

THE TEXT OF THE HERMETIC LITERATURE

THE TEXT OF THE HERMETIC LITERATURE
AND THE TENDENCIES OF ITS MAJOR COLLECTIONS

By

JOHN F. HORMAN, M.A.

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

November 1973

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1973)
(Religious Sciences)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: The Text of the Hermetic Literature and the Tendencies of
Its Major Collections

AUTHOR: John F. Horman, B.A. (Waterloo Lutheran)
B.D. (Waterloo Lutheran)
M.A. (McMaster University)

SUPERVISOR: Professor B. F. Meyer

NUMBER OF PAGES: xix, 349

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RESEARCH

Among the writings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus, the most interesting are those which deal with topics of a religious or philosophical nature. These writings, once believed to be the wisdom of ancient Egypt, are now more commonly thought to have originated within the Greek speaking part of the Roman empire, but at a date which, as we shall see, remains in dispute. Thus we have in the movement responsible for these writings one of the competitors of Christianity.

This dissertation deals with two sources for these religious or philosophical Hermetic writings, the Corpus Hermeticum and the fragments given in Stobaeus' Anthology. These two collections form a natural starting point, since it is the Corpus Hermeticum which has attracted the most attention from students of the Hermetic movement, and since many of the Stobaeian fragments overlap to a large degree with the documents of the Corpus Hermeticum. The question discussed in this dissertation is basic to any further discussion of the material: How reliable are these collections both as witnesses to the text of the writings of the Hermetic movement and as witnesses to the movement which gave us those texts? Any discussion of these writings must presuppose an answer to this question. As this question has not previously received disciplined treatment, it is hoped that the results of this dissertation will provide a sounder basis for future studies in these writings.

The answer given in this dissertation is somewhat complicated. Neither collection is in itself a reliable witness to the Hermetic

movement. The Corpus Hermeticum, it will be seen, is a late compilation, and is to be dated between the ninth and the eleventh century. The quality of the transmission of the text of the documents included in the Corpus Hermeticum is very uneven; moreover, some of the documents were wrongly included. There is, however, no deliberate attempt to give a false picture of these writings. Therefore, if the Corpus Hermeticum is used critically, it is possible to gain a reasonably accurate picture both of the text of these writings and of the movement which produced them. The tractates which are useful in that respect are ii, iv, v, vi, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiv, and (with reservations) xiii.

The Stobaeon fragments, on the other hand, seem to be quite unreliable in both respects. Not only do they have their share of manuscript errors, but it would appear that certain Hermetic doctrines, notably the doctrine that apotheosis is the proper goal of man, are systematically excluded. In addition, there is good reason to believe that the style of the Hermetic writings is emended in the Stobaeon fragments. The most probable explanation of these facts is that Stobaeus was using a Christian anthology of Hermetic writings. Therefore the Stobaeon fragments must be used with great caution as evidence for the writings of the Hermetic movement. In tractates in which these two sources overlap, it is the Corpus Hermeticum which is the more trustworthy, apart from manuscript errors. Accordingly, Nock's edition of tractates ii, iv, and x needs revision.

ABSTRACT

Two major sources of the Hermetic literature are assessed for reliability in this dissertation, the Corpus Hermeticum and Stobaeus' Anthology. Included in this assessment are both the accuracy of the text given by those two collections and the accuracy of the picture which those two collections give of the religious movement responsible for the Hermetic writings. It is discovered that the Corpus Hermeticum does not in itself provide an accurate picture. Reasons are given to suggest that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled in the Byzantine period, between the ninth and the eleventh century, at a time when the movement responsible for the Hermetic writings is likely to have become extinct. Much of the material in the Corpus Hermeticum, moreover, seems not to have been the product of the movement responsible for the bulk of the religious and philosophical Hermetic writings. However, there is no evidence of deliberate alteration of this material. Therefore the Corpus Hermeticum, if used critically, can provide a reasonably reliable picture of the Hermetic movement. Typical tractates include C. H. ii, iv, v, vi, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, xiv, and (with reservations) xiii.

Stobaeus' material, on the other hand, suffers not only from textual corruption, but also from deliberate alterations. Central Hermetic doctrines, notably the doctrine that apotheosis is the proper goal of man, are systematically excluded. The style of these writings, moreover, seems to have been revised in the Stobaeian fragments. It is suggested that the most probable explanation of these facts is that

Stobaeus was using a Christian anthology as his source for Hermetic fragments. In those instances in which the text of Stobaeus overlaps with the text of the Corpus Hermeticum, the text of the Corpus Hermeticum is normally to be preferred, apart from manuscript errors. As a result, Nock's edition of tractates ii, iv and x should be revised.

In the process of examining the range of possibilities with respect to the treatment of classical authors in Stobaeus, Stobaeian fragments from Xenophon, Plato, Herodotus, Homer, Theocritus, and Epictetus are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation was undertaken in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at McMaster University. Accordingly, I must thank the Department of Religious Sciences at McMaster both for acceptance of my candidacy and for guidance and support in carrying out these requirements. I must also express in this place my gratitude to the Canada Council for material assistance during the completion of a large part of this project. While it would scarcely be possible to enumerate all those who have assisted in one way or another during my studies, I may perhaps mention here those who have participated directly in the supervision of this dissertation, that is, my supervisor, Dr. B. F. Meyer of the Department of Religious Sciences, Dr. E. P. Sanders, also of the Department of Religious Sciences, and Dr. P. Kingston, of the Department of Classics. In addition, I must thank Dr. W. J. Slater of the Department of Classics, who has read and criticised a large part of this dissertation.

I may also here thank Mrs. Ruth Ard, who has not only typed my thesis very accurately, but has saved me from stylistic boners. In addition, I may thank my wife, Magdalene, and my children for their patience while I have been involved with this task.

John Horman

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation grew out of a desire to understand the relationship between the Hermetic literature and early Christianity. This problem, first raised in the early seventeenth century by Isaac Casaubon, who held that the author was a "semi-Christian,"¹ and debated in a desultory manner during the late eighteenth and nineteenth century,² was raised in a radical manner at the beginning of this century by R. Reitzenstein, who declared that the Poimandres, that is, Tractate i of the Corpus Hermeticum, was, in an earlier, more complete form, a source for the Pastor Hermae, therefore no later than the first century A.D.,³ and

¹I. Casaubon, Exercitationes XVI, ad Cardinalis Baronii Prolegomena in Annales (Londini, MDCXIIII), pp. 51-65.

²Dieterich Tiedemann, in Hermes Trismegist, Poemander, tr. D. Tiedemann (Berlin und Stettin: Friedrich Nicolai, 1781), p. vi, intro., concurred, calling the author of the Poimandres a Half-Christian Gnostic; so also J. D. Chambers, tr., The theological and philosophical works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neoplatonist (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882), gave an extremely turgid translation from the viewpoint that "Hermes" was a Christian apologist; on the other side, L. F. O. Baumgarten-Crusius, De librorum Hermeticorum origine atque indole (Jenae: Prostat in Libraria Braniana, 1827), p. 7f., held that the Hermetic writings were anti-Christian, coming from the school of Porphyry; both R. Ménard, in Hermès Trismégiste, tr. R. Ménard, 2nd. ed. (Paris: Librairie Académique. Didier et C^e, Libraires éditeurs, 1867), pp. lvi-lviii, intro., and B. J. Hilgers, De Hermetis Trismegisti Poimandro Commentatio (Bonnae: Litteris G. Georgianis, 1855), p. 17, apparently independently, ascribed the Poimandres to Philo's Therapeutae.

³R. Reitzenstein, Poimandres (Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1966; reprinted from the edition of Leipzig, 1904), p. 32.

indeed was itself related to the so-called "Memphis Theology,"¹ a document which, although transmitted to us only on a stele dated to the eighth century B.C., is thought on linguistic grounds to be much earlier.² Accordingly, the Poimandres, in Reitzenstein's view, was influential in the development of early Christianity, and was itself related to a very early stage of Egyptian religion.

Not everyone who has followed Reitzenstein has accepted his chronology. His account of the relationship between the Poimandres and the Pastor Hermae was soon attacked by G. Bardy.³ J. Kroll, on the basis of an examination of the teachings of the Corpus Hermeticum, found that a date earlier than the middle of the second century A.D. was out of the question.⁴ W. Scott, using the same method, found that the majority of the Hermetic documents were written in the second and third century A.D.⁵ Similarly, A.-J. Festugière assumes a date no earlier than the second or

¹Ibid., p. 67. Reitzenstein later came to consider Iranian influences to lie at the root of the basic concepts of the Poimandres. See below, p. 157, n. 2.

²Reitzenstein, on the authority of Breasted, believed the text to be eight centuries older than our exemplar, ibid., p. 60, n. 1; J. A. Wilson, however in the introduction to his translation of this text in The Ancient Near Eastern Texts, ed. J. B. Pritchard (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1955, 2nd. edition), p. 4, believes it to have been composed two thousand years before our exemplar.

³G. Bardy, "Le Pasteur d'Hermas et les livres hermétiques" Revue Biblique, N.S., VIII (1911) 391-407.

⁴J. Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. XII, Heft 2-4;" Münster i. W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914), p. 389.

⁵Hermetica, tr. and ed. W. Scott (4 vols.; Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924-1936), I, 10.

third century A.D.¹ Others have, however, accepted Reitzenstein's dating of the Poimandres, as for example F.-N. Klein,² and C. H. Dodd (who regards Valentinus as the terminus ante quem)³. As a result, Reitzenstein's dating remains in dispute.

It is probable that the question of dating, and other questions concerning the relationship between the Hermetic literature and early Christianity, might more easily be resolved if we knew more about the development of the Hermetic literature. This question, while discussed to some degree in the nineteenth century,⁴ was first given disciplined treatment by R. Reitzenstein. He postulated two communities, a schismatic Poimandres-community founded by the author of the original document behind C. H. i, and a Hermes-community from which it had separated. These two communities were re-united in the second century, as can be seen from C. H. xiii. The Corpus Hermeticum was an apologia for the re-united community, compiled for the emperor Diocletian according to the plan indicated in the Kore Kosmou, Stobaeon fragment xxiii.6,7 (Nock).

¹A.-J. Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste (4 vols.; 3rd ed.; "Études Bibliques;" Paris: Librairie LeCoffre, 1950-1954); although Festugière does not argue specifically for any date, his introduction to volume one clearly presupposes the date indicated.

²F.-N. Klein, Die Lichtterminologie bei Hilon von Alexandrien und in den Hermetischen Schriften (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1962), p. 82.

³C. H. Dodd, The interpretation of the fourth Gospel (Cambridge: At the University Press, 1968 = 1953), p. 12, n. 2.

⁴In addition to the works discussed above, p. 1, n. 2, we may point to the indications given by Tiedemann, op. cit., that many of the tractates in the Corpus Hermeticum are incomplete.

C. H. xviii was, according to this plan, a concluding address made to capture the benevolence of the intended recipient.¹

This outline has generally been disbelieved. The Hermetic documents have been divided by Zielinski,² Bousset,³ Bräuninger,⁴ and F.-N. Klein⁵ into two or more mutually exclusive groups. Clearly such a view creates difficulties for those who wish to believe in the existence of a Hermetic community. In any case, whether or not one accepts such a strict division of the tractates into mutually exclusive groups, it is difficult to avoid seeing, with Festugière, that the various tractates hold contradictory views on a number of subjects. He, for this reason, is also unwilling to believe in the existence of a Hermetic community which was responsible for the Corpus Hermeticum.⁶ C. H. Dodd also dismisses this notion.⁷ Reitzenstein's date for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum, while accepted by W. Kroll on the basis of a quotation by Zosimus,⁸ has been rejected both by W. Scott⁹ and by

¹Op. cit., pp. 190-214.

²Th. Zielinski, "Hermes und die Hermetik," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, VIII, 321-372.

³W. Bousset, "Besprechung von Krolls Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger CLXXVI (1914) 697-755.

⁴Fr. Bräuninger, Untersuchungen zu den Schriften des Hermes Trismegistos (Diss. Berlin, 1926).

⁵Klein, op. cit., p. 80 f.

⁶Festugière, op. cit., II, 5 ff. ⁷Dodd, op. cit., p. 12.

⁸W. Kroll s. v. "Hermes Trismegistos," R.E. VIII, 795.

⁹On the basis of a scholion ascribed to Michael Psellus, Scott regards the eleventh century A.D. as a probable terminus ante quem for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum.

Festugiere.¹ Klein's views in this regard are bewildering: he ascribes the present redaction of the Corpus to Psellus, but believes that Zosimus "hat allerdings vielleicht unsere oder eine der unseren weitgehend ähnliche Sammlung hermetischer Schriften gekannt."² But his views about the disunity of thought in the Corpus should perhaps suggest a fairly late date of composition, as Bräuninger saw.³

However, these questions can scarcely be answered until we have more information about the reliability of our sources for the Hermetic literature. Under the term "reliability," two separate but related questions are posed: 1) to what extent do our sources for the Hermetic literature present us with accurate texts? Under this question we must consider not only manuscript defects and errors in copying, but also, as we shall see, deliberate alterations of the text; 2) to what extent do our sources permit us an accurate picture of the original nature of the Hermetic literature? Do our sources, for example, give us a sufficiently reliable picture to enable us to answer the question whether there was a Hermetic movement which produced the Hermetic literature?

Now, questions about the reliability of sources arise naturally

¹Festugière considers the quotation from Zosimus, below, p. 8n.3 as insufficient evidence to assign such an early date to the Corpus Hermeticum, especially since Stobaeus, who, in Festugière's view, showed wide acquaintance with the Hermetic literature, does not cite the Corpus Hermeticum, op. cit. II, 2 f. Hence, he would place the date of the Corpus Hermeticum between the sixth and the eleventh century, II, '5.

²Op. cit., p. 82.

³Op. cit., p. 39 f. Bräuninger finds the time of Diocletian too early, that of Psellus too late.

in our study of any ancient religious movement or body of literature. Without denying the legitimacy of imaginative reconstruction, it must be affirmed that we are, in the final analysis, limited by the evidence at our disposal. In the case of the philosophical Hermetic literature, the question of reliability of sources is crucial because our sources are fairly haphazard in nature. Fortunately for us, most of these sources have been collected, first in the unserviceable edition of Walter Scott,¹ and then in a much more useful form in the edition of A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugière.²

These sources may be divided into five parts. Perhaps the best known of these is the Corpus Hermeticum, given in volume I and part of volume II of the Nock-Festugière edition. This is a collection of seventeen tractates, written in Greek. It is represented by manuscripts dating back to the fourteenth century.³ This collection will be the subject of our Part One.

Overlapping with this source to some degree are the fragments transmitted in the Anthologium of Joannes Stobaeus. These fragments, printed in volume III and part of volume IV of the Nock-Festugière edition, are the subject of Part Two of this dissertation.

Our third major source is the Asclepius, which survives in Latin,

¹See above, p. 3, n. 2. This edition is unserviceable because of the large number of arbitrary corrections made by Scott in the text.

²A. D. Nock, ed., and A.-J. Festugière, tr., Corpus Hermeticum (4 vols.; vols. I & II, 2nd. ed.; "Collection des Universités de France;" Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," vols. I & II, 1960, vols. III & IV, 1954).

³See Nock's discussion, ibid., p. xi ff., intro.

and is printed in the second part of volume II of the Nock-Festugière edition. This source overlaps only slightly with the Stobaeon fragments, and not at all with the Corpus Hermeticum. To be properly evaluated, it must be compared with the fourth major source, the Hermetic material in Coptic discovered at Nag Hammadi. This material, recently published by M. Krause and P. Labib, contains a great deal of material already known from the Asclepius,¹ as well as one tractate which shows a fascinating resemblance to C. H. xiii.² While it was not possible, because of considerations of time, to undertake this work in the course of this dissertation, it is hoped that such work will not long be delayed.

The final source for the Hermetic literature is made up of a group of miscellaneous fragments from various sources, mainly Christian. These are given in the second part of volume IV of the Nock-Festugière edition. While many of these fragments overlap with one or more of the above named sources, some have not been associated with any known Hermetic document.

This document will concern itself with the reliability of the first two above mentioned sources, the Corpus Hermeticum and the Stobaeon fragments. The choice of these two sources suggests itself because

¹M. Krause und P. Labib ed., Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und VI (Glückstadt: Verlag J. J. Augustin, 1971). Two separate tractates overlap with the Asclepius, "Das Gebet, das sie sprachen," VI.63.33-65.7 and "Asclepius," VI.65.8-78.43, pp. 185-206.

²Ibid., VI.52.1-63.32, pp. 170-184.

parts of tractates ii, iv, and x are also given by Stobaeus. The text of these fragments is not given separately by Nock and Festugière, but is integrated into the text of those tractates, so that, if one wishes to compare the text of Stobaeus with the text of those tractates, it is necessary to recover the two texts from Nock's apparatus. In this task the apparatus of Wachsmuth in the Wachsmuth-Hense edition of Stobaeus¹ serves as a useful supplement. This I have done below, pp. 280-334. When the two manuscript traditions are compared, it becomes clear that, while there is no doubt that both go back to the same documents, nevertheless the divergence between the two texts is far greater than can be explained on the basis of mere scribal error. Nock believes that the version given by Stobaeus is the more faithful, and that the text given in the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum "a été le résultat, non pas d'une copie mécanique, mais d'une reproduction assez libre de groupes de mots, où l'on a interchangé des mots et des phrases de même sens."² This view, if correct, would have serious implications for our evaluation of the two documents as sources for the Hermetic literature. While transpositions of the sort supposed by Walter Scott³ are scarcely supported by comparison of the two texts,⁴ it is evident that, if the text of the

¹Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium, ed. C. Wachsmuth & O. Hense (5 vols.; Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1884-1923, reprinted 1958).

²Nock, loc. cit., p. xliv, intro.; cf. pp. xli-xlvi, intro.

³Examples may be found on virtually every page of his text. As noted in his introduction, I, 24, he gives fair warning in the Greek text (but not in the translation) by his use of square and pointed brackets.

⁴Nock, loc. cit., p. xlii, n. 1.

Corpus Hermeticum has suffered corruption to such a degree, at the very least it furnishes an extremely untrustworthy witness to the text of the original documents. As will be seen, some doctrines present in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum are absent in the corresponding passages of Stobaeus. If the text of the Corpus Hermeticum has suffered such violence, then the Stobaeian fragments are a more reliable guide for the Hermetic literature, and the Corpus Hermeticum can be used only with caution, except when it can be supplemented from Stobaeus. However, as will be seen, there is, I believe, sufficient reason to suppose that the opposite is the case, and that it is Stobaeus' text which is a paraphrase.

However, it seems to me to be insufficient merely to say that the text of the Corpus Hermeticum is more reliable than the text of the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus. In addition, it seems necessary to say something about the nature of the documents, to show what sorts of variants may be expected in them. First it will be necessary to say something about the date and provenance of the Corpus Hermeticum. These questions are to some degree related. If the Corpus is as early as Reitzenstein supposed, then it is much more likely to be, as he suggested, the product of a community,¹ or as A. D. Nock believed probable, the work of "un dévot."² If on the other hand the Corpus was compiled at a later date, then Festugière's scepticism in this regard is justified. The date I propose is, as will be seen, very late. It is also necessary to say

¹See above, p. x f.

²Loc. cit., p. xlvii.

something about the quality of the transmission. I believe that it can be shown that the text of the Corpus Hermeticum suffers more from carelessness than from deliberate alterations. These considerations will all occupy Part One.

Part Two will concern the text of Stobaeus. But first, in order to investigate Stobaeus' credibility as a witness, it will be necessary to examine Stobaeus' treatment of other ancient authors. It will be seen from the selection given, that Stobaeus' treatment of these authors is quite variable, being quite reliable for Xenophon's Memorabilia, but absolutely unreliable for the Encheiridion of Epictetus. It will be necessary to investigate the causes for such variability before proceeding to a study of Stobaeus' treatment of the Hermetic literature. It will be found that the variants in tractates ii, iv, and x are by no means all arbitrary, but that many are best explained as showing signs of tendentious alterations on the part of Stobaeus, or, more likely his source. Many of these variants are best explained under the supposition that Stobaeus used a Christian collection of Hermetic documents revised and paraphrased for apologetic purposes.

No detailed study will be given here of the relation of the other three above mentioned sources to the Corpus Hermeticum. However, it is to be hoped that such work will not long be delayed. I believe that, when the mutual relationship of these documents is better understood, then we will be in a better position to undertake a history of the Hermetic documents, and will know more about the origins and development of that literature. Then we will perhaps be in a better position to see how that literature is related to early Christianity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Brief Description of Research	iii
Abstract	v
Acknowledgements	vii
Introduction	viii

Part I

THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

Chapter 1: The manuscripts	1
Chapter 2: The date of the formation of the <u>Corpus</u> <u>Hermeticum</u>	7
Chapter 3: The date of the formation of the <u>Corpus</u> <u>Hermeticum</u> : More evidence from the manuscripts	28
Chapter 4: The date of the formation of the <u>Corpus</u> <u>Hermeticum</u> : Evidence from the contents of the tractates.	98
Chapter 5: The date of the formation of the <u>Corpus</u> <u>Hermeticum</u> : The evidence of the non-typical tractates	148
Chapter 6: Conclusions to Part One	186

Part II

THE HERMETIC FRAGMENTS IN STOBÆUS

Chapter 1: Introduction	191
-------------------------	-----

Chapter 2: The position of the Hermetic fragments within Stobaeus	199
Chapter 3: Stobaeus' treatment of classical texts	204
Chapter 4: Stobaeus' treatment of the Hermetic literature	277
Chapter 5: Conclusions	341
Bibliography	345

PART I:

THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

CHAPTER I: THE MANUSCRIPTS

The best account of the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum is given by Nock in his introduction to the Nock-Festugière edition. It will be sufficient for our present purposes to summarize Nock's account, supplemented where necessary from Reitzenstein, Scott, and our own observations.

Nock, following Reitzenstein,¹ insists on the unity of the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum, which appears to go back to a single Byzantine archetype.² The reasons for this supposition are given by Nock on pages xiii-xv of his introduction; the strongest of these will furnish the starting point for our next chapter. Nock thinks that this archetype contained a number of variant readings; these are given on pages xiv f. Since many of the variants given there could easily be the result of conjecture, it is perhaps wise to maintain a certain agnosticism in that regard.

A list of the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum is given by Nock on pages xi and xii of his introduction. No useful purpose would be served by repeating his whole list here; however, it might prove useful to say something about those manuscripts which Nock finds the most valuable.

¹Op. cit., p. 319.

²In Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xiii.

They are:

- A. Laurentianus 71.33 (14th cent.; C. H. i-xiv)
- B. Parisinus gr. 1220 (mid 14th cent.; complete)
- C. Vaticanus gr. 237 (14th cent.; complete)
- M. Vaticanus gr. 951 (14th cent.; complete)
- D. Vindobonensis phil. 102 (15th cent.; complete)
- 1297. Parisinus 1297 (16th cent.; C. H. i-xiv)
- N. Neapolitanus II c 32 (14th-15th cent.; extracts).

Most of the other manuscripts can, according to Nock, be closely identified with one or another of the above.

A, the first of these, represents a relatively isolated textual tradition. Readings peculiar to A are given by Nock on page xvi. According to Nock, A was taken from an exemplar in which several letters in tractates i and xi had become illegible.¹ A group of manuscripts listed by Nock reproduces the peculiarities of A.² Apart from these, the text of A seems most closely related to that of N³ and of 1297,⁴ and also frequently to agree with B against CM.⁵

B has suffered greatly at the hands of a corrector, but nevertheless retains a few useful peculiar readings, which are given by Nock on page xvii. B tends to agree with A against CM, and with C against AM.⁶ The corrector or correctors of B use, apart from a rather fruitful imagination, a manuscript of the group d. B² or B^C was the source of many of the defects in Parthey's edition, since Parthey did not trouble to distinguish between B, B^C and B².

¹Ibid., p. xvi.

³See below, p. 4 f.

⁵Ibid., p. xx f.

²Ibid., p. xvii.

⁴Nock, op. cit., p. xxxiv.

⁶Ibid., p. xix f.

C has, according to Nock, little to offer in the way of independent readings.¹ It is of interest chiefly because of its relation to B and M.

The fourth of these, M, contains several interesting readings of its own, as well as several that are shared with C. The readings peculiar to M are given by Nock on p. xviii f. These include some that are supported by B² and D, both of which, according to Nock, are based on a manuscript closely associated with M.² M also has some fairly important agreements with Stobaeus, including the retention of ii.11.6-8.³ While M's text differs to some degree with the text of Stobaeus for these lines, it agrees with Stobaeus in reading an erroneous $\mu\epsilon\alpha\delta$ for $\mu\epsilon\sigma\delta$.⁴ These agreements indicate that M tends to offer a more faithful version of the archetype of the Corpus Hermeticum, not that he interpolated from Stobaeus, since in most places M agrees in error with the Corpus Hermeticum against Stobaeus.⁵

While Nock does not attempt to give a diagramme of the relation between ABCM, perhaps it may be possible to do so, partly on the basis of the above mentioned reading. According to Nock, C agrees

¹Ibid., p. xvii f.

²Ibid., p. xxv f., xxxv.

³All citations for those parts of tractates ii, iv, and x for which Stobaeus also gives a text are printed below, pp. 280-334. Tractate and chapter numbers are as in Nock; verse numbers have been given to facilitate cross-reference. Citations from these passages are given by tractate, chapter, and verse, not by tractate, chapter, page, and line in Nock-Festugière.

⁴Ibid., p. xlvi.

⁵Ibid., p. xix, n. 1.

with B against AM about 21 times, frequently in very striking error, and with M against AB about sixty times, including the instances which will be discussed in the following chapter.¹ It would appear that A is relatively independent of M, since the agreements of BC are mostly in errors.² It would seem most reasonable to suppose that B and C come from a common source, which is reproduced with considerably more fidelity by C (perhaps B is interpolated from A), that this common source has in turn a common source with M, and that this common source in turn has a common source with A. But this would not in itself account for the coincidence that ABC in this and other instances agree in error against M and Stobaeus. Perhaps Nock is correct in saying that in the archetype the lines in ii.11 were first omitted, then written in the margin.³ Perhaps if that feature were continued to the ancestor of BCM, then a scribe could have reintroduced those words into the text, as he did with a note of Michael Psellus which was written into the margin of B, and which appears in the text of M in i.18.

N, according to Nock, supplies a relatively independent although heavily interpolated text for the Corpus Hermeticum.⁴ Unfortunately these conclusions are but poorly supported by the readings which Nock gives in their favour. That N is heavily interpolated will be easily granted. But the most important of the shared readings given by Nock on pages xxiii f concern only two manuscripts, A and B.

¹ Below, p. 12 f.

² Ibid., p. xx, n. 1.

³ Ibid., p. xix, n. 1.

⁴ Ibid., p. xxii ff.

The three readings shared with CM, ~~Εχελ~~ for ~~Εχελ~~ in iv.8 and again in x.17, and ~~φανερωτερα~~ for ~~φανερωτατα~~ in iv.9, could easily be the result of coincidence. More likely N comes from a manuscript related to either A or B, but interpolated from the other.

This leaves essentially D and the group d, a group of manuscripts associated with D, listed by Nock on page xxv. Nock is of the opinion that the readings of this group are the results of an edition,¹ based on M, but containing readings from other manuscripts,² as well as many conjectures.³ In his apparatus, Nock cites D only rarely; some other readings of D are given in his introduction on pages xxvii-xxxii; comparison with a photocopy of D suggests that even these readings are a relatively small sample of the peculiar readings of D. This procedure is in my view justified, since the majority of these readings are almost certainly wrong. That D is not likely to represent an independent source is further verified, as Nock notes, by the lack of significant agreement with Stobaeus against the other manuscripts;⁴ Nock might have added that also the large number of cases in which ABCM agree with Stobaeus against D suggests that D's special readings are for the most part conjectural. It is of course possible that some of the readings peculiar to D are the result of collation with manuscripts now lost. Therefore D may perhaps be of limited use in fixing the text, as long as it is used with caution.

¹ Ibid., p. xxv.

² Ibid., p. xxviii.

³ Ibid., pp. xxx ff.

⁴ Ibid., p. xxxii.

This leaves 1297, associated by Nock with Vaticanus gr. 914 (Vat.) and Matritensis gr. 84 (Matr.), the latter two being quite fragmentary. Reitzenstein thinks it possible, "aber für die Kritik gleichgiltig," that B² goes back in part to an interpolated manuscript at the base of 1297.¹ Nock identifies this manuscript with a supposed intermediary stage between d and μ , a postulated ancestor of M and d.² The evidence for this stage is, however, as he admits, light.³

These are the manuscripts which Nock finds the most valuable. Scott would add to these Bodleianus 3388 (Q), Bodleianus 16987, Bodleianus 8827 (R) and Bodleianus 3037 (S);⁴ most of these are subsumed by Nock under group d,⁵ although R follows A for tractates i-xiv, joining group d for C. H. xvi-xviii.⁶ For the most part Nock ignores these in his apparatus.

Finally, B² cannot be ignored. It has sources which are no longer extant, as is proved by the scholion attributed to Psellus in i.18, also included in the text of M.⁷ It also has many shrewd textual emendations. Nock cites B² only sporadically.⁸

Thus the manuscripts most useful for establishing the text of the Corpus Hermeticum are ABCM. Most important for our present purposes, C and M are especially reliable sources.

¹Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 323, n. 4.

²Nock, op. cit., p. xxxiii.

³Ibid., p. xxxiv. In fact, Nock makes little use of these manuscripts in his apparatus.

⁴Scott, op. cit., I, 21 f.

⁵Nock, op. cit., p. xxv.

⁶Ibid., p. xvii.

⁷Ibid., p. xxxv.

⁸Ibid., p. xxxv f.

CHAPTER TWO

THE DATE OF THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

As was noted in the introduction,¹ there is little agreement among scholars concerning the date of the Corpus Hermeticum. As we have seen, dates between 300 A.D. and 1050 A.D. have been suggested.

As indicated,² the date of the Corpus Hermeticum would give an important clue about the purpose of this collection. A very late date would render implausible the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum is the product of a religious community or that it was collected by a devotee.³ An early date would at least leave this question open, although it would not settle it, since even if an early date is indicated, the possibility remains that the documents were collected for other purposes, as for example scholarly interest, in a

¹ Above, p. x ff.

² Above, p. xvi f.

³ Unless, of course, we accept Scott's suggestion that the Hermetic documents reached Byzantium by way of the pagan community of Harran. According to Scott, op. cit., I, 97-109; following D. Chwolsch, Die Ssabier und der Ssabismus, St. Petersburg, 1856, the Harranians, when faced by the Moslems with a choice between extirpation and conversion if they could not give an account of themselves, said that they were Sabians, their Scriptures were the Hermetic writings, and their prophets were Hermes and Agathos Daimon. He thinks that some of these, facing religious persecution, fled with their sacred writings to Byzantium during the eleventh century. But if that is so, then it is curious that Agathos Daimon appears only in two tractates, x and xii. In any case, other means of transmission, for example, through a few scholars with esoteric tastes, are also possible, and perhaps more probable.

fore-runner of Plato, or Christian apologetic purposes.

In addition, of course, a date for the Corpus would provide a sort of terminus ante quem for the literature inside the Corpus, unless there should be some reason to suppose that some parts have been interpolated.

The literary evidence for the date of the Corpus is, unfortunately, inconclusive. As already indicated, Reitzenstein places the compilation of the Corpus Hermeticum in its present form (except for the loss of one tractate and part of another)¹ in the reign of Diocletian.² This conclusion is based on his interpretation of C. H. xviii, which he interprets as a document commending the Egyptian religion to a monarch on the grounds that it promotes loyalty to a ruler. The reign of Diocletian, he urges, forms the best Sitz im Leben for such a document. It was written by the compiler of the Corpus Hermeticum to capture the benevolence of the emperor, its intended reader.³

This collection was, according to Reitzenstein, formed according to a definite plan expressed in Stob. Herm. xxiii.6,7.⁴

¹Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 193.

²Ibid., p. 207.

³Ibid. Surprisingly enough, he does not use for this purpose the reference in Zosimus (καὶ καταδραμοῦσα ἐπὶ τοὺς Ποιμένανδρα καὶ Βαρτισθεῖον τῷ κρατῆρι), in Berthelot-Ruelle, Collection des anciens alchimistes grecs (London: The Holland Press Ltd., 1963; Paris: G. Steinheil, 1888), p. 245, which he does, however, quote in another context on p. 214, n. 1.

⁴I use Nock and Festugière's numbering system for convenience.

According to this passage, when Hermes ascended to the stars, he left Tat and Asclepius as the inheritors of his teachings. This, according to Reitzenstein, explains why, after C. H. xiv, the dialogues are ascribed to Tat and Asclepius rather than to Hermes.¹ The dialogues in the Corpus are deliberately made to alternate between Tat and Asclepius; the introductions are artificial, and are intended to connect the dialogues.² An introduction to the series is supposed to have been found between the title and the beginning of the text of C. H. ii.³

A similar date is suggested by W. Kroll. On the basis of the citation from Zosimus noted above, p. 8, n. 3, he concludes that the Corpus Hermeticum was known to Zosimus, and was therefore compiled by the fourth century.⁴ In addition, he claims that the Corpus may have been known to Fulgentius, and perhaps also to Stobaeus.⁵ For these last two statements he gives no evidence; presumably the grounds for the first are those given by Reitzenstein:⁶ Fulgentius cites C. H. i.1 (p. 26,18 Helm), and, under the impression that he is quoting from Plato, gives a line which may be paraphrased from C. H. xii.1,2:

νοῦς ἀνθρώπου θεός· οὗτος ἐὼν ἀγαθός, θεός ἐξ ἐργαζόμενος

(p. 88,3 Helm); cf. C. H. xii.1 οὗτος δὲ ὁ νοῦς ἐν μὲν ἀνθρώποις θεός ἐστι; C. H. xii.2, ὁ γὰρ νοῦς ψυχῶν ἐστὶν εὐεργέτης ἀνθρώπων· ἐργάζε-

¹Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 191 f.

²Ibid., pp. 194-196.

³Ibid., p. 193.

⁴W. Kroll, loc. cit., p. 795.

⁵Ibid.

⁶Op. cit., p. 210.

ταὶ γὰρ αὐτὰς εἰς τὸ ἀγαθόν. However, the case is somewhat weakened by the fact that, of the other two references, one (p. 85,21, Helm) is so vague that it can be assigned to several places inside and outside the Corpus, and the other (p. 74,12, Helm) cannot be assigned to our Corpus except on the hypothesis that it belongs to a passage which has dropped out of the text. Therefore it can be proved that Fulgentius knew C. II. i, and it is possible that he knew C. H. xii, but it cannot be proved that he knew the Corpus Hermeticum. And of course, there is no reason to believe that Stobaeus knew the Corpus Hermeticum, especially since he cites tractates ii, iv, and x as coming from other collections.¹

Since the references to Stobaeus and Fulgentius lack probative force,² therefore the only external evidence in favour of an early date is the citation from Zosimus. But neither Festugière³ nor Scott⁴ accept this evidence as conclusive. In the case of Scott, the solution is agnosticism: "In short, the Corpus may have been put together at any time between A.D. 300 and 1050. Or again, it may not have been put together at any one time, or by any one person, but may have been formed gradually, by appending to Corp. I a series of other libelli

¹As pointed out by Festugière, op. cit., II, 2 f., and by Scott, op. cit., I, 28 f.

²In fact, Festugière finds that the lack of reference to the Corpus in Stobaeus' citations is positive proof that the Corpus Hermeticum was not available to Stobaeus, "qui avait accès à une ample littérature hermétique," op. cit., II, 2 f.

³Ibid., II, 4.

⁴Op. cit., I, 29.

(or small groups of libelli) in succession, and at various dates."¹ Festugière, on the other hand, finds that the lack of reference to the Corpus on the part of Stobaeus indicates a date later than the sixth century, but that the scholion by Psellus does not permit a date earlier than the eleventh century.² Nor is Festugière satisfied with the plan alleged by Reitzenstein, since he fails to find evidence of any sort of plan in the Corpus: "En effet, son caractère le plus saillant, c'est qu'il est aussi divers que possible, et tout d'abord, quant aux titres des opuscules."³ Support for this viewpoint is given, as we have seen, by Zielinski, Bousset, Bräuninger, and F.-N. Klein, all of whom see in the Corpus Hermeticum two or more mutually exclusive tendencies⁴ - although Klein at least agrees that the Corpus was known in some form to Zosimus.⁵

These arguments are, so far, quite inconclusive. Festugière was undoubtedly correct, as we shall see, in stressing the diversity of the Corpus Hermeticum. On the other hand, the reference by Zosimus is very striking, and almost certainly connects tractates i and iv, since the name Poimandres appears in extant literature only in this place in Zosimus, in Fulgentius Mythographus (p. 26,17 Helm), citing C. H. i.1, and in C. H. i and xiii,⁶ and the reference to

¹Ibid.

²Festugière, op. cit., II, 5.

³Ibid., p. 5; see also II, 6-18.

⁴See above, p. intro., and notes.

⁵Above, p. intro., and n.

⁶See Scott, op. cit., II, 14 f.

baptism in a crater in C. H. iv is otherwise practically unparalleled.¹ But there is little to connect C. H. i with C. H. iv except the fact that both are included in the Corpus Hermeticum. Is the disunity within the Corpus Hermeticum sufficiently great to overrule the conclusions suggested by the citation from Zosimus? A way out of this dilemma is suggested by the following set of interesting readings from the Corpus Hermeticum:

- xii.8(177.10,11) ὥς οὖν δυνατόν νοῦν . . . ποιεῖν ὅπερ βούλεται.
(ὥς εἶναι δυνατόν Reitzenstein; πᾶς οὖν δδύνατον Ferguson)
- xii.9(177.17,18) καὶ οὐδὲν οὐτῷ δδύνατον, οὔτε εἰμαρμένης ὑπεράνωθεν οὖν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην (ὑπεράνωθεν οὖν mss.: ὑπεράνω θεῖναι Flussas; malim ὑπεράνωθεν εἶναι)
- xii.9(177.18,19) οὔτε ἀμελήσαν . . . ὑπὸ τὴν εἰμαρμένην οὖν.
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C; θεῖναι Flussas)
- xii.13(179.13,14) ὁ γὰρ μακάριος θεὸς Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμων ψυχὴν μὲν ἐν σῶματι ἔφη οὖν, (οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C)
- xii.15(180.13,14) Ἰψὺν γὰρ ἡθέλησεν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτὸ οὖν ἔστ' ἂν συνέστηκε.
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C)
- xii.15(180.14,15) διὸ καὶ θεὸν οὖν ἀνάγκη. (οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C)
- xii.16(180.15-17) πᾶς ἂν οὖν δύναιτο . . . νεκρὰ οὖν ; (νεκρὰ οὖν CM: νεκρὰ εἶναι ADB^C)
- xii.17(181.4,5) πᾶς οὐκ ἂν γελοῖον εἴη τὴν τροφὴν πάντων ἀκίνητον οὖν,
(οὖν ACM, εἶναι DB^C)
- xii.18(181.11,12) τὸ δὲ Ἰψὺν πᾶν οὐκ ἀνάγκη τὸ αὐτὸ οὖν. (οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C)
- xii.22(183.3) τί δὲ οὐσαν ἢ σαρὸν αὐτὴν οὔει οὖν, (οὔει οὖν CM: οὔει εἶναι DB^C; ἢ εἶναι A)

¹See A.-J. Festugière, "Hermetica," in Hermétisme et mystique païenne, (Paris: Aubier-Montagne, 1967), pp. 100-112, reprinted from the Harvard Theological Review XXXI (1938) 1-20.

xii.23(183.16,17) θρησκεία δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ μία ἐστὶ, μὴ οὖν κακόν.
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADB^C; cultus autem dei unus est, malum non
esse, Lact., Div. inst. vi.25.10)

xvii(243.2,3) τὰ ἐν ἐσθπτροῖς φαινόμενα σήματα οὐ δοκεῖ σοι
δοῦναι οὖν (οὖν CM: εἶναι DB^C)

xvii(243.5) οἶον αἱ ἰδέαι οὐ δοκεῖ οὖν σοι, δαίματα οὐσαῖ (δοκεῖ
οὖν CNDB^C: δοκεῖ B; δοκοῦσιν εἶναι Reitzenstein; δαίματα
εἶναι R; δαίματα εἶναι οὐσαῖ Bodl. 16987)

And for completeness we should add the following:

xii.22(183.4,5) τὰς γὰρ ἐνεργείας ἔφαμεν εἶναι μέρη τοῦ θεοῦ.

This last citation is the only context in tractate xii containing the
form εἶναι in which that form is not confused in at least two of the
manuscripts with οὖν. In addition, there are sixteen cases in C. H.

xii and one in C. H. xvii in which οὖν is used but is not confused with

εἶναι. They are xii.1(174.5); xii.3(175.6); xii.3(175.13); xii.11

(178.10); xii.11(178.17); xii.13(179.15); xii.14(179.17); xii.14

(179.18); xii.16(180.15); xii.16(180.18); xii.16(180.20); xii.16

(181.1); xii.21(181.17); xii.21(182.18); xii.22(183.1); xii.22(183.5);

xvii(243.12). It is also possible that, in two of the contexts which

have been quoted above in full, xii.8(177.10,11) and xvii(243.5), the

οὖν may be original.¹

¹ In the first of these, either reading makes excellent sense. As often in Hellenistic Greek, ὅς is written for ὅτε. One would expect an infinitive after ὅς; but δυνατόν is frequently used absolutely in the Hermetica, as an impersonal verb. On the other hand, if the οὖν is original, then it is strictly speaking redundant, since the preceding ὅς already indicates that δυνατόν is the result of what precedes. Also, if εἶναι is the original reading, then this is just the sort of circumstances under which an unfamiliar abbreviation might be misunderstood.

In the example in xvii(243.5), if Reitzenstein is correct, two errors were made: δοκεῖ for δοκοῦσιν and οὖν for εἶναι. It is possible that οὐ δοκεῖ οὖν σοι is parenthetical, in which case either

The reading for B (before correction) is not in Nock's apparatus. Although I have not been able to consult B directly, I have been able to make some conjecture about the original reading of B in most of these cases with the aid of a microfilm. First, normally both $\alpha\tilde{v}$ and $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$ are written in full in B without any use of compendia whatsoever. In fact, typically even the ϵ and the ι are written separately, although occasionally the two are joined thus: $\epsilon\iota$ or $\epsilon\iota$. However, in ii.14(37.15), where B^c inserts $\nu\alpha\tilde{v}$ after $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$, the $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$ is rewritten thus: $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$, to provide room for the $\nu\alpha\tilde{v}$.

In tractates xii and xvii, in the places cited, the situation is as follows: in six cases, xii.9(177.19), xii.13(179.14) xii.15(180.15), xii.16(180.15), xii.22(183.3), xvii(243.3), the $\epsilon\iota$ are joined thus: $\epsilon\iota$ the ν written immediately after (in the latter five, an uncial N is used.) Thus the $\epsilon\iota\nu$ take the space of two letters. In the first of these, the $\alpha\iota$ is represented by α written above $\epsilon\tilde{v}$ in the other cases, $\alpha\iota$ is written above the line. Since the $\epsilon\iota\nu$ take the space of only two letters, it is possible to see that the space of one letter remains bare on the line. In each of those cases that space is smudged; in the first two it seems just possible to detect a ν in the bare space. This is consistent with the supposition that B, like C and M, once read $\alpha\tilde{v}$ in these cases.

In three cases, $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$ is written entirely on the line, but in

$\alpha\tilde{v}$ or $\epsilon\tilde{v}\alpha\iota$ is tolerable. It is also possible that a more serious corruption, for example a lacuna, may be involved. However, Reitzenstein's emendation does make excellent sense.

such a way that it is apparent that it is not the original reading. In each of these cases **et** is joined thus: **¶**. In xii.17(181.5), **et** is slightly crammed and smudged. In xii.17(181.12), it is smudged but not apparently crammed. In xii.23(183.16) it is only very slightly smudged, but it runs into the next word.

In xii.15(180.14), it is written thus, **¶**. There is little sign of smudging. Since it appears at the end of the line, there would not be evidence of cramming in any case; however, it fits very well into the available space.

In xii.22(183.5), where **et** is written correctly in all manuscripts, it is written in full, with the **e** and the **t** separated, as is the usual custom in B.

In xvii(243.5), **ov** is omitted by B, but is written in thus: **ov**, above the line by **B^c**.

While certainty is clearly impossible, it seems most plausible to suppose that in all of these cases, with the possible exception of xii.14(180.14), the original reading in B was **ov**. This is indicated by the evidence of cramming and by the faintly visible **v** in xii.9(177.19).

This reading would be consistent with the close relation between B and CM noted in the last chapter.

It is noteworthy that B retains **ov** in xii.8(177.10) and xii.9(177.18). Thus **B^c** corrects **ov** to **et** in all cases in which A reads **et**, but in addition reads **et** in xii.17(181.5), where A reads **ov**, and makes the correction in xvii(243.3), which of course is missing in A, since A contains only tractates i-xiv. This in itself is scarcely remarkable, since it is a rather obvious correction. What

is remarkable is that B^C like A gives οὖν in xii.9(177.18), where an infinitive is obviously required. Therefore it seems likely that collation with a manuscript like A played some part. If Nock is right about the place of 1297 in furnishing evidence for an interpolated manuscript which could have supplied the base for some of the readings of B², then that manuscript would have been the source of most of the above-mentioned corrections in B^C.

Therefore for these two tractates we have the following circumstances: in sixteen cases, or at best eighteen, οὖν is written correctly in all manuscripts. In eleven, perhaps thirteen cases, οὖν is written either in some manuscripts or in all where we would expect another word. In most of these cases, perhaps in all, that other word is εἶναι (for the two instances in xii.9 I would read, respectively ὑπερβύθου εἶναι and ὑπὸ τὴν εἰμαρμένην εἶναι).¹ In no case is εἶναι written where we would expect οὖν. In one case, εἶναι is written correctly.

¹ In the Hermetic literature, δδύνατον normally governs either an infinitive alone or an accusative with infinitive. To be sure, the dative and infinitive does occur in ii.6.6 in the manuscripts of the Corpus; that it was not the normal use is shown by the fact that in Stobaeus' version, the offending αὐτῷ is removed. If Flussas' conjecture for xii.9 is correct, then this is another instance in which δδύνατον is construed with dative and infinitive. But it is clear that the normal use is with accusative and infinitive. Examples in tractate xii are xii.15(180.5) and xii.17(181.6). If we read εἶναι for οὖν in the two cases in xii.9, then ψυχὴν is the subject for each εἶναι, and αὐτῷ is a dative of reference depending on δδύνατον. More important, it seems more economical to suppose that the two cases in which an impossible οὖν is given in this sentence goe back to the same original reading as the other impossible cases of this same word in this tractate.

It will be noted that in one certain (xii.9(177.18)) and two plausible cases (xi.8(177.10) and xvii(243.5)), the confusion is found in all manuscripts; in most of the remainder, it is found at least in C and M (and so presumably in the manuscripts allied to C) and also, perhaps, in B; and in one case it is found not only in C and M, but also in A (and presumably in the manuscripts allied to A). These are all, if Nock's evaluation is correct (summarized in chapter 1, pages 1-7), extremely valuable manuscripts. Indeed, this distribution of readings seems to me sufficient reason to suppose, with Nock, that the error in question goes back to the archetype of all our existing manuscripts.¹

These facts become interesting when it is pointed out that this confusion between $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ and $\omicron\zeta\upsilon$ occurs nowhere else in the Corpus Hermeticum; on the following pages I give an index of all the uses of $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ and $\omicron\zeta\upsilon$ in all of the tractates except xii and xvii, for which they have already been given; whoever wishes may ascertain that in none of these cases is there any possibility of confusion. In tractates ii, iv, and x I have given in brackets those instances which occur only in Stobaeus, since these are irrelevant for our present purpose. This leaves us, as our table shows, with 87 cases outside of tractates xii and xvii in which $\omicron\zeta\upsilon$ is written correctly, and 51 cases in which $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ is written correctly. Presumably the strong contrast between these two tractates and the others in this regard is not altogether the result of chance.

¹Nock, op. cit., p. xiv, intro.

TABLE ONE

USES OF EINAI AND OYN IN THE CORPUS HERMETICUM APART
FROM TRACTATES XII AND XVIIC. H. i:

EINAI: 10(10.5)

OYN: 6(8.18); 8(9.12); 15(11.22); 17(12.16); 21(14.6).

C. H. ii:

EINAI: [1(32.8)]; [3(32.17)]; [10(36.1)]; 10(36.6); 11(36.16);
 12(37.8); 13(37.14); 14(37.14); 14(37.15); 14(37.16);
 14(38.1); 14(38.5); 16(38.18); [cf. ms. A, 16(38.17)].

OYN: [2(32.12)]; [3(32.17)]; [4(33.1)]; 5(33.3); 6(33.14);
 7(34.1); 8(35.3); 8(35.4); 9(35.10); 9(35.15); 10(36.3);
 11(36.10); 11(36.16); 12(36.18); 12(37.2); 12(37.7);
 14(37.14); 14(37.15); 15(38.12); 16(38.14); 16(39.4);
 16(39.5).

C. H. iii: no examplesC. H. iv:

EINAI: no examples

OYN: 3(50.2); 3(50.6); 4(50.14); 7(51.19); 9(52.13); 9(52.15);
 10(53.4); [11(53.11)].C. H. v:

EINAI: 8(63.18); 9(63.22).

OYN: 2(60.16); 10(64.11).

C. H. vi:EINAI: 1(72.5); 2(73.11); 2(73.14); 3(74.12); 4(74.17);
 5(75.15); 6(75.22).

OYN: 3(74.2); 3(74.6); 5(75.13).

C. H. vii: no examplesC. H. viii:

EINAI: no examples

OYN: 5(89.9).

C. H. ix:

EINAI: no examples

OYN: 2(96.16); 5(98.13); 8(99.16); 8(99.22); 8(99.24);
10(100.24).C. H. x:EINAI: 1(113.9); 2(113.12); 2(113.14); 2(114.5); 3(114.10);
3(114.14); 4(114.15); 9(117.16); 10(118.5); 13(119.11);
16(121.7); 25(126.10); 25(126.10mg).OYN: 1(113.5); 7(116.11mg); 10(118.3); 10(118.6); 11(118.17);
11(118.21); 17(121.16); 18(121.20); 20(123.7);
22(124.4); 22(124.10); 23(125.3).C. H. xi:EINAI: 8(150.21); 9(150.24); 11(151.18); 11(151.19);
12(152.9); 13(152.13); 15(153.8); 16(153.21);
20(155.21); 20(155.22).OYN: 1(147.2); 2(148.2); 3(148.7); 3(148.14); 8(150.20);
10(151.10); 11(151.18); 12(151.20); 16(153.17);
16(153.20); 16(153.22); 20(155.9); 20(155.11).C. H. xiii:

EINAI: no examples

OYN: 6(202.14); 7(203.3); 10(204.24); 12(205.15); 12(206.1);
16(207.10).C. H. xiv:

EINAI: 2(222.18); 5(223.19); 5(223.24); 6(224.6).

OYN: 3(223.5); 4(223.7); 5(223.27).

C. H. xvi:

EINAI: 1(231.14); 3(233.6); 3(233.9); 4(233.16).

OYN: 2(232.9); 4(233.12); 7(234.15); 13(236.7); 15(236.22);
16(237.1); 16(237.8); 17(237.11); 19(238.3).C. H. xviii:

EINAI: 12(253.18)

OYN: 7(251.7); 8(251.18); 14(254.11).

TOTALS

EINAI: 52 examples (plus three in Stobaeus but not in mss., and one
only in ms. A).

OYN: 89 examples (plus four in Stobaeus but not in the mss.).

Now, to write οὐν for εἰς is clearly an egregious blunder. Apart from the more obvious reasons why the two words are not interchangeable, it is necessary to bear in mind that οὐν normally occurs as the second or third word in a sentence. But in this gallery of examples, there is only one case, xii.8(177.10,11), noted as uncertain, in which the offending οὐν appears in the proper position, unless οὐ δοκεῖ οὐν σοι, xvii(243.5) really is parenthetical; in another case, xii.15(180.14,15), the incorrect οὐν occurs as the fourth word, but has already been made redundant by the opening διο. If we add to this consideration the fact that in all of the cases given except xii.8(177.10,11) and perhaps xvii(243.5) the context clearly demands an infinitive, we can see that this is a very grave blunder indeed.

Now it is to be assumed that any scribe, if sufficiently weary and alienated, is capable of making virtually any mistake once. But that a scribe should make such an error at least eleven, perhaps thirteen times in tractates twelve and seventeen, in fact omitting only one opportunity to make the error, but should make the mistake nowhere else in the Corpus Hermeticum, clearly calls for a sufficient explanation.

Now A. D. Nock, in his introduction to the Budé edition, draws one important conclusion from these facts, namely that all our manuscripts have a common miniscule archetype. That this error goes back to a common ancestor is proven by the distribution of the error among the manuscripts, since even though the error is regular in only two manuscripts, it appears sporadically in all of them. That the ancestor was in miniscule is proven by the kind of error: an error which makes so little sense demands an orthographical explanation, and

the only explanation which seems to fit demands a miniscule original.

"Si $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ dans l'archétype pouvait être lu comme $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$, une légère contraction dans l'écriture (miniscule) a dû être la cause de la corruption, car on n'en voit pas d'autre raison évidente."¹

Unfortunately, he does not inform us what sort of abbreviation he had in mind. The problem evidently does not concern the form of $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$: although $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$ is written eleven to thirteen times for $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$, $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ is not written for $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$ even once. In any case, the abbreviation for $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$ in miniscule seems to have been fairly stable, if we are justified in making such a judgement from the examples given by T. W. Allen.² But Allen gives a rather greater variety of examples for $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$,³ none of which on the surface appear to be very likely to be mistaken for $\omicron\lambda\upsilon$. Now, Allen's lists are by no means exhaustive. Indeed, B. A. van Groningen gives the discouraging information that abbreviations in miniscule are "countless and occur in as many forms as there are handwritings."⁴ Therefore it is possible that Nock did not point to an example of the abbreviation which caused the confusion simply because no example is extant. If, however, any of the examples presented by Allen is likely to have caused the trouble, it is his example number three under $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ on plate IV ($\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$). If the first dot in this sign

¹Ibid.

²Abbreviations in Greek manuscripts (Amsterdam: Adolph M. Hakkert, publisher, 1967, reprinted from Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1889), p. 21 and plate VI.

³Ibid., p. 14 and plate IV.

⁴B. A. van Groningen, Short manual of Greek palaeography (Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1967), p. 47.

were drawn with too heavy a hand, so that it almost closed a circle with the hook above it, it might be thought to resemble Allen's first example under $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$ on plate VI (q). Given that the first example of this abbreviation, xii.8(177.10,11) if Reitzenstein's emendation is correct, could easily have been understood in its context as $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$, it is quite possible that a scribe could have innocently supposed that this abbreviation stood for $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$, and have gone on making that mistake unswayed by the fact that the supposed interpretation in most cases did not fit the context.

At any rate, as Nock points out, no alternative explanation exists. There is, for example, no dialectal form of $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ which is spelled $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$. In any case, tractate xii shows no trace of any dialect other than the standard Hellenistic koinē. It is true that one may discover around the first century A.D. forms of E which could conceivably be mistaken for O.¹ However, this would explain only part of the offending form, and in any case one would expect confusion with θ rather than with O. Also, the abbreviations for $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ and $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$ used on papyri, \backslash and o respectively,² would not readily be confused by any scribe, however careless. So also the shorthand forms given by Milne for $\text{o}\bar{\text{o}}\nu$ (J) and $\epsilon\bar{\iota}\nu\alpha\iota$ (q)³ seem sufficiently distinct to allow even

¹See E. M. Thompson, An introduction to Greek and Latin palaeography (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1912), facsimiles 8, 9, 12, and 16, pp. 123, 124, 129, and 138.

²Ibid., p. 81.

³H. J. M. Milne, Greek shorthand manuals, syllabary, and commentary (London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1934), p. 42, #400, and p. 63, #740.

the most careless secretary to distinguish them. It is to be granted that there were probably other conventions which are now unknown to us, and that some of these might have been more liable to confusion; but at any rate the error in question probably should not be attributed to incompetent stenography, since, because of the ambiguous nature of so many of these forms,¹ it is likely that a secretary who confused his symbol ~~for~~ $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ with his symbol for $\omicron\upsilon\nu$ would have made many more mistakes. Therefore it seems most likely that the mistake in question did originate in the process of transcription from a miniscule manuscript.

Now, if the conventional date for the beginning of the miniscule hand at around the beginning of the ninth or the end of the eighth century is correct,² and if we suppose that some time must have elapsed for the offending version of $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ to be so thoroughly mistaken for $\omicron\upsilon\nu$, it seems that we are compelled to place the misinterpretation of the offending form well into the miniscule period. Perhaps a date in the ninth century is tolerable, if we suppose that one scholar borrowed from another a document containing abbreviations some of which he did not understand. But more likely the error was made no earlier than the tenth or eleventh century.³

¹ Ibid., p. 5.

² Van Groningen, op. cit., p. 34.

³ The confusion between $\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$ and $\omicron\upsilon\nu$ is in any case more easily explained on the supposition of a mediæval date. Given the progressive obsolescence of the Greek infinitive documented by P. Burgière, Histoire de l'infinitif en Grec ("Études et Commentaires;" Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1960), it is possible that the scribe simply did not instinctively know where to expect an infinitive in a sentence in Hellenistic Greek.

Therefore in our manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum we have an error which is best explained as having first been made from a misreading of a miniscule manuscript, therefore no earlier than the ninth century, but more probably in the tenth or eleventh century. The distribution of this error¹ makes it probable that it appeared in the ancestor of ABCM, therefore (most likely) of all our manuscripts. But then we must explain why this error occurred only in tractates xii and xvii, in spite of 87 cases of oiv and 51 cases of eiv elsewhere in the Corpus Hermeticum. The most natural explanation appears to me to be that the abbreviation responsible for this confusion was given only in these two tractates and nowhere else in the documents which now make up the Corpus Hermeticum. But such a circumstance would be most likely if these two tractates had not been incorporated into a single manuscript with the others until at least the ninth century.

It is, of course, possible that these two tractates were inserted into an already existing Corpus Hermeticum at a very late date. However, it is very difficult to show a motive for such an insertion. In the case of C. H. xvii we have apparently only a very small fragment;² however, we do have all of tractate xii, and we may say with confidence that it is not very different from the bulk of the tractates, especially the two which immediately precede it, except in the interesting hint that perhaps for the enlightened gross immorality does

¹See above, p. 16 f.

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 242.

not stain the essential person: "ἄλλ' ὁ ἐλλογιμος, ὃ τέκνον, οὐ μοιχεύ-
 σας πέσεται, ἀλλ' ὡς μοιχεύσας, οὐδὲ φονεύσας, ἀλλ' ὡς φονεύσας,"
 xii.7(176.23,24)¹ and in the utter confusion shown in its eleventh chap-
 ter,² in which every important statement is either directly controverted
 or indirectly subverted by some other statement made in the same para-
 graph. Moreover, apart from the error in question, the text of C. H.
 xii is not exceptionally insecure in comparison with the other trac-
 tates. In **other** words, there is little likelihood that only tractates
 xii and xvii were inserted into the Corpus Hermeticum at the date sug-
 gested by this particular error.

A more probable explanation, in my view, is that the Corpus
Hermeticum itself was compiled at the same time that these two trac-
 tates were associated with the others. The confusion between εἶναι
 and οὖν existed only in tractates xii and xvii because only those two
 were taken from manuscripts containing abbreviations likely to be mis-
 understood in that way. Perhaps the documents existed either in
 separate collections or in small booklets until, some time in the per-
 iod spanning the ninth to the eleventh century, someone decided to make
 a new collection. This makes better sense than to suppose that someone
 arbitrarily inserted tractates xii and xvii into an already formed
Corpus at that late date.

(A date later than the eleventh century is probably to be ruled

¹ Ibid., p. 194 f.

² Cf. Festugière, "Je renonce à entendre ce #11 que Tat juge
 'parfaitement clair'", ibid., p. 187, n. 28.

out because of the scholion given in B² under the name of Psellus. Had the collection been made much later than Psellus' time, it is scarcely likely that this note would have found its way into the Corpus.)¹

Thus, the repeated confusion between οὖν and εἴναι in two tractates of the Corpus Hermeticum gives us warrant to suppose that the Corpus was formed at a very late date. If so, then the Corpus is not likely to have been made by a Hermetic community, but was more probably compiled by a scholar.

If the collection was made during the eleventh century, it is quite possible that the documents from which it was taken, now in any case become obsolete, should simply have disappeared during the Frankish occupation resulting from the fourth crusade. This would explain why only one collection of Hermetic literature in Greek was handed down to us.

This leaves the quotation from Zosimus, who urged Theosebeia to hasten to Poinandres and be baptized by the crater (καὶ καταδραμοῦσα ἐπὶ τὸν Ποιμένανδρα καὶ βαπτισθεῖσα τῷ κρατῆρι).² Now the name of Poinandres occurs nowhere else except in this passage, in Fulgentius Mythographus, p. 26, 17 Helm, citing C. H. 1, and in tractates 1 and xiii of the Corpus Hermeticum.³ Also, the conception of baptism by (?)

¹As admitted by Scott, op. cit., I, 28.

²Above, p. 8, n. 3.

³Above, p. 11, n. 6.

a crater is sufficiently uncommon, although Festugière points to a similar example in the fourth book of Pistis Sophia, cp. 142, and in the second book of Jeu, cp. 45.¹ Zosimus himself, in his surviving works, uses the term βαπτίζω once apart from this passage. In this other instance it is a synonym for βάπτω, a technical term for the process of changing the substance of metals. He also uses, apart from this passage, the word κρατήρ once and its derivative κρατήρσα once.² In each of these cases he is describing equipment, and says that it is a good idea to have a κρατήρ around containing water and a sponge to wipe off the ἄγρος. ("ἔχειν δὲ δεῖ ἐπὶ ὕδαν κρατήρα ὕδατος καὶ περιψᾶν σπόγγῳ τὸ ἄγρος .) In other words, the reference within a single sentence to Poimandres and baptism involving a crater can be explained neither by reference to the general Zeitgeist nor by an appeal to Zosimus' extant works. Hence the most probable explanation for this passage is that Zosimus read and associated with each other our present tractates i and iv. Were it not for the evidence pointed to earlier in this chapter, this passage might be taken to demonstrate that the Corpus Hermeticum was extant in Zosimus' time. As it is, however, we can only say that Zosimus read these two tractates, that he valued them highly, and that he associated them with each other.

¹Above, p. 13, n. 1.

²For βαπτίζω see Zosimus in Berthelot, op. cit., p. 155. For κρατήρ see ibid., p. 224. For κρατήρσα see ibid., p. 234.

CHAPTER THREE

THE DATE OF THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS HERMETICUM:

MORE EVIDENCE FROM THE MANUSCRIPTS

In the last chapter, a surprisingly late date was suggested for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum. On the basis of an error which occurs repeatedly in only two of the tractates, an error which can best be explained as having arisen from the misreading of an unfamiliar form in a manuscript from the miniscule period, a date within the period from the ninth to the eleventh century has been suggested for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum. It may now be asked whether the Corpus Hermeticum as we now have it supports this supposition. In the next two chapters ^{it} will be our task to investigate this question.

This question may perhaps be divided into two parts. One part is essentially literary in nature, dealing with the thought and form of each tractate, the way in which it is unique and the way in which it represents the sort of literature found in the Corpus Hermeticum generally. It will be asked whether a date similar to the one suggested in the last chapter is not strongly supported by the extreme variety of the literature in the Corpus Hermeticum. This part of the question will form the substance of our fourth and fifth chapters.

The other part of the question concerns the nature of the text of the Corpus Hermeticum. If it was compiled within the time period suggested in the last chapter, then it is reasonable to suppose that there might be some differences in the quality of transmission of the various tractates. In this chapter it will be our task to investigate whether or not this is the case.

It should be noted in advance that unevenness in transmission does not in itself prove that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled at a late date unless, as I believe is the case with the errors discussed in the last chapter, the difference in quality of transmission is caused by factors which could be present only at a particular period, and unless the errors in question are extremely prevalent in certain tractates even though the possibility of their occurring is present in others.

As we shall see in the next **Part**, older collections such as that of Stobaeus are also quite variable in the quality of their transmission; moreover, such factors as scribal fatigue and manuscript damage could also cause uneven transmission, although perhaps the results would not fall quite so neatly into tractates. For these reasons, the evidence noted in this chapter is not likely to be as striking as that discussed in the last - although it is interesting that in the text of C. H. xi, there is some evidence to suggest that unfriendly glosses probably written by a Christian scribe had intruded themselves into the text, see below, p.73 f. As we shall see, the evidence from the manuscripts of the other tractates is at least consistent with the views advanced in the previous chapter.

The text of the Corpus Hermeticum will be evaluated in the following way: with the aid of Nock's apparatus, those passages will be investigated where there seems reason to suppose that the archetype, either in the sense in which A. Dain wishes us to use the term, i.e. "le plus ancien témoin de la tradition où le texte d'un auteur se

trouve consigné dans la forme qui nous a été transmise,"¹ or in the more usual sense, what Dain prefers to call "le-plus-proche-commun-ancêtre-de-la-tradition,"² appears to have been unintelligible. In each case, an attempt will be made to determine the sort of error. In order to do this, it is necessary to examine at least the more plausible solutions offered in each case, since in order to determine the sort of error, we must have some idea of what the original text must have looked like. From time to time it will be necessary for me to advance my own proposed solution. While it is hoped that many of these will meet with general approval as contributions toward establishing the text of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum, their more specific purpose in the present context lies in their contribution to our understanding of the nature of the archetype of the Corpus Hermeticum.

Not all the passages which according to Nock are in need of emendation will be investigated in this way. In some cases the manuscript reading can be retained in spite of apparent difficulties. On the other hand, there are cases in which Nock apparently sees no difficulty, but where the manuscripts appear to me to be corrupt.

Because of considerations of space, credit for proposed emendations will be given only by appending the name of the author of the proposed emendation. In any case, the bulk of these are in Nock's apparatus.

¹A. Dain, Les manuscrits ("Collection d'Études Anciennes;" Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1964), p. 108.

²Ibid., p. 122. If our proposed dating for the Corpus Hermeticum is correct, this distinction may be unnecessary. An error of the sort postulated in the last chapter would tend very soon either to be corrected, as apparently happened in most instances in AB^Cd, or to result in further errors.

Emendations which seem to have no likelihood of being correct will frequently be passed over in silence. Most of Scott's emendations fall under this category, especially those which involve completely rewriting the text.

It is no reproach to the excellent edition of Nock and Festugière, but rather a comment on the unfortunate state of the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum that more work must be done on the text of the Corpus. In many cases the text as it appears in the manuscripts is simply unintelligible: either a large number of words has dropped out, or some nonsense word has been inserted in a key place. In such cases it is unlikely that the text will ever be settled for all times.

Since our purpose is to discover the peculiar features of the text of each tractate, it will be necessary to discuss the text tractate by tractate. When the text of a tractate differs markedly from the normal pattern of the Corpus Hermeticum, attention will be called to the fact. Then it will be possible to ask whether the text of the Corpus Hermeticum supports the findings of the last chapter.

C. H. i

Beginning then at the beginning, it is clear that there is a large number of instances in which the text of C. H. i is clearly corrupt. Some of these corruptions are of a fairly elementary nature, such as φησιν ἐμὲ for φησιν ἐμοί (Flussas) in i.3(7.13), no doubt the result of itacism; κτῆσιν for κτρίσιν (given correctly in Par. 1297) in i.13(10.10) from the same cause; παρῖ probably for πυρῖ (Zielinski; here Festugière defends παρῖ, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III,

86, n. 2), also in i.13(10.20), and παρδς for παρδς (Patritius) in i.16(12.8), both errors having been made by an absent-minded Christian.

Three times in C. H. i, γῆ is clearly demanded by the context but is omitted: in i.5(8.12), supplied by Reitzenstein, in i.11(10.13), supplied by Patritius, and in i.17(12.17), where it is inserted in different places by Nock and Scott; Reitzenstein, following B², reads γῆ for γὰρ in this sentence. It is, however, used correctly in i.5(8.9), i.5(8.10), i.11(10.12), i.14(11.13), and i.15(11.18). Note that in two of the three cases where it is omitted, it is correctly given immediately before in the manuscripts. It may be that, in the three cases where γῆ is incorrectly omitted, an earlier scribe had used the alchemic symbol ~ for γῆ, and that a later scribe, perhaps the compiler, did not recognize it.¹ At any rate, the confusion appears nowhere else in the Corpus.

In i.21(14.4) and i.22(14.11), the manuscripts give an impossible εὖ φημι. Nock, following Reitzenstein, gives εὖ φῆς for the first of these, and εὖ φημι, also given by B² and 1297, for the second. I would prefer, following B² (and Parthey's edition), to read εὖ φημι in both instances, seeing a distinction between God, who is light and life, and man, who consists of light and life. This error would also be due to itacism. Since the other tractates always use εὖ φημι rather than εὖ φημι, it is not possible to decide whether this error is attributable

¹See M. Berthelot, Introduction a l'étude de la chimie des anciens et du moyen âge (Paris: Georges Steinheil, 1889), pp. 110, 118.

to a tendency of the compiler.

In i.13(10.20), $\xi\zeta \delta\upsilon\nu \tau\eta\nu \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu \xi\zeta\upsilon\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$, probably the original read $\xi\zeta\omega\nu \kappa\tau\lambda$. (Reitzenstein); no doubt an unaccented text provided the occasion. If that is the case, then this error is likely to have been committed before our postulated date for the compilation of the Corpus Hermeticum, presumably at an earlier stage of the manuscript tradition of C. H. i.

In i.13(11.3), perhaps $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ is erroneous for $\alpha\delta\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ (B^2); similarly in i.14(11.14) we have $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}$ for $\alpha\delta\tau\tilde{\eta}$ (Reitzenstein). This is a fairly common confusion, perhaps due to absent-mindedness.

In i.10(10.1), an extraneous $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ (Tiedemann) was inserted before $\delta \tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$. I am unable to suggest a cause, unless there was a partially obscured $\tau\omicron\upsilon \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ in a manuscript explained by a gloss which was later incorporated into the text along with the original reading.

The oblique cases of $\delta\rho\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon\varsigma$ cause trouble in i.15(12.1), where the correct form is given in Par. 1297 and B^C , i.16(12.10), where B^C gives the correct form, and the others a variety, and in i.18(13.5), where B^C correctly gives $\delta\rho\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\eta\lambda\epsilon\alpha$ while the others give $\delta\rho\rho\epsilon\nu\theta\eta\lambda\upsilon$. Perhaps this error ought to be charged to the author of tractate i.

If Nock is correct, the strange reading $\epsilon\kappa \delta\epsilon \varphi\omega\tau\delta\varsigma \tau\epsilon \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in BCM (A leaves a space of six letters where the others have $\tau\epsilon$) in i.5(8.5) indicates a misunderstanding of the archetype, which, he suggests, read $\varphi\omega\tau\delta\varsigma <\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\upsilon>$, using the abbreviation $\alpha\upsilon\upsilon$ for $\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omicron\upsilon$.

There are some indications that in several cases either a letter or a group of letters or even a whole word has been obscured or

obliterated. Thus we have οδ for οδς (Keil) in i.16(12.8), τοϋ for τοϋτων (Nock) in i.20(13.19,20), and θρῖσκει for perhaps τιτρῖσκει (Nock), i.23(15.2), unless in this last case we should read θρῖσκει <ἐπ'> αὐτὸν (Reitzenstein).

A partially obscured letter wrongly interpreted may have been responsible for ἐνοήσας for δ νοήσας (Reitzenstein) in i.21(14.1); a similar cause may have given us παραδῶ for παραδοῦναι (δδ²) in i.22(14.17). In i.22(14.18), μυσάττοντες (AD^C; μυσάσσοντες B; μουσάσσοντες CND; μύοντες B²) for μυσάττονται (Turnebus) could result either from similar causes or from a misread abbreviation. So also in i.20(13.23), προκατέρχεται for προκατάρχεται (Reitzenstein) may have resulted from a partially obscured letter, but may also have resulted from absent-mindedness, because of the similarity of the two words.

In i.14(11.9,10), ἦν ἰδοῖσαι ἀδρεστον κάλλος πᾶσαν ἐνέργειαν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐκόντα, at least two errors are to be suspected: ἐκόντα for ἔχοντα (B^C) will surprise no one, because of the similarity of the two words; ἦν for ὅν (Turnebus) may have been caused by a partially obscured letter, or attracted by the immediately preceding μορφῇν. If we accept that reading, then we need not, with Patritius, supply καὶ after κάλλος, since ἀδρεστον κάλλος would be in apposition to ὅν; for that reason I do not favour ἥτις (B²) or ἡ δὲ (Reitzenstein).

In several cases, a word seems to have dropped out. Thus in i.18(13.9,10), καὶ ἀναγνωρίστω ἔννους, presumably ὁ has been omitted before ἔννους (Turnebus); similarly in i.24(15.8), περὶ (B²) has been omitted before τῆς ἀνόδου. I suspect that the same is the case in i.14(18.8,9), καὶ ἔδειξε τὴν κατωφερῇ φῶσιν τὴν καλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μορφῇν.

Here B² gives τῇ κατωφέρει φύσει; I would prefer <εἶ> τὴν κατωφερῇ φύσιν as more easily explainable on the basis of the present state of the manuscripts. So also in i.17(13.2), καὶ (B²) has been omitted between τέλους and ἄρχων (for which read with Nock ἀρχῶν (B²)). Each of these cases can be attributed either to manuscript damage or carelessness.

There is one certain and at least two probable major lacunae in the text. The certain one is in i.15(12.1,2), where the mss. give ἀρρενοθήλυς δε ὢν, ἐξ ἀρρενοθήλυος (ἀρρενοθήλεος 1297, B^c) ὢν πατρός καὶ αὐπνος ἀπὸ αὐπνου κρατεῖται. Of the many solutions proposed for this text, for which see Nock's apparatus, the most likely is the one which he ascribes to Reitzenstein, who inserts after αὐπνου the words ὁπ' ἔρωτος καὶ ὕπνου, since a scribe could easily leap from αὐπνου to ὕπνου.

A similar accident seems to have occurred in the following line, i.16(12.3), where the text as it now stands is needlessly abrupt: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, Νοῦς δ' ἐμός· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρῶ τοῦ λόγου, although Nock prints the manuscript tradition as it stands. Here again, Reitzenstein's emendation: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα <ἐγὼ· διδάξον με πάντα>, Νοῦς δ' ἐμός κτλ. gives the most plausible reading, although I would prefer to read ταῦτα rather than πάντα.

Perhaps a similar explanation is demanded in i.4(8.4,5), where the manuscripts read εἶτα βοή ἐξ αὐτῆς δυνάμεως ἐξεπέμπετο, ὥς εἰκάζει φωνὴν φωτός. The difficulty concerns the last two words: φωνὴν has no plausible grammatical relation to the context, and the shout in question comes from nature, which in turn evolves from

darkness (σκοτος), the opposite of light. These two words have been variously emended to read φωνή πυρός (Nock), φωνή πυρός (Reitzenstein), φωνή πνεύματος (Einarson), and φωνή φωτός (Festugière; Festugière also reads ἐξ αὐτῆς for ἐξ αὐτῆς¹). Scott rewrites these words as follows: ὥς εἰκόσαι <με> φωνὴν <εἶναι τοῦ> φωτός, and transposes them into the next sentence after ἐπέβη τῇ <ὕγρῳ> φύσει. This last solution seems quite arbitrary, since it supposes four apparently deliberate alterations in a single sentence. Festugière's solution is better, although strictly speaking his ἐξ αὐτῆς, which is necessary to retain φωτός so that the voice of light does not come from nature, would be redundant because of εἶτα. I would prefer to believe that something has been omitted after φωνήν, as e.g. φωνήν <φύσεως κρᾶζειν ἐξ ἐναντίου τοῦ> φωτός, perhaps because of the repeated initial φ in φύσεως and φωτός. But then it would be necessary, with Scott, to read με after εἰκόσαι: ὥς εἰκόσαι <με> φωνὴν <φύσεως κρᾶζειν ἐξ ἐναντίου τοῦ> φωτός.

Perhaps no major change is needed for C. H. 1.4(7.18-8.2), which reads in the manuscripts: σκολιῶς πεπειραμένον, ὥς εἰκόσαι με εἰδόντα (B^c ἰδόντα) μεταβαλλόμενον τὸ σκοτος εἰς ὑγρὴν τινα φύσιν, except Reitzenstein's reading of ἐσπειραμένον for an impossible πεπειραμένον. However, Reitzenstein and Nock emend the text further to read respectively, ὥς εἰκόσαι με <δρακόντι> and ὥς <οφει> εἰκόσαι με, and also to read εἶτα for εἰδόντα. But perhaps the manuscript reading (accepting the emendation of ἐσπειραμένον for πεπειραμένον) would make

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 41, n. 1.

sense¹ if it were translated as follows: "coiled in a tortuous manner, as far as I could guess, since I saw (accepting the probably conjectural reading of B^c) the darkness changing into some kind of a moist nature."

