umanitas
upplementum

Plutarque

Éditions, Traductions, Paratextes

Françoise Frazier, Olivier Guerrier (coords.)

Quot lectiones, tot Turnebi
Adrien Turnèbe in recent editions of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione*[1]

Bram Demulder (bram.demulder@arts.kuleuven.be)
KU Leuven / Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO)

Abstract — Current critical editions of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione* frequently mention the contributions of Adrien Turnèbe (Adrianus Turnebus, 1512 – 1565) in their *apparatus critici*. Behind this single name hide different sources which should be acknowledged in their diversity. For Turnèbe's reading of *De animae procreatione* we can refer to the handwritten notes in his reading exemplar, his edition of the work, and his translation. These sources do not always present the same textual solutions. By discussing all passages from *De animae procreatione* where current editors refer to Turnèbe, I sketch this diversity of sources and point to some misunderstandings which arise when it is not taken into account.

key words — *De animae procreatione*, edition, translation, *marginalia*, humanism, Renaissance

1. Introduction

If Montaigne's judgement is to be trusted, this paper brings together two of the greatest men in intellectual history: Plutarch and Adrien Turnèbe, or, as Montaigne lovingly calls them, 'nostre Plutarque' and 'mon Turnebus'[2]. Plutarch, whom Montaigne knew through Amyot's translation[3], is lauded as 'si parfaict et excellent juge des actions humaines'[4]. Montaigne was so deeply influenced by the Chaeronean's work that he had the feeling of 'le connoistre jusques dans l'ame'[5]. This influence is clear throughout his *Essais*, where he refers to Plutarch's work over five hundred times[6]. Less ubiquitous but perhaps even more heartfelt is his appreciation for the humanist Adrien Turnèbe, who died fifteen years

---

[1] I would like to thank Geert Roskam and Xanne Huybrecht for their valuable suggestions.

[2] 'Nostre Plutarque': *Essais* I, 26 = Villey and Saulnier 1988: 156 (henceforth VS, preceded by the page number); II, 2 (p. 346 VS). 'Mon Turnebus': *Essais* II, 12 (p. 578 VS).

[3] *Essais* II, 4; see Guerrier 2014: 547. On Plutarch and Montaigne, see also Konstantinovic 1989 and Guerrier 2004.

[4] *Essais* II, 2 (p. 346 VS); cf. II, 31 (p. 714 VS): 'Plutarque est admirable par tout, mais principalement où il juge des actions humaines'.

[5] *Essais* II, 31 (p. 716 VS).

[6] Guerrier 2014: 547. In *Essais* I, 47 (p. 284 VS) Montaigne voices his appreciation for 'les mots mesmes de Plutarque, qui valent mieux que les miens'. Also important is *Essais* II, 32, where Montaigne launches a vigorous defence of Plutarch as a historian against the accusations of Bodin (cf. also II, 10 on Montaigne's appreciation for Plutarch as a historian).

before the first edition of the *Essais* (1580) was published. In *Du pédantisme* Montaigne warmly praises Turnèbe as the prototypical opposite of the snobbish pseudo-intellectuals, who are targeted in this essay ('le plus souvent ils ne s'entendent ny autruy, et […] ils ont la souvenance assez pleine, mais le jugement entierement creux'). Turnèbe is exceptional because his great learning – 'n'ayant faict autre profession que des lettres, en laquelle c'estoit, à mon opinion, le plus grand homme qui fut il y a mil' ans' – is free from any pedantry. This is what made him 'l'ame la plus polie du monde'[7]. Elsewhere, Montaigne simply calls him 'Adrien Tournebu, qui sçavoit toutes choses'[8].

Adrien Turnèbe (1512 – 1565) started his career as a professor of Greek at the university of Toulouse in 1545[9]. On the death of his master Jacques Toussaint two years later, he returned to Paris, where he had studied, in order to become the Royal Reader in Greek at the *Collège des lecteurs roy-aux* (which is now the *Collège de France*). Subsequently, from 1561 until his death in 1565, he moved to the chair of Royal Reader in Greek and Latin Philosophy. Equally important was his appointment as *Imprimeur royal pour les livres grecs*, a position which he assumed in 1552. After four astonishingly productive years, he resigned from this post and was succeeded by his trustee Guillaume Morel.

Turnèbe's appointment as the royal printer marks the start of a prolific period in which he edited, translated, and commented a variety of classical texts, both pagan and Christian[10]. From his scientific accomplishments during this period and the years thereafter, it is clear that Turnèbe shared Montaigne's enthusiasm for Plutarch[11]. In 1552, his first year as royal printer, he published no less than four volumes of Plutarch: an edition and a translation of both *De animae procreatione* and *De primo frigido*. Four years later an annotated translation of *De defectu oraculorum* followed. In the posthumously published *Opera omnia* we find further translations of the *Septem sapientium convivium* and the spurious works *De fato* and *De fluviis*. Moreover, an autograph manuscript conserves a translation of *De virtute et vitio*.

---

[7] *Essais* I, 25 (p. 139 VS).

[8] *Essais* II, 23 (p. 440 VS). Montaigne also praises Turnèbe for his poetry and says that he 'sçavoit plus et sçavoit mieux ce qu'il sçavoit, que homme qui fut de son siecle, ny loing au delà' in *Essais* II, 17 (p. 661 VS). On the different ways of writing Turnèbe's name – Montaigne normally uses the Latinized name '(Adrianus) Turnebus', using the French 'Adrien Tournebu' only once – see Lewis 1998: 28–31.

[9] The definitive study about Turnèbe's bio-bibliography is Lewis 1998, on which I rely for the following paragraph.

[10] An exhaustive overview can be found in Lewis 1998: 105–212.

[11] While Plutarch may be Turnèbe's favourite Greek, his favourite author overall was undoubtedly Cicero. This latter appreciation was manifestly not shared by Montaigne; see e.g. Green 1975.

2. Turnèbe and Plutarch's *De animae procreatione*: a variety of sources

In what follows, I will focus on the mention of Turnèbe in the three critical editions of Plutarch's *De animae procreatione* which are commonly used today, i.e. the Teubner edition prepared by K. Hubert and corrected by H. Drexler (1959), H. Cherniss' edition in the Loeb Classical Library (1979), and the Italian edition in the Corpus Plutarchi Moralium by F. Ferrari and L. Baldi (2002)[12]. My intention is to show that a variety of sources hides behind the name 'Turnebus' in our *apparatus critici* and that unawareness of this variety can give rise to misunderstandings concerning Turnèbe's intentions and – perhaps – to an underestimation of his philological and philosophical *acumen*[13].

First, therefore, we need to consider the different sources to which the name 'Turnebus' can possibly point. Two have already been mentioned. Both Turnèbe's translation and his edition of *De animae procreatione* appeared on the same day, 23 January 1552. Whereas the translation was printed by Turnèbe himself as the new *imprimeur royal*, the edition was – quite remarkably – printed by Guillaume Morel. Nevertheless – and as the simultaneous publication already suggests – the two works are clearly intended as a pair, sharing the same illuminated upper border and a similar initial on the first page of text[14]. In the dedicatory letter preceding the translation, Turnèbe writes that he took up translating *De animae procreatione* while he was teaching Plato's *Timaeus*[15]. The edition does not offer paratextual material.

The most influential source of Turnèbe's reading of *De animae procreatione*, however, is neither his translation nor his edition, but the collection of scribbles in the margin of his own reading copy of Plutarch's *Moralia*, an exemplar of the 1509 edition printed in Venice by Aldus Manutius[16]. The reason for the

---

[12] Henceforth, I refer to all editions of *De animae procreatione* by the name(s) of the editor(s). The respective editions can be found in the first part of the bibliography. On the history of the text of the Moralia, including both the manuscript tradition and the editions, see Irigoin 1987. Wyttenbach 1795: lxxvii–cxxxv remains indispensable on the early editions. On renaissance translations see esp. Becchi 2009. For an introduction to *De animae procreatione* see Opsomer 2004.

