

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 Olympos, 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

*Platonis Epistulae. Recognovit Jennifer Moore-Blunt. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. BSB B.G. Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Leipzig 1985. XXIII, 66 S. M. 28.50.—.*

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 Ἐλυμοί in Ep. 12). But would it not have been possible to include the fragmentary remains we have of other Platonic Letters (N<sup>os</sup> XIV and XV in Hercher, and the 'Socratic Letters' 26—28) and the letters of Plato's 'correspondents' (Archytas and others)?

H. Thesleff

*Senocrate — Ermodoro: Frammenti. Edizione, traduzione e commento a cura di Margherita Isnardi Parente. Bibliopolis, Napoli 1982. 460 p. Lit. 60.000.*

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

too. By far the most vexed problem in this connection is the question of Plato's 'First Principles'. Isnardi Parente remains sceptical regarding the tenets of the Tübingen School which imply that Xenocrates should be considered as a central source for the reconstruction of the 'unwritten doctrines' (see now also G. Reale, *Per una nuova interpretazione di Platone*, <sup>2</sup>Milano 1986). It is in a way a pity that her edition and the presentation of Xenocrates by the Tübingen scholar H.J. Krämer in the new *Ueberweg* (1983, p. 44—72, based mainly on Heinze) were published independently; but since the time is not yet ripe for what I believe will be an inevitable compromise, and interpretation is, in this case, very much a matter of emphasis, it can be maintained that serious students of Platonism should welcome the coexistence of the Xenocrates of both Isnardi Parente and Krämer.

Be this as it may, Isnardi Parente's comprehensive collection of the fragments and testimonies, with Italian translation, commentary and very full references, will be of very great service to scholars.

H. Thesleff

*Angelo Casanova: I frammenti di Diogene di Enoanda. Studi e Testi 6. Università degli Studi di Firenze, Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità "Giorgio Pasquali", 1984. 465 p. & indici 24 p. Lit. 50.000.*

Wir sehen jetzt: C.W. Chiltons Teubneriana (1967) und seine kommentierte Übersetzung (1971) bilden den Schlußpunkt der ersten Etappe der Erforschung der Monumentalinschrift des Diogenes von Oinoanda, deren erste Steine i.J. 1884 in der südwestlichen Türkei gefunden wurden.

Zwischen 1970 und 1982 hat nun Martin Ferguson Smith die 'New Fragments' 1—121 dieser Inschrift entdeckt und mit vorläufigen Kommentaren herausgegeben. Seine Ausgabe von NFF 122—124 (*Anatolian Studies* 34 [1984] 43—57) hat Casanova nicht mehr berücksichtigen können. Da vor Smith 88 Fragmente bekannt waren, steigt die Gesamtzahl nunmehr also auf 212 (vgl. Casanova S. 26). Smith hat bekanntgegeben, daß er eine kommentierte Ausgabe des gesamten Materials vorbereitet.

Casanova, seit 1981 als Diogenesforscher bekannt, legt hier eine 'Zwischen-Ausgabe' vor. Sie soll eine 'Bilanz' (consuntivo S. 7) der bisherigen wissenschaftlichen Arbeit auch zu den neuen Fragmenten bieten. C. äußert sich im Vorwort bescheiden, aber in der Tat haben wir hier zum ersten Mal alte und neue Fragmente beisammen, mit kritischem Apparat und italienischer Übersetzung, ohne Kommentar, aber mit Hinweisen auf antike und moderne Literatur.

Dies ist an sich schon begrüßenswert, aber C. bietet noch mehr: für das ganze Textmaterial eine durchdachte neue Ordnung, die er S. 48f. diskutiert und S. 49—69 ausführlich begründet. Voraussetzung dazu war ein Erfassen des philosophischen Inhalts in jedem einzelnen Fragment (wozu bekanntlich gewisse mechanische Charakteristika kommen). Hierbei gelangt C. (S. 52) zu einer neuen Definition des Begriffs 'Fragment' bei Diogenes: er hat sich entschlossen, jeden erkennbaren Zusammenhang, auch wenn er aus mehreren Steinen besteht, Fragment (Fr.) zu nennen. Das umfangreichste (Fr. 10) besteht