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

The Manuscripts which contain or. 54:¹

*Codices vetustissimi:*
- S = Parisinus gr. 2934 (9\textsuperscript{th}/10\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- A = Monacensis gr. 485 (9\textsuperscript{th}/10\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- F = Marcianus gr. Z 416 (= 536) (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Q = Marcianus gr. Z 418 (= 312) (10\textsuperscript{th}/11\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- D = Ambrosianus D 112 sup. (10\textsuperscript{th}/11\textsuperscript{th} cent.)

*Codices recentiores:*
- Ai = Ambrosianus E 119 sup. (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- B = Monacensis gr. 85 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Cd = Malatestianus plut. D.XXVII.1 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Fh = Laurentianus plut. 59.8 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- K = Parisinus gr. 2998 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Lb = Leidensis Perizonianus Q 4 (a 1457)
- Ln = Londiniensis Addit. 39617 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Lp = Londiniensis Lambeth Palace 1207 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Mk = Marcianus gr. Z 417 (= 839) (late 14\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Mm = Marcianus gr. Z 420 (= 860) (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Na = Neapolitanus II.E.11 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Nc = Neapolitanus II.E.13 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Pu = Parisinus gr. 2997 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- R = Parisinus gr. 2936 (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Sh = Skokloster, Bielke (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Vc = Vaticanus gr. 69 (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- vg (= Xg) = Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 172 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)
- Vi = Vaticanus Palatinus gr. 224 (15\textsuperscript{th} cent.)

¹ No papyri have been found containing any part of or. 54.
VI = Vaticanus (Reginensis gr.) Pii II 41 (15th cent.)
vr (= Xq) = Vaticanus Urbinas gr. 114 (15th cent.)
Vs = Vaticanus gr. 2207 (14th cent. [in the part containing or. 54])

Five manuscripts (SAFQD) which contain Against Conon are considered primary mss. and have been dated to the 9th/10th century (SA), the 10th century (F) and the 10th/11th century (QD). For or. 54 only A and F are capostipiti for the mss. recentiores. FQD are gemelli since they derive from a common ancestor for or. 54 and for most other orations of Demosthenes. FQD share conjunctive errors, but SAFQD each introduce separative errors against each other proving that they are not copied from each other. I have adopted the format used by Leganés Moya and Hernández Muñoz for presenting the relationship of the codices recentiores to the vetustissimi (veteres):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VETUSTISSIMI</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RECENTIORES</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Vi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Vi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cd</td>
<td>Pu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
<td>Sh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>vr (= Xq)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nc</td>
<td>Ln</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vs</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Lb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fh</td>
<td>Ai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vg (= Xg)</td>
<td>Vi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lp</td>
<td>Vl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Butcher 1903, vi; Fuhr 1914, xx. Gernet I, 1954, 13: “F, Q et D sont de même époque et très étroitement apparentés; aussi bien certaines de leurs divergences doivent faire conclure qu’ils ne procèdent pas l’un de l’autre, mais tous ensemble du même original: celui-ci devait comporter des variantes quelquefois révélées par une correction commune, souvent indiquée par le sigle γρ (γράφεται) qui introduit en marge une leçon particulière – tantôt dans les trois manuscrits, tantôt dans un seul d’entre eux.” But see K. Kapparis, Apollodorus: Against Neaira [D. 59], Berlin 1999, 68. Kapparis produces evidence that the text of or. 59 in ms. D is derived from the exemplar for the primary ms. Y (Paris. gr. 2935), and also bears a close relationship with ms. R. For our purposes, codex Y does not contain or. 54, and R belongs to the A family for the text of the Against Conon.


Genealogy of the *recentiores* for or. 54:

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

• Mk: copy of Lp, and source of Lb, shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnLbAi, but has separative errors against LpPuShLpvrLnAi.

• Lb: apograph of Mk, and shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnMkAi, and introduces separative errors against LpPuShvrLnMkAi.

• Ai: copy of Lp, shares conjunctive errors with PuShvrLnMkLb, but has separative errors against LpPuShvrLnMkLb.

