Insights into the Transmission of Demosthenes I[*]

Jana GRUSKOVÁ

The works of the *Corpus Demosthenicum* have made a long journey to arrive at the point they are at today: from the original texts through many manuscript (hand-written) copies to the first printed editions in 1499 and 1504, and even afterwards through centuries of examining and editing the rich extant material. Copying the texts over the course of transmission in Antiquity and the Middle Ages resulted in numerous changes along the way. Some were accidental, others deliberate. Scribes and readers made emendations to problematic words or passages, often consulting other, nowadays mostly lost manuscripts in addition to their exemplar, and thus 'contaminated' the lines of descent. With the invention of printing, the Demosthenic texts entered a new phase. Numerous editions followed. However, it is not long ago that the methods of textual criticism matured adequately and the achievements of the rapidly developing discipline of Greek palaeography began to be systematically adopted in philological works. Yet, though there are many studies on various aspects of the complex transmission of Demosthenes, a great deal of further work is needed before a full account can be attempted.[1] There are still more questions open than closed. The purpose of this article is to introduce the topic and provide a brief overview of some key points.[2]

---

[*] The original draft of this article was written for the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford University Press 2019), hence references to relevant chapters of the Handbook have been included. Those chapters were available to the author in a pre-print version, therefore the page numbers in quotations are missing. I would like to express my deep gratitude to Gunther Martin, Nigel Wilson, Otto Kresten and Herbert Bannert for their valuable comments.

[1] Particularly noteworthy are the summarizing reports in DRERUP 1899; DRERUP 1902; PASQUALI 1934, 269–294; ERBSE 1961, 262–264; CANFORA 1974, 65–98; HASLAM 1976, 9–10; SEALEY 1993, 221–229; DILTS 2002, V–XV; DE ROBERTIS 2015, 5–42.

[2] The second part of this overview will be published in GLO 41–42 (2020). It will focus on the manuscripts, the scholia, the *testimonia* and the editions of Demosthenes.

The textual transmission of Demosthenes covers all the works transmitted under his name, both the genuine and the non-Demosthenic ones. The authenticity of many of the speeches was questioned already in Antiquity. In a number of cases the authorship is still a matter of debate and opinions differ. We should certainly be grateful for the confusion or the intention which led to the inclusion of speeches of other authors in the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, for otherwise these works might have been lost forever, along with the bulk of Attic oratory.[3]

The extant *Corpus Demosthenicum* contains 61 speeches (see Appendix),[4] 55 prologues[5] and six letters. The direct or primary transmission comprises both ancient and medieval manuscript copies of the texts. Fragments of over 190 ancient manuscripts, on papyrus or parchment, have come to light from Egypt, and new fragments are published almost every year.[6] They range in date from the first century BCE to the sixth century CE. Medieval manuscripts, written in minuscule, in which the texts have the advantage of being complete, enter the scene in the ninth century, and thereafter become increasingly plentiful.[7] There is also a rich indirect or secondary transmission (*testimonia*), the nature of which ranges widely, from less direct forms of evidence to the indirect tradition in the conventional sense, i.e. quotations in post-Demosthenic literature.[8]

The seven oldest extant medieval manuscripts – of the ninth to the early eleventh centuries – are generally accepted as the main or primary source for the text: **S** (Paris. gr. 2934), **A** (Monac. gr. 485), **Y** (Paris. gr. 2935), **P** (Laur. plut. 59.9), **F** (Marc. gr. Z. 416), **D** (Ambr. D 112 sup.), **Q** (Marc. gr. Z. 418); most of the speeches (λόγοι, lat. *orationes*) have been transmitted only in some of them.[9] Editors retained the order of the speeches adopted in the *editio princeps* (Venice 1504) (see Appendix), though their order in the manuscripts varies. The prologues, i.e. the openings of political speeches (προοίμια [δημηγορικά], lat. *prooemia* or *exordia*), are preserved in **S Y F D Q**, letters 1–5 (ἐπιστολαί, lat. *epistulae*) in **S F Q**, letter 6 only in **F Q**.

---

[3] KAPPARIS 2014, 126. See also TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2019; CANFORA 2015; CANFORA 2014; MACDOWELL 2009; KAPPARIS 1999; SEALEY 1993, 230–240; TREVETT 1992.

[4] The extant corpus contains among the speeches also *Philip's Letter* numbered as 'or. 12'; see below with note 53. – Since referring to a speech from the extant corpus as 'Dem.' has often proved misleading, 'or.' (*oratio*) and 'orr.' (*orationes*) are used in this article.

[5] In a few cases there is doubt as to whether the manuscripts wrongly combine two prologues into one or divide one into two (see MACDOWELL 2009, 6). Robert Clavaud in his critical edition (1974) adjusted the numbering from 56 to 55, following the evidence of the Vienna manuscript Phil. gr. 105. "Δ" Rennie = "[Δ]" Clavaud, "E" Rennie = "Δ (E)" Clavaud, "Ϛ" Rennie = "E (Ϛ)" Clavaud.

[6] See MERTENS-PACK³ (MP³) and LDAB. For some insights see GLO 41–42 (2020).

[7] See CANFORA 1968 and GLO 41–42 (2020) with further bibliography.

[8] For an overview see GLO 41–42 (2020) with further bibliography.

[9] See GLO 41–42 (2020) with further bibliography and GRUSKOVÁ 2014 (with images).

History of the text and its transmission

The history of a text begins with the author's autograph or master copy.[10] Such evidence has not survived for Demosthenes, but inferences can be made. Only a part of the many speeches assumed to have been composed or delivered by Demosthenes have survived.[11] We know the titles of several speeches that were attributed to Demosthenes in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, but are now lost.[12] Besides, if the extant prologues are not a product of the later rhetorical tradition, i.e. if they are genuine, which seems likely,[13] one might wonder whether at least some of the items that do not correspond closely to the openings of the extant Demosthenes' speeches are the openings of speeches which have not otherwise survived.[14]

No precise answer can be given to the question whether the extant genuine speeches of Demosthenes are what he said in the assembly or in the lawcourts for himself, but the range of uncertainty can be delimited.[15] An individual approach to each speech is necessary.

We may generally assume that the extant lawcourt speeches for his own trials are based on, if not identical with, the versions that Demosthenes prepared, for he seems not to speak without written preparation, although the possibility of improvisation cannot be denied.[16]

As for the surviving genuine assembly orations, he is usually assumed to have used writing to prepare his speeches in advance. Clearly, in the course of

---

[10] WILSON 2014, 655.

[11] See e.g. TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2019; MACDOWELL 2009, 1–13 (2–5 for the lawcourt speeches, 5–7 for the speeches in the assembly).

