

LUCRETIUS

MONTARESE (F.) *Lucretius and His Sources. A Study of Lucretius, De rerum natura I 635–920*. (Sozomena 12.) Pp. xii + 314. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter, 2012. Cased, €89.95, US\$126. ISBN: 978-3-11-019452-4. doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002133

This volume is offered as a detailed untangling of the philosophy, rhetoric and poetry found in Lucretius' 'critique' of Heraclitus (635–704), Empedocles (705–829) and Anaxagoras (830–920) in the opening book of his *De rerum natura* (*DRN*). M. aims first to establish the nature and date of Lucretius' sources, and second to highlight the adaptation and elaboration Lucretius employed in turning philosophical cut and thrust into gripping poetry. Such a study also strives to enhance our understanding of the reception of the Presocratics and the development of Epicureanism in late Republican Rome, by identifying Lucretius' role in both endeavours. This monograph, a lightly edited Ph.D. thesis, is aimed primarily at Epicurean scholars and particularly those interested in Presocratic doxography.

M. begins by clearing the ground with a comprehensive discussion of scholarship on the extent to which Lucretius' material was derived from early (largely Peripatetic) doxographical sources or from a polemical Epicurean source. He concludes that Lucretius' treatment of the Presocratics, while ultimately deriving from Peripatetic material, is largely based on Epicurean polemical sources. M.'s conclusions largely follow Rösler ('Lukrez und die Vorsokratiker: doxographische Probleme im I. Buch von *De Rerum Natura*', *Hermes* 101 [1973], 48–64), although he brings recent advances, most notably those of Sedley (*Lucretius and the Transformation of Greek Wisdom* [1998]), to bear on key questions regarding Lucretius' treatment of the Presocratics.

In Chapter 2, the longest of the book, M. undertakes a comprehensive presentation and analysis of the papyrological remains of Epicurus' Περὶ φύσεως (ΠΦ) 14 and 15. The chapter attempts to accomplish two things. First, it aims to challenge Sedley's theory that ΠΦ 14 and 15, as Lucretius' primary source, were largely concerned with a systematic critique of Presocratic material theories, to which Epicurus appended digressions concerning his own theory of atomic aggregation. Second, it presents a 'new edition of some of the fragments' of ΠΦ 14 and 15 (p. 10) based on autopsy of the papyri. As admirable as these individual ambitions are, they often compete with one another for attention. The chapter is difficult to navigate, both for the papyrologist in search of the new readings, who must wade through the negative arguments regarding Lucretius' reliance on these books, and for the philosopher who finds the line of argument regarding Epicurus' criticisms of his predecessors entangled with the minutiae of textual criticism. If both audiences persist, however, they will find a comprehensive account of the text and its content. M., in a reversal of Sedley's emphasis, argues that the majority of ΠΦ 14 was dedicated to Epicurus' own theory of the formation of atomic aggregates, and that the criticisms in ΠΦ 14 and 15 were ancillary to this account.

The detailed analysis M. presents of the Epicurean criticisms in ΠΦ 14 and 15 are of interest to scholars of ancient doxography, although the relevant information is difficult to locate. The bulk of chapter two is taken up with three arguments. First, M. maintains that in ΠΦ 14 Epicurus was more concerned with refuting monist arguments concerning rarefaction and condensation than those concerning fire, calling into question whether Heraclitus figures at all in this section of the ΠΦ. On the basis of the evidence regarding the order and length of the papyrus roll, M. further argues that there is no room for an extended treatment of Empedocles in ΠΦ 14, since Plato's position is the last to be addressed; not last among the limited pluralists as Sedley suggests, but last full stop, since M. argues that the category

of limited pluralists is not present in ΠΦ 14. Finally, regarding the role of Anaxagoras' theory in ΠΦ 15, M. prefers the conclusion of Rösler, that Epicurus uses terms related to ὁμοιομέρεια not only in his criticism of Anaxagoras' theory, but also in his own account of atomic compounds, over that of Sedley, who sees them as a sign that refuting Anaxagoras was Epicurus' primary concern. Ultimately, M. opposes the view that Theophrastus' φυσικὰ δόξαι is a source for Epicurus, instead contending that Epicurus used Aristotle's *De caelo*, although without the detailed argument one comes to expect from M.

Having set out a strong negative case against Sedley's thesis regarding the source of Lucretius' critique in Chapter 2, the reader expects Chapter 3 to provide positive claims about the alternative sources at Lucretius' disposal. Instead, we get a revision of modern scholarly opinion that rarely takes the discussion further, even when it could. M. tends to follow Sedley's analysis, even when his own suggestions point towards different conclusions or new contributions. For example, Sedley provides three motivations for placing the critique at the centre of Book 1, the first being that this allows Lucretius to emphasise the theme of how philosophy can best be written. M. writes 'this is in my view the main reason behind Lucretius' decision to introduce the Critique at this point of book I' (p. 165) before going on to summarise Sedley's two further points. And yet, M. later presents, albeit in telegraphic form, the intriguing suggestion that rhetorical strategy and formal argumentation lie behind Lucretius' choice (p. 167). M. concludes, although never explicitly, that the nature of our extant evidence leaves the identity of Lucretius' source for the critique in question.¹

