

PLATO AT ALEXANDRIA: ARISTOPHANES, ARISTARCHUS, AND THE ‘PHILOLOGICAL TRADITION’ OF A PHILOSOPHER*

The Alexandrian scholars, and Aristarchus of Samothrace in particular, are much better known for their work on poetry, especially Homer, than for their work on prose. That Homer was at the core of their interests is certainly true: the epics were, after all, the basis of Greek culture and education. We also have much more evidence for the Homeric studies of the Alexandrians. But this does not mean that their activity was limited to Homer, or to poetry. With the publication of *PAmh.* 2.12 (third century A.D.), a papyrus preserving part of a commentary by Aristarchus on Herodotus,¹ we discovered that Aristarchus worked on at least one prose author.² Here I would like to present some new evidence and suggest that the Alexandrians produced an edition of and a commentary on Plato. If this hypothesis is correct, it provides good evidence for the breadth of ancient scholarship, and in particular that of Aristarchus, a ‘scientific’ scholar with wide interests who employed a clear and constant methodology. Moreover, it gives a new insight into the story of the Platonic corpus itself, which seems to have undergone a process similar to Homer’s, despite the clear generic differences between these two authors.

Among the glosses in the Byzantine lexis which quote the name of Aristarchus, two are particularly interesting. The first is preserved only by the *Etymologicum Genuinum*:³

EGen. οὐκ ἐτός: οὐκ ἐτώσιον, οὐ μάτην· ἄλλοι δὲ τὸ οὐκ ἐτός ἀντὶ τοῦ οὐκ ὄντως, οὐκ ἀληθῶς· παρὰ τὸ ἐτόν, τὸ ἀληθές· Ἀριστάρχος δὲ λέγει οὐκ εἰκότως καὶ ἀναγινώσκει οὐκ ἐτός (ὡς) οὐκ ἐμός.

1 *EGen.* constitui ex A (240^f) et B (199^v) | le. οὐκ ἐτός scripsi: οὐκετος A: οὐκετός B | οὐκ ἐτώσιον om. B | οὐκ ἐτός² scripsi: οὐκετος A: οὐκετός B | ἀντὶ τοῦ om. A 2 ἐτόν B: ἐτέον A οὐκ ἐτός scripsi: οὐκετός A B | (ὡς) addidi | οὐκ ἐμός scripsi: οὐκεμός A B

[*EGen.* οὐκ ἐτός (‘not without reason’): ‘not fruitlessly’, ‘not in vain’; others (understand) οὐκ ἐτός as ‘not really’, ‘not truly’, from ἐτόν, which means ‘true’; Aristarchus says (that it means) ‘not reasonably’ and reads οὐκ ἐτός (as) οὐκ ἐμός.]

* This is a revised version of papers I presented at Harvard, Columbia and Princeton universities in 2004–05. I would like to thank the attendees for useful comments and suggestions; thanks also to Patrick Finglass, Enrico Magnelli, and Nigel Wilson for reading and improving my drafts.

¹ The end title is preserved: Ἀριστάρχου/Ἡροδότου/α/ὑπόμνημα.

² Cf. R. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford, 1968), 224–5; F. Montanari, ‘L’erudizione, la filologia e la grammatica’, in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, and D. Lanza (edd.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica* (3 vols; Rome, 1992–6), 1.2 *L’Ellenismo* (1993) 235–81 at 248.

³ The *Etymologicum Genuinum*, like most Byzantine *Etymologica*, is mainly unpublished. The glosses containing the fragments analysed here have been collated by me on the basis of the two existing manuscripts (A and B) in connection with my work on the fragments of Aristarchus preserved in the Byzantine *Etymologica*; cf. F. Schironi, *I frammenti di Aristarco di Samotracia negli etimologici bizantini: introduzione, edizione critica e commento*, Hypomnemata 152 (Göttingen, 2004), fr. 72–3.

The lemma οὐκ ἐτός is an Attic expression which means ‘not without reason’, ‘not in vain’, where ἐτός means ‘without reason’ or ‘in vain’. Among the classical authors before Aristarchus, it is used only by Aristophanes (*Ach.* 411, 413; *Av.* 915; *Lys.* 138; *Thesm.* 921; *Eccl.* 245; *Plut.* 404, 1166; fr. 9.1 *PCG*), by other playwrights such as Anaxilas (fr. 29.1 *PCG*) and Philetaerus (fr. 8.1 *PCG*), and then by Plato (*Resp.* 414E7, 568A8). However, there is also a homograph ἐτός which means ‘true’ (cf. Callim. fr. 780 Pf.) and is derived from ἐτεός, but is never found in union with οὐκ in the sense of ‘not true’. Our gloss in the *Etymologicum Genuinum* comments on the first ἐτός and correctly translates the lemma οὐκ ἐτός as οὐκ ἐτώσιον ‘not fruitlessly’ and οὐ μάτην ‘not in vain’. It adds, however, that others took it to mean οὐκ ὄντως ‘not really’, οὐκ ἀληθῶς, ‘not truly’. Some ancient exegetes thus confused this ἐτός, ‘in vain’, with the homograph ἐτός meaning ‘true’, which is often glossed with ἀληθής.⁴ The same happens in the translation attributed to Aristarchus, who is said to have understood the expression as a synonym of οὐκ εἰκότως, that is ‘not reasonably’, ‘unreasonably’, hence ‘unlikely’. Does this mean that Aristarchus too, like others in antiquity, did not understand the real meaning of οὐκ ἐτός?

Unfortunately, we have no other evidence for Aristarchus’ interpretation of οὐκ ἐτός: among the other sources dealing with this lemma, none of them quotes Aristarchus, and, moreover, οὐκ ἐτός is translated rightly as οὐ μάτην ‘not in vain’, οὐ ματαίως ‘not without ground’, οὐκ ἀλόγως ‘not irrationally’ or, in a positive way, as δικαίως ‘rightly’.⁵ οὐκ ἐτός is glossed with οὐκ εἰκότως in only one other source, Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A, an old scholium to Plato,⁶ which ascribes this interpretation to some anonymous exegetes (οἱ δέ):

Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A οὐκ ἐτός [ἔτος A: ἐτώσιον A²], ὅτε μὲν οὐ μάτην, ὅτε δ’ οὐκ ἀλόγως· παρὰ τὸ ἐτώσιον, ὃ ἔστι τὸ μάταιον, οἱ δὲ οὐκ εἰκότως.

Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A οὐκ ἐτός (‘not without reason’), sometimes ‘not in vain’, sometimes ‘not irrationally’; from ἐτώσιον (‘fruitless’), which means ‘vain’; others, instead, (understand it as) ‘not reasonably’.

