The twelve codices devoted to the Attic Orators in Photius' *Bibliotheca* have stimulated an indigestible amount of philological investigation. I hesitate to add to it, but the two codices on Isocrates, 159 and 260, contain separate, short critiques of Isocrates' style which look very different in content and seem unlikely to be produced by the same person. They thus pose an interesting question and René Henry, the latest editor of the *Bibliotheca*, invites his reader to compare them. 1) This paper attempts such a comparison. For the convenience of my own reader I quote here the two passages from Henry's edition.

1) Cod. 159: II p.121 Henry = 102 b 4-19 Bekker Κέχρηται δὲ μάλιστα μέν, ὡς αὐτίκα τοῖς ἀναγινώσκουσι δῆλον, εὑκοινεία καὶ καθαρότητι, πολλὴν τοὺς ἐπιμέλειαν περὶ τὴν ἔργασιν τῶν λόγων ἐπιθέλουσαν, ὡστε καὶ εἰς περιττὸν αὐτῷ διεκπεπείν τὸν κόσμον καὶ τὸ ἐπιμελές. Καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ τῆς ἔργασις πλεονάζον παρ’ αὐτῷ οὐ τὸ γόνυμον μᾶλλον τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων ἢ τὸ ἀπειρόκαιν παριστά. "Ήθος δὲ καὶ ἀλήθεια καὶ γοργότης οὐδὲ μετέστην αὐτῷ. Μεγέθους δὲ αὐτῷ δοσον εἰς τὸν πολιτικὸν ἐναρμάζει λόγον, ἀρίστα καὶ παραπλησίως κέχρατα τῇ σαφνείᾳ. 'Ατονος δὲ πλέον τοῦ δέοντος ὁ λόγος. Οὐχ ἤκιστα δὲ αὐτοῦ συμφρολογίαν καὶ τὸ προσκορές τῶν παρισώσων αἰτητάται. Ἀλλὰ ταύτα φαμεν πρὸς τὴν ἐν λόγους αὐτοῦ ἀρετὴν τὸ ἐκπίπτον ἐκείνης καὶ ἀνέμοιον ἐνδεικνύμενοι, ἐπεὶ πρὸς γε ἐνός τῶν γράφειν λόγους ἐπαιρομένων ἀρεταὶ δὲ δοξώσεi καὶ τὰ ἐκείνου ἑλαττώματα.

II) Cod. 260: VIII p.47 Henry = 487 b 26-32 B. Τῶν δὲ λόγων αὐτοῦ τὸ εὐκρινὲς καὶ σαράς καὶ μεμελημένων πάσι δηλον, καὶ ὡς ἐπανδέι αὐτοῖς οὐ μόνον ἐμφυτὸν ἄλλα καὶ κοιμώτηκιν κάλλος. Οὐ γὰρ τοὺς τῷ γε πολυσχῆμων ὁ ἀνήρ, οὐδὲ ταῖς κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τροπαῖς ποικιλλόμενος διδ καὶ δι’ ἐνδεικτὸς ὑπὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς λόγοις ὑποστάσεων ἤ συνέχεια.

The opening sentence of each critique contains a judgment about Isocrates' style which reflects in part his own view of himself and was certainly formed early in the critical tra-
dition. This judgment sees the chief characteristics of his style as clarity in diction and careful execution in composition. These are of course qualities which Isocrates himself claimed for his style. Likewise the third element in common, the observation that Isocrates' style is unsuited for dicanic or demagoric speaking, corresponds to Isocrates' personal views though he would doubtless not agree with the particular emphasis given this fact in the critical tradition. To this extent both critiques contain a consensus which appears to go back to the late fourth or early third century. To search for specific sources of these general notions is futile and the problem of how these and the other elements in the two critiques eventually reached Photius is, as Ziegler says, unsolvable. But analysis of the two critiques as autonomous parts of their respective codices may still be suggestive.

The critique in Cod.159 consists of three distinct parts. The first part is a kind of rhetorical paragraph from the formulaic opening word ἔχοντα to the concluding τῇ σωφνυείᾳ which repeats the content of the opening clause. The concepts and language employed here come entirely from Hermogenes. Six of the seven major Ideas are used: two in a positive fashion to show what Isocrates excells in—Clarity and Grandeur (though the latter is qualified), three negatively—Ethos, Realism, and Vigor—to show what is lacking in his style. The employment of the Idea of Beauty is rather ambivalent. Meticulous execution (ἐπιμελεία) is a good quality of style, but when carried to excess, especially in the use of parisoses as Isocrates does, it becomes a weakness and a sign of lack of taste. Photius evidently has in view the observations which Hermogenes makes about Isocrates in his discussion of Beauty (De Id. 12 p.301 R.). In fact, it looks as though Photius' ultimate source for this part of his critique is Hermogenes' own criticism of Isocrates which appears elsewhere in the On Ideas (II p.397.14-17 R.).

