

## THE LATE ARRIVAL OF THE LONG *THIRD PHILIPPIC* 9th Century Contamination in the *Philippics*

Abstract: This paper presents and analyzes the distribution of the variants in the early manuscripts (commonly designated A, S, F, and Y) of Demosthenes' *Philippics* and shows that the state of the text they offer reflects the “general pretraditional contamination” as theorized by Giorgio Pasquali. There is, however, also clear evidence of specific contamination. It is shown that Y is influenced by an A-related source up to and including Dem. 8, that A is influenced by an FY-related source in Dem. 8, and that the so-called long version of Dem. 9 must have entered the corpus tradition not long before the large early Byzantine manuscripts were written. This incipient Byzantine manuscript interaction prefigures the formation of the later, equally generally contaminated Demosthenic text pool.

Keywords: Demosthenes' *Philippics*, open tradition, ‘text pool’, variant distribution, contamination

Theorists of textual criticism and history of the text are fond of aquatic similes. In his little book “Textual Criticism”,<sup>1</sup> Paul Maas in paragraph 21 likens the transmission of a text to a mountain stream being polluted by the various environments it passes as it descends; optimistically, Maas thinks it possible to discern in the lower stream the elements of pollution. In his massive response to Maas' book, “Storia della tradizione e critica del testo”,<sup>2</sup> Giorgio Pasquali on p. 141 was delighted to find this bit of poetry in Maas' otherwise so very prosaic work, but insisted that Maas' image is relevant only for vertical transmission; the horizontal influences that Pasquali investigates he thinks better compared to a drop of oil dispersing over the surface. Pasquali's best image, however, is

---

1) A book published in any number of editions and versions. I have used the English translation by Barbara Flower from 1958: Paul Maas, *Textual Criticism*, Oxford, here p. 20.

2) G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze 1952. Though no less towering than Maas' little volume this book, μέγα though no κακόν, has never been translated into any language, to my knowledge.

on p. 133: traditions displaying horizontal contact are compared to rivers springing from one and the same mountain lake and particularly in their lower course occasionally forming branches from one of the streams to another. Sometimes one can still discern, Pasquali maintains, the vertical pattern, but in the case of widely read and copied texts this is not possible – which of the streams that left the mountain lake originally carried any particular element (any specific quantity of water, or text) can no longer be determined; the tradition is “open”, a technical term that Pasquali takes some pride in having introduced (p. XXI).

Obviously, the mother of all open traditions is that of the New Testament, and in their magisterial “Der Text des Neuen Testaments”,<sup>3</sup> the Alands also resort to an aquatic simile to illustrate how the tradition of the New Testament formed and eventually became the Byzantine vulgata. In every church province the text of any given holy text spreads from the centre to the periphery like waves from a stone thrown into a pond (p. 65). The waves cross other waves from other stones in other provinces, and in the end everything somehow settles in a calmer, more unified surface – or text.

This can only partially be transferred to other open traditions – there is nothing quite comparable to church provinces, bishops and convents with secular literature. But the images are slightly insufficient in a more essential way. Neither the oil drop nor the stone reflect exactly what is going on in textual transmission. As Dieter Irmer points out,<sup>4</sup> an oil drop will not blend with the water; it remains discernible (as a thin film), as words from a foreign language would in a text. And the stone is a completely distinct entity, not reacting with the water at all. For contamination to occur, that is in order to have the new material mix with the old, we have to imagine that something that is able to dissolve is thrown into the water – a bucket of water taken from somewhere else or a handful of salt, anything with a distinct chemical profile, representing metaphorically text with a different history, different characteristics.

---

3) Kurt Aland / Barbara Aland, *Der Text des Neuen Testaments*, Stuttgart 1989. This book is also accessible in many editions and languages – my copy is the 2nd German edition.

4) Dieter Irmer, *Zur Genealogie der jüngeren Demostheneshandschriften. Untersuchungen an den Reden 8 und 9*, Hamburg 1972, on p. 14.

No image or analogy can ever do full justice to its illustrandum, and there are many details that simply do not fit. The theorists probably chose to express themselves in this way to make this rather dry, theory-laden subject a little easier to visualize. Perhaps I may be excused for expanding or correcting the simile a little in order to clarify another important distinction in the transmission of texts.

The images of Maas and Pasquali refer to streaming water, whereas the image of the Alands is better taken to refer to a system of ponds or lakes. In fact a stable water system is also what fits Pasquali's "open tradition" best. As used by Maas the water imagery is relevant only for textual transmissions that allow building a stemma. In this case, ideally, manuscripts live solitary lives, separated from each other in space and time, and they succeed one another in a continuous process of diversification. Should any foreign material intrude into one of the branches it will remain characteristic of this branch. But the state of tradition in antiquity as conceived by Pasquali cannot be described in terms of solitary manuscripts. The manuscripts are, in principle, all there at the same time, they are many, and they interact in much more multifarious and unpredictable ways. Any new manuscript could, in principle, adopt any variant known from other manuscripts surrounding it; it is not simply dependent on the primary text of its immediate exemplar but may adopt readings noted, e. g., in the margin of it or even retrieve new readings from completely different sources. Otherwise the tradition would not be really "open". The transmission discussed by Maas and Pasquali consists of vertical and horizontal influences; perhaps in this case one should speak of 'lateral' influences. In an open tradition one could also say that the text of a manuscript is only a reflection of another 'text', made up by the sum total, the 'pool', of textual possibilities when the text was solidified in manuscript form with a basically random selection of these possibilities.<sup>5</sup>

---

5) Another analogy may clarify this concept – that of the forest and the trees making it up. All the oak trees in a forest are the same and yet they are not; they all share, probably, a common ancestry and yet there is no way of reconstructing how. No tree is 'original' or 'standard' and no single tree tells us much about the origin or even the current state of the forest. The concept of the 'text pool' is about seeing the forest and not only the trees.

This ‘potential text’ exists nowhere in itself but expresses itself in ‘actual texts’, manuscripts, that come to be at a given place and time (a church province or the imperial court, for instance, in the ninth or the fourteenth century). Theoretically, in the perfect open tradition every new specimen of the text will eventually contain the same proportion of any specific diversity as any other manuscript.

Perhaps one could say that while vertical transmission, Maas’ mountain river, is governed mainly by gravity, open traditions follow the laws of thermodynamics and tend towards entropy, an indeterminate mixture of all components of the system in question, chaos or complete order, as you please to see it (just as the salinity of the oceans is remarkably constant). Readings in a textual ‘pool’ or ‘pond’ mix, as water molecules in a stable environment do, indiscriminately and with amazing speed,<sup>6</sup> quite unlike what happens in a stemma.

The manuscripts at our disposal are, so to speak, frozen samples of the tradition. In a closed tradition a new manuscript is simply a copy of its exemplar (most likely with a few new endogenous variants). Particulars will remain recognizable for generations. Not so in an open tradition. Only if the sample was taken in the vicinity (locally and temporally) of an important change in the open tradition system – a ‘splash’, if you like – we will be able to determine the nature of that event. Later the traces it left will have been diluted beyond recognition in the process of (further) contamination. But irregularities in the distribution of variants must have a cause. Something must have happened – some extra material must have been added, as if someone threw something into a pond.

The state of texts in antiquity was a pond situation – a very large pond. This is what Pasquali calls “total pretraditional contamination”. The sixth to eighth centuries CE he thinks more like streams underground, but with the renaissance of the ninth textual transmission immediately took to mixing again, and widely

---

6) Perhaps water is not really the right substance for the simile – after all, contamination does not take place quite that speedily. Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz, *Los papiros y las arengas Demosthénicas (Or. I–XVII)*, ZPE 162 (2007) 43–50, on p. 45 describes the ancient text of Demosthenes as being “en estado muy fluido, casi como un ‘magma textual’”. Water, however, is the more receptive of fluids – and many things enter the texts that one would not have thought would. But whichever fluid is chosen, it will tend towards entropy, complete mixture.

read texts quickly contaminated, manuscripts being collated over and over again. This is Pasquali's vision, stated repeatedly.<sup>7</sup> But this means, one might add, that in large traditions a new pond was forming – and eventually we shall have a 'total posttraditional contamination', if you like.

When, some years ago, I was about to finish a translation of Demosthenes' *Philippics* and decided to have a look at the manuscript tradition, it struck me that few traditions can be as apt to test Pasquali's dogma as that of Demosthenes. Pasquali was very well aware of that and dedicated a long section of his book to Demosthenes (pp. 269–294). His treatment of Demosthenes is now, of course, outdated in many particulars, but the essential facts remain much the same. There are, for the *Philippics*, four very early manuscripts, A, F, S, and Y (see below for details), that do not stem from one and the same archetypus – there was no archetypus, for any number of reasons, even the simple one that there is scarcely time for so many variants to form in the brief period of time available (Pasquali, *Storia* [n. 2] 271). After these early manuscripts, tradition is not rich until the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries where we find more than 250 of the 279 manuscripts in the catalogue of L. Canfora.<sup>8</sup> The later manuscripts do not relate to the early ones in any straightforward way. In fact there are virtually no direct copies of S and Y (only one of each); as for the rest of them, the successors of A and F,<sup>9</sup> the

---

7) E. g., for antiquity, "decalogo" 10 on p. xviii, or p. 397, which goes for medieval tradition as well – see also "decalogo" 7 on p. xvii, or p. 146, where he coins the phrase "contaminazione totale pretradizionale". Pasquali's method of going forward case by case means that many of the theoretical points are formulated in various parts of the book, and the index does not always help one finding them. L. D. Reynolds and N. G. Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars*, Oxford 1938, 293, object that general contamination, in the medieval ages, applies only to a few very contaminated traditions and doubt that Pasquali would have claimed otherwise. Perhaps, but Pasquali was not interested only (or even primarily) in classical authors. Much of what Pasquali says has been developed while he was working on early Christian authors with huge traditions.

