the author's lifelong passion for the city shines through ('I first visited Rome in 1959', xiii). 'Rome is not a museum,' Dyson argues, 'but a living, dynamic city, shaped, informed, and constrained by its past, but never subservient to it' (1).

This is a book that wears its learning lightly. Throughout, Dyson couples historical narrative with sharp-sighted critique: consider the take on J. J. Winckelmann ('His associations of liberty and artistic genius had a certain irony, for Winckelmann was a functionary of the absolutist papal state', 16), or what is concluded about the Grand Tour ('More commonly it left a legacy of venereal disease and weakened livers', 17). The book has no qualms in naming its heroes, or for that matter in shaming its villains; indeed, it is expressly dedicated 'To those who have fought long and hard to save the heritage of Rome' (v). Most gloomy of all is the 'deliberate ambiguity' (xiv) with which Dyson closes, with his 'general sense of uncertainty' (6) about the archaeology of the twenty-first-century city (287–93). 'The curation of archaeological heritage in Italy has always been in crisis' (293), we are told. But, in the wake of Berlusconi, budget cuts run rife: public investment has given way to new sorts of capitalist enterprise (see 6–7). A nice example comes in Diego della Valle's sponsorship of the Colosseum: in exchange for financing much-needed architectural repairs, della Valle gained exclusive corporate rights for the building, using it as a backdrop to market designer Tod's shoes (292).[27] It is a pattern of upmarket branding that is now familiar across the city: the restored Trevi Fountain, brought to you by Fendi fashion, for instance, or the Spanish Steps sponsored by Bulgari watches, jewellery, and 'luxury goods'…

Dyson shrinks from closing his study 'on a too pessimistic and negative note', even when 'the economy is weak and unemployment, especially among the young, very high' (293). When it comes to preserving Rome's archaeological heritage, 'Resources will always be inadequate' (293). So it is that, in the future, just as in the past, we should expect both the good guys and the bad: 'There were the Mũnozs [*sic*], but also the Cadernas and the La Reginas' (293).

Truth be told, however, the picture in 2020 looks bleaker than the author could ever have imagined. In the past, the 'research and advocacy of dedicated savants, public servants, and scholars' might have been enough (xv). But in the wake of the current health crisis, one has to wonder: will these alone suffice?

MICHAEL SQUIRE
michael.squire@kcl.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0017383520000121

Philosophy

Many introductory courses on ancient, or indeed modern, philosophy begin from the observation that the word 'philosophy' itself describes a 'love of wisdom'. Christopher Moore's wide-ranging, original, and fascinating new book sets out to examine the value

[27] For the marketing pitch, see <https://www.tods.com/gb-en/stories/tods-for-colosseum.html>, accessed 29 May 2020.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of that etymology.[1] He argues persuasively that *philosophos* does not, in fact, originate as a label applied respectfully to pick out a 'lover of wisdom' for emulation. Rather, the term is appropriated and developed from its origins as a pejorative name applied to those perceived to be striving too hard and in the wrong way to achieve the status of *sophos*, a 'sage-wannabe' as Moore has it. As he is careful to emphasize, his history of the origins of *philosophos* and *philosophia* does not and need not coincide with the origin story of 'philosophy' as a certain kind of discipline involving a certain way of talking about specific questions. Nevertheless, by scrutinizing the origins of these terms and their application in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE, Moore sets himself up to offer some further enlightening discussion of the fifth- and fourth-century development of the discipline of 'philosophy'.

A useful introduction ('Introduction: The Origins of *Philosophia*') sets out the overall argument of the book. By looking at the first *philosophoi*, rather than the first 'philosophers', we see an origin story and development rather different from the widely assumed and repeated claim that the first *philosophoi* established the discipline of philosophy in their pursuit of wisdom and intellectual cultivation. In building the foundations of his argument, Moore considers the purported origins of the name in the story of Pythagoras' act of naming himself a *philosophos*, versions of which are preserved in several sources from antiquity. He suggests that this story may well represent Pythagoras laying claim to a name that had been applied to him by others in a less than approving tone.

