

## THE CHREIA AND ANCIENT RHETORIC



Society of Biblical Literature



Writings from the Greco-Roman World

John T. Fitzgerald, General Editor

*Editorial Board*

David Armstrong  
Elizabeth Asmis  
Brian E. Daley, S.J.  
David G. Hunter  
David Konstan  
Michael J. Roberts  
Johan C. Thom  
Yun Lee Too  
James C. VanderKam

Number 2

THE CHREIA AND ANCIENT RHETORIC  
Classroom Exercises

Volume Editor  
Johan C. Thom

The Chreia  
and Ancient Rhetoric  
  
Classroom Exercises

Translated and Edited by  
Ronald F. Hock  
and  
Edward N. O'Neil

Society of Biblical Literature  
Atlanta

# THE CHREIA AND ANCIENT RHETORIC

## Classroom Exercises

Copyright © 2002 by the Society of Biblical Literature.

All rights reserved.

No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Department, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Suite 350, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA.

---

### Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

The chreia and ancient rhetoric: classroom exercises / edited by Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil.

p. cm. — (Writings from the Greco-Roman world; v. 2)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Text in English, Greek and Hebrew.

ISBN: 1-58983-018-0 (pbk.: acid-free paper)

1. Chreiai. 2. Rhetoric, Ancient. 3. Education—Greece. I. Hock, Ronald F., 1944-. II. O'Neil, Edward N. III. Series.

PA3469.C48 C48 2002

888/.00208-dc21

2002003851

---

02 03 04 05 06 07 08 09 — 5 4 3 2 1

The book is printed in the United States of America  
on recycled, acid-free paper.

To Charlotte



# Table of Contents

Preface	ix
Abbreviations	xiii

## *Chapter 1. Reading and Copying the Chreia: The Uses of the Chreia in the Primary Curriculum*

Introduction	I
Text 1. P.Bour. 1.141-68 (= P.Sorb. inv. 826)	5
Text 2. P.Mich. inv. 25	13
Text 3. P.Mich. inv. 41	20
Text 4. P.Oslo III.177	24
Text 5. P.Berol. inv. 21258 <sup>v</sup>	27
Text 6. P.Mil.Vogl. VI.263	31
Text 7. O.Clermont-Ganneau	36
Text 8. P.Vindob.G. 19766	38
Text 9. P.Sorb. inv. 2150 (formerly P.Rein. II.85)	41
Text 10. SB I.5730	45
Texts 11 and 12. O.Wilck. 1226 and 1330	48

## *Chapter 2. Declining the Chreia: The Use of the Chreia in the Secondary Curriculum*

Introduction	51
Text 13. Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533	56
Text 14. Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 3019	60
Text 15. Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37516	62
Text 16. Diomedes, <i>Ars grammatica</i>	67
Text 17. John Doxapatres, <i>Homiliae</i> 2	74

## *Chapter 3. Elaborating the Chreia: The Use of the Chreia in the Rhetorical Curriculum*

Introduction	79
Text 18. PSI I.85	94
Text 19. Sopatros in John of Sardis, <i>Comm. in Aphth.</i> 3	98
Texts 20-23. Libanius, <i>Progymnasmata</i> 3	113
Text 20. Chreia Elaboration 1	140
Text 21. Chreia Elaboration 2	156

Text 22. Chreia Elaboration 3	168
Text 23. Chreia Elaboration 4	188
Texts 24-27. Ps.-Nicolaus, <i>Progymnasmata</i> 3	198
Text 24. Chreia Elaboration 1	212
Text 25. Chreia Elaboration 2	218
Text 26. Chreia Elaboration 3	224
Text 27. Chreia Elaboration 4	230
Texts 28-30. Anonymous Elaborations in Doxapatres	234
Text 28. Chreia Elaboration 1	244
Text 29. Chreia Elaboration 2	248
Text 30. Chreia Elaboration 3	254
Text 31. Rhetorica Marciana	258
Text 32-33. Nikephoros Basilakes, <i>Progymnasmata</i> 3	280
Text 32. Chreia Elaboration 1	288
Text 33. Chreia Elaboration 2	294
Text 34. Gregory of Cyprus, <i>Chreia</i>	308
Text 35. George Pachymeres, <i>Progymnasmata</i> 3	334
Text 36. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, <i>Progym- nasmata</i> 3	348
Bibliography	361
Index of Greek Words	375



# Preface

This volume represents the second of three volumes designed to make available all the educational texts regarding the small but important literary form known as the chreia (Greek χρεία; Latin *chria*). The first volume, published in 1986 by Scholars Press, included the chapters on the chreia in compositional textbooks known as *Progymnasmata*. This second volume presents thirty-six texts that illustrate the use of the chreia in all three stages of the educational curriculum—the primary, the secondary, and the tertiary. Twelve texts from the primary stage show how young students used chreiai to learn how to write letters correctly and then to read the words that these letters formed. Five texts from the secondary stage show how chreiai were used by more advanced students as they learned to write the correct forms and endings of the words in a Greek or Latin sentence. Finally, eighteen texts from the tertiary stage illustrate how students of rhetoric learned argumentation and stylistic skills by elaborating a chreia into an eight paragraph essay. The third volume will include portions from Byzantine commentaries and scholia on the chreia chapter in Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*.

All three volumes represent the research being carried out by the Chreia in Ancient Education and Literature Project at the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity (IAC) of the Claremont Graduate University in Claremont, CA.

The completion of the second volume has been delayed far longer than even we expected, but in one sense the delay has benefitted us, in that in the years since the appearance of the first volume the study of ancient education has experienced a revival of interest which has advanced this discipline beyond the standard treatments by Henri Marrou and Stanley Bonner. We have, in particular, benefitted from the work on educational texts on papyri, ostraca, and tablets by Raffaella Cribiore and Teresa Morgan as well as from the work on education in Palaiologan times by Constantine Constantinides.

This volume builds on their work by focusing on one literary form—the chreia—that had a role throughout the educational curriculum from the early Roman Empire into late Byzantine

times. Familiarity with the forms and manipulations of the chreia that students gained from school helps to explain the widespread popularity of this literary form for preserving and expressing the wit and wisdom of philosophers, orators, kings, and others from ancient through Byzantine times.

There remains the pleasant duty of acknowledging the many people who have provided assistance in various ways during the preparation of this volume. For draft translations of and preliminary introductions to some of the texts in this volume we wish to thank Dr. James Butts (PSI 1.85), Professor David Lull of Wartburg Theological Seminary (Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533), Professor Marvin Meyer of Chapman University (Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos), and Professor Antonia Tripolitis of Rutgers University (Libanius 1). Many other texts benefitted from the contributions of members of the Chreia Project during the initial discussions of them at the IAC.

We also wish to thank Professor James M. Robinson, Director of the IAC, under whose auspices this project has been housed and supported since 1980. This support has continued under the current Co-Directors, Professors Dennis R. MacDonald and Karen Jo Torjesen. We are especially grateful to Mr. Rafael Chodos, Chairman of the IAC Board of Trustees, for his generous financial assistance, which allowed us this past year to have the help of Linden Youngquist, a doctoral candidate in New Testament at the Claremont Graduate University. Mr. Youngquist gave us all kinds of help—as research assistant, as proofreader, as computer specialist, as preparer of the bibliography and list of abbreviations, to name just a few of his responsibilities. His help greatly aided in completing the volume.

We also received prompt and frequent assistance from Joyce Toscan, Librarian, and her staff at Global Express-Interlibrary Loan of the University of Southern California. In addition, we extend special thanks to David Hock, Belinda Kwong, and Karen Lull for their help in retrieving materials from the Library of Congress, the Cornell University library, and the Columbia University library.

We wish to thank Professor John T. Fitzgerald of the University of Miami for his acceptance of this volume into the Writings from the Greco-Roman World series. He and Professor Johan Thom of the University of Stellenbosch read the volume in

a timely and meticulous manner and saved us from many errors, for which we are immensely grateful.

Finally, a word of deep appreciation is owed to Charlotte O'Neil. We may not live by bread alone, but bread is necessary, and it is hard to imagine better bread than that provided by Charlotte, who, every Thursday after we had spent the morning translating the texts included in this volume, prepared a delicious lunch and provided a relaxing and enjoyable mealtime. For this unstinting and much appreciated assistance we offer our deepest gratitude and consequently have dedicated this volume to her.

Ronald F. Hock  
Professor of Religion  
University of Southern California

Professor Edward N. O'Neil  
Professor of Classics, emeritus  
University of Southern California

It is my sad duty to report that my friend and colleague Ed O'Neil died on August 21, 2001, while this volume was in press.      RFH



# Abbreviations

ABla	Analecta Blatadon
<i>AncSoc</i>	<i>Ancient Society</i>
<i>Archiv</i>	<i>Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete</i>
ASP	American Studies in Papyrology
AWTS	Altertumswissenschaftliche Texte und Studien
AttiSocLSL	Atti Società Linguistica Scienze e Letteratura
<i>BASP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>BICS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies</i>
BICS Suppl.	Supplements to <i>BICS</i>
BIFAO	Bulletin de l'Institut français d'archéologie orientale
<i>BMQ</i>	<i>British Museum Quarterly</i>
<i>BNJ</i>	<i>Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher</i>
BNN	Byzantina et Neo-Hellenica Neapolitana
<i>BollClass</i>	<i>Bollettino dei classici, a cura del Comitato per la preparazione dell'Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini</i>
ByzA	Byzantinische Archiv
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Byzantinische Zeitschrift</i>
<i>CdÉ</i>	<i>Chronique d'Égypte</i>
<i>Chreia</i> 1	Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, eds., <i>The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric. Vol. 1. The Pro-gymnasmata</i> (SBLTT 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986).
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CRAI</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions</i>
<i>DOP</i>	<i>Dumbarton Oaks Papers</i>
<i>EA</i>	<i>Epigraphica Anatolica</i>
<i>GOTR</i>	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>
<i>G&amp;R</i>	<i>Greece &amp; Rome</i>
HAW	Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft
IAC	Institute for Antiquity and Christianity
<i>JHM</i>	<i>Journal of the History of Medicine</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JÖB</i>	<i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik</i>
LCL	Loeb Classical Library

MPER	Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
ODB	<i>Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium</i>
PAPhS	<i>Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society</i>
<i>PhW</i>	<i>Philologische Wochenschrift</i>
PLRE	<i>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</i>
PSBA	<i>Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology</i>
PW	Pauly-Wissowa, <i>Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
PWSup	Supplement to PW
QUCC	<i>Quaderni urbinati di cultura classica</i>
REA	<i>Revue des études ancienne</i>
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>
REB	<i>Revue des études byzantines</i>
RGRW	Religions in the Graeco-Roman World
<i>RhM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum</i>
RHT	<i>Revue d'Histoire des Textes</i>
RSBN	<i>Rivista di studi bizantini e neoellenici</i>
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBL SBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
SBL RBS	SBL Resources for Biblical Study
SBL TT	SBL Texts and Translations
SGRR	Studies in Greek and Roman Religion
SIFC	<i>Studi italiani di filologia classica</i>
<i>Stud.Pal.</i>	<i>Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde</i>
TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
TGF <sup>2</sup>	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, 2nd edition</i>
ZPE	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

## Chapter I

# Reading and Copying the Chreia: The Uses of the Chreia in the Primary Curriculum

### Introduction

The primary and secondary stages of education are, strictly speaking, beyond the scope of this volume, which is concerned with the role of the literary form “chreia” (Gr. χρεῖα, Lat. *chria*) in the tertiary, specifically the rhetorical, stage of education. At the same time, to ignore the role of the chreia in the earlier stages is to distort its role at the tertiary stage by leaving it unclear about how familiar or unfamiliar students were with this form when they entered the classroom of a rhetorician. Consequently, in this and the following chapter we will present the ways in which chreiai functioned in the primary and secondary stages of education. Only then will we turn to our principal task, an investigation into the role of the chreia in rhetorical education.

### PRIMARY EDUCATION

The stages of education in antiquity—primary, secondary, and tertiary—have received classic treatment from Henri Irénée Marrou and Stanley F. Bonner,<sup>1</sup> although recently other scholars have proposed various modifications. At the primary stage, for example, Alan Booth has suggested several modifications; his review of the evidence shows that primary education may often have

<sup>1</sup> See Henri-Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. G. Lamb; New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956) 142-85, and Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) 165-249.

been more informally taught at home rather than by a γραμματιστής, or primary teacher, in a classroom, as is usually assumed; may have required only two years to complete the curriculum instead of the four or five usually assumed by scholars; and may even have been offered, not by a primary teacher, but by a γραμματικός, or secondary teacher, who was thereby ensuring a supply of pupils for his own level of teaching. In fact, the primary schoolroom, so much the focus of previous scholars, may have served less as an institution for most primary aged pupils than as one for poor and marginalized children like Kottalos in Herodas' mime.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, while primary education may have been more fluid and varied than previously thought,<sup>3</sup> the curricular sequence itself is not thereby challenged, in that students, however they learned, still progressed from learning to read and write to studying literature and grammar and then to receiving training in rhetorical composition and delivery.

To be sure, Raffaella Cribiore has proposed some minor changes in the curricular sequence, at least at the primary stage.<sup>4</sup> She has focused especially on the documentary evidence—papyri, ostraca, and wooden tablets—that preserves the actual classroom activities of teachers and students alike<sup>5</sup> and has concluded that

<sup>2</sup> See Alan Booth, "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire," *Florilegium* 1 (1979) 1-14. Kottalos, the son of an old, blind fisherman, is a poor boy who attends the primary school of a certain Lampriskos in hopes of becoming a clerk (see Herodas, *Mime* 3).

<sup>3</sup> See also Robert A. Kaster, "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity," *TAPA* 113 (1983) 323-46. He not only states Booth's views more forcefully, but also emphasizes that local variations cannot be ignored either, thereby further stressing the fluidity and variety in the conventions of primary and secondary schooling.

<sup>4</sup> See Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (ASP 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996).

<sup>5</sup> The standard, though dated, survey of the documentary evidence is Roger A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Greco-Roman Egypt* (2nd ed.; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965) 137-40. For a more recent and expanded survey, see Janine Debut, "Les documents scolaires," *ZPE* 63 (1986) 251-78. Cribiore's survey of the evidence (*Writing*, 173-284) is obviously more up-to-date but also more informative and more methodologically sophisticated than previous surveys (cf. also her "Literary School Exercises," *ZPE* 116 [1997] 53-60). The texts treated in this chapter will be initially identified, if possible, by reference to Pack<sup>2</sup>, Debut, and Cribiore along with their respective document number.



the sequence of first learning letters and syllables; of then reading words and short passages; and, eventually, of reading longer, poetic texts is not the whole story, as scholars have previously thought, largely on the basis of scattered references to education in the literary sources.<sup>6</sup>

In contrast, Cribiore argues that some elements in the sequence have been ignored. Left out, for example, is the importance that primary teachers placed on having pupils write their own names and having them do so from the outset, that is, as soon as they started to learn the letters of the alphabet.<sup>7</sup> In addition, scholars have emphasized reading at the expense of learning to copy materials correctly, indeed beautifully or “calligraphically.” In fact, Cribiore shows that students continued to work on copying skills even after beginning to read, whereas some students hardly moved beyond the task of copying.<sup>8</sup>

But Cribiore’s major contribution is her typology of student hands. She identifies four, from those of beginners to those of more advanced students: zero hand, alphabetic, evolving, and rapid.<sup>9</sup> This typology will help us to classify some texts more precisely and hence to pinpoint the place in the curriculum where the text was used.

Finally, Teresa Morgan has also made a full and sophisticated study of the documentary evidence. Her investigation adds a sense of historical development and reality to the standard picture of the curricular sequence. She claims that the standard curriculum developed shortly after the conquests of Alexander the Great and indeed in response to them, specifically as a means

<sup>6</sup> See Marrou, *Education*, 150-59, and Bonner, *Education*, 165-77. Still useful, if dated, are Paul Beudel, “Qua ratione Graeci liberos educerint, papyris, ostracis, tabulis in Aegypto inventis illustratur” (Diss. Münster, 1911) 6-29; Erich Ziebarth, *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914) 61-74; and Paul Collart, “À l’école avec les petits grecs d’Égypte,” *CdÉ* 11 (1936) 489-501, esp. 497-501. For a handy collection of some documentary evidence from the primary level, see Joseph G. Milne, “Relics of Graeco-Roman Schools,” *JHS* 28 (1908) 121-32.

<sup>7</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 40, 139-52.

<sup>8</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 43-44.

<sup>9</sup> For details on the typology, see Cribiore, *Writing*, 102-18.

by which “Greek culture could be identified and distributed and the Greek ruling class could be defined.”<sup>10</sup>

Morgan also discovers that this curriculum, as it was represented in literary sources like Quintilian’s *Institutio oratoria*, is more ambitious than what the documentary evidence from Egypt suggests students actually learned, a discovery that prompts her to propose a core and periphery model in which all pupils learned a core of skills and authors, whereas only the most advantaged among them went on to more peripheral ones.<sup>11</sup> This core is rather modest, with students learning their letters and getting as far as reading maxims and some Homer and perhaps a little Euripides, whereas the periphery included more authors, such as Menander, as well as some rhetoric—a far cry from what scholars, using literary sources, imagine as typical of a Greco-Roman education.<sup>12</sup>

By maxims Morgan includes not only γνῶμαι but also chreiai.<sup>13</sup> In other words, chreiai belonged to the core of the primary curriculum and hence were familiar to most students. And Cribiore’s study shows that these chreiai were used both to teach reading short passages and to practice writing rapidly and calligraphically. Accordingly, we present these texts—twelve in all—that illustrate the use of this literary form in the primary stage of education. One text, P.Bour. 1, places five chreiai in an explicit curricular context and hence will be treated first. The other texts, without context and often fragmentary, will be presented in a roughly chronological sequence.

<sup>10</sup> See Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 23. For the initial developments of this literate curriculum before Alexander, see her “Literate Education in Classical Athens,” *CQ* 49 (1999) 46–61.

<sup>11</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 67–73.

<sup>12</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 71.

<sup>13</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 123.

Text I. P.Bour. I.141-68 (= P.Sorb. inv. 826)  
 (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2643 = Debut 206 = Criore 393)

## INTRODUCTION

P.Bour. 1 is an extremely valuable papyrus codex that was first published at the beginning of the twentieth century by Pierre Jouguet and Paul Perdrizet, then again in 1926 by Paul Collart, and several times since.<sup>14</sup> The first editors date the codex to the fourth century A.D., but say nothing about its provenance.<sup>15</sup> The fourth century dating is still accepted,<sup>16</sup> but recently Alain Blanchard has given this "cahier d'écolier" at least the outlines of a likely provenance. He notes the presence of numerous names from Menander's plays in P.Bour. 1 as well as in a similar textbook, the Chester Beatty papyrus schoolbook published by Willy Clarysse and Alfons Wouters.<sup>17</sup> In particular, Blanchard finds names from the triad of plays in the famous Bodmer papyri of Menander (*Samia*, *Dyskolos*, and *Aspis*) and possibly from another triad of his plays (*Epitrepontes*, *Heros*, and *Phasma*), and then argues that both P.Bour. 1 and the Chester Beatty papyrus as well as the Menandrian plays came from the same school setting,

<sup>14</sup> See Pierre Jouguet and Paul Perdrizet, "Le Papyrus Bouriant no. 1: Un cahier d'écolier grec d'Égypte," *Stud. Pal.* 6 (1906) 148-161 (text: 150-56), and Paul Collart, ed., *Les Papyrus Bouriant* (Paris: Édouard Champion, 1926) 17-27 (text: 21-26). References to this papyrus will be according to the line numbers in Collart's edition. The whole text is reprinted in Erich Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule: Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka* (2nd ed.; Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1913) 21-24; portions of it in Morgan, *Literate Education*, 314-15. For the chreiai only, see Gotthard Strohmaier, "Diogenesanekdoten auf Papyrus und in arabischen Gnomologien," *Archiv* 22/23 (1974) 285-88 (text on pp. 286-87); Italo Gallo, *Frammenti biografici da papiri. Vol. 2: La biografia dei filosofi* (Rome: Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1980) 377-90 (text on pp. 385-86); and Gabriele Giannantoni, *Socraticorum Reliquiae* (4 vols.; Naples: Ateneo, 1983-1985) 2.489-90, 498-99, and 583. See also Alfred Körte, "Literarische Texte mit Ausschuss der christlichen," *Archiv* 6 (1920) 223-68, esp. 266; Bonner, *Education*, 169, 171-73, 175-76; and Criore, *Writing*, 87, 153, 276.

<sup>15</sup> See further Jouguet and Perdrizet, "Cahier d'écolier," 148.

<sup>16</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 378, and Criore, *Writing*, 276.

<sup>17</sup> See Willy Clarysse and Alfons Wouters, "A Schoolboy's Exercise in the Chester Beatty Library," *AncSoc* 1 (1970) 201-35.

a post-Constantinian school in Egypt which was Christian, to be sure, but not monastic.<sup>18</sup>

P.Bour. 1 contains eleven sheets, all of which, except for the eleventh, have writing on both sides in a hand that Criboire classifies as rapid, the most advanced of her four types.<sup>19</sup> The contents are clearly those from the classroom of a γραμματιστής. The first five sheets contain lists of words—some 213 words of one, two, three, and four syllables (lines 2-140). The purpose of these words was to teach pupils to write their letters clearly and correctly and to spell and pronounce the words they had written. Pronunciation is obviously the purpose of such difficult to pronounce words as ῥώξ (line 7), λύγξ (line 12), and Ῥηξήνωρ (line 110). But, as Janine Debut has recently argued, these lists also introduced students to Greek history and culture since the polysyllabic words in particular are mostly proper names taken from philosophy (for example, Thales [line 24]), literature (for example, Achilles [line 57]), mythology (for example, Herakles [line 76]), and history (for example, Xenophon [line 92]). As noted above, these lists also contain names from Menander's plays—for example, Demeas (line 74) and Moschion (line 100) from the *Samia*, Gorgias (line 51) and Sikon (line 45) from the *Dyskolos*, and even Menander's own name (line 99).<sup>20</sup> The γραμματιστής no doubt commented on the identity, character, and significance of these people at the same time as the pupils were learning to pronounce and write their names.<sup>21</sup>

Following these lists of words on the sixth sheet and on a portion of the seventh are five complete sayings-chreiai (lines 141-68), all with Diogenes as the πρόσωπον, or the person to whom the sayings are attributed. In addition, all five belong to the same sub-type of chreia—what Theon calls the εἶδος ἀποφαντικὸν κατὰ περίστασιν, whose formal characteristics are a participial clause

<sup>18</sup> See Alain Blanchard, "Sur le milieu d'origine du papyrus Bodmer de Ménandre," *CdÉ* 66 (1991) 211-20.

<sup>19</sup> See Criboire, *Writing*, 276.

<sup>20</sup> See further Blanchard, "Milieu," 214-18. Cf. also Colin Austin, ed., *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in papyris reperta* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973) 123-24.

<sup>21</sup> See Janine Debut, "De l'usage des listes de mots comme fondement de la pédagogie dans l'antiquité," *REA* 85 (1983) 261-74, esp. 263-69.

using ἰδών, or “on seeing,” that identifies the περίστασις, or circumstance, followed by the response of the πρόσωπον, introduced by εἶπεν . . . , that is “seeing . . . he said . . .” (see Theon 40-45).

The appearance of these five chreiai immediately after the lists of individual words means that they were the pupils’ first experience with reading a series of words that made connected sense. What is especially noteworthy about these sentences is that they are presented in the same format as the preceding lists of words. In other words, they, too, are written in columns of single words (with two columns per sheet). To illustrate the format, the first chreia is presented as it appears on the papyrus:<sup>22</sup>

ΙΔΩΝ	ΔΙΟΓΕΝΗC
ΜΥΙΑΝ	ΠΑΡΑ-
ΕΠ-	ΣΙΤΟΥC
ΑΝΩ	ΤΡΕΦΕΙ.
ΤΗC <sup>23</sup>	- - - - -
ΤΡΑΠΕΖΗC	(the
ΑΥΤΟΥ	next
ΕΙΠΕΝ	chreia
ΚΑΙ	follows)

This unusual format—perhaps an innovation by the teacher, since it occurs nowhere else<sup>24</sup>—has been explained as representing a transitional stage for the pupils who were moving from mere lists of words to series of words having connected sense.<sup>25</sup> In contrast to the Gueraud-Jouguet manual, which jumps immediately from lists of words to a lengthy quotation from the comic poet Straton, a difficult passage in and of itself but made still more difficult by being written with no spaces between the words,<sup>26</sup> the

<sup>22</sup> Two words are themselves divided and written on two lines (ΕΠ-ΑΝΩ and ΠΑΡΑ-ΣΙΤΟΥC). These are the only two words so divided in the entire papyrus.

<sup>23</sup> When quoting documentary texts we use c throughout for sigma, not σ and ς. Using c does not prejudice whether a sigma in a partially preserved text is an internal or final sigma.

<sup>24</sup> So Marrou, *Education*, 154.

<sup>25</sup> See Jouguet and Perdrizet, “Cahier d’écolier,” 149; Beudel, “Qua ratione,” 16; and Ziebarth, *Schule*, 23.

<sup>26</sup> For the Gueraud-Jouguet manual, see Octave Gueraud and Pierre Jouguet, eds., *Un livre d’écolier du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.* (Cairo: L’Institut Français d’Archéologie Orientale, 1938) 1-45. On the difficulty of reading a text

five chreiai of P.Bour. 1 are not only short and simple, they are also made even easier to read by having been written in columns of single words instead of in *scriptio continua*.<sup>27</sup>

Indeed, these formally identical chreiai would have made reading them easier in yet another way. The repetition of the initial ἰδών would have indicated to the pupils where each chreia, or sentence, began, and the pattern of subordinate clause (ἰδών . . .) followed by main clause (εἶπεν . . .) would have likewise helped comprehension. In short, their form (simple and repetitive) and their format (written in columns) made them ideal for starting pupils on the road to literacy.

Once the pupils had learned to read such relatively easy sentences in columnar format, they could then proceed to sentences written in the traditional format—on horizontal lines and in *scriptio continua*. The following material in P.Bour. 1 is in fact presented in this fashion. On the remainder of the seventh sheet and continuing through the ninth are twenty-four maxims, arranged alphabetically and written two lines per maxim (lines 169-239). To illustrate the increased difficulty of reading these maxims in comparison with the columnar-formatted chreiai, the first maxim (lines 169-70) is presented below in *scriptio continua*:

ΑΡΧΗΜΕΓΙΣΤΗΤΟΥΦΡΟ  
ΝΕΙΝΤΑΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ.<sup>28</sup>

After the maxims comes a longer continuous passage—the first twelve lines from the introduction to the fables of Babrius—which appear on the tenth sheet as well as on the recto of the eleventh (lines 240-72). This passage, which represents the most advanced lesson in reading, concludes this “cahier d’écolier.”

To return to the chreiai: Having Diogenes as the πρόσωπον of these chreiai calls for further comment. To be sure, Diogenes is not a surprising choice, since he will appear again and again in the elementary texts to be discussed below (see Texts 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10). But also relevant are both the first letter of Diogenes’ name and the number of syllables in his name. We saw that the

of all capitals, no spaces between words, and no punctuation (= *scriptio continua*), see Cribiore, *Writing*, 148.

<sup>27</sup> So also Cribiore, *Writing*, 87.

<sup>28</sup> This maxim—Ἀρχὴ μεγίστη τοῦ φρονεῖν τὰ γράμματα (“Letters are the best beginning to become wise”)—is especially frequent in educational materials, and well it should be. See further Cribiore, *Writing*, 33.

preceding lists of words progressed from one to four syllables and were often made up of proper names. Furthermore, the lists of one, two, and three syllable words are complete, with from one to usually four words to illustrate each letter of the alphabet (lines 2-127). The list of four syllable words, however, is far from complete. In fact, only the letters Α, Β, and Γ are illustrated (lines 129-40) before the papyrus shifts, rather abruptly, to the chreiai (lines 141-68). The πρόσωπον of these chreiai, however, makes this shift less abrupt, once we recognize that the name “Διογένης” fits logically into this context, as it begins with the next letter Δ and has four syllables. Also, it is not surprising that the name of a philosopher should have been used, given the occurrence of other philosophers in this “cahier:” Zeno (line 16), Thales (line 24), and Socrates’ student Xenophon (line 93). Diogenes’ name therefore fits the logic of the lists. Consequently, we need not assume, as some do, that some material has been lost from the “cahier” in the course of copying.<sup>29</sup>

In any case, the text of the five chreiai from P.Bour. I. 141-68 is as follows, printed in lines rather than in columns:

## TEXT

Ἰδὼν μῦθον ἐπάνω τῆς τραπέζης αὐτοῦ εἶπεν·

Καὶ Διογένης παρασίτους τρέφει.

Ἰδὼν γ[υν]αῖκα διδα[σκ]ομένην γράμματα εἶπεν·

Οἷον ξίφος ἀκονᾶται.

5 Ἰδὼν γυν[αῖ]κα γυ[ν]αϊκὶ συμβουλευούσαν εἶπεν·

Ἄσπις παρ’ ἐχίδνης φάρμακον πορίζεται.

Ἰδὼν Αἰθίοπα καθαρὸν τρωγόντα <εἶπεν>·

Ἰδοῦ, ἦ νῦξ τὴν ἡμέραν πνίγει.

Ἰδὼν Αἰθίοπα χέζοντα εἶπεν·

10 Οἷος λέβης τέτρηται.

7 εἶπεν addidimus 9 δὲ post Αἰθίοπα addiderunt Jouguet et Perdrizet, unde Ziebarth; papyro deest.

<sup>29</sup> See Jouguet and Perdrizet, “Cahier d’écolier,” 149; Collart, *Papyrus Bouriant*, 18; and Gallo, *Frammenti*, 378. They all argue that some sheets of papyrus—perhaps four—were lost, namely those that would have given a full complement of four syllable words.

## TRANSLATION

Seeing a fly<sup>30</sup> on his table, he said:

“Even Diogenes keeps parasites.”

Seeing a woman being educated, he said:

“Wow! A sword is being sharpened.”

5 Seeing a woman giving advice to a woman, he said:

“An asp is being supplied venom from a viper.”

Seeing an Ethiopian eating white bread,<sup>31</sup> <he said>:

“Look! Night is swallowing day.”

Seeing an Ethiopian defecating, he said:

10 “Look! A kettle with a hole in it.”

One cannot leave these chreiai without commenting on their content. The last four are surely surprising in a primary school setting, as they make their humorous point at the expense of women and Ethiopians. Modern scholars have often registered their amazement,<sup>32</sup> noting that the aim of the primary curriculum

<sup>30</sup> The translation of this chreia in the Catalogue (see *Chreia* 1.318) incorrectly rendered *μῦα* as “mouse,” a slip prompted by the fact that in the other version of this chreia in Diogenes Laertius, 6.40, as well as in the related stories in Plutarch, *Quom. quis suos in virt. sent. prof.* 77F-78A, and Aelian, *V.H.* 13.26, the parasitic creature is a mouse (*μῦς*). The mouse in fact seems the more probable parasite (see also Stobaeus, *Flor.* 3.6.37 [p. 294 Hense]; *AP* 6.302 [Leonidas]; and Gustav A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Colophon* [Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909] 29 and n. 7), and the change to a fly (*μύῃον*) may simply have been a corruption of *μῦν* (see Gallo, *Frammenti*, 387 n. 1), although a fly could also be regarded as a parasite (see, e.g., Lucian, *Musc. enc.* 8, and Athenaeus, 1.4f-5a).

<sup>31</sup> On white bread, which was thought preferable to dark bread, see Juvenal, *Sat.* 5.67-75; Lucian, *De merc. cond.* 17; and Pliny the Elder, *Hist. Nat.* 18.81-95, esp. 82 and 85-86. Reference to the blackness of Ethiopians was proverbial, as in *Αἰθίοπα σμήκειν ἐπιχειρῶν* (“trying to wash an Ethiopian [white]”) (Lucian, *Ind.* 28), a proverb taken up into a chreia attributed to Diogenes (see Antonius and Maximus, *Serm. de hominibus malis*, p. 64 [2.300 Mullach]).

<sup>32</sup> On the problematic character of the contents of these chreiai, see, e.g., Paul Collart, “À propos d’un ostracon Clermont-Ganneau inédit l’Académie des Inscriptions,” *CRAI* (1945) 249-58, esp. 254-55; Gueraud and Jouguet, *Livre d’écolier*, xx; Marrou, *Education*, 156; and esp. Strohmaier, “Diogenesaneekdoten,” 286: “Verwunderlich ist, warum der Lehrer gerade diese trivialen Spässe als geistige Nahrung für seine Schüler ausgewählt.”



was supposedly to inculcate morals along with reading skills,<sup>33</sup> and by today's standards all four chreiai are inappropriate. Nevertheless, it should be added that the sentiments expressed here are not at all atypical in the ancient and medieval worlds, as these very chreiai appear elsewhere—in other school texts,<sup>34</sup> in various collections of chreiai,<sup>35</sup> and even in Arabic gnomologia.<sup>36</sup> In fact, similar sentiments against women appear in the following maxims of P.Bour. 1 itself, not to mention Greco-Roman literature and society as a whole.<sup>37</sup> Morgan explains the presence of these sentiments within the broader context of the various themes of maxims that were read in school. These maxims, she says, address a number of topics—mostly wealth, but also friendship, the value of education, the gods, fate, women, etc.—that helped students “identify with powerful high-status Greek or Roman socio-cultural groups;” hence, these sentiments functioned

<sup>33</sup> See esp. Quintilian, 1.1.35, and, more generally, Bonner, *Education*, 172.

<sup>34</sup> Chreia 4, e.g., reappears in SB I.5730 (= Text 10).

<sup>35</sup> Chreia 1 is also found in Diogenes Laertius, 6.40; *Gnom. Par.* 30 (p. 40 Sternbach); and Arsenius, *Violetum*, p. 206 Walz. Chreia 2 is found in *Gnom. Par.* 4 and 27 (pp. 2 and 40 Sternbach). Chreia 3 reappears in *Gnom. Par.* 220 (p. 23 Sternbach); Antonius and Maximus, *Serm. de mulieribus improbis* (2.304 Mullach); and Arsenius, *Violetum*, p. 197 Walz. For Chreia 4, see previous note. Chreia 5 alone seems unattested elsewhere; see also Strohmaier, “Diogenesanekdoten,” 287: “Dieser Geistesblitz scheint in der Überlieferung untergegangen zu sein, was kein Schade wäre.” But this chreia was hardly the invention of the school teacher either (see Gallo, *Frammenti*, 390).

<sup>36</sup> For parallels, see, in addition to Strohmaier, “Diogenesanekdoten,” 286–88, Dimitri Gutas, “Sayings by Diogenes Preserved in Arabic,” in *Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements* (eds. M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet; Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993) 475–518.

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., P.Bour. 1.194–95: “The savagery of a lioness and a woman is the same.” The examples are legion: see the many attacks on women in the monostichoi attributed to Menander (nos. 342, 371, 502, 591, 700 [ed. Jaekel]). Outside the classroom the same sentiments appear in literature (see, e.g. Juvenal, *Sat.* 6.434–56; Lucian, *Fug.* 30–32; and the collection of quotations from comedy and history made by the γραμματικὸς Leonidas in Athenaeus, 13.558e–560f). One especially striking example appears in *Gnom. Barocc.* 255 (p. 30 Bywater): Secundus the wise man, on being asked what a woman is, said, “A shipwreck for her husband, a storm in the household, an obstacle to being care-free, a waster of a livelihood, a daily debit, a self-incurred battle, an expensive war, a live-in beast, a permanent object of care, a coiled viper, an asp as bedmate, an aroused lioness, a dolled-up Scylla, an evil creature, and a necessary evil.”

to distinguish these groups from others, such as women and barbarians.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>38</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 120-51 (quotation from p. 150).

## Text 2. P.Mich. inv. 25

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2085, not in Debut or Cribiore)

## INTRODUCTION

P.Mich. inv. 25 is made up of three small fragments, although only one is large enough ( $11.5 \times 4$  to 11 cm) to allow any sense to be reconstructed. This fragment contains portions of twelve lines on which parts of three chreiai are discernible, one attributed to Aristippus and two to Aesop. This papyrus received a brief notice from John Garrett Winter in 1933 and hence its inclusion by Roger A. Pack in his catalogue of literary papyri (see Pack<sup>2</sup> 2085),<sup>39</sup> but it was not edited until much later, first in 1978 by Thomas M. Tanner in a master's thesis<sup>40</sup> and then again in 1980 by Italo Gallo in his *Frammenti biographici da papii*.<sup>41</sup>

Gallo dates P.Mich. inv. 25 to the first century A.D.,<sup>42</sup> which thus corrects Winter's second or third century date, a date accepted by Tanner.<sup>43</sup> Gallo also says that the fragment belongs to "una raccolta di χρεῖαι di vari personaggi," and, given the sequence Aristippus-Aesop, to a chreia collection arranged alphabetically.<sup>44</sup> This collection, he says, was used in a classroom setting, not only because of the handwriting, but also because of the repetition of the name of the πρόσωπον, along with an identifying apposition, which is especially characteristic of school texts.<sup>45</sup> For example, in this text we find the words Αἰσωπος ὁ

<sup>39</sup> See John Garrett Winter, *Life and Letters in the Papyri* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1933) 262-63.

<sup>40</sup> See Thomas M. Tanner, *Michigan Papyri* (M.A. Thesis, University of Illinois, 1978) 1-16 (text on p. 8).

<sup>41</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 433-45 (text on pp. 437-38) and Tavola XV. See also Giannantoni, *Reliquiae*, 1.231.

<sup>42</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 434.

<sup>43</sup> See Tanner, *Papyri*, 1.

<sup>44</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 435. While Aristippus and Aesop are not, strictly speaking, in alphabetical order, it should be noted that ancient alphabetization was by first letter only, on which see further Lloyd W. Daly, *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages* (Brussels: Latomus, 1967) 62-63.

<sup>45</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 328 and 435.

λογοποιός in both the second and third chreiai.<sup>46</sup> In contrast, in literary collections of chreiai, such as those in Diogenes Laertius or in the *gnomologia*, this repetition is absent since the name of the πρόσωπον is usually replaced by the words ὁ αὐτός or is dropped altogether after the first chreia attributed to a specific πρόσωπον is recited.<sup>47</sup>

Restoration of these chreiai, in particular the chreia attributed to Aristippus, has witnessed some progress. Tanner provides his own minimalist restoration, and he includes the fuller ones of David Sansone and Miroslav Marcovich, along with his own objections to them.<sup>48</sup> In addition, Gallo offers his own restoration.<sup>49</sup> Taken together, these proposals have made some progress in filling the lacunae. All of them, for example, have restored ἐρωτηθεῖς after φιλόσοφος in line 1.<sup>50</sup> This restoration is correct, of course, since ἐρωτηθεῖς—itself a tell-tale formal marker of a chreia—is also preserved in the following two chreiai which are attributed to Aesop (lines 6 and 8). In other words, we should probably assume that all three chreiai belong to same sub-type, namely those that respond to a question, what was known as the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα.<sup>51</sup>

In addition, the presence of the singular forms of αὐλη[τή]c in line 2 and [μά]γειρον in lines 3-4 as well as the use of coordinating phrases, such as παρὰ μ[έν] and παρὰ δέ in lines 2-3 and οὐ and ἀλλ[ὰ] in line 4, also aid in filling lacunae. Consequently, all have restored παρὰ μ[έν] τοῖς αὐληταῖς and παρὰ δέ τοῖς ἄλλ[οι]ς in lines 2-3 and οὐ τοῖς μαγ[εῖ]ροις ἀλλ[ὰ] τοῖς ἄλλοις in line 4.<sup>52</sup>

At this point, however, scholars diverge in their restorations, and none of the proposals is satisfactory. The problem is that not one of these scholars has taken into consideration the formal features of the specific sub-type of chreia that is represented in these

<sup>46</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 435; cf. also Tanner, *Papyri*, 1.

<sup>47</sup> For the use of ὁ αὐτός, see *Gnom. Vat.*, *passim*. For the name dropped altogether, see Diogenes Laertius, 6.22-28.

<sup>48</sup> For Tanner's own restoration, see *Papyri*, 8; for those of Marcovich and Sansone, see pp. 10 and 15 n. 12.

<sup>49</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 437. See also his "Aristippo e l'auleta Timoteo," *QUCC* 30 (1979) 143-47.

<sup>50</sup> See esp. Tanner, *Papyri*, 9-10.

<sup>51</sup> See Theon 36-37, 46-49, and 61-66.

<sup>52</sup> See esp. Gallo, "Aristippo," 146-47.

lines. Gallo illustrates this problem, especially when he restores a verb (πα[ρενδοκιμεῖται] in line 3 and when he assumes that only an infinitive (συγκατοι/[κεῖν]) is needed in Aristippus' answer in lines 4-5. But formal considerations argue against both proposals. To take the infinitive first: this construction, which is used in indirect discourse, can appear in chreiai, but only in chreiai of certain subtypes—particularly in the εἶδος ἀποφαντικὸν καθ' ἐκούσιον and sometimes in the εἶδος ἀποφαντικὸν κατὰ περίστασιν where the περίστασις is stated as a genitive absolute.<sup>53</sup> But only very, very rarely does an infinitive appear in the subtype used here, the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα,<sup>54</sup> and even here the articular infinitive is much more likely.<sup>55</sup> In other words, while the letters -κειν in line 5 point to the infinitive of an -ω or -έω verb,<sup>56</sup> we must also restore a finite verb on which this infinitive depends, or, possibly, make the infinitive articular, or even propose another sub-type altogether, since the formal marker of this subtype, ἐρωτηθεῖς, is itself part of the reconstruction of line 1. In any case, Gallo's mere infinitive does not fit the restoration as it stands.

Similarly, the verb πα[ρενδοκιμεῖται] in line 3 is problematic. Here the formal objection is more subtle. Enough of the chreia is preserved, or restored, to match it up with a number of other chreiai, all belonging to a sub-type of the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα. This sub-type was not recognized and named by writers of *Progymnasmata*, and we need not name it here either. Suffice it to say that a perusal of hundreds and hundreds of chreiai has turned up a sub-type in which a person, when asked why something is the case and something else is not, says that it is because of some reason. Here are three of the twelve examples we have found of this sub-type; these three should be sufficient to indicate the recurring formal features:

<sup>53</sup> For the latter, see, e.g., *Gnom. Vat.* 30 (p. 16 Sternbach), 40 (p. 20) 52 (p. 25), and 65 (p. 30).

<sup>54</sup> In the first two hundred chreiai in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* only once is the infinitive of indirect discourse used (see *Gnom. Vat.* 154 [p. 66 Sternbach]).

<sup>55</sup> See, e.g., *Gnom. Vat.* 20 (p. 12 Sternbach), 36 (p. 17), 53 (p. 25), 58 (p. 28), 101 (p. 47), 118 (p. 54), and 182 (p. 74).

<sup>56</sup> It is also possible for the -κειν ending to point to the third person singular active pluperfect, as in ἐλέλυκει(ν), to use the standard model verb λύω. But such a tense is unlikely in a chreia.

Διογένης ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί προσαίταις μὲν ἐπιδιδόασι, φιλοσόφοις δὲ οὐ, ἔφη, ὅτι χωλοὶ μὲν καὶ τυφλοὶ γενέσθαι ἐλπίζουσι, φιλοσοφῆσαι δ' οὐδέποτε (Diogenes Laertius, 6.56).

Diogenes, on being asked why men give to beggars but not to philosophers, said, "Because they expect to become crippled or blind, but never expect to take up philosophy."

Ἀρίστιππος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ Διονυσίου διὰ τί οἱ μὲν φιλόσοφοι ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν πλουσίων θύρας ἔρχονται, οἱ δὲ πλούσιοι ἐπὶ τὰς τῶν φιλοσόφων οὐκέτι, ἔφη, ὅτι οἱ μὲν ἴσασιν ὧν δέονται, οἱ δ' οὐκ ἴσασιν (Diogenes Laertius, 2.69).

Aristippus, on being asked by Dionysius why philosophers go to the doors of the wealthy, but the wealthy no longer go to the doors of philosophers, said, "Because the former know what they want, but the latter do not."

ὁ αὐτὸς (scil. Σοφοκλῆς) ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί αὐτὸς μὲν ποιεῖ τὰ ἥθη τῶν ἀνθρώπων χρηστά, Εὐριπίδης δὲ φαῦλα, ὅτι, ἔφη, ἐγὼ μὲν, οἷους ἔδει εἶναι, τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ποιῶ, ἐκεῖνος δέ, ὅποιοι εἰσιν (*Gnom. Vat.* 518 [p. 190 Sternbach]).

The same one (Sophocles), on being asked why he made the character of men good, but Euripides made them wicked, said, "Because I make men as they ought to be, but he as they are."

The formal features of this sub-type of chreia can now be identified. First, we usually find ἐρωτηθεὶς followed by the interrogative διὰ τί. In the question itself we typically have a μὲν-δέ construction, with both halves of the question often governed by a single verb—e.g., in the first chreia recited above by the verb ἐπιδιδόασι. A negative particle often comes at the end of the second half of the question—again, as in the first chreia where we have οὐ. Finally, the answer, indicated by ἔφη, begins with ὅτι. These features are not rigidly followed, so that variations occur,<sup>57</sup>

<sup>57</sup> For example, instead of the usual ἐρωτηθεὶς (four of twelve cases) we also find ἐρωτήσαντος (e.g., Plutarch, *Apoph. Lac.* 220A), πυνθανομένου (Plutarch, *Apoph. Lac.* 232C), πρὸς τὸν πυθόμενον (Diogenes Laertius, 4.43), *vel sim.* Instead of the usual διὰ τί (ten cases) we also find διὰ τίνα αἰτίαν (Arsenius, *Violetum* [p. 208 Walz]). Single verbs govern both halves of the question in eight of twelve cases. And we can have either ὅτι ἔφη (six cases) or ἔφη ὅτι (five cases) (the ὅτι is missing, though implied, in Diogenes Laertius, 4.43).

but the form nevertheless remains recognizable, as in this further example:

Χάριλλος, πυνθανομένου δέ τινος διὰ τί τὰς μὲν κόρας ἀκαλύπτους, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας ἐγκεκαλυμμένας εἰς τοῦμφανὲς ἄγουσιν, ὅτι, ἔφη, τὰς μὲν κόρας ἄνδρας εὐρεῖν δεῖ, τὰς δὲ γυναῖκας σῶζειν τοὺς ἔχοντας (Plutarch, *Apoph. Lac.* 232C).

Charillos, when someone asked him why Spartans take their daughters out in public unveiled, but their wives veiled, said, "Because it is necessary for their daughters to find husbands, but for those who have wives to keep them."

It should now be evident that the first chreia in P.Mich. inv. 25 conforms to the sub-type outlined above. If so, we can fill in at least some of the papyrus simply by considering these formal features of this sub-type. Thus, after ἐρωτηθεῖς in line 1 we suggest διὰ τί. In line 3 it is not necessary to supply a verb, as Gallo has done, but simply complete the negative particle, in this case οὐ π[ά]ν. And in the space remaining in line 3 we need to add ἔφη ὅτι or ὅτι ἔφη. Lastly, in line 4 we must assume that a finite verb is necessary for the infinitive, of which there is only the ending -κειν in line 5.

Formal analysis, however, will not solve all problems. We are still in the dark about what specific verb ending in -μει or μεῖ in lines 2-3 governs the question, although it is likely that this verb governed both halves of the question. Likewise, we do not know which infinitive to restore in lines 4-5, although we now know that a finite verb goes with it. Perhaps, something like [δεῖ ἀρέσ]/κειν may get at the sense required. In any case, the somewhat minimalist reconstruction offered here seems a better basis for other scholars to build on than do previous restorations.

Restoration of the two chreiai attributed to Aesop is even more difficult, and little has been accomplished so far. The obvious restorations of ἐρ[ω]τηθεῖς [ὑπό τινος and εἶπ[ε]ν in lines 6 and 7 as well as the preservation of ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος and εἶπεν in lines 8 and 9 clearly point, as we have said, to both chreiai belonging to the sub-type εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα. But, despite the presence of some words from the questions and answers in these

chreiai, no restorations of the actual questions and answers have been forthcoming.<sup>58</sup>

The text of P.Mich. inv. 25 can be partially restored as follows:

## TEXT

- Ἀρίστιππος ὁ Κυρη[ναῖ]ος φι[λόσοφος, ἐρωτηθεὶς διὰ τί  
 Τιμόθεος ὁ αὐλη[τῆ]ς παρὰ μ[ὲν τοῖς αὐληταῖς + 6  
 -μεῖ, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς ἄ[λλ]οις οὐ πάνυ, ἔφη ὅτι + 7 μά-  
 γειρον οὐ τοῖς μαγ[εῖ]ροις ἀλ[λὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις + 7  
 5 -κεῖν.  
 Αἰσώπος ὁ λογοποιός, [ἐρ]ωτηθεὶς [ὑπό τινος  
 .]ος ἔστιν, εἶπ[ε]ν . . . χου [...] α . [  
 Αἰσώπος ὁ λογοποιός, ἐρωτηθεὶς [ὑπό τινος ἀν-  
 θρ]ώπου εἶπεν· λύπη καὶ π. λ . [  
 10 ]αὐτῆς ἄ[ν]αυσις θάνατος  
 ]γον ἀνα [. . . .] . [. .] [  
 ] . . . μεν[

1 διὰ τί Marcovich et Gallo τί Tanner and Sansone 2 Τιμόθεος omni edd. Τιμόθεος papyrus 2-3 -μεῖ Tanner ἀπευδοκι-μεῖ Gallo οὐκ εὐδοκι-μεῖ Marcovich εὐστο-μεῖ Sansone 3 οὐ π[άν]υ supplevimus οὐ πα[ρευδοκιμεῖται] Gallo <πάνυ,> οὐ πα[ράδοξον] Marcovich οὐ, Πάμφιλον Sansone οὐ πα[ρ] Tanner 3-4 ἔφη ὅτι . . . μά-γειρον supplevimus εἶπεν μά-γειρον Gallo εἶπεν καὶ μά-γειρον Marcovich ἔφη τὸν μά-γειρον Sansone ἔφη μά-γειρον Tanner 4-5 -κεῖν Tanner συγκατοι-κεῖν Gallo ἀρέε-κεῖν Marcovich ἐπαε-κεῖν Sansone 6 ὑπό τινος supplevimus ὑπὸ NN Tanner om. Gallo 7 χου [...] α. Gallo ου [. .] αλ Tanner 8 ὑπό τινος supplevimus ὑπὸ NN Tanner om. Gallo 8-9 ἀνθρ]ώπου Gallo -[.]ωπου Tanner 9 π.λ. Gallo .λ. Tanner 10 θάνατος Tanner θαν[άτου] Gallo

## TRANSLATION (OF LINES 1-9)

Aristippus the Cyre[nai]an phi[losopher, on being asked why

<sup>58</sup> Gallo (*Frammenti*, 443-44) makes some good conjectures in wording and sense, but even he hesitates to consider them more than conjectures. For the first chreia attributed to Aesop he proposes, drawing on a saying of Aesop in Plutarch, *Pel.* 34.5, the following: Αἰσώπος ὁ λογοποιός, [ἐρ]ωτηθεὶς [ποῖος θάνατος | χαλεπώτατ]ός ἐστιν, εἶπ[ε]ν· εὐτυχοῦ[ντα] ἀπ[οθανεῖν].



Timotheus the flute-pl[aye]r<sup>59</sup> [       ] among [flute-players,  
but not at all among o[ther peo]ple, [said, “[Because a co-]  
ok [       ] not with c[oo]ks bu[t with  
other people.”

Aesop the writer of fables, on being asked [by someone . . .  
. . . said . . .

Aesop the writer of fables, [on be]ing asked [by someone . . .  
. . . said, “Grief and . . .

<sup>59</sup> The identity of this Timotheus is disputed. He may be Timotheus of Miletus, a classical lyric poet, best known for his *Persae*, as preferred by Tanner (*Papyri*, 2-5). But this Timotheus is never called an ἀλητής. Therefore, Gallo (“Aristippo,” 145-46) proposes—and correctly so—another Timotheus, a native of Thebes and a contemporary of Alexander the Great. This Timotheus was known as a talented and famous ἀλητής, on whom see Dio, *Orat.* 1.1; Athenaeus, 13.565a; Lucian, *Ind.* 5, *Harm.* 1-3; and scholia on Hermogenes’ *On Staseis* (4.50, 25-29 Walz) and *On Ideas* (7.903, 22-25 Walz).

## Text 3. P.Mich. inv. 41

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2086, not in Debut or Cribiore)

## INTRODUCTION

Another papyrus fragment (13.5 × 7.5 cm), known as P.Mich. inv. 41, contains a collection of chreiai. In fact, the fragment contains varying portions of 21 lines that preserve parts of nine, perhaps ten, chreiai, as is indicated by the tell-tale appearances of ἐρωτηθεῖς (lines 5 and 15) and ἔφη (lines 7 and 11) or εἶπεν (lines 9, 13, 16, and 21). In 1933 Winter referred briefly to this papyrus<sup>60</sup> which led Pack to give it a number (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2086). But it was not for many years that the papyrus itself was finally published, first by Gallo in 1980<sup>61</sup> and then again in 1984 by Guido Bastianini.<sup>62</sup>

Gallo and Bastianini agree on dating P.Mich. inv. 41 to the first century A.D.<sup>63</sup> and both assign it to the classroom, regarding its chreiai, as Gallo says, to have been “compilata ad uso scolastico.”<sup>64</sup> Restoration of P.Mich. inv. 41, however, has had only limited success. Indeed, only one of the chreiai on this papyrus has been identified so far. Gallo reports that Peter J. Parsons, the papyrologist who was originally assigned to publish this papyrus, suggested *per litteras* a restoration for lines 5-6. He restored ἐπαιδευμ in line 6 as π[ε]παιδευμ[ένων] and then proposed a well-known chreia about the Muses dwelling in the souls of the educated (οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι) to round out the rest of these two lines.<sup>65</sup> Gallo and Bastianini accept Parsons’s proposal, although Bastianini suggests some minor changes, largely on the basis of the wording of

<sup>60</sup> See Winter, *Life and Letters*, 269.

<sup>61</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 325-40 (text on pp. 331-33) and Tavolo XII. See also Giannantoni, *Reliquiae*, 2.556-57.

<sup>62</sup> See Guido Bastianini, “A proposito di due frammenti di detti diogenici (P.Mich. inv. 41 e P.Osl. III.177),” *Sileno* 10 (1984) 43-47 (text on pp. 44-45).

<sup>63</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 326, and Bastianini, “Due frammenti,” 43.

<sup>64</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 328, and Bastianini, “Due frammenti,” 46. Cf. Giannantoni, *Reliquiae*, 3.421.

<sup>65</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 331.

SB I.5730, an ostrakon that also contains this chreia (see Text 10).<sup>66</sup>

Beyond this one chreia, however, restoration has been limited to single words or phrases. Gallo and Bastianini are in general agreement in this regard, but they also differ at some points in their readings of the papyrus (see apparatus). One point, however, calls for special mention. In lines 13 (ἰλοσοφος) and 15 (φι[.]οσοφος) it is certain that the papyrus reads φιλόσοφος. And, given the word φιλόσοφος in these lines, it is likely that the same word appears in lines 5 (ἰc), 9 (ἰc), 11 (φι[.]co[.]oc), 18 (ἰoc), and 21 (φ[....]φος). But only in line 15 is there any hint of the preceding name of the πρόσωπον, and then it is only a final c that is legible. Gallo proposes Διογένης as the πρόσωπον and not only here but throughout, so that he restores Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος in lines 5, 9, 11, 13, 15, 18, 21, and 23.<sup>67</sup> Bastianini, however, does not accept Διογένη[c at line 15 or anywhere else, except for line 5, although here he restores Διογένης ὁ κυνικός φιλόσοφος. Instead, he thinks that the chreiai on P.Mich. inv. 41 were attributed to various philosophers.<sup>68</sup>

Accordingly, the partially restored text of P.Mich. inv. 41 is as follows:

## TEXT

]αση[  
 ]αι μάλι[στα  
 ] . αχ . ς[  
 ] . .  
 5 Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος], ἐρωτηθεῖ[c ποῦ αἱ Μοῦσαι κατοικοῦσιν, ἔφη· ἐν ταῖς τῶν π]επαιδευμένων ψυχαῖς  
 ἔ]φη ἐὰν τὰ τῆς π[  
 ]  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος] εἶπεν τὴν φρό[νησιν  
 10 ] . [ . . . . κ]αλῶς ζ[ῆ]ν.

<sup>66</sup> See Bastianini, "Due frammenti," 47. To be sure, there are other chreiai with ἐρωτηθεῖς and πεπαιδευμένων. See, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 5.19: <Ἀριστοτέλης> ἐρωτηθεῖς τίνι διαφέρουσιν οἱ πεπαιδευμένοι τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν, ὅσῳ, εἶπεν, οἱ ζῶντες τῶν τεθνεώτων. As popular as this chreia is (see also Diogenes Laertius, 1.69; 2.69), it must be rejected because it cannot be written in two lines so that ἐρωτηθεῖς and πεπαιδευμένοι are above one another.

<sup>67</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 326-27.

<sup>68</sup> See Bastianini, "Due frammenti," 45-47.

ὁ ] φι[λό]σο[φ]ος ἔφη πάντα κ[  
 τῆ]ς πα[ι]δείας καὶ τῆς σωφρ[οσύνης  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος μηθὲν οὕτως εἶπ[εν  
 ]εων [. ] δ[ι]ηρῆσθαι ὥς τὴν [  
 15 ]ς ὁ φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑ[πὸ] τινος  
 ]ματιμοὶ ἄριστοι, εἶπεν ο[  
 ]  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος παρεκελεύετο τὰς τῶν ξ[  
 ]ερίας ὑπομένειν ἵνα] μὴ τ[  
 20 ]ἄνα[δέ]χωνται  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος εἶπεν [ . . ] πε[  
 ]αὔξετα[ι  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος] εἶπε

1 αcη Gallo αcι Bastianini 2 αι Gallo ν Bastianini 3 .αχ . c Gallo μάχηc  
 Bastianini 5 Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος]c Gallo Διογένης ὁ κυνικὸς φιλόσοφος]c Bas-  
 tianini || ἐρωτηθεὶς]c Gallo ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος Bastianini 6 ἔφη Gallo εἶπεν  
 Bastianini 7 ἔ]φη ἐάν Bastianini .πε ἄν Gallo 9 ὁ φιλόσοφος]c supplevimus  
 Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος]c Gallo ]c Bastianini 11 ὁ] supplevimus Διογένης ὁ]  
 Gallo ] Bastianini || κ[ Bastianini .[ Gallo 13 ὁ φ] supplevimus Διογένης φ]  
 Gallo φ] Bastianini || εἶπ[εν Bastianini εἶπ[ε Gallo 14 δ[ι]ηρῆσθαι Bastianini  
 ελ.ρῆσθαι Gallo || τὴν Bastianini τη. Gallo 15 ]c Bastianini Διογένης]c Gallo  
 || ὑ[πὸ τινος Bastianini π[ Gallo 16 ]ματιμοὶ Bastianini χρη]ματιμοὶ Gallo  
 18 ὁ φιλόσοφος]c supplevimus Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος]c Gallo ]oc Bastianini ||  
 ξ[ Bastianini .[ Gallo 19 ἵνα] μὴ τ[ Bastianini .[. . ] .[ Gallo 21 ὁ] supple-  
 vimus Διογένης ὁ] Gallo ] Bastianini 23 ὁ φιλόσοφος]c supplevimus Διογένης  
 ὁ φιλόσοφος Gallo ]η[ Bastianini || εἶπε Gallo ε[ Bastianini

#### TRANSLATION (OF LINES 5-6)

Diogenes the philosopher, on being asked where the Muses dwell, said: “In the souls of the educated.”

It is especially frustrating that, despite the legibility of some words in the other chreiai, none of them has been identified. Indeed, enough words—καλῶς ζῆν (line 9), τῆ]ς πα[ι]δείας καὶ τῆς σωφρ[οσύνης (line 12), δ[ι]ηρῆσθαι (line 14), ἄριστοι (line 16), ὑπομένειν (line 19)—are legible, so that identification of at least some of the chreiai seems inevitable, but Gallo admits making an extensive search of the “ricca letteratura apoftegmata relativa a Diogene cinico” but has come up with nothing, and our own search of chreiai attributed to many πρόσωπα has not borne fruit either.

Still, given the total number of chreiai preserved, it is unlikely that all of these other chreiai are not attested somewhere.

## Text 4. P.Oslo III.177

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2857, not in Debut or Cribiore)

## INTRODUCTION

This fragmentary papyrus (5.1 × 4.3 cm.), known as P.Oslo III.177, was first published in 1936 by Samuel Eitrem and Leiv Amundsen. The provenance of the fragment is unknown, but the editors dated it to the third or fourth century A.D. The editors attempted no restoration of its six lines since only a few words as well as parts of several others remained. All that they could say was that the papyrus was “perhaps literary.”<sup>69</sup>

Then, in 1974, Jean Lenaerts was able to identify the contents of the papyrus more precisely as a “fragment d’un recueil d’anecdotes sur Diogène.” This papyrus, he realized, contains two chreiai, only one of which he could restore. Lenaerts recognized that εὔδειν βουλη[ in line 3 and καὶ τόσσα με[ in line 4 come from two successive lines in Homer (*Il.* 2.24-25). This recognition led to the further discovery that these very lines also appear in a double chreia attributed to Alexander and Diogenes that is preserved by Epictetus and Theon.<sup>70</sup> That these Homeric lines in P.Oslo III.177 indeed were part of this well-known chreia finds confirmation, Lenaerts says, by the partially preserved participle κοῤῥιμωμένω in line 2, which Eitrem and Amundsen had already restored but which Laenerts also found in Epictetus’ and Theon’s recitations of this chreia. Lenaerts, therefore, could largely restore the chreia on the papyrus fragment by using the parallels in Epictetus and Theon.<sup>71</sup>

Gallo edits this text, too, and, of course, accepts Lenaerts’s identification of the first chreia.<sup>72</sup> But he has also made further modest restorations of the papyrus, in particular κα[ὶ εἰπόντος in

<sup>69</sup> See Samuel Eitrem and Leiv Amundsen, eds. *Papyri Osloensis, Vol. 3. Short Texts and Fragments* (Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1936) 262.

<sup>70</sup> See Epictetus, 3.22.92; Theon 88-93; and *Chreia* 1.314-15.

<sup>71</sup> See Jean Lenaerts, “Fragment d’Analecta sur Diogène (P.Osl. III, 177),” *CdÉ* 49 (1974) 121-23 (quotation and text on p. 122).

<sup>72</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 355-67 (text on p. 363) and Tavolo XIII.3. See also Giannantoni, *Reliquiae*, 2.427-28.

line 2.<sup>73</sup> But even more can be plausibly restored. For example, the name Διογένης clearly belongs at the beginning of line 1, given his role in the other recitations of this chreia (and not just in the two parallels already mentioned<sup>74</sup>). Further, the genitive Ἀλεξάνδρου likewise belongs in line 1, more likely after αὐτῷ, as Lenaerts hesitatingly suggests,<sup>75</sup> than before πορε]λθόντος, as Gallo proposes.<sup>76</sup>

Restoration of the last two lines awaits a breakthrough identification similar to that of Lenaerts for the first four lines. Still, Gallo is correct in suspecting a second chreia in these two lines<sup>77</sup> and in adding τινος after ὑπ[ό in line 6.<sup>78</sup> In addition, the name of a πρόσωπον, perhaps Διογένης, belongs at the beginning of line 5.

At any rate, Bastianini has contributed to the discussion in another way by proposing a revised dating of the papyrus. He proposes a first century A.D. date, not a third or fourth century date, since its handwriting is the same as that of P.Mich. inv. 41, dated, as we have seen, to the first century. Indeed, he suggests that the papyrus may have belonged to the same roll as P.Mich. inv. 41 and hence would have formed part of a larger collection of chreiai.<sup>79</sup>

<sup>73</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 366.

<sup>74</sup> This chreia also appears in the Aphthonius scholia. See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 39, 7-11; 41, 4-11 Rabe), and Doxapatres, 2.254, 5-8 Walz. See also Alessandro Sabatucci, "Scolii Antichi ad Aftonio nel Cod. Laur. Gr. LX.15," *SIFC* 16 (1908) 41-102, esp. 63.

<sup>75</sup> See Lenaerts, "Diogène," 123. Gallo (*Frammenti*, 365) calls this word order "insolita e innaturale." But, in fact, Lenaerts's participle-object-subject order is quite typical, to judge from a perusal of similar chreiai in, say, the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*. See esp. *Gnom.Vat.* 179 (p. 73 Sternbach): ... πορε]λθόντος αὐτῷ τινος καὶ λέγοντος. . . See also *Gnom.Vat.* 45, 92, 104, 105, 157, 210, 233, 318, 372, 385, 487, and 557.

<sup>76</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 363 and esp. 365. When Gallo places Ἀ[λεξάνδρου before πορε]λθόντος, he has space left at the end of the first line, space he fills with an indication of place, specifically ἐν τῷ Κρανεῖω. This gymnasium is a frequent setting for chreiai attributed to Diogenes, including those involving Alexander (see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.38). But nowhere in the various recitations of this chreia is a location given. Hence such a place indication seems very unlikely here.

<sup>77</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 366-67.

<sup>78</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 363.

<sup>79</sup> See Bastianini, "Due frammenti," 43-47.

Finally, Gallo has assigned P.Oslo III.177 to an educational setting, largely because the script of the papyrus was made, he says, “di mano inesperta” which thus points to a pupil’s homework assignment. Specifically, Gallo proposes a rhetorical school.<sup>80</sup> But such a proposal seems unlikely. Gallo is swayed too much by the chreia’s appearance in a rhetorical text, namely Theon’s, and he thinks the chreia, being a double chreia, is too complex for younger pupils.<sup>81</sup> But pupils at the rhetorical level, or even at the literary level, did not simply copy chreiai. At those levels pupils declined or elaborated chreiai, and there is no evidence of such manipulations here. Hence it is probably better to assign this papyrus to the primary level.

The partially restored text of P.Oslo III.177 is as follows:

TEXT

Διογένης προσε]λθόντος αὐτῷ Ἀ[λεξάνδρου  
 κο]ιμωμένῳ κα[ὶ εἰπόντος·  
 «οὐ χρὴ παννύχιον εὔδειν βουλη[φόρον ἄνδρα,» ἔφη  
 «ὧ λαοί τ’ ἐπιτετράφατα]ι καὶ τόσσα μέμ[ηλε.»  
 5 π]ορευομένο . [  
 ἐρ]ω[τ]ηθεὶς ὑπ[ὸ τινος

1 Διογένης supplevimus || προσε]λθόντος Lenaerts ἐ]λθόντος Eitrem et Amundsen || αὐτῷ Lenaerts λυπομ[ Eitrem et Amundsen || Ἀ[λεξάνδρου supplevimus (cf. Lenaerts, “Diogène,” 123) 2 κο]ιμωμένῳ Eitrem et Amundsen || κα[ὶ εἰπόντος Gallo 3 ἔφη Gallo εἶπεν vel ἔφη vel ἀπεκρίνατο Lenaerts (cf. “Diogène,” 123) 3-4 Il. 2.24-25 5 π]ορευόμενον Eitrem et Amundsen π]ορευόμενος Gallo 6 ἐρ]ω[τ]ηθεὶς ὑπ[ὸ τινος Lenaerts || τινος Gallo

TRANSLATION (OF THE FIRST FOUR LINES)

Diogenes], when A[lexander came] to him  
 as he s]lept a[nd said,  
 “To sleep a[ll night ill-suits a] coun[selor,” replied,  
 “On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many” (Il. 2.24-25)

<sup>80</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 355-57 and esp. 361.

<sup>81</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, esp. 356-57.



Text 5. P.Berol. inv. 21258<sup>v</sup>  
(not in Pack<sup>2</sup>, Debut, or Cribiore)

INTRODUCTION

Among the unidentified fragments from the Berlin collection, published recently by Grace Ioannidou,<sup>82</sup> are four that have now been identified by Michael Gronewald.<sup>83</sup> Three of these fragments are literary: P.Berol. inv. 21214 = Hesiod, *Theog.* 767-72; 21262 = Xenophon, *Ag.* 1.18; and 21265 = Psalms 145-46.<sup>84</sup> The fourth, P.Berol. inv. 21258<sup>v</sup>, contains portions of three chreiai and hence is the fragment that is of interest to us.

These chreiai appear on the verso of a documentary papyrus (16.3 × 8.7 cm). The hand is a cursive and has been dated to the first or second century A.D. The very fragmentary remains, as partially restored by Ioannidou, are as follows:

	Ἰ	Ἀλεξ]	ανδρ[ο]ν
		]	οιηειν και[
		]	ναγε[ . ] . [
		βα	]
5			α]ιλειν α]αθου
		]	
		Μακ	]
			εδωνων βασιλειν
		]	των φιλων . . . .το
		]	εχθ[ . . .τ]οις πολε
10		]	εστι[ν κ]λεππειν
		]	
		]	. μητηρ ακου
		]	. μετηλλαχεν
15		]	ιον αταφο{1}c με[
		]	του λοιπου του[
		]	νυν δ ουδε τηc

<sup>82</sup> See Grace Ioannidou, *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin* (P.Berol. inv. 21101-21299, 21911) (Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1996) 203-4.

<sup>83</sup> Michael Gronewald, "Hesiod, Xenophon, Psalmen und Alexanderapophthegma in Berliner Papyri," *ZPE* 115 (1997) 117-19.

<sup>84</sup> See further Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 117-19.

Gronewald has securely identified the second of the three chreiai in this papyrus and has rather fully reconstructed it. The words Μακ]εδονων βασιλευς in line 7 can be further restored as Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τῶν Μακ]εδόνων βασιλεύς. Although the πρόσωπον of this chreia is thus secure, identifying the chreia itself depends on the restoration of another word, κ]λεπτειν in line 10. For this word recalls a moment in Alexander's life when, shortly before he was to engage King Darius and the Persians at Gaugamela, he was advised to attack at night so as to surprise the enemy and hence ensure victory. Alexander, however, rejected the advice, saying: "I'm not stealing (κλέπτω) the victory."<sup>85</sup>

Plutarch, in narrating this event, says that Alexander's saying was well known.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, the saying was taken up in chreia form and was preserved, as Gronewald notes,<sup>87</sup> in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, where we read this chreia attributed to Alexander:

Ὁ αὐτὸς παρακαλούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν φίλων νυκτὸς ἐπιθέσθαι τοῖς πολεμίοις εἶπεν· οὐ βασιλικὸν τὸ κλέψαι τὴν νίκην.<sup>88</sup>

The same one, on being encouraged by his friends to attack the enemy at night, said, "It is not fitting for a king to steal the victory."

With the help of this chreia Gronewald attempts a reconstruction of lines 7-10 of P.Berol. inv. 21258<sup>v</sup> as follows:

#### TEXT

[Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Μακ]εδόνων βασιλεύς  
 [παρακαλούμενος ὑπὸ] τῶν φίλων πρὸς τὸ  
 [ (νυκτὸς) ἐπιθ]έσθ[αι τ]οῖς πολε-  
 10 [μίοις εἶπεν· οὐ βασιλικὸν] ἐστι[ν κ]λέπτειν  
 [τὴν νίκην. ]

<sup>85</sup> See Plutarch, *Alex.* 31.6-12, and Arrian, *Anab.* 3.8.7-10.4. For this final and decisive victory over the Persians in 331 B.C., see further N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (3rd. ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986) 615-18.

<sup>86</sup> Plutarch, *Alex.* 31.12.

<sup>87</sup> See Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 119.

<sup>88</sup> *Gnom. Vat.* 77 (p. 77 Sternbach). See also *Gnom. Par.* 12 (p. 3 Sternbach).

## TRANSLATION

Alexander, the] king of the Mac[edonians,  
 on being urged by] his friends  
 to att]ack h[is enemies at night,  
 10 said, "It is [not fitting for a king to] s[teal  
 the victory." ]

Gronewald is less certain about the remaining two chreiai. In fact, he offers some suggestions, but stops short of attempting a reconstruction of either. Regarding the first chreia (lines 1-6), he tries to identify the chreia by focusing on ]οιηciv in line 2 and proposes two possibilities: παιδοπ]οίηciv and π]οίηciv. The former draws attention to a chreia attributed to Alexander's father, Philip, as preserved by Plutarch: Philip, on learning that Alexander was criticizing him because he had fathered children (παῖδας . . . ποιῆ-ται) by many women, said: "Very well, although you have many rivals for my kingdom, become an excellent person (γένου καλὸς ἀγαθός) in order that you get (ἵνα . . . τύχης) this kingdom on your own and not on account of me."<sup>89</sup>

This proposal is attractive in that lines 3-4 might thereby be partially reconstructed as ἵνα γέ[νη [ / βα]σιλεὺς ἀγαθός, which parallels γένου καλὸς ἀγαθός in Plutarch,<sup>90</sup> but beyond that the reconstruction becomes problematic and therefore this reconstruction fails.

The second suggestion, π]οίηciv, points to a biographical detail regarding Alexander, again preserved by Plutarch: If ever there was a comparison of the verses of Homer in lectures or during symposia, one preferred one verse and another another, but Alexander judged this line to be best of all:

"He is both, a noble king and a powerful warrior" (*Il.* 3.179).<sup>91</sup>

Gronewald attempts no further reconstruction of the papyrus in the light of this chreia in Plutarch and hence it becomes even less likely than the first proposal.

<sup>89</sup> See Plutarch, *Reg. et imp. apophth.* 178E, and Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 120.

<sup>90</sup> See Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 120.

<sup>91</sup> See Plutarch, *De fort. Alex.* 331C. The line from Homer is part of Helen's description of Agamemnon, the leader of the Greeks at Troy.

The third chreia (lines 13-17) seems more amenable to reconstruction, for several words are preserved that could provide clues to its identity. In particular, the words μητηρ ακου in line 13 are most likely to be restored as μήτηρ ἀκού[σασα] ὅτι. These words confirm the presence of a chreia and even suggest a Spartan mother as the πρόσωπον of this chreia, as Spartan mothers appear in chreiai, usually demanding bravery from their sons.<sup>92</sup> Gronewald has proposed a parallel, once again from Plutarch: A Spartan mother, on hearing (ἀκούσασα) that her son had died in battle just where he had been stationed, said: "Bury him, and let his brother fill in his place in the battle formation."<sup>93</sup> This proposal illustrates the type but hardly fits what remains of the papyrus. Hence this third chreia, like the first, remains unidentified, at least for the present.

<sup>92</sup> See Plutarch, *Lac. apophth.* 240C-242D, and *Gnom. Vat.* 568-70, 575 (pp. 202, 204 Sternbach). See also Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 120.

<sup>93</sup> See Plutarch, *Lac. apophth.* 242A, and Gronewald, "Berliner Papyri," 120.

## Text 6. P.Mil.Vogl. VI.263

(Cribiore 188, not in Pack<sup>2</sup> or Debut)

## INTRODUCTION

This fragmentary papyrus (8.6 × 9.9 cm), which comes from Tebtunis, contains portions of two chreiai which were written on the verso of a papyrus first used to record accounts of some kind. Its editors, Claudio Gallazzi and Mariangela Vandoni, date the fragment, on the basis of its writing, to the second century A.D., and place it in a school setting, also on the basis of its handwriting, which displays a rough, irregular, and unpracticed hand. Accordingly, they classify it as “un esercizio scolastico,” specifically a dictation exercise, as suggested by several phonetic errors: υ for ι, ι for ει, ντ for νδ, ο and for ω.<sup>94</sup>

Cribiore likewise includes this papyrus among her collection of school texts, although she classifies its handwriting more precisely as “evolving,” hence as belonging to the third category of her typology. She also adds that the various phonetic errors do not guarantee dictation, so that we may have yet another example of an exercise involving copying chreiai.<sup>95</sup>

Discussion of these chreiai has focused, understandably, on the nearly complete chreia, one attributed to Demosthenes in lines 1-6, since the second one, attributed to Epameinondas, has only the opening words preserved (lines 7-10). What has drawn scholars' attention in the chreia attributed to Demosthenes is the apparent error in placing the death of Aeschines before that of Demosthenes. The latter's death, by suicide, is securely dated to 322 B.C., shortly after the Lamian War.<sup>96</sup> The year of Aeschines' death, however, is far less secure, given the uncertainty regarding his life once he exiled himself from Athens in 330. One

<sup>94</sup> See Claudio Gallazzi and Mariangela Vandoni, eds., *Papiri della Università degli Studi di Milano* (7 vols.; Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1961-1981) 6.9-11 (text on p. 11).

<sup>95</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 217.

<sup>96</sup> Demosthenes, who had sided with Athens in a losing war against Antipater, was condemned to death. He then fled to the temple of Poseidon on the island of Calauria where he committed suicide by poison. See further Plutarch, *Demosth.* 28-29, and Hammond, *History of Greece*, 645-49.

ancient source, a biography of the orator by a certain Apollonius, allows a calculation of the year of his death. Apollonius says that Aeschines died at age 75, or about 315, if we compare this statement with one of Aeschines' own.<sup>97</sup> The editors of this papyrus, however, offer the possibility that this chreia may have been formulated on the basis of other, vaguer traditions in which Aeschines' death is not specifically dated but is left open so that it may have been imagined to have occurred before Demosthenes' death.<sup>98</sup>

And yet, whether the chreia is correct on the sequence of the deaths of Demosthenes and Aeschines,<sup>99</sup> the point of the saying correctly draws attention to the intense rivalry that marked Aeschines' relationship with Demosthenes.<sup>100</sup> Consequently, Demosthenes' saying in the chreia is yet another attack on Aeschines by alluding to the latter's earlier role as a court clerk (ὑπογραφεύς), a subordinate role in which he merely recorded the thoughts of others.<sup>101</sup>

The formal features of these chreiai, however, have not been sufficiently discussed. Both chreiai are sayings-chreiai, and both are ἀποφαντικόν, to use Theon's term for one sub-type of sayings-chreiai. But Theon divides this sub-type even further, into those

<sup>97</sup> See Apollonius, *Vit. Aeschin.* (p. 6, 63 and 65 Martin-Budé): ἐτελεύτησε δ' Αἰσχίνης ... βεβιωκώς ἔτη οε'. The year 315 is calculated from Aeschines' statement in which he says that he was forty-five at the time of his prosecution of Timarchus in 345 (see Aeschines, *Orat.* 1.49). See further Wilhelm Schmid and Otto Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (HAW 7.1.1-2; 6th ed.; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1912-1924) 1.610 and n. 2, and Victor Martin and Guy de Budé, eds., *Eschine Discours* (2 vols.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962) 1.ii.

<sup>98</sup> See Gallazzi and Vandoni, *Papiri*, 11. Full discussion in Theodore Thalheim, "Aischines (15)," *PW* 1 (1893) 1053-62, esp. 1059.

<sup>99</sup> See George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963) 237: "The date of his death is unknown."

<sup>100</sup> On this rivalry, which came to a climax in 330 when Aeschines objected to Demosthenes' being voted a crown and brought suit against the man who had proposed the crown, leading to Aeschines' speech "Against Ctesiphon" and Demosthenes' reply in "On the Crown," see Kennedy, *Art of Persuasion*, 226-45.

<sup>101</sup> On Aeschines' being attacked for having been a ὑπογραφεύς, see Demosthenes, *Orat.* 18.127, 209, 261, 265; and 19.200. See also Apollonius, *Vit. Aeschin.* (p. 5, 16 Martin-Budé), and ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 840A.

whose sayings are unprompted (καθ' ἐκούσιον) and those whose sayings arise from a specific circumstance (κατὰ περίστασιν).<sup>102</sup>

The chreia attributed to Demosthenes belongs to the latter sub-type, for his saying arises from the περίστασις of his having heard a report of Aeschines' death. In addition, while the usual participle identifying the περίστασις is some verb of seeing, such as ἰδών, the verb used here, ἀκούσας, is occasionally attested.<sup>103</sup> Indeed, one example uses the same circumstance, the report of a death: A Laconian woman, on hearing (ἀκούσασα) that her son had died in pitched battle, said: "My child, what noble rearing you've displayed for your fatherland!"<sup>104</sup>

The other chreia belongs to the other sub-type, ἀποφαντικὸν καθ' ἐκούσιον, for, even though the chreia is only partially preserved, this sub-type is confirmed by the lack of a circumstantial participle before the main verb εἶπεν. Unfortunately, only one word of the saying is preserved in lines 9-10: ἄρις[τ]ος, so that the restoration of the saying can only be tentative. Nevertheless, this one word is enough to suggest two possibilities. The first recalls a chreia that is recited by Diodorus Siculus, who tells of Thebans who were pointing to omens (οἰωνοί) that portended their defeat by the Spartans. Epameinondas replied to those who said that he should pay attention to these omens by quoting Homer:

"One omen is best (εἷς οἰωνὸς ἄριστος)—to fight on behalf of one's country" (*Il.* 12.243).<sup>105</sup>

This saying contains the preserved word ἄριστος, but it is not in first position, and, although one might cite only a portion of a poetic line (so Chreiai 67-68),<sup>106</sup> to do so here—by dropping the first two words εἷς οἰωνός—would require changing ἄριστος to ἄριστον. Also, citing this line, even in a partial and modified form, seems to require a circumstantial clause, which is precluded here by the καθ' ἐκούσιον form of this chreia. Hence this restoration is too problematic to be the one that was originally on this papyrus.

A second possibility has fewer problems. In the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* we find the following chreia:

<sup>102</sup> See Theon 36-45, and *Chreia* 1.27-28.

<sup>103</sup> See, e.g., *Gnom. Vat.* 48 (p. 23 Sternbach), 174 (p. 71), 183 (p. 74), 222 (p. 88), and 551 (p. 197).

<sup>104</sup> *Gnom. Vat.* 569 (p. 202 Sternbach).

<sup>105</sup> See Diodorus Siculus, 15.52.7.

<sup>106</sup> See further *Chreia* 1.342-43.

ὁ αὐτὸς (*scil.* Epameinondas) τὸν κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον θάνατον εἶπεν ἱερόθυτον εἶναι.<sup>107</sup>

The same one (Epameinondas) said that death in war is a sacrifice for one's country.

To be sure, this chreia does not contain the word ἄριστος, but the word ἱερόθυτον, even though it seems to allude to some lines of Pindar, may not be essential to the saying. In fact, Plutarch recites this chreia with κάλλιστον as a synonym for ἱερόθυτον, as follows:

Ἐπαμεινώνδας ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν ἐν πολέμῳ θάνατον εἶναι κάλλιστον.<sup>108</sup>

Epameinondas said that death in war is the most noble one.

Both recitations of this chreia are καθ' ἐκούσιον, as is the chreia on the papyrus, and Plutarch's recitation suggests that perhaps ἄριστος might also be a synonym for ἱερόθυτον, so that we propose the following restoration: Ἐπαμεινώνδας ὁ Θηβαίων στρατηγὸς εἶπεν· ἄριστος ὁ κατὰ πόλεμον θάνατός ἐστιν.

The restored text of P.Mil.Vogl. VI.263 is as follows:

#### TEXT

Δ]ημοσθένης ὁ ῥή-  
τ]ωρ ἀκούσας ὅτι Αἰ-  
c]χίνης ἐτελεύτη-  
c]εν εἶπεν· ἀπώλε-  
5 τό μου τὸ γραφ-  
εῖο]ν τῶν λόγων.  
Ἐ]παμεινώνδας ὁ  
Θηβαίων στρατη-  
γὸς εἶπεν· ἄρις-  
10 τ]ος [ὁ κατὰ πόλ]ε-  
[μον θάνατός ἐστιν.]

**1** Δημοσθένης correxerunt Gallazzi et Vandoni ]ημοσθαινης papyrus **2-3** Αἰ-  
c]χίνης correxerunt Gallazzi et Vandoni E[ ]χυνης papyrus **4-5** ἀπώλετο cor-  
rexerunt Gallazzi et Vandoni απολετον papyrus **5-6** γραφεῖον correxerunt Gal-  
lazzi et Vandoni γραφι[. .]ν papyrus **6** τῶν λόγων correxerunt Gallazzi et  
Vandoni τον λογον papyrus **7** Ἐπαμεινώνδας correxerunt Gallazzi et Vandoni  
]παμεινωντας papyrus **10-11** ὁ κατὰ πόλεμον θάνατός ἐστιν. supplevimus

<sup>107</sup> See *Gnom. Vat.* 280 (p. 109 Sternbach).

<sup>108</sup> Plutarch, *De glor. Ath.* 349C, citing Pindar, *Frag.* 78.



## TRANSLATION

D]emosthenes the ora-  
t]or, on hearing that Ae-  
s]chines had died,  
5 said, "The sty-  
l]us<sup>109</sup> of my speeches has  
perish[ed."  
E]pameinondas the  
Theban gener-  
al said, ["Bes]t  
10 [is the death that comes  
in w]a[r]."]

<sup>109</sup> For pictures of a variety of this writing implement, see Bonner, *Education*, 128 (fig. 14).

## Text 7. O.Clermont-Ganneau (no inventory number)

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2656 = Debut 202 = Cribiore 145)

## INTRODUCTION

This ostrakon (8 × 7 cm), which was discovered in 1907/1908 in Elephantine, Egypt, was not published until 1945 by Paul Collart.<sup>110</sup> He dates it to the middle of the second century A.D. and classifies it, because of its uneven, irregular, and clumsy handwriting, as “un devoir d’écolier.”<sup>111</sup>

The ostrakon contains a single, complete chreia. The saying of this chreia, or at least its sentiment, is widely attested.<sup>112</sup> From its appearance in Stobaeus,<sup>113</sup> however, we can restore not only the original poetic wording of the saying—τύχη τὰ θνητῶν πρᾶγματ’, οὐκ εὐβουλία—but also its true source: the most famous tragedy of the fourth century B.C. dramatist Chaeremon, the *Achilles Thersitocotomus*.<sup>114</sup> The ostrakon’s attribution to Euripides is therefore incorrect, although the teacher who supplied the chreia for copying may have had few books and thus had to depend on his memory, and Euripides was a good guess, given his sententious bent and his popularity among teachers.<sup>115</sup>

The form of this chreia is the simplest one available. It contains merely the πρόσωπον, the verb εἶπεν, and a λόγος. In Theon’s

<sup>110</sup> See Paul Collart, “À propos d’un ostrakon Clermont-Ganneau inédit de l’Académie des Inscriptions,” *CRAI* (1945) 249–58 (text on p. 250).

<sup>111</sup> See Collart, “Ostrakon,” 249–51. Since this ostrakon is now lost, Cribiore (*Writing*, 218) cannot classify this hand according to her typology and hence must simply repeat Collart’s description.

<sup>112</sup> See, e.g., Menander, *Aspis* 411; Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.9.25; Plutarch, *De fort.* 97C; and Libanius, *Orat.* 25.11 (2.542, 15 Foerster). For an educational context for this sentiment, see Menander, *Mon.* 732 (p. 75 Jaekel). See also Cribiore, *Writing*, 162.

<sup>113</sup> See Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 1.6.7 (1.85 Wachsmuth).

<sup>114</sup> See Chaeremon, *Frag.* 2 (= *TGF* [p. 217 Nauck<sup>2</sup>]), where the ostrakon has τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων instead of τὰ θνητῶν. On Chaeremon and this drama, see Franz Stoessl, “Chaeremon (5),” *PWSup* 10 (1965) 124–25, and Christopher Collard, “On the Tragedian Chaeremon,” *JHS* 90 (1970) 22–34, esp. 26.

<sup>115</sup> On the popularity of Euripides, see Bonner, *Education*, 173, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 164–65.

classification of chreiai, this chreia conforms to the form εἶδος ἀποφαντικὸν καθ' ἐκούσιον.<sup>116</sup>

Finally, that the λόγος contains no verb deserves mention, as a form of the verb “to be,” which can often be understood, makes little sense here. We have supplied “directs” from Cicero’s Latin rendering of this line, which uses the verb *regere*: *vitam regit fortuna, non sapientia*.<sup>117</sup>

## TEXT

Εὐριπίδης ὁ  
τῶν τραγωδιῶν  
ποιητῆς εἶπεν· τύ-  
χη τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώ-  
5 πων πράγματα,  
οὐκ εὐβουλία.

1 Εὐριπίδης correxist Collart Εὐριπίδης ostrakon 4-5 τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ostracon  
con τὰ θνητῶν Chaeremon 6 εὐβουλία correxist Collart εὐβουλεία ostrakon

## TRANSLATION

Euripides, the  
writer of tragedies, said:  
“Chance, not good counsel,  
directs human affairs.”

<sup>116</sup> See Theon 37-38.

<sup>117</sup> Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* 5.9.25.

## Text 8. P.Vindob.G. 19766

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 1989 = Debut 313 = Cribiore 192)

## INTRODUCTION

Another text which preserves at least one chreia is a fragmentary papyrus (8 × 6 cm), known as P.Vindob.G. 19766. This papyrus was first published in 1939 by Hans Oellacher<sup>118</sup> and again in 1980 by Gallo.<sup>119</sup> Oellacher dated the papyrus to the second half of the second century A.D.,<sup>120</sup> a dating which has been accepted ever since.<sup>121</sup> Oellacher also assigned the papyrus to the classroom, given the “unausgeglichene zaghafte Hand,” as does Gallo.<sup>122</sup> Cribiore, however, is more precise in classifying the pupil’s hand as alphabetic, which makes it a copying exercise.<sup>123</sup>

Portions of nine lines remain. Oellacher securely restored three of them (lines 3-5). He recognized the remains of a chreia. The presence of the letters ]ο τινος in line 4 points to the formula ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπ’]ο τινος, which is typical of sayings-chreiai of the sub-type εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα.<sup>124</sup> Accordingly, a verb of saying, εἶπεν or ἔφη, is also required.

Fortunately, enough of the question and answer is preserved to allow identification of this fragmentary chreia with one known elsewhere and attributed to the Cynic philosopher Diogenes.<sup>125</sup>

<sup>118</sup> For full discussion of this papyrus, see Hans Oellacher, ed., *Griechische literarische Papyri II* (MPER n.s. III; Vienna: Rohrer, 1939) 52-53. Cf. also Alfred Körte, “Literarische Texte mit Anschluss der christlichen,” *Archiv* 14 (1940) 103-50, esp. 137-38; Paul Sanz, ed., *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes* (MPER n.s. IV; Vienna: Rohrer, 1946) 137; and Cribiore, *Writing*, 218.

<sup>119</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 341-48 (text on p. 345) and Tavallo XIII.1.

<sup>120</sup> See Oellacher, *Papyri*, 52.

<sup>121</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 341, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 218.

<sup>122</sup> See Oellacher, *Papyri*, 52, and Gallo, *Frammenti*, 341-42.

<sup>123</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 341-42, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 218.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. Theon 46-48.

<sup>125</sup> For this chreia, see Diogenes Laertius, 6.51; *Gnom. Vat.* 172 (p. 71 Sternbach); Antonius Melissa, *De avar.* 127 (= PG 136.896a); and Arsenius, *Viuletum*, p. 197 Walz.

Hence the restoration of Διογέν]ης in line 3 as the name of the πρόσωπον is certain, and the restoration of the key word χ[λωρόν in line 4 is likewise assured.<sup>126</sup>

The other lines, however, are not as easily restored. Lines 1-2 remain unintelligible, and lines 6-9 raise more questions than answers. To be sure, Autolycus is clearly the mythical thief, given the presence in line 8 of his father Hermes, and Paul Sanz has plausibly restored line 8 further than had Oellacher, so that we have at least the beginning of the question put to Autolycus. Nevertheless, this additional restoration fills in only the form of the question (Αὐτόλ]υκος Ἑρμοῦ ἐ[ρομένου] ... τί δὲ[... ἔφη), not its content.<sup>127</sup> Moreover, Autolycus is otherwise unknown as a πρόσωπον in a chreia. And since mythical figures are more likely to appear in narratives than in chreiai, it is likely that we do not have a chreia in these lines at all. Indeed, Guido Bastianini and Wolfgang Luppe have recently proposed another solution; they suggest that we have here the beginning of a hypothesis of Euripides' first satyr play named *Autolycus*.<sup>128</sup>

Accordingly, the partially restored text of P.Vindob.G. 19766 is as follows:

## TEXT

] . ενεῖμαι ... [.] των .. [  
 ]λαβον  
 Διογέν]ης ὁ κυνικὸς φιλόσοφ[ος ἔρωτη-  
 θεῖς ὑπ]ό τινος διὰ τί τὸ χρυσίον χ[λωρόν ἐς-  
 5 τιν, ἔφη,] ὅτι πολλοὺς ἐπιβο<ύ>λ[ο]υε ἔ[χει.  
 τὸ δρᾶμα Εὐ[ρ]ιπ(ίδου)  
 Αὐτόλ]υκος α[.]  
 Αὐτόλ]υκος Ἑρμοῦ ἐ[ρομένου] . τί δὲ[... ἔφη

<sup>126</sup> Diogenes is always the πρόσωπον of this chreia. The word χλωρός ("pallid") suggests fear, and in fact the expression χλωρόν δέος appears in Homer (*Il.* 7.479; 15.4; and *Od.* 11.43). The same word appears in the recitation of this chreia in Diogenes Laertius, 6.51, although the synonym ὠχρός also appears (see, e.g., *Gnom. Vat.* 172 [p. 72 Sternbach]).

<sup>127</sup> See Sanz, *Literarische Papyri*, 137. Gallo, *Frammenti*, 345, accepts this restoration.

<sup>128</sup> See Guido Bastianini and Wolfgang Luppe, "Una hypothesis Euripidea in un esercizio scolastico (P.Vindob.G. 19766 verso, Pack<sup>2</sup> 1989): Ἰ' Αὐτόλ]υκος, πρῶτος," *Analecta Papirologica* 1 (1989) 31-36.

]ων[

**3-5** textum supplevit Oellacher 6 τὸ δρᾶμα Εὐ[ρ]ῖπ(ίδου) Bastianini et Luppe  
 το δρᾶμα . [.] . Oellacher **8** ἐ[ρομένου] vel ἐ[ρωτῶντος] Sanz .[. . . .] Bastianini  
 et Luppe || τί δὲ [ . . . ἔφη] vel sim. Sanz τιδε [ Oellacher τιαφ[ + 7 Bastianini et  
 Luppe

## TRANSLATION (OF LINES 3-8)

Diogen]es the Cynic philosoph[er, on being  
 asked b]y someone why gold [is] p[allid,  
 said,] “Because it h[as] many who plo[t against it.”

The drama of Euripides

Autolycus

Autolycus, son of Hermes, on being asked, “Why . . .,” said

## Text 9. P.Sorb. inv. 2150 (formerly P.Rein. II.85)

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 1990 = Cribiore 211, not in Debut)

## INTRODUCTION

This papyrus fragment (7 × 4 cm) contains at least one partially preserved chreia. Its editor, Paul Collart, dated the fragment to the end of the third century A.D.,<sup>129</sup> a dating that has been accepted ever since.<sup>130</sup> Likewise, Collart's assignment of this papyrus to the classroom has been accepted, although Cribiore is more precise classifying the hand as alphabetic, thereby making it a copying exercise.<sup>131</sup>

Restoration of the first two lines has made some progress. Thus restoring Διογ[ένης in line 1 as the πρόσωπον seems most likely, given the further identification of the πρόσωπον as ὁ κυνικός[ς, although another Cynic philosopher, Ἀντι[σ]θένης, cannot be ruled out. In addition, the restoration of the rest of line 1 is virtually assured. The addition of φιλόσοφος after the word κυνικός is standard in educational chreiai, and the words ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος, which makes this chreia conform to the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ φύσιν,<sup>132</sup> is probable in view of the question τί ἐστιν ἄνθρωπος; in line 2. Finally, some verb of saying, whether εἶπεν (Collart) or ἔφη (Gallo), must be added to line 2 as well.

From this point on, however, nothing is assured. In particular, the answer of Diogenes is difficult, if not impossible, to restore. For example, it is difficult to decide whether the name "Aristotle" in line 3 belongs to the answer of Diogenes or whether this name signals a new chreia with Aristotle as the πρόσωπον. If the former, then the difficulty becomes finding chreiai attributed to Diogenes which mention Aristotle. Only one is known to us,

<sup>129</sup> See Paul Collart, ed., *Les Papyrus Théodore Reinach, Tome II* (BIFAO 39; Cairo: L'Institut de Papyrologie, 1940) 25-26 (text on p. 26; dating on p. 25). This papyrus has also been edited, with valuable commentary, by Gallo, *Frammenti*, 349-54 (text on p. 351). See also Giannantoni, *Reliquiae*, 2.520. Cf. also Alfred Körte, "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen," *Archiv* 14 (1940) 103-50, esp. 138, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 222.

<sup>130</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 349, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 222.

<sup>131</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 349-50, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 222.

<sup>132</sup> See Theon 46-48.

but it does not otherwise fit the remaining letters of lines 3-4.<sup>133</sup> Consequently, scholars tend to prefer the latter option by restoring Diogenes' answer without reference to Aristotle.<sup>134</sup>

Collart has offered two possibilities, each stating Diogenes' views regarding human nature. He proposes as one answer: *συνετώτατον* or *ματαιότατον* τῶν ζώων, an answer derived from a chreia attributed to this philosopher in Diogenes Laertius.<sup>135</sup> That one must choose *συνετώτατον* or *ματαιότατον*, rather than keep both as in the chreia, is necessary because there is space for only twenty to twenty-two letters (including *εἶπεν* or *ἔφη*) in line 2. Collart also suggests Diogenes' parody of Plato's definition of man as another possibility,<sup>136</sup> but he does not explain how it would fit here.<sup>137</sup>

Gallo discusses Collart's proposals at some length and concludes by preferring the first possibility, specifically by restoring *ματαιότατον* (*εἶναι*), an answer he considers more Cynic. But he also recognizes some problems with this restoration. He admits that choosing either *συνετώτατον* or *ματαιότατον* dilutes the answer which depends on rhetorical antithesis for its point.<sup>138</sup> But he should have also admitted that eliminating the *περίσταισις* in Diogenes Laertius' recitation of the chreia likewise dilutes the answer, since without it the alleged silliness of humans has no rationale.

<sup>133</sup> See Plutarch, *De exil.* 604D: "Aristotle lunches whenever it seems best to Philip, but Diogenes does so whenever it seems best to Diogenes." For a fuller version of this chreia, see Diogenes Laertius, 6.40: To the one who asked Diogenes at what time one should eat lunch he said: "If you are rich, whenever you want; if poor, whenever you can."

<sup>134</sup> So Körte, "Texte," 103; Gallo, *Frammenti*, 350; and Cribiore, *Writing*, 222. Chreiai attributed to Diogenes followed by those to Aristotle appear in *Gnom. Barocc.* 253-54 (pp. 29-30 Bywater) and *Gnom. Par.* 207-8 and 233-34 (pp. 22 and 24 Sternbach).

<sup>135</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6.24: Diogenes used to say that, when he watched ship captains, doctors, or philosophers at their livelihoods, he regarded humans as the wisest of creatures (*συνετώτατον* τῶν ζώων), but, when he watched dream interpreters, diviners and those who paid attention to them, or those puffed up by fame and fortune, he thought no creature more silly (*ματαιότατον*) than a human.

<sup>136</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6.40: When Plato defined a human being as a creature with two feet and no feathers and was highly respected for it, Diogenes plucked a rooster and brought it into the school and said: "This is a human being according to Plato."

<sup>137</sup> See Collart, *Les Papyrus*, 26.

<sup>138</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 349-50 and 353.



Therefore, Collart's use of Diogenes Laertius, 6.24, is hardly convincing and hence remains in the apparatus as a mere possibility.

A possible restoration not yet considered involves a chreia preserved in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*,<sup>139</sup> modified here to fit the wording and spacing of the papyrus:

Διογ[ένης] ὁ κυνικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος τίς ἔν ἀν-  
θρώπ[οις] ἐστὶ πλούσιος εἶπεν· ὁ αὐτάρκης.

Diog[enes] the Cyni[c philosopher, on being asked by some-  
one, "Who] among me[n is rich," said, "The self-sufficient  
man."

This chreia is not only recited completely but it fits the two line format as well. In fact, the final c (or perhaps the -ης) in αὐτάρ-  
κης may go on to the beginning of the line 3, where a c precedes the  
name "Aristotle." The only problem with this proposed restora-  
tion is that the opening words in line 2 differ slightly from what  
Collart and Gallo have printed. In other words, we have sug-  
gested τίς ἔν rather than τί ἐς]τιν. Gallo is not sure of the τ in  
ἐς]τιν, and only a careful reading of the papyrus can confirm our  
proposal. Unfortunately, the photograph of this papyrus in Gal-  
lo's book is too dark to decide the matter. Hence we propose this  
alternative as only a possibility for further consideration and so  
leave the text as the editors have printed it.

The partially restored text of P.Sorb. inv. 2150 is as follows:

#### TEXT

Διογ[ένης] ὁ κυνικὸς φιλόσοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος  
τί ἐς]τιν ἀνθρωπ[ος, εἶπεν  
]ς Ἀριστοτέλ[ης  
]ην υπ[.] . ]κει . [

**1-3** textum supplevit Collart **2** εἶπεν Collart ἔφη Gallo || post εἶπεν addidit  
Collart συνετώτατον vel ματαιότατον τῶν ζώων; post ἔφη addidit Gallo ματαιό-  
τατον εἶναι τῶν ζώων Gallo

<sup>139</sup> See *Gnom. Vat.* 180 (p. 74 Sternbach): <δ> αὐτὸς (= Διογένης) ἐρω-  
τηθεὶς τίς ἐν ἀνθρώποις πλούσιος εἶπεν· ὁ αὐτάρκης.

## TRANSLATION

[Diog]enes the Cyni[c philosopher on being asked by someone]  
[What i]s a human bei[ng? said:  
s Aristotl[e

## Text 10. SB I.5730

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 1988 = Debut 205 = Cribiore 215)

## INTRODUCTION

In 1912 Sir Herbert Thompson purchased and published an ostrakon that contains two complete chreiai, both attributed to “Diogenes the Cynic philosopher.”<sup>140</sup> The ostrakon was then taken up in Friedrich Preisigke’s *Sammelbuch* and hence has become known by the latter’s system as SB I.5730.<sup>141</sup> Thompson accepted the seller’s claim that the ostrakon, along with the others he had purchased, had come from Thebes in Egypt, and he tentatively dated it to the third or fourth century A.D.,<sup>142</sup> a dating accepted by Gallo, its most recent editor.<sup>143</sup> Thompson did not assign this ostrakon to any particular setting, but Preisigke described it as a “Schulübung,” a characterization repeated by Gallo<sup>144</sup> and refined by Cribiore, who classifies its hand as “rapid,” therefore as the most advanced school hand.<sup>145</sup>

The wording of the first chreia troubled Thompson. Specifically, he noted that the syntax of ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος in line 1, when combined with ἰδὼν in line 2, does not make sense. His solution was to emend ἰδὼν to ἰδόντος, so that the participle would agree with τινος.<sup>146</sup> William A. Oldfather, however, correctly noticed that the words ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος do not belong at all to this

<sup>140</sup> See Sir Herbert Thompson, “A Greek Ostrakon,” *PSBA* 34 (1912) 197 and Plate XXII.

<sup>141</sup> See Friedrich Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten* (5 vols.; Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1915-50) 1.629.

<sup>142</sup> See Thompson, “Ostrakon,” 197. Preisigke (*Sammelbuch*, 1.629), however, gives a fourth/fifth century dating, followed by Winter, *Life*, 268.

<sup>143</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 369-75 (text on p. 371; dating on p. 369). Cf. also Cribiore, *Writing*, 223.

<sup>144</sup> See Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, 1.629, and Gallo, *Frammenti*, 369.

<sup>145</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 223.

<sup>146</sup> See Thompson, “Ostrakon,” 197, where he then translates: “. . . when questioned by one who saw . . .” Winter (*Life*, 268) translates similarly.

chreia and that ἰδών need not be changed; hence he deleted ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος,<sup>147</sup> a solution accepted by Gallo.<sup>148</sup>

Neither Oldfather nor Gallo, however, refers to the appropriate sub-type of chreiai in order to explain the mistake. This chreia belongs to the εἶδος ἀποφαντικὸν κατὰ περίστασιν and hence requires ἰδών as its introductory participle;<sup>149</sup> ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος belongs to another εἶδος, the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα.<sup>150</sup> The pupil, given his rapid hand, has apparently copied many chreiai before, so that he becomes careless when writing out this one. Chreiai attributed to Diogenes, as we have seen, have usually been of the εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα type, so that, after copying out Διογένης ὁ κυνικὸς φιλόσοφος, he thoughtlessly continued on with the introductory participial formula for this sub-type (ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος) before looking back to his model and then continued with the words he saw there ἰδών Αἰθίοπα καθάριον ἐχθίοντα κτλ.<sup>151</sup>

Thompson also assumed that both chreiai were “unrecorded elsewhere.”<sup>152</sup> But, as we have seen, the first chreia appears in P.Bour. 1 (see Text 1), as Gallo has also noted.<sup>153</sup> Indeed, P.Bour. 1 confirms the textual decision made above, since here, too, we have ἰδών, not ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος.

But the second chreia is also recorded elsewhere. Gallo points to P.Mich. inv. 41, where this chreia is the most likely restoration of lines 4-5 (see Text 3).<sup>154</sup> But, apparently, even he is unaware of the appearance of this chreia in the *Progyrnasmata* of

<sup>147</sup> See William A. Oldfather, “Preisigke, ‘Sammelbuch 5730,’” *Aegyptus* 14 (1934) 496-97, esp. 497.

<sup>148</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 369 and 373.

<sup>149</sup> See Theon 40-41.

<sup>150</sup> See Theon 61-66.

<sup>151</sup> Gallo (*Frammenti*, 373) proposes another scenario: the pupil had started to copy a chreia that had the words ἐρωτηθεῖς ὑπό τινος, but was then distracted and continued to copy another chreia, one using ἰδών.

<sup>152</sup> See Thompson, “Ostrakon,” 197.

<sup>153</sup> See Gallo, *Frammenti*, 370. Gallo notes that P.Bour. 1 was first published in 1906, six years before Thompson published this ostrakon.

<sup>154</sup> Thompson (“Ostrakon,” 197) can only point to a similar sentiment in an epigram of Plato on Aristophanes, in which the Graces, eager for a precinct of their own, found one in Aristophanes (see Ernst Diehl, ed., *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca* [2nd ed.; 3 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949] 1.106: Αἱ Χάριτες τέμενός τι λαβεῖν ὅπερ οὐχὶ πεσεῖται/ ζηλοῦσαι, ψυχὴν ἡδύρον Ἀριστοφάνους).

Hermogenes and Nicolaus. The only difference is that the πρόσωπον in these texts is Plato, not Diogenes, as here. Aside from this difference, however, the chreia is clearly the same, particularly as Nicolaus recites it:

Πλάτων ἐρωτηθεὶς ποῦ οἰκοῦσιν αἱ Μοῦσαι, ἐν ταῖς τῶν παιδευμένων, ἔφη, ψυχαῖς.<sup>155</sup>

Plato, on being asked where the Muses live, said, "In the souls of the educated."

The text of SB I.5730, therefore, is as follows:

## TEXT

Διογένης ὁ κυνικὸς φιλό-  
σοφος {ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος}  
ἰδὼν Αἰθίοπα καθάριον  
ἐσθίοντα εἶπεν· ἡ νύξ τήν  
5 ἡμέραν τρώγει.

Διογένης ὁ κυνικὸς φιλό-  
σοφος ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος,  
ποῦ αἱ Μοῦσαι κατοικοῦσιν,  
εἶπεν· ἐν ταῖς τῶν πεπ[αι-  
10 δευμένων ψυχαῖς.

2 ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος ostrakon per errorem; delevit Oldfather 3 Αἰθίοπα correxuit Thompson Αἰτίοπα ostrakon 4 ἐσθίοντα correxuit Thompson ἐσθοντα ostrakon

## TRANSLATION

Diogenes the Cynic philosopher,  
{on being asked by someone}  
on seeing an Ethiopian eating  
white bread, said: "Night is  
devouring day."

Diogenes the Cynic philosopher,  
on being asked by someone  
where the Muses dwell,  
said: "In the souls of the educated."

<sup>155</sup> See Nicolaus 135-37. Cf. also Hermogenes 7-8.

## Texts 11 and 12. O.Wilck. 1226 and 1330

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2076, 2081 = Debut 203, 204 = Cribiore 217, 218)

## INTRODUCTION

The final texts that contain chreiai and derive from an educational context are two late Roman ostraca from Egypt which Ulrich Wilcken published in 1899.<sup>156</sup> Both ostraca are fragmentary. They do contain the name of the πρόσωπον and an identifying apposition, and enough of the chreia form—ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος—is preserved to identify them as, in fact, chreiai and classify them according to sub-type.

The participial formula ἐρωτηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος shows that both chreiai belong to the sub-type known as εἶδος ἀποκριτικὸν κατὰ πύσμα.<sup>157</sup> Moreover, the full recitation of this formula, along with name of the πρόσωπον and the apposition indicating his social role, points to an educational context.

Unfortunately, too little of the saying of the first chreia and none of the second remain to allow restoration of the sayings.

The fragmentary text of O.Wilck. 1226 is as follows:

## TEXT

Αἴσωπος ὁ λογοποιὸς ἐρω-  
τηθεὶς ὑπὸ τινος . . .  
.ν οὗτ' ἐνγέλωτι [. . . . .]<sup>158</sup>

1-2 supplevit Wilcken

## TRANSLATION

Aesop the writer of fables, on being  
asked by s[omeone] . . .

<sup>156</sup> See Ulrich Wilcken, ed., *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien* (2 vols.; Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1899) 2.327 and 350. Wilcken did not identify these ostraka as containing chreiai, nor has Pack (*Literary Texts*, 113), but Debut ("Documents," 261) has correctly identified their form.

<sup>157</sup> Cf. Theon 61-66.

<sup>158</sup> Wilcken (*Ostraka*, 2.327) says that there are traces of a fourth line on this ostrakon, but he prints nothing. The whereabouts of these ostraca is unknown (so Cribiore, *Writing*, 224).

not with ridicule (?) . . . .

The fragmentary text of O.Wilck. 1330 is as follows:

TEXT

Ἰσοκράτης ὁ φι-  
λόσοφος ἐρωτη-  
θεὶς] ὑπὸ τ[ινος

1 Ἰσοκράτης Wilcken Ἰσωκράτης ostrakon 2-3 supplevit Wilcken

TRANSLATION

Isocrates the  
philosopher,<sup>159</sup> on being  
ask[ed] by s[omeone]

<sup>159</sup> The name of Isocrates is misspelled—using an ω rather than an ο. But since Isocrates is identified as a philosopher and since the philosopher Socrates is spelled with an ω, it might be the case that the chreia's πρόσωπον has been changed from Socrates to Isocrates.





## Chapter II

# Declining the Chreia: The Use of the Chreia in the Secondary Curriculum

### Introduction

#### SECONDARY EDUCATION

Once pupils had learned the rudiments of reading, writing, and arithmetic, they moved on to the secondary curriculum offered by the γραμματικός, or teacher of grammar and literature. In one sense this curriculum was quite similar to the one they had just completed, in that it also progressed from letters to syllables, then to words, and finally to poetic works. Under the γραμματικός, however, this progression was much more complex and sophisticated. Thus, instead of merely learning the names and forms of the letters of the alphabet, pupils began to classify them, distinguishing consonants from vowels and classifying both according to various sub-categories, such as vowels into long and short. Likewise, instead of merely pronouncing exhaustive lists of syllables, they started to learn the metric values of the syllables they found in their reading. And, instead of merely reading lists of words containing ever more syllables, they began to classify those words according to one of the eight parts of speech and to analyze those parts—nouns, verbs, participles, articles, etc.—into various sub-categories. And, finally, instead of merely reading short, connected passages, they started to read and interpret lengthy literary works, primarily Homer, but also some Euripides, and perhaps a little Menander and other poets.

