

Gagarin opens with a brief (35 page) "Introduction" that, with the partial exception of the segment on Language and Style (24-35), is obviously intended for an elementary audience. There is little here for the specialist, and so it is largely thus that this "Introduction" must be judged.

Gagarin repeats views he has argued at length elsewhere. So, he continues (5f.) in the belief that Antiphon of Rhamnus (Kirchner, *PA* 1304; cp. Thuc. 8.68.1), the author of our speeches, is identical with Antiphon the Sophist (D.-K., *Vorsokr.* 87; see now Declève Caizzi, *CPF* 1.1, 1989, 176-222). This question of the identity of Antiphon is complex—too complex, indeed, for the elementary reader—and the result is that Gagarin's discussion is slightly unfocused. It is also somewhat misleading: the arguments against his unitarian position, while not absolutely conclusive, remain quite strong, and students would be more accurately served had Gagarin struck a more agnostic note. Certainly, it is not correct to refer to Thuc. 8.68 as the "[m]ost compelling" piece of evidence; Thuc. 8.68 compels nothing either way.

Gagarin reiterates (8f.) his support for the authenticity of those short model speeches known as the *Tetralogies* (Ant. 2, 3, and 4). Here, the specifics of the debate are readily grasped, and might have been presented profitably to Gagarin's readers (as, e.g., Gernet, *Antiphon. Discours* [Paris, 1923], 6-16). Unfortunately, Gagarin's discussion is brief and remains too general. Of all the issues raised in connection with the authenticity of the *Tetralogies*, the most important concern what appear to be discrepancies between Attic law as actually practiced and, on the other hand, certain specifics mentioned by the *Tetralogies*. Of these, the most intractable has been a reference (3.2.9, etc.) to a 'law' (ὁ νόμος) that seems to prohibit *all* types of homicide, both just and unjust (μήτε ἀδικῶς μήτε δικαίως), which appears to conflict with the provision, sufficiently attested for Attic law, allowing that certain types of homicide were indeed justifiable (δικαίως) and would not be punished.¹ Like others, Gagarin argues (pp. 8, 24, 151f.), and has argued (*GRBS* 19, 1978, 291-306), that the νόμος of 3.2.9 was not intended by the author to be taken as an actual 'law', but was instead meant to be seen only as a *moral* injunction or rhetorical flourish. Gagarin has had many takers.² Yet the 'law' in question appears to be cited and utilized as if it were an actual law and, as I have demonstrated elsewhere, Gagarin's analysis of the passage (3.2.9)—as a rhetorical or moralizing flourish not essential to the argument—is, in any event, untenable.³

Such discrepancies, of course, if admitted, hardly prove that the *Tetralogies* are not the work of Antiphon. They can as easily be explained by the supposition that the *Tetralogies* are rhetorical set-pieces or school

Michael Gagarin, ed., *Antiphon: The Speeches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Pp. ix, 266. \$59.95. ISBN 0-521-38029-4 (hb); \$22.95. ISBN 0-521-38931-3 (pb).

The general editors of the 'green-and-yellow' Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics have finally gotten back to the orators, and publishing a commentary on the speeches of Antiphon was an excellent and obvious choice: due to the focus and unity of these speeches (λόγοι φωνικοί), as well as the simplicity and relative clarity of the prose, Antiphon makes a plausible author for intermediate readers. Michael Gagarin too was a most obvious choice to serve as editor and commentator. Easily the most prolific of American scholars working in the field of Greek law generally, Gagarin has been publishing papers on Antiphon for years, including a recent monograph on Antiphon 5 (*The Murder of Herodes*, 1989 [henceforth = *MH*]). Indeed, apart from Maidment's very serviceable Loeb (*Minor Attic Orators I*, 1941), there is little available in English, as Gagarin duly notes (ix),¹ and so students of Antiphon will surely want to have this volume. Yet it must be said that as soon as one considers carefully the specifics of this book, the results are not entirely unmixed.

