Studia graeco-arabica

Studies dedicated to Rüdiger Arnzen on His Sixtieth Birthday

Edited by Yury Arzhanov

10

———

2020

Submissions
Submissions are invited in every area of the studies on the trasmission 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. Prospective 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 10 (2020), claims and customer service: redazione@pacinieditore.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)

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

the appearences of ghosts (...) namely of the pneumatic vehicle of the soul, showing to what degree Ammonius' view diverged from that of his teacher Proclus" (p. 152). According to Papachristou, "the theory of the soul found in the preface of Philoponus' commentary on the *De Anima* reflects Ammonius' doctrines and teachings" (p. 164) and she claims that "however, there is no evidence to support the view that Philoponus has his own disagreements with respect to the theory he reports on the nature of the pneumatic body or that he even had an account of his own" (p. 165).

Pantelis Golitsis, "Μετά τινων ἰδίων ἐπιστάσεων. John Philoponus as an Editor of Ammonius' Lectures", pp. 167-93, provides an analysis of Philoponus' editorial work on Ammonius' lectures with the aim to "shed new light on Philoponus' development as a commentator and the dating of his commentaries" (p. 169). The titles of the commentaries are telling: Golitsis analyses in particular the term *epistasis* and claims that "when Philoponus wrote the titles of the commentaries that he published, he meant to indicate to his readers that Ammonius' exegesis would be occasionally interrupted by Philoponus reservations and divergent interpretation (...) his 'critical observations'" (p. 169). An interesting epistemological implication is that "given Philoponus' evolution and his gradual liberation from the Neoplatonic authorities, which found its peak in the publication of his autonomous treatise against Proclus and against Aristotle, published around 529 and 532 respectively, the number and content of his criticisms may serve as a criterion for dating his commentaries" (p. 178). The second part of Golitsis' article is devoted to the dating of Philoponus' commentaries (pp. 178-93) and constists in a revised "Chronology of Philoponus' Philosophical Works" (p. 193).

The last article of the collection is by Sten Ebbesen, "The Un-Byzantine Byzantine on Two Sophisms" (pp. 195-206). It provides the edition with an English translation and a commentary of "a little text, unfortunately mutilated at the end, that discusses two completely untraditional sophisms: Ὁ δύνασαι λέγειν ἀγαθὸν ἀγαθόν ἐστι and Ἔστι φαγεῖν τινα τῶν ἀνθρώπων σήμερον (p. 196)". A line by line exegesis of these sophisms follows. On the one hand, they "have no background in Aristotelian exegesis" (p. 195); on the other, there is "nothing even remotely like in the whole of the Byzantine material" (*ibid.*).

A Bibliography (pp. 204-18) completes the volume which also includes an Index of names and of passages by François Nollé (pp. 219-34). The volume is stimulating and its editors deserve our gratitude.

EC

S.A. Adams (ed.), *Scholastic Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras. Greek, Latin, and Jewish*, De Gruyter (Transmissions. Studies on Conditions, Processes and Dynamics of Textual Transmission, 2), VII + 230 pp.

The university of Glasgow hosted in 2017 a colloquium on *Ancient Scholarship: Scholastic Culture in the Hellenistic and Roman Eras* and the convenor Sean A. Adams collects the papers in the present volume. He is the author both of the general introduction, "Themes in Ancient Scholarship", and of an interesting chapter on Latin and Jewish translations (see below). The aim of the colloquium was "to investigate scholastic culture in the Hellenistic and Roman eras, with a particular focus on ancient book and material culture as well as scholarship beyond Greek authors and the Greek language" (p. 1).

G. Coqueugniot, "Scholastic Research in the Archive. Hellenistic Historians and Ancient Archival Records" (pp. 7-30) surveys the works of "historians from Egypt, Mesopotamia, and the Levant" and highlights their importance for the transmission of information to later ages: "These historians were often members of the local, traditional elite of the temples (...). They all seem to have had access to old archival records and used them to write a historical chronicle of their land. (...)

The archives they consulted were written in local languages, and a significant part of these scholars' work was their translation of native texts into Greek. Josephus in particular insists on this task of translation. This was essential for the later historians who thus gaines indirect access to archival documents the would have been unable to use otherwise" (p. 23). Coqueugniot lays emphasis on "the cosmopolitan context of Hellenistic scholarship". The outcome of the work of these scholars was that "Foreign histories and wisdoms were then made available to the Graeco-Macedonian court elites" (p. 24). This use of archival records has often been depicted as "an antiquarian method and opposed to the supposedly more serious historical method of 'global' historians such as Polybius" (p. 25). On the basis of an enquiry on the archival research in the Hellenistic culture Coqueugniot comes to the conclusion that "More than a real difference in practice between the historian of mainland Greece and those of the East in their treatment of archival documents, our fragmentary sources rather show several complementary aspects of the use of documentary testimonies in the local and regional histories of the Hellenistic period" (pp. 28-9).

