

however receive discussion in the introduction) but the commentary on fragments 1–68 extends to 120 pp. The result is an ensemble less extensive than Jacoby but undoubtedly more approachable, and offering notable constructive dissonance with Jacoby's views of A.'s political slant.

Throughout the volume, H.'s strengths as a commentator are evident: he offers help even-handedly both on historiographic questions (A.'s methods and attitudes; use made of him [minimized] by the Aristotelian *Ath. Pol.*) and on historical matters arising (e.g. the early Areopagus Council, FF. 3–4; the chronology of the Kolakretai, FF. 5, 36; the reforms of Solon, F. 34; ostracism, FF. 6, 42; the Athenian generalship, F. 38; the return of Alcibiades, F. 45). The notes are invariably lucid and well-arranged, and display salutary caution about speculating upon A. beyond the evidence of his surviving text. More broadly, it will come as no surprise to readers of H.'s articles that he sees A. not as an ideological conservative, but as a democratic politician writing within a democratic tradition. H. is surely right to insist that most of A.'s surviving fragments show no conservative ideology, and that his father Andron cannot be *proved* to have been the Andron who was a member of the Four Hundred; but he carries fashionable distrust of ideology too far when he writes as if no active Athenian fourth-century politician *would* have written from an ideologically conservative point of view (how can we know? An *Atthis* is not an Assembly speech, and A. was completing his in *exile*). Likewise H. is not compelling in denying a conservative tenor to F. 4 (*pace* H., Solon's own poem *apud Ath. Pol.* 12.4 suggests that A. is a conservative dissenter) and to F. 42 (where incidentally we have no right to reject the contemporary testimony of Thuc. 8.73 on the *a priori* grounds that 'we have no reason to believe' something that T. is precisely asserting!).

H.'s translation of testimonia and fragments is in the main clear, accurate, and helpful. Only in a few instances should more concessions be made to the Greekless reader: T1, 'orator' would be preferable to the pseudo-technical '*rhetor*'; F2, for 'every fifth year' (for the Great Panathenaea) read 'every four years'; 10, 'Tenpartner' is not a perspicuous expression for δεκαδοῦχος and the ambiguity of τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα should not be confined to the commentary; 24, 'Fourth Philippic' (instead of 'First Philippic', for δ, Φιλιππικῶν) will mislead in the text, despite H.'s note; 30, H. does not explain why he prints a lacuna and [[διὰ]] τοῖν θεοῖν would be better rendered 'for the Two Goddesses' (with διὰ dropped) (not 'on account of. . .'); 35, Ballene in the text, when Pallene is in the notes, will baffle or be thought a misprint, since H. fails to explain that Ballene is a joke in Aristophanes; 38, for the Greekless reader, the use of * in a text should be elucidated; 41, H.'s use of 'done in' instead of the simple 'done' as a colloquialism for 'cheated' will mislead those for whom 'to do in' connotes murder (but perhaps Canadian usage differs); 59, Lykos and the Wolf both appear in the translation but the Greekless will miss the pun and at 61 they will need more linguistic help on Iaones and Ionians. Finally, at 6, ἐτυράνησε has more point when taken as ingressive, and at 34, πάντων ὁμοῦ and at 57 ὡς<δ>αὐτὸς κ.τ.λ. have dropped out of the translation.

Yet these are minor points. This English Androtron will be a great aid to the serious study of Greek history in translation, which has been such a welcome feature of the last generation, and H.'s introduction and commentary are an important contribution to scholarship. Both editor and publisher are to be congratulated.

University of Glasgow

RONALD A. KNOX

E. HEITSCH: *Geschichte und Situationen bei Thukydides*. (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde, 71.) Pp. 103. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1996. ISBN: 3-519-07620-9.

The goal H. sets himself in this monograph is to illustrate how Thucydides' *History* brings out the general message it promises about 'the human condition' (1.22. 4). His method is to analyse the specific details of Th.'s narrative of the years 425–420 B.C. (4–5.48). And his conclusion is that Th. points up the multiplicity of factors (conflicting interests, chance, etc.) which are hard for agents to assess or foresee, and which render decision-making difficult.

