Christopher Carey, ed., *Lysiae Orationes cum Fragmentis*. Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford: OUP, 2007, xli + 571 pp., ISBN 0198140726

Chris Carey's new Oxford Classical Text of Lysias is a welcome replacement for the 1912 OCT by Carl Hude. Hude's text has served well for almost a century, but there are several reasons for replacing it. The most important of these, and the most obvious difference between it and this new text, is the absence of any fragments. Carey includes all the fragments (in 255 pages), trying to be "as inclusive as possible," and even includes an Appendix with fragments which are wrongly (in his view) attributed to Lysias by "scholars whose views deserve respect" (xxx). This is the fullest collection of Lysias's fragments available, and given the attention now being paid to the fragments, including the first English translation of many of them by Stephen Todd (*Lysias*, Austin 2000, 342-89), their inclusion in itself is reason enough to upgrade to Carey. Carey also has a much longer introduction than Hude -- in English, though Latin is used in the apparatus and in introductions to some of the fragments -- and a much fuller apparatus in which he includes many more conjectures. The net result is an edition more than twice as long as its predecessor.

Besides the fragments, other changes, though less obvious, are also for the better. Scholars today have a better understanding of the manuscript tradition, and Carey himself has collated several mss.; in particular, he shows clearly that a fifteenth-century ms. (C) extensively used by Hude is in fact a direct copy of another fifteenth-century ms. (Af), which Carey cites instead. As an editor, Carey is conservative, in many cases returning to the ms. reading where Hude and others had emended the text. Latenineteenth-century editors commonly emended the text of Lysias (and other orators) in an effort to make the Greek conform with what they considered to be correct Attic. In such cases,

ISSN: 1699-3225

Carey often adheres to the ms. reading, sometimes explaining his reasons in the apparatus — see e.g., 22.1, where he retains the somewhat unusual ms. word order,  $\pi$ 0100µév00 $\zeta$  λόγ00 $\zeta$  (Hude reverses the order), and notes in the apparatus that he thinks Lysias was trying to avoid ambiguity (ambiguitatis evadendae causa). Carey also takes advantage of the considerable advance in our knowledge of the historical development of Attic Greek morphology, which has been provided by epigraphical research and discoveries; for example, he regularly writes (often preserving the ms. reading)  $\tilde{\eta}\nu$  rather than  $\tilde{\eta}$  or  $\tilde{\eta}\delta\epsilon\nu$  rather than  $\tilde{\eta}\delta\eta$ .

As for the fragments, Carey considers 513 of these authentic, including some as short as a single letter. He has given them his own consecutive numbering, and has given each identifiable speech a Roman number, but for each fragment he also notes the numbering of previous editors (if any). For many of the fragments or speeches he provides an introduction (in Latin); these range from a line or two to one (XI.  $\pi \rho \delta \varsigma$  Åντιγένη ἀμβλώσεως) that runs almost two pages. The (sometimes quite extensive) context of a fragment is given in a slightly smaller font than the words Carey considers to be Lysias's; this works reasonably well, though it was sometimes difficult for old eyes like mine to distinguish the two.

Finally, I must regrettably add that the proofreading of this volume falls far short of the usual standards of the Oxford University Press and especially of its Greek texts. Misprints are everywhere, from note 8 in the Preface (vii) to the page heading at the end of the Index (571). Most will not seriously inconvenience readers, especially those who know Greek well, but novice readers may have considerable difficulty with  $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$  (for  $\alpha \dot{\upsilon} \tau \tilde{\omega} \nu$ ) or  $\dot{\upsilon} \mu \tilde{\iota} \nu$  (for  $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\iota} \nu$ ). There are even cases where Greek font is used instead of Roman and vice versa; the resulting gibberish is obvious enough, but nonetheless inexcusable. I don't know if this is the result of some sort of computerized proofreading, but if so, the human element needs to be restored before the volume is reprinted.

MICHAEL GAGARIN
The University of Texas at Austin
gagarin@mail.utexas.edu