Photius on the Ten Orators
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The differences between the two surviving versions of *The Lives of the Ten Orators* have given rise to various explanations for the history of the treatise. The original work of that title is no. 55 of Plutarch's *Moria* (832B–52C: hereafter 'Ps.-Plutarch'), and a second version is presented in codices 259–68 of Photius' *Bibliotheca*. The differences between the two, some major, some minor, are many. In the *Bibliotheca*, for example, most of the lives have been rearranged to present a more chronological flow of narrative. The pinax in which Photius lists the works contained in the *Bibliotheca* gives the ten orators' lives in the traditional order, by birth, in which they occur in the *Moria*. In the codices themselves, however, *Isocrates* appears second, not fourth, *Lycurgus* has been moved from seventh place to tenth,¹ and almost every life shows minor deletions and additions when compared with the corresponding life as given by Ps.-Plutarch. Four of the lives, however, are prefaced by extensive stylistic criticisms. These range from collections of brief comments to a twenty-five-line quotation of Caecilius of Caleacte on Antiphon's use of figures (485B 14–40).

¹ I have found no other example of such reordering. Whether or not it was Photius who reorganized this material, it is more likely that someone rearranging an already written work would put less organized items into better order than that the process of transmission could produce as many changes for the worse as these lives show. This contradicts the assumption basic to source criticism that the later order is a degraded version of the original.

Both the *Bibl.* pinax and the traditional order of the *Lives* are firmly attested by the manuscripts. The Dinarchus life, codex 267, ends with the sentence, "In these sections is a record of the speeches that were read of the nine orators," and the first words of the *Lycurgus* codex continues, "But we did not have time to read the speeches of Lycurgus, who is the equal of any." Although Photius moved the life of Lycurgus because he did not read his speeches, the change in the case of *Isocrates* and the discrepancy between the pinax order and the actual order remain puzzling; cf. 185 infra.
The differences presented by the *Bibl.* version have received much study, the results of which still embrace the verdict that the lives given by Photius are purely derivative texts to which no change has been made. This opinion lingers despite Photius’ acknowledged rôle as an active editor and critic possessing a strong sense of style. In fact, comparison of some of the material in 259–68 with examples of Photius’ prose and his editing in other parts of the *Bibl.* suggests that here as elsewhere he gave much attention to the question of literary style. I shall argue that Photius wrote more than the perfunctory comments placing the codices in the context of the *Bibl.*: he also introduced and commented on some of the quoted stylistic criticism, and he seems to have offered a few critical remarks of his own.

I

Scholarly work has in general either dealt with these codices only in part or, when it has actually examined them, drawn debatable conclusions. Most recently, Warren T. Treadgold has maintained that “They do not include any excerpts from the orations. Instead, they are made up of extracts from a lost work which Photius calls simply a ‘history’ and which was plagiarized

2 These codices begin, as do many others in the *Bibl.*, with a sentence reporting what work(s)—in this case how many speeches—were read.

in an earlier version by the author of the Ps.-Plutarchan Lives of the Ten Orators.” Treadgold cites A. Mayer and R. Ballheimer, who believed that Photius had not the time, interest or (in Mayer’s opinion) ability to make any of the changes from the original version. Ballheimer, whose conclusion Mayer was citing, appears to be the originating force behind this assessment of codices 259–68. His arguments need to be re-examined, for he is cited as though he presented compelling evidence that Photius and Ps.-Plutarch were fundamentally different in a way that demanded the positing of an older source. His method, however, is typical of the source criticism of his time, and his conclusions are insupportable.

Mayer, rev. A. Vonach, “Die Berichte des Photius über die fünf ältern attischen Redner,” CommAenipont 5 (1910) 14–76, in BZ 20 (1911) 220–23. Mayer assumed that Photius was unable to make any of the changes that distinguish his from the Mor. version. This is the only basis for Mayer’s criticism of Vonach for minimizing these differences. Vonach’s “complicated and unnecessary arguments” (Treadgold, supra n.4: 48 n.45) are actually a list of possible sources for the brief, unattributed stylistic criticisms in the section of the Lives that is common to both Ps.-Plutarch and Photius. Vonach’s study, which covered the first five lives, produced no surprises, and he concluded that for these lives Photius was either drawing from the sources he named or simply commenting himself. Vonach is mistaken, however, in reporting that the Bibl. version contains no textual readings better than the corresponding passages in Ps.-Plutarch (cf. n.13 infra). He claims (222£), citing Ballheimer (De Photi viis decem oratorum [diss.Bonn 1877: hereafter ‘Ballheimer’]),

daß die Vorlage des Photios nicht die uns erhaltenen Ps.-Plutarchischen Viten gewesen sein können, sondern eine (von Phot. cod. 268 mit den Worten ὑπὸ ἑλλεὶθεν ἔπιθεν zitierte) noch nicht auf Plutarchs Namen getaufte ältere und vollständigere Fassung unserer Biographien, die sich vor der Abfassung des Lampriaskatalogs von der später ins Corpus Plutarchium geratenen Rezension abgetrennt haben muß. Dieser schon von Ballheimer s.12ff festgestellten Erkenntnis konnte V. nur durch falsche Interpretation der Tatsachen aus dem Wege gehen.

E. Orth, Photiana (Leipzig 1928), whom Treadgold notes was apparently unaware of Ballheimer’s work, believed (89) the same of Photius, conjecturing that he found the contents of these codices in a compendium of critical commentary similar to those he believed Photius depended on for his knowledge of first-, second-, and third-century rhetorical writers.

Cuvigny, ed., Plutarque, Oeuvres Morales XII.1 (Paris 1981) 35 n.1, notes that A. Prasse, De Plutarchi quae feruntur Vitis X oratorum (diss.Marburg 1891), ‘disproved’ Ballheimer’s theory, but this is not actually true. The
Ballheimer based his conclusions about the sources for the lives on the biographical text common to both works, not the critical additions in Photius’ version. His arguments concern three different groups of textual features: (1) several small additions and changes in the part of the text common to Photius and Ps.-Plutarch (some of phrasing only) that he believed Photius could not have made (4–11); (2) various minor omissions, likewise ‘impossible’ for Photius (11–29); and (3) comments in the Photius version that do not appear in Ps.-Plutarch but which he nonetheless judged were not Photius’ words. Regarding the separate and longer critical comments on style that appear in Photius and not in Ps.-Plutarch (the material upon which I base my own conclusions), Ballheimer shared the opinion, common to his time, that the authors Photius cited were so various that he could not have drawn them from his own knowledge or reading but must have been using a compendium (33–36).

Under headings (1) and (3), Ballheimer asserted that Photius could not have added from memory such things as Xenophon’s name to the list of Isocrates’ pupils, or four words, which amount to a mere rephrasing, to the sword/spit story in the Demosthenes life.7 He also isolated several phrases of the type “quae rhetoricam originem sapit”—for example in the life of Lysias (489B 29, added to 835D8): ἐπολιτεύτω τῶν πολλῶν

four ‘errors’ Prasse (15–18) considered proof that Photius drew from Ps.-Plutarch are either the kind of differences that may be expected in two such texts or are not errors at all.

A possible exception to Ballheimer’s influence seemed to be J. Schamp, Photios historien des lettres. La Bibliothèque et ses notices biographiques (Liège 1987), who examined the biographical and bibliographical material that Photius added to several of his codices and gives Photius full credit for its inclusion. But in the case of codices 259–68, Schamp believes there were two versions, one circulating with the works of the orators, and therefore augmented with rhetorical criticism (the Photian version), and one consisting of lives culled from these editions and put together in the form of a biographical treatise and attributed to Plutarch (Mor. version), both ultimately deriving from an older common source. Schamp expressed this view by letter, 17 May 1991, at which time his oral paper on the codices and subsequent article were forthcoming.

7 Ballheimer 4f on Isocrates (Mor. 837c8; Bibl. 486B36) and Demosthenes (Mor. 844ε6; Bibl. 493A11).
In Ballheimer's view Photius could not have added these elements himself; and because they were not in Ps.-Plutarch they must derive from a version older than both.

Under heading (2) the arguments concerning omissions in Photius' version of items in the Mor. are similarly vitiated by Ballheimer's low estimation of Photius' abilities. The Ps.-Plutarch life of Andocides (Mor. 834C6–3D), for instance, contains an explanation of Andocides' involvement in the profanation of the mysteries that is omitted in Photius (Bibl. 488A27). Ballheimer thus explains the discrepancy: "aut consulto ab hoc omissos esse statuendum—qui quamvis multa falsi securus e 'Plutarcho' transcripsit, uta duas quasi traditionis viae sumamus...." From this point on Ballheimer simply assumes that there were two lines of transmission, one in which the gloss entered the text and one, Photius', in which it did not. He argued similarly from examples in the Lycurgus life, where the list of Lycurgus' services performed for the city is edited in the Bibl. by removal of two small sections. Ballheimer was...

---

8 "He was fairly active in public affairs." The other sentences of this type are Demosthenes (494b15, added to 846e8), καταλμπόν ὁ ρήτωρ τὴν μηδ' ἐσωτήρ δυναμένην σῶσαι πόλιν ἔφυγε ("Leaving a city that was unable to save even itself, the orator fled."); Demosthenes (493b311, added to 845b55), δηλῶν μέγα μέρος εἶναι τῆς ἐν τῷ δῆμῳ πεποίησα τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ("demonstrating that a great part of his influence over the people was his skill in delivery"); Demosthenes (494a111, added to 845e9), τῆς μὲν συμβάσεις τύχης ἰδιῶς οὕδεν ἐνδεέστερον, τῆς δ' ἀλλής αὐτοῦ περὶ λόγους δυνάμεως οὕκ ἀλήγα ἐνδεέστερον ("perhaps not falling short of the events that had befallen, but not a little falling short of his usual power of speaking").