H.'s conclusion is a useful antidote to some overly reductive readings of Th.'s narrative. And he makes good points along the way (particularly welcome is his positive assessment of Th.'s narrative of the uneasy peace). But his good points are often buried in paragraphs of prolonged paraphrase; and there are no section headings or index to help the reader locate them. A bigger

problem is that H. wavers between studying Th. as 'history' and as 'literature': at times he discusses variations in Th.'s presentation—but mostly he just mentions these variations, and then fills in Th.'s gaps by telling his own story (typically a story about shifting political majorities in Athens and Sparta). He does not suggest any reasons why we might want to resist Th.'s conception of political life, or his employment of the aftermath of Pylos; and where he does mention (p. 14 n. 16) the most brilliant (and perhaps the most flawed) of those works which have resisted a positivist reading of Th., Cornford's *Thucydides Mythistoricus*, he attributes to him a view which Cornford explicitly rejected. Other studies of Th.'s literary techniques he scarcely mentions—even though these highlight how Th. carries out his historical analysis through techniques such as structural balance, echoes between different episodes, and evocations of epic (contrast the livelier way in which S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* ii [Oxford, 1996], treats roughly the same section of Th.).

The Queen's College, Oxford

T. C. B. ROOD

M. L. GILL, P. RYAN (trans.): *Plato: Parmenides*. Pp. viii + 175. Indianapolis, IN and Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company, 1996. £22.50 (Paper, £7.50). ISBN: 0-87220-329-8 (0-87220-328-X pbk).

Although the complete Hackett translation of Plato is now available in one volume, the separate hardback and paperback editions of individual dialogues will continue to serve a function. This point is well illustrated by the G.&R. *Parmenides*. Cornford's classic *Plato and Parmenides* of 1939 has long been out of print, and R. E. Allen's 1983 translation and commentary, reissued in a lightly revised version by Yale U.P. in 1997, is not the ideal replacement. Allen's book does not engage seriously with the intensive scholarship on the dialogue of the last few decades, its impact on Plato studies has been limited, and it is not available in paperback. The Hackett *Parmenides* now best supplies what most English-speaking teachers, students, and other readers of the dialogue are likely to want: a good translation and a substantial but not exhaustive introduction, keyed to a fairly extensive bibliography of scholarship in English—at a bargain price.

Allen's translation achieved a spare elegance which the workmanlike Hackett does not match. And his layout was distinctly preferable. By presenting the dialogue properly as dialogue, Allen made the arguments of Part II easier to follow (and more vivid, too) than in the Hackett format, where change of speakers is indicated by dashes within continuous paragraphs. On the other hand G.&R. avoid Allen's occasional inaccuracies, eccentricities (he translated εἶδη as 'characters' and prejudicial rendering of εἷν as 'unity'). They make a contribution to establishing the Greek text in the difficult section in Deduction 5 on being and not-being as 'bonds'. Shorey (followed by Burnet) added a μῆ at 162A8 and deleted one at 162B2. Simply by virtue of their acute grasp of Parmenides' philosophizing at this point, G.&R. are able to make good sense of the original MSS readings.

The 100 page introduction (by G.) is a lucid, accessible, and authoritative guide to one of Plato's most demanding and (in Part II) forbidding dialogues. Evidently G.'s aim is first to give the reader a firm grasp of its structure, and then to prompt reflection on how its two halves fit together philosophically, and also (rather ambitiously) on the way the deductions of Part II may build on each other to form a single developing argument, not just a collection of contradictions all as compelling or un compelling as each other. But throughout G. concentrates on the difficulties *Parmenides* is explicitly—or more often implicitly—prompting us to recognize, rather than on the solutions we might give them. Her very Eleatic Plato wants us to make progress by focusing and articulating better the philosophical choices we need to make. So she sees her maieutic rôle as helping us to respond to the dialogue accordingly.

The treatment of Part I is relatively full. G.'s discussions contain novel and distinctive elements, notably in her handling of the regress arguments, but naturally rely heavily on previous scholarship. Coverage of Part II is necessarily more selective and illustrative, and any way G. is interested most in the general morals we might derive from the gymnastic exercise as a whole. She has an attractive and original theory to propose. A key point is the observation that the first two deductions are much longer and weightier than the rest. They result in contradictory conclusions: considered solely as it is in itself, the one is nothing at all; considered in its relations to other things, the one is everything indiscriminately. G.'s idea is that this result is in a sense the focus of all the ensuing argumentation. The appendix to Deductions 1 and 2 explores unsuccessfully one