

the Academy, and Heliodorus confirms that this is the right interpretation.

It follows that the house in Melite was quite separate from the garden. Cicero's letter to Atticus in which he refers to the "ruins in Melite" (*quae de parietinis in Melita laboravi* [*Att.* 5.19.3]) suggests that the property was a town house, to be distinguished from the suburban garden. It is possible that it also had its garden and that Pliny had this in mind when he said that Epicurus was the first to have a garden in a town (*HN* 19.51); more probably Pliny did not distinguish between the actual city of Athens and the suburban area outside the walls.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF NORTH WALES, BANGOR

## TEXTUAL COMMENTS ON TIMAEUS 27 C-D

JOHN WHITTAKER

IN AN ARTICLE entitled "*Timaeus* 27 D 5 ff.," published in *Phoenix* 23 (1969) 181 ff., I argued that at *Tim.* 27 D 6 f. we should read not *τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν ἀεί* but simply *τί τὸ γιγνόμενον μὲν*, rejecting the *ἀεί* as a tendentious interpolation inserted into the text in later antiquity in support of the non-literal interpretation of Plato's account in the *Timaeus* of the creation of the universe.

I have in the meantime had occasion to note that the manuscript evidence is much more strongly in favour of my thesis than I had supposed. According to Burnet and Rivaud the *ἀεί* in question is attested in both *Parisinus gr.* 1807 and *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 173, but in the case of neither manuscript is this information correct. In the *Palatinus* (fol. 127 verso) the *ἀεί* is lacking entirely, and the *apparatus* of Burnet and Rivaud should be corrected accordingly.<sup>1</sup> In the *Parisinus* (fol. 118 verso

<sup>1</sup>It is perhaps appropriate to point out here that the hand of *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 173 seems to me indistinguishable from that of *Vindobonensis phil. gr.* 314 fol. 1-112, copied by an otherwise unknown Ἰωάννης γραμματικός in the year 925. The text of the two manuscripts is written in the same minuscule hand and shows the same range of abbreviations, whilst the scholia are in an identical half-uncial hand and display the same mixture of uncial and minuscule elements as well as the same abbreviations. Likewise, the half-uncial script in which titles and subscriptions are executed is identical in the two manuscripts. On the *Vindobonensis* cf. J. Bick, *Die Schreiber der Wiener griechischen Handschriften* (Vienna 1920) 17 (Bick's *Tafel* I shows fol. 110 recto with the subscription of Ἰωάννης γραμματικός); L. G. Westerink and B. Laourdas, "Scholia by Arethas in *Vindob. phil. gr.* 314," *Ἑλληνικά* 17 (1960) 105 ff.; H. Hunger, *Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der österreichischen Nationalbibliothek* 1 (Vienna 1961) 405 f.;

col. 1) the  $\alpha\epsilon\iota$  is indeed present but has been cancelled by dots placed above the  $\alpha$  and  $\iota$  by the corrector whom Burnet identifies elsewhere as A<sup>2</sup> (cf., e.g., the case of  $\pi\eta$  at *Tim.* 27 C 4 which has been similarly cancelled by means of dots; cf. further below), but who in this and many other instances is not necessarily distinguishable from, and should in my opinion not be distinguished from, the first hand. Since the scribe of *Parisinus* gr. 1807 usually erases his mistakes, the employment of dots suggests hesitation on his part rather than the desire to delete entirely. I suspect therefore that  $\alpha\epsilon\iota$  was already cancelled by means of dots in the exemplar of the *Parisinus*<sup>2</sup> and that the scribe, in conformity with his usual practice with regard to corrections made in his exemplar,<sup>3</sup> has reproduced them in his copy. Thus, though the  $\alpha\epsilon\iota$  in question is not entirely absent from the manuscript tradition (it appears, e.g., as a marginal correction in *Vaticanus* gr. 226, fol. 111 verso, and, as I have noted in my "*Timaeus* 27 D 5 ff.," in a number of ancient citations of the relevant text), there is little indeed to support it.

