

Abstracts

Luciano CANFORA, Textgeschichte des Demosthenes im Wandel der Jahrhunderte

This paper focuses on two questions: (a) the Demosthenic “demegoriai” were intended to be actual speeches; the celebrated “pamphlet theory” (Paul-Louis Courier, Eduard Schwartz, Wilamowitz, Karl Hahn) seems to be groundless and self-contradictory; (b) the assembling of the corpus was the work of the Athenian party that continued the great leader’s politics after his death; the creation of such a “corpus” had political, not philological aims: hence the substantial presence of “spuria”.

Herwig MAEHLER, Demosthenes-Kommentare auf Papyrus – Eine vorläufige Übersicht

The remains preserved in papyri of the first five centuries AD of ancient commentaries on Demosthenes show little correlation with the scholia of the medieval manuscripts. While these deal mostly with rhetorical aspects of the orations, the ancient commentators, beginning with Didymus’ *Περὶ Δημοσθένους*, focus mainly on historical and philological questions. The only exception is the beginning of an *hypomnema* on or. 21 (P.Lond.Lit. 179), which betrays the influence of Hermagoras’ classification of ‘issues’ (στάσεις, *status*) already in the first century AD.

László HORVÁTH, Bemerkungen über die Rede XVII im *Corpus Demosthenicum*: Hypereides als Verfasser (?)

The authenticity of or. 17 in the *Corpus Demosthenicum* was already questioned in Antiquity. In his *hypothesis* to this speech, Libanius attributed it to Hyperides together with other speeches particularly on the basis of vocabulary typical of Hyperides’ style. However, it is not only the identification of the author that is problematic; the circumstances of the composition of the speech (e. g. the political situation, date of composition) are also unclear. In this paper, parallels will be drawn between Hyperides’ speeches and or. 17 – although they will probably not solve the questions once and for all, they will definitely support Libanius’ assumption highlighting the obvious similarities in the development of thoughts of the speeches.

Luciano CANFORA, Demosthenes und Hypereides: Ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι

By analyzing the surviving Athenian “logoi epitaphioi” one might infer that none of them is an “actual” speech. Moreover, it is very unlikely that the text preserved in the “Pap. Stobart” is Hyperides’ actual funeral speech, as the author of the preserved speech is aware of events that happened several months after Leosthenes’ funeral rites.

Herbert BANNERT, Zur Sammlung der Prooimien des Demosthenes

Several of the manuscripts of the *Corpus Demosthenicum* preserve a collection of 56 (or, according to the 1974 edition of Robert Clavaud, 55) preambles to Assembly speeches. The passages are roughly the same length, comprising the beginning and the first sentences of a speech; five passages correspond closely to the beginning of five of Demosthenes’ Assembly speeches. But the last three pieces of the collection differ, because they do not present the beginning of a speech, but discuss certain special problems: pr. 54 on sacrifice, pr. 55 on the iteration of the *strategoï* in Athens, and finally, pr. 56, a kind of *memorandum*, summarizing some aspects of the rhetor’s behavior, especially when the audience is unruly and heckles. Some central points in the text are discussed in the light of other passages, e. g. of the *prooemia* and of the Ps.-Aristotelian *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*.

Konstantinos A. KAPPARIS, The Transmission of Apollodoros and the Edition of Mervin Dilts

Ever since Arnold Schaefer tentatively suggested that several of the speeches in the *Corpus Demosthenicum* were actually written by Apollodoros, scholars began to study Apollodoros as an author in his own right, but no independent edition of his *Corpus* has been published. As a result, Apollodoros has been overshadowed by Demosthenes for millennia. The recent edition of Demosthenes by Mervin Dilts following established patterns retains the traditional order of the Demosthenic *Corpus*. In this paper I discuss the merits and tactics of the edition of Dilts with regard to the speeches of Apollodoros and try to answer the question whether an independent edition of the Apollodoran *Corpus* is necessary. As part of this investigation, I briefly comment on Apollodoros as an author and a litigator, discuss the authority of F and Q with regard to the *Corpus* of Apollodoros, and focus upon a number of select textual points from three Apollodoran speeches (D. 53, 47, 46). I compare the edition of Dilts with previous printed editions, assess its merits and propose an emendation (46.18). The ultimate objective is to explore how the Apollodoran *Corpus* has fared within

the latest edition of the Demosthenic *Corpus*, and make a contribution towards a better understanding of this underappreciated author.