[13] One important difference between our text of *De animae procreatione* and the text as it was received by Turnèbe and his contemporaries is the transposition of 1022E-1027F, which has been discovered only in the 19th century. After 1017C all current editions print 1022E-1027F before continuing with 1017C-1022E and 1027F-1032F. For discussion see Decorps-Foulquier 1982.

[14] The same border with similar initial reappears in both the translation and edition of *De primo frigido,* both of which were printed in the same year by Turnèbe himself. Of these publications we do not know the exact printing dates.

[15] 'Explicanti mihi Timaeum Platonis […] venit in mentem commentarium Plutarchi in procreationem animi in Latinum convertere.'

[16] On the Aldine edition see Irigoin 1987: cclxxxvii–ccxcii. Turnèbe's copy is conserved in the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* (location: Rés-J-94) and was digitized in April 2015 (ark:/12148/bpt6k8586633).

influence of these *marginalia* is that a selection made it into the *index* of the two-volume 1599 Frankfurt edition[17]. Unfortunately, as D. Wyttenbach was already aware, the report of the *marginalia* in the 1599 edition was done 'negligenter'[18]. Wyttenbach, moreover, was the first to remark that the *marginalia* were written in different hands[19], only one of which should be identified as Turnèbe's, whereas the 1599 edition lists readings from all hands as being Turnèbe's. Scholarly discussion ensued, then, on which hand is in fact Turnèbe's. M. Cuvigny, discussing previous attempts to solve this question, concludes in desperation: 'Quant à […] designer exactement ce qui revient ou non à la main de Turnèbe, nous avouons en être absolument incapable'[20]. Only a few years later, however, M. Decorps-Foulquier convincingly identified 'la grosse écriture visible en marge' as Turnèbe's[21], although there are instances where the difference between 'la grosse écriture' and the hand which she identifies as 'une écriture moyenne' is less clear than one would hope.

It has thus far been shown that a reference to Turnèbe in an edition of *De animae procreatione* can, at least theoretically, point to three different sources: the translation, the edition, or the notes in his Aldine copy. In the latter case, we need to be aware of the influence of the unreliable report of those readings in the 1599 Frankfurt edition and of the only quite recent identification of Turnèbe's hand among different other hands. In what follows, I will confront this variety of sources with what we find in current critical editions of Plutarch's treatise.

3. Turnèbe and recent editions of *De animae procreatione*

Before turning to the discussion of the passages where Turnèbe is adduced as a source in our recent critical editions of *De animae procreatione*, I want to make clear what the following discussion is *not*. First, it is not a full assessment of Turnèbe's textual criticism of this treatise. I am aware that, by starting from the mentions of Turnèbe in the *apparatus critici* of recent editions, I exclude the discussion of many of Turnèbe's *marginalia* and translational or editorial choices. Secondly, it is not a critique of the critical editions used here. I realize that it

---

[17] This is the edition to which the 'Stephanus' pages in our current editions refer. It is a reprint of Stephanus' original 1572 edition with, on the facing pages, reprints of Cruserius' 1564 translation of the *Lives* and Xylander's 1570 translation of the *Moralia*.

[18] Wyttenbach 1795: xcv: '[Q]uos [i.e. the editors of the 1599 edition] negligenter eo [i.e. the *exemplum Turnebi*] usos esse, plurimarum lectionum vel omissione vel vitiosa descriptione, infra ostendemus.'

[19] Wyttenbach 1795: xcv and Sturel 1908: 463–471 distinguish three different hands (cf. also Lewis 1998: 184). Cuvigny 1973: 65, however, rightly remarks that 'la distribution des variantes entre trois écritures simplifie arbitrairement les faits'. There are, indeed, at least four different hands at work (see also Decorps-Foulquier 1978: 282 with n. 2).

[20] Cuvigny 1973: 65.

[21] Decorps-Foulquier 1978.

would not add to the practicality and usefulness of these editions if all issues discussed here were included, although it might be possible to show Turnèbe in more of his diversity than has been done hitherto[22]. My only intention is to point to the complexity hiding behind a seemingly simple reference in an *apparatus* and to invite the reader to appreciate this complexity.

3.1 The Aldine marginalia *vs* the edition and translation

καὶ τῆς μὲν ὕλης τὸ μετοχῇ καὶ εἰκασίᾳ τοῦ νοητοῦ μορφωθὲν εὐθὺς ἁπτὸν <καὶ> ὁρατόν ἐστιν (*De an. procr.* 1013C)
'[A]nd any matter that by participating in the intelligible and simulating it has got shape is straightway tangible <and> visible […].' (tr. Cherniss[23])
Cherniss: <καὶ> −added by Xylander, implied by versions of Turnebus and Amyot
Hubert and Drexler: add. Turn.[24]

The insertion of καί is not merely, as Cherniss has it, 'implied' by Turnèbe (i.e. in his translation), only to be explicitly added by Xylander in his 1574 edition. Both Turnèbe's edition and his translation ('&') have it, so that there is no reason to suspect Turnèbe's intention to include it. One should write, like Hubert and Drexler: add[idit] Turn[ebus]. Turnèbe's Aldine edition has a καί written in the margin as well. However, it is clear that the hand is not Turnèbe's: the marginal note was added by a later owner of the book. How did a later addition, then, get into Turnèbe's edition and translation? Decorps-Foulquier discusses this particularly problematic case and suggests: 'l'auteur de ces leçons [i.e. the later owner of Turnèbe's copy] partageait peut-être avec Turnèbe éditeur la connaissance d'un manuscrit ou d'un recueil de variants perdu'[25]. Such speculation, however, is not necessary in this case: a philologist of Turnèbe's stature could easily have come up with this solution, perhaps based on the parallel later in the *De animae procreatione*[26], on his first-hand knowledge of Plato's *Timaeus*, in which we find a parallel as well[27], or simply on the logical assumption that the

---

[22] In a future edition one could, for instance, choose to designate different *sigla* to the three different Turnebian sources.

[23] All translations of *De animae procreatione* are taken from Cherniss' edition.

[24] As a rule, I will reproduce Cherniss' *apparatus* for the underlined words, only adding the apparatus of Hubert and Drexler and/or Ferrari and Baldi when they provide other or more information.

[25] Decorps-Foulquier 1978: 287.

[26] *De an. procr.* 1016D-E: τὸν κόσμον εἶναι γενητόν, ὅτι ὁρατὸς καὶ ἁπτὸς καὶ σῶμα ἔχων ἐστὶ ('the universe is subject to generation because it is visible and tangible and has body').

[27] *Tim.* 32B: συνεστήσατο οὐρανὸν ὁρατὸν καὶ ἁπτόν ('he [i.e. the demiurge] constructed the visible and tangible universe); *Tim.* 31B: σωματοειδὲς δὲ δὴ καὶ ὁρατὸν ἁπτόν τε δεῖ τὸ γενόμενον εἶναι ('[n]ow that which comes to be must have bodily form, and be both visible

nonsensical ἁπτὸν ὁρατόν needed a conjunction like καί[28].

<div align="center">*</div>

> ὅ γε μὴν οὗτοί τε κοινῇ καὶ οἱ πλεῖστοι τῶν χρωμένων Πλάτωνι φοβούμενοι
> καὶ <u>παραλυπούμενοι</u> […] (*De an. procr.* 1013D-E)
> 'In any case, what frightens and embarrasses these men [i.e. Xenocrates and
> Crantor, whose interpretations Plutarch has just refuted] in common with
> most of those who study Plato […].'
> *Cherniss*: παραμυθούμενοι –Turnebus.
> *Hubert and Drexler* (reading παραμυθούμενοι): παραλυπούμενοι Ω corr.
> Turn.