In my above-mentioned article (p. 184, n. 15) I discussed briefly a further instance of tendentious emendation in the textual tradition of the *Timaeus* at 27 C 4 f., where according to both Burnet and Rivaud the text should read as follows:  $\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \pi\eta\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\varsigma,\ \eta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\ \eta\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ . Philoponus (*De aetern.* 186. 17 ff. Rabe) reports that in order to provide textual support for the non-literal interpretation of the *Timaeus* Calvisius Taurus (whom Philoponus quotes *verbatim*) read at *Tim.* 27 C 5  $\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ . Philoponus goes on to quote a passage from Alexander of Aphrodisias' lost commentary on the *De caelo* in which the latter criticized in no uncertain terms those who tampered with the transmitted text of Plato at this point by altering  $\eta$  to  $\epsilon\iota$  (*De aetern.* 214. 10 ff. Rabe):  $\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\omicron\iota\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \epsilon\iota\sigma\iota\nu\ \omicron\iota\ \pi\epsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \eta\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\ \epsilon\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\rho}\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\gamma\iota\omega\sigma\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\ '\epsilon\iota\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon,\ \epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\cdot\ \pi\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \tau\omega\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron\pi\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\acute{\rho}\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\eta\ \omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\ \pi\omicron\sigma\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\iota\alpha\lambda\omicron\gamma\eta\tau\omicron\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota$

L. G. Westerink, *Anonymous Prolegomena to Platonic Philosophy* (Amsterdam 1962) pp. L f.; P. Lemerle, *Le premier humanisme byzantin* (Paris 1971) 216; L. G. Westerink, "Marginalia by Arethas in Moscow Greek Ms 231," *Byzantion* 42 (1972) 201 f. For unstated reasons Bick (*loc. cit.*) claims South Italian provenance for the *Vindobonensis*. For a bibliography of *Vaticanus Palatinus* gr. 173 cf. P. Canart and V. Peri, *Sussidi bibliografici per i manoscritti greci della Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e Testi 261 [Vatican City 1970]) 253.

<sup>2</sup>The practice of cancelling by means of dots goes back to antiquity; cf. the examples in E. G. Turner, *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World* (Oxford 1971), Palaeographical Index, s.v. "cancel dot."

<sup>3</sup>Cf. the instance (noted by H. Alline, *Histoire du texte de Platon* [Paris 1915] 188) on fol. 202 verso col. 1 of the *Parisinus* in which the scribe has written  $\alpha\iota\div\ \rho\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  without there being any indication of an erasure under the  $\div$ . Similarly (cf. Alline, *loc. cit.*) on fol. 240 there are two whole lines made up of  $\div$ 's but with no sign of any erasure beneath them. Cf. further T. W. Allen, "Palaeographica III: A group of ninth-century Greek manuscripts," *The Journal of Philology* 21 (1893) 51.

οὐδαμῶς τοῖς ἐφεξῆς λεγομένοις συνάδει τὸ λεγόμενον ὑπ' αὐτῶν· κτλ.<sup>4</sup> It is not absolutely apparent whether the reading to which Calvisius Taurus gave his adherence was that condemned by Alexander (εἰ γέ γονεν, εἰ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν) or ἡ γέγονεν εἰ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν (on which reading cf. below). Philoponus, *De aetern.* 186. 17 ff. Rabe, suggests, but hardly confirms, that Calvisius preferred the former reading. If this is really the case, then Calvisius Taurus was perhaps the prime target of Alexander's attack. Be this as it may, it is not without importance for the history of the text that Alexander of Aphrodisias was not alone in accusing Platonists of deliberately falsifying the transmitted text of Plato. It is possible that Plutarch had in mind no more than forced interpretations when he wrote (*De an. procr. in Tim.* 1013 D f.) . . . οἱ πλείστοι τῶν χρωμένων Πλάτωνι φοβούμενοι καὶ παραμυθούμενοι πάντα μηχανῶνται καὶ παραβιάζονται καὶ στρέφουσιν, ὥς τι δεινὸν καὶ ἄρρητον οἰόμενοι δεῖν περικαλύπτειν καὶ ἀρνεῖσθαι, τὴν τε τοῦ κόσμου τὴν τε τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ γένεσιν καὶ σύστασιν, . . . But the charge of premeditated falsification is repeated by Aeneas of Gaza (*Theophr.*, PG 85, col. 884): Βούλονται μὲν οἱ ἐξ Ἀκαδημίας πείθειν, ὥς οὐ διαφωνεῖ Πλάτων αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ. νοήματα καὶ ὀνόματα ὥς ἂν ἐθέλωσι μετατιθέντες· ὥσπερ οἱ τοὺς χρησμοὺς πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῶν βούλησιν ἐρμηνεύοντες. Δοκοῦσι δέ μοι παντελῶς ὑβρίζεσθαι. The extent to which already in antiquity the text of Plato was deliberately tampered with in matters of detail but of nonetheless crucial concern is a topic which calls for detailed investigation.<sup>5</sup>

