

An Amphictyonic Decree, Aristotle, and the Scythians: A Crux in Didymus' Commentary on Demosthenes

Craig A. Gibson

The only surviving commentary of Didymus of Alexandria covers Demosthenes 9–11 and 13, and is preserved on papyrus in 15 columns. The contents of most of the columns are now clear, thanks to a hundred years of careful editing and scholarship. But the heavily damaged columns 2–3 remain a mystery, and the contents of the beginning of column 4, though legible, have not been convincingly connected to anything in the text of Demosthenes. This paper advances an explanation of the contents of cols. 3–4 and argues that they not only target a particular passage of Demosthenes, but also draw upon a long and well-attested tradition of scholarship on, among other things, the nomenclature of Scythian tribes. A solution will take approximately one-tenth of the extant text of Didymus out of the trash can and put it back on the table, where it belongs, for scholarly consideration. John F. Oates, a long-time fan of Didymus' commentary, urged me nearly ten years ago to solve this problem. I offer this solution now with sincere gratitude for his introducing me to Demosthenes and Didymus.¹

First, a summary of the contents of cols. 1–6 of the papyrus. All but the end of the commentary on Dem. 9 has been lost, and col. 1 begins with a discussion of Dem. 9.57–58:

¹I wish to thank Christopher Blackwell, Joshua D. Sosin, and the readers and editor of *GRBS* for their valuable suggestions.

- Col. 1.1–25: On Dem. 9.57–58. Dem. 18.79 and Philochorus are cited to show that the Athenians sent aid to Oreus in 342/1 and to Eretria in 341/0.
- Col. 1.26–53: On Dem. 10.1. Philochorus is cited to show that Dem. 10 was delivered in 341/0 and not earlier.
- Col. 1.53–2.2: On Dem. 10.17. Philochorus is cited to show that the peace was still in effect in 340/39. An anonymous authority is cited for the view that the speech should be dated to 342/1, and then the text breaks off.
- Col. 2.3–3.62: Target passage(s) unclear. Only traces of letters and a few scattered individual words can be made out.
- Col. 4.1–47: Target passage(s) unclear. An Amphictyonic decree regarding the Megalopolitans and Messenians is cited; a quotation from Book 3 of Aristotle’s *Nomima* is introduced and begun, and then the text breaks off, so that the quotation is largely lost.
- Col. 4.48–6.62: On Dem. 10.32. The man alluded to in the passage is identified as Hermias of Atarneus. Sources cited include Theopompus, Callisthenes, Aristotle, Theocritus of Chios (via Bryon), Hermippus, and Anaximenes.

Our concern is the section containing the Amphictyonic decree and a mostly lost citation of Aristotle’s *Nomima Barbarika*, a section preceded and followed by heavily damaged text (col. 4.1–20):²

[τῶν] Ἀμφικτυόνων κ(αὶ) μ(ετα)σχῶν τ(ῆς) [Ἀμφικ]τυο[νε]ίας,
 [κατὰ]³ ψήφισμα τόδ(ε)· [ἔ]δοξε τοῖς Ἀμφικτύοσιν· ἐπει-
 [δῆ] Μεγαλοπολίται κ(αὶ) Μεσσηνιοὶ ἠξίωσαν ε[ύε]ρ-
 [γέτ]αι [τ]οῦ θεοῦ κ(αὶ) τῶν Ἀμφικτυόν(ων) ἀ(να)γραφῆνα[ι] κ(αὶ)
 5 [(εἶ)ναι] δοκ[εῖ]ν Ἀμφικτύονες, ἀποκρίνασθαι αὐτοῖς
 [ὅτι] περὶ μ(έν) τῆς Ἀμφικτυονείας ἐπανενεγ-
 [κόντες] εἰς τ(ὰς) πόλεις ἕκαστοι βουλευσονται κ(αὶ) εἰ[ς]
 [τὴν ἐρ]χομ(έν)ην πυλαίαν ἀποκρινοῦνται [αὐτ]οῖς
 ὑπὲρ τούτων· εὐεργέτας δ(ὲ) τοῦ θεοῦ κ(αὶ) [τ]ῶν Ἀμ-

²Text from L. Pearson and S. Stephens, edd., *Didymi in Demosthenem Commenta* (Stuttgart 1983).

³So H. Diels and W. Schubart, edd., *Didymos Kommentar zu Demosthenes* (BKT 1 [1904]), and H. Wankel, review of Pearson and Stephens, *Gnomon* 59 (1987) 220, for their [κ(αὶ) τὸ].

