introduction, provided that the limitations are appreciated—and the grand claims of the jacket blurb ignored.

University of Cologne INGO WITZKE

doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni221

A PRESOCRATIC FESTSCHRIFT

V. CASTON, D. W. GRAHAM (edd.): *Presocratic Philosophy. Essays in Honour of Alexander Mourelatos*. Pp. xvi + 346. Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2002. Cased, £47.50. ISBN: 0-7546-0502-7.

This volume emanates from a tribute to Alexander Mourelatos by his colleagues and former students, held at the University of Texas at Austin in March 1998. The primary theme was the Presocratics and Sophists: the consistent 'favourite subject', we are told, of Professor Mourelatos over the years (p. ix). There are twenty-two essays divided into five unequal parts covering (1) the Milesians, (2) Heraclitus and Parmenides, (3) the Pluralists, (4) the Sophists, and (5) Transmission, Traditions, and Reactions.

It is difficult to do justice in a short review to so many high quality, insightful (and at times provocative) essays. In what follows, I will attempt to provide the original flavour of each essay and at times some terse critical comments of my own.

In Chapter 1, Stephen White argues (contra Dicks) that Thales deserves to be considered as the founder of Greek astronomy. W. argues that Thales could have determined the equinoxes and the solstices using basic arithmetic and did not need (contra Dicks) an adequate geometrical model to do so. He thus stresses Thales's observational side rather than his speculative side. There is, however, good evidence that the Babylonians had already accomplished the same astronomical achievements that White attributes to Thales.

In Chapter 2, Michael Gagarin challenges the popular view (first initiated by Vernant, Vlastos, and Lloyd) that law was the essential model (or impetus) for Greek rational thought. G. argues against the idea that legal thinking and institutions influenced Presocratic cosmological ideas. While G. makes an excellent case, the fact remains that there is a correlation between political and cosmological models.

In Chapter 3, Daniel Graham re-examines the old controversy of who came first, Heraclitus or Parmenides, and who is attacking whom? He examines all the relevant corresponding passages in Parmenides and Heraclitus. In my view, G. convincingly shows that it is likely that Parmenides had Heraclitus' text in front of him. He concludes that it was Heraclitus' radical critique of his tradition that caused Parmenides to react in the innovative manner now associated with his name.

In Chapter 4, Alexander Nehamas argues (contra Graham) that Parmenides is not denouncing Heraclitus' perspective, but in fact shares to some degree the same ontological and epistemological enterprise. Moreover, N. wants to argue that Parmenides is writing independently of Heraclitus (again contra Graham). N. also confronts the age-old question of the status of the second part of Parmenides' poem (the *Doxa*) in light of the relationship between Parmenides and Heraclitus. N plausibly argues that although mortal opinions are deceptive for Parmenides, his own cosmology is correct. The *Doxa* is thus 'the very first effort to go beyond Milesian monism'. I tend to agree with N., although I would still argue that it is better characterized in analogy with Plato's *Timaeus* as a 'likely story'.

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Chapter 5, R. J. Hankinson argues for a metaphysical rather than a semantic or modal interpretation of Parmenides' argument for the notion of changelessness.

In Chapter 6, Charles Kahn wants to show that Parmenides rather than the Pythagoreans (contra Aristotle) was the primary influence behind Plato's *Theory of Forms* and that this influence is already present in the earlier dialogues. K. also revisits and again defends his 'veridical' interpretation of *esti*, that is, *esti* as a generalized truth claim as opposed to the 'existential' (Owen, Barnes, Gallop) and 'predicative' (Mourelatos) interpretations. Finally K. argues (contra Burkert and Furley) that the topography and revelation in Parmenides proem are creations of Parmenides himself despite certain epic allusions.

In Chapter 7, Scott Austin examines Parmenides' massive use of negative expressions in his arguments and wonders why this is the case in a poem that is otherwise devoted to positive expression and the rejection of not-being. He also observes that Plato noticed a similar phenomena in his *Parmenides* and attempted to address it in a number of his Hypotheses.