By the standards of the Corpus Hermeticum, the text of tractate i is moderately corrupt. Perhaps the most striking feature is the tendency to omit γῆ. Also noteworthy is the number of cases in which it appears that one, two, or three letters in a manuscript had become obscured. This could suggest either that the exemplar used by the compiler (if not one of its ancestors) had been old and in frequent use, or that this tractate, being both the first and the most interesting document in the Corpus Hermeticum, had received more than its share of use since the Corpus was compiled. While the large number of major lacunae in this tractate is typical of many of the others as well, it is to be noted that none of the cases in which a major lacuna occurs in this tractate is to be explained by the supposition of physical damage to the original; in all cases the resemblances of the words at the beginning and end of the lacunae are sufficient to explain the text as we have it.

It should be added, for the sake of the discussion in part two of this thesis, that while there is considerable evidence of mistakes due to carelessness or to light damage to the manuscript in this tractate, there is no convincing evidence of deliberate alteration of the

¹Dodd also hesitatingly accepts the manuscript tradition here, although he speaks of "language whose obscurity may be partly due to textual corruption," in The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge: at the University Press, 1968=1953), p. 37. He translates εἰκάζει με ὡς εἶδον as "I seemed to see;" but should not εἰκάζει then be passive?

text. It is true that Christian glosses have been suspected from time to time: thus according to Reitzenstein, in the text in his Poimandres, λογος in i.⁹(9.17) is a Christian gloss; however, it is reinstated in his later edition.¹ So also Hilgers wishes to remove as a Christian interpolation the words δημοδοσιος γαρ ην i.10(10.3).² But δημοδοσιος is not exclusively Christian property; see Nock in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 20, n. 29. Of course it is to be admitted that deliberate alteration of a text is very difficult to uncover, at least if it is done well.

C. H. ii.

The text of tractate ii will be discussed in greater detail in Part II of this dissertation, below pp. 280-306. On pages 280-306 we have separated the text of the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum (after Nock's) apparatus from the text given by Stobaeus. To facilitate cross-reference, those parts of the tractate which are also given in Stobaeus have been supplied with verse numbers in addition to tractate and chapter numbers. Since the manuscript readings of the Corpus Hermeticum are readily available in those tables, reference to these passages will be given by tractate, chapter and verse rather than by tractate, chapter, page and line of Nock-Festugière. The same procedure will be followed in tractates iv. and x. In this chapter, as already noted,

¹ R. Reitzenstein and H. Schaeder, Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland ("Studien der Bibliothek Warburg;" Leipzig: Teubner, 1926), p. 156.

² B. J. Hilgers, De Hermetis Trismegisti Poimandro Commentatio (Bonnae: Litteris C. Georgianis, 1855), p. 8 f.

we are concerned only with those variant readings in the Corpus which can be explained only on the supposition of textual corruption in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum.

The most intriguing difficulty in the manuscript tradition of this tractate meets us right at the beginning. This tractate in the manuscripts is given the title Ἑρμοῦ πρὸς τὰς λόγους καθολικὰς, which is singularly inappropriate since it is Asclepius whom Hermes addresses in this dialogue, and he is addressed with great frequency. In addition, there are several lines missing at the beginning of this tractate. In the manuscript tradition of the Corpus, this tractate begins very awkwardly with ἡ (ἡ om AC) θεός, τὸ θεῖον λέγω νῦν, οὐ τὸ γεννητόν (= sulphur?), ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον, ii.4.3, 4. A context is supplied by Stobaeus i.18.2; but this excerpt does not itself appear, as Tiedemann saw, to have started at the original beginning.¹ It does, however, at least give us an intelligible starting point. Reitzenstein's theory, that the manuscript title originally applied to a tractate which had dropped out along with the beginning of our present tractate ii,² is interesting, and has been generally accepted, but is not the only possible explanation of the facts. It is also possible that the compiler took out tractate ii from another collection in which a tractate bearing the present title stood first. If he had intended to copy out only one excerpt, and if he had thought that this excerpt had come from the first item of the former collection, the same results would have followed.

¹ Tiedemann, op. cit., p. viii, intro.

² Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 193.

At any rate, it is a remarkable blunder.

A blunder on the same level occurs in ii.12.1. Apparently some scribe, misled by a repeated **ὁ Τριμεγιστε**, had started to write out chapter 11 a second time, and had evidently caught himself in time to avoid writing out the whole chapter again. At any rate, these words, which do not occur in Stobaeus, make no sense in their present context in the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum. Evidently it did not cross his mind to erase or even to cross out the offending lines.

In ii.6.3,4 there appears to be some minor corruption in the text brought about by a repeated confusion between **ὡς** and **ὅτι** **εἰ** **ὅτι** **νοητὸς ὁ τόπος, οὐχ ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ὁ τόπος· εἰ ὅτι καὶ ὁ** (AD^C **ὡς**) **θεός, οὐχ ὡς τόπος ἀλλ' ὡς θεός κτλ.** Sock, on the advice of Puech and of AD^C, reads, in part, **οὐχ ὡς θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς τόπος, εἰ ὅτι καὶ ὡς θεός κτλ.** The advantage of this emendation is that these two statements would be fully parallel to each other. At any rate, although it is difficult to account for the repeated confusion of **ὡς** and **ὅτι**, I have none better to offer.

There are a large number of minor difficulties in the text which suggest that some copyist cared little for accuracy. In ii.10.1, **κενῷ** (Flussas) evidently became **ἐκεῖνῳ** because of the similarity of the two words; so also in ii.10.9, **μεστώτα** (Stobaeus; Einarson would emend to **γεμιστά**, which however would not explain Stobaeus' reading) became **μέγιστα** for the same reason. In ii.12.4, **ὅλος** (Stobaeus) became **λόγος** and in ii.12.4, **ἐλευθερον** (Stobaeus) became **ἐλευθερος**. So also in ii.12.9, presumably Patritius is right in reading

ἐντὶ for ἐπὶ, cf. Stobaeus' reading, ἔν. All of these errors can be seen as simply the result of carelessness in transcription.

Misreading of an unaccented miniscule original could have given us αὐτῇ for αὐτῇ (Stobaeus) in ii.6.9 and ἐν* ἀλλοτριώτατον for ἀναλλοτριώτατον (Nock) in ii.16(38.18).

There are a large number of omissions in this tractate which may also have been caused by carelessness. In ii.14(37.15), νοῦν is undoubtedly missing from ἀχτιος δὲ τοῦ εἶναι; no doubt, with Scott, we should place it before εἶναι and not, with B^C, after. In the same chapter (38.6), a negative is missing from τὰ δὲ ἅλλα πάντα χωρητὰ ἐστὶ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φύσεως, and is to be supplied by writing either ἀχωρητὰ (B^C) or οὐ χωρητὰ (Tiedemann) or, less plausibly, οὐ χωρητικὰ (Nock). In ii.7.6, τὸ should be inserted before αὐτὸ (B^C; Stobaeus has τὰ αὐτὰ; τὸ is also missing before ἀγαθόν (Scott) in ii.16(39.5).

In ii.7.8, ἔστι ἡ for ἔστημεν given by Stobaeus is most easily accounted for if we suppose that K was misread for H in a miniscule exemplar in which the last two letters were obscured.

That the compiler should not be made to bear responsibility for all of the unacceptable readings in this tractate is shown by the fact that Stobaeus shares with M the reading μετὰ for μεστὰ in ii.11.8. These lines are missing in ABC, but inserted by B², who with d correctly reads μεστὰ. So also in ii.9.2, τὰ οὖν ξῶλα καὶ τοὺς λείθους καὶ τὰ ἅλλα πάντα ἔμψυχα οὐ σῶματα ἐστὶ τὰ κινεῦντα, it is difficult to see why τοὺς λείθους is in the accusative case. Nor is this any clearer in Stobaeus' version, τὰ οὖν ξῶλα καὶ τοὺς λείθους καὶ τὰ ἅλλα πάντα ἔμψυχα οὐ σῶματα ἐστὶ. There will be an opportunity to discuss this further,

below, p. 294. Another place where the text offers even greater difficulties in Stobaeus' version than in the Corpus Hermeticum is in ii.7.2, which will be discussed below, p. 286 ff.

It is very difficult to give a convincing explanation for ii.7.7, τὸ περὶ αὐτὸ κωλύει τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ καλυόμενον τοὺς τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ, εἰ ἔσται εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτό, most of which, beginning from καλυόμενον, Stobaeus omits.

Nock is probably right with regard to ii.14(37.14) when he writes, "suspicio τῶ . . . ποτε librario locum male intellegenti deberi."

These examples are the most clear instances in which the text of C.H. ii is at fault. There are also some other instances in which we have to choose between an inelegant text in the Corpus and a slightly more elegant text in Stobaeus. In these cases it is not at all easy to see whether the text in Stobaeus has been improved or whether the text of the Corpus has become mangled in transmission. More will be said about this in part II.

However, it is clear that the text of C. H. ii has suffered, perhaps more than once, at the hands of a careless and indifferent scribe. Apart from the confusion of $\delta\varsigma$ with δ noted above, there are no characteristic errors in the text of this tractate. What is typical is the indifference of at least one of the scribes in its tradition to the task of producing an accurate copy. This judgement is made not so much on the basis of the numerous errors in the text of the tractate as on the basis of the mistaken title, which even a moment's investigation would have corrected, and the mistaken repetition in ii.12.1, which was not even deleted after the mistake became obvious to the scribe.

On the other hand - the relevance of this statement will be seen in Part II - there is little evidence that anyone in the manuscript tradition of this tractate up to and including the archetype was very interested in patching up the text. The errors tend to be fairly obvious in nature, and in many cases could have been disguised with little effort. This will become clearer after the detailed analysis of Part II.

C. H. iii.

The text of tractate iii is unusually corrupt, even for the Corpus Hermeticum. If one examines Nock's edition, one sees a large number of instances in which he simply abandoned any attempt to emend the text. Although the tractate is a mere forty-three lines in Nock's text, he is driven to this expedient no less than seven times. For example, he prints, under protest, καὶ ἐνδὴν ὅφ' ἄμμο ἐξ ὑγρᾶς οὐσίας στοιχεῖα, iii.1(44.8). Now, one can make better sense, following Cumont, by emending ὅφ' ἄμμο to ἐφ' ἄμμο. Nevertheless, the mention of sand is very abrupt. It would be simple, following Nock, to take ὅφ' ἄμμο as a gloss. But what purpose would this gloss serve? If we read <γῆ> ὑπαμιος (Ferguson), then what would we do with στοιχεῖα? Either the passage is very corrupt, or the author (accepting Cumont's reading) just assured that the sand would naturally always be there at the bottom.

It is also difficult to make sense out of καὶ θεοὶ πάντες κατα- διεπῶσι φύσεως ἐνοπύρου, iii.1(44.9). Of the solutions given, that of Festugière, καταδιαίρουσι <τὴν τῆς> φύσεως ἐνοπύρου, is perhaps the most economical. The only difficulty is that, while Festugière does indeed provide a translation, "et tous les dieux divisent les êtres (?)"

de la nature germinale," it is still far from clear what the passage means, as he himself admits by the bracketed question mark.

It is relatively easy to supply the gap in iii.2(44.15-45.1), **καὶ διηρθρώθη σὺν τοῖς ἐν αὐτῇ θεοῖς**: a subject is needed for διηρθρώθη and it is either **ἡ πυρινή οὐσα** (Scott) or **ἡ ἀναφερῆς φύσις** (Dodd) or something to that effect.

We can perhaps make sense of **τὸ σπέρμα τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (αὐτοῖς CM) ἐσπερμολόγουν**, iii.3(45.6,7) by substituting either **ἐσπερμοβόλουν** (Reitzenstein) or **ἐσπερμογόνουν** (based on Scott's proposed **σπερμογονοῦντα**). If we read **ἑαυτοῖς** with AB, then **θηρὰ τετραπόδα κτλ.**(45.4) would be the subject; if we read **αὐτοῖς** with CM, then the subject is **ἕκαστος θεός** (45.3). In either case, **τάς τε γενέσεις τῶν ἀνθρώπων**, directly following, would then remain suspended unless we were to insert some verb after **ἀνθρώπων**, as for example **ἐδίδαξαν** or **ἐπαίδευσεν**. (Both of these conjectures would favour the reading of **ἐσπερμοβόλουν** in the previous line.)

Another puzzle is furnished by **τερασπορίας** in iii.3(45.12), which if accepted would be a **ἄπαξ λεγόμενον**. The context: **καὶ πᾶσαν ἐν σαρκὶ ψυχὴν διὰ δρομήματος θεῶν ἐγκυκλίαν τερασπορίας, εἰς κατοπτρεῶν οὐρανοῦ κτλ.**, would be satisfied by a verb in its place, but by what verb?

In iii.3(45.14), **εἰς τε σημεῖα ἀγαθῶν** gives a tantalizing impression of meaning something, and it is probable that something has dropped out of the text after **ἀγαθῶν**.

In iii.3(45.15), **μοίρης ὀχλουμένης** is simply unintelligible. Ferguson reads **ἀμοιβὰς κυκλομένης**; I can neither accept that reading

nor propose a better one.

In iii.4(45.18), ἄρχεται ἀδῶν βιωῶν τε καὶ σοφισθῆναι, sense can perhaps be made, following Nock, by interpolating τὸ before βιωῶν. Dodd, who foresaw that possibility, preferred ἀρκεῖ τε ἀδῶν βιωῶν, supposing two errors.

But it is not clear what can be meant by ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καταλιπόντες ἐν ὄνομτι χρόνων ἀμαύρωσιν καὶ πᾶσαν γένεσιν ἐμψυχου σαρκὸς καὶ καρποῦ σπορᾶς καὶ πάσης τεχνουργίας τὰ ἐλαττούμενα ἀνανεωθήσεται ἀνάγκη κτλ., iii.4(46.2-6), although it would perhaps contribute towards a solution if we understand a lacuna between ὄνομτι and χρόνων, to be filled in, e. g., by ἀδῶν εἰς or, with Dodd, simply εἰς. The words καὶ πᾶσαν γένεσιν . . . τεχνουργίας make sense in themselves, but demand a participle, which presumably fell somewhere between τεχνουργίας and τὰ ἐλαττούμενα, along with at least a co-ordinating conjunction. Perhaps a tear along a corner of a manuscript is responsible.

Given the small size of this tractate and the large number of obvious errors, it is clear that the text of this tractate has undergone **severe** mutilation. If we compare the text of this tractate with the text of C. H. vii, which, as we shall see, has no severe problem and only one obvious error, it is possible to speculate that the difference between these two tractates is caused to some degree by the difference between the manuscripts of these two tractates when they reached the hands of the compiler. One would suppose either that the text of C. H. iii was hopelessly corrupt before it reached the hands of the compiler, or that it was written in an extremely unreadable hand. This would support the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled at

a very late date, since it would give us further reason to believe that the tractates had separate textual histories for a long time before they were brought together. But it must be admitted that neither C. H. iii (43 lines of text in Nock-Festugière) nor C. H. vii (30 lines) are sufficiently long to allow very firm conclusions to be drawn in this regard.

C. H. iv

The text of C. H. iv is moderately corrupt. There are a few careless substitutions, as for example, in iv.8(52.11), δδιδβαρον (Patritius) for διαβαρον; conversely, in iv.11.1, δδιασπερον is evidently an erroneous reading for διασπερον, given by Stobaeus. In iv.7(52.3), παραγόμενοι (Patritius) has become παραγενόμενοι, doubtless because of the similarity of the two words.

In iv.7(50.20) οὐ θαυμάζοντες οὐ τὸ θεῶν ἄξια, an extra οὐ has been inserted, for whatever reason; N omits the second, whether by conjecture or through collation.

Apparently in iv.3(50.4), someone has written γὰρ ὁ for ὁ γὰρ (Turnebus). Perhaps one of these words was accidentally omitted in a manuscript, then written between the lines; a later scribe, restoring it into the text, misjudged its position.

In iv.6(51.7,8), ἐνροψα, a nonsense word, presumably is the result of poor handwriting. Although D's reading, θεωψα, makes better sense, it is difficult to see how θεωψα could have become ἐνροψα. Scott's reading, εὐροψα, while easier from that point of view, has this unfortunate defect, that it can make sense only if, with Scott, we

rewrite the whole context.

The text of iv.1.5, ἀγαθὸς ὢν, μόνῳ γὰρ τοῦτω ἀνατίθεται, ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι, (κόσμησας BCM) will be discussed in Part II, below, p. 308. If I may anticipate my conclusions, they are that for the most part the text of the Corpus is to be followed here, but we should read μόνῳ γὰρ τοῦτω ἑαυτῷ for μόνῳ γὰρ τοῦτω. (Stobaeus gives ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὢν, μόνῳ ἑαυτῷ τοῦτω ἀναθῆναι. ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι.

We could certainly make better sense of iv.2(49.12,13), καὶ ὁ μὲν κόσμος τῶν ἱψῶν ἐπλεονέκτει τοῦ ἱψοῦ καὶ τοῦ κόσμου τὸν λόγον καὶ τὸν νοῦν, if with Nock we read τὸ δεξιῶν, <ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος> for τοῦ ἱψοῦ; however, it would be extremely difficult on that hypothesis to account for the present state of the manuscripts. Scott seeks to salvage the text by transferring the sentence to the beginning of chapter three, supposing a lacuna after κόσμος and a new sentence beginning with ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος, interpolating ἄλλων before ἱψῶν, reading πλεονέκτει, and removing τοῦ ἱψοῦ καὶ τοῦ κόσμου. But such a chain of errors is highly unlikely. More plausibly, we can postulate a lacuna before ἐπλεονέκτει in which we could interpolate, for example, <ἐπλεονέκτει τὴν σφαῖραν, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος> ἐπλεονέκτει κτλ. This omission could very easily be explained as resulting from the repeated ἐπλεονέκτει. Under this hypothesis, τοῦ ἱψοῦ is still puzzling. Perhaps this is another of those accidental substitutions to which so many of the tractates are prone. I would substitute τοῦ θεοῦ on the grounds that the νοῦς which the man receives is a gift of God along with the λόγος, see iv.3(50.2-4).

Another omission in C. H. iv is in iv.10.3, οὐσα πάντων ἀρχὴ καὶ βίβλα καὶ ἀρχὴ οὐσα; where a repeated βίβλα causes trouble, as may be seen by comparing Stobaeus' text, οὐσα πάντων ἀρχὴ καὶ βίβλα, ἐν πᾶσιν ἔστιν ὥς ἔν βίβλα καὶ ἀρχῇ. Presumably the text behind C. H. iv.10.3 retained οὐσα.

Finally we may refer to iv.6(51.16,17), οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀμφοτέρω ἐν οἷς τε ἡ ἐξαίρεσις καταλείπεται. The reading of B² here is interesting: οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀμφοτέρω συνελθεῖν ἐν οἷς τε ἡ αἵρεσις καὶ ἐν οἷς ἡ ἐξαίρεσις καταλείπεται. If this is really an emendation, and does not come from collation, then it is shrewd: the similarity of αἵρεσις and ἐξαίρεσις would have caused the difficulty, and the presence of ἐν οἷς τε leads us to expect καὶ ἐν οἷς. Unfortunately this emendation does not make much sense, since it seems to suppose some kind of meaningful contrast between αἵρεσις and ἐξαίρεσις. But it does seem plausible to expect another clause beginning with καὶ ἐν οἷς, unless, with Einarson, we simply delete the τε. Therefore I would place a lacuna after καταλείπεται, to be filled in perhaps with καὶ ἐν οἷς ἡ αἵρεσις μένει. This solves part of the problem. But some kind of a completion is needed for ἔστιν; συνελθεῖν, supplied by B² is a reasonable conjecture, and no doubt followed ἀμφοτέρω. The most likely explanation for these two omissions in subsequent lines is that a corner had been torn from a page of the exemplar.

As may be seen from the above discussion, the text of C. H. iv is in reasonably good condition compared to the text of the majority of the tractates in the Corpus Hermeticum. Of the three major omissions, two were probably caused by homoeoteleuton, the third by manuscript

damage. No single characteristic error emerges to distinguish the manuscript tradition of this tractate.

C. H. v

The text of C. H. v is in a moderately damaged condition. Occasionally a short word is omitted. In v.1(60.6), οὐ γὰρ ἔν. ἦν εἰ ἀφανὲς ἦν, Tiedemann is probably right in interpolating μὴ before ἀφανὲς; there is, however, no need to interpolate δέ, whether between ἔν and ἦν, as Scott hesitatingly suggests, or between ἦν and εἰ, suggested by Einarson, since the dichotomy is between the invisible (τὸ ἀφανὲς), which is, and that which appears (τὸ φαινόμενον), which becomes.

In v.10(64.7), πάντα γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ οὐτός ἐστι, we should probably, following Flussas, read πάντα γὰρ <δ> ἐστὶ κατλ. Reitzenstein's solution, πάντα γὰρ <οὐτός> ἐστὶ καὶ οὐτός ἐστὶ <πάντα>, is less economical.

It is possible that the same sort of solution is needed in v.4(62.3-5): καὶ γὰρ εἰ τὸ ἄτακτόν ἐστι ἐνδοξός, ὅτε κατέχει, τοῦτο ἐστὶ, τὸν τρόπον τῆς τάξεως, καὶ ὅθ' δεσπότην ἐστὶ τὸν μηδέπω αὐτῇ τὴν τάξιν τάξαντα, Nock tentatively suggests ὅτε <μὴ>, Puech ὅτι <μὴ>. Dodd suggests a lacuna, not implausibly, since the text of the Corpus Hermeticum is full of lacunae; however, this does not appear necessary in this case, since καὶ ὅθ' δεσπότην κατλ. seems to follow naturally after ἐνδοξός. Therefore I would adopt Nock's suggestion, regarding ὅτε <μὴ> κατέχει . . . τῆς τάξεως as parenthetical.

There are a number of cases in which the text of this tractate appears to have been accented in an unfortunate manner in the archetype,

as for example αὐτῇ for αὐτῇ (Nock) in v.4(61.19); περὶ ταῦτα for περὶ ταῦτα (Tiedemann) in v.5(62.10); ἡ for ἡ (Turnebus) in v.8(63.17); and εὐλογῆσαι for εὐλογῆσαι (Nock) in v.10(64.11); in this latter, it is also possible, following Turnebus, to read <δοῦναιτο> εὐλογῆσαι or, following Reitzenstein, εὐλογῆσαι. It is also possible that in v.1(60.13) we should, following Scott, read ἡ . . . ἡ for ἡ . . . ἡ, although in this case either reading would make sense. These errors in the use of accents, while by no means unknown elsewhere in the Corpus Hermeticum, are somewhat more common in this tractate, and may have been a feature of the exemplar for this tractate available to the compiler.

Some of the errors in this tractate are the result of simple substitution of similar words by an absent-minded or distracted scribe. In v.9(64.3), ἔχοντα no doubt stands for ὄντα given by DB^C. Velsenius was surely justified in proposing παντοσώματος for παντός σώματος in v.10(64.6) even though that would be a ἄπει λεγόμενον; see Nock in the critical apparatus ad loc. In v.9(64.1,2), ἔστιν αὐτός καὶ τὰ ὄντα αὐτός καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα. Nock may be right in reading ὁδός for the first αὐτός, although it must be said that the passage still seems rather clumsy. Probably also v.2(61.7,8), πῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐν αὐτῷ διὰ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν σοὶ φανήσεται is to be emended by reading αὐτός for ἑαυτὸν (Turnebus).

There are two virtually certain lacunae in the text of this tractate. In v.4(62.1,2), the reading given in the manuscripts, πῶς γὰρ ταῖς δροσὶ καὶ ἀμετρὶς ἀπορήτος is, in its context, nonsense, and ought, following Scott, to be supplemented as follows: πῶς γὰρ ταῖς <ποιητῇ, μόνῃ δὲ ἡ> δροσὶ κατλ.; no doubt either damage to an earlier manuscript or absent-mindedness brought about that error.

In the other case, the text cannot so easily be supplemented, but we can at least guess at the contents of the omission: μηδέποτε, ὃ τέκνον Ἰδτ, ἀποστερήσης τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τὰ δημιουργήματα, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ κρεῖττων ἐστὶν ὅση (κρεῖττον^ω . . . ὅσον A; ὅσος D) κατὰ θεὸν ὀνόματος, v.8(63.14,15). There are two difficulties with this passage: the clause beginning with μᾶλλον δὲ does not follow from the previous sentence; and in any case, it is difficult in itself.

The first difficulty can be resolved by placing a lacuna either before μᾶλλον δὲ (Nock) or after (Scott). In fact, μᾶλλον δὲ suits both contexts remarkably well, and so perhaps we should read μηδέποτε . . . ἀποστερήσης τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τὰ δημιουργήματα, μᾶλλον δὲ < . . . μᾶλλον δὲ > καὶ κρεῖττων κτλ. This lacuna would contain at least two main clauses. The first of these, containing perhaps a verb in the imperative mood, would demand that we affirm the creative activity of God, e.g. μᾶλλον δὲ <ὅς πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν ἐκεῖνον λόγισαι . . . >. The second clause would deny that the title θεός is appropriate to God, cf. v.1(60.4), for example <. . . οὐδὲ δεῖ θεὸν ἐκεῖνον ὀνομαζεῖν, μᾶλλον δὲ > καὶ κρεῖττων κτλ.

There is still a problem with καὶ κρεῖττων ἐστὶν ὅση κατὰ θεὸν ὀνόματος. In the Budé edition, Festugière suggested that this should be changed to ἡ κατὰ θεοῦ ὄνομα, supposing three errors in four words. Later, adopting a reading from A, he proposed καὶ κρεῖττων ἐστὶν, ὅσον κατὰ θεόν, ὀνόματος.¹ While this reading is more economical from the

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 70.

point of view of the manuscripts, and no doubt possible, yet it leaves $\delta\nu\delta\mu\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ in a rather odd position; if this had been what the author had intended, it seems more likely that he would have placed $\delta\sigma\omicron\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\theta\epsilon\delta\nu$ before $\kappa\alpha\iota$. The reading proposed by Scott, $\kappa\pi\epsilon\iota\tau\tau\omega\nu$ $\dot{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\nu\delta\mu\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$, while no doubt giving the sense that the author intended, could be explained only on the hypothesis that the scribe was severely absent-minded. I prefer Festugière's reading from the Budé edition, with the possible exception of $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ η for $\delta\sigma\eta$. The strange combination $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$ $\theta\epsilon\delta\nu$ $\delta\nu\delta\mu\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ can possibly be explained as a Spoonerism, the two errors, as it were, attracting each other. The reading of $\delta\sigma\eta$ for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ η can be the result of a smudge on the manuscript.

At any rate, this last passage creates the only real difficulty in this tractate. Presumably this reflects to some degree the condition of the exemplar for this tractate available to the compiler.

C. H. vi

The text of C. H. vi is moderately corrupt. The omission of the final ν in $\dot{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\omicron\upsilon\nu$ (Parthey) in vi.1(72.7) is scarcely surprising, and may be the result of a misread abbreviation. In vi.2(73.1), $\delta\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Nock) presumably became $\delta\nu\tau\omega\nu$ because of the attraction of the previous $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$. In vi.4(75.6), $\omicron\upsilon\delta\delta\dot{\epsilon}$ (Scott) is probable for $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$. In vi.3(73.17,18), Nock is probably right in reading $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ for $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$, although $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ $\tau\omicron$ $\delta\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\nu$ transmitted by Didymus would also be acceptable.

Probably in vi.1(72.10), $\dot{\epsilon}\nu$ has been inserted before $\omicron\upsilon\delta\delta\epsilon\nu\dot{\iota}$ (Patritius), although it is difficult to see why, unless it is attracted

by the dative οὐδένι. Also difficult to explain, although probable, is the insertion of ἄλλων (Nock) in vi.5(75.14,15), ἀκοινώνητα γὰρ ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις τῶν ἄλλων ἡμῶν ἐστί.

There are also a few minor omissions perhaps caused by carelessness. In vi.2(73.2,3), ὡςπερ γὰρ οὐδέν τῶν ἐν τῇ τοιαύτῃ οὐσίᾳ, something is missing after τῶν. Nock is probably right in believing that ἄλλων, not κακῶν (Flussas), has been omitted. In vi.2(73.14), ὡς should be inserted before ἐν τῷ μέρει τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸς εἶναι (Flussas), since otherwise εἶναι would have no grammatical context. Festugière would place it before καθὰ in the previous line;¹ this is possible, although perhaps too complicated for the style of this tractate.

In vi.1(72.16), καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῦ ἐρασθήσεται, something is missing before καὶ διὰ, most likely οὔτε καλλίον, supplied by Nock. This error could be the result either of carelessness or of manuscript damage.

In vi.4(75.1-3), τὸ δὲ καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν οὐδέν ἐστι καταλαβεῖσθαι τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, Nock reads ἐν οὐδένι for οὐδέν. Nevertheless it may be asked whether a lacuna is not to be suspected. Patritius' reading, ἀγαθὸν <ἐστι· ἀγαθὸν δ'> οὐδέν κτλ., is unsatisfactory because it would be virtually tautological, since τὸ καλὸν and τὸ ἀγαθὸν are so closely associated, in this tractate as elsewhere, as to be virtually indistinguishable. If there is a lacuna, it could be placed after καλὸν. We may perhaps supplement: τὸ δὲ καλὸν <καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἐν μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ ἐστι· καλὸν γὰρ> καὶ ἀγαθὸν οὐδέν κτλ. In that case, the error

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 64.

would be the result of homoearcton.

There are at least two other places¹ where major lacunae are to be suspected. One of these is vi.3(74.11-14): ὅτι ἕκαστον τούτων τῶν προειρημένων ἐμπενέσεται ἐνθάδε τὸ μέγιστον εἶναι ἀγαθόν, τὸ μᾶλλον ἀνυπερβλήτον κακόν. ἡ γαστριμαργία, ἡ τῶν κακῶν πάντων χορηγός ἡ πλάνη ἡ ἀπουσία ἐνθάδε τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶ. Nock, in his critical apparatus ad loc., writes: "aut ἡ γ. . . χορηγός glossema est, aut exciderunt nonnulla." As a gloss, these words would seem unmotivated; therefore a lacuna is more probable. Nock in his text places a lacuna after χορηγός. Probably this was once followed by a verb, among other things. Perhaps also ἡ γαστριμαργία after κακόν is needlessly abrupt in its context. Here again a lacuna seems to be indicated, this time after κακόν. Presumably the original text would have discussed more vices in detail, and would have had a number of short sentences patterned after the last part of this passage, ἡ πλάνη ἡ ἀπουσία ἐνθάδε τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶ. It seems most probable that two such consecutive lacunae would have been caused by physical damage to a manuscript.

We may postulate the same cause in vi.4(75.4,5), which in the manuscripts reads τὸ δὲ μὴ ὁποισπροντα, μάλιστα δὲ ἡ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. At least a noun modified by ἡ and a main verb or some kind of a predicate is demanded. Scott in his apparatus suggests ἀληθῆ following ὁποισπροντα and ἰδέα following ἀγαθοῦ. The second of these seems very good to me, the first at least plausible. Einarson supplies οὐσία τοῦ θεοῦ ὅντως ἐστὶ after ἀγαθοῦ. I would prefer to take

¹I do not see the need for a lacuna after τοῦ θεοῦ (Scott) in vi.4(74.18).

something from each of these conjectures and read τὰ δὲ μὴ ὑποπίπτοντα, μάλιστα δὲ ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ <ἰδέα, ὅντως ἔστι.> Zuntz' reading, τὰ δὲ μὴ ὑποπίπτοντα <οὕτω ἔστι καὶ ὅντως ὄντα,> μάλιστα δὲ κτλ.,¹ seems to me less preferable since the purpose of ἢ before τοῦ καλοῦ becomes on that hypothesis obscure.

Thus the manuscript tradition of C. H. vi has suffered some damage, but perhaps less than the majority of the tractates. Like so many of the tractates, it is given to lacunae; at least two major lacunae in this tractate are probably due to manuscript damage. Most of the other errors are easily explained.

C. H. vii

Our text for tractate vii is quite sound; in fact there is only one case where the manuscript reading is undoubtedly corrupt. That is in vii.3(82.6,7), τὰ δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ νομιζόμενα αἰσθητήρια ἀναίσθητα ποιῶν. The problem here is the implied contrast between δοκοῦντα and μὴ νομιζόμενα, which appears purposeless. While the problem could be solved by omitting either καὶ μὴ νομιζόμενα (Nock) or δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ (Scott) or just μὴ (Dodd), this solution is not altogether satisfactory, since it would be difficult to account for the insertion of these words. Festugière's reading, τὰ μὴ δοκοῦντα καὶ νομιζόμενα, which he translates, "les organes des sens qui ne paraissent point et qui ne sont pas tenus pour tels," seems excellent to me, although it would be easier to account for the error if the text had originally read, τὰ <μὴ> δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ νομιζόμενα κτλ.

¹G. Zuntz, "Notes on the Corpus Hermeticum," Harvard Theological Review XLIX (1956) 73 f.

Otherwise the text of this tractate presents no obvious problem. If our hypothesis about the date of composition is correct, this could be accounted for on the supposition that the exemplar used by the compiler for this tractate had few errors. However, the tractate, being but thirty lines in Nock's text, is much too short to allow us to use this as proof of a late date for the compilation of the Corpus Hermeticum.

C. H. viii

The text of C. H. viii has suffered extreme corruption. Comparatively few of the errors are of the sort that can easily be cleared up. In viii.2(87.18), the manuscripts read ἰδίου, emended by Turnebus to read διῖδίου. This reading is practically guaranteed by the following line, τὸ γὰρ δειλῶτον τοῦ διῖδίου διαφέρει. Such a substitution is easily understood because of the similarity of the two words.

Either carelessness or a small defect in a manuscript is responsible for the reading of viii.2(88.1,2), ὁ δὲ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ διῖδιος, in which either δι' (Einarson) or ὅφ' (Tiedemann) should be inserted before αὐτοῦ. Scott's reading, αὐτοῦ ἄγιος, is to be rejected because it presupposes his implausible emendation of the previous sentence, which will be discussed below. Similar circumstances are responsible for the omission of a word in viii.3(88.3,4), καὶ ὅσον ἦν τῆς ὕλης ἀποκεκμενον (ἀποκεκμενον A) τῷ αὐτοῦ, in which at least one word, a noun modified by τῷ, has dropped out. Tiedemann's emendation of ὅφ' αὐτοῦ for τῷ αὐτοῦ is implausible since it is difficult to see how such an error could have arisen. We may perhaps read τῷ αὐτοῦ

<θελήματι> with Scott or τῷ ἑαυτοῦ <νῷ> with Einarson.

In viii.2(88.2,3), ὁ δὲ κόσμος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δίδιος καὶ δδα-
νατος γέγονε, it is necessary to emend δίδιος, since otherwise this
sentence would conflict too blatantly with the distinction between
δίδιος and δειζωος in viii.2(87.19,20). Perhaps Flussas is right in
reading δειζωος for δίδιος; a scribe, if distracted, could be made to
confuse the two words because of the similarity in beginning and ending.
This would be easier if the middle letters had become smudged or ob-
scured.

These errors are relatively easy to explain. We now turn to
the instances of major damage. In viii.2(88.1), τὸ γὰρ δίδιον, οὐ
δίδιον ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν has been variously emended to <τοῦτο> γὰρ δίδιον
<δι> οὐ δίδιον ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν (Einarson), τὸ γὰρ δίδιον, ἢ δίδιον
ἐστίν, αὐτόγονον (W. Kroll); δίδιον γὰρ, οὐ δίδιον ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν
(Tiedemann), and τὸ γὰρ αἵτιον <τοῦ [δίδιον ἐστὶ] <εἶναι> τὸ πᾶν <ὁ
πατήρ> (Scott). Scott's emendation makes the most sense, but, like
so many of his emendations, is utterly divorced from the manuscripts.
Tiedemann's and Einarson's emendations are more faithful to the manu-
scripts, but don't really improve the sense of the passage. W. Kroll's
emendation, while by no means as fanciful as Scott's, raises the ques-
tion how αὐτόγονον could have been changed to τὸ πᾶν in the manuscripts.
To me, the most likely solution is that a line has dropped out be-
tween τὸ γὰρ δίδιον and οὐ δίδιον ἐστὶ τὸ πᾶν. The author had been in
the process of defining τὸ δίδιον. Probably then τὸ γὰρ δίδιον had
been followed by some additional material defining that word. Then we
would expect the beginning of the sentence which ends with οὐ δίδιον

ἔστι τὸ πᾶν. Since the next sentence begins with ὁ δὲ πατήρ, it seems probable that this sentence had begun with ὁ μὲν κόσμος. It may then have proceeded <. . . ὁ μὲν κόσμος δθάναντόν ἐστι ζῶον> οὐ δίδιδόν ἐστι τὸ πᾶν. Perhaps manuscript damage caused this omission.

A perhaps insoluble problem is furnished by viii.3(88.13,14), ἔχει δὲ καὶ ἐνθάδε τὴν περὶ τὰ ἄλλα μικρὰ ποιεῖ εἰλουμένην τὸ τῆς αὐξήσεως καὶ τὸ τῆς μειώσεως. While we could emend τὴν . . . εἰλουμένην to γῆ . . . εἰλουμένη (Einarson) or <ἡταχτόν> τι . . . εἰλούμενον (Scott), these emendations seem arbitrary; in fact, Scott adds and subtracts several other items to make sense out of the passage. More likely, something has been lost after εἰλουμένην, such as διαξίαν (Nock). Since ὕλη in the previous sentence is the most likely subject for ἔχει, this would leave τὸ τῆς αὐξήσεως καὶ τὸ τῆς μειώσεως suspended. Probably the grammatical context for these words was lost in the same lacuna. Manuscript damage is indicated here as well.

In viii.4(88.20), ἡ δὲ ἀποκατάστασις τῶν ἐπιγέμων σωμάτων συστάσεως, a lacuna is to be suspected, and to be filled in, e.g. by συστάσεως <διαλύσις> (Einarson), συστάσεως <διαλύσει ἀνανέωσις> (Nock), or <διαλυθείσης γίνεται τῆς> συστάσεως (Scott).

In viii.5(89.4), οὐ κατὰ βούλησιν τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων, Flussas' emendation, νοῦν for οὐ has been easily accepted because of the parallel expression, οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὸν δεῦτερον θεὸν συμπάθειαν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔννοιαν τοῦ πρώτου, in the following lines. Nevertheless, it is not easy to see how νοῦν could have become οὐ. It is to be noted that the subject of the sentence, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ζῶον, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, lacks a suitable predicate. Perhaps this state of affairs is not altogether

unsatisfactory, since the interruption by Tat in viii.5(89.9) may be taken as breaking the train of thought. It is notable, however, that the text of this tractate as we have it does not allow Hermes to state whether he believes the soul to be immortal, in spite of his promise to discuss that topic in viii.1(87.4,5). Is it fanciful to suppose that this information was included in some material now omitted between τοῦ πατρὸς and ἔχων, as e.g., οὐ κατὰ βούλησιν τοῦ πατρὸς <ἀποθνήσκει, ὥστε ἀθανάσιον> ἔχων, κτλ.?

Without wishing to lay a great deal of stress on at least this last conjecture, which admittedly conflicts with the usual explanation of this tractate,¹ we can nevertheless suggest that the text of this tractate is unusually prone to lacunae. Although it consists of only 55 lines in the Nock-Festugière text, we can count, apart from accidental omissions of short words, two certain lacunae, viii.3(88.13,14) and viii.4(88.20), a probable lacuna in viii.2(88.1), and a possible lacuna in viii.5(89.4). These lacunae tend to be of the sort for which the most plausible explanation is physical damage to an earlier manuscript, caused for example by tearing. In any case, it is probable that the exemplar for this tractate available to the compiler was in very bad condition, and had perhaps suffered a great deal of physical damage.

C. H. ix

The text of C. H. ix has suffered somewhat from carelessness.

¹See below p. 130.

There are occasionally strange substitutions of words. Twice forms of κίνησις appear for forms of νόησις: in ix.1(96.6), rectified by Vergicius, and in ix.5(98.23), corrected by Flussas. There are also eighteen instances in this tractate in which νόησις is used correctly. I have no explanation for this error, although it is interesting to note that, according to the author, God is the perpetual motion of everything, τὸ τὸ πᾶντα δὲ κινεῖν, ix.9(100.12,13). Another strange substitution is συσκιᾶσαι for συστᾶσαι (Flussas), ix.8(99.21). Since συσκιᾶσις is an extremely rare word, one can only pay tribute to the learning of the author of the malapropism.

Among the more pedestrian substitutions are ἀλσθηῖναι for (probably) ἀλσθηθῆναι (Einarson) in ix.2(96.18); perhaps καίνοῦ (καὶ νοῦ M) for κενοῦ (A^2N) in ix.3(97.9), although here, since the context is corrupt, it is not possible to be certain; εἴπομεν for εἶπον ἐν (Scott) in ix.4(98.5); ἀφορᾷ for διὰφορα (Ménard) in ix.5(98.20); τῷ for τὸ (Scott) in ix.6(98.25); αὐτοῦ for αὐτὸς (B^C) in ix.9(100.16), and μου for οὐ (Zielinski) in ix.10(100.19). These errors indicate carelessness in the manuscript tradition of this tractate.

There are also some small omissions. In ix.1(96.10), a καί should be inserted before ἡ νόησις, following Nock. Either ἕως (Nock) or μέχρι (B^C) should be inserted before τῆς ἀληθείας in ix.10(100.21). The author had used μέχρι τῆς ἀληθείας in ix.10(100.19,20) and μέχρι τινὸς in ix.10(100.21). In ix.6(99.6,7), οὐκ (Turnebus) or καὶ οὐκ (B^C γρ.) is clearly demanded before ἔστι. These readings may indicate either carelessness in copying or manuscript damage to the exemplar.

There is also evidence that at least one page in this tractate

had suffered either physical damage or interpolation or both. In ix.2(97.1-3), the text as given in the manuscripts reads as follows: ἔμοι δὲ δοκεῖ τὸ γεγονέναι ἀμφοτέρως τὰς ἐνεργείας ἐν τῇ τῶν δυνάμεων ὕψει ἐγρηγοροῦσι γὰρ αἰσθῆσαι. Festugière here reads ἀπογεγονέναι for τὸ γεγονέναι and, following Scott, places a lacuna after γὰρ, which he fills in by "l'intellection est toujours unie" in his translation (Scott: <συνέζευκται δὲ νόησις> αἰσθῆσαι). If this emendation is accepted, then the most probable source of error is damage to the manuscript.

More troublesome is ix.3(97.9-11), μηδενὸς μέρους τοῦ κόσμου καινοῦ (καὶ νοῦ M) ὕψος δαίμονος τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πεφωτισμένῳ δαίμονι. As previously noted, καινοῦ may be for κενοῦ. It is possible that μηδενὸς . . . δαίμονος is explanatory. But since in the context demons are responsible for evil thoughts, therefore demons in the Christian sense of the word, whereas the explanation seems more appropriate to daemons in the classical sense, it should perhaps be rejected as a gloss (Scott, J. Kroll). This leaves us with τῷ . . . δαίμονι. Einarson would have us read <πλήν> τοῦ . . . πεφωτισμένου, omitting δαίμονι. But in that case it is difficult to see why δαίμονι was ever introduced. Zielinski's reading, τῷ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεχωρισθαι δαίμονα,¹ is equally difficult to explain. F. Cumont would have us believe that there is a lacuna after δαίμονι produced by homoeoteleuton.² Perhaps this is the

¹Th. Zielinski, "Hermes und die Hermetik," Archiv für Religionswissenschaft VIII (1905), 336.

²In Nöck-Festugière, op. cit., p. 102, n. 1.

case; but it must be said that ὅστις ὑπεισελθὼν, which in the manuscripts directly follows δαίμονι, could be understood very well if it followed without interruption ὅταν ὑπὸ τινος τῶν δαιμονίων, which immediately precedes μηδενὸς . . . δαίμονι. Therefore I am ready to believe, following J. Kroll, that this phrase is also a gloss, although I must confess that I am baffled as to the motive for its insertion.

In sum, then, the text of C. H. ix, apart from the difficulties already noted in ix.2(97.1,2) and ix.3(97.9-11), has relatively few problems. Most of the errors seem to be simple substitutions of single words.

C. H. x

The text of C. H. x has suffered considerable damage in transmission. Some of the errors are simple substitutions, due no doubt to absentmindedness. Among these are κατικνεῖσθαι for καθικνεῖσθαι (B²) in x.4(115.4); δβλαβῆς δὲ πῶσης καὶ δθανασίας for either δβλαβῆς δὲ καὶ πῶσης δθ. (Turnebus) or δβλαβετίας δὲ πῶσης καὶ δθ. (Nock) in the same place; ἦν for ἥς (Reitzenstein)¹ in x.5(115.5); οὕτως probably for οὕτω (Patritius) in x.5(115.10); αὔτε for αὐταί (given by Stobaeus) in x.7.4; ἐπιλαβόμενος for ἐπιλαθόμενος (given by Hermippus) in x.6(115.18); ὀγκυμένου (ὀγκυμένον A) for ὀγκυμένου (Turnebus) or ὀγκουμένου (d) in x.15(120.15); συγχρωματίζόμενον αὐτῷ for συγχρωτίζόμενον αὐτῇ (Stobaeus) in x.17.4; οἱ περὶ (l) for ὑπηρέτη (Stobaeus, ms. P²) in x.17.6; ἐστὶ for εἰσὶ (D¹, Ven.) in x.20(123.15); ὑπνοῦσα

¹He also removes τῆς θέας in the same line, in Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen (3rd. ed.; Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956, reprinted from 1927), p. 231, n. 1.

for $\delta\mu\sigma\sigma\alpha$ (Flussas) in x.21(124.1); and perhaps $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ for $\sigma\delta\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ (Stobaeus) in x.25.1. These all appear to be slips of memory in the inner dictation of the scribe as he transfers the text from his exemplar to his new page.¹ While they could happen to anyone, they are unusually frequent in this tractate, indicating perhaps a casual attitude on the part of one of the scribes in its manuscript tradition.

The substitution of $\epsilon\lambda$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ for η $\tau\omicron$ (Turnebus) in x.2(113.13), as that of $\delta\zeta$ perhaps for $\delta\eta$ (Scott) in x.5(115.6) are based on confusion brought about by similarity of pronounciations.

A few of the errors in this tractate are most easily explained on the basis of a misreading of an uncial exemplar, as $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\tau\alpha$ for $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\rho\gamma\alpha$ (d) in x.5(115.14), and $\epsilon\nu$ η $\tau\omicron$ for $\theta\nu\eta\tau\omicron$ (Scott) in x.11(118.20); $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ $\tau\epsilon$ perhaps for $\sigma\tilde{\omega}\mu\alpha$, $\tau\alpha$ $\tau\epsilon$ (Einarson) in x.10(118.3) is probably the result of the misreading of an unaccented text. On the other hand, a miniscule exemplar is more likely responsible for the substitution of $\epsilon\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha$ for $\epsilon\delta$ $\mu\sigma\sigma\iota\sigma\sigma\alpha$ (Flussas) in x.21(124.2).

Probably $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ for $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (given by Stobaeus) or $\mu\alpha\lambda\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (Turnebus) in x.8.3 is merely a spelling error. The same is likely true of $\epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha\iota$ ($\epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha\iota$ CM) for $\epsilon\lambda\tau\epsilon\gamma\alpha\iota$ (D, Stobaeus) in x.24.1.

A few errors in this tractate involve the omission of one letter: $\epsilon\nu\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}\nu$ for $\gamma\epsilon\nu\iota\kappa\tilde{\omega}\nu$, x.1(113.4), given correctly in x.7(116.7); $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\tilde{\eta}$ for $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\tilde{\eta}\varsigma$ (Turnebus), x.11(118.14); $\mu\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}$ (BCM; $\mu\lambda\eta\nu$ $\epsilon\lambda$ A; $\mu\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ DB^c) for $\mu\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\omega$ (Ménard) or $\mu\lambda\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\omega\nu\alpha$ (Nock) in x.11(118.19); $\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$ ($\theta\varsigma$ A) for $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ (d; $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\delta\epsilon$ B², Stobaeus) in x.18.8. Some slight

¹See Dain, op. cit., pp. 44 ff.

defect in a manuscript caused these errors.

There are also occasional omissions of words. In x.6(116.3), τὸ is omitted, and should be inserted either before τοῦ δγαθοῦ (B^C) or before κἀλλος (Reitzenstein). In x.4(114.17,18), ὁδίου γὰρ τοῦ δγαθοῦ τὸ γνῶσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ δγαθόν, following Festugière,¹ we should perhaps punctuate after γνῶσθαι and insert τοῦτο before ἐστὶ. In x.11(118.18), ἐν ᾧ should be inserted before ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχὴ, see Nock's apparatus ad loc.

It is not clear why we have εἰσδύνασθαι for εἰσδύνας (B^C) in x.21(123.21) or τῶν κατὰ μετρώσαν for either κατὰ μετρώσαν, omitting τῶν (Nock) or ὧν κατὰ μετρώσαν (Einarson) in x.2(114.1). Perhaps a scribe was absent-minded.

There are also a large number of lacunae in the text of this tractate. We can for convenience divide these into two groups: those that can best be explained as caused by homoeoteleuton, homoearcton, or related phenomena, and those that can best be explained in terms of manuscript damage. For some in the first group, the original reading may be furnished by Stobaeus. In x.7.10, the manuscripts read αἱ δὲ ἀνθρώποι δθανασας (αἱ δθανασας A) ἔχουσι. This becomes clear if we read, with Stobaeus, <ἀρχὴν> δθανασας. (We need not follow him in reading ὀσχουσιν for ἔχουσι.) Presumably the succession of words beginning with A helped to precipitate this error.

For x.22.4,5, we have, in the text of the Corpus Hermeticum, the enigmatic words, καὶ κοινῶνους μὲν αἱ τῶν θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

¹Festugière, Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 57, n. 1.

ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντων. This becomes clear if, with Stobaeus, we read: καὶ κοινύνουσι μὲν αἱ τῶν θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, <αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων. ἐπιμελοῦνται δὲ οἱ κρείττονες τῶν ἐλαττόνων, θεοὶ μὲν ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωποι δὲ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῴων,> ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντων.

It may also be possible, with the help of Stobaeus, to reconstruct x.13.2, ὁ νοῦς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν τῷ σῶματι. The difficulty is that the next sentence begins with τὸ πνεῦμα. Since Stobaeus reads πνεύματι for σῶματι, it would be possible simply to follow Stobaeus here; such a substitution is not impossible given the tendencies of the manuscript tradition of this tractate. But it is also possible that a lacuna is to be suspected: ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν τῷ <πνεύματι, τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ> σῶματι. This is presupposed in Mead's translation, *op. cit.*, II, 149. (So Turnebus and Wachsmuth.)

A similar error probably occurred in x.1(113.6,7), ἡ μὲν γὰρ φύσεως καὶ αὐξήσεως ἐστὶ προσηγορία. Since the sentence in its context should be defining φύσις, it is, as it stands, tautological.

J. Kroll would solve this problem by reading φύσεως for φύσεως, clearly a good choice, since it would provide a contrast for αὐξήσεως. Scott would read φύσις γενεσεως, Zuntz¹ φύσις μειψεως. These emendations would suggest that two words had become telescoped into one. This is also quite possible. I would prefer, borrowing from each suggestion, to read φύσις φθ(σ)εως the error being caused by the close juxtaposition of two similar words.

¹Zuntz, *loc. cit.*, p. 74.

The same tendency may have caused the error in the subordinate clause immediately following: ἅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ τὰ μεταβλητὰ καὶ κινητὰ καὶ ἀκίνητα. Here the repeated -ητα would tend to cause errors. Patri-tius reads: μεταβλητὰ <καὶ ἀμετέβλητα>, which however destroys the sense of the passage, which contrasts φύσις and ἐνέργεια. Nock, who points this out, saves the sense by reading <ἡ δὲ> καὶ <περὶ τὰ> ἀκίνητα. It is, however, difficult on that hypothesis to account for the present condition of the manuscripts. The solution is more likely to be along the lines suggested by Scott: <ἡ δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργεια περὶ τὰ ἀμετέβλητα> καὶ ἀκίνητα. I would, however, preserving a more strict parallelism with the preceding clause, prefer to read: <ἡ δὲ ἐνέργεια θελήσεως καὶ ποιήσεως ἐστὶ προσήγορα, ἅπερ ἐστὶ περὶ τὰ ἀμετέβλητα> καὶ ἀκίνητα. It is to be noted that, according to x.2 (113.11,12), the activity (ἐνέργεια) of God is θελήσεις and, according to x.3(114.7,8), the Good is τὸ ποιητικόν.

There are also many errors in the text of this tractate which seem to be the result of damage to the manuscripts. A major example may conveniently be cited here, since it follows directly on the last mentioned, in x.1(113.8,9): τοῦτέστι τὰ θεῖα τε καὶ ἀνθρώπεια ὧν αὐτὸς βούλεται εἶναι. Here the major difficulty is that ὧν cannot be explained in its present context. Scott salvages it in part by transferring it, removing τε in the process: τοῦτέστι τὰ θεῖα [τε] ὧν καὶ <τὰ> ἀνθρώπεια αὐτὸς βούλεται εἶναι. While this emendation is less arbitrary than many of Scott's, it is still difficult to account for the present state of the text if it is correct. Einarson reads ὧ for ὧν, but again such a substitution is not easy to explain; moreover, on this

hypothesis, the text is rather abrupt. Patritius' emendation, *ὡς* <ἐκαστον>, is more economical, but leaves unexplained the relation of this sentence to the definition of φύσις in the previous line. I suspect a larger lacuna, as for example: <ἐν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώποις ποιητικὴ ἡ ἐνέργεια τῶν ἐπιγείων μόνον, ἐν δὲ τῷ θεῷ πάντων> ὃν αὐτὸς βούλεται εἶναι. (According to x.18.10,11, the human νοῦς is creative with respect to earthly things.)

(Perhaps the following sentence, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ ἐνέργειαν καθὼς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐδιδάξαμεν θεῶν καὶ ἀνθρώπων, x.1(113.9-11), needs no emendation, since it is adequately translated in its present state by Festugière; for the use of ἐπὶ see Liddell-Scott-Jones s.v. ἐπὶ, A.III.4, p. 621.)

Although Festugière wishes to salvage ἀλλὰ ὑπαρξιν αὐτὴν τῶν ὄντων in x.2(113.14),¹ it seems best to suppose either that there is a lacuna in the text or, as Nock suggests, that the words are a gloss.

In x.3(114.13,14), ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τῷ εἶναι τὰ πάντα, Nock's emendation of τὸ for τῷ might be acceptable except that one would expect this sentence to continue the (rather forced) distinction between τὸ ποιητικόν and ὁ ποιῶν introduced in x.3(114.10). Festugière's insertion (after Scott) of θέλειν before εἶναι² suffers in the same way. I would read τῷ εἶναι τὰ πάντα <δεῖ ποιητικόν.>; cf. Scott, τῷ <θέλειν> εἶναι τὰ πάντα <πάντων πατὴρ.>

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 6.

²Ibid., IV, 57.

In x.4(114.15-17), καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο θελεῖ εἶναι καὶ ἔστι καὶ αὐτῷ, μάλιστα δὲ αὐτοῦ. καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα διὰ τοῦτον ἔστι, we may perhaps postulate a lacuna caused by a tear across either the bottom or the top of a page, leaving gaps after αὐτῷ and ἔστι. The second of these was suspected by Scott, mainly because of the abruptness of the text; grammatically he did not need it since he read διὰ τοῦτο, following Pal., Q, for διὰ τοῦτον. Festugière in the Budé edition wanted to obviate the need for postulating the first lacuna by reading καὶ ἔστι καὶ αὐτοῦ, μάλιστα δι' αὐτοῦ, perhaps supposing too many alterations in the text; later he reverted to the manuscript reading, which he translated, "Car cela aussi Dieu veut que cela soit, est c'est là une propriété qu'il possède lui aussi et principalement. De fait tout le reste n'existe que pour cela."¹ But this is perhaps too clumsy.

A lacuna must also be supposed in x.15(120.10,11), οὕτω (οὕτως CM) μόνον ἀγαθῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ οὐδέποτε ἀγαθῇ, κακῇ δὲ γίνεται. In the context in x.15, the subject of discussion is the γνῶσις of God, which is characterized as the only salvation, and as the road to Olympus. Now, Nock emends the words here quoted by reading μόνως for μόνων and inserting δὲ after οὐδέποτε ἀγαθῇ. The difficulty is, that it is not at all easy to see how a soul which is on the road to Olympus should ever become evil. This is all the more astonishing since we learn in the next paragraph that the subject of discussion is now the soul of a child before it has become corrupted. It seems reasonable to suppose that there is a large lacuna in the text, perhaps after οὕτω

¹Ibid., IV, 60.

μόνων. (Scott, who makes other changes, places a lacuna after ψυχῆ.) This omission would have contained the words which had changed the subject. There may also be a minor omission of δεῖ (Nock) or μένει after οὐδέποτε διαθή.

In x.15(120.14,15), τοῦ σώματος αὐτῆς ἔτι ὀλίγον ὕκνωτο (ὕκνωτο D) καὶ μηδεὶς τὸ πᾶν ὀγκυμένον (ὀγκυμένον A; ὀγκοῦμενον d), it is possible that ἔτι ὀλίγον ὕκνωτο καὶ is a comment by a scribe which has intruded itself into the text.

Thus it appears that the text of this tractate has suffered considerable damage in the course of transmission both from scribal errors and from manuscript damage. Characteristic is the omission of individual letters, indicating perhaps light manuscript damage rather than carelessness. Also characteristic is the large number of lacunae, some apparently caused by manuscript damage, others by carelessness induced by homoeoteleuton or homoearcton. No evidence of deliberate alteration of the text was uncovered, although in at least one case it is apparent that a gloss has intruded itself into the text.

C. H. xi

The text of C. H. xi is thoroughly corrupt. Among the more easily explained errors are ἐγχωρεῖν for ἐκχωρεῖν (Scott) in xi.5 (149.10), caused by the similarity in appearance of the two words; καινὸν for κενὸν (D, Bon.; καῖνόν Ven., Pal.) in xi.5(149.15), caused by itacism; ῥύψειν for ταῖς ὀψείν (Turnebus) in xi.16(154.1), for which I can assign no cause, and θνητῶν for δθανάτων (Tiedemann) in xi.10(151.11), again caused by the resemblance of the two words. In

xi.13(152.14), εἰ μὴ θέμις εἰπεῖν, we may choose between ὅ μὴ (Scott), caused by inattention, or εἵ μοι (which I propose), caused by itacism. In xi.20(155.12,13), τῶν ὁμοφῶν was written for τῷ ὁμοφῶ (Vergicius), presumably through mere carelessness.

In xi.15(153.14,15) καὶ ἡ μὲν δόνησις στροφῆ, ἡ δὲ κρύψις δυνάμωσις, Nock indicates that στροφῆ is suspect. I would write τροφῆ for στροφῆ; the error would be caused by the resemblance of the two words. The text as it now stands is practically tautological: "whirling is turning." If this emendation were accepted, the sentence would read "its whirling is nurture, but its hiding is renewal."

Twice superlatives are written for comparatives: in xi.20 (155.18), ὑψηλότερος for ὑψηλότερος (Turnebus) and in xi.22(156.17), φανερώτατος for φανερώτερος (given by Cyril). Perhaps in these two cases we ought not to exculpate the author.

As in tractate x, some errors appear to have been caused by one or two letters being obscured. This may, for example, have given us δὲ for ὕδρ (Scott) in xi.7(150.8); μεταβάλλουσα for μεταβάλλουσιν (DB^C) in the following line; οὐδὲ (οὐδ' CM) for οὐδὲν (DB^C) in xi.18(154.16); πᾶς for πῶς (Tiedemann) in xi.10(151.10); and πρᾶγμα for πρᾶγματα (DB^C) in xi.20(156.2).

In xi.20(155.11), τὸν κόσμον, ἑαυτὸν, ὅλον, we may choose between ἑαυτὸν <τε> ὅλον (Reitzenstein) or ἑαυτὸν, <τὸ> ὅλον (Scott); in either case a word was omitted, either through carelessness or because of manuscript damage.

If Nock is right, then a massive error due to itacism is found in xi.16(153.22-154.1), which in A reads μὲν οὖν ἔχει εἰ δὲ ἔν εἵ τις

ἰστέιν αὐτοῦ ἰδέα, this last word apparently being a correction from ἰδέα, found also in CMD and probably originally in B. The words εἰ δὲ ἔν τῃ τις became in BCM εἰ δὲ ἔν τῇ τις, perhaps a partial correction. In D they became ἰδέαν ἔν τῇ τις, in Ven. εἰ δὲ ἔν ἡ τις, in B^C εἰ δὲ τῇ τις. According to Nock, the reading of A is faithful to the archetype, and stands for ἰδέαν εἰ τις;¹ this reconstruction seems very plausible to me.

A similar error has been suspected in xi.19(154.20), εἰς ἣν δὲ καὶ πορευθῆναι. Nock, following Patritius, wishes to read εἰς Ἰνδοικὴν πορευθῆναι; but perhaps Scott's conjecture, εἰς ἣν δὴ καὶ <βούλει γῆν> is more plausible; if so, then manuscript damage may be suspected.

The reading of the manuscripts for xi.22(156.16), εἰκόνι ταῖς δόματα ὁ θεός, is baffling. Nock prints εἴτα φῆς, given by Cyril (see Nock's addenda, II, 403), which is probably right; but it is very difficult to account for the reading given in the manuscripts.

Similarly difficult to account for is ἄρχων καὶ ἡγεμὼν for ἄρχοντος καὶ ἡγεμόνος (Turnebus) in xi.7(150.7). It is difficult to suppose a lacuna here, since there is no apparent gap in the contents of the paragraph. Therefore we must blame this error on inattention. This sort of error is very frequent in tractate xii, see above p. 76 f.

Some of the errors in C. H. xi make sense on the supposition that a word or group of words was first omitted accidentally, then written into the margin, and later incorporated into the wrong place in the

¹See Nock in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, xvi, intro.

text in the course of recopying. So for example the first words of the tractate, κατόχας οὖν τῶν λόγων, ὃ Τρισμέγιστε Ἑρμῆ, καὶ μέμνησο τῶν λεγομένων. ὥς δέ μοι ἐπῆλθεν εἰπεῖν οὐκ ὀκνήσω, xi.1(147.2-4) do not make sense as an opening. Nock in his apparatus indicates that they ought to be transferred to xi.1(147.7), immediately after φανέρωσιν. If so, then the above explanation would be the most probable.

In xi.2(147.7,8), the words ὁ χρόνος lack any context. But in xi.2(147.9) in BCM, the words θεός, ὁ αἰὼν, ὁ κόσμος, ἡ γένεσις occur. These words also occur in A, except that χρόνος appears for κόσμος. Perhaps we can best account for this state of affairs by supposing that A's reading of χρόνος is a conjecture, so that the archetype in this case read as BCM. Then we may suppose that in an earlier text, perhaps the exemplar used by the archetype, ὁ χρόνος had first been omitted, then written into the margin. The compiler would then have made an unfortunate guess as to the original position of ὁ χρόνος. Originally, the whole line, θεός, ὁ αἰὼν, ὁ κόσμος, ὁ χρόνος, ἡ γένεσις (the order being guaranteed by xi.2(147.10,11), immediately following, was probably a gloss.

Ferguson would, perhaps rightly, amend xi.6(149.23-150.1), διὰ κιντὸς δὲ δαμαῖον καὶ νέον καὶ μᾶλλον δαμαϊότερον, by transferring ἔσται from xi.6(149.23), καὶ οὐ παλαιότερον οὐδὲν ἔσται. If so, then a similar explanation is to be suspected. This passage may also be emended, however, by removing καὶ μᾶλλον δαμαϊότερον (Reitzenstein), these two words being a gloss on either παλαιότερον or δαμαῖον.

Festugière suggests that xi.15(153.6,7), ἐστὶ τοῖνυν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ αἰὼν, τοῦ δὲ αἰῶνος ὁ κόσμος, τοῦ δὲ κόσμου ὁ ἥλιος is displaced,

and originally followed xi.14(153.4), [ωη] δε ἐστὶν ἕνωσις νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς. This suggestion, for which he gives detailed justification in his La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste IV, 156-158, seems to me quite plausible, and if correct would be another instance of the tendency in the manuscript tradition of this tractate for groups of words to become displaced, for the reasons suggested above.

The text of this tractate has attracted a large number of unfriendly glosses. That is how, following Ferguson, I would interpret γελοϊότατον in xi.11(151.17) and ἐν πολλῷ γελοϊότατον in xi.12(151.20). These would not have referred precisely to the words immediately following, which in both cases are inoffensive, but to words in the immediate context: καὶ τὸν μὲν κόσμον ἀμολόγησας δεῖ εἶναι in xi.11(151.17,18) and αὐτὸν δὲ τὸν θεὸν πῶστον εἶναι θελαίς in xi.11(151.19). So also in xi.15(153.11), δεισιδαιμόνων ὧς (δεισιδαιμόνως B^C) ἀμούεις was rightly attributed by Reitzenstein to a Christian glossator; it has no logical connection with its present context. We may compare these with such notes as the scholion attributed to Psellus in the margin of B² at i.18, and incorporated into the text of M. Apparently only the text of C. H. xi suffered in this way in the archetype. It seems most plausible to suppose that these glosses are comments by a Christian scribe distressed at the teachings of some parts of this tractate. Since only tractate xi suffers in this way, although there is occasion in all of the tractates, it seems reasonable to suppose that at least this tractate had passed through the hands of a Christian scribe before becoming incorporated into the Corpus Hermeticum. This is consistent with the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled at a late date, and

inconsistent with the hypothesis that it was the product of a Hermetic religious community.

As often in the Corpus, there is evidence of lacunae in the text. That is how, for example, I would interpret xi.5(149.10,11), τὶς γὰρ μετ' ἐκεῖνον εἴτε ζωῆς καὶ θανάσας μεταβολῆς ποιότητος. Nock, accepting Scott's reading of ποιητῆς for ποιότητος as well as Turnebus' reading of θανάσας <καὶ> μεταβολῆς, also reads ἔστι for εἴτε. All of these postulated misreadings would be acceptable in themselves; but a more economical solution would be to postulate a lacuna after ποιότητος, supplementing, in part, as follows: ποιότητος <χορηγός εἴτε . . .>. The καὶ after ζωῆς may be secondary. This lacuna would have been caused by damage to the manuscript.

There is a major difficulty in xi.21(156.10,11), τὸ δὲ δύναισθαι γινῶναι καὶ θελῆσαι καὶ ἀλπίσαι ὁδὸς ἔστι εὐθεῖα ἴδῃ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φέρουσα καὶ βρόδῃ. Reitzenstein gives διὰ for ἴδῃ which should mean "through" the Good. But surely the Good should be the goal, not the means. If with Einarson we read εὐθυωψία for εὐθεῖα, what should we do with ἴδῃ? The beginning of the sentence, up to εὐθεῖα, is in itself acceptable, and would mean, "being able to know and will and hope is a straight road;" in this context ἴδῃ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is also perhaps acceptable: "belonging to the Good." It is the next words, φέρουσα καὶ βρόδῃ, which present a problem. Festugière would read βρόδῃ for βρόδῃ, changing only an accent, and would translate, "amenant même avec soi (ayant pour conséquence) des chose faciles."¹ I find this translation

¹Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, III, 110, n. 6.

rather enigmatic, however, and therefore I would prefer to suppose a lacuna after either ἀγαθοῦ or φέρουσα. This lacuna may have contained some reference to the idea of the Good, which is the logical subject for the next sentence, δδεύοντι σοι πανταχοῦ συναντήσῃ καὶ πανταχοῦ δοθήσεται, κτλ., for which no subject appears to be available in the context.

Significant damage has occurred in xi.10(151.10-12), πῶς οὖν καὶ τὰ θνητὰ ζῶα ἄλλα τῶν θνητῶν; πῶς δὲ τὸ θάνατον καὶ θάνασσαν ποιοῦντα (ποιοῦν τὰ Bd) ζῶων μὴ ποιεῖν. In the context, the author is attacking the doctrine that there are two creators. One variant of this doctrine, mentioned in xi.9(151.1,2), is that one of these created matter, the other souls. In xi.10, the author apparently intends to question this view: οὕτω δὲ νοεῖ, ὡς παντὸς σώματος ζῶντος ἐξ ὕλης καὶ ψυχῆς τὴν οὐσίαν ἔχοντος This, according to the writer, leads to the conclusion that the creator of immortal animals is responsible for the creation of all life, reading with Tiedemann πᾶσης for πᾶς, xi.10(151.10). Then follow these two sentences, which are supposed to clinch the argument. The first may easily be solved, with Tiedemann, by reading τῶν θανάτων for τῶν θνητῶν. The second sentence should perhaps read πῶς δὲ <δεῖ τὸν> (δεῖ <τὸν> Ferguson) τὸ θάνατον καὶ θάνασσαν ποιοῦντα <τὰ σώματα> ζῶων (ζῶων θνητῶν Ferguson) μὴ ποιεῖν. The first of these omissions would have been caused by the similarity of the surrounding words, the second by the repeated endings in -τα.

For xi.13(152.12,13), εἰ γὰρ ἀποδείκνυται μηδὲν δυνάμενον εἶναι, Nock's solution, <σε> μηδὲν <ποιοῦντα μὴ> δυνάμενον εἶναι, and Head's, μηδὲν <ἀργὸν> δυνάμενον εἶναι, both seem plausible; we

could perhaps add μηδὲν δυνάμενον εἶναι <εἰ μὴ ποιεῖ.>

This tractate then has its share of lacunae, mainly, it would appear, caused by manuscript damage. In addition, it has a large number of copying errors, of which the majority seem to have been caused by carelessness, although some were probably caused by light damage to a manuscript. An unusual feature is the large number of cases in which it appears that a sentence or a group of words has been transposed. Even more unusual in the Corpus Hermeticum is the number of unfriendly, presumably Christian glosses which this tractate has attracted. As already indicated, this last feature is consistent with the date postulated in the previous chapter for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum.

C. H. xii

Apart from the readings noted in the previous chapter, the text of C. H. xii presents relatively few difficulties, most of which are easily explained. The most common error in this tractate is the substitution of one form of a word for another. Thus in xii.1(174.5), we have αὐτὸν probably for αὐτὸς (Reitzenstein);¹ αὐτὸ (Einarson) is more clumsy. So also in xii.1(174.9), we have αὐτοῦ for αὐτῶν (Flussas); in xii.4(175.19), τὸ ἄλογον for τὸ ἄλογα (B^C); συνέστηκε for συνεστήκη (Scott) in xii.15(180.14); ἀπολέσαι for ἀπολέσθαι (Parthey) in xii.16(180.19); ὅπερ for ὡςπερ (DB^C γρ.) in xii.21(182.19); ἔλη for ἔλην (DB^C) in xii.22(183.7); ἔλη ἐνέργεια for ἔλης ἐνέργειαν (Patritius) in

¹Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen, p. 408, supported by Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 7, n. 5.

xii.22(183.9); ἡ οὐσία for τῆς οὐσίας in xii.22(183.10). If there is any tendency here, it is to replace the oblique cases with the nominative singular; but it is not followed consistently.

It seems plausible to suppose with W. Kroll that in xii.3(175.12), εἰς was written for αἰς. Presumably this was caused by itacism.

Frequently small words are omitted. In xii.6(176.7,8), τὸ δὲ νῦν ἔχον ὁ περὶ κακίας καὶ εἰμαρμένης λόγος, a negative is missing. Nock, on the advice of Tiedemann, reads οὐ for ὁ and then, following Scott, inserts ὁ before λόγος. I would prefer to leave ὁ in its present position, reading <οὐχ> ὁ. In xii.8(177.7), we should insert τὸ (B^C) before νοητὰ σῶματα, in xii.14(180.1), τὰ (Turnebus) before σύνθετα σῶματα, in xii.22(183.9,10), τὴν (B^C) before συμδότητα. Perhaps in xii.9(177.13,14), we should, following Nock's suggestion, read <καὶ> τοῦ νοῦ. In xii.21(182.20), as indicated in Festugière's translation, we should perhaps read μέλη ἐστὶ <τοῦ θεοῦ>, cf. Scott's μέρη ἐστὶ <τοῦ θεοῦ> (θεοῦ B^CD). In xii.1(174.11) we should perhaps insert ἀνθρώπους after θανόντων (B^C). In xii.14(179.17), ὁ οὖν λόγος ἐστὶν εἰκὼν καὶ νοῦς τοῦ θεοῦ, the insertion of τοῦ νοῦ after εἰκὼν (Flussas) would make a great deal of sense; compare the similar chain of being in xi.15(153.6,7).

In xii.21(182.21), αἵμα is probably in error for εἰμαρμένη (Scott); this error could have been facilitated by itacism.

In xii.4(175.21), γὰρ καὶ (DB^C) became καὶ γὰρ. Perhaps one of these words had been omitted in the course of copying, then inserted between the lines, from which it was later introduced into the wrong place.

It is difficult to know what to do with xii.5(176.2,3), καὶ κολλῶνται ἢ ὁ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τῆς εἰμαρμένης ὁράσας τὸ ἔργον. Nock brackets ἢ in his text, but in his apparatus suggests ὁ ἀποδὲν ἀλλ' ἢ ἐξ κτλ., supposing two errors.

There appears to be a lacuna in xii.6(176.12-14): καὶ πάλιν ὅτι ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄλλοις ἔφοις οὐκ ἔστιν εὐεργητικός, ἀλλ' ἀνόμοιος ἐν πᾶσι, τὸ τε θυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν σβεννύων, it seems best to read, as Nock tentatively suggests, πᾶσι<ν>, ἐν δὲ ἀνθρώποις> κτλ. Perhaps more words have been omitted; but at least these words are demanded by the context.

There is also one apparent addition to the text, in xii.12 (178.21-179.1): ὅτι δύο ταῦτα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὁ θεὸς παρὰ πάντα τὰ θνητὰ ἔφα ἔχαρσατο, τὸν τε νοῦν καὶ τὸν λόγον, ἰσότημα τῇ ἀθανασίᾳ, τὸν δὲ προφορικὸν λόγον ἔχει. The last five words here seem to be a gloss based on chapter thirteen immediately following. But in fact it is incorrect, since the author appears to equivocate between the ἐνδιδθετος λόγος and the προφορικὸς λόγος, if indeed he is even aware of the distinction.

Some proposed emendations to the text of this tractate are unnecessary since they presuppose a logical consistency foreign to the author. So for example, when the author writes ὅπου γὰρ ψυχῇ, ἔκει καὶ νοῦς ἔστιν, xii.2(174.13), and in the same chapter ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀλόγοις ἔφοις ἡ ψυχὴ ἔστι κενὴ τοῦ νοῦ (174.14,15) and (νοῦς) καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀλόγοις τῇ δι' ἐκάστου φάσει συνεργεῖ (174.16-175.1), it is not necessary to postulate an insertion, with Reitzenstein; the author is simply not concerned with the logical coherence of his statements. For

a discussion of similar problems in xii.11, see below, p. 117 f.

In summary then, the text of C. H. xii, while not without problems, compares favourably with the text of most of the Hermetic tractates. There is little evidence of manuscript damage, but there is some evidence of carelessness. The most common type of error, apart from the tendency to write οὖν for εἶναι noted in the previous chapter, is the tendency to write the wrong form of a noun or a verb.

C. H. xiii

The text of C. H. xiii has suffered moderate damage. Some of the corruptions are easily explained as resulting from errors in copying. Thus μεταβάσεως for καταβάσεως (Reitzenstein) in xiii.1(200.8) most likely goes back to a misreading of a miniscule K. In xiii.1 (200.14), παλιγγενεσίας παραδοῦναι (παλιγγενεσιαν παραδοῦναι NBC), the most plausible explanation, following Zuntz, is that παρδοοσιν has dropped out before παραδοῦναι because of the similarity in appearance of the two words.¹ So also in xiii.9(204.11), κρ(σεως (Parthey) became κτ(σεως and in xiii.10(204.23), ἐθεωθημεν (Reitzenstein) became ἐθεωρήθημεν.

