

TIZIANO DORANDI

ANCIENT ΕΚΔΟΣΕΙΣ  
FURTHER LEXICAL OBSERVATIONS ON SOME  
GALEN'S TEXTS

**ABSTRACT:** I believe that it is necessary to re-examine some topics I already dealt with in my earlier researches on the practices of composing a literary work by classical authors, against the backdrop of the results of recent scholarship. I would like to go back to a distinction, which Galen drew on various occasions between works 'for publication' (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) and works 'not for publication' (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). Then, I will take into account the question of the so-called Attic (ἀττικήα, ἀττικά) or Atticus' editions (Ἀττικιανὰ) of Plato; finally, I will discuss the meaning of the expression 'the Plato of Panaetius' (Πλάτων ὁ Παναητίου) used by Galen in his *On the Avoidance of Grief*.

**SOMMARIO:** Vorrei tornare a esaminare alcune questioni di cui mi sono già occupato nelle mie precedenti ricerche sulle pratiche di composizione delle opere letterarie da parte degli autori antichi sullo sfondo dei risultati raggiunti da studi recenti. Vorrei tornare alla distinzione tracciata da Galeno in diverse occasioni tra opera 'per la pubblicazione' (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) e opere 'non per la pubblicazione' (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). Poi prenderò in considerazione la questione delle cosiddette edizioni attiche (ἀττικήα, ἀττικά) o di Attico (Ἀττικιανὰ) di Platone. Discuterò, infine, il significato dell'espressione 'il Platone di Panezio' (Πλάτων ὁ Παναητίου) che Galeno usa nello scritto *Sull'imperturbabilità*.

**KEYWORDS:** Galen; Ancient Editions; Plato; Panaetius; Philodemus

In the early 1990s, when I first engaged myself in the study of the practices of composing a literary work used by classical authors, this was still a largely unexplored field of research. My first provisional results were published in

1991.<sup>1</sup> Having continued and intensified my study in the following years, I published a book on this fascinating topic which first came out in French, followed by a revised, corrected and extended Italian version some years later.<sup>2</sup> Since then, I have almost completely abandoned this field, with the exception of the publication of an article inspired by the edition of Galen's newly discovered book *On the Avoidance of Grief*. I have, however, tried to stay as well informed as possible on the research carried out in this area which has augmented and progressed strikingly in recent years.<sup>3</sup>

I believe that it is necessary to re-examine some topics I already dealt with in my earlier researches on the practices of composing a literary work by classical authors; I would thus like to go back to a distinction Galen drew on various occasions between books 'for publication' (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) and books 'not for publication' (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). In a second step, I will take another look at the question of the so-called Attic (ἀττικήα, ἀττικά) or Atticus' editions (Ἀττικιανὰ) of Plato and discuss the meaning of the expression 'The Plato of Panaetius' (Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου) used in Galen's *On the Avoidance of Grief*.

οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν vs. πρὸς ἔκδοσιν

In my book *Nell'officina dei classici*,<sup>4</sup> I dedicated two chapters to a group of textual witnesses that distinguish between works which their authors intended to publish (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) and works which were not meant for publication (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). The majority of evidences of this distinction can be found in the works of Galen of Pergamon (129-after 210 AD).

Firstly, with respect to the meaning of the noun ἔκδοσις, I believe (with van Groningen)<sup>5</sup> that we have to avoid rendering it as 'edition'.

---

<sup>1</sup> T. Dorandi, "Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut: Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den antiken Schriftstellern", *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 87, 1991, p. 11-33.

<sup>2</sup> T. Dorandi, *Le stylet et la tablette: Dans le secret des auteurs antiques*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2000 and *Nell'officina dei classici: Come lavoravano gli autori antichi*, Roma, Carocci, 2007. The edition of 2007 represents the final stage of my research, replacing everything I had written on this topic before. It must thus be considered as the definitive expression of my reflections.

<sup>3</sup> Let me cite as an example the rich and convincing volume by O. Pecere, *Roma antica e il testo: Scrittura d'autore e composizione letteraria*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2010.

<sup>4</sup> Dorandi, *Nell'officina dei classici*, p. 65-101.

<sup>5</sup> B. A. van Groningen, "ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ", *Mnemosyne*, 16, 1963, p. 1-17.

ἐκδοσις is generally the act of the author who “makes the text available to others”. The noun might mean ‘publication’ and the corresponding verb ἐκιδόναι might mean ‘to publish’.

As the focus of my research went beyond Galen, I paid particular attention to the contribution made by the *subscriptiones* in some of the books of the treatise *On Rhetoric* by the Epicurean Philodemus of Gadara (1st c. BC). The passages in Galen and the *subscriptiones* on the papyri of Philodemus’ work brought me to the conclusion that in ancient times, several authors reserved parts of their literary production for restricted circulation, limited to only one or a few friends or study companions, and consequently declined to publish these works, at least in the first instance. Later on and under special circumstances, however, some authors decided to make publicly available even those books that were originally written for ‘private’ use only (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν).

Galen often opted for one of these two practices: reserving some of his books for a restricted circle of disciples and friends (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) or publishing them (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). This is stated by Galen himself in some passages of his bio-bibliography *On His Own Books*.<sup>6</sup> In the preface to this work, Galen reminds his friend Bassus that many have slandered his texts, using them in private lectures as if they were their own writings and abridging, amending and reworking them as they thought appropriate. He then reveals that the reason for such exasperating interventions was that he handed his books to friends and disciples without a title (χωρὶς ἐπιγραφῆς) as he did not intend to publish them (οὐδὲν πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) but expected to see them used as a *memorandum* (ὑπομνήματα) by those who requested them only. As these works had not been written with publication in mind (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν), but for the private use and instruction of those who required them, some aspects might be elaborated in more detail than others, and the exposition and explanation of the principles were sometimes complete and sometimes imperfect (τὴν ἑρμηνείαν αὐτὴν τε τῶν θεωρημάτων τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἢ τελείαν ὑπάρχειν ἢ ἔλλιπῆ). Galen takes up the same topic a few pages later, when he speaks of his work commenting on the writings of Hippocrates. Galen explains that he initially wrote comments on some books by Hippocrates without intending to publish them but merely for exercise purposes. In a similar fashion, he had written

---

<sup>6</sup> Gal. *De libris propr.* Prol. 6 & 9 Boudon-Millot.

a number of treatises on every field of medical doctrine just for himself. One day, having heard a person approve of a wrong explanation of an aphorism by Hippocrates, Galen decided to compose his comments not just with those in mind for who they were destined, but in view of an actual publication.<sup>7</sup>

Significant evidence for this practice can be found in the surviving Greek parts of the *Commentaries to Hippocrates' Epidemics Book 6*. In the preface, Galen recognizes books 1 and 3 of Hippocrates' *Epidemics* as being *πρὸς ἔκδοσιν*, 'for publication', while books 5 and 7 were clearly forgeries and books 2 and 6 works *οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν*, written in a provisional draft and destined for his own personal use. Thessalos, Hippocrates' son, had then published them after his father's death. *Epidemics* book 6, says Galen,<sup>8</sup>

is not an actual treatise meant for publication (*σύγγραμμα*) but a draft or sketch (*παρασκευαί τινες ἢ ὑποτυπώσεις*) as we often prepare them for ourselves (*ἑαυτοῖς*). Hippocrates had not planned to publish (*πρὸς ἔκδοσιν*) these two books, but had merely compiled a draft for himself (*ἑαυτῷ τινα ὑποτύπωσιν*).

