

FELIPE G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ

The Transmission of the Demosthenic Text: Open Issues

The intention of this contribution is to present the conclusions (some still provisional) concerning four open issues in the transmission of the Demosthenic text. These issues shall be addressed in the following order:¹

(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.

(4.) The “scriptio plena” and the testimony of the *veteres*. The “law of μέν – δέ” of Demosthenic authenticity.

I wish to dedicate my work to Professor Mervin Dilts, whom I thank for his suggestions and encouragement.

1. THE TESTIMONY OF THE PAPYRI AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP TO THE MAIN DEMOSTHENIC *VETERES* S A F Y²

The number of published Demosthenic papyri has significantly increased since the turn of the twentieth century: with regard to orr. 1–17, S. H. Butcher could only use three papyri (Oxford 1903); the number increased to 18 in 1963, when P. J. Sijpestein published his study, and then again to 58 used by M. Dilts for his critical edition (Oxford 2002). The readings of these papyri should be

¹ This paper is part of a publicly funded research project entitled: “Manuscritos griegos en España y su contexto europeo – Greek manuscripts in Spain and their European context” (MICINN, ref. FF12011-25805). I would like to express my gratitude to Sonia de Juana Calvo for her guidance in the preparation of the English version of this paper, as well as to Prof. H. Bannert and Dr. J. Grusková.

² The *sigla* of the *veteres* are: S (Paris. gr. 2934), A (Monac. gr. 485), F (Marc. gr. 416), Y (Paris. gr. 2935). The abbreviations (some in superindex) are the usual ones in textual criticism: a (*ante correctionem*), c (*post correctionem*), s.l. (*supra lineam*), in marg. (*in margine*), γρ. (γράφεται).

systematically analyzed.³ They offer the possibility of reconstructing the state of the Demosthenic text before the Byzantine recension.

Which of the Demosthenic *veteres* (S A F Y) shares more often readings with the papyri? In 1994 there was some controversy in *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*⁴ on the coincidence of a papyrus reading (CtYBR inv. 1348) with the manuscript S or A, concerning the general question of antiquity and quality of one or another manuscript. In the same journal I have published a comprehensive study of the similarities of the papyri used by M. Dilts in his edition of orr. 1–17 and the Demosthenic *veteres* S A F Y (both individually and grouped).⁵ The conclusion is that the coincidences are spread in a balanced way:

In isolation: S (17 coincidences), A (also 17), F (14), Y (4).

By groups: AFY (19 coincidences), SF (17) and AF (13).

The speeches attested in a greater number of papyri are or. 4 (*First Philippic*: 8 different papyri), or. 8 (*On the Chersonese*: 6 papyri) and or. 3 (*Third Olynthiac*: 5 papyri). These statistics draw the attention to the relative scarcity of other *Philippics* preserved in papyri. For example, the *Third Philippic* (one of the most virulent attacks against Philip) is preserved in only three different papyri, which may be a result of censorship in the times of the Diadochi.

J. Muñoz Flórez has pointed out that for the other political speeches (orr. 18–26) there are discourses attested in a greater number of extant papyri (*On the False Embassy*: 17 papyri, *On the Crown*: 12 papyri, *Against Meidias*: 11 papyri) which share more readings with A and F:⁶

In isolation: A (39 coincidences), F (14), S (7), Y (5).

By groups: AFY (23 coincidences), AF (23), SAY (8) and SFY (7).

All this data may suggest the existence of a Demosthenic text that was already circulating in antiquity in a very fluid way, with a pattern that coincides with S, but also with A and F. From a chronological point of view, the coincidences with A seem to be documented earlier than the coincidences with S.

³ Cf. J. GRUSKOVÁ, Zur Notwendigkeit einer systematischen Aufarbeitung der Demosthenes-Papyri und -Pergamentfragmente für eine neu zu gestaltende Demosthenesausgabe, *Analecta Papyrologica* 12 (2000), 95–139.

⁴ R. BABCOCK, ZPE 100 (1994), 100 vs. H. WANKEL, ZPE 102 (1994), 194.

⁵ F. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, Los papiros y las arengas demosténicas (Or. I–XVII), ZPE 162 (2007), 43–50.

⁶ Los papiros de Demóstenes, in: F. G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ (ed.), La tradición y la transmisión de los oradores y rétores griegos – Tradition and transmission of Greek orators and rhetors, Berlin 2012, 195–204.

2. THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE SPANISH *RECENTIORES*

D. Jackson and G. O. Rowe⁷ have already pointed out the need to review the readings of the Demosthenic *codices recentiores*. However, the use of these manuscripts in editions of Demosthenes is very limited. In his recent Oxford edition (2002–2009), M. Dilts has broken this trend, including the testimony of a relatively large number of *recentiores*. Among them, many are located in Spain (especially in the National Library of Madrid and the Monastery of El Escorial). L. Canfora was the first to catalogue these manuscripts in his *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene* (Padua 1968) – a very meritorious effort, although a little incomplete for Spain; he pointed out 13 Spanish manuscripts, but there are at least 17 known today.⁸

The following manuscripts (with one exception, of the 15th–16th centuries) preserved in Spanish libraries transmit the text of the *Philippics*: Matrit. BN 4647, copied by Constantinos Lascaris; Salm. M 231, with initial entries by Pinzianus; Salm. M 243, also used by Pinzianus, with the Demosthenic part copied by Johannes Rhosos; Salm. M 224; Hispal. 330-155-1, copied by Thomas Bitzimanos; Escorial. Σ.III.12 (111); Escorial. Σ.III.16 (115); Escorial. Σ.I.13 (70); Escorial. Ψ.4.4 (478) with the Demosthenic part copied by Andreas Darmarios; Escorial. Φ.II.1 (198); Escorial. R.I.20 (20); Caesaraug. gr. 17, copied by Bartolomé Llorente and several other hands from his circle. Some of these scribes also worked on certain manuscripts that could have been the source for the Aldine edition(s) (cf. infra).

When collating the *Fourth Philippic* (or. 10) I have noticed that the *recentiores hispanici* fall into two main groups:

GROUP 1: Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (and Malatest. D.XXIX.3, a *recentior* related to them), which transmit readings of the *vetus* F, but also of A.

GROUP 2: Salm. M 231, Escorial. R.I.20, Escorial. Φ.II.1, Hispal. 330-155-1 (as well as Paris. gr. 2938, Malatest. D.XXVII.1 and the Aldine editions⁹), which usually agree with FY.

The manuscripts of each of these groups share the same additions and other variants, for example:

⁷ Demosthenes 1915–1965, *Lustrum* 14 (1969), 17.

⁸ There is some information about these Spanish manuscripts in D. IRMER, *Zur Genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften. Untersuchungen an den Reden 8 und 9*, Hamburg 1972.

⁹ As we will see in the following section, it is necessary to consider two Aldine editions that sometimes show textual differences; editions we will designate as A11 (first Aldine edition) and A12 (second edition). When their readings coincide, we will quote them simply as A1. There is also an “Appendix of variants”, at the end of both, which will be abbreviated as Var.

GROUP 1 adds δι' αὐτό γε (10.18), τὸ αἴτιον (10.58) and the pronoun σε (10.70).

GROUP 2 adds ὦ ἄνδρες ἀθηναῖοι (10.23), γε (10.28), ἄν (10.42) and ἅπαντα (10.58).

GROUP 1 transmits ἄ instead of ὅ (10.27), αἰ for πᾶσι (10.46) and ὄντος instead of ἐσομένου (10.63).

GROUP 2 transmits ἀθηναίων οὐδενός instead of οὐδενὸς ὑμῶν (10.18), πῶποτε for ποτέ (10.22) and δεῖ instead of εἶναι (10.56).

In a more detailed form, we can now see how *veteres* and *recentiores* are related in this discourse. Normally, the Demosthenic *recentiores*, including the Spanish ones and the Aldine editions, should agree with the *veteres* AFY¹⁰ when these manuscripts split from S, for example:

10.7 <ἀλλ'> ἴν', 10.17 γίγνεσθαι] γενέσθαι, 10.20 οὐ] ὅτου, 10.22 χρημάτων (πραγμάτων SVar), 10.25 μὲν om., 10.27 ἀνάγκη <τις>, 10.28 τοῖς <οὔσι>, 10.30 τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦναντίον] τοῦναντίον τοῖς ἄλλοις, 10.34 τά <γε>, 10.35 φοβοῦμαι <λέγειν>, 10.36 ἐπιδεεῖς] καταδεεῖς, 10.39 εἰ <μή>, 10.45 μεγάλη transp. post πόλις, 10.48 ἔχειν transp. post μεγάλην, 10.52 δὴ om., 10.54 ἀχθεσθῆναι <μοι>, 10.60 <εὐ> οἶδ', 10.61 οὐδὲ] οὐ, 10.63 ἀγῶνος <ὑμῖν>, 10.63 προσπταίσαντας] προσπταίοντας, 10.65 πεπόνθασιν] πάντες ἴσασιν, 10.70 ἡσύχιον <καὶ ἀπράγμονα>, 10.73 σοι transp. ante ὑπάρχει.