If Eitrem is right,² then a similar accident has happened in xiii.12(205.11,12), ἐξ ἀριθμῶν δώδεκα ὄντων τῶν ἀριθμῶν (τῶν ἀριθμῶν A, corr. A^c). He would, for ἀριθμῶν, read either ἄρθρων or, "melius," ἀρμῶν or ἀρμονιῶν. The error, he suggests, was attracted by τῶν ἀριθμῶν in the following line. Festugière would render this unnecessary by

¹ Zuntz, op. cit., p. 76 f.

² S. Eitrem, "Varia CVIII," Symbolae Osloenses XXVII (1949) 144

suppressing τῶν ἀριθμῶν (which he takes to have been the reading of the archetype) as a variant, leaving ἐξ ἀριθμῶν as it is, but understood in the sense of "item" or "term of a series," see Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. ἀριθμός, 1, 4, p. 240.¹ In this case Eitrem's solution seems to me to be the most plausible.

In xiii.22(209.15), ἐπιγγεῖλαι presumably became ἐπιγγεῖλε (ἐπιγγεῖλε B; ἐπιγγεῖλον B^C) because of itacism. In xiii.3(201.19), οὐαίρι (Keil) apparently became οὐαίρι. In this case the error will have been facilitated by the fact that the two expressions have the same first and last syllables. In xiii.7(203.15), διδ τοῦ (B^C) could easily have become διδ τοῦτο simply because the latter expression is common, and therefore would tend to be used, as it were, automatically. According to Zuntz,² in xiii.17(207.23), χρῆσις given by B^C, has become κῆσιν (κῆσιν 1297), no doubt because of the similarity of the two words.

According to Reitzenstein, in xiii.3(201.14), ὁρῶν τι ἐν ἑμοῖ ἡπλαστον θεῶν (ὁρῶντι AM; ὁρῶν B^C), τι takes the place of a partially obscured word in the manuscript. He proposed ποτε, which seems to be demanded by the sense of the paragraph. Flussas had proposed τιν' for τι; but in that case τιν' appears to be unnecessary. Festugière would punctuate after τι,³ θεῶν would then be in apposition. This reading is

¹A.-J. Festugière, "Corpus Hermeticum 13, 12," Classical Philology XLVIII (1953) 237-238.

²G. Zuntz, "On the hymns in Corpus Hermeticum xiii," Hermes LXXXIII (1955) 76.

³Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 202, n. 1.

quite possible, although I prefer Reitzenstein's reading.

Presumably manuscript damage also gave us πνεῦμα for πνευμάριε (Keil) in xiii.18(208.17).

The most economical solution for xiii.15(206.18), καθὼς Ὀγδοῶδα ὁ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέλοντες, is that proposed by Zuntz, who would simply remove Ὀγδοῶδα on the grounds that it could easily have intruded itself from the previous line.¹ (Scott also removes Ὀγδοῶδα, but makes other unnecessary alterations.) Presumably a scribe began to recopy a line, but caught himself in time. (See above, p. 40 for a similar phenomenon on a larger scale in ii.12.1.) Nock once wished to remove the whole clause,² but apparently repented, since he does not even mention that proposal in his apparatus in the Nock-Festugière edition. Reitzenstein had at first postulated a lacuna, which he filled, καθὼς ἀνέστρεψεν μοι εἰς τὸν Ὀγδοῶδα; later, however, he obviates the difficulty by punctuating after ἐθέλοντες, associating the words quoted above with the previous sentence.³ While this reconstruction wins the approval of Festugière, it seems to make less sense than Zuntz's correction, as may be seen by Festugière's rather forced translation: "selon que Poimandrès a rendu son oracle de l'Ogdoadé."⁴

Zuntz also suspects a similar intrusion from a previous line

¹ Zuntz, "Notes on the Corpus Hermeticum," p. 76 f.

² A. D. Nock, "Notes and studies," The Journal of Theological Studies XXIX (1927-28) 42 f.

³ Reitzenstein-Schaeder, op. cit., p. 28, n. 1.

⁴ Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 206.

in xiii.21(209.7), θεε, ου πατερ, where he would remove θεε on the grounds that ου cannot stand between two vocatives. (In the previous line, he reads Τῷ θεε for Τῷ θεῷ.) In addition, he finds θεε unacceptable on metric grounds, since if θεε is deleted, then the hymn in xiii.21 contains five cola of eleven syllables each.¹ Moreover, in xiii.18(208.13), δι' ἐμοῦ δεῖξαι τὸ πᾶν λόγῳ λογικῇν θυσίαν, he believes that δι' ἐμοῦ has intruded from a previous line; in the same line, he regards λόγῳ as a doublet, attracted by the following word, λογικῇν.² He also regards λογικῶς in xiii.21(209.8) as a gloss based on the previous line which has expelled the original reading.³ If these readings are all correct, then the text of this tractate is unusually susceptible to this sort of error.

Most of the other alterations alleged by Zuntz, except the apparent omission of σε after τὸ πᾶν, following Flussas, in xiii.19(208.14),⁴ were, according to him, adjustments made by the author of tractate xiii to fit the hymns of xiii.17-21 into the present context. Therefore they are not relevant to our present purposes.

A lacuna must also be supposed somewhere in xiii.12(205.14,15): ἀχωριστὸς ἐστὶν ἡ προπέτεια τῆς ὁργῆς· εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ δίδωριστοι. I prefer one of Einarson's solutions here, εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ <φθόνος καὶ ἀνδρῆ> δίδωριστοι, although it might be necessary, comparing xiii.8(204.3)-9(204.20) with xiii.7(203.10-13), to read instead εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ <δόλος καὶ κακ(α)> δίδωριστοι. This point hinges on the interpretation of

¹ Zuntz, "On the hymns in Corpus Hermeticum xiii," p. 69

² Ibid., p. 72.

³ Ibid., p. 69

⁴ Ibid., p. 73.

xiii.9(204.14-17). If ἀλήθεια drives out φθόνος in addition to ἀπάτη, then Einarson's emendation is to be preferred. However, it appears to me that it is τὸ ἀγαθὸν which drives out φθόνος, leaving δόλος, ὀργή, προπέτεια and κακία for the remaining two δυνάμεις, ζωὴ and φῶς.

Evidently some words have been omitted from xiii.6(202.20-22), τὸ μὲν ἀνωφερές, ὡς πῦρ, καὶ κατωφερές, ὡς γῆ, καὶ ὑγρόν, ὡς ὕδωρ, καὶ σὺμπνοον ὡς ἀήρ, πῶς αἰσθητῶς αὐτὸ νοήσεις κτλ., some words are missing, most likely after ἀήρ. We may supply either ἀήρ αἰσθήσει ὑποπίπτει· ὁ δὲ χωρὶς τούτων, > πῶς κτλ., with Reitzenstein, or ἀήρ αἰσθήσει ὑποπίπτει· τὸ δὲ τούτοις ἀνόμοιον, > πῶς κτλ., with Scott, but without accepting his other changes.

For most of xiii.13, the text is thoroughly mangled. It contains a number of phrases, each of which might make sense if it were not for the context:

(1) Αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, ᾧ τέκνον, τὸ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ τριχῇ διαστατόν

(2) διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον τὸν περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας

(3) εἰς ὃν ὑπεμνηματισμένην

(4) Ὡς μὴ ᾄμεν διὰβολοὶ τοῦ παντὸς εἰς τοὺς πολλοὺς

(5) εἰς οὗς ὁ θεὸς αὐτὸς θέλει (αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς θέλει M; ὁ θεὸς θέλει B; αὐτοὺς θέλει ὁ θεός d)

Perhaps 2 and 3 can be combined. But we need (a) between 1 and 2, an object for φαντάζεσθαι and also a conjunction; (b) either between 1 and 2 or between 2 and 3, a verb (probably an infinitive) to be modified by διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον; (c) some object or modifier for ὑπεμνηματισμένην; and (d) some introduction or conjunction so that εἰς οὗς will be less abrupt. The most probable explanation for these consecutive lacunae is

that a corner of a page has been removed, so that several words are missing. These words may be supplied, for example, with Festugière, by "mais se voir dans le tout" after διαστατόν and "pour toi seul" after ὑπεμνηματισμένη;¹ another possibility (which I propose) is τὸ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ τριχῇ διαστατόν <τὸν οὐσιωδῆ ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἐκ τῶν δυνάμεων συνεστὸς λογίζεσθαι> διὰ τὸν λόγον τοῦτον τὸν περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, εἰς ὃν ὑπεμνηματισμένην <αἰχματωδῶς καὶ οὐ τηλαυγῶς> ἵνα μὴ ᾖμεν διάβολοι τοῦ παντός εἰς τοὺς πολλούς, <ἀλλὰ μόνον> εἰς οὗς (<ἀλλ'> εἰς οὗς Reitzenstein) ὁ θεὸς αὐτοὺς θέλει (following the reading of ACB^C). But there are a large number of words missing, so that probably the passage will never be reconstructed with any certainty.

One curious feature of the text of C. H. xiii is the title placed at C. H. xiii.17(207.13), ὕμνος κρυπτή, λόγος Δ'. This title evidently refers to the hymn in chapters 17-20. Against Reitzenstein, this title is not likely to refer to a series including also C. H. i.31, 32, iii, and vii,² since these four are not at all similar in form, i.31,32 and xiii.17-20 both being in the form of hymns, iii in the form of a sacred narration, and vii in the form of a sermon. It is also unlikely, against Festugière, to refer to Asclepius 41,³ since we have no reason to believe that C. H. xiii and the Asclepius were ever combined

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 41.

²Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 345.

³Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 217, n. 76.

into a single Corpus. More probably, this title indicates that C. H. xiii once stood in a collection of Hermetic documents each of which contained a similar hymn. This need not, of course, have been its original setting, and so the possibility remains that this title is, as Nock suggests, redactional,¹ although it is not likely to be by the compiler of the Corpus Hermeticum.

The text of C. H. xiii, accordingly, has suffered somewhat from carelessness. In addition, there are at least three places where lacunae have occurred. In one of these places, manuscript damage is almost certainly indicated, because there seem to be a number of omissions within a short space. In the other cases the cause could be either manuscript damage or carelessness. Apparently there is a tendency in this tractate for individual words from immediately preceding lines to be repeated in the text; I would conjecture that in these cases a scribe started to recopy a line, but had stopped after one word. That C. H. xiii had previously appeared in another collection is as much as proven by the enigmatic introduction to xiii.17-20 in xiii.17(207.13). It cannot, however, be shown on the basis of the text of this particular tractate when it had been inserted into its present context.

C. H. xiv

Taken in itself, the manuscript tradition of C. H. xiv presents relatively few problems. Problems do, to be sure, arise when the

¹ Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 217, n. 76.

manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum for this chapter is compared with the text furnished by Cyril, Contr. Jul. 2.63-64(76,597D-600B Migne), for xiv.6(224.9)-7(225.1) and xiv.8(225.5)-10(226.8).

However, I would prefer to discuss the relative merits of those two texts at a later date and discuss here only those cases which can be explained only on the supposition that there is a deficiency in the text of the Corpus Hermeticum. In fact, the variant readings supplied by Cyril are similar in kind to those supplied by Stobaeus, which will be discussed in Part II of this dissertation. That being the case, our judgement of the merits of these readings will be strongly influenced by our judgement of the merits of the readings given by Stobaeus.

In xiv.3(223.4,5), it seems reasonable to suppose, with Nock, that $\delta\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$ (given by Matritensis gr. 84 for 223.4) was twice changed to $\delta\delta\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$, perhaps because some scribe could not believe that God could be both $\delta\delta\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$, xiv.3(223.4, in the previous sentence) and $\delta\pi\alpha\rho\varsigma$.¹

In xiv.6(224.5), Einarson's reading of $\tau\delta\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ for $\tau\delta\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$ seems right; $\tau\delta\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$ was no doubt attracted by $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ in the same line.

In xiv.6(224.9,10), $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\varsigma\acute{\iota}\nu\upsilon\acute{\nu}\ \delta\upsilon\omicron\ \delta\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\delta\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}$, we may supply $\langle\tau\delta\ \delta\acute{\nu}\tau\alpha,\ \tau\delta\ \tau\epsilon\rangle\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu$ from Cyril. This error may have been caused either by carelessness or manuscript damage.

In xiv.7(224.14,15), the manuscripts read, $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \delta\iota\delta\ \tau\eta\acute{\nu}\ \pi\omicron\iota\kappa\iota\lambda\sigma\alpha\acute{\nu}\ \tau\omega\acute{\nu}\ \gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\omicron\mu\epsilon\omicron\nu\omega\acute{\nu}\ \phi\omega\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\eta\ \delta\ \phi\omicron\beta\omicron\upsilon\acute{\mu}\epsilon\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\upsilon\acute{\nu}\sigma\tau\eta\tau\alpha\ (\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\upsilon\acute{\nu}\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\ M)$

¹For a discussion of the doctrine, common in many of the Hermetic writings, that the invisible God is made visible in his creation, see Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 51-59.

καὶ δόξαν τῷ θεῷ περὶδῆς (περὶδῆ B^C Matr. R). Nock, following Cyril, removes the article before φοβούμενος and reads περὶδαί.

(In his apparatus, Nock, relying on Aubert, gives this last as a conjecture by Aubert, but in the addenda, p. 404, he notes that the reading is also found in one of the manuscripts of Cyril, Venetus 123.) Both of these emendations seem right, although we may perhaps keep the article before φοβούμενος, interpreting these words as a nominative used for a vocative, as often in Hellenistic Greek.

Perhaps it is not necessary to emend xiv.5(223.24-224.2), οὐκ ἔστι τὸ ἕτερον τοῦ ἑτέρου χωρισθῆναι, ἀλλ' αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ. Nock reads ἀλλ' <οὐδέ> αὐτὸ ἑαυτοῦ, which Festugière translates, "bien plus, ne peut même pas être séparé de lui-même." But that proposition would scarcely be controversial. Perhaps what we have here is an ellipsis: "but <it would be easier for it to be separated> from itself." Naturally this is an exaggeration to make a point.

In sum, there is, apart from the variants given by Cyril, little reason to suppose that this tractate has suffered much damage in transmission. Therefore if we are to answer the question of the reliability of the text for this tractate, we must first answer the question of the relative reliability of its two manuscript traditions. There are two possibilities: either the text of this tractate has suffered little in transmission, or it has been reworked by a skillful editor.

C. H. xvi

The text of C. H. xvi is moderately corrupt. It is perhaps not surprising that no manuscript has πρὸς Ἀμμωνα correct the first time,

although B received the correct form through a correction. Since the manuscripts give a variety, it is perhaps possible that the archetype was illegible.

Reitzenstein is probably right in reading ἐνίοτε for ἐνίοις in xvi.1(231.11). If so, this error can most plausibly be explained as having arisen in the course of transcription from a miniscule exemplar, although the surrounding dative plurals no doubt contributed. On the other hand, if Cumont is right in reading καταβολαῖς for μεταβολαῖς in xvi.10(235.17), a misreading of a miniscule exemplar is to be suspected.

Presumably in xvi.2(232.15), κενούς (B^C) became καινούς through itacism.

It seems probable that in xvi.3(233.1), τὸν, in ἔνα, ὄντα τὸν πᾶντα, originally read τῷ, as Turnebus supposed, but that τὸν was written because of the attraction of the preceding πᾶντα, ὄντα τὸν ἔνα.

Reitzenstein would simplify this sentence by removing τὸν ἔνα and ὄντα τῷ πᾶντα as resulting from conflation of two concepts; but if it is a conflation it is probably the author of the tractate, not a scribe, who is responsible.

Occasionally the similarity of words precipitates errors in this tractate. Thus in xvi.2(232.17), we have μεγίσταις for μεστῆς (Tiedemann); in xvi.8(235.1) we have γένεσιν for γενέσεσιν (Reitzenstein); and in xvi.15(236.19) we have τιμὴν for σιγμὴν (Reitzenstein).

In xvi.5(233.17,18), οὕτω γὰρ οὐρανὸν καὶ γῆν δέξαι ὁ δημιουργός, it is possible that for δέξαι we should read συνδέξαι (Reinhardt); in this case, a few letters would have been obscured in an uncial exemplar. Alternately, I would suggest δέξαι <συνδέξαι>, the latter word having become

lost through homoeoteleuton.

Occasionally a letter or group of letters appears to have become obscured. Thus in xvi.16(237.1), we have τῷ (τῶν B; τοῖς B^c) for δτω (Keil); similarly in xvi.19(238.4) we have τδ for πάντα (Reitzenstein).

There are also some instances in which a single word seems to have been obscured. Thus in xvi.2(232.7,8), καὶ ἡ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἔχει τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῶν λεγομένων, it is clear that something should be supplied, whether ὀνομάτων δύναμις (given by Nicephoras Gregoras), ὀνομάτων <φράσις> (Reitzenstein), ὀνομάτων <ὀνομασία>, Einarson, or <ἥχω> ὀνομάτων, which Nock hesitatingly proposes. Presumably some light manuscript damage is to be suspected. So also in xvi.10(235.14,15), ἔνθεν δὲ λαχόντες τούτων χώραν, we should perhaps supply τὴν before τούτων (d). Reitzenstein would supply instead μέχρι, but it is not clear to me why. In the same chapter (235.13), Reitzenstein plausibly supplies οἱ <τοῖς θνητοῖς ὄντες> σύννομοι. In these cases also, some light damage is to be supposed.

A series of corruptions is to be supposed in xvi.6(234.6-8). Here, as in xiii.13, the individual phrases make sense in themselves, but not in their present context:

- (1) αὐτὸς μόνος οἶδεν
- (2) ἡ καὶ τῷ τότῃ καὶ τῇ φῶσει
- (3) ἔγγυς ἴδεν ἑαυτοῦ
- (4) μὴ δὲ ἡμῶν δρῶμενος
- (5) στοχασμῷ (στοχασμῶν d) δὲ βιαζομένων νοεῖν.

Possibly 2 and 3 as well as 3 and 4 are to be joined. In any case, it seems likely that some words have dropped off as a result of a tear in

a manuscript. I am unable to make good the deficiency. Scott would supply αὐτὸς μόνος οἶδεν <ὁ θεός· ὁ δὲ ἥλιος> [ἡ] καὶ τῷ τόπῳ καὶ τῇ φύσει ἔγγυς ὢν <ἡμῶν, ὅψιν> ἑαυτοῦ <παρέχει. καὶ ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἀφανής,> μὴ ὕφ' ἡμῶν δρῶμενος, στοχασμῷ δὲ βιαζομένων νοοῦμενος>. But it would seem to me likely that the subject of the first sentence is the sun, since that is the topic of discussion; see Reitzenstein's note, op. cit., p. 350, l. 16.

It is also possible that something has dropped out from xvi.1 (231.14-232.2), ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐναντίων ἀσαφὲς οὖσα καὶ κεκρυμμένον τὸν νοῦν τῶν λόγων ἔχουσα, καὶ ἔτι ἀσαφεστάτη, τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑστερον βουλευθέντων κτλ. This passage would be more clear if we suppose either that something has dropped out after ἔχουσα, perhaps a genitive absolute explaining the circumstances under which his words would become unclear, or if we suppose that, as Reitzenstein suggests, a dative has dropped out after ἐναντίων. He suggests that it would refer to unbelievers; Scott would propose <δραμμένοις διαβληθήσεται ὥς> ἀσαφὲς κτλ.

In other words, the text of C. H. xvi has no unusual features. Like most of the tractates, it presents several problems. There is, however, no characteristic error.

C. H. xvii

The major textual difficulties in this short fragment were discussed in the last chapter; we may probably add αἰσθητοῦ for νοητοῦ (B^C) in xvii(243.12).

C. H. xviii

The text of C. H. xviii seems in very poor condition. A

characteristic which might perhaps furnish a clue for at least one of the reasons is that the text contains a number of duplications. The clearest example of this tendency is in xviii.6(250.17-19), λέγεται μὲν δὲ καὶ τινος τεχνίτου καθαρθέναν διαγωνιζομένου, τῆς νευρᾶς βαρεσίης, ὑπὸ τοῦ κρεσττονος, omitted by Turnebus. One would expect that eventually an accusative and infinitive would follow. But the author apparently lost his nerve and continued λέγεται μὲν δὲ τινα καθαρθένον κτλ. Since every point in xviii.6(17-19) is repeated in the new version, it is clear that the author simply changed his mind about the best way to proceed. Another example may be found in xviii.4(250.1,2), ὅτι δὲ τὸν τόνον ὑποχαλάσας, ὅτι δὲ τὸν τόνον ὑπεραιώσας (ὑπεραιώσας C), where Reitzenstein would remove the second of these duplicate formulations, Nock the first. If Einarson's suggestion of ὑπεραραιώσας were adopted, the problem would be somewhat alleviated, although it is difficult to see why ὅτι δὲ would be repeated. Nock sees a similar tendency in xviii.2(249.1-4), ὅρτι δὲ καὶ ἀδλητῶν τοῖς μελικοῖς ὄργανοις τὸ τῆς μελῶδίας λιγυρὸν ἐργασμένων καὶ καλῶν καὶ πληκτρῶν τῆς φῶξης τὴν μόλην ἐπιτελούντων, as partly responsible for the difficulties of that text; however, the two expressions here are not equivalent, and moreover the difficulty can otherwise be explained, see below p. 93. Be that as it may, it is certain that the justification which he gives in this case, that this tractate had not received a final revision by its author, explains the other two instances in a satisfactory manner.

If it is the case that the text of C. H. xviii was never revised by the author, then many of its errors could be explained in this way. An example is in xviii.1(248.9-13), ὁ γὰρ τοι κατὰ φύσιν μουσικῶς

θεός . . . ἀνάματός ἐστιν ὁ θεός, where either the first θεός should be removed (Einarson) or the second should be changed to ὡς θεός (Keil). Perhaps the author had forgotten that he had already used θεός, or had changed his mind about the best way to proceed. It is, of course, possible that θεός in line 10 is simply a gloss. In the same way, in xviii.1(248.4,5), εἰ κατὰ τὴν ἐπιδείξιν ἐμποδὼν τι (τι M^C supra lin.; om. BD; ras. in C.) τῇ προθυμίᾳ γένηται ἡ τῶν ὀργάνων ἀναρμοσσία, in which Nock would change εἰ to ἐάν, Reitzenstein γένηται to γεγένηται, and Scott γένηται to γένοιτο, it is possible that the author changed his mind in the course of the sentence.

Certain sentences which appear out of context, if they are not mere glosses, may indicate that the author had changed his mind. In xviii.5(250.10,11), the words οὕτω καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὡς τιμιώτατοι, ἔνδον πάλιν τῷ μουσουργῷ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀναρμόσασθαι λύραν, are certainly intelligible in themselves. Festugière says of them, "Cette phrase en elle-même intelligible, et tout-à-fait dans le goût de Clément d'Alexandrie, n'a rien à voir dans le contexte."¹ Perhaps the author had thought of raising this topic, but had changed his mind. So also in xviii.13(253.21), the words οὕτως, δὲ καὶ τὰ βασιλέως, while they may be a gloss, as Nock suggests, may also indicate that the author had first decided to come to the point, but then had changed his mind.

Perhaps also some of the lacunae in the text of C. H. xviii are really to be ascribed to indecision on the part of the author. Thus at the beginning of chapter 2, we meet a dative, εἰ δὲ ποτε (ποτε D;

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 250, n. 13.

τότε BCM Ven.) θελήσαντι τῇ τεχνιτῇ ὥστε μάλιστα ἐναγωνίζεσθαι περὶ μουσικῆν, with no visible reference. This is followed by a genitive absolute, ἄρτι μὲν καὶ σαλπιγκτῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιδείξιν τῆς ἐπιστήμης ποιησάμενων, another genitive absolute, ἄρτι δὲ καὶ ἀδλητῶν τοῖς μελικοῖς ὄργανοις τὸ τῆς μελωδίας λιγυρὸν ἐργασάμενων, and what appears to be part of another genitive absolute, καὶ καλᾶμψ καὶ πλῆκτρῳ τῆς φῶδης τὴν μολπὴν ἐργασάμενων. These are abruptly followed by what appears to be the apodosis of the condition: οὐ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ μουσικοῦ τις ἀναπέμπεται τὴν αἴτιαν. Missing is a noun in the genitive case modified by ἐπιτελούντων (unless, following Nock, we regard καὶ καλᾶμψ . . . ἐπιτελούντων as an author's variant for τὸ . . . ἐργασάμενων) and a verb to govern τεχνίτη. Reitzenstein, on the advice of Keil, reading ἐπιτελοῦντι, supplies τὸ ὄργανον οὐχ ὀπῆκουσεν ἐντεινομένῳ after ἐργασάμενων. I would prefer, retaining ἐπιτελούντων, to continue ἐπιτελούντων <τῶν λυριστῶν, μὴ ὀπῆκουσε τὸ ὄργανον>, or ἐπιτελούντων <τῶν λυριστῶν, σαθρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ ὄργανον>. Perhaps the author had been undecided as to the best way to continue, and had left a blank. On the other hand, it is also thoroughly possible that some manuscript deficiency was responsible.

Similarly, either hesitation on the part of the author or manuscript damage may have been responsible for the apparent lacuna in xviii.4(249.15-17), εἰ δὲ μάλιστα τῷ φειδῶ τῷ δημιουργῷ οὐχ ὀπῆκουσεν ἢ τῆς ὕλης χρεῖα πρὸς ἐντελῇ τὴν ποικιλίαν, since the following words, διήρκησε δὲ αὐτὸς ὁ μουσουργὸς κατὰ δύναμιν κτλ., seem not to follow from these words. Reitzenstein, who believes that C. H. xviii was originally a religious document presented with the Corpus Hermeticum to

commend the Corpus Hermeticum to Diocletian and his colleagues,¹ wishes to supply, "so ist kein Wunder, wenn auch der göttlichen Demiurg in der ὅλη sich nicht ganz ausdrücken kann."² However, as Nock points out in his apparatus ad loc., "sermo vero tantum de arte musices." In fact, the reference to the divine demiurge is gratuitous not only in the specific context but also in the tractate as a whole. Presumably the author had intended to add something like τῆς θαυμαστέας εἰ καὶ μουσουργοῦ τὸ ὄργανον ἐνιόχε οὐχ ὁπακούει, unless the author had simply intended to delete this reference.

In xviii.5(250.6,7), after ὁπότε τῆς κρούσεως πολλὰκις πρὸς τὸν τόνον ἐμπεσοῦσης, at least a verb, and presumably also a subject, is missing. Here again we may hesitate between suspecting a lacuna and supposing that here also the oration had not been completed.

In xviii.13(254.3-5), οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ γνώσις τοῦ παντός, ἥπερ βωὴν πᾶσι προτυνεύει καὶ τὴν εἰς θεὸν εὐφημίαν, ἣν ἡμῖν ἐδώρησατο, at least a main verb is missing. Reitzenstein would place a lacuna after προτυνεύει. I would prefer, following, Nock, to place it after ἐδώρησατο, since a subject for that verb is also needed. While it is possible here again to suspect manuscript damage, it is also conceivable that the author either intended to add the missing words or had decided to abandon the sentence and begin again.

In all of these cases the most probable explanation appears to

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, pp. 199-208; see below, pp. 178 ff. for discussion. In my judgement, this hypothesis is extremely improbable, given both the nature of the Corpus Hermeticum and the character of C. H. xviii.

²Ibid., p. 356, 3, n.

me to be that the sentences in question had been left incomplete by the author, although in no case can manuscript damage be ruled out. The suspicion that these sentences had been left in that condition by the author is awakened in the first instance by the evidence that the oration had never received its final form, above, p. 91, but is increased by the circumstance that in each case the lacuna seems to have affected only the end of one sentence or clause, but seems to have left the following sentence apparently unimpaired. If these lacunae had been caused either by carelessness or by manuscript damage, presumably in more cases the damage would have occurred in the middle of a sentence, or would have impaired the end of one sentence and the beginning of the next.

Some of the errors in this document, must, however, be attributed to scribal error. These include ἐμποδίσας and συλήσας for ἐμποδίσασα and συλήσασα respectively (Reitzenstein) in xviii.2(249.8,9); εὐσεβῶς for ἀσεβῶς (Reitzenstein) in xviii.3(249.11); θεμενοί for either θεμένων (Keil) or θεμενον (Einarson) in xviii.6(250.16); ἄρτι for ἀντί (Reitzenstein) in xviii.6(251.2); ἀρρωστῆας for ἀριστῆας (C^c) in xviii.10(252.11); χάριν for ἀρχήν (Reitzenstein) in xviii.12(253.19), and ἀπὸ τοῦ for ἀπὸ τοῦτου (Turnebus) in xviii.15(254.21). Perhaps in xviii.16(255.4,5), ἅστε καὶ τοῦνομα σύμβολον εἰρήνης, we should read σύμβολον <εἶναι> εἰρήνης (Keil); but see Nock in the critical apparatus ad loc. Finally a lacuna caused either by inattention or by manuscript damage may be found in xviii.9(252.4,5), ἀφ' οὗ πᾶσαι αἱ νῆκαι εἰς τὸν τοῦς B^c) ἐξῆς φέρονται διαδεξάμενοι τὴν νῆκην. Nock, accepting τοῦς from B^c and inserting οὗ before διαδεξάμενοι, places the lacuna after νῆκην. I would prefer, supposing fewer errors, to place a lacuna

after φέρωνται.

Thus while the text of C. H. xviii appears to have suffered a great deal of damage, it seems that perhaps the majority of the apparent errors can best be explained on the supposition that it had never been revised by the author. No evident pattern emerges for those errors which cannot be explained in this way.

Conclusions

Each tractate in the Corpus Hermeticum has its own textual history. Some, like C. H. xiv and C. H. vii, appear to have received relatively little damage, unless they have been thoroughly reworked at the hands of a scholar. Others, like C. H. iii, have suffered grievously in the course of transmission. These facts are consistent with the late date already postulated for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum, although, as we can see from the example of Stobaeus, they would permit an earlier date.

In one tractate, C. H. xi, unfriendly glosses by a Christian scribe appear to have become incorporated into the text. Since only C. H. xi appears to have suffered in this way, this fact is consistent with the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was formed at a late date, and inconsistent with the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled by a devotee or that it was the product of a Hermetic religious community.

Some indications suggest that some of the tractates at least had suffered at the hands of a scribe who was quite indifferent to his task. These include the repetition of a few lines from ii.11 at the

beginning of ii.12 and the repetition of single words in C. H. xiii.

In this respect we may also mention the large number of lacunae in many of the tractates. In cases in which it appears that a corner of a page had been torn off, the scribe or scribes apparently did not signal a lacuna in the text, although he did apparently remove incomplete parts of words.

No evidence has been uncovered so far that the tractates had undergone any kind of deliberate alteration or paraphrasing in the course of transmission. Reitzenstein believes that in C. H. xviii, some parts were omitted for dogmatic reasons; however, I believe that Reitzenstein is misled in his interpretation of the text. It is to be admitted that evidence of deliberate alteration is likely to be extremely elusive, at least if the alteration was done with any sort of care. However, the lack of homogeneity in style, content, as well as quality of text make it unlikely that any of these tractates was altered in this way while in the Corpus Hermeticum.

The state of the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum then, even apart from the variant readings noted in the last chapter, is consistent with the date for its formation suggested in the last chapter. It remains to be seen whether its contents are consistent with a similar date. To that question we turn in the next two chapters.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE DATE OF THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS HERMETICUM:

EVIDENCE FROM THE CONTENTS OF THE TRACTATES

In the previous two chapters it has been shown that the condition of the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum can best be explained on the supposition that the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled at a very late date. It may now be asked whether the contents of the Corpus Hermeticum support this hypothesis.

In order to answer this question, it will be necessary to investigate each tractate to see in what way it is unique, in what way it is typical of the Corpus Hermeticum. The greater the variety within the Corpus, the more likely it is that it was compiled at the date suggested in the last chapter. On the other hand, if we should find that the chapters are for the most part homogeneous in nature, then the date proposed in chapter two will seem less plausible.

Now the hypothesis that there are striking inconsistencies between the tractates of the Corpus Hermeticum is neither new nor particularly controversial. When Festugière says that the character of the Corpus Hermeticum is "aussi divers que possible,"¹ he is giving a consensus which began with Tiedemann, who found for example in C. H. I

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 5.

Christian, Jewish, and both Platonic and neo-Platonic ideas, in C. H. ii Aristotelian ideas, in C. H. iii Gnostic ideas ("aber nach eigenen Ideen-Verbindungen entworfen), in C. H. v a mixture of Cabbalistic and early Greek ideas, and so forth.¹ Zielinski dealt with this question in a more systematic way, finding evidence of two types of dualism in the Corpus, which he characterizes as "platonisierend" and "peripatetisch," as well as evidence of pantheism.² It is to be noted that Zielinski does not intend either "peripatetisch" or "platonisierend" to be taken in the strict sense of the word; the former he uses to mean "realistisch-dualistisch," the latter "idealistisch-dualistisch."³

It was, however, Bousset who proposed the division which has found the greatest following. He finds a two-fold division between the monistic tractates, iii, v, viii, xi, and xiv, and the dualistic, "Gnostic" tractates, i, iv, vi, vii, xiii. Tractates ix, x, xii, and xv (i. e. xvi; Bousset refuses to follow the traditional numbering after C. H. xiv) he calls mixed, and C. H. ii he regards as singular.⁴ This division is also followed by Bräuninger, who adds the first part of C. H. xii to the dualistic group, adds the second part of xii to the monistic group, and wishes to isolate iii, which he believes to show Jewish tendencies.⁵ Klein also follows this division, but places

¹ Tiedemann, op. cit., pp. iv-xvii, intro.

² Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 321-372.

³ Ibid., p. 330 f.

⁴ Bousset, loc. cit., p. 749 f.; see also p. 750, n. 1.

⁵ Bräuninger, op. cit., p. 40.

tractate x among the dualistic tractates, and adds ii, ix, xii, and xvi to the monistic tractates, to which he also restores C. H. iii.¹

Reitzenstein and J. Kroll, in reaction to whom Zielinski and Bousset wrote at great length on the diversity of the Hermetic literature, did not themselves contest that diversity. J. Kroll admitted the diversity in these words: ". . . man darf in ihnen kein festes System mit bestimmten Lehrmeinungen suchen, man darf überhaupt nicht von einer Lehre des Hermes sprechen, sondern nur von Lehren und Meinungen, die unter seinem Namen sich finden, die, verschiedensten Zeiten und Strömungen entstammend, unausgeglichen und unverarbeitet nebeneinander stehen."² He then unfortunately proceeds to systematize the Hermetic teachings for approximately four hundred pages. Reitzenstein, although he believes that the tractates were "planmässig zu einem Corpus verbunden,"³ nevertheless declared that the Corpus "besteht aus achtzehn von einander unabhängigen Stücken, die verschiedenen theologischen Systemen und, wie ich jetzt wohl sagen darf, sehr verschiedenen Zeiten angehören."⁴

Therefore it should be possible, on the basis of such general agreement, simply to say that the frequently noticed contradictions in the Corpus Hermeticum support the suggested late date for the formation of the Corpus. But caution is suggested by another frequently noted tendency in the Hermetic documents, the tendency to ignore rather obvious

¹Klein, op. cit., pp. 84-156.

²J. Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen, Bd. XII, Heft 2-4," Münster i. W." Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914), p. 2.

³Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 191.

⁴Ibid., p. 190.

contradictions. We may, for example, cite in this regard Walter Scott's posthumous editor, A. S. Ferguson, who, in indicating his dissent from Scott's tendency to rewrite the Corpus Hermeticum because of contradictions in the text, wrote, "Contradictions did not especially trouble the Hermetists. They worked upon a school tradition, which they were not concerned to turn into consistency or to state in logical order; they often reveal most of themselves when they are least intelligible."¹

This tendency is expressed ironically by Festugière: "Il ne faut donc trop presser l'hermétiste quand, dans le même traité x où Dieu est défini comme Père, c'est-à-dire Père du monde, et où le monde est dit beau et dieu hylique, ce même monde soit qualifié de non bon parce que matériel. Soyons sûrs que l'auteur hermétique n'a pas senti ces contradictions. Il répète simplement des schèmes d'école."²

We may ask if this same tendency is not also admitted by both Bousset and Brauningner when they place a number of tractates in a neutral category called "mixed tractates" or by Klein when he admits for many of the tractates that their monism (or dualism) is not consistently applied. If the two viewpoints in question are mutually exclusive, then mixed tractates should not exist. One could, to be sure, have interpolated tractates, but not mixed tractates.

But if contradictions of this sort did not trouble the writers of many of the tractates, it is reasonable to suppose that they would also not have troubled a redactor or compiler, if the Corpus Hermeticum

¹ A. S. Ferguson, ed., in Walter Scott, op. cit., IV, ix, intro.

² Festugière, op. cit., IV, 55.

had been formed at the date suggested by Reitzenstein. Accordingly, if we are to find evidence from the tractates of a nature sufficient to verify the date suggested in chapter two, it is not enough to find contradictions. It is necessary to find features so incongruous as to preclude the possibility that the Corpus was compiled at an early date, and by an adherent to Hermetism.

In our examination of this question it seems best to begin with the typical Hermetic tractates. I believe that there is a typical pattern to which the majority of documents in the Corpus Hermeticum comply. In this pattern, if I am correct, there is a remarkable agreement between form and content. The form, called by Festugière "le logos hermétique d'enseignement," has been described by him in some detail.¹ It may be described as a discussion by Hermes with one of his disciples. Occasionally the disciple is silent throughout the discussion, as in v and vi, or is given only a token part, as in viii, ix, and xi; in others, the disciple is expected to take a more active part in the conversation. Whether or not he takes part, it is taken for granted that his opinions do not count for much.

Festugière believes that this genre has been derived from the Platonic dialogue, especially from the report of the revelation of Diotima to Socrates in the Symposium.² But there are significant distinctions between the Hermetic and the Platonic dialogue. The most significant of these is that the Hermetic dialogue is always a dialogue of a master with his disciple. There is never, as frequently in the Platonic dialogue, any sudden development to upset a premature agreement.

¹ Ibid., II, 28-50.

² Ibid., p. 30 f.

Again, the dialogue is always between the master and a single student, although the other may be noted as present.¹ Festugière sees this feature as coming from the practice of the schools;² however, we may also see it as a limitation of the authors. Another distinction is that the implied setting of the Hermetic dialogue, although almost never explicitly stated, is normally felt to be secluded. The surrounding culture is simply not permitted to penetrate. Reference to any external events or circumstances of the speakers is not permitted.³ Moreover, there is next to no description of the characters participating, although we may note references to the immaturity of Tat in xiii and in xiv.1, an anecdotal reference to the Agathos Daimon in xii.8,9, and reference to "our ancestors, Uranus and Cronus" in x.5.

If we accept Festugière's analysis of this genre, then it may be seen that this genre is well suited to express certain recurrent themes in many of the Hermetic tractates. In this regard the names of the participants are very important. Typically the Hermetic dialogue has as its major speaker Hermes Trismegistus, the other participants being usually either Asclepius or Tat, i. e. Thoth, or, exceptionally, Ammon. It would be a mistake in most instances to think of these as mere pseudonyms, designed to give the tractates an authority which otherwise they could not claim,⁴ although this is clearly the case in C. H. xvi, and perhaps also in C. H. xiv. The choice of these names is more likely motivated by the doctrine common

¹Ibid., p. 36 ff.

²Ibid., p. 36.

³Ibid., p. 29 f.

⁴Scott, op. cit., I, 3.

in Hermetism that apotheosis is the goal for those who possess νοῦς.¹

It is to be noted that, while Hermes, Asclepius, Tat, and Ammon are best known to us as gods, they do not appear to us in that capacity in the Hermetic literature. They are not, as Heinrichi wrongly supposed, gods living in some unknown heavenly area.² As Scott rightly points out, the Hermes Trismegistus of the Hermetic dialogues is represented as "a man like you and me," but as "a man who attained to gnosis and after his death he became a god - just as you and I also, if we attain to gnosis, will become gods after our deaths."³ This is the point of,

C. H. x.5(115.5-10):

. . . ἡς οἱ δυνάμενοι πλέον τι ἀρύσασθαι τῆς θεᾶς κατακοι-
μίζονται πολλάκις [δὲ] ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὴν καλλίστην
ὕψιν ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸς καὶ χρόνος, οἱ ἡμέτεροι πρόγονοι, ἐντε-
τυχῆκασιν. - Εἴθε καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὦ πατερ. - Εἴθε γάρ, ὦ τέκνον.
νῦν δὲ ἔτι ἀτονούμεν πρὸς τὴν ὕψιν καὶ οὕτω ἰσχύομεν ἀνα-
πεύδουσι ἡμῶν τοῦς τοῦ νοῦ ὀφθαλμούς κτλ.

This passage would be meaningless if Hermes and Tat were not regarded

¹C. H. i.26(16.12,13); iv.7(51.21); x.6,7(116.2-5), omitted by Stobaeus. This doctrine is presupposed in C. H. x.25(126.9-11) and xii.1(174.8-12), which give the slogan that earthly man is a mortal god, while the heavenly god is an immortal man. See also C. H. x.7,8, which gives a sort of cursus honorum of souls until they "dance into the dance of the gods," also xi.20(155.15), Αἰὼν γενοῦ, xiii.14(206.15), θεὸς πέφικας, as well as Asclepius 11(310.20-26) and 37(347.20-348.8). According to Festugière, this idea was "banale sous l'Empire," La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, xi, intro.; some of the reasons for this statement are given in W. Bousset, Kyrios Christos (4th ed.; Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935), pp. 335 ff.; English translation J. E. Steely (Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1970), pp. 422 ff. While this idea is by no means unique to Hermetism, it is extremely common in the Hermetic literature and seems to be the central concept of Hermetism.

²C. F. G. Heinrichi, Die Hermesmystik und das Neue Testament, ed. E. von Dobschütz ("Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentum;" Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1918), p. 8.

³Scott, op. cit., I.6.

as fully men. We may see here a religious euhemerism in which the gods are men who have become deified because they had attained to that vision.

Therefore it is essential for the purpose of these tractates that the protagonists are men who have become gods. As they, though formerly human, have become gods, so we are challenged to become gods.

While a more complete verification of the pattern given here will have to await a formal history of the Hermetic movement I believe that this pattern forms a useful tool for sorting out the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum. The typical Hermetic tractate is then provisionally defined as belonging to the genre, "le 'logos' hermétique d'enseignement," having Hermes Trismegistus and Tat or Asclepius as participants, and having apotheosis as the goal. This chapter will deal with typical tractates, the following with non-typical tractates. The question will then be raised: can the differences be understood simply as another instance of inconsistency in the Hermetic movement, or do they reveal that the compiler did not understand the Hermetic movement, but had put together a number of documents which he took to be Hermetic?

C. H. x

It is customary to begin discussion of the Corpus Hermeticum with C. H. 1, the Poimandres. This is done for a variety of reasons: C. H. 1 is intrinsically fascinating; but it is especially fascinating to New Testament scholars and historians of religion interested in early Christianity because of its verbal parallels with the Septuagint,¹

¹Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, 99-200.

with the Hermae Pastor,¹ and with the Gospel of John,² as well as its thematic parallels with the Gnostic movement.³ In addition, some scholars are of the opinion that the Poimandres is the basic document of the Corpus Hermeticum.⁴

However, our present purpose is to discuss the typical Hermetic tractate. As we shall see, there are several features of the Poimandres which set it apart from the majority of the dialogues.⁵ A much more suitable starting point is furnished by that most typical of all Hermetic tractates, C. H. x, called Κασις, "Key."

This "Key" enjoys a very unfavourable reputation among students of the Hermetic literature. Tiedemann says of it, "überhaupt bedürfte dieser Schlüssel eines neuen."⁶ Nock, who quotes this opinion with approval, blames the present condition of C. H. x on "un copiste de l'antiquité qui, s'intéressant lui-même à l'hermétisme, aura complété un texte antérieur en y ajoutant ce qu'il a pu apprendre d'autres écrits de même tendance."⁷ As already indicated, both Bousset and Bräuninger place this tractate among the mixed tractates.⁸ Zielinski

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, pp. 11-13.

²Dodd, The fourth Gospel, pp. 33-36.

³Reitzenstein, Poimandres, pp. 68-114.

⁴See for example Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 323 f.

⁵See below, p. 149 ff. ⁶Tiedemann, op. cit., p. 71, n.

⁷Nock, in Nock-Festugiere, op. cit., I, 112. According to Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 196, n. 2, it is "stark überarbeitet."

⁸See above, p. 99 f.

regards chapters 1-4a as "peripatetic," chapters 4b-9 as "Platonizing," and 10-25 as "Konkordanztheologie,"¹ a term used by Klein to describe the contents of the whole tractate,² which according to him "mit seiner Sinnenfeindlichkeit an sich dem dualistisch Typus zugehört . . . ,"³ but "hat eine ausgesprochen pantheistische Tendenz, die allerdings nicht konsequent durchgeführt ist."⁴

In fact, this tractate does have some very abrupt transitions as well as some glaring inconsistencies. For example, in x.10(118.6), the words, *τς οὖν ὁ ὑλικὸς θεὸς ὅδε*, would lead one to believe that a "material God" had previously been mentioned. But in fact this is not the case. In x.8.3, we learn that souls who in the human stage remain evil must begin again in the bodies of serpents, but in x.19.7,8 we learn that it is contrary to the law of God for a human soul to inhabit the body of an unreasoning beast. Such facts seem to indicate that the tractate is composite in nature.

Nevertheless, it is possible to detect a guiding theme in the tractate. This guiding theme does not perhaps indicate unity of authorship, since it is treated differently in different parts, but at least suggests a unified purpose in the redaction. The theme in question is raised for the first time in x.4(114.19,20): *ἐπλήρωσας ἡμᾶς, ὦ πατερ, τῆς ἀγαθῆς καὶ καλλίστης θεᾶς*, "You have filled us, O father, with the good and most beautiful θεᾶ." (I leave this last word untranslated for

¹ Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 346-348

² Klein, op. cit., p. 123.

³ Ibid., p. 119.

⁴ Ibid., p. 117.

the time being.) By drawing from this $\theta\epsilon\alpha$, x.5(115.5,6), we may perhaps arrive at the $\theta\psi\iota\varsigma$ which "our ancestors, Uranus and Cronos, gained," x.5(115.7,8), and toward which we are still striving, x.5(115.9-12.) Presumably $\theta\epsilon\alpha$ represents a kind of metaphorical seeing or at any rate an incomplete seeing, whereas $\theta\psi\iota\varsigma$ represents the full vision of God. While this vision disqualifies us from any bodily activity, x.6(115.14-19), it lightens the whole $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ and soul (here apparently identified) and draws them through the body to $\omicron\delta\omicron\varsigma\alpha$, x.6(115.19-116.2); "for it is impossible for the soul, when it has beheld the beauty of the Good, to be deified while it is in a human body," $\delta\delta\upsilon\lambda\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\gamma\alpha\rho, \delta\tau\epsilon\kappa\nu\omicron\nu, \psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu. \delta\pi\omicron\theta\epsilon\omega\delta\eta\eta\alpha\iota: \epsilon\nu\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota\delta\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\alpha\sigma\alpha\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\nu\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\upsilon\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\varsigma,$ x.6 (116.2-4).

Elsewhere in this tractate, this experience is called $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$. While ignorance is the evil of the soul, x.8.5, since one who is ignorant "collides with the bodily passions," $\epsilon\nu\tau\iota\nu\omega\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota\kappa\omicron\iota\varsigma$, x.8.6, the virtue of the soul is $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$, and "the one who knows is good and pious and divine," x.9(117.10,11). God "knows and wants to be known," x.15(120.7,8). In fact, $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$ leads to "Olympus," i. e. apotheosis, x.15(120.9,10).

Since the question of $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$ has received extensive treatment, there is no need to discuss it at length here. It is sufficient to say that, here as elsewhere in Hellenistic religious literature, it refers not to information, but to a special kind of spiritual illumination.¹

¹For a very clear exposition see R. Bultmann s. v. $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$ in G. Kittel, ed., *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Vol. I, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, 1933), pp. 692-696; English translation by

In fact it is virtually synonymous with $\delta\psi\iota\varsigma$ in x.6.

The part of man which receives this $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is, in this tractate as frequently in the Hermetic literature, called the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$.¹ This part, which is variously treated in the Hermetic literature, is in C. H. x the most divine part of the human soul. The human $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in fact, appears, as it were, wrapped in layers: the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is in the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ in the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, the $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ in the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, the $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ in the body (reading $\eta\ \psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\ \langle\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota,\ \tau\omicron\ \pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\tilde{\eta}\rangle\ \sigma\acute{\omicron}\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, x.13.2), see below, p. 317:

When this $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ receives $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$, it separates itself from its garments ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$), the soul, the breath ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$), and the body, and puts on a fiery garment which is appropriate to it, $\tau\omicron\nu\ \gamma\delta\iota\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron\ \chi\iota\tau\omega\alpha$, $\tau\omicron\nu\ \nu\upsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\nu$, x.18.2. The $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in this condition is identifiable with the creator of everything, and needs the fire as an instrument (supplying $\delta\rho\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu\eta$ from Stobaeus), x.18.9; without the fire it can create only earthly things, but with the fire it can also create heavenly things, x.18,19.

In C. H. x, as elsewhere in the Corpus Hermeticum, not every soul has the good $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, but sometimes the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ stands out of the soul, so that the soul resembles an unreasoning animal, x.24.2-4. In such

G. W. Bromiley, Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964), pp. 692-696. For a discussion of $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the Hermetic literature see especially Brauminger, op. cit. pp. 5-30, and Reitzenstein, Die hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen, 284-295; $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is equated with $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$ by Reitzenstein on p. 290.

¹ On the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ see A. Wlosok, Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis ("Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaft, Philos., Hist. Klass., 1960, 2;" Heidelberg: Winter, 1960), p. 121 ff. "Der Nus fungiert dann als mystischer Sinn oder pneumatisches Auge," ibid., p. 121.

a condition one cannot properly be called man, x.24.9, since man properly so called is either above or at least equal to the so called heavenly gods, i. e. the stars, x.24.10-12. The gods cannot come down to earth, but man in his ecstasy can go up to heaven, x.25.1-4. The tractate then closes with the formula, x.25.5, that earthly men are mortal gods, but the heavenly gods are immortal men.

That the author was not always in control of his material is indicated by the tendency in this tractate for discussions of the vision or of $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ to lead to a discussion of the fate of the soul after death. Thus in x.7, after noting in x.6(116.2-4) that the vision leads to apotheosis, the author is very easily led to discuss the progress of the soul, from serpents to water animals to land animals to flying animals to men to demons, until they "dance into the dance of the gods," x.7.11 (retaining the reading of the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum), who have two dances, one of the planets, one of the fixed stars. Therefore this passage envisages stellar immortality as the ultimate goal of souls.¹ According to Bousset, this passage is eccentric, since in most places where the Corpus discusses immortality, it is in terms of unity with the transcendent deity.² No doubt this is the case, although it must be said that the Hermetic writers are capable of ignoring obvious contradictions.

So also, x.19.2-4, after the discussion of the journey of the

¹For this concept see F. Cumont, Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans (New York: Dover Publications, 1960 = 1912), pp. 96 ff.

²Bousset, "Joseph Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," p. 744.

soul in its fiery body in x.16-18, we learn that after death, if the soul has engaged in the struggle of piety, it becomes a god (accepting the reading of the manuscript tradition of the Corpus), but the impious soul again seeks a human body, x.19.5, since it is contrary to divine law for a human soul to inhabit the body of an unreasoning animal, x.19.7,8, contradicting, as noted, x.8.2,3. Thus impiety is its own punishment, x.20(123.8,9); as a punishment the impious man is incited by the $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ in the form of a daemon to greater punishment, x.21(123.19-24).

The other material in C. H. x is loosely connected to this theme. Thus the reference to the vision of the Good, in x.4(114.19,20), is made to grow out of the discussion of God in x.1-4. Unless there is a major gap in the text, this vision would appear to have been brought on by discussion of God as creative rather than creating, x.3(114.7-14), who has an activity ($\epsilon\nu\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha$) rather than a nature ($\phi\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$), x.1(113.6), which is to will the existence of all things, x.2(113.1,2).

Similarly in x.10b-14, there are discussed such topics as the $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ (called the $\delta\lambda\iota\kappa\omicron\delta\varsigma$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$, the "material god"), x.10(118.6); man, the "second" animal, x.12.2, the $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ being the first), the human soul, which as we have seen consists of layers, x.13.3; and the $\delta\rho\chi\eta$, which comes from God, x.14(119.16-120.1); but the purpose of all of this is to relate the human soul closely to God: $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ δ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$ $\upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma$, δ $\delta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon$, $\hbar\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$, "the $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ is the son of God, and man is the son of the $\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, a grandson, as it were," x.14(120.5,6). This of course leads directly to a discussion of the possibility of knowing God in x.15(120.7,8).

In spite of the numerous contradictions in tractate x, then, it is possible to find a common theme. This common theme is a kind of religious experience given only to the few. This experience, called "vision", ὁψις, or γνῶσις, is received by the most divine part of man, the νοῦς, and through this experience man becomes deified. The inconsistencies in this tractate are explained and in part justified by the fact that this one theme is so important to the author (or redactor) that all of the other inconsistencies seemed unimportant to him, at least in the light of his major theme.

Thus, while the author is admittedly inconsistent on many of the issues which are extremely important to modern researchers, especially the distinction between dualism and monism, nevertheless tractate x shows unity in the one theme which is important to him. If the author/redactor was aware that dualism and monism are irreconcilable, evidently this awareness did not trouble him. More likely, he was willing to ignore inconsistencies and use any conceptions available, even those which are directly opposed to each other. In connection with tractate xii, Bräuninger says that ". . . die Philosophie für diesen Autor wie für die meisten des Corpus Hermeticum nur ein Decumantel ist, um seine religiösen Anschauungen darunter zu verstecken" ¹ While this distinction between philosophy and religion seems extremely forced in connection with the Hermetic writings, it is clear that, for the author of tractate x, most of the topics discussed are merely ancillary to his major topic, the vision or γνῶσις of God.

¹Bräuninger, op. cit., p. 35.

C. H. xii

The same religious experience which in C. H. x is treated under the names of $\delta\psi\iota\varsigma$ and $\gamma\nu\omega\iota\varsigma$ is in C. H. xii discussed as the activities and effects of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. The benefits of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ are given the clearest expression in xii.12(178.21-179.4):

Κἀκεῖνο δὲ ὄρα, ὃ τέκνον, ὅτι δύο ταῦτα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ὁ θεὸς παρὰ πάντα τὰ θνητὰ ἔχαρισατο, τὸν τε νοῦν καὶ τὸν λόγον, ἰσότημα τῇ ἀθανασίᾳ τοῦτοις δὲ εἴ τις χρησάιτο εἰς τὸ δεῖν, οὐδὲν τῶν ἀθανάτων διόσσει· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ὁδηγηθήσεται ὑπὸ ἀμφοτέρων εἰς τὸν τῶν θεῶν καὶ μακάρων χορὸν.

(I have omitted the words τὸν δὲ προφορικὸν λόγον ἔχει, bracketed by Nock, since they are clearly a gloss, and moreover probably mistaken; see above, p. 78). The mention of λόγος in this passage seems intrusive, but is more likely to indicate inconsistency on the part of the author than textual corruption. The two are equivalent (ἰσότημα) to immortality, and lead a man out of his body (ecstasy?) into the dance of the gods, cf. x.7.11, discussed above, p. 110.

The theme of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is very prominent in the first fourteen chapters of this tractate, which have perhaps the most comprehensive treatment of that theme in the Hermetic literature. This $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ comes from the essence of God, "if there is some essence of God," εἴ γέ τις ἔστιν οὐσα θεοῦ, xii.1(174.3,4). This $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is not something split off from God's "essentiality," οὐσιότης, xii.1(174.5,6), "but is, as it were, unfolded, like the sun's light," ὥπερ ἠγλαμένοσ καθάπερ τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς, xii.1(174.7). It is "God among men," ἐν μὲν ἀνθρώποις θεὸς ἐστι, and because of it some men become gods, xii.1(174.7-9). The $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ treats good

men by making them suffer, as does a physician,¹ xii.3, but bad men it incites to further crimes, xii.4. The νοῦς can do what it wants, xii.8(177.10,11), and rules over everything, including fate and law, xii.9(177.17-19); for the text see below, p. 16, n. 1. All men suffer what is fated, but the "reasonable" suffer in a different way: 'ἀλλ' ὁ ἐλλογιμος, ὃ τέκνον, οὐ μοιχεύσας πέσεται, ἀλλ' ὡς μοιχεύσας, οὐδέ φονεύσας, ἀλλ' ὡς φονεύσας, καὶ ποιότητα μεταβολῆς δόνατόν ἐστι διεκφυγεῖν, ὥπερ καὶ γενέσεως, xii.7(176.22-25); this appears to mean that even if the body, constrained by fate, commits certain crimes, the essential person is delivered from turpitude by the νοῦς.²

The other major theme in this tractate is that the κόσμος and all that is in it is living; this is the major theme of chapters fifteen to twenty. In fact the κόσμος is the πλήρωμα of life, xii.15(180.7-10). Everything moves, and the activity of life is movement, xii.16(180.25-181.2). Therefore everything is alive, "especially man," πάντων δὲ πᾶλλον ὁ ἄνθρωπος, xii.19(180.20,21), since he associates with God. It does not occur to the author that this "especially" subverts the effect of the statement that everything is alive.

In this section also, the theme of experiencing God is prominent, but is expressed differently. God is seen through the order of the universe: εἰ δὲ θέλεις αὐτὸν καὶ θεωρῆσαι, ἴδε τὴν τάξιν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν εὐκοσμίαν τῆς τάξεως, xii.21(182.11,12). This means of seeing God

¹Scott would remind us here of Plato, Gorgias 477E-481B, op. cit., II, 342.

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 194 f.; so also Festugière, "L'Hermétisme", in Hermétisme et mystique païenne, p. 60 f.

is, as Bräuninger saw,¹ sharply distinguished from the means of seeing God in the first part of the tractate. Here there is no question of a special faculty possessed in full only by a few, but of ordinary seeing, if only one draws appropriate conclusions from what one sees. But nevertheless, it is the special capacity of man which enables him to see God in this way. Man is the only animal with whom God has intercourse, xii.19(181.22) and man (presumably because of his intellect), is able to traverse all parts of the *κόσμος*.

As we shall see, this theme, that God is visible in his *κόσμος*, is just as much at home in the Hermetic writings as is the theme of seeing God or having *γνώσις* of God. Because of the logical incompatibility of these two themes, Bräuninger,² following Scott,³ would divide the tractate into two parts in the middle of chapter fourteen. According to Scott, some pages have dropped out between the end of xii.1-14a and xii.14b, including the opening of a new tractate.⁴ Adding verisimilitude to this view is the fact that the term *νοῦς*, which is so prominent in xii.1-14a, scarcely appears in the rest of the tractate. But it must be noted that if two documents have been joined, this has happened before our present *Corpus* was formed, since it will be seen from the table on p. 13 f. above that the striking variant of *οὐν* for *εἴνα* appears in both sections of this tractate.

However, it is probably not necessary to postulate such a division.

¹Bräuninger, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

²*Ibid.*, p. 33.

³Scott, *op. cit.*, II, 336.

⁴*Ibid.*

It is clear that the author of this tractate was not very concerned with consistency. Granted that the subject matter of xii.14b follows abruptly on what precedes, it must also be noted that the connection of chapter thirteen with the discussion of νοῦς is also quite tenuous: in chapter twelve the author introduces λόγος in an abrupt manner, speaking of two "gifts," νοῦς and λόγος, and then in chapter thirteen goes on to discuss the λόγος. According to chapter fourteen, the λόγος is the image of νοῦς and νοῦς is the image of God. (Accepting Flussas' emendation; see above, p. 77). This leads him to the discussion of various chains of being: the body is the image of the idea, and the idea of the soul, xii.14(179.17,18); air is the lightest part of matter, soul of air, νοῦς of soul, and God of νοῦς, xii.14(179.18-20). This leads naturally to another chain of being: ἀνάγκη and πρόνοια and φύσις are the instruments of the κόσμος, but the essence of the "intelligibles" (νοητῶν; tr. Festugière); and their essence is "identity." This in turn leads to a discussion of the immortality of the κόσμος, which is living, as are each of its members. It seems arbitrary, given the casual connection of each of these statements, to select any one of them as a new starting point; it seems more reasonable to suppose that the author of this tractate, like the authors of so many of the Hermetic writings, wrote without a plan, but discussed each idea as it came to his head.¹

In fact, if there is any characteristic feature of this tractate, it is the totally carefree attitude of the author to contradiction. This

¹See Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, *op. cit.*, I, 188, n. 37: "Vu la composition assez lâche des écrits hermétiques"

may be seen, for example, in chapter eleven. Festugière writes of that chapter, "Je renonce à entendre ce #11 que Tat juge 'parfaitement clair'."¹ In fact, each individual sentence in that chapter makes sense; it is only the chapter as a whole which is nonsensical. Most proposals for the emendation of this chapter have concerned the insertion or removal of a negative. But unless we suppose that someone has arbitrarily inserted and removed negatives at will in several places, the chapter will not make sense. Let us examine it, one sentence at a time:

- (1) πάντα, ὃ τέκνον, τὰ ἐν σῶματι δούματα παθητά,
- (2) καὶ κυρίως αὐτὰ ἐστὶ πάθος.
- (3) πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κινεῖν δούματον,
- (4) πᾶν δὲ τὸ κινούμενον σῶμα,
- (5) καὶ τὰ δούματα δὲ κινεῖται ὅπῃ τοῦ νοῦ.
- (6) κίνησις δὲ πάθος.
- (7) πάσχει οὖν ἀμφοτέρω, καὶ τὸ κινεῖν καὶ τὸ κινούμενον, τὸ μὲν ἄρχον, τὸ δὲ ἀρχόμενον.
- (8) ἀπαλλαγείς δὲ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπηλλαγὴ καὶ τοῦ πάθους.
- (9) μᾶλλον δὲ ποτε, ὃ τέκνον, οὐδὲν ἀπαθές, πάντα δὲ παθητά.
- (10) διαφέρει δὲ πάθος παθητοῦ. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ, τὸ δὲ πάσχει.
- (11) τὰ δὲ σῶματα καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ἐνεργεῖ.
- (12) ἢ γὰρ ἀκίνητά ἐστὶν ἢ κινεῖται.
- (13) ὁποῦτον δὲ εἴναι ἢ, πάθος ἐστὶ,
- (14) τὰ δὲ δούματα δεῖ ἐνεργεῖται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παθητά ἐστὶ.

¹Ibid., I, 187, n. 28.

(15) μὴ οὖν σε αἱ προσηγορίαι παρατρέψωσιν.

(16) ἢ τε γὰρ ἐνέργεια καὶ τὸ πάθος ταῦτό ἐστιν.

(17) εὐφημώτερον δὲ τῷ ὀνόματι χρῆσθαι οὐ λυπεῖ.

Of these sentences, 15 and 17 are parenthetical. Among the contradictions are the following: 5 directly contradicts 4; 7 makes 3 and 4 irrelevant; 8 contradicts 14; 9 contradicts 8; if 10, then 1 and 2 are incompatible; 11 contradicts 3; and if 13, then 12 and 6 are incompatible. As long as one does not expect this passage to cohere logically, however, it presents no difficulties.

Thus contradictions are by no means foreign to the author of this tractate. And so we may suppose that, even though the conceptions in chapters 1-14a do not, strictly speaking, always cohere logically with those of 14b-22, it is still highly conceivable that the tractate as a whole is the work of a single author, who may, to be sure, have used sources. In both parts, an essential theme is the knowledge of God; if this is done by mutually incompatible methods, the author is perhaps not the only one to be inconsistent in this way.

An amiable feature of C. H. xii is the frequent references to a now deified older contemporary of Hermes named Ἄγαθος Δαίμων, cf. xii.1(174.10), xii.8(177.2), xii.9(177.20), and xii.13(179.14). He is said to be one who, like a first-born god, saw everything and uttered divine words: ὃς πρωτόγονος θεός, τὰ πάντα κατείδεν θεοῦς λόγους ἐφθέγγετο, xii.8(177.4,5). Reitzenstein, relying in part on the large number of citations of sayings of Ἄγαθος Δαίμων in alchemic and other Hellenistic religious literature, perhaps takes the references to the Ἄγαθος Δαίμων in this tractate too seriously when he suggests that the

author had before him a collection of sayings attributed to Ἀγαθός Δαίμων;¹ more probably the author used these sayings to add verisimilitude to his message.²

C. H. iv

The same inconsistency with regard to the ways of knowing God which has been noted in C. H. xii may be seen to some degree in tractate iv. In iv.2(50.1,2), we meet a way of knowing God which is appropriate to the final chapters of C. H. xii: θεατῆς γὰρ ἐγένετο τοῦ ἔργου τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἐθαύμασε καὶ ἐγνώρισε τὸν ποιῆσαντα. One would expect, on the basis of this formula, a tractate which, like tractate v, shows how God, though invisible, can be seen in the order of the κόσμος. In fact, however, the theme of C. H. iv is the νοῦς, which in this tractate as elsewhere is a special faculty for receiving γνῶσις. The author is not insensitive to the tension between these two ways of knowing God; this tension is expressed by the formula that God apportioned λόγος among all men, but established νοῦς as a prize for the few, iv.3. However, he makes no attempt to resolve this tension, but passes immediately to his major theme, why only some men have νοῦς although all have λόγος.

The solution for this problem is, for the author, given in terms of an image which has caused a great deal of difficulty, that of the

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 127.

²Ménard's suggestion, op. cit., p. lxxiii, intro., that the reference to the Ἀγαθός Δαίμων is a disguised tribute to Ammonius Saccas from an untalented student, is merely fanciful.

crater. We are told that God sent a huge crater, filling it with νοῦς, and sent a herald to proclaim that everyone who is able should immerse himself into the crater and ascend to God, κρατῆρα μέγαν πληρώσας τούτου κατέπεμψε, δοῦς κήρυμα, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτῷ κηρύξαι ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καρδίαις τὰδε· βάπτισον σεαυτὴν ἢ δυναμένη εἰς τοῦτον τὸν κρατῆρα, ἢ πιστεύουσα ὅτι ἀνελεύσῃ πρὸς τὸν καταπέμψαντα τὸν κρατῆρα, ἢ γνωρίζουσα ἐπὶ τῇ γέγονας, iv.4(50.8-13).

So many of the words in this chapter are familiar to us as technical terms in early Christian literature that it is difficult to dismiss the possibility of Christian influence.¹ However, as Festugière points out, this in itself does not solve the most difficult problem of the chapter, the mixture of references to sacramental drinking from a cup and ritual immersion.² Festugière proposes two solutions in the same article: the first, that βάπτισον σεαυτὴν is used metaphorically for becoming drunk, in this case acquiring the "sober drunkenness" of γνῶσις,³ the second, that in this tractate the two rites are in fact mixed, and that the origins of the formula of baptism in the crater are to be found in the circles which were responsible for a similar formula in II Jeû 45 and Pistis Sophia 142, in which the disciples are baptized

¹So Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 140 f. Scott does not, however, rule out the possibility of a non-Christian sacramental baptism of the sort mentioned in iv.4. For an explanation of the crater, Scott refers to two no longer extant Orphic hymns of that title, as well as to the legend that Empedocles leaped into the crater of Mount Aetna, p. 141 f.

²Festugière, "Hermetica," p. 102.

³*Ibid.*, pp. 104-107.

in a crater of wine which is turned into water.¹ While Festugière chooses the second of these solutions,² the first is also thoroughly plausible.

According to Festugière, this tractate contains a common "doctrine de salut" with i, vii, and xiii.³ The doctrine "implique . . . une anthropogonie, une doctrine de la genèse de l'humanité; cette anthropogonie suppose à son tour une cosmogonie, une doctrine de la genèse du monde qui mette en relief le divorce entre le monde céleste, lumineux, et le monde de la matière, ténébreux; enfin cette cosmogonie exige de son côté une théologie, une doctrine de Dieu et de ses relations avec le monde de la matière."⁴

Now it is scarcely controversial to say that the soteriology of C. H. iv shows marked resemblances to that of C. H. i.⁵ Among the common themes is $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$, which in iv as in i is a special faculty by which one may receive $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$. (In C. H. i, $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ is also identified with God; in C. H. iv is it a gift ($\delta\omega\pi\epsilon\alpha$) from God, iv.5(50.23), and is not hypostasized.) So also, in iv as in i, $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is in a sense self-knowledge, cf. iv.4(50.13), $\eta \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \tau\epsilon \gamma\epsilon\gamma\omicron\nu\alpha\varsigma$, and i.21(14.6,7),

¹Ibid., pp. 107-112.

²After demonstrating in a very convincing manner the first, Festugière continues, "Toutes ces considérations eussent fixé mon choix . . . s'il n'y avait . . . un texte remarquable avec lequel, depuis longtemps, on a comparé le nôtre (ibid., p. 107).

³Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," Hermétisme et mystique païenne, p. 39, reprinted from Bull. de la Soc. roy. de Lund, 1948, pp. 1-58.

⁴Ibid., p. 50.

⁵Ibid., pp. 58-64.

ἔαν οὖν μάθῃς ἑαυτὸν (ἑαυτὸν mss.: αὐτὸν Reitzenstein) ἐκ βωῆς καὶ φωτὸς ὄντα, καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τούτων τυγχάνεις, εἰς βωὴν πάλιν χωρήσεις.

Moreover, in both documents, apotheosis is the goal, i.26(16.12,13) and iv.7(51.19-21).

Furthermore, it is reasonable to suggest that perhaps the author of C. H. iv would have been more consistent if he had in fact presupposed the sort of anthropogony, cosmogony, and theology outlined by Festugière and supported from C. H. i, with its tendency to remove God as far as possible from the creation of the world,¹ and its tendency to relate man directly to God without the intervention of the demiurge.² This may be supported by such statements as ἔαν μὴ πρῶτον τὸ σῶμα σου μισήσῃς, ὃ τέκνον, σεαυτὸν φιλήσῃς οὐ δύνασαι, "If you do not first hate your body, my son, you cannot love yourself," iv.6(51.9-11).

But the author inconsistently affirms a very different theology, cosmogony, and anthropogony. There is no hint in C. H. iv that the creator of the κόσμος is in any way to be distinguished from the supreme God. While he is called δημιουργός, iv.1(49.2), he is spoken of in terms that leave no room for a higher God: ὥστε οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνει ὡς τοῦ παρόντος καὶ δεῖ ὄντος καὶ πάντα ποιήσαντος καὶ ἑνὸς μόνου, ᾧ ὁ δὲ αὐτοῦ θελήσει δημιουργήσαντος τὰ ὄντα, "conceive of him therefore in this way, as the one who is present and always exists and has made all things and is one alone, but has with his will created what exists," iv.1(49.3-5). Moreover, it is this same creator who sent man to earth

¹Ibid., p. 53.

²Ibid., pp. 55-57.

as an adornment (κόσμος) for it, iv.2(49.10,11), and who apportioned ἄδωξ to all men, iv.3(50.2,3), but established νοῦς as a prize, iv.3(50.7,8). God is not responsible for evil, according to the author of this tractate; it is man who is responsible: ἐπεὶ ὁ μὲν θεὸς ἀναίτιος, ἡμεῖς δὲ αἴτιοι τῶν κακῶν, iv.8(52.7,8). Since men are responsible, there is no need for some subordinate god to be made to take the blame. Hence the elaborate cosmology of C. H. i is for the author of this tractate unnecessary.¹

That being the case, it may be asked whether this tractate, with its admitted inconsistencies, does not belong in its teachings with tractates x and xii already discussed, sharing common traits with C. H. i only to the extent that both share in the general spirit of their times. In C. H. iv, as in the other two, the central message is that we too, like Hermes and Tat, may become deified through γνῶσις.

C. H. v

The differences between C. H. iv and C. H. v are well known. C. H. iv is normally placed among the dualistic tractates, while C. H. v is normally considered non-dualistic or even pantheistic.² That there are genuine differences cannot, in my view, be denied; it may be asked, however, on the basis of our discussion of C. H. x, xii, and iv, whether

¹Against Zielinski, who writes, concerning the relation between this tractate and C. H. i, "was dort persönlich und mythologisch ist, erscheint hier entpersönlich und lediglich philosophisch," loc. cit., VIII, 341. C. H. iv does in fact have a myth explaining the creation of the world and the present state of man, but it is a myth describing creation of the universe by the supreme God.

²See above, pp. 93-100.

the author was himself conscious of these differences.

Tractate v, in the form of an address to Tat, seeks to accomplish a philosophical tour de force by proving that God is at the same time invisible and the most visible of all. This theme he develops with a consistence unusual in the Hermetic literature¹ by proving that God is revealed through the κόσμος: ἄφθονος γὰρ ὁ κύριος φαίνεται διὰ παντὸς τοῦ κόσμου, v.2(61.4,5); in fact, seeing the κόσμος is seeing God: εἰ δὲ θέλεις αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν, νόησον τὸν ἥλιον, νόησον τὸν σεληνῆς ὁρμόν, κτλ., v.3(61.8 ff.). If one sees all of these wonders, one is led to their originator: ἔστι γὰρ τις, ὃ τὰτ, ὁ τοῦτων πάντων ποιητὴς καὶ δεσπότης, v.4(61.22,23). The creation cannot exist without the creator, v.4 (61.23-62.1); neither can the creator exist unless he continues to create, οὕτω καὶ τοῦτον δεῖ (Scott; δεῖ mss.) μὴ εἶναι, εἰ μὴ πάντα δεῖ ποιοῦντα, v.9(63.21,22), since it is his essence to bring to birth and make everything, τοῦτου ἐστὶν οὐσία τὸ κτείν πάντα καὶ ποιεῖν, v.9 (63.20).

This theme of seeing God by seeing the order of the universe is, of course, already familiar through C. H. xii.21. As we have seen, there is some reason to suppose that C. H. xii was the product of an author who was unconcerned with the difference between this kind of "seeing God" and the kind of seeing which is given as a special gift through the voûs.² Could the same be the case with the author of

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 58.

²See above, p. 115 ff.

tractate v7. In fact, the author does sometimes use the language of that other kind of seeing. Thus v.1(60.4), ὅπως μὴ ἀμύητος ᾖς τοῦ κρείττονος θεοῦ ὁνόματος, suggests, as Scott points out, a γνῶσις given only to a few.¹ Furthermore, if Tat is to receive this knowledge, he must pray to God that he may receive mercy, v.2(60.17,18), thus implying that it is a gift; this same theme of knowledge as a gift may be seen in iv.5(50.23) and in vi.4(74.15). With this mercy he may then be able to know God (θεὸν νοῆσαι).² This knowledge appears as a beam of light, v.2(61.1), which is only seen by the eyes of the νοῦς, v.2(61.3,4).

If this sort of seeing and knowing reserved for the few is to some extent out of place with the cosmic piety which predominates in this tractate,³ it must be noted that this tractate has been found inconsistent in other respects. Thus Dodd sees inconsistency in its simultaneous use of the language of creation and of pantheism,⁴ Festugière in its simultaneous use of terms of transcendence and immanence.⁵

To some extent the author is inconsistent in his language about God because of the paradoxical point which he is trying to make, namely

¹ Scott, *op. cit.*, p. 157.

² According to Bräuninger, *op. cit.*, p. 24, the use of the term νοῦς rather than γινῶσκω indicates a different, "Greek" rather than "oriental," way of knowing God; however, this alleged difference is obscured in this case by use of the language of the mysteries and reference to the mercy of God.

³ So Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 140.

⁴ Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, p. 237.

⁵ Festugière, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, II, 54.

that God is at once invisible and the most visible of all. In order to prove this paradox, the author asserts an identity between becoming and appearance: πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φαινόμενον γεννητόν· ἐφάνη γάρ, "everything which appears has become; for it has appeared," v.1(60.7). Contrasted to this is the invisible, which does not appear, but always is, τὸ δὲ ἀφανὲς δαί ἐστι, v.1(60.7,8). But the invisible makes all the other things visible, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα φανερὰ ποιεῖ, αὐτὸς ἀφανὴς ὢν, v.1(60.9); in fact, becoming is the same thing as φαντασῶ (presumably: making appear): οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἢ φαντασῶ ἢ γένεσις (ἢ φαντασῶ ἢ γένεσις Scott), v.1(60.12,13). Therefore the invisible, although without origination (ἀγέννητος) and not given to appearance (ἀφαντασάστος) and invisible (ἀφανής), nevertheless makes all things appear, and itself appears through all things, τὸ δὲ πάντα φαντασιῶν διὰ πάντων φαίνεται, v.2(13-15); this last point is subverted in typically Hermetic style by the addition of καὶ μάλιστα οἷς ἔν αὐτὸς βουληθῇ φανῆναι, v.2(60.15,16).