8) L. Canfora, *Inventario dei manoscritti Greci di Demostene*, Padova 1968; for an conspectus of the chronological distribution of the manuscripts, see p. 83.

9) Actually, perhaps not 'copies' or even 'descendants', see Irmer (n. 4) 28 (it cannot be demonstrated that A is the ancestor of other manuscripts), 61 (F has only one actual copy, *Monacensis* gr. 85, known as B), and 88 (only one certain descendant of Y). Of course, Irmer's conclusions are based on a rather limited material.

probing of Irmer show what must be described as contamination chaos and, if one were looking for important new readings, are a total disappointment.<sup>10</sup> With the recentiores, the image of a pond actually presents itself, the readings floating, almost freely, among each other, and all the material coming from known sources – A, F, S, and Y. In this article, focus is on the relationship of these four early manuscripts – the state of transmission on the verge of forming a new pond or pool, the initial events still discernible. I deal only with the *Philippics*, the texts of primary interest to me; one may see this article as a pilot project to be followed up with more extensive research, if the method used here proves viable.

My overall conclusion confirms the theory of Pasquali: the early manuscripts do display an even distribution of variants conforming to a state of general contamination (in antiquity).<sup>11</sup> The manuscripts split three ways, F and Y being very close in the *Philippics*, copies of the same exemplar ( $\phi$ ). Were it just to show this, I would not write this article. But working my way through the figures I noticed a few anomalies that are much more interesting. Assuming that the overall distribution of properties in a system such as the *Philippics* will normally be relatively constant (that is, that the aquatic simile is meaningful), I have come to the conclusion that Y has been contaminated by an A-related manuscript (not A, but a probably close ancestor,  $\alpha$ ), and that the material that forms the long version of the *Third Philippic* (9) must have entered tradi-

---

10) Irmer (n.4) 9–10 and 24; his findings are confirmed by the collation of Spanish recentiores by Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz, *The Transmission of the Demosthenic Text: Open Issues*, in: Jana Grusková / Herbert Bannert (edd.), *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita. Studien zur Textüberlieferung des Corpus Demosthenicum*, Wien 2014, 147–155. Douglas MacDowell reached, for the *Against Meidias*, the very same conclusion: “All the later manuscripts are derived from A or F or Y.” (D. MacDowell: *Demosthenes, Against Meidias*, Oxford 1990, 92). I have myself carried out rough collations of speeches 5 and 11 and the passages still found in A of the *Olymthiacs*, in 6 late medieval manuscripts; the results are interesting, if provisional, but confirm a state of general contamination. What surprised me most was the extensive presence of distinctly S material.

11) The evidence for this general contamination in the papyri has been analyzed several times; the most recent analysis is by Fr. De Robertis, *Per la storia del testo di Demostene. I papiri delle Filippiche*, Bari 2015, pp. 258–60. See also Hernández Muñoz (n.6).

tion not long before the formation of our manuscripts. I have also come to suspect that in the generation or generations prior to our manuscripts an ancestor of A had access to  $\phi$  material in the *On the Chersonese* (8), but only there.

The study of the transmission of Demosthenes is booming in these years after more than a century of virtual neglect, had it not been for the efforts of men like Dieter Irmer, Luciano Canfora, and Douglas MacDowell. A project aimed at a meticulous recording of all early Demosthenic manuscripts, funded by the Austrian Science Fund, ran for 2008–2011 under the auspices of the Austrian Academy of Sciences, and one eagerly awaits the publication of its findings. A 2014 volume of conference papers contained a detailed description by Jana Grusková of the main manuscripts which is the basis of the few preliminary remarks I must make about S, A, F, and Y.<sup>12</sup>

A, *Monacensis* gr. 485, is written in a skilled but cursive hand with quite a number of abbreviations; the parchment is not of top quality, and the dimensions are moderate. As a whole, the manuscript seems to have been made for personal use by some scholar. Interestingly, A has *On the Trierarchic Crown* (51) twice, in two different recensions. Brigitte Mondrain<sup>13</sup> recently updated this manuscript to the middle of the ninth century CE, making it the earliest testimony to the text. It was probably written in or near Constantinople. The status conservationis at one point was poor; the beginning and the end of the codex was lost, and some time late in the thirteenth century it was repaired and a new text provided of the first part, up to *First Philippic* (4) 28, from another source.

---

12) Grusková / Bannert (n.10). The contribution by Grusková herself, *Paläographisch-kodikologische Betrachtungen zu den vetustissimi des Demosthenes unter philologischen Gesichtspunkten*, is on pp. 263–312. This paper largely replaces Engelbert Drerup, *Vorläufiger Bericht über eine Studienreise zur Erforschung der Demosthenesüberlieferung*, *Sitz. Ber. Akad. München*, 1902, 287–323. Sadly, a paper by Grusková intended as a chapter in the new *Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes*, ed. Gunther Martin, Oxford 2019, but substituted there by a shorter essay, has not yet appeared in the electronic review *Graecolatina et Orientalia*.

13) Brigitte Mondrain, *Le rôle de quelques manuscrits dans l'histoire du texte de Démosthène: remarques paléographiques et philologiques*, in: Grusková / Bannert (n. 10) 199–226, on pp. 201–205.

The original volume may have contained all Demosthenic material. A few of the first pages were preserved in the volume; these passages are too small to be of any use for our purposes, and my use of A begins, consequently, in 4,28.

The other three manuscripts are luxury products, state of the art books, copied with extreme care, so extreme indeed that even the ancient stichometric information is copied (it is absent in A), although the medieval scribes certainly did not know what it meant (see below p. 288).

F, Marcianus gr. (Z) 416, is very well preserved. It was written some time in the middle of the tenth century by a professional who also added a number of corrections and variants. F contains all known Demosthenic material, even adding and numbering the *Letter of Philip* (12) as number 12 in the series; the *On Syntaxis* that follows then gets number 13 – and so on.

Y, Parisinus gr. 2935, had undergone some serious damage very early, and the text from the beginning up to 7,19 was replaced in the fifteenth century. But the bulk of the text is early, from the beginning of the tenth century, written on parchment of excellent quality by a professional scribe from one of the important scriptoria in Constantinople. The codex does not contain a complete Demosthenes; it is focused on the political texts. The manuscript has a rich history; many variants have been added over the centuries, but not, it seems, by the first hand.<sup>14</sup> Y also contains the *Letter to Philip*, but does not number it; the *On Syntaxis* retains number 12 etc.

The presence of this text which is unknown to the other early manuscripts shows that F and Y or perhaps rather their common ancestor, φ, are, like α, inquisitive manuscripts; it testifies to the desire to rescue all that could be rescued of the ancient heritage. The fact that it lacks in A is more remarkable; its absence in S was to be expected.

A, F, and Y are early products from the central part of the Byzantine empire. The fourth important early manuscript, S, Parisinus gr. 2934, may stem from southern Italy.<sup>15</sup> If so, its date

14) Drerup (n. 12) 292–3.

15) See Grusková (n. 12) 269 for a brief presentation of the debate on this matter. I have not followed this trail; I am, as most scholars, completely at the mercy



is some time in the middle of the tenth century; if not, it will have been written around 900 CE. Most obviously, it differs from the other early manuscripts in having a different order of speeches (1–4, 8, 7, 5, 6, 9–11); otherwise, above all, it has a more concise text; words and phrases found in the other manuscripts are often not in S. When, later in the middle ages, it was in the possession of the Sosandri in Asia Minor, it was extensively ‘normalized’ in that respect;<sup>16</sup> the order of the speeches, obviously, could not be normalized that easily. S was ‘discovered’ remarkably late and only utilized systematically from the 1820’s. It was immediately hailed as ‘codex optimus’, opposition to that idea quickly repressed and the other manuscripts relegated to representing a ‘vulgate’ in the pejorative sense. Most editions have since based themselves primarily, sometimes almost exclusively, on S.<sup>17</sup>

Grusková’s careful description of the manuscripts at our disposal will be followed up by an improved, more complete “apparatus lectionum”.<sup>18</sup> For the time being, however, we must make do with the critical editions at hand, above all that of Mervin Dilts in the Oxford series (Oxford 2002). The numbers and patterns presented here are based on a database compiled by me of all readings in the *Philippics* as recorded by Dilts. I have often doublechecked the information given by Dilts, especially in the apparatus in Carl Fuhr’s 1914 Teubner edition; the remaining editions, particularly the old OCT by S. H. Butcher and the Budé text by Maurice Croiset

---

of the specialists. But I should not be sorry, were it possible to show a distant provenance of the ms.

16) See Drerup (n. 12) 290–1. Surely the new repertorium will contain a fuller discussion of the no less than 10 corrective hands Drerup believes to have identified. – Where the manuscript ended up was established by N. Wilson, *The Libraries of the Byzantine World*, GRBS 8 (1967) 53–80, on p. 78.

