

Mervin R. Dilts-David J. Murphy, *Antiphontis et Andocidis Orationes*, Oxford: OUP, xxxii+212 pp., 2018, £40.00, ISBN 978-0-19-960547-7.

In n. 1 of the preface (in English) D.J. Murphy explains that both the preface and the text and apparatus started as the work of M.R. Dilts but this was subsequently revised and 'I' references in both preface and main text refer to Murphy.<sup>1</sup> Nevertheless, unless otherwise specified, I will refer to 'the editors' (abbreviated as DM). The edition contains the extant speeches of Antiphon and Andocides with the ancient 'Life of Antiphon' (abbreviated from *Lives of the Ten Orators*), and ancient *hypotheseis* where available. Some will regret that the editors have chosen not to include the surviving fragments of Antiphon, as they are substantial, unlike C. Carey, for example, whose Oxford edition of Lysias is greatly enriched by the extant fragments. The volume opens, following the preface, with a register of previous editions, and studies, and closes with an index of names. The combination of Antiphon and Andocides in one volume seems to be unique,<sup>2</sup> and this is the first OCT of these authors. Blass' Teubner is now well over a hundred years old.

The text is presented in a nice readable font, with *testimonia* where they exist (sparse) and an *apparatus* of about the usual Oxford size.<sup>3</sup> I am not sure I like the editors' decision to number the lines of text in their edition in integers of five and use these for *lemmata* in the *apparatus*; for example, Andoc. *De Myst.* runs from 1 to line 1255. Anyone citing an entry in the *apparatus* in their edition will have to make the conversion from, say, 998 to (And. 1) 118.4 (the usual precise way of citing from the text). A further complication arises from the fact that *testimonia* are keyed to *chapter* numbers, and not the same line numbers. Another debatable point lies, in my opinion (not confined to their new edition), in numbering Antiphon's tetralogies either 2-3-4 (a,b,c,d or  $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta$ ) or *Tetr.* A,B, $\Gamma$  ( $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta$ ). Accordingly a speech of the *Tetralogies* is either, say, 3b (or 3  $\beta$ ) or *Tetr.* B  $\beta$ . Not ideal.

In the preface, the editors express their opinion that, of the extant corpora of both men, only Andocides 4 *Against Alcibiades* should be considered spurious, which 'bears the marks of being a later rhetorical exercise' (Aeschines of Sphettus?). They also prefer to assume that Antiphon Sophistes is not the same man as Antiphon Rhetor. In And. 1 they accept the verdict of Canevaro and Ha-

<sup>1</sup> So we have here a situation perhaps comparable to the Gomme-Sandbach commentary on Menander, Oxford 1973.

<sup>2</sup> An exception is K.J. Maidment's *Minor Attic Orators* (vol. I), Antiphon, Andocides, Cambridge MA (Loeb) 1941.

<sup>3</sup> But any superscript letters or numbers attached to *sigla* are unreadable (to me) without a magnifying glass!

ris that the laws cited are all spurious.<sup>4</sup> They maintain, with good reason, that the manuscript order of Antiphon's speeches is 'probably ancient'.

After a good discussion of the manuscripts used in this edition, which the editors have examined nearly exclusively in photographs and digitizations, they delineate some principles of their edition. Of the mss. the editors acknowledge the superiority of ms. N over A. The main point is their decision to swim with the more modern trend of retaining manuscript readings, where viable, against the nineteenth-century's tendency to establish norms and good practices of Attic oratory from the *fourth* century and, as it were, interpolate these back into Antiphon and Andocides. The result may have been a more consistent and smooth text, but such an approach is to 'beg the question' whether this was really fifth-century practice. Concomitant with this decision about style, grammar, word-order, vocabulary etc., the editors have not removed historical references from the text (particularly) of Andocides, where these appear historically inaccurate. Perhaps the orator was simply mistaken himself, but really included the historical documents in his text. They are also prepared to accept rare and poetic words in the *paradosis*. An interesting case comes in Ant. 5.76.8 (= line 613 DM) εὐρόπως (εἶχεν ἀπτῶι), the reading of the second corrector of A, whilst AN have εὐρ' ὄπως, which is not syntactical. Now εὐροπος is a very rare, and poetic, word with only one attestation (with ἄμμα, noose: 'an easily sliding noose' in the Anth. Pal.) apart from this corrected reading in Antiphon. The adverb is not attested elsewhere. The question is: is εὐρόπως a conjecture by A2, or does it derive from another ms. (a possibility mentioned by DM on p. ix)? Schömann conjectured the much more common word εὐπόπως, which, together with εἶχεν ἀπτῶι, would constitute a 'normal expression' (and is printed by Maidment). Perhaps this is a case where the *lect. faciliior* is preferable.