Donal Spence MCGAY, The Weak Contamination in the Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Or. 54, κατὰ Κόνωνα

This paper presents the evidence of the limited examples of contamination in the manuscript tradition of Demosthenes' oration 54, κατὰ Κόνωνα, and explores some possible reasons for this weak contamination. Five manuscripts (SAFQD) which contain *Against Conon* are considered primary manuscripts and have been dated to the 9th/10th century (SA), the 10th century (F) and the 10th/11th century (QD). Of the twenty-six extant manuscripts that contain or. 54, only eight report γράφεται variants: five belong to the F family (FQDBVc) and three manuscripts belong to the A branch (ViVsAi). No papyrus fragments of κατὰ Κόνωνα have yet been found, but several testimonia survive that prove that the tradition of or. 54 diverged in antiquity. Nevertheless, the extent of contamination in the κατὰ Κόνωνα is less severe than in other orations of Demosthenes.

Felipe G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, The Transmission of the Demosthenic Text: Open Issues

This paper deals with the following four “open issues” related to the transmission of Demosthenic text: (1.) The testimony of the papyri and their relationship to the main Demosthenic *veteres*. (2.) The contribution of the *recentiores*, especially those preserved in Spanish libraries. The *vetus* Matrit. UCM 30. (3.) The Aldine edition(s) and the problem of its (their) sources, and (4.) The “scriptio plena” and the testimony of the *veteres*. The “law of μέν–δέ” of Demosthenic authenticity.

Stefano MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, Some Remarks about the Relationship between the Primary Witnesses of the *Corpus Demosthenicum*

In my paper, I will discuss the results of a fresh collation of manuscripts S (Paris. gr. 2934), A (Monac. gr. 485), F (Marc. gr. 416), D (Ambr. D 112 sup.) and Q (Marc. gr. 418) for a couple of counter-indictments (*paragraphai*), i. e. *Against Zenothemis* (32) and *Against Apaturius* (33). My aim is to elucidate – if possible – the relationships between the primary witnesses for part of the more or less compact *corpusculum* of the *paragraphikoi logoi*, in particular for two speeches that arguably had a limited circulation: a scarcity of quotations, along with the circumstance that, to date, no relevant papyri have been found, may suggest that much. Moreover, the speech *Against Zenothemis* is the only one in

the whole *Corpus* with a mutilated ending, and one might expect that this should have prevented contamination. Nevertheless, this is not the case. My conclusion is that even short speeches, which could fit in a single roll or, later, in a small *codex-corporisculum*, went through their own *Einzelüberlieferung*. As a matter of fact, interaction between *Einzelüberlieferung* and *Corpusüberlieferung* is in my opinion a major factor influencing contamination. I will conclude my paper with some remarks about the relationship between *Textüberlieferung* and editorial technique.

Ernst GAMILLSCHEG, Demosthenes in Konstantinopel: Zur Lokalisierung von Cod. Par. gr. 2934

Cod. Par. gr. 2934 is known as an important witness for the text of Demosthenes. It belongs to the manuscripts written in the minuscule “tipo Anastasio”, which can be localized in Constantinople and later in Southern Italy. This codex Parisinus of Demosthenes contains marginal notes concerning Byzantine history of the late 12th century and is a testimony for the book production in the capital of the Byzantine Empire.

Brigitte MONDRAIN, Le rôle de quelques manuscrits dans l'histoire du texte de Démosthène : remarques paléographiques et philologiques

The manuscript tradition of Demosthenes has been much studied by the different editors but, as is of course legitimate, primarily from a philological perspective. By examining a few specific manuscripts, this paper proposes briefly to illustrate two aspects that can help us in understanding the relationships that exist between the manuscripts of Demosthenes and to put them in the historical context in which they were copied and then read: the question of the dating of the witnesses and the relationship between the text and the notes and scholia that comment the text.