When the *veteres* that split are FY, the *recentiores* (and the Aldine editions) usually agree with them, for example:

10.4 δύο <μέρη>, 10.14 <τὸν> ἔχοντα, 10.19 ὅσων δέονται] ὧν ἄν δέωνται, 10.25 <τῶν> πεπραγμένων, 10.31 διαφέρει (διαφεύγει S^cAC : διαφεύγειν S^a), 10.32 (ἅ-)παντα <ὅσα>, 10.34 ἀπεψηφίζεσθε] ἀπεψηφίσασθε, 10.36 <οὔ> οὐδέν, 10.39 μηδέν <τῶν δεόντων>, 10.40 ἄτοπον τῶν ὄντων] ἀτοπώτατον ὄντα, 10.41 προσήκει] προσήκειν, 10.45 ὑπὲρ] περὶ, 10.50 σφαλερῶς] φαύλως, 10.54 <συν>τείνει, 10.62 οὐχ] οὐδὲ, 10.62 ἐπιστήσεσθε] ἐπίστασθε, 10.64 ὑπάγει] ὑπάγεται, 10.68 γίνονται] γεγόνασι, 10.69 φοβερός <ἔστι>, 10.70 Ἀριστόμηδες] Ἀριστόδημε, 10.71 δοίμεν] συγχωρήσαιμεν, 10.72 κίνδυνος] ἐπικίνδυνον, 10.74 ἥκοντας] προιόντας, 10.74 τῶν ἄλλων <ἐλλήνων>.

¹⁰ Although the groups are quite stable, some of the examples may contain a change within the manuscript itself, owing to the existing “contamination”. There can also be changes in the groups, from one discourse to another. – If two readings are mentioned in the passage, the second one, after square bracket (]), belongs to the group which is actually considered.

Occasionally, the corrections of S agree with the reading of AFY or FY either via contamination or access to a lost common ancestor:

10.3 <οἱ μὲν> εἰρηκότες, 10.13 <δικαίως> μισεῖν, 10.16 Ἀθηναίων] Ἀθήνησι, 10.17 <μῆ> πολεμήσετε, 10.19 πολεμεῖ (ποιεῖ S^aA11), 10.29 οὐκ] οὔτε, 10.32 πιστὰς <τὰς κατηγορίας>, 10.55 τὸ τὴν (τῷ τὴν S^a), 10.67 πρὶν <ῆ>, 10.73 <δὶς> ἐκ, 10.73 <ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν> σεσωσμένοι, 10.76 κολακείας <καί>, 10.76 ἀργύριον <μὲν>.

Perhaps the most relevant data, as we already pointed out before, is that there is a group of *recentiores* (GROUP 1: Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 and Malatest. D.XXIX.3) that sometimes agrees with A, whereas the other *recentiores* and the Aldine editions agree with FY (GROUP 2: Salm. M 231, Escorial. R.I.20, Escorial. Φ.II.1, Hispal. 330-155-1, as well as Paris. gr. 2938 and Malatest. D.XXVII.1):¹¹

GROUP 1: 10.2 πλήθος <ἐστί>, 10.16 τόπου] τόπων, 10.18 <δι' αὐτό γε> τοῦθ' ἅπαντες, 10.27 ὃ] ἄ, 10.29 ταῦτὸ] ταῦτα, 10.46 πᾶσι] ἀεὶ (per similit. – ACI/-AEI), 10.57 ἀποστήναι] ἀφιστάναι (ἀφεστάναι Malatest. D.XXIX.3), 10.58 <τὸ αἴτιον> τὸν, 10.58 οὐδεῖς] οὐδένα, 10.58 εἶπεν] εἰπεῖν, 10.61 προσβάλλων] προσβαλεῖν <αὐτῶν>, 10.62 ἐθέλητε] ἐθελήσητε, 10.63 ἐσομένου] ὄντος, 10.67 αὐτοῖς transp. post Πυλαίαν, 10.69 ἅπασι <τοῖς>, 10.70 ἔροισι <σε>.

GROUP 2: 10.17 <λαβεῖν> βουλομένων (<λαβεῖν οὐ> βουλομένων A11), 10.18 οὐδενὸς ὑμῶν] ἀθηναίων οὐδενός, 10.22 ποτὲ] πώποτε, 10.23 ἂν ἴσως <ὦ ἄνδρες ἀθηναῖοι>, 10.23 ἂν om., 10.28 ἔχει <γε>, 10.30 ἠθέλετε] ἠθελήσατε, 10.35 του] τοῦτο (του τοῦτο A1 per conflat.), 10.42 ποιεῖν <ἄν>, 10.51 τὰ τῶν] τὸ τῶν, 10.53 οὐδέσι] οὐδένι, 10.55 οὐδὲ] καί, 10.55 οἱ <γε>, 10.56 δ' εἶναι] δὲ δεῖ, 10.56 κωλύειν] κωλύσειν (κελύσειν sic A11), 10.58 <ἅπαντ'> ἀναθεῖναι, 10.60 <τὴν> βοήθειαν, 10.61 πρότερον <ῆ>, 10.61 προσβάλλων] προσβαλὼν.

This division between *recentiores* and *veteres* can also be observed in other *Philippics*, such as the *Third*, even within a single passage:

9.36 πάντα τὰ S : πάντα τὰ <τῶν ἐλλήνων> GROUP 1 : τὰ <τῶν ἐλλήνων> GROUP 2;

9.40 ταῦτα S : ταῦτα <πάντα> GROUP 1 : <ἅπαντα> ταῦτ' GROUP 2;

9.47 οἱοί S : <τηλικούτος> οἱοί GROUP 1 : <τοιούτος> οἱοί GROUP 2.

¹¹ Of all the main *veteres*, S is the one that shares less often isolated readings with other *recentiores*. For this reason, some readings of S (or some of its corrections) also found in Salm. M 231 merit attention: 10.20 οὐδὲν ἄλλ' οἶμαι] οἶμαι οὐδὲν ἄλλο (γρ.), 10.31 ἀπὸ ταῦτο-μάτου] ἀπ' αὐτομάτου, 10.42 τοὺς ... εὐπόρου] τοῖς ... εὐπόροις, 10.63 τῶν ἔξω] ἔξω τῶν.

Returning to the *Fourth Philippic*, within the group of *recentiores* I could identify some subgroups of manuscripts that share a particularly close kinship, for example:

Escorial. R.I.20, Escorial. Φ.II.1 (sometimes Paris. gr. 2938 as well): 10.26 ποί] τί, 10.33 ὁ δὴ] καὶ δὴ (ante corr.), 10.49 κεκήλησθε] ἠπάτησθε (supra lin. cum *Schol. Dem.* Y), 10.54 <γε> τείνει, 10.54 ἔτεροι] οἱ προδόται καὶ ὁ Φίλιππος (supra lin. cum *Schol. Dem.* Y), 10.58 τοῦ om., 10.65 τὰ ἐπὶ] τὰς ἐπὶ.

Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12: 10.2 Φίλιππος χρήται] <ἀεὶ> χρήται Φίλιππος, 10.11 ἀκούσαι ... χρή om., 10.13 <δικαίως αὐτὸν> μισεῖν, 10.26 ποί] μέχρι ποί, 10.26 ἀνθρώπων om., 10.36 ἀπόρων] εὐπόρων (ante corr.), 10.43 γε <ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων οἶμαι>, 10.54 <τᾶλλα> λέξω, 10.55 4 τῶν] τοῦ, 10.55 οἱ <δὴ>, 10.55 τοῦ om., 10.56 δ' εἶναι] δὲ <δεῖ> εἶναι, 10.56 μὲν om. (cum A), 10.57 ἐφ'] ὑφ', 10.60 ἀκριβῶς om. (cum A), 10.62 ὑμῖν] ἡμῖν <τε> (ὑμῖν <τε> A), 10.70 αἰρεῖ] αἰρεῖν (ante corr.), 10.72 <μὴ> πράττειν (supra lin.), 10.75 ὥς ὀρθῶς λέγεται] καὶ ὀρθ. λέγετε.