As brief as this summary of the grammatical curriculum is,<sup>1</sup> and it seems not to have developed fully as a separate part of the curriculum until the early Roman period and did so as “an extra rung on the ladder of literate status,”<sup>2</sup> this summary does allow us to identify the place in the curriculum where the γραμματικός made use of the chreia. Specifically, the γραμματικός employed the chreia at the point where he gave more sophisticated instruction regarding words. Previously, the lists of words contained only nouns, often proper names, but always in the nominative case. Under the γραμματικός, however, pupils moved on to the more challenging task of classifying words according to the eight parts of speech.<sup>3</sup> For example, the pupils now identified nouns and then learned the three genders of nouns along with their five case endings and their three numbers. Verbs likewise received attention, as pupils now learned to distinguish their various forms (-ω, -=ω, and -μι), not to mention the many endings and other changes that indicate person, number, tense, voice, and mood.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For standard treatments of the secondary curriculum, see Henri-Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. G. Lamb; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956) 160-85; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977) 189-249; and, most recently, Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 152-89. The standard grammatical textbook was that composed by Dionysius Thrax in the second or first century B.C.; for the text, see Gustav Uhlig, ed., *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica* (Grammatici Graeci 1.1; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1883) 3-100; ET in Alan Kemp, “The ΤΕΚΗΝÊ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚÊ Translated into English,” in *The History of Linguistics in the Classical Period* (ed. D. Taylor; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987) 169-89. For related grammatical texts on papyri, see Alfons Wouters, *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the Study of the ‘Ars Grammatica’ in Antiquity* (Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1979). See also the historical survey of Robert H. Robins, *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History* (Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 70; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993).

<sup>2</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 57-63 (quotation on p. 63).

<sup>3</sup> For the eight parts of speech—noun, verb, participle, article, pronoun, preposition, adverb, and conjunction—see Dionysius Thrax, 11-20 (pp. 22-100 Uhlig).

<sup>4</sup> For discussion, at least of the noun and verb, see Bonner, *Education*, 192-97. For full discussion of the parts of speech, see Robins, *Grammarians*, 53-86.

The γραμματικός taught his pupils these numerous changes in nouns and verbs by means of a formal exercise called κλίσις (= Lat. *declinatio*), or the systematic presentation of a noun's declension or a verb's conjugation.<sup>5</sup> To be sure, teachers' manuals were slow to incorporate κλίσις, since the full conjugation of the regular verb τύπτω was not added to Dionysius Thrax's standard grammar until the fifth century.<sup>6</sup> Numerous texts on papyri, ostraca, and wooden tablets, however, provide earlier examples of κλίσις, ranging from declensions of articles, adjectives, and nouns to conjugations of verbs in their various tenses, voices, and moods.<sup>7</sup> One text, for example, contains noun groups in all three genders—ὁ χρηστὸς πατήρ, ἡ ἀγαθὴ παραίνεσις, and τὸ φιλάνθρωπον ἦθος—and declines them through all five cases and three numbers.<sup>8</sup>

## DECLINING THE CHREIA

Of special interest to us is another but even more advanced form of κλίσις in which pupils were asked to inflect articles, adjectives, nouns as well as finite verbs and participles all at the same time—precisely what is required of one who composes in Greek. In order to do this advanced declension exercise the γραμματικός made use of the chreia, a form which, as we have seen, was already familiar to students from their copying and reading exercises in the primary curriculum (see Texts 1-12).

To be sure, the κλίσις of a chreia was originally an exercise associated with the rhetorical curriculum, as is clear from Theon, who listed this exercise among eight manipulations that students could do with a chreia.<sup>9</sup> But, as Adolf Brinkmann has argued,

<sup>5</sup> See Robins, *Grammarians*, 113-20.

<sup>6</sup> See Marrou, *Education*, 172.

<sup>7</sup> For illustrative texts and discussion, see Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (ASP 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 263-69, and Wouters, *Papyri*, 225-73.

<sup>8</sup> For the complete text of these κλίσεις, see Erich Ziebarth, *Aus der antiken Schule: Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka* (2nd ed.; Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1913) 32. Cf. Cribiore, *Writing*, 263-69.

<sup>9</sup> See Theon 190-94, which lists recitation, declension, comment, objection, expansion, condensation, refutation, and confirmation. For his lengthy discussion of declining a chreia, see Theon 199-275.

documentary evidence from Roman Egypt as well as some comments in the *Progymnasmata* of Nicolaus of Myra<sup>10</sup> show that soon after Theon this advanced form of κλίσις became a part of the curriculum taught by the γραμματικός.<sup>11</sup> Brinkmann knew of two wooden tablets from the classroom of a γραμματικός (Texts 13 and 15), and since then a third has been published (Text 14).

In order to inflect the noun and verb forms that appear in a chreia, however, students had to insert various formulae which allowed the declension to move through the cases and numbers. Thus when shifting from the nominative to the genitive case for the πρόσωπον in the chreia, students would have to insert a formula—for example, λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος—so that the name of the πρόσωπον would have to be in the genitive. As an example we refer back to one of the chreiai from P.Mich. inv. 41, lines 5-6 (Text 3), that appears there in the nominative case:

Διογένης ὁ φιλόσοφος, ἐρωτηθεὶς ποῦ αἱ Μοῦσαι κατοικοῦσιν,  
ἔφη· ἐν ταῖς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων ψυχαῖς.

Diogenes the philosopher, when he was asked where the Muses dwell, said: “In the souls of the educated.”

In order to cast the name Διογένης and the words dependent on it in the genitive, students were instructed to use the formula λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος and to insert it just before the saying,<sup>12</sup> as follows:

Διογένους τοῦ φιλοσόφου, ἐρωτηθέντος ποῦ αἱ Μοῦσαι κατοικοῦσιν,  
λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος· ἐν ταῖς τῶν πεπαιδευμένων ψυχαῖς.

The saying of Diogenes the philosopher, when he was asked where the Muses dwell, is remembered when he said: “In the souls of the educated.”

<sup>10</sup> See Nicolaus 12-17.

<sup>11</sup> See Adolf Brinkmann, “Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht,” *RhM* 65 (1910) 149-55. He chronicles the shift of the κλίσις from the rhetorical curriculum, as is clear from Theon 199-275, to the grammatical curriculum, as is apparent from the tablets to be discussed here. He concludes: “So wird man annehmen dürfen, dass die κλίσις der χρεῖα bereits im Laufe des ersten Jahrhunderts zum festen Bestande des Unterrichts der griechischen Grammatiker geworden ist” (p. 155). Brinkmann’s dating of this shift may be too early since he dates Theon to the Augustinian period (see p. 152), not mid- to late first century A.D., as scholars do today (see *Chreia* 1.64).

<sup>12</sup> See Theon 226-38.

For the other cases there were other formulae—for example, ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν for the dative and φασί (or λέγεται) εἰπεῖν for the accusative.<sup>13</sup> Given the difficulty of this exercise it is not surprising that γραμματικοί provided their students with a list of these formulae for easy reference (so Texts 13-14). And we also have texts that incorporate these formulae into the κλίσις of actual chreiai, one by a student (Text 15) and others by teachers (Texts 16-17).

In this chapter we present these texts in roughly chronological order.

<sup>13</sup> For the full instructions, see Theon 254-75.

## Text 13. Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2712 = Debut 336 = Cribiore 385)<sup>14</sup>

## INTRODUCTION

The first school text to be discussed is made up of eight wooden tablets (9.5 × 27 cm) which are fastened together by silken cords. Edited in 1909 by Frederic G. Kenyon,<sup>15</sup> this schoolbook belonged to a certain Epaphroditus<sup>16</sup> who, sometime during the late third century A.D.,<sup>17</sup> copied out a portion of the grammatical curriculum he was learning. The first four tablets contain a list of 207 verbs and the cases they govern (lines 2-227), a classification of the letters of the alphabet (lines 228-51), a series of gnomic questions and their answers (lines 252-73), and a complex classification of nouns with examples (lines 281-319). On the fifth tablet appear formulae for the κλίσις of a chreia (lines 320-29). The remaining tablets are blank.

<sup>14</sup> As in Chapter I, references to documentary texts come from the following catalogues: Roger A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt* (2nd ed.; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965); Janine Debut, "Les documents scolaires," *ZPE* 63 (1986) 251-78; and Cribiore, *Writing*, 175-284. Cf. also Cribiore, "Literary School Exercises," *ZPE* 116 (1997) 53-60. When referring to texts, we cite them, if possible, according to the following scheme: Pack<sup>2</sup>, Debut, and Cribiore along with their respective document number.

<sup>15</sup> For this school book, see Frederic G. Kenyon, "Two Greek School-Tablets," *JHS* 29 (1909) 29-40 (text on pp. 32-39) and Plate VI. We cite this text according to Kenyon's line numbers. The text is also available in Ziebarth, *Schule*, 24-29. See also Brinkmann, "Schulunterricht," 149-51; Paul Beudel, "Qua ratione Graeci liberos docuerint, papyris, ostracis, tabulis in Aegypto inventis illustratur" (Diss. Münster, 1911) 49-51; Paul Collart, "À l'école avec les petits grecs d'Égypte," *CdÉ* 21 (1936) 489-507, esp 501-2; Kenneth Painter, "Greek and Roman Wooden Writing Tablets in the British Museum," *BMQ* 31 (1967) 103-10, esp. 109; Cribiore, *Writing*, 94, 264-65; and Morgan, *Literate Education*, 157.

<sup>16</sup> See Kenyon, "School-Tablets," 32 n. 4. For a list of names of students preserved on school texts, see Cribiore, *Writing*, 171. Incidentally, the name Epaphroditus may seem familiar, for it appears as the name of a helper of the apostle Paul (see Phil 2:25).

<sup>17</sup> See Kenyon, "School-Tablets," 32, a date accepted ever since (see, e.g., Beudel, "Qua ratione," 50; Ziebarth, *Schule*, 24; Painter, "Tablets," 109; and Cribiore, *Writing*, 264).

Kenyon, however, did not connect the formulae in lines 320-29 to the κλίσις of a chreia. He merely spoke vaguely of them as "a set of formulae for the use of the various cases with verbs."<sup>18</sup> Brinkmann, however, soon made the connection and related these formulae to those used in the κλίσις of a chreia which appears in Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37516 (see Text 15) as well as in the *Progymnasmata* of Theon and Nicolaus.<sup>19</sup>

To be sure, Brinkmann's precise identification of the formulae in Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533 is inescapable, but some differences must also be noted, especially with the discussion in Theon's *Progymnasmata*. Theon is much more complex in his instructions for the κλίσις of a chreia. For the genitive case, for example, Epaphroditus wrote a single formula on his tablet: λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος (line 321). Theon, however, distinguishes between sayings- and action-chreiai and between subtypes of each and has different formulae for each. Therefore, instead of a single formula for the genitive case he offers four. For sayings-chreiai he says: "The formula λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται suits all the sayings-chreiai better, except the one in the form of an unprompted statement. For this one the formula τὸ ῥηθὲν μνήμης ἔτυχεν is better suited."<sup>20</sup> Similarly for action-chreiai Theon recommends these formulae: τὸ συμβὰν μνήμης ἔτυχεν for active action-chreiai and τὸ προχθὲν μνήμης ἔτυχεν for passive action-chreiai.<sup>21</sup>

This greater complexity in Theon's discussion is a result of his instructions being intended for advanced, or rhetorical, students; κλίσις was for Theon only one of eight manipulations he proposed for his students to do with the chreia.<sup>22</sup> When sometime after Theon the κλίσις of a chreia became part of the secondary curriculum, this exercise became simplified to suit the younger age of students like Epaphroditus. This simplification finds confirmation in the discussion of κλίσις in Nicolaus. He explicitly says

<sup>18</sup> See Kenyon, "School-Tablets," 32, a vagueness that continues to appear in the scholarship on this tablet (see Collart, "À l'école," 502, and Painter, "Tablets," 109).

<sup>19</sup> See Brinkmann, "Schulunterricht," 152-55. For the *Progymnasmata*, see Theon 199-275 and Nicolaus 12-38. Cf. also Beudel, "Qua ratione," 50-51.

<sup>20</sup> Theon 239-42.

<sup>21</sup> See Theon 243-53.

<sup>22</sup> See Theon 190-94.

that by his time, the fifth century, the κλίσις of a chreia had become an exercise in the secondary curriculum,<sup>23</sup> and his own illustration of how it was done at that stage reflects a set of formulae similar to those found in Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533.<sup>24</sup>

A second difference between the set of formulae copied out by Epaphroditus and those that appear in Theon and Nicolaus is that, while Theon and Nicolaus admit the possibility that the κλίσις of a chreia could be carried through the dual and plural, neither one actually illustrates them.<sup>25</sup> In Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533, however, the formulae for the dual are also listed, except for the vocative (see lines 325-29). This omission of the vocative may have been inadvertent since the dual accusative formula (φασὶν εἰπεῖν) (line 329) is at the bottom of the tablet and the following tablets are blank. It thus becomes likely that Epaphroditus may have intended to continue on the next tablets with the formulae for the dual vocative as well as the plural formulae, and possibly with the κλίσις of an actual chreia.

In any case, the text of the κλίσις-formulae contained on the fifth tablet of Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533 that we do have is as follows:

#### TEXT

320 ὁρθή· εἶπεν  
γενική· λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος  
δοτική· ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν  
αἰτιατική· φασὶν εἰπεῖν  
κλητική· κύ ποτε εἶπας

325 καὶ δυικῶς  
ὁρθή· εἰπάτην  
γενική· λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντοιν  
δοτική· ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν  
αἰτιατική· φασὶν εἰπεῖν

<sup>23</sup> See Nicolaus 12-17.

<sup>24</sup> See Nicolaus 18-38, where the formulae used in the κλίσις of a chreia are as follows: nominative (ἔφη), genitive (ἔρωτηθέντος . . . λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται), dative (ἐπῆλθεν εἰπεῖν), accusative (εἰρηκέναι φασιν), and vocative (σύ, ὦ . . . , εἶπας).

<sup>25</sup> See Theon 199-200 and Nicolaus 35-38.



## TRANSLATION

- 320      Nominative: He said  
            Genitive: The saying is recalled of the one saying  
            Dative: It seemed best (to him) to say  
            Accusative: They say that (he) said  
            Vocative: You once said
- 325    And in the dual  
            Nominative: The two said  
            Genitive: The saying is recalled of the two saying  
            Dative: It seemed best (to the two) to say  
            Accusative: They say that (the two) said

## Text 14. Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 3019

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2732 = Debut 335 = Cribiore 388)

## INTRODUCTION

Another third century schoolbook contains the formulae for the κλίσις of a chreia. This schoolbook, edited in 1970 by Peter J. Parsons,<sup>26</sup> contains seven wooden tablets (11 × 23.8 cm) that preserve various grammatical exercises copied out by different hands, three teachers' hands according to Parsons, but only two students' hands, one evolving and one rapid, according to Raffaella Cribiore.<sup>27</sup>

Particularly noteworthy are the three κλίσεις that are scattered throughout the tablets. One κλίσις conjugates the verb ποιεῖν by a student with an evolving hand (Tablet 7a). Two other κλίσεις are by the student with a rapid hand and thus indicate an older boy. Of these two one is the only extant example of a declension of the personal pronouns (Tablet 1a).<sup>28</sup> The second provides the formulae for the κλίσις of a chreia (Tablet 5b).

The formulae on Tablet 5b are identical to those of Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533 (see Text 13), as far as they can be compared. In this text, however, we have a complete set of formulae, including the dual vocative as well as the formulae for the plural, formulae that are missing on Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37533.

The text of this complete set of formulae on Tablet 5b in Bodl. Gr. Inscr. 3019 is as follows:

## TEXT

ὁρθή· εἶπεν  
γενική· λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντος  
δοτική· ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν  
αἰτιατική· φασὶν εἰπεῖν  
5 κλητική· κύ ποτε εἶπας

<sup>26</sup> See Peter J. Parsons, "A School-Book from the Sayce Collection," *ZPE* 6 (1970) 133-49 (text of formulae of the κλίσις on pp. 143-44). See also Cribiore, *Writing*, 273-74, and Morgan, *Literate Education*, 157.

<sup>27</sup> See Parsons, "School-Book," 134 and 147, and Cribiore, *Writing*, 274.

<sup>28</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 274.

καὶ δυικῶς  
 ὀρθή· εἰπάτην  
 γενική· λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντοιν  
 δοτική· ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν  
 10 αἰτιατική· φασὶν εἰπεῖν  
 κλητική· ὦ σφώ ποτε εἶπατον

καὶ πληθυντικῶς  
 ὀρθή· εἶπον  
 γενική· λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται εἰπόντων  
 15 δοτική· ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν  
 αἰτιατική· φασὶν εἰπεῖν  
 κλητική· ὑμεῖς ποτε εἶπατε

3 ἔδοξεν correximus ἔταξεν tabula 9 ἔδοξεν correximus ἔδαξεν tabula

## TRANSLATION

- Nominative: He said  
 Genitive: The saying is recalled of the one saying  
 Dative: It seemed best (to him) to say  
 Accusative: They say that (he) said  
 5 Vocative: You once said
- And in the dual  
 Nominative: The two said  
 Genitive: The saying is recalled of the two saying  
 Dative: It seemed best (to the two) to say  
 10 Accusative: They say that (the two) said  
 Vocative: You two once said
- And in the plural:  
 Nominative: They said  
 Genitive: The saying is recalled of those saying  
 15 Dative: It seemed best (to them) to say  
 Accusative: They say that (they) said  
 Vocative: You (pl.) once said

Text 15. Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37516  
 (= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2711 = Debut 336 = Cribiore 364)

INTRODUCTION

A single wooden tablet (41.5 × 13.5 cm), which was whitened and ruled lengthwise and dates to the third century A.D., contains, on the “recto” side, the complete κλίσις of a chreia: “Pythagoras the philosopher, when he had disembarked and was teaching literature, used to advise his pupils to abstain from red meat.”<sup>29</sup> The κλίσις—copied by a student with a rapid, or most advanced, hand<sup>30</sup>—extends through all cases in the singular and likewise through the dual and plural. This chreia is more complex than usual, in that it contains two introductory participles (ἀποβάς and διδάσκων), and its main verb, συνεβούλευεν, is much rarer than the verbs we usually find in sayings-chreiai (ἔφη or εἶπεν).<sup>31</sup>

A complete κλίσις requires a student to recite a chreia through the five cases and three numbers, or fifteen times in all, which prompts Parsons to call such a demanding, if mechanical, exercise “a grammatical mind-twister.”<sup>32</sup> Thus, it should not surprise us to find copying errors.<sup>33</sup> Kenyon points out, for example, that the student seemingly forgot to include ἔδοξεν when reciting the chreia in the dative singular, but later added this word above the next one, i.e., συνεβουλεύσαι (line 3). The student also wrote δυκω

<sup>29</sup> See Kenyon, “School-Tablets,” 29-31 (text on p. 30). Kenyon’s assignment of recto and verso to this tablet is of course arbitrary. Text of the κλίσις also appears in Ziebarth, *Schule*, 16-17. Brief discussions also in Brinkmann, “Schulunterricht,” 152-53; Beudel, “Qua ratione,” 50; Collart, “À l’école,” 501-2; Marrou, *Education*, 175; Painter, “Tablets,” 110; Parsons, “School-Book,” 144; Bonner, *Education*, 257; Cribiore, *Writing*, 265; and Morgan, *Literate Education*, 157. The verso contains the conjugation of “the optative and participles of the verb νᾶζω in all its moods” (Kenyon, p. 29; text on p. 31). On the Pythagorean tenet of vegetarianism in this chreia, see *Chreia* 1.335-36.

<sup>30</sup> See Cribiore, *Writing*, 265.

<sup>31</sup> For συνεβούλευεν in chreiai, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 1.60, 92; 2.37; 6.8; and *Gnom. Vat.* 425 (p. 159 Sternbach).

<sup>32</sup> See Parsons, “School-Book,” 144.

<sup>33</sup> The nominative singular is correct, presumably because it was provided by the teacher for the student to decline.

instead of *δυνικῶς* (line 6) and did not change *ν* to *μ* before *β* in the unaugmented forms of *συμβουλεύω*, as just cited for *συνβουλεύσαι* in line 3. And, Kenyon points out, *ἑαυτοῦ* is used throughout.

In particular, the student had problems with the correct forms of the requisite participles and finite verbs as he went from case to case. Kenyon identifies some of these errors: *αποβαντες* for *ἀποβάντος* (line 2), *συνεβουλευσατον* for *συνεβούλευσας* (line 5), and *διδασκοντοις* for *διδάσκουσι* (line 15).<sup>34</sup> But there are several others:

*διδασκον* should be *διδάσκων* (line 5),  
*συνβουλευετην* should be *συνεβουλευέτην* (line 7),  
*αποβαντην* should be *ἀπόβαντε* (line 11),  
*συνβουλευσατην* should be *συνεβουλευσάτην* (line 11),  
*συνεβουλευετην* should be *συνεβούλεον* (line 13), and  
*συνβουλευετιν* should be *συνεβουλεύετε* (line 17).

Moreover, the sudden shift to the passive of *συμβουλεύω* only in line 13 is inexplicable. The student was clearly still learning his verbal forms, which is understandable since the “verso” side of the tablet is dedicated to the various forms of the verb *νικάω*.

Nevertheless, that the student “misused” one of the formulae, as Parsons claims,<sup>35</sup> is unjustified, since using *λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται* (line 2), rather than *τὸ ῥηθὲν μνήμης ἔτυχεν*, which Theon prescribes, was a distinction that got lost when the *κλίσις* of a *chreia* was simplified for use in the secondary curriculum. In addition, using the third person reflexive *ἑαυτοῦ* for first and second persons is acceptable, though not for the dual and plural.<sup>36</sup>

The inclusion of the dual and plural has raised some scholarly eyebrows. Marrou, for example, characterizes the dual and plural forms on this tablet as “scorning all logic,” illustrating “the dead weight of these teaching methods,”<sup>37</sup> and Bonner is no less generous, saying that these forms are “ludicrous.”<sup>38</sup> To be sure, the dual is dying out, but plurals of proper names appear regularly

<sup>34</sup> See Kenyon, “School-Tablets,” 29.

<sup>35</sup> See Parsons, “School-Book,” 144 n. 30.

<sup>36</sup> See Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (rev. by G. M. Messing; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956) §1230, citing Plato, *Phd.* 78D, and Xenophon, *Cyr.* 6.3.27.

<sup>37</sup> Marrou, *Education*, 175.

<sup>38</sup> Bonner, *Education*, 257.

in literature and hence would have been practical for students to learn these forms during the κλίσις of a chreia.<sup>39</sup>

The corrected text<sup>40</sup> of the verso of Brit. Mus. Add. MS 37516 which contains the complete κλίσις of this chreia is as follows.

## TEXT

- 1 ὁ Πυθαγόρας φιλόσοφος ἀποβάς καὶ γράμματα διδάσκων συνε-  
βούλευεν τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 2 τοῦ Πυθαγόρου φιλοσόφου ἀποβάντος καὶ γράμματα διδάσκον-  
τος λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται συμβουλευόντος τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ  
μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπ[έ]χεσθ[αι].
- 3 τῷ Πυθαγόρᾳ φιλοσόφῳ ἀποβάντι καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντι  
ἔδοξεν συμβουλευῆσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέ-  
χεσθαι.
- 4 τὸν Πυθαγόραν φιλόσοφον ἀποβάντα καὶ γράμματα διδά-  
σκοντά φασιν συμβουλευῆσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμό-  
νων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 5 ὦ Πυθάγορε φιλόσοφε ἀποβάς καὶ γράμματα διδάσκων κύ ποτε  
συνεβούλευσας τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 6 καὶ δυ<ι>κῶς
- 7 τὼ Πυθαγόρᾳ φιλοσόφῳ ἀποβάντε καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντε  
συνεβουλευέτην τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχε-  
σθαι.
- 8 τοῖν Πυθαγόροιν φιλοσόφοιν ἀποβάντοιν καὶ γράμματα δι-  
δασκόντοιν λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται συμβουλευόντοιν τοῖς  
ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνω[ν] ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 9 τοῖν Πυθαγόροιν φιλοσόφοιν ἀποβάντοιν καὶ γράμματα δι-  
δασκόντοιν ἔδοξεν συμβουλευῆσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς  
ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 10 τὼ Πυθαγόρᾳ φιλοσόφῳ ἀποβάντε καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντέ  
φασιν συμβουλευῆσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέ-  
χεσθαι.

<sup>39</sup> Proper names in the plural are legion. See, e.g., *V. Aes.* 16; Chariton, 5.2.8; Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 4; and Aelian, *V.H.* 2.11.

<sup>40</sup> We tacitly change ν to μ in the unaugmented forms of συμβουλευῶ, since it occurs ten times. We, however, do not change the singular ἑαυτοῦ to the plural ἑαυτῶν in the dual and plural forms since the saying usually was not affected by the κλίσις.

- 11 ὦ Πυθαγόρα φιλοσόφω ἀποβάντε καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντε  
 φῶ ποτε συνεβουλευσάτην τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμό-  
 νων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 12 καὶ πληθυντικῶς
- 13 οἱ Πυθαγόραι φιλόσοφοι ἀποβάντες καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντες  
 συνεβούλευον τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 14 τῶν Πυθαγορῶν φιλοσόφων ἀποβάντων καὶ γράμματα διδά-  
 σκόντων λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται συμβουλευσάντων τοῖς  
 ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 15 τοῖς Πυθαγόραις φιλοσόφοις ἀποβᾶσι καὶ γράμματα διδασκόν-  
 τοις ἔδοξεν συμβουλεύσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων  
 ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 16 τοὺς Πυθαγόρας φιλοσόφους ἀπο[βάν]τας καὶ γράμματα διδά-  
 σκοντάς φασιν συμβουλεύσαι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμό-  
 νων ἀπέχεσθαι.
- 17 ὦ Πυθαγόραι φιλόσοφοι ἀποβάντες καὶ γράμματα διδάσκοντες  
 ὑμεῖς ποτε συνεβουλεύετε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς ἐναιμόνων  
 ἀπέχεσ[θαι].

2 ἀποβάντος Kenyon αποβαντες tabula 5 διδάσκων correximus διδασκων tab-  
 ula || συνεβούλευσας Kenyon συνεβουλευσατον tabula 6 δυικῶς Kenyon δυ-  
 κως tabula 7 ἀποβάντε correximus αποβαντην tabula || συνεβουλεύετην cor-  
 reximus συνβουλευετην tabula 10 ἀποβάντε correximus αποβαντην tabula 11 ἀπό-  
 βαντε correximus αποβαντην tabula || συνεβουλευσάτην correximus συνβου-  
 λευσατην tabula 13 συνεβούλευον correximus συνεβουλευσθην tabula 15 ἀπο-  
 βᾶσι Kenyon αποβαντοις tabula || διδάσκουσιν Kenyon διδασκοντοις tabula 17  
 συνεβουλεύετε correximus συνβουλευετιν tabula

## TRANSLATION

- 1 Pythagoras the philosopher, when he had disembarked  
 and was teaching letters, used to advise his pupils to  
 abstain from red meat.
- 2 The statement of Pythagoras the philosopher, when he  
 had disembarked and was teaching letters, is remem-  
 bered for advising his pupils to abstain from red  
 meat.
- 3 To Pythagoras the philosopher, when he had disembarked  
 and was teaching letters, it seemed best to advise his  
 pupils to abstain from red meat.

- 4 They say that Pythagoras the philosopher, when he had disembarked and was teaching letters, advised his pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 5 O Pythagoras, you philosopher, when you had disembarked and were teaching letters, you once advised your pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 6 And in the dual:
- 7 The two Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, used to advise their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 8 The statement of the two Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, is remembered for advising their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 9 To the two Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, it seemed best to advise their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 10 They say that the two Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, advised their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 11 O you two Pythagorases, the philosophers, when you had disembarked and were teaching letters, you two once advised your pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 12 And in the plural:
- 13 The Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, used to advise their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 14 The statement of the Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, is remembered for advising their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 15 To the Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, it seemed best to advise their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 16 They say that the Pythagorases, the philosophers, when they had disembarked and were teaching letters, advised their pupils to abstain from red meat.
- 17 O you Pythagorases, philosophers, when you had disembarked and were teaching letters, you once used to advise your pupils to abstain from red meat.



Text 16. Diomedes, *Ars grammatica*

(1.310, 1-29 Keil)

## INTRODUCTION

Diomedes is the name on MSS of an *Ars grammatica* which includes a discussion of the *declinatio* of a chreia. No *praenomen* is given, and little else is known about this grammarian who probably lived during the late fourth or fifth century A.D.<sup>41</sup>

The discussion of *declinatio* appears early in the first book of the *Ars grammatica* in a brief section entitled “*De declinatione exercitationis chriarum*”<sup>42</sup> and can be divided into three sections: 1) the *declinatio* of a chreia attributed to Marcus Porcius Cato; this *declinatio* extends through all six, not five, cases, since Latin has the ablative, and in the singular and plural only, since Latin has no dual (lines 1-35); 2) a series of five additional sayings-chreiai, two attributed to Vergil and one each to Cato, Demosthenes, and Diogenes; they are all recited only in the nominative case and are presumably meant to serve as further examples that the teacher could assign to students to decline as Diomedes has done for the previous chreia (lines 36-46); and 3) the *declinatio* of an action

<sup>41</sup> On Diomedes, see Georg Goetz, “Diomedes (14),” PW 5 (1903) 827-29; Martin Schanz, Carl Hosius, and Gustav Krüger, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian* (HAW 8.1-4; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1914-1935) 4.1.169-72, and esp. Robert Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988) 270-72. For the text of Diomedes’ *Ars grammatica*, see Heinrich Keil, ed., *Grammatici Latini* (5 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1855-1868) 1.297-529. Kaster (*Guardians*, 271) says that Diomedes is not named a *grammaticus*, but in the postscript to Book 1 of Codex Monacensis 14467 (1.419 Keil) and in the postscript to Book 2 of Codex Parisinus 7493 (1.471 Keil) we read: *explicit ars Diomedis grammatici*. Thus by the ninth century, the date of both MSS, Diomedes was clearly known as a *grammaticus*.

<sup>42</sup> The only other place where Diomedes refers to the chreia is in Book 3, in a section entitled “*De specie poematos exegetici vel enarrativi*,” where he merely says: *Exegetici vel enarrativi species sunt tres, angellice, historice, didascalice. angellice est qua sententiae scribuntur, ut est Theognidis liber, item chriae* (1.482, 33 Keil). (“Exegetical or expository species (sc. of poetry) are three: advisory, historical, didactic. Advisory is where sayings are written, as in Theognis’ book, also chreiai.”) Diomedes thus says nothing about the definition, classification, or other manipulations of the chreia.

chreia attributed to Diogenes, but only in the singular (lines 47-60).

Several features of this discussion deserve further comment. First, the dependence on the Greek grammatical tradition is readily apparent not only in the use of chreiai attributed to such Greek figures as Demosthenes and Diogenes,<sup>43</sup> but also by the use of Latinized versions of the Greek formulae for declining a chreia that are familiar from the wooden tablets from Egypt discussed above (Texts 13-15). The Latin and their Greek counterparts are paired below:

Nom. sing.	<i>dixit</i> = ξφη
Gen.	<i>dictum fertur</i> = λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται
Dat.	<i>placuit dicere</i> = ἔδοξεν εἰπεῖν
Acc.	<i>ferunt dixisse</i> = φασὶν εἰπεῖν
Voc.	<i>ne tu egregie dixisti</i> = σύ ποτε εἴπας <sup>44</sup>

Second, while Diomedes' *declinatio* of the chreia attributed to Cato includes all cases and numbers, it is still not declined in full. He does not repeat the saying—*litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores*—in the dative, accusative, and vocative plural; instead, he merely uses the words *id quoque*, or “and so on” (see lines 28-32). The same is true of the *declinatio* of the chreia attributed to Diogenes, where the genitive, dative, accusative, and vocative singular again use the words *id quoque* instead of repeating Diogenes' act (see lines 51-57). In each *declinatio*, however, the following ablative is written out in full (see lines 34-35 and 59-60), presumably because the ablative has no Greek counterpart and hence Diomedes emphasized this unusual Latin form by writing out this case in full. In any case, there is really no need to include the saying (or act) in a κλίσις, since it is not affected by the changes in inflection.

Third, two signs of inconsistency or even carelessness are evident. In the *declinatio* of chreia attributed to Cato, Diomedes

<sup>43</sup> In addition, some of the chreiai that Diomedes uses are clearly Greek in origin, though now attributed to Romans. Thus the opening chreia, which is attributed to Cato, is usually attributed to Isocrates, Aristotle, or Demosthenes (see further *Chreia* 1.325-26). The other chreia which is attributed to Cato is attributed elsewhere to Demosthenes (see further *Chreia* 1.308).

<sup>44</sup> The ablative sing. formula is: *a (ab) + name dictum accepi*mus.

translates τοὺς καρποὺς γλυκεῖς as *fructus iocundiores* in the nominative through the accusative singular (see lines 5, 6, 11, 14), but thereafter as *fructus dulciores* (see lines 16, 20, 23, 26, 35). Moreover, in the *declinatio* of the chreia attributed to Diogenes, which is an action-chreia, Diomedes declines the vocative as though the chreia were a sayings-chreia! Diomedes says: “O Diogenes, Cynic philosopher, excellently did you SAY (*dixisti*)” (see l. 27) rather than “... excellently did you ACT.”

The text of Diomedes’ discussion of *declinatio* of a chreia is as follows, with Keil’s page and line numbers placed in parentheses for easy reference.

## TEXT (1.310 KEIL)

## De declinatione exercitationis chriarum

Chriarum exercitatio in casus sic variatur:

Nominativo casu, numero singulari:

5 Marcus Porcius Cato dixit litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus iocundiores.

Genetivo casu:

Marci Porcii Catonis dictum fertur litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus iocundiores.

Dativo:

10 Marco Porcio Catoni placuit dicere litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus iocundiores.

Accusativo:

Marcum Porcium Catonem dixisse ferunt litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus iocundiores.

15 Vocativo:

O tu Marce Porci Cato, ne tu egregie dixisti litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores.

Ablativo:

(310, 10) A Marco Porcio Catone dictum accepimus litterarum  
20 radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores.

Nominativo plurali:

Marci Porcii Catones dixerunt litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores.

Genetivo:

25 Marcorum Porciorum Catonum dictum fertur litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores.

Dativo:

Marcis Porciis Catonibus placuit dicere, id quoque.

Accusativo:

30 Marcos Porcios Catones dixisse ferunt, id quoque.

Vocativo:

(310, 15) O Marci Porcii Catones, ne vos egregie dixistis, id quoque.

Ablativo:

35 A Marcis Porciis Catonibus dictum accepimus litterarum radices amaras esse, fructus dulciores.

Hoc quoque exemplo ceterae chriae declinationes subiciuntur:

Nominativo:

40 Puplius Vergilius Maro dixit, "Auri sacra fames" (*Aen.* 3.57).

Similiter nominativo:

Puplius Vergilius Maro dixit, "Degeneres animos timor arguit" (*Aen.* 4.13)

(310, 20) Item nominativo:

46 Marcus Porcius Cato dixit leges nervos esse civitatum.

Item nominativo:

50 Demosthenes Atheniensis interrogatus quo modo orator factus sit respondit, "Plus vino inpendens olei."

Similiter nominativo:

Diogenes Cynicus philosophus in die accensa lucerna quaerebat hominem.

Genetivo:

55 Diogenis Cynici philosophi memoria fertur, id quoque.

Dativo:

(310, 25) Diogeni Cynico philosopho visum est, id quoque.

Accusativo:

60 Diogenem Cynicum philosophum aiunt diligenter, id quoque.

Vocativo:

O Diogene Cynice philosophe, optime dixisti id quoque.

65

Ablativo:

A Diogene Cynico philosopho memoriae traditum est in die accensa lucerna quaesitum hominem esse.

#### TRANSLATION

The exercise with chreiai is done in the various cases like this:

In the nominative case, singular:

5

Marcus Porcius Cato said that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits more pleasant.

In the genitive case:

The statement of Marcus Porcius Cato, that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits more pleasant, is reported.

10

In the dative:

To Marcus Porcius Cato it seemed good to say that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits more pleasant.

In the accusative:

They report that Marcus Porcius Cato said that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits more pleasant.

15

In the vocative:

You, O Marcus Porcius Cato, certainly you said brilliantly that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits sweeter.

In the ablative:

20

From Marcus Porcius Cato we have received the statement that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits sweeter.

In the nominative plural:

The Marci Porcii Catones said that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits sweeter.

In the genitive:

- 25       The statement of the Marci Porcii Catones, that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits sweeter, is reported.

In the dative:

To the Marci Porcii Catones it seemed good to say, and so on.

In the accusative:

- 30       They report that the Marci Porcii Catones said, and so on.

In the vocative:

O Marci Porcii Catones, you certainly said excellently, and so on.

In the ablative:

- 35       From the Marci Porcii Catones we have received the statement that the roots of education are bitter, its fruits sweeter.

With this example, too, declension is applied to the remaining chreiai:

In the nominative:

- 40       Publius Vergilius Maro said, "Accursed is hunger for gold" (*Aen.* 3.57).

Similarly, in the nominative:

Publius Vergilius Maro said, "Fear proves souls base-born" (*Aen.* 4.13).

- 45       Likewise in the nominative:

Marcus Porcius Cato said that laws are the sinews of states.

Likewise, in the nominative:

- 50       Demosthenes the Athenian, on being asked how he had become an orator, replied, "By spending more on oil than on wine."

Similarly, in the nominative:

Diogenes the Cynic philosopher used to seek a man by day with a lighted lamp.

In the genitive:

- 55       The recollection of Diogenes the Cynic philosopher is reported, and so on.

In the dative:

To Diogenes the Cynic philosopher it seemed best,  
and so on.

In the accusative:

60        They say that Diogenes the Cynic philosopher dili-  
             gently, and so on.

In the vocative:

O Diogenes, Cynic philosopher, excellently did you  
say, and so on.

65        In the ablative:

             There is a tradition that a man was searched for dur-  
             ing the day during the day with a lighted lamp by  
             Diogenes the Cynic philosopher.

Text 17. John Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 2

(2.192, 14–193, 8 Walz)

## INTRODUCTION

John Doxapatres—not Doxopatres or Doxopater<sup>45</sup>—is a little known but invaluable commentator on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius of Antioch. Writing at Constantinople, probably in the second half of the eleventh century,<sup>46</sup> Doxapatres has left us the most extensive commentary on Aphthonius.<sup>47</sup> At two points in this commentary Doxapatres discusses the κλίσις of a chreia. One discussion is reserved for our third volume since it appears in his commentary on Aphthonius' chreia chapter which will be presented in full in that volume.<sup>48</sup> A second, and briefer, discussion, however, appears in another chapter of this commentary, namely, in the διήγημα, or narrative, chapter and hence is treated here.

Doxapatres opens his comments on the διήγημα with an elaborate defense of the Aphthonian τάξις, or order, of this *progymnasma* within the overall sequence of the fourteen individual *progymnasmata*. Doxapatres cites seven reasons why Aphthonius placed the διήγημα in second place, after the μῦθος, or fable, chapter.<sup>49</sup> The last reason is of particular interest to us. Here he argues that the μῦθος occupies first place in the sequence and the διήγημα second because of their correlation to the first two parts of a public speech. The μῦθος is most often used, it is said, in the προοίμιον, or in the first part of a speech, while the διήγημα is

<sup>45</sup> On Doxapatres (Δοξαπατρῆς) as the correct spelling, see Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 6. Weitere Textquellen für Johannes Diakonos," *RhM* 63 (1908) 512–30, esp. 512 n. 3. The spelling Doxopater (Δοξόπατρος) goes back to Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 2.iii.

<sup>46</sup> On Doxapatres, see, in addition to the fuller discussion in the introduction to Texts 28–30, Ludwig Radermacher, "Doxapatres," *PW* 5 (1905) 1611–13; Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 3. Die Quellen des Doxapatres in den Homilien zu Aphthonios," *RhM* 62 (1907) 559–86; Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (HAW 12.5.1–2; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978) 1.79, 83–84; and Alexander Kazhdan, "John Doxopatres (sic)," *ODB* 1.660.

<sup>47</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.81–564 Walz.

<sup>48</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.264, 10–265, 12 Walz.

<sup>49</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.190, 6–193, 8 Walz.



used only in the διήγησις, or second part of a speech. Accordingly, in the *progymnasmata*, which are designed to prepare students to compose speeches, the μῦθος rightly belongs in first place and the διήγημα in second.<sup>50</sup>

Doxapatres, however, is not persuaded by this particular argument. He notes that some speeches begin without an introduction, so that the narrative is in effect first, as happens in one of Demosthenes' speeches (*Orat.* 41: On the Trierarchic Crown).<sup>51</sup> Doxapatres adds that he knows of some older writers of *Progymnasmata*—which ones he does not say—who placed the chreia, not the διήγημα, in second place because the chreia at that time was manipulated according to cases, i.e., a κλίσις, and not, as developed later, according to the κεφάλαια, or eight sections used in an elaboration. Manipulation of a chreia according to cases is simpler, he says, than composing a διήγημα, so that the chreia should precede the διήγημα, but only so long as this simple exercise is the one used. In other words, once the chreia is subjected to the more complex elaboration exercise it justly follows the διήγημα. The Aphthonian τάξις is thereby defended.

Doxapatres then goes on to provide a κλίσις that is presumably taken from one of these earlier *Progymnasmata*. The formulae are similar to those already discussed, except for the dative which uses ἐπῆλθεν, not ἔδοξεν, along with the infinitive εἰπεῖν. Note also that only the singular of the κλίσις is provided.

The text of this κλίσις and its immediate context from Doxapatres' commentary on Aphthonius' διήγημα chapter is based on Christian Walz's edition of 1835<sup>52</sup> and is as follows:

## TEXT

- 1 Ἄλλοι δὲ πάλιν μετὰ τὸν μῦθον τὴν χρεῖαν ἔταξαν, διὰ τὸ εὐκολωτέραν  
ταύτην ἡγεῖσθαι τοῦ διηγήματος, ἐπεὶ μηδὲ κατ' ἐκεῖνα τὰ κεφάλαια  
ἐβούλοντο αὐτὴν διαιρεῖν, καθὰ τὰ νῦν παρ' ἡμῶν διαιρεῖται, ἀλλὰ  
κατὰ πάσας ὁμοῦ τὰς πτώσεις, ὅπερ πολὺ δήπουθεν εὐκολώτερον ἦν  
5 τοῦ ἐκθέσθαι διήγημα. πῶς γὰρ οὐ πάντῃ τοῖς βουλομένοις εὐμεταχεί-  
ριστον τὸ κατὰ πτώσεις διαιρεῖν τὴν χρεῖαν;  
κατ' εὐθεῖαν μὲν, οἷον·

<sup>50</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.192, 5-14 Walz.

<sup>51</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.192, 5-14 Walz.

<sup>52</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.192, 14 -193, 8 Walz.

Διογένης ἐρωτηθεῖς, πῶς ἂν τις ἔνδοξος γένηται, ἀπεκρίνετο, ὥς ἥκιστα δόξης φροντίζων.

10 κατὰ γενικὴν δέ, οἶον·

Διογένους ἐρωτηθέντος, πῶς ἂν τις ἔνδοξος γένοιτο, λόγος ἀπομνημονεύεται <εἰπόντος>, ὥς ἥκιστα δόξης φροντίζων.

κατὰ δὲ δοτικὴν, οἶον·

15 Διογένηι ἐρωτηθέντι, πῶς ἂν τις ἔνδοξος γένοιτο, ἐπῆλθεν εἰπεῖν, ὥς ἥκιστα δόξης φροντίζων.

κατὰ δὲ αἰτιατικὴν, οἶον·

Διογένην ἐρωτηθέντα, πῶς ἂν (p. 193) τις ἔνδοξος γένοιτο, φασὶν εἰπεῖν, ὥς ἥκιστα δόξης φροντίζων.

κατὰ δὲ κλητικὴν, οἶον·

20 σύ, ὦ Διόγεες, ἐρωτηθεῖς, πῶς ἂν τις ἔνδοξος γένοιτο, ἔφη, ὥς ἥκιστα δόξης φροντίζων.

Οὕτω καὶ οἱ παλαιοὶ κατὰ τὰς πτώσεις τὰς χρείας ἡξίουσαν διαιρεῖν, οἰόμενοι τοῖς νέοις ἄρτι ποιητικῶν ἀφισταμένοις καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἰοῦσιν ἄρκεῖν τὸ οὕτως αὐτὴν διαιρεῖν πρὸς τὴν τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου μελέτην.

25

12 εἰπόντος addidimus (cf. Theon 228-29) 14 ἐπῆλθεν supplevimus (cf. Theon 256) ὑπῆλθεν Walz

#### TRANSLATION

But again others have placed the chreia chapter immediately after the fable chapter because they regard the chreia to be simpler than the narrative since they did not want to manipulate the chreia according to those headings into which it is now manipulated among us, but according to all the cases which was doubtlessly much easier than setting forth a narrative. For how can the manipulation of the chreia according to cases not be altogether easier to cope with for those who want to do it?

In the nominative, for example:

Diogenes, on being asked how one might become famous, answered: "By thinking about fame as little as possible."

In the genitive, for example:

The statement of Diogenes, on being asked how one might become famous, is remembered <when he said>: "By thinking about fame as little as possible."

In the dative, for example:

To Diogenes, on being asked how one might become famous, it occurred to say: "By thinking about fame as little as possible."

In the accusative, for example:

They say that Diogenes, on being asked how one might become famous, said: "By thinking about fame as little as possible."

In the vocative, for example:

You, O Diogenes, on being asked how one might become famous, you said: "By thinking about fame as little as possible."

In this way the ancients thought it fitting to manipulate chreiai according to cases, supposing that manipulating them in this way was sufficient for youths just leaving the poets and moving on to rhetoric, to the practice of the public speech.



## Chapter III

# Elaborating the Chreia: The Use of the Chreia in the Rhetorical Curriculum

## Introduction

### RHETORICAL EDUCATION

After completing their studies under a γραμματικός, students could move on to the tertiary stage of education, usually to the study of philosophy or rhetoric.<sup>1</sup> Most boys, now about fifteen years old, chose the latter—indeed, overwhelmingly so.<sup>2</sup> In any case, the students who embarked on the study of rhetoric had as their goal the mastery of the three types of speech—the judicial speech (δικανικόν), the advisory speech (συμβουλευτικόν), and the celebratory speech (ἐπιδεικτικόν).<sup>3</sup> Skill at composing and delivering

<sup>1</sup> On tertiary education, see further Henri-Irénée Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (trans. G. Lamb; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956) 186-216. Aspects of secondary education, in particular the reading of literature, did not end, however, with the commencement of the tertiary curriculum. Quintilian, for example, encourages students of rhetoric to continue the reading they had done under a γραμματικός and recommends certain genres and specific authors (see 1.8.1-12, esp. 12). Indeed, nowhere is the life-long practice of reading and then quoting from literature more apparent than in the dinner conversations of Athenaeus, on which see Ronald F. Hock, “A Dog in the Manger: The Cynic Cynulcus among Athenaeus’ Deipnosophists,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. D. L. Balch et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 20-37.

<sup>2</sup> On the dominance of rhetoric over philosophy, see Marrou, *Education*, 194-96. Note also that even students at Epictetus’ Stoic school in Nicopolis are assumed to have had previous instruction in rhetoric (see, e.g., Epictetus, 2.2.7; 24.24-26; 3.1.1, 34).

<sup>3</sup> The division of speeches into three γέννη goes back to Aristotle (see *Rhet.* 1.3.3-5) and the Stoics (see Diogenes Laertius, 7.42) and soon became

these speeches prepared them for carrying out their eventual adult responsibilities of managing their households and governing their cities.<sup>4</sup>

In order to become skilled at making these speeches, students were led through many rhetorical methods, rules, and models before beginning to compose and deliver their own practice speeches (μελέται). Rhetorical method involved the five steps required to compose and deliver a speech: invention (εὑρεσις), arrangement (τάξις), style (λέξις), memory (μνήμη), and delivery (ὑπόκρισις).<sup>5</sup> Rules, however, were countless, as handbooks on rhetoric contained rule upon rule on how best to compose the various parts of a speech—the introduction (προοίμιον), narrative (διήγησις), proof (ἀπόδειξις), and conclusion (ἐπίλογος). These rules often included illustrative passages from speeches of famous orators like Demosthenes and Cicero, and students also had complete model speeches to imitate, again those of Demosthenes and Cicero but also those of their own teachers.<sup>6</sup>

conventional (see, e.g., *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 1.2.2), if not universal. See further George A. Kennedy, "The Genres of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. S. F. Porter; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997) 43–50.

<sup>4</sup> On rhetorical education, see further Marrou, *Education*, 194–205; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley: University of California, 1977) 277–327; and Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998) 190–239.

<sup>5</sup> These five steps in rhetorical method are one of the organizing principles of the *Rhet. ad Herenn.* and, to some extent, of Quintilian's *Institutio oratoria*. For detailed discussion, see the respective articles in the *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric* (see above n. 3): "Invention" by Malcolm Heath (pp. 89–119), "Arrangement" by Wilhelm Wuellner (pp. 51–87), "Style" by Galen O. Rowe (pp. 121–57), and "Delivery and Memory" by Thomas H. Olbricht (pp. 159–67).

<sup>6</sup> On these rules and their illustrations, see the short handbook by Rufus of Perinthus (in Leonard Spengel, ed., *Rhetores Graeci* [3 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1884–1886; vol. 1, pt. 2 rev. by C. Hammer, 1894] 1.2.399–407). On Rufus, see Otmar Schissel, "Die rhetorische Kunstlehre des Rufus von Perinthus," *RhM* 75 (1926) 369–92, and Walter Ameling, "Der Sophist Rufus," *EA* 6 (1985) 27–33. The longer handbooks by Anonymous Seguerianus and Apsines of Gadara are now available in a splendid, new edition: Mervin R. Dils and George A. Kennedy, eds., *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, & Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus & to Apsines of Gadara* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997).

Accordingly, by working through the five steps, following the rules, and keeping an eye on their models, students learned to compose their own *μελέται*. These *μελέται* drew on some person, event, or issue from history and required students to take some position on the issue and then defend it in a speech, in which they spoke as though they were one of the participants. For example, they might have to argue whether Cynegirus or Callimachus, fallen heroes at Marathon, deserved the greater honor, a subject treated with virtuosity by one teacher of rhetoric, the sophist Polemo of Smyrna.<sup>7</sup>

#### PROGYMNASMATA IN RHETORICAL EDUCATION

For students to begin immediately with mastering all the methods, rules, and models, much less composing their own *μελέται*, would be, to use Theon's apt comparison, much like learning to become a potter by beginning with a *πίθος*, or huge storage jar.<sup>8</sup> Or, as John Doxapatres, the eleventh century Byzantine commentator on Aphthonius, puts it, it is foolish for students to attempt "to grasp all at once the whole of the rhetorical art."<sup>9</sup> Better to begin with shorter, simpler compositions that nonetheless teach the rudiments of rhetorical argumentation and style. Such pre-rhetorical compositions, called *progymnasmata*, provided this intermediary step between the simpler lessons learned under the *γραμματικός* and the more complex *μελέται* to be learned at the school of a *σοφιστής*.<sup>10</sup>

For a survey of these and other rhetorical treatises, see Kennedy, "Historical Survey of Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400* (ed. S. F. Porter; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998) 3-42.

<sup>7</sup> Polemo's two *μελέται* on this subject have been newly edited, translated, and commented upon by William Reader, ed., *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo* (SBLTT 42; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996). For more general surveys of declamation, see Donald A. Russell, *Greek Declamation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983), and D. H. Berry and Malcolm Heath, "Oratory and Declamation," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400* (ed. S. F. Porter; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1998) 393-420.

<sup>8</sup> Theon, *Progymn.* 1 (1.146, 3-6 Walz).

<sup>9</sup> Doxapatres, 2.136, 18-19 Walz.

<sup>10</sup> The best discussion of the *progymnasmata* is Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (HAW 12.5.1-2; Munich: C.

The *progymnasmata* numbered fourteen and were arranged in a graded series of increasing length, complexity, and difficulty.<sup>11</sup> Students began with the easiest *progymnasmata*, that is, with the μῦθος, the διήγημα, the χρεία, and the γνώμη. But even at the start of the sequence students were already learning specifically rhetorical lessons. Indeed, as Doxapatres explains, the *progymnasmata* provided preliminary instruction in the three types of speeches and in the four parts of a speech; for example, the skills needed in writing μῦθοι or elaborations of a chreia are used later when composing advisory speeches; the skills learned in composing an ἀνασκευή, κατασκευή, or κοινὸς τόπος help later when writing judicial speeches; and the skills used in delivering an ἐγκώμιον, ψόγος, or σύγκρισις can be used later when composing celebratory speeches; likewise, the μῦθος provides instruction that is also used in composing introductions, the διήγημα and ἔκφρασις in composing narratives, and so on.<sup>12</sup> Doxapatres explains:

Just as the task of the introduction is to make the audience attentive to what will be said in the narrative, so also the task of the fable is to prepare the audience for accepting the moral of the fable. Accordingly, the one who has been trained with the fable to make someone attentive to the advice in the moral of the fable would clearly not be at a loss to compose an introduction.<sup>13</sup>

In other words, by the time students had reached the end of the *progymnasmata* sequence—the ἔκφρασις, the θέσις, and the

H. Beck, 1978) 1.92-120. See also Otmar Schissel, "Rhetorische Progymnasmatik der Byzantiner," *BNJ* 11 (1934-35) 1-11; Heinrich Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (2nd ed.; Munich: Hueber, 1973) §§1106-39; George A. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983) 54-66; *Chreia* 1.9-22, 63-66, 155-60, 211-16, and 237-39; and Helena Cichocka, "Progymnasma as a Literary Form," *SIFC* 10 (1992) 991-99.

<sup>11</sup> The number and sequence of exercises became fixed, in the late fourth century, with Aphthonius of Antioch; they are: 1) fable (μῦθος), 2) narrative (διήγημα), 3) chreia (χρεία), 4) maxim (γνώμη), 5) refutation (ἀνασκευή), 6) confirmation (κατασκευή), 7) common place (κοινὸς τόπος), 8) encomium (ἐγκώμιον), 9) invective (ψόγος), 10) comparison (σύγκρισις), 11) characterization (ἡθοποιία), 12) description (ἔκφρασις), 13) thesis (θέσις), and 14) introduction of a law (νόμου εἰσφορά). Cf. further *Chreia* 1.16-22.

<sup>12</sup> Doxapatres, 2.125, 3-126, 6 Walz.

<sup>13</sup> Doxapatres, 2.125, 15-22 Walz: ὥσπερ γὰρ προοιμίους ἔργον ἐστὶν τὸ προσεκτικὸς ποιεῖν τοὺς ἀκροατὰς πρὸς τὰ ἐν τῇ διηγήσει ῥηθισμένα, οὕτω



νόμου εἰσφορά—they had honed their compositional skills to the point that they, to use Doxapatres' imagery again, had ascended the stairsteps (ἀναβαθμοί) to the very threshold of the rhetorical art.<sup>14</sup> Only now were students ready to learn rhetoric proper, to master the methods, rules, and models of the discipline that would turn them into orators and the best of them into sophists.<sup>15</sup>

#### THE CHREIA AND ITS ELABORATION

Our interest, of course, is in only one progymnasma, the third in the sequence, the chreia, an exercise that came therefore at the initial stages of rhetorical education. To judge from the extant *Progymnasmata*, students learned the definition of the chreia as well as its etymology and classification into types and sub-types,<sup>16</sup> but they also learned to manipulate the chreia by means of various classroom exercises. Theon of Alexandria, for example, discusses eight exercises performed on the chreia; we have already discussed the κλίσις of the chreia (see Texts 13–17), but Theon also includes recitation, comment, objection, expansion, condensation, refutation, and confirmation.<sup>17</sup> As we have seen, the κλίσις of the chreia became a grammatical exercise soon after Theon,<sup>18</sup> but by the time of Hermogenes of Tarsus in the late second century only one of these exercises, the confirmation of a chreia, still had a role.

In Hermogenes, however, the confirmation exercise has a considerably different format from Theon's eighth exercise of the same name. Hermogenes outlines a short essay in which the truth of the chreia is expounded through eight brief paragraphs: 1) praise (ἔπαινος), 2) (paraphrase of) the chreia (ἡ χρεία), 3) rationale

καὶ τοῦ μύθου ἔργον τὸ παρασκευάσαι τοὺς ἀκροατὰς πρὸς ὑποδοχὴν τοῦ ἐπιμυθίου. ὁ τοίνυν διὰ μύθου δυνηθεὶς τινι προσοχὴν ἐμποιῆσαι τῆς ἐν τῷ ἐπιμυθίῳ παραινέσεως, εὐδελον ὡς καὶ προοίμιον ὁ τοιοῦτος ποιῆσαι οὐκ ἀπορήσειν.

<sup>14</sup> Doxapatres, 2.138, 16–17 Walz.

<sup>15</sup> On sophists, the virtuoso public speakers who dominated intellectual life in the early Roman Empire and on into late antiquity, see Glen W. Bowersock, *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), and, more generally, Graham Anderson, *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

<sup>16</sup> See Text 18 and *Chreia* 1.23–35.

<sup>17</sup> See Theon 190–404. On Theon, see Willy Stegemann, “Theon (5),” *PW* 5A (1934) 2037–54, and *Chreia* 1.63–78.

<sup>18</sup> See Adolf Brinkmann, “Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht,” *RhM* 65 (1910) 149–55, esp. 155.

(αἰτία), 4) opposite (κατὰ τὸ ἐναντίον), 5) analogy (ἐκ τοῦ παραβολῆς), 6) example (ἐκ παραδείγματος), 7) judgment (ἐκ κρίσεως), and 8) exhortation (παράκλησις).<sup>19</sup>

In the late fourth century Aphthonius of Antioch gave this exercise a fully worked-out model confirmation of a chreia, which, along with fully worked-out models for all the *progymnasmata*, gave his version the edge over other *Progymnasmata* resulting in its being added to the *Corpus Hermogenianum*, which soon became the rhetorical canon of Byzantine education.<sup>20</sup> Consequently, given his prominent place in Byzantine education, it is not surprising that Aphthonius' terminology and sequence of the eight sections as well as the language and style of his model confirmation exerted considerable influence for the next thousand years. Aphthonius' influence will be noted time and again in the analyses of the chreia elaborations presented below (see Texts 24-36).<sup>21</sup>

#### HISTORY OF THE FORM OF THE CHREIA ELABORATION

Before Aphthonius gave the elaboration of a chreia its standard and influential treatment, however, it had gone through a lengthy history.<sup>22</sup> The beginnings of this history are obscure, in part because they lie outside the *Progymnasmata* themselves and indeed apart from discussions of the chreia. In other words, we cannot look to Theon's confirmation exercise, the earliest we possess,<sup>23</sup> since his instructions are more suggestive than fixed, amounting

<sup>19</sup> See Hermogenes 30-62. On Hermogenes, see Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 1. Nachrichten über das Leben des Hermogenes," *RhM* 62 (1907) 247-62; Ludwig Radermacher, "Hermogenes (22)," *PW* 8 (1912) 865-77; and *Chreia* 1.155-71. On the exercises of recitation (ἀπαγγελία) and expansion (ἐπεκτείνωσις), see *Chreia* 1.36-42.

<sup>20</sup> See Aphthonius 24-78. On Aphthonius, see J. Brzoska, "Aphthonios," *PW* 1 (1884) 2797-2800, and *Chreia* 1.211-12. The importance of Aphthonius' model exercises was recognized by his commentators (see, e.g., Doxapatres, 2.131, 15-18 Walz, and, more generally, *Chreia* 1.212-16).

<sup>21</sup> See the Introductions to Texts 24-36.

<sup>22</sup> See Bonner, *Education*, 259-60; Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.98-100; and esp. Burton L. Mack, *Anecdotes and Arguments: The Chreia in Antiquity and Early Christianity* (IAC Occasional Papers 10; Claremont, CA: IAC, 1987) 9-28. See also Burton L. Mack and Vernon K. Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels* (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge, 1989) 51-67.

<sup>23</sup> See Theon 193-94, 334-404.

to little more than a list of arguments from which the writer might choose.<sup>24</sup> To be sure, these arguments are to be placed within a speech context, as Theon also mentions introducing and concluding the confirmation.<sup>25</sup> And yet, what Theon suggests for confirming a chreia bears so little formal resemblance to Hermogenes' and Aphthonius' elaborations of a chreia that Theon seems to belong to another tradition, one related more to developing a thesis.<sup>26</sup>

Rather, the Aphthonian tradition, or at least the earliest traces of it, begins long before Theon in Hellenistic rhetorical theory,<sup>27</sup> specifically in the penchant among Hellenistic rhetoricians to stress argumentation and to aid such argumentation by providing lists, sometimes long lists, of possible arguments from which orators might choose for their speech.<sup>28</sup> For example, a list of arguments for an advisory speech appears in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which was written after 340 B.C. and possibly by Anaximenes of Lampsakos.<sup>29</sup> At any rate, in this list we find the τελικὰ κεφάλαια, or final arguments, which were to persuade or dissuade by appeal to what is just (δίκαιον), lawful (νόμιμον), advantageous (συμφέρον), noble (καλόν), pleasurable (ἡδύ), easy (ῥᾶδιον), possible (δυνατόν), and necessary (ἀναγκαῖον). The list goes on to suggest supporting arguments, namely appeals to the similar (τὸ ὅμοιον), to the opposite (τὸ ἐναντίον), and to the judgments of others (τὰ κεκριμένα).<sup>30</sup> This list represents the first step

<sup>24</sup> See Theon 334-38.

<sup>25</sup> See Theon 395-404. Theon's discussion of the confirmation and refutation of a chreia should be placed alongside similar discussions of the fable, narrative, introduction of a law, and maxim (see *Progymn.* 3 [1.178, 15-181, 23 Walz]; *Progymn.* 6 [1.216, 20-222, 9]; and *Progymn.* 12 [1.253, 23-25]). All these discussions are similar, but that on the fable the longest.

<sup>26</sup> See Theon, *Progymn.* 12 (1.243, 13-17 Walz).

<sup>27</sup> See Mack, *Anecdotes*, 18-22, and Mack and Robbins, *Persuasion*, 52-55.

<sup>28</sup> See Mack, *Anecdotes*, 19-20, and Mack and Robbins, *Persuasion*, 55-57.

<sup>29</sup> On the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, see further Manfred Fuhrmann, *Das systematische Lehrbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960) 11-28, and Kennedy, "Historical Survey," 22-23.

<sup>30</sup> See *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1421b 20-1422a 27, and Mack, *Anecdotes*, 20.

in identifying a series of arguments that would later be used to elaborate a chreia.<sup>31</sup>

To be sure, there are obvious similarities between this list of arguments and those found later in the elaboration pattern—in particular, the supporting arguments of the similar, the opposite, and the judgments of others. And the style used in τὸ ὅμοιον appears in the παραβολή-section of the chreia-elaboration.<sup>32</sup> In addition, the final arguments may be of some use in analyzing a chreia elaboration. At any rate, John Geometres, a tenth century commentator on Aphthonius preserved in part by Doxapatres, recognizes two final arguments, τὸ χαλεπὸν and τὸ ἔνδοξον, in Aphthonius' elaboration.<sup>33</sup>

But these similarities do not tell the whole story. Geometres' identification of final arguments in Aphthonius is more analysis of content than of form. More important, the supporting arguments are too few in number and their terminology, nature, and order<sup>34</sup> are too different to place this passage from the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* directly on the trajectory leading to the argumentative pattern of the elaboration of a chreia.

A better place to trace the origin of the elaboration pattern is in another rhetorical handbook, one based on earlier Greek sources but available to us only in Latin dress, the so-called *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, which dates from about 85 B.C.<sup>35</sup> In this

<sup>31</sup> So Mack, *Anecdotes*, 20.

<sup>32</sup> Note in particular the identical wording (ὥσπερ γὰρ . . . τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον . . .) (see *Rhet. ad Alex.* 1422a 30-31, and Aphthonius 59, 61).

<sup>33</sup> See Geometres, quoted in Doxapatres, 2.267, 15-26 Walz.

<sup>34</sup> Instead of the terms τὸ ὅμοιον and τὸ κεκριμένον in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, we find the terms παραβολή and μαρτυρία παλαιῶν used in the elaboration of a chreia (so Aphthonius 20-21). To be sure, Hermogenes' use of κρίσις (55) is closer to τὸ κεκριμένον, but even here there are differences beneath the similar language, for the illustrations of this argument in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* are to historical people and events (see 1422a 39-42, 1422b 20-24, 1423a 4-9), whereas in Hermogenes this section uses literary quotations (see Hermogenes 55-59). Finally, note that in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* τὸ ἐναντίον follows τὸ ὅμοιον, so that τὸ ἐναντίον provides the converse of τὸ ὅμοιον, not of the αἰτία, as in the elaboration (see Hermogenes 42-47).

<sup>35</sup> On the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, esp. its sources and dating, see George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C.-A.D. 300* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972) 111-13, 126-38. Cf. also Fuhrmann, *Systematische Lehrbuch*, 41-58, and Kennedy, "Historical Survey," 24.

handbook there is a discussion of what the author calls a complete argument (*absolutissima et perfectissima argumentatio*). It has five parts: 1) a proposition (*propositio*), 2) a rationale (*ratio*), 3) a confirmation of the rationale (*rationis confirmatio*), 4) an embellishment (*exornatio*), and 5) a summary (*complexio*).<sup>36</sup> Moreover, the *exornatio* is made up of such arguments as an analogy (*simile*), an example (*exemplum*), and a previous judgment (*res iudicata*).<sup>37</sup>

When compared to the eight sections of a chreia elaboration, it becomes immediately obvious that the complete argument has more in common with the elaboration than the list of final and supporting arguments in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*. But an even closer parallel appears elsewhere in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. There we find a discussion treating *expolitio*, or embellishment of an idea. *Expolitio* is part of a longer discussion on figures of thought<sup>38</sup> and is itself a rather complex figure, taking on either of two forms. Specifically, *expolitio* works either 1) by repetition of an idea by means of changes in wording, delivery, or treatment,<sup>39</sup> or 2) by development of an idea through a series of seven arguments.<sup>40</sup>

The latter form of *expolitio* is the one that especially concerns us, even though it has nothing directly to do with a chreia, despite claims to the contrary.<sup>41</sup> In any case, the author gives this outline for embellishing a subject (*res*) by means of seven successive arguments. In particular, he says that a person must:

- 1) state the subject plainly (*simpliciter*),
- 2) append a rationale (*ratio*),
- 3) then (*deinde*) restate the subject a second time (*dupliciter*), with or without rationales (*rationes*),
- 4) then (*deinde*) bring forward a contrary (*contrarium*),
- 5) then (*deinde*) an analogy (*simile*),
- 6) an example (*exemplum*), and

<sup>36</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 2.18.28. Cf. also Mack, *Anecdotes*, 20-22, and Mack and Robbins, *Persuasion*, 56-57.

<sup>37</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 2.29.46.

<sup>38</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.35.47-55.69.

<sup>39</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.42.54-43.56.

<sup>40</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.43.56-44.58.

<sup>41</sup> On this misunderstanding and its correction, see Bonner, *Education*, 369 n. 66.

7) then (*deinde*) a conclusion (*conclusio*).<sup>42</sup>

The author also supplies a model *expolitio* of a *res*, specifically the *sententia*, or maxim, that “the wise man will avoid no danger on behalf of his country.”<sup>43</sup> Then he concludes his discussion by noting that *expolitio* can be exceedingly ornate; therefore, he encourages Herennius to practice *expolitio*, even *extra causam*, or apart from an actual case, because of its importance for embellishing an argument and for training in style.<sup>44</sup> The importance thus assigned to *expolitio* lifts it out of its immediate context and gives it a prominence that it might otherwise not have had for those who were training to become orators.

Since *expolitio* can be done *extra causam*, it is not surprising that someone would eventually make a chreia the *res*. In fact, we actually find *expolitio* applied to a chreia (and maxim) by Hermogenes. To be sure, the pattern of *expolitio* is not taken over exactly, and the pattern is more blandly termed an exercise (ἐργασία), but the resemblance between the two is unmistakable, as a side by side presentation of the two patterns of argumentation shows:<sup>45</sup>

<i>Rhet. ad Herenn.</i>	Hermogenes
subject	1) praise (ἔπαινος) 2) then (εἴτα) (paraphrase of) the chreia
rationale subject twice, with or without rationales	3) then (εἴτα) the rationale (αἰτία)
opposite	5) then (εἴτα) the opposite (ἐναντίον)
analogy	6) then (εἴτα) an analogy (παραβολή)
example	7) then (εἴτα) an example (παράδειγμα)
	8) judgment (κρίσις)
conclusion	9) exhortation (παράκλησις)

Some differences between these two patterns require discussion. Thus, the first item, ἔπαινος, which Hermogenes adds at the beginning of the list, is prompted by the form of the chreia itself.

<sup>42</sup> *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.43.56. This analysis differs in many ways from that of Mack, *Anecdotes*, 22.

<sup>43</sup> *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.44.57-58.

<sup>44</sup> *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.44.58.

<sup>45</sup> See Hermogenes 30-62.

A chreia requires the attribution of a saying or action to a πρόσωπον, who can receive a word of praise.<sup>46</sup> Consequently, the ἔπαινος adds an encomiastic element to the argumentation and, as we shall see, came to be seen as being comparable to the προοίμιον, or introduction of a standard speech.

In addition, while the *res* and paraphrase of the chreia have much in common, in that both state the subject to be elaborated, the paraphrase of the chreia adds a narrative dimension and thereby makes it comparable to the διήγησις, or narrative part of a speech. In other words, the Hermogenean ἐργασία is not simply an *expolitio*, or embellished argument, but a short speech.

Hermogenes also simplifies the pattern of *expolitio* by eliminating the repetition of the *res* and *rationes*, and he expands the pattern by adding the κρίσις of other writers.<sup>47</sup> It is possible, however, that the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* may have omitted this item from his source, given his rejection elsewhere of the Greek convention of citing other authors as illustrations of what one is discussing.<sup>48</sup> In any case, whether the author omitted the κρίσις or Hermogenes added it—and even Hermogenes says that it is not required<sup>49</sup>—it is still clear that the *expolitio* as presented in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* and the ἐργασία as outlined by Hermogenes are fundamentally similar, if not identical.

Once we see Hermogenes' elaboration of a chreia as a development of the complete argument and especially of the embellishment of a subject, we come to understand that it is a compositional exercise in which students learned to introduce, narrate, argue, and conclude a subject. In other words, students learned, by means of this third *progymnasma*, to compose their first complete, if brief, speech and thereby take their first steps toward becoming orators.

The elaboration pattern changes very little after Hermogenes. Although a number of *Progymnasmata* were written in the

<sup>46</sup> See Hermogenes 38-39.

<sup>47</sup> See Hermogenes 55-59, where the poets Hesiod and Epicharmus are quoted in support of Isocrates' saying in Chreia 43.

<sup>48</sup> See *Rhet. ad Herenn.* 4.1.1; 4.7.

<sup>49</sup> See Hermogenes 55: ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐκ κρίσεως ἐπιχειρῆσαι ("It is also possible to argue from an authority").

third and fourth centuries,<sup>50</sup> only two have survived from this period, one in fragments, the other complete. The former, by the fourth century Sopatros, exists only in fragments taken up by John of Sardis in his ninth century commentary on Aphthonius. What remains of his elaboration of a chreia will be discussed in detail later in this volume (see Text 19). Suffice it to say here that the elaboration pattern, or what remains of it in John's commentary, adds little that is new and indeed largely follows Hermogenes in his terminology, using, for example, the Hermogenean terms κρίσις and παράκλησις for his seventh and eighth sections.

The complete *Progymnasmata* is that by the late fourth century student of Libanius, Aphthonius of Antioch. His elaboration of a chreia—Isocrates said that the root of education is bitter, but its fruits are sweet—follows the Hermogenean pattern,<sup>51</sup> but Aphthonius does make some terminological changes. Thus he called the eight parts of the elaboration by the general name κεφάλαια, literally “headings,” though we prefer to translate “sections.” And he changed Hermogenes’ ἐπαινος to ἐγκωμιαστικὸν <scil. κεφάλαιον>, or encomiastic <section>, and χρεία to παραφραστικὸν <scil. κεφάλαιον>, or paraphrastic <section>. In addition, at the end he changed Hermogenes’ κρίσις to μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, or testimony of the ancients, and παράκλησις to ἐπίλογος βραχύς, or brief epilogue. For the next thousand years students would elaborate a chreia according to these eight Aphthonian κεφάλαια:

- 1) ἐγκωμιαστικὸν <κεφάλαιον> (encomiastic <section>)
- 2) παραφραστικὸν <κεφάλαιον> (paraphrastic <section>)
- 3) αἰτία (rationale)
- 4) ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου (from the opposite)
- 5) παραβολή (analogy)
- 6) παράδειγμα (example)
- 7) μαρτυρία παλαιῶν (testimony of the ancients)
- 8) ἐπίλογος βραχύς (brief epilogue).<sup>52</sup>

<sup>50</sup> On these *Progymnasmata*, mostly known only by titles in the works listed in the respective articles of the *Suda*, see Hugo Rabe, ed., *Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (Rhetores Graeci 10; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926) 54-57.

<sup>51</sup> For this elaboration, see Aphthonius 23-78.

<sup>52</sup> See Aphthonius 18-22.



THE RHETORICAL FUNCTION  
OF THE CHREIA ELABORATION

Neither Aphthonius nor anyone else before him drew attention to the function or logic of this sequence of eight κεφάλαια. Such analysis, however, begins in the fifth century with Nicolaus of Myra and continues, with considerable sophistication, by later Byzantine commentators on Aphthonius. Nicolaus makes explicit the rhetorical character of the chreia elaboration. He asserts that the various κεφάλαια correspond to the four parts of a standard speech. Thus the first κεφάλαιον, the ἐγκωμιαστικόν, is similar to the προοίμιον; the second, or the παραφραστικόν, corresponds to the διήγησις; the next five κεφάλαια—αἰτία, ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολή, παράδειγμα, and μαρτυρία παλαιῶν—function as the ἀπόδειξις; and the eighth, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς, is clearly like the ἐπίλογος.<sup>53</sup>

But if Nicolaus merely asserted the correspondences, Doxapatres provides the explanation. For example, he notes that the ἐγκωμιαστικόν corresponds to the προοίμιον because the former tries to secure εὖνοια, or good will, one of the functions of the προοίμιον.<sup>54</sup> Similarly, the παραφραστικόν is analogous to the διήγησις, because both attempt to set forth what was said or done.<sup>55</sup> He then draws correspondences for the other κεφάλαια.<sup>56</sup>

In addition, Doxapatres provides a rather complex explanation for the precise sequence of the next five κεφάλαια. Doxapatres groups these five κεφάλαια together as τὰ ἀγωνιστικά, or the argumentative κεφάλαια. Doxapatres then compares the αἰτία with an ἐπιχείρημα, or main argument of a speech, whereas the next three—ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολή, and παράδειγμα—are analogous to ἐργασίαι, or elaborating arguments.<sup>57</sup> Since in speeches ἐπιχειρήματα precede ἐργασίαι, the αἰτία therefore comes before these three sections in a chreia elaboration.<sup>58</sup> Moreover, of the ἐργασίαι the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου precedes the παραβολή and παράδειγμα because it is an ἀποδεικτικόν, or a demonstrative argument, whereas the

<sup>53</sup> See Nicolaus 152-61.

<sup>54</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.267, 27-30 Walz.

<sup>55</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.269, 20-22 Walz.

<sup>56</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.248, 19-29 Walz.

<sup>57</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.266, 30-267, 1 Walz.

<sup>58</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.2.270, 14-18 Walz.

other two are πανηγυρικά, or celebratory ones.<sup>59</sup> In addition, the παραβολή takes precedence over the παράδειγμα because the general precedes the specific in order that the specific can confirm the general.<sup>60</sup> Finally, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, which is an uninvented proof, comes last, for uninvented proofs are more persuasive than invented ones, so that the μαρτυρία functions to ratify all the previous arguments.<sup>61</sup>

Doxapatres' explanation of this sequence also shows that this sequence was not subject to variation. Rather, it was fixed for rhetorical reasons. Each κεφάλαιον built rhetorically on the previous one, and the whole thus became a persuasive confirmation of the point of the saying (or action) in the chreia. Put rhetorically, students could exercise little freedom at this early stage of tertiary education in terms of invention and arrangement when elaborating a chreia, at least at the formal level of deciding which arguments to use and which order to give them. Compositional freedom had to wait until they had first mastered the conventions of composing a persuasive argument.

But it is not only invention and arrangement that were already decided. Style, too, was fixed to some extent. Indeed, the influence of the style of Aphthonius' elaboration will be apparent in most of the elaborations to be presented below. Since these elaborations will receive detailed and individual treatment later, it is sufficient here merely to indicate some of the stylistic borrowings from Aphthonius' elaboration that appear again and again in these elaborations.

Especially noticeable is the borrowing of Aphthonius' language that served to identify transitions from one κεφάλαιον to another—for example, the words οἷα περὶ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησεν to conclude the ἐγκωμιαστικόν;<sup>62</sup> the parenthetical use of φησὶν to indicate the παραφραστικόν;<sup>63</sup> the conjunction γάρ to introduce the αἰτία;<sup>64</sup> the words εἰ δέ to move the argument on to the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου;<sup>65</sup> the syntactical cues ὥσπερ γάρ . . . τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον . . .

<sup>59</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.270, 270, 18-21 Walz.

<sup>60</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.270, 26-30 Walz.

<sup>61</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.271, 2-7 Walz.

<sup>62</sup> See Aphthonius 32-33.

<sup>63</sup> See Aphthonius 34.

<sup>64</sup> See Aphthonius 38.

<sup>65</sup> See Aphthonius 53.

to signal the syntax of a παραβολή;<sup>66</sup> the phrase ὅρα μοι to introduce the παράδειγμα;<sup>67</sup> the use of διὸ θαυμάσαι to praise the author cited in the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν;<sup>68</sup> and the words πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντες . . . θαυμάζειν to begin the ἐπίλογος.<sup>69</sup> All these stylistic features and more will be used by authors of chreia elaborations who followed Aphthonius.

#### CHREIAI IN THE RHETORICAL CLASSROOM

We turn now to the texts that illustrate the use of chreiai in the rhetorical classroom. One text, on papyrus, shows students learning about the definition and etymology of the chreia (Text 18). All the other texts, however, illustrate the principal exercise done with the chreia, the elaboration (Texts 19-36). These texts will be presented in their chronological order.

<sup>66</sup> See Aphthonius 59, 61-62.

<sup>67</sup> See Aphthonius 64.

<sup>68</sup> See Aphthonius 71.

<sup>69</sup> See Aphthonius 77.

## Text 18. PSI I.85

(= Pack<sup>2</sup> 2287, not in Debut or Cribiore)

## INTRODUCTION

Among a relatively small number of papyri that derive from rhetorical classrooms<sup>70</sup> is one that contains a short series of questions and answers about the chreia. This small scrap of papyrus (13 × 14 cm) comes from Oxyrhynchus and was dated by its first editor, Teresa Lodi, to the third century A.D.,<sup>71</sup> a dating that has been accepted ever since.<sup>72</sup>

The questions and answers about the chreia appear on the verso of this papyrus and take up twenty-two lines before breaking off, presumably at the start of another set of questions and answers about the διήγη[μα, another progymnasma (line 22). Hugo Rabe thinks that this fragmentary papyrus comes from an otherwise unknown *Progymnasmata*.<sup>73</sup> But the question-answer format is not typical of *Progymnasmata*, although not unheard of either, as Rabe has shown.<sup>74</sup> Rabe's thesis, therefore, is possible, if not assured. At any rate, a scholion on Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* contains the same question as that which opens the papyrus: τί ἐστὶ χρεία; <sup>75</sup> The following answer, however, is very different from that on the papyrus.<sup>76</sup> Similarly, questions like those that

<sup>70</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 201, 286-87, which lists only nineteen texts, and esp. pp. 71-72, where she explains the dearth of such texts on the core/periphery model; rhetoric was a peripheral part of the literate curriculum and hence learned by only a small number of very privileged students.

<sup>71</sup> See Teresa Lodi, "PSI I.85. Appunti di retorica," in *Papiri greci e latini* (15 vols.; Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri greci e latini in Egitto; ed. E. Pistelli; Florence: Enrico Ariani, 1912) 1.187.

<sup>72</sup> See Alfred Körte, "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen," *Archiv* 7 (1924) esp. 228, and Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, 52.

<sup>73</sup> See Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, 52.

<sup>74</sup> See Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, 53.

<sup>75</sup> Anonymous scholia, 2.585, 10 Walz.

<sup>76</sup> See Anonymous scholia, 2.585, 10-12 Walz: διδασκαλία καὶ ἀπόφθεγμα τινος σύντομον.

follow on the papyrus are also attested, such as Διὰ τί ὁ μῦθος Συβαριτικός καὶ Κίλιξ καὶ Κύπριος καλεῖται; in another scholion.<sup>77</sup>

A closer formal parallel to this papyrus, however, is a passage from the *Progymnasmata* of the fifth century sophist Nicolaus of Myra. To be sure, Nicolaus does not include questions, as does the papyrus. But, like the papyrus, Nicolaus begins with a definition of the chreia,<sup>78</sup> then explains each part of the definition, and ends with an explanation of the etymology of the word chreia.<sup>79</sup> Nicolaus' explanations are implicitly answers to questions like those on the papyrus.

Indeed, Nicolaus' discussion is even of some help in resolving a lacuna in the papyrus on the answer regarding the etymology of the word chreia. Rabe partially restored this answer (see lines 19-20), depending on a parallel passage in Theon, but the discussion in Nicolaus permits further restoration. Nicolaus says that the chreia is so called not because the other progymnasmata do not have some "utility" (= χρεία) but because the chreia has been honored with this common noun (κοινὸν ὄνομα) as though it were a proper one (ἴδιον ὄνομα) on account of the chreia's pre-eminent utility (κατ' ἐξοχήν).<sup>80</sup> With this etymology in mind it becomes possible to suggest a restoration of line 21. The papyrus, according to Lodi, reads: ἰδονε + about eight or more letters. We propose ἴδ<ι>ον ἐ[cti prò κοινοῦ ὄνομα.

Two other readings of the text are problematic. First, in line 4 the papyrus seemingly reads επενετον. Editors have proposed ἐπενε<κ>τόν and ἐπαινεντόν as supplements. Both are attractive, although the former, from ἐπιφέρω, is probably more likely, since it may be a variant of the standard verb in definitions of the chreia, namely ἀναφέρω. The latter introduces an element of praise that does not otherwise appear in definitions of the chreia. Second, in lines 6-7 the words ὅτι ἀπομνημονεύεται ἵνα λεχθῇ make up the answer to the question why the word ἀπομνημόνευμα defines a chreia. But these words make little sense, so little in fact that Adolf Brinkmann proposed a major correction, as reported in Rabe's apparatus: ὅτι λέγεται ἵνα ἀπομνημονευθῇ.<sup>81</sup> The partially restored

<sup>77</sup> Anonymous scholia, 2.574, 8-9 Walz.

<sup>78</sup> See Nicolaus 45-49.

<sup>79</sup> See Nicolaus 50-58 and 59-64.

<sup>80</sup> See Nicolaus 60-61.

<sup>81</sup> See Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, 52.

text of PSI 1.85 and a translation of this catechism on the chreia are as follows:

## TEXT

- τί] ἐστι<ν> ἡ χρ<ε>ία;  
 ἀπομνημόνευμα σύντο-  
 μον ἐπὶ προσώπου τινὸς  
 ἔπενε<κ>τόν.
- 5 Διὰ τί ἀπομνημόνευμα ἡ χρ<ε>ι-  
 α; ὅτι ἀπομνημονεύεται  
 ἵνα λεχθῇ.
- Διὰ τί σύντομον;  
 ὅτι πολλάκις ἐκταθὲν
- 10 ἡ διήγησις γίνεται ἢ  
 ἄλλο τι.
- Διὰ τί ἐπὶ προσ<ώ>που;  
 ὅτι πολλάκις ἄ[ν]ευ προ-  
 σώπου σύντομο[ν] ἀπομνη-
- 15 μόνευμα ἢ γνώμη ἐστὶ<ν>  
 ἢ ἄλλο τι.
- Διὰ] τί εἴρηται χρ<ε>ία;  
 διὰ τὸ χρ<ε>ιώδης [ε]ἶν[αι], οὐχ ὥς  
 οὐ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων [τοῦτο
- 20 ἐχόντων, ἀλλὰ [κατ' ἐξοχὴν  
 ἴδ[ι]ον ἐ[στὶ] πρὸ κοινοῦ ὄνομα.
- Τί ἐστιν ἡ διήγη[μα];

**1** τί omni edd. || ἐστι<ν> Lodi et Rabe ἐστι papyrus, unde Körte || χρ<ε>ία Rabe χρία papyrus **4** ἔπενε<κ>τόν Körte ἐπαινετόν Rabe ἐπενετόν papyrus et Lodi **5** χρ<ε>ία Rabe χρία papyrus, unde Lodi et Körte **6-7** ἀπομνημονεύεται ἵνα λεχθῇ omni edd. λέγεται ἵνα ἀπομνημονευθῇ Brinkmann **12** προσ<ώ>που omni edd. **15** ἐστι<ν> Lodi et Rabe ἐστι papyrus, unde Körte **17** διὰ omni edd. || χρ<ε>ία Rabe χρία papyrus, unde Lodi et Körte **18** χρ<ε>ιώδης [ε]ἶν[αι] οὐχ ὥς Rabe χριῶδες εν .. ουκως papyrus **19** τοῦτο Rabe **20** κατ' ἐξοχὴν Rabe **21** ἴδ<ι>ον ἐ[στὶ] πρὸ κοινοῦ ὄνομα supplevimus; cf. Nicolaus 60-61 ἰδονε papyrus **22** διήγη[μα] supplevimus διήγη[σις] Lodi et Rabe

## TRANSLATION

What] is the chreia?

A concise reminiscence  
associated with some  
character.

Why is the chreia a “reminiscence”?

Because it is remembered  
so that it may be recited.

Why “concise”?

Because often, once it has been expanded,  
it becomes a narrative or  
something else.

Why “with a character”?

Because often without a char-  
acter a concise reminis-  
cence is a maxim  
or something else.

Why is it called “chreia”?

Because of its [b]ei[ng] useful, not because  
the other exercises do not have [this quality,  
but because of [its excellence,  
the name is a proper one instead of a common one.

What is the narrat[ive?

Text 19. Sopatros in John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3

(pp. 41, 46-48, and 50 Rabe)

## INTRODUCTION

## RECOVERING A HIDDEN CHREIA ELABORATION

Embedded in the early ninth century commentary by John of Sardis on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius<sup>82</sup> are scattered fragments of what appears to be a chreia elaboration. When John of Sardis discusses Aphthonius' list of eight κεφάλαια for the elaboration of a chreia,<sup>83</sup> he provides only brief commentary on the first three κεφάλαια.<sup>84</sup> The next five, however, receive fuller discussion and include illustrations of how that κεφάλαιον might work.<sup>85</sup> Each of these illustrations, moreover, has the same subject—sleeping and staying awake. Their thematic coherence is further enhanced by the mention of Alexander and Diogenes in the comments on the seventh and eighth κεφάλαια. These men, in fact, are the key to recognizing that John of Sardis drew his illustrations from a single chreia elaboration. In fact, the way they are mentioned in these κεφάλαια points to Alexander being the πρόσωπον of the chreia being elaborated. For example, in the commentary on the seventh κεφάλαιον the illustration begins “And so not only did Alexander make this judgment about Diogenes . . . , but so have many other ancient authorities” (7). The wording makes it clear that Alexander is the πρόσωπον of the chreia being elaborated. Likewise, the eighth κεφάλαιον is worded in such a way that it points to Alexander being the πρόσωπον: “Properly, then, did Alexander utter the line to Diogenes” (8).

<sup>82</sup> See Hugo Rabe, ed., *Ioannis Sardiani Commentarium in Aphthonii Progymnasmata* (Rhetores Graeci 15; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1928). Except for the fragments of the chreia elaboration, all references to this commentary will be to page and line numbers of this edition.

<sup>83</sup> See Aphthonius 18-22.

<sup>84</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 46, 1-11 Rabe).

<sup>85</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 46, 12 - 48, 12 Rabe). In other words, while only eleven lines of Rabe's text discuss the first three κεφάλαια, the next five receive forty-eight lines of commentary, or three times more discussion, on average, than the first three.



That Alexander was the principal πρόσωπον is confirmed elsewhere in the commentary, where John of Sardis actually supplies the very chreia being elaborated. In his commentary on the classification of chreiai John of Sardis goes beyond Aphthonius' classification by retrieving a distinction that goes back to Theon's fuller classification system—a distinction between simple and double sayings-chreiai.<sup>86</sup> Like Theon, John of Sardis illustrates this distinction by reciting a chreia that is known in both forms:

As a simple chreia:

Alexander, on seeing Diogenes asleep, said:

"It ill-suits a counselor to sleep all night" (*Il.* 2.24).<sup>87</sup>

As a double chreia:

Alexander, stood over a sleeping Diogenes and said:

"It ill-suits a counselor to sleep all night" (*Il.* 2.24).

But Diogenes got up and said to him:

"On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many" (*Il.* 2.25).<sup>88</sup>

In other words, the thematically unified illustrations that John of Sardis uses to illustrate the last five κεφάλαια surely confirm this chreia, specifically in its form as a simple sayings-chreia. Indeed, John of Sardis says as much: "Should you happen to be treating the chreia with the saying—"It ill-suits a counselor to sleep all night" (*Il.* 2.24).<sup>89</sup>

We are not the first to draw attention to this fragmentary elaboration. In his magisterial edition of this commentary Hugo Rabe also identifies this elaboration and even proposes that the source of it is the late fourth century *Progymnasmata* of Sopatros.<sup>90</sup> Unfortunately, Rabe's discussion has been ignored by

<sup>86</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 41, 2-15 Rabe). See also Theon 84-95.

<sup>87</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 41, 4-7 Rabe).

<sup>88</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 41, 8-11 Rabe). As a double sayings chreia, the approval shifts from Alexander to Diogenes, who, though sleepy, can recite the next line from the *Iliad* (2.25), which restricts the advice of Alexander's line to rulers, not to an unencumbered individual like the Cynic Diogenes.

<sup>89</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 48, 15-16 Rabe).

<sup>90</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvii-xxviii.

scholars,<sup>91</sup> and in fact we became aware of it only after recognizing the fragments on our own.<sup>92</sup>

The tasks in this introduction, therefore, are three: first, to review Rabe's source analysis that identifies Sopatros as the author of this fragmentary elaboration; second, to characterize Sopatros' *Progymnasmata* as a whole; and, third, to analyze the chreia elaboration itself in the light of Sopatros' habits throughout his work.

#### RECOVERING SOPATROS' PROGYMNASMATA

Rabe's remarks about this fragmentary chreia elaboration are part of a larger discussion of the sources used by John of Sardis when writing his commentary on Aphthonius.<sup>93</sup> Rabe identifies twelve sources, but of special interest to us is John's use of other *Progymnasmata* besides that of Aphthonius. Some of these are still extant—for example, those by Theon, Hermogenes, and Nicolaus—so that Rabe's interest here is primarily text critical, in that he uses these texts to help determine whether the commentary preserves better readings than do the MSS of the authors themselves.<sup>94</sup>

One of these *Progymnasmata*, however, is no longer extant, and this is one written by Sopatros. Rabe is not especially interested in Sopatros himself, who is in any case barely visible to historical eyes. He lived during the fourth century, probably the latter part of it; was taught at Athens, perhaps by Himerius; and

<sup>91</sup> For the most comprehensive treatment of the theory and practice of progymnasmata, see Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.92-120. And yet, he says nothing about Sopatros' *Progymnasmata*, much less this hidden chreia elaboration.

<sup>92</sup> It seems that Joseph Glettnier also recognized these fragments on his own. See his "Die Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos," *BZ* 33 (1933) 1-12, 255-70, esp. 262. Glettnier does not refer to Rabe's discussion and in fact mentions only three fragments, not five, as Rabe does. His observations, however, confirm our suspicion of a fragmentary elaboration of a chreia in the commentary of John of Sardis.

<sup>93</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xx-xxxiv: De fontibus.

<sup>94</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xx, where he mentions several passages in the quotations from Theon that are of value for establishing Theon's text and the same for Hermogenes. As far as Nicolaus is concerned, Rabe defers to the discussion in Joseph Felten, ed., *Nicolai Progymnasmata* (Rhetores Graeci 11; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913) praef. xiv-xvi.

was the author of several rhetorical writings, including the Διαίσεις Ζητημάτων, or "Division of Questions."<sup>95</sup> Rabe's real interest is *Quellenforschung*. Consequently, he attempts to reconstruct as much of this lost *Progymnasmata* as possible.

Rabe begins this reconstruction with the eight passages which John of Sardis explicitly cites as coming from Sopatros.<sup>96</sup> Rabe suspects, however, that these eight citations hardly exhaust the use John made of Sopatros. His suspicions are based on John's use of Theon, where seven explicit quotations are only a fraction of the total that can be identified with the help of Theon's text.<sup>97</sup>

In the light of this tacit use of Theon, therefore, Rabe looks for a similar usage of Sopatros' *Progymnasmata*. In order to identify tacit quotations Rabe works backward from the known fragments, noting other passages where Sopatros' language or views are present and assigning them to Sopatros. It is not necessary to review Rabe's entire discussion,<sup>98</sup> only those points that bear on identifying the fragments of the chreia elaboration as having come from Sopatros.

Especially important is the longest explicit citation, which is from Sopatros' θέσις chapter.<sup>99</sup> Included in this lengthy quotation are, as Rabe points out, discussions of four topics, among them the θέσεως διαίρεσις, or formal structure of a thesis, and within this discussion there is a sample θέσις.<sup>100</sup>

The inclusion of a sample *progymnasma*, however, is not restricted to the θέσις chapter. Rabe claims that Sopatros' sample *progymnasmata* are preserved, in whole or in part, in other chapters as well. In the explicit quotation from the μῦθος chapter, for example, Sopatros mentions the fable of the dog with meat who

<sup>95</sup> On Sopatros, see further Stephen Glöckner, "Sopatros (10)," PW 2<sup>nd</sup> series 3.1 (1927) 1002-6; George Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983) 142, 276; and esp. Doreen Innes and Michael Winterbottom, *Sopatros the Rhetor: Studies in the Text of the Διαίσεις Ζητημάτων* (BICS Suppl. 18; London: Institute for Classical Studies, 1988) 1, 13. For the text itself, see 8.2-385 Walz.

<sup>96</sup> For these eight fragments, none of them from the chreia chapter, see Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, 57-70. References to these fragments will not be to this collection but to their page and line numbers in John's commentary.

<sup>97</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxiv.

<sup>98</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxiv-xxix.

<sup>99</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (pp. 247, 13 - 252, 5 Rabe).

<sup>100</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (pp. 248, 7 - 250, 22 Rabe).

looked into a river.<sup>101</sup> Later in the chapter John of Sardis actually narrates this fable, complete with an ἐπιμύθιον, or concluding moral.<sup>102</sup> Rabe argues that since Sopatros had mentioned this fable, he was also the source of its narration.<sup>103</sup> Rabe also observes that in the κοινὸς τόπος chapter Sopatros is explicitly quoted as mentioning tyranny, desertion, and adultery as subjects for sample κοινὸι τόποι;<sup>104</sup> when these three subjects constantly recur as illustrations for sections of a κοινὸς τόπος, Rabe again assigns these illustrations to Sopatros.<sup>105</sup> In the νόμος chapter Rabe finds yet another sample *progymnasma* and attributes it to Sopatros on the basis of stylistic similarities with the explicit quotations.<sup>106</sup>

With these precedents it is possible that John of Sardis may have also included at least portions of a sample chreia elaboration from Sopatros. To be sure, he nowhere cites Sopatros explicitly in his commentary on Aphthonius' chreia chapter. But Rabe nevertheless suspects usage of Sopatros here as well. He proposes several passages,<sup>107</sup> but of importance to us is Rabe's discussion of one in particular. He observes that, while Aphthonius uses *Il.* 2.24—"It ill-suits a counselor to sleep all night"—to illustrate an apotreptic γνώμη, John of Sardis uses this line instead as the saying of a chreia attributed to Alexander the Great.<sup>108</sup> Since he did not get this chreia from Aphthonius, he must have taken it, Rabe argues, from Sopatros.<sup>109</sup> This argument loses some of its force since this chreia appears in Theon as well as in a school papyrus, thereby making it somewhat of a classroom favorite.<sup>110</sup> At any rate, since none of these other sources elaborates this chreia, the

<sup>101</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 1 (p. 7, 1-2 Rabe).

<sup>102</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 1 (p. 13, 8-14 Rabe).

<sup>103</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvi.

<sup>104</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 7 (p. 113, 16-26 Rabe).

<sup>105</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvi-xxvii.

<sup>106</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxv.

<sup>107</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvii-xxviii, where he assigns to Sopatros, besides the fragments of a chreia elaboration, a discussion of the etymology of the word chreia (p. 39, 1-21 Rabe), a sub-division of sayings-chreiai (p. 41, 2-15), and an argument from example (p. 54, 9-17).

<sup>108</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 39, 7-9; 41, 4-6 Rabe).

<sup>109</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvii.

<sup>110</sup> See Theon 88-92 and Text 4. Cf. *Chreia* 1.314-15.

fragments from such an elaboration may well have come, as Rabe claims, from Sopatros.<sup>111</sup>

We conclude that this review of Rabe's discussions has made it likely that Sopatros tended to include illustrative material for the *progymnasma* he was discussing—explicitly so for the θέσις and κοινὸς τόπος and tacitly for the μῦθος and νόμος. This tendency makes the chreia elaboration seem likely, too. We therefore accept Rabe's identification of these fragments of a chreia elaboration as coming from Sopatros.

#### THE PROGYMNASMATA OF SOPATROS

Sopatros' *Progymnasmata* likely conformed to the scope of those other *Progymnasmata* that are known to us. This likelihood derives not only from the conservatism of the rhetorical curriculum, but also from the fragments themselves. They come from chapters long attested since Theon and Hermogenes—μῦθος, χρεία, γνώμη, κοινὸς τόπος, ἐγκώμιον, ἡθοποιία, θέσις, and νόμος. That only eight of the usual fourteen *progymnasmata* are represented is surely due, in part, to the excerpting of John of Sardis, although, as Rabe points out, Sopatros himself apparently did not include chapters on ψόγος and σύγκρισις.<sup>112</sup> Thus the scope of Sopatros' *Progymnasmata* is similar to the traditional series, which was fixed as early as Theon.

In addition, within these standard chapters the fragments from Sopatros treat the usual subjects—definition, etymology, classification, differentiation from similar *progymnasmata*, and prescriptions for composing each *progymnasma*. Nevertheless, one feature of Sopatros' *Progymnasmata* is not typical. This feature is his practice of illustrating the formal parts of a *progymnasma* as he discusses each part rather than illustrating all the parts in an independent sample *progymnasma* at the end of each chapter, as Aphthonius had. A comparison of Sopatros with Aphthonius will highlight the difference.

Aphthonius begins each *progymnasma* with a discussion of its definition, etymology, classification, and compositional features—a discussion that his Byzantine commentators call the

<sup>111</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxvii-xxviii.

<sup>112</sup> See Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, praef. xxix.

μέθοδος.<sup>113</sup> Aphthonius then presents an illustrative, fully worked out, sample *progymnasma*, which they call the μελέτη.<sup>114</sup>

Sopatros' contrasting format is clearest in the longest fragment, that on the θέσις. John of Sardis quotes a portion of Sopatros' μέθοδος, specifically the θέσεως διαίρεσις,<sup>115</sup> in which Sopatros divides the θέσις into its constituent sections, identifying each and sometimes clarifying or illustrating them. Accordingly, he identifies the προοίμιον, or introduction, to a θέσις and clarifies it by saying that it can be single or double. Then he simply names the next section, the ἐκθεσις, or exposition.<sup>116</sup> Then he moves on to the ἐπιχειρήματα, or arguments, that form the body of a θέσις, naming these arguments—ἀπὸ τοῦ δικαίου, ἀπὸ τοῦ νομίμου, ἀπὸ τοῦ συμφέροντος, and ἀπὸ τοῦ δυνατοῦ—and adding an explanatory comment.<sup>117</sup> He also illustrates each argument in turn by arguing a sample θέσις, one which he had announced earlier: whether one should exercise.<sup>118</sup> This style of presentation continues for the following παραδείγματα, or examples; then for the ἀντίθεσις and λύσις, or objection and rebuttal; and finally for the συμπέρασμα, or conclusion.<sup>119</sup>

In other words, in contrast to Aphthonius' format which first lists the formal sections of a *progymnasma* at the end of the μέθοδος and then adds a complete sample *progymnasma*, or μελέτη, Sopatros has, in effect, only a μέθοδος, the μελέτη being embedded in the μέθοδος.

One consequence of this format is that Sopatros' sample *progymnasmata* are usually incomplete—the only exception being the short and simple μῦθος.<sup>120</sup> Usually, though, Sopatros fails to give illustrations for all parts of the various *progymnasmata*. These

<sup>113</sup> See, e.g., Doxapatres, 2.177, 26-31 Walz. See also John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 8 (p. 156, 15 Rabe).

<sup>114</sup> See, e.g., Doxapatres, 2.179, 7-11 Walz. As an example, the μέθοδος of the chreia chapter includes the definition, etymology, and classification of the chreia (Aphthonius 2-17). Then follow a mere list of the formal parts of a chreia elaboration (Aphthonius 18-22) and the μελέτη, a complete chreia elaboration (Aphthonius 23-78).

<sup>115</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (pp. 248, 4 - 250, 22 Rabe).

<sup>116</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 248, 8-9 Rabe).

<sup>117</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (pp. 248, 9 - 249, 19 Rabe).

<sup>118</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 248, 7 Rabe).

<sup>119</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 250, 9-22 Rabe).

<sup>120</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 1 (p. 13, 8-14 Rabe).

omissions may be due to John of Sardis' method of excerpting, but in the case of the extensive quotation from the *θέσις* chapter, such omission is unlikely. At any rate, the opening one or two sections, the *προοίμιον* and the *ἐκθέσις*, are not illustrated,<sup>121</sup> and illustrations are notably lacking in the excerpts for the *κοινὸς τόπος*, although Sopatros' use of three subjects—tyranny, desertion, and adultery—may have made it difficult to keep the illustrations going throughout. In any case, this incompleteness, as we will see, extends to the *chreia* elaboration.

A second consequence of Sopatros' format is that his sample *progymnasmata* tend to be shorter than those provided by Aphthonius. For example, the latter's sample *θέσις*—whether one should marry—is one hundred lines long,<sup>122</sup> but Sopatros' *θέσις*, once the illustrations of the various sections are brought together, is only thirty lines long. This relative brevity is due not only to some sections being unillustrated, but also due to the illustrations being more suggestive of what might be said than complete. For example, Sopatros sometimes indicates the content of an illustration with only a few words. Thus in the sample *θέσις* he mentions Herakles, Minos, and Rhadamanthus as examples of those who had benefitted from exercise, but then develops only the first, saying: "Herakles, because he exercised, became honored, powerful, famous, and immortal; similarly, Minos and Rhadamanthus."<sup>123</sup> At other times Sopatros begins an illustration and then merely says that it should be extended. Thus at the end of illustrations we often find the words *καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα*, or "and so forth." These words are used once in the *θέσις*,<sup>124</sup> three times in the *νόμος*,<sup>125</sup> and twice in the *chreia* elaboration.<sup>126</sup>

A third consequence of Sopatros' format is that it gives him some freedoms that an independent *μελέτη* would not allow him. For example, by embedding his illustrations within the *μέθοδος*, Sopatros could add a clarifying comment that was omitted by Aphthonius who merely lists the sections of *progymnasma* before

<sup>121</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 248, 8-9 Rabe).

<sup>122</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 13 (pp. 42, 11 - 46, 18 Rabe).

<sup>123</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 250, 9-11 Rabe).

<sup>124</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 250, 20 Rabe).

<sup>125</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 14 (pp. 265, 28; 266, 6-7, 11 Rabe).

<sup>126</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 46, 18; 48, 11 Rabe).

writing the complete *progymnasma* himself. In Sopatros' discussion of the θέσις, for example, he adds this comment regarding the ἀντίθεσις-λύσις, or objection-rebuttal, section: "Then you will make use of one ἀντίθεσις in order that those who are being trained in rhetoric might have some experience in the use of them."<sup>127</sup> Then he adds: "Generally, λύσεις will be expressed by means of a comparison."<sup>128</sup>

Occasionally, Sopatros could even give a right and wrong illustration of a section of a *progymnasma*, something that Aphthonius' format made impossible. For example, in the κοινὸς τόπος, Sopatros discusses the παρέκβασις, or digression, section, in which the common type of person being attacked—in this case, an adulterer—is also assumed to have other vices. Sopatros warns that these other vices must be appropriate to the type being attacked. He says:

Otherwise this section is unpersuasive and ridiculous, whenever, for example, we are speaking against an adulterer and say, "It is probable that this man also hates the city and has been counted among its enemies." These vices are foreign to adultery. Rather, we will say: "This man formerly behaved arrogantly—he beat many slaves, corrupted children, succumbed to beauty, and was a slave to his belly."<sup>129</sup>

To sum up: In contrast to Aphthonius who kept the theoretical μέθοδος and illustrative μελέτη sections of each chapter separate, Sopatros preferred to incorporate his illustrative material within his theoretical discussion. The consequences of this format made for sample *progymnasmata* that, if separated out from the μέθοδος, would be incomplete, brief, and, occasionally, illustrative of what should and should not be said. Since these characteristics apply across all the explicit fragments preserved by John of Sardis, we now have a precise literary context for analyzing Sopatros' fragmentary chreia elaboration.

#### SOPATROS' CHREIA ELABORATION

The analysis of Sopatros' chreia elaboration will proceed in two steps. First, we will view this elaboration in terms of the format,

<sup>127</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 250, 12-14 Rabe).

<sup>128</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 13 (p. 250, 17-18 Rabe).

<sup>129</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 7 (p. 102, 8-14 Rabe).



established above, of Sopatros' *Progymnasmata* as a whole. Then, we will compare this elaboration to Aphthonius' sample chreia elaboration in order to determine the extent to which Sopatros represents a tradition that was unaffected by the authority that Aphthonius exercised over later writers of such elaborations.

When we analyze the fragments of the chreia elaboration in the light of Sopatros' habits throughout his *Progymnasmata*, we find that these features appear in the chreia elaboration as well. For example, the incompleteness of the chreia elaboration has already been pointed out. Illustrations remain only for the last five κεφάλαια (using Aphthonius' terms): ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολή, παράδειγμα, μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, and ἐπίλογος βραχύς.

There is still one question to be answered, however, and that is whether the illustrations for the first three κεφάλαια—ἐγκωμιαστικόν, παραφραστικόν, and αἰτία—were overlooked by John of Sardis or were never included by Sopatros. For the first two κεφάλαια it is likely that Sopatros did not provide illustrations, since illustrations for the equivalent two sections of the most fully preserved sample *progymnasma*, the θέσις—namely, the προοίμιον and the ἔκθεσις—are likewise omitted. For the third κεφάλαιον, the αἰτία, however, it is less likely that Sopatros omitted an illustration. All the other argumentative sections of the elaboration are illustrated, suggesting that this one was, too. For whatever reason John of Sardis was content with a very brief comment on the αἰτία and hence did not to turn to Sopatros for an illustration of it.<sup>130</sup>

Besides being incomplete, Sopatros' chreia elaboration is also much briefer than that of Aphthonius, being approximately twenty-five per cent shorter than the last five κεφάλαια of Aphthonius' elaboration. It should be added, however, that Sopatros twice ends his illustrations with καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα,<sup>131</sup> so that he imagined a complete elaboration that would be longer than the suggestions he provided.

The third feature of Sopatros' sample *progymnasmata* is his provision of right and wrong illustrations, or at least alternative ones. At first glance, this feature also appears in the chreia elaboration, for John of Sardis provides two illustrations. One clearly

<sup>130</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 46, 8-11 Rabe).

<sup>131</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 46, 18; 48, 11 Rabe).

belongs to the Alexander-Diogenes chreia (6). The other illustration is as follows: "Do you wish to see the benefits of rhetoric? Look at Demosthenes."<sup>132</sup> This illustration hardly fits the theme of the elaboration, and it appears in a discussion of the definition of a παράδειγμα, so that it may be unrelated to any elaboration. Hence, while Sopatros may be the source of this illustration—it is found in no other author—it is still only merely possible, and we have not included it in our reconstructed text of Sopatros' elaboration.

Thus, while we have found that Sopatros' chreia elaboration fits in with what we know of his sample *progymnasmata* as a whole, we also need to compare it with Aphthonius' sample elaboration, so that we can estimate the fluidity of the elaboration tradition before Aphthonius became the norm. Put differently, does Sopatros preserve a pre-Aphthonian tradition in the composition of a chreia elaboration?

In one sense the answer is no, for the structure of an elaboration was already fixed centuries earlier, as is clear from what Hermogenes said at the end of the second century A.D. about the eight κεφάλαια that make up an elaboration.<sup>133</sup> In other, if less dramatic, senses, however, the answer is yes. There was room for variation in terminology, contents, and phrasing. In other words, Sopatros' sample elaboration is valuable precisely because it exhibits some of the fluidity that was later lost when Aphthonius' elaboration became the sole model for imitation.

For example, in three of Sopatros' five preserved κεφάλαια we note a variation in terminology. Sopatros speaks of the fourth κεφάλαιον as ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου (4), whereas Aphthonius has ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου.<sup>134</sup> That both are translated "From the Opposite," however, shows how insignificant this variation is. And yet, greater variation is apparent in the terminology for the seventh κεφάλαιον. Aphthonius calls it μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, or "Testimony of the Ancients."<sup>135</sup> But Sopatros uses very different language: ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων κρίσεως, or "From the Judgment of Others" (7).

<sup>132</sup> John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 47, 12-13 Rabe).

<sup>133</sup> See Hermogenes 30-62.

<sup>134</sup> See Aphthonius 20.

<sup>135</sup> See Aphthonius 20.

The difference in terminology, though, does not suggest a difference in content as both Sopatros and Aphthonius understand this κεφάλαιον to require the citation of some classical author whose opinion is the same as that of the πρόσωπον in the chreia. Finally, Sopatros' terminology for the eighth κεφάλαιον is also different—παράκλησις, or "Exhortation" (8) vs. Aphthonius' ἐπίλογος βραχύς, or "Brief Epilogue"<sup>136</sup>—but once again the contents are the same.

Surprisingly, the only difference in content occurs in the fifth κεφάλαιον, where both use the same term: παραβολή (5).<sup>137</sup> The difference arises because each seems to be using a different definition of the word παραβολή. John of Sardis explains the difference when distinguishing a παραβολή from a παράδειγμα.<sup>138</sup> He distinguishes these terms in two ways. On the one hand, a παραβολή, he says, uses ἀόριστα <πρόσωπα>, or unspecified persons, while a παράδειγμα uses ὠρισμένα <πρόσωπα>, or specific individuals,<sup>139</sup> and it is this distinction that Aphthonius uses, speaking in the παραβολή of unspecified farmers (οἱ γῆν ἐργαζόμενοι) but of the specific individual Demosthenes in the παράδειγμα.<sup>140</sup> On the other hand, John of Sardis restricts a παραβολή to inanimate or irrational creatures and the παράδειγμα to humans or gods.<sup>141</sup> Sopatros seems to have used this distinction, for his παραβολή refers to drowsy creatures (τὰ ὑπνώττοντα τῶν ζώων) (5) and his παράδειγμα to Themistocles and Demosthenes (6).

One other difference between Sopatros and Aphthonius has to do with phrasing and syntax. Sopatros' elaboration contains virtually none of Aphthonius' phrases and syntactical constructions that were imitated so consistently by later writers of chreia elaborations.<sup>142</sup> Only the opening phrase of the παραβολή section—"Ὡσπερ γάρ (5)—reflects Aphthonian style,<sup>143</sup> but this way of beginning an analogy is so common that it hardly qualifies as Aphthonian.

<sup>136</sup> See Aphthonius 21-22.

<sup>137</sup> See Aphthonius 20.

<sup>138</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 47, 13 - 48, 5 Rabe).

<sup>139</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 47, 14-15 Rabe).

<sup>140</sup> See Aphthonius 59-70.

<sup>141</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 47, 15 - 48, 1 Rabe).

<sup>142</sup> For details, see the introductions to Texts 24-36.

<sup>143</sup> See Aphthonius 59.

This comparison of Sopatros and Aphthonius has shown sufficient variation in terminology, content, and style so that we can speak of a limited freedom in composing elaborations in the centuries leading up to Aphthonius, although even that limited freedom was soon lost as Aphthonius became the standard to imitate as closely as possible.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The relevant sections of Rabe's edition of John of Sardis' commentary on Aphthonius are, of course, the basis of our reconstructed text of Sopatros' fragmentary chreia elaboration, both the chreia itself and the five preserved κεφάλαια.<sup>144</sup> We have numbered the κεφάλαια and have put the corresponding page and line numbers of Rabe's edition after each κεφάλαιον for easier reference. Changes from Rabe's text are clearly noted in the apparatus.