It is of some interest that Galen attributes the practice of writing treatises not intended for publication (*οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν*) already to Hippocrates (c. 460–370? BC). If we were able to prove the authenticity of this claim with respect to Hippocrates' work method, this would provide a relatively old testimony of this practice. I have the strong impression, however, that it does not date back to the time of Hippocrates and that instead Galen attributed a method to his predecessor that was actually his own or common in his own time.

An even older trace of this method can be found in Iamblichus' *On the Pythagorean Way of Life*. Iamblichus (c. 240–325 AD) ascribes it to Pythagoras (6th c. BC) and his disciples. The members of the Pythagorean school, writes Iamblichus, refused to use the common language, understandable to everybody, because they wanted to avoid making immediately accessible their discussions and their mutual encounters, their writings in the form of notes, as well as their texts and all publications.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., ch. 9 Boudon-Millot.

<sup>8</sup> Gal. *In Hipp. Epid.* 118, 24-26 Wenkebach (CMG V 10, 2, 2).

<sup>9</sup> Iambl. *V. Pyth.* 23, 104.

Like in the case of Galen and Hippocrates, however, I believe that we are in fact looking at an anachronism here.

What we should focus our attention on in this passage of Iamblichus is rather the distinction between a category of writings in the form of notes (ὑπομνηματισμοὶ καὶ ὑποσημειώσεις), reserved for a limited form of dissemination, and a category of finished compositions destined for publication (συγγράμματα καὶ ἐκδόσεις).

I also drew attention to what I considered to be the oldest witness for this practice, the proem to the first book of the *Conics* by Apollonius of Perga (3rd/2nd c. BC). Apollonius writes to his friend Eudemus in order to present him with a correct version of this book and to inform him that he will send the other books as soon as they are finished. Earlier, Apollonius had already written a first version of the eight books of the *Conics*, exposing in great haste and upon the request of the geometrician Naucratos the results he had obtained in this domain. While preparing that first version of the *Conics*, Apollonius had not taken the trouble to revise the text carefully but had simply written down everything that came to his mind, expecting to revise his material at a later date. Only after correcting and finalizing the text did he publish his revised work. Yet some of his friends had by then already received the first two books in their initial versions, which explains the differences between the final and the first versions of these books.

A more detailed description of this two-stage practice can then be found in the Neoplatonic commentators of Aristotle in the 5th and 6th centuries AD. Beginning with Ammonius, all surviving Greek commentaries on Aristotle's *Categories* (by Philoponus, Olympiodorus, Simplicius and Elias) are preceded by a preface comprising ten points. The second one raises the question: How are Aristotle's works to be classified? The Neoplatonic commentators divide the Aristotelian *corpus* into particular (μερικά), intermediate (μεταξύ) and universal (καθόλου) works; and within the group of universal works, a further distinction is made between notebooks (ὑπομνηματικά) and systematic (συνταγματικά) works.

In the *On Aristotle's Categories* by Ammonius Hermiae of Alexandria (c. 435/445–517/526 AD):

Among the universal <works> some are systematic (συνταγματικά) and some are notebooks (ὑπομνηματικά). The <works> called notebooks are those in which only

the main points (κέφαλαια) are registered. Note that in ancient times, those who proposed to write would compile in summary fashion their own particular discoveries into an exposition of the subject; then they would take many thoughts from even older books, in order to confirm the ones that were correct and refute those that were not. Last of all, of course, they composed their writings, making them beam with the beauty of their words and the ornamentation of their narrative. In this way the notebooks differed from the systematic <works> in ordering and beauty of expression.<sup>10</sup>

The most interesting aspect of this passage is the detailed description of the specific characteristics of ‘hypomnematic’ works and the properties that distinguish them from ‘syntagmatic’ works. The adjective ὑπομνηματικόν here denotes the composition of a literary text that has not yet been thoroughly revised by its author or an imperfect version designed for restricted dissemination only and therefore neither completely elaborated nor formally consistent.

Despite the late attestation and the Neoplatonic origin of this information, there are aspects which may lead us to believe that the distinction between ὑπομνηματικά and συνταγματικά writings dates back to a much earlier time.

An older attestation can be found in Galen’s commentary on the treatise *On Joints* by Hippocrates:

In the second book of his *Epidemics*, [Hippocrates] dealt with the nerves attached to the vertebrae in a hypomnematic fashion (ὑπομνηματικῶς), and not like he would in a finished treatise (οὐ συγγραφικῶς); in the same way that [he dealt with] the other topics of this book, which, as we have proved, served him as a *memorandum* and did not have the status of a finished work. Only the first and third books of the *Epidemics* were effectively written by him in view of a publication (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν).<sup>11</sup>

The distinction made here between a ‘hypomnematic’ work and a finished treatise is in fact the same one that we have encountered in the neoplatonic commentaries on Aristotle.

We can, however go back even further, to the 1st century BC and to Philodemus of Gadara.

---

<sup>10</sup> Amm. *In Cat.* 4, 3-13 Busse (*CAG* XII 1), translated by S. M. Cohen & G. B. Matthews, *Ammonius, Aristotle Categories (Ancient Commentators on Aristotle)*, London & Ithaca, Duckworth & Co, 1992. Olympiodorus (6th c. AD) and Philoponus (6th c. AD) present the same text.

<sup>11</sup> Gal. *In Hpp. Art. comm.* 3, 32 (XVIII A 529, 13-530, 2 Kühn).

In the *subscriptions* on three scrolls containing the first three books of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric*, we read, following the title Περὶ ῥητορικῆς, the adjective ὑπομνηματικόν. This concerns *PHerc.* 1427 (book 1), *PHerc.* 1674 (book 2) and *PHerc.* 1506 (book 3). The mention of ὑπομνηματικόν is no longer found in the *subscriptions* of the second copy of *On Rhetoric*, books 2 and 3, which is transmitted in *PHerc.* 1672 (book 2) and *PHerc.* 1426 (book 3). Unfortunately, there is no trace of a second copy of book 1.

What is the meaning of the adjective ὑπομνηματικόν in these three *subscriptions*?