Following this introduction the book is divided into three parts. The first two treat the origins and development of the term *philosophos* (and sometimes *philosophia* – it is notable, and fits Moore's argument, that *philosophia* starts to edge out *philosophos* as the key term as the book progresses). The third and final part takes the development of the term in Plato and Aristotle as its focus.

In the first of three chapters dedicated to the origins of the label *philosophos* ('Heraclitus against the *Philosophoi*'), Moore offers a detailed and persuasive reading of Heraclitus B35, which, if genuine, represents a reference to *philosophoi andres* more or less contemporary with Pythagoras. Scholars have challenged the authenticity of the fragment, on the grounds that it seems inconsistent with the critique of polymathy found elsewhere in Heraclitus. As Moore persuasively argues, this problem falls away if we recognize that Heraclitus is not using the term *philosophos* in a positive sense, but rather as part of a critique of the misguided epistemic ambitions of the Pythagoreans. On this reading, Heraclitus B35 fits both the pejorative and the Pythagorean origins for the term that Moore seeks to establish.

Chapter 3 ('What *Philosophos* Could Have Meant: A Lexical Account') offers a 'lexical account' of early uses of *philosophos* via a careful consideration of the meaning and usage of a variety of comparative *phil-* terms across a range of sources. Moore emphasizes the fact that these terms tend not to be as transparent in meaning as they, and certainly *philosophos*, are often assumed to be. He demonstrates too that they tend to be applied by others, rather than self-appellations, and that they often express negative

[1] *Calling Philosophers Names. On the Origin of a Discipline.* By Christopher Moore. Princeton and Oxford, Princeton University Press, 2020. Pp xxiv + 411. Hardback £38, ISBN: 978-0-691-19505-6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

judgements, sometimes indicating an excessive interest rather than a neutral or even positive 'love for x'. Moore suggests that there is good reason to think that the origin of the term *philosophos* lies in its use as a term applied, with a sense of bafflement, to those perceived to be aspiring to the social and political authority of *sophoi*, without understanding the realities of such success. In Chapter 4 ('Pythagoreans as *Philosophoi*'), Moore argues that it is the Pythagoreans themselves who are plausibly regarded as the primary targets of this assessment.

Having established an origin story and nuanced understanding of the likely early meaning of *philosophos*, Moore goes on to survey a variety of sources in order to see whether their uses fit the model that he has sketched. In Chapter 5 ('Fifth-Century *Philosophoi*'), he turns to fifth century uses of *philosophos* etc., as found in Aristophanes, Herodotus, Gorgias, and others. He demonstrates that here, too, we find no evidence of the use of *philosophoi* to mean 'intellectual cultivators' or 'lovers of wisdom'. Rather, insofar as it is used with a positive connation, it seems to refer to those who engage in practical reasoning about a broad range of questions. In Chapter 6 ('Socrates' Prosecution as *Philosophos*'), Moore notes how infrequently the label is applied to Socrates across the writings of both Plato and Xenophon. He makes the interesting suggestion that Socrates may have been negatively labelled *philosophos* through his association with Anaxagoras, before proposing that Xenophon, in particular, may have sought a nuanced position, seeking neither to defend Socrates' status as a *philosophos*, nor to distinguish him from the *philosophoi*. Moore suggests that Plato's hesitation to apply the term *philosophos* to Socrates may result from his awareness that 'Socrates died because he was deemed a *philosophos*' (193). This is an intriguing suggestion which, it seems to me, would be enhanced by comparison with the representation of the relationship between Socrates and the Sophists. Given that Plato is more than happy to labour the distinction between Socrates and the Sophists, why is the relationship between Socrates and the *philosophoi* treated so obliquely? Turning to *philosophoi* and *philosophia* in the broader philosophical tradition of the fourth century BCE in Chapter 7 ('Non-Academic Philosophy'), Moore notes a plausible and repeated connection between *philosophia* and a practice of self-improvement, as opposed to a specific interest in the discovery and communication of truths.