In Hermogenes' view of literature Isocrates is an author of πολιτικός λόγος. Political discourse is a mixture and union of the Ideas of Beauty, Character and Realism (De Id. II.11 p.395 R.). But treating Isocrates' style from this point of view presents an immediate problem; his style is at best only a partial realization of this mixture of Ideas.
Consequently Hermogenes' critique develops in a series of antitheses and qualifications: (A.) Isocrates is a political writer (α.) (μέν) because he has purity and limpidity (i.e. the Idea of Clarity), (β.) (δὲ) but he lacks the Ideas of Character and Realism (i.e. the other two required ingredients of the normal mixture). (B.) However (μέντολ), he abounds in the Ideas of Beauty and Grandeur (α.) except that his interest in Beauty eliminates 'vehemence' and 'roughness' (elements of the Idea of Grandeur), (β.) and he effects 'enlargement' (another element of Grandeur) (i) less by the procedures of method and diction, (ii) but (δὲ) most through the thought. (C.) And/But (δὲ) he is completely without the Idea of Vigor, (α.) but (δὲ) ⁵ is relaxed, diffuse and repetitive in the manner of the elderly and teachers.⁶ (b.) And/But (δὲ) he is excessive in his avoidance of natural Realism and in his elaborate constructions as if making a display of his capacity to discover thoughts without saying anything really pertinent. (This sentence, which repeats in Hermogenes' own language the substance of the preceding sentence, is further explanation of why Isocrates lacks Vigor. This statement is followed by a comparison with Demosthenes which is as long as the rest of the critique.) (D.) However (μέντολ), he also has a good deal of the Idea of methodical Deinotes (i.e. his use of rhetorical techniques is patent and undisguised).

The same pattern of antitheses and qualifications appears in the first part of Photius' critique but with some suggestive differences. First, the omission of any reference to the Idea of Deinotes may or may not be inadvertent. Hermogenes' single sentence, coming at the very end of his discussion, could have been overlooked or disregarded if one believed that Isocrates in fact lacked this quality.⁷ But more importantly, the Hermogenic contrasts have been made more trenchant and concentrated into a single major antithesis between the presence of the Ideas of Clarity and Beauty on the one hand and the absence of the Ideas of Character, Realism and Vigor on the other. Hermogenes' triple qualification about Grandeur in Isocrates has been abbreviated into a paraphrase (ὅσον εἰς τὸν πολιτικὸν ἐναρμόζει λόγον) which has hardly any meaning without the Hermogenic original. Photius combines Grandeur with Clarity whereas Hermogenes joins it rather with the Idea of Beauty and Execution. Similarly, the view that Isocrates' ἔπιμελεία is simultaneously the source of his strength and his weakness is differently located in the two critiques. Despite the similarities
these differences might seem to cast doubt on the assumption of any close connection between the two. However, at one point Photius (or his immediate source) appears to be directly correcting Hermogenes. Hermogenes relates Isocrates' ἐργασία to his inventiveness (ἐφεσις ἔννοιών). Photius, however, denies that they are a mark of mental fertility (τὸ γόνυμον) and attributes them to a lack of taste (τὸ ἀπειρόκαλον). In Hermogenic terms ἀπειρόκαλος would be the inability to recognize the point at which discourse is no longer beautifully symmetrical. Ἀπειρόκαλος is a fourth century B.C. word and this particular criticism could have been made against Isocrates at any time, but the combination here with τὸ γόνυμον τῶν ἐπιχειρημάτων looks like a specific comment on Hermogenes' own opinion. But whether Photius made this correction himself or is drawing on some earlier critic is difficult to say. The use of antitheses and the organization of the observations on style in positive and then negative sections are found in many other codices and appear to be characteristic of Photius' own criticisms of style. 8

