
The volume has been supplied with the general ‘Index’ and ‘Index locorum’ which makes the job of consulting the book very easy.


As can be assumed from F.’s explanation on 270, West’s proposal of deciphering and supplementing the text (ZPE 151 (2005), 1–9) has been accepted by him; the means of indicating the ‘New Sappho’ by F. can, however, be misinterpreted: it seems to acknowledge West as the editor princeps of the papyri.

F.’s book maintains the high standards of volumes published in the series ‘Oxford Classical Monographs’. It will be an invaluable assistance to anyone interested not only in Apbr., but also in the entire archaic corpus of hexameter poetry.

Krytyzna Bartol


The Antidosis [=Ant.] is a huge and complex speech and one of central importance for several reasons within the work of Isocrates [=Is.]. For this reason, in the wake of the renewed interest in Is. and after the publication of commentaries to four of his works in recent years,1 the commentary on the Ant. by Yun Lee Too [=T.] – a scholar who devoted her PhD thesis to this author and has been working on him ever since2 – came as good news.


The Ant. has had a complicated textual history. A complete text was rediscovered only at the beginning of the 19th century in four Mss.: the Vat. Urb. Gr. 111 (I) with its two close descendants (Vat. Gr. 936 [J] and Ambros. O 144 sup. [E]) and the Laur. plut. 87,14 (Θ). The remaining extant Mss. (the Vat. Gr. 65 [A] and 12 other Mss. ultimately deriving from it) all display a vast lacuna between § 72 and § 310, which affected nearly 3/4 of the text. The Ant. was therefore known in this shorter form for centuries, from when it was first printed in Milan in 1493, in the editio princeps of Is.’ works from a mutilated Ms. Only in 1811–1812, did a Greek scholar living in Italy, Andreas Mustoxidis, find Θ and E

1 Busiris by N. Livingstone (Leiden 2001), Helena by S. Zajonz (Göttingen 2002), Panathenaius by P. Roth (München-Leipzig 2003), Evagoras by E. Alexiou (Thessaloniki 2005).

and publish the first complete edition of the speech (Milan 1812). Soon after the find, which was one of the last great discoveries of ancient texts before the age of papyri, a Swiss scholar, Johannes Caspar von Orelli, best known for his work on Cicero, Horace and Dante, published a new edition of the Ant. with notes printed in Gothic German type (Zürich 1814). A further annotated edition was published by Ernest Havet, the father of the Latin philologist Louis, in the France of the Second Empire (Paris 1862). This beautifully produced book, with its ample introduction, a French translation by Auguste Cartelier and accurate notes, is still a remarkable piece of work. Despite owing much to the scholarship and taste of the time, it remains the closest thing we have to a commentary on the Ant.

Unlike the other recently published commentaries, the present work has a clearly defined aim. T. sees the Ant. as «a work of self-representation» and her commentary «seeks to draw attention to the conventions and contexts which determine the portrait of the ‘speaker’ and of his community as offered by the oration» (‘Methodological preface’, at the beginning of the book). This option, though of course legitimate, necessarily rules out several problems and issues (textual, literary, antiquarian, historical) which arise from this multifaceted speech and which perhaps deserved fresh attention.

Strikingly, the ‘Introduction’ displays, at its very beginning (1), a serious misunderstanding about the ‘fictional’ status of the Ant.: «In post-Periclean Athens a litigious individual (a ‘sycophant’) named Lysimachus charges with tax evasion a wealthy individual» etc. (see also 6: «The fiction of a liturgy trial»). Unfortunately, the same odd confusion emerges at other points of the commentary (cf. e.g. comments on § 21 at 107 about Is.’ reference to capital punishment; and on § 54 at 125 about time constraints provided for real court speeches).

