

Photius on the Ten Orators

Rebekah M. Smith

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 *Moralia* (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 *Moralia*. 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 (485B14–40).

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.*:² 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 part³ 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.

³ E.g. J. J. Bateman, "The Critiques of Isocrates' Style in Photius' *Bibliotheca*," *ICS* 6 (1981) 182–96, gives the tradition behind the opinions of Isocrates' style but does not seek to investigate precisely whose they are. F. Leo, *Die griechische-römische Biographie* (Leipzig 1901) 33, viewed Caecilius as an agent in a stage of expansion of the *Lives* from an original κοινή ιστορία whose original form predated Ps.-Plutarch. L. Van Hook, "The Criticism of Photius on the Attic Orators," *TAPA* 38 (1907) 41–47, following E. Ofenloch, *Caecilii Calactini Fragmenta* (Leipzig 1907), assumed the criticisms in Photius' codices 259–68 originated with Caecilius. G. L. Kustas, "The Literary Criticism of Photius: A Christian Definition of Style," *Hellenika* 17 (1962) 132–69 at 136 n.4, notes that the criticism of the orators "owes much to another source, either Ps.-Plutarch's Βίοι τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων or Caecilius of Caleacte." He does not, however, note two comments Photius makes in these codices using the first-person pronoun, which I discuss below. R. Henry's edition of the *Bibl.*, *Photius: Bibliotheca* I–VIII (Paris 1959–77) at I 219, notes the problem in passing and remarks, "Je vois mal Photius 'picorant' dans toute une série de critiques et de rhéteurs pendant qu'il rédigeait ses notices et qu'il a dû prendre pour guide quelque manuel scolaire perdue dont il y aurait sans doute lieu de préciser la physionomie." E. Drerup, *Demosthenes im Urteile des Alertums* (Würzburg 1923) 194, shared this opinion.

in an earlier version by the author of the Ps.-Plutarchan *Lives of the Ten Orators*.”⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶

⁴ W. Treadgold, *The Nature of the Bibliotheca of Photius* (=DumOST 18 [Washington, D.C., 1980]) 48.

⁵ A. 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 (222f), citing Ballheimer (*De Photi vitis 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 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\xi \text{ιστορίας μεμαθήκαμεν}$ 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 Plutarcheum 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.

⁶ M. 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): ἐπολιτεύετο 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.* 844E6; *Bibl.* 493A11).

οὐκ ἐνδεέστερον.⁸ 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 falso securus e 'Plutarcho' transcripserit, potuit nihilominus semel nimia sententiae pravitate ut eam omitteret moveri—aut ab eo exemplari afuisse quod Photius exscripsit, ita ut duas quasi traditionis vias 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.⁹ 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.¹⁰ Ballheimer was

⁸ "He was fairly active in public affairs." The other sentences of this type are Demosthenes (494B15, added to 846E8), καταλιπὼν ὁ ῥήτωρ τὴν μηδ' ἐαυτὴν δυναμένην σῶσαι πόλιν ἔφυγε ("Leaving a city that was unable to save even itself, the orator fled."); Demosthenes (493B11, added to 845B5), δηλῶν μέγα μέρος εἶναι τῆς ἐν τῷ δήμῳ πειθοῦς τὴν ὑπόκρισιν ("demonstrating that a great part of his influence over the people was his skill in delivery"); Demosthenes (494A11, added to 845F9), τῆς μὲν συμβάσης τύχης ἴσως οὐδὲν ἐνδεέστερον, τῆς δ' ἄλλης αὐτοῦ περὶ λόγους δυνάμεως οὐκ ὀλίγῳ 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 A10 (*Bibl.* 497 A30-34). 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: ἐποιήσατο δὲ καὶ νόμων εἰσφορᾶς διαφόρων ὧν ἔστι 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

II

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: ἐνεγκάμενος; *Bibl.* 489B41: Θρασυδαῖον, *Mor.* 835F8: Θρασύλαιον; *Bibl.* 488B28: Δημηγορίαί, *Mor.* 836B5: Δημηγορία; *Bibl.* 486B13: Ἐρχιέως, *Mor.* 836E2: ἀρχιερέως; *Bibl.* 487A6: μὲν ἄς; *Mor.* 837D7: μὲν ἄς μόνας—Mau and Cuvigny do not make it clear how many Mss give this reading; Westermann moved μόνας to improve the sense—*Bibl.* 487A6: ἐκμαθεῖν—cf. Smythe 2279—*Mor.* 837E1: ἐκμάθη or -οι; *Bibl.* 487B8: τριηραρχεῖν, *Mor.* 838A8: τριήρας; *Bibl.* 487B9: καὶ δις, *Mor.* 838A8: καὶ τὸ δις—all Mss. thus, but Mau gives κίτιοι; *Bibl.* 497B1: μοι γέγονε βοηθός, *Mor.* 842C2: βοηθῆσαι. μόγις εἰσήνεγκε—the scribe apparently saw the correct original, βοηθῆσαι; cf. Mau 25—*Bibl.* 493B27: πολεμική, *Mor.* 845D6: πομπική; *Bibl.* 495B16: Κολλυτεύς, *Mor.* 848D5: Κολυττεύς—or ιττεύς or υτευ—*Bibl.* 495B24: Δημοσθένει, *Mor.* 848F1 Δημοσθένους), but I have found nothing in the textual readings that indicates that Photius' version is anything but a later version of the Ps.-Plutarch.