The text turns out to be very well prepared and, in fact, after the editors' programmatic remarks in the preface, to reflect a judicious balance of manuscript readings and scholars' emendations. I think one could call the text conservative in the best sense: readings of mss. are conserved where they are viable, the best emendations and supplements are also wisely included where they represent a real improvement. The result is a readable and reliable text. I will look at two representative speeches in more detail, Ant. 1 *Against the Stepmother* and And. 1 *On the Mysteries*.

Let us begin with a few formalities of presentation. In Ant. 1 line 24 we read in the *app.* τῷ δὲ N: τῷ δ' A, both readings being dative sg. It is a useful convention in papyrology to add iota subscriptum to such readings (as against adscriptum, which represents an iota written in the manuscript), avoiding confusion. DM print oblique case endings of scholars' names (e.g. line 46 'apud Gagarinum', 491-2 MacDowellio) but nominatives as normal. This appears somewhat bizarre. The following are (rare) moments in the text where I thought DM's decisions were debatable, but there is not a 'bad' reading among them.

<sup>4</sup> M. Canevaro and E.M. Harris, "The Authenticity of the Documents in Andocides' *On the Mysteries* 77-79 and 83-84", *Dikē* 19, 2016 [2017], 7-48.

In line 39 Hertlein's ἄλλοσε is certainly more grammatically correct than mss.' ἄλλοθι, which DM retain. Conversely in 46 they print Cole's conjecture καὶ πῶς...; instead of mss. AN's καὶ οὐ (not a question), which is perfectly intelligible.

Sections 6-8. DM make a good job of presenting a plausible text despite many difficulties in the paradosis.

Lines 92-6 may well be a scholion intruding into the main text, as Blass and Gernet thought. Otherwise, the thought is redundant.

In line 97 I would think N's καταφηρίσεσθε (despite not being the 'regular' Attic future) after ὅπως would be preferable, although the subjunctive (A1) is possible.

In line 112 πυθομένη is really rather difficult in context, and there is something to be said for its substitution for αἰσθομένη in the next line, proposed by Cobet. If retained, it surely does not mean 'enquired about (her)' (DM preface p. xiv), but rather 'heard about (her)'.

In line 171 Dobree's προβούλωσ gives better sense than mss. ἀβούλωσ, as the stepmother was certainly acting 'with malice aforethought' according to the speaker.

Likewise in line 184 the insertion of ἄν before δικαιότερον (Dobree) is grammatically more correct although DM state in the preface that they will not always add a missing ἄν where strict grammar demands it.

In 202 one might consider writing ἀπολουμένη (fut.) to rescue A's ἀπολλουμένη. DM's ἀπολομένη is the *comm. opinio*.

Turning to Andocides 1 *De Mysteriis*, first a very few minor orthographic errors (numbers refer to DM's line numbers):

28-9 ὑπομένειεν ᾤ Valckenaer in the *app.* should be ὑπομείνειεν, ᾤ

35 Ἑλλησι not Ἐλλησι in the main text.

582 Λυσίωτρατον in the main text.

447 etc. DM print aorists of σῶζω here and elsewhere with iota subscript. This goes against normal usage, but reflects the spelling of some inscriptions.

Then a matter of type-setting which I cannot check:

431-32 shouldn't this belong to main text in the usual size font?

Then, as in Ant. 1, a few debatable decisions. In most cases this reflects their preference for the paradosis over emendation. I would suggest:

17 ἐθελοντῶν Ald., preferable to ἐθελόντων A

266 ἡγήσαισθε Reiske, preferable to ἡγήσεσθε

335 του Lipsius, not preferable to τοῦ A

424 Ὀρχησαμενοῦ Wilhelm, preferable to ὁ ὀρχησάμενος

634 τετρακοσίων Dobree, perhaps preferable to τυράννων A

1048 κατεκλίθη A, loc. vexatus: κατεκωλύθη Sluiter: κατελήφθη Dobree: κατελύθη Baiter. As a further conjecture, one might try κατεκλάσθη, 'broke off', referring to the rope with which Ischomachos' daughter tried to hang herself.

1053 ἦγον Stephanus, perhaps preferable to ἦκον A

1133 One might write τούναντίον instead of <τὸ> ἐναντίον

1217 ἔσται Steph. prob. preferable to ἔστιν A.

1239 ἀναβιβάζωμαι Blass prob. preferable to ἀναβιβάζομαι A.

The overall impression, then, is of a very carefully constituted and presented text with *apparatus*. This will be the reference text for these authors henceforth,<sup>5</sup> but researchers will need to look elsewhere for the fragments of Antiphon. DM do not believe Antiphon Rhetor is the same person as Antiphon Sophistēs, but clearly, if one takes a different view, it would be very useful to have the fragments of the sophist presented in the same volume.

William Furley  
 Universität Heidelberg  
 william.furley@skph.uni-heidelberg.de

5 M. Gagarin's 1997 Cambridge edition of Antiphon's speeches in the 'Green and Yellow' series retains the advantage of a helpful introduction and commentary.