

Studia graeco-arabica

9



2019

Editorial Board

Mohammad Ali Amir Moezzi, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Carmela Baffioni, Istituto Universitario Orientale, Napoli
Sebastian Brock, Oriental Institute, Oxford
Charles Burnett, The Warburg Institute, London
Hans Daiber, Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a. M.
Cristina D'Ancona, Università di Pisa
Thérèse-Anne Druart, The Catholic University of America, Washington
Gerhard Endress, Ruhr-Universität Bochum
Richard Goulet, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris
Steven Harvey, Bar-Ilan University, Jerusalem
Henri Hugonnard-Roche, École Pratique des Hautes Études, Paris
Remke Kruk, Universiteit Leiden
Concetta Luna, Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa
Alain-Philippe Segonds (†)
Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee (WI)

Staff

Elisa Coda, Cristina D'Ancona, Giulia Guidara, Issam Marjani, Cecilia Martini Bonadeo

Submissions

Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the transmission of philosophical and scientific texts from Classical Antiquity to the Middle Ages, Renaissance, and early modern times. Papers in English, French, German, Italian, and Spanish are published. Prospect authors are invited to check the *Guidelines* on the website of the journal, and to address their proposals to the Editor in chief.

Peer Review Criteria

Studia graeco-arabica follows a double-blind peer review process. Authors should avoid putting their names in headers or footers or refer to themselves in the body or notes of the article; the title and abstract alone should appear on the first page of the submitted article. All submitted articles are read by the editorial staff. Manuscripts judged to be of potential interest to our readership are sent for formal review to at least one reviewer. *Studia graeco-arabica* does not release referees' identities to authors or to other reviewers. The journal is committed to rapid editorial decisions.

Subscription orders

Information on subscription rates for the print edition of Volume 9 (2019), claims and customer service: redazione@pacineditore.it

Web site: <http://learningroads.cfs.unipi.it/sga>

Service Provider: Università di Pisa, ICT - Servizi di Rete Ateneo

ISSN 2281-2687

ISSN 2239-012X (Online)

Registration at the law court of Pisa, 18/12, November 23, 2012.

Editor in chief Cristina D'Ancona (cristina.dancona@unipi.it)

Mailing address: Dipartimento di Civiltà e Forme del Sapere, via Pasquale Paoli 15, 56126 Pisa, Italia.

Italian Scientific Journals Ranking: A (ANVUR, Classe A)

Indexing and Abstracting: ERIH PLUS (SCH ESF); Index Islamicus (Brill Bibliographies); Scopus (Elsevier)



© Copyright 2019 by Industrie Grafiche Pacini Editore, Pisa.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the Publisher. The Publisher remains at the disposal of the rightholders, and is ready to make up for unintentional omissions. *Studia graeco-arabica* cannot be held responsible for the scientific opinions of the authors publishing in it.

Cover

Māshad, Kitābhāna-i Āsitān-i Quds-i Raḍawī 300, f. 1v
Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, *grec* 1853, f. 186v

M.-L. Lakmann, *Platonici minores. 1. Jh.v.Chr. - 2. Jh.n.Chr. Prosopographie, Fragmente und Testimonien mit deutscher Übersetzung*, unter Mitarbeit von D.J. O'Meara. Übersetzungen von M. Baltes (†), E. Pahnke (†), H. Thoss, Brill, Leiden - Boston 2017 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 145), xiv + 824 pp.

For a work that deals with successors of Plato, it is perhaps fair to begin with the *diadoche* it stems from. This scholarly succession initiates from Heinrich Dörrie's plan for *Der Platonismus in der Antike*,¹ a sequence of old typewritten sheets still visible at the Institut für Altertumskunde of the University of Münster i.W.; it continues with the late lamented Matthias Baltes,² and is transmitted now to Marie-Luise Lakmann, to whom we owe this landmark book on Middle Platonism.