Cod. 160, for example, begins with a criticism of Choricius' style which certainly looks modeled on the immediately preceding critique of Isocrates. The same Hermogenic Ideas are employed; in fact, ἀλήθεια, the Idea of stylistic Naturalism or Realism apparently occurs only in these two critiques and not elsewhere in the Bibliotheca. Both authors have similar qualities of diction, but unlike Isocrates whose ἀπειρόκαλα leads him into excessive compositional elaboration, Choricius understands καλός (a key ingredient in the Idea of Deinotes), uses περίβολο properly (εἰς τὸ χρόνιον; Hermogenes in the observation corrected by Photius had said of Isocrates πολλὰ χρόνιομας λέγων p.397.27 R.), and does not spoil his clarity by the length of his periods. This description of Choricius' style is stated in an antithesis between Clarity in diction on the one hand and the avoided misuse of Grandeur which could ruin clarity on the other. The antithesis is artificial and forced when read by itself, but becomes understandable when we realize that it is shaped by the latent contrast with Isocrates in Photius' mind. But Choricius' diction has some negative aspects which are then stated in a new sentence that also concludes the critique. The sentence structure of the Choricius critique is loose and rambling compared to the more tightly organized critique of Isocrates. This probably means only that Photius was composing the Choricius critique entirely on his own whereas he had access
to other critical comment on Isocrates. The positive/negative pattern is a commentary technique which was in use as early as II century A.D.  

Vonach is certainly correct in denying that Photius was transcribing Hermogenes in Cod. 159, but it seems equally certain that this part of the critique could not have taken the form it has without the model of Hermogenes. For this reason alone Ofenloch's inclusion of this passage among the fragments of Caecilius of Calacte is misguided. One is less sure, however, about the next two sentences in the critique, from ἄτονος to αἰτιάτα. Henry doubts that Photius went "picorant" through works of literary criticism while composing his notices.  

But in literary matters Photius' notices do have the appearance at times of magpie nests. Whether he copied the Hermogenic criticism from some source on some occasion or constructed it himself for the present notice, he realized that it omits an important element in the traditional criticism of Isocrates' style, its ἄτονια. This concept is implicitly referred to by Hermogenes when he comments on the relaxed character and lack of Vigor in Isocrates' writing, but it does not have any real function in his literary theory and criticism, and indeed rests on a fundamentally different conception of style.  

Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes Isocrates' style as ἄτονος and lacking in "firm wrestling holds" (De Dem. 20 p. 169.16 Us.-R.). A few lines later (p. 170.12-14) he replaces these metaphors with the terms "lifeless" (βίωμα), "emotionless" (οὐ ψυχήματι), and "without the least portion of breath" (πνεύμα). Life, emotion and breath are the attributes which one needs most in "combative speeches" (ἔναγμον ῥήματος). Isocrates sacrifices that pungency which hits the hearer like a blow to oily smoothness and pleasure (p. 171.4-8). Nor does Isocrates employ the varied figures designed for contests and capable of arousing listeners' feelings, but instead puerile parisoses, frigid antitheses and the like (ibid. 8-13). Nowhere do we meet "turns" (προσαί) and "variations" (μεταβολαί) and "variegated figures" (πολυπληματικαί) which by their own nature relieve mental weariness (p. 172.1-3). Dionysius is describing certain psychological effects of style which he sees residing partly in diction, but mostly in composition and whose presence makes a style "combative", that is, useful for speeches in actual forensic and deliberative situations, but which can also have an emotional effect on the uninvolved reader like himself. In c. 22 in the famous comparison of Isocrates and Demosthenes this emotional effect
is associated primarily with delivery which is conceived as a τὸνος embodied in the words themselves of the speeches (p.177.12-178.2). Although Dionysius is describing here his own experience, the criticism and stance he takes have antecedents which can be traced back to Demetrius of Phalerum and Theophrastus. 13) Dionysius himself has preserved some of the evidence (De Isocr.13), but the clearest statement of this critical concept occurs in a fragment of Hieronymus of Rhodes found in Philodemus, De Rhet. 4, Col.XVI13-XVIII8, I pp.198-200 S.). Hieronymus observes that Isocrates' speeches can be read well enough, but do not allow a genuinely oratorical delivery because the style is "lifeless, unlistenable to, and made to a single tone; it has rejected change, variation or relief gained from heightening and lowering tones or through emotional transpositions of words; it is everywhere a slave of smoothness." This combination or linkage of emotion, auditory effect and composition, described by Hieronymus and Dionysius, is summed up in the term τὸνος. From the time of Hieronymus certainly and possibly even Theophrastus Isocrates' style is characterized as ἄτονος with particular reference to his periods which lack the variety, tautness, and emotional impact necessary for effective speaking. 14) Persuasive as distinct from merely pleasurable speaking is called λόγος ἐνοχών-τος and embodies λέξις ἀγωνιστική in contrast to the λέξις γραμμικῆ of works intended for recitation or reading. This contrast between 'deliverable' and 'readable' styles was extended to drama 15) and perhaps to other kinds of literature too. It was one of Theophrastus' major contributions to rhetorical and literary theory, but it became largely meaningless by the second century A.D. even if some of the concepts and terms associated with it linger on in the scholastic tradition. 16)

