friendly attitude to wealth and status, Aristotle (4b), Theophrastus (4a), and Xenocrates (4a); Plato and Epicurus are not named at all, and no collective name for any school is used. This certainly indicates a sympathy for that branch of the Socratic tradition that was concerned primarily for practical moral preaching and example, and looked askance on wealth and status as values; but—at least as far as the surviving fragments go—questions of loyalty and group identity do not arise. Teles' Cynic heroes are prized as showing to a heroic, limiting degree how completely immunity to the blows of fortune can be achieved, but they are not held up as practitioners of a lifestyle to be embraced in all its details. Moreover, in one place, Diogenes and his kind are explicitly contrasted with the author and his audience (fr. 2, 10.6–1.7).

F. prints his own text of Teles, defending his choices at some length in specially constituted sections of the commentary, with a tendency to reject editorial interventions where possible and restore the transmitted wording. The results are not always convincing, and it does not help that only a very selective apparatus criticus is given, and that the layout of both text and commentary make it difficult to cross-refer quickly from one to the other. In this respect at least, there are reasons for not banishing Hense to the stacks quite yet.

King's College London M. B. TRAPP

PHILODEMUS ON POETRY

R. JANKO: *Philodemus on Poems,* Book One. Pp. xvi + 591, 21 pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-815041-5.

In spite of the fact that Epicurus considered poetry and music among the 'unnecessary' pleasures, and potentially dangerous if used to distract men from more serious philosophical meditations, the most versatile of his followers not only devoted some time to creating delightful epigrams, but also composed at least three voluminous monographs (ὑπομνήματα), *on Poems*, *On Rhetoric*, and *On Music.* The publication of the three major aesthetic works of Philodemus is the goal of the ambitious Philodemus Translation Project, directed by D. Blank, D. Obbink, and R. Janko. The first harvest of many years of toil is the splendid edition of Philodemus' *On Poems* Book 1 by R. Janko, based not only on the surviving papyrus fragments discovered in the eighteenth century in the 'Villa dei Papiri' at Herculaneum, but also on newly discovered transcripts made before some fragments were lost.

Philodemus was one of the figures who acted as a bridge between the most refined Latin poetry (Horace, Virgil, and their successors) and the literary theories of the Hellenistic period, and, as J. points out, apart from Horace, 'he was . . . . the only ancient poet whose literary criticism also survives' (p. v). According to the Epicureans, the only justification for the existence of poetry, and of the music accompanying it, was its rôle as a vehicle for the transmission of philosophical truths; without them, virtuosity of language was vain. As Lucretius' masterpiece shows, Epicurean principles fell on fertile ground in the practical Roman culture, not particularly sensitive to the belief in *l'art pour l'art*; and Philodemus' influence is probably to be detected in Virgil and in all the Augustan and late Latin poets who combined highly engaged contents with the most refined *labor limae.*

The importance of Philodemus' *De poematis* resides not only in the author's own principles, but also in the fact that in this treatise are summarized the theories of many

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.263 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Hellenistic philosophers and literary critics whose works are now completely lost and therefore unknown outside Philodemus' work. This monumental volume should therefore also be considered as the first edition of the fragments of these scholars: in Chapter 5 J. provides a very useful summary of the views of Megaclides, Andromenides, Heracleodorus, and Pausimachus, listing the extant fragments of their works and commenting both on their contents and on their style with the provision of numerous parallels; many of the fragments of Crates reported by Philodemus also include quotations of ancient poets, some of them anonymous.

Thanks to the recovery of Philodemus' work, we can now fill in the gap between Aristotle's *Poetics* and Horace's *Ars Poetica*. The main concern of the author in Book 1 is to dismiss the principle that good poetry is only recognized by the ear and defined by pleasant sounds. From the beginning of Greek civilization μουσική designated a mixture of music, poetry, and dance. That musical virtuosity was on its way towards prevailing over poetry was already suspected at the end of the fifth century by Euripides and Plato, while the euphonic properties of language were studied in the Pythagorean tradition by Democritus and Archytas (pp. 173–4). Moreover, from the beginning, both the Peripatetic and Stoic schools engaged in the study of the properties of sounds and the analysis of language. As a result of this newly edited treatise of Philodemus, we now realize that from the fourth to the first century B.C. many philosophers shared an overwhelming enthusiasm for phonetic thories, and musicology in fact invaded the field of literary criticism to the point where euphony was sometimes considered as the main, if not the only, characteristic of good poetry. Not all philosophers, though, were seduced by these trends; some of them still preferred to take into account the content, and not only the musical qualities of the language, when evaluating poetry.