It is, of course, possible that Aristarchus has got his interpretation wrong. We do have evidence that in antiquity the distinction between ἐτός ‘in vain’ and ἐτός ‘true’ was not always clear.⁷ However, it is hardly an attractive hypothesis to say that the greatest

⁴ Cf. Hrd. *GG* 1.114.9 (ex Theogn. in *AO* 2.50.31 et Sch. *A II.* 18.410d); Hrd. *GG* 1.216.1 (ex Theogn. in *AO* 2.75.3); *EGen.* A(ε¹ε²) B s.v. ἐτεός και ἐτός; *EM* 385.54 (≅ Hrd. *GG* 2.228.12); Zon. 889; *Et. Or.* 59.27 ≅ *EGud.* 546.22 De Stef.; *EM* 387.23; *EGud.* 548.16 De Stef. = Ep. Hom. ε 77; *EGen.* A(ε¹) s.v. ἐτώσιον; *EGen.* A(ε²) B s.v. ἐτώσιον ≅ *EM* 387.30; Zon. 892; *EGud.* 550.21 De Stef.; *EM* 387.43 (≅ Hrd. *GG* 2.850.25) ≅ *EGud.* 550.9 De Stef. ≅ Ep. Hom. ε 123; *EGen.* A(ε¹) B s.v. ἐτυμος ≅ *EM* 388.1; Zon. 890; *EGen.* α 246 L-L ≅ *EM* α 561 L-L ≅ *ESym.* α 313 L-L; *EM* α 2113 L-L ≅ *ESym.* α 1582 L-L; *EGud.* 237.5 De Stef. ≅ Ep. Hom. α 29 (cf. Hrd. *GG* 2.315.22); Eust. 1408.12.

⁵ Cf. Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A; Phot. 2.37 Naber; Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 414E; Ps.-Did. *Lex. Plat.* 399; Tim. *Lex. Plat.* 167; Sch. Ar. *Lys.* 138; Sch. vet. Ar. *Plut.* 404a; Sch. vet. Ar. *Plut.* 1166b; Sch. Tzetz. Ar. *Plut.* 404; Sch. Tzetz. Ar. *Plut.* 1166; Sch. rec. Ar. *Plut.* 404a; Sch. rec. Ar. *Plut.* 1166a; The wrong οὐκ ἀληθῶς, οὐκ ἐτεός occur in Sch. vet. Ar. *Plut.* 404b, while both meanings, the correct one (οὐ ματαίως, οὐκ ἀλόγως) and the false one (οὐκ ἀληθῶς), are to be found in Hsch. ο 1703, *Suda* ο 889. None of these glosses, however, mentions Aristarchus.

⁶ Cf. L. Cohn, ‘Untersuchungen über die Quellen der Plato-Scholien’, *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie*, Suppl. 13 (1884), 773–864 at 803.

⁷ For example, Sch. *A II.* 18.410d and *EGen.* A(ε²) B s.v. ἐτώσιον ≅ *EM* 387.30 contain two fragments by Philoxenus (fr. 578 and 491 Theodoridis), according to whom ἐτός, meaning ἀληθής, is derived by antiphrasis from ἐτώσιος ‘vain’.

of the Alexandrian grammarians has made a simple semantic error. It is more likely that the fault lies not with Aristarchus, but with the transmission of his ‘fragment’. Evidence for such a corruption may lie in a gloss in the lexicon of Photius, which offers a different ‘translation’ of the phrase:

Phot., s.v. οὐκ ἐτός (2.37 Naber). *οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἢ οὐ μάτην· παρὰ τὸ ἐτώσιον, ὃ ἐστι μάταιον· οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἀλόγως.*

Phot., s.v. οὐκ ἐτός (‘not without reason’), ‘not unreasonably’ or ‘not in vain’: from ἐτώσιον (‘fruitless’), which means ‘vain’; others, instead, (understand it as) ‘not irrationally’.

Photius does not quote Aristarchus or any other grammarian, but his gloss is correct: for here οὐκ ἐτός ‘not in vain’ is glossed with οὐκ ἀπεικότως ‘not unreasonably’, ‘not without reason’. Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A and Phot., s.v. οὐκ ἐτός, are very similar to each other, but only Photius has the right ‘translation’ ἀπεικότως, instead of εἰκότως in the Platonic scholium and the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. The corruption of ἀπεικότως into εἰκότως is easy to explain: it is just a question of dropping the first syllable of the word. The Byzantine lexicographers, moreover, are characterized by a wide usage of abbreviations for preverbs, which may have made ἀπ(ο)- even more prone to omission. In addition, the double negative οὐκ ἀπεικότως may have been a source of confusion. Notwithstanding the frequency of double negatives in Greek, people would be more familiar with the phrases οὐκ εἰκός or οὐκ εἰκότως, whereas οὐκ ἀπεικότως would be a rarer form of expression. It thus seems plausible to ascribe ἀπεικότως to Aristarchus, who correctly interpreted the Attic οὐκ ἐτός, ‘not without reason’, and glossed it accurately with οὐκ ἀπεικότως ‘not unreasonably’.

The *Etymologicum Genuinum* gives another piece of information about Aristarchus: ἀναγινώσκει οὐκ ἐτός (ὡς) οὐκ ἐμός. This note seems to hint at the accent: Aristarchus read οὐκ ἐτός with oxytone ἐτός, by analogy with ἐμός. Though the analogical parallel is not straightforward, as there is not much in common between the adverb ἐτός and the possessive ἐμός, there is no other obvious way to read this parallel. Aristarchus was thus proposing to read ἐτός as an oxytone word, a clarification that implies the existence of another variant.

Indeed, an alternative reading ἐτώς, with omega and circumflex accent, has left traces in our sources: it is a variant added by scribe A at Sch. Pl. *Resp.* 568A (quoted above), and recurs again in the *Suda*:

Suda ο 888 οὐκ ἐτώς: οὐκ εἰκότως, ἢ οὐ μάτην· παρὰ τὸ ἐτώσιον, ὃ ἐστι μάταιον· οὐκ ἀλόγως. Ἀριστοφάνης (*Plut.* 1166–7): “οὐκ ἐτώς ἅπαντες οἱ δικάζοντες θαμὰ / σπεύδουσιν ἐπὶ πολλοῖς γεγράφθαι γράμμασιν”.

Suda ο 888 οὐκ ἐτώς: ‘not reasonably’ or ‘not in vain’; from ἐτώσιον (‘fruitless’), which means ‘vain’; ‘not without reason’. Aristophanes (*Plut.* 1166–7): ‘Not without reason [*but: οὐκ ἐτώς!*] all the jurymen so eagerly/try to get entered for many tribunals’.

The same mistaken interpretation οὐκ εἰκότως is referred this time to the lemma οὐκ ἐτώς, which is also the reading (metrically and semantically impossible) in the quotation from Aristophanes’ *Plutus*.