Sure, the labels 'Middle Platonism' and 'Neoplatonism' have been increasingly challenged in contemporary scholarship. Albeit not unprecedented, doubts about these historiographical labels date essentially from the 1987 issue of the collection *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*. In his chapter on Numenius, the late lamented Michael Frede proposed to dismiss 'Middle Platonism' as a label coined by 18th century scholars who debased late Antiquity.³ His suggestion was to adopt instead the distinction between 'Academici' – the direct heirs of Plato – and 'Platonici' – the philosophers of Platonic allegiance – that was current in ancient times.⁴ Since 1987, and despite voices in defence of the admittedly conventional, but useful labels like 'Neoplatonic',⁵ the claims of

¹ The series is known worldwide, but Lakmann is right in listing (p. 5) the titles of each volume, because in many respects the series counts as the starting point also for her work. Hence, let's have the list ready at hand here too: *Der Platonismus in der Antike. Grundlagen-System-Entwicklung*, begründet von H. Dörrie, fortgeführt von M. Baltes unter Mitarbeit von F. Mann. Band 1: H. Dörrie, *Die geschichtlichen Wurzeln des Platonismus. Bausteine 1-35*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. von A. Dörrie, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1987. Band 2: H. Dörrie, *Der Hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus. Bausteine 36-72*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar aus dem Nachlaß hrsg. und bearb. von M. Baltes unter Mitarb. von A. Dörrie und F. Mann, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1990. Band 3: H. Dörrie - M. Baltes, *Der Platonismus im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert nach Christus. Bausteine 73-100*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1993. Band 4: H. Dörrie † - M. Baltes, *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Einige grundlegende Axiome / Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis) I. Bausteine 101-124*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1996. Band 5: H. Dörrie † - M. Baltes, *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Platonische Physik (im antiken Verständnis) II. Bausteine 125-150*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 1998. Band 6: H. Dörrie † - M. Baltes, *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Von der Seele als der Ursache aller sinnvollen Abläufe* (Band 6.1: *Bausteine 151-168*; Band 6.2: *Bausteine 169-181*): Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 2002. Band 7.1: H. Dörrie † - M. Baltes † - Chr. Pietsch unter Mitarbeit von M.-L. Lakmann, *Die philosophische Lehre des Platonismus. Theologia Platonica. Bausteine 182-205*: Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart - Bad Cannstatt 2008.

² M.-L. Lakmann, "Matthias Baltes", in *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexicon*. Band 28, Bautz, Nordhausen 2007, cols. 85-89.

³ Cf. E.N. Tigerstedt, *The Decline and Fall of the Neoplatonic Interpretation of Plato. An Outline and Some Observations*, Societas Scientiarum Fennica, Helsinki - Helsingfors 1974; F.P. Hager, "Zur Geschichte, Problematik und Bedeutung des Begriffes 'Neuplatonismus'", *Diotima* 11 (1983), pp. 98-110; G. Varani, *Pensiero alato e modernità. Il neoplatonismo nella storiografia filosofica in Germania (1559-1807)*, CLEUP, Padova 2008 (La filosofia e il suo passato, 25), pp. 331-69.

⁴ Cf. M. Frede, "Numenius", in H. Temporini - W. Haase (eds.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, II 36.2, W. de Gruyter, Berlin - New York 1987, pp. 1034-75: "Statt dessen [i.e. the labels 'Neoplatonism' and 'Middle Platonism'] können wir, mehr oder weniger dem antiken Sprachgebrauch folgend, zwischen 'Akademikern' und 'Platonikern' unterscheiden, wobei die Akademiker die Mitglieder der platonischen Schule bis zu ihrer Auflösung im frühen 1. Jh. v. Chr. sind, die Platoniker aber die Philosophen, die sich nach der Auflösung der akademischen Skepsis mit Antiochus und dem Zerfall oder die Auflösung der Schule als Institution um die Wiederherstellung der wahren Philosophie durch eine Rekonstruktion der platonischen Lehre bemühen" (pp. 1040-41).

