

# The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)



---

## The New Rhetorical Fragment ( *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part III., Pp. 27–30) in relation to the Sicilian Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias

W. Rhys Roberts

The Classical Review / Volume 18 / Issue 01 / February 1904, pp 18 - 21

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00209086, Published online: 27 October 2009

**Link to this article:** [http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract\\_S0009840X00209086](http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00209086)

### How to cite this article:

W. Rhys Roberts (1904). The New Rhetorical Fragment ( *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part III., Pp. 27–30) in relation to the Sicilian Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias. *The Classical Review*, 18, pp 18-21 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00209086

**Request Permissions :** [Click here](#)

THE NEW RHETORICAL FRAGMENT (*OXYRHYNCHUS PAPYRI*, PART III, Pp. 27-30) IN RELATION TO THE SICILIAN RHETORIC OF CORAX AND TISIAS.

THE rhetorical fragment in question shows some interesting points of contact with the Sicilian Rhetoric of Corax and Tisias. For this early rhetoric three principal authorities are:—

(1) Cic. *Brut.* 46: 'itaque ait Aristoteles, cum sublati in Sicilia tyrannis res privatae longo intervallo iudiciis repeterentur, tum primum, quod esset acuta illa gens et controversiae nata, artem et praecepta Siculos Coracem et Tisiam conscripsisse: nam antea neminem solitum via nec arte, sed accurate tamen et de scripto plerosque dicere.' There can hardly be a doubt that Cicero is here translating from Aristotle's lost *συναγωγή τεχνῶν*, which described and summarised the various Greek systems of rhetoric. And the words *accurate* and *de scripto* correspond closely to the words ἀκριβέως and γεγραμμέναις as found at the beginning of the new fragment, which opens thus in Grenfell and Hunt's text: καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τὸ ἀξιώσονται. καὶ αἱ κ' ἐν ταῖς λέξεσι ταῖς <κατ'> ἀρχαῖς τῶν ἐφόδων καὶ μὴ γεγραμμέναις δοκῇ χρῆσθαι[τις] ἀλλὰ ἰδιωτικαῖς [κα]ὶ μὴδὲν ὡς ἀκριβέως εἰ> [δ]ὲ ὡς ἄλλ' ὡς οἰόμε[ν]ος καὶ ἀκακοῦς λέγειν ἢ τῶν δικαστῆ[ρ]ων ἢ ἄλλων τινῶν. It may be noted in passing that this parallel, if accepted, confirms the manuscript reading *de scripto* in the 'Brutus' as against the conjectural emendations *descriptis* and *discriptis*.

(2) *Prolegomena in Hermogenem* (Walz, *Rhet. Gr.* iv. 12): εἰσελθὼν οὖν [sc. οὗτος ὁ Κόραξ] ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν ἣ ὁ πᾶς συνηθροίσθη δῆμος, ἤρξατο λόγοις πρότερον θεραπευτικοῖς καὶ κολακευτικοῖς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ τὸ θορυβῶδες καταπραῖναι τοῦ δήμου, αἵτινα καὶ προοίμια ἐκάλεσε· μετὰ δὲ τὸ καταπραῖναι καὶ κατασιγᾶσαι τὸν δῆμον ἤρξατο περὶ ὧν εἶδει συμβουλευεῖν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ λέγειν ὡς ἐν διηγήσει καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσθαι καὶ ἀναμνηρῆσαι ἐν συντόμῳ περὶ τῶν φθασάντων καὶ ὑπ' ὧν ἄγειν τὰ λεχθέντα τῷ δήμῳ, ἅπερ ἐκάλεσε προοίμιον, διήγησιν, ἀγῶνας, παρέκβασιν, ἐπίλογον· διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἐμνηχανάτο τὸν δῆμον πείθειν καθάπερ ἓνα ἄνθρωπον. With the aims and methods of Corax as thus defined Grenfell and Hunt's fragment is in close agreement, and (short as it is) it contains the technical terms *προοίμιον* and *διήγησις*. It inculcates the importance of producing an impression of

fairness (ἐπιείκεια), and of masking one's art by means of a judicious εἰρωνεία. It presents the characteristics which Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* assigns to the earlier rhetoricians generally. In the excerpt from the *Prolegg. in Hermog.*, Corax alone is mentioned. Tisias' name, however, occurs immediately afterwards in the same passage; and in general it may be said that the Greek and Latin authorities on the history of rhetoric usually couple the two names together, referring to 'Corax and Tisias,' or to 'Tisias and Corax,' or to 'the School of Tisias and Corax.'

