
The position of Anaxagoras in the history of Greek thought is certainly worth reconsideration in several respects. His relation to the early Ionians, the Eleatics, the Pythagoreans and Empedocles, the Atomists, and indeed the Socratics and Aristotle, has never been satisfactorily delineated, even though we happen to possess quite a substantial body of texts and doxography. Teodorsson’s book shows, both explicitly and implicitly, that a great deal can still be done.

The book is concerned mainly with the problem of the ὅμοιομεθή and σπέρματα, and in general with the implications of the infinite divisibility of Anaxagoras’ universe. After a critical assessment of various earlier interpretations, and a partial refutation of Gershenson’s & Greenberg’s theory of inauthenticity (1964), Teodorsson produces ‘Another Interpretation’ (p. 65ff.). His approach is, perhaps, rather too positivistic (e.g. p. 71, the supposed polemic of Anaxagoras “against all three contemporaries and competitors of his, Empedocles, Leucippus, and Zeno”), although on the whole prudently cautious. Among the interesting new ideas that emerge are the rendering of μονα (B6) as “feature”, and in particular the explanation of σπέρματα as semi-abstract “matrices”. The last-mentioned point, if acceptable (it is in fact likely to be controversial), would provide us with a new clue to Anaxagoras. At the end (p. 94) there is a suggestion of Aristotle’s theory of εἶδη and ὑλὴ being an extrapolation of Anaxagoras’ theory; the impact of Anaxagoras on Plato, obviously the ‘missing link’ here, is not discussed.

Teodorsson’s book is an important contribution to the study of the Presocratics, however controversial many of its results may appear to be.

H. Thesleff


This is a large and learned work, with a commentary designed mainly for classical scholars, although it can profitably be used by undergraduates, too — if not as a set course book, at least as an additional source of information for difficult passages. As this play abounds in difficult passages, a commentary on this scale is well motivated. The textual problems are very great in the Suppliants; these are discussed in detail in the commentary as well as in part 5 of the introduction and Appendix II on textual corruption. The text and apparatus are based on the work of H. Friis Johansen in his earlier edition of the Suppliants (Copenhagen 1970), although the text has been revised. Many other problems presented by this play are also creditably discussed; I would like to mention especially the discussion on the central theme of the play (Introduction, part 3), namely, whether the Danaids reject marriage to the Egyptians alone or marriage and sex in general.