The starting point of the paper by M. Hatzimichali, "Circulation of Lexica in the Hellenistic and Early Imperial Period" (pp. 31-50) is the debate about the so-called "austere view" about the circulation of learning in antiquity. In his *Le stylet et la tablette. Dans le secret des auteurs antiques* (2000) Tiziano Dorandi shed light on the editorial practices in classical and post-classical antiquity, from the stage of collecting the primary data to the 'publication' (*ekdosis*), a term which has a different meaning compared to our 'publication'. At variance with the modern meaning, *ekdosis* means primarily the process of preparing one's work for the circulation among peers. Hatzimichali remarks that even though in the Imperial age a sort of general bookmarket can be envisaged, the "austere view" holds substantially true in Hellenistic times. She focuses on *ekdosis* in this period. "Hellenistic scholarship stands out as a peculiar case in this regard, both because of the nature of the works produced (...) and because of the political consideration that gave rise to it: there was a sustained drive by the Ptolemies in Egypt, and other Hellenistic monarchies to a certain extent, to accumulate both books and highly educated personnel, in an effort both to assert themselves as the 'true' heirs of Greek civilization and to promote Greek culture *vis-à-vis* the conquered civilizations. These cultural politics, culminating in the establishment of the Museum and Library at Alexandria, resulted in several generations of scholars enjoying a privileged status of patronage at court. This, in turn, raises questions about whether the works they produced had any dissemination and impact in the world outside the 'ivory towers' of the great libraries and indeed if there was any interest in them beyond technical scholarly debates" (p. 32). This is the case for *lexica*. A telling example is *On Names and Rare Words* by Pamphilius of Alexandria (1st cent. b.C.): this gigantic work served as the source for later excerpts and re-compilations made by "networks of scholars with members residing both at Alexandria and in the provinces and specialist booksellers" (p. 50).

The focus of the paper by M. Nicholls, "'Bookish Places' in Imperial Rome: Bookshops and the Urban Landscape of Learning" (pp. 51-68) is the cultural life in second-century Rome, and Galen's *On My Own Books* is a privileged vantage point. "The setting is not one of the great libraries or lecture halls nearby – though Galen certainly also used and talked about these – but among the commercial booksellers of the nearby street"; the story is that of Galen attending a dispute about the authorship of one of his works, an episode which inspired him to write a book "aiming to establish an accurate canon of his own circulating writings" (p. 51). This and other anecdotes exemplify the role of the "bookish places" of the title of this paper: these are urban spaces "for the sort of conversations which were also located by these same authors inside libraries – discussions about authenticity, attribution, points of grammar, and so on" (p. 53). A survey of the libraries follows which includes documentation coming from another work by Galen recently discovered, the *De Indolentia*. The "central part of

the town, where the emperor, magistrates, senate and courts transacted their business, naturally also contained archives. Many of these were apparently co-located with library spaces or nearby (...) and we might therefore add archives to the range of 'bookish places' in this area. The third category of purpose-built public cultural spaces in this region of Rome included the halls for performance, debate, lecture or recitation that often seem to have been co-located with Roman public libraries" (p. 63). Nicholls then discusses the co-existence of such areas with "educational spaces" and concludes his paper with a living picture of the "bookish people". "The busy population of human readers and authors considered above, ranging from school children to slave copyists to the emperor's physician, interacting in various ways woth written texts and with each other in private commercial and street places and among the institutional libraries and lecture halls of of central Rome, is an interesting contribution to the study of this lively lettered world" (p. 68).

The aim of S. Ammirati in her paper "Towards a Typology of the Ancient Latin Legal Book" (pp. 69-82) is "to survey the earliest evidence of the ancient Latin book in order to determine the possible form (or forms) of such books. Do these books have graphic and/or physical features in common? Was a legal book immediately distinguishabel from a book of a different content? Papyrological and epigraphic evidence will be taken into consideration alongside literary sources". The enquiry extends up to the end of the 3rd century CE, given that "the 4th century marked a significant watershed in the history of the ancient book. As is well known, the book in codex form, already attested and in use in previous centuries, particularly in the Latin world, superseded the book roll and this, as has been noted, caused significant changes in the layout and distribution of these manuscripts" (p. 69). Ammirati examines the main ways to drew attention on portions of a text witten on a book roll, i.e. *capita* and *rubricae*, in papyri and epigraphies, comparing them with testimonies dating from late Antiquity, when such devices continued to be used "in manuscripts in codex form" (p. 75). While "for the early period (1st-3rd centuries CE) we cannot talk of precise, definite typologies of Latin books of legal content", things change later on, although slowly. "A recognisable and definite book typology for the Latin book of legal content is not attested until the end of the 5th century CE" (p. 80).

