

*Antiphon the Sophist: The Fragments*. Edited by GERARD J. PENDRICK. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 39. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002. ISBN 0-521-65161-1. XII, 472 pp. GBP 55.

The earlier editions of Antiphon present some problems common to the older fragment corpora, among which the most conspicuous is the brevity of citations and comments. This tends to leave the laborious construction of the frame of reference to the – often casual, non-expert – reader. Pendrick's aim has been to correct these shortcomings by offering a more comprehensive selection of testimonia and fragments presented with a more extensive context and by providing translations and detailed commentary on the material. The readings of the texts depend on existing editions.

The texts are preceded by an introduction carefully contextualizing the material. The testimonia are treated in the chapter on the identity of Antiphon, the fragments in the following chapters discussing first the division of the works, then the individual works and finally the thought of the sophist in its context. The testimonia and fragments follow, accompanied by critical remarks and translations. The texts are followed by a commentary that concentrates on further details of interpretation, context and text history.

Pendrick wanted to preserve as far as possible the numbering of fragments established in the earlier editions. Hence, he uses letters to identify both independent fragments (*e.g.*, F81A) and text material concerning one fragment (*e.g.*, F80(a–b)). The system is clear once explained, and without doubt conceived for the benefit of the user, but a question arises whether the material should have been reidentified and rearranged more drastically. The fragments are arranged under the titles of the works of Antiphon: *Περὶ ἀληθείας* (F1–44), *Περὶ ὁμοιοῦς* (F45–71), *Πολιτικός* (F72–77) and the "dream-book" (F78–81B). In the present layout, the uncertain attribution of a fragment to a work is not indicated. In the case of the shortest citations lacking the name of the work, some uncertainty remains. In many cases (*e.g.*, F40, 62), Pendrick expresses his doubt in the commentary.

The direct quotations of Antiphon's texts are typographically indicated by printing in bold. This shows once again how small a percentage of cited text can be regarded as cited "verbatim" and works as a sound argument against the puristic definition of the fragment as a "direct citation". Most of the preserved citations paraphrase original text on various levels of accuracy. Pendrick's definition of direct quotation seems quite broad since he presents in bold even parts of Galen's text in Arabic (F29A), although usually translation is seen as a subspecies of paraphrase.

The commentary is supplemented by a list of works cited and indices of passages cited, subjects and Greek words. The reader would benefit from a separate, chronological summary of cited authors and a list of the sources of the fragments although this information is included in the index of passages. In all, Pendrick's is a welcome and valuable addition to the growing number of up-to-date fragment commentaries.

*Ulla Laitakari*