

M. CASEVITZ – D. BABUT, Plutarque, *Œuvres morales, Tome XV:1.Traité 70: Sur les contradictions stoïciennes; Traité 71: Synopsis du traité 'Que les stoïciens tiennent des propos plus paradoxaux que les poètes'*. Texte établi par Michel Casevitz, traduit et commenté par Daniel Babut, Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004, 383 pp., ISBN 2-251-00522-6.

This volume, Tome XV:1, completes the Budé edition of Plutarch's expressly anti-Stoic works. It postdates Tome XV:2, which was published in 2002, a somewhat anomalous arrangement implying that lists of abbreviations and bibliographic references are only to be found there (pp. 37-48) as well as indices: *Index locorum*, *Nomina antiquiora*, *Nomina recentiora* and *Mots grecs* (pp. 385-464). The reader of the present volume runs the risk of being bewildered initially when looking in vain for these indispensable sections – until on p. 4, foot-note 2, one hits upon a short, rather incidental notice supplying the necessary information, together with a reference to the *Avant-propos* (p. 5) common to the two parts of the publication, where we are informed that the distribution of tasks in the cooperation of the two editors has been the same in both volumes, while each, however, has occasionally made contributions in the field of the other.

The volume comprises three sections, 1. the introductory Notice (pp. 3-22) followed by *Index siglorum* (pp. 23-4), 2. the Greek text with translation (pp. 26-105), and 3. the commentary (pp. 107-382).

Daniel Babut (B.) begins his part of the Notice with a survey of Plutarch's writings against the Stoic doctrines as documented in the Lamprias catalogue. Out of eight works expressly levelled against the Stoa only three are extant, among these the rudimentary *Synopsis* (*Lampr. cat.* no. 79). Beside these there are numerous works in the *Moralia*, which are characterized by anti-Stoic argumentation and polemics.

Plutarch was certainly not the first to write a work aiming at the demonstration of conflicting statements by Stoic philosophers. It was formerly thought (H. von Arnim) that he followed a rather early Hellenistic source, notably Clitomachus, the pupil or Carneades, but the unsystematic and capricious composition of *De Stoic. rep.* has given rise to the hypothesis (K. Ziegler) that Plutarch instead consulted a number of later, inferior Academic anti-Stoic works.

However, this notion of a multiplicity of sources appears no more plausible than the assumption of a unique one. B. sides with H. Cherniss in the view that Plutarch has not used secondary sources but himself studied the works of Chrysippus, which is evidenced by the frequent literal quotations. He assumedly worked quite freely and chose examples of contradiction at his own discretion; hence the lack of a systematic order of the work. B. (pp. 10-4) argues convincingly in favour of this explanation, which is in line with the general reassessment of Plutarch's method of research and ability of independent work which is now gaining ground among Plutarchean scholars.

In deliberating on how to arrive at a plausible dating of the present work B. (pp. 15-8) compares the spirit and style of the groups of works against Stoics and Epicureans with that of the Delphic dialogues and concludes that the anti-Stoic group was composed no later than the 80s.

The commentary of B. is extraordinarily extensive, containing profound analyses and broad treatments of each and every issue. He gives an explanation and motivation for this by quoting (p. 18 n. 43) Hershbell, *ANRW* II 36, 5, 3338: "What is needed after Cherniss' edition 'is a painstaking analysis, paragraph by paragraph, of the arguments' of Plutarch's anti-Stoical treatises." It should be declared at once that B. has fulfilled this demand to the utmost, and thereby reached his end, namely (p. 18) "porter un jugement plus équitable et plus équilibré qu'on ne l' avait fait jusqu' ici sur la valeur de ces écrits et sur le profit que peut en tirer notre connaissance de la philosophie post-classique et plus spécialement notre compréhension de la pensée stoïcienne".

A survey of the manuscript tradition and editions by M. Casevitz (pp. 20-4) completes the Notice. One observes two

slight mistakes in the presentation (p. 21) of *Paris. gr.* 1951 (see Pohlenz, p. X): the number printed is 1957; and the date stated, “la fin du X^e siècle”, differs from the correct date “s. XI ex.” given in the *Index siglorum*.