Finally, so far as we know, this is the first translation of Sopatros' elaboration into any language.

#### TEXT

<Ἔστω δὲ προκειμένη χρεία> Ἀλέξανδρος, ἰδὼν Διογένην καθεύδοντα, εἶπεν·

Οὐ χρή παννύχιον εὔδειν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα (*Il.* 2.24). (41, 4-7)

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> (fortasse non expositum ab Sopatro)

2. <Παραφραστικόν> (fortasse non expositum ab Sopatro)

3. <Αἰτία> (fortasse omissum ab Ioanno Sardiano)

4. <Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Ὁ δὲ ἀγρυπνῶν φροντίζει τὰ εἰκότα, ἅει τὸν νοῦν ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἔχει, διορᾷ, τί μὴ δεόν ποιεῖν καὶ τί δεόν, καὶ τῶν συμφερόντων ἐστὶ κριτής. (46, 15-18)

5. <Παραβολή> Ὡσπερ γὰρ τὰ ὑπνώττοντα τῶν ζώων εὐάλωτα ὄντα πολλοῖς περιπίπτει κακοῖς, τὰ δὲ συνεχῶς ἐγρηγορότα διασφύζει θᾶττον αὐτὰ, οὕτω καὶ οἱ πολλῶ κεχρημένοι τῷ ὕπνῳ μηδὲν τῶν δεόντων φροντίζοντες πολλοῖς κακοῖς περιπίπτουσι. (47, 5-9)

6. <Παράδειγμα> Οὕτω Θεμιστοκλῆς ἀγρυπνῶν καὶ τὸν χρησὸν ἐπελύσατο καὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα διέσωσεν, οὕτω καὶ Δημοσθένης ὕπνῳ

<sup>144</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (pp. 41, 46-48, and 50 Rabe).

μη κεχρημένος πολλῶ καὶ νυκτὸς τῆς τέχνης ἐπιμελόμενος ῥήτωρ γεγένηται ὁ μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος ἀοίδιμος. (48, 7-11)

7. <Ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων κρίσεως> Καὶ οὐ μόνον Ἀλέξανδρος τοῦτο ἐπὶ Διογένους ἔκρινεν . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ τῶν παλαιῶν, ὡς Πυθαγόρας ὁ Σάμιος ὕπνου φείδεσθαι συνεβούλευεν. (48, 14-15, 16-18)

8. <Παράκλησις> Καλῶς ἄρα τὸ ἔπος [ἧ τόνδε τὸν λόγον] Ἀλέξανδρος πρὸς Διογένην ἐφθέγγετο. (50, 10-12)

introductio: ἔστω προκειμένη χρεία addidimus; cf. 52, 6-7 8 ἧ τόνδε τὸν λόγον fortasse delendum

## TRANSLATION

<Let the assigned chreia be>: Alexander, on seeing Diogenes asleep, said:

“It ill-suits a counsellor to sleep all night” (*Il.* 2.24).<sup>145</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> (perhaps not included by Sopatros)

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> (perhaps not included by Sopatros)

3. <Rationale> (perhaps omitted by John of Sardis)

4. <From the Opposite> The one who stays awake thinks about what is likely to happen; he always has his mind on affairs; he distinguishes what one ought and ought not to do, and is a good judge of what is advantageous, and so forth.

5. <Analogy> For just as drowsy creatures are susceptible, and fall prey, to many evils, whereas those that are constantly alert more readily keep themselves safe, so also men who are accustomed to much sleep and do not worry about their responsibilities encounter many evils.

6. <Example> In the same way, Themistocles, because he slept little,<sup>146</sup> both explained the oracle and saved Hellas;<sup>147</sup> and

<sup>145</sup> On this chreia, see further *Chreia* 1.314-15.

<sup>146</sup> On Themistocles' habit of sleeping very little, see Plutarch, *Them.* 3.3-4.

<sup>147</sup> On Themistocles' famous interpretation of the Delphic oracle calling for a “wooden wall” as Athens' salvation against the Persians, which Themistocles interpreted as meaning a naval fleet, see Herodotus, 7.140-41, and Plutarch,

Demosthenes, too, because he was not accustomed to much sleep and practised his craft at night, became an orator who is famous down to the present time,<sup>148</sup> and so forth.

7. <From the Judgement of Others> And so not only did Alexander make this judgement about Diogenes . . ., but so have many other ancient authorities, such as Pythagoras of Samos, who used to counsel, "Sleep sparingly."<sup>149</sup>

8. <Exhortation> Properly, then, did Alexander utter the line<sup>150</sup> [or this saying] to Diogenes.

*Them.* 10.3, and which led to the decisive defeat of the Persians in the sea-battle off Salamis in 480 B.C., see Herodotus, 8.83-96; Thucydides, 1.73-74; Plutarch, *Them.* 17; and N. G. L. Hammond, *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* (3rd ed.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986) 237-44.

<sup>148</sup> On Demosthenes' reputation for burning the midnight oil, see, e.g., Plutarch, *Demosth.* 8.4; Quintilian, 10.3.25; Aelian, *V.H.* 7.7a; and ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 844D. Demosthenes' later fame is indicated, e.g., by his becoming known as simply "the orator" (see Nicolaus 62).

<sup>149</sup> On Pythagoras, born ca. 570 B.C., whose philosophy stressed an ascetic lifestyle in general, see Diogenes Laertius, 8.9, 13, 19, 23-24, although the specific counsel to sleep sparingly appears only rarely; see *Golden Verses* 9-10: κρατεῖν δ' εἰθιζέο . . . ὕπνου ("accustom yourself to be a master of . . . sleep), and Johan C. Thom, *The Pythagorean Golden Verses: With Introduction and Commentary* (RGRW 123; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995) 126-30.

<sup>150</sup> That is, *Il.* 2.24, the Homeric line being elaborated.

Texts 20-23. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3  
(8.63-102 Foerster)

Introduction

LIFE AND WRITINGS

In some ways Libanius resembles Cicero. That is, from his voluminous published works as an orator and especially from the enormous amount of personal correspondence we have a remarkably clear and detailed account of his life, as we do for the Roman statesman. Indeed, in the case of Libanius George Kennedy ventures the assessment that "we have more detailed information about the career, works, and personality of Libanius than about any other Greek of any period."<sup>151</sup> Much of the information about his life to which Kennedy refers is to be found, of course, in Libanius' autobiography (*Orat.* 1).<sup>152</sup> He first composed this lengthy account of his life in 374, when, at age 60, he

<sup>151</sup> Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 151. Libanius' voluminous writings are available in the magisterial edition of Richard Foerster, ed., *Libanii Opera* (12 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1903-1927). A small selection of his orations and letters is available in the LCL: Albert Francis Norman, ed. and trans., *Libanius: Selected Works* (2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969), and *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters* (2 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992). Recent translations into English of some other works of Libanius include: *Orat.* 59 (4.208-96 Foerster) in Samuel N. L. Lieu and Dominic Montserrat, eds., *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views* (New York: Routledge, 1996) 164-205 (trans. only); *Orat.* 64 (4.420-98 Foerster), in Margaret E. Molloy, *Libanius and the Dancers* (AWTS 31; Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1996) 114-76 (text and trans.); *Decl.* 36 and 44 (7.207-33 and 480-521), in Michael Heath, *Hermogenes, On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) 198-208 and 160-75 (trans. only); and *Progymn.* 7.3 (8.182-94) in Richard M. Ratzan and Gary B. Ferngren, "A Greek Progymnasma on the Physician-Poisoner," *JHM* 48 (1993) 157-70, esp. 163-70 (trans. only).

<sup>152</sup> For text and translation of this oration (1.79-206 Foerster), along with extensive commentary, see Albert Francis Norman, ed. and trans., *Libanius' Autobiography: Oration I* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965), with extensive commentary (pp. 146-235). The translation of this oration is also available in Norman's LCL edition of Libanius: *Autobiography and Selected Letters*, 1.52-337.

had finally settled in Antioch, to roam no more; in subsequent years he attached several addenda which brought the account almost up to the time of his death in 393.<sup>153</sup>

Modern accounts of Libanius' life and writings are readily available, and we have little that is new to add here on the general course of his life, so that for the most part a capsuled version of the standard presentations must suffice.<sup>154</sup> We will pay special attention, however, to his role as a teacher of rhetoric and to his reputed teacher-student relationship with Severus of Alexandria and Aphthonius of Antioch, since these two men composed *progymnasmata*.

But first the salient events of Libanius' life. He was born in A.D. 314, the second of three boys into a wealthy and illustrious family of Syrian Antioch.<sup>155</sup> He received his early education in his native city where, after a lackadaisical beginning, he acquired "an intense love"<sup>156</sup> for the ancient authors<sup>157</sup> that prompted him to adopt the life of an intellectual.<sup>158</sup> Indeed, the young Libanius soon dreamed of studying rhetoric in Athens<sup>159</sup> and indeed got to go there in 336, but his experiences in Athens were disappointing

<sup>153</sup> The original edition of the autobiography occupies only slightly more than half of *Oration 1* (1-155). Eight, perhaps nine, addenda, starting as early as 380 and ending in 393, have been distinguished. For details, see Norman, *Libanius: Autobiography*, 7-9.

<sup>154</sup> See, e.g., Gottfried R. Sievers, *Das Leben des Libanius* (Berlin: Weidmann, 1868); Richard Foerster and Karl Münscher, "Libanios," *PW* 12 (1925) 2485-2551, esp. 2485-98; Wilhelm Schmid and Otto Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (HAW 7.2.1-2; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1912-1924) 2.987-96; Norman, *Libanius' Autobiography*, vii-xii; A.-J. Festugière, *Antioch païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie* (Paris: E. de Boccard, 1959) 91-119; J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972) 1-39; and Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 150-63.

<sup>155</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.2-4, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2487.

<sup>156</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.5: *δριμύς τις ἔρως*.

<sup>157</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.8.

<sup>158</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.11.

<sup>159</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.11-13.



as he encountered mediocre teachers, unruly students, and political intrigue.<sup>160</sup> The intrigue ended with Libanius having an offer to teach at Athens withdrawn.<sup>161</sup>

Libanius then left Athens with his friend Crispinus, and the two of them lectured from city to city on their way back to Crispinus' home in Herakleia.<sup>162</sup> Libanius continued to travel, however, visiting the new capital of Constantinople, then Athens, and then on returning to Constantinople he taught in a private capacity. His tenure was brief, from 341 to 342, but successful, as he soon attracted eighty students. He was forced to leave, however, because of jealous rivals and political intrigue.<sup>163</sup> Libanius then got another private teaching position, this time in Nicea in Bithynia. His stay, however, was quite brief, for he was soon appointed, in 344, as the official sophist of neighboring Nicomedeia, a position he held for five years (344-348).<sup>164</sup>

Libanius had fond memories of his tenure in Nicomedeia, saying that during those years he enjoyed "health of body, contentment of soul, frequent opportunity to give declamations, audiences leaping up in praise at each declamation, study at night, hard work during the day, honors, good will, and affection."<sup>165</sup> Indeed, it was a proud Libanius who could note that Nicomedeia had replaced Athens as the city of choice for residents of Bithynia to send their sons to study rhetoric.<sup>166</sup>

But this idyllic period was shattered by the jealousy of rival sophists, by charges of sorcery, by journeys to stand trial, and, finally, by an imperial decree that summoned him back to Constantinople in 349.<sup>167</sup> His return trip to the capital he compared to the grief captives feel at being taken from home, and his abiding love for Bithynia led, in 350 and 351, to short vacation trips back to Nicomedeia, though they were made even shorter by plague

<sup>160</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.18-25.

<sup>161</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.25, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2488-89.

<sup>162</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.26-33.

<sup>163</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.34-47.

<sup>164</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.48, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios" 2489-90.

<sup>165</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.51, and Festugière, *Antioch païenne*, 98.

<sup>166</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.53.

<sup>167</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.62-74.

and famine.<sup>168</sup> Nevertheless, Libanius had considerable success in Constantinople in terms of students, honors, and income, and his success even led to an offer to teach in Athens, but, given the professional rivalries there that typically led to physical violence, he declined the offer.<sup>169</sup>

Instead, Libanius sought and received permission from the emperor Gallus (351-354) to visit his native Antioch for four months during the summer of 353. He later recalled that visit quite vividly:

I beheld my beloved streets and gates, I beheld the temples and stoas, I beheld the old walls of my home, I beheld the gray hair of my mother, I beheld her brother who still had the name of father,<sup>170</sup> I beheld my older brother who was already called grandfather, my classmates (some of them governors, others advocates), a few of my father's friends, and my city made strong by an abundance of wise men.<sup>171</sup>

It seems that the city of Antioch was just as happy to have Libanius back, for he claims that his declamations received such enthusiastic applause that the audience began to call on the emperor to return him to Antioch permanently, which is precisely what he desired.<sup>172</sup> Consequently, once back in Constantinople, Libanius began negotiating his return. He sought political allies in his attempt to get the emperor to agree to his return, but he also appealed to his doctors, arguing that Antioch, not the capital, was the place to treat his migraine headaches, an affliction which had troubled him ever since, at age twenty, he had been struck by a thunderbolt shortly before he left Antioch for the first time in 334. Libanius succeeded in getting medical leave and hence headed back to his home city in the spring of 354.<sup>173</sup>

<sup>168</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.75, 77.

<sup>169</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.79-85, and Festugière, *Antioch païenne*, 98-99.

<sup>170</sup> Libanius regarded his mother's brother, his uncle Phasganius, as a father following his own father's death in 325 when Libanius was only eleven (*Orat.* 1.4). Phasganius persuaded his sister to allow Libanius to study in Athens (13), engaged his daughter to Libanius (though she died before they could marry) (99), and was deeply missed when he died in 359 (117).

<sup>171</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.86.

<sup>172</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.87-88, 92.

<sup>173</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.94-95, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2490-91, and Festugière, *Antioch païenne*, 99. For the incident in which he was struck by a thunderbolt, see *Orat.* 1.9, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 149.

That fall he opened a school with about fifteen students, most of whom he had brought with him from Constantinople. The enrollment soon more than doubled,<sup>174</sup> and in the spring of 355 he was appointed official sophist of his native city, a position he would hold for the remainder of his life.<sup>175</sup>

During his years in Antioch Libanius not only carried on his teaching career, but was also involved in the political life of the city. Indeed, the latter far outweighs the former in his account of these years, in part because his position as official sophist placed him in the center of political life in Antioch. Thus he met, befriended, and addressed emperors; had to deal with the stream of governors who came to Antioch; and was called upon to give speeches at religious festivals, at times of crisis, or at the deaths of friends and relatives.

On the political side, it seems that his relations with the emperor Julian (361-363) were the most satisfying. To be sure, Julian had become acquainted with Libanius, or at least with his speeches, years earlier when Libanius was teaching in Nicomedeia,<sup>176</sup> but it was not until the emperor's nine-month visit to Antioch, beginning in July 362,<sup>177</sup> when he was en route to a campaign against Persia, that the two became staunch friends, bound by their common love for rhetoric and the pagan gods. Libanius had a high regard for Julian's rhetorical abilities<sup>178</sup> and he rejoiced at the accession of the pagan Julian in 361, for it meant that once again "altars received animal sacrifices, their smoke bore the aroma of burning fat to heaven, and the gods were honored with festivals."<sup>179</sup>

<sup>174</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.101-2. Cf. also Libanius, *Ep.* 6.4-6.

<sup>175</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.101-2, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2491. Libanius' appointment as official sophist follows the death of his former teacher Zenobius (see *Orat.* 1.104-5).

<sup>176</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 18.13.

<sup>177</sup> On this visit, see Libanius, *Orat.* 1.118-32; 18.164-203; Ammianus Marcellinus, 22.9.14-14.6; and Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conflict* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961) 381-96.

<sup>178</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.120, where he praises the emperor as ῥητορικώτατος.

<sup>179</sup> Libanius, *Orat.* 1.119.

Once in Antioch Julian was eager to hear Libanius speak.<sup>180</sup> Indeed, as official sophist Libanius welcomed him to Antioch with a speech,<sup>181</sup> and at the following New Year's festival he spoke on the emperor's entry into the consulship.<sup>182</sup> The latter speech so impressed Julian that he leapt to his feet in applause.<sup>183</sup> And at his departure for Persia in early March Julian again praised Libanius highly.<sup>184</sup> Libanius' tears of sadness at the emperor's departure<sup>185</sup> soon became tears of grief, however, when Julian was killed a couple months later during the campaign against the Persians.<sup>186</sup> Indeed, on hearing the news of his death Libanius was unable to write, since, as he put it, using the words of Euripides, "One day has deprived me of every happiness."<sup>187</sup>

But, aside from Libanius' speaking before emperors and in regard to various political matters, he remained first and foremost a teacher of rhetoric.<sup>188</sup> Scattered throughout his autobiography and letters are references to his activities as a teacher. He had first taught at home on his return to Antioch, but he soon moved to a shop near the agora and then to a permanent location, the βουλευτήριον, or city hall.<sup>189</sup> His daily schedule entailed teaching until noon, as other teachers did, but the large number of students often required his attention until dark,<sup>190</sup> and it was not unusual for

<sup>180</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.120. Libanius' Julianic orations (*Orat.* 12-18, 24) are available in vol. 1 of Norman, *Selected Works*.

<sup>181</sup> For this speech, *Orat.* 13 (2.63-82 Foerster), see Norman, *Selected Works*, 1.2-33.

<sup>182</sup> For this speech, *Orat.* 12 (2.9-45 Foerster), see Norman, *Selected Works*, 1.36-97.

<sup>183</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.129, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 184.

<sup>184</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.131.

<sup>185</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.132.

<sup>186</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.133-34.

<sup>187</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 111.2, citing Euripides, *Hecuba* 285. Cf. Norman, *Autobiography*, 188: "The death of Julian was indeed the one real tragedy of Libanius' life up to this time."

<sup>188</sup> See Liebeschuetz, *Antioch*, 8, and esp. Festugière, *Antioch païenne*, 101-11.

<sup>189</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.101-2, 104.

<sup>190</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.108. Cf. Libanius, *Epp.* 29.4 and 45.2, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 177.

him to stay up all night to write or even to write during an illness.<sup>191</sup> The students, too, were up at cockcrow to practice their speeches,<sup>192</sup> and they imitated not only classical authors like Demosthenes but also more contemporary ones like their teacher Libanius; in fact, it is a proud Libanius who ended the original edition of his autobiography with precisely this claim: that his speeches were being read by teachers and students alike.<sup>193</sup>

Indeed, the time Libanius spent at writing, to judge from the many references he makes to this activity,<sup>194</sup> constituted a principal part of his life, and the output of his writing makes him one of the most prolific writers of any period in antiquity.<sup>195</sup> His extant writings, if we leave aside the question of authenticity, consist of some 64 orations, 51 declamations, 144 *progymnasmata*, and over 1600 letters.<sup>196</sup> Besides the autobiography, the most famous and important of his orations are his encomium of Antioch<sup>197</sup> and his funeral oration on the emperor Julian.<sup>198</sup> Noteworthy among the declamations are the apology of Socrates<sup>199</sup> and the self-denunciation of a δῦσκολος, or ill-tempered man, who has a talkative wife.<sup>200</sup>

<sup>191</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.109, 142.

<sup>192</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 25.7 (= *Ep.* 36.7 Norman).

<sup>193</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.155. Cf. also Eunapius, *VS* 496, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 193-94.

<sup>194</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.98, 109, 112, 117, 129, 141, 155, 169, 189, 208, 220, 223, 232, 253, 266, 267.

<sup>195</sup> For a comprehensive survey of Libanius' writings, see Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2498-2529.

<sup>196</sup> The orations fill the first four volumes of Foerster's Teubner edition, the declamations volumes five through seven, the *progymnasmata* volume eight, and the correspondence volumes ten and eleven. Volume nine contains extensive prolegomena to the letters as well as the ps.-Libanian *Characteres epistolici*, which is translated in Abraham J. Malherbe, *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (SBLBS 19; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986) 66-81.

<sup>197</sup> *Orat.* 11 (1.437-535 Foerster); translation in Glanville Downey, "Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch," *PAPhS* 103 (1959) 652-86, esp. 656-81.

<sup>198</sup> *Orat.* 18 (2.236-371 Foerster); text and translation in the Loeb edition: Norman, *Selected Works*, 1.278-487.

<sup>199</sup> *Decl.* 1 (5.13-121 Foerster). Cf. Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2509.

<sup>200</sup> *Decl.* 26 (6.511-44 Foerster). Cf. Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2514, and esp. Russell, *Declamation*, 91-96.

In many ways, Libanius is the last great pagan Greek writer. He remained a champion of old, traditional values and consequently was an advocate of pagan gods and festivals,<sup>201</sup> but he seems, as A. F. Norman says, to have avoided “the extremism of reactionary paganism.”<sup>202</sup> Consequently, some Christians were among Libanius’ friends and students. Indeed, of the almost 200 students who have been gleaned from Libanius’ letters and orations by Paul Petit, at least a dozen can be identified as Christian.<sup>203</sup> For example, the Cappadocian Amphilochius, a student in 361-362, gained rhetorical skills that “caused old men to leap up” in applause, as a proud Libanius later put it;<sup>204</sup> Amphilochius, after being a rhetor in Constantinople, became bishop of Iconium (373-394) and was later made a saint.<sup>205</sup> In addition, Libanius had links with other, more famous Cappadocians, in particular Basil the Great. Basil may have been a student or, at least, an auditor of Libanius,<sup>206</sup> and a small body of correspondence between Basil and Libanius is extant.<sup>207</sup> At least some of the letters

<sup>201</sup> See esp. Libanius’ joy at the ascension of Julian and his attempt to restore the pagan system of gods and sacrifices (*Orat.* 1.118-19).

<sup>202</sup> Norman, *Autobiography*, viii.

<sup>203</sup> See Paul Petit, *Les Étudiants de Libanius: Un professeur de faculté et ses élèves au bas empire* (Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1956) 196.

<sup>204</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 144 (= *Ep.* 1543 Foerster).

<sup>205</sup> On Amphilochius (= *PRLE* 1.58 [4]), see Petit, *Étudiants*, 54, 125, and esp. 128. Cf. also Barry Baldwin, “Amphilochios of Ikonion,” *ODB* 1, 80.

<sup>206</sup> See Foerster, *Opera* 9.198; Petit, *Étudiants*, 40, 125 n. 163, and Philip Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994) 57-59.

<sup>207</sup> This correspondence is readily available in the LCL edition of Basil’s letters, as *Epp.* 335-59 (= 11.572-97 Foerster).

may be genuine,<sup>208</sup> and they document the numbers of Cappadocian youths, such as Firminus,<sup>209</sup> whom Basil persuaded to study rhetoric with Libanius.<sup>210</sup>

In fact, Libanius' students came from all over the Greek East,<sup>211</sup> and most, of course, were pagan. Seventy-five are clearly so.<sup>212</sup> One of them, a certain Eusebius, Libanius ranks among his very best students,<sup>213</sup> and several others also receive his praise. For example, he praised Apringius for his desire to study rhetoric,<sup>214</sup> he praised his own son Cimon for his rhetorical skill as an advocate,<sup>215</sup> and he praised Calliopius for his assistance in the classroom.<sup>216</sup>

Of special interest to us, however, are two other students of Libanius who, like Calliopius, became teachers, but who, like Libanius, also wrote sample *progymnasmata*. The first is Severus

<sup>208</sup> The authenticity of this correspondence has been much debated, with Foerster (*Opera* 9.198) being quite skeptical, accepting only *Epp.* 501 (10.476-77) and 647 (10.591-92 as genuine. More recently, however, judgment has moved toward accepting more letters as authentic (see esp. Petit, *Étudiants*, 40, 126 nn. 167 and 168). Paul Jonathan Fedwick ("A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea," in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic* [2 vols.; ed. J. P. Fedwick; Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981] 1.3-19, esp. 5 n. 19) accepts nine: Basil, *Epp.* 335-41, 344, 346, 358. Cf. also Rousseau, *Basil*, 57.

<sup>209</sup> On Firminus, see *PRLE* 1.339 (3) and Petit, *Étudiants*, 126-27.

<sup>210</sup> See esp. Basil, *Epp.* 335-39, and Petit, *Étudiants*, 114-15.

<sup>211</sup> See Libanius, *Epp.* 4.10; 6.4-5 (= *Epp.* 391, 405 Foerster), and the comprehensive chart in Petit, *Étudiants*, 114.

<sup>212</sup> See Petit, *Étudiants*, 196.

<sup>213</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.188. The identity of this Eusebius is unsure (cf. Norman, *Autobiography*, 204).

<sup>214</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 62 (= *Ep.* 150 Foerster). Cf. *PRLE* 1.86. Cf. also *Epp.* 1170-71 Foerster and Petit, *Étudiants*, 18, 143 n. 33, and 180-81.

<sup>215</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 169.3 (= *Ep.* 959 Foerster).

<sup>216</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 62.35 (4.364, 5-18 Foerster); *Ep.* 188.6 (= *Ep.* 1063 Foerster). Cf. *PRLE* 1.175 (4) and esp. Peter Wolf, *Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike: Studien zu Libanius* (Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1952) 69. Petit (*Étudiants*, 84) estimates that Libanius accepted 35-50 students each year, making it impossible for him to teach them all by himself, so that assistants were required, largely to assist in "l'explication des grands textes classiques" (p. 87 n. 208; cf. Wolf, *Schulwesen*, 64-65), precisely what is said of Calliopius' responsibilities (*Ep.* 189.1 [= *Ep.* 1064 Foerster]).

of Alexandria, whose preserved *progymnasmata* include six διηγήματα and eight ῥητοποιίαι.<sup>217</sup> But it was not until the detective work of Otmar Schissel that this Severus was identified as a student of Libanius. Previously, he was identified as a Roman Severus who was *consul ordinarius* in 470.<sup>218</sup> Schissel, however, discovered a Severus in an oration of Libanius<sup>219</sup> and identified this Severus as the writer of the διηγήματα and ῥητοποιίαι printed under this name.<sup>220</sup>

Schissel's identification of Severus of Alexandria as one of Libanius' students has been accepted by scholars ever since,<sup>221</sup> and Petit has gathered all the information in Libanius' writings about him. Thus, Severus came from Alexandria to Antioch to learn rhetoric from Libanius, probably during the reign of Valens (364-378), but he left in his second year at the order of his father who wanted to capitalize on his son's talents; he did indeed succeed as an advocate and later served as a governor of Syria.<sup>222</sup> The collection of sample διηγήματα and ῥητοποιίαι—many of the latter re-edited by Schissel and his students—also suggests a career in teaching.<sup>223</sup> But since Severus' extant *progymnasmata* contain no chreia elaborations we need not pursue him any further.

The second student who wrote sample *progymnasmata* is Aphthonius of Antioch. He is clearly Libanius' most influential student, given the subsequent prominence of his *Progymnasmata*

<sup>217</sup> See 1.537-48 Walz.

<sup>218</sup> So, e.g., Christ-Schmid, *Geschichte*, 1027.

<sup>219</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 57.2 (4.150-51 Foerster).

<sup>220</sup> See Otmar Schissel, "Severus von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.," *BNJ* 8 (1929-30) 1-13, esp. 1-3.

<sup>221</sup> See, e.g., Karl Gerth, "Severos von Alexandria," *PWSup* 8 (1956) 715-18, and Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.110.

<sup>222</sup> See Petit, *Étudiants*, 25, 62, 64, 81, 155, and 187. Cf. also Otto Seeck, "Severus (36)," *PW* 2A (1923) 2005-6.

<sup>223</sup> Of the eight sample ῥητοποιίαι, six have been re-edited: no. 3 (1.541 Walz) by Josef Glettner ("Severos von Alexandria," *BNJ* 9 [1930-31] 96-103); no. 4 (1.543-44 Walz) by Anna Staudacher (*BNJ* 10 [1932-33] 321-24); no. 5 (1.544 Walz) by Fr. P. Karthaler (*BNJ* 8 [1929-30] 327-30); no. 7 (1.545-46 Walz) by Schissel (*BNJ* 8 [1929-30] 1-13); and no. 8 (1.546-48 Walz) by Karl Pichler (*BNJ* 11 [1934-35] 11-24). No. 2 (1.540-41 Walz), however, has been reassigned to Theodorus of Kynopolis by Schissel ("Theodorus von Kynopolis," *BNJ* 8 [1929-30] 331-49).



in the *Corpus Hermogenianum* and hence his profound influence on the intellectual culture of Europe until the rise of industrialism.<sup>224</sup> Oddly, however, Aphthonius' name does not appear in Petit's survey of the students of Libanius. To be sure, there is only one reference to Aphthonius in all of Libanius' writings, in a single letter addressed to him.<sup>225</sup> In it Libanius praises Aphthonius for his toils (πόννοι)—one of the linguistic indicators that Petit elsewhere uses to identify students of Libanius<sup>226</sup>—and for his many writings.<sup>227</sup>

But while Aphthonius is thus a student of Libanius, little else is known about him and even that is very tentative, given the lateness of the sources.<sup>228</sup> The *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius, however, has survived, and his treatment of the chreia and its elaboration will provide valuable comparative material, especially since he elaborates the same chreia as Libanius does in his third elaboration: "Isocrates said, "The root of education is bitter, but its fruits are sweet."<sup>229</sup>

Before turning to Libanius' own *progymnasmata*, however, a concluding comment on his life is necessary. Libanius realized that he had received many favors from Τύχη: privileged birth and upbringing, a talent for rhetoric, teaching positions in several cities, friendships with emperors and many others, and success

<sup>224</sup> On the *Nachleben* of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, see *Chreia* 1.212-16.

<sup>225</sup> See Libanius, *Ep.* 1065 (11.189 Foerster).

<sup>226</sup> Petit's method is to locate students of Libanius by the language he uses to describe them, such as obvious terms like *μαθητής*, which nets Petit some 21 students (see *Étudiants*, 17-19). He then goes on to check other usages, including the term *πόννοι*, which describes 24 individuals (see *Étudiants*, 25-26). Here Aphthonius' name should have appeared.

<sup>227</sup> The key sentence of *Ep.* 1065 reads: *χαίρω δὲ καὶ τοῖς πόνοις σου χαίροντος τοῖς ἐν τῷ παιδεύειν οὖσιν, ὅτι πολλά τε γράφεις καὶ πάντα καλὰ καλῶς δεικνύοντα τὴν σποράν* (11.189, 8-10 Foerster) ("I delight in your toils as you delight in the subject of education because you write many things, all of which display well the seed").

<sup>228</sup> See further Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 2. Aphthonius der Schüler des Libanius," *RhM* 62 (1907) 262-64. Cf. *PRLE* 1.81-82.

<sup>229</sup> See Aphthonius 24-78.

at training many orators. But he also had his share of misfortunes.<sup>230</sup> Throughout his career he was involved in jealousies and disputes with rival sophists and public officials,<sup>231</sup> and he witnessed the pagan revival collapse with the death of Julian<sup>232</sup> as well as the decline in Greek instruction in the face of increasing demand for instruction in Latin.<sup>233</sup> But it was his personal life that brought him the most suffering and grief. He suffered from numerous physical ailments—in particular, from migraines and gout<sup>234</sup>—and from legal troubles regarding his illegitimate son's right to inherit.<sup>235</sup> He grieved at the deaths of his uncle Phasganius, his mother and brothers,<sup>236</sup> and various of his friends,<sup>237</sup> students,<sup>238</sup> and secretaries.<sup>239</sup> He also grieved at the death of the woman with whom he had lived for many years,<sup>240</sup> but his grief was especially deep for his only son Cimon, whose rhetorical promise, as already mentioned, had so exhilarated Libanius.<sup>241</sup>

<sup>230</sup> Libanius begins his autobiography with this very sentiment: "I am neither the most blessed nor the most wretched of men" (*Orat.* 1.1). Cf. Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2497-98.

<sup>231</sup> Indeed, Libanius' life in Antioch was marked by persistent disputes which he had with rival sophists and public officials (see *Orat.* 1.96, 103, 114, 126, 136-37, 146, 156-58, 160, 162 et passim).

<sup>232</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 18.114, 126-27, 161, 281, 283, 286-87, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 158, 198.

<sup>233</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.214, 235, 255, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 210.

<sup>234</sup> For his chronic migraines, see Libanius, *Orat.* 1.124, 140, 243, 268, and *Ep.* 92.4-5; for gout, see *Orat.* 1.139, 247, and *Ep.* 137.2.

<sup>235</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.145, 195-96, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 224.

<sup>236</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.117-18, 197, 213; *Epp.* 50.1-2; 129.2; and Norman, *Autobiography*, 180.

<sup>237</sup> Especially hard to bear was the death of Aristaenetos of Nicomedeia, who died during an earthquake there in 358 and caused Libanius' hair suddenly to go white (see *Orat.* 1.118; *Epp.* 37.1; 39.1-2; and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2490, 2492). For other friends, see *Orat.* 1.171 and 275.

<sup>238</sup> Libanius comments at one point that it seemed that the best of his students were the ones who died suddenly on him, such as his prize student Eusebius (see *Orat.* 1.151-53, 188). For other students, see *Orat.* 1.174, 218; and *Ep.* 184.4.

<sup>239</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 1.184, 185, 232.

<sup>240</sup> On this person, described as a good, if not a free, woman, see Libanius, *Ep.* 188.5, *Orat.* 1.278, and Norman, *Autobiography*, 231.

<sup>241</sup> See Libanius, *Epp.* 182.7; 183.2; 184.2, 4; 187.4; 188.5; 189.1; and Norman, *Autobiography*, 231-32.

Cimon died in 392, and Libanius died shortly thereafter, probably in 393.<sup>242</sup>

#### LIBANIUS' PROGYMNASMATA

The most extensive collection of sample *progymnasmata* that has survived goes under the name of Libanius. In fact, the MSS attribute 144 sample *progymnasmata* to Libanius, which are available in the eighth volume of Richard Foerster's Teubner edition (8.1-571). The collection includes samples of all fourteen *progymnasmata*, although the coverage is far from even, ranging from only one νόμου εισφορά and two ἀνασκευαί to twenty-seven ἡθοποιαί, thirty ἐκφράσεις, and forty-one διηγήματα.<sup>243</sup>

Foerster's principal concern with these *progymnasmata*, apart from summarizing their contents and noting sources and parallel attempts, is to determine how many of them derive from Libanius himself, for Libanius' name seemingly acted as a magnet that attracted sample *progymnasmata* of other writers. Indeed, Foerster concludes that less than half of the sample *progymnasmata* attributed to Libanius are genuinely his—to be specific only sixty-two, or 43%.<sup>244</sup> Foerster, building on the earlier work of Kurt Orinsky on the sample *progymnasmata* attributed to Nicolaus of Myra,<sup>245</sup> argues that a number of these falsely-ascribed *progymnasmata* can be attributed to Nicolaus. Thus a number of

<sup>242</sup> On the date of his death, see Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2498.

<sup>243</sup> For a brief survey of the contents of these *progymnasmata*, see Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2518-22. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.92-120, and esp. Bernard Schouler, *La tradition hellénique chez Libanios* (2 vols.; Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984) 2.51-86. To be complete the collection includes: three μῦθοι (8.25-28 Foerster), forty-one διηγήματα (8.33-58), four χρεῖαι (8.63-102), three γνῶμαι (8.106-120), two ἀνασκευαί (8.123-35), three κατασκευαί (8.138-54), five κοινοὶ τόποι (8.158-208), nine ἐγκώμια (8.216-77), eight ψόγοι (282-328), five συγκρίσεις (334-60), twenty-seven ἡθοποιαί (8.372-437), thirty ἐκφράσεις (8.460-546), three θέσεις (8.550-66), and one νόμου εισφορά (568-71).

<sup>244</sup> See Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2518-22. Foerster says (col. 2518) that the *progymnasmata* were edited after Libanius died and that, as in the case of the declamations, many unguine pieces were added to them in the course of time.

<sup>245</sup> See Kurt Orinsky, "De Nicolai Myrensis et Libanii quae feruntur progymnasmatis" (diss. Breslau, 1920), which, while virtually unavailable because only four copies were made, is summarized in detail by Eberhard Richtsteig's review of Orinsky in *PhilW* 41 (1921) 697-701.

these *progymnasmata* by Nicolaus have been identified among the Libanian MSS as well as one by Severus, not to mention a number of others that are not by Libanius either, although the identity of these other authors is now lost. For example, only three of the forty-one διηγήματα are genuine and only seven of the thirty ἐκφράσεις.<sup>246</sup>

In the case of the four chreia elaborations, however, Foerster accepts the first three as genuine, but regards the fourth as too “inhaltlich schwach und formell dürftig” to be assigned to Libanius.<sup>247</sup> Foerster does not assign this elaboration to a specific author, but he does group it with the third γνώμη-elaboration and perhaps with the second ἀνασκευή and third κατασκευή as all deriving from the same, if anonymous, writer.<sup>248</sup>

#### CHREIA ELABORATION I

The first elaboration confirms an action chreia attributed to Alexander the Great, the king of the Macedonians: Alexander, on being asked by someone where he kept his treasures, pointed to his friends.

The sentiment of this chreia—namely, that friends are treasures—is common enough,<sup>249</sup> and the chreia itself appears elsewhere in rhetorical texts,<sup>250</sup> so that Libanius’ knowledge of the chreia and his decision to elaborate it are not surprising. And yet, it is the appearance of this chreia in a writing outside the rhetorical tradition that may be more significant for understanding Libanius’ decision to elaborate it.

<sup>246</sup> See Foerster-Münscher, “Libanios,” 2518-19, 2521-22. To be complete, the genuine *progymnasmata*, according to Foerster-Münscher (“Libanios,” 2518-22) are: all three μῦθοι, only the first three of the forty-one διηγήματα, the first three of four χρεῖαι, only the first of three γνώμαι, the first of two ἀνασκευαί, the first two of three κατασκευαί, all five κοινοὶ τόποι, the first eight of nine ἐγκώμια, the first seven of eight ψόγοι, all five συγκρίσεις, sixteen of twenty-seven ἡθοποιαί (nos. 1-6, 8, 10-12, 14-15, 18-19, 21, and 23), the first seven of thirty ἐκφράσεις, and the first of three θέσεις. The one νόμου εἰσφορά is not genuine.

<sup>247</sup> Foerster-Münscher, “Libanios,” 2519.

<sup>248</sup> Foerster-Münscher, “Libanios,” 2520.

<sup>249</sup> See, e.g., ps.-Menander, *Mon.* 810 (p. 79 Jaekel).

<sup>250</sup> See the texts cited in *Chreia* 1.302.

The Roman historian Ammianus Marcellinus, a contemporary of Libanius, recites this chreia in the context of a discussion of the virtues of the Emperor Julian. He illustrates Julian's generosity (*liberalitas*) by noting *inter alia* his refusal to amass wealth because he was convinced that wealth was safer when kept among his subordinates; Julian justified his conviction by frequently (*aliquotiens*) reciting this very chreia: Alexander the Great, on being asked where he kept his treasures, responded in a kindly way: "Among my friends."<sup>251</sup>

In Julian's own writings there is also one passage where he seemingly has this chreia in mind. Julian, when commenting on the generosity of the Emperor Constantius (324-337), noted that "no emperor was ever seen to distribute so much wealth to his friends—save Alexander, the son of Philip."<sup>252</sup>

Accordingly, Libanius' decision to elaborate this chreia may have been a way of indirectly praising Julian. Indeed, at one point in the first section of the elaboration, the ἐγκωμιαστικόν, Libanius seemingly switches from praising Alexander to praising Julian indirectly. Libanius mentions Alexander's making himself affable (κοινός) and accessible (ὁμιλητικός) (1.3), a trait that other writers on Alexander do not confirm, stressing instead his increasing adoption of Persian manners, such as obeisance (προσκύνησις).<sup>253</sup> In contrast, Libanius elsewhere notes Julian's affability (κοινότης).<sup>254</sup>

In any case, the elaboration of this chreia is less a discussion of Alexander and indirectly of Julian, at least after the first two sections, than it is a discussion of friendship. Discussions of

<sup>251</sup> See Ammianus Marcellinus, 25.4.7-15, esp. 15: *Alexandrum Magnum, ubi haberet thesauros interrogatum, "apud amicos" benivole respondisse.*

<sup>252</sup> Julian, *Orat.* 1.43C.

<sup>253</sup> See, e.g., Diodorus Siculus, 17.77.3-4; Plutarch, *Alex.* 45.1; 54.2-55.1; and Arrian, 4.7.4; 9.9.

<sup>254</sup> See Libanius, *Orat.* 18.189.

friendship have a long history,<sup>255</sup> and Libanius shows a familiarity with them here. For example, in the third section, the αἰτία, he emphasizes the extent to which a man will go to help his friends (1.5-11), a commitment that recalls some of Lucian's examples of friendship in his *Toxaris*.<sup>256</sup> Similarly, Libanius cites several pairs of friends, all of them familiar from other discussions of friendship: Herakles and Theseus, Theseus and Perithous, Orestes and Pylades, and Achilles and Patroclus (1.18-22).<sup>257</sup> And Libanius makes use of Euripides, an author often cited in discussions of friendship,<sup>258</sup> paraphrasing a passage from Euripides' *Orestes* (cf. 1155-57) as his testimony (1.23). Finally, Libanius adopts a stylistic feature of discussions of friendship, in that he uses a number of verbs with the prefix συν-, all of them emphasizing how friends share each others' lives, especially life's burdens and misfortunes: συναλγέω (1.7), συμπαιανανίζω and συνάχθομαι (1.13), συμπνέω (1.18), συνακολουθέω (1.20, 21), and συναγωνίζομαι (1.21).<sup>259</sup>

## CHREIA ELABORATION 2

The second elaboration expounds a mixed chreia attributed to the most famous of Cynic philosophers, Diogenes of Sinope: Diogenes, on seeing a youth misbehaving, struck his paedagogus, adding: "Why do you teach such things?"

<sup>255</sup> On these discussions, see the pioneering survey of Gottfried Bohnenblust, *Beiträge zum Topos Περί φιλίας* (Inaug. diss., Univ. Bern; Berlin: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Gustav Schade [Otto Francke], 1905) 26-44, as well as such recent treatments as John T. Fitzgerald, ed., *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship* (SBLRBS 34; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), and Carolinne White, *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992).

<sup>256</sup> See Lucian, *Tox.* 12-34.

<sup>257</sup> On these *Freundschaftspaare*, see Bohnenblust, *Beiträge*, 41, and the corresponding notes in the translation of this elaboration.

<sup>258</sup> See further White, *Friendship*, 19-21.

<sup>259</sup> On friends sharing each others' adverse fortune, see Lucian, *Tox.* 6, and Bohnenblust, *Beiträge*, 32-34; on the use of the prefix συν-, see further Ronald F. Hock, "An Extraordinary Friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: The Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances," in Fitzgerald, *Perspectives on Friendship*, 145-62, esp. 156 and n. 16.

This chreia, the most frequently quoted in the rhetorical tradition, is usually recited in order to illustrate a mixed chreia,<sup>260</sup> but it is also the subject of three elaborations—by Libanius (Text 21), by ps.-Nicolaus (Text 24), and by an anonymous writer preserved in Doxapatres (Text 30). In fact, this is the only chreia to receive more than one elaboration, so that a comparison of these three texts gains in importance as it will show how traditional these elaborations were in thought and expression.

Libanius' elaboration is much longer than the other two, as his Αἰτία, or rationale, section itself is longer than the whole elaboration of either ps.-Nicolaus or Anonymous. The latter two elaborations are roughly the same length, and they are strikingly similar to one another in wording. Libanius' contents are often parallel to, and may indeed be the source for, the other two. A brief review of the similarities and differences will demonstrate the close relationship.

The similarities begin with the encomiastic heading. All three praise philosophy in general and go on to praise Diogenes specifically for his rejection of the branch of philosophy known as physics and for his exclusive focus on ethics. These similarities extend to language:

Libanius:	ἅπασα . . . φιλοσοφία
ps.-Nicolaus:	φιλοσοφίαν ἅπασαν
Anonymous:	πᾶσαν φιλοσοφίαν
ps.-Nicolaus:	μάλιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο
Anonymous:	μάλιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο
ps.-Nicolaus:	τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον ὁδούς
Anonymous:	τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον ὁδούς
ps.-Nicolaus:	καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν <τοῦ> ἡλίου περίοδον
Anonymous:	καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου περίοδον
Libanius:	ἄλλοις ἀφῆκεν
ps.-Nicolaus:	ἐτέροις παρῆκεν

The similarities continue in the paraphrastic section. All three paraphrase the chreia at roughly the same length. Moreover, all three expand on the situation implicit in the chreia (with ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous specifying the place as the ἀγορά), and

<sup>260</sup> See *Chreia* 1.316.

they emphasize that Diogenes deliberately bypassed the young man and then struck the irresponsible paedagogus. The similarities extend to language, especially between ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous, where they are numerous and close:

ps.-Nicolaus: ὅθεν

Anonymous: ὅθεν

ps.-Nicolaus: παρεστηκότος παιδαγωγοῦ

Anonymous: παρεστηκότος παιδαγωγοῦ

ps.-Nicolaus: παιδαγωγὸν μετελθὼν ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς σωφρονίζει

Anonymous: παιδαγωγὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐσωφρονίζειν

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰργασται τάδε

Anonymous: καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰργάσατο τάδε

ps.-Nicolaus: πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς

Anonymous: πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς

The rationale section also displays some similarities. All three regard the nature of youth as one reason for there being a need for parents to have paedagogi for their sons, and all three comment on the high price of paedagogi. Verbal parallels again are confined to ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous:

ps.-Nicolaus: κατιδὼν γὰρ ὁ Διογένης

Anonymous: κατιδὼν γὰρ ὁ Διογένης

ps.-Nicolaus: εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου κέκτηναι πείραν

Anonymous: καὶ εἰ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου πείραν κομίζουσιν

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ τοὺς πατέρας εἰδὼς ὡς χρημάτων πολλῶν

Anonymous: καὶ τοὺς πατέρας εἰδὼς χρημάτων πολλῶν

In striking contrast to the previous sections (and to those that follow), there is little similarity in content and none in language in the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου section. The closest we come to a parallel is the conditional argument of Libanius and ps.-Nicolaus that had Diogenes struck the boy instead of the paedagogus, people would have said that he used poor judgment (so Libanius) or they would have blamed Diogenes (so ps.-Nicolaus). Otherwise, all three go their separate ways.

Similarities re-emerge, however, in the following, or παρβολή, section. All three elaborations share one analogy: the



captain is held responsible for the mistakes made by his sailors; and once again the similarities extend to language in ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous:

ps.-Nicolaus: ὥσπερ δὲ τὰ ναυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα κυβερνήταις ἐπανατίθεται

Anonymous: ὥσπερ γὰρ τὰ ναυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα κυβερνήταις ἀνατίθενται

Since there is only this one analogy in Anonymous, we leave it and look further only at the other two. Libanius includes four more analogies, two of which appear also in ps.-Nicolaus: the faults of a chorus are attributed to the trainer, and those of an army to the commander.

In the παράδειγμα section all three elaborations cite the naval disaster at Arginusae where the generals received the blame for not retrieving the bodies of the fallen due to a violent storm in the Hellespont. And again, the expressions used are similar:

ps.-Nicolaus: τὴν Ἀθηναίων σκόπει μοι πόλιν

Anonymous: τὴν Ἀθηναίων ὄρα μοι πόλιν

ps.-Nicolaus: πεπτωκότων ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ στρατιωτῶν

Anonymous: ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ πεπτωκότων στρατιωτῶν

Libanius and ps.-Nicolaus also share a second example: Themistocles receiving the credit for the victory at Salamis even though many others fought in the battle.

The testimony section calls for special mention, for Libanius has seemingly omitted it. The other two, however, both refer to the same passage from Sophocles' *Philoctetes* (lines 386-88) and both paraphrase it in similar and at times exactly the same language:

ps.-Nicolaus: πόλιν ἅπασαν τῶν ἡγουμένων εἰπόντα

Anonymous: πόλιν ἅπασαν τῶν ἡγουμένων εἰπόντα

ps.-Nicolaus: τοὺς δὲ ἀκοσμοῦντας ἀνθρώπους διδασκάλων τρόποις

Anonymous: τοὺς δὲ ἀκοσμοῦντας ἀνθρώπους διδασκάλων τρόποις

The last section, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς, is roughly the same length in all three, although similarities in language occur only between ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous:

- ps.-Nicolaus: πρὸς ἅ πάντα δεῖ βλέποντας  
 Anonymous: πρὸς ἅ δεῖ βλέποντας  
 ps.-Nicolaus: Διογένην θαυμάζειν  
 Anonymous: Διογένην θαυμάζειν  
 ps.-Nicolaus: ὡς σωφρονιστὴν ἄριστον  
 Anonymous: σωφρονίζειν νεότητά ἐπιστάμενον

It is difficult, with these similarities in content and language throughout the elaborations, not to conclude that they are related. Libanius' elaboration, presumably the earliest, may well have been a source for the other two, at least at the level of ideas presented in the encomiastic and paraphrastic sections, the rationale, the analogy, and the example sections. Linguistic parallels are largely confined to ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous, and the number, length, and distribution of these linguistic parallels throughout the elaboration (save for the opposite section) argue clearly for literary dependence. But, given the pseudonymity of the elaboration attributed to Nicolaus and the anonymity of the one in Doxapatres, it is not easy to date them and hence it is equally unclear about who copied whom. At any rate, it appears that teachers of rhetoric also had models to follow when providing elaborations as models for their students.

### CHREIA ELABORATION 3

The third chreia elaboration expands on a sayings-chreia attributed to Isocrates: Isocrates said, "The root of education is bitter, but its fruits are sweet."

This chreia is also the subject of Hermogenes' outline of an elaboration (Hermogenes 35-62) as well as Aphthonius' complete sample elaboration (Aphthonius 24-78). Libanius' elaboration is much, much longer than either of the other two, but a comparison with them shows that Libanius nevertheless has much in common with them, especially with the elaboration by his student Aphthonius. Indeed, an analysis shows that Aphthonius is much indebted to his teacher, thereby confirming the teacher-student relationship, but the similarities with Hermogenes also indicate that much of the subject matter of the elaboration of this chreia had taken shape long before Libanius.

The similarities begin with the encomiastic section. For example, both Libanius and Aphthonius use the rhetorical figure

known as παράλειψις, or pretended omission, as John of Sardis noted for the latter in his commentary on Aphthonius.<sup>261</sup> To be sure, there are no exact linguistic parallels, but both say, in effect, that while many of Isocrates' teachings are worthy of attention, only the one teaching on education can be treated in the elaboration (3.4; cf. Aphthonius 29-33).

In the paraphrastic section, however, the similarities are rather minimal,<sup>262</sup> although in the paraphrase itself Libanius and Aphthonius use some of the same terms: the word πόννοι to characterize the root of education (3.5; cf. Aphthonius 34-35) and the corresponding nominal and verbal forms of a word to indicate the end of education (3.5: τὴν τελευτήν; cf. Aphthonius 35: τελευτώντων).

It is in the rationale section, however, that the similarities begin to pile up, not only with Aphthonius but with Hermogenes as well. The similarities with Aphthonius are especially numerous and significant. For example, both structure this κεφάλαιον by discussing the difficulties implicit in the "root" of education (3.7-12; cf. Aphthonius 38-51), followed by the rewards suggested by its "fruits" (3.12-21; cf. Aphthonius 51-52). More specifically, both identify the difficulties schoolboys face in the same order: first those from their teachers (3.7; cf. Aphthonius 38-42), then those from their paedagogi (3.8; cf. Aphthonius 42-47), and finally those from their parents (3.9-11; cf. Aphthonius 47-51), and both see each person as worse than the previous one (3.8: βαρύτερος, 9: χαλεπώτεροι; cf. Aphthonius 44: φοβερώτεροι, 48: χαλεπώτεροι). In addition, both emphasize the fear that characterizes schoolboys' lives (3.7; cf. Aphthonius 40, 41, 43, 44), the pervasiveness of punishment (3.7, 8, 10; cf. Aphthonius 43, 45), and the lack of praise for assignments done well (3.7; cf. Aphthonius 46-47).

Aphthonius' discussion of the "fruits" of education is very brief (cf. Aphthonius 52-53), but even so what little he does say—that boys, as a result of education, are crowned with virtue (52:

<sup>261</sup> See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 52, 2-3 Rabe).

<sup>262</sup> Indeed, Aphthonius corrects Libanius. The former's use of φησὶν (Aphthonius 34) is consistent with the form of the chreia, which is a sayings chreia with an unprompted statement (see Theon 37-40), whereas Libanius' use of εἶδε (3.5) changes the chreia into one arising from a specific circumstance (see Theon 40-45).

περιστέφεται)—finds a parallel in Libanius' much longer exposition (3.12-19), as he, too, mentions crowns (3.13, 21: στέφανοι). In short, while Libanius' account is much longer than his student's, the latter's treatment nevertheless seems to be little more than a highly condensed version of his teacher's.

Libanius, however, may also be dependent at this point on the tradition represented by Hermogenes. At the end of the rationale Libanius introduces a distinction that governs Hermogenes' rationale and opposite. This is the distinction between important and trivial matters, between τὰ μέγιστα τῶν πραγμάτων and τὰ τυγχόντα τῶν πραγμάτων, and both, it need hardly be said, assign education to the former (3.20-21; cf. Hermogenes 42-43, 45-46).

The similarity with Hermogenes continues in Libanius' own discussion of the opposite, for now he does what Hermogenes did with the distinction between important and trivial matters. He argues that toil is a component of important matters; ease, of trivial ones (3.22-23; cf. Hermogenes 42-47). Aphthonius, incidentally, does not argue in this way at all, pointing out instead the losses incurred by not associating with teachers, paedagogi, and parents (cf. Aphthonius 53-58).

The next section, the analogy, is somewhat similar to those of Hermogenes and Aphthonius, in that all three cite farmers who must toil on the land before reaping their crops (3.27-28; cf. Hermogenes 48-50; Aphthonius 59-63). But not only is Libanius' presentation more detailed, complete with a Homeric reference, but there are also no linguistic or stylistic correspondences, and Libanius has subordinated this analogy to an even more detailed analogy about merchants (3.24-26). In other words, Libanius seems not to have depended on Hermogenes nor to have influenced Aphthonius very much in this κεφάλαιον.

In the sixth section, however, the relation of Libanius with Hermogenes and Aphthonius is once again more apparent, as all three cite the example of Demosthenes (3.29-34; cf. Hermogenes 51-54; Aphthonius 64-70). To be sure, Libanius' discussion is much longer, but it also has specific parallels: Libanius, like Hermogenes, refers to Demosthenes' practice of retiring to a room in order to practice his speeches (3.32; cf. Hermogenes 52), and he, like Aphthonius, mentions Demosthenes' other practice of shaving half his head in order to assure his having sufficient time to compose and practice his speeches before his hair grows out (3.32;

cf. Aphthonius 67-68). These specific parallels, however, are not expressed in similar language and hence are not as close as they might at first sight appear.

In the next section, however, the parallels between Libanius and Hermogenes and Aphthonius are closer (Libanius 3.36-38; cf. Hermogenes 55-59; Aphthonius 71-76). All three cite Hesiod, specifically the lines (cf. *Op.* 285-91) about the road to virtue being rough, but its summit smooth (3.36; cf. Hermogenes 56-57; Aphthonius 71-72). Libanius and Aphthonius do not quote Hesiod, being content to paraphrase the poet, and both go on to equate Hesiod's reference to "road" to Isocrates' mention of "root," which, they say, shows that the sentiment is the same, though the language differs (3.36-37; cf. Aphthonius 73-76). In addition, Libanius and Hermogenes go on to mention a second poet who corroborates Isocrates. Neither identifies this poet by name, and only Hermogenes actually quotes him, specifically a line that has been attributed elsewhere to Epicharmus (3.38; cf. Hermogenes 58-59).<sup>263</sup> Thus the relationship of Libanius in the testimony of the ancients section is quite close, suggesting Libanius' knowledge of Hermogenes' elaboration and Aphthonius' dependence on his teacher's.

Libanius' final section, the epilogue, has little in common with either of the other two elaborations, although Libanius and Aphthonius do express their admiration for Isocrates' philosophy of education (3.39: θαυμάζομεν; cf. Aphthonius 77: θαυμάζειν).

This comparison of Libanius' elaboration of this chreia with those of Hermogenes and Aphthonius has shown a number of parallels in thought and expression, pointing to Libanius' knowledge of Hermogenes' elaboration and Aphthonius' knowledge of Libanius'. Still, while the parallels are undeniable, the differences are also just as clear, even in the case of Libanius and Aphthonius, so that the latter, on occasion, seems independent of his teacher.

<sup>263</sup> See Xenophon, *Mem.* 2.1.20 (*Frag.* 287 Kaibel). Indeed, Xenophon not only preserves the line from Epicharmus but also quotes Hesiod, *Op.* 287-92, immediately before it, suggesting that Hermogenes got his twin testimony precisely from this passage of Xenophon.

## CHREIA ELABORATION 4

The fourth chreia elaboration expounds a sayings-chreia attributed to Theophrastus, a student of Aristotle and hence a Peripatetic philosopher: Theophrastus, on being asked what love is, said: "The passion of an idle soul."

The sentiment of this chreia, even the very wording, is attested elsewhere,<sup>264</sup> and the argument presented in the elaboration is not without interest, in that it claims that only by engaging in serious pursuits—intellectual, political, commercial, and agricultural—can one resist the power of love (see esp. 4.4-5, 7-8).

Scholarly interest in this elaboration, however, has centered on the question of authenticity. Foerster, as we have seen, has denied the Libanian authorship of this elaboration, saying that it exhibits such a poverty of content and style that it can hardly be assigned to the talented sophist.<sup>265</sup> Foerster's denial, brief as it is, receives confirmation in various ways. The poverty of content is immediately obvious from the relative brevity of this elaboration when compared with the other three elaborations by Libanius, in that this fourth one is only slightly more than half the average length of the others.<sup>266</sup> In addition, the poverty of content is apparent in the *Testimony of the Ancients*, where the author could not think of one other writer who had expressed a similar sentiment. Stylistically, this elaboration is deficient, especially in its use of particles. For example, several combinations of particles that appear in at least two of the three Libanian elaborations are absent from this one: *μὲν γάρ* (1.3, 7, 9; 2.2, 3; 3.17, 23), *μὲν οὖν* (1.3, 12, 18; 2.4, 20; 3.9, 22), and *καὶ μὴν γέ* (1.6, 10, 16; 3.21).

Once this elaboration is denied to Libanius, it becomes difficult to date, although Foerster proposes that the author of this elaboration is the same person who wrote the third elaboration

<sup>264</sup> See further *Chreia* 1.342.

<sup>265</sup> See Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 8.61-62. Cf. also Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2519, and Schouler, *La tradition hellénique*, 82.

<sup>266</sup> Specifically, this elaboration is only 42% as long as the third elaboration, the longest, and still only 73% as long as the second, the shortest.

of a γνώμη, the second ἀνασκευή, and, perhaps, the third κατασκευή.<sup>267</sup> Thus, the fourth chreia elaboration may well have been part of a collection of sample *progymnasmata* that was added later to Libanius' collection. Only a vague post-Libanian dating for this elaboration is possible.

## TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Foerster's Teubner edition of Libanius' voluminous writings, published from 1903 to 1927, superceded that of J.J. Reiske,<sup>268</sup> not least because of the much larger number of MSS known to him than to his predecessor, and it remains the standard edition today. Hence, it is the basis of our text of Libanius' chreia elaborations, although some changes have been introduced: Aphthonius' terms for the eight κεφάλαια have been placed in parentheses at what appear to be the appropriate places;<sup>269</sup> the paragraphing and punctuation have been changed at a number of places; and a few changes in the text, all noted in the apparatus, have been made.

Foerster lists fifteen MSS for the first elaboration, thirteen for the second and third,<sup>270</sup> but he uses only six MSS for establishing his text. These six fall into two families of three,<sup>271</sup> with Foerster clearly preferring the first three listed below (although he is also not averse to emendation, sometimes doing so brilliantly):<sup>272</sup>

Ba = Vat. Barb. 240 (13th/14th c.)

<sup>267</sup> See 8.117-20, 128-35, and 150-54 Foerster, and Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2520. Elsewhere, Foerster (*Libanii Opera*, 8.62, 104-5, 122, 137) notes that, except for the third κατασκευή, these *progymnasmata* are all found in the same five MSS, and even the third κατασκευή is found in two of them.

<sup>268</sup> See Io. Iacobus Reiske, ed., *Libanii Sophistae Orationes et Declarationes* (4 vols.; Altenburg: Richter, 1791) 4.856-75 (first three elaborations), 1122-25 (fourth elaboration). For earlier editions of these elaborations and various textual emendations, see Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 8.59-62.

<sup>269</sup> One MS, B, has marginal notations indicating the beginning of two κεφάλαια for the third elaboration. The second hand of this MS has correctly added παραφραστικόν at the beginning of 3.5 and τὸ τῆς αἰτίας at the beginning of 3.6 (cf. 8.84 Foerster).

<sup>270</sup> See Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 8.59-60.

<sup>271</sup> For the stemma, see Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 8. 15.

<sup>272</sup> See, e.g., 4.12, where Foerster's emendation of the MSS's πιττακόν to Πιττάλικον is most certainly correct.

Pa = Paris. gr. 2918 (15th c.)

B = Vat. Barb. 220 (15th c.)

P = Paris. gr. 3014 (14th c.)

L = Laur. LVIII (15th c.)

Vi = Vindob. phil. gr. CCLIX (15th c.).

For the fourth, non-Libanian, chreia elaboration Foerster lists five MSS, four of which he used for his text,<sup>273</sup> but only one of them, B, comes from those used for the first three:

B = Vat. Barb. 220 (15th c.)

E = Esc. Ψ-IV-12 (16th c.)

Es = Esc. Φ-III-19 (16th c.)

Pal = Vat. Pal. gr. 148 (15th c.)

Vat = Vat. Pal. gr. 277 (16th c.)

So far as we are aware, these chreia elaborations have not been translated before into a modern language, although small portions of two of them have been: a portion of the third (3.4-13) into French<sup>274</sup> and a portion of the fourth (4.1-3) into English.<sup>275</sup>

<sup>273</sup> See Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 8.61-62.

<sup>274</sup> See Festugière, *Antioche païenne*, 444-45.

<sup>275</sup> See William W. Fortenbaugh et al., *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence* (Philosophia Antiqua 54, 2; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992) 383.





Text 20. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(8.63, 3–73, 19 FOERSTER)

Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεὶς παρὰ τινος ποῦ ἂν ἔχοι τοὺς θησαυροὺς τοὺς φίλους ὑπέδειξεν.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ὅτι μέγας μὲν καὶ θαυμαστός ὁ βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ τὴν ἡπειρον ἐκατέραν τῶν αὐτοῦ κατορθωμάτων ἐνέπλησε καὶ τοσοῦτον τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν καὶ τοὺς ὕστερον παρήνεγκεν ὥς πρώτην χώραν μὴ δοῦναι, πάντας ἂν ἡγοῦμαι συμφῆσαι, πλὴν εἴ τις ἢ παντάπασιν ἀναισθήτως ἢ λίαν ἀγνωμόνως ἔχοι· ἐμοὶ δὲ δοκεῖ <κᾶλλα> καλὰ πρᾶξαι καὶ παραδοῦναι τοῖς ἐσομένοις ὑμνεῖν, οὐ Τύχῃ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνέσει χρησάμενος (p. 64) πρὸς ἅπαντα καὶ τῇ παρ' ἐκείνης ῥοπῇ καὶ τὰ παρὰ τῆς φρονήσεως ἀγαθὰ συνεισενεγκών. 2. οὐ γὰρ ταῦτόν ἔπαθε τοῖς ἄλλοις βασιλεῦσιν οἷς ἄχρηστος μὲν ἢ παιδεία κέκριται, τῆς δὲ εὐδαιμονίας ὄρος ἢ τρυφή, ἀλλ' ἡγησάμενος οὐδὲν τῶν ἀνδραπόδων διαφέρειν τοὺς ἀμοιροῦντας τούτου τοῦ κτήματος καὶ βουλευθεὶς ἐν τῷ καλλίστῳ τῶν ὄντων ἀμείνων εἶναι τῶν ἀρχομένων Ἀριστοτέλει φέρων ἑαυτὸν συνῆψε καὶ κατέστησε τοῦ σοφωτάτου μαθητήν. καὶ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα λαμπρῶν καὶ βεβοημένων ἢ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον συνουσία τὴν ὑπόθεσιν δέδωκε.

3. Περὶ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἀνδρείας ἢ τῆς δεινότητος ἢ τοῦ πρὸς ἔργοις ἔχειν αἰεὶ τὸν λογισμὸν ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων εἰ διεξίοιμι, μακροτέρων ἂν δέοι λόγων· ὥς δὲ κοινὸν ἑαυτὸν κατέστησε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς

Text 20. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(8.63, 3-73, 19 FOERSTER)

Alexander, on being asked by someone where he kept his treasures, pointed to his friends.<sup>276</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> That Alexander, king of Macedonia, was greatly admired and filled both continents<sup>277</sup> with his accomplishments and so far surpassed both his predecessors and his successors that he has not yielded first place, everyone, I suppose, would agree, unless there is someone who is completely senseless or very foolish. In my opinion, he performed other <noble> deeds as well and left it for future generations to praise them for his having made use on every occasion not only of Fortune but also of keen intelligence and for his having joined the benefits of his wisdom to the aid of Fortune.<sup>278</sup> 2. For he was not of the same mind as other kings who considered education to be useless and luxury the standard for happiness. On the contrary, because he believed that those who have no share in this attainment are in no way different from slaves and because he wished to be better than his subjects in the noblest of possessions, he went and enrolled with Aristotle and became a student of that wisest of men.<sup>279</sup> And so his association with Aristotle has provided the foundation for his subsequent illustrious and celebrated accomplishments.

3. Accordingly, if I were to speak at length about his courage, his astuteness, his constant application of reason to deeds, or any other such quality, a much longer treatise would be needed. But

<sup>276</sup> On this chreia, see *Chreia* 1.302. Libanius alludes to this chreia again in *Orat.* 8.8-9 (1.388, 1-11 Foerster).

<sup>277</sup> That is, Europe and Asia, Egypt being considered a part of the latter rather than a part of Libya (i.e., Africa), as is also the case in Arrian, *Anab.* 7.30.1. There was a debate whether Egypt should be considered a part of Asia or of Libya, i.e., Africa (see Aristotle, *Mun.* 394a 1-3).

<sup>278</sup> On the role of Fortune in Alexander's career, see, e.g., Plutarch, *Alex.* 20.7.

<sup>279</sup> Elsewhere it is claimed that it was Philip, Alexander's father, not Alexander himself, who chose Aristotle to be his teacher (see Plutarch, *Alex.* 7.2, and, more generally, A. B. Bosworth, *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988] 20-21).

συνόντας όμιλητικόν ὥστε καί ἐρέσθαι τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐξεῖναι καί τυχεῖν ἀποκρίσεως εὖμενοῦς, τοῦτο τίς οὐκ ἂν ἀγασθεῖη; τοῖς μὲν γάρ ἄλλοις <βασιλεῦσιν> εἴ τις ἀντιβλέψειεν, ἀδίκημα νενόμισται· Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ εἰ μὴ πρὸς τὰς ἐντεύξεις ἡμερώτατος φαίνοιτο, πάντων αἰσχιστον ἡγεῖτο.

4. <Παραφραστικόν> Καί γάρ τοι προσελθὼν τις ἡδιστ' (p. 65) ἂν, ἔφη, τοὺς θησαυροὺς ἴδοιμι τοὺς σοὺς, ὦ βασιλεῦ. καί μοι δοκεῖ τοῦτο ἐπαρθῆναι ποιῆσαι ὁρῶν μὲν ἅπαν ἔθνος ἤδη κατεστραμμένον, ἡγούμενος δὲ πλήθει χρημάτων ταῦτα εἰς τέλος ἡκεῖν. πῶς οὖν Ἀλέξανδρος; οὐχ ὑβρίζειν ὑπέλαβεν, εἴ τις ἐρωτήσῃ προχείρως. ἔπειτα οὐκ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς διακόνοις λαβοῦσι τὸν ἄνθρωπον περιάγειν καί δεικνύναι χρυσίου πλῆθος, ἀργυρίου τάλαντα τόσα καὶ τόσα, λαφύρων ἀφθονίαν, ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς φίλους προστάξας ἰδεῖν μὴ ζητήσης ἕτερον, φησίν, Ἀλεξάνδρου πλοῦτον. οὗτοι γὰρ ἐμοὶ θησαυροί.

5. <Αἰτία> Ὡς τοίνυν εἰκότως ταύτην ἡγήσατο πρέπειν τοῖς φίλοις τὴν προσηγορίαν, ῥάδιον γινῶναι, εἴπερ ἐξετάσομεν τοὺς τε καιροὺς οἷς ἀνάγκη χρῆσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ τύχας ἀμείνους καὶ παραπλησίους καὶ χείρονας, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἡλικίας . . . καὶ ὅτε τις βουλεύεται.

that he made himself affable and accessible to those around him with the result that it was possible for those who wished both to ask a question and to receive a gracious reply—who would not admire this quality? For if anyone were to look other <kings> straight in the face, it would be considered an affront. Alexander, however, considered it the most disgraceful thing of all if he did not appear very courteous in his conversations.<sup>280</sup>

4. <Paraphrastic [section]> Therefore, someone approached him and said, “I would very much like to see your treasures, O King.” And it seems to me that the man was prompted to do this because he had seen an entire people subdued recently and because he supposed that this had resulted in a pile of money. How then did Alexander react? He did not become violently angry if someone asked him an impertinent question. Nor did he then order his subordinates to take the fellow, lead him around, and show him the pile of gold, a certain number of talents of silver, and the abundance of enemy spoils. Instead, he ordered him to look at his friends and said, “Look for no other wealth of Alexander. These are my treasures.”<sup>281</sup>

5. <Rationale> Just how reasonably he considered this designation to be an appropriate one for his friends will be easier to judge if we examine the basic conditions and fortunes with which men must deal—whether they are of higher, equal, or lower status—; and further, if, in addition to these, we examine the ages of life . . .<sup>282</sup> and when someone serves as counselor.

<sup>280</sup> We have not found this quality in treatments of Alexander’s career, although it is present, as noted in the introduction, in characterizations of the Emperor Julian (see Libanius, *Orat.* 18.189) and of the ideal king (so e.g., Dio, *Orat.* 1.20-36, esp. 34).

<sup>281</sup> Libanius paraphrases this chreia by having Alexander speak and thus changes it from an action-chreia, as he had recited it at the beginning of the elaboration, to a mixed one. This paraphrase is vague about the occasion of this chreia, but it may have been imagined to have occurred after the victories over Darius at Issus and Gaugamela, when Alexander came into possession of a king’s treasure (see, e.g., Plutarch, *Alex.* 20.11-13; 24.1; 36.1-2; 37.3-4; 39.1; Arrian, *Anab.* 3.16.6-7; 18.10), much of which he distributed to his friends (see, e.g., Plutarch, *Alex.* 34.1; 39.1-40.5; 41.1; 42.5). On this period of Alexander’s conquests, see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 608-20.

<sup>282</sup> We suspect a lacuna here. Otherwise, we have kept Foerster’s text, although we note Reiske’s conjecture: “f(ortasse) καὶ πρὸς ἡλικίας ἔστιν τις βουλεύεται. Neither reading, however, makes much sense.

6. Οὐκοῦν δύο μὲν καιροὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα διαιτῶσι (p. 66) πράγματα, λέγω δὴ πόλεμον καὶ εἰρήνην. ἐν ἑκατέρῳ δὲ μέγιστον ἢ τῶν φίλων ἰσχύει μερίς. οἷον τοῖς πολεμοῦσι δεῖ μὲν χρημάτων, δεῖ δὲ ὀπλων, δεῖ δὲ συμβούλων, δεῖ δὲ συμμάχων. οὐκοῦν λυεῖ μὲν τὴν ἀπορίαν τῶν χρημάτων εἰς μέσον τιθεὶς τὰ ὄντα ὁ φίλος οὐχ αὐτοῦ μᾶλλον ἡγούμενος εἶναι τὴν οὐσίαν ἢ τοῦ συνήθους, συμβουλὰς δὲ τὰς ἀρίστας ἀναζητῶν καὶ λέγων ἐκείναις ὀρθοῖ τὰ πράγματα. ἤδη δὲ τινες ὀπλων ἀποροῦντες εἰς τοὺς φίλους ἰδόντες εὐπόρησαν. καὶ μὴν τό γε τῶν συμμάχων ἀγαθὸν τῆς φιλίας ἡγησαμένης ἂν γένοιτο.

7. Τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ πόλεσι καὶ τοῖς καθέκαστα χρήσιμον. καλῶ μὲν γὰρ ἐγὼ πόλεων φίλους τοὺς εὐνοὺς τοῖς καθεστηκόσιν, οὗτοι δὲ οἱ νόμους τιθέντες καὶ ψηφίσματα γράφοντες καὶ γνώμας ἀγορεύοντες καὶ τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας ἐλέγχοντες καὶ τοὺς χρηστοὺς ἀμείβεσθαι πείθοντες. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τοῖς καθέκαστον (p. 67) μέγα παρὰ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων τὸ κέρδος. ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ νουθετοῦντες ἀμαρτάνοντας ἢ σφαλλομένους ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω μεθιστῶντες, οἱ δεομένοις ἐπικουροῦντες, οἱ ταῖς εὐπραξίαις χαίροντες, οἱ τοῖς ἀτυχοῦσι συναλγοῦντες. ἐκεῖνοι καὶ πολέμους πειρῶνται καταλύειν ὥς ἄριστα καὶ τὴν εἰρήνην ὥς ἐπιπλεῖστα φυλάττειν καὶ τὸ πρόσφορον ἑκατέρῳ τηροῦντες καὶ αἰεὶ τὰ συνοίσοντα πράττοντες.

8. Ἀλλὰ μὴν πόλεων τὰς μὲν βασιλεύεσθαι, τὰς δὲ δημοκρατεῖσθαι συμβέβηκεν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίας καθεστάναι. ὁ δὲ τοῖς ὑπάρχουσιν οἰκείως ἔχων σώζει μὲν βασιλεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν, τηρεῖ δὲ δήμοις τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, φυλάττει δὲ ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις τὸ σχῆμα.

9. Ἀλλὰ μὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ μὲν πενίᾳ συζῶσι, τοῖς δὲ πολλὺς παρὰ τῆς τύχης ὁ πλοῦτος. ἐκότερον δὲ δεῖται πρὸς ὑπερβολὴν τῆς τῶν φίλων ῥοπῆς. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ διασώζει τὰ ὄντα, τοῖς δὲ ἐπικουφίζει τὴν πενίαν.

6. So, then, two basic conditions regulate human affairs—I mean, of course, war and peace. In each condition the role of friends<sup>283</sup> is of utmost importance. For example, people at war need money, need arms, need advisers, need allies. The friend, then, relieves the need for money by making available what he has in the belief that his own property is no more his than it is his friend's. Also, by seeking out and giving the best advice the friend makes matters right. And some people, because of a need for arms, looked to their friends and immediately had a ready supply. In fact, the benefit of allies can occur only if friendship is in command.

7. In the same way, friendship is useful both to cities and to individuals, for I term those men "friends of cities" who are well-disposed toward those in authority. And these friends are the ones who pass laws, propose decrees, express opinions, prosecute wrongdoers, and persuade good men to contribute their share. But even for individuals the profit from friends is great. They are the ones who admonish those who go astray or change for the better those who stumble, who help those in need, who rejoice at their good conduct, and who sympathize with their misfortunes. They also try to end wars on the best possible terms and preserve the peace as long as possible, both by safeguarding what is advantageous to each side and by always doing those things which will be beneficial.

8. Of course, in the case of cities, some happen to be governed by kings, some have a democracy, and in others oligarchies are in power. And the man who is on familiar terms with those in authority tries to protect the kingdom for the king, safeguard freedom for the people, and preserve for oligarchies their form of government.

9. Of course, in the case of men, some spend their lives in poverty, while others have great wealth that comes from Fortune. But for each group there is an utter need for the aid of friends, as this aid preserves the property of the one group and alleviates the poverty of the other.

<sup>283</sup> From this point forward Libanius draws upon various conventional ideas of friendship.

10. Καὶ μὴν ἅ γε δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν πράττειν ἀδύνατον, ταῦτα τῇ τῶν φίλων προσθήκῃ πληροῦμεν. τίς γὰρ οὐκ οἶδεν ὅτι δεῖ μὲν γυναικὸς (p. 68) ἀνδρὶ κατὰ τὸν Ἡσίοδον; αὐτοὶ δ' οἱ γαμῆιν μέλλοντες ἐρυθρίασαιεν ἂν ὑπὲρ τοῦ γάμου διαλεγόμενοι. ἐνταῦθα δὴ τὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἡ χρεία καλεῖ. ὁ δὲ πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς μελετήσας λόγους καὶ τὰ ὄντα ἄρας καὶ τὰ οὐκ ὄντα προσθεῖς ῥᾶστα συνάπτει τὰ γένη. 11. ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς ἀποβολαῖς τῶν παιδῶν καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαιοτάτων, οὗ πολλὰκις τὸ πάθος μεῖζον ἢ φέρειν, τίνες οἱ παρόντες καὶ τῆς λύπης ἀφαιροῦντες καὶ κωλύοντες ὀρμῆσαι πρὸς ξίφος; οὐχ οὗτοι; πᾶς ἂν συμφήσειεν ὅστις οὐκ ἄπειρος φίλων.

Ἐπεὶ καὶ πᾶσαν ἡλικίαν ἔγωγ' ἂν φαίην μέγιστα τοῦ πράγματος ἀπολαύειν. τὸ γῆρας ἐκεῖθεν κουφότερον, τοῖς ἀκμάζουσιν ἀπὸ τούτων οἱ συνεργοί, τοῖς παισὶν οὐχ ἐτέρωθεν οἱ τῶν ἀσκήσεων κοινωνοί. οὕτως οὐδὲν ἔστιν ὃ φαίης ἂν ἔξω καθεστάναι τῆς παρὰ τῶν συνήθων χρείας.

12. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Ἔστι μὲν οὖν οὐδὲ ταῦτα σμικρὰ παραδείγματα τοῦ σώφρονα ἀποκρίνασθαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον, δοκεῖ δ' ἂν μοί τις ἰδεῖν ἀκριβέστερον ἡλικὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα τῶν φίλων, εἰ τοὺς ἑστερημένους ἐκείνων σκέψαιτο. 13. οὐκοῦν ὁ μὲν τύραννος ἐν φόβῳ βέβαιον μὲν οὐδὲν τῶν (p. 69) παρόντων ἀγαθῶν ἡγούμενος, αἰεὶ δὲ τὸ μέλλον προσδοκῶν χαλεπὸν; ᾧ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι σύμβουλος ἀποστήσων μὲν τοῦ χείρονος, προσάξων δὲ τῷ βελτίονι καὶ πείσων τὰ μὲν φεύγειν, τὰ δὲ διώκειν, πῶς ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἢ πολεμήσειεν, ὅτ' ἄμεινον, ἢ τὴν εἰρήνην, ὅτε βέλτιον, ἔχοι; παρὰ τοῦ δ' ἂν τοὺς ἐπιβουλεύοντας προμαθῶν ἀποκρούσαιτο πρὸ τῆς πείρας τὰ δυσχερῆ; τίς δ' ἂν αὐτῷ νενικηκότε συμπαianίσειε; τίς δ' ἂν ἡττημένῳ συναχθεσθεῖη;

Τῇ πόλει δὲ κηδεμόνος ἀπορούση τίς τῶν ὄντων ἀσφάλεια, τίς ὑπὲρ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἄδεια; 14. εἶεν. τοῖς δὲ δὴ καθέκαστον οὐκ



10. In fact, what is impossible to do by ourselves we accomplish with the assistance of our friends. For example, who does not know that, according to Hesiod, a man needs a wife?<sup>284</sup> But the very ones who are about to marry may blush when broaching the subject of marriage. At this point need summons the friend; and he, by composing many fine speeches and by extolling the qualities he does have and imputing to him those he does not, very easily unites the families. 11. And at the loss of children and close relatives, where the pain is often too great to bear, who are the ones who are there, assuaging the grief and preventing a rush to suicide? Is it not friends? Anyone would say "yes" who has not been without friends.

Indeed, I would say that every period of life derives the greatest benefits from this relationship: Old age is less burdensome because of it; for those in the prime of life their associates come from their friends; for boys, those who share their exercise come from no other source. There is thus no situation you can mention that is beyond a need for friends.

12. <From the Opposite> These, then, are not insignificant examples of the fact that Alexander gave a wise answer, but I think that anyone can see more accurately how important the relationship of friends is if he investigates those men who have been deprived of them. 13. Isn't the tyrant in a state of fear because he believes that none of his present prosperity is secure and because he continually expects his future to be precarious? Indeed, for him there is no adviser to divert him from the worse course and to guide him to the better, to counsel him to avoid the former and to pursue the latter. How could such a man either wage war when that is preferable or maintain peace when that is more fitting? From whom could he learn in advance about those plotting against him and protect himself from the difficulties before the attempt? Who would congratulate him on his victories? Who would commiserate with him when he is defeated?

And for the city deprived of its guardian, what security is there for property, what confidence is there in the future? 14. Well, then, for individuals isn't a life that is deprived of such

<sup>284</sup> Cf. Hesiod, *Op.* 695-705.

ἀλγεινότητος ὁ βίος τῆς τοιαύτης κοινωνίας ἐστερημένος; τίς ἐπ' ἄγορᾷ διαλέξεται; τίς ὁ τι χρή πράττειν ὑποθήσεται; τίς ὁ φυλάσασθαι δεῖ συμβουλεύσει; τίς κουφίσει συμφορὰν; τίς κρινομένῳ παρέσται; 15. ἀφήρηται καὶ τῆς νεότητος ἡ τέρψις ἄνευ φίλων, καὶ γῆρας βαρύτερον, εἰ τοῦτο ἀφέλοι τις, καὶ πενία μὴ τοῦτο ἔχουσα διπλοῦν ἂν εἴη κακόν. ὁ δέ γε πλούσιος τοὺς μὲν ἐπιβουλεύοντας πολλοὺς, τοὺς δὲ βοηθοῦντας οὐδαμῶς ὄψεται. καὶ πολλὰ ἂν εἴη λέγειν ἃ τοῖς ἀποροῦσι φίλων συνέζευκται χαλεπά. εἰ τοίνυν τοῖς σπανίζουσι (p. 70) φίλων πάντα περιέστηκε τὰ δεινὰ, τοῖς γε ἐν εὐπορίᾳ γνωρίμων εὐδαιμονία πολλή. καὶ παραπλησίως τοῖς μὲν ἡδιστος, τοῖς δὲ βαρύτερος ὁ βίος.

16. <Παραβολή> Καὶ μὴν εἰκότως ἂν μᾶλλον οἱ φίλοι θησαν-ροὶ προσαγορευθεῖεν ἢ ταῦτα ἃ νῦν οὕτω κέκληται. τί γὰρ τοσοῦτον παρὰ τῶν χρημάτων ὅσον τὸ παρὰ τούτων; παρετάξατο χρήματα πολεμοῦσι καὶ παρεκινδύνευσεν; οὐκ ἔστιν. ἀλλ' εἰσηγήσατο γνώμην; ἀλλὰ προκατεμήνυσεν ἐνέδραν; ἀλλ' ἔλυσε στάσιν; ἀλλὰ φρονιμωτέρους ἐποίησεν; οὐδαμῶς. καὶ μὴν πάντα γε ταῦτα καὶ ἔτι πλείω τούτων παρὰ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων καὶ πρὸς γε αὐτὰ τὰ χρήματα παρ' αὐτῶν γέ-νοιτ' ἂν. ἔτι τοίνυν οἱ μὲν ἄριστοι τῶν φίλων οὐδεπώποτε χείρους τοὺς χρωμένους ἐποίησαν, τὸν δὲ πλοῦτον ἀκούομεν πολλάκις εἰς κακίαν συν-τελεῖν.

17. Ὡστε νουνεχόντως Ἀλέξανδρος μετέστησεν ἀπ' ἐκείνων ἐπὶ τούτους τοῦνομα. διόπερ αἰεὶ φίλων δεῖ τοῖς μέλλουσιν εὐδαιμόνως βιώ-σεσθαι. ὅτῳ δὲ οὐκ ἔστι τοιοῦτον κτῆμα, παραπλήσιον ἂν εἴη πεπονθῶς τῷ τῆς ἐτέρας ἐστερημένῳ ταῖν χεροῖν. ὅσον γὰρ ἀλλήλοις οἱ πόδες ἐν τῷ βαδίζειν συνεισφέρουσι, τοσοῦτον ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν οἱ φίλοι (p. 71) παρέχουσιν. οὐχ ἁμάρτοι δ' ἂν τις οὐδὲ τὴν συζυγίαν τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν παραβαλὼν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῶν φίλων. 18. ἔστι μὲν οὖν καὶ παρὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν γινομένων πλῆθος ἀποδείξεων λαβεῖν καὶ μεστὸς ὁ βίος τῶν εἰς τοῦτο φερόντων.

companionship very distressing? Who will converse with him in the agora? Who will suggest a proper course of action? Who will advise what should be guarded against? Who will alleviate misfortune? Who will stand by him when he is on trial? 15. Even the enjoyment of youth is taken away by a lack of friends, and old age is more burdensome if someone should remove this relationship; and poverty without it can be a double evil. And the rich man will certainly not perceive the many who are plotting against him and never those who are helping him. And so, it would be possible to identify many grievous things that are associated with those who are without friends. If, then, all terrible things happen to those who lack friends, much happiness certainly comes to those with an abundance of friends. And so, life is equally very pleasurable for the latter group and very burdensome for the former.

16. <Analogy> Moreover, friends can more reasonably be called “treasures” than the things that presently have that name. For what is there that comes from money that is as important as that which comes from friends? Has money taken its place alongside those who are waging war and shared in their dangers? Impossible. Well, has it put forward an opinion? Has it revealed an ambush in advance? Has it resolved a political conflict? Has it made people wiser? Never! And yet, all these things, and even more than these, come from friends and, in addition to those, money can come from them! Moreover, virtuous friends have never made their associates worse, but we hear that wealth often contributes to evil.

17. Consequently, Alexander wisely transferred the word “treasures” from money to friends. Therefore, for those who intend to live happily there is always a need for friends. Whoever does not have such a possession can suffer like a person who has lost one of his hands. Indeed, friends contribute just as much to one’s affairs as the feet assist one another in walking. And one would not be wrong to compare<sup>285</sup> the coordination of the eyes with the cooperation of friends. 18. Thus it is

<sup>285</sup> The word translated “compare” is *παραβάλων*, which is clearly an allusion to this very *κεφάλαιον*, namely the *παραβολή*.

<Παράδειγμα> Ἔχοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄνω χρόνους τῶν ἡμιθέων ὁρῶν ἅπ' αὐτῶν κομίσαι τὰ παραδείγματα. τί γὰρ ἐνδοξότερον τῆς Ἡρακλέους καὶ Θησέως φιλίας; ἢ τί τῶν κατωρθωμένων αὐτοῖς διὰ τοῦ ταῦτά προελέσθαι τε καὶ φρονῆσαι παραπλήσια καὶ συμπνεῦσαι πρὸς τοὺς ἄθλους; ὅτε δὲ ἀποστροφῆς ἐδέησεν αὐθις τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ, τίς ἀγαγὼν αὐτὸν Ἀθήναζε πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν ἤρκεσεν; ὁ Θησεύς.

19. Αὐτὸς τοίνυν οὗτος Θησεύς ὁ Πειρίθῳ χρώμενος— ἐξετάσωμεν ἃ τε ἀπήλαυσεν ἃ τε παρέσχεν. οὐκ οὖν ἔδει (p. 72) μὲν τῷ Θησεῖ τὴν Ἑλένην ἀγαγέσθαι δι' ἄρπαγῆς; ἐπεὶ δὲ πείθων οὐκ εἶχε λαβεῖν, ἦν δὴ ὁ κίνδυνος οὐ μικρός, τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ τοῦ πατρός, τοῦτο δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἐν Λακεδαίμονι. ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐτόλμα Θησεύς, οὐκ ἀπελείπετο δὲ Πειρίθους τὴν χάριν πρὸ τῶν φόβων τιθέμενος.

20. Καὶ οὐκ ἐμέμψατο τὴν προθυμίαν, ἀλλὰ τάχιστα δὴ τὴν ἀντίδοσιν ἐκομίζετο. βουλευθεὶς γὰρ μνηστεῦσαι Κόρην τὴν Διὸς καὶ Δήμητρος ἐκέλευσε μὲν τῷ Θησεῖ συνακολουθῆσαι, ὁ δὲ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα κατέχειν ἐπειρᾶτο πρόδηλον εἶναι λέγων τὴν συμφοράν, ἐπεὶ δὲ πείθειν λέγων οὐκ ἴσχυεν, ἐκοινώνει τῶν κινδύνων εἰδὼς μὲν ἃ πείσεται, παθεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον αἰρούμενος ἢ λυπῆσαι τὸν φίλον.

possible to take a number of proofs from day-to-day occurrences.<sup>286</sup> Indeed, life is full of things that contribute to this topic.

<Example> One can, however, also look to the earlier times of the demigods and take examples<sup>287</sup> from them. For what is held in higher esteem than the friendship of Herakles and Theseus?<sup>288</sup> Or what is more esteemed than what was accomplished by them through their having undertaken the same course of action, thinking alike, and breathing as one in their struggles? And when Herakles later needed refuge, who took him to Athens and satisfied his need? Theseus.<sup>289</sup>

19. Further, this Theseus was himself the friend of Perithous—let us examine both what he received and what he gave.<sup>290</sup> Wasn't it necessary for Theseus to marry Helen by force? For he was unable to obtain her by persuasion. There was, of course, no little danger, partly from her father and partly from her brothers and the others in Lacedaemon. Nonetheless, Theseus made the bold attempt, and Perithous did not desert him, since he set service ahead of his fears.

20. Perithous also did not blame him for his eagerness, but in fact very quickly got repayment. For he wanted to marry Kore,

<sup>286</sup> With the words *παρὰ τῶν καθ' ἡμέραν γινομένων* Libanius now alludes to the rhetorical definition of *παραβολή*, or analogy, that later commentators on Aphthonius quote in full for this *κεφάλαιον*; see esp. Doxapatres who defines a *παραβολή* by distinguishing it from a *παράδειγμα*, or example, the next *κεφάλαιον*: "An analogy differs from an example insofar as the former is taken from those things that happen everyday (*ἀπὸ τῶν καθ' ἑκάστην γινομένων*) . . . , whereas the latter is taken from those things that have happened once (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἅπαξ γεγονότων*)" (2.273, 4-9 Walz).

<sup>287</sup> Libanius' choice of *παραδείγματα* here is apposite since he is now turning to the *κεφάλαιον* called *παράδειγμα*.

<sup>288</sup> Libanius makes use of a common technique—citing pairs of friends as a way of illustrating true friendship. He cites four pairs, and all of them, including the first, are frequently mentioned elsewhere; for Herakles and Theseus, see, e.g., Diodorus Siculus, 4.26.1; Plutarch, *Thes.* 26.1; 30.5; 35.1-2; Aristides, *Orat.* 1.35; and Aelian, *VH.* 4.5.

<sup>289</sup> Libanius is no doubt referring to the occasion when Herakles was distraught after killing his children and Theseus invited his friend to Athens (see, e.g., Euripides, *HF* 1322-39).

<sup>290</sup> This pair of friends is also celebrated; see, e.g., Plutarch, *De amic. mult.* 93E. For the following stories regarding what Theseus received from Perithous and vice versa, see Plutarch, *Thes.* 29.2; 30.1-31.4; 35.1.

21. Τὸν δὲ παῖδα τὸν Ἀγαμέμνωνος πῶς ἀκούομεν διατεθῆναι μετὰ τὸν φόνον τῆς μητρός; οὐκ ἡλαύνετο μὲν ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑριννύων, ἐμισεῖτο δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων, ἐπάρατος δὲ καὶ δυσσεβῆς ἐδόκει παρὰ πᾶσι καὶ μιαρώτατος εἶναι; ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ Πυλάδης οὐκ ἀπεστράφη μετὰ τῆς τύχης τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐδὲ ἐνθυμηθεῖς ὡς μεταλήψεται τῆς ἀδοξίας ἐγκαλυψάμενος ἔφυγεν, ἀλλὰ παρῆν καὶ συνηκολούθει καὶ συνηγωνίζετο καὶ θεραπεύειν (p. 73) οὐκ ἠσχύνετο τὸν αὐτόχειρα τῆς μητρός.

22. Μικρὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν Ἀχιλλέως γνώμην κρινόμενα. ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ᾔδει σαφῶς ἀκούσας ὡς δεῖ δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ τὸν Ἑκτορα μὴ διαφθεῖρειν ἢ καὶ αὐτὸν τεθνάναι, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔμπροσθεν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ψυχῆς ἐποίησατο τιμωρῆσαι Πατρόκλῳ.

23. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Αὕτη μὲν ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων Ἀλεξάνδρῳ μαρτυρία, δεῖ δὲ μηδὲ Εὐριπίδην παραλιπεῖν, πάντως δὲ οὐκ ἀμφισβητήσιμος ἡ σοφία τοῦ ποιητοῦ. τί οὖν ἐκεῖνός φησι; μηδὲν εἶναι προτιμότερον φίλου σαφοῦς, οὗ δεύτερον πᾶν ἐφεξῆς ἄριστον. εἴτ' ἐπειδὴ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ἑώρα πλοῦτον καὶ τυραννίδα θαυμάζοντας, διαρρήδην φησίν·

the daughter of Zeus and Demeter, and ordered Theseus to accompany him. At first, Theseus tried to restrain him by saying that disaster was obvious from the start. When, however, he could not persuade him with talk, he shared the dangers, knowing what he would suffer and yet choosing to suffer rather than cause his friend distress.<sup>291</sup>

21. And the son of Agamemnon:<sup>292</sup> how do we hear he fared after the murder of his mother? Wasn't he persecuted by the Furies and hated by his own people, and didn't he seem accursed, impious, and utterly defiled in the eyes of everyone? Nonetheless, Pylades did not, like Fortune, desert the man, nor after he realized that he would share in the disgrace did he hide his face and flee. Instead, he remained by Orestes' side, accompanied him, shared his struggles, and was not ashamed to aid a man who had slain his own mother.<sup>293</sup>

22. All these examples pale when judged in the light of Achilles' decision. For he knew well, having been told that of necessity he had two options: Either not slay Hector or die himself. Nonetheless, he considered revenge for Patroclus more important than his own life.<sup>294</sup>

23. <Testimony of the Ancients> This is the testimony<sup>295</sup> for Alexander's affairs: One should not overlook Euripides. Surely, the wisdom of this poet is not controversial. What, then, does he say? There is nothing more precious than a true friend, next to

<sup>291</sup> See further Isocrates, *Helen* 20, and Plutarch, *Theseus* 31.4.

<sup>292</sup> The son of Agamemnon is, of course, Orestes, whom Libanius in what follows never does identify by name.

<sup>293</sup> Again, a very celebrated pair of friends, depicted in Euripides' *Orestes* and *Iphigeneia at Tauris*, whose friendship even merited them divine honors, at least among the Scythians (so Lucian, *Tox.* 1-8). See also Cicero, *Amic.* 15, and Plutarch, *De amic. mult.* 93E.

<sup>294</sup> Libanius is probably correct in identifying Achilles and Patroclus as the most famous pair of friends (see, e.g., Chariton, 1.5.2; Plutarch, *De amic. mult.* 93A; and Lucian, *Tox.* 10). Achilles' choice was either not to fight Hector, return home, and die in old age or to fight the Trojan hero, kill him, but die later at Troy (see *Il.* 9.410-11; 18.94-126; 19.400-23; cf. Philostratus, *Im.* 1.2).

<sup>295</sup> Once again Libanius has signaled his turning to a new κεφάλαιον by using a word (μαρτυρία) that is also found in the name for this κεφάλαιον: μαρτυρία τῶν παλαιῶν.

οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ τυραννὶς τοῦδε βέλτιον.

24. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Εἰκότως ἄρα θησαυροὶ τε ἐνομίσθησαν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ καὶ ὠνομάσθησαν οἱ φίλοι. ἔστι τοίνυν ἔχόντων νοῦν καὶ κεῖνον ἐπαινεῖν τοῦ λόγου καὶ αὐτοὺς μιμεῖσθαι τοῖς ἔργοις, ὥς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως εὐδαιμόνως βιώσομεν, εἰ μὴ φίλων πολλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν εὐποροῖμεν.



whom everything else is second best (cf. *Or.* 1055-56). Accordingly, when he has seen men admiring wealth and sovereignty, he says explicitly:<sup>296</sup>

Not wealth, not power is better than a friend.

24. <Brief Epilogue> It is reasonable, therefore, that friends have been considered and have been called "treasures" by Alexander. Consequently, it is the duty of intelligent men both to commend him for this saying and for them to imitate him by their deeds because there is no way that we are going to spend our lives happily unless we have many good friends.

<sup>296</sup> Libanius seems to be quoting from Euripides' *Orestes* from memory. At any rate, the exact words of Euripides (*Or.* 1155-56) that Libanius is recalling are:

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρεῖσσον ἢ φίλος σαφής,  
οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ τυραννίς.

There is nothing better than a true friend,  
Not wealth, not power.

Text 21. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(8.74, 1-82, 11 FOERSTER)

Διογένης μειράκιον ἰδὼν ἀτακτοῦν τὸν παιδαγωγὸν ἔπαισεν ἐπειπὼν· τί γὰρ τοιαῦτα παιδεύεις;

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ὑπάρχουσα μὲν μοι φιλοσοφία τίμιον καὶ δαιμόνιον καὶ μοι δοκοῦσιν οἱ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ ζῶντας μὴ θαυμάζοντες ἴσως ἂν πάντων τῶν θεῶν ὀλιγωρῆσαι, χρὴ δὲ τοσοῦτον αὐτοὺς ὑπολαμβάνειν τῶν λοιπῶν διαφέρειν ὅσον περ ἐκείνους τῶν θηρίων· τῶν δ' αὖ τοῦτον ἡρημένων τὸν βίον εἰκότως ἂν μοι δοκῶ Διογένη τε διαφερόντως ἀγασθῆναι καὶ τὴν ὁδὸν ἣν οὗτος ἦλθε.

2. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ οὐρανοῦ τε καὶ γῆς μέτρα ἡλίου τε καὶ σελήνης διερευνήσασθαι δρόμους ἄλλοις ἀφῆκεν, αὐτὸς δὲ μετῆλθεν ἀρετὴν ἢ μάλιστ' αὐτοὺς ζῶντας ὀνήσειν ἔμελλε. πλούτου κατεφρόνει, τῶν ἡδονῶν ἐκράτει, τὸ σῶμα παρῆχε τοῖς πόνοις, τὴν τῶν δυνατῶν εὐδαιμονίαν δυστυχίαν ἐνόμιζε. πάντας δὲ ἀνθρώπους οἰκείους (p. 75) ἡγούμενος ἐπεμελεῖτο πάντων καὶ συλλήβδην εἰπεῖν Ἡρακλέους ἑαυτὸν ζηλωτὴν κατέστησεν αὐτῇ βακτηρίᾳ περιῶν ἐπὶ τῷ βελτίους ποιεῖν οἷς ἐντυχάνοι. 3. οἷον δ' αὖ κακεῖνο διεπράξατο.

Text 21. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(8.74, 1-82, 11 FOERSTER)

Diogenes, on seeing a youth misbehaving, struck his paedagogus, adding: "Why do you teach such things?"<sup>297</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> Every philosophy, in my opinion, is a valuable and heaven-sent thing, and so people who do not admire those living by it would seem to me, perhaps, to be slighting all the gods. It is necessary to suppose that philosophers differ from the rest of mankind as much as these people do from wild beasts. Moreover, I should think it likely that of those who have chosen this way of life Diogenes as well as the path which he has followed have been especially admired.

2. Diogenes left to others the tasks of examining the dimensions of heaven and earth as well as the courses of the sun and moon, while he himself pursued virtue which was going to be of special benefit to the living. He despised wealth, controlled his pleasures, exposed his body to toil, and considered the good fortune of the powerful to be misfortune. Because he regarded all people to be kindred, he was concerned for everyone and, in a word, appointed himself a zealous follower of Herakles, going around with that staff of his for the improvement of those he met.<sup>298</sup> 3. And what accomplishments has this man done!

<sup>297</sup> On this chreia, the most popular in the rhetorical tradition, see *Chreia* 1.316. Two other elaborations of this chreia are extant (see below Texts 24 and 30); on their close relation with Libanius, see the introduction to Libanius.

<sup>298</sup> Libanius, who otherwise refers to Diogenes only one other time (*Orat.* 17.16 [2.213, 1-4 Foerster]), has summarized Cynic teaching rather well. Cynics rejected physics and concentrated on ethics (Diogenes Laertius, 6.103); rejected wealth (Lucian, *Gall.* 13, 20-33); pursued self-control (ps.-Socrates, *Ep.* 12 [p. 250 Malherbe]); preferred toil over pleasure (Dio, *Orat.* 8.12-26); and emulated Herakles, identifying their staff with their hero's club (Lucian, *Peregr.* 36). That this summary is done with detail, accuracy, and ease is not surprising, however, as the educational curriculum, as early as the primary stage, introduced students to Cynics and Cynicism (see further Ronald F. Hock, "Cynics and Rhetoric," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.D. 400* [ed. S. E. Porter; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997] 755-73, esp. 764-72).

<Παραφραστικόν> Παιδὶ μὲν γὰρ ὁ παιδαγωγὸς παρῆν, τὸν δὲ προσήκοντα κόσμον ὁ παῖς οὐκ ἐφύλαττε, Διογένης δὲ τὸ πραττόμενον ἐπανορθώματος ἐδόκει δεῖσθαι. τί οὖν ποιεῖ; τὸν νέον ὑπερβὰς ἐπὶ τὸν ἐφεστηκότα φέρεται καὶ παίει κατὰ τοῦ νώτου πολλὰς καὶ προστίθησι ταῖς πληγαῖς τὸν λόγον, ὥς οὐκ ἄρα χρή τοιοῦτον εἶναι παιδευτήν.

4. <Αἰτία> Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἀμφοτέρων εἵνεκα τὸν ἄνδρα ἐπαινῶ, τοῦ τε μὴ κατοκνήσαι ταῖς χερσὶ χρήσασθαι πρὸς τὸ σωφρονίσει καὶ τοῦ τὴν αἰτίαν εἰπεῖν δι' ἣν τοῦτο ἐποίησε. τοὺς τε γὰρ σφόδρα ἀδικοῦντας ἔργῳ παιδεύειν ἡξίου τό τε μὴ σιωπῆσαι καὶ τὸ <εἰπεῖν> πόθεν ἐπὶ τὰς πληγὰς παρωμήθη δηλοῦντος ἦν τῷ πεπονηθότι τοῦ χάριν ταῦτ' ἐπεπόνθει. εἰ γὰρ πλήξας ἀπιὼν ῥέχετο σιωπῇ, οὐδὲν ἂν ἐκώλυσε τὸν μὲν παιδαγωγὸν ἀγνοῆσαι πλημμελήσαντα, τῇ δὲ ἀγνοίᾳ μηδὲν βελτίῳ γενέσθαι.

5. Καὶ μὴν τὸ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τοῦ νέου (p. 76) παρὰ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ τὴν τιμωρίαν λαβεῖν νοῦν ἐχόντων εὐρήσομεν. ἐνθυμηθῶμεν γὰρ ὅτου χάριν οἱ γονεῖς μισθοῦνται τοὺς ἐπιστησομένους τοῖς υἱέσιν. ἄρά γε μάτην ἐπιθυμοῦντες δαπανᾶσθαι χρήματα, ἀναλίσκειν πλοῦτον; πόθεν; οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀπόπληκτος. 6. ἀλλὰ πρὸς τί δὴ βλέπουσιν; ἴσασιν ἐκεῖνοι τὴν νεότητα ἐπιρρεπῇ φύσει πρὸς τὰ ἀμαρτήματα, κατὰ δὲ τῶν χρηστῶν ἀεὶ τὴν ἐναντίαν δόξαν ἔχουσιν καὶ φεύγουσιν μὲν ἀφ' ὧν ἔστιν εὐδαιμονίαν λαβεῖν, διώκουσιν δὲ δι' ὧν ἔστιν ἀθλιωτάτους γενέσθαι. 7. ἴν' οὖν τῷ νέῳ παρὰ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μαθήσθαι εἴη, τίσι μὲν προσεκτέον, τίνων δ' ἀφεκτέον, τούτου χάριν τὴν πλείστην πρόνοιαν ἐνταῦθα εἰσφέρονται παιδαγωγοὺς ὥς μάλιστα βελτίστους ἀνερευνᾶν κανόνα τῶν τοῦ παιδὸς πραγμάτων ποιούμενοι τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην. 8. τεκμήριον δέ, τῶν γὰρ ἀνθρώπων ἕκαστος τῷ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ τρόπῳ τεκμαίρεται τὸν τοῦ νέου. κἄν μὲν ἦ χρηστὸς ἐκεῖνος, καὶ

<Paraphrastic [section]> A paedagogus<sup>299</sup> was in the company of a boy, but the boy was not maintaining the proper decorum. To Diogenes his behavior seemed to need correction. What, then, does he do? He ignores the young man and goes after the one in charge, inflicts many blows on his back, and adds to the blows the remark that such a man should certainly not be a teacher.

4. <Rationale> First, then, I praise Diogenes on both counts: on his not hesitating to use force to reprimand and on his stating the reason for doing so. For in the case of those doing serious harm, he thought it proper to chastise them with an act; and his not keeping silent but <stating> why he had been provoked to the blows was his way of revealing to the recipient why he had received them. For if he had dealt the blows and gone away in silence, he would in no way have prevented the paedagogus from remaining ignorant of his mistake, and because of this ignorance the paedagogus would not have been improved.

5. Indeed, we shall find it characteristic of intelligent men to exact punishment from the paedagogus for the mistakes of the young man. For let us consider why parents hire those who are to be placed in charge of their sons. Is it out of a desire to spend money in vain, to squander wealth? Impossible! No one is so senseless. 6. Well, what is their intention? They know that youth is by nature prone to mistakes, since it always holds the opposite opinion about what is good, fleeing from those things by which it is possible to derive happiness and pursuing those by which it is possible to become extremely wretched. 7. Therefore, in order that the young man may be able to learn from his elders—what one should pursue and what one should avoid—for this reason parents apply the greatest forethought in this matter when searching out the best possible paedagogi, because they consider the judgment of the paedagogus to be the norm for the boy's actions. 8. And there is proof of this, for each man judges the character of the young man by that of the paedagogus. And if the latter is

<sup>299</sup> On the paedagogus, who was typically an older slave with the responsibilities of overseeing a boy's progress at school as well as his daily conduct to and from school and at home, see the detailed portrait of this slave role in Diogenes Laertius, 6.30-31. Cf. also N. H. Young, "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NovT* 29 (1987) 150-76, esp. 157-75.

περὶ τούτου προσδοκᾷ τὰ βελτίω, (p. 77) μὴ τοιούτου δὲ ὄντος χείρους ἐλπίδας καὶ περὶ τοῦ νέου λαμβάνει. 9. οὐκοῦν τοῦ μὲν πατρὸς ἀργύριον δοῦναι, τοῦ δὲ παιδαγωγοῦ τῶν λοιπῶν φροντίσαι μηδὲν ὑποστέλλομενον. διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ παίζειν καὶ ἄγχειν καὶ στρεβλοῦν καὶ ἅ τῶν δεσποτῶν πρὸς τοὺς οἰκέτας, ταῦτα καὶ τῶν υἱέων τοῖς ἐφ' ἐστῶσιν ἀξιοῦσιν ὑπάρχειν, ὥς μηδεὶς ἀπόλογος ἐσύστερον ἦ.

10. Τί οὖν φημι; μᾶλλον δέ, τί Διογένης φησὶν; ἂν πίνειν πέρα τοῦ μετρίου βούληται, μηδαμῶς, ὦ τάν, ἐπίτρεπε. καὶ τὸν ὕπνον δὲ τὸν ἕξω τοῦ προσήκοντος διάκοπτε. καὶ πρὸς ἀργίαν ἐκφερόμενον ἀνέγειρε καὶ παρατήρει βλέμμα καὶ σχῆμα καὶ φωνὴν μὴ παρὰ μέλος συμβῇ. καὶ τὰ μὲν πρῶτα πειρῶ νοθετεῖν, εἰ δ' ἀντιτείνει, κόλαζε καὶ πικρὸς ὑπὲρ σωφροσύνης φαίνου μᾶλλον ἢ τῇ φιланθρωπίᾳ ζημιοῦ. πάρεστιν ἱμάς. ξαίνει κατὰ τοῦ νώτου πολλὰς. φοβείσθω τὴν σὴν βακτηρίαν. εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἑκεῖνος τὴν σὴν, σὺ τὴν ἐμήν.

Τούτους ἡγεῖσθαι χρή Διογένης τοὺς λόγους. ἐν γὰρ τῷ τί γὰρ τοιαῦτα παιδεύεις; εἰπεῖν ταῦτα πάντα περιείληφεν. 11. ἔτι τοίνυν ὥδι σκεψώμεθα. πότερον οὖν παρῆν (p. 78) τῷ παιδί διαπαντὸς ἢ οὐ; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεστάτει, προδότης ἦν τοῦ νέου σαφής· εἰ δὲ συνέζευκτο, πότερον ἠρέσκετο τοῖς πλημμελήμασιν ἢ οὐ; εἰ μὲν γὰρ βουλομένου ταῦτα ἦν ἁμαρτάνεσθαι, τίς τοῦ τοιούτου πονηρότερος; εἰ δὲ οὐ βουλομένου, τί παθῶν οὐκ ἐκώλυνεν; οὐ γὰρ δὴ χεῖρας ἔμελλεν ὁ νέος ἀνταίρειν. τὸ γὰρ πείθεσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀντιβλέπειν ἀναγκαῖον ὃν ἠπίστατο.

12. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Εἰ δὲ ἅ τὸν παιδαγωγὸν ὁ Διογένης, ταῦτα τὸν νέον ἐτύγχανε δράσας, οὐκ ἂν ἐκεῖνον εἰπεῖν νομίζομεν; ὦ σοφώτατε Διόγενες, ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὑπείληπται καλὸν ὃ δίδωσι πράττειν ὁ κύριος. καὶ νῦν σὺ μὲν ταύτην ἀταξίαν, ἐγὼ δὲ παιδεῖαν ἡγοῦμαι. σημεῖον δὲ τὸ μηδὲ τὸν παιδαγωγὸν ἀποτρέπειν ποιοῦμαι.

decent, he expects the best from the former; but if he is not such a man, he entertains worse hopes about the young man as well. 9. Therefore, it is the father's duty to pay money, that of the paedagogus to attend to everything else, with no reservation. This is why beating, throttling, torturing and whatever is characteristic behavior of owners toward their slaves—all these parents deem it proper for those in charge of their sons to do, so that there can be no excuse afterwards.

10. What, therefore, am I saying? Or rather, what is Diogenes saying? "If the young man should want to drink too much, by no means, my fine fellow, give in. Interrupt his sleep that is longer than is fitting, and rouse him when he is inclined to laziness. Carefully watch his facial expression, his attire, and his voice,<sup>300</sup> so that he not turn out badly. First, try to admonish him, but if the young man resists, chastize him, and appear harsh for the sake of self-control or be punished for leniency. The strap is available. Apply numerous lashes to his back.<sup>301</sup> Let him fear your staff. But if he doesn't fear yours, you will mine."

It is necessary to regard this speech as characteristic of Diogenes, for when he said, "Why do you teach such things," he has included all these ideas. 11. Let's examine further, as follows: Was the paedagogus with the boy at all times, or not? For if he was usually absent, he has clearly betrayed the young man. But if he was virtually yoked to him, was he pleased with this bad behavior, or not? For if it was in his character to want these mistakes to be committed, who would be more evil than such a man? But if it was not, why did he not prevent it when he saw it happening? For the young man was surely not going to raise his hands against him, because he knew that obeying and not looking him straight in the face was required.

12. <From the Opposite> If, however, Diogenes had happened to treat the young man as he did the paedagogus, would we not suppose the young man to say: "O Diogenes, wisest of men, it has been my understanding that what the master allows me to do is proper. And now you consider this to be unruly behavior, but

<sup>300</sup> The language here recalls Demosthenes, *Orat.* 21.72: τῷ σχήματι, τῷ βλέμματι, τῇ φωνῇ.

