is also one of the key witnesses. These contributions are particularly rich in detail. The section concludes with a methodological piece by Eric Nelson (117–40).

The second section, 'Hippocratic concepts', contains another six papers (by Joel Mann, 143–62, Roberto Lo Presti, 163–94, Elizabeth Craik, 195–208, Jacques Jouanna, 209–41, Ralph Rosen, 242–57, and Maithe Hulskamp, 258–70). Common themes are terms such as *technē* and their use in both the Hippocratic corpus and Plato, regimen in both its theoretical understanding and practice, along with its implications for certain medical topics such as dreams, and, again, the broader philosophical context in which the Hippocratic corpus came into existence. Particularly rich is Jouanna's contribution on regimen; Craik takes another very detailed look at the Hippocratic text *On Glands*. The latter paper forms a neat connection to the following contributions.

The third section, 'Hippocratic topics in cultural contexts', consists of three papers (by Patrick McFarlane, 273–91, Laurence Totelin, 292–307, and Leanne McNamara, 308–27), which are actually quite curious. The first examines a topic that is commonly underrepresented in scholarship: ancient dentistry. The second article consists of a comparative structural analysis of recipes in Aristophanes and the Hippocratic corpus, which clearly required some very substantial background research. And the third covers love-sickness, not just in its more frequently studied description in literary texts, but also the medical implications.

The final section, 'Galen's Hippocratism', contains five papers (by Amneris Roselli, 331–44, Robert Alessi, 345–77, Véronique Boudon-Millot, 378–98, Todd Curtis, 399–420, and R.J. Hankinson, 421–43). As is the case in the preceding section, some articles thankfully concern texts or topics that are not in the focus of mainstream research. Roselli discusses orthopaedics and Hankinson physics. The latter paper connects very well to the more philosophically themed contributions in the first half of the volume. Alessi analyses Arabic evidence, which provides some rather curious details on the transmission. The remaining two contributions have a rather philological focus, with Todd writing on *On the Nature of Man*. Boudon-Millot's contribution on the term 'Hippocratic' concerns a central aspect, and should perhaps have been situated at the start of the collection rather than at the end.

Overall, the volume makes a very interesting and engaging read. The very fact that it caters for both those with mainstream interests, such as Plato, and those studying more unusual topics, in a rather seamless connection, makes it stand out amongst similar collections. The fact that the contributors all come from different schools and backgrounds also renders the collection more stimulating.

If anything, the volume shows that our understanding of the nature, content and context of the Hippocratic corpus is at its beginnings, and there is plenty more to be discovered, both within itself in direct transmission and also in the secondary transmission and reception in Galenic works. Moreover, we need a substantial amount of additional research on 'Hippocratic' texts at the fringes of the corpus.

The volume would be of interest to both scholars with highly specialized research interests, such as papyrus transmission or lexicography, along with similar topics that can be found throughout, and also readers at a more intermediary level, such as final-year undergraduate students. The book would certainly make an excellent addition to libraries that cater for medical historians of antiquity and the Middle Ages, including the Islamic world.

BARBARA ZIPSER
Royal Holloway, University of London
Barbara.Zipser@rhul.ac.uk

LONGO (A.) and TAORMINA (D.P.) (eds) **Plotinus and Epicurus: Matter, Perception, Pleasure**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016. Pp. xvii + 236. £64.99. 9781107124219.
doi:10.1017/S0075426918000447

Given that Plotinus refers explicitly to Epicurus only once in the *Enneads*, the reader might well wonder why scholars would spend any time examining the connections between the two philosophers, and Plotinus' criticism thereof. For instance, the editors grant that 'Platonism and Epicureanism may not unreasonably by regarded as philosophies so distant from one another as to appear quite incompatible and unsuitable for comparison' (x). Nonetheless, wonder no more; this book investigates virtually any (possible) allusion to Epicurus or Epicureanism and determines how (un)likely it was that Plotinus was referring to or influenced by either. Along the

way, Gnostics, Middle Platonists, Stoics, early (anti-)Christians are brought in to fill out the analysis, with well-argued, thoroughly researched scholarship.

The ten papers are divided into three areas: (1) Plotinus' polemical, anti-Epicurean arguments, (2) Plotinus' critical attitude toward distinctly Epicurean or atomistic doctrines; and (3) Plotinus' borrowing of Epicurean terms, ideas and overall conceptions (9).