Sometimes Malatest. D.XXIX.3 belongs to the subgroup of Matrit. BN 4647 and Escorial. Σ.III.12: 10.5 πλείστῳ] πλείστῳ καὶ μεγίστῳ (conflatio cum μεγίστῳ A), 10.30 ἀνθρώπων om., 10.30 τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῦναντίον] ἄλλοις ἀνθρώποις, 10.60 βουλόμεθ' ἡμεῖς] βούλεσθ' ὑμεῖς, 10.62 ἀπάντων om.

In the entire *Harangues* (orr. 1–17) some readings transmitted in other isolated manuscripts, but accepted as genuine by Dilts, are confirmed by Spanish *recentiores*:

1.2 βοηθήσετε Palat. gr. 142, Malatest. D.XXIX.3 + Escorial. Ψ.4.4^c (pro βοηθήσητε);

1.21 ἔχει Malatest. D.XXVII.1^{s.l.}, Ambros. C 87 sup., Ambros. D 39 sup., Paris. gr. 2940 + Salm. M 231, Hispal. 330-155-1 (pro ἔχη vel ἔχοι);

3.34 ἀνάγκη Urb. gr. 113, PSI 1205 + Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro ἀνάγκη).

In some cases, in the *Corpus Demosthenicum* the Spanish *recentiores* provide evidence for emendations, sometimes found also in other (non Spanish) *recentiores*, e. g.:

1.7 τέως Reiske, Malatest. D.XXIX.3, Palat. gr. 142 + Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro ὥς);

4.28 προσποριεῖται Cluster, Paris. gr. 2936 + Escorial. Φ.II.1^{s.l.} (pro προσποριεῖ);

6.28 ὑμῖν Fuhr, Malatest. D.XXIX.3, Paris. gr. 2938^c, Malatest. D.XXVII.1 + omnes rec. hispan. (praeter Hispal. 330-155-1) (pro ἡμῖν);

8.21 ὑμᾶς del. Rüdiger, om. Matrit. BN 4647;

9.75 ποιήσοντας <εἰ γὰρ ... οὐκ εἰσὶν> Schaefer + Harl. 6322, Malatest. D.XXIX.3;

10.41 εἰς Malatest. D.XXIX.3, Paris. gr. 2998 + Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro τις), εἰς τις Reiske;

10.51 ποιῆσαι Reiske, Malatest. D.XXVII.1 (pro ποιῆσαι);

10.58 εἰθισμένοις Cobet, A, Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro οἰομένοις);

13.26 ἀκούσαντες del. Cobet, Butcher, om. Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12, Escorial. R.I.20, A1;

15.27 ἐτέρως del. Cobet, om. Escorial. Φ.II.1;

59.103 αἰσθόμενοι Blass, Hispal. 330-155-1 (pro προαἰσθόμενοι vel αἰσθανόμενοι);

Ep. I.5 προτέρων Blass, Matrit. BN 4637^a (pro πρότερον);

Ep. I.7 δὴ Schaefer, Escorial. R.I.20 (pro δέ);

Ep. I.11 εἶρηται Wolf, Matrit. BN 4637^a (pro εἴρηνται);

Ep. II.7 ἡγοῦμαι Wolf, Matrit. BN 4637^a (pro ἡγούμεν);

Ep. II.19 τι del. Schaefer, om. Matrit. BN 4637^a;

Ep. III.40 ἂν κοιμισάμην Reiske, Matrit. BN 4637^a (ut vid., pro ἀνακομισάμην);

Ep. V.3 τὴν Wolf, Matrit. BN 4637 (pro τῆς).

Some readings can be found also in papyri:

1.9 προσῆκον P.Oxy. 1810, Salm. M 243^a (ut vid.) : προσῆκεν cett.;

1.20 ἀντιλαμβάνεσθε P.Oxy. 4311, Salm. M 243, Malatest. D.XXIX.3, Hispal. 330-155-1 : ἀντιλάβεσθε cett.;

1.21 ποτε τὸν πόλεμον P.Oxy. 4311, Escorial. Σ.III.12 : τὸν πόλεμόν ποτε cett.;

9.63 ὑμῖν <ἐστιν> P.Mich. inv. 918b, Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12, Malatest. D.XXIX.3;

Ep. III.6 ἐκρίνατε P.Lond.Lit. 130, Matrit. BN 4637 : ἐκρίνετε cett.;

Ep. III.32 ἐκφέρητε P.Lond.Lit. 130, Escorial. R.I.20, Matrit. BN 4637^c, A1 : ἐκφέρεται cett.;

Ep. III.33 γε P.Lond.Lit. 130, Matrit. BN 4637 : τε cett.

Furthermore, there is a number of interesting variants in some of these Spanish *recentiores* (sometimes shared by Aldine editions: A1, in short):

2.29 βοηθησόμενοι Salm. M 231 (γρ. Pinzianus) (pro βοησόμενοι);

4.3 αἴσθησθε Matrit. BN 4647 in marg. (pro θεάσθησθε);

4.23 χρήσασθαι Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro χρήσθαι);

4.47 παύσετε Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro παύσεται);

6.8 οἶδε Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (pro εἶδε);

- 6.28 ὑμῖν Escorial. R.I.20, Escorial. Φ.II.1, Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12, Salm. M 231, Al (pro ἡμῖν);
 8.10 πράγματα πάντα Matrit. BN 4647 (pro πράγμαθ' ἅπαντα);
 8.46 συνοίσουσιν ἡμῖν Matrit. BN 4647 (pro σώσουσαν ὑμεῖς);
 10.2 αἰεὶ χρῆται Φίλιππος Matrit. BN 4647, Escorial. Σ.III.12 (cf. 21.1) (pro Φίλιππος χρῆται).

The latest Greek manuscript of Demosthenes preserved in Spain is the Caesar-augustanus gr. 17 (Zaragoza). It was copied by Bartolomé Llorente, a Spanish humanist of the mid-sixteenth century, as well as by some other hands in his circle.¹² The transmitted text (or. 2: the *Second Olynthiac*) has apparently never been studied. I will present the manuscript and some preliminary conclusions about the transmitted text. It seems to belong to group F, transmitting even its marginal corrections, but it sometimes shows evidence of contamination with corrections from S and A. It also contains interesting textual variants, agrees in one instance with the reading of a papyrus and anticipates later emendations by Dindorf and Bekker:

- 2.1 γενομένην Caesaraug. gr. 17, pro γιγνομένην;
 2.4 βέλτιον Caesaraug. gr. 17, pro βέλτιστον;
 2.15 ὑπῆρχε Caesaraug. gr. 17, pro ὑπῆρξε;
 2.21 ἕως (pro τέως), Dindorf, Caesaraug. gr. 17 (cum Stob.);
 2.26 νυνὶ Caesaraug. gr. 17, pro νῦν;
 2.26 ὑμῶν τουτ' ἔργον P.Oxy. 4315, Caesaraug. gr. 17 (pro ἡμῶν ἔργον τοῦτο);
 2.29 βοησόμενοι <οἱ> τριακόσιοι Bekker, Caesaraug. gr. 17 (cum Al2).

Although this section is mainly concerned with the *recentiores*, I would also like to present a Spanish *vetus* related to the transmission of Demosthenes' text. The oldest codex among the Greek manuscripts preserved in the ancient archive of the Complutense University of Madrid (number 30 in the *Catálogo de Villamil*) is a parchment manuscript, written in Greek miniscule of the "Eustathius type" and copied apparently by several hands in Southern Italy around the year 1100.¹³ Its content is related to the so-called *Cyrrillus' Lexicon* and other rheto-

¹² Cf. A. ESCOBAR CHICO, *Codices Caesaraugustani Graeci*, *Catálogo de los manuscritos griegos de la Biblioteca capitular de la Seo (Zaragoza)*, Zaragoza 1993, 78–79.

