of the *Electra.* Some parts, such as that on Hitchcock's films, could have been kept much more concise as they are not absolutely necessary for our understanding. Instead, introducing the analysis of the play at an earlier stage would have made the theoretical discussion clearer and less dry. Alternatively, F. could have expanded his 'Ausblick' (which includes two more tragedies, Sophocles' *Philoctetes* and Aeschylus' *Supplices*, and raises further thought-provoking questions), and interpreted one or both of these plays at greater length and compared the results with that of the analysis of Euripides' *Electra.*

The interpretation of *Electra* is very enjoyable to read. It not only supports and displays an application of the theoretical part of the book, but also shows how artfully the passages are composed to create dramatic suspense. Since this interpretation will also be understandable without knowing all of the theoretical discussion, I would recommend the reader to start by reading the second part of the book, i.e. the interpretation of *Electra*, before tackling the more tedious theoretical part.

University of Birmingham BABETTE PÜTZ

DEMOSTHENES THE STATESMAN

I. WORTHINGTON (ed.): *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator*. Pp. xiv + 289. London and New York: Routledge, 2000. Paper, £15.99. ISBN: 0-415-20457-7.

In the words of its editor, the aim of this collection is to make good the long-standing 'lack of a modern treatment of Demosthenes [D.] within two covers' (p. viii). That such a book is a desideratum, at least in English (see below), is beyond question. The nine chapters cover D.'s public career (Badian, Ryder, Worthington, Buckler), his judicial and deliberative oratory (Mirhady, Milns), the use of his speeches as a source for the writing of social history (Golden), and his reputation in antiquity and later (Cooper, Harding).

Badian writes on D.'s early career. After some general remarks on the nature of the Demosthenic corpus, he discusses D.'s family background, the dispute with his guardians, and the early speeches down to the *First Philippic.* He emphasizes D.'s personal reasons for involving himself in the prosecutions of Androtion and Timocrates, and plausibly represents him as an ambitious politician with as yet no real policy. Of particular interest is his suggestion of a link of some kind between the families of D. and Aeschines (pp. 14–15). Ryder provides a clear and judicious account of D.'s policy towards Philip. Worthington argues that D. judged resistance to Alexander to be futile, and correctly advised caution at the time of Agis' revolt and again when Harpalus fled to Greece; his conviction by the Areopagus is attributed as much to the collapse of his policy of diplomatic engagement with Alexander over the Exiles Decree as to his venality. Buckler's chapter on D. and Aeschines is thorough and forthright: D. is sharply criticized for his misjudgement of the military and political situation in 346, and little merit is seen in his prosecution of Aeschines in 343. A valuable appendix considers the problems involved in using the speeches of D. and of Aeschines as historical evidence.

Golden first tries to qualify the common belief that statements made by the Attic orators must have been plausible to their audience, and then uses allusions to athletics in D. 19 and Aesch. 2 to demonstrate his point. The discussion of plausibility is

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press

suggestive but rather too brief to be cogent; that of athletics, although interesting in itself, seems only tenuously connected to what went before.

Mirhady emphasizes D.'s legal expertise and use of documentary evidence as areas in which he excelled as a writer of judicial speeches. He illustrates his argument from the speeches relating to D.'s inheritance and, very briefly, *Against Conon.* His thesis is an interesting one, locating D. in a world in which written texts were increasingly important, but suffers from a lack of space either to compare D.'s practice to that of other speech-writers, or to do much more than summarize the speeches on which he has chosen to concentrate. Milns, in his chapter on the assembly-speeches, follows brief remarks on authenticity and publication (10 and 13 are rejected as spurious), with a fine characterization of their style and artistry.

Writing on the reception of D. in the Hellenistic period, Cooper traces the picture of D. as an orator who owed his success more to diligence than to natural ability to early Hellenistic writers such as Demetrius of Phalerum and Theophrastus, who contrasted him unfavourably with his more gifted contemporaries. It was only in the first century B.C. that rhetorical writers elevated D. above them. The unfavourable characterization of D. by Demetrius and Theophrastus is attributed in part to their hostility to his nephew Democharés. Lastly, Harding provides a necessarily selective but informative account of the later *Nachleben* of D., from Cicero to the present day.

Regrettably, whatever the merits of the individual chapters, the book as a whole suffers from a lack of editorial direction. Neither the preface nor the introduction adequately explains (rather than describes) its scope, or identifies its intended readership. It is an ambitious task to seek to provide a comprehensive study of D. in fewer than 300 pages, and it is not obvious that the inclusion of a chapter on D. and the social historian, and two chapters on his *Nachleben*, is the best use of space. Several contributors (Golden, Mirhady, and Cooper) would in my opinion have benefited from more space in which to develop their arguments.