Also in my account of *Tim.* 27 C 4 f. I was in my above-mentioned article misled by wrong information presented in the *apparatus* of Burnet and Rivaud. At *Tim.* 27 C 4 both editors correctly indicate that in *Parisinus gr.* 1807 (fol. 118 recto col. 2) *πη* has been marked with dots (thus *πιη*).<sup>6</sup> But both editors have failed to note that at *Tim.* 27 C 5 the *Parisinus* reads not *ἡ γέγονεν* but *ἡι γέγονεν* with a dot above the iota of *ἡι*.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup>For Alexander's views on the interpretation of the *Timaeus* cf. also Simplicius, *In De caelo* 297. 9 ff. Heiberg. Simplicius quotes Alexander *verbatim* but with considerable disapproval.

<sup>5</sup>Another obvious instance of minute but crucial tampering with the text of Plato is at *Tim.* 40 B 8 f., where Plato's answer to the question whether or not the earth rotates upon its axis depends on whether we read on the one hand *εἰλλομένην* or *εἰλουμένην*, or on the other hand *ἰλλομένην* or even *ἰλλομένην δὲ τὴν*. Cf. in particular Rivaud's discussion of this problem (*Timée, Critias* [Paris 1925] 59 ff.) and further F. M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology* (London 1937) 120 ff. The vacillation between *εἰλλομένην* and *ἰλλομένην* could conceivably be (though I am sure it is not) simply an iotacistic confusion. But the insertion (or removal?) of *τὴν* can only have been deliberate tampering. The correct reading, since so much hinged upon it, was a matter of dispute throughout the entire post-Platonic period. One is reminded of the cunning alteration of *ὁμοούσιος* to *ὁμοιούσιος* practised by Eusebius of Nicomedia and others at Nicaea; cf. Philostorgius, *Hist. eccles.* 1. 9 (= PG 65. 465).

<sup>6</sup>But probably by the scribe himself and not, as the editors suggest, by Burnet's A<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>7</sup>The dots on *πιη* and *ἡι* as well as on *ἀεὶ* at *Tim.* 28 A 1 are all clearly visible in H. Omont's facsimile edition of the *Parisinus* (*Platon: Oeuvres philosophiques, fac-similé en phototypie du manuscrit grec 1807 de la Bibliothèque Nationale* [Paris 1908] 2 vol.).

