

# MICHELE CURNIS

## *Topic on contribution about Stobaeus*

*Plato Stobaeensis*. Studies in indirect manuscript tradition of platonic quotations in the *Anthologion* of Johannes Stobaeus.

In this work-project I would analyzed the platonic quotations in the *Anthologion* of Johannes Stobaeus, to point out the manuscript problems of textual evidences, in a comparison between the main tradition (the authentic and complete text of Plato, his manuscripts, and of course *papyri*), and the indirect one (especially quotations from authors of late antiquity). The purpose is to find the numerous textual variations, that oppose the *lectiones* of Stobaeus to these ones of direct tradition of Plato. They are first of all different, but in what way? Recent studies (by D. T. Runia, J. Mansfeld, R. M. Piccione, L. Canfora) have showed that the variations of secondary literature (Proclus, Olympiodorus, Eusebius, Jamblichus, Stobaeus) are often superior than the direct text of each quoted author. In the Stobaeus we can find a lot of platonic *lectiones difficiliores* (some times *veriores* too), because Plato is the most quoted author in the *Anthologion* (at the same time with Euripides and Plutarchus). Scholars have not yet studied all these textual variations, because the editors of the Stobaeus (C. Wachsmuth and O. Hense, with their five volumes edition of 1884-1912) have often rejected the original text of the *gnomologus* (because of a philological prejudice about constant superiority of direct tradition), getting back the direct text of medieval manuscripts of Plato.

But nowadays indirect tradition too has to be considered with a new methodology: I think above all at the studies of S. Timpanaro about Vergilius (especially the last book of the great scholar, *Virgilianisti antichi e tradizione indiretta*, Firenze 2001). On the other hand we must study too, how the quotations in late anthologies become a new and autonomous text, with definite, didactic aims: the school purpose of late antiquity literature maybe is not only to preserve ancient texts, but even to discuss them, in order that they come alive again. In a *florilegium* a little fragment too can change into a marvellous teaching.

After have studied the summons of *The Laws* in *Anthologion*, I would work on these ones of *Republic* (the most quoted platonic text in the anthology), **(1)** to understand the quotation method of Johannes, **(2)** which text of Plato Stobaeus could have used for his work, and **(3)** to find fragments of better text (if possible) in indirect tradition. About direct tradition of *Republic* I'm going to examine, for example, the excellent American study, by G. Boter, *The textual Tradition of Plato's Republic*, Leiden 1989; but a specific research about indirect tradition of this dialogue (in late antiquity and Byzantine texts) doesn't exist. The result of all the work already made is an encouragement to continue the systematic comparison (philological and linguistic) of different traditions, in order to establish which textual typology has the greater probability of being closest to the oldest version of the original text. Still today, in most cases, every evidence of indirect tradition of a classical text is usually considered a partial copy, full of mistakes (in transcription, because of distraction), or even knowingly inserted by the copyist (for ideological reasons or due to stylistic prejudice). It is necessary to reflect on an item of a macroscopic nature: all the indirect affirmations of a text go back to a manuscript tradition (that of the author who quotes and uses the classical text under examination) which is definitely older than the oldest direct tradition manuscripts of the same text.