I believe that in order to answer this question, we must reconstruct the compositional *iter* of Philodemus' work *On Rhetoric*. In my opinion, Philodemus began to write this treatise when he was still in Athens, before leaving for Italy following the death of his teacher Zeno of Sidon (in the mid-70s BC). The composition of this work which came to contain ten books took him several decades, perhaps until the 40s BC. Book 4 is, in fact, dedicated to Gaius Pansa, whom was consul in the year 43. According to my hypothesis, the first three books of *On Rhetoric* formed a conceptual unity aiming to determine whether or not rhetoric was an art (τέχνη). Philodemus criticizes several Epicureans who had lived and taught on the islands of Rhodes and Cos in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC and who he considered to be 'dissidents' (σοφισταί), that is, Epicureans who officially belonged to the school, but suggested an interpretation of a number of aspects of 'canonical' thought which differed from the one Philodemus attributed to the Masters of the Garden (the καθηγημόνες: Epicurus, Metrodorus, Hermarchus and Polyaeus). Those Epicureans argued that no type of rhetoric was to be regarded as an art. Philodemus, on the other hand, advocates the idea of his teacher Zeno, which for him is the genuine expression of the Masters' doctrine, namely that only sophistic or epideictic rhetoric can be counted as an art. Thus Philodemus aims to oppose the idea that the technical character of sophistic rhetoric was an innovation introduced by Zeno and not part of the genuine doctrine of the Masters.<sup>12</sup>

In my interpretation, the 'dissident' Epicureans did not attack Zeno after the publication of a preliminary version (ὑπομνηματικόν) of the first

---

<sup>12</sup> See M. Erbi, "La retorica dell'Epicureismo: una riflessione", *Cronache Ercolanesi*, 41, 2011, p. 189-205.

three books of *On Rhetoric* (hypothesis held by Sudhaus), but Philodemus had prepared a version of these three books (the one referred to as ὑπομνηματικόν) in order to defend his teacher Zeno against preceding attacks by the ‘dissidents’. The composition of these three books dates back to the time when Philodemus was still in Athens, probably to the last years of Zeno’s life. By adding the mention of ὑπομνηματικόν to their title, Philodemus wished to emphasize that these books, thought to be in a definite, final version, were meant for a restricted dissemination and use within the school. Hence, they constituted a work that Philodemus considered to be οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν. Some decades later, however, Philodemus picked up this version of the three books again, having decided to reorganize his treatise on rhetoric in one coherent work containing more books and destined for publication (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν). In that new structure, the three initial books became books 1-3 of the treatise *On Rhetoric*.

Thus, the papyri of the first three books of *On Rhetoric* by Philodemus provide concrete proof of the existence of different practices of composing a literary work similar to those described by Galen. Given that we dispose of the ‘published’ version (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) of books 2 (*PHerc.* 1672) and 3 (*PHerc.* 1426) of Philodemus’ *On Rhetoric*, we can prove that the first version (ὑπομνηματικόν) was, both formally and textually, finished in itself and to a large extent definitive. What distinguished the final version (πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) from the earlier one was the formal presentation: a more elegant style of handwriting, a more accurate arrangement of the columns, some process of correction (διόρθωσις). Although the content was identical, the two versions were meant for entirely different purposes. Adopting the terminology used by Galen, the one Philodemus describes as ὑπομνηματικόν had been composed οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν, the other πρὸς ἔκδοσιν.

There is, however, one aspect in which the practice attested in the papyri of Herculaneum differs from the one Galen describes in the preface to his *On His Own Books*.<sup>13</sup> Here we are told that Galen used to give his books which were not intended for publication (οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν) to friends and disciples without a title (χωρὶς ἐπιγραφῆς/οὐδὲν ἐπέγραψα). I drew the conclusion above from his passage that ‘hypomnematic’ writings bore no title because they were meant to remain in a private sphere and not to be

---

<sup>13</sup> Gal. *De libris propr.* Prol. § 6 & 12 Boudon-Millot.

disseminated. Only the edition would display the title that its author had chosen to give it.<sup>14</sup> The papyri of Philodemus, however, attest an entirely different reality: they all bear a title, sometimes complemented by a stichometric note. We cannot rule out the possibility that practices had changed from the lifetime of Philodemus to Galen, nor that some authors used both methods independently (addition of a title or not), depending on the specific moment and occasion.

A new interpretation of the passages in Galen and Apollonius of Perga has recently been proposed by Gurd.<sup>15</sup> He examines the passages of Galen's *Commentaries* on Hippocrates' *Epidemics* and those of *On His Own Books*, confronting "Galen's views on revision and publication with those of other ancient authors" and "concluding by observing the affinities his discussion of ἐκδοσις reveals between him and the performative culture of the Second Sophistic".<sup>16</sup> The fact that Hippocrates wrote books 2 and 6 of his *Epidemics* "only for his own use means that much in them is unclear; part of Galen's task as a commentator is to re-express the more condensed parts of the text more precisely, fully, and clearly",<sup>17</sup> and "what distinguishes the outline note found in *Epidemics* 6 from Galen's hypothetical publishable version is the level of specification: in publication, Hippocrates would have provided all the relevant information". For Galen in fact,

something written for publication should provide a full and exact account [...]. Correct linguistic exposition should describe what is the case clearly and precisely: what does not do this, or so our first conclusion suggests, is not yet ready for publication.

A second and "no less crucial ingredient" for distinguishing a work οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν from a work πρὸς ἔκδοσιν is "the nature of a text's intended readership",<sup>18</sup> because "a text written πρὸς ἔκδοσιν should attempt to provide an explanation useful to a 'normal', that is, not expert but not ignorant, reader". In *On His Own Books*, "the main divergence between works written for publication and works not written for publication lies in

---

<sup>14</sup> See Dorandi, *Nell'officina dei classici*, p. 81 n. 76.

<sup>15</sup> S. A. Gurd, "Galen on ἐκδοσις", in T. Schmidt, P. Fleury (eds.), *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times: Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, Toronto-Buffalo-London, University of Toronto Press, 2011, p. 169-184.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 171-172.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 172-173.

the nature of their intended audiences”. When Galen speaks of texts οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν, reserved for the “individual use and instruction of specific students”, the expression “*does* mean ‘not for general release’, but it does *not* mean ‘for the desk drawer’ or ‘never meant to see the light of day’”. Gurd goes on to explain that the “difference between πρὸς ἔκδοσιν and οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν is configured not merely as a difference in the level of detail, but as a difference in detail *determined by* the needs of a specific reader”. Hence “the fact that by calling a work ‘not for publication’, Galen effectively renders its free dissemination possible”.<sup>19</sup> Gurd reconstructs the progress of Galen’s writing as follows:

he gave ὑπομνήματα to individual students early in his career. These began to disseminate and to be interpolated. Later, Galen attempted to respond to this situation by removing interpolations, adding titles and prefaces, and writing the *On His Own Books*. What he could not do was get every copy back and guarantee that the new versions would supersede the old. What he could do was authorize circulation after the fact by being more precise about who should read what, using the distinction πρὸς ἔκδοσιν/οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν to facilitate this. At the same time, this distinction allowed him to reinstate the division between public and private that the dissemination of his work had dissolved. Consider that his works were going to circulate beyond his control, and that they were going to be interpolated [...]. As Galen deployed it, the distinction between πρὸς ἔκδοσιν and οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν was a useful tool for controlling, if only in imagery terms, a materially uncontrollable situation, a surprisingly canny solution to an intractable problem – that is, the continued dissemination of works beyond Galen’s control.<sup>20</sup>

In other words, Galen never had the intention to rewrite πρὸς ἔκδοσιν works that had seen the light as οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν. All he wished to do was correct the errors and interpolations and add a title and preface. In this respect, his method differs from that used by Apollonius of Perga, for example, who rewrote his own text.