¹³ G. De Andrés dated it to the 10th–11th century, considering the Abbey of San Salvatore as its place of origin (Lingua Fari, Messina), cf. *Catálogo de los códices griegos de las colecciones Complutense, Lázaro Galdiano y March de Madrid*, *Cuadernos de Filología Clásica* 6 (1974), 239, 243–244. Although it seems clear it comes from Southern Italy, its presence in San Salvatore of Messina is dubious, cf. S. LUCÀ, *Il Lessico dello Ps.-Cirillo (Redazione V1): da Rossano a Messina*, *RSBN* 31 (1994), 45–80, especially 72–73.

rical and lexicographical *opuscula* connected with this lexicon, that were compiled in Alexandria, probably in the 5th–6th centuries (without ruling out the possibility of earlier dates). In ff. 281–292^v and 295–302^v of this manuscript, there are several *Demosthenic Lexica* (or one in three parts):

– ff. 281–292^f: glosses to the Demosthenic discourses from or. 2 (*Second Olynthiac*, starting in 2.30) to or. 11 (*Reply to Philip*, ending in 11.20). It was first edited, without the aid of the manuscript of the Complutense, by J. N. Kazazis.¹⁴ These include, in total, 657 glosses, although the first 172 are missing in our manuscript because of loss of material.

– f. 292^v: ostensibly new glosses to the Demosthenic discourses from or. 13 (*On Organisation*, starting in 13.4) to or. 15 (*On the Liberty of the Rhodians*, ending in 15.16).¹⁵

– ff. 295–302^v: Demosthenic glosses (together with others by Pindar and Aristophanes) first edited by M. Naoumides.¹⁶ The Demosthenic section starts in 13.4, but later skips to 19.274 and contains primarily glosses to or. 18 (*On the Crown*) and or. 21 (*Against Meidias*).

Thus, if we join these three parts we would have a glossary of the political discourses of Demosthenes: the first two correspond to the *Harangues* (or discourses before the Assembly) and the third one, edited by M. Naoumides, corresponds to the “political-judicial” discourses. Moreover, the discourses before the Assembly would be divided into strictly “Philippic” discourses (the part edited by J. Kazazis) and the rest, “deliberative discourses”¹⁷ (the new part included in the manuscript of the Complutense).

In the first part, which was edited by Kazazis, the Complutense manuscript includes a total of eleven new glosses (post glosses 246, 310, 362, 379 – two glosses, 192, 517 – two glosses, 629 – another two glosses, and 649), six additions to already existing glosses (in glosses 321, 383, 446, 590, 591 and 614) and twenty-one confirmations of corrections made by Kazazis to the text of the manuscripts he used (in glosses 244, 245, 246, 248, 262, 333, 344, 377, 412, 415, 438, 441, 450, 456, 476, 493, 569, 603, 606, 616 and 624). All these, together with the existence of new readings (as in glosses 551 and 583), make us consider the possibility that our manuscript, of South Italian origin, has accessed

¹⁴ J. N. KAZAZIS, *Φιλιππικῶν ῥητορικαὶ λέξεις*, Thessaloniki 1986.

¹⁵ F. G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, *Demosthenica*, CFC(G) 16 (2006), 278–281.

¹⁶ M. N. NAOUMIDES, *Ῥητορικαὶ λέξεις* (editio princeps), Athens 1975.

¹⁷ Such is certainly the title of this section in the manuscripts Vat. gr. 2130, f. 177 (178), and Urb. gr. 157, f. 269^v, approximately contemporary to the manuscript of the Complutense: ΛΕΞ<E>ΙΣ ΣΥΜΒΟΥΛΕΥΤΙΚΩΝ ΔΗΜΟΣΘΕΝΟΥΣ.

a different branch of the tradition. This consideration is based on the fact that from a genealogical point of view it does not share the “separative errors” mentioned by Kazazis for family *a*, nor the “conjunctive errors” of family *b* nor those of family *y*, but it retains a certain relationship with the *codices* P Q, which, according to Kazazis, belong to a branch separated from the tradition.¹⁸

Perhaps later are the twenty-one new glosses that our manuscript adds in the second part, after number 657 of Kazazis. These, as we have pointed out, may be the continuation of the *Demosthenic Lexicon* – lost in other manuscripts – with the glosses to the Demosthenic discourses 13.4–15.26¹⁹ or a smaller, new glossary inserted later.²⁰ These glosses are:²¹

- gl. 1 παραναλ[ε]ίσκεται : εισφέρεται ἐκ περιττοῦ (Demosthenes, 13.4);
- gl. 2 τοὺς ὑπὲρ κατάλογον : τοὺς γέροντας (13.4);
- gl. 3 ἐφόδευ<ου>σαν : ἐφρούρησαν (13.8);
- gl. 4 παρερρυήκασι : παρεισεδύησαν (13.16);
- gl. 5 οἰκοτρίβαι : οἰκογενεῖς οἰκέται (13.24);
- gl. 6 φθορός : φθορᾶς ἄξιος (13.24);
- gl. 7 ἀκολουθούς : παραπλησίους (13.33);
- gl. 8 πεπολίτευσθε : ἀνενδεῶς προστήσθ’ (13.35);
- gl. 9 ἐφικέσθαι (ἐφικέσθαι ante correct.) : καταλαβεῖν (14.1);
- gl. 10 ὑπειλημμένης : κεκριμμένης (14.1);
- gl. 11 παραδέξασθε : διαδέξασθε (14.1);
- gl. 12 προσαπεχθεσόμεθα : προμισηθῶμεν (14.4);
- gl. 13 τιμήσαντες : διατιμησάμενοι (14.21);
- gl. 14 διαγράμματος : ἀναγραφῆς (14.21);
- gl. 15 ἀ[μ]<ν>ήνντα : ἀπλήρωτα, ἀκατόρθωτα (16.26);

¹⁸ KAZAZIS, op. cit., 19.

¹⁹ As the section edited by Kazazis ends in or. 11 and the new begins with or. 13, I think the glosses for or. 12 (*Letter of Philip*) never existed, since this discourse was not regarded as Demosthenic, and therefore glosses pertaining to it did not belong to the content of the glossary. In the new section of the manuscript of the Complutense, the glosses of or. 16 (*For the Megalopolitans*) precede those of or. 15 (*On the Liberty of the Rhodians*), because this was the ancient order, as attested by manuscripts S A and the papyrus Berol. 13274.

²⁰ This last possibility would be suggested by the title that the manuscripts Vat. gr. 2130 and Urb. gr. 157 place at the beginning of the new section, as well as its division into three parts: ΛΟΓΟΣ Α, ΑΡΧΗ Β ΛΟΓΟΥ and ΑΡΧΗ ΤΡΙΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ. However, we have ascertained that several glosses are missing in these manuscripts (numbers 15 and 16), which are present in the Complutense manuscript.

²¹ The numeration is mine. Sometimes I had to correct the corrupted reading of the manuscript using the corresponding diacritic signs. The referenced Demosthenic passage appears at the end of each gloss, in parentheses. As a whole, the offered text shows a certain eclecticism in comparison with the medieval manuscripts S A F Y.

- gl. 16 ἀνενέγκωσιν : σωθῶσιν (16.31);
- gl. 17 ἀνυπόπτου : φανεράς, ἁδόλου (15.4);
- gl. 18 συνενηχότων : συνενεγκόντων (15.9);
- gl. 19 ἀπείπεν : ἀπηγόρευσεν (fortasse 15.9);
- gl. 20 παρεῖνται : εἰσδέχονται (15.15);
- gl. 21 συντελῆς : ἀποτελῆς (15.26).

3. THE ALDINE EDITION(S) AND THE PROBLEM OF ITS (THEIR) SOURCES

There are two Aldine editions of Demosthenes with textual changes that are not merely typographical. The date of the first and most famous edition is indubitable (November 1504), but the second one is still disputed. While some authors, such as A. Renouard, date it ca. 1513, to serve as a complement of the Aeschines edition of that year (because of the lack of copies of the first Demosthenic edition), others, such as A. Cataldi Palau, date it between 1520 and 1527.²² There is also an “Appendix of variants” at the end of the first edition (which is repeated unchanged in the second one), entitled “Variants we have found in other manuscripts”.²³ Sometimes there is a * above the word that has been substituted for the “Appendix of variants”. The issue is complicated because the manuscript exemplar could change within a speech or from one speech to another.