In Chapter 8, Herbert Granger gives a comprehensive overview of the contemporary (and ancient) positions of the status of the *Doxa* portion of Parmenides' poem. He endeavours to show that since the goddess has cogently argued for a single uniform being, any plurality can only be deceptive. G.'s analysis appears so thorough as to leave the reader with the impression that his own 'opinion', while plausible, is not sufficiently convincing, but equally deceptive. I am still with Nehamas.

In Chapter 9, David Furley gives a stimulating and convincing argument for how Anaxagoras theoretical reply to Parmenides anticipates (and indeed influenced) Plato's *Theory of Forms*. F. argues that for Anaxagoras the senses are not able to identify the objects, that is, the predominant ingredients, of the sensible world. However, Anaxagoras still believes that the objects of the sensible world can be named according to the predominant ingredients. How? Commentators, as F. correctly notes, have failed to take Anaxagoras' description of Mind as having a knowledge of all things (and its paradigmatic counterpart, the human mind), seriously. The mind apprehends (in analogy with Plato) the dominant ingredients through some kind of *noesis*.

In Chapter 10, André Laks reflects on the old controversy as to whether Empedocles wrote two poems or one in light of the recently discovered fragments of Empedocles in Strasbourg. L. attempts to show (contra the editors, Martin and Primavesi) that the four occurrences of the first person plural in the recently discovered fragments are not semantically homogenous (and thus referring in all four cases to the 'divinities' that 'we' are), but rather have different meanings and thus cannot be used to confirm (or deny) the old question as to whether Empedocles wrote one poem or two separate ones.

In Chapter 11, Patricia Curd discusses the processes of mixture and separation in post-Parmenidean cosmology. She notes that prior to Parmenides these rational processes were almost nonexistent, and in conjunction with this she briefly examines the pre-Parmenidian processes to show why they would be prime targets for Parmenides' arguments. This is an enlightening essay, although I am left with the impression that if Empedocles and Anaxagoras considered their accounts from C.'s perspective, their positions would be more tenable.

In Chapter 12, Jacques Brunschwig elucidates Xeniades of Corinth's original thesis against Eleatism (including the acceptance of a generation *ex nihilo*) and then convincingly shows how this thesis can clarify Democritus' famous fragment 68 B11

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(the polemic between the mind and the senses) in which one gets the impression that the mind is not, contrary to what Democritus argues elsewhere, the highest criterion of knowledge.

In Chapter 13, Julia Annas argues cogently (and correctly, in my view) that the ethical factor has been overlooked in Democritus. She shows that for Democritus, the goods proper to the soul are not only more important than those of the body, but, as in Plato, that they are the sine qua non of human happiness. Democritus can thus be seen as a eudaimonist, a pioneer of the dominant form of ethical theory in the ancient world.

In Chapter 14, Sylvia Berryman endeavours to show that the void for Democritus is a determining cause of motion while avoiding the problematic claim that it is an efficient cause. This essay is one of the best concise accounts of the various approaches that Democritus may have provided to account for how atoms actually move in the void.

In Chapter 15, Paul Woodruff argues that while there was no theory of 'natural justice' before Plato, there was a theory of 'universal justice'. This essay is rich and insightful. However, it would have been useful to have a clear definition of what 'natural justice' consisted for Plato in order to make a value judgement.

In Chapter 16, Victor Caston examines how Gorgias' famous argument in *On Non-Being* can be construed such that it is not self-refuting. He argues that the only approach to take to make sense of the argument is dialectical, that is, in the same spirit as the courtroom tactics of the period for which the sophists were famous. Gorgias is thus directing his arguments not only at Parmenides, but at his sophistic contemporaries.

In Chapter 17, Owen Goldin explores the first evidence of philosophical reflection on the problem of indexicals (e.g, 'I', 'this', 'now', 'here') as advanced in the *Dissoi Logoi* (formal reflections on the power of *logoi*) and examines in some detail Aristotle's reaction—indeed struggle—with its implications for the principle of noncontradiction. Goldin notes that certain modern solutions to indexicals (e.g. Frege's) never occurred to Aristotle, but it is unclear why they should have.

