

CHALCENTERIC NEGLIGENCE¹

DIDYMUS, in modern works of reference, gets rather a good press. It is conceded on all sides that he was not an original researcher and that his remarks often betray a certain want of common sense. But the general estimate is favourable: more recent works do not substantially dissent from Sandys' verdict (*History of Classical Scholarship*, i. 143): 'The age of creative and original scholars was past and the best service that remained to be rendered was the careful preservation of the varied stores of ancient learning; and this service was faithfully and industriously rendered by Didymus.' His industry is, of course, beyond question.² But it is perhaps surprising that his reputation for accuracy did not drop sharply with the publication of the Berlin papyrus of the *περὶ Δημοσθένους*,³ the defects of which cast grave doubt on his reliability and general competence.

By any standards, Didymus is an important figure in the history of scholarship, and here, if anywhere, we deal with him directly. Yet though there has been intensive and continuous work on Didymus' historical citations, and much which was obscure when the papyrus was published is now reasonably clear, the authoritative study of the *περὶ Δημοσθένους* is still that of Leo, published in 1904, to which anyone who wishes to orientate himself in this not altogether easy text must turn. Many of the defects of Didymus' work, which result from his precarious grasp of the historical background, have, naturally enough, been more obvious to historians of the period than to those who interested themselves in Didymus for his own sake. It has become increasingly clear that he lacked the necessary historical knowledge to digest his sources intelligently. Since no one has ever credited Didymus with any particular historical acumen, I should emphasize that by 'the necessary historical knowledge' I mean something fairly elementary. The trouble is more deep-rooted than mere insouciance about chronology: the work as a whole seems slapdash and ill-digested, and these symptoms should surely diminish our confidence in Didymus elsewhere.

¹ I should like to thank Mr. G. L. Cawkwell for his unfailing advice and encouragement.

² He is variously credited with 3,500 or 4,000 books. The figure has no doubt been tidily rounded off, but need not, as is often said, be wildly exaggerated. The papyrus itself gives us some idea of the length of one such book; with the assistance, which Didymus may reasonably be supposed to have enjoyed, of trained slaves acting as research assistants, stenographers, and copyists, it ought not to have been difficult to produce two a week; such a routine, if followed for thirty-five years, would yield the required total. But more important than actual figures is Quintilian's 'Didymo quo nemo plura scripsit' (i. 8. 20).

³ Ed. pr. Diels u. Schubart, *Berliner Klassikertexte*, i (1904), cf. *Didymi de Demosthene commenta* (Leipzig, 1904). The secondary

literature is extensive: the following seem to me to be the most important discussions: Blass, *APF* iii (1904), 284 ff.; Leo, 'Didymos *περὶ Δημοσθένους*', *NGG* 1904, 254 ff. (= *Ausgewählte kl. Schr.* ii. 387 ff.); Foucart, 'Étude sur Didymos', *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France, Académie des Inscriptions et belles lettres*, xxxviii (1909), 27 ff.; Lossau, *Untersuchungen z. antiken Demosthenesexegese* (*Palingenesia*, Bd. ii), 1964; on the historical fragments Jacoby's commentary supersedes all earlier discussions.

The papyrus itself is in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin; I re-examined it in July 1967, and should like to take this opportunity to thank Dr. Müller and his assistants for their help. It is perhaps worth noting here that nearly all the allegedly improved readings published by Crönert (*Rh. Mus.* lxii (1907), 380 ff., *GGA* 1907, 267 ff.) are illusory.

