Worlds', McKirahan associates Anaximander with those who believe in an Infinite Universe. Although McKirahan ultimately favors the view that Anaximander's infinite worlds are coexistent, he shows that a more nuanced and careful appreciation of that theory makes Anaximander's thought more intricate and worthy of appreciation than commonly assumed.

In his 1869–70 lectures on the Preplatonic philosophers, Nietzsche writes, 'Plato is the first grand *mixed character* both in his philosophy and in his philosophical typology. Socratic, Pythagorean, and Heraclitean elements unite in his theory of the Ideas; it should not, without further qualification, be called an original conception' (F. Nietzsche, *The Pre-Platonic Philosophers*, trans. G. Whitlock [Chicago, 2000], p. 1). Nietzsche acknowledges what C. Huffman attempts to prove in his piece 'The Philolaic Method: The Pythagoreanism Behind the *Philebus*'. Huffman argues that the residue of Pythagoreanism is on display in Plato's *Philebus*. Specifically, he argues that Plato's *Philebus* makes use of the fifth-century Pythagorean Philolaus' belief that there are limiters and unlimiteds and when these are bounded together and expressed mathematically they reveal the truth concerning reality.

As P. states in the introduction, W. I. Matson, J. Wilcox, and I. M. Bodnár examine 'early Greek views of natural process' (p. 2). Matson advocates the minority view, contrary to what he calls the majority view (i.e. that the Eleatic philosophers denied that motion was possible), that Parmenides, Zeno, and Melissus did not deny the possibility of motion, but rather ascribed this position to their opponents. Wilcox's '"Whole-Natured Forms" in Empedocles' Cosmic Cycle' provides an analysis of Empedoclean Love and Strife to support his argument that Empedocles' cosmic cycle is symmetrical. Bodnár's 'Atomic Independence and Indivisibility' provides an overview of Epicurean atomism explaining why 'the atomists lacked a credible and comprehensive theory of atomic immutability' (p. 123).

The last four essays, Preus tells us, discuss '"the useful virtues and politics" as those issues were understood in the days of Socrates' (p. 3). We learn from P. Curd 'Why Democritus Was Not a Skeptic'. M. Gagarin's 'The Truth of Antiphon's *Truth*' claims that Antiphon holds a view of truth that originates with Hesiod. T. M. Robinson attempts to elucidate the aim and meaning of Sextus Empiricus' *Dissoi Logoi*. C. S. Gould contends not only that Sophocles' *Philoctetes* is a work of serious philosophical merit, but also that the play 'anticipates a model of virtue' found in Plato's *Republic* (p. 199).

Although the evidence supporting the claims in these essays is hardly well-documented in some cases and speculative at best in others, the contributors to this volume remind us of the enduring significance of what Plato's predecessors had to teach him and what they can still impart to us.

DePaul University D. N. R. EVANS JR

ORPHICS, DIONYSUS, AND PYTHAGOREANS

M. T. Ghidini, A. S. Marino, A. Visconti (edd.): *Tra Orfeo e Pitagora. Origini e incontri di culture nell' Antichità. Atti dei Seminari Napoletani 1996–1998*. Pp. 575, pls. Naples: Bibliopolis, 2000. Paper, L. 90,000. ISBN: 88-7088-395-7.

In the recently revived and continuing interest in Orphic literature, this volume has a

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

critical part to play. It stems from three international seminars held in Naples from 1996 to 1998, coordinated by the Pythagorean scholar Alfredo Mele. His three collaborators were Marisa Ghidini, the Italian translator of West's *Orphic Poems*, with expertise in religion; Alfredina Marino, the coordinator of the Roman contributions; and Amadeo Viscenti, the main editor of the *Atti*. The papers are divided into *Parte Prima*, on Orphic and Dionysic ritual, and *Secunda*, on the Pythagoreans, the two together presenting 'una prospettiva diacronica e interdisciplinare', with particular attention paid 'ai momenti di incontro tra civiltà greca e civiltà indigine dell' Italia antica e alla conessione dell'orfismo con il dionisismo e con l'insegnamento di Pitagora'. The volume is elegantly produced, clear, and accurate, and with an excellent bibliography, yet, as often with continental European publications, the usefulness of the different contributions and the links between them would be immediately enhanced if indexes of passages and topics had been added.

