

CHASLAV D. KOPRIVICA, *The Ideas and the Principles. Research of Plato's Ontology*. (in Serbian language) Izdavachka knjizharnica Zorana Stojanovicha. Sremski Karlovci - Novi Sad, 2005 (612 pp., ISBN 86-7543-098-1).

Chaslav D. Koprivica, Docent (Assistant Professor) at the Faculty of Political Sciences at the University in Belgrade, has written a book which formally treats a fundamental topic of ancient ontology as conceived in Plato. Actually, it is dedicated to the problem of the modern concept of European metaphysics which, in the context of Platonic studies in Germany, has been developed last several decades.

Originally, this work is a doctoral thesis, revised and extended for publishing. It is one of the reasons why the research is methodologically carefully accomplished and the content is easy to be surveyed. The study is divided into three main parts. In brief, Part 1. deals with the original and basic meaning of the ideas as a philosophical concept in Plato; Part 2. interpretes this Platonic doctrine on the more profound level and, Part 3. is a survey of Plato's ontology.

In the Introductory chapter, the author refuses doxographical approach to Plato considering it as banal and useless and, at the same time, suggests establishing coordinates in the context of modern understanding of Plato's ontology. He looks for contemporary stand point of view which could be relevant as a starting position. Koprivica distinguishes three main interpretative streams: first, the so called traditional-humanistic German School founded by Schleiermacher and Schlegel and developed by the School of Heidelberg; second, an interpretation of Plato's unwritten doctrine founded by Tübingen School, and third is very widely defined "interpretation of Plato in English speaking countries".

According to Koprivica, apart from these three "main streams" there is no any other relevant interpretation.

He refuses the way Plato being interpreted in English speaking countries (it means Anglo-Saxonic hermeneutic) in view of the fact of partial approach to the problems and obvious anachronism where Platon could be understood as our contemporary. He criticizes the "philological scrupulousness" of traditional German School as well, as not being able to keep a distance from immediate Plato's words in the written dialogues. The author himself declares that his own critical position will be somewhere in the middle, between the two German Schools, that of traditional-philological (Heidelberg) and that of unwritten doctrine (Tübingen) one (p. 17 n. 9).

Koprivica accepts a fundamental interpretation which tries to go beyond ("though not opposite to") the meaning of the separate written dialogues and to project some kind of virtual general sense of Plato's philosophy as a base for the sole productive understanding (14). What Plato has said, should be understood by means of what he has not said (99. n. 97). This presupposes a reconstruction of his philosophical development and original motives i. e. genetic-problematic reconstruction of Plato's thought from the stand point of modern phenomenology.

The author believes that the theory of forms (ideas) is explained very close to the contemporary phenomenological way of thinking. Opposite to the common interpretation of Plato's metaphysics by using the *horismos* between the two worlds as a fundamental problem, the modern phenomenology could

explain the original endeavour in order to ensure continuity between phenomenological and noumenological levels. This is original intention in Plato in addition.

The investigation of the ideas and their origin begins with the well-known statement that Plato's philosophy begins with a criticism of Parmenides. More precisely, his radical doctrine of being has produced discrepancy between the theory and experience at the very beginning of Greek philosophy. However, Koprivica extends this statement by conclusion that a gap between theoretical concept of the world and the world itself is essential feature of Presocratic philosophy as a whole. The opposition between flux theory and logos in Heraclitus is given as a typical example. The contraposition, *changing world - unchangeable logos* according to the author, is an absurd (he rhetorically asks himself: How is the existence of unchangeable logos in the changeable world possible?). Of course, this is a simplification of Heraclitean doctrine¹, but Koprivica needs it as a pretext for genesis of Plato's doctrine of ideas (p. 102, n. 101). Pythagorean Doctrine of One (Limited) and Dyad (Indefinite) is not presented.

The essential relation between the One and the Many, between the original Parmenidean Being and plurality of the sensible things is solved by introducing the ideas. In Plato, the ideas have an intermediate position; they do not double the world, opposite to the world of the separate things: the concept of idea is an original solution of the old problem which has arisen in the Presocratic ontology (p. 204).

