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ἐπειδή λόγου δέναις τυγχάνει ψυχαγωγία οὖσα, τὸν μέλλοντα ῥητορικὸν ἔσεσθαι ἀνάγκη εἰδέναι ψυχή δος εἰδὴ ἔχει.

Plato, Phaedrus, 271 D.

κράτιστος γὰρ δῆ πάντων ἐγένετο ῥητόρων φόσιν ἀνθρώπων κατοπτεύει, καὶ τὰ προσέχοντα ἐκάστοις ἀποδοῖναι, πάθη τε καὶ ἰσθα καὶ ἔργα.

Dionysius Hal., de Lyvia Judic., c. 7.
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ETHOPOIIA.

Definition of Ethopoiia.

Ethopoiia is dramatic delineation of character, especially as displayed in speeches written for court by a logographer, who has studied and depicted in the thought, language and synthesis of the oration, the personality of the client who delivers the speech. It differs from προσωποποιία, or personification, in that the latter is the feigned speech of an absent party, or of an inanimate object treated as a person. The Archidamus of Isocrates is an example of προσωποποιία. εἰδωλοποιία, on the other hand, is dramatic representation of the dead, as an example of which Aeschines, in Ctesiphontem, § 153, may be cited. Or, following Aphthonius, we may define ἥθοποιία as the portrayal of the character of a known and living being, εἰδωλοποιία as the dramatic representation of a known but dead person, and προσωποποιία as the personification of a person or object entirely fictitious and non-existent. Such are the distinctions made by the later rhetoricians, but προσωποποιία and ἥθοποιία appear to have been fully synonymous in earlier times. μιμησις, Latin imitatio, figuratio, expressio, is another word often used as synonymous with ἥθοποιία, but it is a more comprehensive term. The later rhetoricians have mentioned this subject frequently in their various works, and Ernesti, in his Lexicon Technologiae, has given a very good resumé of their views, under the words ἥθοποιία, ἥθος, μιμησις, κτλ.

Ethos.

The nature of ethos is discussed in cap. 11.2 ff. of the treatise entitled Ars Rhetorica in the corpus of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

1 This word is used in the sense in which it is employed by the Greek rhetoricians, i.e., as referring to the structure of the period and of the sentence.
2 Cf. Longinus, ap. Walz, IX. 543.
3 Cf. Walz, I. 101.
4 It must not be overlooked that in his rhetorical works Dionysius is not an original authority; he gathers together the views and results of a long line of professed
The statements there made may be summed up as follows: There are two classes of ethos, the universal and the particular. The sphere of the former is philosophy; of the latter, oratory. In the first case it impels to virtue and deters from evil, while in the case of oratory it is the means by which the speech is adapted to the speaker, the hearers, the opponent, the subject, and other circumstances. This oratorical ethos involves six points, the race, family, age, principles, lot, and pursuits of the person. Furthermore, the race may be subdivided, for the ethos will vary according as the subject is Greek or foreigner, or again, as he is Athenian, Boeotian, or Spartan, or Scythian, Celt, or Egyptian. The foreigner will speak differently from the Greek, and among the Greeks the Athenian will not speak like the Spartan. Again, in the matter of family it is important to what race or tribe the father and mother belong. Age is the third point, for young men and old do not speak in the same way, for their characters differ. The former are more, the latter are less spirited. Similar differences are to be expected when you speak of a brother, a wife, a husband, or a son. Fourthly, in the matter of a man's nature, we must consider whether he is affectionate, or harsh, or austere, or covetous. Further, as to a man's lot or fortune, we must note whether he is successful or not. These things to be sure are not ethic, but they profoundly affect a man's life. Lastly, we must take into consideration the profession or pursuits of the subject. For the soldier, physician, orator, farmer, all will be influenced by their mode of life. The physician will say in conversation: "A purgative must be used in this case, but in that, the knife." The musician will say: "These words are out of tune, those are not in harmony." For each and every man, whatever his profession, there will be his own individual character.


1 It is to this kind of ethos that Plato refers in the third book of his Republic, where he treats of μιμωρία, and discusses what classes of characters are most valuable as examples to the youths of his ideal state.

2 Reading τραχώς. Cf. Plato, Cratylus, 406 Α, τὸ μὴ τραχῶ τοῦ ἡθος.

3 δεί τούτο ἐκκαθάρισα, ἐκτερέμιν αὐτῷ.

4 παρὰ μέλος λέγεις, οὗ συνάδει τὰ λεγόμενα.
The difference between τὸ πρέπον, or appropriateness, and ἡθοποιία is not clear at first. In the tract on Lysias, c. 9, Dionysius states that τὸ πρέπον concerns the character of the speaker, of the audience and of the speech. To be appropriate to the speaker an oration must be adapted to his age, race, training, pursuits, mode of life and other characteristics. With respect to the audience the writer must consider whether the speech is addressed to the jury, the senate, the assembly, or the masses. Furthermore, the style must vary with the parts of the speech as well as with its subject. Now I have already shown, quoting the Ars Rhetorica, that ethos has for its sphere the character of the speaker, audience, and subject, and it would thus appear that the two terms are almost, if not quite, synonymous. But a careful reading of the tract on Lysias, c. 8, shows that Dionysius meant ἡθοποιία to refer merely to the character of the speaker, while τὸ πρέπον, as defined in c. 9, plainly includes the audience and subject as well as the speaker. Hence it is evident that the sphere of ἡθοποιία is more restricted than that of τὸ πρέπον, and that the former in fact is to be regarded as a subdivision of the latter. Accordingly ἡθοποιία in its relation to the character of the speaker is the subject of this study.

The Relation of ἐνάργεια to ἡθοποιία.

ἡθοποιία is also closely allied to another figure, ἐνάργεια, or vividness, the graphic presentation to the senses of the facts of the case in such a way that they speak for themselves. It is effected by a skillful treatment of such details as exhibit in a lifelike way the actions or behavior of a man under the circumstances in which he is placed. It requires therefore a keen insight into human nature and its motives, and contributes to that ἡθοποιία whose object is not only to delineate a man’s inner character, but also his character as shown by his actions. An excellent example of ἐνάργεια is the narrative of Lysias, Or. 1 § 6–27.

διατύπωσις or ὑποπτύπωσις, fidelity to nature, is yet another figure related to ἡθοποιία in very much the same way as ἐνάργεια.