Critical editions indicate that Turnèbe read παραμυθούμενοι instead of the
manuscript's παραλυπούμενοι. Hubert and Drexler adopt this reading with the
comment 'corr[exit] Turn[ebus]'. In Turnèbe's Aldine copy of Plutarch's works,
we can indeed find the suggestion παραμυθόμενοι *in margine* in Turnèbe's
hand. However, both in his edition (παραλυπούμενοι) and in his translation
('anguntur') Turnèbe retains the manuscript (and Aldine) reading. About
such cases in general, where Turnèbe's marginal correction is not reflected in
his edition, Decorps-Foulquier hypothesizes that 'Turnèbe en a peut-être eu
connaissance postérieurement à son édition'[29]. An equally probable hypothesis
seems to me that there was, in Turnèbe's mind, a difference between a
handwritten correction – perhaps made by the reader in a spur of the moment
– and a printed correction and that, when preparing the edition, he just decided
against some of the corrections he had made earlier. There is – as far as I can see
– no reason to assume that the *marginalia* not featured in the edition were later
additions. Moreover, one could ask why – although this *argumentum e silentio* is
anything but decisive – these supposedly later corrections remained absent from
Turnèbe's later *magnum opus*: throughout the 30 books of his *Adversaria* – a
seemingly endless hotchpotch of readings and emendations of classical texts
of all sorts – Plutarch is discussed several times, but there is no mention of *De
animae procreatione*. To me it seems quite possible that the 1552 edition should
be considered Turnèbe's final word on this text.

<div align="center">*</div>

---

and tangible'; tr. Zeyl). We know from Turnèbe's dedicatory letter preceding his translation of
the *De animae procreatione* and from his *Praefatio in Timaeum* preserved in his *Opera omnia* (III,
46-49) that Turnèbe lectured on the *Timaeus*. (Cf. supra n. 15)

[28] Decorps-Foulquier 1978: 286 remarks that there are seven other instances where
marginalia from Turnèbe's Aldine copy which were not written by him reoccur in his edition.
These instances are easily explained, as the author does: one could be taken from an earlier
edition, two have identical solutions in *marginalia* which are written by Turnèbe and four are
solutions to 'fautes manifestes'. I think the instance ἁπτὸν <καὶ> ὁρατόν should not be singled
out as an exception: it belongs to the latter category.

[29] Decorps-Foulquier 1978: 286 n. 2.

[...] ἐξεῖλε τὴν πολλὴν ἀοριστίαν καὶ πλημμέλειαν ἁρμονία καὶ ἀναλογία καὶ ἀριθμῷ χρώμενος ὀργάνοις· ὧν ἔργον ἐστὶν οὐ μεταβολῇ καὶ κινήσει ἑτερότητος πάθη καὶ <u>διαφορᾶς</u> παρέχειν τοῖς πράγμασιν [...] (*De an. procr.* 1015E-F)

'[The demiurge] removed the vast indefinitude and jangle [sc. from matter], using as tools concord and proportion and number, the function of which is not by change and motion to impart to things the modifications of diversity and difference [...].'

Cherniss: διαφορᾶς –H. C. [i.e. an emendation proposed by Cherniss himself] ("diversitatis et differentiae" –Turnebus): διαφορὰς –mss.

All manuscripts have διαφορὰς. Cherniss introduced διαφορᾶς as an emendation of his own, although not without refering to Turnèbe's translation 'diversitatis et differentiae'. As opposed to a case which will be discussed later, the interpretation of the translation is correct. More importantly, however, full credit should have been given to Turnèbe, since he did include the (very plausible[30]) emendation διαφορᾶς in his edition[31]. There is, however, no mention of an emendation in Turnèbe's Aldine copy, so that this reading was not – through the list in the 1599 edition – passed on to subsequent editions.

<div align="center">*</div>

συμβέβηκεν οὖν ἐν μὲν τῇ ἀριθμητικῇ ταὐτῷ μέρει τὸ μέσον ὑπερέχεσθαι καὶ ὑπερέχειν, ἐν δὲ τῇ ὑπεναντίᾳ ταὐτῷ μέρει τῶν ἄκρων τοῦ μὲν ἀποδεῖν <u>τὸ</u> δ' ὑπερβάλλειν (*De an. procr.* 1019C-D)

'So it is characteristic in the arithmetical [sc. mean] for the middle [sc. term] to exceed and fall short by the same fraction and in the subcontrary [sc. mean] for it to be inferior to one of the extremes and to surpass the other by the identical fraction of them [...].'

Cherniss: τὸ -Turnebus; τοῦ -r; τὸν –all other mss., Aldine.

Cherniss' report seems to be – to phrase it rather irreverently – accidentally correct here. Since, in other cases, his references to Turnèbe's Greek text seem to be to the report of the *marginalia* in the 1599 Frankfurt edition, this is probably the case here as well. There we find indeed that Turnèbe read τὸ μὲν ἀποδεῖν τὸ δ' ὑπερβάλλειν, thus solving the problem of the impossible τὸν δ' from the majority of the manuscripts, but creating a new problem by reading τὸ μὲν before ἀποδεῖν, which should surely take a genitive. In the Aldine copy itself, then, we do find τὸ μὲν ἀποδεῖν τὸ δ' ὑπερβάλλειν in the margin, but in a different hand than Turnèbe's, the 1599 report thus being incorrect here. Moreover, in Turnèbe's hand we can (albeit hardly) read τοῦ, a reading which

---

[30] Cherniss ad *Quaest. Plat.* 1002D (p. 45 n. b) rightly points out that ἑτερότης καὶ διαφορά is a collocation which occurs quite frequently in Plutarch's philosophical works.

[31] *Pace* Ferrari and Baldi: '*corr*[exit] Chern[iss]'.

is also in one manuscript and which is not impossible, since ὑπερβάλλειν can take a *genitivus pro accusativo* (*LSJ* q.v. II.2.b). In his edition, however, Turnèbe ultimately preferred to read τὸ, thus printing the reading that is accepted today.

*

> νοῦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ <τὸ> <u>νοητὸν</u> ἡ τῆς νοητῆς μέθεξις ἀρχῆς ἐμπεποίηκε, δόξας δὲ καὶ πίστεις [...] τοῦτ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἐκ μονάδων οὐδὲ γραμμῶν οὐδ' ἐπιφανειῶν ἁπλῶς νοήσειεν ἐγγιγνόμενον. καὶ μὴν οὐ μόνον αἱ τῶν θνητῶν ψυχαὶ γνωστικὴν τοῦ <u>αἰσθητοῦ</u> δύναμιν ἔχουσιν […] (*De an. procr.* 1023D)
> 'Intelligence and intelligibility have been produced in her [i.e. the soul] by participation in the intelligible principle; but opinions and beliefs […] there is not anyone who could conceive of this arising in her simply from units or from lines or surfaces. Now, not only do the souls of mortal beings have a faculty that is cognizant of the perceptible […].'
> *Cherniss* ad νοητὸν: mss. and *Epitome* 1031B […]; νοητικὸν –Turnebus; νόησιν –Wyttenbach […].
> *Cherniss* ad αἰσθητοῦ: αἰσθητοῦ -Turnebus (so *Epitome* 1031C); αἰσθητικοῦ -mss.

Whereas Cherniss rejects Turnèbe's first correction (νοητικόν) and accepts the second (αἰσθητοῦ) (cf. also Ferrari and Baldi), Hubert and Drexler accept both Turnebian corrections. In the Aldine *marginalia* we indeed find the two corrections in Turnèbe's hand. In the edition, however, Turnèbe retains the manuscript readings in both cases[32].

