NOTICES OF BOOKS

of Peitho and Apollo, prove to conceal an initiation rite involving segregation out of town in part five! It is surprising to find no mention of the similar Athenian girl suppliants at the Delphinion, a parallel first noted by K. O. Müller (Dorier*, i, 330 f.) and quoted by Frazer (Pausan. vol. iii, 57).

Part six is concerned with a Delphic festival. It is maintained that the second part of the Septerion (the journey of a pais amphithales to Tempe) was originally an initiation rite and was only associated with the Septerion and the Pythia (through the laurel) in the sixth century. This network of conjecture cannot be proved wrong, through lack of evidence. What can be proved is that it is based on the subtle technique of allowing a faint hypothesis to form the basis of another hypothesis by accepting it as fact. The conjecture that the overturning of the triapeza in the Septerion might indicate the presence of a monster who eats children needs no comment.

B.'s awareness of bibliography concerning the Sacred War and relations between Delphi and Thessaly leaves something to be desired. The following works ought, in my opinion, to have been quoted: H. W. Parke-J. Boardman in JHS lxvii (1957) 276-282; P. Guillon, Études béotiennes. Le Bouclier d'Héraclès et l'histoire de la Grèce centrale dans la période de la première guerre sacrée (Aix-en-Provence 1963); J. Ducat in REG lxvii (1964) 289-90; W. G. Forrest in JHS lxviii (1965) 173.

The Delphic 'initiation rite' is used by B. as the basis for a general hypothesis about Greek initiations. He suggests that a further development is to be found in the identification of both the mythical prototype and the 'representatively initiated' subject with the god himself; a process which would give permanent value to the initiation and attribute new traits to the divine figure. However, when the basis of the argument is so shaky, I do not see how the argument itself can be considered plausible.

A forty-two page Appendix closes the book; the author tries hard to justify its presence—and fails. Most of it consists of repetition and generalities and it contains one monstrosity: the suggestion that the dedication of kouroi and korai might have been 'una forma devozionale sorta coerentemente nel corso dei rimodellamenti del 'retaggio' iniziatico, ma poi diffusasi, sulla cresta di una delle grandi ondate livellatrici della storia religiosa greca, nei culti più vari' (449). No comment is, I believe, needed. We may only regret that a more thorough study of bibliography—or indeed only of Richter's Kouroi and Korei to which he gives a reference—did not allow B. to realise first, that contrary to what he believes, archaeologists have studied the 'ragion d'essere' of these statues, and second, that the diversity of the functions of the kouroi and korai, not conjectured but attested through inscriptions and find places (and this is also valid for the earliest of the series), excludes any serious consideration of his hypothesis.

On p. 460 an important reference (to Soph. fr. 308 N) is wrong; the correct one is Soph. fr. 755 N. In conclusion: the book fails to be the model of sound method which the author's 'Premessa' claims it is (pp. 6 and 9), but can be useful if treated with prudence, which particularly needs to be exercised in the parts concerned with historical events or archaeological evidence. It will prove very useful for the literary evidence on many aspects of Greek ritual life. It contains some good 'mises au point' and some interesting ideas which would have been better appreciated had the author not judged it his duty always to prove his points, which he can only do by pressing the evidence too far.

Pai des e Parthen ois is undoubtedly written by a very brilliant man, and in masterly style. Its apparent authority should not disguise the fact that it must be used with caution.

CHRISTIANE SOURVINOU

St Hilda's College, Oxford

ISLER (H. P.) Acheloos: eine Monographie. (Schriften hrsg. unter dem Patronat der schweizerischen geisteswissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft, 11.) Berne: Francke. 1970. Pp. 206. 23 plates. Sw. fr. 28.

