

DONAL SPENCE MCGAY

The Weak Contamination in the Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Or. 54, κατὰ Κόνωνος

The Manuscripts which contain or. 54:¹

Codices vetustissimi:

S = Parisinus gr. 2934 (9th/10th cent.)

A = Monacensis gr. 485 (9th/10th cent.)

F = Marcianus gr. Z 416 (= 536) (10th cent.)

Q = Marcianus gr. Z 418 (= 312) (10th/11th cent.)

D = Ambrosianus D 112 sup. (10th/11th cent.)

Codices recentiores:

Ai = Ambrosianus E 119 sup. (15th cent.)

B = Monacensis gr. 85 (13th cent.)

Cd = Malatestianus plut. D.XXVII.1 (13th cent.)

Fh = Laurentianus plut. 59.8 (15th cent.)

K = Parisinus gr. 2998 (13th cent.)

Lb = Leidensis Perizonianus Q 4 (a 1457)

Ln = Londiniensis Addit. 39617 (14th cent.)

Lp = Londiniensis Lambeth Palace 1207 (13th cent.)

Mk = Marcianus gr. Z 417 (= 839) (late 14th cent.)

Mm = Marcianus gr. Z 420 (= 860) (14th cent.)

Na = Neapolitanus II.E.11 (15th cent.)

Nc = Neapolitanus II.E.13 (13th cent.)

Pu = Parisinus gr. 2997 (14th cent.)

R = Parisinus gr. 2936 (14th cent.)

Sh = Skokloster, Bielke (15th cent.)

Vc = Vaticanus gr. 69 (13th cent.)

vg (= Xg) = Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 172 (15th cent.)

Vi = Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 224 (15th cent.)

¹ No papyri have been found containing any part of or. 54.

Genealogy of the *recentiores* for or. 54:

- B: copy of F.
- Vc: derives from F, shares conjunctive errors with Mm, but introduces separative errors against Mm.
- Mm: derives from F, shares conjunctive errors with Vc, but introduces separative errors against Vc.
- Vi: derives from A, shares conjunctive errors with VI, but introduces separative errors against AVI. There are several shared readings of ViVI which agree with SF against A.
- VI: derives from A, shares conjunctive errors with Vi, but introduces separative errors against AVi. There are several shared readings of ViVI which agree with SF against A.
- Cd: derives from A, but reports many corrected readings whose source is F.
- K: apograph of A, and source of NaNcVs (Vs before correction).
- Na: copy of K, and shares conjunctive errors with NcVs^a, but has separative errors against KNcVs^a.
- Nc: copy of K, and shares conjunctive errors with NaVs^a, but has separative errors against KNaVs^a.
- Vs: copy of K, and shares conjunctive errors with NaNc, but has separative errors against KNaNc. Vs is corrected and has added variant readings from unidentifiable ms. or mss.
- R: copy of A, and source of Fhvg.
- Fh: copy of R, and source of vg.
- vg (= Xg): apograph of Fh.
- Lp: copy of A, and source of PuShvrLnMkLbAi.
- Pu: copy of Lp, and source of Sh, shares conjunctive errors with ShvrLnMkLbAi, but has separative errors against LpvrLnMkLbAi.
- Sh: copy of Pu, and shares conjunctive errors with vrLnMkLbAi, and introduces separative errors against LpPuvrLnMkLbAi.
- vr (= Xq): copy of Lp, shares conjunctive errors with PuShLnMkLbAi, but has separative errors against LpPuShLnMkLbAi.

- Ln: copy of Lp, shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrMkLbAi, but has separative errors against LpPuShvrMkLbAi.
- Mk: copy of Lp, and source of Lb, shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnLbAi, but has separative errors against LpPuShLpvrLnAi.
- Lb: apograph of Mk, and shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnMkAi, and introduces separative errors against LpPuShvrLnMkAi.
- Ai: copy of Lp, shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnMkLb, but has separative errors against LpPuShvrLnMkLb.

Upon reviewing the evidence of my examination and collation⁵ of the manuscript witnesses for or. 54 of Demosthenes, κατὰ Κόνωνα, I have made note of the striking lack of strong contamination among the *codices recentiores* that contain the text of or. 54. In the most general terms, and unlike the transmission of most other orations in the *Corpus Demosthenicum* whose primary and secondary mss. have been collated,⁶ the codices for or. 54 suffer from very little cross-contamination. The short length of the *Against Conon*, which contains forty-four paragraphs and covers only sixteen pages in Dilts' OCT edition, may account for its ostensible purity from contamination. But, when considering that scribes are including other orations into the same codex, and that these orations often contain interpolations from a variety of sources, the size of an oration like or. 54 should not be the primary factor in explaining its weak contamination.

Another possible answer for the very weak contamination is that or. 54 survives in only twenty-six medieval codices, though a number of lost intervening manuscripts can be proven to have existed, and the Aldine editions of or. 54 contain several readings that do not appear in any extant mss.⁷ Indeed, twenty-six is a small number, especially for an oration which was praised in antiquity for its style. Although no papyrus survives for or. 54, we do have several ancient testimonia, which, I would argue, show that *Against Conon* was often studied by rhetoricians and grammarians. Thanks to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who

⁵ See MCGAY 2005.