17) The supremacy of S was questioned by Hartmut Erbse, *Überlieferungsgeschichte der griechischen klassischen und hellenistischen Literatur*, in: Herbert Hunger, *Die Textüberlieferung der antiken Literatur und der Bibel*, Zürich 1961, 262–4, supported by a thesis by Dieter Irmer, *Zum Primat des Codex S in der Demostheneskritik*, Hamburg 1962 (unpublished), but their arguments have found little favour. Unjustly, I think. Irmer, 9–16, describes how S came to dominate.

18) Grusková (n. 12) 266, suggests that this might be published online – which would be most useful. By e-mail (Aug. 10th 2018) professor Grusková kindly informs me that while work on the ‘apparatus lectionum’ is steadily progressing, publication still lies several years in the future.

are very inadequate. The edition by Henri Weil (I have used the second, from 1881) is occasionally very useful in elucidating readings in S.<sup>19</sup> Not rarely I have availed myself of yet another useful new development: all four manuscripts are now accessible online in generally excellent photographs.<sup>20</sup>

The database distinguishes between four kinds of variant: lexical, morphological, word order and additional words ('plus words'),<sup>21</sup> and of course between readings before and after correction (also in the non-acceptance form of a *γράφεται*), but in this

---

19) Demosthenis Orationes, I, ed. M. R. Dils, Oxford 2002; Demosthenes, Orationes, ed. C. Fuhr, Leipzig 1914; Demosthenis Orationes Tomus I, ed. S. H. Butcher, Oxford 1978 (orig. 1903); Démosthène, Harangues II, ed. M. Croiset, Paris 1967 (orig. 1924); Les harangues de Démosthène, ed. H. Weil, Paris 21881. The recent commentary by J. Herrman, Demosthenes. Selected Political Speeches, Cambridge 2019, is of little or no use for our purposes, even though the book contains a text with an apparatus of a kind and occasionally refers to questions of textual transmission.

20) Some of the addresses are impractically long. S and Y are on the Bibliothèque Nationale de France website (<http://gallica.bnf.fr>); F is most easily found via the Bibliotheca Marciana (<https://marciana.venezia.sbn.it>); A is on <http://daten.digitale-sammlungen.de/~db/0003/bsb00032659/images/index.html>. The images of A are quite poor, unfortunately. For my own use, I have made the manuscripts more easily accessible at <http://arkhaia.dk/demosthenica/mss.htm>; each paragraph of text is linked with the corresponding image. This page is publicly accessible.

21) In the database, a variant is registered whenever one of the manuscripts differs in a reading from any or all of the others; it is registered for each manuscript separately. In the tables below, when two or three manuscripts offer the same text the variant is recorded under that combination, much as it is done in a critical apparatus. A lexical, morphological or word-order variant in one manuscript automatically implies another in the other manuscripts. Instances of fewer words ('minus words'), however, are not recorded – the fourth kind of variant is therefore different from the other three. Furthermore, in the tables it is not the number of extra words that is registered, but the mere fact that there are more words. If a word is missing in S as compared to AFY, AFY will display one more variant than S. This was a choice made early in compiling the database; it would be very difficult to undo, nor need it be: what is vital is that all the texts are treated in the same way – in that way the patterns are comparable, regardless. To exemplify the actual counting: in 9,4 S gives *αἴτιαι δὲ τῶν κακῶν*, A *αἴτιαι δὲ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων*, and FY *αἴτιαι δὲ τῆς παραχῆς καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων*. In this case, in *αἴτιαι δὲ* there is no variant, and nothing is registered; *τῶν κακῶν* is registered as a lexical variant under SA, *τῆς παραχῆς* under FY, and *καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων* as a plus word variant under AFY, while nothing is registered under S.

investigation focus is on the primary hand in the manuscripts.<sup>22</sup> The database also registers and numbers parallel texts (mainly quotations in rhetorical works), especially if they offer alternative readings. It is my impression that at least the early material is adequately presented in Dilts' edition, but there is no doubt that there is some uncertainty about the data presented in this article. Perhaps the quite small amounts of data processed should warn with even greater emphasis against making too wide-ranging conclusions. With more material at hand greater precision could be achieved, of course – but since this investigation concentrates on the *Philippics* we have only this small amount of text to work on. In my opinion there is, however, enough to ensure valid results albeit with some margin of uncertainty.

Up to 4,28 only two of the four manuscripts, S and F, are preserved; the original Y is lost until 7,19, and A does not give continuous text until 4,28.<sup>23</sup> With only two manuscripts analysis of distribution makes no sense, so we shall begin from 4,28.

In the *First Philippic* (4) 28–51, *On the Peace* (5), the *Second Philippic* (6) and *On Halonnesus* (7) 1–19 the variants distribute as follows:

Table 1: distribution of variants in the *First Philippic* (4) 28–51

	SF	AF	SA	S	F	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	9	6	9	5	9	9	47	26,55
Morph.	13	7	12	8	13	14	67	37,85
W.order	5	2	2	2	2	5	18	10,17
'Plus'	6	17	2	3	10	7	45	25,42
Total	33	32	25	18	34	35	177	
Pct.	18,64	18,08	14,12	10,17	19,21	19,77		

22) I should like to stress that this is not a point of principle. I have much sympathy with Sophia Kotzabassi, Demosthenes im 13. Jahrhundert, in: Grusková / Bannert (n. 10) 313–322.

23) Fragments of the first speeches survive from the original manuscript of A, but the passages are too brief to be of any practical significance.

Table 2: distribution of variants in *On the peace* (5)

	SF	AF	SA	S	F	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	10	11	3	10	3	10	47	28,31
Morph.	10	8	7	8	8	11	52	31,33
W.order	2	5	7	5	7	2	28	16,87
'Plus'	4	15	1	6	8	5	39	23,49
Total	26	39	18	29	26	28	166	
Pct.	15,66	23,49	10,84	17,47	15,66	16,87		

Table 3: distribution of variants in the *Second Philippic* (6)

	SF	AF	SA	S	F	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	8	6	10	7	11	9	51	23,50
Morph.	13	16	8	19	11	16	83	38,25
W.order	2	4	9	5	11	4	35	16,13
'Plus'	4	21	2	5	9	7	48	22,12
Total	27	47	29	36	42	36	217	
Pct.	12,44	21,66	13,36	16,59	19,35	16,59		

Table 4: distribution of variants in *On Halonnesus* (7) 1–19

	SF	AF	SA	S	F	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	5	3	7	5	9	6	35	35,35
Morph.	8	4	1	5	2	9	29	29,29
W.order	2	0	6	0	6	2	16	16,16
'Plus'	1	5	3	3	4	3	19	19,19
Total	16	12	17	13	21	20	99	
Pct.	16,16	12,12	17,17	13,13	21,21	20,20		

The *Fourth Philippic* (10) and *On Philip's letter* (11) produce much the same pattern as in the four tables above. That Y is present in these texts makes no significant difference; Y and F are so close that it is not only possible but advisable to treat them as only one

textual source, not two. In the full tables given below the data are inversed, the sigla being to the left, and the four categories of variant on top of the table.<sup>24</sup>

Table 5a: distribution of variants in the *Fourth Philippic* (10)

	Lexical	Morph.	Word order	Plus words	Total	Total pct.
SFA	2	4	2	6	14	2,24
SFY	20	24	9	26	79	12,62
SAY	2	2	0	0	4	0,64
AFY	35	22	15	38	110	17,57
SF	3	3	1	0	7	1,12
SA	31	25	7	9	72	11,50
SY	1	2	1	0	4	0,64
AF	1	2	0	1	4	0,64
AY	2	2	0	0	4	0,64
FY	40	28	8	32	108	17,25
S	43	28	19	11	101	16,13
A	29	30	13	28	100	15,97
F	2	2	1	2	7	1,12
Y	2	6	2	2	12	1,92
Total	213	180	78	155	626	
Total pct.	34,03	28,75	12,46	24,76		

Table 6a: distribution of variants in *Reply to Philip's letter* (11)

	Lexical	Morph.	Word order	Plus words	Total	Pct.
SFA	0	0	0	1	1	0,59
SFY	12	8	2	7	29	17,16

24) The number of manuscript combinations cannot be accommodated horizontally; there is no space. I'm sorry for the inconvenience.

SAY	1	0	0	0	1	0,59
AFY	5	10	7	5	27	15,98
SF	1	1	0	0	2	1,18
SA	11	3	3	2	19	11,24
SY	1	0	0	0	1	0,59
AF	1	0	1	1	3	1,78
AY	0	0	0	0	0	0,00
FY	13	3	4	6	26	15,38
S	7	10	9	1	27	15,98
A	15	9	3	4	31	18,34
F	1	0	0	0	1	0,59
Y	0	0	1	0	1	0,59
Total	68	44	30	27	169	
Total pct.	40,24	26,04	17,75	15,98		

As one can see, with F or Y alone or in combinations not with each other, the values are extremely small; F and Y are all but identical. Clearly, they are copies of one and the same exemplar ( $\varphi$ ).<sup>25</sup> For comparison with the earlier speeches, one can simply ignore readings separating Y from F, which brings out the following tables.

