A major problem with the Greek text is the frequency of misprints, by my count about one per page. Sometimes entire words are missing, for instance, the main verb ἔχομεν in the first sentence of the *Mul. virt.* At other places there appear monsters, such as ἐξαγένεσθε (ἐξεγένεσθε), δώξας (διώξας), διαθέν (διαρθέν), which one can only hope are due to careless proof-reading. By contrast, the French translations appear faithful to the Greek and are carefully proof-read.

In short, this is not a satisfactory addition to the Budé *Moralia*.

Harvard University CHRISTOPHER P. JONES

LONGINUS THE PLATONIST

I. MÄNNLEIN-ROBERT: *Longin: Philologe und Philosoph. Eine Interpretation der erhaltenen Zeugnisse*. Pp. 795. Munich and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2001. Cased, €138. ISBN: 3-598-77692-6.

Cassius Longinus is a fascinating and at the same time rather enigmatic figure of the intellectual history of the turbulent third century A.D. For several decades, he was a leading representative of the Platonic tradition in Athens, who numbered Porphyry among his pupils; the latter, however, left him to join the circle of Plotinus at Rome, whose thinking was to determine the future of Platonism. Towards the end of the 260s, Longinus himself departed from Athens to become an adviser of the Palmyrene ruler Zenobia, whose ever more independent policies led her into armed conflict with the Roman emperor Aurelian; after Aurelian's victory, Longinus was executed for having supported Zenobia's break away from Rome. Thus ended the life of a man who might have claimed to be one of the leading intellectuals of his age—not only as a philosopher, but also as a consummate scholar, with interests in textual philology, rhetoric, and metrics—had he not been overshadowed by Plotinus and his followers. That development resulted in his marginalization within the Platonist tradition and in the almost total loss of his philosophical writings, of which only scanty fragments remain. His philological production fared somewhat better, most of all his works on rhetoric, of which longer excerpts and an epitome are still extant.

In this book, Irmgard Männlein-Robert has set herself the task of collecting and interpreting all the remains (except the purely rhetorical ones) of Longinus' once copious and variegated production. A look at the concordance on pp. 650–2 shows that she has indeed brought together more material than either of her two most important predecessors (L. Vaucher, *Études critiques sur le Traité du Sublime et sur les écrits de Longin* [Geneva, 1854]; and L. Brisson and M. Patillon, 'Longinus Philosophus', *ANRW* ser. II, 36/7 [1994], 5214–99 and 'Longinus Philologus', *ANRW* ser. II, 34/4 [1998], 3023–3108), although she wisely refrains from including the treatise *De sublimitate* as a work written by Longinus; despite recent efforts to prove the contrary, she rightly points out (p. 19) that this work is still overwhelmingly regarded as having been written by an earlier Anonymus.

The book is divided into two rather uneven parts (not counting the ample bibliography and indexes on pp. 653–795). A first section charts an 'outline of a portrait of Longinus' (pp. 26–96), while a much longer second section (pp. 97–649) provides detailed interpretations of all material to which the name of Longinus is still attached. This second section, the *pièce de résistance* of the book, itself comprises a number of substantial chapters: a biographical one (pp. 97–138), and chapters on Longinus and his relations to Porphyry and the circle of Plotinus (pp. 139–250), on

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Longinus as a philologist and literary critic (pp. 251–397), on his exegesis of Platonic dialogues (mainly of the *Phaedrus*, the *Phaedo*, and the *Timaeus*: pp. 398–535), on his thinking about Platonic ideas, metrics, the concept of 'figures of thought', and his possible praise of the Biblical account of creation in the book of *Genesis* (pp. 536–613; all subsumed, not very fortunately, under the heading 'Sprache und Denken'), and, lastly, on his teachings about the soul (pp. 614–49). M.-R. sets about these interpretations in a meticulous and painstaking way, always giving detailed information about the background of each scrap of text in which Longinus' name appears. This treatment proves very fruitful for the longer fragments; let me highlight here M.-R.'s exhaustive interpretation of a letter from Longinus to Porphyry, quoted in Porphyry's *Vita Plotini* (pp. 150–67), of the proem of Longinus' treatise *Περὶ τέλους* (pp. 167–232), of the depiction of Longinus in Porphyry's *Φιλόλογος ἀκρόασις* (pp. 251–92), of Longinus' contributions towards the elucidation of the first section of the *Timaeus* (pp. 409–532), and of his polemics against the Stoic and Epicurean conceptions of the soul (pp. 629–49). All in all, there emerges a much more detailed, comprehensive portrait of Longinus the man, the scholar, and the philosopher (not least regarding his peculiar position within the tradition of Platonism) than was ever achieved before; one may well doubt that after M.-R.'s efforts any really new facets of Longinus can be discovered.