This suggestion has many more aspects in common with what I have said before than one might think at first sight. Perhaps a more accurate reading of my book (in its Italian rather than in its French version) could help to redimension some of the novelties of Gurd’s article.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Ibid., p. 174-175.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid., p. 176.

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 169-170 summarizes my conclusion in a highly reductive manner, translating only one sentence (Dorandi, *Le stylet et la tablette*, p. 77-8) which does not, by any means, give account of my arguments.

Interesting ideas and suggestions are finally provided in Amneris Roselli's recent remarks on the occurrences of ἐκδοσις in Galen.<sup>22</sup> In her analysis of all occurrences of the term ἐκδοσις in Galen's works (including *On the Avoidance of Grief*, which was strangely disregarded by Gurd), she briefly considers the expression πρὸς ἐκδοσιν which, she believes, refers to texts characterized by a completeness of content and form (thus adopting some elements of Gurd's hypothesis): "All the works described as ἐξ καθαρὸν ἔδαφος, following the diction of *On the Avoidance of Grief*", she states, "would have to be classified as πρὸς ἐκδοσιν, despite the fact that they had been published".<sup>23</sup>

Ἀττικιανὰ vs. Ἀττικά

Let me move on to the second point that I wish to consider. In an article entitled *'Editori' antichi di Platone*, I tried to reassess the debate on the existence of ancient editions of the *Dialogues* (particularly the one attributed to a certain Atticus), against the backdrop of the contribution made by Galen's *On the Avoidance of Grief*.<sup>24</sup>

New aspects brought into the discussion by Roselli and Stramaglia and an article by Maria Jagoda Luzzatto, which had previously slipped my attention, have impelled me to raise this question again.<sup>25</sup>

I would like to start by giving a summary of the results I published in my earlier study.

---

<sup>22</sup> A. Roselli, "Galeno e la filologia del II secolo", in E. Bona, C. Lévy, G. Magnaldi, *Vestigiai notitiae. Scritti in memoria di Michelangelo Giusta*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso, 2012, p. 67-70.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 68.

<sup>24</sup> T. Dorandi, "'Editori' antichi di Platone", *Antiquorum Philosophia*, 4, 2010, p. 161-167.

<sup>25</sup> A. Roselli, "Libri e biblioteche a Roma al tempo di Galeno: La testimonianza del *De indolentia*", *Galenos*, 4, 200, p. 127-148; A. Stramaglia, "Libri perduti per sempre: Galeno, *De indolentia* 13; 16; 17-19", *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 139, 2011, p. 118-147 and M. J. Luzzatto, "Emendare Platone nell'Antichità: Il caso del *Vaticanus gr. 1*", *Quaderni di Storia*, 34, 2008, p. 29-85. See also L. Canfora, "Le collezioni superstiti", in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, II. *La ricerca e l'attualizzazione del testo*, Roma, ed. Salerno, 1995, p. 176-177, 202, and M. R. Pierro, *Luciano: Contro un bibliomane ignorante*, Palermo, Sellerio, 1994, p. 78-80 n. 4.

Using the current editions of the texts that attest Atticus' copies ('Αττικιανά, (τὰ) *sc.* ἀπόγραφα *vel* ἀντίγραφα), we can base ourselves on five references in the *Lexeis of the Ten Orators* by Harpocration (2nd c. AD), two in Galen and two in manuscripts of the Demosthenic *corpus*. It is important to bear in mind, however, that the form 'Αττικιανά is attested only three times in Harpocration (*s.v.* ἀργᾶς, Θύστιον and ναυκραρικά); while in two other passages of his work (*s.v.* ἀνελοῦσα and ἐκπολεμῶσαι), we read 'Αττικά, just like in the *subscriptions* of the manuscripts of Demosthenes. The Galen manuscripts likewise attest ἀττικῶν (*In Timaeum*) and ἀττίκια μὲν (*De indolentia*), Attic (copies). The variants in these texts that are attributed to Atticus' or Attic copies have mostly been considered to be inferior to the readings of the remaining tradition. Consequently, this has led to a devaluation of the contribution by these copies, which have not been treated as results of high-level 'editorial' activity carried out by a professional scholar.

The two forms 'Αττικιανά and 'Αττικά seem *a priori* acceptable. However, after Hemsterhuis suggested to restore the form 'Αττικιανά in all five passages of Harpocration's *Lexeis*, his example was followed not only by the editors of the *Lexeis*, but served as a basis also for the editors of Demosthenes and Galen who corrected the manuscript readings they were working on.

If we accept the conjecture 'Αττικιανά in all cases, all these passages testify the existence of copies (ἀντίγραφα or ἀπόγραφα) of the works of Demosthenes, Aeschines and Plato produced by a certain Atticus. Scholars do not unanimously agree that he is identical to Cicero's friend of the same name, Titus Pomponius Atticus. In fact, some have pointed out two passages in Lucians' diatribe *The ignorant Book-collector*<sup>26</sup> which refer to the names of a famous Atticus (ὁ ἀοίδιμος 'Αττικός) and an unknown Callinos, presenting both as βιβλιογράφοι. This hypothesis seems to have a parallel in a passage of Galen's *On the Avoidance of Grief* (§ 13), where, again, the names of Callinos and Atticus (if we accept the editors' suggestion of correcting the manuscript's reading of ἀττίκια μὲν into 'Αττικιανά) appear together (Καλλίνεια καὶ 'Αττικιανά).

---

<sup>26</sup> Luc. *Adv. ind.* § 2 & 24.

Thus, I came to the following conclusions: Callinos and Atticus, who Galen refers to, are indeed the same individuals mentioned by Lucian, and both authors knew them as βιβλιογράφοι in the sense of ‘scribes’, ‘calligraphers’, renowned for the quality of their works. In Galen, there is nothing that points to an ‘editorial’ activity of these two men. If we rule out the possibilities that Lucian and Galen confused Atticus the Roman ‘editor’ with a ‘scribe’ or that in fact Ἀττικιανὰ designated the books of Atticus’ private collection which Cicero also made recourse to, two possibilities could be envisaged: 1) we no longer identify Atticus with the Roman ‘editor’ of the same name; 2) or, if we wish to maintain this identification, the attestations in Lucian and Galen are excluded from the Ἀττικιανὰ dossier inasmuch as the Atticus they refer to is not Titus Pomponius Atticus, but an anonymous ‘scribe’ of uncertain identity. Given the passage of *On the Avoidance of Grief*, in particular, I considered the first option to be more likely.