From various passages of *De poematis* it is clear that Philodemus derives information on some of his opponents from a discussion of their theories included in an unnamed work by Crates of Mallos, the Stoic philosopher active in Rome in 168/7 B.C., and the first to identify himself as both a philosopher and a κριτικός; by Philodemus' time the latter term had acquired the meaning of 'literary critic'. As we know from a summary in *De poematis* Book 5, coll. 24.23–29.22, Crates was in favour of a literary criticism that blended content and form: the task of the critic was to judge the 'sound'; the appreciation of poetry was not a totally irrational process, and the ear was certainly aware of the content, but we should not use it to evaluate the form. He then distinguished between 'philosophers', who, like Epicureans, considered content fundamental in judging poetry, and 'critics', some of whom were criticized for attaching too much importance to sound—that is, essentially, the choice and order of words. Although the start of the papyrus roll containing *De poematis* Book 1 is lost, and with it the summary of Crates' arguments against the philosophers, a recapitulation of this passage is included in the section devoted by Philodemus to the rebuttal of musical theories, which extends almost until the end of *De poematis* Book 2 (Roll B). From Book 1 col. 130 onwards he recapitulates the views of the individual critics discussed by Crates: the Peripatetics Megaclides and Andromenides, Heracleodorus and Pausimachus. They seem to be presented here, and probably already in the intermediary source, in chronological order, and in a progression from the most moderate to the most radical in stressing the importance of sound in the perception of poetry. Although not treated in the surviving passages of Book 1, it is highly probable that Heraclides Ponticus' theories about poetic euphony were also taken into consideration by Philodemus (p. 137). It is not surprising to know that some of the most extreme critics, like Heracleodorus and Pausimachus (late third

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.263 Published online by Cambridge University Press

century B.C., p. 165), hold that rules of genre and style as classified by Aristotle and Theophrastus were a mere product of convention and thus, together with the content, irrelevant in judging the excellence of poetry; in fact, obscurity and the mixing of generic conventions mark the works of many Hellenistic poets of the third and second centuries B.C. (Callimachus, Lycophron, Euphorion). But it is not possible to make too easy a link between critical theory and individual poetic practice. For example, the Callimachean exaltation of *τέχνη* is very far from the priority attached by Pausimachus and Heracleodorus to the *ingenium*; according to them, the poet has a natural ability to choose sounds that gives pleasure. In Pausimachus, the most radical of the euphonist critics, we find both the elements of the *τέχναι περὶ φωνῆς*, the belief in a natural relationship between sound and meaning, which was later endorsed by the Stoics, and an interest in the study of grammar, which enables us to push back the date of the development of the Greek grammatical system. Philodemus, faithful to Epicurus' teaching, and inspired perhaps by the theories of his master Zeno and his older contemporary Demetrius Laco, refutes, in a vivacious style full of *hapax legomena* and colloquialisms (p. 193), not only the extremism of musical theories but also the moderate views of Crates, advocating content as the only criterion to judge poetry.

In a particularly detailed and well-organized introduction the reader is presented with an interpretation of the entire *De poematis*, and not only Book 1. In fact, we are to expect two more volumes containing the rest of Philodemus' treatise, Books 2 and 5, and J. has worked closely with their editors. A large section of the introduction is devoted to the history of the text and to the methods employed in reconstructing the papyrus roll containing *De poematis* Book 1 (Roll A). The papyrus fragments needed not only re-editing, but putting both in relation to each other and in an absolute sequence as they were originally written in the roll. The first step towards understanding the structure of the roll was to go back to the moment when the carbonized papyrus was cut open in the Officina dei Papiri at the end of 1700: the technique used in this case was *scorzatura totale* (so that the innermost section of the roll, the *midollo*, was lost), then, for a part of the roll obtained as a result, 'a kind of *scorzatura* in reverse' (p. 19). Thus the editor had to retrace in a rather adventurous way the procedures of cataloguing (pieces of a second roll [Roll B, *P.Herc.* 1087, 1403] containing the second book of *De poematis* were apparently confused in the numeration), describing, reproducing, and interpreting the fragments employed at the dawn of the era of scientific philology. Since many of the fragments resulting from the *scorzatura* were subsequently lost, the editor often had to rely on drawings made when the roll was cut and on contemporary trancriptions; J. recalls the thrilling moment when he discovered by chance in the archives of the Officina a packet of manuscripts by the *interpreti* (scholars supervising the work of *disegnatori* and engravers), whose existence had been unknown for centuries and had therefore not been taken into account in the previous editions of the fragments. Chapter 2 therefore represents a fascinating exploration into the early history of philology and papyrology, and into the day-to-day practice of the Officina dei Papiri in Naples from the eighteenth century until today; the personalities and idiosyncrasies of the first scholars dealing with the Herculaneum papyri are irreverently exposed by J. in a delightful and enjoyable way.

Chapter 3 provides a full and rigorous catalogue of all the papyri of *De poematis* Book 1. A careful palaeographical analysis of the surviving pieces of the original papyrus roll completes this section. A full catalogue of the *disegni* follows. These transcripts were fundamental to reconstructing the text wherever the papyrus was lost; thus the graphic habits and the errors of the four *disegnatori* involved in the process are

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.263 Published online by Cambridge University Press

studied by J. as carefully as those of the ancient copyists. Unfortunately, surviving letters at the edge of fragments were not copied because their importance was not perceived at that time; this certainly does not facilitate the task of matching the fragments where the original papyrus is lacking. A catalogue of the transcripts by the scholars working as supervisors in the Officina (*interpreti*) is then provided. The last three sections of the chapter are devoted to the description of the physical and palaeographical data of the papyri. Although the roll became deformed as a result of pressure and humidity, and was carbonized in the hours following the eruption of Vesuvius (p. 95), it is still possible to calculate its average dimensions. It is unusual to deal with full papyrus rolls from outside Egypt, and by now it is impossible to have a clear idea of the nature of book production in the rest of the Mediterranean world. It is striking to know that the roll of *De poematis* 1, with its 23 cm height and 16 m length, its wide margins and careful layout, its systematic use of punctuation (and also corrections) by the same scribe who wrote it, compares very favourably to the best products of Roman Oxyrhynchus; this copy of Philodemus' work was not only splendidly produced, but also used by an intelligent and scholarly reader, who annotated accents on the very passage in which Philodemus discusses the effects of euphony (p. 84). As in Egyptian rolls, Maas's law (lines drifting leftwards) is confirmed in Roll A; a strange phenomenon, however, is the fact that the number of lines per column diminishes towards the end of the roll instead of rising (p. 97). Chapter 4 provides an effective lesson in how to reconstruct a *volumen* from a galaxy of small papyrus fragments and transcriptions, with the aid of a sound methodology, mathematical acumen, papyrological experience, and infinite patience (see the cross-section on Fig. 2, p. 105).

The layout of the edition follows the clever formula used by D. Obbink for his edition of Philodemus' *On Piety*: on the left hand page a diplomatic text written in columns (keeping the papyrus's original lineation) and a critical apparatus are provided; the same text, standardized in spelling and laid out continuously, appears on the right hand page, followed by a translation and some notes of commentary.

A set of twenty-one plates includes a photograph of *P.Herc.* 460 fr. 1 (it is a pity that J. could not reproduce more of the photographic record, p. vi), the reproduction of some transcripts by the *interpreti*, and drawings of the extant papyri carefully produced by J. as a result of his painstaking observation of the original text, both with a microscope on the papyrus itself and in slides enhanced by Adobe Photoshop (pp. 48–9). Frequent tables, scattered throughout the introduction, help the reader to unravel the complexity of the philological, papyrological, and mathematical problems met by the editor in the process of reconstructing the text and the physical characteristics of the roll containing the treatise. The volume concludes with a bibliography, a set of useful concordances between the papyrus, the *disegni*, Bernardo Quaranta's trancription (for the first time taken into account in an edition of *De poematis*), the unreliable *Herculanensium Voluminum . . . collectio altera*, unfortunately exploited by scholars until 1955 (pp. 38–9, 45), and the previous editions of *De poematis* by Hausrath, Gomperz, Sbordone, and Nardelli; there follow detailed *indexes verborum*, *poetarum*, and *locorum*, and a general index.

