

Hyperides, *Against Diondas*, in defence of the date January–March 334 BC

LÁSZLÓ HORVÁTH^{1,2*} 

¹ Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary

² Eötvös József Collegium, Byzantium Centre, Budapest, Hungary

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Received: December 11, 2025 • Accepted: December 16, 2025

Published online: February 10, 2026

© 2025 The Author(s)



ABSTRACT

The significant fragment of Hyperides' speech *Against Diondas*, which survived in the Archimedes Palimpsest, was previously dated to the spring (Horváth) or summer (Rhodes) of 334 BC. Lane Fox's recent paper in *ZPE* expressed doubts, primarily regarding the January–March 334 BC date and instead placed the speech in 331 BC. This study responds to that suggestion and reconfirms the early 334 BC date.

KEYWORDS

Hyperides, *Against Diondas*, Dating of the speech, January–March 334 BC

R. J. Lane Fox recently published a study in the pages of *ZPE* in which he dates the speech to June–July 331 BC instead of January–March 334 BC, as I had previously determined.¹ Below, after a brief summary of the content of the speech, I will present the three main arguments on which my earlier dating is based, the second and third of which are disputed by Lane Fox. I will then present Lane Fox's position and supporting arguments, before finally listing my counter-arguments (I–IV).

* Corresponding author. E-mail: horvathl@eotvos.elte.hu

¹LANE FOX (2025).

I

In July 338 BC, Hyperides proposed a wreath in honour of Demosthenes, due to his political successes prior to the Battle of Chaeronea. However, the day after that defeat, Diondas attacked the proposal on the grounds of γραφή παρανόμων, arguing that the policies of Demosthenes and his allies did not best serve the interests of the city, and that Demosthenes was responsible for the ill-advised military alliance with Thebes and the lost war against Macedonia. The speech Against Diondas took place several years later. As in Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown*, the orator, Hyperides, presents a comprehensive political apology for Demosthenes' and his own political activities prior to the military defeat. In this account, Athens' glorious historical past and the defence of Greek freedom obliged the city to fight against Macedonia, even if blind luck (τύχη) deprived it of the glory of victory. Athens also bore the brunt of the Persian Wars, and the orator even mentions the number of Athenian ships in the allied fleets. Moreover, according to the speech, Diondas is a sycophant who, like Demades and the Macedonian adulators, is a traitor and a notorious litigant who, at the age of just twenty-five, has filed twice as many lawsuits against anti-Macedonian politicians. The text, which provides valuable insight into Athenian domestic politics, breaks off before the epilogue. Diondas lost the lawsuit – based on the dating of the speech to spring 334 BC, I believe he most likely joined Alexander's army and disappeared from Athenian political life for ever.

II

To date the speech, I have highlighted three main points from the text, along with a few minor observations (here I will repeat only the most necessary ones for a precise understanding of the arguments and counterarguments).²

1. The presence of Theban refugees in Athens

καὶ νῦν γε, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πολλοὶ Θηβαίων ἀκροῶνται ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ σχολὴν ἄγοντες (ὥς οὐκ ἂν ἐβουλόμην).³

And now, men of Athens, many of the Thebans are listening in the law court with time on their hands (and I wish it were not so). (trans. Carey)

The sentence clearly indicates that after the destruction of Thebes, the Athenians – with Alexander's subsequent permission – took in the Boeotian refugees. Thus, the first *terminus post quem* for the speech is September 335 BC.

²I have summarized my results in four publications. HORVÁTH (2008) and HORVÁTH (2009) 191f.; then placing it in a broader context: HORVÁTH (2014) 10–23, and interpreting for Hungarian readers: HORVÁTH (2015) 23–39. While acknowledging my edition with German explanations, Lane Fox refers to the English-language Hyperidea study and gives the *loci* of the speech based on CAREY ET AL. (2008), i.e., the first edition.

³Hyp. *Dion.* (17) 173^v 25ff.

2. Connecting Diodorus XVII 15.1–3 and 3–5 with Hyp. Dion. (22) 175^r 8–16

After the destruction of Thebes at the end of September 335 BC, Alexander demanded the immediate extradition of eight (or perhaps ten) Athenian politicians accused of collaboration. Plutarch's summary of the events (*Dem.* XXIII) is probably accurate. However, Plutarch's biography of Phocion (*Phoc.* XVII 2–9; see also Arrian I 10.2–6) describes the Athenians' first embassy to Alexander as a complete failure; only the second embassy, led by Demades, was able to appease the king, thus avoiding punishment.

According to Diodorus, the situation in Athens was extremely tense. Perhaps Hyperides himself spoke out against the extradition proposal.⁴ Finally, Demades was persuaded to mediate and to draft a resolution that would both save the politicians and meet the Macedonian king's expectations.