In the editors' view, 'Plotinus redeploys Epicurean material, insofar as he believes that the process of production of the world cannot suitably be described by invoking a demiurge who (like a human artisan) plans and carries out his work with his own hands, or tools and assistants' (22). However, since Plato states that the Demiurge-created Living Creature has no hands (*Ti.* 33d) or feet or legs (*Ti.* 34a), let alone eyes, organs for respiration, hearing, food reception or evacuation (*Ti.* 33c–d), it is arguably an interpretive stretch to state that Plotinus got this idea of no hands or feet from Epicurus per se.

Tiziano Dorandi (29–50) offers an impressive historical accounting of Epicurus' Garden and its influence, detailing a letter of Plotina's request to the Roman emperor Hadrian to change the law that required a Roman citizen to be the successor of a school, for instance (31–32).

Angela Longo (51–68) helpfully puts Plotinus' criticism of Epicurus in the context of Celsus' polemic against Judaeo-Christian providence and Origen of Alexandria's arguments against Celsus, which elucidate Plotinus' criticisms of Epicurus and the Gnostics. In particular, she shows the way in which Origen connected the denial of providence (due to the lack of rewards and punishments in the afterlife) with the pursuit of pleasure, and plausibly hypothesizes that Plotinus must have thought similarly (66–67).

Manuel Mazzetti (69–81) investigates a question that no one has ever examined or justified well: the view that providence reaches as far as the earth but does not dominate it fully. He adduces Platonic sources for Plotinus and identifies the latter's opponents (69).

While Mauricio Pagotto Marsol (82–95) initially describes the three kinds of humans of *Ennead* 5.9.1 excellently, and introduces interesting parallels from Irenaeus' critique of Gnosticism, he implausibly tries to argue that Plotinus' first order or kind of humans might refer to Gnostics, since nothing is particularly Gnostic in the passage.

Pierre-Marie Morel (96–112) examines 5.5.1 [32], refereeing a dispute between whether Plotinus' opponents are the Gnostics (D. O'Meara), Peripatetics or Peripatetically influenced Platonists (E. Emilsson), or Epicurus (E. Bréhier, A.H. Armstrong, W. Dufour). He persuasively argues that Bréhier et al. have the most plausible interpretation.

Daniela Patrizia Taormina (113–32) argues (agreeing with Bréhier and P. Henry and H.R. Schwyzer) that Plotinus (in 5.5.1.12–19 [32]) is indeed best seen as criticizing Epicurus' view, invoking Plutarch. She then uses 4.6.1.28–32 [33] to argue against the anti-realist interpretation of 5.5.1.12–19 [32], while adeptly discussing sense perception in Epicurus and Plotinus.

Marco Ninci (133–59) carefully and methodically breaks down four points Plotinus makes against Epicurean atomism in 2.4.7.20–28 [12], one of which interestingly argues that atoms do not exist and another that incorporeal entities (for example soul and intellect) must exist.

Andrei Cornea (177–88) examines Plotinus' use of Epicurus' phrase *athroa epibolē* ('concentrated approach' or 'apprehension', 180), arguing that Plotinus used Epicurus' phrase for his own purposes, adding a metaphysical (and opposite) element(s) to it (185). Unfortunately, these additions undercut Cornea's argument that Plotinus borrowed Epicurus' 'useful, technical formula' (188) to support his polemic against the Gnostics and to argue for a non-literal interpretation of *Timaeus* (187), neglecting (as mentioned) that Plato averred that the Demiurge-created Living Creature did not have hands or feet (*Ti.* 33d, 34a).

Alessandro Linguiti (189–98) convincingly demonstrates that Plotinus almost certainly refers to Epicureans in his bull of Phalaris passage (1.4.13.5–12 [46]) and that Plotinus' perspective on happiness is superior to that of Epicurus. Lastly, Linguiti plausibly argues that Plotinus and Epicurus agree that happiness does not increase with time, while not claiming that the former was influenced by the latter on this point.

This work is certainly an invaluable addition to comparative scholarship on the (lack of) Epicurean influence on Plotinus' thought, covering issues in metaphysics, epistemology, ethics and sense perception.

DAVID J. YOUNT
Mesa Community College
david.yount@mesacc.edu

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426918000447 Published online by Cambridge University Press