The Classical Quarterly

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAQ>

Additional services for *The Classical Quarterly*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On the Text of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria

J. P. Postgate.

The Classical Quarterly / Volume 8 / Issue 04 / October 2014, pp 237 - 247

DOI: 10.1017/S0009838800019832, Published online: 11 February 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009838800019832

How to cite this article:

J. P. Postgate. (2014). On the Text of the *Stromateis* of Clement of Alexandria. The Classical Quarterly, 8, pp 237-247 doi:10.1017/S0009838800019832

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ON THE TEXT OF THE *STROMATEIS* OF CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

THE germ of the following paper is as old as the previous century, when in the year 1898 my attention was accidentally drawn to one of the passages discussed below. But progress was impossible until the facts of the MS. tradition of the *Stromateis*¹ were properly presented—a service for which we are indebted to the excellent edition of Clement by Dr. O. Stählin (Leipzig 1906-1909).

We need do no more than turn the pages of this book to convince ourselves of the large part which omissions have played in deforming the text, and, if a textual critic is to do anything to repair the mischief, it is obvious that he must first inquire into their character. The object then of what follows is not to maintain a thesis but to submit certain facts and considerations which may be of use to systematic students of the traditional text of the *Stromateis* as presented in the above-named edition of Stählin.

The causes of omission in MSS are three. For the first of these—external injury to the exemplar—the copyist is in no way responsible, nor can light be thrown upon such omissions by any study of a scribe's personality as disclosed in any other part of his work. This is not the case with the other two causes that we may distinguish—oversight for which there is excuse and oversight for which there is none. The first includes all the errors covered by the term *homoeographon*.² The second those in respect to which there is no evidence that the scribe's eye has been ensnared by similarities of words or letters, and carelessness is therefore alone to blame.

Method in textual criticism requires that the two last kinds of omission should be discriminated, as the effects they produce are often dissimilar, and that (as I have said elsewhere³) they should both be established for the text with which we are concerned.

That *homoeographon* has produced omissions of letters, syllables and words in the *Stromateis* the following selection of examples may suffice to show: I. 67. 2 καὶ <ἄλλοι> ἄλλοθι πολλαχοῦ, 79. 3 ὁ Κυμαῖος πρῶτος <τοῦ

¹ That is the true and full record of the testimony of L. Laurentianus V. 3.

² *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Ed. 11), 'Textual Criticism,' vol. 26, p. 711, col. 2; *Classical Review*, 16 (1902), p. 309a.

³ E.g. in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* l.c., p. 713,

col. 1, 'since different kinds of scribes are prone to different kinds of errors we must ever bear in mind the particular failings of the scribes responsible for the transmission of our text as these failings are revealed in the *apparatus criticus*.'

γραμματικοῦ ἀντὶ τοῦ κριτικοῦ εἰσηγήσατο τοῦνομα, I40. I τοὺς <βαρ> βάρους. IV. 125. 3 εὐτυχεῖν <δυστυχεῖν> τε χρή. V. 92. 6 ψυχὴν ἐνοικοῦσαν <καὶ διοικοῦσαν>, ib. μίαν ἢ πλείους; <πλείους>. VI. 24. I τέλος ἐπιθεῖναι τὸ πρόσφορον <Ἐφορον>, ib. 149. 5 οὐ γὰρ ἵνα δόξωμεν εἶναι <χρηστοὶ εἰς> Χριστὸν πιστεύομεν, ib. 162. 5 εἰ φιλοσοφητέον <φιλοσοφητέον>. VII. 4. 2 ἀποτελέσματα <ἀ', i.e. πρῶτον> τὸ γινώσκειν, cf. ib. 76. 5 τὰς ὁψείας αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὰ <ἀ>δρατα χειραγωγῶν, 29. 3 δε<δαί> δαλμένον, ib. 46. 2 τῶι γνωστικῶι <γνωστικῶς> ἕκαστα ἀποδίδονται.

That omission occurred *without* the lure of *homoeographon* may be shown by the following: I. 150. 5 fin. ὅτι μάλιστα <δι' ὀλίγων (or διὰ βραχέων)>. Μωσῆς. II. 106. I ἐντεῦθεν οἶμαι καὶ <τὸν εὐρόντα> τὰς τελετάς, ib. 115. 2 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως <γίγνεσθαι or εἶναι> τὴν σωτηρίαν. IV. 30. 3 ὡς τὸ πεπυρωμένον καὶ τὸ πεφωτισμένον <τοῦ πυρὸς καὶ τοῦ φωτὸς> φῶς οὖν, ib. 92. 4 χαίρων καὶ συγχαίρων <τοὺς δέ> πρὸς οὓς ὁ λόγος τῶι ἀποστόλῳ. VII. 45. I τὰ περὶ τοῦ θεοῦ διειληφώς <δεδιδαγμένος or δεδιδαγμένα> πρὸς αὐτῆς τῆς ἀληθείας.

The causes which have produced the two kinds of losses that we have been considering are not to have their sphere artificially restricted to letters, syllables or words: they must be allowed to affect larger blocks of writing and to cause the omission of whole lines, single or several. Nor shall we be surprised to find such omissions in the text of the *Stromateis*.

Here, however, it is necessary to discriminate; for the two causes do not produce quite similar effects. The omissions of negligence in such cases are in units, we may say; that is, they are (approximately) losses of whole lines or of multiples of these. But omissions through the straying of the eyes in *homoeographa* from one line to another are not necessarily to the same extent in units. We have always to allow for the possibility of some lateral deflexion. In amount therefore an omission of this kind may from the outset be somewhat more or less than a single line or a multiple of lines. This must be borne in mind when we come to calculations.

In the present connexion Loss cannot be separated from Repetition and Transposition. Meaningless (that is, mechanical) repetition of a unit is obviously correlated to its mechanical omission; and, as I have said elsewhere,¹ transposition of lines and passages is really 'arrested loss.'