ἐπὶ τελευτῆς δὲ Δημάδης, πεπεισμένος ὑπὸ τῶν περὶ Δημοσθένην, ὥς φασι, πέντε ταλάντοις ἀργυρίου, συνεβούλευε μὲν σώζειν τοὺς κινδυνεύοντας, παρὰ γὰρ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ κολάζειν κατὰ τοὺς νόμους, ἂν ὦσιν ἄξιοι τιμωρίας. ὁ μὲν οὖν δῆμος ἀποδεξάμενος τὴν ἐπίνοιαν τοῦ Δημάδου τό τε ψήφισμα ἐκύρωσε καὶ τὸν Δημάδην μεθ' ἑτέρων ἀπέστειλε πρεσβευτὴν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, δοὺς ἐντολὴν καὶ περὶ τῶν Θηβαίων φυγάδων ἀξιώσαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον συγχωρῆσαι τῷ δήμῳ τοὺς πεφευγότας Θηβαίους ὑποδέχεσθαι. ὁ δὲ Δημάδης πρεσβεύσας καὶ τῇ τοῦ λόγου δεινότητι πάντα κατεργασάμενος ἔπεισε τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἀπολῦσαι τοὺς ἄνδρας τῶν ἐγκλημάτων καὶ τὰλλα πάντα συγχωρῆσαι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις.⁵

In the end, Demades, influenced, it is reported, by a bribe of five silver talents from Demosthenes's supporters, counselled them to save those whose lives were threatened, and read a decree that had been subtly (φιλοτέχνως) worded. It contained a plea for the men and a promise to impose the penalty prescribed by the law, if they deserved punishment. The people approved the suggestion of Demades, passed the decree and dispatched a delegation including Demades as envoys to the king, instructing them to make a plea to Alexander in favour of the Theban fugitives as well, that he would allow the Athenians to provide a refuge for them. On this mission, Demades achieved all his objectives by the eloquence of his words and prevailed upon Alexander to absolve the men from the charges against them and to grant all the other requests of the Athenians. (trans. Oldfather)

In my opinion, Diodorus' account can be linked to Hyperides' following description, which is expressed with bitter sarcasm and formulated in general terms. In it, Demades blackmails the people: if they do not accept the text of his proposed resolution, he will refuse to help them and leave the city:

ἀλλὰ, οἶμαι, τὰ πράγματα τῇ πόλει οὕτως νῦν περιέστηκεν, ὥς οὐκ ἂν ἐβουλόμην. ἐπεὶ τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀλγήσειεν, ὅταν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ὑμῶν κελευόντων ἀπαλείψαι τι τῶν γεγραμμένων μὴ ἐθέλῃ Δημάδης – ἄλλο γράψουσιν αὐτοῖς ὅτι φησὶ ἀπέναι ἐκ τῆς πόλεως – παρελθὼν δὲ τις τῶν κοινῶν αὐτοῦ εἴπῃ ὅτι ὑμεῖς, ὥς ἂν ἔχη, ψηφιεῖσθε ταῦτα, ὅπως ἂν δουλείαν ὑπάγειν ὑπὸ Δημάδου ἔχητε.⁶

⁴*Vitae X Or.* 848 E: καὶ περὶ τῶν στρατηγῶν ὧν ἤτει παρ' Ἀθηναίων ἀντείπε (...) καὶ περὶ τῶν τριήρων. Cf. WILL (1983) 45.

⁵D. S. XVII 15.3–5.

⁶Hyp. Dion. (22) 175^r 8–16.

But – I think – the city’s situation has now turned out in a way I would not have wished. For who would not be pained, whenever in the Assembly despite your call to expunge a clause in a written proposal Demades refuses (furthermore he will tell you when you intend to draft otherwise that he will leave the city), and one of his collaborators comes along and says that you will vote for this regardless, so that you can endure servitude by Demades. (trans. Carey with minor alterations)

Hyperides’ account of Demades, who insisted on his own terms and stuck to the text of his proposal, fits perfectly with the picture painted by Diodorus. If we understand the lines about Demades’ behaviour to refer to the second mission sent to Alexander, then these lines, which suggest very recent experiences, provide further clues to the date. Demades may have returned with a favourable response from Abae, where Alexander was already preoccupied with preparations for the campaign against Persia, at the end of November or beginning of December 335 BC.