We can thus suppose that Aristarchus was commenting on a passage which presented two different readings, very similar in sound: οὐκ ἐτώς, with omega and circumflex accent (not attested elsewhere), and οὐκ ἐτός, with omicron and acute accent. He decided that the correct version was the latter and in order to support his reading quoted the analogous οὐκ ἐμός.

Now, which text was Aristarchus correcting and commenting on? We might suppose that he was commenting on Ar. *Plut.* 1166, as quoted in the *Suda*: he was

correctly interpreting the expression as meaning ‘not without reason’ (οὐκ ἀπεικότως) and, moreover, wanted to emend the transmitted text, which had the wrong οὐκ ἐτώς, into the correct οὐκ ἐτός.

But there is another, more plausible possibility. For in several ways our sources seem to suggest that Aristarchus referred to Plato and not to Aristophanes. First of all, in the manuscript tradition of Aristophanes a variant οὐκ ἐτώς is never attested in any of the passages where οὐκ ἐτός occurs (these are much more numerous than in Plato).⁸ The only instance is the quotation in the *Suda*. Moreover, none of the many Aristophanic scholia analysing the lemma οὐκ ἐτός⁹ has the Aristarchean gloss οὐκ ἀπεικότως, nor the incorrect οὐκ εικότως, as found in the *Etymologicum Genuinum*. On the other hand, in the two passages from the *Republic* where οὐκ ἐτός occurs (*Resp.* 414E7 and 568A8, the only two occurrences of the expression in Plato), οὐκ ἐτώς is attested as a manuscript variant.¹⁰ οὐκ ἐτώς also recurs as a variant in the scholium to *Pl. Resp.* 568A, as we have already seen.

But there is more. All the main sources that we have analysed (*EGen.* s.v. οὐκ ἐτός; *Sch. Pl. Resp.* 568A; *Phot.*, s.v. οὐκ ἐτός; *Suda* ο 888) are very similar to each other. The glosses οὐκ ἐτώσιον and οὐ μάτην recur in all four sources, while the error οὐκ εικότως for οὐκ ἀπεικότως is shared by the *Suda*, the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, and the Platonic scholium against Photius, which is the oldest among our preserved sources. Moreover, the first part of the *Suda*’s gloss (οὐκ ἐτώς· οὐκ εικότως, ἢ οὐ μάτην· παρὰ τὸ ἐτώσιον, ὃ ἐστι μάταιον· οὐκ ἀλόγως) is very similar to Photius: οὐκ ἐτός· οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἢ οὐ μάτην· παρὰ τὸ ἐτώσιον, ὃ ἐστι μάταιον· οἱ δὲ οὐκ ἀλόγως. As in many other glosses like this, which recur identically in the *Suda* and Photius, the common source is the so-called *erweiterte Synagoge*, a collection of difficult words that forms the basis of many Byzantine lexica. Among the main sources for the *Synagoge* were two Platonic lexica, one by Boethus and the other by Timaeus. This *erweiterte Synagoge*, via Photius, is the source of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*.¹¹ We can thus suppose that the Platonic entry οὐκ ἐτός passed from the Platonic lexica of Boethus and Timaeus to the *erweiterte Synagoge* and that from there it arrived with many corruptions in the *Suda*,¹² Photius, the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, and, on the other hand, the scholium to Plato. To this evidence we can add that one of the Platonic lexica mentioned above, that of Timaeus, is still extant and does indeed have this entry, though highly corrupted: *Tim. Lex. Plat.* 167,¹³

⁸ See the references listed on page 2.

⁹ Included in the list at n. 5 above

¹⁰ See the apparatus in Chambry’s edition (2 vols; Paris, 1947–8): the second hand in A (*Par. Gr.* 1807) has corrected and written ἐτώς (*sic*) in *Resp.* 414E7 and 568A8; the variant is attested also in F (*Vindob.* 55) in *Resp.* 568A8. Cf. also Burnet’s *Oxford Classical Text* (*Oxford*, 1905) ad *Resp.* 414E7: ‘ἐτώς fecit A’; Slings in his recent *Oxford Classical Text* (*Oxford*, 2003) does not mention any variant.

¹¹ On the *Synagoge* as the source of Photius and the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, see R. Reitzenstein, *Der Anfang des Lexicons des Photios* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1907), xxix–xxxiv; G. Wentzel, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Lexicographie*, *Sitzungsber. d. Preuß. Akad.* (1895), 477–87 (= *LGM* 1–11); K. Alpers, *Das attizistische Lexikon des Oros: Untersuchung und kritische Ausgabe der Fragmente*, *SGLG* 4 (Berlin, 1981), 69–79; I. C. Cunningham, ‘Harpocration and the *Synagoge*’, *GRBS* 27 (1986), 205–21; *id.*, ‘Introduction’, in *SYNAGOGE, ΣΥΝΑΓΩΓΗ ΛΕΞΕΩΝ ΧΡΗΣΙΜΩΝ, Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B*, *SGLG* 10 (Berlin and New York, 2003), 13–61.

¹² The *Suda* added to this the quotation from Aristophanes. The addition of external material, especially quotations from classical sources (in particular Aristophanes), is a peculiarity of the *Suda*.

¹³ Ed. G. A. Koch (Leipzig, 1828).

οὐκ ἔτως· οὐκ ἔτωσίως, where the lemma was already emended by the editor into οὐκ ἔτός.

To conclude: it is Plato and not Aristophanes to whom all our sources point. Aristarchus does indeed seem to have worked on the Platonic text. In this passage from the *Republic* he suggested an emendation and gave an interpretation in order to clarify an expression that was probably not clear. The fact that the passages commented on come from the *Republic* is also significant, and will be discussed further below.

We come now to the second fragment, which recurs in three sets of sources: the *Etymologica* (EGen. AB s.v. ἦ δ' ὄς ≅ EM 416.31); Photius and the *Suda*; and a minor lexicon to Plato (Ps.-Did. *Lex. Plat.* 399). This time the common source of all these glosses is probably the Platonic lexicon of Boethus,¹⁴ and, since the *Suda* and Photius preserve a better text, we shall limit ourselves to them:

Phot. η 51 ≅ Suda η 100 ἦ δ' ὄς: οἱ μὲν περὶ Ἐρατοσθένην ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη δὲ ὄς. [...] καὶ ἡ ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη· ἀλλὰ περιμενοῦμεν, ἦ δ' ὄς ὁ Γλαύκων' (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327B). καὶ ἦν δ' ἐγώ' (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327C), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφην δὲ ἐγώ· [...]. Ἀρίσταρχος δὲ τὸ μὲν ἦ δ' ὄς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη δὲ ὄς, τὸ δὲ ἦν δ' ἐγώ, ἔφην ἐγώ· τὸ δὲ ἦ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἔφη εἶναι λεξειδίων, Ὁμηρον δὲ οὐ κατὰ πάντα χρῆσθαι αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ σχηματίζειν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀνάλογον {μὲν}, ὡς ὅταν λόγου τελευτητὴν σημαίνῃ; ἦ καὶ κυανέησιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι' (*Il.* 1.528). καὶ ἦ καὶ ἐπ' Ἀντινώ' (*Od.* 22.8). τοὺς δὲ μεθ' Ὁμηρον ἀδιφρόρως αὐτὸ τάσσειν.