(3) Aristot. *Soph. El.* 183 B: ταύτης δ' εὐρημένης [sc. τῆς ἀρχῆς] ῥᾶον τὸ προστιθέναι καὶ συναυξάνειν τὸ λοιπὸν ἐστίν· ὅπερ καὶ περὶ τοὺς ῥητορικοὺς λόγους συμβέβηκε, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας πάσας τέχνας. οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἀρχὰς εὐρόντες παντελῶς ἐπὶ μικρόν τι προήγαγον. οἱ δὲ νῦν εἰδοκιμοῦντες παραλαβόντες παρὰ πολλῶν οἶον ἐκ διαδοχῆς κατὰ μέρος παραγαγόντων οὕτως πῆξήκασιν, Τισίας μὲν μετὰ τοὺς πρώτους, Θεοδῶρος δὲ μετὰ τοῦτον, καὶ πολλοὶ πολλὰ συνειρηγόνασι μέρη· διόπερ οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν ἔχειν τι πλῆθος τὴν τέχνην. ταύτης δὲ τῆς πραγματείας οὐ τὸ μὲν ἦν τὸ δ' οὐκ ἦν προεξεργασμένον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν. καὶ γὰρ τῶν περὶ τοὺς ἐριστικούς λόγους μισθαρνοῦντων ὁμοία τις ἦν ἡ παιδευσίς τῇ Γοργίου πραγματείᾳ. λόγους γὰρ οἱ μὲν ῥητορικοὺς οἱ δὲ ἐρωτητικούς ἐδίδουσαν ἐκμανθάνειν, εἰς οὓς πλειστάκις ἐμπιπτεῖν ψήθησαν ἑκάτεροι τοὺς ἀλλήλων λόγους.

The last of the three passages seems to suggest that, in regard to the development of the art of rhetoric by means of written treatises, Tisias played a more important part than his fellow-Sicilians such as Empedocles, Corax, Gorgias, and others doubtless whose names are now no longer known. He would appear to have improved and enlarged the τέχνη of Corax, which dealt mainly, if not exclusively, with the topic of probability (Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 24, 11). Reference is made to the τέχνη of Tisias and Corax in the *Phaedrus* 273 c φεῦ, δεινῶς γ' ἔοικεν ἀποκεκρυμμένην τέχνην ἀνευρεῖν ὁ Τισίας ἢ ἄλλος ὅστις δὴ ποτ' ὦν τυγχάνει καὶ ὁπότεν χαίρει ὀνομαζόμενος. Gorgias, impressive personality and great influence in literary prose though he was, cannot be shown on satisfactory evidence

to have written any formal τέχνη. His method rather was that indicated by Aristotle in the *Soph. El.* (l.c.). Alcidas, a pupil of Gorgias, gives us the right point of view: οἱ γὰρ εἰς τὰ δικαστήρια τοὺς λόγους γράφοντες φεύγουσι τὰς ἀκριβείας καὶ μιμοῦνται τὰς τῶν αὐτοσχεδιαζόντων ἐρμηνείας, καὶ τότε κάλλιστα γράφειν δοκοῦσιν, ὅταν ἦκιστα γεγραμμένοις ὁμοίους πορίσωνται λόγους<sup>1</sup> (Alc. *Soph.* 13). With these words should be compared and contrasted Dionys. Hal. *de Imitat.* ii. 8. Γοργίας μὲν τὴν ποιητικὴν ἐρμηνείαν μετένεγκεν εἰς λόγους πολιτικούς, οὐκ ἀξίων ὁμοίων τὸν ῥήτορα τοῖς ιδιώταις εἶναι. The aim of forensic oratory is to hide its art. In the law-courts it is impressive to dissemble, rather than to proclaim, one's preparation; or as the latter portion of the fragment has it, οἷον γὰρ μὴ ἐπιβεβωλευκῆμεν ἀλλ' αὐτοσχεδιάζων τὸ ἐπιλελᾶσθαι . . . σχεδὸν] δὲ καὶ πᾶν τὸ εἰρ[ω]ν[ικόν] μεγαλ[ο]πρ[ε]πές. Tisias' τέχνη had in view the requirements of the law-courts, and it seems probable that the present fragment should be referred to his school (cp. Walz *Rhet. Gr.* iv. 19 οἱ περὶ Τισίαν καὶ Κόρακα ὀρίζονται αὐτὴν οὕτως: ῥητορικὴ ἐστὶ πειθοῦς δημιουργός). No doubt the τέχνη of Tisias was often revised and enlarged. We know from the *Phaedrus* how popular it was (ἀλλὰ μὴν τὸν γε Τισίαν αὐτὸν πεπάτηκας ἀκριβῶς, *Phaedr.* 273 A). According to Pausanias (vi. 17, 8), Tisias came to Athens along with Gorgias in the year 427 B.C. Probably he was there ten years later, since Dionysius (*de Isocr.* c. 1) describes Isocrates, who was born in 436 B.C., as ἀκουστής . . . Τισίου τοῦ Συρακουσίου. Lysias also was a pupil of Tisias, but at an earlier date than Isocrates and at Thurii. Like his master, Lysias practised the plain style, which he brought to a high state of perfection (ἐτελείωσε δ' αὐτὴν καὶ εἰς ἀκρον ἤγαγε τῆς ιδίας ἀρετῆς, Dionys. Hal. *de adm.* vi. *dic. in Dem.* c. 2). In the extract given above from the *Proleg. in Hermog.* it will be noticed that one of the excellences attributed to Corax is the power ὑπ' ὅψιν ἀγειν