The famous codex S, Parisinus gr. 2934, is considered by all editors of Demosthenes to be the oldest witness of his corpus of works, and is dated at the end of the 9th or at the beginning of the 10th century. The Monacensis gr. 485 is dated to the beginning of the 10th century or, occasionally, possibly to the 9th–10th century. But the examination of the script in the Monacensis and its confrontation with the script in another Munich manuscript, the Monacensis gr. 331, suggest an earlier dating, to the middle of the 9th century, thus making it the oldest manuscript.

The dating of other manuscripts less important for the history of the text of Demosthenes should be also reviewed. Thus Fi, Laurentianus 59.10, apograph of another manuscript later than A but also famous, B, Monacensis gr. 85, dates

back to the 14th century and is the work of scribe and scholar John, whose production as a copyist is important and diverse – he worked with Maximos Planudes, Nikephoros Moschopoulos, and with Nikephoros Gregoras in particular.

A palaeographical and codicological study of manuscript B is taken as a starting point to analyse the question of the relationship between the text and the notes and scholia, in order to help solve the vexed question of its relationship to the manuscript F, Marcianus gr. 416: B has been frequently said to be an apograph of F for the text but it has also often been said that there was an intermediary between the two manuscripts for the scholia.

Lisa BENEDETTI, L'interpunzione di Philippica III, 28–40; 59–68 nei manoscritti Par. gr. 2934, Par. gr. 2935, Monac. gr. 485, Marc. gr. Z 416

The aim of this article is to compare the punctuation of fragmentary witnesses (P.Fay. 8, P.Oxy. LXII 4333 and P.Mich. inv. 918) with the one present in primary manuscripts of Demosthenes' tradition, at §§ 28–40 and 59–68 of the *Third Philippic*. The occurrences of the three types of punctuation (τελεία, μέση, ὑποστιγμή) and the praxis used to separate the text into paragraphs have been examined. By comparing medieval manuscripts with earlier testimonies, it turns out that they are unanimous only in placing the τελεία to signal a pause at the end of a sentence or sometimes to signal an interrogative meaning.

Lorenzo Maria CIOLFI, Demostene nel X secolo. Il caso del Laur. 59.9

A close codicological examination of Laur. 59.9 and a detailed palaeographical analysis of its different scribes highlight some special features of this manuscript – one of the five oldest Byzantine witnesses of Demosthenes. This codex, which has always remained in the background of philological studies, could now provide some useful details helping to analyse and to interpret the readings of the Demosthenic *Corpus* and should shed light on the concept of classicism itself, during the middle Byzantine period.

Jana GRUSKOVÁ, Paläographisch-kodikologische Betrachtungen zu den *vetustissimi* des Demosthenes unter philologischen Gesichtspunkten

This paper presents a project of the Austrian Science Fund, being carried out at the Austrian Academy of Sciences in Vienna, that focuses on the textual transmission of Demosthenes from Antiquity to the 11th century. In this project, particular emphasis has been placed on a comprehensive re-examination, a detailed description as well as a more extensive critical documentation of the oldest Byzantine manuscripts of the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, dating from the 9th to the

11th centuries. Achievements in the field of Greek palaeography in the past 40 years have opened new approaches and have brought us to update the previous knowledge on the extant manuscripts; numerous new findings concerning the Byzantine scribes and scholars have offered substantial revisions and additions. A brief survey of the *codices vetustissimi* of Demosthenes (with some images) serves to illustrate the topic.

Sofia KOTZABASSI, Demosthenes im 13. Jahrhundert

The paper first considers the question of a systematic study of the manuscript tradition of Demosthenes based on correct datings and new palaeographical and codicological data. It then examines (a) the position of Paris. gr. 2998 (whose main copyist was the scholarly Patriarch of Constantinople Gregory of Cyprus, 1283–1289) within this tradition; (b) the information provided by Gregory's letters about some manuscripts, among them one belonging to Theodora Raoulaina which he intended to give to the scribe Melitas to be copied; and (c) the possibility that Melitas' copy is codex Malatestianus D.XXVII.1.