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

© John F. Horman 1974
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1973)  McMaster University
(Religious Sciences) 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 Stobaean 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 Stobaean 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 Stobaean fragments. The most probable explanation of these facts is that Stobaeus was using a Christian anthology of Hermetic writings. Therefore the Stobaean 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, vii, 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 Stobaean 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, Stobaean fragments from Xenophon, Plato, Herodotus, Homer, Theocritus, and Epictetus are discussed.
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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," and debated in a desultory manner during the late eighteenth and nineteenth century, 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., and

---

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

2 Dieterich 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 (Jena: Prostat in Libraria Braniana, 1827), p. 7f., held that the Hermetic writings were anti-Christian, coming from the school of Porphyry; both R. Hénard, in Hermés Trismégiste, tr. R. Hénard, 2nd. ed. (Paris: Librairie Académique, Didier et Cie, Libraires éditeurs, 1867), pp. Ivi-ivii, 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.

indeed was itself related to the so-called "Memphis Theology," 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. 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. 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. W. Scott, using the same method, found that the majority of the Hermetic documents were written in the second and third century A.D. 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.


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, Stobaean 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.


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. xvili 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 docu-
ments have been divided by Zielinski, 2 Bouset, 3 Bräuninger, 4 and F.-N.
Klein 5 into two or more mutually exclusive groups. Clearly such a view
creates difficulties for those who wish to believe in the exist-
tence 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 trac-
tates 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. Scott 9 and by.


2Th. Zielinski, "Hermes und die Hermetik," Archiv fur Religions-
wissenschaft, VIII, 321-372.

3W. Bouset, "Besprechung von Krolls Lehren des Hermes Trismegis-

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

5Klein, op. cit., p. 80 f.

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


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.
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 unsersen weitgehend ähnliche Sammlung hermetischer Schriften gekannt." But his views about the disunity of thought in the Corpus should perhaps suggest a fairly late date of composition, as Bräuninger saw.

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.

1 Festugière considers the quotation from Zosimus, below, p. 82 n. 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.

2 Op. cit., p. 82.

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, and then in a much more useful form in the edition of A. D. Nock and A.-J. Festugiére.

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-Festugiére edition. This is a collection of seventeen tractates, written in Greek. It is represented by manuscripts dating back to the fourteenth century. 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-Festugiére 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.


3See Nock’s discussion, ibid., p. xi ff., intro.
and is printed in the second part of volume II of the Nock-Festugièrè edition. This source overlaps only slightly with the Stobaean 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, as well as one tractate which shows a fascinating resemblance to C. H. xiii. 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-Festugièrè 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 Stobaean fragments. The choice of these two sources suggests itself because

---


2Ibid., VI.52.1-63.32, pp. 170-184.
parts of tractates i, 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 Stobaeus 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." 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 Scott are scarcely supported by comparison of the two texts, it is evident that, if the text of the

---


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.

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 Stobaean 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

\(^1\)See above, p. x f. \(^2\)Loc. 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.
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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.

\(^1\)Op. cit., p. 319

\(^2\)In 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)
D. Vaticanus gr. 951 (14th cent.; complete)
D. Vindobonensis phil. 102 (15th cent.; complete)
1297. Parisinus 1297 (16th cent.; C. H. i-xiv)
K. 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. A group of manuscripts listed by Nock reproduces the peculiarities of A. Apart from these, the text of A seems most closely related to that of N3 and of 1297, and also frequently to agree with B against CM.

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 AN. The corrector or correctors of B use, apart from a rather fruitful imagination, a manuscript of the group d. B2 or Bc was the source of many of the defects in Parthey's edition, since Parthey did not trouble to distinguish between B, Bc and B2.

---

1Ibid., p. xvi.
2Ibid., p. xvii.
3See below, p. 4 f.
4Nock, op. cit., p. xxxiv.
5Ibid., p. xx f.
6Ibid., p. xix f.
C has, according to Nock, little to offer in the way of independent readings.\textsuperscript{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 B\textsuperscript{2} and D, both of which, according to Nock, are based on a manuscript closely associated with M.\textsuperscript{2} M also has some fairly important agreements with Stobaeus, including the retention of ii.11.6-8.\textsuperscript{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 μεραν for μεραν.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{5}

While Nock does not attempt to give a diagram 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

\begin{enumerate}
\item Ibid., p. xvii f. \hfill \textsuperscript{2}Ibid., p. xxv f., xxxv.
\item All 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-Festugièrè.
\item Ibid., p. xlvi. \hfill \textsuperscript{5}Ibid., p. xix, n. 1.
\end{enumerate}
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. It would appear that A is relatively independent of M, since the agreements of BC are mostly in errors. 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. 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*. 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 ff 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, Εξειβ for Εξείλ in iv.8 and again in x.17, and φανερωτερα for φανερωτα 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, based on M, but containing readings from other manuscripts, as well as many conjectures. 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; 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. xxvii.
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 gleichgültig," 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 6987, 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-xvii.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 Pselius in i.18, also included in the text of H.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, 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, 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. 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 ff.
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. Chwolson, Die Sabier und der Sabianismus, St. Petersburg, 1856, the Harranians, when faced by the Nestrians 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)² 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 καταδραμότοι ἐπὶ τοῦ Ποιμένανδρα καὶ βασιλεία τῷ βασιλείᾳ), 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:

\begin{quote}

 νοῦς ἀνθρώπινος θεός· ὁ ὁμός ἐν ἀνθρώποις, θεός ἐν ἑρμηνευμένοις

\end{quote}

(p. 88,3 Helm); cf. C. H. xii.1 ὁμός ὁ ὁμός ἐν μεν ἀνθρώποις, θεός ἐστιν; C. H. xii.2, ὁ γὰρ νοῦς ψυχῶν ἐστὶν εὐργευμένος ἀνθρώπων ἐργαζόμενος.

---

¹ Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 191 f.
⁴ W. Kroll, loc. cit., p. 795. ⁵ Ibid.
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. H. 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.

(or small groups of *libelli*) in succession, and at various dates."¹

Festugièrè, on the other hand, finds that the lack of reference to
the *Corpus* on the part of Stobæus 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 Festugièrè 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, Braüninger, 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. Festugièrè
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, and the reference to

¹Ibid. ²Festugièrè, 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 with-
in 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) δε οὖν δύνατον νοεῖν . . . ποιεῖν ὑπὲρ ὑποτελαι.
(δε εἶναι δύνατον Heitzenstein; τὰς οὖν δύνατον Ferguson)

xii.9(177,17,18) καὶ οὗτοι οἵτω δύνατον, οὗτο έλιμαμένης ὑπερανάθεν
οὖν ψυχήν ἀνθρωπίνην (ὑπερανάθεν οὖν mss.: ὑπερανάθεν εἶναι
Flussas; malim ὑπερανάθεν εἶναι)

xii.9(177,18,19) οὗτος ἀμελήσας . . . ὑπὲρ τὴν έλιμαμένην οὖν.
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADBc; η εἶναι Flussas)

xii.13(179,13,14) δὲ γὰρ μακάριος θεὰς ἀγαθὰς Δαιμόνιαν ψυχήν μὲν ἐν
οὐλατε ἓν οὖν; (οὖν CM: εἶναι ADBc)

xii.15(180,13,14) έρρον γὰρ ἐμβλησθέν διὸ πάση ἀτέλος οὖν ἐστιν ἄνωθεν
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADBc)

xii.15(180,14,15) διὰ καὶ θεάν οὖν ἀνάγκη. (οὖν CM: εἶναι ADBc)

xii.16(180,15-17) τὰς οὖν οὖν οὐναίτω . . . νεκρὰ οὖν ; (νεκρὰ
οὖν CM: νεκρὰ εἶναι ADBc)

xii.17(181,4,5) τὰς οὖν ἐν γελοῖον εἰς τὴν τροφὴν τῶν ἁλαμπρῶν οὖν,
(οὖν ACM, εἶναι DBc)

xii.18(181,11,12) τὸ δὲ έρρον τὴν οὖν ἀνάγκη τὸ ατελος οὖν.
(οὖν CM: εἶναι ADBc)

xii.22(183,3) τὸ δὲ οὖν η ἀνανάκινων οὖς, οὖς CM: οὖς
εἶναι DBc; η εἶναι A)

xii.23(183.16,17) θρησκευα δε του θεου μια ξοτι, μη οβν λαβον.
(οβν CN: ειναι ADB; cultus autem dei unus est, malum non esse, Lact., Div. inst. vi,25,10)

xvii(243,2,3) Τα εν εσωτεριοις φαινομενα σαματα οδ δοκετ σοι
δοματοι οβν (ον CN: ειναι DB)

xvii(243.5) οβν αι λεια οδ δοκετ οβν σοι, δοματοι οδοσι (δοκει
ον CN: δοκει DB; δοκει ειναι Heitzenstein δοματοι ειναι R; δοματοι ειναι οβν οδοσι Bodl. 16987)

And for completeness we should add the following:

xii.22(183.4,5) τας γαρ ενεργειας εφαινε ειναι μερη του θεου.

This last citation is the only context in tractate xii containing the
form ειναι in which that form is not confused in at least two of the
manuscripts with οβν. In addition, there are sixteen cases in C. II.
xii and one in C. II. xvii in which οβν is used but is not confused with
ειναι. 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
οβν may be original.

1 In the first of these, either reading makes excellent sense.
As often in Hellenistic Greek, δε is written for δοκε. One would expec
an infinitive after δε; but δοματον/ is frequently used absolutely
in the Hermetica, as an impersonal verb. On the other hand, if the οβν
is original, then it is strictly speaking redundant, since the preced-
ing δε already indicates that δοματον is the result of what precedes.
Also, if ειναι is the original reading, then this is just the sort of
circumstances under which an unfamiliar abbreviation might be misunder-
stood.

In the example in xvii(243.5), if Heitzenstein is correct, two
errors were made: δοκει for δοματον and οβν for ειναι. It is possible
that οδ δοκει οβν 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 ς ων and ειναι 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: € or €. However, in i.i.14(37.15), where Bc inserts ς ων after ειναι, the ειναι is rewritten thus: ειναι to provide room for the ς ων.

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 ει are joined thus: € the ν written immediately after (in the latter five, an uncial Ν is used.) Thus the ειναι take the space of two letters. In the first of these, the αι is represented by ιι written above ειναι in the other cases, αι is written above the line. Since the ειναι 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 ς ων in these cases.

In three cases, ειναι is written entirely on the line, but in ς ων or ειναι 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 ει is joined thus: έ. In xii.17(181.5), είναι 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, δύνα. 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 είναι is written correctly in all manuscripts, it is written in full, with the ε and the ι separated, as is the usual custom in B.

In xvii(243.5), οὖν is omitted by B, but is written in thus: Υ', above the line by Ε.

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 οὖν. This is indicated by the evidence of cramming and by the faintly visible ι 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 οὖν in xii.8(177.10) and xii.9(177.18). Thus B corrects οὖν to είναι in all cases in which A reads είναι, but in addition reads είναι in xii.17(181.5), where A reads οὖν, 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 $ο̱ν$ 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 $B^2$, 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 cir-
cumstances: in sixteen cases, or at best eighteen, $ο̱ν$ is written
correctly in all manuscripts. In eleven, perhaps thirteen cases, $ο̱ν$
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 $ε\nuαi$ (for the two instances in xii.9 I would read, respectively
$διεργάται ειναι$ and $ο̱ν την ειμαρκένην ειναι$). In no case is
$ε\nuαi$ written where we would expect $ο̱ν$. In one case, $ε\nuαi$ is written
correctly.

1In the Hermetic literature, $διεργατω$ 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 $ο̱ν$ is removed. If Flussas' con-
jecture for xii.9 is correct, then this is another instance in which
$διεργατω$ 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 $ε\nuαi$
for $ο̱ν$ in the two cases in xii.9, then $ψυχη$ is the subject for each
$ε\nuαi$, and $ο̱ν$ is a dative of reference depending on $διεργατω$. More
important, it seems more economical to suppose that the two cases in
which an impossible $ο̱ν$ 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 (xii.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.  

These facts become interesting when it is pointed out that this confusion between εἶναι and ὁδώρυ occurs nowhere else in the Corpus Hermeticum; on the following pages I give an index of all the uses of εἶναι and ὁδώρυ 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 ὁδώρυ is written correctly, and 51 cases in which εἶναι 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 XVII

C. H. i:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: 6(8.18); 8(9.12); 15(11.22); 17(12.16); 21(14.6).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. H. ii:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: [1(32.8)]; [3(32.17)]; [10(36.15)]; 10(36.6); 11(36.15); 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)].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. H. iii: no examples

C. H. iv:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: 2(32.12); [3(32.17)]; [4(33.1)]; 5(33.3); 6(33.14); 7(34.1); 8(35.3); 9(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).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. H. v:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: 8(63.18); 9(63.22).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. H. vi:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: 2(60.16); 10(64.11).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

C. H. vii: no examples

C. H. viii:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EINAI</th>
<th>OYN: 5(89.9).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
C. H. ix:

EINAI: no examples
OYN: 2(99.16); 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 ὄνω for ἴσων 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 ὄνω 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 ὄνω appears in the proper position, unless ὄν ὄνω ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄν ὄ

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 minuscule original. "Si ελβαί dans l'archétype pouvait être lu comme οδυ, une légère contraction dans l'écriture (minuscule) 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 οδυ: although οδυ is written eleven to thirteen times for ελβαί, ελβαί is not written for οδυ even once. In any case, the abbreviation for οδυ in minuscule 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 ελβαί,³ none of which on the surface appear to be very likely to be mistaken for οδυ. Now, Allen's lists are by no means exhaustive. Indeed, B. A. van Groningen gives the discouraging information that abbreviations in minuscule 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 ελβαί on plate IV (_rhs_). If the first dot in this sign

¹Ibid.


³Ibid., p. 14 and plate IV.

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 οὐ on plate VI (§). Given that the first example of this abbreviation, xii.1(177,10,11) if Reitzenstein's emendation is correct, could easily have been understood in its context as οὐ, it is quite possible that a scribe could have innocently supposed that this abbreviation stood for οὖ, 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 εἰναι which is spelled οὖ. In any case, tractate xii shows no trace of any dialect other than the standard Hellenistic koine. It is true that one may discover around the first century A.D. forms of Ε which could conceivably be mistaken for Θ. ¹ However, this would explain only part of the offending form, and in any case one would expect confusion with Θ rather than with Ω. Also, the abbreviations for εἰναι and οὖ used on papyri, \ and o respectively, ² would not readily be confused by any scribe, however careless. So also the shorthand forms given by Milne for οὖ (σ) and εἰναι (ι) ³ seem sufficiently distinct to allow even


²Ibid., p. 81.

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, it is likely that a secretary who confused his symbol for ειναι with his symbol for ὅδε 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, and if we suppose that some time must have elapsed for the offending version of ειναι to be so thoroughly mistaken for ὅδε, 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.  

---

1Ibid., p. 5.  
2Van Groningen, op. cit., p. 34.  
3The confusion between ειναι and ὅδε is in any case more easily explained on the supposition of a medieval date. Given the progressive obsolescence of the Greek infinitive documented by P. Burgièr, Histoire de l'infiniif 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 minuscule manuscript, therefore no earlier than the ninth century, but more probably in the tenth or eleventh century. The distribution of this error 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 Ὠὕ and 51 cases of ἐἴκα 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; 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.

not stain the essential person: "\*'αλλ' ὁ ἀλληγορος, ὁ τέκνον, οδ' ἀρχεύοντας περιενέναι, ἀλλ' ὃς ἀρχευότας, ὁδ' ἀρχεύοτας, ἀλλ' ὃς ἀρχεύοτας," xii.7(176.23,24) and in the utter confusion shown in its eleventh chapter, in which every important statement is either directly controverted or indirectly subverted by some other statement made in the same paragraph. Moreover, apart from the error in question, the text of C. H. xii is not exceptionally insecure in comparison with the other tractates. In other words, there is little likelihood that only tractates xii and xvii were inserted into the Corpus Hermeticum at the date suggested 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 tractates were associated with the others. The confusion between εἶναι and ὁδ' existed only in tractates xii and xvii because only those two were taken from manuscripts containing abbreviations likely to be misunderstood in that way. Perhaps the documents existed either in separate collections or in small booklets until, some time in the period 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 B^2 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 οὐ and εἶναι 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 pro-
ably 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 (ὡς καταδραμοῦνα
ἐν τὸν Ποιμενανθρα καὶ Ἑβαπτισθὲνα τῷ κρατηρί).\(^2\) 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 (?)

---

\(^1\) As admitted by Scott, op. cit., I, 28.
\(^2\) Above, p. 8, n. 3.
\(^3\) Above, p. 11, n. 6.
a crater is sufficiently uncommon, although Festugièrè points to a simi-
lar example in the fourth book of Pistis Sophia, cp. 142, and in the
second book of Jev, cp. 45.\(^1\) Zosimus himself, in his surviving works,
uses the term \(\text{βαπτισμός}\) once apart from this passage. In this other
instance it is a synonym for \(\text{βάπτισμος}\), a technical term for the process
of changing the substance of metals. He also uses, apart from this pas-
sage, the word \(\text{κρατήρ}\) once and its derivative \(\text{κρατηρία}\) once.\(^2\) In each
of these cases he is describing equipment, and says that it is a good
idea to have a \(\text{κρατήρ}\) around containing water and a sponge to wipe off
the \(\text{άγγος}\). (\(\text{Ἐξείρισεν ὑπ᾽ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ οἱ κράτηρα ὑδάτος καὶ περιψάξας}

to \(\text{άγγος}\).) 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.

\(^1\)Above, p. 13, n. 1.

\(^2\)For \(\text{βαπτισμός}\) see Zosimus in Berthelot, op. cit., p. 155. For
\(\text{κρατήρ}\) see ibid., p. 224. For \(\text{κρατηρία}\) 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 term 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 Stobacus 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-ance-tre-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.


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 ABCd, 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 ἐμοι (Flussas) in i.3(7.13), no doubt the result of itacism; κτίσιν for κτίσιν (given correctly in Par. 1297) in i.13(10.10) from the same cause; παρπί for πυπι (Zielinski; here Festugière defends παρπί, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III,
86, n. 2), also in i.13(10.20), and παρδος for πυρδος (Patritius) in i.16 (12.8), both errors having been made by an absent-minded Christian.

Three times in C. H. i, γη 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 B^2, reads γη for γαρ 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 γη is incorrectly omitted, an earlier scribe had used the alchemic symbol ♂ for γη, 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 εδο μεθι. Nock, following Reitzenstein, gives εδο μεθι for the first of these, and επρημει, also given by B^2 and 1297, for the second. I would prefer, following B^2 (and Parthey's edition), to read επρημει 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 επιμηκον rather than επρημει, it is not possible to decide whether this error is attributable

to a tendency of the compiler.

In i.13(10.20), ἐξ δὲ τὴν πάσαν ἐξουσίαν, probably the original read ἐξουσίαν κτλ. (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 Β. II. i.

In i.13(11.3), perhaps καρπόν is erroneous for αὐτὸν (Β²); similarly in i.14(11.14) we have καρπόν for αὐτόν (Reitzenstein). This is a fairly common confusion, perhaps due to absent-mindedness.

In i.10(10.1), an extraneous τοῦ θεοῦ (Tiedemann) was inserted before ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος. I am unable to suggest a cause, unless there was a partially obscured τοῦ θεοῦ in a manuscript explained by a gloss which was later incorporated into the text along with the original reading.

The oblique cases of ἀπενεδήλως cause trouble in i.15(12.1), where the correct form is given in Par. 1297 and Β⁶, i.16(12.10), where Β⁶ gives the correct form, and the others a variety, and in i.18(13.5), where Β⁶ correctly gives ἀπενεδήλως while the others give ἀπενεδήλως. Perhaps this error ought to be charged to the author of tractate i.

If Nock is correct, the strange reading ἐξ δὲ φαντάς τί λόγος in ΒCN (Α leaves a space of six letters where the others have τί) in i.5(8.5) indicates a misunderstanding of the archetype, which, he suggests, read φαντάς <τοῦ πρωτου>, using the abbreviation αυτ. for πρωτου.

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 οδέ (Keil) in 1.16(12.8), τοῦ for τοῦτων (Nock) in 1.20(13.19,20), and ἔρχομαι for perhaps τετρακίσ (Nock), in 1.23(15.2), unless in this last case we should read ἔρχομαι ἐν αὐτῶ (Keitzenstein).

A partially obscured letter wrongly interpreted may have been responsible for ἔνωσας for δ νοσφας (Keitzenstein) in 1.21(14.1); a similar cause may have given us παράδο for παραδόνα (du) in 1.22(14.17). In 1.22(14.18), μοῦσαντες (AB; μοῦσαντες Β; μοῦσαντες C-D; μοῦντες B²) for μοῦσαντα (Turnebus) could result either from similar causes or from a misread abbreviation. So also in 1.20(13.23), προκατάρχεται for προκατάρχεται (Keitzenstein) 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 1.14(11.9,10), ἢν ἱσόσα διάσεστον κάλλος πίσαι ἐνέργειαν ἐν καυτῷ ἐκόντα at least two errors are to be suspected: ἐκόντα for ἐκώντα (B) will surprise no one, because of the similarity of the two words; ἢν for θν (Turnebus) may have been caused by a partially obscured letter, or attracted by the immediately preceding μορφήν. If we accept that reading, then we need not, with Patrizius, supply καί after κάλλος, since διάσεστον κάλλος would be in apposition to θν; for that reason I do not favour θητεῖς (B²) or θεῖ (Keitzenstein).

In several cases, a word seems to have dropped out. Thus in 1.18(13.9,10), κατ διικαλιστὸν ἐννοοῦ, presumably Ὑ has been omitted before ἐννοοῦ (Turnebus); similarly in 1.24(15.8), ἐπὶ (B²) has been omitted before τῆς ἀνὰ. I suspect that the same is the case in 1.14(18.8,9), καὶ ἔδειξε τὴν κατουρήσῃ φῶςιν τὴν καλὴν τοῦ θεοῦ μορφήν.
Here $b^2$ gives τὴν κατωφέρει φόσιν; I would prefer <ε> τὴν κατωφερην φόσιν as more easily explainable on the basis of the present state of the manuscripts. So also in 1.17(13.2), κατ ($b^2$) has been omitted between τέλος and αρχῶν (for which read with Nock ἀρχῶν ($b^2$). Each of these cases can be attributed either to manuscript damage or carelessness.

There is one certain and at least two probable lacunae in the text. The certain one is in 1.15(12.1,2), where the MSS. give ἀρρενόθελος δὲ δὴ, εἶς ἀρρενόθελος (ἀρρενόθελος 1297, $b^3$) ὅν πατρὸς καὶ δόμπνος ἄν δόμπνου 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 δόμπνου the words ὅν πατρὸς καὶ ἄμπνου, since a scribe could easily leap from δόμπνου to ἄμπνου.

A similar accident seems to have occurred in the following line, 1.16(12.3), where the text as it now stands is needlessly abrupt: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, Νοὸς ὁ ἐμὸς· καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρώ του λόγου, although Nock prints the manuscript tradition as it stands. Here again, Reitzenstein's emendation: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα <ἐγὼ· ἀδεξάμως με τὸν> Νοὸς ὁ ἐμὸς κτλ. gives the most plausible reading, although I would prefer to read ταῦτα rather than τὸν.

Perhaps a similar explanation is demanded in 1.4(8.4,5), where the manuscripts read εἶτα βοή ἐς αὐτῆς ἀνακρῆς ἀνεύμητο, ὅς εἰσάχας φιλόθνα φυτές. The difficulty concerns the last two words: φιλόθνα has no plausible grammatical relation to the context, and the shout in question comes from nature, which in turn evolves from
darkness (ομός), the opposite of light. These two words have been variously emended to read φωνῇ πυρός (Nock), φωνῇ πυρός (Reitzenstein), φωνῇ πνεύματος (Einarsen), and φωνῇ φωτός (Festugière; Festugière also reads ἐξαυτῆς for ἔξαυτης). Scott rewrites these words as follows: ὃς εἶδος: με> φωνῇν ἐνὶ τοῦ φωτός, and transposes them into the next sentence after ἐπεξη τῇ ἐγραφῇ φῶσι. 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 ἐξαυτῆς, which is necessary to retain φωτός so that the voice of light does not come from nature, would be redundant because of ἐπεξη. I would prefer to believe that something has been omitted after φωνῇ, as e.g., φωνῇ φῶσεως κραξίν ἐν ἐναντίον τοῦ φωτός, perhaps because of the repeated initial ἐ in φῶσεως and φωτός. But then it would be necessary, with Scott, to read με after εἶδος: ὃς εἶδος: με> φωνῇν φῶσεως κραξίν ἐν ἐναντίον τοῦ φωτός.

Perhaps no major change is needed for C, H, 1.4(7.18-8.2), which reads in the manuscripts: σκολίῳ πεπειραμένον, ὃς εἶδος: με εἶδος (β' Ιδόντα) μεταβαλλόμενον το σκότος εἰς ἑγράφα τίνα φῶσιν, except Reitzenstein's reading of ἐπειραμένον for an impossible πεπειραμένον. However, Reitzenstein and Nock emend the text further to read respectively, ὃς εἶδος: με ἐφακόντα and ὃς <οφεί> εἶδος: με, and also to read ἐπεξη for εἶδος. But perhaps the manuscript reading (accepting the emendation of ἐπειραμένον for πεπειραμένον) would make...
sense 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 \( \beta^c \)) the darkness changing into some kind of a moist nature."

By the standards of the Corpus Hermeticum, the text of tractate \( \text{\textit{i}} \) is moderately corrupt. Perhaps the most striking feature is the tendency to omit \( \gamma\eta \). 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

\[1\] Dodd 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 \( \epsilon\lambda\delta\alpha\nu\mu \lambda\delta\varsigma\nu \lambda\alpha \) as "I seemed to see," but should not \( \epsilon\lambda\delta\alpha\nu \) 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, λογρ 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 διοντικης παρ ην i.10(10.3).² But διοντικης is not exclusively Christian property; see Nock in Nock-Festugièrè, op. cit., 1,20, 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-Festugièrè. The same procedure will be followed in tractates iv and x. In this chapter, as already noted,


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 Hermoticum.

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 'Ερμοῦ πρὸς Τὰτ λόγος καθολικὸς, 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 Η (Η om AC) θέσεις, τὸ θείον λέγω νῦν, οὗ τὸ γεννητὸν (= sulphur?), ἀλλά τὸ γεννητὸν. 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 Θρημεγγοτα, 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 δς and δις. In δος of τόπος, οδης δις ηθος, δις δις τόπος· δις δις κατ δς (Αδς δς) ηθος, οδης δς τόπος δις δις ηθος κτλ. Sock, on the advice of Puech and of Ahf, reads, in part, οδης ηθος 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 δς and δ, 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, κενθ (Flusser) evidently became ἐκενυφ because of the similarity of the two words; so also in ii.10.9, μεσοτατα (Stobaeus; Einarson would extend to γεμιστα, which however would not explain Stobaeus' reading) became μεγιστα for the same reason. In ii.12.4, θος (Stobaeus) became λόγος and in ii.12.4, ἐλεοθερον (Stobaeus) became ἐλεοθερος. So also in ii.12.9, presumably Patritius is right in reading


thus for ἐπι, cf. Stobaeus' reading, ἐν. All of these errors can be seen as simply the result of carelessness in transcription.

Mistreatment of an unaccented minuscule original could have given us αὐτή for αὑτή (Stobaeus) in ii.6.9 and ἄν' ἀλλοτριστατον for ἄν' ἀλλοτριστατον (Nec) 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 ἀλλος δὲ τοῦ εἴναι; no doubt, with Scott, we should place it before εἴναι and not, with β, after. In the same chapter (38.6), a negative is missing from ὃ ἔλλα πάντα χωρεῖ ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ ἄγαθος φύσεως, and is to be supplied by writing either ἄγαθος (α) or ὅ χωρητά (Tiedemann) or, less plausibly, ὅ χωρητά (Nec). In ii.7.6, τὸ should be inserted before αὑτό (β; Stobaeus has τὸ αὑτό; τὸ is also missing before ἄγαθος (Scott) in ii.16(39.5).

In ii.7.8, ἐστή Ἡ for ἐστηκέν given by Stobaeus is most easily accounted for if we suppose that Η was misread for Η in a minuscule 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 Η the reading μεστὰ for μεστὰ in ii.11.8. These lines are missing in ABC, but inserted by B, who with d correctly reads μεστά. So also in ii.9.2, τὸ οὖν ἔστω καὶ τοὺς λέοντος καὶ τὸ ἔλλα πάντα ἐμικαὶ ὁ σώματα ἐστὶ τὰ κινοῦστα, it is difficult to see why τοὺς λέοντας is in the accusative case. Nor is this any clearer in Stobaeus' version, τὸ οὖν ἔστω καὶ τοὺς λέοντας καὶ τὸ ἔλλα πάντα ἐμικαὶ ὁ σώματα ἐστὶ. There will be an opportunity to discuss this further,
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 καλώσει τὸ ὅπερ αὐτὸ καλυπτεῖν τοῦ σὺ τὸ ὅπερ αὐτὸ, εἴ έστιν εἰς τὸ περὶ αὐτὸ, most of which, beginning from καλυπτεῖν, Stobaeus omits.

Nock is probably right with regard to ii.14(37.14) when he writes, "suspicor το... more librarie locum male intellegenti debere."

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 ας with ά 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 ἐπὶ θ' ἐμμὴ εἰς θράς ὁδόρας στοιχεῖα, iii.1(44,8). Now, one can make better sense, following Cumont, by emending θ' ἐμμὴ to θ' ἐμμὴ. Nevertheless, the mention of sand is very abrupt. It would be simple, following Nock, to take θ' ἐμμὴ as a gloss. But what purpose would this gloss serve? If we read θ' ἐμμὴς (Ferguson), then what would we do with στοιχεῖα? Either the passage is very corrupt, or the author (accepting Cumont's reading) just assumed that the sand would naturally always be there at the bottom.

It is also difficult to make sense out of καὶ θεοὶ πίντες κατα-
διερώσει φόσεως ἔνσωροι, iii.1(44,9). Of the solutions given, that of Festugière, καταδιαίροσι καὶ τῇ φόσεως ἔνσωροι, 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 germinalé," 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 διηρθηθέν σῶν τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ὑποθέσεσθαι: a subject is needed for διηρθηθέν
and it is either ἡ πυρινὴ ὁδός (Scott) or ἡ ἀναστρεφθείσα φάσις (Dodd) or
something to that effect.

We can perhaps make sense of τὸ σπέρμα τῆς παλιγγενεσίας ἐν
ἐναυτίς (ἀπόστις Σ.Ν.) ἐπερμολγοῦν, iii.3(45.6,7) by substituting either
ἐπερμοβίλουν (Reitzenstein) or ἐπερμογόνων (based on Scott's pro-
posed ἐπερμογόνωντα). If we read ἐναυτίς with AB, then θέρμα τετράποδα
κτλ. (45.4) would be the subject; if we read ἀπόστις with Σ.Ν., then the sub-
ject is ἔκαστος θεός (45.3). In either case, τὰς τε γενέσεις τῶν ἄν-
θρωπων, directly following, would then remain suspended unless we were
to insert some verb after ἄνθρωπων, as for example ἔστελεν ὁ ἡπαθεῖσαι.
(Both of these conjectures would favour the reading of ἐπερμοβίλουν
in the previous line.)

Another puzzle is furnished by τερασοπράς in iii.3(45.12),
which if accepted would be a ἀπέκ πράγματος. The context: καὶ πάσαν
ἐν σαρκί φυσῆν διὰ ὑποτεθέαν θεῶν ἐγκυκλίην τερασοπράς, εἰς κατοπτεσαν
σώραν οὐχ. κτλ., would be satisfied by a verb in its place, but by what
verb?

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

In iii.3(45.15), μυθής ὑπουμένης is simply unintelligible.
Ferguson reads ὑποξανθής κύκλωμενα; I can neither accept that reading
nor propose a better one.

In iii.4(45.18), ἄρχεται αὐτῶν ἔτισα τῇ καὶ σοφιστῆται, sense can perhaps be made, following Nock, by interpolating τῇ before βιωσάι. Dodd, who foresaw that possibility, preferred ἄρχεται τῇ αὐτῶν βιωσάι, supposing two errors.

But it is not clear what can be meant by ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καταλιπόντες ἐν δύσματι χρόνων ἀμαμμώσιν καὶ πάθουν γένεσιν ἐμφάνου σαρκός καὶ λαρποῦ σπόρας καὶ πάσης τεχνουργίας τὰ ἐλαττωμένα ἀνανεώθησεται ἀνάγκη κτλ., iii.4(46.2–6), although it would perhaps contribute towards a solution if we understand a lacuna between δύσματι and χρόνων, to be filled in, e. g., by αὐτῶν εἷς or, with Dodd, simply εἷς. The words καὶ πάθουν γένεσιν . . . τεχνουργίας make sense in themselves, but demand a participle, which presumably fell somewhere between τεχνουργίας and τὰ ἐλαττωμένα, 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 a 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 tracts 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-Festugièere) 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), διαβοτόν (Patritius) for διαβοτόν; conversely, in iv.11.1, διαφερόν is evidently an erroneous reading for διαφέρον, 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) οδ θαμβίοντας ου τα θεος ἡγε, an extra ον has been inserted, for whatever reason; Ν omits the second, whether by conjecture or through collation.

Apparently in iv.3(50.4), someone has written γίνο δ for δ γίνε (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), ἐκροφα, a nonsense word, presumably is the result of poor handwriting. Although D's reading, ἑκρόφα, makes better sense, it is difficult to see how ἑκρόφα could have become ἐκροφα. Scott's reading, σχιμάφα, while easier from that point of view, has this unfortunate defect, that it can make sense only if, with Scott, we
The text of iv.1.5, ἀγαθὸς ὦν, μόνη γὰρ τοῦτο αναθέτεικεν, ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι, (κόσμησας BCH) will be discussed in Part II, below, p. 308. If I may anticipate my conclusions, they are that for the most point the text of the Corpus is to be followed here, but we should read μόνη γὰρ τοῦτο εὐαυτῷ ὑπὸ μόνη γὰρ τοῦτο. (Stobaeus gives ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὦν, μόνη εὐαυτῷ τοῦτο ἀναθέτεικεν ἠθέλησε καὶ τὴν γῆν κοσμήσαι.