⁵ P.L. Donini, "Medioplatonismo e filosofi medioplatonici. Una raccolta di studi", *Elenchos* 11 (1990), pp. 79-83, repr. in

inadequacy with respect to ‘Middle Platonism’ and ‘Neoplatonism’ multiplied.⁶ In this debate, Marie-Luise Lakmann sides with the traditional position and speaks plainly of ‘Middle Platonism’ and ‘Neoplatonism’. The rationale for doing so is given at the beginning of the Introduction (pp. 3-34): “Im 1. Jh.v.Chr. kommt es in der Geschichte des Antiken Platonismus in doppelter Hinsicht zu entscheidenden Wendungen: Zum einen verliert die Schule Platons durch die Zerstörung der ‘Akademie’ in Athen ihren lokalen Mittelpunkt, zum anderen wird die von Arkesilaos begründete skeptizistische Interpretation der Lehren Platons immer mehr in Frage gestellt. Mit Antiochos von Askalon und Eudoros von Alexandrien beginnt eine neue Epoche, die seit Karl Praechter allgemein als ‘Mittelplatonismus’ bezeichnet wird. Sie erstreckt sich über drei Jahrhunderte bis zum Anfang des 3. Jh.n.Chr., dem Beginn des von Plotin begründet sog. Neuplatonismus” (p. 3).⁷

Id., *Commentary and Tradition. Aristotelianism, Platonism, and Post-Hellenistic Philosophy*, ed. by M. Bonazzi, W. de Gruyter, Berlin - New York 2011 (Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca et Byzantina. Quellen und Studien, 4), pp. 283-96: “(...) si può giungere (...) a una completa dissoluzione della categoria del medioplatonismo, ma anche, a voler essere davvero coerenti, di quella del neoplatonismo. (...). Se tuttavia l’esito della proposta di Frede (...) dovesse essere davvero quello di racchiudere in un’unica fase del platonismo e, per così dire, in un unico contenitore storiografico personaggi così diversi come Giamblico e Plutarco, Proclo e Apuleio, molti avrebbero probabilmente dubbi e obiezioni da avanzare. (...) Ci si può domandare allora se sarebbe veramente opportuno approdare a una situazione in cui con il solo termine di ‘platonismo’ si coprirebbero tanti secoli di filosofia e tante filosofie così diversificate, dagli immediati scolari di Platone all’età di Giustiniano” (p. 82, pp. 286-7 of the reprint). Cf. also M. Zambon, “Middle Platonism”, in M.L. Gill - P. Pellegrin (eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy*, Blackwell, Oxford 2006 (Blackwell Companions to Philosophy), pp. 561-76, here p. 562.

⁶ L.P. Gerson, “General Introduction”, in Id. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Philosophy in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge U.P., Cambridge - New York 2010, pp. 1-10, rejects the term ‘Neoplatonism’ on the basis of the fact that it is “an artefact of eighteenth-century German scholarship; no follower of Plato in our period [i.e. between 200 AD and early Middle Ages] would have embraced a label suggesting innovation. (...) On behalf of a more neutral or at least less tendentious stance, I have by editorial fiat abolished the pejorative label from this volume. We refer throughout to ‘Platonism’ or ‘late Platonism’ or ‘Christian Platonism’ when discussing Plotinus, his successors and those Christian thinkers who were in one way or another shaped by the dominant tradition in ancient philosophy” (p. 3). One cannot but observe that this “fiat” has at times strange and undesirable consequences. Consider, for instance, in the chapter on Philoponus by K. Verrycken, the following sentence: “The resulting paradox can be solved by assuming that Ammonius and Philoponus implicitly introduced the Platonic distinction between the One and the divine Intellect into Aristotle’s God” (pp. 738-9), a sentence that is either false (if one understands ‘Platonic’ as ‘made by Plato’) or desperately confused (if one understands ‘Platonic’ as ‘held by Platonists’), but that becomes perfectly clear and informative, if one re-establishes the banished adjective ‘Neoplatonic’. Indeed, it is true that Plotinus and several Neoplatonic philosophers after him separated the One from the divine Intellect as two distinct principles, but this idea is obviously not shared by other philosophers of Platonic allegiance like, for one, Plutarch of Chaeronea. This example illustrates the truth of Donini’s caveat recalled above, n. 3. Instead, L. Catana, “The Origin of the Division between Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism”, *Apeiron* 46 (2013), pp. 166-200, sides with Gerson: “we ought to give up the division between Middle Platonism and Neoplatonism, since it is artificial and misleading” (p. 168).