1 Cf. Dion. H. de Lysia Lud. c. 7.
Ethopoia.

It is, however, not identical with ἐνάργεια, for the latter involves a graphic liveliness that is by no means always involved—be it said with regret—in fidelity to nature. A further explanation may be found in Quintilian IX. 2.58, and in Volkmann, p. 442.

The Place of Ethopoia in the Category of Figures.

Although it is thus possible to distinguish between ethopoia and its kindred figures, it is impossible to say whether it belongs to the category of the figures of thought, or of language. For it involves both thought and language, and therefore cannot be said to belong exclusively either to the one or the other. It is simply one of those figures that link the two classes together in closest union.

The Practical Value of Ethopoia in Oratory.

The practical value of ethopoia as a tool in the oratorical workshop was as a means of persuasion. The Attic jury, made up by lot of all classes of citizens, rich and poor, educated and ignorant, was influenced almost entirely by its opinion of the moral worth of the defendant or plaintiff, as the case might be. It is only judges skilled in the law that are likely to be influenced by argument and evidence, and by them alone. "Every man his own lawyer" was the principle at Athens, for the interested party had to plead his own case, although he could consult another and have his speech written for him, if he so desired. Naturally he could not sound the trumpet in praise of his own merits,1 for such action would have been disastrous to his suit. Hence it became the duty of the clever speech writer to place those words and expressions in the mouth of his client, that would produce the effect of innocence and true worth, without any overt statement of the same. The farmer's language savors of the fields and farmyard, while the soldier has the air of the camp, and refers as if by accident to battles fought for home and fatherland. By these and similar means an effect was produced upon the jurymen that was well-nigh irresistible. But very delicately the work had to be done. A touch too little, and the jury

1To what extent an Athenian could dwell upon his own meritorious actions is shown, e.g., in Or. 16, §13, 15–17. Cf. also pp. 19, 20, 22, 25, of this dissertation.
The Practical Value of Ethopoiia in Oratory.

failed to catch the meaning of this "speech-artist"; a touch too much, and the case was lost. The Greek mind was very quick, and with true artistic feeling preferred a suggestion to complete and perhaps revolting detail. Realizing this the logographer handled his tool, ethopoiia, with very great delicacy, and often gives only the faintest suggestion of a line, where a vulgar realist of modern times would draw a mark thick and long. It may be on account of this adumbration of the character that some thick-witted critics have failed to detect the ethopoiia where delicate analysis shows it plainly to exist, and it will be one of the objects of this dissertation to show this fact in several cases.

There was yet another good reason making for the use of ethopoiia. It was the necessity of concealing the hand of the logographer by giving each speech individual traits, as the professional speech-writer was not in good odor in Athens in those days, and to make use of his art was hardly creditable, although customary.¹

To handle this keen-edged and even dangerous tool properly and effectively required a subtle mind, and such a mind we find in that keen-sighted Greek orator who is justly famous for his perception and portrayal of character, Lysias. In this quality he excels all others,² and it is a feature of a piece with his other characteristics; yet we must not deny the other orators the praise that is their due. Isaeus holds the place after Lysias, and some of his character painting is admirable. M. Léon Moy, in his Plaidoyers d'Isée, has devoted considerable space to a description of some of the characters in the orations of Isaeus, and his remarks are well worth reading. But Dionysius, in his tract on Isaeus, in drawing a comparison between Lysias and the later orator, shows that the former, excelling the latter in simplicity, and less apparently artistic, surpassed him also in ethopoiia. The rhythmic, periodic, and artistic style of Demosthenes was not the natural home of ethos, but we find it often in the private speeches not ineffectively used, notably in the Conon, which is almost Lysianic in its ethic coloring. And in the De Corona, that golden mean in Greek style, ethos is admirably employed, especially at the opening and close, where it would be most effective. Hyper-

¹ Cf. Plato, Phaedrus, 257 C, D; Euthyd. 289 D, E.
² Cf. Dion. H. de Lys. Iud. c. 7.
eides also made skillful use of ethopoia, and it is not lacking in the other orators, but Lysias is always facile princeps.

LYSIAS' USE OF ETHOPOIIA.

Dionysius on the Ethopoiia of Lysias.

Of Lysias' use of ethopoia Dionysius, De Lysia Iudicium, c. 7 ff., says in substance: "Lysias proved himself the superior of all the orators in perception of human nature, and in assigning to each individual his appropriate emotions, characteristics, and actions. And therefore I accord to him the highest praise for his talent and skill in the employment of ethopoia, as I can find no character in his works poorly delineated or lifeless. Excelling in the treatment of those features in which ethopoia appears, namely, in thought, language and synthesis, he not only gives the speakers sentiments proper and useful and moderate, so that their speeches seem to be portraits of their characters, but also places in their mouths appropriate language, in style simple, clear, literal, and popular. For lofty, strange, and studied terms ill befit true character painting. Furthermore his method of synthesis is plain and simple, for he recognized that the natural home of ethos is not in the periodic or rythmic style, but ἐν τῷ διάλεξαμένῃ λέξει. In every respect Lysias' synthesis is pleasing and persuasive, and it is so natural and easy, without any appearance of striving after effect or of art, that I should not be surprised if many laymen—yes, and even scholars themselves not a few—thought that the result is reached without study and without the use of rhetorical methods." In c. 19 Dionysius mentions the three artistic means of persuasion;\(^1\) they are a man's actions and ethos, together with the use of pathos. "Of ethos," says Dionysius in effect, "Lysias made most skillful use, for frequently by references to his client's past life and actions, to his character and habits, he portrays him as worthy of confidence and respect. When his life affords no opportunity for this method of treatment, Lysias himself makes up such a character for his client that he is deemed entirely trustworthy. For he represents his conduct as polite, and graceful,

\(^1\) Cf. Arist. Rhet. I. 2. 2 ff.
and modest, and makes him use language befitting such conduct. His client is always distressed at injustice, and is always endeavoring to act with justice. Every detail that will serve these ends the orator does not fail to introduce.” Such is the opinion of the Greek critic on Lysias’ use of ethopoiia.