The third and final part of the book offers three chapters that treat Plato's and Aristotle's use and influence on the meaning of *philosophia*. In Chapter 8 ('Plato's Saving of Apperances'), Moore sets out to challenge the idea that Plato completely redefined *philosophos* and *philosophia*, arguing that, while Plato certainly did seek to develop these ideas, we must also recognize the degree of continuity between his use and that of the fifth century. Plato, Moore suggests, is not simply 'defiantly adopting a dubious name for an obscure practice' (222). In fact, his own use of these terms maintains a significant continuity with the earlier idea of 'making people better through conversation'. Chapter 9 ('Aristotle's Historiography of *Philosophia*') turns to Aristotle's influence in shaping both the discipline of *philosophia* and its history. Indeed, as Moore neatly argues, *philosophia* can only become a discipline once it has a history. Aristotle calls *philosophoi* those with whom he can share opinions about matters central to his own concerns. He moves *philosophia* beyond its previous sense of self-improvement through conversation – and, by presenting the history of *philosophia* in terms of diachronic conversations, he models the practice of philosophy as a discipline.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Chapter 10 ('Ambivalence about *Philosophia* beyond the Discipline'), Moore notes that the ambivalence towards *philosophoi* and *philosophia* in the later fourth century BCE indicates that the negative origins of *philosophos* terms are not completely elided. He ends by offering an epilogue on the relation between modern philosophy and the history of the *philosophia* he has set out, arguing that philosophy remains the 'practice of talking with the goal of becoming a better person'. I would have liked to have seen this section expanded to consider to what degree the bafflement of those who dismissed ancient *philosophoi* might also be found in the modern world.

Moore has produced a hugely enjoyable history of the origins of *philosophia* that will be of value to anyone with an interest in the history of philosophy and intellectual history more broadly. He covers a lot of ground, and at times his narrative is slightly harder to follow through the detail of his account than is ideal. But the results of the pursuit are enlightening and challenging in a positive way.

Thinking about the origins and development of philosophy will be encouraged in different directions by two substantial new works on early Greek philosophy. With the first, *Xenophanes von Kolophon*, Benedikt Strobel and Georg Wöhrle present a monumental new edition of the evidence for the sixth- to fifth-century BCE philosopher-poet Xenophanes.[2] This is the third volume in Wöhrle's *Traditio Praesocratica* series, following those on Thales, and Anaximander and Anaximenes. At present, only the Thales volume has a companion edition with English translations and apparatus, but further such translations are promised. The aim of the *Traditio Praesocratica* series is to provide complete editions of the *testimonia* for individual early Greek thinkers. These volumes therefore tend to go far beyond what has generally been incorporated in previous editions, including material from the Latin, Syro-Arabian, and Armenian traditions and from as late as the thirteenth century CE. The sheer volume of evidence collected here speaks to the huge potential of this edition to inspire new directions in the study of Xenophanes. In keeping with the series as a whole, the focus is on the reception and development of accounts of Xenophanes, rather than on an attempt to reconstruct his own thought. All of the 'fragments', generally treated as *ipsissima verba*, are presented in context, with *testimonia* organized chronologically (and accompanied by a German translation), including even those *testimonia* preserved only by report in later sources. So, for example, Strobel and Wörhle's 'Xen 1' is listed under Epicharmus and notes a claim reported in Aristotle that Epicharmus discussed Xenophanes. It is also referred to as 'Xen 8', listed under Aristotle, which gives us the relevant evidence from the *Metaphysics*. The editors have sought to minimize notes and commentary on the texts themselves but have enhanced ease of reference through a series of appendices, including the extremely useful *Similienapparat*, which enables searching and cross-referencing via key terms and themes. New editions of early Greek philosophy often try to set themselves apart via a new system of organizing more or less the same material (sometimes with some novel inclusions). The *Traditio Praesocratica* volumes set themselves apart, and render themselves indispensable to scholars of early Greek philosophy, by adopting the simplest of orders (chronological),

[2] *Xenophanes von Kolophon*. By Benedikt Strobel and Georg Wöhrle. *Traditio Praesocratica* 3. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2018. Pp viii + 549. Hardback £136.50, ISBN: 978-3-11-055944-6; paperback £27, ISBN: 978-3-11-071011-3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

but incorporating an invaluable pool of new evidence. No scholar of Xenophanes will be able to ignore this work, and we can look forward to future volumes in the series.

