

CORPUS DEI PAPIRI FILOSOFICI GRECI E LATINI (CPF). TESTI E LESSICO NEI PAPIRI DI CULTURA GRECA E LATINA, PT. II: FRAMMENTI ADESPOTI E SENTENZE, VOL. 1: FRAMMENTI ADESPOTI*, LEO S. OLSCHKI, FIRENZE 2019, PP. XXX + 268, ISBN: 9788822266897.

ANGELA ULACCO
UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG



This volume is part of a major, ongoing international project, whose goal is to publish in a single corpus all of the papyrus texts relating to philosophy, along with a translation and commentary. The project was officially proposed in Florence in 1983, during an international meeting at the Accademia Toscana di Scienze e Lettere ‘La Colombaria’. Currently, the project is being coordinated by an international scientific and editorial committee directed by Fernanda Decleva Caizzi, whose members include, in alphabetic order, Guido Bastianini, Gábor Betegh, Antonio Carlini, Maria Serena Funghi, Daniela Manetti, Franco Montanari, Glenn W. Most, Valeria Piano, Rosa Maria Piccione, and David Sedley.

The corpus (*Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini*, CPF for short) has been published over the years in several volumes and yet more volumes are on the way. It is divided into four main parts. Part I (« Autori noti ») is dedicated to known authors and philosophical schools, and is subdivided into two parts: the first one gathers testimonies and fragments concerning Greek and Latin philosophers, as well as lists of authors and philosophical works (including the *Testimonia Herculanensia*); the second one focuses on those writers who played a particularly relevant role in the history of philosophy and culture. Part II (« Frammenti adespoti; Gnomologi e sentenze ») consists of three sections: the volume presented here, dedicated to the *adespota* (i.e. unattributed fragments); a second part on maxims and *chreiai* of known authors; and a third part dealing with the maxims and *gnomica* of unnamed authors. Part III (« Commentari ») is dedicated to papyrus commentaries on philosophical texts, such as the anonymous commentary on Plato’s *Theaetetus*. Part IV provides indices and tables (in several volumes). There is also a very informative website (<www.papirifilosofici.it>), where it is possible to find a presentation and history of the project, an overview of the methodology, the catalogue of published and planned volumes, and the list of collaborators. This monumental and solidly executed work, of which every library should have a copy,

is the result of a collaboration between several scholars, both from Italy and from abroad, in the fields of classical philology and the history of ancient philosophy.

The present volume – which gathers the *adespota* (literally: papyri ‘without owners’) and is last in order of publication – is no exception. It is referred to as Part II.1*, where the asterisk is meant to indicate that other tomes are on their way. After a short but helpful preface by Maria Serena Funghi (p. v–ix) and warnings (p. x), we find a list of abbreviations – i.e. for the bibliography (p. xii–xvii), journals (p. xviii–xxi), general abbreviations (p. xxii–xxiii) –, critical signs (p. xxiv), and collaborators (p. xxv). This is followed by a list of the editors of each papyrus in this tome in the order treated (p. xxvi) and an overview of the whole of Part II.1; here one can find a list not only of the fragments published in this tome, but also of the selected fragments for the upcoming tomes (p. xxvii–xxix). The volume ends with an « Indice analitico » and, for the first time in the history of the CFP, with photographic reproductions of the papyrus fragments discussed. These are accompanied by various acknowledgments and warnings, a very useful list of papyrological collections along with a list of the libraries and institutes that conserve the papyri, and a list of the papyri discussed in chronological order. An index of Greek words is missing, but it will probably be included once Part II is completed.

In the preface, Funghi explains the origins, methodology and difficulties involved in dealing with unattributed philosophical papyri. As Funghi observes, the new edition of the *adespota* has been eagerly anticipated, especially by scholars working in ancient philosophy. The texts collected in this volume contain references to several schools of philosophical thought, from the Socratic to the Stoic and the Epicurean, as well as from Middle Platonism to Aristotelianism and Christian Neoplatonism. They can be dated indeed from the Hellenistic to the Imperial period (i.e. from the third century BC to the sixth century AD), a long and important phase in the history of ancient philosophy. As a matter of fact, recent years have witnessed an increasing interest in Post-Hellenistic and Imperial philosophy, especially, though not exclusively, in relation to Platonism, and Aristotelianism. This period does indeed mark the transition to a new way of doing philosophy, one that is mostly textual, based on the exegesis and commentary of the works of ancient authorities.¹ For information about texts and writers from this time, we mostly rely on the doxographic tradition and testimonies of later authors, which requires detailed and precise study. Research on philosophical papyri was expected to provide new data about this phase of ancient thought, especially regarding the part not transmitted by the medieval manuscript tradition. As Funghi remarks, when measured against the initial enthusiasm, the