⁶ LEGANÉS MOYA - HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ 2008; KAPPARIS 1999; R. PASSWEG, The Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Oration 24, In *Timocratem*, Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University 1975; D. M. MACDOWELL, Demosthenes, *Against Meidias* (Oration 21), Oxford 1991; D. M. MACDOWELL, Demosthenes, *On the False Embassy* (Oration 19), Oxford 2000; M. R. DILTS, *Scholia Demosthenica*, 2 vols., Leipzig 1983–1986; and D. IRMER, Zur Genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften: Untersuchungen an den Reden 8 und 9, Hamburg 1972 (*Hamburger Philologische Studien*, 20).

⁷ Presumably these readings which were not conjectures were culled from mss. that were used and then discarded.

reported a large portion of the speech in the first century BC, we can attempt to evaluate the version he had *in manu* (*Demosthenes* 12).⁸ Dionysius excerpted paragraphs 3–9 of the *Against Conon* for his discussion of *ethopoeia* or characterization, and reported that the speech was very Lysianic in style. In fact, Dionysius mused that since the *Against Conon* was so similar in subject matter and style to the *Against Tisis* of Lysias, that, had the speeches been transmitted outside of their respective corpora, their authorship might be confused:

ἡδονῆς δὲ ἄρα καὶ πειθοῦς καὶ χαρίτων καιροῦ τε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης τῆς τοῖς Λυσιακοῖς ἐπανθούσης ἀρετῆς οὐχὶ πολλὴ μοῖρα; οὐκ ἔνεστι ἄλλως εἰπεῖν. εἰ γοῦν μὴ διὰ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, οὐ τινός ἐστιν, ἑκάτερος τῶν λόγων γνώριμος ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀνεπιγράφοις περιετύχομεν αὐτοῖς, οὐ πολλοὺς ἂν ἡμῶν οἶομαι διαγνῶναι ῥαδίως, πότερος Δημοσθένους ἐστὶν ἢ Λυσίου· τοσαύτην οἱ χαρακτήρες ὁμοίότητα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχουσι. (D. H., *Demosthenes* 13)

“Does it (*Against Conon*) certainly not possess a great degree of the charm, persuasiveness, elegance, a timely use of grace and every other excellent feature which embellishes the speeches of Lysias? I cannot deny it. If each of the speeches was not identified by the title to which author each belonged, but we happened to have them anonymously, I do not think that many of us could easily determine which was by Demosthenes or which by Lysias. The characteristics of each speech have so great a similarity.”

Pasquali observes caution when considering the value of the indirect tradition of the text of Dionysius: “Il testo adottato da Dionigi è notoriamente pessimo: esso mostra in che condizioni si poteva ridurre un oratore nelle scuole dei retori.”⁹ Gernet concludes that Dionysius must have had multiple exemplars when quoting from the orations of Demosthenes: “Nous observons, d’ailleurs, que chacun d’eux (Dionysius and Harpocration) avait plusieurs exemplaires, parfois, à sa disposition.”¹⁰ Gernet also believes that some of the readings of Dionysius are “recommandables.”¹¹ As a whole, the citation from the *Against Conon* by Dionysius agrees with the readings of the A family against SFQD.¹² Interestingly enough, the tradition of Dionysius’ text for the *Against Conon* offers several peculiar variants which do not appear in any surviving mss., including A. Are we then to assume that the citation of Dionysius is an isolated iteration whose sources have not survived and did not have any bearing on the

⁸ For quote of the scholia in its entirety, see DILTS 1986, 469a, 508.

⁹ PASQUALI²1952, 288.

¹⁰ GERNET I, 1954, 14.

¹¹ GERNET I, 1954, 15.

¹² FUHR 1914, xx; PASQUALI²1952, 288; MCGAY 2005, 22.

subsequent transmission of extant manuscripts? It is unlikely that Dionysius was quoting such a large passage from memory, but it is quite probable that Dionysius or his associates made changes to the text.¹³ And whatever changes were made in his text apparently did not find a home in any of the mss. of Demosthenes, as evidenced by my collation.

A comparison of the studies cited above shows that the orations *inter se* may have similar traditions, but rarely share the exact same line of transmission. The manuscript tradition of or. 54, as my examination corroborates, is unique. Kapparis underscores the value of collating individual orations, but with the following caveat: "It is clear that inappropriate use and uncritical application of studies of the Demosthenic manuscripts based on other speeches could be misleading and create the wrong picture. The only reliable way of establishing precisely the relationships between manuscripts and evaluating their authority, when it comes to the speech 'Against Neaira', is to collate the sections containing this speech."¹⁴

The reasons for this variability in transmission among the manuscripts are numerous. Internal evidence, for example, of γράφεται variants and other marginalia, reveal that a scribe often had more than one manuscript in front of him during transcription. Consequently, a scribe might introduce variant readings into his text, with or without acknowledging his sources, or the scribe might incorporate variants from a predecessor who himself had access to other copies of the oration. Indeed, corruptions and interpolations, scribal conjectures and emendations, may predate the extant mss. by several generations and stem from the Byzantine or Hellenistic periods or earlier. Moreover, during transcription a scribe often quit copying from one exemplar and switched to a different witness, sometimes changing traditions even in the middle of an oration.¹⁵ There are several other instances where it can be proved that scribes were using multiple sources.¹⁶ The result in many cases is a contamination across lines of transmission between manuscripts.

