

## Demosthenes, *De Corona* §§ 169–170 in P.CtYBR inv. 4671

Mark de Kreij<sup>\*</sup>

**Abstract:** A scrap of papyrus from the Beinecke library, dating to the late first century BCE or early first century CE, has yielded a passage from Demosthenes' *De Corona*. The text is good, and in one place offers further support for Demosthenes' avoidance of hiatus.

**Keywords:** Demosthenes, *De Corona*, hiatus, Yale

**DOI** 10.1515/apf-2015-0003

Yale papyrus CtYBR 4671 was purchased in 1997 from *Galerie Nefer*, Zurich (provenance unknown). I would like to thank the Yale Papyrus Collection, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library, for providing the digital images, and Dr. Dobbin-Bennett for her efficient assistance. The fragment measuring 6.3 by 11.3 cm contains 16 lines of a column, written along the fibres (the back is blank), which I have identified as Demosthenes' *De Corona*. Line length fluctuates between 16 (l. 7) and 21 (l. 9) letters; at its most narrow, intercolumnium is 1.55 cm. There are indeterminate traces of the preceding column: 1, 2, 5 ( ]ç ), 6, 9, 10 ( ]αλ ) 11, 12, and 16 ( ]ξ ). The bottom margin appears to be preserved, no top margin remains. There is one apparent sign of punctuation, a high stop before καί in line 7 (which would coincide with the start of § 170), but no accents. Elision is effected, but it is unclear if it was marked (lines 8, 15).

The hand is a slowly written upright, but not very consistent in letter forms and spacing, with a few ligatures (αι l. 4, 11 and ει l. 14). Besides ι, β, and (to a lesser extent) ρ, the left upright of η also extends above the line, and there is no real sense of bilinearity. There is some contrastiveness in letter size, but omicron, omega, and sigma are only slightly smaller than the other letters, and they do not hang from the top of the line. η is written

---

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: Mark de Kreij, 27 Bridge St., Oxford OX2 0BA, United Kingdom, <de\_Kreij@uni-heidelberg.de>

with a loop in the upper left and a curved right-hand side, κ has a little hook to the left at the top of the upright; π has uprights that curve outward at the bottom; α vacillates between round and angular (e.g. l. 11). Especially remarkable is the strong slant of the α, paralleled in the ‘climbing’ μ and ν which seem tilted towards the left. The letters at the beginning of the line are typically slightly enlarged (cf. Turner, *GMAW*<sup>2</sup> p. 7).

It looks like a skilled documentary scribe aiming for a book hand. We might compare it to the “formal documentary script” (Cavallo/Maehler, *HB* p. 16) sometimes used to copy literary texts in the second century BCE. The relative lack of ligatures in our papyrus can be explained from the scribe’s attempt to write slowly and carefully (cf. P.Dion. 25, 104 BCE = Cavallo/Maehler, *HB* no. 53). The hand shows a general similarity to the documentary hands of P.Oxy. II 282 (Roberts, *GLH* no. 10b, 30–35 CE) and P.Oxy. II 246 (Roberts, *GLH* no. 10c, 60 CE), but some letter forms (especially π, η, and round α) are better paralleled in P.Oxy. XII 1453 (Roberts, *GLH* no. 8b, 30–29 BCE). A date in the late first century BCE or early first century CE therefore seems most likely.

I have collated the papyrus with Dilts 2002 *Demosthenis Orationes* I and Fuhr 1914 *Demosthenis Orationes* I, and the sigla in the notes are taken from the same editions. The papyrus gives a good text: one mistake is corrected by what appears to be the same hand (l. 12), and the only other divergence is οὐθεῖς for οὐδεῖς (see l. 15n.). Further, the text offers one variant that looks to be superior to the reading of the mss. (see l. 8n.).

This papyrus makes a total of twenty-seven papyri of *De Corona*, based on the MP<sup>3</sup>. It may be worth noting that this is the fourth papyrus containing (part of) § 169 (along with P.Ryl. I 57, P.Paramone 2, and P.Oxy. XI 1377). Comparison with the other extant papyri of *De Corona* reveals three things: (1) None of the published papyri are a match for the hand, nor are two unpublished papyri in the Oxyrhynchus Collection (MP<sup>3</sup> 282.01: P.Oxy. inv. 34 4B.77/D(2–3)a, 34 4B.77/D(4–6)c,d and 282.02: P.Oxy. inv. C 229 22–7);<sup>1</sup> (2) the two papyri that give part of the same passage as our papyrus do not have the same line division (P.Ryl. I 57 and P.Paramone 2); (3) a number of papyri containing other passages from *De Corona* have similar line lengths.<sup>2</sup> The Yale papyrus may be part of a

<sup>1</sup> A comparison with the other early Demosthenes papyri in MP<sup>3</sup> has yielded no matches either.

<sup>2</sup> P.Köln VIII 334, P.Mil. Vogl. I 12, P.Oxy. III 462, and P.Oxy. XI 1377.

similar editorial tradition as these fragments, but the question of line-by-line copying is still open (see Johnson, *Bookrolls and Scribes*, pp. 48–49).