¹ As argued by PIERRE HADOT, « Théologie, exégèse, révélation: écriture dans la philosophie grecque », in MICHEL TARDIEU (ed.), *Les règles de l'interprétation*, Editions du CERF, Paris 1987 (Patrimoines. Religions du Livre. Centre d'Études des Religions du Livre), p. 13–34.

volume of information we can gain from the papyri is quite modest, not only because we often only have small fragments at our disposal, but also because it is not an easy task to determine with certainty to what extent they can be considered to contain philosophical material. Moreover, the fragments of papyrus rarely allow us to establish a precise chronology or to attribute them to a specific philosophical school. Even the analysis of the lexicon used in the fragments can produce ambiguous results. It must be noted that the study of terminology, as important it is, does not in itself allow for a specific attribution to a philosophical school, since it was very common in Post-Hellenistic and Imperial times for schools to share a lexicon – i.e. a terminology that originated in a specific school but was later adopted and appropriated by others, not infrequently by modifying the original meaning.² This consideration alone shows that, in studying this very important but fragile material, not only critical editions, textual revisions, and new translations are needed, but that the study of the cultural and philosophical context is essential in order to gain a deeper understanding of the extant material.

The volume presented here does not disappoint in this regard. Although the papyri presented have been already edited and, in some cases, translated and commented elsewhere, this volume, like other tomes in the series, is not a mere collection of texts, but proposes new conjectures and new translations. The commentaries given for each papyrus are very informative; in most cases, they not only present an overview of the current debates, but also offer new interpretations of the philosophical and cultural content of the fragment.

The papyri have been selected in light of a careful reconsideration of the available material in comparison with the papyrus databases (*LDAB*, the Leuven Database of Ancient Books, and *MP³*, the Mertens-Pack³), whose conclusions regarding the classification of philosophical papyri have not always been accepted. A preliminary set of 115 fragments was reduced to 90, of which 33 are published in the present volume. The selected papyri – also those which will be published later – are listed in the « Piano del volume » (p. xxvii–xxix). Of the 90 fragments that most likely can be classed as philosophical, about 40 can be traced back to a particular school: slightly more fragments are linked to Platonic philosophy than to Stoic philosophy. These are then followed, in decreasing order, by fragments related to the Peripatetics, the Epicureans, and the Socratics. When looking at the 33 fragments presented in the volume, one gets the impression that, although they can be identified with certainty as parts of commentaries or handbooks, many of them are linked to some kind of exegetical activity bearing on authoritative texts

² See, for instance, the appropriation of Stoic terminology within the Platonic tradition, cf. RICCARDO CHIARADONNA, « Platonismo e teoria della conoscenza stoica tra II e III secolo D.C. », in MAURO BONAZZI, CHRISTOPH HELMIG (eds.), *Platonic Stoicism-Stoic Platonism. The Dialogue between Platonism and Stoicism in Antiquity*, Leuven University Press, Leuven 2007 (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, Series I, 39), p. 209–241.

from the main philosophical schools, or to discussions and disputes in cultural environments which express a 'popular' philosophy.

The papyri treated – and presented in approximate chronological order from the third century BC to the sixth century AD – are the following: P. Ai Khanum; P.Heid. 193; P.Hib. 28; P.Hib. 188; P.Hib. 189; P.Jen inv. 660; PSI inv. 3192; P.Daris. inv. 134; P.Berol. inv. 9814; P.Heid. inv. 1740; P.Lond. Lit. 161; P.Berol. inv. 10356; P.Fay. 311; PSI 1215; P.Vind. 29800; P. Aberd. 122; P.Oslo inv. 1039; P.Oxy. 3320; P.Oxy. 4941; PSI 851b; PSI 852; PSI 1095; PSI 1508; P.Amh. 15; P.Oxy. 438; P.Oxy. 3007; P.Oxy. 3656; P.Berol. inv. 16545; P.Brux. inv. E. 7191; P. Oxy. 3008; P.Oxy. 3658; PSI 1612; PSI 1612.

Each chapter has a similar layout, opening with a general description of the content, the possible chronology, and the reference number of the corresponding photographic reproduction at the end of the volume. We then find other useful information, such as the geographical provenance of the papyrus, the library or the institution where it is preserved, and a list of previous editions, translations, and other relevant literature. Each chapter opens with a description of the papyrus itself and an explanation of the problems involved in its reconstruction. This is followed by an edition with a critical apparatus, a translation into Italian (where the text is not too fragmented) and a line-by-line commentary, which deals with previous interpretations and, in most cases, also offers new arguments or possible new interpretations for the textual conjecture and/or for the content and its possible attribution.