Of the twenty-six extant manuscripts that contain or. 54, only eight report γράφεται variants. Five belong to the F family (FQDBVc)¹⁷ and three manu-

¹³ FUHR 1914, xx.

¹⁴ KAPPARIS 1999, 61.

¹⁵ For two examples of this abrupt change of traditions in the middle of an oration, see MACDOWELL 1990, 60. Mm (Marcianus gr. 420), a ms. which also carries or. 54, follows readings from the F family up to § 154, then from § 154 on bears A family readings.

¹⁶ For example, codex A carries two different versions of or. 51, and FQD all repeat the συγγραφή of or. 35; in both these examples, the versions derive from different exemplars. See GERNET I, 1954, 17, 20; FUHR 1914, xix–xx.

¹⁷ For or. 54, six manuscripts can be said to belong to the F branch: F (10th cent.), Q (10th/11th cent.), D (10th/11th cent.), B (13th cent.), Vc (13th cent.), and Mm (14th cent.).

cripts belong to the A branch (ViVsAi).¹⁸ FQD often report the very same γράφεται variants, leading to the conclusion that they were merely copying marginal notes from their source (or sources) and not looking at other manuscripts during transcription:

20.7 συνειλεγμένοι] SAF^{yp}·Q^{yp}·D^{yp}, συνηγμένοι FQD

27.12 ἥδη SAFQDBCd, ἔτι F^{yp}·Q^{yp}·B^{yp}.

28.14 ληχθῆναι A¹, δειχθῆναι SF^{yp}·Q^{yp}·B^{yp}·MmVcVi^{yp}, λεχθῆναι A^cFQDBCd

31.11 χαριμένους SACdRVi, χαρῖμένους FQDMmVi^{yp}·Vc

The corrections for F are in the same hand as the text for or. 54, and as well as for the entire codex.¹⁹ All these γράφεται variants are *intra familiam* F branch, and show agreement with SA (20.7) or with S (28.14) or against SAFQD (27.12). In his examination of or. 21, MacDowell initially believed that F was a contamination of S and A, and thus held an “intermediate position of value between S and A.”²⁰ He noticed that readings in F at times agreed with S and at other times with A, yet he believed that the greater part of the text of F could not be derived from either S or A. In his opinion, the “conflationary character of F” was the result of the “scribe of F picking and choosing readings from S and A, and sometimes includes both leading to nonsense.”²¹ Consequently, MacDowell conjectured that F could not represent a third line of transmission, because its text and even its errors resembled S and A too closely.²²

MacDowell later revised these views upon his examination of or. 19, now believing F must have had access to a separate and ancient line of transmission due to his analysis of documents and stichometry.²³ In the first place, F carries thirty-nine lines of a quote from Solon, whereas A has only four lines of the quote, and S omits it altogether. “The only likely explanation is that someone before the end of antiquity found a text of Solon and copied the relevant passage into a copy of Demosthenes, and that the scribe of F had access to that

¹⁸ Vi (15th cent.), Vs (14th cent. [in the part containing or. 54]), and Ai (15th cent.). Vi and Ai do not contain the full oration: Vi ends at § 40 (πιστευθεὶς ἄν κατὰ πάντα) and Ai terminates at § 26 (ἐποιοῦν βούλομαι πρὸς).

¹⁹ MACDOWELL 1990, 54.

²⁰ MACDOWELL 1990, 51.

²¹ MACDOWELL 1990, 51.

²² MACDOWELL 1990, 52–53: MacDowell includes readings of F that differ from S and A which could be correct readings, though he notes that these are not “impressive”.

²³ MACDOWELL 2000, 35–36. The two documents are quotations from Sophokles and Solon. The quote of Solon is not transmitted in S and only partially in A. Since F has more complete versions of the documents, and since it is unlikely that they were added after antiquity, codex F must derive from an ancient ms., distinct from S and A.

copy (or a subsequent copy of it) but the scribes of S and A had not.²⁴ Or. 54 does not carry any documents or quotes.

