

offers a global explanation of katharsis (67–75). If in the wake of Bernays' *Zwei Abhandlungen über die aristotelische Theorie des Drama* (Berlin 1857), 'medical' exegetes stated that spectators sought to purge their emotions, 'ethical' exegetes read the *Poetics* as a counterpart of the *Ethics* and interpreted katharsis in regard to the idea of 'right measure' ('katharsis would be the "purgation" of an emotional overflow, which would allow for the "purification" of piety, or its just measure, which transforms it into a virtue', my translation from the French, 71). The interpretation of Martha Nussbaum ('Tragedy and Self-Sufficiency: Plato and Aristotle on Fear and Pity', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy* 10 (1992), 107–52) relies on a different translation of *katharsis* ('clarification'), which has no relation to the musical katharsis of the *Politics*. Destrée suggests a more 'minimalistic' and 'global' interpretation of katharsis (as it also applies to comedy, according to Iamblichus and Proclus) that takes into account *Politics* VIII and Aristotle's biological corpus. By inducing fear and pity through the plot (which culminates in recognition), the katharsis of these emotions would be nothing more than their expression, which happens concretely through the tears and shouts of fear and lamentation. Like comedy and music (in the *Politics*), tragedy would therefore bring a kind of emotional relief which, in addition, does not contradict the goal of these activities, which is leisure.

The French translation is never pedantic and always tends towards transparency. In this respect, the book does not address specialists but targets a broader readership without, however, giving up on precision and scholarship. Destrée avoids literal translations that might be misleading or obscure; for example, according to the context, λέξις is translated as *langage* ('language'), *mot* ('word'), *expression* or *figure de style* ('figure of speech'). I note some wonderful solutions: for example, translating Δειλιάς as *Poltroniade* ('Cowardiad', 1448a13), where Destrée maintains the play on the word in French; *grave et sérieuse* ('grave and serious') to translate (or gloss) the adjective σπουδαίος (1449a24), qualifying the kind of action represented by tragedy; *intègre* ('upright') to render χρηστός, defining the first virtue of the characters in tragedy (1454a17); *revirement de situation* ('sudden turn') for περιπέτεια (which indeed does not correspond to the French *péripétie*, 'incident'); translating τῇ λέξει συναπεργάζεσθαι (1455a22–23) with 'when he builds his plots, the poet must help himself by reciting them' (my translation), where συναπεργάζεσθαι (usually understood as 'completing the effect [of the emotions]') and λέξις (usually understood as 'expression') are translated according to the explanation in footnote 203: for Destrée refers here to the passage in 1455a30, where *lexis* designates the attitude of the poet reading his own plot out loud. As a result, Aristotle's advice is the following: while reciting the text he is composing, the poet must visualize its action.

Reading this beautiful translation is even more pleasant because Destrée adds titles and subtitles to Aristotle's text, making clear a structure that can be hard to grasp at first sight. The footnotes (171–248) provide historical, cultural and Aristotelian context; they explain and justify, in a more technical but always clear manner, the choices made in the translation

FRÉDÉRIQUE WOERTHER

CNRS (UMR 8230, Centre Jean Pépin/ENS Ulm)

Email: frederique.woerther@cnrs.fr

GREGORIĆ (P.) and KARAMANOLIS (G.) (eds) **Pseudo-Aristotle: *De Mundo (On the Cosmos): A Commentary***. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. xi + 245; illus., maps; 24 cm. £75. 9781108834780.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000933](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000933)

The work *Περὶ Κόσμου (De mundo, DM)* is not by Aristotle. Purporting to be a letter to Alexander the Great, its author aims to present an Aristotelian picture of the universe,

traversing, as it were, the multitudinous sublunary phenomena and culminating in an account of god. The *DM* has largely suffered the fate of many pseudonymous texts: deemed second-rate and derivatively eclectic, scholarship mired with questions of dating, (in)authenticity and sources. The recent translation and collection of papers edited by J.C. Thom (*Cosmic Order and Divine Power: Pseudo-Aristotle, 'On the Cosmos'* (Tübingen 2014)) was a step in the right direction, but it is only as of the present volume that we have a comprehensive discussion of the theories and arguments of the entire treatise. The nine contributors offer a section-by-section analysis of the *DM*, treating it as a serious and interesting piece of philosophy.

An introduction by the editors sets out the aims of the volume and offers a series of considerations for post-Aristotelian/Hellenistic authorship. There follow chapters on each of the sections of the *DM*: the preface (George Karamanolis), the supra- and sublunary realms (Karel Thein and Jakub Jirsa, respectively), geography (Irene Pajón Leyra and Hynek Bartoš), meteorology (István Baksa), cosmic harmony and eternity (Pavel Gregorić), god's power (Gábor Betegh and Gregorić) and the names of god (Vojtěch Hladký).

Karamanolis' discussion emphasizes the introductory and proreptic character of the *DM* and is sensitive to the author's style and various registers. He highlights an important theme that recurs throughout the volume, the various overlaps between the *DM* and Stoic and Platonist thought. The *DM* attempts to offer a Peripatetic alternative to these schools not through open polemic but through appropriation and implicit criticism.

The chapters on the heavenly sphere, the elements and sublunary phenomena are the most commentary-like of the volume, focussed on explicating the text, highlighting parallels and discussing, if not always resolving, interpretative cruxes. As a whole they strike a good balance between the forest and the trees. Jirsa's remark on the *DM*'s view on the four elemental layers can apply to *DM* 2–4 as a unit: 'the author's intention is to prepare the reader for his conclusion that even the highly diverse stratum teeming with plants, animals, growth and decay is governed by a single power which penetrates the whole cosmos' (68–69). The chapters on geography and meteorology are highlights for their thoroughness and utility and could serve double duty as critical introductions to post-Aristotelian developments in these sciences.