[12] E.g. *Against Demades* (*Synagoge* B α 252 Cunningham [Bk. p. 335, 27] s.v. ἄγειν: Δημοσθένης δὲ τὸ ἄγει ἐν τῷ … Κατὰ Δημάδου· ʽἦγεν δὲ πέντε μνᾶς'), *Against Critias* (see bellow Call. fr. 445 Pf. = Harp. ε 51), *Against Medon* (Pollux 8, 53 Bethe: Δημοσθένης δὲ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μέδοντος καὶ κατὰ τῶν μὴ προσηκόντως τῇ ἐπικλήρῳ συνοικούντων γίνεσθαι τὰς εἰσαγγελίας λέγει, and Harp. δ 16 s.v. δεκατεύειν: Δημοσθένους δʼ ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μέδοντος περί τινος παρθένου λέγοντος οὕτως· ʽοὐ δεκατεῦσαι ταύτην οὐδὲ μυῆσαι'), *Against Polyeuctus* (Antiatticista δ 58 Valente [Bk. p. 90, 28] s.v. δικάσιμον: Δημοσθένης πρὸς Πολύευκτον παραγραφῇ), *For the Orators* (Suda α 1458 Adler s.v. ἅμα: Δημοσθένης ἐπὶ τοῦ εὐθέως καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔταξε. καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ τῶν ῥητόρων λόγῳ εἰπών· ʽοὐ γὰρ ὁ θάνατος τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσιν οἰκτρός· τοῦτο γὰρ ἅμα τῷ γενέσθαι πάντων κατέγνωσται', and Plut. *Dem*. 23, 5–6 [Aristobulus FGrH 139 F3]), *For Satyrus* (see bellow Call. fr. 446 Pf. = Phot. *Bibl*. cod. 265, 491b). For the editions see BAITER – SAUPPE 1850, 251–257; CLAVAUD 1987, 127–148. See also SEALEY 1993, 223–225; MACDOWELL 2009, 8–9; CANFORA 2015; TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2019; HARRIS 2019.

[13] See TREVETT 2019; MACDOWELL 2009, 6–7; WORTHINGTON 2019.

[14] See MACDOWELL 2009, 6.

[15] See SEALEY 1993, 221.

[16] See TREVETT 2019; MACDOWELL 2009, 1–13 (here esp. 2–4); TUPLIN 1998.

the debate, he must often have been forced to depart from what he had prepared.[17] He might also have prepared beforehand and memorised only the first few sentences of a speech, i.e. a prologue, even if he then had to extemporize the rest. Most of the extant prologues seem to be openings of speeches of which the rest was never written.[18] As his self-confidence increased, he may have no longer found it essential to prepare the speech in writing. In fact, no assembly speeches have survived from the last eighteen years of his life.[19]

Whether there are grounds for postulating a revision of the written speeches after delivery is a question which needs to be considered for each speech individually. For instance, a revision is likely in the two longest speeches, or. 18 (*On the Crown*) and or. 19 (*On the False Embassy*), both for trials in public prosecutions. For the extant deliberative speeches, it is impossible to say exactly how much, if any, revision they have undergone, but in single cases we can draw some conclusions (cf. e.g. or. 9 [*Third Philippic*]).[20]

Speeches created for delivery in the lawcourts by another person (e.g. a friend, a client) – during Demosthenes' generally assumed career as a speech-writer (logographer)[21] – needed to be written down and handed over to this person in a fixed form, while Demosthenes possibly may have kept a copy.

Apollodorus, whose many speeches are preserved in the *Corpus Demosthenicum* (orr. 46, 49, 50, 52, 53, 59),[22] is likely to have written a complete speech ready for delivery in court.[23]

We may assume that Demosthenes kept his writings at home.[24] Concerning the question as to whether he published his speeches, we should ask what 'publication' means in the time of Demosthenes.[25] There is no sign that he offered his works to booksellers. There is also no evidence that Demosthenes distributed his speeches systematically like Isocrates. However, it has been reasonably assumed

---

[17]   See TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2019; CANFORA 2015; MACDOWELL 2009, 5–7; TUPLIN 1998. Cf. Plut. *Dem*. 8–9. According to the *Lives of the Ten Orators* (see below), Demosthenes, when he was upbraided for his premeditating what he was to say, replied: "I should be ashamed to extemporise when giving advice to so great an assembly" ([Plut.] *X orat*. 848c: "αἰσχυνοίμην γὰρ ἄν", εἶπεν, "εἰ τηλικούτῳ δήμῳ συμβουλεύων αὐτοσχεδιάζοιμι").

[18]   See e.g. MACDOWELL 2009, 2–7 (here 6); WORTHINGTON 2019.

[19]   At that time he may have felt less need of a text. On the other hand, a corpus collected after his death may have been 'purified' of pieces harmful to his reputation. See CANFORA 2019; TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2015; MACDOWELL 2009, 5–13.

[20]   See TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2019; CANFORA 2014; MACDOWELL 2009, 7–9; TUPLIN 1998.

[21]   See e.g. MACDOWELL 2009, 60.

[22]   See KAPPARIS 2014; TREVETT 2019. Or. 45 and or. 47 may also belong to this group.

[23]   See KAPPARIS 1999, 79.

[24]   See MACDOWELL 2009, 7–9 (here 8); TREVETT 2019; SEALEY 1993, 228–229.

[25]   See TREVETT 2019, who emphasizes that publication, such as it was, could take different forms; cf. e.g. Plut. *Dem*. 8, 2. See also MACDOWELL 2009, 7–9.

that at least some of them had been put into circulation after being delivered, from political or rhetorical reasons.[26]

In the later tradition, there is a story reported by Pliny the Younger (*Ep.* 2, 3, 10) – if we may believe such evidence – who mentions Aeschines at Rhodes, in his school of rhetoric, reading a speech of Demosthenes, most likely *On the Crown*.[27] A scholion preserved in **A** tells us that Demosthenes, when asked to compare the public reputation of his speeches and those of Callistratus replied, "I did better when the speech was written, Callistratus when it was heard."[28] In Plutarchus' *Life* of Demosthenes (*Dem.* 11, 4), Aesion, a contemporary of Demosthenes – if we may identify him with the fourth-century orator – says that the speeches of Demosthenes as compared with those of his own time, when read (aloud), are far superior in point of arrangement and power.[29] Although the story in the *Lives of the Ten Orators* ([Plut.] *X orat.* 845d) does not tell us that Philip was given copies of Demosthenes' speeches,[30] Photius (*Bibl.* cod. 265, 493b 20–22), while retelling this story, asserts that Philip "received and read Demosthenes' public speeches against him";[31] if so, he must have possessed a copy of them.

The formation of the extant *Corpus Demosthenicum* that exhibits contradictory characteristics is a story not easily traced.[32] Demosthenes himself might have collected some of his speeches in an Ur-corpus.[33] When he died, his nephew Demochares, an Athenian orator and statesman,[34] is the most likely person to have inherited his uncle's library that may have included an 'archive' or the Ur-corpus

---

26 See Canfora 2019 (esp. on or. 9); Trevett 2019; Canfora 2014; MacDowell 2009 (esp. 7–9); Milns 2000, 207–209; Tuplin 1998; Sealey 1993, 229; Canfora 1974, 65ff.

27 Plin. *Ep.* 2, 3, 10: … illud Aeschinis, qui cum legisset Rhodiis orationem Demosthenis, admirantibus cunctis, adiecisse fertur: "τί δέ, εἰ αὐτοῦ τοῦ θηρίου ἠκούσατε;" There is also a story in [Plut.] *X orat.* 840d–e, describing Aeschines reading his own speech against Ctesiphon.

28 *Schol.* 271 in or. 24: Ἐγὼ μὲν γραφόμενος, Καλλίστρατος δὲ ἀκουόμενος. See Canfora 2019.

29 Plut. *Dem.* 11, 4: ἀναγινωσκόμενοι δ᾽ οἱ Δημοσθένους λόγοι πολὺ τῇ κατασκευῇ καὶ δυνάμει διαφέρουσιν. See Trevett 2019; Canfora 2019.

30 [Plut.] *X orat.* 845d: … Φίλιππον δὲ πρὸς τοὺς ἀναφέροντας αὐτῷ (to those who reported to him about) τὰς κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ δημηγορίας εἰπεῖν ὅτι "Καὶ αὐτὸς ἂν ἀκούων λέγοντος Δημοσθένους ἐχειροτόνησα τὸν ἄνδρα πρὸς τὸν κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ πόλεμον". Cf. Fuhr 1914, III.