Some of the manuscripts that have been proposed as possible sources for the Aldine edition(s) are: Malatest. D.XXIX.3, copied at the end of the 15th century

²² The first Aldine edition is the one known from Venice, 1504; for the second one, A. CATALDI PALAU (Gian Francesco d’Asola e la tipografia aldina, Genua 1998, 433) prefers, on account of its typography, a date between 1520–1527. This date is also mentioned in the Catalogue of the Ahmanson-Murphy Aldine Collection at UCLA, Los Angeles 1994, fasc. V, 127, but the edition may have been printed earlier, in 1513, since there are almost no copies of the limited print run of the 1504 Demosthenic edition, which served as a complement to the edition of Aeschines (and other orators), which appeared in 1513; cf. A. RENOARD, *Annales de l’imprimerie des Alde ...*, Paris 1854, 47. This author speaks of “second edition” and “second print” indistinctly, but given the textual (not merely typographical) changes between them, it seems preferable to use the term “edition”. J. REISKE (*Demosthenis quae supersunt*, vol. I, London 1822, LXXXVI), already noticed the typographical changes between both editions in a sample of the *First Olynthiac*, but he may have misunderstood the terms, since what he referred to as the “vetustior” (= A11) is in fact the “junior” (= A12), and vice versa. The last editor in Oxford, M. DILTS (vol. I, 2002, XII) also talks about a “revision after initial publication, between 1520–1527”, evidenced by “differing printer’s marks, details of typography and page layout”, but more important than these are the textual changes, which I will mention later.

²³ This would entail, at least, three manuscripts: the one used as base, plus the “manuscripts” (in plural, and therefore, two at least) from which the “variants” written at the end of both editions were extracted. Three are also the manuscripts mentioned by RENOARD, *op. cit.*, 47.

by Johannes Rhosos; Paris. gr. 2938, the Demosthenic part copied in 1480 by Antonios Damilas; Monac. gr. 85, dated to the 13th century, and Matrit. BN 4647, copied in 1486 by Constantinos Lascaris.²⁴

In passages of the *Third* and *Fourth Philippics* where there are textual changes between editions or in the “Appendix of variants”, we can see how they match with these manuscripts:

Abbreviations:

A11 = First Aldine edition (Venice, 1504)

A12 = Second Aldine edition (Venice, ca. 1520)

Var. = Appendix (the same in both editions) entitled “Variants we have found in other manuscripts”

C = Malatest. D.XXIX.3

p = Paris. gr. 2938

M = Matrit. BN 4647

B = Monac. gr. 85

Within the *Third* and *Fourth Philippics* (orr. 9 and 10), each of the above-mentioned manuscripts (C p M B) seems to present exclusive coincidences with one of the Aldines (A11 or A12) or with the “Appendix of variants” (Var.) in passages where their readings are different. According to a descending order of frequency these are:

Manuscript C:

– with A11: 9.46 ἀναγίνωσκε A11 C / ἀναγινώσκετε A12 (Y^c) / ἀνάγνωσις B / om. p M; 9.48 τοὺς ἑλληνας A11 C (S^cAF^cY^c) / τοὺς ἄλλους ἑλληνας A12 M / τοὺς ἄλλους Var. p B (SFY);

²⁴ Malatest. D.XXIX.3 is suggested by M. I. MANOUSSACAS and C. STAIKOS (Le Edizioni di Testi Greci da Aldo Manuzio e le Prime Tipografie Greche di Venezia, Atena 1993 [*Venetiae quasi alterum Byzantium*, 4], 90, n. 24); Paris. gr. 2938 has been identified through its copyists and print marks by A. CATALDI PALAU, op. cit., 433ff., who regards it as source for the second edition, not for the first (435); for Monac. gr. 85 as base of the Aldine, cf. K. KAPPARIS, Apollodoros, Against Neaira [D. 59], Berlin 1999, 76; we proposed Matrit. BN 4647 as a manuscript close to the Aldine edition: Notas al Matritensis núm. 4647: Constantino Láscaris y el texto de Demóstenes, CFC(G) 10 (2000), 263. Moreover, a recent *collatio* of the *First Olynthiac* (or. 1) has shown us some significant coincidences with Monac. gr. 172. The possible connection of this manuscript, including its marginal corrections, with the Aldine is also an issue that remains open waiting for more systematic *collatio* in other Demosthenic speeches.

- with A12: 9.24 τὴν δυναστείαν τὴν αὐτὴν A1 1 p M B (FY) / τὴν αὐτὴν δυναστείαν A12 C (SA);
- with A11 A12: 10.40 ἄτοπων τῶν ὄντων A11 A12 C (SA) / ἄτοπώτατον ὄντα p M B (FY);
- with Var.: 9.7 εἰρήνην ἢ πόλεμον ἄγειν A11 A12 p M B (FY) / εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἢ πολεμεῖν Var. C; 9.19 ἐὰν δὲ ἀναβάλῃσθε A11 A12 p(λλ) M(λλ) B (FY) / ἐὰν δ' ἐάσῃτε, οὐδὲ τοῦτο Var. C (SA); 10.70 Ἀριστόδημε A11 A12 p M B (FY) / Ἀριστόμηδες Var. C (SA);
- with A12 Var.: 9.35 ἐνὸς A11 p M B (FY) / καθ' ἓνα A12 Var. C (A); 10.6 ὑπολειπόμεθα A11 p M B (S^cF^aY) / ἀπολειπόμεθα A12 Var. C (AF^c); 10.23 ποῦ A12 Var. C (SAY^c) / ποῖ A11 p M B (FY^a).

Manuscript p:

- with A11: 9.48 στρατεύεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον A12 C M B (S^cAY^c) / om. A11 p; 9.51 κινήσῃτε A11 p / κινήσετε A12 (Y) / κινήσεται C M / κινήσῃται B (SF^a); 10.61 εἰ A11 p / ἢ A12 C M B;
- with A11 A12: 10.32 ἀνάρπαστος A11 A12 p / ἀνάσπαστος Var. C M B;
- with Var.: 9.20 ἐὰν δὲ ληρεῖν A11 A12 C M B / ἐὰν δὲ λοιδορεῖν Var. p.

Manuscript M:

- with A11: 9.1 αὐτὰ διατεθῆναι A11 M (S^cAY) / αὐτὰ διαθεῖναι C / διατεθῆναι A12 Var. p B;
- with A12: 9.22 ἓνα ἕκαστον A11 C p B (AFY^c) / ἓνα A12 M (SY); 9.48 τοὺς Ἕλληνας A11 C (S^cAF^cY^c) / τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας A12 M / τοὺς ἄλλους Var. p B (SFY) (conflation); 10.56 ἀποστήναι A11 p B (SFY) / ἀφιστάναι A12 M (A) / ἀφεστάναι C Index Lamb.

Manuscript B:

- with A11: 10.62 ἐπιστήσεσθε A11 B / ἐπίστασθε A12 p M B(γρ.) (Fγρ.Y) / ἐπιστήσεσθαι C;
- with Var.: 9.16 ἂν τ' ἐπὶ μικροῦ ... μείζονος A11 A12 C p M B (ante corr.) / ἂν τ' ἐπὶ μικροῖς ... μείζοσι Var. B^c (F^c).

All this implies that among the four manuscripts (C p M B), C (Malatest. D.XXIX.3) is the one that most often agrees exclusively with the Aldine editions or the “Appendix of variants”. However, none of these manuscripts seems to have been used exclusively by the editors; rather, in some passages other manuscript(s) have been used (*ope codicum*), or corrections have been made by conjecture (*ope ingenii*). Another supporting piece of evidence is the existence of passages wherein the reading of the Aldines in the “Appendix of variants”

does not correspond with any of the manuscripts mentioned above, nor with the *veteres*; this occurs most often with A11 in the *Fourth Philippic*, and with A12 in the *Third Philippic*. However, what can be concluded is that the source would be closer to F Y than to S A, but also that contamination has occurred between the two groups. Finally, there are lapses in A11 against A12. Therefore, the asseveration of A. Renouard²⁵ that the second edition provides a “more accurate and refined” text, is not entirely correct, e. g.:

9.23 τοὺς τελευταίας A12 (pro τελευταίους A11);

9.59 ἄνθρωπως A12 (pro ἄνθρωπος A11).

In the other discourses there also seem to be more mistakes in the second Aldine than in the first one.