There is one element of uncertainty which an inquiry into the constitution of the unit-line, if I may call it so, of the exemplar of the *Stromateis* cannot hope to eliminate, and which therefore it is obliged to neglect. This is the question to what extent abbreviations occurred in that exemplar. That numerals, ordinal as well as cardinal, were denoted frequently, if not invariably, by letters is not only probable in itself, but supported by the

¹ *Encyclopaedia Britannica* I.c., p. 712, col. 2. The matter is dealt with at length in the *Classical Review*, 16 (1902), p. 308. Transposition of words

also is sometimes due to 'arrested loss.' VI. 65. 6 γεωμετρει καὶ γεωργει (L, corr. St.) is an interesting case.

indications of our MS. as recorded in Stählin's apparatus; thus $\bar{\epsilon}$ represents $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$ (vol. i., p. 139. 26) and $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\mu\pi\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (*ib.* p. 474. 12).¹ But how far other abbreviations were employed we can only conjecture. We must then content ourselves with simply counting the letters, the ι adscript of course reckoning as one.

The evidence which I would submit to readers of the *Classical Quarterly* as perhaps adequate to support a definite conclusion, viz., that the average unit-line contained slightly more than 30 letters, consists of the following passages:

OMISSIONS DUE TO 'HOMOEOPHONA.'

II. 135. 1 (I. p. 187, St.) $\tau\omicron\nu\acute{\nu} \alpha\rho\tau\omicron\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \pi\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\nu\tau\iota \delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota <\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\upsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu \pi\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\iota \tau\omicron \alpha\rho\gamma\upsilon\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota \tau\omicron\kappa\omega\iota \delta\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\iota>$. Loss of 46 letters, supplied from Ezekiel.

I. 102. 4 (I. p. 66, St.) $\phi\alpha\nu\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota <\tau\omicron\omega\iota \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\epsilon\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\omega\iota \acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\iota \tau\eta\varsigma \text{'}\text{Α}\sigma\sigma\upsilon\rho\iota\omega\nu \alpha\rho\chi\eta\varsigma \tau\eta\varsigma \delta\grave{\epsilon} \text{Β}\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\chi\omicron\upsilon \tau\omicron\upsilon \omicron\gamma\delta\omicron\upsilon \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\varsigma> \tau\omicron\omega\iota \delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\tau\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\omega\iota \eta \text{Μ}\omega\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma \kappa.\tau.\acute{\epsilon}$. Loss of 80 or 52 letters, according as words or numeral letters were used, supplied from Eusebius.

IV. 33. 1 (I. p. 262, St.) $\delta\iota\alpha \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron \acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha \gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\tau\omega <\tau\grave{\alpha} \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta \tau\grave{\alpha} \delta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\alpha \cdot \tau\grave{\alpha} \lambda\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha \kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\iota\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu \alpha\nu\omicron\mu\iota\alpha\nu \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu \cdot \acute{\epsilon}\xi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota \kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma> \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \tau\grave{\alpha} \chi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta \tau\grave{\alpha} \delta\acute{\omicron}\lambda\iota\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\alpha\nu \kappa.\tau.\acute{\epsilon}$. The omitted words, restored from 'Clem. Rom. Syr.,' total 71 letters, 68 if $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was abbreviated.

MECHANICAL REPETITIONS. I. OF BLOCKS OF WORDS.

IV. 72. 4 (I. p. 281, St.) $\delta\iota\omicron\pi\epsilon\rho \alpha\rho\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \omicron\upsilon\delta\acute{\epsilon}\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\nu\tau\alpha\iota \cdot \alpha\rho\nu\omicron\upsilon\nu\tau\alpha\iota \delta\grave{\epsilon} \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\nu \omicron\acute{\iota} \mu\eta \delta\upsilon\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\omega\iota$, an exact repetition of the last words of § 4. 69 letters.

V. 4. 2 (I. p. 328, St.) $\kappa\alpha\iota \pi\rho\acute{\omicron} \tau\eta\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon \pi\alpha\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\alpha\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\kappa\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \delta\eta \kappa\alpha\iota \sigma\omega\iota\zeta\omicron \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$, 52 letters, a duplication of the same words in § 1, where they are preceded by $\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\varsigma$. The *homoeographon* seems to have caused their repetition in the wrong place.

VI. 35. 4 (I. p. 449, St.) $\acute{\omicron}\nu \tau\omicron \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\upsilon \delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\sigma\mu\omicron \tau\omicron\omega\nu \alpha\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega\nu \phi\alpha\iota\nu\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\rho\omega\nu <\tau\omicron \delta\grave{\epsilon} \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \tau\eta\varsigma \tau\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\omega\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\eta\varsigma \sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\nu\eta\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\omega\nu \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon \pi\lambda\alpha\nu\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu> \tau\omicron \delta\grave{\epsilon} \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \tau\omicron\omega\nu \sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\delta\omega\nu$. The omitted words were inserted by Gruppe from 36. 1, where with the exception of $\tau\omicron \delta\grave{\epsilon} \pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$ they appear after $\gamma\epsilon\omega\gamma\rho\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$. They contain 63 letters, 59 if $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau\epsilon$ was written $\bar{\epsilon}$.

II. OF SINGLE WORDS OVER A CONSIDERABLE SPACE.

VII. 13. 1 (II. p. 10, St.) $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\rho\gamma\eta \delta\grave{\epsilon} \acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\nu\iota \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\sigma\tau\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \alpha\kappa\rho\iota\beta\omega\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\iota\lambda\iota\kappa\rho\iota\nu\eta \tau\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\phi\upsilon\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\iota\varsigma \psi\upsilon\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\omega\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma \theta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu, \acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\omega\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\delta\iota\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\phi\rho\omicron\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\nu \acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu \kappa\alpha\rho\pi\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\iota}\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\eta\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma \acute{\alpha}\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\alpha\varsigma$. That one of the $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\acute{\omicron}\rho\epsilon\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$'s (St. brackets the second) has come from the other seems certain. There are 59 letters between them.

