

# 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

<sup>1</sup>R. M. Smith, "Photius on the Ten Orators," *GRBS* 33 (1992) 159–189; "Two Fragments of 'Longinus' in Photius," *CQ N.S.* 44 (1994) 525–529; "A Hitherto Unrecognized Fragment of Caecilius," *AJP* 115 (1994) 603–607 (hereafter SMITH with dates). The passages she attributes to Caecilius are conveniently listed in (1994a) 527.

hypothesis too brusquely discarded by Smith.<sup>2</sup> 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) ὁ μέντοι Σικελώτης Καικίλιος μὴ κεχρησθαί φησι τὸν ῥήτορα τοῖς κατὰ διάνοιαν σχήμασιν, ἀλλὰ κατευθὺ αὐτῷ καὶ ἀπλάστους τὰς νοήσεις ἐκφέρεσθαι, τροπὴν δὲ ἐκ τοῦ πανούργου καὶ ἀνάλλαξιν οὔτε ζητῆσαι τὸν ἄνδρα οὔτε χρήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτῶν δὴ τῶν νοημάτων καὶ τῆς φυσικῆς αὐτῶν ἀκολουθίας ἄγειν τὸν ἀκροατὴν πρὸς τὸ βούλημα. (b21) οἱ γὰρ πάλαι ῥήτορες ἰκανὸν αὐτοῖς ἐνόμιζον εὐρεῖν τε τὰ ἐνθυμήματα καὶ τῇ φράσει περιττῶς ἀπαγγεῖλαι. ἐσπούδαζον γὰρ τὸ ὅλον περὶ τὴν λέξιν καὶ τὸν ταύτης κόσμον, πρῶτον μὲν ὅπως εἶη σημαντικὴ καὶ εὐπρεπής, εἶτα δὲ καὶ ἐναρμόνιος ἢ τούτων σύνθεσις. ἐν τούτῳ γὰρ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὴν πρὸς τοὺς ἰδιώτας διαφορὰν ἐπὶ τὸ κρεῖττον περιγίνεσθαι. (b27) εἶτα εἰπὼν ὡς ἀσχημάτιστος εἶη κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ τοῦ Ἀντιφῶντος λόγος, ὡς περ ἐπιδιορθούμενος ἑαυτόν· (b29) οὐ τοῦτο λέγω, φησὶν, ὡς οὐδὲν εὐρίσκεται διανοίας παρὰ Ἀντιφῶντι σχῆμα· καὶ γὰρ ἐρώτησίς που καὶ παράλειψις καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα ἔνεισιν αὐτοῦ

<sup>2</sup>On Longinus see most fully L. Brisson and M. Patillon "Longinus Platonicus Philosophus et Philologus, I. Longinus Philosophus," *ANRW* II 36.7 (1994) 5214–5299, and "II. Longinus Philologus," 34.4 (1998) 3023–3108. My references to the fragments of Longinus follow their numeration. In "Longinus On Sublimity," *PCPS* 45 (1999) 43–74, I argue that the treatise *On Sublimity* is likely to be by Longinus, but the position developed in the present paper is independent of that claim.

τοῖς λόγοις· ἀλλὰ τί φημι; ὅτι μὴ κατ' ἐπιτήδευσιν μήτε συνεχῶς ἐχρήσατο τούτοις, ἀλλ' ἔνθα ἂν ἡ φύσις αὐτῆ μεθοδείας τινὸς χωρὶς ἀπῆγεν· ὃ δὴ καὶ περὶ τοὺς τυχόντας τῶν ιδιωτῶν ἔστιν ὁρᾶν. (b36) διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὅταν τις ἀσχηματίστους εἶναι λέγη λόγους, οὐ καθάπαξ οἰητέον τῶν σχημάτων αὐτοὺς ἀπεστερημένους εἶναι (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀδύνατον) ἀλλ' ὅτι τὸ ἐμμέθοδον καὶ συνεχὲς καὶ ἐρρωμένον τῶν σχημάτων οὐκ ἔστιν ὁρώμενον ἐν αὐτοῖς. (b40)

(485b14) 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.<sup>3</sup> Ofenloch prints the whole passage as Caecilius fr.

