Caecilius, Longinus, and Photius

Malcolm Heath

Photius drew on a number of different sources in compiling his essays on the ten orators (codices 259–268). His core biographical source is the pseudo-Plutarchan Lives of the Ten Orators; for Demosthenes, Libanius’ hypotheses are also used. An important contribution by Rebekah M. Smith identified a number of passages which show stylistic evidence of Photius’ own hand, proving that he made a more significant contribution than has generally been acknowledged. But a residue of material remains which cannot be assigned to any extant source. Smith subsequently extended her analysis, arguing that significant sections of this residue are derived, directly or indirectly, from Caecilius of Caleacte.1 In this paper I shall argue for a different position, defending the following three theses:

(i) Photius’ unidentified source is an author who cited Caecilius, but who was also willing to comment on and criticise his opinions. Since there are grounds for believing that this later author cited and criticised the views of others as well, only those passages in which Caecilius is named (485b14–36, 489b13–15) can safely be included among his fragments.

(ii) The later author who cited, commented on, and criticised Caecilius was the third-century critic Cassius Longinus—a

hypothesis too brusquely discarded by Smith. Since Longinus, an exceptionally erudite and authoritative critic, is unlikely to have followed any one predecessor slavishly, this strengthens the argument against attributing material to Caecilius where he is not referred to by name.

(iii) We do not know how material from Longinus reached Photius, or with what degree of adaptation; and we cannot be sure to what extent Photius himself rearranged, abbreviated, paraphrased and added to this material. We must therefore also exercise caution in attributing material to Longinus.

1. Antiphon, cod. 259, 485b14–40

(485b14) ο μέντοι Σικελώτης Καικίλιος μη κεχρησθαι φησι τον ρήτορα τοίς κατὰ διάνοιαν σχήμασιν, ἀλλὰ κατευθὴ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπλάστους τὰς νοῆσεις ἐκφέρεσθαι, τροπὴν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πανούργου καὶ ἀνάλλαξιν οὕτε ζητήσαι τον ἄνδρα οὕτε χρήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ δι’ αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν νοημάτων καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς αὐτῶν ἀκολουθίας ἄγειν τὸν ἀκροατὴν πρὸς τὸ βούλημα. (b21) οἱ γὰρ πάλαι ρήτορες ικανὸν αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον εὑρεῖν τε τὰ ἐνθυμηματα καὶ τῇ φράσει περιττῶς ἀπαγγεῖλαι. ἐσπούδαζον γὰρ τὸ ὄλον περὶ τὴν λέξιν καὶ τὸν ταύτης κόσμον, πρῶτον μὲν ὑπὸς εἰς σημαντικὴ καὶ εὑρετική, εἰτὰ δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόνιος ἢ τοῦτων σύνθεσις. ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἰδιώταις διαφορὰν ἐπὶ τὸ κρείττον περιγίνεσθαι. (b27) εἰτα εἰπὼν ὡς ἀσχηματιστὸς εἰς κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ τοῦ Ὁρισματοφύλακτος λόγος, ὥσπερ ἐπιδιορθούμενος ἔκαστόν· (b29) οὐ τοῦτο λέγω, φησίν, ὡς οὐδὲν εὑρίσκεται διανοιας παρὰ Ὁρισματοφύλακτος· καὶ γὰρ ἑρωτησίς που καὶ παράλειψις καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα ἐνείσιν αὐτοῦ

But the Sicilian Caecilius says that the orator did not use the figures of thought; instead, his ideas are expressed directly and without contrivance, and he did not seek out or make use of any unscrupulous turn or inversion, but led the hearer wherever he wished through the thoughts themselves and their natural sequence. (b21) For the ancient orators considered it sufficient to invent arguments and express them in an excellent style. Their whole concern was with diction and its ornamentation—first, that it should be meaningful and appropriate, and then that the arrangement of the words should also be harmonious. For it is in this that their difference from and superiority to lay people lies. (b27) Then, having said that Antiphon’s discourse is unfigured with respect to thought, as if correcting himself he says: (b29) I do not mean that no figure of thought is found in Antiphon—for erotesis and paraleipsis and other things of the sort are present in his speeches. So what do I mean? That he did not use them habitually or continually, but only where nature itself led him to it without any technical artifice; and this can be observed in ordinary lay people as well. (b36) For this reason, whenever someone says that speeches are unfigured, one should not jump to the conclusion that they are devoid of figures (that is impossible), but that the systematic, continual and pronounced use of figures is not to be observed in them. (b40)

This passage derives from a source which reports and quotes Caecilius.³ Ofenloch prints the whole passage as Caecilius fr.

---

³Since Photius himself is not likely to have had direct access to Caecilius’ work, and since in the parts that are not direct quotation there are none of the signs of Photius’ style identified by Smith, it is reasonable to assume that the mix of report and quotation was already present in Photius’ source.
103, marking b21–27 and b29–40 as direct quotations; but it is clear from the infinitive περιγίνεσθαι that b21–27 is indirect, and Smith (1994a, 526) treats only b29–40 as direct quotation. I suspect, however, that even this goes too far. It is not clear why Caecilius should move at b36 from explaining what he meant by describing Antiphon’s discourse as unfigured to commenting on what anyone might mean by describing any discourses as unfigured; but it is easy to imagine the later author who quotes Caecilius’ self-clarification using it as a peg on which to hang general advice of his own about how negative statements of that kind are to be understood.