The papyrus preserves his commentary on Demosthenes, *Speeches* 10, 11, and 12: the *subscriptio* shows that the roll originally held his discussion of 9 as well. The title is given thus: Διδύμου περὶ Δημοσθένους κη Φιλιππικῶν γ, 'Didymus, On Demosthenes, Book 18, On the Philippics, Book 3'.¹ Didymus gives the general background of each speech and then comments on points which he finds interesting or which might cause difficulty to a reader of a reasonable standard of education; he deals mainly with historical ζητήματα, but we also find grammatical (e.g. col. 7, 1 ff.) and philological (e.g. col. 14, 2 ff.) observations. The editors were disconcerted by the relative meagreness of the commentary: 'Sobald man nach dem ersten Gefühle dankbarer Freude über die reiche Gelehrsamkeit, die der Schreiber uns gerettet hat, sich genauer die Struktur dieser Erklärungsschrift überlegt, kann man unmöglich übersehen, wie willkürlich hier die einzelnen Lemmata zur Interpretation herausgegriffen und wie einseitig sie erklärt oder als Vorwand der Erklärung benützt werden. Sollte dies wirklich alles sein . . . was Didymos für Erklärungswürdig hielt? Selbst wenn man nur die Artikel des Harpokration vergleicht, die aus inneren Gründen Anspruch haben für didymeisch zu gelten, und wenn man sich nur auf die im Papyrus vollständig erhaltenen Kommentare zu I, IA, IB beschränkt, fehlen mehrere wichtige Scholien, die man bei Didymos erwartete.' The editors found particularly disturbing the absence of any comment on Ἀντρώνες (*Or.* 10. 9), μόραν (13. 22),² and Προτύλαια (ib. 28),³ since the relevant articles in Harpocration must be supposed to derive from Didymus. These apparent deficiencies, the scantiness of the commentary on 13, and the general incoherence of some sections of the text (as, for instance, the account of the origin of the expression ἐς κόρακας (col. 11, 56 ff.) and the discussion of the date of 13 (col. 13, 25 ff.)) led Diels to suggest that the papyrus in fact preserves only extracts from Didymus' work.

It must be emphasized at the outset that this is not, and Diels did not pretend it was, an easy assumption. The continual abbreviation of commentaries and similar works of reference, by which successive generations reduced gigantic works of scholarship to handy compendia and marginal notes, is, of course, familiar enough. But what Diels was forced to postulate was not normal, common-sense epitomization but verbatim excerption. The style of the commentary is markedly leisurely, and one has only to read it through to see how easy it would be to shorten it considerably without losing anything of substance: the section on Hermias, for example, could be condensed to a quarter of its present length. Moreover, it is hard if not impossible to divine any principle of selection on which the hypothetical excerptor might have been operating.

Nevertheless, Diels's theory is still often repeated with approval, although its basis, as Blass showed, is very shaky. The argument from incoherence, though flattering to Didymus, is intrinsically circular. Certainly the exposition of ἐς κόρακας has suffered some sort of mutilation in the course of transmission, but I should suppose this to be accidental rather than purposive, and though we have reason to think that Didymus offered a rather different account in his περὶ παροιμιῶν, there is nothing particularly sinister about a change of mind on

¹ The meaning of the numerals has been disputed: see further Wilcken, 'Die Subscriptio des Didymus-Papyrus', *Hermes*, lv (1920), 324 f.

² On μόραν we may also compare the note

in the fragment of a lexicon to Dem. *Or.* 23, republished by Diels and Schubart along with the Didymus papyrus (Pack², 317).

³ A fourth item in Diels's list is simply due to a false reference.

a point of this sort. On the incoherence of the introduction to 13 I shall say more below; it seems to me too deep-rooted to be easily laid to the charge of anyone but the author. The argument from the meagreness of the commentary is very largely answered by Didymus himself, who says in introducing 13 (col. 13, 62 ff.): ζητείται δ' ἐν τῷ λόγῳ οὐδέν, ὅτι μὴ λόγου τινὸς ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ τέτευχεν.¹ We do not actually know in what order Didymus treated the speeches, though his reference to an earlier discussion of the *De corona* (col. 12, 35 ff. *ὅτι Μακεδόνες Ἀθηναίοις φόρους ἐτέλουν ἐν τῷ Περὶ τοῦ στεφάνου δεδηλώκαμεν* cf. 42) shows that it was not ours and discourages speculative reconstruction. As it happens, a long section of 13 (§§ 21–31) also occurs, with a few minor differences, in 23, and Harpocration's notes on *μόραν* and *Προπύλαια* no doubt derive from Didymus' commentary on that speech; the theoric fund, the real theme of 13, must already have been dealt with in connection with the Olynthiacs. The poor condition of the papyrus is a sufficient explanation for the absence of any note on *Ἀντρώνες* (10. 9), since almost all that Didymus had to say on §§ 1–31 of this speech is lost (cols. 2, 3). The omissions of which Diels specifically complained can thus all be accounted for. The other articles in Harpocration relevant to the speeches covered by this papyrus² are of little evidential value, as all but one of the terms concerned occur in other speeches too; the exception, a note on *καθήκοντα* (10. 37), seems rather elementary for Didymus. There is thus no reason to suppose that Harpocration, or anyone else, had at his disposal a fuller version of Didymus' commentary on these speeches. Without such supporting evidence the hypothesis of a series of extracts is a mere speculation grounded only on the assumption that Didymus must originally have said more.