The other example MacDowell offers of a divergence of SF that occurred in antiquity involves stichometry. The tradition of A does not report any stichometric notations, but SFQ do. Stichometry, or the Hellenistic practice of numbering of every one hundred lines of text, was copied out in most of the orations in SFQ. For or. 19, MacDowell noticed two different stichometric numberings, one for S, another for FQ which was based on shorter lines. Yet, as an interesting point of fact, SFQ each end or. 19 with the stichometric sum of XXX HH Γ^Δ ΔΔΔ or 3, 280. This tally corresponds with the lines in S and not those in FQ.²⁵ MacDowell believes the stichometry found in the text of S to be the original numbering, and that at some point in antiquity a scribe devised his own stichometry for his copy which is the ancestor of FQ, but failed to change the original sum at the end of the oration.²⁶

For or. 54, the final stichometry in SQ reads HHHH Γ^Δ Δ or 460 in acrophonic numerals, while F lacks stichometry for the *Against Conon*. Both SQ show sporadic traces of the stichometric lettering in the margin. S and Q have stichometric agreement at one point in the middle of or. 54 – at paragraph 28.17, then again at the end of the speech, they both have the stichometric sum of 460.

Stichometric/ Label Letter	codex S	codex Q
A	missing	missing
B	εἰς ἡ κακηγορίας (§ 17.22)	missing
Γ	τὰ πλείστα (§ 28.17)	-φαῖνον τὸ πρῶτον (§ 28.17)
Δ	missing	missing
end	HHHH Γ ^Δ Δ	HHHH Γ ^Δ Δ

²⁴ MACDOWELL 2000, 36.

²⁵ MACDOWELL 2000, 38.

²⁶ MACDOWELL 2000, 38: “S’s numbering is the original one, possibly going back as early as the Hellenistic period. At some later date one scribe, whose lines were roughly shorter, wrote the marginal letters against every hundredth line in his own copy, though without changing the total written at the end; and F and Q are both descended from that copy, whereas S is not.”

For the text of the *Against Conon*, there exists a closer affinity of the F branch to codex S, since F(QD) almost always agree with S when S is correct. When A offers a variant reading to S, F does not agree with A. The few instances where AF agree against S are not impressive:

- 10.11 εἷς τε τὸ] S, εἰς τὸ AF(QD)
 10.15 κομίσαι] S, κομίσαι <με> AF(QD)
 15.2 ὑβρίσθαι] S, ὑβρισθῆναι AF(QD)

As for the three manuscripts that belong to the A family which have γράφεται variants (ViVsAi), both Vs and Ai show report marginal readings of no value which have not been transmitted in any extant codices. Despite agreement with SF against A at 43.1, there is no other evidence to conclude that the scribe of Vs was considering a ms. from the S or F family. The scribe of Vs admits that he was looking at other manuscripts, but the data (or lack of data) suggest that he was not including readings from other mss. in a systematic or comprehensive way. Outside of 43.1, Vs does not have any readings that derive from any primary mss. other than A.

- 20.8 ἐρωῶντες] AFQDKNaNcVs¹, ἐρωτες S, ἐρωτῶντες Vs^{yp}.
 36.25 περιέρχονται] SAFQDKNaNcVs, παρέρχονται Vs^{yp}.
 43.1 σκοπεῖτε] SFQDCd²Vs, σκοπεῖν τε ACd¹KNaNcVs^{yp}.
 43.1 δὴ] AK^cNaVs, δεῖ K^aNcVs^{yp}.

There is only one γράφεται variant in Ai at 17.20, which acknowledges a reading from another manuscript which does not survive:

- 17.20 τὰναντία] SAFQDAi, ἐναντίας Ai^{yp}.

The situation is quite different when we look at the γράφεται variants and the readings in Vi, which essentially belongs to the A branch because it carries the majority of the errors of A. In the margin the scribe of the text of Vi often writes ἐν ἄλλῳ κείμεναι, ἐν ἄλλοις κείμεναι, or ἐν παλαιῷ γρ., thus reporting the marginalia and γράφεται variants from his source, or that he was copying from more than one ms. at time of transcription. Voemel observes that the marginal notes of Vi are in the same hand as the text.²⁷ Voemel, who examined or. 37 (*In Pantaenetum*) and the *argumenta* of the private orr. in this codex, found that Vi belongs to the F family, but has been corrected in many places with other mss. In like manner for or. 54, it is clear that the text of Vi is contaminated from the F branch, as the following readings show:

²⁷ VOEMEL 1857, 254.