In all the discourses before the Assembly (orr. 1–17),²⁶ there are nearly 200 changes between both Aldine editions. If we except mistakes or omissions, the major textual changes (excluding those with elisions, movable -v, etc.) are as follows. A considerable number (over 40) are textual additions (introduced below through the symbols < >), distributed in both editions in a balanced way. The first reading belongs to the first Aldine edition (A11); the second reading, after colon (:), belongs to the second Aldine (A12).²⁷

1.7 δεῖν : δεῖ, 1.14 σκοπεῖτε : σκοπεῖσθε, 1.15 κινδυνεύσωμεν : κινδυνεύσομεν, 1.16 τοὺς περὶ : τοὺς <ύστάτους> περὶ, 1.16 οἶμαι δεῖν : οἶμαι <γε> δεῖν, 1.21 ἔχη : ἔχοι (A12, P.Oxy. 4311), 1.27 αὐτοῖς : αὐτῇ, 1.27 δεδαπάνητε : δεδαπάνησθε.

2.3 ὑμῖν (A11, Richards) : ἡμῖν, 2.4 αὐτοῦ : αὐτοῦ, 2.5 αὐτοῦ : αὐτῷ, 2.6 μὲν οὖν : γὰρ, 2.7 ἡμᾶς : ὑμᾶς, 2.13 παραινεῖν : περαινεῖν, 2.14 ἐβοήθησαν : ἐβοήθησε, 2.16 οὐθ' (sic) : οὐθ', 2.17 πεζέτεροι : πεζαίτεροι, 2.18 παρεῶσθαι : παρεωρᾶσθαι, 2.20 ταῦτ' : πάντ', 2.22 ἡμῶν : ὑμῶν, 2.28 ἰδίους : ἰδίᾳ, 2.29 ταῦτα : ταύτας, 2.29 ὑμῖν : ἡμῖν, 2.29 βοηθησόμενοι : βοησόμενοι <οἱ>.

3.6 τίς <οὔτος> : τις, 3.8 ὑμῖν : ἡμῖν, 3.10 καθιστᾶτε : καθίστατε, 3.13 παρ' ὑμῖν : παρ' ἡμῖν, 3.19 ῥᾶον : ῥᾶστον, 3.19 αὐτὸν : αὐτὸν, 3.20 μισθοὺς : μισθὸν,

²⁵ RENOARD, op. cit., 47.

²⁶ I would like to express gratitude to my students of Greek textual criticism at the Complutense University of Madrid, with whom I worked on this issue as a practical exercise.

²⁷ It should be noted that in these discourses there are numerous textual changes between the two Aldine editions in or. 14 (*On the Navy*). Generally in this discourse the text of the second Aldine edition seems more accurate; it follows manuscript A with regard to its additions, whereas that of the first Aldine edition agrees more with F Y. In the discourses other than the speeches before the Assembly there are minor textual changes between both Aldines; for instance, in a discourse as large as or. 21 (*Against Meidias*) I noted only 13 changes; in the private ones *Against Aphobus* I–III (orr. 27–29), only 10.

3.20 οὔτοι : οὔτοι, 3.29 κοιῶμεν : κοινῶμεν, 3.29 δόξων : ἀδόξων, 3.31 ἡ βοηδρόμια : ἡ βοΐδια, 3.33 ἀλλὰ νῦν γ' ἔτι : ἔτι καὶ νῦν, 3.33 ἄν : ἄ.

4.1 οὔτοι : αὐτοί, 4.5 αὐτοῦ : ἑαυτοῦ, 4.9 ἐπὶ τούτων : ἐπὶ τούτοις, 4.37 εἰρωνείαν : ῥαθυμίαν, 4.47 ὥστε μὴ : οὐ γάρ.

5.15 καθαδεῖται (sic) : καθεδεῖται, 5.18 ἐχροδεστέρωσ : ἐχθροτέρωσ, 5.19 περὶ τοῦ συμφέροντος : πέρα τοῦ συμφέροντος, 5.22 ἔμελλον : ἔμελων (sic), 5.22 ἑαυτὸν : αὐτὸν, 5.25 παρακεχωρήκαμεν : παρακεχωξήκαμεν (sic).

6.16 ἄ : ἄν, 6.20 ἐκβάλλων : ἐκβαλὼν.

7.20 μνησθήσεσθε : μέμνησθε, 7.21 μεταβάλλειν : μεταβάλλει, 7.21 αὐτοῦ : αὐτοῦ, 7.25 ἐξηπάνα (sic) : ἐξηπάτα, 7.26 οὔτ' : ὅτ', 7.33 διατελεῖ : διατελεῖν, 7.33 εἰρήνης (sic) : εἰρήνης, 7.34 αὐτοῦ : αὐτοῦ, 7.34 πιστεύητε : πιστηύητε (sic), 7.34 εὐεργετήσιν : εὐεργετήσιν, 7.37 πότερον : πρότερος, 7.38 πρόξενον (sic) : πρόξενον, 7.41 σφετερίζεται : σφετρίζεται (sic), 7.43 ὑμῶν : ὑμῖν, 7.44 ἀνασκάσειν (sic) : ἀναγκάσειν.

8.5 παρασκευάζεται : συσκευάζεται, 8.8 αἷς : ἄς, 8.9 δεινὰ <δὲ> ποιοῦσιν : δεινὰ ποιοῦσιν, 8.9 ἐπιτρέπιν : ἐπιτρέπιν (sic), 8.17 αὐτοῖς : αὐτοί, 8.26 <τε> τρέφειν : τρέφειν, 8.27 <συγ>καταπραξαμένῳ : καταπραξαμένῳ, 8.32 πρὶς (sic) : πρὸς, 8.34 παρήκατα (sic) : παρήκατε, 8.52 μὲν ἑάσω : μὲν <ἄλλα> ἑάσω, 8.54 <οὐχί> τῷ τοῦ : τῷ τοῦ, 8.59 φήσομεν : φήσομεν <τότε>, 8.59 πολεμεῖν ἡμῖν : πολεμεῖν ἡμῖν <ἐρεῖ>, 8.60 πλείω ἄλλων τῶν : πλείω τῶν ἄλλων, 8.61 προσήκεν οὕτω : οὕτω προσήκει, 8.67 ταῦτα : τούτων, 8.67 φέρεσθαι : στέρεσθαι, 8.70 <τὴν> πόλιν : πόλιν, 8.73 <καί> τοιοῦτον : τοιοῦτον, 8.74 σὺν : ἐν, 8.74 ἐδημηγόρησεν : ἐδημηγόρει.

9.1 <αὐτὰ> διατεθῆναι : διατεθῆναι, 9.2 τὰ αἷτια : <ἐστιν> αἷτια, 9.7 βουλευσασθαι : βουλευέσθαι, 9.11 καὶ πρέσβεις : <καὶ φίλους> καὶ πρέσβεις, 9.18 ὑμῖν : ἡμῖν, 9.18 ᾧ : τῷ, 9.22 ἓνα <ἕκαστον> : ἓνα, 9.23 τοὺς τελευταίους : τοὺς τελευταίας (sic), 9.24 δυναστείαν τὴν αὐτήν : τὴν αὐτὴν δυναστείαν, 9.25 τοὺς <ἄλλους> : τοὺς, 9.25 πολλοστὸν <πέμπτον> μέρος : πολλοστὸν μέρος, 9.26 αὐτῶν ἀφήρηται : αὐτῶν παρήρηται, 9.35 ἐνὸς : καθ' ἓνα, 9.46 ἀναγίνωσκε : ἀναγινώσκετε, 9.48 τοὺς ἔλληνας : τοὺς <ἄλλους> ἔλληνας, 9.48 οἱ : στρατεύεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον, 9.51 κινήσητε : κινήσετε, 9.59 ἄνθρωπος : ἄνθρωπος (sic), 9.61 ἡβούλοντο : ἐβούλετο, 9.73 προεμένους : προομένους (sic).

10.6 ὑπολειπόμεθα : ἀπολειπόμεθα, 10.17 <οὐ> βουλομένων : βουλομένων, 10.19 ποιεῖ : πολεμεῖ, 10.23 ποῖ : ποῦ, 10.37 ἐποίουν : ἐποιοῦμεν, 10.49 κέκλησθε : κεκήλησθε, 10.51 σκέψασθε : σκέψεσθε, 10.54 πέπραται : ἐκπέπραται, 10.54 κεκυλημένοι : κεκλημένοι, 10.56 ἀποστήναι : ἀφιστάναι, 10.61 εἰ : ἡ, 10.62 ἐπιστήσεσθε : ἐπίστασθε, 10.73 δόξα σοι : δόξασον (sic).

11.17 νεώτερον : νεωτέραν, 11.20 κοινῶν : δημοσίων.