<sup>3</sup>Since 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<sup>4</sup> 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: ἐμμέθοδος (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):

ὅτι τροπή ἐκ τοῦ πανούργου καὶ ἐξάλλαξις οὐδεμία ἦν ἐν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τοῦ νοῦ σχήματα ὀψέ ποτε εἰς τοὺς δικανικοὺς λόγους παρεισήλθεν· ἡ πλείων γὰρ αὐτοῖς σπουδὴ περὶ τὴν λέξιν καὶ τὸν ταύτης κόσμον ἦν καὶ τὴν συνθήκην καὶ ἁρμονίαν. (213.8–12)

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

<sup>4</sup>Smith’s translation (1994b, 604 n.3) is misleading on this point, rendering the indefinite λόγους as “his speeches.”

contains derives from a later period.<sup>5</sup> One example that does not seem to have been mentioned before is the parallel between excerpt 6 (214.7–9, on the handling of παραγραφή) and Sopater's commentary on Hermogenes (*Rhet.Gr.* IV 315–22, esp. 317.27–318.13; cf. 596.30, 599.16)—the very passage cited above for the use of ἐμμέθοδος.<sup>6</sup>

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,<sup>7</sup> but this instance affords no specific grounds for doubt. Smith, in rejecting the attribution of the excerpts to Longinus, makes two points.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Secondly, she conjectures that the attribution was prompted by the mention of Longinus in excerpt 2 (213.6); but the text there (λέγουσι Λογγίνος) is clearly corrupt, and (given that the heading is not a later addition) Longinus' name is more likely to have intruded as a *result* of the superscription.

<sup>5</sup>A. Mayer, *Theophrasti περὶ λέξεως 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).

<sup>6</sup>It may be relevant that Sopater derived some material indirectly from Longinus' pupil Porphyry: H. Rabe, *Prolegomenon Sylloge* (Leipzig 1931) xiii–xiv.

<sup>7</sup>See M. Heath, "Apsines and pseudo-Apsines," *AJP* 119 (1998) 89–111.

<sup>8</sup>Smith (1994a) 525, overlooking some relevant contributions to the discussion: H. Graeven, "Ein Fragment des Lachares," *Hermes* 30 (1895) 300–303; B. Keil, "Longinfragmente," in M. Adler, ed., *Verhandlungen der Siebendvierzigsten Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmänner in Halle a. d. Saale vom 7. bis 10. Oktober 1903* (Leipzig 1904) 54; A. Brinkmann, "Rhetorica," *RhM* 62 (1907) 625–628; K. Aulitzky, "Longinos," *RE* 13 (1927) 1411. More recently, Brisson and Patillon II (*supra* n.2) 3078–3080 have also accepted the attribution to Longinus.

<sup>9</sup>Graeven (*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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup>

## 2. Lysias, cod. 262, 488b25–489a9

(488b25) ἔστι μὲν ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγοις αὐτοῦ λόγοις ἠθικός, γίνεται δὲ κατὰ διάνοιαν ὁ ἠθικός, ὅταν χρηστὴν ἔχη προαίρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ῥέπουσαν. (b27) ὄθεν οὐ χρὴ ψιλῶς τὰ πραχθέντα λέγειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν γνώμην συνάπτειν μεθ' ἧς ἐπράττετο ἕκαστον, οἷον ἂν μὲν χαλεπὰ ἦ καὶ πρὸς φίλους ἢ ἄλλως μετρίους τὴν ἀνάγκην αἰτιᾶσθαι, ἂν δὲ ἀμείνω, τὴν προαίρεσιν. αὕτη δὲ μάλιστα πιθανὴ 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· διὸ καὶ Λυσίας ἐν αὐτῷ φαίνεται πολλάκις διαμαρτάνων. (b36) θαυμάζονται μέντοι γε αὐτοῦ ἄλλοι τε πολλοὶ λόγοι καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ πρὸς Διογεΐτονα ἐπιτροπῆς· πιθανὴν τε γὰρ καὶ καθαρὰν τὴν

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

<sup>11</sup>Cf. F. Solmsen "Tiberius (2)," *RE* 6A (1936) 804–807; G. Ballaira, *Tiberii de figuris Demosthenicis libellus cum deperditorum operum fragmentis* (Rome 1968).