Certainly more should have been done to guide the reader who is not already familiar with the period. There is no glossary, list of dates, map, or *index locorum*, whilst the Select Index would be more useful if it were less select and more complete (the Athenian general Chares is mentioned several times in the text before his first appearance in the index). Greek terms are transliterated, except in Chapter I, but where these lack translations they will mean little to the Greekless reader. For example, the second line of the Introduction refers to D. as a *logographos*, but does not translate or explain this term. In the bibliography the names of the less familiar journals at least should have been given in full.

The contributors do not refer to each other's chapters (the cross-references are editorial insertions, which, because they do not direct the reader to specific pages, are of limited use). Vague statements such as 'This will be a useful introduction to what may be developed by other contributors to this volume' (p. 14) should have been edited out. Whilst the editor tolerates disagreement between contributors, reasonably enough, this policy causes a serious problem in the case of Mirhady's chapter, since Badian casts serious doubt on the Demosthenic authorship of two of the speeches (27 and 28, perhaps also 30) which Mirhady uses to illustrate D.'s skills as an advocate. Twice similar names are confused (Apollonius for Apollodorus at p. 39 n. 23; Aristocles for Aristocrates at p. 165).

In short, this is an uneven collection, which would have benefited from a firmer editorial hand. Whilst some of the contributions are fine, and none is without interest, it is not the 'cohesive and comprehensive' treatment of D. that the publisher's blurb

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press

promises. For that, one should turn to P. Carlier's *Démosthène* (Paris, 1990), a scholarly and accessible book that goes unmentioned in the present volume.

York University, Toronto JEREMY TREVETT

DEMADES RE-EXAMINED

P. BRUN: *L'orateur Démade. Essai d'histoire et d'historiographie*. Pp. 199. Bordeaux: Diffusion de Boccard, 2000. Paper, frs. 184. ISBN: 2-910023-22-2.

Demades the orator usually receives a bad press for his venality and extravagance in our ancient sources (from his contemporaries such as Dinarchus and Hyperides to much later ones, including Plutarch, Pausanias, Athenaeus, and the *Suda*). Demades served on several important diplomatic missions in the later fourth century, including those to Philip II after Chaeronea in 338 and to Alexander after the razing of Thebes in 335. He persuaded Alexander to cancel his demand for the surrender of Athenian politicians at that time, for which he received a statue and *sitesis*. Implicated in the Harpalus affair of 324/3, Demades fled Athens, but returned in probably 322 and was arguably the most powerful politician in the oligarchy imposed by Antipater after Crannon. It was during this time, apparently, that much of his activities were to earn his condemnation by the sources. Some modern scholars, influenced by the later sources in particular (Schaefer and Blass, for example), saw Demades as a power-hungry, corrupt politician; more recently, there has been an attempt to divorce Demades from the criticism of the sources and to view him as a politician who did work for Athens' best interests. Here may be singled out works by Fordyce Mitchel ('Lykourgan Athens: 338–322', *Semple Lectures* 2 [Cincinnati, 1970]) and J. M. Williams ('Demades' Last Years, 323/2–319/8 B.C.: A "Revisionist" Interpretation', *Ancient World* 19 [1989], 19–30).

B. goes further than any scholar to date in critically appraising the life and career of Demades on the basis of a close analysis of the literary and epigraphical sources. While the core of the book is a biography of Demades, its subtitle prepares us for the lesson in historiography that runs through this study. B. discusses not only the veracity of the literary sources about Demades but also why they painted the picture of him that they do, and the conclusion is that Demades deserves a much better press.

The book has ten chapters and a Conclusion. The first chapter sets the scene in terms of the problems associated with studying Demades given our literary sources. In the second chapter, B. cites all the ancient sources on Demades, and what we can piece together about his life and actions from them. There is also a survey of modern scholars' opinions of Demades, much of which is devoted (given B.'s thesis) to those who have followed anecdotal evidence and the like, and thus denigrated Demades for their own reasons (pp. 34–40). Chapters III–VIII are a biography of Demades. Chapter III deals with Demades' family, youth, and career to 338, in which B. argues in favour of such things as the family's wealth and against any family connection with Demosthenes. Demades' rise to political influence is traced in Chapter IV, the period from the battle of Chaeronea (B. queries the veracity of the story of his famous rebuke to Philip after Chaeronea) to Philip's assassination, and in Chapter V, the revolt of Thebes and Demades' successful mission to Alexander in its aftermath. In Chapter VI, B. treats the war of Agis III and Demades' opposition to it (the accusation pointed against him that he bribed voters not to go to war is disputed). Chapter VII deals with

© Oxford University Press, 2002

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/52.1.39 Published online by Cambridge University Press