We could certainly make better sense of iv.2(49,12,13), καὶ δὲ μὲν κόσμος τῶν ἥψαν ἐπιλεονέκτητε τοῦ ἱδεῖ μαί τοῦ κόσμου τῶν λόγων καὶ τῶν νοῦν, if with Nock we read τὸ δεῖξαν, δὲ δὲ ἄνθρωπος for τοῦ ἱδείου; 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 δὲ, ἄνθρωπος, interpolating ἀλλὰν before ἥψαν, reading πλεονέκτηται, and removing τοῦ ἱδείου καὶ τοῦ κόσμου. But such a chain of errors is highly unlikely. More plausibly, we can postulate a lacuna before ἐπιλεονέκτητε in which we could interpolate, for example, ἐπιλεονέκτητε τὴν σφαίραν, δὲ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐπιλεονέκτητε κτλ. This omission could very easily be explained as resulting from the repeated ἐπιλεονέκτητε. Under this hypothesis, τοῦ ἱδείου is still puzzling. Perhaps this is another of those accidental substitutions to which so many of the tractates are prone. I would substitute τοῦ ἱδείου 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, ὁδὸν πάντων δρχὴ καὶ βίοτα καὶ δρχὴ ὁδὸν, where a repeated βίοτα causes trouble, as may be seen by comparing Stobaeus’ text, ὁδὸν πάντων δρχὴ καὶ βίοτα, ἐν πολυ̣ ἐστίν ὅ̣ς ἐν βίοτα καὶ δρχή. Presumably the text behind C. H. iv.10.3 retained ὁδὸν.

Finally we may refer to iv.6(51.16,17), ὁδὲ Ἐστίν δμφότερα ἐν οἴς τε ἡ ἔκαστεις καταλείπεται. The reading of B² here is interesting: ὁδὲ Ἐστίν δμφότερα συνελθεῖν ἐν οἴς τε ἡ αὑρεις καὶ ἐν οἴς ἡ ἔκαστεις καταλείπεται. If this is really an emendation, and does not come from collation, then it is shrewd: the similarity of αὑρεις and ἔκαστεις would have caused the difficulty, and the presence of ἐν οἴς τε leads us to expect καὶ ἐν οἴς. Unfortunately this emendation does not make much sense, since it seems to suppose some kind of meaningful contrast between αὑρεις and ἔκαστεις. But it does seem plausible to expect another clause beginning with καὶ ἐν οἴς, unless, with Einarson, we simply delete the τε. Therefore I would place a lacuna after καταλείπεται, to be filled in perhaps with καὶ ἐν οἴς ἡ αὑρεις μένει.

This solves part of the problem. But some kind of a completion is needed for Ἐστίν: συνελθεῖν supplied by B² is a reasonable conjecture, and no doubt followed δμφότερα. 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 tractateś 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), oδ ἐν ἡν ἦν eti διὰνεφ ην, Tiedemann is probably right in interpolating μή before διὰνεφ; there is, however, no need to interpolate eti, whether between ην and ην, as Scott hesitatingly suggests, or between ην and eti, suggested by Einarson, since the dichotomy is between the invisible (τὸ διὰνεφ), which is, and that which appears (τὸ φαίνεται), which becomes.

In v.10(64.7), πάντα γὰρ ἐστι καὶ οὕτως ἐστι, we should probably, following Flussas, read πάντα γὰρ ην ἢ ἐστι κτλ. Reitzenstein's solution, πάντα γὰρ οὕτως ἐστι καὶ οὕτως ἐστι πάντα, is less economical.

It is possible that the same sort of solution is needed in v.4(62.3-5): καὶ γὰρ eti τὸ ἀτελέω ἐστι ἐνδεικτικα, ὅτε κατέχει, τούτο ἐστι, τόν γρόνον τῆς τάξεως, καὶ ὅπως δεσπότην ἐστι τὸν μηδένων αὐτῆς τήν τάξιν πάσαν. Nock tentatively suggests ὅτε Αμή, Puech eti Αμή. 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 ὅπως δεσπότην κτλ. seems to follow naturally after ἐνδεικτικα. Therefore I would adopt Nock's suggestion, regarding ὅτε Αμή κατεχεὶ . . . 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 οὕτως for οὕτη (Nock) in v.4(61.19); περὶ ταῦτα for περὶ ταῦτα (Tiedemann) in v.5(62.10); ἦ for ἦ (Turnebus) in v.8(63.17); and εἴδολησι for εἴδολησι (Nock) in v.10(64.11); in this latter, it is also possible, following Turnebus, to read <δύνατον> εἴδολησι or, following Reitzenstein, εἴδολησι. It is also possible that in v.1(60.13) we should, following Scott, read ἦ... ἦ for ἦ... ἦ, 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 ἤντα given by DB. Velsenius was surely justified in proposing παντοκύριος for παντὸς σωματος in v.10(64.6) even though that would be ἤντα λεγόμενον; see Nock in the critical apparatus ad loc. In v.9(64.1,2), ἔστιν οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἤντα οὕτως καὶ τὰ μὴ ἤντα. Nock may be right in reading οὕτως for the first οὕτως, although it must be said that the passage still seems rather clumsy. Probably also v.2(61.7,8), πῶς οὖν ἐν σαρκί διὰ τῶν φθαλμών σοι φανήσεται is to be emended by reading οὕτως for οὖν (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 τὰίς δρομοῖς καὶ διανοίγοντας δρομοῖς  is, in its context, nonsense, and ought, following Scott, to be supplemented as follows: πῶς γὰρ τὰίς <ποιητῆς, μόνῃ δὲ ἦ> δρομοὶ κ.λ.; 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, ἐὰν καὶ κρηττῶν ἐστίν ὑπὸ (κρηττῶν . . . ὅσον Α; ὅσος Β) κατὰ θεῶν ὄνοματος, 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 . . . ἀποστρήσες τοῦ δημιουργοῦ τα δημιουργήματα, μᾶλλον δὲ < . . . μᾶλλον δὲ> καὶ κρηττῶν 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 <άς ποτέρα καὶ ποιητήν ἔκειν άληθεσι . . . >. The second clause would deny that the title θεός is appropriate to God, cf. v.1(60.4), for example < . . . οδὸν δὲ θεῶν ἐκεῖνον ὄνομα ἔχειν, μᾶλλον δὲ> καὶ κρηττῶν κτλ.

There is still a problem with καὶ κρηττῶν ἐστίν ὑπὸ κατὰ θεῶν ὄνοματος. In the Budé edition, Festugière suggested that this should be changed to η κατὰ θεοῦ ὄνομα, supposing three errors in four words. Later, adopting a reading from A, he proposed καὶ κρηττῶν ἐστίν, ὅσον κατὰ θεῶν, ὄνοματος. While this reading is more economical from the

---

[Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 70.]
point of view of the manuscripts, and no doubt possible, yet it leaves ἀνάμισος in a rather odd position; if this had been what the author had intended, it seems more likely that he would have placed ὑπὸν καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἀνάμισος before καὶ. The reading proposed by Scott, κριττῶν ὑστὶν οὗτος καὶ τῷ Ἰσχνοῦ δνάμισος, 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 οὗτος ἦ for ὑπὸν. The strange combination καὶ τῷ Θεῷ ἀνάμισος can possibly be explained as a Spoonerism, the two errors, as it were, attracting each other. The reading of ὑπὸν for οὗτος ἦ 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 Ἐχονς (Parthey) in vi.1(72.7) is scarcely surprising, and may be the result of a misread abbreviation. In vi.2(73.1), Ἐτότο (Nock) presumably became Ἐτότω because of the attraction of the previous Ῥώμων. In vi.4(75.6), ὂβε (Scott) is probable for ὄντε. In vi.3(73.17,18), Nock is probably right in reading τῷ ἀγαθῶν τῷ κακόν for τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τοῦ κακόν, although τοῦ κακοῦ τοῦ ἀγαθῶν transmitted by Didymus would also be acceptable.

Probably in vi.1(72.10), ἐν has been inserted before ὑπὸν (Patritius), although it is difficult to see why, unless it is attracted
by the dative οὐδὲν. Also difficult to explain, although probable, is
the insertion of ἄλλων (Nock) in vi.5(75.14,15), ἀκοινοῦτα γὰρ τοιά
τωσ ἄλλως τῶν ἄλλων γέγον ἐστὶ.

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

In vi.1(72.16), καὶ διότι αὕτου ἰδανηθησαί, something is missing before καὶ διό, most likely οὐκ ἄλλον, supplied by Nock. This
error could be the result either of carelessness or of manuscript damage.

In vi.4(75.1-3), τὸ ὡς καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν οὐδὲν ἔστι καταλαβέωσαι
tῶν ἐν τῷ κάθοι, Nock reads ἐν οὐδὲν for οὐδὲν. Nevertheless it
may be asked whether a lacuna is not to be suspected. Patritius' reading,
ἀγαθὸν ὡς ἔστι· ἀγαθὸν ὡς οὐδὲν 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 should be placed after
καλὸν. We may perhaps supplement: τὸ ὡς καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἐν μόνῳ τῷ
θεῷ ἔστι· 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 places\footnote{I do not see the need for a lacuna after τοῦ θεοῦ (Scott) in vi. 4(74.18).} where major lacunae are to be suspected. One of these is vi. 3(74.11-14): ὅτι ἐκατον τούτων τῶν προειρημένων ἐμπεπεστευται ἐνθέδε τῷ μέγιστον εἶναι ἄγαθόν, τῷ μίλλον-Δυνατόντος κακόν, ἡ γαστριμαργία, ἡ τῶν κακῶν πίντων χορηγὸς ἡ πλάνη ἡ ἄνωσις ἐνθέδε τοῦ ἄγαθος ἔστι. Nock, in his critical apparatus ad loc., writes: "aut ἢ γ. . . . χορηγὸς 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 χορηγὸς. Probably this was once followed by a verb, among other things, perhaps 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 ἄνωσις ἐνθέδε τοῦ ἄγαθος ἔστι. 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 ἐπομηντοντα, μαλιστα δὲ ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἄγαθος. At least a noun modified by ἢ and a main verb or some kind of a predicate is demanded. Scott in his apparatus suggests ἀνῆθη following ἐπομηντοντα and ἔδεα following ἄγαθος. The second of these seems very good to me, the first at least plausible. Einarson supplies ὁ διὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄντως ἔστι after ἄγαθος. I would prefer to take
something from each of these conjectures and read τά δὲ μὴ ὑπονοητοντα, μαλίστα δὲ ἡ τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἦδον, ἢντως κετί. Zuntz' reading, τά δὲ μὴ ὑπονοητοντα <οἶον ἀντὶ καὶ ἡντως κατο>, μαλίστα δὲ κτλ. ¹ seems to me less preferable since the purpose of ἡ 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), τά δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ νομιζόμενα αἰσθητήρια ἀναγοραὶ 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, τά 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, τά <μὴ> δοκοῦντα καὶ μὴ νομιζόμενα κτλ.

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 ἰδεοῦ, emended by Turnebus to read ἀδεοῦ. This reading is practically guaranteed by the following line, τὸ γὰρ ἀδεοῦ τοῦ ἀδεοῦ 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), δὲ πεντὰ ἀδρῶς ἡμῶν ἀδεοῦ διάλογος, in which either δ’ (Einarson) or ψ’ (Tiedemann) should be inserted before ἡμῶν. Scott’s reading, ἡμῶν ἀδρῶς, 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 ἤσον ᾧ τῆς ἱλικίας ἀποκεκλειόνων (ἀποκεκλειόνων Α) τῷ ἡμῶν, in which at least one word, a noun modified by τῷ, has dropped out. Tiedemann’s emendation of ἵν’ αὐτῶν for τῷ ἡμῶν is implausible since it is difficult to see how such an error could have arisen. We may perhaps read τῷ ἡμῶν.
<δελφος> with Scott or τῷ ἐκατον <γυς> with Einarson.

In viii.2(88,2,3), ὁ ὁκεῦμος ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς δίδιος καὶ διδοντος γέγονε, it is necessary to emend δίδιος, since otherwise this sentence would conflict too blatantly with the distinction between δίδιος and διδωκος in viii.2(87,19,20). Perhaps Flussas is right in reading διδωκος 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 obscured.

These errors are relatively easy to explain. We now turn to the instances of major damage. In viii.2(88,1), τῷ γὰρ δίδιον, οὐ δίδιον ἔστι τῷ πᾶν has been variously emended to <τοῦρο> γὰρ δίδιον <δι'> οὗ δίδιον ἔστι τῷ πᾶν (Einarson), τῷ γὰρ δίδιον, ή δίδιον ἔστιν, αὐτόγονον (W. Kroll); δίδιον γὰρ, οὐ δίδιον ἔστι τῷ πᾶν (Tiedemann), and τῷ γὰρ αὐτὶ <ου> [δίδιον ἔστι] τῇ τοῦ πᾶν <τοῦτούρ> (Scott). Scott’s emendation makes the most sense, but, like so many of his emendations, is utterly divorced from the manuscripts. Tiedemann’s and Einarsen’s emendations are more faithful to the manuscripts, 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 question how αὐτόγονον could have been changed to τῷ πᾶν in the manuscripts.

To me, the most likely solution is that a line has dropped out between τῷ γὰρ δίδιον and οὐ δίδιον ἔστι τῷ πᾶν. The author had been in the process of defining τῷ δίδιον. Probably then τῷ 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.
Since the next sentence begins with ὅ ὑπνόη, it seems probable that this sentence had begun with ὅ μέν κόσμος. It may then have proceeded <...> ὅ μέν κόσμος διάνοιαν ἔστιν ἡμών> οὗ ἀφιεν ἔστιν τὸ πάν. 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 μικρά ποῖα ἐπιλογείην τὸ τῆς ἀξιοῦσας καὶ τὸ τῆς μειώσεως. While we could emend τὴν ἔπληθος ἐπιλογείην to γῆ... ἐπιλογείην (Einarson) or ἄπειρον τι... ἐπιλογείην (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 ἐπιλογείην, such as ἄταξαν (Nock). Since ἦν in the previous sentence is the most likely subject for ἔχει, this would leave τὸ τῆς ἀξιοῦσας καὶ τὸ τῆς μειώσας 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), ὁ ὑποκατάστασις τῶν ἐπιγέφυν σωμάτων ὑποκατάστασίς, a lacuna is to be suspected, and to be filled in, e.g., by ὑποκατάστασις <διάλυμα> (Einarson), συντάσσων <διαλύσεις ἀνανέωσις> (Nock), or <διαλυθείσης γίνεται τῆς> συντάσσεται (Scott).

In viii.5(89.4), οὗ καὶ βοηθησιν τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχων, Flussas' emendation, νοῦν for οὗ has been easily accepted because of the parallel expression, οὗ μόνον πρὸς τὸν δευτερον θείαν συμπαθείαν ἔχων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐννοιαν τοῦ πρώτου, in the following lines. Nevertheless, it is not easy to see how νοῦν could have become οὗ. It is to be noted that the subject of the sentence, τὸ ὑπὸ τριστὸν ἡμῶν, ὁ ἀνθρώπος, 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 be-
tween τοῦ πατρὸς and ἔχων, as e.g., ὁ κατὰ βουλήσιν τοῦ πατρὸς
<ἀποθνῄσκειν, ἄρε δεανασάν> 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 acci-
dental 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 Vergilius, 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 τάξιν ἔρχεται κίνησις, ix.9(100.12,13). Another strange substitution is σοφίστες for σωφράστες (Flussas), ix.8(99.21). Since σοφίστες 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 αἰσθήματι for (probably) αἰσθηθείλα (Einarson) in ix.2(96.18); perhaps καίνου (καὶ νοῦ Μ) for κενοῦ (ἈΝ) in ix.3(97.9), although here, since the context is corrupt, it is not possible to be certain; ζύνημεν for ζύνον ἐν (Scott) in ix.4(98.5); ἄφοσι for διάφορα (Ménard) in ix.5(98.20); τῷ for τῷ (Scott) in ix.6(98.25); αὐτοῦ for αὑτοῦ (B C) in ix.9(100.16), and μου for οὗ (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 ἐκ εἰς (Nock) or μέχρι (B C) should be inserted before τὴς ἀληθείας in ix.10(100.21). The author had used μέχρι τῆς ἀληθείας in ix.10(100.19,20) and μέχρι τῶν ἄνδρων in ix.10(100.21). In ix.6(99.6,7), ὥρ (Turnebus) or καὶ ὥρ (B C γρ.) is clearly demanded before ἑστι. 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:

εμοι δὲ δοκεῖ τῷ γεγονόναι διομητέρας τὰς ἐνεργείας ἐν τῶν ἐνεργῶν ὑπὲρ ἐγγυροφοβία γάρ αἰσθήσαι. Festugière here reads διομητέραν for τῷ γεγονόναι and, following Scott, places a lacuna after γάρ, which he fills in by "l'intellection est toujours unie" in his translation (Scott: ηἀντεμεικται δεὶ νόησις αἰσθήσαι). 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), ηπένδως μέρους τοῦ κόσμου καινοῦ (καὶ νοῦ Μ) οὐνος δασμονος τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ πεπωτισμένῳ δασμονι. As previously noted, καινοῦ may be for κενοῦ. It is possible that ηπένδως... δασμονος 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... δασμονι. Einarson would have us read πλὴν τοῦ... πεπωτισμένου, omitting δασμονι. But in that case it is difficult to see why δασμονι was ever introduced. Zielinski's reading, τῷ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κεχωρισθαί δασμονα, is equally difficult to explain. P. Cumont would have us believe that there is an αμφα after δασμονι produced by homoeoteleuton. Perhaps this is the


2In Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 102, n. 1.
case; but it must be said that ὡς τις ὑπεισελθὼν, which in the manuscripts directly follows δαμονί, could be understood very well if it followed without interruption ὅταν ὡς τινος τῶν δαμονίων, which immediately precedes μηδενας... δαμονί. 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. II. 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. II. 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 κατικεύομαι for καθικεύομαι (b²) in x.4(115.4); ἀθλητὴς ὡς πόσης και ἀθοναστὰς for either ἀθλητὴς ὡς καὶ πόσης ὡς (Turnebus) or ἀθλητὰς ὡς πόσης και ὡς (Nock) in the same place; ἦν for ἤς (Reitzenstein)¹ in x.5(115.5); ὡς probably for ὥς (Patritius) in x.5(115.10); αὑτὲ for ἀὑτα (given by Stobaeus) in x.7.4; ἐπιλαθδεμονος for ἐπιλαθδεμονος (given by Hermippus) in x.6 (115.18); ὡς υμδενον (ὁμοιμενον A) for ὡς υμδενον (Turnebus) or ὡς υμδενον (d) in x.15(120.15); συνκρατιζομενον αὐτῷ for συνκρατιζομενον αὐτῷ (Stobaeus) in x.17.4; αἱ πέρι (1) for ὧς πέρι (Stobaeus, ms. P²) in x.17.6; ἐτοὶ for ἐπὶ (D¹, Ven.) in x.20(123.15); ὡς ὄνομα

for ἀμπελός (Flussas) in x.21(124.1); and perhaps ἰσχὺς for οὗτος (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. 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 εἰ τοῦ for ἦ τοῦ (Turnebus) in x.2(113.13), as that of δὲ perhaps for δὴ (Scott) in x.5(115.6) are based on confusion brought about by similarity of pronunciation.

A few of the errors in this tractate are most easily explained on the basis of a misreading of an uncial exemplar, as κατάργσα for κατάργσα (d) in x.5(115.14), and εἷς ἦ τοῦ for θυσία (Scott) in x.11 (118.20); οὕῳ ὤς perhaps for σῶμα, τὸ τοῦ (Einarton) 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 ἐμποιοῦσα for εἰς ποιοῦσα (Flussas) in x.21(124.2).

Probably παλαισσυρτος for παλασσυρτος (given by Stobaeus) or παλλασσυρτος (Turnebus) in x.8.3 is merely a spelling error. The same is likely true of εἰρῄσι (εἰρῄσι CH) for ἔρῄσι (D, Stobaeus) in x.24.1.

A few errors in this tractate involve the omission of one letter: εἰνιὼν for γενικῶν, x.1(113.4), given correctly in x.7(116.7); κεφαλῆς for κεφαλῆς (Turnebus), x.11(118.14); παλαι (BCH), πάλιν εἰ (A); πλεῖν (DBD) for πλεῖω (Néard) or πλεῖον (Nock) in x.11(118.19); ὁδὸς (D, A) for νοῦς (D, νοῦς δὲ B, Stobaeus) in x.18.8. Some slight

---

1 See 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 δημοῦ (B C) or before καλλος (Reitzenstein). In x.4(114.17,18), ζὴν γὰρ τοῦ δημοῦ τῶν γυμνὸσθαι ἐστι τὸ δημοῦ, following Festugière, we should perhaps punctuate after γυμνὸσθαι and insert τοῦτο before ἐστι. In x.11(118.18), ἡ θυτὴ should be inserted before ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχή, see Nock's apparatus ad loc.

It is not clear why we have εἰσόδυνασ for εἰσόδυνας (B C) in x.21(123.21) or τῶν κατὰ μετουσίαν for either κατὰ μετουσίαν omitting τῶν (Nock) or ἐν κατὰ μετουσίαν (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 ἀνθρώπους ἄθανασια (αἱ ἄθανασιας Α) ἔχουσι. This becomes clear if we read, with Stobaeus, ἄρξῃ ἄθανασιας. (We need not follow him in reading ἔχουσιν for ἔχουσι.) Presumably the succession of words beginning with Α helped to precipitate this error.

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

---

1 Festugière, Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste; IV, 57, n. 1.
δὲ θεός πάντων. This becomes clear if, with Stobaeus, we read καὶ
κοινώνουσι μὲν αἱ τῶν θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, κἂν δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς
tῶν ἄλλων. Ἐπιμελοῦνται δὲ οἱ κρείττονες τῶν διατόνων, θεοὶ μὲν ἀν-
θρώπων, ἀνθρώποι δὲ τῶν ἄλλων ἔσοντες, δὲ δὲ θεοὶ πάντων.

It may also be possible, with the help of Stobaeus, to recon-
struct x.13.2, ὃ νοῦς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, ὃ λόγος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἡ ψυχὴ ἐν τῷ
σώματι. The difficulty is that the next sentence begins with τὸ
πνεύμα. Since Stobaeus reads πνεύματι for σώματι, 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 πνεύμα ἐν τῷ> σώματι. 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), ὃ μὲν γὰρ
φύσεως καὶ αὐξήσεως ἐστὶ προσηγορία. Since the sentence in its con-
text should be defining φύσις, it is, as it stands, tautological.
J. Kroll would solve this problem by reading φύσεως for φύσεως, clear-
ly a good choice, since it would provide a contrast for αὐξήσεως. Scott
would read φύσις γενεσθεῖς, Zuntz¹ φύσις μεταφθαρθεῖς. These emen-
dations would suggest that two words had become telescoped into one.
This is also quite possible. I would prefer, borrowing from each sug-
gestion, to read φύσις φθάσθησθεῖς, 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: ἀνερ ἄστρι περὶ τὰ μεταβληθά καὶ κινητά καὶ διάνυστα. Here the repeated -ήτα would tend to cause errors. Patri- tius reads: μεταβλήτη τὰ μεταβλητα, which however destroys the sense of the passage, which contrasts φάσις and ἐνέργεια. Nock, who points this out, saves the sense by reading ἀνερ ἀνερ περὶ τὰ διάνυστα. 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: ἀνερ ἀνερ θεοῦ ἐνέργεια περὶ τὰ μεταβλητα καὶ διάνυστα. I would, however, preserving a more strict parallelism with the preceding clause, prefer to read: ἀνέρ ἐνέργεια θελήσεως καὶ ποιήσεως ἐστὶ προσηγορία, ἀνερ ἄστρι περὶ τὰ μεταβλητα καὶ διάνυστα. It is to be noted that, according to x.2 (113.11,12), the activity (ἐνέργεια) of God is θελήσις and, according to x.3(114.7,8), the Good is τὸ ποιητικὸν.

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): τοῦτοι τὰ θεία τε καὶ ἄνθρωποι ἰνα ἀν- τὸς βουλεύει γίνεται. Here the major difficulty is that ἰνα cannot be explained in its present context. Scott salvages it in part by transferring it, removing τε in the process: τοῦτοι τὰ θεία [τε] ἰνα καὶ <τῶν> ἀνθρώπων ἀντὸς βουλεύει γίνεται. 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 ἐν for ἰνα, but again such a substitution is not easy to explain; moreover, on this
hypothesis, the text is rather abrupt. *Patristius' emendation*, ὃς ἔκαστον, is more economical, but leaves unexplained the relation of this sentence to the definition of φῶς in the previous line. I suspect a larger lacuna, as for example: ἐὰν μὲν γὰρ αὐθάρμοις ποιητικὴ ἑνεργεία τῶν ἐνικητῶν μόνον, ἐν δὲ τῷ θεῷ πάντων ἐν αὐτῶς θουλεῖται εἶναι. (According to x.18.10.11, the human νοῦς is creative with respect to earthly things.)

"(Perhaps the following sentence, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἑνεργείαν καθάς καὶ ἐν τῶν ἄλλων ἔδιδεμεν θεῖαν καὶ αὐθαρμοίνως x.111.9-11), needs no emendation, since it is adequately translated in its present state by *Festugières* for the use of *en* sec. *Liddell-Scott-Jones* s.v. ἐν, A.III.4, p. 621.)

Although *Festugières* wishes to salvage ἀλλὰ ἐπιρρέουσιν αὐτήν τῶν ἐντων in x.2(113.14), 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), ὡς θεὸς καὶ παθήρ καὶ τὸ δυσθον 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 ποιητικὸν and ὃ ποιῶν introduced in x.3(114.10). *Festugières's insertion (after Scott)* of θέλειν before εἶναι suffers in the same way. I would read τῷ εἶναι τὰ πάντα <ὅπως ποιητικὸν.>; cf. *Scott*, τῷ θέλειν εἶναι τὰ πάντα <πάντων παθῆρ.>

---

1 *Festugières*, *La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, IV, 6.

In x. 4(114.15-17), καὶ γὰρ τὸ θέλει εἶναι καὶ ἔστι καὶ ὑπὸ, μαλλιστά δὲ αὐτός, καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα διὰ τούτων ἔστι, we may perhaps postulate a lacuna caused by a tear across either the bottom or the top of a page, leaving gaps after ὑπὸ 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 τούτων, following Pal., Q, for διὰ τούτων. Festugière in the Budé edition wanted to obviate the need for postulating the first lacuna by reading καὶ ἔστι καὶ ὑπὸ, μαλλιστά δὲ ὑπὸ, 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." But this is perhaps too clumsy.

A lacuna must also be supposed in x. 15(120.10,11), ὑπὸ (ὑπὸς CH) μόνον ἄγαθὴ ψυχή, καὶ ὁδὸντο τῷ ἄγαθῷ, καὶ ζῆς δὲ γνώτι. In the context in x. 15, the subject of discussion is the γνώσις 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 μόνον and inserting δὲ after ὁδὸντο τῷ ἄγαθῷ. 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 ὑπὸς.

---

1Ibid., IV, 60.
μόνων. (Scott, who makes other changes, places a lacuna after ψυχή.) This omission would have contained the words which had changed the subject. There may also be a minor omission of δε (Nock) or μένει after ὁδόντια ἀγαθή.

In x.15(120.14,15), τοῦ σώματος αὐτῆς ητί ὁλγον ὄγκωτο (ὀγκωτὸν D) καὶ μηδεὶς ὁ πᾶς ὁ ὑγιαστὸν (ὑγιαστὸν A; ὑγιαστὸν d), it is possible that ητί ὁλγον ὄγκωτο 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 homoearchton. 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 ὑγιαστὸν for ὑγιαστήν (Scott) in xii.5 (149.10), caused by the similarity in appearance of the two words; ἡμιδόν for ἡμιδόν (D, Bon.; καὶδόν Ven., Pal.) in xii.5(149.15), caused by itacism; τοῦτον for τοῦτο τοῦτον (Turnebus) in xii.16(154.1), for which I can assign no cause, and θητέων for θῆτεόν (Tiedemann) in xii.10(151.11), again caused by the resemblance of the two words. In
xi.13(152.14), εί μή δέμις εἶπεν, we may choose between ὑ μὴ (Scott), caused by inattention, or εἴ μοι (which I propose), caused by itacism.

In xi.20(155.12,13), τῶν δῶμων was written for τῶ δῶμων (Vergelian), presumably through mere carelessness.

In xi.15(153.14,15) καὶ ἡ μὴ δάφνης στροφὴ, ἢ δὲ κρύψης ἀνακρίσις, Nock indicates that στροφὴ is suspect. I would write τροφὴ for στροφὴ; 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), δψηλότατος for δψηλότερος (Turnebus) and in xi.22(156.17), φανερότατος for φανερότερος (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 ὡς (Scott) in xi.7(150.8); μεταβαλλοῦσα for μεταβαλλοῦσαν (DBc) in the following line; οὔδε (οὔδε CH) for οὔδὲν (DB0) in xi.18(154.16); κόσμος for κόσμης (Tiedemann) in xi.10(151.10); and πρᾶγμα for πράγματα (DBc) in xi.20(156.2).

In xi.20(155.11), τὸν κόσμον, ἑαυτὸν, ὦλον, we may choose between ἑαυτὸν <τε> ὦλον (Reitzenstein) or ἑαυτὸν, <τὸ> ὦλον (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 ἔξι: εἰ δὲ ἦν εὖ τις
The last word apparently being a correction from "λέα" found also in C and probably originally in B. The words "ει δε ου ευ τις" became in BCH "ει δε ου ευ η τις", perhaps a partial correction. In D they became "λεαν ου ευ η τις", in Ven. "ει δε ου η τις", in Bκ "ει δε ου εν η τις". According to Nock, the reading of A is faithful to the archetype, and stands for "λεαν ευ τις". This reconstruction seems very plausible to me.

A similar error has been suspected in x1.19(154.20), "εις ην δε και πορευόμενι. Nock, following Patritius, wishes to read "εις Ιωάννην πορευόμενι; but perhaps Scott's conjecture, "εις ην δε και <βολείς γην> is more plausible; if so, then manuscript damage may be suspected.

The reading of the manuscripts for x1.22(156.16), "ειδυνα ταμις δόματος δ θεος" is baffling. Nock prints εις πάσης, 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 "δραχων και η γημον" for "δραχωνος και η γεμονος" (Turnebus) in x1.7(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 text.

---

1 See Nock in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, xvi, intro.
text in the course of recopying. So for example the first words of the tractate, κατὰ κινούμενον τὸν λόγον, δὲ Τρισμέγιστος ἔρριφ, καὶ μὲν ἡμῖν τῶν λεγομένων, ἡς ὅτι μοι ἐπήλθεν εἰπεῖν ὄνω ῥανηθεῖσα. 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 φανερώσων.

If so, then the above explanation would be the most probable.

In xi.2(147.7,8), the words δ' χρόνος lack any context. But in xi.2(147.9) in BCH, the words θέσεις, δ' αἰών, δ' κόσμος, ή 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 BCH. Then we may suppose that in an earlier text, perhaps the exemplar used by the archetype, δ' 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 δ' χρόνος. Originally, the whole line, θέσεις, δ' αἰών, δ' κόσμος, δ' χρόνος, ή 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), διδυμόνος δὲ δυσματέρων καὶ νεον καὶ μᾶλλον δυσματέρων, by transferring Επίσταμεν from xi.6(149.23), καὶ οὐ παλαιότερον οδύν ἔπαι. If so, then a similar explanation is to be suspected. This passage may also be emended, however, by removing καὶ μᾶλλον δυσματέρων (Reitzenstein), these two words being a gloss on either παλαιότερον οὐ δυσματερον.

Festugière suggests that xi.15(153.6,7), ἔστω τοῖς θείνων τοὺς

θείοι δ' αἰών, τοῦ δὲ αἰώνος τοῦ κόσμου, τοῦ δὲ κόσμου τοῦ θεοῦ is displaced,
and originally followed xi.14(153.4), ὅτι δὲ ἔστιν ἕνωσις νοῦ καὶ ψυχῆς. This suggestion, for which he gives detailed justification in his La révélation d’Hermès Trièmegiste IV, 156-158, seems to me quite plau-
sible, and if correct would be another instance of the tendency in the manuscripts tradition of this tractate for groups of words to become dis-
placed, for the reasons suggested above.

The text of this tractate has attracted a large number of un-
friendly glosses. That is how, following Ferguson, I would interpret γελοιόστατον in xi.11(151.17) and ἐν πολλῷ γελοιόστατον in xi.12(151.20). These would not have referred precisely to the words immediately follow-
ing, which in both cases are inoffensive, but to words in the immediate context: καὶ τὸν μὲν κόσμον ἀμολόγησας δὲ εἶναι in xi.11(151.17,18) and οὖτων δὲ τὸν θεόν πάστον εἶναι θελεῖς in xi.11(151.19). So also in xi.15(153.11), δεισιδαίμων δὲ (δεισιδαίμονως B6) διοδεῖς 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 plausi-
ble 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 incor-
porated into the Corpus Hermeticum. This is consistent with the hypothe-
sis 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), τῆς γὰρ μετ' οὐκέτων εὕτε Ἰωῆς καὶ ἀθανασίας μεταβολῆς ποιήτητος.

Nock, accepting Scott's reading of ποιήτης for ποιήτητος as well as Turnerbus' reading of ἀθανασίας <καί> μεταβολῆς, also reads ἐστιν for εὕτε.

All of these postulated misreadings would be acceptable in themselves, but a more economical solution would be to postulate a lacuna after ποιήτητος, supplementing, in part, as follows: ποιήτητος <χορηγός εἴτε ...

