(covering chh. 1–21, Wiesbaden, 1998), as does A. Stückelberger's ongoing project to re-edit the entire work (see www.cx.unibe.ch/kps/forschung.html, and note now his overview in W. Hübner [ed.], *Geographie und verwandte Wissenschaften* [Stuttgart, 2000], pp. 195–208). Two other significant new contributions are the collection edited by D. N. Parsons and P. Sims-Williams, *Ptolemy: Towards a Linguistic Atlas of the Earliest Celtic Place-names of Europe* (Aberystwyth, 2000), with papers by J. Gorrochategui and P.-Y. Lambert focusing on Gaul; and J. M. Headley's appreciation (with invaluable bibliography) of the stunning intellectual impact made by the first printed maps drawn according to Ptolemy's instructions, in his 'Geography and Empire in the Late Renaissance: Botero's Assignment, Western Universalism, and the Civilizing Process', *Renaissance Quarterly* 53 (2000), 1119–55.

None of the limitations, let it be stressed, takes away from the lasting value of the translation and associated explanatory material. This book at once becomes a standard work, with wide appeal, long overdue.

University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill RICHARD J. A. TALBERT

DIOGENES LAERTIUS

M. MARCOVICH (ed.): *Diogenes Laertius*. Vitae Philosophorum. Vol. I: Libri I–X. Vol. II: Excerpta Byzantina. Pp. i + 826, 346. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 3-519-01316-9, 3-519-01317-7.

Diogenes Laertius, in Nietzsche's phrase, is the porter who guards the gate of the Castle of Ancient Philosophy. Scholars may scorn him; but they must pass by him and cannot pass him by. Parts of his text they can read in honest editions; but for the work as a whole they have had to make do with an unsatisfactory OCT. Marcovich's Teubner has long been awaited.

The first of its two volumes contains the text of the *Vitae*, preceded by the index of the Paris MS, which contains the names of the twenty-odd Stoics who were treated in the missing passage at the end of Book 7. The text is followed by the Epicurean sentences contained in the Vatican Gnomology. The second volume promises 'Excerpta Byzantina et indices'. There are no indexes (but we have K. Janacek, *Indice delle Vite dei filosofi di Diogene Laerzio* [Florence, 1992]). The 'excerpts' are: (1) a short note in Photius, *Bibl*. cod. 161, on Sopater's extracts from Books 1, 5, 9, and 10; (2) the Suda's snippets, rearranged to correspond to the order of their occurrence in DL; (3) an edition of [Hesychius], *Vir. Ill.*—seventy-eight jejune biographies of philosophers, half of which are lifted from DL; (4) an *editio princeps* of the '*magnum excerptum*', a twelfth-century compilation of extracts from DL running to some 180 pages. (*Pace* T. Dorandi, *Phronesis* 45 [2000], 331–40, at p. 338, items (3) and (4) are not comparable to the publication of a MS. But note that in vol. II M. refers to the *magnum excerptum* as Φ, whereas in vol. I the same letter designates the chief MS of the work.) The concordances at the end of the volume suggest that M. had intended to print the excerpts in Arsenius and 'Eudocia', and the early Latin translation preserved by pseudo-Walter Burleigh.

The text has a double apparatus, the upper part serving (i) to indicate where the Byzantine excerpts are available; (ii) to give pertinent references to modern editions of fragments, etc.; and (iii) to provide some pointers to the secondary literature. There

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

are odd omissions in (iii), notably vols IV and V of F. Nietzsche, *Werke und Briefe* (Munich, 1935–40), and also in (ii)—see M. F. Smith, *Hyperboreus* 6 (2000), 188–97. More vexatious are the deficiencies in (i): if you want to know whether a piece of text is contained in **Φ**, you had better turn to vol. II.

The Preface lists the works cited under (iii) in a bibliography of twenty pages; it also gives details of earlier editions of DL and of translations. Add now M.-O. Goulet-Cazé (ed.), *Diogène Laërce: vies et doctrines des philosophes illustres* (Paris, 1999), with a fuller list of translations (pp. 26–7).

The Preface has only ten pages on the foundations of the text. The Byzantine extracts are described, and some thirty MSS are cursorily noticed; three more need to be added, including the extracts from Book 3 in Vindob. phil. gr. 314, the earliest MS to transmit any of DL (see Dorandi, *Phron*, pp. 337–8). No argument is offered in favour of the affiliations which M. proposes; and his sketchy stemma carries a bizarre footnote. For a full account of the evidence see D. Knoepfler, *La vie de Ménédème d'Erétrie de Diogène Laërce* (Basel, 1991). There is a clear summary by Dorandi in Goulet-Cazé, pp. 33–8.

