰς ζῶων κληρουχίας,...

θεὸς δὲ R p.c.: θεὸς R a.c.: θεὸς δὲ <ἐποίησε> Meiser: κληρουχίας <ἔκτισε> vel <ἐγέννησε> Davies

Meiser's and Davies's conjectures address the need for a transitive verb to govern κληρουχίας, but they leave a second problem untouched. If the passage is to make any sense as it stands, the subject of ἐμίγη in the previous sentence has to be supplied, rather awkwardly, from κακά, and even then the overall run of thought is not of the smoothest. The key to something better, I suspect, is to suppose that the early correction in R, from θεὸς to θεὸς δὲ, is itself a mistake, and that there should be no sentence break between ἐμίγη and θεός. If this is so, then it also follows that ἐμίγη must be corrupt, since (as already noted) a transitive verb is needed to govern κληρουχίας; and besides, the notion of God becoming entangled in the physical world is entirely unwanted in such a Platonizing passage as this one. What then should be read in place of ἐμίγη? ἐμείγνυ would be close in sound, but an aorist would sit better than an imperfect; perhaps then ἔμιξε or (as Donald Russell suggests to me) ἐνέμιξε. Alternatively, drawing on a parallel passage in *Dial.* 36 (413.4), ἐνέμιμε.

King's College London

M. B. TRAPP

THE TEXT OF *PERVIGILIUM VENERIS* 74

The extant MSS. of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, which all derive from a single archetype,¹ are unanimous in their reading at line 74. Yet, as is widely agreed, this reading cannot be correct. The poet is describing the descendants of Venus:

ipsa Troianos nepotes in Latinos transtulit;	
ipsa Laurentem puellam coniugem nato dedit;	70
moxque Marti de sacello dat pudicam virginem;	
Romuleas ipsa fecit cum Sabinis nuptias,	
unde Ramnes et Quirites proque prole posterum	
†Romuli matrem† crearet et nepotem Caesarem.	74

It was she who made Latins of her Trojan descendants, she who gave the girl of Laurentum as wife to her son; soon afterwards from the sanctuary she gave the chaste virgin to Mars. It was she who made the marriage of Romulus' men with the Sabines, that, from their union, she might create the Ramnes, the Quirites, and, for later generations, †the mother of Romulus† and Caesar, the grandson.²

Romuli matrem makes no sense in what is otherwise a clear chronological sequence from the ancient Trojans to 'Caesar': the Ramnes and Quirites, themselves the offspring of Romulus' army, cannot also be the distant ancestors of Romulus' mother. Emendation is unavoidable. Catlow discusses the various restorations that have been suggested, and rightly concludes that none of them is satisfactory. He agrees with the consensus view (adopted by Lipsius, Wernsdorf, Clementi and Schilling) that, whatever the exact wording of the poet's original line 74, the line's meaning was 'that she might create Julius Caesar and Augustus'. Catlow summarizes: 'In this line reference is probably made to Julius and Augustus Caesar, but the

¹ The tradition of the MSS. is discussed by L. Catlow in his edition of the poem: *Pervigilium Veneris: Collection Latomus* 172 (Brussels, 1980), pp. 7–17.

² I cite here the text and the translation of Catlow, op. cit.