Today, I would argue less categorically, against the backdrop of (among other things) the remarks brought forward by Roselli and Luzzatto concerning the legitimacy of reconstructing in all instances the adjective Ἀττικιανὰ which would point to a person named Atticus, whoever this might be.

Luzzatto has studied the problem in detail on the basis of an in-depth analysis of the approximately four hundred *marginalia* written on the late 9th-century codex *Vaticanus gr. 1* (O) by an anonymous scribe, whose hand (a ‘scholarly hand’) can paleographically be dated to the mid-11th century or shortly after (O<sup>4</sup>). The Vatican manuscript, mutilated in the beginning of 23 fascicles, contains the last part of an edition of Plato’s *Opera omnia* (*Leges, Epinomis, Epistulae, Definitiones, Spuria*). The *marginalia* are introduced by three different types of abbreviations which Luzzatto indicates as πρ, αλ, ορ and of which she suggests her own personal interpretation. I would like to take a closer look at the interpretation of the abbreviation αλ (assuming the form of ’-λλ<sup>λ</sup> in the manuscript, with a tachygraphic initial *alpha* constituted by a simple horizontal line) which accompanies a textual variant 102 times (to *Leges, Epinomis* and *Epistulae*).<sup>27</sup> Commonly, this abbreviation has been understood to stand

---

<sup>27</sup> Luzzatto, “Emendare Platone nell’Antichità”, p. 70-85.

for the adverb ἀλλαχοῦ ‘elsewhere’, thus indicating rather generally that the variant concerned is transmitted by another textual witness. Luzzatto puts this interpretation up for discussion because “ἀλλαχοῦ is never indicative of *v.l.* (thus equivalent to ἐν ἄλλῳ or ἐν ἄλλοις) in the scholarly terminology of ancient and Byzantine Greek”.<sup>28</sup> Hence, Luzzatto discusses the hypothesis that the abbreviation ’-λλ<sup>x</sup> copied by O<sup>4</sup> in the 11th century refers to a model written in cursive capital of late antiquity by a scholar who was so accustomed to tachygraphic writing that he used a tachygraphic *alpha* at the beginning of the word.<sup>29</sup> In this type of writing, a sequence of two original *tau* could systematically be mistaken for a double *lambda*; the incorrect ’-λλ<sup>x</sup> can thus be identified as the abbreviation -ττ<sup>x</sup> which indicated terms starting in ἀττικ-. Luzzatto concludes that,

if the incorrect ἀλλαχοῦ is the result of a systematic misreading of an abbreviation ἀττ<sup>x</sup>, the old editorial source on which are based hundred variants of *Leges*, *Epinomis* and *Epistulae*, often accompanied by the precious ορ,<sup>30</sup> was identified, characterized and defined for ancient readers of Plato specifically on the basis of its being ‘Attic’ [...]. The source of ἀλ had the characteristics of an old *ekdosis*, still at least partly associated with *semeia* [...]. The path that remains open from this point is effectively predetermined. The abbreviation ἀττ<sup>x</sup> [...] can be identified as the famous ἔκδοσις τῶν ἀττικῶν ἀντιγράφων [...]. The ‘Attic copies’, the ἀττικὰ ἀντίγραφα or simply ἀττικά, must have been *biblia* characterized by the registration and addition of variants (so-called διτταὶ γραφαί) which in the more difficult cases [...] permitted philological discussions of the text of a famous ancient author.<sup>31</sup>

These Ἀττικὰ ἀντίγραφα were finally characterized by a “systematic *diorthosis* which also accounted for ancient variants and corrections” deriving from an edition arranged under the banner of Atticism not much before the 2nd century AD (a time in which it is attested by Harpocration and Galen).<sup>32</sup>

It goes without saying that whoever accepts Luzzatto’s results will have to reassess the predominant opinion to date, that the variants of these

---

<sup>28</sup> Ibid., p. 70.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 79.

<sup>30</sup> That is, the abbreviation that had been read as ἀπ’ ὀρθώ(σεως) and that Luzzatto, “Emendare Platone nell’Antichità”, p. 62-69 takes as a misinterpretation for Ἄ(ριστοφάνους) διόρθω(σις) or Ἄ(ριστοφάνης) διορθω(τής).

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., p. 81-82.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., p. 84.

ἀντίγραφα are inferior, taking into consideration the more than one hundred witnesses in O<sup>4</sup> which provide important high-quality material for the *constitutio textus* of the three Platonic dialogues *Laws*, *Epinomis* and *Epistles*.

I conclude *non liquet*, because I cannot judge the palaeographic evidence which Luzzatto puts at the basis of the systematic misinterpretation of the abbreviation ἀττ<sup>κ</sup> as ᾿λλ<sup>λ</sup> (with a tachygraphic *alpha* at the beginning of the word), for its part confused with the *nonsense* αλλ<sup>λ</sup> which would then have been traced back to ἀλλαχοῦ. May others evaluate and judge this aspect.

What I would like to emphasize at this point is the pertinent methodological *caveat* that Luzzatto expresses in view of the systematic unifying correction of all ancient witnesses of the adjective denoting this edition into ᾿Αττικιανά. As we have seen, this form is documented in only three passages of Harpocration; whereas in two other passages of Harpocration as well as in the *subscriptions* of the Demosthenic manuscripts, we read ᾿Αττικά. In the two instances in Galen, the manuscripts attest ἀττικῶν (*In Timaeum*) and ἀττικία μὲν (*On the Avoidance of Grief*). Luzzatto suggests correcting the two readings of ᾿Αττικιανά into ᾿Αττικά<sup>33</sup> because “the adjective ἀττικιανός, assuming that it refers to a proper name ᾿Αττικός (a fact that is completely unproven), stems from the incorrect reading of the abbreviated ἀττικ,α’ (mistaking for a *iota* the truncation mark after the *kappa*) which stood for ἀττικ(ὰ) ἀν(τίγραφα), briefly referred to as ἀττικά”.<sup>34</sup>

Here again, I do not possess the competence to judge the palaeographic aspect of this question. I would like to stress, however, that, if we accept Luzzatto’s suggestion, the criterion of simplification will again, *mutatis mutandis*, gain the upper hand: no longer ᾿Αττικιανά but ᾿Αττικά. For this reason I wonder if it would not be better to try and remain in each

---

<sup>33</sup> Thus, in a first instance, B. Hemmerdinger, *Essai sur l’histoire du texte de Thucydide*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1955, p. 23, but then see Id., “᾿Αττικιανά: Quid?”, *Bollettino dei Classici*, 18, 1997, p. 55-56.