(a) Wyttenbach comments on Turnèbe's *marginale* νοητικόν, which was reported in the 1599 edition, that it has the advantage of having an active sense (i.e. 'the intellective'), as opposed to the manuscript reading ('the intelligible'). However, Wyttenbach judges that this particular use of νοητικόν would require an article, so he rejects Turnèbe's marginal correction[33]. Wyttenbach's assumption that an active sense is necessary here, is – and this is what Cherniss seems to suggest in his translation – not correct: the active sense is covered by the mention of νοῦς and including the passive sense as well fits perfectly with Plutarch's philosophy[34]. Nevertheless, this does not seem to have been Turnèbe's reason for keeping the manuscript reading. His translation reads 'mentem enim et intelligentiae sensa' (for νοῦν μὲν γὰρ αὐτῇ καὶ νοητόν). It seems, thus, like he assumed that νοητόν could exceptionally take an active sense, which is not

---

[32] To my mind it is very unlikely that the reading preserved in the so-called *Epitome,* an excerpt of *De an. procr.* 1023B-1025B which is transmitted as a separate text in the *corpus Plutarcheum*, was a factor in Turnèbe's reasoning. Turnèbe's Aldine copy does not have a single *marginale* in Turnèbe's hand for the text of the *Epitome.*

[33] Wyttenbach: 'recepissem, si lectio, potius quam correctio videretur: hactenus placet, quod habet activam vim, quam locus requirit: sed item articulum requirit usus'.

[34] Cf. *Quaest. Plat.* 1002C-E.

impossible *per se* (*LSJ* q.v. II), but which is never the case in *De animae procreatione*, where νοητόν and νοητικόν (or νοερόν) remain distinguished. Turnèbe's doubt and his ultimate decision to retain the manuscript reading are, however, understandable and correct.

(b) Throughout *De animae procreatione* the distinction between τὸ αἰσθητόν (the perceptible) and τὸ αἰσθητικόν (the perceptivity) is strictly maintained[35]. It would thus probably be incorrect to read τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ and interpret this as 'of the perceptible', which seems clearly what is meant here. As appears from the translation, this is not what Turnèbe is doing in his edition. He translates: 'mortalium animi partis sentientis iudicio facultateque praediti sunt', thus understanding 'partis sentientis' / τοῦ αἰσθητικοῦ as pertaining to perceptivity, not perceptibility, and taking the genitive to express a specification of 'iudicio facultate' / γνωστικὴν δύναμιν. Both in his edition and his translation Turnèbe thus presents us with a reading which is far less evident with respect to the interpretation of the text, but attempts to save the manuscript reading.

<div align="center">*</div>

> […] τὴν τοῦ κόσμου φησὶν ἀνακυκλουμένην αὐτὴν πρὸς ἑαυτήν, ὅταν οὐσίαν σκεδαστὴν ἔχοντός τινος ἐφάπτεται καὶ ὅταν ἀμέριστον, λέγειν κινουμένην διὰ πάσης ἑαυτῆς, ὅτῳ τ' ἄν τι ταὐτὸν ᾖ καὶ ὅτου ἂν ἕτερον, πρὸς ὅ τι τε μάλιστα καὶ ὅπη καὶ <u>ὅπως</u> συμβαίνει κατὰ τὰ γιγνόμενα πρὸς ἕκαστον <ἕκαστα> εἶναι καὶ πάσχειν. (*De an. procr.* 1023E)
> '[…] he [i.e. Plato] says that the soul of the universe also as she is revolving upon herself, whenever she touches anything that has being either dispersed or indivisible, is moved throughout herself and states of anything's being the same and different with regard to whatever it is so precisely the respect and context and manner of its happening to be or to have as attribute <either of these> in relation to each among the things that come to be.'
> *Cherniss:* ὅπως <καὶ ὁπότε> –Pohlenz from *Timaeus* 37 B 1 (*cf. quid quoque loco aut modo aut tempore* –Turnebus).

An example of a correction inspired by Turnèbe's knowledge of Plato's *Timaeus*, where we read πρὸς ὅτι τε μάλιστα καὶ ὅπη καὶ ὅπως καὶ ὁπότε συμβαίνει (*Tim.* 37B). Whether or not this insertion should be accepted, Cherniss (and the other recent editors) should have given more credit to Turnèbe for proposing it. Not only does it occur in his translation – like in other cases where Plutarch cites the *Timaeus*, Turnèbe actually quotes from Cicero's *Timaeus* translation – but also in the edition. Since there is no marginal note in the Aldine exemplar – and, consequently, the correction was not transmitted through the 1599 Frankfurt edition – this has not been acknowledged in recent editions. As to

---

[35] This is not the case for the entire *corpus Plutarcheum*. See e.g. *De cap. ex inim.* 90B (with *LSJ* s.v. αἰσθητικός II).

the correctness of the insertion, I remain undecided. Given the fact that this is a rather confusing passage featuring a stack of question words, it is possible that the καὶ ὁπότε was omitted (consciously or unconsciously) by Plutarch himself or somewhere in the manuscript tradition.

<div align="center">*</div>

> […] θ´ καὶ κ´ καὶ ψ´, ὅς γ´ ἅμα τετράγωνός τε καὶ κύβος ἐστί· (*De an. procr.* 1028B)
> '[…] 729, which is at the same time a square and a cubic number […].'
> *Cherniss*: ὅς γ' –Hubert; ὅτι –E, B, e, u, Aldine; ὅτε –f, m, r, Escor. 72; ὅστις –Stephanus ("qui numerus" – Turnebus).

There is no *marginale* in the Aldine copy. The reading ὅστις does appear however in Turnèbe's edition, and Stephanus may have adopted it from there or from Turnèbe's translation, which he printed along with his own edition of *De animae procreatione* in his 1572 edition. Hubert's solution may be more elegant, but Turnèbe's suggestion certainly improves upon the manuscript readings.

<div align="center">*</div>

Considering all *marginalia* in general, Decorps-Foulquier remarks that '[l'] édition […] témoigne d'un effort de correction plus complet que les annotations de l'exemplaire qui reviennent à Turnèbe'[36]. I think all passages discussed here can be considered examples of this general rule: between his reading notes and his published works, Turnèbe added but also rejected corrections.

3.2 Translation *vs* edition

> ἡ μὲν <γὰρ> ἐκ τῆς νοητῆς καὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς οὐσίας λεγομένη μῖξις οὐ διασαφεῖται πῆ ποτε ψυχῆς μᾶλλον ἢ τῶν ἄλλων, ὅ τι ἄν τις εἴπῃ, γένεσίς ἐστιν. (*De an. procr.* 1013B)
> '<For>, as to what the one party calls the mixture of the intelligible and the perceptible being, it is not made clear how in the world this is generation of soul rather than of anything else one may mention […].'
> *Cherniss:* <γὰρ> added by Maurommates ("nam" –Turnebus; "car" –Amyot).

The insertion of γάρ is found first in Maurommates' 1848 edition. Cherniss mentions Turnèbe, who translates 'nam', as a predecessor of this solution. However, neither in Turnèbe's Aldine copy nor in his edition a trace of γάρ can be found. In the reading copy nothing is mentioned *in margine*. In the edition, however, Turnèbe shows awareness of a missing particle, but he inserts οὖν. Although Turnèbe exhibits great variation in translating οὖν – he uses more than ten synonyms throughout his translation of *De animae procreatione* (*igitur, ergo,*

---

[36] Decorps-Foulquier 1978: 287 n. 1.

itaque, *proinde*, …) – it seems unlikely that he intended the causal connector *nam* as a translation for the virtually opposite, consecutive connector οὖν. In any case, *nam* / γάρ is obviously the best choice if the structure of Plutarch's argument is taken into account: what follows after γάρ is an explanation of why – as was stated in the previous sentence – Plutarch's rival interpreters are mistaken. I cannot but wonder why Turnèbe did not match his translational conjecture with his editorial conjecture. Did he possess a witness which read οὖν?

