

Zitierhinweis

Murphy, David J.: Rezension über: Gijbert Jonkers, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Timaeus and Critias*, Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2017, in: *Exemplaria Classica*, 22 (2018), S. 233-237, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v22i0.3504, heruntergeladen über Website

exemplaria
C L A S S I C A
Journal of Classical Philology

copyright

Dieser Beitrag kann vom Nutzer zu eigenen nicht-kommerziellen Zwecken heruntergeladen und/oder ausgedruckt werden. Darüber hinausgehende Nutzungen sind ohne weitere Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber nur im Rahmen der gesetzlichen Schrankenbestimmungen (§§ 44a-63a UrhG) zulässig.

GIJSBERT JONKERS, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Timaeus and Critias*. Mnemosyne Supplements. Monographs on Greek and Latin Language and Literature, 400. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2017, xvii+548 pp., \$202.00. ISBN 978-90-04-32591-3.

This book is a revised and expanded version of Jonkers' 1989 Amsterdam dissertation. With Gerard Boter, who classified the witnesses to the text of the *Republic*, Jonkers was enlisted by the late Simon Slings to help lay the groundwork for a new edition of Tetralogy VIII. Before he died, Slings edited the *Clitophon* (Cambridge 1999, revising his 1981 Amsterdam dissertation) and, as an OCT, the *Republic* (2003). Jonkers' revised study now solidifies the foundation upon which a new edition of the *Timaeus* and of the *Critias* can be established. Prof. Boter intends to undertake that task.

Jonkers had already succeeded in 1989 in classifying 55 manuscripts of these two dialogues and in identifying the primary witnesses. He has now expanded his treatment in three significant ways, by: 1) keeping abreast of much of the work done by others since 1989 on dating, identifications of copyists and correctors, etc.; 2) evaluating the ancient and medieval versions; 3) appending a vast *Index Testimoniorum*. This index justifies Jonkers' change of title, for it amounts to 122 pages of quotations from and allusions to the *Timaeus* made by Greek writers up to the year 1458, plus three pages from/on the *Critias*. This material will be a great boon to students of textual transmission, ancient and medieval reception of these dialogues, and more broadly, Byzantine and Renaissance scholarship.

Two MSS. are primary witnesses to both *Timaeus* and *Critias*: Par. gr. 1807 (= A, c. 900), and Vind. suppl. gr. 39 (= F, s. XIII^{ex}–XIV). The independence of A was never in doubt since the work of Schanz and Jordan in the late 1870s. For its part, F was shown to be independent by Burnet, whose conclusions, Jonkers notes, have been supported for the *Republic* and *Hippias Major*.¹ Beyond A and F, Jonkers identifies the following primary witnesses to the *Timaeus*: Vind. phil. gr. 337 (= V, s. XV–c. 1500); Tüb. Mb 14 (= C, s. XI); Vind. Phil. gr. 21 (= Y, s. XIII^{ex}–XIV^{init}); Vat. gr. 226 (= Θ, s. XIV); Par. gr. 2998 (= Ψ, 1273–1283). Jonkers designates by 'g' his reconstruction of the source common to YΘΨ. The contribution of fragments of papyrus MSS. is negligible—one from *Ti.* and one, published in 2014, from

¹ G. Boter, *The Textual Tradition of Plato's Republic*. Mnemosyne Supplement 107, Leiden–New York 1989, 67–77; B. Vancamp, "Le texte de l'*Hippias Majeure* de Platon dans le Vindobonensis Suppl. gr. 39 (F)," *Philologus* 139, 1995, 238–50.

Criti. The *Ti*. papyrus aligns with the family of A more than with that of F, while the *Criti*. fragments are too scanty to be classified securely (378–80).

It follows that we have a bipartite MS. tradition in *Criti*. In *Ti*. as well, Jonkers divides the primary MSS. into two families: AV and FCg (132–138). Consequently, the indirect tradition promises a payoff if it can support one MS. branch against the other in certain readings.

In the Introduction, Jonkers outlines his methods of establishing filiation. While horizontal transmission of variants, or contamination, is widespread in classical texts, Jonkers wisely avoids invoking contamination precipitously to explain divergent variants, for such hypotheses too easily become unfalsifiable. Instead, he first works meticulously to amass evidence of vertical transmission, either *prove materiali* or conjunctive errors in trivial matters like little omissions or transpositions, which tend to go unnoticed by correctors. He posits contamination when that is left standing as best explanation. Jonkers' caution in the face of often recalcitrant material is to be commended. With only one caveat voiced below, I endorse his conclusions about filiation.