For Photius' method of excerpting quoted text, cf. Treadgold (*supra* n.4) 62f; J. Bompaire, "Photius et la Seconde Sophistique, d'après la Bibliothèque," *TravMém* 8 (1981) 79–86; T. Hägg, *Photios als Vermittler antiker Literatur* (Uppsala 1975) 131, 156f, and "Photius at Work: Evidence from the Text of the *Bibliotheca*," *GRBS* 14 (1973) 213–22.

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, Cleochares 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" (121A14ff, οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς συμβαλεῖν. οὐ γὰρ δὴ γε τολμῆσαι 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 (468B8) that he has seen this work: ἦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ἴσμεν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἐπιγραφομένην τῷ ὀνόματι. A second example occurs later in the same codex (487A11–17), also inserted into the Ps.-Plutarch text (at *Mor.* 837F4) that lists and describes the orator's work: τὸν μὲν οὖν περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως καὶ τὸν πανηγυρικὸν καὶ τινὰς τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν εἴρηται μοι ὅπως τε καὶ ὅτε συνέταξε.¹⁵ This probably refers to 486B19–26 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 (265.491A12–21), 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: ἐγὼ δὲ εἰδὼς πολλάκις καὶ λόγους διαφόρων γεννητόρων πολλὴν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοιότητα.¹⁶ 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 sym-bouletic speeches, both how and when they were composed." Cf. Tread-gold, "The Recently Completed Edition of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius," *Byzantinoslavica* 41 (1980) 50–61 at 60. The reference is probably not to codex 61.102A18–30, also on Isocrates. If it were, the words referred to would indeed be Photius' own, but their content would not be precisely what is decribed 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' ῥητόρων οἱ λόγοι, ὧν ἐποιησάμεθα τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν, ἐν τούτοις περιγράφεται ἡ μνήμη. The following *Lycurgus* codex begins: Λυκούργου δὲ οὐδενός, ὅσα γε τελεῖν εἰς ῥήτορας καὶ δημαγωγούς, τὸ ἔλαττον φερομένου οὐπω παρέσχεν ἡμῖν ὁ χρόνος λόγους ἀναγνῶναι, φέρεσθαι δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐξ ἱστορίας ἰε' μεμαθήκαμεν. 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 Chrysostom, but οὐκ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ δέ. τοῖς τε γὰρ ἐνθυμήμασι καὶ τῇ πείρᾳ τῆς γραφῆς πολὺ τὸ ἐνδεὲς τῶν ἄλλων αὐτοῦ λόγων ἀποφέρεται. πλὴν τινα καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ παρεξεβλήθη. ἔστι δὲ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ λέξις 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 τελεῖν εἰς ῥήτορας καὶ δημαγωγούς, 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 εὐκρινὲς καὶ σαφὲς καὶ μεμελετημένον πᾶσαι δῆλον, καὶ ὡς ἐπανθεῖ αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον ἔμφυτον ἀλλὰ καὶ κομμοτικὸν 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 (*scil.* 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 (159.102B 5), σαφήνεια (159.102B 13), and careful working of language (102B 5, 8).¹⁹ 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.²⁰ Photius frequently employs the adjective ἔμφυτος, and κομμωτικός, used in the *Bibl.* only here, occurs twice in Photius' letters.²¹ His style seems distinguishable again in codex 264 on Aeschines, where a one-sentence description reads: ἔστι δὲ λόγοις αὐτοῦ γλυκύς τε καὶ καθαρὸς καὶ εὐκρινῆς καὶ τῆ τῶν ἐνθυμημάτων σαφηνεῖα σεμνυνόμενος.²² 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.²³ The simple stringing together of terms is also typical in a description of style (καὶ ... καὶ ... τε καὶ...).²⁴ This resemblance to Photius' prose style stands out in

¹⁹ In codex 159 Photius uses ἐπιμέλεια (102B5) and τὸ ἐπιμελής (102B8), here τὸ μεμελετημένον, which appears in various forms descriptively or in critical sections nine times: μεμελετημένον, codex 51.12A38; ἀμελέτητον, 122.94 B9 and 182.127A20; ἐκμελετώ, codex 141.98B18 and ἐκμελῆς, codex 79.55A24; μελέτην, 160.103A11, 167.115B25, 259–68 (bis) here and 260.487A32; ἐμελετήθησαν, 167.107B30.

²⁰ In the *Bibl.* ἀνθεῖ at codex 197.161A14 in the description of a work and 32.6B20 in a critical section; ἀνθηρός in 41.9A8, 69.34B3, 74.52 A8, 78.54B38, 110.89B6, 127.95B14, 165.107B28, 239.318B33; ἀνθῶν at codex 657.33 B42, 86.66A7; in general e.g. *Ep.* 201.63, 284.1083, 285.315.

