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/52.2.267 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which I am more inclined to read as a discussion of how the gods can have enduring memories given that, as unities from merely similar elements, their constituent parts are different from one moment to the next.

I may be wrong about this, however; the text is so fragmentary that it is hard to be sure. Nevertheless, it is a text that cannot be ignored by scholars interested in Epicurean theology and epistemology (e.g. in 'impulsi inferenziali', as S. translates D.'s term ἐπισπασμοί), or in Epicurean attitudes toward other philosophers. (D. polemicizes against the Stoics and Peripatetics, and neutralizes an argument against anthropomorphism by Bion of Borysthenes.) We Epicurean scholars, then, are in S.'s debt for improving our understanding of this tantalizing text.

University of Oklahoma JEFFREY S. PURINTON

PHILOSOPHY UNDER THE PRINCIPATE

A. BRANCACCI (ed.): *La filosofia in età imperiale: Le scuole e le tradizione filosofiche*. Pp. 326. Rome: Bibliopolis, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 88-7088-399-X.

La filosofia in età imperiale: Le scuole e le tradizione filosofiche is a collection of papers presented at the 1999 Primo Colloquio Sulla Filosofia in Età Imperiale. Among its contributors are some of the most distinguished Italian scholars in the field of ancient philosophy, and the uniformly high quality of the essays gathered here bodes well for future research.

The volume opens with Anna Maria Ioppolo's '*Decreta* e *Praecepta* in Seneca'. As Ioppolo notes, the relationship between *decreta* and *praecepta* is a problem much debated in recent scholarship on Stoicism. She deftly sidesteps the controversy concerning the normative status of *praecepta* by relating the difference between *praecepta* and *decreta* to the Stoic distinction between *kathēkonta* and *katorthōmata*. Though only the latter may be called virtuous, Ioppolo argues, it is only through continual fulfilment *of kathēkonta* that the perfected understanding necessary to *katorthōmata* is achieved. This dextrous reorientation of the problem makes Ioppolo's a substantial contribution to the ongoing debate.

Aldo Brancacci's article, 'Libertà e fato in Enomao di Gadara', examines the definition of 'freedom' advanced by the second-century A.D. Cynic. Brancacci argues that Oenomaus' rejection of the term *eleutheria* in favour of *exousia* and his polemics against philosophical concepts such as *anangkē* of Democritus and the Stoics' *heirmon aitiōn* point toward a fundamental reconception of the nature of 'freedom'. In emphasizing not the individual's autarkic freedom from influence from external factors, but the potential of the individual to affect these factors themselves, Oenomaus appears to have altered profoundly the basis of Cynic ethics.

A similarly radical reinterpretation of earlier thought is described in Mario Vegetti's '*De Caelo in Terram:* Il *Timaeo* in Galeno (*De Placitis*, *Quod Animi*)', which documents Galen's tendentious attempts to harmonize the contents of the *Timaeus* with the Hippocratic/Aristotelian synthesis effected elsewhere in his works. The dichotomy Plato here assumes between the mental and the physical poses a significant challenge to Galen's attempt to create a comprehensive medical theory capable of explaining all human behaviour physiologically. His solution—to identify absolutely each component of the Platonic tripartite psyche with a single corresponding physical

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.267 Published online by Cambridge University Press