9 Ballheimer 14; Cuvigny (supra n.6) 199 n.3 thinks that this is a marginal gloss.

10 A paraphrase translation indicates the omitted sections in brackets: "Lycurgus had a notable public career; was entrusted also with the public finances; was treasurer for three periods of four years in charge of 14,000 talents [or as some say, and among them the man who proposed the vote of honors for him, Stratocles the orator, 18,650 talents; was elected the first time but afterwards ran under the name of a friend because of a law concerning the treasury; and was always devoted to public affairs, summer and winter]. When elected to provide war munitions, he restored many buildings in the city; provided 400 triremes; [constructed the gymnasium in the Lyceum and planted trees in it; built the palaestra and finished the Dionysiac theater when he was in charge of it; took care of 250 talents on private trust; provided gold and silver ornaments for use in procession and gold Victories]; and finished many buildings, including the ship-sheds and the arsenal. He put the foundation walls around the Panathenaic stadium and leveled the ravine."
prepared to grant that the first section was a spurious addition, but he still considered it one that Photius the “proto-secretarius” would not have been “doctus” enough to have recognized and removed. Likewise he argued that the second fit too smoothly into the text for anyone to have removed it editorially; thus Photius did not receive these in the version of the life he copied, and they were therefore proof of two recensions from a single older source.

Whether it was Photius or an unknown copier of the Lives who did the paring down, the deletions are no proof of the existence of a common source for Ps.-Plutarch and Photius. In fact, a single clear sign of editing in the Bibl. tells against Ballheimer’s theory. It has been noticed more than once that whoever edited the Photian version of the life of Lycurgus did not retain all five of the laws that appear in Mor. 841f5–42 α10 (Bibl. 497 λ30–34). There the laws are spelled out and are followed by a story concerning the fifth, which Lycurgus’ own wife is said to have been acquitted for violating. In the Bibl. version we find only the last law described, and it is introduced by the phrase: ἔποιήσατο δὲ καὶ νόμον εἰσφοράς διαφόρων ὅν ἐστιν πέμπτος. Whoever condensed the list lets us know what he was reading in full when he chose to preserve only the fifth item.11

These small differences in the biographical text of the two versions, both additions and subtractions, are not surprising, considering the separate traditions and the different ages of the Bibl. and Mor. versions. Such changes may have been made by Photius or may have come about in the long course of transmission between the second and ninth centuries. But the question should be viewed in the light of Photius’ style of excerpting, which often condenses and adds to original material. In either case, Ballheimer’s investigation draws attention to the details of difference between the two versions without proving his claim.12

---

11 Henry’s note to this section quotes Ballheimer’s opinion but reminds us that this sort of trimming was typical of Photius’ excerpting method.

12 On the textual tradition cf. C. G. Lowe, “The Manuscript Tradition of Pseudo-Plutarch’s Vitae Decem Oratorum,” Univ. Ill. St. Lang. Lit 9 (1924) 4–53, and introductions to the editions of the Mor. by Jürgen Mau (Leipzig 1971) i–viii, and Cuvigny (supra n.6) 35–38. Lowe (23f) deduced that the common archetype for all our manuscripts of the Mor. containing the Lives of the Ten Orators was an extremely corrupt minuscule text of the ninth century. While
We can see positive indications of Photius’ own editing in the longer critical additions at the beginning of four of the lives. These substantial additions, clearly independent of the Mor. version, have been attributed to a rhetorical reference book of some sort that Photius is assumed to have used. Since Orth’s time, Photius has been recognized as an active editor and critic, if not in these codices, despite the resemblance in several sections to Photius’ work as we see it in other parts of the Bibl. For even prior to detailed examination of these sections, a general similarity is evident. Although the codices on the orators are unique in the Bibl. in giving biographical material in place of a report on the material read, the critical additions to the lives of Demosthenes and Lysias have one partial parallel. Codex 176 of the Bibl. is a report on selections from Theopompus’ Philippica; following the report, Photius gives a patchwork of biographical and bibliographical information that looks to be drawn from several different sources. Unlike the stylistic commentary at the beginnings of the Demosthenes and

warning against editing the Mor. lives by Photius’ text unless the wording is almost identical, Cuvigny (35ff) states that Photius’ text bears witness that errors common to all our manuscripts were present in the ninth century. Editions of the Mor. lives are full of readings supplied by Photius (e.g. Bibl. 486A14: ἐν Πεισάνδρῳ, Mor. 833c5f: σὺν Πεισάνδρῳ; Bibl. 488A28: εἰσενεγκάμενος, Mor. 834d10: εὐεργετάμενος; Bibl. 489A41: θρασυβαίνων, Mor. 835f8: θρασύλαυοι; Bibl. 488B28: δημηγορία, Mor. 835B5: δημηγορία; Bibl. 486B13: Ἐρίκτως, Mor. 836f2: ἀρχηγέως; Bibl. 487A6: μὲν ἦς; Mor. 837e7: μὲν ἦς μόνας—Mau and Cuvigny do not make it clear how many Mss give this reading; Westermann moved μόνας to improve the sense—Bibl. 487A6: εἰκασθείν—cf. Smythe 2279—Mor. 837e1: ἐκμαθήθη or -οι; Bibl. 487B8: τριπολερίειν, Mor. 838A8: τριπόλης; Bibl. 487B9: καὶ δίς, Mor. 838A8: καὶ τὸ δίς—all Mss. thus, but Mau gives κύτταρος; Bibl. 497e1: μοὶ γέγονε βοηθῶς, Mor. 842c2: βοηθησαί, μόνης εἰσήγαγε—H. the scribe apparently saw the correct original, βοηθῆσαι; cf. Mau 25—Bibl. 493b27: πολεμική, Mor. 845D6: πολιτική; Bibl. 495b16: Κολλυτεύς, Mor. 848D5: Κολλυττεύς—or τετευος or τετευε—Bibl. 495B24: Δημοσθένεις, Mor. 848f1 Δημοσθένους), but I have found nothing in the textual readings that indicates that Photus’ version is anything but a later version of the Ps.-Plutarch.

Lysias codices, this information is not strictly critical, nor does it actually replace the report on the history. It is, however, the same sort of commentary-in-pastiche that prefaces the lives of Lysias and Demosthenes. J. Schamp attempts to identify the various sources of this information, and although his analysis differs slightly from mine, his conclusion about the overall nature of the passage is the same: “En somme, on échappe difficilement à l'impression que Photios a utilisé le bios comme un canevas qu'il a nourri des éléments tirés de ses lectures et de ses constatations personnelles.” 13 Photius quotes from several sources, whether directly or indirectly, including Theopompus, Duris of Samos, Cleocharis of Smyrlea, and “they,” and he also comments on Theopompus’ claim that the historians of former times were inferior to those of his own age: “But who it is in earlier times he speaks of I am not able to conjecture clearly, since I do not assume that he dared to include Herodotus and Thucydides” (121 A 14ff, οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς συμβαλεῖν. οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε τολμήσαι αὐτὸν ὑπολαμβάνω). Here and in the Bibl. generally Schamp concluded that Photius drew his biographical and bibliographical information from supplementary resources he found in the manuscripts of the authors he was reading. This is a substantial part of Photius’ material contribution to the Bibl., along with his occasional informed queries on matters of authenticity and the stylistic analyses. 14

Turning to the specific, the stylistic criticisms in codices 259–68—which are lengthy additions to the Ps.-Plutarch version—show clear signs of Photius’ personal involvement with the material. Four aspects of this critical commentary are similar to Photius’ work in other parts of the Bibl. First, Photius here as elsewhere speaks in the first person and makes direct comments. Second, two sentences, one in the life of Isocrates and one in that of Aeschines, resemble in style and vocabulary Photius’ one hundred and thirty or so stylistic descriptions of authors with whom Photius was familiar; they are quoted in a

13 Schamp (supra n.6) 359; cf. 353–68 for his analysis of the passage.
14 Cf. Schamp (supra n.6) and Treadgold (supra n.4) 97–110 on Photius’ literary interests; L. Van Hook “The Literary Criticism of Photius in the Bibliotheca of Photius,” CP 4 (1909) 178–89, presents several examples and illustrates Photius’ tastes and his expressive imagery in describing the effects of an author’s style; Kustas (supra n.3) shows how the critical vocabulary of Hermogenes was employed by Photius in the structure of his own aesthetic, which was imbued with the ethical values of Christianity.
way that shows that they are being fitted into their present context. Finally, several general observations are made in the codices on Isocrates, Lysias, and Demosthenes that are similar in vocabulary and style not only to the prose of the introduction and postscript of the Bibl., but also to relevant passages in Photius’ letters and treatises. When these four points are taken together and considered in light of Photius’ work in general, the greater differences between the Ps.-Plutarch lives and the Photius’ version are readily explainable as products of Photius’ own method.

