It would have been clearer to say that here the Souda may be offering a fragment of Pausanias.

The rare compound verb is found several times in Hippocrates, as may be verified from the Kühn–Fleischer Index Hippocraticus. Ruhnke was right here.

Why print quotations of Pindar and Cratinus as if they were prose?

The quotation presented as A. fr. 43A is in fact from ps.-Longinus 3.1.

Surely the word ἔυξοκ does not need to be described as ‘plutôt exotique et rare’.

I do not see the distinction in meaning that the Editor claims.

The point should have been made that συμβιβάζω is normally transitive.

Since συμβιβάζω can mean ‘pay’, especially taxes, the explanation makes sense, and the lemma was probably not taken from Plato or Antiphon. The scholium on Ar. Nub. 336 does not appear in the standard modern edition.

There was no need to see any difficulty in the use of διασφραγιζω.

One of the two occurrences of λέγεται looks like an erroneous dittography.

Despite the luxurious production the book is by no means free of misprints, particularly of the Greek accents. Most are easily corrected, but on p. 50 note that the figure for the number of entries in the lexicon of Hesychius should be 50,000, not 5,000.
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more explicit by citing from ch. 4, p. 114 ed. W.D. Smith. 167: It would have been clearer to say that here the Souda may be offering a fragment of Pausanias. 171: διεφθαρμό is not corrupt; this form of the perfect can be intransitive. 180: It ought to be made clear that Malchus wrote c. 500 or later and cannot be the source of the lemma. 186: Why print quotations of Pindar and Cratinus as if they were prose? 191: The rare compound verb is found several times in Hippocrates, as may be verified from the Kühn–Fleischer Index Hippocraticus. Ruhnke was right here. 193: Surely the word ἔτρος does not need to be described as ‘plutôt exotique et rare’. 194: I do not see the distinction in meaning that the Editor claims. 222: The quotation presented as A. fr. 43A is in fact from ps.-Longinus 3.1. 227: Bast’s expansion of the compendium results in a most unusual word. Capperonnier did better, and his dative looks preferable to the accusative. 235: The gloss is a typical hybrid of Latin and Greek. 241: Because of the last two words of the explanation the lemma probably comes from the passage of Herodotus referred to by the Editor. 246: I am puzzled by the rendering of ἀλαζονεύωσαθαι by ‘pousser le cri de guerre’. 268: The discussion fails to indicate whether the rare epithet πυραμοειδῆς is explained elsewhere. 288–9: Ar. fr. 130 should be cited as such from K.–A. 291: For ἔτροι one might read ἀμφότεροι. 338: If one is to discuss the orthography of the name Parnes, reference should be made to Ar. Ach. 348 and commentaries ad loc.

Reference to chess is a gross anachronism, and n. 274, apart from a misprint, seems to confuse πέσσειν with πεσσεῖσθαι. 380: The long text on p. 350 is a Souda entry, and Adler’s symbol P means Photius, not Pausanias. 389: I wonder if the puzzling σπαραστομίνη should be replaced by σπαραστομίνη found in the parallel scholium at Plat. Symp. 206d. 400: The point should have been made that συμβιβάζω is normally transitive. 407: συντατώμενος is perhaps to be explained by reference to the meaning of σχηματίζω given by LSJ s.v. II.3. 415: Since τελέω can mean ‘pay’, especially taxes, the explanation makes sense, and the lemma was probably not taken from Plato or Antiphon. 433: The scholium on Ar. Nuh. 336 does not appear in the standard modern edition.

There was no need to see any difficulty in the use of διασφραγίζω.

One of the two occurrences of λέγεται looks like an erroneous dittography.

Despite the luxurious production the book is by no means free of misprints, particularly of the Greek accents. Most are easily corrected, but on p. 50 note that the figure for the number of entries in the lexicon of Hesychius should be 50,000, not 5,000.
With the *Timaeus*, the *Parmenides* constituted the climax of Platonic studies according to the Neoplatonic canon formalised by Iamblichus. The dialogue is seen as a vital contribution to metaphysics and especially to theology by most prominent Platonists at least from the later treatises of Plotinus onwards. It remained so for most members of the Athenian school, with the notable exception of Marinus, until Justinian hastened the demise of the school in A.D. 529. From the scholaer of that era, Damascius, we have extensive discussion of it. However, apart from a fragmentary part of an earlier commentary in a famous Turin palimpsest (suggestive in places of Porphyry), re-edited in 1995 in the *Corpus dei papyri filosofici. III: Commentary* and by G. Bechtle (*The Anonymous Commentary on Plato’s ‘Parmenides’* [Bern, 1999]), we have no extant commentary on this dialogue prior to Proclus. In fact it is largely through Proclus that the earlier history of *Parmenides*-interpretation may be studied. When one adds that commentaries were the most important vehicle of Platonist communication, and that Proclus’ position as the greatest ancient commentator on Plato is undisputed, it becomes clear that this particular commentary is of paramount importance to the study of later Platonism. The introductory book is of special importance in showing the hermeneutical strategies of Proclus and his predecessors, while Books 2 and 3 examine some of the most widely appealing material in the *Parmenides*, where ‘Socrates’ is questioned about his postulation of ‘forms’ (128e6–130e4).

