M. Serres (*La naissance de la physique dans le texte de Lucrèce: fleuves et turbulences* [Paris, 1977]), a book very provocative in its day, besides being relevant to contemporary epistemological debates (see esp. N. Ordine, *Belfagor* 37 [1982], 238–42). The reader can appreciate the scrupulous care with which C. questions one of the several most fascinating (but oracular, and not rigorously demonstrated) insights offered by M. Serres, that the atomism of Epicurus/Lucretius presupposes an advanced knowledge of infinitesimal calculus.

By combining the aims of a school text with a serious interest in contemporary philosophical debate, C.'s book finds an illustrious model in the Henri Bergson's *Extraits de Lucrèce, avec un commentaire, des notes et une étude sur la Poésie, la Philosophie, la Physique, le texte et la langue de Lucrèce* (Paris, 1883) ('Avant-Propos' and 'Introduction' reprinted in H. Bergson, *Mélanges* [Paris, 1972], 265–310; for basic information see Ph. Soulez, Fr. Worms, *Bergson* [Paris, 2002], 50–2). Without abandoning his pedagogical aims, the young Bergson (at that time a *professeur de lycée* in the French provinces) took the opportunity of writing a teaching text to emphasize the philosophical autonomy of Lucretius (although for an end result that was too reductive of Epicurus' thought; cf. *Mél.*, esp. 280–5). In addition, Bergson remarked on the importance of Lucretius as a precursor both to modern atomic theory and to Darwin's evolutionism, which he cautiously introduces as not yet demonstrated: *Mél.*, 290–2, esp. 292). In this juvenile work published for school consumption, the characteristic Bergsonian emphasis on intuition as the privileged path to philosophical truth seems to be prefigured: 'Avec son imagination ardente et forte, le poète devine quelques-unes des grandes lois de la nature; il en a comme le pressentiment' (p. 290; cf. also p. 285 on the 'pictorial', imagination that, as Bergson remarks, identifies Lucretius). Certainly one of the merits of C.'s book is that it brings to mind the early work of Bergson, which he does not fail to mention in his bibliography (p. 188).

Among the imperfections of the book, some bad printing of Greek should be observed (not without some real slips, for example at p. 37).

Università di Siena—Arezzo ANDREA CUCCHIARELLI
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni067

LUCRETIUS AND PHILODEMUS

A. MONET (ed.): *Le jardin romain. Épicurisme et poésie à Rome. Mélanges offerts à Mayotte Bollack*. Pp. 376. Villeneuve d'Ascq: Centre de Gestion de l'Édition Scientifique, Université Charles-de-Gaulle—Lille 3, 2003. Paper, €28. ISBN: 2-84467-057-1

Perhaps the most pressing question for interpreters of Roman Epicureanism is that of the relationship, if any, between the two great Epicurean writers of the time: Lucretius, a Roman writing an Epicurean hexameter epic/didactic, and Philodemus, a Syrian living in Italy, writing Greek treatises in prose. Did they know each other? Had they read one another's works? What did Cicero know of either of them? We would surely like to put together the rich resources of Lucretius' poem and the texts excavated from Herculaneum to generate a composite picture of Republican Epicureanism. This collection of nineteen essays plus introduction, offered as a *Festschrift* for Mayotte Bollack, tackles the nature of Roman Epicureanism through a number of different approaches. Some essays address directly the question of the

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

possible interrelation between Philodemus, Lucretius, Cicero, and Republican Rome more generally. Others tackle the relationship between the Epicureanism of Lucretius and Philodemus and that of the Hellenistic garden. A third section offers readings of particular themes in Lucretius, and a fourth contains essays looking for the influence of these Roman Epicureans on later writers, including Virgil and—perhaps surprisingly—Kant. A final section ('Lectures') contains three close readings of sections of Lucretius 5 and Philodemus *On poems* 5; the first of these, by José Kany-Turpin, is followed by a transcription of the discussion after the presentation and gives a brief glimpse of what the original colloquium may have been like. The focus is pretty sharp for a Festschrift and there will be something of interest in here for those working on Epicurean philosophy and Republican culture. I hope I can be excused for concentrating on only some of the contributions.