<sup>1</sup> The words ἀκριβείας, αὐτοσχεδιαζόντων, ἐρμηνείας, γεγραμμένοις may be compared with ἀκριβέως, αὐτοσχεδιάζειν, λέγει, γεγραμμένοις in the fragment. αὐτοσχεδιάζειν occurs near the end of the fragment, and if (as Grenfell and Hunt suggest) something has fallen out before καὶ μὴ γεγραμμένοις towards the beginning, the lost word may be αὐτοσχεδιαστικάς. Or might we not expect the whole of the first sentence to run somewhat as follows: καὶ ἄλλοι τινὲς τὸ ἀξιώσονται καὶ αἰκεν ταῖς λέξεσι ταῖς κατ' ἀρχὰς τὰν ἐφόδων μὴ γεγραμμένοις δοκῆς χρῆσθαι ἀλλὰ ιδιωτικαῖς καὶ (ἢ κἢ) μὴδὲν ὡς ἀκριβέως εἶδες ἀλλ' ὡς οἰόμενος καὶ ἀκακοῦς λέγεις ἢ τῶν δικαστῶν ἢ ἄλλων τινῶν?

τὰ λεχθέντα τῷ δήμῳ, which quality is no other than the ἐνάργεια elsewhere ascribed to Lysias (D. H. *de Lysia*, c. 7 ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐνάργειαν πολλὴν ἢ Λυσίου λέξεις αὐτῇ δ' ἐστὶ δύναμις τις ὑπὸ τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἀγούσα τὰ λεγόμενα, γίνεται δ' ἐκ τῆς τῶν παρακολούθωντων λήψεως).

From Dionys. Hal. (*de Isaeo* c. 2, *de Lysia* c. 15) we find that ἔφοδοι (Lat. *insinuationes*: a variety of the προοίμιον) were used by Isaeus but not by Lysias. This does not necessarily imply that Isaeus invented the term; it may have been invented by Corax or Tisias, the former of whom we know to have used κατάστασις as an equivalent for προοίμιον (*Rhet. Gr.* iv. 575 γνωστὸν δὲ ὅτι καὶ Κόραξ ὁ τεχνογράφος τῷ τῆς καταστάσεως ὀνόματι κέχρηται, προοίμια τοῦ λόγου τὴν κατάστασιν καλῶν). The early treatises were probably richer in technical terms and nice distinctions than is commonly supposed. We are too apt to think that technical expressions found in late writers such as Dionysius are late formations. Many stray indications tend to show that terms of this character filled the air at the time of the Peloponnesian War. Even in the *Oedipus Tyrannus* (v. 932) I would suggest, unlikely as it may at first sight seem, that a rhetorical term is employed in its technical sense. The term is εὐπέεια, and the context is as follows:—

- ΑΓ. ἀλλ' ὀλβία τε καὶ ξὺν ὀλβίῳς αἰεὶ  
γένοιτ', ἐκείνου γ' οὔσα παντέλης δάμαρ.  
ΙΟ. αὐτὼς δὲ καὶ σύ γ', ὦ ξέν' ἄξιός γάρ εἰ  
τῆς εὐπεείας οὐνεκ'. ἀλλὰ φράζ' ὅσον  
χρήζων ἀφίξει χώ τι σημῆναι θέλων.  
*Soph. Oed. Tyr.* 929.