There are, however, some features about this book which detract from the unqualified success it otherwise might have been. First of all, one may question the wisdom of its overall division into the two large sections mentioned. By putting the 'Longinportrait' first, M.-R. actually gives a summary of what is to follow only later, and this leads to many things being stated twice (or even more often); it might have been more advisable to present the detailed interpretations first and then sum up, possibly more succinctly than is now the case. M.-R. has tried very hard to provide copious cross-references between the two sections, but her internal reference system is rather unsatisfactory: it gives the numbers of chapters, sub-chapters, and sub-sub-chapters, but as these numbers are never shown in the column-titles (these indicate only the chapters), the reader often has to leaf through many pages before he can find the sub-sub-chapter he is directed to; it would have been much more convenient simply to give page-numbers. Another drawback is M.-R.'s decision (stated on p. 24) to call every kind of text connected with Longinus' name a 'fragment'. In this respect, she follows the tradition of Vaucher and Brisson–Patillon, but falls behind modern standard practice, which makes a distinction between 'testimonia' and 'fragments'. If M.-R. had tried to do this for Longinus (though some doubtful cases might possibly have remained), a much clearer picture of Longinus' own production and how he was perceived by others would have emerged. (Sometimes, also, questionable distinctions are made between 'fragments'; for example, nos 65 and 66 should preferably have been treated as 65a and 65b, because they are basically the same text.)

There are also problems of more limited scope. When we read the heading of Section B.I.2 (pp. 104–6), 'Außerhalb der Suda überlieferte Werktitel Longins', we expect naturally to get a list of all those works by Longinus not mentioned in the *Suda* article; but M.-R. here gives only an obscurely attested *Chronica* in eighteen books, and an *Ethnica* (of uncertain extent), without mentioning a good number of other works by Longinus which M.-R. deals with, often at some length, elsewhere in her book: the *Φιλόλογοι ὁμιλίαι* in twenty-one books (see pp. 321–2, 329, 336, 345–6, 352–3, 390), a speech entitled *Ὀδαίναθος* (see p. 333), prolegomena and commentary to the metrical *Enchiridion* of Hephaestion (see pp. 369, 551), a treatise *Περὶ τέλους* (see pp. 167–232), another one *Περὶ ὁρμῆς* (see pp. 224, 625), yet another *Περὶ ἀρχῶν*

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(see p. 198), a work called *Φιλάρχαιος* (see pp. 140, 142), the commentaries on Plato (see pp. 398–535), and maybe yet other writings (see pp. 211–12). In general, M.-R. should have tried to key her presentation more to the transmitted titles of Longinus' scholarly and philosophical output; as things are, the reader has to piece the relevant information together himself.

Other problems concern the quoting of primary sources and scholarly literature; for example, the *Suda* (where letter of alphabet and number of lemma as given by Adler would have been sufficient) is cited in a rather cumbersome way. M.-R. has not always availed herself of the newest critical editions. On p. 98 n. 5 and on pp. 299–300 she should have cited A. R. Dyck, *Epimerismi Homerici II* (Berlin and New York, 1995), p. 192 (*α* 347) instead of Cramer, *Anecd. Graeca (Oxon.)* 83. Dealing with Aristophanes of Byzantium (e.g. p. 103 n. 42, p. 271 n. 99, p. 288), M.-R. does not seem to know W. J. Slater's magisterial edition (with commentary) on the fragments of that author (Berlin and New York, 1986). Citing the tragedian Theodectes (p. 276 n. 126), she still uses Nauck instead of Snell (*TrGF* I 72 F 1a); the epic fragments of Antimachus (p. 276 n. 128, p. 277 nn. 130–1) are still cited after the obsolete Kinkel (and this, although she knows Wyss and Matthews) and Cratinus still after Kock (p. 277 n. 130), although *PCG* by Kassel-Austin has been around for almost twenty years. For Aelius Aristides (pp. 327, 329, 513 n. 470) we are referred to the hoary Dindorf edition; similarly, the old edition by Lobeck is cited for the *Eclogae* of Phrynichus (pp. 329–30), though E. Fischer (Berlin and New York, 1974) is available. For scholia on the *Clouds* we get the old edition of Dübner (p. 357) and not D. Holwerda (ed.), *Scholia in Nubes (scholia vetera)*, = *Scholia in Aristophanem* 1.3.1 (Groningen, 1977).

Another problematic feature is the presence of internal contradictions. On pp. 26 and 99, M.-R. states that Longinus must have been with Ammonius Saccas before 232, because he does not mention the presence of Plotinus, who was with Ammonius in the years between 232 and 242/3; on p. 184 (n. 189), however, she allows that Longinus may deliberately have omitted to mention Plotinus, which would invalidate any chronological conclusion from his silence. On p. 225, she argues that Longinus does not yet, at the time when he himself is writing *Περὶ τέλους*, know the treatise *Ὅτι μόνος ποιητὴς ὁ βασιλεύς* by the contemporary Platonic philosopher Origenes, and that therefore Longinus' treatise must have been written before early summer 268; but on p. 190 (n. 236) she considers that Longinus may simply have chosen not to mention Origenes' work. On p. 229 she deems it rather improbable that *Περὶ τέλους* and *Περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν βίου* may be two titles for the same work; yet on p. 100 she maintains just this possibility. On p. 69, she suggests that Longinus, like the earlier Platonic philosopher Atticus, might have located the Ideas in the soul of the demiurge; on p. 540 she regards this suggestion as unprovable, while she toys with it again on p. 543.