At 1034 C 10-2 n. 46 B. argues convincingly in favour of Pohlenz’s suppletion of the long lacuna. — Commenting at length on the passage 1034 E-F, B. n. 60 shows that Zenon does not parody the sophistic methods of refutation practised by the Megarians and that he did not altogether condemn dialectics but advocated a moderate use of it, which is to be seen at 1035 F-6 A. — At 1035 A 3 B.’s substitution of τούτων for τούτοις is an ingenuous and simple correction. — In n. 62 B. treats abundantly of the much discussed difference of the order of the three parts of philosophy, logic, ethics and physics, as presented at 1035 A and verified by Plutarch’s direct quotation of Chrysippus’ *Περὶ βίων*, as compared with the order stated by Diog. Laert. 7.40: logic, physics, ethics. B. cites several sources which indicate that there actually existed different ways of description and presentation of the parts of Stoic philosophy. — At 1035 B Chrysippus’ series of invocations to the gods were called “just lip-service” by Brunschwig. B. shows (p. 68) that the Stoic attitude to the gods was not that superficial. — In n. 69 B. notices that Plutarch’s frequent use of the 2 pers. imper. indicates that he had a pedagogic aim in writing the treaty. — At 1035 C 6 Casevitz’ reading εἰ μέλλομεν ἐρεῖν τι is entirely convincing. Most MSS. have εἰ μ. ἔρωτι ἐρεῖν. The deletion of ἔρωτι should have been indicated more clearly in the app. crit. and by printing the word within square brackets in the text. Incidentally, in n. 76, in the middle of p. 132 the word order has been changed by mistake into μέλλομεν τι ἐρεῖν. — At 1036 A 5 n. 85 B. rightly defends καταστοιχίζειν which most MSS. have. The use of two verbs of the same root, στοιχειοῦν καὶ καταστοιχίζειν, is part of Chrysippus’ style, and the emphasis on rigorous ordering is in accordance with the Stoic system. — At 1036 F 7 B.’s addition τῶν μὲν παχύτερον <ἐχόντων> appears as self-evident. — At 1037 D 12 n. 123 B. rightly defends the suppletion of Méziriac, and himself, by inserting μή before κλέπτειν, explains the omission as due to haplography: ἀπαγορεύει δὲ <μή κλέπτειν, προστάττει

δὲ» μὴ κλέπτειν. — At 1037 E 11 n. 126 B. is obviously right in preserving the reading of the MSS, κατόρθωμα προστάττων οὐ μέσον, which was reversed by Madvig, μέσον π. οὐ κ., and adopted universally by later editors and commentators. In fact, this transposition means that Plutarch's argument is annulled. B. would prefer not even to cite Madvig's mistaken change in the app. crit. — At 1037 F 7 B.'s concise suppletion of the lacuna is clearly preferable to the circumstantial conjectures of Pohlenz or Cherniss. — In n. 153 B. discusses at length the uncertain passage at 1037 F. The text as presented in this edition seems to have been emended in the best way possible. — At 1040 A 1 n. 179 B. rightly defends πράγματα MSS. — In n. 199 B. points out that Plutarch's phrase at 1040 EF βέλτιον δὲ τὰς ἐκείνου λέξεις ἀναλαβεῖν, followed by a quotation, indicates his careful use of Chrysippus' texts. In n. 409 B. observes that Plutarch's insertion of the phrase at 1050 A 8, καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον ἅπασαν ἀναιρῶν ἀμφιβολίαν, in his quotation of Chrys. Περὶ φύσεων shows that he had direct access to the text. Incidentally, there is also an inserted phrase in line 5: καὶ πάλιν μετ' ὀλίγον, not mentioned by B. — In the phrase supplemented by Reiske at 1051 B 2, <Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἔχει καλῶς ἀρθῆναι> τὴν ἀνομίαν, B. rightly excludes ἄλλ'. It is the subsequent sentence that forms the contrast: αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν κακίαν... ἀναιρῶν. — At 1952 C 2 B.'s suppletion, καθ' ἕτερον τρόπον <τῶν ἄλλων πάντων εἰς πῦρ> ἀναλίσκομένων, is entirely convincing and probably what once stood in the lacuna, but there is no reason to take the genitive phrase as absolute (see n. 481); it goes naturally with ἕτερον as comp. gen.

The second text of the present volume, the *Synopsis*, is no doubt a collection of examples extracted from the lost work *Stoicos absurdiora poetis dicere* (*Lamp. cat.* no. 79). Its Plutarchean style is obvious. — At 1057 D 8 B. rightly rejects Pohlenz's substitution of οἰκείους for τοιούτοις in ἐν πάθεσι τοιούτοις. The phrase naturally rounds off the preceding enumeration of calamities. B. translates: "dans les épreuves de ce genre". — The lacuna at 1058 A 7 is tentatively and rather plausibly filled by Babut.

To sum up, the excellent teamwork of these two scholars has resulted in a thoroughly established text in two volumes and commentaries which give the impression of having reached the terminal point of exhaustiveness.

SVEN-TAGE TEODORSSON
Göteborgs universitet
Teodorsson@class.gu.se