

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

CHAPTER I

*The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC**Myrto Hatzimichali*

One of the main developments that characterise first-century BC philosophy is that the detailed study of texts became an autonomous and often central philosophical activity in its own right. For this reason, any investigation of philosophical developments during this period must address questions surrounding the circulation of written texts. In this chapter I will examine the respective fates of the texts of Plato and Aristotle, and the editorial interventions that shaped each tradition. The case of Plato, as well as further evidence on the activity of ancient scholars and editors, will then inform my proposed interpretation of developments in the textual tradition of Aristotle, where the first century BC holds particular prominence thanks to the well-known sensational stories about the rediscovery of long-lost works. The history of these texts indicates two different and separable types of activity, namely textual criticism and canon-organisation. However, the modern term ‘edition’ is sometimes used to describe either activity, thus making it more difficult to ascertain what it was that ancient ‘editors’ actually did. In fact, as Dorandi pointed out, Porphyry is probably the only ‘real’ ancient editor of a philosophical corpus, having dealt with both aspects of Plotinus’ text.¹ Keeping the two activities distinct will help to clarify what happened to Aristotle’s text in the first century BC and inform the eventual value judgement that this period was of paramount importance for the way in which Aristotle has been transmitted to us.

TEXT-BASED PHILOSOPHY

In the context of the three revivals of Plato, Aristotle and Pythagoras it is significant that, as Frede notes, they were connected with the beginnings of classicism as a broader cultural development calling for a return to the ancients. A principal means available for this return to authors/authorities

¹ Dorandi 2010: 172.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

from many centuries earlier was none other than the systematic study of their texts.² Textual exegesis of Plato's and Aristotle's writings was central to the articulation of organised philosophical systems for the two authors, systems that for historical reasons did not develop during the Hellenistic period in the way that the Stoic system did.³ Matters are more complicated in the case of the Pythagoreans, given the lack of a recognised corpus of writings going back to Pythagoras himself. I will not have much to say about them in the course of this chapter, apart from remarking that the importance of written texts is evident in this movement too, taking the form of a proliferation of pseudepigrapha, attributed to several early Pythagoreans and aimed at supplying the missing texts.⁴ The first century BC was a pivotal period for this type of activity too: Pseudo-Archytas, who claims paternity of the Aristotelian categories for the fourth-century Pythagorean,⁵ as well as 'Timaeus Locrus', *On the nature of the cosmos and of the soul*, a work claiming to be the model for Plato's *Timaeus*, have both been dated to this period.⁶

The increased focus on texts may also be connected to the decentralisation of philosophy from the Athenian schools during the first century BC, following the growing impact of Rome as a cultural centre and the disruptions of the Mithridatic war. The new peripheral philosophical groups were deprived of the traditional school environment and dialectical interaction, and thus focused on books, which eventually became the cohesive element and starting point in the construction of these groups' philosophical identities. Sedley has pointed out that these developments amount to an 'end for the history of philosophy' in the first century BC, in the sense that most (even the most innovative and creative) philosophical activity now takes the form of looking back, recovering and interpreting the wisdom of the ancients through their texts.⁷

The precise ways of 'looking back', the tactics and attitudes of individual first-century BC philosophers towards the texts of the ancients, are taken up by different chapters within this volume. In what follows, I will focus on the state in which the texts of Plato and Aristotle were made available to anyone who was keen on approaching the original words of the two fourth-century philosophers. Activities that document this keenness on the ancients' original words and are crucial for the circulation of

² Frede 1999: 783–4. ³ See Donini 1994, esp. 5027–35, 5089–94.

⁴ The evidence can be found in Thesleff 1961. ⁵ See Szlezák 1972.

⁶ For the possibility that the *Pythagorean Commentaries* ascribed to Alexander Polyhistor is his own compilation, in which case it will be a further text created in this period, see Long's discussion in Chapter 7 below.

⁷ Sedley 2003a, esp. 35–9.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC* 3

texts include: collecting and distributing copies of books; engaging in textual criticism; defining and maintaining canons (by dealing with questions of authenticity); and writing commentaries or producing other forms of exegesis such as translations or monographs on topics arising from particular texts.⁸ All of these enterprises flourished in the first century BC with respect to philosophical texts, marking a philological as well as a philosophical revival. It is also pertinent to bring up at this point Strabo's tantalising tale about the loss and rediscovery of Aristotle's books (13.1.54): the most extravagant claim in that story is that the Peripatos declined because its members had almost no access to Aristotle's works, a report that is highly questionable with respect to the Hellenistic period. But the fact that this loss was deemed a satisfactory explanation for the Peripatetic decline does betray very eloquently the importance placed upon original foundational texts in Strabo's own intellectual milieu in the first century BC.