²¹ For ἔμφυτος cf. *Ep.* 1.589, 156.22, 165.111; *Bibl.* 125.94B33; 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 εὐκρινῆς and καθαρὸς often occur together, for example in codex 47.11A24 on Josephus, 98.84B7 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, 70.35 A6, 90.67B11, 95.78B10, 97.84A35, 102.86A13, 114.90B22, 129.96B28, 140.98A32, 203.164A20, 226.243B1, 167.112B4, and 168.116 B36 in the description of contents. For instance, 57.17A16 (Appian): "Ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν ἀπέριτος καὶ ἰσχνός, τὴν δὲ ἱστορίαν, ὡς οἶόν τ' ἐστί, 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 Caleacte. 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 preceding statement about Antiphon's cleverness: ὁ μέντοι Σικελιώτης Καικίλιος (485 B14); then the direct quotation is given, in

γικῶν διὰ τῆς ἱστορίας μεθόδων, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος, ὑποφῆτης, ἐπᾶραι τε λόγοις τεταπεινωμένον φρόνημα στρατοῦ καὶ διαπραῦναι φλεγμαῖνον καὶ πάθος δηλώσαι καὶ εἶ τι ἄλλο λόγοις ἐκμιμήσασθαι ἄριστος, or 90.67B14 (Libanius): τῇ γὰρ πόλλῃ περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους φιλοπονία τε καὶ περιεργία τὴν τε ἔμφυτον τοῦ λόγου καὶ αὐτοσχέδιον (ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι) χάριν ἐλυμήνατο καὶ τέρψιν, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἀσαφέστερον περιέτρεψε, πολλὰ μὲν ἐπισκοτίζων παρενήκας, ἕνια δ' ἀφαιρέσει καὶ τοῦ ἀναγκαίου, or, 226.243B11 (Eulogius): Ἔστι μὲν οὖν οὗτος ὁ συγγραφεὺς καθαρὸς τε καὶ ἠδύς, καὶ διὰ συντόμου καὶ λείας ὁδοῦ τοὺς ἐλέγχους ποιούμενος, καὶ πρὸς μηδὲν τῶν ἔξω τοῦ ἀναγκαίου φερόμενος.

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 σχημάτων), 50, 50a, 61, 64–67, 71–76, 126, 136; among traces of Caecilius' lexicon, p.58 *s.v.* εἰσαγγελία, 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 485B16–27, 488B30–40, 488B25–36 (=Ofenbach fr.109), 488B37–489A9 (=fr.109), 489A14–35, 489B3–13 (=fr.110), 491A40–491B7, 491B12–17 (=fr.143), 491B8–22 (=fr.143), 491B23–28, 491B29–492A5 (=fr.144).

which Caecilius explains, ὡπερ ἐπιδιορθούμενος ἑαυτὸν (485B829), 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 489B3–13 (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: Καικίλιος δὲ ἀμαρτάνει εὐρετικὸν μὲν τὸν ἄνδρα, εἴπερ ἄλλον τινά, συνομολογῶν, οἰκονομησαὶ δὲ τὰ εὐρεθέντα οὐχ οὕτως ἱκανόν. καὶ γὰρ κὰν τούτῳ τῷ μέρει τῆς ἀρετῆς τοῦ λόγου οὐδενὸς ὀραῖται 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, εἴπερ ἄλλον τινά/εἴπερ τις ἄλλος (“as much as anyone/if anyone else”), is one that Photius uses often in critical or descriptive comments (in critical sections: 119.93A40; in reports on the contents of various works: 146.99A16, 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, 224.222B14, and 262.488B, 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' πλασματικοί (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.

²⁹ 491A2–12, *On Halonnesus*; 491A22–28, *On the Treaty with Alexander*; 491A31f, *Against Aristogeiton*; 492A14–20, *On the Peace*; 492A23f, *Against Neaera*.

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 his contemporaries, the following argument cannot prove that these passages were indeed composed by Photius.³² 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).³³

³² For a technical description of particular usages in Byzantine Greek, cf. G. Böhling, *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 Böhling, 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 $\tau\omicron\upsilon$, $\tau\omega$, the middle, optative, accumulation of negatives, pleonastic use of particles (especially $\kappa\alpha\iota$), and preference for abstracts 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 ῥᾶστα κατάφωρον γίνεται,
ἐν δὲ ταῖς τυχούσαις πολλὰ παροράται
καὶ οὐδ' εἰς ἀμάρτημα κρίνεται.

or 1.575 οὕτως ἡμῶν οἱ πατέρες παρειλήφασιν,
οὕτως ἡμῶν τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνους παραδεδώκασιν.³⁴

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

163.6 οὐκ ἀκοῦσαι δὲ μόνον,
ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν ἀπαγγεῖλαι,
οὐκ ἀπαγγεῖλαι δὲ μόνον,
ἀλλὰ καὶ χρυσῷ πετάλῳ γράφειν παραδοῦ-
ναι.³⁵

Quite often two parallel or antithetical terms are set in chiasmic order, as in *Ep.* 1.577, ἀρεταῖς κοσμεῖν τὴν πίστιν καὶ τῇ πίστει τὰς ἀρετὰς λαμπροτέρας ἀπεργάζεσθαι, 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
λάβοι μελέτη, τῆς ἄνωθέν σοι δηλονότι ῥοπῆς εἰς
εὐμένειαν ὀρώσης, θαυμάσιας ἂν μᾶλλον ὅπως (σε)

³⁴ Cf. also e.g. Proem, μᾶλλον δ' ὁ τὸ ἀναμιγμένον νομίζων ἀξιόλογον, αἰρούμενος δὲ καὶ τὸ ποικίλον; 163.6; 234.86.