1. ἦ: ἦ semper g z, corr. Porson 2 ἦν δ' ἐγώ: δ' Su. et EGen.; cf. Plat.: δὲ g z 4 ἔφην ἐγώ: ἔφην δ' ἐγώ coniecerat Porson | τὸ δὲ ἦ: ἦ z g 5 μὲν del. Bernhardt, oblocutus est Ludwich, *RhM* 41, 1886, 439, n. 11, qui μὲν ὡς ex μόνως depravata esse coniecit 6 ἦ καὶ ἐπ' Ἀντινώ Porson: ἦκε ἐπαντινώ g: ἦκε ἐπαντινώ z

Phot. η 51 ≅ Suda η 100 ἦ δ' ὄς: Eratosthenes (says that ἦ δ' ὄς is used) in the sense of ἔφη δὲ ὄς ('he said'); [...] and ἦ (is used) in the sense of ἔφη ('said'); "'So we will wait', said Glaucón' (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327B), and 'said I' (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327C) (is used) in the sense of ἔφην ἐγώ ('I said'). [...]. Aristarchus (says that) ἦ δ' ὄς (is used) in the sense of ἔφη δὲ ὄς ('he said') and ἦν δ' ἐγώ (in the sense of) ἔφην ἐγώ ('I said'). And he said that ἦ is an archaic word and that Homer does not use it everywhere, nor does he construct a whole paradigm from this form according to the analogy, as (he uses it only) when it indicates the end of a speech: '(So the son of Cronus) spoke, and (bowed) his dark brow (in assent)' (*Il.* 1.528) and 'Odysseus spoke, and (aimed a bitter arrow) at Antinous' (*Od.* 22.8); (Aristarchus says that) on the other hand the authors after Homer use ἦ syntactically without discrimination.

The question concerns the expression ἦ δ' ὄς 'he said', which is absent from Homer but typical of Attic.¹⁵ Together with the parallel expression for the first-person singular ἦν δ' ἐγώ 'I said', it is often used in comedy¹⁶ and even more by Plato, who uses it frequently in his dialogues.¹⁷ I shall not go through all the different interpretations that ancient exegetes, whose opinions are preserved in the gloss of the *Etymologicum Genuinum*, gave of this expression.¹⁸ Instead I shall focus on Aristarchus, according to whom ἦ δ' ὄς was equivalent to ἔφη δὲ ὄς (where ὄς has the meaning of a demonstrative and not of a relative pronoun), and ἦν δ' ἐγώ to ἔφην ἐγώ.

¹⁴ Cf. Cohn (n. 6), 795, 806. On Boethus see A. R. Dyck, 'Notes on Platonic lexicography in antiquity', *HSCP* 89 (1985), 75–88 at 75–84.

¹⁵ Cf. Greg. Cor. 141; Sch. Ar. *Eq.* 634b.

¹⁶ Cf. *Vesp.* 795; *Lys.* 514; Cratin. fr. 205 *PCG* (ἦ δ' ὄς); Ar. *Eq.* 634 (ἦν δ' ἐγώ).

¹⁷ Cf. Sch. Ar. *Vesp.* 795d; *Suda* η 371. For Platonic occurrences of these expressions cf. L. Brandwood, *A Word Index to Plato* (Leeds, 1976), s.vv. ἦν δ' ἐγώ. ἦ δ' ὄς.

¹⁸ Cf. also Phot. η 52 ≅ Σ η 36. On the different solutions proposed by ancient grammarians for this Platonic expression see A. Ludwich, 'Die Formel ἦ δ' ὄς', *RhM* 41 (1886), 437–53.

The same interpretation had already been given by Aristarchus' predecessor Eratosthenes.¹⁹

Aristarchus also noticed that the form ἦ was an archaic expression: it was present in Homer, who used it only to mark the end of direct speech, but never to introduce it. However, it is clear that Aristarchus is commenting here not on a Homeric but on a Platonic expression; he was actually translating it into more 'modern' Attic. In theory, we might suppose that the reference to this Attic and Platonic expression was included by Aristarchus in his Homeric commentary, but, as we have already found some evidence for a Platonic commentary, it might be fruitful to continue with the latter hypothesis.

In the glosses we see that Aristarchus analyses first ἦ δ' ὅς and then ἦν δ' ἐγώ (... Ἀριστάρχος δὲ τὸ μὲν ἦ δ' ὅς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφη δὲ ὅς, τὸ δὲ ἦν δ' ἐγὼ ἔφην ἐγώ). This order (first the third person, followed by the first) is certainly not the most obvious. But if we suppose that the analysis occurred in a commentary on Plato, it is likely that Aristarchus dwelt on and analysed the two expressions when he first encountered them. For in running commentaries, the exegete normally dwells on the first occurrence of expressions or words that need explanation. He does not normally repeat his note when he finds the same expressions later in the same text.²⁰

Photius and the *Suda* quote two passages from the *Republic*: "ἀλλὰ περιμενούμεν, ἦ δ' ὅς ὁ Γλαύκων" (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327B8). καὶ "ἦν δ' ἐγώ" (Pl. *Resp.* 1.327C6, 10), ἀντὶ τοῦ ἔφην δὲ ἐγώ. These are the first occurrences of these expressions in the *Republic*. We can thus suppose that Aristarchus was commenting on this text, where he met the expressions in that order. He wrote some comments on them, glossing them and tracing a comparison with his beloved Homer, something which would be particularly natural to him.

All this evidence seems to confirm what we already knew of Platonic scholarship in Alexandria. Diogenes Laertius (3.61) informs us that Aristophanes of Byzantium, Aristarchus' predecessor, had ordered Plato's work into trilogies instead of tetralogies:

Diog. Laert. 3.61: ἔνιοι δέ, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Ἀριστοφάνης ὁ γραμματικός, εἰς τριλογίας ἔλκουσι τοὺς διαλόγους, καὶ πρώτην μὲν τιθέασιν ἧς ἡγείται Πολιτεία, Τιμαίος, Κριτίας· δευτέραν Σοφιστής, Πολιτικός, Κρατύλος· τρίτην Νόμοι, Μίνως, Ἐπινομίς· τετάρτην Θεαίτητος, Εὐθύφρων, Ἀπολογία· πέμπτην Κρίτων, Φαίδων, Ἐπιστολαί. τὰ δ' ἄλλα καθ' ἑν καὶ ἀτάκτως.