<sup>301</sup> The language here is a virtual quotation from Demosthenes, *Orat.* 19.197: ἰμᾶντά τις φερέτω . . . ὁ οἰκέτης ξαίνει κατὰ νότου πολλάς.

Εἰ ταῦτα ἤκουσεν, ἄρ' οὐχ ὠμολόγησεν ἄν ἀκρισίᾳ περὶ τὰς πληγὰς κεχρηῆσθαι; πάνυ γε. διόπερ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον οὔτε ἔπραξεν οὔτε ἤκουσεν.

13. Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ πανταχοῦ τὰς ἀρχὰς καὶ τὰς ὑποθέσεις προσήκει τῶν πραγμάτων σκοπεῖν καὶ πρὸς ἐκείνας πάντα (p. 79) ἀναφέρειν τὰ δεύτερα (τὸ γὰρ παρέχον τὴν ἀφορμὴν καὶ τῶν ἀκολουθούντων κομίζεται τὸν λόγον, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀταξίας ὑπὸ μὲν τοῦ παιδὸς ἐγίγνετο, κατεσκευάστο δὲ τῇ τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ ῥαθυμίᾳ), οὐ δὴ ψιλὸν ἐξήτασε τοῦργον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν δόντα τῷ πράγματι τὴν καταβολὴν καὶ τῷ μὲν πράττοντι συνένω, τὸν δὲ δόντα τὴν ἄδειαν ἐμίσησεν. 14. οὗ γὰρ μὴ συγχωρήσαντος οὐκ ἂν ποτ' ἐπέπρακτο, τοῦτον ἡγεῖτο δίκην τῶν πραχθέντων ὀφείλειν. καὶ γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς τῶν ἀτοπωτάτων, εἰ μὲν τι τῶν ἀμεινόνων ὑπὸ τῶν νέων γένοιτο, τὸν ἐφεστηκότα τὴν δόξαν καρποῦσθαι, τῶν δὲ ὡς ἐτέρως ἐχόντων μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι.

15. Ἐγὼ πολλάκις ἔγνων τὸν μὲν νέον ἀπομνημονεύοντα καλῶς, τὸν δὲ παιδαγωγὸν μέγα φρονεῖν ἀξιοῦντα, καὶ τὸν νέον μὲν ὡς ὀξύτατα συνιέντα, τὸν δὲ μάλιστα σεμνυνόμενον, καὶ τὸν μὲν σωφρονοῦντα, τὸν δέ, εἰ μὴ τις αὐτὸν ἐπαινοίῃ, δεινὰ φάσκοντα πάσχειν. 16. καὶ μὴν οἱ γονεῖς ὅταν αἰσθῶνται τὰ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῖς ὡς (p. 80) ἄριστα προχωροῦντα καὶ λόγων εἵνεκα καὶ τρόπων, αὐτὸν μὲν οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἂν θαυμάσαιεν, εἰς δὲ τὸν ἐπόπτην καὶ τὸν ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἄγοντα ῥέπουσι, κροτοῦσιν, ἐπαινοῦσι, χρήματα προτείνουσι, καὶ τῶν παραχρῆμα διδομένων τὰ προσδοκώμενα μείζω.

17. Ἔστιν οὖν ἀπλοῦς καὶ δίκαιος λόγος· οὐδεὶς θαυμάσεται τὸν νέον τῶν ἀγαθῶν. οὐ τοίνυν οὐδὲ κολάσει τῶν ἐναντίων. ἐπὶ τὸν



I consider it to be education. I base my belief on the fact that the paedagogus does not even try to dissuade me.”

If Diogenes had heard these words, would he not have agreed that he had used poor judgment regarding the blows? Of course, he would. Therefore, he neither did nor heard such a thing.<sup>302</sup>

13. Since it is altogether fitting to examine the origins and bases of actions and to attribute all subsequent actions to these (for what provides the starting-point also carries with it the reason for what follows, and so the unruly behavior originated with the boy, but the way for it had been prepared by the negligence of the paedagogus), Diogenes did not, of course, examine just the conduct; he also examined the one who set the stage for the conduct; and so he excused the one who acted but hated the one who tolerated the excessive freedom. 14. For, if the paedagogus had not consented, the act would never have been done, and so Diogenes thought that the paedagogus deserved punishment for what had been done. Indeed, how truly ridiculous it is for the one in charge to reap the glory if there is some improvement by the young men, but when the opposite occurs, for the same man not to be responsible.

15. I have often observed that when the young man has performed well, the paedagogus thinks it proper to be proud; and when the young man has a very keen intelligence, the paedagogus affects an especially grave and solemn air; but when the young man is well-behaved, the paedagogus, if someone does not praise him, says that he is being horribly treated. 16. Indeed, the parents, whenever they perceive that their boy's progress in rhetoric and character is developing as well as possible, could admire him more than a little for this progress; but they incline towards the one who is supervising and guiding the boy's progress, applaud him, praise him, offer him money, and his expectations are greater than what is given at the moment.

17. Straightforward and just, therefore, is Diogenes' statement: "No one will admire the young man for his virtues, nor

<sup>302</sup> Libanius seems to be saying here that since he struck the paedagogus, he did not strike the youth, and since he did not strike the youth, then he also did not hear such a statement as that put in the mouth of the youth.

παιδαγωγὸν ἤξει τὸ θαῦμα τῶν δεξιῶν, οὐκοῦν καὶ τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἡ ζημία. ἢ μέγιστα ἂν εἶεν πλεονεκτοῦντες καὶ κείνων δῶρα λαμβάνοντες καὶ τούτων δίκην μὴ διδόντες. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄξιον. ἀλλ' [οἱ] <εἰ κατορθῶτό τι> τῶν τιμῶν καὶ τῆς τιμωρίας, εἰ πλημμελοῖτό τι, κληρονομοῖεν ἂν εἰκότως. καὶ μὴ τῆς φιλοτιμίας ἀντιποιοῦμενοι ἀγανακτούντων ἐπὶ ταῖς πληγαῖς.

18. <Παραβολή> Τοῦτο τὸ δίκαιον πανταχοῦ σωζόμενον εὐρήσομεν. ἦσεν ὁ χορὸς πλημμελῶς. τὸν διδάσκαλον ἐν αἰτίαις ἔχει τὸ θέατρον, καὶ τῶν μὲν χορευτῶν οὐδεὶς καθάπτεται, τὸν δὲ οὐ καλῶς ῥυθμίσαντα τοῦτον ἐλαύνουσι. δῆλον γὰρ ὡς, εἴπερ οὗτος ὑψηγέτο τὴν ἀμείνω, ταύτην ἂν ἦλθεν ἐκείνων ἕκαστος. 19. βοῦς (p. 81) δὲ ὅταν κυρίτῃ, πότερα τὸν βουκόλον ἢ ἐκείνον μεμφόμεθα; πῶλος δὲ ὅταν ἀτακτῇ, πότερον ἐκείνον ἢ τὸν ἡνίοχον κακίζομεν; φροντιζέτω δὲ καὶ τῆς τῶν ναυτῶν ἀρετῆς ὁ κυβερνήτης ὡς αὐτὸς ὑφέξων λόγον ὧν ἂν ἐκείνοι σφαλῶσιν. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸν λοχαγὸν τὰ τῶν ἐπομένων ἐγκλήματα βαδίζει, τὰ γὰρ ἐκείνου νεύματα τῶν πρακτέων τοῖς στρατιώταις ὁρος, οὕτω καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῶν ἀμαρτανομένων τοῖς νέοις ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ κεφαλὴν δικαίως ἂν ἀναθεῖεν ἅπαντες.

20. <Παράδειγμα> Γένοιτο δ' ἂν ὃ φημι γνωριμώτερον, εἰ πρὸς τὰς μεγίστας τῶν Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων ἀποβλέψαιμεν, τὴν Ἀθηναίων λέγω καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων. Ἀθηναῖοι μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀναιρεθέντων τῶν πεσόντων ἐν Ἀργινούσαις τοὺς μὲν στρατηγούς ἀπέκτειναν, τοὺς δὲ λοιποὺς οὐδ' ἐμέμψαντο. καίτοι γε πάντες ὁμοίως ἦσαν ἡμεληκότες τῆς τῶν ἀπελθόντων ταφῆς, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τὴν ῥαθυμίαν ἥδεσαν ἀπὸ τῶν στρατηγῶν ὠρμημένην, τούτων τὸ ἐγκλημα (p. 82) καὶ τὴν δίκην ἐποίησαντο.

again will anyone punish him for the opposite. To the paedagogus will come admiration for the young man's virtues and consequently punishment for his mistakes." Otherwise, paedagogi would be at a very great advantage if they received gifts for the former but paid no penalty for the latter. But that is not right. Rather, they can reasonably expect honors, <should something be successfully completed>, and punishment, should some mistake be made. And so, since they seek after honor, let them not be angry at the blows.

18. <Analogy> We will find this kind of justice preserved everywhere. The chorus has sung off-key. The audience holds the trainer at fault. No member of the chorus is upbraided, but the one who has not provided the proper training is dismissed. For it is clear that, if he had shown them the better path, each of them would have taken it. 19. Whenever an ox butts, do we blame the cowherd or the animal? And whenever a colt is unruly, do we reprimand it or its rider? And let the sea-captain worry about the skill of his sailors since he alone will render account for whatever mistakes they may make. For just as accusations against followers go to their commander, for the commands of the latter are a standard for his soldiers' actions, so also would everyone rightly place the blame on the head of the paedagogus for the mistakes of young men.

20. <Example> What I am saying would be more intelligible if we look closely at the greatest of Greek cities, I mean Athens and Lacedaemon. For example, the Athenians, when the bodies of those who had fallen at Arginusae were not recovered, executed the generals but did not blame anyone else. And yet, all were equally negligent about the burial of those who had perished, but when they realized that the negligence had begun with the generals, the Athenians accused and punished them.<sup>303</sup>

<sup>303</sup> Libanius is referring to the naval battle at Arginusae, fought in 406 B.C. toward the end of the Peloponnesian War and considered the greatest naval battle of Greeks against Greeks (so Diodorus Siculus, 13.98.5). Although the Athenians defeated the Peloponnesians, the victory turned sour when it was learned that the bodies of the dead were not retrieved due to a violent storm which struck the Hellespont shortly after the battle. As a result the generals were blamed, condemned, and put to death. On the battle and its aftermath, see Xenophon, *HG* 1.7.1-35; Diodorus Siculus, 13.97.1-103.2; and Hammond,

21. Λακεδαιμόνιοι δὲ τῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεμιστοκλέα τιμῇ δῆλον κατέστησαν ὥς τῶν τὰς αἰτίας παρεχομένων τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα γίνεται. μετὰ γὰρ τὰς γενναίας ἐκείνας καὶ θαυμαστὰς πράξεις ἃς ἐπεδείκνυντο κατὰ τοῦ βαρβάρου Θεμιστοκλῆς μὲν ἦκεν εἰς Σπάρτην, οἱ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐστεφάνωσαν τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι ναυμαχίας ἀφορμὴν ποιούμενοι τὴν ἐκείνου διάνοιαν.

<Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> omisit Libanius

22. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Οὐκοῦν Διογένης μὲν ὀρθῶς οἶδεν ὅτω προσήκουσιν αἱ πληγαί, δεῖ δὲ τοὺς εὖ φρονούντας ἐκεῖνον ἐπαινεῖν καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις μιμεῖσθαι.

21. The Lacedaemonians clearly established, by their honor to Themistocles, that all matters derive from those who furnish the causes. For, after the noble and remarkable actions which the Lacedaemonians displayed against the barbarian, Themistocles came to Sparta, and the Spartans crowned him because they considered his intelligence to have been the reason for the naval battle at Salamis.<sup>304</sup>

<Testimony of the Ancients> (Missing)<sup>305</sup>

22. <Brief Epilogue> Therefore, Diogenes correctly understood which one deserved the blows, and so it is necessary for those who are prudent to praise Diogenes and imitate him by their actions.

*History of Greece*, 414-16. On the trial, see Douglas M. MacDowell, *The Law in Classical Athens* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978) 186-89. Incidentally, this battle and the trial were familiar to students of rhetoric who encountered them, in a form rather close to the one Libanius is using, in connection with *συγγνώμη*, or plea-for-leniency (see Hermogenes, *Stat.* 2 [p. 39, 3-26, esp. 15-16 Rabe]: "An example of a plea-for-leniency: the ten generals who did not pick up the bodies on account of the storm are brought to trial"). See further Heath, *Hermogenes on Issues*, 76, and, more broadly, Susan A. Stephens, "The Arginusae Theme in Greek Rhetorical Theory and Practice," *BASP* 20 (1983) 171-80.

<sup>304</sup> This great naval battle occurred in 480 B.C. The Greeks destroyed much of the Persian fleet and hence achieved a decisive victory over them (see Herodotus, 8.83-96, and Hammond, *History of Greece*, 237-44). Themistocles, the Athenian leader who proposed that the Greeks encounter the Persians at sea, was credited with the victory but was disliked by the Athenians and eventually banished; in Sparta, however, he received the honors mentioned here (see Herodotus, 8.124; Thucydides, 1.73-74; and Plutarch, *Them.* 17).

<sup>305</sup> The omission of the Testimony may be accidental, as Libanius otherwise includes all eight *κεφάλαια*. Nevertheless, since both the preceding Example section and the following Epilogue are complete, a lacuna is most unlikely, leaving a deliberate omission as the more likely explanation. The two other elaborations, ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous, cite Sophocles, *Phil.* 386-88, as the testimony for this chreia.

Text 22. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(8.82, 12–97, 9 FOERSTER)

Ἰσοκράτης τῆς παιδείας τὴν μὲν ρίζαν ἔφη πικράν, τοὺς δὲ καρποὺς γλυκεῖς.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ὁ μὲν τις Ἰσοκράτην ἐπαινεῖ τῶν λόγων οἷς (p. 83) τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἐκόσμησεν, ὁ δὲ τῶν συμβουλευτῶν ἐν αἷς πολλὴν ἐπεδείξατο τὴν σύνεσιν, ἔνιοι δὲ καὶ τῶν δικανικῶν ἐν οἷς οὐδενὸς ἐφάνη φαυλότερος. οἱ δὲ τοῦ τῶν ὀνομάτων, οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦ τῶν ῥυθμῶν ἐαλώκασι κάλλους. 2. ἡσθόμην δὲ τινων καὶ τὸ μηδὲ τοῖς κοινοῖς αὐτὸν ἐθελῆσαι προσελθεῖν ἐν θαύματι πεποιημένων. λογίζονται γὰρ ὥς, εἰ μὲν ἐγένετο τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, αὐτὸν ἂν μόνον παρέσχε ρήτορα τῇ πόλει τῶν Ἀθηναίων, παιδεύειν δὲ τάξας ἑαυτὸν καὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων ὑψηγεῖσθαι τέχνην πολλοὺς ἀνθ' ἑνὸς τῷ βίῳ κατέστησεν.

3. Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπαινῶ μὲν καὶ ταῦτα ἢ σφόδρα ἂν εἶην ἄτοπος, εἰ μὴ βουλοίμην ἐπαινεῖν. οὐδὲν ἥττον μέντοι θαυμάσας ἔχω τὰς ὑποθήκας, αἷς ὅσοι ἐπείσθησαν εὖρον ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων τὸ κέρδος. αὐτῶν δὲ γε τῶν ὑποθηκῶν τὰς μὲν ἐν γράμμασι, τὰς δὲ ἀπὸ στόματος οὕτοσιν πρὸς τοὺς συνόντας εἰπὼν ἐν μνήμῃ καταλέλοιπε. 4. τῶν δ' αὖ τῇ μνήμῃ σωζομένων πολλὰς μὲν ἔξεστιν ἐξετάσαι, χαλεπὸν δὲ ἀπάσας. διόπερ ἐνὶ μόνῳ χρήσομαι πρὸς τὸ παρόν, ὃ περὶ τῆς παιδείας εἴρηκε. καὶ γὰρ ἂν εἴη πρέπον παιδεύειν ἐπιχειροῦντα τοῦτο πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων (p. 84) πρεσβεύειν.

Text 22. Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(8.82, 12-97, 9 FOERSTER)

Isocrates said, "The root of education is bitter, but its fruits are sweet."<sup>306</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> One person praises Isocrates for the speeches with which he honored good men; another praises him for the advisory speeches in which he displayed great intelligence; and still others praise him also for the judicial speeches in which he appeared second to none.<sup>307</sup> Some have also been captivated by the beauty of his words, others by the beauty of his rhythms.<sup>308</sup> 2. I have also observed some who have considered it admirable that he did not desire to enter public life. For they reason that, if he had belonged to those at the bar, he would have offered himself only as a public speaker to the city of Athens, but by undertaking the task of educator and guide in the arts of oratory, he produced many orators by means of his profession instead of just one.

3. I, too, praise these activities—indeed, I would be very ridiculous if I were unwilling to offer praise. At any rate, I have admired his teachings no less, those by which all who have accepted them have found profit in their affairs. Of the teachings which are remembered, some he has left in writing and some in oral form which he told to his students. 4. Of the teachings that are preserved in tradition, it is possible to examine many, but it is difficult to do so for them all. Therefore, I will treat just one teaching at present—the one he delivered concerning education. In fact, it would be fitting for one who strives to be an educator to give this teaching precedence over the others.

<sup>306</sup> On this chreia see further *Chreia* 1.325-26 as well as the much briefer elaborations of it in Hermogenes 35-62 and Aphthonius 23-78.

<sup>307</sup> On Isocrates' acknowledged excellence in all three kinds of speech, see, e.g., ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 837A-C. Cf. also Doxapatres, 2.277, 9-14 Walz.

<sup>308</sup> On Isocrates' style, see Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Isoc.* 2-3, 13-14, and *Dem.* 17-20.

5. <Παραφραστικόν> Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ ὡς εἶδε τοὺς νέους ἀποδιδράσκοντας τῷ φόβῳ τῶν πόνων καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐν ἀρχῇ λογιζομένους ἰδρῶτας, τὸ δὲ ἀπ' αὐτῶν κέρδος οὐ προσενθυμουμένους τί ποιεῖ; παρὰ τοῖς πρώτοις τὴν τελευτὴν καὶ τοῖς λυπηροῖς τὴν ἡδονὴν μᾶλλον δι' ἐκείνην ἔρωμενεστέρους κατέστησεν ἢ διὰ ταῦτα ῥαθυμοτέρους. ἡ γὰρ παιδεία, φησὶν, ἔχει μὲν ρίζαν, ἔχει δὲ καρπούς καὶ τῇ μὲν τὸ πικρὸν πρόσεστιν, τοῖς δὲ τὸ ἥδιστον συνέzeugται.

6. <Αἰτία> Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειε πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων εὐθύς τὴν ἀλήθειαν; ἐξετάσωμεν γὰρ ἀμφοτέρους τοὺς καιρούς, τὸν τε τῆς ἀρχῆς ἢν ὀνομάζει ρίζαν, καὶ τὸν τῆς τελευτῆς εἰς ὃν φέρει τὸ τῶν καρπῶν. εὐρήσομεν γὰρ τὴν μὲν ἀποκναίουσιν ἀηδία, τὴν δὲ εὐφραίνουσιν μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς.

7. Σκόπει γὰρ· ἵδρυται μὲν ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ τινος <θρόνου>, ὥσπερ οἱ δικασταί, φοβερός, συνάγων τὰς ὀφρῦς, θυμὸν ἐμφανίζων, οὐδὲν εἰρηναῖον προδεικνύς. (p. 85) δεῖ δὴ τὸν νέον προσιέναι τρέμοντα καὶ συνεσταλμένον ποικίλην ποιησόμενον τὴν ἐπίδειξιν ὧν εὔρεν, ὧν συνέθηκε, μνήμης ἐπὶ τούτοις. κἂν φαύλως αὐτῷ ἢ ταῦτα παρεσκευασμένα, ἀγανακτήσεις, λοιδορίαι, πληγαί, περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀπειλαί· ἂν δὲ πάντα αὐτῷ πρὸς ἄκρον ἡσκημένα φαίνεται καὶ μηδαμοῦ μέμψει παρέχη χώραν, κέρδος τὸ μὴ παθεῖν κακῶς καὶ παραγγέλσεις τοῦ μὴ χεῖρω πρὸς τὰ δεύτερα γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον δέ, τοῖς πάντα ἃ προσήκει πληροῦσιν ἀπόκειται τι χαλεπόν. ὁμοῦ τε γὰρ ἀνενδεῶς ἔδοξαν



5. <Paraphrastic [section]><sup>309</sup> When Isocrates saw<sup>310</sup> young men running away from toil out of fear and considering only the initial sweat but not thinking also of the profit that comes from toil—what does he do? By setting the end alongside the beginning and the pleasure alongside what is painful, he made the young men more enthusiastic on account of the pleasure rather than more discouraged on account of the pain. “For education,” he says, “has a root but it has fruits as well; and to the former bitterness is attached, but to the latter the sweetest pleasure is closely joined.”

6. <Rationale><sup>311</sup> Who, therefore, would not immediately honor the truth before everything else? Let us examine both periods of times: the one at the beginning which he terms “root” as well as the one at the end to which he assigns the term “fruits.” We shall discover the former to be irksome because of its unpleasantness but the latter to be exceedingly enjoyable.

7. Consider: The teacher is seated on some lofty <seat>, like judges: fearsome, frowning, exhibiting his temper, showing no patience at all. The young man must, of course, approach trembling and cringing as he is about to make a complex declamation of his own invention and composition, and on top of that he must do it from memory. And if these tasks have been badly prepared by him, there are reproofs, reproaches, blows, and threats regarding the future. On the other hand, if everything seems to have been rehearsed perfectly by him and he nowhere offers occasion for censure, his reward is not to suffer badly as well as orders not to be worse next time. What is more, for those who accomplish everything that is proper there is still something difficult in store. For they thought they had spoken faultlessly, and still they

<sup>309</sup> The second hand of one MS, B, has correctly added in the margin the section title, *παραφραστικόν*.

<sup>310</sup> By adding the notion of “seeing” Libanius has in effect changed the form of the chreia recited at the head of the elaboration from *ἀποφαντικὸν καθ’ ἐκούσιον* to *ἀποφαντικὸν κατὰ περίστασιν* in the paraphrase here. For this distinction, see Theon 36-45 and *Chreia* 1.28.

<sup>311</sup> Again, the second hand of B has correctly added *τὸ τῆς αἰτίας* in the margin, thereby indicating the beginning of the rationale section. For whatever reason none of the following *κεφάλαια* is so identified.

εἰρησθαι καὶ μείζον ὑπομένουσι φορτίον. [δοκοῦσι γὰρ καὶ τοῖς μείζοσι τάχιστα ἂν ἀρκέσαι.]

8. Τὰ μὲν δὴ τοῦ διδασκάλου τοιαῦτα καὶ παραπλήσια, ὁ δὲ δὴ παιδαγωγός, Ἡράκλεις, τῶν δεσποτῶν βαρύτερος ἐφεστηκώς αἰεί, μικροῦ καὶ συνημμένος, ἐπεγείρων συνεχῶς, ἐπιπλήττων διαπαντός, ῥαστώνης ἀπελαύνων, πρὸς ἔργοις τὸν λογισμὸν ἔχειν κελεύων, τῶν μὲν χρηστῶν οὐδὲν ἐπαινῶν, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς μικροῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως κολάζων, ἔνοπλος, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, ἐπόμενος (p. 86) βακτηρίαν ἢ σκύτος ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ προφέρων.

9. Ἄλλ' οἱ γονεῖς φιλάνθρωποι τοῖς νέοις; οὐδὲν μὲν οὖν τῶν εἰρημένων ἡμερώτεροι, πολλῶ δὲ χαλεπώτεροι. καὶ γίνεται δεύτερος ἀγὼν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν τοῖς διδασκαλείοις φανυλότερος. ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ σιτίου ἢ ποτοῦν ὀρέξαι τί κατειργάσω καὶ τί προκέκοψαι καὶ τί προσείληφας εἰς λόγους; καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα παρὰ τοῦ πατρός. προσθήσω δὲ καὶ ἃ παρὰ τῆς μητρός εἰσιν, ἥ τὸν νέον ἀνάγκη τὰς εὐθύνας διδόναι. 10. εἰ δὲ τις λήθης αἰτία γένοιτο, μικρὸν εἰπεῖν τὰς πληγὰς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν σιτίων ἀποκεκλείσθαι δεῖ. ἐσπέρας δὲ ἐπελθούσης, ἢ τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις λύει, τοῖς δὲ ἐπιτείνει τοὺς πόνους καὶ τὴν τέχνην, νύξ δὲ δὴ καιρὸς ἀναπαύλης δοθεὶς ἔργου τοῖς νέοις γίνεται καὶ μεγίστων ἐγκλημάτων, εἰ μὴ πρὸ τοῦ κόρου τὸν ὕπνον ἀποσεύσαιντο. 11. οὗτ' οὖν προιοῦσιν οὗτ' οἴκοι διατρίβουσιν, οὐ παρὰ τοῖς παιδευταῖς, οὐ παρὰ τοῖς γονεῦσιν, οὐ νυκτός, οὐχ ἡμέρας ἐστὶν ἀναπαύλης σχολή, ἀλλὰ διὰ πάντων τὰ τῶν πόνων χωρεῖ. τοῖς δὲ γε οὐδὲ (p. 87) ὄνειράτων ἔνεστιν εἰρηνικῶν ἀπολαῦσαι, ἀλλὰ κάκεῖνα τῶν μελλόντων ἀλγεινῶν ἔχει τὴν μαντείαν πολλάκις.

12. Μὴ τῷ δοκεῖ κακῶς ἐσκέφθαι τῆς παιδείας τὴν ῥίζαν Ἴσοκράτης; ὀρᾷς τὸ χαλεπόν, τὸ πικρόν, τὸ γέμον φροντίδος; οὐ μὴν ἐνταῦθα, φησὶν, ἔστηκε τὸ πρᾶγμα. οὐδὲ τῆς παιδείας ὄρος τὸ χαλεπόν, ἀλλ'

undertake a greater assignment. [For they think that with more difficult assignments they most quickly give satisfaction.<sup>312</sup>]

8. These and similar actions are characteristic of the teacher. But regarding the paedagogus, Herakles! He's harsher than his masters, always standing over the young man, almost glued to his side, continually urging him on, constantly reprimanding him, averting him from laziness, ordering him to pay attention to his tasks, praising none of his accomplishments but berating him excessively over petty matters, accompanying him under arms, as one might say, since he brandishes a staff or whip in his right hand.

9. But are parents kindhearted toward their sons? They are not a bit more gentle than the people already mentioned! Rather, they are much harsher. And so a second struggle takes place at home that is no easier than the struggles in the schoolrooms. For instead of offering food or drink, there are questions: "What have you achieved?" "What progress have you made?" "What additions have you made to your speeches?" This, then, is what he gets from his father, but I'll also add those which he gets from his mother, to whom the young man must render an accounting. 10. Should some charge of forgetfulness occur, it is a slight matter to mention the blows; why, he even has to be deprived of his food. And when evening comes, which for others is a release from toil and trade, but for young men it prolongs them—<sup>313</sup> and then night, ordained as a time of rest, becomes for the young men a time of work and loud recriminations if they do not shake off sleep before they have enough. 11. Therefore, for young men, neither when they go out nor when they remain at home, is there time for rest, not when they are with their teachers, not when they are with their parents, not by day or by night. Instead, at all times the toil goes on. It is not even possible for them to enjoy peaceful dreams. Rather, even these often contain a prophecy of future miseries.

12. No one thinks, does he, that Isocrates had an erroneous view of the root of education? You see now, don't you, the difficulty, the bitterness, the overwhelming anxiety? "But not here," he is saying, "does the matter stand. Difficulty is not all

<sup>312</sup> This sentence sounds suspiciously like an explanatory remark of some scribe, and as such it is best deleted.

<sup>313</sup> This sentence is awkward. Instead of a deliberate anacoluthon there may be a lacuna at this point.

ἀπόβλεπον εἰς τοὺς καρπούς, καὶ παραθεῖς ἐκείνους τῇ ρίζῃ τάχα τοῖς λυπηροῖς εὐρήσεις τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀντίπαλον. 13. τί δὲ δὴ λαμπρόν, τί δὲ ὅλως τῶν βελτιόνων ἐστὶν ᾧ μὴ τοῦτο κεκοινώνηκεν; ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ὁ νέος ἱκανῶς ἔχη τοῦ παιδεύεσθαι, καλεῖται μὲν εἰς βουλὴν, καλεῖται δὲ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν, δῆμος δὲ ὅλος εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου γνώμην ὀρᾷ, καὶ καθάπερ χρησιμοῖς πείθονται ταῖς εἰσηγήσεσι. τούτῳ μείζον μὲν εἰς ἡδονὴν τὸ πρυτανεῖον ἢ τὸ διδασκαλεῖον εἰς λύπην, μείζων δὲ τῶν πληγῶν ὁ στέφανος. πάρεσι δὲ τὴν τῶν παιδαγωγῶν ἀηδίαν ἢ τοῦ κήρυκος φωνή, ὅταν παραστὰς λαμπρῶ τῷ κηρύγματι τὴν εὐνοίαν μαρτυρῇ.

14. Δέχου δὴ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν καρπῶν· πρεσβείας καταλαμβάνει καιρός. εὐθύς ἢ ψῆφος ἐπὶ (p. 88) τὸν πεπαιδευμένον. καὶ γίνεται τῇ πατρίδι δι' ἐκείνου τὸ κέρδος. ἐκεῖνος δὲ παρ' ἀμφοτέροις περιφανής, τοῖς τε ἀπεσταλκόσι καὶ παρ' οὓς ἤλθε πρεσβεύων.

15. Συμβαίνει διαφορὰ πρὸς ἀστυγείτονας καὶ δεῖ ταύτην λυθῆναι. ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἰσχυρός, οὐ πλούσιος, οὐ κάλλει διαφέρων, ἀλλ' ὁ παιδεύσει διαφέρων πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων κεχειροτόνηται. 16. ὅλως δὲ τὰ μὲν μέγιστα ταῖς πόλεσι παρὰ τῶν ῥητόρων, οἱ δὲ ῥήτορες ἀπὸ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων. ἐκεῖνοι νόμους, ἐκεῖνοι ψηφίσματα γράφουσιν, οἷς πέφυκεν ἡ πολιτεία συνέχεσθαι· καίτοι τὸ δοκεῖν τὰ μέγιστα παρασχεῖν μείζω τοῖς παρέχουσιν ἢ τοῖς λαμβάνουσι παρέχει τὴν ἡδονήν. αἱ γὰρ εὐεργεσίαι τοῖς μὲν ὠφελουμένοις ἐπανορθοῦσι τὰς χρείας, τοῖς δὲ ὠφελοῦσιν ἀρετῆς δόξαν κομίζουσι.

17. Καὶ μὴν κάκεῖνο δῆλον ὡς ἀμύνασθαι τοὺς λελυπηκότας, μὴ παθεῖν δὲ κακῶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν πάντων μέγιστον. ταῦτα τοίνυν ἄμφω μετὰ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων ἐστί· τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἡδικηκότας αὐτοὺς γράφονται, κρίνουσιν, εἰς δικαστήριον ἄγουσι, παραδιδόασιν τοῖς νόμοις. εἰ δὲ τις ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ἔλθοι συκοφάντης, δεινὸν οὐδέν. ἀρκεῖ γὰρ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἡ δεινότης. (p. 89) 18. κηδεῦσαι δὲ τίς οὐκ ἂν εὐχὴν ποιήσαιτο τῷ πεπαιδευμένῳ, γενέσθαι δὲ φίλος, ἐπιτήδειος δὲ κληθῆναι; ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς μόνοις ἀρκοῖεν ἂν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς συνήθεσιν ἀντὶ λιμένων καθίστανται παρόντες ἐν ταῖς χρεαίαις, ἐν ταῖς ἀκαιρίαις

there is to education. Rather, look at the fruits, and by setting them alongside the root you will quickly discover pleasure to be a counter-balance to the pains." 13. What, then, is there that is illustrious and what is there, generally speaking, that is worthwhile with which pain is not associated? For when the young man is fully educated, he is invited to the Council, he is invited to the Assembly, and the entire People looks to his opinion and trusts his words of advice as though they were oracles. For him the Town Hall means greater pleasure than the schoolroom did pain, and greater than the blows is the garland. And overtaking the odiousness of the paedagogi is the voice of the herald when he stands forth and in a brilliant proclamation testifies to the goodwill toward him.

14. Hear also the rest of the fruits. An occasion for an embassy occurs. At once the vote goes to the educated man, and gain for the country ensues because of him, and he becomes highly visible with both groups: those who sent him out and those to whom he went as an ambassador.

15. A quarrel arises between neighboring cities, and it must be resolved. In this situation it is not a strong man, nor a rich one, nor a very handsome one, but the one who is superior in education who is chosen before the rest. 16. And, on the whole, the most important benefits for cities derive from orators, and orators come from those who are educated. It is they who propose laws and decrees, by which the body of citizens is naturally held together. Indeed, being reputed to provide the most important benefits affords more pleasure to providers than to receivers. For benefactions supply the needs of those who are being benefitted, while to the benefactors they bring a reputation for virtue.

17. And this, too, is clear: To punish those who have caused grief and not to be ill treated by one's enemies is the greatest benefit of all. And again, both of these benefits accrue to the educated. For they prosecute the ones who have wronged them, bring them to trial, hale them before the court, subject them to the laws. If, however, some informer should come after them, there is no cause for alarm, for their rhetorical power is sufficient for safety. 18. And who would not pray to contract a marriage with the educated man, to become his friend, and be called his confidant? For the educated are not only sufficient to themselves, but they also stand as havens for their friends: present in times of need, allies

συμμαχοῦντες, παραμυθούμενοι, βοηθοῦντες. 19. ὅπως δὲ λαμπρῶς ἐπὶ τὸ βῆμα παραπέμπονται, ὅπως δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ βήματος λαμπρότερον, ἡνίκα ἂν εὐδοκίμησωσι. καὶ μὴν εἰ χρημάτων χρέως αὐτοὺς εἰσέλθοι, πλησίον ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ οὗτός γε δίκαιος καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης. ἔτι τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς συλλόγοις ἀπόντας μὲν ποθοῦσι, παρόντων δὲ θαρροῦσιν. εἰρήνη δὲ καὶ πόλεμος δι' ἐκείνων πρυτανεύεται, εὐδοξίαν δὲ τοῖς γονεῦσι παρέχουσιν, εὐκλειαν δὲ τοῖς παισὶν ἀπολείπουσιν. τὸ δὲ τοῦ γήρως αἰδέσιμον ἐπ' ἐκείνων διπλασιάζεται τῇ παιδείᾳ. τετελευτηκότων δὲ εἰκόνες ἐπ' ἀγορᾷ σώζουσι μήκει χρόνου τὴν μνήμην.

20. Ὅρῳ τοὺς καρπούς ὡς ἀπεναντίας τῇ ῥίζῃ πεφύκασιν; ὁρῳ ὡς τοῦ πονῆσαι πλέον ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τῆς (p. 90) παιδείας τὸ τερφθῆναι; ὁρῳ ὅτι τὸ σκυθρωπὸν ἐκείνο καταλαμβάνει τὰ πάντων φαιδρότατα; καὶ μοι δοκεῖ τοῦτο εἰκότως οὕτως ἔχειν. ἐξετάσωμεν γὰρ πότερον μικρόν τι καὶ φαῦλον ἢ παιδεία καὶ τοιοῦτον ὃ κἂν διαπτύσαι τις ῥαδίως ἢ τοῦναντίον μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν καὶ τῷ κεκτημένῳ συμφορώτατον καὶ τοῖς οὐ κεκτημένοις ζηλωτόν. 21. καὶ μὴν ἃ γε ἄρτι κατελέξαμεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς δείκνυσιν ὡς οὐκ ἐν ἐσχάτῃ μοίρᾳ τεθείη δικαίως. πάντα γὰρ φαίνεται λαμβάνουσα· κρότον, ἔπαινον, εὐπορίαν, στεφάνους, τιμὰς ζῶσι καὶ τελευτήσασιν. ἔχει τοίνυν τὴν αἰτίαν ἐγγύθεν δι' ἣν ἀνάγκη πονήσαντα κτήσασθαι.

22. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Καὶ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει. τῶν πραγμάτων τὰ μὲν οὐδενὸς ἄξια, τὰ δὲ πολλοῦ. τῶν μὲν οὖν προτέρων διὰ ῥασιμότητος ἢ κτήσεως, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ δεύτερον παραπέμπουσιν οἱ πόνοι καὶ οὔτε τοῖς μικροῖς ἰδρῶτας συνέζευξεν ἢ φύσις οὔτε τοῖς μεγίστοις τὴν ῥαθυμίαν. ἀλλ' ἐφ' ἑκατέρῳ προσοίμιον ἀρμόττον τῷ τέλει, ἐκεῖ μὲν τρυφή, τάλαιπωρία δὲ ἐνταῦθα. 23. δεῖ δὲ δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ τὸ τῆς παιδείας εἰπεῖν μικρόν εἶναι ἢ μὴ τοῦτο ὁμολογοῦντα δέχεσθαι τοὺς πόρους. εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἀπαιδευσίας ἢ τινος τῶν φαυλοτέρων Ἰσοκράτης διαλεγόμενος τῶν τοιούτων ταῖς ἀρχαῖς (p. 91) ἔφησε προσεῖναι πόρους, πάνυ ἂν ἐμεμφάμην, μεστὰι γὰρ ἡδονῆς ἐκείνων αἱ ῥίζαι· ἐπεὶ δὲ ὑπὲρ πράγματος οὗ τὴν δόσιν εἰς θεοὺς ἀναφέρειν ἄξιον λόγον ἀποφαινόμενος τὰς μὲν ἀρχὰς ἔφησεν ἀηδεστέρας εἶναι, τὴν δὲ τελευτὴν εὐφροσύνην, καὶ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος μέγεθος συναγωνίζεται τῷ λόγῳ.

in times of adversity, giving consolation, offering help. 19. How splendidly are they accompanied to the speaker's platform and how much more splendidly are they escorted from the platform when they are highly esteemed. And if a need for money should arise, wealth is at hand, and it is honest and comes from their profession. Furthermore, in public assemblies people long for them when they are absent and take heart when they are present. Peace and war are decided by them. They bring honor to their parents and bequeath glory to their children. And respect for old age is doubled in their case because of their education, and after their death statues in the marketplace preserve their memory for a long time.

20. Do you see that the "fruits" are naturally the opposite of the "root"? Do you see that enjoyment in the case of education is greater than the toil? Do you see that the most delightful things of all overcome the earlier dreariness? And to me it is reasonable that this is so. For let us examine whether education is something petty, insignificant, and the kind of thing that one can easily reject or, on the contrary, it is something important, admirable, and most beneficial to the one who possesses it and envied by those who do not. 21. Indeed, what we have just said about education shows that it is right not to set it among what is least important. For education seems to be the recipient of everything: applause, praise, prosperity, garlands, honors for the living and the dead. Consequently, education has ready at hand the reason why it is necessary that one acquire it by toiling.

22. <From the Opposite> Therefore, some things in life come cheap, others dearly. Acquisition of the former comes through ease, but toil is an escort for the latter, and so nature has linked neither sweat to trivial things nor idleness to the most important. Rather, in each case there is a prelude appropriate to the outcome: in the first case, luxury; in the latter, hardship. 23. Either of two options must be true: one must either say that education is a trivial matter or, if he disagrees with this view, he must accept the toil. For if Isocrates had talked about ignorance or some more foolish subject and had said that toil is associated with the beginnings of such things, I would certainly have found fault, for the roots of those things are filled with pleasure. But since he spoke about a subject which deserves to be considered a gift of the gods, saying that its beginnings are rather unpleasant

24. <Παραβολή> Τοιοῦτόν τι καὶ τὸ τῶν ἐμπόρων. οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρα καθεύδουσιν οὐδὲ οἴκοι καθημένοις ἄνευ πραγμάτων ὁ πλοῦτος περιγίνεται, ἀλλὰ δεῖ μὲν προσεδρεῦσαι λιμένι καὶ τῷ ναυκλήρῳ διαλεχθῆναι, δεῖ δὲ ἐνθέμενον τά τε ὄντα καὶ τὸ σῶμα εἰς τὴν ναῦν γῆν μὲν ἀποκρύψαι, πελάγιον δὲ ἀναχθῆναι πολλὰς ἡμέρας ἐφεξῆς νυκτὰς συνάπτοντα. 25. καὶ οὕτω τὸ μείζον εἴρηται. πολλάκις γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἄρτι κατὰ πρύνμαν ἐστηκότα λήγει πνεύματα, κάτεισι δὲ τὰ ἐναντιώτατα, καὶ πάλιν ὅθεν ἀνήχθησαν, ἐκεῖσε καταφέρονται καὶ κέρδος οὐδὲν τοῦ διηνυσμένου. σκηπτοὺς δὲ τοὺς ἐμπίπτοντας ἐγγὺς τῆς (p. 92) ὀλκάδος καὶ βροντὰς ῥηγνυμένας καὶ τὸ κλυδώνιον ἐπανιστάμενον καὶ τρικυμιῶν φόβον τίς ἂν πρὸς ἀξίαν διέλθοι; ταῦτα ἐκεῖνοι μετὰ πάσης ἀνδρείας ἐνεγκόντες ὠνοῦνται τῶν κινδύνων εὐπορίας. καὶ δεῖ δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ πολλῶν ἀνέχεσθαι δυσχερῶν ἢ μὴ μείζω ποιῆσαι τὴν οὐσίαν. 26. καὶ μὴν εἴ τις ἀντιθεῖναι βούλοιτο τῇ παιδείᾳ τὸν μέγιστον πλοῦτον, γέλως ἂν φανείη παρὰ ταύτην κρινόμενος. τί δὲ θαυμαστόν εἰ προσδεῖται πόνων ἐκείνη μηδὲ τῶν ἐλαττόνων ἄνευ ταλαιπωρίας ἐθελόντων περιγίγνεσθαι;

27. Τὰ δὲ τῆς Δήμητρος οἱ γεωργοὶ πῶς σοι δοκοῦσι θερίζειν; ἄρα ἄσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα κατὰ τοὺς Κύκλωπας; μῦθος ἐκεῖνα καὶ λόγος. ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἀνάγκη θεραπεῦσαι βοῦν καὶ ἄροτρον πῆξασθαι καὶ ἀναρρῆξαι τὴν γῆν εἰς αὐλακὰς καὶ σπόρου καιρὸν διαγινῶναι καὶ μὴ τοῖς ὀρνέοις ἐπιτρέψαι τὸ καταβληθὲν ἀνελέσθαι καὶ τὰ τοῖς στάχυσιν



but its end is pleasure, the importance of the subject also argues for what he said.

24. <Analogy> Such is also the situation with merchants. Wealth does not come to those who “sleep on both ears”<sup>314</sup> or to those who sit at home uninvolved in business. Rather, the merchant must sit at the harbor and haggle with the ship’s captain. He must put his cargo and himself on board the ship, lose sight of land, and sail over the sea for many days and nights in succession. 25. And the more important point has not yet been mentioned. For often the winds, one moment steady astern, cease, and strong contrary gales set in. And so the merchants are driven back to the place from which they put out to sea, and they have gained nothing from the distance traveled. Who would, for profit, go through thunderbolts striking near the ship, flashes of lightning, swells building up, and fear of capsizing waves? Those merchants who have endured such tribulations with complete courage purchase their prosperity at the price of danger. And so, either of two options must be true: either they endure many hardships or they fail to increase their property. 26. Furthermore, if anyone should want to compare the greatest wealth with education, he would appear ridiculous if he decided against the latter. Why is it remarkable, then, that education requires toil since even less important activities cannot succeed without hardship?

27. How do you think farmers reap Demeter’s grain? Is it “without sowing and plowing,” as it is in the Cyclopes episode?<sup>315</sup> That’s fable and fiction. On the contrary, one must necessarily tend the ox, ply the plow, break up the soil into furrows, know the planting time, not allow the birds to pick up what has been

<sup>314</sup> Some MSS read ἐπ’ ἀμφόδοις καθεύδουσιν, “sleeping on the streets,” as printed by editors before Foerster. Foerster, however, following BaPaB, reads ἐπ’ ἀμφοτέρω καθεύδουσιν, “sleeping on both (ears),” a proverbial expression for sleeping soundly that Libanius cites elsewhere (*Epp.* 490.4 [10.466, 9 Foerster] and 1252.5 [11.328, 18]). See further Foerster, “Aristophanes oder ein anderer?” *Hermes* 12 (1877) 207-16, esp. 214.

<sup>315</sup> These words are taken from a description of the land of the Cyclopes (*Od.* 9.105-15, esp. 109). Incidentally, by referring to this section of the *Odyssey* as the Cyclopes episode, Libanius is thereby following an ancient system of reference to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* in which various sections had separate titles—e.g., the Nekyia (in *Od.* 11), the Bath Scene (in *Od.* 19), and so on. For a fuller list of these titles, see esp. Aelian, *VH.* 13.14.

παραφυσόμενα πρὸς λύμην ἐκκόψαι. 28. ἐπειδὴν δὲ πᾶν εἶδος ἐπιμελείας εἰσενέγκηται περὶ τὸ λήιον τὸ θέρος ἀναμείνας, οὕτω προσοίσει τὸ δρέπανον. καὶ οὐ δεῖ τοῦτο σκοπεῖν μόνον, ὅτι τὰς ἄλως (p. 93) ἐπλήρωσεν, ἀλλ' ὅσους ὑποστάντι πόνους τοῦτο ὑπῆρξεν ἰδεῖν. ταῦτά δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ποιμένων εἴποι τις ἂν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν ὧν οὐ κατὰ παιδείαν τὸ κέρδος.

29. <Παράδειγμα> Καὶ τί δεῖ περὶ ταῦτα διατρίβειν ἔχοντα παραδείγματα χρήσιμα ἢ λαμπρότερον μαρτυρεῖ τῷ λόγῳ; τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο μείζον ἢ σεμνότερον Δημοσθένους; οὐ τοῦ στρατηγῆσαντος ἐν Σικελίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ῥήτορος λέγω. ἢ τί μᾶλλον ἐν καιρῷ τοῖς τε Ἀθηναίοις πάλαι καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κατέστη; τίς οὐκ ἂν εὖξαιτο τὸν ἑαυτοῦ παῖδα μὴ ὅτι τοιοῦτον ἀποφανθῆναι παντελῶς, ἀλλ' ὅπως οὖν προσάψασθαι τοῦ ζήλου; 30. ἐκεῖνος τοῖνον οὐχ ἐστιάσει καὶ πότῳ προσέχων τὸν νοῦν οὐδὲ Συβαριτικὴν παρατιθέμενος τράπεζαν οὐδὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν εὐδαιμονίαν κρίνων οὐδὲ τῇ γαστρὶ χαριζόμενος οὐδὲ πρὸς ἀνάπαυλιν τὸ πλεῖστον ποιούμενος εἰς τοσοῦτον προὔβη τῆς νῦν περὶ αὐτοῦ κατὰ πᾶσαν γῆν καὶ θάλατταν κατεχοῦσης δόξης.

sown, and cut away the weeds which grow with the grain and ruin it. 28. And when every kind of care has been expended on the crop, he will await the harvest and thus wield the sickle. And so one must consider not only that the farmer has filled the threshing floors, but he must also observe how much toil this activity entails for the one who has undertaken it. And one could say the same thing about shepherds and the other occupations whose profit does not rely on education.<sup>316</sup>

29. <Example> But why is it necessary for us to spend time on these analogies when we have useful examples<sup>317</sup> which attest more clearly Isocrates' saying? And what example could be more important or more respected than that of Demosthenes? I do not mean the man who served as general in Sicily<sup>318</sup> but rather the orator.<sup>319</sup> Or what example occurred more opportunely both for the Athenians in former times and afterward for all mankind? Who would not pray for his own son, not that he be proclaimed such a man outright, but that he approach ever so little to the zeal of Demosthenes? 30. That man, by not paying attention to feasting and drinking, by not setting a Sybaritic table,<sup>320</sup> by not considering pleasure to be happiness, by not indulging his belly, and by not devoting most of his attention to rest, rose to a height of glory that is now being spread about him over every land and sea.

<sup>316</sup> We have preferred the reading *κατὰ παιδείαν*, given Libanius' contrast between the toil expended on education and that on lesser activities, a contrast that is essential to the logic of the *παραβολή* section as a whole. Foerster's reading *κατὰ πόδας* makes sense (on the heels, immediately) but it has little manuscript support (only B) and breaks up the logic of this section.

<sup>317</sup> Libanius' use of the word *παραδείγματα* is a clear and deliberate indication that he is shifting to the next *κεφάλαιον*, called the *παράδειγμα*.

<sup>318</sup> On this Demosthenes who was an Athenian general and led the attack on Syracuse in 413 B.C., but failed and lost his life as well, see Thucydides, 7.33-87. Libanius refers to this Demosthenes elsewhere (see *Decl.* 18.34 [6.261.1 Foerster]). For more on this figure who has been eclipsed by the more famous Demosthenes, see Graham Wylie, "Demosthenes the General—Protagonist in a Greek Tragedy?" *G&R* 40 (1993) 20-30.

<sup>319</sup> Hermogenes (51-54) and Aphthonius (64-70) also cite Demosthenes as their example. On this Demosthenes (384-322 B.C.), see Plutarch, *Demosthenes*; ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 844A-848D; and George A. Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963) 206-36.

<sup>320</sup> A Sybaritic table was proverbial for living luxuriously (see, e.g., Athenaeus, 12.518c-522a, 527c-e).

31. Ἀλλὰ πόθεν δὴ καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ τοιαύτην συνέλεξε δεινότητα ; συνελόντι μὲν εἰπεῖν, ἐκ τοῦ τῶν πόνων συνεχοῦς, τὰ δὲ καθέκαστα, ἐκ τοῦ φεύγειν τὰ ῥῆστα, ἐκ τοῦ προστετηκέναι (p. 94) βιβλίοις, ἐκ τοῦ τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦ οἴνου χρησιμώτερον νομίσαι τῷ γε ἐν λόγοις βιοῦντι, ἐκ τοῦ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ὕπνου καιρὸν ἔργων ποιήσασθαι. 32. ὅς γε οὕτω σύμπαντα ἑαυτὸν ἀνέθηκε τοῖς μαθήμασιν ὥστε ὑπὸ γῆν ὀρύξας οἴκημα καινὴν τινα καὶ ἄτοπον ἐμηχανήσατο οἴκησιν, ὡς ἂν μηδεὶς θόρυβος αἰσθησιν παρέχων ἐκκρούῃ τῶν προκειμένων τὸν λογισμόν.

Οὕτω τὸ μέγιστον εἴρηται. ἐκείνος γὰρ τὰς προόδους μέγιστον ἐμπόδισμα ἡγούμενος καὶ βουλόμενος αὐτῷ τετάσθαι τοὺς πόνους ξυρεῖν ὥηθη δεῖν τῆς κεφαλῆς τι μέρος τὴν οἴκοι μονὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἑαυτῷ κατασκευαζόμενος.

33. Οὕτωςί μὲν δὴ ὁ Δημοσθένης πικρᾶς ἀπήλαυσε τῆς ρίζης, ἀλλ' ἀπήλαυσε μέντοι καὶ τῆς τῶν καρπῶν ἡδονῆς. ἀντὶ γὰρ τῶν λυπηρῶν ἐκείνων σώζειν οὐ μόνον τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους Ἕλληνας ἐπεπίστευτο καὶ πάντα χαίρειν ἔασαντες εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἔβλεπον μόνον δημαγωγὸν εὖνουν, σύμβουλον ἀγαθόν, ῥήτορα δεξιόν, συνετόν, ὁξύν, πάντα τὰ ἄριστα καλοῦντες καὶ πάντα ἐκεῖνον ἡγοῦντο νόμους τιθέντα, ψηφίσματα γράφοντα, πρεσβείας ὑφιστάμενον, (p. 95) λέγοντα, πείθοντα.

34. Καί τοι τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκείνην ἣν ἐδόκει διαθεῖναι κακῶς ὕστερον ἐστεφανωμένην ἐδείκνυεν. ἀντὶ δὲ τῆς καθεύξεως ἐκείνης καὶ στενῆς διατριβῆς εἰς ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκουμένην τὸ κλέος ἐξήνεγκε καὶ

31. But from what source and in what manner did Demosthenes acquire such rhetorical power? Put briefly, it was from his constant application of toil; in particular, it was from his avoidance of the easiest tasks, from his absorption in books, from his belief that water is more useful than wine for one who makes eloquence his life, and from his turning the time for sleep into an occasion for work.<sup>321</sup> 32. In fact, he had so completely dedicated himself to learning that he dug out a room under the ground and constructed for himself a novel and extraordinary study so that no noise could disturb him and disrupt his concentration on the subject at hand.<sup>322</sup>

The most important point has not yet been mentioned. Because Demosthenes considered going out in public a very great nuisance and because he wanted extended periods of time for his work, he decided that it was necessary to shave a portion of his head, thereby ensuring for himself a lengthy stay at home.<sup>323</sup>

33. In this way Demosthenes benefitted from the "bitter root," but he also benefitted from the pleasure of the "fruits." For in return for those troubles, he was entrusted with saving not only the Athenians but the other Greeks as well.<sup>324</sup> And, ignoring everyone else, they looked to him alone as a devoted leader, a good advisor, a skilful orator, intelligent, passionate, calling him the best in every way. And they considered him one who proposed laws, enacted decrees, undertook embassies, a speaker, a voice of persuasion.

34. And, of course, that head which he seemed to have treated badly he later displayed crowned with a wreath. And in return for that confinement and cramped way of life, his reputation went forth to the whole world, and, even though he died, he

<sup>321</sup> Traditional portraits of Demosthenes emphasized these very traits: hard work, study, water drinking, and late nights (see, e.g., ps.-Lucian, *Dem. enc.* 11, 14-15).

<sup>322</sup> Demosthenes' practice room is widely attested, appearing not only in Hermogenes 52, but also in Plutarch, *Demosth.* 8.1; Quintilian, 10.3.25; ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 844D; and ps.-Lucian, *Dem. enc.* 14.

<sup>323</sup> Mention of Demosthenes' shaving half his head also appears in Aphthonius 67-68 as well as in ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 844D, and ps.-Lucian, *Dem. enc.* 14.

<sup>324</sup> Demosthenes was the strongest advocate for standing firm against the Macedonians of King Philip II, as seen in the *Philippics* and the *Olynthiacs* (cf. Kennedy, *Art of Persuasion*, 207, 223-27).

τετελευτηκώς οὐκ ἔληξεν, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις, τὸν βίον, ἀλλὰ θέλγει τὰς ψυχὰς καὶ νέων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων οἷς ἔρωσ τῆς ῥητορικῆς. καὶ οὔτε ῥίζης ἀηδεστέρας οὔτε καρπῶν βελτιόνων οὐδεὶς ἐγεύσατο.

35. Τί δὲ ὁ Λυκοῦργος ἐκεῖνος ὁ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐκεῖνον γεγωνὸς τὸν Δημοσθένην; ἄρ' ἢ φαῦλός τις ἔδοξεν εἶναι ῥήτωρ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἢ τὸ μέγας εἶναι τε καὶ νομίζεσθαι χωρὶς τῶν πόνων ἐκτήσατο; καὶ τίς οὕτως ὀψιμαθὴς ὅστις οὐκ ἀκήκοε τὸ κλινίδιον καὶ τὸν τρόπον ᾧ τὸν ὕπνον διέκοπτεν;

36. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ὅτι τοίνυν σωφρόνως ὁ λόγος ἔχει, μετὰ πολλῶν τῶν εἰρημένων Ἡσίοδος ὁμολογεῖ, πάντως δὲ οὐδεὶς οὕτω θρασὺς οὐδὲ πάντα τολμῶν, ὅστις ἂν ἐπισκῆψει (p. 96) τῷ μάρτυρι. οἶμαι γὰρ δὴ καὶ τοὺς παῖδας τοῦτο ἐγνωκέναι, ὡς μάλιστα δὴ τῶν ὑμνουμένων ποιητῶν Ἡσίοδος ὁ Μουσόληπτος γένοιτο καὶ παρ' ἐκείνων προσταχθεῖν γένος τε θεῶν καὶ πολλὰ ἄλλα χρηστὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἔδειν. ἐκεῖνος τοίνυν ἐν τοῖς ἔπαισι ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς διαλεγόμενος ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ μὲν αὐτὴν καθῆσθαι φησιν, ὁδὸν δὲ τὴν ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἀνάντη τε εἶναι καὶ χαλεπὴν, ἣν ἀνῦσαι χρή μετὰ πολλῶν ἰδρώτων τῷ γε τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιθυμοῦντι λαβέσθαι.

has not, one might say, ended his life. Rather, he continues to charm the souls of both the young and the old who have a love of rhetoric. And so, no one has tasted a “root” more bitter or “fruits” that are finer.<sup>325</sup>

35. But what about that famous man Lycurgus who was a contemporary of that same Demosthenes?<sup>326</sup> Did he seem to the Athenians to be some insignificant orator? Did he acquire his greatness and his reputation without toil? Who is so dull-witted that he has not heard about his cot and the way in which he used it to cut short his sleep?<sup>327</sup>

36. <Testimony of the Ancients> Moreover, because the saying is sound, Hesiod agrees with many of the things that have been said. And certainly there is no one who is so rash or utterly reckless who could find fault with his testimony. For I suppose that even schoolboys know that Hesiod in particular among the celebrated poets was inspired by the Muses and was commanded by them to sing about the race of the gods and about many other topics that are useful to mankind. Accordingly, when discussing virtue in his poetry, he says that she resides on high and that the path to her is steep and difficult, and that the one who yearns to reach virtue must make his way with much exertion.<sup>328</sup>

<sup>325</sup> Demosthenes was not only included among the ten Attic orators but transcended all others to become known as ὁ ῥήτωρ (“the orator”), as in Nicolaus 63 and Doxapatres, 2.253, 24-28 Walz; indeed, Doxapatres not only names Demosthenes as “the orator,” but also Homer as “the poet,” Thucydides as “the historian,” and Plato as “the philosopher.”

<sup>326</sup> On Lycurgus (ca. 390-324 B.C.), see Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 841A-844A, and Kennedy, *Art of Persuasion*, 249-52.

<sup>327</sup> See ps.-Plutarch, *Vit. dec. orat.* 842C: “Lycurgus practiced his speeches night and day because he was not a natural at speaking extemporaneously, and he had a cot, on which were only a sheepskin and pillow, in order that he might arise more easily and start practicing.” The words τὸ κλινίδιον, translated “his cot,” are not in the MSS, which have τι καινόν, but are Foerster’s emendation.

<sup>328</sup> Libanius is paraphrasing a passage of Hesiod (*Op.* 285-91, esp. 289), which reads:

τὴν μὲν τοι κακότητα καὶ ἱλαδὸν ἔστιν ἐλέσθαι  
 ῥηιδίως· λείη μὲν ὁδός, μάλα δ’ ἐγγύθι ναίει.  
 τῆς δ’ ἀρετῆς ἰδρωῖτα θεοὶ προπάρουθεν ἔθηκαν  
 ἀθάνατοι· μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐς αὐτὴν  
 καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον· ἐπὴν δ’ εἰς ἄκρον ἔκχεται,  
 ῥηιδίη δὴ ἔπειτα πέλει, χαλεπὴ περ ἐοῦσα.

37. Εἰς ἀμφοτέρων ὁ λογισμὸς καὶ πρὸς ταὐτὸ φέρεται ταῖς γνώ-  
μας, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὀνόμασι τὸ διαλλάττον. ὅπερ Ἴσοκράτης παίδευσιν,  
τοῦτο ἐκεῖνος ἀρετὴν ἔφη, ὃ δὲ οὗτος ρίζαν, τοῦτο ἐκεῖνος οἶμον, καὶ πά-  
λιν ὅπερ Ἡσίοδος τραχεῖαν, τοῦτο Ἴσοκράτης πικράν.

38. Ὁ δὲ παρὰ μὲν τῶν θεῶν εἰπὼν ὠνεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὰ  
ἀγαθὰ, ὠνεῖσθαι δὲ οὐκ ἀργυρίου καὶ χρυσίου καὶ τῶν τοιούτων, (p.  
97) ἀλλὰ πόνων ἄρ' οὐ δοκεῖ καλῶς μὲν Ἴσοκράτει, καλῶς δὲ Ἡσιόδῳ  
συνάδειν;

39. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Εἴθ' ἡμεῖς οὕτως ἔξομεν ἀγνωμόνως  
ὥστε τοσούτων ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀγαθῶν ἀποστερήσομεν τῷ τὰ πρότερα  
δεῖσαι; καὶ οὐ τῶν μὲν ἐπιθυμήσομεν, τὰ δὲ ἀνδρείως ὑποστησόμεθα;  
καὶ πῶς οὐ δόξομεν πολλῶν καὶ σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν κατεγνωκέναι λῆρον;  
πῶς δὲ οὐκ ἀνάγκη δυοῖν θάτερον δοκεῖν, ἢ ψέγειν ἢ θαυμάζειν ἄξιον ἢ  
πεῖθεσθαι τούτοις ἢ δὴ θαυμάζομεν;



37. The reasoning of both men is the same and amounts to the same thing in its sentiments; the difference lies only in the words. What Isocrates called “education” Hesiod called “virtue;” what the former called “root” the latter called “path.” And again, what Hesiod called “rough” Isocrates called “bitter.”

38. And the man who said that mankind purchases its benefits from the gods and that it purchases them not with silver, gold, or such things but with toil—doesn’t he seem to harmonize well with Isocrates and well with Hesiod?<sup>329</sup>

39. <Brief Epilogue> Will we, then, be so ignorant that we will deprive ourselves of such important benefits because we fear the earlier conditions? Indeed, will we not desire the former and bravely endure the latter? How will we not seem to be accusing many wise men of foolishness? And how is it not necessary to consider one of two courses of action: either to censure what is worthy of admiration or be persuaded by what we do in fact admire?

<sup>329</sup> The person Libanius refers to here is presumably Epicharmus, since Hermogenes had followed his citation from Hesiod (*Op.* 289) with a line from a poet he explicitly names as Epicharmus, i.e., τῶν πόνων πωλοῦσιν ἡμῖν πάντα τὰγαθὰ οἱ θεοί (“At the price of toil do the gods sell every good to us” [= *Frag.* 287 Kaibel])). Libanius’ use of this line is most apparent in his use of ὠνεῖσθαι, a word that recalls Epicharmus’ πωλοῦσιν; in addition, Libanius clearly refers to this line of Epicharmus elsewhere in his writings (see *Orat.* 55.27 [4.123, 10-12 Foerster] and esp. *Orat.* 64.105 [489, 11-12]: τῶν πόνων πωλοῦσιν ἅπαντα οἱ θεοὶ τὰγαθὰ).

Text 23. Ps.-Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 4  
(8, 97, 11-102, 8 FOERSTER)

Θεόφραστος ἐρωτηθεὶς τί ἐστιν ἔρως ἔφησε πάθος ψυχῆς σχολαζούσης.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ καὶ Θεόφραστον ἐπαινεῖν, ὃς ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ λαμπρὰν ἐκτήσατο δόξαν ζηλωτῆς Ἀριστοτέλους τοῦ διδασκάλου γενόμενος καὶ τοὺς ἐκείνου πόρους καὶ τὰς ἐκείνου διδασκαλίας δείξας τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ συγγράμμασιν, ὧ καὶ τοῦνομα διὰ τὴν περὶ τὸ λέγειν ὑπῆρξεν ἀρετὴν τῶν τὸν ἐκείνου λόγον τεθαυμακότων προσηγορίαν θεμένων αὐτῷ τὸν Θεόφραστον.

2. <Παραφραστικόν> Τοῦτον ἡρετό τις προσελθὼν ἀξιῶσας παρ' αὐτοῦ μαθάνειν τί ποτ' ἄρα χρή νομίζειν τὸν ἔρωτα καὶ περὶ τί φύεται τῶν ὄντων. ὁ δὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔφη· τὴν ἀφειμένην τῶν φροντίδων ψυχὴν ταύτην τοῖς (p. 98) ἐρωτικοῖς κατέχεσθαι πάθεσι καὶ ταύταις ἐνοχλεῖν τὸν ἔρωτα ἔγνωμεν, ὁπόσας ἔστιν εὑρεῖν τῶν ἄλλων πραγμάτων κεχωρισμένας.

3. Εὖ γε τοῦ λόγου, Θεόφραστε. καλῶς ἐμοὶ κατανενοηκέναι δοκεῖς τοῦ πάθους τὰς ἀφορμὰς. μαρτύριον δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων ἐναργὲς τὸ τοὺς ὀρθῶς ἔχοντας λογισμοὺς τοῦτω τῷ λόγῳ συμβαίνειν. ὅτι δὲ τοῦτο τῶν μετεχόντων ἀληθείας ἐστὶ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοφράστου ῥηθὲν γινῶναι ῥάδιον.

4. <Αἰτία> Ἐνθυμηθῶμεν γὰρ οὕτως καὶ λογισώμεθα ψυχὴν εἶναι τινα μὴτε παιδείας ὀρεγομένην, δι' ἧς ἡ ῥητορεύειν ἔστιν ἡ φιλοσοφεῖν, μὴτ' αὖ μετιοῦσαν τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἐργασίαν, οἷον χαλκευτικὴν ἢ τεκτονικὴν ἢ τὸ ναυπηγεῖσθαι ναῦς ἢ τὴν τῶν οἰκοδομούντων ἢ τὴν ὑφαντικὴν ἢ τινα τοιαύτην ἑτέραν ἢς τὸ ἔργον ἐν ταῖς χερσίν. εἰ τοίνυν τοιαύτην εὕρισκοιμεν ψυχὴν ἀργίᾳ χαίρουσαν, ὅκνοις ἡδομένην, ἀτεχνίᾳ συνοῦσαν, ἄρα τὴν τοιαύτην οὐκ ἂν ἀποφαινοίμεθα φυγὴν αὐτῶν σπουδασμάτων ἢ τινα χεῖρω νοσεῖν; ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ γεωργεῖν

Text 23. Ps.-Libanius, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 4  
(8, 97, 11-102, 8 FOERSTER)

Theophrastus, on being asked what love is, said: "The passion of an idle soul."<sup>330</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> It is also my intention to praise Theophrastus, the man who acquired a brilliant reputation in philosophy by becoming an admirer of his teacher Aristotle and by explaining that man's researches and teachings in his own compositions. His name arose on account of his excellence in speaking, since those who admired his oratory gave him the name "Theophrastus."<sup>331</sup>

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> Someone approached Theophrastus and asked him a question in the expectation that he would learn from him what one really ought to consider love to be and in what category it naturally belongs. In reply to him Theophrastus said, "I hold that a person, when he is released from his responsibilities, becomes the captive of erotic passions and that love harasses those souls which are found to be disengaged from life's other activities."

3. A fine statement, Theophrastus! I think you have understood well the causes of this emotion, and clear proof of what he has said is the fact that those who reason correctly agree with his statement. And because this view is characteristic of those who share in the truth, what was said by Theophrastus is more readily accepted.

4. <Rationale> Let's think about it this way and suppose that there is a person who neither yearns for education—by which it is possible to be an orator or philosopher—nor, again, pursues a trade—for example, metal-working, carpentry, shipbuilding, construction, weaving, or any other trade whose work is with the

<sup>330</sup> On this chreia, see *Chreia* 1.342.

<sup>331</sup> The name Theophrastus means "divinely eloquent." Moreover, it was Aristotle himself who gave him this nickname; originally his name was Tyrtamus (see Diogenes Laertius, 5.38; Strabo, 13.2.4; Cicero, *Orat.* 19.61; Quintilian, 10.1.83; and Fortenbaugh, *Theophrastus*, 1.52-55).

οἵκοι καθήμενον καὶ καταρραφθυμοῦντα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ πλεῖν ἐν τῇ γῇ μένοντα μάτην οὐ πεπιστεύκαμεν τῇ διανοίᾳ παρέχειν σχολὴν ὥστε τῶν ἀτόπων ἔρᾶν ;

5. Καὶ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχει καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα φύσει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. ὁ περὶ μηδενὸς τῶν ἀναγκαίων πεφροντικῶς μηδέ γε τῇ ψυχῇ μεριμνήσας μηδὲ ὑπὸ τινων ἐπιτηδευμάτων ἐλκόμενος οὗτος ἀντὶ τοῦ τῶν βελτιόνων ἔρᾶν ἃ τῆς ἀργίας ἐστὶν (p. 99) ὑπομένει τῆς τοῦ σώματος ἐπιθυμίας ἡττώμενος καὶ ταύτῃ δουλεύων καὶ ταύτην αἰρούμενος, οὐκ ἐπιτιθεῖς τοῖς ἔρωσι χαλινὸν τὴν ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις σχολήν.

6. Καὶ εἰκότως. ὁ γὰρ μήτε δικάζων μήτε νομοθετῶν μήτε δημηγορῶν μήτε ψηφίσματα γράφων μήτε συνηγορῶν μήτε πρεσβεύων μήτε στρατηγῶν μήτε πολεμῶν μήτε περὶ τὴν γῆν πονῶν, μὴ περὶ τὸ πλεῖν ἀσχολούμενος, μὴ λόγων ἔρῶν, ὅλως δὲ μηδὲν τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις μετιῶν ἐξ ὧν ἐστὶν ἢ πόλιν ὠφελεῖν ἢ τὸν αὐτοῦ βίον οἰκονομεῖν, οὗτος τίνας οὐκ ἂν ἔρασθει τῶν πονηρῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, αἷς τὸ σῶμα διδοὺς ἥκιστα τῇ ψυχῇ σωφρονεῖ ; καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους ἂν εὗροις μεθύοντας, κωμάζοντας, γάμοις ἐπιβουλεύοντας, κόρας ἀρπάζοντας, διασπῶντας τὴν σωφροσύνην, ἀπλῶς εἰπεῖν, μόνον ἔρᾶν ἀντὶ τοῦ σπουδάζειν εἰδότας.

7. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Κατενοήσαμεν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπὸ σπουδαίων σχολάζουσας. ἴδωμεν δὲ καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν ἢ τοῦναντίον διακειμένη φιλοπόνῳ τῇ φύσει κέχρηται. γινῶναι δὲ ῥάδιον οὕτωςί. πονεῖτω τις ἐν λόγοις καὶ τούτων μόνον ἐράτω. ὁ τοιοῦτος οὐκ ἂν εἰς ἑτέρους ἔρωτας ὀλισθαίνει τῷ βελτίονι κατεχόμενος.

Ἄλλος ἐργαζέσθω τὴν γῆν, ἕτερος πλείτω τὴν θάλατταν. ὁ μὲν χαλκεύετω, τῷ δὲ μελέτω τεκτονικῆς, ἑτέρῳ δὲ στρατηγεῖν, τῷ δὲ πρεσβεύειν, καὶ τῷ μὲν νομοθετεῖν, τῷ δὲ ψηφίσματα γράφειν, καὶ τῷ μὲν πολεμεῖν, τῷ δὲ διατιθέσθαι τὰς πανηγύρεις. 8. τίς οὖν ἂν ἄφαιτό ποτε

hands. If, therefore, we should find such a person enjoying idleness, delighting in indecision, living without a trade, wouldn't we proclaim such avoidance of serious pursuits to be a sickness or something worse? Furthermore, do we not believe that the man who sits at home and neglects his land instead of farming it or the man who, instead of going to sea, remains idly on shore is deliberately providing himself with leisure in order to enjoy harmful pursuits?

5. Therefore, the situation is, by nature, like this: The man who has given no thought to necessities and who is neither anxious about his soul nor attracted to any of the normal pursuits, this person, instead of cherishing the finer things, submits to things that are characterized by idleness, is overcome by bodily desire, becomes its slave, even prefers desire, and does not put the leisure that comes in the midst of toil as a bridle on his yearnings.

6. And quite reasonably. For the one who is not a judge or lawgiver or public speaker or proposer of statutes or advocate or ambassador or general or soldier or one who works the land or busies himself with going to sea or is not a lover of words—in short, one who participates in none of the human activities by which it is possible either to benefit the city or to build one's livelihood—is there any wicked desire that this person would not be enamored of? And by yielding his body to these desires, he has absolutely no control over his soul. And so, you could find such people getting drunk, carousing, breaking up marriages, raping girls, destroying self-control—in short, knowing only how to love instead of how to follow serious pursuits.

7. <From the Opposite> We have examined the person who is not occupied with serious pursuits, but let us look now at another person, one who, in contrast,<sup>332</sup> is by nature disposed to industry. He is easily recognizable from what follows. Let someone study rhetoric and desire only it. Such a person would not slip into other desires because he is being restrained by the better one.

Let one man work the land, another sail the sea. Let one be a smith, another follow the carpenter's craft, another be a general, another an ambassador; let one person be a lawgiver, another propose statutes; let one be a soldier, another manage festivals.

<sup>332</sup> The word *τοῦναντίον* seems to be a signal that the elaboration has shifted now to the *κεφάλαιον* known as *ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου*.

τῶν οὕτως ἐχόντων (p. 100) ἄτοπος ἔρωσ; οὐκ ἔστι. τοῦ γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀνθέλκοντος ἔρωτος πᾶσα ἀνάγκη καὶ τὸ σῶμα ταῖς σπουδαῖς ὑπουργεῖν. καὶ τοὺς τοιοῦτους καλοῦμέν τε καὶ νομίζομεν σώφρονας, οἷς ἐπιβέβληται τῇ ψυχῇ χαλινός, ὃ μικρῷ πρόσθεν ἔφην, τὰ μάταια τῆς ψυχῆς κατείργων κινήματα καὶ ποιῶν αὐτὴν ἐν τῷ φιλοπονεῖν μὴ τοῖς σώμασιν εἴκειν ἄργοῦσι μηδὲ γε πρὸς τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐξίστασθαι μηδὲ τῇ τοιαύτῃ δουλεύειν φύσει, ἀλλ' εἶναι πάντων ἀμείνονα τῶν πεφυκότων ἐπὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα καθέλκειν.

9. <Παραβολή> Ἄν ἄγης ἵππον ἄνευ πόνων καὶ τοῦτον ἀφείς παραδιδόναι τοῖς πωλοδάμναις ἄγων τῇ φάτνῃ προσδήσης τρυφᾶν γε μόνον, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς δρόμον ἐξάγων, ἄρ' οὐκ ἂν ἴδοις αὐτὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιτρέποντα τῇ ῥύμῃ τῆς φύσεως καὶ κεχρησθαι τῷ κεκτημένῳ γενόμενον ἀνεπιτήδειον; τὸν δὲ γε προσομιλοῦντα τοῖς πόνοις καὶ συνόντα τοῖς δρόμοις καὶ μὴ κατεχόμενον ὄκνοις ἄρ' οὐκ ἤδη καὶ τὴν ἐνοῦσαν εὐρήσομεν ἀποβαλόντα θρασύτητα καὶ πείθεσθαι τὸν ἐπιστάτην ἄγειν εὐκόλως ἐπιστάμενον;

Ταῦτά δὴ συμβαίνειν οἶου καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους· αἱ φύσεις ἐν τῷ πονεῖν σωφρονοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ῥαθυμεῖν ἀκολασταίνουσιν, καὶ τὸ κατέχον οὐκ ἔστι τὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα κατέχεσθαι τοῖς πόνοις.

10 <Παράδειγμα> Ὁ Δημοσθένης πόνων ἐπιθυμῶν καὶ τοὺς ἀτόπους (p. 101) ἔφευγεν ἔρωτας. τῶν ἡρώων ὁ Διομήδης σωφρονέστατος ἦν, ὅτι καὶ πονεῖν ἐπιτήδειος, τῶν φιλοσόφων ὁ Πυθαγόρας, τῶν στρατηγῶν ὁ Θεμιστοκλῆς καὶ ὁ Περικλῆς, ὁ μὲν ἔργον ἔχων τὸ φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ τοῖς θεοῖς ὁμιλεῖν, οἱ δ' ὅτιοῦν ἐχρῶντο καλῶς καὶ βουλῇ καὶ χειρὶ τὴν ἐνεγκοῦσαν ἐκσῶζοντες. 11. ἐπεὶ πότ' ἂν ἔρωσ εἰσῆλθε Θεμιστοκλέα τοιοῦτος κατὰ Μήδων παραταττόμενον καὶ περὶ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνους βουλευόμενον μάχης, περὶ τῶν λογίων ἐνθυμούμενον καὶ τὸ ξύλινον εὐρίσκοντα τεῖχος τὰς ναῦς, πότε τὸν Περικλέα τὸν πάνυ, τὸν Ὀλύμπιον,

8. What harmful desire, then, would ever touch people behaving in this fashion? There is none, for since love is pulling the soul in the opposite direction, it is utterly necessary that the body assist by means of serious pursuits. And so we call and consider such men self-controlled, on whose souls a bridle has been placed, as I said earlier, which curbs the useless emotions of the soul and causes it in its industry not to yield to idle bodies, nor to drive it toward desire, nor to be a slave to such a nature; but to be better than everything that is by nature drawn to such things.

9. <Analogy> If you trained a horse without exercise and, after neglecting to turn it over to horsebreakers, you take it and tie it to the manger only to live in luxury and no longer take it out to the race course, wouldn't you see the horse reverting to its natural spiritedness and so becoming unfit to serve its owner? But a horse which is accustomed to toil, familiar with race courses and not restrained by sluggishness, won't we soon find it throwing off its natural high spirit and knowing how to obey its driver submissively?

Suppose the same conditions also exist in the case of humans: Their natures show self-control when they toil, are licentious when they are idle, and so there is nothing which restrains the one who does not want to be restrained by toil.

10. <Example> Demosthenes, because of his desire for toil, avoided the harmful passions.<sup>333</sup> Of the heroes, Diomedes was the most self-controlled because he, too, was disposed to toil.<sup>334</sup> Of the philosophers, Pythagoras was, and among generals, Themistocles and Pericles were: Pythagoras having as his calling philosophy and intimacy with the gods,<sup>335</sup> the latter two managing everything well and preserving their city by counsel and action. 11. When would a harmful passion have ever entered Themistocles while he was drawing up his forces against the Medes and making his battle plans against them,<sup>336</sup> or while he

<sup>333</sup> For Demosthenes' reputation for hard work, see, e.g., Aelian, *VH.* 7.7a; Athenaeus, 2.44e-f; and ps.-Lucian, *Dem. Enc.* 15. See also *Chreia* 1.311.

<sup>334</sup> The phrase ἐπιτήδειος ποιεῖν thus fits him.

<sup>335</sup> On Pythagoras' reputation for self-control, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 8.9, 19, 23.

<sup>336</sup> Presumably the naval battle off Salamis in 480 B.C. is meant. Themistocles, the principal Athenian leader against the Persians, pressed to

ὥ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐφύτευσαν οἱ πόνοι; καὶ μὴν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ καὶ τὸν Ἀριστείδην τὸ δικαιοσύνης ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ περὶ τοῦτον ἐσπουδακέναι τὸν βίον ἀπάσης ἀμείνω πεποιηκέναι χείρονος ἐπιθυμίας καὶ δυνατώτερον.

12. Εἰ δέ μοι λέγεις Καλλίαν τὸν δημόσιον ἢ Πιττάλακον ἢ μίμους γελοίων τε καὶ ποιητὰς ἐπονιδίστων ᾄσμάτων ὅτι τοιούτοις ἐδούλευον ἔρωσιν, οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσαιμι πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ῥαθυμίαν ὁρῶν καὶ ὡς οὐδὲν ἦν τῶν ἀξίων ἐπαίνου πράττοντας ἐκείνους ἰδεῖν καὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ παρεχόντων σχολήν.

13. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ταῦτὰ καὶ ποιητῶν οὐκ ὀλίγοι καὶ φιλοσόφων (p. 102) καὶ τῶν ἐπὶ ῥητορικῇ μέγα δεδυνημένων, εἰ καὶ μὴ μνημονεύειν ἔχω τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἐπήνεσαν, ἐθαύμασαν, ἐν τῷ λέγειν ἐπαίδευσαν.



was pondering the oracles and deciding that the “wooden wall” meant the fleet?<sup>337</sup> When would such a passion have ever entered the famous Pericles the Olympian, whose toils engendered this appellation?<sup>338</sup> And besides, it seems to me that Aristides’ desire for justice and his eager concern for this way of life has made him superior to, and master of, every base desire.<sup>339</sup>

12. But if you tell me that Callias the public slave,<sup>340</sup> Pittalacus,<sup>341</sup> or buffoons and poets of disgraceful songs<sup>342</sup> were slaves of such passions, I would not be surprised, when I observe the idleness in their life, and thus it was impossible to see them doing anything that deserves praise or anything that provides leisure for thought.

13. <Testimony of the Ancients> The same things not a few poets, philosophers, and those who have great skill in oratory have praised, admired, and taught while lecturing, although I cannot recall their names.<sup>343</sup>

make Athens a naval power, then commanded the Athenian contingent under the Spartan naval commander Eurybiades when the Persians attacked, and played a decisive role in defeating the Persian fleet off Salamis. For details of this sea-battle and Themistocles’ role in it, see Herodotus, 8.83-96, and, for a modern historical account, see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 219-44.

<sup>337</sup> On Themistocles’ interpretation of this oracle, see Herodotus, 7.141-43; Plutarch, *Them.* 10.2-3; and Hammond, *History of Greece*, 223-24, 238.

<sup>338</sup> On the phrase ὁ πᾶν for Pericles, see also Xenophon, *Mem.* 3.5.1. On the appellation Ὀλύμπιος, see Diodorus Siculus, 12.40.5; 59.4; Theon, *Pro-gymn.* 8 (1.229, 12 Walz); Plutarch, *Per.* 8.3; 39.2; and Lucian, *Im.* 17. See also *Rhet. Marc.* 24 (Text 31). On Pericles’ toils on behalf of Athens, see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 287-332.

<sup>339</sup> Aristides’ reputation for justice was legendary (see, e.g., Diodorus Siculus, 11.47.2; Plutarch, *Arist.* 2.2-5; 4.1-2; 6.1; 7.6; 23.2; 25.2; and *Chreia* 1.305).

<sup>340</sup> For Callias the public slave, see Demosthenes, *Orat.* 2.19, and the scholia on this passage (1.72 Dilts).

<sup>341</sup> Pittalacus is Foerster’s emendation of the MSS which read *πιττακόν* (cf. his “Libaniana,” *RhM* 32 [1877] 86-95, esp. 91). On Pittalacus, also a public slave, see Aeschines, *Orat.* 1.54; Demosthenes, *Orat.* 19.245; Suda, s.v. *Τίμαρχος* (4.550 Adler); and K. Fiehn, “Pittalakos,” *PW* 40 (1950) 1873.

<sup>342</sup> The wording here derives from Demosthenes, *Orat.* 2.19: *μίμους γε-λοιῶν καὶ ποιητὰς αἰσχυρῶν ἁσμάτων*.

<sup>343</sup> It is highly unusual to have no specific author cited in the *μαρτυρία* section, but Doxapatres allows for the possibility, saying: “One should realize that, as far as the Testimony of the Ancients is concerned, our predecessors would have us use, when we are at a loss for a testimony, the figure ‘pretended

14. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Εἴ τις οὖν ἐπιθυμεῖ κακὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐκφεύγειν, ἐράτω τῶν βελτιόνων, ἵνα μὴ τῶν χειρόνων, καὶ σχολάζετω τοῖς κρείττοσιν, ἵνα μὴ τοῖς βλάπτουσι. ταῦτα δὲ ἂν εἴη, καθάπερ ἔδειξα τοῖς λογισμοῖς, οἱ πονηροὶ τῶν σωμάτων ἔρωτες.

14. <Brief Epilogue> Therefore, if anyone desires to avoid an evil desire, let him love the better things so that he does not love the worse. And let him devote himself to loftier things so that he does not devote himself to harmful ones. And these harmful things would be, as I have shown by my reasoning, the wicked passions of the body.

omission' (κατὰ παράλειψιν), speaking as follows: 'It would be possible to cite many sayings of ancient authors which support the saying under consideration, but I know that being loquacious is contrary to the present subject.' " (2.273, 27-274, 1 Walz). Nevertheless, the inability to cite someone in the μαρτυρία section is another indication that Libanius is not the author of this elaboration. Incidentally, one possible ancient authority that the author could have cited here is Euripides, who has a similar view of Eros as associated with idleness in his *Danae*; see *Frag.* 322 (= *TGF* [p. 455 Nauck<sup>2</sup>]):

Ἔρως γὰρ ἄργον καὶ τοιούτοις ἔφυ  
φιλεῖ κάτοπτρα καὶ κόμης ξανθίσματα  
φεύγει δὲ μόχθους.

Eros is an idle creature and is inclined to idleness,  
He loves mirrors and hair dyed blonde,  
And he flees toils.

Texts 24-27. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3

(1.272, 20-278, 3 Walz)

## Introduction

## A PSEUDONYMOUS COLLECTION OF PROGYMNASMATA

In 1832 Christian Walz published the *editio princeps* of an extensive collection of sample *progymnasmata* that appear in a late fourteenth century MS known as Paris. gr. 2918 and that are attributed to a Nicolaus the sophist (Νικολάου σοφιστοῦ).<sup>344</sup> This collection is complete, since it includes at least one example of each of the fourteen standard *progymnasmata*. The 111 individual *progymnasmata* in the collection, however, are rather unevenly distributed. They range from a single example of the proposal of a law, here termed κατηγορία, to fourteen examples each of συγκρίσεις and ἡθοποιίαι. Ranking eleventh in representation is the chreia, with four sample elaborations.<sup>345</sup>

Walz's *editio princeps* has turned out to be the only edition of these *progymnasmata*, and its shortcomings make a new edition highly desirable. For example, Walz used only the Paris MS, although he knew of other MSS (but inaccessible to him) that contain portions of this same collection. These other MSS include: Barocc. 131 (13th c.), Vat. Barb. 240 (13-14th c.), and Bodl. Misc. 89 (16th c.). A new edition would certainly have to consider all the textual evidence.

In addition, Walz was already aware of the principal problems involving this collection—that is, the attribution to Nicolaus in the superscript and the relation of this collection to others that contain at least some of the same *progymnasmata*. But subsequent scholarly discussion has also gone significantly beyond Walz's obviously preliminary attempts to solve these problems. A new edition of this collection would have to take into account

<sup>344</sup> See 1.266-420 Walz.

<sup>345</sup> As printed the collection includes, by ranking: fourteen συγκρίσεις and ἡθοποιίαι, twelve διηγήματα, eleven ψόγοι and ἐκφράσεις, ten μῦθοι, nine κατασκευαί, seven ἀνασκευαί, seven ἐγκώμια, five κοινοὶ τόποι, four χρεῖαι, four γνῶμαι, two θέσεις, and one κατηγορία <τοῦ νόμου>, for a total of 111 *progymnasmata*.

this scholarship that has attempted, since Walz, to sort out the relations among these various collections and determine which sample *progymnasmata* belong to whom.

The first of these problems involves the attribution to a Nicolaus the sophist in the superscript. Walz assumed that the Nicolaus of the Paris MS is identical to the fifth century sophist Nicolaus of Myra, known to him only from brief notices in the *Suda* and in John Doxapatres' commentary on Aphthonius, both of which refer to this Nicolaus as the author of a *Progymnasmata* and other rhetorical writings.<sup>346</sup> Walz's assumption that Nicolaus of Myra is the author of the collection of the sample *progymnasmata* in the Paris MS is thus plausible, and no one has suggested any other Nicolaus. But whether there are good grounds to accept the correctness of this attribution, in whole or in part, is bound up with the second problem: the relation of this collection to others.

Walz was also aware, thanks to a brief comment by M. S. Friedrich Schoell,<sup>347</sup> that some of the sample *progymnasmata* in the Paris MS appear in other collections under the name of Libanius. After comparing the collections, Walz found that only the final fourteen sample *progymnasmata* in the Paris MS—all eleven ἐκφράσεις, both θέσεις, and the one κατηγορία—also appear in the Libanian MSS. As far as the other *progymnasmata* are concerned, Walz asserted that only the subjects of some of them are the same, not the wording. Therefore, Walz failed to consider the latter any further and discussed only the identically-worded *progymnasmata*. Walz decided to retain them for Nicolaus and regard the attribution to Libanius as secondary.<sup>348</sup> Consequently, he printed all 111 *progymnasmata* from the Paris MS and assigned them to Nicolaus of Myra.

<sup>346</sup> Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 1.263-64, citing the *Suda* (3.469 Adler) and Doxapatres, 2.198, 30-199, 2 and 539, 14-18 Walz.

<sup>347</sup> See M. S. Friedrich Schoell, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur von der frühesten mythischen Zeit zur Einnahme Constantinopels durch die Türken* (2nd ed.; 3 vols.; Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1828-1830) 3.139-40.

<sup>348</sup> Walz (*Rhetores Graeci*, 1.265) defended the attribution to Nicolaus on these grounds: a) it would be astonishing if Nicolaus illustrated eleven of the *progymnasmata* but then failed to do so for the last three, and b) secondary attribution to Libanius, who was the more famous of the two, is more likely than the reverse. But Walz was also keenly aware that attribution is an uncertain possession and theft all too typical so that one should be cautious in accepting MS attributions.

Subsequent scholarship has made several advances that help to resolve the problems raised by these *progymnasmata*. First, whereas Walz knew only of brief references to Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata*, scholars now possess the textbook itself. As a first step, Eberhard Finckh was able to detect portions of Nicolaus' textbook that appear in Doxapatres' commentary on Aphthonius as well as in the Aphthonian scholia. He published his proposed reconstruction of this textbook in 1856 in Leonard Spengel's *Rhetores Graeci*.<sup>349</sup> Then, in 1895, Heinrich Graeven confirmed Finckh's identification by drawing attention to a fifteenth century MS in the British Museum (Brit. Mus. Add. 11889) which contains a large portion of Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata* copied alongside and below the text of Aphthonius.<sup>350</sup> Finally, in 1913, Joseph Felten used this MS in preparing his Teubner edition of Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata*. As a result of these advances we now know more about the alleged author of the collection of sample *progymnasmata* than Walz could have. The importance of the recovery of Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata* will become apparent shortly, but the next stage in the scholarly analysis of the sample *progymnasmata* focused elsewhere.

This stage involved the sample *progymnasmata* directly. Walz's assertion, that only the examples of the last three *progymnasmata* are identical in wording to those also attributed to Libanius, is wrong. In fact, three narratives and one encomium are common to both,<sup>351</sup> and, in addition, all ten fables and one characterization are attributed elsewhere to Aphthonius.<sup>352</sup>

<sup>349</sup> For Finckh's reconstruction of the text of Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata*, see Leonard Spengel, ed., *Rhetores Graeci* (3 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1853-56; repr. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1966) 3.449-98. Cf. also *Chreia* 1.238.

<sup>350</sup> See Heinrich Graeven, "Die Progymnasmata des Nicolaus," *Hermes* 30 (1895) 471-73. For the edition of Nicolaus, using this MS, see Joseph Felten, ed., *Nicolai Progymnasmata* (*Rhetores Graeci* 11; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913). Cf. also *Chreia* 1.239 and 245-46. The standard treatment of Nicolaus of Myra remains that of Willy Stegemann, "Nikolaos (21)," *PW* 17 (1936) 424-57.

<sup>351</sup> Specifically, the common *progymnasmata* are: narrative (Nicolaus 6, 8, and 10 = Libanius 36, 32, and 34), encomium (Nicolaus 1 = Libanius 9), description (Nicolaus 1-11 = Libanius 18-28), thesis (Nicolaus 1-2 = Libanius 2-3), and proposal of a law (Nicolaus 1 = Libanius 1).

<sup>352</sup> Specifically, the common *progymnasmata* are: fable (Nicolaus 1-10 = Aphthonius 8, 10, 13, 17, 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, and 23) and characterization (Nicolaus 1 = Aphthonius 1).

Finally, to complicate matters further, scholars working on Libanius' *progymnasmata* have denied many to Libanius and have proposed Nicolaus as the author of at least some of these. A brief summary of this state of affairs will have to suffice.

Kurt Orinsky's 1920 Breslau dissertation is the first detailed analysis of the sample *progymnasmata* attributed to Nicolaus.<sup>353</sup> Only four copies of his dissertation were printed, however, so that scholars have had to depend on the detailed summary of it in the *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift* by Eberhard Richtsteig.<sup>354</sup>

Orinsky observes that of the four MSS in which the sample *progymnasmata* of Nicolaus appear three also contain *progymnasmata* of Libanius. One of these, Paris. gr. 2918, attributes them to Nicolaus, as does the unrelated fourth MS, Barocc. 131,<sup>355</sup> which, Orinsky concludes, ensure Nicolaus as their author. Thus Orinsky follows Walz in assigning all 111 *progymnasmata* to Nicolaus of Myra.<sup>356</sup> But Orinsky goes further. A number of other *progymnasmata* attributed to Libanius in the MSS cannot, however, have been written by him, as proved by numerous linguistic and stylistic tests but especially through analysis of accented clauses. These criteria point, Orinsky argues, to Nicolaus as their author. These Libanian *progymnasmata* include narratives 19, 22, 24, 31, 37-39; characterization 26; and descriptions 8-17. As a result, the number of *progymnasmata* Orinsky finally attributes to Nicolaus is 129,<sup>357</sup> although in the years since one more Libanian *progymnasma*—invective 8—has been added to the collection as well.<sup>358</sup>

But while Orinsky's rejection of Libanian authorship of various *progymnasmata* and his assignment of them (on the basis of similarly accented clauses) to the collection attributed to Nicolaus

<sup>353</sup> Kurt Orinsky, *De Nicolae Myrensis . . . progymnasmatis*.

<sup>354</sup> For Richtsteig's review of Orinsky's dissertation, see *PhW* 41 (1921) 697-701.

<sup>355</sup> For the attribution of these *progymnasmata* to Nicolaus the sophist, see further Nigel G. Wilson, "A Byzantine Miscellany: MS. Barocci 131 Described," *JÖB* 27 (1978) 157-79, esp. 170-71.

<sup>356</sup> See Richtsteig's review of Orinsky, 698. This identification was also made *en passant* by Heinrich Graeven ("Ein Fragment des Lachares," *Hermes* 30 [1895] 289-313, esp. 299).

<sup>357</sup> See Richtsteig's review of Orinsky, 700-1.

<sup>358</sup> See Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2520.

have been generally accepted,<sup>359</sup> his identification of this Nicolaus with Nicolaus of Myra has not. Hugo Rabe raised doubts about the attribution and in fact tentatively proposed Aphthonius as the author, given numerous similarities in wording between Nicolaus and Aphthonius, not to mention the inclusion of fables elsewhere attributed to Aphthonius and the inclusion of Aphthonius' entire chapter on characterization. Rabe pulled back, however, saying that before such a proposal of Aphthonian authorship could be sustained various examinations of the MSS, the history of the collections of *progymnasmata*, and the relation of the rules in Nicolaus' *Progymnasmata* with the sample *progymnasmata* had to be done.<sup>360</sup>

This suggestion of Aphthonian authorship has been developed, however, by Willy Stegemann.<sup>361</sup> In particular, he compares the compositional prescriptions given by Aphthonius with those by Nicolaus and finds that the sample *progymnasmata* attributed to Nicolaus follow the prescriptions given by Aphthonius!<sup>362</sup> With respect to the four chreia elaborations, for example, Stegemann notes that they follow Aphthonius' prescription for eight κεφάλαια, not Nicolaus' six.<sup>363</sup> Nicolaus illustrates a mixed chreia—A Laconian, on being asked where the walls of Sparta were, extended his spear and said, "Here"<sup>364</sup>—but the fourth sample elaboration recites it as an action chreia (A Laconian, on being asked what Sparta's boundaries were, showed his spear). And the four elaborations illustrate the classification of Aphthonius (sayings-chreiai, action-chreiai, and mixed chreiai) but ignore the distinctive classifications of Nicolaus. The latter distinguishes chreiai that show the way things are or the way they ought to be as well as chreiai that are simple or in response to something. The elaborations illustrate only the way things are and are all in response to something. Finally, various transitional phrases in the four elaborations (specified below) often reflect

<sup>359</sup> See, e.g., Schmid-Stählin, *Literatur*, 994 n. 8, and esp. Stegemann, "Nikolaos," 447-49.

<sup>360</sup> See Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, xiv.

<sup>361</sup> See Stegemann, "Nikolaos," 451-57.

<sup>362</sup> See Stegemann, "Nikolaos," 452-55.

<sup>363</sup> See Aphthonius 18-22 and Nicolaus 162-184, esp. 162-72. Cf. *Chreia* 1.244-45.

<sup>364</sup> See Nicolaus 77-79.



those in Aphthonius' model elaboration.<sup>365</sup> In short, virtually every means of analysis of the elaborations shows Aphthonian influence. Accordingly, Stegemann, after noting many similarities in vocabulary, phraseology, and accented clauses, concludes that Aphthonius, not Nicolaus (or Libanius), should be considered the author of these sample *progymnasmata*.<sup>366</sup>

Stegemann's conclusion, however, has recently received renewed attention. Wolfram Hörandner has made an extensive study of prose rhythm in Byzantine rhetorical literature and has focused especially on *progymnasmata*.<sup>367</sup> His analysis of concluding accented clauses—the number of unaccented syllables between the last two accented syllables that precede a main pause—confirms much of what Orinsky and others argued regarding the presence of non-Libanian *progymnasmata* among the genuine ones and their likely (but far from certain) authorship to be the same as that of the *progymnasmata* attributed to Nicolaus.<sup>368</sup> But Hörandner is not persuaded by Stegemann's claim for Aphthonius as the author of these *progymnasmata*. To be sure, Aphthonius follows the rules of closing accented clauses, but, statistically, his model *progymnasmata* are not as close to either the non-Libanian *progymnasmata* or those attributed to Nicolaus as the latter two are to each other.<sup>369</sup>

Consequently, at the present time the only conclusion to make is that the sample *progymnasmata* attributed to Nicolaus are not by Nicolaus. Hence, we simply refer to the author as ps.-Nicolaus. The many similarities with Aphthonius, however, do point to a date sometime after the sixth century when Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* emerged as the standard textbook and hence served as an authoritative model.<sup>370</sup> In addition, the thirteenth

<sup>365</sup> See Stegemann, "Nikolaos," 452-53.

<sup>366</sup> See Stegemann, "Nikolaos," 457.

<sup>367</sup> See Wolfram Hörandner, *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 16; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981).

<sup>368</sup> See Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 56-59. Stegemann's analysis is limited to narratives, finding that the genuine Libanian narratives do not observe accented clauses, whereas the others do. He cautions, however, that these non-Libanian narratives are not thereby all by one author since following the rules of concluding clauses is typical of writers of *progymnasmata*.

<sup>369</sup> See Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 60, 65-67.

<sup>370</sup> See further *Chreia* 1.212-16.

century, the date of the earliest MS (Barocc. 131), thus becomes the *terminus ante quem*.

#### THE CHREIA ELABORATIONS OF PS.-NICOLAUS

These four brief elaborations treat one mixed chreia, two sayings-chreiai, and one action chreia, whose one consistency is the way in which they reflect the Aphthonian structure and style for an elaboration.

The first elaboration (Text 24) treats a mixed chreia, one attributed to the Cynic Diogenes. This chreia—the most cited in the rhetorical tradition and one often used to illustrate a mixed chreia in the classification of chreiai—is the subject of three elaborations: by Libanius (Text 21), ps.-Nicolaus, and Anonymous (Text 30). A detailed comparison of these three was carried out above in the introduction to Libanius' elaborations. That comparison need not be repeated here, except to restate the conclusion: Libanius' elaboration is the earliest, and the other two at various points seem clearly to have made use of it, at least at the level of ideas in the encomiastic and paraphrastic sections as well as in the rationale, analogy, and example sections; ps.-Nicolaus and Anonymous show even closer agreements, as virtually identical wording is apparent in various sections, so that one is obviously dependent on the other. The direction of dependence would seem to be that Anonymous used ps.-Nicolaus, although the uncertain dating of ps.-Nicolaus—after the sixth century but before the thirteenth—makes such a conclusion less than certain. But ps.-Nicolaus here and in the following three elaborations also shows dependence on Aphthonius' elaboration structure of eight κεφάλαια, as is clear from our insertion of these section titles in the text and translation.<sup>371</sup> The parallels also go, however, to transitional words and syntactical constructions, especially if we consider Aphthonius' elaborations of both a chreia and a maxim. For example, in the second, or παραφραστικόν, section (1.2), we find clear use of the Aphthonian model, especially of his maxim elaboration:

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε<sup>372</sup>

<sup>371</sup> See Aphthonius 23-78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>372</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1 Rabe).

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ ἃ μὲν εἴργασται τάδε

Aphthonius: πάρεστι δὲ ἰδεῖν ὡς καλῶς<sup>373</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς κατιδεῖν ὡς καλῶς

The transitional particles to the next four sections likewise follow Aphthonius' lead. The third section, the αἰτία, has γάρ (1.3);<sup>374</sup> the fourth, the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, has εἰ γάρ (1.4);<sup>375</sup> the fifth, the παραβολή, has ὥσπερ δέ (1.5);<sup>376</sup> and the sixth, the παράδειγμα, has σκόπει μοι (1.6).<sup>377</sup> In the seventh and eighth sections even the syntax is similar (1.7, 8). In the seventh section, for example, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, we find:

Aphthonius: θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ . . . εἰπόντα<sup>378</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: τὸν Σοφοκλέα θαυμάζεσθαι δεῖ, . . . εἰπόντα

And, finally, in the eighth section, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς, the syntax is once again modelled on Aphthonius:

Aphthonius: πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας . . . θαυμάζειν<sup>379</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: πρὸς ἃ πάντα δεῖ βλέποντας . . . θαυμάζειν

In short, ps.-Nicolaus is not only dependent on a tradition going back to Libanius regarding the content of this elaboration, but also on Aphthonius for the structure, transitions, and wording of the elaboration.

The second elaboration (Text 25) treats a sayings-chreia which is attributed to the Pythagorean philosopher Theano, who, whether she is the wife or merely a student of Pythagoras,<sup>380</sup> is nevertheless the only woman who is the πρόσωπον of an elaborated chreia. This distinctive trait, in particular given the negative portrayal of wives and women in the educational ethos,<sup>381</sup>

<sup>373</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 2 Rabe).

<sup>374</sup> See Aphthonius 38 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>375</sup> Cf. Aphthonius 53: εἰ δέ.

<sup>376</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12 Rabe).

<sup>377</sup> Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 16 Rabe): σκόπει, and Aphthonius

64: ὅρα μοι.

<sup>378</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (o. 10, 3-4 Rabe). Cf. Aphthonius 71-72: θαυμάσαι τὸν Ἡσίοδον δεῖ . . . εἰπόντα.

<sup>379</sup> Aphthonius 77.

<sup>380</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 8.42, and Kurt von Fritz, "Theano (5)," *PW* 12 (1934) 1379-81, esp. 1379-80.

<sup>381</sup> On this educational ethos and the portrayal of women in it, see Morgan, *Literate Education*, 120-51, esp. 135-38.

clearly created problems for ps.-Nicolaus. In the first and eighth sections, where we expect praise of the πρόσωπον Theano, we read instead of praise for Pythagoras (2.1, 8).<sup>382</sup> She clearly is subordinated to her husband (or teacher).

The elaboration itself, however, once again follows the Aphthonian structure of eight κεφάλαια, as is clear from the insertion of these κεφάλαια in the text and translation. Also clear is the use by ps.-Nicolaus of various words, phrases, and rhetorical figures that derive from Aphthonius' elaborations of a chreia and maxim. In the first κεφάλαιον, or ἐγκωμιαστικόν, we find the rhetorical figure κατὰ παράλειψιν, in which the author pretends to pass over something but says it anyway, if briefly. Thus we read that many women have benefitted from Pythagoras' wisdom, but especially one woman—Theano (2.1). Aphthonius uses this figure in his chreia elaboration, and, what is more, he not only uses this same figure in his maxim elaboration but his wording is also taken up by ps.-Nicolaus, as shown here:

Aphthonius: καὶ πολλῶν μὲν ἂν τις ἐπαινέσει τὸν Θεόγνιν<sup>383</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ πολλαὶ μὲν τῆς Πυθαγόρου σοφίας ἀπώναντο

Aphthonius: μάλιστα δὲ Θεανώ, περὶ ἧς κτλ.<sup>384</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: μάλιστα δὲ ὧν περὶ τὴν κτλ.

At the close of the second section, the παραφραστικόν, ps.-Nicolaus once again looks to the language of Aphthonius at the close of this sections in his elaborations (2.2):

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε<sup>385</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: τὸ δὲ θαῦμα τοῖς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται

Aphthonius: τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα<sup>386</sup>

The transitional particle to the next section, the αἰτία, is the same as in Aphthonius' elaborations, namely γάρ (2.3).<sup>387</sup> And

<sup>382</sup> Theano was, of course, also admired for her wisdom, as is clear from *Gnom. Par.* 197: 'Ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ ἐθαυμάσθησαν Διοτίμα Μαντινική, Εὐμητις Ῥοδία, Ἀσπασία Μιλησία, Θεανώ, Κλεοβουλίνη, Ἰππαρχία (p. 56 Sternbach).

<sup>383</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 19-20 Rabe).

<sup>384</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 20 Rabe).

<sup>385</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1-2 Rabe).

<sup>386</sup> Aphthonius 36-37.

<sup>387</sup> See Aphthonius 38, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

while there are no parallels with the next section, the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, the similarities appear in the next four sections. In the fifth section, the παραβολή, ps.-Nicolaus opens with the words ὥσπερ δέ (2.5), as does Aphthonius.<sup>388</sup> In the sixth, the παράδειγμα, the word ὅρα (2.6) also comes from Aphthonius,<sup>389</sup> and the sentence that opens the seventh, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν (2.7) is clearly modelled on that of Aphthonius:

ps.-Nicolaus: διὸ . . . Σοφοκλέα θαυμάσαι με δεῖ κτλ.

Aphthonius: διὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ κτλ.<sup>390</sup>

And, finally, the word θαυμάζων in the last section, the ἐπίλογος βραχὺς (2.8), derives from Aphthonius once again.<sup>391</sup>

The third elaboration (Text 26) is also based on a sayings-chreia, this time one attributed to the Cynic philosopher Diogenes. This chreia also appears in Theon, but there it is attributed to the Cynic Antisthenes,<sup>392</sup> although Theon attributes it to him only to acknowledge the inappropriateness of this πρόσωπον.<sup>393</sup> Theon does not say who the appropriate πρόσωπον would be, but since Diogenes Laertius also attributes this chreia to Diogenes,<sup>394</sup> it is fairly sure that Theon also knew of this chreia as attributed to Diogenes. In any case, Diogenes was often associated with a simple, even harsh, way of life, one not very different from the rigors of Spartan life.<sup>395</sup>

The elaboration itself once again follows the Aphthonian structure of eight κεφάλαια, as indicated by our insertion of them in the text and translation. Also evident in this elaboration, however, are various words, phrases, and rhetorical figures that derive

<sup>388</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12 Rabe). Cf. Aphthonius 59: ὥσπερ γάρ.

<sup>389</sup> Aphthonius 64: ὅρα.

<sup>390</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 3-4 Rabe). Cf. Aphthonius 71: διὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν Ἡσίοδον δεῖ κτλ.

<sup>391</sup> See Aphthonius 77: θαυμάζειν, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 6 Rabe): θαυμάσαι.

<sup>392</sup> See Theon 363-65.

<sup>393</sup> See Theon 362.

<sup>394</sup> See Diogenes Laertius, 6.59.

<sup>395</sup> See also Diogenes Laertius, 6.27, 39; ps.-Diogenes, *Ep.* 27 (p. 118 Malherbe); Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 7-11.

from either Aphthonius' chreia or maxim elaboration.<sup>396</sup> In the second section, the παραφραστικόν, for example, ps.-Nicolaus imitates the style of Aphthonius when he says: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε (3.2). Aphthonius' corresponding sentence in the maxim elaboration is identical (καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε)<sup>397</sup> and in the chreia elaboration nearly so (καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε ταῦτα).<sup>398</sup>

We also find the same transitional particle to the next section, the αἰτία, namely γάρ (3.3),<sup>399</sup> and ps.-Nicolaus, like Aphthonius, refers explicitly to the saying of the chreia at the close of the next section, the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου (3.4).<sup>400</sup> In addition, the opening words of the fifth section, the παραβολή, are ὥσπερ γάρ (3.5), as in Aphthonius' chreia elaboration,<sup>401</sup> and the words ὅρα μοι in the next section, the παράδειγμα, also come from Aphthonius' chreia elaboration.<sup>402</sup> Finally, in eighth section, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς, ps.-Nicolaus uses πῶς, as in Aphthonius' maxim elaboration,<sup>403</sup> and his use of φιλοσοφήσαντι is found in both,<sup>404</sup> thereby rounding out a dependence on Aphthonius that is evident throughout this elaboration.

The fourth elaboration (Text 27) treats an action-chreia and is distinctive among the elaborations of ps.-Nicolaus—indeed, among all of the elaborations in this volume—in that its πρόσωπον is not a specific person—a Diogenes or an Alexander—but a character type, in this case a Laconian. The distinction is thus between a ὀρισμένον πρόσωπον and an ἀόριστον πρόσωπον, as Hermogenes puts it.<sup>405</sup> A ὀρισμένον πρόσωπον for this chreia is attested elsewhere, since it is attributed to individual Spartans like

<sup>396</sup> For these elaborations, see Aphthonius 23-78, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>397</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1 Rabe).

<sup>398</sup> Aphthonius 36.

<sup>399</sup> See Aphthonius 38 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>400</sup> See Aphthonius 57.

<sup>401</sup> Aphthonius 59. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12 Rabe): ὥσπερ δέ.

<sup>402</sup> Aphthonius 64.

<sup>403</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 6 Rabe).

<sup>404</sup> See Aphthonius 78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>405</sup> See Hermogenes, *Progymn.* 9 (p. 20, 19-23 Rabe).

Agesilaus, Archidemus, and Lysander.<sup>406</sup> But here it is an ὁρίστον πρόσωπον, the characteristic Spartan, whose action with the spear is elaborated.

As with the first three elaborations, this one follows the Aphthonian structure of eight κεφάλαια, which are inserted at the appropriate places in the text and translation. In addition, this elaboration frequently adopts Aphthonius' words, phrases, and rhetorical figures in the same sections where Aphthonius used them, especially if again we take into consideration not only Aphthonius' elaboration of a chreia but also his elaboration of a maxim.<sup>407</sup> For example, in the first section, the ἐγκωμιαστικόν, we find the rhetorical figure κατὰ παράλειψιν, or pretended omission, in which ps.-Nicolaus alludes to many admirable deeds of the Lacedaemonians, but focuses on one deed, their decision not to build walls around their city. Aphthonius uses this figure in both of his elaborations,<sup>408</sup> and his use of the words μάλιστα δὲ ὦν περὶ τὴν πενίαν in his maxim elaboration<sup>409</sup> is adapted by ps.-Nicolaus: μάλιστα δὲ ὦν περὶ τῆς . . . κρίσεως (ps.-Nicolaus 4.1).

The last sentence of the next section (4.2), the παραφραστικόν, is clearly modelled on Aphthonius. The similarities are apparent:

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε ταῦτα, τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα<sup>410</sup>

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ ἃ εἰργασται τάδε, τὸ δὲ θαῦμα παρὰ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ὑπάρχει καταμαθεῖν

The third section, the αἰτία, shows no echoes from Aphthonius, but they resume in the fourth, the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. We find ps.-Nicolaus beginning this section with εἰ (4.4)<sup>411</sup> and, more

<sup>406</sup> For this chreia attributed to these specific Spartans, see Plutarch, *Apoph. Lac.* 210E, 218F, and 229C respectively.

<sup>407</sup> For these elaborations, see Aphthonius 23-78, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>408</sup> See Aphthonius 32-33 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 19-20 Rabe). On the identification of his figure, see John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 52, 2-3 Rabe).

<sup>409</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 20 Rabe).

<sup>410</sup> Aphthonius 36-37. See also Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1-2 Rabe): καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε, τάδε· πάρεστι δὲ ἰδεῖν ὥς καλῶς.

