

The two following chapters are devoted to the analysis of the second and the third theses defended by G. in his *ONB* ('... if it is, it is unknowable, if it is and it is knowable, it cannot be communicated to others'), which, according to the author, form the theoretical foundations of G.'s rhetoric. M. follows the arguments step by step (as Migliori and Newiger do in their works on G.), and in many cases M. compares the two sources of the work (the anonymous author of *On Melissus, Xenophanes and Gorgias*, and Sextus *Adv. Math.* 7.65ff.). At the end of each one of these chapters readers will find an outline of the arguments, arranged in a way that makes clear where the two sources converge and where they do not. M. then passes to the intriguing problem of the character of *ONB*, which others take as a rhetorical or as a philosophical work, and concludes that both philosophy and rhetoric have their own place in it; he also makes some points on the word *πράγματα*, which has so much tantalized scholars, and which has been used as an argument that favours the view that in *ONB* G. refers to the phenomenal world, and not to abstract philosophical entities (Calogero and Kerferd; *contra* Mansfeld and recently Palmer).

In the last two chapters (V and VI) M. turns to *Palamedes* and *Helen*, the works which are most frequently seen as exemplifications of what is usually termed as a model-speech. In the former the emphasis is placed on the tracing of the elements (mainly epistemological and argumentative) that draw upon *ONB*; in the latter he investigates the similarities between *Helen* and *ONB* as well, but he also proceeds to what seems to me the most exhaustive comparison of the *Encomium* with Euripides' relevant plays (mainly *Troades*, and *Helen*); M. has some words to say about the question of the nature of *Helen* (an encomium or a defence?), and about the very last and very tantalizing word of the work (*παύσιον*).

In the Appendix, M. provides his readers with a facing translation of *Helen, Palamedes, ONB*, and some of the B fragments (the Greek text is from Untersteiner's edition), along with some short notes. At the end of the book one finds an extensive bibliography, which, however, lacks Buchheim's commentary, the only serious one on the whole of G.'s work, and T. Cole's work on the origins of Greek rhetoric (M. was probably not aware of Schiappa's book, which also appeared in 1999).

Some general remarks: M.'s book is certainly intended for those who already have a significant knowledge of G.; those with this knowledge will find in it several interesting approaches, especially to *ONB*, but I do not know how many of them will tolerate so many *-isms* (G. would not have thought of them anyway). The hard-dying view that there are theoretical foundations expressed in *ONB*, which illuminate the interpretation of *Helen* and *Palamedes*, does not convince me: if there are similarities there are dissimilarities as well, and it is also true that persuasiveness needs flexibility. Greek words are very frequently misprinted.

*University of Glasgow*

DIMOS SPATHARAS

C. CAREY: *Aeschines*. Pp. xxi + 261. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2000. Paper, £13.50. ISBN: 0-292-71223-5.

This is the third volume in the Texas series of translations of the Attic orators edited by Michael Gagarin, and the standard is as high as ever. The book follows the regular format, beginning with Gagarin's excellent Series Introduction, which surveys classical oratory, and Athenian government and law. In his own Introduction to *The Life and Times of Aeschines*, C. offers a lucid account of the rise of Macedonia, the Peace of Philocrates and its aftermath down to 322, and Aeschines' life, which provides more than adequate background information for newcomers to this complex period of Athenian history. I would have welcomed, in addition, a section on Aeschines' oratory. The chapter closes with a brief note on the text (C. bases his translations on the 1997 Teubner of M. R. Dils, with some well argued differences: e.g. pp. 153 n. 226, 243 n. 262) and a bibliography, with brief annotations, of works in English (to which might be added J. F. Kindstrand, *The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity* [Uppsala, 1982]). Each of the translations is preceded by an introduction, which puts the speech into its historical and legal context, and contains a synopsis of its different sections and overall rhetorical strategies—this is particularly handy, given the length of all three orations. The translations themselves amply fulfil the aim of the series, to make available to the Greekless reader translations which are 'up-to-date, accurate, and readable'. C. D. Adams's 1919 Loeb has stood the test of time well, but C.'s modern, colloquial English makes his versions more readable. He captures nicely the sometimes rambling narrative style of Aeschines, and not at the expense of accuracy. There are, inevitably, rhetorical figures in the Greek which are nigh on impossible to

reproduce in English without the translation becoming stilted, but to point these out consistently would require a full literary commentary: Aeschines was, after all, a very capable rhetorician. C.'s notes, indeed, are noticeably fuller than those of the previous volumes, which is rightly justified by the absence of modern commentaries (p. xi; I am aware of two recent but as yet unpublished doctoral dissertations, both on speech 2); but their emphasis is on historical, legal, prosopographical, and occasionally mythological and textual matters. If on some pages, where the notes take up more space than the translation (e.g. p. 119), they can be a little distracting, this very minor quibble is amply compensated for by their quality: they are reliable, informative, and balanced, in line with recent scholarship that does not see the world entirely through Demosthenic eyes (cf. pp. 130 n. 138, 137 n. 161; see further pp. 12–14). The comprehensive index is a useful tool and, as with the footnote references, highly accurate.