3. The question of warships and the dispatch of the Paralus

A few lines below the passage quoted above, Hyperides again condemns Diondas:

καὶ γὰρ νῦν τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἔασω τῆς ἀσελγείας αὐτοῦ, ἔλεγε δὲ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ δεῖν ὑμᾶς τὴν Πάραλον πέμψαντας ὥς Ἀλεξάνδρον μέμφεσθαι αὐτῷ, ὅτι ὑστάτοις ὑμῖν ἐπέστειλεν περὶ τῶν τριήρων. οὕτως δὴλον, ὅτι τὸ λοιπὸν πρώτοις ἡμῖν ἐπιτάττει καὶ ἃ [οὐ]δ’ ἀναγκαζομένους καλῶς ἔχει ποιεῖν, ταῦ(τα) [ἀ]γανακ[τ]εῖ.⁷

Just now I shall omit the rest of his outrageous behaviour. But in the Assembly the other day he said that you should send the Paralus to Alexander and complain that he wrote to you last of all about the warships. So, it goes without saying that from now on he will command us to do everything first, and if we do not willingly do what we are forced to do, even if it is dishonourable, he will even become angry. (trans. Carey with minor alterations)

Regarding the warships, Hyperides is undoubtedly referring to Alexander’s request to the League of Corinth for military support for the invasion of Asia. The date of Alexander’s request to Athens is decisive for dating the speech. Although Hyperides’ statement ‘the recent assembly’ (πρώτῃ) may refer to a week or two, a month, or even a year, any data relating to the Macedonian king’s request (late winter/early spring of 334 BC) may confirm the above dating of the speech based on other considerations. Decades before the discovery of Hyperides’ Diondas speech, Will established that Alcimachus, as the king’s envoy, was on a mission to Athens in the winter of 335/4 BC.⁸ At the popular assembly, Demosthenes also spoke against Alcimachus, alongside Hyperides. The orator refers to the ‘recent’ assembly (πρώτῃ). The term appears once in Hyperides’ surviving speeches, where it clearly means ‘at the end of the previous month’ (Eux. [35] col. XXVII [XLIV] 8ff.). If we adhere to Hyperides’ usage, then the *terminus post quem* (one month after Alcimachus’s embassy) is January 334 BC.⁹

⁷Hyp. *Dion.* (24) 174^v 20ff.

⁸Will (1983) 57f.

⁹Rhodes (2009) 225f. agreed with my main conclusions regarding the dating, including that “the response to Alexander’s demands is the most likely occasion for Demades’ threat to leave the city, and that must have been towards the end of 335.” On the other hand, he places the trial a few months later, after the Macedonian victory at the Battle of Granicus, in May–June 334 BC.

My conclusion that the speech was delivered between January and March 334 BC is also based on what the orator said about the dispatch of the *Paralus*. *Paralus* was Athens' sacred 'corvette'. The ship, manned by a select crew of Athenian citizens, carried out diplomatic missions. Hyperides' indignation is justified by Diondas' unimaginable servility: in other words, Diondas wanted to 'reproach' the king for not having honoured Athens earlier as he had requested. This is a clear case of servility, if Diondas had not hesitated to send the state's 'corvette' on an inglorious boot-licking mission in winter (!) under dangerous sailing conditions.

III

Lane Fox agrees with the first of my three statements regarding dating (1), disputes the second (2), and has a completely different opinion about the third (3). The last of these (Lane Fox's revision of the third dating reference point) also nullifies my second statement.¹⁰

Ad 2. Regarding Hyp. *Dion.* (22) 175^f lines 10–16 (Demades' blackmailing in the assembly), Lane Fox is worth quoting in full.

Horváth proposes that this complaint refers precisely to the debates over sending an embassy to plead with Alexander to change his demand for several Athenian orators to be extradited to him for punishment in the aftermath, again, of the sack of Thebes. Horváth even proposes that the account, very brief, of the second Athenian debate about this affair in Diodorus Siculus is based on Hyperides' speech. This proposal is unconvincing. The allusion in the speech is not directly matched by what Diodorus narrates. In Diodorus, Demades brings a proposal 'skilfully' and nobody is said to have wanted some of it expunged nor is Demades said to have threatened to leave Athens if it was. Hyperides' speech was delivered some while after this debate. Diodorus' underlying source was probably Cleitarchus, but even if it was the Athenian Diyllus who was the son of Phanodemus, politically active at the time and an Attidographer later, Diodorus' narrative shows no sign anywhere else of drawing on an oblique reference in an orator's speech about quite a different topic, delivered at a different time to one under narration.¹¹

Ad 3. The question of warships and the dispatch of the *Paralus*, Hyp. *Dion.* (24) 174^v 20ff.