¹ The notes on pp. 446, 447, 449, 489 afford other examples.

Similarly in 15. 1 (II. p. 11, St.) τὸ θεῖον is repeated at a distance of 100 letters from its proper place.

Again in VIII. 14. 3 (II. p. 88, St.) ἀπάντων is repeated 65 letters, or 61 if πρώτη was abbreviated, away from its proper place.

Similarly in V. 94. 4 (I. p. 388, St.) ἐπείσῳδον has produced εἴσοδον in the following line 26 letters off.

In VIII. 30. 2 (II. p. 99, St.) after αἵτιοι τοῦ the following words, προκόπτειν κατηγορήματος λέγεται δὲ ἀλλήλοις αἷτια ποτὲ μὲν τῶν αὐτῶν ὡς ὁ ἔμπορος καὶ ὁ κάπηλος ἀλλήλοις εἰσὶν αἷτιοι τοῦ, 102 letters, were repeated by the first hand in L.

PASSAGES TRANSPOSED.

An interesting example of *homoeographon* appears in a verse quotation in V. 109. 3 (I. p. 400, St.) :

ἀλλ' εἴ τοι χεῖράς γ' εἶχον βόες ἢ λέοντες
ὡς γράψαι χεῖρεσσι καὶ ἔργα τελεῖν ἄπερ ἄνδρες
ἵπποι μὲν θ' ἵπποισι βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοίας
καὶ κε θεῶν ιδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν
τοιαῦθ' οἷον περ καὶ αὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ὁμοῖον.

So the passage is given in Stählin. But his order for the last three lines and the ὁμοίας which he takes from the quotation in Theodoret are obviously wrong.

The original form of the verses was

καὶ κε θεῶν ιδέας ἔγραφον καὶ σώματ' ἐποίουν
τοιαῦθ' οἷον περ καὶ αὐτοὶ δέμας εἶχον ἕκαστοι
ἵπποι μὲν θ' ἵπποισι βόες δέ τε βουσὶν ὁμοῖα,

with the ἕκαστοι of Hiller and Diels and the transposition of Karsten. The first corruption was the miscopying of ὁμοῖα for ἕκαστοι from the following line. After that, homoeographon at the end of the two verses caused the omission of the latter which was subsequently reinserted but copied into a wrong place. Theodoret's ὁμοίας is worthless in itself, but interesting as pointing to ὁμοῖα which in Clement's text, as offered by L, and in Eusebius has been changed to ὁμοῖον. The lines may have been written continuously, and the distance from the beginning of one ὁμοῖα to that of the other would be 35 letters.

I deviate for a moment to consider a textual question arising on the first line of the fragment. Stählin's critical note is as follows :

ἔχον Eus. . . . ἀλλ' εἰ χεῖρας ἔχον βόες <ἵπποι τ'> ἢ λέοντες . . . ἢ λέοντες] ἢ ἐλέφαντες Theod. MSCV ἢ κέλητες Schultess ἢ κελέοντες Diels Berl. Sitz. B. 1891 S. 578.

The motive underlying these changes is that λέοντες and ἵπποι are 'incompatible' (Diels l.c.). If real 'lions' were meant, this would be true; but these animals are only illustrative. For the writer's purpose 'lions' are as good as 'horses,' and the substitution of the one for the other is merely

legitimate poetic variation. One might as reasonably attack the text of Persius *Choliamb.* 8 sqq. 'quis expediuit *psittaco* suum "chaere" | pिकासque docuit uerba nostra conari? magister artis ingenique largitor | uenter, negatas artifex sequi uoces. | quod si dolosi spes refulserit nummi, | *coruos* poetas et poetridas picas | cantare credas Pegaseium nectar,' where *psittacus* means 'a talking bird such as a parrot,' and *coruus* 'a talking bird such as a raven.'¹ This superficial inconsistency in the details of an illustration occurs elsewhere, Hor. S. II. 1. 52 sqq. '*dente* lupus, *cornu* taurus petit — mirum | ut neque *calce* lupus quemquam neque dente petit bos.' The ox, or bull, is formidable both with hoofs and horns: the reader may take his choice. There is no diplomatic reason for doubting our text; ἡ ἐλέφαντες (in itself quite possible) has simply come from a wrong division of words ἡ ἐλέοντες. And that lions might be imagined in the rôle of artists we can see from Babrius *Mythiamb.* 194 (Crusius) εἰ λέοντες ἡδεῖσαν γλύφειν πολλοὺς ἀν' ἀνδρας εἶδες ὑποκάτω λέοντος.

I. 82 (I. p. 53, St.) discusses the question whether non-interference (τὸ μὴ κωλύον) is the same as responsibility (τὸ αἴτιον). §§ 2-5 read as follows αὐτίκα κολάζονται πρὸς τοῦ νόμου οἱ τούτων αἴτιοι. ὧι γὰρ κωλύσαι δύναμις ἦν, τούτῳ καὶ ἡ αἰτία τοῦ συμβαίνοντος προσάπτεται. <διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ἐπιτελεῖται ὅτι τὸ κωλύσαι δυνάμενον οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ οὐδὲ κωλύει> φάμεν δὴ πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὸ αἴτιον ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν καὶ δρᾶν νοεῖσθαι, τὸ δὲ μὴ κωλύον κατὰ γε τοῦτο ἀνενέργητον εἶναι. ἔτι τὸ μὲν αἴτιον πρὸς τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἐστὶ, καθάπερ ὁ μὲν ναυπηγὸς πρὸς τῷ γίγνεσθαι τὸ σκάφος ὁ δὲ οἰκοδόμος πρὸς τῷ κτίζεσθαι τὴν οἰκίαν. τὸ δὲ μὴ κωλύον κεχώρισται τοῦ γιγνομένου. τί γὰρ ἐνεργεῖ ὁ μὴ κωλύων; Prof. J. B. Mayor's transposition of the words which stand in the MS. after γιγνομένου, and break and stultify the argument there, seems inevitable. They contain 64 letters.

