

Review published in *New England Classical Journal* 30.3 (2003) 164–7.

Harvey Yunis (ed.). *Demosthenes. On the Crown*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press. 2001. Pp. xiv + 314. ISBN: 0521620929. \$74.95.

Yunis' edition and commentary of *On the Crown* appears exactly one hundred years after the last full scale English commentary on the Greek text. Yunis' volume follows the typical format of the Green and Yellow series, with an introduction, text, commentary, end bibliography and Greek and English indices. Two brief appendices provide a synopsis of the arguments of the speech and a timeline of the events mentioned. A map of Greece, Macedon and the Aegean is also included.

Yunis' introduction is divided into five parts. The first part considers the history of the period, from the rise of Philip to the battle of Chaeronea. Yunis focuses on the Athenian response and the different policies advocated by Aeschines and Demosthenes. The second section considers the circumstances immediately after the battle, when Ctesiphon proposed Demosthenes' honorary crown. Yunis rightly points out that the specific provisions of Ctesiphon's proposal were not unusual. He then explains what the *graphē paranomōn* procedure was, and that it was common for political arguments to appear alongside more technical legal points. Yunis also discusses the growth of Macedonian hegemony between the time of Aeschines' indictment in 336 and the actual trial in 330. The third section examines how Demosthenes takes advantage of the Athenians' collective memory of Chaeronea and the events leading up to that defeat. Rather than deny his responsibility, Demosthenes proudly asserts that his policy, even if it ended in a terrible loss, was the best choice for the Athenians, and the only one that lived up to the "burden of the Athenian past" (16), a century and a half before, when the Athenians had defended the other Greeks against Persia. The fourth section is entitled "Demosthenes' rhetorical art." Yunis summarizes and lists examples of the orator's use of diction, rhetorical figures, invective and irony. Yunis also offers a nice assessment of the variety of Demosthenes' sentences and how he uses his narrative to reinforce his political goals in the speech. Yunis also emphasizes the importance of Demosthenes' prose rhythm in the oral delivery of the oration and urges students to read the oration aloud. He provides a useful summary of Demosthenes' avoidance of tribrachs and hiatus (although readers seriously interested in prose rhythm should use Dilts' new Oxford Classical Text (Oxford, 2002); see below for further comments on this point). The fifth section introduces the Greek text.

Yunis provides his own text of the speech with a brief critical apparatus. The apparatus refers only to the primary manuscripts and to ancient papyri, and comments only on cases in which the adopted text is not found in any of these manuscripts, or in which there are substantial differences in meaning among the texts of these manuscripts. In these cases Yunis also lists important modern editorial suggestions. For the most part, Yunis relies upon the standard editions for information about the manuscript readings.¹ All in all, Yunis' editorial work in the text and apparatus is very sensible and he provides a useful version of the text for his audience of advanced undergraduates. Yunis achieves a more readable text by relegating editorial brackets to the apparatus and by eliminating the many spurious documents found in the manuscripts.² He also makes the text more friendly by regularly breaking the longest paragraphs of the standard editions into shorter ones.

¹ The new OCT had not appeared as Yunis was writing; in his preface Yunis thanks Mervin Dilts for an advance look.

² The only document included is the ten line epigram for the dead at Chaeronea in §289. Yunis judges all of the lines except the ninth, which is quoted in the text of the following section, as likely to be spurious. Yunis also comments upon one letter found in the papyri but not in the medieval manuscripts (note on §221).

The only real problem with his text, which may not affect many readers, is his treatment of elision and *scriptio plena*. Since the late 19th century, when Friedrich Blass observed the pronounced tendency of Demosthenes to avoid three or more short syllables, standard editions have paid too little regard to the manuscripts with regard to prose rhythm, particularly in cases where an editor must decide whether to print elision or *scriptio plena*. In recent years, editors have rightly seen that we must give precedence to the manuscripts, if they show some consensus for *scriptio plena*, and not to modern hypotheses about Demosthenic prose rhythm.³ Whether our transmitted text accurately represents what Demosthenes actually said in court or not, the manuscripts constitute our best evidence for the written version of the text. Unfortunately, Yunis often disregards this evidence and prints elision in cases “where Demosthenes apparently elided short vowels to obviate hiatus” (33), although he doesn’t explain how that determination is to be made.⁴