There is some slight lexical evidence in b36–40 to support the suggestion that Photius’ source is an author significantly later than Caecilius: ἐμέθοδος (b39) does not seem to be attested in other rhetorical texts before Sopater (Rhet.Gr. IV 318.8, 12) and Syrianus (2.81.2 Rabe). Moreover, part of this passage appears (in epitome) as the third of a series of excerpts on topics in rhetorical theory and criticism (213–216 Spengel-Hammer):

There was no unscrupulous turn or inversion in the ancients. In fact, the figures of thought entered forensic speeches at a late date; their predominant concern was with diction, its ornament and harmonious arrangement.

This is not the only parallel between the excerpts and Photius: as we shall see, there is another clear example in 488b25–27 (= §2 below), and a possible one in 492b9–17 (§6). It seems likely, therefore, that the collection of excerpts was made from the same work that was Photius’ source. The collection certainly postdates Caecilius, since much of the rhetorical doctrine that it

4Smith’s translation (1994b, 604 n.3) is misleading on this point, rendering the indefinite λόγους as “his speeches.”
contains derives from a later period.\(^5\) One example that does not seem to have been mentioned before is the parallel between excerpt 6 (214.7–9, on the handling of \(\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\rho\alpha\varphi\eta\)) and Sopater's commentary on Hermogenes (\textit{Rhet.Gr.} IV 315–22, esp. 317.27–318.13; \textit{cf.} 596.30, 599.16)—the very passage cited above for the use of \(\epsilon\iota\mu\mu\epsilon\theta\delta\omicron\omicron\zeta\).\(^6\)

The collection of excerpts is headed “From Longinus” (= Longinus F16); so if this ascription is trustworthy, we can identify Photius' source precisely. There is always a measure of uncertainty in the manuscript attribution of technical material,\(^7\) but this instance affords no specific grounds for doubt. Smith, in rejecting the attribution of the excerpts to Longinus, makes two points.\(^8\) First, she reports Spengel's claim that the superscription is in a different hand from the excerpts themselves; but subsequent inspection of the manuscript by Graeven overturned this claim.\(^9\) Secondly, she conjectures that the attribution was prompted by the mention of Longinus in excerpt 2 (213.6); but the text there (\(\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\ \Lambda\omicron\gamma\gamma\iota\nu\omicron\zeta\)) is clearly corrupt, and (given that the heading is not a later addition) Longinus' name is more likely to have intruded as a \textit{result} of the superscription.

\(^5\)A. Mayer, \textit{Theophrasti peri \(\lambda\varepsilon\zeta\omega\varsigma\) libri fragmenta} (Leipzig 1910) xxx–xxxvii, was driven to this conclusion, even after resorting to the desperate expedient of twice emending “Aristides” into “Aeschines.” He suggests (xxxvii) Apsines as a source, implausibly seeing (e.g.) excerpt 16 (215.18–21, with four heads of purpose) as a summary of “Apsines” 291–296 (with six).

\(^6\)It may be relevant that Sopater derived some material indirectly from Longinus' pupil Porphyry: H. Rabe, \textit{Prolegomenon Sylloge} (Leipzig 1931) xiii–xiv.


\(^9\)Graeven (\textit{supra} n.8) 302.
The resemblance between excerpt 7 (214.10-15) and a fragment of book 2 of Longinus' *Philological Discourses* preserved by the fifth-century sophist Lachares (F21a = Lachares 294.14-35 Graeven) provides an admittedly limited measure of corroboration.

There is nothing implausible in the hypothesis that it was Longinus who transmitted this fragment of Caecilius. Caecilius' works were available to members of Longinus' intellectual circle: a fragment of Porphyry (408F Smith = Euseb. *Praep.Evang.* 10.3.13) describes a discussion at a dinner-party given by Longinus in which one of the participants cites a judgement of Caecilius on Menander. Caecilius was also available to Tiberius (probably the philosopher and sophist of *Suda* τ 550), who cites him in *On Figures*; since he also cites Apsines he cannot be earlier than the third century.

2. Lysias, cod. 262, 488b25-489a9

(488b25) ἐστὶ μὲν ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγοις αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἡθικοῖς, γίνεται δὲ κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ ἡθικός, ὅταν χρηστήν ἔχῃ προαιρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ἰέπουσαν. (b 27) ὅθεν οὐ χρὴ ψιλῶς τὰ πραξθέντα λέγειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γνώμην συνάπτειν μεθ’ ἢς ἐπράττετο ἐκατον, οἷον ἢ μὲν χαλεπὰ ἢ καὶ πρὸς φίλους ἢ ἄλλως μετρίους τὴν ἀνάγκην αἰτιᾶσθαι, ἢν δὲ ἀμείνω, τὴν προαιρεσίν. αὐτὴ δὲ μάλιστα πιθανῆ γίνεται, εἰ τὴν αἰτίαν προσλάβοι. τὰς μέντοι αἰτίας οὐ χρὴ τοῦ λυσιτελοῦς ἕνεκα παραλαμβάνειν· φρονίμου γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ χρηστοῦ καὶ εὐγνώμονος τὰ τοιαῦτα. χαλεπὸς δὲ ὁ τρόπος φυλάξαι· διό καὶ λυσίας ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεται πολλάκις διαμαρτάνων. (b 36) θαυμάζονται μέντοι γε αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ λόγοι καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ πρὸς Διογένειον ἐπιτροπῆς· πιθανῆς τε γὰρ καθάραν τὴν