A text of this sort was, of course, exposed to certain dangers in the course of transmission against which the text of a classical author was protected, at any rate after the work of the Alexandrians; it is generally accepted that less care was taken to reproduce the exact wording, provided that the gist of the argument was reported. Obviously this does not reflect deliberate commercial policy on the part of the ancient equivalent of University Paperbacks; there is no reason why we should assume a greater degree of sheer scribal negligence in works of this type than elsewhere. But scholarly works such as commentaries and lexica must have been reproduced very largely as private copies made by interested individuals for their own use, and the temptation to intelligent condensation would be strong. Still, any such deliberate alteration is self-defeating if it makes the text less intelligible, less easy to use, and one should perhaps be cautious in invoking this explanation. But even if we make every allowance for the hazards of transmission, there are some oddities in this work which can only be due to sheer thoughtlessness on the part of the author.

So far I have impenitently followed the editors in calling the work a commentary. It is, after all, concerned primarily with the exegesis of the text of Demosthenes, and is of no use or interest except in relation to the latter; it is not a specialized monograph devoted to a single topic or series of closely related topics, a general study of Demosthenes, or a collection of original *Lesefrüchte*. Leo, however, maintained that this was a misconception, that there was a clear

¹ In this and subsequent quotations from the papyrus I have not indicated doubtful letters or lacunae where the context makes the reconstruction certain.

² On *Δρογγίλον* (10. 15, cf. 8. 44), *βαράθρῳ*, *μελάνη* (10. 16, cf. 8. 45), *καθήκοντα* (10. 37), *ἡλικία* (13. 4, cf. 1. 28).

distinction between a *ὑπόμνημα* or commentary and a book *περὶ τοῦ δεῖνα*, such as its title declares this to be: 'Als ein unterscheidendes Merkmal darf man ansehen, dass ein Buch *περὶ τοῦ δεῖνα* stets ein selbständiges Buch bedeutet, das unabhängig vom Texte gelesen werden kann. Das *ὑπόμνημα* ist nur mit dem Text zusammen zu lesen und gehört, da es seinem Wesen nach nur der Theil eines Buches, einer commentirten Ausgabe ist, mit dem Text zusammen.' Leo was clearly moved to formulate this distinction in order to meet the apparent difficulty of the omissions of the papyrus; on his view Didymus' *ὑπομνήματα εἰς Δημοσθένην* cited by Harpocration¹ were quite different from the *περὶ Δημοσθένους*. We have seen that there is a more economical way of accounting for the alleged omissions, and Leo's narrowly restricted definition of *ὑπόμνημα* is in fact untenable. The word is used of a wide range of literary productions,² from rough jottings to the history of Polybius; when a writer so describes his own work we may often detect a certain mock modesty, an attempt to disarm criticism by presenting his production as mere notes, a tentative sketch or outline of the subject. The word takes on a more precise meaning from its context; in itself it is as vague as 'note' in English. *ὑπομνήματα εἰς Δημοσθένην* is a perfectly suitable designation of the work preserved in the Berlin papyrus; there is no reason to suppose that the work cited by Harpocration was something other than this, and indeed it is not easy to see how it can have been. One feels few qualms about the multiplication of entities when we are dealing with the writings of an author as prolific as Didymus, but if we accept Leo's view we must conclude that the *ὑπομνήματα* were very small beer, being restricted to matters grammatical and philological, while the discussion of the historical background of the speeches was reserved for a separate treatise. Such a demarcation of the material would be perverse and artificial, but cannot, I suppose, be excluded *a priori*. But on this assumption it becomes very difficult to account for the presence in the *περὶ Δημοσθένους* of occasional grammatical and philological observations: were they intended to supply the deficiencies of his earlier *ὑπομνήματα* or what? In effect, the serious student of Demosthenes, if he relied on Didymus for guidance, would on Leo's theory be required to consult two commentaries, one grammatical, one historical, until such time as it might occur to someone to conflate the two: if Didymus attached any value at all to the form of his works one would think that the hazards of built-in obsolescence would deter him from separating what, in the case of this author above all others, naturally belonged together. The hypothesis of two distinct works is much less comfortable than Leo evidently supposed; it is altogether more satisfactory to identify *ὑπομνήματα* and *περὶ Δημοσθένους*.