- 3.7 δέ] SACdVi^a, om. FQDBMmVi^{yp}·VI
 6.14 τοῖς] SFQDVi^{yp}, ὡς ACdViVi^a
 7.24 τῶν] SAFQDCd¹Vi^{yp}, τοῦ Cd²ViVI
 9.18–19 τινὰ καὶ] SFQDVi^{yp}, τινὰ <ᾱ> καὶ ACdVi^aVI
 9.19 ὀνομάζειν] SFQDCdVi^{yp}, λέγειν ACdVi^aVI
 18.26 μηδέ] SAViVI, ἢ FQDVi^{yp}.
 18.28 τοῦ] SFQDVi^{yp}, τῷ ACdViVI
 19.4 εἶναι] AFQDCdVi^a, om. S, τὸ εἶναι Vi^c
 20.7 συνειλεγμένοι] SAF^{yp}·Q^{yp}·(καὶ)D^{yp}·CdVi, συνηγμένοι FQDVi^{yp}, συνει-
 φλεγμένοι VI
 22.28 νυν] SFQDVi^{yp}, <οὔτος> νυνὶ ACdViVI
 23.30 ἐαυτοῦ] FQDCdVi^aVI, εαυτου S, αὐτοῦ Vi^c, αὐτοὺς A
 25.17–18 παρεκελεύσατο] SFQDVi^{yp}, ἐπέταξεν ACdViVI
 26.4 οὐδείς] SACdVi^a, οὐδείς <ἔστιν> FQDVi^cVI
 26.5 οὔτοι] SFQDVi^c, om. ACdVi^aVI
 27.11 οὔτοι] SAFQDCd¹Vi^c, del. Cd², om. Vi^a
 28.14 πρῶτον] SFQDVi^{yp}, τοῦτο ACdVi^aVI
 28.14 ληχθῆναι] A¹, δειχθῆναι SF^{yp}·Q^{yp}·B^{yp}·MmVcVi^{yp}, λεχθῆναι A^cFQDCd
 ViVI
 28.17 ὑβρίσμεν] SAFQDVi^{yp}·VI, ὑβρί Vi
 29.22 φήσει] SFQDCdVi², φησὶν AVi¹VI
 29.22 οὐ] SFQDVi², μὴ ACdVi¹VI
 30.5 αὐτῷ] αὐτῷ FDBVi^{yp}, αὐτω S, αὐτῷ Q, αὐτοῦ ACdViVI
 30.6 καὶ νῦν] ACdViVI, παρ' ὑμῖν SFQDVi^{yp}.
 31.11 Χαίρητιος] SFDB, Χαίριτιος Q, χαίρέτιος Vi^{yp}, Χαίρέτιμος ACdVi¹VI
 31.11 χαριμένους] SACdViVI, χαρῖμένους FQDVi^{yp}.
 37.4 γενοίμεθ' ἄν] SFQDVi^{yp}, ἐγενόμεθα ACdViVI
 39.20 τά] SFQDVi^{yp}, om. ACdViVI
 39.20 κατεσθίειν] ACdViVI, κατακαίειν SFQDVi^{yp}.
 40.25 δέ] SAFQDCdViVI, τε Q^{yp}·Vi^{yp}.

Although Vi^{yp} does agree with Q^{yp} once at 40.25, Vi and Q, as well as Vi^{yp} and Q^{yp}, do not have any other conjunctive errors.

Vi is a relative of VI. ViVI have conjunctive errors, and separative errors against each other, proving the existence of a lost codex²⁸ as their source. ViVI together reproduce approximately 85% of the significant errors of A, so it can be said that they (and their source) are more in the A branch. But, where ViVI do not agree with A they agree with F and even S. The following are errors of A

²⁸ I gave this codex the siglum ε: MCGAY 2005, 76.

which are not carried in either Vi or Vl, thus showing that codex ε was contaminated from F and perhaps slightly by S:

- 7.6 τήν] SFQDBViVl, om. ACd
 8.12 ἐξέδυσαν] SFQDBViVl, ἐξέδυον ACd
 12.2 πάνυ πολλή] SFQDBVi, πάνη πολλῆς Vl, om. ACd
 13.10 τινὰς] SFQDBViVl, om. ACd
 15.2 ὑβρίσθαι] SViVl, ὑβρισθῆναι AFQDCd
 15.5 ἄν τις] S, τις ἄν FQDViVl, τις ACd
 20.6 ἄν] SFQDViVl, ἔάν ACd
 27.5 δ' οὖν] SFQDViVl, γοῦν ACd
 31.9 ἀγνοήσειν] SFQDViVl, ἀγνοεῖν ACd
 32.14 – 15 πιστεύουσιν] SFQDViVl, πιστεύοντας ACd
 32.21 ἔπειτ' αὐτὸς ἐγὼ] SFQDB, ἔπειτ' αὐτὸς ἔγωγε ViVl, οὐτ' αὐτὸς ἔγωγε ACd
 35.14 ἀλλήλοις] SFQDCd²ViVl, ἀλλήλους ACd¹
 36.26 ταυτασί] SFQDViVl, ταύτας ACd
 38.14 ἀποβλέποντας] SFQDViVl, ἀποβλέποντα ACd
 40.26 καὶ] SFQDViVl, καὶ ACd
 40.3 ἄν] SFQDViVl, om. ACd

There is one case where Vi follows SFQD and Vl carries the omission of A:

- 22.28 alterum ὁ] SFQDVi, om. ACdVl

It is clear that codex ε was contaminated from the F family as the following readings show:

- 3.7 δέ] SACdVi^a, om. FQDVi^cVl
 7.20 ποιείσθαι] SACd, ποιήσασθαι FQDViVl
 15.5 ἄν τις] S, τις ACd, τις ἄν FQDViVl
 26.4 οὐδεῖς] SACdVi^a, οὐδεῖς <ἔστιν> FQDVi^cVl