In fact, the Ant. does not concern a «tax evasion» or a «liturgy trial» and its title\(^1\) has little to do with the content. Is. underwent a trial connected with an antidosis procedure for a trierarchy some years before the composition of the speech; but the accusations delivered on his life and teaching on that occasion supplied the pretext for writing an apology in the form of an imaginary court speech, in which, like a new Socrates, he defends himself from the charge of corrupting youth brought by a fictitious prosecutor called Lysimachus. The story is told by Is. himself without ambiguity in the preface to the speech (esp. §§ 4–8), where he also states that he was 82 when he finished writing it (he was born in 436); the fictitious charge is also explicitly reported (§ 32). Moreover, we know from Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dinarchus 13,8, that the actual antidosis trial took place in the Attic year 356/5 (Dionysius put it at the time of Timotheus’ strategy in the summer of 356), that the accuser was called Megacleides and that Is.’ stepson Aphareus acted for his father in court. But no reference to Dionysius’ information is to be found in T.’s ‘Introduction’, although this is the only reliable evidence we have on the ‘prehistory’ of the Ant. apart from Is.’ statements; it comes from an ancient scholar whose first concern in his treatise on Dinarchus was chronology and who relied on a source which preserved the title and the incipit of Aphareus’ speech. (Dionysius’ other important testimonium about Is.’ forensic production [Isoc. 18] is recalled at 88 without mention of the source). Nonetheless, the section entitled ‘Fiction’ tries in vain to get a consistent picture of the facts only from the garbled evidence contained in Ps.-Plutarch, Vitae dec. orat. 837A, 838A, 839C (Ps.-Plutarch is again uncritically quoted in the commentary, cf. 94). The same information occurs in Photius, Bibliotheca, chap. 262, listed by T. as an independent source while it is known that Photius put to use the Ps.-Plutarchean biographies in chaps. 259–268 in his work.

\(^1\) The two forms περὶ ἀντιδόσεως and περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως have been handed down via Mss. Aristotle, Rhet. 1418b 27 quoted it simply as ἡ ἀντίδοσες.
More useful information and a more effective insight can be found in the remaining sections of the ‘Introduction’, especially where T. deals with issues concerning the uses of rhetoric and language in relation to the cultural and political stance of Is.

The section entitled ‘Antidosis’ is well informed on the legal procedure and rightly stresses that Is. strives to make his teaching appear as an invaluable service he is providing to the polis. The section ‘Self-representation’ deals convincingly with the attempt of Is. to provide an image of himself as a responsible and quiet citizen. But one would have expected in these pages something about the role, within this ‘strategy’, of the large self-quotations included in the speech with the author’s detailed presentation (§ 59: Paneg. 51–99; § 66: De pace 25–56 and 132–145; § 72: Ad Nic. 14–39; §§ 194: C. soph. 14–18; §§ 253–257: Nic. 5–9), an aspect which remains undeveloped throughout the book. The reappropriation and re-evaluation of the term ‘sophist’ by Is. is interestingly argued in the following section, while ‘Rhetoric’ and ‘The Archaeology of Language’ include sound remarks on the uses and changes of public language and on Is.’ attempt to restore it in a presumed historical sense. Finally, the section entitled ‘Philosophy’ discusses the meaning of the word in Is.’ works (T. is right in seeing in the Ant. a precedent for other ancient ‘literary’ trials, such as Apuleius’ Apologia).

The closing section on the ‘Textual Tradition’, however, cannot be seriously taken into consideration, since it is entirely misleading. It does not account for recent advances and it is largely and incorrectly dependent on what Georges Mathieu wrote in the preface to his ‘Budé’ edition of the speech in 1942 (not in «1960», which is the date of a reprint).¹

The opening statement (27) that the Ant. is preserved by 17 MSS. results from adding the only known papyrus up to 1942 to the erroneous figure provided by Mathieu (16 medieval and humanistic MSS.). But in fact there are (and there already were in Mathieu’s time) 17 medieval and humanistic MSS. preserving the Ant., and the number of papyri of the speech published in the meantime is 3.³ Nor is it correct to say that the great lacuna (§§ 72–109) that affected most MSS. starts from a section «where the author begins to cite passages from his own speeches», since self-quotations begin at § 59. Moreover, T. ignores the bipartite nature of the manuscript tradition of Is.; she highlights the value of α, a direct copy of Γ, and Ε, copied in turn from α, that are not to be taken into consideration for the constitutio textus (except from a few particular sections in the case of Δ)⁴, but she does not list L (from the year 1063), which, though not complete for the Ant., is a primary Ms. of the second family together with Θ. It is therefore incorrect to conclude that «the four important, because complete, MSS are» Γ Δ Ε Θ. Also the statement (28) «the citation of 194 (Against the sophists) is shown by all the codices as below» [i.e. in the abridged form] is likewise unreliable, since all the four Ms. which preserve this part of the speech, including Γ, do give the whole text of the quotation. Delicate problems of the manuscript tradition are compressed and dealt with in a cursory manner, and an overconfident use of the unreliable apparatus criticus of Mathieu is made (also in the commentary). T. claims to have based her translation on the text of the Loeb edition of Norlin (1929) and lists some cases where she maintained Norlin’s readings even when they depart from ms. Γ; but, at least in the case of §§ 88/89 and 128, T.’s translation inconsistently follows the text of

¹ See at least the collective works Studi sulla tradizione del testo di Isocrate, Firenze 2001, and Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini (CPF), I.2, Firenze 2008
² The same misprint as we find at 101 of Mathieu’s edition (‘Ambros. E 144’ instead of ‘Ambros. O 144 sump’) confirms the uncritical dependence.
The translation appears on the whole to be reliable. Yet, some selected remarks can be made about a few delicate points.

