

R. J. HOFFMANN (ed.): *Celsus, On the True Doctrine: a Discourse against the Christians*. Pp. xiii + 146. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987. Paper.

According to the blurb this is 'the first modern English translation of this classic work of antiquity'. Yes and no: since all that we have of Celsus' attack on the Christian faith is contained in Origen's *Contra Celsum*, the remnants of it have already been translated, most notably and accessibly by Chadwick, of whose work H. might well have taken more notice than he did. What H. has done is in fact to take the *disiecta membra* from Origen and link them together with transitions and other rhetorical devices of his own, without telling the reader. He also says (p. 44) that 'no attempt has been made to restore the original order of Celsus' work', but the reader would not realise this from the summary of the argument in the preceding pages, where we find after successive bullet points the words, 'Celsus begins his attack . . . Celsus interrupts his dialogue . . . Celsus follows with an attack . . .'. The section on 'The Text', where H. might have enlightened his reader on such matters, is compressed indeed.

The remainder of the introduction contains a section on 'Anti-Christian Polemic before Celsus', in which H. draws on his knowledge of Biblical Christianity, and a much shorter one, centred on Lucian, on 'Pagan Opposition: from Moral to Intellectual Critique'. H. finds in the Christians of this period—we now seem to be in the period of Clement and Tertullian, but the chronological focus is not always clear, in spite of its importance to H.'s thesis that the moral critiques of Christianity antedate the philosophical assaults of writers like Celsus—'a provocative contempt for the moral philosophy of the Empire and a certain elegiac attitude towards imperial Roman religion'. Obliquity likewise spoils his brief discussion of the identity of Celsus (pp. 30–3). Because the lifetime of the Celsus known to Lucian and the likeliest date of *Contra Celsum* are close to the year 180, 'there is no reason on strictly chronological grounds to argue their separate identities'. As for the Epicureanism of Galen's Celsus and perhaps Lucian's, which Chadwick saw as a grave obstacle to their identification ('with Epicureanism he betrays no affinities at all'), H. admits that 'epicurean opinions are not in bold relief in the passages cited in the *Contra Celsum*' but is prepared to argue that there may have been affinities in the lost parts of this or other writings of Celsus.

The notes vary considerably in their usefulness. Sometimes a myth is given in some detail (Dionysus, Phaethon), sometimes there is only a reference to Apollodorus, or something even less useful. And I cannot imagine what a student will make of the words (p. 57) 'the myth of the Danae, and the Melanippe, or of the Auge and the Antiope', on which there is nothing at all. (The mistranslation, I should add, seems untypical.) It is certainly not true, as claimed, that the notes make the text 'completely accessible to students as well as to scholars of religious history and philosophy'. Little thought has been given to the question of what kind of things the targeted readership might wish to have explained. The notion of presenting Celsus' work like this was a good one—the secrecy apart—but the execution is very disappointing.

Glasgow

ROGER GREEN

M. PATILLON, A. P. SEGONDS, with L. BRISSON (edd., trans.): *Porphyre, De l'abstinence. Tome III, Livre IV* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'association Guillaume Budé). Pp. lxiv + 176. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1995. ISBN: 2-251-00444-0.

The Porphyry *équipe* at CNRS works to a long time-scale. Ten years separated the two large and useful volumes of *Porphyre: La Vie de Plotin* (1982 and 1992, edd. L. Brisson and others). This final volume of the Budé *De l'abstinence*, complete with *index verborum* and *index nominum* for the full text, comes (without explanation) sixteen years after II (1979) and eighteen years after I (1977). Both I and II were edited by Patillon (with J. Bouffartigue), and S. advised on II. The editors of III have revised (pp. lvii–ix) their previous opinion about the MS tradition. The intervening years have also seen Andrew Smith's edition of the fragments of P. (1993), Richard Sorabji's sympathetic assessment of his arguments in *Animal Minds and*

*Human Morals* (1993), and a mass of work offering new interpretations of Plotinus, late-antique Platonism and Pythagoreanism, theurgy, asceticism, mysterious oriental wisdom, and other aspects of the philosophical and social context in which P. wrote *On Abstinence from Animate Food*. There are also far more vegetarians around than in the late 1970s (but still not so many in France).