Francken however in his Commentationes Lysiacae, fails to catch the full meaning of the Greek. For he is of the opinion that Dionysius means by the ethopoiia of Lysias the giving to all the characters alike a certain simplicity calculated to win favor, and not the individual portraiture of the traits of each person. But the words of Dionysius, c. 8: οὐ γὰρ διανοομένους μόνον ὑποτίθεται χρηστά καὶ ἐπιεική καὶ μέτρια τοὺς λέγοντας, ὥστε εἰκάνας εἶναι δοκεῖν τῶν ἠθῶν τῶν λόγων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν λέξιν ἀποδίδωσι τοῖς ἠθεσιν οἰκεῖαν, ἦ πέφυκεν αὐτὰ ἑαυτῶν κράτιστα δηλοῦσθαι—these words themselves do they not prove the contrary? And the passage from the Ars Rhetorica, which I have already fully quoted, is yet more conclusive. Furthermore, Francken is refuted out of his own mouth when he says, following Dionysius: Lysias — pro diversis aetatibus, studiis, reliquisque, quibus homines inter se different, variat orationem. K. O. Müller, Rauchenstein, Blass, Perrot, and Jebb plainly disagree with Francken, though Müller states what is the case, that the general tone was that of the average man.

Finally the actual facts disprove this thesis of Francken’s. For in the speakers of Or. 10, 24, 31, where is that simplicity that he claims Lysias gave to all his characters alike? And are there not many marked individual traits and noteworthy contrasts of character? As examples, compare the characters of the humbly born Euphiletus of Or. 1, with all his moral dignity, and of the high born defendant of Or. 3, who, despite his birth, can rise to no such moral heights. Compare the patriotic Mantitheus of Or. 16, or Aristophanes of Or. 19, with the political “trimmer” of Or. 25, or Philon of Or. 31. What a difference between the affected Cripple

1 P. 9, 10.  
of Or. 24 and the simple defendant of Or. 7! And indeed Or. 1 alone disproves this thesis, as there is a noticeable difference in the portraits of the injured husband, and the rakish, craven Eratosthenes; the deceitful, unfaithful wife, and her servile maid. There is also a striking contrast of yet a different group of characters in Or. 19. All of which goes to prove that Francken is entirely wrong.

The Influence of Ethopoiia upon Lysias' Style.

Lysias' distinctive style throughout his private speeches is due, I think, entirely to his desire of winning favor for his client. Perhaps the most effectual means of securing this object was attributing the appropriate thoughts and words to each speaker, and therefore τὸ πρέπον becomes of prime importance as the ultimate origin of the distinctive characteristics of this orator. Now, as we have seen, ethopoiia is linked in closest union with τὸ πρέπον, and hence to it is due in large measure the Lysianic style. His pure Attic, after the form prevailing at his time, was appropriate to a plain Athenian citizen. The rhetorical figures are only used sparingly, for they are in keeping with fine writing alone, which ill becomes the humble or inexperienced speaker. Fine and foreign words too, are avoided for the same reason, which would also militate against a periodic style. Clear, neat, and terse expression was also calculated to win favor, while as for the relation of ἐνάργεια to ethopoiia, that has already been discussed. As regards the grace, or χάρις, of Lysias, it cannot be said that he applied it to his speeches with the conscious desire to persuade, for it was a part of the orator's very nature, the consummate flower of his genius, a gift born with him and not to be acquired or applied consciously, like the colors of the painter's palette.

A comparison of the logographic speeches of Lysias with Or. 12, and with his Ὀλυμπιακός, which he spoke himself, shows that there are noteworthy differences, in the line of ornamentation, between the two classes of speeches. In Or. 12 the style is more artistic, and less in accord with the distinctive characteristics of

1 Francken can see no difference here. Yet one is the simple speech of the well born, the other the affected speech of the low born. Which is all the difference in the world in my humble opinion!
Lysias as we know him in his logographic speeches. This would tend to show that he departed from his individual style when writing for his clients, and adopted one suited to their position and attainments, and therefore more likely to persuade the court.

The Types of Character in Lysias.

The plan of this study has been to group the characters according to their types, and to show how their traits appear in the thought, language and synthesis of the speeches, as indicated by Dionysius. As a preliminary a careful examination was made of all the speeches of Lysias, but for obvious reasons the genuine forensic orations are alone included in this dissertation, and among these Or. 12, 14, 15, are omitted, as ethos is absent from them on account of their political nature. Or. 13, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, are also of a public character, and are referred to only casually. Or. 5 is too brief for us to draw any conclusions. As regards the remaining, the plan has been to make an exhaustive study of the characters of Or. 1, 16, 24, and a less complete examination of Or. 3, 4, 7, 10, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 26, 31, 32, using them chiefly by way of reference and comparison.

It would be interesting, if the limits of this dissertation allowed, to show how the treatment of ethos, coupled with other phenomena, proves the spuriousness of such orations as 8, 9, 20. Its absence certainly casts a doubt on Or. 14, 15.

It is hoped that this essay may serve as a contribution towards a more general knowledge of Greek types of character as illustrated in Greek literature. At first thought it might be supposed that constant comparisons might be made between the characters of Lysias and the other orators and those of the comedy. But further reflection shows that this cannot be so in the nature of things, for the object of comedy is to lay bare a man’s weaknesses and eccentricities, of rhetoric, to explain away his weaknesses and bring out his good points. Still oratory as giving portraits of the different

2 Cf. p. 14 of this dissertation.
traits of the average man serves as a good screen on which to project, by way of contrast, the peculiarities of the persons in a comedy. A comparative study of this kind might help the interpreters to a better understanding of some of Aristophanes’ characters. The same objection as in comedy obtains with regard to Theophrastus, for his clever character studies are devoted to men’s failings and peculiarities rather than to their nobler traits.

A cursory comparison of the points developed in Ribbeck’s *Alazon* and *Kolax* with those explained in the following study, especially the parts about Mantitheus,\(^1\) amply illustrates these statements. We must, in fact, go into other departments of classical literature if we would find resemblances to the characters in the orators to Homer,\(^2\) to Plato,\(^3\) and to tragedy, especially to the lawyer-poet, Euripides.

The Study of the Types in Lysias.

The Patriotic Man.

Theophrastus has given us an amusing description of the character of the man of petty ambition (μικροφιλοστημία), that contrasts with the men of noble ambition portrayed in the orations of Lysias. These delight in serving their country well; they are φιλότιμοι,\(^4\) patriotic, a trait our orator has depicted again and again in his clients,—doubtlessly with good effect upon an Athenian jury. Foremost among these patriotic men is Mantitheus, the speaker of Or. 16, the noblest of all the men we know through Lysias. Ambition, such as he and others in these orations display, Aristotle\(^5\) tells us is a mark of a noble character, not of a rash or boastful, as some modern commentators would have it.\(^6\)

Mantitheus, a young Athenian about thirty years of age,\(^7\) came of an old family that had long taken a prominent part in public affairs, but had lost its fortunes in the recent revolutionary troubles. Elected

---

\(^1\) Cf. p. 20 of this dissertation.