- 10 φικτηνόν(ων) δε(ε)δόχθαι (εἶναι) αὐτούς· ἀποκρίνασθαι δὲ
 [⁵] . . οἰς ὅτι [δο]κεῖ τοῖς Ἀμφικτύουσιν ἀ-
 [ναγραφῆ]ναι αὐτούς εὐε[ργ]έτας τοῦ θεοῦ κ(αὶ) [τ]ῶν
 [Ἀμφικ]τυόν(ων) καθάπερ [αἰτ]οῦνται. κ(αὶ) . [⁵] . .
 [⁸]τα· Ἀριστοτ[έλης ἐν] τῆι τρίτη[ι τῶν Νομί-]
 15 [μων, ἢ περὶ] τὰ] τ(ῶν) Σκυθῶν ἔ[θη ἐ]στί, φη[σ]ὶ [⁶]
 [⁵]το[. .]ρον μεικρα[.] . [.] . δε . [⁴] . [. .]
 [⁶]του προσαγορ[ε]υθῆναι [ὑπὸ τ]ῶν βαρ-
 [βάρων . . .] . . δ ν τῆς δρασ[⁸]ασαρι
 [⁶] . . . ν δι(α)θ[. . .]ελλ[⁹]ουσευ
 20 [⁷]ηνη . [¹⁸]ασπαι

... of the Amphictyons, and participating in the Amphictyony, in accordance with the following decree: "It is resolved by the Amphictyons: Since the Megalopolitans and the Messenians requested to be inscribed as benefactors of the god and of the Amphictyons and to be considered to be Amphictyons, the Amphictyons shall reply to them that, as regards the Amphictyony, having each referred the matter to the member cities, they would take counsel and reply to them about these things at the upcoming meeting. It has been resolved: that they shall be benefactors of the god and of the Amphictyons; and to answer the... that the Amphictyons vote to inscribe them as benefactors of the god and of the Amphictyons, just as they requested." And ... Aristotle in Book 3 of the *Nomima*, which is on the customs of the Scythians, says that ... were hailed as ... by the barbarians ...

Various suggestions have been offered to account for this section of the commentary, but most have focused on the Amphictyonic decree alone, to the exclusion of the citation of Aristotle's *Nomima Barbarika*.⁴ It has even been suggested that

⁴The principal discussions are Diels/Schubart 14–15; P. Foucart, *MémAcInscr* 38 (1909) 113–117; Pearson/Stephens XIII–XIV and *ad col.* 3.43; Wankel (*supra* n.3) 219–220; K. T. Osborne, *The Peri Demosthenous of Didymos Grammatikos* (diss. Univ. Washington 1990) 101–106; C. A. Gibson, *Interpreting a Classic: Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators* (Berkeley 2002) 105–106. The inscription is dated by Lefèvre (*CIDelphes* IV 7) to 346/5 or soon after (Philip's reforms of the Council's membership).

Didymus quoted the wrong decree, when he should have been quoting the one recording Philip's admission into the Amphictyonic Council.⁵ In fact, however, as K. T. Osborne first pointed out, both the decree and the passage from Aristotle must be connected with a single lemma that derives from Dem. 10.17–32.⁶ Noting the occurrence of *euergetai* in the decree, Osborne suggested that the lemma may have been Dem. 10.31: "For first, those whom the king trusts and has taken in as his *euergetai* hate Philip and are making war against him" (πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οἷς βασιλεὺς πιστεύει καὶ εὐεργέτας ὑπέιληφεν ἑαυτοῦ, οὗτοι μισοῦσι καὶ πολεμοῦσι Φίλιππον). He went on to speculate that the citation of Aristotle may have had something to do with relations between barbarians and the Delphic oracle, but did not press his conclusions further. No one has offered a convincing reconstruction of the argument of this section.

The Amphictyonic decree and the passage from Aristotle must, as Osborne saw, be connected with a single lemma taken from Dem. 10.17–32, and the *euergetai* of Dem. 10.31 must be the subject under discussion in col. 3–4. I argue the following: The fragmentary citation of Aristotle related the story of how the Arimaspians/Ariaspian were renamed the *Euergetai*. In addition, most of col. 3 and much of the first half of col. 4 contained a word study illustrating the various senses in which Classical authors used the term *euergetai*; a historical discussion of the possible referents of *euergetai* in Dem. 10.31; or a combination of the two. If the section contained a word study, the decree and the Aristotle passage were cited as two of several examples of the meaning of *euergetai* in Classical

⁵See Wankel (*supra* n.3) 219–220 for further discussion.