Sir Richard Jebb (in agreement with Stephanus and later dictionaries) translates τῆς εὐπεείας οὐνεκ' by 'tis the due of thy fair greeting,' and in his note says 'εὐπεείας, gracious words, = εὐφημίας, in this sense only here: elsewhere = elegance of diction: Isocrates τὴν εὐπέειαν ἐκ παντὸς διώκει καὶ τοῦ γλαφυρῶς λέγειν στοχάζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ ἀφελῶς (*Dionys. Isocr.* 538).' The fact rather is that Jocasta (or the poet through her) congratulates the messenger on his εὐπέεια in its strict rhetorical sense of 'elegant diction.'<sup>2</sup> The messenger has successfully employed the figure ἀναδίπλωσις (Lat., 'conduplicatio'; Elizabethan English, 'the Redouble': cp. the juxtaposition of

<sup>2</sup> For anachronisms in Attic Tragedy reference may be made to Jebb's notes on *Soph. El.* 48, 701, and *Oed. Col.* 66, 695.—The occurrence in it of the rhetorical term εὐπέεια may perhaps be added to the arguments for assigning a comparatively late date to the *Oedipus Tyrannus*.

διπλασιολογία and εἰπέα in Plat. *Phaedr.* 267 c) in the words δλβία . . . δλβίους. There is some gentle irony in Jocasta's gracious reply, and after paying her compliment to his neatly-turned phrase she quickly brings the man to the point. As Aristotle (*Rhet.* iii. 2, 3) remarks, εἰ δοῦλος καλλιποῖτο ἢ λίαν νέος, ἀπρεπέστερον. Such figures would more fittingly be found in the mouth of ὁ καλλιπῆς Ἀγάθων (Aristoph. *Thesm.* 49), whose lavish use of ἀναδίπλωσις is attested alike by his own fragments and by Aristophanes' parodies.—Another dramatic passage to which the correct interpretation of a rhetorical term gives an added force is Aristoph. *Ach.* 633, 634:—

φησὶν δ' εἶναι πολλῶν ἀγαθῶν ἄξιός ὑμῖν ὁ  
ποιητής,  
παύσας ὑμᾶς ξενικοῖσι λόγοις μὴ λίαν ἐξαπα-  
τᾶσθαι.

By ξενικοῖσι λόγοις are meant, as the Scholiast says, τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ξένων πρέσβων λεγομένοις. That is to say, the reference is to the embassy of Gorgias to Athens (427 B.C.), two years before the *Acharnians* was produced. But the adjective ξενικός is seen to be still more appropriate, when we think of its rhetorical use as in Aristot. *Rhet.* iii. 2, 8 καὶ τὸ σαφές καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ ξενικὸν ἔχει μάλιστα ἡ μεταφορά, or of what Diodorus (himself of Sicily) says of Gorgias on this occasion: τῷ ξενίζοντι τῆς λέξεως ἐξέπληξε τοὺς Ἀθηναίους διὰ τὰς εὐφυεῖς καὶ φιλολόγους (Diod. Sic. xiii. 53). The effect of the words ξενικοῖσι λόγοις in Aristophanes is much as if, soon after the visit of some eloquent French deputies to the British Parliament, we were to speak of 'the distinguished style of our visitors.'

In the fragment itself the terms μεγαλοπρεπής (also μικροπρεπής) and ἀδέως occur, but not (I think) in the full rhetorical sense (as epithets of style itself) deprecated by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* iii. 12, 6 τὸ δὲ προσδιαυρεῖσθαι τὴν λέξιν, ὅτι ἡδεῖαν δεῖ καὶ μεγαλοπρεπῆ, περιέργον. τί γὰρ μᾶλλον ἢ σῶφρονα καὶ εὐθερίον καὶ εἴ τις ἄλλη ἥθους ἀρετή; Verbal μεγαλοπρέπεια would more naturally be attributed to the epideictic than to the forensic style,—to Lysias in his earlier than to Lysias in his later manner,—to Gorgias than to Tisias. The sense borne by μεγαλοπρέπεια in the new fragment seems to be ethical rather than literary. It means not 'heightened speech' (the 'supra modum se tollens oratio' of Quintil. iv. 2, 61; the μεγαλοπρέπεια of Demetr. *de Elocutione*) so much as impressiveness of personal character: cp. ἐν δὲ [ταῖ] διαγήσει τῶν πρα[γμ]άτων

