

within a series whose prior members are logically and ontologically contained in the posterior members—such as the series of kinds of soul. W. takes careful note of the similarities and differences between cumulation and analogy and focality, and explains the use of cumulation in the treatment of the different kinds of soul and in the treatment of friendship in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

This is an important book for anyone interested in Aristotle's use of the three concepts: it forces one to think hard about the relations involved in these different kinds of case. Moreover, W.'s own views are in general balanced and undogmatic. I suspect two features of its style will limit its readership. First, the book is straightforwardly a work of scholarship: it is so firmly rooted in Aristotle's conception of demonstrative science, which it (reasonably enough) does not question, that it is unlikely to make any significant difference to contemporary thought about disciplinary unity; this distinguishes the book from much recent discussion of Aristotle, which has tended to draw Aristotle into contemporary philosophical debates. Secondly, the book reads very much as something based on a (very good) doctoral dissertation: it assumes a considerable familiarity with a large amount of quite esoteric scholarly literature, and would not help a reader new to the area to see the nature of the debates and the shape of the problems. One editing defect also makes it more difficult to use: the index seems not to refer to citations in the footnotes, where a considerable amount of supporting work is done. The worst thing about the book is its title, which suggests that Aristotle believed that all sciences can ultimately be unified, whereas the book itself argues for no such claim.

University of Sussex

MICHAEL MORRIS

TELES

P. P. FUENTES GONZÁLEZ: *Les Diatribes de Télès: introduction, texte revu, traduction et commentaire des fragments (avec en appendice une traduction espagnole)*. Pp. xvi + 620. Sorbonne: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1998. Paper, frs. 240. ISBN: 2-7116-1350-X.

This revised French translation of Pedro Pablo Fuentes González's 1990 Granada dissertation divides into seventy-eight pages of introduction, fifty-two of text and French translation, 400 of commentary, plus a summary in Spanish, a bibliography, and five indexes (of passages cited, themes and terms in French and Greek, proper names, and modern authorities). Broadly speaking, it has the expected strengths and weaknesses of a work of this style and origin. The bibliography on Teles, from Wilamowitz to Kindstrand (and beyond, in either direction), has never been so minutely and carefully reviewed; the central questions of Teles' style, sources, and doctrinal affinities are discussed at length; and copious parallels for his choice and manipulation of exempla, quotations, and images are cited. At the same time, the effort of coming to terms in such detail with the accumulated scholarship, and setting out the results of the review, leave the author with little energy to stand back and do anything very innovative. F. is level-headed and modestly revisionary, but limited in his approaches to Teles by the parameters set by the discussions he catalogues and criticizes.

The major strength of F.'s contribution (besides the simple collection of material, which is impressive in itself) lies in his coolly critical attitude to earlier scholars'

preoccupation with Teles' sources, and in particular his supposed debt to Bion of Borysthenes. Against the claims of the *Quellenforscher* and 'Biomaniacs', for whom Teles was a mechanically derivative author, of value almost solely in so far as he preserved the work of earlier and supposedly more significant figures, F. sensibly and repeatedly insists that the degree of his dependence has been greatly exaggerated, and that he deserves, and will repay, the courtesy of being read for himself. The key methodological point that F. rightly urges against the *Quellenforscher*—an obvious one, but in danger of being forgotten in some recent work on related authors—is that when Teles quotes an earlier thinker's dictum (e.g. Stilpon's at the start of fr. 3, on exile) it should not automatically be assumed that the whole surrounding context depends on that author. At the same time, and equally sensibly, F. is clear about the limits on what can be said about the overall shape and tendency of Teles' work, given that it comes to us in the form of anthologized excerpts (all eight of them) chosen by Stobaeus not from a full text but from an epitome.

The question of 'diatribe' naturally arises (handled principally in the introduction, pp. 44–78). Following what is now a fairly well-established trend, F. argues that 'diatribe' as a literary form, 'founded' by Bion, and now best exemplified by the shreds of Teles, is a chimaera, but that the word can usefully be retained (as he does himself in his title) to indicate a (lively, informal) style and a particular activity (preaching). This seems well enough; what is at issue is the development of a suitable stylistic medium for the conveying of a particular kind of subject-matter to a range of different audiences in different specific contexts. Less satisfactory, perhaps, is F.'s desire, in discussing the origins of this medium (pp. 56–61), to distance it both from philosophical (Socratic) dialogue (not needed, according to F., in order to explain the 'dialogic' element in Teles) and from sophistic *epideixis*—as if the credit of Teles and his like somehow depended on their freedom from the taint alike of sophistry and of scholastic philosophy. Counter-indications spring readily to mind. On the one hand, this kind of preaching was a heavily Socratic form, and where were the resources of Socratic communication to be found preserved for imitation and development, if not in dialogues? On the other, given the sophists' claims as virtuosi in the manipulation of audiences through stylistic resourcefulness, it would have been crazy for any popular communicator not to have sought to learn from them. Part of the problem in this respect may be F.'s keenness to read Teles as a live performer and to stress the orality of his style (pp. 62–6), rather than to think of him as primarily the composer of written texts. This is both questionable in itself and makes it more difficult to think constructively about connections with earlier work circulating in written form.