⁶Osborne (*supra* n.4) 106. The last passage discussed before the break at col. 2.3 is Dem. 10.17, and the next obvious passage discussed after the text resumes at col. 4.1 is Dem. 10.32. There is no room for a new quotation of Demosthenes in col. 4.13–14 between the two citations; this is significant because Didymus always gives a quotation of at least several lines in length before discussing a new passage of Demosthenes.

authors. But if, as I suspect, the section attempted to identify the precise referent of *euergetai* in Dem. 10.31, Didymus first argued (or discussed someone else's argument) that the cities named as *euergetai* in the Amphictyonic decree were also considered *euergetai* of the Persian king, either for some past service or simply because they were now making war on Philip. He then argued (or discussed someone else's argument) that Aristotle's story of how the Arimaspians were renamed *Euergetai* by the Persian king somehow relates to the situation alluded to in Dem. 10.31.

We begin with the organization of Didymus' commentary and his use of quotations (lemmata) from Demosthenes. In P.Berol. inv. 9780 Didymus provides a series of lemmata from Dem. 9–11 and 13, comments on them, and supplements his comments with quotations from a wide range of Classical and Hellenistic authors. In nearly every instance in which the papyrus is well preserved, there is an easily identifiable lemma from Demosthenes. The lemmata are always discussed in the same order as one would find them in a text of Demosthenes. In addition, one lemma may motivate and support more than one kind of discussion. For example, Didymus quotes Dem. 10.34 and explains how Demosthenes' "hyperbatic phrasing" can be corrected for easier comprehension (col. 6.66–7.7); without any transition or repetition of the lemma, he immediately goes on to identify Demosthenes' allusion to the Persian king's previous and recent "restorations" mentioned in the same passage (7.7–8.32). A lemma from Dem. 11.1 serves to introduce a discussion first of the speech's date and then of its authenticity (10.13–11.14); the lemma is not repeated between the two discussions, and again there is no transition between them.

A final example is more complicated. In discussing the date of Dem. 13, Didymus gives a lemma from Dem. 13.7–8 and shows how the affair of the sacred Orgas helps to establish the date of the speech. The Orgas affair is mentioned in Dem. 13.32, but

Didymus does not quote the passage. Then he gives an etymological discussion of the word “Orgas,” quotes the relevant lemma from Dem. 13.32, and finally discusses the meaning of the word “accursed” (καταράτους) as it is used in the context of Dem. 13.32 (col. 13.31–15.10). And all of this is strung together in one seamless discussion, free from division or clear transition.

Osborne’s suggestion that Dem. 10.31 is the topic of discussion in col. 4.1–46 is attractive. Since there is no room for a new lemma between the Amphictyonic decree and the passage of Aristotle, the two passages must somehow be related to the same lemma. But the letters that do survive in the damaged text of col. 3.19–62 will not accommodate Dem. 10.31 (or any other passage of Demosthenes, for that matter); the lemma from Dem. 10.31 must therefore have occurred in the totally lost lines of col. 3.1–18. Although the papyrus preserves no lemma, the word *euergetai* does appear both in Dem. 10.31 and three times in the Amphictyonic decree, which suggested to Osborne that Dem. 10.31 is the missing lemma. Demosthenes there mentions the first of the two advantages that he believes the Athenians should act upon, and the second one (10.32) is discussed in the next intelligible section of the commentary (col. 4.48–6.62).

What sort of things would Didymus be likely to discuss in connection with this lemma? In P.Berol.inv. 9780 Didymus addresses the dates and authenticity of speeches, gives etymologies and historical background, and identifies proper names and other potentially unclear historical allusions. Almost anything is possible as a subject of discussion, of course, but certain options can be ruled out. The date of Dem. 10 is an unlikely subject. Didymus discusses the dates of speeches at the beginnings of his commentaries on Dem. 11 (col. 10.13–17) and Dem. 13 (col. 13.25–62). He had already discussed the date of Dem. 10 in col. 1.26–2.2ff, and it is doubtful that that discussion could have continued through the rest of col. 2 and

all of col. 3. On at least one occasion Didymus worried at length over the authenticity of a speech, but his comments on that subject occur near the beginning of the commentary on that speech (col. 11.7–26 on Dem. 11). Didymus does not appear to doubt the authenticity of Dem. 10, and even if he did, it is difficult to see why he would wait until the middle of the speech to discuss it, and nearly impossible to see how an Amphictyonic decree and a citation of Aristotle on Scythian tribes could contribute to this. Moreover, although no etymology is so inane as to escape the notice of an ancient commentator, it seems unlikely that the etymology of the word “do-gooders” could have occupied even a Didymus for more than ninety lines.