In order to understand better the ways in which users gained access to these foundational texts, some general remarks on the circulation of books in our period are required by way of introduction. The feature that stands out first of all is the overwhelming centripetal force exercised by Rome and Italy in terms of accumulation of books (alongside other objects of culture such as artefacts, cultic statues etc.).⁹ The first Roman general to have obtained an entire collection of Greek books as war booty was Aemilius Paullus in 168 BC, when he permitted his sons to carry off the books of King Perseus – since they were lovers of learning (Plut. *Aem.* 28.11; Isid. *Etym.* 6.5). Then Sulla famously took from Athens the library of the bibliophile Apellicon of Teos, which contained valuable Aristotelian texts (Str. 13.1.54; Plut. *Sull.* 26). Similarly, Lucullus amassed a very significant collection as war booty from Pontus and Asia Minor (Isid. *Etym.* 6.5). From Cicero's *de Finibus* (3.7–10) we learn that this library contained many Stoic texts as well as Aristotelian *commentarii*.¹⁰

The Romans also employed gentler ways of acquiring Greek books. Cicero's letters to Atticus in 67 BC contain references to a library (that is, a substantial collection of books) that Atticus had promised to obtain in Greece for Cicero's benefit: *et velim cogites, id quod mihi pollicitus es, quem ad modum bibliothecam nobis conficere possis* ('and please give some thought to how you are to procure a library for us as you have promised', Cic. *Att.* 1.7). Thus it appears that Greek collections (including philosophical

⁸ Snyder 2000: 5. ⁹ Strabo 12.5.3; 13.1.19; 14.2.19; 10.2.21 etc.¹⁰ On Lucullus' library see Dix 2000.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

works, presumably among other types of literature) were available for purchase en bloc by Romans who could afford it, especially given economic difficulties in Greece in the aftermath of the Mithridatic war. Finally, with Philodemus we have evidence for the voluntary transportation of a substantial philosophical collection to Italy by a Greek intellectual himself (we know that the collection predates Philodemus' migration, because the Herculaneum papyri include several texts written considerably earlier than Philodemus' time).¹¹

This concentration and increased availability of books in Italy certainly informs the background to Cicero's philosophical work, but it would doubtless have also benefited the increasing number of Greek philosophers as well as other scholars who pursued a teaching career in Rome (in fact, Plutarch is keen to stress that Lucullus' library was particularly welcoming for Greeks).¹² Meanwhile in the East, we have evidence for the continued flourishing of libraries in Pergamum and Alexandria, and perhaps also Smyrna (Plut. *Ant.* 58; Str. 14.1.37). Strabo (13.1.54) and Posidonius are in agreement about the book-acquisition tactics of Apellicon of Teos in the early decades of the first century; he did not always employ legitimate means, yet his activities offer some indication about the opportunities open to a private bibliophile with philosophical interests and deep pockets. Thus Posidonius wrote:

ἐκπέμψας οὖν εἰς τὴν νῆσον Ἀπελλικῶντα τὸν Τήιον, πολίτην δὲ Ἀθηναίων γενόμενον, ποικιλώτατόν τινα καὶ ἀψίκορον ζήσαντα βίον ὅτε μὲν γὰρ ἐφιλοσόφει τὰ περιπατητικά, καὶ τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους βιβλιοθήκην καὶ ἄλλας συνηγόραζε συχνὰς (ἦν γὰρ πολυχρήματος) τὰ τ' ἐκ τοῦ Μητρώου τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτόγραφα ψηφισμάτων ὑφαιρούμενος ἐκτᾶτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων εἴ τι παλαιὸν εἶη καὶ ἀπόθετον.

He [the tyrant Athenion] sent Apellicon to the island [Delos]; he was from Teos but had become an Athenian citizen, and had led an eventful and diverse life. When he developed an interest in Peripatetic philosophy, he purchased both Aristotle's library and many others (for he was very rich); and he acquired by stealth the original copies of the ancient decrees of the Metroon, as well as any other old and rare document that was to be found in other cities. (Ath. 5.214d–e = Posidon. Fr. 253 E–K)

¹¹ See Sedley 2003a: 35.