The form  $\eta\iota$  is of course meaningless, and the  $\iota$  has in consequence been cancelled by means of a dot by, I believe, the scribe himself following the example of his exemplar. In other words, the reading  $\eta\iota$  (which looks like an unhappy conflation of  $\eta$  and  $\eta\iota$ ) has been hesitatingly corrected to  $\eta$  in *Parisinus gr.* 1807 and probably therefore already in its exemplar. Here again then both Burnet and Rivaud have wrongly reported the reading of the *Parisinus*. Moreover, both editors wrongly present their version of the text of Plato ( $\eta\iota$  γέγονεν  $\eta$  καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν) not only as though it were that of *Parisinus gr.* 1807 but also as if it were that to which Proclus, in his discussion of the passage in question, makes reference in the following terms (*In Tim.* 1. 218. 28 ff. Diehl): πάλιν τοίνυν τὸ  $\eta$  γέγονεν  $\eta$  καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν οἱ μὲν ἐξηγήσαντο τὸ μὲν πρότερον  $\eta$  δασύναντες, τὸ δὲ δεύτερον ψιλώσαντες, ὅσοι φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐρεῖν περὶ τοῦ παντός, καθ' ὅσον γέγονεν ἀπ' αἰτίας, εἰ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν, ἵνα γενόμενον αὐτὸ θεωρήσαντες τὴν ἐν αὐτῷ φύσιν κατὶδωμεν. Proclus' words can only be correctly understood when one realizes that he is here using  $\eta$  not simply to represent the letter *eta* but rather as a phonetic equivalent which in the case of the text in question might equally well stand for *ei* as for  $\eta$  or  $\eta\iota$ .<sup>8</sup> Once one has noted this important fact, it becomes obvious that in the above passage Proclus is referring not to the reading preferred by Burnet and Rivaud but, as his explanation indicates (ὅσοι φασὶν αὐτὸν ἐρεῖν περὶ τοῦ παντός, καθ' ὅσον γέγονεν ἀπ' αἰτίας, εἰ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν), to the reading  $\eta$  γέγονεν *ei* καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν. Proclus in the continuation (*In Tim.* 1. 219. 2 ff. Diehl) seems to suggest that this latter reading was that preferred by Albinus (καὶ ὁ γε Πλατωνικός 'Αλβίνος ἀξιοῖ κατὰ Πλάτωνα τὸν κόσμον ἀγένητον ὄντα γενέσεως ἀρχὴν ἔχειν· κτλ.). Proclus goes on to indicate that some scholars read (*In Tim.* 1. 219. 14 f. Diehl)  $\eta$  γέγονε καὶ  $\eta$  ἀγενές ἐστι, and that (*In Tim.* 1. 219. 20 ff. Diehl) Πορφύριος δὲ καὶ 'Ιάμβλιχος ἀμφότερα ψιλοῦσιν, ἵνα  $\eta$  τὸ λεγόμενον, πρότερον γέγονε τὸ πᾶν  $\eta$  ἀγενές ἐστι (i.e., either  $\eta$  γέγονεν  $\eta$  καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν<sup>9</sup> or more probably *ei* γέγονεν  $\eta$  καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν). From the point of view of the reconstitution of the correct text as Plato wrote it, it is of considerable importance that in listing the variants preferred by different scholars and the various possible interpretations of the text in question Proclus makes no reference whatsoever to the reading preferred by Burnet and Rivaud. Thus, not only does their reading not have the support of *Parisinus gr.* 1807, but it was also apparently un-

<sup>8</sup>This point escaped me at the time of writing my "*Timaeus* 27 D 5 ff." as it likewise escaped A. J. Festugière, *Proclus: Commentaire sur le Timée*, traduction et notes vol. 2 (Paris 1967) 42 f.

<sup>9</sup>This is the reading of *Vindobonenses suppl.* gr. 7, 21 and 39, as well as *Parisinus gr.* 1812 (all correctly reported by Rivaud). Unfortunately the passage in question is not included amongst the extracts from the *Timaeus* in *Vaticanus Palatinus gr.* 173. On the possibility of  $\eta$  . . .  $\eta$  in indirect alternative questions cf. E. Mayser, *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* 2. 3 (Berlin/Leipzig 1934) 53 f.

known to Proclus or at least not thought worthy by him of consideration. We would do well therefore to reject the choice of Burnet and Rivaud, and instead throw in our lot with Porphyry and Iamblichus (cf. above), with Philoponus,<sup>10</sup> and also Proclus himself (cf. *In Tim.* 1. 236. 4 and 1. 275. 10 Diehl), all of whom seem to have preferred *ἐι γέγονεν ἢ καὶ ἀγενές ἐστιν*.<sup>11</sup>

MEMORIAL UNIVERSITY OF NEWFOUNDLAND, ST. JOHN'S

<sup>10</sup>Cf., e.g., *De aetern.* 136. 8; 139. 7; 153. 3 f.; 156. 15 f.; 214. 8 f. Rabe (quoting Alexander of Aphrodisias, for whose testimony cf. also Simplicius, *In De caelo* 297. 19 f. Heiberg).

<sup>11</sup>I was able to examine *Parisini gr.* 1807 and 1812 on numerous occasions in 1970/1971; *Vindobonenses phil. gr.* 314 and *suppl. gr.* 7, 21 and 39 in October 1970; *Vaticani gr.* 226 and *Palatinus gr.* 173 in May 1971 and again in May 1972. I am deeply grateful to M. Ch. Astruc for rechecking in January 1973 all the passages in *Parisinus gr.* 1807 to which I have made reference. I am happy to report that M. Astruc shares my opinion that the dots above *ἀελ*, *πῆι* and *ῆι* are the work of the scribe himself. For support of my research I am indebted to the Canada Council.