Thus this tractate, although strictly non-dualistic, contains in itself a very strict dualism, that between appearance (becoming) and existence (the invisible). This dualism is resolved in an essential monism, however, since the appearances in question are manifestations of the invisible. When the author speaks of God in terms of transcendence or as the creator of the universe, we may perhaps charitably ascribe this not to mere confusion, but to the use of language appropriate to God conceived solely as the invisible, who is "not the one, but he from whom the one is derived," v.2(60.17,18). When the author uses terms of immanence, we may correspondingly ascribe this to the use of language as appropriate to the invisible God revealing himself through the κόσμος.

It is only with regard to God in his invisible aspect that terms of γνῶσις can appropriately be used.

Tractate v lacks reference to the doctrine of apotheosis. While it is difficult to see where a place for such a doctrine could be found in the philosophical system of that tractate, we may not underestimate the ability of the Hermetic writers to find room for seemingly irreconcilable doctrines.

C. H. vi

This tractate, in the form of an address by Hermes to Asclepius, is the most thoroughly dualistic of all the Hermetic tractates.¹ It affirms that good exists in God alone, and in fact is to be identified with God: τὸ ἀγαθόν, ὃ Ἀσκληπιε, ἐν οὐδενί ἐστιν, εἰ μὴ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ θεῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν αὐτὸς ἐστίν ὁ θεὸς δέος, vi.1(72.3-5). In contrast, the κόσμος contains only evil: ὁ γὰρ κόσμος πλήρως ἐστὶ τῆς κακίας, vi.4(74.17,18). This last sentiment is qualified to some degree in vi.2 by the observation that matter participates in all things, and therefore also participates in the Good (73.11,12), and also by the surprising qualification that the world is good insofar as it creates, <ὅς> ἐν τῷ μέρει τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθὸς εἶναι, (73.14); Zielinski dismisses this as a pantheistic insertion.² But this aberration is followed by the observation that the world is not good in any other respect: ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πᾶσιν οὐκ ἀγαθός· καὶ γὰρ παθητός ἐστι, καὶ κινητός, καὶ

¹Klein, op. cit., p. 133, says that it is "von radikalem Welt-pessimismus."

²Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 333.

παθητῶν ποιητῆς, (73.14-16).

The qualification that the κόσμος is good insofar as it creates, as Scott notes,¹ indicates a slight instability in the position of the author. God is called good not only because he has no needs: οὐτε γὰρ ἐνδεής ἐστὶ τινος, ὥνα ἐπιθυμήσας αὐτὸ κτήσασθαι κακὸς γένηται, κτλ., vi.1(72.11,12), and therefore no παθῆ, in this case either "passions" or "sufferings,"² which are identified with becoming, παθῶν γὰρ πλήρη τὰ γεννητὰ, αὐτῆς τῆς γενέσεως παθητῆς οὐσης, vi.2(73.6,7), but also because he is the provider (τὸ χορηγοῦν), vi.1(72.8). But παθος and the Good are mutually exclusive: ὅπου δὲ παθος, οὐδαμοῦ τὸ ἀγαθόν· ὅπου δὲ τὸ ἀγαθόν, οὐδαμοῦ οὐδὲ ἐν παθος, vi.2(73.8,9). Thus anything which to any degree "suffers," i. e. has passions, cannot in the slightest way be called good, although we customarily call good what is not altogether bad, vi.3(73.18-74.1). But although all created things are evil since they have παθος, nevertheless the Good, that is, God, is the essence of all movement and becoming, εἰ δὲ οὕτως, οὐσίαν εἶναι· δεῖ πάσης κινήσεως καὶ γενέσεως (γενέσεως MB^C: γνύσεως ABC, vi.1(72.5,6), everything which provides is good, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ χορηγοῦν ἀγαθόν, vi.1(72.8), and, as noted, the κόσμος is good insofar as it creates, vi.2(73.14). As Scott points out, the author does not resort to Gnostic solutions to resolve this problem.³ There is no trace of the myth of the alien

¹Scott, op. cit., II, 173 f.

²Klein, op. cit., p. 133, n. 4, identifies παθος in this tractate with the Buddhist tanha.

³Scott, op. cit., II, 174.

God.

Nevertheless the author did postulate a great gap between God and man. This gap can be filled only by γνῶσις, which is given by the grace of God: κἀγὼ δὲ χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ, τῷ εἰς νοῦν μοι βαλόντι κλιν περὶ τῆς γνῶσεως τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, vi.4(74.15,16). Piety combined with γνῶσις is the only road which leads to God: μὴ γὰρ ἐστὶν εἰς αὐτὸ ἀποφέρουσα ὁδός, ἢ μετὰ γνῶσεως εὐσέβεια, vi.5(75.17,18). Otherwise we remain enmeshed in human "good things" which we can neither escape nor hate; worst of all, we cannot do without them, vi.6(76.3-6).

To a greater extent than any of the tractates examined so far in this chapter, C. H. vi raises the question of the unity of the Corpus Hermeticum. The statement that the κόσμος is the πλήρωμα of evil, vi.4(74.17,18), is directly contradicted by ix.4(98.6,7), χωρὶς γὰρ αὐτῆς (i. e. τῆς κακίας) ἡ γῆ, οὐχ ὁ κόσμος, ὥς ἔνιοι ποτε ἔροῦσι βλασφημοῦντες. In vi.4(74.15-17), κἀγὼ δὲ χάριν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ, τῷ εἰς νοῦν μοι βαλόντι κλιν περὶ τῆς γνῶσεως τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, ὅτι δόυναιτόν ἐστιν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ εἶναι, "And I thank God, who has placed into my mind also what concerns the knowledge of the Good, because it is impossible for it to be in the world," the argument from design which forms the basis of C. H. v is by implication dismissed.

These considerations speak strongly against, but do not in themselves disprove the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was the product of a Hermetic religious community. We may compare these with the contrast within the New Testament between, for example, Romans 3:28 and James 2:26. And so it may be asked whether the differences between C. H. vi and some of the other documents in the Corpus do not simply

attest to the extreme variety of the Hermetic movement. Among the characteristically Hermetic features are the emphasis on Gnosis and the derivation of man from God through the κόσμος.

C. H. viii

Since the text of this tractate is extremely corrupt, it is difficult to be certain about its contents. According to its opening sentence, tractate viii deals "with the soul and the body, the way in which the soul is immortal, and the sort of energy which causes the integration and the disintegration of the body": περί ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, ὃ καὶ, νῦν λεκτέον, τρόπον μὲν ποῶ ἀθάνατος ἡ ψυχὴ, ἐνέργεια δὲ ποῶντι ἐστὶ συσπύσεως σώματος καὶ διαλύσεως, viii.1(87,4-6).

The words τρόπον μὲν ποῶ are ambiguous and can be taken to indicate that the soul is not immortal in the ordinary sense of the word, but only in an equivocal sense. Thus, according to Festugière, this tractate "dénie implicitement toute survie de la conscience individuelle, puisque le composé humain se dissout en ses éléments."¹ This proves, according to Festugière, the composite nature of the Corpus Hermeticum, since of course so many of the tractates prove just the opposite.²

This conclusion, if it were correct, would furnish a striking confirmation for the hypothesis of a very late date for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum. Unfortunately I am dubious whether this is the case. Perhaps an analysis of this tractate will demonstrate the

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 85; see also Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 355.

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 85.

point.

First of all, it should be noted that the author has two topics, soul and body. He divides the discussion of these topics in this way: *τρόπῳ μὲν ποῶν θάνατος ἡ ψυχῇ*, "in what way (or "how") the soul is immortal," *ἐνέργεια δὲ ποῶντι ἐστὶ συστάσεως σώματος καὶ διαλύσεως*, "and of what sort is the energy which causes the integration and disintegration of the body." This seems to me to indicate that he proposes to show that the soul is in some sense immortal in a way in which the body is not. This point is somewhat obscured by the following statement, *περὶ οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν ὁ θάνατος*, "death has to do with neither of these" viii.1(87.6,7). But I believe that the distinction is maintained. First, however, we must demonstrate how the author justifies this last surprising statement, since it is this justification which is in part responsible for the confusion.

Beginning with the stated premise that the *κόσμος*, the "immortal animal" (*ζῷον θάνατον*), is the second God, viii.1(87.10,11), and with the unstated premise that a god cannot die, either as a whole or in part, he thereby concludes that no part of the *κόσμος* can die, viii.1(87.11,12). But everything in the *κόσμος* is a part of the *κόσμος*, therefore by implication immortal, "especially man, the logical animal," *μάλιστα δὲ ὁ ἄνθρωπος, τὸ λογικὸν ζῷον*, viii.1(87.12-14). If man were immortal only in the sense that other parts of the *κόσμος* are immortal, this last note would tend to subvert the point which the author is making; therefore these words may suggest a difference between the fate of man and the fate of the rest of the *κόσμος*.

But before discussing the fate of the parts of the *κόσμος*, the

author first gives his reasons for believing that the κόσμος is immortal. The κόσμος, according to the author, has come into existence from God: δεύτερος δὲ ὁ κατ' εἰκόνα αὐτοῦ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γινόμενος, vii.2(87.16,17), and is everlasting since it comes from an eternal father, viii.2(87.18,19). There follows a digression in which it is pointed out that the κόσμος is ever living (δαίμων), but that only God is eternal (ἀθάνατος), viii.2(87.19-88.3); unfortunately the text here is hopelessly corrupt.

There then follows a discussion on matter, identified with bodies. Here again the text is unhappily very corrupt. However, the author affirms that God wrapped the κόσμος with immortality, so that matter would not dissolve into disorder: τῇ δὲ θανάτῳ περιβαλὼν τὸ πᾶν σῶμα, ὥστε μὴ ῥαγε . . . διαλυθῇ εἰς τὴν αὐτῆς ἀταξίαν, viii.3(88.9-12). Heavenly bodies always keep their order, which is renewed whenever they return to their proper places,¹ viii.4(88.16-19); the same function is performed for earthly bodies by death, which apparently (the text here is corrupt) is really the restoration to "indissoluble bodies." They are bereft of perception, but there is no death, viii.4(88.19-89.2).

Having thus demonstrated that bodies do not die but are merely separated from consciousness and dissolved into the "immortal bodies" or elements, the author continues, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ζῷον, ὁ ἄνθρωπος, "but the third animal, man, . . .", viii.5(89.3). Unfortunately, as we have seen, this subject lacks a predicate.² I have already tentatively

¹ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκδοῦς ἀποκαταστάσεως: astrological term; see Festugière in Nock-Festugière, *op. cit.*, I, 90, n. 17.

² The text of this passage is discussed above, p. 58 f., where an emendation is proposed.

suggested the proposal that this predicate once contained the promised answer to the question in what way the human soul is immortal. That this answer was in the affirmative is suggested first by the distinction between the treatment promised for the immortality of souls and that promised for the integration and disintegration of bodies in viii.1(87.4-6) and second by the ending of the tractate: Tat speaks (for the first time in the tractate) and asks if this animal (presumably man) dies. Hermes does not answer directly, but orders Tat to avoid blasphemy (εὐφημῆσον) and consider the meaning of God, immortal animal, and corruptible animal, as well as the relation of the κόσμος to God and of man to the κόσμος, viii.5(89.9-13). To us this is a thoroughly ambiguous answer; it would not perhaps have seemed so to the original readers, who, in my view, would have concluded that of course man is immortal because of his special relation to the κόσμος and therefore to God.

If this analysis is correct, then the contents of C. H. viii are in line with the rest of the typical Hermetic tractates.

C. H. 11

Tractate 11 is chiefly interesting because of its no doubt original but perhaps unconvincing topological argument for the existence of God. The author demonstrates the existence of God from the fact of motion, but in his own way. He asserts that everything which moves needs a place greater than itself in which to move, 11.1.1,2, and that the place must be of the opposite nature to that which moves in it, 11.1.4. Since the incorporeal is opposite to the body, 11.4.2, therefore

this place must be incorporeal, hence either divine or God, 11.4.3.

While in chapters six to eleven the author discusses some objections to this argument through Tat's questions, they are by no means the only objections that occur to the reader.

In the remainder of the tractate, God is described mainly in negative terms as free of any body, unswerving, impassible, and untouchable, yet the provider and saviour of everything, 11.12.5,6. He is not to be identified with anything, yet he is the cause of all that exists: ὁ μὴδὲ ἐν τοῦτων ὀνείρων, ὡν δὲ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τοῦτων (τοῦτοις Stob.) αἴτιος, 11.12.9, cf. 11.14(37.15-38.1). God may receive only two designations, the Good, 11.14-16, and Father, 11.17. While it is, in this tractate as in C. H. vi, impiety to call anything good except God alone, 11.15(38.11-13), it is also impiety not to emulate God by being a father, 11.17(39.10-18).

This tractate makes no mention of the theme of apotheosis or of divine vision or γνῶσις. These themes are not, however, inconsistent with the thought of the tractate.

C. H. ix

While the stated purpose of C. H. ix is to discuss perception, ix.1(96.5,6), in fact the contents are of a rather scattered nature, and the arrangement is so loose as to defy analysis. The author maintains that perception and understanding (νόησις) are united and undifferentiated in men, ix.1(96.8,9). However, animals have only perception, ix.1(96.9,10), and in fact not all men have understanding, since some are merely ὁλικός, ix.5(98.13-15); in this last case, νόησις is similar

in function in this tractate to γνῶσις in C. H. x, xii, iv, and vi. The κόσμος, like man, has both perception and understanding, identifiable in this case with making everything and dissolving (?) everything back into itself: τὸ πάντα ποιεῖν καὶ εἰς ἑαυτὴν (Scott ἑαυτὸν) ἀπονοεῖν, ix.6(98.25-99.1).

In this tractate, νοῦς seems not to be used as a technical term for a special organ by the use of which we may apprehend God, as especially in C. H. xii and iv, but can be translated simply as "mind." According to the author, all thoughts are conceived by the mind, and are good thoughts if the mind is impregnated by God, but bad thoughts if it is impregnated by demons, ix.3(97.7-9). Demons in this tractate are understood in a Christian or, according to Festugière,¹ a Zoroastrian sense. Probably if a late date is suspected for the writing of this tractate, Christian influences will seem the more probable.

That a late date is to be suspected seems indicated by reference to persecution of those who have γνῶσις, ix.4(98.1-4). This theme may well be, as Festugière says, "banal depuis Platon;"² but among the extant Hermetic documents it is confined to this place and Asclepius 24-26. Perhaps then actual persecutions, presumably by Christians, are indicated. J. Bernays, on similar grounds, concluded that Asclepius 25(329.9-11) was an interpolation referring to a persecution by Christians no earlier

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 102, n. 10. Bousset, in "J. Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," p. 723 f., raises the possibility of Jewish influence.

²Ibid., I, 103, n. 14.

than the time of Constantius in the middle of the fourth century.¹ Perhaps a similar date is indicated for C. H. ix.²

The reference to the λόγος ῥηλαίος in ix.1(96.4) may perhaps refer to the Greek original of the Asclepius,³ but may also, as Nock admits, be merely a literary expedient.⁴ The two documents have in common a carefree approach to logical continuity.

This tractate is called "platonisierend" by Zielinski,⁵ but is listed among the non-dualistic tractates by Klein.⁶ In fact, both tendencies are present.

That the author believed with the other Hermetic writers that it is possible to experience God through a special kind of γνῶσις enjoyed by a few but denied to the many is proven by the reference to those who have γνῶσις (οἱ ἐν γνῶσει ὄντες) in ix.4(98.1) as well as the distinction between those who are ὀλικός and those who are οὐσιώδης. While the author does not refer to the doctrine of apotheosis, it is not inconsistent with his system.

¹J. Bernays, "Über den unter Apuleius' Werken stehenden hermetische Dialog Asclepius," Monatsberichte der kgl. Akademie zu Berlin, Sitzung der philosophischhistorischen Klasse (1871) 518.

²Scott places this tractate between 280 and 300 A. D.^b He believes that there was sufficient reason even then for the Hermetic writers to fear Christian persecution.

³Bernays, loc. cit., p. 514 f.; cf. Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 96, n. 2, and Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit. II, 284 f.

⁴Ibid., II, 284, n. 3.

⁵Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 335 ff.

⁶Klein, op. cit., p. 140 f.

C. H. xiv

C. H. xiv does not strictly belong in this chapter, since it is not in the form of a "'logos' hermétique d'enseignement," but is in the form of a letter from Hermes to Asclepius. However, with these reservations it may perhaps be discussed here.

The present title, 'Ερμού Τριθύμεγιστου Ἀσκληπιῷ εὖ φρονεῖν, could have formed the greetings, especially if with Matritensis gr. 84 we read 'Ερμῆς Τριθύμεγιστος.¹ The occasion of the supposed letter is given in the introduction, chapter one: since the immature Tat (ὄψις καὶ νεώτερος) wanted to learn the nature of the universe, xiv.1 (222.3-6), Hermes had to discuss this exhaustively with him because of his immaturity, xiv.1(222.6,7), but since Asclepius is older and understands nature, Hermes can write out the more important points to him and explain them more "mystically," xiv.1(222.7-10).

Reitzenstein sees in this chapter the activity of a redactor seeking to connect C. H. xiv with the preceding tractate.² This theory has a great deal of verisimilitude: Tractate xiii is a dialogue between Hermes and Tat, and in it Tat is presented as immature. But it seems more reasonable, here as elsewhere, to suspect that the reference to a previous tractate is a literary convention, in this case to give verisimilitude, since C. H. xiv is presented as a letter written by Hermes. Similar introductions occur in C. H. xiii, x (which Reitzenstein links to ix), and ix, that is, in four of the seventeen tractates. By

¹On the form of the introduction see Scott, op. cit., II, 420.

²Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 191, n. 1.

coincidence, we find that in two of these cases, x and xiii, a name is given in the introduction which can be referred to the second participant in the previous tractate. In the other two cases, the introduction refers to the title of a tractate rather than to the name of the second participant; this title is not in either case the title of the previous tractate. Since in the majority of the tractates the second participant is either Tat or Asclepius, it is perhaps not surprising that in two of four instances the name given in the introduction is also the name of the second participant in the previous tractate; such an average suggests not deliberate editorial activity but random juxtaposition.

This tractate is unusually consistent for the Corpus Hermeticum. Arguing from the premises that all visible things come to be, and that all things which come to be do so not from themselves but from another, xiv.2(222.11,12), the author concludes that there must be a maker, who is unborn, and therefore older than the things which come to be, xiv.2(222.15,16), and who makes in order to make himself visible,¹ xiv.3(223.4,5), cf. C. H. v.2(61.4,5).

This tractate has the merit of clarifying the relation between the language of creation and the language of pantheism which creates difficulties in C. H. v. The author embraces a strict dualism between the creator and the created: . . . χρη νοεῖν δύο ταῦτα, τὸ γινόμενον καὶ τὸν ποιοῦντα· μέσον γὰρ τούτων οὐδέν οὐδὲ τρίτον τι, xiv.4(223.16, 17); δύο γὰρ εἰσι τὰ πάντα, τὸ γινόμενον καὶ τὸ ποιοῦν, xiv.5(223.21,22). However, these two are said to be inseparable: καὶ διασπῆναι τὸ ἕτερον

¹Reading ὁπαρός twice (with Nock) for δόπατος, see above, p. 86.

τοῦ ἑτέρου δόυναιον· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν ποιοῦντα χωρὶς τοῦ γινομένου δυναιτὸν εἶναι, xiv.5(223.22-24). Strictly repudiated is any solution that would attribute creation to any besides God; those who hold such views suffer from folly and lack of γνῶσις: ὃ τῆς πολλῆς δνοσας καὶ δγνωσας τῆς περὶ τὸν θεόν, xiv.8(225.7,8).

The suggestion that there is δγνωσα raises also the possibility of its opposite, γνῶσις. That this is not a mere lapse on the part of the author is suggested also by the promise of Hermes to reveal the nature of the whole "more mystically" (μυστικώτερον) to Asclepius than he did to the immature Tat, a claim which Scott professes to find baffling, since the contents of this tractate seem not to be very esoteric.¹ Scott would remove these words; this would, however, be unnecessary, since the theme of knowing God occurs again in xiv.4(223.6,7): οὕτως ἐστὶν ἄξιον νοῆσαι καὶ νοήσαντα θαυμάσαι καὶ θαυμάσαντα ἑαυτὸν μακαρίσαι, τὸν πατέρα γνωρίσαντα, as well as its opposite in xiv.8 (225.7,8), noted above.

This tractate lacks reference to the doctrine of apotheosis. As with C. H. v, it is difficult to find a place for such a doctrine within the views expressed in the tractate, unless we make allowance on the basis of the carefree attitude to consistency held by so many of the writers.

¹Scott, op. cit., II, 422. The word γνῶσις occurs in xiv.1 (222.5), but perhaps not in the sense in which it is used in most of the Hermetic tractates.

C. H. xi

C. H. xi also may be placed in this chapter only with reservations, since, although it is in the form of a dialogue, the dialogue takes place between Νοῦς and Hermes, not between Hermes and a disciple, as normally in the "logos" hermétique d'enseignement." This Νοῦς can be compared with Poimandres, ὁ τῆς αὐθεντίας Νοῦς, who speaks in C. H. i,¹ although it should perhaps be emphasized that this comparison is made neither directly nor by implication in C. H. xi. That a god named Νοῦς should appear here as a teacher is, in spite of the example of C. H. i, a curiosity, since in some ways this conflicts with the euhemerism of most of the Hermetic documents. In other documents in the Corpus Hermeticum, νοῦς appears as the innermost, divine essence of man, cf. x.16.3-6 and x.18.1, or as a special organ by which some men are enabled to know God, as in iv.3(50.2-5) and iv.4(50.14-18), as well as in i.22(14.11). In this tractate, νοῦς and ψυχή are identified as the activity (ἐνέργεια) of God. This is almost the status of Νοῦς in i.6(8.16,17), where Νοῦς is the God who underlies everything; cf. x.18.8,9, where νοῦς is called the δημιουργός of everything. Thus when Festugière says that "le Nous dieu qui parle ici est, en un sens, notre nous,"² it must be remembered that this is the case only in a very special sense, since this νοῦς is also the νοῦς of God.

¹So Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 34, and Zieliński, loc. cit., VIII, 323.

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 158, n. 20.

Although this tractate is very loose in its organisation,¹ some sense can be made of it by dividing it into three parts: 1) the chains of being, chapters 2-4; 2) God is the creator of everything, chapters 5-20a; 3) to know God, you must become like God, 20b-22. All of these are related to the theme of God and τὸ νῦν announced in the introduction.

The first of these resembles a series of incantations. In it, everything is related by a chain to God, but in various, often incompatible formulas. The first may be taken as the model: God makes the αἰών, the αἰών makes the κόσμος, the κόσμος makes time, and time makes "becoming" (γένεσις), xi.2(147.10,11). One might suppose that this chain of being had the same goal which Festugière ascribes to the cosmogony in *C. H.* i, that is, "de tenir le Dieu suprême aussi étranger que possible à la production d'un monde qui est regardé comme mauvais."² But in fact the opposite seems to be the case. These chains of being have the common tendency to link everything in a giant chain to God. According to Klein, this tractate is "ausdrücklich pantheistisch."³

The author then proceeds to discuss the creative activity of God. In these chapters there is little mention of the chains of being

¹ Contrary to Zielinski, who considers this tractate to contain "Gnostic pantheism," and continues "... aber - und das ist das Neue - die Darlegung ist straffer, vor Widersprüchen hat sich der Verfasser gehütet, kurz, wir haben eine geordnetere Wiederaufnahme der hauptsächlich in xii behandelten Probleme," *loc. cit.*, VIII, 353.

² Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 53.

³ Klein, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

described in chapters 2-4, although the αἰὼν is described as holding everything together in xi.5(149.3) and as filled by the planetary spheres in xi.7(150.1-3); moreover another chain of being is given in xi.15 (153.6,7): the αἰὼν is the image of God, the κόσμος is the image of the αἰὼν, the sun is the image of the κόσμος, and man the image of the sun. Strictly speaking, the description of the chains of being is incompatible with these chapters, which emphasize that God is unique, xi.5(149.7-12), that God always creates, xi.5(149.12-16) and xi.13 (152.12-15), that there is nothing which exists apart from God, xi.14 (152.24-26), that everything comes to be from God, xi.14(153.3,4), and that there can be no such thing as a second creator, xi.9-12.

In the third section, chapters 20b-22, we meet the familiar theme of knowing God. But the γνῶσις of this tractate may be contrasted with the γνῶσις which we have met elsewhere. G. van Moorsel calls the γνῶσις of this tractate "ascensive Gnosis,"¹ Festugière "la mystique par extraversion."² In contrast with C. H. vi.4 (74.15,16) and C. H. iv.5 (50.23), according to which γνῶσις is a gift, in this tractate man must seize γνῶσις aggressively, by making himself equal to God: ἐὰν μὴ οὖν σεαυτὸν ἐξισώσῃς τῷ θεῷ, τὸν θεὸν νοῆσαι οὐ δύνασαι, xi.20(155.11,12). Anyone who is not willing to do this is characterized as a lover of the body (φιλοσώματος) and evil, xi.21(156.8,9). This may be compared with xi.5(149.7,8), which emphasizes that nothing should be compared with God:

¹G. van Moorsel, The mysteries of Hermes Trismegistus (Utrecht: Druckerij Keminkten Zoon-Domplein 2, 1955), p. 27.

²Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 141.

διδ, Ἐρμῇ, μηδέποτε τῶν κείτω μηδέ τῶν ἄνω ὁμοίων τι ἡγήσῃ τῷ θεῷ.

It is to be noted that the kind of "knowing God" which is present in this tractate is more appropriate to the pantheistic tendencies which we find in this tractate, the second part of C. H. xii, C. H. v, and C. H. xiv. God, who is greater than the κόσμος, can be apprehended only by one who makes himself equal to God. However, as Festugière has pointed out, xiii.11 contains formulae almost identical to xi.20;¹ yet that tractate is considered by most scholars to be dualistic.²

Knowing God in this tractate is virtually the same as becoming God. Hermes is exhorted to make himself equal with God (ἔδν μὴ σεαυτὸν ἐξισόσης τῷ θεῷ), xi.20(155.11,12), to become Αἰδν,³ xi.20 (155.13) and to consider himself immortal (σεαυτὸν ἡγήσαι δόδνατον), xi.20(155.16). This is tantamount to apotheosis, which therefore is compatible at least with the pantheism of this tractate. It may, however, be unwarranted to ascribe this view also to the author of C. H. v.

Thus compared with the other tractates discussed in this chapter, the most striking features of this tractate are the aggressive approach to the theme of γνῶσις, the speculation about the chains of being, and the appearance of Νοῦς as the major speaker. No doubt these differences are not sufficiently striking to support the date indicated in chapter two for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum.

¹ Ibid., IV, 145.

² But see below, p. 171 ff.

³ For a discussion of Αἰδν in this tractate see Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 275, and Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 152-162.

Conclusions

With the possible exception of C. H. vi,¹ the contents of none of the tractates discussed in this chapter have been of such a nature as to speak decisively against the view that the Corpus Hermeticum was composed at an early date, and that it was the product of a devotee or of a postulated Hermetic religious community. While it is true that there are grave differences between tractates, it must be remembered that there are serious inconsistencies within tractates as well; perhaps the best example is C. H. xii.

Unfortunately the distinction between dualistic and non-dualistic tractates proves not very helpful. Tractates which are considered to be predominantly dualistic prove to have non-dualistic features. For example, C. H. iv, which is considered very similar in outlook to C. H. i, uses an argument from design which ought to be appropriate to C. H. v.² On the other hand, C. H. v, which is generally pantheistic, speaks of God with the language of transcendence.³ The Hermetic writers seem not to take this distinction very seriously.

In any case, the term "dualism" is less precise than seems usually to be assumed by those who divide the Hermetic tractates in this way. The "Proposal for terminological and conceptual agreement with regard to the theme of the Colloquium of Messina (1966)" gives three possible uses of the term "dualism," without, in my view,

¹ Discussed above, pp. 127-130.

² Discussed above, pp. 119-123.

³ Discussed above, pp. 123-127.

exhausting the subject. They are: "the anticosmic dualism of Gnosticism," "Zoroastrian dualism," and "metaphysical dualism."¹ Zielinski had already divided this last into a "Platonizing" dualism and a "peripatetic" dualism.² We may perhaps also speak of a dualism between creator and creation, and dualism between reality and appearance, although this last, as any student of Indian philosophy knows, is a dualism only in words, since the appearance has no separate existence apart from the reality which underlies it.

Of these, the first sort of dualism, which was Bousset's model, seems not to be applicable to the tractates discussed in this chapter. It is to be noted that van Moorsel rejects the use of the term "Gnosticism" as a description of the Hermetic writings, since they lack the "anti-cosmic fanaticism of Gnostic thought."³ An exception may perhaps be made in the case of C. H. vi, which, however, does not contain certain other features of Gnosticism. It remains to be seen whether any of the non-typical tractates contain this sort of dualism.

As an oddity, C. H. ix contains a dualism of a "Zoroastrian" type.⁴

¹"Proposal for terminological and conceptual agreement with regard to the theme of the Colloquium of Messina (1966)," tr. J. M. Robinson, in Le origini dello Gnosticismo, ed. U. Bianchi ("Studies in the History of Religion - Supplements to Numen, Vol. XII," Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967, p. xviii f.

²See above, p. 99.

³Van Moorsel, op. cit., p. 20 f.

⁴See above, p. 135. The dualism of this tractate can be called "Zoroastrian" in the sense given in the proposal cited above, in that evil "intervenes from the outside into a good world." This need not imply that the author received this idea directly from Zoroastrianism.

More typical of the Hermetic tractates is the dualism between creator and creation, and metaphysical dualism, especially of the "Platonizing" sort. These two kinds of dualism are not at all incompatible, and may be found together in C. H. iv. Less compatible are the dualism between appearance and reality and the dualism between creator and creation. These kinds of dualism are, however, shared in C. H. v and xiv.

It might be thought that the distinctions between various kinds of dualism might provide a more refined tool for dividing the tractates into groups. Unfortunately, however, the examples of C. H. xiv and v, which mix two theoretically incompatible kinds of dualism, warn us that this is not likely to be a very profitable activity.

I believe that the pattern of the typical Hermetic dialogue discussed earlier in this chapter¹ is a more fruitful instrument for grouping the tractates. As has been seen, both the form of the dialogues and the identity of the participants as men whom we now know as gods are important. The reader is encouraged to identify with the junior participant, who, though still a man and unperfected in γνῶσις, is on the way to full γνῶσις and apotheosis. The theme of γνῶσις, as the theme of apotheosis, is not the private property of the Hermetic writers. Peculiarly Hermetic is this particular way of handling the theme, through a dialogue between men whom we now know as gods.²

¹ See above, pp. 102-105.

² Cf. W. Kroll, loc. cit., p. 804: "Indes ist doch eine gewisse Einheit vorhanden, die auch die Verfasser veranlasst, die Schriften dem H. und seinem Trabanten in dem Mund zu legen; sie ist durch die

In the following chapter, we will deal with those tractates which do not follow this typical pattern discussed above. In not every case will the evidence demand that the Corpus Hermeticum be treated as a late compilation. In my view, however, the weight of the evidence from these non-typical tractates will, by its cumulative force, add plausibility to the date of compilation suggested in chapter two.

Hoffnung auf die Erlösung und die Erlösungslehre gegeben, und diesen gegenüber ist alles andere so unwesentlich, dass es auf Widersprüche wenig ankommt."

CHAPTER FIVE

THE DATE OF THE FORMATION OF THE CORPUS HERMETICUM

THE EVIDENCE OF THE NON-TYPICAL TRACTATES

In the previous chapter it has been suggested that there is a typical pattern to which the majority of the Hermetic tractates conform, and which we have called, after Festugière, the "'logos' hermétique d'enseignement."¹ In this chapter we will discuss deviations from this pattern.

As will be seen, there is no single pattern in the tractates which do not conform to what has been called the typical pattern. The documents in this group tend to resemble each other only to the extent that they resemble the typical pattern. Thus we have, not two opposing patterns, but one pattern to which only some of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum conform.

However, it is possible to make certain groupings in discussing these tractates. For example, we may place C. H. 1 in a group with C. H. 111, vii, and xiii. These last three each resemble C. H. 1 in some respect, although they do not in any way resemble each other.

Another group may be formed from C. H. xvi and xvii. These two resemble each other to the extent that each has a pupil of Hermes as its major participant, but do not resemble each other in any other way.

¹For discussion see above, pp. 102-105.

Finally, as we shall see, C. H. xviii belongs in a category all by itself.

It should be pointed out in advance that not every one of these documents raise the question of unity with equal insistence. Both C. H. i and C. H. xiii raise relatively few problems; C. H. xiii is treated by Festugière as an example of the "'logos' hermétique d'enseignement."¹ If a place is found for C. H. i, then C. H. vii may easily be accepted. C. H. xvii is far too short to allow any sort of valid judgement in that regard. C. H. xvi, as we shall see, is not without difficulties. The most severe problems with regard to the unity of the Corpus Hermeticum are, as we shall see, raised by C. H. iiii and C. H. xviii. On the other hand, since none of these tractates are free of problems with regard to their setting within the Corpus Hermeticum, it would be profitable to discuss each of them.

C. H. i

It seems most reasonable to begin the investigation of this chapter with C. H. i, the Poimandres.² C. H. i, undoubtedly the most interesting of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum, has many peculiar

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 36; concerning C. H. i, he writes, "il me paraît plutôt une arétalogie, sans que l'hypothèse d'un logos didactique soit exclue."

²The Poimandres can, in spite of Reitzenstein, be treated as a literary unity. To be sure, Reitzenstein has shown that chapters six to eight (Poimandres, pp. 37-46, 211 f.), thirteen (ibid., p. 49), and twenty-four (ibid., pp. 51-55, 211 f.) are incompatible in concept with the rest of the Poimandres. However, it is perhaps methodologically unsound to conclude that contradictions imply interpolations. E. Haenchen has shown that the author is aware of contradictions, and has disguised them by various literary devices, "Aufbau und Theologie des 'Poimandres,'"

features. The most striking of these is that C. H. i, along with C. H. iii, vii, and xviii, lacks any reference to Hermes, Tat, and Asclepius, the usual persons participating in the Hermetic dialogues. Instead, we have a first person narrative relating a revelatory encounter with an otherwise practically unknown God named Poimandres.¹

Although all external evidence supports the view that the narrator of C. H. i ought to be identified with Hermes,² it is difficult to avoid Scott's scruples in that regard:

"If the author had intended to put the narrative into the mouth of a well-known personage, he would have named that personage. On the other hand, if he was speaking in his own person, and narrating what he himself had experienced, his withholding of the name can be more easily accounted for; he may have shrunk from intruding himself, and felt that it was his message alone, and not his name, that mattered."³

Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche LIII (1956) 149-191, as for example in the case of 1.5-8 by alternating dream and interpretation, p. 159. Moreover, by showing that Poimandres makes sense as a literary unity, Haenchen has rendered implausible any theories involving the supposition of large interpolations.

¹ See above, p. 11 f. Fortunately we need not enter here into the vexed question of the meaning of the name "Poimandres." For a discussion see Scott, op. cit., II, 14-17 and R. Marcus, "The name Poimandres," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VIII (1949) 40-43.

² As noted above, p. 11, Zosimus apparently connected C. H. i with C. H. iv. Presumably this indicates that he considered C. H. i to be Hermetic. Fulgentius (p. 26, 18 Helm) cites the Poimandres as a work of Hermes (Hermes in Opimandre libro). It is thought by Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 323, and by Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 34, that the voûc in C. H. xi is to be identified with Poimandres; but see above, p. 140. There is also an apparent quotation from C. H. i.9 (9.20,21) in C. H. xvi.16 (237.9,10), ascribed to Hermes, see below, p. 177. Scott also points to a similarity between C. H. i.15 and Ascl. 9 (304.2-10), which is, however, as he points out, inconclusive.

³ Scott, op. cit., II, 12.

But there are other reasons for scepticism in this regard. First, there is the form of the Poimandres. Although it contains a great deal of dialogue, much of which follows the question and answer format of the typical Hermetic tractate, the form of the whole is narrative. According to Festugière, it is in the form of an aretalogy,¹ although he seems not to be correct when he describes this tractate as containing "l'expérience d'une divinisation, c'est-à-dire d'un processus psychologique au cours duquel le disciple se sent soudain devenu dieu"² This form appears nowhere else in the Corpus Hermeticum.

Furthermore, in contrast with the emphasis on secrecy in some of the Hermetic writings,³ the narrator of C. H. I considers himself under an obligation to proclaim his vision to humanity: καὶ ἡργμαὶ κηρύσσειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας καὶ γνώσεως κάλλος, C. H. I.27 (16.19,20), cf. 1.26(16.13-15). It is this obligation to proclaim which gives this tractate, in Festugière's words, "le ton . . . d'un dévot inspiré, d'un évangeliste prêchant une religion nouvelle."⁴ More seriously, this evangelistic emphasis contrasts very strongly with the intensely private attitude of most of the other documents.⁵ In most

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 36.

²Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 35.

³E. g. C. H. xiii.22(209.14-17) and Ascl. 41(297.10,11); this emphasis on secrecy need not in every instance be taken with high seriousness, since, then as now, the promise of esoteric teachings reserved for the few undoubtedly increased the desirability of books.

⁴Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 9. See also Scott, op. cit., II, 9.

⁵Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 29.

of the Hermetic documents, the crowds are not even mentioned. Where they do appear, as in C. H. ix.4(98.1-4), they are felt as threatening. Only the Poimandres and C. H. vii, to be discussed below, have any place for proclamation.¹

The dualism of this tractate is not quite the same as the dualism of the tractates discussed so far. Using the model already discussed, it is a "metaphysical dualism," but between light and darkness, identified respectively with Noûs and "nature" (φύσις). While this dichotomy suggests the dualism of Manichaeism, with which Klein compares it,² it must be emphasized that there are some very important differences between Manichaean dualism and the dualism of this tractate. There seems to be in the Poimandres no notion of an evil spiritual principle. Matter in C. H. i is a regrettable fact whose origin is not explained,³ which came into existence later than Noûs and which somehow must be dealt with, i.4(7.17-8.5). The demiurge is in no sense the principle of darkness which we meet in Manichaeism, but is begotten himself by Noûs specifically to deal with this problem: ὁ δὲ Noûς ὁ θεός, ἀρρενόςθηλυς ὢν, ζωὴ καὶ φῶς ὄντων, ἀπεκύησε λόγῳ ἑτέρῳ Noûν δημιουργόν i.9(9.17,18). Similarly, the planets are created by the

¹While the term "proclamation" is used in C. H. iv, this "Proclamation" is not openly proclaimed by a preacher, but is proclaimed "to the hearts of men" by a special herald sent by God, iv.4(50.8-10).

²Klein, op. cit., pp. 87-101. He admits, however, that this dualism is "nicht ganz durchgeführt," p. 101, n. 7.

³So Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 52. Haecian, loc. cit., p. 155, holds that the darkness is derived from light, but without apparent textual support.

demiurge to assist in the control of matter: ἐδημιούργησε διοικητὰς
 τινὰς ἑπτὰ, ἐν κύκλοις περιέχοντας τὸν αἰσθητὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἡ διοίκησις
 αὐτῶν εἰμαρμένη καλεῖται, 1.9(9.19-21). It is through his own im-
 prudence that man allows himself to become subject to matter and to the
 orderings of the planets;¹ he himself was begotten by Νοῦς, 1.12
 (10.15,16), and is therefore the brother of the demiurge, 1.12(11.1),
 but has imprudently entered the κόσμος: διὰ τῆς ἁρμονίας παρέκυψεν,
 ἀναρρήξας τὸ κράτος (κύτος Scott), 1.14(11.7,8), and become ensnared
 because he fell in love with his own reflexion in matter, 1.14(11.8-17).
 It is wrong to see any inconsistency at the level of the intention of
 the author between the valuation of the planets in 1.25 and their valu-
 ation in 1.13 and 9, since the planets were made to control nature,
 and were never intended to control man.²

The major difference therefore between the thought of the Poimandres and Manichaeism (or for that matter most Gnostic systems) is in
 the valuation of the demiurge and of the κόσμος. The dualism of this
 tractate cannot properly be called the "anti-cosmic dualism of Gnosti-
 cism."³ It is rather a "metaphysical dualism," in spite of the language
 of light and darkness. Man's proper place is not in the κόσμος because
 the κόσμος is material, therefore inferior, not because the κόσμος is
 the creation of an inferior, evil god.

This is not to deny that parallels exist between the thought

¹ So Hans Jonas, The Gnostic religion (2nd ed., enlarged; Boston: Beacon Press, 1963), p. 148.

² Against Klein, op. cit., p. 97.

³ See above, p. 145.

of the Poimandres and Gnosticism. Tiedemann no doubt overstated the case when he called the author of the Poimandres a "half-Christian" Gnostic,¹ as did Ménard when he called the author a precursor of Gnosticism.² Nevertheless, when Reitzenstein derived from a non-Christian Gnostic source that part of the Poimandres which seemed to him to come from a non-Egyptian source, it was because of genuine similarities.³ We cannot discuss in detail at this time the merits of Dodd's argument that the Poimandres is a precursor of Valentinian Gnosticism, therefore no earlier than the first quarter of the second century,⁴ or of Haenchen's argument that the Poimandres draws on a developed Gnosticism.⁵ The Poimandres does contain some notable analogies to Gnosticism, whatever the facts of its relation to that movement may be. However, these are strongest with regard to the myth of the Ἀνθρώπου. Concerning the doctrine of creation, there are, as pointed out above, very serious differences, which ought not to be overlooked.

While parallels to the metaphysical dualism of the Poimandres can be found elsewhere in the Corpus Hermeticum, the other documents of the Corpus do not know the usual cosmogony of the Poimandres. We have already seen that C. H. iv, associated by Festugière with the

¹Tiedemann, op. cit., p. vi, intro.

²Ménard, op. cit., p. lix, intro.

³Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 114.

⁴These are discussed, ibid., pp. 68-114, as well as by Jonas, op. cit., pp. 147-173.

⁵Haenchen, loc. cit., p. 191; see also Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 88 f.

Poimandres in this respect, has a very different cosmogony.¹ It remains to be said that, while the possibility of a cosmogony like that of C. H. 1 cannot be ruled out for C. H. vii and xiii, at least in the case of C. H. xiii it is implausible since, as we shall see, the dualism of that tractate seems to be one between reality and appearance.²

However, the cosmogony of the Poimandres is not an incidental feature, but is extremely important within the structure of the Poimandres. Thus we have, in the centre of the Poimandres, and immediately after the narration of man's descent into matter, these solemn words: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἐπὶ γῆς ἴσα διπλοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, θνητὸς μὲν διὰ τὸ σῶμα, δόδνατος δὲ διὰ τὸν οὐσιώδη ἄνθρωπον, 1.15(11.18-20). Moreover, this cosmogony is salvific, since it is only if man knows about the duality of his nature that he will understand the necessity to escape his lower nature. Thus it is highly significant that no other document of the Corpus Hermeticum refers to this cosmogony.

The way out of man's predicament for the author of C. H. 1, as for so many in the Hellenistic period, is through γνῶσις. For this writer, the content of that γνῶσις is that man should not identify himself with the matter in which he has become enmeshed, nor even with the empirical personality given to him by the seven planets,³ but with life and light, cf. 1.21(14.6,7): ἐὰν οὖν μάθῃς ἑαυτὸν (αὐτὸν Reitzenstein) ἐκ φωτὸς καὶ φωτὸς ὄντα καὶ ὅτι ἐκ τούτων τυγχάνεις, εἰς φωτὸν πάλιν

¹ See above, p. 120 f.

² See below, pp. 171-173.

³ Jonas, op. cit., p. 128 ff.

χωρήσεις. Thus γνῶσις for the author of this tractate is supremely self-knowledge,¹ therefore also knowledge of God, since we are of God's substance. This theme of γνῶσις is of course a point in common between C. H. i and the typical Hermetic tractate.

Another point in common is that the goal of this γνῶσις is for man to become deified: τοῦτο ἐστὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλος τοῖς γνῶσιν ἐσχηκόσι, θεωθῆναι, i.26(16.12,13). Properly speaking, what we have here is not so much apotheosis as self-realization. It is this doctrine, as well as the external evidence and the echoes in i, vii, xiii and xvi, which connects C. H. i with the bulk of the Corpus Hermeticum. However, in C. H. i the name of Hermes is not used as a guarantee of apotheosis. As has been seen, the idea of apotheosis was, in Festugière's words, "banale sous l'Empire."² Therefore the appearance of this idea within the Poimandres does not in itself connect it with the Hermetic literature.

One interesting feature of the Poimandres which sets it apart from most of the Corpus Hermeticum (except C. H. iiii) is its literary dependence on the Septuagint. Since this problem has been treated at great length by C. H. Dodd,³ it is enough here simply to take note of the fact. While Dodd does, to be sure, find parallels between other tractates of the Corpus Hermeticum and the Septuagint,⁴ these are neither

¹ Cf. Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 58.

² Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, ix, intro.; see above, p. 104, n. 1.

³ Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 99-200.

⁴ Ibid., pp. 235-242.

as numerous nor as convincing as those which he uncovers for the Poimandres.

The much disputed question of the origins of the teachings of the Poimandres, whether they are to be sought in Egypt,¹ in Iran,² in Judaism,³ in Platonism,⁴ in Gnosticism,⁵ or even in Arcadia as mediated through Cyrene,⁶ fortunately does not have to be settled here. With regard to method, it is important to bear in mind the principle suggested by Reitzenstein in his review of the second volume of Scott's work:

"Die Frage kann jetzt gar nicht mehr so gestellt werden, was sich in der Kosmogonie des Poimandres zur Not noch mit der jüdischen zusammenbringen lässt, sondern nur, ob die Übereinstimmungen mit der jüdischen oder die mit der persischen stärker sind, und in sich die Grundgedanken und die leitenden Anschauungen der Poimandres reiner finden."⁷

With this principle in mind, it is possible to see that, while Platonism has contributed a great deal of the technical vocabulary of the Poimandres, and the Septuagint a number of direct quotations as well

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, especially pp. 59-69, 131-134 and 159 f.; Reitzenstein, Zwei Religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten Texten der Strassburger Bibliothek (Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1901), p. 59 f.

²Reitzenstein, in Reitzenstein-Schaeder, op. cit., pp. 8-32, and Reitzenstein, "Hermetica", ed. Walter Scott, vol. II, "Gnomon III (1927) 268-279.

³Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, pp. 99-200; see above, p. 156.

⁴Scott, op. cit., II, 6-8.

⁵Reitzenstein, Poimandres, 68-114; Jonas, op. cit., pp. 147-173; see above, p. 153 f.

⁶Zielinski, loc. cit., IX (1906) 25-60.

⁷Reitzenstein, "Hermetica", ed. Walter Scott, vol. II, p. 278.

as some stylistic features, there is left over a great deal which must be explained from other sources. Reitzenstein may be right in deriving this remainder from Iranian sources, although it is at least surprising that in the Poimandres there is no counterpart to Ahriman.¹ At any rate, the Egyptian antecedents alleged by Reitzenstein in his earlier works, while no doubt indicating considerable erudition, seem unfruitful as aids for understanding the Poimandres. Reitzenstein's attempt to derive the cosmogony in the Poimandres from the so-called "Memphis theology"² serves in my view only to emphasize the gulf between the ancient Egyptian religion and the concepts of the Poimandres.

However, these questions, as stated, need not be settled here. What is interesting from our point of view is that it is precisely those doctrines which cause the most difficulty with respect to the origins of the teachings of the Poimandres which are also the least consistent with the teachings of the majority of the tractates in the Corpus Hermeticum.

However, the deviations in C. H. I from the pattern of the "logos" "hermétique d'enseignement" prove little about the date of the Corpus since the Poimandres seems to have been accepted as Hermetic at a very early date.³ If the Corpus Hermeticum errs in giving the Poimandres as a Hermetic dialogue, it was, if the date of compilation suggested in chapter two is correct, by that time a very venerable error.

¹See also Festugière's remarks, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 24 f.

²See especially Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 66 f.

³See above, p. 150, n. 2.

Nevertheless, the position of C. H. i in the Corpus Hermeticum raises problems for those who believe that the Corpus Hermeticum is the product of a Hermetic religious community. Compared with the majority of the dialogues in the Corpus Hermeticum, the Poimandres is a very unusual document. Why would a member of a Hermetic religious community wish to emphasize a document which diverges so extensively from the other documents in the collection? Since it is emphasized by position, why is the subject matter of the Poimandres then virtually ignored through the rest of the Corpus?

C. H. vii

Since C. H. vii is relatively short and presents relatively few problems, it is convenient to treat it next. While it nowhere mentions the name of Poimandres, it has been associated with C. H. i because it is similar in form and content to the proclamation in 1.27-28,¹ which was given as a result of a direct commandment by Poimandres in 1.26 (16.13-15). Therefore C. H. vii, like C. H. i, has a public character, in contrast with the private character of most of the Hermetic tractates.²

The proclamation of C. H. i.27,28, with which we may compare C. H. vii, consists of two short addresses. In the first of these, the human race is addressed as earthborn (γῆγενεῖς) and given to drunkenness, sleep, and ignorance of God. As a remedy, they are to become sober and wake up, 1.27(16.21-23). In the second of these, mankind is again called

¹See Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 181, Scott, op. cit., II, 181 f., and Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 78.

²See above, p. 151 f.

earthborn. They are said to be given to death, but to have the power to participate in immortality. As a remedy, they are to repent, to become free of the "dark Night," take on immortality, and leave corruption behind, i.28(16.25-17.3). Thus the form of both parts is, first, a description of the human predicament, and second, an exhortation to stop doing those things which lead to this predicament.

This is exactly the form of C. H. vii. Men are addressed as drunken, because they have imbibed the unmixed ($\alpha\kappa\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$) word of ignorance ($\delta\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$), vii.1(81.3,4). As a remedy they are to become sober and look up with the eyes of their hearts: $\delta\nu\alpha\beta\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\psi\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\phi\theta\alpha\lambda\mu\omicron\iota\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\iota\alpha\varsigma$, vii.1(81.5,6). Ignorance is compared to a flood which has covered the whole earth, vii.1(81.7-10). As a remedy, they are to anchor themselves onto the harbour of salvation, vii.2(87.10-12). Changing the metaphor, they are to find a guide to lead them to the doors of $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$: $\zeta\eta\tau\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\ \chi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\delta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \delta\delta\eta\gamma\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\nu\alpha\ \delta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \epsilon\nu\tau\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\epsilon\omega\varsigma\ \theta\upsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma$, vii.2(81.12-14). But first it is necessary to break through the body (called $\delta\nu\ \varphi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \chi\iota\tau\omega\nu\alpha$), vii.2(81.18), which is denounced at great length, vii.2(81.18)-3(82.9).

C. H. vii and C. H. i.27-28 are, then, very similar. Nevertheless, while the antitheses, between drunkenness and sobriety, sleep and wakefulness, ignorance and knowledge, and light and darkness are the same as those presupposed in the proclamation of i.27-28, and although both the form and the tone of urgency are the same, this is not enough to allow us to give a very strong assent to Festugière's tentative suggestion

that the author of C. H. vii is the same as the author of C. H. i,¹ the themes used are, after all, as Festugière points out, "banal."² However, we are at least permitted to conclude that these two documents have similar purposes and similar world-views.

C. H. vii is placed among the dualistic tractates.³ While its dualism no doubt shares many common features with the dualism of C. H. i, there is no hint as to how its author solved the difficulty common to all dualists of explaining how two unlike substances like body and soul came to be united. However, it is clear that C. H. vii shares most closely with C. H. vi its exuberance in denouncing the evils of the body.

C. H. vii, like C. H. i, does not mention Hermes and his disciples. Indeed, it is difficult to see how they could even be imagined as involved in such a public document, which addresses itself simply to the human race (ὁ γένετης), vii.1(81.3).

Since C. H. vii resembles the proclamation in C. H. i.27-28 so precisely, its place within the Hermetic movement depends heavily on the place which we make for C. H. i. I suspect that in both cases a place was found for documents which in their origin were not Hermetic.

C. H. iii

C. H. iii, like C. H. i.4-18, presents a cosmogony. According to Dodd, these two cosmogonies share a common outline, based on

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., i.78. So also Dodd, in The Bible and the Greeks, p. 181, who finds that it is "in all probability by the same author."

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 78.

³See above, p. 99.

Genesis 1.¹ Both Scott and Nock point out that there is a very strong literary connection between C. H. 111 and Genesis 1, LXX.² The formula which appears in C. H. 1.18(13.7,8), ἀξάνεσθε ἐν ἀξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθε ἐν πληθει, is alluded to in 111.3(45.10,11), εἰς τὸ ἀξάνεσθαι ἐν ἀξήσει καὶ πληθύνεσθαι ἐν πληθει. If Dodd is correct in seeing these words as derived from Genesis 1.22,28, LXX, ἀξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε καὶ πληροῦσθε,³ then we must suppose a literary connection between 1 and 111 or a common source drawing on Genesis, since the quotation is altered in the same (rather inelegant) way in both instances.⁴

While attempts to get at the sense of this tractate are frustrated in part by the clearly corrupt text,⁵ it also seems likely that the text, even in its original state, did not make a great deal of sense. What does it mean, for example, to say, Δόξα πάντων ὁ θεὸς καὶ θεῖον καὶ φύσις θεῶν, 111.1(44.2)? Surely only one of these can be said to be the "glory" (δόξα) of everything. So also the following two sentences: ἀρχὴ τῶν ὄντων ὁ θεός, καὶ νοῦς καὶ φύσις καὶ ὕλη, σοφία εἰς δεξιὴν ἀπέναντον ἄν· ἀρχὴ τὸ θεῖον καὶ φύσις καὶ ἐνέργεια καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ τέλος καὶ ἀναψῶσις, 111.1(44.2-5) seem to make little sense. If God is the ἀρχή and all of these other things are also the ἀρχή, is not ἀρχή in that case simply an empty word? Nock accuses the author of being overly fond

¹Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 219.

²Ibid., pp. 210-234; Scott, op. cit., pp. 110-112.

³Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 228 f.

⁴Ibid., p. 233; Scott, op. cit., II, 128.

⁵Above, pp. 43-46.

of big, sonorous words;¹ it is clear that he can also use even a standard technical term of the philosophy of his day simply for sonorous effect.

The term γνῶσις occurs twice in C. H. iii, each time in chapter 3(45.8 and 15). While the text is damaged and the context in part lost in both instances, it seems likely that γνῶσις here means not a special way by which a restricted elite are able to see God, but a possibility for all men given by the gods in creation.

Apparently the author does not believe in any sort of survival after death. He does, to be sure, use the term παλιγγενεσία, iii.3 (45.6), which in C. H. xii seems to be a technical term for apotheosis, but apparently in the sense of the reproduction of the species. According to Dodd, the immortality of man is "emphatically denied."² This is to some extent an over-statement, based in part on his conjectural reading of ἀρκεῖ τε αὐτοῖς for ἄρχεται αὐτῶν in iii.4(45.18).³ However, the words καὶ ἀναλυθῆναι εἰς ὃ ἔσται, iii.4(46.1,2), as Scott also points out, seem to exclude any possibility of survival after death.⁴

In contrast with the monotheism or monism of most of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum, the thought of C. H. iii is frankly polytheistic. Creation is not the activity of God or of the κόσμος,

¹ Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 43.

² Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 216.

³ Ibid., p. 213.

⁴ Scott, op. cit., p. 130. See Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 230.

but of the seven planets, iii.2(44.12-14) and iii.3. Dodd is frankly embarrassed by this tendency, which he ascribes either to a Jew on the fringes of Judaism or to a "philosophic pagan approaching Judaism from the outside."¹ While the other documents do occasionally speak of the stars as gods, cf. x.7.11,12 and xii.12(179.3,4), there is in most of the Hermetic literature only one creator.

I believe that in the case of C. H. iii we have a document so incompatible with the remainder of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum that it cannot conceivably have been placed there by a member of a Hermetic religious community or by a devotee. C. H. iii does not mention the name of Hermes or of his disciples. Undoubtedly it was ascribed to Hermes, but belonged rather to the so-called "lower Hermetism," and was accepted in good faith by the compiler. One may see it as a brief astrological treatise which either was attributed to Hermes by its author or acquired the name of Hermes in the course of transmission.² It seems most reasonable to suppose that a document of this nature could most easily have been accepted into a collection of Hermetic writings after Hermetism had ceased to be an active religious movement. Thus the nature of C. H. iii is extremely compatible with the date advanced in chapter two for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum.

¹Ibid., p. 224.

²For the possibility of an accident of this sort see Ch.-Em. Ruelle, "L'exégèse dite anonyme de la tétrabible de Claude Ptolémée et le traité dit d'Hermès le philosophe "De revolutionibus nativitatum" attribués à l'astrologue arabe Aboumasar - découverte du texte grec du second traité," Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et des Belles Lettres (1910) 34 f.

C. H. xiii

Although C. H. xiii is in almost every respect a typical Hermetic tractate, it is convenient to treat it in this chapter because of its special relation to C. H. i. As we have seen, there is some reason to believe that C. H. i was not originally "Hermetic" in the sense of being the product of the same religious movement which was responsible for the typical Hermetic tractates discussed in the previous chapter. However, it appears in C. H. xiii that C. H. i is taken as a Hermetic document, the first person narrator being identified with Hermes. Since however there is no reference to C. H. i elsewhere among the typical Hermetic tractates in the Corpus Hermeticum, the references to the Poimandres in C. H. i are decidedly a non-typical feature.

While the form of C. H. xiii is that of the "'logos' hermetique d'enseignement," it has, as Festugière points out, a subject matter that is not itself capable of being taught, cf. xiii.2(201.7,8), 3(201.16-18), 16(207.9).¹ Thus while its form is that of a teaching dialogue, its content is that of a mystery religion. G. Sfameni Gasparro has analysed C. H. xiii as a mystery, and has divided it into three stages which, she says, are typical of a mystery: "stato iniziale, crisi (nel suo aspetto di morte), rinascita in una condizione del tutto nuova, piu garantita, anzi divina."² The first of these corresponds to the initial state in the body, the second to the time when Tat begins to be estranged from

¹ Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 210.

² G. Sfameni Gasparro, "La gnosi ermetica come iniziazione e mistero," Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni XXXVI (1965) 43-61.

his body, and the third to the rebirth of a new man.¹ While Sfamoni Gasparro points to the use of the language of the mysteries in other Hermetic documents, it is only in C. H. xiii that she finds that the structure of the mysteries is important.²

The purpose of this mystery is, of course, apotheosis. As Festugière points out, in this tractate, unlike in most of the Hermetic tractates, apotheosis is depicted as taking place.³ This process had already happened to Hermēs: ὁρῶν <ποτε> (Reitz., see above, p. 80 f.) ἐν ἑμοὶ ἡπλαστον θῆαν γεγεννημένην ἐξ ἑλεοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ ἑμαυτὸν ἐξε-
 λήλυθα εἰς θάνατον σῶμα, καὶ εἰμι νῦν οὐχ ὁ πρὶν, ἀλλ' ἐγεννήθην
 ἐν νῷ, xiii.3(201.14-16). To the unfortunate Tat, as he undergoes this process, it seems like madness: εἰς μανίαν με οὐκ ὀλίγον καὶ οὐστρη-
 σιν φρενῶν ἐνέσειςας, ὦ πατερ· ἑμαυτὸν γὰρ νῦν οὐκ ὁρῶ, xiii.4
 (202.3,4); cf. xiii.6(202.18). This is undoubtedly because one is no longer to be identified with the three-dimensional body to which one is accustomed, xiii.13(206.4,5).⁴ First, however, one must purge away the "vengeances of matter:" καθαράι σεαυτὸν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀλίγων τῆς ἕλης
 τιμωριῶν, xiii.7(203.6,7). When we have done this by the aid of the

¹Ibid., p. 57.

²Ibid., pp. 43-55.

³Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 35; see also Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 217 ff. Festugière ascribes this feature to the Poimandres as well; see above, p. 151. Reitzenstein's description of the process as "Propheten-Weihe," Poimandres, p. 220, while meeting the approval of Festugière, la révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 114, seems to me to be not altogether satisfactory, since in this tractate, as elsewhere, Tat does not appear as a prophet, but indeed is ordered to keep silent, cf. xiii.22(209.14-17).

⁴Assuming a restoration of the text similar to that proposed above, p. 84.

"powers," Tat is told, we can become deified, xiii.10(204.22-24), reading with Reitzenstein, ἐθεωθήμεν for ἐθεωρήθήμεν, see above, p. 79. Following these words, Tat has an experience in which he sees himself as present throughout the κόσμος: ἐν οὐρανῷ εἰμι, ἐν γῇ, ἐν ὕδατι, ἐν ἀέρι κτλ., xiii.11(205.5 ff.); as Festugière points out, this experience is similar to that demanded by Νοῦς in C. H. xi.20.¹ As a result of this experience, Tat is assured by Hermes that he has become a god:² ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι θεὸς πέφυκας καὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς παῖς, ὅ κἀγὼ, xiii.14(206.15). Tat is then able to sing a hymn to himself as a god; at least, that is how I would interpret the difficult xiii.21(209.6.7): σοί, γενάρχα τῆς γενεσιουργίας, Τὰτ θεῶ, πέμπω λογικὰς θυσίας.³

As has already been seen the theme of apotheosis is at the heart of many, perhaps all of the typical Hermetic tractates, and is also emphasized in C. H. i. We need not doubt that it was because of this doctrine that C. H. i was appropriated by the Hermetic movement, whether by the author of this tractate or by someone else.

¹ Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 143 ff.; so also Reitzenstein, Poimandros, p. 238 f.

² According to Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 34, he is "redevenu fils de Dieu." Rather, he has realized his true nature.

³ Zuntz, "On the hymns in Corpus Hermeticum XIII," 70 f., reads Τὰτ θεῶ on the supposition that the hymn was addressed to Tat. However, he concludes from this that the hymn was originally addressed to the Egyptian god Thoth, but was taken over for its present context by the Hermetic writer, who changed θεῶ to θεῶ because of the present context. However, the latter hypothesis is unnecessary, given the development of C. H. xiii. Whether we read θεῶ or θεῶ, the hymn still appears to be addressed by Tat to Tat, who has become divine.

It must be pointed out that the points of contact between C. H. xiii and C. H. i are not very numerous, although numerous enough to allow us to suppose some sort of literary relation between the two.¹ The strongest point of contact is C. H. xiii.15(206.20), which appears to quote C. H. i.2(7.9,10): δ Ποιμάνδρης, δ τῆς ἀθθεντίας νοῦς Poimandres is also referred to in xiii.15(206.18,19): καθὼς [Ὁγδοῦδα] δ Ποιμάνδρης ἐθέσπισε, τέκνον, καλῶς σπεύδεις λῦσαι τὸ σκῆνος,² although this reference unhappily cannot be traced back to C. H. i. There may also be an indirect reference to the name of Poimandres in xiii.19(208.17,18): Λόγον γὰρ τὸν σὸν ποιμαίνει δ Νοῦς.

The words δ εξαί λογικῶς θυσίας, i.31(19.1) are echoed in C. H. xiii in the hymns, with three variations: [δ ι' ἐμοῦ] δ εξαί τὸ πᾶν [λ όγω] λογικὴν θυσίαν, xiii.18(208.13), πῶς λογικῶς θυσίας, xiii.21(209.7), and δ εξαί θυσίας ὡς θέλεις ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, xiii.21(209.8).³ So also in xiii.20(208.19), the words δ σὸς ἄνθρωπος seem to be taken from i.32(19.7).

When Tat, in xiii.15(206.16-18), refers to the hymn which Hermes had heard from the Powers when he had reached the Ogdoad, we may suppose a reference to i.26(16.5,6).

Finally, the liturgical directions in xiii.16(207.9-12) resemble to some degree those given in i.29(17.10-12), although the latter are

¹ In addition to dependence of C. H. xiii, it is possible to suppose dependence on a common source, or to postulate an intermediary source between i and xiii.

² For the text see above, p. 81.

³ For the text of the first and third of these see above, p. 82.

not directly connected with the closing hymn of the Poimandres.

But there are significant differences. First of all, C. H. xiii has no reference at all to the striking cosmogony of C. H. i. It is not a sufficient explanation to say with Klein that "in XIII das mythologische Element ganz zurückgetreten ist."¹ As we shall see, much of C. H. xiii is simply incompatible with this creation myth.

I need not mention the differences between the catalogues of "vengeances" and "powers" in the two tractates, since these have already been discussed by others at length.² At any rate it is not certain how literally the writers took such lists.

Finally, C. H. xiii emphasizes secrecy, xiii.22(209.14-17), C. H. i proclamation, i.26(16.13-15). We may if we wish suppose in both instances that these are literary devices; but even in that event they betray different religious interests.

Presumably, then, the author of C. H. xiii, in drawing on the Poimandres, does not thereby adopt all the views expressed in C. H. i. We may suppose, however, that he did find enough in common with his own viewpoint to allow him to use the Poimandres as a Hermetic document.

It is quite plausible that it was the author of C. H. xiii who was the first to treat the Poimandres as a Hermetic dialogue. To this extent we may follow Reitzenstein in his reconstruction of the movement,³

¹Klein, op. cit., p. 116.

²Ibid., pp. 109-111; see also Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 153-157.

³Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 216.

but without necessarily believing in his reconstruction of an original prophet who left the Egyptian religion to establish a Poimandres community.¹ If so, then we may not extrapolate from the Poimandres to reconstruct the beliefs of the Hermetic movement.

There is, then, reason to suppose a literary relation of one sort or another between C. H. xiii and the Poimandres. There are also suggestions from time to time that some other documents are used. The most striking of these is the reference in C. H. xiii.1(200.4) to the Γενικοὶ λόγοι, which do not appear to have a great deal in common with the works of the same name mentioned at the beginning of C. H. x, which claims to be the epitome of these λόγοι, or with the documents of that name mentioned in St. H. ivA.1 and St. H. vi.1. It is difficult to escape the suspicion, following Festugière, that these titles are fictitious.²

It is perhaps more plausible to suppose that the reference to the prophecy in xiii.15(206.18,19) refers to a previous document. Festugière, who wishes to retain ὀγδοῦσα, finds in this a reference to C. H. i as a whole, taking ὀγδοῦσα as the object of ἐθέμις.³ If so, it is a fairly obscure reference, since it is difficult on that hypothesis to see how C. H. i could be described as "revealing the Ogdoad." In any case, this reference could just as easily be a literary device.

¹ Ibid., p. 159; see his summary on p. 248.

² Festugière in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 114, n. 2.

³ Ibid., II, 216, n. 66.

So also the reference to written (or engraved) documents in C. H. xiii.15(206.20-207.1) may refer to sources of C. H. xiii. However, in this case as well it is very easy to suspect a literary fiction.

Such fictions are the easier to suspect because C. H. xiii is full of the novelistic details which we saw to a lesser degree in C. H. x, xii, and xiv. Tat is depicted as the immature son of a wise father who uses his relationship to demand from his father revelations which he may not be entirely qualified to receive. This is especially apparent in xiii.1-3. Tat accuses his father of speaking to him in riddles, xiii.1 (200.4,5) and of not speaking to him as if he really were a son, xiii.2 (201.6,7). When he is not satisfied with the answer he receives, he even goes so far as to infer that he is being rejected because he is a bastard: ἔθεν πρὸς ταῦτα ὁρθῶς ἀντειπεῖν θέλω· ἀλλότριος υἱὸς πέφικα τοῦ πατρικοῦ γένους· μὴ φοβέει μοι, πατέρ· γνήσιος υἱὸς εἰμι, xiii.3(201.10-12). This motive of the immaturity of Tat, which also appears in C. H. xiv.1 (222.5-7), may simply be a commonplace of the later Hermetic literature.¹

While this tractate is normally placed among the "dualistic" tractates,² its pantheistic elements are also noticeable.³ The hymn is thoroughly pantheistic, except for references to the dualism between creature and creation. Similarly, the description of the ecstasy of Tat in

¹As Reitzenstein points out, this theme is also used to stress the author's point that only God can give true understanding of the doctrine of this tractate, Poimandres, p. 216 and 246 f.

²See above, p. 99.

³Klein, op. cit., p. 112 f.

xiii.11, as also in xiii.13(206.3), uses the language of pantheism. Bousset would dismiss this pantheism as "nur ein "äusserer Firnis,"¹ but perhaps this judgement is unnecessary. It seems to me that if any dualism is carried through in this tractate, it is the dualism between appearance and reality. An explicit reference to this kind of dualism can be seen, in spite of the broken state of the text, in xiii.13 (206.4,5): Ἀὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, ᾧ τέκνον, τὸ μηκέτι φαντάζεσθαι εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ τριχῇ διαστατόν² We may cite in addition xiii.3(202.1,2), οὐκ ὁφθαλμοῖς τοῦτοῖς θεωροῦμαι νῦν, ᾧ τέκνον. Other references, unfortunately partially obscured by a corrupt text, may be found in xiii.3(201.14-202.1).

This sort of dualism is of course really a monism, since the apparent has no independent existence. Nevertheless, dualism between appearance and reality is quite consistent with a vigorous denunciation of the merely apparent.

If this represented the considered view of the author, it might be possible on this basis to reconcile such statements as διὰ τοῦ (B^C: διὰ τοῦτο mss.) δεσποτηρίου τοῦ σώματος αἰσθητικῶς πύσχειν ἀναγκάζουσι τὸν ἐνδοκίθετον ἄνθρωπον, xiii.7(203.15-17) with ὁμνεῖν μελλῶ τὸν τῆς κτίσεως κύριον, καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ ἕν, xiii.17(207.17,18). We may, however, be unduly systematizing the author; it may be that he

¹Bousset, "Joseph Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," p. 749.

²For a possible reconstruction of this text see above, p. 83 f.

was more concerned with the religious experience which he describes than with consistency in other respects, so that he is willing to use any kind of statement to support that experience.

Probably the author did not adhere to the myth of creation given in C. H. i. This can be seen by the use of the language of creation and of pantheism, especially in the hymns. Nowhere is there any reference to a second God who creates the world. In this respect C.H. xiii belongs with the typical Hermetic dialogues, and not with the Poimandres.

In summary, then, C. H. xiii is in most respects a typical "logos" hermétique d'enseignement." It is discussed here mainly because of its relationship with the Poimandres.

C. H. xvi

Both C. H. xvi and C. H. xvii have this in common, that the teacher is no longer Hermes, but a pupil. According to Reitzenstein, this follows the plan of the redactor, who, following the sacred history given in St. H. xxiii (λόγος κόσμου). 5-7, had left Tat and Asclepius as his δίδωχοι.¹ It is inconvenient for this plan that the extremely pedestrian C. H. xiv should come between C. H. xiii and C. H. xvi. At any rate, it is not altogether unexpected at any date that a compiler or redactor should place the documents attributed to the successors at the end of the collection.²

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 191 f.

²It is intriguing that one family of manuscripts, Laurentianus 71.33 (A) and its associates, lacks tractates xvii-xviii; Nock thinks that a scribe was under the impression that these works belonged to a different collection. Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, xvi, intro. It is

C. H. xvi is perhaps the only document in the Corpus Hermeticum which can be called pseudonymous in the proper sense of the word (assuming that the titles of C. H. i and C. H. iii are secondary). Using the form of a letter to a "king Ammon," a character whom we also meet in some of the Stobaeian fragments, he establishes his pseudonym not only by disposing of the objection that this tractate contradicts some of the others: φανήσεται γὰρ σοι καὶ τοῖς ἑμοῖς ἐνίστε (Reitzenstein; mss. ἐν(οις) λόγοις ἀντίφωνος, xvi.1(231.10,11), on the grounds that they are improperly translated from the "original" Egyptian, xvi.1 (232.2-5), but also by forbidding the king to allow its translation, xvi.2(232.9,10), since the Greek language destroys philosophy: μήτε τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑπερήφανος φράσις καὶ ἐκλελυμένη καὶ ὡς περ κεκαλωπισμένη ἐξέστηλον ποιήσῃ τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ στιβαρόν, καὶ τὴν ἐνεργητικὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων φράσιν, xvi.2(232.11-14), and Greek philosophy is just a noise of words: καὶ αὕτη ἐστὶν Ἑλλήνων φιλοσοφία, λόγων ὥρυς, xvi.2(232.15,16). In fact, the Greek of this tractate is among the best in the Corpus Hermeticum, and there is no reason to suppose that the author spoke or understood any language besides Greek.

As Festugière points out, the title, "Οροι, definitions, does not suit the contents.¹ Nor does the list of contents following immediately upon the title give any idea at all of the actual contents of

not impossible, however, that they were added to the Corpus Hermeticum at a later date, so that they were not in A's exemplar.

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 228.

the tractate. There is in fact only one topic, and that is the fifth given, $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\ \eta\lambda\sigma\upsilon$. In this tractate, the sun is called the demiurge, xvi.5(233.18) as well as the charioteer who secures the chariot of the $\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, xvi.7(234.12,13). In addition, the sun is in some way (the text is corrupt) in control of the daemons which oversee human activity and execute the commandments of the gods by various physical phenomena, xvi.10(235.12-18). It is, moreover, the daemons which convey the influence of the astral gods to men, xvi.13. But they control only two parts of the soul, leaving the reasonable part open to the influence of the sun, xvi.15(236.22-26). Those who receive the influence of the sun are freed from the influence of the daemons, xvi.16(237.1-4). Nevertheless the sun, depending on the intelligible world, which itself depends on God, conveys the influence ($\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\phi\eta$) of God to men, xvi.17(237.11-14).

Nock raises the possibility that part of this tractate, along with the beginning of the next, may have been lost.¹ If so, then perhaps the missing section may have contained the remaining topics expected from the list of contents. But it should be noted that C. H. xvi as it stands is a unity. After the introduction denouncing the Greek language, xvi.1 & 2, there are some preliminary words about God, who is both One and All, as the context within which the discussion is to be understood, chapter 3. No doubt this chapter could be seen as the first item promised in the table of contents, $\pi\epsilon\pi\iota\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon$. So also we can, under pressure, accept chapter 4, which describes the earth as the storehouse of all

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 228, n. 2.

matter, as providing the second item in the table of contents, περὶ ἡλίου. But in terms of the structure of the tractate, it leads up to chapter 5, which introduces the genuine topic, the sun, which as we have seen is fifth in the supposed list of contents. In connection with the sun, the daemons (which have no place in the supposed list of contents) and stars are mentioned, chapters 10-15, but only to emphasize the pre-eminent role of the sun, chapter 16. Finally the relation of the sun to God is reaffirmed in terms of the present discussion, chapters 17-19. Therefore the structure, after the introduction, is abcba, with the sun occupying the major part of the discussion. This structure is not likely to be accidental; therefore it is likely that the tractate has always stood in its present form.

That being the case, we must account for the table of contents. No doubt they are redactional; but why were they added? They can perhaps be explained if we suppose that this tractate originally stood in a collection of tractates given the name, Ὅροι Ἀσκληπιοῦ πρὸς Ἀμμωνίου βασιλέα. The table of contents would have described the contents of this collection. Perhaps our compiler applied this title and table of contents uncritically to this one tractate, either because the others in this collection were lost, or because he did not understand the relation of this title to the tractate excerpted. Therefore this title may easily be due to a redactor, as Nock suggests,¹ but not necessarily to the redactor of the Corpus Hermeticum.

This tractate lacks reference to either γνῶσις or apotheosis.

¹ Ibid.

Salvation, for the author, is acquired when a ray of the sun shines into the "logical" (λογικός) part of the soul, xvi.16(237.1,2), thus setting at naught the influences of the daemons (237.2-4). Since the author does not discuss how the influence of the sun makes itself felt, it is impossible to say whether this influence is in any way related to the theme of γνῶσις.

Thus the connection between this work and those discussed in the previous chapter is somewhat tenuous. The names of the participants are indeed Hermetic, but the teachings bear a scant resemblance to those of most of the Hermetic tractates.¹ While it is not possible to be certain, it seems likely that C. H. xvi did not come from the same circles which produced most of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum. That, being the case, it is to that extent less plausible that the Corpus Hermeticum is the product of a Hermetic religious community.

It is intriguing that the author, in an apparent reference to C. H. i.9(9.20,21), cites Hermes as calling the administration of the planets fate (εἰμαρμένη) xvi.16(237.9,10).² This would seem to indicate that the author knew the Poimandres as a Hermetic document. Of course, C. H. xvi clearly presupposes an extensive Hermetic literature; that is why he must discuss possible contradictions with "his" other works,

¹Reitzenstein sees many Hermetic features in C. H. xvi, notably the slogan Ἐν τῷ νῦν, the doctrine of εἰμαρμένη, and the νοῦς (?) which is not subjected to it. (These are by no means doctrines peculiar to the Hermetic literature.) He continues, however, "Neu aber und diesem System ganz widersprechend ist die Auffassung der Sonne als Allgott," Poimandres, p. 197.

²Scott, op. cit., II, 454 f.

xvi.1(231.10,11).