¹ Still, the comment that "there has not been a commentary on all the speeches in any language since that of Maetzner in 1838" (ix), while strictly true, obscures the fact that much good work has been done on the speeches and the *Tetralogies* individually; notably J. H. Thiel, *Antiphon's Erste Tetralogie* (Groningen, 1932); A. Barigazzi, *Antifone: Prima orazione and Sesta orazione* (Firenze, 1955); F. Declève Caizzi, *Antiphonitis Tetralogiae* (Milano, 1969); M. Edwards - S. Usher, *Greek Orators I: Antiphon and Lysias* (Warminster, 1985), 30-124 (by Edwards) on Ant. V. Gagarin makes good use of this prior work. For a recent English translation of the speeches, see M. Gagarin - D. M. MacDowell, tr., *Antiphon and Andocides* (Austin, 1998).

¹ For justifiable homicide, see P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford, 1981), 644f., who cites earlier bibliography; add K. Latte, *RE* 16.1, 1933, 285 (= *Kl. Schrift.*, 387f.).

² See, e.g., H.C. Avery, "One Antiphon or Two?", *Hermes* 110, 1982, 155n.36. Even R. Senley, "The *Tetralogies* Ascribed to Antiphon", *TAPA* 114, 1984, 75f., who otherwise doubts the authenticity of the *Tetralogies*, is unsure of how to respond. In fact, both critics (Gernet, 10-12) and defenders (Declève Caizzi, 21ff., 31ff.) of the *Tetralogies* have taken similar approaches, denying that ὁ νόμος here signifies an actual 'law'.

³ See A. Tulin, *Dike Phonon: The Right of Prosecution and Attic Homicide Procedure*, *BzA* 76 (Stuttgart u. Leipzig, 1996), 85f.n.227. Full discussion of this passage must be reserved for another occasion.

exercises.¹ Even so, we ought not go so far as Gernet's (16) "enfin que des exercices d'école supposent une école, donc un professeur". The evidence that Antiphon of Rhamnus was some type of teacher, whether of Thucydides, as was often supposed, or of others—a view that Gagarin himself continues to endorse (pp. 4, 25, 33; also *GRBS* 31, 1990, 29ff.)—is extremely tenuous (see G. Pendrick, *GRBS* 34, 1993, 219f., esp. n.18) and ought probably to be abandoned.

The next section of the "Introduction", on Law and Rhetoric (9-24), offers less scope for controversy, and Gagarin's treatment here is more even-handed. There is a brief and excellent account of Athenian law (9-13); his views (21f.) on the purely rhetorical use of the *proklesis* (see *CP* 91, 1996, 1-18) are, on the whole, persuasive; comments (22f.) on the tetralogist's manipulation of the doctrine of *miasma* are worthy of further development. On the other hand, the sections on argumentation (13-21) are somewhat puzzling. For example, though he announces the importance of the so-called *eikos*-argument for Antiphon, Gagarin fails to discuss this mode of argumentation as such, and launches instead into a brief account (14) of what he likes to call (*MH* 47n.3; *CP* 85, 1990, 30) the "reverse *eikos*-argument".² Indeed, we never do get a systematic account of *eikos*, nor of arguments from probability generally, though references to it are scattered throughout the book. Similarly, there is only passing reference to *ethopoia* (16; cp. Edwards, 69), little or nothing on enthymemes, *argumenta ex contrario*,³ and the like, and little interest is shown in the rhetorical commonplaces (*Gemeinplätze*) that might have been collected and catalogued in a work of this sort.⁴ In sum, the basics are often ignored, which, given the audience envisioned, severely restricts the utility of this segment of the "Introduction".