*

οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐν Τιμαίῳ λεγομένην ἀνάγκην, ἐν δὲ Φιλήβῳ περὶ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον ἐλλείψεως καὶ ὑπερβολῆς ἀμετρίαν καὶ ἀπειρίαν τῇ ὕλῃ προστιθέντες ἀλλὰ μὴ τῇ ψυχῇ, ποῦ θήσονται τὸ τὴν ὕλην ἀεὶ μὲν ἄμορφον καὶ ἀσχημάτιστον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λέγεσθαι κτλ. (*De an. procr.* 1014 E-F)
'Those, however, who attribute to matter and not to soul what in the *Timaeus* is called necessity and in the *Philebus* measurelessness and infinitude in the varying degrees of deficiency and excess, what will they make of the fact that by Plato matter is said always to be amorphous and shapeless […]?'
Cherniss: Turnebus; ψυχῇ γε οὐ –mss. (ψυχῇ … vac. 16 –f; vac. 17 –m; vac. 10 –r … γε οὐ).

For ψυχῇ, ποῦ θήσονται our manuscripts read ψυχῇ γε οὐ θήσονται. The Aldine edition, however, along with three 16th-century manuscripts which go back to the same hyparchetype as Aldus' edition[37], posit a *lacuna* between ψυχῇ and γε οὐ. The change from γε οὐ to ποῦ is attributed to Turnèbe by our current editions[38] and is indeed found in Turnèbe's Aldine copy, where in his quirky hand he jotted down ποῦ θήσονται *in margine*. In his edition, however, Turnèbe retains the Aldine reading, perhaps incorrectly suspecting the *lacuna* to antedate the textual corruption to γε οὐ. In the translation, on the other hand, the conjecture written in the margin of his Aldine exemplar is used ('quo tandem modo tuebuntur', aptly rendering the exasperation included in the question word ποῦ with 'tandem'[39]).

*

[…] γενομένην δὲ καὶ γενητὴν πάλιν, ἣν ὁ θεὸς ἔκ τε ταύτης καὶ τῆς μονίμου τε καὶ ἀρίστης οὐσίας ἐκείνης ἔμφρονα καὶ τεταγμένην ἀπεργασάμενος καθάπερ εἶδος καὶ τῷ αἰσθητικῷ τὸ νοερὸν καὶ τῷ κινητικῷ τὸ τεταγμένον ἀφ' αὐτοῦ παρασχὼν ἡγεμόνα τοῦ παντὸς ἐγκατέστησεν. (*De an. procr.* 1016C)
'[…] come to be and so subject to generation is said on the other hand of soul that god installed as chief of the sum of things when out of this soul here and that abiding and most excellent being yonder he had produced a rational and

---

[37] See the stemma in Hubert and Drexler 1959: xvii.
[38] Hubert and Drexler: 'corr[exit] Turn[ebus]'.
[39] *LSJ* q.v. II: ποῦ used in 'indignant questions'.

orderly one and from himself had provided intellectuality and orderliness as form for her perceptivity and motivity.'
Cherniss: B. Müller ("de suo" –Turnebus; "ex se" –Dübner); ἀπ' αὐτοῦ –mss.

It seems impossible to retain the manuscript reading ἀπ' αὐτοῦ and make philosophical sense of the text. Müller, in his 1873 edition, prints the reflexive form ἀφ' αὐτοῦ for the first time, without reference to predecessors in his *apparatus*. This rather evident solution is adopted by all subsequent editions. Earlier translations, however, show awareness of a problem: Xylander did not translate ἀπ' αὐτοῦ and Cherniss mentions the translations of Turnèbe ('de suo') and Dübner ('ex se'), which seem to point to ἀφ' αὐτοῦ in the Greek text. However, just like Dübner, Turnèbe did not alter the Greek text: neither his edition nor his Aldine copy suggest the reading ἀφ' αὐτοῦ.

<center>*</center>

σαφέστατα διδάσκων ὡς οὐχὶ σώματος ἁπλῶς οὐδ' ὄγκου καὶ ὕλης, ἀλλὰ συμμετρίας περὶ σῶμα καὶ κάλλους καὶ ὁμοιότητος ἦν ὁ θεὸς πατὴρ καὶ δημιουργός. ταῦτα δὴ δεῖ διανοεῖσθαι καὶ περὶ ψυχῆς, ὡς τὴν μὲν οὔθ' ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γενομένην [...], τὴν δ' αὐτὸς ὁ θεὸς διαρμοσάμενος [...]. (*De an. procr.* 1017A-B)

'So he [i.e. Plato] most manifestly teaches that god was father and artificer not of body in the absolute sense, that is to say not of mass and matter, but of symmetry in body and of beauty and similarity. This, then, is what one must suppose in the case of soul also, that, whereas the one neither was brought into being by god […], the other was regulated by god himself […].'
Cherniss: ταὐτὰ –Hubert (dub., cf. "quod idem …" –Turnebus).

All current editions follow the manuscript reading ταῦτα, although the emendation ταὐτὰ has been proposed *dubitanter* by the editor of the Teubner edition. Cherniss refers to Turnèbe's translation ('idem') as a predecessor of this solution. Again, Turnèbe's edition retains the manuscript reading[40]. There is no marginal note in the Aldine exemplar. Any judgement on this passage will probably remain – like Hubert's – *dubitanter*, since both readings make perfect sense. Ταῦτα neutrally points forward to the explanatory ὡς clause. Ταὐτά pushes Plutarch's interpretation a bit more, since it emphasizes the parallel between the construction of the cosmic body and the cosmic soul, a key feature of Plutarch's exegetical efforts in this treatise. One could argue, however, that the parallelism is already sufficiently indicated by καί ('also') and that reading ταὐτά makes the sentence a little pleonastic.

---

[40] The same line, however, does have two marginal corrections to the Aldine reading (ἤν ὁ θεὸς corrected to ἦν ὁ θεὸς; ταῦτα δὴ, corrected to ταῦτα δεῖ). The same adjustments occur in Turnèbe's edition, but in my (duly cautious) opinion, the marginal corrections are not written in Turnèbe's hand.

*

ὁ γὰρ Θεόδωρος, οὐχ ὡς ἐκεῖνοι δύο στίχους ποιῶν ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μιᾶς εὐθείας ἐφεξῆς τούς τε διπλασίους ἐκτάττων καὶ τοὺς τριπλασίους, πρῶτον μὲν ἰσχυρίζεται τῇ λεγομένῃ κατὰ μῆκος <u>σχίσει</u> τῆς οὐσίας δύο ποιούσῃ μοίρας ὡς ἐκ μιᾶς οὐ τέσσαρας ἐκ δυεῖν (*De an. procr.* 1022D)
'For Theodorus unlike those others [i.e. Crantor and Clearchus] does not make two rows but sets out the double and the triple numbers one after another in a single, straight line, relying for this in the first place upon what is stated to be the cleavage of the substance lengthwise that makes two parts presumably out of one, not four out of two […].'
Cherniss: σχίσει –m (ί over original έ), Turnebus; σχέσει –all other mss., Aldine.

Once again, this seems to be an unproblematic correction: we find it in Turnèbe's hand in the Aldine copy as well as in the edition. The validity of the correction cannot be doubted, since we are dealing here with a clear reference to *Timaeus* 36B, where it is described how the world soul is sliced in two along its length (κατὰ μῆκος σχίσας). Turnèbe's knowledge of the *Timaeus* is apparent here. However, the translation poses a puzzling problem here: Turnèbe translates the manuscript (and Aldine) reading σχέσει instead of his own correction: 'Ac primum quidem nititur illo naturae *habitu* qui in porrectum dicitur.' I am at a loss to explain Turnèbe's choice of translation here. Was it perhaps just a translational lapsus?

*

The previous examples have shown that, in Turnèbe's mind, a translation was fundamentally different from an edition, while current editions refer to the edition and translation indiscriminately in order to report Turnèbe's view on the *constitutio textus*. In general, it should be kept in mind that Turnèbe allowed himself more liberty in the translation, while being more conservative in the edition.

