
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 ὅμοιομερή 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 μοῖρα (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 εἴδη and ὀλὶ̄χ 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.
A related problem is the reconstruction of the tetralogy, which is discussed with proper caution in part 4 of the introduction. I would also like to draw attention both to Appendix I on lyric metre, which, although it does not, in the words of the authors, lay claim to originality, explains the lyrics with clarity and provides more discussion and references than is usual in these appendices, and also to the general and Greek indices, which have been formulated with special emphasis on linguistic matters.

Maarit Kaimio


The volumes of this series, each containing an introduction, text and a commentary, are designed mainly for undergraduates and students in the upper forms of schools, although they are also intended to attract the attention of classical scholars — as in fact every textbook for students should. The texts are supplied with a critical apparatus short enough to be grasped by students and detailed enough to allow discussion of most important textual questions in the commentary. The commentaries themselves are adequate for student’s purposes. The introductions are also designed to be useful to those readers who do not understand Greek, but are interested in the tragedies as works of literature. In her introduction to the Trachiniae, Mrs. Easterling gives a very illuminating survey of the problems of the structure of the play and of the intricate twining of its themes. The exposition of the transmission of the text is left to an appendix, probably to avoid disturbing the non-Greek reader. I think, however, that it would be of particular importance for these very readers to get a glimpse of the conditions in which the classical texts were transmitted. An example of an excellent short exposition of textual transmission is found in R. D. Dawe’s introduction to the Oedipus Rex. His discussion of the content and structure of the play is very personal and interesting, bringing out the several instances of Aristotelic alogon in the structure of this masterpiece. However, for the benefit of the beginner and the general reader, one would also wish for a clearer exposition of the merits of the structure — or are these thought to be self-evident for every reader? Mark Griffith keeps his introduction to the Prometheus Bound very carefully neutral as regards the problem of the authorship of the play; as we know that the editor is one of the chief experts in this field, he is perhaps being too modest when he avoids giving his personal view, telling us that ”a number of scholars … have concluded that it is not the work of Aeschylus at all” (p. 32) and ”most would date the play to the 440s or 430s” (p. 33), and only including his own name among others in the notes. The question of the trilogy is, in my opinion, too central a problem to be left to the appendix.

Maarit Kaimio