¹ S.v. *γαμηλία*, cf. s.v. *ἐνθρυπτα*, *Δίδυμος ὁ γραμματικὸς ἐν τῷ ὑπομνήματι τοῦ λόγου*; normally he simply cites Didymus without giving a more precise reference.

² See LSJ and the detailed discussion of F. Bömer, 'Der Commentarius', *Hermes*, lxxxi (1953), 215 ff. Leo attached a good deal of importance to the distinction which Didymus himself makes between Aristarchus' *συγγράμματα* and *ὑπομνήματα*: Sch. A on *Il.* 2. 111: *εἰ . . . τὰ συγγράμματα τῶν ὑπομνημάτων προτάττομεν*; the former are evidently in this case more detailed studies. But though

the two words may take on a more precise significance in a particular context, it is wrong to draw a rigid distinction between them, as is clear from Galen 15. 1, where the two terms are used interchangeably of a single work: *περὶ τῶν καθ' Ἱπποκράτην στοιχείων πάλαι ποθ' ὑπόμνημα τῶν ἐταίρων τινὶ πρὸς ἀποδημίαν στελλομένῳ γράφας ἐπέδωκα, τῆς ἐκείνου στοχαζόμενος ἕξεως. ἄπερ οὖν ᾗδεν αὐτὸν ἀκριβῶς ἐπιστάμενον, οὐτ' ἀπέδειξα κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ συγγράμματος οὐτ' ἀνέμνησα κτλ.*

So much by way of preliminaries; I shall now attempt to justify my earlier description of the work as hasty and slapdash.

In discussing each speech Didymus' first concern is to establish its date. Comparison with the very similar discussion of his younger contemporary, Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*ad Amm.* pp. 270, 272–3), and his own references to earlier scholars make it quite clear that the chronological spadework had already been done.¹ But this veneer of historical method is deceptive: Didymus' grasp of the chronology of the events with which Demosthenes deals is shaky.

Thus, for example, we find a clear inconsistency in his exposition of the background of 11, the reply to Philip's letter. We know from his introduction to 10 that he dated this speech and the formal declaration of war to 340/39, the year of Theophrastus:

(col. 1, 67 ff.) ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ Θεοφράστου τοῦ μετὰ Νικόμαχον ἄρξαντος αἱ στήλαι καθηρέθησαν ἀρκέσει Φιλόχορος ἐκφανῶς διὰ τῆς ἑκτῆς γράφων οὕτως (F.Gr.Hist. 328 F 55 (b)): ὁ δὲ δῆμος ἀκούσας τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, Δημοσθένους παρακαλέσαντος αὐτοὺς πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον καὶ ψήφισμα γράψαντος, ἐχειροτόνησεν τῇ μὲν στήλῃ καθελεῖν τὴν περὶ τῆς πρὸς Φίλιππον εἰρήνης καὶ συμμαχίας σταθεῖσαν, ναῦς δὲ πληροῦν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν τὰ τοῦ πολέμου.

Yet here, after describing the events which he regards as the immediate cause of the outbreak of war, he concludes (col. 10, 50 f.) ταῦτα δὴ πέρυσι διαπέπραχεν ἐπὶ Θεοφράστου τοῦ μετὰ Νικόμαχον ἄρχοντος, though πέρυσι is obviously irreconcilable with the archon-date.

