Aristotle's work on τόποι is condensed in a rather sketchy way in fewer than five pages. As such, it does not help the reader to appreciate the nature of the methodology pioneered by Aristotle, and its possible use or development in the work of Cicero. Again, in commenting Cicero's *loci* individually, R. neglects to point out relationships with the work of Aristotle that could, however, be highly significant for a grasp of the essence of the *Topica*. Just to quote an example, in *Topica* 8 Cicero introduces a group of *loci* that are drawn from without (*extrinsecus*) and are opposite to the *loci* attached to the subject under discussion (*loci in eo ipso de quo agitur haerent*). R. correctly notes that the former group is linked to the pre-Aristotelian and Aristotelian non-technical proofs. What he does not note, however, is that in *Rhetoric* B23, at 1398b19–1399a6, Aristotle speaks of a τόπος ἐκ κρίσεως which closely resembles the idea behind the *loci* drawn *extrinsecus*. But Cicero, differently from Aristotle, separates these *loci* from the others. There must be a reason behind this separation, which should be explored in its historical context. This could provide precious insight into the relationship between Cicero's list of *loci* and the list of τόποι discussed by Aristotle in *Rhetoric* B23.

Despite my comments above, I want to conclude by stressing once again that R.'s work is certainly the most successful work on Cicero's *Topica* to date. I am convinced that it will spur further scholarly interest in this sophisticated and still somehow enigmatic book by Cicero. However, there is more to be done to give the *Topica* its full credit. I believe that more investigation is needed, especially, as I have suggested above, in its relationship to the texts of Aristotle. How the author of this review would do this . . . is another story!

University of Lugano/University of Leeds SARA RUBINELLI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni282

LUCRETIUS V

G. CAMPBELL: *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution. A Commentary on* De Rerum Natura *Book Five, Lines 772–1104*. Pp. xii + 385. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003. Cased, £63. ISBN: 0-19-926396-5.

This is a welcome and constantly revealing commentary on 332 lines from Lucretius' account of the early history of this world and the human race in Book 5 of the *De Rerum Natura*. Lucretius' prehistory and its sequel are of compelling interest, since we have no such an extensive and fascinating recreation of this archaeology of human civilization from any other sources, either Greek or Roman. C. has chosen to comment on one of the most interesting passages in the *DRN*. *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution* has a short introduction and two appendices: one a Table of Themes in Ancient Accounts of Creation, Zoogony, and Anthropogony, the other a Table of Themes in Prehistories and Accounts of the Golden Age, including the accounts of Columbus, De Léry, and Montaigne of the 'noble savages' discovered in the 'New World'.

This is the second monograph published by Oxford University Press that is devoted to a discreet argument in Lucretius' *DRN*. It is dedicated to Don Fowler, who wrote the first. This is Fowler's treatment of *Lucretius on Atomic Motion: A Commentary on De Rerum Natura 2.1–332*, pubished posthumously by Oxford in 2002. Like C.'s *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution*, Fowler's commentary began life as an Oxford

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dissertation (1984). These recent topical commentaries follow R. D. Brown's *Lucretius on Love and Sex*: *A Commentary on De Rerum Natura IV.1030–1287* (Leiden, 1987). This commentary too began life as an Oxford dissertation in 1977. They now constitute a genre of commentary on 'Lucretius on . . .'. They will long continue to enlighten the reader who has relied on that monumental contribution to Lucretian studies from Oxford, Cyril Bailey's three volume Prolegomena, Text, and Commentary that appeared in 1947. In England, Bailey's work on the text and argument of Lucretius' *De Rerum Natura* came to dominate the field of Lucretian studies for almost all of the twentieth century: his first edition of the poem appeared as an Oxford Classical Text in 1900; his revised edition appeared in 1922. His commentary on the entire poem has deservedly served as a constant point of reference and, at times, dispute.