Diog. Laert. 3.61: Some, Aristophanes the grammarian among them, arrange the dialogues into trilogies. They have the first trilogy consisting of the *Republic*, the *Timaeus*, and the *Critias*; the second consisting of the *Sophist*, the *Statesman*, and the *Cratylus*; the third consisting of the *Laws*, *Minos*, and *Epinomis*; the fourth consisting of the *Theaetetus*, the *Euthyphro*, and the *Apology*; the fifth consisting of the *Crito*, the *Phaedo*, and the *Epistles*. The rest consist of separate texts, without any arrangement.

According to this arrangement, there were five trilogies for a total of fifteen Platonic works that corresponded (apart from the *Clitophro*) to the works contained in the first, second, eighth, and ninth tetralogies, as shown in Table 1. The rest of Plato's works,

¹⁹ According to *EGen.* and *EM* 416.31, however, Eratosthenes glossed ἦ δ' ὅς with ἔφη δὲ οὗτος ('this man said'). Cf. C. Strecker, *De Lycophrone, Euphronio, Eratosthene comicorum interpretibus* (diss. Greifswald, 1884), 39–40; G. Bernhardt, *Eratosthenica* (Berlin, 1822), 217–18.

²⁰ That is why the bulk of learned notes in ancient commentaries concern the very beginning of the work commented on and become fewer and fewer in the course of the commentary.

TABLE 1. Division of Platonic dialogues into tetralogies and trilogies

TETRALOGIES	TRILOGIES
1. <i>Euthyphro, Apology, Crito, Phaedo</i>	1. <i>Republic, Timaeus, Critias</i>
2. <i>Cratylus, Theaetetus, Sophist, Statesman</i>	2. <i>Sophist, Statesman, Cratylus</i>
3. <i>Parmenides, Philebus, Symposium, Phaedrus</i>	3. <i>Laws, Minos, Epinomis</i>
4. <i>Alcibiades, 2nd Alcibiades, Hipparchus, Rival Lovers</i>	4. <i>Theaetetus, Euthyphro, Apology</i>
5. <i>Theages, Charmides, Laches, Lysis</i>	5. <i>Crito, Phaedo, Letters</i>
6. <i>Euthydemus, Protagoras, Gorgias, Meno</i>	
7. <i>Hippias major, Hippias minor, Ion, Menexenus</i>	
8. <i>Clitopho, Republic, Timaeus, Critias</i>	
9. <i>Minos, Laws, Epinomis, Letters</i>	

on the other hand, were καθ' ἑν και ἀτάκτως: not arranged into any collection and edited as separate texts.²¹

According to Diogenes Laertius, the first trilogy opened with the *Republic*. This seems to confirm our hypothesis. If Aristarchus did work on Plato, he would have analysed the first occurrence of a common and typical Platonic expression such as ἦ δ' ὅς at its very first occurrence in the corpus. And this passage from the *Republic* (1.327B8) with ἦ δ' ὅς ὁ Γλαύκων, is indeed the first occurrence of this pervasive Platonic expression under the arrangement into trilogies provided by Aristophanes of Byzantium. It is tempting, therefore, to imagine Aristarchus commenting on Plato and using the edition prepared by his predecessor Aristophanes. In his work on Homer too, Aristarchus used Aristophanes' edition when he wrote his first commentary.²²

That the text of Plato was the object of exegetical activity can also be seen from the famous list of critical signs used in the Platonic corpus as preserved again by Diogenes Laertius:

Diog. Laert. 3.65: ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ σημεῖα τινα τοῖς βιβλίοις αὐτοῦ παρατίθενται, φέρε καὶ περὶ τούτων τι εἰπωμεν· χι λαμβάνεται πρὸς τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰ σχήματα καὶ ὅλως τὴν Πλατωνικὴν συνήθειαν· διπλὴ πρὸς τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα Πλάτωνι· χι περισστιγμένον πρὸς τὰς ἐκλογὰς καὶ καλλιγραφίας· διπλὴ περισστιγμένη πρὸς τὰς ἐνίων διορθώσεις· ὀβελὸς περισστιγμένος πρὸς τὰς εἰκαίους ἀθετήσεις· ἀντίσιγμα περισστιγμένον πρὸς τὰς διττὰς χρήσεις καὶ μεταθέσεις τῶν γραφῶν· κεραύνιον πρὸς τὴν ἀγωγήν τῆς φιλοσοφίας· ἀστερίσκος πρὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων· ὀβελὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν.

Diog. Laert. 3.65: As certain critical signs are affixed to his works, I will now say something about them. The *chi* is used to mark expressions and figures of speech, and in general Platonic usage; the *diplē* is used to mark doctrines and ideas typical of Plato; the dotted *chi* is used to mark selected expressions and elegance of style; the dotted *diplē* is used to mark corrections suggested by editors; the dotted *obelus* is used to mark wrong *athetēseis*; the dotted *antisigma* is used to mark repetitions and transpositions; the *ceraunium* is used to mark the philosophical school; the asterisk is used to mark an agreement of doctrine; the *obelus* is used to mark an *athetēsis*.

²¹ According to H. Tarrant, *Thrasyllos Platonism* (Ithaca, NY and London, 1993), 205, Aristophanes knew only those fifteen works and did not exclude anything from his edition. Only later at Alexandria would the rest of Plato's works become available, and they would be edited separately.

²² We have evidence of two Homeric commentaries by Aristarchus, of which only the second was based on his own edition. Cf. Sch. A II. 2.133a; see also Sch. A II. 2.111b; Sch. A II. 7.130a¹; Pfeiffer (n. 2), 216–17.

The evidence of Diogenes Laertius is confirmed by a papyrus (PSI 1488 = Plato 142 T *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini* [CPF]) of the second century A.D. It lists the same critical signs, but in a fuller and more ‘logical’ order:²³

.
 τὸ μὲν χεῖ λαμβάνεται πρὸς]
 τὴν Πλατωνικὴν συν]ήθειαν ἢ δὲ διπλῆ >
 πρὸς τὰ δόγμα[α λαμβάνε]ται καὶ τὰ
 ἀρέσκοντα Πλ]άτωνι· ὁ δὲ ὀβελ[ὸς] [- πρὸς
 τὴν ἀθέτησιν] λαμβάνεται· τὸ δὲ ἀντίσιγ-
 μα > πρὸς τὰς] δισσογραφίας καὶ τ[ρ]ισσάς·
 τὸ δὲ περιεστιγ]μένον χεῖ ·χ· [πρὸς τὰς ἐκ-
 λογὰς καὶ καλλιγ]ραφίας· ἢ [δὲ περι-
 στιγμένη διπ]λῆ > πρὸς τὰς ἐ[ν]ίων διορ-
 θώσεις· ὁ δὲ πε]ριεστιγμέν[ος] ὀβελὸς ÷
 πρὸς τὰς εἰκα]σθεῖται· τὸ δὲ περι-
 εστιγμένον ἀ]ντίσιγμα > [πρὸς τὰς δισσάς
 χρήσεις καὶ μ]εταθέσει[ς] τῶν γραφῶν·
 τὸ δὲ κεραύνιον T σ]ημείον πρὸς τὴν
 ἀγωγὴν τῆς φιλοσο]φίας· ὁ δ[ὲ] ἀστερί-
 σκος * πρὸς τὴν συμ]φ[ωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων]

The same list also recurs in a Latin manuscript (the so-called *Anecdutum Cavense*).²⁴ I shall not analyse these critical signs in detail,²⁵ but draw attention to two points.