3.3 Turnèbe wrongly reported

παραμυθούμενος, ὡς ἔνεστι, τὸ <u>ἄηθες</u> τοῦ λόγου καὶ παράδοξον (*De an. procr.* 1014A)
'[…] vindicating as far as may be by probability what is unusual and paradoxical about my account […]'
Cherniss: Wyttenbach (after the versions of Turnebus and Amyot); ἀληθές –mss.

A peculiar consequence of the greater freedom Turnèbe allowed himself while translating the text can be deduced from this example. All manuscripts have ἀληθές instead of ἄηθες, Wyttenbach's conjecture which is accepted by

all critical editions. Wyttenbach was particularly pleased with this conjecture, calling it 'certissima' but giving part of the credit to Turnèbe ('jam Turnebus vertit'). Wyttenbach indicates that Turnèbe's conjecture can be found in his translation. Indeed, there is no marginal note in Turnèbe's reading exemplar and his edition preserves the manuscript reading ἀληθές. However, I doubt that Turnèbe had a conjecture on his mind when translating this passage. He translates: 'ex verae rationis insolentia et admirabilitate, quoad eius facere potero, deonerans'. Wyttenbach probably saw 'insolentia' as an implied insertion of ἄηθες. However, Turnèbe, like his idol Cicero, constantly opts for paraphrasing one Greek word by two Latin words. To my mind, 'insolentia et admirabilitate' is Turnèbe's translation of the single word παράδοξον, intended to bring out two connotations included in the one Greek word. Taking 'insolentia' as a rendering of a conjecture ἄηθες would make it hard to account for the presence of the adjective 'verus' in Turnèbe's translation: with λόγος Plutarch refers to his account without any explicit claim as to its truth value. Elsewhere, Turnèbe understands this correctly and translates accordingly[41]. That the matter is less clear in this case is due to the fact that Turnèbe got into syntactic problems by interpreting παραμυθέομαι as 'deonerare' ('to remove a burden, unload', *OLD* q.v.), taking his inspiration for using this very rare Latin verb from – of course – Cicero[42]. This rendering of παραμυθέομαι is very well possible[43], but it would evidently be absurd to claim to unload the truth. Thus, Turnèbe, aware of the fact that the semantic range of παραμυθέομαι is broader than that of *deonerare*[44], chose to alter the syntax in his translation – which he rarely does – and to translate τὸ ἀληθές as if it were dependent on τοῦ λόγου and not the other way around. That Wyttenbach, who understood παραμυθέομαι in the same way, took the inspiration for his conjecture ἄηθες

[41] *De an. procr.* 1012B: δεῖν [...] τυχεῖν ἰδίας ἀναγραφῆς τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ('a separate treatise ought to be devoted to this account'), Turnèbe: 'suaque privatim scriptione rem istam comprehendendam'; *De an. procr.* 1013F: προϊὼν ὁ λόγος ἐνδείξεται ('this will be made plain by our account as it proceeds'), Turnèbe: 'progressus orationis monstrabit'. One could object that Turnèbe, by translating λόγος by 'ratio' (as opposed to the renderings 'res' and 'oratio') here, is thinking of another, more philosophical meaning of λόγος, which could have the element of truth implied. However, for a rendering of λόγος-account as 'ratio', see *De an. procr.* 1012C: ἔστι δὲ βραχὺς ὑπὲρ ἀμφοῖν ὁ λόγος ('[t]he statement concerning both [i.e. the interpretations on the generation of the world soul by Xenocrates and Crantor] is concise'), Turnèbe: '[a]c certe perbrevis est utriusque ratio'. See also *De an. procr.* 1023E, where Timaeus 37B (λόγος [...] ἀληθής) is quoted and Turnèbe translates – or, rather, quotes from Cicero's Timaeus translation – 'ratio […] vera'.

[42] Cic., *Div. Caec.* 46: 'cum […] ex illius invidia deonerare aliquid et in te traicere coeperit'. (Note the similar construction of 'deonerare' with 'ex'.)

[43] *LSJ* q.v. 3: 'relieve, assuage, abate'.

[44] *LSJ* q.v. 5: 'support, justify'. Cf. *De an. procr.* 1012B: δεόμενον παραμυθίας ('in need of vindication'), Turnèbe: 'subsidii firmamentique indigentem'. (This is at the same time an example of Turnèbe's habit of translating one Greek word by two Latin words.)

from reading Turnèbe's translation is understandable, but the (in my opinion unnecessary[45]) conjecture itself is to his credit alone.

<div align="center">*</div>

ἕτεροι δὲ τοῦ διὰ τεσσάρων ὅρους θέμενοι, τὸν μὲν ὀξὺν ἐν <τοῖς> σπη΄ τὸν δὲ βαρὺν ἐν τοῖς σις΄, ἀναλόγως ἤδη <u>τοὺς</u> ἑξῆς περαίνουσιν· (*De an. procr.* 1022A)

'As terms of the fourth, however, others put the high note at 288 and the low at 216 and then determine proportionally those that come next […].'

Cherniss: τοὺς –H. C. [i.e. Cherniss] (scil.ὅρους); τοῖς –mss.; τὰ -B. Müller (1873), cf. "reliqua" in the versions of Turnebus and Xylander.

Turnèbe's translation indeed shows that he took the complement of περαίνουσιν ('transigunt') to be neutral and thus not with an implied ὅρους (the masculine 'finis'). However, there is no marginal correction to the Aldine reading τοῖς, which we find also in Turnèbe's edition. Turnèbe should thus not be adduced as a predecessor to Müller's reading.

<div align="center">*</div>

[…] Ἡράκλειτος δὲ <u>παλίντροπον</u> ἁρμονίην κόσμου ὅκωσπερ λύρης καὶ τόξου […] (*De an. procr.* 1026B)

'Heraclitus [calls destiny] concord of the universe retroverse like that of lyre and bow.'

Cherniss: mss. […]; παλίντονον –Turnebus.

This is an example of the problematic report of Turnèbe's *marginalia* in the 1599 Frankfurt edition, which mentions παλίντονον as Turnèbe's correction. We find παλίντονον written *in margine* in a hand which is definitely not Turnèbe's: the correction has been added by a later owner of the exemplar. In his edition Turnèbe prints παλίντροπον, which is also reflected in his translation ('intentionem […] refugam'). For the Heraclitus fragment in question (fr. B51 DK) παλίντονος and παλίντροπος seem to be ancient variants and Plutarch seems to have been aware of this, using the former in *De Iside et Osiride* (369B)

---

[45] This is not the place to discuss this textual issue extensively, but I see no real problem with keeping the manuscript reading ἀληθές and translating 'vindicating as far as may be by probability the truth of my account and [i.e. including] the paradoxical aspect of it'. (For τὸ ἀληθές meaning the truth value of a statement, see e.g. *De an. procr.* 1021A: ἔξεστι δὲ καὶ νῦν βασανίσαι τὸ ἀληθές ['[i]t is possible even now to test the truth of this'] or – a closer parallel – Philo, *De virt.* 192: τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς τοῦ λόγου ῥᾴδιον καὶ ἀφ' ἑτέρων διαγνῶναι.) This interpretation means that we should take παραμυθέομαι to mean 'justify' (*LSJ* q.v. 5) and not 'abate' (*LSJ* q.v. 3), as Turnèbe and Wyttenbach took it. That this is possible and even preferential is shown by the first sentence of *De an. procr.* (1012B), where Plutarch presents his interpretation as τὸν λόγον τοῦτον […] δεόμενον παραμυθίας ('this account, as it is […] in need of vindication'): here, παραμυθία is clearly to be taken in the sense of 'justification' (*LSJ* q.v. 4: 'explanation') and not 'relief from, abatement of' (*LSJ* q.v. 3).

and the latter here as well as in *De tranquillitate animi* (473F-474A)[46]. Turnèbe, in any case, certainly read παλίντροπον here.

3.4 Turnèbe's conjectures

In the remaining cases Turnèbe's *marginalia*, his edition, and his translation are in accord.