The section on style (24-35) is the fullest and, thus, the best part of the "Introduction". There are useful discussions of diction, syntax, word order, and other stylistic features, though Gagarin might have collected more instances to illustrate his points; not everyone will have Cucuel's *Essai sur la langue et le style de l'orateur Antiphon* (1886) to hand. Analysis of the import of certain stylistic features, such as periphrasis (29) or variation (Antiphon "frequently implies by variation that reality is not so neatly comprehended" [31]), is not persuasive. The "Introduction" closes, finally, with an attempt to explain the stylistic differences between the genuine speeches (Ant. 1, 5, and 6) and the *Tetralogies* as due to the advent of "written communication" (32ff.).

Gagarin does not show much interest in the manuscript tradition, which (admittedly) was long ago established on a sound basis. Such neglect is excusable in a work of this sort. In accord with the general format of the series, use of *apparatus criticus* is spartan. Gagarin notes (35) the two primary witnesses (A and N), and distinguishes between the two correctors of A, A¹ and A², though more ought to have been said about the importance of A², which

¹ See C. Eucken, *Mus. Helv.* 53, 1996, 73n.1; also Schmid-Stählin, *Gesch. d. gr. Lit.* (1959-61), 3:123ff.; D.C. Innes, "Gorgias, Antiphon and Sophistopolis," *Argumentation* 5, 1991, 222-27.

² For *εἰκόσ* in Antiphon, see Fr. Solmsen, *Antiphonstudien* (Berlin, 1931), 53ff.; Kroll, *RE*, Suppl. VII, 1940, 1042; Barigazzi I, 27f.; Schmid-Stählin, 3:113n.2, 121f.; Decleva Caizzi, 46ff.; Gagarin, *MH*, 47ff.

³ E.g., 5.43; 63 οὐ γὰρ δῆπου κτλ., 85, etc.; see G. Gebauer, *De hypotacticis et paratacticis argumenti ex contrario formis* (Zwiccavine, 1877), index, s.v.; also Barigazzi I, 28f.

⁴ Cp. Barigazzi I, 58f.; B. Due, *Antiphon: A Study in Argumentation* (Copenhagen, 1980), 72ff.; Edwards ad 5.1 et passim.

ceases abruptly at 5.84.¹ relative to A ("pieno di errori") and A¹ (which latter seems to be the scribe of A himself; the corrections in N, on the other hand, have little value). Gagarin also claims (*Pref.* ix) to have used collations of A and N made "some years ago" by Prof. James Zeisel. This claim, strangely, is hard to evaluate, since Gagarin does not once indicate (so far as I can see) where his text is in any way indebted to this new source of information. Gagarin's apparatus, it turns out, differs from Thalheim-Blass only in 11 places, and not all of these differences are real. In fact, it appears that Gagarin, having previously (*Introd.* 35) distinguished the correctors of A, as A¹ and A², now proceeds to conflate them (under the name 'A²') in the apparatus. While this is nowhere stated, it is inferred from the fact that the apparatus never mentions A¹, and from Gagarin's note ad 6.21 οὐ A²N: om. A; οὐ N², where Thalheim had written μου temptavi: οὐ A (supra versum), N pr., οὐ corr. N. As noted above, A² breaks off at 5.84; Thalheim's "A (supra versum)", of course, is A¹. This conflation of the correctors (if I diagnose correctly Gagarin's procedure) explains divergencies in the apparatus at another five locations: ad 6.23 (εἰμι N); 2.2.6 ἄν ἦν A², which Thalheim (also Decl. Caizzi) ascribes to A¹; 4.1.2 τροφῆας τε A²: τροφῆας τε καὶ AN (Gagarin), with which cp. Thalheim's τε καὶ NA pr., καὶ erasum in A (also Decl. Caizzi, 238, "A¹ aggira ... eliminando κα()"); 4.3.5 οὐκ A²N (Gagarin), NA¹ (Decl. Caizzi); 5.16 ὑπελείπου A² ὑπελείπου AN, where Thalheim (who prints ὑπελείπου) placed in his apparatus ὑπελείπου NA pr., ras. corr. Apart from these six passages, 5.37 τῷ A² (cp. Thalheim's τὸ NA pr., τῷ corr. 2) is given thus by Edwards; 5.39 συνελών (sic) is presumably a proof-reading error. This leaves only three passages where new ms. readings may possibly have been offered to us: 5.39 (where Gagarin has ἐξάγοι A: ἐξάγει N, while Thalheim [also Edwards] gives ἐξάγει NA pr., ἐξάγοι ras. corr.), 2.3.9 (φανερῶς A²; so, by implication, Thalheim; but cp. Decl. Caizzi φανερώς A pr.: φανερός NA¹)—either of which may be due to confusion—and 5.51, where there clearly seems to be some new information offered (though it is of little importance), but whose source is again not divulged. A very minor haul, indeed! If this is all that was to be gained by consulting fresh collations of the manuscripts, then we have here a fine confirmation, albeit indirect, of the view of Decleva Caizzi (87) that "[u]n' edizione delle *Tetralogie* di Antifonte non richiedeva né una nuova collazione dei codici, né un esame generale della tradizione manoscritta per ricostruirne lo stemma. A ciò hanno provveduto i precedenti editori ... con risultati che sembrano ... definitivi".²

