

or Socratic literature or both, while the stray ostraca bearing Damon's name do not constitute evidence for an actual ostracism. By the end of the essay, one has been gently but firmly persuaded that Damon was indeed an unlikely candidate for ostracism. The case may not be settled to everyone's satisfaction, but the burden of proof has been shifted to the other side.

Edward Cohen's 'Athenian Prostitution as a Liberal Profession' liberates the study of prostitution from the narrow and often surprising moralising of many professional historians. Cohen rightly sets prostitution within the ancient normative context in which work was evaluated chiefly in relation to the worker's freedom from or subjection to outside control. In this regard, the 'sex industry' was no different from other types of work. *Pornai* working in brothels were, to be sure, slavish according to ancient Greek norms, but *hetairai* could make contracts with their suitors, choose their clients, and live prosperous and socially acceptable lives (pp. 228–31). Meanwhile, Jane Chaplin's 'Livy's Narrative Habit' focusses on exclusively literary topics: the fable of the 'Belly and the Limbs' and Livy's treatment of Coriolanus. Chaplin maintains that Livy differed from his Greek predecessors in avoiding editorial commentary and advancing historical interpretations solely through his narrative presentation. This argument helpfully isolates one of the distinctive elements of Roman historiography, although Chaplin does not speculate on the reasons for this distinctive approach.

This volume contains many other instructive and, at times, entertaining contributions. It is a well-earned tribute to its influential honorand.

Washington University in St. Louis

RYAN BALOT
rkbalot@artsci.wustl.edu

EAST–WEST RELATIONS

LLOYD (G.E.R.) *Ancient Worlds, Modern Reflections*. Pp. 240. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2004. Cased, £27.50, US\$35.00. ISBN: 0-19-927016-3.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X0500123X

L.'s latest *tour de force* in the art of comparing ancient Greece and China goes far beyond his forays to date. He not only tackles head on some of the basic questions of what such a comparison means for contemporary debates about realism and relativism in epistemology and ontology, he also moves on to moral issues – how can ancient history be brought to bear on crucial social and political problems of today, to wit, universities, democracy and human rights? As in earlier works, his *tertium comparationis* is fundamentally social; we need more than technical, cultural or economic reasons to *explain* why people think the way they do.

The questions about realism and relativism are dealt with in chapters on whether there is one science, one reality, one logic and one truth for all, the status and functions of belief, explanations, classifications and examples. An impressive array of primary material, ancient and modern, alongside much secondary work, is mobilised in favour of the claim that we are neither bound to a strict realism, nor disconcertingly afloat in relativism. Important conceptions underlying L.'s approach are those of 'semantic stretch': univocity is the limiting case, not the norm, and of the variety of 'styles of enquiry': we have to appreciate what the historical agents thought they were doing.

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved

Anyone who has tried explaining Plato or indeed Mencius to students will be familiar with the phenomenon of ‘untranslatable terms’, but L. is surely right that this is a weak basis indeed for claiming there are Kuhnian incompatible systems of belief. For the adherent of one system can understand the other, just as the Kuhnian commentator does. As shown in recent work by Robert Wardy, Chinese translators of Aristotle’s *Organon* (in the *Minglitan*) often did not do appreciably worse than the Coimbra translators into Latin.

The concept of truth is of particular importance not only for the Greeks and the west generally, but especially for comparative studies because of the western commentators who deny the ancient Chinese this concept. L. points to the linguistic means for ascribing truth values: *shi / fei* (what is so, what is not so) are one pair, *ran / bu ran* (so, not so) another. *Shi / fei* are defined in a way reminiscent of Aristotle’s definition of telling the truth in *Metaphysics* IX 10, namely by the Confucian thinker Xunzi (Bk 2.12): ‘calling *shi shi*, and calling *fei fei* is straight (*zhi*)’. Furthermore, the radical forms of relativism in the *Zhuangzi* show a keen awareness of what is involved in making a truth claim. There, both affirmation and denial are relativised to a viewpoint: one person judges *shi*, another *fei*. This goes even further than Plato’s portrayal of Protagoras, as he allows relative judgements: the wind *is* hot to the person who judges it so. In contrast, the *Zhuangzi* moves from the judgements of different people to the referents of such judgements to conclude no distinction is possible while conceding one has to rely on such judgements (*yin shi*).

The *Zhuangzi*’s chief concern is not philosophy of language, but the way we should live. And of course this is one of the main points that critics of the Chinese projects can make: pure theory, of which there is no shortage in Greece, is rare indeed. Of course, one of L.’s concerns is to ask us to question just what is to count as theory. Hence the importance of his demonstration that reasoning by example as in the *Jiuzhang Suanshu* (*Nine Chapters on Mathematical Procedures*), along with Liu Hui’s commentary, are much more abstract than their apparently practical bias suggests. These investigations fall within L.’s commodious concept of science: any activity aiming at explaining, predicting or understanding ‘natural’ phenomena (and no holds barred, apparently, on what may fall under any one of these weighty terms p. 15). Thus the Chinese mathematical project, rather than being axiomatic like the Greeks with their urge to bring *explananda* under general rules, is a search for unities, analogies and general patterns, which are hunted down using particular cases.