12.4 <ει> ἐφ' οἷς : ἐφ' οἷς, 12.9 ἀποδείκνυσθε : ἀποδείκνυσθαι, 12.10 ὄσσην : ὄσης, 12.10 εἶχε : ἤρχεν, 12.11 ἔτι : ὅτι, 12.11 φροντίζοιμι : φροντίζοι μοι, 12.18 ἐλλήνων : ἐλλήνως (sic), 12.21 ἀδριάντα (sic) : ἀνδριάντα.

13.4 φημί τὸ : φημί <χρήναι> τὸ, 13.6 τὴν : καί, 13.7 ἄνευ γὰρ τοῦ : καὶ ἄνευ τοῦ, 13.7 λόγος : λόγος <οὔτος>, 13.10 βασιλέως : <τῶν> βασιλέως, 13.10 ἵππους : ἱππέας, 13.14 <καὶ> σκοπεῖτε : σκοπεῖτε, 13.14 ἄξια : ἄξα (sic), 13.19 τοῖς : τῶν 13.21 ὑπερετίμων : ἐτίμων, 13.23 ἔννεμον : ἐδίδοσαν, 13.26 ἔχοι : ἔχοι <τῶν πραγμάτων>, 13.26 γενέσθαι βελτίους : κρείττους γενέσθαι, 13.28 ἀλλὰ τί : ἀλλ' ὅτι, 13.29 δυνάμει : δυνάμει <τότε>, 13.29 πόλεως : πολιτείας, 13.29 ἀριστείδου : ἀριστείδου <καὶ μιλιάδου>, 13.36 πεισομένους : πειθομένους.

14.2 μάλιστα : μάλιστα <δύνασθαι>, 14.2 ἅπαντες : ἅπαντες <οἱ μέλλοντες>, 14.2 φανείμην : φανείμην <ὄντες>, 14.2 ἔσται : ἔσται <νῦν>, 14.2 βασιλέα : <τὸν> βασιλέα, 14.4 τι ἐναργές : ἐναργές τι, 14.5 ἀρχὴν : ταραχὴν, 14.7 ἐπὶ ταύτῃ φρονεῖν αἰρουμένη : φρονεῖν ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ προαιρέσει, 14.9 ἀναγκαίους : ἀναγκαίως, 14.10 μὴδ' ἐξ ἐνός : ἐκ μηδενός, 14.12 ἐνίων ὑμῶν : ὑμῖν ἐνίων, 14.19 ἐπειδὴν : ἐπειθὲν (sic), 14.21 ἐκάστω : ἐκάστω <τῷ>, 14.21 πράξαντας : πράξαντας <τὰς>, 14.22 τίς, ἡ καὶ σαφής : καὶ σαφής ὅθεν, 14.22 λέξω : λέγω, 14.23 ἐκάστης : ἐκάστη, 14.25 χρησμοδοῖεν : χρησμοφθεῖεν (sic), 14.26 εἰσενέγκαι : εἰσενέγκοι, 14.26 αὐτοῦ : ἐαυτοῦ, 14.27 <τὴν> ἑκατοστήν : ἑκατοστήν, 14.27 ἐρεῖ <νῦν> : ἐρεῖ, 14.27 θεῷ : θῷ, 14.28 ἡμᾶς : ὑμᾶς, 14.28 κατάθοιτε : καταθεῖτε, 14.28 ἡμᾶς : ὑμᾶς, 14.29 ῥάδιόν τι : ῥάδιον εἶναι, 14.30 ὀκτακισχίλια : ἑξακισχίλια, 14.30 ἀκούσεται : ἀκούσετε, 14.33 ἐκείνων : τούτων, 14.34 διαλύσονται : ἀναλύσονται, 14.37 ἡμᾶς ἐκείνον ἀδίκημα ἂν ἔθηκα : ὑμᾶς ἔθηκα ἐκείνον, 14.38 πείσονται : πείσετε, 14.40 ποτε : πρὸ τούτων, 14.41 σκοπῶμεν : σκωπεῖν (sic), 14.41 ὀργισθήσεσθε : ὀργισθε.

15.7 παραινέσαιμι : παραινέσαι, 15.9 πολέμησας : βοηθήσας, 15.10 ἐαυτῶν : ἐαυτοῦ, 15.10 om. : αὐτοῖς.

16.4 ἀσθενεῖς : ἀσθενοῖς (sic), 16.12 ὑμῖν : ἡμῖν, 16.17 ἴωσιν : ἴσωσιν (sic), 16.22 ὑπολαμβάνω (sic) : ὑπολαμβάνω, 16.23 λακεδαιμονωνίων (sic) : λακεδαιμονίων.

17.14 ὁμογίαις (sic) : ὁμολογίαις.

4. THE *SCRIPTIO PLENA* AND THE TESTIMONY OF THE *VETERES*

In this section some issues related to textual criticism, as well as to phonetic and literary stylistics, including questions of authenticity, will be discussed.

Although in editions of Greek authors we usually see that word-final vowels are deleted or elided almost mechanically with the initial vowels of the following word (*scriptio elisa*), this rule may not correspond to what was the real *pronuntiatio* of the texts, nor with the author's own writing.

In the field of the Demosthenic speeches, recent editors seem to have questioned this principle, restoring many final vowels (*scriptio plena*) before starting the next word. This practice has stylistic implications. Indeed, if one compares the Demosthenic editions of Douglas MacDowell (Demosthenes, *Against Meidias*, Oxford 1990, and Demosthenes, *On the False Embassy*, Oxford 2000), or the latest edition of Mervin Dilts (Demosthenis *Orationes*, Oxford 2002–2009) with previous editions of Demosthenes, one finds that many cases of *scriptio elisa* have become *scriptio plena*, for reasons related primarily to textual criticism. As noted by MacDowell, due to our lack of information about the real *pronuntiatio* (and *scriptio*) of the speech by Demosthenes, we should turn to the testimony of the manuscripts, especially when it coincides with most of the *veteres* SAFY or when some of the *testimonia* in these passages have been confirmed by some papyri.

In that way, some stylistic “rules”, like the one alleged by Blass about the presumed avoidance by Demosthenes of three short successions or the analogous one by Benseler about the avoidance of hiatus, present a greater number of exceptions than commonly believed. I have reviewed the manuscript tradition of S A F Y on the four *Philippics* and believe that by following the methodological principles of MacDowell and Dilts, more instances of *scriptio plena* can be restored: there are 87 new cases (of which 34 correspond to three short syllables, *tribrachs*) of restoration of *scriptio plena* in the *Philippics* because of the coincidence of three or four main *veteres*, or at least the two most important (S A).

Among all, there are 19 remarkable instances of *scriptio plena* (7 of which are *tribrachs*, denoted by *) agreeing with the main *veteres*, S A; these instances should perhaps be considered in future editions of these speeches:

- 4.29 ταῦτ(α) οὕτως ἔχη SA
- 4.30 δεδυνήμεθ(α) εὐρεῖν SA
- 4.31* ἐκεῖσ(ε) ἀφικέσθαι SA
- 4.33 ἄν ταῦτ(α), ὦ ἄνδρες SA
- 4.47 πράγματ(α) αἰσχύνῃς SA
- 4.50* τὰ δέοντ(α) ἐσόμεθα SA
- 9.17 ἀπτόμενον κ(αὶ) ἐν Εὐβοίᾳ SA
- 9.39 ἀντεισῆκται δ(ἐ) ἀντὶ τούτων SAFY
- 9.40 καὶ τᾷλλ(α) οἷς ἄν τις SA
- 9.60 τὰ μὲν ἄλλ(α) ὡς ὑβρίζετο SA
- 9.61* Εὐφραῖον οἱ(α) ἔπαθεν μεμνημένοι SA
- 9.66 τὸν δ(ἐ) Ἀπολλωνίδην SAFY
- 9.73* καὶ τᾷλλ(α) ὅσα ἀξιούσι SA
- 10.4* ὅτου ποτ(ἐ) ἄν οἴωνται SA

- 10.6 οἱ δ(ἐ) ὑπὲρ τοῦ ποῦ SA
 10.19 τᾷλλ' ὅσ(α) εἰς πόλεμον SA
 10.19 ταῦτ(α) ᾗ νῦν ποιεῖτε SA
 10.46* ἕκαστον πάντ(α) ἐτέρους SA
 10.65* οὐχὶ τ(ᾷ) ἐπὶ Θράκης SA