10 If Longinus was the author of *On Sublimity* (see supra n.2), then of course we know that he studied Caecilius' works.

diýhēs ¯n ποιεῖται, ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ εὑθὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς αὐξήσεις καὶ τὰς δεινώσεις, ὀπερ πολλοὶ πάσχουσιν, ὑπάγεται. καὶ γὰρ οὐδ᾽ ἔστιν οἰκεία τὰ τοιαῦτα τῆς πρότης διδασκαλίας τοῦ πράγματος, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταύτα χώραν ἔχει καταλέγεσθαι. καὶ πολλὴν δὲ τὴν καθαρότητα καὶ σαφήνειαν ἐν τε τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ ταῖς λέξεσιν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ λόγου προβάλλεται ἀρχῆς, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ κατ᾽ εὐθείαν ἀρμόζον ἀφιγῆσε, καὶ τὸ μηδὲν τι ἔξωθεν συνεφέλεσθαι. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρμονίας αὐτοῦ κάλλος οὐ παντὸς ἐστὶν αἰσθάνεσθαι· καὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ μὲν ἀπλῶς καὶ ώς ἐτυχε συγκεῖσθαι, εἰς ὑπερβολὴν δὲ κόσμου κατεσκεύασται.

(a9)

(488b25) In many of his speeches he expresses character. One expresses character in respect of thought whenever there is an intention that is virtuous and inclines towards what is morally superior. (b27) So one should not simply state the facts, but also add the intent with which each thing was done—e.g. if it was harsh and directed towards friends or other reasonable people, attribute it to necessity; but if it was better, to free choice. This is most convincing if the reason is included as well—though reasons should not include advantage: that is the mark of someone who is calculating rather than virtuous and well-meaning. This manner is hard to sustain, which is why even Lysias can often be seen making mistakes in it. (b36) But very many of his speeches are held in high esteem, and not least that Against Diogeiton, dealing with a case of guardianship. He makes the narrative persuasive and lucid, and is not immediately diverted into amplification and expressions of strong emotion, as happens to many. That kind of thing is not appropriate to the initial exposition of the facts, though they do have their place in what follows. He achieves a high degree of lucidity and clarity both in the facts and in his diction from the very start of the speech, and likewise the figure of direct assertion, which is suitable to narration, and the avoidance of introducing external factors. Not everyone can perceive the beauty of his arrangement of words; the construction seems to be simple and spontaneous, but is contrived to an exceptional degree of ornament. (a9)

As noted above, b25–27 corresponds to Longinus, excerpt 14 (215.14–15):
A speech expresses character in respect of thought whenever it has an intention that is virtuous and inclines towards what is morally superior.

Ofenloch prints b25–a13 as fr.109; his annotation (“Dionysii esse non possunt ... quare haec et quae praecedunt Caecilio tribui”) notably fails to consider all the alternative possibilities. Smith (1994a, 527) curtails the Caecilian fragment at a9, convincingly assigning the next sentence to Photius on stylistic grounds; she supports the attribution to Caecilius on the grounds that b25–27 is “strikingly similar to Caecilius’ writing on Antiphon which is quoted in codex 259”—i.e. 485b14–40 (§1). But the similarity is not sufficiently striking to compel the attribution; and if the identification of Photius’ source as Longinus is correct, then he was fully competent to deploy the technical language of rhetoric with the authoritative tone on which Smith remarks (1994a, 528; cf. 1994b, 603).

3. Lysias, cod. 262, 489a14–489b2

(489a14) ἀμφιβάλλεται μὲν παρ’ ἑνίοις ὁ περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ λόγος· ὁ σηκός δὲ νῦν εἰδὸς ἔστιν ἱερᾶς ἐλαίας. (a15) ἀλλ’ ὁτι μὲν γνήσιος Λυσίου, ἐκ τῶν κεφαλαίων δήλον καὶ ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιχειρημάτων καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ προσομίου τῆς τε διηγήσεως καὶ τοῦ ἐπιλόγου (πάνω γὰρ δαισόμενως καὶ κατὰ τήν εἰθισμένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπλότητι δεινότητα ἐστὶν ἐξειργασμένα ταῦτα). καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ κατ’ ἐνθύμημα ἄλλα μὴ κατ’ ἐπιχείρημα πράττειν τάς ἀποδείξεις τοῦ Λυσίου μάλιστα τὸ ἱδίωμα ἀπαγγέλλει. ἄλλα καὶ τὸ μὴ καθ’ ἐν διατρίβοντα μηκύνειν τὸν λόγον τῆς τοῦ Λυσίου ἔστιν ἀκριβείας, καὶ τὸ εὐπαγές τῶν λόγων, καὶ τὸ διὰ βραχύτητος πολλῆν παρέχειν ἥδονήν, ὃ μετά ἔρημος οὕτως μόνος τῶν ἄλλων ῥητορῶν φαίνεται κατορθώσεις, καὶ τὸ κάλλος δὲ τῆς διατυπώσεως, ἐν ὑ μήτε Πλάτωνος μήτε Δημοσθένους μήτε Αἰσχίνου τὸ ἔλαττόν ἐστιν.
The authenticity of the speech *On the Stump* is disputed by some. (The stump is a kind of sacred olive tree.) But that it is genuinely Lysias’ work is clear from the heads of argument, and from the detailed argumentation, and from the proem itself and the narrative and the epilogue; for these things are worked out very remarkably, and in accordance with the man’s characteristic combination of simplicity and forcefulness. Even using enthymemes rather than epicheiremes to effect the demonstration is a strong indication of Lysias’ individual technique. Moreover, not lengthening the speech by dwelling on points one by one is a mark of Lysias’ precision; also the compactness of the language, and the great pleasure afforded by brevity (in which, apart from Demosthenes, he alone among the orators is successful), and the beauty of his descriptions (in which he is not inferior to Plato, Demosthenes, or Aeschines). Another feature of Lysias’ individual technique is the introduction of counterpositions that give no hint of being premeditated, but display what is suggested by the actual facts. Also evidence of Lysias’ power is the harmonious arrangement of the cola in each period, and the combination of purity and freshness in the style.