\(^3\) Cf. Dr. Newhall’s dissertation on Plato’s *Gorgias*.

\(^4\) The good sense prevails in Lysias.

\(^5\) Rhet. II. 15.

\(^6\) Cf. p. 20 of this dissertation.

\(^7\) Cf. Blass, 518.
The Patriotic Man.

to office, his confirmation by the senate was opposed on the ground that he had shown hostility to the democracy, by serving as a knight under the Thirty, and also on the ground that he was morally unworthy. As the first charge was readily disproved, he devoted the larger portion of his defence to a review of his actions as a man, a citizen, and a soldier. Straightforwardness is the keynote of Mantitheus' character, whose patriotism, his chief spring of action, appears in his devotion to his various duties as a citizen. For at home he was a kind and generous brother, and in public affairs he was ever a friend of the democracy, and entirely unlike other young men who passed their time in gambling, drinking, and other evil ways. He was liberal to needy citizens, and no one ever brought suit against him for any cause. Zealous in the performance of all his ordinary military duties, he also volunteered in deeds of risk not required of him, and was never found hanging back, but was with the foremost in an attack, and with the hindmost in a retreat. In everything, in short, he was above fear and above reproach.

Straightforwardness, as the special note of Mantitheus' character, demands more detailed study. It appears in the frank and direct expression of his thought and meaning, in his simple and unadorned language, and in the brief form of the speech, together with an unpretentious method of synthesis. A direct narration of facts in a simple way is a mark of his straightforwardness, which, however, appears more especially in his readiness to advert to his own merits, of which he is fully conscious, as every true man must be. Illustrations of these characteristics are noticeable throughout. At the outset he displays confidence that he will win, in his somewhat humorous expression of thanks to his accusers, especially in the expression in § 2 ἐμαυτῷ πιστεύω, the usual formula being πιστεύω τῷ δικαίῳ, or, τῷ πράγματι. Compare with this passage his entire disregard of the usual supplication to the judges in the epilogue, and his slight reference to the scrutiny in § 3, 8. Noteworthy is his detailed recountal of his own merits, reviewed in the preceding paragraph. But especially interesting is his calm and assured way

1 For questions here involved cf. Frohb., Einl. z. Rede f. Mant.
2 § 10.
3 § 4–9.
4 § 11.
5 § 14.
6 § 10, 12.
7 § 13, 15, 16, 17.
8 § 18.
9 Cf. Frohb., ad loc.
of meeting the taunt that he was too young to speak as he had in public matters, § 20, 21. "I fancy I was rather more ambitious than I should have been, but then my ancestors have always been statesmen, and also I knew that you, to tell the truth, have little opinion of men that take no part in public affairs." A man that did things out of the ordinary run could not but incur malicious dislike, and that such existed in this case is indicated by the expressions used in § 1 τοῦ ἀδίκως διαβεβλημένως, § 2 εἰ τις πρός με τυγχάνει ἄριστος διακείμενος, § 3 παρὰ τὴν δόξαν κτέ., § 11 περὶ ἐμοῦ λογοποιοῦντας καὶ φευδομένους. Cf. § 18 ff. He is, however, plainly indifferent to slander and gossip—it cannot affect him—but there is occasionally an irony entirely devoid of malice or bitterness, and this is but another evidence of his self-confidence, for he would not dare to direct his shafts against others, if he thought his own position open to assault. The expression εὐγνήθεις, "good-natured," in § 6 is an euphemism ironically used for "silly." The periphrasis τοῦ σεμνοῦ Στεφρίδος in § 15 is an ironical reference to Thrasybulus. A quiet irony is apparent in § 16: "Everybody was alarmed—as was natural, for it was hard when barely rescued from one danger to be obliged to incur another almost immediately." In § 18, if we accept Hamaker's clever conjecture of κομά for τολμᾶ, we have a case of slight irony: "That a man wears his hair long like the knights is no cause for hating him."¹

This frank self-consciousness of worth is never marked with boastfulness or undue boldness, although Mantitheus is bolder than any other character in Lysias. His behavior is the outcome of the natural pride of a brave man in duty well done. Far different is he therefore, from the miles gloriösus that the words of Dobree would lead us to expect.² His character is indeed decidedly different in quality from that of the hero of Plautus' famous play, for Pyrgopolynices was a vulgar, braggart soldier, with all the vices of a man risen from the ranks, while Mantitheus was the honorable Athenian gentleman rejoicing in time of war to serve his country in her armies, in time of peace in her senate or assembly. One was a low born mercenary, the other the high bred patriot. There are in this character therefore, as Blass observes,³ not a few resemblances to the

¹ Cf. Blass, 520, note 6.
² Cf. Adversaria, I. 192, and Blass, 520, note 5.
³ P. 521.
The Patriotic Man.

knights of Aristophanes’ play. But if Mantitheus, Athenian of the highest type though he was, had been as like Alcibiades as the German critic finds him, would he not be known to us otherwise than through the superscription of a private oration of Lysias? Alcibiades himself, and his son, are the objects of the charges brought in Or. 14 and 15, but the attack is so virulent and cast in such rhetorical language that delicate ethos and grace are banished.

In harmony with the thought, the language of this speech is quite simple and unadorned. Several expressions occur that are a little removed from common parlance; can we be surprised at them in the mouth of Mantitheus, a man of high breeding and cultured associations? Among these note in § 11 λογοσοιούντας, in § 15 the half-ironical ἐτέρων ἀνδρομένων, and in the same section τῆς ἱμετέρας φυλῆς δυστυχησάσης, and cf. the animated expressions in § 15–17. The rhetorical figures of thought are absent, the ornamental figures are rare and of the most common kind. Instances are ἐπαναφορά πολλοὺς μέν - - πολλοὺς δέ, § 8; ἀμα μέν - - ἀμα δέ, § 21; συμενοδοχε in use of plural of abstracts, e. g., περὶ κύβοις ἢ πότους ἢ ἐτέρας τοιαύτας ἀκολασίας τυγχάνουσι τὰς διατριβὰς ποιούμενοι, § 11. There are too a few pairs, e. g., χρηστοὺς δύτας καὶ προβούμους, § 14, πράττειν καὶ λέγειν, § 21.

