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/bni284 Published online by Cambridge University Press

material in a way that lets him describe his heroes and express his ideas according to the aims he set himself. Accordingly, what are usually regarded as Nepos' mistakes are as a rule interpreted as deliberate alterations of the source material. Nevertheless here, as in some previous studies, the wish to discover contemporary relevance in Nepos' statements, e.g. in his use of political slogans, too often disregards his use of *topoi*, an emphasis on which would have suited A.'s aim of putting Nepos in the tradition of moralistic historiography. The interpretation of the entire book as commenting on contemporary politics and being a sort of *Fürstenspiegel* (pp. 171–4) carries little conviction.

A. argues for a careful structuring of the book on foreign generals, as we have it in the second edition, a structuring that explains Nepos' occasional, but intentional, disrespect for chronology: authorial comments as well as the composition itself allow us to see its division into a decade, the glory that was Athens, consisting of a first heptad (the Lives of Miltiades to Alcibiades) and a triad (Thrasybulus, Conon, and Dio); a central triad of the end of Athenian hegemony (Iphicrates, Chabrias, and Timotheus); and a second decade, the decline of the non-Roman world, again divided into a heptad (Datames to Timoleon) and a closing triad consisting of the chapter *de regibus* and the Lives of Hamilcar and Hannibal. While in the first decade it was the state that determined the fate of the individual, in the second it is more often than not the general who brings about or signals the decline or fall of his country. Though this division is quite convincingly argued, it leaves open the question of the composition of the book in the first edition.

I have indicated my doubts as to the pervasive political interpretation, rather than literary analysis, of Nepos' use of catchwords. These doubts are not lessened by some suspect statements on sources and history: the worst howler is the confusion of Eumenes of Cardia, the subject of the biography, with Eumenes of Pergamum in the *Life of Hannibal* (p. 140 n. 293 and p. 158 n. 379). Also the portrayal of Atticus as Nepos' ideal reader (pp. 175–82) is far from compelling. In fact, I still believe that the idea of an intended middle-brow readership is worth pursuing. Yet despite its faults the book does have one great merit. Even if we do not agree with all the details, the literary study of the *Lives* sets Nepos the author in a far more favourable light than ever before. He appears now as a thoughtful writer with often quite elaborate literary designs: this may well be the last nail in the coffin of Nepos the 'intellectual pygmy' (a phrase coined before the advent of political correctness).

Under the pretension of a somewhat tiresome meticulousness, the book is produced with—if one may take recourse to an oxymoron—a curiously pedantic carelessness. First names rather than initials may be helpful, but then we get, e.g. on pp. 18–19, Hans Georg (Hans-Georg correctly in the bibliography) Gadamer in full six times in sixteen lines and James Robert Bradley on pp. 48–9 six times in twenty-one. This were not so bad did we not also get Antonia (for Carlotta or Anna Carlotta) Dionisotti, Peter L. Schmidt's middle initial read as Ludwig rather than Lebrecht, and the famous paper 'Zur Geschichte des Wortes Fides' attributed to Ernst Fraenkel and dated 1961 (for 1916); László Havas is throughout Lázló, while in the bibliography Lefévre appears twice, as both Eckard and Eckhart. C. Valerius Catullus and Marcus Terentius Varro in full do no harm, but then we get in the Table of Contents (p. 6) and throughout (pp. 175–81 also as a header on the uneven pages) Tiberius Pomponius Atticus. References of the sort 'Epistola CXII Hieronymi ad Augustinum, zit. nach Jacques Paul Migne (Hrsg.): Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis presbyteri opera omnia Bd. I (= Patrologiae cursus completus. Series prima, Bd. 22), Paris 1845, S. 917' (p. 33 n. 131, and similarly p. 28 n. 102) are not only

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni284 Published online by Cambridge University Press

grossly redundant, but beg also the question of why Hilberg's *CSEL* or Labourt's *Belles Lettres* edition was not used. The proof-reading is indifferent; on p. 40 n. 165 there is a reference to a non-existent page, p. 132 n. 254 a reference to n. 254. The book has a 'Personenregister' (of scholars) but neither a general index or *index locorum*. One expected better from this publisher.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem JOSEPH GEIGER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni284

PHILODEMUS' ROMAN GARDEN

D. ARMSTRONG, J. FISH, P. A. JOHNSTON, M. B. SKINNER (edd.): *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*. Pp. xiv + 361. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004. Cased, US$55. ISBN: 0-292-70181-0.

From the end of nineteenth century, Philodemus' texts have made an increasingly significant contribution to classical literary studies. Until quite recently, however, Philodemus' work was usually cited from old Teubner editions or from the earlier work conducted in Naples and published as the *Herculanensia Volumina*. Scholars who quoted from these editions, not always familiar with the state of the texts on which they were based, tended to place too much trust in the editors' supplements and conjectures, not all of which have stood up to closer scrutiny. Work at the Centro internazionale per lo studio dei papiri ercolanesi and elsewhere in the last three decades of the twentieth century have advanced our understanding of these difficult and fragmentary texts. Improved (if more cautious) methodologies in Herculaneum papyrology (Dirk Obbink's essay in the volume under review here is a significant specimen of the new approach) and renewed studies of the text have led to reliable editions.

The establishment of secure texts of Philodemus and well-informed exegetical commentaries was (and remains) an urgent task, since his theoretical treatment of poetics, rhetoric, and music coincided in time and place with one of the most studied periods of Latin literary history. We also know that Philodemus was personally acquainted with many of the leading intellectual and creative figures of the age (confirmed several years ago by the publication of *P. Herc. Paris*. 2 frr. 278b and 279a, where Virgil is among a list of poets and intellectuals directly addressed by Philodemus), and that he not only wrote theoretical treatises, but was an accomplished poet himself. From these facts one might reasonably expect that careful study of Philodemus could illuminate certain aspects of Latin literature of the first century b.c., and this is the assumption upon which the majority of the essays in this book rely.

The current collection, which arose from a Symposium held in Cuma in 2000, is one of several important publications devoted to the Epicurean, and specifically Philodemean, influence on Late Republican literature that have appeared recently (e.g. Dirk Obbink's collection of essays *Philodemus and Poetry* [Oxford, 1995], D. Sider's edition of Philodemus' epigrams [Oxford, 1997], and the collection *Le jardin romain: épicurisme et poésie à Rome*, edited by Annick Monet [Lille, 2003]). These studies indicate that the papyrological labour of the last decades is starting to bear fruit and that Philodemus is moving from the periphery of scholarly consciousness towards its centre. The danger with the present volume, and others like it, is that scholars contributing to it will be encouraged to spy an Epicurean lurking behind

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni284 Published online by Cambridge University Press