In summary then, the contents of C. H. xvi are consistent with, but do not in themselves demand, the date of compilation suggested in chapter two.

C. H. xvii

This fragment is really too short to allow any strong conclusions to be drawn with respect to the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum. One gathers that the main purpose of the dialogue was to defend the worship of idols, cf. xvii(243.11,12). While Festugière and Scott both would have us believe that the king in question is Ammon,¹ it may be asked whether the closing lines: "Ὅρα ἔστιν, ὦ προφῆτα, περὶ τὴν τῶν ξένων ἐπιμελειαν γενέσθαι· τῇ δὲ ἐπιουῶν περὶ τῶν ἐξῆς θεολογήσομεν, xvii (243.13-15), do not encourage us to believe that Tat is visiting a foreign country. Festugière cites with approval the opinion of Einarson that the scene resembles that of the conversation between Apollonius of Tyana and the king of India.²

C. H. xviii

We now turn to tractate xviii, perhaps the most atypical of all the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum. It is an oration given in praise of kings, whether actual or idealized.

¹Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 242; so also Scott, op. cit., II, 458.

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 242.

An outline of this oration is given by Festugière in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 246. As it stands, the oration is incomplete.¹ The preamble, an extended and extremely tiresome metaphor comparing the (presumably inadequate) orator to a musician who is blameless because his instrument fails him although he is trying his best, covers almost half of the speech, chapters one to seven. In the course of chapter seven, the writer finally admits that his topic is not incompetent musicianship or bad oratory, but the praise of the king and kings generally, xviii.7 (251.10-12). Then he announces his plan in chapter eight, which is to praise kings, first God, who is the king over everything, and then earthly kings, who resemble him insofar as they hold the sceptre, xviii.8 (251.20-23). This plan is then repeated at greater length in chapters nine and ten. Eulogy of God takes up chapters eleven to fourteen, leaving the final two chapters for the praise of earthly kings, on the grounds that they guarantee peace. One would expect that these would be followed by more details on the reasons for praising kings, as well as by a conclusion.

One of the more surprising aspects of this speech is the almost complete absence of any reference to any concrete king. The only plausible exception is in xviii.16(255.3,4), καὶ ὅτι γε ὑπερέχειν πέφυκε τῆς βασιλείας τῆς βαρβαρικῆς, although this reference is so vague that, given a tendency to exaggerate, it could be made to apply to virtually any Roman emperor up to the time of Psellus, as well as to any number of

¹Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 360, 18, n., as well as Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 246.

kings of surrounding barbarian kingdoms. In fact, there is no proof that this speech was ever intended to refer to any particular king or group of kings.¹

That being the case, it is surprising that Reitzenstein is willing to identify the king in question with Diocletian.² According to Reitzenstein, this speech, along with the accompanying collection of Hermetic documents, was handed over to Diocletian and his colleagues to prove that the Hermetic religion was conducive to supreme loyalty to the emperor.³ Unhappily, the reference to an actual king was lost in a lacuna between chapter ten and eleven.⁴ (In my judgement, such a lacuna is not demanded by the context.) That Diocletian was the emperor in question is, according to Reitzenstein, suggested on both political and religious grounds. The political grounds are that the speech presupposes peace (according to Reitzenstein, peace in Egypt), coupled with frontier wars against the barbarians. The religious grounds are that submission of a pagan collection to an emperor is improbable after the time of Constantine, but that apparent references to solar monotheism (doubtless in xviii.11(253.1-6) as well as in C. H. xvi) rule out a date before Elagabalus.⁵ Moreover, the relation of the ruler to the governed presupposed in this tractate, as well as the nature of the references to the

¹ According to Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 244, there is no proof that this speech was ever delivered; given the absence of concrete references, we may ask if it was ever intended for delivery.

² Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 207.

³ Ibid.

⁴ Ibid., p. 358, 11, n.

⁵ Ibid., p. 207.

deity, the glorification of the sun, and the mention of ὡσεὶς are all Hermetic.¹

As noted above, however, in the text as we have it there is no reference to any concrete king, and virtually no reference to any actual political situation, except for the reference to rule over the barbarian kingdom (or, according to Festugière, royalty). Far from referring to solar monotheism, xviii.11(253.1-6) gives a commonplace comparison of the activity of God with the activity of the sun. It is true that a wide gap is presupposed between king and subject in this tractate, but no greater than might be found at any time in the later Roman empire, before or after the triumph of Christianity.

The piety of this oration, although extremely vague and given to platitudes,² is at least compatible with Hermetism.³ As in the typical Hermetic tractates, God is frequently called πατήρ; in one case he is even called νοῦς ὁ πατήρ, xviii.14(254.13), an expression which reminds us of C. H. i.12(10.15), ὁ δὲ πᾶντων πατήρ ὁ νοῦς, cf. i.6(8.19). The repeated references to God as τὸ κατεῖρτον, while unparalleled elsewhere

¹Ibid., p. 206 f.; I omit mention of such less compelling features as the use of the Egyptian (?) flute, the Alexandrian (?) mention of virtuosity in music, and "das Hervorheben der gottgewollten, erlösenden Kraft des Hymnus, des Lobpreises Gottes."

²Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 244, refers to "la piété amphigourique, d'ailleurs parfaitement banale, de certains morceaux du discours.."

³So Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 244, n. 3.

in the Corpus Hermeticum,¹ are at least consistent with Hermetism. That God is called "father of our souls" is also compatible with Hermetism. Also consistent with Hermetism is the reference to τὸ ἡμέτερον τῶν ψυχῶν ὁπερ οὐρανία φύξις, xviii.11(253.8), at least if we take τῶν ψυχῶν as descriptive rather than possessive or objective, cf. Festugière's translation, "ces plantes supra-célestes que sont nos âmes." Similarly Hermetic is the reference to ἡ γυνῶσις τοῦ παντός, xviii.13(254.3,4), although much of the context is missing. So also the reference to the musician to whom the god of music was well disposed, xviii.6(250.19-251.6), while by no means Hermetic, is certainly compatible with Hermetism. Similarly, the references to the images (διδόματα), xviii.16(255.6-8), of the kings can have a place within Hermetism, cf. Asclepius 37.

On the other hand, there is nothing specifically Hermetic in this tractate. No reference appears to the hope of apotheosis, nor to Hermes, Asclepius, Tat, and Ammon, the usual characters in the typical Hermetic teaching dialogue. The omission of Ammon is perhaps surprising, given the purpose of the speech. It is even more surprising if we accept Reitzenstein's hypothesis of the purpose of this speech, since reference to a "king Ammon" would be a welcome compliment to the divine Diocletian. In fact, the oration could have been written by virtually any educated pagan in the late empire. It could even have been written by a Christian

¹ God is, however, described as κρείττων καὶ εἰς καὶ μόνος ὄντως σοφὸς τὸ πάντα, xiv.3(222.19), and receives in C. H. v such epithets as ὁ θεὸς ὀνόματος κρείττων, v.10(64.3) cf. v.1(60.4) and v.8(63.16).

of a moderately syncretistic sort, if he were under Hermetic or similar pagan influence. Since C. H. xviii was apparently never intended for public delivery, it is in any case beside the point whether its religious views would have suited the dynasty of the time.

That being the case, the most plausible hypothesis is that the inclusion of C. H. xviii in the Corpus Hermeticum is the result of chance. Festugière attributes its inclusion to "l'impéritie d'un rédacteur qui se sera laissé abuser par la piété amphigourique, d'ailleurs parfaitement banale, de certains morceaux du discours."¹ The two titles, *περὶ τῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους τοῦ σώματος ἐμποδιζομένης ψυχῆς* (248.1,2), and *περὶ εὐφημίας τοῦ κρείττονος καὶ ἐγκάμιον βασιλέως* (252.15,16), have, as Reitzenstein points out, little relation to the contents.² I would conjecture that it was these titles which induced the compiler of the Corpus Hermeticum to include this document. Reitzenstein's hypothesis, that the oration was intended to commend the Corpus Hermeticum and the Hermetic movement to Diocletian and his colleagues, lacks convincing supporting evidence. It seems more reasonable to suppose that C. H. xviii was placed in the Corpus Hermeticum by someone who did not understand the movement which produced the Hermetic literature, and long after that movement had ceased to exist. It is to be conceded, however, that since C. H. xviii is the last document in the Corpus Hermeticum, its inclusion may be purely accidental, and may have happened after the formation of the Corpus.

¹In Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 244.

²Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 199.

Conclusions

With the exception of C. H. xiii and C. H. xvii, the documents in this chapter are to a greater or lesser degree inconsistent with the belief that the Corpus Hermeticum is the product of the religious movement which produced the typical Hermetic tractates. While the typical Hermetic tractates resemble each other quite closely in form, and, with certain notable exceptions, reasonably closely in teachings, the documents discussed in this chapter present a bewildering variety. While it is possible to associate C. H. iii, vii, and xiii in a group with C. H. i, since each of the former resembles C. H. i in some degree, that is only to emphasize how greatly they diverge from each other. C. H. i may have been read by the authors of C. H. iii, xiii, xvi, and perhaps also vii; but it is odd that only one of these is in the traditional form of the "'logos' hermétique d'enseignement," and that only two mention the name of Hermes or his pupils. C. H. xvi may be associated with C. H. xvii only to the extent that in both cases the major participant is not Hermes but a pupil. C. H. xviii, of course, stands alone.

Of the tractates discussed, C. H. iii and C. H. xviii have the least right to stand in the Corpus Hermeticum. We may perhaps in the case of C. H. xviii attribute its inclusion to scribal error - although the titles (see above, p. 183) suggest that C. H. xviii could very easily have been taken as Hermetic by the compiler. But it is scarcely likely that a similar explanation can be given for C. H. iii, which falls well inside the Corpus. Therefore the inclusion of these two tractates alone makes it extremely implausible that the Corpus is the product of a Hermetic religious movement.

With respect to the other documents discussed, the evidence is less clear. C. H. i was, as we have seen, taken as Hermetic at a very early date. But it seems improbable that, if the Corpus Hermeticum were really the product of a Hermetic religious community, the Poimandres would have been given such a prominent position and then been completely ignored for most of the Corpus. C. H. vii can be accepted, as previously noted, if C. H. i is accepted, but otherwise seems quite out of place. C. H. xvi, while eccentric in its teachings, at least refers to the major characters of the typical Hermetic tractates. C. H. xiii is typically Hermetic in almost every respect, but was treated in this chapter because of its special relation to C. H. i.

The evidence presented in this chapter, then, supports strongly the hypothesis that the Corpus Hermeticum was not the product of a Hermetic religious movement. Less strongly, the evidence presented in this chapter suggests that the compiler had no first-hand understanding of such a movement. If so, then the evidence presented in this chapter supports the date of compilation advocated in chapter two.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS TO PART ONE

There is a great deal of evidence to support the view that the Corpus Hermeticum is a late Byzantine collection compiled no earlier than the ninth century. This evidence has been presented in chapters two to five of Part I of this dissertation. The most compelling evidence, in my view, is textual in nature. Unless the date which I have advocated is correct, it is difficult to explain in a satisfactory fashion the manuscript difficulty in C. H. xii and xvii noted in chapter two.¹ A similar date is suggested by the unfriendly Christian glosses noted in C. H. xi.² Further support is given by the divergent quality of the manuscript tradition for each tractate. It appears that each tractate has had its own manuscript tradition; the difference in kinds of errors as well as in the quality of the text is so great that a late date of compilation is supported.³

A late date is suggested also by the nature of the documents in the collection. While perhaps the majority of the documents conform to the type of the "logos" hermétique d'enseignement,⁴ there is a significant minority of documents which cannot be made to conform to that

¹See above, pp. 20-26.

²See above, pp. 73, 96.

³See above, p. 96 f.

⁴See above, pp. 102-105

pattern.¹ This judgement is made not so much on the grounds that these documents contradict the others - as has already been noted, the Hermetists by no means were afraid of contradictions² - as on the grounds that these documents represented purposes which were quite remote from the purposes of the Hermetic writers. In the case of two of these documents, the difference in form and content was sufficiently great to give very strong support to a late date for the formation of the Corpus Hermeticum.³

One important conclusion which can be drawn from this is that the Corpus Hermeticum as a collection is not a reliable witness to the Hermetic religious movement. One cannot by combining the teachings of these documents come to a reliable picture of the movement. The documents owe their present position in the Corpus Hermeticum only to the fact that a not very well informed Byzantine scholar took them to be Hermetic.

Thus the Corpus Hermeticum was not, as Reitzenstein suggests, "planmässig zu einem Corpus verbunden."⁴ In retrospect, it is difficult to see how Reitzenstein reached such a conclusion. In the Corpus, the three documents which can be associated in contents with the Poimandres, iii, vii, and xiii, are scattered throughout the Corpus. The Poimandres is apparently given prominence by being placed at the beginning of the

¹ Above, p. 148 f.

² Above, p. 100 f.

³ Above, p. 161 ff. and p. 178 ff.

⁴ Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 191. See the discussion above, p. 8 f.

Corpus, yet its central figure, Poimandres, is ignored throughout the tractates except for the references in C. H. xiii. This latter would make an excellent climax for the Corpus; but C. H. xiv provides an anticlimax. On the other hand, the document which, more than any other, seems to give the essence of Hermetism, C. H. x, is buried in the middle of the Corpus. Thus the judgement of Festugière is upheld: the character of the Corpus Hermeticum is "aussi divers que possible."¹

However, the conclusions which can be drawn from Part I are not all negative. If the discussion in chapter four is upheld by further research, then it has been possible to uncover a typical form of Hermetic dialogue called, after Festugière, the "'logos' hermétique d'enseignement."² Dialogues in this form normally carry the name of Hermes and one of his disciples, and frequently have as their central thrust a special way of knowing God, as well as the teaching that apotheosis is the goal for those who possess this "knowledge." In spite of the random nature of the collection, more than half of the documents in the Corpus follow this pattern. Therefore we may be justified in taking those documents which follow this pattern as the most reliable guides to the Hermetic religious movement, especially since, as we have seen, the doctrine of apotheosis in itself explains the choice of pseudonyms.

In this respect, it is useful to point out that there is no

¹ Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 5.

² Above, pp. 102-105.

evidence that there has been any deliberate tampering by the compiler. The very variety of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum suggests that this has not happened. If the compiler had tampered with the documents, we would expect to see a collection that is much more homogenous, both with respect to teachings and with respect to the state of the manuscripts. There is of course no guarantee that the documents were all free from this sort of attention before they came into the hands of the compiler; however, if this has happened, it is at least improbable that all of them were tampered with in the same way.

Therefore, even though the Corpus Hermeticum as such is not a reliable source for the Hermetic religious movement, some of the documents within it, especially tractates x, xii, and iv, most likely are reliable, if proper allowance has been made for the corrupt state of their text. We now turn to Part II, where the same questions will be asked concerning the Stobaeon fragments.

PART II

THE HERMETIC FRAGMENTS IN STORANIUS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Part II will be concerned with those fragments of Hermetic literature which have been transmitted to us by Stobaeus. It will be remembered from Part I that the text of the Corpus Hermeticum had suffered a great deal of damage from scribal error, especially in certain tractates, although no evidence was found of deliberate alteration of the text. Moreover, the Corpus Hermeticum contains documents of such a diverse nature that it was difficult to conceive any impression of a Hermetic religious movement from them; in any case, given the late date of compilation, such a movement, if it ever existed, would long have been extinct by the time the Corpus Hermeticum was compiled.

Given these facts, it may be asked if the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus provide a more reliable source for the Hermetic literature or for the religious movement which underlies it. In both cases a negative answer will be given; in fact, it will be asserted that for all its faults, as documented in the last chapter, the Corpus Hermeticum nevertheless gives us both more useful information about the religious movement responsible for the Hermetic writings and a more reliable text for those passages of tractates ii, iv, and x which occur in both the Corpus Hermeticum and Stobaeus.

The text of Stobaeus used will be that of Wachsmuth and Hense.¹

¹Ioannes Stobaeus, Anthologium, ed. C. Wachsmuth et O. Hense (Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1884-1923, reprinted in 1958).

Concerning the inadequacies of the earlier editions enough has been said by Wachsmuth and Hense in their introductions to their volumes I and III respectively; I myself have attempted in vain to use the editions of Meineke and of Gaisford, and found them utterly inadequate for the present purposes. In any case, the numbering system for those and most earlier editions is completely different from that followed by Wachsmuth and Hense; those earlier editions follow the so-called "vulgate" order, invented by Gesner, an earlier editor,¹ while Wachsmuth restores the order of the manuscripts.

About Stobaeus himself, little is known except that he may have flourished around the early part of the fifth century. The name Stobaeus refers to the town of Stoboi in Macedonia; his actual name was Ioannes.² According to an epistle quoted in condensed form by Photius, Stobaeus compiled his anthology in order to provide for the cultural development of his son, Septimius.³ Perhaps strangely, since he bore the Christian name of John, there is nothing in the anthology from any Christian author;⁴ this may mean either, as Mead wants us to believe, that Stobaeus "studiously avoided" Christian writings,⁵ or, as is also possible, that

¹For the origins of the corrupt so-called "vulgate" order, see O. Hense, "Die Reihenfolge der Eklogen in der Vulgata des stobäischen Florilegium," Rheinisches Museum, N. F., XXXIX (1884) 359-407, 521-557.

²O. Hense s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," RE IX, 2549.

³Ibid. This letter is quoted in Wachsmuth's edition, vol. I, p. 3.

⁴Hense, s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," p. 2549.

⁵G. R. S. Mead, Thrice greatest Hermes (III vols.; London and Benares: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1906), I, 4.

already in Stobaeus' time we have that distinction made in Byzantium during the Middle Ages between 'inner' and 'outer' learning,¹ a distinction which enabled Byzantines to read pagan literature without fear of any compromise to their own faith.

No more need be said about Stobaeus. But to make the course of my arguments clear, I ought to discuss the state of the manuscripts of his Anthology.

Originally the Anthology appears to have consisted of four books, the first dealing with the physical sciences, the second two with ethics, and the final with a variety of topics. This work was seen, bound in two volumes, by Photius, who was good enough to describe them rather fully to his brother.² In fact, he has given a list of all the chapters as well as a list of the authors excerpted. Thus it is thanks to Photius that we have some idea of the original shape especially of the first two books. Also, perhaps in the eleventh century, there was compiled the original of the Gnomologium Laurentianum (L), now existing only in a fourteenth century manuscript, an anthology of Christian and 'profane' writings which drew a part of its material from some chapters of the undivided manuscript of Stobaeus. Some of these chapters and excerpts survive only in L, and so L would be invaluable in fixing the text of Stobaeus, were it not that the compiler, rightly from his point of view, seems to have corrected the text of Stobaeus from other

¹S. Runciman, The Last Byzantine Renaissance (Cambridge; at the University Press, 1970), p. 28 f.

²Hense, s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios", p. 2549 ff., Wachsmuth, Vol. I, "prolegomena", p. vii.

manuscripts of some of the authors quoted.¹

The compiler of this anthology may, for all we know, have been the last person to see the complete Anthology of Stobaeus. Since that time, as far as is known, it has existed in two sections, comprising roughly the first two and the last two books respectively.

The first part, given the name "Eclogae", seems to have suffered the most. It was, in Wachsmuth's words, epitomized "ab homine Platonis Aristotelisque amantissimo";² that is to say, in Book I, chapters one and three to thirty have the appearance of being relatively intact; of the remaining chapters of Book I, however, only excerpts attributed to Plato, Aristotle, Hermes, Archytas, and Porphyry have been retained; indeed, whole chapters, including chapter two, have been omitted by the epitomiser. In Book II, chapters 1, 8 and 9 appear complete, except that some parts of chapter one along with parts of two and four are for some reason missing from the so-called "Eclogae", but are attached to the end of the manuscripts of the second section, the so-called "Florilegium" which otherwise consists of Books III and IV. The epitomiser has also left extracts from Plato plus one selection from Archytas from chapters 2-6, and has given the ethics of Arius Didymus for chapter 7. The rest of Book II was either left out or unknown.

This epitome survived in two manuscripts, the Farnesinus of the

¹Hense, "Prolegomena", Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium, ed. C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, Vol. III, pp. xxxvi f. Additional support for this view will be given later in Part Two.

²Wachsmuth, "Prolegomena", Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium, ed. C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, Vol. I, p. xvi f.

fourteenth century (F) and the Parisinus gr. 2129, of the fifteenth century (P).¹ Thus for the first two books we have really three separate manuscript traditions: the tradition of the excerpter (FP), that of the Gnomologium Laurentianum (L), and that of the Florilegium, to which we will soon turn. Unfortunately there is no overlap between FP and the tradition of the Florilegium, and little between FP and L, so that little instruction with regard to the tendencies of these groups can be drawn from this rich variety in the tradition.

For the other part of the Anthology the situation is much more complex. For this part the manuscript tradition is represented by three streams. The first of these is represented principally by the codex Vindobonensis gr. LXVII (S), an eleventh century document, but also by Trincavelli's editio princeps of 1535 (Tr.), based on the codex Marcianus IV, 29, and represented also by a number of other manuscripts whose importance Hense does not rate highly.² The second group is represented principally by two manuscripts, the Parisinus gr. 1984 (A), of the fourteenth century, a rather faulty document which however possesses some excerpts missing in all the others, and the codex Nendogae (alias Escorialensis LXXXX or Scorialensis),³ whose importance

¹Ibid., p. xxv f. From these two, according to Wachsmuth, all others are drawn.

²Hense, "Prolegomena", III, vii ff., xxii ff.

³Hense, "Prolegomena", p. xxix ff. and xxxvi ff. I omit reference to Parisinus gr. 1985 (B) since Hense makes little use of it, although Festugière, Héraclès Trismégiste Vol. III, p. v intro. indicates that it should not be ignored. According to Hense, the excerpts of Macarius Chrysocephalus were drawn from a ms. similar to NA.

Hense rates very highly, so highly that without it, according to Hense, it would not be possible even to think of restoring the text of Stobaeus.¹ Finally, we have other anthologies derived from Stobaeus, of which the most important for our purposes are the *Bruxellensis* (Br) and the *Georgianum Laurentianum* mentioned above. As previously pointed out, L seems to have corrected Stobaeus against other manuscripts of some of the authors quoted; this appears also to have been the case with Br.²

While the second part of the *Anthology* is less important for establishing the text of the Hermetic documents, it is useful for investigating the habits of Stobaeus as an excerpter. This subject, which would merit further study, has, as we shall see, considerable importance for our evaluation of Stobaeus' fragments as a source for the literature of the Hermetic movement. The text of the second part of Stobaeus' *Anthology* ought to be considered here for at least three reasons: first, because we may hope that we have a reasonably complete text for the last two books, therefore perhaps a more reliable basis for forming judgements about Stobaeus' design (although it is to be admitted that no manuscript contains all of the excerpts surviving from those two books); second, because the variety of the manuscript tradition gives us firmer grounds on which to decide which features of the text are to be ascribed to Stobaeus and which features we owe

¹ *Ibid.*, p. xxx.

² See above, p. 194, n. 1. Hense in the same place states that Br. also was interpolated.

merely to scribal error; and third, because the second part of the tradition, with its wider variety of authors, enables us to check Stobaeus against many more manuscript traditions. In all of this we are taking very seriously the advice of Hense: "vis scire quo modo Stobaeus scriptores tractaverit quos servavit solus? exquire, quo modo illos tractaverit, quos etiam aliunde cognitos habemus."¹ Therefore the text of the second part of Stobaeus, the so-called Florilegium, mainly books three and four, is important for our purposes even though it contains only four Hermetic fragments, in ii.1.26; iii.11.31; iii.13.65; and iv.52.47.

It should be noted that in the pages below Stobaeus will be used in more than one sense. Sometimes it will refer to the excerpter himself; more often it will refer to the text as it is given in the manuscripts of Stobaeus, as indicated in the critical apparatus of Wachsmuth and Hense. This text will have been subject to alteration at at least three stages: first, the text which came to the hands of Stobaeus may already have been altered; second, Stobaeus himself may have added to or subtracted from the text as it presented itself to him; third, the text after it left the hand of Stobaeus may have undergone alteration. In the first two stages, deliberate alteration seems more plausible, although of course anyone is capable of making a scribal blunder. Alterations in the third stage probably tend to be accidental blunders, except in the case of L and Br where deliberate harmonizing of the text

¹Hense, "Prolegomena," in Wachsmuth-Hense, op. cit., vol. V, p. xxvi.

against the major manuscript tradition of the author concerned is sometimes visible. Where possible, attempts will be made to assign responsibility for these alterations to one of the three stages.

CHAPTER TWO

THE POSITION OF THE HERMETIC FRAGMENTS WITHIN STOBAEUS

Before entering into a discussion of the text of the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus, a few words about their setting in Stobaeus may be useful. It is to be noted that Hense, in his article on the "vulgate" order of the text of Stobaeus, gives evidence that Stobaeus used various collections of single authors. These include a collection of eleven sayings of Socrates, a collection of thirteen by Democritus, and a collection of six by Eusebius, all in ii.4; a collection of five by Eusebius, and of several by Plutarch in iii.6; one of six by Iamblichus in iii.5; one of ten by Archytas, one of four by Xenophon, one of forty-seven by Epictetus, and one of fifteen sayings of Pythagoras, all in iii.1. The existence of all of these collections is betrayed by their concentration in a recognisable order within a single book in Stobaeus.¹

If Stobaeus had in fact used an earlier collection for the Hermetic literature, this would increase our reservations about their reliability. Woldemar Görler has shown that the fragments of Menander in Stobaeus can be divided into two groups. Those which are given with the name of the play in the lemma tend to be relatively reliable, and show few signs of deliberate alteration. Those with only the name of Menander tend to be radically falsified.² It will be noted in the

¹Hense, "Die Reihenfolge der Eklogen in der Vulgata des sto-bäischen Florilegium," p. 536 ff.; see also Hense, s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," p. 2570 ff.

²W. Görler, *Μενάνδρου Γνῶμαι*, Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der philosophischen Fakultät der Freien Universität Berlin, Berlin, 1963, p. 111.

following chapters that the quality of transmission of classical texts in Stobaeus varies considerably from author to author. It will be seen that Stobaeus gives a relatively reliable text for Plato and Xenophon,¹ but an absolutely unreliable text for the Encheiridion. Perhaps one factor contributing to this circumstance is the kind of source from which the excerpt is taken.

It is to be admitted that the evidence for a previous collection of Hermetic fragments used by Stobaeus is not as good as the evidence for some of the collections used by Stobaeus. However, our curiosity in that regard is aroused by a curious coincidence involving those fragments extracted from our C. H. ii and C. H. x. The fragments from C. H. ii are found within Stobaeus i.18 (περὶ κενοῦ καὶ ὅπου) and i.19 (περὶ κινήσεως). These fragments, three in all, are the only Hermetic fragments found within those two chapters. The fragments from C. H. x, five in number, are similarly grouped in i.47 (περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπων), i.48 (περὶ νοῦ), and i.49 (περὶ ψυχῆς). Although there are eight other fragments attributed to Hermes in i.49, no less than four of these are in the form of addresses by Isis to Horus, therefore eccentric in nature as compared to the other Hermetic fragments. These are, however, the only excerpts of addresses of Isis to Horus in Stobaeus, except for a doubtful line, iii.13.65.

¹According to Hense, s. v. "Ioannes Stobaeus," p. 2569 f., Stobaeus appears to have taken the majority of his excerpts of Plato, Xenophon, Herodotus, and Thucydides from his own reading.

A list of the Hermetic fragments appearing in Stobaeus is given by Festugière in the introduction to volume III of the Nock-Festugière edition.¹ If one examines this list, other groupings also become apparent. In i.4, *περὶ ἀνάγκης <θεσίας> κτλ.*, are two fragments, St. H. 8² (Hermes to Tat) and St. H. 13 (Hermes to Ammon). In i.5, *περὶ ἐφαρμένης κτλ.*, are three excerpts, St. H. 29, a poem, and St. H. 14 and 12, both to Ammon. In i.41, *περὶ φύσεως κτλ.*, seven Hermetic fragments occur: St. H. 2B, 11, 4, 5 (all to Tat; 2B and 11 form a single excerpt in the manuscripts); St. H. 16, 15 (both to Ammon), and St. H. 21 ("of Hermes"). The others are scattered: St. H. 28, a saying of Hermes, and *C. H. iv.1*(49.5-10), Hermes to Tat, are both in Stobaeus i.1, *ὅτι θεὸς δημιουργὸς τῶν ὄντων κτλ.*; *C. H. iv.10,11* however, is excerpted in i.10. St. H. 7 is in St. i.3; St. H. 10 is in St. i.8; St. H. 9 is in i.11; St. H. 6 is in i.21; St. H. 22 is in i.42. This gives thirty-six excerpts in book i of Stobaeus. Only five appear in the other three books: St. H. i in ii.1; St. H. 18 in ii.8; St. H. 2A in iii.11; St. H. 27 in iii.13, and *Asclepius* 27 in iv.52a.

These coincidences can be explained to some degree on the basis of subject matter. *C. H. ii* up to chapter twelve deals exclusively with the subject matter of St. i.18,19. However, from chapter 13, its contents are admirably suited to the subject matter of St. i.1, *ὅτι θεὸς*

¹Nock-Festugière, *op. cit.*, III, ix-xi.

²These numbers refer to the order of the excerpts given in the Nock-Festugière edition.

δημιουργὸς τῶν ὄντων κτλ., if indeed ii.17 were not cited for St. iv.24a, ὅτι καλὸν τὸ ἔχειν παῖδας. C. H. x is somewhat more uneasy in its present position. The central theme of C. H. x is, as we have seen, apotheosis through γνῶσις, a theme which, for understandable reasons, never becomes the subject for a chapter in Stobaeus. The author does, to be sure, in carrying out his central theme, deal with such topics as the nature of men, νοῦς, and soul, the topics of St. i.47-49; but he also deals with the topic of St. i.1 in chapters 1-4; with the subject of iii.1, περὶ ἀρετῆς, in chapter 9; with the subject of iii.2, περὶ κακίας, in chapter 8, excerpted by Stobaeus in i.49; and with the subject of i.21 in chapters 10 and 11. On the other hand, it is clear that the excerpt from iv.1 was not originally intended for its present position in St. i.1, since if it was, then it is difficult to see why the excerpter would have omitted the opening of this paragraph, which is not only directly on this topic, but would in Stobaeus' day have been considered completely inoffensive.

Now it is clear that convenience played a role in the grouping of the Stobaeian fragments into chapters; that would explain why excerpts from a single tractate are always placed in a few closely related chapters. But it seems likely that in the first instance, the convenience of an earlier excerpter played a role. This would explain why some of the excerpts fit poorly into their present position. In other words, there appears to be some reason to suppose that Stobaeus used an already existing collection of Hermetic excerpts. Some observations about the nature of this collection will be made below, p. 338.

For this reason it is impossible to say how much Hermetic

literature was available to Stobaeus. If he did in fact rely on a collection, as suggested, then this could have been the only collection of Hermetic literature available to him. Therefore we cannot argue, with Festugière, that Stobaeus would have known about the Corpus Hermeticum if it had been available at his time.¹ Of course, we could make the same argument about his source; but this would prove little since his source must have been somewhat earlier. It is, however, at least clear that Stobaeus did not know the Corpus as we have it, since he always cited the tractates now included in the Corpus as coming from other collections.²

Nor are we authorized to conclude from the evidence that Stobaeus received his Hermetic fragments second-hand, that therefore these documents had a long history before appearing in the Anthology. Fifty years or less would be ample time. Stobaeus would be guided not so much by the date of the collection containing them as by his belief that the Hermetic writings themselves were ancient and highly edifying documents.

¹Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 2 f.

²As indicated by Scott, op. cit., I, 83.

CHAPTER THREE

STOBAEUS' TREATMENT OF CLASSICAL TEXTS

1. Introduction

In the previous chapter, the possibility was suggested that Stobaeus had used an already existing collection of Hermetic fragments. If this is the case, then the chances of textual corruption in these fragments are increased simply because we must contend with the possibility not only of deliberate alterations at the hand of Stobaeus, but also of deliberate corruption by an earlier collector.

This raises in an insistent way the question of the reliability of the Hermetic fragments of Stobaeus. Under "reliability," I wish to deal with two separate but closely related questions. First, we may ask whether the manuscripts of Stobaeus present us with a faithful and accurate text of the Hermetic fragments which they contain. Second, we may ask whether these Hermetic fragments present us with an accurate picture of the religious movement responsible for the Hermetic literature.

It is evident that Nock rated the text of the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus very highly on both counts, since he normally preferred Stobaeus' reading. In his introduction, while noting Hense's observations about characteristic errors in anthologies, he nevertheless indicates that in the majority of instances he believes that Stobaeus gives the correct reading.¹ Now, most of the excerpts from Stobaeus differ

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, xlii ff.; Intro.

considerably from the corresponding passages in the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum. On pp. 280-334, below, I give, after the apparatus of Nock and Wachsmuth, what appears to have been the readings of those two traditions in the manuscripts. In my view, these discrepancies are rather greater than can be explained under the usual categories of scribal error. It appears more probable that someone has deliberately altered the text, whether, as Nock supposes, someone in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus Hermeticum (or tractates ii, iv, and x before they came to be incorporated) or someone in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus - either Stobaeus himself, his excerpter, or, less plausibly, some later scribe.

Concerning the second question, I will say in a preliminary way that scholars interested in the Hermetic movement have tended not to concentrate their attention on the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus. This is so in part, as we shall see, because the Stobaeian fragments tend not to discuss the most striking and interesting of the Hermetic doctrines; in fact they tend to be somewhat bland in their contents. The major exception to this last statement is the group of Isis to Horus fragments, St. H. xxiv-xxvii, which, however, in some other respects stand apart from the other Hermetic documents.

In order to answer the first question more accurately, it seems best first to follow the advice of Henze noted above, p. 197, and examine the text of other authors in Stobaeus. While, as will become apparent, the treatment of classical authors in Stobaeus is quite variable, it will at least be possible to gain some idea of the range of possibilities.

Since considerations of time urged against reviewing every excerpt quoted by Stobaeus from an ancient author, I have decided to proceed in the following way: first I selected particular works and parts of works which occur with reasonable frequency in the indices at the end of volumes II and V of Wachsmuth and Hense's edition of Stobaeus and for which reasonably adequate critical texts exist; I then attempted to single out the significant discrepancies¹ between the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus and the manuscript tradition of the author in question; and finally I attempted to classify the discrepancies, making general observations where permitted by the evidence. It will be seen that the authors and works chosen are of a sufficient variety that we may hope that we have an adequate sample of the sorts of variants that can be expected in Stobaeus and hence to make judgements in specific instances with regard to Stobaeus' information concerning the text of C. H. ii, iv, and x.

The following authors have been chosen: for an example of a Hellenistic text I have chosen the Encheiridion of Epictetus. It will be seen that, in spite of the unsatisfactory nature of Schweighaeuser's edition,² it has been possible to draw extremely interesting conclusions

¹The words, "significant discrepancies," will perhaps shock some, since they imply a certain arbitrariness in method. What is meant is this: that since the collations used frequently omit certain details considered minor by the editor, therefore I cannot use them for information which they do not provide. Therefore such variants as ξυυ- for ουυ-, μειγ- for μιγ-, and the use and abuse of v moveables, elision, and so forth, must regretfully be ignored.

²Epicteti, Manuale et Cebetis tabula, ed. and tr. Iohannes Schweighaeuser (Lipsiae: In Libraria Weidmannia, 1798). Schenkl in his edition of Epictetus, Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arrianae digestae,

from the text of the Encheiridion as it appears in Stobaeus, conclusions which will perhaps be of interest also to students of the Encheiridion. A greater variety of selections was possible for texts from the classical period. For Xenophon, I used his Memorabilia, book i, supplementing this from book iv for Stobaeus i and ii since there are very few samples for that part of the work. The text used was that of Marchant,¹ although I suspect that his apparatus is too condensed. From Plato, I have chosen two smaller works, the Sophistes and the Timaeus, using Burnet's edition in both instances.² Because of the large number of long citations from the Timaeus in Stobaeus i, it was found necessary to abandon that dialogue at 39D for those two books. In addition, Stobaeus' text was compared with the text of Herodotus vii, using the edition of Hude.³ Since so few excerpts from Herodotus survive in the first two books, for those two books Herodotus ii was also used.

editio major, 2nd. ed. (Stuttgartiae: in Aedibus B. G. Teubner, 1916, reprinted 1965), reconstructs the text of Schweighaeuser from the latter's major edition of Epictetus, in which Schweighaeuser had given Upton's text with his own text in the notes. Schenkl is therefore able at great pains to reproduce the text of the Encheiridion as given by Schweighaeuser in the edition of the Encheiridion already cited. Unfortunately he fails to cite the manuscripts individually, but only by group as in Schweighaeuser's introduction.

¹Xenophontis Opera Omnia, ed. E. C. Marchant (Vol. II, 2nd. ed.; Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1921).

²Platonis Opera, ed. J. Burnet (Vols. I & IV: Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1900).

³Herodoti, Historiae, ed. C. Hude (II vols; 3rd. ed.; Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1927).

Finally, Stobaeus' excerpts from the Odyssey¹ and from Theocritus² were also examined. These last three proved less useful for the present purposes, partly because, especially in the case of Herodotus and Theocritus, the dialect was a problem as much for the scribes of the major manuscript tradition as for the scribes in Stobaeus' tradition. Moreover the shortness of the excerpts from the Odyssey and Theocritus made it difficult to draw general conclusions except when discrepancies of a particularly striking sort were evident.

With this work as a basis, it will then be possible in the next chapter to discuss the text of the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus from C. H. ii, iv, and x. This in turn will give a basis for discussion of the reliability of the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus generally as sources for the Hermetic literature.

2. Xenophon

We shall begin with Stobaeus' excerpts from Xenophon's Memorabilia, since these excerpts seem to furnish the fewest textual difficulties. The reader is asked to remember, when we are immersed in the difficulties of Stobaeus' text of the Encheiridion that these citations from Xenophon also exist, and perhaps have more of a right to be considered typical of Stobaeus.

As we shall see, Stobaeus' text of Xenophon furnishes very little difficulty; indeed, the variations within the main manuscript

¹Homeri, Opera, ed. T. Allen (Vol. III, 2nd. ed.; Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1917).

²Bucolici Graeci, ed. A. S. F. Gow (Oxonii: E Typographeo Clarendoniano, 1952).

tradition of Xenophon's text, as far as one can see from Marchant's apparatus, are just as great as those between the main tradition and Stobaeus' text. A few variant readings, as we shall see, can with plausibility be attributed to editorial activity on the part of either Stobaeus or his source. These include the omission of material, such as the omission of four lines in the first excerpt discussed, and the omission of some lines from the ninth and tenth excerpt to be discussed. In addition, as we shall see, occasionally connectives at the beginning of excerpts are (apparently) deliberately omitted.¹

For the citations from Xenophon, as for those from all of the classical authors to be studied, I will give for each excerpt the number of lines in Wachsmuth and Hense's text of Stobaeus, in order to give a rough idea of the comparative lengths of the passages involved, and also the standard abbreviations of the major Stobaeian manuscripts which contain the passage, after Wachsmuth and Hense's apparatus. This will be followed by a list of the significant discrepancies between the two traditions. In each case a discussion will follow. The numbers at the end of the lines refer to the subdivisions (chapter or page) within the classical authors quoted.

1) Xen. Mem. 1.1.11-14 = St. 11.1.30 (20½ lines, SMA)

St.	Xen.	
μπαλινοντες επεδεσκνυεν (επεδεσκ- νυεν SC)	μπαλινοντες επεδεσκνυεν	(11)
(St. om. καὶ πρῶτον . . . τὰ προσήκοντα πράττειν, 1.1.12,4 lines.)		
(St., Isid.) ἐστιν αὐτοῖς	αὐτοῖς ἐστιν	(13)
(St., Euseb.) δδυνάτον ἐστιν	οὐ δύνατον ἐστιν	

¹For this tendency see Hense x.v. Ioannes Stobaios, p. 2584.

εἴ γε καὶ τοὺς μέγιστον
δεῖνα φοβεῖσθαι
τῶν θεῶν

ἀπολέσθαι (ἀπολέσθαι, Euseb., *Pr.*
ev. xv, p. 853A; ἀπολλύσθαι, *ibid.*,
i, p. 25D).

ἐπεὶ καὶ τοὺς μέγιστον
φοβερὰ φοβεῖσθαι
τῶν θεῶν
ἀπολειπῆσθαι

In all, eight discrepancies are sufficiently striking to attract our notice. This leaves out of account a few cases in which one or more manuscripts of Stobaeus agrees with the manuscripts of Xenophon against one or more manuscripts of Stobaeus. It is easy to account for ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς for αὐτοῖς ἐστὶν and δδύνατον for οὐ δυνατόν on the grounds that in each case the expression favoured in Stobaeus is more common and hence would tend to be substituted, as it were, automatically. Similarly, θεῶν for θεῶν and ἀπολέσθαι for ἀπολειπῆσθαι can easily be accounted for on the basis of the hasty misreading of a miniscule εἰ as ε. In the second of these, however, it may be that the context: τοῖς δὲ οὐτ' ἂν γενέσθαι ποτὲ οὐδὲν οὔτε ἀπολειπῆσθαι, may have aided in promoting the error; since, moreover, the error is shared with Eusebius, it may actually be a conscious correction in Stobaeus' source. Since ἐπεδέκνυσεν is corrected to ἀπεδέκνυσεν in one of the manuscripts of Stobaeus, it is possible that the substitution is very late. On the other hand, εἴ γε for ἐπεὶ is very common in Stobaeus generally, and may be his own contribution. In none of these cases does it appear that the correct reading is found in Stobaeus.

The omission of Xen. *Mem.* i.1.12 is interesting, especially since Eusebius also omits these words in his quotation in *Praep. ev.* i, p. 25d (but not in xv, p. 853a). Eusebius however accounts for the omission by inserting the words, καὶ ἐπιλέγει ἐξῆς, after which he continues where

Stobaeus resumes. Presumably then Stobaeus found this excerpt in a previous anthology. Since these words would not be missed if we had not the manuscript tradition of Xenophon with which to compare Stobaeus' text, we can see that not all of the alterations in Stobaeus are clumsy.

2) Xen. Mem. 1.2.4 = St. iv.37.19 (5½ lines, S)

St.
ἐμποδίζειν

Xen.
ἐμποδίζειν ἔφη

The omitted word, being the last word of the passage excerpted, could have been omitted for a variety of reasons, the most plausible being carelessness.

3) Xen. Mem. 1.2.10,11 (13½ lines, SMA)

St.
πρόσεστιν ἔχθρα καὶ κίνδυνος
τὸ αὐτὸ γίγνεται
οὐκοῦν οὐ

Xen.
πρόσεισιν ἔχθραι καὶ κίνδυνοι (10)
ταῦτά γίγνεται
οὐκοῦν

In the first of these examples, Stobaeus' reading, ἔχθρα καὶ κίνδυνος, has a more abstract effect than Xenophon's plural and therefore more vivid ἔχθραι καὶ κίνδυνοι. Therefore it is possible that this is a deliberate alteration, although it would not be possible to exclude the possibility that we have here a mere lapse of memory as the words are transferred from one manuscript to the next. The other two are most likely due to lapses on the part of a scribe.

4) Xen. Mem. 1.2.19-23 = St. iii.29.95 (37 lines, SHABr; Br. om. γῶς οὖν . . . αὐτοῖς δδυνατεῖν, 32½ lines.)

St.
τὸ τοῦ σώματος δοκοῦντας
διδ τοὺς υἱεῖς (υἱοὺς M)
μαρτυρῶ τοῦτό γε

Xen.
τὸ σώματα δοκοῦντας (19)
δι' ὅ καὶ τοὺς υἱεῖς (20)
μαρτυρῶ τοῦτοῖς (21)

This is a remarkably small number of discrepancies, given the length of the text. (There are also numerous instances where either

Stobaeus agrees with some manuscripts of Xenophon against others, or where one Stobaeian manuscript gives an isolated reading. I could detect no significant pattern in these.) There is a tendency in Stobaeus for καί in the sense of "even" or "also" to be omitted. In writing τὸ τοῦ σώματος for τὰ σώματα, Stobaeus or his source may have been influenced by a previous τὸ τοῦ σώματος in the same sentence. If τοῦτό γε for τοῦτοίς is not a simple misreading of an uncial original, it may be a misguided emendation of the text.

Given the quality of the text transmitted by Stobaeus for this passage, in this case at least the evidence supports Hense's view that Stobaeus drew on his own reading for excerpts from Xenophon.¹

5) Xen. Mem. 1.2.57 = St. iii.29.94 (6½ lines, SMA)

St.
Σωκράτης
ἐπεὶ διωμολογήσατο (ἐπιδιωμολο-
γήσατο SA)
καὶ ἀγαθὸν
ἐργάζεσθαι ἔφη
ἔχοι

Xen.
Σωκράτης δ'
ἐπεὶ διωμολογήσατο
καὶ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι
ἐργάζεσθαι τε ἔφη
ἔχοι τὸ

This excerpt, although much smaller, has many more errors than the last. The omission of the δ', which links this paragraph with the preceding in Xenophon, is to be expected, as a general tendency in anthologies.² That the aorist indicative is substituted for the aorist optative is not unexpected, given the gradual disappearance of the optative. The εἶναι may have been omitted through carelessness, as also the

¹Hense s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," p. 2569 f.

²Ibid., p. 2584.

re in the following example. Either Stobaeus or his source may not have understood that the $\tau\delta$ in the last example governs the quotation from Hesiod which follows. In view of the large number of errors in this excerpt as compared to the excerpt discussed immediately before, Stobaeus may have drawn this excerpt from a different, less reliable source.

6) Xen. Mem. 1.3.5-8 = St. 111.17.43 (23 lines, SMABr)

St.
παρεσκευασμένος εἴη (παρεσκευασμέ-
νος ἦει N; ἦει Br)
(St., Plut. moral., Clem. Al.)
 $\tau\delta$ ἀναπεθόντα

πεινῶντα . . . διψῶντα
οἴεσθε δ' ἔφη (οἴσθα vel οἴσθαι A¹)

Xen.
παρεσκευασμένος ἦει

(6)

$\tau\delta$ πεθόντα
πεινῶντας . . . διψῶντας
οἴεσθαι δ' ἔφη

(7)

For the first of these variant readings we may cite two factors: first, the combination used by Stobaeus (SA) is by far a more frequent combination, and hence would tend to be substituted as it were automatically; in any case, it would be favoured by itacism. Since the correct reading appears in Br., it is probable that the change was made fairly late within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus, although, as we shall see, the possibility cannot be ruled out that Br. gave the correct reading through collation. The reading οἴεσθε for οἴεσθαι is presumably caused by itacism. In the context πεινῶντα and διψῶντα make no sense. Presumably they were attracted by ἀναπεθόντα in the same sentence. None of these alterations need be charged to Stobaeus.

Since $\tau\delta$ ἀναπεθόντα occurs also in Plutarch and in Clement of Alexandria, it is likely to be an earlier variant which Stobaeus found in his source. The reading in the manuscript tradition of Xenophon, πεθόντα, which Marchant prints, is more plausible; cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones

s. v. περὶ, A.II.3, p. 1354.

7) Xen. Mem. 1.3.11-13 = St. iv.20b.62 (23 lines, SMA)

St.
ὁ Ἡρακλῆς, ἔφη, ὦ Ξενοφῶν ('Ηρα-
κλεις, ἔφη ὁ Ξενοφῶν Ττ; Ἡρακλῆς,
A²)

οἶσθα ὅτι τὰ φαλάγγια

ὅ σὺ οὐχ ὀρᾷς (ἦ γὰρ οὐχ ὀρᾷς Α)
ὅτι καὶ πρόρωθεν
μόγεις γὰρ
ὀγιᾶς γένοιτο

Xen.

ὦ Ἡρακλεις, ἔφη ὁ Ξενοφῶν (12)

οἶσθ' ἔφη τὰ φαλάγγια (AB;
οἶσθ' ἔφη ὅτι τὰ C)
ὅτι σὺ οὐχ ὀρᾷς (13)
ὅτι καὶ πρόρωθεν
μόλεις γὰρ
ὀγιᾶς γένοιτο

The confusion between the vocative and the nominative in the first of these variant readings was promoted either by similarity in pronunciation or by the later use of the nominative in place of the vocative. The intrusion of a later use is also to be suspected in the substitution of μόγεις for μόλεις, cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. μόγεις, p. 1142; on the other hand, it is Stobaeus who furnishes the regular Attic πρόρωθεν for πρόσωθεν (but only in one of the two examples), cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. πρόσωθεν, p. 1533. It is conceivable that ὅ was written for ὅτι because of light damage to a manuscript. Presumably ὀγιᾶς γένοιτο for ὀγιᾶς γένοιτο, while promoted by similarity in pronunciation, was also encouraged by the adjacent τὸ ὀγιᾶς; presumably someone thought that the bite was to become healthy.

Marchant prints Stobaeus' reading, ὅτι, for the third of these variants. If so, presumably ἔφη was written above the line by someone who intended it to be inserted as in C of Xenophon, but was taken as a substitute reading in AB. In this case, then very probably it is Stobaeus who has here preserved the original reading.

8) Xen. Mem. 1.5.1-5 = St. 111.17.31 (34 lines, SMABr)

St.	Χέν.	
εἴ τι προὔρβαλε	εἴ τι προὔρβαλε	(1)
ὅφ' οὐ μάλιστα	ὅφ' οὐ μάλιστα ἔν	
τοῦτον αἰροῦμεθα (αἰροῦμεθα M)	τοῦτον ἔν αἰροῦμεθα	
ἡγησάμεθ' ἔν	ἡγησάμεθα	(2)
ἢ βοσκήματα ἢ ταμίαν (ταμίᾱ A)	ἢ βοσκήματα ἢ ταμίᾱ	
ἐπιστάσαν	ἐπιστάσιν	
τὸν τοιοῦτον	τοιοῦτον	
ἢ ὅψ τε καὶ τῷ οὔνῳ	τῷ ὅψ τε καὶ τῷ οὔνῳ	(4)
ταύτην πρῶτην	ταύτην πρῶτον	
ἡμετέρεον	ἡμετέρεον (BC, ἡμετέρεον A2U)	(5)

In this excerpt there is difficulty in Stobaeus' text with the particle ἔν. In the second example, a decision is difficult. The clause in question, ὅφ' οὐ μάλιστα ἔν αὐτοὶ μὲν αἰροῦμεθα, would normally be expected to contain ἔν. However, Schwyzer does give examples even from Plato and Xenophon in which ἔν is omitted, especially in cases in which, as in the present case, the governing verb is itself optative, as for example Xen. Ana. 1.3.17, Xen. Conv. 8.17, and Plato, Men. 92c.¹ In the third example, ἔν before αἰροῦμεθα is clearly demanded by the context, and its omission is presumably accidental. In the fourth, ἔν is inserted and the indicative is replaced by the optative, presumably because the optative had been used in the protasis of the condition.

The substitution of τι for τι can be explained as a misreading of an uncial exemplar, or as an unhappy attempt to improve Xenophon's style. However, the insertion of τὸν before τοιοῦτον, the omission of τε after τῷ ὅψ, and the change of πρῶτον to πρῶτην may be due to inattention.

¹E. Schwyzer, Griechische Grammatik, ed. A. Debrunner (2nd. ed.; Vol. II; "Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, ed. Walter Otto," München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), p. 325 f.

Stobaeus' reading of ἐπιστάσαν seems to suit the sense better than ἐπιστάσιν of the manuscript tradition of Xenophon; therefore it is possible that in this case someone in Xenophon's manuscript tradition has attempted an unfortunate correction. Stobaeus is also undoubtedly correct in reading ἐκελευσέν; the readings of the manuscript tradition of Xenophon in this case do not make sense.

9) Xen. Mem. 1.6.5b-10 = St. iii.17.32 (20 lines, SHABrMacChrys)

St.	Xen.	
(St. om. ἤδη οὖν . . . βουλαμαι, 6b, 3 lines)		
μελετήσωσιν (μελετήσουσι A)	μελετῶσι	(7)
(St. om. ἐμὲ δὲ ἄρα . . . ταῦτα νομίζων, 7b-9a, 12 lines)		
ποτέρῳ πλεόν (πλεῶν B _r)	ποτέρῳ ἢ πλεῶν (A; ἢ BC ₁ ἢ B ³)	(9)

In this excerpt, as in so many in Stobaeus, a general sentiment is extracted by the omission of two references to Xenophon's own feelings.¹ The substitution of μελετήσωσιν for μελετῶσι is easily explained on the grounds that the aorist subjunctive is the commoner form. The ἢ in ἢ πλεῶν seems to have caused a great deal of difficulty in interpretation in the manuscript tradition of Xenophon; therefore it is perhaps not surprising that it is simply omitted in Stobaeus. The change from πλεῶν to πλεόν was no doubt facilitated by the similarity in pronunciation.

10) Xen. Mem. 1.6.13-15 = St. iii.1.205 (25½ lines, MA)

St.	Xen.	
γενώμεθα	γινώμεθα	(14)
(St. om. ἐμοὶ μὲν δὲ ἀκούοντι . . . ἄγειν, 14, 2 lines)		
πάλιν ποτὲ	καὶ πάλιν ποτὲ	

¹See Hense s. v. Ioannes Stobaios, p. 2584.

As in the previous excerpt, a personal note is suppressed in Stobaeus' text. The omission of καὶ at the beginning of the sentence following the omitted personal material helps to disguise the omission. The change from present to aorist subjunctive seems pointless, although, again, the aorist is the more common form.

11) Xen. Mem. iv.3.3-6 = St. i.1.37 (26½ lines, F)

St.

κατεσκευάσθαι
ἀναπαύσεως τε
ἡμῖν οὐ μόνον
παρασκευάζουσα
ἔσται συμπεῖν
οὕτω παρέχειν πολλοῦ πολλοῦ ἄξιον
τοῖς τρέφουσιν
ἰδίῳ ποιεῖν ταῦτα

Xen.

κατεσκευάσθαι (3)
ἀναπαύσεως γε
αἱ ἡμῖν οὐ μόνον (5)
παρασκευάζουσιν
ἔσται καὶ φυτεῖν (6)
παρέχειν οὕτω πολλοῦ ἄξιον
πᾶσι τοῖς τρέφουσιν
ἡδὲ ποιεῖν αὐτὰ (ταῦτα B,
according to Wachsmuth's
apparatus.)

Most of the variant readings in this excerpt are likely to be scribal errors. It is easy to see τε for γε as arising from a confusion in transcription from an uncial exemplar. The repetition of πολλοῦ, as the omission of πᾶσι, are likely to be due to inattention. Lack of attention similarly is likely to account for the substitution of οὕτω παρέχειν for παρέχειν οὕτω in the same sentence; οὕτω is clearly to be taken with πολλοῦ. Since the reading ταῦτα for αὐτὰ is, according to Wachsmuth's apparatus, shared by B of Xenophon, it was probably in Stobaeus' source. Both ἰδίῳ and κατεσκευάσθαι are nonsensical. While in the case of the first, factors of pronunciation can be cited, nevertheless both errors indicate serious inattention. It is also difficult to see why in iv.3.5 the relative αἱ is omitted and the indicative παρασκευάζουσιν is changed to the feminine singular participle παρασκευάζουσα, which is nonsense in the context.

There is also one good reading furnished by Stobaeus for this excerpt: συμφέρειν for καὶ φταίνειν. . In this case, while the version given in the manuscripts of Xenophon makes sense, Stobaeus' reading seems better, and in fact is printed by Marchant.

12) Xen. Mem. iv.7.2-10 = St. ii.31.127 (59 lines, L)

St.	Xen.	
γεωμετρῶσαν	αὐτίκα γεωμετρῶσαν	(2)
ἱκανὸς γένοιτο	ἱκανὸς τις γένοιτο	
διαγραμμῶν γεωμετρῶσα	διαγραμμάτων γεωμετρῶσαν	(3)
ἔφη δὲ ἱκανὰ εἶναι	ἔφη δὲ ταῦτα ἱκανὰ εἶναι	
	1 ms. αὐτὰ, according to Marchant)	
τὰ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περιφορᾷ	τὰ μὴ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περιφορᾷ	(5)
σταθμητοὺς δαστέρας	δασταθμητοὺς δαστέρας (δασταθ- μεῖς B, acc. Wachsmuth)	
ἀφελειαν οὐδεμῶσαν	ἀφελειαν μὲν γὰρ οὐδεμῶσαν	
καίτοι γε οὐδὲ	καίτοι οὐδὲ	
εὖ αἰρετὰ ἀνθρώποις	εὖρετὰ ἀνθρώποις	
περιφρονῆσαι	παραφρονῆσαι	
(St., Eus.) ἡγνῶει ὅτι	ἡγνῶει ὥς (ἡγνῶει ὅτι ὥς B)	(7)
ἄνευ ἡλίου αὐτῆς	ἄνευ μὲν ἡλίου αὐτῆς	
(St., Eus.) πάντα τὸν χρόνον	τὸν πάντα χρόνον	
τοῖς συνοῦσι	τοῖς συνοῦσι	(8)
προὔτρεπε	προέτρεπε	(9)
ὀγείας	ὀγίεας	
προσέχοντας	προσέχοντα	
συμφέρει αὐτῷ	συμφεροὶ αὐτῷ	
ὅπως τοῦτοις χρώμενος	πῶς τοῦτοις χρώμενος	
οἱ δ' ἄν θεοί	οἱ δ' ἄν οἱ θεοί	(10)

It will be seen at a glance that this particular excerpt does not compare favourably with the others in its transmission of the text of Xenophon. This is significant, since the manuscript involved, L, will be found, in its treatment of other classical authors, to present a text closer to the main manuscript tradition of the author involved than to the other manuscripts of Stobaeus.

In this list, the omission of αὐτίκα is readily intelligible as redactional, since the excerpt is thereby set free from its context. It

is also conceivable that the reading σταθμητοῦς for δσταθμητοῦς is redactional, since Stobaeus or his source may have thought that δσταθμητοῦς is required so as to contrast with πλάνητας in the same sentence; however, the fixed stars had been discussed in iv.7.4. It is also conceivable that εὑρεῖν was altered to εὖ αἰρεῖν as an editorial comment, although it is equally possible that a mere scribal error based on similarity of pronunciation is involved.

Two readings shared with Eusebius, ἡγνῶσι ὅτι for ἡγνῶσι ὅς and πᾶντα τὸν χρόνον for τὸν πᾶντα χρόνον, both printed by Marchant, seem likely to be early variants; that the first of these is an early reading is guaranteed by B's reading, ἡγνῶσι ὅτι ὅς. Other possible readings are συνιδῶσι for συνοῦσι, προὔτρεπε for προέτρεπε, and ὅπως for πῶς. In view of the large number of errors in Stobaeus' text, a reserved attitude to these variants is however indicated.

There are a large number of careless omissions in Stobaeus' text, as for example τις from ἱκανός τις γένοιτο, the letters ατ from διαγραμμαῶν, the omission of ταῦτα before ἱκανῶ, the omission of μὴ before ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περιφορᾷ, the omission of μὲν γὰρ after ἀφελείαν, the omission of μὲν before ἡλίου, the omission of ι in ὀγίετας, and the omission of of before θεοί. Also careless is the reading περιφρονῆσαι for παρφρονῆσαι, presumably induced by similar abbreviations, the reading of αὐτῆς for αὐγῆς, presumably because of the similarity between uncial T and Γ, and προσέχοντα for προσέχοντα, perhaps influenced by the accusative plurals in the previous sentence. We may see in καστοί γε for καστοί the influence of late Greek. Presumably none of these are to be charged to Stobaeus.

Let these examples suffice for Xenophon. Stobaeus' text for Xenophon is reasonably reliable, but furnishes relatively few probable readings against the text of Xenophon. In most instances the variations against the manuscript tradition of Xenophon are the result of scribal error, either before the text came into Stobaeus' hands or in the later manuscript tradition. There are a few deliberate alterations of the text of Stobaeus, mostly in the form of omissions either of connectives at the beginning of an excerpt or of personal material within the excerpt.

3. Plato

This chapter could be much briefer if what was said about the treatment of Xenophon in Stobaeus were also true about the treatment of ancient authors generally. But as we shall see, the treatment of some other authors is much more complex. This is particularly true of Plato. Here complications arise both from the manuscripts of Plato and from those of Stobaeus.

In the case of Plato, difficulties are created by codex Vindobonensis 54, suppl. phil. gr. 7 (W) and codex Vindobonensis 55, suppl. phil. gr. 39 (F). Of the two dialogues to be discussed in this section, the Sophistes is contained in the former, the Timaeus in the latter. Both of these manuscripts share significant readings with Stobaeus, leading Burnet to suppose that they, with Stobaeus and other ancient authorities, witness to an early recension of Plato quite divergent from that represented by most of our manuscripts.¹

¹ See Burnet, "Praefatio," to volumes I and IV of his edition of Plato.

From the side of Stobaeus, complication is offered by L, in which Stobaeus apparently is corrected against some manuscript of Plato accessible to the compiler.¹ Hence the results of a comparison of the text of Plato in Stobaeus against the manuscript tradition of Plato tend to be confusing. Perhaps it would be best to let the tendencies be seen inductively, beginning with the first excerpt to be examined, from the Timaeus.

13) Plato, Tim. 17c-19B = St. iv.2.9 (55 lines, SMAL; MA om. χθές τῶν . . . ἐκάστην τέχνην, 8 lines)

a) Stobaeus against Plato

St.
καταφαίνεται μοι (καταφαίνεται' ἄν
μοι L)

Pl.
κατεφαίνεται' ἄν μοι

(Evidently L neglected to re-introduce the augment when revising Stobaeus.)

b) Stobaeus (SMA) against Plato + L

St. (SMA)
χθές τῶν ὅπ' ἐμοῦ ῥηθέντων
καταφαίνεται μοι
κατὰ νοῦν ἄπασιν
καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ὄδοντες
μήτε μηδὲν ἄλλο ποτὲ
διὰ παντὸς ἀρετῆς (διαπαντὸς SA;
ἀρετῆς om. Tr.)
διαγνώσοιτο
ἐπαυξανόμενων (ἐπαυξομένων Tr.)
ποθοῦμέν τι

Pl. + L.
χθές που τῶν ὅπ' ἐμοῦ ῥηθέν-
των (Ἀθες που L)² (17C)
κατεφαίνεται' ἄν μοι (καταφα-
νεται' ἄν μοι L)
πᾶσι (ν) κατὰ νοῦν
καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ὁρῶντες (L, Pl(Y),
Procl.: δηλοῦντες F; ὁρῶντες
A; γε ὁρῶντες A²)
μήτε ἄλλο ποτὲ μηδὲν (18B)
ἀρετῆς διὰ παντὸς
ἰδὲα γινώσοιτο (18C)
ἐπαυξανόμενων δὲ (ἐπαυξομένων
δὲ γ) (19A)
ποθοῦμεν ἔτι τι

¹See above, p. 193 f.

²L has suffered from a careless rubricator. See Wachsmuth, "Prolegomena," Wachsmuth and Hense, op. cit., I, xxviii.

(SMA om. ὃ φησι Τιμαῖος . . . ὃς ἀπολειπομένων and ἀλλὰ ταῦτα . . . ὃ Σέκρατες, 19AB, 2 lines.)

Since the first four readings are, for the text of Stobaeus, given only in S and L, the possibility must be considered that the variants in S are all very late errors. For the second variant at least, however, that possibility seems excluded by the fact that the compiler of L carelessly left evidence of his work, since he re-introduced ἄν, but neglected to restore the augment in κατεφάνετ'. The omission of πού at the beginning of the excerpt also is likely to be the work of either Stobaeus or his source, since it is customary in Stobaeus to remove connecting particles; see above, p. 209. Similarly, the omission of some material at the end of the passage appears to have been done deliberately by either Stobaeus or his source, since these words connect the excerpt to what follows; that the omission is a deliberate alteration of the text is proven by the retention of the word οὐδὲμῶς in the middle of the material omitted. Thus in at least three instances the text of Stobaeus is likely to have been corrected in L, presumably with reference to a manuscript of Plato.

It is of course thoroughly possible that this has happened in every case. Thus forms of ἄπας for forms of πᾶς are frequent in Stobaeus. Assuming that in the fourth example the reading of PL.(Y) and L, ὁῖ δόντες is the original, then in Stobaeus' text a particle has been carelessly omitted; this is by no means uncommon in the text of Stobaeus. So also, ὁῖ has been omitted after ἐκφυζανόμενων and ἔτι after ποθοῦμεν (no doubt because of the τι which follows). While these omissions need not be charged to Stobaeus or his source, they are common enough in his

manuscripts, and so may have been corrected by L. Either deliberate or unconscious correction or light manuscript damage is likely to have given διαγνώσοιτο for ἰδὲ γινώσοιτο. If the variant in question is ancient, then it must have been corrected by L. Similarly it is conceivable, although obviously it cannot be proven, that the displaced μηδὲν and ἀπερὶς were restored to their original position by L. Since conclusive evidence is available in none of these cases, we may perhaps suspend judgment.

There are also instances, it should be noted, where L diverges from all other manuscripts. These include the first two examples given in the previous list of variants as well as the following:

c) Readings peculiar to L

L	cet.
οὐδὲ πρὸ πάντων	τούτους οὐδὲ πρὸ πάντων (τοὺς S ¹) (17D)
κοινῇ κατὰ τε πόλεμον	κοινῇ κατὰ τε πόλεμον (18C)
ὅποτε περὶ	ὅτ τὸ περὶ (παρὰ Tr.)
καὶ ἄνω γονέας	καὶ ἄνωθεν γονέας (18D)
τὰ μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν	τὰ μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν (19A)
ἔγειν δεῖν	ἀνάγειν δεῖν
παρὰ φύσιν	παρὰ σφίσιν

All of these discrepancies can, in my judgment, be explained as scribal errors. Thus the omission of τούτους is easily understandable because of the οὐδὲ which follows. It would be easy to understand ὅποτε for ὅτ τὸ on the basis of a misreading of an uncial exemplar; however, it could also result from mere inattention. Presumably the τε is a secondary correction. No comment is needed in the case of τῶν for τῶν. So also ἄνω for ἄνωθεν and ἔγειν for ἀνάγειν are easily explainable either as lapses or as the result of light damage to a manuscript; neither makes sense in the context. The reading παρὰ φύσιν for παρὰ

ορφοῖν is easily explained since the two words resemble each other both in form and in pronunciation and since the combination used by L is much more frequent, although it makes little sense in the context. Only the second reading in the list, κοινῇ for κοινῷ, makes any sense at all in the context, and could conceivably be derived from L's source. However, even in this case κοινῷ makes better sense in the context.

Occasionally L agrees with one or more manuscripts of Plato against Stobaeus and other manuscripts of Plato. It is perhaps instructive to note these cases.

d) Readings shared by L and some manuscripts of Plato.

L, Pl.(A) καὶ ἀπ' ἐκάστου τῇ τέχνῃ	St.(S), Pl.(F, Amg) μῖαν ἐκάστην τέχνην	(17D)
---------------------------------------	--	-------

L, Pl.(AF) τὸ γεγεννημένον αὐτῶν (γεγεννημένον A) \	St., Pl.(Y) τὸ γεγεννημένον αὐτῶ (τὸ γε- γεννημένων αὐτὸ S)	(18C)
---	---	-------

L, Pl.(A) χώραν διαλλάττειν	Pl.(F) χώραν ἐπαλλάττειν	St., Procl., Pl.(A ² Y) χώραν μεταλλάττειν (μεταλλάττειν A)(19A)
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

For the first of these, neither variant makes sense in the context; Burnet prints μῖαν ἐκάστην τέχνην, which he credits to Stobaeus, but is actually a correction by Gaisford; see Hense ad loc. Since both readings are erroneous and neither is likely to have occurred spontaneously, this coincidence suggests a link between L and Pl.(A) on the one hand and Stobaeus and Pl.(F) on the other. Since the reading in Stobaeus and Pl.(F) is closer to what is likely to be the original reading, however, the coincidence between those two manuscripts is less significant. In the second of these, Stobaeus agrees in error with Pl.(Y); however, the error in question could appear independently in more than one manuscript,

if an abbreviation was misread. In the case of the third of these, it seems not at all easy to decide whether to read $\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ with L, Pl.(A) or $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$ with St., Procl., Pl.(A²). Liddell-Scott-Jones gives "substitute, transfer" as a fourth possible meaning of $\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\tau\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$, but cites only this passage. At any rate, once again L is associated with Pl.(A), although this time Stobaeus is associated not with Pl.(F), which offers an eccentric reading, but with Proclus and Pl.(A²). In addition to these three, L is associated with AY in reading τροφήν where Pl.(F) and Proclus read τροφής and Stobaeus and Pl.(F^C) τροφή (18A). In this case, however, L and Pl.(Y) read δέ against Pl.(A), which reads δαί. L agrees with Pl.(Y) again in reading δὴ δόντες where Pl.(A) reads δίδοντες, Stobaeus δόντες, and Pl.(F) δηλοῦντες. In this case, Pl.(A)'s reading is almost certainly a corruption through itacism, and presupposes the reading of pl.(Y) and L.

While this evidence is somewhat scanty, it gives us some reason to suppose that in L the text of this particular excerpt is corrected from a manuscript of Plato related to Pl.(A). The errors peculiar to A in the last two examples discussed suggest that the manuscript in question was not A itself but either an ancestor or a close relation.

In view of Burnet's suggestion noted above concerning the affinity of Stobaeus' readings to Plato's ms. F, it would perhaps be useful to indicate those cases in which Stobaeus (disregarding the reading of L) gives a reading shared by one or more, but not all, of the Plato manuscripts.

e) Readings shared by Stobaeus with some manuscripts of Plato.

St., Pl.(F, Amg)
μσαν ἐκδοστην τέχνην

Pl.(A), L
καὶ ἀφ' ἐκδοστού τῇ τέχνῃ (17D)

St., Pl.(A), Procl.
καὶ φύσει φιλοῖς
ὅσα προσήκει

Pl.(F)
ἔτε καὶ φιλοῖς
οἷα προσήκει

Pl.(Y)
ἔτε φύσει φιλοῖς (18A)
ὅσοις προσήκει

St., Pl.(AY)
μηχανώμενους ὅπως
ὁμογενεῖς

Pl.(F)
μηχανώμενοι ὅπως (18C)
ὁμογόνους (18D)

St., Pl.(Y)
τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῷ (τὸ γεγενημένων
αὐτοῦ S)

Pl.(AF), L
τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῶν
(γεγενημένον A) (18C)

St., Pl.(F^C)
τῆ δὲ τροφῇ (δαὶ
SM; τροφῇ S)

Pl.(AY), L
τῆ δὲ τροφῇν (δαὶ A)

Pl.(F), Procl.
τῆ δὲ τροφῆς (18A)

St., Pl.(A²Y)
χώραν μεταλλάττειν
(μεταλλάττειν St. (A))

Pl.(A), L
χώραν διαλλάττειν

Pl.(F)
χώραν ἐπαλλάττειν (19A)

St., Pl.(A²)
Ἄρ' οὖν

Pl.(AFY), L
Ἄρ' οὖν δὴ

In this passage Stobaeus agrees with only one singular reading of Pl.(F), namely μσαν ἐκδοστην τέχνην, discussed above, p. 224. Agreements with A are more frequent, but unfortunately prove little, since in each case where Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(A) or (AY), the reading offered by Stobaeus and Pl.(A) is very plausible, and in fact is the one printed by Burnet. (In most of these instances the readings in Pl.(F) and Pl.(Y) are almost as plausible, although ὅσοις προσήκει in Pl.(Y) doesn't make sense, and may have been attracted by the preceding dative.) One hesitates to attach too much significance to Stobaeus' agreement with Pl.(F^C) in reading τροφῇ against τροφῇν in Pl.(AY) and L, or in Stobaeus' agreement with Pl.(A²) in omitting δὴ after Ἄρ' οὖν. The reading χώραν μεταλλάττειν, which Stobaeus shares with Pl.(A²Y),

discussed above, p. 225, has already been seen to prove little.

Stobaeus, then, tends to agree with A against F. However, in most of the cases in which Stobaeus agrees with other manuscripts against F, the readings of F are otherwise unattested, so that the possibility cannot be overlooked that many of these readings are the result of later creativity within the manuscript tradition of Pl.(F). In other words, the variants in this excerpt give neither strong support for nor decisive proof against the supposition that Stobaeus and Pl.(F) are related.

Since this excerpt, because of the problems involved, has been discussed at great length, it may be useful to give a brief summary of the findings. First, if L is taken as representing the text of Stobaeus, then there is no significant variation between the text of Stobaeus and the main manuscript tradition of Plato. But in fact L appears rather to represent the main manuscript tradition of Plato, from which the compiler of L has extensively corrected the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. This is proven first by an incomplete correction in L (see above, p. 222), then by the correction in L of variant readings resulting from well-known tendencies in Stobaeus (above, p. 222), and finally by the correction in L of certain readings which enjoy support of some of the manuscripts of Plato by the substitution of certain readings which enjoy the support of other manuscripts of Plato. Hence if we wish to uncover Stobaeus' text for this excerpt, we must disregard the readings of L. If we do so, we find that in Stobaeus the text of this excerpt, has been separated from its context by the removal of a particle at the beginning and two sentences at the end. These alterations we may charge to either

Stobaeus or his source. Other readings correspond to general tendencies within the text of Stobaeus generally, but in most cases may as easily be charged to later scribal error.

14) Plato, Timaeus 26B = St. ii.31.110^k (1½ lines, L)

L
(δ)ς δ' ἦ τι

Pl.
ὡς δὲ τοι

(According to Wachsmuth ad loc., the vulgate tradition of Plato gives ὡς δὲ τι, and is therefore closer to Stobaeus. Therefore it is conceivable that L's erroneous reading was drawn from some manuscript related to the vulgate tradition of Plato. However, it is conceivable that this error could have arisen spontaneously in more than one unrelated manuscript, through itacism.)

15) Plato, Timaeus 28 AB = St. i.13.1a (7 lines, FPL)

St.
ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίγνεται
γένεσιν ἔχειν
ὅταν οὖν

πρὸς τὸ κατὰ ταῦτα
τινὶ χρώμενος
(St., Procl.) τὴν ἰδέαν καὶ τὴν
δύναμιν
ὁπότεν δ' εἰς τὸ γεγονός (γένος P)
γένη, τῷ παραδείγματι (γενητῷ P²)

Pl.
ἐξ ἀνάγκης γίγνεσθαι (28A)
γένεσιν σχεῖν
ὁτοῦ μὲν οὖν ἔν (FY; ὁτοῦ
μὲν ἔν AP, Procl.)
πρὸς τὸ κατὰ ταῦτα
τινὶ προσχρώμενος
τὴν ἰδέαν καὶ δύναμιν αὐ-
τοῦ (αὐτοῦ om. Y)
οὗ δ' ἔν εἰς τὸ γεγονός
(τὸ om. F, Procl.) (28B)
γενητῷ παραδείγματι (FYA²,
Procl.; γεννητῷ AP)

The number of variant readings in this passage is striking.

Some of these can no doubt be interpreted as scribal errors. For example, ἔχειν for σχεῖν can be ascribed to a confusion between uncial Σ and Ε, if it is not the result of a lapse in memory. No doubt ταῦτα for ταῦτά and γένη, τῷ for γενητῷ or γεννητῷ are both presumably caused by the misunderstanding of an unaccented exemplar. While Stobaeus'

reading of χρῶμενος for προσχρῶμενος is not impossible, the latter reading from the manuscript tradition of Plato makes better sense, since it provides a contrast with βλέπων in the same sentence. Presumably the omission of these letters in Stobaeus is accidental, unless Stobaeus or his source had wanted χρῶμενος to contrast with προσχρῶμενος in the following sentence.

On the other hand, γίγνεται for γίγνεσθαι, the first of these variants, is likely deliberate. The sentence as it stands in Plato is in implied indirect discourse; in its new context in Stobaeus it is the main verb of the sentence.

It is also possible that ὅταν οὖν for ὅτοῦ μὲν οὖν ἔν or ὅτοῦ μὲν ἔν and ὁπόταν, ὅ' for οὐδ' ὅ' ἔν are the result of deliberate activity, since in both cases a relative clause becomes a temporal clause. Perhaps the variants in Stobaeus were selected as the more usual combinations at the time of compilation.

The text of Stobaeus for this particular excerpt is unusually bad. This could perhaps indicate either that Stobaeus had used an especially unreliable source, or that he had added this quotation from memory.

16) Plato, Timaeus 28C = St. ii.1.15 (2 lines FPL)

(There is no discrepancy common to all the manuscripts of Stobaeus against the manuscript tradition of Plato for this section.)