In invention and construction this speech is brief and direct, and its synthesis is thoroughly simple. Hiatus is avoided, the average being 1 case in 14.8 Teubner lines against a general average of 1 in 7 lines in the forensic speeches of Lysias. This enabled the speaker in his delivery to be rapid and smooth, and it was probably this effect that was desired, as it would contribute to his earnest straightforwardness. In periodic structure great simplicity is evinced in the free and easy sentences, which exhibit periodic combination in but 3 cases in a total of 24 rhythmically arranged periods. In the narrative, which prevails in this speech, there is the usual historical period, now with terse brevity and again with massed effect. The order of words in the sentence is natural and emphatic, and therefore not ornamental. Of antithesis and balance there is no more use than we should expect in Greek, and the homoioteleuta, in § 6 ἐνεισὶν - - - εἰςίν, and in § 18 σκοπεῖν - - - μοσεῖν,

1 Other influences, unconnected with ethos, may have been at work however.
2 Cf. § 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 12–15, 17–21; and see Berbig, p. xii.
3 Cf. § 14.
Ethopoiia.

seem to be unintentional. We may, perhaps, recognize some ornamentation in § 13 in the closing of two balanced clauses with the synonyms νομιζοντας and ἡγομένων, and the opening sentence of § 19 has a gnomic form.

A good citizen like Mantitheus is the speaker of Or. 17. Voluntarily he surrenders to the state a large proportion of what is due to him, § 6, and displays, especially in the latter part of the speech, a disinterestedness that makes it impossible to deny him the trifle he asks for. His character, as exhibited in his speech, is not only patriotic, but also simple and direct. This is shown by the brevity; for proem, narrative, argument and epilogue are reduced to their smallest limits, the points at issue being dismissed with a few short statements and with such expressions as ῥαδίως - - - εὑρήσειν, § 1; ῥάδιον εἰδέναι (γνώναι), § 4, 7; ἐγνωστόν, § 4 bis. The narrative is direct, in finite verbs, e. g. § 2. The language is simple and unadorned by figures or rare words, except εὔγνωστον. That rounding is apparent in the synthesis which is required for succinctness and compactness, but the sentences are free and running, and hiatus is not avoided, as there is but 1 case in each 2.5 lines.

More like Mantitheus, though, is the speaker of Or. 21, for he shares with him a conscious pride, as well as patriotism and a certain simplicity. Far beyond the demands of the laws has he performed a citizen’s duties, spending large sums upon the state, though limiting his private expenditures, and bravely has he staked his life for his country, without indulging in regrets for wife and children at home. For is not death and bereavement better than the disgrace of being saved like a coward? Proudly thus he recounts his meritorious actions, pointing his statements with suitable maxims, and showing in all that above all he prizes honor, and that he deserves well of his country, in return for his benefactions and services, which, it should be noted, he does not disdain to point out to his judges. Yet, although a prominent and wealthy citizen, he does not display any forwardness like Mantitheus, and he sets up no superior claims for his political insight like the speaker of Or. 25, but only bases his demands upon duty well done. His pride in the performance of his duties is apparent therefore in his statements; and the form in

---

1 Cf. Blass, 618, note 2.
2 § 16 f.
3 § 23 f.
4 §§ 5, 6, 11, 15, 16.
which his frank thought is expressed is simple and direct. The language, which is plain on the whole, gives a hint that we should look to. There are 6 cases of the figura etymologica, while in Or. 16 it occurs not at all. This is 1 case in each 1.2 pages, although the Lysianic norm is 1 case in each 2.5 pages. Now this figure is a mark of common, vulgar speech; is it therefore too fanciful to infer that Lysias, with his delicate pencilling, is delineating a rich plebeian, and one too like the νεόπλουτος, fonder of effect than the aristocratic, yet simple Mantitheus? For take into consideration the conscious pride before mentioned, and notice a rather ornate sentence structure, with antitheses not infrequently pointed with homoio teleuta, e. g. § 16 ὃστ' ἵδια μὲν τῶν ὡν ἄντων' φείδομαι, δημοσία δὲ λευτουργόν ἔδομαι. Cf. also § 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 bis, and especially § 17, 18, 19 bis, 24. Note too the ἐραναφορά, § 8 πόσα, ἡ πόσα, ἡ πόσα, § 18 ὃς, ἡ ὃς, ἡ ὃς, § 25 ἀνάξια μὲν, ἀνάξια δὲ. It might also be observed that there is another mark of popular speech, in addition to fig. etym., in the failure to avoid the repetition of ἀνήλωσα in § 1–5. In one form or another there are 9 cases of this word, and 5 of ἐνίκησα, in 25 lines. The recurrence, to be sure, is more or less inevitable.

Patriots of a different stamp we meet in Or. 19. The father has served his country nobly ὁ φιλοτιμίας ἐνεκα, ἄλλα τεκμήριον ποιούμενος, κτέ, φιλοτιμία here meaning "ambition." Like the speaker of Or. 21, he spent more money on the State than on his family, and was unfailing and constant in all his duties as a citizen, helping friends and needy Athenians, but without attracting public attention to his good deeds, and winning honor for himself and the state by his successes in the Nemean and Isthmian games. Disinterested in money matters he saw that the marriages in his family were made only with a view to the merits of the suitors. Furthermore he concerned himself with his own affairs alone, and was very different in his steady, old-fashioned ways, from the ambitious, venturesome Aristophanes of this same speech, who, like so many men

---

1 In accordance with the count of E. R. Schulze, De fig. etym. ap. Or. Attic. usu, in Comment. phil. in hon. Ribbeck, including only the genuine private orations. Cf. pp. 25, 32, 34, of this dissertation.
2 § 56. 3 § 9, 56, 57, 59, 62, 63. 4 § 18, 59. Cf. Or. 16 § 14.
5 § 63. 6 12–17. 7 § 18 τὰ ταυτοὶ πράττειν.
in those stirring times, was launching forth from the quiet shores of Attica and seeking glory for self and fatherland in all the regions of Hellas and parts adjacent.\(^1\) Poor yet, like his richer father-in-law, generous, money was no motive with him, but ambition and the pure love of adventure. A devoted citizen he served the state in many ways,\(^2\) as his father did before him. Hence, we have in these two characters, as Professor Jebb points out,\(^3\) the steady Athenian of the old type, and the adventurous patriot of the new school.