31 Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 265, 493b, 20–22: Φασὶ δὲ τὸν Μακεδόνα Φίλιππον, ἐπεὶ τὰς κατ᾽ αὐτοῦ δημηγορίας τοῦ Δημοσθένους ἐδέξατο καὶ ἀνέγνω, μέγα θαυμάσαντα εἰπεῖν ὡς "Καὶ αὐτὸς ἄν, εἴπερ ἤκουσα κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ δημηγοροῦντος Δημοσθένους, ἐχειροτόνησα ἂν τὸν ἄνδρα πρὸς τὸν κατ᾽ ἐμοῦ πόλεμον".

32 See Canfora 2019; Trevett 2019; Canfora 2014; MacDowell 2009, 7–9; Canfora 2006; Tuplin 1998; Sealey 1993, 221–229; Canfora 1974, 65–98.

33 See Trevett 2019; Tuplin 1998. Sealey 1993, 228–229, suggests that Demosthenes had both the time and the motive to compile a collection of public speeches with some historical information including dates of delivery as an *apologia pro vita publica sua*.

34 In 280/279 BCE, Demochares proposed a motion for setting up a statue of his uncle. Cf. [Plut.] *X orat.* 847d; 850f–851c. See MacDowell 2009, 424–426; Canfora 2019.

of speeches and his private papers.[35] It is not known how many copies were initially made of the original papyrus rolls of Demosthenes and how exactly they were distributed in the early years. The assembling of a corpus that also included works of other authors (i.e. non-Demosthenic works) seems to have started in Athens and to have served political ends; Demochares is likely to have played a major role in this respect.[36] There were also other ways in which a non-Demosthenic work could have ended up in the corpus, e.g. if someone else's speech found among Demosthenes' possessions after his death was assumed to be his own, or a non-genuine writing may have been ascribed to him by a bookseller.[37]

The rolls in Athens will have served as a source for further circulation.

About a half-century after Demosthenes' death, writings that circulated under his name were incorporated into the Library of Alexandria. Callimachus catalogued them in his *Pinakes* (frr. 443–446 Pfeiffer) in the mid-third century BCE, apparently already facing the problem of the authenticity of some texts. We do not know much about Callimachus' corpus, but it seems to have also contained some now lost speeches.[38]

Call. fr. 443 (Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 13): ὁ δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς παρὰ Φιλίππου ῥηθεὶς λόγος, ὃν ἐπιγράφει Καλλίμαχος ὑπὲρ Ἀλοννήσου, ὁ τὴν ἀρχὴν τήνδε ἔχων· ‘ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, οὐκ ἔστιν, ὅπως αἱ αἰτίαι, ἃς Φίλιππος αἰτιᾶται’ ὅλος ἐστὶν ἀκριβὴς καὶ λεπτὸς καὶ τὸν Λυσιακὸν χαρακτῆρα ἐκμέμακται εἰς ὄνυχα.

Call. fr. 444 (Dion. Hal. *de Din.* 10): … Κατὰ Θεοκρίνου ἔνδειξις· ‘τοῦ πατρός, ὦ ἄνδρες’. τοῦτον Καλλίμαχος ἐν τοῖς Δημοσθένους φέρει.

Call. fr. 445 (Harp. ε 51): ἐνεπίσκημμα· ἔστι δὲ καὶ λόγος τις ἐπιγραφόμενος ‘Δημοσθένους πρὸς Κριτίαν περὶ τοῦ ἐνεπισκήμματος’, ὃν Καλλίμαχος μὲν ἀναγράφει ὡς γνήσιον, Διονύσιος δὲ ὁ Ἁλικαρνασεὺς ὡς ψευδεπίγραφον.

Call. fr. 446 (Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 265, 491b): καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ Σατύρου δὲ λόγον τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς πρὸς Χαρίδημον οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἔχοντες τὸ ἀσφαλὲς Δημοσθένους λέγουσιν εἶναι, ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος, οὐδ' ἱκανὸς ὢν κρίνειν, Δεινάρχου νομίζει.

---

[35] See Canfora 2019; Canfora 2014; Tuplin 1998; Sealey 1993, 228–229. The letters, if genuine, may have survived among them; see Trevett 2019; Worthington 2019.

[36] See Canfora 2019; Canfora 2015; Canfora 2006; Canfora 2014, with a summary on p. 21: "It is likely to have been the work of the Athenian party – Demochares belonged to – that continued the great leader's politics after his death and the creation of such a corpus to have had political, not philological aims: hence the substantial presence of spuria". Sealey 1993, 228–229 suggests that the compiler(s) may have set out to give a documentary history of both the public life of Demosthenes and the orator's time; under this goal various non-genuine speeches may have been included.

[37] See Trevett 2019; MacDowell 2009, 9; Sealey 1993, 228–229.

[38] See Canfora 2019; Trevett 2019; Blum 1991 (1977), 159, 180–181.

It is generally assumed that in Alexandria the texts were studied so as to produce an edition, which became a model for copies. In the course of transmission, further additions and losses occurred.

In the Hellenistic and Roman world, where rhetoric flourished and was a part of the educational system, Demosthenes' works continued to be studied; besides, his politics were reflected in the historiography.[39] Hence the copies multiplied. Many scholars contributed their own comments and explanations on Demosthenes (e.g. Didymus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Hermogenes, Harpocration),[40] at that time written as stand-alone texts, independent of the work that they illustrated.[41] The revival of interest in Attic Greek, starting from the first century BCE and culminating in the second and later again in the fourth century CE, combined with the emphasis on rhetoric, ensured the survival of the admired models, among them Demosthenes.[42] By the fourth century CE, the time of the culmination of ancient scholarship, readers of Demosthenes were well served with philological and historical commentaries, rhetorical handbooks, lexica, biographies, etc.[43] In Late Antiquity, cultural centres of the Greek East (in Egypt, Syria, and Palestine) played an important role.[44] In the fourth century CE, Libanius of Antioch added introductions, *Hypotheses* (ὑποθέσεις, *argumenta*), to Demosthenes' speeches prefaced by a *Life* (*Vita*) of Demosthenes and a brief note on his works (see below).[45]

The extant pieces of this rich indirect tradition, though they are very fragmentary, provide valuable insights into the condition of the *Demosthenic corpus* during ancient times. Certain groups of speeches were established, following the principle of a generic classification (in symbouleutic, forensic, and epideictic oratory), refined for Demosthenes.[46]

For example, among the deliberative or symbouleutic speeches (δημηγορίαι or συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι), all the speeches against Philip (orr. 1–11)[47] were called 'Philippics' (Φιλιππικοὶ λόγοι), the others (orr. 13–17) only symbouleutic speeches. In the fourth century CE, Libanius explains this classification in the above mentioned note in the *Prolegomena* to his *Hypotheses* to Demosthenes' speeches[48] as follows:

---

[39]   See CANFORA 2019.
[40]   See CANFORA 2019; GLO 41–42 (2020) with further bibliography.
[41]   See MAEHLER 2014. Some of this scholarship has survived in the scholia written in the margins of the medieval manuscripts that transmit the texts.
[42]   See REYNOLDS – WILSON 1991, 10, 45–47.
[43]   See GIBSON 1999, 171; MAEHLER 2014; REYNOLDS – WILSON 1991, 51–58.
[44]   See CANFORA 2019.
[45]   See FOERSTER 1915; GIBSON 1999. See also CANFORA 2019; COOK 2019. Libanius' handbook survives in **F** (see below). There is a gap of unknown length at the end of the *Life*.
[46]   See e.g. DRERUP 1899, 534; COBETTO GHIGGIA 2019.
[47]   I.e. not only the four entitled "Against Philip" (Κατὰ Φιλίππου, *In Philippum*).
[48]   See FOERSTER 1915, 606, 19 – 607, 17.