¹² 'He was more keen on the use than the acquisition [of books]; his library was open to everyone, and the promenades and study-rooms surrounding it were without restriction receiving the Greeks, who gathered there as to a nest of the Muses and spent their days in each other's company' (Plut. *Luc.* 42.1–2).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC* 5

From this brief survey it emerges that two widespread ways of gaining possession of philosophical books in the first century BC were war plunder and bloc purchases, the fruits of which could be shared among groups of peers. It is worth noting that our evidence points to private initiatives and networks much more than public or even school collections. But what sorts of texts would these initiatives yield, and how did they develop through scholarly and editorial intervention? This is the main question I will be dealing with in the rest of this chapter, focusing first on the text of Plato and then on that of Aristotle.

PLATO'S TEXT

In order to approach the state of play for Plato's text in the first century BC, one must reconstruct the stage between the Hellenistic period and the organisation of the corpus by Thrasyllus, astrologer to the Emperor Tiberius in the first century AD (Tac. *Ann.* 6.20–1). Thrasyllus' arrangement ultimately became canonical, having been universally adopted by modern editions since Burnet.¹³ In what follows, I will discuss the main evidence on the history of Plato's text in order to demonstrate the different types of editorial intervention it was subject to, and to show how they resulted in the situation encountered by Thrasyllus.

There is good reason to believe that Plato was read widely (and beyond Athens) during the Hellenistic period, not only as a philosopher but also as a literary author. Part of the evidence for this is a group of early Ptolemaic papyri, including those of the *Laches* (*P.Petr.* II 50), *Phaedo* (*P.Petr.* II 5–8) and *Sophist* (*P.Hib.* 228), all going back to the third century BC. This is precisely the type of evidence that is lacking in the case of Aristotle, making it more difficult to get clear about the circulation of his texts during the Hellenistic period. What makes the Plato papyri listed above particularly significant is that they contain a very large number of variants and deviations from the manuscript tradition, enough to earn the characterisation 'wild' from Turner.¹⁴ The fact that the papyri from our period onwards (first century BC to first century AD) present a much more normalised text is a phenomenon paralleled in the papyri of Homer. It suggests that some

¹³ The Thrasyllan order, however, was far from the norm in editions circulating between the Renaissance and the twentieth century: see Burnyeat 2001. For the order of the dialogues in mediaeval manuscripts and its variation from Thrasyllus see Alline 1915: 124, 176–8.

¹⁴ Turner 1968: 108. The *Phaedo* papyrus contains around 70 variants in 4–5 pages of Oxford text, while the *Laches* papyrus offers 40 variants in 3 pages. Burnet adopted 8 and 7 of these variants respectively.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

form of editorial activity intervened, probably originating from the scholars of the Alexandrian Museum and Library, where the second century BC was the most productive period.¹⁵

Nevertheless, many scholars have been reluctant to credit the Alexandrian librarian Aristophanes of Byzantium with any major influence on the text of Plato and deny any critical edition by him, despite this evidence for a normalisation of the text in the Alexandrian Library.¹⁶ It may be that we have to look to Aristophanes' successor Aristarchus for a more detailed engagement with the minutiae of Plato's text, as indicated by Schironi on the basis of new fragments from what may be a commentary on the *Republic* focusing on linguistic/stylistic aspects.¹⁷ The evidence on Aristophanes of Byzantium is of a different nature, and concerns his view on the arrangement of the dialogues, where he opted for five trilogies, with the rest of the dialogues in no particular order:

ἐνιοι δέ, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός, εἰς τριλογίας ἔλκουσι τοὺς διαλόγους, καὶ πρώτην μὲν τιθέασιν ἧς ἡγεῖται Πολιτεία Τίμαιος Κριτίας· δευτέρα Σοφιστῆς Πολιτικός Κρατύλος τρίτην Νόμοι Μίνως Ἐπινομίς τετάρτην Θεαίτητος Εὐθύφρων Ἀπολογία πέμπτην Κρίτων Φαίδων Ἐπιστολαί. τὰ δ' ἄλλα καθ' ἓν καὶ ἀτάκτως.

Some people, one of whom is Aristophanes the grammarian, drag the dialogues into trilogies and place first the one headed by the *Republic* [followed by] *Timaeus* and *Critias*. As a second [trilogy they place] *Sophist*, *Politicus*, *Cratylus*; third *Laws*, *Minos*, *Epinomis*; fourth *Theaetetus*, *Euthyphro*, *Apology*; fifth *Crito*, *Phaedo*, *Letters*. The rest follow individually in no particular order. (D.L. 3.61–2)

Diogenes or his source (which may be Thrasyllus himself) does not agree with this arrangement: a critical stance is implied by the verb 'drag', and there is an accusation of randomness in the expression 'in no particular order/in a disorderly fashion'.