The son, who makes the speech, is of the same type as his father, clinging steadfastly to the good old ways. This is shown in a very subtle way by his adherence to the old fashioned \(\tau\varepsilon - - \tau\varepsilon\), for \(\kappa\alpha\iota - - - \kappa\alpha\iota\).\(^4\) His youth—he is thirty years old\(^5\)—and consequent inexperience, are emphasized throughout his speech, by a display of modesty, a lack of clear logic, and by occasional forcible expressions. Modesty is apparent in his saying little of himself, in his filial behavior in not answering his father back, in avoidance of public life,\(^6\) in his respectful and timid demeanor towards the judges,\(^7\) omission of usual attacks on opponent, and in the use of modest formulae, and in repetition of the same formula, \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\) \(\delta\nu\nu\omega\nu\mu\alpha\).\(^8\) His youth—he is thirty years old\(^5\)—and consequent inexperience, are emphasized throughout his speech, by a display of modesty, a lack of clear logic, and by occasional forcible expressions. Modesty is apparent in his saying little of himself, in his filial behavior in not answering his father back, in avoidance of public life,\(^6\) in his respectful and timid demeanor towards the judges,\(^7\) omission of usual attacks on opponent, and in the use of modest formulae, and in repetition of the same formula, \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\) \(\delta\nu\nu\omega\nu\mu\alpha\).\(^8\) These expressions modify commonplace sentiments\(^9\) as well as facts, \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\), the two instances in \(\S\ 5\). The modesty, perhaps, is a little overdrawn, \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\) \(\S\ 55, 62\), but the serious nature of the case seems to have demanded it. As to his inexperience and simplicity, marks of them are such expressions as \(\rho\alpha\delta\iota\iota\nu\) \(\gamma\nu\omega\nu\alpha\iota\), \(\S\ 1\), 18, 24, 27, 53. \(\S\ 4, 5, 11, 16, 48, 50, 52\). The lack of sharp, logical reasoning is specially apparent in \(\S\ 34-44, 48, 52, 63\), although as a whole the argumentation and invention are clever and effective.\(^9\) Plain and unadorned as the language is,—suiting

\(^1\) Cf. Blass, 530 f., 538. \(^2\) Cf. 18-23, 29, 34-44. \(^3\) Jebb, Attic Or. 175, 240. \\
\(^4\) \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\), \(\gamma\alpha\nu\o\iota\omega\nu\omega\nu\mu\alpha\).\(^3\) 13, 3 clauses united by \(\tau\varepsilon\) used thrice; \(\varepsilon\gamma\iota\omega\), 2 clauses. \(\Cf.\) Jebb, 169, note. \\
\(^5\) \(\S\ 55.\) \(^6\) Ibid. \\
\(^7\) Ibid. \(^8\) To evince a knowledge of popular wisdom befits a speaker who would disclaim all practical and personal experience in such things. \(\Cf.\) \(\S\ 5, 53, 59, 61,\) and Blass, 539, with note 4. \\
the modesty of the speaker—yet in pathetic passages it does not fail to show traces of that force that young men display under such circumstances, e. g. § 11, 34, 49, 53, 54. As an instance note especially § 34, 54, πρὸς θεῶν Ὀλυμπιῶν, forms of swearing being very uncommon in Lysias.\(^1\) To accord with the language and thought the synthesis is plain, with rare continuous rhythmic effects, with few antitheses and homoioteleuta, with frequent hiatus.\(^2\)

We have now learned that the father and son of this oration, though like Mantitheus and Aristophanes in pride in duty well done, are unlike them in their retiring dispositions,—a trait the son has carried to the point of extreme modesty. This same retiring disposition,\(^3\) coupled with pride in magnificent services to the state,\(^4\) is found again in the speaker of Or. 7. He displays a certain confidence in himself in that he is not afraid to come before the court and to allow it to treat him as it will, while his foes are cowards who did not have the courage to bring the charge against him in person, but suborned a miserable sycophant to take their place.\(^5\) He is not without a sense of humor, for he suggests that this sycophant, Nicomachus, was prompted by patriotism,\(^6\) and even asks the court if it has not the same opinion.\(^7\) The speaker is a citizen of some wealth,\(^8\) but is probably of humble antecedents, or at least not a man of high culture. For note the 5 instances of figura etymologica, an average of 1 case in 1.6 pages, especially the 4 instances in 4 sections, § 38—41.\(^9\) The language too, in harmony with the simple thought and his retiring disposition, is unadorned with rhetoric, and yet vigorous when vigor is called for; e. g. § 1, 12. In § 1 indeed, the naive hyperbole is another characteristic, like the fig. etym., of popular speech,\(^10\) and the prolixity noted by Francken\(^11\) in § 5, 6—8, 11, 17, cf. § 12, 21, may well be considered as contributing to the same effect.\(^12\) Moreover, the technical language

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. Rehdantz, Demosth. Neun Philipp. Reden, Index II. s. v. Schwurformeln, and references there cited.

\(^{2}\) 1 case in 2.3 lines.

\(^{3}\) Or. 7, § 1 ἡσυχίαν ἀγαντί, i. e., ἀπράψιον.

\(^{4}\) Cf. § 31, 41.\(^5\) Cf. § 39, 40; cf. § 20.\(^6\) § 20 εἰ δὲ τὴν πόλεως ἑνεκα ἐπάτητες.

\(^{7}\) § 38.\(^8\) Cf. § 21, 31.\(^9\) Cf. pp. 23, 32, 34, of this dissertation.


\(^{11}\) Commentt. Lys. 53, 54. But Blass, 595, ad fin., thinks this apparent prolixity essential to the evidence.

\(^{12}\) Cf. p. 32 f.
about olives and olive stumps gives the individual color of a man familiar with farming. Finally, in synthesis Or. 7 is perfectly natural and plain.