In chapter 3 we read that the ideas, as they are presented, are not fundamental principles: they are not final elements (*archai*) because they could be deduced from the principles of One-Good and Indefinite Dyad. The ideas are intermediate between the principle of One and the Many in real world. The theory of the two principles is essential part of Plato ontology, and as it is well known, according to the Tübingen School, this is the main subject of the so called unwritten doctrine. The author accepts the challenge and undertakes a reconstruction of this theory. One of the main results in his research is that this kind of "archaeology" (*archai*) gives an extended horizon of understanding eidological Ontology.

By reading the work of Koprivica, we realise again that nowadays, after more than a half of a century of Tübingen School existence, it is difficult to say something new and original referring to this subject of Platonic doctrine. The author of this book is sincerely trying to do that, and that what he does, he does with erudition and elegance.

On the other hand, the level of presentation is essayistic. Certainly, this approach was pointed out at the beginning of the work: the goal was a reconstruction of Plato's general ontological intentions mainly based on unwritten doctrine. Nevertheless, it is impossible to interpret Plato properly without Plato i.e. the written dialogues. Koprivica is conscious of this fact and many quotations in the *Index locorum* appear to be an evidence. But, it is strange that there are no quotations (in Greek or in translation) of Plato in front of many quotations of secondary (interpretative) literature. The bibliography, at the end of the book, is informative, however, mainly restricted to German Language. Only one original critical edition of Plato's work (Oxford) is given; in fact,

¹ Logos as an everlasting principle of change is very well explained in fr. B 1 D/K in Heraclitus and accepted by many modern scholars (Gigon, Guthrie, Conche, Kahn...) as a satisfactory explanation of the problem.

primary bibliography consists of translations in Serbian, Croatian and German Language. This might be a reason for some mistakes in quotation of Greek words. It is a pity that there is no summary in some Congress Language.

In conclusion, I will say that in spite of some critical notes mentioned above, our general impression is that this book of Koprivica, thanks to its profound analysis of the current Platonic problems, is important contribution to the modern philosophical investigations in Serbia. If translated (as a comprehended edition) in some of the Congress Languages it could be interesting in the world, specially for the readers of ancient Greek philosophy.

Vitomir Mitevski
Faculty of Philosophy, Skopje.

ARISTOTE. *Constitution d'Athenes, La regime politique des Atheniens*. traduction nouvelle, introduction, notes et index par Michel Seve, Paris 2006. 190 pp.

Минатата година, после цели 84 години од првиот превод на француски јазик, излезе нов превод на списот *Аџинско уредување*, припишан на Аристотел, што за една средина со традиција во преведувањето на класични автори е неособично, та дури и несфатливо. За воља на вистината треба да се каже дека првиот превод (на G. Mathieu и V. Hausouller) со мали подобрувања и вовед беше преобјавен во 1999 год. од С. Mosse. Најновиов превод, под перото на проф. Мишел Сев, проф. по античка историја на Универзитетот во Мец е сосема оправдан не само заради значењето на овој редок вид на извор (што се гледа и трите колоквиуми организирани по повод 100 годишнината од објавувањето на текстот) туку и заради новите археолошки истражувања што ни овозможува да разбереме некои нејасни места. Авторот има сден избалансиран приод во обработката на овој исклучително стручен текст, приод што ги задоволува и научниците и студентите (од класични студии, историја, философија, до право и политички науки) од една страна и пошироката публика која се интересира за историјата на институциите на еден од најславните градови во класично време, од друга страна. Авторот во белешките упатил на други антички автори каде што има дополнувања (на прво место кај Демостен) или аналогии за уредувањето на Атина, изработил показател на имиња и поими со објаснување што е корисна комбинација на показател со толковен речник, како и основна библиографија. Во воведот пак авторот прво го прикажува историјатот на откривањето, карактерот на текстот и методите на работа на авторот, а потоа дава многу јасен приказ на атинските институции при што се служи со податоци од археолошките ископувања пред сè за идентификување на теренот (илустрирано со планови на атинската Агора како и на одделните институции) што е типично за француската историска школа, а особено за оние кои се школувале во Француската археолошка школа во Атина формирана во далечната 1846-та год. чиј член бил проф. М. Сев.

Од текстот, насловен *Аџинско уредување*, сè до откривањето на четирите ролни папирус кај Хермуполис во Египет (сега во Лондон) беа зачувани само куси извадоци. По објавувањето во 1891 год. се покажа