Gagarin says (35) that the text he presents "is generally conservative, in that it resists the tendency of earlier editors to normalize Antiphon's language

¹ See Th. Thalheim - Fr. Blass, *Antiphantis orationes et fragmenta* (Lipsiae, 1914), v: "Post V 84 vestigia manus A² deficiunt"; W. Wyse, *The Speeches of Isaeus* (Cambridge, 1904), xxxiv-vi. A² "offre lezioni ora eccellenti, tratte da un altro codice, ora sospette come congetture dotte" (Decleva Caizzi, 87).

² On the other hand, what is one to make of the likes of 5.12 αὐθις (αὐτοῖς mss.; "ad iudicas refertur" Maetzner), printed in the text without any comment whatsoever? Is this the result of the (promised) new collation, Gagarin's own emendation, or simply an error? The paucity of information given elsewhere leaves the reader baffled; cp. 5.80 δεδιδαγμένον (προ δεδιγαγμένον); 81 γενομένοις om. (see Maetzner ad loc.); 94 οὐτε (pro οὐδέ) and 95 (!) οὐδέ (pro οὐτε). I have only compared (for this purpose) the text of Ant. 5; instances, presumably, will be found in the text of other speeches as well (as, e.g., 1.7 τ' εἰδός). Gagarin also claims (ix) to have seen "three Teubner editions of Antiphon that Wilamowitz had annotated ... now in the Wilamowitz library ... in Berlin"; these annotations are utilized (so far as I can see) only ad 4.3.2, where Wilamowitz' note is actually of very little value.