The καί after Ἰωῆς 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 ἀναμνῄσκοντα γνῶναι καὶ θελήσας καὶ ἐλπίσας ὅτι εὐθεῖα ἴσα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φέρουσα καὶ ἔργα. Reitzenstein gives ὅτα for ἴσα which should mean "through" the Good. But surely the Good should be the goal, not the means. If with Einarson we read εὐθεία for εὐθεῖα, what should we do with ἴσα? The beginning of the sentence, up to εὐθεία, is in itself acceptable, and would mean, "being able to know and will and hope is a straight road," in this context ἴσα τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ is also perhaps acceptable, "belonging to the Good." It is the next words, φέρουσα καὶ ἔργα, which present a problem. Festugière would read ἔργα for ἔργα, 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 ἀγαθόν or φρονεῖα. This lacuna may have contained some reference to the idea of the Good, which is the logical subject for the next sentence, ἀπειροντι σοι πάντων ἐναντίον καὶ πάντων δρᾶσει, 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 θετικὰ ἐν αὐτὰ τῶν θετικῶν; πῶς δὲ τὸ δεδομένον καὶ διανασκεῦται ποιούμενα (ποιούμεν τὰ Bd) ἔρωιν 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: οὔτω δὲ νόει, ἢς πάντων σώματος ζῶντος ἐξ ἀληθείας καὶ ὑψηλῆς τῆς σύστασιν ἔρωιν ... 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 ποίησις for πῶς, 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 διανασκευάτων for τῶν θετικῶν. The second sentence should perhaps read πῶς δὲ <ἐν τῶν> (ἐν τῶν Ferguson) τὸ δεδομένον καὶ διανασκεύασθαι ποιούμενα <τῶν σώματος> ἔρωιν (guéon θετικῶν 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 ἀποθέτειται μηδὲν δυνάμενον εἶναι, Nock's solution, <πε> μηδὲν <ποιούμενα μὴ> δυνάμενον εἶναι, and Head's, μηδὲν <ἐφη> δυνάμενον εἶναι, both seem plausible; we
could perhaps add μηδὲν δυνάμενον εἰναι <εἰ μή 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 αδώνι probably for αθώς (Reitzenstein); ἀδών (Einarson) is more clumsy. So also in xii.1(174.9), we have αδών for αθών (Flussas); in xii.4(175.19), τὰ ἀλογον for τὰ ἀλογα (B³); συνέστηκε for συνέστηκη (Scott) in xii.15(180.14); ἀπολέσαι for ἀπόλεσαι (Parthey) in xii.16 (180.19); ἔπερ for ἔπερ (B³ γρ.) in xii.21(182.19); θλη for θλην (B³) in xii.22(183.7); ἐνεργεία for ἐνεργεῖαν (Patritius) in

---

1 Reitzenstein, Die Hellenistische Hysterienreligionen, p. 408, supported by Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 7, n. 5.
xii.22(183.9); ἡ ὀφθαλμα for τῆς ὀφθαλμος 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 seem plausible to suppose with W. Kroll that in xii.3(175.12), εἷς 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 δὲ περὶ καινιστὸν καὶ εἰμαρμένης λόγος, a negative is missing. Nock, on the advice of Tiedemann, reads ὁδὸν for ὁδδ and then, following Scott, inserts ὁδὸν before ὁδῶς. I would prefer to leave ὁδὸν in its present position, reading ὁδὸν ὁδ. In xii.8(177.7), we should insert τὸ (ἐκ) before νοστὰ σώματα, in xii.14(180.1), τὸ (Turnebus) before σύνθεσιν σώματα, in xii.22(183.9,10), τὴν (ἐκ) before σώματιν. 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 ἄστρι <τοῦ θεοῦ>, cf. Scott's μέρη ἄστρι <τοῦ θεοῦ> (Θεοῦ Ὁ). In xii.1(174.11) we should perhaps insert ἄνθρωποις after ἄνθρωπος (ἐκ). In xii.14(179.17), ὃ ὁν ἔμοι ἔστων εἰμαν καὶ νοῦς τοῦ θεοῦ, the insertion of τοῦ νοῦ after εἰμαν (Flussas) would make a great deal of sense; compare the similar chain of being in xii.15(153.6,7).

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

In xii.4(175.21), γὰρ καὶ (.bb) 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 xi.5(176.2,3), καὶ χολόδεται ἡ ὡς ἐξ ἀνάγης τῆς εἰμαρμένης ὁρᾶσας τῷ ἑργον. Nock brackets ἡ in his text, but in his apparatus suggests ὃ <μηδὲν ἀλλ’> ἡ ὡς κτλ., supposing two errors.

There appears to be a lacuna in xi.6(176.12-14): καὶ πάλιν ὡς ἐν μὲν τοῖς Ἀλλοις Ἰδοῖς ὅσα ἦστιν εὐθειατικῶς, ἀλλ’ ἀνόμοιος ἐν πᾶσι, τὸ τε θυμικὸν καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν οὐκ ἐξέχουσαν, it seems best to read, as Nock tentatively suggests, πάσιν, ἐν δὲ ἀνάρωμοι 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 xi.12 (178.21-179.1): ὡς ὅπο τρίτη τῷ ἀνάρωμα ὁ θεὸς παρά πάντα τῇ ἑνήκᾳ ἵππω εὐαργεῖστο, τὸν τε νοῦν καὶ τὸν λόγον, ἐστίν τῇ ἐθνοσφαγῆ, τὸν δὲ προφορικῶν 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 ἐνδιδοτικῶς λόγος and the προφορικῶς 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 ἧσον γὰρ ὑπὸ, ἦστι καὶ νοῦς ἐστίν, xi.2(174.13), and in the same chapter ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀλώγοις Ἰδοῖς ἤ ὑπὸ ἦστι κενῆ τοῦ νοοῦ (174.14,15) and (νοῦς) καὶ τοῖς μὲν ἀλώγοις τῇ δὲ ἐκδοτον φοίτη τοις εὐτεργεῖ (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 tracts. 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 ἤναν, 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 παράδοσιν (παλιγγενεσίαν παράδοσιν NBC), the most plausible explanation, following Zuntz, is that παράδοσιν has dropped out before παράδοσιν because of the similarity in appearance of the two words. So also in xiii.9(204.11), κρίσεως (Parthey) became κρίσεως and in xiii.10(204.23), έθεσθημεν (Reitzenstein) became έθεσθημεν.

If Eitrem is right, then a similar accident has happened in xiii.12(205.11,12), ες δριθμου δωδεκα ήν των δριθμων (των δριθμων A, corr. A²). He would, for δριθμος, read either δροθαν or, "melius," δροθαν or δροθανιον. The error, he suggests, was attracted by των δριθμων in the following line. Festugière would render this unnecessary by

---

1 Zuntz, op. cit., p. 76 f.

2 S. Eitrem, "Varia CVIII," Symbolae Oloenses XXVII (1949) 144
suppressing τῶν δριθωμῶν (which he takes to have been the reading of the archetype) as a variant, leaving ἐξ δριθωμῶν as it is, but understood in the sense of "item" or "term of a series," see Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. δριθωμῶν, 1,4, p. 240. In this case Eitrem's solution seems to me to be the most plausible.

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

According to Reitzenstein, in xiii.3(201.14), δρῶν τί ἐν ἄλοιπον τοῦ αἰῶν (δρῶντι A; δρῶν B), τί takes the place of a partially obscured word in the manuscript. He proposed μορφή, which seems to be demanded by the sense of the paragraph. Flussas had proposed τίνι for τί; but in that case τίνι appears to be unnecessary. Festugiè re would punctuate after τί; 3 θέλω would then be in apposition. This reading is

3 Festugiè re, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 202, n. 1.
quite possible, although I prefer Reitzenstein's reading.

Presumably manuscript damage also gave us πνεύμα for πνευμάτιс (κειλ) in xiii.18(208.17).

The most economical solution for xiii.15(206.18), καθάς 'Ογόδδα δ Πομπάνος ἔθεοτος, is that proposed by Zuntz, who would simply remove 'Ογόδδα on the grounds that it could easily have intruded itself from the previous line. 1 (Scott also removes 'Ογόδδα, 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, καθάς <δύσοντι μοι στὸν> 'Ογόδδα; later, however, he obviates the difficulty by punctuating after ἔθεοτος, 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 Poimandres a rendu son oracle de l'Ogdoade." 4

Zuntz also suspects a similar intrusion from a previous line

3 Reitzenstein-Schaeeder, op. cit), p. 28, n. 1.
4 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 206.
in xiii.21(209.7), θελ, σο πάρεπ, where he would remove θελ on the
grounds that σο cannot stand between two vocatives. (In the previous
line, he reads Το γελ for Το γελ.) In addition, he finds θελ unac-
ceptable on metric grounds, since if θελ is deleted, then the hymn in
xiii.21 contains five cola of eleven syllables each. Moreover, in
xiii.18(208.13), δι' εμου δέξαι το παν λόγψ λογικήν θωσίν, he be-
lieves that δι' εμου has intruded from a previous line; in the same
line, he regards λόγψ as a doublet, attracted by the following word,
λογικήν. He also regards λογικάς in xiii.21(209.8) as a gloss based
on the previous line which has expelled the original reading. If
these readings are all correct, then the text of this tractate is un-
usually susceptible to this sort of error.

Most of the other alterations alleged by Zuntz, except the
apparent omission of σο after το παν, following Flussas, in xiii.19
(208.14), 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):
δείκτικως δέσιν ἡ προσέτεια τῆς δργῆς· εἰσίν οὐκ ἐν διάδρισιν. I
prefer one of Einarson's solutions here, εἰσίν οὐκ ἐν δούλον καὶ διανή
διάδρισιν, although it might be necessary, comparing xiii.8(204.3)-
9(204.20) with xiii.7(203.10-13), to read instead εἰσίν οὐκ ἐν δόλος
καὶ κακίον διάδρισιν. 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 αὐθείᾳ drives out φθόνος in addition to ἀδίκη, then Einarson’s emendation is to be preferred. However, it appears to me that it is τὸ ἀγάθων which drives out φθόνος, leaving ὀδος, ὅργη, προσεκτίᾳ and καυσία for the remaining two ὑπάλληλοι, ἔνα and ἀνάκρισις.

Evidently some words have been omitted from xiii.6(202.20-22), τὸ μὲν ἄνωφερόν, ὡς πῦρ, καὶ κατωφερόν, ὡς γῆ, καὶ ἄγρον, ὡς ἱδρυ, καὶ σύμπινον ὡς ἄτρ, πῶς αἰσθητῶς αὐτὸ νοπηντεῖ κτλ., some words are missing, most likely after ἄτρ. We may supply either ἄτρ ἀλοθησεὶ ὑποποιείτων ἀπὸ τῶν, πῶς κτλ., with Reitzenstein, or ἄτρ ἀλοθήσει ὑπολοιπεῖτων τῶν τῶν τούτων ἀνθρωποι, 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. ἀλήθεια ἡ πολιτεία ἡ πολιτιγγενεσία ἡ τέχνη, ὡς μείκτη φαντασίας εἰς τὸ σῶμα τὸ τρίχῃ διαστάτον
2. διὰ τῶν λόγων τούτων τόν περί τῆς πολιτιγγενεσίας
3. εἰς τὸν ὑπεμνηματισμὸν
4. ἵνα μὴ ἐμὲ διδομοι κατὰ πάντως εἰς τοὺς πάλλους
5. εἰς ὁδεὶς δ' θεός αὐτός θέλει (αὐτός δ' θεός θέλει Η; δ' θεός θέλει Β; αὐτός θέλει δ' θεὸς d)

Perhaps 2 and 3 can be combined. But we need (a) between 1 and 2, an object for φαντασίας; 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 τῶν λόγων τούτων; (c) some object or modifier for ὑπεμνηματισμὸν; and (d) some introduction or conjunction so that εἰς ὁδεὶς 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 διαστάτων and "pour toi seul" after ὑπεμνηματισμόνναι. Another possibility (which I propose) is ὁ μάθητας μικρότερος εἰς τὸ σύμνοι τρικάλοι ἰδίωτα καὶ οὐδές τὸν άνθρωπον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἐκ τῶν δυσμένων συνεκτός λογισμοῦ διὰ τὸν λόγον τούτον τὸν περὶ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας, εἰς ὅπως ὑπεμνηματισμόνναι ἀνισόμετος καὶ ὁδοιπορίας, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ὅπως τῆς πολιτικεύσεως, εἰς ὅπως ὑπεμνηματισμόνναι ἀνισόμετος καὶ ὁδοιπορίας. 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), ὑμνότα ἡμιτίθη, 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. 1.31, 32, iii, and vii, since these four are not at all similar in form, 1.31, 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, since we have no reason to believe that C. H. xiii and the Asclepius were ever combined

1 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 41.
2 Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 345.
3 Festugière, 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, 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
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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 δρατος (given by *Matritensis* gr. 84 for 223.4) was twice changed to δρατος, perhaps because some scribe could not believe that God could be both δρατος, xiv.3(223.4, in the previous sentence) and δρατος.¹

In xiv.6(224.5), Einarson’s reading of το ποιειν for το ποιουν seems right; το ποιουν was no doubt attracted by το το ποιουντος in the same line.

In xiv.6(224.9,10), ει τοινυ δο δο的心γηται γινομενον και το ποιουν, we may supply το δντι, το τε γινομενον from Cyril. This error may have been caused either by carelessness or manuscript damage.

In xiv.7(224.14,15), the manuscripts read, και μὴ διδ την ποιηκιαν των γινομενων φυλαξη δ φοβομενος ταπεινοσθη (ταπεινοσθη Μ).

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 ἄδοξον τῷ Θεῷ περὶ ἐπιστῆς (περὶ ἐπιστῆς) B3 Ματ. Ρ. Nock, following Cyril, removes the article before φοβοῦμενος and reads περὶ ἐπιστῆς.

(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 φοβοῦμενος, 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), ἔδωκεν ὅτι τὸ ἐτέρον τοῦ ἐτέρου χωρισθήναι, ἀλλ' ἀδύνατον. Nock reads ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἀδύνατον, 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 Ἄμμανα 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 ἐνίσχτε for ἐνίσχοις 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 καταβολαίς for μεταβολαίς in xvi.10(235.17), a misreading of a minuscule exemplar is to be suspected.

Presumably in xvi.2(232.15), κενοῦς (b⁶) became κατοῦς through itacism.

It seems probable that in xvi.3(233.1), τὸν, in ἥνα, ἰητὰ τὸν πάντα, originally read τὰ, as Turenebus supposed, but that τὸν was written because of the attraction of the preceding πάντα, ἰητὰ τὸν ἥνα.

Reitzenstein would simplify this sentence by removing τὸν ἥνα, ἰητὰ τὸν πάντα as resulting from conflations 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 μεγίστας for μεγίστας (Tiedemann); in xvi.8(235.1) we have γενεσίν for γενέσειν (Reitzenstein); and in xvi.15(236.19) we have τιμήν for στιμήν (Reitzenstein).

In xvi.5(233.17,18), ὅτε τῷ γὰρ ὀδρανὸν πολ γῆν δεῖ ὁ δημιουργός, it is possible that for δεῖ we should read συνῶς (Reinhardt); in this case, a few letters would have been obscured in an uncial exemplar. Alternately, I would suggest δέ [συνῶς], 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 Β; τοῖς Β²) for δητ (Keil); similarly in xvi.19(238.1) we have τὸ 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 Ἀργοστῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἦσε τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῶν λεγομένων, it is clear that something should be supplied, whether ὀνομάτων δύναμις (given by Nicephorus Gregoras), ὀνομάτων <φράσεις> (Reitzenstein), ὀνομάτων ὁνομασία, Einarson, or <κλω> ὄνοματος, which Nock hesitatingly proposes. Presumably some light manuscript damage is to be suspected. So also in xvi.10(235.14,15), καὶ ὅτι λαχάντες τοῦτον χάραν, we should perhaps supply τὴν before τοῦτον (d). Reitzenstein would supply instead μέχρι, but it is not clear to me why. In the same chapter (235.13), Reitzenstein plausibly supplies οὐ <τοῖς θυντοῖς δινέτες> συνοικοί. 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. αὐτῶς μόνος ὁδεν
2. καὶ τῷ τοῖς καὶ τῇ γοῦδα
3. ἦγγος οἴπω λαυτοῦ
4. μὴ ἔργον ἡμῶν ὀργάνων
5. στοχασμῷ (στοχασμὼν 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 οὐδὲς μάνος οἷς ἂν <δὺ θεὸς> οὐ δὲ ἡλίως [η] καὶ τῷ ὑπὲρ καὶ τῷ φύσει ηὗτος τὸν ἡμῶν, δυσὶν ἱστούτι παρέχει. καὶ ὁ μὲν θεὸς δειονήσθη μὴ δὲρ ἡμῶν ὑψωμένος, στοχασμῷ δὲ βιαζομένων νοούμενος>. 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 ἱεράντων δοσφῆς ὁδα καὶ κεκρημεμένον τῶν νοῦν τῶν λόγων ἔχουσα, καὶ ἐκτὸς δοσφηστάτης, τῶν Ἐλλήνων ὄστερον βοιληθέντων 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 ἱεράντων. He suggests that it would refer to unbelievers; Scott would propose δραμαμένος διαβληθείσαι ἀρ νὸς δοσφῆς 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 ροποῦ for νοῦτοῦ (B的现象) in xvi.1 (243.12).

C. H. xviii

The text of C. H. xviii seems in very poor condition.
characteristics 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 δὴ καὶ τίνος τεχνίτου κιθαρίστου δισυνιζωμένου, τῆς νευρᾶς βαγετοὺς, ὑπὸ τοῦ κραστονος, 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 δὴ τίνα κιθαρίστου καλ. 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 δὴ τὸν τόνων ὑποχαλάσσα, ὅτι δὴ τῶν τόνων ὑποραιώσασα (ὑποραιώσασα 6), where Reitzenstein would remove the second of these duplicate formulations, Nock the first. If Einarson's suggestion of ὑποραιώσασα were adopted, the problem would be somewhat alleviated, although it is difficult to see why ὅτι δὴ would be repeated. Nock sees a similar tendency in xviii.2(249.1-4), ὅτι δὲ καὶ αὐλητῶν τοῖς μελικοῖς ὑργάσοις τὸ τῆς μελικοῦς λιγυρὸν ἑργασιώμενον καὶ καλάμφω τὴν πλακτῆς τῆς φῶς τὴν μολὴν ἐπιτελοῦντον, 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), ὅ γὰρ τοι κατὰ φόσιν μουσικὸς
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), ei kata tηn επιστευτιν εμποδον τι (τι H supra lin. 1 om. BD; ras. in C.), την προθεματα γένηται η των δραγδων αναρμοστια, in which Nock would change ei to edv, 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 ουτω και ομεις, δε τιμιωτατοι, ξυνον πωλιν, τη μουσουργη την οικεσαν εναρμονισθε λυραν, 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." Perhaps the author had thought of raising this topic, but had changed his mind. So also in xviii, 13 (253.21), the words οδυσω, ει και τα βασιλεως, 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, ei ουτος (not D);

τὸτε ἘΧΘ Βελήσαντι τῇ τεχνιτῇ ἡσαυρὶ μᾶλιστα ἑναγωνίζονται περὶ μουσικῆν, with no visible reference. This is followed by a genitive absolute, ἀρτι μὲν καὶ σαλπιγκτῶν τῆν αὐτήν ἐπιδείξει τῆς ἐπιστήμης ποιησμένων, another genitive absolute, ἀρτι δὲ καὶ αδλητῶν τοῖς μελικοῖς ἰργανοῖς τῷ τῆς μελφίδας λιγυρόν ἐργασμένων, and what appears to be part of another genitive absolute, καὶ καλάμῳ καὶ πληκτρῷ τῆς ὁδῆς τῆς μολῆς ἐργασμένων. These are abruptly followed by what appears to be the apodosis of the condition: οὐ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ μουσικοῦ τῆς ἀναπέμπεται τῆς αἰτίαν. Missing is a noun in the genitive case modified by ἐπιτελοῦντων (unless, following Nock, we regard καὶ καλάμῳ ... ἐπιτελοῦντων as an author’s variant for τὸ ... ἐργασμένων) and a verb to govern τεχνιτῇ. Reitzenstein, on the advice of Keil, reading ἐπιτελοῦντι, supplies τῶν ἰργανῶν ὀδὸν ὅποιον τοὺς ἐντεινομένοις ἐργασμένων. I would prefer, retaining ἐπιτελοῦντων, to continue ἐπιτελοῦντων τῶν λυριστῶν, μὴ ὅποιος τὸ ἰργανὼν, or ἐπιτελοῦντων τῶν λυριστῶν, σαθρὸν ἐγένετο τὸ ἰργανὼν. 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 xvi,4(249.15-17), εἰ δὲ μᾶλιστα τῷ θείῳ τῷ δημιουργῷ ὀδὸν ὅποιον ἡ τῆς θλῆς χρειάζεται πρὸς ἐντελῆ τῆς ποικιλίας, since the following words, διήρκεσε δὲ αὐτῶς ὁ μουσικοῦ κατὰ δύναμιν κτλ., seem not to follow from these words. Reitzenstein, who believes that C. H. xvi 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 θαν σιν τας γ ν ν τας αριστεραι το μη συγκεκριμένο το λέγοντας ένιστε οδή γιανατοί, unless the author had simply intended to delete this reference.

In xviii.5(250,6,7), after θαν σιν τας γ ν ν τας αριστεραι το μη συγκεκριμένο το λέγοντας ένιστε οδή γιανατοί, 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), οδηγεί δε και η γνώσει του παντός, και με αυτήν νά συναντεί και την εις θεόν εκφυμαν, και μήν έκφυσαν, at least a main verb is missing. Reitzenstein would place a lacuna after συναντεί. I would prefer, following, Nock, to place it after εκφυμαν, 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, Poinandres, 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 συλλαβάς for ἐμποδίσως and συλλαβῶς respectively (Reitzenstein) in xviii.2(249.8,9); ἔστεβος for ἄστεβος (Reitzenstein) in xviii.3(249.11); θέμενοι for either θεμένου (Keil) or θέμενον (Einarson) in xviii.6(250.16); ἀρτί for ἀντί (Reitzenstein) in xviii.6(251.2); ἄροστος for ἄροστες (C) in xviii.10(252.11); χάριν for ἀρχήν (Reitzenstein) in xviii.12(253.19), and ἀνδρόν for ἄνδρων (Turnebus) in xviii.15(254.21). Perhaps in xviii.16(255.4,5), ἢστε καὶ τοῦνομα σύμβολον εἰρήνης, we should read σύμβολον <εἰρήνης> 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), ἄφ' ὁδ' πάσαι αἱ νῦν ἐξ τὸν τοὺς ἑξῆς φεροντι διαισίδεμοι τὴν νῦκην. Nock, accepting τοὺς from B and inserting ἀφ' before διαισίδεμοι, places the lacuna after νῦκην. I would prefer, supposing fewer errors, to place a lacuna
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 11.12 and the repetition of single words in C. H. xili.
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," he is giving a consensus which began with Tiedemann, who found for example in C. H. 1

\[1\] Festugière, 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. 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. It is to be noted that Zielinski does not intend either "peripatetisch" of "platonisierend" to be taken in the strict sense of the word; the former he uses to mean "realistisch-dualistisch," the latter "idealistisch-dualistisch." 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.

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. Klein also follows this division, but places

---

1 Tiedemann, op. cit., pp. iv-xvii, intro.
2 Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 331-372.
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.\textsuperscript{1}

Reitzenstein and J. Kroll, in reaction to whom Zielinski and Bouget 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: 

\begin{quote}
... 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.\textsuperscript{2}
\end{quote}

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,"\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{1}Klein, op. cit., pp. 84-156.

\textsuperscript{2}J. Kroll, Die Lehre des Hermes Trismegistos ("Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters: Texte un Untersuchungen, Bd. XII, Heft 2-4," Münster i. W., Aschendorffische Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1914), p. 2.

\textsuperscript{3}Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 191.

\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., 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 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 Brauninger 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

¹A. S. Ferguson, ed., in Walter Scott, op. cit., IV, ix, intro.
²Festugière, 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 Festugiére "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.

Festugiére 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.

¹Ibid., II, 28-50. ²Ibid., p. 30 f.
Again, the dialogue is always between the master and a single student, although the other may be noted as present. Festugière sees this feature as coming from the practice of the schools; 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. 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, 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, Annon. It would be a mistake in most instances to think of these are mere pseudonyms, designed to give the tractates an authority which otherwise they could not claim, 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

1Tbid., p. 36 ff.  2Tbid., p. 36.
3Tbid., p. 29 f.  4Scott, op. cit., I, 3.
in Hermetism that apotheosis is the goal for those who possess ψωξ. 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 Heinrici 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):

... ἐὰν ὁ δυνατόν τι ἄρεσθαι τῆς ψωξς κατακοι-

μίγοντας πολλάκις [δὲ] ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος εἰς τὴν καλλιστὴν

διόν ύπερ θανάτου καὶ ἀρχῆς, οἱ ἁρτεροὶ πρόγονοι, ἐντε-

tυκάνων. - Εἴθε καὶ ἡμεῖς, ὁ πᾶτερ. - Εἴθε γὰρ, ὁ τέκνον-

νῦν δὲ ἔτη ἄνωθεν πρὸς τὴν διόν καὶ οὕτως θυσίων ἀνα-

πετάει τὴν τοῦ τοῦ δραματικὸς 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 xii.20(155.15), Avgy vnoú,xiii.14(206.15), θεὸς

πέφρασος, as well as Asclepius li.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 & Ruperecht, 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.


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 former-
ly 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 in-
stance of inconsistency in the Hermetic movement, or do they reveal that
the compiler did not understand the Hermetic movement, but had put to-
gether 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 ear-
ly 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 thematique 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 ΚΛΕΣΣ, "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

⁴See for example Zielinski, *loc. cit.*, VIII, 323 f.
⁵See below, p. 149 ff.
⁸See above, p. 99 f.
regards chapters 1-4a as "peripatetic," chapters 4b-9 as "Platonizing," and 10-25 as "Konkordanztheologie," a term used by Klein to describe the contents of the whole tractate, which according to him "mit seiner Sinnenfeindlichkeit an sich dem deaistisch Typos zugehört...," but "hat eine ausgesprochen pantheistische Tendenz, die allerdings nicht konsequent durchgeführt ist." 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, τῆς οὐδὲν ὑλής ὑπὸς νεοῖς ὑπὸς, 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): ἐπάνω αὐτοῖς ἡμῶν, ὁ πατέρ, τῆς ἀγαθής καὶ καλλίστης θεᾶς, "You have filled us, O father, with the good and most beautiful Θεᾶ." (I leave this last word untranslated for

---

1Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 346-348
2Klein, op. cit., p. 123.
3Ibid., p. 119.
4Ibid., p. 117.
the time being.) By drawing from this ἰδα, x.v(115.5,6), we may perhaps arrive at the ἑτερικός which "our ancestors, Uranus and Cronos, gained," x.v(115.7,8), and toward which we are still striving, x.5(115.9-12.) Presumably ἰδα represents a kind of metaphorical seeing or at any rate an incomplete seeing, whereas ἑτερικός represents the full vision of God. While this vision disqualifies us from any bodily activity, x.6(115.14-19), it lightens the whole νοῦς and soul (here apparently identified) and draws them through the body τοῦ οὐσία, 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," ἐστίνατον γὰρ, ὁ τελευτάς, ψυχήν ἀποθεόηθην ἐν σώματι ἀνθρώπων ἔκαθορισθήν τῷ τοῦ ἄγαθον καλός, x.6 (116.2-4).

Elsewhere in this tractate, this experience is called γνώσις. While ignorance is the evil of the soul, x.8.5, since one who is ignorant "collides with the bodily passions," ἐντείνεσθε τοῖς πάθεσι τοῖς σωματικοῖς, x.8.6, the virtue of the soul is γνώσις, 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, γνώσις leads to "Olympus," i. e. apotheosis, x.15(120.9,10).

Since the question of γνώσις 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. γνώσις 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 ὦς in x.6.

The part of man which receives this γωνις is, in this tractate as frequently in the Hermetic literature, called the νοῦς. 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 νοῦς in fact, appears, as it were, wrapped in layers: the νοῦς is in the λόγος, the λόγος in the ψυχή, the ψυχή in the πνεῦμα, the πνεῦμα in the body (reading ἡ ψυχή ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ σώματι, x.13.2), see below, p. 317;

When this νοῦς receives γωνις, it separates itself from its garments (ἐνδύματι), the soul, the breath (πνεῦμα), and the body, and puts on a fiery garment which is appropriate to it, τὸν ἱδρυον ἐνδύματο χιτώνα, τῶν πυρινῶν, x.18.2. The νοῦς in this condition is identifiable with the creator of everything, and needs the fire as an instrument (supplying δραγων 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 νοῦς, but sometimes the νοῦς stands out of the soul, so that the soul resembles an unreasoning animal, x.24.2-4. In such


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 γαώς 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

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

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 νοῦς in the form of a daemon to greater punishment, x.21(123.19-24).

The other material in C. H. i 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 (ἐνέργεια) rather than a nature (φύσις), 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 κόσμος (called the ὄλιμπος θεός, the "material god"), x.10(118.6); man, the "second"animal, x.12,2, the κόσμος being the first), the human soul, which as we have seen consists of layers, x.13.3; and the ἄρχη, 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: καὶ γίνεσθαι ὃ μὲν κόσμος τοῦ θεοῦ νῦν, ὃ δὲ ἄνθρωπος τοῦ κόσμου, ἀπέρ ἄγγελος, "the κόσμος is the son of God, and man is the son of the κόσμος, 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", ὑπομοιωσις, or γυμοσις, is received by the most divine part of man, the υπομοιωσις, 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 nonism, nevertheless tractate $x$ shows unity in the one theme which is important to him. If the author/redactor was aware that dualism and nonism 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, Braüninger says that "... die Philosophie für diesen Autor wie für die meisten des Corpus Hermeticum nur ein Denkmantel 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 γυμοσις of God.

\(^1\) Braüninger, op. cit., p. 35.
The same religious experience which in C. H. x is treated under the names of ἡγίας and γνώσις is in C. H. xii discussed as the activities and effects of νοῦς. The benefits of νοῦς are given the clearest expression in xii.12(178.21-179.4):

Κάκειτο δὲ δρα, ἡ τέκνον, ἢ τί ὅριν τούτα τῇ ἀνθρώπῳ ὁ θεός παρὰ πάντα τὰ θυμία ἐξ ἐχαρίσματο, τὸν τέ νοῦν καὶ τὸν λόγον, ἱστημα τῇ ἐθανασίᾳ . . . τούτων δὲ εἴ τις χρησιμοὶ εἰς οὐ δεῖ, ὁδὸν τῶν ἐθανατῶν διοίκει μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ἐξελθόν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος δήμηθησετα ὀποὶ ἀμφότερον εἰς τὸν τῶν θεῶν καὶ μακάρων χορὸν.

(I have omitted the words τῶν δὲ προφορικῶν λόγων 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 (ἱστημα) 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 νοῦς 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 νοῦς comes from the essence of God, "if there is some essence of God," εἰ γε τις κυτιν ὁσία θεοῦ, xii.1(174.3,4). This νοῦς is not something split off from God's "essentiality," ὁσιότητι, xii.1(174.5,6), "but is, as it were, unfolded, like the sun's light," διότι ἡμάτιον καθάπερ τὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου 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 νοῦς treats good
men by making them suffer, as does a physician, \(^1\) xi1.3, but bad men it incites to further crimes, xi1.4. The \(\nu o\)\(\nu\)\(\xi\) can do what it wants, xi1.8(177.10,11), and rules over everything, including fate and law, xi1.9(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 ἄλλοιμοις, ἐκ τέκνων, οὐ μοιχεύοις πείσται, ἄλλ᾽ ὡς μοιχεύοις, οὐδὲ φονεύοις, ἄλλ᾽ ὡς φονεύοις, καὶ ποιήσαντά μεταβολής ἀδονατόν ὕπο διεκφυγῇν, ὡσπερ καὶ γενέσεως, xi1.7(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 \(\nu o\)\(\nu\)\(\xi\).\(^2\)

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, xi1.15(130.7-10). Everything moves, and the activity of life is movement, xi1.16(180.25-181.2). Therefore everything is alive, "especially man," πάντων δὲ καὶ ἀλλον ἀνθρώποις, xi1.19(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 θελεῖς αὐτὸν καὶ θεωρῆσαι, ὑπὲ τὴν τάξιν τοῦ κόσμου καὶ τὴν κόσμομαν τῆς τάξεως, xi1.21(182.11,12). This means of seeing God

---

\(^{1}\) Scott would remind us here of Plato, Gorgias 477E-481B, op. cit., II, 342.

\(^{2}\) Festugière, 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, 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, following Scott, 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. 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 σῶς for σινασίω appears in both sections of this tractate.

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

---

1 Bräuninger, op. cit., p. 27.  
2 Ibid., p. 33.  
3 Scott, 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: ἀναγκή and πρόνοια and φῶς 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 qu'il que Tat juge 'parfaitement clair'." 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, ὁ τέκνον, τὰ ἐν σώματι δούματα παθητὰ,
(2) καὶ κυρίως αὐτὰ ἐστὶ πάθη·
(3) πᾶν γὰρ τὸ κινοῦν δούματον,
(4) πᾶν δὲ τὸ κινούμενον σῶμα,
(5) καὶ τὰ δούματα δὲ κινεῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ νοοῦ·
(6) κίνησις δὲ πάθος·
(7) πάσχει οὖν δι' αὑτῆς, καὶ τὸ κινοῦν καὶ τὸ κινούμενον; τὸ μὲν ἄρχον, τὸ δὲ ἄρχομεν·
(8) ἀπαλλαγεῖς δὲ τοῦ σώματος, ἀπαλλάγη καὶ τοῦ πάθους·
(9) μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦτο, ὁ τέκνον, οὐδὲν ἀποθεῖς, πάντα δὲ παθητὰ·
(10) διαφέρει δὲ πάθος παθητοῦ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ, τὸ δὲ πάσχει·
(11) τὰ δὲ σώματα καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὰ ἐνεργεῖ·
(12) ἡ γὰρ ἀκίνητα ἐστὶν ἢ κινεῖται·
(13) ὅπωρον δὲ τὸν ὑπὸ πάθος ἐστὶ·
(14) τὰ δὲ σώματα δὲν ἐνεργεῖται, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παθητὰ ἐστὶ·

1Ibid., I, 187, n. 28.
(15) μη ον γε αι προσηγοριαι παρατητησαν.
(16) η τε γαρ ενεργεια και το παθος θαυτα δεστιν.
(17) ειρημοτερα δε τη δυναμιν χρησατααι ου λυπει.