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

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

---

7 Presumably these readings which were not conjectures were culled from mss. that were used and then discarded.
reported a large portion of the speech in the first century BC, we can attempt to evaluate the version he had in manu (Demosthenes 12). 8 Dionysius excerpted paragraphs 3–9 of the Against Conon for his discussion of ethopoeia or characterization, and reported that the speech was very Lysianic in style. In fact, Dionysius mused that since the Against Conon was so similar in subject matter and style to the Against Tisis of Lysias, that, had the speeches been transmitted outside of their respective corpora, their authorship might be confused:

ηδονῆς δὲ ἄρα καὶ πειθοῦς καὶ χαρίτων καίρων τε καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης τῆς τοῖς Λυσιακοῖς ἐπανθούσης ἀρετῆς οὐχὶ πολλὴ μοῖρα; οὐκ ἔνεστι ἄλλως εἰπέταιν. εἰ γοῦν μὴ διὰ τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς, οὔ τινός ἐστιν, ἐκάτερος τῶν λόγων γνώριμος ἤν, ἂλλ’ ἀνεπιγράφοις περιετύχομεν αὐτοῖς, οὐ πολλοῖς ἀν ἦν ὡμοία διαγιγνοίρα ῥάδιως, πότερος Δημοσθένους ἐστίν ἢ Λυσίου· τοσαύτην οἱ χαρακτῆρες ὁμοί-τητα πρὸς ἄλληλους ἔχουσι. (D. H., Demosthenes 13)

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

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

---

8 For quote of the scholia in its entirety, see DILTS 1986, 469a, 508.
9 PASQUALI 2 1952, 288.
10 GERNET I, 1954, 14.
12 FUHR 1914, xx; PASQUALI 2 1952, 288; McGAY 2005, 22.
subsequent transmission of extant manuscripts? It is unlikely that Dionysius was quoting such a large passage from memory, but it is quite probable that Dionysius or his associates made changes to the text.\textsuperscript{13} And whatever changes were made in his text apparently did not find a home in any of the mss. of Demosthenes, as evidenced by my collation.

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

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

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{13} \textsc{Fuhr} 1914, xx.
\item \textsuperscript{14} \textsc{Kapparis} 1999, 61.
\item \textsuperscript{15} For two examples of this abrupt change of traditions in the middle of an oration, see \textsc{MacDowell} 1990, 60. Mm (Marcianus gr. 420), a ms. which also carries or. 54, follows readings from the F family up to § 154, then from § 154 on bears A family readings.
\item \textsuperscript{16} For example, codex A carries two different versions of or. 51, and FQD all repeat the συγγραφή of or. 35; in both these examples, the versions derive from different exemplars. See \textsc{Gernet} I, 1954, 17, 20; \textsc{Fuhr} 1914, xix–xx.
\item \textsuperscript{17} For or. 54, six manuscripts can be said to belong to the F branch: F (10\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Q (10\textsuperscript{th}/11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), D (10\textsuperscript{th}/11\textsuperscript{th} cent.), B (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), Vc (13\textsuperscript{th} cent.), and Mm (14\textsuperscript{th} cent.).
\end{itemize}
The corrections for F are in the same hand as the text for or. 54, and as well as for the entire codex. All these γράφεται variants are *intra familiam* F branch, and show agreement with SA (20.7) or with S (28.14) or against SAFQD (27.12). In his examination of or. 21, MacDowell initially believed that F was a contamination of S and A, and thus held an “intermediate position of value between S and A.” He noticed that readings in F at times agreed with S and at other times with A, yet he believed that the greater part of the text of F could not be derived from either S or A. In his opinion, the “conflationary character of F” was the result of the “scribe of F picking and choosing readings from S and A, and sometimes includes both leading to nonsense.” Consequently, MacDowell conjectured that F could not represent a third line of transmission, because its text and even its errors resembled S and A too closely.