by emendation.¹ In general, it is closest to Thalheim's for the court speeches, to Declava Caizzi's for the *Tetralogies*." In fact, the text is not nearly as conservative as these comments might suggest. Gagarin frequently departs from Thalheim-Blass and Declava Caizzi, sometimes returning to the vulgate, sometimes adopting conjectures—following (so it seems) no fixed principle, save for the editor's tastes. What is more, he often departs from these standard texts without giving the reader any notice that he does so, either in the commentary or in the apparatus.² There is, unfortunately, no list of such divergencies. All this, when joined with the ordained brevity of the apparatus generally, means that one cannot use Gagarin's text without having a critical edition always open before one. In Antiphon 5, just 22 pages of Greek, I count approximately 40 instances where Gagarin diverges from Thalheim-Blass without alerting the reader either in the commentary or in the apparatus. The specifics, moreover, are instructive. These include: 5.3 τῶν δυναμένων λέγειν; 4 αἰτήσομαι ὑμᾶς; 5 τάδε δὲ (A²); 11 οὐτ' ἂν πολλὰ (mss.); 12 αὐθις (see above, 733, n. 2); 14 τοὺς τῶν κατηγορῶν λόγους (see Th.-Bl. app. crit. ad loc.); 17 πώποτε ἐδέθη (N); 26 αὐτὸ (N); 27 οὔτε αἶμα οὔτε ἄλλο (N); 32 ὅ τι ἂν (adopted, nicely, from the Aldine by Maetzner); *ibid*, τούτῳ (which apparently has no ms. authority, and is just an old conjecture, 'quo non iam opus est', by Sauppe; *ibid*, αὐτοὶ (Blass, elegantly); 38 αὐτοῖς δὴ; 42 εἰρημένους (simply a conjecture by the scribe of N [?]; the text, it seems, was already corrupt in the archetype); 45 τε (see below, n. 1); cp. 5.60 οὐδὲ ἐκείνου (N), 79 δέ ἐστι (I); 47 ἐγένεσθε (Schoell; cp. 51 γιγνόμενος, 52 γεγένηται); 55 ταύτη γ' (Jernstedt: ταύτην mss. et plur. edd.); 57 *varia*; 59 σὺ φόνου (Maetzner); *ibid*, δέ με (δ' ἐμὲ, surely); 70 ἀπήχθη (AN Maetzner: ἀπελύθη plur. edd.; cp. Poll. 8.68); 74 καίτοι γε (is not idiomatic; cp. 14 καίτοι τοὺς γε νόμους, 19 καίτοι χαλεπὸν γε, etc.; despite, e.g., Andoc. 1.72); 76 παρέχεσθαι (Hirschig); 77 ἐχορήγει (mss., but cp. κατατιθησιν); 80-81 (see above, 733, n. 2); 89 ἀμαρτίαν (bene; Th. hic errat); 91 χρῆ τούς γε (but Blass' χρῆν seems to be required). A text presented thus has limited value, even apart from the quality of these particular readings.

As regards this quality, the attentive reader will doubtless be able to form his or her own judgment from the foregoing instances. It is nice to see Gagarin defend Bekker's καιόντων at 2.1.9, Blass' αὐτοὶ at 5.32 and εἶπερ at 6.9 (cp. §46 εἶπερ ἠδικοῦντο), and plausible solutions are offered at 3.2.6, 6.16 (ἀράμενος) and 17. But consider 1.10 βασανιστάς τε (which fatally breaks the logic of the passage; cp. §11 τοῦτο μὲν ... τοῦτο δὲ); 2.4.7 κυρίων (see

¹ Gagarin's refusal to "normalize" the text is most noticeable in his retention of the first person ἦν (see p. 250 ad fr. 1a 1-9), which is reasonable (though he regularizes ἦδεν: 2.2.3, 9; 5.74), and in his insistence on accepting the occasional omission of ἂν (p. 27f. et pass.; add 6.19)—this last, however, produces a very unpleasant effect at 2.1.4, where Gagarin prints (without any comment in the apparatus) οὐ γὰρ ἄωρος, which cannot be right. (On the restoration of ἦν, see further Declava Caizzi, p. 219; would Gagarin also defend Crippsianus' [A's] omission of ἂν in, say, Andoc. 1.67, 102, etc.?). Gagarin's adherence to the readings of A and N, while admirable in theory (in fact, these mss. often appear quite careless in these matters), leads him to defend such peculiarities as τὰ τε ἐν τῆ at 5.45.

² See, e.g., 2.4.7 τῶν κυρίων ἐχθρῶν Gagarin (without comment), where Declava Caizzi had correctly printed τῶν κυρίως ἐχθρῶν. See her app. crit. ad loc.: κυρίων APF: κυρίως A¹N. Clearly, κυρίων was simply an error made by the scribe of A, which he himself (as A¹) later corrected. Declava Caizzi aptly comments: "stupisce che gli editori abbiano preferito la lectio facillior di APF, cfr. un esempio analogo in Plin. *Phaedo*, 66B: τοῖς γνησίως φιλοσόφοις (codd.: γνησίως Jambl.)." This should have been definitive.

above, 734, n. 2); 3.2.1, where καταστήναι or the like is required; 3.2.7 ἐμελέτα (N; cp. Dover, *CQ* 44, 1950, 46n.1); 4.1.2 τροφῆας τε παρέδωκε (omitting καὶ), etc.