17) Plato, Timaeus 29CD = St. ii.1.19 (7½ lines, SMA)

St.
παρεχόμεθα εἰκόνας
ὥς δ' λέγων ἡμεῖς

Pl.
παρεχόμεθα εἰκόνας (29C)
ὥς δ' λέγων ἡμεῖς (Y) ὥς δ'
λέγων ἐγὼ ἡμεῖς AFP, Procl.)
(29CD)

We may add the following instances in which Stobaeus agrees with one or more manuscripts of Plato against the rest:

St., Pl.(AFP), Procl.
πολλὰ πολλῶν περὶ (περὶ cf. Diehl)

Pl.(Y)
πολλὰ πολλῶν, εἰπόντων περὶ (29C)

St., Pl.(FPA²), Gal.
χρῆ μεμνημένου

Pl.(AY), Procl.
χρῆ μεμνημένον

The two variants in Stobaeus seem both to be caused by scribal error; in the case of the former, the similarity in appearance of the two words would have been sufficient; in the case of the latter, itacism is probably involved. That both Stobaeus and Y omit ἐγὼ after λέγων may perhaps indicate manuscript affinity, but it is not conceivable that an error of this nature could occur independently in unrelated manuscripts because of the similarity in ending between λέγων and ἐγὼ. The εἰπόντων inserted in Y in πολλὰ πολλῶν περὶ seems to be a fairly old error, since it seems to be presupposed in the text of C. H. xi.1 (147.4,5), 'Ἐπεὶ πολλὰ πολλῶν καὶ ταῦτα διάφορα περὶ τοῦ παντός καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ εἰπόντων. It is, however, an error, and in this case Stobaeus shares the correct reading against Y. Stobaeus is also undoubtedly correct in reading χρῆ μεμνημένου with Pl.(FPA²) against Pl.(AY). Thus the text of Stobaeus for this excerpt seems not to be closely related to any of the surviving manuscripts.

18) Plato, Timaeus 29E = St. iii.38.33 (1½ lines, SMABr)

St.
ἐγγίνεται

Pl.
ἐγγίνεται

The variant reading in Stobaeus here is of course a Hellenistic usage, for which Stobaeus may or may not be responsible. (The discrepancy is not noted in Hense's apparatus, although the reading in question

appears in his text.)

19) Plato, Timaeus 30A = St. 1.10.16b (4 lines, FP);
Plato, Timaeus 30AB = St. 1.21.1 (14½ lines, FP)

St. 1.21.1
φλαῦρον δὲ καὶ (καὶ om. P²)
πλημμελῶς τε καὶ (πλημμελεῖσαι P¹)
αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν

(end of excerpt in 1.10.16b)

Pl., St. 1.10.16b
φλαῦρον δὲ (φαῦλον δὲ St.(P),
Pl.(F), Plut.) (30A)
πλημμελῶς καὶ
εἰς τὰς αὐτὸ ἤγαγεν (ἤγεν
Pl.(F), Procl., Plut.)

St. 1.21.1
παντὸς ἄμεινον
θέρμιν δ' οὐτ' ἦν
εὐρίσκειν
οὕς γενέσθαι

Pl.
παντὸς ἄμεινον (30A)
θέρμιν δ' οὐτ' ἦν
εὐρίσκειν (30B)
παράγενέσθαι

We may also mention one case in which Stobaeus agrees with some of the manuscripts of Plato:

St., Pl. (AFY)
οὐτ' ἔστι(ν)

Pl.(P,A²)
οὐτ' ἔσται (30A)

There is also another instance apart from the first example above in which one manuscript of Stobaeus supports one manuscript of Plato against the other manuscript of Stobaeus and the remaining manuscripts of Plato:

St.(P), Pl.(F)
ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ

St.(F), Pl.(AFY)
ἐν ψυχῇ

Undoubtedly none of these discrepancies represent deliberate policy on the part of Stobaeus. It will be noted that Stobaeus' readings from the same text differ quite radically between 1.10.16b and 1.21.1. This probably reflects a difference in source. Since Stobaeus 1.10.16b exhibits a text much closer to the main manuscript tradition, it is quite reasonable to suppose that this difference is at least in part due to the use of a more reliable exemplar for 1.10.16b. However,

caution is suggested by the fact that most of the variant readings in 1.21.1 do not make sense, although the insertion of *τὸ* before *καί* in the second example makes little difference in the sense of the passage, and *παντὸς* in the fourth example may have been attracted by the preceding *τοῦτου*.

Because the reading of St.(P) agrees with Pl.(F) in one instance in 1.10.16b (the first example from this excerpt, *φαῖλον* for *φλαῦρον*) and in one instance in 1.21.1, *ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ* for *ἐν ψυχῇ*, it is possible that the text of St.(F) has been corrected against a manuscript of Plato. However, the examples, especially the second, are quite inconclusive, and could be due to coincidence.

20) Plato, Timaeus 31 AB = St. 1.22.3d (10½ lines, FP)

St.	Pl.	
πάλιν γὰρ ἕτερον	πάλιν γὰρ ὅν ἕτερον	(31A)
εἴη τὴν ἐκείνω	εἴτην ἐκείνω	
ἀτελεῖ γὰρ	παντελεῖ γὰρ	(31B)

The following examples of partial agreement may also be given:

St., Pl.(FP), Procl.	Pl.(A)	Pl.(Y)	
περὶ ἐκείνω	περὶ ἐκείνω	περὶ ἐκεῖνο	(31A)
St., Pl.(PYA ²), Procl.	Pl.(AF)		
ἔστι τε καὶ ἕτ' ἔσται	ἔστι(ν) καὶ ἕτ' ἔσται		(31B)

The omission of *ὅν* is quite common in Stobaeus. No doubt difficulty in recognizing the dual is responsible for *εἴη τὴν* for *εἴτην*; presumably that error need not be charged to Stobaeus. On the other hand, *ἀτελεῖ* for *παντελεῖ* could easily be a deliberate alteration, if it is not to be ascribed to absence of mind. The two examples of partial agreement are hardly significant: in the first of these the variants against Stobaeus and Pl.(FP) are both clearly errors; in the second, the

insertion or removal of $\tau\epsilon$ makes very little difference to the sense, so that it is impossible to decide which is the correct reading. Either way, the agreement between Stobaeus and Pl.(PYA²) could be due to coincidence.

While I could furnish additional examples of excerpts from Plato's Timaeus, I believe that the examples given are sufficiently representative. As with the excerpts from Xenophon, the variant readings in the excerpts from the Timaeus tend to be of two sorts: deliberate alterations made either to correct or adapt the text, or gross scribal errors. The former are more likely to be from Stobaeus or his source, the latter from scribes in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. Only occasionally does Stobaeus alone offer a plausible alternative reading to the manuscript tradition of Plato.

It would appear then that in the reconstruction of the text of Plato, Stobaeus' text is of interest mainly because of the support which the readings of Stobaeus give to one or more of the ancient manuscripts of Plato. While the sample taken from the Timaeus is far from supporting Burnet's views about the relation between Stobaeus and Pl.(F), it is to be remembered in the first place that Pl.(F) is likely to have been interpolated from other sources as well, and in the second place that the Timaeus seems to have been popular in late antiquity, so that it is likely that Stobaeus' excerpts represent more than one manuscript tradition. In any case, it is likely that at least some of these excerpts were taken from other anthologies.

The other Platonic dialogue to be examined here is the Sophistes. It will be remembered that for this dialogue Burnet has postulated a

close relationship between Stobaeus and Pl.(W).

21) Plato, Soph. 219A-221C = St. iv.18a.6 (82½ lines, SMA; S om. λέγεται γὰρ . . . εἰλήφαμεν ἱκανῶς, 14 lines, 220E-221B)

St.	Pl.
ἀλλὰ μὴν γε τῶν τεχνῶν	ἀλλὰ μὴν τῶν γε τεχνῶν (219A)
σχεδὸν πασῶν	πασῶν σχεδὸν
δύο πως	δύο. Πῶς;
τιμητικῇ	μιμητικῇ (219B)
εἰς οὐσαν	τις ὅν ὑστερον εἰς οὐσαν
	(ὅν W)
νῦν διήλθομεν (διελθομεν Tr.)	νυνδὴ διήλθομεν (νυνδὴ
	Burket)
τὴν αὐτῶν δυνάμιν (αὐτοῦ Tr.)	τὴν αὐτῶν δυνάμιν
μαθητικὸν	μαθηματικὸν (219C)
ἀντρέψειεν (ἐκτρέψειεν Tr.)	ἂν διαπρέψειεν (διαγράφειεν
	T)
οἷου δῆλον	που δῆλον (219D)
προσέχοντας (πρὸς ἔχοντας A)	πρὸς ἐκόντας
ὠρεῶν καὶ μισθώσεων	ὠρεῶν καὶ μισθώσεων καὶ
	ἀγοράσεων (ὠρεῶν καὶ ἀγο-
	ράσεων καὶ μισθώσεων T)
τί δαί	τί δέ
ἀμπαδόν	ἀναφανδόν (219E)
ἀγωνιστικὸν τιθέντας	ἀγωνιστικὸν θέντες (θέν-
	τας W)
ἀνώνυμον πλὴν	ἀνώνυμον ἔδν πλὴν (ἀνώνυ-
	μον ὅν πλὴν Heindorf) (220A)
νευστικοῦ ἴψου	τὸ δ' ἕτερον νευστικοῦ
	ἴψου
μὲν γε πᾶσα (μὲν πᾶσιν A)	μὴν γένους πᾶσα (220B)
ὀρνιθευτικῇ (M: ὀρνεοτευτικῇ S;	τις ὀρνιθευτικῇ
ὀρνίετευτικῇ A; ὀρνεοτευτικῇ Tr.)	
λέγεται	λέγεται γὰρ οὖν
ἀλιευτικῇ τὸ σύνολον	τὸ σύνολον ἀλιευτικῇ
St. om.	Ναι.
τί δαί	τί δέ
κατὰ τὰ μέγιστα	κατὰ μέγιστα
διελοίμεν	διελομένην
ἐν τῷ νῦν χρεῶν	ἐνὶ λόγῳ νῦν χρεῶν (220D)
ᾧ θαεσσητε, εἴποι	θαεσσητε, εἴποι (εἴποι,
	ᾧ θαεσσητε W)
τῆς μὲν τοίνυν πληκτικῆς	τῆς τοίνυν πληκτικῆς
βηθῆναι	βηθῆναι συμβέβηκεν
παναγκιστρευτικῇν (παναγκεστρευτι-	πάν ἀγκιστρευτικόν
κῇν M)	
τῆς πληγῆς	τῆς πληκτικῆς (220E)
ποῖον	τὸ ποῖον (B om.)
οὐχ ἢ τις (M; οὐχ εἴ τις A; S om.)	οὐχ ἢ τις (ἦ τις B)
οὐ τι φήσομεν	οὐ τι φήσομεν (221A)

St.
δ' ἐξευρεῖν
πάντας εἰ μὲν οὖν

Pl.
δεῖν ἐξευρεῖν
παντάσῃ μὲν οὖν (221C)

No doubt most of the variant readings from Stobaeus in this excerpt are mere errors. As often in Stobaeus, the word order is frequently disturbed. It is difficult to see why, in the first example, γε is placed immediately after ἀλλὰ μὴν, since this is an unusual combination in the Hellenistic period.¹ In 220B, it makes little difference to the sense whether τὸ σύνολον comes before or after ἀλειτουργικῆς; probably the sentence was transcribed carelessly. In the second example, however, it is possible that σχεδὸν was deliberately moved in front of πᾶσιν in order to make certain that σχεδὸν was taken to modify πᾶσιν. If so, we may perhaps attribute this transposition to either Stobaeus or his source.

It is probable that for this excerpt physical damage had occurred either within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus or in Stobaeus' source. That seems to me the most plausible explanation for the omission of τις ὅν ὕστερον in 219B, the substitution of μὲν γε πᾶσιν for μὴν γένους πᾶσιν, the omission of γὰρ οὖν after λέγεται, and the omission of τὸ δ' ἕτερον before νευστικοῦ in 220B, the substitution of ἐν τῷ νῦν for ἐνὶ λόγῳ νῦν (uncial Γ being read as T), the omission of συμβέβηκεν in 220D, and the substitution of δ' for δεῖν in 221A.

A more complicated problem is posed by ἀντρεψείεν in 219C. The reading itself is clearly nonsense; however Gaisford emends it by reading ὅν πρῆψείεν. This latter could be either the original reading

¹J. Blomqvist, Greek particles in Hellenistic prose (Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1969), p. 65.

(since Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 409, cites only this passage under διαπρέπω for the particular sense demanded here, i. e. "to be suitable") or a deliberate alteration by Stobaeus or his source or even the result of accidental mutilation of the text. On the whole, the most likely hypothesis seems to me to be that the passage was deliberately altered; it is difficult to see why a change from πρέψειεν to διαπρέψειεν should have occurred in the manuscript tradition of Plato.

If εἰς in 220A stood in the exemplar available to Stobaeus or his source, its omission very likely would have been deliberate, since it makes no sense.

Some of the omissions may simply be the result of carelessness. In this category we may include the omission of δὴ from συνδὴ in 219B, the omission of καὶ after τὸ σύνολον, as well as the omission of τις before ὀρνιθευτική in 220B, the omission of τὸ before ποῖον in 220E, and the omission of καὶ ἀγοράσεων in 219D. None of these need be attributed to Stobaeus.

There are also some apparent insertions in the text of Stobaeus. It is difficult to account for the insertion of δὴ before σου in 219D or of μὲν before τοῖν in 220D; however, given the general unreliability of Stobaeus' text for this excerpt, we may be justified in retaining the readings of the manuscript tradition of Plato. Perhaps τὸ before μέγιστα in 220B is an attempted correction. On the other hand, ὃ before θαλάττης in 220D may be retained, with Burnet.

Some errors indicate a lack of comprehension of the text by someone in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. Of course δύο πῶς for δύο πῶς; in 219A, αὐτῶν for αὐτῶν in 219B, πινυγκιστρευτικήν for πέν

ἀγκιστρευτικὸν in 220D, and οὐχ ἦ for οὐχ ἡ in 221A indicate the misunderstanding of an unaccented text. There are also some substitutions of words without reference to the sense, such as τιμητικῇ for μιμητικῇ in 219B, μαθητικὸν for μαθηματικὸν in 219C, προσέχοντας or πρὸς ἔχοντας for πρὸς ἔκδοντας in 219D, πληγῆς for πλημικῆς in 220E, and πάντας εἰ for παντάπασιν in 221C. (In the latter, itacism was probably a factor.) On the other hand, Stobaeus seems to provide the correct reading in one instance in 220B, διελοίμεν for διελομένην.

Finally, τῷ δαί for τῷ δέ (in 219D and 220B) is extremely common in Stobaeus' treatment of Plato. Literary pretensions are perhaps indicated by ἀμπαδόν for ἀναφανδόν, an alteration which perhaps may be ascribed either to Stobaeus himself or to his source.

We may now examine those cases in which Stobaeus agrees with one or more of the ancient manuscripts of Plato against the others. The following are the instances of agreement with Pl.(W) against the rest:

St., Pl.(W)	Pl.(cet.)	
δικαιότατα	δικαιότατ' ὅν	(219B)
τῇν γε μὴν θηρευτικῇν	τῇν δέ γε μὴν θηρευτικῇν	(219E)

In addition, Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(W) in reading ᾧ before θεαστήτε, but with BT in placing θεαστήτε before εἶποι. These agreements, given the tendencies of Stobaeus to omit ὅν and other small particles, could be ascribed to chance.

In one case Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(TW) against Pl.(B):

St., Pl.(TW)	Pl.(B)	
ταύτην αὖ τῇν θήραν	ταύτην ὅν τῇν θήραν	(220B)

In this particular instance Pl.(B) is almost certainly in error. Therefore nothing can be concluded from this coincidence.

In the following instances Stobaeus agrees with the others against

Pl.(W):

St., Pl.(cet.)

τὸ μὴ οὐ τέμνειν

καὶ τοιαῦτ'

τὸ μὲν πτηνὸν φύλον ὁρῶμεν, τὸ δὲ

ἔνυδρον (φύλλον S)

τὸ μὲν ἔρκεσιν (BT)

κύρτους δὴ (δὴ om.A) (BT)

οὐδὲν

πάνυ γε

ταύτη πληγῆς

θηρευθέντος (θηρευέντος T)

οὐ τε

Pl.(W)

τὸ μὴ τέμνειν

(219E)

καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτ'

(220A)

τὸ μὲν πτηνὸν φύλον, τὸ δὲ

ἔνυδρον ὁρῶμεν

(220B)

τὰ μὲν ἔρκεσιν

κύρτους δὲ

(220C)

οὐδὲν ἄλλο

πάνυ μὲν οὖν

(220D)

ταύτης πληγῆς

(220E)

θηρευόντος

(221A)

οὐ γε

Unfortunately this list proves little, since of the distinctive readings of Pl.(W) only πάνυ μὲν οὖν in 220D has any possibility of being the correct reading, although even here the reading of Stobaeus and Pl.(BT) is at least as acceptable. We may see a tendency in the variants given in Pl.(W) to substitute more common combinations, without regard to the sense of the whole, as for example τὰ τοιαῦτ' for τοιαῦτ' in 220A, and οὐ γε for οὐ τε in 221A. Presumably ταύτη in 220E was changed to ταύτης because of the attraction of πληγῆς immediately following, although ταύτη is demanded by the ἐναντίας which precedes in the sentence. No doubt the οὐ in τὸ μὴ οὐ τέμνειν, 219E, was felt as redundant; on the other hand, ἄλλο may have been added to οὐδὲν in 220C because the response was felt as ambiguous. Since all of these variants could have arisen in the manuscript tradition of Pl.(W) either as errors or as conjectures after the compilation of Stobaeus' Anthology, they prove nothing about the relations of Stobaeus' text to the manuscript tradition of Plato.

Inconclusive for obvious reasons is the following case of partial

agreement against Pl.(TW):

St., Pl.(B)
δοκῶ μὲν

Pl.(TW)
δοκῶμεν

(221A)

Presumably Stobaeus' exemplar was unaccented; therefore this variant is meaningless for our present purposes.

The agreements of Stobaeus against T are equally inconclusive:

St., Pl.(cat.)

τις οἶμαι

ἐνυγροθηρικὸν ἐνυγροθηρικοῦ (ἐνυγρο-
θηρικὸν om. MA)

τοῦτου δὲ

Pl.(T)

οἶμαι τις

ἐνυδροθηρικὸν ἐνυδροθη- (220E)

ρικοῦ (221B)

τοῦτο δὲ

In all of these readings Pl.(T) is clearly in error. It is probable that in 220E τις was displaced accidentally. It seems reasonable to suppose that τοῦτο was attracted by the τὸ which follows in the sentence. Probably a misspelling gave us ἐνυδροθηρικὸν κτλ. for ἐνυγροθηρικὸν κτλ. Here again little can be proven.

In summary then there is little reason to suppose that the text of Stobaeus in this excerpt is closely related to Pl.(W), but even less reason to suppose that it was closely related to Pl.(B) or Pl.(T).

While Stobaeus tends to agree with Pl.(B) more than with the others, this may indicate merely that Pl.(B) represents a more faithful manuscript tradition. Since in this excerpt Stobaeus occasionally presents a plausible reading against all of the others, it may be that for this excerpt Stobaeus follows a manuscript tradition not closely related to Plato(BTW).

22) Plato, Soph. 227D-230E = St. 11.31.129 (100½ lines, L)

St.

περὶ ψυχῆς

ἐν ᾧ γένος

καὶ σκοπὸν τινα θέμενον

Pl.

περὶ ψυχῆς

(227D)

ἐν γένος (ἐν ᾧ γένος τ) (228A)

καὶ σκοπὸν τινα θέμενα (228C)

St.

καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην ὁρμὴν
ἀκούσασιν πᾶσαν πᾶναγνον οὔσαν
ὅ δὴ νῦν λέξαντος

ἡμφιγνόησας. οὐ

ἐν γε σῶματι

παθήματα ταῦτα

φαίνεται

φατέον ἢ πλείω

εἶναι μέγιστοι

κατὰ μέσον αὐτῇ

ἐφ' ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτῶν

ἀγνοίας τ' οὖν

ἀποριζόμενον

αὐτὸν ἀντισταθμοῦν

δοιεῖν εἰδέναι

δι' ἀγνοίας

τί δαὶ δὴ

τῆς διδασκαλικῆς ἄρα μέρει

δημιουργικῆς διδασκαλίας

καὶ τοῦτο ἐπισκεπτέον

ἐξάτομόν ἐστιν ἤδη

ἀρχαιοπρεπές

αὐτὸς ὁρθότατα εἴποι

οὐδὲ τ' ἂν ἐθέλειν

τούτων οἷός τε περὶ

ἐπεκβολὴν ἄλλοτρόπως στέλλονται

τίνοι δέ

συνάγουσι

εἰς ταῦτόν τε τιθέασιν

πρὸς ταῦτα κατὰ ταῦτα

περὶ αὐτοῦς

πασῶν ἀπαλλαγῶν

τὰ ἐμποδίζοντα ἐντός (ἐκτός L¹)

αὐ καθαρῶτατον

Pl.

καθ' ἑκάστην ὁρμὴν

ἤκουσαν πᾶσαν πᾶν ἀγνοοῦσαν

ὅ νυνδὴ λέξαντος (ὅν νῦν

δὴ B)

(228E)

ἡμφιγνόησά σου (ἡμφιγνόησας

οὐ T)

ἐν γε τῷ σῶματι (H; ἐν σῶ-

ματί γε BT)

παθήματα τοῦτω

(228E)

φαίνεσθον

(229A)

φατέον εἶναι ἢ πλείω

(229B)

εἶναι μέγιστω

κατὰ μέσον αὐτῆς (H; αὐτῆς BT)

ἐφ' ἐνὶ γένει τῶν αὐτῆς

ἀγνοίας γοῦν (H; δ' οὖν BT)(229C)

ἀποριζόμενον

αὐτῆς ἀντισταθμον

δοκεῖν εἰδέναι

διανοία

τί δέ δὴ

τῷ τῆς διδασκαλικῆς ἄρα μέρει

δημιουργικῆς διδασκαλίας (229D)

ἔτι καὶ τοῦτο σκεπτέον

ἄρ' ἄτομον ἤδη ἐστὶ (H; εἰ

ἄτομον BT)

τὸ μὲν ἀρχαιοπρεπές (229E)

αὐτὸ ὁρθότατα εἴποι (230A)

οὐδὲν ποτ' ἂν ἐθέλειν (οὐ-

δὲν ποτ' ἂν T)

εἶναι σοφὸν τούτων ὅν οἷοιτο

περὶ

ἐπὶ ἐκβολὴν ἄλλῃ τρόπῳ στέλ-

λονται

(230B)

τίνοι δέ

συνάγοντες

εἰς ταῦτόν τιθέασιν

πρὸς τὰ αὐτὰ κατὰ ταῦτα

περὶ αὐτοῦς

(230C)

πασῶν τε ἀπαλλαγῶν

τὰ ἐμποδίζοντα ἐν αὐτῷ

ἢ καθαρῶτατον

(230E)

Because of the generally poor quality of the text of L, it

would perhaps be useful to confine our attention to those readings which have some chance of representing either the result of deliberate activity on the part of Stobaeus or genuinely early tradition in the text of Plato.

We may perhaps ascribe the first example above to the activity of Stobaeus, if he construed the words with ῥητέον which follows. However, it is more likely that the reading in Stobaeus is merely an error. Since περὶ ψυχῆς is by far the more frequent combination, at least in the Hellenistic period, it would tend to be substituted automatically, without regard to the context. Similarly δαὲ for δέ (229C) is so common in Stobaeus that it may very easily be the result of deliberate activity on the part of Stobaeus or his source.

Among the readings which may with some plausibility be considered as genuine readings are ἐν ὅν (for which with Burnet following Schleiermacher read ἐνδόν) for ὅν (228A), ἐν γε σώματι for ἐν σώματι γε, cf. Pl.(W) ἐν γε τῷ σώματι (228E), and ἐντός for ἐν αὐτῷ in 230C; each of these readings are accepted by Burnet. Burnet also wishes to follow Stobaeus in removing εἶναι from φατέον εἶναι ἢ πλεῖω and γένει from ἐφ' ἐνὶ γένει, both in 229B. The second may easily be conceded; the first is possible. Burnet would also follow Stobaeus in removing τε from παῶν τε ἀπαλλαγῶν in 230C; here however the context may have suffered a more serious corruption. Finally, the following readings: δι' ἀγνοίας for διανοίας in 229C and συνάγουσι . . . εἰς ταῦτόν τε τιθέασι for συνάγοντες . . . εἰς ταῦτόν τιθέασι, while inferior to the readings in the manuscript tradition of Plato, are at least in themselves plausible, and may be the result of activity by Stobaeus or his source.

The following are the instances of agreement by Stobaeus (or L) against part of the manuscript tradition of Plato:

St., Pl.(cet.)	Pl.(W)	
ἔχω τι χρη	ἔχω ὅτι χρη	(228A)
ἐν ψυχῇ	ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ	(228B)
πειρώμενα (B om.)	πειρώμεθα	(228C)
μάλιστα δὴ πασῶν (δ' ἢ B)	δὴ μάλιστα πασῶν	(229A)
St., Pl.(W)	Pl.(cet.)	
ἐν γε σῶματι (ἐν γε τῷ σῶματι W)	ἐν σῶματι γε	(228E)
ἀγνοῶς γούν (τ' οὖν St.)	ἀγνοῶς δ' οὖν	(229C)
ἀμαθῶν τοῦνομα	ἀμαθῶν τοῦνομα	
οἶμαι μὲν	οἶμαι μὲν οὖν	(229D)
ὅφ' ἡμῶν κεκλησθαι	οἱ' ἡμῶν κεκλησθαι	
ἔχει διαφρεσιν	ἔχον διαφρεσιν	
μῶριον αὐτῆς	αὐτῆς μῶριον	(229E)
ἐκότερον λέγομεν	ἐκότερον λέγωμεν	
πρὶν τὴν ἐμποδίζοντα	πρὶν ἢ τὴν ἐμποδίζοντα	(230C)
St., Pl.(cet.)	Pl.(T)	
ἡγητέον νόσον	ἡγητέον ὅσον	(228E)
ἐξαμαρτάνωσι τι	ἐξαμαρτάνωσι	(230A)
τῷ τοι ταύτης	καὶ γὰρ τοι ταύτης	(230B)
τὸν ἀνέλεγκτον	τὸ ἀνέλεγκτον	(230D)
St., Pl.(T)	Pl.(cet.)	
ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν	ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν	(229D)
ὁ μέγας ὢν	ὁ μέγας ὅν	(230E)
St., Pl.(TW)	Pl.(B)	
αὐτὰς αὐταῖς	αὐτὰς αὐτοῖς	(230B)

Stobaeus' agreements with the other Plato manuscripts against

Pl.(W) seem inconclusive. The first of these, Pl.(W)'s reading, ὅτι (for ὅ τι), is plausible, but could as easily be the result of a correction in the tradition of Pl.(W) after the compilation of Stobaeus' Anthology.

The other variants peculiar to Pl.(W) seem to me to be errors of the sort that could arise at any time, and are most likely to be ascribed to inattention.

Some of the agreements between Stobaeus and Pl.(W) in this section, however, are of such a nature as to suggest a close relation between these two manuscript traditions. The position of αὐτῆς given by Stobaeus and Pl.(W) in 229E is presumably erroneous, because it would be

ambiguous, if that reading were accepted, whether it is to be construed with $\mu\delta\rho\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ or with $\lambda\epsilon\iota\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$. In 229D, $\delta\varphi' \eta\mu\omega\nu$, favoured by Stobaeus and Pl.(W), being the more common expression, is likely to have been substituted for $\delta\iota' \eta\mu\omega\nu$ given by the other Plato manuscripts. Finally, in 230C both Stobaeus and Pl.(W) omit $\delta\nu$ where it is clearly demanded by the context. To be sure, the omission of $\delta\nu$ seems to be a tendency in both Stobaeus and Pl.(W), so that at least this last reading could be coincidence. In most of the other cases the readings favoured by Stobaeus and Pl.(W) are clearly right, and therefore prove little.

None of the instances in which Stobaeus agrees with the majority of the Plato manuscripts against Pl.(T) seem conclusive. One of these, $\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\alpha\rho$ for $\pi\tilde{\omega}$, 230B, seems to be the result of a deliberate alteration of the text. The others are the result of carelessness. Equally inconclusive are the two instances in which Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(T), since in both cases Stobaeus and Pl.(T) clearly give the correct reading. The reading $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in Pl.(B) for $\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ in Stobaeus and Pl.(TW) is of course an error and proves nothing.

Therefore for this section at least it seems quite plausible to suppose that there is a close relationship between Stobaeus and Pl.(W). It may of course be asked whether we are indebted for this agreement to Stobaeus or to the compiler of L.

23) Plato, Soph. 228D = St. iii.4.97 (1 line, MA)

St.
 $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \delta\nu\sigma\eta\tau\omicron\nu$

Pl.
 $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta\nu \delta\pi\alpha \delta\nu\sigma\eta\tau\omicron\nu$

Since $\delta\pi\alpha$ links this brief excerpt to its context in the Sophistes, its omission is surely the result of editorial activity on

the part of either Stobaeus or his source.

24) Plato, Soph. 231A = St. ii.2.24 (2 lines, FP)

St.
ποιεῖσθαι

Pl.
δεῖ ποιεῖσθαι

I am unable to detect a motive for this omission. Presumably it is the result of an oversight.

25) Plato, Soph. 232E-233A = St. iii.1.184 (6 lines, S recente manu, Tr.)

St.
τάχα γὰρ ὁμοῖς
τω κατανῶ
ἄνθρωπον ἐστὶ δυνατόν
μακρῖον μὲν πᾶν
ὃ ξυνέχειν

Pl.
τάχα γὰρ ὅν ὁμοῖς (232E)
του κατανῶ (233A)
ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ δυνατόν
μακρῖον μὲν' ὅν
ὃ ξέρε, ἦν

Stobaeus also agrees in one instance with Pl.(BT) against Pl.(W):

St., Pl.(BT)
οὐ δὴ (δὲ Tr.)

Pl.(W)
οὐ δὲ δὴ (232E)

As frequently in Stobaeus, ὅν is omitted. It may be that ἄνθρωπον for ἀνθρώπων was attracted by the preceding τινι, although the error may have been caused simply by the similarity in sound. No doubt μὲν πᾶν for μὲν' ὅν was caused partly by the hasty misreading of an uncial manuscript. On the other hand, ξυνέχειν for ξέρε, ἦν is presumably in part caused by itacism. Of the variants given by Stobaeus, only the second, τω for του, has plausibility; however, given the large number of very foolish errors in this small excerpt in Stobaeus, we may be justified in rejecting this reading, especially since the reading in the manuscripts of Plato is at least as plausible.

The agreement between Stobaeus and Pl.(BT) against Pl.(W) in reading δὴ for δὲ δὴ is of course insignificant, especially since, had δὲ been available in the exemplar used by Stobaeus or his source, it

would undoubtedly have been removed in order to adapt the passage to its new context.

26) Plato, Soph. 235C-236C = St. iv.18a.7 (33 lines, ^{FE}MA)

St.

τὴν γὰρ ζητούμενην
τῷ-δύο λέγεις
ἕτερον δίκαιον
τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦτο μέρος
εἰκέναι τῷ καλῷ
μηδ' εἰκός (μηδ' A)
ὀρθότατα (ὀρθότητα Af)
τοῦτο τοίνυν δύο ἔλεγον

Pl.

τὴν δὲ ζητούμενην (235D)
τίνε τῷ δύο λέγεις
ἕτερον οὐ δίκαιον (236A)
τὸ ἐπὶ τοῦτω μέρος (236B)
ἔοικέναι τῷ καλῷ
μηδ' εἰκός
ὀρθότατ' ἔιν (236C)
τοῦτω τοίνυν τῷ δύο ἔλεγον

This excerpt shows relatively few variant readings against the manuscripts of Plato. Some of the errors may have been caused in part by unfamiliarity with the dual, as for example the omission of τίνε in the second example and the change of τοῦτω to τοῦτο as well as the omission of τῷ in the last. The omission of οὐ in the third example may perhaps be set down to mere carelessness. The omission of ἔιν in the second last example is of course, as we have seen, common in Stobaeus' excerpts from Plato. Since εἰκέναι and ἔοικέναι as well as εἰκός and εἰκός are interchangeable, it is difficult to choose in the case of the fifth and sixth examples. In the first example, the reading from the manuscript tradition of Plato is clearly correct. Quite probably the substitution is the result of scribal error,¹ although it is possible that Stobaeus or his source had wanted to sever the connection of the excerpted passage from its context by making the sentence in which this

¹ Prof. Slater has advised me that δὲ διὰ τοῦ γὰρ is a frequent scholion. Therefore the substitution could have been accidental or the result of an early variant.

change occurs appear as a comment on the first sentence of the excerpt.

The following are cases of agreement between Stobaeus and some manuscripts of Plato:

St., Pl.(cet.)

ποθ' ἡμῖν οὖσα
οὐδέπω μοι δοκῶ νῦν
εἰκαστικὴν ὁρῶν (εἰκαστικὴν M)
πάνυ μὲν οὖν (Pl.(B) om.)
πάνυ μὲν οὖν (BT)
τὸ μὲν ἄρα ἕτερον
εἰκός γε ἔν, εἰκόνα καλεῖν
ψ φησιν εἰκέναι (εἰκέναι MA)
πολυ γε

Pl.(W)

ποτέ οὖσα ἡμῖν (235D)
οὐδέπω νῦν δοκῶ μοι
εἰκαστικὴν ὁρῶ
δοκεῖ μοι πάνυ μὲν οὖν (236A3)
παντάπασί γε (236A7)
ἄρ' οὖν τὸ μὲν ἕτερον
εἰκαστικὸν καλεῖν
ψ φησιν εἰκέναι (236B)
πάνυ γε (236C)

St., Pl.(W)

εἰπὲ καὶ ὄρελε πρῶτον
προσέκοντα ἐκάσταις
φάντασμα ἄλλ' οὐκ εἰκόνα

Pl.(cet.)

εἰπὲ πρῶτον καὶ ὄρελε (235D)
προσέκοντα ἐκάσταις (BT)(235E)
φαντάσματα ἄλλ' οὐκ εἰκόνα (236C)

St., Pl.(cet.)

κατὰ ξύμπασιν (σύμπ- Pl.)

Pl.(T)

κατὰ τὴν ξύμπασιν (236C)

This list is quite inconclusive. Some of the readings peculiar to Pl.(W), notably παντάπασί γε for πάνυ μὲν οὖν and ἄρ' οὖν τὸ μὲν ἕτερον for τὸ μὲν ἄρα ἕτερον, are sufficiently striking that they are conceivable as early variants, without, however, permitting us to rule out the possibility that they are to be attributed to a later period. Stobaeus shares one probable error with Pl.(W) in the displacement of πρῶτον in 235D. In all other cases Stobaeus clearly supports the correct reading. Therefore, here as in most excerpts, it is not possible to identify Stobaeus' text very closely with that of any of the surviving manuscripts.

27) Plato, Soph. 240C-241A = St.iii.12.23 (20 lines, Str.)

St.

ἐπαλξεως
ἠνάγκασεν ἡμᾶς
τὸ μὴ ἔν οὐκ ἔχοντας

Pl.

ἐπαλλάξεως (240C)
ἠνάγκαμεν ἡμᾶς
τὸ μὴ ἔν οὐκ ἔκοντας (240C)

St.

τὶ δαὶ δὴ
τὴν τέχνην αὐτοῦ τινα
τὶ γὰρ ἢν ἄλλο εἴποιμεν
οὕτως· τὰ ἐναντὶα
μὴ ὄντα δοξάζειν

πῶς λέγεις εἶναι
τὰ μὴ ὄντα λέγε
κατὰ ταῦτα νομισθήσεται

Pl.

τὶ δὲ δὴ
τὴν τέχνην αὐτοῦ τινα
τὶ γὰρ ἢν ἄλλο εἴποιμεν (240D)
τὰναντῖα
τὰ μὴ ὄντα δοξάζειν (δοξάζειν
τὰ μὴ ὄντα H)
πῶς εἶναι (240E)
τὰ μὴ ὄντα δεῖ γὰρ
κατὰ ταῦτα νομισθήσεται (T;
κατὰ ταῦτα ταῦτα B; κατὰ ταῦτα
ταῦτα H)

In addition, Stobaeus omits the opening words of the first speech of this excerpt, πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἔτιονον, presumably because they link the speech to its context.

I cannot account for the substitution of ἐπαλλέως for ἐπαλλδέως in 240C. In the context, ἐπαλλδέως is clearly demanded. No doubt the error is to be attributed to a learned but absent-minded scribe.

Most of the other readings given by Stobaeus for this excerpt are clearly the result of scribal error. No doubt ἠνείκασεν for ἠνείκακεν is caused by unfamiliarity with the perfect. As often in Stobaeus we read ἔχοντας for ἐκόντας and δαί for δέ. Of course τινα for τίνα is late, and the result of misunderstanding of the text. Perhaps εἴποιμεν for εἴπαιμεν is an attempt to correct Plato. The omission of τὰ before μὴ ὄντα is clearly accidental. Probably δεῖ γὰρ became λέγε through misreading of an uncial exemplar. Presumably these errors are later than Stobaeus.

On the other hand, πῶς λέγεις εἶναι for πῶς εἶναι is clearly an attempt to interpret an admittedly compactly worded section of the dialogue. This may be attributable either to Stobaeus or to his source.

Burnet accepts Stobaeus' reading, οὕτως· τὰ ἐναντῖα for

τῶν αὐτῶν in 240D. This is possible, but the reading of the manuscript tradition of Plato is also acceptable. Stobaeus' reading κατὰ ταῦτα is of course similar to the reading of Pl.(T), although the latter is incorrectly accented.

The following instances of partial agreement may be recorded:

St., Pl.(W) ἀπορρίζοντες πῶς γὰρ ἔν ἄλλως	Pl.(cet.) ἀπορρίσαντες πῶς γὰρ ἔν ἄλλος	(240C) (240E)
St., Pl.(T) περί τὸ φάντασμα	Pl.(B) ¹ περί τὸ φᾶσμα	(240D)
St., Pl.(TW) ὁρᾷς γοῦν ὅτι	Pl.(B) ὅτι	(240C)
St., Pl.(cet.) πότερον ψευδῆ τὰ μὴ ὄντα δοξάζειν (τὰ om. St.)	Pl.(W) πότερα ψευδῆ δοξάζειν τὰ μὴ ὄντα	(240D)
St., Pl.(cet.) ψεύσεται ποτέ τις τι	Pl.(T) ψεύσεται ποτέ τις	(240E)

It could be argued that in reading ἀπορρίζοντες for ἀπορρίσαντες, Stobaeus shares an erroneous reading with Pl.(W). This coincidence, however, is inconclusive. Since φάντασμα is apparently more common in the Hellenistic period, if we may judge from the citations given by Liddell-Scott-Jones under the respective words, pp. 1916 and 1919, we may perhaps regard φάντασμα as an error shared by Stobaeus and Pl.(T). This again is inconclusive. We may have here another case in which the manuscript used by Stobaeus or his source is not closely related to any of our surviving manuscripts.

¹ According to his table of sigla, Burnet does not record the readings of W when they are in agreement with B.

28) Plato, Soph. 260BC = St. iii.12.24 (10½ lines, SMA)

St.
τὸ μὲν μὴ ὅν
ἅπαντα διδύκη

Pl.
τὸ μὲν ὅτι μὴ ὅν
πάντα διδύκη

It will be noted that in S this excerpt directly follows the preceding. The discrepancies against the manuscript tradition of Plato are few. As often, Stobaeus or his source omits an initial particle, in this case ὅτι. Stobaeus seems to prefer ἅμας to πάντες.

There is also one reading in which Stobaeus agrees with the other manuscripts of Plato against Pl.(W):

St., Pl.(cet.)
γένος ὅν διεισὶν (γένος διεισὶν T)

Pl.(W)
γένος ὅν ἐπεισὶν

This would scarcely give warrant for any theory about the manuscript affinities of Stobaeus' text for this excerpt.

While more examples could be given from Stobaeus' excerpts from the Sophistes, those given above are sufficiently representative to allow some general conclusions to be drawn. We may then discuss the quotations from Plato and Xenophon as a whole, since these form a group.

In the first place, Stobaeus' text for the Sophistes contains a shockingly large number of scribal errors. These should for the most part be ascribed not to Stobaeus, but to deficiencies in his sources or to errors arising within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. The vast majority of the variant readings in Stobaeus can be explained in this way.

It should be noted that the quality of text in the excerpts in Stobaeus from the Sophistes is very uneven in that regard. We may compare in this respect the text of Soph. 219A-221C = St. iv.18a.6, for

which Stobaeus gives 36 variants in 82½ lines, therefore approximately a variant for every two lines, with the text of Soph. 235C-236C = St. iv.18a.7, immediately following, for which Stobaeus gives eight variants in 33 lines, therefore one variant for every four lines. While such variable factors as scribal fatigue undoubtedly contributed, it would be remarkable if this difference were not also in part attributable to an unevenness in the quality of Stobaeus' sources. If so, then it is implausible that Stobaeus was indebted for all of his excerpts for the Sophistes to his own reading.

Some of the variants can most plausibly be explained as resulting from deliberate alteration of the text. That this is the case is especially clear with respect to the suppression of material connecting an excerpt to its context. This may include the removal of a connecting particle, but may also include the excision of a sentence or a part of a sentence as in Plato, Soph. 240C-241A = St. iii.12.23. Here again the practice in Stobaeus is quite varied, and suggests a variety of sources. In other cases there is apparently an attempt to emend the text. Such an attempt would perhaps be more easily ascribed either to Stobaeus or to his source than to a scribe. Some substitutions, such as $\delta\alpha\varsigma$ for $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$, are so frequent as to be almost regular in Stobaeus.

Finally there are a few instances in which Stobaeus gives a convincing alternate reading found in none of the major manuscripts. Since Stobaeus' text would be, either directly or ultimately, based on a manuscript far older than any of the surviving manuscripts of Plato, it would be surprising if this were not the case. In this respect, however, caution seems to be indicated in those cases in which the

manuscript tradition of Plato offers a viable alternative, since the possibility always exists that the reading in Stobaeus represents either an attempt at emending the text or an accidental substitution caused by distraction.

In addition, Stobaeus will frequently be found to support one or more of the ancient manuscripts of Plato against the others. In one of the excerpts, St. ii.31.129 = Soph. 227D-230E, there was a very clear tendency to support the readings of Pl.(W); unfortunately, in this case, Stobaeus is represented only by the text of L, which, as we have seen, above, pp. 221-225, is sometimes interpolated from the other manuscripts. In the other cases it was not possible to demonstrate an affinity between the text given by Stobaeus and that of any of our other manuscripts of Plato. While there were a few instances in which the text of Stobaeus agreed in error with Pl.(W), these instances are neither sufficiently numerous nor sufficiently striking to allow positive conclusions to be drawn.

Thus in establishing the text of the Sophistes, Stobaeus must be used with extreme caution. While readings in Stobaeus frequently support readings from other manuscripts of the Sophistes, and indeed occasionally give correct readings which are otherwise unattested, it is also highly susceptible to scribal errors of all sorts, and indeed is occasionally deliberately altered by Stobaeus and his source.

In this respect there is little difference between Stobaeus' text for the Sophistes and his text for the Timaeus. Hence we may be justified in supposing that what was said about Stobaeus' treatment of those two dialogues is likely to be true about his treatment of Plato

generally. Because of the difference in the treatment of individual excerpts, we may conclude that Stobaeus did not gather all of his excerpts from Plato from a single source, for example, from his own personal reading of Plato. This does not, of course, rule out the possibility that Stobaeus gathered some of these excerpts from his own reading. However, it would seem likely that in the majority of cases Stobaeus gathered his excerpts of Plato from other anthologies.

We may at this time cite the findings of E. Bickel.¹ Bickel's purpose in studying the excerpts from the Phaedo in Stobaeus was to determine whether Schanz was correct in deriving all of the manuscripts of Plato from a single Byzantine archetype.² In order to investigate this problem, Bickel compared the readings from Stobaeus given in Wachsmuth and Hense's edition with the readings from the manuscript tradition of Plato given by the collations of Bekker and Schanz.³ Unfortunately these did not include two manuscripts to which Burnet attaches a great deal of importance, T (cod. Venetus Append. Class. 4, cod. 1), and W (cod. Vindobonensis 54, Suppl. phil. Gr. 7). However, of the manuscripts which he does cite, the readings of family E, that is, Schanz' E and Bekker's ACEHJL, tend to follow the readings of Burnet's T, while Bekker's ΔΓs frequently support the peculiar readings of Burnet's W. Therefore at least a rough comparison is possible.

According to Bickel, there are at least four sources for Stobaeus'

¹E. Bickel, "De Ioannis Stobaei excerptis Platoniciis," Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, Suppl. Bd. XXVIII (1903) 405-501.

²Ibid., p. 410.

³Ibid., p. 415.

excerpts.¹ One of these shares many striking errors with family E noted above, therefore also with Burnet's T. This includes St. 1.50.36 = Pl. Phaedo 60B-C and St. 1.49.7-9 = Pl. Phaedo 69E-70B, 70C-71A, 71C-72A, 78B-C, 79A-80B.² For this last group of excerpts Bickel is embarrassed by four apparently correct readings appearing in Stobaeus where his family E and BCD share common errors;³ however, these instances, as he himself admits, are scarcely conclusive.⁴ (None of the four cases which he noted⁵ were even included in the apparatus by Burnet who, however, frequently cites readings from Stobaeus.) Two excerpts, 1.49.13 = Pl. Phaedo 91E-95A and 1.49.58 = Pl. Phaedo 107B-114D, seem closely related to BCD, but especially to C, which Burnet rarely cites.⁶ A third group, 1.49.14-16 = Pl. Phaedo 95E-96C, 99E-100A, and 105C-107A, is related, though less closely than the first, to Bekker's ACEHJL; for the first two of these, Stobaeus' readings are very closely related to Bekker's Γ, a manuscript which does not appear in Burnet's apparatus;⁷ after 102, according to Bickel following Schanz, this manuscript is drawn from Bekker's G.⁸ The fourth group, St. 1.49.56,57 = Plato, Phaedo 63B-C and 80D-82C, seems to be related to no surviving manuscript.⁹

Relatively few of the readings peculiar to Stobaeus seem likely

¹Ibid., p. 477.

²Ibid., pp. 422, 437.

³Ibid., p. 438.

⁴Ibid., pp. 438 f.

⁵Ibid., p. 438.

⁶Ibid., pp. 450, 477.

⁷Ibid., pp. 455 ff.

⁸Ibid., p. 456 f.

⁹Ibid., p. 462.

to Bickel to be anything other than errors. (As has already been noted, even some readings which he does concede to be correct do not meet the approval of Burnet.) Thus the main value of Stobaeus' readings from the Phaedo, according to Bickel, is that, by comparing his readings with the readings of some of the later Plato manuscripts, we are often able to determine that these manuscripts witness to a relatively earlier textual tradition, so that the hypothesis of a Byzantine archetype is improbable,¹ although not conclusively disproven.²

The treatment of the text of Plato in Stobaeus seems to differ only in degree from his treatment of the text of Xenophon. Since there are relatively fewer variant readings in the text of Stobaeus against the text of Xenophon, we may conclude that Stobaeus' text of Xenophon goes back to a manuscript tradition not very different from our own. This need not imply that Stobaeus therefore relied on his own reading for his text of Xenophon; in one case, as we have seen, a coincidence between the text of Stobaeus and the text of the corresponding passage of Eusebius makes it probable that he did not.³

The treatment of Xenophon and the treatment of Plato in Stobaeus have at least this in common, that there is relatively few instances in which there is evidence of deliberate changes in the text. On the other hand, there is, with respect to the text of the excerpts cited in Stobaeus from both authors, some indication that scepticism is in order.

¹Ibid., pp. 489 ff.

²Ibid., pp. 485 ff.

³Above, p. 210 f.

4. Herodotus, Homer, and Theocritus

While it would be possible to treat Stobaeus' excerpts from Herodotus in the same way, this would not be justified in terms of my present purpose. A few general observations, however, would perhaps be helpful.

First, it is scarcely surprising that Herodotus' Ionic Greek is frequently Atticized in Stobaeus. Thus ν moveables are frequently introduced where they would be expected in Attic Greek, $-\sigma\sigma-$ frequently is changed to $-\tau\tau-$, $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\pi\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{o}\nu$ become, respectively, $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\varsigma$ and $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}$, $\zeta\acute{o}\eta$ becomes $\zeta\omega\eta$, and occasionally $\sigma\epsilon\omega\upsilon\tau-$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\omega\upsilon\tau-$ becomes $\sigma\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau-$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau-$ as in Attic. In addition, contractions frequently intrude where they would be expected in Attic Greek. These tendencies are of course present, although perhaps to a lesser degree, in the manuscripts of Herodotus.

There are, however, in addition, deliberate alterations of the text in Stobaeus. These take a variety of forms. Herodotus vii.49 as quoted in Stob. iv.13.31 is given a context by the introduction of the name of the speaker: $\delta\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{'Αρταβανος}\ \acute{\alpha}\mu\epsilon\sigma\beta\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\nu$. The retention of the $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in this case is surprising, since it refers to the larger context in Stobaeus. In this same excerpt, the words $\omicron\upsilon\delta\alpha\mu\acute{o}\theta\iota$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega\ \epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\alpha}\mu\iota$ are omitted in Stobaeus, thus giving to Stobaeus' version the form of a timeless truth rather than of an opinion expressed by Artabanus. The same effect is achieved in Stobaeus' citation of Her. vii.102 = St. iii.7.59, which Stobaeus introduces by the words $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \Delta\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$. 'Επείδῃ rather than the original $\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \eta\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\ \Delta\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon$. $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\upsilon$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\eta$, thus leaving nothing to indicate that the words

in question were once part of a larger context. Similarly in Her. vii. 160.1 as cited in St. iii.20.44, the words ὃ ξείνς Σπαρτιῆτα are omitted so as to eliminate all traces of the context in which the words were spoken. In iii.19.19, however, the same words are quoted, but with the words in question retained.

It is highly likely that Stobaeus has received at least some of his quotations from Herodotus, if not all, from a number of anthologies. This is shown not only by the fact that Her. vii.160.1 is cited twice in two successive chapters, in one case with a deliberate alteration, in the other case without, but also by the treatment of Her. vii.44-46 in Stobaeus, which is quoted in full in iv.34.73 (SMA, 24½ lines), as well as in part from Her. vii.46.1b in St. iv.53.40 (15 lines, MA) and from Her. vii.46.3b in iv.34.61 (5 lines, SMA). It may perhaps be useful to set out in tabular form the variant readings given by Stobaeus for this passage:

29) Her. vii.44-46 = St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40, iv.34.61

St. iv.34.73	προεξέδρη λιβου	
Her.	προεξέδρη λιβου λευκοῦ	(44)

St. iv.34.73	οὐ. ἐποίησαν δὲ . . . καὶ τῷ στρατῷ,	5 lines.
--------------	--------------------------------------	----------

St. iv.34.73	ὥς δὲ ἔωρα	
Her.	ὥς δὲ ἔωρα	(45)

St. iv.34.73	ὁ πατρώιος (S; πατῶος MATr.)	(46.1)
Her.	ὁ πατρως (πατρος R)	

St. iv.34.73	οὗτος οὖν ἀνὴρ	
Her.	οὗτος ἀνὴρ (ἀνὴρ SV)	

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40	ὥς πολὺ ἀλλήλων	
Her.	ὥς πολλὸν ἀλλήλων (πολὺ L)	

St. iv.34.73 ἐργάσαιο (ἔργα σα ὅ MA)

St. iv.53.40 ἔργα σα ὅ

Her. ἐργάσαιο

St. iv.34.73 μακαρίσας γὰρ ἑωυτὸν (ἑαυτὸν M)

Her., St. iv.53.40 μακαρίσας γὰρ σεωυτὸν (ἑωυτὸν Her.(C¹))

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 ὁ δὲ εἶπεν

Her. ὁ δὲ εἶπε

(46.2)

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 κατοικτεῖται

Her. κατοικτῖται (κατοικτεῖται L)

St. iv.34.73 εἰ τοῦτων γε ὕντων

St. iv.53.40 εἰς τοῦτων γε ἔδντων

Her. εἰ τοῦτων γε ἔδντων

St. iv.34.73 οὐδεὶς ἐς ἑκαστον ἔτος (ἑκατὸν Tt.)

Her., St. iv.53.40 οὐδεὶς ἐς ἑκατοστὸν ἔτος (οὐδ' εἰς St.(A))

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 παρὰ τὴν λῶην

Her. παρὰ τὴν λόην (λῶην RSV)

(46.2)

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 πέφυκεν

Her. πέφυκε

(46.3)

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 καὶ οὐχὶ ἤπαξ

Her. καὶ οὐκ ἤπαξ (οὐκ d)

St. iv.34.73 τεθνάναι βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ λῆν

St. iv.53.40 τεθνάναι μᾶλλον βούλεσθαι ἢ λῆν

Her. τεθνάναι βούλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ λῶειν (λῶειν C; λῆν dP)

St. iv.34.73 αἶ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ συμπίπτουσαι

St. iv.34.61 αἶ γὰρ τοὶ συμφοραὶ προσπίπτουσαι

Her., St. iv.53.40 αἶ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ προσπίπτουσαι

St. iv.34.73, iv.34.61 συνταράττουσι

St. iv.53.40 συνταράσσουνται (συνταράττουσαι A)

Her. συνταράσσουνται (S: -άσουνται DRV; -άττουσαι dP)

St. iv.53.40 δοκεῖν εἶναι (δοκεῖ A)

Her., St. iv.34.73, iv.34.61 δοκεῖν εἶναι

St. iv.53.40 οὕτω δὲ μὲν θάνατος

Her., St. iv.34.73, iv.34.61 οὕτως δὲ μὲν θάνατος

(46.4)

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40 μοχθηρῆς ἐούσης τῆς λῶης

St. iv.34.61 μοχθηρᾶς ἐούσης τῆς λῶης

Her. μοχθηρῆς ἐούσης τῆς λῶης (λῶης SV)

St. iv.34.73, iv.53.40, iv.34.61 γέγονεν
Her. γέγονε

St. iv.34.73, iv.34.61 δ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν τεύξας τὸν αἰῶνα
Her., St. iv.53.40 δ δὲ θεὸς γλυκὺν γεύσας τὸν αἰῶνα

St. iv.34.73 φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται ἔδν (ἔδν om. HA)

St. iv.34.61 δυσξύνετος ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται αἶων (αἶων A²)

Her., St. iv.53.40 φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὑρίσκεται ἔδν

Both the similarities and the differences between the variants against Herodotus given in these three excerpts are interesting. With respect to the similarities, it will be noted that the three excerpts are in almost complete agreement with each other in errors attributable to Atticism. This includes the use of *v* moveables, as in *εἶπεν*, *γέγονεν*, and *πέφικεν*, as well as the use of Attic forms, such as *κατοικτεῖραι* for *κατοικτῖραι* (with Her.(L)), *ἰῶν* and *ἰῶης* for *ἰόην* (with Her.(RSV)) and *ἰόης* (with Her.(SV)), *ἰῶν* for *ἰόειν* (with Her.(dP)), and *οὐχί* for *οὐκί*. While errors of this sort are to be expected by Stobaeus' time, such unity in error is remarkable, and may perhaps indicate a common source. Probably that source is to be identified with the gnomological tradition, which would not be interested so much in the peculiarities of Ionic Greek as in the sentiments expressed.

Because of a large number of shared errors, then, these three excerpts go back ultimately to a common original. However, it is implausible that Stobaeus used this common source. In the first place, it is difficult to see why, if this is the case, Stobaeus cited the same excerpt twice in one chapter. If he found these excerpts in separate anthologies, the reason is obvious: Stobaeus was forgetful. In the second place, it is interesting that in each case the excerpt begins at a different place within the anecdote from Herodotus. The reason for

this is also clear: in each case the anthologist was interested principally in the profoundly pessimistic conclusion to Artabanus' speech, and therefore included as much of the preceding context as he thought necessary to provide a setting for the saying. The anthologist responsible for transmitting iv.34.61 to Stobaeus removed the whole context, and indeed obliterated all traces of it by changing αὖτε γὰρ to αὖ γὰρ τοι. In St. iv.34.73, on the other hand, the whole anecdote is preserved up to the conclusion of Artabanus' speech. Indeed, even the connecting particle δὲ is retained at the beginning of the excerpt. This again suggests a variety of sources.

Additional confirmation is given by the variants in the last section, Her. vii.46.4. In this passage an error is shared by St. iv.34.73 and iv.34.61, respectively the longest and the shortest excerpts: τεύεας is given for γεύεας. This could be either an error in copying based on the similarity of the two words in uncial or a deliberate alteration of the text;¹ whatever the case, the text as changed was presumably understood by the anthologist responsible for the excerpt iv.34.61 to mean, "but although God has made eternity sweet." The conclusion would then appear monstrous to the sensibilities of the age: "he is found to be grudging in it." Therefore he emends the passage to read, "he is found to be difficult to understand in (concerning?) it." (Αἴων for ἔδω is presumably a mere error due to itacism.) Thus in two

¹ Originally I had considered only the possibility of deliberate alteration. While I still think that such a possibility cannot be ruled out, Prof. Kingston has shown me that it is neither the only nor the most likely possibility.

stages the meaning of the passage is completely altered, since the reading given by the manuscript tradition of Herodotus would read, "but when God has given a taste of life that is sweet, he is found to be grudging in it."

The most plausible explanation of this coincidence is that the passage came down to Stobaeus in two branches, the first being the source of iv.53.40, the second being the common ancestor of the sources of iv.34.73 and iv.34.61. This second branch was then deliberately altered by the source of iv.34.61. Stobaeus cannot be held responsible for the alterations in iv.34.61, since if he were, he would have made the same intentional alteration in the last clause of iv.34.73.

If we are correct in believing that Stobaeus was indebted for this passage to three separate anthologies of varying reliability, then we must conclude that no fewer than three anthologies containing, perhaps among other things, excerpts from Herodotus, were available to Stobaeus. That being the case, we may safely say that the chances of Stobaeus having drawn any excerpt of Herodotus from his own reading are quite remote.

We may be similarly brief in our treatment of Stobaeus' excerpts from Homer. Since most of these citations are extremely brief, it is difficult to draw valid general conclusions. We find in Stobaeus some excerpts which faithfully reproduce the text of Homer, as well as excerpts in which the text of Homer is altered in a variety of ways. Occasionally scribal error is responsible:

St. iv.7.8 οὐτε τινα βεβας κλονει ξηρον οὐτε τι εινον (εξερων M; ξηρον A)
 Od. iv.690 οὐτε τινα βεβας εξασιον οὐτε τι εινον

Presumably in this case κακὸν has intruded itself into the text as a gloss. So also ἔξιστον is an error caused partly by itacism. T for Σ is perhaps more plausible if we suppose a miniscule exemplar in which the upright stroke of the T was carelessly allowed to join the horizontal stroke.

Sometimes careless quotation from memory is responsible:

St. iii.39.20 αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἰμεῖρετο ἥς γαίης καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῆσκοντα νοῆσαι (αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἰμεῖρετο Tr.) αὐτὰρ . . . ἰμεῖρετο. om. MA)
 Od. i.57-59 αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς
 ἰέμενος καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρῆσκοντα νοῆσαι
 ἥς γαίης, θανέειν ἰμεῖρεται.

This may have been wrested by Stobaeus from a passage in which Homer is paraphrased rather than quoted.

There are also instances of deliberate alteration by Stobaeus or

his source:

St. iv.17.1 οὐ μὲν γὰρ τίς ποῦ ἐστὶ κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης (ἄλλο om. SA)
 Od. viii.138 οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γὰρ τίς φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης

St. iv.39.1a ἔλθον ἐπικλῶσαι γαμέοντι τε γινομένῳ τε·
 αὐτὸν μὲν λιπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν ἐν μεγάροισιν,
 υἷας δ' αὖ πινυτοὺς τε καὶ ἔγχυσιν εἶναι ἀρστούς.
 Od. iv.207-211 βεῖτα δ' ἀργύητος γόνος ἀνέρος ψ̣ τε Κρονίων
 ἔλθον ἐπικλῶσαι γαμέοντι τε γεινομένῳ τε,
 ὥς νῦν Νέστορι δῶκε διαμπερὲς ἥματα πάντα
 αὐτὸς μὲν λιπαρῶς γηρασκέμεν ἐν μεγάροισιν,
 υἷας αὖ πινυτοὺς τε καὶ ἔγχυσιν εἶναι ἀρστούς.

(In the first line of the excerpt cited in St. iv.39.1a, the manuscripts of Stobaeus alternate between γινομένῳ and γεινομένῳ: S¹ gives γινομένῳ corrected from γεινομένῳ, and A¹ gives γεινομένῳ from γινομένῳ. In addition, A¹ gives γε as a correction for the first τε.)

The first of these alterations is very skillful; indeed, if we had not the text of Homer with which to compare it, it is very likely that it would have been accepted without question. It is to be noted

that in Stobaeus' version, the metre is left undisturbed. The effect of the alteration is, however, to transform a statement of personal preference into a timeless truth.

The second of these alterations is clumsier, since a grammatical context is lacking for ἐπικλῶσαι. In addition, the metre is disturbed in one place: the δ' inserted before οὐ changes the quantity of the last syllable of οὐδ'αυ. However, in this passage as often, every individual note is removed; Hense in his note ad loc. writes, "vides quam licenter grassatus sit gnomologus ut aliquid generali sententiae simile extunderet."

In summary, then, the quality of the text in the excerpts from Homer in Stobaeus is extremely variable. No doubt this variety in quality is at least in part attributable to the variety in quality of transmission in Stobaeus' sources.

Nor need the excerpts from Theocritus detain us long. These are noteworthy chiefly because of the difficulty within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus in getting Theocritus' literary Doric right. Thus in St. iii.20.23 = Theocr. i.15-18 we read σὺρφοδεῖν for σὺρφοδεν, ποτὶ βῖνα for ποτὶ βινί, and οὐ θέμις ἄμιν (ἄμμιν Tr.) for οὐ θέμις ἄμμιν; in iv.24d.47 = Theocr. viii.64 we read μικρὸς for μικκός; in ii.46.7 = Theocr. v. 38 we read ὥστε φαγοντί for ὥς τε φαγοντί.

There are a few variants which may be taken seriously. In St. iv.20b.60 = Theocr. iii.16, Stobaeus gives δρύμω τέ νιν ἔτρεπε while the majority of the manuscripts of Theocritus give δρύμω τέ μιν ἔτρεπε (μιν ἔτρεπε Pap.¹, A). Here Gow adopts both variants from Stobaeus into his text. In St. iv.24d.47 = Theocr. viii.63, Stobaeus gives

φεῖδευ τῶν ἀρνῶν, φεῖδευ, λύκε, τῶν ἐρῶν μεῦ (φεύγευ, λύκε A) for φεῖδευ τῶν ἐρῶν, φεῖδευ, λύκε, τῶν τοκάδων μευ. Apart from the erroneous τῶν for τῶν, Stobaeus here presents a plausible alternative text. In St. iii.16.10 = Theocr. x.55, Stobaeus gives διαπρῶν τὸ κύμινον for καταπρῶν τὸ κύμινον. Here again Stobaeus' reading is at least plausible. Finally in St. iii.20.23 = Theocr. i.15-18, Stobaeus gives ἔστι for ἔντι. Here Gow accepts Stobaeus' reading on the grounds that ἔντι is incorrect Doric. In this case, however, I fear that Stobaeus may have been correct for the wrong reason, and that ἔστι may have been inserted because it is the correct Attic reading.

In summary, then while Stobaeus' text of Theocritus occasionally provides plausible readings, it has suffered a great deal because of the linguistic difficulties which it would have presented by Stobaeus' time. There is little evidence of deliberate alteration,

5. The Encheiridion

This brings us to the selections which Stobaeus gives us from the Encheiridion of Epictetus. The variants given by Stobaeus for the Encheiridion differ both in quantity and quality from those given by Stobaeus for the authors treated above.

Apart from demonstrating the range of possibilities in Stobaeus with regard to the reliability of the transmission of texts, the conclusions which can be drawn from these excerpts from the Encheiridion are not without interest to students of the text of the Encheiridion. Therefore it seems to me most reasonable to provide a summary here, with a few examples which in my view best represent the range of difficulties

encountered in the study of Stobaeus' text of the Encheiridion. These examples are not chosen at random, as in the previous sections, but deliberately, to illustrate particular points. Because the excerpts in question are very short, it seems best to provide the complete text of the corresponding passages in Stobaeus and the Encheiridion in parallel columns, underlining the variants. As usual, a list of the relevant manuscripts of Stobaeus is given, and a commentary follows.

Variant readings from the manuscripts of Epictetus will be given selectively, after the apparatus of Schweighaeuser, when they throw light on the text given by Stobaeus. In particular the two Christian paraphrases, the one ascribed to St. Nilus, the other anonymous, under the symbols of Nil. and Par. respectively, will be cited only in those occasions in which their readings support Stobaeus' readings. In the first place, sporadic errors in individual manuscripts of Epictetus, when without parallels in Stobaeus, shed little light on our present purpose, which is to investigate the treatment of the text of the Encheiridion within Stobaeus. In the second place, geographical considerations seem to have been pre-eminent in the selection of manuscripts for Schweighaeuser's edition: all but one of the manuscripts used was located in Paris; the remaining manuscript was located in Strassburg. Perhaps consultation of other manuscripts would make the use of some of these manuscripts unnecessary. Finally, the relation of these manuscripts to each other needs to be sorted out. It is clear that Schweighaeuser's Pa, Pb, Pi, and V are quite closely related; when these agree, they will be cited under Schenkl's symbol A. Similarly Schweighaeuser's Pe, Arg, and Hal. are very closely related, and will, when they agree, be cited under Schenkl's symbol B. So also

we may cite Schweighauser's Pc and Ax under Schenkl's symbol D. However, the relation of Schweighauser's Pd, Pf, Pg, and V² to each other and to the other groups named is very complex, and needs to be clarified. Until this is done, a more exhaustive discussion of the manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion is scarcely possible.

The following is perhaps typical of the excerpts from the Encheiridion in Stobaeus:

30) Ench. 5 = St. iv.51.20 (5 lines, SA)

St.
παράσσει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
οὐ τὰ πράγματα,
ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν
πραγμάτων δόγματα.
θνήσκουσιν οὐ φοβερὸν,
ἐπεὶ καὶ λυκράται ὡς ἔν, ἦν,
ἀλλὰ τὸ δοῦναι τὸν θνήσκον
εἶναι φοβερὸν.

ὅταν οὖν ἐμποδίζωμεθα,

μηδέποτε ἄλλον αἰτιώμεθα,
ἀλλ' ἐαυτοὺς,
τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ φαῦλα δόγματα.

¹ τῶν πραγμάτων: αὐτῶν A, B, Pg.

³ δ om. Arg, Pg, H, V².

⁵ ἐκεῖνο . . . ἐστὶ om. B, Pat.

Ench.
παράσσει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους
οὐ τὰ πράγματα,
ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν
πραγμάτων¹ δόγματα.
οἷον δὲ θάνατος οὐδὲν⁴ δεινόν, (5)
ἐπεὶ καὶ λυκράται ὡς ἐφαίνετο,
ἀλλὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ
θανάτου διότι δεινόν,
ἐκεῖνο τὸ δεινόν ἐστίν.⁵
ὅταν οὖν ἐμποδίζωμεθα
ἢ παρασώμεθα ἢ λυπώμεθα,⁶ (10)
μηδέποτε ἄλλον αἰτιώμεθα,
ἀλλ' ἐαυτοὺς,
τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ ἐαυτῶν δόγματα.

² οἷον om. Nil.

⁴ οὐδὲν: οὐ Nil.

⁶ ἢ λυπώμεθα om. Arg.

These variants are striking both in their quality and in their quantity. With respect to quantity, it can be seen at a glance from the table above that almost half of the words appearing in the text of the Encheiridion are either altered or omitted in the text of Stobaeus. This is an unusually large number of variants for Stobaeus generally, but not, as we shall see, for his text of the Encheiridion. It would be very surprising if this difference in the quality of the text were not

attributable to the source used by Stobaeus for his excerpts from the Encheiridion.

However, very few of these variant readings can simply be called errors. To be sure, the omission of words corresponding to $\text{ἐκεῖνο τὸ δεινὸν ἔστι}$ in line 9 can be attributed to an ancient error, since these words are missing in Ench.(B, Par.). In line 5, ὁλον δ could have been omitted through carelessness; Nil. omits the first of these, and several manuscripts the second. We may also suppose that $\text{ἡ παρασσεμμεθα ἡ λυπεμμεθα}$ were omitted accidentally because of the repeated -μμεθα .

But some of the alterations cannot easily be explained as scribal errors. For example, it is difficult to see why φοβερόν should systematically replace δεινόν as a result of mere scribal error, as in lines 5 and 8. Moreover, it is clear that Stobaeus' version for lines 7 and 8 in effect paraphrases the version of the Encheiridion; that is, the version in Stobaeus conveys precisely the same information as does the version of the Encheiridion, but in different words. Finally, φαῖλα in line 14, while not conveying the same information as ταυτῶν in the corresponding passage in the Encheiridion, could be understood as explanatory.

Thus many of the alterations in Stobaeus' text for this excerpt are not likely to have arisen as the result of manuscript corruption. Instead, the whole passage is rewritten. Two possible explanations may be considered. The first is that either Stobaeus or his source gave the passage from memory. Since the Encheiridion is relatively short, it is not impossible for it to have been committed to memory. In this case, however, the extreme unevenness of the text is surprising. The

other possibility is that the text has been deliberately rewritten. If so, then the most probable motive is a desire to simplify the text. If the omission of οἷον δ was deliberate, then death, instead of being an example, is the subject of discussion. No doubt φοβερός, while conveying the same sense as δεινός, is more common, although also more pedestrian. Stobaeus' source may have found ἀλλὰ τὸ δόγμα κτλ. too complicated for his purposes, and have substituted the corresponding expression in Stobaeus, ἀλλὰ τὸ δόξαι κτλ. Finally, the substitution of φαῦλα for ταυτῶν may be explanatory.

[31] Ench. 33.15-16 = St. iii.1.102 (9½ lines, A)

St.
 πῖ πολλὰ δὲ καὶ τὸ γέλαν ἀπέστω
 καὶ τὸ γέλωτα κινεῖν.
 ὀλισθηρὸς γὰρ ὁ τρόπος
 εἰς ἰδιωτισμὸν
 καὶ ἅμα τὴν αἰδῶ
 τὴν πρὸς σὲ τῶν πλησίων
 ἱκανὸς ἀνεῖναι καὶ διαφθεῖραι.
 καὶ ἄλλος παρῴκεται τρόπος
 ἐπισφαλὲς ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀνέσεσι,
 τὸ εἰς ἀσχρολογίας
 εὐκολῶς προαγαγεῖν τὸν πλησίον.
 ὅταν οὖν τι συμβῇ τοιοῦτον,
 ἂν μὲν εὐκαιρὸν ᾖ,
 καὶ ἐπὶ πληξὸν τῷ ἀσχρολογήσαντι.
 εἰν δὲ τοιαῦτα ἢ πᾶσι πρόσωπα
 ὥστε μὴ καιρὸν εἶναι,
 τῷ ἀποσιωπῆσαι καὶ σκυθρωπῆσαι
 καὶ ἐρυθριᾶσαι
 ὁῖος γενοῦ δυσχερεστῶν
 τῷ ῥηθέντι.

Ench.
 ἀπέστω δὲ
 καὶ τὸ γέλωτα κινεῖν.
 ὀλισθηρὸς γὰρ ὁ τρόπος¹
 εἰς ἰδιωτισμὸν
 καὶ ἅμα ἱκανὸς τὴν αἰδῶ (5)
 τὴν πρὸς σὲ τῶν πλησίων²
 ἀνεῖναι.

ἐπισφαλὲς δὲ καὶ
 τὸ εἰς ἀσχρολογίας (10)
 προελθεῖν.
 ὅταν οὖν τι συμβῇ τοιοῦτον,
 ἂν μὲν εὐκαιρὸν ᾖ,
 ἐπὶ πληξὸν³ τῷ προελθόντι.
 εἰ δὲ μὴ, (15)

τῷ γε ἀποσιωπῆσαι καὶ ἐρυθρι-
 ᾶσαι καὶ σκυθρωπῆσαι⁴
 ὁῖος γενοῦ δυσχερεστῶν
 τῷ λόγῳ.

¹τρόπος Pf, Nil., Simpl.

²πλησίων B.

³καὶ ἐπὶ πληξὸν Pa, Pg, Nil.

⁴σκυθρωπῆσαι Pa, Pd, Pg, Nil.

Here again the majority of the variants given by Stobaeus are likely to be the result of deliberate activity in Stobaeus' source. In

this excerpt, many of the changes are the result of additions. In these cases, it is difficult to know whether the author of these changes was deliberately altering the sense of the Encheiridion or whether he thought that these changes simply made clear what was already implicit. In line 1, the addition of τὸ γελᾶν has the effect of expanding the prohibition: not only is the reader to restrain himself from inciting others to laughter, but he is not to laugh himself. This is, after all, a minor step. The addition of καὶ διαφθεῖραι to ἀνεῖναι is explanatory. The substitution of καὶ ἄλλος παρδύκεται τόπος ἐπισφαλῆς ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀνέσει for ἐπισφαλὲς δὲ καὶ may have been intended to clarify the first part of lines 9 to 11, as well as to link the discussion which follows more closely to the preceding paragraph. So also ἔάν δὲ τοιαῦτα ᾗ τὸ πρόσωπα ὥστε μὴ καιρὸν εἶναι is an explanation of εἰ δὲ μὴ, giving the situation in which one might hesitate to reprove the user of obscene language. So also δῆλος γενοῦ δυσχερεστῶν τῷ βῆθεντι merely paraphrases δῆλος γίνου δυσχερεστῶν τῷ λόγῳ. The author of Stobaeus' version might have found βῆθεντι more precise, δυσχερεστῶν easier for his intended reader to understand.

However, a substantive change is introduced in line 11, where in Stobaeus' version, εὐκολῶς προαγαγεῖν τὸν πλησίον is substituted for προελθεῖν. In the version in our text of the Encheiridion, lines 9-11 merely give the general information that it is easy to descend to the use of obscene language. In Stobaeus' version, this is changed into a warning that it is easy to lead one's companion into the use of obscenity. It is difficult to see why this change was made, unless the author of Stobaeus' version did not want to lose an opportunity for admonishing

his intended reader.

Probably the variant readings of this excerpt are not to be attributed to an anthologist, whether Stobaeus or his source. If they had, it would be difficult to account for the first few words, τὰ πολλὰ δὲ καί, which link this excerpt to its context in Ench. 33.14. If this passage had been paraphrased for an anthology, it would have begun something like ἀπὸ τῶν πολλῶν τὸ γελῶν. More plausibly this excerpt first received its present form in a paraphrase of the Encheiridion. If this is the case, then the same is no doubt true for all of the excerpts of the Encheiridion in Stobaeus which share the characteristics of this one, that is, practically every one. If so, then either Stobaeus or his source depended on a paraphrase of the Encheiridion.

Before discussing the complications, we may perhaps give one more example:

32) Ench. 39 = St. iv.32a.13 (6 lines, SMA)

St.
μέτρον¹ κτήσεως τὸ σῶμα
ὥς ὁ ποῦς ὑποδήματος.
ἐὰν μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦτου σῆς,
ἔχεις τὸ μέτρον καὶ τὴν ἐπιβάραν.
ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερβῇς,
ἀφῆκας ὥς κατὰ κρημνοῦ σεαυτὸν.

οὕτω γίνεται² κατὰ χυρσον ὑπόδημα,
εἴτα πορφυρεῖν,³ εἴτα κεντητόν.
ὑπερέβη γὰρ τὴν χρεῖαν τοῦ ποδός.
τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτήσεως,
ἐὰν ὑπερβῇ σῶμα,
ὅρος οὐδεὶς ἐστίν.

St.

¹μέτρος M, μέρον M¹.

²ποφυροῦν S.

Ench.
μέτρον κτήσεως τὸ σῶμα ἐκάστῳ⁴
ὥς ὁ ποῦς ὑποδήματος.
ἐὰν μὲν οὖν⁵ ἐπὶ τοῦτου⁶ σῆς
φυλάξεις τὸ μέτρον.
ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερβῇς, (5)
ὥς κατὰ κρημνοῦ λοιπὸν ἀνάγκη
φέρεσθαι.
καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑποδήματος,
ἐὰν ὑπὲρ τὸν πόδα ὑπερβῇς,
γίνεται κατὰ χυρσον ὑπόδημα, (10)
εἴτα ποφυροῦν, εἴτα κεντητόν.

