

MADDALENA BONELLI, *Timée le Sophiste, Lexique platonicien*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par Maddalena Bonelli, avec une introduction de Jonathan Barnes. *Philosophia Antiqua* 108, Leiden-Boston: E. J. Brill, 2007, pp. xiii + 668, ISBN 9789004158870.

Almost nothing is known with certainty about “Timaeus the Sophist”, the apparent author of a Platonic lexicon (in which the entries are chiefly, but not entirely, from Plato). Preserved in a single manuscript, the Coislinianus 345, tenth century, it is the only lexicon to Plato to come down to us. Others are known but survive only in fragments. For Clement and Boethus see pp. 35–42. (For two eighteenth century copies of the Coislinianus see pp. 9ff.) There is a dedicatory epistle but even the name of the dedicatee is uncertain because of manuscript corruption. The dates of Timaeus himself are unknown. (Perhaps roughly some time between 200 and 400 AD?) These are just a few of the many uncertainties surrounding this lexicon. With the appearance of the work under review—a work almost seven hundred pages in length—we are in a much better position to understand some of these uncertainties, indeed to understand the nature of Greek lexicography as practiced by our ancient colleagues.

I begin with the “introduction” of Jonathan Barnes. Some 125 pages in length, it really is much more than a perfunctory introduction; it is a monograph in its own right, and an impressive one. Here are the titles of some of the sections: “The manuscripts of the *Lexicon*”; “Timaeus the Sophist”; “The Date of the *Lexicon*”; “The Colleagues of Timaeus”; “Lexicography in Antiquity”; “Some non-Platonic Entries”; “Lost Entries”. But one must read the discussions themselves to appreciate the richness of Barnes’ contribution to this work. One of his virtues is a willingness to pronounce a *non liquet* when the evidence doesn’t really permit us to go beyond such a pronouncement. In dealing with a work such as this, such a virtue is welcome.

After the Introduction come the text and (French) translation (pp. 129–75) followed by a brief “Note on the apparatuses” (pp. 176–80), which are 1) apparatus to the scholia, 2) apparatus of *loci Platonici*, 3) apparatus of *loci similes*, and 4) a traditional *apparatus criticus*.

Then comes the *Commentary* proper. Some four hundred and fifty pages in length (pp. 183–632), it is a commentary on the grand scale. Some may feel it is on too grand a scale. I think not. (See below.) The quality of the scholarship is very high indeed and often illuminating. And one must keep in mind that there are precious few earlier editions of the *Lexicon* and not much by way of previous commentary. There can and will be occasional differences of opinion about particular readings and comments. This is as it should be and hardly detracts from the value of the work as a whole. Herewith a few specimen passages, merely *exempli gratia*. (The numbers refer to the entry number.)

4. Ἀγείρουσαν · ὡς ἰέρειαν περιερχομένην. Bonelli (henceforth ‘B.’) pronounces this entry as “bizarre”, partly on the grounds that Timaeus glosses the lemma ἀγείρουσαν (“celle qui mendie”) with περιερχομένην (“celle qui erre”). But these two verbs are sometimes used as approximate synonyms. The thought sequence is as follows: περιέρχομαι can, in the appropriate context, mean “I go about (sc. begging)” and similarly ἀγείρω can mean “(sc. going about) I collect money”. The words in parentheses are easily supplied mentally. These are no inventions of mine but usages fully recognized by LSJ. See ἀγείρω II.2: “...collect by begging...abs., collect money for the gods...abs., go about begging...” περιέρχομαι I.1: “...go about like a beggar...” See also LSJ s.v. ἀλάλημαι: “wander, roam about, like a beggar...” B. does seem correct however in assuming that the entry has been abridged.

6. Ἄγιν · Τὸν ἠγούμενόν τινος. “celui qui conduit quelqu’ un”. B. prints Ruhnken’s conjecture Ἄγιν for ἀγίαν of the MS. Ruhnken compared Pl. *Cra.*394C: ...καὶ ἄλλα γε αὐτὸν στρατηγὸν (sc. σημαίνει), οἷον Ἄγιν καὶ Πολέμαρχος καὶ Εὐπόλεμος. But the *singular* τινος makes a reference to a general or military leader in command doubtful: who (or what) is the *someone* (singular!) ? The lemma ἀγίαν is clearly corrupt, but Ἄγιν does not seem to be the solution. I would print ἀγίαν and place the obelus beside it.

21. Ἀκταίνειν · γαυριῶν καὶ ἀτάκτως πηδῶν. B. states in her commentary ad loc. that the verb ἀκταίνειν occurs only in Aeschylus, Plato and the comic poet Plato. That this word occurred in Plato Comicus is doubtful. See LSJ Suppl.s.v. ἀκταινόω and, especially, Plato Comicus, fr. 303 Kassel-Austin (VII 548). They print it among the spuria. (I note that here, and elsewhere, B. prints the present infinitive of contract verbs in -άω with a iota subscript. This practice is wrong and long since superseded. For other examples of this curious orthography see s.v.v. ἀσπαλιεύς, ἱμᾶν.)

218. Θαύματα · νευρόσπαστα. “marionnettes”. The MS has θραύματα νεβροσπάσματα, which is clearly nonsense, and Ruhnken corrected to θαύματα νευροσπάσματα. B. conjectures, and prints, θαύματα νευρόσπαστα, an obvious improvement which convinces immediately. νευροσπάσματα is unattested, νευρόσπαστα occurs elsewhere in the correct sense. (B. compares X. *Smp.* 4.55; compare also Hdt. 2.48.)

There are a number of typos, especially in the Greek. Most are easily corrected but some can confuse. For instance, commentary to 410 on p. 578: Ταλαντοῦσθαι · ἢ περὶ τῶν ἐρίων ἐργασίμη τέχνη. What to make of that? The answer is that the gloss belongs not to 410 ταλαντοῦσθαι, but to the preceding lemma, 409, Ταλασιουργία, which itself has the false gloss (p. 577) ἔθος τοῖς νικήσασιν ἀναδοῦναι ταινίας, which actually belongs to lemma 408 ταινίας ἀναδόμενοι!

To summarize: This is a work of high quality and impressive philology. One can learn from it a good deal about early Greek scholarship in general and ancient Greek lexicography in particular. There are many instructive observations and exegeses sprinkled throughout the work; it well repays the effort of careful study. Indeed, for anyone interested in learning something about the nature and practices of the early lexicographers this can, *mutatis mutandis*, serve as an excellent introduction. And for those who profess no interest in such studies, well perhaps they should rethink their attitudes. Granted that not everyone is enthralled by such dry studies, still every classical scholar can profit by acquiring some familiarity with the classical scholarship of antiquity. It is thus not really a question of studying Timaeus for his own sake but rather for what we may learn from him about the scholarly practices of his time.

R. RENEHAN
University of California, Santa Barbara
renehan@classics.ucsb.edu