There also seems slight contamination of lost codex ε from the S family as the following readings show, although these may be accidental:

- 9.3 μόγις] SViVl, μόλις AFQDCd
 10.11 εἷς τε τὸ] SVi, εἷς τὸ AFQDCdVl
 15.2 ὑβρίσθαι] SViVl, ὑβρισθῆναι AFQDCd
 33.25 γε πρώτου] S^cVi, γε πρώτον S^lVl, τε πρώτου AFQDCd

The only other manuscript containing the text of or. 54 which shows signs of contamination is the famous Cd or codex Malatestianus plut. D.XXVII.1, 13th century, located in Cesena, Italy.²⁹ Cd should be a reservoir for contamination, because halfway through the codex, the scribe changed traditions. Drerup was the first to notice that codex Cd has two divisions.³⁰ From comparing the order of orr. in the mss., Drerup remarked that the first part of Cd depends on Y (Paris. gr. 2935, 10th cent.), and the second part of Cd, which effectively begins with or. 54, derives from A. The scribe may have demarcated the sections by drawing a thick horizontal bar across the page before writing ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΚΟΝΩΝΟΣ. Recent collations performed on the first part by Passweg (orr. 24), Irmer (orr. 8, 9), and MacDowell (orr. 19, 21) confirm that Cd depends on Y or the Y branch for the text of the orations they examined. MacDowell explained a large omission in or. 19, by suggesting that ms. Cd was copied from a copy of P, which had lost some leaves.³¹ In turn, the first division of Cd, as reported in Passweg, may be the source for the dated ms. Wd (Vienna, Phil. gr. 105, 1300).

But Canfora, who re-examined Cd and its stemmatic relationship, once again challenged traditional opinion by showing that the tradition of Cd is more complicated. While Drerup's observation is true to a certain extent, it is not absolute, for the scribe of Cd tended to alternate traditions or "intertwine his sources."³² The first part of Cd ends with orr. 59, 60, 61, but, according to Canfora, the texts of orr. 59 and 61 depend on S, and not on A or Y.³³ The second part of Cd begins with the title ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΚΟΝΩΝΟΣ, just as it appears in codex A and only in codex A,³⁴ and Cd more or less follows codex A's order of orations.³⁵ Moreover, on the basis of large omissions due to homoioteleuton, Canfora makes a case that Cd is not a descendant of A, but rather derives from the predecessor of A: "Non credo che il Cesenate sia figlio di A"³⁶

²⁹ For a thorough examination of Cd, see L. CANFORA, *Sul Cesenate D.XXVII.1 di Demostene*, RFIC 120 (1992), 292–299; DILTS 1979, 265, n. 7; DRERUP 1899, 580; CANFORA 1968, 35; MACDOWELL 1990, 71–73; MACDOWELL 2000, 39, 44; PASSWEG 1975, 44–49; IRMER 1972, 35, 37; ZAZZERI 1887, 228–229; MIONI 1964, 57–58; VOEMEL 1857, 245–247. CANFORA 1992, 295, shows that or. 59 derives from S.

³⁰ DRERUP 1899, 580.

³¹ MACDOWELL 2000, 44.

³² CANFORA 1992, 295.

³³ CANFORA 1992, 295.

³⁴ It may be relevant to point out that only A family codices use the word ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΙ or the singular ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΣ in the title, whereas F mss. use Κατὰ Κόνωνος αἰκίας for the title. Only ViVl add the words δημοσθένους λόγοι as follows: δημοσθένους λόγοι οἱ λεγόμενοι ἰδιωτικοί Vi, δημοσθένους λόγοι ἰδιωτικοί Vl.

³⁵ Cd does not repeat or. 51 as A does.

³⁶ CANFORA 1992, 298.

and "il Cesenate, nella sua «seconda parte», non ha avuto A come suo modello; probabilmente dipende dal modello di A".³⁷

Since I have found no separative errors of A against Cd for *Against Conon*, I do not have enough evidence to support Canfora's theory that Cd derives from the exemplar of A instead of from A.³⁸ Cd repeats all the significant errors of A for or. 54, except where corrected by a later hand, and aside from a close relationship with R.³⁹ There are, as a result, very few errors in or. 54 due to both the meticulous transcription by the original scribe and the corrections made by later scribes.

A note at the beginning of Cd on folio II tells us the codex was purchased there for twenty-one Byzantine hyperpyra by Nicolò Martinozzi for the birthday of John Galiottes in 1431.⁴⁰ Further notes reveal that Cd was read and corrected several times in the 15th century. An unidentified hand, not a scribe of the text for Cd, writes the date 1412 in his subscription on f. 545^v. Another note on f. 16^v records that Leon Atrapes, Cd³ in Passweg, used Cd to teach Demosthenes in March 1426.⁴¹ Ioannes Chrysoloras⁴² (fl. 1442–1494), claims on f. 544^v that he has corrected the entire manuscript. Chrysoloras appears to be responsible for making most of the corrections and introducing most, if not all, of the scholia in the entire codex. In accord with the findings of Passweg and Dilts, the source for the changes and scholia of or. 54 in Cd was a codex of the F branch. Passweg identifies Chrysoloras as Cd² for or. 24, and I follow the same designation.