After surveying earlier work in Part I, Jonkers in Part II describes each MS. He supplies nine categories of information: references in library catalogues and in earlier lists of Plato MSS.; date; physical characteristics, incl. hands of correctors; history, when known; contents; editors' sigla; collations of *Ti*. and *Criti*. made by others; other scholars' views on the MS.' stemmatic position; Jonkers' own view. This digest of information about each MS. of *Ti*. and *Criti*. adds to endeavors inaugurated by Post for the *Laws* and *Spuria* and fleshed out for MSS. of other dialogues by Boter, Brockmann (*Smp.*), Joyal (*Thg.*), and Vancamp (*Meno*), for *Timaeus* Locrus by Marg, and for *Albinus* by Reis.² If digests like these continue to be made for all MSS. of given dialogues, we may eventually amass an annotated conspectus of Plato MSS. like that which Paul Moraux and Dieter Harlfinger et al. began for MSS. of Aristotle.³ It is regrettable that Jonkers omits reference to some

² L. A. Post, *The Vatican Plato and its Relations*, Middletown Ct. 1934; W. Marg, *Timaeus Locrus. De Natura Mundi et Animae. Überlieferung, Testimonia, Text und Übersetzung*, *Philosophia Antiqua* 22, Leiden 1972; C. Brockmann, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung von Platons Symposion*. *Serta Graeca* 2, Wiesbaden 1992; B. Reis, *Der Platoniker Albinus und sein sogenannter Prologos*. *Serta Graeca* 7, Wiesbaden 1999; M. Joyal, *The Platonic Theages*. *Philosophie der Antike* 10, Stuttgart 2000. In *La tradizione testuale del Liside di Platone*, Florence 1997, Stefano Martinelli Tempesta offers information about the MSS. of that dialogue, but the data are not summarized in a dedicated section.

³ *Aristoteles Graecus: die griechischen Handschriften des Aristoteles*. Peripatoi 8. Erster Band, Alexandria–London 1976.

⁴ B. Vancamp, *Untersuchungen zur handschriftlichen Überlieferung von Platons Menon*. *Palingensia* 97, Stuttgart 2010; L. Ferroni, "Per una nuova edizione dello *Ione* platonico: la discendenza del Marc. Gr. App. Class. IV 1 (T)," *BollClass* 27, 2006, 15–87; eiusdem, "Per una nuova edizione dello *Ione* platonico: i manoscritti primari et l'indipendenza del Mar. Gr.

pertinent recent works on transmission of the Platonic text.⁴ Some work not mentioned in 1989 remains unmentioned as well, e.g. Jennifer Moore-Blunt's classification of MSS. and reports about correctors of A (*Platonis Epistulae*, Leipzig 1985).

Jonkers collated every MS. of *Criti.* in full. In *Ti.* MSS. he collated 17a1–25d6 and 86b1–end, plus further sample passages in some MSS. He collated the entire *Ti.* in the primary MSS. and the excerpt MS. Vat. Pal. gr. 173 (= P, s. X), as well as in three apographa of Ψ. Working mostly from photographs, Jonkers by autopsy collated AFC and checked passages in VYΨ, while Slings consulted a microfilm of Zittaviensis I at Yale. It is worth noting that *Ti.* comes to us via more primary witnesses than do *Clitophon* and *Republic*, to which we have only three: AF and Marc. gr. 195 (= D, s. XII). One may suppose that the *Timaeus* is more amply represented because, first, it is shorter than *R.*, so that it posed less labor of copying, and second, because *Ti.* was the subject of more widespread interest in antiquity.

Joining AF as independent in *Ti.* is C, as is evident from its age, unique maiuscule errors, and various types of agreements with the indirect tradition against A (100–104). Jonkers does not mention that C's primary status was vindicated also by the editors of OCT vol. I (1995) and by Antonio Carlini for *Alc.* I and II. I have collated C in *Phdo.*, *Alc.* I, and *Alc.* II and agree with their assessment.

V as well is independent beginning at 34b3, for it is a *gemellus* of A (prior folia are later and descend from an apograph of Ψ). Jonkers deduces this from V's unique maiuscule errors, errors of word division and diacritical marks, and from V's agreements in error sometimes with A *ante correctionem*, sometimes with A after it was corrected by the first scribe, A² (96–97, 125–128). AV agree with the indirect tradition in a good number of significant readings against the other MSS. Because V also shows signs of contamination from the Cg branch and possibly from elsewhere, Jonkers acknowledges the theoretical possibility that V could have descended from a copy of A made before A²'s corrections. Jonkers' best evidence against that possibility is the long-acknowledged fact that most accents and breathing marks in A were put in by A², and these are taken over by V (126). Because Moore-Blunt (*Epist.*, vii), however, believed that O was copied from A *ante correctionem*, one might think that V too is not independent but was copied from A^{ac}. Moore-Blunt, however, was refuted by Slings (*Mnemosyne* 42, 1989, 192–98 at 193–94). Had Jonkers cited this discussion, he would have added weight to his own case. The next editor of *Ti.*, then, should not relegate V to apograph status.