Table 5b: distribution of variants in 10 with readings separating Y from F eliminated and FY termed  $\varphi$

	S $\varphi$	A $\varphi$	SA	S	$\varphi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	20	35	31	47	40	32	205	34,80
Morph.	24	22	25	33	28	34	166	28,18
W. order	9	15	7	21	8	13	73	12,39
Plus	26	38	9	11	32	29	145	24,62
Total	79	110	72	112	108	108	589	
Pct.	13,41	18,68	12,22	19,02	18,34	18,34		

25) See below note 47 for some examples of their differences.

Table 6b: distribution of variants in 11 with readings separating Y from F eliminated and FY termed  $\phi$ 

	S $\phi$	A $\phi$	SA	S	$\phi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	13	6	12	8	14	15	68	40,72
Morph.	9	10	3	10	3	9	44	26,35
W. order	2	8	3	9	4	3	29	17,37
Plus	7	6	2	1	6	4	26	15,57
Total	31	30	20	28	27	31	167	
Pct.	18,56	17,96	11,98	16,77	16,17	18,56		

As is clear the relative extent of textual variation in the various entities (single manuscripts or combinations) in these speeches is fairly constant; the difference from speech to speech in the percentual for each entity exceeds 4 pct. only in a few cases. The values, assembled for easier inspection, are these:

Table 7: distribution of variants on manuscripts in speeches 4b–7a and 10–11 (percent)

	S $\phi$	A $\phi$	SA	S	$\phi$	A
4 (28–51)	18,64	18,08	14,12	10,17	19,21	19,77
5	15,66	23,49	10,84	17,47	15,66	16,87
6	12,44	21,66	13,36	16,59	19,35	16,59
7 (1–19)	16,16	12,12	17,17	13,13	21,21	20,20
10	14,33	19,00	12,67	17,50	19,17	17,33
11	18,56	17,96	11,98	16,77	16,17	18,56
Average	15,97	18,72	13,36	15,27	18,46	18,22

A preliminary conclusion would be that the roughly even distribution of the variants suggests the total pretraditional contamination Pasquali claims to be the normal pattern in the ancient world. As mentioned before (p. 273) Pasquali points out that the manuscripts considered here are too early for medieval transmission to have developed so much diversity – this is not ‘traditional’ medieval contamination but a reflection of the ancient state of the

text. If any combination of manuscripts is any rarer than the other combinations, it is SA, and that only marginally.<sup>26</sup>

When the old hand of Y begins (in 7,19) the situation in *On Halonnesus* (7) and particularly in *On the Chersonesus* (8) proves complicated, and there are special problems in the *Third Philippic* (9) as well. These three blocks of text do not immediately conform to the pattern we have seen above.

The figures for the *Third Philippic* (9) resemble those of the last two speeches (10 and 11) quite closely. F and Y alone show small values; they are practically identical. The one significant deviation from the distribution in 10 and 11 is the value for plus words in A, AF, and AFY. This was to be expected. Since S was first applied to establishing the text of Demosthenes in the 1820's, it has been clear that a number of words, from single words to whole sentences and paragraphs, in 9 have a particular status; they are not found in S, but to a large extent in A (which on no less than 127 occasions has extra words, compared to S), to a smaller extent in F (109), and again to an even smaller extent in Y (94). As S was immediately taken as a codex optimus (see above p. 277 with n. 17), these extra words from then on were generally excluded from the text, or at least printed in smaller type to set them off from the less questionable material; this is also what Dilts does in the new Oxford edition.

The full table is as follows:

Table 8a: distribution of variants in the *Third Philippic* (9)

	Lexical	Morph.	Word order	Plus words	Total	Total pct.
SFA	2	3	0	3	8	1,48
SFY	17	20	3	13	53	9,81
SAY	1	2	1	1	5	0,93

26) The values of S and Sφ are also slightly smaller than the others. But since minus words are not recorded, and S often lacks words found in other mss., this was to be expected.



AFY	20	24	3	54	101	18,70
SF	3	7	0	0	10	1,85
SA	19	15	16	8	58	10,74
SY	3	2	0	1	6	1,11
AF	3	3	2	19	27	5,00
AY	3	6	0	3	12	2,22
FY	25	17	21	20	83	15,37
S	23	25	4	8	60	11,11
A	25	24	8	39	96	17,78
F	3	3	1	0	7	1,30
Y	4	6	2	2	14	2,59
Total	151	157	61	171	540	
Pct.	27,96	29,07	11,30	31,67		

In order to facilitate comparison we can remove readings separating Y from F, as we did above in tables 5b and 6b, and give the siglum  $\varphi$  to FY. However, the high values for plus words in AF (and AY) must be taken into account; I have added them to A $\varphi$ . The simplified table then gives the following result:

Table 8b: distribution of readings in 9 with FY as  $\varphi$  and plus words in AF and AY added to plus words in A $\varphi$

	S $\varphi$	A $\varphi$	SA	S	$\varphi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	17	20	19	23	25	25	129	27,27
Morph.	20	24	15	25	17	24	125	26,43
W. ord.	3	3	16	4	21	8	55	11,63
Plus	13	76	8	8	20	39	164	34,67
Total	53	123	58	60	83	96	473	
Pct.	11,21	26,00	12,26	12,68	17,55	20,30		

This is at variance with the standard values, as we have seen them in 4b–7a and in 10–11 (tables 1–7), and the problem lies with the plus

word count. The following table shows how much the plus word count in Aφ and A in 9 differs from the standard pattern.

Table 9a: plus word variants in percent of all variants in speeches 5–11

	Sφ	Aφ	SA	S	φ	A	Total
5	2,41	9,04	0,60	3,61	4,82	3,01	23,49
6	1,84	9,68	0,92	2,30	4,15	3,23	22,12
7	1,99	4,78	1,99	2,39	3,59	2,39	17,13
8	3,58	10,51	0,45	2,24	3,80	2,68	23,27
9	2,75	16,07	1,69	1,69	4,23	8,25	34,67
10	4,41	6,45	1,53	1,87	5,43	4,92	24,62
11	4,19	3,59	1,20	0,60	3,59	2,40	15,57

The abnormal values for plus words in Aφ and A are, of course, due to the words found there but not in S. As is clear from the table itself, in the genuine Demosthenic texts<sup>27</sup> there are always more plus word instances in Aφ than in any other manuscript or combination of manuscripts, with values varying from 6,45 pct. to 10,51 pct. Which extra words were there before the arrival of the new, exceptional material and which are part of that material is impossible to say without further evidence or careful interpretation, but the number of instances in the exceptional category can be determined with some certainty. The plus word count for A is more than double the one expected, and for Aφ it is almost double what one would expect. And in fact, if one reduces the count of the instances of Aφ (76) to 38 and that of A (39) to 19, the pattern normalizes:

Table 9b: plus word variants in percent of all variants in 9 with Aφ and A values reduced by half

	Sφ	Aφ	SA	S	φ	A	Total
9 corrected	3,13	9,16	1,93	1,93	4,82	4,58	25,54

27) It is a most interesting fact, and one that calls for an explanation, that the plus word values for Aφ in the non-Demosthenic texts 7 and 11 are much lower.

A table, 8c, showing the general values of 9 with the same reduction also presents a much more acceptable pattern compared to the average values of speeches 4b–7a and 10–11 given above in table 7.

Table 8c: distribution of variants in 9 with Aφ and A plus word values reduced by half

	Sφ	Aφ	SA	S	φ	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	17	20	19	23	25	25	129	31,08
Morph.	20	24	15	25	17	24	125	30,12
W. ord.	3	3	16	4	21	8	55	13,25
Plus	13	38	8	8	20	19	106	25,54
Total	53	85	58	60	83	76	415	
Pct.	12,77	20,48	13,98	14,46	20,00	18,31		
Average values (4b–7a; 10–11; table 7):								
	15,97	18,72	13,36	15,27	18,46	18,22		

The value for Sφ is slightly off the mark, but not alarmingly so. What is alarming is that in order to restore this pattern it is necessary to eliminate no less than half of the plus words, basically a reduction corresponding in size to the extra material in A and φ. What this procedure shows is that at least the greater part of the extra material in the *Third Philippic* is foreign to the entire medieval (corpus) tradition. Not only to that of F and Y (this has been suspected before, as we shall see shortly), but also to that of A. To recreate the standard pattern these words must simply be taken away, there is no space for them. This, in turn, means that they have entered tradition not long before the formation of the early medieval manuscripts; it is precisely one of those special events we specified in the first paragraphs of this article – a ‘splash’. Had a text containing these words been known in mainstream tradition earlier in antiquity they would have dispersed in time and would eventually have been integrated into the standard text, as they were to be in the later medieval tradition.

There are other arguments to show the extraneous character of the new material in 9 than by analyzing the pattern of distribution of variants.