The source of Cd² or the readings of Chrysoloras can be discovered in the ViVI mss., which derive from A, but suffered contamination from the F family. Also included on this list are readings where Cd² shows agreement with F:

³⁷ CANFORA 1992, 299.

³⁸ Another argument Canfora put forward for suggesting that Cd is not a copy of A but from the exemplar of A involves a lacuna in or. 50 §§ 53–56. Both scribes of A and of Cd are aware of the lacuna. In Canfora's opinion the scribe of Cd more accurately left 19 lines blank, while the scribe of A left an insufficient 17 lines blank. I tested this theory by counting the number of lines required by A and Cd for three different OCT paragraphs in three different sections of or. 54. In all three tests A used on average 2 fewer lines than Cd. An examination of the size of the letters and words in Cd and in A shows that the scribe of Cd is writing using bigger letters and more elongated words than the scribe of A. And this could account for the two extra blank lines in Cd which Canfora suggests is a more accurate space allotment for the lacuna.

³⁹ Scholium at beginning of the oration: Cd shares variant reading with R. Also, Cd¹R share the minor omission at 38.14: prius tòv] SAFQDCd²ViVI, om. Cd¹R.

⁴⁰ See DILTS 1979, 265. VOEMEL 1857 estimated that the sale price of twenty-one hyperpyra for Cd should be valued at a little more than a ducat (Prolegomena, 245).

⁴¹ See DILTS 1979, 265; PASSWEG 1975, 45. For Leon Atrapes, see RGK, vol. 2.328.

⁴² On Ioannes Chrysoloras, see SOSOWER 1986, 142.

6.11–12 μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ μὴν ἔγωγ' ὥόμην δεῖν οὔτε δίκην λαχεῖν αὐτοῖς] SAFQDCd¹, οὐ μὴν ἔγωγ' ὥόμην δεῖν οὔτε δίκην λαχεῖν αὐτοῖς μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς Cd²ViVi

7.24 τῶν] SAFQDCd¹Vi^{yp}, τοῦ Cd²ViVi

8.14 ἐναλλόμενοι] SAFQDCd^{2c}ViVi, ἐναλλόμενοι Cd¹

8.16 κατέλιπον] D. H. (codex M), καταλείπειν ACd¹, καταλιπεῖν FQDCd²ViVi, καταλιπειν S

11.23 ἰδόντων] AFQDCd²ViVi, εἰδόντων S, ἰδόντων Cd¹

15.3 δόξει] SFQDCd²ViVi, δόξη ACd¹

23.30 αὐτοῦ] Cd²Vi: αὐτοῦ ACd¹Vi, ἑαυτοῦ FQD, εαυτου S

27.11 οὔτοι] SAFQDCd¹Vi^cVi, om. Vi^a, del. Cd²

35.14 ἀλλήλοισι] SFQDCd²ViVi, ἀλλήλους ACd¹

38.9 ἐπαράσασθαι] S^cCd²Vi, ἐπαράσασθαι S¹AFQDCd¹Vi

42.20 ἐμίσει] SFQDCd², μισεῖ ACd¹

43.1 σκοπεῖτε] SFQDBCd², σκοπεῖν τε ACd¹

At 6.11, I observed the deletion of μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς (Cd¹). Several erasures are visible throughout Cd; presumably they are the emendations of Chrysoloras. The fact that Cd² also corrects accents, demonstrates how closely he inspected the texts of the orations in Cd. Since Vi ends at 40.3, it cannot be the source for the corrections at 42.20 and 43.1 in Cd. In addition, Cd²Vi share one scholium, but Vi has an additional scholium not found in the Cd. For the scholium at 54.1, the scribe of Vi, which is the same hand as that of the text, appears to start copying the scholium which appears in ACdR, but gives up after only a few words: ἀπὸ Δ' (= τεσσάρων) δεῖ λαμβάνειν τὰ προοίμια. Thus, I believe that Chrysoloras was using multiple mss. when correcting Cd, and that Vi or the source of ViVi may have been one of them. He entered in the readings and scholia of Vi into Cd, but did not feel the need to insert all the readings in Vi.

Yet finally, codex Cd does perhaps lead us to the answer for why or. 54 suffers from only weak contamination. In order to include the private orations or the ἰδιωτικοί, the scribe of Cd needed to change traditions from Y to a branch that contained the ἰδιωτικοί. The fact that the YP branch does not contain the private law speeches undoubtedly sheltered them from many interpolations. MacDowell and others have noted the conflatory character of Y.⁴³ Thus, the lack of contact with this branch of primary mss. kept or. 54 freer from more severe contamination.