This dissertation has been published in the form in which it was submitted at Zurich in 1966. The subject is one which Dr F. Matz included in his Göttingen dissertation on 'nature-persifications' in Greek art in 1913, and this leads Dr Isler to ask what justification there is for a new monograph on the subject. He finds part of the answer in his belief that Acheloos was not a nature-persification but a living deity in the minds of men. This distinction is surely more nominal than actual; indeed the one may include the other, and this seems to be more or less implied by Dr Isler himself when he remarks that water was called Acheloos ('ebenso wurde das Wasser auch Acheloos genannt'). In the same way the sun was Helios and the sky was Ouranos, and both were conceived as living deities. A better justification for choosing this subject is that Dr Isler is able to publish some representations of Acheloos in Greek art which have been either unpublished or inadequately published hitherto. Moreover, he gives a clear and detailed collection of the material available. The catalogue of representations, arranged under twelve headings from sculpture to coin-types, contains three-hundred-and-seventy-one items and covers sixty-eight pages. It is excellently composed, with description, bibliography, location, date, etc., for each item, and there are full cross-references to the text. There are also sub-divisions by geographical regions. The footnotes are much to the point and kept within reasonable bounds in a subject where one can easily indulge in an extravagance of reference. These are twenty-three plates, well produced, which give a good cross-section of representations, and the key to the plates is well organised. There is no index. Otherwise it is a model of production for anyone who wishes to pursue the study of Acheloos.
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The text itself is little more than a hundred pages, which are mainly devoted to description and the tracing of stylistic development in each genre. Comparisons are made with the literary tradition, especially for the struggle between Heracles and Acheloos. Finally, the author gives his conclusions on the oriental origins of the man-faced bull which sometimes represents Acheloos, the associations of the god with water and with Dionysos, and his place in the myth of Heracles. It is all very orderly and efficient. One longs for something of the mystery and the magic which envelope a great river, and for comparisons, for instance, with the wrestling of Jacob and the river-god at the ford Jabbock, or for the geographical reasons which led Ambracia, built on the banks of 'The Tearer', Arachthos, to put the emblem of the river-god upon her coins. But one cannot expect everything in a doctorate dissertation. It is admirably printed, and the only misprint which I noticed will give no offence: the 'Trusties of the British Museum'.

GUTHRIE (W. K. C.)  A history of Greek philosophy. 3. The fifth-century enlightenment. Cambridge: the University Press. 1969. Pp. xvi + 544. £5.00

The third volume of Guthrie's history has the distinct quality of philosophia de salea deoseta implied in its title. The dedication 'to the memory of my daughter Anne, with whom I discussed the plan of this volume' will be both welcome and significant to all who had the privilege of knowing her. Even so it is a plan which makes considerable demands on the reader. There is a clear division into 300 pages on the Sophists and 200 pages on Socrates, and there is a kind of chiastic arrangement within these divisions. General questions and matters of doctrine precede the biographical material on the Sophists, but the personal factors in the discussion of Socrates precede the philosophical. Antisthenes, Aristippus and Eucleides receive personal notice (the first among the Sophists, the other two at the end of the volume, after Socrates) but we are promised fuller treatment in the next volume. A conscious awakening from dogmatic slumbers was bound to be somewhat different from the increasing freedom of tentative enquiry and social adaptation which we find in the earlier time. There are 'echoes' of the Sophists, conscious and unconscious, in the later centuries, but nothing like exact correspondences. Perhaps Diderot and Hippias would have understood one another with very little introduction, and one can find antecedents of people as different as Montesquieu, Rousseau and Comte in France or as Bentham and Huxley in Britain; but Voltaire and J. S. Mill would not be so easy to pair off with Greek fifth-century counterparts. Nor was there any historical event like the French Revolution, affecting men's future thoughts and related to past intellectual development, in the Greek period.

But we must return to our text. The introductory chapter says that we turn now from long-settled scientific matters (flat earth, for example) to living issues on which Thrasymachus and Socrates, Plato and Democritus still enlist their supporters. Thus Grote champions the Sophists, Jowett counters in his introduction to his translation of Plato Sophistes, and later iconoclasm blasts Jowett with Plato—or perhaps with Hegel. The second chapter suggests that the fifth century made a 'reasoned rejection of