⁷ In all likelihood the allusion to Praechter points to the periodisation that, advanced first in Praechter’s 1920 edition of the first volume of F. Überweg’s *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* – the so-called ‘Überweg-Praechter’ – was then reworked in his article “Nikostratos der Platoniker”, *Hermes* 57 (1922), pp. 481-517 (repr. in H. Dörrie [ed.], *Karl Praechter. Kleine Schriften*, G. Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 1973, pp. 101-37). In the 1920 edition of the *Grundriss*, Praechter’s presentation followed in Überweg’s footsteps, interpreting late Platonism in terms of ‘eclecticism’: “Nachdem Antiochos in der vorangehenden Phase der akademischen Lehrentwicklung (...) die Übereinstimmung der Platoniker, Peripatetiker und Stoiker in den Grundlehren behauptet hat, bietet der an ihn anschließende mittlere Platonismus im Ganzen das Bild eines weitgreifenden Eklektizismus von dem nur die Lehre Epikurs ausgeschlossen ist. (...) Eklektizismus, Mystik, gelehrte Arbeit und Orthodoxie mischen sich bei den einzelnen Vertretern der Schule in sehr verschiedener Weise, so daß von einem einheitlichen System des mittleren Platonismus nicht die Rede sein kann. Erst dem aus ihm hervorgewachsenen Neuplatonismus gelang es, die überkommenen Elemente innerlich unzugestalten und zu einem – trotz vielfacher Variationen – wohlgefügt Ganzen zu verarbeiten” (F. Überwegs *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie des Altertums* (...) herausgegeben von Dr. Karl Praechter [...], Mittler, Berlin 1920, pp. 536-7). The in-depth discussion of Nicostratus’ stance with respect to the Aristotelian *Categories* led Praechter to reconsider ‘eclecticism’

The criteria that allow a philosopher to be defined a 'Platonist' in this period form the focus of Chapter 3 of the Introduction (pp. 18-31), where Lakmann discusses also the issue of 'Academics' vs 'Platonists'. Her interpretation of the two labels is in part different from that which has been summarised above. We have just seen that the divide was placed by Frede between the immediate heirs of Plato – the 'Academics' – and the followers of Plato's doctrines – the 'Platonists'. For Lakmann, the *Academici* coincide with the members of the Sceptic Academy, while the *Platonici* are those philosophers who, following in the footsteps of Antiochus of Ascalon and his so-called 'dogmatic turn',⁸ believed that Plato held doctrines properly speaking – instead of teaching how to challenge others' pretensions to truth⁹ – and adhered firmly to them. "Zahlreiche Philosophen werden in den antiken Zeugnissen ausdrücklich als 'Platoniker' oder als 'Platonischer Philosoph' bezeichnet. Diese Bezeichnung für die Anhänger der platonischen Philosophie als Angehörige der seit dem 1. Jh.v.Chr. bestehenden dogmatisch Ausrichtung des Platonismus – in Abgrenzung zu den skeptizistischen 'Akademikern' – ist nach unserer Kenntnis erst seit dem 1. Jh.n.Chr. sicher belegt" (p. 19). Lakmann calls attention to the fact that the label 'Platonist' occurs even before (e.g. in Cicero and in Eratosthenes' lost writing *The Platonist*); in such cases, however, the label defines individuals as estimators of Plato, rather than pointing to a doctrine or a body of doctrines. This second meaning, which identifies a doctrine as held by Plato or traceable to him, becomes current only later on: "Die Bezeichnung 'Platoniker' im eigentlichen Sinne setzte sich ab dem Ende des 1./Anfang des 2. Jh.n.Chr. immer weiter durch" (pp. 19-20). In this sense the adjective features in the 2nd century authors Galen, Aulus Gellius, Lucian and Marcus Aurelius, as well as in virtually all the Neoplatonic philosophers from Porphyry to John Philoponus. Lakmann does not include Plotinus in her list, and she is right: the adjective does not feature in the *Enneads*. However, when Plotinus says that "(...) but how this is so, he [Plato] left us to investigate and discover, if we claim to be worthy of our title (εἰπερ ἄξιοι τῆς προσηγορίας φαμὲν εἶναι)",¹⁰ it is the denomination as Platonists that he is thinking of, for himself as well as for his audience.

as the main feature of Platonism after Antiochus and before Plotinus: "Vorläufig wurde der Eklekticismus wieder und wieder durch platonisch-orthodoxe Bestrebungen durchkreuzt. (...) Das Neben- und Durcheinander dieser einander widerstrebenden Tendenzen (...) bildet die eigentliche Signatur dieser Übergangszeit zwischender Rückkehr der Akademie zum Dogmatismus durch Antiochos und der systematischen Ausgestaltung dieser Dogmatismus durch die Neuplatoniker" (p. 493).