This is relatively trivial, and it would not greatly affect Didymus' credit if it stood alone. More serious is the extraordinarily confused and incoherent discussion of the date of 13. After explaining why the speech should not be classed as a Philippic, Didymus suggests that it is perhaps to be dated after the Peace of 346 (col. 13, 25 ff.): καὶ μήποτε μετὰ τὴν πρὸς Φίλιππον εἰρήνην τοῦτον τὸν λόγον συντέταχεν ὁ Δημοσθένης ἐπεὶ τὰ μὲν πρὸς τοὺς Μακεδόνας ἡρέμει τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, τὰ δὲ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπολυπραγμόνουν, and supports this with a quotation from the speech (§ 7). But then, without giving any reason for rejecting this date, he continues (40 ff.) χρόνον δὲ τοῦ λόγου συνίδει τις ἂν τὸν μετ' Ἀπολλόδωρον ἄρχοντα Καλλιμάχον (349/8) and develops his argument for this earlier dating as if nothing had yet been said on the topic: we may compare the very similar phrase which *introduces* the discussion of the date of 10 (col. 1, 29 ff.), τοὺς καίρους τοῦ λόγου τάχ' ἂν τις συνίδει ἐξ ὧν Φιλόχορος προθεῖς ἄρχοντα Νικόμαχον κτλ. This sudden volte-face is disconcerting. A writer who is generous enough to provide evidence in support of a view which he does not hold ought not to conceal his grounds for rejecting it. It looks as if Didymus has combined two authorities here without adequately digesting them. The argumentation by which he arrives at 349/8 is crude and clearly faulty. He starts from Demosthenes' reference to a dispute between Athens and Megara over the *Orgas* or Sacred Plain (§ 32), οἷον ἂν πρὸς τοὺς καταράτους Μεγαρέας ἐψηφίσασθ' ἀποτεμνομένους τὴν ὀργάδα, ἐξίναί, κωλύειν, μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν: taking this to be an allusion to the Athenian expedition against Megara of 350/49, he quotes the account of that incident given in Philochorus, his usual authority for Athenian history (F.Gr.Hist. 328 F 155). τούτων ἑωραμένων, Didymus continues, εἴη ἂν μετὰ τόνδε τὸν ἄρχοντα συντεταγμένος ὁ λόγος. But this only provides a *terminus post quem*; it is quite arbitrary to fix on 349/8 as the date of delivery. Moreover,

¹ Cf. Lossau, *op. cit.*

in identifying the allusion of § 32 with the troubles of 350/49, Didymus ignores Demosthenes' comment (§ 33) that the decree came to nothing, τὰ ἔργα δ' ἀπὸ τούτων οὐδαμοῦ. The inadequacy and incoherence of this section cannot easily be explained in terms of scribal negligence.¹

There is a further oddity in Didymus' commentary on this speech, which again seems to argue a lack of care on the part of the author rather than mere clerical incompetence. He discusses at some length the word *orgas*, which he illustrates with quotations from several authors, among them Androtion (*F.Gr.Hist.* 324 F 30); this last, however, uneconomically duplicates the passage from Philochorus quoted sixty lines earlier to establish the date of the speech. The effect is awkward and even slightly misleading to the reader, who naturally expects that Androtion's account of the affair, if it is worth quoting at such length, will contain some detail absent from Philochorus, whereas in fact it merely shows that the latter has reproduced his source with scrupulous fidelity. Didymus has evidently looked up his lexicographical files and reproduced the information which he found there without dovetailing it to its present context. The slight clumsiness might easily have been eliminated; it is surely significant that Didymus did not take the trouble to do so.

This obvious lack of revision suggests that the absence of the promised evidence for Athenian financial difficulties after Aegospotami is due to the author's negligence, not to an accident in the course of transmission. Didymus is concerned with Demosthenes' reference (10. 37) to an occasion οὐ πάλαυ when the city's revenues dropped to 130 talents: (col. 8, 49 ff.) εἴη ἂν οὗτος ὁ καιρός, ἐν ᾧ περὶ Αἰγὸς ποταμοῦς ἡττηθέντες ἑταπεινώθησαν καὶ εἰς βραχὺ ὁ δῆμος συνεστάλη τῶν ἑξωτικῶν προσόδων περικοπεισῶν [σ]αφές δὲ τοῦτο ποιήσει:² there follows a blank space in the papyrus extending for about ten lines. The editors were inclined to think that the exemplar was damaged at this point; but the damage would have been oddly delimited, and it is hard to imagine what accident would have this effect on a roll. Foucart suggested that Didymus himself had forgotten to insert the quotation required, having no doubt failed to find what he wanted in his usual authority, Philochorus. One might feel some qualms about assuming that a work which lacked so obvious a finishing touch could pass into circulation, but the haphazard way in which Galen's writings are said to have come on the market against his wishes and intentions (*libr. propr. proem.*) shows that it is not intrinsically improbable. Moreover, we