³⁵ Cf. also Proem, ἴν' ἔχοις ... καὶ κοινοτέραν τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν; Proem, μίαν μὲν γὰρ ... ῥᾶδιον εἶναι; Postscript, ἔχοις ... ἀπαρχὴν καὶ τελευτήν; and Proem, ὅψε μὲν ἴσως ... ἐκδεδώκαμεν.

³⁶ Cf. also *Ep.* 165.25, 72; 234.34, πόθεν τηλικαῦται καὶ ποσαῦται πληγαί.

τοσαύτης σοφίας διελάνθανε χάρις καὶ κάλλος ἐμφύτον λόγου (θερμὸν ἐραστήν) οὐκ εἶχεν. Οἱ μὲν ἄλλοι τοῦ Πλάτωνος λόγοι τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου πεφύκασι γνώμονες.³⁷

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 γλῶττα λέγειν ἔχειν ἄττα ἂν καὶ λέγοι, μήτε εἰς ἐπὶ μέρους καὶ ὠρισμένην ἀξίωσιν τὴν κοινοτέραν καὶ ἀόριστον περιενεγκόντος, μηδὲ σαφῶς δεδηλωκότος τίνων ἐστὶ σοι χρεῖα βιβλίων καὶ ποίας τῶν ῥητορικῶν τεχνῶν πραγματείας καὶ τίνος τεχνογράφου, πῶς ἂν δυναίμην.... (235.6)

and three others extend the ends of sentences.³⁸ Parenthetical expressions are also quite frequent. Ten occur even within this small selection,³⁹ and participial phrases create similar extensions, for example at 234.86:

ὥστε καὶ ὁ μακρὸς καὶ ὁ βραχὺς τοῦ βίου χρόνος, τῷ παρόντι μόνον τὴν αἴσθησιν τῶν ἡδέων περικλείων, εἰς ἴσην καὶ ὁμοίαν ἀπόλαυσιν τὸν τε εἰς γῆρας βαθύνοντα καὶ τὸν ἐνακμάζοντα τῇ νεότητι συνάγει, ἐκατέρου μὲν τὴν αἴσθησιν τῇ παρούσῃ τέρπει διαπλανῶν, οὐδενὸς δὲ οὔτε τῶν παρεληλυθότων οὔτε τῶν μελλόντων οὐδεμιᾶς ἡδονῆς οὐδετέρω μετέχειν ἐδιδούς.⁴⁰

³⁷ Cf. also *Ep.* 207.1: Proem, τὸν σὸν ὡσπερ ... ἐκδεδώκαμεν; Proem, εἰ δέ σοί ποτε ... φιλοπονουμένω; Proem, καὶ οὐδὲ τὰς σὰς ... φροντίδα; Postscr., σὺ δ' ᾧ ... καταλάβοι τέλος.

³⁸ 165.270; 234.190, 257. The other genitive absolutes occur in Proem 16f and *Ep.* 164.46, 92; 165.4, 67, 134, 151; 166.139, 157; 234.43, 235.19.

³⁹ Proem, εἰ καὶ διατυπωτικὴν τινα ... τοῦ σοῦ διαπύρου πόθου καὶ; *Ep.* 1.526, 529, 560; 165.69, 131 for example.

⁴⁰ Also Proem, ἐπειδὴ τῷ τε κοινῷ τῆς πρεσβείας καὶ τῇ βασιλείῳ ψήφῳ πρεσβεύειν ἡμᾶς ἐπ' Ἀσσυρίους αἰρεθέντας ἤτησας τὰς ὑποθέσεις ἐκείνων τῶν βιβλίων; Postscr., ἔχοις τὴν αἴτησιν τῆς ἐλπίδος οὐ διαμαρτοῦσαν ... 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, πόνθεν τηλικαῦται καὶ τοσαῦται πληγαί (234.34). And in the letter to Boris-Michael:

1.520, εἰλικρινῆς καὶ εὐθὲς καὶ ἐξηρημένον καὶ ἀκήρατον

1.538, ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἀκριβεστάταις καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ῥᾶστα κατάφωρον γίνεταί, ἐν δὲ ταῖς τυχούσαις πολλὰ παροράται καὶ οὐδ' εἰς ἀμάρτημα κρίνεταί.

1.557, κατὰ πάντων ἄμαχον τὸ κράτος καὶ ἀήττητον ἀναδέχεται καὶ καλοῖς καὶ σωσικόσμοις διὰ παντὸς θριάβοις ἐγκαλλωπίζεται.

1.564, στήθι στερρῶς ἐν τῇ πέτρα τῆς πίστεως, ἐν ἧ καλῶς ὑπὸ κυρίου τεθεμελίωσαι

Photius' fondness for expressing a single thought in double terms⁴¹ also creates frequent pairs of rhyming or alliterative words in, for example,

1.534, ἀκοσμίας καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης

165.202, τὸ βαθὺ καὶ βεβηκὸς

234.11, ἀκοσμίας καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης

⁴¹ Cf. Proem, διατυπωτικὴν τινα καὶ κοινοτέραν; Postscr., ἡ σπουδὴ καὶ μελέτη; 1.522, καὶ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου καταφαίνεται τε καὶ διελέγχεται; 1.527, συνωρᾶται καὶ πεφώραται; 1.531, θρησκείας καὶ πίστεως.