Since it is not possible, for present purposes, to analyse every single chapter, I will briefly discuss one of the fragments that I consider to be among the most interesting in the volume, namely n. 33 (P.Vind. Inv. 29800r, p. 228-255). The text is cautiously presented as reporting traces of Platonic philosophy. There exist two groups of fragments of the papyrus, which has been reconstructed and rearranged to the final revision by Maria Serena Funghi. Each fragment is analysed by a different scholar (Maria Serena Funghi, Eva Falaschi, Mauro Bonazzi), such that the chapter brings together multiple areas of expertise, as is also the case for other fragments in the volume. The first part of the chapter concerns the material criteria used to classify the fragment, such as the type of writing, which in this case can be narrowed to a temporal range between the end of the first BC to the beginning of the second century AD. The text exhibits diacritic signs resulting from corrections made by the scribe himself. As for the content, the lexicon is typically Platonic (ἰδέα, δημιουργός, παράδειγμα). That said, it is clear that this is not enough to determine the nature of the text and when exactly it was composed. The presence of references to Aristotle's *Categories* and Plato's *Timaeus* suggests an exegetical and scholarly context between the middle of the fourth century BC and the second century AD. We know that, at the beginning of the first century BC, these two works were considered the most important texts written by the so-

called ‘Ancients’ and were held to be worthy of exegesis. Most probably P.Vind. Inv. 29800r originated in a Middle Platonic milieu. Contrary to what is cautiously suggested by Boys-Stones,³ there is evidence that speaks against the hypothesis that the fragment is part of a commentary on the *Timaeus*. One of reasons is that we cannot find therein any commented or paraphrased *lemmata* as we would expect from a commentary. The main topic of the short fragment is a description of the painter and of the sculptor in their activity: when they cannot look at the model, they can find the form in themselves, and, on the basis of it, shape (the matter) and create, looking with the eye of soul the object of their vision. Parallels can be found in the Imperial philosophical literature in the use of the image of the artist who looks at an internal model (an intellectual model) which is better than looking at a sensible one. I will not explore further the hypothesis about the possible origin of this analogy in the Platonic tradition. I think it suffices, for present purposes, to mention that the image of the artist who can have an internal or an external model recurs in the Platonism of early Imperial times, often in the context of an explanation of causes, and in particular of Platonic Forms. However, there are some cases (Alcinous, *Did.* 163.17–23 and Seneca, *Ep.* 65,8–9), where there is no downgrading of the external model (the sensitive model) compared to the internal and intelligible model in the artist’s mind, as is the case in the papyrus fragment. It is not possible to establish with certainty the relation of the fragment with the debates on the status of the ideas as immanent, as thoughts of God⁴ (who is often identified with the *τεχνίτης*; see for instance Ps.-Archytas, *de princ.* 19,26–20,2; Philo, *de op. mundi*, 67.9–12; 20,2). The commentary on this point covers the possible meanings of the content of the fragment, even if the explanation, given the highly incomplete state of the text, can only be hypothetical. I do, however, believe that it would indeed be fruitful to compare these results with other Platonic references from the Imperial period in order to gain a better understanding of the use of this analogy in the Platonic tradition.

Other significant fragments in this volume include, in my opinion, those related to Epicurean philosophy (in particular n. 23, P. Oxy 3658) and to Stoic philosophy (n. 6, P. Berol. inv. 16545), as well as the interesting (probably Peripatetic) text on utopic constitution (n. 12, P. Hib. 28).

³ Cf. GEORGE BOYS-STONES, *Platonist Philosophy 80 BC to AD 250. An Introduction and Collection of Sources in Translation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2017, p. 67.

⁴ For this topic in Middle Platonism, see JOHN DILLON, « Ideas as Thoughts of God », *Études Platoniciennes*, 8 (2011), p. 31–42; and ALEXANDRA MICHALEWSKI, *La puissance de l’intelligible. La théorie plotinienne des Formes au miroir de l’héritage médioplatonicien*, Leuven University Press, Leuven 2014 (Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, Series 1), esp. p. 69–93.

Angela Ulacco

The volume is the product of solid, collaborative scholarship. It will be welcomed by papyrologists and historians of ancient philosophy, as well as, in general, by everyone interested in in the philosophy and literature of Post-Hellenistic and Imperial times.