Regarding the indignation of the speaker quoted (whether it be Demades or Diondas), in other words why Alexander wrote to Athens last, Lane Fox explains that it is unlikely that Alexander would have turned to Athens within the framework of the League of Corinth's regulations:

If the reference is to his demand for them to be sent to his fleet in 334 BC it is not at all obvious why this demand was written 'last'. The demand was made through the League of Corinth to his Greek allies and none was more important than the Athenians, surely a first priority, not least because of the numbers of triremes in their harbours, far the most of any Greek state's. The putative

¹⁰Lane Fox accurately describes the essential elements of the international research, but we must clarify a few points. The work was not carried out exclusively by two research groups (one in London and the other in Budapest): the photographs were distributed between the leaders of these two groups and also between Judson Hermann and Natalie Tchernetska for the initial parallel work. The extent of the participating researchers' contributions is accurately documented in the archived correspondence, held in the archives of ELTE Eötvös József Collegium, and in the metadata of <https://hypereidoc.elte.hu/Hyperides.html>, developed for the project.

¹¹LANE FOX (2025) 20.

speaker also refers to despatch of the *Paralus*, the state trireme used on diplomatic missions. No such despatch is attested or even likely in the context of Alexander's demand for allied ships in 335/4 BC.¹²

According to the author, everyone mistranslated the Greek text because they adapted the passage to the accepted dating.

They take its aorist participle 'πέμψοντάς' as the equivalent of an infinitive 'πέμψαι', directly governed by the preceding 'δεῖν'. The first editors therefore translate it as 'you should send the *Paralus* to Alexander and complain etc.' This translation makes the need to send the *Paralus* to be part of the speaker's proposal, one which was not necessarily carried out. ... However, the supremely 'abominable behaviour' which Hyperides presents as exemplified in this incident is not the proposal to despatch the state trireme. It is the accompanying insistence on the need to protest to Alexander that he 'wrote to you last concerning the triremes'. Hyperides then grossly distorts this protest and presents it as one made with the aim 'clearly in future he [Alexander] may impose orders on you first [of all] about each thing'. This aim is Hyperides' rhetorical allegation, not the speaker's avowed aim at the time. It enables him to present the speaker's proposal as a supreme example of 'abominable behaviour'.¹³

Lane Fox suggests an alternative translation and interpretation:

the putative speaker said in the assembly that 'it is your duty, when you have despatched the *Paralus* to Alexander to complain to him that...'. The speaker is not saying that the *Paralus* *should* be despatched: he is tacking on the need to complain to Alexander face to face now that the *Paralus* is being sent to him anyway.

He concludes that the sources document a clear historical situation for the mission to which, in his opinion, the passage from the Diondas speech refers. According to Arrian's account, in 331 BC (late April, early May), the *Paralus* sailed to Tyre to meet Alexander, bearing, in addition to the crew of Athenian citizens (Πάραλοι), a certain Achilleus and Diophantus as envoys.

Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ ἅμα τῷ ἥρι ὑποφαίνοντι ἐκ Μέλφιος ἦει ἐπὶ Φοινίκης· καὶ ἐγεφυρώθη αὐτῷ ὁ τε κατὰ Μέλφιν πόρος τοῦ Νείλου καὶ αἱ διώρυχες αὐτοῦ πάσαι. ὥς δὲ ἀφίκετο ἐς Τύρον, καταλαμβάνει ἐνταῦθα ἦκον αὐτῷ ἤδη καὶ τὸ ναυτικόν. ἐν Τύρῳ δὲ αὐθις θύει τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ καὶ ἀγῶνα ποιεῖ γυμνικόν τε καὶ μουσικόν. ἐνταῦθα ἀφικνεῖται παρ' αὐτὸν ἐξ Ἀθηνῶν ἡ Πάραλος πρέσβεις ἄγουσα Διόφαντον καὶ Ἀχιλλέα· ξυνεπρέσβευον δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ οἱ Πάραλοι ξύμπαντες. καὶ οὗτοι τῶν τε ἄλλων ἔτυχον ὧν ἐνεκα ἐστάλησαν καὶ τοὺς αἰχμαλώτους ἀφῆκεν Ἀθηναίοις ὅσοι ἐπὶ Γρανίκῃ Ἀθηναίων ἐάλωσαν.¹⁴

As soon as spring began to appear, he went from Memphis to Phoenicia, bridging the stream of the Nile near Memphis, as well as the canals issuing from it. When he arrived at Tyre, he found his fleet already there. In this city he again offered sacrifice to Heracles, and celebrated both a gymnastic and musical contest. While there, the state vessel called the *Paralus* came to him from Athens, bringing Diophantus and Achilleus as envoys to him; and all the crew of the *Paralus* were joined with them in

¹²LANE FOX (2025) 18.

¹³LANE FOX (2025) 19.