Didymus seems to have been especially interested in historical background. The Amphictyonic decree practically begs for such explication: the surviving portion of the decree mentions specific cities making specific petitions and obtaining specific results, and much of the heavily damaged cols. 2–3 (like much of the rest of the papyrus) seems to focus on historical problems. Unfortunately, these cities and their petition to the Amphictyonic Council do not figure in Dem. 10, and since we have no independent testimony as to the date or circumstances of the petition, it is difficult to see how it could provide historical background for anything mentioned in Dem. 10.17–32. Didymus’ other references to Scythians and the Amphictyonic Council in this commentary are not helpful.⁷ Furthermore, whatever historical situation this decree was quoted in order to illustrate must still be connected with a single lemma to which a passage from Aristotle on the Scythians must also be relevant.

Finally, Didymus often conducted word studies (not limited to etymology) and gave detailed identifications of proper names and historical allusions. Perhaps we should envision a word-study/identification akin to his treatment of Hermias (col.

⁷Scythians: col. 2.21, 4.15, 11.47; Amphictyons: col. 11.28, 11.46.

4.48–6.62), the previous and recent “restorations” of the Persian king (7.7–8.32), the Theoric Fund (8.32–44), Aristomedes (9.38–10.10), Nicaea (11.26–52), or “accursed” Boeotians (14.49–15.10). In each case, Didymus quotes a lengthy lemma rather than simply quoting the one word under discussion. Thus even in the case of a word study, we should still expect to find a full lemma from Dem. 10.31 somewhere before the Amphictyonic decree; efficiency suggests that it must have been quoted in the now lost col. 3.1–18, from which not even a trace of letters survives. This cannot, however, be proven.

If the fragmentary discussion in cols. 3 and 4 was a word study like the examples above, Didymus would have quoted Dem. 10.31 and then said something like, “They⁸ used the word *euergetai* in several senses.” Eventually the Amphictyonic decree and the passage from Aristotle would have been quoted to provide additional examples. If, however, the section discussed the particular referent of *euergetai* in Dem. 10.31, Didymus would have quoted the lemma and then said, “Some say that the *euergetai* here are the [name; justification; quotation of sources]. But others say...” Eventually he would have discussed the proposition that the cities referred to as *euergetai* in the Amphictyonic decree were somehow also considered *euergetai* of the Persian king, and then he would have related Aristotle’s discussion of other people who were considered Persian *euergetai*. It is also possible that Didymus’ discussion of Dem. 10.31 combined word study with historical discussion. In his identification of the city of Nicaea (col. 11.26–52), Didymus quotes Timosthenes’ *On Harbors* in order to distinguish the Nicaea referred to in Dem. 11.4 from other cities of the same name, but he also goes on to quote Philochorus’ discussion of

⁸*I.e.*, Classical Greek authors. If this section contained a word study, it was certainly not limited to Demosthenes. Didymus never discusses variant uses of a word within the Demosthenic corpus, and in fact Demosthenes’ use of the word *euergetai* elsewhere seems wholly unremarkable.

how “Philip ordered the Thebans to give this city back to the Locrians” (11.37–51: *FGrHist* 328 F 56b). His word study of “Orgas” (13.62–14.49), which focuses primarily on the word’s etymology and relationship to other words connoting moisture and fertility, also includes a historical discussion of Athens’ dealings with Megara over the sacred Orgas.⁹ Given these two parallels, it is possible that Didymus was addressing a word study question and a historical question at the same time. However, even if he did not cite the Amphictyonic decree in order to explain a historical reference in Dem. 10.31, it is in keeping with his apparent interest in history to have cited it at all. After all, he could simply have said that the Amphictyons sometimes voted to regard certain cities as *euergetai* and left it at that.

The exact referent of the *euergetai* in Dem. 10.31 has long been debated,¹⁰ and so ancient commentators presumably could have found it worth their attention as well. Nothing in Aristotle’s

⁹Didymus cites Philochorus’ account (col. 13.47–58: *FGrHist* 328 F 155) before the word study and Androtion’s nearly identical account (col. 14.37–49: 324 F 30) after it.