Four times in codices 259–68 Photius speaks in the first person, and although this was largely ignored in the assessments of those who did not believe in Photius’ involvement here, all these occurrences have been noted at one time or another. The first is at the beginning of the codex on Isocrates. The text of Ps.-Plutarch text lists Isocrates’ works, including a rhetorical handbook; Photius adds (46888) that he has seen this work: ἢν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἤσμεν τοῦ ἀνδρός ἐπιγραφομένην τῷ ὀνόματι. A second example occurs later in the same codex (487α1–17), also inserted into the Ps.-Plutarch text (at Mor. 837α4) that lists and describes the orator’s work: τὸν μὲν ὅν περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως καὶ τῶν πανηγυρικῶν καὶ τινὰς τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν εἴρηται μοι ὅπως τε καὶ ὅτε συνέταξ· This probably refers to 486β19–26 just previous, where both Ps.-Plutarch and Photius have described the writing of the Antidosis, Panegyricus, and “some other deliberative speeches.” Third, in the Demosthenes codex (265.491α12–21), following a quotation of Libanius’ report on the authenticity of the speech On Halonnesus, Photius remarks on the danger of using style as a criterion: ἔγω δὲ εἰδός πολλάκις καὶ λόγοις διαφόροις γεννητόροις πολλήν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοιότητα. The fourth use of the first person is one of the statements by which Photius fits the lives of the orators into

15 “I have spoken of the Antidosis, Panegyricus, and some of the symposium speeches, both how and when they were composed.” Cf. Treadgold, “The Recently Completed Edition of the Bibliotheca of Photius,” Byzantinostudia 41 (1980) 50–61 at 60. The reference is probably not to codex 61.102α18–30, also on Isocrates. If it were, the words referred to would indeed be Photius’ own, but their content would not be precisely what is described here.

16 I shall argue (180ff infra) on the grounds of style that this passage is Photius’. Cf. Kustas (supra 3) 139 n.1; N. Wilson, Scholars of Byzantium (London 1983) 110; Henry (supra n.3) 222 (ad p.57): “Je puis avancer que Photius parle rarement à la première personne, mais cela lui arrive.”
the format of the *Bibl.* Codex 267 on Dinarchus ends with the sentence, τῶν μὲν οὖν θ’ ῥήτορον οἱ λόγοι, ὅν ἐποιησάμεθα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ἐν τούτοις περιγράφεται ἢ μνήμη. The following *Lycurgus* codex begins: Λυκούργου δὲ οὐδενός, ὅσα γε τελείν εἰς ῥήτορας καὶ δημαγωγοὺς, τὸ ἔλαττον φερομένου οὔπω παρέσχεν ἡμῖν ὁ χρόνος λόγους ἀναγνώσας, φέρεσθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἔξ ἱστορίας ἢ μεμαθήκας. Thus, Photius’ own words appear in these ten codices no less than in other parts of his work, where short, introductory sentences like those of the lives of Isocrates, Dinarchus, and Lycurgus occur quite often. The longer comment on style in the Demosthenes life is characteristic of Photius.17 (Cf. his remark on Theopompus’ claim about differences among historians at 274.510b9 [supra 166]). A sermon bears the name of John Cyrysostom, but οὐκ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ δὲ τούς τε γὰρ ἐνθυμῆμαι καὶ τῇ πείρᾳ τῆς γραφῆς πολὺ τὸ ἔνδεξα τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοῦ λόγων ἀποφέρεται. πλὴν τινα καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρεξεβλήθη. ἦστι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ λεξίς χυδαία καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου παραλλάττουσα. 18 Note too that the phrase beginning Photius’ note concerning Lycurgus’ speeches is very like those that Ballheimer isolated as “rhetoricam originem sapientes”: Λυκούργου δὲ οὐδενός, ὅσα γε τελείν εἰς ῥήτορας καὶ δημαγωγοὺς, τὸ ἔλαττον φερομένου. On grounds of sheer similarity, such a statement there suggests that this type of comment, dismissed by Ballheimer as derivative, may in fact originate with Photius.

Photius wrote descriptions of the styles of some 130 of the authors he reported on in the *Bibl.*, and these have a uniform critical vocabulary and simplicity of style. The second aspect of the orators’ codices that is characteristic of Photius’ work consists of two sentences marked by this style and vocabulary. The first appears at the beginning of the second critical passage in the Isocrates life (487b26–40): τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτοῦ τὸ εὐκρίνες καὶ σαφὲς καὶ μεμελημένον πᾶσαι δῆλον, καὶ ὡς ἐπανθεὶ αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον ἔμφυτον ἄλλα καὶ κομμωτικὸν κάλλος. Here,

17 For statements in voce auctoris, cf. Treadgold (supra n.4) 40 on Photius’ use of the second person plural both as a general ‘you’ and in direct address to Tarasius. I have found over twenty occasions on which Photius uses the first person singular pronoun. Wilson (supra n.16) 110 also gives several examples of Photius’ observations on his texts.

18 “but I don’t think it is his. In demonstrations and knowledge of scripture it is much lacking compared to his other writings. Except that some things in it were drawn from him (sci. his genuine works). Its style is vulgar and not as good as his.”
as in Photius’ full-scale description of Isocrates’ style in codex 159, there is mention of Isocrates’ εὐκρίνεια (159.102b5), σαφήνεια (159.102b13), and careful working of language (102b5, 8). The comment begins with the usual marker of his stylistic descriptions, τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτοῦ, and includes an image that Photius often applies to literary style, that of blooming or flowering. Photius frequently employs the adjective ἐμφυτός, and κομμωτικός, used in the Bibli. only here, occurs twice in Photius’ letters. His style seems distinguishable again in codex 264 on Aeschines, where a one-sentence description reads: ἔστι δὲ λόγων αὐτοῦ γλυκός τε καὶ καθαρός καὶ εὐκρινής καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων σαφείας σεμνονόμενος. The evaluation of style here agrees with what Photius says of Aeschines in codex 61 and is typical of Photius in its use of Hermogenes’ vocabulary—here stating a judgment quite unlike Hermogenes’ own opinion of Aeschines. The simple stringing together of terms is also typical in a description of style (καὶ ... καὶ ... τε καὶ... ). This resemblance to Photius’ prose style stands out in

19 In codex 159 Photius uses ἐπιμέλεια (102a5) and τὸ ἐπιμέλης (102b8), here τὸ μεμελέτημένον, which appears in various forms descriptively or in critical sections nine times: μεμελέτημένον, codex 51.12a38; ἐμελήτητον, 122.94a9 and 182.127a20; ἐμελήτω, codex 141.98b18 and ἐμελές, codex 79.55a24; μελέτην, 160.103a11, 167.115a25, 259–68 (bis) here and 260.487a32; ἐμελετήθησαι, 167.107a80.

20 In the Bibli. ἀνθέει at codex 197.161a14 in the description of a work and 32.6a20 in a critical section; ἀνθήθασις in 41.8a8, 69.34a3, 74.52a8, 78.34a38, 110.89a6, 127.95a14, 165.107a28, 239.318a33; ἀνθών at codex 657.33a42, 86.66a7; in general e.g. Ep. 201.63, 284.1083, 285.315.

21 For ἐμφυτος cf. Ep. 1.589, 156.22, 165.111; Bibli. 125.94a33; κομμωτικός: Ep. 165.170, 283.6.

22 “In his speeches he is sweet, pure, and distinct, and prides himself on the clarity of his arguments.”

23 J. F. Kindstrand, The Stylistic Evaluation of Aeschines in Antiquity (Uppsala 1982) 61ff, observes that Photius often mentions enthymeme and epicheireme together, and that εὐκρινής καὶ καθαρός often occur together, for example in codex 47.11a24 on Josephus, 98.84a7 on Zosimus, and 223.222a40 on Diodorus of Tarsus. He also points out that this evaluation by Photius is similar to Hermogenes’ evaluation of Aeschines the Socratic (On Types of Style 406–407) and one by Photius in codex 178, suggesting that Photius may have confused the two. This is unlikely in light of Photius’ care in identifying both men and the attention he gave this topic.

24 E.g. 57.17a15, 70.35a6, 90.67b11, 95.78b10, 97.84a35, 102.86a13, 114.90a22, 129.96a28, 140.98a32, 203.164a20, 226.243b1, 167.112a4, and 168.116a36 in the description of contents. For instance, 57.17a16 (Appian): Ἕστι δὲ τὴν φρόσιν ἀπερίττον καὶ ἱσχνός, τὴν δὲ ἱστορίαν, ως οὖν τ’ ἔστι, φιλαλήθης, καὶ στρατη-
contrast to the surrounding quoted material, especially in
the life of Isocrates, Photius' introduction is followed by a variety
of remarks whose language changes noticeably from that of
the first sentence, on Isocrates' use of figures, his suitability for
contests, the organization of his subject matter, and his use of
earlier models for eulogistic speech.

III

Rhetorical figures are, in fact, the subject of much of the
stylistic criticism in the four codices under discussion. These
discussion of figures, σχήματα, are uniform in style as well as
subject, and they have been attributed to Caecilius of Calaecite.
At the beginning of the Antiphon life in particular, Caecilius is
cited by name in what is part paraphrase, part direct quotation.25
This is the most direct quotation of Caecilius that survives, and
the manner in which it is quoted is, I believe, part of the third
aspect of editing in codices 259–68 that should be attributed to
Photius. Caecilius' opinion is quoted here as a reply to a pre­
ceding statement about Antiphon's cleverness: ὁ μὲν τοι Ἐκκλη­
istής Καϊκίλιος (485β14); then the direct quotation is given, in

γιὰδιά τῆς ἰστορίας μεθόδων, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, ὑπορήτης, ἐπάρα τε λόγοις
tetapeinomevnoin pronymia stratou καὶ διαπραλαι φελεμαίνων καὶ πάθους
dhλωσαι καὶ εἰ τὸ ἄλλο λόγος ἐκμημησασθαι ἀριστος, ὁ 90.67β14 (Libanius):
tῇ γὰρ πολλῇ περὶ τοῦ ἄλλου φιλοσοφίαν τε καὶ περιεργία τὴν τε ἐμφυτὸν τοῦ
λόγου καὶ αὐτοσχέδιον ὡς ἄν τις εἴποι χάριν ἐλευμήνατο καὶ τέρτων, καὶ εἰς
tὸ ὁσαφέστερον ἀπείρετε, πολλὰ μὲν ἐπισκόπησαν παρενήγας, ἕνα δὲ
ἀφαιρέσαι καὶ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου, ὁ 226.243β11 (Eulogius): ἔστι μὲν ἀν ὅσον ὁ
συγγραφεύς καθηρὸς τε καὶ ἡδός, καὶ διὰ συντόμων καὶ λείτων ὀδοῦ τούς
ἐλέγχους ποιομένως, καὶ πρὸς μηδέν τῶν ἔξω τοῦ ἀναγκαῖο περιβόμενος.