¹ The speech is not altogether easy to date and Didymus might have confessed himself baffled without loss of face. It most probably belongs to 353/2, cf. Cawkwell, 'Eubulus', *JHS* lxxxiii (1963), 48 n. 9. The wrangle over the border territory went on for some years; it had certainly begun by 352, as we know from *IG* ii². 204, a decree of late 352, which refers in l. 55 to a previous decree. It is not clear whether Didymus can reasonably be blamed for failing to realize this. The fragments of Androtion and Philochorus relating to 350/49 give no hint of the earlier history of the affair, but we cannot safely infer from this that nothing had previously been said on the subject.

The authenticity of 13 has been ques-

tioned in modern times (see, most recently, R. Sealey, 'Pseudo-Demosthenes XIII and XXV', *REG* lxxx (1967), 250 ff.), but there is no reason to think it was suspected in antiquity. It is true that Dionys. Hal. (*ad Amm.*) ignores it, but the uncertainty of its dating renders it useless for his argument, and we cannot take his silence to indicate suspicion. It would, therefore, be unreasonable to criticize Didymus for failing to raise the question of its genuineness.

² The restoration σ]αφές is not altogether certain, but the sense is surely beyond doubt. The editors, who take the subject of ποιήσει to be Demosthenes, print a stop after it; there is no punctuation in the papyrus here.

find similar omissions in a work which in all other respects is a finished and well-considered piece of writing, the commentary on *Job* of Didymus' blind namesake and fellow Alexandrian.¹ Unlike some of the latter's commentaries, which evidently derive from shorthand notes taken during his lectures, this is a careful composition, obviously intended to reach a wider public: its editor described it as 'ein ausgearbeitetes und zur Veröffentlichung bestimmtes Werk, das in dieser Form auf Didymos selber zurückgeht, wie die planmässige Komposition des Ganzen mit den zahlreichen Rückverweisen zeigt'. In several places we find a blank space instead of a promised Biblical quotation:² presumably Didymus was uncertain of the wording of the passage he had in mind and deputed an assistant to look it up. This is of course a special case, a reflection of the difficulties under which the blind theologian worked. Still, it demonstrates that in antiquity it was possible for a book to pass into general circulation in a condition which would be intolerable to a modern publisher. In both works, it should be noted, the evidence of the author's failure to supply the appropriate text might very easily have been suppressed: presumably the manuscript was left as it was in the hope that a reader might be luckier than the author had been.

It is not surprising that Didymus failed to produce evidence for his view. It is generally agreed that his interpretation of Demosthenes is wrong and that the latter must have in mind a more recent occasion than the end of the Peloponnesian War: Demosthenes could not naturally describe as οὐ πάλαι a period before most of his audience was born, and Didymus' comment reflects both a lack of historical perspective and a certain insensitivity to Demosthenes' general use of πάλαι and οὐ πάλαι.³ Demosthenes apparently alludes to the financial crisis at the end of the Social War. It might be the case that Didymus was correct as to the fact, though wrong in his application of it, but his failure to produce confirmation strongly suggests that no ancient authority said anything of the sort. Presumably Didymus assumed *a priori* that after Aegospotami Athenian revenues must have fallen to the lowest point they ever reached and did not see reason to distrust this hypothesis, as he obviously should have done, when he failed to find explicit evidence for it. It looks as if it must have been his own idea; had the passage been neglected by earlier commentators on Demosthenes?

Didymus' demonstrable weaknesses as a historian lend some support to the theory put forward by Bruce (*Historia*, xv [1966], 272 f.) that he has misunderstood the authorities whom he castigates (col. 7, 11 ff.) for their interpretation of Demosthenes' reference to an occasion on which the Persian King συνεπηνώρθωσε τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα (10. 34) as an allusion to the peace proposals of 392/1:

¹ Ed. pr. A. Henrichs, *Didymos der Blinde, Kommentar zu Hiob*, Bonn, 1968.