With these patriotic Athenians we may compare the senator of Or. 31, in that he comes forward against Philon only from a strict sense of duty, and is not prompted by any personal reasons. Without adverting in any way to his own character, as was fitting in a man prosecuting a public suit, he betrays a severe though dispassionate sense of justice. And in proof of this read his dissection of Philon’s career, § 8 ff.; it is searching, but thoroughly fair, and supported by ample evidence. As becomes the importance of the case he speaks with force, and employs a full measure of senatorial ornament and rhetoric, so that there is more of this than is usual in Lysias. But such language was demanded by the dignity of the body before whom the speech was made, and the rank of the speaker, which required an approximation to the γένος συμβούλευτικῶν. So it is an index of the character of the speaker, whom it brings before our eyes in all his senatorial stateliness. His force appears in the thought of such phrases as διὰ τὸ μῆ γὰρ τὴν πόλιν κτέ. § 6, the first sentence of § 14, and § 21, 22; and in the frequent use of the rhetorical figures of thought in argument, e. g., αὔξησις, (exaggersatio), elsewhere rarely used by Lysias, in § 8 ἀπαεὶ τοὺς ἄλλοις, § 34 καυνά. The last instance is also a case of indignatio, as is § 11 δοσι — — — ἄξοι ἔσον. In § 10 καίτοι — — — ἔποίησεν ἄν, § 23 ὅσι — — — πουήσεων, and § 28, we find the argument in form of the conclusio α minori ad maius. Further, note in § 3 οὐκ ἀπὸ ἔσης κτέ, hyperbole, § 8 ἢς — — — μέμνημαι, praemunitio, § 20 οἶα — — — παρήσαυ, aposiopesis, § 24 f., hypophora, § 27 ἀκοῦω δ’ αὐτὸν λέγειν, procatalepsis. This formidable array of figures is a mark also of σεμώνης, which is further enhanced by the language. Observe the periphrases, § 4 τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν κακίαν, uncommon for τ. αὐτοῦ κ.,

1 Francken, 5, designates him an agricola, on the basis of § 18, τοῦς γείτονας, i. e., “ruri habitat”! He may also have in mind § 11, αὐτὸς γεωργ. Not sufficient evidence. He was rather a landed proprietor.

2 Of. § 1, 2, 5, 6.

3 Hence some have adjudged the speech spurious. But cf. Blass, 485, Frohberger, Einl. z. Or. 31, § 5.

4 Cf. Ibid. § 4, with note 22.

5 Cf. Frohberger, ad loc.

6 Cf. Frohberger, ad loc.

7 Of. Ibid.
The Patriotic Man.

§ 7 ἀκινδύνως τὸν βίον διάγειν, § 26 προδύωκε τὴν ἐλευθερίαν, equivalent to καταδουλοῦν. Also in § 2 ἵδιαν ἐχθραν οὐδεμίαν μεταπορεύόμενος, the last word, which does not occur elsewhere in classic Greek, seems to be used to produce fulness, instead of the more usual μετερχόμενος or μετιών. Indeed the whole oration seems weighted down with heavy forms, especially passive aorists, e. g., § 3 ὅφεληθήναι, ἀποδόκιμασθήναι, § 9 κατεργασμένοις, συγκατεθείν, κατεργασάμενος, cf. § 1 δοκιμασθησόμενοι, § 19, 20, 26, 27, etc. Rare words also, or unusual in the orators, are § 7 ἀκινδύνως, § 10 ὀνόματημα, § 12 ταλαιπωρεῖν, § 19 ἀδύναμαί (not rare in Plato) and ὑπερμακάσατε, § 24 τουγάρτοι, § 25 ἀμνημονεύν. Unusual phrases are § 15 λειτουργεῖν τοῖς σῶμασι, § 31 ἀπόρρητα τυρησαί. Marks of higher style are: § 11 καθέστηκεν ὧν ἔστι, § 24 ταῖς χάριτας, plural of abstract, such old-fashioned uses as § 2 τέ solitium, § 19 τέ - - - τέ, and the extraordinary proportion of articular infinitives in this oration. τέως μὲν τοι in § 8, has an archaic color in an orator. There is a tendency towards sententiousness in this oration, and even towards a sophistic ring, that is very apparent in the synthesis. The structure of the sentences is artistic and the order of words is not always natural, e. g. displacement of εἶναι, § 5, after ἡγεῖσθαι; it belongs to ἀναγκαίον σφίσιν αὐτοῖς. Not to speak of ordinary cases of antitheses, we have them here ornamented with homoioteleuta and balance, 7 cases, in § 2, 9, 12, 17, 19, 25, 31, with chiasm, e. g. § 2, and with paronomasia and assonance to an unusual degree, viz. in § 9, 11, 17, 18, 24, 26, 30, 31, 32. Such a double case as § 9 ἐπὶ κατεργασμένοις μάλλον ἐλθεῖν βοηλόμενος ἢ συγκατεθείν κατεργασάμενο κτέ., should be noted. Sometimes there is an antithesis of form even when there is none in the thought, e. g. § 11 ὅσοι δὲ γνώμη τούτῳ ἐπραξαν, οὐδεμῖς συγγρώμης ἄξιοι εἰσίν. And thus from every point of view this speech shows the rhetorical color of the senate-house.

1 Cf. Frohb. on § 2. 2 For all these cf. Berbig, xiii.
4 Cf. Frohb. on § 8. 5 Cf. § 5, 6, 10, 11, 24, 25. 6 § 3 f., 31.
7 There are 35 periodic sentences, 7 of them in combination. Cf. Berbig, xii., and Blass, 484, note 2.
The speaker of Or. 26 is a marked contrast to the dispassionate senator of Or. 31. Devoid of statesmanship or patriotism, he is a party man, bitter out of the fulness of his hatred, and prosecuting the case in the most scathing terms. Hence, bold expressions, apostrophes, sentences now in great streams, and again, terse and curt like Demosthenes. But yet more unlike the senator is Philon, his opponent. This Acharnian is a selfish nobody that consults only his own interests, sacrificing family or state, as the case may be. In his heartlessness he has a counterpart in Diogeiton of Or. 32, that Diogeiton who, in a few cruel words, turned loose to shift for themselves the boys that were at once his grandchildren, his nephews and his wards, having made away with the inheritance left them by their father, his brother, and regarding all as of less value than money.

But the most marked contrast with Mantitheus, the speaker of Or. 21, and the other patriots whose characters we have studied, is the politician of Or. 25. He is a “trimmer,” suiting his politics to his interests; a practical “worker” and no theorist. He exhibits considerable confidence in his political wisdom, which has carried him along safely so far. His candor is certainly admirable. His style is not vigorous, yet not without attempts at rhetoric, and his thought is often cast in ample expressions pregnant with nothing, reminding us strongly of the “big talk”, with nothing behind it, of modern ward politicians. To such a character patriotism is entirely alien, and entirely unintelligible as a motive for action.

In these orations, 25, 26, 31, individual traits appear with far less prominence than in those before treated. This is due to the

1 Cf. § 3–5, 9, 23. See Jebb, 245.
2 Cf. § 3 ἐπισθόρα τὰ πράγματα καὶ διακλέπτοντα κτλ., § 4 δεμυηπτότερα, § 6 ἀθροί, § 9 ἐλαβήςαντο, § 17 βάδανον, § 21 μισοθείμαν. Cf. also § 16, 21, and see Blass, 480, note 2.
3 § 1, 20.
4 E. g. § 12 ff.
5 § 17. There are in all 22 periodic sentences, with 4 of them in combined relation to each other.