First: many of these signs are identical with those that Aristarchus used for Homer: the ὀβελός, the διπλῆ, the ἀντίσιγμα, the ἀστερίσκος, and the διπλῆ περιεστιγμένη. The other signs, the χί, the κεραύνιον,²⁶ the ὀβελὸς περιεστιγμένος, the χί περιεστιγμένον, and the ἀντίσιγμα περιεστιγμένον, are different but seem to be created according to the same principles: there is a set of ‘simple’ signs (ὀβελός, διπλῆ, χί, ἀντίσιγμα) and their ‘dotted’ counterparts.²⁷ The logic underlying this system is that of Aristarchus, who was also the first scholar to make the distinction between simple and dotted σημεῖα. Moreover, although the Platonic signs are in part different from those used by

²³ Cf. V. Bartoletti, ‘Diogene Laerzio III 65–66 e un papiro della raccolta fiorentina’, in *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, 1: *Écriture sainte*, Studi e Testi 231 (Vatican City, 1964), 25–30, and M. Gigante, ‘Un papiro attribuibile ad Antigono di Caristo? PSI 1488, Vite dei filosofi’, in *Papiri Filosofici Miscellanea di studi II*, STCPF 9 (Florence, 1998), 111–14; M. J. Luzzatto, ‘Itinerari di codici antichi: un’edizione di Tucidide tra il II ed il X secolo’, *MD* 30 (1993), 167–203 at 195–6. I report Gigante’s edition, though his attribution to Antigonus of Carystus seems quite doubtful; cf. T. Dorandi, ‘Prolegomeni per una edizione dei frammenti di Antigono di Caristo. III’, *ZPE* 106 (1995), 61–90 at 84–5; H. Dörrie, *Der Platonismus in der Antike*, 2: *Der hellenistische Rahmen des kaiserzeitlichen Platonismus* (Stuttgart and Bad Cannstatt, 1990), 354–5; Tarrant (n. 21), 183, n. 14.

²⁴ Cf. A. Reifferscheid, ‘Mittheilungen aus Handschriften. I: Anecdutum Cavense de notis antiquorum’, *RhM* 23 (1868), 127–133 at 131–2.

²⁵ Cf. H. Alline, ‘Aristophane de Byzance et son édition critique de Platon’, *REA* 17 (1915), 85–97; id., *Histoire du texte de Platon* (Paris, 1915), 86–93; G. Jachmann, *Der Platontext* (Göttingen, 1942), 334–41; A. Carlini, *Studi sulla tradizione antica e medievale del Fedone* (Rome, 1972), 20–1; Dörrie (n. 23), 92–6, 347–56.

²⁶ We have no evidence that Aristarchus used the *chi* and the *ceranium* for Homer. They seem in any case to date back to the Alexandrians. The *ceranium* was used by Aristophanes to comment on *Od.* 18.281–3 (cf. Sch. H *Od.* 18.282), and it is possible that Aristophanes used the *chi* as well: cf. A. Gudeman, s.v. ‘Kritische Zeichen’, in *RE* 21.2 (Stuttgart, 1922), 1916–27 at 1924–5.

²⁷ The asterisk and the *ceranium* were apparently used only as simple signs, probably because an addition of dots would have been quite problematic (at least for the asterisk, already provided with four).

Aristarchus for Homer, in both authors the *ὀβελός* is used to mark passages considered spurious, the *διπλή περιεστιγμένη* is a 'polemical' sign to mark disagreement with other critics, and the *ἀντίσιγμα* is used for transpositions. As for the new signs, they might have been invented for the commentary on Plato, whose text differed in many respects from that of Homer. We can thus suppose that it was commented on in a different way, with a fuller set of editorial marks.²⁸

Secondly: the very existence of critical signs presupposes the existence of a commentary.²⁹ The names and usages of these Platonic signs are too evocative of Alexandrian scholarship not to suggest the existence of a sort of commentary on Plato by the time of Aristarchus, and indeed by his hand.

Aristarchus commented on Plato as a Homerist, not as a philosopher: he established the Platonic text through analogy (cf. *οὐκ ἔτός* as *οὐκ ἔμός*) and noticed usages and Homeric echoes in Platonic diction (*ῆ*). And this way of working, especially analogy and attention to the usage of an author, is perfectly in keeping with what we already know of Aristarchus' methodology and scholarship.

This is a very attractive hypothesis. Until now we have had no evidence, besides *PAmh.* 2.12, that Aristarchus or other Alexandrian grammarians worked on prose authors. These two Platonic fragments, if my reconstruction is correct, give us a new insight into and a better understanding of Aristarchean activity, which was by no means limited to Homer or to poetry. Rather, it embraced prose of different kinds. His interest in Plato, an author who continually engaged with the work of Homer, is revealing and fits well with Aristarchus' interest in Herodotus, defined by the ancients as *Ῥομηρικώτατος* ([Longinus] *Subl.* 13.3). It is not a surprise that Herodotus and Plato were the very prose authors who attracted the attention of a Homeric scholar such as Aristarchus.

Moreover, these pieces of evidence preserved in the Byzantine lexicæ open up a new perspective on the textual history of another great classic. The problem of the ancient editions of Plato has been debated for a long time and by outstanding scholars.³⁰ Wilamowitz, Bickel, and Pasquali thought that the edition of Plato was prepared in the Academy by Arcesilaus.³¹ Alline³² and then

²⁸ For a discussion of the similarity of these signs to those used by Aristarchus for Homer, see F. Solmsen, 'The Academic and the Alexandrian editions of Plato's works', *ICS* 6 (1981), 102–11 at 106–7. It is hard to accept the analysis of Alline, 'Aristophane de Byzance' (n. 25), who tries on the one hand to ascribe all of the signs to Aristophanes and on the other to undermine Aristarchus' contribution in this field.

²⁹ Cf. E. G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: An Introduction* (Oxford, 1980²), 115–18; Carlini (n. 25), 19–20; and more recently K. McNamee, *Sigla and Select Marginalia in Greek Literary Papyri* (Brussels, 1992), 11, 19–20. *Contra* Pfeiffer (n. 2), 115, n. 4.