It would appear, then, that the grouping and arrangement of the dialogues was a point of contention for the Platonic corpus in the period up to Thrasyllus. It was probably the dramatic form of the dialogues that

¹⁵ This evidence of course pertains to texts circulating in Egypt and does not permit a parallel assessment of the text(s) used in the Academy. We only know that at the time of Zeno of Citium the works of Plato had recently been made available, and perusal was possible upon payment of a fee to the owners of copies (according to the *Life of Zeno* by Antigonos of Carystus, cited at D.L. 3.66). Barnes 1991: 127–8 is certainly right in pointing out that there was not one 'Hellenistic Plato', and that none of the 'editions' we have information on may be considered as authoritative.

¹⁶ E.g. Pfeiffer 1968: 196–7; *contra* Dörrie 1990: 334; Aline 1915: 84–103. See Schironi 2005: 431–2 for further references.

¹⁷ Schironi 2005. She brings to attention new fragments from Aristarchus' pronouncements on Platonic expressions occurring at *Rep.* 327b7, 327c6, 414e7, 568a8.

The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC 7

encouraged an arrangement following the pattern of the plays performed in the Athenian dramatic festivals. Thrasyllus is explicit about the use of Athenian drama as a prototype and ascribes it to Plato himself:

Θράσυλλος δέ φησι καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογίαν ἐκδοῦναι αὐτὸν τοὺς διαλόγους, οἷον ἐκεῖνοι τέτρασι δράμασιν ἠγωνίζοντο – Διονυσίοις, Ληναίοις, Παναθηναίοις, Χύτροις – ὧν τὸ τέταρτον ἦν Σατυρικόν· τὰ δὲ τέτταρα δράματα ἐκαλεῖτο τετραλογία.

Thrasyllus says that he [*sc.* Plato] published his dialogues following the example of the tragic tetralogy, in the way that they competed with four plays (at the festivals) – at the Dionysia, the Lenaea, the Panathenaea and the Chytroi – of which the fourth was a satyric drama. The four plays together were called a tetralogy. (D.L. 3.56)

It is possible that Aristophanes' trilogies were the result of thinking along the same lines, but opting for the tragic trilogy without the satyric play.¹⁸ Aristophanes could point to dramatic interrelations between the dialogues he grouped together – for example, the connection between *Theaetetus* and *Euthyphro* must be based on direct dramatic sequence, since at the end of the *Theaetetus* Socrates leaves to face Meletus' indictment at the king's porch, where he meets Euthyphro.

The evidence on Aristophanes of Byzantium and the fact that all but fifteen dialogues were left by him in no particular arrangement shows that the tetralogical ordering was not the norm in the Hellenistic period, even if it did originate in the Academy (there is no explicit evidence for this, apart from Thrasyllus' conviction). Still, Thrasyllus must have found some sort of precedent to legitimise his ascription of the arrangement to Plato, and the only hint we have for such a tetralogical precedent comes from the first century BC. It consists of a problematic passage in Varro, where a reference to the *Phaedo* is prefaced by what seems to be 'Plato in the fourth', suggesting that for Varro the *Phaedo* came fourth, either in its own tetralogy or in the corpus as a whole: *Plato in IIII de fluminibus apud inferos quae sint in his unum Tartarum appellat* ('Plato in the fourth [?] concerning rivers that are in the underworld names Tartarus as one of them', *Ling.* 7.37). Doubts have been cast, particularly by Barnes and Tarrant, on the reliability of this reading and the peculiar use of the numeral when one would expect a title.¹⁹ Varro's reference, however, remains our only pointer

¹⁸ See also Schironi 2005: 432–3.

¹⁹ Barnes 1991: 127 with n. 50; Tarrant 1993: 75–6. Tarrant proposes taking the numeral as a cardinal and reading '*in quattuor fluminibus*' rather than '*in quarto de fluminibus*'; he ascribes to Varro the mistake of treating Tartarus as one of the rivers.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century BC : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

towards the organisation of the Platonic corpus in the first century BC, prior to Thrasylus' intervention.²⁰