¹⁰T. Leland, *The Oration of Demosthenes: Pronounced to Excite the Athenians against Philip, King of Macedon I* (London 1814) 219–220: “He probably means the Thebans, who had given Ochus powerful assistance in the siege of Pelusium; and who were now much provoked at Philip, on account of Echinus, which he had taken from them”; C. R. Kennedy, *The Crown of Philip and Ten Other Oration of Demosthenes* (London 1911) 212 n.2: “The Thracians, who had always been regarded as benefactors of the Persian king since they assisted Darius on his invasion of Scythia. Philip was making war in Thrace at this time, and had subjected a considerable part of the country”; H. Weil, *Les harangues de Démosthène* (Paris 1912) *ad loc.*: “Parmi ces satrapes, il faut distinguer Mentor, qui venait de rendre les plus grands services à Ochus dans la guerre d’Égypte et qui jouissait alors de toute sa confiance ... On sait que les satrapes de l’Asie Mineure secoururent la ville de Périnthe assiégée par Philippe ... Mais, ce fait étant postérieur à 341, il faut, si l’on maintient l’unité de ce discours, croire qu’ils se montrèrent dès lors hostiles à ce prince. Quoi qu’il en soit, les bienfaiteurs du Roi, qui font la guerre à Philippe, ne sont certainement ni les Thébains ni les Thraces: les conjectures que certains éditeurs ont faites à ce sujet se réfutent assez d’elles-mêmes”; M. Croiset, *Démosthène: Harangues II* (Paris 1946) 128 n.1: “Allusion aux satrapes qui avaient bien servi Artaxerxès et qui, inquiets de l’avance de Philippe vers l’Hellespont, armaient contre lui”; J. H. Vince, *Demosthenes I* (London 1930) 286, agrees with Kennedy.

extant works or fragments provides a clue as to what aspect of the Scythians might be relevant here.¹¹ However, a story in Diodorus (17.81.1–2) illuminates the subject of Aristotle’s and Didymus’ discussion:

ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων γενόμενος καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Δραγγινὴν καταστήσας ἀνέζευξε μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τοὺς πρότερον μὲν Ἄριμάσπους,¹² νῦν δ’ Εὐεργέτας ὀνομαζόμενος διὰ τοιαύτας τινὰς αἰτίας. Κῦρος ὁ τὴν Μήδων ἀρχὴν μεταστήσας εἰς Πέρσας ἔν τινι στρατείᾳ περιληφθεὶς ἐν ἐρήμῳ χώρᾳ καὶ πάσῃ σπάνει τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἦλθε μὲν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐσχάτους κινδύνους, διὰ τὴν ἔνδειαν τῆς τροφῆς ἀναγκαζομένων τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἀλλήλους σαρκοφαγεῖν, τῶν δ’ Ἄριμασπῶν τρισμυρίας ἀμάξας σίτου γεμούσας παρακομισάντων σωθεὶς παραδόξως ἀτελείαις τε καὶ ἄλλαις δωρεαῖς ἐτίμησε τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τὴν προϋπάρχουσαν προσηγορίαν ἀφελόμενος προσηγόρευσε Εὐεργέτας. τότε δὲ Ἀλέξανδρος εἰς τὴν τούτων χώραν στρατεύσας καὶ τῶν ἐγχωρίων φιλοφρόνως αὐτὸν προσδεξαμένων ἐτίμησε τὸ ἔθνος ταῖς ἀρμοζούσαις δωρεαῖς.

After getting free from this situation and settling everything in Drangine, he (Alexander) marched off with his army to the people who were formerly known as Ari(m)aspians, but are now called by the name of *Euergetai* for the following reason: When the Cyrus who transferred the power of the Medes to the Persians was trapped in the desert during an expedition and out of a total lack of necessary provisions was facing extreme danger, and his soldiers were being forced because of a lack of food to eat one another, the Ari(m)aspians came conveying 30,000 wagons full of grain. Rescued in this unusual way, Cyrus honored the tribe with tax-exemptions and other gifts, and dispensing with their former appellation he gave them the new name of *Euergetai*. And so on the present occasion when Alexander had marched to their country and the natives had given him a friendly reception, he honored this tribe with suitable gifts.