25 See Ofenloch (supra n.3). His collection includes too much. Once a very
conservative rule is applied, putting aside passages that precede or follow on
phrases with Caecilius' name in them, rejecting entries that only show the
'spirit' of Caecilius, and questioning what may be imitation, not quotation, we
are left with: Ofenloch fragment numbers 31 ( testimonia to the title περὶ
σχήματον), 50, 50a, 61, 64–67, 71–76, 126, 136; among traces of Caecilius' lexicon,
p.38 s.v. εἰσυγγελία, ἐξούλης, θεωρός/θεατής, προβολή; and fragments
158, 163, and 168. Ofenloch attributes sometimes too much, sometimes too
little of the commentary on figures in the Bibl. to Caecilius. On the basis of
subject and style, I believe he is quoted at 485β16–27, 488α30–40, 488β25–36
(=Ofenbach fr.109), 488β37–489α9 (=fr.109), 489α14–35, 489α3–13 (=fr.110),
491α40–491β7, 491β12–17 (=fr.143), 491β8–22 (=fr.143), 491β23–28, 491β29–
492λ5 (=fr.144).
which Caecilius explains, ὡσπερ ἐπιδιορθούμενος ἡμιτόν (485β829), that Antiphon does not avoid figures altogether but uses them without artificial methods or technique and in a way natural to the course of his argument. The critical section ends with a return to the words of the Ps.-Plutarch version: “There are sixty speeches, and Caecilius says twenty-five are spurious.” Henry observes of the passage “Il ne figure pas dans le Ps.-Plutarque et il est difficile de préciser par quelle source Photius a pu le connaître, s’il ne l’a pas utilisé directement.” The twenty-five-line section certainly does not look like the material of a marginal gloss, nor is it similar to the condensed offerings of a rhetorical handbook. Further, the matter in which the quotation is presented is a lively one: “Caecilius says ... ” followed by the summary of his opinion and then the direct quotation, marked by “he says, as if correcting himself.” This looks like thoughtful excerpting, not hurried copying.26

In the Lysias codex, the last rhetorical comment at the beginning of the life concerns the orator’s use of auxesis. Lines 489β3-13 (cf. Ofenloch fr.110) argue that Lysias’ ability to expand and elaborate the content of his speeches is not to be challenged. Line 13, however, continues: Καικίλως δὲ ἀμαρτάνει εὐρετικὸν μὲν τὸν ἀνδρᾶ, εἶπερ ἄλλον τινά, συνομολογῶν, οἰκονομίζασθαι δὲ τὰ εὑρεθέντα οὐχ ὀὕτως ἰκανόν. καὶ γὰρ κἂν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει τῆς ἀρετῆς τῶν λόγων οὐδενὸς ὀρᾶται φαυλότερος (13–17). This addition both suggests that the preceding is (as Ofenloch thought) Caecilius’ opinion and also voices an independent judgment. In the Antiphon codex Caecilius’ opinion was introduced and described in words that reflected an awareness of what was quoted. Here it is both quoted and then corrected in words that express a critical authority of their own.27

26 Photius omitted one citation of Caecilius that is contained in the Antiphon codex of Ps.-Plutarch: “Caecilius attached this decree to his work on Antiphon.” Photius’ lives of the orators include none of the four decrees given by Ps.-Plutarch. Photius also cites Caecilius by name three times in addition to those in the Ps.-Plutarch version, one in codex 61 and twice in the critical material under discussion. These citations have been considered in the source criticism on these ten codices, without providing any grounds for conclusion.

27 Judging only by similarity, this language is Photius’. He uses συνομολογῶν only once (209.166b25 in the description of a work), but the expression, εἶπερ ἄλλον τινά/εἶπερ τίς ἄλλος (“as much as anyone/if anyone else”), is one that Photius uses often in critical or descriptive comments (in critical sections: 119.93α40; in reports on the contents of various works: 146.99α16, 191.153b33,
Libanius is another of Photius’ sources of critical material on the orators, specifically on the speeches of Demosthenes.28 Here too there are signs that Photius may have added critical material. Commentary from Libanius’ Hypotheses appears several times,29 only once giving Libanius’ name: “Some, especially Libanius the sophist, say that the speech was prepared but not delivered” (492A14–20). Several speeches are discussed in the critical material of this codex. The order in which these are treated is neither that of the Hypotheses nor of any known manuscript of Demosthenes.30 Presumably it is the order in which Photius read the speeches. Not all the critical comment available in the Hypotheses is used in the Bibl., and Photius’ reading seems to have included some of the speeches that Libanius did not summarize.31

Twice in the Hypotheses Libanius speaks in the first person. The quotation in Photius’ codex (491A2–12, 492A14–20) removes the first person, rephrasing to render the statement impersonal. Further, at the end of the life of Demosthenes (not in the critical section of the codex) Ps.-Plutarch’ report of Demosthenes’ nickname “Batalus” is augmented in Photius (495A35–44) by a passage that offers further explanation for the

---

198.162A15, 224.222A14, and 262.488a, which occurs in the biographical part of the life but is an addition, possibly Photius’). καὶ γὰρ καὶ occurs forty-two times in the Bibl. and rarely in Attic models, namely twice in Herodotus, twice in Thucydides, once in Xenophon, twice in Plato, and once in Aeschines.

28 In codex 90 Photius reviews Libanius’ orations and describes his prose style, noting that Libanius’ παραμυθατωκά (fictive discourses) and exercises were more useful than his other works and that Libanius wrote letters. Ep. 207 shows that Photius read these, as he recommends Libanius as a model of epistolary prose.


30 Many manuscripts of Demosthenes contain the Hypotheses, and of these, some give Libanius’ work in one piece, some separated, with each hypothesis placed before the speech it describes. I know of no manuscript that gives the speeches in the same order as Photius’ (7, 17, 25, 5, 59). The only Ms. containing the hypotheses in an order different from the standard is S or Σ, Par. 2934, where the order is 7, 5, 25, 59, 17.

31 Libanius’ summaries of speeches 31 and 58, for example, contain some description of style or of type, and neither of these speeches is described in codex 265. For Satyrus, e.g., which is treated in the codex, is not treated by Libanius.
name. This comes from Libanius' life of Demosthenes, which is the preface of the *Hypotheses*, and Libanius is duly cited as its source.

Photius knew Libanius' works well; their frequency in the surviving manuscripts of Demosthenes suggests that he very likely had the *Hypotheses* in his copy of the speeches. The order in which the speeches are presented in the codex suggests, however, that it was Photius' own order of reading and not a mechanical culling of material from Libanius. On the other hand, the suppression of the first person in quoted material and the additional use of Libanius' story about "Batalus" suggest that Photius drew on the *Hypotheses* for critical material as he read through the speeches.

Aelius Aristides is among the orators whose style Photius admires. His *Panegyricus* and the four speeches *Against Plato, for Rhetoric* (codices 246–48) are represented in the *Bibl.* by extensive abstracts chosen, Photius explains, for their style and beauty of expression. Aristides is mentioned twice in the Demosthenic codex, in sentences that I shall argue are Photius' own (265. 491b 7–11, 492b 9–17): once when two of Demosthenes' speeches are criticised for contradictory elements, and once when Demosthenes is said to have found it temperamentally difficult to withstand attacks by his opponent. In the first instance, Photius (?) exclaims, "But what would these critics say of Aristides, who uses this particular device too much...", and in the second Aristides' character is described as similar to Demosthenes' in its sharp and passionate quality. These references to Aristides, together with the manner in which Caecilius and Libanius are quoted and paraphrased, are consistent with the possibility of Photius' editorial voice in the codices on the orators.

IV

My fourth and final point of argument concerns seven passages in the critical commentary that stand out in contrast—both in style and in content—to the simpler language surrounding them. These passages share vocabulary with Photius' other works and include literary devices also found in Photius' more ornate and rhetorical moments. All the passages comment less on specific points of style or argument (as in the rest of the collected commentary) than on the general nature of composition and criticism. As one of these very passages points out,
stylistic similarity is no positive proof of identity of authorship, and because I do not offer an analysis that distinguishes Photius' style from that of this contemporaries, the following argument cannot prove that these passages were indeed composed by Photius. I am, however, pointing to similarities of language that are significant, especially when taken along with the aspects of style and content discussed above.

Photius' language varies greatly from one context to another. The simple, straightforward prose of his stylistic critiques in the Bibl. is an example of one extreme, while the complexity and rhetorical flair of the proem demonstrate the other. For the sake of providing evidence for the sake of comparison, it will be helpful to glance first at a number of Photius' observations on rhetoric that are couched in self-consciously rhetorical language and for that reason resemble Photius' more ornate and affected style. Even the vocabulary of this limited sample has much in common with the selection of Photius' prose that I shall present in order to illustrate both his ornate style and his language when analyzing literary style. This preliminary evidence consists of the proem and epilogue of the Bibl. (44 lines) and nine letters or parts of letters (1,099 lines).