In Chapter 18, Carl Huffman explores the evidence of a debate between the sophist Polyarchus and the Pythagorean Archytas on the relation between virtue and *pleonexia*. While H. convincingly shows how Polyarchus has a thesis similar to those of Callicles and Thrasymachus, it is the rôle of calculation (*logismos*) in Archytas' counter-thesis as the *sine qua non* of political equality and thus of the stable state that provides new insights into this important and influential contemporary of Plato and the later sophistic movement.

The fragments and testimonia relative to the Presocratics are derived from doxographic literature which, for the most part, is derived from late authors. While no one contests that Aristotle inaugurated the doxographic tradition, there is a considerable amount of scholarly debate on the transmission of the sources. In Chapter 19, Jaap Mansfeld, one of the primary specialists working in the area, provides an acute and convincing analysis of the manner in which the later doxographical sources are dependent on Aristotle.

In Chapter 20, Paul Thom explores the different positions that Parmenides, Gorgias, Plato, and Aristotle maintained on the class and/or extent of what-is. In the final analysis, he shows that each philosopher argues for a different position including, what-is as universal (Parmenides); what-is-not as universal (Gorgias); what-is and what-is-not as both universal (Plato); what-is and what-is-not as both non-universals (Aristotle).

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni222 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Chapter 21, Sarah Broadie observes the relation between the nature of the heavens and the search for first principles in Aristotle (a theme which originates to some degree with Thales) and his distinctions with Theophrastus and Plato. While this is clearly a thought-provoking essay, I tend to disagree with her contention (contra Bos) that the sun does not play a dominant rôle in the physical universe for Plato.

In Chapter 22, William J. Prior argues that the Great Speech in Plato's *Protagoras* in favour of democracy is not only a powerful challenge to Socratic moral philosophy, but it shows that Plato is sympathetic to certain aspects of Athenian democracy, aspects that he will incorporate in his own theory of justice in the *Republic*. An important point that Prior appears to miss (and that may strengthen his argument) is that the seeds of the tripartite structure of the future city of the *Republic* (including the political, military, and productive arts) can already be discerned in Protagoras' myth on the origin of society.

In the final analysis, this is a rich display of exceptional essays by distinguished scholars worthy of any mentor (*chapeau* Professor Mourelatos). Caston and Graham must be highly commended for putting ths truly outstanding volume together.

York University GERARD NADDAF
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni222

A HERODOTEAN COMPANION

E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, H. van Wees (edd.): *Brill's Companion to Herodotus*. Pp. xx + 652, maps. Leiden, Boston, and Cologne: Brill, 2002. Cased, €179, US$208. ISBN: 90-04-12060-2.

Brill's Companion to Herodotus presents a rich and stimulating range of essays on many aspects of Herodotus' *Histories*, a very important collection and a considerable achievement on the part of the three editors and contributors. With its 672 pages in all, thirty-seven-page bibliography and *index locorum* as well as general index, it is weighty in literal terms too, but it is a pity that its price may discourage even some libraries. It reflects the vitality and exciting nature of current work on Herodotus. Indeed, it is more than a Companion: rather, it is a collection of essays by known Herodotean specialists, and refreshingly, others less closely associated with Herodotean scholarship, of which most are good and many really excellent. Thematic sections treat 'Herodotus and his work', 'Herodotus and his world', 'The Histories as narrative', 'The Historical method', and 'History and Ethnography'.

Despite the editors' valiant efforts, the *Companion* cannot be comprehensive. The slightly awkward final section gathers together useful chapters on elements of Herodotus' ethnography, including an overview of his Egyptian *logos* by A. Lloyd, and a critical evaluation of his Scythian one by S. West, and on periods of Greek history for which Herodotus is a crucial source (Osborne, Fordyce, Harrison). But there is no one chapter, for instance, discussing his approach to (or inclusion of) ethnography as a whole (Kartunnen calls the ethnography of the fringes merely 'entertaining', p. 459), and no chapter on Persia itself, which was to have been provided by Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Other gaps are perhaps surprising: there is no dedicated treatment of Herodotus' language or style (except that of Slings), his speeches, his political stance, his predecessors apart from Homer, little attempt by most contributors to examine in any sustained way his achievement in comparison to

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni222 Published online by Cambridge University Press