Readers should be aware, finally, that Gagarin often proposes new paragraph divisions; these divisions have interpretative value and must be evaluated independently in every case.¹ Furthermore, he does not print the hypotheses or, for the *Tetralogies*, the titles found in the manuscript tradition. This decision would have been defensible were this a more rigorous text, since these titles and the hypotheses derive from later, rhetorical school traditions.² But in a text of this sort, it would have been useful to have these to hand.

The commentary itself is serviceable, and will certainly help students get through the text. Not surprisingly, Gagarin tends to focus on the many legal issues raised by the speeches, and it is precisely in his discussion of such legal technicalities that Gagarin's commentary will prove most useful. Many of the particular notes are quite good in this regard, though the points will not always be free of controversy. The introductory set-ups for each case are especially clear, and will serve as a nice complement to those provided by Gernet and Maidment. But Antiphon is more than a sourcebook on Attic law, and Gagarin's treatment of the linguistic and rhetorical aspects of the text is less successful. The commentary is directed (at least in part) towards undergraduates. Yet there is no note, as one might expect, on (e.g.) 5.60 αὐτοῦ, on the use of ὧς + ppl. (see below), or on the polite use of μοι ("please") at 5.35 or 56. At 6.1 ἀνθρώπων ὄντι surely needs comment (see Barigazzi *ad loc.*) more than does ἡδιστον, as does 6.2 ἦ οὐ or 6.5 μὴ οὐ. Likewise, at 1.5 καὶ εἰ (*mirror si*) is certainly more difficult than καθέστηκε. At other times, notes may appear to be insufficient (e.g., 1.3 κατὰ τὸ αὐτὸ; 2.2.2 παρέχοντα μὴ διαφθαρηναί; 2.4.10 οὐκ ... οὐκ ἔστιν; 3.2.6 ἔτι δὲ, without comment), or inaccurate (on the allegedly concessive use of ἐκεῖ ... γε at 5.50, 6.9, 14, etc., see Tulin, *op. cit.*, 89). More broadly, far too little attention is devoted to analysis of the actual logic of the arguments (as, say, the enthymeme at 2.1.4-8), or to the compositional structure of specific passages (contrast, e.g., Gagarin, 118f. [ad Ant. 1.21-24], with the excellent note at Barigazzi 1, 64f.). Such omissions are critical, and much work thus remains to be done on the argumentative and rhetorical strategies of this author—especially as regards the *Tetralogies*. Compare, in all this, the very full exposition in Adams' *Lysias*, also composed for undergraduates.

The best section of the commentary is no doubt that on Antiphon 5, *De caede Herodis*. Gagarin gives, with admirable brevity, a clear and excellent introduction to the case as a whole (173-77), reasserting his view (*MH passim*; also Due, 50), that Euxitheos may have been guilty all along. The introductory set-ups to the individual sections of the speech are also well done. I append a few comments and observations. 5.8 πρῶτον μὲν οὖν, ὡς παρανομώτατα κτλ.: for this choice of opening, cp. Andoc. 1.8. 5.9 φόνου δίκην φεύγω: "the expression also suggests" equivocates, given Gagarin's more forceful position elsewhere (*MH* 19n.7); in fact, the ppl. ἐνδεδειγμένους is concessive

¹ I would prefer, e.g., to follow Declava Caizzi at 2.1.9 and 2.4.10; also at 3.2.10 (which should not, I think, be part of the epilogue). At 1.8, we probably need to break after φήθησαν (with Barigazzi).