32 For a technical description of particular usages in Byzantine Greek, cf. G. Böhlting, Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantiner, mit besondere Berücksichtigung der Schriften des Michael Psellos (Berlin 1956). H. Hunger, "On the Imitation (Mimesis) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature," DOP 23-24 (1969-70) 17-38, discusses figures, literary references, quotations, and the use of classical works and genres as literary models. Referring to Böhlting, he lists a few specific points of Attic style that were imitated by educated Byzantine authors, some of which are noticeable in Photius: the observance of grammarians whose doctrines were formed during the Empire, and use of the dative more than the actual conditions of linguistic development required, of indefinite pronouns, especially shortened τον, τη, the middle, optative, accumulation of negatives, pleonastic use of particles (especially κατά), and preference for abstractions over concrete expressions.

The general Byzantine taste for the Hellenistic style, as reflected in Photius' excerpts from Philostratus (codex 241) and Aristides (246-48), produced in Photius' writing several characteristics of Hellenistic Greek: verbs with two adverbial prefixes, the redoubling of synonyms (cf. 177f infra), extended participles (cf. 175f infra), and a penchant for abstract nouns.

33 Cf. the Appendix (185 infra) for a comparison of vocabulary. My selection includes Epp. 1.516-628 to Boris-Michael on the purity of the Christian faith and the ruler as its exemplar, 163 on the utterance of the name of God, 164-66 on Paul's style, 207 on epistolary writers, 234 the consolatio to Tarasius on the death of his daughter, and 235 to Nicephorus.
Photius’ favorite stylistic devices involve symmetry. Simple parallelism is a constant in passages where Photius creates point. For example,

1.538 ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἀκριβεστάταις καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων βάστα κατάφωρον γίνεται, ἐν δὲ ταῖς τυχόνσις πολλὰ παροράται καὶ οὐδ’ εἰς ἀμάρτημα κρίνεται.

or 1.575 οὕτως ἡμῶν οἱ πατέρες παρείληφασιν, οὕτως ἡμῶν τοῖς μετ’ ἐκείνους παραδεδόκασιν. 34

Antithesis invites parallelism, and Photius often presents elements in pairs, one word, phrase, or thought opposing another:

163.6 οὐκ ἀκούσαι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεύσιν ἀπαγείλαι, οὐκ ἀπαγείλαι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρυσῷ πετάλῳ γράφειν παραδοῦναι. 35

Quite often two parallel or antithetical terms are set in chiastic order, as in Ep. 1.577, ἄρεταις κοσμεῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τῇ πίστει τάς ἄρετας λαμπροτέρας ἀπεργάξεσθαι, or Ep. 165.23, σοφία οὖν θεοῦ ἢ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀρχόντων σοφία. 36

The effects of parallelism are often offset in longer sentences by the interweaving of connected or corresponding words, creating order as in a line of poetry. The entire preface and much of the postscript display this technique, and in a description of the effect of Paul’s style on his readers, it articulates the structure of the sentence (Ep. 165.4):

Εἰ δὲ (σε φιλοπονωτέρα) περὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου λόγους λόβοι μελέτη, τίς ἄνοιξεν σοι δηλονότι ὁπνὲς εἰς εὐμένειαν ὁρώσης, θαυμάσιας ἂν μᾶλλον ὡς (σε)

34 Cf. also e.g. Proem, μᾶλλον δ’ ὁ τὸ ἀναμιμένον νομίζων ἀξιόλογον, αἰρούμενος δ’ καὶ τὸ ποικίλον; 163.6; 234.86.
35 Cf. also Proem, ἵν’ ἔχοις ... καὶ κοινωτέραν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν; Proem, μίαν μὲν γὰρ ... ῥάδιον εἶναι; Postscript, ἔχοις ... ἀπαρχήν καὶ τελευτήν; and Proem, ὅψ’ ἐν μὲν ἰσος ... ἐκδεδώκας.
36 Cf. also Ep. 165.25, 72; 234.34, πόθεν πηλικώτατο καὶ τοσοῦτοί πληγαί.
Photius’ more elaborate sentences often contain elements extended by a long genitive absolute, a participial phrase, or simply a long parenthetical expression. In the 1,140-line sample of Photius’ prose, genitive absolutes occur fifteen times. Of this number one falls within the sentence:

....σοῦ δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν μηδὲν προσθέντος, μήτε ὅτι παραγενέσθαι δέοι, ἵνα καὶ γλώττα λέγειν ἐχειν ἀττα ἂν καὶ λέγοι, μήτε εἰς ἐπί μέρους καὶ ὀρισμένην ἀξίωσιν τὴν κοινοτέραν καὶ ἀόριστον περιενεκόντος, μηδὲ σαφῶς δεδηλωκότος τίνων ἐστὶ σοὶ χρεία βιβλίων καὶ ποίας τῶν ῥητορικῶν τεχνῶν πραγματείας καὶ τίνος τεχνογράφου, πῶς ἂν δυναίμην.... (235.6)

and three others extend the ends of sentences. Parenthetical expressions are also quite frequent. Ten occur even within this small selection, and participial phrases create similar extensions, for example at 234.86:


37 Cf. also Ep. 207.1: Proem, τὸν σὸν ἄστερ ... ἐκδεδόκαμεν; Proem, εἰ δὲ σοί ποτὲ ... φιλοσοφοῦμεν; Proem, καὶ ὠδὲ τὰς σάς ... φρουρίσε; Postscr., σὺ δὲ ὅ ... καταλάβοι τέλος.
38 165.270; 234.190, 257. The other genitive absolutes occur in Proem 161 and Ep. 164.46, 92; 165.4, 67, 134; 166.139, 157; 234.43, 235.19.
39 Proem, εἰ καὶ διατυπωτικὴν τινὰ ... τοῦ σοῦ διαπερίου πόθον καί; Ep. 1.526, 529, 560; 165.69, 131 for example.
40 Also Proem, ἐπείδη τῷ τε κοινῷ τῆς πραγματικῆς καὶ τῇ βασιλείῳ φύσι προβλέπειν ἡμᾶς ἢ πρὸς αἰσχρότας περιβλέπειν ἡμᾶς ἢ πρὸς ἢς ὑποκείμενοι σὺν τοῖς βιβλίοις; Postscr., ἔχοι τῆν αἴτησιν τῆς ἔλπιδος σὺ διαμαρτύσουν ... θεωρίαν αἰτήσεων τὴν ἐκπλήρωσιν: Ep. 1.603; 234.86.
In terms of content, Van Hook illustrates in his list of Photius’ “trenchant and striking expressions in critical characterizations” (supra n.14: 186f) how many vivid descriptions are cast as metaphors. These range from brief images in the stylistic analyses to longer topoi in the letters, among them a comparison of death to the sickle-thrust of the grim reaper (Ep. 234.19), of envy as a personified enemy hurling shafts of misfortune (Ep. 234.31), of personal disasters as the malevolent orchestration of a tragic chorus (Ep. 234.36), holy inspiration as a flowing stream (Ep. 165.288), or the trials of life as an athletic contest set by God (Ep. 134.234).

Finally, Photius enjoys the devices of alliteration and rhyme. In the consolatio to Tarasius, a highly stylized genre piece, for example, play on sound is constant: of a serpent’s hiss, we find ὁ πονηρὸς ἐκεῖνος καὶ σκολιὸς ὄφις (234.14), or in a description of force, πέθεν τηλικαύται καὶ τοσάυτα πληγαί (234.34). And in the letter to Boris-Michael:

1.520, εἰλικρίνεις καὶ εὐθές καὶ εξηρημένον καὶ ἀκήρατον

1.538, ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἀκριβεστάταις καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ῥόστα κατὰφωρὸν γίνεται, ἐν δὲ ταῖς τυχούσαις πολλὰ παροράται καὶ οὐδ’ εἰς ἀμάρτημα κρίνεται.

1.557, κατὰ πάντων ἀμαχον τὸ κράτος καὶ ἄρρητον ἢν α-δεχεται καὶ καλοῖς καὶ σωσικόσμοις διὰ παντὸς θριάβως ἐγκαλλοπίζεται.

1.564, στήθι στερρῶς ἐν τῇ πέτρᾳ τῆς πίστεως, ἐν ἡ καλῶς ὑπὸ κυρίου τεθημελιώσα

Photius’ fondness for expressing a single thought in double terms also creates frequent pairs of rhyming or alliterative words in, for example,

1.534, ἀκοσμίας καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης
165.202, τὸ βαθὺ καὶ βεβηκός
234.11, ἀκοσμίας καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης

41 Cf. Proem, διατυπωτικήν τινα καὶ κοινωτέραν; Postscr., ἢ σπουδὴ καὶ μελέτη; 1.522, καὶ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον καταφαίνεται τε καὶ διελέγεται; 1.527, συνορᾶται καὶ πεφώραται; 1.531, θρησκείας καὶ πίστεως.
These are the more striking rhetorical devices Photius employs when writing for effect or embellishment. Keeping them in mind, let us turn to the seven passages in codices 259–68 that I suggest Photius wrote himself. The compositional elements in these few sentences reflect a self-consciousness in commenting on style, and they are not unlike the ornate prose just described.

