

## Citation style

Cação, Elisabete: Rezension über: Mirko Canevaro (ed.), Demostene, Contro Leptine. Introduzione, traduzione e commento storico, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2016, in: Exemplaria Classica, 22 (2018), S. 245-247, DOI: 10.33776/ec.v22i0.3506, heruntergeladen über Website

**exemplaria**  
C L A S S I C A  
Journal of Classical Philology

## copyright

This article may be downloaded and/or used within the private copying exemption. Any further use without permission of the rights owner shall be subject to legal licences (§§ 44a-63a UrhG / German Copyright Act).

MIRKO CANEVARO, *Demostenes, Contro Leptine. Introduzione, traduzione e commento storico*. Texte und Kommentare, 55. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2016, ix+529 pp., \$168, ISBN 978-3-11-048868-5.

This work, *Demostenes, Contro Leptine. Introduzione, traduzione e commento storico* by Mirko Canevaro, is divided into four main parts: introduction, text and translation, commentary, and abbreviations, bibliography and indexes.

The introduction itself is divided into fifteen parts. In the first part, Canevaro discusses the context of Athenian public finances that are implicit on Demosthenes' speech *Against Leptines*. It covers the financial rupture caused by the Social War (357-355), based on Demosthenes' account, referring occasionally Isocrates' and Xenophon's views on the matter.

In subchapter 2, Canevaro discusses the date of the speech and provides much historical information to date this speech to 356/5, around the last months of the Social War.

In subchapter 3, the author gives a brief account of the steps one would have to take to bring a γραφή νόμων μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θείναι and goes on to discuss the way contradictory laws should be revoked. He asserts the correct procedure for repelling laws based on this very speech and also based on Demosthenes' *Against Timocrates*. Canevaro supports his argument with linguistic examples, and there is no lack of explanations and clear interpretations of expressions used by Demosthenes on laws cited, concerning the replacement of old laws in the process of *nomothesia*. Canevaro argues that Demosthenes was not trying to deceive the jurors by proposing an immediate substitute law for approval in the *Against Leptines*' speech but knew that the replacing law would have to go through the *nomothetai* for approval after the contradictory one was repealed by the jurors.

In the fourth part of the introduction, Canevaro discusses the participants' names of this speech and how were they relevant or what have they achieved socially and politically. He tries to identify Leptines itself, Batippo, the first trying to prosecute Leptines' law, his son Apsephion, Phormio, Ctesippus, for the accusation team; and for the defense team, the *syndikoi*, Leodamas of Acharnae, Aristophon of Hazenia, Cephisodotus of Ceramicus and Dinias of Herchia.

In subchapter 5, he reviews the scholarship around the enactment of the Leptines' law and gives a brief account of the state of art on this subject. Canevaro argues that besides political parties, friendships or enmities,

Athenians would act and vote according to their own and to the polis' convenience. He then concludes that circumstances dictated why such a law, as Leptine's law, was passed in a first moment, but later repealed by a γραφή νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θεῖναι and then repealed.

In the first five subchapters, Canevaro discusses mainly the procedure of *nomothesia*. From this subchapter on, Canevaro starts discussing the meaning and content behind this speech and the liturgical system of Athens. He lists the several existent liturgies on fourth century Athens and gives an account of how many citizens were contributing to these taxes and an explanation for the purpose of the most prestigious and profitable ones: the trierarchy and the *eisphora*. He relates the political, military and social context of the aftermath of the Social War to the need for redistributing and organizing the symmories in order to get more revenue.

In subchapter 7, Canevaro discusses the types of *ateleia* in existence during fourth-century Athens and the contradiction/ misinformation on Demosthenes' speech about what types of *ateleia* the Leptines' law intended to abolish. He then explains what were the implications of the lack of citizens liable to liturgical service, only to confirm a contradictory interpretation given by Demosthenes of the Leptines' law regarding the equitable distribution.

In subchapter 8, Canevaro essays on the much-debated question whether Demosthenes was, in a first moment, a supporter or not of Eubulus' financial politics, whether there was any type of political groups supporting conjunctive measures or were the political initiatives private, and what was Demosthenes' role in this case, a mere logographer or, in addition to it, a political supporter.

Then Canevaro argues the suitability of the γραφή νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θεῖναι compared to a γραφή παρανόμων for the *Against Leptines'* speech, in what cases should each *graphe* be used, and determines what constitutes philologically the term *epitedeion* and to what it refers, both to the polis and the citizen himself, elaborating on the philosophical aspect of Athenian politics and political *ethos*.

The author then develops the topic of the previous chapter, regarding the dialectical characteristic of merit and convenience when conferring honours by the *demos*. As a circular economic movement, he exploits the concept of *philotimia* and early evergetism and argues in favour of Demosthenes' strategic view in repealing Leptines' law. As Canevaro puts it: "mostrarsi indegni dei servizi evergetici ricevuti comprometterà le prospettive future della città". He discusses the social context of reciprocity between the *demos* and the city in evergetic actions.

The author finishes the introduction stating that the Leptines' law was indeed repealed, for which he gives epigraphical evidence, although remarking on Blass's rejection of Demosthenes' victory.

Subchapters 12, 13, and 14 cover the *conspectus siglorum*, editions and commentaries, and papyri for this speech. Subchapter number 15 of the introduction presents a list of 28 cases where Canevaro does not follow Dilts' critical edition or Kremmydas'. On those cases he discusses his own edition on the commentary section.

For the translation section, Canevaro provides a very competent translation but it is my opinion that in some parts the author offers a somewhat free translation and tries to recreate literary aspects of the Greek text into Italian.

In the commentary section, Canevaro divides the text into groups of paragraphs and summarizes them at the beginning of his commentary. The number of commentaries varies for each paragraph, sometimes going up to more than ten. The commentaries are very rich, informative, full with references from ancient authors and also references to recent bibliography. There are cross references to other paragraphs of the text where the same subject is discussed. The bibliography is up to date and the indexes useful.

Finally, I would like to suggest two corrections for future editions of this work. Throughout the introduction there are several cross references inside the text leading to the commentary section that are very useful, so one should prepare going back and forth many times during the reading. Nonetheless there is one immediate error on page 3, when the text refers to "comm. §65[2]". In the comment section (page 302), there is only one commentary to paragraph number 65.

In the commentary section, I would also strongly suggest that all entries should have the number of the paragraph followed by the number of the commentary. E.g., the commentaries for paragraph number 31 start on page 244 and follow on to page 251. Commentary number [3] is on page 248, and commentaries number [4] and [5] are on the following page 249. If at any point of the introduction you are sent to read commentary §31[4], you have to go back to page 244 to see where paragraph number 31 begins (or page 251 to see §32[1]), to go back to commentary number [4] on page 249. If on page 249 it was written "31[4]", instead of only "[4]", we wouldn't have this much trouble.

ELISABETE CAÇÃO<sup>1</sup>

Centro de Estudos Clássicos e Humanísticos  
Universidade de Coimbra  
elisabetecacao@gmail.com

<sup>1</sup> Research developed under the Project UID/ELT/00196/2013 and the PhD scholarship SFRH/BD/111097/2015, funded by the Portuguese FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology.