T. Dorandi (ed.): *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxxviii + 72 (2–42 text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00475-0.

R. W. Sharples

The Classical Review / Volume 50 / Issue 02 / October 2000, pp 584 - 585
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00400053, Published online: 12 April 2006

T. DORANDI (ed.): *Antigone de Caryste. Fragments* (Collection des Universités de France publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Pp. cxxxviii + 72 (2–42 text double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1999. Cased. ISBN: 2-251-00475-0.

From editing Philodemus' *History of Philosophers* Tiziano Dorandi has gone on to produce a

definitive collection of the fragments of Antigonus of Carystus; ten of the seventy-six texts included here are drawn from Philodemus. The thirty-two texts drawn from Diogenes Laertius rest on new collations.

Collections of the evidence for ancient writers whose works are now lost can be either generous or restricted in their scope. D.'s edition is of the latter type; a few reports which do not mention Antigonus by name are included, but they are very much in the minority.

A very full introduction (123 pages, as against forty-one pages of Greek and Latin texts) establishes the scope of Antigonus' activity, ascertaining which reports refer to him and which to others, and giving a systematic account of earlier scholarship. D. follows O. Musso ('Sulla struttura del Cod. Pal. Gr. 398 e deduzioni storico-letterarie', *Prometheus* 2 [1976], 1–10) in denying to Antigonus the authorship of the paradoxographical collection attributed to him but in fact dating from the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus in the tenth century A.D. Four sections of the 173 in that collection do, however, make their way into D.'s edition as deriving from the real Antigonus' work *On Animals*. (One of these four, Pseudo-Antigonus 10.2 = 52B Dorandi, is missing from the *index fontium* on p. 69.) D. further quotes with apparent approval (p. xvi and n.2) Musso's argument (in *Michele Psello: Nozioni paradossali* [Naples, 1977], pp. 15–17) that paradoxography, the description of wonders just as such, was not a separate ancient literary genre at all, but a Byzantine construct.

D. accepts the identification of Antigonus, who he suggests was born *c*. 290 B.C., not only as the author of *Lives of the Philosophers* but also as the sculptor reported by Pliny (*Nat. hist.* 34.84) as both practising and writing on the art. He counters Andreae's argument that the sculptor worked on the memorial to the victory of Eumenes II over the Galatians in 184 B.C., and must therefore be later than the biographer, interpreting Pliny as implying only that Antigonus worked on the memorial to the victory of Attalus I in 241 B.C.

On the character of the *Lives* D. argues that our evidence is too slight to draw general conclusions; previous discussions have accepted too readily Wilamowitz's more generous view of the amount of material deriving from Antigonus (p. xliv). Nevertheless, D. maintains, in the case of the life of Polemo there is enough evidence for a reconstruction, which supports the view that Antigonus was above all interested in portraying the characters of those he remembered from his youth, rather than in their doctrines or writings; his writings were memoirs rather than biographies in the Peripatetic or Alexandrian sense. It is possible that they were not concerned only with philosophers; we simply do not know.

In addition to fifty-four texts deriving from or referring to the *Lives*, and eight relating to the work on sculpture and painting, D. also includes ten from *On Animals* and four (concerned with sea creatures) from the work Περὶ λέξεως (on which D. justly remarks that lack of evidence makes it difficult to know how to translate the title). But he distinguishes our Antigonus from the poet of the first century B.C., and from the authors of a *History of Italy* and a geographical description of Macedonia.

D. explicitly acknowledges at the outset that his aim is different from, and narrower than, that of Wilamowitz in his *Antigonos von Karystos*. The great learning shown in D.'s introduction is directed to the particular aim of identifying what we can and what, given the state of the evidence, we cannot know about Antigonus' works. There is full discussion of the extent to which Pliny and Diogenes Laertius may have drawn on Antigonus; but D. does not cast his net wider and investigate or list all parallels to his texts. For example, the statement that mice on the island of Gyarus gnaw iron, attributed to Antigonus by Stephanus of Byzantium (fr. 51A in D.) and also found in the Pseudo-Antigonus paradoxography (18 = fr. 51B D.), is attributed to Theophrastus by Pliny, *Nat. hist.* 8.222. Unless Pliny is mistaken, either the genuine Antigonus was dependent on Theophrastus, or both drew their information from a common source or tradition. The same report is also found in the Pseudo-Aristotle *Mirabilia* (25); D. notes in general terms (p. xxiv) that material from Antigonus' *On Animals* appears in the *Mirabilia*, and argues that the fact that it does so is evidence for the existence of the former work.

D.'s collection will form the basis for future discussion of these wider questions. I, at least, would have referred to 'Antigonus' more cautiously in the past if D.'s edition had already been available.

University College London R. W. SHARPLES