<sup>34</sup> Luzzatto, “Emendare Platone nell’Antichità”, p. 83 n. 124 with a reference to the ‘sana perplessità’ (‘sound perplexity’) of C. Fuhr, *Demosthenis Orationes* I 1, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914, p. VII n. 2 who drew attention to the fact that in the manuscripts of Demosthenes, ἀττικ, is followed by a truncation mark, such as ὄλυθιακ, (for ὄλυθιακῶν). See Roselli, “Galeno e la filologia del II secolo”, p. 68 n. 24.

and every instance as faithful to the manuscript readings as possible. I thus suggest to retain Ἀττικιανὰ in the three passages of Harpocration (whoever the Ἀττικός, from which the adjective is derived, may refer to, and in spite of Luzzatto's doubts about the legitimacy of this formation) and Ἀττικά in all other cases with the exception of Galen's *On the Avoidance of Grief*, where I prefer to read ἀττίκεια {μέν} with Stramaglia, taking up a suggestion (*per verba*) brought forward by Luzzatto, and possibly of *In Timaeum*, where Roselli also proposed to correct the manuscript's reading ἀττικῶν into ἀττικείων.<sup>35</sup> Whether we correct the ἀττίκεια μέν into Ἀττικιανὰ or ἀττίκεια {μέν}, the sequence Καλλίνεια, Ἀττίκεια, Πεδουκαῖα in § 13 of *On avoidance of Grief*<sup>36</sup> clearly indicates that the adjective we are looking at refers to the proper name Ἀττικός, whoever this might be.

#### Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου

The second part of my article *'Editori' antichi di Platone* dealt with the interpretation of the expression Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου attested in the same section (§ 13) of *On the Avoidance of Grief*, which has been interpreted as evidence for the existence of an 'edition' of the Platonic *Dialogues* arranged by the stoic philosopher Panaetius of Rhodes.<sup>37</sup>

In the meantime, the passage in Galen (rather badly transmitted and corrupt in several aspects) has received new revision and editing which has helped to reorganize it and render it more lucid. In my opinion, the best text is the one proposed by Stramaglia, which I transcribe, accompanied by his translation:<sup>38</sup>

οὐδ' ὅτε οὖν ὅσα σπάνια καὶ ἀλλοτρίως ἀχόθι μηδαμόθεν κείμενα δυνατὸν ἐστὶν εὐρεῖν ἐξιστιν, οὔτε τῶν μέσων <μέν>, διὰ δὲ τὴν τῆς γραφῆς ἀκρίβειαν ἐσπουδασμένων, Καλλίνεια καὶ Ἀττίκεια {μέν} καὶ Πεδουκαῖα, καὶ μὴν Ἀριστάρχεια –οἵτινές εἰσιν Ὀμηροὶ δύο –, καὶ Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, διασωζομένων ἐν τοῦτοῖς

<sup>35</sup> Gal. *In Tim.* 13, 3-7 Schröder. See Roselli, "Libri e biblioteche a Roma", p. 138 n. 53.

<sup>36</sup> For the text, see *infra*.

<sup>37</sup> Dorandi, "Editori' antichi di Platone", p. 167-172.

<sup>38</sup> Stramaglia, "Libri perduti per sempre", p. 120-129 (for the apparatus see 120-121). See also the two recent Italian annotated translations by I. Garofalo (*Galeno. L'anima e il dolore. De indolentia, De propriis placitis*, Edited by I. Garofalo and A. Lami, Milano, Rizzoli, 2012) and M. Vegetti (*Galeno. Nuovi scritti autobiografici*, Introduction, Translation and Commentary by M. Vegetti, Carocci, Roma, 2013).

τῶν γραμμάτων ἐκείνων αὐτῶν ἅ καθ' ἕκαστον βιβλίον ἢ ἔγραψαν ἢ ἐνεγράψαντο οἱ ἄνδρες ὧν ἦν ἐπώνυμα τὰ βιβλία. καὶ γὰρ γραμματικῶν πολλῶν αὐτόγραφα βιβλία τῶν παλαιῶν ἔκειντο καὶ ῥητόρων καὶ ἰατρῶν καὶ φιλοσόφων.

Non è dunque più possibile trovare né quei libri che sono rari e non disponibili da nessun'altra parte, né, di quelli abbastanza correnti <bensi>, ma ricercati per la loro accuratezza grafica, (vari) esemplari callinii, atticii, peducei, e finanche aristarchei – vale a dire i due Omeri –, e il Platone di Panezio, e molti altri di tal genere: nei quali erano conservati quegli stessi scritti che, libro per libro, o avevano vergato o si erano trascritti gli uomini di cui quei libri portano il nome. E difatti erano in deposito libri autografi di molti antichi grammatici, retori, medici e filosofi.

Gourinat (who then had only the *editio princeps* of Boudon<sup>39</sup> at his disposal) considered this passage in Galen to be evidence of the fact that Panaetius' love of Plato

went as far as to the existence of a 'Plato of Panaetius' (most likely a text of Plato edited by Panaetius) which Galen owned a copy of until 192, when he lost it in the fire of the magazines at Via Sacra, along with all other documents that he had stored there.<sup>40</sup>

According to Gourinat, it would thus be evident that the list of works quoted by Galen

refers indeed to what it claims to refer to, that is, books that the men whose names they carried Atticus, Callinos, Pedoukos (or Peducaeus) and Aristarchus had 'in each case either copied themselves or had copied for them by others', producing renowned and accurate 'critical' editions of those works. The conclusion is obvious: 'The Plato of Panaetius' was a text of Plato edited by Panaetius, possibly for his private use, and equally famous as the Plato, the Demosthenes or the Aeschines of Atticus or the Homers of Aristarchus.

In view of the fact that in this context other 'editions' are mentioned, too, we must rule out the possibility that 'The Plato of Panaetius' (Πλάτων ὁ Παναητιῶν) refers to a text by the stoic philosopher *on* Plato. Gourinat concludes that the passages concerning Panaetius' interest for Plato, when read in the light of the passage in Galen,

---

<sup>39</sup> V. Boudon-Millot, "Un traité perdu de Galien miraculeusement retrouvé: Le *Sur l'inutilité de se chagriner*" texte grec et traduction française, in V. Boudon-Millot, A. Guardasole, M. Caroline (eds.), *La science médicale antique: Nouveaux regards. Études réunies en l'honneur de J. Jouanna*, Paris, Beauchesne, 2007, p. 72-123.

<sup>40</sup> J.-B. Gourinat, "Le Platon de Panétius: A propos d'un témoignage inédit de Galien", *Philosophie Antique*, 8, 2008, p. 141.

take on a whole different meaning and correspond with the existence of Panaetius' editorial work on Plato's text: this edition [...] must have been accompanied by a commentary, which could have consisted in a parallel work [...] or an introduction to the edition.<sup>41</sup>

According to Gourinat, the expression Πλάτων ὁ Παναητιῶν alludes to practices “of ancient bibliographies which listed a reference edition under the name of the city where it had been produced or under the name of its editor, if he was known: in the first case, one spoke of editions κατὰ πόλεις, in the latter of editions κατ' ἄνδρα”.<sup>42</sup> For this practice, distinctive of the ancient ‘editions’ of Homer, Gourinat refers to the *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, published by West.<sup>43</sup> However, the meaning West attributes to αἱ κατ' ἄνδρα, “‘personal’ texts, the ones named after particular scholars, or owners”,<sup>44</sup> is contrary to the one Gourinat recognizes in the expression Πλάτων ὁ Παναητιῶν, and none of the examples mentioned in West corresponds with the wording in Galen.