234.30, φρικτὴν καὶ φοβερὰν
 234.139, ἐν ἀφθόνοις δὲ καὶ ἀνεκλαλήτοις ἀγαθοῖς.

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): Διὸ καὶ πολλοῖς πολλὰς παρέσχε τῶν κριτικῶν διατριβὰς μὲν καθ' ἑαυτούς, διαφωνίας δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, τῶν μὲν ἐμβαθνομένων τῇ μελέτῃ καὶ διασκέψει τοῦ λόγου, τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν ποιουμένων. ἔστι δ' εἰπεῖν καὶ διότι τοῖς μὲν ἔνεστι φύσις εὖ ἔχουσα 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) διατριβὰς μὲν καθ' ἑαυτούς
διαφωνίας δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους
- (b) τῶν μὲν ἐμβαθνομένων τῇ μελέτῃ καὶ διασκέψει τοῦ
 λόγου
τῶν δὲ κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν
ποιουμένων
- (c) τοῖς μὲν ἔνεστι φύσις εὖ ἔχουσα 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, πολλοῖς πολλὰς παρέσχε τῶν κριτικῶν διατριβὰς, 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 chiasmatically. 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): Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν κωλύει παραπλησίων ἀνακυπτόντων πραγμάτων ταῖς ὁμοίαις ἐξεργασίαις κεχρηῆσθαι καὶ τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν, οὐχ ὑποβαλλόμενον τὰ ἀλλότρια, ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀναβλαστανούσης φύσεως τοιαῦτα οἷα καὶ τοῖς προλαβοῦσι προβαλλομένη ἐπιδείκνυται.⁴³

This sentence as a whole is balanced: first the “nothing prevents” clause extending through “and enthymemes,” containing ταῖς ὁμοίαις ἐξεργασίαις and τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν, which are arranged one on each side of the infinitive κεχρηῆσθαι. Then the phrase οὐχ ὑποβαλλόμενον 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 βλασ-. The language of sprouting or putting forth suggests a metaphor of flowering or plant growth.

(3) *Lysias* (262.489 A34–B2): Παῦλος δέ γε ὁ ἐκ Μυσίας τόν τε περὶ τοῦ σηκοῦ λόγον, οὐδὲν τῶν εἰρημένων συνιείς, τῆς τε γνησιότητος τῶν λυσιακῶν ἐκβάλλει λόγων, καὶ πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς ἄλλους εἰς νόθους ἀπορριψάμενος πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης τοῦς 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 γεγεννημένης.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

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.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 ἐπ' ἄλλων πολλῶν. Subject and verb are interwoven in the first sentence, and verb and objects in τῶν λυσιακῶν ἐκβάλλει λόγων and πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὠφελείας. 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' εὐρισκομένων ἔτι τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσόντων), and the genitive absolute that ends the last sentence above.

(4) *Demosthenes* (265.491 A12–21): Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶδως πολλάκις καὶ λόγους διαφόρων γεννητόρων πολλὴν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοίωτα καὶ διάφορων ἐργασίαν λόγων τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγνωκότων γεννήτορα—οὐ γὰρ αἰεὶ καθέστηκεν ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος κατὰ πάντα, ὡσπερ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οὕτως οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς λόγους ἢ ἀνθρωπίνῃ δύνاميς, ἄλλως τε δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καιριωτάτοις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων τοῦ ῥήτορος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐπ' ὀλίγον ὁρῶν τὴν διαφορὰν, οὐκ ἔχω θαρρεῖν ἀποφῆνασθαι εἴτε Ἡγησίππου πόνος ὁ περὶ Ἀλοννήσου λόγος εἴτε τῆς Δημοσθενικῆς ἐλάττωμα καθέστηκε φύσεως.⁴⁷

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.”

⁴⁶ Cf. codex 204.164B15–21, χρήσιμον ἐς τὰ μάλιστα τὸ βιβλίον, καὶ αὐταῖς γοναῖς τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσι τὸ γνήσιον ἐπιδεικνύμενον αὐτίκα τοῦ γεγεννηκότος (“The book is especially useful, and by means of its own offspring it demonstrates to those who encounter it the genuineness of their progenitor”).

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 *On the Halonnesus* is the work of Hegesippus 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: ὅτι μιᾷ πολλάκις ὁμιλία καὶ τοὺς σὺν ἡμῖν ἐκάστοτε κατ' αὐτῶν ἱσταμένους καὶ πολεμιωτάτους ὄντας νῦν ὑπηκόων ἔχει καὶ μαθητῶν εὐγνωμόνων τάξις.⁴⁸ 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 πολλὴν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοιότητα
διάφορον ἐργασίαν λόγων τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγνωκότων γεννήτορα,

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 chiasmatically in each. The same type of symmetry governs the following pair, with the nouns/attributives in chiasmatic sequence with the prepositional phrases in each phrase. A sense of careful arrangement governs the word order:

οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καιριωτάτοις τῶν ιδιωμάτων τοῦ ῥήτορος,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐπ' ὀλίγον ὀρῶν τὴν διαφοράν,

and in the last part of the sentence, where the orators' names come first and the verb (καθέστηκεν) 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 ἀεὶ καθέστηκεν ... ὀρῶν τὴν διαφοράν.

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

Ἐγὼ δὲ εἶδος 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 ἐργασίαν λόγων τὸν αὐτὸν ...

οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ καθέστηκεν ...

ὥσπερ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις,
οὕτως οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς λόγους ἢ ἀνθρωπίνη δύναμις

ἄλλως τε δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καιριωτάτοις ... τοῦ ῥήτορος,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐπ' ὀλίγον ὁρῶν τὴν διαφορὰν

οὐκ ἔχω θαρρεῖν ἀποφήνασθαι εἴτε Ἡγησίππου πόνος ...
εἴτε τῆς Δημοσθενικῆς ἐλάττωμα....

And there is a touch of alliteration in *πολλάκις, πολλήν, and ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος*.

(5) *Demosthenes* (265.49B17–11): 'Ἄλλ' οἷ γε τούτους αἰτιώμενοι, τί ἂν φαῖεν περὶ Ἀριστείδου, ὅς καὶ κατακόρως τῷ ιδιώματι τούτῳ φαίνεται κεχρημένος, ὥσπερ καὶ τῷ προιέναι κατὰ τὰς ἐργασίας πέρα τοῦ μετρίου, καὶ τῷ περιττῷ 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 περιττῳ... The second part of this latter half is divided also between τῷ περιττῳ and τῷ μέτρῳ..., typical of Photius' fondness for expressing a single thought in double terms. The pattern καὶ τῷ περιττῳ/ἢ τῷ μέτρῳ is repeated although the construction following the article varies. Τοῦ μετρίου and τῷ μέτρῳ, finally, also create a varied repetition.

(6) *Demosthenes* (265.492A 38ff): Καὶ πολλοῖς οὗτος ὁ λόγος παρέσχεν ἀγῶνα κρίνεσθαι προτεθείς, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἀσπασίῳ τῷ ῥήτορι, ἅτε μηδ' ἀφιγμένῳ τῆς τοῦ λόγου θεωρίας εἰς ἀκρίβειαν.⁵⁰

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 Aspasia, 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 ἀγών of judging it. Word order is interwoven, with πολλοῖς separated from Ἀσπασίῳ τῷ ῥήτορι, οὗτος ὁ λόγος from προτεθείς, ἀφιγμένῳ from εἰς ἀκρίβειαν. 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): Ἀλλά γε χαλεπώτατόν ἐστι λόγων ἀγωνιστικῶν ἐργάτη διὰ τέλους φυλάξαι πρὸς τὸν ἀνταγωνιστὴν τὸ ἦθος, μάλιστα δὲ τοῖς ὅσοι φύσεως ἔτυχον πικροτέρας τε καὶ παθητικώτερας, ἧς οὐχ' ἥκιστα Δημοσθένης τε καὶ Ἀριστείδης μετέχει. Διόπερ πολλάκις ἐξάγονται τῆς προθέσεως ἐλαττουμένης ὑπὸ τῆς φύσεως. οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδ' ἔστιν ἱκανὴ τέχνη κατορθῶσαι τὸ βούλημα, μὴ σύνεργον ἔχουσα καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ιδιότητα.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/ἀγωνιστικὴν, and alliteration in the pair of words, πικροτέρας τε καὶ παθητικώτερας. The phrase φυλάξαι τὸ ἦθος encloses πρὸς τὸν ἀνταγωνιστὴν, and the participial phrase μὴ σύνεργον ἔχουσα καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως ιδιότητα 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 Caccilius, 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 πολλοῖς ... 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), ἐλαττούμενος (1, 7), ὡσπερ καί (3, 5, 6), and ἐργασίαν (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.⁵² 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 *Amphilochia* 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.*

⁵³ "The Preface of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius: Text, Translation and Commentary," *DOP* 31 (1977) 343–49; W. Treadgold and T. Hägg, "The Preface of the *Bibliotheca* of Photius Once More," *SymbOslo* 61 (1986) 133–38, and Treadgold (*supra* n.4) 18 n.4; L. G. Westerrink, ed., *Photii Patri-*

I. Isocrates (260.487A29–35)

διὸ καί:⁵⁴ *Ep.* 165.227; 1.626.

πολλοῖς πολλὰς: *Ep.* 165.71 πολλοῖς πολλακίς; 234.91 πολλοῖς πολλακίς; 234.172 πολλαχοῦ ἐν πολλοῖς; Proem πολλοῖς πολλακίς.

παρέσχε: *Ep.* 164.8 τὸν νοῦν τῆς περιόδου παρέχουσα; 165.138 γέλωτος αἰτίαν καὶ χλεύης παρέσχειν; 165.9 κράτος τε ... καὶ ἰσχὺν θαυμάζεσθαι παρέχει; Postscr. παρεχομένων τὴν ὠφέλειαν; *Ep.* 235.1 ῥητορικὰς ἀφορμὰς παρασχεῖν.

κριτικῶν: *Ep.* 166.184, 207.7; *Amph.* 42.234*.

διατριβὰς: *Amph.* 78.227*.

διαφωνία: *Bibl.* 34.7A22, 91.68B36, 214.171B39, 222.203A25.

πρὸς ἀλλήλους: *Ep.* 163.11.

ἐμβαθνομένων: *Ep.* 234.20 δρέπανον ἐμβαθνομένον; 165.302.

ἐμβαθνομένος: *Ep.* 234.88 βαθύνω; *Bibl.* 196.160A35, 222.181B2, 192B23.