189 (S)," *RPh* 81, 2007, 271–89; F. Petrucci, "Il Vat. gr. 1029 di Platone: struttura codicologica e dinamiche di allestimento," *S&T* 12, 2014, 333–69.

Finally, as we have seen, Jonkers shows (188–201) that $\Theta Y\Psi$ descend in tripartite fashion from a lost hyparchetype, g , which is closely related to C but independent of it. Some caution is warranted toward Y , since it was falsely considered independent in other dialogues by Immisch and Budé editors. In *Ti.*, however, Y acquits itself. Conjunctive errors show that $\Theta Y\Psi$ form a group. Each is separated by further errors, and banal errors not likely to attract attention of correctors show that no one of the three is parent of either of the other two. Alongside $\Theta Y\Psi$, Schanz had also ranked Par. gr. 2010 (= S , s. XIV), Vind. suppl. gr. 7 (= W , s. XIII⁴ in *Cl.*, *R.* and *Ti.*), and initially, Vat. gr. 1029 (= R , s. XIII–XIV). Schanz did not gain supporters, however, and Jonkers demonstrates that SWR in fact are derived through various stages from Ψ (229–260).

V and Θ boast no apographa. In *Criti.*, two apographa are derived from A and the rest from F , while in *Ti.*, most of the secondary MSS. descend from $Y\Psi$. It is worth noting that Jonkers finds no evidence that P is independent of A in *Ti.* (203–205; P lacks *Criti.*), although in Tetr. I–VII, P is a primary MS. in the W family. Jonkers' five agreements of P with C and/or g against A could have resulted from contamination, as he suggests, but they could just as easily have arisen independently: sc. *Ti.* 24c7 οἴσοι AF : οἴσει PCg; 29a6 τὸ PCY^{PC} : τῶ AFG; 71d3–4 χρωμένην AVCF: χρωμένη Pg; 72b5 ὀνομάζοιεντ' AVFY : ὀνομάζοιεντ' PC $\Theta\Psi$; 76e2 τῆς PCg : τὸ τῆς AVF.

As for Vat. gr. 228 (= Vat, s. XIV), although Burnet (*CR* 19 1905, 298 n. 2) thought it a corrected copy of the archetype of F , and thus, independent, Jonkers deems it probable that Vat is a contaminated copy of F itself in both dialogues (207–213, 347–351). It does not follow, however, that correct readings in Vat “must be regarded as due either to conjecture or contamination” (349), for Vat's secondary status is not proved. Since Jonkers has not collated Vat in its entirety in these dialogues, the next editor will do well to do so, as further evidence for or against Vat's independence may yet be forthcoming.

Jonkers offers many details about the secondary MSS. and early printed editions. Examination by autopsy enables him to advance some *prove materiali* (e.g. lacunae in Vind. suppl. gr. 7 match unwritable surfaces in Ψ , 232). From the evidence that Jonkers presents, it appears that good readings found only in secondary MSS. are Byzantine or humanist conjectures. Most striking are the corrections introduced into Flor. Laur. 80.19 (= β , s. XIV), for they are unique, superior readings, as Boter found also for the *Republic*. Stefano Martinelli Tempesta and Daniele Bianconi have recently discovered that some β^2 corrections were written by Gemistus Plethon, and at least one by Demetrius Triclinius. All merit further study, in hope that the MS.' other correctors can be identified and the antiquity of unique β^2 variants can be judged. Other information added since 1989 includes a report that the medieval Armenian version is based on a Greek MS. closely related to A but which preserved older variants (393).

In the *Index Testimoniorum*, Jonkers includes not only verbatim quotations but also citations, borrowings, and allusions. The authors and compilers to whom we owe these testimonia are listed in a twelve-page *Index Auctorum ... Laudantium*. By far most often represented are Middle Platonist, Aristotelian, and Neo-Platonist commentators: Plutarch, Alcinous, Porphyry, Proclus, Simplicius, et al. We also frequently encounter scientific writers like Galen and Strabo, Christian churchmen such as Clement and Cyril of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Origen, and Augustine, and scholiasts and other scholarly compilers. Researchers into late antique and Byzantine thought will profit from searching the *Index Auctorum* for writers of their interest.

As befits its cost, this volume is attractively produced and, as far as I noticed, free of typos. A stemma showing all the MSS. on one page would have been helpful. Any specialist on the Platonic text tradition needs to use this book.

DAVID J. MURPHY
New York
david.murphy20@verizon.net