This interpretation has never convinced me, and it does not convince me now in spite of Gourinat's attempt to counter my objections:<sup>45</sup>

It can hardly be doubted that ‘The Plato of Panaetius’ was not a manuscript of Plato's text in Panaetius' possession, but the editorial work that Panaetius had accomplished himself, possibly for his personal use or that of the narrow circle of his disciples, but more likely in view of a publication. Galen [...] places ‘The Plato of Panaetius’ on the same level as ‘The Homers of Aristarchus’, which speaks for a well-known and renowned edition. The dissemination of ‘The Plato of Panaetius’ might have exceeded Panaetius' intentions, but judging by the description provided by Galen, it clearly acquired the status of a widespread edition. It goes without saying that such

---

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 148, 149, thence the two quotations.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 145.

<sup>43</sup> Gourinat refers to M. L. West, *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich-Leipzig, Saur, 2001, p. 61-73, yet pages 33-73 must be considered.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., p. 52. As ‘personal’ texts named after particular scholars or owners, West interprets the Homer of Zenodotus (“Zenodotus' text was a rhapsode's copy, or directly descended from one. It was not a critical text constructed by him from multiple sources, but a single exemplar that he happened to own and in which he marked his atheteses: that was his διόρθωσις”, p. 43. Cf. p. 39 and 45), that of Antimachus of Colophon (“it was evidently a set of book-rolls to be found in the Alexandrian library, labelled in some way as having belonged to Antimachus. [...] it may simply have been his personal copy of Homer”, p. 53) and that of Rhianus of Crete (“so there is not certainty that his was a critical recension [...], rather than just a copy that he had owned”, p. 57).

<sup>45</sup> J.-B. Gourinat, “Le Platon de Panétius”, in J.-B. Gourinat-F. Alesse, “Panétius de Rhodes”, in R. Goulet (dir.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, V 1, Paris, CNRS, 2012, p. 135-137.

an edition was not necessarily a ‘critical edition’ in the modern sense of the term, but the publication of a new text, based on the correction of manuscripts that the ‘editor’ had at his disposal.

The Πλάτων ὁ Παναητίου mentioned by Galen can thus only indicate<sup>46</sup> a manuscript of the Platonic *Dialogues* in Panaetius’ possession, who might eventually, as Galen himself used to do, have annotated or adapted it for his own personal use. The copies of the Platonic text which used to belong to Panaetius (the original that I presuppose was conserved in one of the Palatine libraries, and the copy which Galen apparently owned) were forever lost in the great fire in early 193 AD.

I believe that my hypothesis is also confirmed if we accept the text of the passage in Galen that Stramaglia proposes, and particularly his suggestion to retain ἀυτόγραφα, to be understood

not as ‘autographic originals’ of works written by the παλαιοί themselves who these books had belonged to, but as copies in which the παλαιοί had transcribed by their own hand (ἐνεγράψαντο) [conjecture by Stramaglia for ἀνεγράψαντο in the manuscript] and, in doing so, in many cases annotated the works of famous earlier *auctores*.<sup>47</sup>

‘The Plato of Panaetius’ belonged to this type of books.

Perhaps we can take a small step forward in the reconstruction of this difficult text. I am fully convinced that ἀυτόγραφα is to be conserved and that ἀνεγράψαντο does not make sense and must thus be corrected. Of all suggestions, I would like to defend the ἀν<τ>εγράψαντο advocated by Jouanna, yet attributing to this verb a different sense.

Basing himself on a parallel in the *Athenaion Politeia* (54 3) by Aristotle, referring to the tasks of the secretary (γραμματεὺς) of the prytany, ὃς τῶν γραμμάτων ἐστὶ κύριος καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα τὰ γιγνόμενα φύλαττει καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται, Jouanna understands the verb ἀντιγράφομαι in the sense of ‘transcribe’ (thus the secretary ‘transcribes all the rest’): “We

---

<sup>46</sup> See also V. Nutton, “Galen’s Library”, in C. Gill, T. Whitmarsh, J. Wilkins (eds.), *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, Cambridge, CUP, 2009, p. 28 (“the Plato that had belonged to Panaetius”); P. Tucci, “Galen’s Storeroom, Rome’s Libraries, and the Fire of A.D. 192”, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 21, 2008, p. 142; C. Jones, “Books and Libraries in a Newly-discovered Treatise of Galen”, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 22, 2009, p. 391; Stramaglia, “Libri perduti per sempre”, p. 122 and Vegetti, *Galeno. Nuovi scritti autobiografici*, p. 287-290.

<sup>47</sup> Stramaglia, *ibid.*, p. 128.

are certainly looking at the manuscript copy here. It was clearly not the secretary himself who copied, but he had public slaves copy for him. The factitive is, however, implicit”. Jouanna translates the sentence in Galen as follows: “Étant donné qu’étaient conservés à l’intérieur (des bibliothèques) ces fameux écrits que, livre par livre, avaient écrits ou transcrits les hommes auxquels les livres devaient leur nom”.<sup>48</sup>

In my opinion, the verb ἀντιγράφωμαι does not mean ‘transcribe’, ‘copy’ (as Stramaglia already recognized), but rather ‘check’, ‘verify’, ‘control’ or ‘examine’ a written text (by collation with one’s own model or other). The verb ἀντιγράφωμαι has, in fact, the same meaning in the passage of Aristotle’s *Athenaion Politeia* (54 3; see also 54 4), as results from the close parallels quoted in the commentary by Rhodes.<sup>49</sup> If this is the case, the sentence in Galen must be translated as follows: “in which were conserved the same writings that had, book by book, either been written or checked by the men who these books are named after”, that is, books copied (ἔγραψαν) for personal use by the men who these books are named after (ἄνδρες ὧν ἦν ἐπώνυμα τὰ βιβλία) or books copied by them or others and checked (ἀντεγράψαντο) by the men who these books are named after, on the basis of their model or other copies.<sup>50</sup>

### Conclusions

To conclude, I can only recall, briefly and succinctly, the hypothesis I have discussed and the results I have attained in this paper. Gurd’s study on Galen’s use of the expressions πρὸς ἕκδοσιν and οὐ πρὸς ἕκδοσιν presupposes more often than one might think a number of results of my earlier contributions which Gurd seems to have read a little too hastily and only in the non-updated French version. Concerning the question as to which meaning must be attributed to the adjectives Ἀττικιανὰ or ἀττικά or Ἀττίκεια, an article by Luzzatto has brought me to express a necessary

---

<sup>48</sup> Jouanna in *Galien: Ne pas se chagriner*. Texte établi et traduit par V. Boudon-Millot et J. Jouanna, avec la collaboration de A. Pietrobelli, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2010, p. 53-54, thence the quotations.

<sup>49</sup> P.-J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1981, p. 600-604. Rhodes, *ibid.*, p. 601, translates καὶ τὰλλα πάντα ἀντιγράφεται as follows: “And checks the recording of everything else”.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. T. Dorandi, “Due note a Clearco e Galeno”, in *Festschrift I. Taifacos*, forthcoming.