According to M., the surviving witnesses to the text derive from a ninth-century archetype by four independent streams: **Φ**, the Suda, a dozen MSS belonging to a *recensio vulgata*, and a second class of MSS of which the chief representatives are **F**, **B**, and **P**. **B** and **P** are twins. **F** is independent of their hyparchetype. The position of [Hesychius] is left in the dark. M. asserts that **Φ** is of great importance for the reconstruction of the text (p. X), that **B** is 'best of all the MSS' (p. XII), and that **P** is an excellent MS (ibid.). 'In constituting the text I have preferred **B** and **P** to the other MSS, and I have made considerable use of **Φ** and of **D**' (p. XVII—**D** belongs to the *recensio vulgata*). This editorial decision is scarcely consistent with M.'s assessment of the evidence. Nor does it correspond to his practice. He cites **BPFΦ** throughout the text, thus adding **Φ** to the three authorities favoured by the OCT. **D** he scarcely mentions before Book 7. **V**, another representative of the *recensio vulgata*, is cited for Books 1–6 (it gives out at 6.66), but far less often than is **D** thereafter. Readings in other MSS are occasionally noted, in aleatory fashion. Thus in 9.61–108, **Q**, an apograph of **P**, is cited some fifty times, never to any purpose.

I have looked fairly carefully at the *Life of Pyrrho*, 9.61–108 (on which see J. Barnes, *ANRW* II 36.6, 4241–301). Casual browsing suggests that it is a fair sample. 'In the apparatus criticus I have recorded *all* the variant readings and errors of the MSS **BPFΦ**' (p. XVII—the italics are M.'s). He has not: the apparatus to 9.61–108 refers to **Φ** about 100 times (some thirty-five references in the OCT), but there are at least eighty variants, half of them interesting, which it fails to record. As for the MSS, I have glanced at a few pages of **P** (Parisinus gr. 1759), which M. collated twice (p. XVII). A dozen variants are omitted from M.'s apparatus, and there are a dozen false reports. Most of these are, to be sure, trifles. (Thus M. notes only half of the places where **P** spells 'Pyrrho[nian]' with a single rho, and does not note that a later hand frequently corrects the error.) But they are no more trifling than the spelling errors which litter M.'s apparatus. (He might more usefully have reported some of the abbreviations in **P**.)

The apparatus differs from the OCT in dozens of places: M. records numerous readings which the OCT ignores; he tacitly corrects several errors in the OCT; and he adds some conjectures—but not nearly enough. The form of the apparatus is neither concise nor elegant. Use of Ω and α would have spared innumerable **BPFΦ**s and **BPF**s. There is no merit in an entry like '**FD** Cobet', or in the tag '. . . agn. X, Y, Z'. As for 'lacunam indicavere Wachsmuth, Wilamowitz et Diels': et avunculus T.C. et omnes.

In the text itself, M. differs from the OCT in about sixty-five places. In half of them

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

he prefers a different, or a new, MS reading; in half he prints a different or a new emendation. By my reckoning, he is right thirty-seven times against OCT. Of his thirteen own conjectures, one is probably right. In fifteen places M. takes **Φ** to be right against all-comers. In most, if not all, of these cases it is clear that **Φ** represents not *Ω* but a Byzantine conjecture.

In the following notes numerals in bold type signal sections in Book 9; numerals in square brackets give page- and line- references to M.'s edition.