¹¹ Although Aristotle mentions Scythia and the Scythians a number of times in his works, his discussions are limited to their strange customs and physical characteristics and the geographical situation and fauna of Scythia. Yet there is enough in the corpus to suggest that Aristotle or one of his students might well have written a book dedicated solely to the Scythians. For other fragments of the *Nomima* see frs.604–610 Rose; none of these concerns the Scythians.

¹² Emended to Ἄριάσπους, and below to Ἄριασπῶν, by P. Goukowsky in his recent Budé edition, adducing Curt. 7.3.1–3 and Arr. *Anab.* 3.27.4; he notes that “Les Ariaspes occupaient le bassin inférieur de l’Etymandros” (232).

Curtius and Arrian, not surprisingly, have similar accounts.¹³ Strabo briefly picks up the story as well: εἶτ' ἐκ Δραγγῶν ἐπὶ τε τοὺς Εὐεργέτας ἦκεν, οὓς ὁ Κῦρος οὕτως ὠνόμασε (15.2.10). Finally, Aelius Herodian and Stephanus of Byzantium know of a Scythian tribe called both Arimaspians and *Euergetai*, but despite their references to Strabo, they supply a mythological story to account for the name change:¹⁴

Εὐεργέτης· Σκυθικὸν ἔθνος, Στράβων. ὃ καὶ Ἀριμασποὶ ἐλέγετο. ἐκεῖ γὰρ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀργούς χειμῶνος πνεύσαντος διασωθῆναι τὸ σκάφος καὶ οὕτω κληθῆναι.

Euergetes: A Scythian tribe (mentioned in) Strabo, which was also known as the Arimaspians. For there when a storm blew up against those aboard the *Argo*, the boat was saved and (the *Euergetai*) thus received their name.

The required elements are all here in Diodorus and Herodian/Stephanus. First, we can now explain why Didymus would cite a work of Aristotle on the Scythians. Compare the subject of Aristotle's third book cited in col. 4.15: [ἢ περὶ τὰ] τ(ῶν) Σκυθῶν ἔ[θη ἐ]στί. Here "customs," ἔ[θη], is now perhaps better restored as "tribes," ἔ[θη]. The Ari(m)aspians are represented in Diodorus and the grammarians as an ἔθνος, and they are represented in the grammarians and other literary sources specifically as an ἔθνος of the Scythians.¹⁵ This connection allows us cautiously to propose additional restorations in col. 4.17–20:

¹³Curt. 7.3.1-3 (*Arimaspos* Bardon, Hedicke, for codd. *armatos*); Arr. 3.27.4-5 (Ἀριάσπας); there is also a mention of the name *Euergetai* in Arr. 4.6.7.

¹⁴Ael. Herodian *De prosod. cath.* p.73 Lentz, whence Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Εὐεργέται.

¹⁵Perhaps from their association with the Scythians and Hyperboreans in Herodotus 4.13 and 4.27, the Arimaspians are later represented as a Scythian tribe (Poll. *Onom.* 4.76; Eust. *Comm. in Dionys. Per.* 31) or a Hyperborean tribe (schol. Callim. *Hymn.* 4.291 [II 73 Pf.]; Ael. Herodian p.188 Lentz; Callim. as cited in Steph. Byz. *s.v.* Ὑπερβόρειοι; attributed to no source in Steph. Byz. Ἀριμασποὶ; *Suda* Ἀριστέας). On the Arimaspians see J. S. Romm, *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought* (Princeton 1992) 69–74.

[⁻⁶⁻] του προσαγορ[ε]υθῆναι [ὑπὸ τ]ῶν βαρ-
 [βάρων . . .] . . δ . . . ν τῆς Δραγ[γινῆς . . τ]ᾶς Ἄρι-
 [μάσπας] . . . ν δ(ια)θ[. . .]ελλ[⁻⁸⁻ τ]οῦς Εὐ-
 20 [εργέτας] ηνη . [⁻¹⁴⁻ Ἄριμ]άσπαι¹⁶

18: δραε[P./S.