Firstly, it was clear to some of the earliest editors who used S that the ancestors of F and Y did not contain the extra material.<sup>28</sup> As noted above (p. 276), manuscripts S, F and Y contain information about the length (in lines) of the texts, so-called stichometry. This information is very ancient, written in acrophonic numbers which went out of use at the very latest early in the first century BC;<sup>29</sup> it reflects a very early state of the texts. The stichometrical notice in F and Y (and S) at the end of 9 indicates that the extent of this speech was 580 lines. Speech 8 was 590 lines long; speech 10 had 633. Now, speech 8 has 22100 letters, which makes each line 37,5 letters long; speech 10 has 23000 letters, making a line of 36,3 letters. In these long speeches, then, the average line is 36,9 letters long. With lines of 36,9 letters speech 9 should be 21771 letters long; actually, in S it is 20740 letters long, so in theory it is 1031 letters (some 120–150 words) short. Now, there is no reason to think that ancient scribes when calculating the basis for their payment (which is certainly one of the reasons for stichometry) had the patience to count as accurately as modern electronic equipment allows us to do, so perhaps the average line in 9 did actually measure only 35,75 letters.<sup>30</sup>

---

28) Io. Georgius Baiterus et Hermannus Saupprius: *Oratores Attici*, Turici 1839–1843, preface to Demosthenes, p. III, on the basis of the stichometric information at the end of the speech; later e. g. W. Christ, *Die Attikusausgabe des Demosthenes*, Abh. Bayern (Philos.-Philol. Kl.) 16 (1882) 155–234, at p. 205, and Fr. Burger, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen zu Demosthenes und Herodot*, Diss. München 1892, esp. on p. 22. – The subject of stichometry is not richly studied, but see Th. Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen in seinem Verhältniss zur Literatur*, Berlin 1882, who conveniently gives the value in letters of the  $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\iota$  of the Demosthenic speeches on pp. 194–196, with a variation from 33,8 to 37,3 letters to the  $\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\chi\omicron\varsigma$ . Kurt Ohly, *Stichometrische Untersuchungen*, Leipzig 1928, is interested mostly in the function and purpose of stichometry and gives little for the study of specifically Demosthenes. For a truly fascinating discussion of the use of stichometric data in Demosthenic texts, see Jonathan A. Goldstein, *The Letters of Demosthenes*, New York / London 1968, 9–26.

29) M. N. Tod, *The Greek Numeral Notation*, BSA 18 (1911/12) 98–132, at pp. 128–9.

30) As it will if the correct text really is 20740 letters long (20740/580 = 35,75). This is a low number, however, the earlier speeches (1–7) have lines of 35,9 to 37,3. Birt's maximum was 37,3 (n. 28).

Alternatively, S may have omitted some authentic textual material that FY retained.<sup>31</sup> What is, however, absolutely certain is that the 580 lines could never hold all 23120 letters that the speech consists of in A. This would make for an average line of 39,9 letters. Whatever the solution to this problem is, the 580 lines refer to a text more like that of S than that of A. So in the stichometric note FY indicate themselves that something approaching the text of S is what we should expect to find. A does not give any stichometric information.

Secondly, we saw that the plus words are not evenly distributed in F and Y; this caused some concern to Leonhard Spengel, the first to realize the importance and difficulty of the lack of the extra material in S. The problem is most easily solved, as Drerup saw, by the assumption that most of the plus passages were marginal additions in  $\phi$ , probably acquired from A or an A-related source, and were incorporated into F and Y in the course of copying, the scribes tiring in the end (first Y, then F) from fitting these marginalia into the main text.<sup>32</sup> At the end of the speech even A seems tired; one fairly long sentence, found only in A, is probably misplaced.<sup>33</sup>

Thirdly, this hypothesis is to some extent confirmed precisely by the way the new material makes its way into A, F, and Y. I shall discuss four passages.

---

31) Luciano Canfora, *Discorso all'assemblea per ambascerie in Asia e in Grecia*, Bari 1971, 53, tries to use the stichometry to show that par. 6 and 7 belong to the short version; this, however, founders on the partial stichometry. As Burger (n. 28) 6 points out, the numerical symbol 'A' that signals 100 lines is found next to τοιοῦτοις καιροῖς in 9,12 (in F and its copy B); with par. 6–7 there are 4152 letters up to that point, making 115 lines. The extra text in par. 6–7 is 606 letters long, making 17 lines or so. These 17 lines correspond very well to the excess of 15 in the 115 στίχοι calculated before.

32) L. Spengel, *Über die dritte Philippische Rede des Demosthenes*, Abh. Akad. München, 1839, 157–206, on p. 193; Engelbert Drerup, *Antike Demosthenesausgaben*, *Philologus Suppl.* 7 (1899) 533–588, on p. 538. In fact, the scribe of Y is at his most inattentive in the middle of the speech. One would so much like to know how the extra material presented itself in the exemplar.

33) In A 9,75 ends with the sentence εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν εὐρηγὰ ἂν πάλαι, ἔνεκα γὰρ τοῦ μηδὲν ὑμᾶς αὐτοὺς ποιεῖν ἐθέλειν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰσίν. As both a medieval scholar / scribe (Harl. 6322) and Gottfried Heinrich Schaefer, *Apparatus criticus et exegeticus ad Demosthenem etc.*, I, London 1824, 608, saw, these words need to be transposed and placed after ποιήσοντας.

1) The extra material in AFY is ancient. No one suspected otherwise<sup>34</sup> before S turned up without it, and in 1925 a ‘papyrus’, PMich. 918,<sup>35</sup> was published which contains substantial parts of 9 with the additions integrated in the text. The ‘papyrus’ consists of leaves from a parchment codex to be dated to the fourth century; but whether we are dealing with a complete Demosthenes or a partial edition there is no way of knowing. Personally I would prefer it to be partial; a complete Demosthenes with the extra material would, I suspect, have made a greater impact on the ‘potential text’ (see p. 272). In any case, PMich. 918 is extremely useful.

In par. 66 the editors print *μαστιγούμενοι καὶ σφαττόμενοι* from SA. FY have *στρεβλούμενοι* for *σφαττόμενοι*. Above the line, S notes a γρ. with *στρεβλούμενοι* and Y one with *σφαττόμενοι*.<sup>36</sup> The editors’ choice would be unobjectionable, were it not that PMich. offers *μαστιγούμενοι καὶ στρεβλούμενοι καὶ σφαττόμενοι*. Suddenly, FY have ancient authority for their text, but as an addition, not a substitution. In the manuscript(s) from which FY were copied the word *στρεβλούμενοι* was probably placed *supra lineam*, above *σφαττόμενοι*, with or without a preceding *καὶ*, or in *marginē*. Had it been in *versu*, FY would almost certainly have had all three words, as would probably A (which does not take note of *στρεβλούμενοι*). On the assumption, of course, that the papyrus has the correct text. The reader of the review wonders whether *σφαττόμενοι* makes sense about people who *δουλεύουσι*, and whether Demosthenes would not rather have said *ἀποσφαττόμενοι*. Neither *simplex* nor *compositum* is frequent in Demosthenes, see 9,62 (of a suicide) and 23,169 (of murdering one’s own son), both *ἀποσφάττω*. Perhaps, the point is, *στρεβλούμενοι* should be seen as a substitution for *σφαττόμενοι*, as we find it in FY, and the error lies with the papyrus for taking it as an addition.

---

34) Nor did anyone doubt that this material was Demosthenic, until S was ‘discovered’. This is a difficult problem which is not yet definitively settled. I propose to contribute to the debate in another context; I believe it to be genuine. Even if it is not, the extra material was known in antiquity at least since the 2nd century CE (PFay. 8, see below at n. 40).

35) J. G. Winter, A Fragment of Demosthenes, CPh 20 (1925) 97–114. The text is now accessible in a new edition by Fr. De Robertis (n. 11) 210–244.

36) In Y, the text is not corrected to *σφαττόμενοι*, as one might think from Dilts’ apparatus. Fuhr, as usual, gets it right. Both *γράφεται* are later additions.

2) In par. 43 we have Demosthenes insisting on the attention of his audience:

S:	λογίζεσθε δὴ	πρὸς		θεῶν		
A:	λογίζεσθε δὴ	πρὸς	Διὸς καὶ	θεῶν		παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς
F:	λογίζεσθε δὴ	πρὸς	Διὸς καὶ	θεῶν	καὶ θεωρεῖτε	παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς
Y:	λογίζεσθε δὴ	πρὸς		θεῶν	καὶ θεωρεῖτε	παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς

This is another bit of text which can really only be explained if the extra words were not in *versu* in the exemplar(s).<sup>37</sup> I have no doubt that F reports correctly what was in its exemplar (or exemplars). This is certainly genuine Demosthenic style.<sup>38</sup> But the text to be copied cannot have been tidy; both Y and A fail to report some of it. Unfortunately, the Michigan papyrus is not available in this passage.

3) In par. 3 S has αἴτιαι δὲ τῶν κακῶν, A αἴτιαι δὲ τῶν κακῶν καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων, and FY αἴτιαι δὲ τῆς ταραχῆς καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων. Editors, as usual, follow S, which makes perfect sense, even though it is clearly, rhetorically, the weaker text. The text of A is odd; the two elements κακά and ἀμαρτήματα are not really compatible. This cannot be said of FY; disorder and errors go perfectly hand in hand. But once again, what we are looking at is text imported from an interlinear or marginal position. FY take the complete phrase τῆς ταραχῆς καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων as a replacement of τῶν κακῶν; A takes τῶν κακῶν and τῆς ταραχῆς as alternatives (and chooses τῶν κακῶν) and καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων as an addition. In margin F knows of S's reading and S of φ's. Copyists of S and F would have had to choose between these variants – just as, clearly, the writers of A and FY had to.

4) Henri Weil had a particular take on these problems;<sup>39</sup> he printed several of the AFY passages as alternatives to text found

37) In his apparatus, Dilts gives the impression that there is πρὸς before both Διὸς and θεῶν. There is not. Fuhr gets it right.

