involved, soon augmented by ample groups of *nobilitas* (lines 524–5), are from the whole of Gaul—in Sidonius' words, the area bounded by the Cottian Alps, the Tyrrhenian sea, the Rhine and the Pyrenees; this is a meeting of the Council of the Gauls, set up in 418. The apparently unsuspecting Avitus had misread the position of the Gauls, but the detail of his serious but transient sadness serves to add to the picture of a sensitive and tactful diplomat.

A speech by an unnamed noble (lines 530–71)—the question of his identity does not concern us here[15]—is greeted with applause that fills the hall at Ugernum[16] where they have met, and all are persuaded that Avitus must be emperor. This decision is legitimated two days later by another acclamation by the soldiers and the presentation to Avitus of a military torc and unspecified *insignia regni*. The poet notes here that even now Avitus is *maestus*, but for a different reason. This is not quite the conventional reluctance of secular and sacred appointees,[17] but perhaps rather a glumness or apprehensiveness, which Sidonius explains by saying (in line 580) that Avitus had hitherto taken on only the cares of a *princeps*, and not (he implies) the joys of one. Perhaps, the poet adds in a typical simile, Hercules looked like that when he accepted the burden of Atlas (lines 581–4). This may, indeed, be a feature of the real Avitus, noted by his son-in-law. Be that as it may, the Fates then weave a *felix tempus* ('happy time') for his reign, and their looms produce a Golden Age for the consulship which has just begun.[18]

University of Glasgow ROGER GREEN
Roger.Green@glasgow.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000690

TOO MUCH THEOLOGY: A TEXTUAL PROBLEM IN OLYMPIODORUS' *PROLEGOMENA* 9.10-12 AND ITS SOLUTION

In the Neoplatonic schools, introductions to logic, and the *Categories* in particular, would begin with a list of ten different questions relating to Aristotle's philosophy and his ideal interpreter and student.[1] Olympiodorus' own introduction to logic (the

[15] The question has hardly been discussed; according to Loyen (n. 3), 186 n. 91, it is Tonantius Ferreolus 'sans doute'.

[16] Line 572. Not *Viernum*; the form of the name found in all relevant inscriptions is *Ugernum*, which palaeographically differs only in a single letter, and the explanation of the difference is most likely to be scribal error. J. Sirmond in J. Sirmond (ed.), *C. Sollii Apollinaris Sidonii Arvernorum Episcopi Opera* (Paris, 1614 and 1652), 135 was right to declare the emendation certain, but not in his expectation that no one would disagree.

[17] For example, Claudian 17.245 and Paulinus of Nola 6.93 (*non/nec se meruisse fatetur*), where Claudian is surely the borrower.

[18] I wish to thank Professor Jill Harries and Dr Jesús Hernández Lobato for advice and assistance with this paper.

[1] The list of ten questions to be discussed before the reading of Aristotle goes back to Proclus, who composed a treatise, lost to us, on this subject. See Elias, *In Cat.* 107.24-6, and cf. J. Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to be Settled before the Study of an Author or a Text* (Leiden, 1994), 22. These questions are: '(1) Where do the names of the philosophical schools come from? (2) What

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Prolegomena) follows this pattern; he expands on the remarks of his own teacher Ammonius of Alexandria, and closely models his discussion on his predecessor's work.[2] In the standard list of ten questions that must be discussed in an introductory philosophy course, the third relates to the subject with which the student is to start his or her philosophical education. Which of logic, ethics, natural science and mathematics is the proper starting-point for philosophy?[3]

Olympiodorus, following Ammonius' footsteps, opts for logic, although he concedes that some role must be given to the formation of character. A soul that is disturbed by the passions would not be able to properly grasp the teachings of philosophy, and so a harmonious character must be attained before any other subject matter can be studied.[4] But on this reasoning, ethics, and not logic, should be the first subject of study for any beginning philosophers. Olympiodorus recognizes the difficulty, and attempts a resolution, but the relevant passage is textually corrupt (*Prol*. 9.7-11):

ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ δίκην ἀλόγων ζῴων καὶ ἰδιωτικῷ τρόπῳ κοσμοῦμεν καὶ καλλύνομεν τὰ ἤθη ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ συλλογιστικῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ ἀποδεικτικῆς μεθόδου, δίκαιον τὴν λογικὴν προηγήσασθαι τῆς τε ἠθικῆς <καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς> καὶ τῆς μαθηματικῆς καὶ τῆς θεολογικῆς.

But since we do not order and beautify our characters in the manner of unreasoning animals and in a vulgar way, but through the syllogistic and demonstrative method of proof, it is right that logic should come before ethics, <natural science>, mathematics and theology.

The insertion of <καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς> follows Busse's suggestion. It is justified by the fact that Olympiodorus has given logic priority over the remaining three disciplines, i.e. ethics, natural science and mathematics. But where does theology fit into this schema? The answer is, I think, 'nowhere'. Consider the continuation of the passage (*Prol*. 9.11-12):

ἐν δὲ αὐταῖς ταύταις ταῖς τρισὶ δέον ἐστὶ προηγεῖσθαι τὴν φυσικὴν τῆς μαθηματικῆς καὶ τὴν μαθηματικὴν τῆς θεολογικῆς.