In II. 59. 6—60. 1 (I. p. 145, St.) ὁρμὴ μὲν οὖν φορὰ διανοίας ἐπὶ τι ἢ ἀπὸ του. πάθος δὲ πλεονάζουσα ὁρμὴ ἢ ὑπερτείνουσα κατὰ τὸν λόγον μέτρα, ἢ ὁρμὴ ἐκφερομένη καὶ ἀπειθὴς λόγῳ. παρὰ φύσιν οὖν κίνησις ψυχῆς κατὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸν λόγον ἀπειθειαν τὰ πάθη. ἢ δ' ἀπόστασις καὶ ἀπειθεια ἐφ' ἡμῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ ὑπακοὴ ἐφ' ἡμῖν. διὸ καὶ τὰ ἐκούσια κρίνεται. αὐτίκα καθ' ἕνα καστον τῶν παθῶν εἴ τις ἐπεξίῳι, ἀλόγους ὀρέξεις εὔροι ἀν' αὐτά. (60) τὸ γοῦν ἀκούσιον οὐ κρίνεται. διττὸν δὲ τοῦτο τὸ μὲν γιγνόμενον μετ' ἀγνοίας τὸ δὲ ἀνάγκῃ even a casual observer may see, what Prof. J. B. Mayor has pointed out, that the words αὐτίκα το αὐτά at the end of 59 are out of place. They include 63 letters.

In III. 52, 53 (I. pp. 220 sq. St.) Clement cites the example of pillars of the Church against the contemporaries whom he is attacking. In 52. 1 we read οὐ δὲ καὶ τούτους (as generally understood, Elijah and Samuel) ὑπερφέρειν λέγοντες πολιτεῖαι καὶ βίῳ οὐδὲ συγκριθῆναι ταῖς ἐκείνων πράξεσι δυνήσονται. These words follow on καὶ Σαμουὴλ δὲ ὁ προφήτης [ἦν] ὃν καταλελοίπει κωλὸν ἐξ ὧν ἡσθιε φέρων ἔδωκε τῷ Σαοὺλ φαγεῖν, and they precede ὁ μὴ ἐσθίων τοῖνυν

¹ It is worth noting that some of the inferior MSS. of Persius give before or after v. 9 a line designed to get rid of the 'incompatibility,'

'coruos quis olim concauum (or Caesarem) salutare,' which bears a strong family resemblance to Prof. Diels's first correction here

τὸν ἐσθίουτα μὴ ἐξουθενείτω with more on the practice and teaching of Christ and his apostles as regards eating, drinking and marriage; this ends in 54. § 4 ἀλλὰ μὴν ὁ αὐτὸς οὗτος κέκραγεν ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ βρῶσις καὶ πόσις οὐδὲ μὴν ἀποχὴ οἴνου καὶ κρεῶν ‘ἀλλὰ δικαιοσύνη καὶ εἰρήνη καὶ χαρὰ ἐν πνεύματι ἀγίῳ.’ Next comes a section relating to οἱ μακάριοι προφῆται: Elijah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, John the Baptist are mentioned. It begins τίς αὐτῶν μηλωτὴν καὶ ζώνην δερματίνην ἔχων περιέρεχεται ὡς Ἡλίας; With the present order, there is nothing for this αὐτῶν to refer to, except the New Testament worthies, which is absurd. It must obviously mean the same people as the οἱ in 52. 1. Recognising this, Professor Mayor proposed to move the words to follow *δυνήσονται* above. They contain 251 letters, so that a block of 8 lines would have been displaced ($8 \times 31 = 248$). But there is another alternative. The first passage contains 91 letters, i.e. about 3 lines; and so it might be moved down in front of the second one. This will do away with the break in the exposition of the right doctrine of eating and drinking which is the effect of its present place, while it will also give more pertinence to its expression. For it will now mean ‘Our friends who actually claim to be superior to the saints of the New Testament (τούτους) cannot stand a comparison even with those of the Old (ἐκείνων).’

A small and easily cured displacement has occurred at IV. 138. 4 (I. p. 309, St.) οὐ δεῖ δὲ ἀρθέντας μετατεθῆναι ἀλλὰ βαδίζοντας ἀφικέσθαι οἱ δεῖ [τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐλκυσθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρός] διὰ πάσης τῆς στενῆς διελθόντας ὁδοῦ, τὸ ἄξιον γενέσθαι τὴν δύναμιν, τῆς χάριτος παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ λαβεῖν¹ ἀκωλύτως ἀναδραμεῖν. The words διὰ—ὁδοῦ, 31 letters in all, were omitted after οἱ δεῖ and reinserted when the words τοῦτο—πατρός had been written, leaving the latter in a place where they furnish neither proper sense nor construction. The correction is due to Potter.

In VI. 80. 1 (I. p. 471, St.) again Professor Mayor has detected a dislocation. The passage should run: κατ’ ἐπακολούθημα τοίνυν καὶ τοῖς εἰς γνώσιν γυμνάζουσιν αὐτὸν προσανάκειται, παρ’ ἐκάστου μαθήματος τὸ πρόσφορον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ λαμβάνων, τῆς μὲν οὖν μουσικῆς τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἡρμοσμένοις ἀναλογίαν διώκων <καὶ ἐθιζόμενος συνεχές τι διάστημα νοεῖν> ἐν δὲ τῇ ἀριθμητικῇ τὰς αὐξήσεις καὶ μειώσεις τῶν ἀριθμῶν παρασημειούμενος καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους σχέσεις καὶ ὡς τὰ πλείστα ἀναλογίαι τινὲς ἀριθμῶν ὑποπέπτωκεν, ἐν δὲ τῇ γεωμετρικῇ οὐσίαν αὐτὴν ἐφ’ ἑαυτῆς θεωρῶν καὶ οὐσίαν ἀμετάβλητον, ἑτέραν τῶνδε τῶν σωματῶν οὐσαν· ἔκ τε αὐτῆς ἀστρονομίας κ.τ.ξ., except that the second οὐσίαν appears to be another case of the intrusion of a word from an adjacent line. The words καὶ το νοεῖν (L νοεῖ), which obviously refer to μουσική, follow θεωρῶν in L and contain 34 letters as preserved in that MS. Homoeographon ἡρμοσμένοις, ἐθιζόμενος may have been at work here.