Alongside the *Traditio Praesocratica* series, De Gruyter has established a monograph series, *Studia Praesocratica*. The most recent publication in the series presents another monumental work of scholarship in the field. Edited by Christian Vassallo, *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition* offers a collection of chapters developed out of an international workshop held in Trier in 2016.[3] It presents eighteen varied and individually fascinating engagements with both published and unpublished papyrological evidence for early Greek philosophy, including the Herculanean sources, and the Derveni and Strasbourg papyri. The individual chapters, authored by leading figures in the fields, demonstrate an enormous range of perspectives on and potential in the papyrological evidence. They are divided into seven sections, presented in more or less chronological order. Following a brief introduction by the editor, four chapters treat aspects of the Orphic tradition, with two (by David Sedley and Richard McKirahan) focusing on the Derveni Papyrus. McKirahan ('Some Controversial Topics in the Derveni Cosmology') offers a survey of several questions which continue to vex interpreters of this enigmatic but enriching text, arguing for the sensible methodological point that we should keep an eye on the degree to which our expectations inform our interpretations of the evidence. In the final chapter of the Orphic section ('Pherecydes of Syros in the Papyrological Tradition'), Marco Santamaría uses evidence from Oxyrhynchus and Herculaneum to reconsider the status and interests of Pherecydes of Syros. We are given an insight into the content of Pherecydes' book, possibly the first prose book in Greek literature, and, on the basis of the Herculanean evidence, we are given reason to question the Peripatetic tradition that treats Pherycedes as a theologian rather than a philosopher of nature. In the first of three chapters on the Pythagoreans ('The Papyrological Tradition on Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans'), Leonard Zhmud provides an enormously useful survey of the papyrological evidence for Pythagoras, along with some suggestions as to the implications of considering the evidence as a whole. Aldo Brancacci ('Music and Philosophy in Damon of Oa') takes us beyond the Pythagoreans in considering the evidence for the thought of this musical theorist, particularly the question of his Pythagoreanism and his credentials as a Sophist. On the basis of evidence from Philodemus' *On Music*, Brancacci argues for the significant connection between music and ethics in Damon's thought. In one of two chapters on Heraclitus ('Column IV of the Derveni Papyrus: A New Analysis of the Text and the Quotation of Heraclitus'), Gábor Betegh and Valeria Piano present a fascinating re-evaluation of this section of the Derveni Papyrus, significantly informed by Piano's recent edition of the first columns. Betegh and Piano demonstrate how this material enhances our understanding of both the Derveni Papyrus and the apparently familiar Heraclitean material with which is engages. On the basis of careful argument, they conclude that the Derveni author is probably closer to the original in his quotation of Heraclitus B3 than the standard source for the fragment (Aëtius). In contrast, Plutarch is probably closer to the original than the Derveni author in his rendering of

[3] *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition. A Philosophical Reappraisal of the Sources*. Edited by Christian Vassallo. *Studia Praesocratica* 10. Berlin, De Gruyter, 2019. Pp xii + 690. Hardback £118, ISBN: 978-3-11-066321-1.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

