

M. R. DILTS, *Demosthenis Orationes, I*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002, 352 pp., ISBN 0198721684.

The editor of Demosthenes faces an enormous task. *The Corpus Demosthenicum* comprises some sixty speeches and various other works, many spurious, and survives in 279 medieval manuscripts<sup>1</sup> and numerous papyrus fragments. There can be few, if any, scholars better qualified to undertake this enterprise than Mervin Dilts, who has edited the scholia to Demosthenes and Aeschines, and a new Teubner text of Aeschines<sup>2</sup>. The present volume is the first of a planned series of four<sup>3</sup>, which will eventually replace the OCT of Butcher and Rennie<sup>4</sup>.

In his excellent introductory guide to textual criticism, Martin West asks the prospective editor to consider the important question, 'Is your edition really necessary?'<sup>5</sup>. There can be little doubt that in the case of Demosthenes the answer is a resounding 'yes'. Dilts comments on 'Butcher's flawed apparatus'<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See L. Canfora, *Inventario dei manoscritti greci di Demostene*, Padua 1968.

<sup>2</sup> M. R. Dilts, *Scholia Demosthenica* (2 vols), Leipzig 1983-1986; *Scholia in Aeschinem*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1992; *Aeschinis orationes*, Stuttgart-Leipzig 1997.

<sup>3</sup> According to the dust-jacket they 'are scheduled to appear at four-yearly intervals'.

<sup>4</sup> S. H. Butcher and W. Rennie, *Demosthenis orationes* (3 vols in 4 parts), Oxford 1903-31. It should be noted that the first volume of the old OCT included speech 19, whereas Dilts ends with the *De Corona*; and that Butcher and Rennie included ancient hypotheses to the speeches.

<sup>5</sup> M. L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart 1973, 61.

<sup>6</sup> Dilts p. xv n. 26. See also H. Yunis, *Demosthenes. On the Crown*, Cambridge 2001, 32 n. 108: 'the OCT edition of Butcher and the Budé edition of Mathieu are untrustworthy guides to the manuscripts'.

and the ‘very limited use of testimonia’ in the Teubner edition of Fuhr and Sykutris<sup>7</sup>. Dilts indeed follows his own practice in the Aeschines Teubner of printing the testimony of other ancient authors as a separate apparatus, and this in itself is a great advance on the earlier OCT (and Didymus’ commentary on Demosthenes was published in 1904, the year after Butcher’s first volume<sup>8</sup>). As for the medieval manuscripts, few would quibble with Dilts’ reliance on SAFY as the primary manuscripts, against Butcher’s ‘optimos nostros codices, Parisinum S et Laurentianum L’<sup>9</sup>.

The Preface, written in English not Latin, has four sections, beginning with a history of the Demosthenic corpus in antiquity. In this succinct discussion Dilts rehearses the arguments that S does not derive from the recension of an unidentified Atticus, to whom four variant readings are attributed by Harpocration; and that the two scholia to the *Against Meidias* which refer to an ‘ancient’ (ἀρχαία) text and the ‘vulgate’ (δημώδης) do not prove that S should be equated with the former, and A and others with the latter, but ‘that readings found in primary manuscripts were already current in antiquity’. He supports the second contention with further readings from papyri and testimonia that are found in each of his four primary manuscripts.

The second section contains descriptions of these primary manuscripts and indicates which editors were the first to use each of them. In addition, Dilts explains his collective sigla A\* (comprising manuscripts Ag, A<sup>sup</sup>, Cd and L1), used for 1-4.28 ‘to recover readings from missing parts of the first two quires of A’; and Y\* (Af, T and Wb), used for 1-7.19. In both instances the manuscripts ‘share the errors’ of A or Y respectively, and also have ‘separative errors’; and while Dilts’ method could not be expected to produce certainty about the readings of A in the lost folios, it seems a defensible and highly useful approach (but

<sup>7</sup> K. Fuhr and I. Sykutris, *Demosthenis orationes* (2 vols), Leipzig 1914-1937.

<sup>8</sup> Butcher ends his Praefatio (p. xv) with the seemingly prophetic words ‘nec deest quidem spes fore ut ex Aegyptia tellure, quae tot tantisque nos donis locupletavit, papyrorum messis uberior proveniat’.

<sup>9</sup> Butcher p. 5. His L is, confusingly, Dilts’ Ft.

see below). Of slightly less use seems the inclusion of Q in the list of primary manuscripts: although it is one of the *codices vetustissimi* (of the 11th century, slightly later than SAFY), it contains only speech 18 from this volume and 'has been rarely used for or. 18, since it tends to replicate readings of F, except when it has separative errors of no particular interest'<sup>10</sup>. Where the reading of Q is recorded, it is preceded, in my view unnecessarily, by 'cod.'<sup>11</sup>. A great deal more information about the medieval manuscripts is provided by MacDowell in his editions of the *Meidias* and *Embassy* speeches,<sup>12</sup> but Dilts offers plenty for the purposes of an OCT volume.

In the third section Dilts discusses earlier editions, from the Aldine *editio princeps* of 1504, through those of Feliciano (1543), Lambin (1570), Wolf (1572), Reiske (1770-1), Bekker (1823) and Blass (1885-9), to the OCT of Butcher and Rennie (1903-31). Other editions are referred to briefly in the footnotes, including (without full referencing in n. 26) the revised Teubner of Fuhr and Sykutris, which corrected the appalling edition of Blass and, since it provided 'a full and accurate account of primary MSS', might be deemed equally worthy of inclusion in the main text (despite Dilts' above-mentioned reservation concerning the testimonia).