At § 2 (35) τοις το πινάκων γράφουσιν can hardly be translated «as scribes»: in fact, here Is. is refusing to be labelled a teacher of forensic oratory – in the same way, he says, it would hardly be accurate to call Pheidias a maker of statuettes, or to describe the great painters Zeuxis and Parrhasius as painting little votive pictures. The real meaning of πινάκων in this passage was questioned also by ancient lexicographers (cf. Pollux 7.128; 10.83). At § 12 (37), Is. gives advice to those who will recite the speech (a kind of instruction uncommon in the literature of this age). But T.’s contradictory translation «those who read it [i.e. the Ant.] should realize that they are listening to a mixed discourse, etc.» fails to render convincingly the expression (not found elsewhere) ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀκρόασιν for a reading before an audience. Nor can the reader get more information from the commentary (101), where the paper by Knox has little to do with this passage and it would have been preferable to quote H.L. Hudson-Williams, ClQu 43, 1949, 65–69 and S. Usener, Isokrates, Platon und ihr Publikum (Tübingen 1994), 27–28, 55–56. At § 321 (83) the translation of τοὺς λόγους τοὺς προειρημένους ἵπ’ ἐμοῦ καὶ γεγραμμένους as «the arguments I have uttered and written» is a consequence of the underestimation of the role of the self-quotations in the speech: here Is. is conclusively reaffirming that he could not have defended himself against slanders except through his works, which play in the Ant. the role that documents and testimonies had in actual court speeches. So λόγος should be translated as «works, speeches» and not «arguments», and doubts about the reference to the self-quotations should be removed in the relevant commentary (242).

As far as the core of the book – the commentary – is concerned, it must be said that one does not escape a general impression of disorder. The often paraphrastic style, together with repetitions and inconsistencies, contributes to convey this feeling. T.’s attention to the ideological value of Is.’ vocabulary, and otherwise useful information (as the one concerning the Attic law) thus has difficulty emerging. Some troubling points can be singled out here.

The idea (87) that §§ 1–13 are the first proemium of the speech according to the rhetorical division recognized in Aristotle’s Rhetoric is disputable. The idiosyncratic character of the Ant. scarcely allows for such a possibility. These §§ are actually a kind of independent preface to the whole work which answers to compositional and performance needs. As a consequence, Is.’ statement about the new and different character of the Ant. should not be considered merely conventional (88), since the speech was in fact an experimental one. On the whole, T. seems to disregard the attempt of Is. to try new ways of composing prose works: it must be remembered that the Ant. quite uncommonly encompasses, besides large self-quotations, an encomium of Timotheus including an address by the author himself ( §§ 101–139), and a direct speech of a former pupil ( §§ 142–149). At 103, the name of the fictional opponent of Is., Ἀστυπαῖος, can hardly mean «one who loses the fight/battle» as T. states (for an attempt to explain the name, cf. F. Roscalla, Athenaeum 86, 1998, 130–132). At 123, as far as the self-quotations are concerned, a fine observation like «Isocrates shows that it is possible to control the reception of these texts as he summarizes their intention and theme» should have deserved some elaboration. Moreover, the problem of whether the quotations from earlier speeches were included in full in Is.’ autograph and in the copies stemming from it (124), can only be assessed by considering the nature of the book that would receive the text, i.e. a roll of papyrus, which would have not allowed a ‘modernistic’ summary reference to long sections of other books. The arrangement of the book that would receive the text, i.e. a roll of papyrus, which would have not allowed long sections of other books. The arrangement of the

1 See at least R. Nicolai, Studi su Isocrate. La comunicazione letteraria nel IV sec. a.C. e i nuovi generi della prosa, Roma 2004.
Ms. Ψ, which preserves only the first and last words for the first three quotations, is the result of much later editing, carried out at a time when the codex was the prevailing bookform. In dealing with this issue, the fact that there are differences between the text of these sections in the earlier speeches and that of the quotations should not be disregarded (an en passant remark is at 28). Connected with the self-quotations is the mention of the paraphrase note in § 79 (127), which would have merited further comment, since it is the oldest mention of this marginal sign in a Greek author. At least a reference to Arist. Rhet. 1409a 20–21 and to the lexicon of Harpocrate s.v. was expected. Historical, prosopographical and antiquarian aspects have sometimes received unsatisfactory treatment. This is true of the comment devoted to Aphareus, Is.’ stepson and collaborator (§ 145, 166), to whom Ps.-Plutarch devoted a whole section in the biography of Is. One would have expected a reference to other evidence in Is.’ corpus (Epist. ad reg. Myst. 1), in Demosthenes (In Every et Mnseib. 51–52; In Callipp. 14–15); in Dionysius Hal. (Isoc. 18) and Suidas (α, 4556 L.).