The newest of the commentaries on topics in Books 2 and 5 of the *De Rerum Natura* invite us to gauge how Lucretian scholarship and classical studies have changed in half a century. Any reviewer of Fowler or C. will be tempted to calculate the ratio between text and exegesis in their commentaries and the text (Volume I) and commentary (Volumes II and III) of Bailey. The exercise is profitless. Fowler and C. had the task of incorporating the argument of Greek philosophical texts either unknown to Bailey or known to him only in inadequate editions. In the case of the notoriously difficult Epicurean doctrine of the swerve (Lucretius' *exiguum clinamen*), there is no clear reference to a swerve of atoms in perpendicular fall or enclosed within the human thorax in any surviving writing of Epicurus. Fowler had to take into account the new editions of Book 25 of Epicurus' *On Nature*. Here, in three papyrus copies we can now decipher, thanks to the work of D. Sedley and S. Laursen, Epicurus' vindication of human freedom from the compulsion of mechanical necessity of earlier atomism. Then there are the new or newly edited fragments of Diogenes of Oenoanda which we owe to Martin Ferguson Smith's first supplement to La Scuola di Epicuro, *Diogenes of Oinoanda: The Epicurean Inscription* (Naples, 1993). Smith has now edited the new texts excavated in 1997 as the third supplement to La Scuola di Epicuro (Naples, 2003). New frr. 126 and 127 would have been relevant to the antitheological and antiteleological themes C. is much concerned with in his monograph. Diogenes treats both the origins of language (in fr. 12 II.11–V.14 Smith, cited on pp. 287–8) and the Golden Age (in fr. 56 Smith). C. makes many references to Empedocles, as had Robin and Bailey before him, but he is in a position to exploit the fascinating and disruptive 'new Empedocles' of Strasbourg. He and Sedley (in *Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* [Cambridge, 1998]) are the first to make use of the new fragments in the interpretation of the old Lucretius; with Sedley, C. is tempted to think that his poem began with a Hymn to Venus, thus adding a third invocation to the the two invocations to Muses in DK 31 B 3 and 131. But for this invocation we have only the evidence of Lucretius' Invocation to Venus.

What is most remarkable about C.'s commentary on *Lucretius on Creation and Evolution* is its astounding range. It addresses Lucretius' text, Latinity, and prosody, and it offers the reader revealing and full citations from Greek and Latin literature (including the poetry of Michele Marullo) and philosophy, but it takes the reader a long step further in its engagement with the theories of evolution that follow long after Lucretius' poem. C. faces a problem that now wears a Janus face: the benign and Godlike face of the Creationist and the simian (or Darwinian) face of the Evolutionist. In the USA, Lucretius' violent polemics against 'creationism' in any of its forms would almost certainly banish his poem from high school syllabuses in the states of Georgia and Kansas. Bailey, by contrast, never once looks for enlightenment

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

for the text and thought of Lucretius in the conflict represented by Sir Richard Blackmore's *Creation* (of 1712), David Hume's *Dialogues Concerning Natural Religion* (1779), or J.-B. Lamarck's *Philosophie zoologique* (1809) or *Histoire naturelle des animaux sans vertèbres* (1835). Darwin's *On the Origin of the Species* (1859) and *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871) are central texts for C. Bailey mentions Darwin only twice in passing (commenting on 3.1462 and 1463). (It is odd not to find Richard Bentley's Boyle lectures of 1698 in this survey of the polemic between creationists and evolutionists, since Bentley was much concerned with Lucretius.) Fred Hoyle and DNA were, of course, unimagined on Bailey's horizons, as were the web pages frequently listed in this commentary (as on pp. 100–1). If I am right, Juan Luis Borges, C. S. Lewis, and Piero di Cosimo are invoked for the first time in a Lucretian commentary.

The text presented is virtually that of Bailey's editions of 1922 and 1947, as is the apparatus. In **5.1200** C., who pays close attention to the temporal adverb *tum* in Lucretius, accepts (as would I) M. F. Smith's emendation of *tum* for the *nec* of OQ. The translation is not far from that of Bailey or Smith's revision of W. H. D. Rouse's version for the Loeb Classical Library. A departure from other translations of Lucretius' Latin can be seen in C.'s treatment of **5.836** as emended by Richard Bentley. L's subject is the fertility of the earth (*terra* in **822**) and its changing states (*ex alio terram status excipit alter*, **835**). In the following line, OQ give *quod potuit nequeat*, *possit quod non tulit ante*. The subject must be *terra*. Bentley emended *potuit* by *tulit ut*, and his emendation has long been accepted. C. (following D. West) argues that this emendation has not been understood and translates: 'and one state of earth takes up from another, so that what bore before no longer can, and what could not bear before now can'. Much hangs on this, since this line would implicitly supply an acknowledgement of a transition between spontaneous but short-lived generation and sexual reproduction (see his commentary to **836**). I would argue that the subject remains *terra* and that Lucretius is arguing that earth in its old age is incapable of producing the strange forms of life she produced in the infancy of the world. Thus he continues *Multaque tum tellus etiam portenta creare* / *conatast* . . ., referring to the earliest doomed products of a teeming earth (as runs the history of **2.1150–74**).

