A.'s book will make a contribution to this development. There are not many revolutionary new insights, but A.'s use of the exceptionality of Athens for his reading of Solon often works well and leads to a few interesting points of detail.

Welcome as A.'s project is, though, to my mind the book has obvious drawbacks. First, pacing is an issue. Quite long stretches of Chapters 1–3 (pp. 1–174) are taken up by summaries of previous scholarly work. Arguably, A. could have made his methodological points more swiftly, using some of the space differently, perhaps to give the overall argument a broader focus, looking further beyond *dikē* and beyond two fragments.

Secondly, at times A. puts perhaps too much faith in the objectivity of archaeological findings. There can be no doubt that the dates and nature of the literary and historical sources set clear limits for a purely text-based approach to Solon. A. must be right to point to the importance of the material culture of Solon's own time as a further source. However, I think it is misleading to refer to the '*polis* idea' as presented by the new classical archaeologists as an 'objective background' (p. xv) or 'objective standard' (cover text). Archaeologists, too, need to interpret; and a further degree of interpretation is needed when their findings are applied to literary texts. For example, A. (appealing to Morris) adopts the terms 'agathoi' and 'kakoi' as though they referred to social groups that are clearly identifiable and whose changing fortunes archaeologists have established. But these terms are borrowed from literary texts, like Theognis, which often demonstrate just how much room for disagreement there was in calling somebody 'good' or 'bad'. It would probably be more helpful to treat archaeological work as just one more element that contributes to the overall picture, rather than as equipping us with objective referents.

Leading on from this, thirdly and finally, A. says little about the function or context of Solon's poetry itself. Solon's performance context has been debated at length recently. After a period of almost exclusive emphasis on the symposium, scholars appear to be prepared again to envisage different contexts, and hence different effects and functions. We will probably never find certain answers to these questions. But the questions need to be debated if one wants to come to a judgement about the place of justice (or indeed any other socio-political concept) in Solon's poetry.

In sum, then, this book is a useful reminder of the need to blend literary, historical, and archaeological methods, but it is perhaps not as successful as it might have been.

The Open University FELIX BUDELMANN
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni007

EMPEDOCLES DIVIDED

J. BOLLACK: *Empédocle*: Les purifications. *Un projet de paix universelle*. Édité, traduit et commenté. (Collection Points, Série Essais, 498.) Pp. 144. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2003. Paper. ISBN: 2-02-056915-9.

Since his monumental commentary in the sixties (J. Bollack, *Empédocle* [Paris, 1965–9]), Jean Bollack has been one of the leading interpreters of Empedocles, hence this edition of the *Purifications* has been eagerly awaited. However, there are serious problems with the book. Due to the publication in 1999 of Alain Martin and Oliver Primavesi's edition of the new Strasbourg fragments (A. Martin and O. Primavesi

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni008 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[edd.], *L'Empédocle de Strasbourg: (P. Strasb. gr. Inv. 1665–1666)* [Berlin and Strasbourg, 1999]), Empedoclean studies have undergone a surge of interest not seen since the sixties. These are the first ancient papyrus fragments of Empedocles, and indeed the first papyrus fragments of any of the Presocratic philosophers, and the material they contain has forced nearly everyone who works on Empedocles to seriously rethink their interpretations of both his philosophy and poetry. Central questions are still whether Empedocles wrote two poems (*On Nature* and the *Purifications*) or one poem (perhaps with the alternative titles *On Nature* and the *Purifications*, or perhaps *On Nature and Purifications*), with the physical doctrine in *On Nature* and the contrasting religious doctrine in the *Purifications*, and whether Empedocles' cosmology describes two worlds or one. The former point is more crucial than it may seem; the Strasbourg fragments can be confidently attributed to *On Nature* and contain both physical and religious material. This fact strongly suggests that, for Empedocles himself at least, there was no disjunction between his physical and religious views: both are part of a unified system, and there was probably only one poem (see especially Simon Trépanier, *Empedocles: an Interpretation* [New York and London, 2004], pp. 1–30). While B. has discussed the Strasbourg fragments elsewhere ('Voir la Haine: Sur les nouveaux fragments d'Empédocle', *Methodos* 1 [2001], 173–85), here in his edition of the *Purifications* they receive barely a mention, and B.'s views are essentially unchanged since the sixties: there are two poems, which he calls *Les Origines* and *Les Purifications* (or les *Catharmes*), and only one world. As a consequence, this edition seems somewhat out of date. For example, B. prints the old text of fr. 139 from the indirect tradition and does not mention in his note that Strasbourg ensemble 'd' is considered by the editors to contain fr. 139 but with a new and better reading ('Alas that merciless day did not destroy me sooner, before I devised with my claws ['about my lips' in fr. 139] terrible deeds for the sake of food'). Elsewhere B. has rejected Martin and Primavesi's identification of fr. 139 with ensemble 'd' (*Methodos* 1 [2001], 173–4), but here passes over ensemble 'd' in silence. Therefore this edition relies on assumptions about Empedocles' system and poetry that are now very difficult to support in the light of the Strasbourg fragments, but does not highlight the problems this brings. Simply publishing an edition of the *Purifications* as a work separate from *On Nature* is now a radical act, and requires defence. Accordingly it is difficult to give the book a warm reception.

On the other hand, B.'s overall ethical reading of Empedocles' purificatory material is more valuable; B. sees Empedocles' stance against warfare, slaughter, animal sacrifice, and meat-eating as a radically political one 'Les *Catharmes* se présentent comme un manifeste et un projet de réforme universelle des sociétés' (p. 1). It is just a pity that this stimulating view is not backed up by better evidence.

National University of Ireland, Maynooth GORDON CAMPBELL
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni008

STESICHORUS IN THE PAPYRI

G. SCHADE: *Stesichoros: Papyrus Oxyrhynchus 2359, 3876, 2619, 2803.* (*Mnemosyne* Supplementum 237.) Pp. viii + 239, ill. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2003. Cased, €74, US$100. ISBN: 90-04-12832-8.

Schade provides in this revised *Habilitationsschrift* editions with introduction and

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni008 Published online by Cambridge University Press