To quote just another instance: as regards the honour of Ἐμοῖο, Ἐστίν ἔχειν ὁμοιόμορφον ἱπποπόταμον τὸν ἄργον ἐν τῷ τελευτήν. «ἀργὸν τελευτήν» note the oxymoronic juxtaposition which introduces the quotation from Ὀρ. 2 and which may explain why the ms. had viewed this sentence as an obvious division marker and ended the oration with the previous sentence. For another emblematic instance of this trend, see this journal 78, 2006, 583–596.

But the lacuna was in all probability rather the outcome of material damage than of a copyist’s deliberate choice. Sometimes the use of Mathieu’s apparatus criticus, yields misleading information, such as that concerning the name Φιλόμηλος in § 93 (141): here the actual readings of the ms. are Φιλόμηλος (ΓΔΕ) and Φιλόμηδος (Θ). At § 321 the words ὑπ’ ἐμόν καὶ γεγραμένοις are not omitted in the more authoritative Ms. (242). They can actually be read in all the Ms. of the second family (ΛΘ and the descendants of Λ); as for the first family, they fall within a section of text missing in Ψ, where it was subsequently copied in the margin by the scribe of Δ, who found it in a complete Ms. and copied it also in his own (it was then copied in Δ’s ‘offspring’, Β), but during this later transcription in Β’ and Δ the words were omitted, probably for a saut du même au même.

It can be said conclusively that the need for a new commentary to the Ant. remains unfulfilled. Owing to its complexity, the speech would have benefited from a more inclusive treatment and one wonders whether a paper might have better served Τ.’s purpose. In addition, the work is marred by a shockingly high number of misprints, most of them involving neglect or misplacement of Greek accents, breathings and letters (even in the final ‘Index of Greek Words’), which is hardly tolerable in a commentary to an ancient text. This fact, together with the incorrect spelling of technical words (e.g. polytoton at 103 and polypoton at 112), repetitions (see the two deaths of Timotheus at 144), inconsistencies and references to non-existing sections (cf. 166), shows that the book did not receive either a serious revision or a professional proof-reading, which is all the more surprising in the case of a leading academic publisher. This reveals much about the current state of publishing in the field of classical studies, which increasingly suggests a loss of command of ancient languages and textual problems, the ne-

1 These differences are also evident in the short passages extant in Ψ. S. De Leo provides a reliable evaluation of the text of the quotation from the De pace in: Studi sulla tradizione del testo di Isocrate, 201–248.

2 For another emblematic instance of this trend, see this journal 78, 2006, 583–596.
glecting of old but not out-of-date studies and of the bibliography written in languages other than English, to say nothing of the disappearance of competent proof-readers. The future of classical studies will probably entail new perspectives and needs, which can in themselves be challenging. However, changes should not necessarily mean giving up the best of a tradition of studies.

Barrie Pasquale Massimo Pinto


Das neue Buch von Paul Millett (M.) ist die erste Monographie in englischer Sprache, die Theophrasts Charaktere zum Hauptthema hat. In gewisser Hinsicht vervollständigt diese Studie das umfangreiche Unternehmen von James Diggle, der in seinem kürzlich erschienenen Kommentar zahlreiche philologische und literarische Probleme erläutert, mit denen der Leser der Charaktere konfrontiert ist. Im Gegensatz zu Diggle wendet sich M., selbst ein Historiker, hauptsächlich an ein historisch interessiertes Publikum, indem er dieses Werk Theophrasts im Hinblick darauf liest, «to identify its uses for the historian» (S. 5). M. bezeichnet das Genre seiner Abhandlung als essay, was nicht nur ihre relative Kürze (117 Seiten gefolgt von 40 Seiten Anmerkungen, drei Appendices, einer Bibliographie und einem Index locorum), sondern auch ihren experimentellen Charakter betonen soll.


---

2. X «I have tended in the text to refer to this monograph as an ‘essay’. This reflects not only its length, but also the idea of an attempted exploration of the world of Theophrastus, for which there seemed to be no clear precedent.»