> [...] ὁ δὲ καὶ γενέσει καὶ ἀρετῇ προτέραν <καὶ πρεσβυτέραν> τὴν ψυχὴν σώματος, ὡς δεσπότιν καὶ ἄρξουσαν ἀρξομένου, συνεστήσατο. (*De an. procr.* 1016B)
> '[H]e constructed the soul prior <and senior> to body in generation and excellence to be mistress and ruler of it as her subject.'
> *Cherniss:* <...> added by Turnebus from Timaeus 34 c 4-5 [...]

We find Turnèbe's emendation in the margin of his Aldine copy, in his edition, and in his translation. This addition is a testimony to Turnèbe's excellent knowledge of Plato's *Timaeus*: Plutarch is quoting *Tim.* 34C[47]. The (probably correct[48]) addition is all the more remarkable since Cicero, on whose partial translation of the *Timaeus* Turnèbe heavily depends for his own translation, did not translate καὶ πρεσβυτέραν[49]. It should be added that, as the mark in the text of the Aldine copy indicates, Turnèbe intended the insertion of καὶ πρεσβυτέραν after τὴν ψυχὴν. This is reported correctly in the 1599 Frankfurt edition and Turnèbe adopts the same word order – contra Plato's *Timaeus* – in his edition. Did he complete the *Timaeus* quote from memory or did he have a *Timaeus* text which had a different word order than our *textus receptus*?

<p style="text-align:center">*</p>

> ἀποδεικτέον ὅτι, τούτου συμπληρουμένου δυσὶν ἐπογδόοις, λείπεται διάστημα τηλικοῦτον, ἡλίκον ὡς ἐν ἀριθμοῖς τὰ ϛʹ καὶ νʹ καὶ σʹ πρὸς τὰ γʹ καὶ μʹ καὶ σʹ. (*De an. procr.* 1021E)
> 'It is to be proved that, when this is filled in with two sesquioctaves, there is left an interval of the size that numerically expressed is 256 to 243.'
> *Cherniss*: πρὸς τὰ γʹ καὶ μʹ καὶ σʹ -f, m, r (ἔχει πρὸς ... σʹ -Turnebus); omitted by E, B, e, u, Escor. 72, Aldine.

---

[46] For discussion of Plutarch's usage see Cherniss *ad loc.* For discussion of the variants in the Heraclitus fragment see e.g. Kirk 1954: 210–215.

[47] The only difference between Plato's text as we have it and Plutarch's quote is that Plato does not have an article before ψυχήν.

[48] One could object that Plutarch misquoted Plato and that, therefore, the manuscript reading (i.e. the incorrect quotation from the *Timaeus*) should be retained. However, Cherniss rightly refers to *De an. procr.* 1013F, where Plutarch calls the soul προτέρα καὶ πρεσβυτέρα, probably anticipating the *Timaeus* quote.

[49] Cicero, *Timaeus* 21: 'deus autem et ortu et virtute antiquiorem genuit animum [...]'.

Although the content of this sentence on the mathematical division of the world soul may be puzzling to the reader not familiar with the context in which it appears, this correction is more or less straightforward. It occurs in Turnèbe's hand in the marginal note and is reported correctly in the 1599 Frankfurt edition. Moreover, he included it in his edition and translated it. Turnèbe may have taken it from one of the manuscripts that have the correct text: three 16th-century manuscripts with the correct reading are known to us. However, it seems more likely to me that Turnèbe inferred the correct reading from the context: this would explain his addition of ἔχει, absent from the manuscripts but occurring a few lines earlier[50].

*

τὰ δὲ σνϛ´ τῶν σμγ´ ὑπερέχει τοῖς ιγ´· ταῦτα δὲ τῶν ὑπεροχῶν <u>ἀμφοτέρων</u> ἐλάττω ἢ ἡμίσεά ἐστι. (*De an. procr.* 1022B)
'256 exceeds 243 by thirteen, which is less than half of both the excesses 32 and 27.'
Cherniss: Turnebus; ἀμφότερα –e, u, f, m, r, Escor. 72, Aldine; ἀμφότερα after ὑπεροχῶν –E, B.

This case is very similar to the previous one. Again, the correction must have been quite easily inferred from the context by a man with Turnèbe's philological and philosophical *acumen*. It occurs in his hand in the Aldine copy, it reappears in the edition, and it is translated accordingly.

*

καὶ τούτου μὲν ἔργον, ὧν ἂν ἅψηται, διιστάναι καὶ ἀλλοιοῦν καὶ πολλὰ ποιεῖν ἐκείνου δὲ συνάγειν καὶ συνιστάναι δι' ὁμοιότητος ἐκ πολλῶν μίαν <u>ἀναλαμβάνοντος</u> μορφὴν καὶ δύναμιν. (*De an. procr.* 1025C)
'[T]he function of the latter [i.e. difference] is to divide and diversify and make many whatever it touches but of the former [i.e. sameness] is to unite and combine, recovering from many by means of similarity a single form and force.'
Cherniss: H. C. [i.e. emendation by Cherniss himself]; ἀναλαμβάνοντα – mss.; ἀναλαμβανόντων –Turnebus, Stephanus.

The manuscript reading, which requires taking ἀναλαμβάνοντα as the object of συνάγειν καὶ συνιστάναι, is nonsensical or at least strangely tautological. Turnèbe – both in a marginal note in his reading exemplar and in his edition – tries to remedy this by taking the participle together with πολλῶν, thus reading ἀναλαμβανόντων, as his translation also testifies: 'cum per similitudine multa

---

[50] *De an. procr.* 1021E: καὶ τοῦτ᾽ ἐστὶν ὅ φησιν ὁ Πλάτων τὰ ἐπίτριτα τοῖς ἐπογδόοις συμπληροῦντα τὸν θεὸν λείπειν ἑκάστου μόριον αὐτῶν, οὗ λόγος ἐστίν, ὃν ἔχει τὰ ϛ´ καὶ ν´ καὶ σ´ πρὸς τὰ γ´ καὶ μ´ καὶ σ´ ('This is just what Plato says god in filling in the sesquiterces with the sesquioctaves leaves a fraction of each of them, the ratio of which is 256 to 243').

in unam se formam induant et potestatem'[51]. It may be possible to interpret the active ἀναλαμβανόντων in a medial sense, as seems to be Turnèbe's strategy[52], but the solution is syntactically (how to account for ἐκ?) and philosophically (the unifying force is due to sameness, not to the 'multa') problematic. Cherniss' suggestion is certainly the correct one.

4. CONCLUSION: *À LA RECHERCHE DU TURNÈBE PERDU.*

Let us, finally, return to Montaigne. In the second edition of the *Essais* (1588) Montaigne adds praise for a rising star of humanism, who had not been mentioned in the first edition: the Leuven *alumnus* Justus Lipsius (1547 – 1606), who was at that time teaching in Leiden but would soon – in 1592 – return to Leuven to become one of the university's most famous professors[53]. According to Montaigne, Lipsius was the only worthy successor to Turnèbe: he is 'le plus sçavant homme qui nous reste, d'un esprit tres-poly et judicieux, vrayement germain à mon Turnebus'[54]. Lipsius was only eighteen years old when Turnèbe died, but the Paris professor must have left a strong impression on the young scholar. In a 1587 letter to one of Turnèbe's sons, Lipsius speaks highly of the legacy of Turnèbe *senior*, 'vir divinus': 'ille vivet in summa aeternaque gloria, quamdiu res Graecae aut Romae'[55].

I would not want to disagree with the judgement of one of Leuven's greatest classicists, who professed that Turnèbe will live as long as the study of Greek and Latin are alive. If this volume is one of many testimonies to the fact that classical scholarship is still very much alive, this paper may have been a minute call to resuscitate Turnèbe's legacy. Although his contributions are mentioned frequently in our current editions of *De animae procreatione*, the diverse nature of these contributions has – quite understandably, given the necessity to produce an economical *apparatus criticus* – been forgotten. Nevertheless, as the few examples discussed here have shown, this diversity is essential to our understanding of Turnèbe's thoughts on the *constitutio textus*.