VII. 83. 1 (II. p. 59, St.) appears thus in the tradition (except that L has ἀποκεκαθαρμένους) ἐπ’ οὐδενὶ τοίνυν εἰκότως ταρασσεται τῶν συμβαινόντων οὐδὲ ὑποπτεύει τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομίαν ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι γιγνομένων οὐδὲ αἰσχύ-

¹ καὶ ἀκωλύτως Stählin.

νεται ἀποθανεῖν, εὐσυνείδητος ὦν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ὀφθῆναι, πάντας ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν τοὺς τῆς ψυχῆς ἀποκεκαθαρμένους σπύλους, ὃ γε εὖ μάλα ἐπιστάμενος ἄμεινον αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν ἔξοδον γενέσθαι (γενήσεσθαι Mayor, Stählin). Professor Wilamowitz has rightly noted that ὃ γε and the words following, totalling 53 or (taking *γενήσεσθαι*) 55 letters, are out of place; and he would put them after ἀποθανεῖν. But this verb is itself an interloper. αἰσχύνεται ἀποθανεῖν is a senseless phrase; φοβεῖται ἀποθανεῖν would be intelligible. The word is a gloss on ταῖς ἐξουσίαις (i.e. the angelic hierarchy, a well-attested use) ὀφθῆναι. Our perfect Gnostic will not be afraid to die, nor, as he has a good conscience, will he be ashamed to meet the angel hosts. And accordingly, inserting τι after ὑποπτεύει with Heyse or, perhaps better with Mayor, οὐδὲν after γιγνομένων, we may appropriately place the words in question immediately before οὐδὲ αἰσχύνεται.

In VII. 109. 1 (II. pp. 76, 77, St.) ὁπῇ οὖν τινα ὀλίγην ὑποδείξαντες τοῖς φιλοθεάμοσι τῆς ἀληθείας ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τὰς θυσίας νόμου περί τε Ἰουδαίων τῶν χυδαίων περί τε τῶν αἱρέσεων μυστικῶς διακρινομένων, ὡς ἀκαθάρτων, ἀπὸ τῆς [περὶ καθαρῶν καὶ ἀκαθάρτων ζώων] θείας ἐκκλησίας καταπαύσωμεν τὸν λόγον. The words περί—ζώων are senseless where they stand and Stählin brackets them. But Lowth's remedy, to put them after νόμου, is clearly better. They contain 28 letters, and homoeographon περί(τε)—περί will have caused their omission.

I now take a passage where the text of Clement has been used to emend that of an earlier author.

In I. 93. 1 (I. p. 59, St.) the manuscript reads κὰν τῷ Δημοδόκῳ εἰ δὴ τοῦ Πλάτωνος τὸ σύγγραμμα 'μὴ δὲ ἡγοῦ¹ τοῦτο φιλοσοφεῖν' λέγειν² 'περὶ τὰς τέχνας κυπτάζοντα³ ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθ οὐ ν τ α ἀλλὰ ἄλλο τι, ἐπεὶ ἐγῶγε ὥμην καὶ ὄνειδος εἶναι.' The quotation is from the *Erastae* attributed to Plato (p. 137 B), where the tradition gives ἀλλὰ μὴ οὐχ οὕτως, ὦ φίλε, ἔχωσι μὴδὲ⁴ ἢ τοῦτο φιλοσοφεῖν περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἐσπουδακέναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμον οὐ ν τ α κυπτάζοντα ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθ οὐ ν τ α ἀλλ' ἄλλο τι ἐπεὶ ἐγὼ ὥμην καὶ ὄνειδος εἶναι τοῦτο καὶ βαναύσους καλεῖσθαι τοὺς περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἐσπουδακότας. Cobet, Λόγιος Ἑρμῆς (p. 531) and Professor Jackson subsequently (*J. Phil.* l.c. p. 139) maintained, and this with justice, that the text here was unsatisfactory; and proposed to strike out the words ἐσπουδακέναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμονοῦντα as 'a duplicate of κυπτάζοντα ζῆν οὐδὲ πολυμαθοῦντα.' But anything less like a 'duplicate' of this than ἐσπουδακέναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμονοῦντα it is not easy to conceive. And it will be observed that the homoeographon in πολυπραγμον οὐ ν τ α—πολυμαθ οὐ ν τ α was quite capable of causing the omission from the text of Clement of a total of 32 letters. The same cause produced a similar effect in the text of the *Erastae*; but here the words lost were restored, though not to their proper place. The passage then should run περὶ τὰς τέχνας κυπτάζοντα ζῆν, οὐδὲ πολυμαθοῦντα ἐσπουδακέναι οὐδὲ πολυπραγμο-

¹ μὴ οὐκ ἢ τοῦτο Professor H. Jackson, accepted by Stählin.

² λέγει Stählin, Professor Jackson, *J. Phil.*

27. 140.

³ κυπτάζοντα Dindorf.

⁴ οὐδ' ἢ Professor Jackson.