In the case of these three sciences, natural science must come before mathematics, and mathematics before theology.

is the division of Aristotle's books? (3) Where should one begin with Aristotle's books? (4) What is their respective rank, and which ones can carry us to the summit of his philosophy? (5) What obvious utility derives from the attainment of philosophy? (6) What kind of person should a student of Aristotle's books be? (7) What kind of person should a commentator be? (8) Why did the Philosopher make a point of being unclear? (9) What is the style of his writing? (10) How many and what kind of preliminaries should there be for each book?' (Olympiodorus, *Prol*. 1.16-24; my own translation).

[2] The Greek text of Olympiodorus' *Prolegomena* is that by A. Busse, *Olympiodori Prolegomena et in Categorias Commentarium* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, 12.1) (Berlin, 1902), 1–25. Ammonius' *Prolegomena* are contained in A. Busse, *Ammonius in Aristotelis Categorias Commentarius* (*Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, 4.4) (Berlin, 1895), 1–15.

[3] For this list of four disciplines, cf. *Prol*. 8.30-2: καὶ περὶ τούτου τέσσαρες δόξαι γεγόνασιν· καὶ οἱ μὲν τῆς πρώτης δόξης φασὶν ὅτι τῆς ἠθικῆς δεῖ ἄρξασθαι, οἱ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας τῆς φυσιολογικῆς, οἱ δὲ τῆς μαθηματικῆς, οἱ δὲ τῆς λογικῆς.

[4] Cf. *Prol*. 8.34-6: ὥσπερ γὰρ οἱ τὰ σκοτεινὰ ὄμματα ἔχοντες οὐ δύνανται πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον ἀποβλέψαι, οὕτως οὐδέ τις βαρυνόμενος πάθεσι ψυχῆς δύναται τούτων ἅψασθαι. Olympiodorus here departs from Ammonius, who argues that ethical reasoning uses, and therefore presupposes knowledge of, syllogistic reasoning. Cf. Ammonius, *In Cat*. 6.2-5: ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῃ κέχρηται ἀποδείξεσι καὶ συλλογισμοῖς, ἐμέλλομεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἀγνοεῖν ἀνήκοοι τῶν τοιούτων ὑπάρχοντες λόγων, διὰ τοῦτο ἅρα ἀπὸ τῆς λογικῆς ἀρκτέον, προκοσμήσαντας μέντοι τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἤθη καὶ δίχα τῆς ἠθικῆς πραγματείας.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

There is clearly something wrong here. Olympiodorus needs to tell us how ethics, natural science and mathematics are related, given the priority of logic over these last three sciences. Yet, for some reason, ethics has disappeared from the discussion. If we insert <τὴν ἠθικὴν καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς> into the text, we now have four sciences that are related to one another, and not three, so this change will not get us out of the difficulty.

The solution, I submit, depends on realizing that both instances of τῆς θεολογικῆς are later intrusions into the text.[5] A less than careful reader of Olympiodorus' text would have assumed that the philosopher is presenting a hierarchy of the sciences, and that 'theology' ought to be included as the highest term. Such a hierarchy is presented, for example, at *Prol*. 9.32-6, where Olympiodorus lists the degrees of philosophy:

φαμὲν τοίνυν ὅτι πέντε τινὰ καθέστηκεν τὰ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ἡμᾶς ἀπάγοντα τῆς φιλοσοφίας, οἷον λογική, φυσική, ἠθική, μαθηματική, θεολογική. καὶ ἔστιν ἀρχὴ μὲν ἡ λογική, μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἠθική, μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἠθικὴν ἡ φυσική, μετὰ δὲ ταύτην ἡ μαθηματική, μετὰ δὲ τὴν μαθηματικὴν ἡ θεολογία.

Now we say that that there are five disciplines that lead us towards the summit of philosophy, namely logic, physics, ethics, mathematics and theology. Logic is the starting point, and after it comes ethics, after ethics physics, after physics mathematics, and after mathematics theology.

Theology here stands at the apex of philosophy, logic at its beginning. But we should not read this hierarchy back into our problematic passage (*Prol.* 9.7-11). Our author does not even consider the implausible thought that the study of theology should be placed at the beginning of the philosophical curriculum; for this reason, he mentions only ethics, natural science and mathematics as viable candidates.[6] We would thus expect him to consider the order of these four sciences, and to leave theology out of the question.