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

---

18 Vi (15th cent.), Vs (14th cent. [in the part containing or. 54]), and Ai (15th cent.). Vi and Ai do not contain the full oration: Vi ends at § 40 (πιστευθεὶς ἂν κατὰ πάντα) and Ai terminates at § 26 (ἐποίουν βούλομαι πρός).
19 MACDOWELL 1990, 54.
20 MACDOWELL 1990, 51.
21 MACDOWELL 1990, 51.
22 MACDOWELL 1990, 52–53: MacDowell includes readings of F that differ from S and A which could be correct readings, though he notes that these are not “impressive”.
23 MACDOWELL 2000, 35–36. The two documents are quotations from Sophokles and Solon. The quote of is not transmitted in S and only partially in A. Since F has more complete versions of the documents, and since it is unlikely that they were added after antiquity, codex F must derive from an ancient ms., distinct from S and A.
copy (or a subsequent copy of it) but the scribes of S and A had not.” 24 Or. 54 does not carry any documents or quotes.

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stichometric/Label Letter</th>
<th>codex S</th>
<th>codex Q</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>εἰσὶ κακηγορίας (§ 17.22)</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>τὰ πλέιστα (§ 28.17)</td>
<td>-φαίνον τὸ πρῶτον (§ 28.17 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>missing</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end</td>
<td>ΗΗΗΗ ΓΔΔΔ</td>
<td>ΗΗΗΗ ΓΔΔΔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 MacDowell 2000, 36.
25 MacDowell 2000, 38.
26 MacDowell 2000, 38: “S’s numbering is the original one, possibly going back as early as the Hellenistic period. At some later date one scribe, whose lines were roughly shorter, wrote the marginal letters against every hundredth line in his own copy, though without changing the total written at the end; and F and Q are both descended from that copy, whereas S is not.”
For the text of the Against Conon, there exists a closer affinity of the F branch to codex S, since F(QD) almost always agree with S when S is correct. When A offers a variant reading to S, F does not agree with A. The few instances where AF agree against S are not impressive:

10.11 εἰς τε τὸν] S, εἰς τὸ AF(QD)
10.15 κομίσαι] S, κομίσαι <με> AF(QD)
15.2 υβρισθαι] S, υβρισθήναι AF(QD)

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

20.8 ἐρῶντες] AFQDKNaNcVs¹, ερωτες S, ἐρωτοντες Vs³p.
36.25 παρέρχονται] SAFQDKNaNcVs, παρέρχονται Vs³p.
43.1 σκοπέτε] SFQDCd²Vs, σκοπεῖν τε ACd¹KNaNcVs³p.
43.1 δὴ] AKcNaNcVs, δεῖ K³NeVṣ³p.

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

17.20 τάναντία] SAFQDAi, ἕναντίας Ai³p.

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

---

27 Voemel 1857, 254.
3.7 δὲ] SACdVi, om. FQDMmVi\textsuperscript{70}Vl
6.14 τοῖς] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, ός ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}
7.24 τῶν] SAFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{1}Vi\textsuperscript{70}, τοῦ Cd\textsuperscript{2}ViVl
9.18 – 19 τινά καὶ] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, τινὰ <ἀ> καὶ ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
9.19 ὀνομάζειν] SFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{Vi}, λέγειν ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
18.26 μηδὲ] SAV\textsuperscript{Vi}, ἵ FQDV\textsuperscript{70}
18.28 τοῦ] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, τῶ ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
19.4 εἶναι] AFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{Vi}, om. S, το εἶναι Vi\textsuperscript{c}
20.7 συνειλεγμένοι] SAF\textsuperscript{70}Q\textsuperscript{70} (καὶ)D\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{Vi}, συνηγμένοι FQDV\textsuperscript{70}, συνε-
φθεγμένοι ViVl
22.28 νῦν] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, <οὔτος> νῦν ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
23.30 εἰς] FQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{i}Vi, εἰς τοῦ S, αὐτοῦ Vi\textsuperscript{c}, αὐτοὺς A
25.17 – 18 παρεκελεύσατο] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, ἐπέταξεν ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
26.4 οὐδεὶς] SACd\textsuperscript{Vi}, οὐδεὶς <ἔστιν> FQD\textsuperscript{70}Vl
26.5 οὔτοι] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, om. ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
27.11 οὔτοι] SAFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{i}Vi\textsuperscript{c}, del. Cd\textsuperscript{2}, om. Vi\textsuperscript{a}
28.14 πρῶτον] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, τοῦτο ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
28.14 λῆχθηναι] A\textsuperscript{1}, δειπνῆναι SF\textsuperscript{70}Q\textsuperscript{70}B\textsuperscript{70}MmVc\textsuperscript{Vi}, λεζηθήναι A\textsuperscript{c}FQD\textsuperscript{Cd\textsuperscript{i}}VlVl
28.17 ύβρισμαι] SAFQDV\textsuperscript{70}ViVl, ύβρί Vl
29.22 φήσαι] SFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{Vi}, φησὶν AV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
29.22 οὕ] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, μὴ ACdV\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{a}Vl
30.5 αὐτῶ] αὐτῷ FDBV\textsuperscript{70}, αὐτῷ S, αὐτῶ Q, αὐτοῦ ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
30.6 καὶ νῦν] ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl, παρ᾽ ύμῖν SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}
31.11 Χαιρήτιος] SFDB, Χαιρήτιος Q, χαιρέτιος Vi\textsuperscript{70}, Χαιρέτιος ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
31.11 χαιριμένους] SACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl, χαριμένους FQDV\textsuperscript{70}
37.4 γενοίμεθ᾽ ἀν] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, ἐγενόμεθα ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
39.20 τά] SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}, om. ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl
39.20 κατεσθίειν] ACdV\textsuperscript{i}Vl, κατακαίειν SFQDV\textsuperscript{70}
40.25 δὲ] SAFQD\textsuperscript{70}Cd\textsuperscript{Vi}Vl, τε Q\textsuperscript{70}Vi\textsuperscript{70}.