διήγησιν ποιεῖται, ἀλλ' οὐκ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὰς αὐξήσεις καὶ τὰς δεινώσεις, ὅπερ πολλοὶ πάσχουσιν, ὑπάγεται. καὶ γὰρ οὐδ' ἔστιν οἰκεία τὰ τοιαῦτα τῆς πρώτης διδασκαλίας τοῦ πράγματος, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα χώραν ἔχει καταλέγεσθαι. καὶ πολλὴν δὲ τὴν καθαρότητα καὶ σαφήνειαν ἔν τε τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ ταῖς λέξεσιν ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ λόγου προβάλλεται ἀρχῆς, ὡσπερ καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τὸ κατ' εὐθείαν ἀρμόζον ἀφηγήσει, καὶ τὸ μηδὲν τι ἔξωθεν συνεφέλκεσθαι. τὸ δὲ τῆς ἀρμονίας αὐτοῦ κάλλος οὐ παντός ἐστιν αἰσθάνεσθαι· καὶ γὰρ δοκεῖ μὲν ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε συγκεῖσθαι, εἰς ὑπερβολὴν δὲ κόσμου κατεσκευάσται. (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):

ὅτι ἠθικὸς λόγος γίνεται κατὰ διάνοιαν, ὅταν χρηστὴν ἔχη προαίρεσιν καὶ πρὸς τὰ βελτίω ῥέπουσαν.

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’ ἐνίοις ὁ περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ λόγος· ὁ σηκὸς δὲ νῦν εἶδός ἐστιν ἱερᾶς ἐλαίας. (a15) ἀλλ’ ὅτι μὲν γνήσιος Λυσίου, ἔκ τε τῶν κεφαλαίων δῆλον καὶ ἐκ τῶν περὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπιχειρημάτων καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ γε τοῦ προοιμίου τῆς τε διηγήσεως καὶ τοῦ ἐπιλόγου (πάνυ γὰρ δαιμονίως καὶ κατὰ τὴν εἰθισμένην τῷ ἀνδρὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπλότῃ δεινότητά ἐστιν ἐξειργασμένα ταῦτα). καὶ μὴν καὶ τὸ κατ’ ἐνθύμημα ἀλλὰ μὴ κατ’ ἐπιχείρημα πρᾶττειν τὰς ἀποδείξεις τοῦ Λυσίου μάλιστα τὸ ἰδίωμα ἀπαγγέλλει. ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ μὴ καθ’ ἐν διατρίβοντα μηκύνει τὸν λόγον τῆς τοῦ Λυσίου ἐστὶν ἀκριβείας, καὶ τὸ εὐπαγῆς τῶν λόγων, καὶ τὸ διὰ βραχύτητος πολλὴν παρέχειν ἡδονήν, ὃ μετὰ γε Δημοσθένην οὗτος μόνος τῶν ἄλλων ῥητόρων φαίνεται κατορθώσας, καὶ τὸ κάλλος δὲ τῆς διατυπώσεως, ἐν ᾧ μήτε Πλάτωνος μήτε Δημοσθένους μήτε Αἰσχίνου τὸ ἔλαττόν ἐστιν



ἀπηνεγμένος. ἰδίωμα δὲ Λυσίου καὶ τὸ τὰς ἀντιθέσεις προάγειν μηδαμῶς μὲν ἐμφαινούσας τὸ ἐπιβεβουλευμένον, τὸ δὲ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπεσπασμένον δεικνύειν. τεκμήριον δὲ τῆς λυσιακῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τὸ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ περιόδῳ τῶν κώλων εὐάρμοστον καὶ μετὰ καθαρότητος εὐανθές. (a34)

(489a14) The authenticity of the speech *On the Stump* is disputed by some. (The stump is a kind of sacred olive tree.) (a15) 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. (a34).