Didymus' reference to someone's "being hailed as [– – –] by the barbarians" in 4.17–18 can now be explained by Diodorus' story of the name change (τὴν προὔπαρχουσαν προσηγορίαν ἀφελόμενος προσηγόρευσεν), which even uses some of the same language. Didymus' and Aristotle's "barbarians" in this case are the Persians, who assigned the Arimaspians their new name *Euergetai*. Although much is possible in a lost work attributed to Aristotle, and Didymus' own interests were very wide-ranging, it seems more likely that the passage from Aristotle related the historical account found in Diodorus, Arrian, Curtius, and Strabo than the mythological account found in Aelius Herodian/Stephanus. If Aristotle related the mythological account, the phrase [ὑπὸ τ]ῶν βαρ[βάρων] would be difficult to explain. In any case the decisive fact is that while P.Berol.inv. 9780 contains many examples of historical discussions, it contains none that are mythological.

This proposed restoration of Didymus' argument is supported by other reasons as well. It constitutes further evidence for a connection between Didymus and several literary sources—Arrian, Diodorus, Stephanus of Byzantium, and Strabo—which furnish parallels for other discussions in this same commentary.¹⁷ An account of a Persian king and his involvement in

¹⁶Or Ἄρι[μάσπας and Ἄρι]άσπαι, cf. *supra* n.12. The Arimaspians are more frequently known as Ἄριμασποί; the form is Ἄριμάσπαι in Dionys. Per. 31 and Orph. *Argon.* 1063. The many occurrences found in the genitive plural are indeterminate.

¹⁷Arrian: see Pearson and Stephens' note to col. 9.48; Diodorus: their notes to col. 1.1, 5.5, 7.41, 7.43, 7.45, 7.54, 7.64, 8.18, 12.49, 12.66; Steph. Byz.: their note to col. 6.58; Strabo: their note to col. 4.68.

a benefaction also fits well with Didymus' known interests; elsewhere in the commentary he records details about Artaxerxes II and III, and he is above all interested in their various benefactions to Athens.¹⁸ Finally, not only did Didymus apparently consult historical sources also used by Diodorus, but he also seems to have shared with his near contemporary a great interest in discussing historical instances of *euergesia*.¹⁹

If the argument advanced here is correct, much of columns 3 and 4 was devoted to a discussion of the *euergetai* mentioned in Dem. 10.31. This means that column 2 discussed a passage or passages occurring between Dem. 10.17 and 10.31. What those passages were is still unclear. As to column 3, it would be interesting to know what other views of Dem. 10.31—and based on what sources—were discussed in it. Pearson and Stephens, following in part a suggestion of Foucart, suggested that column 3 may have included a comparison of Dem. 10 with Dem. 5.14–23, which mentions Amphictyonic decrees, Messenians, and Megalopolitans.²⁰ If their suggestion is correct, and if Didymus cited another speech or his commentary on another speech here²¹ in order to clarify the view that the Megalopolitans and Messenians were somehow considered benefactors of the Persian king,²² then a connection between this papyrus and

¹⁸Didymus mentions the Persian king in his discussions of Hermias of Atarneus (col. 5.18–21, 5.71–6.13, 6.39–43, 6.50–59) and Aristomedes of Pherae (9.43–52). He discusses the king's benefactions to the Athenians at great length in 7.7–8.32.

¹⁹See K. Sacks, *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century* (Princeton 1990) 61–82, 103–106, 124, on Diodorus' emphasis on culture heroes and the progress in human history resulting from their benefactions.

²⁰On the occurrence of the word πρόφασιν in col. 3.43, Pearson and Stephens p.10 comment: "Cf. Dem. 10.28, sed etiam Dem. 5.14–23 ubi monet ne propter umbram Delphicam belli fiat πρόφασις et de petitione Megalop. et Messen. loquitur. Fort. res huius anni (341) cum periculo temporis prioris comparantur"; cf. pp. XIII–XIV. For a similar proposal, Foucart (*supra* n.4) 114–117.

²¹Didymus cites Dem. 18 in his comments on Dem. 9.57–58 (col. 1.8–12), and he refers to his commentary on Dem. 18 in his remarks on Dem. 11.16 (col. 12.35–37) and Dem. 11.22 (col. 12.40–42).

²²Assuming that this is a study of the referent of *euergetai* in Dem. 10.31 and not a more general study of the word.

Dem. 5 suggests the possible relevance of P.Berol.inv. 21188,²³ a fragment of a commentary on Dem. 5.25 that not only alludes to an earlier discussion of an Amphictyonic decree (now lost), but is also explicitly attributed to Didymus.

February, 2002

Department of Classics
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52246
craig-gibson@uiowa.edu

²³Greek text with commentary by H. Maehler, "Der Streit um den Schatten des Esels," in *Pap.Congr.XIX* (Cairo 1992) 625–633.