<sup>411</sup> See Aphthonius 53: εἰ δέ.

significantly, ending it with a reference back to the πρόσωπον of chreia (4.4).<sup>412</sup>

The final four sections reflect Aphthonian language. In the fifth section, the παραβολή, ps.-Nicolaus mirrors the opening of the same section of Aphthonius' maxim elaboration: "Ὡσπερ δέ (4.5).<sup>413</sup> The sixth section, the παράδειγμα, begins in Aphthonian fashion, though not exactly. Thus ps.-Nicolaus says θέα μοι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τὴν πόλιν (4.6), whereas Aphthonius' chreia elaboration has τὸν Δημοσθένους ὄρα μοι βίον.<sup>414</sup> The seventh section, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, has the words πρὸς ἃ δὴ βλέπων (4.7), which reflect Aphthonius' πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας, although these words of Aphthonius appear in his last section, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς.<sup>415</sup> In ps.-Nicolaus' ἐπίλογος, however, we find the word φιλοσοφοῦσα (4.8), which makes little sense here because the chreia being elaborated is an action chreia; its presence, however, may indicate ps.-Nicolaus' unreflective dependence on Aphthonius.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

As noted at the outset, the only edition of these chreia elaborations is that of Walz, which was based on a single MS (Paris. gr. 2918).<sup>416</sup> Accordingly, we have had to use Walz's text, although we have also proposed several changes in Walz's text—all noted in the apparatus. In addition, we have introduced the standard, or Aphthonian, section titles as well as paragraph numbers to make for easier reference.

The translation of these elaborations is the first, so far as we know, into any language.

<sup>412</sup> See Aphthonius 57.

<sup>413</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12 Rabe).

<sup>414</sup> Aphthonius 64.

<sup>415</sup> Aphthonius 77.

<sup>416</sup> See Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 1.263-64 (text on pp. 272-78).





Text 24. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3

## CHREIA ELABORATION I

(1.272, 20–274, 6 WALZ)

Περὶ χρείας μικτῆς· χρεία αὕτη μικτή.

Διογένης μεράκιον ἑωρακὼς ἀτακτοῦν τὸν παιδαγωγὸν ἐτύπτη-  
σεν, ἐπειπὼν, τί γὰρ τοιαῦτα παιδεύεις;

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Φιλοσοφίαν ἅπασαν ἐπαινέσαι καλόν, μά-  
λιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον (p.  
273) ὁδοὺς καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν <τοῦ> ἡλίου περίοδον ἑτέροις παρῆκεν·  
αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν ἐπιστήμην εἰς ἐπανόρθωσιν ἐποιεῖτο τῶν τρόπων.

2. <Παραφραστικόν> “Ὅθεν κατ’ ἀγορὰν ἐμβαλὼν καὶ περιτυ-  
χὼν μὴ σωφρονοῦντι<sup>1</sup> παιδί, παρεστηκότος παιδαγωγοῦ, τὸν μὲν  
παῖδα παρῆκεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν παιδαγωγὸν μετελθὼν ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς  
σωφρονίζει τὸν φύλακα. καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πληγῆς οὐκ ἀπέκρυψε· το-  
σαῦτα γὰρ, ἔφη, πᾶς οὐ καλῶς παιδαγωγῶν ὑποστήσεται. καὶ ἃ μὲν  
εἴργασται τάδε, πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς κατιδεῖν ὥς καλῶς.

3. <Αἰτία> Κατιδὼν γὰρ ὁ Διογένης, ὥς μὲν νεότης χρῆμα τῶν  
ὄντων ἀλόγιστον, πολιαὶ δέ, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου  
κέκτηνται πείραν, καὶ τοὺς πατέρας εἰδὼς, ὥς χρημάτων πολλῶν πρε-  
σβύτας ὠνοῦνται, καὶ παρακαθιστᾷσι τοῖς νέοις, ἐπανορθούμενοι τὸ τῆς  
νεότητος ἄβουλον τῇ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων βουλῇ. ταῦτα εἰδὼς ἀφείς τὸν

1 τοῦ addidimus 2 σωφρονοῦντι correximus σωφρονοῦντ Walz 3 οἱ πατέρες  
addidimus

Text 24. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(1.272, 20–274, 6 WALZ)

Concerning a mixed chreia; this is a mixed chreia:

Diogenes, on seeing a youth misbehaving, beat the paedagogus, adding, “Why are you teaching such things?”<sup>417</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> It is proper to praise every philosophy but especially that which Diogenes practised. For he left to others the investigation of the paths of stars and the examination of the circuit of the sun, whereas he himself applied his knowledge to the correction of character.<sup>418</sup>

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> This is why, when he had entered the marketplace and chanced upon a boy who was showing a lack of self-control although his paedagogus was in attendance,<sup>419</sup> he disregarded the boy, went after the paedagogus, and chastised the guardian instead of the boy. Nor did he conceal the reason for his blow: “This much at least,” he said, “anyone who is not a good paedagogus will understand.” And so this is what he has done, but it is possible from what follows to understand that he has acted properly.

3. <Rationale> Diogenes understood that youth is an irrational sort of being, whereas old men have acquired, if nothing else, the experience of age. He also knew that parents pay a high price for old men and set them as guardians over their young men, so that they correct the thoughtless nature of youth by the thoughtfulness of their elders. Knowing these things, he ignored

<sup>417</sup> On this chreia, see *Chreia* 1.316 as well as the two other elaborations of it in this volume (Texts 21 and 30).

<sup>418</sup> This characterization of Diogenes’ philosophy is much briefer than that in Libanius, as it refers only to the Cynic emphasis on ethics over physics (see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.103).

<sup>419</sup> On the paedagogus being responsible for his boy’s behavior in the market place, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.31. On paedagogi in general, see N. H. Young, “Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor,” *NovT* 29 (1987) 150–76.

νέον ἐπὶ τὸν παιδαγωγοῦντα μετέρχεται, ὥς τὸν παῖδα <οἱ πατέρες> παρεκατέθεντο σωφρονίζειν, τοῦτον ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς προελόμενος.

4. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Εἰ γὰρ μὴ τῷ παιδαγωγῷ τὴν πληγὴν, ἀλλὰ τῷ παιδὶ προσετρίψατο, τίς οὐκ ἂν ἥτι᾿ατο τὸν Διογένηος σωφρονισμόν, μὴδὲν μὲν ἐπισταμένης νεότητος, οἷς δὲ μὴ κρίνει θαυματούσης αἰεὶ τὸ γενόμενον.

5. <Παραβολή> Ὡςπερ δὲ τὰ ναυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα κυβερνήταις ἐπανατίθεται, καὶ χορὸς πλημμελῶν ἐν αἰτίαις ποιεῖ τὸν διδάσκαλον, καὶ στρατὸς ἄκοσμων αἰτιᾶσθαι παρασκευάζει τὸν στρατηγόν, οὕτω παῖς ἁμαρτῶν κατηγορεῖσθαι ποιεῖ τὸν παιδαγωγόν.

6. <Παράδειγμα> Τὴν Ἀθηναίων σκόπει μοι πόλιν, ἢ πεπτωκότων ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ στρατιωτῶν, τοὺς στρατηγοὺς μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν Ἑλλησποντον ἔκρινεν, ἐφ' οἷς τοὺς πεπτωκότας τῶν στρατιωτῶν οὐκ ἀνείλοντο, καὶ <τὸ> γεγονός ἐξ ἐτέρων ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν στρατηγῶν ἀνήγετο μέμψιν.

Καὶ Θεμιστοκλέα τῆς ἐν Σαλαμῖνι νίκης ἡτιῶντο, καὶ ταῦτα ναυμαχοῦντος δήμου καὶ πόλεως· οὕτω τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ἐφ' (p. 274) ἑκάτερα τὰς αἰτίας ἀνατιθέασι καὶ κατορθοῦσι καὶ πταίουσιν.

7. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ἐφ' οἷς τὸν Σοφοκλέα θαυμάζεσθαι δεῖ, πόλιν ἅπασαν τῶν ἡγουμένων εἰπόντα, τοὺς δ' ἄκοσμοῦντας ἀνθρώπους διδασκάλων τρόποις πονηροὺς γίνεσθαι.

the young man and went after the paedagogus, on whom the parents were relying to discipline their boy, and deliberately chose the man instead of the boy.

4. <From the Opposite> Indeed, if he had inflicted the blow, not on the paedagogus, but on the boy, who would not fault Diogenes' discipline? For youth understands nothing but is always impressed by what has happened in matters where he lacks judgement.<sup>420</sup>

5. <Analogy> Just as the mistakes of sailors are attributed to pilots, and a chorus, when it hits a false note, allows the trainer to be blamed, and an army, when it is disorderly, causes the general to be blamed, so a boy, when he makes a mistake, causes his paedagogus to be accused.

6. <Example> Consider, if you will, the city of the Athenians which, when its soldiers died in the Hellespont, passed judgment on the generals, rather than on the Hellespont, because they had not retrieved the soldiers who had died. And so what occurred because of other factors was alleged to be the fault of the generals.<sup>421</sup>

The Athenians also credited Themistocles with the victory at Salamis, even though the people and the city fought, too.<sup>422</sup> Thus, in either case, the Athenians held responsible those in charge, both when they succeeded and when they blundered.

7. <Testimony of the Ancients> For this reason, it is necessary to admire Sophocles, who said that every city is under the influence of its leaders, and people who are unruly become wicked through the character of their teachers.<sup>423</sup>

<sup>420</sup> This last clause is very opaque and our translation very tentative.

<sup>421</sup> As had Libanius, the author here is alluding to the naval battle of Arginusae in 406 B.C., which ended in an Athenian victory but was followed by a trial of the generals for not having retrieved the bodies of their fallen comrades due to a violent storm in the Hellespont. On the battle and its aftermath, see Xenophon, *HG* 1.7.1-35; Diodorus Siculus, 13.74.1; 97.1-103.2; and Hammond, *History of Greece*, 414-16.

<sup>422</sup> Again, as Libanius had, the author refers to Themistocles' being credited for the naval encounter off Salamis which proved to be a decisive victory of the Greeks over the Persians (see Herodotus, 8.124; Thucydides, 1.73-74; and Plutarch, *Them.* 17).

<sup>423</sup> The author does not quote Sophocles, but merely paraphrases him and clearly does so from the *Philoctetes*. The lines paraphrased are 386-88:

8. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Πρὸς ᾧ πάντα δεῖ βλέποντας ὡς σωφρονιστὴν ἄριστον Διογένην θαυμάζειν.

8. <Brief Epilogue> After looking at all these points, we have to admire Diogenes as the best disciplinarian.<sup>424</sup>

πόλις γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα τῶν ἡγουμένων  
στρατός τε σύμπας· οἱ δ' ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν  
διδασκάλων λόγοισι γίνονται κακοί.

A city is entirely dependent on its leaders,  
As is an army. Those who are unruly  
Have become wicked through their teachers.

<sup>424</sup> On the role and responsibilities of a σωφρονιστής, see Aristotle, *Ath.* 42, and J. Oehler, "Σωφρονισταί," PW 30 (1927) 1104-6. For the appropriation of this role to Cynics, see Gustav A. Gerhard, *Phoinix von Kolophon* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909) 36, 122-23.

Text 25. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(1.274, 7–275, 15 WALZ)

Περὶ ἄ&lt;λλης&gt; χρείας

Θεανὼ ἡ Πυθαγορική φιλόσοφος, ἐρωτηθεῖσα πόσον ἔσται ἀπ' ἀνδρὸς γυνή προσελθοῦσα τοῖς Θεσμοφορίοις, εἰ μὲν ἐξ οἰκείου, παραχρῆμα, ἔφη, εἰ δὲ ἀπ' ἄλλοτρίου, μηδέποτε.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐπαινουμένην ἐπὶ παντὶ θαυμάζεσθαι μᾶλλον Πυθαγόρας παρέσχετο· διηρημένων γὰρ τῶν γενῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰς φύσεις ποιουμένων τὰς πράξεις Πυθαγόρας φιλοσοφῶν συνῆψε τὰ γένη πρὸς ἀρετὴν οὕτω· γυναῖκας φιλοσοφίαν ἀναπείθων τιμᾶν, ὥς ἄνδρες πεφύκασιν. καὶ πολλὰ μὲν τῆς Πυθαγόρου σοφίας ἀπώναντο· μάλιστα δὲ Θεανώ, περὶ ἧς τί δεῖ τᾶλλα διεξελεῖν, ἀλλ' οἷα περὶ σωφροσύνης ἐνομοθέτησεν.



Text 25. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(1.274, 7-275, 15 WALZ)On an<other><sup>425</sup> chreia

Theano the Pythagorean philosopher, on being asked how soon after being with a man may a woman attend the Thesmophoria, said, "If with your own man, immediately; if with someone else's, never."<sup>426</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> As far as the philosophy being commended is concerned, it is rather Pythagoras<sup>427</sup> who offered it for universal admiration. For after the sexes had been divided and assigned their tasks in accord with their gender, Pythagoras, by his philosophy, united the sexes with respect to virtue in this way: by persuading women to honor philosophy as men do naturally. And so, many women have benefitted from the wisdom of Pythagoras, but especially Theano,<sup>428</sup> concerning whom it is hardly necessary

<sup>425</sup> As Walz notes, the MS has only an  $\alpha$  and a small following lacuna. Walz filled the lacuna with  $\acute{\alpha}<\mu\acute{\iota}\kappa\tau\omicron\upsilon>$ . This restoration, however, is not persuasive, as an "unmixed" chreia is otherwise not attested. We have tentatively proposed  $\acute{\alpha}<\lambda\lambda\eta\varsigma>$ , or "an<other>," i.e., another sayings-chreia (Text 24), a word which is also attested in the MSS of Libanius (see Text 21).

<sup>426</sup> On this chreia, see also *Chreia* 1.340-41.

<sup>427</sup> Pythagoras, born on the island of Samos, ca. 570 B.C., founded a philosophical community in southern Italy that stressed *inter alia* a simple, indeed ascetic, life (Diogenes Laertius, 8.9, 13, 33). Although the school did not long survive his own death ca. 480 B.C., it revived in the Hellenistic period as Neopythagoreanism and continued for many centuries thereafter. On Pythagoras and the early Pythagoreans, including Theano, see further Diogenes Laertius, 8.1-50, and Kurt von Fritz, "Pythagoras von Samos," PW 24.1 (1963) 171-209. Pythagoras is also the  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  of a chreia that was the subject of a  $\kappa\lambda\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  (see Text 15).

<sup>428</sup> Theano, identified as either the wife of Pythagoras or simply as one of his disciples (see Diogenes Laertius, 8.42), was later regarded as an ideal wife, as shown in this chreia preserved by Stobaeus: "Theano, on being asked how she would be famous, said: 'By plying my loom and sharing my marriage-bed' (Il. 1.31)" (*Flor.* 4.23.32 [p. 580 Hense]). Consequently, her selection as the  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  of Chreia 64 is quite appropriate. On this role for Theano, see also Plutarch, *Præcept. coniug.* 142C; Diogenes Laertius, 8.43; and *Gnom. Vat.* 574 [p. 204 Sternbach]). On Theano, see also Kurt von Fritz, "Theano (5)," PW

2. <Παραφραστικόν> Μυστήρια ἦν, καὶ περὶ ταῦτα γυνὴ προσήκει τοῖς ἱεροῖς· δεδοικυῖα δέ, μὴ προσιοῦσα θεοῖς ἀδικοίη θεούς, Θεανοῦς ἐπύθετο, πόσον ἂν χρόνον ἀνδρὸς διεστῶσα γυνὴ προσίοι τοῖς ἱεροῖς· ἡ δὲ τὴν μὲν κατὰ νόμους ἀνδρὶ συνοικήσασαν μετὰ τὴν ὁμιλίαν προσάγει <παραχρῆμα> τοῖς ἱεροῖς, τὴν δὲ νόθον ἡδονὴν προτιμήσασαν ἀλλοτριοῖ καθάπαξ τῶν ἱερῶν· καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε· τὸ δὲ θαῦμα τοῖς ἐξῆς δηλωθήσεται.

3. <Αἰτία> Γάμος μὲν γὰρ ἅπας εὖρημα καὶ δῶρον θεῶν, φυλακὴ δὲ τῆς φύσεως, καὶ κοινὴ παντὸς συνθήκη τοῦ γένους. οὗτος οὐρανὸν

2 ὁμιλίαν coniecit Boissonade (cf. 1.658 Walz) ἄμιλλαν codex unde Walz || παραχρῆμα addidimus 3 κοινή scripsimus (cf. Demosthenes, *Orat.* 25.16) κοινῇ codex unde Walz

to discuss other matters except the rules she legislated about self-control.

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> The mysteries were taking place,<sup>429</sup> and in connection with them a woman came to the rites. Yet in fear that by approaching the gods she would be acting unjustly toward them, she asked Theano how soon after intercourse with a man could a woman come to the rites. Theano allows the woman who has lived with a man legally into the rites <immediately> after intercourse, but the woman who has preferred meretricious pleasure Theano banishes once and for all from the rites.<sup>430</sup> And so, this is what she taught, but our admiration of it will be shown in the sections that follow.

3. <Rationale> Marriage is entirely an invention and gift of the gods, a safeguard of human nature, and a common covenant

10 (1934) 1379-81, and Holger Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period* (Acta Academiae Aboensis Ser. A, Humaniora 30.1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1965) 193-201.

<sup>429</sup> The Thesmophoria, one of the most widespread of religious festivals in the Greek world, was a festival in which women honored the goddess Demeter for her civilizing gift of grain. See further Walter Burkert, *Greek Religion* (trans. J. Raffan; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985) 242-46; Marcel Detienne, "The Violence of Wellborn Ladies: Women in the Thesmophoria," in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks* (trans. P. Wissing; eds. M. Detienne and J. P. Vernant; Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989) 129-47; and N. J. Lowe, "Thesmophoria and Haloa: Myth, Physics, and Mysteries," in *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece* (eds. S. Blundell and M. Williamson; New York: Routledge, 1998) 149-73.

<sup>430</sup> Rules about sexual purity requirements at temples vary. Inscriptions stipulate refraining from sexual intercourse for one, two, three on up to ten days (see Eugen Fehrle, *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum* [RVV 6; Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1910] 155-62, and Heinrich von Staden, "Women and Dirt," *Helios* 19 [1992] 7-30, esp. 25 n. 58). For the Thesmophoria, the number seems to have been three, at least for some participants, according to a scholion to Lucian's *D. Meretr.* 2.1 (on which see Lowe, "Thesmophoria," 165). In one inscription, which is cited by Fehrle (*Keuschheit*, 135 [= Dittenberger, *Syll.*<sup>2</sup> 566]) and was set up in the temple of Athena in Pergamum, perhaps in the mid-first century B.C., we find a ruling that echoes Theano's language, though nowhere near as strict: "Let citizens and all others perform religious ceremonies and enter the temple of the goddess on the same day after intercourse with their own wife or husband (ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς ἰδίας γυναικὸς καὶ τοῦ ἰδίου ἀνδρὸς αὐθιμερόν), but only after bathing on the second day after intercourse with someone else's wife or husband (ἀπὸ δὲ ἀλλοτρίας καὶ ἀλλοτρίου δευτεραῖοι)."

μὲν θεῶν ἀναπίμπλησι, τὴν δὲ γῆν τῶν μετ' ἐκείνους γενῶν, καὶ τοῖς μὲν (p. 275) θεοῖς φύλακα καταλείπει τὴν φύσιν, τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς τῶν γενῶν ἑαυτὸν ποιεῖ τῆς γονῆς φυλακτῆριον· ἃ γὰρ ἡ φύσις ἀπορεῖ τελευτῶσα, ταῦτα γάμος ταῖς διαδοχαῖς ἀναπληροῖ τῶν γενῶν· καὶ δοκεῖ τὸ γένος ἀθάνατον οἷς ἐπιγίνεται.

4. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Νόθον δὲ ἡδονὴν ἀγνοοῦσι μὲν οἱ θεοί, κο-  
λάζουσι δὲ νόμοι, καὶ σωφρονοῦντες ἄνθρωποι φεύγουσιν.

5. <Παραβολή> Ὡσπερ δὲ ὅσοι τοῖς κρείττους θύουσι τὰ νεο-  
σηκότα τῶν θυσιῶν ἀποκρίνουσι, οὕτως οἱ νοσοῦντες τὰς ἡδονὰς ἔξω  
τῆς τῶν θεῶν τελετῆς καθεστήκασιν.

6. <Παράδειγμα> Ὅρα τὴν Νῆινον, τὴν Ἀθηναίων ἱέρειαν, ἣ τὰς  
ἡδονὰς ἀναμίξασα θύμασι δέδωκε δίκην οὐ σμικρὰν παροινήσασα.

7. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Διὸ καὶ περὶ ταῦτα Σοφοκλέα θαυ-  
μάσαι με δεῖ, φιλοσοφοῦντα τοὺς θεοὺς προσκειμένους τοῖς σώφροσιν,  
ἀπεχθανομένους δὲ τοῖς τὰς ἡδονὰς προτιμήσασιν.

8. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Ὁ τοίνυν θαυμάζων τὴν Θεανῶ τὴν Πυ-  
θαγόρου θαυμαζέτω σοφίαν.

of every species.<sup>431</sup> Marriage fills heaven with gods and the earth with species subordinate to them. As far as the gods are concerned, marriage allows their nature to be a safeguard, but for the other species marriage makes itself a bastion of their propagation. For what nature lacks because of its mortality marriage provides by the succession of generations. And so, the species seems immortal to those who marry.

4. <From the Opposite> The gods, however, do not recognize meretricious pleasure, the laws punish it, and self-controlled men avoid it.

5. <Analogy> Just as all who sacrifice to the higher powers exclude the diseased victims from the sacrifices, so those who are sick with pleasures have been excluded from the rites of the gods.

6. <Example> Consider Ninos, the priestess of the Athenians, who combined pleasures with sacrificial victims and paid no slight penalty for her carousing.<sup>432</sup>

7. <Testimony of the Ancients> Therefore, on these matters, too, I must admire Sophocles, who teaches that the gods are devoted to the self-controlled but are hostile to those who have preferred pleasures.<sup>433</sup>

8. <Brief Epilogue> Consequently, let the man who admires Theano admire the wisdom of Pythagoras.

<sup>431</sup> This sentence is clearly modeled on Demosthenes, *Orat.* 25.16, esp. the words *πᾶς ἐστὶ νόμος εὐρημα μὲν καὶ δῶρον θεῶν . . . πόλεως δὲ συνθήκη κοινή*.

<sup>432</sup> This priestess of the god Sabazios is a surprisingly elusive figure. She seems to have lived during the first half of the fourth century B.C. and may well have been referred to by Demosthenes (*Orat.* 19.281) when describing Aeschines' mother, who had convened the worshippers of Sabazios during which another priestess (*ἐτέρα ἱέρεια*) died—indeed, was sentenced to death, as a scholion says, and was named Ninos (Σ 19.281 [2.83 Dilts]). See further H. S. Versnel, *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion* (2 vols.; SGRR 6; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990-1992) 1.115-18. Cf. also Martin P. Nilsson, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion* (2 vols.; HAW 5.2; 3rd ed.; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1961-1967) 1.630, 836, and Robert Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 163 n. 34.

<sup>433</sup> Walz does not suggest a Sophoclean passage, but it seems that the author had *Ajax* 132-33 in mind:

τοὺς δὲ σώφρονας

θεοὶ φιλοῦσι καὶ στυγοῦσι τοὺς κακοὺς.

The self-controlled

the gods love and abhor the wicked.

Text 26. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(1.275, 16–276, 32 WALZ)

Περὶ χρείας λογικῆς

Διογένης ἐκ Λακεδαιμόνος εἰς Ἀθήνας ἰὼν, πόθεν καὶ ποῖ βαδίζεις ἐρομένου τινός, ἐκ τῆς ἀνδρωνίτιδος ἐπὶ τὴν γυναικωνῖτιν εἶπεν.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ὅσον Ἡρακλῆς εὖ ποιεῖ καὶ ζηλούμενος, Διογένης δηλοῖ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ὁρῶν. Ἡρακλέους γὰρ ζηλωτῆς καταστάς, οὐ μόνον εὖ ποιεῖν ἐπειρᾶτο τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεις ὅλας ἐπὶ βραχέος ἔσωφρόνισε ῥήματος.

2. <Παραφραστικόν> Τὴν γὰρ Σπάρτην ἀφείς καὶ περὶ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἰὼν, ἐπειδὴ τις αὐτοῦ τὴν πορείαν ἐπυνθάνετο, τὴν ἀνδρῶν, εἶπεν, ἐστίαν ἀφείς ἐπὶ τὴν γυναικῶν κατελήλυθα, ἔργοις τὰς φύσεις δηλῶν οὐκ ὀνόμασι. καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε (p. 276) τάδε· σαφέστερα δὲ τῶν λεχθέντων τὸν νοῦν ἑκατέρα δείκνυσι πόλις.

3. <Αἰτία> Λακεδαιμόνιοι γὰρ πολιτεύονται τὴν ὀλίγων ἀρχήν, καὶ πόλιν οἰκεῖν ἀτείχιστον εἶλοντο τὴν γῆν τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τειχίζοντες. εἴτα τελούμενοι νεώτεροι τελετὰς Ἀρτέμιδος τὴν εὐψυχίαν ἥσκουν

Text 26. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(1.275, 16–276, 32 WALZ)

On a sayings-chreia

Diogenes, when someone asked him on his journey from Lacedaemon to Athens whence and whither he was traveling, said, “From the men’s quarters to the women’s.”<sup>434</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> To the extent that Herakles is a benefactor and is to be imitated, Diogenes clearly looks to him as model. For once having become an imitator of Herakles, he not only tried to be a benefactor to people he happened to meet, but he also reprimanded entire cities with a terse saying.<sup>435</sup>

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> After he had left Sparta and was going around in Athens and someone asked him about his journey, he said, “I have left the abode of men and have come to that of women,” thereby identifying their nature by their deeds, not by their names. And so, this is what he taught, but more plainly than his words does each city exhibit its character.

3. <Rationale> The Lacedaemonians have an oligarchical form of government<sup>436</sup> and have chosen to inhabit an unwalled city by walling the land with its inhabitants.<sup>437</sup> Furthermore, as the younger men are being initiated into the rites of Artemis,

<sup>434</sup> On this chreia, see also *Chreia* 1.303-4.

<sup>435</sup> On Herakles, the son of Zeus and Alcmene, see Diodorus Siculus, 4.8-39. On Herakles as a model for Diogenes (and for Cynics generally), see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.71; ps.-Diogenes, *Ep.* 26 (p. 118 Malherbe); Lucian, *Vit. auct.* 8; *Symp.* 13, 16; and Abraham J. Malherbe, “Herakles,” *RAC* 14 (1988) 559-83, esp. 560-61. On Diogenes reprimanding cities, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.57; Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 3; and ps.-Diogenes, *Ep.* 1 (p. 92 Malherbe).

<sup>436</sup> On this oligarchy, see further Plutarch, *Lycur.* 7-10.

<sup>437</sup> The Lacedaemonians were known for having never walled their city, being confident instead in the strength of their arms (see, e.g., Plutarch, *Apophth. Lac.* 212E, 215D).

μελετῶντες αἰεὶ καὶ τελούμενοι· μητέρες δὲ περὶ τὰ σπάργανα πρὸς ἀνδρίαν παιδαγωγοῦσι τοὺς παῖδας, τείχος εἶναι τῇ γῇ τοῖς παραγομένοις ἐπιβώμεναι. ταῦτα τὴν Διογένους παρεσκεύασε κρίσιν, ἀνδρῶν μητέρα καλεῖν τὴν Σπάρτην.

4. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὸ μὲν οἷα δημοκρατεῖν, καὶ τὸ μηδὲν ἕτερον ἑτέρου πλέον ἔχειν παρ' ἐκείνοις εὐδοκιμεῖ· ἔπειτα κῶμοι καὶ θέατρα, καὶ <τὸ> τὰς δεξιὰς ἀδικεῖν τῶν φύσεων· ἐπὶ τούτοις σκηνὴ δι' ἐναντίων ποιουμένη τὴν τέχνην, γέλωτα τιμῶσα καὶ δάκρυα, καὶ <τὸν> προσιόντα σπουδάζουσα τοῖς πονηροῖς καὶ τερπνοῖς ἐπιφέρεσθαι· δι' ἃ δὴ πάντα Διογένης γυναικῶν ἐστὶαν τὰς Ἀθήνας προσεῖπεν.

5. <Παραβολή> Ὡσπερ γὰρ οἱ φυτῶν ἐπιμέλειαν ἄγοντες τὰς τῶν δένδρων φύσεις τοῖς οἰκείοις μεταβάλλουσι πόνοις, οὕτως ἄνθρωποι τὰς αὐτῶν πράξεις πρὸς τὰς οἰκείας ἐκφέρειν ἐγνώκασι φύσεις.

6. <Παράδειγμα> Ἐκατέραν ὄρα μοι πόλιν δεῖγμα τοῦ λόγου σαφέστατον· αἱ τε γὰρ Ἀθῆναι παραλαβοῦσαι <τὸ> τῆς Ἑλλάδος κρατεῖν ἡδοναῖς τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκβεβλήκασιν· οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προκινδυνεύειν ἐθέλοντες τὴν τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἀρχὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς μετεστήσαντο.

7. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Κἂν ταῖς κωμῳδαῖς Ἀριστοφάνης τῆς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ῥαθυμίας κατήγορος, μηδὲν ἄλλο δρᾶν πλὴν δικάζεσθαι

4 τὸ τὰς δεξιὰς ἀδικεῖν scripsimus τὰς δεξιὰς ἀδικοῦντες Walz || τὸν addidimus  
6 τὸ addidimus || αὐτοὺς correximus αὐτοὺς Walz 7 Κἂν correximus Κἂν Walz || μετ' ἐκείνους exclusimus



they practice courage, always practicing and perfecting it.<sup>438</sup> And mothers train their sons in bravery while they are in swaddling cloths, shouting out to those going astray that they are the wall for the land.<sup>439</sup> These practices prompted Diogenes' decision to call Sparta the mother of men.

4. <From the Opposite> But the Athenians' type of democracy and the principle that one person has no more than another are esteemed among them. Then, there are carousings, spectacles, and violation of the pledges of their nature; in addition to these, there is the stage plying its craft with contraries: honoring laughter and tears, and eager to assail the spectator with evils and pleasures. For all these reasons Diogenes called Athens an abode of women.

5. <Analogy> Just as those who tend to the care of plants change the nature of trees with the proper toil, so do men know how to accomplish their deeds in conformity with their own nature.

6. <Example> Consider, if you will, each city as a very obvious example of the saying: The Athenians, after assuming control of Hellas, threw away their rule in favor of pleasures; but the Lacedaemonians, willing to bear the brunt of dangers, transferred the rule of the Athenians to themselves.<sup>440</sup>

7. <Testimony of the Ancients> And in the comedies of Aristophanes when he said that the Athenians did nothing except go to court, he was accusing them of shirking their duty.<sup>441</sup> And

<sup>438</sup> Artemis Ortheia was honored by a ritual in which Spartan youths were whipped until their blood spattered her altar (see Xenophon, *Lac. Pol.* 2.9; Plato, *Laws* 633B; Pausanias, 3.16.7-11; and Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 152).

<sup>439</sup> According to Plutarch (*Lycurg.* 16.3), Spartan babies were reared without swaddling cloths (ἄνευ σπαργάνων). Still, Spartan mothers had a reputation for instilling bravery in their sons, as revealed in this chreia: "A Laconian woman, on hearing that her son had died in battle, said: 'Child, how nobly you've repaid your upbringing!'" (*Gnom. Vat.* 569 [p. 202 Sternbach]).

<sup>440</sup> After the Athenians defeated the Persians decisively at the naval battle off the island of Salamis in 480 B.C., they became the dominant power in the Aegean, but by the end of the century, lost this power to the Lacedaemonians in the Peloponnesian War, on which see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 219-53, 345-419.

<sup>441</sup> The author is rather vague, but seems to be referring to Aristophanes' *Wasps*, in which Bdelycleon attempts to keep his father Philocleon from

φήσας· ὁ δ' αὖ Εὐριπίδης φιλοσοφῶν τὰς Λακεδαιμονίων κόρας συγγυμνάζεσθαι τοῖς νέοις φησίν, οὐκ ἀκрасίαν κατηγορῶν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ῥώμην ἑκατέροις ἐξ ἴσου διδοὺς ἀνδράσι τε ἅμα καὶ [μετ' ἐκείνους] ταῖς γυναιξίν.

8. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Πῶς οὖν ἦν ἐπαληθεῦσαι Διογένη φιλοσοφήσαντι μὴ τοῦτον ἀμφοῖν προτεθέντα τὸν ὅρον;

of course Euripides, in a philosophic vein, says that Lacedaemonian maidens exercised with the young men; he was not accusing them of lacking modesty, but was assigning strength equally to both, to the men as well as to the women.<sup>442</sup>

8. <Brief Epilogue> How, then, was it possible for the philosopher Diogenes to speak the truth unless he proposed this distinction between the two cities?

his addiction to jury service; Philocleon and many others of his generation have become dependent on the payment received from such service (see 87-88, 215-16, 503-7 et passim).

<sup>442</sup> The author is referring to Euripides' *Andromache*, where Peleus mentions co-educational exercising in the nude at Sparta (595-601). The author, however, misunderstands Euripides, for Peleus clearly criticizes the practice, saying that it produces women like Helen. For a positive evaluation of this practice, however, see Plutarch, *Lycurg.* 14.2.

Text 27. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3

## CHREIA ELABORATION 4

(1.277, 1–278, 3 WALZ)

Περὶ χρείας πρακτικῆς

Λάκων, ἐρωτηθεὶς τίνες ἂν εἶεν τῆς Σπάρτης οἱ ὄροι, τὸ δόρυ ἔδει-  
ξεν.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Τὴν αὐτῶν ἀρετὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων Λακε-  
δαιμόνιοι φέρουσιν· Ἡρακλέους γὰρ ὄντες ἀπόγονοι τοῖς πεπραγμένοις  
δηλοῦσι τὸν πρόγονον, καὶ Λακεδαιμονίους μὲν ὑπῆρξεν ἐφ’ ἅπασιν  
ἄγασθαι, μάλιστα δὲ ὧν περὶ τῆς τῶν πόλεως ἐπράξαντο κρίσεως.

2. <Παραφραστικόν> Οἰηθεὶς γάρ τις τὴν Λακεδαίμονα τοσοῦ-  
τον χώρας περιβαλέσθαι μέτρον, ὅσον τροπαίων ἐπράξατο πλῆθος,  
προσιῶν ἐπυνθάνετο· ποῖ δὲ οἱ τῆς Σπάρτης καθεστήκασιν ὄροι· ὁ δὲ  
<Λάκων> τὴν γῆν ὑπερβὰς ἐπὶ τοῦ δόρατος κατεμέτρει τὴν Σπάρτην,  
καὶ ἃ μὲν εἵργασται τάδε, τὸ δὲ θαῦμα παρὰ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ὑπάρχει κατα-  
μαθεῖν.

3. <Αἰτία> Ἄπαντες ἄνθρωποι τὰς αὐτῶν χώρας τοῖς οἰκείοις  
περιβάλλουσιν ἔργοις, καὶ νικῶντες μὲν ἐπὶ πλεῖστον ἐκφέρουσιν, ἀφαι-  
ροῦνται δὲ νικηθέντες τὴν γῆν, καὶ τὴν τῶν ἔργων μένουσι νίκην τοῖς  
κατορθουμένοις ὀρίζοντες ἢ τῷ χωρίῳ.

4. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Ὡστε εἰ μὴ τὸ δόρυ, δι’ οὗ πράττεται  
πόλεμος, ἀλλὰ τὴν γῆν ὑπῆρχεν ὁ Λάκων ἐπιδειξάμενος, ἐδόκει ψευδὴς  
μεταβολὴ τύχης ἕτερον Σπάρτης φερούσης ὄρον.

Text 27. Ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 4  
(1.277, 1-278, 3 WALZ)

## On an action-chreia

A Laconian, on being asked what Sparta's boundaries were, showed his spear.<sup>443</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> Lacedaemonians achieve their identity through deeds, for since they are descendants of Herakles, they resemble their ancestor through what they have done.<sup>444</sup> And in fact the Lacedaemonians were admired for all their deeds, but especially for what they did regarding their decision about matters of state.

2. <Paraphrastic [section]> For someone, having supposed that Lacedaemon encompassed just as much territory as the number of trophies it had erected, approached and asked, "Where have Sparta's boundaries been set up?" And the Laconian went about the land and measured out Sparta with his spear. And so this is what he did, and it is possible to learn what is admirable about it from the sections that follow.

3. <Rationale> All men possess their land through their own deeds; when they conquer, they increase their territory to the fullest extent; but when they are defeated, they are deprived of it. And so, men maintain the victory of their deeds when they define victory by accomplishments rather than by territory.

4. <From the Opposite> Consequently, had the Laconian pointed not to his spear (with which war is waged), but to his land, this reversal in character (which carries with it another definition of Sparta) would seem false.

<sup>443</sup> On this chreia, see further *Chreia* 1.328-29.

<sup>444</sup> On Herakles as their ancestor, see Apollodorus, 2.7.7; 8.3; Diodorus Siculus, 4.37.3; 58.6; 12.59.4; and Aelian, *VH.* 4.5. The resemblance through deeds refers to Herakles' being known for his twelve labors, on which see Diodorus Siculus, 4.10.6-26.4.

5. <Παραβολή> Ὡςπερ δὲ οἱ πονεῖν τὰ τῆς γῆς προελόμενοι τὰ κηπεύματα ταῖς ἐργασίαις ἐκτείνουσιν, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτήν.

6. <Παράδειγμα> Θέα μοι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τὴν πόλιν, ἣ προῆλθε μὲν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκ Δωριέων· ἔπειτα Πελοπόννησον ἐπεισήνεγκεν ἅπασαν, καὶ τῆς ὅλης Ἑλλάδος ἡγεῖτο κρατήσασα.

7. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Πρὸς ἃ δὴ βλέπων Ἀλκαῖος ὁ ποιητής, οὐ ξύλα καὶ λίθους, ἀλλ' ἄνδρας ἐφιλοσόφησε πόλεως σύστασιν.

8. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Ἐπαινετέα τοίνυν ἐστὶν ἡ Λακεδαιμόνων <πόλις> καὶ φιλοσοφοῦσα καὶ πράττουσα.

5. <Analogy> Just as those who have chosen to work at agricultural pursuits extend their gardens by their labor, so, too, do the Lacedaemonians extend their land by their deeds.

6. <Example> Consider, if you will, the city of the Lacedaemonians: they came at first from the Dorians, then added all of the Peloponnese, and, after gaining mastery of all Hellas, became its leader.<sup>445</sup>

7. <Testimony of the Ancients> With a view to these matters, the poet Alcaeus taught that a city is composed, not of timbers and stones, but of men.<sup>446</sup>

8. <Brief Epilogue> The <city> of the Lacedaemonians, therefore, is to be praised both for its teaching and for its practice.

<sup>445</sup> A brief capsule of Spartan history: The Spartans were descended from the Dorians, people of northwestern Greece who migrated before 1100 B.C. into the Peloponnese, the southern peninsula of Greece (Thucydides, 1.12.3); they conquered the peoples living there and eventually gained mastery over all Hellas for the brief period between the collapse of Athens in 404 B.C. and the defeat of Sparta in the battle of Leuctra in 371 B.C., on which see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 72-82, 105-8, 409-19, 435-82, 491-516.

<sup>446</sup> Ps.-Nicolaus is alluding to Alcaeus, *Frag.* 426 (in Campbell's LCL edition). Aelius Aristides (*Orat.* 46.207) says that many people had referred to this passage, thereby making ps.-Nicolaus' use of it here not unusual. Ps.-Nicolaus does not quote Alcaeus literally, but a fragmentary papyrus (P.Berol. 9569) preserves the relevant line and its context, for which see David A. Campbell, ed. and trans., *Greek Lyric* (5 vols.; LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982-1993) 1.284. In any case, this one line of Alcaeus became proverbial and hence is preserved elsewhere: ἄνδρες πόλεως πύργος ἀρήμιος (see scholia to Aeschylus, *Pers.* 347; Sophocles, *OT* 56; and Theodorus Bergk, ed., *Poetae Lyrici Graeci* [4 vols.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1882] 3.156-57).

## Texts 28-30. Anonymous Elaborations in Doxapatres

Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3 (2.282, 6-286, 6 Walz)

## Introduction

A LITTLE KNOWN COLLECTION OF SAMPLE  
PROGYMNASMATA

Scattered throughout John Doxapatres' voluminous commentary on the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius<sup>447</sup> are several unattributed μελέται, or model exercises, as he designates them. These μελέται total nine and illustrate seven of the fourteen individual *progymnasmata*. Only in the case of the chreia is there more than one, and in this case there are three. These μελέται always follow Doxapatres' commentary on Aphthonius' own sample *progymnasma* and hence function as supplementary illustrations of the compositional techniques that are being taught by means of these *progymnasmata*.

Hugo Rabe drew attention to these supplementary μελέται, but was himself interested in only one of them, the ἡθοποιία,<sup>448</sup> because its subject—"What words Michael who had been banished from his kingdom might say as he was being driven from his palace"<sup>449</sup>—gave him a clue for dating Doxapatres. Rabe identifies this Michael as Michael V Kalaphates, who reigned briefly from 1041 to 1042,<sup>450</sup> thereby making 1042 the *terminus post quem* for Doxapatres' composition of his commentary.<sup>451</sup>

Rabe was unsure whether Doxapatres himself composed this ἡθοποιία or whether he was dependent on some source, but

<sup>447</sup> See John Doxapatres, 2.81-564 Walz. The complete title of this commentary is: 'Ρητορικὰὶ ὁμιλίαι εἰς τὰ τοῦ Ἀφθονίου Προγυμνάσματα.

<sup>448</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.508, 18-509, 3 Walz.

<sup>449</sup> Doxapatres, 2.508, 18-19 Walz.

<sup>450</sup> On this Michael and his banishment, see Charles M. Brand, "Michael V Kalaphates," *ODB* 2.1366.

<sup>451</sup> See Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 3. Die Quellen des Doxapatres in den Homilien zu Aphthonius," *RhM* 62 (1907) 559-86, esp. 580-81. Cf. also Rabe's *praefatio* to his *Prolegomenon Sylloge* (Rhetores Graeci 14; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1931) li-lii.



he tended to favor composition by Doxapatres.<sup>452</sup> He was certainly capable, Rabe says, of composing such a *progymnasma*, and he was clearly not dependent at this point on his principal *Vorlage*, i.e., Rabe's hypothetical *Hauptquelle* for both Doxapatres and the roughly contemporary P-scholia, not merely because this ἡθοποιία is missing in the P-scholia, but because such dependence is excluded on chronological grounds, for Rabe had dated this *Vorlage* to about 1000.<sup>453</sup> What is more, Rabe goes on to attribute all the supplementary μελέται to Doxapatres, though not without expressing some doubts, especially as some of the μελέται appear independently in a fifteenth century manuscript.<sup>454</sup>

Rabe should have pursued these doubts, however, for Doxapatres himself has a remark<sup>455</sup>—presumably one Rabe missed—that attributes at least the chreia elaborations to predecessors. Specifically, Doxapatres says that the chreia elaborations were not composed by him but by those before him.<sup>456</sup> It is important therefore to see if all the supplementary μελέται can be traced back to predecessors.

Unfortunately, no thorough analysis of these μελέται has been attempted. Indeed, aside from Rabe's brief discussion, they have been overlooked by scholars. Even Herbert Hunger, whose survey of *progymnasmata* in Byzantine rhetorical theory and practice remains the fullest,<sup>457</sup> refers to the ἡθοποιία regarding Michael only in the context of dating Doxapatres<sup>458</sup> but is otherwise unaware of any of the other μελέται that appear in the commentary. And while no thorough analysis is possible here, some preliminary discussion of these μελέται is required, especially regarding the question of whether they all belong to a single

<sup>452</sup> See Rabe, "Quellen des Doxapatres," 580.

<sup>453</sup> On this *Vorlage*, see Rabe, "Quellen des Doxapatres," 563-86; for the date, p. 585.

<sup>454</sup> On this Paris MS (Paris. gr. 2925), see Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 2. Aphthonius der Schüler des Libanios," *RhM* 62 (1907) 262-64, esp. 264 n. 1.

<sup>455</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.282, 6-11 Walz.

<sup>456</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.282, 10-11: . . . μελέτας οὐχ ἡμῶν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πρὸ ἡμῶν μελετηθεῖσας.

<sup>457</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.77-120.

<sup>458</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.83.

collection. If they do, then the three chreia elaborations can be dated more securely.

Doxapatres supplemented Aphthonius' own model exercises, as already indicated, seven times. He added three extra chreia elaborations as well as one μελέτη for each of the following: a refutation (ἀνασκευή) and a confirmation (κατασκευή) of a narrative about Ganymede,<sup>459</sup> an encomium (ἐγκώμιον) and an invective (ψόγος) of Agamemnon,<sup>460</sup> a comparison (σύγκρισις) of the grapevine and olive tree,<sup>461</sup> and the characterization (ἡθοποιία), as already noted, of the emperor Michael's reaction to being deposed from the throne.

Three observations about these μελέται suggest that Doxapatres took them from a single collection. First, the presence of pairs of *progymnasmata* treating the same subjects connects at least some of them together. The refutation and confirmation both deal with Zeus' cupbearer, Ganymede, and the encomium and condemnation treat the leader of the Greek forces at Troy, Agamemnon. The latter pair, incidentally, confirms that these μελέται are not by Doxapatres because he elsewhere explicitly rejects the practice of writing an encomium and condemnation on the same person.<sup>462</sup>

Second, the chreia elaborations represent the first time Doxapatres has supplemented Aphthonius' own sample μελέται, so that the comment preceding them may be Doxapatres' disavowal of having composed any of them.

Third, the incompleteness of some chapters of Doxapatres' commentary—specifically, those on the commonplace (κοινὸς τόπος) and description (ἐκφρασις)—leaves open the possibility that he had included a supplementary μελέτη in these chapters as well. These chapters both break off in the midst of Doxapatres' comments on Aphthonius' model exercise,<sup>463</sup> so that it is certainly

<sup>459</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.349, 21–353, 5 and 366, 16–369, 4 Walz.

<sup>460</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.456, 31–460, 28 and 476, 16–478, 12 Walz.

<sup>461</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.491, 25–492, 28 Walz.

<sup>462</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.465, 9–15 Walz.

<sup>463</sup> The chapter on the commonplace breaks off in the middle of Doxapatres' comments on Aphthonius' model commonplace (2.411, 7 Walz; cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 7 [p. 19, 10 Rabe]). The chapter on description breaks off close to the end of his comments on Aphthonius' model description (2.532, 16; cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 12 [p. 41, 6 Rabe]).

possible that Doxapatres had provided a supplementary μελέτη for them, too. If so, we can posit a fuller, if still not complete, collection of μελέται from which Doxapatres drew.

If we accept this tentative proposal of a single collection of μελέται that Doxapatres used to supplement Aphthonius' models, then we can say that the three chreia elaborations and the collection as a whole originated after the deposition of Michael V Kalaphates and before the last years of Doxapatres' own life. The former boundary is specific, that is, after 1042, but the latter is more difficult to identify because the dates of Doxapatres are only vaguely known. Doxapatres probably belongs to the second half of the eleventh century or perhaps a little later.<sup>464</sup> Hence the collection of sample *progymnasmata* must also derive from the second half of the eleventh century, too. As there is no indication of authorship, the collection must also remain anonymous.

#### THE CHREIA ELABORATIONS PRESERVED BY DOXAPATRES

The three supplementary elaborations treat all three kinds of chreiai: a sayings-chreia, an action-chreia, and a mixed chreia. In addition, they follow Aphthonius' prescription for eight κεφάλαια, or sections, and, what is especially noteworthy, Anonymous has inserted the names of these sections at the appropriate places in the elaborations, although the terminology he uses differs slightly from Aphthonius' terms. He uses ἐγκωμιαστική and παραφραστική instead of ἐγκωμιαστικόν and παραφραστικόν for the first two sections. The change is slight but difficult to explain, in that no feminine noun comes to mind that might govern these adjectives, whereas Aphthonius' neuter forms clearly assume the noun κεφάλαιον. Other changes: παραβολική for παραβολή, παραδειγματική for παράδειγμα, and ἐπίλογος for ἐπίλογος βραχύς.

The first elaboration treats a sayings-chreia that is unusual in several respects. First, the chreia itself is recited with the πρόσωπον in the genitive case, a manipulation that is familiar from the grammatical exercise called κλίσις,<sup>465</sup> but is otherwise unattested

<sup>464</sup> On dating Doxapatres, see Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.79, 83, and 87, who points out that the first person to mention Doxapatres by name is John Tzetzes (1110-1180) who criticizes him in his epitome of rhetoric (see, e.g., 3.673, 11; 679, 31; and 686, 1 Walz).

<sup>465</sup> See above Texts 13-17.

in chreiai that are used in elaborations. Second, the πρόσωπον is none other than Aphthonius and not some well known person from literature, philosophy, or politics, as is typically the case in school texts. Third, the saying in this chreia is simply a sentence that has been lifted from Aphthonius' model ἡθοποιία about Niobe and the loss of her children,<sup>466</sup> so that the chreia appears to have been manufactured precisely for this elaboration. Incidentally, Doxapatres elsewhere realizes that the saying is also simply a paraphrase of something Thucydides had said in his famous funeral oration.<sup>467</sup>

At any rate, the elaboration itself is not unusual, as it is structured according to the eight Aphthonian κεφάλαια and contains words, phrases, and rhetorical figures that derive from Aphthonius' model chreia and maxim elaborations.<sup>468</sup> In the first section, the ἐγκωμιαστική, Anonymous employs the rhetorical figure κατὰ παράλειψιν, in which someone pretends to pass over something but says it nonetheless. Thus Anonymous refers to many subjects Aphthonius had addressed, but says he will focus on what he said in the saying of the chreia (1.1). Aphthonius uses the same figure in his chreia and maxim elaborations.<sup>469</sup>

In the second section, the παραφραστική, the opening words τί γάρ φησιν; (1.2) recall the corresponding words in Aphthonius' maxim elaboration: καὶ τί φησιν;<sup>470</sup> And the section ends with wording (1.2) that parallels the ending of the παραφραστικόν in Aphthonius' chreia elaboration:

Anonymous: ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἀποδείξομεν

Aphthonius: τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα<sup>471</sup>

In the next section, the αἰτία, Anonymous uses the same transitional particle (γάρ) (1.3), as Aphthonius did in both the

<sup>466</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 11 (p. 36, 2 Rabe): τὸ γὰρ εἰς πείραν ἦκον ἀναιρὸν εἰς ἀφαίρεσιν.

<sup>467</sup> See Doxapatres, 2.506, 29–507, 2 Walz, and Thucydides, 2.44.2: καὶ λύπη οὐχ ὧν ἂν τις μὴ πειρασάμενος ἀγαθῶν στερίσκηται, ἀλλ' οὗ ἂν ἐθὰς γένόμενος ἀφαιρεθῇ.

<sup>468</sup> See Aphthonius 23–78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13–10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>469</sup> See Aphthonius 31–33 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 19–20 Rabe).

<sup>470</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 21 Rabe).

<sup>471</sup> Aphthonius 36–37.

chreia and the maxim elaborations.<sup>472</sup> And the Aphthonian influence extends to the syntax in the transitional sentence of the next section, the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου (1.4):

Anonymous: οὐ μὴν τὰ μὴ εἰς πείραν ἐλθόντα τοιαῦτα

Aphthonius: οὐ μὴν οἱ πενίας ἀπηλλαγμένοι τοιοῦτοι<sup>473</sup>

The similarities are fewer in the remaining sections, but the transitional phrase ὥσπερ δέ (1.5) in the παραβολική and the transitional particle ὥστε (1.8) in the ἐπίλογος reflect Aphthonian wording, at least in his maxim elaboration.<sup>474</sup>

The second elaboration deals with an action-chreia attributed to Alexander that has already been the subject of a much longer elaboration by Libanius (Text 20). Indeed, despite the significantly different length, several similarities between the two elaborations nevertheless point to the use of Libanius' elaboration by Anonymous. Libanius characterizes Alexander as "affable" (κοινός),<sup>475</sup> as does Anonymous who uses the expression "as affable as possible" (ὡς κοινότατος) for Alexander (2.2). In addition, both organize their rationale sections according to the tripartite scheme of political situations, individual fortunes, and stages of life,<sup>476</sup> so that both argue for the value of friendship whether one is at war or peace, whether one is rich or poor, and whether one is young or old (2.3). Moreover, in the παραδειγματική, or example section, Anonymous cites two of Libanius' four pairs of friends (Orestes and Pylades, Theseus and Herakles) (2.6),<sup>477</sup> and in the next section, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, both Libanius and Anonymous cite the same lines from Euripides *Orestes* (2.7).<sup>478</sup>

Otherwise, the elaboration shows dependence on Aphthonius' chreia and maxim elaborations<sup>479</sup> for its wording, especially at transitional points. For example, in the παραφραστική section

<sup>472</sup> Aphthonius 38 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>473</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 4 Rabe).

<sup>474</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 9, 12 and 10, 6 Rabe).

<sup>475</sup> See Libanius 1.3.

<sup>476</sup> See Libanius 1.5, 6, 9, 11.

<sup>477</sup> See Libanius 1.18, 21.

<sup>478</sup> See Libanius 1.23.

<sup>479</sup> See Aphthonius 23-78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 12-10, 7 Rabe).

the concluding sentence (2.2) reflects the wording of Aphthonius in his maxim elaboration:

Anonymous: καὶ ἃ μὲν εἵργαστο τάδε

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε<sup>480</sup>

Anonymous: πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἐπαινέσαι τὸν ἄνδρα

Aphthonius: πάρεστι δὲ ἰδεῖν ὡς καλῶς<sup>481</sup>

Another stylistic parallel appears in the transitional syntax of the fourth, or ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου section, where both Aphthonius and Anonymous begin with the words εἰ δέ τις (2.4).<sup>482</sup> Aphthonian wording appears in the transition to the sixth, or παραδειγματική section. Aphthonius' ὅρα μοι<sup>483</sup> is paralleled by the ὅρα of Anonymous (2.6). The syntax and wording of the initial sentence of the seventh, or μαρτυρία παλαιῶν section (2.7), is also similar:

Anonymous: θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ

Aphthonius: θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ<sup>484</sup>

Lastly, we have the same note of admiration (θαυμάζειν) in the eighth section, or ἐπίλογος (2.8), as we do in Aphthonius,<sup>485</sup> thereby showing that the Aphthonian style appears throughout the elaboration.

The final elaboration treats a chreia that is elaborated by two other authors, the others being Libanius (Text 21) and ps.-Nicolaus (Text 24). A detailed comparison of these three elaborations was carried out in the introduction to Libanius (Texts 20-23). That comparison need not be repeated here except to say that while Libanius, at least at the level of ideas, seems to be the source for the other two, these latter two share not only ideas but also extensive wording, so that they must be literarily dependent. Dating is difficult to pin down, especially for ps.-Nicolaus, whose dating is some century after the sixth but before the thirteenth,

<sup>480</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1 Rabe). The use of εἵργαστο rather than ἐφιλοσόφησε reflects the shift from Aphthonius' elaboration of a maxim to the elaboration of an action chreia here.

<sup>481</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 2 Rabe).

<sup>482</sup> See Aphthonius 53.

<sup>483</sup> Aphthonius 64.

<sup>484</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 3 Rabe).

<sup>485</sup> See Aphthonius 77 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 6 Rabe).

whereas Anonymous belongs to the latter part of the eleventh century; hence he is likely to have used ps.-Nicolaus.

An example of nearly identical wording is a portion of the first section, the ἐγκωμιαστική, where Anonymous follows his source for nineteen consecutive words (3.1). Such lengthy identical wording persuades us of his dependence on ps.-Nicolaus:

ps.-Nicolaus: μάλιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο

Anonymous: μάλιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο

ps.-Nicolaus: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον ὁδοὺς

Anonymous: τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον ὁδοὺς

ps.-Nicolaus: καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν <τοῦ> ἡλίου περίοδον

Anonymous: καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου περίοδον<sup>486</sup>

In addition to being dependent on ps.-Nicolaus, Anonymous also shows the influence of Aphthonius.<sup>487</sup> For example, in the second section, or παραφραστική, the concluding sentence (3.2) is similar to that found in Aphthonius' maxim elaboration:

Anonymous: καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰράσατο τάδε

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε<sup>488</sup>

Anonymous: πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἐπαινεῖν <αὐτόν>

Aphthonius: πάρεστι δὲ ἰδεῖν ὡς καλῶς<sup>489</sup>

In the next section, the αἰτία, we find the same transitional particle γάρ (3.3) as we do in Aphthonius.<sup>490</sup> Likewise, for the fifth and sixth sections, where we read ὥσπερ γάρ (3.5) and ὅρα μοι (3.6).<sup>491</sup> The parallels extend to the language and syntax in the last two sections. In the seventh, the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, the opening words (3.7) are virtually the same:

Anonymous: διὸ θαυμάσαι Σοφοκλέα με δεῖ

Aphthonius: διὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ<sup>492</sup>

<sup>486</sup> See ps.-Nicolaus 3.1.

<sup>487</sup> See Aphthonius 23-78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>488</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1 Rabe).

<sup>489</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 2 Rabe).

<sup>490</sup> Aphthonius 38 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>491</sup> See Aphthonius 59: ὥσπερ γάρ, and 64: ὅρα μοι.

<sup>492</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 3 Rabe).

Likewise, in the eighth section, the ἐπίλογος, we find not only the note of admiration (θαυμάζειν) (3.8)<sup>493</sup> but also the very same opening words:

Anonymous: πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας

Aphthonius: πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας<sup>494</sup>

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The text used for the translation of these three anonymous chreia elaborations is, as we have noted, that by Walz, where they appear in the midst of Doxapatres' commentary on Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*.<sup>495</sup> This text has been sharply criticized,<sup>496</sup> but since we have no other, we have used it, although we have proposed a number of changes, all of which are noted in the apparatus. The names of the various κεφάλαια are already provided, but we have supplied paragraph numbers for the various sections to aid in making references.

The translation, so far as we know, is the first into any language.

<sup>493</sup> See Aphthonius 77 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 6 Rabe).

<sup>494</sup> Aphthonius 77.

<sup>495</sup> Doxapatres, 2.282, 6–286, 6 Walz.

<sup>496</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.79.





Text 28. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(2.282, 12–283, 21 WALZ)

Χρείας λογικῆς μελέτη.

Χρεία λογική·

Ἀφθονίου τοῦ ῥήτορος τὸ εἰς πείραν ἦκον ἀνιαρὸν εἰς ἀφαίρεσιν εἶναι εἰπόντος, τὸ ῥηθὲν ἀπομνημονεύεται.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστική> Φιλοσοφεῖν ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ ῥητορεύειν ὁ Ἀφθόνιος εἵλετο, καὶ μήτε <μὲν> τὴν ἐκ τῆς ῥητορείας δεινότητα τῶν ἐκ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἀποστερεῖν ἀγαθῶν, μήτε δὲ τὰς φιλοσόφους ἀποφάνσεις ῥητορικῆς εὐφραδείας ἔξωθεν τίθεσθαι· τῷ μὲν γὰρ ῥητορικὰς συγγράφειν μεθόδους καὶ ἀκολουθῶς τοῖς κανόσι τὰς μελέτας ἐκτίθεσθαι, τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἐζήλωσε δύναιμι· τῷ δ' ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς μελέταις περὶ <τῆς> τῶν πραγμάτων, ὡς ἔχουσι, φύσεως ἀποφαίνεσθαι, τὴν φυσικὴν φιλοσοφίαν τετήρηκε, καὶ ἄλλοτε μὲν καὶ ἄλλως περὶ τινων ἀποφαίνονται, νυνὶ δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀποβαλόντων τὰ εἰς πείραν αὐτοῖς ἐλθόντα, τίνα πεφιλοσόφηκεν, ἰδωμεν.

2. Παραφραστική. Τί γὰρ φησίν; ὑστέρησεν παθῶν, <ὧν οὐ πεπειράται, ἀλλ' > ὧν συνήθειαν ἔσχηκεν ἀνιαρὰν τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν πέπονθε, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἅπερ ὁ σοφιστὴς ἀπεφήνατο· ἡμεῖς δ' ὡς ὀρθῶς ἔχει τὰ ῥηθέντα καὶ πάνυ καλῶς, ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς ἀποδείξομεν.

3. Ἐκ τῆς αἰτίας. Εἰδὼς γὰρ τὰ γνώριμα τῶν ἀγνοουμένων μᾶλλον ἅπασιν ἀγαπώμενα, καὶ ταῦτα (p. 283) τιθεμένους περὶ πλείονος ἅπαντα ὧν τὸ χρήσιμον ἴσασι, καὶ τὴν τούτων ἀποβολὴν ἀλγεινοτάτην νενόμικεν· ὧν γὰρ ἡ κτῆσις ἡδίστη καὶ περισπούδαστος, τούτων ἡ στέρησις ἀνιαρὰ δὲ καὶ λύπησιν παραίτιος.

1 ἐγκωμιαστική addidimus; cf. Anonymous 2.1; 3.1 || μὲν scripsimus δὲ MSS || τῆς addidimus 2 ὧν οὐ πεπειράται, ἀλλ' haec verba vel sim. per haplog. cecederunt

Text 28. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(2.282, 12–283, 21 WALZ)

## Model Exercise for a Sayings Chreia

A sayings chreia:

The statement of Aphthonius the rhetor is remembered when he said, “What becomes familiar causes distress at its loss.”<sup>497</sup>

1. <Encomiastic.> Aphthonius chose to be a philosopher and a rhetor at the same time and not to deprive rhetorical forcefulness of philosophical benefits or to set philosophical pronouncements apart from rhetorical correctness of expression. For by drawing up rhetorical instructions and setting forth model exercises according to the rules, he has aimed at rhetorical power; and by expressing his opinion in the model exercises themselves about the nature of affairs, he has adhered to natural philosophy. And so, on other occasions and in other ways he expresses himself on certain subjects, but in the present case let us look at what he has taught about those who have lost what had become familiar to them.

2. Paraphrastic. For what is he saying? A person feels no distress <over those things to which he has not grown accustomed, but> over those things to which he has become used he suffers grievous loss. And so, this is what the sophist said, and we will demonstrate in the following sections how accurate and completely apt his words are.

3. Rationale. Knowing that familiar things are more agreeable to everyone than the unfamiliar, and knowing, too, that people consider that everything whose usefulness they understand is more valuable, he has also considered their loss very painful. For the possession of these things is very pleasant and desirable; their loss is distressing and the cause of grief.

<sup>497</sup> On this chreia, whose saying is taken from Aphthonius’ sample ἡθολογία on Niobe (*Progymn.* 11 [p. 36, 2 Rabe]), see further *Chreia* 1.304–5.

4. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. Οὐ μὴν τὰ μὴ εἰς πείραν ἔλθόντα τοιαῦτα· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τούτων στερούμενος, ὧν οὐκ οἶδε τὸ χρήσιμον, λύπης ἐπὶ τούτῳ πρόφασιν λήψεται.

5. Παραβολική. "Ωσπερ δὲ τῶν ζώων τοῖς σώμασιν αἱ τῶν συνήθων τόπων ἀναχωρήσεις νόσων καθεστήκασι πρόξενoi, οὕτω καὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ὅσα πείρα τὸ χρήσιμον ἐβεβαίωσαν ἀνιαιρά εἰσιν ἀφαιρούμενα.

6. Παραδειγματική. "Ενθεν τοι καὶ ὁ Πηλέως ἡσπάζετο τὴν τῆς Βρισηίδος συνήθειαν, ἤλγει δὲ ταύτην ἀφαιρουμένου τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος, οἷς γὰρ τῆς κόρης ἔσχηκε πείραν, λυπηρὰν εἶχε τὴν ταύτης ἀφαίρεσιν.

7. Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν. Ταῦτα καὶ Θουκυδίδης ὁ σοφὸς ἐπιστάμενος, λύπη, εἴρηκεν, οὐχ ὧν ἂν τις μὴ πειρασάμενος ἀγαθῶν στερίσκηται, ἀλλ' οὗ ἂν ἐθὰς γενόμενος ἀφαιρεθείη.

8. Ἐπίλογος. "Ωστε οὐ μᾶλλον τοῦ σοφιστοῦ τὸ περὶ τὴν ῥητορικὴν ἐπαινετέον εὐδόκιμον, ὅσον τὰ περὶ τὰς ἀποφάνσεις θαυμαστέον φιλοσοφώτατον.

4. From the Opposite. Not at all like this are the things that have not become familiar; for no one, on being deprived of those things whose usefulness he does not recognize, will find a reason for grief at their loss.

5. Analogy. Just as the loss of their customary haunts has usually resulted in the onset of diseases to animals' bodies, so also everything that has proved its usefulness to human affairs through experience is distressing when it is taken away.

6. Example. Therefore, even the son of Peleus eagerly welcomed the intimacy of Briseis and was distressed when Agamemnon took her away; because he had been familiar with the girl, he regarded her loss painful.<sup>498</sup>

7. Testimony of the Ancients. These sentiments the wise Thucydides also understood and expressed: "Grief comes not when someone is deprived of the benefits which he has not known but rather when the thing he has become accustomed to is taken away."<sup>499</sup>

8. Epilogue. Consequently, one should not praise the reputation of the sophist in rhetoric so much as he should admire the very philosophic substance of his pronouncement.

<sup>498</sup> Anonymous refers, of course, to a central event of the *Iliad*: Agamemnon, the leader of the Greeks against the Trojans, was forced to return his captive Chryseis to her father and then replaced her with Briseis, Achilles' favorite captive. Achilles, angered by the loss of Briseis, refused to continue fighting, the consequences of which fill out the rest of the *Iliad* (see esp. *Il.* 1.334-56; 2.681-94).

<sup>499</sup> See Thucydides, 2.44.2, whose use here Doxapatres also recognized (see 2.506, 29-31 Walz).

Text 29. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(2.283, 22–284, 32 WALZ)

Ἑτέρα

Πρακτική·

Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεὶς ποῦ ἂν ἔχοι τοὺς θησαυρούς, τοὺς φίλους παρόντας ὑπέδειξεν.

1. Ἐγκωμιαστική. Καὶ οἱ λόγοι μὴ φράζωσιν ἄξια, ὅμως δεῖ βραχέα διὰ λόγων διεξελεθῆναι, ἵνα δι' ἀμφοτέρων κηρύττηται, καὶ τοῖς ὀπλοῖς κρατῶν καὶ τοῖς λόγοις ὁ δηλούμενος. ἱκανὴν γὰρ ἀμφοτέρων πείραν παραστησάμενος, τὸν γεγεννηκότα ὑπερέβη ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ Φιλίππου φανεὶς τοῦ Διὸς ἐνομίζετο.

2. Παραφραστική. Βασιλεὺς δὲ γεγονὼς ὡς κοινότατος ἐδίδου πᾶσιν μαθεῖν (p. 284) περὶ ὧν ἂν ἐτελήσωσι, καὶ δοκοῦντός τινος τοσοῦτον αὐτὸν κεκτῆσθαι τὸν πλοῦτον ὅσον τῶν τροπαίων ἐκτήσατο πλῆθος, καὶ ζητοῦντος μαθεῖν, πόσα κέκτηται, παρελθὼν τοὺς πόνους ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος τὸ πλουτεῖν ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν ὠρίζετο, καὶ δι' ὧν ὁ πλοῦτος ἐστὶν ἀσφαλέστερος, τούτους καὶ πλοῦτον ὠρίσατο βέβαιον, καὶ ἃ μὲν εἴργαστο τάδε, πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἐπαινέσαι τὸν ἄνδρα.

3. Ἐκ τῆς αἰτίας. Καιροὺς καὶ τύχας καὶ [τὰς] ἡλικίας ἔσχεν Ἀλέξανδρος, βεβαιούσας τὴν ἐκείνου διάνοιαν, εἰρήνην καὶ πόλεμος ἀναμένει φίλων τὴν εὐνοίαν· προπαρέχεται μὲν γὰρ εἰρήνην τῶν φίλων ἡ σπουδή, πόλεμος δὲ συνεργοῦσαν ἔχει τῶν ἐπιτηδείων τὴν εὐνοίαν. εἴτα πενία καὶ πλοῦτος, ἡ μὲν ἐκ φίλων μεταβάλλεσθαι πέφυκεν, ὁ δὲ διὰ φίλων φυλάττεσθαι, καὶ τὰ χρηστὰ διασώζεσθαι, καὶ νεότης καὶ γῆρας

Text 29. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(2.283, 22-284, 32 WALZ)

## Another Model Exercise

## An action-chreia:

Alexander, on being asked where he had his treasures, pointed to his friends who were present.<sup>500</sup>

1. Encomiastic. Even words cannot give adequate expression; nevertheless, one must briefly use words so that the man who is being shown as an expert with weapons as well as with words can be heralded for both. For because he had demonstrated sufficient skill with both, he surpassed his natural father in his deeds and so, though obviously a son of Philip, was deemed a son of Zeus.<sup>501</sup>

2. Paraphrastic. Being a king who was as affable as possible, he allowed everyone to ask about whatever they desired. And so, when someone, supposing that he possessed as much wealth as the number of trophies which he had acquired, sought to learn how many he possessed, Alexander, passing over his labors, defined his wealth in terms of friendship. And he defined as abiding wealth those men through whom wealth was the more secure. And so, this is what he did, and it is possible from what follows to praise the man.

3. Rationale. Alexander took situations, changes of fortune, and times of life into consideration as a way of confirming his opinion: peace and war depend on the loyalty of friends, for the zeal of friends first provides peace, while war brings out the loyalty of friends as allies. Then poverty and wealth: the one is abolished by friends; the other is preserved because of friends, and so its benefits are safeguarded. Youth and old age are both

<sup>500</sup> On this chreia, see further *Chreia* 1.302-3.

<sup>501</sup> Alexander's alleged divine parentage was widely known (see, e.g., Plutarch, *Alex.* 27.5; Diodorus Siculus, 17.51.1-2; Aelian, *V.H.* 2.19; 5.12; 8.37; and Richard Stoneman, *Alexander the Great* [New York: Routledge, 1997] 34-43).

ἐκ φίλων συνέστηκε· νεότης μὲν γὰρ ἡδίων συνοῦσα τοῖς φίλοις, γῆρας δὲ διὰ φίλων ἐπικουφίζεται.

4. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. Εἰ δέ τις ἐξέλαι τοὺς φίλους τῶν ὄντων, αὐτὴν ἀνείλε τοῦ βίου τὴν ὄνησιν. . .

5. <Παραβολική deest>

6. Παραδειγματική. Ὁρέστην ὄρα τὸν Ἀγαμέμνωνος, Πελοπιδῶν μὲν ἓνα γινόμενον, μίαν δὲ ἔχοντα τῶν ἀσχημάτων παραψυχὴν, τὴν Πυλάδου συνήθειαν, καὶ ὃν ἐλύπει τὸ γένος, φίλος συνῶν ἐθεράπευεν. καὶ τί δεῖ τὸν Ὁρέστην εἰπεῖν, ἀλλ' ὁ Ποσειδῶνος Θησεὺς κατείληπτο μὲν τοῖς ἐν Αἴδου δεσμοῖς, λύσιν δ' ἔσχε τῶν κάτω δεινῶν τὴν Ἡρακλέους συνήθειαν, οὕτω καὶ οἷς θεοὶ πατέρες γεγόνασιν, οἱ φίλοι λυσιτελέστεροι.



strengthened by friends, for youth is more pleasant because it is spent in the company of friends, and old age is alleviated because of friends.

4. From the opposite. But if anyone should remove friends from his possessions, he would remove enjoyment itself from life. . . <sup>502</sup>

5. <Analogy is missing>

6. Example. Consider Orestes, the son of Agamemnon, who, although he was one of the Pelopidae, nevertheless had only one consolation for his disgraceful acts, the loyal friendship of Pylades. This man, whose family caused him pain, a friend accompanied and cared for. <sup>503</sup> And why should I mention only Orestes? Indeed, Theseus, the son of Poseidon, was kept in chains in Hades' realm. Yet he had the loyal friendship of Herakles as a means of escape from the dreaded ones below. Thus even for those whose fathers are gods friends are more useful. <sup>504</sup>

<sup>502</sup> We suspect a lacuna here (and continuing through the analogy). The opening of the opposite is nearly identical to the wording of two opposites among the maxim elaborations of ps.-Nicolaus. But in both cases the Opposite continues beyond the opening sentence, suggesting that perhaps Anonymous composed an Opposite that is longer than what is preserved here; see ps.-Nicolaus, *Progymn.* 4 (1.279, 6-8 Walz): εἰ δέ τις σοφίαν ἐξέλοι τῶν ὄντων, οὐκ ἀσφάλεια πόλεσιν, οὐ σωτηρία τοῖς πλέουσιν, οὐ στρατευομένοις ἴστανται τρώπαια, and 280, 19-23: εἰ δέ τις ἐξέλοι τῶν ὄντων τὰ χρήματα, πᾶσαν ἀναιρεῖ τοῦ βίου τὴν ὄνησιν, οὔτε γὰρ πόλεμος εἶχε παρασκευήν, οὔτε περιβόλους αἱ πόλεις, οὔτε στρατεύματα δύναμιν, οὔτε ἄλλο τῶν ὄντων οὐδὲν διεπράττετο μὴ κατορθούμενα χρήμασιν.

<sup>503</sup> After Orestes had murdered his mother Clytemnestra and her lover Aegistheus, the murderers of his father Agamemnon, Pylades remained loyal to Orestes, caring for his now-maddened friend and accompanying him to the land of the Taurians to rescue his sister Iphigeneia; see esp. Euripides' *Orestes* and *Iphigeneia at Tauris*. Orestes and Pylades became one of the famous pairs of friends (see Plutarch, *De amic. mult.* 93E; Lucian, *Tox.* 10; and Libanius 1.21).

<sup>504</sup> Theseus had accompanied his friend Perithous to Hades to help him abduct Persephone but was imprisoned there until rescued by Herakles; see further Diodorus Siculus, 4.26.1; 63.4; and Plutarch, *Theseus* 31.4.

7. Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν. Ὅθεν θαυμάσαι τὸν Εὐριπίδην με δεῖ, μηδὲν εἶναι κρεῖττον τῶν φίλων φιλοσοφήσαντα, μὴ πλοῦτον, μὴ δύναμιν, ἀλόγιστον δὲ καὶ πλοῦτον τῶν φίλων ὀρίζειν ἀντάλλαγμα.

8. Ἐπίλογος. Ὅθεν προσήκει θαυμάζειν Ἀλέξανδρον τὸ πλουτεῖν ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν ὀρισάμενον.

7. Testimony of Ancients. Consequently, I must admire Euripides, who taught that nothing is better than friends, not wealth, not power; and he taught that it is illogical to define even wealth as a substitute for friends.<sup>505</sup>

8. Epilogue. Consequently, it is fitting to admire Alexander for having defined wealth in terms of friendship.

<sup>505</sup> Anonymous is paraphrasing, rather closely, Euripides, *Or.* 1155-57, where Orestes says to Pylades:

οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν κρεῖσσον ἢ φίλος σαφής,  
οὐ πλοῦτος, οὐ τυραννίς· ἀλόγιστον δέ τι  
τὸ πλῆθος ἀντάλλαγμα γενναίου φίλου.

There is nothing better than a true friend,  
Not wealth, not power. It is illogical to regard  
The people as a substitute for a genuine friend.

Text 30. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(2.284,33–286, 6 WALZ)

Ἑτέρα

μικτή·

Διογένης μειράκιον ἑωρακὼς ἀτακτοῦν (p. 285) τὸν παιδαγωγὸν ἔπαισεν εἰπὼν, Τί γὰρ τοιαῦτα παιδεύεις;

1. Ἐγκωμιαστική. Καὶ πᾶσαν μὲν φιλοσοφίαν θαυμάσαι μοι τῷ βίῳ ἐπῆλθε, μάλιστα δὲ ἦν Διογένης ἡσκήσατο, τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζητεῖν τὰς τῶν ἄστρον ὁδοὺς καὶ περισκοπεῖν τὴν τοῦ ἡλίου περίοδον κρεῖττον ἀνθρωπείας ἐστὶ φύσεως· τὸ δὲ σωφρονίζειν νεότητα κέρδος τοῦ βίου νενομίκεν ἄμεινον.

2. Παραφραστική. Ὅθεν περιήει τὴν ἀγορὰν ὥσπερ ζητῶν, τίνα σωφρονήσεις, καὶ παῖδα πλημμελοῦντα θεώμενος, παρεστηκότος παιδαγωγοῦ, τὸν μὲν νέον παρῆλθε, τὸν δὲ παιδαγωγὸν ἀντὶ τοῦ παιδὸς ἐσωφρονίζεν, ἑκατέρῳ ἐπὶ μιᾷ πληγῇ τιμωρίαν ἐπιτιθεῖς, καὶ ἃ μὲν εἰργάσατο τάδε, πάρεστι δὲ ἐκ τῶν ἐφεξῆς ἐπαινεῖν <αὐτόν>.

3. Αἰτία. Κατιδὼν γὰρ ὁ Διογένης τὸ μὲν τῆς νεότητος ἀτακτον, τὴν δὲ παιδείαν καὶ εἰ μὴδὲν ἕτερον, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου πείραν κομίζουσαν, καὶ τοὺς πατέρας εἰδὼς χρημάτων πολλῶν ὠνούμενους παιδαγωγούς καὶ πρεσβύτην παρεχομένους φύλακα τῆς νεότητος, τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς πατράσιν ἔχει διάνοιαν, καὶ οἷς οἱ πατέρες τοὺς παῖδας

Text 30. Anonymous in Doxapatres, *Homiliae* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 3  
(2.284,33–286, 6 WALZ)

Another chreia elaboration

A mixed chreia: <sup>506</sup>

Diogenes, on seeing a youth misbehaving, struck the paedagogus, saying, “Why are you teaching such things?” <sup>507</sup>

1. Encomiastic. It has occurred to me to admire every philosophy, but especially the one which Diogenes practiced. For the investigation of the paths of stars and the examination of the circuit of the sun are beyond human nature, but the chastizing of youth he considered a bigger gain for living. <sup>508</sup>

2. Paraphrastic. This is why he used to go around the marketplace investigating, so to speak, someone he could chastize. <sup>509</sup> And so, on seeing a boy misbehaving, although a paedagogus was in attendance, <sup>510</sup> he disregarded the young man and chastized the paedagogus instead of the boy, inflicting punishment on both with a single blow. And so, this is what he did, and it is possible from what follows to praise <him>.

3. Rationale. Because Diogenes understood the unruly nature of youth and realized that education, even if nothing else, brings the experience that comes with time; and because he

<sup>506</sup> On the mixed chreia, see Aphthonius 12: “A mixed chreia is one which is composed of both a saying and an action” (cf. also *Chreia* 1.224).

<sup>507</sup> On this chreia, see *Chreia* 1.316, as well as the two other elaborations of it in this volume (Texts 21 and 24). For detailed comparison of these three elaborations, see the introduction to Libanius.

<sup>508</sup> For this characterization of Diogenes’ philosophy as rejecting physics and preferring ethics, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 6.103.

<sup>509</sup> This portion of the paraphrase may be dependent for its language on another famous chreia attributed to Diogenes, namely the one in which it is said that he was going around (περιήζει) saying, “I am looking for (ζητῶ) an (honest) man” (Diogenes Laertius, 6.41).

<sup>510</sup> On the paedagogus being responsible for the boy’s behavior, see Diogenes Laertius, 6.31, and on paedagogi in general, see Young, “Paidagogos,” 150–69.

πιστεύουσι, τούτους ὁ Διογένης ἐκόλασεν ἀμαρτάνοντας.

4. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. Καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἄλογον κατορθοῦντος μὲν τοῦ παιδὸς τὸν παιδαγωγοῦντα νεανιεύεσθαι, πλημμελοῦντος δὲ μὴ κολάζεσθαι· ὧν γὰρ εἰσιν αἱ τιμαί, τούτων εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ τιμωρίαι.

5. Παραβολή. Ὡσπερ γὰρ τὰ ναυτῶν ἀμαρτήματα κυβερνήταις ἀνατίθενται, οὕτω καὶ τὰ παίδων κατηγορήματα τοῖς παιδαγωγοῖς περιτίθενται.

6. Παράδειγμα. Τὴν Ἀθηναίων ὄρα μοι πόλιν, ἐν Ἑλλησπόντῳ πεπτωκότων στρατιωτῶν παρὰ τῶν στρατηγῶν τὴν δίκην λαμβάνουσιν· οἷς γὰρ ὑπήκοος πέπτωκε, τὸ κρατοῦν ἐκολάζετο.

7. Μαρτυρία. Διὸ θαυμάσαι Σοφοκλέα με δεῖ, (p. 286) πόλιν ἅπασαν τῶν ἡγουμένων εἰπόντα, τοὺς δὲ ἀκοσμοῦντας ἀνθρώπους διδασκάλων τρόποις ἐναντίους καταφαίνεσθαι· οὕτω τὸ πλημμελοῦν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἀναφέρει τὴν πρόφασιν.

8. Ἐπίλογος. Πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας τὸν Διογένην θαυμάζειν, σωφρονίζειν νεότητα ἐπιστάμενον.

also knew that fathers purchase paedagogi at great expense and thereby provide an old man as the guardian of youth, he was of the same mind as the fathers, and so it was those to whom the fathers entrusted their sons that Diogenes punished when they made a mistake.

4. From the opposite. Indeed, it would be illogical for the paedagogus to act like a youth when the boy is acting properly, but for him not to be punished when the boy misbehaves. For those to whom honors belong are also the ones who are subject to punishment.

5. Analogy. For just as the mistakes of sailors are attributed to their captains, so, too, are the faults of boys assigned to their paedagogi.

6. Example. Consider, if you will, the city of the Athenians which, when its soldiers died in the Hellespont, exacted punishment from the generals. For, because a subordinate is dead, authority was punished.<sup>511</sup>

7. Testimony. Therefore, I must admire Sophocles who said that a city is entirely under the influence of its leaders and that unruly men seem contrary to the ways of their teachers.<sup>512</sup> Thus, he attributes the fault to their leaders as the reason for their conduct.

8. Epilogue. After looking at these arguments it is necessary to admire Diogenes since he knew how to chastize youth.

<sup>511</sup> As had Libanius and ps.-Nicolaus, the author here is alluding to the naval battle of Arginusae in 406 B.C., which ended in an Athenian victory but one which ended in the trial of the generals for not having retrieved the bodies of their fallen comrades due to a violent storm in the Hellespont (see Xenophon, *HG* 1.6.29-38; 7.1-35; Diodorus Siculus, 13.97.1-103.2; and Hammond, *History of Greece*, 414-16). On the trial, see MacDowell, *Law in Classical Athens*, 186-89. Missing from the example, however, is Libanius' and ps.-Nicolaus' second example regarding Themistocles' being crowned as the one responsible for the victory at Salamis despite the participation of the Athenians.

<sup>512</sup> As had ps.-Nicolaus, the author merely paraphrases lines from Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. These lines (386-88) read:

πόλις γάρ ἐστι πᾶσα τῶν ἡγουμένων  
στρατός τε σύμπας· οἱ δ' ἀκοσμοῦντες βροτῶν  
διδασκάλων λόγοισι γίγνονται κακοί.

A city is entirely dependent on its leaders,  
As in an army. Those who are unruly  
Became wicked through the words of their teachers.

## Text 31. Rhetorica Marciana

(1.602, 1–605, 18 Walz)

## Introduction

## ANONYMOUS PROGYMNASMATA

The elaboration of a line from Sophocles—“Those who have wisdom everywhere prevail” (*Ajax* 1252)—appears in a nearly complete collection of sample *progymnasmata* which Walz discovered in a fourteenth century Venetian MS (Ven. 444). Since the MS identifies the collection merely as τὰ προγυμνάσματα τῆς ῥητορικῆς, Walz himself edited these *progymnasmata* under the heading Ἀωνύμου Προγυμνάσματα at the very end of the first volume of his *Rhetores Graeci*.<sup>513</sup> This collection thus follows on a series of similar collections of sample *progymnasmata* by ps.-Nicolaus, Nikephoros Basilakes, Severus of Alexandria, and George Pachymeres.<sup>514</sup>

The anonymous character of these *progymnasmata* probably accounts for Walz’s decision to place them last in the sequence, since the other collections are in roughly chronological order, or at least as Walz understood that order. In any case, Walz notes only that the author of these anonymous *progymnasmata* was clearly a Christian, given their contents,<sup>515</sup> a claim echoed later by J. Brzoska who pointed specifically to the sample σύγκρισις, or comparison, of “the theologian” and Basil the Great<sup>516</sup> and concluded that the author lived sometime after these fourth century theologians—“indeed, considerably later.”<sup>517</sup>

<sup>513</sup> See 1.597–648 Walz.

<sup>514</sup> See ps.-Nicolaus, 1.266–420 Walz; Nikephoros Basilakes, 1.423–525; Severus of Alexandria, 1.537–48; and George Pachymeres, 1.551–96.

<sup>515</sup> See Walz, *Rhetores Graeci*, 1.597 n 1.

<sup>516</sup> See Anonymous, 1.630, 5–636, 8 Walz. “The theologian” is Gregory Nazianzus (see 1.630, 16).

<sup>517</sup> See J. Brzoska, “Anonymi rhetorischen Inhaltes,” *PW* 1 (1884) 2328–33, esp. 2328.



In the early decades of the twentieth century Vittorio DeFalco and Hugo Rabe indirectly helped the study of these anonymous *progymnasmata* through their investigations of other portions of this Venetian MS, which is now known as Marc. gr. 444 (after the Venetian library of San Marco where it is located) and dated more precisely to the mid-fourteenth century.<sup>518</sup> DeFalco provided a complete list of the contents of this MS.<sup>519</sup> This straight-forward description is helpful because it clarifies the relation of the sample *progymnasmata* to the other rhetorical writings in the MS since Walz not only failed to include folio numbers but also edited only portions of the MS and scattered those he did edit in various volumes of his *Rhetores Graeci*. These anonymous *progymnasmata*, as we have said, are at the end of Walz's first volume, whereas the scholia and biographical information on Hermogenes and his writings in this MS do not appear until the third and fourth volumes.<sup>520</sup>

Of greater importance, however, is another section of this MS which is entitled Περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἀφθονίου Προγυμνασμάτων. Walz understood this section to be an epitome of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata*, presumably on the model of Matthew Kamariotes' self-styled epitome of this same book. In any case, Walz edited Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* in his first volume<sup>521</sup> and then followed it with Kamariotes' epitome<sup>522</sup> and then with the Περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἀφθονίου Προγυμνασμάτων, although now styled as an Ἀωνύμου Ἐπιτομή.<sup>523</sup> The effect of Walz's editorial decisions is to associate these two portions of the Venetian MS more with their formal relatives—i.e., with epitomes and sample *progymnasmata*—than with each other.

DeFalco's description of the contents of Marc. gr. 444, however, suggests a much closer relation between these two writings.

<sup>518</sup> See Germaine Aujac, "Recherches sur la tradition du περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων de Denys d' Halicarnasse," *RHT* 4 (1974) 1-44, esp. 38-39.

<sup>519</sup> See Vittorio DeFalco, "Trattato retorico bizantino (*Rhetorica Marciana*)," *Atti Soc. Linguistica Scienze e Lett.* 9 (1930) 71-124.

<sup>520</sup> For excerpts from the scholia and the biographical note, see 3.610-12 and 4.31 Walz.

<sup>521</sup> See Aphthonius, 1.59-120 Walz.

<sup>522</sup> See Matthew Kamariotes, 1.121-26 Walz.

<sup>523</sup> See Anonymous, 1.127-35 Walz.

He says that the epitome occupies fol. 1<sup>v</sup>–8 of the MS, the sample *progymnasmata* follow in fol. 9–23<sup>r</sup>, and the Hermogenean materials in fol. 25–91.<sup>524</sup> Other rhetorical writings follow—e.g., by Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Maximus of Ephesus<sup>525</sup>—but our interest remains on the folios already identified with their Aphthonian-Hermogenean sequence and especially on the first two, the so-called epitome and the sample *progymnasmata*. Is there a material relation between the two which might help to clarify the function of the sample *progymnasmata*?

Rabe's investigations on various rhetorical MSS and specifically on Marc. gr. 444 point to an affirmative answer. He regards this MS to be a deliberately structured and coherent rhetorical corpus and calls it the *Rhetorica Marciana*.<sup>526</sup> Rabe's view of this MS has been accepted by subsequent scholarship,<sup>527</sup> but before developing the implications of this view for the sample *progymnasmata*, we need to discuss Rabe's dating of the *Rhetorica Marciana*.

Rabe improved considerably on the open-ended dating of Brzoska—considerably later than the fourth century. Rabe establishes a *terminus ante quem* by calling attention to two other MSS that contain this rhetorical corpus: the thirteenth century Marc. gr. 599 and the late fourteenth century Vat. gr. 899. The former MS thus pushes back the latest date for the *Rhetorica Marciana* at least a century, i.e., from the fourteenth to the thirteenth.<sup>528</sup> For the *terminus post quem* Rabe turns to the so-called epitome and notes its use of the Π-scholia.<sup>529</sup> Since Rabe dates the Π-scholia to the mid-eleventh century, he thus establishes a narrower range

<sup>524</sup> See DeFalco, "Trattato," 71 and n. 1.

<sup>525</sup> See further Aujac, "Recherches," 38–39.

<sup>526</sup> See Hugo Rabe, ed., *Prolegomenon Sylloge* (Rhetores Graeci 14; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1931) xix n. 1. On his notion of a rhetorical corpus, see his "Rhetoren-Corpora," *RhM* 67 (1912) 321–57, esp. 321.

<sup>527</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.85.

<sup>528</sup> See Rabe, *Prolegomenon*, cxvi.

<sup>529</sup> For the use of the Π-scholia in the epitome, as demonstrated by textual peculiarities, see Hugo Rabe, "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 3. Die Quellen des Doxapatres in den Homilien zu Aphthonius," *RhM* 62 (1907) 559–86, esp. 576 n. 1. See also Rabe, *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*, xix.

of dates for the *Rhetorica Marciana*—from the late eleventh to the thirteenth centuries.<sup>530</sup>

But while Rabe's dating is a clear improvement on Brzoska's, it can be narrowed even further, if we look once again at the Christian content of the sample *progymnasmata*. Christian content extends beyond the σύγκρισις of Gregory and Basil that Brzoska mentioned. The ἐκφρασις, for example, is of the baptistry of a church;<sup>531</sup> the ἐγκώμιον takes the Christian value of ταπείνωσις, or humility, as its subject;<sup>532</sup> and the ψόγος of ὑπερηφάνια quotes passages from Scripture, such as Heb. 10:31.<sup>533</sup> This inclusion of Christian material into an otherwise classical tradition began with Nikephoros Basilakes (1115-1182), whose innovation in this regard prompted Schissel to call him "den byzantinischen Libanios . . . weil er christlichen Gegenständen breiten Raum gewährte."<sup>534</sup> Consequently, the *terminus post quem* must now be pushed forward to the time of Basilakes or, more likely, to the period shortly afterwards, that is, to the end of the twelfth century. Therefore, the anonymous *progymnasmata* which formed part of the *Rhetorica Marciana* were composed between the end of the twelfth century and the time when Marc. gr. 599 was copied in the thirteenth century.

<sup>530</sup> See Rabe, *Prolegomenon*, xxiv. See also Rabe, *Comm. in Aphth.*, xiii n. 1. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.85.

<sup>531</sup> See Anonymous, 1.638, 28-644, 14 Walz. For identificaton of this church, see further Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.117.

<sup>532</sup> See Anonymous, 1.619, 7-624, 30 Walz. Cf. Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.106.

<sup>533</sup> See Anonymous, 1.625, 1-630, 4 Walz (quotation from Hebrews on p. 627, 14-16). Cf. Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.106.

<sup>534</sup> See Schissel, "Progymnasmatik," 5. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.112-13.

THE APHTHONIAN SECTION  
OF THE *RHETORICA MARCIANA*

It is unfortunate that the scholars who have investigated the *Rhetorica Marciana* have focused on parts other than the opening Aphthonian ones.<sup>535</sup> To be sure, even full discussion of the so-called epitome of fol. 1<sup>v</sup>–8 must await the third volume of *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, but some preliminary observations here about it will establish the close relation that exists between it and the sample *progymnasmata* which follow in fol. 9–23<sup>r</sup>. Once this relation is established, the function of the sample *progymnasmata* will emerge more clearly.

As already noted, Walz classified the opening folios of Marc. gr. 444—Περὶ τῶν τοῦ Ἀφθονίου Προγυμνασμάτων—as an epitome of Aphthonius' textbook. He presumably made this classification because the document is considerably shorter than Aphthonius' textbook—roughly 300 lines long (using Walz's text) compared to Aphthonius' 1100 lines. This considerable reduction, however, is not, for the most part, the result of epitomizing Aphthonius but of omitting all the sample *progymnasmata* that Aphthonius had provided for each chapter. In other words, all that remains of Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* are the μέθοδοι—the definitions, etymologies, classifications, and compositional instructions that precede the sample *progymnasmata*. But even with respect to these portions "epitomizing" is not the appropriate word for what has happened. To be sure, some chapters have been shortened by summarizing some discussions or eliminating non-essential words and sentences, as happens, for example, in the largely redundant γνώμη and ψόγος chapters as well as in the little used τοῦ νόμου εἰσφορά chapter, where Aphthonius' discussions have been reduced by fifteen, fifty-five, and thirty per cent, respectively.

Elsewhere, however, we find considerable revision of Aphthonius' discussions. Indeed, Aphthonius' discussions in the μῦθος, διήγημα, χρεῖα, ἀνασκευή, κοινὸς τόπος, and ἡθοποιία chapters are expanded in the *Rhetorica Marciana*—as much as eighty-seven per cent in the χρεῖα chapter and 158% in the διήγημα chapter.

<sup>535</sup> For the Hermogenean scholia, see DeFalco, "Trattato," 72–124; for the treatise Περὶ ἀλύτων ἀντιθέσεων by Maximus, see Rabe, *Prolegomena*, cxv–cxxvi and 427–47; and for the treatise Περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, see Aujac, "Recherches," 1–44.

This additional material, derived from the Π-scholia, tends to provide further practical instruction on how to compose the respective *progymnasma*. In addition, there is what amounts to a preface that clarifies the relation between *progymnasmata* and strictly rhetorical speeches.<sup>536</sup> This preface has no parallel in Aphthonius. Not surprisingly, therefore, this document turns out to be actually *longer* than the corresponding sections in Aphthonius! Clearly, “epitome” is not the best way to characterize this portion of the *Rhetorica Marciana*.

What we have in the Περί τῶν τοῦ Ἀφθονίου προγυμνασμάτων is a deliberate revision of the instructional sections of Aphthonius’ textbook. Since this revision contains none of Aphthonius’ sample *progymnasmata*, the set of sample *progymnasmata* that follows in the *Rhetorica Marciana* functions to provide an alternate, or at least a supplementary, set of models for students to use. Walz’s separation of this revision of Aphthonius’ textbook from this set of sample *progymnasmata* has thus obscured the close relation that existed originally between these two initial parts of the *Rhetorica Marciana*.

#### THE CHREIA ELABORATION IN THE RHETORICA MARCIANA

The anonymous set of sample *progymnasmata* in Marc. gr. 444 has received only fleeting attention from scholars.<sup>537</sup> Hunger’s comprehensive survey of the theory and practice of *progymnasmata* is a welcome addition,<sup>538</sup> but even he inexplicably fails to include three sample *progymnasmata* from the *Rhetorica Marciana*: the μῦθος,<sup>539</sup> the διήγημα,<sup>540</sup> and the chreia elaboration.

<sup>536</sup> See Anonymous, 1.127, 1–128, 5 Walz.

<sup>537</sup> See, e.g., Schissel, “Progymnasmatik,” 4.

<sup>538</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.92–120.

<sup>539</sup> See Anonymous, 1.597, 1–599, 31 Walz. This μῦθος tells of a wolf who captures an ass, but before eating him he initiates a trial in which both are to tell of their various sins. The wolf has many, but presents them as though they are minimal. The ass has only one, but presents it as though it were great. The wolf pounces on this one sin and makes it the justification for killing the ass.

<sup>540</sup> See Anonymous, 1.600, 1–601, 31 Walz. This διήγημα tells the familiar story of Priam’s son Polydorus being sent to the Thracian king Polymnestor for safekeeping only to be killed by the king for the gold the boy had brought with him.

And where Hunger does treat them, his comments are necessarily brief, limited to summaries of the subjects treated and cross references to similar treatments elsewhere,<sup>541</sup> to criticisms of the author's literary abilities,<sup>542</sup> and to the presence of Christian subjects and themes in these *progymnasmata*.<sup>543</sup>

The Christian content is clearly important, for, as we have seen, it helps in dating the collection, and its continuation in the Hermogenean scholia<sup>544</sup> gives further evidence of the *Rhetorica Marciana* being a coherent rhetorical corpus. Nevertheless, this Christian content does not extend to the chreia elaboration, where traditional classical sources remain in place. Hence, when viewing the chreia elaboration within the entire collection, it is better to note another feature of this collection—the unusual length when compared to Aphthonius' sample *progymnasmata* which this collection has apparently replaced.

For example, the length of the sample μῦθος is sixty-two lines, in Walz's edition, compared to only seven for Aphthonius' μῦθος, again using Walz's edition.<sup>545</sup> Likewise, the sample διήγημα is fifty-eight lines long, much longer than Aphthonius' fifteen.<sup>546</sup> This increased length continues throughout the collection and is especially apparent in the σύγκρισις, which is 195 lines long compared to only forty-three for Aphthonius.<sup>547</sup>

<sup>541</sup> See, e.g., Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.104: the maxim elaboration of a statement on the necessity of money by Demosthenes (*Orat.* 1.20) is the same statement elaborated by ps.-Nicolaus (1.279, 20–280, 31 Walz) and by Pachymeres (1.555, 9–557, 16 Walz).

<sup>542</sup> See, e.g., Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.108: the author's enthusiasm for Saints Gregory and Basil exceeded his ability to compare them.

<sup>543</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.106, 108, 117.

<sup>544</sup> See DeFalco, "Trattato," 81–86, 92, 95, 114. Cf. also George L. Kustas, *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric* (Abl 17; Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973) 70, and Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.85.

<sup>545</sup> See Anonymous, 1.597, 1–599, 31 Walz, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 1 (1.60, 6–12 Walz).

<sup>546</sup> See Anonymous, 1.600, 1–601, 31 Walz, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 2 (1.61, 11–62, 11 Walz).

<sup>547</sup> See Anonymous, 1.630, 5–636, 8 Walz, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 10 (1.98, 11–100, 20 Walz).

The chreia elaboration, which, at 113 lines, is more than twice as long as Aphthonius' fifty,<sup>548</sup> is thus consistent in this respect with the collection as a whole. This greater length will have to be taken into account in the analysis of the elaboration. Comparison with the so-called epitome that preceded the sample progymnasmata in the *Rhetorica Marciana* will also be taken into consideration. Finally, Aphthonian influence in wording and syntax will be noted.

The first section of the elaboration, the ἐγκωμιαστικόν, is almost twice as long as Aphthonius' but still reflects Aphthonian style at several points. The use of δίκαιος (1) recalls Aphthonius' use of this very word,<sup>549</sup> and the phrase περὶ φρονήσεως φιλοσοφεῖ (4) is clearly modeled on Aphthonius.<sup>550</sup> Aphthonius' use of the rhetorical figure κατὰ παράληψιν<sup>551</sup> is copied here as well. Thus just as Aphthonius briefly mentioned Isocrates' various benefits to mankind before focusing on his philosophy of education,<sup>552</sup> so the author refers to all of Sophocles' plays before singling those out that deal with wisdom (3).

One feature of this section, however, appears to follow the advice given in the epitome, which defines the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section as being designed "to sing the praises (ἐγκωμιάσαι) of the one who spoke the saying in the chreia." The use of this verb is to be expected, but it also suggests another *progymnasma*, the ἐγκώμιον, and among the parts of an ἐγκώμιον is, according to Aphthonius, a σύγκρισις, or comparison.<sup>553</sup> Thus, Sophocles' praises are duly sung by comparing him to Homer and to other tragedians (1-2).

The παραφραστικόν section is Aphthonian in length and style. There is the parenthetical φησὶν (5),<sup>554</sup> and the transition to the next section (5) is clearly, if freely, modeled on Aphthonius:

<sup>548</sup> See Anonymous, 1.602, 1-605, 18 Walz, and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 3 (1.63, 14-67, 2 Walz).

<sup>549</sup> See Aphthonius 26: δίκαιον.

<sup>550</sup> See Aphthonius 32-33: περὶ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησεν. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 20 Rabe).

<sup>551</sup> For Aphthonius' use of this figure, see Doxapatres, 2.268, 11-20 Walz.

<sup>552</sup> See Aphthonius 30-33. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 19-20 Rabe).

<sup>553</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 8 (p. 22, 9-10 Rabe).

<sup>554</sup> See Aphthonius 34: φησὶν.

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε ταῦτα, τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα<sup>555</sup>

*Rhetorica Marciana*: καὶ τοῖς μὲν ῥήμασιν οὕτως ἢ ψῆφος μικρά, εἰ δὲ τῷ νῷ μεγάλη, μαρτυρήσει λόγος ὁ ῥηθησόμενος

The next two sections, the αἰτία and the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, form the heart of the elaboration (6-18), and their length is worth noting, as the αἰτία is over twice as long as Aphthonius' and the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου is more than four times as long. Still, Aphthonian style is apparent. For example, the transitional particle γάρ and a participial subject—ὁ φρονήσεως γάρ ἀκραιφνοῦς εὐμοιρῶν—begin the αἰτία (6), as they do in Aphthonius.<sup>556</sup> Likewise, the opening of the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου begins the same way, as the words εἰ δέ τις (14) match those of Aphthonius.<sup>557</sup>

The greater length of these two sections allows the author to compose a rather complex argument, required perhaps by the phrase "on every occasion" in the παραφραστικόν section (5). In addition, these two sections seemingly follow the advice in the so-called epitome. It advises that these sections should state the ὠφέλεια, or benefit, should the saying be carried out, and the βλάβη, or harm, should it not be.<sup>558</sup> Accordingly, in the αἰτία section the author shows how wisdom is beneficial when giving advice, rendering judgment, leading an army, ruling a kingdom, enjoying good fortune or experiencing bad, and knowing when to remain silent and when to speak out (6-13). In fact, the benefit of wisdom is that it makes a person appear as more than mortal (13).

In the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου section, in contrast, the harmful effects on a person who lacks wisdom are legion: getting blows, bringing disgrace on his family, misusing his beauty, losing his wealth and perhaps even his life, and appearing worthless when he is silent and ridiculous when he speaks (14-18). Consequently, a person without wisdom is regarded as less than human (18).

The παραβολή section is twice as long as that in Aphthonius' elaboration, due, however, to the use of two παραβολαί (19-20), not one, as in Aphthonius. Otherwise, the similarities are the

<sup>555</sup> Aphthonius 36-37.

<sup>556</sup> Aphthonius 38: οἱ γὰρ παιδείας ἐρῶντες. Cf. also Aphthonius, *Pro-gymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe): ὁ γὰρ πενίχ συζῶν.

<sup>557</sup> Aphthonius 53: εἰ δέ τις.

<sup>558</sup> See Anonymous, 1.130, 2-4 Walz.



more prominent. Both elaborations begin this section with ὥσπερ γάρ (19), and both continue by using participial constructions (19) in introducing the subject of the comparison:

Aphthonius: οἱ γῆν ἐργαζόμενοι πόνῳ<sup>559</sup>

*Rhetorica Marciana*: οἱ ἐντελεῖ φρονήσει συζῶντες

The παράδειγμα section is significantly longer than Aphthonius'—over three times, in fact. The greater length is due once again to the inclusion of three examples (21-24), not just one, as in Aphthonius.<sup>560</sup> The first example, the capture of Troy, is introduced by the clause εἰς νοῦν λαβέ μοι (21), which is somewhat similar to Aphthonius' ὄρα μοι.<sup>561</sup> At any rate, the capture of Troy is attributed not to the warring of countless heroes over ten years but to the wisdom of one man, Odysseus (21-22). Likewise, the second example, the defeat of the Persian king Xerxes, is credited to the wisdom of Themistocles (23). And the third example, Pericles' struggles, also points to the role of his wisdom; his struggles earned him the appellation "Olympian" and prompts the author to say that the wise in general are deserving of such an appellation (24). In other words, these examples not only illustrate Sophocles' saying in the chreia but also pick up on the claim of divine status for the wise that concluded the αἰτία (13).

The μαρτυρία παλαιῶν section is about the same length as in Aphthonius, for both cite just one witness. For the *Rhetorica Marciana* the witness is Homer, who is called upon to confirm Sophocles' line—specifically a speech by Agamemnon in which he wishes for ten counselors as wise as Nestor (25).<sup>562</sup> Homer is not quoted but the appearance of the words δέκα . . . συμφράδμονας do point unmistakably to this speech.<sup>563</sup>

The final section, the ἐπίλογος βραχύς, reflects the length, language, and syntax of Aphthonius, as is apparent from a comparison of the *Rhetorica Marciana* (27) with Aphthonius:

<sup>559</sup> Aphthonius 59. See also Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12 Rabe): οἱ δεσμῷ κατεληγμένοι δεινῷ.

<sup>560</sup> See Aphthonius 64-70.

<sup>561</sup> Aphthonius 64.

<sup>562</sup> See *Il.* 2.370-93.

<sup>563</sup> See *Il.* 2.372.

Aphthonius: δεῖ Ἰσοκράτην θαυμάζειν κάλλιστα περὶ τῆς παιδείας φιλοσοφήσαντα<sup>564</sup>

*Rhetorica Marciana*: Σοφοκλέα . . . ὑπερθαυμάζειν πάντας εἰκός, τοιαῦτα περὶ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς φρονήσεως μέγιστα . . . ἀποφηνόμενον

To sum up, this chreia elaboration, although it is more than twice the length of Aphthonius', still follows Aphthonius in various ways, sometimes more closely in one section than in another, but still more than enough to observe the continuing hold of Aphthonian language and style on Byzantine teachers of rhetorical composition. At times the influence of the so-called epitome that preceded the sample *progymnasmata* in the *Rhetorica Marciana* can be detected, such as in the multiple comparison in the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section and the attempt in the αἰτία and the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου sections to show the benefit and harm that comes from following or ignoring the saying in the chreia. This influence, slight as it is, nevertheless tends to confirm the coherence of the *Rhetorica Marciana*. Analysis of the entire set of sample *progymnasmata*, however, is necessary before any conclusions can be made regarding the overall role of these *progymnasmata* in the *Rhetorica Marciana* as well as their role over against Aphthonius' sample *progymnasmata*.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Walz's 1832 edition of the anonymous sample *progymnasmata*, based on Marc. gr. 444, remains the only one,<sup>565</sup> although a new edition is clearly needed, if only to incorporate the MSS—Marc. gr. 599 and Vat. gr. 899—that Rabe has identified which also contain this text. In the meantime, however, we must use Walz's text, although we have added paragraph numbers for easier reference, inserted the various κεφάλαια where appropriate, and suggested some changes in the text, all noted in the apparatus. And we have followed the lead of DeFalco and Rabe in identifying this sample chreia elaboration as part of a larger rhetorical corpus, known as the *Rhetorica Marciana*.

<sup>564</sup> Aphthonius 77-78.

<sup>565</sup> See 1.597, 1-648, 17 Walz.

So far as we know, this is the first translation of this elaboration into any language. Because of some obscurities—obscure, at least to us—this initial translation remains tentative at some points.

## Text 31. Rhetorica Marciana

CHREIA ELABORATION  
(1.602, 1-605, 18 WALZ)

Οἱ φρονοῦντες εὖ, φησὶ Σοφοκλῆς, κρατοῦσι πανταχοῦ.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ὅδε δὲ Σοφοκλῆς τῶν τραγικῶν τὸ κεφάλαιον· καὶ ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος ἐν πολλοῖς ποιηταῖς μόνος ἔξοχον τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα εἴληχεν, οὕτω Σοφοκλῆς ἐν πολλοῖς τραγικοῖς τραγικὸς ὀνομάζεσθαι δίκαιος, ὑπεράρας πάντας τοὺς τοιαῦτα ποιήσαντας· 2. μᾶλλον δὲ ταῖς μὲν ὑποθέσει καὶ τῷ μέτρῳ τραγικός, ταῖς δὲ γνώμας ἡρωϊκὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ ἀναφαίνεται, μόνος ποιητῶν ἐν ἱαμβείοις ἡρωϊκὰς γνώμας ἐκθέμενος, 3. καὶ ἐν πᾶσι μὲν, ὅσοις ἐξέθετο, σοφὸς ἐπωνύμως ἐκρίθη [καὶ κλέος ἔτι σμικρὸν ἦρατο]· 4. ἐν οἷς δὲ περὶ φρονήσεως φιλοσοφεῖ, τοσοῦτον πλέον ἢ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῦ λοιποῖς θαυμάζεται, ὅσον κάκεῖνα κατὰ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν αὐτοῦ τὴν νικῶσαν φέρει καὶ πάσαις ψήφοις κρατεῖ.

5. <Παραφραστικόν> Τί δὲ περὶ τούτου ἀπεφάνητο; ἡ ἐντελής φρόνησις, φησιν, ἐν πᾶσι κρατεῖ, καὶ τοῖς μὲν ῥήμασιν οὕτως ἡ ψῆφος μικρά, εἰ δὲ τῷ νῶι μεγάλη, μαρτυρήσει λόγος ὁ ῥηθησόμενος.

6. <Αἰτία> Ὁ φρονήσεως γὰρ ἀκραιφνοῦς εὐμοιρῶν εἰς νέους μὲν ἔτι τελῶν εὐθύς ἀπὸ γραμμάτων κακίας ἀρετὴν ἀνθαιρήσεται, κἀντεῦθεν πᾶν ἀγαθὸν ἐξασκήσει, καὶ παιδείας πάσης ἀνθέξεται, 7. οἷς ὠπλισμένοις εἰς ἀνδρας γραφεῖς, τίσι τῶν ἀρίστων οὐκ ἂν προσβάλῃ, καὶ προσβαλὼν, ποῖα τούτων οὐ μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς κατορθώσασαιτο;

## Text 31. Rhetorica Marciana

CHREIA ELABORATION  
(1.602, 1-605, 18 WALZ)

"Those who have wisdom," says Sophocles, "everywhere prevail."<sup>566</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> Sophocles is the consummate tragedian. And so, just as among the many poets Homer alone has acquired the designation of "the poet" because of his excellence, so also among the many tragedians Sophocles deserves to be called "the tragedian" because he has surpassed all those who have written such compositions. 2. And yet, it is more in his themes and meter that the man is shown to be a tragedian, while in his sentiments he appears heroic, being the only one of the poets to have composed heroic sentiments in iambs. 3. And in everything that he composed he was judged, in keeping with his name, "wise" [and "fame" he acquired a little later]. 4. In those tragedies in which he deals with wisdom he is admired much more than for his other tragedies; similarly, even those other tragedies carry the prevailing opinion in comparison with his non-tragic writings and win on every count.

5. <Paraphrastic [section]> What opinion has he given on the subject? Perfect wisdom, he is saying, prevails in every situation. And so, as far as its words are concerned, the count is therefore small, but whether it is profound in its thought the discussion which follows will attest.

6. <Rationale> The one who is blessed with unsullied wisdom while still enrolled among youths will choose virtue in preference to vice immediately upon leaving school; and thereafter he will practice every good and abide by every instruction. 7. Thus, armed with these weapons— which civic affairs could he not assume once he has been enrolled among men? And having assumed them, which could he not accomplish with distinction?

<sup>566</sup> See Sophocles, *Ajax* 1252 (missing only the initial ἀλλ'). Cf. further *Chreia* 1.338-39.