τῆ μελέτῃ (τοῦ λόγου): *Ep.* 165.5 περὶ τοὺς λόγους μελέτῃ; 165.289 μελέτης καρπός; 165.308 κατὰ μελέτην προσσχεῖν; 166.236 τέχνη καὶ μελέτῃ; 166.242 μελέται; Proem τὰς σὰς μελέτας.

κατὰ τὸ ἐπιπόλαιον: Proem ἐπιπολάζει; *Bibl.* 75.52A34; 181.126B19, 215.173B29, 223.211A35, 230.282B18.

ἐλαττούμενος: *Bibl.* 265.492B14; *Ep.* 135.62 (active)*; *Amph.* 1.718 (active)*, 40.106 (active)*; *Ep.* 211.80, *et al.* (passive)*; *Bibl.* 159.102B4.

II. Isocrates (260.487B35–40)

(οὐδὲν) κωλύει: Postscr. κωλύομενον (as part of a number); *Ep.* 1.584 κωλύει; οὐδὲν κωλύει:⁵⁵ *Bibl.* 96.83B19 ἀλλ' οὐδὲν κωλύει τοὺς ἀναγινώσκοντας ἐκλεγομένους τὰ χρήσιμα; *Bibl.* 222.195A36 οὐδὲν κωλύει; *Bibl.* 222.198B41 οὐδὲν κωλύει.

παραπλησίων: *Ep.* 1.544 παραπλησίως; 163.22 παραπλησίως; 166.42 παραπλησίον; 166.42 παραπλησίον; Postscr. παραπλησίου τύπου.

archae Constantinopolitani Epistulae et Amphilochia VI.1 (Leipzig 1989) 39–151 (“Index Grammaticus”), 66–138 (“Vocabula Selecta”).

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 *Bibl.* and may possibly be Photius' own wording: οὐδὲν κωλύει· 222.195 A37; 229.258 B32, 261 B23; 230.280 B11, 282 A23, 282 B23 284 B34f; 247.418 A6.

ἀνακυπτόντων: *Bibl.* 265.495A 12–15 πρὸς τὴν ἀνακύπτουσαν χρέϊαν.⁵⁶
 πραγμάτων: *Bibl.* 35.7A38, 40.8B39, 61.20B19, 69.34B8, 86.66A10,
 94.74A1, 213.171B4.⁵⁷
 κεχρηῆσθαι: *Ep.* 165.260 κεχρηῆσθαι; *Bibl.* 107.88A39, 144.98B9, 189.146A
 18; (not infinitive: 41 times, e.g. codices 5. 14, 40, 42, 55, 60, etc.).
 ἐνθυμήμασιν: *Bibl.* 6.3B22, 47.11A 27, 61.20B22, 119.93A39, 172–74.
 119A34, 195.159B20, 209.165B14, 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 ἐκεῖνα ...
 σταλαγγῶν λογισμοῖς ὑποβάλλειν (suggest).
 προβαλλομένη: *Ep.* 1.571 καρποῦς ἀρετῶν προβάλλειν; 166.200
 προβάλλεται καὶ τὴν ... ἔλλειψιν; Proem προβαλοί; *Ep.* 235.4
 προβαλλομένῳ καὶ ἀπροσδιορίστῳ ῥήματι.

III. Lysias (262.489A34–489B2)

ἀπορριψάμενος: *Ep.* 234.156 ἀπορρίψαμεν.
 πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης ... ὠφελείας: *Ep.* 207.16 πολλῶν ἄλλων καὶ
 μεγάλης συλλέξαι ὠφελείας; Proem τὴν ὠφέλειαν.
 ὡσπερ καί: *Ep.* 164.36; 166.29, 119.
 οὐδὲν τῶν εἰρημένων συνιείς: *Ep.* 166.131 τῶν μὴ συνιέντων τῶν ἐν
 τῷ γράμματι σχημάτων; 165.20 συνιέντων.
 τῶν ὑπὸ διαβολὴν πεσότων: *Ep.* 166.185 ὑπὸ ἐπιτίμησιν ἔπεσον.
 ἐπικρατεστής: *Ep.* 135.75*, 284.1470*, 3004*, 3283*; *Amph.* 45.144*,
 71.22*, 165.23*.

⁵⁶ This is an addition in Photius' version to the Ps.-Plutarch version of the life of Demosthenes. The text is: φέρονται δὲ οὐτοῦ ἀποφθέγματα πλεῖστα καὶ γνωμολογία, ἅπερ αὐτός μὲν ἐκάστοτε πρὸς τὴν ἀνακύπτουσαν χρέϊαν ἀρμοστόμενος ἔλεγεν, οἱ δὲ ἀκούοντες μνήμη τε καὶ γραφῇ 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 ἅπερ αὐτός 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. ἅπερ, with a participle, however, is typical of Photius' language, and for a parallel to the last phrase, cf. the preface to the *Bibl.*: ὅσας αὐτῶν ἢ μνήμη διέσωσε.

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 (?), 487B35 (here); 262.488B41 (Caecilius?), 489A31 (Caecilius?); 263.490A14 (Ps.-Plutarch), 265.491B34 (Caecilius?).

IV. Demosthenes (265.491A12–21)

πολλοῖς πολλάκις: *cf. supra* I.