61 [674.16] M. prints *ὡς δέ φησι*, claiming the *δέ* for **DP**^{pc}; **P**^{pc} adds *δέ* after *φησι* (so the OCT). [675.2] For *Στίλπωνος* the Suda has *Κλεινόμαχου μαθητοῦ*: not noted in M.'s apparatus—and in the text of the Suda printed in vol. II the phrase is replaced by '. . .'. **63** [676.11] M. omits *τε* with **FD** (and with **P**^{pc})—rightly (cf. Pl. *Phdr* 245B). **64** [677.8] *πολλοὺς εἶχε ζηλωτάς*—so M., with *Ω*; the OCT prints *ζ.ε.π.* without comment. [677.9–10] M.'s transposition has no sense: mark a lacuna after PÊqwni (Wachsmuth). **66** [678.9] *ἐκάθαιρεν* [Hesych]; *καθάροι Ω*. M. refers to [Hesych] a dozen times. He might reasonably have added readings at 675.2, 676.5, 678.12, 678.13/14, 678.15–679.1. [678.12] Keep *λαβόμενον*, against M. and all editors: cf. e.g. Pl. *Legg*. 637C. [679.2] *λόγῳ* + *πρὸς τὰ δόγματα*? **68** [679.18] For *τῶν . . . ἐμπλεόντων* (*συμπλεόντων αὐτῷ* **Φ**, M.) see Thuc. 3.77.2. **69** [680.10] *Ω* and M. are ungrammatical: omit *πέραν* (**FP**^{pc}**Φ**) or read *τοῦ Ἀλφειοῦ* (cf. Eur. *HF* 386). [680.14] *ἀπάνθρωπον καὶ* (Casaubon: cf. SE *PH* I 224 = Timon, fr. 60 D) is palmary. **70** [681.8–10] M.'s inelegant conjecture is not supported by SE *PH* I 7: Barnes is better. [681.12] *τὸν σκεπτικόν* (Suda) for *τὴν -κήν* is tempting. [682.2] Cobet's addition of *τις*, and then *ὁμότροπος*, is worth recording. **74** [685.6] *τὰ τῶν ἄλλων* del. Brunschwig (in Goulet-Cazé, p. 1111 n. 2). [685.10] Remove the comma between *ὡς* and *εἰ* (e.g. Menagius): 'just as we could have done it with a nod'. **76** [686.16] The capital lambda on *Λόγῳ* destroys the sense; and *ὡς* for *ὅς* (Patillon, in Goulet-Cazé, p. 1113 n. 3) is plausible. **77** [686.20–1] Attach *πρὸς ὃ . . . προσεπισχυρίζειν* to the end of § 76: begin the new section with *μόνον οὖν*. [686.21] *διακενῶς* for *διακόνοις*? [687.1] *ἀποδεικτικῶς* cannot be right: *ὑποδεικτικῶς*? *ἀπαγγελτικῶς* (SE *PH* I 197)? *ἀπορητικῶς* (*M* IX 12)? **79** [687.18] M.'s addition of *εἶναι* is pointless. [687.22] M. deletes *καθ' οὗς*, with Frobenius, and changes *τίθησι* to *τιθέασιν*. The plural is attractive (and should be ascribed to Barnes)—though Nietzsche's *καὶ Θεοδόσιος* deserves a mention. But something more is needed: e.g. *καθ' ἓν* (Hermann) or *οὕτως* for *καθ' οὗς*. [688.1] *Ω* presumably had *ἓν πρῶτον*: *πρῶτος* (**D**) is perhaps preferable to *ὧν πρῶτος* (**Φ**, M., and the OCT). **80** [688.9] *ὀξυδερκέστατοι* (Traversari) or *ὀξυωπέστατοι* (cf. SE *M* IX 65; Arist. *HA* 620a2) are neater than Reiske's <*ὁρᾶν*> *ὀξύτατοι* which M. prints. [688.16] *κατὰ ἔθνη καὶ συγκρίσεις Ω*: M. prints *καὶ τὰ ἔθη* (**D**) *καὶ ἰδιοσυγκρισίας* (after Menagius). The reference to *ἐθη* is inept. Menagius' suggestion, *κατὰ ἰδιοσυγκρισίας*, is supported by SE *PH* I 81 and misreported by M., but there is nothing wrong with *συγκρίσεις* (e.g. Soranus, I xxii 5). **81** [689.1] No need to add *δέ* (Cobet): cf. 696.6. **82** [689.9] M. rightly prints *κοινάς* with **Φ**. [689.12] *πνεῖν* is strange: *πονεῖν*? M. adopts Reiske's more radical solution. **83** [689.20] M. prints *τὰς ἐθικάς* for *τεχνικάς* (see SE *PH* I 145). Like the OCT and Barnes, he ascribes it to Menagius: Menagius proposed *ἐθικάς*, which is preferable. [690.2] *περὶ ἀληθῶν . . . κακῶν* om. **Φ** (M.'s apparatus is misleading). **84** [690.20] M., like the OCT, prints <*ὅτε*> *ὁ ἥλιος* <*δύνει*>, attributing the text to Kühn: Kühn says that this gives the sense but not the words of DL. There are better conjectures; but the telegraphic text may be sound—see J. Annas and J. Barnes, *The Modes of Scepticism* (Cambridge, 1985), p. 187. **85** [690.20–691.1] *ὑπὸ δυοῖν* is odd and *κουφιζόμενος* can scarcely be right. **87** [691.22] [*ἢ σπάνιον*]? [692.9] *οὐκέτ'*: *οὐκ* **P**^{pc}**Φ** (not noted by M.). **89** [693.8] Cobet's *βεβαιῶν* (for *βεβαιοῖ* **BPF**; *καὶ βεβαιοῖτο* **Φ** [*sic*]) is superior to M.'s proposal. **90** [693.18] *διαστιζομένου Ω*: M., like his predecessors, prints *δισταζομένου* (**D**): better delete as a gloss ('punctuate'). **92** [694.14] *παρὰ φύσιν* for *κατὰ φύσιν*? [694.16] *περίστασιν* (**D**) for *ἀντιπερίστασιν* is an evidently correct conjecture. [694.19] *ἴσως* (or *ἐπ' ἴσης*) for *ἴσων* (cf. SE *PH* II 8; *M* VII 400)? **93** [695.4] *ἐν ταῖς <αἰσθήσεσι καὶ> νοήσεσι* (Kühn) deserves noting. [695.7] M. prints *ἢ πιστός*, noting: '*ἢ* scripsi: *εἰ* **Φ** om. **BPFD** | *πιστός* **FP**^{4}: *πιστόν* **BP**^{1}**QD**'. **Φ** also has *πιστόν*—its author tried to mend things by adding *εἰ*; the copyist of **F**, from whom **P**^{4} took its reading, made the right conjecture. **94** [695.20] [*καὶ ψεύδους*]? [696.1–2] The OCT is