B94. In the first of three papers on Empedocles (which treat the evidence in the Derveni Papyrus, the Strasbourg Papyrus, and the Herculaneum papyri respectively), Mirjam Kotwick ('Aphrodite's Cosmic Power: Empedocles in the Derveni Papyrus') investigates the possible influence of Empedoclean physics on the Derveni author, his tendency to be aligned with Anaxagorean ideas notwithstanding. Kotwick presents an enlightening argument in favour of an Empedoclean influence in the Derveni cosmology, specifically in its explanation of the formation of compounds. Giuliana Leone turns to the under-explored evidence for Empedocles in the Herculaneum papyri to provide an up-to-date *status quaestionis* ('Empedocles in the Herculaneum Papyri: An Update'), indicating the value of these *testimonia* for our developing understanding of the text of Empedocles' verse, and hinting at the further potential of this evidence for helping us to understand its influence on the Epicurean tradition. In the first of two chapters on Anaxagoras and his school ('Anaxagoras from Egypt to Herculaneum: A Contribution to the History of Ancient "Atheism"'), Christian Vassallo sets out to collect the relatively extensive papyrological evidence for Anaxagoras in the Graeco-Egyptian and Herculanean sources. Vassallo demonstrates particularly well how consideration of the papyrological evidence can help us to understand the development of the tradition of Anaxagoras as an atheist. The volume's two chapters on the Atomists cover a great deal of the papyrological evidence. In the first ('Democritus' Doctrine of *Eidola* in the Herculaneum Papyri: A Reassessment of the Sources'), Enrico Piergiacomi presents a revised account of Democritean simulacra. In the second ('Anaxarchus from Egypt to Herculaneum'), Tiziano Dorandi surveys the relatively meagre papyrological evidence for the Democritean Anarchus of Abdera. In the only chapter assigned to a section titled 'The Sophistic Movement' ('The Authorship of the Derveni Papyrus, A Sophistic Treatise on the Origin of Religion and Language: A Case for Prodicus of Ceos'), Andrei Lebedev makes an extensive and detailed case for classifying the author of the Derveni treatise as an Ionian Sophist, rather than a natural philosopher. He goes on to argue that the Sophist Prodicus of Ceos is the most likely candidate for authorship. In the final chapter in the volume ('Lists of Principles and Lists of Gods: Philodemus, Cicero, Aëtius, and Others'), Jaap Mansfeld considers the relationship between the papyrological and doxographical traditions by comparing the theological evidence as it is found in Cicero's *On the Nature of the Gods* and the remains of Philodemus' *On Piety* with the Aetian *Placita*.

As this brief overview of a selection of the chapters in this volume aims to demonstrate, *Presocratics and Papyrological Tradition* offers innumerable insights, provocations, and avenues for new research. It is a testament to the value of papyrological evidence for the ongoing study and developing understanding of the earliest philosophers in the Western tradition and will offer rewards for any scholar with an interest in philosophical papyri or early Greek philosophy.

A new volume edited by Hallvard Fossheim, Vigdis Songe-Møller, and Knut Agotnes returns to the well-trodden path of the relationship between form and content in Plato's writing.[4] As one would expect, the thirteen chapters collected by the editors

[4] *Philosophy as Drama. Plato's Thinking through Dialogue*. Edited by Hallvard Fossheim, Vigdis Songe-Møller, and Knut Agotnes. London, Bloomsbury, 2019. Pp xiv + 247. Hardback £85, ISBN: 978-1-3500-8249-6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

address this issue from a broad range of perspectives. In some cases, the concern is with the explicit connection between dialogue form and philosophical argument. In others, we see an interest in the specifics of Plato's attitude towards and reworking of 'poetic' ideas. The editors provide a useful introductory summary of the interests which motivate the volume, making clear their commitment to the idea that Plato is more or less unique in the demands he puts on the reader to be a 'creative presence "in" the text' (7).

The chapters are divided into four sections. Two of those collected under the heading 'Genre and Philosophical Dialogue' take the *Symposium* as their focus. Drew Hyland ('The Whole Comedy and Tragedy of Philosophy: On Aristophanes' Speech in Plato's *Symposium*') concentrates on Aristophanes' speech to argue that, in combining tragedy and comedy within the story he attributes to the comic author, Plato represents the tragedy of erotic striving. But this tragedy is united with comedy by the absence of beauty and nobility from the speech. Elena Irrera ('As Praise of the Philosophical Written Speech? Ethics and Philosophical Progression in Plato's *Symposium*') considers the *Symposium* as a whole to argue that the presence of multiple speeches within the text demonstrates the 'dialectical potentialities of the philosophical written speech' (29). She suggests that the *Symposium* is as much about philosophical writing itself as it is about *eros*.

In the first of three chapters on 'Virtue and Soul-Shaping', Paul Woodruff ('Plato's Inverted Theatre: Displacing the Wisdom of the Poets') offers a fascinating case for reading the *Phaedrus*' Palinode as a condemnation of poetic authority. Woodruff suggests that the landscape of the heaven described by Socrates inverts the topography of the Athenian theatre. At the same time, it alters the audience's role, shifting them from passive observers of drama to a state of constant and active *watching* of divine activity. In one of three chapters dedicated to 'Reason and Irrationality', Cynthia Freeland reconsiders the role of pleasure, and specifically the pleasure we gain from art. She makes the case for a more nuanced reading of Plato's attitude towards art than is generally offered. According to Freeland, Plato is not straightforwardly dismissive of the value of art. In fact, certain kinds of art and poetry produce pleasures that are essential for the good life.