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” (ἀντίθεσις a30) in a sense that does not seem to be attested before the second century A.D.<sup>12</sup> The subject-

<sup>12</sup>The 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 δέ γε ὁ ἐκ Μυσίας τόν τε περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ λόγον, οὐδέν τῶν εἰρημένων συνιεῖς, τῆς τε γνησιότητος τῶν λυσιακῶν ἐκβάλλει λόγων, καὶ πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς ἄλλους εἰς νόθους ἀπορριψάμενος πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὠφελείας ἀπεστέρησεν, οὐχ εὕρισκομένων ἔτι τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσόντων· ἅπαξ γὰρ ἀποκριθέντες παρεωράθησαν, ἐπικρατεστέρας τῆς διαβολῆς, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπ' ἄλλων πολλῶν, ἢ 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-

---

tenuous) for the distribution of the term in this sense see Heath (*supra* n.7) 106–107. The usage is found in the excerpts from Longinus (213.14, 214.4–5).

certain.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> The Paul mentioned by Eunapius is sometimes identified with Paul of Lycopolis,<sup>15</sup> 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 τοὺς πρὸς αὐξήσιν διαθεῖναι λόγους. (b4) τινὲς μὲν οὖν τῶν περὶ τοὺς ῥητορικοὺς διατριβόντων λόγους οὐκ ὀρθῶς ὑπήχθησαν

<sup>13</sup>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).

<sup>14</sup>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.”

<sup>15</sup>The identification is assumed in *PLRE* I 683 s.v. “Paulus (1)”; J. Geiger, “Notes on the Second Sophistic in Palestine,” *ICS* 19 (1994) 221–230, at 227. Stegemann (“Paulus [18],” *RE*) is more cautious; cf. Millar (*supra* n.14) 18: “perhaps identifiable with an Egyptian sophist whom the *Suda* makes a contemporary of Constantine.”

εἰπεῖν περὶ Λυσίου ὡς ἀποδείξαι μὲν τὰ ἐγκλήματα παρ' ὄντιναοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν ἀνδρῶν τὸ προκεκριμένον ἔχει, ἀυξῆσαι δὲ ταῦτα πολλῶν ἐνδεής. καὶ γὰρ ἐλέγχονται φανερώς ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ λόγων πολὺ τῆς ἐπ' αὐτῷ διασφαλλόμενοι κρίσεως. καὶ μάλιστα γὰρ τούτους ὁ κατὰ Μνησιπτολέμου διελέγχει· θαυμαστῶς γὰρ τὴν κατηγορίαν πρὸς μέγεθος οὗτος ἠύχησε. (b13) Καικίλιος δὲ ἀμαρτάνει εὐρετικὸν μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα, εἴπερ ἄλλον τινά, συνομολογῶν, οἰκονομῆσαι δὲ τὰ εὐρεθέντα οὐχ οὕτως ἱκανόν· καὶ γὰρ κὰν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ λόγου οὐδενὸς ὀρᾶται φαυλότερος. (b17)

(489b3) Lysias is skilled at stirring emotions, and well-equipped to compose speeches so as to achieve amplification.