Ofenloch does not include this passage among the fragments of Caecilius. Smith (1994b) assigns it to him on the grounds of stylistic similarities to 485b14–40 (§1), 488b25–489a9 (§2), and 489b3–b17 (§4). However, the similarities to §1 are not sufficiently distinctive to establish common authorship, and there is no positive evidence to connect §2 or §4 to Caecilius. One possible terminological pointer to a later date is the use of “counterposition” (ἀντιθέσεις a30) in a sense that does not seem to be attested before the second century A.D.12 The subject-

---

12The reference is to the technique of mentioning an argument on the opposing side in order to refute it. For the evidence (which is inevitably
matter of this paragraph fits well with Longinus’ status as a recognised authority in questions of attribution (Eunap. VS 4.1.5 = 6.27–7.2 Giangrande), and in what immediately follows we find another piece of evidence consistent with the identification of Photius’ source as Longinus:

(489a34) Παῦλος 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 ἀπορριψάμενος πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὑφελείας ἀπεστήρησεν, οὐχ εὐρισκομένων ἐτί τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσόντων· ἀπαξ γὰρ ἀποκριθέντες παρεωρῴθησαν, ἐπικρατεστέρας τῆς διαβολῆς, ὡσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν, ἡ τῆς ἀληθείας γεγενημένης. (b2)

(489a34) Paul of Mysia, not understanding the things I have just explained, excludes the speech On the Stump from the genuine corpus of Lysianic speeches. And by rejecting many other fine speeches as spurious he does mankind a serious disservice. For works that have fallen victim to slander are no longer in circulation; having once been judged inauthentic they are neglected, slander proving (as is the case in other areas, too) stronger than the truth. (b2)

Smith (1992, 179f; 1994b, 606) convincingly assigns this passage to Photius. But we must also ask where Photius got the name of Paul of Mysia from, and why he mentioned him here. The most obvious explanation is that the source from which Photius drew the preceding section referred to Paul of Mysia (or “some, including Paul”) by name, and that Photius has substituted “some” at a14, reserving the name for use in his own appended comment.

Paul of Mysia is probably identical with Paul of Germe, mentioned in the Suda (π 811) as a commentator on Lysias, with an interest in questions of attribution. His date is un-
certain. But Eunapius (4.3 = 10.11-13) refers to “Paul and Andromachus from Syria” as leading teachers of rhetoric in Athens in Porphyry’s time; if these names are derived from Porphyry himself, they are likely to reflect the situation in Athens before he left the city in 263. Andromachus is probably Andromachus of Neapolis, who according to the Suda (α. 2185) taught in Nicomedia under Diocletian (A.D. 284-305). If he was invited to teach in Nicomedia when Diocletian established his capital there, this would imply that he was already distinguished in Athens; so his career could well have overlapped with Porphyry’s Athenian period. The Paul mentioned by Eunapius is sometimes identified with Paul of Lycopolis; but he is dated by the Suda (π 812) to the reign of Constantine, making it unlikely that he was prominent in Athens before 263. I therefore prefer an alternative candidate: there is a perfect chronological fit if we assume that the Paul who was a leading rhetorician in Athens while Porphyry was there is Paul of Germe, also known as Paul of Mysia, and that the criticism of Paul of Mysia’s judgement in Photius derives from Longinus.

4. Lysias, cod. 262, 489b3-b17

(489b3) ἔστι δὲ ὁ Λυσίας δεινὸς μὲν παθήνασθαι, ἐπιτήδειος δὲ τούς πρὸς αὐξήσαι διαθείναι λόγους. (b4) τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν περὶ τούς ῥητορικοὺς διατριβόντων λόγους οὐκ ὅρθως ὑπήχθησαν

13 W. Stegemann, “Paulus (15), (16),” RE 18 (1949) 2372–2373; PLRE II 850 s.v. “Paulus (12)” (there is no evidence to support the suggested fourth-century date).

14 Cohn, “Andromachos (20),” RE 1 (1894) 2154; PLRE I 63 s.v. “Andromachus (2).” F. Millar, “P. Herennius Dexippus: the Greek World and the Third-century Invasions,” JRS 59 (1969) 12–29, at 18: “it would be a reasonable guess, though no more, that Andromachus went first to Athens, like other Syrians, and moved from there to Diocletian’s court at Nicomedia.”