τῶν δὲ συμβουλευτικῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων οἱ μὲν αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἔχουσιν ἐπίγραμμα συμβουλευτικοί, οἱ δὲ οὐδὲν μὲν ἧττόν εἰσι συμβουλευτικοί, Φιλιππικοὶ δὲ ἐπιγράφονται ἐκ τοῦ περὶ τῶν <Φιλίππου> πραγμάτων εἰρῆσθαι τὴν κλῆσιν λαβόντες. καὶ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν ἔκαστος ἰδίαν τινὰ ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχει κατὰ τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἑκάστων ἰδιότητα (Lib. *Arg.D.* pr. 21 Foerster 607, 11–17).[49]

It is clearly reflected also in the oldest Byzantine codices, see e.g. the tenth-century tables of content (so-called *Pinax*) in **F** (fol. 12r) and **Y** (fol. 1r).[50] According to the evidence given by Didymus of Alexandria and the slightly younger Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[51] in the first century BCE the group of *Philippics* comprised twelve speeches. Didymus (*P.Berol.inv.* 9780[52]) gives orr. 9–11 as 'the ninth', 'the tenth' and 'the eleventh Philippic', and or. 13 (Περὶ συντάξεως) as 'the twelfth Philippic' (col. XIII, 16–19), obviously while this was the case in the corpus he used (*Philip's Letter*, or. 12, was not included[53]), but on or. 13 he disagrees: κ(αὶ) τοῦτον ἔνιοι τὸν λό[γ]ον εἰς τοὺς Φιλιππικο(ὺς) παρείρουσιν· [ο]ὐκ ὀρθῶς ὅσα γο(ῦν) ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ.[54] Libanius too claims that it is not one of the *Philippics*, but a simple symbouleutic speech (*Arg.D.* ιβ′ [12]): ὁ λόγος οὗτος οὐκ ἔτι Φιλιππικός ἐστιν, ἀλλ᾽ ἁπλῶς συμβουλευτικός. Dionysius (*Amm.* 10)[55] describes orr. 5–11 as 'the sixth', 'the seventh', 'the eighth' ... of the 'κατὰ Φιλίππου' or 'Φιλιππικαὶ δημηγορίαι', arriving at twelve since he has divided or. 4 into two speeches. For him, or. 11 (*Response to Philip's Letter*) is the last of the κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγορίαι.[56]

---

[49]   "Some of his symbouleutic speeches are entitled 'συμβουλευτικοί', others that are not less symbouleutic (than those) are entitled 'Φιλιππικοί' (i.e. *Philippics*); they received the title because they were delivered in the political affairs <concerning Philip>. And each of the *Philippics* has its own title according to the character of the individual affairs", i.e. *First Olynthiac* (Ὀλυνθιακὸς α′), *On the Peace* (Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης), etc.

[50]   For the images of these *Pinakes* see GRUSKOVÁ 2014, 295, Abb. 3, and 303, Abb. 11.

[51]   On these and other authors of the rich indirect tradition see GLO 41–42 (2020).

[52]   *P.Berol.inv.* 9780 (MP³ 339, LDAB 769) are fragments from a papyrus roll probably of the late second century CE which contain a part of Didymus' work *On Demosthenes*, in particular comments on orr. 9, 10, 11, and 13; see MAEHLER 2014; WILSON 2007; CANFORA 2006; HARDING 2006; GIBSON 2002. On this Commentary see also GLO 41–42 (2020).

[53]   See CANFORA 2019; TREVETT 2019; CANFORA 2006. Among the primary manuscripts, **S** sure and **A** (which is mutilated at the end) most probably did not include *Philip's Letter*; in **F** it is included and numbered as 'or. 12', in **Y** it follows at the end of the group of *Philippics*, but it is not numbered, although all the other speeches are; see GLO 41–42 (2020).

[54]   See HARDING 2006, 90–91: "And some people include this speech amongst the *Philippics*, not correctly, in my opinion at any rate." See also the heading above col. XIII: [Ὅ]τι οὐκ (ἔστι) τ(ῶν) Φιλιππικῶν ὁ λό[γος], Δημοσθένους δ(ὲ) ἄλλως ("the speech is not (one) of the *Philippics*, but is Demosthenes' all the same"), *op. cit.*, 89, 240.

[55]   Besides his references to political and public lawcourt speeches in *To Ammaeus* (*Ad Ammaeum*), Dionysius refers to some private speeches in *On Demosthenes*.

[56]   Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 10: καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη τελευταία τῶν κατὰ Φιλίππου δημηγοριῶν, ἀρχὴν ἔχουσα ταύτην· ὅτι μὲν ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι Φίλιππος οὐκ ἐποιήσατο τὴν εἰρήνην πρὸς

The title δημόσιοι λόγοι – besides meaning 'public speeches' in general (cf. e.g. Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 4 or Zos. *Vita Dem.*, see below) – was used in particular for Demosthenes' lawcourt speeches in public prosecutions.

As for the size of the corpus, the scholarly texts vary in their reports. The unknown author of the *Lives of the Ten Orators* (*Vitae decem oratorum*), a text written no later than in the fourth century CE,[57] mentions that 65 genuine speeches have been transmitted under Demosthenes' name ([Plut.] *X orat.* 847e).[58] Libanius treated in his *opusculum* 58 speeches, all of them extant today, in 57 *Hypotheses*.[59] *Philip's Letter* (or. 12) is absent; and so are the epideictic or. 60 (Ἐπιτάφιος) and or. 61 (Ἐρωτικός), since Libanius considered them spurious (Lib. *Arg.D.* pr. 20 Foerster 607, 3–5): ἐπιδεικτικοὺς δὲ οὐκ ἔχομεν αὐτοῦ λόγους. τοὺς γὰρ φερομένους οὐ πιστευτέον εἶναι Δημοσθένους, τὸν ἐπιτάφιον καὶ τὸν ἐρωτικόν.[60] The main witness for this work, the manuscript **F** of Demosthenes (fols. 1r–11v), shows that Libanius obviously used a corpus in which the speeches were in a different order than the order in which they follow in **F** (fols. 13r–304v). According to the *Life of Demosthenes* attributed to Zosimus of Ascalon (see **Y₂**, fols. 1r–2r), who flourished in the late fifth century CE (*Zosimi vita Demosthenis*), "he left behind many speeches (*logoi*), such as the Philippics (*philippikoi*), his public speeches (*dêmosioi*), those against his guardians (*epitropikoi*), those in private cases (*idiôtikoi*), his prologues (*prooimia*), the speech on love (*erôtikos*), his funeral speech (*epitaphios*), his letters (*epistolai*)" (κατέλειψε δὲ πολλοὺς λόγους, οἷον τοὺς φιλιππικούς, τοὺς δημοσίους, τοὺς ἐπιτροπικούς, τοὺς ἰδιωτικούς, τὰ προοίμια, τὸν ἐρωτικόν, τὸν ἐπιτάφιον, τὰς ἐπιστολάς).[61] As for the titles of individual speeches, prologues and letters, some variations occur in the transmission, both ancient and medieval, both direct and indirect.