(1) Isocrates (260.487A29–35): Διδ καὶ πολλοίς πολλῆς παρέσχε τῶν κριτικῶν διατριβάς μὲν καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς, διαφωνίας δὲ πρὸς ἄλληλους, τῶν μὲν ἐμβαθυνομένων τῇ μελέτῃ καὶ διασκέψει τοῦ λόγου, τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιουμένων. Εἶτε δ’ εἶπεν καὶ διότι τοῖς μὲν ἑνεστὶ φύσις εὖ ἐχοῦσα πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις, τοὺς δὲ ὁ ἐλαττούμενος ἐπιγινώσκει λόγος.42

This first passage from the life of Isocrates opens with alliterative word play and then continues, constructed on antitheses,

(a) διατριβάς μὲν καθ’ ἑαυτοὺς
    διαφωνίας δὲ πρὸς ἄλληλους

(b) τῶν μὲν ἐμβαθυνομένων τῇ μελέτῃ καὶ διασκέψει τοῦ λόγου
    τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιουμένων

(c) τοῖς μὲν ἑνεστὶ φύσις εὖ ἐχοῦσα πρὸς τὰς κρίσεις
    τοὺς δὲ ὁ ἐλαττούμενος ἐπιγινώσκει λόγος.

The parallelism in pair (a) of grammatical construction and the play in rhyme is extremely close, and the third pair contains similar play on sound with ε. At the beginning of the first sentence, the accusatives are interwoven with the indirect object, πολλοίς πολλῆς παρέσχε τῶν κριτικῶν διατριβάς, and

42 “For this reason the speech has given many of the critics much labor by themselves and difference of opinion with each other, some of them delving into it with care and close examination of the speech, but others reading only superficially. One could certainly say that in some there is a nature well adapted to critical judgement, but others are marked by inferior ability.”
within the paired genitive absolutes, the critics and their approach appear chiastically. A small joke is expressed: Isocrates spent much time writing the *Panegyricus*; critics spend much time arguing their differences of opinion about it. A similar witticism occurs in passage 6 below.

(2) *Isocrates* (260.487b 35–40): Ἄλλα ὁδὲν κωλύει παραπλησίων ἀνάκυστρῶν πραγμάτων ταῖς ὁμοιαῖς ἐξέργασίαις κεχρήσθαι καὶ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν, οὕς ὑποβαλλόμενοι τὰ ἀλλότρια, ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀναβλαστανούσης φύσεως τοιαύτα οία καὶ τοῖς προλαβοῦσι προβαλλομένη ἐπιδείκνυται.43

This sentence as a whole is balanced: first the “nothing prevents” clause extending through “and enthymemes,” containing ταῖς ὁμοιαῖς ἐξέργασισις and τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν, which are arranged one on each side of the infinitive κεχρήσθαι. Then the phrase οὕς ὑποβαλλόμενοι τὰ ἀλλότρια falls in the middle of the sentence, providing a brief four-word pivot between the two longer elements. The last part, which begins with ἀλλὰ as does the first, is a long genitive absolute that extends the sentence. The syntax here is as complex as any in the proem to the *Bibl.*, and as in the previous passage from the same codex, there is artful arrangement of word order and alliteration: ἀλλὰ follows on ἀλλότρια, and προβαλλομένη on προλαβοῦσι.44 Alliteration is also sustained in the β and λ of βαλλ-, λαβ-, and βλασσ-. The language of sprouting or putting forth suggests a metaphor of flowering or plant growth.

(3) *Lysias* (262.489 λ34–b2): Παύλος δὲ γε ὁ Ἐκ Μυσίας τὸν τε περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ λόγον, οὐδὲν τῶν εἰρημένων συνεις, τῆς τε γνησιότητος τῶν λυσιακῶν ἐκβάλλει λόγων, καὶ πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς ἄλλους εἰς νόθους ἀπορρισμένους πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης τοῖς ἀνθρώπους ὀφελείας ἀπεστῆσαν, οὐχὶ εὐρισκομένων ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσόντων. ἀπαξ γὰρ ἀποκριθέντες παρεσώθησαν, ἐπικρατεστέρας τῆς διαβολῆς, ὃσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας γεγενημένης.45

43 “But nothing prevents the use of the same method of treatment and enthymemes when similar subject matter arises, not introducing extraneous elements, but rather the nature of the subject matter giving rise to such things as it showed one’s predecessors when it was set before them.”

44 For ἀναβλαστάνω as transitive, cf. LSJ (Philippus Epigrammaticus and Eunapius).

45 “Paul of Mysia, understanding nothing of what has been said, excludes the speech *On the Olive Stump* from the list of Lysias’ genuine speeches and, having cast out many other good speeches as well to be counted as spurious, he has deprived men of much great benefit, because the speeches that have
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The general observation on truth recalls the tone of a homily. The thought that spurious works are declared false in the same way in which spurious children are separated from true children is common, and one that Photius uses elsewhere.\(^\text{46}\) Here again, the syntax is complex. The first sentence contains subject + direct object, participial phrase (dependent on subject), verb + genitives (dependent on direct object), then participial phrase (modifying subject), object of verb + verb, then genitive absolute. The second sentence begins simply and ends in an extended genitive absolute interrupted by the adverbial phrase ὡσπερ καὶ ἐπʼ ἄλλων πολλῶν. Subject and verb are interwoven in the first sentence, and verb and objects in τῶν λυσικῶν ἐκβάλλει λόγων and πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλῆς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑφελείας. Another element of style in these passages has been the use of long genitive absolutes: the end of sentence two in the first passage above, the final words of the second passage, the shorter phrase in the passage above (οὐχ' εὑρίσκομένον ἐτι τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσόντων), and the genitive absolute that ends the last sentence above.

\(^\text{46}\) Cf. codex 204.164B15-21, ΧΡΗΣΙΜΟΝ ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ αὐτάς γοναῖς τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τὸ γνῆσιον ἐπιδεικνύμενον αὐτικὰ τοῦ γεγονηκότος ("The book is especially useful, and by means of its own offspring it demonstrates to those who encounter it the genuineness of their progenitor").

fallen under suspicion are no longer to be found; for once they were excluded, they were neglected since, as is the case with many other things, false accusation has prevailed over the truth.

\(^\text{47}\) "But since I know in many cases speeches by different authors showing great similarity and the same style in speeches that recognize different authors (for human nature is not constantly fixed and unchanging in all respects, in speeches any more than in other areas), seeing this difference to a small degree, and not even in the most striking aspects of the orator's style, I cannot have the temerity to pronounce on whether the speech \textit{On the Halonnesus} is the work of Hegasippus or is a lesser example of Demosthenes' ability."
The attribution of this passage to Photius is not disputed, although it has been often overlooked by scholars who insist that Photius merely copied the text of this codex without adding anything. The passage is characteristic of Photius’ style, being a single sentence constructed as a very long period, with the subject of καθέστηκεν delayed within its own clause. Another example of this procedure can be seen in Ep. 165.115: ὃτι μία πολλάκις ὁμιλία καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἡμῖν ἐκάστοτε κατ’ αὐτῶν ἱσταμένους καὶ πολεμιωτάτους δόντας νῦν ὑπηκόων ἔχει καὶ μαθητῶν ἐγνωμόνων τάξεις. The rumination on style in the Demosthenes codex offers a classic example of Photius’ love of symmetry and carefully arranged word order. Note the balance of

λόγους διαφόρων γεννητόρων πολλήν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοιότητα 

diáφορον ἐργασίαν λόγον τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγνωκότων γεννητόρα,

with six items to each phrase, each phrase ending with the same pattern: adjective modifying object + transitive verb + object of verb. In the first three terms, an accusative is followed by a genitive, and διάφορος and λόγος are arranged chiastically in each. The same type of symmetry governs the following pair, with the nouns/attributives in chiastic sequence with the prepositional phrases in each phrase. A sense of careful arrangement governs the word order:

οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καριστῶτοις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων τοῦ ῥήτορος, 

ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐπ’ ὀλίγον ὅρων τὴν διαφόραν,

and in the last part of the sentence, where the orators’ names come first and the verb (καθέστηκε) is delayed in the second phrase. Photius often expresses an added thought parenthetically; as an example we have here the major portion of the sentence, οὐ γὰρ ὧν καθέστηκεν ... ὄρων τὴν διαφόραν.

In general, the entire passage is constructed with one element posed against another:

Ἐγὼ δὲ εἴδως πολλάκις καὶ ...

48 " ... since often because of a single speech both those on our side then standing among them and those who were most hostile now the band of followers and gentle disciples contains." Cf. also Epp. 163.6, 1.526.
... καὶ διάφορων ἔργασιαν λόγων τὸν αὐτὸν ...

οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ καθέστηκεν ...

ὦσπερ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις,
οὔτως οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς λόγους ἡ ἀνθρωπίνη δύναμις

ἄλλως τε δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καριωτάτοις ... τοῦ ρήτορος,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ταὐτὴν ἐπ’ ὀλίγον ὅρων τὴν διαφοράν

οὐκ ἔχω θαρρεῖν ἀποφήγμασθαι εἴτε Ἡγησίππου πόνος ...

εἴτε τῆς Δημοσθενικῆς ἐλάττωμα....

And there is a touch of alliteration in πολλάκις, πολλὴν, and ἀτρέπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος.

(5) Demosthenes (265.49b 17–11): 'Αλλ᾽ ο hiểm τούτους αἰτιώ-

μενον, τί ἂν φαίην περὶ Ἀριστείδου, ὡς καὶ κατακόρως τῷ ἱδίωματι τούτῳ φαίνεται κεχρημένος, ὦσπερ καὶ τῷ προϊέναι κατὰ τάς ἐργασίας πέρα τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ τῷ περίττῳ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς χρείας συμπαρεκτείνεσθαι.49

We mentioned above the reference here to Aelius Aristides, whose speeches Photius excerpted for the sake of their style. The construction of this sentence is basically antithetical. The second half is in two parts, ὥσπερ καὶ.... and καὶ τῷ περίττῳ.... The second part of this latter half is divided also between τῷ περίττῳ and τῷ μέτρῳ..., typical of Photius' fondness for expressing a single thought in double terms. The pattern καὶ τῷ περίττῳ/ἡ τῷ μέτρῳ is repeated although the construction following the article varies. Τοῦ μετρίου καὶ τῷ μέτρῳ, finally, also create a varied repetition.