⁸ This conventional label points to the resounding abandonment on the part of Antiochus of Ascalon of the positions of the sceptic Academy held by his predecessor Philo of Larissa, as it is attested chiefly by Cicero, *Acad. pr.*, 69-70. On the consequences of the 'dogmatic turn' for the issue at stake here, cf. J. Glücker, *Antiochus and the Late Academy*, Göttingen 1978 (Hypomnemata, 56): "The change of epithet could be explained as a consequence of the strong reaction on the part of the new *Platonici* against the scepticism of the Academy from Arcesilaus to Philo, and their refusal to be called by a name which, to them, must have signified a radical deviation from the doctrine of the founder" (p. 225). P.L. Donini, *Le scuole, l'anima, l'Impero: la filosofia antica da Antioco a Plotino*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Torino 1982 (Sintesi, no number), despite occasional disagreement with Glücker, describes in the same vein the consequences of Antiochus' move: "(...) con la sua iniziativa [i.e. the 'dogmatic turn'] Antioco ristabilì una forma dogmatica del platonismo ed è con ciò stesso all'origine del medioplatonismo. (...) Da una parte, infatti, Antioco difende strenuamente, contro le obiezioni scettiche e accademiche, tanto la validità della conoscenza sensibile quanto il criterio stoico della verità, la *phantasia kataleptike* (...); dall'altra, interpretando gli *eide* aristotelici come forme sensibili (...), può assegnare tali forme come oggetto suo proprio alla rappresentazione catalettica. E poiché infine egli presenta le forme aristoteliche come un'idea indebolita (...) che anche Platone avrebbe tutavia riconosciuto (...), può allora pretendere che il processo dell'astrazione degli universali (...) sia una sorta di ritorno alla conoscenza delle idee" (pp. 74-5).

⁹ On the problems surrounding this point in the history of the schools derived from Plato cf. M. Bonazzi, *Academici e Platonici. Il dibattito antico sullo scetticismo di Platone*, Edizioni universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto, Milano 2003 (Il Filarete. Collana di studi e testi, 213).

¹⁰ V 8[31], 4.54-55, trans. Armstrong in *Plotinus. With an English Translation* by A.H. Armstrong (...) in *Seven Volumes*, Harvard U.P. - Heinemann, Cambridge (MA) - London 1984 (Loeb Classical Series), vol. 5, p. 253.

Lakmann's fundamental work falls into two main parts, a Prosopography (pp. 37-257) and a series of translations (pp. 260-779). A complete list of all the philosophers referring to Plato in one way or another is of course impossible,¹¹ and Lakmann narrows her focus to those thinkers who left a trace of their activity during the period that spans from the 1st cent. bC. to the beginning of the 3rd cent. AD. Each entry of the prosopographical part gathers information on the life and works of a philosopher and includes a bibliography. Eighty-eight individual philosophers (four anonymous), from Aelianus to Zosimus of Athens, emerge out of oblivion. Not all of them, of course, sank really into oblivion: even the non-specialist knows by name Moderatus of Gades and Gaius, Harpocration and Cronius, Severus, or Dercyllides, or Calvenus Taurus, or Lucius and Nicostratus; but – as shown by this last example – mostly because they feature in later exegeses (in the case of Lucius and Nicostratus, of Aristotle's *Categories*) and are quoted, often in a critical vein, by Neoplatonic authors. In this volume, they receive attention in and by themselves.¹²