Based on the extant evidence we may assume – in line with Michael W. Haslam (1976, 9–10) – that the Demosthenic corpus, being of rather fluid constituency, could have taken the following form: a collection or set of boxes of rolls labelled respectively '*Philippikoi logoi*' (Φιλιππικοὶ λόγοι), '*Symbouleutikoi logoi*' (Συμβουλευτικοὶ λόγοι), etc., each box containing the appropriate speeches,

---

ὑμᾶς, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνεβάλετο τὸν πόλεμον'. – Cf. Cicero choosing 12 of his consular speeches to create a corpus in imitation of Demosthenes' *Philippics* (*Ep. Att.* 2, 1, 3); see CANFORA 2019.

[57] See COOK 2019.

[58] [Plut.] *X orat.* 847e: Φέρονται δ᾽ αὐτοῦ λόγοι γνήσιοι ἑξήκοντα πέντε. See CANFORA 2019.

[59] See CANFORA 2019; GLO 41–42 (2020). Orr. 25 and 26 were treated together.

[60] "We do not have epideictic speeches by him; for one should not consider the ones which are being transmitted under his name as being of Demosthenes, (I mean) the Ἐπιτάφιος and the Ἐρωτικός." Cf. also Lib. *Arg.D.* pr. 20 Foerster 607, 5–11. See CANFORA 2019; TREVETT 2019; COOK 2019; CANFORA 2014b (or. 60). – For ancient editions of Demosthenes used by the grammarian Harpocration of Alexandria (2nd cent. CE) in his *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* see OTRANTO 1999. See also CANFORA 2019.

[61] Cf. COOK 2019. For the edition, see DINDORF 1851, 18–22; WESTERMANN 1845, 297–302.

in most cases one roll per speech. This would explain the genitive Δημοσθένους
('of Demosthenes') in some titles or end-titles of individual texts in the primary
manuscripts **A** (the titles of orr. 18, 24, 20, the end-titles of orr. 21, 23, 26[62]) and
Y (the end-title of or. 18). The longest speeches, or. 18 (2768 stichoi) and or. 19
(3280 stichoi), may have comprised even more than one roll. A single roll would
sometimes unite short, connected speeches, as for instance P.Oxy. 4314+P.Oxy.
4764 of the late first or early second century CE with orr. 1–4,[63] or P.Oxy. 1810
of the early second century CE with orr. 1–5.[64] An interesting piece of evidence
for this practice survives in **S** (fol. 29r), where after a group of six *Philippics*,
orr. 1–4, 8, 7, the end-title "The first volume, *Philippics* 6" (Τόμος α΄ | Φιλιππικοὶ
λόγοι ϛ΄) occurs, copied by the scribe himself; it is followed by a stichometrical
calculation for the entire group (2275 stichoi). A further piece of evidence can be
seen in the title Δημοσθένους συμβουλευτικοί before the group of orr. 13, 14, 16,
15, 17 in **A** (fol. 363v). There will have been many such collections of boxes,
some more complete than others.[65] Gradually, the texts will have been transferred
into codex form. Fragments of many ancient codices of Demosthenes, on papyrus
or parchment, survived;[66] some of them contain more than one speech, e.g. MPER
N.S. 3 47 (*P.Vindob. inv. G* 29833 a, papyrus, 4th/5th cent. CE)[67] or *P.Cairo inv.*
274 AB (parchment, 5th/6th cent. CE).[68] The change from roll to codex had several
impacts on further transmission. The fundamental organizing principle was self-
evidently the generic classification, but the order of the groups was not fixed,
and there was also some freedom of movement within the groups.[69]

   Attic Greek retained a strong influence in Byzantium.[70] Hence, there was a
constant motivation for the production of copies, for school and beyond, of
admired models whom Demosthenes ranked among.[71] The works transmitted
under his name were thus in a relatively good position to endure the tense times

---

[62]   Here and in the following lines, the speeches are given in the order in which they appear
       in the manuscripts.
[63]   MP³ 0255.01 (antea 0256.12, 0258.001); LDAB 620 (TM 59519).
[64]   MP³ 0256; LDAB 676 (TM 59574).
[65]   SEALEY 1993, 225–229, postulates as a source for Dionysius *To Ammaeus* a collection of
       public speeches with some historical information including dates of delivery – he calls it
       the "core" – that was recognized as authoritative in the time of Dionysius. "Since the
       'core' comprised some twenty-two speeches including the long forensic ones (18–24), it
       must have occupied several rolls of papyrus", *op. cit.* 227.
[66]   See MP³ or LDAB (TM). See GLO 41–42 (2020) with further bibliography.
[67]   MP³ 0303.1; LDAB 752 (TM 59650).
[68]   MP³ 0270 (antea 0270, 0271, 0273); LDAB 757 (TM 59655).
[69]   HASLAM 1976, 9. One factor in the determination of the resultant order of the texts will have
       been a chance one; see *ibidem*.
[70]   See REYNOLDS – WILSON 1991, 45–48.
[71]   See REYNOLDS – WILSON 1991, 47.

from the seventh until the beginning of the ninth century CE, and were quite secure from being lost.[72] Many quotations from or references to Demosthenes occur in the *Synagôgê lexeôn chrêsimôn* (Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων) from the late eighth or early ninth century,[73] but also in the *Commentary on the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius* by John of Sardeis in the first half of the ninth century, who likely drew mainly on his own reading of the texts.[74] In the ninth century, an important change in the book culture occurred: a new script, the Greek book minuscule – devised probably towards the end of the eight century – started to replace the majuscule.[75] This was a period of peace and a cultural revival associated with Photius († c. 893)[76] and later Arethas († c. 940), who sought out surviving classical texts. The transliteration of the extant heritage of Greek literature into the new script, so-called μεταχαρακτηρισμός (metacharaktêrismos), apparently lasted throughout the ninth and into the tenth century, occasionally even slightly later. In the tenth century, book production was stimulated by the existence of schools in Constantinople and the interest of the Byzantine emperors. The *Suda*, a combination of a dictionary and an elementary encyclopaedia compiled in the latter part of the tenth century, has plentiful references to Demosthenes.[77]

As already mentioned, the modern editions of the extant *Corpus Demosthenicum* are based on the minuscule codices dated from the ninth to the early eleventh centuries.[78] Their diversities, e.g. of order which varies from manuscript to manuscript in a rather strange way, forbid us to think of a single transliteration. A plurality of ancient, probably Late Antique manuscripts must have survived into the Middle Ages to become their ancestors.[79] Some more speeches, no longer extant, may still have been available at that time.[80] Interest in Demosthenes, going together with the production of new copies – although losses still occurred (e.g. during

---

[72] See CANFORA 2019.
[73] See CUNNINGHAM 2003.
[74] See ALPERS [2]2013, 43, 101, 103–108.
[75] See WILSON 2008, 105–108.
[76] Photius' *Lexicon* and *Bibliotheca* contain an important piece of evidence for Demosthenes, see SEALEY 1993, 223–225; CANFORA 2019.
[77] See ADLER 1928–1938 (repr. 1994–2001).
[78] See above, p. 138.
[79] This allowed the notion of one mediaeval archetype to dissipate into non-existence; see HASLAM 1976, 9–10; IRMER 1968; MARTINELLI TEMPESTA 2014; GLO 41–42 (2020).
[80] See *Synagoge* B α 252; Photius, *Bibl.* cod. 265 (cf. also cod. 250); *Suda* α 1458. A tenth-century note in the Paris manuscript Coislin 249 on fol. 100r, inserted after Aeschines' or. 2 § 18, mentions 71 speeches of Demosthenes. For explanations, see SEALEY 1993, 223–225. One may wonder if such a high number may have, at least partly, originated in a way of numbering texts in an old byzantine codex, similar to the numbering in the tenth-century manuscript **F** (Marc. gr. Z. 416), where the scribe numbered the speeches as Nos. 1–61, the prologues as No. 62, and the six letters as Nos. 63–68.