(6) Demosthenes (265.492a 38ff): Καὶ πολλοῖς οὔτος ὁ λόγος παρέσχεν ὁγώνα κρίνεσθαι προτεθείς, ὦσπερ καὶ ἰἈσπασίῳ τῷ ρήτορι, ἢτε μὴ ἀφιγμένῳ τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεωρίας εἰς ἀκρί-


49 “But those who find fault with these speeches, what would they say about Aristides, who clearly uses this particular device to the point of surfeit, going beyond measure in the working out of his speeches and stringing things out excessively rather than by measure of need?”

50 “This speech, in presenting itself for judgment, provided a contest for many, for instance the rhetor Aspasius, since he did not even manage to be accurate in his study.”
Another small witticism: in the Isocrates life (passage 1 above) the *Panegyricus* provided (παρέσχεν) critics with work and disputes. Here, Demosthenes’ agonistic speech has provided (παρέσχεν) the critics with the ἀγῶν of judging it. Word order is interwoven, with πολλοίς separated from ἀπασισίω τῷ ῥήτορι, οὗτος ὁ λόγος from προτεθεῖς, ἀφιμένῳ from εἰς ἀκριβείας.

The indirect objects are distributed into each part of the sentence, the subject encloses παρέσχεν ἀγῶνα κρίνεσθαι in the first part and is repeated in the enclosed section of the participial phrase, which extends the sentence.

(7) *Demosthenes* (265.492B9-17): Ἄλλα γε χαλεπώτατόν ἐστι λόγων ἀγωνιστικῶν ἐργάτη διὰ τέλος φυλάξαι πρός τὸν ἀνταγωνιστήν τὸ ἥθος, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς ὤσι φῦσεως ἔτυχον πικροτέρας τι καὶ παθητικοτέρας, ἢς ὦχ’ ἤκιστα Δημοσθένης τα καὶ Ἀριστείδης μετέχει. Δύσπερ πολλάκις ἐξάγονται τῆς προθέσεως ἐλαττουμένης υπὸ τῆς φύσεως, οὔδε γὰρ οὐδ’ ἐστιν ἱκανή τέχνη καταρθώσαι τὸ βουλήμα, μὴ σύνεργον ἔχουσα καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἰδιότητα. 51

Here again Aristides is mentioned. Although this passage is less stylized than the six above, its elements are composed with care. There is deliberate repetition in ἀγωνιστικῶν/ἀγωνιστικῆν, and alliteration in the pair of words, πικροτέρας τε καὶ παθητικοτέρας. The phrase φυλάξαι τὸ ἥθος encloses πρὸς τὸν ἀνταγωνιστήν, and the participial phrase μὴ σύνεργον ἔχουσα καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἰδιότητα is, again, an extension of the sentence.

These are the seven passages in the codices on the orators that, with the exception of (4), have been attributed to Caecilius, or to an older version of Ps.-Plutarch, or to marginal notes, but not to the author of the work in which they occur. They share common content, making general observations about style and criticism. They share vocabulary with writing known to be Photius’, and there is some similarity of wording among the passages, brief as they are: καὶ πολλοίς ... παρέσχε (1, 6, quite striking because the words occur in the course of making the same

51 “For it is quite difficult for the practitioner of combative speeches to preserve his bearing throughout against his opponent, especially in the case of those who happen to have rather bitter and passionate temperaments, something that both Demosthenes and Aristides certainly share. This is why they are often drawn aside from their purpose, as it is overcome by their nature, for there is no art capable of correcting the will unless it has the aid of the particular person’s nature as well.”
type of witticism), ἐλαττώμενος (1, 7), ὠσπέρ καὶ (3, 5, 6), and ἔργασίαν (4, 5). Style and vocabulary, to the extent that I have presented them here, cannot establish authorship, but to the degree that they indicate likeness to passages certainly composed by Photius, they support the argument for Photius' involvement in these ten codices.

To summarize, these are what I take to be the various signs of Photius' editorial activity: the comments he makes in his own voice, language that resembles that of his other works and other comments on style, and indications that even the quoted material may have come from sources Photius knew. Old arguments for the existence of a third and earliest version of the Lives do not hold up under re-examination. And although Photius may very well have had a text somewhat different from our present Mor., the larger differences between the versions of Ps.-Plutarch and Photius can be explained if we allow that Photius' interests and abilities were the same when he composed these codices as they were elsewhere in the Bibl. In terms of our understanding of the Bibl. as a whole, this reassessment of codices 259-68 underscores that they are atypical for the half of the Bibl. in which they appear. Unlike the other codices after 234, these do show editing and commentary and are not mostly excerpts (Treadgold, supra n.4: 35-51). They are also unique to the work as a whole, for they present bibliographical and biographical material in place of a summary of or excerpt from the works and offer stylistic commentary in a combination of quoted material and occasional observation.

Why, then, were these biographies included in the Bibl.? I suggest that their presence reflects Photius' interest in style, which depended ultimately on the canonical Attic orators. The composition of the biographies as they appear in Photius looks notelike. Photius reports on the speeches of Aeschines and Isocrates in codices 61 and 159. The duplication created by this set of ten lives leads me to think that Photius copied and annotated the Lives of the Ten Orators separately from his work on the Bibl. Treadgold's assessment of the second half of the Bibl. (that it consists of reading notes from a period earlier than that in which Photius wrote the first part) is based on the
composition of the codices in the second part. I find codices 259–68 on the orators consistent with this assessment.

The pinax, as I mentioned at the outset, lists the orators in traditional order, but Photius' Isocrates is second, not fourth, and Lycurgus closes the set because none of his speeches were actually read. Photius' active editing of the codices on the orators may further explain the displacement of the life of Isocrates. Codex 260 is Photius' second treatment of Isocrates (cf. codex 159); the original Isocrates life is unusually disordered, chronologically speaking, and the places in which I have argued that Photius added his critical commentary do nothing to improve the order but rather look like additions made in the course of excerpting. Again, Antiphon and Isocrates are numbers one and two of the orators, on whose lives I believe Photius took the time to comment. Either may explain why the Isocrates life follows immediately on that of Antiphon.

In conclusion, although the Lives of the Ten Orators form a set of codices unique among the reading reports of Photius' Bibl., I hope to have shown that this uniqueness of form does not prove that Photius merely copied a ten-part biography of the orators into his work. Codices 259–68 are also a striking demonstration of Photius' literary interests and an example of his working method.

APPENDIX

The following lists by section vocabulary from the seven passages above and gives citations to identical vocabulary used by Photius in the Bibl. (proem, postscript, and sections written by Photius, not paraphrase or quotation) and in the selection of letters (cf. supra n.33). I include as well pertinent entries from Westerink's indices to the Amphiloehia and Epistles—his "Index Grammaticus" and "Vocabula Selecta"—that are marked with an asterisk. For the texts of the proem and postscript of the Bibl. I have followed Treadgold. Line citations are to the Laourdas and Westerink edition of Photius' works.53

52 For Photius' habit of working with notes, cf. Treadgold (supra n.4) 38f, and 51–73 on the composition of the Bibl.

Isocrates (260.487A29–35)

οὐδὲν καὶ; Επ. 165.227; 1.626.

πολλοῖς πολλάς; Επ. 165.71 πολλοῖς πολλάκις; 234.91 πολλοῖς πολλάκις; 234.172 πολλακός ἐν πολλοῖς; Προεμ. πολλοῖς πολλάκις.

παρέσχε: Επ. 164.8 τὸν νόον τῆς περιόδου παρέχοντα; 165.138 γέλωτος αἰτίαν καὶ χλεῦσης παρέσχεν; 165.9 κράτος τε ... καὶ ἵσχυν θαυμάζεσθαι παρέχει; Προεμ. παρέχομένων τὴν ὑφέλειαν; Επ. 235.1 ῥήτορικάς ἀφορμάς παρασχέν.

κριτικῶν: Επ. 166.184, 207.7; Ἀμφ. 42.234∗.

διατριβῶν: Ἀμφ. 78.227∗.

διαφωνία: Βιβλ. 34.7α22, 91.68β36, 214.171β39, 222.203λ25.

πρὸς ἄλληλους: Επ. 163.11.

ἐμβαθυνομένον: Επ. 234.20 δρέπανον ἐμβαθυνομένον; 165.302.

ἐμβαθυνομένος: Επ. 234.88 βαθύνων; Βιβλ. 196.160α35, 222.181β2, 192β23.

τῇ μελέτῇ (τοῦ λόγου): Επ. 165.5 περὶ τοὺς λόγους μελέτη; 165.289 μελέτης καρπός; 165.308 κατὰ μελέτην προσαχθεῖν; 166.236 τέχνη καὶ μελέτη; 166.242 μελέτας; Προεμ. τὰς σὰς μελέτας.

κατὰ τὸ ἐκπολάσιον: Προεμ. ἐκπολάζει; Βιβλ. 75.52λ34; 181.126β19, 215.173β29, 223.211λ35, 230.282β18.

ἐλαττούμενος: Βιβλ. 265.492β14; Επ. 135.62 (active); Ἀμφ. 1.718 (active); 40.106 (active); Επ. 211.80, et al. (passive); Βιβλ. 159.102β4.