(b4) 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. (b13) 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. (b17)

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: Καικίλιος 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).<sup>16</sup> 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 ιδέας τεκμαιρόμενος]") is either misread or else punningly adapted (491a31: "among whom was Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who provides no substantial evidence for his own assumption [τεκμήριον τῆς ιδέας ὑπολήψεως] ...") in order to provide a transition to a response that is not derived from Libanius:

(491a33) ... οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνο συνιδεῖν ἐθελήσας, ὡς πολλῶ μείζων ἐστὶν ἢπερ ἡ ἐκείνου ἀπόφασις αὐτὸς ὁ Ἄριστογεῖτων ἀνομολογῶν Δημοσθένην κατ' αὐτοῦ γεγραφέναι· καὶ γὰρ ἀπολογούμενος οὐκ ἐν τῷ παρέργῳ λέγων ἀλλ' ἐπιμελῶς ἀνταγωνιζόμενος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ δείκνυται, ὅς ἐπιγέγραπται 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

<sup>16</sup>On 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 συνδιασώσασθαι χαρακτηρί· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς δυσὶ τούτοις λόγοις ἐκ διαλειμμάτων τινῶν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐννοίαις ἐπιβάλλων ἀμιλλᾶσθαι δοκεῖ πρὸς ἑαυτόν, ὥσπερ ἀσκούμενος ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἀγωνιζόμενος τοῖς ἔργοις. διὸ καὶ τινες ἔφησαν ἑκάτερον λόγον ἐν τύποις καταλειφθῆναι, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν διακεκαθάρται· καίτοι καὶ τοῦτο εὐλαβέστερον οἱ ῥηθέντες λόγοι ποιοῦσιν. (b7) ἄλλ' οἷ γε τούτους αἰτιώμενοι, τί ἂν φαῖεν περὶ Ἀριστείδου, ὃς καὶ κατακόρως τῷ ἰδιώματι τούτῳ φαίνεται κεκρημένος, ὥσπερ καὶ τῷ προιέναι κατὰ τὰς ἐργασίας πέρα τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ τῷ περιττῷ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ μέτρῳ τῆς χρείας συμπαρακτείνεσθαι; (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).<sup>17</sup> 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 αἰτίαν ἐν ὑπομνήμασι καταλελειφθαι οὕτω τὴν ἐργασίαν ἀπειληφῶς τελείαν, διότι καὶ ἅ πρὸς τὴν κατηγορίαν πολλὴν ἔσχε τὴν ἀμυδρότητα καὶ κουφότητα, ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ λόγου παρέθετο· ὅπερ οὐκ ἂν περιεῖδεν ὁ ῥήτωρ, εἰς ἐξέτασιν ἀκριβεστέραν τῶν ἰδίων λόγων καταστάς. (b17) ἀλλὰ γὰρ οὐχ οὕτω πρόεισιν ὁ Λυσίου κατὰ Μνησιπτολέμου λόγος, ἐν πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς δεομένοις μέρεσι τὸ παθητικὸν φυλάξας οὐδὲ παυόμενος τῆς ἐπιφορᾶς ἀπέστη, ἐπέτεινε δὲ μᾶλλον, οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ τέλος τοῦς 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

<sup>17</sup>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 Ἰφρυβίου; Adler prints M. Schmidt's περὶ τοῦ κατὰ φύ(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 ἦν ἔμψυχος καὶ περιπατοῦν μουσεῖον, 4.1.3 = 6.13–15 = Longinus F3a)—is a relevant consideration.