The notion then of Isocrates' ἄτονια, whatever this term was thought to mean, was a commonplace. Hence we cannot really say where or how Photius came across it. It appears in Cod.61 in his critique of Aeschines' style: "In regard to composition Aeschines is not too ἄτονος like Isocrates nor compressed and tightly knit like Lysias, but matches Demosthenes in τὸνος and τὸνος." 17) The statement in Cod.159 is evidently a link from the "chain of tradition." A more important question than its origin is whether this link can be attached to the one in the following sentence, Οὖν ἢ μιστα... αἰτιάται. Ofenloch wondered, naturally, whether the unidentified subject of αἰτιάται was Caecilius. 18) There are no solid grounds for confirming or denying this possibility. Philodemus and Dionysius inform us
about the early Peripatetic criticism of Isocrates' long periods and their consequent inadequacy for actual oratory while Dionysius singles out the use of parisosis and the other Gorgianic figures for particular criticism in this respect. We know that Theophrastus had criticized Lysias for just these faults; quite mistakenly in Dionysius' view (De Lys.14). If Theophrastus criticized Lysias on these grounds in his On Style, it is an easy inference that he had something similar to say about Isocrates and thus anticipated his successors, Demetrius, Philonicus and Hieronymus.¹⁹

Μικρολογία is an Isocratean word used to describe the inadequacies of his competitors (cf. e.g. 13.8; 15.2). One can imagine the term being hurled back at him in derision of his own claims to careful writing on highminded subjects. A witty critical looking at Isocrates' view of the relationship between λόγος and ψυχή might well delight in connecting his μικροφυχία with μικρολογία. This is of course speculation. Unlike words such as περίττολογία or μακρολογία and βραχυλογία, μικρολογία does not seem to be a technical term of literary criticism and its reference is not directly apparent. In the present sentence it is clearly connected with the boring use of the Gorgianic figures as a cause of ἀτονία. Accordingly a clue to what is being attacked by this nameless critic can be found in Dionysius' critique of Isocrates' style where after stating that Isocrates' incessant use of antitheses wearsies and disgusts listeners, he explains this effect as the result of the repeated use of words like: οί μὲν γὰρ ἡμεῖς δέ, <καί> κανέναι μὲν ἡμεῖς δέ>, καί· τότε μὲν νῦν δέ, καί· δοον οί μὲν ἡμεῖς δέ, καί· τότο μὲν τούτο δέ (De Dem.20 p.171.16-23). So too the author of On the Sublime in order to illustrate the effectiveness of Demosthenes' varied use of asyndeta and epanaphoras, rewrites a Demosthenic sentence by adding connectors—in the manner of Isocrates (c.21). Μικρολογία appears to be the fussy use of little words whose presence dilutes the psychological impact of what is being said. The result, in the inimitable style of the author of On the Sublime, is to sand the words smooth, leave them no points for goading the soul, and quench any emotion before it begins. This says precisely what Dionysius had said and in a context which associates figures of speech with emotion and delivery.²⁰ Our nameless
critic was evidently working in the same tradition, which we have identified with the Peripatetics. In view of the wide influence of this tradition there seems little prospect of discovering his name.  