The Texas series is already proving a boon to students of classical oratory (here I must declare an interest, as a forthcoming contributor), and C.'s excellent volume will hopefully inspire further study of this surprisingly neglected author.

*Queen Mary, University of London*

M. J. EDWARDS

I. WORTHINGTON (ed.): *Greek Orators II. Dinarchus 1 and Hyperides 5 & 6* (Classical Texts). Pp. xii + 228. Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1999. Paper, £16.50. ISBN: 0-85668-307-8.

W. returns to the Harpalus affair and Dinarchus to offer a guide (historical/literary introduction; text and translation; commentary) to Dinarchus 1 and Hyperides 5–6 which will certainly assist those trying to master some troublesomely obscure events. W. writes as one who blames direct democracy for Athens' defeat in 404 and sees Philip's murder as unfitting 'for the most exciting and dynamic man of the fourth century'. The results of the Leocrates and Crown trials show Macedonian hegemony was not a burning issue in 330 Athens 'and are further grounds for accepting that the Athenians, and the Greeks, benefited from that rule because of the peace and prosperity it brought and accepted it' (pp. 6–7). The Harpalus affair fits: Demosthenes' trial 'vividly exhibits the absolute rottenness of Attic democracy'; and military inaction in 324/3 proves Greek acceptance of Macedonian rule. One could imagine more nuanced ways of putting it.

I do not find W.'s ring-composition analysis of Dinarchus 1 compelling. That 11–28 can be analysed in two incompatible ways allegedly shows that Dinarchus' compositional approach involved imposing secondary-level ring-composition on an already-drafted argument. Sceptics may feel it is not Dinarchus who is doing the imposing. 'These sections display such complex ring structures that go beyond the secondary level that it is hard to reconcile historical accuracy with the level of composition' resembles special pleading. Happily the issue has little impact on W.'s main service, line-by-line explication of the texts. I conclude with some queries noted in a fairly rapid reading.

Dinarchus. 9: *συνέδριον* is 'one of the rarer names by which D. refers to the [Areopagus]'. What are the others? Why the varied terminology? Does *συνέδριον* have a special colour? 11: the emendation (one of four interchanging plural and singular forms of *ἀπόφασις*: *Phil.* 130 [1986], 184ff.) is palaeographically dubious. 14: 'Dinarchus . . . inserted Samos . . . for emotional effect'. Having chosen to mention Timotheus (*inter alia* because of his successes in politically resonant places), he could hardly omit it. 15: 'Scythian' deserves comment. 23: 'boy from the Attic deme Pellene [*sic*]'. But in context the boy must be non-Athenian (Achaean Pellene?) 26: 'an Athenian relief fleet [for Olynthus] arrived too late': inaccurate, as there were three fleets. 32: *ἐλογοποιεῖ*: 'making speeches' misses the overtone of fabrication (LSJ s.v. 2, s.v. *λογοποιός* II.2). 34: the translation (and perhaps text, filling a Teubner lacuna) does not seem right. Dinarchus argues Demosthenes was, and will go on being, useless, so the sentence means 'suppose someone were to create another opportunity like that in Agis' time'. In any case ' . . . another force such as we had in the time of Agis' is (and must be) wrong, given Athenian inertia in 331/0. 35: the way Dinarchus seems to slip from Gaugamela to Issus is worth note. (Aesch. 3.164 clearly distinguishes the two.) 38: Cephalus, et al. are cited for events in 379/8, not 404—though that was still 56 years earlier. (The rôle of this passage as evidence for Athenian behaviour in 379/8 ought to be noted.) 43: award of *sitesis* for a syntrierarchy seems implausible. 68: can *πρὸς τῷ γεγενῆσθαι τῆν τῆς βουλῆς ἀπόφασιν* mean 'relying on the fact of the report of the Areopagus'? 81: *why* does Dinarchus make this wild claim about Demosthenes' trips abroad