fluent and readable version. To this end, he regularly contracts 'is', and occasionally uses colloquialisms (e.g. 'kudos' at §23). More debatable, perhaps, is his decision to gloss oaths by 'really' or the like: whilst this makes the speech less alien to modern ears, it also risks giving a misleading impression of the reality of the gods for Demosthenes and his contemporaries. Overall, indeed, this version is splendidly lucid, but a little lacking in Demosthenic thunder for my taste.

M. also claims that the commentary is not meant to be exhaustive, though it is certainly wide-ranging and comprehensive. Historical, legal, and linguistic matters are all given due attention, and his comments are invariably succinct, clear, and fair-minded. Even where one might disagree with his conclusions, the presentation of the evidence is scrupulous. His commendable desire to keep the commentary within reasonable bounds spares us yet another disquisition on the historicity of the Peace of Callias (*ad* §273), for which I was grateful, but just occasionally I wished that he had probed a little deeper. A case in point is the puzzling allusion at §293 to a 'prosecution [brought by Euboulos] for sacred money against Kephisophon for being three days late in depositing seven mnai at the bank'. M. suggests that Kephisophon may have been a treasurer, and that the reason why sacred money was being deposited in a bank was that the treasurers hoped to obtain interest on it. Since the case is otherwise unknown, and the general point that Demosthenes is making is clear enough (Euboulos prosecutes other people for minor financial irregularities, but ignores Aeschines' acceptance of bribes), one can understand M.'s reluctance to engage in speculation. Yet his hypothesis prompts farther questions. For example, if the treasurers were seeking to earn interest, for whose benefit was this, theirs or the state's? (Compare *Σ ad Dem.* 24.136 for the allegation that a board of treasurers deposited public money in their trust with a banker in the hope of keeping the interest for themselves.) And why are private banks involved (as they appear to be here) in the financial affairs of the state?

In conclusion, this volume, which has been well copy-edited and attractively produced, is a splendid companion to *Against Meidias*, and will be of great value not only to students of Demosthenes, but to all who work on fourth-century Athens.

York University, Toronto JEREMY TREVETT

THE STRUCTURE OF PLATONIC DIALOGUES

G. Casertano (ed.): *La struttura del dialogo platonico*. Pp. 331. Naples: Loffredo Editore, 2000. Paper, L. 32,000. ISBN: 88-8096-720-7.

This collection of essays makes a laudable attempt to consider literary aspects of Platonic dialogues, taken either singly or in groups. A few of the essays provide intriguing perspectives on Platonic literary technique and its relation to philosophical issues. But the quality is not uniformly high, and the editorial treatment of the volume is rather poor. The Greek is occasionally misspelled, or presented in non-Greek font (e.g. 'sunousiva', p. 259). Some of the analogical diagrams in Esposito's essay seem to have been printed incorrectly (p. 249).

There is considerable overlap in theme among the essays, although this does not lead to useful dialogue among them. Several (Cerri, Vegetti, Velardi, and Nonvel Pieri) stress the importance of the interlocutors and their nature in shaping the form of the argument. A number pay particular attention to intertextual reference among

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.251 Published online by Cambridge University Press

dialogues such as *Republic* and *Timaeus* or *Theaetetus*, *Parmenides*, *Sophist*, and *Statesman* (Cerri, Velardi, Nonvel Pieri, and Migliori). Several attempts are made to discuss narrative (especially by R. Velardi, but see also Palumbo, Casertano, and Rotondaro). But none of the authors shows much acquaintance with recent scholarship on narrative, and all fail to make any distinction between what moderns usually mean by 'narrative' and Plato's use of the term *διήγησις*, with results that tend to be confusing.

Particularly strong is J. G. T. Santos's piece on *Meno*: S. argues that the apparently somewhat disconnected topics of this dialogue—virtue, epistemology, and recollection—fit together if considered in a non-sequential fashion. The failed argument about virtue as teachable, S. argues, may be reconstructed by arguing that virtue can be knowledge without being teachable in the normal sense. Instead, it is a product of the elenchus and the resulting process of recollection. Meno and Anytus, incapable of experiencing the awareness of ignorance produced by elenchus in the case of the slave, cannot take the first step in the process.

L. Palumbo begins with an unhelpful discussion of narrative before opening an intriguing study of the theme of time in *Theaetetus*. The life of Theaetetus, closing in the narrative frame but only beginning in the narrated dialogue, contrasts with that of Socrates, who in the narrated dialogue is near the end of his own. The leisurely pace of the philosopher's discussions matches his concern for the timeless, and is to be contrasted both with the fast-moving world of the rhetor, whose discourse is driven by the water clock (*κατεπείγει γὰρ ὕδωρ ῥέον* 172e1), and finally with the 'flowing' world of the Heracliteans, whose incoherent discourse is fragmented by each temporal moment. This last point is not fully developed and would have repaid a more extensive treatment.

Also of interest is a detailed study by P. Grisei of the three great analogies of *Republic* 6–7, Sun, Line, and Cave. The sun as model for the *agathon* is modified by the line, which introduces the concept of gradations of value (p. 283), while the third, cave analogy expands and explicates the function of the sun-*agathon* in the first.

M. Vegetti argues that the differing narrative style of *Timaeus*, and the less tentative presentation of concepts in that dialogue, correspond to the differing character of the internal audience, reflecting a change from the locally Athenian, pro-democracy group that attends the discussion in *Republic* to the more élite and anti-democratic *ξένοι* in *Timaeus* (pp. 81–3).

Of the other essays, M. Migliori's, while lengthy and uneven, contains some useful observations on Platonic 'games' (*gioci*) with the reader (pp. 185–9). G. Cerri argues that the Myth of Er is to serve as a model for the reformed poetry imagined earlier in Book 10 of *Republic*, though he admits that the connection is never made explicit (p. 24). Casertano's essay appears to view *Phaedo* through the lens of a modern preference for epistemology and logic over ethics and metaphysics, categories that have little relevance to Plato's text. M. Esposito (on analogy in Plato and Archytas) and A. Fermani (on *Phaedrus* 242d7) make small useful points.

Two essays are particularly poor, even irrational. S. Nonvel Pieri combines some useful observations on *Parmenides* with numerous absurd suggestions, e.g. Antiphon's obsession with horses should evoke the chariot in the proem of Parmenides (p. 156). T. Ebert argues that Socrates in *Phaedo* makes false arguments in order to parody Pythagorean ideas, a claim that depends upon arbitrary notions of what qualifies as 'Pythagorean' and is unsupported by textual analysis.

Miranda, California ANN N. MICHELINI

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.2.251 Published online by Cambridge University Press