The same critical tradition also appears in Cod.260. The critique in this codex likewise begins with the distinction between clarity and purity in diction and meticulous execution (τὸ μεμελετημένον) in composition. Although the language of the first sentence can be easily paralleled from Dionysius of Halicarnassus and other extant critics, Photius or his source seems to be thinking again primarily in Hermogenic terms though without explicitly mentioning the Ideas. From Hermogenes' point of view κομμωτικὸν μᾶλλον (= ἐπιμέλεια) is produced by καλὰ σχήματα and the other elements of composition comprised by the Idea of Beauty. Hence the next sentence begins with a μέντοι because Isocrates is traditionally οὐ πολυχήμων. However, the antitheses and the positive/negative sequence which Photius likes to employ are not in themselves sufficient grounds for immediately assuming his authorship of this critique. Moreover, the critique does not continue in a specifically Hermogenic vein unlike that in Cod.159. Instead we meet language which appears to be a fusion of the Peripatetic criticism with the doctrine of figures associated with Caecilius of Calacte. However, the same ideas and terminology also occur in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Though not going into details, he had remarked: "Isocrates differs little from Lysias' style in the use of figures and employs them only moderately" (De Isocr. 2 p.56.18 f. Us.-R.). These are the "combative" figures and not the Gorgianic figures whose excessive use Dionysius criticizes so sharply. Dionysius also emphasized the absence of metabole, variation, as another reason for the failure of Isocrates' style to be combative. The compound second sentence of Photius' critique is clearly of one piece and related in content to the second part of the critique in Cod.159 even though the technical terminology seems on the surface quite different.

The practice of including a judgment on an author's style in his Vita may be seen in the Marcellinus Life of Thucydides and the Lives ascribed to Zosimus. The latter's Life of Isocrates is especially pertinent because it suggests the nature of the source from which Cod.260 was drawn either
directly or (more likely) through the intermediate stage of a collection of
such Lives. After recounting various "facts" about Isocrates's career,
his pupils, and the speeches intended for delivery or recitation by others,
Zosimus adds the following brief critique of Isocrates' style (p.105,2-10 D.):

This critique is followed by a list of spurious writings which students
are warned not to accept as genuine. The biography then concludes with
an account of Isocrates' death. The organization of topics in this part
of the Life, though not of course the details themselves, corresponds
closely to the sequence of topics in Photius' notice at this point.

(Photius does not have the list of spurious writings whose existence he either ig-
nores or is ignorant of. He has instead a further comment on the charge of
plagiarism made against the Panegyricus (cf. p.45 Henry = 486 b 15-29 B.),
a charge which Zosimus in turn says nothing about.) Photius and Zosimus' Lives
are not related in any direct way, but they do share certain common
features which belong no doubt to the commentary tradition. Zosimus' own
statements about Isocrates' style seem to derive ultimately from Dionysius
of Halicarnassus without being rewritten in the terminology of later rhe-
toric. The belief that Isocrates' style is 'ethical' and 'plausible' was
in fact denied by Hermogenes whose concept of the Idea of Ethos precluded
the attribution of these qualities to Isocrates. He is followed in this
respect by Photius in Cod.159 and presumably in Cod.260 also since no men-
tion is made of this item. That, however, may be accidental because the cri-
tical background of this part of the critique is not concerned with ethos.

However, the next-to-last sentence of Zosimus' critique
does seem related somewhat to the concluding sentence of Pho-
tius' critique. Henry translates the peculiar phrase τῶν ἐν
τοῖς λόγοις ὑποστάσεων ἢ συνέχεια "la continuité des arguments
dans les discours," guided presumably by apparent parallels
like οὐδὲ ἐπιχειρήμασιν οὐδὲ ἐνθυμήμασι συνεχής τις describing
the improvisatory effect of Aeschines' style (Cod.61, I p.61 =
21 b 22 f. B.) and evidently taking ὑπόστασις to be a synonym
of ἐνθύμημα. But such a use of ὑπόστασις does not seem to occur elsewhere though συνέχεια is found with words like ἀπόδειξις and πρότασις. Photius also uses it with περιόδων in Cod.265 (p.59 H. = 491 b 37) where this notion is combined with plagiasmos and eutonia as identifying features of Demosthenes' style. The notion of συνέχεια in literary contexts usually refers to features of composition, especially ones involving euphony and rhythm.27) Zosimus is probably (I cannot say certainly) talking about the interweaving of idea with idea within the framework of the period rather than a characteristic feature of what Dionysius calls ἡ πραγματική οἰκονομία (De Isocr. 4). His statement would come then from the doctrine of peribole and resembles Hermogenes' discussion of μερισμὸς and μεσότης (De Id. I.11 p.290.13-293.13 R.). Among the various figures which produce peribole is hypostasis, the use of consecutive and correlative clauses.28) If this is the technical language being employed here by Photius, his comment was intended to describe an aspect of the Isocratean period. Hypostasis in this sense was (and still is) a salient characteristic of Isocrates' style.29) Photius' sentence means then something like: "Also Isocratean is the recurrent use of the figure of hypostasis in his speeches."30)