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,

An amiable feature of C. H. xii is the frequent references to a now deified older contemporary of Hermes named Ἄγαθος Δαίμων.

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: ἐκ προτόγονοις ἔδος, τα πάντα καταδόν θείους λόγους ἔφθασιν, 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 Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμον; more probably the author used these sayings to add verisimilitude to his message.  

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. xiii, ἡθικής γὰρ ἔγενεν τοῦ Ἱργαῦ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπος, καὶ ἥθαμαιστε καὶ ἐγνώρισε τὸν ποιητὴν. 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. 1xxiii, intro., that the reference to the Ἀγαθὸς Δαίμον 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, κρατήρα μέγαν πλήρος τούτου κατάπεμψα, δοῦς κήρυκα, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν αὐτῷ κήρυξα ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων καρδίαις ταῖς βάπτισθαι σεαυτὸν ἡ δυνάμενη εἰς τούτον τὸν κρατήρα, ἡ πιστεύουσα διὰ ἀνελθῇ πρὸς τὸν κατασκήνωσα τὸν κρατήρα, ἡ γυναῖκος ἐν τῷ γέγονε, 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. 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. Festugière proposes two solutions in the same article: the first, that βάπτισθαι σεαυτὸν is used metaphorically for becoming drunk, in this case acquiring the "sober drunkenness" of γνῶσις, 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 Jué 45 and Pistis Sophia 142, in which the disciples are baptized.

---

1Scott, 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.


3Ibid., pp. 104-107.
in a crater of wine which is turned into water.\textsuperscript{1} While Festugière chooses the second of these solutions,\textsuperscript{2} the first is also thoroughly plausible.

According to Festugière, this tractate contains a common "doctrine de salut" with i, vii, and xiii.\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{4}

Now it is scarcely controversial to say that the soteriology of C. H. iv shows marked resemblances to that of C. H. i.\textsuperscript{5} Among the common themes is νοῦς, which in iv as in i is a special faculty by which one may receive γνώσις. (In C. H. i, νοῦς is also identified with God; in C. H. iv it is a gift (δώρεα) from God, iv.5(50.23), and is not hypostasized.) So also, in iv as in i, γνώσις is in a sense self-knowledge, cf. iv.4(50.13), ἐγνώσθη ἡ γνώσις τῆς ἐγνώσεως, and i.21(14.6,7),

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1}Ibid., pp. 107-112.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{2}After 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).}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{3}Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," Hermétisme et mystique païenne, p. 39, reprinted from Bull. de la Soc. roy. de Lund, 1948, pp. 1-58.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{4}Ibid., p. 50.}
\footnote{\textsuperscript{5}Ibid., pp. 58-64.
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, and its tendency to relate man directly to God without the intervention of the demiurge. This may be supported by such statements as ἐὰν μὴ πρῶτον τὸ σῶμα σου μισήσῃς, ἐὰν τέκνον, σκεύασάν χαῖρες οὐ δύναις, "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 οὐπόκρης ὅπολεμον ὧς τοῦ παρόντος καὶ δει πάντα ποιήσαντος καὶ ἐνὸς μόνου, καὶ ὃ νοῦν θέλησε δημιουργήσαντος τὸ ἄντα, "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

1 Ibid., p. 53.  
2 Ibid., pp. 55-57.
as an adornment (κόσμος) for it, iv.2(49,10,11), and who apportioned λόγος 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: ἐνι ὡς μὲν ἔριδος δυνάμιν, ἣς ἔκειν δὲ ἄριστοι τῶν μανῶν, 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 Heracles and Tat, may become deified through γνώσις.

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 entpersonlich 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 literature by proving that God is revealed through the κόσμος θεόνος γιὰ κύριος φανεται διὰ πάντας τοῦ κόσμου, v.2(61.4,5); in fact, seeing the κόσμος is seeing God: ζὲ δὲ θέλεις αὐτὸν ἰδεῖν, νόησον τὸν ήλιον, νόησον τὸν σέληνης ὁρμον, κτλ., v.3(61.8 ff.). If one sees all of these wonders, one is led to their originator: ἐστὶ γὰρ τίς, οὐ Μέτ, οὐ τούτων πάντων ποιητής 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, οὐτω καὶ τούτων δεῖ (Scott: δεῖ mu.); μὴ εἶναι, ζῇ μὴ πάντα δεῖ μοιοῦντα, v.9(63.21,22), since it is his essence to bring to birth and make everything, τούτου ἐστὶν ὁ πάσα τοῦ κόσμον 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 unconfused with the difference between this kind of "seeing God" and the kind of seeing which is given as a special gift through the νοῦς.² Could the same be the case with the author of

---

¹ Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 58.
² See above, p. 115 ff.
tractate v? In fact, the author does sometimes use the language of that
other kind of seeing. Thus v.1(60.4), ἦτε μὴ ἐμπετακές ἡς τοῦ ἀπεσταλμένος
θεοῦ δύναμας, suggests, as Scott points out, a γνώσις 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 νοητοῖ). 2 This knowledge appears as a beam of light,
v.2(61.1), which is only seen by the eyes of the νοῆς, 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 in-
consistent in other respects. Thus Dodd sees inconsistence in its
simultaneous use of the language of creation and of pantheism, 4
Festugière in its simultaneous use of terms of transcendence and imma-
nence. 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 Brauning, op. cit., p. 24, the use of the term
νοητό rather than γνῶσις indicates a different, "Greek" rather than
"oriental," way of knowing God; however, this alleged difference is ob-
scured 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: πάν γὰρ τὸ φαντασμένον γεννητὸν ἢφανὴ γὰρ, "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 ἄφανς, δὲι ἐστὶ, v.1(60.7,8). But the invisible makes all the other things visible, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα φανέρα ποιεῖ, ἀφίτος ἄφαντος ἐν, v.1(60.9); in fact, becoming is the same thing as φαντασμα (presumably: making appear); οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐστιν ἡ φαντασμα ἡ γένεσις (ἡ φαντασμα ἡ γένεσις Scott), v.1(60.12,13). Therefore the invisible, although without origination (ἀγέννητος) and not given to appearance (ἀγαντουσμός) and invisible (ἄφαντος), nevertheless makes all things appear, and itself appears through all things, τὰ δὲ πάντα φαντασμάτων διὰ πάντων φανερά, v.2(13-15); this last point is subverted in typically Hermetic style by the addition of καὶ μᾶλλον ὅς ὁ νοῦς θυμός ἔστω φανερῶς, 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 
νοσις 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. It affirms that good exists in God alone, and in fact is to be identified with God: τὸ ἀγαθὸν, τὸ ἀσκολημένῳ, ἐν οἴνῳ ἔστιν, εἰ μὴ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ 
θεῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἀδιάτος ἔστιν ὁ θεὸς ἄει, vi.1(72.3-5). In contrast, the κόσμος contains only evil: δὲ κόσμος ἡλέναι ἐστιν τῆς 
κόσμου, 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,

ἀλλὰ ἐν τῷ μέρει τοῦ ποιεῖν ἀγαθός εἶναι, (73.14); Zielinski dismisses this as a pantheistic insertion. But this aberration is followed by the observation that the world is not good in any other respect: ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις πάσιν οἷς ἀγαθοῖς· καὶ γὰρ πάθητος ἔστιν, καὶ κινητὸς, καὶ

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

2Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 333.
The qualification that the κόσμος is good insofar as it creates, as Scott notes, indicates a slight instability in the position of the author. God is called good not only because he has no needs: οὐτὲ γὰρ ἐνὲκές ἐστὶν τίνος, οὐκ ἔπειθημένος ἀφθονον κτισματικάς γένης, κτλ., vi.1(72.11,12), and therefore no πάθη, in this case either “passions” or “sufferings,” which are identified with becoming, παθῶν γὰρ πάθη τὰ γεννήτα, αὐτῆς τῆς γενέσεως παθητῆς ὀξύς, vi.2(73.6,7), but also because he is the provider (τὸ χορηγοῦν), vi.1(72.8). But πάθος and the Good are mutually exclusive: ὅπου δὲ πάθος, οὐδὲν ἄλλον ὀφθαλμόν ὅπου δὲ τὸ ἁγιόν, οὐδὲν ὀφθαλμόν ὀφθαλμός ἐν πάθος, 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 πάθος, nevertheless the Good, that is, God, is the essence of all movement and becoming, εἰ δὲ ἄλλοι, ἀπὸ σαυτοῦ ἐρχόμενοι κινήσεως καὶ γενέσεως (γενέσεως ΜΒΟ γενέσεως ΑΒ, vi.1(72.5,6), everything which provides is good, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ χορηγοῦν ἄλλον, 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. There is no trace of the myth of the alien

---

1 Scott, op. cit., II, 173 f.

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

3 Scott, 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: καὶ ἐκ χριστίν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ, τῷ εἰς νοῦν μοι βαλόντι κἀν

περὶ τῆς γνῶσεως τοῦ ἄγαθου, vi.4(74.15,16). Piety combined with γνῶσις is the only road which leads to God: μὲν γὰρ ἔστιν εἰς αὐτὸ

ἀποφέρουσα δόξα, ὡς καὶ γνῶσις εὐσεβεία, 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 πλῆκτρα of evil, vi.4(74.17,18), is directly contradicted by ix.4(98.6,7), χαριστὸν γὰρ

αὐτὴς (τ. ε. τῆς κακιᾶς) ἢ γὰρ, οὐκ ὁ κόσμος, ἀλλ’ ἐκ νόμου ποτὲ ἐρωτῶν

βλασφημοῦντες. In vi.4(74.15-17), καὶ ἐκ χριστίν ἔχω τῷ θεῷ, τῷ εἰς νοῦν

μοι βαλόντι κἀν περὶ τῆς γνῶσεως τοῦ ἄγαθου, ὥστε δόξαντον ἔστιν αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ

κόσμῳ εἴναι. "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. vi 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 2:126. 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": ἐν τῷ παντὶ, ψυχῇ λειτουργεῖ, τρόπῳ ἐκ τοῦ ὑπομνήματος καὶ σώματος, ἐν πάση, νῦν λειτουργεῖ, τρόπῳ μὲν ποσῳ ἐν οἴκεται ἡ ψυχή, ἐνεργειά ἐκ τοῦ παντὶ εὐπλήθες σώματος καὶ διαλύσεως, viii.1(87,4-6).

The words τρόπῳ μὲν ποσῳ 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 "dénio 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 Zieliński, 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 ὅρισμα ὀλνοτός ἢ ψυχῆ, "in what way (or "how") the soul is immortal," ἐνεργεία δὲ ποιήση ὕστερον ὑπόστασις σώματος καὶ διάλεξις, "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 δὲ δὲν ἄρρ σῶμα ὀλνοτος, "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" (ὑπον ὀλνοτον), 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," μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ ἱθριοτός, τὸ λογικὸν ἰδεῖν, 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
The author first gives his reasons for believing that the κόσμος is immortal. According to the author, the κόσμος has come into existence from God, διὸ ἡ κόσμος ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου ἀρχή ἐαυτοῦ, 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 (δεινὸς), but that only God is eternal (διός), 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 ἐκ αὐτῶν περιβαλλων τὸ πάν σώμα, Υπὲρ τῆς θλή . . . διαλυθῆς τῆς τε ξηρανθυταίσαν, viii.3(88.9-12). Heavenly bodies always keep their order, which is renewed whenever they return to their proper places, 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 τὴν ἀρχήν ἔχειν, δὲ άνθρωπος, "but the third animal, man, . . . .", viii.5(89.3). Unfortunately, as we have seen, this subject lacks a predicate. I have already tentatively

---

1 ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκ τοῦ δικαιοσύνης: 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 (εὐφρυ ται) 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 μὴ ἐν τούτῳ ὄντραχων, ὁν δὲ καὶ τούτω εἶναι τούτων (τοῦτος Ἰστός). 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 (γνῶσις) 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 διάκος, ix.5(98.13-15); in this last case, γνῶσις is similar
in function in this tractate to γνώσις in C. H. x, xii, iv, and vi.
The κόσμος, like man, has both perception and understanding, identifi-
fable in this case with making everything and dissolving (?) every-
thing back into itself: τὰ πάντα ποιεῖν καὶ εἰς θαυμήν (Scott θαυμᾶν)
διανοοῦσιν, 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 espe-
cially 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 Zoroastri-
an 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 γνώσις, ix.4(98.1-4). This theme may
well be, as Festugière says, "banal depuis Platon;"² but among the ex-
tant 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:

¹ Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 102, n. 66.
Bousset, in "J. Kroll, Die Lehren des Hermes Trismegistos," p. 723 f.,
raises the possibility of Jewish influence.

² Ibid., 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 ζέλαζος 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 γνώσις enjoyed by a few but denied to the many is proven by the reference to those who have γνώσις (οὐ γνώσει οὐγείς) in ix.4(98.1) as well as the distinction between those who are διδακτικοὶ and those who are ὀσιφόθεν. While the author does not refer to the doctrine of apotheosis, it is not inconsistent with his system.

²Scott places this tractate between 280 and 300 A. D. He believes that there was sufficient reason even then for the Hermetic writers to fear Christian persecution.
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, 'Ερμου Τρισμέγιστου Ἀσκληπίου εἰς φρόνεῖν, could have formed the greetings, especially if with Matritensis gr. 84 we read 'Ερμῆς Τρισμέγιστος.¹ The occasion of the supposed letter is given in the introduction, chapter one: since the immature Tat (ὁς οὐδὲς καὶ νεανίς) 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

¹ On the form of the introduction see Scott, op. cit., II, 420.
² Reitzenstein, 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 partici-
pant 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: ... χρὴ νοεῖν δύο τιμᾶτα, τὸ γενόμενον
καὶ τὸν ποιοῦντα· μέσον γὰρ τῶν ὁδῶν ὁδὸς τριῶν τι. xiv.4(223.16,
17); δύο γὰρ ἐστί τὰ πάντα, τὸ γενόμενον καὶ τὸ ποιοῦν, xiv.5(223.21,22).
However, these two are said to be inseparable: καὶ διαστῆναι τὸ Κτερον

¹ Reading ὅφρως twice (with Nock) for ὅφρος, see above, p. 86.
to ἕτερον δύνατον ὡδὲ γὰρ τὸν ποιοῦσα χαρίς τοῦ γινομένου δυνατόν 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 γνώσεις: ὅ τις πολλῆς ἀνοίγει καὶ γνωσθῇ τῆς περὶ τὸν θεόν, xiv.8(225,7,8).

The suggestion that there is γνώσεις raises also the possibility of its opposite, γνώσεις. 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" (μυστικῶς ἐπισκέπτομαι) 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. 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 ἡ σιῶν νοησι καὶ νοησαντα θαυμάζοι καὶ θαυμάζαντα λαυτον μακαρίσας, 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.

---

1 Scott, op. cit., II, 422. The word γνώσεις 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 Noûς and Hermes, not between Hermes and a disciple, as normally in the "logos" hermétique d'enseignement." This Noûς can be compared with Poimandres, ὁ τῆς αἰθερίας Νοûς, who speaks in C. H. i, although it should perhaps be emphasized that this comparison is made neither directly nor by implication in C. H. xi. That a god named Noûς 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, νοûς 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, νοûς and ἀρχή are identified as the activity (ἐνέργεια) of God. This is almost the status of Noûς in i.6(8,16,17), where Noûς is the God who underlies everythings; cf. x.18.8,9, where νοûς is called the δημιουργός of everything. Thus when Festugière says that "le Noûs dieu qui parle ici est, en un sens, notre nous," it must be remembered that this is the case only in a very special sense, since this νοûς is also the νοûς of God.

---

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

2 Festugière, 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 τιμήτω annoncement 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 αἰῶν, the αἰῶν 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. 1, that is, "de tenir le Dieu suprême aussi étranger que possible à la production d'un monde qui est regardé comme mauvais."

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.


³ Klein, op. cit., p. 142.
described in chapters 2-4, although the αἰών 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 αἰών is the image of God, the κόσμος is the image of
the αἰών, 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 in-
compatible 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 γνώσις of this tractate may be contrasted
with the γνώσις which we have met elsewhere. G. van Moorsel calls the
γνώσις 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 γνώσις is a gift, in this tractate man must
seize γνώσις aggressively, by making himself equal to God: ἐὰν μὴ οὖν
σκαύτον ἐξίσους τῷ θεῷ, τὸν θεὸν νοθεύει οὖ στὸν αὐτοῦ, 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 Keminken Zoon-Domplein 2, 1955), p. 27.

²Festugière, La révélation d’Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 141.
διό, Ἐρμής, μὴ ἐσπερᾶ τῶν κατω, μὴ ἑξε τῶν ἀνω ὅμοιον τι ἡγηθη 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, yet that tractate is considered by most scholars to be dualistic.

Knowing God in this tractate is virtually the same as becoming God. Hermes is exhorted to make himself equal with God (ἐὰν μὴ σεσυμφωνὸς τῷ θεῷ), xi. 20 (155.11, 12), to become Αἴῶν, xi. 20 (155.15) and to consider himself immortal (σεσυμφωνὸς θεοῦ) 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 γνώσις, the speculation about the chains of being, and the appearance of Νοῦς as the major speaker. No doubt these differences are 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 Αἴῶν in this tractate see Reitzenstein, Polimandres, p. 275, and Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 152-162.
Conclusions

With the possible exception of C. H. vi, 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. On the other hand, C. H. v, which is generally pantheistic, speaks of God with the language of transcendence. 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 anticomic dualism of Gnosti-
cism," "Zoroastrian dualism," and "metaphysical dualism." Zielinski
had already divided this last into a "Platonizing" dualism and a
"peripatetic" dualism. We may perhaps also speak of a dualism between
creator and creation, and dualism between reality and appearance, al-
though 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 "Gnos-
ticism" as a description of the Hermetic writings, since they lack the
"anti-cosmic fanaticism of Gnostic thought." An exception may perhaps
be made in the case of C. H. vi, which, however, does not contain cer-
tain 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.

---

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:

2 See above, p. 99.

3 Van Moorsel, op. cit., p. 20 f.

4 See 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 chapter\(^1\) 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 imperfect 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 Hund 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. i in a group with C. H. iii, vii, and xiii. These last three each resemble C. H. i 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. 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. iii 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. C. H. i, undoubtedly the most interesting of the documents in the Corpus Hermeticum, has many peculiar

---

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

2 The 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 unwise 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.

Although all external evidence supports the view that the narrator of C. H. i ought to be identified with Hermes, 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.”

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 libri). It is thought by Zielinski, loc. cit., VIII, 323, and by Festugière, “L’Hermétisme,” p. 34, that the ϕοι 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.19(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, 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 ... ." This form appears nowhere else in the Corpus Hermeticum.

Furthermore, in contrast with the emphasis on secrecy in some of the Hermetic writings, the narrator of C. H. 1 considers himself under an obligation to proclaim his vision to humanity: καὶ ἢγγειλαὶ κηρύσσειν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τὸ τῆς ἐστειλας καὶ γνώσεως καλῶς, C. H. i.27 (16.19,20), cf. i.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." More seriously, this evangelistic emphasis contrasts very strongly with the intensely private attitude of most of the other documents. In most

---

1 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 36.
3 E. 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.
4 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 9. See also Scott, op. cit., II, 9.
5 Festugière, 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.

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 Noùς and "nature" (φύσις). While this dichotomy suggests the dualism of Manichaeanism, with which Klein compares it, 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. 1 is a regrettable fact whose origin is not explained, which came into existence later than Noùς and which somehow must be dealt with, 1.4(7.17-8.5). The demiurge is in no sense the principle of darkness which we meet in Manichaeanism, but is begotten himself by Noùς specifically to deal with this problem: α δι Νοùς δ σκοτος, ἀρπαγήσας ὄν, ἵπποι καὶ φύσις ὀπερχαίν, ἀπεικόσμε ὁμοῦ ζερον Νοùς δημιουργον 1.9(9.17,18). Similarly, the planets are created by the

---

1 While 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).

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

3 So Festugière, "L'Hermétisme," p. 52. Haenchen, 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: ἐδομιοφόρησε διοικητὰς τινὰς ἐπὶ δὲν κόκλοις περιέχοντας τὸν ἀισθητὸν κόσμον, καὶ ἡ διοικησις αὐτῶν εἰμαρμένη καλεῖται, 1,9(9,19-21). It is through his own imprudence that man allows himself to become subject to matter and to the orderings of the planets; 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: διά τῆς ἀρχής παρέκκυψεν, ἀναφέρεται τὸ κράτος (κύρος 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 valuation 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 Gnosticism." 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

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, as did Ménard when he called the author a precursor of Gnosticism. 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. 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, or of Haenchen's argument that the Poimandres draws on a developed Gnosticism. 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 Ανθρωπος. 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

1 Tiedemann, op. cit., p. 81, intro.
2 Ménard, op. cit., p. 11x, intro.
3 Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 114.
4 These are discussed, ibid., pp. 68-114, as well as by Jonas, op. cit., pp. 147-173.
5 Haenchen, loc. cité, p. 191; see also Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, 88 f.
Poimandres in this respect, has a very different cosmogony. It remains to be said that, while the possibility of a cosmogony like that of C. H. i 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.

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 ἐν γῆς λέγει διπλῶς ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, θνητός μὲν διὰ τὸ σῶμα, δοξάτος δὲ διὰ τὸν ὁσιώδη 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. i, 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, but with life and light, cf. 1.21(14.6,7): ἐὰν οὖν μὴν ἡμῖν ἐστὶν (οὐτὸν Reitzenstein) ἐκ ψυχῆς καὶ φωτὸς ἔντοι καὶ ὦτι ἐκ τῶν τυχάντων, εἰς ζωὴν παλιν

---

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, 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: οὕτω ἐστὶ τὸ ὄνομα τῶν τελών τοῖς γνῶσιν ἔσχατων, θεωδήνως, 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, ii, 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." 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. iii) is its literary dependence on the Septuagint. Since this problem has been treated at great length by C. H. Dodd, 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, these are neither

---

2 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, III, ix, intro.; see above, p. 104, n. 1.
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, in Iran, in Judaism, in Platonism, in Gnosticism, or even in Arcadia as mediated through Cyrene, 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 judischen zusammenbringen lässt, sondern nur, ob die Übereinstimmungen mit der judischen oder die mit der persischen stärker sind, und in sich die Grundgedanken und die leitenden Anschauungen der Poimandres reiner finden."

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

---


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.

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. 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" 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. 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 Poinandres 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 Poinandres 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 Poinandres, it has been associated with C. H. i because it is similar in form and content to the proclamation in 1.27-28, which was given as a result of a direct commandment by Poinandres 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.

The proclamation of C. H. 1.27,28, 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 (γῆνευόμενοι) 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

---


2 See 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, 1.28(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 (ἀγγελόν) word of ignorance (ἀγνώστα), vii.1(81.3,4). As a remedy they are to become sober and look up with the eyes of their hearts: ἀναθέλοντες τοῖς ὅφθαλμοῖς τῆς καρδίας, 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 γνώσις: ἵππεσατε χείραχεν τὸν δάπηρον ἤμας ἐπὶ τὰς τῆς γνώσεως θύρας, vii.2(81.12–14). But first it is necessary to break through the body (called ὦν φορεῖς χιτώνα), vii.2(81.18), which is denounced at great length, vii.2(81.18–3(82.9).

C. H. vii and C. H. 1.27–28 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 1.27–28, 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 Festugiére 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 γῆς ἡμῖν), 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

¹Festugiére, in Nock-Festugiére, 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."

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

³See above, p. 99.
Genesis 1. Both Scott and Nock point out that there is a very strong literary connection between C. H. iii and Genesis 1, LXX. The formula which appears in C. H. 1.18(13,7,8), αὔξησε ναι θεοῦς καὶ πληθὺς ἐν πλήθει, is alluded to in iii.3(45,10,11), εἰς το αὔξησεν ἐν αὔξησε καὶ πληθὺς ἐν πλήθει. If Dodd is correct in seeing these words as derived from Genesis 1.22,28, LXX, αὔξησεν καὶ πληθὺς καὶ πληθὺς καὶ πληθὺς, then we must suppose a literary connection between 1 and iii or a common source drawing on Genesis, since the quotation is altered in the same (rather inelegant) way in both instances.

While attempts to get at the sense of this tractate are frustrated in part by the clearly corrupt text, 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 παντοῦν δ θεός καὶ θεόν καὶ φύσις θεῖα, iii.1(44,2)? Surely only one of these can be said to be the "glory" (δόξα) of everything. So also the following two sentences: δρχῆ τῶν ἄντων δ θεός, καὶ νους καὶ φύσις καὶ θλή, σφετερίζει εἰς δεξιῶν ἄντων ἄνω δρχῆ το θεόν καὶ φύσις καὶ ἐνέργεια καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ τέλος καὶ ἀναντίωσις, iii.1(44,2-5) seem to make little sense. If God is the δρχῆ and all of these other things are also the δρχῆ, is not δρχῆ in that case simply an empty word? Nock accuses the author of being overly fond

---

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

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

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

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

5 Above, pp. 43-46.
of big, sonorous words; 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 γνώσις 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 γνώσις 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." This is to some extent an over-statement, based in part on his conjectural reading of δρκετ δε αοτοίς for δρκεται αοτῶν in iii.4 (45.18). However, the words και δι' αλληθήναι εἰς το θεόν, iii.4 (46.1, 2), as Scott also points out, seem to exclude any possibility of survival after death.

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-Pestugièrè, op. cit., p. 43.
2 Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 218.
3 Ibid., p. 213.
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." 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. 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.
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 Festugiére 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).  

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, più garantita, anzi divina." 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 Festugiére, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, IV, 210.

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

The purpose of this mystery is, of course, apothosis. An
Festugière points out, in this tractate, unlike in most of the Hermetic
tractates, apothosis is depicted as taking place. 3 This process had
already happened to Hermes θρων (Reit., see above, p. 80 f.)
λοι θεων ους γενημεθην εξ ηλωες θεως, και θματον εξε-
κληθη εις θανατον σωμα, και ει η μν ους ου θηντο, διλλ' γενημεθην
λοι νω, xiii.3(201.14-16). To the unfortunate Tat, as he understands this
process, it seems like madness: εις μναιαν με ου θησιν και θησι-
νην φρανθενεν ενεκεισις, και τρετον θματον γαρ ην ου οικ θρων, 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 "veneances of matter:" καθαρι ομαιον και των δαγγον της θλης
τειμησθαι, xiii.7(203.6,7). When we have done this by the aid of the

1Ibid., p. 57.

2Ibid., pp. 43-55.

3Festugière, "L'Hermétique," p. 351 see also Reitzenstein,
Pœländren, p. 217 ff. Festugière ascribes this feature to the Pœländren
as well, see above, p. 151. Reitzenstein's description of the process as
"Prophètes-lehée," Pœländren, p. 220, while meeting the approval of
Festugière, la révélation d'Hermès Trismègiste, III, 114, seems to me
to be not altogether satisfactory, since in this tractate, as else-
where, 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, ἐξωθήμεν for ἐξωρηθήμεν, see above, p. 79. Following these words, Tat has an experience in which he sees himself as present throughout the κόσμος: ἐν οὐρανῷ εἶμι, ἐν γῆ, ἐν κόσμῳ, ἐν ἄει κλ. xiii.11(205.5 ff.) as Festugière points out, this experience is similar to that demanded by Νοῦς in C. H. xi.20. As a result of this experience, Tat is assured by Hermes that he has become a god: ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι θεὸς πέφυμι καὶ τού ἑνός παῖς, θ' καὶ πτερωμα. 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): σοι, γενειοῦργος, ὅτα θεῷ, πέμπτω λογιμὸς θυσίας. 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, Polymandros, 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 θέα instead of θεία 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 θέα to θεία because of the present context. However, the latter hypothesis is unnecessary, given the development of C. H. xiii. Whether we read θεία or θεία, 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 Ποιμανδρῆς, δ τῆς αὐθεντικῆς νοῦς . . . .

Polimandres is also referred to in xiii.15(206.18,19): Καθὼς [Ὁγδὸν]:

δ Ποιμανδρῆς ἐθέσισε, τέκνον, καλῶς σπεδίσεις λύssé το 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 Polimandres in xiii.19 (208.17,18): Ἀγὼν γὰρ τὸν σὸν ποιμαντεῖ δ Νοῦς.

The words δέξαι λογικὴς θυσίας, 1.31(19.1) are echoed in C. H. xiii in the hymn, with three variations: [δι', ἐμοῦ] δέξαι τὸ πᾶν

[λόγῳ] λογικὴν θυσίαν, xiii.18(208.13), πέμπῃ λογικής θυσίας, xiii.21 (209.7), and δέξαι θυσίας ὡς θέλεις ἐν' ἐμοῦ, xiii.21(209.8).\(^3\) So also in xiii.20(208.19), the words δ σὸς θερμοῦσι seem to be taken from 1.32 (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,\(^3\).

\(^1\)Klein, op. cit., p. 116.

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

\(^3\)Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 216.
but without necessarily believing in his reconstruction of an original prophet who left the Egyptian religion to establish a Poimandres community.\footnote{Ibid., p. 159; see his summary on p. 248.} 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 Φυσικος 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.\footnote{Festugière in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, 114, n. 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 ὑγιόδοδος, finds in this a reference to C. H. i as a whole, taking ὑγιόδοδος as the object of ἔλεοςις.\footnote{Ibid., II, 216, n. 66.} 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.
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:

\[\text{οὐκ ἢ θάνατος ἀνθρώπου τὴν ἁλατόεις ὡς μὴ λέγως πέμμα τοῦ πατρικοῦ γένους. μὴ φοβάσαι μοι, πατέρ, γνώσις ὡς ἐμεῖν, xiii.3(201.10-12).}\]

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.

xi.11, as also in xiii.13(206.3), uses the language of pantheism. Bousset would dismiss this pantheism as "nur ein äusserer Firmus," 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): Ἀληθὴ εὐστίν ἡ παλιγγενεσία, ὃ τέκνον, τῇ μηκῇ φαντασμοῖς εἰς τῷ σώμα τῷ τριτὶ διαστάτῳ . . . 2 We may cite in addition xiii.3(202.1,2), ὅπερ ἔφθασεις τούτοις θεώρομαι νῦν, ὃ 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 (β: διὰ τοῦτο mss.) ἐρωτησάμην τοῦ σώματος αἰσθητικῆς πάθειν ὑπ' ἀναγκαζομαι τοῦ ἐνδεικτον ἄνθρωπον, xiii.7(203.15-17) with ὡμεῖν μελα τόν τῆς κτισμάτων κύριον, καὶ τὸ πᾶν καὶ τὸ ἔν, xiii.17(207.17,18).

We may, however, be unduly systematizing the author; it may be that he

---


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 (Kóρη κόσμου). 5-7, had left Tat and Asclepius as his διδάσκαλοι.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

¹ Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p. 191 f.

² It is intriguing that one family of manuscripts, Laurentianus 71.33 (A) and its associates, lacks tractates xvi-xviii; Nock thinks that a scribe was under the impression that these works belonged to a different collection. Nock-Festugière, op. cit., I, vii, 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 Stobaean fragments, he establishes his pseudonym not only by disposing of the objection that this tractate contradicts some of the others: 

φανεροὶ γὰρ σοι καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς ἐνιστε' (Reitzenstein MSS. ἐνιστε') λόγοις ἀντίφασος, 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 ἐξετασθεὶς ὑπερφασάτος φράσεις καὶ ἐκλεισμένη καὶ ἀπερ ἀκαλλαπισμένη ἔξησθη τὸ σημαντικὸ καὶ στιβαρόν, καὶ τὴν ἐνεργητικὴν τῶν ὄντων φράσειν, xvi.2(232.11-14), and Greek philosophy is just a noise of words: καὶ αὕτη ἐστίν Ἑλλήνων φιλοσοφία, λόγων ψφος, 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, "Ὅποι, definitions, does not suit the contents. Nor does the list of contents following immediately upon the title give any idea at all of the actual contents of

---

6 not impossible, however, that they were added to the Corpus Hermeticum at a later date, so that they were not in A's exemplar.

7 Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 228.
the tractate. There is in fact only one topic, and that is the fifth
given, περὶ Ἅλσου. In this tractate, the sun is called the demiurge,
xvi.5(233.18) as well as the charioteer who secures the chariot of the
κόσμος, 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 in-
fluence 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). Neverthe-
less the sun, depending on the intelligible world, which itself depends
on God, conveys the influence (ἐνιστροφή) 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, chap-
ter 3. No doubt this chapter could be seen as the first item promised
in the table of contents, περὶ θεοῦ. 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, πρό τοῦ ἀνέμου. 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, "Ορος Ὀσκληνοῦ πρὸς Ἀμμονα Ἐσσιλα. 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, but not necessarily to the redactor of the Corpus Hermeticum.

This tractate lacks reference to either γνώσις or apotheosis.

1 Ibid.
Salvation, for the author, is acquired when a ray of the sun shines into the "logical" (λόγικός) 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 γυνώσις.

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. 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 (ἐπιμαχαίρη) xvi.16(237.9,10). This would seem to indicate that the author knew the Poinandres 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.

---

1 Reitzenstein sees many Hermetic features in C. H. xvi, notably the slogan ἐν τῷ τῶι, the doctrine of εἰμαχαίρη, 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," Poinandres, p. 197.

2 Scott, op. cit., II, 454 f.
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, it may be asked whether the closing lines: "Ὦρα ἐστιν, ὁ προφήτης, περί τὴν τῶν ξενών ἔπιμελεῖαν γενοῦσαι τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ περί τῶν ἔξω θεολογοῦμεν." 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.

