that deserves careful reading and reflection, and will stimulate much fruitful discussion.

Brown University MARY LOUISE GILL

DEMOSTHENES' *FOURTH PHILIPPIC*

I. HAJDÚ: *Kommentar zur 4. Philippischen Rede des Demosthenes.* Pp. viii + 475. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2002. Cased, DM 148. ISBN: 3-11-016930-4.

Demosthenes' *Fourth Philippic* (Oration 10) continues to be a controversial text. Even in ancient times, some pundits (Walz, *Rhetores Graeci* 6.253.22–4) thought it spurious, because they did not believe that Demosthenes would have compared the Athenians to drug addicts (10.6), although better critics such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes express no doubt about its authenticity. The earlier modern scholars seem all to have accepted it, but in the nineteenth century it came under vigorous attack. By 1900 the general view was that it had been compiled by some unknown rhetorician incorporating fragments of genuine Demosthenic material. Early in the twentieth century the tables were turned by the discovery of parts of Didymus' commentary on the speech, which seemed to many readers to prove its genuineness, but there have continued to be some dissentients.

Perhaps the most serious problem is the duplicated passages: certain parts of the *Fourth Philippic* are much the same as parts of *On Affairs in the Chersonese* (Oration 8), with minor variations of wording. But this problem has been well discussed by C. D. Adams, *Class. Phil.* 33 (1938), 129–44, and by S. G. Daitz, *Class. Phil.* 52 (1957), 145–62. Their work leads to the conclusion that the text of Oration 8 which we now have is a conflation, made by Demosthenes himself for 'publication' or distribution, from two speeches which he had delivered orally, one being the *Fourth Philippic*, which we also have as Oration 10, the other being a speech on the Chersonese which is not preserved. This explanation has been accepted by many, including Ian Worthington, *Mnemosyne* 44 (1991), 425–8, who uses it to draw a contrast between a text written for oral delivery and one intended for readers, though Jeremy Trevett, *Hermes* 124 (1996), 438–9, thinks it possible that both texts were delivered. The attempt by L. Canfora, *Per la cronologia di Demostene* (Bari, 1968), to analyse the *Fourth Philippic* into a number of disconnected passages of various dates, collected after Demosthenes' death, is less convincing. A stronger argument against the authenticity of the speech has been mounted by R. D. Milns in an article in *Filologia e forme letterarie: studi offerti a Francesco della Corte* (Urbino, 1987), 1.287–302; he criticizes various historical and linguistic elements in the passage about the King of Persia and Hermeias of Atarneus (10.31–4), and suggests that the text has been put together by a compiler drawing not only on Oration 8 but also on Theopompus.

Now István Hajdú has produced the longest and most thorough study of the speech. He has no doubt that it is a genuine work of Demosthenes, and he provides a substantial introduction, including a detailed study of the principal manuscripts, and an extraordinarily full commentary on both linguistic and historical matters. He does not provide a Greek text, but uses Fuhr's Teubner text as his basis, and gives a list of

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the sixteen places where he would prefer a different reading. It is unlucky that his book was published in the same year as the new OCT edited by M. R. Dilts, of which he has been unable to take account, but probably that would not have made any serious difference to his commentary.

Like Fuhr and Dilts, H. regards four medieval manuscripts (SAFY) as authoritative, and ignores all others. That is probably right, although other manuscripts can sometimes show interesting readings, possibly conjectures. For SAFY he provides extensive lists of separative and conjunctive errors. Granted that S and A represent two traditions which were distinct already in antiquity, the most interesting question is whether F and Y depend on those or have independent authority. H. has found no place in this oration where F alone has the true reading, but thinks that there is at least one where Y does so. But here unfortunately there seems to be some misunderstanding: he says that in 10.56 Y alone has *τά γ' ἀφ' ὑμῶν* whereas SAF omit *τά*, but in fact Fuhr and Dilts both report that *τά* is in S and A. However, even if neither F nor Y is ever right alone in this oration, there do seem to be some places where together they preserve a true reading lost in S and A, and I am prepared to accept that they have somehow acquired independent information. (I have made further comments on this question in my edition of *On the False Embassy,* pp. 35–9.)

In other parts of his introduction H. gives a full account of relations between Athens and Philip, and what is known of the internal politics of Athens in the years from 346 to 341. He agrees with those who date the *Fourth Philippic* before the end of 342/1; here he differs from G. L. Cawkwell, *CQ* 13 (1963), 134–6, who argues for 341/0. In an appendix he discusses the passages shared by the *Fourth Philippic* and the *Chersonese* speech, and examines individually more than a hundred discrepancies between them. From this very detailed study, his conclusion is essentially negative: it is not possible to declare which of the two texts, in the form in which we have them, is the earlier. Nor is he willing to say that either is superior to the other; he concedes only that the *Chersonese* reads more like a written speech and the *Fourth Philippic* is more informal. This conclusion is compatible with the views of Daitz and Worthington.

The commentary includes some long notes on historical topics, and in the notes on 10.31–4 there are responses to several of the difficulties raised by Milns. In some cases, at least, those difficulties are just matters of opinion: must we say that anything which is inconsistent or misleading cannot have been written by Demosthenes? H. is more willing than Milns to accept that Demosthenes had such faults. If Demosthenes refers to a man who knows about Philip's plans and has now been taken to the King of Persia, can he assume that his Athenian listeners will know he means Hermeias? Milns thinks he cannot (p. 294), H. thinks he can (p. 265). But the most remarkable feature of H.'s commentary is the exhaustive study of Demosthenes' vocabulary and style, with lists of parallel instances from other speeches of Demosthenes, from non-Demosthenic texts in the Demosthenic corpus, and from the other Attic orators. Some perhaps are really supererogatory: will anyone need, for instance, a list of twelve examples from Demosthenes and thirty-three from other orators of the contrast between *λόγος* and *ἔργον* (p. 103)? However, many of these notes are likely to be invaluable to future students of Demosthenes' text and vocabulary. It is only regrettable that the index does not include all the Greek words discussed, which may make it hard to find the point one wants in this generally excellent commentary.

University of Glasgow DOUGLAS M. MACDOWELL

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.301 Published online by Cambridge University Press