Thus, if one restores the whole passage to its original form, before the ill-advised intervention of a copyist or editor distorted its proper meaning, it will read as follows (text in curly brackets {} is to be deleted):

ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ δίκην ἀλόγων ζῴων καὶ ἰδιωτικῷ τρόπῳ κοσμοῦμεν καὶ καλλύνομεν τὰ ἤθη ἡμῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ συλλογιστικῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ ἀποδεικτικῆς μεθόδου, δίκαιον τὴν λογικὴν προηγήσασθαι τῆς τε ἠθικῆς <καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς> καὶ τῆς μαθηματικῆς {καὶ τῆς θεολογικῆς}. ἐν δὲ αὐταῖς ταύταις ταῖς τρισὶ δέον ἐστὶ προηγεῖσθαι <τὴν ἠθικὴν τῆς φυσικῆς> καὶ τὴν φυσικὴν τῆς μαθηματικῆς {καὶ τὴν μαθηματικὴν τῆς θεολογικῆς}.

This small textual matter may give us an insight into what Olympiodorus' ancient readers were expecting to find in his works, namely statements concerning the supremacy of theology.[7] When faced with the puzzling absence of such statements in the passage discussed above, they were apparently prepared to emend the text in light of their

[5] The only MS for Olympiodorus' *Prolegomena* (Mutiniensis 96, in the Biblioteca Estense; *c*. fourteenth century A.D.) does not show any evidence of tampering with the text at this point (folio 9r), but the corruption might simply date further back. I am grateful to Dr Annalisa Battini for her assistance.

[6] It is worth noting that Olympiodorus' student Elias does not mention theology when discussing the starting point for philosophy (see *In Cat*. 117.20-119.25). See also n. 4 above.

[7] Both pagan and Christian readers and copyists could have brought this assumption to bear on the text. The possibility of a simple scribal error, rather than an ideological emendation, cannot be excluded, however; a parallel in the *Prolegomena* would be e.g. 15.8-9, where τὸ θεωρητικόν and τὸ μαθηματικόν are confused.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000604 Published online by Cambridge University Press

preconception of what the author ought to say.[8] But, as I hope to have shown, there can be too much even of theology.

St John's College, Oxford S.R.P. GERTZ
sebastian.gertz@sjc.ox.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000604

A FURTHER MANUSCRIPT SOURCE FOR PROCLUS' *HYMNS**

In November 2014 I had the pleasure of examining Bruxellensis 11377–80. This paper manuscript was owned by Pierre Pantin at his death in 1611; it occupies no. 30 in his catalogue, where the first text, on fols 1–4, was misidentified as 'Hymni Homeri'. The next owner, André Schott, repeated the error; Omont (and following him the Pinakes database) uses a page-numeration that completely excludes the current fols 1–4.[1]

The manuscript is composed of three parts, as follows:

1) fols 1–4 in fact contain Proclus' *Hymns* 3.12–7.52, together with Orphic fr. 31 Bernabé = 21a Kern; there are twenty-two lines per page. This source is absent from Vogt's edition, even though fols 92v–95r, which contain a further text of Proclus' *Hymns*, are included as MS 5.[2] I identified the scribe as Demetrios Moschos by his handwriting.[3] The watermark is a crossbow within a circle; the chain-lines pass just outside the circle, *c*.32 mm apart. The design is similar to Harlfinger's 'Arbalète 35', but smaller. The watermark described by Formentin from Marcianus gr. 604 fols 132–78, where Moschos copied the *Orphic Argonautica*, may offer a better match.[4] I do not know why fol. 1 is also marked '29' in a later hand.

[8] The influence of Ammonius may have played a role here too; cf. his *In Cat.* 6.6-8: μετὰ δὲ τὴν λογικὴν ἰτέον ἐπὶ τὴν ἠθικήν, καὶ οὕτως ἀντιληπτέον τῶν φυσικῶν, καὶ μετ' ἐκεῖνα τῶν μαθηματικῶν, καὶ οὕτως ἐσχάτων τῶν θεολογικῶν.

* My thanks to the University of Nottingham for funding, and to the staff of the KBR, BnF and Biblioteca Estense for assistance.

[1] See H. Omont, 'Catalogue des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles', *Revue de l'instruction publique en Belgique* 28 (1885), 6–21, 82–9, at 88 for Pantin's catalogue, 89 for Schott's, and 7 for Omont's own description. Pinakes: http://pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr/ (accessed 28 June 2015).

[2] E. Vogt, *Procli hymni* (Wiesbaden, 1957).

[3] E. Gamillscheg and D. Harlfinger, *Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten* (Vienna, 1981-), I no. 97 = II 131 = III 165. I thank Rudolf Stefec for confirming my identification, and for alerting me to his own supplement to the list of manuscripts of Proclus' *Hymns* (Beinecke 532: 'Aus der literarischen Werkstatt des Michael Apostoles', *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 60 [2010], 29–48, at 30).

[4] D. Harlfinger and J. Harlfinger, *Wasserzeichen aus griechischen Handschriften* (Berlin, 1974–1980). M.R. Formentin, 'Il punto su Demetrio Mosco', *Bollettino della Badia Greca di Grottaferrata* 52 (1998), 235–57, at 254. Formentin notes several encircled crossbows among the watermarks on Moschos's paper: Marcianus gr. VIII 18 and Neapolitanus III D 22 = Harlfinger 'Arbalète 32'; Parisinus gr. 2157 ~ 'Arbalète 31' and 'Arbalète 38'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000604 Published online by Cambridge University Press