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.

An outline of this oration is given by Festugière in Nock-
Festugière, op. cit., p. 246. As it stands, the oration is incomplete. 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), ὁ δὲ γὰρ ἅπαξ ἐπερέχεται πέρωμα τῆς βασιλείας τῆς βαρβαρίκης, 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, π., 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.

That being the case, it is surprising that Reitzenstein is willing to identify the king in question with Diocletian. 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. Unhappily, the reference to an actual king was lost in a lacuna between chapter ten and eleven. (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. 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 even intended for delivery.
2 Reitzenstein, Polimandres, p. 207.
3 Ibid.
4 Ibid., p. 358, 11, n.
5 Ibid., p. 207.
deity, the glorification of the sun, and the mention of θυσίας are all Hermetic.

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, is at least compatible with Hermetism. As in the typical Hermetic tractates, God is frequently called πάτηρ; in one case he is even called νοῦς ὁ πάτηρ, xviii.14(254.13), an expression which reminds us of C. H. 11.12(10.15), δε διὰ τοῦ πατήρ τοῦ νοοῦ, cf. 1.6(8.19). The repeated references to God as τὸ κράτος, 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 göttgewollten, erlosenden Kraft des Hymnus, des Lobpreises Gottes."

2Festugière, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 244, refers to "la piété amphibouique, d'ailleurs parfaitement banale, de certains morceaux du discours."

3So Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., II, 244, n. 3.
in the Corpus Hermeticum, 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 τὰ ἁμαρτανον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑπερουργία φυτών, 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 Hermétic is the reference to ἡ γυναῖκα τοῦ παιδός, 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 (δύο πίθηκος), 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 ἅρματον καὶ εἰς καὶ μόνος θεός σωρός ἃ πατημή, xiv.3(222.19), and receives in C. H. V such epithets as ὁ θεός δυνάμεως ἱερότον, 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'impérie de un rédacteur qui se sera laissé abuser par la piété amphiqouique, 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 κριστογυνοῦ 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.

\(^1\) In Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. 244.

\(^2\) Reitzenstein, Polimandres, 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

1 See above, pp. 20-26. 2 See above, pp. 73, 96. 3 See above, p. 96 f. 4 See above, pp. 102-105
pattern. This judgement is made not so much on the grounds that these documents contradict the others— as has already been noted, the Herm-
etists by no means were afraid of contradictions— 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 doc-
ments, 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.

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 doc-
ments 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." 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 Poinandres, iii, vii, and xiii, are scattered throughout the Corpus. The Poinandres is apparently given prominence by being placed at the beginning of the

\[1 Above, p. 148 ff.\]
\[2 Above, p. 100 f.\]
\[3 Above, p. 161 ff. and p. 178 ff.\]
\[4 Reitzenstein, Poinandres, p. 191. See the discussion above, p. 8 f.\]
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 Festugrière 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 Festugrière, 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

¹Festugrière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 5.
²Above, 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 Stobaean fragments.
PART II

THE HERMETIC FRAGMENTS IN STUPAKIUS
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

Concerning the inadequacies of the earlier editions enough has been said by Nachsmuth and Hense in their introductions to their volumes I and III respectively; I myself have attempted in vain to use the editions of Heineke 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 Nachsmuth and Hense; those earlier editions follow the so-called "vulgate" order, inverted by Gesner, an earlier editor,\(^1\) while Nachsmuth 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 Stobol in Macedon; 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 Nead wants us to believe, that Stobaeus "studiously avoided" Christian writings,\(^5\) or, as is also possible, that

---

\(^1\) For the origins of the corrupt so-called "vulgate" order, see C. Hense, *Die Reihenfolge der Eklogen in der Vulgata des stobäischen Florilegium*, Rheinisches Museum, N. F., XXXIX (1884) 359-407, 521-557.

\(^2\) Hense s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," RE IX, 2549.

\(^3\) Ibid. This letter is quoted in Nachsmuth's edition, vol. I, p. 3.

\(^4\) Hense, s. v. "Ioannes Stobaios," p. 2549.

already in Stobaeus' time we have that distinction made in Byzantium during the Middle Ages between 'inner' and 'outer' learning, a distinction which enabled Byantines 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. 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 Gnomologia 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

---


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 "Ecloran", 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; in-
deed, 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 "Ecloran", 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 Farnesianus 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.
fourteenth century (F) and the Parisinus gr. 2129, of the fifteenth century (F). 1 Thus for the first two books we have really three separate manuscript traditions: the tradition of the excerptor (FP), that of the Gnomoloria 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 Karcius 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 Mendozae (alias Escorialensis LXXX or Scorialensis), 3 whose importance

1 Ibid., p. xxv f. From these two, according to Nachsmuth, all others are drawn.


3 Hense, "Prolegomena", p. xxxix ff., and xxxvi ff. I omit reference to Parisinus gr. 1985 (B) since Hense makes little use of it, although Festugière, Hense's Trésor Criste Vol. III, p. v intro. indicates that it should not be ignored. According to Hense, the excerpts of Sacarius 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. Finally, we have other anthologies derived from Stobaeus, of which the most important for our purposes are the Bruxellensis (Br) and the Cod. Laurentianus mentioned above. As previously pointed out, it seems to have corrected Stobaeus against other manuscripts of some of the authors quoted; this appears also to have been the case with Br.

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 excerptor. 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 judgments 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. 199 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 quis servavit solus? exquire, quo modo illos tractaverit, quos etiam aliumde cognitos habeas." Therefore the text of the second part of Stobaeus, the so-called Florilegium, mainly looks 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.32.47.

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 Ær where deliberate harmonizing of the text.

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


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, 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 τόπου*) 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 φόσσεως ἀνθρωποῦ*), 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. If one examines this list, other groupings also become apparent. In i.4, peri άνάγκης <θελας> κτλ., are two fragments, St. H. 8 (Hermes to Tat) and St. H. 13 (Hermes to Ammon). In i.5, peri ελπαρμένης κτλ., are three excerpts, St. H. 29, a poem, and St. H. 14 and 12, both to Ammon. In i.41, peri φόσεως κτλ., seven Hermetic fragments occur: St. H. 28, 11, 4, 5 (all to Tat; 28 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, Ότι θεδς δημιουργας των θντων 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. 11 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, Ότι θεδς

1Nock-Festugière, op. cit., III, ix-xi.

2These numbers refer to the order of the excerpts given in the Nock-Festugière edition.
If indeed ii.17 were not cited for St. iv.24a, 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 γνώσις, 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 δρεπής, in chapter 9; with the subject of iii.2, περὶ κοινας, 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 Stobaean 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. 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.

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.

---

1 Festugière, La révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste, II, 2 f.
2 As 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 Wackernagel, 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 tracts ii, iv, and x before they came to be incorporated) or someone in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus - either Stobaeus himself, his excerptor, 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 Stobaean 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 Heise 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 discrepancies\(^1\) 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

---

\(^1\) The 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 \(\xi\upsilon\upsilon\nu\gamma\) for \(\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\nu\gamma\), \(\mu\upsilon\gamma\nu\) for \(\mu\upsilon\gamma\nu\), and the use and abuse of \(\nu\) moveables, elision, and so forth, must regretfully be ignored.

\(^2\) Epicteti, Manuale et Cebetis tabula, ed. and tr. Johannes 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 1, supplementing this from book 4 for Stobaeus 1 and 2 since there are very few samples for that part of the work. The text used was that of Marchant, 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. Because of the large number of long citations from the Timaeus in Stobaeus 1, 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. Since so few excerpts from Herodotus survive in the first two books, for those two books Herodotus ii was also used.

---


Finally, Stobaeus' excerpts from the *Odyssey*¹ 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


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.

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 Stobaean 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. ii.1.30 (20½ lines, SMA)

St. Μαραγνοντες ἐπεδεικνυεν (ἀπεδεικνυεν SC)
St. om. καὶ πρῶτον... τὰ προσήκοντα πράττειν, 1.1.12,4 lines.
St., Isid.) ἔστιν αὐτοῖς
St., Euseb.) ἄδυνατον ἔστιν

Xen. μαραγνοντες ἐπεδεικνυεν (ἀπεδεικνυεν)

(11)

(13)

1For this tendency see Hense x.v. Ioannes Stobaios, p. 2564.
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 ἐστιν αὐτοῖς for ὁδότις ἐστιν and δῶσατον for ὁ δῶναυν 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, ἑῶν for ἔστιν and ἀπολεῖσαί for ἀπολεῖσθαι can easily be accounted for on the basis of the hasty misreading of a minuscule ει ας ἕ. In the second of these, however, it may be that the context: τοῖς ἐκ οὗτοι ὁ ἱερεῖς εἰς ὁδότις ἔπε. ὁ οὐτε ὁ ὁδοῖς ἀπολεῖσθαι, 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 ἐπείςεξ ὑμνούν is corrected to ἐπείςεξ ὑμνούν in one of the manuscripts of Stobaeus, it is possible that the substitution is very late. On the other hand, εὐ γε for ἐπεί 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 ἐξ ἄοις, 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.* **Herm.** i.2.4 = St. iv.37.19 (5½ lines, S)

*St.* ἔμποδίζειν

*Xen.* ἔμποδίζειν Ἑφή

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.* **Herm.** i.2.10,11 (13½ lines, SMA)

*St.* προσεδετὶν ἔχορα καὶ κίνδυνος τὰ αὐτὰ γίγνεται οὖν ὁδὸν ὁ

*Xen.* προσεδετὶν ἔχορα καὶ κίνδυνοι (10) τὰ τὰ γίγνεται οὖν

In the first of these examples, Stobaeus' reading, ἔχορα καὶ κίνδυνος, has a more abstract effect than Xenophon's plural and therefore more vivid ἔχορα 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.* **Herm.** i.2.19-23 = St. iii.29.95 (37 lines, SHABr; Br. om. Ῥως οὖν . . . αὖτις δυνατείν, 32½ lines.)

*St.* τὰ τοῦ σάματος δοκοῦνται διὰ τοὺς υἱεῖς (υἱους Μ) μαρτυρῷ τοῦτο γε

*Xen.* τὰ σάματα δοκοῦντος (19) δι' θα καὶ τοὺς υἱεῖς (20) μαρτυρῷ τούτωις (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 Stobaean manuscript gives an isolated reading, I could detect no significant pattern in these.) There is a tendency in Stobaeus for καὶ in the sense of “even” or “also” to be omitted. In writing τὰ τοῦ σώματος for τὰ σώματα, Stobaeus or his source may have been influenced by a previous τὰ τοῦ σώματος in the same sentence. If τοῦτο γε for τούτων 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 διαμολογήσατο (ἐπιδιαμολο-
γήσατο SVA)
καὶ ἀγαθὸν
ἐργαζόμεναι ἔχει
ἔχου

Xen.
Σωκράτης ὁ'
ἐπεὶ διομολογήσατο
καὶ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι
ἐργαζόμεναι τε ἔχει
ἔχου τα

This excerpt, although much smaller, has many more errors than the last. The omission of the ὁ’, 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

¹ Hense s. v. “Ioannes Stobaios,” p. 2569 f.
² Ibid., p. 2584.
τὸ in the following example. Either Stobaeus or his source may not have understood that the τὸ 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. i1i.17.43 (23 lines, SHABr)

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 oὐς ὑπὲ for oὐς ὑπὲ is presumably caused by itacism. In the context πεινάντα καὶ διψάντα make no sense. Presumably they were attracted by ὁμαλὲα in the same sentence. None of these alterations need be charged to Stobaeus.

Since τὸ ὁμαλὲα 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, πεινάντα, which Marchant prints, is more plausible; cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones
s. v. πεθεω, A.II.3, p. 1354.

7) Xen. Mem. 1.3.11-13 = St. iv.20b.62 (23 lines, SMA)

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 μόνις for μόλις, cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. μόνις,
p. 1142; on the other hand, it is Stobaeus who furnishes the regular
Attic πόρρωθεν for πρόσωθεν (but only in one of the two examples),
cf. Liddell-Scott-Jones s. v. πρόσωθεν, p. 1533. It is conceivable
that θι was written for θι for its damage to a manuscript. Pres-
sumably θις γενοῖτο for θις γενοῖτο, while promoted by similarity in
pronunciation, was also encouraged by the adjacent θέμας; presumably
someone thought that the θι was to become healthy.

Marchant prints Stobaeus' reading, θι, for the third of these
variants. If so, presumably θι 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 Sto-
bæus who has here preserved the original reading.
8) Χέρ. Μεμ. 1.5.1-5 = St. iii.17.31 (34 lines, SMABr)

St.
ει πη προσβάζει
eπ' οδ μελισσα' 
tοῦτον αἰρομέθα (αἰρομέθα Ν)
ηγησμäche ξυν
ἡ βοσκήματα ἡ ταμίαν (ταμία Α)
ἐπιστάσθαι
tὸν τοιούτον
τῷ βῆς καὶ τῷ σώματι
tοῦτον πρῶτον
Ικετεύον

Χερ.
είν τε προσβάζει
ἐπ' τοῦ μελισσαῦ 
τοῦτον ᾿Αιρομέθα
ηγησμάθε 
ἡ βοσκήματα ἡ ταμία 
ἐπιστάσθη 
τοιούτο 
τῷ βής τε καὶ τῷ σώματι 
τοῦτον πρῶτο 
Ικετεύον (καὶ Ἰκετεύον 
ΑΣ院子里

In this excerpt there is difficulty in Stobaeus' text with the particle ξυν. In the second example, a decision is difficult. The clause in question, ἐπ' οδ μελισσα' ᾿Αιρομέθα, would normally be expected to contain ξυν. However, Schwizer does give examples even from Plato and Xenophon in which ξυν 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. In the third example, ξυν before αἰρομέθα is clearly demanded by the context, and its omission is presumably accidental. In the fourth, ξυν 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 η for τε can be explained as a misreading of an uncial exemplar, or as an unhappy attempt to improve Xenophon's style. However, the insertion of τοῦν before τοιοῦτον, the omission of τε after τῷ βῆς and the change of πρῶτον to πρῶτην may be due to inattention.
Stobaeus' reading of ἐνυφασάν seems to suit the sense better than ἐνυφασίν 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 ἱκετεύσον; 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, SMABrMacChrys)

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.

The substitution of μελετησών for μελετῶν is easily explained on the grounds that the aorist subjunctive is the commoner form. The ἦ in ἦ πλέουν 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 πλέουν to πλέον was no doubt facilitated by the similarity in pronunciation.

10) Xen. Mem. 1.6.13-15 = St. iii.1.205 (25½ lines, MA)

---

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. 1.1.37 (26½ lines, F)

Most of the variant readings in this excerpt are likely to be scribal errors. It is easy to see τοῖς for τοῖς as arising from a confusion in transcription from an uncial exemplar. The repetition of πολλοῦ, as the omission of πῶς, 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 τοῦτο for τοῦτα is, according to Wachsmuth's apparatus, shared by B of Xenophon, it was probably in Stobaeus' source. Both τοῖς and κατοικεύομενοι 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 αὐτὸς is omitted and the indicative παρακευόμενοι is changed to the feminine singular participle παρακευόμενοι, which is nonsense in the context.
There is also one good reading furnished by Stobaeus for this excerpt: συμφέειν for καί φυτεύειν. 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. *Hem.* iv.7, 2-10 = St. ii.31.127 (59 lines, L)

St.  
γεωμετρεῖν  
ικανὸς γένοιτο  
διαγραμμάτων γεωμετρεῖα  
ξηθ. δὲ ἵκανα εἶναι  

τὰ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περιφορᾷ  
σταθμητοὺς ἀστέρας  

ἀπεξειαν οὖν ἐμαυν  
καίτι γε οὖθε  
ἐν αἱρέτι ἀνθρώποις  
περιφορίσαι (St., Eus.) ἠγνόει διτὶ  
ἄνευ ἠλὸυ αὐτῆς  
(St., Eus.) πάντα τὸν χρόνον  
τοῖς συνιούσι  
προστέρπει  
ἀγιεῖς  
προσέχοντας  
συμφέρει αὐτῷ  
ὅπως τοῦτοις χρόμενοις  
δι' ἄν θεοὶ

Xen.  
αὐτικα γεωμετρεῖα  
ικανὸς τις γένοιτο  
διαγραμμάτων γεωμετρεῖα (3)  
ξηθ. δὲ ταῦτα ἵκανα εἶναι  
1 ms. αὐτῆ, according to Marchant  

τὰ μὲ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ περιφορᾷ (5)  
δοκαθμητοὺς ἀστέρας (δοκαθμητοὺς ἀστέρας, B, acc. Nachsmuth)  
ἀπεξειαν μὲν γὰρ οὖν ἐμαυν  
καίτι οὖθε  
ἐν ἀρετῇ ἀνθρώποις  
περιφορίσαι  
HELL. (HELL. ἠγνόει διτὶ δὲ B) (7)  
ἄνευ μὲν ἠλὸου αὐτῆς  
τὸν πάντα χρόνον  
τοῖς συνιούσι  
προστέρπει  
ἀγιεῖς  
προσέχοντας  
συμφέρει αὐτῷ  

ὅπως τοῦτοις χρόμενοις  
δι' ἄν ὁθεοὶ (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 αὑτικα is readily intelligible as redactional, since the excerpt is thereby set free from its context. It
is also conceivable that the reading σταθητοῦς for δοσοληθητοῦς is redactional, since Stobaeus or his source may have thought that δοσοληθητοῦς is required so as to contrast with ὑστηκα in the same sentence; however, the fixed stars had been discussed in iv.7.4. It is also conceivable that ἐσητὰ was altered to ἐση ἀπερατό 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, ἴγνει ὅτι for ἴγνει ὅς and πάντα τοῦ χρόνον for τὸν πάντα 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, ἴγνει ὅτι ὅς. Other possible readings are συνιδούσι for συνιδούσι, προστρέπει for προστρέπει, and ηπιος for τῶς. 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 ἰκανὸς τις γένοιτο, the letters στ from διαγράμματα, the omission of τάστα before ἰκανόν, the omission of μὴ before ἐν τῇ άντι περιφορά, the omission of μὲν γὰρ after ἀφελίζων, the omission of μὲν before ἰδίου, the omission of ί in ὑγιείας, and the omission of ο of before θεοῦ. Also careless is the reading περιφορονθείς for ποροφορονθείς, presumably induced by similar abbreviations, the reading of ἀντις for ἀντις, presumably because of the similarity between uncial τ and Γ, and προσέχοντας for προσέχοντα, perhaps influenced by the accusative plurals in the previous sentence. We may see in καστοι ζε for καστοι 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

¹See 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. 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.
χόδας τῶν . . . ἐκδυσίη τεχνήν, 8 lines)

a) Stobaeus against Plato

St.
καταφαίνεται μοι (καταφαίνετ' ἄν
μοι Ἰ.)

Pl.
καταφαίνετ' ἄν μοι

(Evidently L neglected to re-introduce the augment when revising Stobaeus.)

b) Stobaeus (SMA) against Plato + L

St. (SMA)
χόδας τῶν ὑπ’ ἔμοι βηθέντων
καταφαίνεται μοι
καὶ κατὰ φύσιν δόντες

Pl. + L.
χόδας ποι ὑπ’ ἔμοι βηθέντων (ἄθες ποι Ἰ.)
καταφαίνετ’ ἄν μοι (καταφαίνετ’ ἄν μοι Ἰ.)

(17C)
πάσι(ν) κατὰ νοῦν
καὶ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπὸ δόντες (L, P1(Y),

Procl.1. ὑπὸ δόντες F; δόντες
Α3 ἐν δόντες Α2)

μὴ τε ἄλλον ποτὲ μὴδὲν (18B)
δρετῆς διὰ παντὸς

(18C)
ἐπαυξανομένων ἐπαυξανομένων ἐπαυξανομένων ἐπαυξανομένων ἐπαυξανομένων (19A)

(19A)

nοθοδομεῖν (τι

1See above, p. 193 f.

2L has suffered from a careless rubricator. See Wachsmuth, “Prolegomena,” Wachsmuth and Hense, op. cit., I, xxviii.
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 δυ, but neglected to restore the augment in κατεργασε. The omission of νου 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 οδομως 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 δυς for forms of νυς are frequent in Stobaeus. Assuming that in the fourth example the reading of Pl.Υ and L, δυ

δυντις 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, δυ has been omitted after ομωζονομεν and ξυν after ποθομεν (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 διαγνώσθηκε for διήν γνώσθηκε. 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 ἀνάγειν 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L</th>
<th>cet.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>οὐχ ἦν πάντων</td>
<td>τοῦτος οὐχ ἦν πάντων (τοῦτος ὧν) (17D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κοινὴ κατὰ τὴν πόλεμον</td>
<td>κοινὴ κατὰ τὴν πόλεμον (18C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δὴ τὸ περὶ (παρὰ τε)</td>
<td>δὴ τὸ περὶ (παρὰ τε)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἄνω γονέας</td>
<td>καὶ ἄνωθεν γονέας (18D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰ μὲν τῶν ἁγαθῶν</td>
<td>τὰ μὲν τῶν ἁγαθῶν (19A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνάγειν δεῖν</td>
<td>ἀνάγειν δεῖν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρὰ φωτιν</td>
<td>παρὰ φωτιν</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of these discrepancies can, in my judgment, be explained as scribal errors. Thus the omission of τοῦτος is easily understandable because of the οὐχ which follows. It would be easy to understand δὴ for δὴ 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 ἄνωθεν for ἄνωθεν and ἀνάγειν 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 φωτιν for παρὰ
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, κοινόν for κοινόν makes any sense at all in the context, and could conceivably be derived from L’s source. However, even in this case κοινόν 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 ἄρ' ἐκδότου τὴν τέχνην

St.(S), Pl.(F, Amg)
μὲν ἐκδότην τέχνην

L, Pl.(AF)
τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῶν (γεγενημένον A)

St., Pl.(Y)
τὸ γεγενημένον αὑτῷ (τὸ γε-

gεγενημένων αὑτῷ S)

L, Pl.(A)
χώραν διαλλάττειν

Pl.(F)
χώραν ἐπιλαττεῖν

St., Procl., Pl.(A2Y)
χώραν μεταλαττεῖν

(μεταλαττεῖν A)(19A)

For the first of these, neither variant makes sense in the context; Burnet prints μὲν ἐκδότην 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 διαλλάσσειν with L, Pl.(A) or μεταλλάσσειν with St., Procl., Pl.(A²). Liddell-Scott-Jones gives "substitute, transfer" as a fourth possible meaning of μεταλλάσσειν, 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 τροφῆς and Stobaeus and Pl.(F²) τροφή (18A). In this case, however, L and Pl.(Y) read δὲ against Pl.(A), which reads ὅπως. L agrees with Pl.(Y) again in reading ἕν ὅντες where Pl.(A) reads ἑδοντες, Stobaeus ὅντες, and Pl.(F) ἡλικίωτες. 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) μίαν ἐκδοσὴν τῆν τέχνην
St., Pl. (A), Procl. καὶ φοσει φιλοίς δοσα προσήκει
St., Pl. (AY) μηχανιμένους ηπεως διογενεῖς
St., Pl. (Y) τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῷ (τὸ γεγενημένων αὐτῷ S)
St., Pl. (F) τῇ δὲ τροφῇ (δαί
SM: τροφῇ S)
St., Pl. (A²Y) χάραν μεταλλαττειν (μεταλλαττειν St. (A))
St., Pl. (A²) ᾧ Ἀρ' οὖν

Pl. (A), L καὶ ἄρ' ἐκδοσού τῇ τέχνῃ (17D)
Pl. (F) ἢτε καὶ φιλοίς οἶνα προσήκει
Pl. (Y) ἢτε φοσει φιλοίς (18A) ὡςις προσήκει
Pl. (AY) μηχανιμένως ηπεως (18C) διογνώς (18D)
Pl. (F) τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῶν (γεγενημένων Α) (18C)
Pl. (AF), L τὸ γεγενημένον αὐτῶν (18A)
Pl. (FA), L χάραν ἐπαλλαττείν (19A)

Pl. (AFY), L ᾧ Ἀρ' οὖν δῆ

In this passage Stobaeus agrees with only one singular reading of Pl. (F), namely μίαν ἐκδοσὴν τῆν 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 ὡςις 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) in reading τροφῇ against τροφὴν in Pl. (AY) and L, or in Stobaeus' agreement with Pl. (A²) in omitting δῆ after ᾧ Ἀρ' οὖν. The reading χάραν μεταλλαττείν, 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 pos-
sibility 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 re-
lated.

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. 11.31.110^k (1½ lines, L)

(According to Wachsmuth *ad loc.*, the vulgate tradition of Plato gives δς δη 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. 1.13.1a (7 lines, FPL)

The number of variant readings in this passage is striking. Some of these can no doubt be interpreted as scribal errors. For example, ξείν for σχείν can be ascribed to a confusion between uncial Σ and Ε, if it is not the result of a lapse in memory. No doubt τιμη for τιμή and γένη, τῷ for γενητῷ or γεννητῷ are both presumably caused by the misunderstanding of an unaccented exemplar. While Stobaeus'
reading of χρήμανος for προσχρήμανος 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 χρήμανος to contrast with προσχρήμανος in the following sentence.

On the other hand, γνώσται for γνώσθαι, 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 ὅν for ὅτοι μὲν ὅν ὅν or ὅτοι μὲν ὅν and ὅσταν.δ' for ὅταν δ' ὅν 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)
We may add the following instances in which Stobaeus agrees with
one or more manuscripts of Plato against the rest:

St., Pl. (AFP), Procl.  
πολλά πολλῶν περὶ (περὶ c. Diehl)  

Pl. (Y)  
πολλά πολλῶν, εἰσόντων περὶ (29C)

St., Pl. (FPA^2), Gal.  
χρῆ μεμνημένος

Pl. (AY), Procl.  
χρῆ μεμνημένον

The two variants in Stobaeus seem both to be caused by scribal
errors; 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 έγώ after λέγων
may perhaps indicate manuscript affinity, but it is not conceivable that
an error of this nature could occur independently in unrelated manu-
scripts because of the similarity in ending between λέγων and έγώ. The
εἰσόντων inserted in Y in πολλά 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), Ἐπει πολλά πολλῶν καὶ τυχών διαφορὰ περὶ τοῦ ποντῶς καὶ
tοῦ θεοῦ εἰσόντων. It is, however, an error, and in this case Stobaeus
shares the correct reading against Y. Stobaeus is also undoubtedly
correct in reading χρῆ μεμνημένος with Pl. (FPA^2) against Pl. (AY).

Thus the text of Stobaeus for this excerpt seems not to be closely re-
lated to any of the surviving manuscripts.

18) Plato, Timaeus 29E = St. iii.38.33 (1½ lines, SMABr)

St.  
ἐγγίνεται

Pl.  
ἐγγίγνεται

The variant reading in Stobaeus here is of course a Hellenistic
usage, for which Stobaeus may or may not be responsible. (The discrep-
cy 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
φλαύρον δὲ καὶ (καὶ ὁμ. F²)
πλημμελᾶς ἐκ καὶ (πλημμελῆσαι π¹)
ἀυτῷ πήγεν

(end of excerpt in 1.10.16b)

St. 1.21.1
παντὸς ὅμεινον
ὁμιᾶς δ’ ὁμιᾶς ἡν
ἐνάρεισαι

Pl. 1.10.16b
φλαύρον δὲ (καὶ ἔσεν δ’ St.(P),
Pl.(F), Plut.)
πλημμελῆσαι καὶ
εἰς τὰ διὰ αὐτὸ πήγεν (ἡγεν
Pl.(F), Procl., Plut.)

We may also mention one case in which Stobaeus agrees with some
of the manuscripts of Plato:

St., Pl. (AFY)
ὁμιᾶς ἐστὶ (ν)

Pl. (P,A²)
oμιᾶς ἐστὶ

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 manu-
scripts of Plato:

St. (P), Pl. (F)
ἐν τῷ ψευδῷ

St. (F), Pl. (AFY)
ἐν ψευδῷ

Undoubtedly none of these discrepancies represent deliberate
policy on the part of Stobaeus. It will be noted that Stobaeus' read-
ings 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 καὶ
in the
second example makes little difference in the sense of the passage, and
τιθέναι in the fourth example may have been attracted by the preceding
ῥευσ.

Because the reading of St.(F) agrees with Pl.(F) in one instance
in 1.10.16b (the first example from this excerpt, ψαμμὸν for ψαμμὸν)
and in one instance in 1.21.1, ἐν τῇ ἔκεισιν for ἐν ἔκεισιν, 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.
παρὶν ἄμμον εἰς τὴν ἔκεισιν ἀκείλει Ἴσθ

Pl.
παρὶν ἄμμον ἐν ἄμμῳ ἐκεῖνῳ ἐκεῖνῳ

The following examples of partial agreement may also be given:

St., Pl.(FP), Procl.
περὶ ἐκεῖσιν

Pl.(A)
περὶ ἐκεῖσιν

Pl.(Y)
περὶ ἐκεῖσιν (31A)

St., Pl.(PYA²), Procl.
ἐστὶ τε καὶ ἔτε ζωταί

Pl.(AF)
ἐστὶ τε καὶ ἔτε ζωταί (31B)

The omission of ἐν is quite common in Stobaeus. No doubt diffi-
culty in recognizing the dual is responsible for εἰς τὴν for ἐκεῖνο; pre-
sumably that error need not be charged to Stobaeus. On the other hand,
dιτέλη for ἀκτέλη 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 τε 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, SHA; S om. λέγεται γαρ ... εἰληφθαμεν ἵκανος, 14 lines, 220E–221B)

*St.*

άλλα μὴν γε τῶν τεχνῶν
οἰκείαν πασῶν
δύο πάχ
τιμητικὴ
eἰς οὖσαν

νῦν διηλθομεν (διελθομεν Τρ.)

τὴν αὐτῶν δύναμιν (αὐτοῦ Τερ.)

μαθητικῶν

αντρήψειεν (ἐκτρήψειεν Τερ.)

δὴ ποὺ δήλον

προσέχοντας (πρὸς ἑκοντα Α)

ὁμοῖοι καὶ μισθίσασαν

τῷ δὲ

ἀμαδὸν

ἀμανιστικὸν τιθέντας

ἀνάνυμον πλὴρ

νεωτικοῦ ἱσοῦ

μὲν γε πᾶσα (μὲν πᾶσιν Α)

δρντευτικὴ (Ἡ δρντευτικὴ Σ; δρντιτευτικὴ Α; δρντευτικὴ Τερ.)

λέγεται

ἀλευτικὴ τὸ σύνολον

St. om.

τῷ δὲ

κατὰ τῷ μέγιστα

diēloimēn

ἐν τῷ νῦν χρεῶν

ὁ θεάσθητε, εὔποι

τις μὲν τοῖς πληκτικός

βὴθηναι

παναγκιστρευτικὴν (παναγκιστρευτικὴ Ἡ)

tῆς πληκτικῆς

ποιον

οὐχ ἢ τις (Μ 6 οὐχ εὖ τις ἂς Σ om.)

οὐ τῇ φύσῳμεν

*Pl.*

άλλα μὴν τῶν γε τεχνῶν (219A)

πασῶν σχεδὸν
dύο, πάχ;

μισθίσασαν

(219B)

τις δὴ οὔτερον εἰς οὖσαν

(219C)

νῦν διηλθομεν (νῦν δὴ <8> Buspec)

(219D)

πρὸς ἑκοντα

διαπρήσαν (διαγράψειν)

τῇ δὲ

ἀναφαγόν

ἀμανιστικὸν θέντες (θέντες Η)

ἀνάνυμον εὖν πλὴρ (ἀνάνυμον δὲν πλὴρ Heindolf) (220A)

τῷ δὲ οὔτερον νεωτικοῦ ἱσοῦ

μὴν γένοις πᾶσα
tῆς δρντευτικῆς

(220B)

λέγεται γαρ οὖν
tὸ σύνολον ἀλευτικῆς

(220C)

τῷ δὲ

catā tẽ meigistā

diēloimēn

ἐν ἔλαφῃ νῦν χρεῶν

ὁ θεάσθητε, εὔποι (ἐὔποι, ὁ θεάσθητε Ὡ)

tīs tōn πληκτικῆs

βὴθηναι συμβεβηκέν

πῶς ἀγκιστρευτικὸν

(220D)

tīs πληκτικῆs

tīs ποιον (Β om.)

οὐχ ἢ τις (.Magenta Β)

οὐ τῇ φύσίμεν

(221A)
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 ἄλλα δυνατή, since this is an unusual combination in the Hellenistic period. In 220B, it makes little difference to the sense whether ὁ σῶματος comes before or after ἀλλευτική; probably the sentence was transcribed carelessly. In the second example, however, it is possible that σχεδόν was deliberately moved in front of ποιῶν in order to make certain that σχεδόν was taken to modify ποιῶν. 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 θν κυτερον in 219B, the substitution of μὲν γε ποιῶν for μὴν ἡνοῦς ποιῶν, the omission of γὰρ οὖν after λέγεται, and the omission of τοῦ δ' ἐκτερον before νεωτικοῦ in 220B, the substitution of ἐν τῷ νόν for ἑνὶ λόγῳ νόν (uncial Γ being read as Τ), the omission of ὑσμεβηκεν in 220D, and the substitution of δ' for δὲ in 221A.

A more complicated problem is posed by ἄναρχειαν in 219C. The reading itself is clearly nonsense; however Gaisford emends it by reading ὑν πρεσβείαν. This latter could be either the original reading.

(since Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 409, cites only this passage under διασφαῖρον 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 προφέρειν to διασφαῖρειν should have occurred in the manuscript tradition of Plato.