(491b22) καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸν παραπρεσβείας τινὲς ἐν ὑπομνήμασί φασι καταλειφθῆναι, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς ἔκδοσιν οὐδὲ πρὸς τὸ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀπηρτισμένον γεγράφθαι. διὰ τῆ; διότι μετὰ τὰ ἐπιλογικά, πολλὰ τε ὄντα καὶ σχεδὸν τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος ἐπέχοντα, πολλὰς πρὸ αὐτῶν ἀντιθέσεις εἰπών, πάλιν ἐπὶ ἀντιθέσεις ἐτρέπετο· ὅπερ ἀνοικονόμητόν τε ἐστὶ καὶ διερριμμένον. (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 ἀσφαλὲς Δημοσθένους λέγουσιν εἶναι, ὁ δὲ Καλλιμάχος, οὐδ' ἰκανὸς ὦν κρίνειν, Δεινάρχου νομίζει. τινὲς δὲ αὐτὸν ὑπεβάλλοντο Λυσία, καίτοι καὶ τὸν χρόνον ἔχοντες αὐτοῖς διαμαχόμενον καὶ τὸν τύπον ἅπαντα τῆς ἐργασίας καὶ τὰ πράγματα καὶ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν. μαρτυρία δὲ τοῦ δημοσθενικὸν εἶναι τὸν λόγον καὶ ὁ πλαγιασμός καὶ ἡ συνέχεια τῶν περιόδων καὶ ἡ εὐτονία· ἐξ αὐτοῦ γὰρ τοῦ προοιμίου τούτοις ὁ λόγος διαποικίλλεται. καὶ μὴν καὶ ἡ περὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐκλογή εἰς τὸ ἄριστον ἀνηνέχθαι καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις εὖ ἔχειν πεφιλοτίμηται. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ σχήματα· ἐστὶ γὰρ συνεστραμμένα μετὰ γοργότητος καὶ ποικιλίαν τῷ λόγῳ παρεχόμενα· καὶ γὰρ ἐρωτήσεις προβάλλεται καὶ ὑποστροφὰς καὶ τὸ ἀσύνδετον, οἷς μάλιστα Δημοσθένης χαίρει χρώμενος. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἐπιμελῆς καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν τῷ



κόσμῳ οὐ διαφθείρουσα, αἱ τε περίοδοι τῷ ἀπηρτισμένῳ συναγόμεναι καὶ τὸ πρέπον πανταχοῦ διασφζουσι. (492a5) τὸ μὲν οὖν μηδενὸς φείδεσθαι συνθέσεως ἀλλὰ πάντα διειληφθαι περίοδοις ἔστι μὲν Ἴσοκράτους καὶ Λυσίου πρὸς Δημοσθένην κοινόν· ἢ δὲ κατὰ τὰς περιόδους ἐν τοῖς μεγέθεσι ποικιλία συμπληροῦσα τὰ κῶλα λαμβανομένη τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνους διαφορὰν ἀπεργάζεται, τοῦ μὲν Ἴσοκράτους ὡς τὰ πολλὰ μηκύνοντος τὴν ἐργασίαν αὐτῶν, τοῦ δὲ Λυσίου συντέμνοντος. ἐξ ἑκατέρου δὲ τούτων τῷ Δημοσθένει τὸ πρέπον διασφζεται. (a13)

(491b29) 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 common.<sup>18</sup>

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);<sup>19</sup> 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) φασὶ δὲ τὸν Δημοσθένην δ καὶ κ ἔτη γεγονότα τὸν περὶ τῶν ἀτελείων ἦτοι τὸν πρὸς Λεπτίνην φιλοπονήσασθαι λόγον, οὗ τὸ προοίμιον Λογγίνος μὲν ὁ κριτικὸς ἀγωνιστικὸν νομίζει (ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου δὲ οὗτος ἠκμαζε, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ συνηγωνίζετο Ζηνοβία τῇ τῶν Ὀσροηνῶν βασιλίδι, τὴν ἀρχὴν κατεχοῦσα Ὀδενάθου τοῦ ἀνδρὸς αὐτῆς τετελευτηκότος, ἣν καὶ μεταβαλεῖν εἰς τὰ Ἰουδαίων ἔθη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς δεισιδαιμονίας παλαιὸς ἀναγράφει λόγος). ἀλλὰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν Λογγίνος τοιαύτην περὶ τοῦ προειρημένου προοιμίου ψῆφον ἐξάγει. ἕτεροι δὲ οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἔφασαν τὸ προοίμιον ἠθικὸν εἶναι. (a38) καὶ πολλοὺς οὗτος ὁ λόγος παρέσχεν ἀγῶνα κρίνεσθαι προτεθείς, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἀσπασίῳ τῷ ῥήτορι, ἅτε μηδ' ἀφιγμένῳ τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεωρίας εἰς ἀκρίβειαν. (a40)

(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 aforementioned proem. Others have claimed, incorrectly, that the

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

<sup>19</sup>The 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.<sup>20</sup> 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*.<sup>21</sup> Apsines' birth is generally dated around 190; his pupil would therefore probably be younger than Longinus (born between 200 and 213),<sup>22</sup> but still sufficiently contemporary for Longinus to have engaged in debate with his views.