¹⁴Arr. *Anab.* III 6.1–5. Lane Fox points out that Aeschines also mentions this mission in 330 BC. (III 162): 'Ὡς γὰρ φασιν οἱ Πάραλοι καὶ οἱ πρεσβεύσαντες πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα εἰκότως πιστεύεται, ἔστι τις Ἀριστίων Πλαταϊκός, ὁ τοῦ Ἀριστοβούλου τοῦ φαρμακοπόλου υἱός, εἴ τις ἄρα καὶ ὑμῶν γινώσκει.

the embassy. These men obtained all the requests which they were despatched to make, and the king gave up to the Athenians all their fellow-citizens who had been captured at the Granicus. (trans. Chinnock)

The Athenians had previously asked Alexander to release the Athenian prisoners of war who had been captured at Granicus and taken to Macedonia, but the king had refused to do so in Gordium, saying that they should ask again when the situation was right.¹⁵ This new situation arose at the beginning of 331 BC, when Alexander had practically defeated the Persians. Arrian mentions that, in addition to the matter of the prisoners of war, the envoys of the Paralus also succeeded in achieving their other requests: τῶν τε ἄλλων ἔτυχον ὧν ἕνεκα ἐστάλησαν. According to Lane Fox, the unmentioned other matters refer to the return of the twenty Athenian ships that Alexander had detained in 334 BC. Diodorus, whose reports, according to Lane Fox, supplement Arrian's in several places, including here, says that although Alexander released the ships of all the allied Greek states that fought alongside him in 334 BC, he made an exception of the twenty ships of the Athenians. He did not send them home in order to secure his siege engines during the advance:

τῆς δὲ ναυτικῆς δυνάμεως οὐσης ἀχρήστου καὶ δαπάνας μεγάλας ἐχούσης κατέλυσε τὸ ναυτικὸν πλὴν ὀλίγων νεῶν, αἷς ἐχρήτο πρὸς τὴν παρακομιδὴν τῶν πολιορκητικῶν ὀργάνων, ἐν αἷς ἦσαν αἱ παρ' Ἀθηναίων νῆες συμμαχιδὲς εἴκοσιν.¹⁶

Since the naval force was now useless and entailed great expense, he dismissed the fleet with the exception of a few ships which he employed for the transport of his siege engines. Among these was the Athenian contingent of twenty ships. (transl. Oldfather)

The correct context for Hyperides' remarks about a despatch of the Paralus, spring 331 BC, makes the 'need to complain to Alexander that he wrote to you last concerning the triremes' readily intelligible. The triremes, at this date, were the 20 Athenian ones held by Alexander since summer 334. Indeed he could be said to have 'written to you last' about them, perhaps from Miletus in summer 334 BC when he may have written first to other Greek allies confirming his disbanding of the ships they had been financing for him, perhaps again in a letter after his answer to the embassy received at Gordium or simply because the triremes were a matter outstanding in 331 BC which he had still not addressed in a letter at all.¹⁷

In summary, in April–May 331 BC, the Athenians decided to send the Paralus to Alexander; "Demades might well have been the main proposer. Another speaker, Diondas, added a proposal that the embassy should 'complain to Alexander that he wrote to them last of all about the triremes'."¹⁸ After Alexander fulfilled the embassy's request, the supporters of Macedon felt that the time had come to bring the case against Hyperides. "Diondas brought the case in June–July

¹⁵Arr. *Anab.* I 29.5–6.

¹⁶D. S. XVII 22.5.

¹⁷LANE FOX (2025) 20.

¹⁸LANE FOX (2025) 21.

331 BC and was crushingly defeated.”¹⁹ The later dating further supports the close cooperation between the two orators, Hyperides and Demosthenes, which has been analysed and demonstrated by many, in terms of the argumentation strategies and certain elements of the defence speeches.²⁰

IV

For Lane Fox, the key point of the dating is the question of warships and the dispatch of the Paralus (3), i.e., the precise interpretation of the passage in Hyp. *Dion.* (24) 174^v 20ff. The interpretation of lines (22) 175^r 10–16 (Demades’ blackmailing in the assembly) is secondary to this, because if the third point is correct, the preceding argument becomes unjustified. For this reason, I will reverse the order of my counterarguments and write first about the proposal concerning the Paralus and the question of warships.

Ad 3. Lane Fox essentially presents a philological (a) and a historical (interpreting sources) (b) argument, or set of arguments, to support his position.

