

with theories constantly affirmed throughout the rest of the Hippocratic Corpus, is a therapeutic manual addressed to medical practitioners. The bulk of the work is a pharmacopoeia, whose precise indications of the substances to be deployed inevitably excite comparison with the gynaecological treatises.

*Nature of Bones* is misleadingly entitled. Although it begins with a brief section dealing superficially with general anatomy, starting with the bones, this section does not appear to have any connection with what follows. The treatise, which provides the longest account—or, rather, series of disparate accounts—of the vascular system in the Hippocratic Corpus, has been at the centre of considerable controversy: not only between those who maintain that there is an underlying unity within it and those who deny this, but also between those who find here evidence for their claim that Hippocrates was acquainted with the circulation of the blood and those who reject this hypothesis. D., rightly in my opinion, takes her stand with the ‘Separatists’, regarding the treatise simply as a compilation of lecture notes. She is again correct in her rejection of the attempt to attribute knowledge of the circulation of the blood to Hippocrates. Apart from all other considerations, such a hypothesis is incompatible with Hippocratic physiological and pathological theory.

No less controversial is *The Heart*. Its highly sophisticated anatomical description of this organ, together with what is arguably a reference to human dissection, have persuaded some scholars to maintain a Hellenistic or even later origin for the work. Others, however, have adduced counter-arguments in favour of an earlier date. D. presents a judicious evaluation of this debate and draws her cautious conclusion (with which I am in full sympathy) that the work dates from the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. While believing that some links are displayed with the Alexandrians, she argues that it must be anterior to, or at least contemporaneous with, Praxagoras, and that affinities with ‘Sicilian’ medicine should not tempt one, for several valid reasons, to look to Diocles as its author.

Finally, the brief fragment, *Anatomy*, provides a summary description of the principle organs of the trunk and their connecting vessels. Two studies of this long-neglected work have been published in the same year (see, too, E. M. Craik ‘The Hippocratic Treatise *On Anatomy*’, *CQ* 48 [1998], 1–32). The fragment is marked by an unusual vocabulary that has led one scholar to argue, unpersuasively, for an atomistic origin. Other verbal affinities with Parmenides and Empedocles have given rise to the suggestion that it originated in Magna Graecia. D. herself draws interesting parallels with Pseudo-Rufus, *On the Anatomy of the Parts of Man*. Sensibly, she does not argue for a common authorship, but suggests that they are both manifestations of a desire to write systematic accounts catering to an interest in the new science of anatomy aroused by the discoveries of the great Alexandrians. But if this is the case, I am left wondering why the anatomy described here should be so much less sophisticated even than that of Aristotle.

We are greatly indebted to D. for her meticulous scholarship and wide learning, which have established these treatises upon so sound a basis for future research.

Hamsterley Mill, Durham

JAMES LONGRIGG

G. MAZZARA: *Gorgia. La retorica del verosimile*. (International Pre-Platonic Studies I.) Pp. ix + 261. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag, 1999. Cased, DM 88. ISBN: 3-89665-057-2.

For a long time the (extant) work of the Sophists was treated as complementary material in the footnotes of surveys on more popular authors. But in the last twenty years there has been an increasing interest in the origins of Greek rhetoric and the activity of the Sophists, to a great extent thanks to Italian scholars like M., who continue a long tradition represented by such scholars as Calogero and Untersteiner.

In this book, M. attempts a global approach to Gorgias and his thought, and he proceeds by considering *εἰκός* as the pivotal and the unifying notion of G.’s work, as the title itself suggests. M. discerns three main types of *εἰκός* corresponding to the three major works of G.: *On Not Being*, *The Encomium of Helen*, and *The Defence of Palamedes*.

In the first chapter M. provides readers with an evaluation of possible characterizations of G.’s thought: nominalism (represented by B. Cassin), relativistic realism (which M. locates in *Helen* 11, 13, and mainly in the admittedly obscure quotation from Proklos, fr. 82 B26 DK, which M. discusses plausibly), and finally ‘sensism’ and realism. M. claims that each one of these aspects was used by G. with a certain selectivity, so as to serve his varying needs.