² They derive, presumably, from two different traditions, since the titles certainly reflect an analysis of the *Tetralogies* according to the types of murder involved, rather than by *stasis* theory.

and the whole sentence refers to the prosecution's mishandling of procedure: "Though I have been indicted as a *kakourgos*, I am actually (not legally, to be sure, but for all intents and purposes) having to defend a δίκη φόνου" (see, most recently, B. Manuwald, *Rh. Mus.* 138, 1995, 48-50; cp. §§11-12, 16 ἔλων δ' αὐ ... ὡς τοῦ φόνου τὴν δίκην ὠφληκότα [obviously, ὡς introduces a subjective element, as in ὡς ... ἀπιστήσων, 32 ὡς οὐ τάληθῆ λέγοντα, 41 ὡς ἀδίκως ἀπολλυμένους], 85 ἐγὼ δὲ κτλ., etc.); the καὶ that follows must be adversative: "and yet, they themselves bear witness to this, that I am not a *kakourgos*, for ..."; Gagarin has little to say, unfortunately, regarding particles. 5.10 (ἀν): add *MH* 25n.24 (also, the comma ought to be retained after τὴν κρίσιν). 5.16 ἀξιώσεις; cp. Manuwald, 45. 5.18 διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος κακοπάθειαν (del. Dobree et alii); Gagarin (cp. Due, 51n.7) correctly defends this phrase; for the A-B-A structure (not simply, as Gagarin says, "repetition"), see 3 *bis*, esp. πολλοὶ δὲ ... πιστοὶ γενόμενοι τῷ ψεύδεσθαι, τούτῳ ἐσώθησαν, διότι ἐπεύσαντο; also 31, 35 (τεθνεὼς δὲ ... ἀπολλυμένου); *Andoc.* 1.6, etc. 5.19 ἐκ πολλοῦ ... παραχρηῖμα; see Edwards; also *Pl. Apol.* 18E5-19A2, 24A1-4, 37A6-B2. 5.21: οὐ προνοίᾳ, *recte*; but contrast *MH* 36n.16, which should therefore have been cited. 5.25 τὸ ἀληθὲς καὶ τὸ γεγεννημένον: *variatio* (cp. 5.3, 5.72) is no argument against hendiadys; on hendiadys in Greek oratory, see now Laura Rossi, "Il Problema dell'endiadi in Greco e le orazioni politiche di Demostene," *AION (sez. filolog.-lett.)* 15, 1993, 121-44 (pub. 1995). 5.29-30: discussion of the many interesting problems surrounding the witnesses—including the torturing of a free man—is much too abbreviated; Gagarin does, admittedly, refer to earlier discussions, including his own; still, an elementary commentary of this sort ought to be more self-contained; contrast Edwards, 88ff. 5.30 οὐδὲν ... φλαύρον; Gagarin *ad loc.* (*MH passim*; Edwards, 83f.) finds this "surprisingly weak"; but 42 *fin* ὁ δὲ [sc. the free man] τὸ παράπαν ἔφη οὐκ ἐββῆναι με ἐκ τοῦ πλοίου is unequivocal; whether it is true, of course, is another matter. 5.37 μὲν οὖν; cp. 3.1.1 (οἶμαι μὲν οὖν); 3.4.8; *Pl. Apol.* 36A7 (with de Strycker-Slings *ad loc.*). 5.43 ἤδη δὲ: Gagarin's comment that "only here does Eu. claim (rather vaguely) that he only enlisted help after the crime was accomplished", is confusing; rather, Euxitheos argues, *ex contrario* (see above, 732, n. 3), that he *would* not have acted thus. 5.44 ὡς ὁ τούτων λόγος; that Herodes was slain near the harbor was only an inference (cp. §26 δῆλον γὰρ κτλ.); hence, we have here a fine example of what Due (41f.) refers to as Antiphon's tendency to advance "from probability to certainty". 5.48 δούλω; Gagarin takes the dative in the usual manner, with ἔξεστι ('if it is permitted for a slave to testify ...'); *Pl. Laws* 937A8-B1 δούλῃ δὲ καὶ δούλῳ καὶ παιδί φόνου μόνον ἔξεστω μαρτυρεῖν καὶ συνηγορεῖν is decisive (on συνηγορεῖν, however, see England *ad a5f.*); see Tulin, "Slave Witnesses in Antiphon V.48," *Scripta Classica Israelica* (forthcoming). 5.49 οὐδέπω νῦν (cp. *MH* 64) simply = "never"; see 68 οὐδέπω νῦν ἠύρηνται οἱ ἀποκτείναντες. 5.64-66: that the culprit is often *the first* 'to finger' someone else (οἱ μὲν γὰρ πανουργοῦντες κτλ.) is, indeed, psychologically sound, and is a principle often used in the modern crime story; Euxitheos' strategy is therefore effective; see Due, 46f. 5.75: on the λόγος/ἔργος contrast in Antiphon (Gagarin *ad* 3.3.1; Edwards, 70), add Gebauer, 312f.n.37. 5.76 ἡμαρτε: the references are supplied by Edwards; on εὐρόπως-εὐπόπως, add Diggle, *Ill. Class. Stud.* 19, 1994, 81f. 5.78 χωροφιλεῖ: "found in a letter