- (a) The philological argument that in the sentence ἔλεγε δὲ ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ δεῖν ὑμᾶς τὴν Πάραλον πέμψαντας ὥς Ἀλεξάνδρον μέμφεσθαι αὐτῷ, ὅτι ὑστάτοις ὑμῖν ἐπέστειλεν περὶ τῶν τριήρων the πέμψαντας aor. pt. form indicates such a precedence in relation to μέμφεσθαι that it actually appears in an almost perfect sense and conveys the present state, i.e., the Athenians had already decided to send the Paralus (the Paralus was sent – a *fait accompli*), and all further action follows from this and is based on it. Although no one has previously advocated this interpretation, he could be right. Below, however, I quote two examples from prose texts of high literary standard which clearly show that the aorist participle used in such context is not *suo iure* prior in time, but merely a precursor to the subsequent action, preparing the way for it, which we must understand as part of (a prerequisite for) the action in the proposed imperfect (or infinitive).

¹⁹According to Lane Fox, Alexander agreed to the Athenians’ request not only because the embassy had been excellently prepared (for example, the presence of Achilles, whose name does not appear elsewhere in Athenian public life, must have particularly pleased Alexander, who respected the king of the Myrmidons), but also due to practical considerations: it was then that Alexander learned (see Arr. *Anab.* III 6.1–5) that the Peloponnesians were in revolt, so by releasing the Athenian prisoners of war and warships, he hoped to prevent Athens supporting Agis. Lane Fox also considers that the orators sometimes supplemented their speeches later, before publication. Regarding Diondas’ proposal, he concludes that it was certainly not a later addition, because Diondas could hardly have spoken at the popular assembly after his condemnation. “The putative speaker ‘was saying in the recent assembly’. ‘Recently’, πρώτῃ, can be used by Demosthenes to refer back across a span of more than a year, but as the word-order in this phrase is ‘the recent assembly’, not ‘recently in the assembly’, and the verb ἔλεγε is in the imperfect tense, ‘was saying’, it reads more readily as a reference close to the date of the text.”

²⁰“The two orators may have collaborated and discussed lines of attack on several occasions. The true date of Hyperides’ speech gives them even more scope to do so. They had nearly seven years, not three, in which to work out themes to use in the suits about Demosthenes’ crowning which at some point were likely to come to trial.” Lane Fox refers to TODD (2009), RUBINSTEIN (2000) 224 and n. 89, and also HORVÁTH (2009) 200f. n. 56.

Ἐκ τούτου οἱ μὲν ἀμφὶ Κλέανδρον ἤριστων· τὴν δὲ στρατιὰν συνήγαγε Ξενοφῶν καὶ συνεβούλευε πέμψαι ἄνδρας πρὸς Κλέανδρον παραιτησομένους περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν. ἐκ τούτου ἔδοξεν αὐτοῖς πέμψαντας στρατηγούς καὶ λοχαγούς καὶ Δρακόντιον τὸν Σπαρτιάτην καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ ἐδόκουν ἐπιτήδαιοι εἶναι δεῖσθαι Κλέανδρου κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀφείναι τὸν ἄνδρα.²¹

The decision following the proposal should be understood as follows: that it was decided that envoys would be sent (in order) to request... It is not a statement that, since envoys had already been elected, they should make the request while they were going anyway.

οὐ δὲ ἔνεκα ἐδόκει δεῖν τριήρεις πέμψαντας τὴν θάλασσαν φρουρεῖν παραπλεύσας, (ἀπέστησαν γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἐν Πλαταμῶνι βασιλέως, δείσαντες μὴ ὑπὸ μεγάλου δουκὸς ἁλώσι στόλῳ ἐπελθόντος,) ἵνα μὴ ἐξῇ Καντακουζηνῷ πρεσβεῖαν πέμπειν πρὸς Ἀμοῦρ. καὶ ἐτελεῖτο κατὰ τὰ βεβουλευμένα.²²

Here, too, it is not that warships that have already been dispatched are given further tasks, but rather that the decision to dispatch the ships is an integral part and prerequisite of the execution of the task (φρουρεῖν).²³

Lane Fox's interpretation of πέμψαντας as 'it is your duty, when you have dispatched the Paralus to Alexander to complain to him that...' is, in my opinion, forced and insufficiently substantiated from a philological point of view.²⁴

- (b) One of the starting points for the historical (source interpreting) argument is what we know about the missions of the state "corvette", the Paralus. Lane Fox emphasizes that we know of such a mission in 331 BC, but not in 334 BC. But does every mission undertaken by the Paralus have a surviving report? Moreover, even those that did not take place (since, in my opinion, Diondas' proposal in 334 BC was obviously not accepted)?