The criteria for including a philosopher in this list are classified as follows: (i) he (or she, as in the case of Arria, a scholar of the circle of Galen) is mentioned in the sources as a Platonist or an Academic; (ii) he authored works on Plato (this is the case, for instance, of the Stoic Boethus); (iii) he was the teacher or the pupil of a Platonist; (iv) his works (or parts thereof) exhibit knowledge of Plato's texts or doctrines (this is the case, for instance, of Iuncus, whose philosophical affiliation, if any, is unclear); (v) he features in a list of Platonic philosophers, even though what has come down to us does not confirm this information (as is the case of Cratippus of Pergamon, who moved to the Peripatetic school, but is listed in Philodemus' *Index Academicorum*), or no further information is available; (vi) though labelled a 'Pythagorean', he belongs to that moment in the history of Pythagoreanism when the latter was intermingled with Platonic elements. Fictional characters like the 'Ion' and 'Nigrinus' who feature in Lucian's satirical works, or the 'Diadoumenos' who voices the Platonic doctrines in Plutarch's *On the Contradictions of the Stoics*, are also included.

This list of criteria shows by itself that only a complete reading of the ancient sources could have provided the materials for the prosopography and the anthology of texts, and it is now time to substantiate the allusion to the *diadoche* made at the beginning of this review by quoting Lakmann's account of the background of her work. "Der vorliegende Band vereinigt in sich Ideen und Vorhaben, die schon von Heinrich Dörrie und Matthias Baltes erdacht und geplant waren. (...) Heinrich Dörries ursprünglicher Plan sah vor, 'die antiken Bezeugungen zu den Teilproblemen (...) sinnvoll zusammenzufassen', d.h. er wollte mit seinem Werk keine Fragmentsammlung im eigentlichen Sinne vorlegen (...). Die Bezeugungen für die einzelnen Platoniker sollten vielmehr in einer *Prosopographia Platonica* den Abschluss des gesamten Werkes bilden. (...) Zunächst war vorgesehen, in dieser *Prosopographia Platonica* den Personenbeschreibungen der einzelnen Platoniker eine Auflistung der Stellenangaben aller antiken Zeugnisse beizufügen, gleichsam als Vorarbeiten für eine umfassende Fragmentsammlung, die Matthias Baltes selbst parallel vorbereitete. (...) Als Matthias Baltes am 21. Januar 2003 starb, übernahm ich die 'Abwicklung' einiger seiner zahlreichen begonnenen Projekte, darunter auch die Fragmentsammlung".

What we have at our disposal now, presented with modesty as the completion of the work of others, is a milestone in the historiography on Platonism. Twenty-four long passages reporting the doctrines

¹¹ "Eine endgültige und vollständige Liste aller Mittelplatoniker zu erstellen, ist nicht möglich" (p. 18).

¹² An important exception is Taurus, who is studied in and by himself: Marie-Luise Lakmann has already published on him the monograph *Der Platoniker Tauros in der Darstellung des Aulus Gellius*, Brill, Leiden - New York - Köln 1995 (*Philosophia Antiqua*, 63); cf. now also F. Petrucci, *Taurus of Beirut. The Other Side of Middle Platonism*, Routledge, London - New York 2018 (*Issues in Ancient Philosophy*, 5).

of M. Annius Ammonius, the teacher of Plutarch of Chaeronea, are gathered, accompanied by the translations of E. Pahnke (pp. 276-331). Now, the bibliography at the end of the prosopographical entry (pp. 43-9) contains 29 titles, but no collection of passages existed before. The same is true for Dercyllides, strange as it may seem: Dercyllides is regularly mentioned in the discussions about the ancient layout of the Platonic corpus (17 titles listed in the bibliography at the end of the prosopographical entry, pp. 97-101), but the fragments and testimonies are collected here for the first time (pp. 422-33). The same is true also for Moderatus of Gades: I think that everybody working in the field knows him by name (to the point that one might wonder if he would not better feature in the list of the *Platonici maiores*, on which later on); no less than 39 titles are listed in the prosopographical entry (pp. 183-90); but there was no complete collection of fragments and testimonies before. It is instructive to see also the contrary: the scantiness of attestations on Gaius (pp. 468-73) substantiates Lakmann's claim "ob dieser Gaios (...) mit dem Platoniker identisch ist, wie Praechter und viele andere angenommen haben, kann nicht mit Sicherheit behauptet werden" (p. 117).