νοῦντα ἀλλ' ἄλλο τι κ.τ.ε. There is now nothing faulty in the Greek. *κυπτάζειν περί* requires no illustration, and *σπουδάζω* with a participle (*διδάσκων* as here *πολυμαθοῦντα*) is attested in Xen. *Oecon.* 9. 1.¹

A very natural question now suggests itself. To what extent should acceptable supplements of undeniable gaps in the text of the *Stromateis* be expected to recognise the average unit-line suggested by this inquiry. From the nature of the case the precise form of such supplements can never be free from doubt, and with our present knowledge of the textual conditions of the *Stromateis* a systematic examination of the lacunae might, I fear, be both a lengthy and a sterile undertaking. But I may be permitted to give examples of supplements already proposed which, if the hypothesis we have been considering is correct, will be seen to have unconsciously conformed. I cite then by way of instance the following: I. 17. 4 (I. p. 12. 26, St.) *καθάπερ δ' οἱ γεωργοὶ προαρδεύσαντες τὴν γῆν <εἰθ' οὕτω τὸ σπέρμα καταβάλλουσιν (28 letters, Sylburg)> οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ ποτίμῳ τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι λόγων προαρδεύομεν τὸ γεῶδες αὐτῶν, ὡς παραδέξασθαι τὸ καταβαλλόμενον σπέρμα πνευματικὸν καὶ τοῦτο εὐμαρῶς ἐκθρέψαι δύνασθαι.* II. 68. 3 (I. p. 149. 17, St.) *δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως τριῶν ἀποχῆς ἀμαρτίας τρόπων διδάσκειν ὁ νομοθέτης, τῶν μὲν ἐν λόγῳ διὰ τῶν ἰχθύων τῶν ἀναύδων· ἔστι γὰρ τῷ ὄντι οὐ σιγῇ λόγον διαφέρει· ἔστι καὶ σιγῆς ἀκίνδυνον γέρας· τῶν δὲ ἐν ἔργῳ διὰ τῶν ἀρπακτικῶν καὶ σαρκοβόρων ὀρνέων· <τῶν δὲ ἐν διανοίᾳ διὰ τοῦ χοίρου· ὁ γὰρ (31 letters, Stählin, Schwartz)> χοῖρος βορβόρῳ ἥδεται.* V. 59. 1 (I. p. 365. 26, St.) *ναὶ μὴν ἡ Πυθαγόρου συνουσία καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς ὁμιλητὰς διττὴ κοινωνία ἀκουσματικούς τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ τινὰς μαθηματικούς ἐτέρους καλοῦσα, τοὺς γνησίως ἀνθαπτομένους τῆς φιλοσοφίας, <οὐχὶ² πᾶσαν πᾶσι τὴν ἀλήθειαν συνεχώρησεν (35 letters, Mayor)> ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν φάσθαι τὸ δὲ καὶ κεκρυμμένον εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς ἡνίσσετο.* IV. 152. 1 (I. p. 315. 25) *καθόλου γὰρ τὸ παθητικὸν <παντοδαπὸν ἐστὶν καὶ δουλούμενον (29 letters, Wilamowitz)> παντὶ γένει ἐπιθυμίας, εἰς δὲ τὴν ἀπάθειαν θεούμενος ἀνθρωπος ἀχράντως μοναδικὸς γίνεται.* Lastly in II. 129. 1 (I. p. 183. 1, St.) *πάλιν δ' αὖ Ζήνων μὲν ὁ Στωικὸς τέλος ἡγεῖται τὸ κατ' ἀρετὴν ζῆν Κλεάνθης δὲ τὸ ὁμολογουμένως τῇ φύσει ζῆν . . . ἐν τῷ εὐλογιστεῖν δ' ἐν τῇ τῶν κατὰ φύσιν ἐκλογῇ κείσθαι διελάμβανεν.* The supplements of Arnim *Διογένης* δὲ ὁ *Βαβυλώνιος* τὸ τέλος (29 letters) and of Stählin *Διογένης* δὲ τὸ τέλος κείσθαι ἡγεῖτο (or ἡγεῖται, 30 or 31 letters) will both conform, though I should prefer Stählin's, as ὁ *Βαβυλώνιος* is not a necessary addition in a context where it is clear the Stoic Diogenes is referred to.

A question intimately affecting the text of the *Stromateis* in more than one place is that of Clement's accuracy in quotation. On this Professor Mayor says fairly enough, 'Clement is never very exact in his quotations' (*Cl. Rev.* 8. 237b).

¹ The quotation stops abruptly in Clement, so I note that there are 55 letters from τοῦτο to ἐσπουδακότας.

² Or, better perhaps, οὐ πᾶσαν (33 letters).

So at IV. 53. 4 (I. p. 273, St.) where, continuing a quotation of Euripides *Hypsipyle* (fr. 757 Nauck), he gives according to the MS.

εἶτα ἐπιφέρει ·

ταῦτα δεῖ

στέγειν ἄπερ δεῖ κατὰ φύσιν διεκπερᾶν¹

οὐ δεινὸν οὐδὲν τῶν ἀναγκαίων βροτοῖς,

Clement may have written στέγειν, though, that Euripides wrote τῇ ταῦτα δεῖ | στένειν, the evidence of Plutarch and Stobaeus leaves no doubt.

