B.'s edition represents a vast labour and presents a vast number of facts. It does not replace M.-P.'s OCT; but it may stand alongside that remarkable text.

University of Geneva JONATHAN BARNES

DICAEARCHUS

W. W. FORTENBAUGH, E. SCHÜTRUMPF (edd.): *Dicaearchus of Messana. Text, Translation, and Discussion*. (Rutgers University Studies in Classical Humanities, 10.) Pp. viii + 389. New Brunswick and London: Transaction Publishers, 2001. Cased, £58.95. ISBN: 0-7658-0093-4.

D[icaearchus] did not share the encyclopaedic interests of his master, Aristotle; but his philosophical voice is more distinctive than that of some of Aristotle's followers, and adds variety and depth to our picture of the early Lyceum. The present volume (which follows the editors' *Demetrius of Phalerum* in the same series) supersedes Wehrli's 1944 collection of D.'s fragments by presenting an improved edition of the sources, and a series of ten discursive essays by a distinguished international team of scholars. The edition is by M[irhady]: it starts with a list of book-titles attested for D., provides more contextual material than Wehrli, and adds three substantial new sources. There is a facing English translation (which just occasionally veers into solecism, but is generally elegant and accurate). M.'s 'fundamental criterion of inclusion' is strict: that D. is named in the text (normally, at least; as it happens this is not true of any of the three 'new' fragments). But the great virtue of the volume's arrangement is that more speculative attributions can be covered as well in the essays—where there is more room to discuss their claims.

D. is best known for his contributions to psychology and historical anthropology, and both topics receive multiple treatment in this volume. Sharples and Caston try, in a paper each, to pin down D.'s psychological position, and to square what is certain, that D. denied that the soul was substantially distinct from the body, with trickier evidence that he explained certain forms of divination by the activity of the soul *outside* the body (Source 31A, from Cicero). Sharples inclines towards an emergent view of the Dicaearchan soul according to which it is not independent of the body, but does have causal efficacy over it. His caution in approaching the evidence is well taken; though I am attracted to Caston's argument in favour of a 'bold' epiphenomenalism, a soul which is perfectly reliant on the body and is causally inefficacious. Caston relies for a solution of the apparent contradiction in the claim that the soul could operate outside the body on a nice point (that the crucial claim in the crucial source comes in the mouth of an interlocutor); Sharples, on the other hand, reaches the pessimistic conclusion that insolubility is built into the poor quality of the evidence possessed, and supplied, by Cicero.

D.'s *Life of Greece* and the history of civilization it presents is the subject of discussions by Saunders, Schütrumpf, and Ax. (Ax is interested in the work's influence on Varro, but also has careful and extremely useful discussions of matters such as its title, genre, and theme.) The traditional view of the work has D. argue for the decline of mankind from a 'golden age', but Saunders and Ax both challenge this view, and reconstruct for D. a theory which both describe with a phrase borrowed from from Bernhard Reischl: 'ambivalente Aszendenztheorie'. It is true, they say, that

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press

technological advance brought new perils, but it was an advance, when all is said and done. This seems to me to underplay the opposition one might draw between material and moral advance, and I rather side with Schütrumpf's defence of the view that D. had people better off—morally at least—earlier on. Apart from anything else, there is a certain consistency in attributing to D. an anti-teleological view of history—compare the anti-teleological implications of his reductionist psychology. What all three writers communicate, in any case, is the sophisticated and nuanced character of D.'s model, and this is brought out well again in White's discussion of a cognate aspect of his historical work: his 'biography of philosophy'. White argues that D.'s interest was focused on the distinctive conceptions of philosophy which emerged as the subject evolved from the maxims of earlier sages—a fact that explains why the only individuals mentioned in our evidence are Pythagoras, Socrates, and Plato, who (D. thinks) shaped these different conceptions. But change brought good and bad, which leads White to the moderate conclusion (with which all sides might agree) that D. was 'neither a triumphalist nor a primitivist' in any simplistic sense (p. 235).

The value of philosophy and its rôle in social evolution is a theme implicit too in D.'s preference (against Theophrastus) for the 'active' over the theoretical life. Huby's discussion of this point takes in an examination of D.'s contribution to political philosophy, and eventually leads her to the daring suggestions that D. might have authored the Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens* (p. 325), as well as the *Constitution of the Lacedaemonians* presently to be found among Aristotle's fragments (532–45 Rose). Strangely placed after Huby's piece are papers by Luppe and Dorandi surveying the papyrological evidence for D. (They seem natural neighbours for M., especially since Dorandi discusses *inter alia* the arguments which led to the inclusion of two of the new fragments in his edition—both from Philodemus.) Luppe, whose ostensible interest is in fact what we might learn about lost plays of Euripides, adds some new *incerta*: Oxyrhynchan papyri which conceivably preserve fragments of D.'s *Hypotheses of the Plays of Euripides and Sophocles*. Keyser's fascinating piece on 'The Geographical Work of D.', with which the collection ends, would have followed on nicely from Huby as evidence for D.'s practical interests.

The order in which the contributions are set out is not the only editorial infelicity in this volume. I find odd the way in which M.'s indexes are presented on their own as a kind of fence between his edition of the sources and the essays which discuss them; frustrating the minimal indexing of the essays themselves (there is only an 'Index of Ancient Sources', from which Dicaearchus himself is excluded); and untidy the lack of consistency in primary references (e.g. Source 17 is given and indexed as '*Academici Libri* 2.124', but then turns up in an essay as '*Acad. pr.* 2.124', to which the relevant index reference is '*Lucullus* 124'). None of this does justice to the uniformly high standard of the material in this volume; nor, in particular, does it help the reader make best use of the essays as resources complementary to the texts.

University of Durham GEORGE BOYS-STONES

STOIC DIALECTIC

J.-B. GOURINAT: *La dialectique des Stoïciens*. Pp. 386. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2000. Paper, €38.11/frs. 250. ISBN: 2-7116-1322-4.

Aristo of Chios, one of Zeno of Citium's pupils, wished to discard both Physics and

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.62 Published online by Cambridge University Press