The task of piecing together Republican Epicureanism might turn out to be a little easier if there are indeed remains of a copy of Lucretius' work among the Herculanean papyri. This, at least, would offer a link of some sort between the Roman poet and the Epicurean library. In 1989 Knut Kleve claimed to have found just that, in *PHerc.* 1829–31. In his important contribution to this volume, however, Mario Capasso sets about dismantling Kleve's thesis ('Filodemo e Lucrezio: due intellettuali nel *patriai tempus iniquum*'). Not only, according to Capasso, is there little reason to think that the remains on *PHerc.* 1829–31 are sections of Lucretius, they are instead small sections of *PHerc.* 395 broken off during the first unrolling of that papyrus early in the nineteenth century. Unfortunately, Kleve himself was unable to offer his response to Capasso at the Lille colloquium, so Daniel Delattre takes up the discussion here on Kleve's behalf ('Présence ou absence d'une copie du *De rerum natura* à Herculaneum?'), arguing that *PHerc.* 395 might itself contain Lucretian verses, perhaps from *DRN* 2. I can leave readers to make up their own minds about this increasingly heated debate. Capasso seems to me to have a strong case, although it is made 'de façon quelque peu brutale et même douloureuse' (Delattre, 109). But in any case, as some of the contributors here note, whether or not there was a copy of Lucretius at Herculaneum, this still leaves unresolved the question of whether Philodemus and Lucretius were in any sort of contact. First, the library as we have it must date from the time of the Vesuvian eruption, some time after both their deaths, and there is no clear means of assessing when the various books were acquired. Secondly, there is little reason to think that Philodemus, for example, could have read only material in the villa's library. Even if there was no copy of *DRN* there, Philodemus could still have known or read Lucretius.

Our chances of piecing together Republican Epicureanism, therefore, rest on the careful reading and interpretation of the texts which we do have. And there are some good examples of just this sort of approach here. Michael Erler, for example, in '*Exempla amoris.* Der epikureische Epilogismos als philosophischer Hintergrund der Diatribe gegen die Liebe in Lukrez *De rerum natura*', shows the kind of illuminating work which is now becoming possible given the increasing availability of reliable and well-documented texts of Philodemus and the increasing enthusiasm for reading them. Erler discusses the well-known closing section of *DRN* 4 in tandem with Philodemus' discussion of anger in *De ira* and sees them both as applications of Epicurean techniques of rational therapy and self-management combining elements of ethical, psychological, and epistemological theory. Such an approach can help to throw light on both Philodemus and Lucretius, their differences as well as similarities. To my mind, a less successful attempt at similar work is offered by Sabine Luciani, 'Philodème et la "réhabilitation" de Démocrite dans l'épicurisme'. She argues that Philodemus shows

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni068 Published online by Cambridge University Press

an increased willingness in comparison both with Epicurus himself and also Lucretius to use Democritus as an authority for various substantive, predominantly ethical, arguments. Certainly, Democritus does seem to figure prominently in *De morte*, for example, but these texts are notoriously difficult to interpret and just how much is being attributed to Democritus is not always clear. It is also debatable whether Lucretius is less keen on his atomist ancestor than is Philodemus. Apart from the explicit and apparently approving mention of Democritus at 3.1039–41, a case can be certainly be made, for example, for seeing echoes of Democritus B191 in the proem of *DRN* 2.

Of the pieces devoted to a single author, perhaps the most interesting is by James Porter: 'Lucretius and the poetics of void'. Here, Porter explores how Lucretius' handling of bodies and void operates both at the level of 'physics', of atomist *physiologia*, and at an ethical level, where the *corpus* concerned is the body of a person and the void is the annihilation of death. What follows from this is a challenging reading of the whole poem which takes in themes from the last sections of Book 3, on death, and discussions of earthquakes and plagues from the final book. It is not an account which will persuade everyone and it is certainly possible to question some of Porter's more extravagant claims. For example, one might wonder where in his account of the alienation of the reader from the reality of atoms and void is there still room for the Epicureans' claim that all perceptions are true. Nevertheless, there is good reason to welcome Porter's reminder that there is little if anything in Lucretius' poem which is not aimed at changing the pupil psychologically and ethically for the better. And he shows what results can be achieved by thinking about the *DRN* as a whole.

Corpus Christi College, Cambridge JAMES WARREN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni068

AENEID VII

N. HORSFALL: *Virgil,* Aeneid *7. A Commentary.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 198.) Pp. xliv + 567. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 90-04-10842-4.

Horsfall raises, in passing and not very seriously, the question of the sort of commentary, if any, that Virgil might have envisaged: 'V. never writes with prosy commentators in mind' (760, with reference to the inappropriateness of the phrase *liquidi . . . lacus* for Lake Fucinus). Virgil will not have written for commentators; but he wrote in a context of commentaries, which he himself used, especially on Homer. H. wants to set before the reader of his commentary 'the educated Augustan reader'; more specifically to reconstruct 'the scholarly and literary filters' through which such readers approached the *Aeneid* (p. xxxii; also p. xxi and the commentary, e.g. 31). He envisages Augustan readers interested in mythology, aetiology, and etymology ('the chalcenteric Augustan reader', p. 417), and in questions in Homer (e.g. on *uina coronant*, 147). He might fairly say that this text did as it does present its readers explicitly with myth, history, and topography, in language with its own history. But he is also aware that antiquarian tradition is often secondary to epic tradition (174), and that the antique in the text may be patina (188); and he recognizes the limits of reconstruction, e.g. of genealogies (pp. 146–7 on Latinus) or of topography (e.g. p. 421, on toponyms in the Catalogue). He says less of the Augustan reader's moral filters; he has written well of them elsewhere (on *Aeneid* 12).

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni068 Published online by Cambridge University Press