attributed to the early philosopher Thales" will not do; αἱ τοῦ Θαλοῦ ἐπιστολαί (Diog. Laert. 1.43-44) are clearly apocryphal, as the letter itself indicates ἡμέες δὲ οἱ μηδὲν γράφοντες; see Schmid-Stählin, I.1, 728n.9; also Zeller-Nestle, *Phil. d. Gr.* 1.1⁶, 260n.2. 5.91 ἀσέβημα is not really "sin", which is anachronistic, but (as it were) ἡ περὶ θεοῦ κλημμέλεια; cp. 5.88 *fin* ἀσέβειά ... εἰς τε τοὺς θεοὺς; 93 μηδὲν αὐτῷ συνειδῶτι ... μήτ' εἰς τοὺς θεοῦς ἡσεβηκότι. 5.93 τοῦτο αὐτὸ is not "the ψυχή", but "this very fact", i.e., τὸ ζυνειδέναι (as Maetzner).

Of the fragments, finally, Gagarin gives only an excerpt from περὶ τῆς μεταστάσεως; for the full particulars of this fragmentary text, see Declava Caizzi, *CPF* 1.1 [1989], 224-36.

The book concludes with a select bibliography and several indices. With one understandable exception—Gagarin's own "The Torture of Slaves in Athenian Law," (*CP* 91, 1996, 1-18)—nothing past 1995 is cited. Still, several omissions should be noted: G. Ramirez Vidal, "El logos *AMARTYROS* en Antifonte," in *La Rhetorique Grecque. Actes du Colloque "Octave Navarre", 3^e coll. intern., CRHI—Dec. 1992* (Paris, 1994), 147-62; J. Diggle, "Εὐπόπως ἔχειν and Antiphon, *De caede Herodis* 76," *Ill. Class. Stud.* 19, 1994, 81f.; B. Manuwald, "Zur rechtlichen Problematik von Antiphon, Or. 5," *Rh. Mus.* 138, 1995, 41-59; A. L. Boegehold, *The Athenian Agora, XXVIII. The Lawcourts at Athens* (Princeton, 1995); Ch. Eucken, "Das Tötungsgesetz des Antiphon und der Sinn seiner Tetralogien," *Mus. Helv.* 53, 1996, 73-82; also E. Grace, *VDI* 1992 (no. 4), 28-46 and 1993 (no.1), 25-39 (in Russian). Despite the comments and criticisms offered above, it is useful to have this volume, and to learn, in more systematic fashion, Gagarin's views on many of the problems raised by the text of Antiphon. The appearance of this commentary will no doubt stimulate new discussion of this important author.

Alexander Tulin, Howard University

tulin@concentric.net