Volume III contains the much-cited Book 4, in which P. musters examples to counter the argument that vegetarians are a cranky and antisocial minority. In all cultures, he claims, there is an ascetic spiritual élite which makes its special contribution to civic life. This is the book which describes Egyptian priests and Essenes, Magi and Mithraists, Brahmins and Samanians, and which presents the Lycurgan settlement of Sparta—based, P. notes, on arable land, not on flocks and herds—as another vegetarian triumph. It also includes a remarkable account of purity, in which P. affirms that all sexual intercourse contaminates soul with matter if procreation succeeds, and living body with dead seed if it fails. *Abst.* has survived better than most works of P., but even so the end is missing. The editors, considering the length of Books 1–3, think (pp. lv–vi) that not many pages have been lost. Jerome *adv. Iov.* 2.14 begins with a ruthless summary of some of *Abst.* 4, so they print a section to illustrate the ‘individual testimonies’ promised by P. at the beginning of his last extant chapter; but Jerome’s stories of Antisthenes and Diogenes do little for P.’s argument.

Like its predecessors, this volume is especially helpful on P.’s adaptation of his sources and on social history. Its annotation gives fuller discussion of parallels and references, and it avoids the occasional differences of interpretation between translator and commentator which occur in the first two volumes. There are still footnotes (in addition to the apparatus criticus and the *fontes*) as well as endnotes, but this time the endnotes are numbered consecutively through the book. More important, the notes take account of a wide range of recent scholarship on the many cultures discussed by P., and the introduction is both detailed and perceptive. The work of the Budé editors has greatly enriched the study of this fascinating text.

University of Liverpool

GILLIAN CLARK

Μ. Παπαθωμουλος, Ι. Τσαβαρη, G. RIGOTTI (edd.): *Μαξιμος ο Πλανουδης: Αυγουστινου: Περι Τριαδος: Βιβλια Πεντεκαιδεκα ἄπερ ἐκ τῆς Λατίνων διαλέκτου εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα μετήγεκε: Εἰσαγωγή, Ἑλληνικο και Λατινο Κειμενο, Γλωσσαριο: Ἐδιτιο Πρωχεπο Book 1: Βιβλια Α–Ζ; Book 2: Βιβλια Η–ΙΕ. (Βιβλιοθηκα Α. Μανουση, 3.)* Pp. clx + 463; 464–1056. Athens: *Κεντρον Εκδοσεωσ Ἐργων Ἑλληνων Συγγραφεων*, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 960-7099-30-3; 960-099-31-1.

Planudes will probably be best known to readers of *CR* as the translator of Ovid’s *Heroides* and *Metamorphoses*, but his repertoire of translations from Latin included the *Distichs* of Cato, the *Consolation* of Boethius, and another fifteen-book blockbuster, Augustine’s *De Trinitate*. A massive undertaking—Augustine himself said of these tomes *nimis operosi sunt, et a paucis eos intelligi posse arbitror*—and also one that was theologically and politically sensitive, because of the ongoing controversy over the *filioque* clause in the Nicene–Constantinopolitan Creed, which many Easterners had long repudiated, believing that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father alone. Hence the date of not later than 1281 suggested here, the eve of the accession of Andronicus II Palaeologus in 1282. This is all set forth in a detailed introduction, which also gives a full account of Planudes’ life and studies, his technique of translation, and the manuscript tradition of the Latin original and the present work. There is a copious bibliography, including studies of all his translations. Mountain’s CC edition of Augustine’s treatise is printed side by side with Planudes’ translation, with an apparatus of Biblical references and textual information about both. The editors find it necessary on just about every page to correct the text of the translation, blaming discrepancies either on the copyist(s)—and I wondered at times whether the hypothesis of a deaf amanuensis was admissible—or his text of Augustine (which cannot be identified with that of any extant manuscript) rather than the