8. Βουλευών ευστόχως βαλεῖ, δικάζων τὴν ὀρθὴν ἐξενέγκοι, ἐξαίρετα γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων κατορθώματα φρονήσεως· 9. ἂν στρατηγῇ, μεγάλως εὐδοκιμήσει· μετ' ὀλίγων πολλοὺς καὶ μετ' ἀσθενεστέρων ῥωμαλαιοτέρους τροπώσεται· ἃ γὰρ φρόνησις ἐν πολέμοις ἐργάζεται, ἀνδρία οὐκ οἶδεν, ἃ δ' ἀνδρία, ἢ φρονήσεως οὐ (p. 603) χωρίς, ἢ οὐκ ἀκινδύνως, εἴ τι καὶ δράσειεν·

10. Ἄρχων ὁ φρονῶν εὖ, οὐχ ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀξιώματος ἐκείνος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς τὴν ἀρχὴν κατεκόσμησε, καὶ ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς βασιλείας χρῆμα, λαμπρῶς ἔδειξεν ἂν ἰδιώτης, βασιλέων ἐπικρατέστερος. ὁ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν ἄρχει, ὁ δ' εὖ φρονῶν καὶ βασιλέων, εἰ τύχοι, κρατεῖ· 11. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔστιν ὅτε τὴν ἀρχὴν κλέπτεται ἢ φανερώς ἀφαρπάζεται, τῷ δὲ ἄσυχλόν τε πάντα καὶ ἀναφαίρετον τὸ κράτος μεμένηκεν·

12. Ἄν εὐτυχής, εὐτυχέστερος τῷ πλεονεκτήματι, ἂν δυστυχής, παραμυθεῖται τὴν τύχην τῷ κτήματι· πῶς δ' ἂν καὶ δυστυχῇ ὀνομάσειας, ὅς τοῦ εὐδαιμονεστάτου τῶν παρ' ἀνθρώποις ἀγαθῶν εὐτυχῆς γέγονε·

13. Σιωπῶν τῶν λεγόντων θαυμασιώτερος, οἶδε γάρ, οὐ κρείττων λόγου σιγῇ· ὁμιλοῦντι δ' αὖθις πάντες κεχήνασι, τὸ μέλιτος γλυκίον ῥέον ἐκείνο ὑποδεχόμενοι, καὶ ἀπλῶς, ἵνα μὴ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα λέγοιμι, ὁ φρενῶν εὖ ἔχων ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπον φαίνεται.

14. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Εἰ δέ τις ἀτυχεῖ τούτου τοῦ χρήματος, καὶ πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἀτυχέστατος πέφυκε· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρώποις εὐρημένων ἀγαθῶν ἢ οὐδενὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπιχειρήσεται, ἢ ἐπιχειρησάμενος, οὐδὲν πλέον ἢ πληγῶν καὶ πόνων ὅσων ἀναπλησθεῖς, ὥς ὁ τοῦ κωμικοῦ Στρεψιάδης κενὸς ἀπελεύσεται·

15. Ἄ γὰρ γνῶσις ἐφεῦρε, πῶς ταῦτα τῇ ἀγνοίᾳ κατορθωθῆσεται, καὶ μὴ ὅτι γε ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ ὁ τοιοῦτος οὐδὲν τῶν ἀπάντων ἀγαθῶν κτήσεται, ἀλλὰ καί, ἅπερ φύσις ἢ τύχη ἴσως πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐφιλοτιμήσατο, ταχέως ἡμαύρωσε καὶ τελείως ἀπέσβεσεν· 16. ἂν ἐξ

8. As an adviser, he will give apt advice; as a judge, he would deliver the right verdict, for wisdom's accomplishments are superior to the others. 9. Should he be a general, he will be highly esteemed for routing many men with few, and stronger men with weaker ones. For courage does not know how to accomplish what wisdom does in war; and what courage does accomplish, it does not accomplish without wisdom or without peril—if it could do anything!

10. As a magistrate, the wise man is not adorned by his rank; rather, he alone has adorned this position. All that a reign requires he could demonstrate brilliantly as a private citizen, a man who is superior to kings. For the king rules those who are under him, but the man who is wise, it may be, rules even kings. 11. And so the king sometimes has his rule taken away by intrigue or has it openly wrested away; but for the other man the power remains completely unassailable and impregnable.

12. Should he be fortunate, he is more fortunate because of his superiority in wisdom; should he be unfortunate, he finds solace for his misfortune in his possession of wisdom. But how could you even call unfortunate one who has become fortunate in the most rewarding of blessings among men?

13. When silent he is more admirable than those who are speaking, for he knows when silence is preferable to speech. On the other hand, when he speaks, everyone stands agape on hearing the flow of words that is sweeter than honey; and, in a word and not to go into details, the wise man always appears among mortals as more than mortal.

14. <From the Opposite> But if someone is unfortunate with regard to wisdom, he is also most unfortunate with regard to all blessings. Indeed, of the blessings found among men, he will first either not try to get any of them or, if he has tried, he, after getting his fill of nothing more than many blows and hardships like Strepsiades in the comedy,<sup>567</sup> will end up empty-handed.

15. For how will those things which knowledge has discovered thrive in ignorance? And not that such a man will acquire none of the blessings by himself, but he has quickly obscured or completely extinguished what nature or chance has perhaps lavished on him. 16. Should he be a descendant of the old aristocracy,

<sup>567</sup> See Aristophanes, *Nub.* 1021 and 1321-25.

εὐπατριδῶν, αἰσχύνῃ τῷ γενεῖ, ἂν Νιρεὺς, χείρων Θερσίτου, ἂν Μίδας, ταχέως Ἴρος καθίσταται, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῖς χρήμασι συναπόλλυται· πλοῦτος γὰρ ἄνευ φρονήσεως ὑγιοῦς οὐ μόνον οὐ παραμένει, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν ἔχοντα ἑαυτῷ συναπόλλυσιν· 17. ἂν ῥωμαλαῖος, μὴ μόνον οὐδὲν ἀπονασθαι τοῦ πλεονεκτήματος (p. 604) δύναται, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτο ἐκτήσατο, ῥώμῃ γὰρ φρονήσεως ἄνευ ἵππος ἀκριβῶς ἀχαλίνωτος, ὃς ὅσον θρασύτερος, τοσοῦτον τῷ ἐπιβάτῃ τὸ πτῶμα δεινότερον ἀπεργάζεται.

18. Σιωπῶν μὲν οὗτος οὐδενὸς ἄξιος, ὁμιλῶν δ' αὖ καταγέλαστος, καὶ τὸ ὅλον εἰπεῖν, ὃ μὴ φρονῶν εὖ μέσον λογικῶν εἰς ἄλογον τελεῖ. ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐννοῶν ὁ σοφὸς Σοφοκλῆς τὸ φρονεῖν εὖ πάντων κράτιστον νουνεχῶς ἀπεφήνατο.

19. <Παραβολή> Ὡςπερ γὰρ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑγιεῖς καὶ ἀπειλικρινήμενους πλουτήσαντες, ὅποι πορεύονται, ἀπροσκόπτως καὶ ἀσφαλῶς μάλα φέρονται, οὕτως οἱ ἐντελεῖ φρονήσει συζῶντες ὀρθῶς πᾶσι πράγμασιν ἐπιβάλλουσιν· ὃ γὰρ ὀφθαλμοὶ σώματι, τοῦτο σύνεσις ψυχῇ πέφυκεν.

20. Εἰ δέ γε βούλει, ὃν τρόπον ἥλιος πάντων μὲν ἐκασταχόθεν ὑπέρκειται, ἀστῆρσι δ' ἐν μυρίοις μέγιστος πολλῶ τῷ μέσῳ καὶ διαυγέστατος πέφυκεν, οὕτως ὁ φρονῶν εὖ πάντων ἀνώτατος· λαμπρότατος δὲ καὶ περιφανέστατος ἐν ἅπασι φαίνεται.

21. <Παράδειγμα> Τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Τροίας εἰς νοῦν λαβέ μοι· ἦν γὰρ δεκέτης χρόνος καὶ μυρίον ἡρώων πλῆθος ἐκπορθῆσαι οὐκ ἴσχυσεν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπειρηκότες ἀπέπλεον, ταύτην ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς φρόνημα ἐν μιᾷ καὶ μόνη φυλακῇ νυκτὸς παρεστήσατο, 22. καὶ ἥς ἐμπροσθεν ὑπὲρ ἀριθμὸν ἵπποι ἐμψυχοὶ προσβαλόντες καὶ ἀρετὴν ἐπιδειξάμενοι παντοίαν πεπτώκασιν, ταύτης εἰς ἄψυχος καὶ ἀκίνητος κατεχρεμετίσατο καὶ



there is disgrace for his family; should he be a Nireus,<sup>568</sup> he becomes worse than a Thersites;<sup>569</sup> should he be a Midas,<sup>570</sup> he quickly becomes an Irus<sup>571</sup>—rather he perishes along with his money, for wealth without sound judgment not only does not abide but even destroys along with itself the one who possesses it. 17. Should he be strong, not only can he enjoy none of his advantage, but he has even acquired it to his disadvantage, for strength without judgment is a genuinely unbridled horse: the more high-spirited it is, the more terrible is the fall which it causes its rider.

18. When silent this man is worthless; when speaking he is ridiculous; and, to sum up, the man who is not wise is, in the midst of rational creatures, considered an irrational one. With these and similar thoughts in mind, the wise Sophocles sensibly pronounced wisdom the most important possession.

19. <Analogy> For just as those who are blessed with healthy, clear eyes travel wherever they go without stumbling and in complete safety, so those who live with perfect knowledge comprehend correctly every situation. For what eyes are to the body, knowledge is to the soul.

20. Or, if you prefer, just as the sun is everywhere far above everything and among the countless stars is greatest and most radiant by far, so the man who is wise is most supreme and appears the brightest and most conspicuous among all men.

21. <Example> Consider, if you will, the capture of Troy. This city which ten years and a countless host of heroes were unable to sack—and for this reason the Greeks had given up and were on the point of sailing away—one man's wisdom handed over in one night and in a single watch. 22. And a city before which spirited horses beyond number attacked and displayed all manner of courage only to fall, this city one inanimate and immobile

<sup>568</sup> On Nireus as the most handsome of the Greeks at Troy after Achilles, see *Il.* 2.671-73.

<sup>569</sup> On Thersites as the ugliest of the Greeks at Troy, see *Il.* 2.212-19.

<sup>570</sup> On Midas, king of Phrygia, as renowned for his wealth, see Aristophanes, *Plut.* 287, and Plato, *Rep.* 408B. For the related story of his wish that everything he touch turn to gold, see Ovid, *Met.* 11.85-193.

<sup>571</sup> On Irus as a beggar at Ithaca who begged from the suitors of Penelope, see *Od.* 18.1-116.

κατωρχήσατο, σοφίαν ἑνὸς ἔμφρονος φέρων ἢ καὶ αὐτόν. διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ τῶν ἀναχθέντων εἰς Τροίαν πάντων Ἑλλήνων πτολίπορθος μόνος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀνηγόρευται.

23. Ὁ δὲ γε Περσῶν μέγας βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης, ὃς μετὰ τὸ πάντας σχεδὸν τοὺς ὑπ' οὐρανῷ ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ ποιήσασθαι, καὶ στοιχείων αὐτῶν ἔδοξε κατευμεγεθεῖν, οὐ συνέσει οὗτος ἑνὸς ἀνδρὸς τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους κατεστρατηγήθη, μετὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἀντικρυς τῇ Ἀθηναίων ἐπεισπεσών;

24. Ὁ δὲ Περικλῆς πρότερον τοιούτων (p. 605) ὑπὸ συνέσει τῶν γερῶν ἔτυχεν, οἷον οὐδεὶς τῶν ἀπάντων μέχρι καὶ νῦν. μετὰ γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ γενναίους ἐκείνου ἀγῶνας, οὓς οὐκ ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ τῶν ἀπάντων πλήν συνέσει καὶ βουλῇ κρείττονι λαμπρῶς ἐπεδείξατο, Ὀλύμπιος ἀνερρήθη παρ' Ἀθηναίων· οὕτω τὸ φρονεῖν εὖ ἰσχυρόν, ὥστε τῆς τῶν κρείττόνων αὐτῶν ἐπωνυμίας καὶ ἀξίας τοὺς ἔχοντας ἀξιοῦν.

25. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ὅθεν καὶ ἡ τῶν ποιητῶν κορωνὶς τὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων βασιλέα εἰσάγει οὐ παλαμναιοτάτους τινὰς ἢ πλῆθος τόσον καὶ τόσον, ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν ἀπάντων ζητοῦντα πρὸς τὸ ρίψαι τὴν Τροίαν· ἀλλὰ δέκα μόνον, οἷος ὁ Πύλειος, ἄνδρας συμφράδμονας περσέπολιν Ἀθηνᾶν φέροντας προκυρσάμενον ἀκριβῶς, 26. ὅπερ ὕστερον

horse<sup>572</sup> whinnied and pranced over in triumph because it carried the wisdom of one intelligent man—or rather carried the man himself, too. For this reason, you see, of all the Greeks who set sail for Troy, only Odysseus has been given the name “Sacker of Cities.”<sup>573</sup>

23. Xerxes, the great king of the Persians, after making almost all those under heaven subject to him, had it in mind to control even the elements themselves—wasn’t he out-generaled by the intelligence of one man, Themistocles, when, after attacking the whole world, he straightway fell upon Athens?<sup>574</sup>

24. And Pericles achieved with his intelligence such honors as no one at all has ever done before now. For after his many noble struggles in which he showed himself brilliantly with none of the virtues except intelligence and superior counsel, he was called “Olympian”<sup>575</sup> by the Athenians. Wisdom is so strong that those who possess it deserve the appellation and honor that belong to their superiors.

25. <Testimony of the Ancients> Therefore, the crown of the poets introduces the king of the Greeks as not seeking some bloodthirsty men or such and such a number of them or anything else at all in order to overthrow Troy. Rather, Homer introduces him as carefully choosing beforehand just ten men [for example, Pylean Nestor] to be counselors and bearers of Athena, destroyer of cities.<sup>576</sup> 26. This is precisely what Sophocles said later: all

<sup>572</sup> The reference here is to the wooden, or Trojan, horse, on which see *Od.* 4.279-89; 8.492-520; Vergil, *Aen.* 2.13-267; and Apollodorus, *Epit.* 5.14-21.

<sup>573</sup> The epithet “Sacker of Cities” is, to be sure, used only of Odysseus in the *Odyssey* (8.3; 16.442; 22.283); in the *Iliad*, however, it is used not only of Odysseus (2.278; 8.728) but also of Achilles (8.372; 15.77; 21.550; 24.108) and the god Ares (20.152).

<sup>574</sup> For Themistocles and his decisive role in the defeat of the Persians at Salamis, see Hammond, *History of Greece*, 219-53.

<sup>575</sup> On this epithet for Pericles, see, e.g., Aristophanes, *Ach.* 530; Diodorus Siculus, 12.40.5; 13.98.3; Plutarch, *Per.* 8.3; 39.2; Lucian, *Im.* 17; and above ps.-Libanius 4.11.

<sup>576</sup> See *Il.* 2.370-93, esp. 372: δέκα . . . συμφοράδμονες. Agamemnon, the king of the Greeks, has just received advice from Nestor (337-68), to which Agamemnon replies that he wished he had ten such counselors since they would assure the destruction of Troy. For the epithet “destroyer of cities” for Athena, see Dio, *Orat.* 13.19.

Σοφοκλῆς ἀπεφήνατο, μηδὲν εἶναι τὰ πάντα πρὸς τὴν ἰσχὺν τῆς συνέσεως.

27. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Οὐδὲ πλεονεκτήματος καὶ Σοφοκλέα πλουσίως μάλ' εὐμοιροῦντα ὑπερθαυμάζειν πάντας εἰκός, τοιαῦτα περὶ τῆς ἀκριβοῦς φρονήσεως μέγιστα μικροῖς σαφῶς ἄγαν ἀποφηνάμενον.

things are as nothing in comparison with the power of intelligence.

27. <Brief Epilogue> It is reasonable for everyone to admire the very richly favored Sophocles for his superiority because he said such great things about genuine wisdom so very clearly and in so few words.

Texts 32-33. Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* 3  
(pp. 101-109 Pignani)

Introduction

LIFE AND WRITINGS

Basilakes (Gr. Βασιλάκης) is the name of an illustrious aristocratic family of Armenian or Paphlagonian origin, but by the time of Nikephoros Basilakes, who was born about 1115, the family had lost much of its political prominence.<sup>577</sup> Our Basilakes regained some of this prominence, however, although it was in the intellectual sphere since he pursued a career of teaching and writing.<sup>578</sup> He first taught rhetoric for a while, holding a patriarchal position called *μαίστωρ τῶν ῥητόρων*.<sup>579</sup> Then, he was appointed, about 1140, as *διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου*, or teacher of the Apostle, one of three theological appointments at the Hagia Sophia, and hence as responsible for instruction in the letters of the apostles, especially those of Paul.<sup>580</sup>

Basilakes' teaching career came to end, however, when, in 1156-1157, he became embroiled in a theological controversy regarding the Trinity that had been begun by Soterichos Panteugenos, a deacon at the Hagia Sophia.<sup>581</sup> This controversy led to accusations of heresy against Basilakes and then to his banishment from the capital to Philippopolis. He may have eventually

<sup>577</sup> See further Alexander Kazhdan, "Basilakes," *ODB* 1.262-63.

<sup>578</sup> On Nikephoros Basilakes, see further Robert Browning, "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century," *Byzantion* 32 (1962) 167-201, esp. 181-84. Cf. also Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte des byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Öströmischen Reiches (527-1453)* (2nd ed.; HAW 9.1; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1897) 473-75; Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.124-25; and Alexander Kazhdan, "Basilakes, Nikephoros," *ODB* 1.263.

<sup>579</sup> See Browning, "Patriarchal School," 183.

<sup>580</sup> See Browning, "Patriarchal School," 183; Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 124; and Hunger, *Literatur*, 124. On these three teaching positions—*διδάσκαλος τοῦ εὐαγγελίου* (Gospel), *διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου* (Apostle), and *διδάσκαλος τοῦ ψαλτηρίου* (Psalms)—see Hans-Georg Beck, *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich* (HAW 12.2.1; Munich: C. H. Beck, 1959) 117.

<sup>581</sup> On this dispute, which concerned the debate over whether the eucharistic sacrifice is offered to the Father or to all three persons of the Trinity,

returned to Constantinople but not to his previous public position.<sup>582</sup> He died shortly after 1182.<sup>583</sup>

Basilakes' literary output is considerable and varied.<sup>584</sup> It includes orations and letters,<sup>585</sup> monodies on his brother and a friend,<sup>586</sup> and various sample *progymnasmata*. Basilakes' *progymnasmata*—the most extensive collection since late antiquity<sup>587</sup>—have been re-edited recently by Adriana Pignani<sup>588</sup> and now number fifty-six, eight more than Walz knew of for his 1832 edition.<sup>589</sup> This collection, while extensive, is not complete, for it contains examples of only eight of the fourteen standard *progymnasmata* which are distributed as follows: 1) seven *μῦθοι*, 2) sixteen *διηγήματα*, 3) two *chreia* elaborations, 4) one *maxim* elaboration, 5) one *ἀνασκευή*, 6) one *κατασκευή*, 7) one *ἐγκώμιον*, and 8) twenty-seven *ῥηθοποιίαι*.<sup>590</sup>

The *ῥηθοποιίαι* deserve further attention, not only for their numerical prominence in Basilakes' collection, but also for their contents.<sup>591</sup> In almost one half of them Basilakes departs from the usual classical figures and situations and goes instead to the Bible for these *ῥηθοποιίαι*. Of the thirteen biblical *ῥηθοποιίαι*, six are based

see John Mervyn Hussey, *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986) 151-52. On Panteugenēs, see John Meyendorff, "Panteugenos, Soterichos," *ODB* 3.1574.

<sup>582</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.124.

<sup>583</sup> See Antonio Garzya, "Fin quando visse Niceforo Basilace?" *BZ* 64 (1971) 301-2.

<sup>584</sup> For a list of Basilakes' writings, see Browning, "Patriarchal School," 181-82. Cf. also Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 475, and Hunger, *Literatur*, 124-25, 135, 235, and 409. For the lost satirical writings, see Hunger, *Literatur*, 2.154 n. 194.

<sup>585</sup> See Antonio Garzya, *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae* (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1984).

<sup>586</sup> See Adriana Pignani, ed., *Progimnasmī e Monodie. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione* (BNN 10; Napoli: Bibliopolis, 1983) 235-52, 253-60.

<sup>587</sup> So Wolfram Hörandner, *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner* (Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 16; Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981) 84.

<sup>588</sup> See Pignani, *Progimnasmī*, 71-232.

<sup>589</sup> See 1.423-525 Walz.

<sup>590</sup> On these *progymnasmata*, see further Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.95, 97-100, 103, 106, 111-13, and Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 84-91.

<sup>591</sup> See further Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.112-13, and Pignani, *Progimnasmī*, 27-30.

on the Old Testament, five on the New, and two on post-biblical developments regarding Mary and Peter. The latter, numbering seven through thirteen in Pignani's edition,<sup>592</sup> are as follows:

What words Zechariah, the father of the Forerunner, might say after the birth of the Forerunner and after he has been released from his inability to speak (cf. Luke 1:64).

What words the Theotokos might say when Christ has changed the water into wine at the wedding (cf. John 2:7-9).

What words the man who was blind from birth might say on receiving his sight (cf. John 9:7).

What words Hades might say when Lazarus has been raised up on the fourth day (cf. John 11:39-44).

What words the slave of the high priest might say after having his ear cut off by St. Peter and healed by Christ (cf. Luke 22:50-51).

What words the Theotokos might say when she embraces her Son, God and Savior Christ, as he is being buried.<sup>593</sup>

What words St. Peter might say after throwing down Simon who had been taken up into the air and as he is about to be crucified head-down by Nero (cf. Acts of Peter 32 and 37).

With contents like these it is not surprising that Schissel calls Basilakes "der byzantinische Libanios," Byzantine because of his use of Christian subjects and Libanius because of his being a principal witness to a new flowering of progymnasmatic literature in the twelfth century that would last into the fifteenth.<sup>594</sup> When his other writings, the orations and monodies, are included,

<sup>592</sup> For texts of these ῥηθροποιίαι, see Pignani, *Progimnasmi*, 155-83.

<sup>593</sup> The gospels say nothing of Mary lamenting the death of her son, although in one gospel she is at the cross (see John 19:25-27). Another Mary, Mary Magdalene, is said to have wept at the tomb (see John 20:11-13). Mary's lamenting seems to be a much later development, perhaps as early as the latter part of the fourth century but certainly by the sixth with Romanos' "Mary at the Cross" (see Margaret Alexiou, *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974] 62-78). Incidentally, even though her survey of Mary's laments is seemingly comprehensive, she is unaware of this ῥηθροποιία by Basilakes.

<sup>594</sup> See Schissel, "Progymnasmatik," 5. On Basilakes being the first to integrate fully Christian material into the progymnasmata, see also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.112-13.



Basilakes can be rightly regarded as “a major figure in the literary and learned world of the middle of the [twelfth] century.”<sup>595</sup>

## CHREIA ELABORATIONS

Two chreia elaborations appear among Basilakes’ sample *progymnasmata*. Both elaborate maxim-like sayings.<sup>596</sup> Indeed, since these sayings are not cited formally as chreiai, that is, they do not explicitly attribute these sayings to apt πρόσωπα, there is little to distinguish these elaborations from those of maxims proper. Only the title χρεία λογική in some MSS before each elaboration indicates that some copyists identified them as elaborations of chreiai. We have regarded them as such, although Pignani regards all three elaborations as those of maxims.<sup>597</sup>

The first maxim chreia that Basilakes elaborates is a saying of Gregory Nazianzos, one of the influential Cappadocian Fathers of the fourth century<sup>598</sup> and bishop of Constantinople (380-381) and then of his own city of Nazianzos (382-384). This use of the saying of a Christian reflects the innovation, mentioned above, of Basilakes’ incorporation of Christian material into the composition of *progymnasmata*. This saying, which is explicitly attributed to Gregory in the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section (1), comes from an acrostic of maxims, one maxim each for the twenty-four letters of the alphabet.<sup>599</sup> The first, beginning with the letter alpha, is: Ἀρχὴν ἀπάντων καὶ τέλος ποιοῦ Θεόν (“Make God the beginning and end of all things”). Basilakes selected for elaboration the maxim beginning with the letter epsilon, hence the fifth one in the sequence, which is: Εὐεργετῶν νόμιζε μιμεῖσθαι Θεόν (“In doing good believe you’re imitating God”).

Christian material does not, however, end with the πρόσωπον of the chreia being elaborated, for Basilakes also mentions the Christian doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation (3); quotes a brief passage from “the Divine Apostle,” or St. Paul, specifically

<sup>595</sup> So Browning, “Patriarchal School,” 183. Cf. also Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 473: “Basilakes war einer der fruchtbarsten und gewandtesten Schönredner des 12. Jahrhunderts.”

<sup>596</sup> On the maxim-like chreia, see Theon 124-26.

<sup>597</sup> See Pignani, *Progymnasmata*, 22-24.

<sup>598</sup> On Gregory, see further Barry Baldwin *et al.*, “Gregory of Nazianzos,” *ODB* 2.880-82. Cf. also Baldwin, “Cappadocian Fathers,” *ODB* 1.379-80.

<sup>599</sup> For this acrostic, see *PG* 37.908A, 909B.

Col. 1:26 (3); refers to Abraham, to Joseph, and, more vaguely, to the luminaries of the Church in the παράδειγμα section (14); and quotes from LXX Prov. 22:8a and perhaps from Ps. 33:15 in the μαρτυρία section (15).

And yet, despite this Christian content, the elaboration remains thoroughly Aphthonian in form and style. Basilakes follows the standard Aphthonian κεφάλαια, and the language and style of Aphthonius appear throughout the elaboration, although these Aphthonian cues are not as numerous as in the elaborations of other Byzantine writers.

For example, in the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section Basilakes' syntax of verb with a prepositional phrase using περί and the genitive (4) follows Aphthonius:

Aphthonius: περί τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησεν<sup>600</sup>

Basilakes: περί τῆς εὐποιίας . . . ἐσάλπισεν

In the παραφραστικόν section the parallels with Aphthonius are much stronger. Basilakes begins with the same syntax and likewise ends in a way similar to Aphthonius (5). This section begins with a nominal participial phrase which is interrupted by the word φησίν:

Aphthonius: ὁ παιδείας, φησίν, ἐρῶν<sup>601</sup>

Basilakes: ὁ τῶν καταδεστέρων, φησίν, ἐπιστρεφόμενος

This section ends in a similar way, though with rather different language (5),<sup>602</sup> and Basilakes opens the next section, the αἰτία, in the same way, that is, with the transitional particle γάρ (6).

Basilakes also adopts Aphthonius' phrase ὅρα μοι, although he uses it to open his παραβολή section (11), whereas it appears in Aphthonius' παράδειγμα section.<sup>603</sup> But Basilakes' use of a syntax using ὥς . . . οὕτω καὶ . . . (13) does reflect Aphthonius' ὥσπερ . . . τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον . . .<sup>604</sup>

<sup>600</sup> See Aphthonius 32-33. Cf. also Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 20 Rabe): περί τὴν πενίαν ἐφιλοσόφησε.

<sup>601</sup> See Aphthonius 34. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 21 Rabe): ὁ πενίᾳ συζῶν.

<sup>602</sup> See Aphthonius 36-37.

<sup>603</sup> See Aphthonius 64.

<sup>604</sup> See Aphthonius 59, 61. Cf. also Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 12-13 Rabe).

The second maxim chreia that Basilakes elaborates is a line from Sophocles—Χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστὶν ἢ τίκτους' αἰεί ("It's kindness that ever gives birth to kindness") (*Ajax* 522). This elaboration is much longer than the first and reverts to a classical subject, but it is also, like the first, Aphthonian in structure, having the standard eight κεφάλαια and making use of the language and style found in Aphthonius' sample elaboration.

The first, or ἐγκωμιαστικόν, section (1-12) ends in Aphthonian fashion, in that Basilakes' phraseology (τὸ περὶ χάριτος γνωμολογηθέν) (12) recalls Aphthonius' οἷα περὶ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησε.<sup>605</sup> This similar phrasing is not significant, given the length of this ἐγκωμιαστικόν section, and it is perhaps more intriguing to note that this section is much closer to the chreia elaboration of the *Rhetorica Marciana* (see Text 31). Both praise Sophocles, the πρόσωπον of the saying; both compare him with Homer; both make use of the etymology of Sophocles' name; and both conclude with the same syntax:

*Rhetorica Marciana*: τοσοῦτον ... ὅσον

Basilakes: ὅσω ... τοσοῦτω

In the next sections, however, Aphthonian influence is once again apparent. For example, in the second, or παραφραστικόν, section Basilakes follows Aphthonius in using φησὶν (13).<sup>606</sup> And stylistic markers that indicate their respective sections continue in the fourth through seventh sections. Hence in the fourth section, or ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου (30-35), Basilakes uses phrases of negation (εἰ γὰρ μή [34, 35])<sup>607</sup> as well as the telltale phrase ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων τάναντία (35). And in the fifth, or παραβολή, section we have the syntax of ὥς γάρ ... οὕτω καὶ ..., <sup>608</sup> whereas in the sixth, or παράδειγμα, section (37) and the seventh, or μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, section (42) we have a clear echoes of Aphthonian wording and syntax:

Basilakes: ὅρα μοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸν δῆμον

Aphthonius: τὸν Δημοσθένους ὅρα μοι βίον<sup>609</sup>

Basilakes: δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς μηδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν (scil. μαρτυρίας) ἀποσχέσθαι

<sup>605</sup> Aphthonius 32-33.

<sup>606</sup> Aphthonius 34.

<sup>607</sup> Cf. Aphthonius 53: εἰ δέ.

<sup>608</sup> Cf. Aphthonius 59, 61-62: ὥσπερ γάρ ... τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ...

<sup>609</sup> Aphthonius 64.

Aphthonius: διὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν Ἡσίοδον δεῖ<sup>610</sup>

# TEXT AND TRANSLATION

The need to replace Walz's edition of the *progymnasmata* of Nikephoros Basilakes has long been felt,<sup>611</sup> but it was not until 1983 that Pignani published her new edition. This edition has much to commend it.<sup>612</sup> For example, it has a broader MS base, using sixteen MSS<sup>613</sup> in contrast to Walz's one, the fourteenth century MS Paris. gr. 2918.<sup>614</sup> Consequently, it is not surprising that this larger MS base has brought to light *progymnasmata* that are not included in Walz's collection. One of these MSS—the thirteenth/fourteenth century MS Vind. phil. gr. 321<sup>615</sup>—contains four *progymnasmata* not found in the MSS available to Walz. Pignani thus includes them—one διήγημα and three ἡθοποιαί—in her edition,<sup>616</sup> and, after inspecting all the

<sup>610</sup> Aphthonius 71. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 3 Rabe).

<sup>611</sup> For blanket criticism of Walz's edition of Basilakes, see Schissel, "Progymnasmatik," 5. For detailed discussion, see S. Peppink, "Ad Nicephorum Walzii vol. I," *Mnemosyne* n.s. 60 (1933) 409-22.

<sup>612</sup> For assessment of this edition, see esp. Wolfram Hörandner, "Zu den Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Basilakes: Bemerkungen zur kritischen Neuedition," *JÖB* 33 (1984) 73-88.

<sup>613</sup> For details on these MSS, see Adriana Pignani, "Prolegomeni all'edizione critica dei *Progimnasmata* di Niceforo Basilace," *BollClass* 26 (1978) 41-56, esp. 41-43.

<sup>614</sup> See Walz, *Rhetories Graeci*, 1.140, 422. Although Walz used only this MS, he nevertheless improved on the *editio princeps* of the *Progymnasmata* of Nikephoros Basilakes by Leo Allatius, whose *Excerpta Varia Graecorum Sophistarum et Rhetorum* (Rome, 1641) also used this one MS but edited only some of the *progymnasmata* included in it: five μῦθοι (pp. 125-36), fifteen διηγήματα (pp. 137-15), and seven ἡθοποιαί (pp. 176-220). Walz's edition simply adds those *progymnasmata* in this MS that Allatius left out: two χρεῖαι (1.442-49 Walz), one ἀνασκευή (1.449-54) and one κατασκευή (1.454-61), one γνώμη (1.461-66), and sixteen more ἡθοποιαί (1.466-508). Walz also knows of another MS, the late thirteenth/fourteenth century Barb. gr. 240 (formerly 392), that has these *progymnasmata* but knows it only through Jacob Leopardus' description (cf. 1.422).

<sup>615</sup> See Pignani, "Prolegomeni," 43.

<sup>616</sup> See Adriana Pignani, "Alcuni progimnasmata inediti di Niceforo Basilace," *RSBN* 8-9 (1971-1972) 295-315, esp. 301-8 (text). Cf. also Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 89-91.

MSS, she adds another four so that her edition has eight new *progymnasmata*: two μῦθοι, <sup>617</sup> one διήγημα, <sup>618</sup> four ἡθοιοίαι, <sup>619</sup> and the first example of an ἐγκώμιον. <sup>620</sup>

Despite the considerable increase in the number of MSS, it should be noted that the textual basis for the two chreia elaborations remains much the same. For the first elaboration (Text 32) we are still dependent on one MS. Pignani has, however, used the late thirteenth/fourteenth century MS Barb. gr. 240 (formerly 292) (= Ba) rather than Walz's Paris MS, for the latter is merely a copy of the former. <sup>621</sup>

For the second elaboration (Text 33) there are, besides Ba, two other MSS: Laur. XXXII.33 (early fourteenth century) (= L) and the above-mentioned Vind. phil. gr. 321 (= W). <sup>622</sup> Pignani assigns Ba to one family, L and W to another. <sup>623</sup>

We have accordingly used Pignani's edition as the basis of our text of the two chreia elaborations. We have placed the page numbers of her edition in parentheses in the text. In addition, we have reparagraphed her text, have added the Aphthonian section titles in parentheses at the appropriate places in the text, have indicated all changes in her text from that of Walz, and have proposed some changes of our own, all duly noted in the apparatus.

Finally, we have consulted Pignani's Italian translation and have used it on occasion. <sup>624</sup>

<sup>617</sup> The μῦθοι of the jackdaw and the eagle (p. 76 Pignani) and the lion and the wolf (p. 77).

<sup>618</sup> The διήγημα about Phaethon (pp. 81-82 Pignani).

<sup>619</sup> The ἡθοιοίαι concerning the Theotokos at the cross (pp. 169-80 Pignani), Herakles (pp. 197-99), a sailor (pp. 200-2), and Pasiphae (pp. 221-24).

<sup>620</sup> The ἐγκώμιον of a dog (pp. 133-38 Pignani).

<sup>621</sup> See Pignani, "Prolegomeni," 43, 47.

<sup>622</sup> See Pignani, "Prolegomeni," 42-43.

<sup>623</sup> See Pignani, "Prolegomeni," 47.

<sup>624</sup> For her translations of these elaborations, see Pignani, *Progimnasmata*, 283-88.

Text 32. Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(PP. 101, 1-103, 27 PIGNANI)

Χρεία λογική

Εὐεργετῶν νόμιζε μιμεῖσθαι Θεόν.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων μὲν πολλῶν ὁ πολὺς τὰ θεῖα καὶ μέγας Γρηγόριος ἐγνωρίζετο. 2. ἡ δὲ σοφία ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ ἐπίσημον, οὐ μόνον ἢ κάτω καὶ συρομένη καὶ στροφαῖς λέξεων καὶ λόγοις ἀποκρότοις κατακηλοῦσα τὰς ἀκοάς, ἀλλ' ὅση καὶ πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνάγει τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ψυχὴν καὶ τὸν κοσμοποιὸν ἐξαίρει Θεόν, καὶ τὸν ἄρρητον πλοῦτον τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀγαθότητος ἐκφαντορικῶς ἡμῖν παριστᾷ καὶ τὸ εὐσταλὲς καὶ κοῦφον καὶ εὐζωνον τῷ δεσπότῃ χαρίζεται νῶ, ὥς κατὰ τῆς σαρκὸς συμμαχοῦσα τῷ πνεύματι.

3. Ὅσα μὲν οὖν οὗτος περὶ τε φυσιολογίας πνευματικῶς περὶ τε δογματολογίαν οὐράνιον καὶ περὶ τὰ χωριστὰ τῆς ὕλης ἐπόνησε καὶ τὸ μέγα τῆς Τριάδος μυστήριον καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐν ἀνθρώποις τοῦ Σωτῆρος <σαρκώσεως> ἀπόρρητον τὸ ἀπ' αἰώνων καὶ γενεῶν κατὰ τὸν θεῖον κεκρυμμένον ἀπόστολον, τίς ἂν παραστήσαι λόγος ἐφίκοιτο; 4. ἀλλὰ γε πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον ἡμεῖς τὸν λόγον ἰθύνωμεν καὶ θεωρητέον, τί περὶ τῆς εὐποίας ἢ τοῦ πνεύματος σάλπιγξ ἐσάλπισεν ἢ πάντα περιηχοῦσα τὰ πέρατα· μέγα γάρ τι κέρδος ἐντεῦθεν ἐμπορευσόμεθα.

1 Καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων μὲν πολλῶν Walz Τῶν σοφωτάτων ψαλλόντων καὶ ἐξ ἄλλων μὲν πολλῶν Pignani 2 ἀνθρώπινην Pignani ἀνθρώπινον Walz || Θεόν addidit Pignani || ἄρρητον Walz ἄρρηκτον Pignani 3 φυσιολογίας πνευματικῶς Pignani φυσιολογίαν πνευματικὴν Walz || num σαρκώσεως addiatur

Text 32. Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION I  
(PP. 101, 1–103, 27 PIGNANI)

## A sayings-chreia

In doing good believe you're imitating God.<sup>625</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [heading]> Even among the many other “greats” Gregory was known as the Great and Mighty one in matters divine. 2. His wisdom was his distinguishing attribute, not only worldly wisdom which attracts and charms listeners with turns of phrase and sonorous words, but all wisdom that lifts up to heaven the human soul and exalts the Creator, a wisdom that clearly presents to us the untold wealth of His goodness and graciously gives this light, quick, and nimble<sup>626</sup> element to the mind, its master, as though this wisdom were fighting with the spirit against the flesh.

3. Therefore, all that Gregory wrote on spiritual investigations, on the explanation of heavenly doctrine, on the speculation of the material world—the great mystery of the Trinity and the secret of the Savior's <incarnation> among men “which has been kept hidden throughout the ages and the generations” according to the Divine Apostle<sup>627</sup>—what treatise could ever succeed in presenting them? 4. Still, let us direct our discussion to the saying under consideration. And so one must investigate what the trumpet of the Spirit has trumpeted about beneficence as it echoes in every corner because we will derive a great profit from it.

<sup>625</sup> This saying is left unattributed, which is contrary to the definition of a chreia, although the *πρόσωπον* is identified immediately in the *ἐγκωμιαστικὸν κεφάλαιον* (see 1). Probably, Nikephoros simply lifted the saying from the alphabetic acrostic of sayings by Gregory (see *PG* 37.908A–909A); this saying, which begins with the letter E, thus comes fifth in the series and is not specifically attributed to Gregory (see *PG* 37.909A). For this sentiment attributed to various philosophers and orators, see further *Chreia* 1.323.

<sup>626</sup> Pignani suspects here an allusion to Basil, *Hom.* 22 (*PG* 31.188B): ὥσπερ γὰρ ἡ τρυφή ἀχθοφορεῖν αὐτοὺς ἀναγκάζει τὰς ἀπολαύσεις περικομίζοντας οὕτω κούφους αὐτοὺς καὶ εὐζώνους ἡ νηστεία παρασκευάζει.

<sup>627</sup> The Divine Apostle is Paul. See esp. Col 1:26: τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον ἀπὸ τῶν αἰώνων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γενεῶν (cf. also Eph 3:9–10).

(p. 102) 5. <Παραφραστικόν> Ὁ τῶν καταδεεστέρων, φησίν, ἐπιστρεφόμενος καὶ εὖ ποιῶν κατὰ διηνέκειαν μιμεῖται τὸν ἀπάντων δεσπόζοντα. 6. καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῆς θεηγόρου γλώττης τὰ ῥήματα, ὅτι δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν ἱαμβοκρότοις λόγοις ταῦτα εἴρηκεν, ἡ τῶν λόγων ἀνάπτυξις τε καὶ μεταχείρισις τρανώσει σαφέστατα·

7. <Αἰτία> Πάντα γὰρ ὁ δημιουργὸς πρὸς εὐεργεσίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων παρήγαγεν· ἥλιον πηγὴν τοῦ τῆδε φωτὸς ἡρέμα πως τῷ ἄερί κεραννύμενον καὶ προσηνώς τοῖς ὄμμασι προσεμπίπτοντα, εἴτε ταῖς αὐγαῖς τοῦ πυρὸς καταπυρσεύσαντα τὸ περίγειον· γῆν χλοηφόρον μυρίοις περιπυκαζομένην τοῖς ἄνθεσι καὶ καρποφόροις δένδροις <καὶ> βλαστάνουσιν μυρία ζῶα ἐκ θαλάσσης, ἐξ ἀέρος, ἐκ γῆς· πηγάς ναούσας γλυκερὰ καὶ διειδέστατα νάματα.

8. Ὁ γοῦν πρὸς τοσαύτας καὶ τηλικαύτας εὐεργεσίας τῆς πηγαιῆς χρηστότητος ἀφορῶν, καὶ ἑαυτὸν πάντα προίεμενος καὶ ἐν ὑψηλῷ καὶ μεγάλῳ κηρύγματι προκαλούμενος, Δεῦτε πάντες ἐμὸν ἄρτον φάγετε καὶ πίετε οἶνον, ὃν ὑμῖν κεκέρακα. ἀπολαύσατε τῶν ἐμῶν, ἢ μᾶλλον εἰπεῖν, τοῦ Θεοῦ δωρεῶν, ἀργύρου, χρυσοῦ, μαργάρων, διαυγῶν λίθων πολυτελῶν, περιβλημάτων λαμπρῶν, οὐδὲν ἐμοί, λέγων, ἥδιστον, εἰ μὴ καὶ πρὸς κοινὴν ἀπόλαυσιν καὶ μετάληψιν πρόκειται· οὐ γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἐτέρων ζωῆς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτὸς προτίθεμαι—ἄγαλμα τοῦ Θεοῦ περικαλλὲς ἑαυτὸν περὶ τὸν χθόνιον τοῦτον χῶρον εἰργάσατο καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ παρηγμένος τῆς μὲν κατ' αὐτὸν οὐσίας δίσταται, ἀπομιμεῖται δ' ὡς ἐφικτὸν κατὰ γε τὸ ἐπιστρεπτικὸν καὶ προνοητικὸν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, ἅτε πᾶσι τὰ πρὸς χρεῖαν φιλοτιμούμενος, δοτὴρ ἀγαθῶν καὶ αὐτὸς μετὰ Θεὸν καὶ ὦν καὶ θρυλούμενος πανταχοῦ.

9. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐνάντιου> Ὁ δὲ συνέχων καὶ κατορύττων τὰ κάτω μένοντα καὶ ἄνθεσιν ἴσα ῥέοντα καὶ μὴ δεδυνημένα πρὸς ἑτέραν λήξιν ἡμῖν ἐντεῦθεν χωροῦσιν ἐφέπεσθαι, τὸ κοινὸν ἀπαναινόμενος ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ φύσει κοινωνικόν, μὴ τῆς τῶν ὁμοφυῶν (p. 103) ἀπορίας ἐπιστρεφόμενος, μὴ τῆς τάλαιπωρίας τῶν ὁμογενῶν προμηθεύμενος, μόνης δὲ τῆς σφετέρας ἐξεχόμενος ἀπολαύσεως, ἐκτρέχων τοῦ, πρὸς ὃν ἀφορᾷ ἐπετράπημεν, ὡς εἰς προχάραγμά τι καὶ προκέντημα, ἀποδιίσταται τῆς ὑπερβαλούσης τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλάνθρωπίας καὶ ἀγαθότητος. 10. ἐγγίζει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἐγγίζουσι καὶ τῶν διίσταμένων ἀφέστηκεν.

6 μεταχείρισις Pignani μεταχείρησις Walz 7 πως Walz; cf. Hörandner, "Progymnasmata," 88 n. 10 πῶς Pignani καταπυρσεύσαντα scripsimus καταπυρσευούσαν Walz et Pignani || καί addidimus 9 κοινωνικόν Pignani κοινωνόν Walz || προμηθεύμενος Pignani προθυόμενος Walz ἀφορᾷ Pignani ἀφοραῖν Walz || ὡς Pignani καί Walz



5. <Paraphrastic [heading]> The man who pays attention, he says, to those who are in need and who continually does good deeds imitates the One who is Lord of all. 6. And so these are the words of a language inspired by God, but that Gregory has expressed these thoughts precisely and in iambic meter the explanation and evaluation of these words will make very clear.

7. <Rationale> For the Creator has provided everything for the benefit of mankind: the sun, the source of light here on earth, which is rather gently tempered by the air and falls softly on the eyes or with the rays of its fire lights up the world; the verdant earth which is thickly grown with countless flowers and fruit-bearing trees and which causes countless creatures of the sea, air, and earth to grow; and streams pouring forth sweet, clear water.

8. The man, therefore, who observes such great and varied benefits of this fundamental goodness, who gives of himself completely, who makes his invitation in a lofty and stately proclamation, saying: "Come here, everyone! Eat my bread, drink the wine which I have mixed for you, enjoy my gifts—or, rather, the gifts of God: silver, gold, pearls, gleaming gems of great value, bright raiment. Nothing is very pleasant for me unless these objects are also set out for everyone's enjoyment and use. For I am not one who puts my own life before that of others"—this man has made himself into a very beautiful image of God in this earthly realm and, although he is created by Him, he does not share His nature, yet he imitates Him as much as possible in attentiveness, providence, and generosity, inasmuch as he provides generously for the needs of all and is, second only to God, a giver of benefits and is everywhere acknowledged to be.

9. <From the Opposite> The man, however, who holds on to and buries the things that belong to this world, things which fade like blossoms and cannot accompany us as we depart from here to the other world; who disavows the common good and natural sociability; who shows no regard for the hardship of his fellows; who does not care about the hardship of his own family; but who is attentive only to his own enjoyment and who runs away from the One whom we are commanded to look upon as a pattern and outline—this man is separated from the surpassing love and goodness of God. 10. For God is near to those who are near to Him and withdraws from those who are separated from Him.

11. <Παραβολή> Ὅρα μοι τὸν φυτουργὸν τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἔργον ἀπομιμούμενον· ἐκείνη, διὰ φλεβῶν ὡς διὰ τινων σωλήνων πρὸς τὰ τοῦ σώματος μόρια τὸ αἷμα διαπορθεύουσα, τρέφει, ζωογονεῖ, συνιστᾷ· 12. οὗτος, διὰ τινων συχνῶν ὀχετῶν τὸ ὕδωρ πρὸς τὰς ἀμάρας ὀχετηγῶν, ποτίζει καὶ αὔξει καὶ τὰ βλαστήματα γόνιμα δείκνυσιν. 13. ὡς οὖν οὗτος τὴν ἐπιτροπεύουσαν φύσιν ἀπομιμεῖται, τῆς τῶν φυτῶν ἀρδείας ἐπιμελόμενος, τῆς τῶν δένδρων προνοίας κηδόμενος, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος, τὸ ἐπιστρεπτικὸν καὶ προνοητικὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ παραζηλῶν καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, μιμεῖται τὸν πάσης ὑπεριδρυμένον ὄνότητος.

14. <Παράδειγμα> Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰωσήφ καὶ οἱ φαιδροὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας φωστήρες ἱκανοὶ τῷ λόγῳ πρὸς ἔνδειξιν, τοσοῦτον φιλοξενίας καὶ πτωχοτροφίας φροντίσαντες, ὡς οὐδενὸς ἑτέρου τῶν ἀγαθῶν.

15. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφώτατος Σολομὼν καὶ Δαβὶδ, ὁ προφήτης ἅμα καὶ βασιλεὺς, μακαριστὸν ἡγοῦνται καὶ ἔργον Θεοῦ ἐργαζόμενον τὸν εὖ ποιεῖν προελόμενον καὶ τὸν ἱλαρὸν δότην καὶ μὴ ἀνώμαλον βλέποντα.

16. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Διὰ ταῦτα καὶ ὁ θεοφόρος οὗτος πατήρ τὸ σοφὸν τοῦτο καὶ συνέσεως πληρὲς ὑψηγόρησε λόγιον.

11. <Analogy> Consider, if you will, the gardener who imitates the action of Nature. She, by transmitting the blood through the vessels to the parts of the body as though through pipes, gives nourishment, provides life, and sustains it. 12. The gardener, by conducting water through some long waterpipes to the ditches, irrigates, promotes growth, and has fruitful sprouts to show for it. 13. Therefore, just as the gardener imitates guardian Nature by attending to the irrigation of plants, by showing forethought for the trees, so also the benefactor, by emulating the attentiveness, providence, and benevolence of God, imitates the One who transcends all reality.

14. <Example> Abraham, Joseph, and the bright luminaries of the Church are sufficient proof of this saying, since they were so concerned with hospitality and the care of the poor that they had no concern for any other benefit.<sup>628</sup>

15. <Testimony of the Ancients> What is more, both the very wise Solomon and David (who was prophet and king together) consider the person as most blessed and as doing God's work who makes up his mind to do good and who shows himself to be a cheerful and not inconsistent giver.<sup>629</sup>

16. <Brief Epilogue> For these reasons this inspired Father sublimely expressed this saying which is wise and full of understanding.

<sup>628</sup> For Abraham's hospitality to strangers, see esp. Gen 18:1-8, which was later cited by Christians (see, e.g., 1 Clem. 10:7); for Joseph's provision for the hungry during the seven years of famine, see Gen 41:1-57, esp. 53-57.

<sup>629</sup> Basilakes is clearly citing a specific proverb of Solomon, i.e., Prov 22:8a LXX: ἄνδρα ἱλαρόν καὶ δότην εὐλογεῖ ὁ θεός, quoted loosely by Paul in 2 Cor 9:7: ἱλαρόν γὰρ δότην ἀγαπᾷ ὁ θεός. It is less clear which psalm of David is being referred to, although Ps 33:15 LXX contains the words ποιήσων ἀγαθόν (cf. also v. 8 which has the word μακάριος).

Text 33. Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(PP. 104, 1-109, 22 PIGNANI)

Χρεία λογική

Χάρις χάριν γάρ ἐστιν ἢ τίκτουσ' αἰεί.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Σοφοκλῆν ἐπαινέσαι προάγομαι, οἷς τοῦ μέτρου τὴν χάριν ἐτήρησε καὶ γνωμολογεῖν οὐκ ἀπέλιπε. 2. μοιχείας μὲν γὰρ καὶ γυναικῶν ἀρπαγὰς καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἐκ τοῦ μύθου φλυαρίαν ἀπέπτυσε, πρὸς μόνον δὲ τῆς ποιητικῆς εἶδε τὸ χρησιμώτατον καί, γλῶτταν ἀσκῶν εἰς εὐσέβειαν, οὐ κατεπαίρεται θεῶν, οὐκ ἐτραχηλίζει τὴν νεότητα πρὸς ἀσέλγειαν.

3. Ἀλλὰ τῶν ἄλλων μυθολογούντων, αὐτός, τὸ τοῦ μύθου περιττὸν ἀποσκευασάμενος, διέξεισι μὲν, εἰ τύχοι, μοιχείαν Αἰγίσθου καὶ σφαγὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος. 4. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀφῆκε τὸ κακὸν ἀτιμώρητον, ἀλλ' εὐθύς ἐπὶ σκηνῆς Ὀρέστης εἰσάγεται καὶ πίπτει μετὰ μοιχείαν Αἰγισθος, καὶ ὁ θεατὴς ὁρᾷ τὸ ξίφος ἐπανατεινόμενον τοῖς μοιχοῖς καὶ τὸ κακουργεῖν οὐκ ἐθάρρησε.

5. Σωφρονίζει παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ μαινόμενος Αἴας τοὺς ὁμόφυλον ἐπὶ ψυχῆς μάχην ὠδίνοντας, ἔχει τι παραμύθιον παρ' αὐτῷ καὶ δυστυχῶν ἄνθρωπος, κἂν ἴδῃ τὴν Ἠλέκτραν πενθοῦσαν, οὐ μόνος πενθεῖν ὑπολήφεται, οὐδ' ἔξω φύσεως νομιεῖται τὴν συμφορὰν. 6. Ὀρέστου δ'

Inscriptio Χρεία λογική Ba Χρεία Walz τοῦ αὐτοῦ γνώμη W || 2 μοιχείας Pignani μοιχείαν Walz || ἀρπαγὰς Pignani ἀρπαγὴν Walz 3 μοιχείαν Pignani μοιχείας Walz 4 τὸ κακόν Pignani τὸν κακόν Walz || σκηνῆς Pignani σκηνήν Walz || μοιχείαν scripsimus μοιχείας codices unde Walz et Pignani || τοῖς μοιχοῖς Pignani ταῖς μοιχείαις Walz 5 παρ' αὐτῷ Pignani παρ' αὐτοῦ Walz || μόνος Pignani μόνον Walz

Text 33. Nikephoros Basilakes, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION 2  
(PP. 104, 1-109, 22 PIGNANI)

A sayings-chreia:

“It’s kindness that ever gives birth to kindness.”<sup>630</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [heading]> I am moved to praise Sophocles because he kept the charm of verse and did not neglect to give moral instruction. 2. For he rejected the adulteries, the abductions of women, and all the other foolishness that comes from myth; he kept his eye on only what is the most useful part of poetry. And so, by using his language to foster piety, he is not arrogant toward the gods, nor does he ruin youth by sensuality.

3. Rather, while other poets recount mythic tales, he alone gets rid of the superfluous details of myth and treats, for example, the adultery of Aegisthous and the murder of Agamemnon, but he does not allow their wickedness to go unpunished. 4. Instead, Orestes is immediately brought on stage,<sup>631</sup> and Aegisthous falls as a consequence of the adultery, and the spectator sees the sword brandished threateningly at the adulterers.<sup>632</sup> And so, Sophocles has not encouraged evil living.

5. In Sophocles even the maddened Ajax teaches self-control to those who anguish over the same sort of struggle in their soul, and the man who is unfortunate has some consolation in Sophocles: should he see Electra mourning, he will realize that he is not the only one who is mourning, nor will he consider his misfortune beyond the bounds of nature. 6. But when Orestes returns, her

<sup>630</sup> On this chreia, whose saying comes from Sophocles, *Ajax* 522, see further *Chreia* 1.338.

<sup>631</sup> The play opens with Orestes and Pylades in conversation, but their appearance is, of course, many years after the assassination of Agamemnon and the adulterous affair between Aegisthous and Clytemnestra.

<sup>632</sup> For the scenes where Aegisthous and Clytemnestra are threatened, see *Electra* 1402ff and 1458ff. There is, however, no specific mention of a brandished sword. Basilakes may, of course, be speaking figuratively. Certainly there is no killing in view, here or in any tragedy, for violence on stage was not permitted in the Athenian theatre.

ἐπανήκοντος, κἀκείνη τὰ τοῦ πένθους οἰχήσεται καὶ θεατῆς δυστυχῶν οὐκ ἀτελεύτητον γνώσεται τὸ κακόν.

7. Οὕτως ἐγὼ τὴν Σοφοκλέους τραγωδίαν καὶ δῆμιον ἔννομον τίθεται καὶ τύχης ἀγνωμονούσης ὀρίζομαι παραμύθιον. 8. καὶ μοι δοκεῖ λέγειν ὥς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς·

Πενθεῖς ; ἔλπιζέ ποτε καὶ χαίρήσιν, ὅτι καὶ Ἥλέκτρα μετεβεβλήκει τὸ δάκρυον. πλουτεῖς καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ (p. 105) μέγα φρονεῖς ; μὴ θάρρει·

τὰ τῆς τύχης μένειν οὐκ οἶδε ρεύματα,  
ἀλλ' οἴχεται θάττον καὶ μεταρρεῖ.

9. Καὶ σωφρονιζέτω σε μετὰ βασιλείαν ἐκπίπτων ἀλήτης Οἰδίου. 10. ἀλλ' ἐπιμαίνῃ τῷ κάλλει καὶ συγχέεις γονὴν καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς μοιχείας καταφέρει κακόν, ὅρα μοι τὸν Ὀρέστην μετὰ τοῦ ξίφους καὶ μητρὸς οὐ φεισάμενον.

11. Τοιαῦτα τὴν Ἀθηναίων πόλιν ὁ καλὸς οὗτος ποιητῆς ἐσωφρόνιζεν· ἡλικὸν μὲν τὸ πάθος ἐπὶ σκηνῆς ἐχορήγησεν. ὅσον δὲ τὸ ἦθος μετὰ γνωμολογίας τοῖς δράμασιν ἐγκατέμιξε. καὶ τὸ τῆς ἐπωνυμίας σοφὸν ἔργοις αὐτοῖς ἐβεβαίωσε, τοῦτο τοῖς περὶ τραγωδίας γενόμενος, ὁ τοῖς περὶ ποίησιν Ὅμηρος. 12. ἀλλ' ὅσῳ τοὺς ὁμοτέχνους τῷ περιόντι τῆς σοφίας αὐτὸς ἀπεκρύψατο, τοσούτῳ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐκείνου γνωμῶν τὸ περὶ χάριτος γνωμολογηθὲν χαριέστατον.

6 πένθους Pignani πάθους Walz 9 βασιλείαν Pignani βασιλέα Walz 10 καταφέρει Pignani καταφέρει Walz 11 μετὰ γνωμολογίας τοῖς δράμασιν Pignani τοῖς δράμασιν μετὰ γνωμολογίας Walz || ἐπωνυμίας Pignani γνώμης Walz || τραγωδίας Pignani τραγωδίαν Walz

mourning will go away, and the spectator who is unfortunate will realize that his plight is not without end.

7. Thus I regard and treat the tragedy of Sophocles both as a legitimate public executioner<sup>633</sup> and as consolation for adverse fortune. 8. He seems to me to be speaking as though from the stage:

“Are you mourning? Hope that some day you will also rejoice because Electra too has put aside her weeping. Are you wealthy and for this reason conceited? Don’t be over-confident;

The flow of Fortune knows not how to stay,  
But quickly does it leave and change its course.<sup>634</sup>

9. Also, let the wanderer Oedipus,<sup>635</sup> an exile after his reign, teach you self-control. 10. Well, are you obsessed with beauty, do you break up a family, and are you prone to the evil of adultery? Consider, if you will, Orestes with his sword, not sparing even his mother.”

11. Such lessons in self-control this noble poet taught Athens. How profound the emotions he presented on stage! How much character he mixed with moral instruction in his dramas! And so he confirmed the “wise” part of his name [*Sophocles*] by the works themselves, in this way becoming among tragedians what Homer is among poets. 12. Yet, by as much as Sophocles overshadows his fellow playwrights by the superiority of his wisdom, by so much is what he taught about kindness the most charming of his maxims.

<sup>633</sup> It is not clear whether to render *δήμιος* (sc. *δοῦλος*) as a public physician or as public executioner, both of which are possible (see LSJ s.v.). We have decided on the latter, for Basilakes seems to be saying that Sophocles’ tragedies functioned as executioner for the immoral and as consolation for the unfortunate. For the former, of tragedy as a public physician of failing morals, see Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.100.

<sup>634</sup> These lines may be from a lost play of Sophocles. Indeed, they would be pointless otherwise, for Basilakes has placed them in the mouth of the tragic poet himself. The sentiment of these lines, however, is fairly common (see, e.g., Menander, *Geor. frag.* 2, line 5: τὸ τῆς τύχης γὰρ ῥεῦμα μεταπίπτει τὰ χύ (= Stobaeus, *Flor.* 4.41.28 [p. 936 Hense])).

<sup>635</sup> For the use of *ἀλγῆτης* for Oedipus, see Sophocles, *Oed. Col.* 50, 746, 1096.

13. <Παραφραστικόν> Ἐκ τοῦ καλῶς, φησί, δρᾶν τὸ καλῶς παθεῖν περιγίνεται καὶ πάνθ', ὅποσα μήτηρ παιδί, καὶ χάρις ἀντὶ χάριτος γίνεται.

14. <Αἰτία> Πρῶτον μὲν τὸν ποιητὴν ἐπαινῶ, οἷς καλῶς τὴν ἀνθρωπεῖαν φύσιν ἐσκέψατο καὶ ὡς χαρίζεσθαι πεφύκαμεν ἄνθρωποι μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν καὶ <εὔ> δρῶμεν εὔ παθόντες. 15. ἔπειτα καὶ τοὺς ἀγεννεστέρους τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέσκωψεν, εἰ στείραν οὕτως ἔχει τις τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς τὸ τῆς χάριτος (p. 106) σπέρμα λαβοῦσαν μὴ τὸν τῆς εὐγνωμοσύνης ἀντιδοῦναι καρπὸν.

16. Εἰ δὲ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων μαρτυρίαν προσεπιθήημεν, πολὺ δικαιότερον τῆς γνώμης τὸν ποιητὴν θαυμασόμεθα. 17. τίς οὖν ἡ περὶ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιβεβαίωσις; 18. οὐ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρχῆθεν ἐφεύρηται, ἀλλ' ἕτερα μὲν Ἑλλήνων σοφίσματα, ἕτερα δὲ Φοινίκων ἐπίνοιαι καὶ Περσῶν ἄλλα τεχνήματα· ἔχουσί τι καὶ Θρᾷκες οὐπω τοῖς ἄλλοις ἑλθὼν εἰς εὐρεσιν ἐπιδείξασθαι. 19. καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ὡς ἕκαστα διηρημένα τοῖς γένεσι καὶ ταῖς ἐπινοίαις διήρηνται.

20. Ἄλλ' ἦκεν ἡ χάρις κοινωνικόν τι χρῆμα καὶ φίλιον καί, τὸ θηριῶδες ἐξελοῦσα τῆς γνώμης, πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρωπικώτερον μετερρύθμισε καὶ νῦν παρὰ τοῦτο τῶν θηρίων διενηνόχαμεν ἄνθρωποι. 21. ἐκεῖθεν ἡμῖν ἦλθε καὶ τὸ συναγελαστικόν, ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τὸ τῆς φιλίας ἔχομεν ὄνομα καὶ τὸ τὴν ἔνδειαν ἀναπληροῦν οὐκ ἄλλοθεν ἡμῖν προσεγένετο. ἔχει μὲν Ἰνδός, εἰ τύχοι, ἐλέφαντας, ὅπλα δὲ Λήμνιοι, γράμματα Φοίνικες, οἱ δ' ἔξ Ἀθηνῶν ἵππους ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἀγαγεῖν ἐσοφίσαντο, ἀλλὰ πρὶν ἦκειν τὴν χάριν, οἷς οὐκ εἶχον, πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν ἐλείποντο.

14 εὔ scripsimus; cf. Sophocles, *Philoc.* 672 15 ἀντιδοῦναι Pignani ἀντιδιδόναι Ba unde Walz ἀποδοῦναι L 18 ἕτερα Walz ἐτέραι Pignani 21 εἰ τύχοι Pignani εἰ τύχη Walz || Λήμνιοι Pignani Λήμνιος Walz



13. <Paraphrastic [heading]> The result of doing good, he says, is receiving good. And all that a mother is to a child is kindness in return for kindness.

14. <Rationale> First, I commend the poet because he has given a good analysis of human nature and has shown how we humans naturally show kindness after receiving it; and how we do good after experiencing it.<sup>636</sup> 15. Then, too, he has examined the more ignoble of humanity to see if anyone possesses a soul so barren that, after receiving the seed of kindness, it does not give in return the fruit of its gratitude.

16. If we should add the further testimony from deeds, much more justly will we admire the poet for his maxim. 17. What, then, is the confirmation of the deeds? 18. Not everything has been invented from the beginning by everyone, but some inventions come from the ingenuity of the Greeks, others from the inventiveness of the Phoenicians, and still others from the skills of the Persians; even the Thracians have something to show which has not been invented by others. 19. And so, just as individual nations have been classified by their race, so too they have been classified by their inventiveness.

20. Kindness, moreover, comes as something which is sociable and friendly, and so, after expelling the bestial element from thought, kindness has transformed it into something more human. And now because of this transformation we humans are different from the beasts. 21. From kindness, too, has come our instinct to be gregarious and from it we have a reputation for friendship, and from no other source does the fulfillment of what we lack result: an Indian, for example, has elephants, Lemnians weapons,<sup>637</sup> Phoenicians writing, whereas those from Athens had the skill to put horses under the yoke;<sup>638</sup> still, before kindness came they lacked prosperity because of what they did not have.

<sup>636</sup> See Sophocles, *Philoc.* 672. Cf. Thucydides, 2.40.4.

<sup>637</sup> We have found no reference to the Lemnians having a reputation for making weapons, although in mythology Hephaestus, the smithy of the gods and maker of weapons, is closely associated with Lemnos (see Burkert, *Greek Religion*, 167-68).

<sup>638</sup> For the phrase ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἀγαγεῖν, see *Il.* 5.731. Incidentally, the association of Athens with horsemanship is surprising, an accomplishment associated more with the Trojans.

22. Ἄλλ' ἔγνωσαν ὅστις ὁ τρόπος τῆς χάριτος καὶ οὔτε τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀπεστέρηντο καὶ τὰ παρ' ἑτέροις ἐλάμβανον· 23. τεκτονεύειν τις εἰδώς, ἐδεῖτο μὲν τροφῆς τῆς [ἡμέρου ταύτης τῆς] ἀπὸ σίτου, τῆς ἐκ σπερμάτων καί, πηξάμενος ἄμαξαν, ἀπεδίδου τῷ περὶ γεωργίαν ἔχοντι καὶ σῖτον τῆς τέχνης ἀντεκομίζετο. 24. ἵππεύειν τις τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπεβάλετο καὶ τὴν ἵππικὴν οὐκ ἦν ἐπιδείξασθαι, μὴ παρὰ τοῦ τὰ πρὸς ἵππικὴν ξυνεργὰ κομισάμενος· ἐντεῦθεν εἶχε, τὸν χαλκὸν (p. 107) καταβαλὼν αὐτὸς πρότερον, ὅτου καὶ προσεδέησε.

25. Πλουτεῖς καὶ δεῖ σοι λαμπροτέρας οἰκίας; κατάβαλέ τι τῶν χρημάτων τοῖς οἰκοδόμοις καὶ προσευδαιμονίσεις καὶ τοῦτο τὸ μέρος. περιπλούσιος ὢν ἐθέλεις ἔχειν καὶ θάλατταν; ὁ ναυπηγὸς ἀντιδώσει σοι τὸ ποθοῦμενον, εἰ πρότερον αὐτὸς παρὰ σοῦ λήφεται.

26. Οὐτῶ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἡ χάρις ἐκυφόρησε τὴν ἀντίχαριν καὶ νῦν ἔτι τῆς καλῆς ταύτης κυοφορίας οὐ παύεται—τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἀγῆρως ἡ φύσις οὐδὲν ἤττον ἢ περὶ γένεσιν—οὐ δέχεται παρακμὴν τὰ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως, ἀλλ' ὅλας πόλεις ὁσημέραι γεννᾷ, 27. πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ περιπλεῖ θάλασσαν, πᾶσαν δ' ἐπέρχεται γῆν καὶ παρὰ μέρος ἐστίν, οὐ πολλὰκίς ἐκλείπουσα. τὸ παντελὲς οὐκ ἐξέλιπεν· ἀμβλώσκει μὲν γὰρ ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ χάρις καὶ τὸ βρέφος τὴν ἀντίχαριν οὐκ ἀρτίτοκον ἀποδίδωσιν, ἀλλὰ ψυχῆς ἀγόνου ταῦτα καὶ κύειν οὐκ εἰδυίας χάριν ἐστίν. 28. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤδη τὸ τῆς χάριτος ἄνθος ἀπέρρευσε, ὅτι καὶ φύσις περὶ μὲν τὴνδε ἢ τήνδε τῶν γυναικῶν οὐκ εὐστοχεῖ τὴν γένεσιν, ἐφ' ἑτέρας δὲ τὸ γεννητικὸν ἄρτιον ἐφυλάξατο. 29. ὅσοις μὲν οὖν ἡ χάρις ξυνέστιος καὶ τὰ τῆς χάριτος οὐκ ἀμβλώσκειται—ἢ καὶ τὸ σπέρμα μὴ πρὸς ἄκανθαν μετατέτραπται—, τούτοις δὴ κουροτρόφος εἰρήνην περιχορεύει τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὸ τοῦ μίσους δεινὸν ἐξωστράκισται καὶ τὰ τῆς ἀπεχθείας ἀπέωσται.

30. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Ἐφ' ὅσαις δὲ τῶν πόλεων μὴ τὰ τῆς χάριτος γόνιμα, ὅσος μὲν ὁ φθόνος ὑφέρει. ὅση δὲ ἡ ἀπέχθεια ἤδη καὶ πρὸς μάχην ἀνάπτεται. καὶ ὁ τῶν πόλεων ἀνδραποδισμός, μὴ τικτούσης τῆς χάριτος, ἂν ἔχοι τὴν γένεσιν. 31. ἀλλ' οὐδέ, μάχης ἡκούσης,

22 παρ' αὐτοῖς Pignani παρ' αὐτῆς Walz 23 ἡμέρου ταύτης τῆς omisimus 24 ἐπεβάλετο Pignani ἐπεβάλλετο Ba unde Walz et L 25 περιπλούσιος ὢν scripsimus περιπλέων Pignani περίπλεων Walz περὶ πλοῖον L W || σοι omisit Ba unde Walz 27 γὰρ omiserunt Ba unde Walz et W 28 γεννητικὸν Pignani γεννητὸν Walz 29 ξυνέστιος Pignani ξύνεστι Walz

22. But they came to know what the character of kindness is and so they were not deprived of their own possessions but in fact acquired the possessions of others. 23. Someone with a carpenter's skill was in need of grain [i.e., food that comes from grain, from seeds], and so he built a wagon and gave it to the one whose occupation is farming and so carried off the grain in exchange for his skill. 24. Someone attempted at first to ride a horse but was unable to demonstrate his horsemanship because he had not acquired from anyone the equipment for horseback riding. Then, after first spending his money, he had whatever more he needed.

25. Are you wealthy and do you need a more magnificent house for yourself? Spend some of your money on builders, and you will count yourself prosperous in this respect as well. Since you are very rich, do you want to possess even the sea? The shipwright will give you what you want if he first receives money from you.

26. In this way kindness at first became pregnant with a kindness-in-return, and even now it does not cease from this noble pregnancy; in this respect the nature of kindness is no less youthful than it was at birth: the spirit of giving-in-return does not admit decay, but it daily creates whole cities. 27. For kindness sails around every sea, it visits every land, and so it is in turn seldom deficient and it never fails to appear. For even kindness sometimes miscarries and the infant, when it is new-born, does not pay back the kindness. But this situation belongs to a sterile soul which does not know how to conceive a kindness. 28. But the bloom of kindness has not faded away because even Nature does not succeed in this or that woman's childbirth, while for others it has kept the generative power intact. 29. For everyone, therefore, in whom kindness resides and the spirit of kindness does not miscarry—or the seed has not turned into a thorn—child-nurturing peace<sup>639</sup> dances around the cities, the dread of hatred is banished, and the spirit of enmity is driven out.

30. <From the Opposite> But in each city where the spirit of kindness is not productive, how much envy slips in! How much enmity there is already and is flaring up into battle! And so the enslavement of these cities, if kindness did not give birth, would have its genesis. 31. But not even when the battle begins has

<sup>639</sup> For this phrase, see Euripides, *Bacc.* 419-20.

εἰς τὸ παντελὲς ἐπιλέλοιπεν, ἀλλὰ, πρὸς μὲν (p. 108) τοὺς πολεμίους οὐδ' ἂν ἵχνος ἴδοι τις χάριτος, τὰ δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ξυνδεῖ μὲν εἰς ὁμόνοιαν, ἐπεγείρει δὲ εἰς συμμαχίαν καὶ στρατηγὸς ἄγει τὸ στράτευμα, μισθῶ τοὺς στρατιώτας εἰς ἀντίχαριν ἐπαγόμενος. 32. τὰ δ' ὅπλα πόθεν ἔχουσιν οἱ στρατευόμενοι; οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ὅσοι περὶ τὴν ὀπλοποιητικὴν ἐσπουδάκασι, πρότερον αὐτοὶ καταβαλλόμενοι χρήματα; τοῦτο δὲ τί ἂν εἴη ἕτερον ἢ πάντως ἀντίχαρις; καὶ σύ, ὦ παῖ, εἰ μὴ πρότερον πόνους ἀντιδοίης πολλούς, οὐκ ἂν ποτε τὸ τῶν λόγων χρῆμα κερδήσεις.

33. Τί δεῖ με πολὺν τὸν ἔξω τοῦ λόγου κύκλον ποιεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀφ' ἐστίας ἐπιχειρεῖν ἀπὸ γε τῆς φύσεως; 34. εἰ γὰρ μὴ πρότερον ἢ φύσις τὸ σπέρμα λήψεται, οὐκ ἂν ἀποδοίη βοῦν ἢ ἵππον ἢ ἄλλο τι τῶν <ζώων> ὥς ἕκαστα. 35. εἰ γὰρ μὴ χάρις χάριν ἔτικτεν, οὐδ' ἂν πόλεμον διεδέχετο πόλεμος, οὐδ' ὕβρις ὕβριν μετήρχετο, ἀλλ' εἶχεν ἂν τις ἐκ τῶν ἐναντίων τάναντία καρπούμενος.

36. <Παραβολή> Ὡς γὰρ ὁ σῖτος σῖτον οἶδε γεννᾶν καὶ ἵππος ἵππον καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἄνθρωπον, οὕτω καὶ χάρις ἀντίχαριν.

37. <Παράδειγμα> Ὅρα μοι τῶν Ἀθηναίων τὸν δῆμον, τὸν πλεῖστα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἰσχύσαντα. ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐνέδει τροφῆς καὶ λιμὸς τὴν Ἀττικὴν ἐπεβόσκετο, πρὸς Αἰγυπτίους ἀπῆρσαν καὶ κοιμισάμενοι σῖτον κατὰ Περσῶν συμμαχίαν συνέθεντο, καὶ Πλαταιεῦσι τῆς ἐπὶ Μαραθῶνος

31 εἰς Pignani πρὸς Walz || στρατηγός Pignani στρατιώτης Walz || ἄγει omisit Ba unde Walz 32 ἔχουσιν Pignani ἔσχον Walz 34 ζώων inseruit Pignani 37 ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἐνέδει Pignani ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐνδεια Walz || σῖτον Pignani τοῦτον Walz

kindness failed completely. On the contrary, toward enemies one might not see even a trace of kindness, but the cities' mutual interests bind them in harmony and urge them into an alliance, and so the general leads his army and will pay back his soldiers as a kindness-in-return. 32. Where do those who are campaigning get their weapons? Isn't it from those whose profession it is to make weapons—with them first paying their money? What else could this be except, of course, a kindness-in-return? [And so, unless you, my son, first expend much toil, you will never gain facility in speech. <sup>640</sup>]

33. Why should I emphasize material that is extraneous to the topic and not "begin from the hearth" <sup>641</sup> and argue from nature? 34. For if nature is not going to receive the seed first, she will not give an ox in return, a horse, or any other <animal>, species by species. 35. For if kindness did not beget a kindness, neither would war succeed war nor insult follow insult; instead, someone would have reaped opposites from their opposites.

36. <Analogy> For just as grain knows how to produce grain, as a horse does a horse, a human does a human, so also does kindness know how to produce kindness-in-return.

37. <Example> Consider, if you will, the Athenian people who were the most powerful in Greece. For when they were in need of food and starvation was devouring Attica, they went off to the Egyptians and, after acquiring grain, formed an alliance against the Persians. <sup>642</sup> They also granted Athenian citizenship to the Plataeans in return for their zeal at Marathon. <sup>643</sup>

<sup>640</sup> This sentence is suspect, since it is the only direct address in an elaboration and makes little sense in this context.

<sup>641</sup> This expression is proverbial (see, e.g., Plato, *Euthyphr.* 3A, and *Cra.* 401B), perhaps originating with the Pythagoreans (so Aristotle, *Oec.* 1344a 11). For these references we thank Prof. Johan C. Thom of the University of Stellenbosch.

<sup>642</sup> The Athenians received grain in 445 B.C. from Psammetichus, king of Egypt, who was in revolt from the Persians and hence needed allies (see Plutarch, *Per.* 37.3, and esp. the scholia on Aristophanes, *Wasps* 718, on which see Peter Garnsey, *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis* [New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988] 124-26).

<sup>643</sup> The Plataeans had supplied one thousand men at Marathon and were regarded as allies and citizens of the Athenians (see Herodotus, 6.108; Thucydides, 3.63.2; and Diodorus Siculus, 15.46).

σπουδῆς τὴν Ἀθήναζε πολιτείαν ἀντεχαρίσαντο. 38. κοινῇ μὲν οὖν καὶ πρὸς ὅλας πόλεις οὕτω χάρις χάριν ἀπέτεκεν·

39. Ἰδία δὲ καὶ καθ' ἕκαστα Ἑκτορα μὲν ὁ μέγας Αἴας τοῦ ξίφους ἡμίψατο, ζωστήρα φοινικοῦν ἀντιδιδούς· 40. Γλαῦκον δὲ τῆς πανοπλίας ὁ τοῦ Τυδέως <ἡμίψατο>, 41. καὶ Τεῦκρον (p. 109) τῆς κατὰ τῶν Τρώων εὐστόχου τοξικῆς Ἀγαμέμνων ἐθαύμασε καὶ τὸν αὐτοῦ Τεύκρου πάλιν ἀδελφόν, μετὰ τὴν πρὸς Ἑκτορα μονομαχίαν τῆς ἀριστείας τιμῶν, ἐπὶ τοῦ δείπνου νώτοισι διηνεκέσ<σ>ι γέραιρε.

42. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἔργα τοιαῦτα τὴν μαρτυρίαν, καὶ οὕτως ἐχόμενα τῆς τοῦ ποιητοῦ γνώμης, δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς μηδὲ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Μουσῶν ἀποσχέσθαι· 43. εἴη δ' ἂν, οἶμαι, Μουσῶν, ὅσα-περ ἐπιπνοίᾳ Μουσῶν Ἡσίοδος ἀποφαίνεται. 44. καὶ τί φησιν ἐκεῖνος ὁ Μούσαις κάτοχος γλῶτταν, μᾶλλον δὲ δι' ἐκείνου αἱ Μοῦσαι; τὸν δὲ δεδωκότα τίς ἡμίψατο; πρὸς δὲ τὸν οὐκ εἰδότα χαρίζεσθαι οὐδεὶς ποτε, νοῦν ἔχων, τὴν χάριν ἀνάλωσε.

45. Πῶς δ' ἂν καὶ Πρόδικον τὸν σοφιστὴν παραλίπομεν, ἀξίως τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας ἀποφθεγγόμενον Δὸς τι καὶ λάβε τι, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀντιχάριτος καλὸν αὐτόθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ συντρόφου σώματος παριστῶντα

39 καθ' ἕκαστα Peppink, "Ad Nicephorum," 414 κάλλιστα Walz et Pignani 40 ἡμίψατο addidimus 41 διηνεκέσ<σ>ι Pignani (cf. II. 7.321) διηνεκέσι Walz 45 παραλίπομεν Pignani παραλείπομεν Walz || δεξιᾷ Pignani δεξιᾶς Walz || ἀπὸ τοῦ Pignani ἐπὶ τοῦ Walz ἐπὶ τὴν Ba

38. In public matters, therefore, kindness thus begat a kindness-in-return toward entire cities.

39. In private and individual matters the great Ajax<sup>644</sup> repaid Hector for the sword by giving him a scarlet belt in return.<sup>645</sup>  
 40. The son of Tydeus<sup>646</sup> exchanged a full set of armor with Glaukos.<sup>647</sup> 41. Agamemnon admired Teucer for his expert archery against the Trojans;<sup>648</sup> and he also admired the brother of that same Teucer for his valor and, after his single combat with Hector, "he honored" him at dinner "with the long piece of the chine."<sup>649</sup>

42. <Testimony of the Ancients> Deeds such as these, therefore, provide testimony and thus agree with the sentiment of the poet, but we must not omit the testimony of the Muses.

43. And, I suppose, whatever Hesiod proclaims at the inspiration of the Muses would belong to the Muses. 44. And what does the poet say whose tongue was possessed by the Muses, or better, what do the Muses say through him? Who repaid the giver? No one who has any sense ever used up a favor on one who does not know how to grant a favor.<sup>650</sup>

45. And how can we leave out Prodicus the sophist? He uttered sayings worthy of Sophocles' wisdom: "Give something and receive something,"<sup>651</sup> and he shows that the benefit of a kindness-in-return is confirmed more on the basis of bodily pairs:

<sup>644</sup> The use of μέγας for this Ajax, the son of Telamon, distinguishes him from another Ajax, Locrian Ajax, the son of Oileus, who is styled Αἴας μείων, Ajax the lesser.

<sup>645</sup> See *Il.* 7.303-5.

<sup>646</sup> The son of Tydeus is Diomedes (see *Il.* 5.1 *et passim*).

<sup>647</sup> See *Il.* 6.119-236, esp. 230-36.

<sup>648</sup> See *Il.* 13.313-14.

<sup>649</sup> See *Il.* 7.313-22, with the quotation coming from 321, where δ' Αἴαντα follows νότοισι. For the significance of the νότα at the banquet honoring Ajax, see Athenaeus, 1.13f.

<sup>650</sup> Basilakes seems to be paraphrasing this poet; see Hesiod, *Works and Days* 352-55, esp. 355: δώτη μὲν τις ἔδωκεν, ἀδώτη δ' οὐ τις ἔδωκεν.

<sup>651</sup> See Stobaeus, *Flor.* 3.10.34 (p. 416 Hense), but according to ps.-Plato, *Axiach.* 366C, Prodicus derived this line from Epicharmus (= *Frag.* 30, in Hermann Diels, ed., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch* [2 vols.; 5th ed. by W. Kranz; Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1934] 1.203 and 2.318).

βεβαιότερον. ἃ δὲ χεῖρ τὴν χεῖρα νίζει, καὶ ἡ εὐώνυμος τῇ δεξιᾷ τῶν ἔργων ξυναίρεται· καὶ νῦν μὲν αὕτη πρὸς ἐκείνης, νῦν δὲ ἐκείνη πρὸς ταύτης τῶν πόνων ἐπικουφίζεται.

46. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Οὐκοῦν ἀποδεκτέον τῆς μὲν γνώμης τὸν Σοφοκλῆν, τοὺς δὲ χαριζομένους τῆς χάριτος· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ὅπως ἑτέρως ἀγαθοὺς φίλους πλουτήσαιμεν, εἰ μὴ τὰς χάριτας διαμειβοίμεθα χάρισιν.



"Hand washes hand,"<sup>652</sup> and so the left hand shares in the tasks with the right hand, and at one time this hand helps that hand in toil, at another time that one helps this one.

46. <Brief Epilogue> Therefore, one must approve of Sophocles' maxim and those who bestow kindness for kindness. For we could not otherwise be rich in good friends unless we repay their kindnesses with kindnesses.

<sup>652</sup> Again, see Epicharmus, *Frag.* 30 = ps.-Plato, *Axiach.* 366C. Cf. also Meleager, *AP* 5.208; Petronius, *Sat.* 45; and Seneca, *Apocol.* 9.

Text 34. Gregory of Cyprus, *Chreia*  
(Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2.269-73)

Introduction

The final three chreia elaborations (Texts 34-36) come from an era that is little known to many readers of this volume, including most classicists and New Testament scholars. Consequently, some historical background will help to situate these elaborations in a period about a thousand years or more after the elaboration pattern first arose.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The thirteenth century in Byzantium was a time of extraordinary change and conflict—of political upheaval, social dislocation, and religious strife.<sup>653</sup> In 1204, during the Fourth Crusade, Constantinople itself was captured by the Latins, who appointed a Latin emperor and a Latin patriarch to rule the Byzantines. The former emperor, patriarch, and many wealthy families were forced to flee the capital, and many of them found refuge in Asia Minor in Nicaea, where, under Theodore Laskaris, the son-in-law of the former emperor, Alexios III Angelos, they set about establishing a government-in-exile. Theodore soon secured most of Asia Minor and forged an empire centered in Nicaea, complete with its own patriarch and himself, now known as Theodore I Laskaris, as its emperor. In addition, a whole array of institutions needed replication in Nicaea, including educational ones, but the main goal was to recapture Constantinople. Theodore I, who ruled until 1222, and Laskarid successors, John III Ducas Vatatzes (1222-1254) and Theodore II Laskaris (1254-1258), got ever closer to that goal, but it was a usurper, the founder of the Palaiologan dynasty, Michael VIII Palaiologos (1259-1282), who actually re-entered Constantinople in August, 1261, and once again established Byzantine rule in the old capital.

<sup>653</sup> For a fuller account of this eventful period, see George Ostrogorsky, *A History of the Byzantine State* (trans. J. Hussey; New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1969) 418-98.

Michael VIII still had many diplomatic and political problems to solve, and there were various institutional concerns to address as well, but most problematic was his religious policy of seeking union with the Latin church. He was able to secure a formal agreement of union, made at Lyons in 1274, but that agreement only intensified opposition, and it was not until his son, Andronikos II Palaiologos (1282-1328), reversed this policy and in 1283 appointed Gregory of Cyprus to the patriarchate to resolve the crisis, that peace was restored.

It is surprising that all these changes in politics, religion, and society had so little affect on education, especially on the curriculum.<sup>654</sup> Indeed, elementary and secondary education, as Constantine Constantinides points out, apparently continued in Nicaea and other major towns of the empire without any interruption, in part because Theodore I gave first priority to such instruction.<sup>655</sup> This continuity extended to the teaching of rhetoric, including the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius, as becomes clear right from the beginning of the Nicaean period. For example, Nikephoros Blemmydes (1197-ca. 1269) belonged to a family that moved to Nicaea after the fall of Constantinople; he would have been ready for rhetorical instruction in the second decade of the century and in fact says in his autobiography that he had studied Aphthonius (and Hermogenes) in Nicaea.<sup>656</sup>

But evidence of curricular continuity goes beyond the use of the standard textbooks, as there is also evidence of some teachers of rhetoric composing sample *progymnasmata* in the thirteenth century. Thus, for one teacher, Theodore Hexapterygos (ca. 1180-ca. 1236), there are extant five διηγήματα and one μῦθος

<sup>654</sup> On education, especially higher education, during the Nicaean and early Palaiologan periods, see Friedrich Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter* (ByzA 8; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926) 50-54, and especially Constantine N. Constantinides, *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries* (Texts and Studies of the History of Cyprus 11; Nicosia: Cyprus Research Center, 1982) 5-65. Cf. also Nigel Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983) 218-28.

<sup>655</sup> Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 7.

<sup>656</sup> See Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 7.

which were in use in Nicaea in the early decades of this century.<sup>657</sup> More generally, several other teachers of rhetoric are known from this period, most notably George Akropolites (1217-1282), tutor of the scholarly Theodore II,<sup>658</sup> who himself aided education by rebuilding the church of St. Tryphon in Nicaea as a site for grammatical and rhetorical instruction.<sup>659</sup> Finally, once back in Constantinople, Michael VIII immediately reopened the elementary school at the church of St. Paul.<sup>660</sup> In short, what evidence there is suggests an unbroken continuity in instruction at the lower levels, including the beginning stages of rhetoric which used the *Progymnasmata* of Aphthonius.

The higher levels of education, including advanced rhetoric, mathematics, and philosophy, however, were more affected by events, at least initially. The move to Nicaea meant that buildings and especially libraries were left behind and had to be rebuilt and restocked in the new capital.<sup>661</sup> Worse, some losses were irreparable, as Nigel Wilson emphasizes, for many books at Constantinople were lost forever because of, to use his words, "the ruthless members of the church militant."<sup>662</sup> And Vatatzes' plans for a school of higher education in the mid-1240s proved difficult to realize, as Blemmydes, the leading intellectual of this period, refused the emperor's invitation to head the school.<sup>663</sup>

<sup>657</sup> For these recently edited *progymnasmata*, see Wolfram Hörandner, "Die Progymnasmata des Theodoros Hexapterygos," in *BYZANTIOS: Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. W. Hörandner et al.; Vienne: Becvar, 1984) 147-62, esp. 150-58 (text). Cf. also Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 9-11.

<sup>658</sup> Constantinides refers to "numerous essays in rhetoric Theodore sent to Akropolites for correction and comment" (*Higher Education*, 18 and n. 90).

<sup>659</sup> On this school, see further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 19-20. Cf. also Michael Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261)* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975) 178-80.

<sup>660</sup> See Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen*, 56-57.

<sup>661</sup> See Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 6-7.

<sup>662</sup> Wilson, *Scholars*, 218. Wilson goes on to say (pp. 218-19) that the massive loss of Greek literature belongs to this period, not to the final fall of Constantinople in 1453, for scholars after 1204, unlike those before them, had no direct acquaintance of literature which we cannot read today.

<sup>663</sup> For details, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 14-15.

Nevertheless, despite these obstacles, higher education kept improving during the Nicaean period, thanks largely to the patronage of the Laskarids. Vatatzes, for example, sent Blemmydes in search of books and promoted the building of libraries throughout the empire,<sup>664</sup> while his son, Theodore II, in addition to rebuilding the church of St. Tryphon, demanded a high intellectual tone at his court and achieved it.<sup>665</sup> In addition, he extended imperial patronage outside the capital, as is evident from the support given to schools, such as the rhetorical school headed by George Babouskomites somewhere outside Nicaea and the more philosophical school led by Blemmydes near Ephesus.<sup>666</sup> Finally, the restoration of higher education was completed when Michael VIII re-entered Constantinople in 1261 and soon appointed George Akropolites, the leading scholar of the time, to head an institution of higher education. Akropolites taught Aristotelian philosophy as well as higher mathematics and rhetoric until 1274 when he was sent by the emperor to the council on union at Lyons.<sup>667</sup> In addition, the Patriarch Germanos III, with the help of the emperor, set up a patriarchal school for higher education, headed by the rhetorically-trained Maximos Holobolos.<sup>668</sup>

Higher education had now come full circle, as these schools finally replaced the instruction once available at the Patriarchal School before the fall of Constantinople in 1204.<sup>669</sup> Indeed, Constantinople in the later decades of the century and on into the next

<sup>664</sup> See further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 12-13, and Angold, *Government*, 178.

<sup>665</sup> See further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 21-22.

<sup>666</sup> On these schools, see further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 15-17 and 24-25.

<sup>667</sup> On Akropolites' school, see Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen*, 55-56, and Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 31-35.

<sup>668</sup> On the revived patriarchal school, see Fuchs, *Die höheren Schulen*, 57-58, and Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 52-59.

<sup>669</sup> Constantinides begins his study of higher education in the Nicaean period by noting that before the fall of Constantinople the Patriarchal School was "a flourishing institution providing elementary through higher secular and religious education. Rhetoric, higher mathematics, philosophy and medicine were taught" (*Higher Education*, 5).

witnessed a revival of intellectual culture, a Palaiologan renaissance, highlighted by the polymathy of Maximos Planoudes.<sup>670</sup>

It is during these remarkable decades that several teachers of rhetoric composed their own sample *progymnasmata* for use in their classrooms, and for three of them—Gregory of Cyprus, George Pachymeres, and Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos—a chreia elaboration is extant. A fourth, George Akropolites' son, Constantine (ca. 1250-ca. 1324), wrote samples of seven *progymnasmata*, but since no chreia elaboration of his has survived, he is not treated further here.<sup>671</sup> We thus turn to the first Palaiologan scholar named above—Gregory of Cyprus, perhaps better known as Gregory II, Patriarch of Constantinople from 1283 to 1289.

#### LIFE AND WRITINGS

The life of Gregory of Cyprus<sup>672</sup> mirrors the history we have just summarized. He began his life under Latin domination; his education took him to Nicaea and later to Constantinople, the centers of Laskarid and Palaiologan power; and he became, after a decade of teaching, the Patriarch of Constantinople, which plunged him into the divisive debates over union with the West.

The sources for Gregory's life are many, including both his own writings and those of his students and contemporaries, but clearly the most important is his own autobiographical account.<sup>673</sup> In this account Gregory focuses on his early years on

<sup>670</sup> On this renaissance, see Wilson, *Scholars*, 219 and esp. 229-64.

<sup>671</sup> The seven are: *μῦθος*, *διήγημα*, *ψόγος*, *σύγκρισις*, *ἡθοποιία*, *ἐκφρασις*, and *θέσις*, which, however, have been only partially edited. See further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 100-1 and esp. 100 n. 68.

<sup>672</sup> On Gregory's life, see also Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 476-78; B. A. Müller, "Gregorios (2)," *PW* 7 (1912) 1852-57, esp. 1852-53; Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.168-69; Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 36-49; Wilson, *Scholars*, 223-24; and esp. Aristeides Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1983) 30-32. Cf. also Papadakis, "Gregory II of Cyprus," *ODB* 2.876-77.

<sup>673</sup> The text of this autobiography, along with Latin translation, is available in *PG* 142.19-30. But the standard edition, with facing French translation, is in William Lameere, *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, Patriarche de Constantinople (1283-1289)* (Brussels: Palais de Académies, 1937) 176-91. Subsequent references to the *Autobiography* will be

Cyprus and then on his long odyssey in search of higher education but stops short of detailing his years as patriarch. Some scholars, of course, would prefer that Gregory had given greater attention to his patriarchal years,<sup>674</sup> but his focus serves our purposes much better. Indeed, the rarity of such detailed accounts of a person's educational history—the first since Libanius' own account—justifies a detailed summary of this valuable document.

Gregory was born in 1241 or 1242 on the island of Cyprus, where, he says, he also spent his early years.<sup>675</sup> His baptismal name, however, was not Gregory, but George, the name he had until he became a monk later in life.<sup>676</sup> But since he is widely known as Gregory, in particular as Patriarch Gregory II, we will use this name throughout.

Gregory's family was wealthy and powerful,<sup>677</sup> or at least it had been until the island was captured, years earlier in 1192, by Richard the Lionhearted during the Third Crusade and then ruled by the Lusignans.<sup>678</sup> The consequences of Latin rule were keenly felt. Gregory's family suffered economically, reduced to living moderately though honorably.<sup>679</sup>

Gregory's primary education, however, was little affected by these political events, at least at first. He says that his parents sent him locally to learn his letters with γραμματισταί.<sup>680</sup> When he had completed the primary curriculum and his parents had recognized his academic abilities and achievements, they sent him at age nine to Nicosia to continue his education.<sup>681</sup> Here,

to page and line numbers of Lameere's edition. For discussion and structural analysis, see Antonio Garzya, "Sur l' 'autobiographie' de Grégoire de Chypre," *La parole et l'idée* 10 (1968) 308-11.

<sup>674</sup> So, e.g., Beck, *Kirche*, 685.

<sup>675</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 177, 12 Lameere).

<sup>676</sup> On the practice of taking a new name, usually that of a saint and often with the same first letter, see Alice-Mary Talbot, "Monk," *ODB* 2.1395-96, esp. 1396.

<sup>677</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 177, 5-8 Lameere).

<sup>678</sup> See further Ostrogorsky, *History*, 407.

<sup>679</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 177, 8-11 Lameere).

<sup>680</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 177, 13 Lameere).

<sup>681</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 177, 16-17 Lameere).

however, Gregory encountered difficulties because secondary education was taught only in Latin.<sup>682</sup> Gregory's stay was far from successful, for he admits that he got only the shadow of grammar rather than the subject itself, in part because of the foreign and illegitimate language, as he calls it, of his teachers.<sup>683</sup> As a result, he had to work twice as hard—first to learn what the Latin words meant and then to grasp the subtleties of the subject. He had the same experience with Aristotle's logic, so that he eventually gave up and returned home, now fifteen years old and discouraged.<sup>684</sup>

On returning home Gregory took up pursuits like hunting, but the desire for education, especially now for rhetoric, could not be denied.<sup>685</sup> But since such instruction was not available in Greek on Cyprus, he asked his parents for permission as well as for funds to go to Nicaea where, rumor had it, it was possible, in view of the many learned men there, to think one was seeing ancient Athens.<sup>686</sup> His parents refused, and Gregory himself pretended to change his mind,<sup>687</sup> but some time later he left anyway and thus began his odyssey in search of a truly Greek higher education.

Gregory boarded a ship and, after a difficult and dangerous voyage, reached Ephesus.<sup>688</sup> Here he learned about Blemmydes, who, it was said, was not only the wisest of the Greeks of that time, but the wisest man of all. Gregory's efforts to study with Blemmydes, however, were frustrated, as the philosopher would not deign to see him, since he was young, foreign, and poor.<sup>689</sup>

Having failed in even meeting Blemmydes, Gregory left Ephesus and set out for Nicaea. After six months and a great many hardships and deprivations he arrived in the city for which he had left home.<sup>690</sup> Nicaea, however, proved far less satisfying than he had been led to believe. He did get instruction in Nicaea,

<sup>682</sup> According to Papadakis (*Crisis in Byzantium*, 30), this school was administered by the Roman archbishop of Nicosia.

<sup>683</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 179, 3-5 Lameere).

<sup>684</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 179, 8-19 Lameere).

<sup>685</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 179, 19-21 Lameere).

<sup>686</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 179, 21-28 Lameere).

<sup>687</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 179, 28-181, 8 Lameere).

<sup>688</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 181, 8-11 Lameere).

<sup>689</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 181, 12-17 Lameere).

<sup>690</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 181, 22-183, 8 Lameere).



probably in the school at the church of St. Tryphon, which, as we have seen, had been rebuilt a few years before by Theodore II,<sup>691</sup> but the instruction was only in γραμματική and ποιητική, subjects Gregory had at least tried to learn, in Latin, at Nicosia. Consequently, Gregory speaks disparagingly of his teachers;<sup>692</sup> of his having to practice κλίσεις, or declensions of words; and of his having to read stories about the abduction of Helen, the fall of Troy, and the deaths of the children of Oedipus.<sup>693</sup>

The subjects Gregory really wanted to pursue—ῥητορική and φιλοσοφία—were largely unknown in the city.<sup>694</sup> Depression seized him, and he began to wonder if it had been worthwhile to leave home, make light of his parents' affections, overlook their tears, cross a vast and dangerous sea, and traverse a continent in order merely to read poets who had written largely for pleasure and cared little for the truth. As a result, he thought of returning home and would have, had he possessed the resources for such a trip.<sup>695</sup>

Gregory's plight, however, was resolved, he says, by the recapture of Constantinople in 1261 and Michael VIII's putting George Akropolites in charge of higher education,<sup>696</sup> for Gregory now decided to go, in his words, to the great city of the Byzantines, where not a few others were likewise streaming to study with Akropolites, all of them drawn by a love of education.<sup>697</sup> To be sure, Gregory did not begin his studies right away, but only some years later in 1266-1267, when he was twenty-six years old and still the youngest in the class.<sup>698</sup>

Gregory studied with Akropolites until he was thirty-three.<sup>699</sup> During this period he took up precisely those subjects he had longed to study ever since leaving Cyprus, as Akropolites' curriculum included the philosophy of Aristotle—the syllogistics,

<sup>691</sup> On Gregory receiving instruction at this particular school, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 26.

<sup>692</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 183, 9-10 Lameere).

<sup>693</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 183, 18-22 Lameere).

<sup>694</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 183, 10-13 Lameere).

<sup>695</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 183, 13-18 and 22-27 Lameere).

<sup>696</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 185, 5-17 Lameere).

<sup>697</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 185, 6 and 17-18 Lameere).

<sup>698</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 187, 18-19 Lameere).

<sup>699</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 187, 19 Lameere).

analytics, and metaphysics—as well as rhetoric and mathematics.<sup>700</sup> Gregory himself was especially fond of Peripatetic philosophy and virtually deified Aristotle.<sup>701</sup> His experience with rhetoric was negative at first, but eventually he excelled in it by taking as his models the old masters—for example, Plato, Demosthenes, and Aristides.<sup>702</sup> His fellow students, who once despised his compositional skills, now made *him* their model.<sup>703</sup>

Gregory's student days ended in 1273/1274 when he began his career as a teacher. He speaks of these next years, lasting about a decade, as making him happy and blessed,<sup>704</sup> but at this point he breaks off the narrative style that he had used for his educational odyssey. Consequently, the details of his career as a teacher must be pieced together from other, largely epistolary, evidence, as Aristeides Papadakis does when he uses one of Gregory's letters to place him as a teacher in the Patriarchal School, newly opened, as we have seen, under Germanos II, as well as in the school at the Akataleptos monastery, where he also lived for many years.<sup>705</sup> Constantinides uses another letter to provide information on the subjects that Gregory taught: grammar, poetry, logic, mathematics, rhetoric, and philosophy.<sup>706</sup> Constantinides adds, however, that Gregory's school was mainly devoted to teaching rhetoric,<sup>707</sup> and indeed his later reputation emphasizes his rhetorical expertise.<sup>708</sup>

Constantinides is also interested in recovering the names of Gregory's students. Seven names emerge, including several who went on to important positions in government and church, most notably Theodore Mouzalon, Nikephoros Choumnos, and John Glykes.<sup>709</sup> It is also possible that Constantine Akropolites

<sup>700</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 185, 13-17 and 20-24 Lameere).

<sup>701</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 185, 27-29 Lameere).

<sup>702</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 187, 2-8 Lameere), and Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 46.

<sup>703</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 187, 10-11 Lameere).

<sup>704</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 10-11 Lameere).

<sup>705</sup> Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 32.

<sup>706</sup> Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 36.

<sup>707</sup> See Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 45.

<sup>708</sup> See the evidence collected in Müller, "Gregorios," 1853-54, and Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 47-48.

<sup>709</sup> For discussion of these and all of Gregory's students, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 36-45.

and Maximos Planoudes were Gregory's students, but even without them Gregory's influence as a teacher was considerable, for, as Constantinides concludes, Gregory's students "dominated the Byzantine intellectual scene for nearly two generations."<sup>710</sup>

Besides teaching, Gregory spent much time copying manuscripts, a practice made necessary, he says, by his poverty,<sup>711</sup> but it had the value of familiarizing him with the style of the authors he copied and hence was partially responsible for his own Atticizing style.<sup>712</sup> He also belonged to the palace clergy, holding the position of *πρωταποστολάρχιος*, or first reader of the prophets and epistles in the imperial chapel.<sup>713</sup> His ecclesiastical responsibilities increased dramatically, however, when in 1283 he became a monk<sup>714</sup> and was then appointed Patriarch of Constantinople. Gregory was a reluctant appointee<sup>715</sup> and in fact later spoke of his six-year patriarchate as a misfortune,<sup>716</sup> due largely to the divisive issue of union with the Latin church, a story which is ably told now by Papadakis.<sup>717</sup> He resigned in 1289<sup>718</sup> and died shortly afterwards, probably in 1290.

Gregory left behind a varied and considerable literary legacy, about which he is surprisingly apologetic.<sup>719</sup> He offers several reasons for his not having written more: the relatively late start—at thirty-three—he had in writing;<sup>720</sup> the worries and burdens of

<sup>710</sup> Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 49.

<sup>711</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 20 Lameere).

<sup>712</sup> See further Müller, "Gregorios," 1853, and Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 44-46.

<sup>713</sup> See further Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 32.

<sup>714</sup> Papadakis (*Crisis in Byzantium*, 31 and 42 n. 23) cites epistolary evidence to the effect that Gregory had thoughts about becoming a monk as early as his student days in Nicaea.

<sup>715</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 9-12 Lameere).

<sup>716</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 10 Lameere).

<sup>717</sup> For this story, centered on the anti-union council at Blachernae in 1285, see Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 50-146.

<sup>718</sup> Papadakis (*Crisis in Byzantium*, 32) adds that Gregory retired to the monastery of Aristine, which Theodora Raoulaina Palaiologina, cousin of Andronikos II, had founded. Theodora was part of Gregory's wider intellectual circle which exchanged letters and manuscripts. Cf. also Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 44.

<sup>719</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (pp. 187, 14-15; 189, 15 and 24-32 Lameere).

<sup>720</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 187, 16-18 Lameere).

the patriarchate;<sup>721</sup> the chronic ailments, in particular headaches, that afflicted his body;<sup>722</sup> and the time and energy he spent on copying manuscripts.<sup>723</sup>

No apology, however, is needed. On any reckoning Gregory's writings are considerable,<sup>724</sup> and that judgment would be truer had they all survived.<sup>725</sup> At any rate, pride of place goes, at least in the eyes of modern scholarship,<sup>726</sup> to Gregory's *Autobiography*, which was written late in life and presumably as an introduction to his extensive and valuable correspondence,<sup>727</sup> which at last count numbers 242 letters.<sup>728</sup> In addition, Gregory wrote lengthy encomia of Michael VIII and Andronikos II,<sup>729</sup>

<sup>721</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (pp. 187, 25–189, 8 Lameere).

<sup>722</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 16–19 Lameere).

<sup>723</sup> See Gregory, *Autobiography* (p. 189, 19–24 Lameere).

<sup>724</sup> Fullest discussion of Gregory's writings is still Müller, "Gregorios," 1854–57, but see also Beck, *Kirche*, 685–86, and Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.94, 97, 100, 132, 172, 192.

<sup>725</sup> Constantinides (*Higher Education*, 47) says that in the early fourteenth century George Lakapenos quoted from four of Gregory's writings which are not among Gregory's surviving works.

<sup>726</sup> For favorable assessments of the *Autobiography*, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 477; Müller, "Gregorios," 1854; and Garzya, "Autobiographie," 310.

<sup>727</sup> Garzya, "Autobiographie," 309.

<sup>728</sup> Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 477, and Müller, "Gregorios," 1854, speak vaguely of over 200 letters, as not all of them had been published by then (see *PG* 142.346–418). Then, in 1910, Sophronius Eustratiades published the letters, or 197 of them, in a series of installments and then together in a volume entitled *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι* (Alexandria: Patriarchal Press, 1910). Again, in 1937, Lameere significantly increased the number of Gregory's letters by listing the opening words of 242 letters, divided according to whether the letters come from the period before the patriarchate (nos. 1–127) or during it (nos. 128–242) (*Manuscrite*, 197–203). Cf. also Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 41 n. 3, and esp. Angeliki E. Laiou, "The Correspondence of Gregorios Kyrios as a Source for the History of Social and Political Behavior in Byzantium, or on Government by Rhetoric," in *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaeologenzeit: Referate des Internationalen Symposions zu Ehren von Herbert Hunger* (ed. W. Seibt; Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996) 91–108.

<sup>729</sup> Texts in Jean-François Boissonade, ed., *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis* (5 vols.; Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962 [repr. of the Paris edition of 1829–1833]) 1.313–93.

which are little appreciated today.<sup>730</sup> Theological writings include the lives of five saints<sup>731</sup> and an important treatise on the *filioque* clause in the creed, the *Tomus*, which Gregory wrote after the Council at Blachernae in 1285 to express definitively the orthodox position on this divisive point in negotiations with the Latin church.<sup>732</sup>

We must focus our attention, of course, on Gregory's educational writings, especially those on rhetorical education. There is, for example, a collection of proverbs which may have been used in the context of teaching rhetoric.<sup>733</sup> Clearly rhetorical in function, however, are two other sets of writings. The first comprises three declamations which were composed for instruction in advanced rhetoric. These declamations have attracted attention only to the extent that scholars note that two of them are written in response to declamations by Libanius.<sup>734</sup>

The other set comprises various *progymnasmata*, including a chreia elaboration as well as an ἐγκώμιον of the sea.<sup>735</sup> In addition, there are a number of μῦθοι and διηγήματα and one ῥητοποιία in a separate MS tradition. These latter have attracted the most attention. Sophronius Eustratiades edited them in 1910 using one fifteenth century MS, Vind. phil. gr. 195 (= V).<sup>736</sup> Recently, Sofia Kotzabassi has re-edited these *progymnasmata*, using a fourteenth century MS, Lond. Harl. 5735 (= L), as well.<sup>737</sup> She has corrected and clarified Eustratiades' edition in various ways. For example, Eustratiades was content to follow the title for these

<sup>730</sup> See, e.g., Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 477: they are "luftig, unwahr, and schwerfällig." Cf. also Müller, "Gregorios," 1855.

<sup>731</sup> See further Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 98-99, and esp. Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 41 and n. 54.

<sup>732</sup> Text in *PG* 142.233-46; Eng. trans. in Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium*, 155-65.

<sup>733</sup> Text in *PG* 142.445-70. For their possible use in the teaching of rhetoric, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 45.

<sup>734</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.94; Wilson, *Scholars*, 224; and Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 320-21. For the texts of these two declamations, see Foerster, *Libanii Opera*, 6.52-82 and 7.142-79.

<sup>735</sup> For the text of this ἐγκώμιον, see *PG* 142.433-44.

<sup>736</sup> See Eustratiades, *Γρηγορίων τοῦ Κωνσταντίνου*, 215-30.

<sup>737</sup> See Sofia Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata des Gregor von Zypern," *Ἑλληνικά* 43 (1993) 45-63.

*progymnasmata* in V, which labels them all as μῦθοι,<sup>738</sup> whereas Kotzabassi has incorporated the nomenclature used in L, so that she has correctly identified some of Eustratiades' μῦθοι as either a διήγημα or an ἡθοποιία.<sup>739</sup> Consequently, in her edition we have sixteen μῦθοι, two διηγήματα, and one ἡθοποιία.<sup>740</sup>

Kotzabassi, however, also comments briefly on the chreia elaboration, which, as already mentioned, is part of a different MS tradition. She notes that the elaboration appears either in MSS that contain Gregory's other rhetorical writings or in those that include his ἐγκώμιον.<sup>741</sup> She explains the diverging MS traditions by suggesting that the sample μῦθοι, διηγήματα, and ἡθοποιία derive from Gregory's student days, whereas the chreia elaboration could have been composed later, so that it was considered the equal of the hagiographical works and so was included among these other writings.<sup>742</sup> In any case, it is time to consider Gregory's elaboration of a chreia.

#### GREGORY'S ELABORATION OF A CHREIA

Several features of Gregory's elaboration are worth noting, but one is unique and deserves our immediate attention. This is the only elaboration that does not first recite the chreia itself before turning to the elaboration proper. Rather, after the simple superscription Χρεία, the elaboration begins immediately with the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section (1-3).

<sup>738</sup> The complete title for these *progymnasmata* in V is: τοῦ σοφωτάτου καὶ λογιωτάτου καὶ οἰκουμενικοῦ πατριάρχου κυροῦ Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου μῦθοι.

<sup>739</sup> See Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 47.

<sup>740</sup> For the text of these *progymnasmata*, see Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 51-63. These nineteen sample *progymnasmata* are still two shy of the twenty-one printed by Eustratiades. The reason is that the twentieth and twenty-first μῦθοι (see Eustratiades, *Γρηγορίων τοῦ Κυπρίου*, 230), are actually by Libanius, where they are the sixteenth and twenty-sixth διηγήματα in Foerster's edition of Libanius (8.43-44 and 49-50). On this identification, see further Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.97, and Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 47 n. 11.

<sup>741</sup> See Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 45 n. 3.

<sup>742</sup> See Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 45.

The absence of a recitation of the chreia being elaborated has led to the mistaken identification of the form, as Nigel Wilson, for example, incorrectly calls this elaboration an ἐγκώμιον,<sup>743</sup> presumably because of the encomiastic character of the opening words (Σωκράτους μὲν ἐπαινέτην οἶμαι πάντα πρόθυμον εἶναι γενέσθαι κτλ.) (1). But, even when the essay is correctly identified as an elaboration,<sup>744</sup> an identification which is suggested by the superscription and proved, as will be shown, by its eight-part Aphthonian διαίρεσις, there is still a problem.

The problem is that it is not at all obvious what specific chreia Gregory was elaborating. To be sure, in the first volume of *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*, we simply proposed a saying that came from the relevant portions of the παραφραστικόν section, a decision in line with Hunger's brief discussion of this elaboration:<sup>745</sup> "Some things are adorned by one thing, some by another, but only reason is the proper adorning of the soul" (4).<sup>746</sup> On further reflection, however, it may be better to look elsewhere for clues to the identification of the chreia, and that place is the end of the fourth κεφάλαιον, i.e., the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. The reason is that Gregory has modeled his elaboration on that of Aphthonius, and the latter clearly echoes the language of the chreia he is elaborating at the end of this section: "All these things, then, influenced Isocrates to call education's root bitter"<sup>747</sup>—a statement that recalls the chreia he is elaborating: Isocrates said, "The root of education is bitter, but its fruits are sweet."<sup>748</sup>

Gregory ends his ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου with these words: ἃ δὴ πάντα συνορῶν, ὁ Σωφρονίσκου Σωκράτης πλάστην ἀγαθῶν τῶν ψυχῶν τὸν λόγον ἐδίδασκε (7). The first words—ἃ δὴ πάντα συνορῶν κτλ.—recall Aphthonius' ταῦτα δὴ πάντα κτλ.,<sup>749</sup> so that Gregory, having echoed Aphthonius in this respect, may also have gone on to allude to the saying of the chreia he was elaborating. If so, then the saying may have referred, in some way, to reason as

<sup>743</sup> See Wilson, *Scholars*, 224.