*caveat* against the tendency of correcting and harmonizing these three forms into one and to try to be as faithful to the tradition as possible. However, the question of what these adjectives really designate remains unanswered: Attic editions (possibly compiled in the 2nd c. AD) of Plato, but also of Demosthenes and Aeschines?, ‘editions’ or ‘copies’ of those same texts, arranged by or under the direction of a certain Atticus, whether he be the famous friend of Cicero’s and/or a βιβλιογράφος mentioned by Lucian and Galen? Or do the adjectives, in fact, indicate both of these text types? Finally, in view of the expression Πλάτων ὁ Παναιτίου, I have corroborated my hypothesis that it refers to the copy of the edition of Plato owned by the stoic philosopher, who annotated and revised it for his personal use, but certainly not for an edition of the *Dialogues* that he was working on. This interpretation is supported in the text of the passage of Galen as restored by Stramaglia.\*

#### REFERENCES

- Boudon-Millot, Véronique, *Un traité perdu de Galien miraculeusement retrouvé: Le Sur l’inutilité de se chagriner: texte grec et traduction française*, in Véronique Boudon-Millot, Alessia Guardasole, Magdaleine Caroline (eds.), *La science médicale antique: Nouveaux regards. Études réunies en l’honneur de J. Jouanna*, Paris, Beauchesne, 2007, p. 72-123.
- Boudon-Millot, Véronique-Jouanna, Jacques (eds.) *Galien: Ne pas se chagriner*. Texte établi et traduit par Véronique Boudon-Millot et Jacques Jouanna, avec la collaboration de Antoine Pietrobelli, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2010.
- Canfora, Luciano, “Le collezioni superstiti”, in G. Cambiano, L. Canfora, D. Lanza (eds.), *Lo spazio letterario della Grecia antica*, II. *La ricerca e l’attualizzazione del testo*, Roma, ed. Salerno, 1995, p. 95-250.
- Dorandi, Tiziano, “Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut: Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den antiken Schriftstellern”, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 87, 1991, p. 11-33.

---

\* I read a short version of these pages at the Conference *Books and Quotes: Scientific Works and Scholarly Editions in the 2nd Century AD*, Berlin Academy of Sciences and Humanities, September 28-29, 2012 organized by Liba Taub and Roland Wittwer. I read again this paper in Hamburg on January 23, 2014 at the *Sonderforschungsbereich 950 ‘Manuskriptkulturen in Asien, Afrika und Europa’* by invitation of Prof. Christian Brockmann. I would like to thank the organizers of the Berlin Congress, Professor Brockmann and all the participants at the two meetings for the invitation and their always relevant observations. Prof. D. Hutchinson (Toronto) corrected and improved my English.

- Dorandi, Tiziano, *Le stylet et la tablette: Dans le secret des auteurs antiques*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2000.
- Dorandi, Tiziano, *Nell'officina dei classici: Come lavoravano gli autori antichi*, Roma, Carocci, 2007.
- Dorandi, Tiziano, "Editori' antichi di Platone", *Antiquorum Philosophia*, 4, 2010, p. 161-174.
- Dorandi, Tiziano, "Due note a Clearco e Galeno", in *Festschrift I. Taifacos*, forthcoming.
- Erbì, Margherita, "La retorica dell'Epicureismo: una riflessione", *Cronache Ercolanesi*, 41, 2011, p. 189-205.
- Fuhr, Karl (ed.), *Demosthenis Orationes I 1*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1914.
- Garofalo, Ivan-Lami, Alessandro, *Galeno. L'anima e il dolore. De indolentia, De propriis placitis* (a cura di), Testo greco a fronte, Milano, Rizzoli, 2012.
- Gourinat, Jean-Baptiste, "Le Platon de Panétius': A propos d'un témoignage inédit de Galien", *Philosophie Antique*, 8, 2008, p. 139-151.
- Gourinat, Jean-Baptiste, "Le Platon de Panétius", in Jean-Baptiste Gourinat-Francesca Alesse, "Panétius de Rhodes", in Richard Goulet (dir.), *Dictionnaire des philosophes antiques*, V 1, Paris, CNRS, 2012, p. 135-137.
- Groningen, Bernard Abraham, van, "ΕΚΔΟΣΙΣ", *Mnemosyne*, 16, 1963, p. 1-17.
- Gurd, Sean A., "Galen on ἔκδοσις", in Thomas Schmidt, Pascale Fleury (eds.), *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times: Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son époque*, Toronto-Buffalo-London, University of Toronto Press, 2011, p. 169-184.
- Hemmerdinger, Bertrand, *Essai sur l'histoire du texte de Thucydide*, Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1955.
- Hemmerdinger, Bertrand, "Ἀττικισμός: Quid?", *Bollettino dei Classici*, 18, 1997, p. 55-56.
- Jones, Christopher, "Books and Libraries in a Newly-discovered Treatise of Galen", *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 22, 2009, p. 390-397.
- Luzzatto, Maria Jagoda, "Emendare Platone nell'Antichità: Il caso del *Vaticanus gr. 1*", *Quaderni di Storia*, 34, 2008, p. 29-85.
- Nutton, Vivian, "Galen's Library", in Christopher Gill, Tim Whitmarsh, John Wilkins (eds.), *Galen and the World of Knowledge*, Cambridge, CUP, 2009, p. 19-34.
- Pecere, Oronzo, *Roma antica e il testo: Scritture d'autore e composizione letteraria*, Roma-Bari, Laterza, 2010.
- Pierro, Maria Rita, *Luciano: Contro un bibliomane ignorante*, Palermo, Sellerio, 1994.
- Rhodes, Peter John, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1981.
- Roselli, Amneris, "Libri e biblioteche a Roma al tempo di Galeno: La testimonianza del *De indolentia*", *Galenos*, 4, 200, p. 127-148.
- Roselli, Amneris, "Galeno e la filologia del II secolo", in Edoardo Bona, Carlos Lévy, Giuseppina Magnaldi (eds.), *Vestigia notitia. Scritti in memoria di Michelangelo Giusta*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso, 2012, p. 63-80.

*Ancient ἐκδόσεις*

- Stramaglia, Antonio, “Libri perduti per sempre: Galeno, *De indolentia* 13; 16; 17-19”, *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 139, 2011, p. 118-147.
- Tucci, Pierluigi, “Galen’s Storeroom, Rome’s Libraries, and the Fire of A.D. 192”, *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, 21, 2008, p. 133-149.
- Vegetti, Mario, *Galeno, Nuovi scritti autobiografici*. Introduzione, traduzione e commento, Roma, Carocci, 2013.
- West, Martin L., *Studies in the Text and Transmission of the Iliad*, Munich-Leipzig, Saur, 2001.

TIZIANO DORANDI  
CNRS - Centre J. Pépin/UPR 76 Villejuif  
dorandi@vjf.cnrs.fr