² e.g. pp. 7/8 (on the identity of the author) καὶ οἱ μὲν τῷ ἁγίῳ Ἑσδρα αὐτὸ προσανέμουσιν (almost a whole line is left blank) οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐπεὶ ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ βιβλίου εἴρηται (the latter half of this line and the first half of the next are blank) φασίν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις αἰτε βασιλεῖς ὄντες οἱ φίλοι τοῦ Ἰωβ ἀρεσθέντες τῷ κατορθώματι τὴν περὶ τούτου γραφὴν ἀπέθεντο: the second of the missing texts, that ἐν τῷ τέλει τοῦ βιβλίου is

presumably *Job* 42. 17b οὗτος ἐρμηνεύεται ἐκ τῆς Συριακῆς βίβλου; p. 111 (on *Job* 4. 19 ἔπαισεν αὐτοὺς σιγῆς τρόπον) τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν ὡς εὐτελῶν ἐπιπεμπομένην κόλασιν δηλοῖ. τοῦτο ἐν τῇ Σοφίᾳ δηλοῦται: five lines are then left blank; the reference is presumably to *Si*. 19. 3 σῆτες καὶ σκώληκες κληρονομήσουσιν αὐτόν. For a list of omissions, see vol. i. 19.

³ For detailed arguments against Didymus' view, see Cawkwell, art. cit. 61-2 n. 85.

τὴν προτέραν μὲν οὖν ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐνιοί φασιν αὐτὸν λέγειν τὴν ἐπ' Ἀντιαλκίδου τοῦ Λάκωνος καταβάσαν εἰρήνην, οὐ[κ ὀρθῶς, ὅς]α μοι δ[οκεῖ] ταύτην γὰρ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐδέξαντο Ἀθηναῖοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶν τὸν[αντίον ὡς ἀσεβές]¹ αὐτοῖς ἀπέωσαντο παρανόμημα, ὡς Φιλόχορος ἀφηγεῖται (*F.Gr.Hist.* 328 F 149 (a)) αὐτοῖς ὀνόμασι, προθεῖς ἄρχοντα Φιλοκλέα Ἀναφλύστιον (392/1). “καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην τὴν ἐπ' Ἀντιαλκίδου κατέπεμψεν ὁ βασιλεύς, ἦν Ἀθηναῖοι οὐκ ἐδέξαντο διότι ἐγγράπτο ἐν αὐτῇ τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν οἰκοῦντας Ἑλλήνας ἐν βασιλείῳ οἴκῳ πάντας εἶναι συννενεμημένους. ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς ἐν Λακεδαίμονι συγχωρήσαντας ἐφυγάδευσαν” κτλ.

Didymus has surely done less than justice to the proponents of the view he sets himself to refute: anyone who interpreted Demosthenes' words as a reference to τὴν ἐπ' Ἀντιαλκίδου τοῦ Λάκωνος καταβάσαν εἰρήνην must have had in mind the successful culmination of Antialcidas' diplomatic activity in 387/6, not the abortive peace discussions of 392/1. Didymus, it seems, consulted Philochorus but did not read far enough, and assumed that no more was heard at Athens of any peace terms negotiated by Antialcidas after 392/1.² He clearly supposed that the Athenians did not subscribe to any peace with Persia until 375:

(col. 7, 62 ff.) δύναιτο δ' ἂν καὶ ἐτέρας ἀπὸ βασιλείῳ εἰρήνης, ἣν ἀσμένως προσήκानτο οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, μνημονεύειν τὰ νῦν ὁ Δημοσθένης, περὶ ἧς πάλιν ὁ Φιλόχορος διείλεκται (*F.Gr.Hist.* 328 F 151), ὅτι παραπλήσιον αὐτὴν τῇ τοῦ Λάκωνος Ἀντιαλκίδου προσήκानτο ἀπειρηκότες ταῖς ξενοτροφίαις καὶ ἐκ πάνυ πολλοῦ τῷ πολέμῳ τετρυμένοι, ὅτε καὶ τὸν τῆς Εἰρήνης βωμὸν ἰδρῶσαντο.

So much for historical matters. We have further evidence of Didymus' general lack of interest in his author in his notoriously cursory discussion of the authenticity of 11:

(col. 11, 7 ff.) ὑποτοπήσειε δ' ἂν τις οὐκ ἀπὸ σκοποῦ συμπεφορήσθαι τὸ λογίδιον ἐκ τινῶν Δημοσθένους πραγματειῶν ἐπισυντεθέν. καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ φασιν Ἀναξιμένους εἶναι τοῦ Λαμψακηνοῦ τὴν συμβουλὴν . . . δ[.].³ ἐν τῇ ἐβδόμῃ τῶν Φιλιππικῶν <δλ>ην ὀλίγου δεῖν γράμμασιν αὐτοῖς ἐντετάχθαι.