The other crucial point is the question of the triremes. Lane Fox considers it unlikely that the expression περὶ τῶν τριήρων refers to the ships requested from Athens in 334 BC within the framework of the League of Corinth: why would Alexander have turned to perhaps his most important ally last? However, in my opinion, this is not a reference to the 'self-evident' call-up of the Athenian unit specified in the alliance treaty, but a request or demand for twice that number! Although the text is difficult to read and its restoration is uncertain overall, the phrase 'twice as many warships for some vassal role' is certain in the following passage:

²¹Xen. *Anab.* VI 6.29ff.

²²Cantacuzenus, *Hist.* Vol. II 383.7ff. (Schopen).

²³In a completely different context, but with the same grammatical meaning, see, for example: τὰ οὐδέτερα ἢ μονογενὴ ἐστὶν ἢ ἀπὸ ἀρσενικῶν παρεσχηματισμένα· τὰ οὖν παρεσχηματισμένα ἐνὶ περιλαβῶν κανόνι φησὶ τὴν τῶν ἀρσενικῶν ἔχειν κλίσιν, δηλονότι ἐπὶ γενικῆς καὶ δοτικῆς· αἱ γὰρ λοιπαὶ πτώσεις τοῖς κανόνσι τῶν οὐδετέρων ἔπονται. Δεῖ δὲ μὴ προπετῶς ἀποκρίνεσθαι ἐν ταῖς περὶ τούτων ἀποκρίσεσιν, ἀλλὰ διαστείλαντας καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς συνεμπτώσεως πλάνην προανελόντας τὸν προσήκοντα τῆς κλίσεως ἀποδιδόναι λόγον. Sophronius, *Excerpta* 406.2ff. (*Grammatici Graeci*, vol. 4.2, Hilgard)

²⁴We might add that neither does the word order of the sentence support Lane Fox's interpretation: the word δεῖν comes before πέμψαντας. (I would like to express my thanks to Glenn Most for this observation).

Διώνδας δὲ νῦν μὲν οὐκ ἀγανακτεῖ εἰ ὑπὲρ τοῦ
 ἑτέρῳι ἀκολουθεῖν διπλᾶς τρι[ή]ρεις . . . ο
 ὥσει . . . , ἀλλὰ καὶ γράφει αφ . αυ [κ]α[ι] φησι²⁵

Diondas, however, now does not complain that *they are forcing* us to deploy twice as many warships for some vassal role; even on the contrary, he directly proposes that we *make a voluntary offer*

I have previously discussed at length the highly controversial question of Athens' numerical obligations within the League of Corinth in terms of individual branches of the military, including the number of warships to be offered, based on other new figures found in the Diondas speech.²⁶ The final result cannot go beyond the level of a new hypothesis, which I consider to be strong. Nevertheless, based on the above-quoted passage from the Diondas speech and the fierce protest of the Athenians, which can also be inferred from other sources,²⁷ I believe that *περὶ τῶν τριήρων* refers to the number of warships which was (at least) twice that stipulated in the regulations of the League of Corinth.

If this is the case, as I am convinced it is, it immediately becomes clear why Alexander turned to the Athenians last. He certainly knew that he would encounter resistance, but he may have considered such resistance easier to overcome if he could already point to the 'extra offers' made by the other allies.

On the other hand, I do not find it convincing to link Diondas' 'reproachful' suggestion regarding the 'last' request for triremes with the twenty Athenian ships withheld by Alexander. (Moreover, the return of the ships at Tyre in 331 BC is also unprovable, although it is an appealing suggestion.) From the basic tone of the speech and the context of the text under examination, it seems clear that at the 'recently held assembly' Diondas wanted to 'reproach' the king because Alexander ought to consider Athens his best ally – or, from Hyperides' point of view, as his best 'servant'. The underlying reason for Diondas' 'reproach' is therefore the fact that Alexander turned to Athens last, implying that he did not consider them the best ally, but rather the worst. The sarcastic distortion of this endeavour – indeed an rhetorical exaggeration, but one that reinforces the above interpretation of the passage – is Hyperides' comment following *περὶ τῶν τριήρων* quoted above ("So, it goes without saying that from now on he will command us to do everything first, and if we do not willingly do what we are forced to do, even if it is dishonourable, he will even become angry.") Based on this, how could we apply Diondas' reproach to the dismissal of the twenty Athenian ships that Alexander detained in 334 BC (and, if we accept the interpretation of Arrian's text, finally released in Tyre in 331 BC)? What would underlie the reproach? That, unlike the ships of other Greek allies, which he had released three years earlier, Alexander sent a message to Athens last? This would not be a servile 'reproach' or an adulator's 'rebuke', but a hostile, even indignant demand to know why