ὥστε βέλτε[ον] καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέ[στερον] τὸ ἦθος φαί[νεσθαι] τάδε χρήσιμα, and καὶ γὰρ μικκ[ο]π[ρ]επὲς τὸ τοιοῦ[τον] κ[α]ὶ ἀκολάστῳ ἦθος τὸ δὲ φεύγει τὰς αἰσχρολογίας μεγ[αλ]οπρεπὲς καὶ κόσμος λόγῳ.

The illustrative quotations from the *Iliad* contained in the fragment are of the kind that were, or became later, stock examples in the schools. That from *Il.* ix. 388 ff. is found in Aristot. *Rhet.* iii. 11, while that from *Il.* iv. 443 occurs in Demetr. *de Eloc.* § 124 and in Longinus *de Subl.* ix. 4. It seems highly probable that the earliest handbooks of rhetoric drew many illustrations from Homer, since his poems were supposed to be a treasure-house of rhetorical (as of other) wisdom. Cp. Diog. Laert. viii. 57, as to Empedocles: Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν τῷ Σοφιστῇ φησὶ πρῶτον Ἐμπεδοκλέα ῥητορικὴν εὑρεῖν, Ζήνωνα δὲ διαλεκτικὴν. ἐν δὲ τῷ περὶ ποιητῶν φησὶν ὅτι καὶ Ὀμηρικὸς ὁ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς καὶ δεινὸς περὶ τὴν φράσιν γέγονε, μεταφορικὸς τ' ὢν καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς περὶ ποιητικὴν ἐπιτεύμασι χρώμενος. Possibly it is from the earlier, or later, Sicilian rhetors that the author of the *De Elocutione* derives not only some of his Homeric illustrations but also his references to Phalaris (§§ 237, 292), Gelo (§ 292), Hiero (§ 292), and even to Dion (§ 234) and Dionysius the Younger (§§ 8, 9, etc.). There can be no doubt that these later treatises preserve much of the best teaching of an earlier time and serve to remind us that Western Hellas was the cradle of rhetoric.

The fragment contains another poetical quotation which is of a slightly different character, and helps to fix an upper limit for the date of composition. The context in which it occurs is: τοὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶς ὁμοίως ἀποδέχονται ᾧ δὴ καὶ τῇνο ε[ρ]οτ[η]αί 'οὐ πώποτ' ἠρώτησα, γινώσκων [ὅτι τοι]οῦτός ἐστιν [οἷσπερ] ἡδεῖται ξυνώ[ν]. The lines in question are from the *Phoenix* of Euripides:—

ὅστις δ' ὁμιλῶν ἡδεῖται κακοῖς ἀνὴρ  
οὐ πώποτ' ἠρώτησα, γινώσκων ὅτι  
τοιούτός ἐστιν οἷσπερ ἡδεῖται ξυνών.

The *Phoenix* must have been produced before the *Acharnians* (425 B.C.), since allusion is made to it in line 421 of the latter play. This quotation, therefore, is not inconsistent even with Tisias' own authorship, and there is no reason to suppose that Euripides was not quoted by the early rhetoricians as well as by Aristophanes and the Attic Orators. It will be remembered further that the Syracusans were particularly fond of the poetry of Euripides. The fragment also contains (immediately after the quotations

from the *Iliad*) a reference to Sophocles, and probably some example taken from his plays has fallen out at this point,—some parallel hyperbole to Homer's

οὐρανῷ ἐστῆριξε κάρη καὶ ἐπὶ χθονὶ βαίνει,

which immediately precedes. In extant rhetoricians, quotations from Sophocles are much rarer than those from the more rhetorical Euripides. The lines of the *Phoenix* are often quoted by late rhetoricians, who may have found them in some early manual such as that of Tisias.

