impossibility of saddling Livia with a demeaning title, a designation appropriate to a minor Roman god or a cult that originated in the Greek East—not to the priestess of a major god at Rome. With Ovid's usage of *sacerdos* now brought into perspective the conclusion stands that, whatever the origin of the erroneous information in Velleius, Livia can have served as priestess of the deified Augustus only as *flaminica Diui Augusti*, not as *sacerdos Diui Augusti*.

University of Alberta DUNCAN FISHWICK†
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000215

EPICTETUS, *DISSERTATIONES* 1.18.10

In the late nineteenth century J.L.G. Mowat published a short note in the *Journal of Philology* pointing out that in the Bodleian's MS of the *Dissertationes* of Epictetus there is an ink smudge (on fol. 25r) where all the other MSS have lacunae in several lines, leading to the conclusion that the Bodleian MS is the archetype for all other surviving copies.[1]

The MS in question (Auct. T.4.13; Graec. Misc. 251)[2] was acquired by the Bodleian as one of a group of fifty bought in 1820 for £500.[3] These all came from the collection of Giovanni Saibante. Little is known about Giovanni Saibante but in the early eighteenth century Scipio Maffei described Saibante's library in his *Verona Illustrata*, reporting that it contained 1,300 manuscripts.[4] Among these were eighty Greek manuscripts, out of which came the fifty purchased by the Bodleian.[5] We do not know where the Epictetus MS was before then.[6]

Mowat's observation was built upon by H. Schenkl in his *editio maior* of Epictetus, first published in 1894 and revised in 1916.[7] Schenkl took the Bodleian MS as the

and *flamen Caesaris* [*Augusti*]: *CIL* 10.830.837-8.947-8, while his successor was styled *sacerdos Augusti* once again (*CIL* 10.840, cf. 10.944).

[1] J.L.G. Mowat, 'A lacuna in Arrian', *Journal of Philology* 7 (1877), 60–3.

[2] See H.O. Coxe, *Bodleian Quarto Catalogues I: Greek Manuscripts* (Oxford, [1853] 1969), col. 804, no. 251, and F. Madan, *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford* (Oxford, 1897), 4.422–3, no. 20531. As well as Epictetus the MS also contains Porphyry's *De Vita Pythagorae* and the latter is discussed in V. Rose, 'Porphyrius', *Hermes* 5 (1871), 360–70. Rose reports readings from the MS made by Ingram Bywater, 362–8, presented as supplements to Nauck's text of the *De Vita Pythagorae* in his *Porphyrii Philosophi Platonici Opuscula Tria* (Leipzig, 1860).

[3] The purchase is described in Madan (n. 2), 422. The fifty MSS are described in Coxe (n. 2), cols 774–812.

[4] See S. Maffei, *Verona Illustrata: Parte Terza* (Verona, 1732), cols 241–4. Maffei mentions 'mille trecento manuscritti' in col. 242. In cols 242–4 he lists the 80 Greek manuscripts in the collection. 'Arriano sopra Epitteto' is no. 59.

[5] For further discussion of the Saibante MSS and their fate see E.M. Jeffreys, 'The Greek manuscripts of the Saibante collection', in K. Treu (ed.), *Studia Codicologica* (*Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur* 124) (Berlin, 1977), 249–62. The Epictetus MS is discussed at 259 and is no. 59 in Jeffreys' list. This follows the numeration of Maffei. Of the 30 Greek MSS not acquired by the Bodleian in 1820, Jeffreys traces their current locations where known, and Saibante MSS can now be found in Florence, Paris and London.

[6] Jeffreys (n. 5) reports what is known of the provenance.

[7] H. Schenkl, *Epicteti Dissertationes ab Arriano Digestae* (Leipzig, 1894). This *editio maior* was

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

foundation for his edition and included a facsimile of the page with the ink smudge.[8] Schenkl claimed to have identified the Bodleian MS as the archetype of the surviving tradition, although one of his reviewers thought this was grossly unfair to Mowat.[9] When a little later J. Souilhé turned to prepare the Budé edition of Epictetus, the first volume of which was published in 1943, he took the Bodleian MS to be foundational, to the point of printing its foliation in the margins (as had Schenkl in his 1916 editions).[10]

Since the days of Schenkl and Souilhé the study of MSS has benefitted from the rise of digital imaging. It is now possible to produce a wide range of images of texts such as high-resolution enlargements and infrared images. Recently there arose the opportunity to look again at the ink smudge in Epictetus and to see if, with the help of modern digital imaging, it might be possible to recover a few more words or to confirm or reject some of the conjectures that editors have made.[11]