If ἐὰν 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 νυνθά in 219B, the omission of νοῦ after τοῦ σοφοὺς, as well as the omission of τῶς before ὑπὶθυμητείς in 220B, the omission of τὸ before ποίον in 220E, and the omission of καὶ δύορδες ὑπὸ 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 νοῦ in 219D or of μὴν before τοῖς ὑπὸ 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 τῶς before μέγιστα in 220B is an attempted correction. On the other hand, δὲ before θεαστής 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 μὲν for δύο. πῶς in 219A, ὁτῶν for ὁτῶν in 219B, πανγεκπρετευμέν for πῶς
δυνατοτρεπόν in 220D, and oδιχή for oδιχή in 221A indicate the misunderstanding of an unaccented text. There are also some substitutions of words without reference to the sense, such as τιμητική for μιμητική in 219B, μαθητικῶν for μαθηματικῶν in 219C, προσεχόντας or πρὸς ἔχοντας for πρὸς ἔκδηντος in 219D, πληγῆς for πληκτικῆς in 220E, and πάντως εἰ for παντὶ ποιοῖ in 221C. (In the latter, italics was probably a factor.) On the other hand, Stobaeus seems to provide the correct reading in one instance in 220B, διελοίματιν for διελοίματιν.

Finally, τὸ δὲ for τὸ ἀκ (in 219D and 220B) is extremely common in Stobaeus' treatment of Plato. Literary pretensions are perhaps indicated by δυμασαῖν for δυνασαῖν, 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.(H) against the rest:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(H)</th>
<th>Pl.(cet.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δικαιότατα</td>
<td>δικαιότατας ἐν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὴν γε μὴν θερευτικήν</td>
<td>τὴν δὲ γε μὴν θερευτικήν (219B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὴν δὲ γε μὴν θερευτικήν (219E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(H) in reading ὅ before θεασθῆ, but with BT in placing θεασθῆ before ἔμοι. These agreements, given the tendencies of Stobaeus to omit ἐν and other small particles, could be ascribed to chance.

In one case Stobaeus agrees with Pl.(TW) against Pl.(B):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(TW)</th>
<th>Pl.(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τὴν ὑδραν ἐν τὴν θήραν</td>
<td>τῇ τὴν θήραν (220B)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 ὁδὸν τεμνεῖν
καὶ τοιαῦταν
τὸ μὲν πτεινὸν φῦλον δράμεν, τὸ δὲ
Ἐννοδρον (φῦλον S)
τὸ μὲν ἔρκεσιν (BT)
κύρτους δή (δή om. A) (BT)
οὐδὲν
πάνυ γε
τάστη ἀληθῆς
θηρευθέντος (θηρευθέντος T)
οὐ τε

Pl. (W)
τὸ μὴ τεμνεῖν
καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα
τὸ μὲν πτεινὸν φῦλον, τὸ δὲ
Ἐννοδρον δράμεν
τὰ μὲν ἔρκεσιν
κύρτους δὲ
οὐδὲν ἄλλο
πάνυ μὲν ὅμων
τάστης ἀληθῆς
θηρευθέντος
οὐ γε

Unfortunately this list proves little, since of the distinctive readings of Pl. (W) only πάνυ μὲν ὅμων 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 τοιαῦτα for τοιαῦτα in 220A, and οὐ γε for οὐ τε in 221A. Presumably τάστη in 220E was changed to τάστης because of the attraction of ἀληθῆς immediately following, although τάστη is demanded by the ἐννοδρομεῖ which precedes in the sentence. No doubt the οὐ in τὸ μὴ οὐ τεμνεῖν, 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)  
δοκεῖ 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.(cit.)  
τις οἶμαι  
ἐνυγροθηρικὸν ἐνυγροθηρικὸν (ἐνυγροθηρικὸν om. MA)  
τοῦτο δὲ  

Pl.(T)  
οἶμαι τις  
ἐνυγροθηρικὸν ἐνυγροθηρικὸν (220E)  
τοῦτο δὲ  

(221B)

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 ἐνυγροθηρικὸν 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(BTN).

22) Plato, Soph. 227D-230E = St. ii.31.129 (100½ lines, L)

St.  

peri ὕπατες  
ἐν ὑν γένοις  
καὶ σκοπῶν τίνα θέμενον  

Pl.  

peri ὕπατην  
ἐν γένοις (ἐν ὑν γένοις t) (228A)  
καὶ σκοπῶν τίνα θέμενα (228C)
Εν γε σύματι
παθήματε ταύτω
φαινεται
φατέον ἡ πλείωρ
ἐξαινεί μέγιστοι
κατὰ μέσον αὑτῆ
ἐφ᾽ ἐνὶ τῶν αὐτῶν
ἀγνοοῖς τ᾽ ὄνων
ἀφορίζομενον
αὐτῶν ἀντισταθμόν
δοιεῖτιν εἰδέναι
ὑ θ᾽ ἀγνοοίς
τὸ δεῖ δή
tῆς διδασκαλίας ἢ ὅρα μέρει
ἡμιούργηκη διδασκαλία
καὶ τοῦτῳ ἐπισκεπτέον
ἐξετομὸν ἔσειν ἥπι

ἀρχαιοπρέπεις
αὐτὸς ἀρθότατα ἔλθη
οὔ τ᾽ ἢν ἐθέλειν

τούτων οἴοι τε περὶ
ἐπεμβολὴν ἄλλοτρόπως στελλονται

τίνι δὲ
συνάγομεν
εἰς ταῦτα τε τιθέμαι
πρὸς ταῦτα κατὰ ταῦτα
περὶ αὐτῶς
πασῶν ἀπαλαγῶν
τὰ ἐμποδίζοντα ἐντὸς (ἐκτὸς Λ')
αὐ καθαρασθάτων

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 ἰηρεῖεν 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 ὅσι for ὅσ (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 ὑπ (for which with Burnet following Schleiermacher read ἐν ὕπ) for ἐν (228a), ἐν γε σώματι for ἐν σώματι γε, cf. Pl. (W) ἐν γε τῷ σώματι (228E), and ἐντὸς for ἐν αὐτῷ in 230C; each of these readings are accepted by Burnet. Burnet also wishes to follow Stobaeus in removing εἴναι from ὑπερείπεν εἴναι ἲ πατέω and γένεται from ὑπ' ἐν γένεται, both in 229B. The second may easily be conceded; the first is possible. Burnet would also follow Stobaeus in removing τε from πισών τε ἰππάλαγών in 230C; here however the context may have suffered a more serious corruption. Finally, the following readings: δι' ἰνοίας for διανοίας in 229C and συνήγογαι ... εἰς ταύταν τε τιθέοντο, for συνήγογος ... εἰς ταύταν τιθέον, 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:
Stobaeus' agreements with the other Plato manuscripts against Pl. (W) seem inconclusive. The first of these, Pl. (W)'s reading, 8τι (for 8 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 ἀδρῆς 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 μύριον or with λειστέρον. In 229D, ὅρῃ ἡμῶν, favoured by Stobaeus and Pl.(W), being the more common expression, is likely to have been substituted for ὅρῃ ἡμῶν given by the other Plato manuscripts. Finally, in 230C both Stobaeus and Pl.(W) omit ἢν where it is clearly demanded by the context. To be sure, the omission of ἢν 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, καὶ γὰρ for τῷ, 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 αὐτὸς ἄνευς ἐν Pl.(B) for αὐτὸς ἄνευς 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.
ψυχὴν ἄνευς

Pl.
ψυχὴν ὁπα ἄνευς

Since ὁπα 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.
ποιεῖται

Pl.
δει ποιεῖται

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 γαρ ὅμεις

πω κατανοῶ

ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ δυνατὸν

μακάριον μὲν πάν

ὁ ξυνέχειν

Pl.
τάχα γαρ ὅμεις (232E)

πω κατανοῶ (233A)

ἀνθρώπων ἐστὶ δυνατὸν

μακάριον μὲν τίν

ὁ ξένος, ἦν

Stobaeus also agrees in one instance with Pl. (BT) against Pl. (W):

St., Pl. (BT)
οὐ δὴ (ὁς ὧν Tr.)

Pl. (W)
οὐ δὲ δὴ (232E)

As frequently in Stobaeus, ἦν is omitted. It may be that ἀνθρώπων for ἀνθρώπων was attracted by the preceding γαρ, although the error may have been caused simply by the similarity in sound. No doubt μὲν πάν for μὲν τίν ἦν was caused partly by the hasty misreading of an uncial manuscript. On the other hand, ξυνέχειν for ξένος, ἦν is presumably in part caused by itacism. Of the variants given by Stobaeus, only the second, πω for πω, 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, Ἠ)  

St.  

τὴν γὰρ Ἡτοιμένην  
tu-δυο λέγεις  
ἐτερον δικαιον  
to ἐπὶ τοῦτο μέρος  
eἰκέναι τῷ καλῷ  
μηδὲ εἰκάς (μηδ’ Α)  
ὁρθότατα (ὁρθότητα Ἀ)  
tοῦτο τοῖς ὑπὸ Ἐλεγέν  

Pl.  

τὴν δὲ Ἡτοιμένην  
τίνε τῷ δύο λέγεις  
ἐτερον οὗ δικαίον  
tο ἐπὶ τούτῳ μέρος  
eἰκέναι τῷ καλῷ  
μηδ’ εἰκάς  
ὁρθότατον ἦν  
tοῦτῳ τοῖς ὑπὸ Ἐλεγέν  

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 τῶνε in the second example and the change of τοῦτω to τοῦτο as well as the omission of τῶ in the last. The omission of οὗ in the third example may perhaps be set down to mere carelessness. The omission of ἦν in the second last example is of course, as we have seen, common in Stobaeus’ excerpts from Plato. Since εἰκέναι and ἐοικέναι as well as ἐοικός 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, 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 ἄντι 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.)
ποτ' ἦμιν οὖν ἡμι
οδηγὶς μοι δοκῶ νῦν
eἰκαστικὴν ὁρῶν (ἐκαστικὴν Ἡ)
πάνυ μὲν οὖν (Pl.(B) om.)
πάνυ μὲν οὖν (BT)
tὸ μὲν ἄρα ἔτερον
eἰκὸς γε ὑν, εἰκόνα καλεῖν
ὁ φησὶν λοικέναι (ἐλκέναι ἩΑ)
pολὺ γε

Pl.(W)
ποτ' ὅσοι ἦμιν
οδηγὶς νῦν δοκῶ μοι
eἰκαστικὴν ὁρῶν
δοκεῖ μοι πάνυ μὲν οὖν
παντάσας γε
ἄρ', οὖν τὸ μὲν ἔτερον
eἰκαστικὸν καλεῖν
ὁ φησὶν λοικέναι
πάνυ γε

St., Pl.(cet.)
eἶπεν καὶ ἔτελε πρῶτον
προσφέροντα ἐκάστας
φάντασμα ἀλλ' ὄσκεἰκόνα

St., Pl.(cet.)
κατὰ ἐκμίσχασαν (σομπ- Pl.)

Pl.(T)
κατὰ τὴν ἐκμίσχασαν

This list is quite inconclusive. Some of the readings peculiar to Pl.(W), notably παντάσας γε for πάνυ μὲν οὖν and ἄρ', οὖν τὸ μὲν ἔτερον for τὸ μὲν ἄρα ἔτερον, 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.)
In addition, Stobaeus omits the opening words of the first speech of this excerpt, πῶς γὰρ ὀφεὶ ἄτομον, presumably because they link the speech to its context.

I cannot account for the substitution of ἐπαλλάξεως for ἐπαλλαξίας in 240C. In the context, ἐπαλλάξεως 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 ἐνάγματι for ἐνάγματι is caused by unfamiliarity with the perfect. As often in Stobaeus we read ἐκοινωνίας for ἐκόινων and διὰ for δι. Of course τινὴ for τίνα is late, and the result of misunderstanding of the text. Perhaps εἴποιμεν for εἴποιμεν is an attempt to correct Plato. The omission of τὸ before μὴ ἢντα is clearly accidental. Probably δὲ γάρ became λέγει 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 ἔναντι for
τῦνατο in 240D. This is possible, but the reading of the manuscript tradition of Plato is also acceptable. Stobaeus' reading καὶ τὰ ἄλλα 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(W)</th>
<th>Pl.(B)¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ἀφορητοῦντες</td>
<td>(240C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πᾶς γὰρ ἐν ἄλλως</td>
<td>(240E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(T)</th>
<th>Pl.(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>περὶ τὸ φάντασμα</td>
<td>(240D)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(Th)</th>
<th>Pl.(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>δρᾶς γοῦν δὲ</td>
<td>(240C)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(cet.)</th>
<th>Pl.(W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>πότερον ψεῦδος</td>
<td>(240D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τὰ μὴ ἄντα δοξῆς (τὰ ὁμ. St.)</td>
<td>δοξῆς (τὰ μὴ ἄντα)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St., Pl.(cet.)</th>
<th>Pl.(T)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ψεῦσται ποτὲ τῆς τι</td>
<td>(240E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It could be argued that in reading ἀφορητοῦντες for ἀφορητοῦντες, 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.

¹According 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. 111.12.24 (10½ lines, SMA)

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 δή. Stobaeus seems to prefer Ἕκως to ἤκς.

There is also one reading in which Stobaeus agrees with the
other manuscripts of Plato against Pl. (W):

This would scarcely give warrant for any theory about the manu-
script 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 com-
pare in this respect the text of *Soph.* 219A-221C = Sr. 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 ὅσι for ὅς, 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 ACEHLJ, tend to follow the readings of Burnet’s T, while Bekker’s ΔΓδS 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’

²Ibid., p. 410.
³Ibid., p. 415.
excerpts. One of these shares many striking errors with family E noted above, therefore also with Burnet's T. This includes St. i.50.36 = Pl. Phaedo 60B-C and St. i.49.7-9 = Pl. Phaedo 69E-70B, 70C-71A, 71C-72A, 78B-C, 79A-80B. 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; however, these instances, as he himself admits, are scarcely conclusive. (None of the four cases which he noted were even included in the apparatus by Burnet who, however, frequently cites readings from Stobaeus.) Two excerpts, i.49.13 = Pl. Phaedo 91E-95A and i.49.58 = Pl. Phaedo 107B-114D, seem closely related to BCD, but especially to C, which Burnet rarely cites. A third group, i.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; after 102, according to Bickel following Schanz, this manuscript is drawn from Bekker's G. The fourth group, St. i.49.56,57 = Plato, Phaedo 63B-C and 80D-82C, seems to be related to no surviving manuscript.

Relatively few of the readings peculiar to Stobaeus seem likely

1Ibid., p. 477. 2Ibid., pp. 422, 437. 3Ibid., p. 438. 4Ibid., pp. 438ff. 5Ibid., p. 438. 6Ibid., pp. 450, 477. 7Ibid., pp. 455 ff. 8Ibid., p. 456 ff. 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, although not conclusively disproven.

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.

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.
6. 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 υ moveables are frequently introduced where they would be expected in Attic Greek, -ος frequently is changed to -ης, πολλος and πολλον become, respectively, πολυς and πολυ, ὥστε becomes ὡστε, and occasionally σεως- and έως- becomes σεως- and έως- 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: δὲ Ἀρτάμονος διείσβη ἑγὼν. The retention of the δὲ in this case is surprising, since it refers to the larger context in Stobaeus. In this same excerpt, the words οδομοῦθι, ὡς ἔγνω ἐλευθερώσω 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 ἐλευθερώτας τοῦτος ἐνειδήθη rather than the original ὡς δὲ τοῦτο ἄκουσε Ἀρτάμονος, ἐλευθερώτας τοῦτος ἐνειδήθη, 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 ὁ κύριος Σοφίτης 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. iv. 34. 73</th>
<th>προεξέδρη λίθου</th>
<th>(44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>προεξέδρη λίθου λευκοῦ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. iv. 34. 73</th>
<th>ομ. ἐποίησαν ὅτε ... καὶ τῷ στρατῷ, 5 lines.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. iv. 34. 73</th>
<th>δέ ὦ ἡρα</th>
<th>(45)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>δέ ὦ ἡρα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. iv. 34. 73</th>
<th>ὁ πατρῶς οὗτος (Si πατρῶς MATr.)</th>
<th>(46.1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>ὁ πατρῶς (πατρῶς R) ()</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| St. iv. 34. 73 | ὁπὸς ὄν ἀνήρ | (SV) |
|---------------|---------------|
| Her.          | ὁπὸς ἀνήρ (ἀνήρ SV) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>St. iv. 34. 73, iv. 53. 40</th>
<th>δέ πολὺ ἄλληλων</th>
<th>(40 L)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>δέ πολλὰν ἄλληλων (πολὺ L)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
St. Ivv. 34.73 ἐργάζομαι (κρίγα αὖ ᾶ ΗΑ)
St. Ivv. 53.40 κρίγα αὖ γ' 
Her. ἐργάζομαι

St. Ivv. 34.73 μακαρίσσας γάρ ἐσωτήρν (καυτῶν Η) 
Her., St. Ivv. 53.40 μακαρίσσας γάρ σεσωτήρν (ἐσωτήρν Ηερ. (C1))

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 δὲ ἐὰνπε 
Her. δὲ εἶπε (46.2)

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 κατοικτεῖτραι 
Her. κατοικτεῖτραι (κατοικτεῖτραι Λ)

St. Ivv. 34.73 εἰ τούτων γε ἔστων 
St. Ivv. 53.40 εἰς τούτων γε ἔστων 
Her. εἰ τούτων γε ἔστων

St. Ivv. 34.73 οδεῖς εἰς ἐκαστόν ἔτος (ἐκαστὸν Ττ.) 
Her., St. Ivv. 53.40 οδεῖς εἰς ἐκατοστὸν ἔτος (οδεῖς εἰς Στ.Α)

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 υπάρ τὴν ἔκδην 
Her. υπάρ τὴν ἔκδην (ἔκδην RSV) (46.2)

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 πέφυκεν 
Her. πέφυκε (46.3)

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 καὶ οὖχ ἤπαξ 
Her. καὶ οὖχ ἤπαξ (οὖξ α)

St. Ivv. 34.73 τεθνάναι βουλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἦ ἔκδη 
St. Ivv. 53.40 τεθνάναι μᾶλλον βουλεσθαι ἦ ἔκδη 
Her. τεθνάναι βουλεσθαι μᾶλλον ἦ ἔκδη 
(ἔκδην C; ἔκδην dP)

St. Ivv. 34.73 αὐτῷ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ συμπιστουσαί 
St. Ivv. 34.61 αὐτῷ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ προσπιστουσαί 
Her., St. Ivv. 53.40 αὐτῷ τε γὰρ συμφοραὶ προσπιστουσαί

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 34.61 συνταράττουσα 
St. Ivv. 53.40 συνταράττουσα (συνταράττουσα Α) 
Her. συνταράττουσα (Συ-δοσούσα DRV; -δουσα dP)

St. Ivv. 53.40 δοκεῖν εἶναι (δοκεῖ Α) 
Her., St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 34.61 δοκεῖν εἶναι

St. Ivv. 53.40 οὗτος δὲ μὲν θάνατος 
Her., St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 34.61 οὗτος δὲ μὲν θάνατος (46.4)

St. Ivv. 34.73, Ivv. 53.40 μοχθηρῆς εὐσφής τῆς ἔκδης 
St. Ivv. 34.61 μοχθηρῆς εὐσφής τῆς ἔκδης 
Her. μοχθηρῆς εὐσφής τῆς ἔκδης (ἔκδης SV)
St. iv. 34.73, iv. 53.40, iv. 34.61 γέγονεν
Her.

γέγονε

St. iv. 34.73, iv. 34.61 δ ὥς θεὸς γλυκὸν τεῦχας τὸν αἵμαν
Her., St. iv. 53.40 δ ὥς θεὸς γλυκὸν γεύσας τὸν αἵμαν

St. iv. 34.73 φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὐφρωνεῖται ὅν (ὅν ομ. ΗΑ)
St. iv. 34.61 δυσζύμητος ἐν αὐτῷ εὐφρωνεῖται αἵμαν (αἵμαν Λ²)
Her., St. iv. 53.40 φθονερὸς ἐν αὐτῷ εὐφρωνεῖται ὅν

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 εἴπεν, γέγονεν, and πέφωνεν, as well as the use of Attic forms, such as κατοικτέραι for κατοικτέραι (with Her.(L)), ἴσην and ἴσης for ἴδην (with Her.(RSV)) and ἴδης (with Her.(SV)), ἵνα for ἴδιν (with Her.(dP)), and oὐχὶ for oὐκ. 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 α\\\varepsilonιτε γάρ to α\\\varepsilonιτε γάρ τον.

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: τεύξαι is given for γεύσαι. 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." (Ἀλλ' for ἄλλον 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 οὗτε τινά βέεας καμόν ήξετον οὔτε τι εἰπόν (ἐξετον Μ; ἤξετον Α)
Od. iv.690 οὗτε τινά βέεας ἡξασον οὔτε τι εἰπόν
Presumably in this case κακόν has intruded itself into the text as a gloss. So also Ψεττον is an error caused partly by itacism. T for Σ is perhaps more plausible if we suppose a minuscule 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 αὔτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἱμέρετο ἦς γαῖς καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρίσκοντα νοῆμι (ἀὔτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἱμέρετο Πτ. αὔτὰρ ... ἱμέρετο. Ὀμ. ΜΑ)

ἀὔτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἰδεῖν οἷς καὶ καπνὸν ἀποθρίσκοντα νοῆμι ἦς γαῖς, θανάτειν ἱμέρεται.

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 sources:

St. iv.17.1 οὗ μὲν γάρ τι πού ἔστι καμώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης (ἄλλο άν. ΜΑ)

Od. viii.138 οὗ γάρ ἔχει γέ τι φημι καμώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης

St. iv.39.1α ἰδίον ἐπικλώσαι γαμέσοντι τε γεινομένῳ τε.

Od. iv.207-211 θεία δ' ἀγνώστος γόνος ἀνέρος ὁ τε κρονίων ἰδίον ἐπικλώσαι γαμέσοντι τε γεινομένῳ τε,

(In the first line of the excerpt cited in St. iv.39.1α, the manuscripts of Stobaeus alternate between γεινομένῳ and γεινομένῳ. S¹ gives γεινομένῳ corrected from γεινομένῳ, and A¹ gives γεινομένῳ from γεινομένῳ. In addition, A¹ gives γέ 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 ἐπικλάοις. In addition, the metre is disturbed in one place: the ζ inserted before α ε changes the quantity of the last syllable of ὀλος. However, in this passage as often, every individual note is removed; hence in his note ad loc. writes, "vides quam licenter grassatus sit gnomologus ut aliquid generali sententiae simile extenderet."

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.15-16 we read συρισθείν for συρίσθεν, ιον ἄνα for ιον ἄνα, and οδ θαμίς ἀμίν (Χμίν Πα.) for οδ θαμίς Χμίν; in iv.24d.47 = Theocr. viii.64 we read μικρός for μικράς; in ii.46.7 = Theocr. v. 38 we read ξος πάγοντες for ξε τὰ πάγοντες.

There are a few variants which may be taken seriously. In St. iv.20b.60 = Theocr. iii.16, Stobaeus gives ὕπω τέ νῦν ηρεῖν while the majority of the manuscripts of Theocritus give ὕπω τέ μην ηρέει (μην ηρέει Pap.¹ A). Here Cow adopts both variants from Stobaeus into his text. In St. iv.24d.47 = Theocr. viii.63, Stobaeus gives
Apart from the erroneous τῶν for τῶν, Stobaeus here presents a plausible alternative text. In St. iii.16.10 = Theocr. x.55, Stobaeus gives διαμέτρων τὸ μὴν τὸν καταμετρῶν τὸ μὴν. Here again Stobaeus' reading is at least plausible. Finally in St. iii.20.23 = Theocr. 1.15-18, Stobaeus gives ἐντὸς for ἐντὶ. Here Gow accepts Stobaeus' reading on the grounds that ἐντὶ is incorrect Doric. In this case, however, I fear that Stobaeus may have been correct for the wrong reason, and that ἐντὸς 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 Schweighaeuser's Pc and Ax under Schenkl's symbol D. However, the relation of Schweighaeuser's Pd, Pf, Pg, and $v^2$ 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.
παράσει τοῦ ἄνθρωπον
οὐ τὰ πράγματα,
ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν
πραγμάτων δόγματαν.

ἀδυνατὸς ὁμοβεβηκόν,
ἐπεὶ καὶ συμπέπτει ἐν ᾧ,
ἀλλὰ τὸ δόξα τῶν ἀδυνατον
εἶναι ὁμοβεβηκόν.

ἐντὸς οὖν ἑμποδιζήθη,

μὴ δέστο ἀλλον αἰτίαμεθα,
ἀλλ' εαυτος,
τούτο δὲ ἐστι τὰ ράθα δόγματα.

Ench.
παράσει τοῦ ἄνθρωπον
οὐ τὰ πράγματα,
ἀλλὰ τὰ περὶ τῶν
πραγμάτων δόγματαν.

οἶον 2 ὃ ἀδυνατὸς ὄδυν 4 δεινὸν, (5)
ἐπεὶ καὶ συμπέπτει ἐν ἐμπεργατῷ,
ἀλλὰ τὸ δόξα τὸ περὶ τοῦ
θανάτου διότι δεινῶν,
ἐκεῖνο τὸ δεινὸν ἑτεῖν, 5
ἐντὸς οὖν ἑμποδιζήθη,

ἡ παραποιήσεως ἡ λυπήσεως, 6
μὴ δέστο ἀλλον αἰτίαμεθα,
ἀλλ' εαυτος,
τούτο δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ εαυτῶν δόγματα.

1 τῶν πραγμάτων: αὐτῶν A, B, Pg.  2 οἶον om. Nil.
3 ὃ om. Arg, Pg, H, $v^2$.  4 ὃδυν: ὃν οἱ Nil.
5 ἐκεῖνο . . . ἑτεῖ om. B, Par.  6 ἡ λυπήσεως 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 ἐμπνευσαμένοιν; in line 9 can be attributed to an ancient error, since these words are missing in Ench. (B, Par.). In line 5, ὀλον δὲ could have been omitted through carelessness; Nil. omits the first of these, and several manuscripts the second. We may also suppose that ἡ ἀποστολὴ ἡ λαμπάλεια were omitted accidentally because of the repeated -μεθα.

But some of the alterations cannot easily be explained as scribal errors. For example, it is difficult to see why φοβεροϊ should systematically replace ἐμπνευσαμένοιν; 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, φαῦλα in line 14, while not conveying the same information as ταύτων 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 ὃ was deliberate, then death, instead of being an example, is the subject of discussion. No doubt φοβερος, while conveying the same sense as δεινος, is more common, although also more pedestrian. Stobaeus' source may have found ἄλλα τῷ δόξα κτλ. too complicated for his purposes, and have substituted the corresponding expression in Stobaeus, ἄλλα τῷ δόξαι κτλ. Finally, the substitution of φαύλα for εἰσιν may be explanatory.

31) Ench. 33.15-16 = St. iii.1.102 (9½ lines, A)

St.

τι πολλα δε καὶ το γελαν ἀπεστω
καὶ το γελωτα κινεῖν
διασφραξη γιαρ δ τοπος
εἰς ἱστιμον
καὶ δημα την αλδω
την προς σε των πλησιον
ἐκαντο δενείναι καὶ διαφεδρα.
καὶ ἄλλος παρακειται τόπος
ἐπισμαλες ταις τοιαυταις ἀνέστησι,
το εἰς ἀσχολογίας
εὐκαλως προσαγαγειν των πλησιον.
οταν ουν τι συμβη τοιοτονι
ηιν μεν ευκαιριον τι
καὶ ἐπιστηθης τω ασχολογησαντι
τιν δε τοιαυτα τα προστατα
δετε μη καιρον ειναι,
τω δημοσιωπησαι και σκφβρωπσαι
και ἐρυθεισαι
δηλος γενου δυσαιρετων
tω βθεναι.

1τροπος Pf, Nil., Simpl.
2πλησιον B.
3καὶ ἐπιστηθην Pa, Pg, Nil.
4σκφβρωπσαι Pa, Pd, Pr, 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 διικεῖται to ἄνεγκται is explanatory. The substitution of καὶ ἄλλος παράκειται τοῦ ἐπισταλής ταῖς τοιαύταις ἀνέκδοται for ἐπισταλής 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 ἐὰν δὲ τοιοῦτο ἢ τῇ πρόσωπῳ δότε μὴ καρδὶν εἶναι is an explanation of ἐὰν ἢ μὴ, giving the situation in which one might hesitate to reprove the user of obscene language. So also δήλος γενοῦ δυσερετῶν τῷ βηθέντι merely paraphrases δήλος γίνον δυσερετῶν τῷ λόγῳ. The author of Stobaeus' version might have found βηθέντι more precise, δυσερετῶν easier for his intended reader to understand.

However, a substantive change is introduced in line 11, where in Stobaeus' version, εἰκολῶς προαγαγεῖν τὸν πλησίον ἐξετασθεῖν. 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 ἡ καὶ, 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 δὴ Ὑπέρ τὰ πολλὰ τὸ γελᾶν. 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.
μέτροντι κτήσεως τὸ σώμα
dιὸ τού ὑποδήματος.
ἐὰν μὲν ἐπὶ τούτου στῆς,
ἐχεῖς τὸ μέτρον καὶ τὴν ἐπιβάτραν.
ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερβῆς,
ἀρκέσας ὡς κατὰ κρημνοῦ σεαυτὸν.

Ench.
μέτρον κτήσεως τὸ σώμα ἐκάτων
dιὸ τοῦ ὑποδήματος.
ἐὰν μὲν ὅνων ἐπὶ τούτου στῆς
ὑπερδεξίον τὸ μέτρον.
ἐὰν δὲ ὑπερβῆς,
(5) ὡς κατὰ κρημνοῦ λοιπῶν ἀνάγκη
ὑπερθεοῦ.
καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὑποδήματος.
ἐὰν ὑπὲρ τῶν πόδα ὑπερβῆς,
γίνεσθαι καταξίμασον ὑπόδημα (10)
ἐῖτα πορφυροῦ, ἐῖτα κεντήτον.

οὕτω γίγνεσθαι2 καταξίμασον ὑπόδημα,
ἐῖτα πορφυροῦ,3 ἐῖτα κεντήτον.
ὑπερβηθαί γὰρ τὴν χρεάν τοῦ πόδος.
τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς κτήσεως,
ἐὰν ὑπερβηθαί σώμα,
ὅρος ὀδέσθε ἐστίν.

St.
1μέκρος Ὡ, μέκρον Ὡ.
2πορφυροῦν Ἐ.

2γίγνεσθαι Ἐκ.
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 ἐναστυφές ὡς ὁ ποῦς 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, ἔδω ὑπαρκῆς 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 Lbr. 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, MAT=Lbr + 4 lines, Lbr)

Ench., St. (Lbr)
μέμνησο, 8τὶ ὡς ἐν συμποσίῳ
σὺ δὲ ἂν ἀναστρέψῃς τὸ περιφερόμενον γέγονε κατὰ σὲ
ἐκτενὰς τὴν χείρα
κοσμῶς μετάλλησα,

St. (MAT)
ἐν συμποσίῳ σε ὀφθαλμὸν δεῖ
ἀναστρέψῃς τὸ περιφερόμενον
γέγονε κατὰ σὲ
ἐκτενὰς τὴν χείρα
μετάλλησα μάλιστα.
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: ἔλησα for
ἐκεῖ in line 7, ἀλλὰ ἐκέχου κατὰ σὲ γενέσθαι αὐτός for ἀλλὰ περὶ μενεν,
μέχρις ἂν γένηται κατὰ σὲ in lines 8 and 9. So also in line 5, κοσμίως
μεταλαβε becomes μετριῶς καθαίρει.

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 para-
phrase of the Encheiridion, presumably for those for whom the version
transmitted in our manuscripts was thought to be too difficult, there-
fore most probably for the young.

The following excerpts do not illustrate the tendencies of that
paraphrase:

34) Ench. 8 = St. 1.18.23 (2 lines, FP; no lemma: the text fol-
lows directly on Ench. 9 = St. 1.18.22

St.

μὴ ἦσσει τὰ γινόμενα
γινέσθαι ὧς θέλεις,
ἀλλὰ θέλε ὡς τὰ γινόμενα γίνεται,
καὶ ἐυρόφεις.

Ench.

μὴ ἦσσει τὰ γινόμενα
γινέσθαι ὧς θέλεις,
ἀλλὰ θέλε τὰ γινόμενα γίνεται,
καὶ ἐυροφεῖς.
In this excerpt we note a tendency to Atticize the Encheiridion. In addition the difficult ευροθείαι is replaced by ευροθείαι, 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 θέλειν ὑπὲρ τα γινόμενα γίνεται, Stobaeus gives a text similar to that given in B, with this exception, that B erroneously reads θέλειν for θέλειν.

35) **Ench. 9 = St. ii.8.22 (2½ lines, FF)**

None of these alterations is likely to be deliberate. In line 4, χαλασις is well attested within the manuscript tradition of the Encheiridion. Similarity in pronunciation is no doubt responsible for σῶν in place of οὖν. 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 ό ωκεν ἢστιν for όδε 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 εἰρωνείς 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 εἰρωνείς.

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.

μεθηνοσ οτι ὅποκρής
εἰ δραματος,
ολον ἄλη δ διαδικολος
Ἀν βραχυ, βραχεος·
Ἀν μακρόν, μακρυο·
Ἀν πτυχαν ὅποκραναθαθελη,
τοῦτων για καλας ὅποκρήθη·

Ench.

μεθηνοσ οτι ὅποκρής
εἰ δραματος,
ολον ἄλη δ διαδικολος
Ἀν βραχυ, βραχεος·
Ἀν μακρόν, μακρυο·
Ἀν πτυχαν ὅποκραναθαθελη,
τοῦτων για καλας ὅποκρήθη·

ōn για τοτε το δοθεν
ὁποκραναθαθαι καλας·

ἐκλεξαθαι δε το πρόσωπον ἄλλου.

St.

1θεληση F.

Ench.

3ολον B, Fc.

2οην F.

4πρόσωπον ὅποκραναθαι Rg, Nil

Two alterations in this excerpt are clearly to be ascribed to a deliberate paraphrase of the text. In line 7, Stobaeus’ reading, τοῦτον.
...simplifies the reading of the Encheiridion; perhaps here the ἦν was displaced accidentally within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus. In line 10, ἀπὸ is replaced by τὸ πρὸς ὁμοτῷ 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 ἡπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ημῖν, one would have expected Stobaeus, if he had consulted a manuscript of the Encheiridion, to have used chapter one, which begins, τῶν ἐν τῶν τα μὲν ἑσει ἐπὶ ημῖν 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 wilfully 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 Stobaean excerpts for which no other manuscript tradition exists. They must be proven to be reliable.

