
This, the first volume of a complete edition of these important scholia, is a revised version of the editor’s doctoral thesis at Florence, published in the series of works on ancient scholarship directed by Franco Montanari. Despite some reservations, it is to be greatly welcomed and will immediately become the standard text.

The long and detailed introduction, in Italian, begins (pp. i-xxviii) with a survey of the previous editions and the manuscripts used for them, and of investigations into the sources and history of the scholia. There follow sections on the scholia on the *Gorgias* (pp. xxviii-xliv), including enquiries into the two or three scribes who wrote them in the MS. B (Bodl. Clark. 39), viz. B¹ (possibly Arethas, though he cannot be their author; philosophical scholia), B² (also possibly Arethas at a later date), and B³ (later than B¹, but possibly directed by Arethas; grammatical scholia, also in the other MSs), and into the relationship between B³ and the other MSs; on those on the *Theaetetus, Sophista,* and *Alcibiades I* (pp. xliv-lxii), where B¹ and the related D (Marc. gr. 185) have both types; and on those on the remaining dialogues (pp. lxii-lxxxi), where B¹ has only philosophical scholia. Next, and both elaborating on and summarising the preceding, a section on the origin and formation of the corpus (pp. lxxxi-cvi), and finally a description of the basis and content of the edition (pp. cvi-cvii).

After the sigla (relating to the MSs, to testimonia, and to ancient and modern authors) the text follows with three apparatuses (parallels within the scholia, external parallels, and apparatus criticus), bibliography, and indexes (of names, places, and of passages cited).

For the past 70 years ‘Schol. Plat.’ has meant the edition of W.C. Greene, published in 1938 but based on the work of several decades earlier by F.F. Allen, J. Burnet, and C.P. Parker. Cufalo’s is superior to this in almost every respect (its failings may be found in Cufalo’s apparatus, passim). In addition to the MSs B, T (Marc. Gr. app. cl. 4, 1) and W (Vindob. suppl. gr. 7), he uses D and P (Pal. gr. 173); all of these have been collated personally, P in the original, the rest from microfilm,¹ this is particularly important for W, where the previous collation was inadequate.² A number of short notes omitted by Greene are included. The unhelpful and potentially misleading division into ‘scholia vetera’ and ‘scholia

¹ One might wish that he had looked at B and T, where modern technology applied to the original might yield better results in faded passages.

² This is similar to the situation with regard to Plato himself; see e.g. Dodds’ edition of the *Gorgias* (Oxford 1959), 39, Bluck’s of the *Meno* (Cambridge 1961), 133.
Arethae’ is abandoned, and all scholia on a dialogue, whatever MS they derive from, are printed together, numbered sequentially. Testimonia are given much more fully, and the analysis of them is thorough and takes account of the relevant scholarship, whereas Greene was already in the 1930s considerably out of date. The text is suitably conservative for this type of material, i.e. errors from within the tradition are corrected, while those deriving from the sources are not.

My reservations relate to both introduction and testimonia, and more to the presentation than the content. Specialists on Plato and on ancient grammatical and lexicographical literature will obviously be significant users of the work, but they will not be the exclusive ones. Others will have occasion to look at single passages for a variety of purposes, and clearly it would be beneficial to them to know the nature and sources of the material. As the book stands, they will have to read over a hundred pages of closely argued text to discover this, with no overview or summary to assist them. And even the specialists would benefit from such a summary. It would say, in essence: the corpus of Platonic scholia is made up of three parts, compiled from older sources in the ninth century: first philosophical (found in the MSs BD), second proverbial (largely in the MS T, using sources similar to Zenobius Ath. and the scholia on Olympiodorus), and third grammatical and lexicographical (in the MSs BTWP, using *inter alia* a version of the enlarged Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων); with references to the parts of the introduction where more detailed discussion may be found. I would strongly suggest that such a summary is provided in the next volume.

With regard to the testimonia (which include all references from the grammatical and lexicographical literature, not only those related to the scholium in question; useful collections on e.g. ὦ τῶν *Ap. 25c6* n. 35 and Ἀχελῶς *Phdr. 230b7-8* n. 28), I have two problems. Frequently one scholium has several sections, from different sources; but the testimonia for each of these are not clearly differentiated. For example that on *Euthphr. 3a7* n. 11 is in three parts, clearly marked by vertical lines in the text, but the testimonia for each run on, separated only by semi-colons. In such cases a more emphatic separator is required, whether it be a vertical line as in the text, or numbering, or paragraphing. There are also cases where the sections are numbered, but even there it requires very close reading to find the divisions (e.g. *Phdr. 260c7* n. 119).

Secondly, the reasons for the order in which the testimonia are listed are not clear. In *Euthphr.* just cited, the first part is from the Συναγωγή (of which there are here several witnesses), and its gloss derives from the Atticist Pausanias (quoted by Eustathius); but instead of stating this (or at least having this order), Cufalo begins with Pausanias. Similarly in *ibid. 4c4* n. 20 his order is Timaeus, Photius, Aelius Dionysius, Suda: logical would be Συναγωγή (witnesses Photius, Suda), from Timaeus and Aelius; the then following citations, preceded by ‘cf.’, are all in vari-