In I. 67. 4 (I. p. 42, St.) we read ψυχὰς γὰρ ἀγαθὰς κατὰ Πλάτωνα καταλιπούσας τὸν ὑπερουράνιον τόπον ὑπομεῖναι ἐλθεῖν εἰς τόνδε τὸν τάρταρον καὶ σῶμα ἀναλαβούσας τῶν ἐν γενέσει κακῶν ἀπάντων μετασχεῖν ὑπολαμβάνουσι κηδομένας τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένους αἱ νόμους τε ἔθεσαν καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ἐκήρυξαν 'οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν τῶι τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένει οὔτ' ἤλθεν ποτε ἐκ θεῶν οὔτ' ἀφίξεται.' The reference to Plato appears not to have been identified; but the last words are assumed to be a quotation from *Timaeus*, p. 47 A, B ἐξ ὧν ἐπορισάμεθα φιλοσοφίας γένος οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν οὔτ' ἤλθεν οὔτε ἤξει ποτέ τῶι θνητῶι γένει δωρηθὲν ἐκ θεῶν. If so, the quoting is something worse than 'not very exact.' But to me the words οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν irresistibly suggest the beginning of an iambic line, and I think that both Plato and Clement may have been quoting inexactly, the former no doubt for reasons of his own; compare his paraphrase of *Il.* i. 25-28 at *Rep.* 393 E. Both forms of the quotation fall easily into a couple of trimeters; but all restoration must be tentative. In this spirit I suggest

οὐ μείζον ἀγαθὸν οὔτε τῶι θνητῶν γένει

ἤλθ' ἐκ θεῶν δωρητὸν οὔθ' ἤξει ποτέ

or οὔτ' ἀφίξεται.

Apropos of the *Timaeus* I wonder if a suggestion which I made to the late Mr. Archer-Hind when his edition was preparing and which he accepted has met with any favour. It was that in 76 E the words δέρμα τρίχας ὀνυχὰς τε ἐπ' ἄκροις τοῖς κώλοις ἔφυσαν (with his necessary addition of τ' after τρίχας) are an hexameter taken from 'some old physical poet' and accommodated to the prose rhythm.

δέρμα τρίχας τ' ὀνυχὰς τ' ἐπ' ἄκροις κώλοισιν ἔφυσαν.

The metre and prosody of the verse have nothing alien to Empedocles.

Strom. VII. 45. 4 with the following chapter (II. p. 34, 18, St.) is an exalted description of the perfect Gnostic in the genuine Stoic vein. Beginning οὗτος ἡμῖν ὁ γνωστικὸς ὁ πιστὸς ὁ πεπεισμένος ἄριστα διοικεῖσθαι τὰ κατὰ τὸν κόσμον, in 46. 7 it pursues the theme in the following strain τῶι δὲ ἐνθένδε εἰς γνώσεως ἀκρότητα καὶ τὸ ἐπαναβεβηκὸς ὕψος ἀνδρὸς ἐντελοῦς γεγυμνασμένῳ πρὸ ὁδοῦ τὰ κατὰ χρόνον καὶ τόπον ἅπαντα ἀμεταπτῶτως βιοῦν ἐλομένῳ καὶ ἀσκοῦντι διὰ τὴν τῆς γνώμης πάντοθεν μονότονον

¹ διεκπερᾶν Stob. Plut., δεῖ δ' ἐκπερᾶν L.

ἐδραιότητα· ὅσοις δὲ βρίθουσά τις ἔτι ὑπολείπεται γωνία κάτω
ρέπουσα, καὶ κατασπᾶται τὸ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἀναγόμενον.

The word in black type has been attacked by scholars who have failed to see its relation to the words which are put in spaced type. Yet no part of the Stoic doctrine should be better known than the comparison of the sage, the perfect man, to the perfect figure, the sphere of the divine and perfect universe and the perfect soul.¹ I subjoin, chiefly from v. Arnim's *Stoicorum Veterum fragmenta*, a selection of passages sufficient to make this clear.

Aëtius *Plac.* I. 6 ὀρίζονται δὲ τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ οὐσίαν οἱ Στωικοὶ οὕτως . . . ἔσχον δὲ ἔννοιαν τούτου πρῶτον μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ κάλλους τῶν ἐμφαινομένων προσλαμβάνοντες . . . καλὸς δὲ ὁ κόσμος· δῆλον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ χρώματος καὶ τοῦ μεγέθους καὶ τῆς περὶ τὸν κόσμον τῶν ἀστέρων ποικιλίας. σφαιροειδὴς γὰρ ὁ κόσμος ὃ πάντων σχημάτων πρωτεύει· μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο τοῖς αὐτοῦ μέρεσιν ὁμοιοῦται· περιφερὴς δὲ ὧν ἔχει τὰ μέρη περιφερῇ· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸ ἱερώτατον συνέστηκεν ὁ νοῦς, cf. Diog. Laert. VII. 148 οὐσίαν δὲ θεοῦ Ζήνων μὲν φησι τὸν ὅλον κόσμον καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ Χρύσιππος κ.τ.ε. Aët. *Plac.* II. 2. 1 οἱ μὲν Στωικοὶ σφαιροειδῇ τὸν κόσμον. Seneca *Apocolocyntosis* 8 (in ridicule of the deified Claudius) 'Ἐπικούρειος θεός non potest esse: οὐτ' αὐτὸς πρᾶγμα ἔχει οὔτε ἄλλοις παρέχει. Stoicus? quomodo potest *rotundus* esse ut ait Varro sine capite sine praepotio. est aliquid in illo Stoici dei, iam uideo; nec cor nec caput habet.' Cf. the Herculanean fragm. Arnim II. no. 1059 πῶς γὰρ ἰδίαν ἔχει μορφήν τὸ σφαιροειδές. Schol. in Hom. *Il.* Ψ 65 Χρύσιππος δὲ [τὰς ψυχὰς] μετὰ τὸν χωρισμὸν τοῦ σώματος σφαιροειδεῖς γενέσθαι δογματίζει. So Lucan 9. 9 'aeternos animam collegit in *orbis*' (cf. 'orbem' Ov. *Fast.* 6. 271 below). Hieronymus *Ep.* 108. 23 'ossa audis et carnem et pedes et manus et *globos* mihi Stoicorum atque aëria quaedam deliramenta confingis.' Marcus Aurelius, 12. 3 εἰάν . . . ποιήσης τε σεαυτὸν οἶος ὁ Ἐμπεδόκλειος σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μονίῃ περιγηθεῖ γαίων. Cf. Id. 8. 41, 11. 12 σφαῖρα ψυχῆς αὐτοειδής, Hor. *S.* II. 7. 56 '(sapiens) in se ipso totus, teres atque *rotundus*.'