38) E. g., strikingly, Dem. 21,73: σκέψασθε δὴ πρὸς Διὸς καὶ θεῶν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ λογίσασθε παρ' ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς.

39) Henri Weil, Die doppelte redaction der dritten phil. rede des Demosthenes, NJbb. 101 (1870) 535–541, and of course in the edition (n. 19) 336 ss.

in S. In par. 37 AF give καὶ τιμωρία μεγίστη τοῦτον ἐκόλαζον καὶ παραίτησις οὐδεμία ἢν οὐδὲ συγγνώμη, SY only καὶ τιμωρία μεγίστη τοῦτον ἐκόλαζον. Dilts follows S; most editors print the AF text in smaller type; but Weil prints the two sentences side by side as “*rédictions parallèles*”, and refers to par. 39, where AFY have συγγνώμη τοῖς ἐλεγχόμενοις μῖσος, ἂν τούτοις τις ἐπιτιμῶ, S only from μῖσος onwards. Here all editors print the AFY text in small type, except Weil, who once again prints the two versions side by side, noting that συγγνώμη connects the two AF(Y) passages. If Weil is right, it means that some of the extra material in AF(Y) was meant to replace, not supplement the text of the earlier version.

The Michigan papyrus is not preserved in par. 39. But a papyrus (2nd century CE) now in Toronto, PFay. 8,<sup>40</sup> is even more interesting, since it shows the AFY words between the lines and in the margin in a text more closely aligned with S. Beginning above μῖσος in μῖσος ἂν τούτοις τις ἐπιτιμῶ a second hand adds `[συ]γγνώμη τοῖς ἐλεγχόμε[νοις] ἐ[v]| τούτο[ις]`, with the words ἐλεγχόμε[νοις] ἐ[v]| τούτο[ις] placed in the margin. The last two words are an innovation by the papyrus. Not only in the medieval manuscripts but also in antiquity we find the two versions of the text in contact with each other.

Many more passages could be brought in to show how the extra material was incorporated, but I hope this will suffice to warrant or at least allow some conclusions. The extra material was found, by the writers of A, F, and Y – or of their predecessors – added in all probability between the lines and in the margin of their exemplar(s) as it is in PFay. 8 just referred to. It was sometimes taken to mean that old text should be replaced, but more often the new text was simply added. The extra material is certainly ancient, but there were also texts in antiquity that did not contain it.

A, F, and Y each had independent access to the source of the extra material – as we can see in the examples above, A, F, and Y cannot have been copied from each other. The somewhat random presence of elements is a further indication, as I have argued, that

---

40) Now in De Robertis (n. 11) 204–207; see also the image at [papyri.info/apis/toronto.apis.35/images](http://papyri.info/apis/toronto.apis.35/images), which illustrates beautifully what is meant by words inter lineas and in margine. As can be seen in the image, De Robertis' text needs to be adjusted.



the material was not inserted into the text of the source manuscript(s), but only recorded inter lineas or in margine. This fits the hypothesis that the material is a new arrival.

Why and how the longer version had so little contact with the rest of the tradition is impossible to say. It probably was not part of a complete edition of Demosthenes but had an entirely separate history. But the existence of otherwise (almost) unknown material is not an entirely unparalleled phenomenon. The double version of *On the Trierarchic Crown* (51) in (only) A and the addition to the corpus of *Philip's Letter* (12) in (only) FY is evidence that steps were taken in the 9th century CE to search for extra material and that some was actually found. Someone found a copy of speech 9 with new material in it, and this caused a sensation – writers of new manuscripts took pains to include the new material. Only S (that is, the first hand) remains curiously unaffected – but this, perhaps, may be due to its being produced in far-off Southern Italy.<sup>41</sup>

In 9 both F and Y adopt extra readings that they found in their source. There is reason to believe that this source was in some way an ancestor of our A, since Y in particular adopts other readings from an A source in the speeches *On Halonnesus* (7) (from par. 19) and *On the Chersonesus* (8).

The simplest block to deal with in showing this is 7,19–46. When the 10th century hand of Y begins in the middle of this speech the values turn out completely different from those in speeches 10 and 11 (tables 5 and 6), and the 'normal' distribution between S, A, and F (representing  $\varphi$ ) and their combinations found in the first part of 7 (table 4) disappears. It is most unlikely that  $\varphi$  should have changed from the first part to the second part of this speech, so the irregularity must have another explanation.

---

41) There is a somewhat parallel example in speech 7,40, where AFY report the text of an epigram which S does not have. Theoretically, S could have excluded it, but I find that unlikely.

Table 10a: distribution of variants in 7,19–46

	Lexical	Morph.	Word order	Plus words	Total	Total pct.
SFA	0	3	1	1	5	3,07
SFY	5	2	0	3	10	6,13
SAY	5	2	4	1	12	7,36
AFY	11	11	1	7	30	18,40
SF	6	4	1	1	12	7,36
SA	3	5	0	1	9	5,52
SY	1	0	0	0	1	0,61
AF	1	0	0	0	1	0,61
AY	6	5	1	1	13	7,98
FY	3	6	0	2	11	6,75
S	9	13	1	3	26	15,95
A	5	4	0	2	11	6,75
F	5	4	4	3	16	9,82
Y	0	4	1	1	6	3,68
Total	60	63	14	26	163	
Total pct.	36,81	38,65	8,59	15,95		

The problem lies with Y. The values for AFY, S and Y itself (and SY and AF) are as expected, but the values for combinations of Y with A not including F (SAY and AY) are far too high, as are the values for F and SF; those of A, SA, SFY, and FY are far too low. One might think that this shows Y as a separate strand in tradition but although possible I find that unlikely. One would expect a higher value of Y alone (and of SY), that is, that Y had more readings of its own, and that the readings that break the standard pattern were not shared only with A. Furthermore, in speeches 9–11 F and Y are so close as to depend, in all likelihood, on one source,  $\phi$ , and a change of source before 9 would be odd. What the numbers suggest is that Y adopts readings from the A strand by ‘contamination’ (which is really a misnomer; there is no passive, medical or

religious, infection going on here – scribes have to do something). If so, the value of Y as a source to the text of  $\phi$  is diminished; to establish that we can use only F. Since F and Y have been shown to be virtually identical in speeches with no sign of contamination, it is likely that the readings that the  $\alpha$  readings replace in Y were  $\phi$  readings now found only in F and registered in the table as such. When Y parts company with F it adopts an  $\alpha$  reading; when we reverse this situation and separate Y from its new affiliation with A, an AY reading becomes an A reading (and an SAY reading an SA reading), and F is likely to hold the  $\phi$  reading that Y should have had. We have to move the value of AY readings to that of A readings, and that of F readings to that of FY (=  $\phi$ ). In effect this means that we eliminate readings of Y separating Y from F, and if we do this systematically the ‘normal’ pattern emerges:

Table 10b: distribution of variants in 7,19–46 with F representing  $\phi$ 

	S $\phi$	A $\phi$	SA	S	$\phi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	11	12	8	10	8	11	60	39,47
Morph.	6	11	7	13	10	9	56	36,84
W.order	1	1	4	1	4	1	12	7,89
‘Plus’	4	7	2	3	5	3	24	15,79
Total	22	31	21	27	27	24	152	
Pct.	14,47	20,39	13,82	17,76	17,76	15,79		
Cf. the average values from the ‘normal’ texts (4b–7a, 10–11, table 7):								
	15,97	18,72	13,36	15,27	18,46	18,22		

This is actually a neat match; only this A-to-Y contamination seems to influence the text of Y. But the road to general contamination has been opened, even at this very early stage of Byzantine tradition. If we had not known about the affinity of F and Y only the markedly low values for SY and for Y alone would have signalled what has happened here. Events like this are certainly frequent in any tradition, but difficult to discover.

The values for the *On Halonnesus* (7) as a whole, then, are as follows:

Table 10c: distribution of variants in the complete 7 (combining table 4 and table 10b)

	Sφ	Aφ	SA	S	φ	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	16	15	15	15	17	17	95	37,85
Morph.	14	15	8	18	12	18	85	33,86
W.order	3	1	10	1	10	3	28	11,16
'Plus'	5	12	5	6	9	6	43	17,13
Total	38	43	38	40	48	44	251	
Pct.	15,14	17,13	15,14	15,94	19,12	17,53		
Cf. the average values from the 'normal' texts (4b-7a, 10-11, table 7):								
	15,97	18,72	13,36	15,27	18,46	18,22		

This is an even better match. When the contamination of Y is disregarded, 7 complies very well with the average values. Basically this means, of course, that Y is of little value as a witness to the text of φ. You can never know if the variant has authority of its own or expresses the text of A.

As we finally turn to the speech *On the Chersonesus* (8), the results prove difficult. So far, with a minimum of intervention it has been possible to bring out a homogenous general distribution, an equilibrium, of variants in the manuscripts in all speeches. In 9 we have seen how the extra material, as expected, distorts the pattern, and in 7 we have seen that Y has adopted readings known from A, another distortion that can be explained, since Y is demonstrably already contaminated in 9 in adopting much of the extra material. This means that we should expect the same influence in 8.

