

Pythagoreans, although Aristotle makes crystal clear that these principles are Platonic in origin. There are of course many problems in interpreting Pythagoreanism and perhaps McKirahan has arguments against the points I make or against Burkert, but the problem is that in his chapter he presents the understanding of Pythagoreanism of Guthrie that is now almost 40 years old without seriously confronting the revolutionary work done since then.

However, I would like to conclude by emphasizing that, apart from the problems with the chapter on the Pythagoreans, this is a very welcome book and a significant achievement. McKirahan is particularly good at structuring difficult chapters in order to make clear what the main thrust of a given philosopher's work is, while at the same time raising important philosophical questions about his achievement. The fragments of Heraclitus are arranged in eleven groups, which help to bring out the central strands in his thought while at the same time emphasizing that he is much more than just a *physiologos*. There is an admirably clear account of the paradoxes of Zeno as well as a satisfying account of his role in Presocratic thought. In the chapter on Anaxagoras McKirahan proceeds by identifying five kinds of entities and six basic principles in his system and then gives a provocative discussion of each of them. In the case of Empedocles McKirahan is convincing in his presentation of the view that there was only one poem and elucidates the cosmic cycle by first giving an overview of it and then raising a series of nine problems. McKirahan is at his best when presenting the basic principles of a system in a dialectical manner. The chapter on atomism has an insightful account of the later history of the theory and its connection to modern atomic theory. This book is a major contribution to the teaching of the Presocratics. In fact McKirahan's treatment of the Presocratics convinces one that, despite the apparent obscurity of the subject, all undergraduates would gain a much better understanding both of themselves and of their world by studying Presocratic philosophy.

Department of Classics
DePauw University
Greencastle IN 46135

Protagoras and Logos: A Study in Greek Philosophy and Rhetoric. By Edward Schiappa. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1991. Pp. xviii + 239. \$29.95.

Gerald A. Press

Over the centuries, estimates of the sophists in general and Protagoras in particular have varied as have estimates of the relations between philosophy and rhetoric. On the whole, philosophers have tended to follow Plato and Aristotle in

believing that philosophy and rhetoric are radically distinct disciplines, that sophists are all essentially the same, viz., morally impoverished and intellectually weak, merely pretending to do what philosophy really does: provide knowledge of what is true and what is important.

Views have been changing: editions and translations by Untersteiner (1949-1962), Dumont (1969), and Sprague (1972), monographic studies of the movement as a whole by Untersteiner (1949), Levi (1966), Classen (1976), and Kerferd (1981) testify to heightened interest and appreciation among classical scholars. Attitudes have been changing among philosophers as well. Kirk and Raven (1957, 1973) simply do not include them. Mourelatos' collection of critical essays on the Presocratics had nothing in the original edition (1974), but noted growing interest in the sophists when it was reissued (1994, xxii-xxiii). By contrast, the sophists occupy half of volume 3 in Guthrie's *History of Greek Philosophy* (1969) and Richard McKirahan devotes more than 40 pages to them, roughly one tenth of his new *Philosophy Before Socrates* (1994).

Schiappa's overall enterprise is self-consciously revisionist. By reconstructing a world-view that can reasonably be attributed to Protagoras, he finds intellectual coherence and influence far beyond what is found in most histories of ancient philosophy.

The book contains fifteen chapters and is divided into three parts concerning, respectively, Schiappa's principles, his interpretations of the individual fragments and testimonies, and his assessment of Protagoras' thought and practice.

Chapter 1 provides a useful account of the evolution of the meaning of the term SOPHISTES, though it might have profited from Kerferd's 1976 paper, 'The Image of the Wise Man in Greece in the Period before Plato'. Chapter 2 makes constructive use of Havelock's and others' work on orality and literacy as well as Kahn's notions of linguistic density and resonance. Chapter 3 is essentially the author's 1990 article arguing that Plato invented rhetoric, and that the sophists should be thought of rather as *logos* theorists, i.e., as part of an intellectualist movement that favored abstract over poetic thinking, as part of the same movement as the Presocratic philosophers, but as transitional figures.

Part 2 examines the fragments one by one. Schiappa finds that 'The Two-LOGOI Fragment' (ch. 5) is a logical extension of Heraclitean thinking about flux and the unity of opposites. Similarly he interprets 'The "Stronger and Weaker" LOGOI Fragment' (ch. 6) in a positive and Heraclitean way 'as advocating the substitution of a preferred but weaker account (*logos*) for a less preferable (but temporarily dominant) *logos* of the same experience' (113). 'The "Human Measure" Fragment' (ch. 7) is seen as a 'response to Eleatic extremism as spawned by Parmenides' (121). Likewise, 'The "Impossible to Contradict" Fragment' (ch. 8) expresses Protagorean relativism in opposition to Eleatic views. DK 80 B4, the famous fragment about the gods, Schiappa reads as anthropology rather than agnosticism. In the same chapter he examines two other passages that might be thought to provide testimony about the Protagorean world-view or even to be described as fragments. (1) Aristotle *Meta.* 997b35,

which refers to Protagoras' refutation of geometry, he finds consistent with the Heraclitean and anti-Eleatic trend of Protagoras' thought as already depicted. (2) The recently discovered passage from Didymus the Blind he believes indicates how Protagoras was understood by Hellenistic philosophers; however, with Barnes and against Mejer and Woodruff he does not consider this a genuine fragment.

Part 3 assesses Protagoras' role in education (ch. 10) and politics (ch. 11), and, finally, his relation to Plato and Aristotle (ch. 12). In all of this, Protagoras turns out to be a much more serious, substantial, and intellectually influential figure than is suggested either by the common pejorative sense of the word 'sophist' or by the stereotypical caricature of the sophists often derived from Plato's dialogues. The overall reconstruction presented here attributes to Protagoras a real world-view, one that is Heraclitean and anti-Eleatic. Thus, he turns out to be 'a transitional figure between "compositional" and "attributional" patterns and logics of explanation', between 'Heraclitus' poetic descriptions' and 'the explanations found in Plato and Aristotle' (113).

Not all students of ancient philosophy will be persuaded by Schiappa's argument. For one thing, the book consists of too many brief chapters; an average chapter is just ten pages of text plus three pages of endnotes. For another, the many repetitions, summaries, and references to scholars by their full names makes it seem both thinner than it actually is and too close to the dissertation in which it originated. This is in many ways a pathbreaking book, and it would have been more effective to make the arguments at greater length and depth. For another thing, scholars accustomed to the specialized philosophic world will be uncomfortable with the fact that the author comes from the rhetorical tradition and that the volume appears in a series called *Studies in Rhetoric/Communication*. Finally, some will be uneasy about the extent to which, methodologically, Schiappa depends on Kahn's notions of linguistic density and resonance and the orality-literacy interpretive framework in trying to clarify the intellectual context in which Protagoras worked and in reconstructing his world-view.

Nevertheless, it is important to understand that context, for it was also the context in which Socrates operated. And it is important to understand the specific views of Protagoras and the other major sophists not only for the sake of historical accuracy but also because, like the other Presocratic philosophers, theirs were views to which Plato and Aristotle reacted in many ways and thus it helps us to understand those who stand in the tradition of ancient philosophy more strictly speaking. Schiappa's book, therefore, makes an important contribution to the ongoing work of revising earlier views about the sophistic movement and it ought to encourage more work on Protagoras and the other sophists as individual teachers and thinkers.

Department of Philosophy
Hunter College, C.U.N.Y.
New York NY 10021