the Fourth Crusade[81]) – did not suffer sustained setbacks. It flourished in the
Greek East in the thirteenth and the fourteenth centuries, during the Palaeologan
period, and in the late fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries, when a revival in
Greek learning and literature took place in the West, stimulated by the immi-
gration of Byzantine scholars and a transfer of Greek manuscripts from the
East.[82] This transfer boomed in the fifteenth and the sixteenth centuries, during
the Renaissance. Hence, many new copies were produced. The first printed edi-
tion (*editio princeps*) of the speeches and the prologues was published in 1504 in
Venice, in the *officina* of Aldus Manutius. It was preceded by the letters in 1499
and the scholia in 1503.[83]

Appendix

The most recent critical edition of the Demosthenic speeches, prepared for the
Oxford Classical Texts by Mervin R. Dilts (*Demosthenis orationes*, Tom. I–IV,
Oxford 2002, 2005, 2008, 2009) contains 61 speeches as listed below (among
them *Philip's Letter* being numbered as or. 12). In the following list, the name of
Demosthenes appears in square brackets, scil. [Δημοσθένους], when the speech is
considered by Dilts not to be Demosthenes' own work. As mentioned above,
some attributions to other authors are nowadays generally accepted, e.g. orr. 46,
49, 50, 52, 53, and 59 to Apollodorus,[84] but for a number of the speeches the
authorship is still a matter of debate.[85] Dilts' edition does not contain the letters
and the prologues.[86] They were edited by Robert Clavaud in 1987 and 1974.

Modern editors retained the order of the speeches adopted in the *editio
princeps* (Venice 1504). This edition was based on manuscripts related to the
tenth-century Venice manuscript **F** (Marc. gr. Z. 416). However, as mentioned
above, the order of the speeches in the primary mediaeval manuscripts varies
from codex to codex.[87]

There is no relationship between the adopted order of the speeches and their
chronology, as the list shows. The dates are taken from Douglas MacDowell's
Demosthenes the Orator (2009, 12), who omits the uncertain ones.[88] The Greek

---

[81]   During and after the sack of Constantinople in 1204, the libraries must have severely suffered.
[82]   See REYNOLDS – WILSON 1991, 48ff.; WILSON 1983; WILSON 2008; BLANSHARD 2019.
[83]   See GLO 41–42 (2020).
[84]   See p. 140 with note 22.
[85]   For most recent views see the *Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes*, esp. TREVETT 2019.
[86]   In previous critical editions (e.g. the Oxford edition by S. H. Butcher [1903, 1907] and W.
       Rennie [1921, 1931], or the (incomplete) Teubner edition by K. Fuhr [1914] and J. Sykutris
       [1934]), the *Hypotheses* of Libanius precede the individual speeches.
[87]   See GLO 41–42 (2020).
[88]   See also the list of speeches in the *Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes*.

titles of individual speeches follow the edition of Mervin R. Dilts[89] (in the primary manuscripts, slight variations sometimes occur[90]).

	Λόγοι (lat. *orationes*, en. *speeches*)	Date BCE
or. 1	Δημοσθένους Ὀλυνθιακὸς αʹ (*Olynthiaca 1 / First Olynthiac*)	349/348
or. 2	Δημοσθένους Ὀλυνθιακὸς βʹ (*Olynthiaca 2 / Second Olynthiac*)	349/348
or. 3	Δημοσθένους Ὀλυνθιακὸς γʹ (*Olynthiaca 3 / Third Olynthiac*)	349/348
or. 4	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Φιλίππου αʹ (*In Philippum 1* or *Philippica 1 / First Philippic*)	351
or. 5	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τῆς εἰρήνης (*De pace / On the Peace*)	346
or. 6	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Φιλίππου βʹ (*In Philippum 2* or *Philippica 2 / Second Philippic*)	344/343
or. 7	[Δημοσθένους] Περὶ Ἁλοννήσου (*De Halonneso / On Halonnesus*)	343/342
or. 8	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τῶν ἐν Χερρονήσῳ (*De Chersoneso / On Affairs in the Chersonese*)	341
or. 9	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Φιλίππου γʹ (*In Philippum 3* or *Philippica 3 / Third Philippic*)	341
or. 10	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Φιλίππου δʹ (*In Philippum 4* or *Philippica 4 / Fourth Philippic*)	341
or. 11	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν[91] (*In epistulam Philippi / Response to Philip's Letter*)	340/339
or. 12	[Φιλίππου] Ἐπιστολὴ (*[Philippi] epistula / Philip's Letter*)	
or. 13	[Δημοσθένους] Περὶ συντάξεως (*De republica ordinanda / On Organization*)	350
or. 14	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τῶν συμμοριῶν (*De classibus / On the Symmories*)	354/353
or. 15	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τῆς Ῥοδίων ἐλευθερίας (*De Rhodiorum libertate / On the Freedom of the Rhodians*)	351/350
or. 16	Δημοσθένους Ὑπὲρ Μεγαλοπολιτῶν (*Pro Megalopolitanis / For the Megalopolitans*)	353/352
or. 17	[Δημοσθένους] Περὶ τῶν πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συνθηκῶν (*De foedere Alexandrino / On the Treaty with Alexander*)	

---

[89] In English translations, departing from the usual convention to latinize Greek names (e.g. Lakritos for Lacritus) has become more common, see e.g. MacDowell 2009.

[90] Minor variations in the titles occur occasionally also in the editions.

[91] Or Πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τὴν Φιλίππου (in other editions).

or. 18	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου (*De corona / On the Crown*)	330
or. 19	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τῆς παραπρεσβείας (*De falsa legatione / On the False Embassy*)	343/342
or. 20	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Λεπτίνην περὶ τῆς ἀτελείας (*Adversus Leptinem / Against Leptines*)	355/354
or. 21	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Μειδίου περὶ τοῦ κονδύλου (*In Midiam / Against Midias*)	347/346
or. 22	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Ἀνδροτίωνος παρανόμων (*Adversus Androtionem / Against Androtion*)	355/354
or. 23	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Ἀριστοκράτους (*In Aristocratem / Against Aristocrates*)	352/351
or. 24	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Τιμοκράτους παρανόμων (*In Timocratem / Against Timocrates*)	353/352
or. 25	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Ἀριστογείτονος α′ (*In Aristogitonem 1 / Against Aristogiton 1*)	325 or 324
or. 26	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Ἀριστογείτονος β′ (*In Aristogitonem 2 / Against Aristogiton 2*)	325 or 324
or. 27	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Ἀφόβου ἐπιτροπῆς α′ (*In Aphobum 1 / Against Aphobus 1*)	364/363
or. 28	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Ἀφόβου β′ (*In Aphobum 2 / Against Aphobus 2*)	364/363
or. 29	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Ἄφοβον ὑπὲρ Φάνου ψευδομαρτυριῶν (*Contra Aphobum / Against Aphobus for Phanus*)	362/361
or. 30	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Ὀνήτορα ἐξούλης α′ (*Contra Onetorem 1 / Against Onetor 1*)	362/361
or. 31	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Ὀνήτορα ἐξούλης β′ (*Contra Onetorem 2 / Against Onetor 2*)	362/361
or. 32	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Ζηνόθεμιν παραγραφή (*Contra Zenothemin / Against Zenothemis*)	
or. 33	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Ἀπατούριον (*Contra Apaturium / Against Apaturius*)	
or. 34	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Φορμίωνα (*Contra Phormionem / Against Phormion*)	
or. 35	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Λάκριτον (*Contra Lacritum / Against Lacritus*)	
or. 36	Δημοσθένους Παραγραφὴ ὑπὲρ Φορμίωνος (*Pro Phormione / For Phormion*)	350/349
or. 37	Δημοσθένους Παραγραφὴ πρὸς Πανταίνετον (*Contra Pantaenetum / Against Pantaenetus*)	347/346
or. 38	Δημοσθένους Παραγραφὴ πρὸς Ναυσίμαχον καὶ Ξενοπείθην (*Contra Nausimachum et Xenopeithea / Against Nausimachus and Xenopeithes*)	
or. 39	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Βοιωτὸν περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος (*Contra Boeotum 1 / Against Boeotus 1*)	348/347