M.-R.'s understanding of primary texts can be less than accurate as well. On p. 172 she wrongly understands *καιρὸς οὐδ' εἰπεῖν ἐστιν* (Porph., *Vita Plotini* 20, l. 19), because she inaccurately cites these words out of context (she paraphrases that Longinus 'eine Schilderung des gegenwärtigen Mangels für nicht am Platze hält'; the correct meaning, in Armstrong's rendering, is: 'at the present moment there is an indescribable shortage of philosophy'). On p. 211, she wrongly interprets Longinus' phrase *ἤδη μὲν οὖν καὶ δι' ἄλλων τουτὶ πεποιήκαμεν* (Porph. *VP* 20, ll. 86–7) as referring to all kinds of writings that were named in the lines before, but it picks up only *ἐπισκοπεῖσθαι τὰ συγγράμματα* (Porph. *VP* 20, l. 81), i.e. the writings of Plotinus and Amelius. On p. 288 (n. 178) she gets a quote from Festus (= Ar. Byz. fr. 363 Slater) quite wrong, taking it to mean that the grammarian Aristophanes founded

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press

a new type of comedy called *Maeson* (but see the Latin original: *Maeson persona comica appellatur . . . , dici ab inventore eius Maesone comoedo, ut ait Aristophanes grammaticus*). On p. 325, she seriously misunderstands Sopatros' characterization of the style of Aelius Aristides: Sopatros says that Aristides 'gives more to thinking than to wording' (*τῆς λέξεως πλείονα διδοὺς τῷ νοεῖν*), but for M.-R. this means that Sopatros 'betont dessen Konzentration auf den Stil'—which is quite the opposite of what Sopatros says. On p. 491 she wrongly paraphrases the word *ἀνάπτυξις* (used in Procl. *In Tim.* I p. 129.19) as 'in die Form des Mythos gekleidete Darlegung', whereas it clearly means 'explanation'.

Typographical errors are too frequent to be enumerated here in detail; in most cases they will not hamper the reader's understanding, but they indicate hasty revision and proof-reading, as do some infelicitous phrasings; for example, on p. 105, we read that Longinus has '18 Bücher Chronik in 228 Olympiaden zusammengefaßt'; it should be the other way round. On p. 112 M.-R. produces the sentence 'Ein Zusammenhang . . . könnte . . . zusammenhängen'. At the bottom of p. 149, the sentence should read '. . . Begebenheit, in der [instead of 'nach welcher'] der Rhetor Diophanes eine rhetorisch stilisierte [instead of 'mit einer . . . stilisierten'] Apologie vorgelesen . . . habe'. On p. 279 she confuses the Alexandrian scholar Lysimachus ('des bereits erwähnten'—but he has not been mentioned before) with Lycophron (who indeed is mentioned on the preceding page). More infelicities of this kind could be added.

The biggest flaw of the book, however, may be its bulk. As I said, M.-R.'s interpretations are often excellent, providing all the information a reader might wish for; nevertheless the paraphrases of the quoted texts might have been more succinct, insights and results are too often repeated with slight variation, and the overall structure of the book (see above) encourages repetitiveness. Some digressions could be missed without great loss; why, for example, must we get a full history of Palmyra before Longinus' time, almost four pages long (pp. 115–18)? A few months (or perhaps only weeks) of additional work on the structure of this book and more rigorous editing of its contents, shedding, say, 150–200 pages, might have given us the definitive publication on Longinus for a long time to come; the book now published represents only a step—though a major one—in that direction.

Georg-August University, Göttingen HEINZ-GÜNTHER NESSELRATH

THE SCEPTICISM OF SEXTUS

A. BAILEY: *Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonean Scepticism*. Pp. xvi + 302. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2002. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-823852-5.

Sextus Empiricus and Pyrrhonean Scepticism sets out to show that Pyrrhonism is a form of global scepticism about rationally justified belief which is consistent and immune to standard self-refutation arguments. Bailey argues that the Pyrrhonist has 'the view that no claim is ever rationally preferable to its contradictory' (p. 9); and that the Pyrrhonist can have this view, and also act in the world, because he has (involuntary) beliefs about his own impressions, but also about the world, which he does not consider to be rationally justified (Chapter 11). This seems a promising variant of a familiar, if controversial, view, and worth further elaboration than it receives.

The book has three parts: Chapters 1, 6, 10, and 11 sketch B.'s positive view; Chapters 2–5 give a historical outline of ancient scepticism; and Chapters 7–9

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.323 Published online by Cambridge University Press