---

1 For a similar variety in quality of transmission within the Stobaean fragments of Menander see W. Görler, 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 Stobaean 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 Stobaean 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

¹ Frequently, 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

St. 1.18.2
1.1 - Πάν τό κινούμενον, ὁ Ἀποκλη-
μένει, ὀμοι ἐν τινὶ κινεῖται καὶ ὡς
τινος;
- Μᾶλλον.
1.2 - Ὡς ἀνάγκη δὲ μετίςον εἶναι
ἐν ὧ κινεῖται τό κινούμενον; (μετι-
ὶ
Lv)
- Ἀπίστη.

Wachsmuth on the advice of Patritius emends this last to read,
<τῷ> ἐν ὧ κινεῖται <ὑπὸ> τό 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
1.3 - Ἰσχυρότερον ἀρα τό κινοῦν
tοῦ κινούμενου;
- Ἰσχυρότερον γάρ.
1.4 - Ἐναντίων δὲ ἔχειν χαίν
ἀνάγκη τὴν ἐν ὧ κινεῖται τῇ τοῦ
κινούμενου;
- Καὶ πάνυ.

For this last, Wachsmuth, no doubt rightly, reads τῷ ἐν ὧ κινεῖ-
tαι.

St. 1.18.2
2.1 - Μέγας οὖν οὗτος κόσμος, οὗ
μετίςον οὐκ ἔστι σῶμα; (μετίςον Ψ)
- Ἰμπλοδηγηται.

Here Patritius reads οὗτος <ὑπὸ> κόσμος.

St. 1.18.2
2.2 - Καὶ στιβαρός; πεπληκτικος γάρ
ἄλλων συμμετοχὴς μεγάλων πολλῶν, μάλ-
λον δὲ πάντων δοκεῖ ἐστι σῶματα;
- Οὗτος ἔχει.
2.3 - Σῶμα δὲ ὡς κόσμος;
- Σῶμα.
As already noted, above, p. 39, C. H. ii not only begins at a
singularly unfortunate place but bears an unfortunate title, 'Ερμοῦ πρὸς
Τὸν λόγον καθολικὸς. 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. ii. 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 θεὸν λέγω νῦν, ὥστε τὸ γεννητὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον. τὸν ἀγέννητον ἐγὼ.

C. H. ii
4.4 τὸ θεὸν λέγω νῦν, ὥστε τὸ γεννητὸν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγέννητον.

Stobaeus has a δὲ which is absent in the Corpus. While this sentence would fill 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, lacks verisimilitude since the context in the Corpus makes little sense in any case. It could, however, have been omitted accidentally.

St.

C. H. ii
3.1 ἐὰν μὲν οὖν ἡ θεῖον, οὐσιαστικά, διέξασται.
5.2 ἐὰν δὲ ἡ θεός, καὶ ἀνωτάτος γεννήτων γίνεται.
5.3 ἄλλος δὲ νοητόν, οὕτως (νοητός, οὕτως λ)
5.4 νοητός γὰρ πρῶτος δὲ θεός διέξασται ἡμῖν, οἷς οὕτως.
5.5 τὸ γὰρ νοητόν τῷ νουοῦντι αἰσθήματι ὑπονεῖται.
5.6 δὲ θεός οὐκ εἰσὶν οἷς οὕτως νοητός.
5.7 ὡς γὰρ ἄλλο τι δὲν τοῦ νουομένου ἡμῖν οὕτως νοεῖται.
6.1 ἡμῖν δὲ άλλο τῷ ἐστὶ.
6.2 διὰ τούτο ἡμῖν νοεῖται (ἡμῖν δὲ... νοεῖται ο.P., B.C.N.)
6.3 εἰ δὲ νοητός δὲ τόπος, οἷς δὲ θεός, ἀλλὰ δὲ τόπος.
6.4 εἰ δὲ καὶ δὲ θεός, οἷς δὲ τόπος ἀλλὰ δὲ ἐνεργεία χωρητική.

1 Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xlii, intro.
The textual confusion in 6.3 and 6.4, as well as Puech's proposed emendation, οὐχ ὧς θεός, ἄλλ' ὧς τόπος· εἰ δὲ καὶ ὧς 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 κινοῦ 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.

The removal of the δὲ in Stobaeus' version is redactional and, as noted, typical of anthologies. ¹

In the version in the Corpus, the words δόξαν γὰρ αὕτη συγκινεῖται are explanatory; in the version in Stobaeus they are apparently to be taken as modifying τὸ κινοῦν. Stobaeus' reading is preferred by Nock. It is, however, possible that γὰρ αὕτη should be retained.

While other documents cited in the Corpus Hermeticum tend to prefer to

¹See above, p. 212.
construe ὁδὸνατον 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 ὁδὸνατον with the bare infinitive seems to be the commoner form.

St. i.19.2  
6.7 - πῶς ἦν, ὃ Ἰρισέγγειτε, τὰ ἐνθάδε συγκινεῖται τοῖς κινοῦσιν;  
C. H. ii  
6.7 - πῶς ἦν, ὃ Ἰρισέγγειτε, τὰ ἐνθάδε συγκινεῖται τοῖς κινοῦσινοις;

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 (ἀφ πλανημέναι), which, Hermes had said, were moved by the sphere of the fixed stars (ἡ ἀπλανη ἐφαίρε). (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 σφαίρας ἄρσθη τὰς πλανημένας κινεῖται ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπλανηνοῦς σφαίρας.  
6.9 - ὃδι ἦστιν αὐτῇ, ὃ ἀσυληπίε, συγκινησεῖς, ἀλλ' ἀντικινησίς (ἀλλ' ἀντικινησίς ὁμ. Π)  
C. H. ii  
6.8 τὰς γὰρ σφαίρας ἄρσθη τὰς πλανημένας κινεῖται ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπλανηνοῦς σφαίρας.  
6.9 - ὃδι ἦστιν αὐτῇ, ὃ ἀσυληπίε, 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. Anacreon 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. On the other hand, it is not surprising if Stobaeus' source, not content with this fallacious argument, should wish to emend κίνησις to συρκίνησις. The difficulty is, however, that in Stobaeus the argument as a whole makes no sense.

In this case ἑνντίσως would normally be expected; moreover, if we suppose a miniscule exemplar in which the final ζ is completely obscured, and ο is partially obscured, it is not at all difficult to see how ἑνντίσως could have become ἑνντίσαι. Therefore we may perhaps accept Stobaeus' reading here.

The erroneous reading ἑνντίσαι in Stobaeus is no doubt caused by the obliteration of the last two letters of ἑνντίσως by light manuscript damage.

---

1 See Ferguson's comment, in Scott, op. cit., IV, 361 f.
The Corpus' reading, στάσεως ἐστι φορά, 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.

Since the effect of διὸ καὶ (of) is not very different from that of αἱ ὢν 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 ἑναντιότητα. 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 Corpus at least offers a better basis for reconstruction, since it provides 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 difficulty. By what are they moved? Our difficulty is caused by the two adverbial phrases governed each by ὅπερ. If the present text is to be retained, 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 ὅπερ ἄλλα καὶ ὅπερ ἄλλα was intended to modify the verbal noun ὁμορρωτος, 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 oppositeness by the standing sphere."

In either case problems remain. In the first place, the words ὅπερ ἄλλα καὶ ὅπερ ἄλλα 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 ὅπερ τὴν ἐνυπνίδησιν ἀντίθησιν, which I have translated, "around the very oppositeness," are difficult. If ὅπερ is used in a spatial sense, "as indeed we might expect, because of ἐνυπνίδησις, 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 ἔπαινεν and perhaps also after ἔναντιστην. 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 σφάτρα; the purpose of ἔξει is completely mysterious, unless it is a fragment from Stobaeus' version of 7.3, καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν δώνατον, 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 ἔστωσαν after ἔναντιστην and with changing ἔστωσας to αὕτης.

St. 1.19.2

C. H. ii
7.3 καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν δώνατον.

This delightfully pompous verse is omitted in Stobaeus' version, whether deliberately or through scribal error.

St. 1.19.2
7.4 τὰς γὰρ ἄκτος ταύτας θὰ δράξει μὴ δυνάσθαι μὴ δεινότερον τε καὶ ἐστάναι; (οὔτε ... ἢ ἡ ῥῆσις)
κίνετοθαί, ἡ Τρισμέγιστοι.

C. H. ii
7.4 τὰς γὰρ ἄκτος ταύτας θὰ δράξει μὴ δυνάσθαι μὴ δεινότερον τε καὶ ἐστάναι; (ταύτας ἀρ. B, ἑπ. B)
κίνετοθαί, ἡ Τρισμέγιστοι.

Stobaeus' reading, οὔτε for οὔτε 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 ἡ in ἡ οὖν is unexpected in its position; it may, however, have
been displaced from after οὖν. 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 οὖν should become πῶς.

The substitution of καί for ἡ is no doubt a secondary corruption by some-
one who understood the sentence to be a vaguely religious description of
the providence of God.

St. i.19.2
7.5 - κύνης τοίον, ὦ 'Ασκληπιε; C. H. ii-
- Τὴν περὶ τὸ αὖτά διάστρεφομένην.
7.5 - κύνης τοίον, ὦ 'Ασκληπιε; - Τὴν περὶ αὖτά διάστρεφομένην.

Neither τὸ αὖτά in Stobaeus nor αὖτά in the Corpus are wholly
acceptable; we may read τὸ αὖτά with Wachsmuth.

Since στρεφομένης is used in 7.4, and since in addition στρεφο-
μένη, suits the sense better here, the reading of the Corpus should be
retained against Stobaeus' διάστρεφομένην. That is, the stars are
simply turning, not turning back.

St. i.19.2
7.6 - Ἡ δὲ περὶφορὰ ἢ περὶ τὸ αὖτά
κύνης τοίον ὄπω σταθεὶς κατεχο-
μένη (ἐποδόστησας Ἄπι)
7.6 - Ἡ δὲ περὶφορὰ τὸ αὖτά
καὶ ἢ περὶ αὖτά κύνης ὄπω
σταθεὶς κατεχομένη (περὶ τὸ
αὖτά β' ὑποδόστησας Ἀγι)

Here, as in the previous verse, an article has apparently been
omitted in the Corpus before the second αὖτά.

St. i.19.2
7.7 τὸ περὶ αὖτά καλλίει
tὸ ὑπὲρ αὖτά

C. H. ii
7.7 τὸ γὰρ περὶ αὖτά καλλίει
τὸ ὑπὲρ αὖτά καλλυμένον ὦ
tοὺς τὸ ὑπὲρ αὖτα, εἰ κάθη
tὸς τὸ περὶ αὖτά (ὑπὲρ (1. 2)
ὑπὲρ γύμνα περὶ Α; τοὺς
ομ. β')

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. 1.19.2
7.8 οὕτω καί ἡ ἑναντία φορά
Κυτηκεν ἑβρασά, ὅπως τῆς ἑναν-
tιστητος στηρίζομένη.

C. H. 11
7.8 οὕτω καί ἡ ἑναντία φορά
Κυτή ἑβρασά, ὅπως τῆς ἑναν-
tιστητος στηρίζομένη. (οὕτως
CH)

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. 1.19.2
8.1 παράδειγμα δέ σοι ἐπιστέον
τοῖς διφθαλαμοῖς ἐπιπίπτον φράσων.

C. H. 11
8.1 παράδειγμα δέ σοι τοῖς
διφθαλαμοῖς πνίπτων φράσων.

The ἐπιστέον of Stobaeus' version is redundant, but may have been added as an explanation. The reading πνίπτων 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. πνίπτω B.III.5, p. 1407, although Iamblichus construes the verb in these cases with ὅπως plus the accusative. But perhaps it is better to accept Nock's emendation, ὅποιον πράτω.²

¹So Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xli, intro.

²In addition, Prof. Kingston has pointed out to me that Stobaeus' reading, ἐπιπίπτων is likely to be an error based on ὅποιον. So also Nock, intro., p. xiii.
8.2 τα ἐπίσκεψη ἤξα, οἷον τὸν
Ἀνθρωπον λέγω, νηχόμενον θεωρησον.

Perhaps Stobaeus wrote ἐπίσκεψη for ἐπίσεια because he had used ἐπίσεια in ii.8.1. But it is ἐπίσεια which is required here. Nock defends ἐπίσκεψη 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 θεωρησον with Stobaeus or θεωρεῖ νηχόμενον with the Corpus. While the variety of readings in the Corpus could suggest that θεωρεῖ 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.

8.3 φερόμενον τοῦ γὰρ θεάτος
Αντιτυπα τῶν ποδῶν καὶ
τῶν χειρῶν στάσης γίνεται
τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τοῦ μὴ συγκατενεχθῆναι τῷ θεάτῃ.

Stobaeus' reading, φερόμενον τοῦ γὰρ for φερόμενον 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 minuscule exemplar, γὰρ τοῦ being later changed to τοῦ γὰρ on the supposition that φερόμενον modified ἀνθρώπου in the previous verse, or γὰρ τοῦ was accidentally changed to τοῦ γὰρ, with a later scribe taking

\(^1\) Nock, in Nock-Festugièrè, op. cit., p. xliii.
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 infinitive\(^1\) or the infinitive with the neuter genitive singular of the definite article\(^2\) 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. 1.19.2
8.4 - Σαφές τὸ παράδειγμα, ὑπρισμηγίστε.

Stobaeus' reading, σαφές τὸ παράδειγμα, is much crisper, although the reading of the Corpus, σαφέστατον παράδειγμα εἶπες, υπρισμηγίστε, 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. 1.19.2
8.5 - Πάοα οὖν κινήσει ἐν στάσει καὶ ὁποιά τάσεως κινεῖται.

The reading in Stobaeus, of course, results from an incorrect interpretation of an unaccented text.

---

\(^1\)Schwyzer-Debrunner, op. cit., p. 363.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 372.

St. 1.19.2
8.6 οὐχ ἢ κίνησις τοῦ κόσμου
καὶ παντὸς ἢς ζώου ὄλικον
οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν κατ’ ἐκτὸς
tοῦ σώματος συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι,

C. H. 11
8.6 οὐχ ἢ κίνησις τοῦ κόσμου
καὶ παντὸς ἢς ζώου ὄλικον...
οὐχ ὑπὸ τῶν κατ’ ἐκτὸς
tοῦ κόσμου συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι,
(κίνησις τοῦ ζώου A)

The ἢ after παντὸς which Stobaeus omits may be in error for ὢν.
If so, then καὶ παντὸς ἢς ἢς ζώου ὄλικον is added as an after-thought, the
real subject of discussion being the motion of the κόσμου. 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 re-
ligious 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
eἰς τὸ κατ’ ἐκτὸς, τῶν νοητῶν,
ψυχῆς ἢ πνεύματος ἢ ἄλλου
tινὸς σωμάτου. (τοῦ πνεύματος F)

C. H. 11
8.7 ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐντὸς
eἰς τὸ κατ’ ἐκτὸς, ἢς ὢν
ψυχῆς ἢ πνεύματος ἢ ἄλλου
tινὸς σωμάτου.

The reading τῶν νοητῶν in Stobaeus appears to be a marginal
gloss which has managed to expel ἢς ὢν in the version of the Corpus.

St. 1.19.2
8.8 σῶμα γὰρ ἐμφυσάντον οὖν
κινεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ τὸ σύνολον
σῶμα, κἂν ἢ ὑποκειται

C. H. 11
8.8 σῶμα γὰρ σῶμα ἐμφυσάντον οὖν
κινεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὅσπερ τὸ σύνολον
σῶμα, κἂν ἢ ὑποκειται.

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 ἢς ὢν after κινεῖ 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 3.6.

St. 1.19.2
9.1 - ἵστο τοῦτο λέγεις, δι'
ΤΡΙΜΕΣΙΤΕ;
9.2 τὰ ὄνειρα καὶ τοὺς
λύθοις καὶ τὰ πάντα Ἑρωκα
οὐ σώματι ἔστιν;

C. H. 11
9.1 - ἵστο τοῦτο λέγεις, δι'
ΤΡΙΜΕΣΙΤΕ;
9.2 τὰ ὄνειρα καὶ τοὺς λύ-
θοις καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα Ἑρωκα
οὐ σώματι ἔστιν τὰ κινοῦται;

In this instant neither version makes sense. In Stobaeus' version, τοὺς λύθοις has no grammatical relation to its context. In the version of the C. H., Ἑρωκα does not make sense; since sticks and stones are not usually conceived of as having souls. Nock would solve this latter problem by reading Ἑρωκα with Stobaeus but retaining τὰ κι-
νοῦται from the Corpus. This is conceivable; it is also possible that a word has been omitted in the Corpus after Ἑρωκα, as for example, Ἑρωκα ἄγωμεν. 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 sug-

St. 1.19.2
9.3 - ὃδεμας, ἀναληπτική

C. H. 11
9.3 - ὃδεμας, ἀναληπτική
(ὁδεμάς om. AC)

In Stobaeus' text, ἀδ is omitted, no doubt by error.

St. 1.19.2
9.4 τὸ γὰρ ἐνδόν τοῦ σώματος
τοῦ κινοῦντος τὸ ὄμολον, οὗ
ὁμα ἐκεῖνο ἐστὶ τὸ ἄκριτον κι
νοῦν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ ἐστιν τοῦ
ματαλαμένου (ΜΑΤΑΛΑΜΕΝΟΝ ΠΡΟ)

C. H. 11
9.4 τὸ γὰρ ἐνδόν τοῦ σώματος
τοῦ κινοῦντος τὸ ὄμολον, οὗ
ὁμα ἐκεῖνο ἐστὶ τὸ ἄκριτον κι
νοῦν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ ματαλαμένος
καὶ τὸ τοῦ ματαλαμένου.
Although 9.4 is the same (except for a clear blunder, βαστάλιοντα, in Stobaeus' FP), 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. i.19.2
9.5 διότερον ἡμνυχον οὐκ ἡμνυχον
κινήσει.

C. H. II
9.5 διότερον ἡμνυχον τῷ καθεύδον,
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 homoeaceton 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. i.19.2
9.6 ὅρης γοὺν καὶ βαρυνομένην
τὴν ψυχὴν, ἦταν δύο
οὐματα φέρετι. (φέρετ P2: φέρετi FP)

C. H. ii
9.6 ὅρης οὖν καταβαρομένην
τὴν ψυχὴν, ἦταν μόνη δύο
οὐματα φέρετι.

I suspect that γοὺν 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 γοὺν are relatively rare in the documents.
of the Corpus Hermeticum, although γον occurs in xii.8(177.5), and γε in vi.4(75.1), viii.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 ἐγ γε for ἦν τι in iv.10.5.)

In the same sentence, Stobaeus' καὶ for καὶ is clearly an error, and could have been caused either by a misunderstood abbreviation or by a partially obliterated ἹΑ in καὶ.

As for the remainder of the words, both κατοβαρέω and κατοβαρύνω 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. ii  
9.7 καὶ δει μὲν ἐν τινι κινεῖται τα κινοῦμενα καὶ ὅπω τινος, ἔμοιν.

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. ii  
10.1 - ἐν ἐκείνῳ δὲ δεῖ κινεῖσθαι τα κινοῦμενα, ὡς ἡρακλεῖος.

As noted above, p. 40, Flussas correctly reads κενῷ for ἐκείνῳ in this verse.

St.  
C. H. ii  
10.2 - ἂν φῦς, ὡς ἀκολούθει.
Whether or not we accept Parthey's emendation of ἑσπρεκτη for εὑ ρης 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 ἢ is an intolerably weak continuation after ἑσπρεκτη. If ἑσπρεκτη were the original reading, then οὐδὲν ἢ would be expected. Therefore Nock, who accepts Parthey's emendation, also follows Stobaeus in reading οὐδὲν ἢ 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 ἢ in οὐδὲν ἢ refers back to 10.2, which he does not use, he or his source may have substituted οὐδὲν ἢ for οὐδὲν ἢ in order to suppress evidence of the context. (The οὐδὲν in οὐδὲν ἢ is not by this time a conjunction; rather, οὐδὲν ἢ is an emphatic form of οὐδὲν. See C. H. vi.2(73.9) and C. H. xii.15(180.13) for similar instances.)

St. i.18.3  C. H. ii
10.3 οὐδὲν ἢ τῶν ὑπò τῶν ἑσπρέκτη λόγων· 10.3 οὐδὲν ἢ τῶν ὑπò τῶν λόγων·
Χενόν τού τῆς ὑπομνήσεως λόγων·

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. i.18.3  C. H. ii
10.4 τὸ δὲ ἢν ὁδὸν ἀληθεύεται εἶναι ἢν, εἰ μὴ μετά τῶν ὑπò τῆς ὑπομνήσεως ἤν·
10.4 μόνον ἢ τὸ μὴ ἢν ἑκάτερον·
Χενόν τού τῆς ὑπομνήσεως·

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.

If Stobaeus' version of 10.4 were correct, we would expect this verse to read τὸ οὖν όπαρχον κάτι

No doubt κανά was omitted accidentally in the manuscript tradition of the Corpus.

οἷον κάθος καὶ κέραμος καὶ λυνότας καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ παραπλησία.
Stobaeus' version here is undoubtedly the more elegant. In the version in the *Corpus*, the opening words, ἔστι τοιαῦτα, are redundant; moreover, the repeated κενὸς is quite monotonous, although the author may have been striving for rhetorical effect; furthermore, the words ὁμοίως ἔλος dissipate the argument, since they are plainly irrelevant. Ferguson believes that these words may have been inserted for ληνὸς κενὸς; he thinks that whoever added them may have been thinking of another argument. 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 - ἔστι τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης, Ἀσκληπιεῖ. (στάνης F)  
10.9 τὰ μίλλον πληρέστατα καὶ μεσοτάτα, ταύτα κενὰ ἡμῖν εἶναι;

C. H. ii
10.8 - ἔστι τῆς πολλῆς πλάνης, Ἀσκληπιεῖ.  
10.9 τὰ μίλλον πληρέστατα καὶ μέγιστα δύνα, ταύτα ἡμῖν κενὰ εἶναι;

In the C. H., μέγιστα was written for μεσοτάτα because of the similarity of the two words. We may, following Nock, retain δύνα from the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus*. In the same verse, ἡμῖν appears to have become dislocated in the text of Stobaeus.

St. i.18.3
11.1 - Πῶς λέγεις, ὁ Τρισιμέγιστε;  
11.2 - ὃδ' οὖμε ἔστιν ὁ δῆρ; - Σύμα.

C. H. ii
11.1 - Πῶς λέγεις, ὁ Τρισιμέγιστε;  
11.2 - ὃδ' οὖμε ἔστιν ὁ δῆρ;
Although the variation here is slight, it has the appearance of being the result of deliberate activity, since the removal or addition of οὖ 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 - Τούτο δὲ τα σῶμα οὐ διά πάντων διήκει τῶν ὄντων καὶ πάντα διήκον πληροῖ; 11. 4 σῶμα δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν τεσσαρῶν κεκραμένον συνεστήσθη;

C. H. ii
11. 3 τούτο δὲ τα σῶμα οὐ διά πάντων διήκει τῶν ὄντων καὶ πάντα διήκον πληροῖ; 11. 4 σῶμα δὲ οὐκ ἐκ τῶν σωμάτων κεκραμένον; (ἐκ σωμάτων)

The version of the Corpus gives offence because σῶμα is used in two different senses. In Stobaeus' version this offence is removed by substituting τεσσαρῶν for σωμάτων. In any case, what is intended is τῶν τεσσαρῶν σωμάτων.

While συνεστήσθη 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 μεστὰ οὖν πάντα λόγῳ, ή σφίς κενά, τοῦ δέρος.

(μεστὰ: δὲ μεστὰ F)

C. H. ii
11. 5 μεστὰ οὖν λογία τῶν πάντων, ή σφίς κενά, τοῦ δέρος.

(οὐ om. ABC)

While πάντα before λόγῳ, 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.
The reading μετά for μεστά is, of course, clearly impossible, even though it appears both in Μ and in Stobaeus. Coincidence cannot be ruled out here; it is to be noted that in 11.5, μεστά becomes μετά in codex P of Stobaeus. The error will, moreover, have been facilitated by the τοῦτο immediately following, since μετά τοῦτο 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, μεστά, could very easily be a correction.

In the same sentence, the manuscripts omit ἐκείνων. In addition, ΒC changes στενοχωρομένων and ἐκόντων to στενοχωροµένα and έχοντα respectively. It is to be freely admitted that it is ΒC’s reading which is grammatically correct. However, I would retain ἐκείνων 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. Η. ιι is likely to have been written; cf. C. Η. 1.7(9.4), εἰσενεχθείς τῷ ἐπὶ πλείονα χρόνον δνωθήσε μοι. Moreover, it would be difficult to account for Μ’s reading on the basis of ΒC’s reading. We could, to be sure, account for στενοχωρομένων on the basis of attraction by
the preceding σωμάτων. However, this would not account for the subsequent ἔχοντων. 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 ἔχοντων is easily accounted for on the basis of inattention.

In the same sentence we should retain τὸνον with the Corpus rather than τοῦτον. If τοῦτον were accepted, it would modify ἔρα.

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 ἔρα.

St. 1.18.3  
11.9 τὰ τινὰ ὄν ὃ σὺ φῆς,  
κολα δεῖ δνομάζειν,  
οδ κενά.

C. H. II  
11.9 τὰ τινὰ ὃν ὃ σὺ φῆσ εἶναι  
κενά, κολα δεῖ δνομάζειν,  
οδ 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 ὅπερκει γὰρ μεσω ἐστιν  
ἀναρητικός καὶ πνευματικός.

C. H. II  
11.10 ὅπερκει γὰρ καὶ μεσω ἐστιν ἀναρητικός καὶ πνευματικός.

In the Corpus, ὅπερκει 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 ὅπερκει, the dative of ὑπερκεῖ.

St. 1.18.3  
12.1 - Ἀπαντηρητος ὁ λόγος, ὁ  
Τριεμέγιστος, (ἐπαντηρητὸς Πτ)  

C. H. II  
12.1 - Ἀναντηρητος λόγος, ὁ  
Τριεμέγιστος ὁ λόγος, Β θ ὁ  
σωμάτιν ὃ ἔστιν ὃ ἔρα  
τῷ ἔστιν ὃ ὄμοι ὃ νῦν πάντων  
διήκει τῶν ἐν τούτων καὶ πάντα  
ὑποτιμών πληροῖ.

Presumably ὃ 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 ὁ Τριψιμέγιος. 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. 1.18.3
12.2 τὸν ὅν τὸν ἔν ὁ κινεῖται τὸ τέλει, το εὔπομεν,
ἄσματον, Ἀσκληπίε.

C. H. 11
12.2 τὸν ὅν τὸν ὅν ἔν ὁ κινεῖται, το εὔπομεν;
ἄσματον, Ἐσκληπιε.

It seems best to retain τὸ τέλει with Stobaeus, since the words seem to be used in the sense of "the universe." We may, however, following Nock, retain τὸν after τὸν with the Corpus. Either τὸν κινεῖται or κινεῖται τὸ τέλει is permissible. I prefer the deliberative εὔπομεν given in the Corpus to εὔπομεν of Stobaeus.¹ Perhaps ὁ before Ἐσκληπιε was omitted accidentally in Stobaeus' version.

St. 1.18.3
12.3 - τὸν ὅν ἀσματὸν ἐστι;

C. H. 11
12.3 - τὸν ὅν ἀσματὸν ἐστι;

Τὸ 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.
Presumably λόγος for θλος is a substitution due to absentmindedness. It is Stobaeus' reading here which makes sense.

No doubt ἐλευθερον in the Corpus is an error. The reading δυνης in the Corpus could have been changed to ἄρχης within the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus because it is a relatively uncommon word, while ἄρχης is fairly common. Alternately, Stobaeus' source could have changed δυνης to ἄρχης 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 σωματι καὶ in the version of the Corpus is to be retained, since it would be difficult to account for their insertion.

The omission of ἐν in the Corpus, as the omission of τῶν by Stobaeus, are probably accidental. Since συγχρητικός given by Stobaeus' codex F lacks the support of Stobaeus' P, and since Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1669, s. v. συγχρητικός 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.
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* ΤΩ ΔΡΧΕΤΤΟΝ ΦΩΣ and Stobaeus' ΤΩ ΔΡΧΕΤΤΟΝ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ. 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 ΦΩΣ, Wachsmuth's choice, is better, since the replacement of ΦΩΣ by ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ, as the replacement of ΟΘΕΡ by ΟΘΕΡ earlier in the sentence, have the effect of muting the realism of the version of the *Corpus*.

In addition, Stobaeus reads ΤΩΤΩ ΟΛΩ ΔΙ ΛΩΛΗΝ where the *Corpus*
reads ΩΛΩ ΘΕΟΣ ΔΙ ΛΩΛΗΝ. 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 ΤΩ ΔΩΛΑΤΟΝ is somehow intermediary between God and the κόσμος.
St. 1.18.3
12.9 - 'Ὁ μὴ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὦν,
ὅτι καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τούτων
αἵτιος ὦν καὶ πάσι καὶ ἐν ἕκαστῳ
τῶν ὄντων πάντων.'

C. H. 11
12.9 - 'Ὁ μὴ δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὄντων ὄντων
ὅτι καὶ τοῦ εἶναι τούτων
αἵτιος καὶ πάσι καὶ ἐπὶ ἕκαστῳ
μέρει εἰρ' ἕκαστον τοῦτων τῶν
ὄντων πάντων.' (εἶναι ταῦτα Β; ἐπ' ἕκαστον ομ. Β')

No doubt manuscript damage was responsible for ὦν in place of ὄντων in Stobaeus' version. The insertion of ὄντων after αἵτιος in his version is very difficult to explain, unless we suppose that someone had forgotten the previous ὦν before δὲ καὶ τοῦ εἶναι.

Stobaeus' reading, τοῦτων for τοῖς seems preferable, and would be a dative of reference depending on αἵτιος: "responsible for the existence of these."

Stobaeus' ὦν and ἔντι in the Corpus are both inadmissible; Patritius' conjecture, ἔντι, would be explainable on the basis of both readings.

I would take the insertion of μέρει and the insertion of ἐπ' ἕκαστον τοῦτων as two separate glosses, both attempting to make sense of the impossible ἔντι ἕκαστῷ 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.
These verses clearly were not omitted by Stobaeus himself, since they are admirably suited to the purpose of his first chapter, entitled, θεία θεώς δημιουργίας τῶν θυσίων 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.

Why Stobaeus' source would have added σώματι, which weakens ἄλλη τινὶ, I am unable to explain. Perhaps they were omitted in error in the Corpus.

The reading of the Corpus here cannot be retained. The abbreviation of ἄνω and ὠνδ is easily confused; moreover, the final το of τῶν could have been repeated in error. As it stands, the text of the
Corpus is nonsense.

St. 1.1.30
1.5 ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὄν,
μόνη ἐναυτῷ τούτῳ ἀναθεῖναι
ἡθλήσει καὶ τὴν γνὴν κοσμησάι
(ἀναθήματι F)

C. H. iv
1.5 ἀγαθὸς γὰρ,
μόνη γὰρ τούτῳ ἀναθείκειν,
ἡθλήσει καὶ τὴν γνὴν κοσμῆσαι,
(ἡθλησέν Α; κοσμησείς ΒΧΘ)
2.1 κόσμων δὲ θεοῦ σώματος
κατέσπευξε τὸν ἄνθρωπον κτλ.
(καὶ κατέσπευξε Λ)

Nock, following Zielinski, inserts οδ before μόνη, understanding ἀναθείκειν 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; ἀναθείκειν or ἀναθείκειν here can be understood in the sense of "attribute." In that case, this sentence expresses the same sentiment as C. H. iv: God alone is good.

In the Corpus, ἀναθείκειν lacks a direct object. We may perhaps, following Patritius, supply this in the light of Stobaeus, and read, μόνη γὰρ τούτῳ ἐαυτῷ ἀναθείκειν. 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 (κοσμῆσαι) even the earth, and as the ornament (κόσμως) 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 ἢ γὰρ μονᾶς, οἱ τῶν πάντων
ἀρχῆ καὶ βίσα, ἐν πάσιν ἔστιν
ὡς ἄν βίσα καὶ ἀρχῆ,
(C. H. iv
10.3 ἢ γὰρ μονᾶς, οἱ τῶν πάντων
ἀρχῆ καὶ βίσα καὶ ἀρχῆ οὖσα,
(πάντων οὖσα Μ)

As noted above, p. 48, a line has dropped out of the text of the Corpus, no doubt because of the repeated βίσα. We may, as indicated,
retain ὰδνα from the Corpus.

St. 1.10.15
10.4 ἅνευ δὲ ἀρχὴς οδεδήν,
10.5 ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐξ οδεδέος, διάτη
ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἐν γ' ἀρχῇ ἐστι τῶν
ἐτέρων.

C. H. iv
10.4 ἅνευ δὲ ἀρχὴς οδεδήν,
10.5 ἀρχὴ δὲ ἐξ οδεδέος η
ἐξ αὐτῆς, ἐν γ' ἀρχῇ ἐστι τῶν
ἐτέρων.

Here we should read, with the Corpus, ἦ for διάτη, and ἐν γ' for ἐν γ'. The particle γ' 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

μονδις ὀφαὶ οὖν ἀρχὴ πάντα
ἀριθμὸν ἐμπεριέχει, ὅποι
μηδενος ἐμπεριεχομένην

C. H. iv
10.6 αὐτὴ γ' ἐπὶ ἑστὶν, ἐπεί
μὴ ἄλλης ἀρχῆς ἐτέκεν, ὦδνα
μονδς, οὖν ἀρχὴ καὶ πάντα
ἀριθμὸν ἐμπεριέχει, ὅποι
μηδενος ἐμπεριεχομένη

(ἡ ἀρχὴ δ')

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: μονδις ὀφαὶ is substituted for ὀφαὶ μονδς, and καὶ is removed.