-----

βουλην ]εκα[λουν εις το ( § 169)  
 βουλευτηρι]ον[ υμεις  
 δ[ εις την εκ]κλ[ησιαν επο  
 ρ[ευεσθε] και πρ[ιν εκεινην  
 5 χρηματικαι [κ]α[ι προβου  
 λευσαι π[α]ς ο δη[μος ανω  
 καθητ[ο]· και μετα ταυ § 170  
 θ ως ηλθεν η [βουλη και  
 απηγγειλαν ο[ι] πρυτανεις  
 10 τα προσηγγελ[μεν ε  
 αυτοις και τον [ηκοντα  
 παρηγαγον `κα`κει[νος ειπεν  
 ηρωτα μεν ο κ[ηρυξ τις  
 αγορευειν βουλ[εται πα  
 15 ρη[ει] δ ουθεις[ πολλακις  
 ..[του κ]ηρυκ[ος



**7** καθητ[ο]: The majority of manuscripts reads καθητο, excepting only A and Y, which read καθηcto. Although the papyrus is damaged and the traces are faint, it is reasonably certain that the papyrus has the prevalent reading.

After καθητ[ο] there is a trace of ink high on the line, that cannot be part of line 6, nor of any likely letter after [ο]; it appears to be a high stop. The lacuna seems large for only an omicron, which suggests that the first hand left a wider space; the punctuation is in the same ink.

**8** The θ is certain (and certainly not ε), and what precedes the sigma cannot be iota, but does match the upper right curve of the omega. Both facts support the reading of ὤc over εἰc, as in the majority of manuscripts (only F and Y have εἰcῆλθεν). The reading ταῦθ' ὤc over ταῦτα ὤc (mss.) contributes to a long-standing discussion about hiatus in Demosthenes. In his most recent edition of the orations (*Demosthenis Orationes* I–IV, 2002–2009), Dilts allows hiatus if it is supported by “two primary manuscripts,” and avoids it if the manuscripts are at variance (Dilts 2002, pp. xvii–xviii). His edition gives ταῦτα ὤc five times in a running sentence (including here) versus fifteen times ταῦθ' ὤc.<sup>3</sup> Here, the syntactical discontinuity after ταῦτα would make hiatus less jarring (καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα, ὤc κτλ.), but elsewhere the manuscripts elide in a similar situation.<sup>4</sup> The reading of the papyrus supports the tendency of the manuscripts elsewhere, which suggests that ταῦθ' ὤc is the better reading in this locus too.

**10–11** Considering the space left at the end of line 10, the ε of ἑαυτοῖc was probably written as in the majority of manuscripts, rather than the contracted αὐτοῖc (Fuhr notes that A has αὐτοῖc [sic]). On the variations ἑαυ-/αὐ- in epigraphy see Threatte, *Gram.* II, 313–325 and for the manuscript tradition see Maysers, *Gram.* I.2, 65 and Gignac, *Gram.* II, 170–171.

The space would even allow -μενα ε (as most mss.), but elision seems more likely, considering lines 8 and 15. In either case, line 10 must have been markedly shorter than 9. One may assume that in line 10 letters were more widely spaced or a space filler was used at line-end to keep a roughly straight right-hand margin.

<sup>3</sup> In two further instances, there is a strong syntactic discontinuity between ταῦτα and ὤc, represented by a period in modern editions: *Contra Zenothemim* § 12.1 and *Pro Phormione* § 22.10.

<sup>4</sup> See especially *De Corona* § 203.1 ἀλλ' οὐκ ἦν ταῦθ', ὤc ἔοικε.

**12** κα added above the line just over the ν of παρηγαγον and the κ of κεινoc, in the same hand.

**15** ουθειc: This alternative spelling is the prevalent form in papyri and inscriptions of the Ptolemaic period, which is corroborated by the quote of *De Corona* § 200 in D.H. (i BCE) *Dem.* 31.21 as οὐθένα κίνδυνον (οὐδένα κίνδυνον MSS.). Since the spelling οὐθειc persists into Roman times, however, it cannot itself provide a *terminus ante quem*. The spelling variant reflects the “assimilation of /d/ before a rough breathing (the feminine is always οὐδεμία, etc.)”, Gignac, *Gram.* I, 97; see also Threatte, *Gram.* I, 472–47, Mayser, *Gram.* I.1, 149, and Schwyzer, *GG* I p. 408δ for further discussions of the issue. In a recent edition of the Isocrates papyri, the editor notes that οὐθειc, quite common in a Ptolemaic papyrus of the *Plataicus* (P.Yale 103v, iii BCE), never occurs in the manuscripts.<sup>5</sup>

**16** ..[ the papyrus is almost completely abraded, but the preceding line and the extant letters later in this line make it likely that δέ stood here.

---

<sup>5</sup> F. Adorno *et al.* (eds) 2008. *Corpus dei papiri filosofici greci e latini, Parte I.2\*\**, *Galenus-Isocrates* (Firenze) 886.