Table 11a: distribution of variants in 8

	Lexical	Morph.	Word order	Plus words	Total	Total pct.
SFA	2	0	0	2	4	0,87
SFY	9	10	0	7	26	5,68
SAY	11	4	7	2	24	5,24
AFY	32	36	7	46	121	26,42

SF	8	13	7	9	37	8,08
SA	4	7	0	0	11	2,40
SY	2	5	0	0	7	1,53
AF	3	5	0	1	9	1,97
AY	9	13	9	7	38	8,30
FY	5	8	0	9	22	4,80
S	36	36	7	10	89	19,43
A	11	11	0	5	27	5,90
F	14	5	9	8	36	7,86
Y	4	1	0	2	7	1,53
Total	150	154	46	108	458	
Total pct.	32,75	33,62	10,04	23,58		

It is immediately clear that Y has taken in, as in 7,19–46, readings from A; the pattern is very similar.

In fact, in 8, we are in a position to study this a little closer. It is necessary to remind the reader that the distribution of variants shows no sign of contamination of Y by A in speech 10 (see table 5a). Almost half of 8 (par. 38–70) is a slightly different version of 10,11–27 and 10,55–70. How it comes to be that two so similar texts exist is a matter to be discussed elsewhere,<sup>42</sup> but as Friedrich Blass noted in his *editio maior*, with circumspection the two versions may be used almost as manuscript foundation for each other.<sup>43</sup> And it turns out that where Y alone goes to A alone in 8,<sup>44</sup>

42) Leonhard Spengel raised the problem in *Die ΔΗΜΗΓΟΡΙΑΙ des Demosthenes*, München 1860, pp. 77–105. Later Charles D. Adams, *Speeches VIII and X of the Demosthenic Corpus*, CPh 33 (1938) 129–144 and Stephen G. Daitz, *The Relationship of the De Chersoneso and the Philippica Quarta of Demosthenes*, CPh 52 (1957) 145–162, developed the argument; in more recent times Luciano Canfora, *Per la cronologia di Demostene*, Bari 1969, is an important contribution. I intend to return to this question in a forthcoming publication.

43) *Demosthenis Orationes*, I, Leipzig 1903, XXV.

44) When S joins AY to contrast F we have to ask whether F is innovating or Y is borrowing from A (which means that F represents φ which, then, differs from SA). In 8,50/10,26 F has τϵ, all the others δϵ; in 8,49/10,25 all mss. except F in 8 have ᾠν. In these cases F is simply innovating. In a few cases F coordinates the

the text that SF offers in 8 is predominantly also that of SAFY in 10. AY 8 is therefore quite probably wrong, Y accepting an erroneous text from A. In most cases the differences are minor, but the general point is clear from 8,60/10,62, where SF in 8 agrees with SAFY in 10 in writing οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἴσων ὑμῖν (ἡμῖν S 8) καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐστὶ ὁ κίνδυνος, whereas AY 8 treats us to οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν νήσων κτλ. – a simple iotacism, of course, corrected (erased violently) in both mss., but strong enough to argue the case, I think. This error could hardly arise twice spontaneously. Less spectacular instances are 8,41 ἔσται AY, ἔστ' SF, 10,13 SAFY, where there is sense to the future tense, since ἦξει follows, or 8,50 ἐκείνον ἐάσωμεν AY, ἐάσωμεν ἐκείνον SF, 10,26 SAFY. There are other instances of different word order, but the dominant variant type is plus words. In 8,50 AY have μὲν, but SF in 8 and SAFY in 10,26 do not have the word (F<sup>c</sup> 8, however, reports it). In a few instances, A coordinates the texts. In 8,59 AY have ἄν, in 10,61 A has it, and the rest do not have it (nor should they); in 8,60 AY have τε, in 10,62 only A has it; the others are silent. τε makes sense here, but it is clearly not original. In 8,59 AY have τότε, SF have nothing, whereas in 10,61 τότε is in SAFY; in 8 A has imported the word from 10, and Y follows suit. In 8,67/10,69 we have a more interesting case – ἐκ τοῦ τούτων ὀλιγώρως ἔχειν ὁ μὲν εὐδαίμων καὶ μέγας καὶ φοβερός πᾶσιν Ἕλλησι καὶ βαρβάροις, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἔρημοι καὶ ταπεινοὶ κτλ. There is no copula, so in 8 AY insert γέγονεν after βαρβάροις, and A does the same in 10, where, however, FY (that is, φ) has ἐστὶ after φοβερός. The need for a copula was felt. In 8 Y helps itself to one by borrowing from A. In 10 this borrowing, or contamination, has stopped.

The specific details of the textual material itself, then, support, or at least do not contradict interpolation of Y by A (or rather α).

---

text of the two speeches – 8,47 ἔστι SAY, ἔνεστι F, 10,22 SAFY; 8,48 μεγάλης SAY, πολλῆς F Y<sup>70</sup>, 10,24 SAFY. If 8 φ had ἔστι and μεγάλης, F is innovating (by borrowing from 10); if 8 φ had ἔνεστι and πολλῆς (by borrowing from 10?), Y is innovating (by borrowing from A). In 8,48 Y<sup>70</sup> has πολλῆς which points to φ having had just that. Y, then, is probably innovating. The problem arises in a slightly different form in 8,51 γιγνομένων SAY, πραγμάτων F Y<sup>70</sup>, 10,27 γιγνομένων SAFY and 8,66 καὶ γάρ τοι SAY, τοιγάρτοι F Y<sup>70</sup>, 10,68 καὶ τάρ τοι SAFY. φ was probably innovating, having πραγμάτων and τοιγάρτοι, Y reverting by contamination to the correct text. There is a very special case with vñν γε δὴ in 6,17 SAFY, 8,41 F, 10,12 FY, vñνι δὴ 10,12 A, vñν γε ἄν 10,12 S. 8,41 SAY do not have the words.

If we then correct the values shown in table 11a of A and SA by transferring the values of AY and SAY to them, as in table 10b, F and Y turn out virtually identical, and we can go on to reconstruct  $\phi$  in the same manner as before. But in 8 this procedure does not create the same pattern of evenly distributed values as in table 10b. In fact, the result is so different (table 11b) as to put the method used so far to the test.

Table 11b: distribution of variants in 8 with F representing  $\phi$ 

	S $\phi$	A $\phi$	SA	S	$\phi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	17	35	15	38	19	20	144	32,21
Morph.	23	41	11	41	13	24	153	34,23
W. order	7	7	7	7	9	9	46	10,29
'Plus'	16	47	2	10	17	12	104	23,27
Total	63	130	35	96	58	65	447	
Pct.	14,09	29,08	7,83	21,48	12,98	14,54		
Cf. the normal average from all other speeches (4b-7; 9-11)								
	15,49	18,92	13,45	15,46	18,50	18,18		

Some significant event has taken place in transmission; we are certainly faced with a splash. A $\phi$  is far too large, by 10 pct., and S exceeds the average by 6; SA and  $\phi$  are down by 6, A by almost 4. Only S $\phi$  has what one could call a standard value. In order to be able to identify the specific problems, we may compare with the distribution as it would be, if it was identical to the one in speech 10. The following table, 11c, then, is a model table enabling us to visualize what the expected values of speech 8 are in the single categories, not only in general percentage. To ease comprehension, the values are not in percent but show the expected number of variants.<sup>45</sup>

45) The sum total of variants in the calculated table 11c is 439, which is less than the 447 in table 10b which is based on an actual count of variants in 8. The difference is due to the rounding of the values to whole numbers. If the values were left with fractions the total would fit, only there is no such thing as a fraction of a variant. However, with values this high the general pattern remains credible, I think.

Table 11c: distribution of expected values in 8 based on the distribution in 10

	S $\phi$	A $\phi$	SA	S	$\phi$	A	Total	Pct.
Lex.	17	26	24	32	31	23	153	34,83
Morph.	20	18	20	22	22	23	124	28,33
W. order	7	11	5	15	7	10	54	12,33
'Plus'	19	29	7	8	25	20	108	24,50
Total	63	83	56	77	84	76	439	
Pct.	14,33	19,00	12,67	17,50	19,17	17,33		
Cf. the normal average from all other speeches (4b–7; 9–11)								
	15,49	18,92	13,45	15,46	18,50	18,18		

The values for word order in table 11b showing the real values of speech 8, are largely as one would expect from this model, 11c, except for the values of S (and, almost by complementary necessity, A $\phi$ ), and so are, which is more important, the single values of S $\phi$ . Whatever goes on here, the S $\phi$  combination is unaffected. The value of plus words in A $\phi$  is much too high; those of  $\phi$  and A too low. The number of morphological and lexical variants in A $\phi$  and in S is also much too high, the corresponding values of SA and  $\phi$  too low. It is important that the differences are not confined to only one category, as in speech 9.

A and  $\phi$  have converged, and it is A (possibly  $\alpha$ , or rather  $\alpha^c$ , but not necessarily) that is the active part – A has adopted a great number of readings from  $\phi$ . The identified numerical aberrations concern only manuscripts or pairs of manuscripts with which A agrees; that is, in many places where A agreed with S (that is, in SA), A has replaced that reading with a  $\phi$  reading (that is, to become A $\phi$ ), and it is likely that A has also accepted some  $\phi$  readings, where A did not agree with S, particularly in the plus word category (since S contains fewer plus words than the rest of the tradition). This fits the image of  $\alpha$  as an 'active', 'inquisitive' manuscript.  $\phi$  was also innovative, but if  $\phi$  had been the receiver in this case, it would occasionally have taken over a reading from A, where  $\phi$  previously agreed with S, and that would have diminished S $\phi$ . S $\phi$ , however, has exactly the values expected, so it is most unlikely to be the case that  $\phi$  was the active part.



