feast'. A *μερίς* is typically a cut of sacrificial meat, and the point is also (compare *mutatis mutandis* the dispatch of slices of wedding cake) to involve friends in the sacrifice. (XIX 7) 'Blaspheme' is no way to translate *βλασφημῆσαι*. (XXVII 4) The *ὀψιμαθής* is inclined (in D.'s text) *εἰς ἥρῳα συμβάλλεσθαι τοῖς μειρακίοις λαμπάδα τρέχων*, which he renders 'he joins the young men's torch-race team for the hero-festivals'. This is difficult. *μειράκια* were the standard competitors in torch-races, but 'hero-festivals' were by no means the standard context in which torch-races were run (nor is *ἥρῳα* = 'hero-festivals' elsewhere attested). Probably we should read *εἰς Ἡρώια* and recognise an allusion to this festival of Asclepius, which by the second century hosted games and very probably torch-races (*AM* 85, 1970, 109). But *εἰς Ἡρώια* where we would expect a dative, 'at the Heroa', remains hard; expressions such as *εἰς Διονύσια χορηγεῖν* are not parallel. (XXVIII 2) According to the Slanderer, a certain individual was Sosias by origin, Sosistratos on military service (as a mercenary?), and something else (obscured by a lacuna) after registration in a deme. D. accepts Meier's Sosidemios to preserve the run of Sos-names, and this may be right. But whereas Sosistratos is a much more pukka name than Sosias, to grade up from Sosistratos to Sosidemios would bring no obvious social advantage. (XXX 14) The *αἰσχροκερδής* keeps his children at home during Anthesterion *διὰ τὸ θέας εἶναι πολλὰς, ἵνα μὴ τὸν μισθὸν ἐκτίνῃ*. D. rightly points to difficulties in the received views of this passage. But his own suggestion that 'the father keeps his son at home in order to avoid paying for "spectacles", which are outings to the theatre (or the like) organised by the school itself', seems quaintly anachronistic: who has heard of school outings in Athens, and what are these theatres always open ready to welcome school parties?

New College, Oxford

ROBERT PARKER
robert.parker@new.ox.ac.uk

THEOPHRASTUS

(1) FORTENBAUGH (W. W.) *Theophrastean Studies*. (Philosophie der Antike 17.) Pp. 345. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2003. Cased, €72. ISBN: 3-515-07808-8.

(2) FORTENBAUGH (W. W.), SHARPLES (R. W.), SOLLENBERGER (M. G.) (edd.) *Theophrastus of Eresus: On Sweat, On Dizziness and On Fatigue*. (Philosophia Antiqua 93.) Pp. viii + 324, ill. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2003. Cased, €85, US\$99. ISBN: 90-04-12890-5.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001648

(1) Bill Fortenbaugh has been the prime mover in the revival of Theophrastean studies since the publication of his *Aristotle on Emotion* (1975) and *Fragmente der Ethik* (1984). The present collection of 22 papers written over a period of 25 years discusses issues in logic, psychology, ethics, rhetoric, religion and poetics, and originates in a range of journals, conference proceedings and a Festschrift; papers originally written in a foreign language are now all in English. Apart from convenience of access, such collections ideally constitute more than the sum of their parts. I think with some qualification this is true for F.'s volume. The kaleidoscopic fragmentation of post-classical philosophy is one reason for an unfortunate emphasis on the classical period until the 1970s. It is thinkers like Theophrastus who give us a

good idea of the reception and development of Aristotle's thought, thus providing insight into the discussions in the early Peripatos. But this can only become clear if the fragmentation is counteracted by patient editing and explication of the works. This is what Project Theophrastus has been doing for two decades.

In what follows I propose to highlight a few points of particular interest. F. is at his best when carefully scrutinising evidence and building his case. This often involves piecing together meagre evidence, but also assessing the wide range of source authors who report Theophrastus' views, from Cicero to Simplicius (A.D. 530). In some cases the value of a fragment is diminished [paper no. 14], in others it can lead to insights about Theophrastus' relationship to Aristotle and how he positions himself *vis-à-vis* the corpus. F. presents some interesting insights on ethics: his analysis of the views on laughter show that Theophrastus probably tried to put forward comedy as having an equally cathartic effect as Aristotle claimed for tragedy [6]. Further we find in [10] a discussion of 'the ancients' great fascination with the casuistry of friendship' (p. 155), when F. explains that rendering a service was considered a *pathos* ('feeling' rather than 'mode of suffering', p. 120), or that Theophrastus did not think that a tortured man could be happy, a moot point for which, as Cicero tells us (*TD* 5.24), he was much criticised (p. 123). A piece on the *Characters* [8] deserves a wider audience: it corrects certain misconceptions about the work, and invites readers to see them as connected to the treatment of vices in Aristotle: the predominantly literary appreciation over the centuries has obscured the philosophical significance of these sketches of characters. F. tackles more complex problems in 'Piety, Justice and animals' [12], important for its ideas on sacrifice and vegetarianism in Porphyry, who lived 232/3–305 C.E. (*not* B.C. as printed), an analysis of the booktitles on rhetoric and how these inform us about his activities in this area (D.L. 5.42–48, cf. FHSg 1.68–291), to be compared with [19], which looks at Cicero as a source for Theophrastus' view on prose rhythm, the connection between *Characters* and rhetoric [16], on delivery [18], and two more studies on poetics [20–1]. An entertaining bonus chapter [22] presents a nineteenth-century version of a character sketch of a scholar in the style of Theophrastus.