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.8 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ungrammatical; M. is better; better still: *ὥστε τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ κρίνειν καὶ κρίνεσθαι, καὶ τὸ κεκρικὸς κριτήριον . . .* **95** [696.7] M. keeps the passive *διαφωνεῖται*—e.g. SE *PH* II 145. [696.17] *εἰ ἔστι* (**DΦ**) for *οὐκ ἔστι* (**BPF**) restores the syntax—and more elegantly than *τό* (Frobenius); but the sense is hopeless: print *οὐκ ἔστι* ***. **97** [697.7] Again, **Φ** restores the syntax more elegantly than Frobenius. [697.11] The dat, *τῷ αἰτιατῷ*, is defensible (against Menagius' acc.)—e.g. SE *PH* II 119. **98** [697.16] *οὑτωσὶ δὲ* (*Ω*) is excellent (Denniston, *Particles*, p. 180); **FΦ** delete *δέ* and M. changes it to *δή*. **99** [698.15–16] Something was lost in *Ω*. Editors have followed the conjecture in $\mathbf{B}^{pc}$ (not Hübner as M. reports); M. prefers **Φ**, which is prettier. **100** [698.21] *εἶναι* (**Φ**) for *ὄντι* (M., OCT) is right. **102** [699.18] *συναγωγῆς* is unknown in the required sense: *ἀγωγῆς* (cf, Photius, *Bibl*. cod. 212, 170b1–3)? [700.1–3] For the difficulties see *ANRW* 4260–3: M.'s <*πολλὰ*> solves nothing. **104** [701.2] *ὡς οὐ δογμάτων* (M., with Frobenius) is hardly right: *οὐ δογματίζοντες* (**Φ**) or *οὐ δογματικῶς*? [701.6] For *ὁρίζομεν* **P** and **Φ** have *ὁριζόμεθα* (not noted by M.). **105** [701.13] *κινεῖταί τι* (M.: *τις Ω*) is probable. **106** [702.8] Has a book title dropped out after *Λαοδικεύς*? [702.11] *τὰ μέν* for *μηδέν* is right, **Φ** anticipating Reiske. **107** [703.2] So too *ὅτε* for *ὅτι*, **Φ** anticipating Barnes. **108** [703.5–6] Fut. indic. (Cobet, OCT) is better than opt. (M.). Apelt's *αὐτοί* for *οὔτε* should be noticed. [703.9] *ὡς δυνήσεται κτλ* is impossible: **Φ**'s *οὐ* (for *ὡς*) should be noted (*ὡς οὐ* Barnes). [703.12] Reiske and Cobet combine to give M. an intelligible text—but I doubt if DL wrote it.

So now we have two unsatisfactory editions of DL instead of one. In the Preface, M. avows that ill-health prevented him from putting the final touches to the work. The house of Teubner might have found another scholar to complete the task. Instead it has published, at a monstrous price, an *opus imperfectum.*

Ceaulmont JONATHAN BARNES

APSINES' RHETORIC

M. PATILLON: *Apsinès. Art Rhétorique. Problèmes à Faux-Semblant* (Collections des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxii + 214. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2001. Cased, frs. 360. ISBN: 2-251-00492-0.

Patillon offers us a new text of the rhetorical treatise traditionally attributed to Apsines, together with the fragment on figured speeches that is in part the work of the same author. The text is accompanied by a translation free (where I have checked it) of the surprising lapses that mar the other recent edition, by M. R. Dilts and G. A. Kennedy (Leiden, 1997; see the review by D.M. Schenkeveld, *Mnemosyne* 53 [2000], 236–40). The excellent supporting material also includes a useful introduction, extensive and informative notes (underpinned by P.'s wide-ranging and profound knowledge of ancient rhetoric), and an *index verborum*. P. retains the new chapter and section numbers introduced by Dilts and Kennedy (references below are by chapter, section, and line, with Spengel–Hammer page and line numbers in parentheses).

Like other believers in the traditional attribution, P. is driven to a series of excisions, eliminating every occurrence of Apsines' name in the text. It is indeed unlikely that Apsines would have referred to himself by name and in the third person, but there is more than one way to resolve that problem (as I have argued elsewhere: *AJP* 119

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.8 Published online by Cambridge University Press