Lysias is skilled at stirring emotions, and well-equipped to compose speeches so as to achieve amplification. Some students of oratorical literature have been misled into saying of Lysias that in demonstrating the charges he has the edge over any of the ancients whatsoever, but that he is inferior in amplifying them. But they are clearly refuted by the speeches themselves as seriously mistaken in their judgement of him. In particular, the speech Against Mnesiptolemus completely refutes these people: his amplification of the accusation in the direction of grandeur is remarkable. Caecilius is mistaken when he concedes that the man is as good at invention as anyone, but not so competent in the disposition of the material invented. In fact, in this aspect of excellence in oratory, too, he is obviously inferior to none.

Ofenloch prints this passage as Caecilius fr.110. Smith (1994a, 527) suggests that b3–13 reports Caecilius’ view, and that “Photius adds at the end of this passage: Καίκιλιος δὲ ἀμαρτάνει ... and contradicts the opinion just reported.” But this mistakes the structure of the argument, which runs as follows: (i) some have supposed that Lysias, though good at demonstration, is weak in amplification; but that is refuted by the effective use of amplification in Against Mnesiptolemus; (ii) Caecilius thinks that Lysias, though good at invention, is weak in arrangement; but he is second to none in this as well. Amplification is part of invention; so the “some” in (i) are identifying a weakness in invention on Lysias’ part. Caecilius, by contrast, denies that Lysias is weak in invention; he finds a different
weakness. Thus the opinion reported in b3–13 cannot be that of Caecilius; and the passage as a whole must derive from a later critic who is familiar with, and willing to contest, the opinions of Caecilius and of other rhetoricians.

5. Demosthenes, cod. 265, 491a33–492a13

After a brief introduction the codex on Demosthenes begins with material on the authenticity of On Halonnesus (491a2–12) and On the Treaty with Alexander (491a22–28) taken (without acknowledgement) from Libanius’ hypotheses; Photius inserts what is probably his own response to Libanius’ denial of the authenticity of On Halonnesus (491a12–22). He then mentions doubts about the authenticity of the speeches Against Aristogeiton (491a29–33), drawing (once again without acknowledgement) on Libanius. But Libanius’ summary of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (“Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not accept that these speeches are by Demosthenes, on the evidence of the style [ἐκ τῆς ἰδέας τεκμαίρομενος]”) is either misread or else playfully adapted (491a31: “among whom was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who provides no substantial evidence for his own assumption [τεκμηρίων τῆς ἰδέας ὑπολήψεως] ...”) in order to provide a transition to a response that is not derived from Libanius:

(491a33) ... οὐδὲ ἐκείνῳ συνιδεῖν ἔθελήσας, ὡς πολλῷ μείζων ἐστὶν ἢπερ ἢ ἐκείνου ἀπόφασις αὐτῶς ὁ Ἀριστογείτων ἀνομολογῶν Δημοσθένην κατ’ αὐτοῦ γεγραφέναι· καὶ γὰρ ἀπολογούμενος οὐκ ἐν τῷ παρέργῳ λέγων ἄλλ᾿ ἐπιμελῶς ἀνταγωνιζόμενος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ δείκνυται, ὥς ἐπιγέρασται ἀπολογία πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν Λυκούργου καὶ Δημοσθένους. (a39)

(491a33) ... He also refuses to see that of far greater weight than his own denial is the acknowledgement by Aristogeiton himself that Demosthenes had written against him. He shows this in his defence (not in a passing comment, but in the course

16On this passage see Smith (1992) 180–182.
of a careful counter-argument) in the speech entitled *Defence against the Indictment brought by Lycurgus and Demosthenes.*

(a39)

The appeal to documentary evidence prevents us from attributing the response to Photius’ independent judgement, but the source is not extant. At this point, therefore, Photius has switched from Libanius to a different source. This is the first part of an extended section of material of unknown provenance.

Photius continues:

(491a40) καὶ ὁ κατὰ Μειδίου δὲ καὶ κατ’ Αἰσχίνου λόγος αἰτίαν ἔσχε τοῦ μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν κατὰ πάντα ἀρετὴν τῷ δημοσθενικῷ συν-διασώσασθαι χαρακτήρι· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ τούτοις λόγοις ἐκ διαλειμμάτων τινῶν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐννοίαις ἐπιβάλλων ἀμιλ-λάθαι δοκεὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, ὦσπερ ἀσκοῦμενος ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἑπ’ 

αὐτοῖς ἁγωνιζόμενοι τοῖς ἔργοις. διὸ καὶ τινες ἐφήσαν ἐκάτερον λόγον ἐν τύποις καταλειφθήναι, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς ἐκδοσιν διακεκαθάρται· καίτοι καὶ τοῦτο εὐλαβέστερον οἱ ἰθέντες λόγοι ποιοῦσιν. (b7) ἀλλ’ οἱ γε τούτους αἰτιώμενοι, τί ἢν φαίην περὶ Ἀριστείδου, ὃς καὶ κατακόρως τῷ ἰδιώματι τοῦτῳ φαίνεται κεχρημένος, ὦσπερ καὶ τῷ προέναι κατὰ τὰς ἔργασιας πέρα τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ τῷ περίττῳ μᾶλλον ἤ τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς χρείας συμπαρεκτείνεσθαι; (b11)