From the evidence discussed so far we may already detect two different ways of making an impact on an author's transmission and circulation: firstly, textual criticism and correction, as indicated by the progressive normalisation of Plato's text as we move towards the end of the Hellenistic period and by Aristarchus' possible commentary; and secondly, corpus-organisation, as evidenced by the different pronouncements on the grouping and order of the dialogues. Some additional information on the former type of activity is provided by Diogenes Laërtius, who preserves traces of professional philological engagement with the Platonic text. Alongside some comments on Plato's distinctive use of terminology designed to prevent the ignorant from understanding his meaning (D.L. 3.63–4), we learn about the presence of critical signs in copies of his texts (3.65–6).²¹ These critical signs are almost the same as those used by the Alexandrian editors of Homer, with the addition of some more 'philosophically-oriented' signs that may have been developed especially for Plato's text.²² Thus Plato's text claims a place not too far behind that of Homer as one of the more intensely studied, corrected and annotated in antiquity, enjoying a rich transmission and provoking interest and debate both within and outside philosophical circles.

A particularly valuable copy of the Platonic text is mentioned alongside equivalent Homeric ones in the recently recovered Galenic treatise *On freedom from grief* (Περὶ ἀλυπτησίας).²³ Galen talks about his lack of grief after a destructive fire in Rome in AD 192, when many valuable items were lost, including old, 'special editions' going back to eponymous sources. The fire devastated both Galen's own books and those kept at the Palatine libraries:

²⁰ The pre-Thrasylan tetralogical arrangement is sometimes associated with a certain Dercyllides (cf. Alb. *Intr.* 4), but we know nothing about his date, and he may well have been later than Thrasylus. See Tarrant 1993: 73.

²¹ A better structured version of this list of critical signs survives in an earlier, second-century AD papyrus from Florence, *PSI* 1488 = *CPF* I.1*** Plato 142T. See Schironi 2005: 429–31.

²² As in the texts of Homer, the *obelos* signifies passages thought to be spurious; the dotted *diple* points to editorial interventions by various scholars, often in a polemical way; the *antisigma* marks transpositions; in addition, the *keraiunion* is used to denote passages central to philosophical education (ἀγωγῆ τῆς φιλοσοφίας), and the *asteriskos* to highlight the harmony across Plato's doctrines.

²³ Boudon-Millot 2007 is the *editio princeps*; a new Budé has since appeared (Boudon-Millot, Jouanna and Pietrobelli 2010); see also Gourinat 2008.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)*The texts of Plato and Aristotle in the first century BC*

9

οὔτε οὖν ὅσα σπάνια καὶ ἀλ<λ>αχόθι μηδαμόθεν κείμενα δυνατὸν ἔστιν εὑρεῖν [ἔστιν], οὔτε τῶν μέσων, διὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς γραφῆς ἀκρίβειαν ἔσπουδαμένων, Καλλίνια καὶ Ἀττικιανὰ καὶ Πεδουκίνια καὶ μὴν Ἀριστάρχεια οἵτινές εἰσιν Ὅμηροι δύο καὶ Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, διασωζομένων ἐν ταύταις [ed.: ἐν τοῖς cod.] τῶν γραμμάτων ἐκείνων αὐτῶν ἃ καθ' ἕκαστον βιβλίον ἢ ἔγραψαν ἢ ἀνεγράψαντο οἱ ἄνδρες ὧν ἦν ἐπώνυμα τὰ βιβλία.

So it is not possible to find those texts that are rare and not available anywhere else, or those that are common, but particularly valued due to the accuracy of their readings, 'Callinia' and 'Atticiana' and 'Peducinia' and equally Aristarchean copies consisting of two Homers, and the Plato of Panaetius and many more such things, because there those very writings were preserved, which the men after whom the books are named either wrote or copied [annotated?] in the case of each individual book. (Galen, *On freedom from grief* 13)²⁴

Galen had seen sought-after 'eponymous' copies of both Plato and Homer, as well as other quality copies of unspecified authors from highly esteemed sources. The context in which Panaetius' Plato is mentioned, which includes a reference to Aristarchus' Homer, suggests some degree of textual criticism by the Stoic, enough to ascribe responsibility for the text to him.²⁵ When an ancient scholar undertook to produce his own text of a particular work, this normally meant using an existing copy as a 'base text' and supplying it with corrections in the form of critical signs (marking atheteseis, transpositions etc.) and/or marginal annotations.²⁶ So in the case of 'the Plato of Panaetius', I take Galen to refer to a copy of Plato which he knew to be either written out or annotated in the way described above by Panaetius himself.²⁷ It is not unthinkable that a physical copy that belonged to or was handled by Panaetius could have survived to Galen's time.²⁸ Galen's

²⁴ The text cited here is that of the *editio princeps*, Boudon-Millot 2007.