It is, of course, likely that A in a number of instances adopted a reading where  $\phi$  agreed with S. But in that case the entire tradition is united; we cannot see what has happened, except, possibly, in a decrease in the sum total of variants. We may actually be able to observe that. Taking again speech 10 as a model, it has 589 variants in 4515 words, making a variant percentage of 13,05. After the removal of all AY variants (table 11b), speech 8 has 447 variants in 4321 words, percentage 10,34. In theory, there must be an explanation of the fact that 8 displays another variant percentage than 10. But the explanation could be simple; perhaps speech 10, being a less ‘classic’ text, simply received less care in transcription.<sup>46</sup> The adoption of an S $\phi$  reading by A would also diminish the value of S $\phi$ . The value of S $\phi$  in table 11b is actually slightly to the low side but not nearly enough to warrant any conclusion.

In speech 8, then, we face a double contamination, one in Y adopting readings from A (or  $\alpha$ , more likely), and one in A adopting readings from the  $\phi$  strand. The readings that A accepted from the  $\phi$  strand must have come from a separate copy of speech 8, or (less likely) from a list of  $\phi$  readings in 8 communicated somehow, perhaps by letter, to the makers of A (or of an ancestor of A). There seems to be no reason why the copyist responsible for these alterations should have confined himself to speech 8, if he had access to  $\phi$  material in the other speeches.

What all this adds up to is an image of textual transmission in the period immediately after the minuscule transcription. In the case of Demosthenes no less than three such transcriptions seem to have taken place, each from a separate (probably late antique) majuscule manuscript. One is represented by S, another by two preserved manuscripts, F and Y, very close indeed,<sup>47</sup> both copies

46) It is difficult to compare in a similar way with 9, since it is not easy to determine which text to use as a basis for the calculation of variant percentage.

47) The few differences they display are not significant. Discounting cases where Y sides with A (see above p. 297) we find a few differences in word order, above all 10,16 and 11,14 and of prefix to verbs (12,13 and 15); there is 10,39  $\pi\alpha\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  YF<sup>c</sup>,  $\mu\alpha\theta\acute{\nu}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  SAF; 12,23  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu$  ποιούντων Y,  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\omicron\pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\acute{\nu}\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\omega\acute{\nu}$  F. In 10,15 and 11,14 things are more complex, but nothing is very decisive. There is nothing like the clear differences proving FY (as  $\phi$ ) distinct from A and S, such as 9,19  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$  FY,  $\acute{\epsilon}\acute{\alpha}\sigma\omega\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma$  SA; 10,71  $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\chi\omega\rho\acute{\eta}\sigma\alpha\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma$  FY,  $\delta\omicron\iota\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\upsilon\sigma$  SA; the very different construction in 7,24 or the very different order of words in 9,24 or 9,51; or the plus

of a lost manuscript which I have termed  $\phi$ . A third transcription is represented by yet another early manuscript, A, for which we have reasons to believe that we can trace some characteristics of a predecessor,  $\alpha$ , possibly the transcription copy itself.

$\alpha$  seems to have been an inquisitive manuscript. It contains two different recensions of *On the Trierarchic Crown* (51), one of which it must have found not in its exemplar but somewhere else, and we have seen that it must have imported the material making up the long version of the *Third Philippic* (9). There are reasons, however, to believe that this discovery occurred after the main text had already been copied. From the way in which the new material was later integrated into A, F, and Y (separately) (see above pp. 289–292), it seems that the long version additions were found in  $\alpha$  between the lines and in the margin, and not in a very orderly fashion. So when the makers of  $\alpha$  (or of A) found a separate copy of the speech *On the Chersonese* (8), of course they collated and integrated it.  $\phi$ , in turn, quite similarly imports the otherwise unknown *Letter to Philip* (12) and the inquisitive nature of  $\phi$  is inherited to both F and Y who integrate the long version of the *Third Philippic* (9).

The first thing to notice here is that such extra material could actually be found and was, probably, actively sought out in the ninth century CE. The next thing is that there is a high degree of individuality about the way the makers of these manuscripts and their predecessors go about dealing with such multiple tradition. ‘Contamination’ is really an active process of integrating other lines of tradition; it is not an infection, a disease, nor a simple process.<sup>48</sup> In these very early manuscripts we find three different strategies of adoption, if ‘strategies’ is not too ambitious a word. But even if it is, what happens at this point of time is probably indicative of what

---

words διαφθαρήσεται καὶ in 8,17 or ὑπὸ τῶν προγόνων ἡμῶν in 10,73 (later also in S<sup>9p</sup>. and A<sup>c</sup>). 10,40 FY have ἀτοπώτατον ὄντα, AS ἄτοπον τῶν ὄντων. Finally, and conclusively, only FY have *Philip’s letter* (12).

48) It would be wonderful if the method used here would be the ‘specific’, the “Kraut” against contamination, Maas (n. 1) 49 claims has not been discovered. It is not. But it does make two things clear. Firstly, we can see that it is possible to ascertain the manner of contamination – what kind of change occurs, and to what extent. Secondly, the patterns do not point to specific passages, but they do give a general warning, helping us to be at our guard against certain irregularities in certain parts of the material. We get a better idea of what may be problematic.

happened later on, as the new, ‘posttraditional’, text pool developed. In these three early manuscripts the process of contamination can still be discerned in some detail. A few steps further and that would not be possible or at least extremely difficult.

The extra words in the *Third Philippic* (9) were first added, as argued just before, around the text in  $\alpha$  and then integrated into the main text of A, F, and Y – not exactly at random, but not very systematically either. This is partial contamination both in the sense that it does not involve all the demegoric texts and in the sense that it concentrates on one kind of variant, plus words.

If the contamination of the *Third Philippic* is partial and filtered, the contamination of *On the Chersonese* (8) in A (or a predecessor) is partial but total, unfiltered – all kinds of variant are adopted, but only in one speech.

The third strategy, that of Y, is a more complex story – the makers of Y knew that there was important new material to be had in  $\alpha$  (or something like  $\alpha$ ), but clearly they were not aware that it was confined to the *Third Philippic*, so they collated the alphoid manuscript totally, lowering their critical attention to accepting even very silly variants ( $\tau\hat{\omega}\nu$  νήσων, 8,60), until they reached the *Third Philippic*; realizing their mistake they changed adoption strategy and filtered the material, letting only extra words in. But by now they were tired and failed to take over as much as they could, and when they reached the *Fourth Philippic* they stopped contaminating altogether. They were looking for novelty, and by now they knew what was new about the extra source of text. Their enthusiasm faded when they were faced with something less sensational.

Nevertheless, it is this eagerness to get hold of everything that is significant. It disturbs the mechanics of tradition, to be sure, but the scribes could not possibly see this as ‘contamination’, quite the opposite: they were salvaging whatever could be rescued from oblivion – improving text, not falsifying it. After centuries of neglect, the classics were returning, and the scribes and their masters were doing their utmost to produce credible and useful texts. Generally, they understood what they were writing, and they did not accept nonsense. So what for us seems chaotic, for them was an attempt to counteract exactly chaos.

All this went on not too far from Constantinople. A, F, and Y can mingle because they are locally and temporally in close prox-

imity to each other. Editors in the 19th century thought that they could see an affinity and treated them as one, a group of secondary value, a vulgata in the pejorative sense. In fact, the tables presented above show that for the most part A and  $\phi$  are as distinct from each other in the sum total of their variants as they are from the third part in this game – S, the greatly admired odd man out of Demosthenic tradition. If not physically distant from Constantinople (still, perhaps it was, at first) it certainly avoids contact with the other manuscripts. The editors admired it for its conciseness, and perhaps unconsciously for the distance it kept from the others – its aristocratic reserve. There seem to be no splashes in S, no vulgar displays of novelty. But water can be stirred in other, more insidious, ways than by splashes; not all disorder comes from outside. And S did stir its waters. But that is another argument, to be pursued separately.

In this paper I have tried to show the plasticity of the medieval tradition of Demosthenes even at its very inception, hopefully providing some insights into the (thermodynamic) mechanics of an open tradition. But the most important and most remarkable thing in all of this is what we have learned about the extra material in the *Third Philippic* (9). It is certainly ancient; but that we already knew. What we did not know and the analysis of the pattern of distribution of variants makes clear, is that the text that contained these extra words and sentences lived a life of its own for centuries (almost a millennium, in fact) and did not enter the corpus editions – the large codices that probably stem ultimately from the libraries in Alexandria and Pergamon<sup>49</sup> – until shortly before the beginning of the medieval tradition. The long version of the *Third Philippic* was a late arrival.\*

Kolding

Simon Laursen

---

49) There is virtually no evidence to substantiate this idea, but it is hard to see how it could be otherwise. On the possibility that S stems ultimately from Pergamon, see Luciano Canfora in the preface to *Demostene, Le Filippiche e altri Discorsi*, a cura di L. C., Torino 1974, 79.

\*) I should like, at the end, to express my gratitude to and admiration for the reader of the review who took on such a tasking contribution as this and with great patience and much stamina, by precise criticism and sound advice brought it to a much more accessible form. It may appear incredible but his efforts have made this text much more readable.