τοῦ γὰρ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον
ὅρος οὐδεὶς⁷ ἐστίν. (15)

²γίνεσθαι Tr.

Ench.

⁴ἐκδοσίου Pb, Ax, Nil.⁶τοῦτου Pa, Pd, Pf, Nil: τοῦτοισι cet.⁵οὐν om. Arg, Par.

τοῦδε εἰς Pg; οὐδεῖς Nil(ed. Rom.)

The major difference between these two versions is in the handling of the metaphor. In the version in our manuscripts of the Encheiridion, the application is left largely to the intelligence of the reader. To be sure, the body and its possessions is explicitly compared to the foot and its shoe in line 1 and 2: μέτρον κτήσεως τὸ σῶμα ἐκδοσίῳ ὥς ὁ ποὺς ὑποδήματος. But in the further working out of this simile the reader is left to draw his own conclusions: "just as with respect to the shoe . . .," the application being left understood. But in the version used by Stobaeus, nothing is left to the intelligence of the reader. First, the analogy of the foot is made not as a simile, but as an independent point in the argument. Then explicit application is made to the body: τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτήσεως, ἔδν ὑπερβῇ σῶμα. The admittedly modest leap of the imagination demanded in versions in our Encheiridion is simply not required in the version used by Stobaeus.

Our discussion is complicated greatly by two of our manuscripts, L and Br. It will be remembered that these are later anthologies drawing on Stobaeus. It will also be remembered that for one excerpt, discussed above, p.221 ff, L corrected the text of Stobaeus against a manuscript of Plato's Timaeus.

33) Ench. 15 = St. iii.5.20 (6 lines, MATrLBr + 4 lines, LBr)

St.(MATr)

ἐν συμποσίῳ σε οὕτω δεῖ
ἀναστρέφειν.

περιφερόμενον τι γέγονε κατὰ σε.

ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα
μετρίως ἔφαι.

Ench., St.(LBr)

μνήσομαι, ὅτι ὥς ἐν συμποσίῳ
σε δεῖ ἀναστρέφειν.περιφερόμενον γέγονε τι⁴ κατὰ σε.ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα
κοσμίως μετέλαβε.

(5)

St. (MATr)

παρέρχεται· μὴ κάτεχε.

οὕτω ἐλήλυθε·

ἀλλὰ² ἐκδέχου κατὰ σέ

γενέσθαι αὐτό.

οὕτω πρὸς πλοῦτον, οὕτω πρὸς ἀρχάς,

οὕτω πρὸς γάμον·

καὶ ἔση ἄξιός

συμπότης τῶν θεῶν.

Ench., St. (LBr)

παρέρχεται· μὴ κάτεχε.

οὕτω ἦκει·

ἀλλὰ περίμενε, μέχρις ἵν

γένηται κατὰ σέ.

οὕτω πρὸς τέκνα, οὕτω πρὸς (10)

γυναῖκα, οὕτω πρὸς ἀρχάς,

οὕτω πρὸς πλοῦτον·

καὶ ἔση ποτὲ ἄξιός

τῶν θεῶν συμπότης.

ἵν δὲ καὶ παρατεθέντων κτλ. (15).

St.

¹ἐφαῖναι M.²ἀλλ' Ττ.

Ench.

³ἐν συμποσίῳ σε οὕτω δεῖ ἀναστρέφεσθαι et LBr.⁴τι γέγονε Pf, Nil, L.⁵μετρίως ἔφασαι Br(mg); καταλαβε Pgi μετῴραλε Pa.

In this excerpt, apart from the first line, LBr are in perfect agreement with the main manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion. Because of the extensive discrepancies between the two versions, only two possibilities can be considered: either the text in LBr has been corrected against the manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion, or the interesting variants in MATr are to be ascribed to the ancestor of those manuscripts, LBr giving the correct text of Stobaeus. The first of these makes more sense. We may easily infer from the number of manuscripts as well as from the two paraphrases of the Encheiridion which have come down to us that the Encheiridion was sufficiently popular that it is not at all difficult to imagine a scribe who knew better writing in the correct version between the lines of his copy of Stobaeus. Moreover, since the Encheiridion is reasonably brief, collation would be relatively easy. On the other hand, the variations given by MATr for this excerpt are clearly for the most part deliberate, and are moreover, as in the other cases discussed, clearly the product of a deliberate revision of the

same nature as those given in the other excerpts from the Encheiridion discussed above. Therefore it seems likely in this case that LBr are corrected from the manuscripts of the Encheiridion.

The most striking feature of this particular excerpt is that in Stobaeus' version what was simile becomes the main subject: that is, in the version given by the manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion we are told to behave as if we were at a banquet, whereas in the version given in Stobaeus we are taught how to behave at a banquet. Thus it is assumed that the reader of Stobaeus' version would not necessarily know this. There are also a few instances of simplification: ἐλήλυθε for ἦκει in line 7, ἀλλὰ ἐκδέχου κατὰ σέ γενέσθαι αὐτό for ἀλλὰ περίμενε, μέχρις ὅν γένηται κατὰ σέ in lines 8 and 9. So also in line 5, κοσμίως μετέλαβε becomes μετρίως ἔφαται.

These excerpts then, as well as several other excerpts, contain a simplified paraphrase of the Encheiridion. While it is not possible to be absolutely certain, it seems probably to me that these changes were made not by an anthologist but by someone who wanted to put out a paraphrase of the Encheiridion, presumably for those for whom the version transmitted in our manuscripts was thought to be too difficult, therefore most probably for the young.

The following excerpts do not illustrate the tendencies of that paraphrase:

34) Ench. 8 = St. 11.8.23 (2 lines, FP; no lemma; the text follows directly on Ench. 9 = St. 11.8.22

St.

μὴ ἴηται τὰ γινόμενα
γίγνεσθαι ὥς θέλεις,¹
ἀλλὰ θελε ὥς τὰ γινόμενα γίγνεται,
καὶ εὐρήσεις.

Ench.

μὴ ἴηται τὰ γινόμενα
γίγνεσθαι ὥς θέλεις,
ἀλλὰ θελε² τὰ γινόμενα ὥς γίγνεται,³
καὶ εὐρήσεις.⁴

St. 1¹θελῆς P.

Ench.

2²ἀλλὰ θέλειν B.

3³τὰ γινόμενα ὥς γίνεται, A, D, P^f, P^g, V² ὥς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεται
B; τὰ γινόμενα γίνεσθαι ὥς γίνεται Pd, Nil(ed. Rom.).

4⁴εὐροήσεις: εὐ ποιήσεις A^g P^c, P^e, P^c, P^g, V² (A^g, P^g εὐροήσεις);
εὐδαιμονήσεις Nil.; ἀλύπως διδῆεις⁵ Par.

In this excerpt we note a tendency to Atticize the Encheiridion.

In addition the difficult εὐροήσεις is replaced by εὐρήσεις, which resembles it in appearance. If the substitution had been made deliberately, no doubt a reading similar to that in Nil. or Par. would have been given. In line 3, ἀλλὰ θέλε ὥς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεται, Stobaeus gives a text similar to that given in B, with this exception, that B erroneously reads θέλειν for θέλε.

35) Ench. 9 = St. 11.8.22 (2½ lines, FP)

St.

νόσος σώματος ἐστὶν ἐμπόδιον,
προαιρέσεως δὲ οὐκ ἐστίν,
ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὴ θέλῃ.¹
χῶλωσις σκέλους ἐστὶν ἐμπόδιον,

σὼν δ' οὐκ

Ench.

νόσος σώματος ἐστὶν ἐμπόδιον,
προαιρέσεως δὲ οὐ,
ἐὰν μὴ αὐτὴ αὐτὴ θέλῃ.
χῶλανσις² σκέλους ἐστὶν ἐμπόδιον,
προαιρέσεως δὲ οὐ. (5)

καὶ τοῦτο ἐφ' ἐκάστου
τῶν ἐμπιπτόντων ἐπὶ λέγει·
εὐρήσεις γὰρ αὐτὸ
ἄλλου τινὸς ἐμπόδιον,³
σὼν δὲ οὐ. (10)

St.

1¹θελήσῃ P.

Ench.

2²χῶλωσις P^c, P^e, P^g, Nil., Par.

3³προαιρέσεως δὲ οὐ. καὶ τοῦτο . . . ἐμπόδιον om. Nil.

None of these alterations is likely to be deliberate. In line 4, χῶλωσις is well attested within the manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion. Similarity in pronunciation is no doubt responsible for σὼν in place of σὸν. The omission of lines 5 to 9, although found also

in Nil., is no doubt an error caused by homoeoteleuton; in any case, Stobaeus' reading does not make sense. Even οὐκ ἔστιν for οὐ could easily be a simple substitution caused by absence of mind.

These two excerpts were presumably found unchanged by Stobaeus. If they had been part of the paraphrase responsible for the variants noted in the other excerpts from the Encheiridion, no doubt at least εὐροήσεις in Ench. 9 = St. 11.8, 22 would have been changed, as in Par. and Nil. However, the erroneous reading of Stobaeus is definitely a misreading of εὐροήσεις.

It is of course conceivable that Stobaeus' version was corrected against the text of the Encheiridion within the manuscript tradition of FP. Complication for such a hypothesis is however given in Stobaeus' version of Ench. 17 = St. 11.8.27, therefore in the same chapter of Stobaeus:

36) Ench. 17 = St. 11.8.27 (5½ lines, FP)

St.
μνήμησο ὅτι ὑποκρίτης
εἰ δράματος,
οἶον εἰν θέλη¹ ὁ διδασκαλός
ἢν βραχύ, βραχέος·
ἢν μακρόν, μακροῦ·
ἢν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνασθαι θέλη,
τοῦτον ἵνα καλῶς ὑποκρίνη·
σὸν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ δοθὲν
πρόσωπον ὑποκρίνασθαι καλῶς·
ἐκλέξασθαι δὲ τὸ πρόσωπον ἄλλου.

Ench.
μνήμησο ὅτι ὑποκρίτης
εἰ δράματος,
οἶον² ἢν θέλη ὁ διδασκαλός·
ἢν βραχύ, βραχέος·
ἢν μακρόν, μακροῦ· (5)
ἢν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνασθαι σε θέλη,
ἵνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐρωῶς ὑποκρίνη·
σὸν γὰρ τοῦτ' ἔστι, τὸ δοθὲν
ὑποκρίνασθαι πρόσωπον⁴ καλῶς·
ἐκλέξασθαι δ' αὐτὸ ἄλλου. (10)

St.
¹ θελήση F.

² σὴν F.

Ench.
³ οἶον B, Pc.

⁴ πρόσωπον ὑποκρίνασθαι Pg, Nil

Two alterations in this excerpt are clearly to be ascribed to a deliberate paraphrase of the text. In line 7, Stobaeus' reading, τοῦτον

ἔνα καλῶς, simplifies the reading of the Encheiridion; perhaps here the ἔνα was displaced accidentally within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. In line 10, αὐτὸ is replaced by τὸ πρόσωπον in Stobaeus, presumably to clarify the sentence. These alterations are not as numerous as those in some of the excerpts discussed above, but they are similar in kind, and may be ascribed to the same source.

Since the last excerpt discussed and the two previous to it are in the same chapter of Stobaeus, and in fact are separated only by three short excerpts (36 lines, including lemmata, in Wachsmuth's text), yet show very different tendencies, it seems probable that they were taken from two separate sources. These sources were probably anthologies. If Stobaeus had taken any of these excerpts directly from the Encheiridion, it is scarcely likely that he would have failed to note the difference in quality in his two sources. Even allowing for laziness, the Encheiridion is not so large that this would be out of the question. Moreover, given that this particular chapter is entitled περὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, one would have expected Stobaeus, if he had consulted a manuscript of the Encheiridion, to have used chapter one, which begins, τῶν ὄντων τὸ μὲν ἔστιν ἐφ' ἡμῖν κτλ. The principle of laziness alone would have dictated such a choice.

6. Conclusions

The treatment of classical authors in Stobaeus is extremely variable. When we are able to control the text by means of another manuscript tradition, we find no single tendency within Stobaeus, but a variety of tendencies. In the case of Xenophon's Memorabilia, the text is

transmitted by Stobaeus in relatively good condition. In the case of the Encheiridion of Epictetus, on the other hand, the text transmitted by Stobaeus not only is unreliable, but has in most excerpts been willfully altered. Presumably this difference goes back to a difference in the quality of Stobaeus' sources for the respective authors. This difference in quality can also occur within the excerpts of a single author, as in the case of the Encheiridion.¹ If so, then in such a case it is likely that Stobaeus has used more than one source for that particular author. In the case of the excerpts from Herodotus and the Encheiridion, the sources used were almost certainly in every instance other anthologies. This is likely to be the case with respect to most of the excerpts from the other authors discussed.

In general, it may be said that Stobaeus' text is apt to be untrustworthy. Only occasionally does Stobaeus present a plausible reading which is not attested in the manuscript tradition of the author in question. Hence we should treat with reserve those Stobaeian excerpts for which no other manuscript tradition exists. They must be proven to be reliable.

¹For a similar variety in quality of transmission within the Stobaeian fragments of Menander see W. Götter, op. cit., discussed above, pp.

CHAPTER FOUR

STOBAEUS' TREATMENT OF THE HERMETIC LITERATURE

We may now discuss Stobaeus' treatment of the Hermetic literature. Two questions are involved in this discussion. The first concerns the accuracy of Stobaeus' text. Is the text of the Hermetic excerpts in Stobaeus relatively free of scribal error? The second concerns the reliability of these fragments as evidence for the Hermetic movement. To what extent do these fragments either give us or permit us to form a reliable picture of the movement responsible for the Hermetic literature.

The previous chapter provides a useful background for answering this question, but not a clear prescription. Stobaeus' treatment of classical authors is extremely variable, as we have seen. In fact, only two general rules can be formed, the first, that the manuscripts of Stobaeus are always prone to error (although certainly not more so than the manuscripts used by the compiler for some parts of the Corpus Hermeticum), and the second, that Stobaeus is never better than his source.

More useful background is given by Part I of this dissertation. Three general rules can be given concerning the treatment of the text of the Hermetic documents given in the Corpus Hermeticum, the first, that the reliability of the manuscript tradition varies considerably from tractate to tractate, the second, that there is no reason to suppose deliberate tampering on the part of the compiler, and the third, that no evidence was brought to light to suggest that the text was deliberately

altered in any of the tractates before compilation. However, it is recognized that evidence of deliberate tampering is very difficult to uncover.

Now the text of the fragments of C. H. ii, iv, and x given by Stobaeus differs strikingly, as we shall see, from the text given in the manuscripts of the Corpus. Already Reitzenstein had protested against Parthey's attempt to derive a text for those three tractates ~~by~~ combining the readings of those two texts.¹ In fact, as we shall see, we have two different editions of the same text.

If that is so, then it is important that we try to determine as precisely as possible the relationship between those two versions. In order to do this, it will be necessary to examine those two versions passage by passage, discussing each variant individually to consider which, if any, has the best claim to be regarded as most faithfully representing the original text. The hypothesis will be advanced that the text of these tractates given in Stobaeus represents a deliberate rewriting of the tractates in question. In the first place, it will be seen that some doctrines central to Hermetism are systematically excluded. The most notable of these is the doctrine of apotheosis, which, as we have seen, is central to the typical Hermetic tractates.² In the second place, it will be seen that in the Stobaeian fragments there are frequent attempts

¹Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 209 f.

²See the discussion of x.7.11,12, below p. 313 and the discussion of x.19.2-4, below, p. 325 f.

to tidy up the style of Hermes, often at the expense of the coherence of the argument.¹

Probably the more striking of the variant readings given by Stobaeus for these tractates are to be ascribed not to Stobaeus, nor to scribes within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus, but to his source. If Stobaeus himself had been responsible for these changes, it is to be supposed that the treatment of classical authors in Stobaeus would be more uniform. As it happens, however, as we have seen from the small sample discussed in the previous chapter, the treatment of classical authors in Stobaeus is extremely variable both in the frequency and in the kind of variants given. This variability must be ascribed to Stobaeus' sources.

In order to examine this question more thoroughly, I have, relying on the apparatus of Nock for the Corpus Hermeticum and of Wachsmuth for the Stobaeian fragments, attempted to get behind those two critical texts to the text of the two manuscript traditions. In addition, I have provided verse numberings within the chapters, in order to facilitate the comparison of individual readings. Where appropriate, these verses will be followed by a discussion of the variants. An attempt will be made to determine which variants are to be ascribed to mere errors, and which are the result of deliberate alteration of the text on

¹Frequently, as will be seen, the evidence in this respect is elusive and ambiguous. However, since the style of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum differs extensively from tractate to tractate, while the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus tend to be relatively homogenous, it is probable that in most cases where the evidence is ambiguous, it is the reading in Stobaeus which has been altered.

the part of one or both of our sources. It is to be hoped that it will, at a later date, be possible on the basis of this discussion, to provide a new critical edition of C. H. ii, iv, and x.

St. 1.18.2

C. H. ii

1.1 - Πάν τὸ κινούμενον, ὃ Ἀσκληπιέ, οὐκ ἔν τινι κινεῖται καὶ ὑπὸ τινος;

- Μάλιστα.

1.2 - Οὐκ ἀνάγκη δὲ μεῖζον εἶναι ἔν ᾧ κινεῖται τὸ κινούμενον; (μεζζων P¹)

- Ἀνάγκη.

Wachsmuth on the advice of Patritius emends this last to read, <τὸ> ἔν ᾧ κινεῖται <ῆ> τὸ κινούμενον. While this reading would make better sense, it may be that Stobaeus' reading ought to be retained, since it is in harmony with the untutored style of the author of C. H. ii.

St. 1.18.2

C. H. ii

1.3 - Ἰσχυρότερον ἄρα τὸ κινοῦν τοῦ κινουμένου;

- Ἰσχυρότερον γάρ.

1.4 - Ἐναντίαν δὲ ἔχειν φύσιν ἀνάγκη τῇν ἔν ᾧ κινεῖται τῇ τοῦ κινουμένου;

- Καὶ πάνυ.

For this last, Wachsmuth, no doubt rightly, reads τὸ ἔν ᾧ κινεῖται.

St. 1.18.2

C. H. ii

2.1 - Μέγας οὖν οὗτος κόσμος, οὗ μεῖζον οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα; (μεζζων F)

- Ὁμολογῆται.

Here Patritius reads οὗτος <ὁ> κόσμος.

St. 1.18.2

C. H. ii

2.2 - Καὶ στιβαρός; πεπληρωτά; γάρ ἄλλων σωματων μεγάλων πολλῶν, μάλλον δὲ πάντων ὅσα ἔστι σώματα;

- Οὕτως ἔχει.

2.3 - Σῶμα δὲ ὁ κόσμος;

- Σῶμα.

St. 1.18.2

2.4 - Καὶ κινούμενον;

C. H. 11

3.1 - Μαλιστα.

- Πηλίκον οὖν δεῖ τὸν τόπον εἶναι
ἐν ᾧ κινεῖται καὶ ποταπὸν τὴν
φύσιν;

3.2 οὐ πολλὴ μέλλουσα, ὥστε δυνηθῇ
ῥέξασθαι τῆς φορᾶς τὴν συνέχειαν
καὶ μὴ θλιβόμενον τὸ κινούμενον
ὑπὸ τῆς στενότητος ἐπὶ σὺν τὴν
κίνησιν.

3.3 - Παμμεγεθές τι χρῆμα, ᾧ Τρισ-
μέγιστε.

4.1 - Ποταπῆς δὲ φύσεως; τῆς ἐναν-
τίας ἤρα, ᾧ Ἀσκληπιεῖ.

4.2 σῶματι δὲ ἐναντία φύσις τὸ
δύσματος.

- ὁμολογῆται.

4.3 - Ἀσώματος οὖν ὁ τόπος, τὸ
δὲ δύσματος ἢ θεῖον ἐστὶν ἢ ὁ θεός.
(ὁ om. P)

4.3 ἢ θεός, (ἢ om. AC)

As already noted, above, p. 39, C. H. 11 not only begins at a singularly unfortunate place but bears an unfortunate title, 'Ερμοῦ πρὸς τὰς λόγος καθολικός. Possible solutions to these facts were discussed above on p. 39: either some pages have dropped out, leaving the title of a previous tractate but not the contents, as Reitzenstein suggests, or the compiler of the Corpus Hermeticum has chosen a singularly poor place to begin his second treatise. Either way, the omission is not likely to have been made deliberately.

As a result of this error, however, we must depend on Stobaeus for the context of the opening sentences of C. H. 11. However, the tractate is not likely to have begun where the excerpt from Stobaeus begins. As has already been noted, Tiedemann has pointed out that a larger context is required.¹ We may suppose from the negative question

¹ Tiedemann, op. cit., p. viii; above, p. 39.

in ii.1.1 that Asclepius had just asked a foolish question.

St. i.18.2

4.4 τὸ δὲ θεῖον λέγω νῦν οὐ τὸ
γεννητόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον.
τὸν ἀγέννητον (F)

C. H. 11

4.4 τὸ θεῖον λέγω νῦν, οὐ τὸ
γεννητόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον.

Stobaeus has a δὲ which is absent in the Corpus. While this sentence would fit more smoothly into its context with δὲ retained, the δὲ is not essential. Examples of λέγω used parenthetically in the sense of "I mean" given by Liddell-Scott-Jones, s. v. λέγω III, 9, p. 1034, sometimes use, sometimes omit connecting particles.

Nock's suggestion, that δὲ had been omitted in the Corpus because it no longer had any meaning after the loss of the opening paragraphs,¹ lacks verisimilitude since the context in the Corpus makes little sense in any case. It could, however, have been omitted accidentally.

St.

C. H. 11

5.1 εἰ μὲν οὖν ἡ θεῖον, οὐσι-
πῶδες ἐστίν.

5.2 εἰ δὲ ἡ θεός, καὶ ἀνου-
σισατον γίνεται.

5.3 ἄλλως δὲ νοητόν, οὕτως
(νοητῶς, οὕτω A)

5.4 νοητὸς γὰρ πρῶτος ὁ θεός
ἐστίν ἡμῖν, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ.

5.5 τὸ γὰρ νοητόν τῷ νοοῦντι
αἰσθήσει ὑποπίπτει.

5.6 ὁ θεὸς οὐκοῦν οὐχ ἑαυτῷ νοητός.

5.7 οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο τι ἢ τοῦ νοου-
μένου ὅφ' ἑαυτοῦ νοεῖται.

6.1 ἡμῖν δὲ ἄλλο τί ἐστι.

6.2 διὰ τοῦτο ἡμῖν νοεῖται.

(ἡμῖν δὲ . . . νοεῖται om. BCM)

6.3 εἰ δὲ νοητὸς ὁ τύπος, οὐχ
ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ὁ τύπος.

6.4 εἰ δὲ καὶ ὁ θεός, οὐχ ὡς
τύπος ἀλλ' ὡς ἐνέργεια χωρητικῇ.

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xlii, intro.

St.

C. H. 11
 (εἰ δὲ καὶ ὡς AD^C; εἰ δὲ καὶ
 δ BCMD)

The textual confusion in 6.3 and 6.4, as well as Puech's proposed emendation, οὐχ ὡς θεός, ἀλλ' ὡς τόπος· εἰ δὲ καὶ ὡς θεός, has been discussed above, p. 40.

It is conceivable that 5.1 to 6.4 were omitted by Stobaeus' source simply because the material from 5.1 to 6.2 was irrelevant to the anthologist's purpose. The title of the chapter in Stobaeus containing the excerpt from 1.1 to 4.4 is περὶ κενοῦ καὶ τόπου. On the other hand, since at least the material in 6.3 and 6.4 is on topic, we may ask if their exclusion was not deliberate. As we shall see, Stobaeus' source has a tendency to omit material which discusses the nature of God.

St. i.19.2

6.5 Πᾶν τὸ κινούμενον οὐκ ἐν κινου-
 μένῳ κινεῖται· ἀλλ' ἐν ἑστῶτι.

C. H. 11

6.5 πᾶν δὲ τὸ κινούμενον οὐκ ἐν
 κινουμένῳ κινεῖται· ἀλλ' ἐν ἑστῶτι.

The removal of the δὲ in Stobaeus' version is redactional and, as noted, typical of anthologies.¹

St. i.19.2

6.6 καὶ τὸ κινεῖν δὲ ἔστηκεν, δό-
 νατον συγκινεῖσθαι.

C. H. 11

6.6 καὶ τὸ κινεῖν δὲ ἔστηκεν, δό-
 νατον γὰρ αὐτῷ συγκινεῖσθαι.

In the version in the Corpus, the words δόνατον γὰρ αὐτῷ συγκινεῖσθαι are explanatory; in the version in Stobaeus they are apparently to be taken as modifying τὸ κινεῖν. Stobaeus' reading is preferred by Nock. It is, however, possible that γὰρ αὐτῷ should be retained. While other documents cited in the Corpus Hermeticum tend to prefer to

¹See above, p. 212.

construe δδύνατον with either a bare infinitive or an accusative and infinitive, as noted above, p. 16, n. 1, it is perhaps slightly easier to account for the removal of the words γὰρ αὐτῷ by Stobaeus than to account for their insertion into the text of the Corpus Hermeticum, since δδύνατον with the bare infinitive seems to be the commoner form.

St. i.19.2

6.7 - Πῶς οὖν, ὦ Τριμέγιστε, τὰ ἐνθάδε συγκινεῖται τοῖς κινουμένοις;

C. H. ii

6.7 - Πῶς οὖν, ὦ Τριμέγιστε, τὰ ἐνθάδε συγκινεῖται τοῖς κινουμένοις;

Here Wachsmuth prefers the version of the Corpus Hermeticum, Nock the version of Stobaeus. I agree in this case with Wachsmuth. . In ii.6.5,6, Hermes had made the point that every moving thing moves within and is moved by something which does not move. Asclepius, if the reading of the Corpus is retained, objects that this is not the case, since apparently some things are in fact moved by things which themselves move. To prove his point, he refers to the spheres of the planets(αἱ πλανώμεναι), which, Hermes had said, were moved by the sphere of the fixed stars (ἡ ἀπλανὴς σφαῖρα). (No doubt this reference is to a section of this tractate which is now missing.) If on the other hand we take the reading of Stobaeus, the question is, how are things moved by things which move them? If so, then Hermes' answer in 6.9 is difficult, since it would have no reference to the question.

St. i.19.2

6.8 τὰς γὰρ σφαῖρας ἔφη τὰς πλανώμενας κινεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπλανοῦς σφαῖρας.

6.9 - Οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῇ, ὦ Ἀσκληπιέ, συγκίνησις, ἀλλ' ἀντικίνησις.
(ἀλλ' ἀντικίνησις om. P)

C. H. ii

6.8 τὰς γὰρ σφαῖρας ἔφη τὰς πλανώμενας κινεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπλανοῦς σφαῖρας.

6.9 - Οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῇ, ὦ Ἀσκληπιέ, κίνησις, ἀλλ' ἀντικίνησις.

The reading αὐτῇ for αὐτῇ is, of course, simply a misinterpretation of an unaccented text. On the other hand, we may be justified in

retaining κίνησις because of the relation between 6.9 and the previous two verses. If κίνησις is accepted, the flow of the argument, while fallacious, is clear. Asclepius has asked how the planets can be moved by the fixed stars, if everything moves inside that which does not move. Hermes answers that that is not movement, but anti-movement.¹ On the other hand, it is not surprising if Stobaeus' source, not content with this fallacious argument, should wish to emend κίνησις to συγκίνησις. The difficulty is, however, that in Stobaeus the argument as a whole makes no sense.

St. 1.19.2
6.10 οὐ γὰρ ὁμοῦς κινουῦνται, ἀλλ'
ἐναντίως ἀλλήλαις·

C. H. 11
6.10 οὐ γὰρ ὁμοῦς κινουῦνται,
ἀλλ' ἐναντίαι ἀλλήλαις· (ἐναν-
τίως B²)

In this case ἐναντίως would normally be expected; moreover, if we suppose a miniscule exemplar in which the final ζ is completely obscured, and ω is partially obscured, it is not at all difficult to see how ἐναντίως could have become ἐναντίαι. Therefore we may perhaps accept Stobaeus' reading here.

St. 1.19.2
6.11 ἡ δὲ ἐναντίως τὴν ἀντίρρι-
σιν τῆς κινήσεως ἐστῶσαν ἔχει·

C. H. 11
6.11 ἡ δὲ ἐναντίως τὴν ἀντί-
ρρισιν τῆς κινήσεως ἐστῶσαν
ἔχει· (ἔχει ἐστῶσαν A; ἔχει om.
B, ins. B^c)

The erroneous reading ἐναντίως in Stobaeus is no doubt caused by the obliteration of the last two letters of ἐναντίως by light manuscript damage.

¹See Ferguson's comment, in Scott, *op. cit.*, IV, 361 f.

St. i.19.2

7.1 ἡ γὰρ ἀντιτυπία σπάρσις πορᾶς.

C. H. ii

7.1 ἡ γὰρ ἀντιτυπία σπάρσεως
ἔστι πορᾶ.

The Corpus' reading, σπάρσεως ἔστι πορᾶ, can be explained if it is taken in conjunction with Hermes' example in ii.8.2,3. Just as the swimmer is able to make himself stand still while treading water because of the opposing movements of his hands, so the motion of the planets in opposition to the fixed stars is the "conveying of rest," that is, it causes rest. This translation is undoubtedly stilted, as is Festugière's translation of the reading offered by Stobaeus, "et cette opposition implique un point d'équilibre fixe pour le mouvement," but which, in view of the illustration in ii.8.2,3, we might translate "the standing still of movement." (Einarson, in a note given by Festugière ad loc., has "stopping of motion," which is also stilted.) Perhaps Stobaeus' source did not take into account the image of the swimmer. Apart from this image, there is little to choose between the two expressions.

St. i.19.2

7.2 διὸ καὶ πλανώμεναι σφαῖραι
ἐναντίας κινούμεναι τῇ ἀπλανεῖ,
ὅπ' ἀλλήλων τῇ ἐναντίᾳ ὑπαντήσῃ
περὶ τὴν ἐναντιότητα ἑστῶσαν
αὐτὴν ὅπ' αὐτῆς ἔξει. (αἱ πλανώμεναι P²)

C. H. ii

7.2 αἱ οὖν πλανώμεναι σφαῖραι
ἐναντίας κινούμεναι τῇ ἀπλανεῖ,
ὅπ' ἀλλήλων τῇ ἐναντίᾳ ὑπαν-
τήσῃ περὶ τὴν ἐναντιότητα
αὐτὴν ὑπὸ τῆς ἑστῶσης κινουῦνται.

Since the effect of διὸ καὶ (αἱ) is not very different from that of αἱ οὖν given by the Corpus, either reading is acceptable.

This verse as it now stands makes little sense, and perhaps never did. At any rate, the two versions are, apart from the first two words, identical up to ἐναντιότητα. The opening of the sentence is at least promising, and may be translated, "and so the spheres of the planets, being moved in opposition to the sphere of the fixed stars, . . ."

The rest of the sentence, however, seems chaotic. The text of the Cor-
pas at least offers a better basis for reconstruction, since it pro-
 vides a verb for the subject of the sentence, so that we may continue:
 "and so the spheres of the planets, being moved in opposition to the
 sphere of the fixed stars, are moved" But here we have a diffi-
 culty. By what are they moved? Our difficulty is caused by the two ad-
 verbial phrases governed each by ὁπό. If the present text is to be re-
 tained, then these two phrases in effect cancel each other out, since if
 the spheres of the planets are moved by the standing sphere (i. e. God),
 then they can hardly be said to be moved by each other. Two possible
 solutions present themselves: either the author was simply inconsistent,
 in which case we might read, "and so the spheres of the planets, being
 moved in opposition to the sphere of the fixed stars, are moved by each
 other through their contrary encounters around the very oppositeness
 by the standing sphere," or ὁπ' ἀλλήλων was intended to modify the verbal
 noun ὑπαντήσῃ, in which case we might translate, "and so the spheres of
 the planets, being moved in opposition to the sphere of the fixed stars,
 are moved through their mutual contrary encounters around the very op-
 positeness by the standing sphere."

In either case problems remain. In the first place, the words
 ὁπ' ἀλλήλων would presuppose that the subject of the sentence is both
 the spheres of the planets and the sphere of the fixed stars. But in
 fact the subject is the spheres of the planets. Furthermore, the
 words περὶ τὴν ἐναντιότητα αὐτῶν, which I have translated, "around the
 very oppositeness," are difficult. If περὶ is used in a spatial sense,
 'as indeed we might expect, because of κινουμένων, then what is meant?

But on the other hand, it would be difficult to translate these words, "with respect to the very oppositeness." Hence, if the author is not to be charged with extreme confusion of mind, we must suspect textual corruption, such as perhaps a lacuna after ἀπλανεῖ and perhaps also after ἐναντιότητα. At any rate, Stobaeus' text offers no help in sorting out this difficult passage, since his text undoubtedly has itself suffered severe corruption. In Stobaeus' version there is no appropriate verb for σφαῖραι; the purpose of ἔξει is completely mysterious, unless it is a fragment from Stobaeus' version of 7.3, καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν δόξαν, which is missing in our text of Stobaeus. If so, then this verse also was altered by Stobaeus' source. At any rate, the present form of 7.2 is scarcely to be attributed to Stobaeus' source, although he may have been responsible for inserting ἐστῶσαν after ἐναντιότητα and with changing ἐστῶσης to αὐτῆς.

St. i.19.2

C. H. 11
7.3 καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν δόξαν.

This delightfully pompous verse is omitted in Stobaeus' version, whether deliberately or through scribal error.

St. i.19.2

7.4 τὰς γὰρ ἄρκτους ταύτας ὅς
ὁρᾷς μῆτε δυνούσας μῆτε ἀνα-
τελλούσας, περὶ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ στρε-
φόμενας, ποιεῖ κινεῖσθαι καὶ
ἐστάναι; (οἶει . . . ἢ p²)
- Κινεῖσθαι, ὃ Τριμέγιστε.

C. H. 11

7.4 τὰς γὰρ ἄρκτους ταύτας ὅς
ὁρᾷς μῆτε δυνούσας μῆτε ἀνα-
τελλούσας, περὶ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ στρε-
φόμενας, ἢ οἶει κινεῖσθαι ἢ
ἐστάναι; (ταύτας om. B, ins. B^c)
- Κινεῖσθαι, ὃ Τριμέγιστε.

Stobaeus' reading, ποιεῖ for οἶει is clearly an error based the misreading of an uncial exemplar; it would mean that some unnamed subject, presumably God, makes the Bear to move and to stand, a confusing proposition which moreover has nothing to do with the context. No doubt

the η in η οἷ is unexpected in its position; it may, however, have been displaced from after οἷ. At any rate, in the exemplar used by Stobaeus' source it is likely to have stood in its present position, since it is otherwise difficult to see why οἷ should become ποιεῖ. The substitution of καὶ for η is no doubt a secondary corruption by someone who understood the sentence to be a vaguely religious description of the providence of God.

St. i.19.2

7.5 - Κίνησιν ποσαν, ὃ Ἀσκληπιε;
- Τὴν περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀναστρεφομένην.

C. H. ii-

7.5 - Κίνησιν ποσαν, ὃ Ἀσκληπιε;
- Τὴν περὶ αὐτὸ στρεφομένην.

Neither τὸ αὐτὸ in Stobaeus nor αὐτὸ in the Corpus are wholly acceptable; we may read τὸ αὐτὸ with Wachsmuth.

Since στρεφόμενος is used in 7.4, and since in addition στρεφόμενην suits the sense better here, the reading of the Corpus should be retained against Stobaeus' ἀναστρεφομένην. That is, the stars are simply turning, not turning back.

St. i.19.2

7.6 - Ἡ δὲ περιφορὰ ἢ περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κίνησις ἐστὶν ὑπὸ στάσεως κατεχομένη* (ὑποστάσεως FP¹)

C. H. ii

7.6 - Ἡ δὲ περιφορὰ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἢ περὶ αὐτὸ κίνησις ὑπὸ στάσεως κατεχομένη* (περὶ τὸ αὐτὸ BC; ὑποστάσεως ACD)

Here, as in the previous verse, an article has apparently been omitted in the Corpus before the second αὐτὸ.

St. i.19.2

7.7 τὸ περὶ αὐτὸ καλύει
τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ.

C. H. ii

7.7 τὸ γὰρ περὶ αὐτὸ καλύει
τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ καλυόμενον δὲ
τοῦς τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτὸ, εἴ ἐστι
εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸ* (ὑπὲρ (1. 2):
ὑπὲρ supra περὶ A; τοῦς
om. B²)

For this passage the version of the Corpus is simply baffling; even the words retained by Stobaeus make little sense. Presumably the

passage was not written in the form in which it appears in the manuscripts of the Corpus Hermeticum. It is, however, not unlikely that it made little sense even in its original form. Perhaps Stobaeus' source thought that the excerpt would not be greatly marred by the omission of most of this verse.¹

St. i.19.2

7.8 οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐναντία φορὰ
ἔστηκεν ἔδρασα, ὑπὸ τῆς ἐναν-
τιότητος στηριζομένη.

C. H. 11

7.8 οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐναντία φορὰ
ἔστη ἡ ἔδρασα, ὑπὸ τῆς ἐναν-
τιότητος στηριζομένη. (οὕτως
CM)

As noted above, p. 41, the variant given by the Corpus Hermeticum for this verse can easily be explained as arising from the misreading of a miniscule K, the last two letters being obscured.

St. i.19.2

8.1 παράδειγμα δέ σοι ἐπιγείων
τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐπιπῖπτον φράσω.

C. H. 11

8.1 παράδειγμα δέ σοι τοῖς
ὀφθαλμοῖς πῖπτον φράσω.

The ἐπιγείων of Stobaeus' version is redundant, but may have been added as an explanation. The reading πῖπτον in the Corpus is barely tolerable if we compare it with two uses from Iamblichus (Comm. Math. 8; in Nic. p.7P) cited by Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. πῖπτω B.III.5, p. 1407, although Iamblichus construes the verb in these cases with ὁπὸ plus the accusative. But perhaps it is better to accept Nock's emendation, ὁπὸπῖπτω.²

¹So Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xli, intro.

²In addition, Prof. Kingston has pointed out to me that Stobaeus' reading, ἐπιπῖπτον is likely to be an error based on ὁπὸπῖπτον. So also Nock, intro., p. xlii.

St. 1.19.2

8.2 τὸ ἐπίκληρα ἱψᾶ, οἶον τὸν
ἄνθρωπον λέγω, νηχόμενον θεώρησον.

C. H. 11

8.2 τὸ ἐπίγεια ἱψᾶ, οἶον τὸν
ἄνθρωπον λέγω, θεώρει νηχόμενον.
(θεώρει M; θεωρεῖα C; θεωρεῖα A,
D², γρ.)

Perhaps Stobaeus wrote ἐπίκληρα for ἐπίγεια because he had used ἐπίγειον in 11.8.1. But it is ἐπίγεια which is required here. Nock defends ἐπίκληρα on the grounds that it is an uncommon word.¹ It is admittedly rare, but has no purpose here.

It is not clear from the context whether we should read νηχόμενον θεώρησον with Stobaeus or θεώρει νηχόμενον with the Corpus. While the variety of readings in the Corpus could suggest that θεώρει is the result of light manuscript damage, it is equally conceivable that Stobaeus' source, perhaps unintentionally, has substituted the aorist simply because the aorist imperative was the more common form.

St. 1.19.2

8.3 φερόμενον τοῦ γὰρ ὕδατος
ἡ ἀντιτυπία τῶν ποδῶν καὶ
τῶν χειρῶν σπᾶσις γίνεται
τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ μὴ συγκατενεχ-
θῆναι τῷ ὕδατι.

C. H. 11

8.3 φερόμενου γὰρ τοῦ ὕδατος,
ἡ ἀντιτυπία τῶν ποδῶν καὶ
τῶν χειρῶν σπᾶσις γίνεται
τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, μὴ συγκατενεχ-
θῆναι τῷ ὕδατι.

Stobaeus' reading, φερόμενον τοῦ γὰρ for φερόμενου γὰρ τοῦ in the Corpus is of course impossible. Probably the two errors were made at different times: either N was accidentally written for Y in copying from a miniscule exemplar, γὰρ τοῦ being later changed to τοῦ γὰρ on the supposition that φερόμενον modified ἄνθρωπον in the previous verse, or γὰρ τοῦ was accidentally changed to τοῦ γὰρ, with a later scribe taking

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xlii.

φερομένου as modifying ἄνθρωπον because of the changed context.

In this same verse Stobaeus gives τοῦ μὴ συγκατενεχθῆναι for a bare μὴ συγκατενεχθῆναι in the Corpus. Either the bare infinitive¹ or the infinitive with the neuter genitive singular of the definite article² is permissible, but the latter use is extremely common in the New Testament,³ and so may have been inserted absent-mindedly in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus.

St. i.19.2
8.4 - ἄμφεξ τὸ παρδειγμα,
ὡς Τρισημέγιστε.

C. H. ii
8.4 - ἄμφεστατον παρδειγμα
εἶπεξ, ὡς Τρισημέγιστε.

Stobaeus' reading, ἄμφεξ τὸ παρδειγμα, is much crisper, although the reading of the Corpus, ἄμφεστατον παρδειγμα εἶπεξ, conveys the same information. Since the difference between the two seems due to paraphrase rather than to scribal error, and since there is already some reason to suspect a tendency on the part of Stobaeus' source to paraphrase this tractate, I suspect that Stobaeus' source has here attempted to improve the style of Hermes.

St. i.19.2
8.5 - Πᾶσα οὖν κίνησις ἐν στήθεσι
καὶ ὑποσπλάχνῃς κινεῖται.

C. H. ii
8.5 - Πᾶσα οὖν κίνησις ἐν στήθεσι
καὶ ὑπὸ σπλάχνῃς κινεῖται. (ὑπὸ
σπλάχνῃς B^C(γρ.): ὑποσπλάχνῃς AD;
ὑπὸ στήθεσι M)

The reading in Stobaeus, of course, results from an incorrect interpretation of an unaccented text.

¹Schwyzler-Debrunner, op. cit., p. 363.

²Ibid., p. 372.

³See the list of examples in W. F. Moulton and A. S. Geden, A concordance to the Greek New Testament (4th. ed. rev. H. K. Moulton, Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1963), pp. 679 f.

St. 1.19.2

8.6 ἡ οὖν κίνησις τοῦ κόσμου
καὶ παντὸς ζῆου ὀλικοῦ
οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν κατ' ἐκτὸς
τοῦ σώματος συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι,

C. H. 11

8.6 ἡ οὖν κίνησις τοῦ κόσμου
καὶ παντὸς δὲ ζῆου ὀλικοῦ
οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν κατ' ἐκτὸς
τοῦ κόσμου συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι,
(κίνησις τοῦ ζῆου A)

The δὲ after παντὸς which Stobaeus omits may be in error for δὴ. If so, then καὶ παντὸς δὴ ζῆου ὀλικοῦ is added as an after-thought, the real subject of discussion being the motion of the κόσμος. Therefore we should in the same sentence read κόσμου rather than σώματος. It is quite possible that Stobaeus' source may have been offended by the religious implications of the reading given in the Corpus, since it would appear from the context in the Corpus that the author was referring to a world soul.

St. 1.19.2

8.7 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς
εἰς τὸ κατ' ἐκτὸς, τῶν νοητῶν,
ψυχῆς ἢ πνεύματος ἢ ἄλλου
τινὸς δωματίου. (τοῦ πνεύματος F)

C. H. 11

8.7 ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς
εἰς τὸ κατ' ἐκτὸς, ἡτοι
ψυχῆς ἢ πνεύματος ἢ ἄλλου
τινὸς δωματίου.

The reading τῶν νοητῶν in Stobaeus appears to be a marginal gloss which has managed to expell ἡτοι in the version of the Corpus.

St. 1.19.2

8.8 σῶμα γὰρ ἔμψυχον οὐ
κινεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ σύνολον
σῶμα, κἂν ἢ ἄψυχον.

C. H. 11

8.8 σῶμα γὰρ σῶμα ἔμψυχον οὐ
κινεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ σύνολον
σῶμα, κἂν ἄψυχον.

Either the second σῶμα was omitted in error in Stobaeus, or it was found to be stylistically inelegant. It is difficult to decide whether Stobaeus' source added ἢ after κἂν or whether a scribe in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus omitted it in error.

If the reading of κόσμου in 8.6 is retained, then the effect of this verse is to say that if the κόσμος had no soul, it could not have an influence on the living creatures inside it. Since the κόσμος (in

the influence of the stars) does have an influence, it is a living being. In Stobaeus' version, this meaning is hidden because of the changes made already in 8.6.

St. 1.19.2

9.1 - Ἰὼς τοῦτο λέγεις, ᾧ

Τριμέγιστε;

9.2 τὸ οὖν ξύλα καὶ τοὺς
λίθους καὶ τὰ πάντα ψυχα
οὐ σῶματ' ἐστὶ;

C. H. 11

9.1 - Ἰὼς τοῦτο λέγεις, ᾧ

Τριμέγιστε;

9.2 τὸ οὖν ξύλα καὶ τοὺς λί-
θους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα ψυχα
οὐ σῶματ' ἐστὶ τὰ κινουῦντα;

In this instant neither version makes sense. In Stobaeus' version, τοὺς λίθους has no grammatical relation to its context. In the version of the C. H., ψυχα does not make sense, since sticks and stones are not usually conceived of as having souls. Nock would solve this latter problem by reading ψυχα with Stobaeus but retaining τὰ κινουῦντα from the Corpus. This is conceivable; it is also possible that a word has been omitted in the Corpus after ψυχα, as for example, ψυχα <λέγωμεν>. In either case, Asclepius' problem is that sticks and stones are seen to be moved around by human bodies. But Hermes has just said that a body cannot move a body. If we accept my suggestion, Asclepius here asks whether that means that sticks and stones also have souls. The implication is, presumably, that the κόσμος also, although it moves, need not have a soul.

St. 1.19.2

9.3 - Οὐδαμῶς, Ἰασκληπιέ.

C. H. 11

9.3 - Οὐδαμῶς, ᾧ Ἰασκληπιέ.
(οὐδαμῶς om. AC)

In Stobaeus' text, ᾧ is omitted, no doubt by error.

St. 1.19.2

9.4 τὸ γὰρ ἔνδον τοῦ σώματος
τοῦ κινουῦντος τὸ ψυχον, οὐ
σῶμα ἐκεῖνός ἐστι τὸ ἀμφοτέρω
κινουῦν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ βαστάζοντος
καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασταζομένου.
(βαστάζοντα FPC)

C. H. 11

9.4 τὸ γὰρ ἔνδον τοῦ σώματος
τοῦ κινουῦντος τὸ ψυχον, οὐ
σῶμα ἐκεῖνός ἐστι τὸ ἀμφοτέρω
κινουῦν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ βαστάζοντος
καὶ τὸ τοῦ βασταζομένου.

Although 9.4 is the same (except for a clear blunder, βασιλῆοντα, in Stobaeus' FP^C), it may be cited in favour of the reading of the Corpus in 9.2. In effect, Hermes is made to say that it is not the man's body which moves the stick, but the man's soul which moves both body and stick. So by implication, the world-soul moves the κόσμος and influences us as well.

St. 1.19.2

9.5 διόπερ ἄψυχον οὐκ ἄψυχον
κινήσει.

C. H. II

9.5 διόπερ ἔμψυχον τὸ καθεῦδον,
ἐπεὶ κινεῖ.

This sentence in the version of the Corpus is delightfully irrelevant, whereas the version given by Stobaeus sticks resolutely to the point. There have been so many non-sequiturs in this tractate that the irrelevance of the version in the Corpus in this case does not speak decisively against it. On the other hand, the version in Stobaeus, while sticking to the point, adds no new information. It is unlikely that both would be retained. While homoearcton could be cited as causing the omission of one or the other, it is perhaps too much of a coincidence to suppose that one of these two should be accidentally omitted in one version, the other in the other. Hence I am inclined to think that Stobaeus' source, offended at the irrelevance of the version in the Corpus, replaced it.

St. 1.19.2

9.6 ὁρᾷς γούν καὶ βαρυνομένην
τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅταν δύο
σώματα φέρῃ. (φέρει P²; φέρει FP)

C. H. II

9.6 ὁρᾷς οὖν καταβαρουμένην
τὴν ψυχὴν, ὅταν μὴν δύο
σώματα φέρει.

I suspect that γούν for οὖν is a refinement introduced by Stobaeus' source, although it adds nothing to the sense of the sentence. It is to be noted that γε and γούν are relatively rare in the documents

of the Corpus Hermeticum, although γούν occurs in xii.8(177.5), and γε in vi.4(75.1), vii.1(81.7), ix.2(97.3), x.24.12, xi.19(155.6), and xii.1(174.4). (Although it is used correctly in x.24.12 in the version in the Corpus, it is removed in Stobaeus' version. Stobaeus also substitutes εἰ γε for ἐναί in iv.10.5.)

In the same sentence, Stobaeus' καί for κατὰ is clearly an error, and could have been caused either by a misunderstood abbreviation or by a partially obliterated TA in κατὰ.

As for the remainder of the words, both καταβαρῶ and καταβαρύνω are attested among late authors, and moreover are identical in meaning. Therefore it is not surprising that one should, no doubt unconsciously, be substituted for the other. It is difficult to say which is original.

I suspect that the omission of μόνη in Stobaeus is accidental.

St. C. H. 11
9.7 καί ὅτι μὲν ἔν τινι κινεῖται τὸ κινούμενα καί ὑπὸ τινος, ὁμῶς.

This verse repeats the point made in ii.1.1, which presumably began the discussion on motion, and sums up the results of 1.1 to 9.6. Stobaeus or his source may have found it irrelevant for the purposes of this particular selection.

St. C. H. 11
10.1 - Ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὲ δεῖ κινεῖσθαι τὸ κινούμενα, ὃ τριμεγιστε;

As noted above, p. 40, Flussas correctly reads κενῶ for ἐκείνῳ in this verse.

St. C. H. 11
10.2 - Εὖ φης, ὃ Ἀσκληπιε.

Whether or not we accept Parthey's emendation of εὐφραμεῖ for εὖ φησ depends very much on what we will do with the first words of 10.3. If we accept the reading of the Corpus, then Parthey's emendation makes little sense, since οὐδὲν δὲ is an intolerably weak continuation after εὐφραμεῖ. If εὐφραμεῖ were the original reading, then οὐδὲ ἔν would be expected. Therefore Nock, who accepts Parthey's emendation, also follows Stobaeus in reading οὐδὲ ἔν in the following verse. Unfortunately, it is all too easy to give another reason for Stobaeus' reading. Since his next fragment begins at 10.3, and since the δὲ in οὐδὲν δὲ refers back to 10.2, which he does not use, he or his source may have substituted οὐδὲ ἔν for οὐδὲν δὲ in order to suppress evidence of the context. (The οὐδὲ in οὐδὲ ἔν is not by this time a conjunction; rather, οὐδὲ ἔν is an emphatic form of οὐδὲν. See C. H. vi.2(73.9) and C. H. xii.15(180.13) for similar instances.)

St. 1.18.3
10.3 οὐδὲ ἔν τῶν ὄντων ἐστὶ
κενὸν τῷ τῆς ὑπερβέως λόγῳ

C. H. 11
10.3 οὐδὲν δὲ τῶν ὄντων ἐστὶ
κενόν

We have already commented on the first two words in connection with 10.2. The final four words given by Stobaeus for that verse could very well be either a gloss or an explanation added by Stobaeus' source.

St. 1.18.3
10.4 τὸ δὲ ἔν οὐκ ἔν ἡδύνατο
εἶναι ὄν, εἰ μὴ μεστὸν τῆς
ὑπερβέως ἦν

C. H. 11
10.4 μόνον δὲ τὸ μὴ ὄν κενόν
ἐστὶ, ἔκινον τῆς ὑπερβέως

Here Stobaeus and the Corpus give two very different versions, the proposition given in the Corpus being the inverse of 10.3 in the Corpus, Stobaeus' version following quite logically after the last four words of Stobaeus' version of 10.3, and in fact explaining them: whatever

is could not be, if it were not full of existence (so that therefore nothing which exists is empty). If this reading is accepted, then Asclepius' response in 10.6,7 is baffling, since he proceeds to give examples of empty things. Thus it would have sufficed for Hermes to repeat his sophism of 10.4. Instead, however, he replies that these things are full of air, 11.3-5. Therefore I would prefer to retain the inelegant version of the Corpus. It is to be admitted that Hermes' argument of 10.3-5 is simply beside the point, since there is no reason why the void mentioned by Asclepius in his question of 10.1 should be considered to be inside anything. But this objection falls with equal force on both versions of 10.4.

While Stobaeus' version of 10.4, along with the last four words of 10.3, could be a gloss, it is surprising that the version in the Corpus should therefore have dropped out. I suspect that we have here a deliberate substitution by Stobaeus' source.

St. i.18.3
10.5 τὸ γὰρ ὑπάρχον κενὸν οὐδέποτε γενέσθαι δύναται.

C. H. ii
10.5 τὸ γὰρ ὑπάρχον κενὸν οὐδέποτε γενέσθαι δύναται.

If Stobaeus' version of 10.4 were correct, we would expect this verse to read τὸ οὖν ὑπάρχον κτλ.

St. i.18.3
10.6 - οὐκ ἔστιν οὖν κενὸν τινα, ὃ Τρισμέγιστε;

C. H. ii
10.6 - οὐκ ἔστιν οὖν τινα, ὃ Τρισμέγιστε;

No doubt κενὸν was omitted accidentally in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus.

St. i.18.3
10.7 οἷον κάδος καὶ κέραμος καὶ ληνὸς καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ παραπλήσια.

C. H. ii
10.7 ἔστι τοιαῦτα· οἷον κάδος κενός καὶ κέραμος κενός καὶ ποταμὸς ὕλος καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα τὰ παραπλήσια (καὶ ante κάδος κενός om. AB)

Stobaeus' version here is undoubtedly the more elegant. In the version in the Corpus, the opening words, ἔστι τοιαῦτα, are redundant; moreover, the repeated κενός is quite monotonous, although the author may have been striving for rhetorical effect; furthermore, the words ποταμός ὄλος dissipate the argument, since they are plainly irrelevant. Ferguson believes that these words may have been inserted for ληνός κενός; he thinks that whoever added them may have been thinking of another argument.¹ Even if these words were written by the original author, this explanation is plausible. As we have seen, the author of this tractate tends to be very loose in his arguments. Therefore it is not impossible that the version of the Corpus ought to be retained. At any rate, it is easy to understand why the version of Stobaeus would replace the version of the Corpus, but less easy to understand why the version of the Corpus would be made to replace the version of Stobaeus.

St. i.18.3
10.8 - φεῦ τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης,
Ἀσκληπιέ. (σπάνης F)
10.9 τὰ μᾶλλον πληρέστατα καὶ
μεστώτατα, ταῦτα κενὰ ἢ γῆ
εἶναι;

C. H. ii
10.8 - φεῦ τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης,
Ἀσκληπιέ.
10.9 τὰ μᾶλλον πληρέστατα καὶ
μέγιστα ὄντα, ταῦτα ἢ γῆ κενὰ
εἶναι;

In the C. H., μέγιστα was written for μεστώτατα because of the similarity of the two words. We may, following Nock, retain ὄντα from the manuscript tradition of the Corpus. In the same verse, ἢ γῆ appears to have become dislocated in the text of Stobaeus.

St. i.18.3
11.1 - Πᾶς λέγεις, ὦ Τριμεγίστε;
11.2 - ὅδ' οὐ σῶμα ἐστὶν ὁ δῆρ;
- Σῶμα.

C. H. ii
11.1 - Πᾶς λέγεις, ὦ Τριμεγίστε;
11.2 - Σῶμα ἐστὶν ὁ δῆρ.

¹Ferguson, in Scott, op. cit., IV, 363, n. 5.

Although the variation here is slight, it has the appearance of being the result of deliberate activity, since the removal or addition of οὐδ is compensated for by the removal or addition of σῶμα. Since it appears that Stobaeus' source was prone to make such changes, we should retain the wording of the Corpus. There is no doubt that Stobaeus' version is the more elegant.

St. i.18.3

11.3 - Τοῦτο δὲ τὸ σῶμα οὐδ' διὰ πάντων διήκει τῶν ὄντων καὶ πάντα διήκον πληροῖ;
11.4 σῶμα δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων κεκραμένον συνέστηκε;

C. H. ii

11.3 τοῦτο δὲ τὸ σῶμα οὐδ' διὰ πάντων διήκει τῶν ὄντων καὶ πάντα διήκον πληροῖ;
11.4 σῶμα δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν συνδύων κεκραμένον; (δὲ om. A)

The version of the Corpus gives offence because σῶμα is used in two different senses. In Stobaeus' version this offense is removed by substituting τεσσάρων for συνδύων. In any case, what is intended is τῶν τεσσάρων συνδύων.

While συνέστηκε in Stobaeus' version seems redundant, it is possible that it is to be retained, with Nock and Scott, since there is no apparent motive for its insertion.

St. i.18.3

11.5 μετὰ οὖν πάντα ἔστιν,
ὅ σὺ φῆς κενά, τοῦ δέρος.
(μετὰ: δὲ μετὰ P)

C. H. ii

11.5 μετὰ οὖν ἔστι πάντα,
ὅ σὺ φῆς κενά, τοῦ δέρος.
(σὺ om. ABC)

While πάντα before ἔστιν, as in Stobaeus, could be defended, it seems better to place it directly before the adjective clause which modifies it, as in the Corpus. At any rate, whether it is Stobaeus' text or the text of the Corpus which is in error, the alteration is not likely to have been made deliberately.

St. 1.18.3

11.6 εἰ δὲ τοῦ δέρος, καὶ τῶν
τεσσάρων συμμάτων·11.7 καὶ συμβαίνει ὁ ἐναντιος
λόγος ἐκφραίνεσθαι,

11.8 ὅτι ἢ οὐ φῆς μετὰ,

ταῦτα πάντα κενὰ ἐστὶ τοῦ δέρος,
ἐκεῖνων ὅπ' ἄλλων συμμάτων στενο-
χωρουμένων καὶ μὴ ἔχόντων τοῦτον
δέξασθαι τὸν δέρα.

C. H. 11

11.6 εἰ δὲ τοῦ δέρος, καὶ τῶν
τεσσάρων συμμάτων·11.7 καὶ συμβαίνει ὁ ἐναντιος
λόγος ἐκφραίνεσθαι,

11.8 ὅτι ἢ οὐ φῆς μετὰ,

ταῦτα πάντα κενὰ ἐστὶ τοῦ δέρος,
ὅπ' ἄλλων συμμάτων στενοχωρου-
μένων καὶ μὴ ἔχόντων τόπον
δέξασθαι τὸν δέρα.(μετὰ M; μεστὰ dB²; ἄλλων ex
ἄλλως M; στενοχωρούμενα et
ἔχοντα B^C; ABC om., B^C ins. 11.6-8

The reading μετὰ for μεστὰ is, of course, clearly impossible, even though it appears both in M and in Stobaeus. Coincidence cannot be ruled out here; it is to be noted that in 11.5, μεστὰ becomes μετὰ in codex P of Stobaeus. The error will, moreover, have been facilitated by the ταῦτα immediately following, since μετὰ ταῦτα is a frequent combination. Nevertheless, it is striking that the same error should occur in both sources. Perhaps this is another indication that the text of this tractate had already suffered mutilation at a very early date. The reading in dB², μεστὰ, could very easily be a correction.

In the same sentence, the manuscripts omit ἐκεῖνων. In addition, B^C changes στενοχωρουμένων and ἔχόντων to στενοχωρούμενα and ἔχοντα respectively. It is to be freely admitted that it is B^C's reading which is grammatically correct. However, I would retain ἐκεῖνων with Stobaeus, for the following reasons: in the first place, misuse of the genitive absolute is not altogether unknown in the Greek of the period in which C. H. 11 is likely to have been written; cf. C. H. 1.7(9.4), εἰπόντος ταῦτα ἐπὶ πλεῖονα χρόνον ἀνυπόμεινε μοι. Moreover, it would be difficult to account for M's reading on the basis of B^C's reading. We could, to be sure, account for στενοχωρουμένων on the basis of attraction by

the preceding συμπάντων. However, this would not account for the subsequent ἐχόντων. On the other hand, given M's reading, the reading in B^C is a very easy and shrewd correction. Moreover, the omission of a word like ἐκείνων is easily accounted for on the basis of inattention.

In the same sentence we should retain τόνον with the Corpus rather than τοῦτον. If τοῦτον were accepted, it would modify δέξα. But, especially in the Greek of the period in which C. H. ii is likely to have been written, one would expect τοῦτον either to directly precede or to directly follow τὸν δέξα.

St. 1.18.3
11.9 ταῦτα οὖν ἢ σὺ φῆς,
κοῖλα δεῖ ὀνομαζεῖν,
οὐ κενά·

C. H. ii
11.9 ταῦτα οὖν ἢ σὺ φῆς εἶναι
κενά, κοῖλα δεῖ ὀνομαζεῖν,
οὐ κενά·

Surely the omission of εἶναι κενά in Stobaeus' version is accidental, and is to be ascribed either to manuscript damage or to inattention.

St. 1.18.3
11.10 ὑπάρχει γὰρ μεστέ ἐστιν
ἄερος καὶ πνεύματος.

C. H. ii
11.10 ὑπάρχει γὰρ καὶ μεστέ
ἐστιν ἄερος καὶ πνεύματος.

In the Corpus, ὑπάρχει is used absolutely in this verse: since they exist, they are full of air and breath. Either Stobaeus' source did not understand this or, if he did, he did not approve, and so he wrote ὑπάρχει, the dative of ὑπαρξίς.

St. 1.18.3
12.1 - Ἀναντρίρητος ὁ λόγος, ὃ
Τρισμέγιστε. (ἐναντρίρητος P¹)

C. H. ii
12.1 - Ἀναντρίρητος λόγος, ὃ
Τρισμέγιστε· (ὁ λόγος B^C)
σῶμα ἐστιν ὁ δῆρ·
τοῦτο δὲ σῶμα οὐ διὰ πάντων
διήκει τῶν ὄντων καὶ πάντα
διήκον πληροῖ;

Presumably ὁ was omitted in error in the manuscript tradition of

the Corpus.

While the repetition of 11.2,3 could conceivably be a gloss explaining which argument is irrefutable, it seems more likely that it is the result of a copying error induced by the repeated ὃ Τριῦμέγιστε. While their repetition in that case would be unintentional, their retention is deliberate. Since the whole passage was not recopied, it seems likely that the scribe responsible for the error realized his mistake before copying out the whole passage. Since he did not erase or scratch out his error, we may assume that he was paid by the line: see above, p. 40.

St. i.18.3

12.2 τὸν οὖν τόπον ἐν ᾧ κινεῖται
τὸ πᾶν, τί εἴπομεν;
- 'Ασώματον, 'Ασκληπιέ.

C. H. ii

12.2 τὸν οὖν τόπον τὸν ἐν ᾧ
πᾶν κινεῖται, τί εἴπομεν;
- 'Ασώματον, ὃ 'Ασκληπιέ.
('Ασώματος BC)

It seems best to retain τὸ πᾶν with Stobaeus, since the words seem to be used in the sense of "the universe." We may, however, following Nock, retain τὸν after τόπον with the Corpus. Either <τὸ> πᾶν κινεῖται or κινεῖται τὸ πᾶν is permissible. I prefer the deliberative εἴπομεν given in the Corpus to εἴπομεν of Stobaeus.¹ Perhaps ὃ before 'Ασκληπιέ was omitted accidentally in Stobaeus' version.

St. i.18.3

12.3 - Τὸ οὖν δῶματόν ἐστι;

C. H. ii

12.3 - Τὸ οὖν δῶματόν τί ἐστι;

Τί is omitted in the text of Stobaeus, no doubt through carelessness.

¹We may, however, retain Stobaeus' reading, with Nock, if we take these words as referring to 11.4.

St. 1.18.3

12.4 - Νοῦς ἄλος ἐξ ἄλου
ἑαυτὸν ἐμπεριέχων.

C. H. 11

12.4 - Νοῦς λόγος ἐξ ἄλου
ἑαυτὸν ἐμπεριέχων.

Presumably λόγος for ἄλος is a substitution due to absentmindedness. It is Stobaeus' reading here which makes sense.

St. 1.18.3

12.5 ἐλευθερος σήματος παντός,
ἀπλανής, ἀπαθής, ἀφάνης,

C. H. 11

12.5 ἐλευθερον σήματος παντός,
ἀπλανής, ἀπαθής σήματι καὶ
ἀναφής,

No doubt ἐλευθερον in the Corpus is an error. The reading ἀναφής in the Corpus could have been changed to ἀφάνης within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus because it is a relatively uncommon word, while ἀφάνης is fairly common. Alternately, Stobaeus' source could have changed ἀναφής to ἀφάνης because the point that the bodiless is invisible had not been made. If Stobaeus' reading were the original, on the other hand, it would be difficult to account for the reading of the Corpus. Presumably σήματι καὶ in the version of the Corpus is to be retained, since it would be difficult to account for their insertion.

St. 1.18.3

12.6 αὐτὸς ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐστὶς,
χωρητικὸς πάντων καὶ σωτήριος
τῶν ὄντων, (συγχωρητικὸς F)

C. H. 11

12.6 αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐστὶς,
χωρητικὸς τῶν πάντων καὶ
σωτήριος τῶν ὄντων,

The omission of ἐν in the Corpus, as the omission of τῶν by Stobaeus, are probably accidental. Since συγχωρητικὸς given by Stobaeus' codex F lacks the support of Stobaeus' P, and since Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1669, s. v. συγχωρητικὸς cites only this passage for this particular word, it may be that it is the creation of some scribe, although it would be difficult to account for such an error.

St. 1.18.3

12.7 οὐ ὡπερ ἀκτῖνες εἰσι
τὸ ἀγαθόν, ἡ ἀλήθεια, τὸ ἀρχέ-
τυπον πνεύματος, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον
ψυχῆς. (τῆς ψυχῆς P)

C. H. 11

12.7 οὐπερ ἀκτῖνες εἰσι τὸ
ἀγαθόν, ἡ ἀλήθεια, τὸ ἀρχέ-
τυπον φῶς, τὸ ἀρχέτυπον ψυχῆς.

In the first of these variants the version of the Corpus appears to take realistically what in Stobaeus' version is to be taken as a metaphor. The decision in this case is difficult, since it is easy to see how the two words could have become telescoped in the version in the Corpus, but it is quite conceivable that Stobaeus' source might have taken offence at the realism of the version in the Corpus.

Ferguson wishes to print both the Corpus' τὸ ἀρχέτυπον φῶς and Stobaeus' τὸ ἀρχέτυπον πνεύματος. While it is perhaps too much of a coincidence to expect that Stobaeus and the Corpus have lost one each from this pair of readings, it is clearly a difficult choice. Perhaps φῶς, Wachsmuth's choice, is better, since the replacement of φῶς by πνεύματος, as the replacement of οὐπερ by οὐ ὡπερ earlier in the sentence, have the effect of muting the realism of the version of the Corpus.

St. 1.18.3

12.8 - ταῦτ' οὖν τί ἐστιν;

C. H. 11

12.8 - 'Ο οὖν θεός τί ἐστιν;

In addition, Stobaeus reads ταῦτ' οὖν τί ἐστιν where the Corpus reads ὁ οὖν θεός τί ἐστιν. Perhaps the alterations in these two verses are examples of the reluctance of Stobaeus' source to follow the author of this tractate in his theology. Stobaeus' source may have, perhaps rightly, taken these words in the Corpus to mean that τὸ δούμαρον is somehow intermediary between God and the κόσμος.

St. 1.18.3

12.9 - 'Ο μηδὲ ἐν τοῦτων ὄν,
ὄν δὲ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τοῦτοις
αἴτιος ὄν καὶ πᾶσι καὶ ἐν ἑκάστῳ
τῶν ὄντων πάντων.

C. H. 11

12.9 - 'Ο μηδὲ ἐν τοῦτων ὄντων,
ὄν δὲ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τοῦτων
αἴτιος καὶ πᾶσι καὶ ἐπὶ ἑκάστῳ
μέρει ἐφ' ἑκαστον τοῦτων τῶν
ὄντων πάντων. (εἶναι ταῦτα B;
ἐφ' ἑκαστον om. B^c)

No doubt manuscript damage was responsible for ὄν in place of ὄντων in Stobaeus' version. The insertion of ὄν after αἴτιος in his version is very difficult to explain, unless we suppose that someone had forgotten the previous ὄν before δὲ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι.

Stobaeus' reading, τοῦτοις for τοῦτων seems preferable, and would be a dative of reference depending on αἴτιος: "responsible for the existence of these."

Stobaeus' ἐν and ἐπὶ in the Corpus are both inadmissible; Patritius' conjecture, ἐνί, would be explainable on the basis of both readings.

I would take the insertion of μέρει and the insertion of ἐφ' ἑκαστον τοῦτων as two separate glosses, both attempting to make sense of the impossible ἐπὶ ἑκάστῳ in the Corpus.

This is the last fragment in Stobaeus from C. H. 11. The contents of the remaining few chapters were, of course, without relevance to these two chapters of Stobaeus, since chapter eighteen deals with the void and space, chapter nineteen with movement. Therefore their exclusion can be explained on these grounds alone. For whatever reason, however, Stobaeus contains relatively few excerpts containing what we would call the religious aspects of Hermetism.

St. i.1.30

C. H. iv

1.1 Ἐπειδὴ τὸν πάντα κόσμον
ἐποίησεν ὁ δημιουργός, οὐ
χερσὶν ἀλλὰ λόγῳ,

1.2 ὥστε οὕτως ὑπολαμβάνει,
ὡς τοῦ παρόντος καὶ δεῖ ὄντος
καὶ πάντα ποιήσαντος καὶ ἐνός
μόνου, (τῇ δὲ αὐτοῦ θελήσει ἐη-
μιουργήσαντος τὰ ὄντα· (τοῦ
παρόντος· παρόντος B²)

These verses clearly were not omitted by Stobaeus himself, since they are admirably suited to the purpose of his first chapter, entitled, ὅτι θεὸς δημιουργὸς τῶν ὄντων κτλ. Moreover, these verses are not likely to have caused offense to Stobaeus' source, especially since iv.1.5, included in Stobaeus, specifically refers to a creative activity of God. A more probable explanation is that Stobaeus' source used the passage for a different purpose, one for which the omitted words have no relevance.

St. i.1.30

1.3 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα
ἐκείνου, οὐχ ἀπτόν, οὐδὲ δρατόν,
οὐδὲ μετρητόν, οὐδὲ διαστατόν,
οὐδ' ἄλλῃ τινὶ σώματι ὅμοιον.
(οὕτε δρατόν F)

C. H. iv

1.3 τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα
ἐκείνου, οὐχ ἀπτόν, οὐδὲ δρατόν,
οὐδὲ μετρητόν, οὐδὲ διαστατόν,
οὐδὲ ἄλλῃ τινὶ ὅμοιον.

Why Stobaeus' source would have added σώματι, which weakens ἄλλῃ τινὶ, I am unable to explain. Perhaps they were omitted in error in the Corpus.

St. i.1.30

1.4 οὕτε γὰρ πῦρ ἐστὶν οὕτε
ὕδωρ οὕτε ἀήρ οὕτε πνεῦμα,
ἀλλὰ πάντα ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

C. H. iv

1.4 οὕτε γὰρ πῦρ ἐστὶν οὕτε
ὕδωρ οὕτε ἀήρ οὕτε πνεῦμα,
ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

The reading of the Corpus here cannot be retained. The abbreviation of ἀπὸ and ὑπὸ are easily confused; moreover, the final τὰ of πάντα could have been repeated in error. As it stands, the text of the

Corpus is nonsense.

St. 1.1.30

1.5 ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὢν,
μόνῳ ἑαυτῷ τοῦτο δναθεῖναι
ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι
(δναθῆναι F)

C. H. iv

1.5 ἀγαθὸς ὢν,
μόνῳ γὰρ τοῦτω δνατέθεικεν,
ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι,
(ἠθέλησεν A; κοσμήσας BCM)
2.1 κόσμον δὲ θεοῦ σήματος
κατέπεμψε τὸν ἄνθρωπον κτλ.
(καὶ κατέπεμψε A)

Nock, following Zielinski, inserts οὐ before μόνῳ, understanding δναθεῖναι in the sense of "dedicate;" cf. Festugière's translation, "il n'a pas voulu se dédier cette offrande à lui seul." In my view, this is unnecessary; δναθεῖναι or δνατέθεικεν here can be understood in the sense of "attribute." In that case, this sentence expresses the same sentiment as C. H. vi: God alone is good.

In the Corpus, δνατέθεικεν lacks a direct object. We may perhaps, following Patritius, supply this in the light of Stobaeus, and read, μόνῳ γὰρ τοῦτο ἑαυτῷ δνατέθεικεν. With this light emendation, the passage makes perfect sense, and would be translated, "Being good, for he attributed that to himself alone, he wanted to bedeck (κοσμήσαι) even the earth, and as the ornament (κόσμος) of the divine body, he sent man, etc." Stobaeus' source cuts this sentence short at the creation of the earth; is it possible that he thought that too much glory is ascribed to man? In any case, Stobaeus contains only one other excerpt from this extremely interesting Hermetic tractate.

St. 1.10.15

10.3 ἡ γὰρ μονάς, οὐσα πάντων
ἀρχῇ καὶ βίβλα, ἐν πᾶσιν ἐστίν
ὥς ἐν βίβλῃ καὶ ἀρχῇ,

C. H. iv

10.3 ἡ γὰρ μονάς, οὐσα πάντων
ἀρχῇ καὶ βίβλῃ καὶ ἀρχῇ οὐσα,
(πάντων οὐσα H)

As noted above, p. 48, a line has dropped out of the text of the Corpus, no doubt because of the repeated βίβλα. We may, as indicated,

retain οὔσα from the Corpus.

St. 1.10.15

10.4 ἄνευ δὲ ἀρχῆς οὐδέν,
10.5 ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐξ οὐδενός, ἀλλ'
ἐξ αὐτῆς, εἴ γε ἀρχὴ ἐστὶ τῶν
ἑτέρων.

C. H. 1v

10.4 ἄνευ δὲ ἀρχῆς οὐδέν,
10.5 ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐξ οὐδενός ἢ
ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἐπεὶ ἀρχὴ ἐστὶ τῶν
ἑτέρων.

Here we should read, with the Corpus, ἢ for ἀλλ' and ἐπεὶ for εἴ γε. The particle γε is extremely infrequent in the Corpus, see above, p. 296, but could easily have been inserted by Stobaeus' source.

St. 1.10.15

10.6
μονὰς οὔσα οὖν ἀρχὴ πάντα
ἀριθμὸν ἐμπεριέχει, ὑπὸ
μηδενὸς ἐμπεριεχομένη,

C. H. 1v

10.6 αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν, ἐπεὶ
μὴ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ἔτυχεν, οὔσα
μονὰς, οὖν ἀρχὴ καὶ πάντα
ἀριθμὸν ἐμπεριέχει, ὑπὸ
μηδενὸς ἐμπεριεχομένη,
(ἢ ἀρχὴ D)

A half verse here seems to have been omitted in Stobaeus, either deliberately, because it was found confusing, or in error. This omission is more likely to be deliberate, since it is patched up in Stobaeus: μονὰς οὔσα is substituted for οὔσα μονὰς, and καὶ is removed.

St. 1.10.15

10.7 καὶ πάντα ἀριθμὸν γεννᾷ
ὑπὸ μηδενὸς γεννημένη ἑτέρου
ἀριθμοῦ.

C. H. 1v

10.7 καὶ πάντα ἀριθμὸν γεννᾷ
ὑπὸ μηδενὸς γεννημένη ἑτέρου
ἀριθμοῦ (γεννομένη A; γεννομένη
C)

11.1 πᾶν δὲ τὸ γεννῶμενον
ἀτελὲς καὶ διαίρετόν καὶ
αὐξητόν καὶ μειωτόν.

11.1 πᾶν δὲ τὸ γεννῶμενον
ἀτελὲς καὶ ἀδιαίρετον καὶ
αὐξητόν καὶ μειωτόν.

*Ἀδιαίρετον is clearly an error, and was perhaps precipitated by ἀτελὲς.

St. 1.10.15

11.2 τῷ δὲ τελείῳ οὐδὲν τούτων
γίγνεται.

C. H. 1v

11.2 τῷ δὲ τελείῳ οὐδὲν τούτων
γίνεται.

Here Stobaeus Atticizes Hermes in reading γίγνεται for γίνεται.