On the whole we may feel entitled to conclude that the new fragment has been considerably influenced by Tisias' τέχνη, whatever its exact relation to that may be. Hence, among other things, the use of the Doric dialect: δωρίσδεν δ' ἔξῃστι δοκῶ τοῖς

Δωριέεσσιν. The dialect is, indeed, of a decidedly mixed character in the text as we have it, which exhibits such forms as διηγῆσαι, πρῶτον, φεύγειν, and πιθανότητα, side by side with distinctively Doric forms. This fact, and the fact that no attempt is made to give the quotations in Doric, may possibly suggest an Attic adaptation of a Doric work, since we hear elsewhere of works current both in Doric and in Attic. Or we may be disposed to conjecture, doubtfully, that we have before us a fragment of that part of Aristotle's συναγωγή τεχνῶν which dealt with the productions of Tisias and his school. Whether Aristotle, however, preserved the original Doric dialect in these cases, we have (so far as I am aware) no evidence to show.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

#### EMENDATIONS OF JULIAN MISOPOGON.

341 C. ἐθάλπετο δὲ τὸ δωμάτιον οὐδαμῶς, οὐπερ ἐκάθενδον, ὅνπερ εἰώθει τρόπον ὑπὸ ταῖς καμίνοις τὰ πολλὰ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἐκεῖ θερμαίνεσθαι.

The use of ὑπό with the instrumental dative may be paralleled in Julian, but is displeasing; and the article is meaningless. Read then ὑποστέγοις καμίνοις. For εἰώθει one would rather have expected εἶωθε, but the tense may have been attracted to that of ἐθάλπετο by the author himself.

349 A. *ad fin.* καὶ ἔμαντοῦ τὴν σκαίότητα καὶ τὴν ἀμαθίαν καὶ τὴν δυσκολίαν καὶ τὸ μὴ ῥαδίως μαλάττεσθαι μηδὲ [ἐν] τοῖς δεομένοις ἢ τοῖς ἐξαπατῶσι τὰ ἔμαντοῦ ποιείσθαι μηδὲ ταῖς βοαῖς εἴκειν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα στέργῳ ὀνειδίη.

καὶ ἔμαντοῦ Hertlein, καὶ ἔμαντῷ MSS. [ἐν] is omitted by many MSS. and Cobet altered it to ἐπί, but if we take μαλάττεσθαι ἐπὶ τοῖς δεομένοις together, then ἢ should be μηδέ. The mischief lies in ποιείσθαι, for which, omitting ἐν, we must read προείσθαι (not προσεῖσθαι by reason of the other present tenses). 'I accept all reproaches on the score of the difficulty I find in giving way and in sacrificing my own wishes to those who either ask me straightforwardly or try to deceive me.'

That the last words also do not stand as Julian wrote them is clear from the staring hiatus of στέργῳ ὀνειδίη and the fact that V and other MSS. omit καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα while some others read τὰ ὀνειδίη.

350 D. οὐ κρείττον ἦν 'ὁδωδέναι μύρων, τὴν ἀγορὰν βαδίζοντός μου καὶ 'παῖδας ἡγείσθαι καλοῦς,' εἰς οὓς ἀποβλέψουσιν οἱ πολῖται, καὶ 'χοροὺς γυναικῶν,' ὅποιοι παρ' ὑμῖν ἴστανται καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν; ἐμὲ δὲ 'ὑγρὸν βλέπειν ριπτοῦντα' πανταχοῦ τὰ ὄμματα [κατόπιν], ὅπως ὑμῖν καλός, οὐτὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρόσωπον ὀφθείην, [ὁ τρόπος οὐ συγχωρεῖ].

I have put in quotation marks the words which I think are quotations from some poet. I follow Hertlein in ejecting the last four words, which are absent from some good MSS., and in reading μου for σου and παρ' ὑμῖν for παρ' ἡμῖν. That those four words must go is obvious from the mood of ὀφθείην, which is right if it depends on κρείττον ἦν, wrong if on συγχωρεῖ.

Who then is the poet here quoted, and what of the word κατόπιν? This κατόπιν is added by the same MSS. which omit ὁ τρόπος οὐ συγχωρεῖ, and, though it by no means follows that they are superior to the others in both places because they certainly are in one of the two, still there is a presumption in their favour. Besides where should they have got κατόπιν while it is easy enough to tell why the last four words should be added by somebody not seeing the construction. I will be bold enough to suggest that κατόπιν is the mutilated remnant of κατ' Εὐριπίδην.

Similarly in the sixtieth epistle 447 B I suspect the meaningless words ὡς φῆς of being a relic of φησὶ Σοφοκλῆς.

Julian continues ἔστι γάρ, ὡς ὑμεῖς κρίνετε,