²⁵Hyp. *Dion.* (14) 144^f 32ff. In the apparatus of my 2014 edition of the text, I suggested the following interpretation and additions to the passage: "cum vestigia litt. valde incerta sint, sententiam hoc modo restitui: Diondas, adulator Macedonum, sicut eum orator describit, munera exsolvenda libenter suscipit eaque Athenienses sua sponte et ultro offerre hortatur. Exemplum de foedere cum Thebanis atque de bello adversus Philippum capit, quod Hyperide et Demosthene ducibus Athenienses pro libertate Graecorum antea fecerunt." And: "in lacuna fortasse ἀναγκάζομεθα ἢ ἀποδώσειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ γράφει ἀφ' αὐτῶν δοῦναι καὶ φησι – vel simile, quod non ubique cum vestigiis litt. congruit".

²⁶HORVÁTH (2009) 214–222 and HORVÁTH (2014) 50–61.

²⁷Plut. *Phoc.* XVI and XXI, see WILL (1983) 18, n. 115. and HORVÁTH (2014) 55.

Alexander was releasing the Athenian ships last. Moreover, Hyperides' sarcastic statement quoted above reveals his belief that Diondas only wanted to speed up the implementation of demands that were disadvantageous to Athens rather than advantageous. How could this be linked to the release of the twenty ships? All this would be more understandable in 334 BC, when Alexander turned to Athens last in order to request a larger number of warships.

Ad 2. The connection between the passages in Diodorus and Hyperides is indeed unprovable; I have merely presumed it (and continue to believe in it) based on the content of the speech and the formulations relating to the historical situation. I appreciate that for Lane Fox (especially because of his new dating proposal discussed in point 3) "this proposal is unconvincing". However, Lane Fox goes further, arguing against such a connection on the basis that certain elements highlighted by Hyperides are missing from Diodorus' account: "In Diodorus, Demades brings a proposal 'skilfully' and nobody is said to have wanted some of it expunged nor is Demades said to have threatened to leave Athens if it was [...]." Certainly, Diodorus did not rely directly on Hyperides, and Lane Fox is right to suggest that Cleitarchus or Diyllus may have been the intermediary sources.²⁸ However, the events described by the two authors, on the one hand with the brevity and detachment characteristic of the historical genre, and on the other hand with exaggerated but realistic rhetorical descriptions based on personal experience, belong together according to my reconfirmed dating of 334 BC.²⁹

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CAREY, C. ET AL. (2008). Fragments of Hyperides' 'Against Diondas' from the Archimedes Palimpsest. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 165: 1–19.
- HORVÁTH, L. (2008). Dating Hyperides' Against Diondas. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 166: 27–36.
- HORVÁTH, L. (2009). Hyperidea. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 52: 187–222.
- HORVÁTH, L. (2014). *Der „Neue Hyperides“, Textedition, Studien und Erläuterungen*. De Gruyter, Berlin–München–Boston.
- HORVÁTH, L. (2015). *Az új Hypereidés [The New Hyperides]*. TypoteX, Budapest.
- LANE FOX, R.J. (2025). Hyperides Against Diondas: Correcting the Date. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 233: 15–23.
- RHODES, P.J. (2009). Against Diondas – Two Problems. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 52: 223–228.

²⁸It is true that my wording: "I suppose that Diodorus' account depends on Hyperides' description worded with bitter irony" (p. 192) is inaccurate and unfounded. I readily accept the existence of the intermediary sources. The exaggerated, categorical statement about the direct connection between Diodorus' description and Hyperides' wording stemmed from my enthusiasm in finding a connection between the two. I should have phrased it more carefully, e.g.: I suppose that the content of Diodorus' account ultimately depends on the events described by Hyperides, where they are worded with bitter irony. However, in German (HORVÁTH (2014) 15): "Nach unserer Annahme ist die sarkastische Darstellungsweise des Hyperides (Dion. 22. 175r. 8ff.) mit dem Bericht des Diodor in Zusammenhang zu bringen." and in Hungarian (HORVÁTH (2015) 29): "Véleményem szerint Diodóros beszámolójával hozható összefüggésbe Hypereidés elkeseredett gúnnyal, általánosságban megfogalmazott leírása."

²⁹For Rhodes' position supporting my opinion, see n. 9.

- RUBINSTEIN, L. (2000). *Litigation and Cooperation: Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens* (Historia Einzelschriften, Heft 147). F. Steiner, Stuttgart.
- TODD, S.C. (2009). Hyperides Against Diondas, Demosthenes on the Crown, and Rhetoric of Political Failure. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 52: 161–174.
- WILL, W. (1983). *Athen und Alexander. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Stadt von 338–322 v. Chr.* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und Rechtsgeschichte 77). C. H. Beck, München.