In selecting these 332 lines out of the argument of Book 5, C. is inevitably led to lose sight of one of the most striking features of the history of his world. Lucretius' world is new, as is Epicurus' understanding of it, and Lucretius himself is a part of the history of this world as one of the first exponents of Epicurean philosophy in Latin (**5.322–38**). This is something Lucretius can only owe to Lucretius. We miss C.'s comments on the syllabus of this book (**5.55–90**) and the lines that follow on **1104**. Now Lucretius treats the origins of a belief in the gods and the latest stages of human development (if, in the dialectic of *tum* and *nunc*, it is possible to speak of a development), leading to the conclusion that brings us to what L. calls the *summum* . . . *cacumen* of civilization (**1457**). This leads us inevitably to Athens and the praise of Epicurus that opens Book 6, a book that concludes with a grim description of the destruction of that pinnacle of civilization.

Throughout his discussion of this limited section of Lucretius' argument, C. is persuasive that in the conflict between creationist and evolutionist, L. is neither (as he first notes in his comment on **5.794**); Robin had stated this clearly in his note on **5.855–77**. L. is committed to a view that the world is the product of random and successful aggregates of matter in which the fittest survive (**5.837–77**), but he does not accept the conception of the evolution of one species into another. C. is right to make the same claim for Empedocles (p. 108). The pronouncements of the *Katharmoi* and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni283 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the 'new Empedocles' do not endorse this Darwinian view; they are only the poet's witness of experiencing as a *daimon* life in a variety of forms of matter. This brings C. to the question of Lucretius and his relation to the poem of poems of Empedocles. (C. only speaks of Empedocles' *On Nature*.) By the principle of 'multiple explanations' (enunciated in Epicurus *ad Hdt*. 79–80 and *ad Pyth*. 85–86, and L. in 5.526–33), astronomy is as remote from the possibility of a close and confirming verification as is the prehistory of our world. It is our bad luck that very little of Books 11 and 12 of Epicurus' *On Nature* survive, so we cannot know what use L. makes of Epicurus in this stage of his argument. As for his use of Empedocles, it is clear that Epicurus has freed him to chose what he found valuable in the poem of his greatest predecessor in philosophical poetry. The passages C. comments on are highly polemical and earlier commentators attempt to pinpoint the thinkers who he was opposed to. In adopting the views and terminology of Richard Dawkins's 'Viruses of the Mind' (1993), C. exploits the concept of the 'meme' or received opinion whose origins we cannot identify in his commentary on **5.925–1010** (pp. 180–4).

One of the great contributions of this commentary is its sustained demonstration of how cosmogony, zoogony, and embryology cohere in Lucretius' reconstruction of the beginnings of human life on earth. C. offers occasional delights in his epigrammatic formulations on the place of wonder and teleological language in this section of the *DRN*. He also assures us that hemlock is in fact harmful to the capricious digestion of goats (commenting on **5.899–900**). The reader who admires the genius ('invenzione') of Piero di Cosimo (and knows Erwin Panofsky's essay on 'The Early History of Man in Two Cycles of Painting's by Piero di Cosimo', republished in *Essays in Iconology*) is given a welcome glimpse into a wonderful pictorial version of Lucretius's prehistory as it appeared in Florence in the early sixteenth century, at just about the time Pietro Candido brought out the Juntine Lucretius (1512).

Duke University DISKIN CLAY
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni283

NEPOS' GENERALS

S. Anselm: *Struktur und Transparenz. Eine literaturwissenschaftliche Analyse der Feldherrnviten des Cornelius Nepos*. (Altertumwissenschaftliches Kolloquium 11.) Pp. 204. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004. Paper, €38. ISBN: 3-515-08478-9.

In the introduction and in the ensuing methodological discussion we are promised a structuralist literary study with the text rather than the author (whose name is thus justly relegated to the subtitle) at its centre. Nevertheless, it is A.'s belief that the *historisch-kritische* and the *hermeneutisch-literaturwissenschaftliche* points of view complement each other, and thus we do get a short but on the whole sensible survey of the author and the book on generals (the *Atticus* gets its due later) and of modern research. This leads to the main part of the book (pp. 67–160), a structuralist analysis of the book on foreign generals, consisting of detailed studies of their individual lives, each introduced with a helpful chart visualizing its structure and its division into narrative parts and authorial comments. We are also shown Nepos' designs of ring-composition both in the larger sections of the book and in the individual lives and the various connexions between these. Moreover, Nepos manipulates his

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni283 Published online by Cambridge University Press