Ghidini introduces the essays in the first section with a standard survey of the ancient evidence 'da Orfeo agli Orfici', but then moves on to the results of her own research into the Italian *lamellae* and the text of the Derveni papyrus. This original work is continued with 'nuovi frammenti orfici e una nuova edizione degli Orfici' by Alberto Berbabi, which, with Pierre Lévêque's commentary on the Olbian bone plates, complements the Laks–Most *Studies in the Derveni Papyrus* (Oxford, 1997), which was published at the same time as this Naples seminar was taking place. The whole subject of Orphic literature is further expanded in the present volume by Angelo Bottini with archaeological evidence from Magna Graeca, by Paolo Poccetti on links with the indigenous Etruscan mystery tradition, and by Ghidini again and Gabriela Ricandella on related Dionysiac myth, ritual, and performance. Presocratic connections with the Orphic and Pythagorean material are suggested first by Luis Breglia, who trawls through the testimonia on Pherecydes and finds him engaging with and modifying Orphic theogonies, and then by Giovanni Casertano, who, as many have done before, sees Empedocles as firmly Pythagorean, connecting frr. 136–9 (among others) to the supposed reference to Pythagoras in 129, although the context there is extended wisdom rather than metempsychosis. Luc Brisson (the only contributor from the Laks/Most volume) adds a coda with a link found for Orphic–Pythagorean–Platonic transmigration mythology in the Orphic-named Aglaophamos, a Pythagorean from Thrace mentioned by Iamblichus (*VP* 146).

The second part of the volume concentrates on Pythagoreanism in Italy, engaging with some general problems of the Pythagoreans concerned with historicity and geographical distribution, and with nothing further on Dionysus or Orphism, except for part of Gabriele Giannantoni's essay 'Mito e *performance* nelle associazioni dionisiache' . This contribution is complemented by that of Eduardo Federico on 'Euforbo/Pitagora genealogo dell' anima: strategie e nuove rappresentazioni dell' *historíe* pitagorica'. As the title suggests, this is a well-documented account of the metempsychosis or palingenesia (the terms seem interchangeable) of the Trojan hero Euphorbus, slain by Menelaus and reborn as the philosopher Pythagoras, his claim reinforced by the memory that provides the criterion of psychic identity. A tributary to the main stream here is a study by Francesca Alesse of Aristotle's references to the Pythagoreans and the myth of metempsychosis in *De Anima*. She concentrates on Aristotle's definition of soul as the particular ἐντελέχεια of a particular body, which involves the rejection of the Pythagorean concept of τὴν τυχοῦσαν ψυχὴν εἰς τὸ τυχὸν ἐνδύεσθαι σῶμα (and there is a long discourse on the exact meaning of ἐνδύεσθαι in a transmigration context).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Roman Pythagoreanism is first given a firm foundation with one of the longest contributions—a detailed investigation by Alfonso Mele into the spread of philosophy, and especially Pythagoreanism, throughout Magna Graeca in the fifth and fourth centuries. Then individual figures are studied. First, in 'Il mistero di Ippaso', Maria Silvestre suggests that the problem with Hippasus is that he was already known at Metapontum as a musician, and may well have established the elements of the musical scale as the fixed ratios of octave, fifth and fourth before the theory was taken over by Pythagoras as his invention (as recorded, for example, by Iamblichus, *VP* 115). This means that harmonics, rather than irrational numbers, may have been the source of the rivalry between the two. Then Amedeo Visconti on Aristoxenus of Tarentum continues the musical theme with 'musica e attività politica'. Alfonso Mele in a second essay discusses Archytas' connections with the Roman aristocracy, arising from Cicero's notice at *Cato* 39, and Bruno Centrone writes on the pseudo-Archytas *Περὶ νόμω καὶ δικαιοσύνας*. The last contribution is by Enrico Flores on Ennius and Pythagoreanism.

This is a wide-ranging and useful collection, with a good spread of new material and fresh inroads into more familiar territory. Useful additions might have been some reference to Virgil's use of Pythagorean/Platonic metempsychosis and, more obviously, to Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 15.

University of Wales Lampeter M. R. WRIGHT

RETROSPECTIVE DIAGNOSIS AND THE *EPIDEMICS*

L. A. Graumann: *Die Krankengeschichten der Epidemienbücher des Corpus Hippocraticum. Medizinhistorische Bedeutung und Möglichkeiten der retrospektiven Diagnose*. Pp. xxii + 272. Aachen: Shaker Verlag, 2000. Paper. ISBN: 3-8265-8216-0.

The words 'retrospective diagnosis' in the title of what was originally G.'s dissertation for the Dr. med. may cause historians of medicine to sigh in exasperation, but they will be well advised to continue reading: G. is not yet another doctor indulging in an ahistorical interpretation of ancient medical texts. The introduction opens with some common statements about the Hippocratic *Epidemics* (empirical, realistic case histories, practically free of any theory and therefore open to diagnosis, often containing the first description of some particular disease, etc.). G. makes it clear from the start, however, that he takes a more sophisticated approach to ancient medicine and to the possibilities of retrospective diagnosis.

Every author writing about Greek medicine faces the necessity of having to explain the background before entering into the actual argument if the book is not to be limited to a very small audience. G., too, begins with an introduction into the Hippocratic Corpus (including the question of authorship) and the *Epidemics*—the meaning of the title, a structural analysis of the seven books, a discussion of their contents, geographical background, date, interrelations and later reception. He also highlights how Galen's verdict of inauthenticity condemned *Epidemics* 4, 5, and 7 to almost total obscurity for about 1800 years. Describing the various phases of transmission, G. rejects the accepted view of the case histories as objective observations and descriptions, pointing out how they have been used as support for a

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

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/54.2.292 Published online by Cambridge University Press