Is this observation a piece of flotsam from the lost commentary tradition which Photius has tacked on here? Is it meant to be complimentary or does it cohere somehow with the negative criticism of the preceding sentence? Given the succinct form of the observation a definite answer is certainly not possible. But Dionysius had long before criticized Isocrates for "fitting all his thoughts into periods and enclosing the periods in the same types of figures and pursuing graceful rhythms in every context."31) In the later essay on Demosthenes he illustrates Isocrates' ὀποιαί with an example of hypostasis (p.169.16-170.1) and goes on to sum up this defect in Isocrates' style in the words: τροπαὶ δὲ καὶ μεταβολαὶ καὶ ποικιλίαι σχήματος, ἀ πέ- φυσι τὸν τῆς διανοίας κόπον, σώδαμον (p.172.1-3 Us.-R.). The theoretical assumptions on which this judgment rests are, as we have seen, Hellenistic and Peripatetic in origin.32) The theoretical perspective changes in the later rhetorical tradition under the influence of the doctrine of figures and the Hermogenic Ideas, but the particular criticism remains.33) A
view transmitted by Marcellinus is particularly apt: "discourse developing through a single Idea and on one figure becomes relaxed and satiates the listeners; the exchange of figures (ἡ ἑξαλλαγὴ τῶν σχημάτων) woos and wins pleasure and beauty for discourse." The Peripatetic doctrine of λέξεως ὑποψηφιότητι (Demetr. On Style 193) has been completely transmogrified by the fifth century A.D., but the original linkage of tone, variation, and figurative language is retained. Thus the observation about Isocrates' special fondness for hypostasis could have formed part of a criticism of the monotonous evenness of his style and belong in thought with the preceding sentence which develops the implication of a style which is not πολυσχήμων.

If this interpretation is correct, then the critique in Cod.260 is a coherent paragraph comparable in its brevity to Zosimus' critique although this brevity is more likely to be the result of shrinkage and truncation in the commentary tradition than a deliberate effort at συντομία on the part of Pho-tius or his source. Despite the surface difference in technical language and in the emphasis given details the underlying content is the same as that in Cod.159. This content originated in the Lyceum, was adopted in a revised and, one should perhaps say, updated form by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and doubtless in a comparable fashion by his friend Caecilius of Calacte, was familiar to Demetrius and [Longinus] though again from the later Hellenistic perspective, and by the second century A.D. was synthesized into a generally critical view of Isocrates' style. This synthesis was rewritten by Hermogenes in his own terminology and underlies almost all his occasional references to Isocrates. We can assume that it was similarly redefined in the concepts of the doctrine of figures sometime between Hermogenes and Marcellinus. This view together with the competing view of admirers like Zosimus found a home in the rhetorical schools and the commentary tradition.

The two codices in the Bibliotheca reveal this summary and essentially critical view in three distinct forms: 1) a revised version of Hermogenes' critique (the first part of Cod. 159); 2) an abbreviated statement in mostly Hellenistic language of the defects in Isocrates' style from the point of view of the (originally considered superior) agonistic style (the
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NOTEs


3) Ziegler, ibid. This futility is exemplified by A. Vonach, "Die Berichte des Photios über die fünf älteren attischen Redner," Comm. Aenipontomes 5 (Innsbruck 1910) 14-76, who very conveniently collects the ancient criticisms of Isocrates' style and discusses them, often acutely (51-64), but reaches inconclusive results because of a poor methodology and limited concept of source criticism.


5) Rabe's punctuation is misleading. There should be a period after ἐνεβάλλει and a colon after τοῦτο (p. 397.22), not conversely as he has it.

6) Hermogenes is himself the best example of τὸ διδασκαλικόν in style. But the language here is uncharacteristic of him and is probably a quotation or reminiscence of an earlier critic; for example, τὸ ὑπόνων καὶ ἐκαστημένον (p. 397.23 f. R.) occurs in Dion. Hal. De Isocr. 15, p. 76.22 Us.-R.

7) ἡ κατὰ μεθόδου διενώσεις would presumably be denied by the critics who according to Photius συναθηκεῖ· μάλλον ἐκ τῆς χρήσεως κατὰ τοὺς λόγους τὸν ἕσοδο κατά (p. 44 Henry = 486 b 1 f. Bekker).

