

Philodemus on Property Management, translated with an Introduction and Notes by Voula Tsouna. Writings from the Greco-Roman World No. 33. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2012. xlv + 125. ISBN 978 1589837652. Hardcover \$39.95, paperback \$19.96.

Philodemus' Περὶ οἰκονομίας or *On Household Management*, which is Book 9 of his *On Vices and their opposing Virtues*, stands out among the writings of this Epicurean philosopher for three reasons. Its text survives in one of the best preserved of the Herculaneum papyri, namely *P. Herc.* 1424; it was edited by Christian Jensen, who was one of the most brilliant editors whom these papyri have had; and it is of extraordinary interest in itself as a treatment of economics in the ancient world, particularly at a time when the terrible effects of unregulated capitalism's economic crisis have wrongly come to bulk larger than the diseased ideology and grubby political decisions that caused it. Scholars have been able to reconstruct this text with great accuracy because the philosopher rebuts two works that have come down to us through the Medieval tradition—Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* and a second *Oeconomicus* found among the works of Aristotle, which Philodemus attributes, with what one would have thought was decisive authority, to Theophrastus. At the end of the work, Philodemus offers us his own thoughts on the topic. The translation and notes by Tsouna (henceforward 'Ts.>') constitute the first treatment of this work in English, and her book deserves a warm welcome from everyone interested in ancient ethics and economics.

The Introduction begins by noting that, for many among the ancients, economics was a branch of ethics (modern bankers take note). To what extent are the acquisition and retention of material goods essential to happiness? In what ways are these aims compatible with the good life? Whereas Xenophon and Theophrastus suppose there is no limit to material acquisition (i.e., in modern parlance, to 'growth'), they nonetheless suppose that, so long as acquisition is legal, those who succeed at it thereby display virtue in the art of acquiring wealth, ideally by the close supervision of agricultural property (pp. xi–xvii). Philodemus has difficulty in agreeing that such people can have a virtuous character if their aim is to maximize their wealth above all else. Ts. reviews his objections, showing how cogent they are and how consistently they accord with Epicurean principles (pp. xvii–xxiv). From col. XII onwards Philodemus outlines his own views, drawing on Metrodorus' *On wealth*. The wise property-manager will temper the need to maximize profit with other considerations. He will share with his friends, since they will return more real wealth to him over the long term than they seem to cost in the short term. He will look on his gains and losses with some detachment, and avoid sources of wealth like the exploitation of slaves in the mines, although income from rental property is acceptable. In other words, he will not be dedicated exclusively to material goals. His ideal source of income will be contributions gratefully received from friends to whom he imparts his wisdom, i.e., in modern terms, payment for college-level teaching (pp. xxv–xl). The introduction ends with an account of the papyrus and the purpose of the book, which is 'to be accessible to readers who have an interest in the subject but do not necessarily know Greek' (pp. xl–xlv). It amply succeeds in this respect.

The fluent translation, facing the text, is the heart of the book, and is keyed to notes at the back. There are some lively turns of phrase, such as 'big spender' and 'liquid assets', and errors are relatively few. At col. V 2, ἐμφορτικ means 'implication'. At V 12,

ἐπ' αὐτήν means 'with a view to it', i.e. prosperity. At V 17, πα[ρὰ] means 'because of'. At VI 17, the supplied noun with τὴν αὐτήν is 'discipline' (ἐπιτιμήμη) not 'meaning'. At VII 41, μᾶλλον δὲ means 'and still more'. At VIII 19–21, ἴδιον is better translated 'particularity'. At IX 26, for 'other <slaves>' read simply 'others'. At IX 43, for 'work more' read 'work most'. At X 26–8, the words 'for they (sc. the free) ... instituted' are rebuttal, not quotation. At XII 1 θεματίζω means 'lay down as a general principle'. At XII 16 δέουσης is 'necessary', not 'appropriate', and at XVIII 26 διαφέρον is 'interest', not 'difference'. In XIX 18–23, read 'easily satisfied *even* with few possessions, while wealth repays a certain measure of care and toil for the purpose of succor *by means of it*'. At XXI 1, for 'possesses money' read 'is master of his money' (κυριεύει). At XXVI 45, for 'offers' read 'injunctions'.

For the papyrologist this book best serves as a powerful proreptic to further work on this text. *P. Herc.* 1424 preserves the last thirty-three columns of a roll that once contained ninety-eight. Since it is written in the commonest hand in the Herculanean library (the Anonimo XXV of G. Cavallo, *Libri scritte scribi a Ercolano*, Naples 1983), and there has been no comprehensive survey of all the fragments in this hand, its outer parts have yet to be identified. Ts. gives a lucid account of the papyrus' palaeography and editorial history (the second set of Neapolitan *disegni* was made in 1807–1808, not 1814, and corrections of εἰ for ἱ are made by putting a dot over the ε, not over the ι).

The text is based on Jensen's Teubner of 1906, but Ts. has also studied both the infra-red digital photographs and the papyrus itself, unfortunately before the introduction in 1997 of microscopes with annular lighting. A number of excellent new readings (some owed to D. Delattre and D. Sedley), e.g. ἐπιθυμιῶν at XVI 32, are signalled in footnotes. However, all the supplements printed in Jensen are ascribed to him, even when Jensen credits them to others. Overlapping columns are still not separated, e.g. in col. V. At IX 25 ἦ is inserted without angle-brackets, and at XXXVIII 2–3 ὕ|πογράφ[ε]ιν has fallen out entirely. At XVI 16 πέραι should be πέρα{\ι/}, as Cavallo's plate XLV confirms. Most importantly, Jensen's edition is followed so closely that the Leiden convention of 1927 is not. Jensen distinguished αῤ 'litterae mutilae sed non dubiae' from [αῤ] 'litterae mutilae', but Ts. does not reproduce his explanation of this obsolete convention. Thus at I 18 what should now be τότε is printed [τ]όττε. The rash of dots makes the text look far less secure than it in fact is; having survived the pyroclastic surge so well, the papyrus did not deserve to catch measles.

The translation sometimes points to the correct reading even when it is not printed. At XV 3 αὐτοῦ should be αὐτοῦ, and is so translated (the subject is τις at XIV 37). At XXII 25 Ts. translates as if <καὶ> has fallen out before κατὰ, as it surely has. προειρημένοις at XVII 2 and προειρημένον at XXI 14 are scribal misspellings of προηρη- from (προ)αιρέομαι, like περιείρηκα and περιειρηκότες (XVIII 20, XII 32); the translations and notes need adjusting accordingly.

Richard Janko
Department of Classical Studies, University of Michigan
rjanko@umich.edu