The two following chapters are devoted to the analysis of the second and the third theses defended by G. in his *ONB* ('... if it is, it is unknowable, if it is and it is knowable, it cannot be communicated to others'), which, according to the author, form the theoretical foundations of G.'s rhetoric. M. follows the arguments step by step (as Migliori and Newiger do in their works on G.), and in many cases M. compares the two sources of the work (the anonymous author of *On Melissus, Xenophanes and Gorgias*, and Sextus *Adv. Math.* 7.65ff.). At the end of each one of these chapters readers will find an outline of the arguments, arranged in a way that makes clear where the two sources converge and where they do not. M. then passes to the intriguing problem of the character of *ONB*, which others take as a rhetorical or as a philosophical work, and concludes that both philosophy and rhetoric have their own place in it; he also makes some points on the word *πράγματα*, which has so much tantalized scholars, and which has been used as an argument that favours the view that in *ONB* G. refers to the phenomenal world, and not to abstract philosophical entities (Calogero and Kerferd; *contra* Mansfeld and recently Palmer).

In the last two chapters (V and VI) M. turns to *Palamedes* and *Helen*, the works which are most frequently seen as exemplifications of what is usually termed as a model-speech. In the former the emphasis is placed on the tracing of the elements (mainly epistemological and argumentative) that draw upon *ONB*; in the latter he investigates the similarities between *Helen* and *ONB* as well, but he also proceeds to what seems to me the most exhaustive comparison of the *Encomium* with Euripides' relevant plays (mainly *Troades*, and *Helen*); M. has some words to say about the question of the nature of *Helen* (an encomium or a defence?), and about the very last and very tantalizing word of the work (*παύσιον*).

In the Appendix, M. provides his readers with a facing translation of *Helen, Palamedes, ONB*, and some of the B fragments (the Greek text is from Untersteiner's edition), along with some short notes. At the end of the book one finds an extensive bibliography, which, however, lacks Buchheim's commentary, the only serious one on the whole of G.'s work, and T. Cole's work on the origins of Greek rhetoric (M. was probably not aware of Schiappa's book, which also appeared in 1999).

Some general remarks: M.'s book is certainly intended for those who already have a significant knowledge of G.; those with this knowledge will find in it several interesting approaches, especially to *ONB*, but I do not know how many of them will tolerate so many *-isms* (G. would not have thought of them anyway). The hard-dying view that there are theoretical foundations expressed in *ONB*, which illuminate the interpretation of *Helen* and *Palamedes*, does not convince me: if there are similarities there are dissimilarities as well, and it is also true that persuasiveness needs flexibility. Greek words are very frequently misprinted.

University of Glasgow

DIMOS SPATHARAS

C. CAREY: *Aeschines*. Pp. xxi + 261. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000. Paper, £13.50. ISBN: 0-292-71223-5.

This is the third volume in the Texas series of translations of the Attic orators edited by Michael Gagarin, and the standard is as high as ever. The book follows the regular format, beginning with Gagarin's excellent Series Introduction, which surveys classical oratory, and Athenian government and law. In his own Introduction to *The Life and Times of Aeschines*, C. offers a lucid account of the rise of Macedonia, the Peace of Philocrates and its aftermath down to 322, and Aeschines' life, which provides more than adequate background information for newcomers to this complex period of Athenian history. I would have welcomed, in addition, a section on Aeschines' oratory. The chapter closes with a brief note on the text (C. bases his translations on the 1997 Teubner of M. R. Dils, with some well argued differences: e.g. pp. 153 n. 226, 243 n. 262) and a bibliography, with brief annotations, of works in English (to which might be added J. F. Kindstrand, *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity* [Uppsala, 1982]). Each of the translations is preceded by an introduction, which puts the speech into its historical and legal context, and contains a synopsis of its different sections and overall rhetorical strategies—this is particularly handy, given the length of all three orations. The translations themselves amply fulfil the aim of the series, to make available to the Greekless reader translations which are 'up-to-date, accurate, and readable'. C. D. Adams's 1919 Loeb has stood the test of time well, but C.'s modern, colloquial English makes his versions more readable. He captures nicely the sometimes rambling narrative style of Aeschines, and not at the expense of accuracy. There are, inevitably, rhetorical figures in the Greek which are nigh on impossible to