8) τὸ γόνιμον τῶν ἐπιχειρομάτων is also attributed to Thucydides who learned it from his teacher Antiphon (Schol. Thucyd. IV.135 p. 287.18 f. Hude = Caecilius Fr. 156a Ofenloch); inventive skill was a special characteristic of Antiphon (cf. Ps.Plut. Vit. X Ovrat. 832 E, p. 2.22-26 Mau). τὸ γόνιμον τῶν ἐπιχειρομάτων looks like a late cliché; it is used by Photius in several other codices where he is voicing his own opinion. It is not a relic of Caecilius. For the use of antitheses, positive vs. negative observations, and related features of Photius' comments of style see Günther.

9) Cf. the fragment of a commentary on Demosthenes XXIII (Yale Pap.1534) edited by H.M. Hubbell, *Yale Cl. St.* 15 (1957) 181-93. At line 6 after some favorable comments the commentator introduces a negative note: οὐκ ἔνοιαν δοκεῖ μὴν τοῦ προσεύχον μὴν... Cf. Lossau (above n.2) 135-37.

10) Vonach (above n.3) 62.


13) Cf. Lossau 39-52. Dionysius makes the same criticism of Lysias' style using similar metaphors from the gymnasion in *De Lys.* 13 p.23.5-12 Us.-R. where the shadow of Theophrastus seems to hover in the background.


15) Demetrius' comparison of Menander and Philemon (On Style 193) suggests a considerable expansion of Aristotle's original distinction of two prose styles with their concomitant illustrations (Rhet. III.12).

16) Hermogenes, for example, does not use this notion at all in his discussion of *ϕωνή* (De Inv. IV.4 p.183-191 R.) and considers *άνοια* merely a technical defect in the period (ibid. 3 p.179.1 f.). Demetrius likewise gives it only peripheral attention in On Style 271 and 303 though he was drawing upon a substantial body of material concerned with the "forceful character."

17) I pp.60 f. H. = 21 b 8-23 B. A similar comparison of Isocrates, Lysias and Demosthenes in regard to the length of their periods appears in Cod.265 p.59 H. = 492 a 5-13 B. The origin of these three-way comparisons with two extremes and a "virtuous" middle has not yet been traced; on the general practice cf. Friedrich Focke, "Synkrisis," *Hermes* 58 (1923) 327-68.


20) Cicero *Orat.* 62 makes the same distinction between 'read' and 'delivered' discourse or style and with metaphors reminiscent of Dionysius and [Longinus'] *ἄνευρον*. Another possibility is that *μετρολογία* is a play on Isocrates' description of rhetoric, later elevated into his "definition" of the art: "to make the great lowly and to confer greatness on the small" (τοῖς μετροῖς μέγαδος περιεῖναι, *Paneg.* 8). Demetrius (On Style 119 f.) converts this notion (maliciously?) into rhetorical *άλασκον* ὅταν η γυνη: δι το μετροίς πράγματι περιβάλλων ὑμν. When this is done ὅταν τοι ὑπερτοῦς, it is 'frigidity' (ψυχρότης). Did the original charge of *μετρολογία* mean *ψυχρολογία*?
21) The concluding sentence of the critique appears to be Photius' personal comment on the material he is reporting. Polemical reactions like this occur elsewhere; see Cod.260 p.46 H. = 487 a 29-35 B. which reveals a similar predilection for antitheses and the commonplace. These pronouncements function as paragraph enders.

22) Cf. De Id. III.12 p.296.24-298.5 R. which is too diffuse to quote here but contains both the point and the language used here by Photius.

23) Hermann Sauppe (GCA 1863, 3, p.1664) argued that the phrase οὐ πολυχρῆμα ὁ ἐκεῖο, οὐδὲ ταῖς κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα τροποῖς ποικιλλόμενος came from Caecilius on the ground that it resembles the language of the citation from Caecilius in Cod.259 (p.41 f. H. = 485 b 14-40 B.) and is basically different from the judgment on style in Cod.159 (which Sauppe evidently believed was written by Photius himself). Brzoska in RE, s.v. Caecilius, III, 1183, and Ofenloch (Fr.122) extend this claim to the entire passage. However, the language here is not that distinctive and while different from that in Cod.159 does not in fact resemble anything in the Caecilius quotation in Cod.259. The one term which might have been an adequate clue, μεταβολή, is clearly not being used in the special sense given it by Caecilius; cf. Jan Ros, Die METABOLH (Variatio) als Stilprinzip des Thukydidé (Rhet. Studien, Ergänzungsband I, Paderborn 1938) 19-85. Ros himself reserves judgment, but apparently thinks the extant Dionysius of Halicarnassus a likelier source (p.36).