While the ink smudge on fol. 25r extends over approximately 15 lines, there are just four lines with letters that have proved completely illegible to previous editors (lines 11–14 = *Diss*. 1.18.10). Mowat, W.A. Oldfather (using Schenkl's text as a base for his Loeb edition)[12] and Souilhé have all proposed different ways of reconstructing those four lines, while Schenkl simply marked the gaps without printing any conjectures in his text. Readers of Epictetus have had little independent evidence against which to assess the competing reconstructions. These four lines of fol. 25r, as printed by Mowat, Schenkl, Oldfather and Souilhé are as follows:

Mowat (1877):
11. καὶ μισητικὸν; [μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς] τὰς φωνὰς ταύτας
12. ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ [εἰκῇ ἐροῦσιν]· τούτους οὖν τοὺς κα-
13. ταράτους καὶ μι[σητοὺς ἐλεήσ]ω; σὺ πῶς ποτ' ἀπεσο-
14. φώθης ἄφνω[ς οὕτως ὥστε] χαλεπὸς εἶ; διὰ τί οὖν

Schenkl (1916):
11. καὶ μισητικόν· μὴ ἐ …… πῃς τὰς φωνὰς ταύτας
12. ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν φ …… των 'τούτους οὖν τοὺς κα-
13. ταράτους καὶ μιαροὺς ……' ἔστω· σὺ πῶς ποτ' ἀπεσο-
14. φώθης ἄφνω ….ν . ᾳ̣λλ̣ῳ̣ς χαλεπὸς εἶ. διὰ τί οὖν

Oldfather (1925):
11. καὶ μισητικόν· μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς τὰς φωνὰς ταύτας
12. ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν φιλοψογούντων "τούτους οὖν τοὺς κα-

followed by an *editio minor* in 1898 and second editions of both were issued in 1916. See W.A. Oldfather, *Contributions Toward a Bibliography of Epictetus* (Urbana, 1927), 6–7.

[8] In the 1916 edition the facsimile plate is mistakenly identified as 'fol. 52a' instead of 25a.

[9] See the review by J.B. Mayor, *CR* 9 (1895), 31–7, supplemented with corrections by W.M. Lindsay, ibid., 37–9. Schenkl replied to what he considered to be a grossly unfair review in *CR* 9 (1895), 231–4, to which Mayor responded in the same issue, 234–5.

[10] J. Souilhé, *Épictète, Entretiens Livre I* (Paris, 1943). A second revised edition was published in 1975. On the status of the Bodleian MS, see lxxii-lxxiii.

[11] The occasion for this was a small exhibition of Stoic-related texts, including the Epictetus MS, at the Bodleian Library under the title 'Stoicism and its Legacy', displayed at the Proscholium in May-June 2013. Digital images of the MS (along with prints of the same) were made possible by a small grant from the Lorne Thyssen Research Fund of the Ancient World Research Cluster at Wolfson College, Oxford, very gratefully acknowledged here.

[12] W.A. Oldfather, *Epictetus, The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*, 2 vols. (London, 1925–8).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

13. ταράτους καὶ μιαροὺς μωρούς" ἔστω· σὺ πῶς ποτ' ἀπεσο-
14. φώθης ἄφνω ὥστε ἄλλοις μωροῖς χαλεπὸς εἶ; διὰ τί οὖν

Souilhé (1943):

11. καὶ μισητικόν· τίς οὖ<ν> εἶ ἄ<νθρωπε> <ἵ>να εἴπῃς τὰς φωνὰς ταύτας
12. ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ εἰώ<θασι λέγειν> « τούτους οὖν τοὺς κα-
13. ταράτους καὶ μιαροὺς <ἆρον »;> ἔστω· σὺ πῶς ποτ' ἀπεσο-
14. φώθης ἄφνω <καὶ νῦν> ἄλλοις χαλεπὸς εἶ; διὰ τί οὖν

On the basis of a fresh examination of prints of high-resolution digital photographs of the MS the following points may be made about each line.[13]

The lacuna on line 11 remains illegible. Schenkl was probably correct to print πῃς afterwards and this accords with Souilhé's reading too. The κῃς required for Mowat's proposal of εἰσενέγκῃς adopted by Oldfather seems doubtful.

In line 12, again the lacuna remains illegible. Schenkl's τῶν after πολλοὶ seems right and this may well be followed by φιλ (this is plausible but not certain), making Oldfather's proposal of φιλοψογούντων certainly possible. This counts against Souilhé's εἰώ.

In line 13 Schenkl's μιαροὺς and ἔστω both look secure. It is not possible to discern the word in between. Oldfather and Souilhé offer different conjectures here, neither of which can be confirmed.