One broader insight emerges from these essays: they confirm that at this stage the Aristotelian corpus was not yet fully canonised, but was being revised, enlarged and criticised. Another point is the scope of Theophrastus' learning, which encompasses rhetorical skills and delivery, religious sensibility, dutiful behaviour, logic and laughter treated with equal ease and sagacity. In short, this is a very useful collection which provides an opportunity to gain insight into one exponent of Peripatetic philosophy. The volume is beautifully produced with only a small number of typographical errors (p. 50, line 6 'is' for 'in'; p. 56 'infelicitates' for 'infelicities'; p. 91 n. 5 'give' for 'given'; p. 105 n. 52 'may <be> classified'; p. 121 'concerns' for 'concern'; p. 174 'B.C.' for 'C.E.'; n. 177 'Theses' for 'These').

(2) The editions of three so-called *opuscula* (*On Sweat*, *On Dizziness*, *On Fatigue*) are combined in one volume for good reasons: they are quite short, and they all deal with physiology. They are a welcome addition to the revision of the Theophrastean corpus undertaken by Project Theophrastus (for the fragments see FHSg 1992, 2 volumes). These short treatises belong to a group of nine which have survived together in a range of manuscripts analysed by Walter Burnikel, *Textgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu neun Opuscula Theophrasts* (Wiesbaden, 1974), who established that for seven works all MSS went back to one codex. The new editions replace the Wimmer editions of 1862 and 1866 (with Latin translation), and offer lavish

commentary, an introduction on the complicated manuscript tradition (Fortenbaugh), indexes and an elaborate second apparatus with parallel sources (e.g. [Arist.] *Problemata*). All three take A (Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1302) as their main MS. In addition, we find important excerpts from Photius' *Bibliotheca* (a tradition independent of the major MSS and often right, p. 95) printed with facing translation.

These editions required a long preparation time because the works, like so many Peripatetic works originating in 'lecture notes', are terse and technical, and fraught with philological and interpretive problems: in *On Sweat* alone (250 lines) I counted five cruces and numerous lacunae. The critical apparatuses map the MSS variants and conjectures extensively, and the commentary presents detailed discussions of text constitution, the Peripatetic framework of scientific and philosophical method and possible connections with other works. The value of these excellent editions can be manifold: exploring interesting links with the rest of the Theophrastean corpus or with the Hippocratic corpus on medical biology (e.g. pp. 60–1; cf. index), providing an opportunity for historians of science and medicine to assess the interaction between early medical and philosophical thinking. The editions are very well produced with only minor errors.

Works such as these allow for a better evaluation and understanding of Theophrastus. And I wholeheartedly agree that comparison with his master would be 'invidious' (T. Brennan, *BMCRCR* 2004.01.09). Judgement from hindsight is too easy and does injustice to an industrious and intelligent philosopher-scientist who had a mind of his own. The 'Publisher's Note' (p. vii) indicates that this book represents 'first fruits' of the continued effort of Project Theophrastus to produce scholarly editions with translations of the *opuscula* (*On Weather Signs* is 'close to completion'). Further volumes are eagerly awaited.

[Although the author of this review is connected to Project Theophrastus, he has no link with the books under review.]

The University of Adelaide

HAN BALTUSSEN
han.baltussen@adelaide.edu.au

EPICURUS ON FREEDOM

O'KEEFE (T.) *Epicurus on Freedom*. Pp. x + 175. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. Cased, £45, US\$70. ISBN: 0-521-84696-X.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X06001654

Tim O'Keefe has written a clear, short and intelligent study of Epicurus' thinking about freedom of action and individual responsibility. For O., Epicurus is primarily concerned to assert a kind of freedom which would be threatened by fatalism, the notion that the future is in no way contingent. He wants to rescue the possibility of reasoning and deliberating effectively about one's future actions, not a libertarian 'freedom of the will'.

Through a careful discussion of a number of texts and sections of text which will be well known to anyone who has ever tried to make sense of Epicurus' views on these matters, together with lengthy discussions of the many various competing interpretations available, O. offers a number of significant conclusions, each well worth serious consideration.