²⁵ See Gourinat 2008, esp. 147–51. He points to further parallels for Panaetius' philological activity on Plato, including his discovery of alternative openings for the *Republic* (D.L. 3.37); a controversial athetesis of the *Phaedo* (*Anth. Pal.* 9.358; Elias in *Cat.* 133); and support for the Attic ending of active pluperfect verb forms in -ῆ in the text of Plato (ἐνενοήκη, ἐπεποιήκη, Eust. *ad Od.* 23.220, 11.305, 31–4 Stallbaum). Panaetius also had views on the books to be ascribed to Aristippus and Aristo, as well as on the authenticity of Socratic dialogues by several authors (D.L. 2.85, 7.163, 2.64). For a critique of Gourinat see now Dorandi 2010.

²⁶ See Montanari 1998: 6–10.

²⁷ The text is unclear and may even be corrupt. It is particularly difficult to ascertain the exact nature of or the relationship between the two activities signified by ἔγραψαν (from *graphō*, 'to write') and ἀνεγράψαντο (from *anagraphomai*, 'to inscribe, record') in this context, which is why editors have corrected the latter to ἀν<τ>εγράψαντο ('had copies made'); see Boudon-Millot *et al.* 2010: 53–4.

²⁸ See Jones 2009: 392; Jones speaks of 'owners or editors' of these texts, 391.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-02011-5 - Aristotle, Plato and Pythagoreanism in the First Century Bc : New Directions for Philosophy

Edited by Malcolm Schofield

Excerpt

[More information](#)

10

MYRTO HATZIMICHALI

evidence is also significant in that it corroborates the beginning of a growing interest in the text of Plato in philosophical circles, already highlighted by Frede with respect to Panaetius.²⁹

The same passage from Galen contains a further piece of information that is of relevance to the circulation and state of Plato's text in the first century BC. It concerns the provenance of the *Atticiana* texts (Ἀττικιανὰ) that were lost in the fire: many interpreters now agree that these are to be associated with Titus Pomponius Atticus, Cicero's close associate, who is known to have been involved in the publication process of Cicero's own works and to have employed skilled Greek copyists whose services were much in demand.³⁰ From Galen's fragmentarily surviving commentary on the *Timaeus* we learn that there was a version of this text from *Atticiana* copies, which at 77c4 (on plants' lack of self-motion) read ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ ('by itself'), the transmitted reading of our mediaeval manuscripts, as opposed to the ἐξ αὐτοῦ ('from itself') of some other copies consulted by Galen.³¹ It is clear that texts of this provenance were held in high esteem, and it would be appealing to associate their quality with the versions that people like Cicero and Varro were working from. Unfortunately we have no contemporary sources on these texts, as all our information about the *Atticiana* comes from authors of the Second Sophistic (apart from these two references in Galen there are a few more in the lexicographer Harpocration regarding *Atticiana* copies of Demosthenes).³²

As we sum up with some preliminary results on the fate of Plato's text, it is evident that it had a rich transmission, gaining the attention of philosophers and non-philosophers alike as a mainstream part of Greek cultural heritage, with recognised literary value and high-quality Attic prose. At the same time, the two types of engagement with the text take shape more clearly; on the one side, there are the text-critical and editorial initiatives such as those of Panaetius and Atticus (the producer of the *Atticiana*), which resulted in specific copies and versions of the text becoming renowned for the quality of their readings and sought after by connoisseurs like Galen. Aristarchus' possible commentary on the *Republic* and the critical signs that

²⁹ Frede 1999: 777.

³⁰ Jones 2009: 392, and 391–3 for possible identifications of Callinus and Peducaeus; Tarrant 1993: 193–4; Gourinat 2008: 144–6. Winsbury 2009: 53–6 is more sceptical, and warns emphatically against assimilating Atticus' activities to those of a modern publisher. See also Dorandi 2010: 165–6.

³¹ αὕτη μὲν ἢ ἐξηγήσις (sc. ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ) μοι γέγονε κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ἀττικιανῶν ἀντιγράφων ἔκδοσιν, ἐν ἑτέροις δὲ εὐρῶν γεγραμμένον “διὰ τὸ τῆς ἐξ αὐτοῦ κινήσεως”, ‘I came across this interpretation (sc. “by itself”) based on the published version of the *Atticiana* copies, while in other copies I found “by the motion from itself”’, Gal. *Plat. Tim.* Fr. 11.107–9 Schröder.

³² For the references see Gourinat 2008: 145–6.