I alluded above to the *Platonici maiores*. They are dealt with in an Appendix (pp. 781-805): the title stands for those Platonic philosophers of the period who, being famous, are not included in the collection, but could not go unnoticed in this volume.¹³ The Appendix directs the reader to the editions of and bibliography on Albinus,¹⁴ Alcinous,¹⁵ the *Anonymus Theaeteti*,¹⁶ Antiochus of Ascalon, Apuleius, Atticus, Eudorus of Alexandria, Longinus,¹⁷ Maximus of Tyr, Nicomachus of Gerasa, Numenius,¹⁸ Origenes,¹⁹ Plutarch of Chaeronea,²⁰ Theon of Smyrna, and Thrasyllus.

The volume is completed by an *Index fontium* (pp. 806-15), the list of the Concordances (pp. 816-18), and an *Index nominum* (pp. 819-24). Marie-Luise Lakmann's *Platonici minores* ought not to be absent from any good library in Humanities.

Cristina D'Ancona

¹³ An anthology of the doctrines held by the most representative Middle Platonists, thematically organised, has been recently published by G. Boys-Stones, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250. An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*, Cambridge U.P., Cambridge 2018.

¹⁴ His fame as an interpreter of Plato is considered by Lakmann, p. 781, as the cause of the attribution of Alcinous' *Didaskalikos* to him.

¹⁵ Lakmann sides with the scholars who maintain that Albinus and the author of the *Didaskalikos* are two distinct philosophers: "Die lange Zeit angenommene Identität mit dem Platoniker Albinos (...) gilt als überholt" (p. 782). As we have seen above, an Alcinous is listed also among the *Platonici minores*, because the question whether or not this Ἀλκίνοος, who is mentioned in a passage by Photius, coincides with the Ἀλκίνοος who wrote the *Didaskalikos* cannot be settled: "Die wenigen Anhaltspunkte, die der Text bei Photios bietet, lassen jedoch keine überzeugende Lösung in der Frage der Identität und der Schulzugehörigkeit des Alkinous zu" (p. 41).

¹⁶ In addition to the bibliography provided there, cf. also M. Bonazzi, "Un dibattito tra academici e platonici sull'eredità di Platone. La testimonianza del commentario anonimo al *Teeteto*", in *Papiri filosofici. Miscellanea di studi IV*, Olschki, Firenze 2003 (Studi e testi per il Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini, 11), pp. 41-74.

¹⁷ One may now add I. Männlein-Robert, "Philosophie als Philologie? Der Platoniker Longin und seine Kritiker", in *Philosophia in der Konkurrenz von Schulen, Wissenschaften und Religionen. Zur Pluralisierung des Philosophiebegriffs in Kaiserzeit und Spätantike* herausgegeben von Ch. Riedweg in Zusammenarbeit mit R. Fuchslin u. C. Semenzato sowie Ch. Horn - D. Wyrwa, Akten der 17. Tagungs der Karl und Gertrud Abel-Stiftung vom 16.-17. Oktober 2014 in Zürich, W. de Gruyter, Boston - Berlin 2017 (Philosophie der Antike, 34), pp. 161-78.

¹⁸ One may now add H. Tarrant, "The *Phaedo* in Numenian Allegorical Interpretation", in S. Delcomminette - P. d'Hoine - M.-A. Gavray (eds.), *Ancient Readings of Plato's Phaedo*, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2015 (Philosophia Antiqua, 140), pp. 134-53.

¹⁹ Lakmann, p. 796, aptly distinguishes this Origenes from Origenes Adamantius by the label "der Heide".

²⁰ One may now add F. Ferrari, "Materia, movimento, anima e tempo prima della nascita dell'universo: Plutarco e Attico sulla cosmologia del Timeo", in E. Coda - C. Martini Bonadeo (eds.), *De l'Antiquité tardive au Moyen Age. Études de logique et de cosmologie ... offertes à Henri Hugonnard-Roche*, Vrin, Paris 2014 (Études musulmanes, 44), pp. 255-76.

Finito di stampare nel mese di dicembre 2019
presso le Industrie Grafiche della Pacini Editore S.p.A.
Via A. Gherardesca • 56121 Ospedaletto • Pisa
Tel. 050 313011 • Fax 050 3130300
www.pacineditore.it