Although Vi\textsuperscript{70} does agree with Q\textsuperscript{70} once at 40.25, Vi and Q, as well as Vi\textsuperscript{70} and Q\textsuperscript{70}, do not have any other conjunctive errors.

Vi is a relative of ViVl. ViVl have conjunctive errors, and separative errors against each other, proving the existence of a lost codex\textsuperscript{28} as their source. ViVl together reproduce approximately 85% of the significant errors of A, so it can be said that they (and their source) are more in the A branch. But, where ViVl do not agree with A they agree with F and even S. The following are errors of A

\textsuperscript{28} I gave this codex the siglum ε: McGAY 2005, 76.
which are not carried in either Vi or Vl, thus showing that codex ε was contaminated from F and perhaps slightly by S:

7.6 τὴν] SFQDBViVl, om. ACd
8.12 ἐξέδυσαν] SFQDBViVl, ἐξέδυον ACd
12.2 πάνυ πολλή] SFQDBVi, πάνη πολλῆς Vl, om. ACd
13.10 τινὰς] SFQDBViVl, om. ACd
15.2 ύβρισθαί] SViVl, ύβρισθήναι AFQDCd
15.5 ἂν τις] S, τις ἂν FQDViVl, τις ACd
20.6 ἂν] SFQDVιVl, ἂν ACd
27.5 δ’ οὖν] SFQDVιVl, γοῦν ACd
31.9 ἀγνοήσειν] SFQDVιVl, ἀγνοεῖν ACd
32.14 – 15 πιστεύοντας] SFQDVιVl, πιστεύοντας ACd
32.21 ἐπειτ’ αὐτὸς εὖ] SFQDB, ἐπειτ’ αὐτός ἐγωγε Vl, οὔτ’ αὐτός ἐγωγε ACd
35.14 ἀλλήλως] SFQDCdVιVl, ἀλλήλους ACd\(^1\)
36.26 ταυτασί] SFQDVιVl, ταύτας ACd
38.14 ἀποβλέποντας] SFQDVιVl, ἀποβλέποντα ACd
40.26 κἂν] SFQDVιVl, καὶ ACd
40.3 ἂν] SFQDVιVl, om. ACd

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

22.28 alterum ὁ] SFQDVι, om. ACdVl

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

3.7 δέ] SACдвι\(^a\), om. FQDVιVl
7.20 ποιεῖσθαι] SACd, ποιῆσασθαι FQDVιVl
15.5 ἂν τις] S, τις ACd, τις ἂν FQDVιVl
26.4 οὐδείς] SACдвι\(^a\), οὐδεὶς <ἔστιν> FQDVιVl