(491a40) The speeches *Against Meidias* and *Against Aeschines* have also been accused of not maintaining in every respect excellence equal to Demosthenes’ distinctive character. For in these two speeches at intervals he gives his attention to the same ideas, and seems to enter into rivalry with himself, as if he were practising rather than engaged in a real contest. So some have said that each speech was left in draft and not revised for publication. Yet the speeches in question do even that with a degree of discretion. (b7) And what would those who criticise them say of Aristides, who clearly uses this particular technique to excess, as well as going beyond due measure in his elaborations and stretching his material out to excess rather than keeping to the limit of what is needed? (b11)

Demosthenes *Against Meidias* is discussed again in 492a41–
b9 (§6). Smith (1994a, 527; 1992, 173) assigns a40–b7 to Caecilius. But there are no specific grounds for this attribution; if the argument presented so far is correct, Longinus would be a more likely candidate. Smith (1992, 182) assigns the discussion of Aristides in b7–11 to Photius; this seems likely: see further on 492b9–17 (§6).

(491b11) μάλιστα δὲ ὁ κατ’ Αἰσχίνου λόγος παρέσχεν αἰτίαιν ἐν ὑπομνήμασι καταλελείφθαι οὕτω τὴν ἐργασίαν ἀπειληφώς τελείων, διότι καὶ ὁ πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν πολλὴν ἐσχε τὴν ἁμυδρότητα καὶ κουφότητα, ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ λόγου παρέθετο· ὀπερ οὐκ ἂν περιείδεν ὁ ῥήτωρ, εἰς ἡξέτασιν ἀκριβεστέραν τῶν ἰδίων λόγων καταστάς. (b17) ἄλλα γὰρ οὐχ οὕτω πρόεισιν ὁ Λυσίος κατὰ Μνησιπτολέμου λόγος, ἐν πάσι δὲ τοῖς δεομένοις μέρεσι τὸ παθητικὸν φυλάξας οὐδὲ παυομενος τῆς ἐπιφορᾶς ἀπέστη, ἐπέτεινε δὲ μᾶλλον, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ τέλος τοὺς ἀκροατὰς ἀποστάς παροξύνειν. (b22)

(491b11) The speech Against Aeschines in particular has been accused of having been left in notes and not having received its final revision, because what makes the most indistinct and insubstantial contribution to the prosecution was placed at the end of the speech; the orator would not have overlooked this if he had undertaken a careful examination of his own speeches. (b17) But Lysias' Against Mnesiptolemus does not proceed in this manner, but in all the sections that need it he sustains the emotional level, and does not relax the intensity, but rather increases it, and does not give up inciting his audience even at the end. (b22)

Ofenloch prints b11–b22 as Caecilius fr.143; Smith (1994a, 527) concurs. It can scarcely be a coincidence that this passage and 489b4–13 (§4) are the only extant references to Against Mnesiptolemus; presumably both derive from the same source, and

There are references to Against Meidias in Longinus, excerpts 18, 20. Brisson and Patillon I (supra n.2) 5231 n.3 ascribe a work on Against Meidias to Longinus, adopting Ruhnken's rather arbitrary emendation of a corrupt entry in the Suda's bibliography, περὶ τοῦ κατὰ τρφιον; Adler prints M. Schmidt's περὶ τοῦ κατά φό(σιν) βίου, palaeographically a more elegant solution, although still uncertain.
Longinus’ exceptionally wide reading—Eunapius describes him as “a living library and a research institute on legs” (βιβλιοθήκη τις ἴν ἐμψυχος καὶ περιπατοῦν μουσεῖον, 4.1.3 = 6.13–15 = Longinus F3a)—is a relevant consideration.

(491b22) and méntoi kai τὸν παραπρεσβείας τινές ἐν ὑπο-μνήμασι φασὶ καταλειφῆναι, ἀλλ’ οὐ πρὸς ἐκδοσιν οὔδε πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀπηρτισμένον γεγράφθαι. διὰ τέ; διότι μετὰ τὰ ἐπιλογικά, πολλά τε ὄντα καὶ σχεδὸν τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος ἐπέχον-τα, πολλάς πρὸ αὐτῶν ἀντιθέσεις εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἐπὶ ἀντιθέσεις ἐτράπετο· ὅπερ ἀνοικονόμητον τέ ἐστι καὶ διερρυμένον. (b28)

(491b22) However, some even say that the speech On the False Embassy was left in notes and not written up for publication or with a view to perfecting its workmanship. Why? Because after the epilogue (which is extensive, and takes up nearly the largest section) although he has addressed many counterpositions before that, he comes back again to counterpositions; and this is poor organisation and disorderly. (b28)

Smith (1994a, 527) assigns this to Caecilius. But note again the use of the term “counterposition” (ἀντίθεσις: cf. on 489a30, in §3 above).