Two papers follow which deal primarily with philological and linguistic issues. The first is S. Roussou, "New Reading in the Text of Herodian" (pp. 83-102), a paper which discusses several new readings in the grammatical work by Herodian, the son of Apollonius Dyscolus. Herodian's work is entitled *On Prosody* in general and "was the most important ancient work on Greek accentuation and the first systematic treatment of ancient Greek prosody to have a substantial and lasting impact on ancient and medieval Greek scholarship and teaching" (p. 83). E. Dickey, "What does a Linguistic Expert Know? The Conflict between Analogy and Atticism" (pp. 103-18) begins her paper highlighting the somehow oxymoronic nature of the expression "linguistic expert": "Language consists of a set of arbitrary conventions shared by members of a given community (...) and therefore no member of the community should be able to have any special status in relation to it. Yet expertise is precisely a special status". While in earlier times the concept of linguistic expertise seems not to be present (Dickey quotes as an example Athens in Aeschyl's times), "later Greek speakers clearly did have linguistic experts" (p. 103), and the paper explores on what basis did such criteria arise.

Suetonius' collection of literary biographies in his *De Viris illustribus* is examined by R.M.A. Marshall, "Suetonius the Bibliographer" (pp. 119-46) with a focus on "the inventory of the subject's written works". Marshall examines Suetonius' models, chiefly Callimachus and his imitator Hermippus, who "served as Callimachus' research assistant, and wrote, in effect, a pupular supplement to the *Pinakes*, concentrating on certain individuals or groups (e.g., lawgivers, the philosophers Aristotle and Theophrastus, the rhetors Gorgias and Isocrates, and the latter's pupils) and greatly expanded the biographical component of their entries" (pp. 124-5). However

he challenges the idea that Suetonius "attached pinacographic or 'Callimachean' book lists to any of his *Lives*. Jerome, despite claiming to follow Suetonius as his chief model, gives a misleading impression of his template in this regard"(p. 133). An examination of the lives of Terence, Horace, and Vergil prompts the conclusion that "Rather than adopt the Alexandrian technique of arranging works by genre, Suetonius uses bibliography as a skeleton to support the flesh of his *Lives*". Marshall maintains that Suetonius "avoided objective and systematic bibliography" (p. 145) and suggests as one of the reasons for this the "institutional contraints encountered in Rome itself. Callimachus' *Pinakes* could only have been written in an universal library; any Roman imitator would have to master the holding of several public institutions. Whether or not Suetonius composed his work when serving as a *bibliothecis*, in the 120s CE, this office was notionally in charge of several physically distinct institutions. (...) Though individual libraries may have held catalogues of parts (or even all) of their holdings, institutional fragmentation militated against the creation of a comprehensive Roman national bibliography" (p. 145).

The editor of the volume S.A. Adams contributes a paper entitled "Translating Texts: Contrasting Roman and Jewish Depictions of Literary Translations" (pp. 147-68) and devoted to a comparison of "the ways that Roman and Jewish writers articulated their understanding of literary translation. This comparison is valuable as translators from both cultures engage with Greek literature, but do so from very different perspectives and positions", meaning chiefly "from both dominant and non-dominant peoples". The differences are "with regard to directionality, religiosity, fidelity, and chronology" (p. 148). Translations were carried out to fulfil the well-known "claim by Romans that its [*sic*] literature is a continuation of Greek culture" (p. 150). "Fidelity to the text, therefore, does not become the primary purpose of the Latin translation as it would render the translator mute and so perpetuate the voice of the Greek original. Rather, translation among Latin authors becomes a method of control and rebranding, allowing the original to say only what they wished to say (e.g., Cicero, *Off.* 1.6). Indeed, to be too faithful to the text would undermine the intention of translation, namely to imbue previous Greek thought with Roman ideals and to provide a new voice for the Roman populous [*sic*]" (p. 154). Then Adams moves to the Jewish translations, chiefly the Septuagint and the *Letter of Aristeas*, a document "set in the Alexandrian royal courts" which "tells the story of the 'translation' of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek" (pp. 156-7). The narrative is not devoid of historical facts, but "the text is inherently ideological" as its author wants to convey the idea that the translators are "fully conversant with the current trends of scholarship and are able to excel in such tasks. (...) The author of Aristeas also makes declarations regarding the nature of the texts, namely that the earlier edition(s) were flawed and that the new text from Jerusalem is superior, both surpassing and replacing previous versions held at Alexandria" (p. 160). The examination of similarities and differences between Roman and Jewish translations suggests that the difference in target language signals "the different relathionship that each group has with Greek culture (...). Although both Roman and Jewish authors recognise the importance, even perhaps superiority, of Greek culture, they take different approaches to translation (...). For the Roman authors, Greek culture might be superior, but they are the dominant political power (...). Jewish authors did engage in cultural negotiation and comparison" (p. 162). Finally, "The 'free' rendering embraced by Latin writers stands in sharp contrast to the depiction of close translations of Jewish authors" (p. 164).