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

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

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

---

30 DRRERUP 1899, 580.
31 MACDOWELL 2000, 44.
33 CANFORA 1992, 295.
34 CANFORA 1992, 295.
35 It may be relevant to point out that only A family codices use the word ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΙ or the singular ΙΔΙΩΤΙΚΟΣ in the title, whereas F mss. use Κατά Κόνωνος αἰκίας for the title. Only ViVl add the words δημοσθένους λόγοι as follows: δημοσθένους λόγοι οἱ λεγόμενοι ιδιωτικοί Vi, δημοσθένους λόγοι ιδιωτικοί VI.
36 Cd does not repeat or. 51 as A does.
nella sua «seconda parte», non ha avuto A come suo modello; probabilmente dipende dal modello di A”.

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

A note at the beginning of Cd on folio II tells us the codex was purchased there for twenty-one Byzantine hyperpyra by Nicolò Martinozzi for the birthday of John Galioctes in 1431. \(^{40}\) Further notes reveal that Cd was read and corrected several times in the 15th century. An unidentified hand, not a scribe of the text for Cd, writes the date 1412 in his subscription on f. 545v. Another note on f. 16v records that Leon Atrapes, Cd\(^3\) in Passweg, used Cd to teach Demosthenes in March 1426. \(^{41}\) Ioannes Chrysoloras \(^{42}\) (fl. 1442–1494), claims on f. 544v that he has corrected the entire manuscript. Chrysoloras appears to be responsible for making most of the corrections and introducing most, if not all, of the scholia in the entire codex. In accord with the findings of Passweg and Dilts, the source for the changes and scholia of or. 54 in Cd was a codex of the F branch. Passweg identifies Chrysoloras as Cd\(^2\) for or. 24, and I follow the same designation.

The source of Cd\(^2\) or the readings of Chrysoloras can be discovered in the ViVl mss., which derive from A, but suffered contamination from the F family. Also included on this list are readings where Cd\(^2\) shows agreement with F:

---

\(^{37}\) Canfora 1992, 299.

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

\(^{39}\) Scholium at beginning of the oration: Cd shares variant reading with R. Also, Cd\(^1\)R share the minor omission at 38.14: prius tòv\] SAFQDCd\(^2\)ViVl, om. Cd\(^1\)R.

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

\(^{41}\) See Dilts 1979, 265; Passweg 1975, 45. For Leon Atrapes, see RGK, vol. 2.328.

\(^{42}\) On Ioannes Chrysoloras, see Sosower 1986, 142.
6.11–12 μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς οὐ μὴν ἔγωγ’ φόμην δεῖν οὐτε δίκην λαχεῖν αὐτοῖς| SAFQDCd1, οὐ μὴν ἔγωγ’ φόμην δεῖν οὐτε δίκην λαχεῖν αὐτοῖς μὰ τοὺς θεοὺς Cd2ViVI
7.24 τὸν| SAFQDCd1Vi10, τοῦ Cd2ViVl
8.14 ἐναλλόμενοι| SAFQDCd2cViVl, ἐναλλόμενοι Cd1
8.16 κατέληπον] D. H. (codex M), καταλείπειν ACd1, καταλιπεῖν FQDCd2Vi VI, καταλιπεῖν S
11.23 ἱδότων] AFQDCd2ViVl, εἰδότων S, ἱδότων Cd1
15.3 δόξης] SFQDCd2ViVl, δόξη ACd1
23.30 αὐτοῦ] Cd3Vi: αὐτοῦ ACd1Vl, ἐαυτοῦ FQD, εαυτοῦ S
27.11 οὗτοι] SAFQDCd1Vi5Vl, om. Vi, del. Cd2
35.14 ἄλληλοις] SFQDCd2ViVl, ἄλληλοις ACd1
38.9 ἐπαράσεσθαι] S Cd2Vi, ἐπαράσασθαι S1AFQDCd1Vl
42.20 ἐμίσει] SFQDCd2, μισεῖ ACd1
43.1 σκοπεῖτε] SFQDCd2, σκοπεῖν τε ACd1

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

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

43 MacDowell 1990, 53.
XXVII.1 di Demostene, R
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