occupied by testimonies relating to personages not usually associated with elegy though they may (or were in antiquity thought to) have played some part in the development of the genre, such as Olympus, Periander, Pittacus, or Sacadas. And on the other hand, the editors have tried not to include epigrams, a task highly laudable but sometimes quite difficult: hence, for instance, Socrates and Critias are represented, but not Plato. Of the poets contained in this volume, Critias is probably the most interesting one. At the end there are some minor additions and corrections to the first volume; the anonymous quotation ascribed to Xenophanes by A.V. Lebedev (1978) is rightly considered a ‘dubium’.

H. Thesleff


It is good to have a new and comprehensive Teubner recension of the Platonic Letters especially because their historical and philosophical importance has become more and more evident in recent years. Jennifer Moore-Blunt seems on the whole to have done a very accurate job; and it would have been pointless to postpone the work in expectation of new emendations to result from the ever-continued discussion of, say, the philosophical ‘digressions’ of the 7th and 2nd Letters. Of course she has not been able to trace all suggestions made (she has not noticed e.g. that I in 1965 accepted Burkert’s ‘Ελυμοι in Ep. 12). But would it not have been possible to include the fragmentary remains we have of other Platonic Letters (N° IV and XV in Hercher, and the ‘Socratic Letters’ 26—28) and the letters of Plato’s ‘correspondents’ (Archytas and others)?

H. Thesleff


Margherita Isnardi Parente’s application of her vast experience to the Bibliopolis project of publishing the texts relating to the Early Academy has resulted in a magnificent monograph (‘La scuola di Platone, III’) of substantial importance for the study of Platonism.

Her Hermodorus is not without interest (and these fragments have never been collected before). But the main advantage of the volume of course comes from her editing and interpreting the fragments of Xenocrates. Some, though not very much new source material has turned up since Heinze’s edition of 1892 (an Arabic fragment published by S. Pines in 1961 is the most notable new piece, frg. 121 I.P.), but there has been an immense accretion of secondary literature of Platonic and Academic matters where Xenocrates is involved in one respect or another. Considering the fact that Xenocrates was, on most points, more conservative than Speusippus, and that he was the first one to attempt a systematization of Plato’s doctrines, a close reading of the evidence can be expected to shed some light on Plato