³⁰ On the edition(s) of Plato in antiquity, cf. Alline, *Histoire* (n. 25), 78–103; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Platon* (2 vols; Berlin, 1920²), 2.324–5; Carlini (n. 25), 13–30; H. Erbse, 'Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur', in H. Hunger, O. Stegmüller, H. Erbse, M. Imhof, K. Büchner, H. G. Beck, and H. Rüdiger (edd.), *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* (Zürich, 1961), 207–83 at 219–21; A. H. Chroust, 'The organization of the corpus Platonium in antiquity', *Hermes* 93 (1965), 34–46; Solmsen (n. 28); Tarrant (n. 21), esp. 14–15, 69–71, 89–98, 103–7, 205–6.

³¹ Cf. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin, 1881), 286; id. (n. 30), 2.326–7; E. Bickel, 'Geschichte und Recensio des Platontextes', *RhM* 92 (1944), 97–159; G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence, 1952²), 261–2. However, Alline, *Histoire* (n. 25), 50–6, maintained that the academic edition was due to Xenocrates.

³² See Alline, *Histoire* (n. 25), 84–103.

Jachmann³³ were the most important supporters of the Alexandrian edition, putting great trust in the passage of Diogenes Laertius, while Wilamowitz, Pasquali, Pfeiffer, and Erbse denied the existence of the edition by Aristophanes and considered the arrangement into trilogies to be no more than a different way of cataloguing the works of Plato,³⁴ perhaps worked out by Aristophanes in his supplement to the *Pinakes*.³⁵ However, while we do not have any evidence of this Academic edition in our sources (an edition which everyone seems to believe in), we do have the evidence of Diogenes Laertius (at 3.61 and 3.65) for an Alexandrian *ekdosis* of Plato; there thus seems no reason to deny it.³⁶

Thus it seems likely that, together with an Academic tradition which produced the Platonic edition by Arcesilaus, followed by the standard one arranged into tetralogies by Thrasyllus, the astronomer of Tiberius (cf. Diog. Laert. 3.56),³⁷ there was another ‘grammatical’ tradition, developed in Alexandria by Aristophanes and then Aristarchus. These scholars were interested in Plato not from a philosophical point of view, but from a philological one. They wanted to fix a good Platonic text (good in terms of language), to clarify Platonic expressions, and to study Platonic style.³⁸ The Alexandrians did not limit themselves to an edition of Plato; Aristarchus wrote a *hypomnēma* on Plato based on the edition of his predecessor Aristophanes. His main concern was grammatical and philological: Aristarchus clarified obscure expressions by ‘translating’ them into more accessible language, established Platonic usages, and chose between different readings.

Not much of this ‘philological’ Platonic scholarship has come down to us, apart from the evidence just discussed. We know of Ammonius, a pupil of Aristarchus, who wrote (cf. Sch. A II. 9.540) a treatise *Περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μετενηνεγμένων ἐξ Ομήρου*, on the borrowings of Plato from Homer. The interest in Platonic diction compared with that of Homer is revealing of the kind of approach Alexandrian scholars had to Plato and, moreover, confirms what we have found about Aristarchus’ work on Plato. In this case too, Aristarchus analysed a Platonic expression and compared it with the Homeric usage. More doubtful evidence is provided by *POxy.* 3219, which analyses Plato’s work in terms of dramatic narrative

³³ See Jachmann (n. 25), 331–46, who denied the existence of the Academic edition by Arcesilaus (pp. 334, 341–4, 345). Bickel (n. 31), 113, replied that the existence of the Alexandrian edition did not exclude an earlier Academic one; cf. also Carlini (n. 25), 22–3.

³⁴ Wilamowitz (n. 30), 2.325: ‘Aristophanes scheint kaum mehr getan zu haben, als an der älteren Ordnung Kritik zu üben’; Pasquali (n. 31), 264–6; Pfeiffer (n. 2), 196–7; Erbse (n. 30), 219, 221.

³⁵ Chroust (n. 30), 35, is more ambiguous: ‘It is not unlikely, however, that these trilogies were part of Aristophanes’ (and Aristarchus’) attempt, promoted at Alexandria in general, to collate and edit what he considered the “best” or most representative literature of the past—a sort of “great books” program or anthology for a wider reading public.’

³⁶ J. Barnes, ‘The Hellenistic Platos’, *Apeiron* 24 (1991), 115–28, denies any ‘official’ edition of Plato in Hellenistic times and concludes: ‘... there was no such beast as the Hellenistic Plato. For in truth, there were several texts of Plato, several versions of Plato’s thoughts, several Hellenistic Platos’ (128). This may well be true, but does not imply that there was no edition of Plato at Alexandria. ‘An’ Alexandrian Plato is not the same as ‘the’ Hellenistic Plato.

³⁷ Although the arrangement into tetralogies is probably earlier than Thrasyllus, perhaps due to the Academy itself; cf. Carlini (n. 25), 24–7; Chroust (n. 30).

³⁸ This reconstruction is, moreover, in keeping with the hypothesis of Tarrant (n. 21), 103–7, who maintains that Thrasyllus wanted to correct the ‘trilogic’ edition of Aristophanes, as this was not a ‘philosophical’ arrangement.

using dramatic characters.³⁹ It has been claimed that this way of understanding Plato as a dramatist cannot be derived from the Academy, but is the Aristophanic, ‘philological’ view of the philosopher: the papyrus could therefore belong to the Aristophanic tradition.⁴⁰ Diogenes Laertius himself argues that some call the Platonic dialogues ‘dramatic’, and this is more of a literary classification than a philosophical one.⁴¹ However, it must be noticed that the ‘dramatic’ character of Platonic dialogues is a feature also present in the tetralogic arrangement by Thrasyllus, as Diogenes Laertius maintains some lines later.⁴²

Even if we leave aside *POxy.* 3219, however, we now have some considerable evidence of the Alexandrian interest in Plato: the two passages of Diogenes Laertius, the mention of Ammonius’ work *Περὶ τῶν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος μετενηνεγμένων ἐξ Ὀμήρου*, and the two new fragments of Aristarchus. It is true that in our extant commentaries on Plato, such as those of Damascius, Olympiodorus, or Proclus, there is no mention of this kind of ‘Alexandrian’ scholarship, nor of Aristophanes of Byzantium, nor of Aristarchus. In the same way, in the commentary on the *Republic* by Proclus there are no hints of the problem of οὐκ ἐτός, nor any discussion of the meaning of ἦ δ’ ὄς. This, however, does not contradict the ‘Alexandrian hypothesis’, since these commentaries are part of the other, ‘philosophical’ tradition, interested in the content and in the speculative aspects of the Platonic text, not in its linguistic and philological side. This lack of evidence in Platonic commentaries cannot therefore be used as proof against the existence of an edition of and a commentary on Plato at Alexandria.