(491b29) καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ Σατύρου δὲ λόγον τῆς ἐπιτροπῆς πρὸς Χαρίδημον οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὴν κρίσιν ἔχοντες τὸ ἁσφαλές Δημο-σθένους λέγουσιν εἶναι, ὃ δὲ Καλλίμαχος, οὐδ’ ἰκανός ὤν κρίνειν, Δεινάρχου νομίζει· τινές δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπεβάλοντο Λυσίβ. καίτοι καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἔχοντες αὐτῶς διαμιμομενον καὶ τὸν τόπον ἄπαντα τῆς ἐργασίας καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν ἐρμη-νείαν. μαρτυρία δὲ τοῦ δημοσθενικόν εἶναι τὸν λόγον καὶ ὁ πλαγιασμός καὶ ἡ συνέχεια τῶν περιόδων καὶ ἡ εὐτονία· ἐχ’ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ προοιμίου τούτος ὁ λόγος διαποτίλεται. καὶ μὴν καὶ ἡ περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἔκλογη εἰς τὸ ἄριστον ἀνηνέχθαι καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις εὗ ἔχειν πεφιλοτίμηται. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ σχή-ματα· ἐστὶ γὰρ συνεπηρμένα μετὰ γοργότητος καὶ ποικιλίαν τῷ λόγῳ παρεχόμενα· καὶ γὰρ ἐρωτήσεις προβάλλεται καὶ ὑποστροφὰς καὶ τὸ ἀσύνθετον, οἷς μάλλοντα Δημοσθένης χαίρει χρώμενος. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἐπιμελῆς καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν τῷ...
Critics of sound judgement say that the speech Against Satyrus, dealing with a case of guardianship in reply to Charidemus, is by Demosthenes. Callimachus (not a competent critic) thinks that it is by Deinarchus. Some have attributed it to Lysias, though they have against them the chronology, the whole manner of its workmanship, the facts, and the style. Evidence that the speech is by Demosthenes is its obliquity, the continuity of the periods, and its vigour; right from the start the speech is distinguished by these features. Moreover, the vocabulary is excellent, and the arrangement of words aspires to high quality. The figures provide further testimony: they are concentrated, have rapidity, and give the speech its variety. He makes use of erotesis, hypostrophe, and asyndeton, all of which Demosthenes particularly likes to use. Moreover, the arrangement of the words is careful, and does not impair the vividness through ornamentation; and the periods, rounded off to perfection, maintain what is appropriate throughout. (492a5) Never to be neglectful of arrangement, but to divide everything into periods, is something Isocrates and Lysias have in common with Demosthenes; but the variation in the length of the cola that make up the periods is what makes the difference between them—Isocrates in general extends them, while Lysias keeps them short; by comparison with each of them, Demosthenes preserves due measure. (a13)

Ofenloch prints b29–a13 as Caecilius fr.144; Smith (1994a, 527) concurs. Again, a point of terminology arises: γοργότης (b41) is not attested as a literary critical or rhetorical term.
before the second century A.D., although it then becomes com-
mon.  

6. Demosthenes, cod. 265, 492a27–b17

After the last passage in §5 Photius returns to Libanius, borrowing comments on On the Peace (492a14–22) and Against Neaera (492a23–6),19 it is only now that he refers to Libanius by name, and even here he does so in a way that disguises his direct dependence. He then reverts to material for which there is no extant source:

(492a27) φασί δὲ τὸν Δημοσθένην δ καὶ κ ἑτη γεγονότα τὸν περὶ τῶν ἀτελείων ἦτοι τὸν πρὸς Λεπτίνην φιλοπονήσασθαι λόγον, οὗ τὸ προοίμιον Λογγίνος μὲν ὁ κριτικὸς ἀγωνιστικῶν νομίζει (ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου δὲ οὔτος ἤκμαξε, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ συνηγονιζέτο Ζηνοβίᾳ τῇ τῶν Ὀσροηνῶν βασιλίδι, τὴν ἀρχὴν κατεχούση 'Οδενάθου τοῦ ἀνδρός αὐτῆς τετελευτηκότος, ἦν καὶ μετα-

(492a27) They say that Demosthenes was 24 years old when he laboured on the speech On the Tax Immunities or Against Leptines, the proem of which the critic Longinus thinks is combative. (He lived under Claudius, and collaborated extensively with Zenobia, the queen of Osrhoene who took power when her husband Odenathus died. An old account records that she converted to Judaism from the Greek superstition.) Longinus, then, casts this vote about the afore-

18See further I. Rutherford, Canons of Style in the Antonine Age (Oxford 1998) 118 n.1.

19The introduction to Libanius’ hypotheses (8.607.3–6 Foerster) is the source of the judgements on the Eroticus and Epitaphios.
proem expresses character. (a38) This speech has caused many people to struggle when it has been put before them for critical evaluation—for example, the rhetor Aspasius, since he failed to achieve precision in his analysis of the speech. (a40)

The reference to Longinus may be read as an oblique acknowledgement of the source, like the reference to Libanius shortly before. The parenthetical biographical notice (a30-35) is probably due to Photius. Smith (1992, 182-183) also assigns a38-40 to Photius. This is, again, plausible, but as with Paul of Mysia (489a34-b2, in §3 above) we have to ask where the name Aspasius comes from. If Photius has transferred the name of a target of criticism in his source to his own following comment, as I have suggested he did with Paul of Mysia, then that source advanced an analysis of the speech’s proem and named Aspasius as the proponent of the alternative view which he rejects. There is some reason to believe that a pupil of Apsines of Gadara named Aspasius (possibly Aspasius of Tyre) wrote on Against Leptines. Apsines’ birth is generally dated around 190; his pupil would therefore probably be younger than Longinus (born between 200 and 213), but still sufficiently contemporary for Longinus to have engaged in debate with his views.