On practical issues, L. is very critical of recent trends in higher education, and wishes to use the authority, or perhaps charismatic examples, of past institutions to counter the tendencies of universities to become purely vocational establishments. From the Chinese, we can learn to value the past, and from the Greeks to value learning for itself. Strange as it may seem to fit these reflections seamlessly on to a learned work comparing Chinese and Greek achievements, it is more in the spirit of some of the works and authors under consideration than a purely academic study. Critical intellectuals are an old and respected part of the landscape in China, as in Greece. Nowadays the tenured, and the not so tenured, may respect them for their freedom, and courage. L. tends to see his subject as ‘science’, but many of the questions addressed may be more readily classed as philosophical, indeed as moral. For example, human rights: the question is one about the basis for objective moral judgements. L. argues in favour of theories of justice and responsibility, at the expense of human nature and rights. In neither Greece nor China was there a notion of universal rights, whereas in China debates as to whether human ‘nature’ is ‘good’ (*xing shan*) or not was a central ethical issue. These debates are fascinating for the comparativist, despite a lack of terms

corresponding exactly to our nature or *physis*, and to our notion of (moral) goodness. L. pleads for the objectivity of moral judgements, but his argument is all too swift here: relativism is simply incoherent. A bravura performance: L. shows how the comparative dialogue with the dead, Chinese and Greek, can make us aware of our parochialism. Long may the conversation continue!

Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

R.A.H. KING
richard.king@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

DICTIONARY OF BRITISH CLASSICISTS

TODD (R.B.) (ed.) *The Dictionary of British Classicists. Volume 1, A-F. Volume 2, G-N. Volume 3, O-Z.* Pp. xxx + 1105. Bristol: Thoemmes Continuum, 2004. Cased, £450. ISBN: 1-85506-997-0.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X05001241

Casaubon, British? ‘Erasmus of Rotterdam’ (so he is tellingly titled), British? Gissing, Thackeray, the author of *The Thirty-nine Steps*, classicists? Only if you make ‘classicist’ a term ‘capacious enough ... to cover schoolteachers and tutors, editors and translators, administrators and organizers, poets and novelists, publishers and printers, antiquarians and travellers, and researchers across the whole spectrum of classical studies’; and only if, to accommodate the Frenchman and the Dutchman, you define what it means to be British as ‘careers ... pursued primarily or significantly in Britain’ – which, it follows, ‘allows the inclusion of refugee classicists who enriched and influenced modern British classical studies from the 1930s onwards’. But a German historian who came as a visiting lecturer for three years and published nothing in English (pp. 836–8)? It is a symptom of the Editors’ open-handedness that they can allow a contributor to write that Robert Graves ‘is perhaps the best known British classicist of the twentieth century and, in his way, one of the most influential’.

These three volumes, compiled by a General Editor with ten Supervising Editors, contain 727 entries, written by about 230 contributors – ‘about’, because at least one, the writer on Coleridge (who misdates *Lyrical Ballads* by a hundred years), is missing from the List of Contributors. They range from the sixteenth century until the second half of the twentieth. At the later end, qualification for entry is ‘careers under way by 1960, and also deceased by 2000’. The latest entrants are Barrett and Hammond (who both died in 2001). Entries are alphabetical, in well-spaced double columns, and the printing, though not elegant, is easy on the eye. Each entry is followed by a selective bibliography of the subject’s work, and suggestions for ‘Further Reading’. The entries vary in length, competence, and quality of writing. It is easy to find flaws and omissions. Before I do so, I applaud the enterprise, and congratulate the editorial team. Taken on their own terms these volumes, for the greater part, can be read with profit and pleasure by the general reader. Others will turn for preference to the *Dictionary of National Biography*, where many of the same subjects are treated more fully, often more accurately, and sometimes by the same contributors.

‘Readers will readily identify and regret certain omissions (and in some cases may prefer to have seen some subjects excluded)’. True. The following (the fruit not of any systematic searching) have as much claim to be included as many that are: Evelyn Abbott, A. Alsop (D.K. Money, *The English Horace: Anthony Alsop and the tradition of British Latin Verse* [1998]), W. Beare, R.R. Bolgar, G.W. Bond, Samuel Butler the younger (T. Whitmarsh, ‘What Samuel Butler saw: Classics, authorship and cultural

The Classical Review vol. 56 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2006; all rights reserved