Most importantly, it has become clear that, for Turnèbe, a translation was different from an edition. Since both appeared on the same day, it is quite unlikely that Turnèbe's opinion on the *constitutio textus* changed between the two publications. Therefore, it should be kept in mind that Turnebus *editor* is much

---

[51] Cf. the similar 'solution' in Xylander's translation: 'contrahere et compingere, ut multa ob similitudinem unam nanciscantur formam atque facultatem'.

[52] Cf. *LSJ* q.v. I.2: 'receive'.

[53] For a brief overview of Lipsius' life see e.g. Papy 2011.

[54] *Essais* II, 12 (p. 578 VS).

[55] *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae* [= *ILE*] II, 87 03 16 (in Nauwelaerts and Sué 1983). Two letters from 1598, addressed to sons of Turnèbe, show that Lipsius' regard did not fade: *ILE* 98 04 02 and *ILE* 98 08 02 T (both in Deneire 2009).

more conservative than Turnebus *interpretor*. Moreover, as we saw, adducing the translation as textual evidence should be done only very carefully, since Turnèbe's Ciceronian method of translation can give rise to misunderstandings. Another *caveat* is the difference between Turnebus *lector* and Turnebus *editor*: some discrepancies between the marginal notes in the Aldine copy – which, through the quite unreliable list in the 1599 edition, were the most influential source of Turnèbe's textual engagement with *De animae procreatione* – and the actual edition and translation. In the end, nothing can be more straightforward than our final conclusion: a set of reading notes, a translation and an edition are different things. Remaining aware of their difference, however, has turned out to be much less straightforward.

Bibliography

Editions and translation of Plutarch used (chronologically)

1552, [Turnèbe, A.]: Πλουταρχου [sic] Χαιρωνέως Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμάιω [sic] ψυχογονίας. Plutarchi Chaeronei De procreatione animi in Timaeo Platonis. Parisiis, apud Guil. Morelium. [Turnèbe's edition.]

1552, Turnèbe, A.: Plutarchi Chaeronei De procreatione animi in Timaeo Platonis Adriano Turnebo interprete. Parisiis, ex officina Adriani Turnebi Typographi Regis. [Turnèbe's translation.]

1570, Xylander, G.: Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia […] Guilielmo Xylandro Augustano interprete […] Basileae, per Thomam Guarinum.

1572, Stephanus, H.: Plutarchi Chaeronensis quae exstant opera, cum Latina interpretatione. Ex vetustis codicibus plurima nunc primum emendata sunt […] excudebat Henr. Stephanus […].

1574, Xylander, G.: Plutarchi Chaeronensis Philosophorum et Historicorum principis varia scripta […] incredibili cura ac labore, & fide summa, multis mendarum millib. expurgata, Indicib. locupletiss. instructa, a Guil. Xylandro […] Basileae, per Eusebium Episcopium & Nicolai Fr. haeredes.

1599, [Frankfurt edition, vol. 2]: Plutarchi Chaeronensis quae exstant omnia, cum Latina interpretatione Hermanni Cruserii: Gulielmi Xylandri, et doctorum virorum notis, et libellis variantium lectionum ex Mss. Codd. diligenter collectarum, et indicibus accuratis. Francofurti, apud Andreae Wecheli heredes […] Tomus secundus, continens Moralia, Gulielmo Xylandro interprete.

1800, Wyttenbach, D.: Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis vitis, reliqua. […] Tomus V. Oxonii, e typographo Clarendoniano. [This volume contains *De an. procr.*]

1848, Maurommates, A.: Πλουτάρχου Περὶ τῆς ἐν Τιμαίῳ ψυχογονίας, ἐκδόντος καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνέχειαν ἀποκαταστήσαντος Ανδρέου Δ. Μαυρομμάτου [...] ἐν Ἀθήναις, Τύποις Χ. Νικολαΐδου Φιλαδελφέως.

1873, Müller, B.: Gymnasium zu St. Elisabet. Bericht über das Schuljahr 1872-1873. […] Plutarch über die Seelenschopfung im Timaeus […], Breslau.

1841, Dübner, F.: Plutarchi Chaeronensis scripta moralia, ex codicibus quos possidet regia bibliotheca omnibus ab Κόντῳ cum Reiskiana editione collatis emendavit Fredericus Dübner. Graece et Latine. Volumen secundum. Parisiis, editoribus Firmin-Didot et sociis.

1959, Hubert, C. and Drexler, H.: Plutarchi Moralia. Vol. VI. Fasc. 1. Recensuit et emendavit C. Hubert, additamentum ad editionem correctiorem collegit H. Drexler, Lipsiae. [Teubner]

1976, Cherniss, H.: Plutarch, Moralia. Volume XIII, part I, Cambridge (MA) – London. [Loeb Classical Library.]

2002, Ferrari, F. and Baldi, L.: Plutarco, La generazione dell'anima nel Timeo, Napoli. [Corpus Plutarchi Moralium.]

Others works

Becchi, F. (2009), 'Le traduzioni latine dei *Moralia* di Plutarco tra XIII e XVI secolo', in P. Volpe Cacciatore (ed.), *Plutarco nelle traduzioni latine di età umanistica*. Napoli, 11–52.

Cuvigny, M. (1973 [immo 1974]), 'Giannotti, Turnèbe, Amyot : résultats d'une enquête sur quelques éditions annotées des *Moralia* de Plutarque', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 3: 57–77.

Decorps-Foulquier, M. (1978 [immo 1979]), 'A propos des différentes écritures marginales dans l'exemplaire aldin des *Moralia* d'Adrien Turnèbe', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 8: 281–287.

——— (1982 [immo 1985]), 'Sur une interversion dans le *De animae procreatione in Timaeo* de Plutarque', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 12: 353–363.

Deneire, T. (2009), *Laconicae cuspidis instar. The Correspondence of Justus Lipsius: 1598. Critical Edition with Introduction, Annotations and Stylistic Study*. Leuven.

Green, J.M. (1975), 'Montaigne's Critique of Cicero', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 36: 595–612.

Guerrier, O. (2004), 'Plutarque', in P. Desan (ed.), *Dictionnaire de Michel de Montaigne*. Paris, 922–925.

——— (2014), 'The Renaissance in France', in M. Beck (ed.), *A Companion to Plutarch*. Malden - Oxford - Chichester, 544–548.

Hubert, K. and Drexler, H. (1959), *Plutarchi Moralia. Vol. VI. Fasc. 1*. Leipzig.

Irigoin, J. (1987), 'Histoire du texte des *Oeuvres Morales* de Plutarque', in R. Flacelière, J. Sirinelli, A. Philippon, and J. Irigoin (eds.), *Plutarque, Oeuvres Morales, I, 1*. Paris, ccxxvii – cccx.

Kirk, G.S. (1954), *Heraclitus. The Cosmic Fragments*. Cambridge.

Konstantinovic, I. (1989), *Montaigne et Plutarque*. Genève.

Lewis, J. (1998), *Adrien Turnèbe (1512 - 1565). A Humanist Observed*. Genève.

Nauwelaerts, M.A. and Sué, S. (1983), *Iusti Lipsi Epistolae. 2 : 1584-1587*. Brussel.

Opsomer, J. (2004), 'Plutarch's De animae procreatione in Timaeo: manipulation or search for consistency?', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 47: 137–162.

Papy, J. (2011), 'Justus Lipsius', in E.N. Zalta (ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Sturel, R. (1908), *Jacques Amyot, traducteur des Vies parallèles de Plutarque*. Paris.

Villey, P. and Saulnier, V.-L. (1988 [= 1965]), *Montaigne. Les Essais*. Paris.

Wyttenbach, D. (1795), *Plutarchi Chaeronensis Moralia, id est opera, exceptis vitis, reliqua. Tomus I*. Oxonii.