<sup>744</sup> So Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.100.

<sup>745</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.100.

<sup>746</sup> See *Chreia* 1.337-38.

<sup>747</sup> Our translation of Aphthonius 57-58.

<sup>748</sup> Our translation of Aphthonius 24-25.

<sup>749</sup> Aphthonius 57.

the sculptor of virtuous souls. Lending support to this supposition is the fact that, as Gregory's editor Jean-François Boissonade himself noted,<sup>750</sup> there is a chreia, attributed to Socrates and preserved by John Stobaeus, that has a very similar saying: Socrates said, "Reason, like a skilful sculptor, provides a lovely form for the soul."<sup>751</sup> Accordingly, we have proposed this chreia as being more likely the one that Gregory was elaborating and have therefore printed it at the head of the elaboration.

When we turn to the elaboration itself we once again find that Aphthonius' own elaboration clearly served as Gregory's model, both structurally and stylistically. Structurally, the elaboration follows the eight-part Aphthonian διαίρεσις. In addition, Gregory imitates throughout the style of Aphthonius, sometimes picking up an Aphthonian phrase and sometimes adopting whole sentences. A brief review of the borrowings will demonstrate Gregory's indebtedness to Aphthonius.

In the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section, for example, Aphthonius wrote that Isocrates' value to kings and individuals "would be a long story to set forth in detail" (μακρὸν ἂν εἶη διεξελθεῖν).<sup>752</sup> Similarly, Gregory says that to discuss all of Socrates' teachings "would be a longer task (διεξιέναι μακρότερον ἂν εἶη) than is in keeping with the present scope of this essay" (2). Also in this section we note that Aphthonius marvels at what Isocrates had taught about education (οἷα περὶ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησεν),<sup>753</sup> and Gregory, though more expansively, uses similar language when speaking of what Socrates taught about reason (ὃ γε περὶ τοῦ λόγου . . . ἐφιλοσόφησεν) (3).

In the παραφραστικόν section Gregory again uses Aphthonius as a model, although the opening question—καὶ τί φησι;—comes from Aphthonius' maxim elaboration.<sup>754</sup> Gregory's closing sentence in this section (4) also echoes Aphthonius:

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε ταῦτα<sup>755</sup>

<sup>750</sup> See Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2.272 n. 1.

<sup>751</sup> John Stobaeus, *Ecl.* 2.4.14 (p. 30 Wachsmuth-Hense). See also *Gnom. Par.* 133 (p. 49 Sternbach) and 285 (p. 61).

<sup>752</sup> Aphthonius 33.

<sup>753</sup> See Aphthonius 33-34.

<sup>754</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 21 Rabe).

<sup>755</sup> Aphthonius 36.



Gregory: καὶ ἃ μὲν περὶ τοῦ λόγου <ἐφιλοσόφησε> Σωκράτης  
ταῦτα

The following sections likewise contain various echoes of Aphthonius' language and syntax, most notably in the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, παραβολή, μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, and ἐπίλογος βραχύς sections. In the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, for example, the opening words (ἂν δέ) (7) reflect the corresponding words of Aphthonius,<sup>756</sup> and we have already observed the way in which Gregory ends this section in the same way that Aphthonius had, i.e., by imitating the latter's syntax and by recalling the saying being elaborated. In the παραβολή section Gregory again follows Aphthonian style by using ὥσπερ ... οὕτω ... to govern the syntax (9).<sup>757</sup> In addition, the μαρτυρία section contains further hints of dependence on Aphthonius, for Gregory uses the words δηλοῦντα and γνώμη, both of which appear in Aphthonius.<sup>758</sup> Finally, in the ἐπίλογος, Gregory reflects Aphthonian style, particularly in this clause (12):

Aphthonius: περὶ τῆς παιδείας φιλοσοφήσαντα<sup>759</sup>

Gregory: περὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐφιλοσόφησεν

Gregory's dependence, both structurally and stylistically, on Aphthonius' chreia elaboration should now be clear. The function of such close allegiance, however, is more complex. It certainly fits in, as we have seen, with Gregory's admiration of the ancient authors and with his own desire to write like them. But the allegiance goes beyond personal explanations, as Aphthonius was imitated by all the writers of elaborations. In that light it appears that Gregory's chreia elaboration functioned as a supplement to Aphthonius' model elaboration form or simply as another example for his students to use when writing their own elaborations.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

In 1830 Boissonade published the *editio princeps* of Gregory's chreia elaboration, based on one thirteenth century MS, Paris.

<sup>756</sup> See Aphthonius 53: εἰ δέ.

<sup>757</sup> See Aphthonius 59 and 61.

<sup>758</sup> See Aphthonius 73 and 76.

<sup>759</sup> Aphthonius 79.

gr. 3010.<sup>760</sup> This text was then simply reprinted, with a Latin translation, in J.-P. Migne's *Patrologia Graeca*.<sup>761</sup> Kotzabassi, as we have seen, has expanded the textual basis by identifying other MSS that contain this elaboration—Leid. B.P.G. 49, Marc. II.169A, Salam. 2737, and Laur. 58,3—but she has not edited the text anew.<sup>762</sup>

Accordingly, we, too, must continue to use Boissonade's text, citing his page numbers in parentheses in the text. But we have also reparagraphed his text in accordance with the Aphthorian διόρσεις and have added the section titles. In addition, we have proposed several emendations, all noted in the apparatus.

Finally, so far as we know, this is the first translation of this elaboration into any modern language.

<sup>760</sup> See Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, 2.269-73. Incidentally, Boissonade was aware of a Leiden MS, as is apparent in a note (2.269) where he says that this MS ascribes this composition to Gregory, whereas the Paris MS leaves it as an anonymous one.

<sup>761</sup> See *PG* 142.417-21.

<sup>762</sup> See Kotzabassi, "Die Progymnasmata," 45 n. 3. We would especially like to know if any of these MSS contains the actual chreia that Gregory was elaborating.



## Text 34. Gregory of Cyprus, Χρεία

## CHREIA ELABORATION

(BOISSONADE, *ANECDOTA GRAECA*, 2.269-73)

<Σωκράτης ἔφη· Ὁ λόγος ὥσπερ πλάστης ἀγαθὸς καλὸν τῇ ψυχῇ περιτίθησι σχῆμα.>

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Σωκράτους μὲν ἐπαινέτην οἶμαι πάντα πρόθυμον εἶναι γενέσθαι, ὅστις οἶδε, λέγω, τὸ τοῦδε ὁπόσον ἐπὶ σοφίᾳ προῆκε, γενέσθαι δὲ ὁμῶς κατ' ἀξίαν οὐδένα. ἐπεὶ τί τις ἂν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρὸς ἔχοι λέγειν, ὃν ἡ Πυθία προλαβοῦσα οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους εἴρηκεν εἶναι σοφόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μόνον τόνδε σοφόν; καὶ εἰκότως. τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων πάντων περὶ τὸ φαινόμενον καὶ τὸ δοκεῖν σπουδαζόντων, ἀμελούντων δὲ κατὰ πάντα λόγον τοῦ εἶναι, ὁ δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐφρόντισεν, οὐ μέχρι τῶν ὀρωμένων τῇ φιλοπραγμοσύνῃ σταθείς, ἀλλ' ὑπερβὰς καὶ εἰς ψυχὴν καὶ νοὸς ἄδυτα παρακύψας, ἅτε μὴ τῇ αἰσθήσει, κατὰ τοὺς ἄλλους, ὀδηγῶ πρὸς τὴν σκέψιν, ἀλλὰ τῷ νῷ κεχρημένος, ὥ γέ μόνῳ ἡ τῶν ὄντων ἀκριβὴς κατάληψις γίνεται.

2. Καὶ τοίνυν Σωκράτους μὲν τοῦδε πράξεις τε καὶ λόγους τοὺς ἄλλους, δι' ὧν κάλλιστον ἀρχέτυπον τοῦ φιλοσόφου ἐγένετο βίου, καὶ βελτίους τοὺς γ' ἐκείνῳ προσεσχηκότας ἐκατέρωθεν ἔδειξεν, ἐξ ὧν τε ὡς ἄριστα ἐπολιτεύσατο, καὶ ὧν περὶ τε θείων περὶ τ' (p. 270) ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ὡς οὐδὲ τις ἐφιλοσόφησε, διεξιέναι μακρότερον ἂν εἴη ἢ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα τοῦ λόγου σκοπόν·

3. Νυνὶ δ' ἀφείς ἐκείνα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλως οἶόν τε), ἐν ἑξ ἀπάντων ἡγοῦμαι προθεῖναι καλόν, ὃν γε καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀμυδρὸν τῆς Σωκράτους

## Text 34. Gregory of Cyprus, Χρεία

## CHREIA ELABORATION

(BOISSONADE, *ANECDOTA GRAECA*, 2.269-73)

<Socrates said, "Reason, like a skillful sculptor, puts a lovely form around the soul."><sup>763</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> Everyone is eager, I think, to sing the praises of Socrates—whoever knows, I mean, the extent of his preeminence in wisdom. And yet, no one is likely to do so to the extent that he deserves. Indeed, what can anyone say on behalf of a man whom the Pythia has already said was not only wise beyond other men but even that he alone was wise?<sup>764</sup> And with good reason. For while everyone else was concerned with "appearing" and "seeming" and in every discussion was neglecting "being," he concentrated on the truth, not stopping with the "visible" because of his curiosity but passing beyond and peering into the soul and the hidden recesses of the mind, inasmuch as he did not use sense perception (like the others) as a guide in his investigation, but rather he used his mind which alone accomplishes the accurate comprehension of "reality."

2. Moreover, to discuss Socrates' deeds and his other sayings by which he became the best archetype for the philosophical life and by which he showed that those who followed him were better in two ways—because he engaged in politics in the best possible manner and because he philosophized about both divine and human matters as no one else has—to discuss all this would be a greater task than is consistent with the present scope of this essay.

3. On this occasion, then, I propose to put aside those other subjects (for otherwise the task is impossible) and out of all of his sayings to put forward a noble one, one which is not a negligible

<sup>763</sup> On our supplying this chreia as the one being elaborated, see the Introduction to this text.

<sup>764</sup> For this oracle regarding Socrates, see Plato, *Apol.* 20D-21C; Diogenes Laertius, 2.37; and Eduard Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung* (3 vols; 5th ed.; Leipzig: Reisland, 1921) 2.1.52 n. 4. Cf. also Joseph Fontenrose, *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1978) 245-46.

σοφίας τεκμήριον· τὸ δέ ἐστιν, ὃ γε περὶ τοῦ λόγου, οἷον τί καὶ ὅσον οὗτος δύναται εἰς ψυχὴν, ὁπηνίκα τὴν ταύτης κυβέρνησιν ἔχοι, ἐφιλοσόφησεν.

4. <Παραφραστικόν> Καὶ τί φησι; "Ἄλλοις μὲν ἄλλα κοσμεῖται· ψυχῆς δὲ κοσμητῶρ οἰκείος μόνος ὁ λόγος, δι' οὗ δὴ καὶ καλλίστη αὐτὴ ἐαυτῆς καταφαίνεται· ὥς, εἰ μὴ οὗτός γε κοσμήσει παραλαβών, κινδυνεύει τοῦ παντὸς αἰσχίῳ εἶναι ψυχὴν. καὶ ἃ μὲν περὶ τοῦ λόγου <ἐφιλοσόφησε> Σωκράτης, ταῦτα· ὥς δὲ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἄξια καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου σοφίας ἀκριβώσαιτ' ἂν τις καλῶς προσέχων τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα.

5. <Αἰτία> Λόγος τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξορίζει θυμόν, καὶ κακῶν ἐπιθυμία φυγαδεύεται λόγῳ· μάλιστα δὲ μετὰ λόγου καὶ ταῦτα εἰς τὰ τῶν ἀρετῶν μεταβαίνουνσι. γίνεσθαι γὰρ ἴσμεν ἀνδρείαν, μετὰ τοῦ λόγου τοῦ θυμοῦ (p. 271) γιγνομένου· καὶ κατὰ λόγον ἐπιθυμήσας τις οὐκ ἂν ὥς κακὸς διαβάλλοιτο· δίκαιοι νομίζονται ἀνθρωποί, ἀλλ' ὅταν, ἐφ' ὧν πράττουσι, τὸν λόγον προβάλλωνται· καὶ φρονίμους οὐκ ὀνομάσει τις, ἀλλ' οὗς οἶδε μάλιστα κεχρημένους τῷ λόγῳ.

6. Ἐπιστήμη διὰ λόγου προσγίνεται τῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ γινώσιν τὴν ὑπὲρ αἴσθησιν μόνῳ τῷ λόγῳ θηρεύομεν ἀνθρωποί· θαυμάζεται μόνος ἀνθρωπος ἐπὶ γῆς, ἀλλ' ἕνεκά γε τοῦ λόγου, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ κάτω γίνεται τοῦτο τὸ ζῶον τῷ λόγῳ χειραγωγούμενον· ἐπίνοιαί, τέχναι τε πᾶσαι καὶ μηχαναί, τοῦ λόγου γεννήματα· σοφίας πατήρ ὁ λόγος, καὶ ἀρετὴ πᾶσα γεννήτορα τὸν λόγον πεπλούτηκεν. οὐκ ἔχει χώραν κακία ὅπου τὸ κράτος ἔχων ἐστὶν οὗτος· καὶ ἀρετὴ δὲ πᾶσα τῇ τοῦ λόγου παρρησίᾳ εἰσάγεται. ταῦτα μὲν δὴ καὶ τὰ τούτων ἔτι πλείω διὰ λόγου γίνεται τῇ ψυχῇ, ὅταν ἔχη ἐγχειρισθεὶς τὴν ταύτης κυβέρνησιν.

7. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> "Ἄν δ' ἕτερον ἀντὶ τούτου κρατῇ τῆς ψυχῆς, οἷα καὶ ὅσα τὰ χαλεπά. ζάλη περὶ αὐτὴν αὐτίκα, καὶ κακῶν ἐπανάστασις, τῶν τε ἄλλων καὶ δὴ καὶ θυμοῦ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας, ὑφ' ὧν κατεχομένη οὐδ' ἂν ἔτι σαφῶς μένοι ψυχῇ, τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀπολέσασα

4 ἐφιλοσόφησε addidimus; cf. Aphthonius 36 5 τὰ scripsimus τὰς Boissonade || post μεταβαίνουνσι inseruit Boissonade φύσεις 6 ψυχῇ scripsimus ψυχῇ Boissonade per errorem 7 μένοι Boissonade μένη codex

proof of Socrates' wisdom. This is what he thought about reason: the nature and extent of its power over the soul and at what point reason takes command of the soul.

4. <Paraphrastic [section]> And so what does he say? Some things are adorned by one thing, some by another, but only reason is the proper adorning of the soul, by means of which the soul appears most beautiful. Consequently, unless reason is to take control of the soul and adorn it, there is danger that the soul will be worse in every respect. And so this is what Socrates <taught> about reason, and just how worthy this teaching is of the man and his wisdom one can understand by paying close attention to the sections that follow.

5. <Rationale> Reason banishes strong emotion from the soul, and desire for evil things is driven out by reason; but most of all with reason these emotions and desires change into virtues. For we know that courage arises when emotion exists along with reason. And nobody can be slandered as evil if his desires are in accord with reason. People are regarded as just, but only when they apply reason to what they do. And no one will call people wise, except for those, he knows, who have made the greatest use of reason.

6. Understanding accrues to the soul through reason, and we human beings search for knowledge that is beyond sense perception by means of reason alone. Humans alone are admired on earth, but only for their reason, and so this creature, because it is guided by reason, is superior to the lower creatures. Inventions as well as every skill and machine are the products of reason; reason is the father of wisdom, and every virtue is enriched by reason, its creator. Wickedness has no access where reason is in control, but every virtue is admitted by the presence of reason. These things, and even more than these, happen to the soul because of reason, whenever it has been entrusted with its guidance.

7. <From the Opposite> But should its opposite have control of the soul, what difficulties there are and how many of them! A storm immediately arises around it, and a surge of evils, including impulse and desire; and when the soul is restrained by these, it can obviously abide no longer since it has lost its proper form; there is motion without logic and discipline, and there is nothing

εἶδος, κίνησις παρὰ λόγον καὶ ἄτακτος, καὶ οὐδὲν μετὰ κόσμου καὶ τοῦ προσήκοντος. ἐπειδήπερ καὶ πάνθ' (p. 272) ὅσα, τοῦ λόγου παρόντος, ἀπῆν τῶν δεινῶν, ταῦτα παρεῖναι ἀνάγκη, τοῦ λόγου μὴ παραμένοντος· ὥσπερ δῆτα καὶ νῦξ ἐστὶν ἀπουσία τοῦ τὴν ἡμέραν ποιοῦντος φωτός, καὶ νόσος ἐπιτρέχει, τῆς Ὑγείας ἀποδημούσης τοῦ σώματος. ἃ δὴ πάντα συνορῶν, ὁ Σωφρονίσκου Σωκράτης πλάστην ἀγαθῶν τῶν ψυχῶν τὸν λόγον ἐδίδαξε.

8. <Παραβολή> Καὶ γὰρ ὃν τρόπον ἐν οἰκίᾳ· τῷ δεσπότῃ μὲν προστατούμεν, ἀνάγκη πάντα τε ὡς εὐπρεπῶς διατίθεσθαι καὶ κατὰ κόσμον γίνεσθαι τὴν διοίκησιν, μὴ ἐκείνου δέ, τῶν δὲ δούλων κρατούντων, ἅπαντ' ἄνω καὶ κάτω μεταπίπτειν τῇ ἐπικρατείᾳ τοῦ χείρονος·

9. Εἰ δὲ βούλει, ὥσπερ ἐν σώματι τῆς συμμετρίας κρατούσης καὶ τοῦ ἄνωθεν λόγου κατάστασις τε πᾶσα περὶ ἐκεῖνο καὶ δὴ καὶ ὑγεία ὡς ἀκραιφνής, ἐκείνων δὲ διαλυθέντων εἰς τ' ἀσυμμετρίαν καὶ ἀταξίαν τῆς κράσεως, ἀνωμαλῖαι τε ἄλλαι συμβαίνουσι, καὶ νόσοι καὶ φθίσεις, καὶ ὅσα τῆς ἀταξίας γεννήματα, οὕτω δῆτα καὶ λόγος παρὼν πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον οἶδε μεταπλάττειν ψυχὴν, ἀπὼν δὲ πρὸς τοῦναντίον ἵεναι παραχωρεῖ, καθὰ δῆπου συνέβη ἂν καὶ πλεούσῃ νηϊ, μὴ τοῦ κυβερνήσοντος κατ' ἐπιστήμην παρόντος.

10. <Παράδειγμα> Διὸ δὴ καὶ πάντες οἷς ἐγένετο καλῶς ἀναπλῆσαι τὸν βίον, ἔργοις αὐτοῖς καὶ λόγοις τῷ λόγῳ μαρτυροῦσι Σωκράτους, δι' ἀμφοτέρων βοῶντες περιφανῶς, ὡς οὐκ ἂν ἦν αὐτοῖς τῶν δεόντων οὐδὲν ἀνύσαι, εἰ μὴ ὁ λόγος ἐχειραγῶγει οἷον καὶ προυπορέετο, ὄντινα δὴ σφίσι διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου προουστήσαντο.

11. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Ἄλλ' (p. 273) ἵνα τά γε τῶν ἄλλων παρέλθω, ὅσα τε εἶπον, ὅσα τ' ἔδρασαν, εἰς ταυτόν γνῶμης Σωκράτει ἐρχόμενοι, τίς οὐκ οἶδε τὸν Εὐριπίδην ἔστιν ἐν οἷς τῶν ποιημάτων



with order and seemliness. Inasmuch as everything that is terrible is absent, when reason is present, every terrible thing must be present when reason is not at hand. In the same way, then, night is the absence of the light that makes the day, and sickness attacks when health departs from the body. Understanding all these matters, then, Socrates, son of Sophroniscus, taught that reason is the sculptor of virtuous souls.<sup>765</sup>

8. <Analogy> Indeed, it is the same in a household: when it is under the guidance of its master, everything is necessarily arranged in a seemly fashion and its management is orderly, but when the slaves are in charge, and not the master, everything is turned topsy-turvy because the baser element is in charge.

9. And, if you prefer, just as in a body when harmony and reason are in control, every condition of the body, especially health, is sound; but when these conditions have been dissolved into disharmony and when disorder of the temperaments and abnormal conditions occur, in particular ailments and infirmities and all the things that are products of this disorder—so also reason, when present, knows how to refashion the soul for the better; but when absent it allows the soul to go in the opposite direction just as, of course, would also happen to a ship under sail if the man who is to pilot it skillfully is not on board.

10. <Example> Therefore, all who lived their lives nobly bear witness to this saying of Socrates by their own deeds and words, shouting plainly with both that it would be impossible for them to accomplish a single one of their duties unless reason, so to speak, took them by the hand and led the way—reason, which they had chosen as a guide for themselves throughout their lives.<sup>766</sup>

11. <Testimony of the Ancients> But to pass over what others have said and done in arriving at the same opinion as Socrates, who does not know that Euripides prays in some of his plays that he would not ever wish to live, nor would this be life at

<sup>765</sup> On Sophroniscus as Socrates' father, see, e.g., Diogenes Laertius, 2.18; Dio, *Orat.* 55.2; Lucian, *Somn.* 12; and Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, 2.1.46 n. 1. That he was a sculptor explains the metaphor of the sculptor here.

<sup>766</sup> Gregory speaks very generally here of people who were guided by reason, although the *παράδειγμα* section usually names specific individuals who illustrate the point of the chreia being elaborated.

εὐχόμενον, μὴ ἐθέλῃν ποτὲ ζῆν, μηδὲ γενέσθαι οἱ τοῦτο συνόλως, ἂν μὴ καὶ λόγος προσῇ τῇ ζωῇ; δηλοῦντα διὰ τούτων, ἣν γε δι' ἄλλων Σωκράτης ἐξήνεγκε γνώμην, ὥς οὐκ ἔστιν εὐκτὴν εἶναι ζωὴν, μὴ τοῦ λόγου τὴν ψυχὴν κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ φύσιν πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον μεταπλάττοντος, ὥστε καλῶς ἔχειν αὐτήν, μηδὲν ἐπίμωμον ἐξ αἰσχροτήτος ἐπιφέρουσιν.

12. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Καὶ οὕτω μὲν Σωκράτης ἀξίως ἑαυτοῦ περὶ τοῦ παρόντος ἐφιλοσόφησεν· ἀξίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐπαίνους λαβεῖν ἔχει παρ' οὐδενός.

all, if reason were not also a part of his life?<sup>767</sup> He thereby shows with these words the same opinion that Socrates expressed with others: that is, that it is impossible for life to be desirable unless reason, in accordance with its nature, refashions the soul for the better, with the result that the soul is noble and displays nothing disgraceful out of shamefulness.

12. <Brief Epilogue> And in this way Socrates taught about the present subject in a manner worthy of himself. And yet from no one can Socrates receive praises that are worthy of him.

<sup>767</sup> Boissonade (*Anecdota Graeca*, 2.273 n. 3) thinks that Gregory has Euripides' *Herakles* in mind, specifically these lines (673-76):

οὐ παύσομαι τὰς Χάριτας  
ταῖς Μούσαισιν συγκαταμει-  
γνύς, ἥδισταν συζυγίαν.  
μὴ ζῶην μετ' ἁμουσίας.

But these lines do not mention reason and actually have only a formal similarity, in that Euripides says here that he would rather not live if he could not live with the Muses.

Text 35. George Pachymeres, *Progymnasmata* 3

(1.553, 20–555, 8 Walz)

## Introduction

## LIFE AND WRITINGS

A second scholar and teacher of the early Palaiologan period who wrote sample *progymnasmata*, including a chreia elaboration, is George Pachymeres.<sup>768</sup> He is best known for having written a history of the lengthy reigns of the first two Palaiologan emperors, Michael VIII (1259–82) and Andronikos II (1282–1328),<sup>769</sup> and the opening lines of this history provide us with some important information about Pachymeres himself. For example, his birthplace is explicitly given, and we can easily deduce his birthdate as well.

Pachymeres says that he came from a Constantinopolitan family, although he was not born there. Rather, because of the capture of Constantinople by the Latins in 1204, the family had found refuge in Nicaea, the site of the exiled Byzantine government. There, Pachymeres says, he was “born and reared”<sup>770</sup> and consequently received his early education in this city, perhaps at the school established at the church of St. Tryphon by Theodore II Lascaris.<sup>771</sup> His birthdate emerges from his statement that the

<sup>768</sup> For general treatments of Pachymeres, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 288–91; Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.37, 447; 2.245–46; Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 61–64; and Wilson, *Scholars*, 241. Cf. also Alice-Mary Talbot, “Pachymeres, George,” *ODB* 3.1550.

<sup>769</sup> See Immanuel Bekker, ed., *Georgii Pachymeris De Michaelē et Andronico Palaeologis libri tredecim* (2 vols.; Bonn: Weber, 1835). This history is also available in Migne (*PG* 143.443–996; 144.15–716). A new edition had long been planned by Vitalien Laurent, but after his death the task has fallen to Albert Failler. The first volume, on Michael Palaeologos, has now appeared: Albert Failler, ed., *Georges Pachymeres, Relations historiques. I et II. Livres I–III et IV–VI*. (2 vols.; Paris: Belles Lettres, 1984).

<sup>770</sup> Pachymeres, 1.11, 1–2 Bekker.

<sup>771</sup> On the educational opportunities available during this period (1204–1261), see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 5–27. Constantinides emphasizes (pp. 5–18) the extent to which education continued during these difficult, if improving, years in Nicaea, due largely to the interests in education of the

recapture of Constantinople in 1261 allowed him to go to the capital. He was, he says, nineteen years old at the time,<sup>772</sup> which thereby fixes his birth in 1242 and makes him an exact contemporary of Gregory of Cyprus.

Constantinople is the setting for the rest of Pachymeres' life. On arrival he continued his education until 1267 under the leading scholar of the day, George Akropolites.<sup>773</sup> Thereafter he became a deacon and a member of the patriarchal clergy and held, from 1277, the position of διδάσκαλος τοῦ ἀποστόλου and earlier, perhaps, that of διδάσκαλος τοῦ ψαλτερίου.<sup>774</sup> He also held the ecclesiastical position known as πρωτέκδικος, which dealt primarily with asylum cases,<sup>775</sup> and the minor imperial appointment of δικαιοφύλαξ, which dealt with ecclesiastical disputes.<sup>776</sup>

Pachymeres' death cannot be pinpointed, but scholars have suggested a date around 1310, arguing, on the one hand, that his history of the reign of Andronikos, which lasted until 1308, is complete, and, on the other, that no evidence about Pachymeres comes from a later time. In any case, his death was marked by a funeral oration written by his student Manuel Philes.<sup>777</sup>

emperors Theodore I Lascaris (1204-22) and John III Vatatzes (1222-1254). Regarding Pachymeres' educational opportunities, however, we should add that Constantinides (pp. 19-20) speaks of Theodore II Lascaris (1254-1258) founding a school that taught grammar and rhetoric at the church of St. Tryphon in Nicaea. The founding of this school would correspond with Pachymeres' years as a schoolboy. He would have been twelve years old when Theodore II became emperor and hence about ready to start studying rhetoric.

<sup>772</sup> See Pachymeres, I.11, 3-4 Bekker.

<sup>773</sup> On the teaching activities of Acropolites in Constantinople, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 31-36.

<sup>774</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, I.447. On the possibility of Pachymeres holding the latter position, see Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 59-60.

<sup>775</sup> Pachymeres, I.11, 4-6 Bekker. On the position of πρωτέκδικος, which was established to protect those who sought asylum in the Hagia Sophia for debt, slavery, and suspected murder, see R. J. Macrides, "Protekdikos," *ODB* 3.1742-43.

<sup>776</sup> Pachymeres, I.11, 6 Bekker. On the position of δικαιοφύλαξ, which required a knowledge of civil and canon law, see R. J. Macrides, "Dikaiophylax," *ODB* 1.624.

<sup>777</sup> For the text of this oration, see Jean-François Boissonade, ed., *G. Pachymeris Declamationes XIII* (Paris: Dumont, 1848) 253-60.

Pachymeres was a prolific writer, despite his involvement in ecclesiastical and civic positions. Most important is the already-mentioned two-volume history, the Συγγραφικαὶ ἱστορίαι, which dedicates six books to the reign of Michael VIII and seven to that of Andronikos II, covering the period from 1260 to 1308. Hunger's excellent summary and analysis of this history<sup>778</sup> shows Pachymeres to have written an objective, if also pessimistic, account of the political situation, both foreign and domestic, of the Palaiologans.<sup>779</sup> He writes as an eyewitness, but his position within the church gives him more the perspective of a patriarchal official than a political outsider, so that there is much on ecclesiastical personalities and quarrels.<sup>780</sup> The latter Hunger finds especially frustrating, as he does Pachymeres' difficult and stilted Greek.<sup>781</sup> But Hunger, and here he follows Germaine G. Arnakis,<sup>782</sup> also senses a humanist perspective in Pachymeres' rejection of the Patriarch Athanasius' asceticism, his attitudes toward fate, his confidence in the ability of people to learn about and adapt to their world, and his embracing of Greek antiquity, which is most notable in his use of old Attic names for the months instead of the hated Latin ones.<sup>783</sup>

But the bulk of Pachymeres' writings, aside from some poetry and an occasional letter,<sup>784</sup> clearly has an educational Sitz im Leben. Indeed, the range of educational subjects shows that Pachymeres taught across the educational curriculum. Given his teaching positions in the church, it is not surprising to find

<sup>778</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.447-53. Cf. Germaine G. Arnakis, "George Pachymeres—A Byzantine Humanist," *GOTR* 12 (1966/67) 161-67.

<sup>779</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.447-48.

<sup>780</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.448.

<sup>781</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.448 ("die endlosen Querelen") and 449 ("der schwierige und geschraubte Stil"). For similar sentiments, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 288.

<sup>782</sup> See Arnakis, "Byzantine Humanist," 163-67.

<sup>783</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.451-52. On the use of Attic names for the months, see Arnakis, "Byzantine Humanist," 164-65, and esp. his "The Names of the Months in the History of Georgios Pachymeres," *BNJ* 18 (1945-49) 144-53.

<sup>784</sup> On this poetry, including an unpublished autobiography, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 289, and Hunger, *Literatur*, 2.105 and n. 25, 162. On a letter of Pachymeres, see Albert Failler, "Le séjour d'Athanase II d'Alexandrie à Constantinople," *REB* 35 (1978) 43-71, esp. 63-71.

scholia on the Psalms and a paraphrase of Dionysius the Areopagite.<sup>785</sup> But his more secular writings, as Constantinides says, suggest an added role as private teacher. For example, scholia on Homer point to secondary education,<sup>786</sup> whereas *progymnasmata* and declamations are evidence of teaching the tertiary subject of rhetoric, as do other writings on arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy as well as a lengthy summary of the philosophy of Aristotle.<sup>787</sup> In short, as Constantinides concludes, "Pachymeres was a distinguished figure in secular as well as in theological learning."<sup>788</sup>

It is the rhetorical writings that require our further attention. These writings include a complete set of sample *progymnasmata* and thirteen declamations. The declamations<sup>789</sup> are full-fledged speeches that respond to a specific legal, political, or social situation. A summary of the situation is given at the beginning, including the side the speaker is to take. For example, the eighth declamation takes up this legal situation: "There was a law that a disowned son is not to share in the family estate, and again another law that the one who remained with a ship that was wrecked in a storm becomes the owner (of its cargo). A disowned son stayed with the family's ship when it was in a storm but was kept from its cargo because it was the family's ship. Let us take the side of the disowned son."<sup>790</sup>

Declamations like these are something of a rarity in later Byzantine literature, as Schissel points out. Declamations, he says, were very popular during the Second Sophistic of the first through fourth centuries but lost ground to *progymnasmata* in the succeeding centuries.<sup>791</sup> In fact, the subjects of Pachymeres' declamations hark back to that earlier period and repeat, or at least recall, the very themes that echoed again and again in the theatre

<sup>785</sup> See further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 63.

<sup>786</sup> See further Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 61.

<sup>787</sup> See further Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.37; 2.245-46.

<sup>788</sup> Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 63.

<sup>789</sup> See Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 1-251.

<sup>790</sup> For the eighth declamation, see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 134-59. The situation appears on p. 134, 9-12.

<sup>791</sup> See Schissel, "Progymnasmatik," 1-11. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.93-94.

of "Sophistopolis," Donald A. Russell's apt term for the world created and inhabited by sophists and their audiences.<sup>792</sup>

The citizens of Sophistopolis, Russell says, were usually at war, so that many declamations dealt with the ἄριστεύς, or war hero, who returned and asked for his reward. Or they dealt with resident aliens defending Sophistopolis from the walls despite laws that forbade their presence. Or they dealt with those seeking entrance to Sophistopolis at night even though laws prohibited the gates from being opened at night.<sup>793</sup> These very cases appear among Pachymeres' declamations, where we find, for example, an ἄριστεύς seeking his reward,<sup>794</sup> resident aliens on trial for illegally mounting the walls and defending the city,<sup>795</sup> and returning soldiers killed before the gates because of laws prohibiting their being opened at night.<sup>796</sup> In fact, the majority of Pachymeres' declamations involve legal conflicts that arise from war.<sup>797</sup>

But Sophistopolis also had its internal conflicts. For example, Russell points to cases in which someone is being charged for planning a tyranny and to others cases in which someone is asking for a reward after killing a tyrant.<sup>798</sup> And once again Pachymeres' declamations reflect these very cases, as two deal with tyranny.<sup>799</sup>

These declamations show that Pachymeres taught rhetoric at an advanced level. His reputation as a teacher of rhetoric was

<sup>792</sup> For a detailed description of Sophistopolis, see Russell, *Declamation*, 21-39.

<sup>793</sup> See further Russell, *Declamation*, 24-27.

<sup>794</sup> The sixth declamation takes up this topic, on which see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 90-112.

<sup>795</sup> So the seventh declamation, on which see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 112-34.

<sup>796</sup> So the twelfth declamation, on which see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 229-48.

<sup>797</sup> So also the fourth, fifth, and thirteenth declamations, on which see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 59-81, 82-89, 248-51.

<sup>798</sup> See further Russell, *Declamation*, 27-37.

<sup>799</sup> So the first and second declamations, on which see Boissonade, *Declamationes*, 1-19 and 20-40.



high, at least in the eyes of his student Philes whose funeral oration calls Pachymeres a "Christian Demosthenes," high praise indeed.<sup>800</sup>

We come at last to Pachymeres' sample *progymnasmata*,<sup>801</sup> which indicate that he also taught rhetoric at a more preliminary level. Only Hunger has discussed these *progymnasmata* to any extent, and he confines his remarks largely to brief summaries of their contents.<sup>802</sup> Otherwise, scholars merely note their existence<sup>803</sup> or even disparage them.<sup>804</sup> Some discussion of them as a whole, therefore, is in order before turning specifically to the chreia elaboration.

Pachymeres' collection of sample *progymnasmata* is the first complete set since that attributed to Nicolaus, although Pachymeres exceeds the set of the *Rhetorica Marciana* by only one, since he includes a sample νόμου εισφορά. This *progymnasma* treats a νόμος that permits coastal residents to plunder shipwrecks and argues both for this law and against it.<sup>805</sup> Also of note is the inclusion of two μῦθοι<sup>806</sup> and two διηγήματα<sup>807</sup> in the set. The reason for two μῦθοι is readily apparent, as the first is supplied with a concluding moral, or ἐπιμύθιον,<sup>808</sup> and the second with an introductory moral, or προμύθιον,<sup>809</sup> so that Pachymeres seems to be illustrating a point of Aphthonius' instructions on composing μῦθοι.<sup>810</sup> The reason for two διηγήματα, however, is less clear, unless Pachymeres simply wanted to illustrate two of Aphthonius' γένη of διηγήματα, so that Pachymeres' first διήγημα, about

<sup>800</sup> See Boissonade, *Declamations*, 254, 18, where the Greek reads, εὐσεβῆς Δημοσθένους, although our translation follows Boissonade's note to this line: "εὐσεβῆς, christianus scilicet."

<sup>801</sup> For these *progymnasmata*, see 1.551-96 Walz.

<sup>802</sup> See Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.96, 98-100, 103-4, 106-8, 115-19. Cf. also the very technical analysis of Pachymeres' clause rhythm in Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 116-17.

<sup>803</sup> See, e.g., Schissel, "Progymnasmatik," 4; Constantinides, *Higher Education*, 61, 152; and Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 321.

<sup>804</sup> So, e.g., Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 288.

<sup>805</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.589-96 and 586-89 Walz.

<sup>806</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.551, 2-11 and 551, 12-552, 9 Walz.

<sup>807</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.552, 11-25 and 553, 1-19 Walz.

<sup>808</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.551, 8-11 Walz.

<sup>809</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.551, 12-13 Walz.

<sup>810</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 1 (pp. 1, 15-2, 2 Rabe).

Odysseus,<sup>811</sup> is ἱστορικόν, whereas the second, about Phaethon,<sup>812</sup> is δραματικόν.<sup>813</sup>

Otherwise, Pachymeres provides only one example of each of the remaining *progymnasmata*, and the subjects dealt with are mostly traditional, if not quite “die uralten, unausrottbaren Themen der Rhetorenschulen” of Karl Krumbacher’s dismissive description.<sup>814</sup> At any rate, if there is an “unausrottbar” theme, it appears in Pachymeres’ maxim elaboration, where he takes up Demosthenes’ oft-used statement, “There is a need for money, and nothing essential can be done without it.”<sup>815</sup> Elsewhere, too, Pachymeres’ subjects can be matched, as Hunger has pointed out, with earlier collections—for example, his διήγημα about Odysseus with that of Nikephoros Basilakes<sup>816</sup> and his σύγκρισις of the olive and grape with that of ps.-Nicolaus.<sup>817</sup> But Pachymeres’ collection is especially dependent on Aphthonius. His ἀνασκευή and κατασκευή<sup>818</sup> take as their topic Aphthonius’ διήγημα about the reason for roses being red,<sup>819</sup> and Pachymeres’ θέσις, “whether one should go to sea,”<sup>820</sup> argues a subject suggested by Aphthonius.<sup>821</sup> This dependence on Aphthonius will be especially apparent in Pachymeres’ chreia elaboration.

#### PACHYMERES’ CHREIA ELABORATION

The chreia which Pachymeres elaborates is, formally speaking, a sayings-chreia, a χρεία λογική, as the title of the elaboration itself

<sup>811</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.551, 2-11 Walz.

<sup>812</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.551, 12-552, 9 Walz.

<sup>813</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 2 (p. 2, 19-21 Rabe).

<sup>814</sup> Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 288.

<sup>815</sup> For the maxim, see Demosthenes, 1.20. For other elaborations of this maxim, see ps.-Libanius, 8.117, 4-120, 14 Foerster; ps.-Nicolaus, 1.279, 20-280, 31 Walz; and Anonymous, 1.605, 19-608, 31 Walz.

<sup>816</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.552, 10-27 Walz, and Nikephoros Basilakes, pp. 81-82 Pignani. Cf. Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.98.

<sup>817</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.572, 12-574, 28 Walz, and ps.-Nicolaus, 1.370, 30-371, 33 Walz. Cf. Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.107-8.

<sup>818</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.557, 17-559, 23 and 559, 24-561, 10 Walz. On the former Hunger (*Literatur*, 1.103 n. 57) correctly notes that the MS is incorrect at this point in having κατασκευή as the title rather than ἀνασκευή.

<sup>819</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 2 (p. 3, 5-19 Rabe).

<sup>820</sup> See Pachymeres, 1.583, 3-586, 11 Walz.

<sup>821</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 13 (p. 41, 17 Rabe).

says. More specifically, its sub-type is, according to Theon, ἀποφαντικὸν καθ' ἐκούσιον, or chreia with an unprompted saying.<sup>822</sup>

The πρόσωπον of this chreia is Chaeremon, presumably the fourth century B.C. tragic poet. At any rate, August Nauck included this somewhat garbled line as *frag.* 40 among the fragments of this Chaeremon in his *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*.<sup>823</sup> This attribution, however, has been increasingly questioned. Bruno Snell, the reviser of Nauck's collection, regards the line as merely a variant of another fragment of Chaeremon, i.e., *frag.* 23,<sup>824</sup> and Christopher Collard denies the attribution to Chaeremon altogether.<sup>825</sup>

Also casting doubt on the attribution is Pachymeres' ἐγκωμιαστικόν section where he claims that Chaeremon distinguished himself as both a military man and a man of letters (1), a claim that is not consistent with what little we know of the tragedian.<sup>826</sup> To be sure, Pachymeres may simply be engaging in encomiastic hyperbole, so that his claim is thus not decisive. But it also does nothing to establish the attribution. Accordingly, we regard this Chaeremon as otherwise unknown.<sup>827</sup>

When we turn our attention to the elaboration itself, we find it to be thoroughly Aphthonian in structure and style.<sup>828</sup> Pachymeres follows the Aphthonian structure of eight κεφάλαια, as is indicated by our insertion of the eight κεφάλαια into the text and translation.<sup>829</sup> The parallels extend also to wording and style. For example, Pachymeres ends the first, or ἐγκωμιαστικόν, section in a way that follows Aphthonius, that is, with a sentence that begins

<sup>822</sup> See Theon 36-40.

<sup>823</sup> See August Nauck, ed., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (2nd ed.; Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1889) 791.

<sup>824</sup> See Bruno Snell, ed., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (2 vols.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971) 1.224.

<sup>825</sup> See Christopher Collard, "On the Tragedian Chaeremon," *JHS* 90 (1970) 22-34, esp. 22.

<sup>826</sup> On what little is known of this Chaeremon, see Albrecht Dieterich, "Chaeremon (5)," *PW* 6 (1899) 2024-25, and Franz Stoessl, "Chaeremon (5)," *PWSup* 10 (1965) 124-25.

<sup>827</sup> See further *Chreia* 1.308-9.

<sup>828</sup> For these elaborations, see Aphthonius 23-78 and Aphthonius, *Pro-gymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 13-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>829</sup> See Aphthonius 18-22.

with an exclamatory οἶον ("What . . .!") and continues with similar syntax and wording (2):

Aphthonius: ἄλλ' οἷα περὶ τῆς παιδείας ἐφιλοσόφησεν<sup>830</sup>

Pachymeres: οἷα δὲ καὶ λόγοις ἐφιλοσόφει περὶ φρονήσεως

In the παραφραστικόν section we once again find clear imitation of Aphthonius' wording and syntax (3):

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε τάδε, πάρεστι δὲ ἰδεῖν<sup>831</sup>

Pachymeres: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφει ταῦτα, πάρεστι δὲ ὁρᾶν

Immediately after this section Pachymeres follows Aphthonius in using the particle γάρ as a transition to the third, or αἰτία, section (4).<sup>832</sup> Indeed, he uses the same syntax—a subject formed around a participial phrase (4):

Aphthonius: ὁ γὰρ πενίᾳ συζῶν κτλ.<sup>833</sup>

Pachymeres: ὁ γὰρ φρονήσει κοσμούμενος κτλ.

In the next, or ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, section Pachymeres once again begins the same way as Aphthonius had, using a similar transition (8):

Aphthonius: οὐ μὴν . . . τοιοῦτοι<sup>834</sup>

Pachymeres: οὐ μὴν δὲ τοιοῦτος

In addition, in the fifth, or παραβολή, section Pachymeres begins with Aphthonian language, i.e., "Ὡσπερ γὰρ . . . (10),<sup>835</sup> as he does in the next, or παράδειγμα, section, where he echoes Aphthonius with the word σκόπει (12). What is more, Pachymeres follows Aphthonian syntax more fully in the next, or μαρτυρία παλαιῶν, section (13):

Aphthonius: διὸ θαυμάσαι τὸν Ἡσίοδον δεῖ<sup>836</sup>

Pachymeres: διὸ τὸν Ἀντισθένην θαυμάζω

Finally, in the ἐπίλογος βραχύς Pachymeres again echoes Aphthonian language, in particular in his use of the word θαυμάζειν (14).<sup>837</sup> In short, Pachymeres continues the practice of

<sup>830</sup> Aphthonius 32-33.

<sup>831</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 1-2 Rabe).

<sup>832</sup> See Aphthonius 39 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>833</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 3 Rabe).

<sup>834</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 9, 8 Rabe).

<sup>835</sup> See Aphthonius 59.

<sup>836</sup> Aphthonius 71. Cf. Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 10, 3 Rabe).

<sup>837</sup> See Aphthonius 77.

writing his chreia elaboration with Aphthonius' model elaborations very much in mind.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Walz included Pachymeres' sample *progymnasmata*, based on one MS, the fifteenth century Paris. gr. 2982, in the first volume of his *Rhetores Graeci* in 1832.<sup>838</sup> No edition has been made since, so that we have used Walz's edition as the basis for our text of this chreia elaboration,<sup>839</sup> although we have reparagraphed the text according to the Aphthonian διαίρεσις, inserted the names of the κεφάλαια at the appropriate places, and suggested a few changes in the text, all noted in the apparatus.

So far as we know, ours is the first translation of Pachymeres' chreia elaboration. Given the oft-noted difficulty of his Greek, however, the translation remains tentative at several points.

<sup>838</sup> See 1.551-96 Walz.

<sup>839</sup> 1.553, 20-555, 8 Walz.

Text 35. George Pachymeres, *Progymnasmata* 3

CHREIA ELABORATION  
(1.553, 20–555, 8 WALZ)

Χρεία λογική

Χαιρήμων ἔφη· πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ φρονεῖν ἐστιν.

1. <Ἐγκωμιαστικόν> Ἐπαινετὸς καὶ Χαιρήμων, καθότι μὴ μόνον στρατηγὸς ἄριστος ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγοις ἐκεκόσμητο, καὶ στρατηγικὴν ἐμπειρίαν λόγοις κοσμῶν, λόγους ἐν μέρει τοῖς κατὰ πόλεμον ἀριστεύμασιν ἔστεφε, τὰ φύσει διεστῶτα συμπλέκων, καὶ παρ' ἀμφοτέρων ἀγλαιζόμενος· 2. ὅσα γοῦν αὐτῷ ἐν ταῖς καθ' αὐτὸν ἡνδραγαθήθῃ μάχαις λεγόντων ἄλλων καὶ ἱστορούντων, ἔστιν ἀκούειν τοῖς θέλουσιν. οἷα δὲ καὶ λόγοις ἐφιλοσόφει περὶ φρονήσεως.

3. <Παραφραστικόν> (p. 554) Ἐλεγε γάρ, ὥς πάντα συλληπτικῶς ἐν τῇ φρονήσει ἐστὶ τὰ κατ' ἀνθρώπου ἀγαθὰ, καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφει, ταῦτα, πάρεστι δὲ ὁρᾶν, ὅποῖα ταῦτα τοῖς ἐφεξῆς.

4. <Αἰτία> Ὁ γὰρ φρονήσει κοσμούμενος, φίλοις μὲν συμπάρων ἀγαστός, ἐχθροῖς δὲ συμπλεκόμενος θαυμαστός, τοῖς μὲν ὑποτιθέμενος τὰ συνοίσοντα, τοῖς δὲ τὰ βλαβερά προξενῶν, 5. καὶ ἐν καιρῷ μὲν εἰρήνης οὐδὲν ὃ τι τῶν συνιστάντων αὐτῷ μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς ἐννοούμενος· 6. στάσεως δὲ ἐμπεσούσης τοῖς πολίταις πολλαχοῦ, αὐτὸς οἰκονομῶν τὴν εἰρήνην, καὶ ὅσα καὶ στάθμη τῇ φρονήσει χρώμενος τὸ μὲν ἀνοιδοῦν καὶ φλεγμαῖνον βαρὺς ἐμπεσῶν καταστέλλει, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς ταπεινούμενον ἀνάγει συνταπεινούμενος. 7. καὶ ἀπλῶς ἐκεῖνα φέρει τὰ ἀγαθὰ, ἅπερ ὁ τὸ λογιστικὸν ἅπας κοσμηθεὶς τῆς ψυχῆς πλουτῶν ὁρᾶται διηνεκῶς.

Text 35. George Pachymeres, *Progymnasmata* 3CHREIA ELABORATION  
(1.553, 20–555, 8 WALZ)

## A Sayings-Chreia

Chaeremon said: “Every blessing depends on wisdom alone.”<sup>840</sup>

1. <Encomiastic [section]> Worthy of praise, too, is Chaeremon inasmuch as he was not only an excellent general, but he has also been decorated for his writings; in fact, by decorating his military experience with speeches, he in turn crowned his writings with valorous deeds in war, thereby combining things that are by nature disparate and being honored by both of them. 2. At any rate, it is possible for those who so desire to hear about all the deeds of valor performed by him in battles of his day since others describe and record them. But what sort of things he taught about wisdom in his writings!

3. <Paraphrastic [section]> For he used to say that every human blessing rests entirely on wisdom.<sup>841</sup> And so, this is what he taught, but it is possible to see the genius of this teaching from the sections that follow.

4. <Rationale> The person who is adorned with wisdom is admired for standing by his friends and esteemed for fighting his enemies, advising the former on what will be advantageous and causing the latter harm. 5. And in time of peace he does not pay undue attention to any matter of personal concern. 6. When party strife erupts in many places among the citizens, he himself brings about the peace. And, using wisdom as a guide, he relieves the swelling and inflammation with a stern rebuke, and he exalts what is unreasonably humbled by being humble along with it. 7. And, in a word, he possesses those blessings by which a person, once he has been equipped with the rational faculty, is viewed as positively rich.

<sup>840</sup> Chaeremon, *frag.* 40 (*TGF*, p. 791 Nauck<sup>2</sup>), on which see further *Chreia*, 1.308–9.

<sup>841</sup> Cf. Chaeremon, *frag.* 23 (*TGF*, p. 788 Nauck-Snell): ὁ γὰρ φρονῶν εἰς πάντα συλλαβῶν ἔχει.

8. <Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου> Οὐ μὴν δὲ τοιοῦτος καὶ ὁ τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ πεδούμενος, ἀλλὰ πολιτευόμενος μέν, οὐχ ὅπως τοῖς φίλοις ἀνόνητος, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς βοηθός. ἰδιωτεύων δὲ πάντα πράξει τὰ χαλεπώτατα, οὐτ' οἶκον ὀφέλλων, ἀλλὰ καὶ προσαπολλύς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, 9. καὶ συνελόντα φάναι, οὔτε τοῖς κοινοῖς χρήσιμος, οὔτε τοῖς ἰδίοις ὠφέλιμος, ἀλλ' οἷον ἄχθος ἀρούρης τὴν γνώμην παντὶ ἀνέμῳ συμφέρεται τῇ κουφότητι, οὐδὲν μέσου διαστέλλων ὠφελοῦντος καὶ βλάπτοντος.

10. <Παραβολή> Ὡσπερ γὰρ ὁ σκότῳ συγκλεισθεὶς ζοφερῶ ἄλλως ἀλᾷται, ταῖς γωνίαις παραδυόμενος, οὐ φίλον οἶδεν, οὐκ ἐχθρὸν ἐπίσταται, οὐ τὸ συνοῖσον προορᾷται, οὐ βλαβερὸν φυλάττεται, ἀλλὰ <πάντα ἀδιάκριτα> τούτῳ φαίνεται, μηδὲν τὸ καλὸν καὶ <τὸ> μὴ διακρίνοντι, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀσυνεσίᾳ συζῶν συγχεῖ πάντα ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχει θάτερον θατέρου διάφορον· 11. εἰ δέ γε καὶ πολλάκις (p. 555) κρίσει τινὶ ἐπιτρέψει τὰ συμπεσόντα, τὸ βλαβερὸν ἀνθείλετο τοῦ συνοίσοντος, καὶ ἀπλῶς οὐδὲν ὅ τι καὶ μὴ βλάψειεν ἢ ἑαυτὸν ἢ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους μετεχειρίσατο.

12. <Παράδειγμα> Σκόπει τοὺς καθ' ἑκάστην ἄφρονας, καὶ ὥς ἐν καθαυτῷ ἐσόπτρῳ τούτοις ὅψει τὰ τῶν λόγων ἐπαληθίζοντα.

13. <Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν> Διὸ τὸν Ἀντισθένην θαυμάζω, πάντ' εὐχεσθαι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς παραινοῦντα, δίχα φρονήσεως.

14. <Ἐπίλογος βραχύς> Ὡστε θαυμάζειν ἐστὶ Χαιρήμονα ὅτι τοιαῦτα περὶ φρονήσεως ἐδογμάτευσεν.



8. <From the Opposite> In no way like this is the person who is shackled by foolishness. On the contrary, if he gets involved in politics, he is not only unprofitable to his friends but is even sometimes helpful to his enemies. If, however, he remains a private citizen, he does only the most dangerous things, not “increasing his household”<sup>842</sup> but even destroying his property instead. 9. To put it briefly, he is neither useful to the public nor helpful to his family, but like “a burden on the land”<sup>843</sup> he is swept along in his opinion by every breeze because of his fickleness, making no distinction between benefit and harm.

10. <Analogy> For just as the person who has been enveloped in gloomy darkness wanders aimlessly slinking in corners, does not know his friend, does not recognize an enemy, does not foresee what will be advantageous, does not guard himself against what is harmful; instead, <everything> appears <the same> to this man since he distinguishes no difference between what is good and what is not; in the same way the person who lives with a lack of intelligence confuses everything within himself and does not consider anything different from anything else. 11. And if perhaps he will submit events to some judgment, he chooses the harmful instead of what will be advantageous. And, in short, he does nothing which will not harm either himself or others.

12. <Example> Consider those people who are foolish every day and you will see, as in a clean mirror, the truth of his words.<sup>844</sup>

13. <Testimony of the Ancients> Therefore, I admire Antisthenes who advises us to pray that our enemies have anything except wisdom.<sup>845</sup>

14. <Brief Epilogue> Consequently, it is possible to admire Chaeremon because he expressed such an opinion about wisdom.

<sup>842</sup> See *Od.* 15.21 (said by Athena to Telemachus about his mother’s aims if she should marry Eurymachus).

<sup>843</sup> See *Il.* 18.104 (said by Achilles of himself in his grief over the death of Patroclus).

<sup>844</sup> Pachymeres’ example section is not only very brief but also too vague as we expect specific individuals or groups to be cited in this section.

<sup>845</sup> Pachymeres is clearly citing a chreia attributed to Antisthenes that is also preserved by Plutarch, but with one significant difference—Pachymeres changes *ἀνδρεία* in Plutarch to *φρόνησις*. Plutarch recites this chreia as follows: ὁρθῶς γὰρ Ἀντισθένης ἔλεγεν ὅτι πάντα δεῖ τοῖς πολεμίοις εὐχεσθαι τὰγαθὰ πλὴν ἀνδρείας (*De fort. Alex.* 336A). Cf. Fernanda Decleva Caizzi, ed., *Antisthenis Fragmenta* (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1966) 51.

Text 36. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos,  
*Progymnasmata* 3  
 (Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 9, 65–10, 113)

Introduction

LIFE AND WRITINGS

A third scholar and teacher of the Palaiologan period who wrote sample *progymnasmata*, including a chreia elaboration, is Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos.<sup>846</sup> He was born sometime before 1256,<sup>847</sup> spent his adult life as a priest at the Hagia Sophia in Constantinople,<sup>848</sup> and became a monk toward the end of his life when he took the name Neilos.<sup>849</sup> He died about 1335.<sup>850</sup>

Xanthopoulos' many years at the Hagia Sophia gave him access to the Patriarchal Library, whose resources he used for his

<sup>846</sup> For general treatments of Xanthopoulos, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 291–93, and Joseph Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos," *BZ* 33 (1933) 1–12, 255–70, esp. 3–7. Cf. also Alice-Mary Talbot, "Xanthopoulos, Nikephoros Kallistos," *ODB* 3.2207. It is unfortunate that Constantinides does not treat Xanthopoulos in his study of higher education in the early Palaiologan period (see *Higher Education*, 60 n. 52).

<sup>847</sup> Estimates of the date of Xanthopoulos' birth have varied widely. Krumbacher (*Geschichte*, 293) used statements from Xanthopoulos' church history and proposed a date before 1291. Others, however, have used a letter sent to Xanthopoulos in 1276 and thus have pushed his birthdate back before 1256 (see the full discussion in Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 3–4), a date now generally, if cautiously, accepted (see, e.g., Talbot, "Xanthopoulos," 2207).

<sup>848</sup> This central fact about Xanthopoulos' life is unambiguously stated in his own writings, on which see further Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 4.

<sup>849</sup> Only the superscript to one of Xanthopoulos' writings mentions this name change, but the name given there, Nallos, was corrected by Krumbacher (*Geschichte*, 293) to Neilos after the fifth century saint, Neilos the Ascetic.

<sup>850</sup> The date of Xanthopoulos' death is even less secure than that of his birth. He surely survived the reign of Andronikos II (1282–1328), since he wrote a posthumous encomium of the emperor, but just how much longer he lived is not at all clear, although a date around 1335 has been proposed, on which see further Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 4, and Talbot, "Xanthopoulos," 2207.

many, largely ecclesiastical, writings. His principal work is a massive but incomplete history of the church, which he dedicated to the emperor Andronikos II Palaiologus (1282-1328). The eighteen books which survive<sup>851</sup> begin with the ἐπιφάνεια of Christ<sup>852</sup> and go as far as the year 610. The contents of five more books, which extend the narrative to 911, are known from the table of contents, but are no longer extant.<sup>853</sup> Xanthopoulos wrote other historical works—most notably a versified account of Jewish history following the Maccabean revolt<sup>854</sup>—as well as several other genres: hagiographical works, poetry, commentaries, and *progymnasmata*.<sup>855</sup>

#### XANTHOPOULOS' PROGYMNASMATA

At the end of the nineteenth century Krumbacher knew of Xanthopoulos' sample *progymnasmata* but only in manuscript form.<sup>856</sup> And they remained unedited until the 1930's when one of Schissel's students, Joseph Glettner, edited this MS, the fourteenth century Paris. gr. 2988, and provided a careful description of the MS, a thorough discussion of Xanthopoulos, and a detailed, if largely stylistic, commentary on the *progymnasmata*.<sup>857</sup>

The MS contains only four of the fourteen *progymnasmata*—fable, narrative, chreia, and maxim. These fill the first folios (fol. 1<sup>r</sup>–4<sup>r</sup>). The next four folios, however, are blank, leading Glettner, who thinks that Xanthopoulos copied them himself on to the MS, to propose that he intended to fill in those folios with the remaining ten *progymnasmata*.<sup>858</sup> Certainly, the sequence of those that are included supports Glettner's proposal, as they are the first four in the Aphthonian sequence. The blank

<sup>851</sup> See *PG* 145.604–147.488.

<sup>852</sup> See *PG* 145.604A.

<sup>853</sup> On this ecclesiastical history, especially its sources and the fluctuations in its evaluation by scholars, see Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 291, and Beck, *Kirche*, 705–6.

<sup>854</sup> See *PG* 147.623–32.

<sup>855</sup> The fullest discussion of Xanthopoulos' writings is in Beck, *Kirche*, 705–7.

<sup>856</sup> See Krumbacher, *Geschichte*, 292.

<sup>857</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 1–3 (text), 4–5 (author), and 255–70 (commentary). Cf. also Hörandner, *Prosarhythmus*, 117.

<sup>858</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 6–7.

pages, therefore, may well have been intended for the following *progymnasmata*, or at least for some of them, but for whatever reason Xanthopoulos never finished copying them.

At any rate, the *progymnasmata* that Xanthopoulos did copy include the fable about the wolf and goat, complete with both προμύθιον and ἐπιμύθιον;<sup>859</sup> a narrative about the wrath of Achilles, which amounts to a synopsis of the entire *Iliad*;<sup>860</sup> the elaboration of a chreia whose saying comes from Homer, on which more below; and, lastly, the elaboration of a maxim taken from the poetry of ὁ θεόλογος, i.e., Gregory Nazianzus.<sup>861</sup>

The maxim elaboration deserves a brief discussion before turning to that of a chreia. That Xanthopoulos elaborates a Christian maxim, specifically one by Gregory Nazianzus, is surprising but not unprecedented, as Nikephoros Basilakes had also made use of Gregory's poetry for one of his chreia elaborations (see Text 33). No, what deserves discussion, as Glettner has pointed out, is the surprising content of the maxim elaborated by Xanthopoulos—"No one is more secure than a poor man, for he looks to God and sees only him."<sup>862</sup>

This maxim directly counters the maxim elaborated by Aphthonius, one taken from Theognis which is highly critical of poverty. Aphthonius denounces poverty, saying, for example, in the παραφραστικόν section: "Let the one who lives in poverty prefer to die, since it is better to depart early from life than to have the sun as a witness to one's shame."<sup>863</sup> Xanthopoulos, in contrast, extols poverty and does so with references to biblical personages and passages. For example, in the παράδειγμα section Xanthopoulos refers to Lazarus, to the son of the carpenter (= Jesus), to John the Baptist, and to the twelve apostles, all of whom placed nothing ahead of poverty,<sup>864</sup> and in the μαρτυρία παλαιῶν section he quotes

<sup>859</sup> For text and commentary, see Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 7-8 and 255-58. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.96.

<sup>860</sup> For text and commentary, see Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 8-9 and 259-61. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.98.

<sup>861</sup> For text and commentary, see Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 10-12 and 264-68. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 1.100-1.

<sup>862</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 10 and 264-65. Cf. also Hunger, *Literatur*, 101. For Gregory's maxim, see *PG* 37.937A.

<sup>863</sup> Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 21-9, 1 Rabe).

<sup>864</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 11, 147-12, 163.

from the Gospel of Matthew.<sup>865</sup> Students coming from the Aphthonian elaboration would certainly have noted a refutation of it in Xanthopoulos' parallel elaboration.

#### XANTHOPOULOS' CHREIA ELABORATION

Xanthopoulos is much more traditional, however, in his chreia elaboration. He elaborates two lines from Homer, the foundational author of the educational curriculum,<sup>866</sup> and indeed two lines (*Il.* 2.24-25) that had long been a staple of this curriculum. These lines, for example, appear on a papyrus that comes from a primary classroom (see Text 4), and they are used by Theon in his classification system of the chreia, specifically to illustrate a double chreia in which one line is cited by one πρόσωπον, the second by another. Theon recites it as follows:

Alexander, the king of the Macedonians, stood over Diogenes as he slept and said:

"To sleep all night ill-suits a counselor" (*Il.* 2.24),

and Diogenes responded:

"On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many" (*Il.* 2.25).<sup>867</sup>

Xanthopoulos, in citing these same lines, drops the double chreia format. In fact, he barely has a chreia. At any rate, he does not recite these lines in any of the standard forms of sayings-chreiai. To be sure, we can classify his "chreia" as ἀποφαντικὸν καθ' ἐκούσιον, a chreia with an unprompted saying, in which the

<sup>865</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 12, 164-66.

<sup>866</sup> See Ronald F. Hock, "Homer in Greco-Roman Education," in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity* (ed. D. R. MacDonald; Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001) 56-77.

<sup>867</sup> See Theon 88-93 and *Chreia* 1.314-15. The first line (*Il.* 2.24) is also used to illustrate types of maxims—an apotrepetic maxim by Hermogenes (*Progymn.* 4 [p. 8, 18-19 Rabe]) and Aphthonius (*Progymn.* 4 [p. 7, 9-10 Rabe]) and a true maxim by Nicolaus (*Progymn.* 4 [p. 26, 9-13 Felten]). Hermogenes goes on to use this line to illustrate the elaboration of a maxim (*Progymn.* 4 [p. 10, 3-21 Rabe]). Libanius also provides an elaboration of this line (8.106-12 Foerster). Another elaboration of this line, wrongly attributed to Libanius, is also extant (8.112-17 Foerster). On the matter of its attribution, see Foerster-Münscher, "Libanios," 2519-20. Finally, this line became a popular saying in Byzantium generally, on which see Herbert Hunger, "On the Imitation (μίμησης) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature," *DOP* 23-24 (1969-70) 17-38, esp. 29-30.

standard form has “so and so said,” followed by the saying.<sup>868</sup> Xanthopoulos, however, merely copies these two lines from the *Il-iad*, preceded by a statement that they come “from Homer.”

The elaboration itself, however, is thoroughly Aphthonian in both its structure and style.<sup>869</sup> This structure is clear because Xanthopoulos inserted the various κεφάλαια of Aphthonius’ διαίρεσις at the appropriate points in the elaboration.<sup>870</sup> Stylistically, the influence of Aphthonius is equally apparent. For example, the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section begins with the Aphthonian note of admiration (θαυμάζεσθαι) (1).<sup>871</sup> In addition, Xanthopoulos’ use of the active κοσμῶν and passive κοσμούμενος (1) recalls Aphthonius’ shift from active to passive.<sup>872</sup> And Xanthopoulos, like Aphthonius, uses the rhetorical figure κατὰ παράλειψιν, or pretended omission. Xanthopoulos says that while he could admire Homer for many things, he focuses on what the poet says about being a responsible counselor (2).<sup>873</sup>

Xanthopoulos, like Aphthonius, opens his παραφραστικόν section with the words καὶ τί φησιν οὗτος (3),<sup>874</sup> although this question is incorrectly assigned to the ἐγκωμιαστικόν section by Xanthopoulos and hence by Glettner.<sup>875</sup> Likewise, the closing words of this section (4) follow Aphthonius’ wording very closely:

Aphthonius: καὶ ἃ μὲν ἐφιλοσόφησε ταῦτα,  
τοῖς δὲ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα<sup>876</sup>

Xanthopoulos: καὶ τοιαῦτα μὲν περὶ τούτων ἐφιλοσόφησε,  
τοῖς δ’ ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα

Xanthopoulos uses the same transitions as Aphthonius for his next two sections, the αἰτία and the ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, specifically

<sup>868</sup> See also Glettner, “Die Progymnasmata,” 262.

<sup>869</sup> See Aphthonius 23-78 and Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (pp. 8, 11-10, 7 Rabe).

<sup>870</sup> Incidentally, these κεφάλαια are not inserted in the maxim elaboration (see Glettner, “Die Progymnasmata,” 10, 115-12, 170), presumably because the students had learned the κεφάλαια and could now recognize them in the maxim elaboration without having them explicitly identified.

<sup>871</sup> See Aphthonius 26: θαυμάσαι.

<sup>872</sup> See Aphthonius 28-29: κηρύττει . . . κεκήρυκται.

<sup>873</sup> See Aphthonius 29-33.

<sup>874</sup> See Aphthonius, *Progymn.* 4 (p. 8, 21 Rabe): καὶ τί φησιν;

<sup>875</sup> See Glettner, “Die Progymnasmata,” 9, 78.

<sup>876</sup> Aphthonius 36-37.

καὶ γάρ for the former (5) and εἰ δέ τις for the latter (7).<sup>877</sup> In the παραβολή section (9-10) the syntax is similar to that of Aphthonius:

Aphthonius: ὥσπερ γάρ ... τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ...<sup>878</sup>

Xanthopoulos: καθάπερ γάρ ... τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ...

The last three sections are likewise stylistically dependent on Aphthonius, especially in the transitions. In the παράδειγμα section Xanthopoulos uses Aphthonius' words ὅρα μοι<sup>879</sup> and he follows Aphthonius' syntax in using τοσοῦτον ... ὥς ... (11). In the μαρτυρία section Xanthopoulos again follows Aphthonius' syntax and much of his language (14):

Aphthonius: διὸ θαυμάσαι ... δεῖ ... εἰπόντα<sup>880</sup>

Xanthopoulos: διὸ δεῖ θαυμάσαι ... λέγοντας

Finally, in the ἐπίλογος section Xanthopoulos imitates Aphthonius again, both with his opening words and later in the section as well (15):

Aphthonius: πρὸς ἃ δεῖ βλέποντας ...

κάλλιστα περὶ ... φιλοσοφήσαντα<sup>881</sup>

Xanthopoulos: πρὸς ὃ βλέποντες

κάλλιστα περὶ ... φιλοσοφήσαντα

The continuing influence of the fourth century Aphthonius on later Byzantine teachers of rhetoric, even as late a teacher as the fourteenth century Xanthopoulos, is remarkable<sup>882</sup> and is thus an excellent illustration of Fernand Braudel's familiar notion of *la longue durée*.

#### TEXT AND TRANSLATION

Xanthopoulos' sample *progymnasmata* appear on the first four folios of Paris. gr. 2988, the chreia elaboration on fol. 2<sup>r</sup>-3<sup>r</sup>,<sup>883</sup>

<sup>877</sup> See Aphthonius 38 and 53.

<sup>878</sup> Aphthonius 59, 61-2.

<sup>879</sup> See Aphthonius 64: ὅρα μοι.

<sup>880</sup> Aphthonius 71-72.

<sup>881</sup> Aphthonius 77-78.

<sup>882</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 268: "Die auffallende Abhängigkeit des Nikephoros Kallistos von Aphthonios ist ein neuer Beweis für die zentrale Bedeutung dieses Autors im byzantinischen Aufsatzunterricht."

<sup>883</sup> For a complete list of the contents and a description of this 14th century MS, see Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 1-3.

which have been splendidly edited, as already noted, by Glettner.<sup>884</sup> We have therefore used this edition, although we have also added paragraph numbers for easier reference and have proposed several changes in the text, all noted in the apparatus.

The translation is, to our knowledge, the first into any language.

<sup>884</sup> See Glettner, "Die Progymnasmata," 9-10.





Text 36. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos,  
*Progymnasmata*

CHREIA ELABORATION  
(PP. 9, 65–10, 113 GLETTNER)

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ χρεία. ἔχει πάντα τῆς χρείας τὰ εἶδη λαμπρά, ἦγουν τὸ ἐγκωμιαστικόν, τὸ παραφραστικόν, τὴν αἰτίαν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου, τὴν παραβολήν, τὸ παράδειγμα, τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν παλαιῶν, καὶ τὸν βραχὺν ἐπίλογον.

Ἡ δὲ χρεία ὑπάρχει ἐξ Ὀμήρου, ἥτις ἐστὶν αὕτη·  
οὐ χρή παννύχιον εὐδεῖν βουληφόρον ἄνδρα,  
ᾧ λαοὶ τ' ἐπιτετράφεται καὶ τόσσα μέμηλε.

1. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐγκωμιαστικοῦ. Καλὸν παρὰ πάντων καὶ Ὀμηρον θαυμάζεσθαι τῆς ποιήσεως· καὶ γὰρ κατάκρας ταύτης ἄλους κόσμος ὅλης αὐτῆς ἀναδέδεικται, κοσμῶν ταύτην ἢ γ' ἐξ ἐκείνης κοσμούμενος, καὶ ὡς ὄνομα τοῦτον ταύτῃ μετασχεῖν τῆς ποιήσεως. 2. τὸν τοιοῦτον ἔξεστι μὲν καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις θαυμάζειν, ὅτινα περὶ πάντων κατερρητόρευσε, μάλιστα δ' ἐν οἷς συμβουλεύει τὸν βουληφόρον μὴ ῥαθύμως διάγειν, μήτε μὴν τῷ ὕπνῳ δαμάζεσθαι.

3. Ἐκ τοῦ παραφραστικοῦ. Καὶ τί φησιν οὗτος; τὸν ἐν βουλαῖς τὰ πρῶτα φερόμενον, ᾧ λαοὶ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς προσαναρτῶσιν, οὐ χρή τοῦτον ὑποπίπτειν τῷ ὕπνῳ, καὶ τούτῳ δαμάζεσθαι καὶ ὅλας νύκτας δουλεύειν, καὶ ταύταις ὅλον παρέχειν αὐτόν. 4. καὶ τοιαῦτα μὲν περὶ τούτων ἐφιλοσόφησε· τοῖς δ' ἐφεξῆς θαυμασόμεθα.

5. Ἡ αἰτία. Καὶ γὰρ τὸν φορτίον λαοῦ τῷ τραχήλῳ ἔχοντα ἐπικείμενον καλῶς προσήκει βουλεύεσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τὸ προσῆκον τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βουλήν ἐξυφαίνειν· 6. χρή δὲ πρὸ πάντων τὰς τῶν ἀντιπάλων

Text 36. Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos,  
*Progymnasmata*

CHREIA ELABORATION

(PP. 9, 65-10, 113 GLETTNER)

A chreia elaboration by the same person (= Xanthopoulos). He keeps all the sections of a chreia elaboration distinct, that is: the encomiastic section, the paraphrastic section, the rationale, the section from the opposite, the analogy, the example, the testimony of the ancients, and the brief epilogue.

The chreia is from Homer and is as follows:

“To sleep all night ill-suits a counselor  
On whom the folk rely, whose cares are many.”<sup>885</sup>

1. From the Encomiastic. It is proper that Homer is admired for his poetry by everyone. Indeed, having become completely absorbed in it, he has been proclaimed its crowning exemplar, adorning poetry more than he has been adorned by it, so that he even shares the name of poetry with it.<sup>886</sup> 2. It is possible to admire such a man in other passages where he has spoken persuasively about everything but especially so in these lines where he advises the counselor not to live in an irresponsible manner and in particular not to be overcome by sleep.

3. From the Paraphrastic. And what is he saying? The man who holds the leadership role in councils, on whom the folk place their own concerns—this man must not succumb to sleep, be overcome by it, be its slave all night long, or ever surrender himself up to such nights. 4. And so Homer taught such lessons about this subject, but in the following sections we will express our admiration of them.

5. The Rationale. It is the proper concern of the man who has the burden of the folk resting on his shoulders to give counsel and to carry out his counsel according to this concern. 6. But above all he must keep watch against the treachery of his opponents, not only by day but especially by night, so that when he has

<sup>885</sup> *Il.* 2.24-25. Cf. also *Chreia* 1.314.

<sup>886</sup> As every schoolboy learned, Homer was known as “the poet.” See Theon 25-28.

ἐπισκοπεῖν (p. 10) ἐνέδρας οὐ μόνον δὴ καθ' ἡμέραν, ἀλλὰ γε δὴ καὶ κατὰ νύκτα, ὅπως βουλὴν συστησάμενον τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐξουσιν εὔ, τοῖς πολέμοις δὲ προσάψῃ τὴν ἦτταν τῷ τοὺς οἰκείους νικητὰς τῶν πολεμίων παρασκευάσασθαι.

7. Ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου. Εἰ δέ τις στρατὸν ἐπικείμενον ἔχων παρ' ἑαυτῷ—εἰπ' ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων, εἴθ' ὑποχαλᾷ τῷ ὕπνῳ, καὶ τούτῳ ἐνδίδωσιν, εὔδει τε παννύχιον—οὗτος, ὅποῖος ἄρα καὶ εἴη, τὸν ὄνον διεξάγει, <τὸν στρατὸν> ἀπόλλυσι, καὶ τούτῳ ἑαυτὸν συναπόλλυσι.

8. ταῦτα τὴν Ὀμήρου γνώμην κατέπεισεν ἀποφᾶναι, μὴ τῷ ὕπνῳ τοὺς βουληφόρους ἀνδρῶν ἐνδίδοσθαι.

9. Παραβολή. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀλιέων συμβαίνειν φιλεῖ, γρηγορούντων μὲν ἐκείνων, καὶ μὴ τῷ ὕπνῳ κατειλημμένων, ὅτι πολλὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς τὴν ἄγραν εἰσφέρουσι, ῥαθυμούντων δέ, καὶ τῷ ὕπνῳ προσανεχομένων οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς κερδᾶναι τι προσγενήσεται, 10. τὸν αὐτὸν οἱ βουλῇ προσκείμενοι τρόπον ἀπεχόμενοι τοῦ ὕπνου κατατροποῦσθαι τοὺς πολεμίους εἰώθασιν.

11. Παράδειγμα. Τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνα ἐγρήγορσιν ὅρα μοι· ὥς τοσοῦτον ὕπνου μετῆν, ὥς μηδεμίᾳ πρὸς ὕπνον ἐνδίδοσθαι ὦρα· 12. καὶ γὰρ τὸν τοιοῦτόν φασι, θαυμάσαντός τινός ποτε τῶν αὐτοῦ οἰκετῶν τὴν ἐν ὀλίγῳ καιρῷ τοῦ παντὸς κόσμου δεσποτεῖαν αὐτοῦ, φάναι μηδεμίαν τῶν ἡμερῶν πρὸς ἀναβολὰς ἐνδιδόναι. 13. διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ πανταχόθεν αὐτῷ ἡ νίκη ἐφείπετο, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀναβολῆς στέρησις μονάρχην αὐτὸν τοῦ παντὸς κατέστησε κόσμου.

14. Μαρτυρία παλαιῶν. Διὸ δεῖ θαυμάσαι τοὺς παλαιούς τῶν ῥητόρων τοὺς τῷ ὕπνῳ χρωμένους σφάλλεσθαι λέγοντας.

15. Βραχὺς ἐπίλογος. Πρὸς ὃ βλέποντες τὸν Ὀμηρον ἐπαινέσωμεν κάλλιστα περὶ τούτου φιλοσοφήσαντα.

offered counsel his personal affairs will prosper, and he may inflict defeat on his enemies by making his own people victor over these enemies.

7. From the Opposite. But if someone who has an army relying on him—if, among such other weaknesses, he yields to sleep, gives in to it, and slumbers through the night—this man, whatever kind of fellow he may be, lives the life of the proverbial ass, destroys <his army> and along with it destroys himself. 8. These considerations influenced the opinion of Homer to declare that counselors of men ought not give in to sleep.

9. Analogy. For just as usually happens in the case of fishermen: if they remain wide awake and are not snared by sleep, they bring in a large catch in their boat; but if they shirk responsibility and devote themselves to sleep, the result will be that there is no profit at all for them. 10. In the same way those whose responsibility is counsel, if they refrain from sleep, usually rout their enemies.

11. Example. Consider, if you will, the wakefulness of Alexander the Macedonian: he was so concerned with sleep that he did not give in to sleep for even one hour. 12. In fact, they say that when a household slave of his once expressed admiration at his domination of the whole world in so short a time, Alexander replied that he did not give in to procrastination for even one day.<sup>887</sup> 13. And for this reason, of course, victory attended him everywhere, and his avoidance of procrastination established him as the sole ruler of the entire world.

14. Testimony of the Ancients. Therefore one must admire the ancient orators who say that those who are subject to sleep come to ruin.<sup>888</sup>

15. Brief Epilogue. When this subject is considered, let us praise Homer for having taught best about it.

<sup>887</sup> Xanthopoulos is referring to a chreia attributed to Alexander that is otherwise known only in the Aphthonius commentary of John of Sardis. See John of Sardis, *Comm. in Aphth.* 3 (p. 40, 6-8 Rabe): 'Ἀλέξανδρος ἐρωτηθεὶς, πόθεν ἐκτῆσατο τοσαύτην δυναστείαν, ἔφη, μηδὲν εἰς αὖριον ἀναβαλλόμενος.

<sup>888</sup> Xanthopoulos cites no specific orator, although he may have had in mind Demosthenes who was known to burn the midnight oil (cf. further *Chreia* 1.311).



# Bibliography

- Adler, Ada, ed. *Suidae Lexicon*. 5 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1928-1938.
- Alexiou, Margaret. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Ameling, Walter. "Der Sophist Rufus." *EA* 6 (1985) 27-33.
- Anderson, Graham. *The Second Sophistic: A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Angold, Michael. *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261)*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Arnakis, Germaine G. "The Names of the Months in the History of Georgios Pachymeres." *BNJ* 18 (1945-1949) 144-53.
- . "George Pachymeres—A Byzantine Humanist." *GOTR* 12 (1966-1967) 161-67.
- Aujac, Germaine. "Recherches sur la tradition de περὶ συνθέσεως ὀνομάτων de Denys d'Halicarnasse." *RHT* 4 (1974) 1-44.
- Austin, Colin, ed. *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta in papyris reperta*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1973.
- Baldwin, Barry. "Amphilochios of Ikonion." *ODB* 1.80.
- . "Cappadocian Fathers." *ODB* 1.79-80.
- et al. "Gregory of Nazianzos." *ODB* 2.880-82.
- Bastianini, Guido. "A proposito di due frammenti di detti diogenici (P.Mich. inv. 41 e P.Osl. III.177)." *Sileno* 10 (1984) 43-47.
- and Wolfgang Luppe. "Una hypothesis Euripidea in un esercizio scolastico (P.Vindob.G. 19766 verso, Pack<sup>2</sup> 1989): L'Αὐτόλυκος πρῶτος." *Analecta Papyrologica* 1 (1989) 31-36.
- Beck, Hans-Georg. *Kirche und theologische Literatur im byzantinischen Reich*. HAW 12.2.1. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1959.
- Bekker, Immanuel, ed. *Georgii Pachymeris De Michaele et Andronico Palaeologis libri*. 2 vols. Bonn: Weber, 1835.
- Bergk, Theodore, ed. *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*. 4 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1882.
- Berry, D. H., and Malcolm Heath. "Oratory and Declamation." Pages 393-420 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.

- Beudel, Paul. "Qua ratione Graeci liberos educerint, papyris, ostracis, tabulis in Aegypto inventis illustratur." Dissertation, Münster, 1911.
- Blanchard, Alain. "Sur le milieu d'origine du papyrus Bodmer de Ménéandre." *CdÉ* 66 (1991) 211-20.
- Bohnenblust, Gottfried. *Beiträge zum Topos Περί φύλας*. Inaugural Dissertation, Bern. Berlin: Universitäts-Buchdruckerei von Gustav Schade (Otto Francke), 1905.
- Boissonade, Jean-François, ed. *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*. Reprint of the Paris edition of 1829-1835. 5 vols. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1962.
- , ed. *G. Pachymeris Declamationes XIII*. Paris: Dumont, 1848.
- Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Booth, Alan. "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire." *Florilegium* 1 (1970) 1-14.
- Bosworth, A. B. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Bowersock, Glen W. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- Brand, Charles M. "Michael V Kalaphates." *ODB* 2.1366.
- Brinkmann, Adolf. "Aus dem antiken Schulunterricht." *RhM* 65 (1910) 149-55.
- Browning, Robert. "The Patriarchal School at Constantinople in the Twelfth Century." *Byzantion* 32 (1962) 167-201.
- Brzoska, J. "Anonymi rhetorischen Inhaltes." *PW* 1 (1884) 2328-33.
- . "Aphthonios." *PW* 1 (1884) 2797-2800.
- Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Translated by J. Raffan. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985.
- Bywater, Ingram, ed. *Gnomologium Baroccianum*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1878.
- Caizzi, Fernanda Decleva, ed. *Antisthenis Fragmenta*. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1966.
- Campbell, David A., ed. and trans. *Greek Lyric*. 5 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982-1993.
- Cichocka, Helena. "Progymnasma as a Literary Form." *SIFC* 10 (1992) 991-99.
- Clarysse, Willy, and Alfons Wouters. "A Schoolboy's Exercise in the Chester Beatty Library." *AncSoc* 1 (1970) 201-35.
- Collard, Christopher. "On the Tragedian Chaerephon." *JHS* 90 (1970) 22-34.
- Collart, Paul, ed. *Les Papyrus Bouriant*. Paris: Édouard Champion, 1926.



- . "À l'école avec les petits grecs d'Égypte." *CdÉ* 11 (1936) 489-507.
- , ed. *Les Papyrus Théodore Reinach, Tome II*. BIFAO. Cairo: L'Institut de Papyrologie, 1940.
- . "À propos d'un ostracon Clermont-Ganneau inédit de l'Académie des Inscriptions." *CRAI* (1945) 249-58.
- Constantinides, Constantine N. *Higher Education in Byzantium in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries*. Texts and Studies in the History of Cyprus 11. Nicosia: Cypress Research Center, 1982.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. ASP 36. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . "Literary School Exercises." *ZPE* 116 (1997) 53-60.
- Daly, Lloyd W. *Contributions to a History of Alphabetization in Antiquity and the Middle Ages*. Brussels: Latomus, 1967.
- Debut, Janine. "De l'usage des listes de mots comme fondement de la pédagogie dans l'antiquité." *REA* 85 (1983) 261-74.
- . "Les documents scolaires." *ZPE* 63 (1986) 251-78.
- DeFalco, Vittorio. "Trattato retorico bizantino (Rhetorica Marciana)." *AttiSocLSL* 9 (1930) 71-124.
- Detienne, Marcel. "The Violence of Wellborn Ladies: Women in the Thesmophoria and Haloa." Pages 129-47 in *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*. Edited by M. Detienne and J. P. Vernant. Translated by P. Wissing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Diehl, Ernst, ed. *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*. 3 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1949.
- Diels, Hermann, ed. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker: Griechisch und Deutsch*. 2 vols. 5th ed. Revised by W. Kranz. Berlin: Weidmann, 1934.
- Dieterich, Albrecht. "Chairemon (5)." *PW* 3 (1899) 2024-27.
- Dilts, Mervin R. *Scholia Demosthenica*. 2 vols. Stuttgart: B. G. Teubner, 1983-1986.
- and George A. Kennedy, eds. *Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, & Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus & to Apsines of Gadara*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conflict*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- . "Libanius' Oration in Praise of Antioch." *PAPhS* 103 (1959) 652-86.
- Eitrem, Samuel, and Leiv Amundsen. *Short Texts and Fragments*. Vol. 3 of *Papyri Osloensis*. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1936.

- Eustratiades, Sophronios. *Γρηγορίου τοῦ Κυπρίου οἰκουμενικοῦ Πατριάρχου ἐπιστολαὶ καὶ μῦθοι*. Alexandria: Patriarchal Press, 1910.
- Failler, Albert. "Le séjour d'Athanase II d'Alexandrie à Constantino-ple." *REB* 35 (1978) 43-71.
- , ed. *Georges Pachymeres, Relations historiques. I et II. Livres I-III et IV-VI*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984.
- Fedwick, Paul Jonathan. "A Chronology of the Life and Works of Basil of Caesarea." Pages 3-19 in *Basil of Caesarea: Christian, Humanist, Ascetic*. Edited by P. J. Fedwick. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, 1981.
- Fehrle, Eugen. *Die kultische Keuschheit im Altertum*. RVV 6. Giessen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1910.
- Felten, Joseph, ed. *Nicolai Progymnasmata*. Rhetores Graeci 11. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Festugière, André-Jean. *Antioch païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie*. Paris: E. de Boccard, 1959.
- Fiehn, Karl. "Pittalakos." *PW* 40 (1950) 1873.
- Fitzgerald, John T., ed. *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*. SBLRBS 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- Foerster, Richard. "Aristophanes oder ein Anderer?" *Hermes* 12 (1877) 207-16.
- , ed. *Libanii Opera*. 12 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1903-1927.
- and Karl Münscher. "Libanios." *PW* 12 (1925) 2485-2551.
- Fontenrose, Joseph. *The Delphic Oracle: Its Responses and Operations, with a Catalogue of Responses*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981.
- Fortenbaugh, William W., et al. *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for His Life, Writings, Thought, and Influence*. *Philosophia Antiqua* 54, 2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992.
- Fritz, Kurt von. "Pythagoras von Samos." *PW* 24 (1963) 171-209.
- . "Theano (5)." *PW* 10 (1934) 1379-81.
- Fuchs, Friedrich. *Die höheren Schulen von Konstantinopel im Mittelalter*. ByzA 8. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926.
- Fuhrmann, Manfred. *Das systematische Lehrbuch: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaften in der Antike*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.
- Gallazi, Claudio, and Mariangela Vandoni, eds. *Papiri della Università degli Studi di Milano*. 7 vols. Milan: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino, 1961-1981.
- Gallo, Italo. "Aristippo e l'auleta Timoteo." *QUCC* 30 (1979) 143-47.
- . *La biografia dei filosofi*. Vol. 2 of *Frammenti biografici da papiri*. Rome: Ateneo & Bizzarri, 1980.

- Garnsey, Peter. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Garzya, Antonio. "Sur l'autobiographie de Grégoire de Chypre." *La parole et l'idée* 10 (1968) 308-11.
- . "Fin quando visse Niceforo Basilace?" *BZ* 64 (1971) 301-2.
- , ed. *Nicephori Basilacae orationes et epistolae*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1984.
- Gerhard, Gustav A. *Phoinix von Kolophon: Texte und Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1909.
- Gerth, Karl. "Severos von Alexandria." *PWSup* 8 (1956) 715-18.
- Giannantoni, Gabriele. *Socraticorum Reliquiae*. 4 vols. Naples: Ateneo, 1983-1985.
- Glettner, Joseph. "Severos von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr." *BNJ* 9 (1930-1931) 96-103.
- . "Die Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos." *BZ* 33 (1933) 1-12 and 255-70.
- Glöckner, Stephen. "Sopatros (10)." *PW* 2<sup>nd</sup> series 3.1 (1927) 1002-6.
- Goetz, Georg. "Diomedes (14)." *PW* 5 (1903) 827-29.
- Graeven, Heinrich. "Ein Fragment des Lachares." *Hermes* 30 (1895) 289-313.
- . "Die Progymnasmata des Nicolaus." *Hermes* 30 (1895) 471-73.
- Gronewald, Michael. "Hesiod, Xenophon, Psalmen und Alexanderapophthegma in Berliner Papyri." *ZPE* 115 (1997) 117-20.
- Gueraud, Octave, and Pierre Jouguet, eds. *Un livre d'écolier du III<sup>e</sup> siècle avant J.-C.* Publications de la Société Royale Égyptienne de Papyrologie, Textes et Documents II. Cairo: L'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1938.
- Gutas, Dimitri. "Sayings by Diogenes Preserved in Arabic." Pages 475-518 in *Le Cynisme ancien et ses prolongements*. Edited by M.-O. Goulet-Cazé and R. Goulet. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1993.
- Hammond, Nicholas G. L. *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.* 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Heath, Malcolm. *Hermogenes, On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- . "Invention." Pages 89-119 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Hock, Ronald F. "A Dog in the Manger: The Cynic Cynulcus among Athenaeus' Deipnosophists." Pages 20-37 in *Greeks, Romans, and*

- Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by D. L. Balch et al. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- . "Cynics and Rhetoric." Pages 755-73 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- . "An Extraordinary Friend in Chariton's *Callirhoe*: The Importance of Friendship in the Greek Romances." Pages 145-62 in *Greco-Roman Perspectives on Friendship*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald. SBLRBS 34. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.
- . "Homer in Greco-Roman Education." Pages 56-77 in *Mimesis and Intertextuality in Antiquity and Christianity*. Edited by D. R. MacDonald. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 2001.
- and Edward N. O'Neil, eds. *The Progymnasmata*. Vol. 1 of *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric*. SBLTT 27. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- Hörandner, Wolfram. *Der Prosarhythmus in der rhetorischen Literatur der Byzantiner*. Wiener Byzantinistische Studien 16. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981.
- . "Die Progymnasmata des Theodoros Hexapterygos." Pages 147-62 in *BYZANTIOS: Festschrift für Herbert Hunger zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by W. Hörandner et al. Vienna: Becvar, 1984.
- . "Zu den Progymnasmata des Nikephoros Basilakes." *JÖB* 36 (1986) 73-88.
- Hunger, Herbert. "On the Imitation (μίμησις) of Antiquity in Byzantine Literature." *DOP* 23-24 (1969-1970) 17-38.
- . *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*. HAW 12.5.1-2. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1978.
- Hussey, Joan Mervyn. *The Orthodox Church in the Byzantine Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Innes, Doreen, and Michael Winterbottom. *Sopatros the Rhetor: Studies in the Text of the Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων*. BICS Suppl. 48. London: Institute for Classical Studies, 1988.
- Ioannidou, Grace. *Catalogue of Greek and Latin Literary Papyri in Berlin (P.Berol. inv. 21101-21299)*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1996.
- Jaekel, Siegfried, ed. *Menandri Sententiae; Comparatio Menandri et Philistionis*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1964.
- Jones, A. H. M., J. R. Martindale, and J. Morris. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*. 2 vols. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1971-1980.
- Jouguet, Pierre, and Paul Perdrizet. "Le Papyrus Bouriant no. 1: Un cahier d'écolier grec d'Égypte." *Stud.Pal.* 6 (1906) 148-61.

- Jugie, Martin. "Poésies rythmiques de Nicéphore Calliste Xanthopoulos." *Byzantion* 5 (1930) 358-90.
- Kaibel, Georg, ed. *Comicorum graecorum fragmenta*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
- Karntaler, Fr. P. "Severos von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr." *BNJ* 8 (1929-1930) 327-30.
- Kaster, Robert A. "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity." *TAPA* 113 (1983) 323-46.
- . *The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 11. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Kazhdan, Alexander. "Basilakes." *ODB* 1.262-63.
- . "Basilakes, Nikephoros." *ODB* 1.263.
- . "John Doxopates." *ODB* 1.660.
- Keil, Heinrich, ed. *Grammatici Latini*. 5 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1855-1868.
- Kemp, Alain. "The ΤΕΚΝΗ ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΙΚΗ Translated into English." Pages 169-89 in *Linguistics in the Classical Period*. Edited by D. Taylor. Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1987.
- Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- . *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
- . *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.
- . "The Genres of Rhetoric." Pages 43-50 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- . "Historical Survey of Rhetoric." Pages 3-42 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Kenyon, Frederic G. "Two Greek School-Texts." *JHS* 29 (1909) 29-40.
- Körte, Alfred. "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen." *Archiv* 6 (1920) 223-68.
- . "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen." *Archiv* 7 (1924) 225-58.
- . "Literarische Texte mit Ausschluss der christlichen." *Archiv* 14 (1940) 103-50.
- Kotzabassi, Sofia. "Die Progymnasmata des Gregor von Zypern." *Ηλ-ληνικά* 43 (1993) 45-63.

- Krumbacher, Karl. *Geschichte der byzantinischen Literatur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Öströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*. 2nd ed. HAW 9.1. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1897.
- Kustas, George L. *Studies in Byzantine Rhetoric*. ABla 17. Thessaloniki: Patriarchal Institute for Patristic Studies, 1973.
- Laenerts, Jean. "Fragment d'Analecta sur Diogène (P.Osl. III.177)." *CdÉ* 49 (1974) 121-23.
- Laiou, Angeliki E. "The Correspondence of Gregorios Kyprios As a Source for the History of Social and Political Behavior in Byzantium or, On Government by Rhetoric." Pages 91-108 in *Geschichte und Kultur der Palaiologenzeit: Referate des Internationalen Symposions zu Ehren von Herbert Hunger*. Edited by W. Seibt. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1996.
- Lameere, William. *La tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre, Patriarche de Constantinople (1283-1289)*. Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1937.
- Lausberg, Heinrich. *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik: Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*. 2nd ed. Munich: Hueber, 1973.
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. *Antioch: City and Imperial Administration in the Later Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Lieu, Samuel N. L., and Dominic Montserrat, eds. *From Constantine to Julian: Pagan and Byzantine Views*. New York: Routledge, 1996.
- Lodi, Teresa. "PSI I.85. Appunti di retorica." Page 157 in *Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papiri greci e latini in Egitto*. Edited by E. Pistelli. Florence: Enrico Ariani, 1912.
- Lowe, N. J. "Thesmophoria and Haloa: Myth, Physics, and Mysteries." Pages 149-73 in *The Sacred and the Feminine in Ancient Greece*. Edited by S. Blundell and M. Williamson. New York: Routledge, 1998.
- MacDowell, Douglas M. *The Law in Classical Athens*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1978.
- Mack, Burton L. *Anecdotes and Arguments: The Chreia in Antiquity and Early Christianity*. IAC Occasional Papers 10. Claremont: IAC, 1987.
- and Vernon Robbins, *Patterns of Persuasion in the Gospels*. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1989.
- Macrides, R. J. "Dikaiophylax." *ODB* 1.624.
- . "Protekdikos." *ODB* 3.1742-43.
- Malherbe, Abraham J., ed. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. SBL SBS 12. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.
- , trans. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. SBL SBS 19. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- . "Herakles." *RAC* 14 (1988) 559-83.

- Marrou, Henri-Irénée. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by G. Lamb. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956.
- Martin, Victor, and Guy de Budé, eds. *Eschine Discours*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1962.
- Meyendorff, John. "Panteugenos, Soterichos." *ODB* 3.1574.
- Migne, J.-P. *Patrologia cursus completus. Series graeca*. 161 vols. Paris: Didot, 1857-1866.
- Milne, Joseph G. "Relics of Greco-Roman Schools." *JHS* 28 (1908) 121-32.
- Molloy, Margaret E. *Libanius and the Dancers*. AWTS 31. Hildesheim: Olms-Weidmann, 1996.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- . "Literate Education in Classical Athens." *CQ* 49 (1999) 46-61.
- Mullach, F. G. A., ed. *Fragmenta philosophorum Graecorum*. 3 vols. Paris: Didot, 1860-1881.
- Müller, B. A. "Gregorios (2)." *PW* 7 (1912) 1852-57.
- Nauck, Augustus, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1889.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*. 3 vols. 3rd ed. HAW 5.2. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1967.
- Norman, Albert Francis, ed. and trans., *Libanius' Autobiography: Oration 1*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- , trans. *Libanius: Selected Works*. LCL. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969.
- , trans. *Libanius: Autobiography and Selected Letters*. LCL. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992.
- Oehler, J. Σωφρονιστάι. *PW* 30 (1927) 1104-6.
- Oellacher, Hans, ed. *Griechische literarische Papyri II*. MPER n.s. III. Vienna: Rohrer, 1939.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. "Delivery and Memory." Pages 159-67 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Oldfather, William A. "Preisigke, 'Sammelbuch 5730.'" *Aegyptus* 14 (1934) 496-97.
- Orinsky, Kurt. "De Nicolai Myrensis et Libanii quae feruntur progymnasmatis." Dissertation, Breslau, 1920.
- Ostrogorsky, George. *A History of the Byzantine State*. Translated by J. Hussey. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1969.
- Pack, Roger A. *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1965.
- Painter, Kenneth. "Greek and Roman Wooden Writing Tablets in the British Museum." *BMQ* 31 (1967) 103-10.

- Papadakis, Aristeides. *Crisis in Byzantium: The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283-1289)*. New York: Fordham University Press, 1983.
- . "Gregory II of Cyprus." *ODB* 2.876-77.
- Parker, Robert. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Parsons, Peter J. "A School-Book from the Sayce Collection." *ZPE* 6 (1970) 133-49.
- Peppink, S. "Ad Nicephorum Walzii vol. 1." *Mnemosyne* n.s. 60 (1933) 409-22.
- Petit, Paul. *Les Étudiants de Libanius: Un professeur de faculté et ses élèves au bas empire*. Paris: Nouvelles Éditions Latines, 1956.
- Pichler, Karl. "Severos von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr." *BNJ* 11 (1933-1934) 11-24.
- Pignani, Adriana. "Alcuni progimnasmi inediti di Niceforo Basilace." *RSBN* 8-9 (1971-1972) 295-315.
- . "Prolegomeni all'edizione critica dei Progimnasmi di Niceforo Basilace." *BollClass* 26 (1978) 41-56.
- , ed. and trans. *Progimnasmi e Monodie. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione*. BNN 10. Naples: Bibliopolis, 1983.
- Preisigke, Friedrich. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*. 5 vols. Strassburg: Karl J. Trübner, 1915-1950.
- Rabe, Hugo, ed. *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. *Rhetores Graeci* 10. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1926.
- . "Libaniana." *RhM* 32 (1877) 86-95.
- . "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 1. Nachrichten über das Leben des Hermogenes." *RhM* 62 (1907) 247-62.
- . "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 2. Aphthonios der Schüler des Libanios." *RhM* 62 (1907) 262-64.
- . "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 3. Die Quellen des Doxapatres in den Homilien zu Aphthonios." *RhM* 62 (1907) 559-86.
- . "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 6. Weitere Textquellen für Johannes Diakonos." *RhM* 63 (1908) 512-30.
- , ed. *Ioannis Sardiani Commentarium in Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. *Rhetores Graeci* 15. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1928.
- , ed. *Prolegomenon Sylloge*. *Rhetores Graeci* 14. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1931.
- . "Rhetoren-Corpora." *RhM* 67 (1912) 321-57.
- Radermacher, Ludwig. "Doxapatres." *PW* 5 (1905) 1611-13.
- . "Hermogenes (22)." *PW* 8 (1912) 865-77.
- Ratzan, Richard M., and Gary B. Ferngren. "A Greek Progymnasma on the Physician-Poisoner." *JHM* 48 (1993) 157-70.



- Reader, William W. *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo*. SBLTT 42. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- Reiske, Io. Iacobus, ed. *Libanii Sophistae Orationes et Declamationes*. 4 vols. Altenburg: Richter, 1791.
- Richsteig, Eberhardt. Review of K. Orinsky, "De Nicolai Myrensis et Libanii quae feruntur progymnasmatis." *PhW* 41 (1921) 697-701.
- Robins, Robert H. *The Byzantine Grammarians: Their Place in History*. Trends in Linguistics, Studies and Monographs 70. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1993.
- Rousseau, Philip. *Basil of Caesarea*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 20. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994.
- Rowe, Galen O. "Style." Pages 121-57 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Russell, Donald A. *Greek Declamation*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Sabatucci, Alessandro. "Scolii Antichi ad Aftonio nel Cod. Laur. LX.15." *SIFC* 16 (1908) 41-102.
- Sanz, Paul, ed. *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhaltes*. MPER n.s. IV. Vienna: Rohrer, 1946.
- Schanz, Martin, Carl Hosius, and Gustav Krüger. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*. 4 vols. HAW 8.1-4. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1914-1935.
- Schissel, Otmar. "Die rhetorische Kunstlehre des Rufus von Perinthus." *RhM* 75 (1926) 369-92.
- . "Severus von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr." *BNJ* 8 (1929-1930) 1-13.
- . "Theodoros von Kynopolis." *BNJ* 8 (1929-1930) 331-49.
- . "Rhetorische Progymnasmatik der Byzantiner." *BNJ* 11 (1934-1935) 1-11.
- Schmid, Wilhelm, and Otto Stählin. *Wilhelm von Christs Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. 6th ed. HAW 7.1.1-2. Munich: C. H. Beck, 1912-1924.
- Schoell, M. S. Friedrich. *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur von der frühesten mythischen Zeit zur Einnahme Constantinopels durch die Türken*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Berlin: Duncker und Humblot, 1828-1830.
- Schouler, Bernard. *La tradition hellénique chez Libanios*. 2 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1984.
- Seeck, Otto. "Severus (36)." *PW* 2A (1923) 2005-6.
- Sievers, Gottfried R. *Das Leben des Libanios*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1868.

- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by G. M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956.
- Snell, Bruno, ed. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971.
- Spengel, Leonard, ed. *Rhetores Graeci*. 3 vols. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1884-1886; vol. 1 revised by C. Hammer, 1894.
- Staden, Heinrich von. "Women and Dirt." *Helios* 19 (1992) 7-30.
- Staudacher, Anna. "Severos von Alexandria: Ein verschollener griechischer Schriftsteller des IV. Jahrhunderts n. Chr." *BNJ* 10 (1932-1933) 321-24.
- Stegemann, Willy. "Nicolaus (21)." *PW* 17 (1936) 424-57.
- . "Theon (5)." *PW* 5A (1934) 2037-54.
- Stephens, Susan A. "The Arginusae Theme in Greek Rhetorical Theory and Practice." *BASP* 20 (1983) 171-80.
- Sternbach, Leo, ed. *Gnomologium Parisinum ineditum*. Cracau: Academiae Litterarum, 1893.
- , ed. *Gnomologium Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1963.
- Stoneman, Richard. *Alexander the Great*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Stoessl, Franz. "Chaeremon (5)." *PWSup* 10 (1965) 124-25.
- Strohmaier, Gotthard. "Diogenesanekdoten auf Papyrus und in arabischen Gnomologien." *Archiv* 22-23 (1974) 285-96.
- Talbot, Alice-Mary. "Monk." *ODB* 2.1395-96.
- . "Pachymeres, George." *ODB* 3.1550.
- . "Xanthopoulos, Nikephoros Kallistos." *ODB* 3.2207.
- Tanner, Thomas M. "Michigan Papyri." MA Thesis, University of Illinois, 1978.
- Thalheim, Theodore. "Aischines (15)." *PW* 1 (1893) 1053-62.
- Thesleff, Holger. *Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period*. Acta Academiae Aboensis Ser. A, Humaniora 30.1. Åbo: Åbo Akademie, 1965.
- Thom, Johan C. *The Pythagorean Golden Verses: With Introduction and Commentary*. RGRW 123. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Thompson, Sir Herbert. "A Greek Ostrakon." *PSBA* 34 (1912) 197.
- Uhlig, Gustav, ed. *Dionysii Thracis Ars Grammatica*. Grammatici Graeci 1.1. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1883.
- Versnel, H. S. *Inconsistencies in Greek and Roman Religion*. 2 vols. SGRR 6.1-2. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1990-1992.
- Wachsmuth, Curt, and Otto Hense, eds. *Joannis Stobaei Anthologium*. 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1884-1912.
- Walz, Christian, ed. *Arsenii Violetum*. Stuttgart: Libraria Loefflundiana, 1832.
- . *Rhetores Graeci*. 9 vols. Tübingen: J. G. Cotta, 1832-1836.

- White, Carolinne. *Christian Friendship in the Fourth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Wilcken, Ulrich, ed. *Griechische Ostraka aus Ägypten und Nubien*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Giesecke & Devrient, 1899.
- Wilson, Nigel. "A Byzantine Miscellany: MS Barocci 131 Described." *JÖB* 27 (1978) 157-79.
- . *Scholars of Byzantium*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983.
- Winter, John Garrett. *Life and Letters in the Papyri*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1933.
- Wolf, Peter. *Vom Schulwesen der Spätantike: Studien zu Libanius*. Baden-Baden: Verlag für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1952.
- Wooten, Cecil, trans. *Hermogenes' On Types of Style*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.
- Wouters, Alfons. *The Grammatical Papyri from Graeco-Roman Egypt: Contributions to the Study of the 'Ars Grammatica' in Antiquity*. Brussels: Paleis der Academiën, 1979.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm. "Arrangement." Pages 51-87 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*. Edited by S. F. Porter. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1997.
- Wylie, Graham. "Demosthenes the General—Protagonist in a Greek Tragedy?" *G&R* 40 (1993) 20-30.
- Young, N. H. "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *NovT* 29 (1987) 150-76.
- Zeller, Eduard. *Die Philosophie der Griechen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*. 3 vols. 5th ed. Reprint of the Leipzig edition of 1922. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963.
- Ziebarth, Erich. *Aus der antiken Schule: Sammlung griechischer Texte auf Papyrus, Holztafeln, Ostraka*. 2nd ed. Bonn: Marcus und Weber, 1913.
- . *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914.