The paper by C. Hezser, "Rabbis as Intellectuals in the Context of Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Christian Scholasticism" (pp. 169-86) concludes the volume. "In Roman and early Byzantine times various types of 'intellectuals' constructed an image of themselves in distinction to others by socialising in networks of like-minded scholars, by literary expression and by creating 'school' traditions that continued for several generations. Philosophers, sophists, Church fathers, monks, and rabbis were involved in continuous attempts to fashion their own identities and to distinguish themselves from

others that claimed to possess superior wisdom" (p. 169). Against this backdrop, Hezser moves to a comparison between Palestinian rabbis and Graeco-Roman intellectuals. She remarks first that "Late antique rabbis who lived in the cities of Tiberias, Sepphoris, and Caesarea, that is, in urban contexts that are likely to have constituted the nodal points for the transmission, collection, and editing of rabbinic traditions, would have been interested in presenting themselves to their coreligionists and perhaps also to non-Jews as scholars who were equal or superior to Graeco-Roman and Christian intellectuals whom they encountered in daily life" (p. 170). In Hezser's opinion, they should be included with full right in the intellectual elites of the time, while they are often overlooked in the literature on the topic: "Rabbis and rabbinic scholarship are usually overlooked by classical scholars focusing on Graeco-Roman and Christian scholarship in the Roman and early Byzantine Empires" (p. 171). However, the practice was to a large extent the same: small circles of disciples gathering under the guidance of a learned teacher. Since Hezser sides whith those scholars who consider that the "ultimate goal" of the Graeco-Roman philosophers was "to provide students with guidance in life", she sees no difference in this regard with Rabbinic schools. "Like Graeco-Roman philosophy and Christian monastic teaching, rabbinic instruction was practically oriented" (p. 173). Another common feature is what Hezser calls "identity creation", a "shared *paideia*" that created "an elite consciousness". After a survey of the relationship between the Palestinian Rabbinic schools and the second Sophistic, she concludes that the two cultural phenomena "seem to have shared an interest in using cultural traditions of the past to create particular Jewish and Hellenic identities" (p. 176), perhaps in the aim to constitute "a Jewish alternative to what they considered 'Greek wisdom'" (p. 177).

As stated in the general introduction, the aim of this volume is that of "reinforcing the interconnected nature of scholarship in antiquity" (p. 6), and this is indeed something which arises in a clear and informative manner from the interesting papers gathered here. Aspects to be taken into further consideration and for understandable reasons underrepresented in this volume are the rise of schools, especially in the field of philosophy, and the connected rise, typology and evolution of the commentary tradition.

EC

C. Lévy, J.-B. Guillaumin (eds.), *Plato Latinus. Aspects de la transmission de Platon en latin dans l'Antiquité. Actes des Diatribai de Gargnano*, Brepols, Turnhout 2018 (Philosophie hellénistique et romaine, 8), 340 pp.

In their Introduction (pp. 7-29) the editors Carlos Lévy and Jean-Baptiste Guillaumin place this volume under the aegis of Cicero's label "the Platonic and Socratic family" (*Tusc*., 1, 55 quoted p. 10 fn. 12). To explore the spread in the Latin language between the 1st century b.C. and the 6th century AD of this remote forerunner of Ficinus' *Platonica familia* means for them, as for several of the authors of this interesting volume, to discuss Cicero's multifaceted Platonism and its heritage. "L'histoire du platonisme latin étant fortement tributaire de l'œuvre philosophique de Cicéron, la première partie de cette présentation étudie l'importance du legs cicéronien dans l'histoire de la philosophie platonicienne en langue latine. (...) En forçant à peine, on pourrait dire que Cicéron a transmis à la philosophie romaine non pas un, mais plusieurs Platons entremêlés, d'une manière qui apparaît parfois comme un défi à la perspicacité de l'historien interprète" (pp. 7-8). Plato's unique place in the history of philosophy consists for Cicero in that his thought instantiates "l'impératif d'une recherche qui ne craint pas l'erreur, puisque celle-ci est considérée comme la conséquence inéluctable de la finitude humaine" (p. 10). In presenting their vision of Cicero's stance, the editors identify the continuity-versus-discontinuity issue of the school of Plato as the core question faced by 1st century BC Platonism. "L'Académie, elle, présentait deux versions de son histoire et de sa pensée. Dans l'une,