The account of the causal power of god is the capstone of the *DM*, so it is no surprise that the chapters on cosmic harmony and god's power are the most interpretatively rich. Gregorić explains how *DM* 5 facilitates the transition from sublunary science to cosmology by illustrating how a cosmos rife with opposing and destructive elemental principles can nevertheless be unperishing. The many echoes of Plato's *Timaeus* in this section are ultimately *anti*-Platonic, although I still find the *DM*'s argument for its Peripatetic alternative to Platonist cosmology difficult to parse. (Gregorić defends this deficiency by appealing to the introductory and rhetorical character of the treatise.) *DM* 6 elaborates the power (*dunamis*) of god through an intricate series of analogies. Betegh and Gregorić, building upon their article 'Multiple Analogy in Ps.-Aristotle, *De Mundo* 6', *CQ* 64 (2014), 574–91, admirably demonstrate how the 12 analogies work together: subsequent images either expand on or emend a deficiency in the preceding one. Their discussion is teeming with insight; I flag two points that mark significant contrast with earlier interpreters. First, they (rightly, in my view) warn against the assimilation of the *DM*'s deity to Aristotle's Unmoved Mover since in the *DM* god is said to reside far off in the highest part of the cosmos rather than transcend it strictly speaking. Second, they interpret the final analogy, which likens god in the cosmos to law in the soul, as meaning that god coordinates 'the goal-directed activities of all members of a political community' (199). Not everyone will agree with their identification of god as a *final* cause in the *DM*, especially since all the other analogies are at pains to explain how god is an *efficient* cause despite acting at such a remove.

This is not strictly a 'commentary', and there are some shortcomings to the section-by-section format: almost all the contributors comment on the *DM*'s relationship to Stoicism, but it would be nice to have a definitive statement on the matter instead of these scattered,

albeit instructive, remarks; and certain overarching themes remain underexplored (especially the ethical and political thought of the *DM* and the work's engagement with traditional Hellenic religion). These cavils aside, the collection of essays is successful in demonstrating the philosophical coherence and sophistication of the *DM*. Perhaps most importantly the volume provides a model for how to approach anonymous or pseudonymous texts as serious and interesting philosophical works. Analysis and dating go hand in glove: in analysing the theory or doctrine of a work, one inevitably asks: In what dialectical context does it make sense for our author to hold this position? To what views does he respond? Why propose this alternative in the first place? The papers here ought to dispel any lingering suspicions of Aristotelian authorship (although A. Bos remains a dogged holdout (*BMCRCR* 2021.06.24)), and this collection certainly should rehabilitate the place of the *DM* in the history of late- and post-Hellenistic philosophy.

MATTHEW WATTON

University of Toronto

Email: matthew.watton@mail.utoronto.ca

ALLISON (J.R.) **Saving One Another: Philodemus and Paul on Moral Formation in Community**. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2020. Pp. xii + 237. \$153. 9789004434004.
doi:[10.1017/S0075426922000945](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075426922000945)

In the wake of recent scholarship attempting to cast light on Paul the Apostle by relating his writings to those of non-Christian Graeco-Roman authors, Justin Reid Allison in *Saving One Another* compares the ideas of Paul to those of the first-century BC Epicurean philosopher Philodemus of Gadara. Since parallels between Paul and Epicurus have already been discussed, for instance, by Norman DeWitt (*Saint Paul and Epicurus* (Minneapolis 1954)), and the communalities between Paul and Philodemus have even been the object of a separate monograph (C. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Greek Psychagogy* (Leiden and New York 1995)), Allison does not break new ground with his revised Durham University PhD thesis (as he himself admits). However, in contradistinction to previous authors, who focussed more narrowly on 'psychagogy', that is, techniques to care for the soul, Allison attempts to advance the comparative scholarship on the two authors by shifting attention to moral formation in the community more broadly and by focusing on the differing theological views and socio-economic realities of the Philodemean and Pauline communities.

The volume consists of roughly two equally long parts, dedicated to Philodemus and Paul respectively, each consisting of three chapters. In the chapters on Philodemus, Allison discusses Philodemus' attitude to wealth and the community within which he lived, the role of the divine in moral formation and the strategies of frank criticism, that is, moral formation proper. In the chapters on Paul, Allison discusses the economic status of the members of the Pauline community before turning to two case studies, focussing on 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1 and 12:1–14:40, that work out the process of communal moral formation in Paul. A final chapter then compares and contrasts the findings of the analyses of Philodemus and Paul.

Given the specialized nature of the project, scholars of early Christianity, on the one hand, and scholars of Epicureanism, on the other, are the natural target audiences for this work, although the book seems overall more geared towards the former than the latter. For instance, Allison dedicates at least some space in chapter 2 (30–33) to giving the reader a basic acquaintance with Philodemus' life, whereas he presupposes comparable knowledge about Paul when the discussion shifts to the apostle in chapter 5. Since my primary expertise is in Epicureanism, others will have to evaluate the book's contribution to Pauline studies. In regard to its contribution to Philodemean studies, Allison himself concedes that it is limited, and I would add that his 'adjustment of certain details of our portrait of Philodemus' (195) is not always convincing.