or. 40	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Βοιωτὸν περὶ προικὸς μητρῴας (*Contra Boeotum 2 / Against Boeotus 2*)	347
or. 41	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Σπουδίαν (*Contra Spudiam / Against Spudias*)	
or. 42	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Φαίνιππον περὶ ἀντιδόσεως (*Contra Phaenippum / Against Phaenippus*)	328/327
or. 43	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Μακάρτατον περὶ Ἁγνίου κλήρου (*Contra Macartatum / Against Macartatus*)	
or. 44	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Λεωχάρη περὶ τοῦ Ἀρχιάδου κλήρου (*Contra Leocharem / Against Leochares*)	
or. 45	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Στεφάνου ψευδομαρτυριῶν αʹ (*In Stephanum 1 / Against Stephanus 1*)	350/349
or. 46	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Στεφάνου ψευδομαρτυριῶν βʹ (*In Stephanum 2 / Against Stephanus 2*)	350/349
or. 47	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Εὐέργου καὶ Μνησιβούλου ψευδομαρτυριῶν (*In Evergum et Mnesibulum / Against Evergus and Mnesibulus*)	356/355
or. 48	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Ὀλυμπιοδώρου βλάβης (*In Olympiodorum / Against Olympiodorus*)	342
or. 49	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Τιμόθεον ὑπὲρ χρέως (*Contra Timotheum / Against Timotheus*)	
or. 50	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Πολυκλέα περὶ τοῦ ἐπιτριηραρχήματος (*Contra Polyclem / Against Polycles*)	359
or. 51	Δημοσθένους Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου τῆς τριηραρχίας (*De corona trierarchiae / On the Trierarchic Crown*)	360/359
or. 52	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Κάλλιππον (*Contra Callippum / Against Callippus*)	369/368
or. 53	[Δημοσθένους] Πρὸς Νικόστρατον περὶ ἀνδραπόδων ἀπογραφῆς Ἀρεθουσίου (*Contra Nicostratum / Against Nicostratus*)	
or. 54	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Κόνωνος αἰκείας (*In Cononem / Against Conon*)	
or. 55	Δημοσθένους Πρὸς Καλλικλέα περὶ χωρίου βλάβης (*Contra Calliclem / Against Callicles*)	
or. 56	Δημοσθένους Κατὰ Διονυσοδώρου βλάβης (*In Dionysodorum / Against Dionysodorus*)	323/322
or. 57	Δημοσθένους Ἔφεσις πρὸς Εὐβουλίδην (*Contra Eubulidem / Against Eubulides*)	346/345
or. 58	[Δημοσθένους] Ἔνδειξις κατὰ Θεοκρίνου (*In Theocrinem / Against Theocrines*)	
or. 59	[Δημοσθένους] Κατὰ Νεαίρας (*In Neaeram / Against Neaera*)	
or. 60	[Δημοσθένους] Ἐπιτάφιος (*Epitaphius / Funeral Speech*)	338
or. 61	[Δημοσθένους] Ἐρωτικός (*Eroticus / Erotic Essay*)	

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADLER, Ada: *Suidae lexicon* I–V, Leipzig 1928–1938 (repr. Leipzig 1994–2001).

ALPERS, Klaus: *Untersuchungen zu Johannes Sardianos und seinem Kommentar zu den Progymnasmata des Aphthonios*, Braunschweig 2013 (2. durchgesehene und verbesserte Auflage [1. Auflage 2009]).

BAITER, Johann Georg – SAUPPE, Hermann: *Oratores Attici* VIII: *Demosthenes* II, Zürich 1850.

BLANSHARD, Alastair: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) Afterlife (Modern Era). In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

BLUM, Rudolf: *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography*, translated from the German (*Kallimachos und die Literaturverzeichnung bei den Griechen*, Frankfurt 1977) by H. H. Wellisch, Madison, Wisconsin 1991.

BUTCHER, Samuel Henry: *Demosthenis orationes*, Tomus I [orr. 1–19], Oxford 1903; Tomus II, Pars 1 [orr. 20–26], Oxford 1907.

CANFORA, Luciano: *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene*, Padova 1968.

CANFORA, Luciano: *Demostene, Discorso all'assemblea per ambascerie in Asia e in Grecia [Terza Filippica]*, Bari 1971.

CANFORA, Luciano: Introduzione. In: *Demostene, Discorsi e Lettere* I. *Discorsi all'assemblea (I–XVII)*, Torino 1974.

CANFORA, Luciano: Falsi demostenici e storia del corpus. In: *L'autore e l'opera: Attribuzioni, appropriazioni, apocrifi nella Grecia antica. Atti del Convegno internazionale (Pavia, 27–28 maggio 2005)*, ed. by F. Roscalla, Pisa 2006, pp. 103–117.

CANFORA, Luciano: Textgeschichte des Demosthenes im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 21–52.

CANFORA, Luciano: Demosthenes und Hypereides: Ἐπιτάφιοι λόγοι. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 81–94 (= CANFORA 2014b).

CANFORA, Luciano: Alla ricerca del Demostene perduto. In: DE ROBERTIS 2015, pp. I–XI.

CANFORA, Luciano: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) Afterlife (Antiquity and Byzantine Era). In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

CLAVAUD, Robert: *Démosthène. Prologues*, Paris 1974.

CLAVAUD, Robert: *Démosthène. Lettres et Fragments*, Paris 1987.

COBETTO GHIGGIA, Pietro: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) Speeches in Private Prosecutions. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

COOK, Brad L.: (Part V. Demosthenes' Life:) The Biographic Tradition. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

CUNNINGHAM, Ian C.: *Synagoge.* Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker 10), Berlin 2003.

Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita. Studien zur Textüberlieferung des Corpus Demosthenicum. Internationales Symposium in Wien, 22.–24. September 2011, hrsg. von J. Grusková und H. Bannert (Wiener Studien, Beiheft 36), Wien 2014.

DE ROBERTIS, Francesca: *Per la storia del testo di Demostene: i papiri delle Filippiche*, Bari 2015.

DILTS, Mervin R.: *Demosthenis orationes* I [orr. 1–18], II [orr. 19–26], III [orr. 27–40], IV [orr. 41–61], Oxford 2002, 2005, 2008, 2009.

DINDORF, Wilhelm: *Demosthenes* VIII: *Scholia Graeca ex codicibus aucta et emendata* [in orr. 1–19], Oxford 1851.

DRERUP, Engelbert: Antike Demosthenesausgaben. *Philologus*, Suppl. VII (1899), pp. 533–588 [published also as a Separatum, Leipzig 1899].

