On this basis, it seems perfectly reasonable to explain the surprising diction of our scholium as the result of the conflation of two distinct annotations such as (for example) these:

ἐμπολήσας] ἀγοράσας.
<τυχών] ἐντυχών [*uel* ἐπιτυχών]·> δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ λέξις καὶ τὸ εὑρών.

Of course, other reconstructions would be possible: for instance, supposing a *saut du même au même* after the unification of two distinct *interpretamenta*, ἐμπολήσας] ἀγοράσας· <τυχών] ἐπιτυχών, κύρσας·> (cf. Hesych. κ 4703 e 4707 L.) δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ λέξις κτλ.; alternatively, we could consider κιχών, conjectured by Heimsoeth: see schol. Nic. *Ther.* 502c (p. 199 Crugnola) κιχών] εὑρών. We could also suppose, more simply, that the typical formula δηλοῖ δὲ ἡ λέξις καί (cf. n. 11) has been added after two independent annotations such as ἐμπολήσας] ἀγοράσας, τυχών] εὑρὼν were merged into one.

In any case, the transmitted text of the scholium cannot be considered free from suspicion; and it seems to me highly plausible that its present incongruous formulation shows traces of a former state of Sophocles' text without the corrupted form τεκών,[14] but with something liable to be explained with εὑρών. In this case, it is difficult to find a better candidate than τυχών.

Alma Mater Studiorum – Università di Bologna FEDERICO CONDELLO
federico.condello@unibo.it
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000288

A LITIGANT IN ATHENS: DEMOSTHENES 56

The speaker of Demosthenes 56 had lent money to a ship-owner Dionysodorus for a commercial voyage, and now is prosecuting him for breach of contract. The prosecutor is usually thought to be a metic. In the course of the speech he does not identify himself; but Libanius in his *Argumenta* of Demosthenes supplies a name, Darius: *Arg.* 54.1 Δαρεῖος καὶ Πάμφιλος Διονυσοδώρῳ δανείζουσι and 2 ὡς δὲ Δαρεῖος λέγει. The manuscripts of the *Argumenta*, which begin in the tenth century, are numerous; Foerster (VIII 677) and Dindorf/Blass (III XLVIII) cite no variant for the name. Libanius' source for this information is unrecoverable.

One can wonder, however, at a man making his way in classical Athens, and even hoping to win over a jury, if burdened with that unfriendly name.[1] In a later age, two

[14] A further detail can be underlined. It should be noted that the ancient commentators are extraordinarily sensitive to Oedipus' utterances seemly inspired by strong emotions. So, at line 1019, Oedipus calls Laius ὁ φύσας, even though the Corinthian has already stated that Laius is not Oedipus' father (lines 1015–18); the scholium ad loc. (p. 201 Pap.) observes: ἴδιον τῶν ἐν παραδόξοις ἀκούσμασι τὸ αὐτὸ πολλάκις ἐπερωτᾶν (an even broader formulation is in MR, where is added: ἤδη γὰρ οὗτος ἔφη ἀλλ' οὐ σ' ἐγείνατο [p. 155 De Marco]; cf. n. 3). It is therefore strange that the stronger contradiction represented by τεκών deserves no observation at all. But this, of course, is simply an argument *ex silentio*.

[1] No one in Athens seems to be named Xerxes or Mardonius.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000124 Published online by Cambridge University Press

men named Darius are on record in Athens: Εὔνικος Δαρείου of Eupyridai is in a catalogue of the first century B.C. (*IG* II^2 2462.13),[2] and Δαρεῖος Εὐνόμου of Semachidai was an ephebe in A.D. 163/4 (2086.82, 2087.53). The name perhaps gave little offence in the cosmopolitan world of Roman Athens, so much visited or adopted by foreigners with alien names.

In any case, we should be uncomfortable with a Darius holding forth to a jury in classical Athens. An alternative is suggested by an error in the transmission of 1 Maccabees. The king of Sparta who famously wrote a friendly letter to the Jews is there called Δαρεῖος. So the MSS: already the earliest, the *Sinaiticus* of the fourth century, has at 1 Macc. 12:7 δαριου του βασιλευοντος, but a garbled ονιααρης βασιλευς at 12:20.[3] Josephus, abstracting this episode from 1 Maccabees, had it right: βασιλεὺς Ἄρειος (*AJ* 12.225, 12.226). This offers a probable *terminus post quem* for the LXX error Δαρεῖος: Josephus found the correct name in his copy of 1 Maccabees—more likely than a correction made by Josephus himself or by one of his copyists. In brief, an early scribe of 1 Maccabees was attracted from a name unfamiliar to him to one well known to every reader of the Bible, the βασιλεὺς Δαρεῖος of Ezra and Daniel.[4] The error was intellectual rather than palaeographic, and it endured; the correction Ἄρειος was first made by Fritzsche in 1871, citing Josephus.[5]

I suggest that the same error can have occurred in the transmission of Libanius' summaries of Demosthenes: a copyist has turned the name αρειος, to him unknown, into δαρειος. He must have worked before a fourth-century theologian made the name notorious to Christians—Arius. A dozen men in Athens are attested with the name Areios, scattered from the sixth century B.C. to the third A.D. In the one fourth-century instance, an Areios is listed in a record of naval expenditures of 323/2 B.C., a catapult operator who was a metic: καταπελτ]αφέτ[ηι] ὧι [ὄνο]μα Ἀρείωι [ἐν Σκα]μβωνιδῶν [οἰκ]οῦντι (*IG* II^2 1631.514). The Demosthenic speech dates from the 320s, for Cleomenes in Egypt (†323/2) is current or recent (Dem. 56.7). It would be rash to identify a firmly attested Areios with a late and emended datum of unknown authority. But having a good Greek name, rather than that of the loser at Marathon or lately in Anatolia, would have saved the prosecutor from some embarrassment.[6]

Chicago KENT J. RIGSBY
krigsby@duke.edu
doi:10.1017/S0009838816000124

[2] J. Curbera (IG) kindly examined the Berlin squeeze for me: the mason has corrected ΔAPIOY to ΔAPEIOY.

[3] Whence the earliest Latin translation, 12:7 *dario* and 12:20 *honiarex rex*: D. de Bruyne, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées* (Bruges, 1932), 74 (his **L**).

[4] E. Bickerman, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (Leiden, 1976), 1.151, of the copyists of Scripture: 'They were particularly prone, as Origen stressed, to amend the proper names in a manuscript at their own sweet will.'

[5] Cf. Ael. *VH* 2.36: the MSS are unanimous, Σωκράτης, where, as urged by N.G. Wilson, *Claudio Eliano, Storie Varie* (Milan, 1996), ad loc., the true subject was Ἰσοκράτης.

[6] The debt of this note to the labours of M.J. Osborne and S.G. Byrne, *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. 2 (Oxford, 1994), and J.S. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* 1- (Toronto, 1994-), will be obvious.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838816000124 Published online by Cambridge University Press