

phrase, considering the views he expresses *in propria persona* in *De Divinatione*). But the suspected 'interference' at 30a seems dubious. If a Pythagorean had wished to magnify Timaeus' Pythagorean 'ancestors', would he have added a mere *παρ' ἀνδρῶν φρονίμων ἀποδεχόμενος*, leaving the reader to guess who these *ἄνδρες φρόνιμοι* — the whole object of the exercise — exactly were?

This is not to say that Burnet's OCT, or the incipient new OCT — not to mention a translation — could serve as a secure basis for each word, sentence or section being what Plato himself really wrote. In some places, Whittaker, Dillon and Tarrant seem to have detected most likely cases of ancient interference, *καὶ τὸ γινόμενον φανερόν ὅτι δυνατόν* in other places. One should go on suspecting cautiously. One suggestion which I have not seen raised is possible 'ephectic' interferences by members of the 'sceptical' Academy, where, for example, Arcesilaus possessed his own edition of all the dialogues (which may or may not have something to do with Antigonus' story in DL 3.66), and Plato was taken to be an 'ephectic' philosopher himself.

I have found much in this book which seems to me far too speculative, or somewhat hasty; and my space for spelling out my arguments for disagreement has been limited (I have also marked some points of agreement on details, and there are more). I hope the reader has seen from places where I have gone into detail what is implied in my criticisms. It is a pity that one has to be so 'uncooperative'. This is the work of a Classical scholar, perfectly at ease with texts in Greek and Latin of various kinds (it even has, at the end, a collection of longer and shorter passages from ancient sources — needless to say, in the original Latin and Greek — taken by Tarrant to constitute the *testimonia* for Thrasyllus and his works: they include the 'prolegomena part' of DL 3 and the long section of Porphyry, both discussed here in some detail). The author is fully aware of elementary procedures such as that the ancient sources, in the original, should be the scholar's basic and indispensable materials; that Greek and Latin words have their individual contexts and histories; and that the interpretation of ancient philosophical texts should keep as close as possible to the texts, rather than impose upon them modern moulds and fashions. But there is, in this book, too much speculation which seems to me to go beyond the little evidence we have, or even to impose itself on it. Not that one should not, sometimes, be imaginative and make hypotheses; but such hypotheses should be tested far more thoroughly and meticulously, even at the price of admitting that, in the penumbra of early Middle Platonism, very little can be described even as *πιθανὸν καὶ ἀπερίσπαστον* — not to mention *διεξωδευμένον*.

John Glucker

Tel Aviv University

Kazimierz F. Kumaniecki (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia. Fasc. 3: De Oratore*. Editio stereotypa editionis primae (1969). Stuttgart-Leipzig: Teubner, 1995.

This volume is a straight reprint of Kumaniecki's 1969 Teubner edition of *De Oratore*. It was well received when it first appeared: see e.g. the enthusiastic reviews of A. Michel, *REL* 47, 1969, 539-41 and E. Malcovati, *Athenaeum* 48, 1970, 441-3; the absence of reviews in major English-language periodicals must merely reflect an editorial policy of

not reviewing editions of texts without commentary. 'Die seit Kumaniecki erschienenen Ausgaben ... beanspruchen keinen wissenschaftlichen Wert' (A.D. Leeman and H. Pinkster, *Cicero: De Oratore. Kommentar* I, Heidelberg 1981, 5) and *L'Année philologique* records no new editions since 1981. Kumaniecki's is therefore still the most recent major scholarly edition, and it is difficult to imagine that it will soon be superseded. The main available competitors are Courbaud's Budé (originally published 1922, revised vol. I 1950, vol. II 1966) and Wilkins' Oxford text (1901). K. gives a judiciously constituted and well presented text. The introduction offers a clear account of the manuscript tradition (more information is now to be found in L.D. Reynolds ed., *Texts and Transmission*, Oxford 1983, 102-9). The apparatus at the foot of each page contains, in addition to the apparatus criticus proper (which is clear and unencumbered by trivialities), a section consisting of bibliographical references on points of text and interpretation, and a collection of parallel passages and testimonia. At the end there is an index of names and an *index verborum*. This is a considerable work of scholarship, offering a good deal more than the average plain text edition, and the decision to reprint it is to be welcomed. No attempt has been made to update the bibliography, but this is little hardship for those to whom the commentary of Leeman and Pinkster is available.

J.G.F. Powell

University of Newcastle upon Tyne

Roger S. Bagnall, *Reading Papyri, Writing Ancient History*, London-New York: Routledge 1995, viii + 145 pp. + 8 pl. b/w.

Le livre écrit par un des plus éminents représentants de la papyrologie moderne, éditeur de textes et auteur d'un grand nombre d'articles et de livres de synthèse¹ n'est pas un ouvrage de vulgarisation² ni même une initiation aux 'arcana' de la profession.³ Issu

¹ Pour une bibliographie choisie des travaux de R.S. Bagnall (jusqu'à 1985) voir I.F. Fikhman, *Vvedenie v dokumental'nyuy papirologiyu* (Introduction à la papyrologie documentaire), Moskva, 1987, 283-5, 389, 390-2, 399, 510-2. Parmi les travaux publiés ultérieurement il faut surtout noter: R.S. Bagnall, 'Papyri and Ostraca from Quseir al-Qadim', dans *B.A.S.P.* 23, 1986, 1-60; R.S. Bagnall, A. Cameron, S.R. Schwartz, K.-A. Worp, *Consuls of the Later Roman Empire*, Atlanta, Georgia, 1987 (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, 36); R.S. Bagnall, T.T. Renner, K.-A. Worp, *Columbia Papyri VIII*, Atlanta, Georgia, [1990] (American Studies in Papyrology, 28); R.S. Bagnall, *Egypt in Late Antiquity*, Princeton, [1993]; R.S. Bagnall, B.W. Frier, *The Demography of Roman Egypt*, Cambridge, [1994] (Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time, 23, voir le c.r. de J. Schellekens dans *S.C.I.* XIV (1995), 176-7); R.S. Bagnall, J.A. Sheridan, 'Greek and Latin Documents from `Abu Sha`ar 1990-1991', dans *J.A.R.C.E.* 31 (1994), 159-168; idem, 'Greek and Latin Documents from `Abu Sha`ar 1992-1993', dans *B.A.S.P.* 31 (1994), 109-20; voir aussi les travaux mentionnés dans R.S. Bagnall, *Reading Papyri*, 130. Sur les travaux en préparation voir *Notiziario di Studi e Ricerche in corso*, P.Pruneti ed., 26, Giugno 1996, pp. 5, 12, 13.

² Pour une liste d'ouvrages adressés au large public voir I.F. Fikhman, *Vvedenie v dokumental'nyuy papirologiyu*, (n. 1), 255-6.

³ Voir, par exemple, H.C. Youtie, *The Textual Criticism of Documentary Papyri. Prolegomena*, London, 1958 (University of London, Institute of Classical Studies. Bulletin Supplement 6), seconde édition revue et augmentée: 1974 (Bulletin Supplement 33); E.G. Turner, *The Papyrologist at Work*. The J.H.Gray Lectures given at the University of Cambridge 1971, Durham, North Carolina, 1973 (Greek-Roman-and Byzantine Monographs 6), dédié surtout à