St. 1.10.15
10.7 καὶ πάντα ἀριθμὸν γεννᾷ
ὅποι μηδενος γεννημένη ἐτέρου
ἄριθμοι.

C. H. iv
10.7 καὶ πάντα ἀριθμὸν γεννᾷ
ὅποι μηδενος γεννημένη ἐτέρου
ἄριθμοι (γεννημένη ἀτ' γεννημένην)

C. H. iv
11.1 πἀν δὲ τὸ γεννημένον
ἀνελεις καὶ διαίρετον καὶ
ἀδελφόν καὶ μειωτόν η

'Ἀδίαιρετον is clearly an error, and was perhaps precipitated by ἄνελεις.

St. 1.10.15
11.2 τὸ δὲ τελεσφ οὐδὲν τούτων

γίγνεται.

C. H. iv
11.2 τὸ δὲ τελεσφ οὐδὲν τούτων

γίγνεται.

Here Stobaeus Atticizes Hermes in reading γίγνεται for γίγνεται.
It is difficult to see why these verses should have been omitted.

Stobaeus' source turns 11.5 into a conclusion by inserting ὅπως
He then associates ὅπως more closely in position with ὑπογεγραμμέναι.

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, ἡδὲ ἀρχῶν καὶ στοιχεῖων τοῦ παντός, or whether they were offensive to Stobaeus' source. I believe, however, that a pattern begins to emerge in the next excerpt.
These three verses, which contain a clear reference to the Herm- 
etic 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 peri ψυχής. I suspect 
that they were omitted for religious reasons, and that they were offen-
sive on religious grounds to Stobaeus' source. Reasons for this sus-
picion will become apparent in the discussion of x.7.11.

Probably αίτε for αύται in the Corpus is an error. The reading 
δονενεμημέναι for δονενεμημέναι in Stobaeus is probably an error 
caused by the misreading of a miniscule exemplar.

Perhaps ὰι was omitted accidentally in the Corpus. However, είς 
twice for ἐν in Stobaeus is deliberate, and was attracted by the repe-
tition of είς in the succeeding verses.
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 γὰρ, and therefore presumably regards this passage as corroborative detail.

Here and in x.7.10, Stobaeus' source prefers the active forms of μεταβαλλω to the middle or passive forms used by the Corpus. It will be seen from Liddell-Scott-Jones, p. 1110 s. v. μεταβαλλω, A.3111 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 Ἐκνύρωι εἰς χειροσία,
C. H. x 7.7 αἱ δὲ τῶν ἐνύρων εἰς χειροσία,

Stobaeus may have written Ἐκνύρωι for τῶν ἐνύρων in order to make these sentences conform to a single pattern.

St. i.49.48 7.8 αἱ δὲ χειροσίαι εἰς πετεινά,
C. H. x 7.8 αἱ δὲ χειροσίαι 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 δέριαι εἰς ἀνθρώπους,
7.10 αἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπους αἱ δραχύν δέοιν

C. H. x 7.9 αἱ δὲ δέριαι εἰς ἀνθρώπους,
7.10 αἱ δὲ ἀνθρώπους δέοιν 

δαίμονας ἔκχουσιν εἰς δαίμονας μεταβαλλούσιν.

As in 7.6, Stobaeus changes a middle or passive form of μεταβαλλω, 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 ἀνθρώπος and ἄνθρωπος, either could be original. Doubtless ἔκχουσιν for ἔκχουσι 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 εἶτ' ὑπὸ οὕτως εἰς τὸν τῶν θεῶν χώρον

C. H. x
7.11 εἶτ' οὕτως εἰς τὸν θεῶν χόρον χορεύοντος.

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. 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 χώρον ὑπὸ θεῶν, ὥ μὲν τῶν πλαναμένων, ὥ μὲν 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 χώρον, the accusative singular, doubtless attracted by the preceding word.

St. 1.49.48
8.1 καὶ αὐτή ψυχής ὑπὸ τελεῖοτάτης δόξας,
8.2 ψυχή δὲ εἰς ἀνθρώπου λειτουργία εἰς εὐελπίδια, όπως τεῦθεν τὰ διαναισθάλει.

C. H. x
8.1 καὶ αὐτή ψυχής ὑπὸ τελειοτάτης δόξας.
8.2 ψυχή εἰς ἀνθρώπου σώμα εἰς εὐελπίδια, όπως τεῦθεν διαναισθάλει.

---

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, Polymantres, p. 70, n. 2.)
The lack of a connective in 8.2 gives the impression that the ὅμω 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, ὃς was omitted accidentally in the Corpus.

On the other hand, the reading εἰς ἀνθρώπου θῶμος 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 θῶμος were obscured in a manuscript in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus; if so, the first three letters of εἰςαλθοῦσα may also have been obscured.

Stobaeus' reading of τυμήτοι for γεύται could be accidental, caused by a confusion (in uncial) of T and Γ. The omission of οὐκ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μεταλλαγμένοι, however, looks deliberate, since it is obscured by changing οὐκ into οὐποτε. 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 παλαιωρτος ὃς τὴν δόξαν ὑποστρέφει τὴν ἐν τῇ ἔρπετα, C. H. x 8.3 παλαιωρτος τὴν δόξαν ὑποστρέφει τὴν εἰς τῇ ἔρπετα, (παλαιώρτος ὃς ὅτι)

I would prefer the reading of the Corpus here, παλαιωρτος, although it would be a ἔρμα λεγόμενον. Undoubtedly a case could be made for either reading. So also εἰς 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 ἀβθη καταδίκη ψυχῆς κακῆς. 8.5 κακὰ δὲ ψυχῆς ἁγνωστά.
C. H. x
8.4 καὶ ἀβθη καταδίκη ψυχῆς κακῆς. 8.5 κακὰ δὲ ψυχῆς ἐστὶν ἡ ἁγνωστά.

Stobaeus' version is undoubtedly crisper, but may be the result of an attempt to emend the text.

St. i.49.48
8.6 ψυχὴ γὰρ, μηδὲν ἔπιγινόσσα τῶν ἄντων, μηδὲ τῶν τούτων φύσιν, μηδὲ τὸ ἄγαθὸν,
C. H. x
8.6 ψυχὴ γὰρ, μηδὲν γινόσσα τῶν ἄντων, μηδὲ τὴν τούτων φύσιν, μηδὲ τὸ ἄγαθὸν,

Since ἔπιγινόσσα is a less common word than γινόσσα, it seems best to read ἔπιγινόσσα here with Stobaeus, assuming that ἐπι- became lost either through carelessness or through manuscript damage.

St. i.49.48
8.7 τυρπλάττουσα δὲ ἐντινάσσει τοῖς σωματικοῖς πάθεσις,
C. H. x
8.7 τυρπλάττουσα ἐντινάσσει τοῖς πάθεσι τοῖς σωματικοῖς, (ἐντινάσσει ὙῚ)

While the δὲ in Stobaeus is unnecessary, it cannot be ruled out. Since either τοῖς σωματικοῖς πάθεσι or τοῖς πάθεσι 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 κακοδαμίαν, ἀγνοφοῦσα οὐαυτὴν, δουλεύει σώματι, σωματικῶν ἀλλοκότων καὶ μοχθηροῖς,
C. H. x
8.8 καὶ ἡ κακοδαμίαν, ἀγνοφοῦσα οὐαυτὴν, δουλεύει σώματι, σωματικῶν ἀλλοκότων καὶ μοχθηροῖς,
8.9 ὅπερ φορτὶν βαστάζουσα τὸ σῶμα καὶ ὅλα 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, οδ καταρχουσι may be corrupt for οδείς τρχουσι (Heineke). This may be; but if so the sense of οδείς here is obscure.

St. 1.49.48
8.10 αὐτῇ κατὰ Ψυχής (καταδίκη ρκ)

C. H. x
8.10 αἰτὴ κακία Ψυχῆς.
9.1 τοῦ τιτανοῦν ἐκ ἀρχῆς Ψυχῆς γνώσις κτλ.

In 8.10, κατά for κακία is clearly an error, and probably due either to inattention or to the misreading of a partially obscured manuscript.

The chapter immediately following in the Corpus is not irrelevant 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 γνώσις of God and the nature of the ineffable God.

St. 1.47.9
12.1

C. H. x
12.1 Καὶ δὲ μὲν κόσμος πρῶτος,

This verse could have been omitted in Stobaeus because it is irrelevant to the chapter in Stobaeus, περὶ φύσεως ἄνθρωπων. 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 nature of the κόσμος in this chapter.

St. 1.47.9
12.2 ὁ μὲν ἀνθρώπος τῷ δεύτερον ἱσόν μετὰ τῶν κόσμων, πρῶτον δὲ τῶν θεῶν.

C. H. x
12.2 ὁ δὲ ἀνθρώπος δεύτερον ἱσόν μετὰ τῶν κόσμων, πρῶτον δὲ τῶν θεῶν, (πρῶτος d)

1Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xliii.
Stobaeus’ source disguises the omission of 12.1 by changing δὲ to μὴν. Unfortunately the μὴν 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 δεύτερον ἢ οὐν is to be retained, with Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.9
12.3 ἔχει
12.4 οὐκέτι δὲ μὴν οὐκ ἄγαθος ἀλλὰ κακὸς ἢ κακὸς
12.5 δὲ μὴν γὰρ κόσμος οὐκ ἄγαθος ἢ κακὸς ἢ κακὸς ἢ κακὸς
12.6 δὲ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ κόσμος καὶ ὁ κόσμος

While 12.3 may have been omitted simply on the grounds that it is extremely obscure, 12.4-6 contains a view of the κόσμος which Stobaeus’ source may have found unacceptable, that is, the κόσμος, while not evil, is also not good.

St. 1.47.9
13.1 ψυχὴ δὲ ἄνθρωποι ἄχειται τῶν τρόπων τούτων
13.2 δὲ νοῦς ἐν τῷ λόγῳ, δὲ λόγος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, ἢ δὲ ψυχὴ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ ἢ ἐν τῷ
πνεύματι

This passage has been discussed above, p. 65. I would read, with Turnebus and Wachsmuth, ἢ ψυχὴ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ σώματι.

Stobaeus’ source may have found the last words, <τὸ πνεῦμα ἐν τῷ σώματι>, redundant in view of 13.3, immediately following.

St. 1.47.9
13.3 τὸ πνεῦμα, διήκον διὰ φιλεῖν καὶ ἀρνητῶν καὶ αἰματος κινεῖ τὸ ἢδον καὶ ἰδίπερ τρόπων τινά βαστάζει. (διοικον Ρ)
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 διό καὶ τίνες τὴν ψυχὴν αἷμα νομίζουσιν εἶναι, σφιγγο-
μενοι τὴν φώσιν,

C. H. x
13.4 διό καὶ τίνες τὴν ψυχὴν αἷμα ἑνώμενος εἶναι, σφιγγο-
μενοι τὴν φώσιν, (σφιγμένοι
Ἀθηνᾶ τῆς φώσιν ομ. Ν)

The ἑνώμενος 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 οἷς εἰδότες ὅτι πρῶτον ὃ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἀναχωρήσαντος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τὸ αἷμα παγήναι καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθέντος τὸ ἱερὸν καταλείπειν

C. H. x
13.5 οἷς εἰδότες ὅτι πρῶτον ὃ ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος ἀναχωρήσαντος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ τὸ τὸ αἷμα παγήναι καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθέντος ἢ τὸ τὸ ἱερὸν καταλείπειν (τὸ ἔτσι ἀντέ αἷμα καὶ τὰς ἀντέ ἀρτηρίας ομ. Α)

Presumably Stobaeus' ὃ for ὃ 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 τῶν by means of the genitive absolute, τοῦ πνεύματος ἀναχωρήσαντος. However, it is difficult to see the function of καὶ τὰς φλέβας καὶ τὰς ἀρτηρίας κενωθέντος 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 τὸν χαμομήν, but the final infinitive lacks a suitable subject. Festugière translates, "cēla fasse pērīr le vivant." Presumably "cēla" refers to the activity in the first part of the sentence. Perhaps καθαρσθῆναι 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 ἐστι θάνατος τού 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  C. H. x
16.1 τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει καὶ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος ἐξείουσιν.
16.2 διαδραμώσας γὰρ ἡ ψυχὴ εἰς ταύτην, συστέλλεται τὸ πνεῦμα εἰς τὸ σῶμα, ἐκ τῇ ψυχῆς εἰς τὸ πνεῦμα, (ἀναδραμώσας γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς) 16.3 δὲ νοῦς καθαρὸς γενεσιμένος τῶν ἐνδυμάτων, θείος θὸν παύει, σώματος πυρίζου λαβόμενος περιπολεῖ πίνακες τῶν,
16.4 καταλείπει τὴν ψυχὴν κράσει καὶ τῇ κατέξερεν ἀκόμη.

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.
Stobaeus’ reading, ἰδέωμα, is likely to be merely an accidental substitution of a relatively common word for a relatively uncommon word.

The omission of ὠ and the substitution of συμπενείν for συμπενεῖν could both be the result of mere inattention.

Stobaeus’ source may have found the ὡ τέκνον in this sentence redundant. In addition, γίνεται has become γίνεται through Atticism.

Perhaps we should retain τὴν before τῆλικατίν with Stobaeus, since the article is also used before τοιαύτην in the same sentence.
Probably since the aorist ἐνεγκαίν is used earlier in the same sentence, it would be best to read ἀνασχέσσαι with Stobaeus for ἀνεχέσσαι. No doubt συγχρωματιζόμενον in the Corpus is an easy error for συγχρωματιζόμενον. Finally, Stobaeus' οὖν makes more sense in the context than οὖν in the Corpus, although οὖν could be tolerated if it is taken as referring back to νοῦν in 17.3.

\[St. \text{ i.68.3} \]
17.5 ἐλαβὲν ὥσπερ περιβολαῖον τὴν ψυχὴν
\[C. \text{ H. x} \]
17.5 ἐλαβὲν οὖν ὥσπερ περιβολαῖον τὴν ψυχὴν

Probably οὖν is omitted in Stobaeus through an oversight. Since there appears to be little difference in meaning between περιβολαῖον and περιβολαίον, 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.

\[St. \text{ i.68.3} \]
17.6 ἂ δὲ ψυχὴ καὶ αὕτη τίς θέσα ὥσα καθάπερ ὑπηρέτη τ̄ τ̄ πνεύματι χρήται· (ὑπηρέτη Π̄ οὐρετού Π̄ οὐρετείς Π̄)
\[C. \text{ H. x} \]
17.6 ἂ δὲ ψυχὴ καὶ αὕτη ἡθέσα τ̄ς ὥσα καθάπερ οἰ περὶ τ̄ π̄ πνεύματι χρήται·

Presumably τίς is to be construed with θέσα. While it could in this case either precede θέσα as in Stobaeus, or follow it, as in the Corpus, the latter position is more common. I believe that τίς may have been accidentally displaced in Stobaeus.

While ὑπηρέτη in Stobaeus' Π̄ may be a conjecture, it is demanded by the sense here, and moreover is suggested by the erroneous readings of Π̄ and Π̄; in any case, of περὶ, the reading of the Corpus, is meaningless.

Finally, αὕτη is wrongly accented in the Corpus.
Stobaeus here omits οὐν either in error or because he found it redundant.

Stobaeus' reading, ἡδύναστο, is an Atticism; see Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., intro., p. xlii.

It is difficult to decide here whether γη was inserted by Stobaeus' source to clarify the sense or whether it was accidentally omitted within the manuscript tradition of the Corpus.

The shift of καὶ in Stobaeus need not be a scribal error, but may be an attempt to improve the style of the passage.
A scribal error is undoubtedly responsible for οὐς in place of νοῦς in the Corpus. Stobaeus' source may, however, have added ἔ and removed τὸν in order to improve the style of the passage. An article may have been omitted in the Corpus before θεῖαν νομιμάζων. Scott, perhaps correctly, accepts τὸ δέκατον from Stobaeus and οὕτω τῷ πῦρ, from the Corpus, translating "has for its body fire, the keenest of all the material elements."

Stobaeus' source may have added ό νοῦς as a gloss. It is doubtful, however, whether πᾶντας τῶν ὁμορφῶν, in the Corpus can be retained. Normally the singular ὁμορφὸς 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 ὄς in x.8.1.2 Moreover, the substitution of the ὁμορφῶν for ὁμορφαὶ can be explained, since the two words

---


2Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, p. 242.
have many letters in common, and therefore could be confused by an in-attentive scribe. Perhaps πάντων τῶν for τῶν πάντων is a secondary error, or a correction of the text based on this misreading.

St. 1.48.3
18.10 καὶ δὲ μὲν τοῦ πάντως τῶν πάντων, ὥς ὡς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς μόνον

C. H. x
18.10 καὶ δὲ μὲν τοῦ πάντως τῶν πάντων, ὥς ὡς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς μόνον.

We may possibly ascribe Stobaeus’ version of this verse to de-liberate alteration. The text in the Corpus postulates a separate γῆς in man which creates all earthly things, (τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς πάντων), whereas the text in Stobaeus insists that the γῆς in man creates only things on earth (τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς μόνον). This is a difference in emphasis.

St. 1.48.3
18.11 γῆς γὰρ ἐν τού πυρός, ὥς ὡς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ ἐπὶ ἐπιγέγραφος νοῶς ἀμυνατή τὰ θεῖα δημιουργεῖν, ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ ὀλίγησει.

C. H. x
18.11 γῆς γὰρ ἐν τού πυρός, ὥς ὡς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, τοῦ ἐπὶ ἐπιγέγραφος νοῶς ἀμυνατή τὰ θεῖα δημιουργεῖν, ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ δοκιμαστῇ.

None of the changes here is likely to be deliberate. Probably we should read ἀμυνατῆ with Stobaeus, since the singular is used in 18.10. Perhaps ἀμυνατῆ for ἐπιγέγραφος and ὀλίγησε for δοκιμαστῇ, both in Stobaeus, are the result of a partially obscured manuscript; alternately, Stobaeus’ source may have found Stobaeus’ ἀμυνατῆ ἐν τῇ δοκιμαστῇ obscure, and had substituted at least ὀλίγησε for δοκιμαστῇ. 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, pro-vides relatively few instances in which the text of the tractate is like-ly to have been deliberately altered by Stobaeus’ source. Two explana-tions 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 Ἕρμοῦ rather than the more com-
plete Ἕρμοῦ ἐκ τῶν πρὸς θάνατος, 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 chap-
ters of Stobaeus. Certainty in this respect is difficult.

St. 1.49.49
19.1 θυχή δὲ ανθρωπισμη, πάσα
μὲν, ἢ δὲ εὐσεβεία, δαιμονία
τῆς ἐστὶ καὶ θεία.

St. 1.49.49
19.2 καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη κατ' ἑπτὰ
τὸ ἀπαλαλῆρην τοῦ κύματος
τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγώνα, ἤ
ἀνωσιμένη

C. H. x
19.1 θυχή δὲ ανθρωπισμη, οὐ
πάσα μὲν, ἢ δὲ εὐσεβεία, δαι-
μονία τῆς ἐστὶ καὶ θεία.

C. H. x
19.2 καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη θυχή μετά
tὸ ἀπαλαλῆρην τοῦ κύματος
τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀγώνα, ἤ
ἀνωσιμένη θείας γίνεται.

No doubt οὐ is omitted in error in Stobaeus' text.

Perhaps Stobaeus' source found θυχή redundant, and added καὶ
before μετά for emphasis. Since the aorist is much more frequent than
the perfect, especially in Hellenistic Greek, it is quite possible that
ἀνωσιμένη in Stobaeus was accidentally substituted for the unfamili-
ar ἀνωσιμένη.

The omission of ἐκ τῶν γίνεται 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.\textsuperscript{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 (ἀνεν δὲ εὐσεβείας τῷ γνώτει τὸ θεῖον καὶ μηδένα ἀνθρώπων δικιήσαι)  

Perhaps Stobaeus' source found τὸν θεὸν too explicit, and replaced it with the vaguer τὸ θεῖον.

St. 8.49.49  
19.4 ἦν νοῦς γίνεται.  

Probably the Corpus' ἦν for ἦν is an accidental substitution. Γίνεται for γίνεται is, of course, an Atticism.

St. 1.49.49  
19.5 ἦ δὲ σοφὴν ψυχὴ μένει ἐπὶ τῆς ἱδρας ὁδοίας, ὥστε ταυτής κολαζομένη, καὶ γη- ἰνον σῶμα ἑπτούσα ἑισελθεῖν, ἐλείς ἀνθρώπινον δὲ.

Perhaps σοφὴν for σοφής 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

\textsuperscript{1} Nock, in Nock-Festugière, op. cit., p. xliii, intro.
substantial εἰς ἀνθρώπινον δὲ.

St. 1.49.49
19.6 ἄλλο γὰρ σῶμα ὁδ Χωρεῖ
ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχήν,
19.7 οὖν θέμις ἐστὶν εἰς
ἄλογον ξύων σῶμα ψυχήν ἀνθρω-
πίνην καταπεσεῖν.
19.8 θεοὺ γὰρ νόμος οὗτος,
φυλάσσειν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην
ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποκύπτης θέρεως.
(φυλάσσει Π)

C. H. x
19.6 ἄλλο γὰρ σῶμα ὁδ Χωρεῖ
ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχήν,
19.7 οὖν θέμις ἐστὶν εἰς
ἄλογον ξύων σῶμα ψυχήν ἀνθρω-
πίνην καταπεσεῖν.
19.8 θεοὺ γὰρ νόμος οὗτος,
φυλάσσειν ψυχὴν ἀνθρωπίνην
ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποκύπτης θέρεως.

Either τοιαῦτης or τοσοῦτος could be the result of scribal error.

St. 1.47.8
22.1

C. H. x
22.1 ἄλλο τέχνον, εὐχαρισ
tοῦντα τῷ Θεῷ δεῖ εὐχεθαί
καλὸ τοῦ νοῦ τυχεῖν.

22.2 εἰς μὲν οὖν τὸ κλεῖτον
ψυχῆς μεταβαίνει, εἰς δὲ τὸ
ἐλάπτον δόθην.

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 ἐστιν ψυχῶν,
22.4 καὶ κοινωνοῦσι μὲν αἱ τῶν
θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ταῖς τῶν ἄλογων.
22.5 ἐπιμελοῦσθι δὲ οἱ κρεῖτ-
tον τοὺς ἐλαττύσσοντες, τοὺς μὲν ἄνθρωπους, ἀνθρώπους δὲ τῶν ἄλο-
γων ἱσών, δὲ τοῖς πάντων.

C. H. x
22.3 κοινωνία δὲ ἐστιν ψυχῶν,
22.4 καὶ κοινωνοῦσι μὲν αἱ τῶν
θεῶν ταῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων,

22.5

δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς πάντων.

Presumably αἱ δὲ . . . ἱσών has dropped out because of the re-
peated endings in -σον.

St. 1.47.8
22.6

C. H. x
22.6 πάντων γὰρ οὕτως κρεῖτ-
tον, καὶ πάντα αὐτοῦ ἐλαττοῦνα.

Presumably this verse was omitted in Stobaeus through inattention.
As often in the manuscript tradition of Stobaeus, ἡπαντα is substituted for πάντα.

It is difficult to see why Stobaeus inserted the article before ἀκτίνες twice in two consecutive verses; at any rate, the article is not needed here. Although the article before ἐπιστήμαι is possible here, I suspect that it has been inserted into Stobaeus' text.

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 ἐνὸς was written in the margin, and substituted by
a later scribe for δι' ἕνως; alternately, it may have been accidentally substituted from the line above.

St. 1.47.8
23.2 ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἐστὶ θείστερον καὶ ἑνεργείστερον καὶ ἑνωτι-
κέτερον ἀνθρώπων μὲν πρὸς τούς θεοὺς, θεῶν δὲ πρὸς ἄνθρωπους.

C. H. x
23.2 ὁδέος ἐστὶ θείστερον καὶ ἑνεργείστερον καὶ ἑνωτι-
κέτερον ἀνθρώπων μὲν πρὸς τούς θεοὺς, θεῶν δὲ πρὸς τούς ἄνθρωπους.
(ἐδ. ΔΒζ. ού. ΑΒΣΜ)

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 τούς before θεοὺς and before ἄνθρωπους; at least, the sentence as Stobaeus gives it is leaner.

St. 1.47.8
23.3 ὁδός ἐστιν ὁ δαμαίδος δαμαίων,

C. H. x
23.3 ὁδός ἐστιν ὁ δαμαίδος δαμαίων,

23.4 ὅ ἐν μακρίᾳ ψυχῇ ἃ τούτῳ πληρεστάτη.

Stobaeus' source has joined these two sentences by ὅ ἐν without apparently noticing that the ὅ renders τούτῳ in the same sentence redundant. A misinterpretation of an unaccented text has given us ἃ for ἃ.

St. 1.47.8
23.5 κακοδαμαίων ὁ δὲ ψυχῇ ἃ τού-
του κενωτάτη.

C. H. x
23.5 κακοδαμαίων ὁ δὲ ψυχῇ ἃ τού-
του κενῆ.

κενωτάτη for κενῆ seems to be unmotivated, unless it is to balance πληρεστάτη in the previous sentence.¹

¹As Prof. Kingston has suggested to me.
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 ἐπὶ was accidentally displaced in one of these versions.

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.

Perhaps in this verse we should accept Heineke's conjecture, ἔξοταται for Stobaeus' ἔξοταται. This could easily have become corrupted, as a result of manuscript damage, to ἔλεος in the Corpus.
As frequently, the definite article is inserted in Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.8
24.4 ἀλλα ἄλγη ψυχῆς οἰκεί
C. E. x
24.4 ἀλλα ἄλγη ψυχῆς οἰκεί
ἀλλά ὀσφ. ins. β'
24.5 τηλικατη δυναμίς ἐστιν
τοῦ νοῦ.
24.6 ἀλλά ὀσφμα ψυχῆς
dενδέχεται (οδ Ρ)

This line was doubtless accidentally omitted in the Corpus because of the repeated ἀλλα.

St. 1.47.8
24.7 ἀλλά καταλεπτεὶ τὴν
ἐν τῷ σώματι προσκεμίην
κατὰ πίντα ἀγχωμένην κατ' ἐμεν.

C. E. x
24.7 ἀλλά καταλεπτεὶ τὴν τοι
ἀδεν ψυχῆν τῷ σώματι προσκε-
κεμίην κατ' ἐμεν ὀσφοῦν ἀγχωμέ

The omission of τοιαύτην ψυχήν in Stobaeus is easily attributed to manuscript damage; perhaps ἐν is a conjecture based on a remaining final ν in ψυχήν. However, προσκεμίην seems to be a deliberate substitution for the slightly more difficult προσκεμίην.

So also κατὰ πίντα for κατά ὁσφοῦ 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 ἢ τοιαύτη δὲ ψυχή, τέκνον,
νοῦν ὁδῷ ἔχει.

C. E. x
24.8 ἢ δὲ τοιαύτη ψυχή, τέκνον,
νοῦν ὁδῷ ἔχει.

Probably the position of δὲ in Stobaeus was shifted by error.

Perhaps δὲ was accidentally omitted in the Corpus.

St. 1.47.8
24.9 ὃΘεν ὀσφμαν ἄνθρωπον ἱερεῖσθαι
dεὶ τὸν τοιοῦτον.

C. E. x
24.9 ὃΘεν ὀσφμαν 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 δ' γάρ ἀνέρματος θείον ἦσον ἐστι
καὶ οὖδὲ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἦσοις
συγκρίνεσθαι τῶν ἐπιγείων τισίν,
ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἰδίω ἐν ὁδρανῷ λεγομένοις
θείοις."  
C. H. x
24,10 δ' γάρ ἀνέρματος ἦσον ἐστι
θείον καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἦσοις οὖ
συγκρίνεσθαι τῶν ἐπιγείων, ἀλλὰ
τοῖς ἰδίω ἐν ὁδρανῷ λεγομένοις
θείοις' (ἴδιον ὁδρανὸν ἐστὶ Ἡδ)

Perhaps θείον 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 συγκρίνεσθαι into a participle, and
changed οὖ to οὖδὲ, perhaps in an attempt to improve Hermes' style. The
function of τίσιν in Stobaeus' version is obscure to me. Perhaps ἰδίω
has become displaced in one of these versions.

St. 1.47.8
24,11 μᾶλλον δὲ ἐκείνην τολ-
μώσαντας εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς,
ὑπὲρ ἑκείνους ἐστὶν ὃ ἐντως
ἀνέρματος,
C. H. x
24,11 μᾶλλον δὲ εἰ ἐκεῖνη
τολμώσαντα εἰπεῖν τὸ ἀληθὲς,
καὶ ὑπὲρ ἑκείνους ἐστιν ὃ ἐν
tως ἅνερματος,

All of the variant readings in Stobaeus in this verse are attri-
butable to scribal error.

St. 1.47.8
24,12 ὃ πάντως ἵσοδυναμοῦσιν
ἀλλοιοῖς.
C. H. x
24,12 ὃ πάντως γε ἵσοδυναμοῦσιν
ἀλλοιοῖς.

Since γε seems to be quite in place here, and since that parti-
cle is very infrequent in the Corpus Hermeticum, it should perhaps be
retained.

St. 1.47.8
25,1 οὖδὲς μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὁδρα-
νῶν ἐπὶ γῆς κατελεύσεται,
οδρανοῦ τῶν δρόνος καταλίπθαν.
C. H. x
25,1 ἡστις μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὁδρα-

νῶν θείων ἐπὶ γῆς κατελεύσεται,
οδρανοῦ τῶν δρόνος καταλίπθαν.

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 οὶ δὲ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἔλς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβαίνει καὶ μετρεῖ αὐτὸν,

C. H. x
25.2 οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωπος εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβαίνει καὶ μετρεῖ αὐτὸν καὶ οὗτο ποίε τὸν καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐστὶν ἄτρικ, οἵτιν εἰς τὸν περὶ, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πίνακα ἀναφέρως μεταβάλει.

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 μεταίον, οὐδὲ τῆς γῆς καταλίπην ἄνω γίνεται.

C. H. x
25.3 καὶ τὸ πάντων μεταίον, οὐδὲ τῆς γῆς καταλίπην ἄνω γίνεται.

Here again γίνεται is substituted for γίνεται in Stobaeus.

St. 1.47.8
25.4 τοσοῦτον τὸ μέγεθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπιστάσεως.

C. H. x
25.4 τοσοῦτον μέγεθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπιστάσεως.

As frequently, Stobaeus adds a definite article. While either
ἐκτίθεσις or ἐκτίθεσις would make sense in this context, ἐκτίθεσις, being a less common word, is probably to be preferred, and is to be understood in the sense of "extension." I suspect that ἐκτίθεσις in Stobaeus was substituted by accident.

St. I.47.8
25.5 διὰ τολμητέων εἰπεῖν τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον ἐπιγείον εἶναι θεᾶν θεόν, τὸν δὲ οὐρανὸν θεῶν ἰδίωτον ἀνθρώπων" (μὲν om. P)

C. H. x
25.5 διὰ τολμητέων ἐπιγείον εἶναι τὸν μὲν ἄνθρωπον ἐπιγείον εἶναι θεᾶν θεόν, τὸν δὲ οὐρανόν θεῶν εἶναι ἰδίωτον ἀνθρώπῳν (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 θεᾶν θεόν or θεῶν θεᾶν is permissible, the reading in Stobaeus is more closely parallel to ἰδίωτον ἀνθρώπων in the same sentence. The copula is omitted twice in Stobaeus.

St. I.47.8
25.6 διὸπερ διὰ τοῦτον τὴν πάντα τῶν ὄντων, κόσμου καὶ ἄνθρωπου"

C. H. x
25.6 διὸπερ διὰ τοῦτον τὰ πάντα διοικεῖται τῶν ὄντων, κόσμου καὶ ἄνθρωπου"

Perhaps διοικεῖται was omitted in Stobaeus through error.

St. I.47.8
25.7 ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς πάντα.

C. H. x
25.7 ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνὸς 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, 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' 

συνεχείς το παράδειγμα and συνεχείς τον παράδειγμα εἴτες 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

---

1 Nock, 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 enend 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. 273 n. 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 Stobaean 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 pur-
poses. Certain characteristic doctrines simply are not transmitted in
the Hermetic fragments in Stobaeus. The most notable of these is the
dDoctrine 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 doc-
trine 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 Her-
metic teachings which we would call religious. Discussions of experience
of God, whether through ὑψωτίς 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 γνώσις 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 11.8. 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 be 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, whether Catholic or Gnostic. 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 Stobaeus fragments.

---

1 Above, p. 293 ff.

2 Scott, op. cit., I, 87-97.

3 As 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 Hermeticus*. 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 Hermeticism with the central teachings removed.

Thus, while the Stobaean 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, 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; moreover, the text is uneven in quality, and is on occasion extremely corrupt. 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.

It is far otherwise with the Stobaean fragments. The anthologist who compiled those fragments has deliberately excluded some key Hermetic teachings from his fragments. Most noteworthy of these are the

\[1\text{Above, p. 25.}\] 
\[2\text{Above, pp. 148-185.}\] 
\[3\text{Above, pp. 28-97.}\] 
\[4\text{Above, pp. 98-147.}\]
doctrine of apotheosis and discussion of γνώσις and of the vision of God. Hence the Stobaean 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 γνώσις 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 monoist 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 Stobaean fragments, because this picture has been blotted out by editorial activity.

A new edition of the text of C. E. 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 favored 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 Stobaeum 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. 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 work has been

---

1 See above, intro., p. xiv, n. 1.

2 In the work cited above, p. 142, n. 1.
characterised by the term, *religio mentis*. Tending to shun \(^1\) 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.

\(^1\) But see Asclepius 23–26. See also van Hoorsel, *op. cit.*., p. 128 ff.

\(^2\) Scott also raises the possibility that some Hermetists themselves became Christians, *op. cit.*, I, 14 f.
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