In line 14 Schenkl and Souilhé both print ἄφνω, which looks secure. However, Souilhé's suggestion <καὶ νῦν> does not look right, for there is space for punctuation immediately after ἄφνω. However, Souilhé's ἄλλοις looks to be correct, against Schenkl's ἀλλῳ̣ς. On the basis of what can be discerned, the most plausible reading here might be ἄφνω· τί τοῖς ἄλλοις χαλεπὸς εἶ; There is no room on the line for the μωροῖς added by Oldfather.[14]

Taking all of these observations into account, it is possible to discern the following text:

11. καὶ μισητικόν· μὴ …… πῃς τὰς φωνὰς ταύτας
12. ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν φιλ[οψογούν]των 'τούτους οὖν τοὺς κα-
13. ταράτους καὶ μιαροὺς …..' ἔστω· σὺ πῶς ποτ' ἀπεσο-
14. φώθης ἄφνω· τί τοῖς ἄλλοις χαλεπὸς εἶ; διὰ τί οὖν

Oldfather's version of this passage, which is probably the most widely read, now looks somewhat harsh. If there is one word that stands out in his text of *Diss.* 1.18.10, it is the repeated μωροί. But there are no secure grounds for accepting the first instance and simply no room on the line for the second. The context of the passage as a whole makes Oldfather's μωρούς (supplied by Capps) in line 13 quite reasonable, if this was meant to be the exclamation of an imaginary interlocutor angry at others. However, the insertion of μωροῖς in line 14 not only does not fit in the space of the line but also seems contextually inappropriate, for here Epictetus is referring in his own voice to people to whom he has been arguing we ought to display understanding (they may

[13] All of the following observations are by Nigel Wilson, who very generously agreed to examine enlarged images of the MS.

[14] In a note Oldfather reports that μωροῖς was 'supplied by Capps', presumably Edward Capps (1866–1950), the first American editor of the Loeb Classical Library.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000112 Published online by Cambridge University Press

be acting wrongly, but all wrongdoing is the product of unintentional error). Where Oldfather translates the final section as 'but how is it that you have so suddenly been converted to wisdom that you are angry at fools?', we might instead put 'but how is it that you have so suddenly been converted to wisdom; why are you so severe to everybody else?'.

King's College London
Wolfson College, Oxford

JOHN SELLARS
john.sellars@kcl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000112

THE DECLINE OF SOPHIA AND A MISLEADING GLOSS IN PLOTINUS, *ENN*. II.9 [33].10.25

In two chapters of *Enn*. II.9 [33], Plotinus discusses the Gnostic idea that the creation of the world is due to the 'decline' (νεῦσις) of a principle that he variously calls Soul or Sophia.[1] The identity of Plotinus' Gnostics is notoriously difficult to establish with any degree of precision; I can only note here that the idea of Sophia's 'decline' features in a number of extant Gnostic texts, such as those from Nag Hammadi and the Berlin Codex (*Papyrus Berolinensis* 8502), as a recent survey of the evidence by Poirier has demonstrated.[2]

The first mention occurs in chapter 4 (lines 6–11): on the basis of the principle that creative power derives from the activity of contemplating a higher reality (discussed at length at III.8 [30]),[3] Plotinus here points out a fundamental incompatibility between the activity of creating and that of a 'decline'. If the Soul 'declines', it must be in the sense that it loses contact with intelligible reality, presumably because Soul is an incorporeal entity and thus cannot literally tend towards a downward motion in space. But if the 'decline' of the Soul implies a kind of forgetfulness of the intelligibles, it must result

[1] I capitalize 'Soul' in the following, to indicate that the discussion deals with the world soul, rather than with particular individual souls. Plotinus, without argument, takes the world soul's activity of administering the universe to be comparable to that of the Gnostic Sophia, who 'illuminates' a pre-existing material substrate. See, for example, *Enn*. II.9.4.1-22, where the subject of Sophia's fall and decline is explained entirely in terms of Soul.

[2] See P.-H. Poirier, 'À propos de la νεῦσις dans les textes de Nag Hammadi', *Laval théologique et philosophique* 68 (2012), 619–26. Particularly interesting in the present context is the Nag Hammadi treatise *Zostrianos*, where we find the claim that Sophia 'emitted the darkness' (trans. Turner) (NHC VIII,1: 9.17), which may perhaps be related to the darkness which the Soul is said to 'illuminate' at *Enn*. II.9.10.25. Further, we find in *Zostrianos* the view that Sophia's 'looking down' is the reason why some immortal souls 'associate' with various types of incarnate souls (27.9-13). The thought that Sophia/Soul is the cause for the descent of particular souls is also implied by *Enn*. II.9.10.24-5, where Plotinus refers to 'the Soul for whose sake the other souls descended'.

[3] See for example *Enn*. III.8.4.39-40. The same idea recurs in treatise II.9, e.g. at the end of chapter 2 (lines 16–18). The two treatises are often thought to be part of a larger composition, the so-called *Großschrift*, originally comprising *Enn*. III.8 [30], V.8 [31], V.5 [32] and II.9 [33], and later somewhat arbitrarily divided by Plotinus' editor Porphyry. Cf. R. Harder, 'Eine neue Schrift Plotins', *Hermes* 71 (1936), 1–10.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000112 Published online by Cambridge University Press