arguments from analogy and their use in theological contexts, including a valuable treatment of the controversial *epilogismos* ('empirical analysis'; 203) and its role in the formation of *prolepseis*. He then moves on to treat the form and bodily constitution of the gods (including detailed consideration of passages to which the idealists have appealed for support), and their homes.

In the last chapter, Essler provides a significantly improved text of Philodemus' *On Gods* 3, cols 8.5–10.6, including the much-debated passage on the star gods, with *apparatus*, translation, and commentary on the content; textual and papyrological questions are treated separately in his 'Falsche Götter bei Philodem (*Di* III Kol. 8,5–Kol. 10,6)', *CErc* 39, 2009, 161–205. Essler shows excellent editorial judgment and avoids the over-supplementation that often afflicts Philodemus. Only rarely would I differ, as at 8.21–22, where asyndeton seems best avoided by taking τ[ο]ῦτο μὲν ζώιων, τοῦτο δὲ φυτῶν ('among animals on the one hand and plants on the other') with the preceding datives. The very full commentary contains much of interest to non-specialists, including an attractive explanation of Philodemus' use of a mirror analogy in explaining the confusion of gods with stars (287–99).

Finally, Essler returns in a conclusion to topics that have come up earlier in the book: the question whether there are different classes of gods, the relationship of Cicero's *transitio* (*ND* 1.49) to Philodemus' *hyperbasis* (rather than *metabasis*), the weaknesses of the thought-construct theory of the gods, and the evidence for a kind of atom peculiar to gods.

A brief review can give no adequate idea of the riches to be found in this book. It will be essential reading for all scholars with interests in Epicureanism.

W.B. Henry
University College London
w.henry@ucl.ac.uk

KUTASH (E.) **Ten Gifts of the Demiurge: Proclus on Plato's *Timaeus***. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press, 2011. Pp. x + 309. £50 (hbk); £11.99 (pbk). 9780715638545 (hbk); 9781853997075 (pbk).
doi:10.1017/S0075426913001274

In 1820, 80 years before the first and only modern edition (E. Diehl, Teubner, 1903–1906), Thomas Taylor translated (and privately published) Proclus' *Commentary on the Timaeus* under the telling title: *The Commentaries of Proclus on the Timaeus of Plato, in Five Books: Containing a Treasury of Pythagoric and Platonic Physiology*. The Greek is forbidding, not to say opaque in some sections, the style rambling, repetitive and often circular. The first modern scholarly translation, into French, was published in 1966–1968 by A.-J. Festugière (a monument of scholarship on the commentary and inexplicably missing from the bibliography of the volume under review). Recently, four of five projected volumes of a new English translation have appeared, making most of this difficult text considerably more accessible for an Anglophone readership (Proclus, *Commentary on Plato's* Timaeus, Cambridge, 2007–). Kutash now offers us a comprehensive guide to the *Commentary*, reorganizing, paraphrasing and elaborating on its themes in the attempt to render its contribution to late antique philosophy and science more accessible. Her book rivals the density and circuitousness (but not the length) of its subject, and there are some genuine gains here: the reader curious to gain a richer idea of Proclus' place in the history of philosophy will find much of interest.

The originality of Kutash's book is to offer a synoptic overview of Proclus' work, effectively creating a commentary on a commentary. Her organizing principle (vi) is derived from the initial list of the demiurge's activities (*Tim.* 31b–40b; *Commentary* II.5 [Diehl]). The first six 'gifts' (perceptibility, proportion, oneness, etc.) concern the physical world. With the seventh, the demiurge animates the world by adding a soul and the last three 'gifts' add respectively, time, the 'sanctuaries of the gods in it who together produce "the perfect year"' (II.5.27–28, tr. Baltzly) and, finally, living things, ourselves included.

The list itself reflects the compulsive systematization of the teacher – today he would use bullet-points – which is characteristic of much of Proclus' writing, from mathematics to theology. Also characteristic is the fact that the relevance of the list, as an organizing principle both of the dialogue and of the *Commentary*, becomes increasingly obscure as the discussion continues. The *Commentary* (which proceeds line by line) breaks off rather abruptly in Book 5 at *Timaeus* 44C, having covered a little more than one third of the text. If he commented at the same rate on the entire text – and given the central role of the *Timaeus* in the curriculum of the late antique schools, one might think this likely – Proclus' complete *Commentary* might have run to some

3,000 Teubner pages (or the same ratio of text to commentary as that on the Myth of Er in the *Republic*, roughly 33–35 pages for a page of text). Kutash, however, argues convincingly that Proclus has 'come full circle' in reaching the subject of man as microcosm, and adduces the organization of the *Elements of Theology* in support of the idea that we have his *Commentary on the Timaeus* largely complete, and that what we have constitutes a coherent whole (231).