(492a41) ὁσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὁ κατὰ Μειδίου· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὕτως οὐκ ἠλίσχοις γέγονεν ἐν σπουδῇ, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀμφισβητήσεως ἀφορμᾶς παρέσχε. (b1) καὶ οἱ μὲν τοῦ παθητικοῦ χαρακτῆρος εἶναι φασίν αὐτόν, μετὰ δεινώσεως ἐπεξεργασ-μένον, οἱ δὲ τοῦ πραγματικοῦ· καὶ ἀπλῶς τῶν τε ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν ἐναρμόνιον, καὶ ὡς τοῖς παθητικοῖς μὲν τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων καὶ ἐνθυμημάτων παθητικήν καὶ τὴν ἁπαγγελίαν περιάπτει, τοῖς πραγματικοῖς δὲ, ὡσα τούτως ἐναρμόττει. (b8) ἔχεται μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦ ἥθους οὐκ ἐν

---

20 Smith (1994a) 526 n.7 cites parallels in Photius.
21 Heath (supra n.7) 99–102.
Similarly the speech Against Meidias: not a few have concerned themselves with it, and it has occasioned mutual controversy. (b1) Some say that it is of the emotional kind, worked out with expressions of strong emotion; others that it is of the practical kind. In fact, it is intense in its vocabulary and harmonious in its composition; he provides emotional epicheiremes and enthymemes with a form of expression that is itself emotional, and factual ones with what is appropriate to them. (b8) He also pays attention to character, not only in this speech, but also in many others. (b9) But it is very difficult for someone working on a combative speech to maintain character towards the opponent all the way through, and especially for those who are of a somewhat bitter and emotional nature—something of which Demosthenes and Aristides especially had their share. So they are frequently led astray, their purpose being overcome by their nature. Technique is not enough to keep intention on the right track when it does not have the cooperation of natural traits. (b17)

The concluding remarks on the necessity of combining technique and nature are similar to Longinus, excerpt 10 (215.1–2):  

23 Compare, too, the assessment of Demosthenes in Subl. 34.3–5, which also recognises how Demosthenes’ temperament limits the range of techniques which he can use effectively.
vant to Longinus’ rejection of the view that the proem of *Against Leptines* is expressive of character, reported in 492a27–40 (above).\(^{24}\) Smith (1992, 183) assigns the comparison of Demosthenes and Aristides in b9–17 to Photius; however, she notes that this passage is “less stylized” than the others which she assigns to Photius. Demosthenes and Aristides appear together in Longinus, excerpt 5 (214.4–6) and in a testimonium to Longinus in Sopater’s *Prolegomena to Aristides* (118.1–4 Lenz = Longinus F18); excerpt 12 (215.9–11) also makes approving reference to Aristides.\(^{25}\) There is therefore no intrinsic difficulty in seeing Longinus as the source of this comparison of Demosthenes and Aristides; the hostile view of Aristides in 491b7–11 (§5) may be due to Photius.

An intermediate source?

For the substance of 492a27–38 (§6), on the prologue of *Against Leptines*, Photius is using either Longinus or a source that names Longinus. The former is improbable: Psellus had access to Longinus’ *Art of Rhetoric* (of which he made an epitome),\(^{26}\) but there is no evidence that other works of Longinus were still available at this date, and Photius does not mention him elsewhere. We must, therefore, reckon with the possibility (at the very least) of an intermediary source. Treadgold attractively conjectured that in these codices Photius made

\(^{24}\) Keil (*supra* n.8) argues that the identification of Photius’ source as Longinus excludes the attribution of *On Sublimity* to Longinus, contrasting “without character” (ἀνθυποστηθος, *Subl.* 34.3) with the acknowledgement of Demosthenic character in b8–9. But one should note the adversative that follows (Demosthenes does have character but his temperament makes it difficult for him to sustain it), and heed the advice in 485b36–40 (§1) on the interpretation of negative terms like “unfigured” or “without character.”

\(^{25}\) Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 185.18–19 (= F21c) may be evidence that Longinus discussed Aristides in book 3 of the *Philological Discourses*.

use of books 3 and 4 of Proclus' *Chrestomathy*. This, if correct, would readily explain the presence of material derived from Longinus. There is ample evidence for the influence of Longinus on Syrianus and his pupils Hermias and Proclus; Lachares, another of Syrianus’ pupils, preserves a fragment of Longinus’ *Philological Discourses* (F21a = Lachares 294.14–35 Graeven).

If we assume that there was an intermediary source, then that source may be following Longinus faithfully, or he may combine material from Longinus (at least sometimes attributed) with material from other sources or his own contributions. The parallels with the excerpts perhaps suggest that the intermediary’s borrowings from Longinus were extensive; but we cannot gauge the degree of adaptation and contamination with any certainty. Moreover, there is (as we have seen) sometimes room for doubt in diagnosing Photius’ interventions. Therefore, while the sections of Photius discussed here offer the attractive prospect of an enhancement of our knowledge of Longinus’ critical writings, a measure of caution is still needed.
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28 See Heath (*supra* n.2), and “Echoes of Longinus in Gregory of Nyssa,” *VigChr* 53 (1999) 395–400.