24) Cf. De Dem. 20 p.171.8 ff. and 172.1-3 Us.-R.; On the Sublime 20.3 where Demosthenes' variation (metabole) in the use of figures is stressed.

25) Cf. Bux, Marcellinus (No. 49), RE XIV (1930) 1450-87, esp. 1465-68 and 1470-80; Schmid-Stählin, GGL I.5 (1948) 3 f.; Otto Luschnat, Thukydidés, RE Suppl.-Ed.XII (1970) 1087. The "Zosimus Life" is cited here from Soholla Gr. in Aeschinem et Isocratem, ed.G. Dindorf (Oxford 1852) 101-06. There is a sizeable literature on the questions of the authorship and relationship of these lives which have yet to be satisfactorily resolved. Though probably pertinent to the larger question of the nature and source(s) of the ten codices (259-268) on the Attic Orators in the Bibliotheca, they do not affect our present problem.

26) Not, I think, Ps.-Plut. Vit. Χ Orat.


30) Another, but remote, possibility is that ὑπότασοις is being used in the meaning of 'underlying reality' and is in effect a synonym of Ἵθεα; cf. Joannes Siculus, In Hermog. De Id. (Prof. Syl.) p.398.27-399.21 R., esp. 399.13. But we probably have in this passage an instance of Joannes' "sermo... sententii implicatis hellwans" (Rabe, p. cxiii).

31) De Isocr. 3 p.58.15-17 Us.-R. This appears to develop a Theophrastan idea; cf. note 32.

33) Ros (above n.23) 44 f. cites parallels from Hermogenes to Maximus Planudes.

34) Hugo Rabe, Prolegomenon Sylloge, p.291.71 ff.; the parallel passages in other Prolegomena do not contain this particular comment, but see Phoebammon De Fig. (Rhet. Gr. III p.43.8-15 Sp.); Hermogenes, De Id. II.10 p.382.13-383.12 R., in a discussion of the function of τὸ κάλλος in political discourse recommends the use of figures and other compositional devices from the Idea of Beauty to relieve excessive austerity in subject matter and to keep the listener awake in τῇ πυκνότητι τῶν νομιμῶν καὶ τῇ συνεχείᾳ.

35) The same combination appears in Cod.265 p.59 H. = 491 b 35 f. B. (καὶ ὁ πλαγιαμοῦς καὶ ἡ συνέχεια περιόδων καὶ ἡ εὐτονία) in a passage claimed for Caecilius (Fr.144 Ofenl.). The difficulty of identifying the scattered remnants of Caecilius is nicely illustrated by Friedrich Zucker, "Ἀνθοποιήτος. Eine semasiologische Untersuchung aus der antiken Rheto-rik und Ethik," SBBA Kl. f. Spr., Lit. u. Kunst, Jahrg. 1952, Nr.4 (Berlin 1953) 24 f., who wants to claim πλαγιαμοῦς as a technical term in the critical vocabulary of Caecilius on the basis of this passage and Apsines Ars Rhet. (Rh. Gr. I p.374.24 Sp.). But in Apsines plagiasmos is the figure referring to the use of the genitive absolute in a period. It belongs to the σχήματα γοργά one of whose functions is the production of εὐτονία (vigor) as Hermogenes also knows (p.293 R.). It is impossible to say whether this conception had anything to do with Caecilius; it simply indicates the way in which earlier stylistic notions like the Peripatetic view of the agonistic style were translated into the terminology of the doctrine of figures. This terminology like the Hermogenic language of the Ideas is pervasive in later rhetorical theory and criticism.

36) Lossau (above n.2) 137 n.26 remarks on this synthesizing tendency in the commentaries.

37) I subscribe to Ziegler's view: "...vom Ausgang des Altertums bis in die Zeit des P(hotios) eine uns sonst wohl nicht erkennbare, aber doch wohl niemals unterbrochene Schultradition auf diesem Gebiete bestanden hat, die P. Überronnen und vermöge einer ihm eigenen besonderen Neigung und Gabe neu belebt und ausgebaut hat" (RE 20.1 col.723.43-50). The way Photius gave new life to this tradition has not yet, I think, been satisfactorily explained.