# Index of Greek Words

- ἄβουλος 212  
Ἀβραάμ 292  
ἀγαθός 27; 29; 53; 140; 144; 146;  
154; 162; 168; 182; 186;  
187; 238; 244; 246; 270;  
272; 290; 292; 293; 306;  
321; 326; 330; 344; 347  
ἀγαθότης 288; 290  
ἄγαλμα 290  
Ἀγαμέμνων 152; 246; 250; 294;  
304  
ἄγαν 278  
ἀγανακτέω 164; 170  
ἀγαπάω 244; 293  
ἀγαστός 344  
ἀγεννής 298  
ἀγήρως 300  
ἀγλαίζω 344  
ἀγνοέω 158; 222; 244  
ἄγνοια 158; 272  
ἀγνωμονέω 296  
ἀγνώμων 140; 186  
ἄγονος 300  
ἄγορά 129; 148; 176; 212; 254  
ἀγορεύω 144  
ἄγρα 358  
ἀγρυπνέω 110  
ἄγχω 160  
ἄγω 17; 142; 150; 156; 162; 174;  
192; 226; 230; 298; 299; 302  
ἀγών 172; 276  
ἀγωνιστικός 91  
ἄδεια 146; 162  
ἀδελφός 150; 304  
ἀδιδάκρυτος 346  
ἀδικέω 144; 158; 174; 220; 226  
ἀδίκημα 142  
ἀδοξία 152  
ἄδύνατος 146  
ἄδυτον 326  
ἄδότης 305  
ἀεί 110; 140; 144; 146; 148; 158;  
172; 214; 226; 285; 294  
ἀείδω 164; 184  
ἀείρω 146  
ἀηδής 176; 184  
ἄήρ 290  
ἄθανατος 185; 222  
Ἀθηνᾶ 276  
Ἀθῆναι 131; 150; 164; 168; 180;  
182; 184; 214; 222; 224;  
226; 256; 276; 285; 296;  
298; 302; 304  
ἄθλιος 158  
ἄθλος 150  
Αἴας 294; 304; 305  
Αἴγισθος 294  
Αἰγύπτιος 302  
αἰδέομαι 164  
αἰδέσιμος 176  
Αἰῶν 250  
Αἰθίοψ 9; 10; 46; 47  
αἶμα 292  
αἶρέω 150; 156; 185; 190; 224;  
244  
αἶρω 188; 270  
αἰσθάνομαι 162; 168  
αἴσθησις 182; 326; 328  
Αἰσχίνης 32; 34  
αἰσχυρός 142; 195; 328  
αἰσχυρότης 332  
αἰσχύνη 274  
αἰσχύνω 152  
Αἴσωπος 13; 18; 48  
αἰτία 16; 84; 86; 88; 90; 91; 92;  
107; 110; 128; 129; 137;  
142; 158; 164; 166; 170;  
171; 172; 176; 188; 205;  
206; 208; 209; 212; 214;

- 220; 224; 230; 238; 241;  
 244; 248; 254; 266; 267;  
 268; 270; 284; 290; 298;  
 328; 342; 344; 352; 356  
 αἰτιάομαι 214  
 αἰτιατικός 58; 60; 61; 77  
 αἰών 288; 289  
 ἀκαιρία 174  
 ἀκάλυπτος 17  
 ἄκανθα 300  
 ἀκίνδυνος 272  
 ἀκίνητος 274  
 ἀκμάζω 146  
 ἀκοή 288  
 ἀκολασταίνω 192  
 ἀκολουθέω 162  
 ἀκόλουθος 244  
 ἀκονάω 9  
 ἀκοσμέω 131; 214; 217; 256; 257  
 ἀκούω 30; 33; 34; 148; 152; 162;  
 344  
 ἄκρα 356  
 ἀκραιφνής 266; 270; 330  
 ἀκρασία 228  
 ἀκριβεία 290  
 ἀκριβής 146; 268; 274; 276; 278;  
 326  
 ἀκριβῶς 328  
 ἀκρισία 162  
 ἀκροατής 82; 83  
 ἄκρος 170; 185  
 ἄλδομαι 346  
 ἀλγεινός 148; 244  
 ἀλγέω 246  
 Ἀλέξανδρος 25; 26; 27; 28; 110;  
 111; 140; 142; 146; 148;  
 152; 154; 248; 252; 358; 359  
 ἀλήθεια 188; 326  
 ἀληθής 162  
 ἀλήτης 296; 297  
 ἀλιεύω 358  
 ἀλίσκομαι 168; 356  
 Ἀλκαῖος 232  
 ἄλλά 14; 18; 76; 96; 111; 140; 142;  
 144; 146; 148; 150; 152;  
 158; 162; 164; 172; 174;  
 176; 178; 180; 182; 184;  
 186; 192; 214; 218; 224;  
 228; 230; 232; 235; 238;  
 244; 246; 250; 271; 272;  
 274; 276; 288; 292; 294;  
 296; 298; 300; 302; 326;  
 328; 330; 342; 344; 346; 358  
 ἀλλήλων 148; 302  
 ἄλλοθεν 298  
 ἄλλος 14; 18; 96; 108; 111; 129;  
 140; 142; 150; 156; 168;  
 170; 172; 174; 180; 182;  
 184; 188; 190; 218; 219;  
 226; 251; 270; 272; 276;  
 288; 294; 298; 302; 326;  
 328; 330; 332; 344; 346;  
 356; 358  
 ἄλλοτε 244  
 ἀλλότριος 218; 220; 221  
 ἄλλως 244; 326; 346  
 ἀλόγιστος 212; 252; 253  
 ἄλογος 256; 274  
 ἄλυτος 262  
 ἄλως 180  
 ἄλωσις 274  
 ἄμα 228; 292  
 ἄμαξ 300  
 ἀμάρα 292  
 ἀμαρτάνω 144; 148; 160; 164; 214;  
 256  
 ἀμάρτημα 131; 158; 164; 214; 256  
 ἀμαυρόω 272  
 ἀμβλώσκω 300  
 ἀμείβω 144; 304  
 ἀμείνων 140; 142; 146; 162; 164;  
 192; 194; 254  
 ἀμελέω 164; 326  
 ἄμικτος 218; 219  
 ἄμιλλα 220  
 ἀμοιρέω 140  
 ἀμουσία 333

- ἀμυδρός 326  
 ἀμύνω 174  
 ἀμφισβητήσιμος 152  
 ἄμφοδον 179  
 ἀμφοτέρος 158; 178; 179; 186;  
 248; 330; 344  
 ἄμφω 174; 228  
 ἄν 77; 140; 142; 144; 146; 148;  
 150; 156; 158; 160; 162;  
 164; 168; 170; 172; 174;  
 176; 178; 180; 182; 184;  
 188; 190; 192; 194; 196;  
 206; 214; 220; 230; 238;  
 246; 248; 270; 272; 274;  
 288; 300; 302; 304; 322;  
 323; 326; 328; 330; 332  
 ἀναβαθμός 83  
 ἀναβάλλω 359  
 ἀναβολή 358  
 ἀναγκάζω 289  
 ἀναγκαῖος 85; 146; 160; 190  
 ἀνάγκη 142; 172; 176; 178; 186;  
 192; 330  
 ἀναγορεύω 276  
 ἀνάγω 178; 214; 276; 288; 344  
 ἀναδείκνυμι 356  
 ἀναζητέω 144  
 ἀναιρέω 164; 178; 214; 250; 251  
 ἀναίσθητος 140  
 ἀναλίσχω 158; 304  
 ἀναμείγνυμι 222  
 ἀναμένω 180; 248  
 ἀνάντης 184  
 ἀνάπαυλα 172; 180  
 ἀνάπαυσις 18  
 ἀναπείθω 218  
 ἀναπέτομαι 300  
 ἀναπίμπλημι 222; 272; 330  
 ἀναπληρώω 222; 298  
 ἀνάπτωξις 290  
 ἀναρρήγνυμι 178  
 ἀνασκευή 82; 125; 126; 137; 198;  
 236; 262; 281; 286; 340  
 ἀνατίθημι 131; 164; 182; 214; 256  
 ἀναφαίνω 270  
 ἀναφαίρετος 272  
 ἀναφέρω 95; 162; 176; 256  
 ἀναχώρησις 246  
 ἀνδραγαθίω 344  
 ἀνδραποδισμός 300  
 ἀνδραποδον 140  
 ἀνδρεία 17; 26; 110; 140; 158; 168;  
 178; 226; 232; 240; 248;  
 270; 272; 276; 293; 328;  
 347; 356; 358  
 ἀνδρωνῖτις 224  
 ἀνεγείρω 160  
 ἀνεῖπον 276  
 ἄνεμος 346  
 ἀνεπιτήδειος 192  
 ἀνερευνάω 158  
 ἄνευ 96; 148; 178; 192; 227; 274  
 ἀνέχω 178  
 ἀνῆρ 146; 186; 218; 220; 221; 224;  
 226; 228; 233; 270; 274;  
 276; 326; 328; 358  
 ἀνήροτος 178  
 ἀνθαιρέομαι 270; 346  
 ἀνθέλω 192  
 ἄνθος 290; 300  
 ἀνθρώπιος 254; 298  
 ἀνθρωπικός 298  
 ἀνθρώπινος 144; 288; 326  
 ἄνθρωπος 16; 18; 36; 37; 41; 43;  
 131; 142; 144; 152; 156;  
 158; 180; 184; 186; 190;  
 192; 214; 222; 226; 230;  
 256; 272; 288; 290; 294;  
 298; 302; 328; 344  
 ἀνιάρως 238; 244; 246  
 ἀνοιδέω 344  
 ἀνόνητος 346  
 ἀνταίρω 160  
 ἀντάλλαγμα 252; 253  
 ἀντέχω 270  
 ἀντί 130; 172; 174; 182; 188; 190;  
 212; 214; 254; 298; 328

- ἀντιβλέπω 142; 160  
 ἀντιδίδωμι 298; 300; 302; 304  
 ἀντίδοσις 150; 300  
 ἀντίθεσις 104; 106; 262  
 ἀντικομίζω 300  
 ἄντικρυς 276  
 ἀντίπαλος 174; 356  
 ἀντιποιέω 164  
 Ἀντισθένης 41; 342; 346; 347  
 ἀντιτείνω 160  
 ἀντιχαρίζομαι 304  
 ἀντίχαρις 300; 302; 304  
 ἀνύω 184; 330  
 ἄνω 150; 274; 330  
 ἄνωθεν 330  
 ἄνωμαλία 330  
 ἄνωμαλος 292  
 ἄνωυμος 258; 259  
 ἄξια 178; 276; 326  
 ἄξιος 164; 176; 186; 194; 248;  
 274; 304; 328; 332  
 ἄξιόω 77; 158; 160; 162; 188; 276  
 ἄξιωμα 272  
 αἰδιδίμος 111  
 ἄόριστος 109; 208; 209  
 ἀπαγγελία 84  
 ἀπαιδευσία 176  
 ἀπαίδευτος 21  
 ἀπαλλάσσω 239  
 ἀπαναίνομαι 290  
 ἄπαξ 151; 344  
 ἄπας 129; 131; 140; 142; 156; 164;  
 182; 187; 194; 212; 214;  
 220; 230; 232; 244; 256;  
 272; 274; 276; 283; 290;  
 326; 330  
 ἀπειλή 170  
 ἀπειλικρινέω 274  
 ἄπειμι (sum) 176; 330  
 ἄπειμι (ibo) 158; 302  
 ἀπεῖπον 274  
 ἄπειρος 146  
 ἀπελαύνω 150; 182  
 ἀπεργάζομαι 274  
 ἀπέρχομαι 164; 272  
 ἀπευδοκιμέω 18  
 ἀπεχθάνομαι 222  
 ἀπέχθεια 300  
 ἀπέχω 64; 65; 285; 304; 358  
 ἀπλοῦς 162; 190; 272; 344; 346  
 ἀπό 104; 108; 110; 111; 130; 146;  
 148; 150; 151; 158; 164;  
 168; 170; 174; 176; 190;  
 212; 218; 221; 254; 270;  
 272; 285; 288; 289; 296;  
 298; 300; 302; 304  
 ἀποβαίνω 62; 63; 64; 65  
 ἀποβάλλω 192; 244  
 ἀποβλέπω 164; 174  
 ἀποβολή 146; 244  
 ἀπόγονος 230  
 ἀποδείκνυμι 238; 244; 306  
 ἀποδεικτικός 91  
 ἀποδείξις 80; 91; 148  
 ἀποδημέω 330  
 ἀποδιδράσκω 170  
 ἀποδίδωμι 298; 300; 302  
 ἀποδιΐστημι 290  
 ἀποθνήσκω 18  
 ἀποκλείω 172  
 ἀποκναίω 170  
 ἀποκρίνω 26; 77; 146; 222  
 ἀπόκρισις 142  
 ἀποκριτικός 14; 15; 17; 38; 41; 46;  
 48  
 ἀπόκροτος 288  
 ἀποκρούω 146  
 ἀποκρύπτω 212; 296  
 ἀποκτείνω 164  
 ἀπόλαυσις 289; 290  
 ἀπολαύω 146; 290  
 ἀπολείπω 150; 176; 294  
 ἀπόλλυμι 34; 328; 358  
 ἀπόλογος 160  
 ἀπομιμέομαι 290; 292  
 ἀπομνημόνευμα 95; 96



- ἀπομνημονεύω 54; 57; 58; 60; 61;  
     63; 64; 65; 69; 77; 95; 96;  
     162; 244  
 ἀπονάίω 274  
 ἀπονίναμαι 206; 218  
 ἀποπλέω 274  
 ἀπόπληκτος 158  
 ἀποπτύω 294  
 ἀπορέω 83; 144; 146; 148; 222  
 ἀπορία 144; 290  
 ἀπορρέω 300  
 ἀπόρρητος 288  
 ἀποσβέννυμι 272  
 ἀποσείω 172  
 ἀποσκευάζω 294  
 ἀποσκώπτω 298  
 ἀποστατέω 160  
 ἀποστερέω 186; 244; 300  
 ἀπόστολος 280; 288; 335  
 ἀποστρέφω 152  
 ἀποστροφή 150  
 ἀποτίκτω 304  
 ἀποτρέπω 160  
 ἀπουσία 330  
 ἀποφάνινω 176; 180; 188; 244; 268;  
     270; 274; 278; 304; 358  
 ἀπόφανσις 244; 246  
 ἀποφαντικός 6; 15; 32; 33; 37; 46;  
     171; 341; 351  
 ἀποφθέγγομαι 304  
 ἀπόφθεγμα 94  
 ἀπρόσκοπτος 274  
 ἄπτω 190  
 ἀπωθέω 300  
 ἄρα 111; 154; 158; 188; 358  
 ἄρα 158; 162; 178; 184; 186; 188;  
     192  
 ἀργέω 192  
 ἀργία 160; 188; 190  
 Ἀργινοῦσαι 164  
 ἀργός 197  
 ἀργύριον 142; 160; 186  
 ἄργυρος 290  
 ἀρδεία 292  
 ἄρέσκω 17; 18; 150; 160  
 ἄρετή 156; 164; 174; 184; 185;  
     186; 188; 218; 230; 270;  
     274; 328  
 ἀρήιος 233  
 ἀριθμός 274  
 ἀριστεία 304  
 Ἀριστείδης 194  
 ἀρίστευμα 344  
 ἀριστεύς 338  
 Ἀρίστιππος 16; 18  
 ἄριστος 22; 33; 34; 132; 144; 148;  
     152; 162; 182; 216; 270;  
     326; 344  
 Ἀριστοτέλης 21; 43; 140; 188  
 Ἀριστοφάνης 46; 226  
 ἀρκέω 77; 170; 172; 174  
 ἀρμόζω 176  
 ἄροτρον 178  
 ἄρουρα 346  
 ἀρπαγή 150; 294  
 ἀρπάζω 190  
 ἄρρηκτος 288  
 ἄρρητος 288  
 Ἄρτεμις 224  
 ἄρτι 77; 176; 178  
 ἄρτιος 300  
 ἀρτίτοκος 300  
 ἄρτος 290  
 ἀρχέτυπος 326  
 ἀρχή 8; 162; 170; 176; 224; 226;  
     272; 283; 300  
 ἀρχῆθεν 298  
 ἄρχω 140; 256; 272  
 ἀσέλγεια 294  
 ἀσθενής 272  
 ἀσκέω 129; 170; 212; 224; 241;  
     254; 294  
 ἄσκησις 146  
 ἄσμα 194; 195  
 ἀσπάζομαι 246  
 ἄσπαρτος 178  
 Ἀσπασία 206

- ἀσπίς 9 288; 289; 290; 294; 296;  
 ἄστρον 129; 212; 241; 254; 274 300; 302; 304; 328; 330;  
 ἀστυγείτων 174 332; 344; 353; 356; 358  
 ἄστυλος 272 αὐτόχειρος 152  
 ἀσυμμετρία 330 ἀφαίρεσις 238; 244; 246  
 ἀσυνεσία 346 ἀφαιρέω 146; 148; 230; 238; 246  
 ἀσφάλεια 146; 251 ἀφαρπάζω 272  
 ἀσφαλής 248; 274 ἀφθονία 142  
 ἄσχημα 250 Ἀφθόνιος 234; 244; 259; 262; 263  
 ἀσχυλῶ 190 ἀφίημι 129; 156; 158; 188; 192;  
 ἀτακτέω 156; 164; 212; 254 212; 224; 294; 326  
 ἄτακτος 254; 330 ἀφίστημι 77; 146; 290  
 ἀταξία 160; 162; 330 ἀφοράω 290  
 ἄταφος 27 ἀφορμή 162; 166; 188  
 ἄτε 290; 326 ἀφροσύνη 346  
 ἀτείχιστος 224 ἄφρων 346  
 ἀτελεύτητος 296 ἀχαλίνωτος 274  
 ἀτεχνία 188 ἄχθος 346  
 ἀτιμώρητος 294 ἀχθοφορέω 289  
 ἄτοπος 162; 168; 182; 190; 192 Ἀχιλλεύς 152  
 Ἀττικὸς 302 ἄχρηστος 140  
 ἀτυχέω 144; 272 ἄψυχος 274  
 ἀτυχής 272 βαδίζω 148; 164; 224  
 αὖ 156; 168; 188; 228; 274 βακτηρία 156; 160; 172  
 αὐγή 290 βάλλω 272  
 αὐθήμερος 221 βάρβαρος 166  
 αὖθις 150; 272 βαρύς 133; 148; 172; 344  
 αὖλαξ 178 Βασιλάκης 280  
 αὐλητής 14; 18; 19 βασιλεία 144; 272; 296  
 αὖξω 292 βασιλεύς 27; 28; 29; 140; 142; 144;  
 αὖριον 359 248; 272; 276; 292; 296  
 αὐτάρκης 43 βασιλεύω 144  
 αὐτίκα 328 βασιλικός 28  
 αὐτόθεν 304 βέβαιος 146; 248; 306  
 Αὐτόλυκος 39; 361 βεβαιῶ 246; 248; 296  
 αὐτός 9; 14; 16; 25; 26; 28; 34; 36; 76; 77; 86; 92; 140; 144;  
 146; 148; 150; 154; 156;  
 162; 164; 166; 168; 170;  
 174; 176; 180; 184; 185;  
 186; 188; 192; 194; 212;  
 224; 226; 230; 232; 235;  
 241; 244; 248; 250; 254;  
 270; 272; 276; 284; 285;

- βιόω 32; 148; 154; 182  
 βλαβερός 344; 346  
 βλάβη 266  
 βλάπτω 196; 346  
 βλαστάνω 290  
 βλάστημα 292  
 βλέμμα 160; 161  
 βλέπω 93; 132; 158; 182; 205; 210;  
     216; 232; 242; 256; 292;  
     353; 358  
 βοάω 140; 330  
 βοηθέω 148; 176  
 βοηθός 346  
 βουκόλος 164  
 βουλευτήριο 118  
 βουλεύω 142; 143; 192; 272; 356  
 βουλή 174; 192; 212; 276; 356;  
     358  
 βουληφόρος 26; 110; 356; 358  
 βούλομαι 76; 140; 142; 150; 160;  
     168; 182; 274; 330  
 βούς 164; 178; 302  
 βραχύς 90; 91; 107; 109; 131; 154;  
     166; 186; 196; 205; 207;  
     208; 210; 216; 222; 224;  
     228; 232; 237; 248; 267;  
     278; 292; 306; 323; 332;  
     342; 346; 356; 358  
 βρέφος 300  
 Βρισηῖς 246  
 βροντή 178  
 βροτός 217; 257  
 γαμέω 146  
 γάμος 146; 190; 220; 222  
 γάρ 76; 82; 86; 92; 109; 110; 129;  
     130; 131; 136; 140; 142; 144;  
     146; 148; 150; 152; 156;  
     158; 160; 162; 164; 166;  
     168; 170; 172; 174; 176;  
     178; 180; 182; 184; 188;  
     190; 192; 197; 205; 206;  
     207; 208; 212; 214; 217;  
     218; 220; 222; 224; 226;  
     230; 238; 241; 244; 246;  
     248; 250; 251; 254; 256; 257;  
     266; 267; 270; 272; 274;  
     276; 284; 285; 288; 289;  
     290; 293; 294; 297; 300;  
     302; 306; 326; 328; 330;  
     342; 344; 345; 346; 347;  
     353; 356; 358  
 γαστήρ 180  
 γε 136; 144; 146; 148; 158; 162;  
     164; 168; 172; 176; 182;  
     184; 188; 190; 192; 272;  
     274; 276; 288; 290; 302;  
     322; 326; 328; 330; 332;  
     346; 356; 358  
 γέλοιος 194; 195  
 γέλως 226  
 γέμω 172  
 γενεά 288; 289  
 γένεσις 298; 300  
 γενικός 58; 60; 61; 77  
 γενναῖος 166; 253; 276  
 γεννάω 248; 300; 302  
 γέννημα 328; 330  
 γεννητικός 300  
 γεννητός 300  
 γεννήτωρ 328  
 γένος 79; 146; 184; 218; 220; 222;  
     250; 274; 339  
 γεραίω 304  
 γέρας 276  
 γεωργέω 188  
 γεωργία 300  
 γεωργός 178  
 γῆ 109; 156; 178; 180; 182; 190;  
     222; 224; 226; 230; 232;  
     267; 290; 300; 328  
 γῆρας 146; 148; 176; 248; 250  
 γίνομαι 16; 29; 77; 96; 111; 144;  
     148; 150; 151; 158; 162;  
     164; 166; 168; 170; 172;  
     174; 180; 184; 188; 192;  
     214; 217; 238; 246; 248;  
     250; 257; 272; 296; 298;  
     321; 326; 328; 330; 332

- γινώσκω 142; 162; 184; 188; 190;  
 226; 296; 300  
 Γλαῦκος 304  
 γλυκερός 290  
 γλύκιος 272  
 γλυκός 70; 168  
 γλῶττα 290; 294; 304  
 γνώμη 4; 82; 96; 102; 103; 125;  
 126; 137; 144; 148; 152;  
 158; 174; 186; 198; 262;  
 270; 286; 294; 296; 298;  
 304; 306; 323; 330; 332;  
 346; 358  
 γνωμολογία 285; 294; 296  
 γνωμολογία 296  
 γνωρίζω 288  
 γνώριμος 148; 164; 244  
 γνώσις 272; 328  
 γονεύς 172; 176  
 γονή 158; 162; 172; 222; 296  
 γονιμός 292; 300  
 γοῦν 290; 344  
 γράμμα 8; 9; 64; 65; 168; 270; 298  
 γραμματικός 2; 11; 51; 52; 53; 54;  
 55; 79; 81; 315  
 γραμματιστής 2; 6; 313  
 γραφεῖον 34  
 γράφω 123; 144; 174; 182; 190;  
 270  
 γρηγορέω 110; 358  
 Γρηγόριος 288; 318; 319; 320; 364  
 γυναικωνίτις 224  
 γυνή 9; 17; 146; 218; 220; 221;  
 224; 226; 228; 294; 300  
 γωνία 346  
 δαιμόνιον 156  
 δάκρυον 226; 296  
 δαμάζω 356  
 δαπανάω 158  
 Δαυίδ 292  
 δεῖγμα 226  
 δείδω 186; 220  
 δείκνυμι 123; 142; 176; 182; 188;  
 196; 224; 230; 272; 292; 326  
 δεινός 148; 162; 174; 250; 267;  
 274; 300; 330  
 δεινότης 140; 174; 182; 244  
 δεῖπνον 304  
 δέκα 267; 276; 277  
 δεκέτης 274  
 δένδρον 226; 290; 292  
 δεξιός 164; 172; 182; 226; 304;  
 306  
 δέος 39; 110; 140  
 δεσμός 250; 267  
 δεσπίζω 290  
 δεσποτεία 358  
 δεσπότης 160; 172; 288; 330  
 δεῦτε 290  
 δευτεραῖος 221  
 δεύτερος 152; 162; 170; 172; 176  
 δέχομαι 174; 176; 300  
 δέω 16; 17; 93; 110; 132; 144; 146;  
 148; 150; 152; 158; 166;  
 170; 172; 174; 176; 178;  
 180; 182; 205; 207; 210;  
 214; 216; 218; 222; 240;  
 241; 242; 248; 250; 252;  
 256; 268; 285; 286; 300;  
 302; 304; 330; 342; 347;  
 353; 358  
 δῆ 144; 146; 150; 158; 160; 162;  
 170; 172; 174; 182; 184;  
 185; 186; 192; 210; 226;  
 232; 278; 300; 321; 328;  
 330; 358  
 δῆλος 164; 166; 174  
 δηλόω 158; 206; 220; 224; 230;  
 248; 323; 332  
 δημαγωγός 182  
 δημηγορέω 190  
 Δημήτηρ 150; 178  
 δήμιος 296; 297  
 δημιουργός 290  
 δημοκρατέω 144; 226  
 δήμος 144; 174; 214; 285; 302  
 Δημοσθένης 34; 110; 180; 182;  
 184; 192; 210; 285; 339

- δημόσιος 194  
 δήπου 330  
 δήπουθεν 76  
 δῆτα 330  
 διά 16; 17; 18; 39; 76; 83; 95; 96;  
     146; 150; 158; 160; 170;  
     172; 174; 176; 188; 226;  
     230; 248; 250; 274; 276;  
     292; 304; 326; 328; 330;  
     332; 358  
 διαβάλλω 328  
 διαγινώσκω 178  
 διάγω 356  
 διαδέχομαι 302  
 διαδοχή 222  
 διαίρεσις 101; 104; 321; 322; 324;  
     343; 352; 366  
 διαιρέω 22; 76; 77; 218; 298  
 διαιτάω 144  
 διάκειμαι 190  
 διάκονος 142  
 διακόπτω 160  
 διακρίνω 346  
 διαλέγω 146; 148; 176; 178; 184  
 διαλλάσσω 186  
 διαλύω 330  
 διαμείβω 306  
 δάνοια 166; 190; 194; 248; 254  
 διανύω 178  
 διαπαντός 160  
 διαπορθμεύω 292  
 διαπράσσω 156; 251  
 διαπτύω 176  
 διαρρήδην 152  
 διασπάω 190  
 διαστέλλω 346  
 διασῶζω 110; 144; 248  
 διατίθημι 152; 182; 190; 330  
 διατριβή 182  
 διατρίβω 172; 180  
 διαυγής 274; 290  
 διαφέρω 21; 140; 156; 174; 298  
 διαφθείρω 152  
 διαφορά 174  
 διάφορος 346  
 διδασκαλεῖον 172; 174  
 διδασκαλία 94; 188  
 διδάσκαλος 131; 164; 170; 172;  
     188; 214; 217; 256; 257;  
     280; 335  
 διδάσκω 9; 62; 63; 64; 65; 321; 330  
 διδράσκω 160; 226; 272; 298  
 δίδωμι 140; 160; 162; 164; 172;  
     190; 222; 228; 248; 304; 305  
 διειδής 290  
 διεξάγω 358  
 διέξιμι (ibo) 140; 294; 322; 326  
 διεξέρχομαι 218; 248; 322  
 διερευνάω 156  
 διήγημα 75; 76; 82; 94; 96; 122;  
     125; 126; 198; 262; 263;  
     264; 281; 286; 287; 309;  
     312; 319; 320; 339; 340  
 διήγησις 76; 80; 82; 89; 91; 96  
 διηγήκεια 290  
 διηνεκής 304; 344  
 διίστημι 220; 290; 344  
 δικάζω 190; 226; 272  
 δίκαιος 85; 104; 162; 164; 176;  
     265; 270; 298; 328  
 δικαιοσύνη 194  
 δικαιοφύλαξ 335  
 δικανικός 79; 168  
 δικαστήριον 174  
 δικαστής 170  
 δίκη 162; 164; 222; 256  
 δύο 93; 207; 222; 241; 256; 286;  
     330; 342; 346; 353; 358  
 Διογένης 7; 9; 16; 21; 22; 25; 26;  
     38; 39; 41; 43; 46; 47; 54;  
     77; 110; 111; 129; 130; 132;  
     156; 158; 160; 166; 212;  
     214; 216; 224; 226; 228;  
     241; 254; 256  
 διοίκησις 330  
 Διομήδης 192  
 Διονύσιος 16

- διόπερ 148; 162; 168  
 διοράω 110  
 Διοτίμα 206  
 διπλασιάζω 176  
 διπλοῦς 148  
 δίχα 346  
 διώκω 146; 158  
 δογματεύω 346  
 δογματολογία 288  
 δοκέω 55; 58; 60; 61; 62; 64; 65;  
     69; 76; 140; 142; 146; 152;  
     156; 158; 170; 172; 174;  
     176; 178; 182; 184; 186;  
     188; 194; 222; 230; 248;  
     276; 296; 326  
 δόξα 77; 158; 162; 174; 180; 188  
 Δοξαπατρῆς 75  
 δόρυ 230  
 δόσις 176  
 δοτήρ 290; 292  
 δότης 292; 293  
 δοτικός 58; 60; 61; 77  
 δουλεύω 190; 192; 194; 356  
 δοῦλος 297; 330  
 δρᾶμα 39; 40; 296  
 δραματικός 340  
 δράω 226; 298; 330  
 δρέπανον 180  
 δριμύς 114  
 δρόμος 156; 192  
 δυικός 58; 61; 62; 63; 64; 65  
 δύναιμαι 83; 194; 274; 290; 328  
 δύναμις 244; 251; 252  
 δυναστεία 359  
 δυνατός 85; 104; 156; 194  
 δύο 144; 152; 176; 178; 186  
 δύσκολος 119  
 δυσσεβής 152  
 δυστυχής 272; 294; 296  
 δυστυχία 156  
 δυσχερής 146  
 δωρεά 290  
 Δωριεύς 232  
 δῶρον 164; 220; 223  
 δώτης 305  
 ἐάν 21; 22; 158; 170; 176; 226;  
     294  
 ἐαυτοῦ 63; 64; 65; 110; 140; 144;  
     152; 156; 162; 168; 174;  
     180; 182; 188; 190; 192;  
     212; 222; 226; 230; 272;  
     274; 276; 290; 306; 328;  
     332; 344; 346; 356; 358  
 ἐάω 182  
 ἐγγίζω 290  
 ἐγγύθεν 176  
 ἐγγύθι 185  
 ἐγγύς 178  
 ἐγκαλύπτω 17; 152  
 ἐγκαταμείγνυμι 296  
 ἐγκλημα 164; 172  
 ἐγκωμιάζω 265  
 ἐγκωμιαστικός 90; 91; 92; 107;  
     110; 127; 140; 156; 168;  
     188; 206; 209; 212; 218;  
     224; 230; 237; 238; 241;  
     244; 248; 254; 265; 268;  
     270; 283; 284; 285; 288;  
     289; 294; 320; 322; 326;  
     341; 344; 352; 356  
 ἐγκώμιον 82; 103; 125; 126; 198;  
     236; 261; 265; 281; 287;  
     319; 320; 321  
 ἐγρήγορσις 358  
 ἐγχειρίζω 328  
 ἐγώ 16; 34; 93; 131; 142; 144; 146;  
     156; 160; 162; 168; 176;  
     194; 205; 208; 210; 214;  
     226; 232; 240; 241; 254;  
     256; 267; 274; 284; 285;  
     292; 296; 302; 353; 358  
 ἐθάς 238; 246  
 ἐθέλω 168; 192; 226; 248; 300;  
     332; 344  
 ἔθνος 142; 298  
 εἰ 92; 130; 140; 142; 146; 148;  
     154; 158; 160; 162; 164;

- 168; 172; 174; 176; 178;  
188; 194; 196; 205; 209;  
212; 214; 218; 230; 240;  
250; 251; 254; 266; 270;  
272; 274; 285; 290; 294;  
298; 300; 302; 306; 323;  
328; 330; 346; 353; 358  
εἶδος 6; 14; 15; 17; 37; 38; 41; 46;  
48; 180; 330; 356  
εἶεν 146; 164; 230  
εἶθε 186; 358  
εἰκός 110; 268; 278; 344  
εἰκότως 142; 148; 154; 156; 164;  
176; 190; 326  
εἶκω 192  
εἰκών 176  
εἰμί (sum) 16; 18; 28; 34; 41; 42;  
43; 76; 82; 89; 94; 95; 96;  
110; 111; 123; 140; 143;  
144; 146; 148; 150; 152;  
154; 155; 158; 160; 162;  
164; 168; 172; 174; 176;  
178; 184; 185; 188; 190;  
192; 194; 196; 212; 217;  
218; 220; 223; 226; 228;  
230; 232; 244; 246; 248;  
250; 251; 252; 253; 254; 256;  
257; 272; 278; 285; 288;  
290; 294; 300; 302; 304;  
306; 321; 322; 326; 328;  
330; 332; 344; 346; 356; 358  
εἶμι (ibo) 77; 224; 330  
εἵπερ 142; 164  
εἵπον 7; 8; 9; 17; 18; 20; 21; 22;  
24; 26; 28; 33; 34; 36; 37;  
38; 41; 42; 43; 47; 54; 55;  
57; 58; 60; 61; 62; 63; 69;  
76; 77; 82; 96; 110; 131;  
156; 158; 160; 168; 172;  
176; 178; 180; 182; 184;  
186; 188; 190; 205; 214;  
224; 244; 246; 250; 254;  
256; 266; 270; 274; 290;  
326; 330; 353  
εἰρηναῖον 170  
εἰρήνη 144; 146; 176; 248; 300;  
344  
εἶρω 241  
εἷς 33; 168; 186; 250; 254; 274;  
276; 326  
εἰς 17; 142; 144; 148; 162; 166;  
170; 172; 174; 176; 178;  
180; 182; 185; 190; 212;  
224; 226; 234; 238; 239;  
244; 246; 267; 270; 274;  
276; 290; 294; 298; 302;  
326; 328; 330; 359  
εἰσάγω 276; 294; 328  
εἰσέρχομαι 176; 192  
εἰσηγέομαι 148  
εἰσήγησις 174  
εἰσφέρω 158; 180; 358  
εἰσφορά 82; 83; 125; 126; 262; 339  
εἶτα 88; 152; 224; 248  
εἵτε 290  
εἴωθα 358  
ἐκ 84; 89; 90; 91; 92; 107; 108;  
130; 146; 150; 160; 176;  
182; 190; 191; 205; 207;  
208; 209; 212; 214; 218;  
222; 224; 226; 228; 230;  
232; 239; 240; 241; 244;  
246; 248; 250; 254; 256;  
266; 268; 272; 285; 288;  
290; 294; 298; 300; 302;  
321; 323; 326; 328; 332;  
342; 346; 352; 356; 358  
ἐκασταχόθεν 274  
ἐκαστος 151; 158; 164; 272; 298;  
302; 304; 346  
ἐκάτερος 140; 144; 176; 214; 224;  
226; 228; 254  
ἐκατέρωθεν 326  
ἐκβάλλω 226  
ἐκεῖ 176  
ἐκεῖθεν 146; 298  
ἐκεῖνος 16; 76; 140; 144; 146; 148;  
152; 154; 156; 158; 160;

- 162; 164; 166; 170; 172;  
 174; 176; 178; 180; 182;  
 184; 186; 188; 192; 194;  
 222; 224; 226; 228; 248;  
 270; 272; 276; 292; 296;  
 304; 306; 326; 328; 330;  
 344; 356; 358  
 ἐκεῖσε 178  
 ἐκθεσις 104; 105; 107  
 ἐκκλησιᾶ 174; 292  
 ἐκκρόπτω 180  
 ἐκκοσμέω 344  
 ἐκκρούω 182  
 ἐκλείπω 300  
 ἐκούσιος 15; 33; 34; 37; 171; 341;  
 351  
 ἐκπίπτω 296  
 ἐκπορθέω 274  
 ἐκσφύζω 192  
 ἐκτάσσω 142; 150; 170; 176  
 ἐκτείνω 96; 232  
 ἐκτίθημι 76; 244; 270  
 ἐκτραχηλίζω 294  
 ἐκτρέχω 290  
 Ἐκτωρ 152; 304  
 ἐκφαντορικός 288  
 ἐκφέρω 160; 182; 226; 230; 272;  
 332  
 ἐκφεύγω 196  
 ἐκφρασις 82; 125; 126; 198; 199;  
 236; 261; 312  
 ἐλαύνω 152; 164  
 ἐλέγχω 144  
 Ἐλένη 150  
 ἐλευθερία 144  
 ἐλέφας 298  
 ἔλκω 190  
 Ἐλλάς 110; 226; 232; 302  
 Ἐλλην 182; 276; 298  
 Ἐλλήνις 164  
 Ἐλλήσποντος 119; 214; 256  
 ἐλπίζω 16; 296  
 ἐλπὶς 160  
 ἐμβάλλω 212  
 ἐμός 140; 142; 160; 188; 194; 290  
 ἐμπειρία 344  
 ἐμπύμπλημι 140  
 ἐμπίπτω 178; 344  
 ἐμπόδισμα 182  
 ἐμποιέω 83  
 ἐμπορεύομαι 288  
 ἔμπορος 178  
 ἐμπροσθεν 140; 152; 274  
 ἐμφανής 17  
 ἐμφανίζω 170  
 ἔμφρων 276  
 ἔμψυχος 274  
 ἐν 21; 25; 34; 43; 47; 54; 82; 83;  
 123; 131; 140; 144; 146;  
 148; 150; 156; 160; 164;  
 166; 168; 170; 172; 174;  
 176; 180; 182; 184; 186;  
 188; 190; 192; 194; 214;  
 238; 244; 248; 250; 252;  
 256; 270; 272; 274; 276;  
 288; 290; 330; 344; 346;  
 356; 358  
 ἐναίμων 64; 65  
 ἐναντίον 84; 85; 86; 88; 90; 91;  
 92; 107; 108; 110; 130; 146;  
 158; 160; 162; 176; 178;  
 190; 191; 205; 207; 208;  
 209; 214; 222; 226; 230;  
 239; 240; 246; 250; 256;  
 266; 268; 272; 285; 290;  
 300; 302; 321; 323; 328;  
 330; 342; 346; 352; 356; 358  
 ἐναργής 188  
 ἐνδεῖα 298; 302  
 ἐνδειξις 292  
 ἐνδέω 302  
 ἐνδίδωμι 358  
 ἐνδοξος 77; 86; 150  
 ἐνέδρα 148; 358  
 ἐνειμι (sum) 192  
 ἐνεκα 158; 162; 328  
 ἐνθεν 246



- ἐνθυμέω 152; 158; 188; 192  
 ἔνιοι 168  
 ἐννοέω 274; 344  
 ἔννομος 296  
 ἐνοχλέω 188  
 ἐνταῦθα 146; 158; 172; 174; 176  
 ἐντελής 267; 270; 274  
 ἐντεῦθεν 182; 270; 288; 290; 300  
 ἔντευξις 142  
 ἐντίθημι 178  
 ἐντυγχάνω 156; 224  
 ἐξάγω 192  
 ἐξαιρετός 272  
 ἐξαιρέω 250; 251; 298  
 ἐξάίρω 288  
 ἐξασκέω 270  
 ἔξειμι (sum) 142; 356  
 ἐξετάζω 162; 192  
 ἐξέχω 290  
 ἐξῆς 206; 220; 238; 244  
 ἐξορίζω 328  
 ἐξοστρακίζω 300  
 ἐξοχή 95; 96  
 ἔξοχος 270  
 ἐξυφαίνω 356  
 ἔξω 146; 160; 222; 294; 302  
 ἔξωθεν 244  
 ἐπάγω 302  
 ἐπαινετέος 232; 246  
 ἐπαινέτης 321; 326  
 ἐπαινετός 95; 96; 344  
 ἐπαινέω 154; 158; 162; 166; 168;  
 188; 194; 206; 212; 218;  
 240; 241; 248; 254; 294;  
 298; 358  
 ἔπαινος 83; 88; 89; 90; 176; 194;  
 332  
 ἐπαίρω 142  
 ἐπαληθεύω 228  
 ἐπαληθίζω 346  
 Ἐπαμεινώνδας 34  
 ἐπανάστασις 328  
 ἐπανατείνω 294  
 ἐπανατίθημι 131; 214  
 ἐπανήκω 296  
 ἐπανίστημι 178  
 ἐπανορθόω 174; 212  
 ἐπανόρθωμα 158  
 ἐπανόρθωσις 212  
 ἐπάνω 9  
 ἐπάρατος 152  
 ἐπεγείρω 172; 302  
 ἐπεί 76; 146; 150; 162; 176; 185;  
 188; 192; 302; 326  
 ἐπειδάν 174; 180  
 ἐπειδή 152; 164; 224; 302  
 ἐπειδήπερ 330  
 ἐπεῖπον 156; 212  
 ἐπεισπίπτω 276  
 ἐπεισφέρω 232  
 ἔπειτα 142; 185; 226; 232; 298  
 ἐπεκτείνωσις 84  
 ἐπέρχομαι 58; 76; 77; 172; 254;  
 300  
 ἐπί 16; 77; 96; 110; 111; 144; 148;  
 156; 158; 162; 164; 168;  
 170; 172; 174; 176; 178;  
 179; 184; 188; 192; 194;  
 197; 206; 212; 214; 218;  
 224; 226; 230; 246; 254;  
 256; 294; 296; 300; 302;  
 304; 326; 328; 358  
 ἐπιβάλλω 192; 274; 300  
 ἐπιβάτης 274  
 ἐπιβεβαίωσις 298  
 ἐπιβοάω 226  
 ἐπιβόσκω 302  
 ἐπιβουλεύω 146; 148; 190  
 ἐπίβουλος 39  
 ἐπιγίνομαι 222  
 ἐπιδείκνυμι 166; 168; 230; 274;  
 276; 298; 300  
 ἐπιδεικτικός 79  
 ἐπίδειξις 170  
 ἐπιδίδωμι 16  
 ἐπιθυμέω 158; 192; 194; 196; 328  
 ἐπιθυμία 190; 192; 194; 196; 328

- ἐπικειμαι 356; 358  
 ἐπικουρέω 144  
 ἐπικουφίζω 144; 250; 306  
 ἐπικράτεια 330  
 ἐπικρατής 272  
 ἐπιλείπω 302  
 ἐπίλογος 80; 90; 91; 93; 107; 109;  
 131; 154; 166; 186; 196;  
 205; 207; 208; 210; 216;  
 222; 228; 232; 237; 239;  
 240; 242; 246; 252; 256;  
 267; 278; 292; 306; 323;  
 332; 342; 346; 353; 356; 358  
 ἐπιλύω 110  
 ἐπιμαίνομαι 296  
 ἐπιμέλεια 180; 226  
 ἐπιμελέομαι 111; 156; 292  
 ἐπιμύθιον 83; 102; 339; 350  
 ἐπίμωμος 332  
 ἐπίνοια 298; 304; 328  
 ἐπιρρεπής 158  
 ἐπίσημος 288  
 ἐπισκήπτω 184  
 ἐπισκοπέω 358  
 ἐπίσταμαι 132; 160; 192; 214; 246;  
 256  
 ἐπιστάτης 192; 346  
 ἐπιστήμη 212; 328; 330  
 ἐπιστολή 318; 364  
 ἐπιστρεπτικός 290; 292  
 ἐπιστρέφω 284; 290  
 ἐπιτείνω 172  
 ἐπιτήδειος 144; 146; 148; 174; 192;  
 193; 248  
 ἐπιτήδευμα 190  
 ἐπιτίθημι 28; 190; 254  
 ἐπιτομή 259  
 ἐπιτρέπω 26; 160; 178; 192; 290;  
 346; 356  
 ἐπιτρέχω 330  
 ἐπιτροπεύω 292  
 ἐπιφάνεια 349  
 ἐπιφέρω 95; 96; 226; 332  
 ἐπιχειρέω 10; 89; 272; 302  
 ἐπιχείρημα 91; 104  
 ἔπομαι 164  
 ἐπονείδιστος 194  
 ἐπόπτης 162  
 ἔπος 111; 184  
 ἐπωνυμία 276; 296  
 ἐπώνυμος 270  
 ἔραω 40; 190; 196; 266; 284  
 ἐργάζομαι 109; 130; 190; 205; 209;  
 212; 230; 240; 248; 254;  
 267; 272; 290; 292  
 ἐργασία 88; 89; 91; 188; 232  
 ἔργον 82; 83; 140; 154; 158; 162;  
 166; 172; 182; 188; 190;  
 192; 224; 230; 232; 292;  
 296; 298; 304; 306; 330  
 Ἐρινός 152  
 Ἐρμῆς 39  
 ἔρομαι 39; 40; 142; 224  
 ἐρωμένος 170  
 ἐρυθρίαω 146  
 ἔρχομαι 16; 26; 156; 164; 174;  
 239; 244; 246; 298; 330  
 Ἐρως 197  
 ἔρωω 114; 176; 184; 188; 190; 192;  
 194; 196  
 ἔρωτάω 14; 15; 16; 17; 18; 20; 21;  
 22; 26; 38; 41; 43; 45; 46;  
 47; 48; 54; 58; 77; 140; 142;  
 188; 218; 230; 248; 359  
 ἐρωτικός 188  
 ἐσθίω 46; 47; 290  
 ἔσοπτρον 346  
 ἐσπέρα 172  
 ἐστία 224; 226; 302  
 ἐστιάω 180  
 ἔσχατος 176  
 ἕτερος 76; 129; 130; 142; 148; 152;  
 176; 178; 186; 188; 190;  
 212; 214; 223; 226; 230;  
 248; 254; 290; 292; 298;  
 300; 302; 306; 328; 346  
 ἐτέρωθεν 146

- ἐτέρως 162; 306  
 ἔτι 142; 148; 160; 176; 270; 300;  
     328  
 ἔτος 32  
 εὖ 166; 188; 224; 270; 272; 274;  
     276; 290; 292; 298; 345; 358  
 εὐαγγέλιον 280  
 εὐάλωτος 110  
 εὐβουλία 36; 37  
 εὐγνωμοσύνη 298  
 εὐδαιμονία 140; 148; 156; 158;  
     180; 298  
 εὐδαίμων 148; 154  
 εὐδηλος 83  
 εὐδοκίμew 18; 176; 226; 272  
 εὐδόκιμος 246  
 εὐδοξία 176  
 εὐδω 24; 26; 110; 356; 358  
 εὐεργεσία 290  
 εὐεργετής 283; 288  
 εὐζωνος 288; 289  
 εὐθεΐα 75  
 εὐθυνα 172  
 εὐθύς 170; 174; 270; 294  
 εὐκλεια 176  
 εὐκολος 76; 192  
 εὐκτός 332  
 εὐλογέω 293  
 εὐμενής 142  
 εὐμεταχείριστος 76  
 Εὐμητις 206  
 εὐμορέω 266; 270; 278  
 εὐνοια 91; 174; 248  
 εὐνους 144; 182  
 εὐπατρίδης 274  
 εὐποιία 284; 288  
 εὐπορέω 144; 154  
 εὐπορία 148; 176; 178  
 εὐπραξία 144  
 εὐπρεπῶς 330  
 εὕρεσις 80; 174; 298  
 εὕρημα 220; 223  
 Εὐριπίδης 16; 37; 152; 205; 207;  
     228; 240; 241; 252; 330  
 εὐρίσκω 17; 46; 158; 164; 168;  
     170; 188; 190; 192; 272  
 εὐσέβεια 294  
 εὐσεβής 339  
 εὐστοαλής 288  
 εὐστομέω 18  
 εὐστοχέω 300  
 εὐστοχος 272; 304  
 εὐτυχέω 18  
 εὐτυχής 272  
 εὐφράδεια 244  
 εὐφροσύνη 176  
 εὐχή 174  
 εὐχομαι 180; 332; 346; 347  
 εὐψυχία 224  
 εὐώνυμος 306  
 ἐφεξῆς 130; 152; 178; 205; 206;  
     209; 212; 230; 238; 240;  
     241; 248; 254; 266; 344;  
     352; 356  
 ἐφέπω 290; 358  
 ἐφευρίσκω 272; 298  
 ἐφικνέομαι 288  
 ἐφικτός 290  
 ἐφίστημι 158; 160; 162; 172  
 ἐχθρός 174; 344; 346  
 ἔχιδνα 9  
 ἔχω 17; 39; 96; 110; 140; 144;  
     146; 148; 150; 154; 158;  
     162; 164; 168; 170; 172;  
     174; 176; 180; 184; 186;  
     188; 190; 192; 194; 226;  
     244; 246; 248; 250; 251;  
     254; 272; 274; 276; 294;  
     298; 300; 302; 304; 326;  
     328; 332; 345; 346; 356; 358  
 ζάλη 328  
 ζάω 21; 22; 156; 332; 333  
 Ζεύς 150; 248  
 ζῆλος 180  
 ζηλόω 46; 224; 244  
 ζηλωτής 156; 188; 224  
 ζηλωτός 176

- ζημία 164  
 ζημιόω 160  
 ζητέω 129; 142; 212; 241; 248;  
 254; 255; 276  
 ζήτημα 101; 366  
 ζοφερός 346  
 ζυγόν 298; 299  
 ζωή 290; 332  
 ζωογονέω 292  
 ζῶον 42; 43; 109; 110; 246; 302;  
 328  
 ζωστήρ 304  
 ἦ 96; 111; 140; 144; 146; 148;  
 150; 152; 155; 160; 164;  
 168; 170; 172; 174; 176;  
 178; 180; 184; 186; 188;  
 190; 194; 214; 230; 253;  
 270; 272; 276; 290; 300;  
 302; 326; 346; 356  
 ἦ 172  
 ἡγέομαι 76; 131; 140; 142; 144;  
 146; 156; 160; 162; 182;  
 214; 217; 232; 256; 257;  
 292; 326  
 ἡγουν 356  
 ἡδη 142; 144; 192; 300  
 ἡδομαι 188  
 ἡδονή 156; 170; 174; 176; 180;  
 182; 220; 222; 226  
 ἡδύς 85; 142; 148; 170; 244; 250;  
 290; 333  
 ἡθη 16  
 ἡθοποιία 82; 103; 122; 125; 126;  
 198; 234; 235; 236; 238;  
 245; 262; 281; 282; 286;  
 287; 312; 319; 320  
 ἡθος 53; 296  
 ἡκιστος 77; 190  
 ἡκω 142; 164; 166; 238; 244; 298;  
 300  
 Ἡλέκτρα 294; 296  
 ἡλικία 142; 143; 146; 248  
 ἡλικος 146; 296  
 ἥλιος 129; 156; 212; 241; 254;  
 274; 290  
 ἡμεῖς 76; 146; 186; 187; 235; 244;  
 285; 288; 290; 298; 304  
 ἡμέρα 9; 47; 148; 151; 172; 178;  
 330; 358  
 ἡμερος 142; 172; 300  
 ἡμίθεος 150  
 ἡνίκα 176  
 ἡνίοχος 164  
 ἡπειρος 140  
 Ἡρακλῆς 150; 156; 172; 224; 230;  
 250  
 ἡρέμα 290  
 ἡρωϊκός 270  
 ἥρως 192; 274  
 Ἡσίودος 146; 184; 186; 205; 207;  
 286; 304; 342  
 ἡττάομαι 146; 190  
 ἡττων 168; 300; 358  
 θάλασσα 180; 190; 290; 300  
 θάνατος 18; 34  
 θαρρέω 176; 294; 296  
 θαῦμα 164; 168; 206; 209; 220;  
 230  
 θαυμάζω 93; 132; 135; 152; 156;  
 162; 168; 170; 186; 188;  
 194; 205; 206; 207; 209;  
 214; 216; 218; 222; 238;  
 240; 241; 242; 246; 252;  
 254; 256; 266; 268; 270;  
 286; 298; 304; 328; 342;  
 346; 352; 353; 356; 358  
 θαυμάσιος 272  
 θαυμαστός 140; 166; 176; 178; 344  
 θέα 210; 232  
 Θεανώ 206; 218; 220; 222  
 θεάομαι 254  
 θεατής 294; 296  
 θέατρον 164; 226  
 θεηγόρος 290  
 θεῖος 288; 326  
 θέλγω 184  
 Θεμιστοκλῆς 110; 166; 192; 214;  
 276

- Θέογνις 206  
 θεόλογος 350  
 θεός 156; 176; 184; 185; 186; 187;  
     192; 220; 222; 223; 250;  
     283; 288; 290; 292; 293; 294  
 θεοφορέω 292  
 θεοφόρος 292  
 Θεόφραστος 188  
 θεραπεύω 152; 178; 250  
 θερίζω 178  
 θέρος 180  
 Θερσίτης 274  
 θέσις 82; 101; 103; 104; 105; 106;  
     107; 125; 126; 198; 199;  
     312; 340  
 Θεσμοφόρια 218  
 θεωρέω 288  
 Θηβαίος 34  
 θηρεύω 328  
 θηρίον 156; 298  
 θηριώδης 298  
 θησαυρός 140; 142; 148; 154; 248  
 Θησεύς 150; 250  
 θνήσκω 21; 152  
 θνητός 36; 37  
 θόρυβος 182  
 Θουκυδίδης 246  
 Θρᾶξ 298  
 θρασύς 184; 274  
 θρασύτης 192  
 θρόνος 170  
 θρυλέω 290  
 θῦμα 222  
 θυμός 170; 328  
 θύρα 16  
 θυσία 222  
 θύω 222  
 ἱαμβεῖος 270  
 ἱαμβόκροτος 290  
 ἴδιος 95; 96; 152; 221; 304; 346  
 ἰδιωτεύω 346  
 ἰδιώτης 272  
 ἰδοῦ 9  
 ἰδρύω 170  
 ἰδρώς 170; 176; 185  
 ἰέρεια 222; 223  
 ἱερόλυτος 34  
 ἱερός 220  
 ἰθύνω 288  
 ἱκανός 174; 248; 292  
 ἱκνέομαι 185  
 ἱλαδόν 185  
 ἱλαρός 292; 293  
 ἱμάς 160; 161  
 ἵνα 22; 29; 95; 96; 158; 196; 248;  
     272; 330  
 Ἰνδός 298  
 Ἰππαρχία 206  
 ἱππεύω 300  
 ἱππικός 300  
 ἵππος 192; 274; 298; 302  
 Ἴρος 274  
 Ἰσοκράτης 49; 168; 172; 176; 186;  
     268  
 ἴσος 228; 290  
 ἴστημι 172; 178; 251; 326  
 ἱστορέω 344  
 ἱστορία 336  
 ἱστορικός 340  
 ἰσχυρός 174; 276  
 ἰσχύς 278  
 ἰσχύω 144; 150; 274; 302  
 ἴσως 156; 272  
 ἵχνος 302  
 Ἰωσήφ 292  
 καθάπαξ 220  
 καθάπερ 174; 196; 353; 358  
 καθάπτω 164  
 καθάριος 46; 47  
 καθαρός 9; 346  
 κάθειρξις 182  
 καθέκαστος 144; 146; 182  
 καθέλκω 192  
 καθεύδω 110; 178; 179  
 κάθημαι 178; 184; 190  
 καθίστημι 140; 144; 146; 156; 166;  
     168; 170; 174; 180; 222;  
     224; 230; 246; 274; 358

- καθοράω 130; 205; 212; 254  
 καθότι 344  
 καινός 182; 185  
 καιρός 142; 144; 172; 178; 180;  
 182; 248; 344; 358  
 καίτοι 164; 174  
 κακία 148; 270; 328  
 κακίζω 164  
 κακός 110; 148; 170; 172; 174;  
 182; 196; 217; 223; 257;  
 294; 296; 328  
 κακότης 185  
 κακουργέω 294  
 καλέω 95; 144; 146; 148; 174; 182;  
 192; 226  
 Καλλίας 194  
 κάλλος 168; 174; 296  
 καλός 21; 22; 29; 34; 85; 111; 123;  
 140; 146; 160; 162; 164;  
 186; 188; 192; 205; 209;  
 212; 240; 241; 244; 268;  
 296; 298; 300; 304; 326;  
 328; 330; 332; 346; 353;  
 356; 358  
 κανών 158; 244  
 καρπός 70; 168; 170; 174; 176;  
 182; 184; 298  
 καρποφόρος 290  
 καρπός 162; 302  
 κατά 6; 14; 15; 17; 33; 34; 37; 38;  
 41; 46; 48; 76; 77; 84; 95;  
 96; 146; 148; 151; 158; 160;  
 161; 166; 171; 178; 180;  
 181; 184; 192; 197; 206;  
 209; 212; 220; 238; 265;  
 270; 272; 274; 288; 290;  
 302; 304; 326; 328; 330;  
 332; 341; 344; 351; 352; 356;  
 358  
 καταβάλλω 178; 300; 302  
 καταβολή 162  
 καταγέλαστος 274  
 καταδεής 284; 290  
 κατακηνέω 288  
 κατακοσμέω 272  
 κατάκρας [see ἄκρας]  
 καταλαμβάνω 174; 176; 250; 267;  
 358  
 καταλέγω 176  
 καταλείπω 168; 222  
 κατάληψις 326  
 καταλύω 144; 224  
 καταμανθάνω 209; 230  
 καταμετρέω 230  
 κατανόω 188; 190  
 καταπείθω 358  
 καταπυρσεύω 290  
 καταρραθυμέω 190  
 καταρρητορεύω 356  
 κατασκευάζω 162; 182  
 κατασκευή 82; 125; 126; 137; 198;  
 236; 281; 286; 340  
 κατάστασις 330  
 καταστέλλω 344  
 καταστρατηγέω 276  
 καταστρέφω 142  
 κατατροπώω 358  
 καταφαίνω 256; 328  
 καταφέρω 178; 296  
 καταφρονέω 156  
 καταχρεμετίζω 274  
 κάτειμι (ibo) 178  
 κατείργω 192  
 κατεπαίρομαι 294  
 κατεργάζομαι 172  
 κατευμεγεθεώ 276  
 κατέχω 150; 180; 188; 190; 192;  
 328  
 κατηγορέω 214; 228  
 κατηγορήμα 256  
 κατηγορία 198; 199  
 κατήγορος 226  
 κατοικέω 47; 54  
 κατοκνέω 158  
 κάτοπτρον 197  
 κατορθόω 150; 164; 214; 230; 251;  
 256; 270; 272

- κατόρθωμα 140; 272  
 κατορύσσω 290  
 κατορχέομαι 276  
 κάτοχος 304  
 κάτω 250; 288; 290; 328; 330  
 κελεύω 142; 150  
 κενός 272  
 κεράννυμι 290  
 κερδαίνω 302; 358  
 κέρδος 144; 168; 170; 174; 178;  
 180; 254; 288  
 κεφάλαιον 76; 85; 90; 91; 92; 98;  
 99; 107; 108; 109; 110; 133;  
 134; 137; 149; 151; 153;  
 167; 171; 181; 191; 202;  
 204; 206; 207; 209; 237;  
 238; 242; 268; 270; 284;  
 285; 289; 321; 341; 343; 352  
 κεφαλή 164; 182  
 κηδεμών 146  
 κηδεύω 174; 292  
 κήπευμα 232  
 κήρυγμα 174; 290  
 κηρύσσω 248; 352  
 Κίλιξ 95  
 κινδυνεύω 328  
 κίνδυνος 150; 178  
 κίνημα 192  
 κίνησις 330  
 Κλεοβουλίνη 206  
 κλέος 182; 270  
 κλέπτω 27; 28; 272  
 κληρονομέω 164  
 κλητικός 58; 60; 61; 77  
 κλινίδιον 184; 185  
 κλίσις 53; 54; 55; 56; 57; 58; 60;  
 62; 63; 64; 69; 75; 76; 83;  
 219; 237; 315  
 κλυδώνιον 178  
 κοιμάω 24; 26  
 κοινός 82; 95; 96; 102; 103; 105;  
 106; 125; 126; 127; 140;  
 168; 176; 198; 220; 223;  
 236; 239; 248; 262; 270;  
 290; 304; 346  
 κοινότης 127  
 κοινώ 174  
 κοινωννέω 150  
 κοινωνία 148  
 κοινωνιικός 290; 298  
 κοινωνός 146; 290  
 κολλάζω 160; 222; 256  
 κόλασις 162  
 κόμη 197  
 κομίζω 130; 150; 162; 174; 254;  
 300; 302  
 Κόρη 150  
 κόρη 17; 172; 190; 228; 246  
 κορωνίς 276  
 κοσμέω 168; 328; 342; 344; 352;  
 356  
 κόσμησις 328  
 κοσμήτωρ 328  
 κοσμοποιέω 288  
 κόσμος 158; 330; 344; 352; 356;  
 358  
 κουροτρόφος 300  
 κουφίζω 148  
 κοῦφος 146; 288; 289  
 κουφότης 346  
 Κράνειον 25  
 κρᾶσις 330  
 κρατέω 112; 156; 226; 232; 248;  
 256; 270; 272; 328; 330  
 κράτος 272; 274; 328  
 κρείττων 155; 196; 222; 252; 253;  
 254; 272; 276  
 κρίνω 85; 86; 111; 140; 148; 152;  
 174; 180; 214; 270  
 κρίσις 84; 86; 88; 89; 90; 108; 111;  
 209; 226; 230; 346  
 κριτής 110  
 κροτέω 162  
 κρότος 176  
 κρύπτω 288  
 κτάομαι 130; 176; 184; 188; 192;  
 212; 248; 272; 274; 359

- κτῆμα 140; 148; 272  
 κτῆσις 176; 244  
 κυβερνάω 330  
 κυβέρνησις 328  
 κυβερνήτης 131; 164; 214; 256  
 κύκλος 302  
 Κύκλωψ 178  
 κυνικός 21; 22; 39; 41; 43; 46; 47  
 κυοφορέω 300  
 κυοφορία 300  
 Κύπριος 95; 318; 319; 320; 364  
 Κυρηναῖος 18  
 κύριος 160  
 κυρίσσω 164  
 κύρος 320  
 κύω 300  
 κωλύω 146; 158; 160; 174  
 κωμάζω 190  
 κωμικός 272  
 κῶμος 226  
 κωμωδία 226  
 λαγχάνω 270  
 Λακεδαιμόνιος 164; 166; 210; 224;  
 226; 228; 230; 232  
 Λακεδαιμόνων 150; 224; 230; 232  
 Λάκων 230  
 λαμβάνω 46; 142; 148; 150; 158;  
 160; 164; 176; 246; 256;  
 267; 274; 298; 300; 302;  
 304; 332  
 λαμπρός 140; 174; 176; 180; 188;  
 272; 274; 276; 290; 300; 356  
 λὰός 26; 356  
 λάφυρα 142  
 λέβης 9  
 λέγω 25; 34; 55; 95; 96; 144; 148;  
 150; 164; 180; 182; 188;  
 194; 224; 272; 290; 296;  
 326; 344; 347; 353; 358  
 λεῖος 185  
 λείπω 298  
 λέξις 80; 288  
 λήγω 178; 184  
 λήθη 172  
 λήιον 180  
 Λήμνιος 298  
 λῆξις 290  
 λίαν 140  
 λίθος 232; 290  
 λιμήν 174; 178  
 λιμός 302  
 λογίζομαι 168; 170; 188  
 λογικός 224; 244; 274; 283; 288;  
 294; 340; 344  
 λόγιος 192; 292; 320  
 λογισμός 140; 172; 186; 188; 196  
 λογιστικός 344  
 λογοποιός 14; 18; 48  
 λόγος 34; 36; 37; 54; 57; 58; 60;  
 61; 63; 64; 65; 69; 77; 111;  
 140; 146; 154; 158; 160;  
 162; 164; 168; 172; 176;  
 178; 180; 182; 184; 188;  
 190; 217; 226; 248; 257;  
 266; 270; 272; 288; 290;  
 292; 302; 321; 322; 323;  
 326; 328; 330; 332; 342;  
 344; 346  
 λοιδορία 170  
 λοιπός 156; 160; 164; 166; 174;  
 222; 270; 296  
 λοχαγός 164  
 λύγξ 6  
 Λυκοῦργος 184  
 λύμη 180  
 λυπέω 150; 174; 250  
 λύπη 18; 146; 174; 238; 244; 246  
 λυπηρός 170; 174; 182; 246  
 λύσις 104; 106; 250  
 λυσιτελής 250  
 λύω 15; 144; 148; 172; 174  
 μάγειρος 14; 18  
 μάθημα 182  
 μαθητής 64; 65; 123; 140  
 μαίνομαι 294  
 μαίστωρ 280  
 μακάριος 293



- μακαριστός 292  
 Μακεδών 28; 140; 358  
 μακρός 140; 185; 322; 326  
 μάλα 21; 129; 144; 148; 150; 156;  
     158; 160; 162; 170; 180;  
     184; 185; 206; 209; 212;  
     214; 218; 230; 241; 244;  
     246; 254; 270; 274; 278;  
     290; 304; 328; 356  
 μανθάνω 158; 188; 248  
 Μαντινικός 206  
 Μαραθών 302  
 μάργαρος 290  
 μαρτυρέω 180; 266; 270; 330  
 μαρτυρία 86; 90; 91; 92; 93; 107;  
     108; 152; 153; 166; 184;  
     194; 195; 197; 205; 207;  
     210; 214; 222; 226; 232;  
     239; 240; 241; 246; 252;  
     256; 267; 276; 284; 285;  
     292; 298; 304; 323; 330;  
     342; 346; 350; 353; 356; 358  
 μαρτύριον 188  
 μάρτυς 184  
 μάταιος 42; 43; 192  
 μάτην 158; 190  
 μάχη 192; 294; 300; 344  
 μάχομαι 22  
 μέγας 8; 134; 140; 144; 146; 162;  
     164; 172; 174; 176; 178;  
     182; 184; 194; 266; 268;  
     270; 272; 274; 276; 278;  
     288; 290; 296; 304; 305  
 μέγεθος 176  
 μεθίστημι 144; 148; 226  
 μέθοδος 104; 105; 106; 244; 262  
 μεθύω 190  
 μείζων 146; 162; 170; 172; 174;  
     178; 180  
 μειράκιον 156; 212; 254  
 μείων 305  
 μελετάω 146; 190; 226; 235  
 μελέτη 77; 80; 81; 104; 105; 106;  
     234; 235; 236; 237; 244  
 μέλι 272  
 μέλλω 146; 148; 156; 160; 170  
 μέλος 160  
 μέλω 26; 356  
 μέμφομαι 150; 164; 176  
 μέμψις 170; 214  
 μέντοι 168; 182  
 μένω 190; 230; 272; 290; 296  
 μεριμνάω 190  
 μερίς 144  
 μέρος 182; 300; 344  
 μέσος 144; 274; 346  
 μεστός 148; 176  
 μετά 76; 140; 152; 166; 170; 174;  
     178; 180; 184; 220; 222;  
     226; 228; 270; 272; 276;  
     290; 294; 296; 298; 304;  
     328; 330; 333; 344  
 μεταβαίνω 328  
 μεταβάλλω 226; 248; 296  
 μεταβολή 230  
 μεταλαμβάνω 152  
 μετάληψις 290  
 μεταπίπτω 297; 330  
 μεταπλάσσω 330; 332  
 μεταρρέω 296  
 μεταρρυθμίζω 298  
 μετατρέπω 300  
 μεταχειρίζομαι 346  
 μεταχείρισις 290  
 μέτειμι (sum) 358  
 μέτειμι (ibo) 188; 190  
 μετέρχομαι 130; 156; 212; 214; 302  
 μετέχω 188; 356  
 μέτριος 160  
 μέτρον 156; 230; 270; 294  
 μέχρι 111; 276; 326  
 μή 22; 110; 111; 140; 142; 148;  
     152; 154; 156; 158; 160;  
     162; 164; 168; 170; 172;  
     174; 176; 178; 180; 186;  
     190; 192; 194; 196; 212;  
     214; 220; 228; 230; 238;

- 239; 246; 248; 251; 252;  
 256; 272; 274; 285; 290;  
 292; 296; 298; 300; 302;  
 306; 326; 328; 330; 332;  
 333; 344; 346; 356; 358  
 μηδαμῶς 160  
 μηδέ 76; 152; 160; 168; 178; 190;  
 192; 285; 304; 332  
 μηδεῖς 22; 110; 130; 152; 158;  
 160; 182; 190; 212; 214;  
 226; 252; 254; 278; 332;  
 346; 358; 359  
 μηδέποτε 218  
 Μηδός 192  
 μῆκος 176  
 μήν 136; 144; 146; 148; 158; 162;  
 172; 174; 176; 178; 194;  
 239; 246; 342; 346; 356  
 μήτε 188; 190; 244; 356  
 μήτηρ 27; 30; 152; 172; 226; 296;  
 298  
 μηχανάομαι 182  
 μηχανή 328  
 μιαιρός 152  
 Μίδας 274  
 μικρός 150; 152; 162; 172; 176;  
 192; 266; 270; 278  
 μικτός 212; 254  
 Μιλῆσιος 206  
 μιμέομαι 154; 166; 283; 288; 290;  
 292  
 μίμησις 351; 366  
 μῖμος 194; 195  
 μισέω 152; 162  
 μισθός 302  
 μισθώω 158  
 μῖσος 300  
 μνήμη 57; 63; 80; 168; 170; 176  
 μνημονεύω 194  
 μνηστεύω 150  
 μοῖρα 176  
 μοιχεία 294; 296  
 μοιχός 294  
 μονάρχης 358  
 μονή 182  
 μονομαχία 304  
 μόνος 111; 140; 168; 174; 180;  
 182; 190; 192; 224; 270;  
 274; 276; 288; 290; 294;  
 326; 328; 344; 358  
 μόριον 292  
 Μοῦσα 21; 47; 54; 285; 304; 333  
 Μουσόληπτος 184  
 μόχθος 197  
 μυθολογέω 294  
 μῦθος 75; 76; 82; 83; 95; 101; 103;  
 104; 125; 126; 178; 198;  
 262; 263; 264; 281; 286;  
 287; 294; 309; 312; 318;  
 319; 320; 339; 364  
 μυῖα 9; 10  
 μυρίος 274; 290  
 μῦς 10  
 μυστήρια 220  
 μυστήριον 288  
 ναίω 185  
 νᾶμα 290  
 ναύκληρος 178  
 ναυμαχέω 214  
 ναυμαχία 166  
 ναυπηγέω 188  
 ναυπηγός 300  
 ναῦς 178; 188; 192; 330  
 ναύτης 131; 164; 214; 256  
 νάω 290  
 νεανιεύομαι 256  
 νέος 77; 158; 160; 162; 164; 170;  
 172; 174; 184; 212; 214;  
 224; 228; 254; 270  
 νεότης 132; 148; 158; 212; 214;  
 248; 250; 254; 256; 294  
 νεῦμα 164  
 νηστεία 289  
 νίζω 306  
 νικάω 62; 63; 146; 230; 270  
 νίκη 28; 214; 230; 358  
 νικητής 358

- Νικόλαος 198  
 Νῆνος 222  
 Νιρεύς 274  
 νόθος 220; 222  
 νομίζω 142; 154; 156; 160; 182;  
     184; 188; 192; 244; 248;  
     254; 283; 288; 294; 328  
 νόμιμος 85; 104  
 νομοθετέω 190; 218  
 νόμος 82; 83; 102; 103; 105; 125;  
     126; 144; 174; 182; 198;  
     220; 222; 223; 262; 339  
 νοσέω 188; 222  
 νόσος 246; 330  
 νουθετέω 144; 160  
 νουνεχής 274  
 νουνεχόντως 148  
 νοῦς 110; 154; 158; 180; 224; 266;  
     267; 270; 274; 288; 304; 326  
 νῦν 76; 148; 160; 180; 276; 298;  
     300; 306  
 νυνί 244; 326  
 νύξ 9; 28; 47; 111; 172; 178; 274;  
     330; 356; 358  
 νῶτον 158; 160; 161; 304; 305  
 ξαίνω 160; 161  
 ξάνθισμα 197  
 Ξέρξης 276  
 ξίφος 9; 146; 294; 296; 304  
 ξύλινος 192  
 ξύλον 232  
 ξυρέω 182  
 ὄδε 111; 130; 154; 204; 205; 206;  
     208; 209; 212; 220; 224;  
     230; 240; 241; 248; 254;  
     270; 290; 300; 326; 342  
 ὀδηγός 326  
 ὀδός 129; 156; 184; 185; 212; 241;  
     254  
 Ὀδυσσεύς 276  
 ὀθεν 130; 178; 212; 252; 254; 276  
 οἶδα 16; 130; 133; 146; 150; 158;  
     166; 170; 190; 212; 244;  
     246; 254; 272; 294; 296;  
     300; 302; 304; 326; 328;  
     330; 346  
 Οἰδίπους 296  
 οἰκεῖος 144; 156; 218; 226; 230;  
     290; 328; 358  
 οἰκέτης 160; 161; 358  
 οἰκέω 47; 224  
 οἶκημα 182  
 οἶκησις 182  
 οἰκία 172; 300; 330  
 οἰκοδομέω 188  
 οἰκοδόμος 300  
 οἶκοι 172; 178; 182; 190  
 οἰκονομέω 190; 344  
 οἶκος 346  
 οἰκουμένη 182; 276  
 οἰκουμηνικός 318; 320; 364  
 οἶμος 185; 186  
 οἶνος 182; 290  
 οἶομαι 77; 182; 184; 192; 230;  
     304; 321; 326  
 οἶος 9; 16; 76; 77; 92; 144; 156;  
     188; 218; 226; 276; 285;  
     322; 326; 328; 330; 342;  
     344; 346  
 οἶχομαι 158; 296  
 οἰωνός 33  
 ὄκνος 188; 192  
 ὀλιγαρχία 144  
 ὀλιγορέω 156  
 ὀλίγος 194; 224; 272; 358  
 ὀλισθαίνω 190  
 ὀλκός 178  
 ὄλος 174; 190; 224; 232; 274; 300;  
     304; 356  
 Ὀλύμπιος 192; 195; 276  
 Ὀμηρος 270; 296; 356; 358  
 ὀμιλέω 192; 272; 274  
 ὀμιλητικός 127; 142  
 ὀμιλία 220; 234  
 ὄμμα 290  
 ὀμογενής 290  
 ὄμοιος 85; 86; 164

- ὁμολογέω 162; 176; 184  
 ὁμόνοια 302  
 ὁμότεχνος 296  
 ὁμοῦ 76; 170  
 ὁμοφυής 290  
 ὁμόφυλος 294  
 ὅμως 150; 152; 248; 326  
 ὄνησις 250; 251  
 ὀνίνημι 156  
 ὄνομα 95; 96; 148; 168; 186; 188;  
     194; 224; 259; 262; 270;  
     298; 356; 361  
 ὀνομάζω 154; 270; 272; 328  
 ὄνος 358  
 ὀντότης 292  
 ὀξυς 162; 182  
 ὀπηγία 328  
 ὀπλίζω 270  
 ὄπλον 144; 248; 298; 302  
 ὀπλοποιητική 302  
 ὄποι 274  
 ὀποῖος 16; 344; 358  
 ὀπόσος 188; 298; 326  
 ὄπου 328  
 ὄπως 154; 176; 306; 346; 358  
 ὀπωσοῦν 180  
 ὀράω 7; 8; 9; 33; 45; 46; 47; 93;  
     110; 131; 142; 144; 146;  
     148; 150; 152; 156; 172;  
     174; 176; 180; 190; 192;  
     194; 205; 207; 208; 209;  
     210; 212; 222; 224; 226;  
     240; 241; 244; 250; 254;  
     256; 267; 284; 285; 292;  
     294; 296; 302; 326; 342;  
     344; 353; 358  
 ὀρέγω 172; 188  
 Ὀρέστης 250; 294; 296  
 ὀρθιος 185  
 ὀρθός 58; 60; 61; 166; 188; 244;  
     272; 274; 347  
 ὀρθώω 144  
 ὀρίζω 109; 208; 230; 248; 252;  
     296  
 ὀρμάω 164  
 ὀρμέω 146  
 ὀρνεον 178  
 ὄρος 140; 164; 172; 228; 230  
 ὀρύσσω 182  
 ὀσημέραι 300  
 ὄσος 21; 148; 168; 180; 222; 224;  
     230; 246; 248; 270; 272;  
     274; 285; 288; 296; 300;  
     302; 328; 330; 344  
 ὄσουςπερ 156; 304  
 ὄσπερ 46; 76; 186; 244; 272; 276;  
     344  
 ὄστις 146; 148; 158; 166; 184;  
     300; 326; 330; 356  
 ὄστισοῦν 192  
 ὄταν 162; 164; 174; 328  
 ὄτε 142; 146; 150; 272; 300; 346  
 ὅτι 16; 17; 18; 30; 34; 39; 95; 96;  
     123; 140; 146; 176; 180;  
     184; 188; 192; 194; 272;  
     290; 296; 300; 346; 347; 358  
 οὐ 14; 16; 17; 18; 26; 28; 36; 37;  
     46; 76; 83; 96; 110; 111;  
     140; 142; 144; 146; 148;  
     150; 152; 154; 155; 158;  
     160; 162; 164; 170; 172;  
     174; 176; 178; 180; 182;  
     184; 186; 188; 190; 192;  
     194; 212; 214; 222; 224;  
     228; 232; 235; 238; 239;  
     244; 246; 251; 253; 270;  
     272; 274; 276; 288; 290;  
     294; 296; 298; 300; 302;  
     304; 305; 306; 326; 328;  
     330; 332; 333; 342; 346;  
     356; 358  
 οὐδαμῶς 148  
 οὐδέ 146; 148; 152; 162; 164; 172;  
     178; 180; 184; 294; 300;  
     302; 326; 328  
 οὐδέεις 140; 146; 155; 158; 162;  
     164; 168; 170; 172; 174;

- 176; 178; 184; 194; 246;  
251; 253; 272; 274; 276;  
290; 292; 300; 304; 326;  
330; 332; 344; 346; 358
- οὐδέποτε 16
- οὐδεπώποτε 148
- οὐκέτι 16; 192
- οὐκοῦν 144; 146; 160; 164; 166;  
306
- οὖν 136; 140; 142; 146; 148; 150;  
152; 158; 160; 162; 164;  
170; 172; 176; 190; 196;  
228; 288; 292; 298; 300; 304
- οὕτω 178; 182; 298
- οὐράνιος 288
- οὐρανός 156; 220; 276; 288
- οὐσία 144; 178; 290
- οὔτε 48; 162; 172; 176; 184; 251;  
300; 346
- οὔτος 76; 96; 111; 140; 142; 144;  
146; 148; 150; 156; 158;  
160; 162; 164; 168; 170;  
174; 176; 178; 180; 182;  
184; 186; 188; 190; 192;  
194; 196; 208; 209; 212;  
214; 220; 222; 226; 228;  
232; 244; 246; 248; 256;  
266; 270; 272; 274; 276;  
288; 290; 292; 296; 298;  
300; 302; 306; 321; 322;  
323; 326; 328; 330; 332;  
342; 344; 346; 352; 356; 358
- οὕτως 22; 77; 82; 110; 146; 148;  
158; 164; 176; 180; 182;  
184; 186; 188; 190; 192;  
214; 218; 222; 226; 232;  
246; 250; 256; 266; 270;  
274; 276; 284; 285; 289;  
292; 296; 298; 300; 302;  
304; 323; 330; 332; 346; 356
- ὀφείλω 162
- ὀφείλλω 346
- ὀφθαλμός 148; 274
- ὀφρῦς 170
- ὀχετηγός 292
- ὀχετός 292
- ὄψις 346
- πάθος 146; 188; 244; 296
- παιδαγωγέω 214; 226; 256
- παιδαγωγός 130; 156; 158; 160;  
162; 164; 172; 174; 212;  
214; 254; 256
- παιδεία 22; 92; 140; 160; 168; 170;  
172; 176; 178; 180; 181;  
188; 254; 265; 266; 268;  
270; 284; 285; 322; 323; 342
- παίδευσις 186
- παιδευτής 158; 172
- παιδεύω 20; 21; 47; 54; 123; 156;  
158; 160; 168; 174; 194;  
212; 254
- παιδοποίησις 29
- παῖς 29; 130; 146; 152; 158; 160;  
162; 176; 180; 184; 212;  
214; 226; 254; 256; 298; 302
- παίω 156; 158; 160; 254
- πάλαι 180
- παλαιός 77; 86; 90; 91; 92; 93;  
107; 108; 111; 152; 153;  
166; 184; 194; 205; 207;  
210; 214; 222; 226; 232;  
239; 240; 241; 246; 252;  
267; 276; 285; 292; 304;  
323; 330; 342; 346; 350;  
356; 358
- παλαμναῖος 276
- πάλιν 76; 178; 186; 304
- πάμφιλος 18
- πανηγυρικός 92
- πανήγυρις 190
- παννύχιος 26; 110; 356; 358
- πανοπλία 304
- παντᾶπασι 140
- πανταχόθεν 358
- πανταχοῦ 162; 164; 270; 290
- παντελής 180; 300; 302
- πάντη 76; 272

- παντοῖος 274  
 πάντως 152; 184; 302  
 πάνυ 17; 18; 162; 176; 192; 195;  
 244  
 παρά 9; 14; 18; 76; 140; 144; 146;  
 148; 151; 152; 158; 160;  
 172; 174; 178; 184; 186;  
 188; 209; 226; 230; 256;  
 272; 276; 290; 294; 298;  
 300; 330; 332; 344; 356; 358  
 παραβάλλω 148; 149  
 παραβολή 84; 86; 88; 90; 91; 92;  
 93; 107; 109; 110; 130; 148;  
 149; 151; 164; 178; 181;  
 192; 205; 207; 208; 210;  
 214; 222; 226; 232; 237;  
 256; 266; 274; 284; 285;  
 292; 302; 323; 330; 342;  
 346; 353; 356; 358  
 παραβολικός 237; 239; 246; 250  
 παράγω 226; 290  
 παράδειγμα 84; 88; 90; 91; 92; 93;  
 104; 107; 108; 109; 110;  
 131; 146; 150; 151; 164;  
 180; 181; 192; 205; 207;  
 208; 210; 214; 222; 226;  
 232; 237; 256; 267; 274;  
 284; 285; 292; 302; 330;  
 331; 342; 346; 350; 353;  
 356; 358  
 παραδειγματικός 237; 239; 240;  
 246; 250  
 παραδίδωμι 140; 174; 192  
 παράδοξος 18  
 παραδύομαι 346  
 παραζηλώω 292  
 παραίνεσις 53; 83  
 παραινέω 346  
 παραίτιος 244  
 παρακαθίστημι 212; 214  
 παρακαλέω 28  
 παρακελεύομαι 22  
 παραινδεύω 148  
 παράκλησις 84; 88; 90; 109; 111  
 παρακμή 300  
 παρακύπτω 326  
 παραλαμβάνω 226; 328  
 παραλείπω 152; 304  
 παράλειψις 133; 197; 206; 209;  
 238; 265; 352  
 παραμένω 274; 330  
 παραμυθέομαι 176; 272  
 παραμύθιον 294; 296  
 παραπέμπω 176  
 παραπλήσιος 142; 148; 150; 172  
 παράσιτος 9  
 παρασκευάζω 83; 170; 214; 226;  
 289; 358  
 παρασκευή 251  
 παρατάσσω 148; 192  
 παρατηρέω 160  
 παρατίθημι 170; 174; 180  
 παραφέρω 140  
 παραφραστικόν 90; 91; 92; 107;  
 110; 137; 142; 158; 170;  
 171; 188; 204; 206; 208;  
 209; 212; 220; 224; 230;  
 237; 238; 239; 241; 244;  
 248; 254; 265; 266; 270;  
 284; 285; 290; 298; 321;  
 322; 328; 342; 344; 350;  
 352; 356  
 παραφύω 180  
 παραχρήμα 162; 218; 220  
 παραχωρέω 330  
 παραψυχή 250  
 πάρειμι (sum) 111; 130; 146; 152;  
 158; 160; 174; 176; 205;  
 209; 212; 240; 241; 248;  
 254; 323; 326; 330; 332;  
 342; 344  
 παρέμβασις 106  
 παρέρχομαι 248; 254; 330  
 παρευδοκιμέω 15; 18  
 παρέχω 148; 150; 156; 162; 166;  
 170; 174; 176; 182; 190;  
 194; 218; 254; 356

- παρίημι 129; 212  
 παρίστημι 130; 148; 212; 248; 254;  
 274; 288; 304  
 παροινέω 222  
 παρορμάω 158  
 παρρησία 328  
 πᾶς 22; 76; 123; 129; 132; 140;  
 142; 146; 148; 152; 156;  
 160; 162; 164; 166; 170;  
 172; 174; 176; 178; 180;  
 182; 184; 187; 192; 205;  
 212; 216; 217; 218; 220;  
 223; 226; 248; 251; 254;  
 257; 268; 270; 272; 274;  
 276; 278; 288; 290; 292;  
 298; 300; 321; 326; 328;  
 330; 344; 345; 346; 347;  
 356; 358  
 πάσχω 140; 148; 150; 158; 160;  
 162; 170; 174; 244; 298  
 πατήρ 53; 130; 150; 160; 172; 212;  
 214; 250; 254; 292; 328  
 πατριάρχης 318; 320; 364  
 Πάτροκλος 152  
 παύω 300; 333  
 πεδός 346  
 πείθω 144; 146; 150; 160; 168;  
 174; 182; 186; 192  
 πείρα 130; 146; 212; 238; 239;  
 244; 246; 248; 254  
 πειράω 144; 150; 160; 224; 238;  
 244; 246  
 Πειρίθους 150  
 πελάγιος 178  
 Πελοπίδαι 250  
 Πελοπόννησος 232  
 πέλω 185  
 πενθέω 294; 296  
 πένθος 296  
 πενία 144; 148; 209; 239; 248;  
 266; 284; 342  
 πέρα 160  
 πέρας 288  
 περί 92; 128; 140; 160; 162; 168;  
 170; 180; 188; 190; 192;  
 194; 206; 209; 212; 218;  
 220; 222; 224; 226; 230;  
 244; 246; 248; 259; 262;  
 263; 265; 268; 270; 278;  
 284; 285; 288; 290; 296;  
 298; 300; 302; 322; 323;  
 326; 328; 330; 332; 342;  
 344; 346; 352; 353; 356; 358;  
 361; 362  
 περιάγω 142  
 περιβάλλω 230  
 περίβλημα 290  
 περίβολος 251  
 περίγειος 290  
 περιγίνομαι 178; 298  
 περίειμι (sum) 296  
 περίειμι (ibo) 156; 254; 255  
 περιηγέω 288  
 περίστημι 148  
 περικαλλής 290  
 Περικλῆς 192; 276  
 περικομίζω 289  
 περιλαμβάνω 160  
 περίοδος 129; 212; 241; 254  
 περιπίπτω 110  
 περιπλέω 300  
 περίπλεως 300  
 περιπλούσιος 300  
 περιπυκάζω 290  
 περικοπέω 129; 212; 241; 254  
 περισπούδαστος 244  
 περίστασις 6; 7; 15; 33; 42; 46; 171  
 περιστέφω 134  
 περιτίθημι 256; 326  
 περιττός 294  
 περιτυγχάνω 212  
 περιφανής 274; 330  
 περιχορεύω 300  
 περσέπολις 276  
 Πέρσης 276; 298; 302  
 πηγαῖος 290  
 πηγῇ 290

- πήγνυμι 178; 300  
 Πηλεὺς 246  
 πίθος 81  
 πικρός 160; 168; 170; 172; 182;  
     186  
 πίνω 160; 290  
 πίπτω 131; 164; 214; 256; 274;  
     294  
 πιστεύω 182; 190; 256  
 Πιττάλικος 137; 194  
 πλάσσης 321; 326; 330  
 Πλαταιεύς 302  
 Πλάτων 47  
 πλεῖστος 144; 158; 180; 230; 302  
 πλείων 148; 176; 226; 244; 270;  
     272; 328  
 πλεονεκτέω 164  
 πλεονέκτημα 272; 274; 278  
 πλέω 190; 251; 330  
 πληγὴ 158; 162; 164; 166; 170;  
     172; 174; 212; 214; 254; 272  
 πληθός 142; 148; 230; 248; 253;  
     274; 276  
 πληθυντικός 61; 65  
 πλημμελέω 158; 164; 214; 254;  
     256  
 πλημμέλημα 160  
 πλημμελής 164  
 πλὴν 140; 226; 276; 347  
 πλήρης 292  
 πληρώω 146; 180  
 πλησίον 176  
 πλήσσω 158  
 πλοῖον 300  
 πλούσιος 16; 43; 148; 174; 278  
 πλουτέω 248; 252; 274; 296; 300;  
     306; 328  
 πλοῦτος 142; 144; 148; 152; 154;  
     155; 156; 158; 176; 178;  
     248; 252; 253; 274; 288; 344  
 πνεῦμα 178; 288  
 πνευματικός 288  
 πνίγω 9  
 πόθεν 158; 182; 224; 302; 359  
 ποθέω 176; 300  
 ποῖ 224; 230  
 ποιέω 16; 29; 60; 82; 83; 110; 142;  
     148; 152; 156; 158; 160;  
     164; 166; 168; 170; 174;  
     178; 180; 182; 192; 194;  
     212; 214; 218; 222; 224;  
     226; 270; 276; 283; 290;  
     292; 293; 302; 330  
 ποίημα 330  
 ποίησις 29; 296; 356  
 ποιητής 37; 152; 184; 194; 195;  
     232; 270; 276; 296; 298; 304  
 ποιητικός 77; 294; 315  
 ποικίλος 170  
 ποῖος 18; 270  
 πολεμέω 144; 146; 148; 190  
 πολέμιος 28; 302; 347; 358  
 πόλεμος 34; 144; 176; 230; 248;  
     251; 272; 302; 344  
 πολίος 212  
 πόλις 131; 144; 146; 164; 168;  
     174; 190; 210; 214; 217;  
     223; 224; 226; 230; 232;  
     233; 251; 256; 257; 296;  
     300; 304  
 πολιτεία 304  
 πολιτεύω 224; 326; 346  
 πολίτης 344  
 πολιτικός 77  
 πολλάκις 96; 146; 148; 162; 172;  
     178; 300; 346  
 πολλαχού 344  
 πολὺς 39; 76; 110; 111; 123; 130;  
     144; 146; 148; 154; 158;  
     160; 161; 168; 172; 178;  
     184; 186; 206; 212; 218;  
     254; 270; 272; 274; 276;  
     288; 298; 302; 358  
 πολυτελής 290  
 πονέω 176; 190; 192; 193; 232;  
     288  
 πονηρός 160; 190; 196; 214; 226



- πόνος 123; 133; 156; 170; 172;  
 176; 178; 180; 182; 184;  
 186; 187; 188; 192; 194;  
 226; 248; 267; 272; 302; 306  
 πορεία 224  
 πορεύω 26; 274  
 πορίζω 9  
 Ποσειδῶν 250  
 πόσος 218; 220; 248  
 πότε 192  
 ποτε 58; 60; 61; 64; 65; 69; 162;  
 188; 190; 296; 302; 304;  
 332; 358  
 πότερος 160; 164; 176  
 ποτίζω 292  
 ποτόν 172  
 πότος 180  
 ποῦ 21; 47; 54; 140; 248  
 πούς 148; 180; 181  
 πρᾶγμα 36; 37; 110; 134; 144; 146;  
 148; 152; 158; 162; 168;  
 172; 176; 178; 188; 190;  
 244; 246; 274; 326  
 πρακτέος 164  
 πρακτικός 230; 248  
 πρᾶξις 166; 218; 226; 248; 326;  
 346  
 πράττω 57; 140; 144; 146; 148;  
 158; 160; 162; 194; 230;  
 232; 328  
 πρέπω 142  
 πρεσβεία 174; 182  
 πρεσβεύω 168; 174; 190  
 πρεσβύτης 158; 184; 212; 254  
 πρίν 298  
 πρό 95; 96; 146; 150; 168; 170;  
 172; 174; 235; 356  
 προάγω 294  
 προαιρέω 150; 214; 232; 292  
 προβαίνω 180  
 προβάλλω 328  
 πρόγονος 230  
 προγύμνασμα 234; 258; 259; 262;  
 263  
 προδείκνυμι 170  
 πρόδηλος 150  
 Πρόδικος 304  
 προδότης 160  
 πρόειμι (ibo) 172  
 προέρχομαι 232  
 προήκω 326  
 προθέω 290  
 προθυμία 150  
 πρόθυμος 321; 326  
 προΐημι 290  
 προίστημι 330  
 προκαλέω 290  
 προκαταμενύω 148  
 πρόκειμαι 110; 111; 288; 290  
 προκέντημα 290  
 προκινδυνεύω 226  
 προκόπτω 172  
 προκυρόομαι 276  
 προλαμβάνω 326  
 προμανθάνω 146  
 προμηθεόμαι 290  
 προμύθιον 339; 350  
 προνοητικός 290; 292  
 πρόνοια 158; 292  
 πρόξενος 246; 344  
 πρόοδος 182  
 προοίμιον 75; 80; 82; 83; 89; 91;  
 104; 105; 107; 176  
 προοράω 346  
 προπαρέχω 248  
 προπαρόιθε 185  
 προπορεύομαι 330  
 πρός 16; 28; 77; 82; 83; 93; 111;  
 132; 140; 142; 143; 144; 146;  
 148; 150; 152; 158; 160;  
 162; 164; 166; 168; 170;  
 172; 174; 178; 180; 186;  
 188; 192; 194; 205; 210;  
 216; 218; 224; 226; 232;  
 242; 256; 272; 276; 278;  
 288; 290; 292; 294; 296;  
 298; 300; 302; 304; 306;  
 326; 330; 332; 353; 358

- προσαγορεύω 148  
 προσάγω 146; 220  
 προσαίτης 16  
 προσαναρτάω 356  
 προσανέχω 358  
 προσαπόλλυμι 346  
 προσάπτω 180; 358  
 προσβάλλω 270; 274  
 προσγίνομαι 298; 328; 358  
 προσδέω 192; 300  
 προσδοκάω 146; 160; 162  
 προσεδρεύω 178  
 πρόσσειμι (sum) 170; 176; 332  
 πρόσσειμι (ibo) 170; 220; 226; 230  
 προσεῖπον 226  
 προσεκτέον 158  
 προσεκτικός 82  
 προσεμπίπτω 290  
 προσενθυμέομαι 170  
 προσεπιτίθημι 298  
 προσέρχομαι 25; 26; 142; 168; 188;  
 218  
 προσευδαίμονίζω 300  
 προσέχω 180; 326; 328  
 προσηγορία 142; 188; 194  
 προσήκω 158; 160; 162; 166; 170;  
 252; 330; 356  
 προσηγής 290  
 πρόσθεν 192  
 προσθήκη 146  
 πρόσκειμαι 222; 358  
 προσκύνησις 127  
 προσλαμβάνω 172  
 προσομιλέω 192  
 προσοχή 83  
 προστάσσω 142; 184  
 προστατέω 330  
 προστήκομαι 182  
 προστίθημι 146; 158; 172; 228;  
 290; 326  
 προστρέβω 214  
 προσφέρω 180  
 πρόσφορος 144  
 πρόσωπον 6; 7; 8; 9; 13; 14; 21;  
 22; 25; 28; 30; 36; 39; 41;  
 47; 48; 49; 54; 89; 96; 98;  
 99; 109; 205; 206; 207; 208;  
 209; 210; 219; 237; 238;  
 283; 285; 289; 341; 351  
 προταποστολάριος 317  
 προτείνω 162  
 πρότερος 176; 186; 276; 300; 302  
 προτιμάω 220; 222  
 πρότιμος 152  
 προφαίνω 172  
 πρόφασις 246; 256  
 προφέρω 172  
 προφήτης 292  
 προχάραγμα 290  
 πρόχειρος 142  
 προχωρέω 162  
 πρύμνα 178  
 πρυτανεῖον 174  
 πρυτανεύω 176  
 πρωτέκδικος 335  
 πρῶτος 39; 140; 150; 158; 160;  
 170; 185; 232; 298; 356; 361  
 πταίω 214  
 πτολίπορθος 276  
 πτῶμα 274  
 πτῶσις 76; 77  
 πτωχωτροφία 292  
 Πυθαγόρας 64; 65; 111; 192; 206;  
 218; 222  
 Πυθαγορικός 218  
 Πυθία 326  
 Πυλάδης 152; 250  
 Πύλειος 276  
 πυνθάνομαι 16; 17; 220; 224; 230  
 πύργος 233  
 πυρός 290  
 πύσμα 14; 15; 17; 38; 41; 46; 48  
 πωλέω 187  
 πωλοδάμνης 192  
 πῶλος 164  
 πῶς 76; 77; 142; 146; 152; 178;  
 186; 208; 228; 272; 290; 304

- πως 290  
 ῥᾶδιος 85; 142; 146; 176; 182; 185;  
 188; 190  
 ῥαθυμέω 192; 358  
 ῥαθυμία 162; 164; 176; 194; 226  
 ῥᾶθυμος 170; 356  
 ῥαστώνη 172; 176  
 ῥέπω 162  
 ῥεῦμα 296; 297  
 ῥέω 272; 290  
 ῥήγνυμι 178  
 ῥῆμα 224; 266; 270; 290  
 ῥητορεία 244  
 ῥητορεύω 188; 244  
 ῥητορικός 77; 117; 184; 194; 244;  
 246; 258; 315  
 ῥήτωρ 111; 168; 174; 180; 182;  
 184; 185; 244; 280; 358  
 ῥίξα 168; 170; 172; 174; 176; 182;  
 184; 186; 276  
 ῥοπή 140; 144  
 ῥυθμίζω 164  
 ῥυθμός 168  
 ῥύμη 192  
 ῥωμαλαῖος 272; 274  
 ῥώμη 228; 274  
 ῥώξ 6  
 Σαλαμίς 166; 214  
 σάλπιγξ 288  
 σαλπίζω 284; 288  
 Σάμιος 111  
 σάρκωσις 288  
 σάρξ 288  
 σαφής 152; 155; 160; 224; 226;  
 253; 278; 290; 328  
 σελήνη 156  
 σεμνός 180  
 σεμνύνω 162  
 σημεῖον 160  
 σιγή 272  
 Σικελία 180  
 σιτίον 172  
 σῖτος 300; 302  
 σιωπάω 158; 272; 274  
 σιωπή 158  
 σκέπτομαι 146; 160; 172; 298  
 σκέψις 326  
 σκηνή 226; 294; 296  
 σκηπτός 178  
 σκοπέω 131; 162; 170; 180; 205;  
 214; 342; 346  
 σκοπός 326  
 σκότος 346  
 σκυθρωπός 176  
 σμικρός 146; 222; 270  
 Σολομών 292  
 σός 142; 160  
 σοφία 152; 206; 218; 222; 251;  
 276; 288; 296; 304; 326; 328  
 σοφίζω 298  
 σόφισμα 298  
 σοφιστής 81; 198; 244; 246; 304  
 Σοφοκλῆς 16; 205; 207; 214; 222;  
 241; 256; 268; 270; 274;  
 278; 294; 296; 306  
 σοφός 140; 160; 246; 270; 274;  
 288; 292; 296; 320; 326  
 σπανίζω 148  
 σπάργανον 226; 227  
 Σπάρτης 166; 224; 226; 230  
 σπέρμα 298; 300; 302  
 σπορά 123  
 σπóρος 178  
 σπουδάζω 190; 194; 226; 302; 326  
 σπουδαῖος 190  
 σπούδασμα 188  
 σπουδή 192; 248; 304  
 στάθμη 344  
 στάσις 148; 344  
 στάχυς 178  
 στείρα 298  
 στενός 182  
 στερέω 146; 148; 246  
 στέρησις 244; 358  
 στερίσκω 238; 246  
 στέφανος 134; 176  
 στεφανώω 166; 182

- στέφω 344  
 στοιχεῖον 276  
 στόμα 168  
 στράτευμα 251; 302  
 στρατεύω 251; 302  
 στρατηγέω 180; 190; 272  
 στρατηγικός 344  
 στρατηγός 34; 164; 190; 192; 214;  
 256; 302; 344  
 στρατιωτής 131; 164; 214; 256;  
 302  
 στρατός 214; 217; 257; 358  
 στρεβλῶω 160  
 Στρεψιάδης 272  
 στροφή 288  
 στυγέω 223  
 σύ 58; 60; 64; 69; 77; 123; 160;  
 178; 296; 300; 302  
 Συβαριτικός 95; 180  
 συγγνώμη 167  
 συγγνώσκω 162  
 συγγράμμα 188  
 συγγραφικός 336  
 συγγράφω 244  
 συγγυμνάζω 228  
 συγκαλέω 346  
 συγκαταμείγνυμι 333  
 συγκατοικέω 18  
 σύγκρισις 82; 103; 125; 126; 198;  
 236; 258; 261; 264; 265;  
 312; 340  
 συγχέω 296; 346  
 συγχωρέω 162  
 συζεύγνυμι 148; 160; 170; 176  
 συζυγία 148; 333  
 συζῶ 144; 266; 267; 274; 284;  
 342; 346  
 συκοφάντης 174  
 συλλαμβάνω 345  
 συλλέγω 182  
 συλλήβδην 156  
 συλληπτικός 344  
 σύλλογος 176  
 συμβαίνω 57; 144; 160; 174; 188;  
 192; 330; 358  
 συμβουλεύω 9; 62; 63; 64; 65; 79;  
 111; 148; 356  
 συμβουλή 144  
 συμβουλία 168  
 σύμβουλος 144; 146; 182  
 συμμαχέω 176; 288  
 συμμαχία 302  
 σύμμαχος 144  
 συμμετρία 330  
 συμπαιανανίζω 128; 146  
 συμπάρειμι (sum) 344  
 σύμπας 182; 217; 257  
 συμπέρασμα 104  
 συμπίπτω 346  
 συμπλέκω 344  
 συμπνέω 128; 150  
 συμφέρω 85; 104; 110; 144; 344;  
 346  
 σύμφημι 140; 146  
 συμφορά 148; 150; 294  
 σύφορος 176  
 συμφράδμων 267; 276; 277  
 συναγελαστικός 298  
 συνάγω 170  
 συναγωνίζομαι 128; 152; 176  
 συναιρέω 182; 306; 346  
 συνακολουθέω 128; 150; 152  
 συναλγέω 128; 144  
 συναπόλλυμι 274; 358  
 συνάπτω 140; 146; 172; 178; 218  
 συνάχθομαι 128; 146  
 συνδέω 302  
 σύνειμι (sum) 142; 168; 188; 192;  
 250; 300  
 συνεισφέρω 140; 148  
 συνεργέω 248  
 συνεργός 146; 300  
 σύνεσις 140; 168; 274; 276; 278;  
 292  
 συνέστιος 300  
 συνετός 42; 43; 182  
 συνεχής 110; 172; 182

- συνέχω 290  
 συνηγορέω 190  
 συνήθεια 244; 246; 250  
 συνήθης 144; 146; 174; 246  
 σύνθεσις 259; 262; 361  
 συνθήκη 220; 223  
 συνίημι 162  
 συνίστημι 250; 292; 344; 358  
 συνοικέω 220  
 σύνολος 332  
 συνοράω 321; 330  
 συνουσία 140  
 συνταπεινός 344  
 συντελέω 148  
 συντίθημι 170; 302  
 σύντομος 94; 96  
 σύντροφος 304  
 σύρω 288  
 σύστασις 232  
 συστέλλω 170  
 συχνός 292  
 σφαγή 294  
 σφάλω 144; 164; 358  
 σφεῖς 330  
 σφέτερος 290  
 σφόδρα 158; 168  
 σχεδόν 276  
 σχῆμα 144; 160; 161; 326  
 σχολάζω 188; 190; 196  
 σχολή 172; 190; 194  
 σῶζω 17; 144; 164; 176; 182  
 Σωκράτης 321; 323; 326; 328; 330;  
     332  
 σωλὴν 292  
 σῶμα 156; 178; 190; 192; 196;  
     246; 274; 292; 304; 330  
 σωτήρ 288  
 σωτηρία 174; 251  
 σωφρονέω 162; 190; 192; 212; 222;  
     254  
 σωφρονίζω 130; 132; 158; 212;  
     214; 224; 254; 256; 294; 296  
 Σωφρονισκός 321; 330  
 σωφρονισμός 214  
 σωφρονιστής 132; 216; 217; 369  
 σωφροσύνη 22; 160; 190; 218  
 σώφρων 146; 184; 192; 222; 223  
 ταλαιπωρία 176; 178; 290  
 τάλαντον 142  
 τάν 160  
 τάξις 75; 76; 80  
 ταπεινός 344  
 ταπείνωσις 261  
 τάσσω 61; 76  
 ταφή 164  
 τάχα 174  
 ταχύς 110; 150; 170; 172; 272;  
     274; 296; 297  
 τείνω 182  
 τεινίζω 224  
 τεῖχος 192; 226  
 τεκμαίρομαι 158  
 τεκμήριον 158; 328  
 τεκτονεύω 300  
 τεκτονικός 188; 190  
 τελειόω 184; 272  
 τελετή 222; 224  
 τελευτάω 32; 133; 176; 184; 222  
 τελευτή 133; 170; 176  
 τελέω 184; 224; 226; 274  
 τελικός 85  
 τέλος 142; 176; 270; 283  
 τέμενος 46  
 τερπνός 226  
 τέρω 176  
 τέρψις 148  
 Τεῦκρος 304  
 τέχνη 111; 168; 172; 176; 226;  
     300; 328  
 τέχνημα 298  
 τηλικούτος 290  
 τηρέω 9; 144; 244; 294  
 τίθημι 144; 150; 176; 182; 185;  
     244; 296  
 τίκτω 285; 294; 300; 302  
 Τίμαρχος 195  
 τιμάω 218; 226

τιμή 164; 166; 176; 256; 304

τίμιος 156

Τιμόθεος 18

τιμωρέω 152

τιμωρία 158; 164; 254; 256

τίς 16; 17; 18; 21; 39; 40; 41; 43;  
94; 95; 96; 110; 142; 146;  
148; 150; 152; 156; 158;  
160; 170; 172; 174; 178;  
180; 182; 184; 188; 190;  
212; 214; 218; 230; 238;  
244; 250; 254; 270; 288;  
298; 302; 304; 322; 326;  
328; 330; 352; 356

τις 17; 18; 22; 25; 26; 38; 39; 41;  
43; 45; 46; 47; 48; 49; 77;  
83; 94; 96; 114; 140; 142;  
143; 144; 146; 148; 150;  
161; 162; 164; 168; 170;  
172; 174; 176; 178; 180;  
182; 184; 185; 188; 190;  
196; 206; 224; 230; 238;  
240; 244; 246; 248; 250;  
251; 253; 266; 272; 276;  
288; 290; 292; 294; 298;  
300; 302; 304; 305; 326;  
328; 344; 346; 353; 358

τοι 142; 182; 185; 246; 268; 276;  
358

τοίνυν 83; 142; 148; 150; 154; 160;  
162; 174; 176; 180; 184;  
188; 222; 232; 326

τοιούτος 83; 105; 107; 140; 146;  
148; 156; 158; 160; 162;  
172; 176; 178; 180; 182;  
186; 188; 190; 192; 194;  
197; 212; 239; 246; 254;  
270; 272; 274; 276; 278;  
296; 304; 342; 346; 352;  
356; 358

τολμάω 150; 184

τοξικός 304

τόπος 82; 102; 103; 105; 106; 125;  
126; 198; 236; 246; 262

τόσος 24; 26; 142; 276; 356

τοσοῦτος 140; 148; 156; 180; 186;  
212; 230; 248; 270; 274;  
285; 290; 292; 296; 353;  
358; 359

τραγικός 270

τραγωδία 37; 296

τρανόω 290

τράπεζα 9; 180

τράχληρος 356

τραχύς 186

τρέμω 170

τρέφω 9; 292

τριάς 288

τρικυμιάω 178

Τροία 274; 276

τρόπαιον 230; 248; 251

τρόπος 86; 92; 131; 158; 162; 182;  
184; 212; 214; 256; 274;  
284; 285; 300; 330; 353; 358

τροπώω 272

τροφή 300; 302

τρυφάω 192

τρυφή 140; 176; 289

τρώγω 9; 47

Τρῶες 304

τυγχάνω 29; 57; 63; 134; 142; 160;  
272; 276; 294; 298

Τυδεύς 304

τύπτω 53; 212

τυραννίς 152; 154; 155; 253

τύραννος 146

τυφλός 16

τύχη 36; 123; 140; 142; 144; 152;  
230; 248; 272; 296; 297; 298

ὕβριζω 142

ὕβρις 302

ὕγεια 330

ὕγεια 330

ὕγιής 274

ὕδωρ 182; 292

υἱός 158; 160

ὕλη 288

- ὑμεῖς 61; 65; 290  
 ὑμνέω 140; 184  
 ὑπάγω 164  
 ὑπάρχω 144; 160; 180; 188; 209;  
 230; 346; 356  
 ὑπέρ 146; 160; 176; 184; 272; 274;  
 326; 328  
 ὑπεραίρω 270  
 ὑπερβαίνω 158; 230; 248; 326  
 ὑπερβάλλω 290  
 ὑπερβολή 144; 170; 270; 344  
 ὑπερηφανία 261  
 ὑπερθαυμάζω 268; 278  
 ὑπεριδρύω 292  
 ὑπέρκειμαι 274  
 ὑπέρχομαι 77  
 ὑπεύθυνος 162  
 ὑπέχω 164  
 ὑπήκοος 256  
 ὕπνος 110; 111; 112; 160; 172;  
 182; 184; 356; 358  
 ὑπνώσσω 109; 110  
 ὑπό 16; 17; 18; 22; 25; 26; 28; 38;  
 39; 41; 43; 45; 46; 47; 48;  
 49; 152; 162; 174; 182; 190;  
 272; 276; 298; 299; 328  
 ὑπογραφεύς 32  
 ὑποδείκνυμι 140; 248  
 ὑποδέχομαι 272  
 ὑποδοχή 83  
 ὑπόθεσις 140; 162; 270  
 ὑποθήκη 168  
 ὑπόκρισις 80  
 ὑπολαμβάνω 142; 156; 160; 294  
 ὑπομένω 22; 190  
 ὑποπίπτω 356  
 ὑποστέλλω 160  
 ὑποτίθημι 148; 344  
 ὑπουργέω 192  
 ὑποχαλάω 358  
 ὕστερέω 244  
 ὕστερος 140; 160; 182; 276  
 ὑφαντικός 188  
 ὑφέρπω 300  
 ὑφίστημι 180; 182; 212  
 ὑψηγορέω 292  
 ὑψηλός 170; 184; 290  
 φαιδρός 176; 292  
 φαίνω 142; 160; 168; 170; 176;  
 248; 272; 274; 326; 346  
 φανερός 272  
 φάρμακον 9  
 φάσκω 162  
 φατνή 192  
 φαῦλος 16; 168; 170; 172; 176;  
 184  
 φείδομαι 111; 296  
 φέρω 140; 146; 148; 158; 161;  
 170; 186; 192; 230; 270;  
 274; 276; 344; 356  
 φεύγω 146; 152; 158; 182; 192;  
 197; 222  
 φημί 16; 17; 18; 20; 21; 22; 26; 38;  
 39; 40; 41; 42; 43; 47; 54;  
 55; 58; 60; 61; 62; 64; 65;  
 69; 77; 92; 133; 142; 146;  
 152; 160; 164; 168; 170;  
 172; 176; 184; 186; 188;  
 192; 212; 218; 228; 238;  
 244; 265; 270; 284; 285;  
 290; 298; 304; 322; 326;  
 328; 344; 346; 352; 356;  
 358; 359  
 φθέγγομαι 111  
 φθίσις 330  
 φθόνος 300  
 φιλανθρωπία 160; 290  
 φιλόανθρωπος 53; 172; 290; 292  
 φιλέω 197; 223; 248; 252; 358  
 φιλία 128; 144; 150; 298; 362  
 φίλιος 298  
 Φίλιππος 248  
 φιλοξενία 292  
 φιλοπονέω 192  
 φιλόπονος 190  
 φιλοπραγμοσύνη 326  
 φίλος 27; 28; 140; 142; 144; 146;  
 148; 150; 152; 154; 155;

- 174; 248; 250; 252; 253;  
 306; 344; 346  
 φιλοσοφέω 16; 92; 188; 192; 204;  
 206; 208; 209; 210; 218;  
 220; 222; 224; 228; 232;  
 240; 241; 244; 252; 265;  
 266; 268; 270; 284; 285;  
 322; 323; 326; 328; 332;  
 342; 344; 352; 353; 356; 358  
 φιλοσοφία 129; 156; 188; 212; 218;  
 244; 254; 315  
 φιλόσοφος 14; 16; 18; 21; 22; 39;  
 41; 43; 46; 54; 64; 65; 192;  
 194; 218; 244; 246; 326  
 φιλοτιμέω 272; 290  
 φιλοτιμία 164  
 φλεγμαίνω 344  
 φλέψ 292  
 φλυαρία 294  
 φοβερός 133; 170  
 φοβέω 160  
 φόβος 146; 150; 170  
 φοινικοῦς 304  
 Φοῖνιξ 298  
 φόνος 152  
 φορτίον 172; 356  
 φράζω 248  
 φρήν 272  
 φρονέω 8; 150; 162; 166; 270; 272;  
 274; 276; 296; 344; 345  
 φρόνημα 274  
 φρόνησις 21; 140; 265; 266; 267;  
 268; 270; 272; 274; 278;  
 342; 344; 346; 347  
 φρόνιμος 148; 328  
 φροντίζω 77; 110; 160; 164; 190;  
 292; 326  
 φροντίς 172; 188  
 φυγαδεύω 328  
 φυγή 188  
 φυλακή 220; 274  
 φυλακτήριον 222  
 φύλαξ 212; 222; 254  
 φυλάττω 144; 148; 158; 248; 300;  
 346  
 φυσικός 244  
 φυσιολογία 288  
 φύσις 158; 176; 190; 192; 218;  
 220; 222; 224; 226; 244;  
 254; 272; 290; 292; 294;  
 298; 300; 302; 328; 332; 344  
 φυτεύω 194  
 φυτόν 226; 292  
 φυτουργός 292  
 φύω 174; 176; 188; 192; 197; 218;  
 248; 272; 274; 298  
 φωνή 160; 161  
 φῶς 290; 330  
 φωστήρ 292  
 Χαιρήμων 344; 346  
 χαίρω 123; 144; 182; 188; 296  
 χαλεπός 86; 133; 146; 148; 170;  
 172; 184; 185; 328; 346  
 χαλινός 190; 192  
 χαλκευτικός 188  
 χαλκεύω 190  
 χαλκός 300  
 χαρίεις 296  
 χαρίζομαι 180; 288; 298; 304; 306  
 Χάριλλος 17  
 χάρις 150; 158; 285; 294; 296;  
 298; 300; 302; 304; 306  
 Χάριτες 46; 333  
 χάσκω 272  
 χέζω 9  
 χείρ 148; 158; 160; 188; 192; 306  
 χειραγωγέω 328; 330  
 χειροτονέω 174  
 χείρων 142; 146; 148; 160; 170;  
 188; 194; 196; 274; 330  
 χθόνιος 290  
 χλοηφόρος 290  
 χλωρός 39  
 χορευτής 164  
 χορηγέω 296  
 χορός 164; 214



- χράομαι 110; 111; 140; 142; 148;  
 150; 158; 162; 190; 192;  
 326; 328; 344; 358  
 χρεία ix; 1; 13; 54; 76; 77; 82; 83;  
 90; 94; 95; 96; 103; 110;  
 111; 125; 126; 146; 150;  
 174; 198; 212; 218; 224;  
 230; 244; 262; 283; 286;  
 288; 290; 294; 320; 326;  
 327; 340; 344; 356  
 χρειώδης 96; 176  
 χρή 26; 110; 148; 156; 158; 160;  
 184; 188; 356  
 χρήμα 130; 142; 144; 148; 158;  
 162; 176; 212; 251; 254;  
 272; 274; 298; 300; 302  
 χρηματισμός 22  
 χρήσιμος 144; 180; 182; 244; 246;  
 294; 346  
 χρησμός 110; 174  
 χρηστός 16; 53; 144; 158; 172;  
 184; 248  
 χρηστότης 290  
 χρόνος 130; 150; 176; 212; 220;  
 254; 274  
 χρυσίον 39; 142; 186  
 χρυσός 290  
 χαλός 16  
 χώρα 140; 170; 230; 328  
 χαρέω 290  
 χαρίον 230  
 χωρίς 184; 272  
 χαριστός 288  
 χῶρος 290  
 ψάλλω 288  
 ψαλτήριον 280; 335  
 ψευδής 230  
 ψήφισμα 144; 174; 182; 190  
 ψῆφος 174; 266; 270  
 ψιλός 162  
 ψόγος 82; 103; 125; 126; 198; 236;  
 261; 262; 312  
 ψυχή 21; 46; 47; 54; 152; 184;  
 188; 190; 192; 274; 288;  
 294; 298; 300; 321; 326;  
 328; 330; 332; 344  
 ᾧ 58; 61; 64; 65; 77; 142; 160; 302  
 ᾧδῃ 160  
 ᾧδινω 294  
 ᾧνέομαι 178; 186; 187; 212; 254  
 ᾧρα 358  
 ᾧς 22; 77; 83; 96; 111; 130; 132;  
 140; 142; 144; 152; 154;  
 158; 160; 162; 164; 166;  
 168; 170; 172; 174; 176;  
 182; 184; 194; 205; 209;  
 212; 216; 218; 239; 240;  
 241; 244; 248; 272; 284;  
 285; 288; 290; 292; 296;  
 298; 302; 326; 328; 330;  
 332; 344; 346; 353; 356; 358  
 ᾧσπερ 82; 86; 92; 109; 110; 131;  
 164; 170; 205; 207; 208;  
 210; 214; 222; 226; 232;  
 239; 241; 246; 254; 256;  
 267; 270; 274; 284; 285;  
 289; 323; 326; 330; 342;  
 346; 353  
 ᾧστε 142; 148; 182; 186; 190; 230;  
 239; 246; 276; 332; 346  
 ᾧφέλεια 266  
 ᾧφέλέω 174; 190; 346  
 ᾧφέλιμος 346  
 ᾧχρός 39