Many will expect the *Symposium*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, and *Republic* to feature heavily in a volume on drama and dialogue form in Plato, but it is notable that the *Sophist* appears in several of the chapters here. In the final chapter of the fourth section, on 'Place and Displacement', and the final chapter of the volume, John Sallis offers a 'Different Look' at the *Sophist*. He considers what sets the *Sophist* apart from the *Theaetetus*, with which it is dramatically linked, suggesting that the 'othering' of the Stranger is significantly linked to the dialogue's search for the nature of the philosopher.

Discussions of philosophical dialogue form are understandably dominated by Plato. But he is not, of course, the only philosopher to write philosophical dialogues. In his *Augustine and the Dialogue*,[5] Erik Kenyon sets outs to present a re-evaluation of Augustine's particular use of the genre. He argues for the need to take Augustine's dialogues on their own terms, at a distance from the autobiography of the *Confessions*.

[5] *Augustine and the Dialogue*. By Erik Kenyon. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2018. Pp xx + 250. Hardback £75, ISBN: 978-1-108-42290-6.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Focusing on the method rather than the doctrine of the dialogues, and treating them as unified wholes, he demonstrates their central and sophisticated pedagogical concerns as texts which encourage in increasingly sophisticated ways a philosophical progress based on methodological reflection and a reliance on plausibility. Kenyon's careful treatment of individual dialogues as carefully constructed wholes will have value for any scholar interested in philosophical method more generally and dialogue form more specifically.

JENNY BRYAN
jenny.bryan@manchester.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0017383520000133

Reception

Bloomsbury's Imagines series, edited by Filippo Carlà-Uhink and Martin Lindner, focuses on classical receptions in the visual and performing arts. It has blazed into 2020 with three edited volumes and one monograph. The monograph by Carlà-Uhink is on the reception of classical Greece in theme parks, and the edited volume that has landed on our desk is *Classical Antiquity in Video Games*.[1] In this attractive volume, clad in the stylish graphics of Alientrap's *Apotheon* (2015), Christian Rollinger has assembled a vital collection of essays on the underexplored subject. As he emphatically proclaims, 'Video games are everywhere' (xiii) and this book is a lifeline for countless university teachers faced with the task of supervising students enthusiastically writing about the ever-expanding mass of classically inspired games.

The emergent field is crying out for a theoretical and practical introduction to gamer classics and a substantial sociological audience history of classically inspired video games. This book does not attempt to offer either. But in practice it is a good stand-in. The first PhDs specializing in this region of classical reception studies have emerged over the past few years, which has heralded a new and welcome theoretical sophistication, as several essays in this volume demonstrate. There are no doubt several perplexed fossils who still feel that video games are not of sufficient cultural importance to warrant serious study, but such a position is increasingly untenable when in Classics departments across the globe students at all levels are exploring game receptions of the classical world.

The present volume offers a diverse range of approaches by an admirably motley array of scholars and developers. It therefore provides an essential collection of case studies illuminating several key aspects of the subject area, and acts as a secure port from which students can launch into classicizing realms often way beyond their supervisors' horizons. The sociological, critical theoretical, and historical frameworks provided by Classical Reception Studies (CRS) can be felt to inform most richly those chapters on the representation of women in *Ryse: Son of Rome* by Sian Beavers (Chapter 4) and of postcolonialism in ancient world games by Ross Clare (Chapter 8). Extremely useful for students will be the perspective of creative practitioners and

[1] *Classical Antiquity in Video Games. Playing with the Ancient World*. Edited by Christian Rollinger. London and New York, Bloomsbury, 2020. Pp. xv + 294. 25 b/w illustrations, 2 tables. Hardback £85, ISBN: 978-1-3500-6663-2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383520000133 Published online by Cambridge University Press