⁴³ MACDOWELL 1990, 53.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BUTCHER 1903 = S. H. BUTCHER, *Demosthenis orationes recognovit, brevis adnotatione critica instruit* S. H. Butcher, tomus I, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1903.
- CANFORA 1968 = L. CANFORA, *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene*, Padova 1968 (*Proagones. Collezione di studi e testi a cura di Carlo Diano*, 9).
- CANFORA 1992 = L. CANFORA, *Sul Ceseate D.XXVII.1 di Demostene*, *RFIC* 120 (1992), 292–299.
- DILTS 1979 = M. R. DILTS, *Notes on Demosthenic mss containing scholia*, *Prometheus* 5/1 (1979), 256–266.
- DILTS 1983 = M. R. DILTS, *Scholia Demosthenica*, vol. I *scholia in orationes 1–18 continens*, Leipzig: Teubner 1983.
- DILTS 1986 = M. R. DILTS, *Scholia Demosthenica*, vol. II *scholia in orationes 19–60 continens*, Leipzig: Teubner 1986.
- DRERUP 1899 = E. DRERUP, *Antike Demosthenesausgaben*, *Philologus*, Suppl. VII (1899), 533–588.
- FUHR 1914 = K. FUHR, *Demosthenis orationes edidit Carolus Fuhr*, Vol. I, Leipzig: Teubner 1914 (Vol. II, 1: I. SYKUTRIS, *Demosthenis orationes post C. Fuhr edidit Ioannes Sykutris*, Vol. II, Pars I, Leipzig: Teubner 1937).
- GERNET I, 1954 = L. GERNET, *Démosthène. Plaidoyers civils I* (Orr. 27–38). *Texte établi et traduit par Louis Gernet*, Paris: Budé 1954.
- GERNET III, 1959 = L. GERNET, *Démosthène. Plaidoyers civils III* (Orr. 49–56). *Texte établi et traduit par Louis Gernet*, Paris: Budé 1959.
- IRMER 1972 = D. IRMER, *Zur Genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften: Untersuchungen an den Reden 8 und 9*, Hamburg 1972 (*Hamburger Philologische Studien*, 20).
- KAPPARIS 1999 = K. KAPPARIS, *Apollodoros, “Against Neaira”* [D. 59]. Ed. with Introduction, Translation and Commentary by Konstantinos A. Kapparis, Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter 1999 (*Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte*, 53).
- LEGANÉS MOYA - HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ 2008 = M. P. LEGANÉS MOYA - F. G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, *Demosthenis In Midiam ediderunt, apparatu testimoniorum ornaverunt, adnotatione critica instruxerunt* M. P. Leganés Moya et F. G. Hernández Muñoz, Universidad de León 2008.
- MACDOWELL 1990 = D. M. MACDOWELL, *Demosthenes, Against Meidias (Oration 21)*. Edited with introduction, translation, and commentary by Douglas M. MacDowell, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1990.
- MACDOWELL 2000 = D. M. MACDOWELL, *Demosthenes, On the False Embassy (Oration 19)*. Edited with introduction, translation, and commentary by Douglas M. MacDowell, Oxford: Oxford University Press 2000.
- MCGAY 2005 = D. S. MCGAY, *The Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Oration 54, Contra Cononem*, Ph. D. Dissertation, Fordham University 2005.
- MIONI 1964 = E. MIONI, *Catalogo di manoscritti greci esistenti nelle biblioteche italiane I*. A cura di Elpidio Mioni, Roma 1965.
- PASQUALI ²1952 = G. PASQUALI, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze ²1952 (¹1934).
- PASSWEG 1975 = R. PASSWEG, *The Manuscript Tradition of Demosthenes' Oration 24, In Timocratem*, Ph. D. Dissertation, New York University 1975.
- RENNIE 1931 = W. RENNIE, *Demosthenis orationes recognovit, brevis adnotatione critica instruit* W. Rennie, tomus III, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1931.

- RGK = E. GAMILLSCHEG - D. HARLFINGER - H. HUNGER (unter Mitarbeit von P. ELEUTERI), Repertorium der griechischen Kopisten 800–1600, 3. Teil: Handschriften aus Bibliotheken Roms mit dem Vatikan, Wien 1997 (*Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Veröffentlichungen der Kommission für Byzantinistik*, III/3, A–C).
- SOSOWER 1986 = M. L. SOSOWER, Palla Strozzi's Greek manuscripts, SIFC 4 (1986), 140–151.
- VOEMEL 1857 = J. Th. VOEMEL, Demosthenis contiones quae circumferuntur, cum Libanii vita Dem. et argumentis, Graece et Latine. Recensuit, cum apparatu critico copiosissimo, prolegomenis grammaticis et notitia codicum edidit Dr. J. Th. Voemelius, Halle 1857.
- ZAZZERI 1887 = R. ZAZZERI, Sui codici e libri a stampa della Biblioteca Malatestiana di Cesena. Ricerche e osservazioni, Cesena 1887.

Donal Spence McGay
 Radnor High School / Villanova University
 130 King of Prussia Rd.
 Radnor, PA 19087, USA
 donal.mcgay@rtsd.org
 donal.mcgay@villanova.edu