DRERUP, Engelbert: Vorläufiger Bericht über eine Studienreise zur Erforschung der Demosthenesüberlieferung, mit Beiträgen zur Textgeschichte des Isokrates, Aeschines, der Epistolographen und des Gorgias. *Sitzungsberichte der kgl. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 3 (1902 [1903]), pp. 287–323.

ERBSE, Hartmut: *Demosthenes*. In: *Geschichte der Textüberlieferung der antiken und mittelalterlichen Literatur* I, ed. by H. Hunger et al., Zurich 1961, pp. 262–264.

FOERSTER, Richard: *Libanii opera* VIII: *Progymnasmata, Argumenta orationum Demosthenicarum*, Leipzig 1915.

FUHR, Karl: *Demosthenis orationes*, Vol. I [orr. 1–19], Leipzig 1914.

GIBSON, Craig A.: The Agenda of Libanius' Hypotheses to Demosthenes. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 40 (1999), pp. 171–202.

GIBSON, Craig A.: *Interpreting a Classic: Demosthenes and His Ancient Commentators*, Berkeley – Los Angeles 2002.

GRUSKOVÁ, Jana: Paläographisch-kodikologische Betrachtungen zu den 'vetustissimi' des Demosthenes unter philologischen Gesichtspunkten'. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 263–312.

GRUSKOVÁ, Jana: Insights into the Transmission of Demosthenes II. *Graecolatina et Orientalia* XLI–XLII (2020) (in preparation).

HARDING, Phillip: *Didymos: On Demosthenes*, Oxford 2006.

HARRIS, Edward M.: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) Speeches to the Assembly and in Public Prosecutions (Dem. 1–24). In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

HASLAM, Michael W.: A problem in the history of the transmission of texts exemplified in Demosthenes. *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 1 (1976), pp. 9–10.

IRMER, Dieter: Beobachtungen zur Demosthenesüberlieferung. *Philologus* 112 (1968), pp. 43–62.

KAPPARIS, Konstantinos A.: *Apollodoros, 'Against Neaira' [D. 59]. Ed. with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Berlin – New York 1999.

KAPPARIS, Konstantinos A.: The Transmission of Apollodoros and the Edition of Mervin Dilts. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 107–128.

LDAB: Trismegistos: Leuven Database of Ancient Books (http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/).

MACDOWELL, Douglas M.: *Demosthenes the Orator*, Oxford 2009.

MAEHLER, Herwig: Demosthenes-Kommentare auf Papyrus – Eine vorläufige Übersicht. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 53–72.

MARTINELLI TEMPESTA, Stefano: Some remarks about the relationship between the primary witnesses of the Corpus Demosthenicum. In: *Demosthenica libris manu scriptis tradita* 2014, pp. 165–190.

MERTENS-PACK[3] (MP[3]). Catalogue des papyrus littéraires grecs et latins, Université de Liège (http://promethee.philo.ulg.ac.be/cedopal/index.htm).

MILNS, Robert David: The Public Speeches of Demosthenes. In: *Demosthenes: Statesman and Orator*, ed. by I. Worthington, London – New York 2000, pp. 205–223.

OTRANTO, Rosa: Antiche edizioni demosteniche in Arpocrazione: i discorsi I–XIII, in: *Studi sulla tradizione classica per Mariella Cagnetta*, a cura di L. Canfora, Roma – Bari 1999, pp. 363–371.

The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes, ed. by Gunther Martin, New York: Oxford University Press 2019 (forthcoming).[92]

PASQUALI, Giorgio: *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze 1934 ([2]1952 [con nuova prefazione e aggiunta di tre appendici]).

RENNIE, William: *Demosthenis orationes*, Tomus II, Pars 2 [orr. 27–40], Oxford 1921; Tomus III [orr. 41–61, prooemia, epistulae], Oxford 1931.

REYNOLDS, Leighton D. – WILSON, Nigel G.: *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature*, Oxford [3]1991 ([4]2013).

SEALEY, Raphael: *Demosthenes and His Time: A Study in Defeat*, New York – Oxford 1993 (pp. 221–229, Appendix I: The transmission of the Demosthenic corpus).

SYKUTRIS, Jannis: *Demosthenis orationes*, Vol. II, Pars 1 [orr. 20–26], Leipzig 1937.

TM: Trismegistos. An interdisciplinary portal of papyrological and epigraphical resources: http://www.trismegistos.org/

TREVETT, Jeremy: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) Authenticity, Composition, Publication. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

TUPLIN, Christopher: Demosthenes' Olynthiacs and the Character of the Demegoric Corpus. *Historia* 47/3 (1998), pp. 276–320.

WESTERMANN, Anton: *Biographi Graeci minores*, Braunschweig 1845.

WILSON, Nigel G.: *Scholars of Byzantium*, London 1983.

WILSON, Nigel G.: Scholiasts and Commentators. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 47 (2007), pp. 39–70.

WILSON, Nigel G.: Greek palaeography. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*, ed. by E. Jeffreys, J. Haldon and R. Cormack, Oxford 2008, pp. 101–114.

WILSON, Nigel G.: The Transmission of Aristophanes. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Greek and Roman Comedy*, ed. by M. Fontaine and A. Scafuro, New York 2014, pp. 655–666.

WORTHINGTON, Ian: (Part VI. The Corpus Demosthenicum:) The Epitaphios, Erotikos, Prooimia, and Letters. In: *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* 2019.

Jana Grusková
Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave
Filozofická fakulta
Katedra klasickej a semitskej filológie
Gondova 2
SK-81499 Bratislava
jana.gruskova@uniba.sk

Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften
Institut für Mittelalterforschung
Abteilung Byzanzforschung
Hollandstraße 11–13
A-1020 Wien
jana.gruskova@oeaw.ac.at

---

[92]   See note *.

Résumé

Insights into the Transmission of Demosthenes I

Jana GRUSKOVÁ

The works of the *Corpus Demosthenicum* have made a long journey to arrive at the point they are at today: from the original texts through many manuscript (hand-written) copies to the first printed editions in 1499 and 1504, and even afterwards through centuries of examining and editing the rich extant material. However, it is not long ago that the methods of textual criticism matured adequately and the achieve-ments of the rapidly developing discipline of Greek palaeography started to be syste-matically adopted in philological works. Yet, though there are many studies on various aspects of the complex transmission of Demosthenes, a great deal of further work is needed before a full account can be attempted. There are still more questions open than closed. The purpose of this article is to introduce the topic and provide a brief overview of some key points.

Pohľady do textovej tradície Démosthena I

Jana GRUSKOVÁ

Diela, ktoré tvoria *Corpus Demosthenicum*, prešli dlhú cestu, kým dospeli do stavu, v ktorom sú dnes: od pôvodných textov cez množstvo rukopisných kópií až po prvé tlačené vydania v roku 1499 a 1504. Nasledovali storočia usilovného skúmania a spracovávania bohatého zachovaného materiálu. Nie je to však tak dávno, čo metódy textovej kritiky dostatočne dozreli a poznatky rýchlo sa rozvíjajúcej gréckej paleo-grafie sa začali systematicky využívať vo filologických prácach. Hoci existuje veľa štúdií o rôznych aspektoch komplikovaného tradovania diel zahrnutých v *Corpus Demosthenicum*, je potrebné vykonať ešte veľa práce, aby bolo možné podať vyčer-pávajúci prehľad. Stále je viac otázok otvorených než zodpovedaných. Účelom tejto štúdie je predstaviť tému a poskytnúť stručný pohľad na niektoré kľúčové javy.