

of early Pythagoreanism as it arises from Aristotle's report. Burkert's criteria and principal conclusions won considerable scholarly recognition and are adopted by Huffman who endeavours to underpin Burkert's assessments by a thorough philological examination of the fragments. The main and significant point in which Huffman's conclusions differ from Burkert's is the negative assessment of fr. 6b and the testimonia A 14 and A 26 with the ensuing disagreement with Burkert on the role of number in Philolaus in particular and of mathematics as distinct from number mysticism in early Pythagoreanism in general.

Yet in spite of the weighty philological arguments Huffman produces in favour of the authenticity of individual fragments I do not feel myself entirely convinced. Such arguments do not and cannot overcome what I see as the principal difficulty, namely, that in accounting for the Pythagorean doctrines Aristotle fails to mention Philolaus' book. Aristotle's silence is especially suspicious in view of the ancient tradition, accepted by both Burkert and Huffman, that Philolaus was the first Pythagorean who published a book. The assumption shared by Burkert and Huffman that Philolaus' book was among Aristotle's sources means that Aristotle was acquainted with the first authoritative exposition of the Pythagorean doctrines but failed to authenticate his account by reference(s) to it; I find this hardly plausible. It is true that Pythagorean pseudepigrapha display a Platonizing tendency, but it may well be that at least among the early ones (the circulation of a book under Philolaus' name is attested about the end of the fourth century BC) some were not Platonizing.

All this however does not affect the fact that the book is a major contribution to the study of the Philolaus fragments in particular and Pythagoreanism in general; I have no doubt that Huffman's philological study and his interpretation of fifth-century Pythagoreanism and Aristotle's account of it will deeply influence subsequent scholarly discussion of the subject.

Aryeh Finkelberg

Tel Aviv University

Walter Burkert, *Platon in Nahaufnahme. Ein Buch aus Herculanum (Lectiones Teubnerianae II)*, Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1993, pp. 40.

Classical scholarship and education in the last 150 years would be unimaginable without the publishing house of B.G. Teubner. For over forty years, Teubner, like Germany, was divided against itself: Leipzig (East) against Stuttgart (West). Now the two have been united. One way of celebrating this is the institution of *Lectiones Teubnerianae*, a series of lectures delivered to a wide audience by distinguished Classical scholars. The first *Lectio* was delivered in 1992 by Reinhold Merkelbach. The present volume is the text of *Lectio Teubneriana II*, delivered by the author in Leipzig on June 4, 1993.

Professor Walter Burkert - like his present publishers - needs no introduction to the Classical reader: he has long been a respected institution in the international Classical community. The present lecture is the counterpart of an article (cited here in note 16) written by Burkert *sibi et doctis* and published in *ZPE* 97, 1993, 87-94. But here, Burkert shows that he is equally capable of making the complexities of papyrology and the Hellenistic history of philosophy intelligible to a non-professional

public. The style is as elegant and crystal-clear as that of the author's more technical works. The narrative is more relaxed, and is interspersed with anecdotes and recondite information, to make it more attractive to the "layman". There is never a dull moment.

Pages 9-16 introduce the reader, in a pleasant narrative manner, to the whole story of the Herculaneum papyri, Philodemus of Gadara, and the *Academicorum Index*. Then comes the *Schwerpunkt* of the lecture (pp. 16-37), a discussion of anecdotes concerning Plato the man and teacher. By analysing some passages of the papyrus, Burkert supports with some of his own arguments a view held before him, but often disputed: that the account of Plato's active contribution to mathematics and the story of Plato's death, as they appear in the *Index*, were derived by Philodemus from fourth-century sources based on first-hand evidence. He uses these arguments to support his contention, that the story narrated by Aelian (*V.H.* 3.19 = Xenocrates Fr. 11 Isnardi Parente) of the quarrel between Plato and Aristotle, in Xenocrates' absence in Chalcedon, during Plato's last year, is also authentic: indeed, that Xenocrates himself may well have been its first-hand source. Moral: one should not be too ready, in the case of all such late anecdotes, with the Classical scholar's traditional dismissal of them as "Hellenistic romance".

In general, the suggestion that such stories should not be dismissed out of hand, *en bloc*, but that each should be treated on its own merits - and on the merits of its likely sources - is a healthy reaction against an attitude which is still prevalent and which, one suspects, has often been used as a labour-saving device. Burkert has done much, in his earlier works, to make us reconsider this "*recentiores, ergo deteriores*" attitude. He has convinced me that the view espoused by Gomperz, Crönert and others, that Philip of Opus is the ultimate source of the mathematical evaluation and the death story in Philodemus, is most probably correct. I am not so sure about Aelian's story. Riginos, p. 130, has some weighty arguments against its authenticity. One can add that Xenocrates was not only Plato's "beloved disciple" in his younger years, but also a personal friend of Aristotle, who spent some time with him at Assos. *Amicus Aristoteles, sed magis amicus Plato?* Perhaps. But Aelian's story is odious. Xenocrates may have been σκυθρωπός - but malicious?

A reviewer should quibble - so I do. On p. 15, Burkert takes it for granted that the *Villa dei Papiri* was not only Philodemus' house and library, but also an Epicurean *Privatuniversität* of which he was the *Präsident*. Do we have sufficient evidence for this? On p. 17, it might have been advisable to inform the reader that the "traditional" proverb *Amicus Plato, magis amica veritas* is based on Aristotle himself: *EN* 1096a16. (Gauthier and Jolif *ad loc.* discuss the genesis of the Latin proverb). On p. 20, conclusion is drawn from the Aristotelian ἀκροάσεις to the existence of *Vorlesungen* in Plato's περίπατος as well. But is there evidence of any lectures by Plato, apart from the notorious περὶ τάγαθού?

*Sed querelae ...* This is a brilliant performance by a great scholar. It demonstrates how - as a result of the patient and accurate work of papyrologists, editors and commentators - we can still learn new things about the life and personality of a great man of the past. Even the expert, who has read the more technical works, may learn one or two things from it. To the general educated reader, one can only say: *tolle, lege!*