διάφορος: *Ep.* 166.228 διαφοράς.

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

γεννητόρων: *Ep.* 228.167*; 245.22*, 94*; 284.2859*, 2996*.

καθέστηκεν + adjective: *Ep.* 1.588 ἔμφυτός πως τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἢ γνῶσις καθέστηκεν.

ἄτρεπτος: (gramm.) *Amph.* 1.878*, (theol.) 13.28*; (Christol.) *Ep.* 284.273*, 2809*; -ως: *Ep.* 284.455*, 1423*, 1488*.

ἀναλλοίωτος: *Ep.* 143.6*, 227.13*, 283.278*, 284.274, *etc.**; -ως: *Ep.* 284.455*, 219.3254*.

κατὰ τοὺς λόγους:⁵⁸ *Bibl.* 160.130A11.

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

ἄλλως τε δὲ: *Ep.* 1.516 ἄλλως τε δὲ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα; 164.27 ἄλλως τε δὲ καὶ εἰ τις; 1.516; *Bibl.* 97.84A37; 126.95A37; 222.183B38, 188A9, 192B29, 197B2, 197B43; 230.279B3; 278.529A4; (Westerink, *s.v.* “δὲ abundans”: ἄλλως τε δὲ [καὶ] *Ep.* 1.922, 10.9, 30.15, et ita fere semper*).

διαφορᾶν: *Amph.* 137.116*, 117*.

ἔχω + infinitive: *Bibl.* 88.66B35 οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς ἐκμαθεῖν; 89.67B9 οὐπω μαθεῖν ἔσχον; 176.121B18 οὐχ ἔχω λέγειν.

θαρρεῖν:⁵⁹ *Bibl.* 117.92A9 ὅσοις μῆτε συγκαταθέσθαι τοῦ θαρρεῖν πρόφασιν ἔχει.

ἀποφίνασθαι: *Ep.* 165.59 ἀποφίνας, 165.235 ἀποφαίνεσθαι.

ἐλάττωμα: *Bibl.* 159.102B19.

V. Demosthenes (265.491B7–11)

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

ὥσπερ καί: *Ep.* 164.36, 166.119.

⁵⁸ κατὰ with accusative in critical sections in the *Bibl.* meaning ‘with regard to’ occurs eleven times: 4.3B1; 92.73A13; 126.95A22; 127.95B13; 160.130A11; 169.116B9; 176.121A24, B19; 181.126B20; 198.162A16; 201.163B16; 202.163B35.

⁵⁹ 186.141A33, 209.167B35, and 250.452A31 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.

κατακόρως:⁶⁰ *Ep.* 166.182 εἰς κόρον; *Bibl.* 40.8A38, 102.86A18, 180.125A40; (κατακορῆς) *Bibl.* 65.27A17.
 τῷ περιττῷ: *Ep.* 164.54 περιττὸν καὶ μάταιον; Proem ἀλλὰ περιττῆς ... φιλοτιμίας.

VI. Demosthenes (265.492A38ff)

παρέσχεν: *Ep.* 164.8 τὸν νοῦν τῆς περιόδου παρέχουσα; 165.9 παρέχει; 165.138 παρέχειν; Postscr. παρεχομένων; *Ep.* 235.1 ῥητορικὰς ἀφορμὰς παρασχεῖν.
 προτέθεις + κρίνεσθαι: *Ep.* 165.212 κοινὸν δὲ πᾶσι τὸ ὄφελος προτιθείς. ὥσπερ καί: *Ep.* 164.36; 166.29, 119.
 ἀφιγμένῳ ... εἰς ἀκρίβειαν: *Ep.* 163.12 οὔτε εἰς ἀκοὰς οὔτε εἰς γῶσιν ἀφίκτο; 165.131 εἰς ἀκοῆς ἀφίκτο πείραν (But cf. Proem εἰς ἀνάμνησιν μετὰ τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς ἐφικέσθαι).
 θεωρίαν: *Ep.* 166.8 θεωρίαν καὶ διάκρισιν; 166.73 θεωρίας καὶ τῆς τῶν λέξεων ἀναπτύχεως.

VII. Demosthenes (265.492B9–17)

φυλάξει τὸ ἦθος: *Ep.* 1.598 τὰς χεῖρας καθαρὰς φυλάξει.
 μετέχει: *Ep.* 234.91 μετέχειν; 234.97 μετέσχε; 166.77 μετέχοντες.
 διόπερ: *Ep.* 164.89.
 πολλάκις: cf. *supra* I.
 ἐξάγονται: *Bibl.* 107.88A40.
 οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδέ: *Ep.* 163.4; 165.270, 288; 166.239; 234.6; *Bibl.* 230.274A 26, 222.201B22, 234.300B22.
 ἱκανή + infinitive: *Bibl.* 224.223B23.
 κατορθῶσαι: *Ep.* 166.242 ἄλλοις ... κατορθοῦσιν; 234.245 κατορθώθη; 1.904*, 1017*, 1106*, 1188, et *passim**.
 ἐλαττουμένη: 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

UNIVERSITY OF RICHMOND
 January, 1993

⁶⁰ Variations: κόρος Proem, 97.84A40, 165.108B32; κατὰ κόρον, 181.126 A12, B11; 203.164 A29; προσκορῆς, 35.7A35, 159.102B15, 92.73 A26.

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.