(492a41) ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὁ κατὰ Μειδίου· καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος οὐκ ὀλίγοις γέγονεν ἐν σπουδῇ, καὶ τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀμφισβητήσεως ἀφορμὰς παρέσχε. (b1) καὶ οἱ μὲν τοῦ παθητικοῦ χαρακτήρος εἶναι φασιν αὐτόν, μετὰ δεινώσεως ἐπεξεργασμένον, 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 παθητικὴν καὶ τὴν ἀπαγγελίαν περιάπτει, τοῖς πραγματικοῖς δέ, ὅσα τούτοις ἐναρμόττει. (b8) ἔχεται μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦ ἤθους οὐκ ἐν

<sup>20</sup>Smith (1994a) 526 n.7 cites parallels in Photius.

<sup>21</sup>Heath (*supra* n.7) 99–102.

<sup>22</sup>Brisson and Patillon I (*supra* n.2) 5219–5220; for Apsines' chronology see J. Brzoska, "Apsines," *RE* 2 (1896) 277–283.

τούτῳ μόνον τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς ἄλλοις. (b9) ἀλλά γε χαλεπώτατόν ἐστι λόγων ἀγωνιστικῶν ἐργάτη διὰ τέλους φυλάξαι πρὸς τὸν ἀνταγωνιστὴν τὸ ἦθος, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς ὅσοι φύσεως ἔτυχον πικροτέρας τε καὶ παθητικωτέρας, ἧς οὐχ ἥκιστα Δημοσθένης τε καὶ Ἀριστείδης μετέχει. διόπερ πολλάκις ἐξάγονται τῆς προθέσεως ἐλαττουμένης ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἔστιν ἰκανὴ τέχνη κατορθῶσαι τὸ βούλημα, μὴ σύνεργον ἔχουσα καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ιδιότητα. (b17)

(492a41) 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):<sup>23</sup>

ὅτι πολλάκις ἐνδεία φύσεως καὶ οἱ ἐπιστήμονες κατὰ τὴν ἐργασίαν ἀποτυγχάνουσιν.

Often natural deficiency makes even those who are experts in respect of craftsmanship fail.

Demosthenes' limited capacity for character is obviously rele-

<sup>23</sup> 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).<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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),<sup>26</sup> 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

<sup>24</sup>Keil (*supra* n.8) argues that the identification of Photius' source as Longinus excludes the attribution of *On Sublimity* to Longinus, contrasting “without character” (ἀνηθοποίητος, *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.”

<sup>25</sup>Σ Ael. Arist. *Pan.* 185.18–19 (= F21c) may be evidence that Longinus discussed Aristides in book 3 of the *Philological Discourses*.

<sup>26</sup>P. Gautier, “Michel Psellos et la rhétorique de Longin,” *Prometheus* 3 (1977) 193–199.

use of books 3 and 4 of Proclus' *Chrestomathy*.<sup>27</sup> 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;<sup>28</sup> 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.

March, 2000

The School of Classics  
University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT U.K.  
m.f.heath@leeds.ac.uk

<sup>27</sup>W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (DOSStud. 18 [Washington 1980]) 50 n.53. On the attribution of the *Chrestomathy* to the fifth-century Platonist see now A. Longo, "Sull'attribuzione della *Crestomazia* a Proclo neoplatonico," *StIt* III 13 (1995) 109–124; but the question remains open.

<sup>28</sup>See Heath (*supra* n.2), and "Echoes of Longinus in Gregory of Nyssa," *VigChr* 53 (1999) 395–400.