St. 1.10.15
11.3

11.4

C. H. iv

11.3 καὶ τὸ μέν ἀδελφὸν ἀδελ-
φεται ἀπὸ τῆς μονᾶδος, (ὅμο
1297)

11.4 ἀλίσσεται δὲ ὁμοῦ τῆς ἀδ-
ελφότητος, μιμητὶ δουλιμενον
τὴν μονάδα χωρήσει.

It is difficult to see why these verses should have been omitted
in Stobaeus.

St. 1.10.15
11.5 αὐτὴ οὖν, ὃ τὰτ, κατὰ τὸ
δυνατὸν σοὶ ὑπογράφεται τοῦ
θεοῦ εἰκῶν. (τὰτ om. P, lacuna
relicta)

C. H. iv

11.5 αὐτὴ σοὶ, ὃ τὰτ, κατὰ τὸ
δυνατὸν ὑπογράφεται τοῦ θεοῦ
εἰκῶν.

11.6 ἢν ἀκριβὲς εἰ θεῶν καὶ
νοήσεις τοῖς τῆς καρδίας δόγμα-
μοις, πιστεύουσιν μοι, τέκνον,
εὐρήσεις τὴν ἡρὸς πλὴν ἄνω δόσον.

11.7 μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὴ σε ἡ εἰκῶν
ὁδηγήσει.

11.8 ἔχει γὰρ τι γόδιον ἡ θεά.

11.9 τοὺς ἐκείνωντας θεοποιεῖται

κατέχει καὶ ἀνέχει.

11.10 καὶ ὅσοι γὰρ ἐν μαγνήτις
ἀφ' ὧν τὸν ὑπόθετον. (μαγνήτις
ἀφ' ὧν μαγνήτις ABCM)

Stobaeus' source turns 11.5 into a conclusion by inserting οὖν
He then associates σοὶ more closely in position with ὑπογράφεται.

The remaining five verses omitted in Stobaeus would be for the
author the most important part of the passage. It cannot, of course,
be decided on the basis of this passage whether these lines are omitted
because they are irrelevant to the theme of Stobaeus' chapter, περὶ ἀρχῶν
καὶ στοιχείων τοῦ παντός, or whether they were offensive to Stobaeus'
source. I believe, however, that a pattern begins to emerge in the
next excerpt.

St. 1.49.48

C. H. x

7.1 - Τὸ ἀποθεωθῆναι πῶς λέγεις,
ὃ πάτερ; (τδ BC; τῷ ACMD)7.2 - Πάσης ψυχῆς, ὃ τέκνον, δι-
αιρετῆς μεταβολας.

7.3 - Πῶς πάλιν διαιρετῆς;

These three verses, which contain a clear reference to the Hermetic doctrine of apotheosis, are omitted in Stobaeus. Why are they omitted? They cannot be said to be irrelevant to the theme of this particular chapter of Stobaeus, which is entitled περὶ ψυχῆς. I suspect that they were omitted for religious reasons, and that they were offensive on religious grounds to Stobaeus' source. Reasons for this suspicion will become apparent in the discussion of x.7.11.

St. 1.49.48

7.4 - Οὐκ ἤκουσας ἐν τοῖς Γενικοῖς ὅτι ἀπὸ μιᾶς ψυχῆς τῆς τοῦ παντός πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ εἰσιν αὗται ἐν τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ κυλινδούμεναι, ὥσπερ ἀπονενεμηκέναι;

C. H. x

7.4 - Οὐκ ἤκουσας ἐν τοῖς Γενικοῖς ὅτι ἀπὸ μιᾶς ψυχῆς τῆς τοῦ παντός πᾶσαι αἱ ψυχαὶ εἰσιν αὔτε ἐν τῷ παντὶ κόσμῳ κυλινδούμεναι, ὥσπερ ἀπονενεμημέναι;

Probably αὔτε for αὗται in the Corpus is an error. The reading ἀπονενεμηκέναι for ἀπονενεμημέναι in Stobaeus is probably an error caused by the misreading of a miniscule exemplar.

St. 1.49.48

7.5 τοῦτων τοίνυν τῶν ψυχῶν πολλαὶ αἱ μεταβολαί, τῶν μὲν εἰς τὸ εὐτυχέστερον, τῶν δ' εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον.

C. H. x

7.5 τοῦτων τοίνυν τῶν ψυχῶν πολλαὶ μεταβολαί, τῶν μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ εὐτυχέστερον, τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ ἐναντίον.

Perhaps αἱ was omitted accidentally in the Corpus. However, εἰς twice for ἐπὶ in Stobaeus is deliberate, and was attracted by the repetition of εἰς in the succeeding verses.

St. 1.49.48

7.6 αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἔρπετῶδεις οὖσαι εἰς ἔνυδρα μεταβάλλουσιν;

C. H. x

7.6 αἱ μὲν οὖν ἔρπετῶδεις οὖσαι εἰς ἔνυδρα μεταβάλλονται;

In the Corpus this is the beginning of the conclusion of the argument, as may be seen from the use of οὖν. Stobaeus source uses γάρ, and therefore presumably regards this passage as corroborative detail.

Here and in x.7.10, Stobaeus' source prefers the active forms of μεταβάλλω to the middle or passive forms used by the Corpus. It will be seen from Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1110 s. v. μεταβάλλω, A.III that the active form is frequently used intransitively, as here; on the other hand, the Corpus' μεταβαλλονται could be tolerated if it were taken as a passive.

St. i.49.48

7.7 αἱ δὲ ἔνυδροι εἰς χερσαῖα,

C. H. x

7.7 αἱ δὲ τῶν ἐνύδρων εἰς χερσαῖα,

Stobaeus may have written ἔνυδροι for τῶν ἐνύδρων in order to make these sentences conform to a single pattern.

St. i.49.48

7.8 αἱ δὲ χερσαῖαι εἰς πετεινά,

C. H. x

7.8 αἱ δὲ χερσαῖα εἰς πτηνά,

It does not seem possible to choose between πτηνά in the Corpus and πετεινά in Stobaeus, except on the basis of the relative reliability of the two texts.

St. i.49.48

7.9 αἱ δὲ δέραι εἰς ἀνθρώπους,
7.10 αἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπιναι ἀρχὴν θανα-
σας ἔχουσιν εἰς δαίμονας
μεταβάλλουσαι,

C. H. x

7.9 αἱ δὲ δέραι εἰς ἀνθρώπους,
7.10 αἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπειαι θανα-
σας ἔχουσαι εἰς δαίμονας μετα-
βάλλονται, (αἱ θανασας A)

As in 7.6, Stobaeus changes a middle or passive form of μεταβάλλω, into an active form, in this case also changing the verb from an indicative to a participle. Since both Stobaeus and the Corpus frequently alternate between ἀνθρώπειος and ἀνθρώπινος, either could be original. Doubtless ἔχουσιν for ἔχουσαι is intended to elevate the style of the

passage.

The omission of ἀρχήν in the manuscripts of the Corpus is no doubt the result of an oversight.

St. 1.49.48

7.11 εἴτ' ἔν οὕτως εἰς τὸν τῶν
θεῶν χῶρον.

C. H. x

7.11 εἴθ' οὕτως εἰς τὸν θεῶν
χόρον χορεύουσι.

The change in this verse verifies the conjecture concerning the motives from the omission of 7.1-3. In the Corpus this verse would be translated, "and thus they dance into the dance of the gods," surely a very poetic reference to the stellar immortality which, according to Cumont, was the hope of many a devotee of astrology.¹ The version of Stobaeus is certainly more prosaic, but perhaps less likely to cause offence on religious grounds: those who reach this stage will go to the "place of the gods."

St. 1.49.48

7.12 χῶρον δὲ δύο θεῶν, ὁ μὲν
τῶν πλανημένων, ὁ δὲ τῶν ἀπλανῶν.
(χῶροι P²)

C. H. x

7.12 χοροὶ δὲ δύο θεῶν, ὁ μὲν
τῶν πλανημένων, ὁ δὲ τῶν ἀπλανῶν.

This change is continued in Stobaeus into the following verse, in which some scribe in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus blundered by writing χῶρον, the accusative singular, doubtless attracted by the preceding word.

St. 1.49.48

8.1 καὶ αὕτη ψυχῆς ἡ τελει-
οτάτη δόξα.
8.2 ψυχὴ δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπους
ἐλθοῦσα ἔάν κακῇ μένῃ,
οὕποτε τεύχεται θάναστος,

C. H. x

8.1 καὶ αὕτη ψυχῆς ἡ τελει-
οτάτη δόξα.
8.2 ψυχὴ εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα
εἰσελθοῦσα ἔάν κακῇ μένῃ,
οὕτε γέυεται θάναστος οὕτε
τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ μεταλαμβάνει,

¹F. Cumont, Astrology and religion among the Greeks and Romans, tr. J. B. Baker (New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1960 = 1912), pp. 95 ff. (The reading of the Corpus is retained by Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 70, n. 2.

The lack of a connective in 8.2 gives the impression that the αὐτῇ in 8.1 points forward to this sentence rather than looking back to 7.11,12. If so, the "most perfect glory of the soul" is something negative and rather trivial. Most likely, δὲ was omitted accidentally in the Corpus.

On the other hand, the reading εἰς ἀνθρώπου σῶμα of the Corpus seems preferable, since it is to be supposed that a soul does not enter more than one human body at a time, even though there may be no limit to the number that it may enter in succession. Perhaps the last three letters of σῶμα were obscured in a manuscript in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus; if so, the first three letters of εἰσελθοῦσα may also have been obscured.

Stobaeus' reading of τεύξεται for γεύεται could be accidental, caused by a confusion (in uncial) of T and Γ. The omission of οὕτε τοῦ διαθοῦ μεταλαμβάνει, however, looks deliberate, since it is obscured by changing οὕτε into οὕποτε. Could Stobaeus' source have taken offence at the idea of a human soul sharing in the good? Stobaeus' version, moreover, changes the whole passage from the present to the future tense, perhaps because he wishes these words to be understood eschatologically.

St. 1.49.48

8.3 παλίσσυρος δὲ τὴν δόδν ὄνο-
στρέψει τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ ἔρπετα,

C. H. x

8.3 παλίσσυρος τὴν δόδν ὄνο-
στρέψει τὴν εἰς τὰ ἔρπετα,
(παλίσσυρος δὲ B^C)

I would prefer the reading of the Corpus here, παλίσσυρος, although it would be a ἄνωξ λεγόμενον. Undoubtedly a case could be made for either reading. So also εἰς is to be preferred: the souls are to go into the serpents.

As in the previous sentence, Stobaeus changes a verb from the present into the future tense.

St. i.49.48

8.4 καὶ αὕτη καταδίκη ψυχῆς κακῆς.

8.5 κακῶς δὲ ψυχῆς ἀγνώστω.

C. H. x

8.4 καὶ αὕτη καταδίκη ψυχῆς κακῆς.

8.5 κακῶς δὲ ψυχῆς ἔστιν ἡ ἀγνώστω.

Stobaeus' version is undoubtedly crisper, but may be the result of an attempt to emend the text.

St. i.49.48

8.6 ψυχῇ γὰρ, μηδὲν ἐπιγνοῦσα τῶν ὄντων, μηδὲ τῶν τοῦτων φύσιν, μηδὲ τὸ ἀγαθόν,

C. H. x

8.6 ψυχῇ γὰρ, μηδὲν γνοῦσα τῶν ὄντων, μηδὲ τῇν τοῦτων φύσιν, μηδὲ τὸ ἀγαθόν,

Since ἐπιγινώσκω is a less common word than γινώσκω, it seems best to read ἐπιγνοῦσα here with Stobaeus, assuming that ἐπι- became lost either through carelessness or through manuscript damage.

St. i.49.48

8.7 τυφλώττουσα δὲ ἐντινάζσει τοῖς σωματικοῖς πᾶθεσι,

C. H. x

8.7 τυφλώττουσα ἐντινάζσει τοῖς πᾶθεσι τοῖς σωματικοῖς, (ἐκτινάζσει B^CD)

While the δὲ in Stobaeus is unnecessary, it cannot be ruled out. Since either τοῖς σωματικοῖς πᾶθεσι or τοῖς πᾶθεσι τοῖς σωματικοῖς would be correct, and since the latter reading is the less common construction, it may be adopted.

St. i.49.48

8.8 καὶ ἡ κακοδαίμων, ἀγνοήσασα ἑαυτήν, δουλεύει σῶμασιν ἄλλοκοτοῖς καὶ μοχθηροῖς,
8.9 ὥσπερ φορτίον βαστάζουσα τὸ σῶμα καὶ οὐκ ἀτάρχουσα ἀλλ' ἀρχομένη.

C. H. x

8.8 καὶ ἡ κακοδαίμων, ἀγνοήσασα ἑαυτήν, δουλεύει σῶμασιν ἄλλοκοτοῖς καὶ μοχθηροῖς,
8.9 ὥσπερ φορτίον βαστάζουσα τὸ σῶμα καὶ οὐκ ἄρχουσα ἀλλ' ἀρχομένη.

Stobaeus' reading here appears to be the result of inattention.

In any case, Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 910, gives only one doubtful

reference for the meaning required here. According to Nock, οὐ κατάρ-
χουσα may be corrupt for οὐκ ἐστὶ ἀρχουσα (Meineke).¹ This may be; but
if so the sense of οὐκ ἐστὶ here is obscure.

St. 1.49.48

8.10 αὐτὴ κατὰ ψυχῆς. (καταδόκη
p2)

C. H. x

8.10 αὐτὴ κατὰ ψυχῆς.

9.1 τοῦναντίον δὲ ἀρετῇ ψυχῆς
γνώσις κτλ.

In 8.10, κατὰ for κατὰ is clearly an error, and probably due
either to inattention or to the misreading of a partially obscured manu-
script.

The chapter immediately following in the Corpus is not irrele-
vant to the theme of Stobaeus' chapter, περὶ ψυχῆς. Stobaeus' source,
however, may have taken offense at it, since it deals with the theme of
the γνῶσις of God and the nature of the ineffable God.

St. 1.47.9

12.1

C. H. x

12.1 Καὶ ὁ μὲν κόσμος πρῶτος,

This verse could have been omitted in Stobaeus because it is
irrelevant to the chapter in Stobaeus, περὶ φύσεως ἀνθρώπων. Also
omitted, however, as we shall see, are some other verses comparing man
to the κόσμος. Since these verses are quite pertinent to Stobaeus'
chapter, the suspicion arises that 12.1 as well as 12.3-6 were omitted
because Stobaeus' source did not care for the discussion about the na-
ture of the κόσμος in this chapter.

St. 1.47.9

12.2 ὁ μὲν ἄνθρωπος τὸ δεύτερον
ἔφρον μετὰ τὸν κόσμον, πρῶτον δὲ
τῶν θνητῶν.

C. H. x

12.2 ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος δεύτερον
ἔφρον μετὰ τὸν κόσμον, πρῶτον
δὲ τῶν θνητῶν, (πρῶτος d)

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xliii.

Stobaeus' source disguises the omission of 12.1 by changing $\delta\epsilon$ to $\mu\epsilon\nu$. Unfortunately the $\mu\epsilon\nu$ in Stobaeus seems to have no function, since the next sentence, 13.1, does not stand in any logical contrast to 12.2. Probably the article before $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu$ $\zeta\omega\nu$ is to be retained, with Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.9

12.3

12.4

12.5

12.6

C. H. x

12.3 $\tau\omega\nu$ $\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu$ $\zeta\omega\nu$ $\tau\omicron$
 $\epsilon\mu\psi\upsilon\chi\omicron\nu$ $\epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota$.

12.4 $\circ\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\tau\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\mu\omicron\nu\omicron\nu$ $\circ\upsilon\kappa$ $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha-$
 $\theta\omicron\varsigma$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

12.5 δ $\mu\epsilon\nu$ $\gamma\iota\rho$ $\kappa\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ $\circ\upsilon\kappa$
 $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\kappa\iota\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\circ\upsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$
 $\delta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\theta\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$.

12.6, δ $\delta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$
 $\kappa\iota\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\theta\eta\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$, $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\varsigma$.

While 12.3 may have been omitted simply on the grounds that it is extremely obscure, 12.4-6 contains a view of the $\kappa\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$ which Stobaeus' source may have found unacceptable, that is, the $\kappa\omicron\varsigma\mu\omicron\varsigma$, while not evil, is also not good.

St. 1.47.9

13.1 $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$
 $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$.

13.2 δ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, δ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\tilde{\eta}$, η $\delta\epsilon$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$
 $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$.

C. H. x

13.1 $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\upsilon$ $\delta\chi\epsilon\iota\tau\alpha\iota$
 $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu$.

13.2 δ $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omega$, δ $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma$
 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\eta}$ $\psi\upsilon\chi\tilde{\eta}$, η $\psi\upsilon\chi\tilde{\eta}$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\iota$.

This passage has been discussed above, p. 65. I would read, with Turnebus and Wachsmuth, η $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}$ $\langle\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\rangle$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\iota$. Stobaeus' source may have found the last words, $\langle\tau\omicron$ $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ $\tau\tilde{\omega}\rangle$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, redundant in view of 13.3, immediately following.

St. 1.47.9

13.3 $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$, $\delta\iota\eta\kappa\omicron\nu$ $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$
 $\phi\lambda\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha-$
 $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\iota\eta\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\zeta\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$
 $\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$ $\tau\iota\tilde{\nu}\acute{\alpha}$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$. ($\delta\iota-$
 $\omicron\kappa\omicron\nu$ P)

C. H. x

13.3 $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ $\delta\iota\eta\kappa\epsilon\iota$ $\delta\iota\acute{\alpha}$
 $\phi\lambda\epsilon\beta\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\eta\rho\iota\omega\tilde{\nu}$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\lambda\mu\alpha-$
 $\tau\omicron\varsigma$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\kappa\iota\eta\epsilon\iota$ $\tau\omicron$ $\zeta\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma-$
 $\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu$ $\tau\iota\tilde{\nu}\acute{\alpha}$ $\beta\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$.
($\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\pi\tau\epsilon$ $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho$ $\sigma\alpha$. B, ins.
BC)

Here Stobaeus' reading is to be preferred on stylistic grounds, but the reading of the Corpus is quite admissible. Perhaps Stobaeus has emended the style of this passage.

St. 1.47.9

13.4 διδ καὶ τινες τὴν ψυχὴν αἷμα νομίζουσιν εἶναι, σφαλλόμενοι τὴν φύσιν,

C. H. x

13.4 διδ καὶ τινες τὴν ψυχὴν αἷμα ἐνόμισαν εἶναι, σφαλλόμενοι τὴν φύσιν, (σφαλλόμενοι AD; τὴν φύσιν om. N)

The ἐνόμισαν of the Corpus suggests that this particular belief was no longer entertained when this tractate was written. It is difficult to see how such a reading could have arisen through error or emendation within the manuscript tradition of the Corpus, but less difficult to see why Stobaeus would have preferred the present, νομίζουσιν.

St. 1.47.9

13.5 οὐκ εἶδότες ὅτι πρῶτον δὴ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀναχωρήσαντος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ αἷμα παγῆναι καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθείσας τὸ ἕψον καταλείπειν.

C. H. x

13.5 οὐκ εἶδότες ὅτι πρῶτον δεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα ἀναχωρῆσαι εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τότε τὸ αἷμα παγῆναι καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθῆναι καὶ τότε τὸ ἕψον καθελεῖν* (τὸ ante αἷμα et τὰς ante ἀρτηρίας om. A)

Presumably Stobaeus' δὴ for δεῖ is a mere scribal error, and should not be charged to Stobaeus or to his source.

It appears as if Stobaeus' source had attempted to recast this sentence into more elegant Greek. To an extent he succeeds; at least he eliminates the repeated καὶ τότε by means of the genitive absolute, τοῦ πνεύματος ἀναχωρήσαντος. However, it is difficult to see the function of καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθείσας in Stobaeus' version; at least, one can scarcely speak of the veins and arteries leaving the body, or being left by the body. I suspect that we have here an attempt at emendation which failed.

The text given in the Corpus for this verse is itself not without difficulties. Not only is the repeated καὶ τότε monotonous, but the final infinitive lacks a suitable subject. Festugière translates, "cela fasse périr le vivant." Presumably "cela" refers to the activity in the first part of the sentence. Perhaps καθαιρεθῆναι had been intended, although it is difficult to account for such a substitution.

St. 1.47.9

13.6 καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶν ὁ θάνατος
τοῦ σώματος.

C. H. x

13.6 καὶ τοῦτο ἐστὶ θάνατος
τοῦ σώματος.

Either Stobaeus' source has inserted the article before θάνατος or it has dropped out in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus.

Since chapter fourteen of the Corpus abruptly opens a new topic, its omission in this excerpt is not surprising.

St. 1.48.3

16.1

16.2

16.3

16.4

C. H. x

16.1 τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει καὶ
τοῖς τοῦ σώματος ἐξιοῦσιν.

16.2 ἀναδραμοῦσα γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ
εἰς ἑαυτὴν, συστέλλεται τὸ
πνεῦμα εἰς τὸ αἷμα, ἡ δὲ
ψυχὴ εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, (ἀναδρα-
μοῦσας γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς BC)

16.3 ὁ δὲ νοῦς καθαρὸς γενέ-
μενος τῶν ἐνδυμάτων, θεῖος
ὢν φύσει, σώματος πυρίνου
λαβόμενος περιπολεῖ πάντα
τόπον,

16.4 καταλιπὼν τὴν ψυχὴν κρῖσει
καὶ τῇ κατ' ἀξίαν δίκῃ.

As a result of the omission of these four lines, the excerpt from this section in Stobaeus is clearly eschatological in nature. The version in the Corpus, on the other hand, tends to mix eschatological concepts with a description of the journey of the soul in ecstasy.

St. 1.48.3

16.5 - Πᾶς τοῦτο λέγεις, ὦ πάτερ;
 16.6 ὁ νοῦς τῆς ψυχῆς χωρίζεται
 καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος,
 16.7 σοῦ εἰπόντος δύναμιν εἶναι
 τοῦ μὲν νοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν, τῆς δὲ
 ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα;

C. H. x

16.5 - Πᾶς τοῦτο λέγεις, ὦ πάτερ;
 16.6 ὁ νοῦς τῆς ψυχῆς χωρίζεται
 καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ πνεύματος,
 16.7 σοῦ εἰπόντος ἐνδύμα εἶναι
 τοῦ μὲν νοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν, τῆς δὲ
 ψυχῆς τὸ πνεῦμα; (σοῦ: τοῦ C;
 σοῦ ex τοῦ H)

Stobaeus' reading, δύναμιν, is likely to be merely an accidental substitution of a relatively common word for a relatively uncommon word.

St. 1.48.3

17.1 - Συννοεῖν δεῖ, τέκνον,
 τὸν ἀκούοντα τῷ λέγοντι, καὶ
συνπνεῖν καὶ δευτέραν ἔχειν
 τὴν ἀκοὴν τῆς τοῦ λέγοντος
 φωνῆς. (τὸν λέγοντα P¹, τῷ
 λέγοντι P^C; ἔχει P¹, ἔχειν
 P^C)

C. H. x

17.1 - Συννοεῖν δεῖ, ὦ τέκνον,
 τὸν ἀκούοντα τῷ λέγοντι, καὶ
συνπνέειν καὶ δευτέραν ἔχειν
 τὴν ἀκοὴν τῆς τοῦ λέγοντος
 φωνῆς. (δεῖ: δε N; πνέειν BN;
 ἔχει AB, ἔχειν A^CB^C)

The omission of ὦ and the substitution of συνπνεῖν for συνπνέειν could both be the result of mere inattention.

St. 1.48.3

17.2 ἡ σύνθεσις τῶν ἐνδυμάτων
 τούτων ἐν σάματι γήνη γίνεται.

C. H. x

17.2 ἡ σύνθεσις τῶν ἐνδυμάτων
 τούτων, ὦ τέκνον, ἐν σάματι
 γήνη γίνεται.

Stobaeus' source may have found the ὦ τέκνον in this sentence redundant. In addition, γίνεται has become γίνεται through Atticism.

St. 1.48.3

17.3 ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸν νοῦν
 ἐν γήνη σάματι γυμνὸν αὐτὸν
 καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐδράσαι.
 17.4 οὔτε γὰρ τὸ γήινον σῶμα
 δυνατόν ἐστι τὴν τηλικαύτην
 θάνασσαν ἐνεγκεῖν, οὔτε τὴν
 τοσαύτην ἀρετὴν ἀνασχεῖσθαι
συχρηματιζόμενον αὐτῇ παθητὸν
 σῶμα.

C. H. x

17.3 ἀδύνατον γὰρ τὸν νοῦν
 ἐν γήνη σάματι γυμνὸν αὐτὸν
 καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐδράσαι.
 17.4 οὔτε γὰρ τὸ γήινον σῶμα
 δυνατόν ἐστι τηλικαύτην θά-
 νασσαν ἐνεγκεῖν, οὔτε τὴν
 τοσαύτην ἀρετὴν ἀνέχεσθαι
συχρηματιζόμενον αὐτῇ παθη-
 τὸν σῶμα.

Perhaps we should retain τὴν before τηλικαύτην with Stobaeus, since the article is also used before τοσαύτην in the same sentence.

Probably since the aorist ἐνεγκεῖν is used earlier in the same sentence, it would be best to read ἀνασχέσθαι with Stobaeus for ἀνέχεσθαι. No doubt συγχρωματίζομενον in the Corpus is an easy error for συγχρωτίζομενον. Finally, Stobaeus' αὐτῇ makes more sense in the context than αὐτῷ in the Corpus, although αὐτῷ could be tolerated if it is taken as referring back to νοῦν in 17.3.

St. 1.48.3

17.5 ἔλαβεν ὥσπερ περιβόλαιον
τὴν ψυχὴν.

C. H. x

17.5 ἔλαβεν οὖν ὥσπερ περιβολὴν
τὴν ψυχὴν.

Probably οὖν is omitted in Stobaeus through an oversight. Since there appears to be little difference in meaning between περιβολὴν and περιβόλαιον, and since both are attested in Hellenistic Greek, we may perhaps favour the reading of the Corpus simply on the basis of the relative reliability of the two versions.

St. 1.48.3

17.6 ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτὴ τις
θεῖα οὕσα καθάπερ ὑπηρέτη τῷ
πνεύματι χρῆται. (ὑπηρέτη P²;
ὑπηρέτου P¹; ὑπηρέτης F)

C. H. x

17.6 ἡ δὲ ψυχὴ καὶ αὐτὴ θεῖα
τις οὕσα καθάπερ οἱ περὶ τῷ
πνεύματι χρῆται.

Presumably τις is to be construed with θεῖα. While it could in this case either precede θεῖα as in Stobaeus, or follow it, as in the Corpus, the latter position is more common. I believe that τις may have been accidentally displaced in Stobaeus.

While ὑπηρέτη in Stobaeus' P² may be a conjecture, it is demanded by the sense here, and moreover is suggested by the erroneous readings of P¹ and F; in any case, οἱ περὶ, the reading of the Corpus, is meaningless.

Finally, αὐτῇ is wrongly accented in the Corpus.

St. 1.48.3

17.7 τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἴψον
διοικεῖ.18.1 ὅταν ὁ νοῦς ἀπαλλαγῇ τοῦ
γῆινου σώματος

C. H. x

17.7 τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τὸ ἴψον
διοικεῖ.18.1 ὅταν οὖν ὁ νοῦς ἀπαλλαγῇ
τοῦ γῆινου σώματος (οὖν om.
B, ins. B^c)

Stobaeus here omits οὖν either in error or because he found it
redundant.

St. 1.48.3

18.2 τὸν ὕδιον εὐθὺς ἀνεδύσατο
χιτῶνα, τὸν πύρινον,18.3 ὅν οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἔχων εἰς
τὸ γῆινον σῶμα κατοικῆσαι.

C. H. x

18.2 τὸν ὕδιον εὐθὺς ἀνεδύσατο
χιτῶνα, τὸν πύρινον,18.3 ὅν οὐκ ἠδύνατο ἔχων
εἰς τὸ γῆινον σῶμα κατοικῆσαι.
(ὅν om. BCM, ins. B^c; ἔχων:
ἔχον ACM)

Stobaeus' reading, ἠδύνατο, is an Atticism; see Nock, in Nock-
Festugière, op. cit., intro., p. xlii.

St. 1.48.3

18.4 γῆ γὰρ πῦρ οὐ βαστάζει.

18.5 πᾶσα γὰρ γῆ φλέγεται καὶ
ὅπῃ δαίγῃ σπινθῆρος.

C. H. x

18.4 γῆ γὰρ πῦρ οὐ βαστάζει.

18.5 πᾶσα γὰρ φλέγεται καὶ
ὅπῃ δαίγῃ σπινθῆρος,

It is difficult to decide here whether γῆ was inserted by Sto-
baeus' source to clarify the sense or whether it was accidentally omit-
ted within the manuscript tradition of the Corpus.

St. 1.48.3

18.6 διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ
περικέχεται τῇ γῇ,

C. H. x

18.6 καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ ὕδωρ
περικέχεται τῇ γῇ,

The shift of καὶ in Stobaeus need not be a scribal error, but may
be an attempt to improve the style of the passage.

St. 1.48.3

18.7 ὥσπερ ἔριμα καὶ τεῖχος
ἀντέχον πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς
φλόγα.

C. H. x

18.7 ὥσπερ ἔριμα καὶ τεῖχος
ἀντέχον πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πυρὸς
φλόγα.

St. 1.46.3

18.8 νοῦς δὲ δξύτατος πάντων
τῶν θεσῶν νοημάτων καὶ τὸ δξύ-
τατον πάντων τῶν στοιχείων ἔχει
τὸ πῦρ σῶμα.

C. H. x

18.8 οὗς δξύτατος ὢν πάντων
θεσῶν νοημάτων καὶ δξύτερος
πάντων τῶν στοιχείων ἔχει
σῶμα τὸ πῦρ. (οὗς: ὅς A; νοῦς
d; νοῦς δὲ B²; νοημάτων θεσῶν
d; σῶμα τὸ: σῶματι A)

A scribal error is undoubtedly responsible for οὗς in place of νοῦς in the Corpus. Stobaeus' source may, however, have added δὲ and removed ὢν in order to improve the style of the passage. An article may have been omitted in the Corpus before θεσῶν νοημάτων. Scott, perhaps correctly, accepts τὸ δξύτατον from Stobaeus and σῶμα τὸ πῦρ, from the Corpus, translating "has for its body fire, the keenest of all the material elements."

St. 1.48.3

18.9 δημιουργός γάρ ὢν ὁ νοῦς
τῶν πάντων, ὀργάνῳ τῷ πυρὶ πρὸς
τὴν δημιουργίαν χρῆται.

C. H. x

18.9 δημιουργός γάρ ὢν πάντων
τῶν οὐρανῶν τῷ πυρὶ πρὸς τὴν
δημιουργίαν χρῆται. (πρὸς om.
BC, ins. B^c)

Stobaeus' source may have added ὁ νοῦς as a gloss. It is doubtful, however, whether πάντων τῶν οὐρανῶν in the Corpus can be retained. Normally the singular οὐρανός would have been used.¹ The plural would be admissible if there were some reason to suspect Jewish or Christian influence. However, Dodd gives no reason to suppose that such influence exists, except for the use of δόξα in x.8.1.² Moreover, the substitution of the οὐρανῶν for ὀργάνῳ can be explained, since the two words

¹H. Traub s. v. οὐρανός, in Kittel's Theologische Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament, V, 497; E. T., V, 497.

²Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 242.

have many letters in common, and therefore could be confused by an inattentive scribe. Perhaps $\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\omega\nu$ for $\tau\omega\nu\ \mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$ is a secondary error, or a correction of the text based on this misreading.

St. 1.48.3

18.10 καὶ ὁ μὲν τοῦ παντός
τῶν $\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$, ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς μόνον.

C. H. x

18.10 καὶ ὁ μὲν τοῦ παντός
τῶν $\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$, ὁ δὲ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου
τῶν ἐπιγεστων $\mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$.

We may possibly ascribe Stobaeus' version of this verse to deliberate alteration. The text in the Corpus postulates a separate $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in man which creates all earthly things, ($\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\pi\iota\gamma\epsilon\sigma\tau\omega\nu\ \mu\epsilon\nu\tau\omega\nu$), whereas the text in Stobaeus insists that the $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in man creates only things on earth ($\tau\omega\nu\ \epsilon\piὶ\ γῆς\ μόνον$). This is a difference in emphasis.

St. 1.48.3

18.11 γυνὸς γὰρ ὢν τοῦ πυρός,
ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ δύναται
τὰ θεῖα δημιουργεῖν, ἀνθρώ-
που ὢν τῇ οἰκῇσει.

C. H. x

18.11 γυνὸς γὰρ ὢν τοῦ πυρός,
ὁ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ $\nu\omicron\varsigma$ δύναται
τὰ θεῖα δημιουργεῖν, ἀνθρώ-
πινος ὢν τῇ διοικῇσει.

None of the changes here is likely to be deliberate. Probably we should read ἀνθρώπῳ with Stobaeus, since the singular is used in 18.10. Perhaps ἀνθρώπου for ἀνθρώπινος and οἰκῇσει for διοικῇσει, both in Stobaeus, are the result of a partially obscured manuscript; alternately, Stobaeus' source may have found ἀνθρώπινος ὢν τῇ διοικῇσει obscure, and had substituted at least οἰκῇσει for διοικῇσει. Presumably the text of the Corpus meant, "human with respect to its administration," that is, in less turgid language, it "governs humans."

It will be noted that this section, from x.16.5 to x.18.11, provides relatively few instances in which the text of the tractate is likely to have been deliberately altered by Stobaeus' source. Two explanations can be considered: either Stobaeus' source found relatively little

to change in this section, or Stobaeus found this extract in a different anthology. In favour of the second hypothesis is the fact that this particular excerpt is given the lemma 'Ερμού rather than the more complete 'Ερμού ἐκ τῶν πρὸς Ἰδρ given for the other excerpts from C. H. x. This could, however, be the result of a scribal lapse. Speaking in favour of the first possibility is the fact that all five extracts in Stobaeus from C. H. x are contained within three closely related chapters of Stobaeus. Certainty in this respect is difficult.

St. 1.49.49

19.1 Ψυχὴ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνη, πᾶσα
μὲν, ἡ δὲ εὐσεβής, δαιμονία
τὶς ἔστι καὶ θεία.

C. H. x

19.1 ψυχὴ δὲ ἀνθρωπίνη, οὐ
πᾶσα μὲν, ἡ δὲ εὐσεβής, δαι-
μονία τὶς ἔστι καὶ θεία.

No doubt οὐ is omitted in error in Stobaeus' text.

St. 1.49.49

19.2 καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη καὶ μετὰ
τὸ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ σώματος
τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγῶνα
ἀγωνισμένην

C. H. x

19.2 καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη ψυχὴ μετὰ
τὸ ἀπαλλαγῆναι τοῦ σώματος
τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγῶνα
ἡγωνισμένην θεὸς γίνεταί.

Perhaps Stobaeus' source found ψυχὴ redundant, and added καὶ before μετὰ for emphasis. Since the aorist is much more frequent than the perfect, especially in Hellenistic Greek, it is quite possible that ἀγωνισμένην in Stobaeus was accidentally substituted for the unfamiliar ἡγωνισμένην.

The omission of θεὸς γίνεταί in Stobaeus is consistent with the practice already noted, above, p. 313, of removing all references to apotheosis. Nock would follow Stobaeus in this regard on the grounds that the words in question could have been a gloss suggested by 1.26,

and that they spoil the phrase.¹ While it is admitted that the version in Stobaeus is smoother, the version in the Corpus does make sense, and moreover contains the typically Hermetic doctrine of apotheosis, always omitted in Stobaeus.

St. 1.49.49

19.3 (ἀγὼν δὲ εὐσεβείας τὸ
γινῶναι τὸ θεῖον καὶ μηδένα
ἀνθρώπων ἀδικῆσαι)

C. H. x

19.3 ἀγὼν δὲ εὐσεβείας τὸ
γινῶναι τὸν θεὸν καὶ μηδένα
ἀνθρώπων ἀδικῆσαι.

Perhaps Stobaeus' source found τὸν θεὸν too explicit, and replaced it with the vaguer τὸ θεῖον.

St. 8.49.49

19.4 ὅλη νοῦς γίνεται.

C. H. x

19.4 ἥδη νοῦς γίνεται.

Probably the Corpus' ἥδη for ὅλη is an accidental substitution.

Γίνεται for γίνεται is, of course, an Atticism.

St. 1.49.49

19.5 ἡ δὲ δσεβοῦς ψυχὴ μένει
ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίας, ὅφ'
ἑαυτῆς κολαζομένη, καὶ γή-
ινον σῶμα ἱητοῦσα εἰσελθεῖν,
εἰς ἀνθρώπινον δέ.

C. H. x

19.5 ἡ δὲ δσεβῆς ψυχὴ μένει
ἐπὶ τῆς ἰδίας οὐσίας, ὅφ'
ἑαυτῆς κολαζομένη, καὶ γή-
ινον σῶμα ἱητοῦσα εἰς δ'
εἰσελθῇ ἀνθρώπειον. (ἀνθρώ-
πινον A)

Perhaps δσεβοῦς for δσεβῆς is an unintentional substitution, although it is difficult to account for such a change.

It almost seems as if the ἀνθρώπειον in the Corpus' version of this verse was put in as an afterthought; in any case it seems very clumsy here. If this was the original reading, then Stobaeus has substantially recast the sentence, replacing a relative clause of purpose with an infinitive of purpose, and replacing ἀνθρώπειον with the more

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xliii, intro.

substantial εἰς ἀνθρώπινον δέ.

St. 1.49.49

19.6 ἄλλο γὰρ σῶμα οὐ χωρεῖ
ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν,
19.7 οὐδὲ θέμις ἐστὶν εἰς
ἀλόγου ἴφου σῶμα ψυχὴν ἀνθρ-
πίνην καταπεσεῖν.
19.8 θεοῦ γὰρ νόμος οὗτος,
φυλάσσειν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην
ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑβρεως.
(φυλάσσει P)

C. H. x

19.6 ἄλλο γὰρ σῶμα οὐ χωρεῖ
ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν,
19.7 οὐδὲ θέμις ἐστὶν εἰς
ἀλόγου ἴφου σῶμα ψυχὴν ἀνθρ-
πίνην καταπεσεῖν.
19.8 θεοῦ γὰρ νόμος οὗτος,
φυλάσσειν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην
ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης ὑβρεως.

Either τοιαύτης or τοσαύτης could be the result of scribal error.

St. 1.47.8

22.1

22.2

C. H. x

22.1 Διὸς δὲ τέκνον, εὐχαρισ-
τοῦντα τῷ θεῷ δεῖ εὐχεσθαι
καλοῦ τοῦ νοῦ τυχεῖν.
22.2 εἰς μὲν οὖν τὸ κρείττον
ψυχὴ μεταβαίνει, εἰς δὲ τὸ
ἐλάττον ἀδύνατον.

These two verses were presumably omitted by Stobaeus' source be-
cause they look back to the previous discussion rather than to the dis-
cussion in the following excerpt. The second of these repeats the sub-
stance of 19.6-8.

St. 1.47.8

22.3 Κοινωνία δὲ ἐστὶ ψυχῶν,
22.4 καὶ κοινοῦσι μὲν αἱ τῶν
θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, αἱ δὲ
τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἀλόγων.
22.5 ἐπιμελοῦνται δὲ οἱ κρείτ-
τονες τῶν ἐλαττόνων, θεοὶ μὲν
ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωποι δὲ τῶν ἀλό-
γων ἴφων, ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντων.

C. H. x

22.3 Κοινωνία δὲ ἐστὶ ψυχῶν,
22.4 καὶ κοινοῦσι μὲν αἱ τῶν
θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

22.5

ὁ δὲ θεὸς πάντων.

Presumably αἱ δὲ . . . ἴφων has dropped out because of the re-
peated endings in -ων.

St. 1.47.8

22.6

C. H. x

22.6 πάντων γὰρ οὗτος κρείτ-
των, καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ ἐλάττονα.

Presumably this verse was omitted in Stobaeus through inattention.

St. 1.47.8

22.7 ὁ μὲν οὖν κόσμος ὑπόκειται
τῷ θεῷ, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος τῷ κόσμῳ,
τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

22.8 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἅπαντα καὶ
περὶ πάντα (ὑπερᾶπαντα F)

C. H. x

22.7 ὁ μὲν οὖν κόσμος ὑπόκειται
τῷ θεῷ, ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος τῷ κόσμῳ,
τὰ δὲ ἄλλα τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ.

22.8 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ὑπὲρ πάντα καὶ
περὶ πάντα.

As often in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus, ἅπαντα is substituted for πάντα.

St. 1.47.8

22.9 καὶ τοῦ μὲν θεοῦ καθάπερ

ἀκτῖνες αἱ ἐνέργειαι,

22.10 τοῦ δὲ κόσμου ἀκτῖνες
αἱ φύσεις,

C. H. x

22.9 καὶ τοῦ μὲν θεοῦ καθάπερ

ἀκτῖνες αἱ ἐνέργειαι,

22.10 τοῦ δὲ κόσμου ἀκτῖνες
αἱ φύσεις,

It is difficult to see why Stobaeus inserted the article before ἀκτῖνες twice in two consecutive verses; at any rate, the article is not needed here.

St. 1.47.8

22.11 τοῦ δὲ ἀνθρώπου, αἱ τέχναι
καὶ αἱ ἐπιστήμαι.

C. H. x

22.11 τοῦ δὲ ἀνθρώπου, αἱ τέχναι
καὶ ἐπιστήμαι.

Although the article before ἐπιστήμαι is possible here, I suspect that it has been inserted into Stobaeus' text.

St. 1.47.8

22.12 καὶ αἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαι διὰ
τοῦ κόσμου ἐνεργοῦσι καὶ ἐπὶ
τὸν ἄνθρωπον διὰ τῶν τοῦ κόσμου
φυσικῶν ἀκτῶν,

22.13 αἱ δὲ φύσεις διὰ τῶν
στοιχείων,

22.14 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τῶν
τεχνῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν.

23.1 καὶ αὕτη ἡ τοῦ παντός
διοίκησις, ἡρτημένη ἐκ τῆς
ἐνός φύσεως καὶ διήκουσα τοῦ
τοῦ ἐνός τοῦ νοῦ· (διήκουσα:
ἡ διοίκουσα P)

C. H. x

22.12 καὶ αἱ μὲν ἐνέργειαι διὰ
τοῦ κόσμου ἐνεργοῦσι καὶ ἐπὶ
τὸν ἄνθρωπον διὰ τῶν τοῦ κόσμου
φυσικῶν ἀκτῶν,

22.13 αἱ δὲ φύσεις διὰ τῶν
στοιχείων,

22.14 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι διὰ τῶν
τεχνῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν.

23.1 καὶ αὕτη ἡ τοῦ παντός
ἐστὶ διοίκησις, ἡρτημένη ἐκ
τῆς τοῦ ἐνός φύσεως καὶ δι-
ήκουσα δι' ἐνός τοῦ νοῦ.

The copula is omitted elsewhere in Stobaeus, as in Stobaeus' version of x.8.5. The omission of τοῦ was probably due to scribal error. Perhaps τοῦ ἐνός was written in the margin, and substituted by

a later scribe for δι' ἐνός; alternately, it may have been accidentally substituted from the line above.

St. 1.47.8

23.2 ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἐστὶ θεϊότερον
καὶ ἐνεργέστερον καὶ ἐνωτι-
κώτερον ἀνθρώπων μὲν πρὸς
θεοῦς, θεῶν δὲ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους.

C. H. x

23.2 οὐδὲν ἐστὶ θεϊότερον
καὶ ἐνεργέστερον καὶ ἐνωτι-
κώτερον ἀνθρώπων μὲν πρὸς
τοὺς θεοῦς, θεῶν δὲ πρὸς
τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. (δὲ DB^c
om. ABCM)

Although ὁ δὲ νοῦς is out of place grammatically, it cannot easily be explained as a scribal error. Perhaps Stobaeus wrote ὁ δὲ νοῦς in a clumsy attempt to clear up what he took to be the meaning of the sentence. On the other hand, Stobaeus may have preserved the original reading in omitting τοὺς before θεοῦς and before ἀνθρώπους; at least, the sentence as Stobaeus gives it is leaner.

St. 1.47.8

23.3 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς δαίμων,

23.4 οὐδ' ἔν μακάρις ψυχὴ ἡ τοῦτου
πληρεστέτη,

C. H. x

23.3 οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθὸς
δαίμων,
23.4 μακάρις ψυχὴ ἡ τοῦτου
πληρεστέτη,

Stobaeus' source has joined these two sentences by οὐδ' ἔν without apparently noticing that the οὐδ' renders τοῦτου in the same sentence redundant. A misinterpretation of an unaccented text has given us ἡ for ἡ.

St. 1.47.8

23.5 κακοδαίμων δὲ ψυχὴ ἡ τοῦ-
του κενωτέτη.

C. H. x

23.5 κακοδαίμων δὲ ψυχὴ ἡ τοῦ-
του κενή.

Κενωτέτη for κενή seems to be unmotivated, unless it is to balance πληρεστέτη in the previous sentence.¹

¹As Prof. Kingston has suggested to me.

St. 1.47.8

23.6 - Πῶς τοῦτο πάλιν λέγεις,
ὦ πάτερ;23.7 - Οὔει οὖν, ὦ τέκνον, ὅτι
πᾶσα ψυχὴ νοῦν ἔχει τὸν ἀγαθόν;23.8 περὶ γὰρ τοῦτου ὁ νῦν
λόγος, οὗ τοῦ ὑπηρετικοῦ περὶ
οὗ ἔμπροσθεν εἰρήκαμεν, τοῦ
καταπεμπομένου ὑπὸ τῆς Δικῆς.

C. H. x

23.6 - Πῶς τοῦτο πάλιν λέγεις,
ὦ πάτερ; (λέγεις πάλιν ABC)23.7 - Οὔει οὖν, ὦ τέκνον, ὅτι
πᾶσα ψυχὴ νοῦν ἔχει τὸν ἀγαθόν;
(τὸ ἀγαθόν AC)23.8 περὶ γὰρ τοῦτου ἔστιν
ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, οὗ περὶ τοῦ ὑπη-
ρετικοῦ, οὗ ἔμπροσθεν εἰρή-
καμεν, τοῦ καταπεμπομένου ὑπὸ
τῆς Δικῆς.

Here Stobaeus' source omits the copula again, cf. x.23.1 and x.8.5. Either ὁ νῦν λόγος or ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος could be the original reading. Since we have here a deliberate alteration, probably it should be charged to Stobaeus' source. Perhaps περὶ was accidentally displaced in one of these versions.

St. 1.47.8

24.1 ψυχὴ γὰρ χωρὶς νοῦ
"οὔτε τι εἰπεῖν οὐτ' ἔρξαι
δύναται."

C. H. x

24.1 ψυχὴ γὰρ χωρὶς τοῦ νοῦ
"οὔτε τι εἰπεῖν οὔτε τι εἶρξαι
δύναται." (τι om. D; εἶρξαι
AB; εἶρξαι CM; ἔρξαι D)

Since it is improbable that Stobaeus' source would have checked the quotation from Theognis in this line, probably the variants within the quotation in the manuscripts of the Corpus are the result of scribal error. The article before νοῦ could have been omitted by accident in Stobaeus or inserted by mistake in the Corpus.

St. 1.47.8

24.2 πολλὰκις γὰρ ἔξιστάται
ὁ νοῦς τῆς ψυχῆς,

C. H. x

24.2 πολλὰκις γὰρ ἔξιστη
ὁ νοῦς τῆς ψυχῆς,

Perhaps in this verse we should accept Meineke's conjecture, ἔξιστάται for Stobaeus' ἔξιστάται. This could easily have become corrupted, as a result of manuscript damage, to ἔξιστη in the Corpus.

St. 1.47.8

24.3 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ οὔτε
βλέπει ἡ ψυχὴ οὔτε ἀκούει.

C. H. x

24.3 καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ οὔτε
βλέπει ψυχὴ οὔτε ἀκούει.

As frequently, the definite article is inserted in Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.8

24.4 ἀλλ' ἀλόγη ἴψη ἔοικε·

24.5 τηλικαύτη δύναμις ἐστὶ τοῦ νοῦ.

24.6 ἀλλ' οὐδὲ νωθρᾶς ψυχῆς
ἀνέχεται. (οὐ P)

C. H. x

24.4 ἀλλ' ἀλόγη ἴψη ἔοικε·

ἀλλ' om. B, ins. B^C)

24.5 τηλικαύτη δύναμις ἐστὶ τοῦ νοῦ.

24.6

This line was doubtless accidentally omitted in the Corpus because of the repeated ἀλλδ.

St. 1.47.8

24.7 ἀλλδ καταλείπει τὴν
ἐν τῷ σήματι προσκειμένην
κατὰ πάντα ἀγχομένην κἄτω.

C. H. x

24.7 ἀλλδ καταλείπει τὴν τοι
αύτην ψυχὴν τῷ σήματι προσηρ-
τημένην καὶ ὅπ' αὐτοῦ ἀγχομέ-
νην κἄτω.

The omission of τοιαύτην ψυχὴν in Stobaeus is easily attributed to manuscript damage; perhaps ἐν is a conjecture based on a remaining final ν in ψυχὴν. However, προσκειμένην seems to be a deliberate substitution for the slightly more difficult προσηρτημένην. So also κατὰ πάντα for καὶ ὅπ' αὐτοῦ is probably a deliberate substitution, and would presumably mean, "in every respect," although it might be a misinterpretation of the corresponding phrase in the Corpus based on the misreading of a manuscript in which some of those letters had become obscured.

St. 1.47.8

24.8 ἡ τοιαύτη ὁδὲ ψυχῆς, ᾧ τέκνον,
νοῦν οὐκ ἔχει.

C. H. x

24.8 ἡ ὁδὲ τοιαύτη ψυχῆς, τέκνον,
νοῦν οὐκ ἔχει.

Probably the position of ὁδὲ in Stobaeus was shifted by error.

Perhaps ᾧ was accidentally omitted in the Corpus.

St. 1.47.8

24.9 ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον ἡγεῖσθαι
δεῖ τὸν τοιοῦτον·

C. H. x

24.9 ὅθεν οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπον δεῖ
λέγεσθαι τὸν τοιοῦτον·

This variation again is the result of alteration of the text, but

for motives which are not clear to me. I would follow the reading of the Corpus for the reason repeatedly given, that it seems to contain the more reliable text.

St. 1.47.8

24.10 ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος θεῖον ἰϋόν
ἔστι καὶ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἰϋοῖς
συγκρινόμενον τῶν ἐπιγεῖων τισίν,
ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἄνω ἐν οὐρανῷ λεγομέ-
νοις θεοῖς.

C. H. x

24.10 ὁ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος ἰϋόν ἔστι
θεῖον καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἰϋοῖς οὐ
συγκρίνεται τῶν ἐπιγεῖων, ἀλλὰ
τοῖς ἐν οὐρανῷ ἄνω λεγομένοις
θεοῖς. (ἰϋόν θεῖόν ἔστι Md)

Perhaps θεῖον had been written above the line in the archetype of the Corpus and had been inserted in different places in M and in ABC. Apparently Stobaeus has changed συγκρίνεται into a participle, and changed οὐ to οὐδὲ, perhaps in an attempt to improve Hermes' style. The function of τισίν in Stobaeus' version is obscure to me. Perhaps ἄνω has become displaced in one of these versions.

St. 1.47.8

24.11 μᾶλλον δὲ ἐχρῆν πολ-
μήσαντας εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθές,
ὕπὲρ ἐκείνους ἐστὶν ὁ ὄντως
ἄνθρωπος,

C. H. x

24.11 μᾶλλον δ' εἰ χρῆ | πολ-
μήσαντα εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθές,
καὶ ὕπὲρ ἐκείνους ἐστὶν ὁ
ὄντως ἄνθρωπος,

All of the variant readings in Stobaeus in this verse are attributable to scribal error.

St. 1.47.8

24.12 ἢ πάντως ἰσοδυναμοῦσιν
ἀλλήλοις.

C. H. x

24.12 ἢ πάντως γε ἰσοδυναμοῦσιν
ἀλλήλοις.

Since γε seems to be quite in place here, and since that participle is very infrequent in the Corpus Hermeticum, it should perhaps be retained.

St. 1.47.8

25.1 οὐδέις μὲν γὰρ τῶν οὐρα-
νίων ἐπὶ γῆς κατελεύσεται,
οὐρανοῦ τὸν ὄρον καταλιπὼν.

C. H. x

25.1 ὅστις μὲν γὰρ τῶν οὐρα-
νίων θεῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κατελεύσεται,
οὐρανοῦ τὸν ὄρον καταλιπὼν.

The discrepancy here is important. If the reading of the Corpus

is accepted, the reference would be to shooting stars, which apparently leave heaven to come down to earth. In that case, however, a main verb would be expected. If Stobaeus' reading is accepted, then the thought is a variation of that frequently expressed by Plato, namely that it is illogical to believe that a god would ever come down to human level (cf. Symp. 203A). However, the Hermetic writer seems to regard this as a limitation. Perhaps a main verb had dropped out of the text before it came to the hands of Stobaeus' source, who would then have emended the sentence to its present form.

St. 1.47.8

25.2 ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ εἰς
τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβαίνει καὶ
μετρεῖ αὐτόν,

C. H. x

25.2 ὁ δὲ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν
οὐρανὸν ἀναβαίνει καὶ μετρεῖ
αὐτόν καὶ οἶδα ποῖα μὲν αὐτοῦ
ἐστὶν ὑψηλά, ποῖα δὲ ταπεινά,
καὶ τὰ ἅλλα πάντα ἀκριβῶς μιν-
θάνει,

It is not clear whether καὶ was added for emphasis in Stobaeus or whether some scribe in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus omitted it through carelessness.

Either the omission of the last part of this sentence was induced by the repeated καὶ in the text or, possibly, Stobaeus' source may have thought that the sentence attributed too much knowledge to man.

St. 1.47.8

25.3 καὶ τὸ πάντων μεῖζον,
οὐδὲ τὴν γῆν καταλιπὼν ἄνω
γίνεται.

C. H. x

25.3 καὶ τὸ πάντων μεῖζον,
οὐδὲ τὴν γῆν καταλιπὼν ἄνω
γίνεται.

Here again γίνεται is substituted for γίνεαι in Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.8

25.4 τοσοῦτον τὸ μέγεθος ἐστὶν
αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκτάσεως.

C. H. x

25.4 τοσοῦτον μέγεθος ἐστὶν
αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐκτάσεως.

As frequently, Stobaeus adds a definite article. While either

ἐκτάσεως or ἐκστάσεως would make sense in this context, ἐκτάσεως, being a less common word, is probably to be preferred, and is to be understood in the sense of "extension." I suspect that ἐκστάσεως in Stobaeus was substituted by accident.

St. 1.47.8

25.5 διδ τολμητέον εἰπεῖν τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον ἐπίγειον εἶναι θνητὸν θεόν, τὸν δὲ οὐρανὸν θεὸν ἀθάνατον ἄνθρωπον* (μὲν om. P)

C. H. x

25.5 διδ τολμητέον ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον ἐπίγειον εἶναι θεὸν θνητὸν, τὸν δὲ οὐράνιον θεὸν εἶναι ἀθάνατον ἄνθρωπον* (οὐρανὸν CHD)

Since οὐρανὸν appears also in manuscripts CHD of the Corpus, it is quite probable that Stobaeus' source had already found that reading in his exemplar of this tractate. While either θνητὸν θεόν or θεὸν θνητὸν is permissible, the reading in Stobaeus is more closely parallel to ἀθάνατον ἄνθρωπον in the same sentence. The copula is omitted twice in Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.8

25.6 διόπερ διδ τούτων τὰ πάντα τῶν δύο, κόσμου καὶ ἀνθρώπου*

C. H. x

25.6 διόπερ διδ τούτων τὰ πάντα διοικεῖται τῶν δύο, κόσμου καὶ ἀνθρώπου*

Perhaps διοικεῖται was omitted in Stobaeus through error.

St. 1.47.8

25.7 ὅπῃ δὲ τοῦ ἑνὸς πάντα.

C. H. x

25.7 ὅπῃ δὲ τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ πάντα.

Here the article is accidentally omitted in Stobaeus' version.

It will be noted that this excerpt, from C. H. x.22.3, also contains relatively few deliberate changes. See the discussion of x.16.5-18.11, above, p.

Conclusions

In general, the variant readings which we have seen may be divided into three classes. The first of these consists of readings

which may without hesitation be ascribed to scribal error in one or the other manuscript traditions. The vast majority of the variant readings can be explained in this way.

The second kind of variant causes the most difficulty. As we have seen, in some passages both versions of a given passage convey the same sense, but the version in Stobaeus is somewhat more elegant. In these cases we have a very difficult choice to make. Did Stobaeus improve the text of these tractates by emending their style, or did some scribe in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus, perhaps transcribing phrase by phrase, as Nock thinks,¹ accidentally substitute expressions less felicitous than those which he found in his exemplar?

For perhaps the majority of the variants of this kind discussed above, a decision is very difficult, and could scarcely be reached on the basis of the comparison of each reading in isolation. So for example in ii.8.4 it would be very difficult to choose between Stobaeus' $\sigma\alpha\phi\epsilon\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\alpha\rho\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha$ and $\sigma\alpha\phi\epsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \mu\alpha\rho\delta\epsilon\iota\gamma\mu\alpha\ \epsilon\lambda\iota\mu\epsilon\varsigma$ in the Corpus. To be sure, Stobaeus' version is more elegant; however, the version of the Corpus makes perfect sense.

We have, however, noted some instances in which Stobaeus, in improving the text, has taken insufficient account of the context; see for example the discussion of ii.6.7,9 and ii.10.4, above, p. 284 f. and 297 f. There are, moreover, instances in which the variant readings in Stobaeus can best be explained on the supposition that an unsuccessful attempt had been made by Stobaeus' source to emend the text; see for

¹Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xlv, intro.

example the discussion of x.13.5 and x.23.2, above p. 318 and 329.

Such instances indicate a tendency on the part of Stobaeus' source to emend the style of the Hermetic literature. Such a tendency has not been shown for the manuscript tradition of the Corpus, nor for the manuscript tradition of tractates ii, iv, and x before incorporation into the Corpus.

As indicated above, p. 273n.1, the homogeneity of style among the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus as compared with the extreme variety in style within the documents of the Corpus indicates that it is in Stobaeus' text that such alterations are more likely to have been made. It will be noted that variants of this sort are much more frequent in the Stobaeian excerpts of tractate ii than in the other two. This is scarcely surprising. If the text of the Corpus for that chapter is at all reliable, then clearly the style of the author of that tractate is very poor. In fact, even Stobaeus' text occasionally transmits readings shared with the Corpus which are very clumsy. Furthermore, the train of argument in that tractate is frequently very poorly developed; see for example the analogy of the swimmer in ii.8.2,3, which is supposed to explain how it can be that the unmoving place in which everything moves can be responsible both for the motion of the fixed stars and the "anti-motion" of the planets; however, in the case of the swimmer it is rather the opposing movements which make the swimmer stand still. Frankly, the style of C. H. ii is very appropriate to its thought.

Alterations of the second sort, while perhaps without interest for the majority of readers of these tractates, should be kept in mind by anyone wishing to study the style of those three tractates, since in

these instances one would normally be interested, except for errors, in the text of the Corpus.

In our third class we may place alterations for dogmatic purposes. Certain characteristic doctrines simply are not transmitted in the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus. The most notable of these is the doctrine of apotheosis, which, as we have seen, above pp. 103 f. and 104, n. 1, is the central concept of the typical Hermetic tractates. Examples of the omission of this doctrine by alteration of the text have been seen in x.7.11 and x.19.2, see above, p. 313 and p. 325. This doctrine does not appear in any fragment of a typical Hermetic document transmitted by Stobaeus.

The doctrine of apotheosis is omitted in Stobaeus not only by alteration of the text, of course, but also by careful selection. Thus for example the selection in x.7 begins at x.7.4, immediately after an explicit reference to apotheosis. Since the beginning of x.7 is no less relevant to the chapter in Stobaeus than the remainder, presumably the choice was deliberate.¹

In general, it may be said that Stobaeus tends to avoid those Hermetic teachings which we would call religious. Discussions of experience of God, whether through ^oγνώσις or through vision, tend to be eliminated. A good example of this is in iv.11.6-10, omitted in Stobaeus although closely related to the preceding discussion.² So also we may read about the unfortunate consequences of ignorance of God in x.8.5-10, but the

¹See above, p. 311.

²Above, p. 310.

discussion of the γνῶσις of God in x.9, while pertinent to the topic, is omitted. Even discussion about the nature of God is relatively infrequent in these fragments, although occasionally allowed, as in iv.1. References emphasizing the divine nature of man tend to be omitted, although the eulogy of man in x.24,25 is transmitted by Stobaeus. The doctrine of the world soul is permitted in x.7.4, but appears to have been suppressed in Stobaeus' text of ii.8.¹ References to the transmigration of souls are, however, retained.

These alterations have the tendency to make the text of the Hermetic writings more acceptable to Christians. Therefore it seems to me plausible to suppose that Stobaeus has used a Christian anthology of Hermetic writings. Most of our early references to the Hermetic writings are in fact Christian,² whether Catholic or Gnostic.³ Presumably the anthologist wished to compile a collection of those Hermetic teachings which he considered useful, eliminating those references which he found dangerous.

For this reason, the excerpts in Stobaeus give us a fairly impoverished impression of Hermetism. It is precisely those points which would have been of greatest interest to the Hermetic writers which are eliminated systematically in the Stobaeian fragments.

¹Above, p. 293 ff.

²Scott, op. cit., I, 87-97.

³As noted in the introduction, p. xiv some Hermetic fragments have been discovered in the collection of Gnostic writings discovered at Nag Hammadi.

An apparent exception to this impression is the Isis to Horus literature, since it is quite polytheistic and contains much that would be offensive to Christians. However, these excerpts may very easily have reached Stobaeus through another channel. Indeed, while they are to be sure attributed to Hermes in Stobaeus, they are by no means fragments of typical Hermetic tractates. Hermes, Tat, and Asclepius are known in these fragments, but as gods, who lived before the creation of the earth (St. H. xxiii.5,6). This would seem to indicate that the author was familiar with Hermetic literature, but had misunderstood the function of the participants, who, it has been suggested, are men who later became gods.¹ In any case, the participants in these dialogues are Isis and Horus, not Hermes and Tat or Asclepius.

The relation of the Isis to Horus fragments to the (in my view) more typical Hermetic fragments needs a good deal more discussion. If they are accepted as Hermetic documents, then the discussion of the reliability of Stobaeus' text must be slightly modified: these fragments at least show no signs of tendentious alterations of the sort noted for tractates ii, iv, and x of the Corpus Hermeticum. In either case, these fragments will have reached Stobaeus from a different source. (The discussion of Stobaeus' treatment of Herodotus vii.44-46, above, shows that this is not a remote possibility.) However, I hope to be able to prove at a later date that the Isis to Horus fragments are not typically Hermetic.

Therefore the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus can be used only

¹ Above, p. 104 f.

with extreme caution as a witness to the Hermetic religious tradition. Not only is the text frequently altered in the interests of improving the style of the author, but certain doctrines are systematically suppressed.

In particular, those Hermetic excerpts surviving only in Stobaeus are likely to have been treated in the same way. Therefore their text as well must be used with caution. These fragments give Hermetism with the central teachings removed.

Thus, while the Stobaeian fragments may be used to correct the text of the Corpus Hermeticum and may even with caution be used to supplement our picture of the typical Hermetic tractate, in themselves they are an extremely unreliable guide both to the text of the Hermetic literature and to the teachings of the movement which produced that literature.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS

Two sources of the Hermetic literature have been discussed, the Corpus Hermeticum and the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus. Both of these sources have been found to be unreliable, but in different ways. The Corpus Hermeticum, compiled between the ninth and the eleventh century,¹ at a time when presumably the Hermetic literature had long ceased to represent a living religious movement, contains a great deal that did not belong to that movement;² moreover, the text is uneven in quality, and is on occasion extremely corrupt.³ However, nothing in this collection is intentionally disguised. It seems to have been the intention of the compiler to make a collection of Hermetic religious literature. Therefore, if his collection is used with sufficient judgement, and those documents which clearly do not belong are excluded, it is possible to gain a reasonably coherent picture of the typical Hermetic tractate, and of the beliefs of the religious movement which must have produced those tractates.⁴

It is far otherwise with the Stobaeian fragments. The anthologist who compiled those fragments has deliberately excluded some key Hermetic teachings from his fragments. Most noteworthy of these are the

¹Above, p. 25.

³Above, pp. 28-97.

²Above, pp. 148-185.

⁴Above, pp. 98-147.

doctrine of apotheosis and discussion of γνῶσις and of the vision of God.¹ Hence the Stobaeian fragments are very unreliable as a source for the Hermetic religious literature.

Therefore, while neither collection is in itself a reliable source for this literature, it is possible to gain, through a critical use of the Corpus, a reliable picture of the beliefs of that movement. We see, for example, that apotheosis was the goal sought most by the Hermetists. This apotheosis was a possibility for all men who experienced God through γνῶσις or through a vision of the Good. Hermes, Tat, and Asclepius in a sense guaranteed this apotheosis: they had once themselves been men, but now they were gods. Unlike the Gnostics, the Hermetists either ascribed creation to the supreme God or even identified the κόσμος as the visible manifestation of God. In spite of the use of the language of polytheism, the Hermetists tended to be either monist or monotheist. In no case is any confusion made between God, who created or is the invisible origin of the κόσμος, and the gods, normally the stars.

However, neither collection in itself would permit us such a picture, the Corpus, because it contains documents which do not belong, the Stobaeian fragments, because this picture has been blotted out by editorial activity.

A new edition of the text of C. H. ii, iv, and x is clearly required. Since Nock tends to prefer the readings given by Stobaeus, and since, as we have seen, the text given by Stobaeus tends to be

¹See above, p. 337 f.

unreliable, therefore Nock's text necessarily needs revision for those three tractates. In addition, the readings given by Cyril for C. H. xiv, also favoured by Nock over the readings of the Corpus Hermeticum, need to be scrutinized to see whether the text given by Cyril does not suffer in the same way as the text of the Stobaeon fragments.

Also needed is an inquiry into the reliability of the other two major collections of Hermetica, the Latin Asclepius and the Coptic tractates discovered at Nag Hammadi. Such a comparison is now possible, since these documents have been published by Martin Krause and Pahor Labib.¹ Such a comparison will no doubt be facilitated by the use of Greek fragments containing some of the passages in common in those two documents. When this task is accomplished, it should be possible to gain a reasonably complete picture of the Hermetic movement.

When this is done, it will be possible, it is to be hoped, to gain a somewhat more reliable picture of the position of the Hermetic movement in the history of religions. Probably this will turn out to be a somewhat isolated position. While some Hermetic writers betray some traces of Christian or Jewish influence, and while the influences of Platonism and Stoicism are undeniably strong, the Hermetic writers themselves seem to have had relatively little influence on other religious groups, except, sporadically, on the Christians. Nevertheless, the Hermetic writers are of interest as representing one tendency in late paganism. This tendency, admirably treated in van Moorsel's work² has been

¹See above, intro., p. xiv, n. 1.

²In the work cited above, p. 142, n. 1.

characterised by the term, religio mentis. Tending to shun¹ external cultic observances, these writers tended, at least as far as concerns their devotional writings, to turn their attention inward to their own essential divinity. While the theoretical differences between this sort of religion and Catholic Christianity should not be underestimated, it seems probable that Hermetism and Christianity would tend to appeal to the same sort of people.² Thus perhaps the major lesson to be gained from studying the Hermetica is that Christianity did not appear in the Roman empire as a completely foreign religion, but that many of the more striking features of Christianity also appealed to some sections of late paganism.

¹But see Asclepius 23-26. See also van Moorsel, op. cit., p. 128 ff.

²Scott also raises the possibility that some Hermetists themselves became Christians, op. cit., I, 14 f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reference

- Allen, T. W. Abbreviations in Greek Manuscripts. Amsterdam: Adolph M. Hakkert, Publisher, 1967, reprinted from Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1889.
- Blomqvist, J. Greek Particles in Hellenistic Prose. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup, 1969.
- Dain, A. Les manuscrits. "Collection d'Études Anciennes;" Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1964.
- Groningen, B. A. van. Short Manual of Greek Palaeography. Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1967.
- Liddell, H. G., and R. Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon. Revised and edited by H. S. Jones. 9th ed. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1940.
- Milne, H. J. M. Greek Shorthand Manuals, Syllabary, and Commentary. London: Egypt Exploration Society, 1934.
- Schwyzler, E. Griechische Grammatik. Edited by A. Debrunner. 2nd. ed. Vol. II. "Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, ed. Walter Otto." München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959.
- Thompson, E. M. An Introduction to Greek and Latin Palaeography. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912.

The Corpus Hermeticum

- Bardy, G. "Le Pasteur d'Hermas et les livres hermétiques," Revue Biblique N. S., VIII (1911), 391-407.
- Baumgarten-Crusius, L. F. O. De librorum Hermeticorum origine atque indole. (Jenae: Prostat in libraria Braniana, 1827), 19 pp.
- Bousset, W. Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. "Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, 10." Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1907.
- . "Joseph Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeiger, CLXXVI (1914), 697-755.

- . Kyrios Christos. 4th. ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1935. And, translated by John E. Stealy. Nashville/New York: Abingdon Press, 1970.
- Bräuninger, F. Untersuchungen zu den Schriften des Hermes Trismegistos. Diss. Berlin, 1926.
- Chambers, J. D. The Theological and Philosophical Works of Hermes Trismegistus, Christian Neoplatonist. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1882.
- Derchain, P. "L'authenticité de l'inspiration égyptienne dans le Corpus Hermeticum", Revue de l'histoire des Religions, CLXI (1962), 175-198.
- Dodd, C. H. The Bible and the Greeks. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1935.
- . The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1953. Reprinted 1968.
- Eitrem, S. "Varia, CVIII", Symbolae Osloenses, XXVII (1949), 144.
- Festugière, A.-J. "Coniectanea", Coniectanea Neotestamentica, XII, W. Bauer Sacrum, (1948), 45-46.
- . "Corpus Hermeticum 13,12", Classical Philology XLVIII (1953), 237-238.
- . Hermétisme et mystique païenne. Paris: Aubier-Montagne, 1967.
- . "Hermetica", Harvard Theological Review, (1938), 1-20. Reprinted, Hermétisme et mystique païenne, pp. 100-120.
- . "L'Hermétisme", Bull. Soc. des Lettres de Lund, 1947-48. Reprinted, Hermétisme et mystique païenne, 28-87.
- . La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste. 4 vols. 3rd. ed. "Études Bibliques," Paris: Librairie LeCoffre, 1950-1954.
- Granger. "The Poemander", Journal of Theological Studies, V (1904), 395-412.
- Gundel, H. "Poimandres", in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, XXI, (1951), 1193-1207.
- Haenchen, E. "Aufbau und Theologie des 'Poimandres'", Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, LIII, (1956), 149-91.
- Heinrici, C. F. G. Die Hermes Mystik und das neue Testament. Edited by E. von Dobschütz. ("Arbeiten zur Religionsgeschichte des Urchristentum". Leipzig: J. D. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1918).

Hilgers, B. J. De Hermetis Trismegisti Poimandro commentatio. Bonnae: Litteris C. Georgianis, 1855.

Jonas, Hans. The Gnostic Religion. 2nd. ed., enlarged. Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

Klein, F. N. Die Lichtterminologie bei Philon von Alexandrien und in den hermetischen Schriften. Leiden: Brill, 1962.

Krause, M. and Pahor Labib. Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und Codex VI. "Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band 2". Glückstadt: Verlag J. J. Augustin, 1971.

Kroll, Joseph. Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos. "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte und Untersuchungen", Bd. XII, Heft 2-4. Münster i.W.: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914.

Kroll, W. s.v. Hermes Trismegistos, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, VIII, 792-823.

Lagrange, M.-J. "L'Hermétisme", Revue Biblique, XXXIII (1924), 481-97; XXXIV (1925), 368-96; XXV (1926), 240-264.

Marcus, R. "The name Poimandres", Journal of Near Eastern Studies, VIII (1949), 40-43.

Mead, G. R. S. Thrice Greatest Hermes. 3 vols. London and Benares: The Theosophical Publishing Society, 1906.

Ménard, L. trans. Hermès Trismégiste. 2nd. ed. Paris: Librairie Académique. Didier et Ce, Libraires Éditeurs, 1867.

Moorsel, G. van. The Mysteries of Hermes Trismegistus. Utrecht: Drukkerij Kemink Zoon.-Domein 2, 1955.

Nock, A. D. "Hermetica", Journal of Theological Studies, XXIX, 41-43.

-----, "Notes and Studies", The Journal of Theological Studies, XXIX (1927-28), 42 f.

-----, ed., and A.-J. Festugiere, trans. Corpus Hermeticum. 4 vols. Vols. I & II. 2nd. ed. "Collection des Universités de France". Paris: Société de l'Édition "Les Belles Lettres". Vols. I & II, 1960; Vols. III & IV, 1954.

Reitzenstein, R. Hellenistische Mysterienreligionen. 3rd. ed. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, 1956.

-----, "Hermetica, ed. Walter Scott, Vol. II", Gnomon III (1927), 268-279.

-----, Poimandres. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1904. Reprinted, 1966.

-----, Zwei religionsgeschichtliche Fragen nach ungedruckten Texten der Strassburger Bibliothek. Strassburg: Verlag von Karl J. Trübner, 1901.

-----, and H. Schaeder. Studien zum antiken Synkretismus aus Iran und Griechenland. "Studien der Bibliothek Warburg." Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.

Robinson, J. M., trans. "Proposal for Terminological and Conceptual Agreement with Regard to the Theme of the Colloquium of Messina (1966)", in Le origini dello Gnosticismo, edited by U. Bianchi; "Studies in the History of Religion - Supplements to Numen, Vol. XII," Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.

Savignac, J. "Quelques problèmes de l'ouvrage dit Le Pasteur d'Hermas", Études Théologiques et Religieuses, XXV (1960), 159-170.

Scott, W., trans. and ed. Hermetica. 4 Vols. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1924-1936.

Sfameni Gasparro, G. "La gnosi ermetica come iniziazione et mistero", Studie Materiali di Storia delle Religioni, XXXVI (1965), 43-61.

Stricker, B. H. "The Corpus Hermeticum", Mnemosyne, 4^e Ser. II (1949), 79-80.

Tiedemann, D., trans. Hermes Trismegist, Poemander. Berlin und Stettin: Friedrich Nicolai, 1781.

Wlosok, A. Laktanz und die philosophische Gnosis. Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Terminologie der gnostischen Erlösungsvorstellung. "Abhandlungen der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos., Hist., Klass., 1960, 2"; Heidelberg: Winter, 1960.

Zielinski, Th. "Hermes und die Hermetik", Archiv für Religionswissenschaft, VIII (1905) 321-372; IX (1906) 25-60.

Zuntz, G. "Notes on the Corpus Hermeticum", Harvard Theological Review, XLIX (1956), 73-78.

-----, "On the Hymns in Corpus Hermeticum XIII", Hermes, LXXXIII (1955), 68-92.

Stobaeus

- Bickel, E. "De Ioannia Stobaei excerptis Platoniciis", Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie, Supp. Bd. XXVIII (1903), 405-501.
- Görler, W. Μεταφύλαξις Γνωρίων, Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades der philosophischen Fakultät der Freien Universität Berlin, Berlin, 1963.
- Hense, O. s.v. "Ioannes Stobaeus", in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, IX, 2549-2586.
- , "Die Reihenfolge der Eklogen in der Vulgata des Stobäischen Florilegium", Rheinisches Museum, N. F., XXXIX (1884), 359-407, 521-557.
- Luria, S. "Entstellungen des Klassikertextes bei Stobaios", Rheinisches Museum, 78, 1929, s. 81-104, 225-248.
- Wachsmuth, C. and O. Hense, editors. Ioannis Stobaei Anthologium. 5 Vols. Berolini: apud Weidmannos, 1884-1923. Reprinted 1958.

Classical texts compared with Stobaeus

- Bucolici Graeci. A. S. F. Gow, ed. Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1952.
- Epicteti. Manuale et Cebetis tabula. Johannes Schweighaeuser, ed. and trans. Lipsiae: In Libraria Weidmannia, 1798.
- Herodoti. Historiae. II Vols. C. Hude, ed. 3rd. ed. Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1908.
- Homeri. Opera. Vol. III. T. Allen, ed. 2nd. ed. Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1917.
- Platonis. Opera. Vols. I & IV. J. Burnet, ed. Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1900.
- Xenophontis. Opera Omnia. Vol. II. E. C. Marchant, ed. 2nd. ed. Oxonii: E typographeo Clarendoniano, 1921.