cover and title, will discover a colorful story that brings to life the society of Athens in the fourth century B.C.E.

Apollodorus' speech 'Against Neaira' has received considerable attention in the past decade. The publication of *Trying Neaira* underlines the growing consensus that the attention is deserved.

Emory University CYNTHIA PATTERSON

THE *REPUBLIC*

B. MITCHELL, J. R. LUCAS: *An Engagement with Plato's* Republic. *A Companion to the* Republic. Pp. xii + 177. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003. Paper, £15.99 (Cased, £45). ISBN: 0-7546-3366-7 (0-7546-3365-9 hbk).

An Engagement with Plato's Republic contributes to a genre on the rise: a work about Greek Philosophy whose target audience is the non-specialist. Sales of scholarly books have been dwindling, and academic publishers must gain a foothold among the general readership in order to survive. The marketing strategy of a book such as this is displayed on its cover: the all-too-familiar reproduction of Raphael's 'School of Athens' has been updated with photographs of a man holding a cell phone and a woman gazing into a laptop.

Even if fueled by economic motives, this trend should be welcomed. It is useful and fair to challenge serious scholars to write books accessible to intelligent readers of all sorts, and not just fellow specialists. In other words, a good scholar should be able to teach as well as do 'research'. (Disclosure: the author of this review has himself contributed to this genre. On the cover of his *Retrieving the Ancients: An Introduction to Greek Philosophy* [Malden, MA, 2004], a photograph of a skyscraper is juxtaposed with one of a Doric column.)

Mitchell and Lucas are serious scholars whose goal is to 'engage' their readers in a study of Plato's *Republic*. They explicate the central issues of the dialogue—morality as mental health, the theory of forms, feminism, the critiques of democracy and poetry—by writing clearly, but never condescendingly. They often cite contemporary examples (television, airport bookstores, British educational policy) to illustrate the 'relevance' of Plato's philosophical arguments. Particularly effective are their discussions of (i) the tripartite soul of Book 4, which they explain as 'three classes' of 'motives' (p. 32); (ii) the tyrant in Book 9, whom they describe as an 'autistic autocrat' (p. 43); (iii) the theory of forms, which they introduce as a 'theory of adjectives' and defend because 'communication would break down if I applied adjectives just as I fancied' (p. 58); and (iv) dialectic, which for them is an 'informal, cumulative style of argument' (p. 107), a notion they illuminate with a vivid 'architectural analogy' (p. 104). In these exemplary sections the reader is in the hands of experienced teachers and able guides.

Nonetheless, this useful little book does not quite live up to its own billing. Rather than *An Engagement with Plato's Republic*, a more accurate title would be 'An Engagement with a Few of Socrates' Arguments that Have been Extracted from Plato's *Republic*'. For, despite their acknowledgement that 'Plato believed that philosophy could only be properly carried out in the form of a dialogue' (p. viii), the authors

The Classical Review vol. 54 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2004; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.314 Published online by Cambridge University Press

themselves largely ignore the dramatic structure of the work. One example: the authors state that 'It is with the entry of Thrasymachus into the conversation that the *Republic* comes alive' (p. 5). By this they mean that only with Thrasymachus is a substantial position articulated and then methodically refuted. The *Republic*, however, is alive from the beginning. Consider the brief appearance of Cephalus in Book 1. As Plato makes clear, he is a self-satisfied old man who, because his sexual desires have quieted and he no longer feels the sting of Eros, is grateful that he has escaped a 'frenzied and savage master' (329c). With this remark he signals a central theme of the *Republic*. Eros, after all, is necessary for the activity of philosophy itself. Simply put, philosophers are 'lovers of wisdom' who 'delight in and love that on which knowledge depends' (480a), namely objects like 'beauty itself' (479e). This is why Glaucon, who is explicitly described as an erotic man (368a, 402e, 474d), is a potential philosopher and an attractive interlocutor, while Cephalus is not.

Eros must be cultivated carefully because it is capable of spawning not only the philosopher, but also the tyrant. Indeed, echoing Cephalus' remark in Book 1, Socrates later says, Eros 'has from old been called a tyrant' (573b). In short, it is the source of humanity's greatest achievements, and worst catastrophes. This human dynamic is arguably the central concern of the entire dialogue.

Despite titling one of their chapters 'Sex, Self and Power', Mitchell and Lucas do little to explore this side of the *Republic*. This is because they treat the dialogue strictly as a series of arguments. Doing so not only suppresses the richly philosophical material implicit in the dramatic context, but also leads to the misleading characterization of Plato as one suffering from an 'obsessive puritanism' (p. 122). In sum, Mitchell and Lucas operate on the basis of their own, rather than Plato's, conception of philosophical activity. Their doing so deprives their readers of much that is truly 'engaging' in this dialogue.

There are other instances when Mitchell and Lucas, rather than opening their reader to an engagement with Plato's dialogue, revert to the authoritative style of the professor. They frequently criticize Plato, often without providing the argumentation lying behind their complaints. For example, they characterize the infamous critique of 'imitation' in Book 10 as containing arguments 'so bad as to make us wonder how Plato came to include them' (p. 156). Without citing a word of text, they describe Aristotle as 'awkward and confused in Book VI of the *Ethics* when he tries to give an account of practical reasoning generally' (p. 103). Finally, they sound dogmatic when they refer to 'the mystical vision which undoubtedly inspired' (p. 57) Plato, and when they declare that 'there can be no doubt about the religious significance of the work' (p. 106). Surely the reader should have been informed that, in fact, some scholars would indeed doubt this. In a simliar vein, they assert that 'the vision of the Good is the equivalent of the beatific vision in Christian theology, an intuition of the divine essence which alone gives the soul supreme satisfaction' (p. 106).

In sum, *An Engagement with Plato's Republic* is a good addition to the growing number of introductory texts in Greek philosophy. It will assist the student in analyzing some of the important arguments Socrates offers in the dialogue. Nonetheless, it is narrow in scope, stamped with the authors' own presuppositions concerning the nature of philosophy itself, and therefore potentially misleading.

Boston University DAVID ROOCHNIK

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.314 Published online by Cambridge University Press