Finally, in Chapter 4, M.'s interpretative strengths become most evident. He turns his attention to the elaborate poetical and rhetorical strategies that Lucretius employs in adapting his source material. M. highlights the playful, parodic and at times sharply ironic approach that Lucretius takes first towards Heraclitus and his Stoic successors, and later towards Anaxagoras. In his analysis of Empedocles, M. highlights the complex relationship Lucretius has to his predecessor, which reveals a mixture of reverence and praise for his accomplishments, while none the less highlighting Lucretius' triumph over his poetic and philosophic rival. M.'s attentiveness to Lucretius' use of wordplay throughout the critique, as well as its extension in subsequent passages, is exemplary, and one wishes that this analysis had been further developed into a line of argument about what the *DRN* reveals about Lucretius' own implicit argumentative aesthetic.

M. includes three appendices, which sit oddly with the rest of the text. The first concerns the composition of Lucretius' text, the second focuses on the format of the papyrus fragments and the last on the relationship between Epicurus' ΠΦ, *ad Herodotum* and *ad Pythoclem*. Only the second appendix has any explicit bearing on the arguments presented in the body of the text, whereas the others seem to have been included in order to round out ancillary issues.

The observations found in this volume are occasionally incisive, but intertwined as they are, it is difficult, even for readers well-versed in the intricacies of this material, to unpick what is original here. Cohesive lines of argument across chapters are missing, and M. overlooks numerous opportunities to highlight his own insightful contributions. Moreover, although M. contends with Sedley's interpretation throughout, he none the less remains under its strong influence. In short, this study would have benefited from

¹M. actually concludes (p. 181) that Lucretius' source is not ΠΦ 14 and 15, but neither is it another identifiable text by Epicurus, nor a later Epicurean text, nor a Stoic or Peripatetic source.

further revision, in both its form and its content. I have every reason to believe that this is a scholar with much to offer us, and this monograph has value in so far as it identifies important issues related to Lucretius' critique of the Presocratics, analyses key Epicurean texts and provides insight into Lucretius' poetical and rhetorical methods.

University of Kent

KELLI C. RUDOLPH
k.c.rudolph@kent.ac.uk

SELECTED PAPERS OF A. J. WOODMAN

WOODMAN (A. J.) *From Poetry to History. Selected Papers*. Pp. xiv + 446. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. Cased, £90, US\$170. ISBN: 978-0-19-960865-2.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X14002029

The present volume assembles 25 papers (some quite recent, some previously unpublished) that provide an exciting overview of W.'s scholarly writings since 1974. W. has silently updated most pieces in various ways (notably with additional references), added a brief introduction and appended a substantial epilogue; the volume concludes with a short concordance of Roman historical fragments cited in the text, a comprehensive bibliography and indexes. Although among the papers 'there is no single or common theme, most of them represent some form of close reading' (p. vii). This modest disclaimer, however, does not do justice to the impression of W.'s output that the volume creates. Taken as a whole, the collection testifies to the breadth of W.'s interests, his sensitivity as a literary critic and his profound historical acumen. At the same time, the essays demonstrate remarkable methodological and thematic continuities, suggesting the contours of an almost autobiographical narrative through a body of scholarship spanning nearly 40 years.

Although the papers are arranged according to genre, moving from poetry to history (as the title suggests), they also follow literary chronology. The first five chapters are pre-Augustan in focus, dealing with Cicero, Catullus and Virgil's *Eclogues*. Chapter 1, 'Poetry and History: Cicero, *De Legibus* 1.1–5', defends W.'s interpretation of the rhetorical nature of Cicero's conception of historiography. This paper, which has not appeared in print before, immediately establishes one of the overarching themes of W.'s career (rhetoric and historiography), prompts the reader to think about the relationship between poetry and history (an important leitmotif for the collection) and simultaneously reveals W.'s deep personal engagement with Latin texts and the scholars who read and write about them. The chapters on Catullus offer close readings of parts of poems 11, 51 and 68A. The most engaging of these is perhaps Chapter 3, 'A Suitable Case for Treatment? Catullus 51', which argues that medical terminology provides the key to understanding the unity of the poem, in particular the connection between the first three Sapphic stanzas and the notoriously un-Sapphic fourth stanza. (Medical terminology and metaphors constitute another theme of the collection.) Chapter 5, however, is sure to raise eyebrows. In 'The Position of Gallus in *Eclogue* 6', W. joins a chorus of influential scholars who feel that Gallus' appearance at lines 64–73 disrupts the chronological and thematic flow of Silenus' song, thereby constituting 'a major problem' (p. 36). To resolve this problem (as well as other supposed stylistic oddities), W. argues for a transposition originally proposed by Scaliger and Heyne: placing lines 64–73 after line 81, thereby producing the sequence of lines 1–63, 74–81, 64–73, 82–6. This kind of wholesale transposition is unlikely to find many supporters amongst twenty-first century textual critics (for W.'s