It is easy to understand why the arrangement by tetralogies of the middle Academy, later reworked by Thrasyllus, was to become pre-eminent. Its philosophical approach and the fact that it was believed to be the ‘original’ arrangement as set up by Plato’s own pupils made it popular and ultimately caused it to be recognized as ‘the most Platonic arrangement’. The Academic school and its tetralogic edition, however, were not particularly interested in the *Wortlaut* or philological analysis of Plato, and this is further demonstrated by the fact that they included dialogues which were not by Plato but by his school, such as *Alcibiades II*, *Theages*, and *Clitopho*.⁴³ If an Alexandrian, ‘philological’ edition of Plato was once in existence and was lost, we should start asking *what* has been lost.

The evidence for an ancient Alexandrian edition of Plato, which did not replace the Academic edition but grew and developed in parallel with it until the Christian era,⁴⁴ is further strengthened by papyrological evidence, which presents a situation very similar to that of Homer. For the analysis of papyri containing Platonic text has

³⁹ Cf. M. W. Haslam, ‘Plato, Sophron, and the dramatic dialogue’, *BICS* 19 (1972), 17–38; id., ‘*POxy.* 3219’, in A. K. Bowman, M. W. Haslam, S. A. Stephens, and M. L. West, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* 45 (London, 1977), 29–39. The text of this papyrus has a close resemblance to *Diog. Laert.* 3.48–52.

⁴⁰ Tarrant (n. 21), 104–6.

⁴¹ *Diog. Laert.* 3.50: οὐδὲ λαμβάνει δ’ ἡμᾶς ὅτι τινὲς ἄλλως διαφέρειν τοὺς διαλόγους φασί—λέγουσι γὰρ αὐτῶν τοὺς μὲν δραματικούς, τοὺς δὲ διηγηματικούς, τοὺς δὲ μικτούς—ἀλλ’ ἐκείνοι μὲν πραγματικῶς μᾶλλον ἢ φιλοσόφως τὴν διαφορὰν τῶν διαλόγων προσωνόμασαν.

⁴² *Diog. Laert.* 3.56: Θράσυλλος δὲ φησι (*FHG* III 505) καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογία ἐκδοῦναι αὐτὸν τοὺς διαλόγους, οἷον ἐκείνοι τέτρασι δράμασιν ἡγωνίζοντο. Cf. Chroust (n. 30), 41.

⁴³ Cf. Carlini (n. 25), 23. We may wonder whether they were regarded as spurious by Aristophanes and Aristarchus (though the *Minos*, the *Epinomis*, and the *Epistles* were included in the Aristophanic edition).

⁴⁴ Already Cohn (n. 6), analysing the corpus of the scholia to Plato, divided them into two main categories, the ‘philosophische’ and the ‘grammatische’. And indeed we have seen that *Sch. Pl. Resp.* 568A preserves a slight trace of the Aristarchean debate on οὐκ ἐτός, a scholium that Cohn himself (n. 6), 803, placed in the latter category.

shown that in antiquity a different tradition was circulating. There are only two papyri dating back to the Ptolemaic period (third century B.C.), one containing the *Laches* (PPetrie 2.50), the other the *Phaedo* (PPetrie 1.5–8).⁴⁵ These show a text that is very different from our vulgate. This eccentric and ‘wild’ tradition seems to die out at the end of the Hellenistic period. Later papyri of the Roman age show a different text, more standardized and similar to the Platonic ‘vulgate’ present in our medieval manuscripts.⁴⁶

Perhaps this standardization in the tradition was the result of the Alexandrian edition, which established a standard text of Plato as it did of Homer. If this is the case, it would provide a very interesting parallel between the Homeric and Platonic traditions. On the one hand, the Alexandrian editions of these authors circulated outside the Museum and fixed a ‘standard’ text for both; on the other hand, the Aristophanic arrangement of Plato into trilogies and the Aristarchean commentaries on Homer and Plato did not enjoy any popularity. In the case of Plato, this is easily explained by at least two facts. First, the ‘philosophical’ approach to Plato was more appealing and interesting in late antiquity; this is even more understandable in Egypt and especially Alexandria, where the Alexandrian Neoplatonic school flourished and eventually influenced the way late antiquity and the following centuries perceived and read Plato.⁴⁷ Against this strong philosophical tradition the old, philological reading of Plato was doomed to be forgotten.⁴⁸ Second, Aristarchus’ commentaries (on Homer as well as Plato) were not meant to reach a wide audience, and were used only in the library by other scholars. Their circulation was thus inevitably limited. However, whereas Aristarchean Homeric exegesis was saved for future generations, thanks to the work of Didymus and Aristonicus, and later Herodian and Nicanor (via the *Viermännerkommentar*), Aristarchus’ Platonic work remained mainly locked up within the Museum, except for some poor fragments that we can recover from late and mainly unpublished lexica of the Byzantine period.

Somerville College, Oxford
Harvard University

FRANCESCA SCHIRONI
schironi@fas.harvard.edu

⁴⁵ Cf. Pasquali (n. 31), 262–4; A. Carlini, ‘Note critiche al testo del Fedone’, *BPEC* n.s. 16 (1968), 25–60; for an assessment of the two papyri, cf. A. Carlini, ‘Plato 23’, in *CPF* I.1 (Florence, 1999), 100–13, esp. 103; id., ‘Plato 40’, in *CPF* I.1 (Firenze, 1999), 159–93, esp. 166–8.

⁴⁶ Cf. Carlini (n. 25), 10–17; J. Irigoin, *Tradition et critique des textes grecques* (Paris, 1997), 83–5; in general on Plato’s papyri, see P. J. Sijpesteijn, ‘Die Platon-Papyri’, *Aegyptus* 44 (1964), 26–33, and Irigoin, 71–4. In very general terms, Plato’s manuscripts are divided into three groups and seem to be derived from an edition of late antiquity (sixth century). Cf. Irigoin, 151–67, 188–90; see also the *Praefatio* of the new Oxford edition of Plato, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1995) by E. A. Duke, W. F. Hicken, W. S. M. Nicoll, O. B. Robinson, and J. C. G. Strachan.

⁴⁷ On ‘philosophical’ exegesis and the different views held by Stoics and Platonists on Plato and his works, see D. Sedley, ‘The Stoic-Platonist debate on *kathêkonta*’, in K. Ierodiakonou (ed.), *Topics in Stoic Philosophy* (Oxford, 1999), 128–52.

⁴⁸ An analysis of Platonic commentaries on papyri shows that they always have a philosophical approach to the text, and this confirms that the philological reading of Plato did not enjoy popularity in antiquity. The only exception is *POxy.* 2087 (second century A.D.), a glossary of prose authors (Plato, Demosthenes, Thucydides, Aristotle), which, however, cannot be regarded as an example of purely ‘Platonic’ scholarship.