In the final section of the Preface Dilts records the principles of his edition, beginning with an evaluation of the relative merits of S and AFY. The recension of S tends to be briefer, and the fuller readings of AFY may often be suspected on the principle of *lectio difficilior potior*. But Dilts sensibly does not go down the dangerous path of always preferring S to AFY, but considers their differences 'on a case by case basis'. Nor

<sup>10</sup> Though interestingly, e.g., according to Fuhr Q corr. has καί at 18.100 (followed by a lacuna of three letters) with S and against AFY (καίτοι).

<sup>11</sup> The same applies to other more rarely used manuscripts, such as 'cod. O' in the apparatus to 18.144.

<sup>12</sup> D. M. MacDowell, *Demosthenes. Against Meidias (Oration 21)*, Oxford 1990; *Demosthenes. On the False Embassy (Oration 19)*, Oxford 2000.

does he follow 'Benseler's hypothetical rule that Demosthenes consciously avoided hiatus', but goes back to 'the evidence of primary manuscripts', allowing hiatus where two of them exhibit it and adopting 'the reading that avoids hiatus or the succession of more than two short syllables' where two primaries are at variance. Dilts thereby avoids the extremes produced by Blass' *rhythmisches Gesetz*, and his text has a very different feel to it from earlier editions, but this method at times also produces strange results: in the well-known opening to the *Third Philippic* we now have προειμένα ὀρῶ for προειμέν' ὀρῶ, which follows nicely after ὑπηγμένα πάντα τὰ πράγματα; but ὡς φαυλότατα ἔμελλε τὰ πράγμαθ' ἔξειν for the usual ὡς φαυλότατ' ἔμελλε τὰ πράγμαθ' ἔξειν may well seem rather odd to some. *Scriptio plena* is full of problems either way, and the rigid adherence to the above principle, while in many ways laudable, does not bring us any closer to how Demosthenes would have actually written (let alone spoken) the words. Dilts ends the section with the principles he has followed in his apparatus of testimonia and in the critical apparatus itself.

The Preface is followed by a very useful list, speech by speech, of the *Fragmenta Papyracea*; a *Compendia Auctorum* with the abbreviations used in the apparatus of testimonia (by no means all the ancient authors are listed, e.g. Hephæstion, and a remarkable omission is Dilts' own edition of the scholia to Demosthenes); and a list of his Sigla.

The text itself seems judicious and the apparatuses accurate (though the critical apparatus, as is usual in the OCT series, tends towards the minimal). I say 'seems' for two reasons. I have not myself collated the major Demosthenic manuscripts (and incidentally Dilts nowhere indicates which ones he has collated), but for the purposes of this review I have looked at Dilts' L1 (Lond. Harl. 6322), one of the four used to form the collective siglum A\*. The results of this examination are disappointing and do not demonstrate the reliability of the A\* readings. If we take speech 2, for example, there are ten reports in the apparatus of A\* readings: of these, four do not correspond to the readings of L1:

- 2.6: φοβερὸν < εἶναι > A\*: there is no added εἶναι in L1;  
 2.6: ἐώρων < αὐτὸν > A\*: I read < αὐτὸν > ἐώρων;  
 2.11: οὗτος (for οὕτως) A\*: I read οὕτως;  
 2.26: τῶν αὐτῶν om. A\*: ante τούτων Y\* Π1810: L1 also has the order τῶν αὐτῶν τούτων.

I have to report, therefore, that it is not possible to deconstruct the collective reading without referring to more than one of the manuscripts of which it comprises<sup>13</sup>. Secondly, it is primarily for scholars who are actively working on editions or commentaries of Demosthenes to engage Dilts in discussion over his preferred readings. I have checked a random selection of passages, in which Dilts' judgment seems to me generally very sound: e.g. at 3.14 he prints προθύμως ὑμᾶς, which is preferable to the deletion of ὑμᾶς made by Cobet and followed by Butcher; and at 15.19 he rightly, in my view, refrains from adding ἄν. It then seems all the more strange that he records conjectures of other scholars, but makes none of his own. I have to note also that in 18.151, where (as Stephen Usher pointed out in his commentary<sup>14</sup>) Fuhr printed περιόντων in his Teubner without comment, instead of περιούτων (the MSS reading printed elsewhere, as by Yunis), Dilts also prints περιόντων without comment.

The volume is excellently produced, and I have only a few minor quibbles, which are offered as suggestions for possible improvements in a second edition. Although there is the *Compendia Auctorum*, there is no modern bibliography; a handful of the abbreviations used in the two apparatuses are not consistent (e.g. Syr./Syrian. p. 2; Greg. Cor./Greg. *passim* - this is fine in itself, but seems inconsistent with, e.g., Syr. Soptr. Marcell. used in both); 'Bl.' is listed as the abbreviation for 'Blass', but 'Blass' is used consistently from p. 87 onwards; similarly, 'Bekker' not 'Bk.' appears on pp. 83, 185, 191, 212, 242, 253, 293, 306; 'Rei.' occurs on pp. 3 and 54, but elsewhere 'Reiske'; 'Ios. Rac.' is simply 'Ios.' on pp. 104, 105, 210 (bis), 213; 'Dind.' is used

<sup>13</sup> Presumably at 4.10 περιόντες is the reading of A\*, not A.

<sup>14</sup> S. Usher, *Greek Orators V. Demosthenes, On the Crown*, Warminster 1993.

for 'Dindorf' on pp. 139, 140; 'Lambinus' (not 'Lamb.')

appears on p. 154; 'Su.' for 'Sud.' on p. 228; and the last line of the apparatus on p. 306 should read '27-p. 307.1 sic interclusit Fuhr'.

In sum, Dilts' learning and experience shine through this text, which is both a welcome and an excellent addition to Demosthenic scholarship. I eagerly await the later volumes.

MICHAEL J. EDWARDS  
Queen Mary, University of London  
m.j.edwards@qmul.ac.uk