A more interesting argument could also have been made over the issue of Teles' doctrinal affinities and allegiances (discussed in the introduction, pp. 37–43, and at intervals throughout the commentary), particularly his relationship to Cynicism. F. hedges his bets, initially arguing (rightly) for a 'syncretizing' Teles without definite doctrinal loyalties, keen on practical morality, self-sufficiency, and immunity to the passions; but he then adds, more questionably, that since Cynicism was such a broad church, this position too can properly be labelled Cynic. This seems to ignore the fact that most of what we think of as the characteristic vocabulary of Cynicism is missing from the fragments, as also is any exhortation to adopt an identifiably Cynic pattern of behaviour. The beginnings of a more subtle approach might be to look more closely at the figures of authority Teles quotes and tells of, and the precise manner of his references. His heroes are Crates (fr. 2, 4a, 4b, 5), Socrates (2, 3, 7), Bion (2, 4a), Diogenes (2, 4a), and Stilpo (3,7), with favourable mentions for Xenophon (2), Aristippus (3), and Zeno (4b); the objects of his scorn are the scholastics, with their

friendly attitude to wealth and status, Aristotle (4b), Theophrastus (4a), and Xenocrates (4a); Plato and Epicurus are not named at all, and no collective name for any school is used. This certainly indicates a sympathy for that branch of the Socratic tradition that was concerned primarily for practical moral preaching and example, and looked askance on wealth and status as values; but—at least as far as the surviving fragments go—questions of loyalty and group identity do not arise. Teles' Cynic heroes are prized as showing to a heroic, limiting degree how completely immunity to the blows of fortune can be achieved, but they are not held up as practitioners of a lifestyle to be embraced in all its details. Moreover, in one place, Diogenes and his kind are explicitly contrasted with the author and his audience (fr. 2, 10.6–1.7).

F. prints his own text of Teles, defending his choices at some length in specially constituted sections of the commentary, with a tendency to reject editorial interventions where possible and restore the transmitted wording. The results are not always convincing, and it does not help that only a very selective apparatus criticus is given, and that the layout of both text and commentary make it difficult to cross-refer quickly from one to the other. In this respect at least, there are reasons for not banishing Hense to the stacks quite yet.

King's College London

M. B. TRAPP

PHILODEMUS ON POETRY

R. JANKO: *Philodemus on Poems*, Book One. Pp. xvi + 591, 21 pls. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Cased. ISBN: 0-19-815041-5.

In spite of the fact that Epicurus considered poetry and music among the 'unnecessary' pleasures, and potentially dangerous if used to distract men from more serious philosophical meditations, the most versatile of his followers not only devoted some time to creating delightful epigrams, but also composed at least three voluminous monographs (*ὑπομνήματα*), on *Poems*, *On Rhetoric*, and *On Music*. The publication of the three major aesthetic works of Philodemus is the goal of the ambitious Philodemus Translation Project, directed by D. Blank, D. Obbink, and R. Janko. The first harvest of many years of toil is the splendid edition of Philodemus' *On Poems* Book 1 by R. Janko, based not only on the surviving papyrus fragments discovered in the eighteenth century in the 'Villa dei Papiri' at Herculaneum, but also on newly discovered transcripts made before some fragments were lost.

Philodemus was one of the figures who acted as a bridge between the most refined Latin poetry (Horace, Virgil, and their successors) and the literary theories of the Hellenistic period, and, as J. points out, apart from Horace, 'he was . . . the only ancient poet whose literary criticism also survives' (p. v). According to the Epicureans, the only justification for the existence of poetry, and of the music accompanying it, was its rôle as a vehicle for the transmission of philosophical truths; without them, virtuosity of language was vain. As Lucretius' masterpiece shows, Epicurean principles fell on fertile ground in the practical Roman culture, not particularly sensitive to the belief in *l'art pour l'art*; and Philodemus' influence is probably to be detected in Virgil and in all the Augustan and late Latin poets who combined highly engaged contents with the most refined *labor limae*.

The importance of Philodemus' *De poematis* resides not only in the author's own principles, but also in the fact that in this treatise are summarized the theories of many