The edition is very carefully and attentively produced; only a few unimportant editorial mistakes are to be spotted, such as the misplacement of the plates, or the typo '*collecto*' for '*collectio*' (p. 198); the only regret is that, although J. could read all the papyrus fragments with the aid of the most advanced electronic tools, he could not yet exploit the newest NASA technique of multi-spectral digital imaging, introduced by S. W. Booras, which will be employed in future readings of the Herculaneum Papyri.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.263 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This is a masterpiece of philology, combining papyrological expertise and the help of new technology; as well as a labour of love, and a wonderful proof of where philological *akribeia* combined with scholarly co-operation can lead.

Milan SILVIA BARBANTANI

P. HERC. 1055

M. SANTORO (ed., trans., comm.): *[Demetrio Lacone], [La forma del dio] (*PHerc. *1055)*. (Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, La Scuola di Epicuro, Collezione di testi ercolanesi diretta da Marcello Gigante, 17.) Pp. 193. Naples: Bibliopolis, 2000. ISBN: 88-7088-382-5.

With the publication of Mariacarolina Santoro's new edition of Herculanean papyrus 1055, the invaluable Scuola di Epicuro series, directed by the late Marcello Gigante, has grown to seventeen volumes. This latest entry focuses on a theological work plausibly attributed to Demetrius of Laconia, an Epicurean exegete writing toward the end of the second century B.C.E. Because the work defends Epicurus' view that the gods are anthropomorphic, S. speculates that its title was *περὶ τῆς θεοῦ μορφῆς*.

S.'s edition of this work follows the usual format of the series. It begins with a general introduction (pp. 23–65), subdivided into sections on (1) the author and title of the work; (2) its date, place of composition (unknown), and dedicatee (one Quintus); (3) its contents; (4) its language and style; (5) its relation to Cicero's *De natura deorum* 1; (6) anthropomorphism in Epicurean texts; and (7) the 'idealist' interpretation of Epicurean theology (which S. rejects). Then there is a second introduction (pp. 69–82), on (1) the state of the papyrus; (2) the apographs; (3) the orthography; (4) previous editions; and (5) the present edition. Following this, after a table of concordances and a one-page summary of the work, we find the Greek text (pp. 91–101) and a good Italian translation (pp. 105–9), marred only by two typographical errors on p. 107. (The numeration there is wrong.) There follows a detailed commentary (pp. 111–85), and finally a short *index nominum* and a long *index verborum*.

Important work on *P. Herc.* 1055 was done by Enrico Renna in the 1980s and 1990s, but S. has improved still further on Renna's readings. Epicurean scholars will also welcome her line-by-line commentary, which not only helps with the interpretation of many passages of this difficult text (of which only twenty-five lacunose columns survive, none more than six lines in length) but also reports how these passages have been interpreted (or misinterpreted) by earlier scholars searching the text for clues about Epicurean theology.

In my article 'Epicurus on the Nature of the Gods', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* XXI (Winter 2001), I cited one such passage as providing one such clue: in Col. XXII, D. refers to the gods as 'dual-natured'. Borrowing terms from D.'s Epicurean contemporary Philodemus, I took this to mean that they are both 'unities from similar elements' (streams of similar-shaped idols) and 'unities from the same elements' (like solid bodies, but only *quasi*-corporeal). Since my article postdates her book, I bring this up not because I blame S. for failing to interpret these terms as I do, but because, as I see it, she does misinterpret them and because this leads her to misconstrue not only Col. XXII, but also Cols IX–XIII, a discussion of memories which she interprets as an account of how men form their conceptions of the gods, but

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.263 Published online by Cambridge University Press