II. Isocrates (260.487B35–40)

(οὐδὲν) κωλύει: Προεμ. κωλύομενον (as part of a number); Επ. 1.584 κωλύει; οὐδὲν κωλύει; οὐδὲν κωλύει; Βιβλ. 96.83β19 ἄλλ' οὐδὲν κωλύει τοὺς ἀναγνώσκοντας ἐκλεγομένοις τὰ χρήσματα; Βιβλ. 222.195λ36 οὐδὲν κωλύει; Βιβλ. 222.198β41 οὐδὲν κωλύει.

παραπλησίαν: Επ. 1.544 παραπλησίας; 163.22 παραπλησίας; 166.42 παραπλησίας; 166.42 παραπλησίας; Προεμ. παραπλησίαν τύπου.


54 Used over 113 times, while it occurs with the following frequency in a sample of classical Attic models: Demosthenes 10 times, Plato 23, Xenophon 5, Isocrates 7, Libanius 11, Dionysius of Halicarnassus 3, “Longinus” 3, Hermogenes 24.

55 The following occur in excerpted or paraphrased material in the Βιβλ. and may possibly be Photius’ own wording: οὐδὲν κωλύει: 222.195 λ37, 229.258β32, 261β23, 230.280α11, 282α23, 282β23, 284β34f; 247.418λ6.
καθήσαται: Ep. 165.260 καθήσαται: Bibl. 107.88A39, 144.98B9, 189.146A18; (not infinitive: 41 times, e.g. codices 5, 14, 40, 42, 55, 60, etc.).

ένθομήμασιν: Bibl. 6.3A22, 47.11A27, 61.20A22, 119.93A39, 172-74, 119A34, 195.159B20, 209.168B14, 223.222A41, 233.292A31, 274.510B10; Ep. 165.306; 187.91*, 105*, 166*; 249.70*; 284.795*; Amph. 42.238*; 47.121*, 123*; 54.39*; 72.75*; 181.60*.

ὑποβαλλόμενον (substituting as one’s own): Ep. 165.260 ἐκείνα ... σταλαγμῶν λογισμοῖς ὑποβάλλειν (suggest).

προβάλλομένη: Ep. 1.571 καρποὺς ἀρετῶν προβάλλειν; 166.200 προβάλλειν καὶ τὴν ... ἔλλειψιν; Προεμ προβαλοί; Ep. 235.4 προβαλλομένῳ καὶ ἀποσθεορίστῳ ῥήματι.

III. Lysias (262.489A34-489B2)

ἀπορριψάμενος: Ep. 234.156 ἀπορρίσαιμεν.

πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης ... ὀφελείας: Ep. 207.16 πολλῶν ἄλλων καὶ μεγάλης συλλέξαι ὀφελείας; Προεμ τὴν ὀφελείαν. ὀσπερ καὶ: Ep. 164.36; 166.29, 119.

οὐδὲν τῶν εἰρημένων συνειείς: Ep. 166.131 τῶν μὴ συνιεῖστοι τῶν ἐν τῷ γράμμῳ σχετικῶν; 165.20 συνιεῖστοι.

τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴς πεινόντων: Ep. 166.185 ὑπὸ ἐπιτίμησιν ἔχετον.


56 This is an addition in Photius' version to the Ps.-Plutarch version of the life of Demosthenes. The text is: φέρονται δὲ ὀντόν ἀποσθέγαμα πλείστα καὶ γνωμολογίαι, ἀπέρ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐκάστοτε πρὸς τὴν ἀνακύπτουσαν χρέαιν ἀρμοστόμονος ἔλεγεν, οἱ δὲ ἀκούοντες μνήμη τῆς καὶ γραφή διεσώσαντο. It is risky to offer a second passage only possibly written by Photius in arguing that a first one is written by him, but I point out that ἀπέρ αὐτὸς μὲν ἐκάστοτε through the end of this sentence looks like Photius' addition to what he found in the text. φέρονται δὲ αὐτοῦ ("There are attributed to him") occurs only in these ten codices, and only in the text of the Ps.-Plutarch lives, formulaically reporting the number of speeches attributed to each orator. ἀπέρ, with a participle, however, is typical of Photius' language, and for a parallel to the last phrase, cf. the preface to the Bibl.: ὥσπερ αὐτῶν ἡ μνήμη διεσώσῃ.

57 These are all the references in the Bibl. that occur in Photius' descriptions of style or of content outside the codices on the ten orators. The word occurs more frequently in codices 259-68: 260.487A24 (?), 487a35 (here); 262.488b41 (Caecilius?); 489a31 (Caecilius?); 263.490a14 (Ps.-Plutarch), 265.491a34 (Caecilius?).
IV. Demosthenes (265.491A 12-21)

πολλοίς πολλάκις: cf. supra I.

διάφορος: Ep. 166.228 διαφόρας.

ἐργασίαν λόγων: Ep. 165.305 τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἐργασίαις γόνιμον.


κατὰ τοὺς λόγους:58 Bibl. 160.130A 11.

ἀνθρωπίνη δύναμις: Ep. 1.610 ἀνθρωπίνων προσταγμάτων; 1.627 ὁ ἀνθρώπινος νοῦς; 165.37 τὸ ἀνθρώπινα; 165.58 σοφίας ... τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης; 165.90 τὸ ἀνθρώπινον; 165.157 ἄδα ἀνθρώπινα; 166.241 τὸ ἀνθρώπινον; Postscr. τὸ κοινὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπινον.

ἅλλος τε δὲ: Ep. 1.516 ἅλλος τε δὲ τὰ μὲν ἅλλα; 164.27 ἅλλως τε δὲ καὶ εἴ τις; 1.516; Bibl. 97.84A 37; 126.95A 37; 222.183B 38, 188A 9, 192B 29, 197B 43; 230.279B 3; 278.529A 4; (Westerink, s. v. “ἀδὲ abundans”: ἅλλος τε δὲ [καὶ] Ep. 1.922, 10.9, 30.15, et ita fere semper*).

διαφοράν: Amph. 137.116*, 117*.

ἐχω + infinitive: Bibl. 88.66B 35 οὐκ ἐχὼ σαφῶς ἐκμαθεῖν; 89.67B 9 οὕτω μαθεῖν ἐχὼν; 176.121B 18 οὐχ ἐχὼ λέγειν.

θαρρεῖν:59 Bibl. 117.92A 9 ὅσις μήτε συγκατδέσθαι τοῦ θαρρεῖν πρόφασαι ἐχει.


ἐλάττωμα: Bibl. 159.102B 19.

V. Demosthenes (265.491B 7–11)

κατὰ τὰς ἐργασίας: Ep. 165.305 τὸ ἐν ταῖς ἐργασίαις γόνιμον.

ἀσπερ καὶ: Ep. 164.36, 166.119.

58 κατὰ with accusative in critical sections in the Bibl. meaning ‘with regard to’ occurs eleven times: 4.3B 1; 92.73A 13; 126.95A 22; 127.95B 13; 160.130A 11; 169.116A 9; 176.121A 24, B 19; 181.126B 20; 198.162A 16; 201.163B 16; 202.163B 35.

59 186.141A 33, 209.167B 35, and 250.452A 31 are within excerpts/summaries that are done fairly broadly and not verbatim. Perhaps the occurrence of θαρρεῖν in these passages is also due to Photius.
VI. Demosthenes (265.492\alpha\,38ff)

παρέσχεν: Ep. 164.8 τόν νοῦν τής περίοδου παρέχουσα; 165.9 παρέχει; 165.138 παρέχειν; Postscr. παρεχομένων; Ep. 235.1 ῥητορικάς ἀφομίας παρασχεῖν.


ἀφιγμένω ... εἰς ἀκριβείαν: Ep. 163.12 οὔτε εἰς ἀκοὰς οὔτε εἰς γνώσιν ἀφίκτο; 165.131 εἰς ἀκοῆς ἀφίκτο πείραν (But cf. Proem εἰς ἀνάμνησιν μετὰ τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς ἐρικέσθαι).

Θεωρία: Ep. 166.8 θεωρίαν καὶ διάκρισιν; 166.73 θεωρίας καὶ τῆς τῶν λέξεων ἀναπτύχεως.

VII. Demosthenes (265.492\nu\,9–17)


μετέχει: Ep. 234.91 μετέχειν; 234.97 μετέσχε; 166.77 μετέχοντες.

διώπερ: Ep. 164.89.

πολλάκις: cf. supra I.

ἐξάγονται: Bibl. 107.88A40.

οὔδε γὰρ οὔδε: Ep. 163.4; 165.270, 288; 166.239; 234.6; Bibl. 230.274\alpha\,26, 222.201b22, 234.300b22.

ἰκανή + infinitive: Bibl. 224.223b23.

κατορθώσασι: Ep. 166.242 ἀλλοίως ... κατορθοῦσιν; 234.245 κατορθώθη; 1.904*, 1017*, 1106*, 1188, et passim*.

ἐλαττομοῦνη: cf. supra I.

ἰδιότητα: saepe (theol.) Ep. 2.123*, 125*, 161*; 265.76; Amph. 28.12*, 14*, 21*; 80.236*; 181.76*; 182.48*; 314.27*; (Christol.) Ep. 284.458*, 1338*, 1471*, 3180–87*; (gramm.) Amph. 56.48*.61
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60 Variations: κόρος. Proem, 97.84\alpha\,40, 165.108b32; κατὰ κόρον, 181.126 \lambda\,12, 811; 203.164\alpha\,29; προσκορής, 35.7a35, 159.102a15, 92.73 \lambda\,26.

61 I would like to thank Professors Philip Stadter, George Kennedy, and Cecil Wooten for their review of this paper in an earlier form and for their very helpful comments. My thanks also to the reader for GRBS, whose thoughtful suggestions have been a welcome aid in revision.