The metaphorical language of Clement will however remain obscure until it is noted that it has a special reference to the central sphere of the universe, to wit the earth, of which, to begin with, we read in Aët. *Plac.* III. 9. 3 οἱ Στωικοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀπ' αὐτῶν σφαιροειδῇ τὴν γῆν. Next may be cited from Achilles *Isagoge* 4 (II. 555 Arnim) part of the description of the κόσμος as a series of concentric spherical shells τὸν δὲ αἰθέρα καὶ οὐρανὸν (εἴτε ὁ αὐτὸς εἴτε διαφόρος) ἔξωθεν εἶναι σφαιρικὸν σχῆμα ἔχοντα. μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ἐντὸς αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀέρα εἶναι, καὶ αὐτὸν σφαιρικῶς περικείμενον ἔξωθεν τῇ γῇ· ἐνδοτέρω δὲ αὐτοῦ τρίτην εἶναι σφαῖραν, τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος, περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν γῆν μεταξὺ τοῦ ἀέρος καὶ τῆς γῆς ἐν δὲ τῷ μεσαιοτάτῳ τὴν γῆν εἶναι, κέντρον ἀξίν καὶ μέγεθος

¹ The doctrine of the perfectness of the sphere is of course pre-Stoic. In the *Timaeus* of Plato it appears in more than one application; 33 B (on

the κόσμος) and 73 C sqq. (of the brain and head) are not without their instructiveness for parts of the present inquiry.

ἐπέχουσιν ὡς ἐν σφαίραι· καὶ τὰς μὲν ἄλλας τρεῖς σφαῖρας ἢ τέσσαρας περιδινεῖσθαι· τὴν δὲ τῆς γῆς μόνην ἐστάναι. This μονότονος ἐδραιότης, 'isolated stability,' is described further on: καὶ τὴν γῆν δέ, πανταχόθεν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀέρος ὠθουμένην ἰσορρόπως ἐν τῷ μέσῳ εἶναι καὶ ἐστάναι· ἢ πάλιν ὥσπερ εἴ τις λαβὼν σῶμα δῆσειε πανταχόθεν σχοινίοις καὶ δολίῃ τισὶν ἰσορρόπως ἔλκειν ἐπ' ἀκριβείας· συμβήσεται γὰρ πανταχόθεν ἐπίσης περιελκόμενον στήναι καὶ ἀτρεμῆσαι. Plutarch *de facie in orbe lunae* cap. 6 p. 923 E γῆν δέ φατε ὑμεῖς (Stoici) ἀνευ βάσεως καὶ ῥίξης διαμένειν· πάνν μὲν οὖν, εἶπεν ὁ Φαρνάκης, τὸν οἰκεῖον καὶ κατὰ φύσιν τόπον ἔχουσιν, ὅσπερ αὐτῇ τὸν μέσον· οὗτος γάρ ἐστι περὶ ὃν ἀντερείδει πάντα τὰ βάρη ῥέποντα, καὶ φέρεται καὶ συννεύει πανταχόθεν· ἡ δὲ ἄνω χώρα πᾶσα, κἄν τι δέξηται γεῶδες ὑπὸ βίας ἀναρριφέν, εὐθὺς ἐκθλίβει δεῦρο μᾶλλον δὲ ἀφίησιν ἢ πέφυκεν οἰκεῖαι ῥοπῇ καταφερόμενον. I have quoted this passage in full because it contains an apparent but very natural and insignificant discordance with Clement in the use of 'up' and 'down.' To a spectator on the surface of the earth the rest of the universe is 'up'; to one at the centre of the same it would be 'down.' This is the point of view in a noteworthy parallel in Ovid, *Fasti* 6. 169 sqq., which I have already discussed and interpreted in this Journal (IV. pp. 196 sqq.) but on which I have now something further to say: 'terra pilae similis, nullo fulcimine nixa, | aere subiecto tam graue pendet onus.' It is thus that the position of the earth presents a parallel to the γνώσεως ἀκρότης and the ἐπαναβεβηκὸς ὕψος of the 'perfect man.' The next pentameter throws a flood of light on Clement's γωνία 'ipsa uolubilitas libratum sustinet orbem | quique premat partes angulus omnis abest,' or, in my translation, 'its very rotundity keeps the globe in equilibrium; it has no corners to depress any one of its parts'—an exact parallel to our author's expression 'All that have any corner (angle) still left to depress them by its downward moment find that dragged down which faith would elevate.' The comparison of the passages has now disclosed that Ovid was drawing from a Stoic source,¹ another indication of which is his identification of *Terra* and *Vesta* and his insistence on the immobility of the earth as the centre of the universe, as we learn from Plutarch *op. cit.* cap. 6, p. 923 A that Cleanthes said Aristarchus of Samos' countrymen should have indicted him for impiety ὡς κινουντα τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἐστίαν ὅτι τὰ φαινόμενα σώζειν ἀνὴρ ἐπειράτο, μένειν τὸν οὐρανὸν ὑποτιθέμενος, ἐξελίττεσθαι δὲ κατὰ λογοῦ κύκλου τὴν γῆν, ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὸν αὐτῆς ἄξονα δινουμένην. The notion of absence of angularity in the perfect man's soul appears also in M. Aurelius II. 12 (l.c) σφαῖρα ψυχῆς αὐτοειδής, ὅταν μὴ τε ἐπιτείνηται ἐπὶ τι μὴ τ' ἔσω συντρέχηι.

J. P. POSTGATE.

June 22, 1914.

UNIVERSITY OF LIVERPOOL.

¹ Stoic influence, it may be added, has recently been traced in the cosmogony of Ovid *Met.* i. by

Mr. F. E. Robbins, *Classical Philology*, 8. (1913) pp. 401 sqq.