If the speech was given practically *verbatim* in Anaximenes' work, then clearly it was not by Demosthenes and the question of its authenticity was settled. Why did not Didymus himself consult Anaximenes' work? If it was not easily accessible,⁴ he ought to have disclosed his sources: were they scholars or unreliable sensationalists? The next sentence is corrupt and the reading uncertain,⁵ though the gist is evidently that the style of the speech shows certain

¹ The supplement is Crönert's; many other suggestions have been made with equal plausibility. But there is general agreement as to the sense.

² I find wholly unconvincing Bruce's further suggestion that the passage of Philochorus which Didymus here quotes really relates to the peace congress of 386, and that Didymus has somehow made a mistake in dating it: this hypothesis creates problems greater than those it is intended to solve. In any case, the mistake assumed is not easy; it is difficult to see how Didymus could have arrived at the year of Philocles at all if it is not in fact correct.

³ γῆν δ[έ], the restoration of the ed. pr., is very uncertain.

⁴ Didymus also cites Anaximenes in his account of Hermias (col. 6, 59 ff.) and in connection with Aristomedes (col. 9, 51 f.); it is possible, though not perhaps very probable, that he found the references to Anaximenes in an earlier writer and had not himself consulted the works concerned.

⁵ In the Teubner text it is given thus: ἐνιοὶ δὲ κ(αὶ) πρὸ α[ὐ]τ(ῶν) φο[ρτι]κωτέρ[ω]ς ἡρμήνευσαν, καθάπερ τὸ “ὀρρωδεῖν” ἦκιστα Δημοσθενικὸν ὃν καὶ εἴ τινα ἄλλα ὁμοία τούτῳ[ι]. Something is clearly wrong with the text: Didymus cannot have meant to say

un-Demosthenic features. However, Didymus is not troubled by these doubts about authenticity, but treats the matter as a mere curiosity of literary history, without further implications for the serious student of Demosthenes.

This catalogue of errors may be thought uncharitable. The prejudice is naturally strong in favour of a scholar from whom, whether as a result of historical accident or of his peculiar intellectual gifts, we derive so much of our information; we have a vested interest in his accuracy. If I have made good my case so far, there remains, I suppose, one line of defence, that the work is genuinely unfinished, and Didymus would not have sanctioned its reproduction in this form. We do not need to imagine death overtaking the laborious scholar while he was still meditating his final version; given the very informal nature of the process of publication before the invention of printing, it is easy enough to see how a preliminary draft might have escaped from his writing table and passed into general circulation. So much for historical romance; I do not myself find this plausible. It is a certain inference from the astronomically high total of Didymus' writings that he must have been a rapid worker; it is not surprising if the result shows signs of haste, inaccuracy, and superficiality. The evidence of the commentary on the *Philippics* suggests that Didymus' reliability has been over-estimated and that where we have a conflict of testimony he should not be given the benefit of the doubt. We might expect that his polymathy would have led to a depth of insight outweighing the defects resulting from lack of time, attention, and specialized interest: this generous hope receives no support from the papyrus. What we have here is potted scholarship, hurried compilation rather than intelligent re-interpretation, and that is no proper activity for a learned man. I think we should be cautious in estimating his achievement.

Hertford College, Oxford

S. WEST

'Some interpreted it in a rather vulgar way', since there is nothing *φορτικόν* about accurate lexical comment. The editors suggest emending *ἡρμήνευσαν* to *ἡρμήνευσθαι* (scil. *φασιν*); the apparent absence of a main verb led someone to alter the text. Much has been made of *καὶ πρὸ αὐτῶν*, but the traces in question are very uncertain, as is clear from

the Abschrift of the ed. pr.; the point may easily be verified from the reproduction of *Tafel 1*. It is not an intrinsically plausible supplement, since it is obviously odd to give relative chronology without names, and the argument from internal, stylistic evidence was not an early, crude form of the argument from external evidence.