epitaphios, and avoided provocative talk in 330 and 324. His behaviour in 336/335 was an understandable reaction to Alexander's alleged demise, and he had Lycurgus' support in the aftermath. Demades is elusive: a spokesman of Alexander's interests, he could also cooperate with Lycurgus, and had no particular political ambitions. Hyperides is often called anti-Macedonian (even fanatically), but, though isolated, his real concern in 338–323 was that nothing should endanger the post-338 settlement and attendant *autonomia*. This informs all his speeches; for example, *For Euxenippus* warns that Lycurgan religious principles, however well intentioned, could threaten democracy and autonomy; *Against Philippides* defends the same values; *Against Demosthenes* criticizes Demosthenes for risking Macedonian attack on Athens, jeopardizing Lycurgan *perestroika* by corrupting those around him, and (ever greedy and treacherous) plotting a *Machtergreifung*. What really lay behind this is Demosthenes' desire to use the Harpalus affair to extract an advantageous outcome for Athens from problems arising from the Exiles' Decree—at least, I think that is W.'s suggestion: no real explanation is forthcoming, and we are not told why Demosthenes took the money. As for the alleged *arrière-pensée* of the three speeches, one has to say that it is in all cases quite some way from the surface appearance. W. is not demonstrably wrong: but, confronted with scrappy remnants of mere contributions to forensic processes by an orator with a reputation for sarcastic wit, how do you decide whether something was in the man's mind other than what appears? Bosworth's summary ('foreign affairs in Athens evoked a complicated mosaic of attitudes and emotions, and few men could or would steer a consistent political course') remains as valid a reading of the data.

University of Liverpool CHRISTOPHER TUPLIN

PYTHAGOREANS

C. H. KAHN: *Pythagoras and the Pythagoreans: A Brief History*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, 2001. Pp. xi + 195. Paper. ISBN: 0-87220-575-4 (0-87220-576-2 hbk).

It is cause for rejoicing that a man of Charles Kahn's learning has taken it upon himself to convert the vast and jagged terrain of Pythagoreanism into a comfortable, easily negotiated room. The subject has long been in need of a sorting out, and this lucid handbook proves an apt guide.

K. begins with the invisible founder himself and the problems of the pre-Platonic period. He takes care to summarize the insights of scholars who have necessarily followed the trail Walter Burkert blazed forty years ago. With good sense and tact K. decides that their depreciation of Pythagoras' accomplishments has been somewhat harsh. Surely Pythagoras was more than a riddling ascetic who preached reincarnation. Despite lack of proof, at the core of his legend there must have been a serious student of mathematics, music, and cosmology.

Turning from fable to something approaching documented fact, K. carefully explains where each notable successor fits into the mosaic of fifth- and fourth-century Pythagoreanism. In the center of this medallion is set Plato's signal contribution. K. tells how, under the spell of reincarnation, the harmonics of Philolaus, and the mathematics, geometry, astronomy, and physics of Archytas, Plato transformed his Socratic inheritance: first into a great new Dialectical synthesis, the theory of heavenly Forms, which is best seen in the *Timaeus*, and then, at the end of his life, into the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.43 Published online by Cambridge University Press

enigmatic mathematical physics of his oral teachings on the One and the Indefinite Dyad. The Forms, the theory of Recollection, the search for the good life, all represent Plato's attempts to rationalize Pythagorean teachings about the afterlife and moral and ritual purity.

Even more than a trenchant sketch of Plato's debt to the past, students of Pythagoreanism have been in need of guidance through the post-Platonic morass. K. provides this in terms that are clear and convincing, starting with the Early Academy and ending with Iamblichus (fourth century A.D.). After delineating an almost lost Hellenistic succession, he recounts the Pythagorean reawakening in the first centuries B.C.–A.D., which flourished side by side with Middle Platonism and a renewed interest in Aristotle. He then proceeds to acquaint his readers with the contributions of Moderatus of Gades (first century A.D.), Nichomachus of Gerasa (second century A.D.), and Numenius of Apamea (second century A.D.). This last founding father of Neopythagoreanism will be familiar to students of Plotinus (third century A.D.), who was accused by his opponents of stealing Numenius' ideas. Thus K. devotes considerable effort to drawing distinctions between what we know of Numenius' doctrine of the Three Gods and Plotinus's ineffable One, Intellect, and Soul.

I feel such admiration for K.'s account up to this point that I cannot help being a bit disappointed that he chose not to trace Pythagorean motifs in later Neoplatonism. Perhaps, had he done so, he would have defeated his own purpose of writing a brief history. But I for one would have welcomed a fuller treatment of this tangled subject. Instead, he gives us snapshots of the divergent views of Pythagoras presented in the extant lives of Porphyry and Iamblichus. He speculates upon what these portraits owe to the figure of Christ and rather abruptly concludes with the truism that Iamblichus and his successors, most importantly the extraordinary Proclus, kept a Pythagorean spark alive through the Middle Ages until it blazed again in the Renaissance. This to me is short shrift for these remarkable thinkers, who speak directly to us in numerous, voluminous treatises that are not only the starting point of the modern study of Pythagoras, but also the final sublime flowering of antique Platonism.

In a last tantalizing chapter on 'The Pythagorean Heritage' K. turns to three popular strains of Pythagoreanism that, early and late, have most affected imitators of the mythic Antique: theurgy, asceticism, and that fusion of mathematics, harmonics, and astronomy usually denominated the Music of the Spheres. The last strain leads to brief discussions of Copernicus and Kepler, poignant reminders that the dust classicists now study once had relevance for modern science.

Chapel Hill GEORGIA MACHEMER

SOCRATIC EPISTEMOLOGY

H. H. BENSON: *Socratic Wisdom. The Model of Knowledge in Plato's Early Dialogues*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. Pp. ix + 292. Cased, £40.00. ISBN: 0-19-512918-0.

This book grew out of a critique of Vlastos' account of the elenchus and Socrates' commitment to the priority of definition and the wish to support it by a comprehensive interpretation of the dialogues (p. vii). Parts of it are revisions of published articles, and it represents Benson's attempt to collect and coordinate his Socratic studies over more than a decade. The result is a thorough investigation of what B. calls 'Socrates, the Epistemologist' in opposition to a prevailing trend (with Vlastos

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.43 Published online by Cambridge University Press