This is the first organizing principle, derived from the text itself, and it serves the author well. There is a second idea shaping Kutash's book: in good Iamblichean fashion, her interpretation is organized around a *skopos*, a single target or theme: 'Proclus stipulated that the ultimate *skopos* of the *Commentary on the Timaeus* is to study nature "insofar as it is produced from the gods" (I.217.18–28)' (177). That this is not precisely what the passage in question says is less important than Kutash's assertion, which does indeed give a concise account of her view of the commentary.

After a general introduction (chapter 1) and a historical one (which unfortunately is based on scholarship from the 1960s and 1970s, and could have greatly benefited from the more recent synthesis by E.J. Watts, *City and School*, Berkeley, 2006) (chapter 2), the next four chapters deal with the 'physical gifts'. By this point, a defensive note has repeatedly been sounded, along with an assertion that a special sort of reading is required to do justice to Proclus' prose. At one point, Kutash maintains that the application of 'any kind of analytic standards would not be true to Proclus' intentions. To truly appreciate Proclus' vision, incredulity must be put aside in favour of a more holistic approach ... [O]ne must acclimate to the fusion of the divine and the scientific if one is to be a truly competent reader of Proclus' (137–38). Kutash tests various comparanda in the search for a satisfactory description of Proclus' original modes of thought, from Kant (120, 206), to relativity (166, 169), to the 'symmetrical logic' of the late Chilean psychoanalyst Ignacio Matte Blanco (208). She seems determined to reconcile 'the disappointed "philosopher" who reads the *Commentary*' to Proclus' lapses into 'metaphor and gnomic oracular utterance' (214), but I fear that the goal is a remote one, as is that of demonstrating that Proclus' 'theory of time stands on its own and is a solution to philosophical *aporiae* native to a Platonist vision of the whole' (160) rather than constituting an outgrowth of contemporary developments in religion (as E.R. Dodds, *Proclus, Elements of Theology*, Oxford, 1963, 228–29 maintained) (159–60).

Kutash's chapter on time (chapter 8) is nevertheless one of the most rewarding parts of the book, as are the two chapters that follow, dealing with the human condition and Proclus' apparent conviction (in contrast to earlier Neoplatonists) that the soul, once descended, is held fast in the bonds of matter. Her discussion of Proclus' theurgical activities benefits from a willingness to accept his chains of divinities as an integral part of his world view and to enter into that world view sympathetically. Again, I doubt, however, that she will win over her 'disappointed "philosopher"' with her closing exhortation to 'put away Occam's razor and bask in the varicoloured light that Proclus casts on the secrets of nature' (251).

ROBERT LAMBERTON
Washington University in St Louis
rdlamber@artsci.wustl.edu

SORABJI (R.) *Ed*. **Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science** (2nd edition). London: Institute of Classical Studies, 2010. Pp. xi + 306. £54. 9781905670185.
doi:10.1017/S0075426913001286

Sorabji is well known as the editor of a vast and growing number of translations of ancient commentaries on Aristotle and the editor of several excellent collections of studies on the Aristotelian tradition, among other things. John Philoponus' philosophical outlook and his impact on later theology and especially on later philosophy and science have been central to many of Sorabji's studies and projects. Philoponus, a sixth-century Christian thinker who was originally trained as a Neoplatonist, is best remembered today for his attack on Aristotle's 'physics'; his – direct or indirect – influence on subsequent theories, for example dealing with the concept of impetus, and implicitly his role in the re-evaluation of Aristotelian science and natural philosophy are indeed remarkable.

The first edition of *Philoponus and the Rejection of Aristotelian Science*, published in 1987 (incidentally, the year when the Ancient Commentators on Aristotle project was just being launched), has been a landmark in this field. The second edition includes a new two-part introduction written by the editor of this volume. The goal of its first part is to explore the significance of recent archeological discoveries – such as the