Yunis’ commentary is the most important part of the book. I will focus my observations on one small but important part of the speech, §§169–180, where Demosthenes describes the Athenian response to Philip’s capture of Elatea. Yunis offers excellent analysis of how the orator recreates the debate in Athens and portrays himself as the only one who could help Athens at that critical juncture, repeatedly likening Demosthenes’ self-presentation to Thucydides’ depiction of Pericles. Yunis is particularly interested in Demosthenes’ rhetorical technique. Within the span of just eight pages of notes (on three pages of text) the reader will find discussion of Demosthenes’ use of anaphora, amplification, chiasmus, climax, personification and prolepsis. Yunis also comments upon how Demosthenes’ choice of words and the details he includes and omits contribute to his rhetorical ends, and how the repetition of key words connects different parts of the oration. Yunis is also right to pay close attention to Demosthenes’ rhythm, although his comments may not always be clear enough for the undergraduate audience. For example, Yunis very perceptively observes that “the abrupt switch from the balanced opening clause” of §169, Ἐσπέρα μὲν γὰρ ἦν, “to the jarring pace that follows,” in ἦκε δ’ ἀγγέλων τις, reflects the shattered tranquility in Athens when the messenger arrived from Elatea (204). Yunis scans these phrases for the reader, but he doesn’t explain that what makes the first half “balanced” is the two cretics, and that it is the last three syllables of the second half that are “jarring,” with the words ἀγγέλων τις breaking the cretic rhythm.⁵

Demosthenes’ Greek can be very challenging, and Yunis regularly offers his own translations of difficult phrases. However, he provides no general discussion of Demosthenes’ Greek style, which might point out some of the common Demosthenic usages that often confuse first-time readers, such as the use of ἄν for ἔάν or frequent articular infinitives phrases.⁶ Yunis assumes a fairly high level of competence in Greek from his readers. Thus, for example, in §178 he doesn’t comment at all on the use of the article to turn a finite verb into a genitive noun (τοῦ πότε δεῖ βαδίζειν), or on what needs to be understood as the main clause in a five-line colon that contains only purpose clauses

³ Donald F. McCabe, *The prose-rhythm of Demosthenes* (New York, 1981), 44–73 convincingly argues for the importance of the manuscript readings in this regard. Following his advice, Dilts’ new OCT prints *scriptio plena* when more than one primary manuscript transmits the text thus. Douglas M. MacDowell, in his editions of *Against Meidias* (Oxford, 1990) and *On the False Embassy* (Oxford, 2000), follows a similar policy.

⁴ In fact, a few pages earlier he had observed that Demosthenes sometimes employs hiatus unpredictably and “for no apparent reason” (26). In the three pages of text of §§169–180, which I used as a sample, there are 17 places in which Yunis differs from Dilts with regard to prose rhythm.

⁵ Other notes on prose rhythm, on §1 for example, are more specific in their explanations of how Demosthenes achieves his effect.

⁶ In one paragraph of the introduction Yunis highlights many of the grammatical elements that contribute to Demosthenes’ complex sentences, with lists of examples (21). It would be helpful if he quoted some of these items and provided a review of their typical usages.

with subordinate protases (ἵνα ἔσται . . .). Along similar lines, he regularly refers to Guy L. Cooper's *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* instead of the more standard, and affordable for students, reference grammar by Smyth. Yunis may be right to prefer Cooper's "wealth of examples and precise explanations" (x), but the average undergraduate reader is very unlikely to have a copy handy every time she needs to check a particular point of grammar.

Some readers may wish to see more emphasis on legal and historical matters in the commentary. Yunis' treatment of these matters is sound, although often quite brief. In a work of this sort I think his approach is reasonable: he usually provides the essential information and then refers the reader elsewhere. Thus, for example, on §169, when the *prytaneis* convene an emergency overnight meeting of the Council in anticipation of the Assembly meeting the next day, Yunis first provides a one-sentence explanation of who the *prytaneis* were, and refers to the relevant section in the *Athēnaion Politeia*. He then adds that the Council must pass a preliminary decree before the Assembly can act, and sends the curious reader to 30 pages of Peter J. Rhodes' *Athenian Boule*.

Despite a few small complaints, I am very grateful to have this up-to-date English commentary on one of Demosthenes' greatest speeches available for my own research and for use in advanced Greek courses. Yunis has done the field a great service.

Judson Herrman
Bowdoin College