Hitherto we have been dependent primarily on two editions of V. Cousin (1839, 1864). But, as S. shows (pp. xxi–xxiv), the Latin translation made by William of Moerbeke before 1286 is from a text far superior to surviving Greek manuscripts. Part of the Latin version, beyond the cut-off point of the Greek text, was published in 1953 by R. Klibansky and C. Labowsky in the *Plato Latinus* series, and a text of the full Latin was published by S. himself in two Louvain volumes (1982, 1985). In effect this makes all earlier work on both texts and translations in need of replacement. It also makes S. uniquely qualified to lead a project intended to do this, a project in which he is joined by C. Macé (Book 2) and P. d’Hoine (Book 3). Two refrains of the *appendix criticus* are the words *correximus ex g* and *addidimus ex g*, where g is of course S.’s reading of William’s Latin.

The need to consider the Latin systematically has inevitably forced an especially thoughtful treatment of textual variants and problems, as well as producing a reassessment of the quality of Parisinus Graecus 1810 (corrected by Pachymeres) as compared with the rest of the Greek manuscript tradition (pp. xxvii–xxxix). Paying regular attention to textual matters, I have for the most part found myself agreeing with the readings selected, and particularly in cases where the Latin has been of help. For instance, at 725.15–27 the revised text with Cousin’s correction, plus corrections from the Latin, made the argument substantially clearer, while reading Δέας for αίρεις at 830.15 again makes the argument clear. I had to look carefully before agreeing that something which seems at first sight palaeographically implausible at 751.8 is actually a huge improvement, and I could have saved myself some agonising had I heeded *vide introductionem* in the *apparatus*.

Improvements are not confined to those assisted by the Latin. Notable corrections have been made at points of the text that are critical for our understanding of the earlier exegetical tradition. Following p. xxxv, I look forward to seeing what is done at 1058.5–8 in a subsequent volume, but an example from this volume is the largely convincing transposition of material at 631.1–25, explained at pp. xxvi–xxvii. Even here a lacuna is postulated at 631.7. And one may question whether the Latin’s *narrativum* really justifies the natural *ψυχητικῶν* for *ψυχητικὸν* at 631.4, for it sounds
more like the unsatisfactory δημητριάκος, and might equally have been an attempt to render the prefix-less form. Naturally there are other emendations whose correctness one may legitimately doubt, such as the addition of ψευδαναμοναίτητος at 747.20, for while the construction of a single term indicating the Idea of a privation is not without parallel, it is certainly clumsy and the argument is intelligible without it.

The restoration of σεμποτός for σχεμάτων at 735.5 could be right but is a tactic of last resort, and the alleged forward reference of ἡ ἐσται προιόντα δήλον to 774.25 seems to come unstuck over the word δήλον. Inevitably not all textual cruces are solved, such as the locus nondum sanatus at 752.3–4, where I suggest σιγαρά τό εἶναι <ἀνθρώπους> ἀνθρώπου ἀπειροί ἐνοικ<αι>.

This edition comes with a readable English preface and important appendices, giving a list of passages relevant to orthography, a list of variations within MSS of the principal Greek tradition, an 18-page list of the Latin’s disagreements with the Greek MSS, and a collection of scholia. Select parallels are offered at the foot of the text, usually involving Platonic dialogues, but without further comment the degree of helpfulness varies, as when SVF 2.1027 (306.19–21) is cited in relation to those who connect the Ideas with spermatikoi logoi. It is important that elements of the Peripatetic and Stoic theories treated at 731.15–26 influenced the Platonic and Neopythagorean tradition in the early Roman Empire, and that Thrasyllus’ spermatikos logos (T23.11–12 = Porphyry, Harm. p.12.11f.) in particular does play a role closely related to the Platonic Ideas, alongside the Aristotelian theory of abstraction from repeated sensation (T23.25–33, Harm. pp. 13–14).

Small reservations are almost inevitable, and nothing said above detracts from my view that this volume does the scholarly world great service, that it deserves a place in any serious collection on late antique philosophy, and that one must look forward greatly to the completion of this OCT project.
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‘We believe that the philosophy of late antiquity now stands where Hellenistic philosophy did in the early 1970s. It is, at least for the anglo-analytic tradition in the history of philosophy, the new unexplored territory.’ Harold Tarrant and Dirk Baltzly make this claim in their note on this new translation of Proclus’ Commentary on Plato’s Timaeus (p. viii), and, like this reviewer, many will agree. The lucid translations in these first two volumes of Proclus’ commentary may rightfully claim their place among the important publications of recent years in the field of late antique
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