

## BOOK REVIEW

*Antiphontis et Andocidis Orationes*. Edited by M. R. DILTS AND D. J. MURPHY. New York, NY.: Oxford Classical Texts, 2018. pp. 256. Hardback, \$45.00. ISBN 978-0-19-960547-7.

The critical edition of the extant speeches attributed to the two earliest orators of the *Canon of the ten Attic orators*, namely Antiphon and Andocides, is particularly welcome, since it fills a gap in the OCT series, and replaces the old Teubner editions of Blass & Thalheim (1914) and Blass & Fuhr (1913) of Antiphon and Andocides respectively, which scholars have used for over a century. As explained in note 1 of page v, part of the work was done by Dilts and revised by Murphy, while the rest was done by Murphy alone.

The volume starts with an enlightening Preface in English (v-xvii). Two introductory paragraphs on the content of the book are followed by three chapters which are to be expected in a critical edition: the first describing the textual tradition, the second offering an account of the previous editions and the final one laying out the principles of the present edition. The editors have wisely included in their edition the *Life of Antiphon* (*Genos Antiphōntos*) and the *hypotheses* to the speeches that are transmitted in the manuscripts. Unfortunately, this volume does not include the fragments of the two orators, for which the standard works remain the two aforementioned Teubner editions. Dilts & Murphy do not enter the debate on the authenticity of Andocides 3, *On the Peace with the Lacedaemonians*, while they rightly treat as spurious the legal texts inserted in Andocides 1, *On the Mysteries* (see M. Canevaro and E. M. Harris, *CQ* 62 (2012) 98-129, and *idem*, *Dike* 19 (2016) 7-48).

The transmission of the text is clearly illustrated on pages vii-xii. The primary manuscript of the text both of Antiphon and of Andocides is A, the Codex Crippsianus (British Library Burney 95), which was written in Constantinople in the first quarter of the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The other primary manuscript of Antiphon is N (Oxonienis Bodleianus Auctarium T.2.4) from the 14<sup>th</sup> century, and of Andocides 3 and 4 is Q (Ambrosianus D 42 sup.) from the late 13<sup>th</sup>/early 14<sup>th</sup> century. All the other manuscripts that witness text of Antiphon and Andocides are descended from A. However, I have noticed that in their list of manuscripts

originating from A, Dilts & Murphy rightly mention BLMZP, but omit the reference to the Vatican parchment codex Chig. Gr. 34 (= Vat. Chig. R.VI.42), copied from L (codex. Bibl. Nazionale Marciana gr. app. VIII, 6) by the very same scribe of L, that is Aristoboulos Apostoles, in Florence between 1492 and 1495. Additionally, the editors acknowledge (vii, note 11) that they do not cite codex P (Bibl. Ambrosiana A 99 sup.), but no explanation is offered for their decision. I also doubt the extent to which it is probable that M (codex Burney 96) was the model of P (vii), for I believe that P was also copied from L, and thus it stands on an equal footing with M with respect to the textual tradition of the minor orators (see R. Hatzilambrou, *Isaeus' On the Estate of Pyrrhus* (2018) 43-48). In the second chapter of the Preface Dilts & Murphy offer fair comments on the previous editions of the text.

Given the meagre papyrological evidence and the poor indirect tradition, one has no option but to use the medieval manuscripts as the basis of the text of the two orators in question. I appreciate the general principle of the edition, put forward on page xiv, which is that “as long as our manuscripts present an intelligible reading, we retain it,” and the exceptions to this principle discussed on pages xv-xvi. I have found particularly stimulating the treatment of inscriptional evidence as far as the spelling of forms is concerned.

The Preface is followed by three indispensable lists: *Conspectus Editionum Potiorum* and *Conspectus Studiorum*, where all essential literature is included, and finally by *Sigla*. In this last list codex Q is omitted and should be supplied.

My personal collation of the text of two speeches, namely Antiphon 1 and Andocides 3, printed in this edition against their primary manuscripts (A, N and A, Q respectively) by using digital images, confirms that Dilts & Murphy have accomplished their work professionally, and thus, they offer to scholarship a reliable and accurate text. The *apparatus criticus* is much friendlier to its reader than the *apparatus criticus* in the older Teubner editions, because it is *positive*, that is, it includes the reading of the text, and because it omits completely some of the emendations suggested especially by scholars in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, e.g. by the Neotticists C. G. Cobet and H. van Herwerden. In very few places I had the impression that readings worth mentioning in the *apparatus criticus* were omitted, as for instance in Ant. 1.28 the suggestion of “*anoias*” by Reiske *in loco* of the manuscript reading “*dianoias*”, or the reading “*isōs hōs*” proposed by Pahle (*apud* M. Gagarin, *Antiphon. The Speeches* (1997) 42) instead of the manuscript reading “*isōs*”, or the “*hōs*” by Bekker which is adopted in the text in Ant. 1.19. Additionally, Dilts & Murphy’s collation of the text of codices descended from A, e.g. of L, has enabled

the correction of errors in the *apparatus criticus* of the older Teubner editions. For instance, the readings “*hautē*” in Ant.1.10 and “*etheloi*” in Ant.1.15 attributed to the Aldina in the edition of Blass & Thalheim is now attributed rightly to L, the codex employed as the exemplar of the Aldina. A couple of conventions observed in the *apparatus criticus* perhaps deserve some reconsideration. Readings in < > wouldn’t be expected in an *apparatus criticus*; thus, for instance in Ant. 1.10, “<*hē basanos*> add. Turr.” would perhaps be better inserted as “*hē basanos* add. Turr.” Moreover, I don’t think that the collocation “*alia alii*,” frequently encountered in the *apparatus criticus*, contributes much to our knowledge of the text. Finally, the reference to all manuscripts (AQBLMZ) in l. 310 of the *apparatus criticus* in And.3 appears superfluous, since it has already been shown in the Preface that the primary manuscripts of the speech are A and Q, and the rest are descended from A. The volume ends with two useful *indices nominum*, one for each author’s orations.

The text is very well edited, and I have noted few typographical errors: a circumflex should be added onto “*tou*” on page xix, l. 20; “*Cominis*” should be corrected to “*Conomis*” on page xxii and where ever it is attested; the initial letters of “*erklärung*”, “*kritik*” and “*schriftsteller*” should be capitalised on page xxii, ll. 29-30; “*G. Gebauer*” should be written in roman on page xxiii, l. 39; “*Litsotakis*” should be altered to “*Liotsakis*” on page xxiv, l. 26; the dot should be deleted just before “*K. Maresch*” on the same page l. 4; the correct inventory number of PSI on page xxxi is “*PSI inv. 320 Ro*”; finally, “*Aigine*” should be corrected to “*Aigina*” on page 207.

However, the typographical errors and the few reservations recorded here are minor quibbles. A modern, updated, reliable critical edition of all the orations of Antiphon and Andocides had for long been a *desideratum* in the discipline. The work of Dilts & Murphy definitely meets this need!

ROSALIA HATZILAMBROU

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, rosahatz@phil.uoa.gr