With regard to *scriptio plena*, also the last open issue addressed in this paper shall be considered. Within the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, presently consisting of 63 works, doubts remain about the authenticity of almost half of them. For some time, there have been attempts, especially in the field of stylometry, to find a kind of “Demosthenic trail”, a “formula” which is somehow less subjective and provides a basis for clarifying a work’s authenticity. Perhaps the best-known is the so called “law of Blass”: the alleged avoidance by Demosthenes of three consecutive brief syllables, a principle which, despite the nuances given by Adams and Vogel, still has numerous exceptions.²⁸

I will present here what I call “law of μέν – δέ” of Demosthenic authenticity, which takes into account the ratio of occurrences of two of the main Greek particles, μέν and δέ within the discourses attributed to Demosthenes; with regard to δέ, the proportion of occurrences of the plenary form (δέ) to the elided form (δ') is noted. This law can be formulated thus: “in the discourses of Demosthenes the number of occurrences of δέ (plenary form) is always inferior to μέν and also tends to be inferior to δ' (elided form)”, namely, μέν > δέ < δ'. We used the data from the TLG, which contains the text of the OCT edition of S. H. Butcher and W. Rennie (Oxford 1903–1931). However, the new Demosthenic edition M. R. Dilts has published in the same collection (Oxford 2002–2009), among other changes made in relation to the first edition, renders numerous cases of elided forms in Butcher and Rennie into plenary forms. At first glance, that may invalidate our formula; nevertheless, as Butcher and Rennie always write δ' before vowels, and δέ almost always before consonants, we may reformulate our law in the following terms, so that it can also be validated according to the orthographic principles of Dilts: “in the authentic discourses of Demosthenes the amount of δέ + consonant is always inferior to μέν, and there exists a tendency to be also inferior to δέ + vowel (δ')”. Consequently, all the works in which

²⁸ F. BLASS, *Die attische Beredsamkeit*, Leipzig ³1893, reimp. Hildesheim - New York 1979, III, 105, 107, n. 5; C. ADAMS, *Demosthenes' Avoidance of Breves*, CPh 12 (1917), 271–294, especially 282; F. VOGEL, *Die Kürzenmeidung in der griechischen Prosa des IV. Jahrhunderts*, *Hermes* 58 (1923), 87–108, especially 88. A good history of the question is found in the “Appendix 3” (Grounds for regarding works as spurious and doubtful) of D. F. MCCABE, *The Prose-Rhythm of Demosthenes*, New York 1981, especially 186–197. See also our *Demosthenica*, op. cit., 281–282.

μέν < δέ should be considered apocryphal, and all those in which μέν > δέ < δ' should be considered authentic, while μέν > δέ > δ', both categories (authentic and apocryphal) would coexist:

- μέν > δέ < δ' : orr. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 13, 15, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, 45, 54, 55, 60 (Epitaphius), Exordia.
- μέν < δέ > δ' : orr. 7, 11, 33, 35, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 56, 57, 59.
- μέν > δέ > δ' : orr. 12, 14, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 24, 26, 31, 32, 34, 51, 58, 61 (Eroticus), Epistulae.²⁹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ADAMS, C.: Demosthenes' Avoidance of Breves, CPh 12 (1917), 271–294.
- BABCOCK, R.: Demosthenes *De Chersoneso* (P. Ct. YBR inv. 1348; pl. I.1), ZPE 100 (1994), 45–46.
- BLASS F.: Die attische Beredsamkeit, Leipzig ³1893, reimp. Hildesheim - New York 1979, vol. III.
- BUTCHER, S. H.: Demosthenis orationes recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit S. H. Butcher, tomus I, Oxford 1903.
- BUTCHER, S. H.: Demosthenis orationes recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit S. H. Butcher, tomus II, pars I, Oxford 1907.
- CANFORA, L.: Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene, Padua 1968.
- CATALDI PALAU, A.: Gian Francesco d'Asola e la tipografia aldina, Genua 1998.
- DE ANDRÉS, G.: Catálogo de los códices griegos de las colecciones: Complutense, Lázaro Galdiano y March de Madrid, Cuadernos de Filología Clásica 6 (1974), 239–249.
- DILTS, M. R.: Demosthenis orationes recognovit, apparatu testimoniorum ornavit, adnotatione critica instruxit M. R. Dilts, tomus I–IV, Oxford 2002, 2005, 2008, 2009.
- ESCOBAR CHICO, A.: Codices Caesaraugustani Graeci, Catálogo de los manuscritos griegos de la Biblioteca capitular de la Seo (Zaragoza), Zaragoza 1993.
- GRAUX, Ch. - MARTIN, A.: Rapport sur une mission en Espagne et en Portugal. Notices sommaires des manuscrits grecs d'Espagne et Portugal, Nouvelles archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires 2 (1892), 130–134 and 304–305.
- GRUSKOVÁ, J.: Zur Notwendigkeit einer systematischen Aufarbeitung der Demosthenes-Papyri und -Pergamentfragmente für eine neu zu gestaltende Demosthenesausgabe, Analecta Papyrologica 12 (2000), 95–139.
- HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, F. G.: Notas al *Matritensis* núm. 4647: Constantino Láscaris y el texto de Demóstenes, CFC(G) 10 (2000), 253–266.
- HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, F. G.: Demosthenica, CFC(G) 16 (2006), 269–282.

²⁹ It is interesting to find, for example, that the so-called “discourses of Apollodorus” (orr. 46, 47, 49, 50, 52, 53 and 59) fall within the second group, that is to say, works which are not Demosthenic, whereas other Demosthenic discourses, such as the *Olynthiacs* (orr. 1, 2 and 3) and the *Philippics*, including the *Fourth* (orr. 4, 6, 9 and 10), belong to the first group, works which are surely Demosthenic.

- HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ, F. G.: Los papiros y las arengas demosténicas (Or. I–XVII), ZPE 162 (2007), 43–50.
- IRMER, D.: Zur Genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften. Untersuchungen an den Reden 8 und 9, Hamburg 1972.
- JACKSON, D. - ROWE, G. O.: Demosthenes 1915–1965, Lustrum 14 (1969), 5–109.
- KAPPARIS, K.: Apollodoros, “Against Neaira” [D. 59], Berlin - New York 1999.
- KAZAZIS, J. N.: Φιλιππικῶν ῥητορικαὶ λέξεις, Thessaloniki 1986.
- LUCÀ, S.: Il Lessico dello Ps.-Cirillo (Redazione V₁): da Rossano a Messina, RSBN 31 (1994), 45–80.
- MACDOWELL, D. M.: Demosthenes, Against Meidias (Oration 21), Oxford 1990.
- MACDOWELL, D. M.: Demosthenes, On the False Embassy (Oration 19), Oxford 2000.
- MCCABE, D. F.: The Prose-Rhythm of Demosthenes, New York 1981.
- MANOUSSACAS, M. I. - STAÏKOS, C.: Le Edizioni di Testi Greci da Aldo Manuzio e le Prime Tipographie Greche di Venezia, Atena 1993 (*Venetiae quasi alterum Byzantium*, 4).
- MUÑOZ FLÓREZ, J.: Los papiros de Demóstenes, in: F. G. HERNÁNDEZ MUÑOZ (ed.), La tradición y la transmisión de los oradores y rétores griegos – Tradition and transmission of Greek orators and rhetors, Berlin 2012, 195–204.
- NAOUMIDES, M. N.: Ῥητορικαὶ λέξεις (editio princeps), Athenais 1975.
- REISKE, J.: Demosthenis quae supersunt, vol. I, London 1822.
- RENNIE, W.: Demosthenis orationes recognovit brevique apparatu critico instruxit W. Rennie, tomus II, pars II, Oxford 1921.
- RENNIE, W.: Demosthenis orationes recognovit brevique apparatu critico instruxit W. Rennie, tomus III, Oxford 1931.
- RENOUARD, A.: Annales de l’imprimerie des Alde, Paris ³1854.
- SIJPESTEIJN, P. J.: Les parchemins et les papyrus de Demosthène trouvés en Égypte, CE 83 (76) (1963), 297–305.
- VOGEL, F.: Die Kürzenmeidung in der griechischen Prosa des IV. Jahrhunderts, Hermes 58 (1923), 87–108.
- WANKEL, H.: Zu dem neuen Yale Papyrus mit Demosthenes 8.6, ZPE 102 (1994), 194.

Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz

Departamento de Filología Griega y Lingüística Indoeuropea

Facultad de Filología

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Ciudad Universitaria

E-28040 Madrid

fhmuno@filol.ucm.es