6 Cf. § 16, and see Blass, 481, with note 2.
8 Cf. Or. 32 § 9.
9 Cf. § 4, 5, 12, 13.
10 Cf. § 7, 8.
11 § 17; cf. § 25.
12 Cf. § 8, 10.
13 Cf. § 11 ff.
14 Cf. § 11 ff.
15 E. g. § 18, parallelism.
16 Cf. § 5, 18, 34, and Blass, 516, with note 3.
public character of the cases, which made a display of ethos on the part of the speaker inappropriate. It would be yet more out of place in Or. 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, as the speakers in these are public prosecutors pleading the state's case.

Patriotism we have seen to be one of the leading traits of Lysias' characters; no less frequent is simplicity, which was as equally effectual as a means of persuasion, when it was delineated in men of humble position or inexperience.

Euphiletus, the injured husband of Or. 1, is the leading exponent of this trait, and he is, as Mr. Jebb says, "the subject of an indirect portrait in which homeliness is combined with the moral dignity of a citizen standing upon his rights."

He was in very moderate circumstances, as appears from his own statement in § 4, from the simple appointments of his humble household, and from his apparent employment in some field labor. He had at this time one child, still a mere infant. Despite his low degree Euphiletus rises to heights of which the high born defendant of Or. 3 is incapable. And this moral elevation and dignity is shown in his actions throughout. It is especially apparent in his refusal to accept a money compensation for the wrong done him, and by his inflicting upon the offender the full penalty of the law. In the proem he distinctly states that there was no enmity between him and Eratosthenes except that due to the latter's seducing his wife, and that he had not killed him for money, nor for any other gain, except the revenge allowed by the law. He thinks that there is no way that he might not have used with all propriety to catch the man that had seduced his wife, but, nevertheless, he laid no ambush, but waited until he knew the man was in the house, and then looked for those that would help him to arrest the adulterer. Finally, in the simple and earnest words of his closing sentence, he says: "For now both my body, and my property, and all that is mine, is in danger, simply because I obeyed the city's laws." These words, his simple, unsuspicous nature, a
prevailing tone of confidence in a favorable verdict, showing that he feels assured of his good reputation,—all are testimony to his moral dignity. The only blot on this trait is the insinuation of his wife, in § 13, that he had been rather free with the maid once when drunk. But this seems to have been given and taken in jest. Even if it is true, it is not an incident that would offend Greek morality, however inconsistent it may be with modern ethical teaching. Quite in harmony with this moral dignity is the absence of expressions in condemnation of his wife’s conduct, as well as of any show of passion or of very great anger. Furthermore Euphiletus appears to have been kind and considerate to his wife,¹ so that she had no just cause for her conduct, and he was thoughtful and hospitable with his friends. For remembering that his friend Sostratus would get home too late for his supper, he asked him into his own house and saw that he was satisfied.²

The homely simplicity of Euphiletus appears in his plain and direct thought, in his simple and unaffected language reflecting the tone of popular speech, and in the unadorned synthesis of the oration. We will study this simpleness therefore, from these three points of view.

In thought the speech is noticeable for an all pervading tone of modesty that harmonizes with Euphiletus’ simple character. The proem opens with a succession of sentences modestly expressed in the form of ideal conditions. In § 4 he sketches what he believes to be his proper line of defence, and in § 5 he expresses it as his belief that his only course is to recite fully all the facts of the case. In § 35, 47, by the use of μέν solitarium in connection with ἐγγόνο, a modest effect is secured, for he thus expresses his statements as his personal opinion, “I for my part think,” etc., and not as absolute, undoubted facts. The epilogue again, though earnest and forcible, is modest and unpretentious. The direct statement of facts and the unadorned narrative is an element contributing largely to the simple effect of this speech. Note especially the short, para-tactic sentences in § 4, 5. Indeed the whole narrative, § 6–27, is remarkably simple. In § 9, 10 the detailed description of his household arrangements, is quite in accord with the minute explanation

¹ § 6. ² § 22, 23. For a contrast, cf. Lys. Fragm. 75 § 3 ff.
of ordinary facts, that is still so familiar as a tedious feature of the
conversation of persons from the lower walks of life. In § 28, 35, Euphiletus expresses thoughts that are almost affected in their
simplicity, and in § 36 his argument on the evil effects of a con-
demnation is almost comic. The way in which he tells his story
without evasion or omission is noticeable. For instance, in § 12,
13, charmingly simple is his repeating his wife's remark about his
little experience with the maid. Another feature of the simpleness
of the thought is the absence of rhetorical pathos and the other orna-
mental figures of thought. Pity is effected by a far more subtle
tool, the pathos of facts. Yet another feature of the simplicity is
anacolouth in the thought, especially in § 40, where the object clause
is changed unexpectedly to a question. Cf. § 32 f., § 37.1

A special mark of his simple trustfulness, as well as of his moral
dignity, is his unsuspicious nature. He had entire confidence in his
wife, although at first he observed all the customary precautions,
and even his being locked up in his bed-chamber, the unaccustomed
noises at night, and his wife's being adorned with cosmetics at an
unusual time, did not awaken his suspicions. But when he was
once aroused, all of these incidents came home to him with over-
whelming force, and he was filled with suspicion to an extent that
seems to have overcome his simple nature with astonishment.3
Henceforward he kept watch with the utmost caution. When he
wished to learn what had occurred from the maid, he took her out
of the house, that there might be no danger of their being over-
heard.4 He took care that she should keep quiet about the matter,5
and was careful to detect the adulterer in the act, and not to depend
on the evidence of a slave alone.6 When Eratosthenes was in the
house he first told the servant to guard the door, and then very
quietly went after his neighbors.7

Like the thought the language is throughout plain and unadorned,
and is specially indicative of the position of Euphiletus in that it is
frequently colored with expressions drawn from popular and con-
versational speech. This feature is evident first in the use of certain
words and phrases. Note the following: § 6 the familiar tone of
the phrase μήτε λιων ἐπ’ ἐκείνη εἶναι ὧτι ἂν θέλῃ ποιεῖν. λιων is

1 Cf. Blass, 577, note 3. 2 § 6. 3 § 17.
4 § 18. 5 § 21. 6 § 21, 23 ff. 7 § 23.
rare except in Euripides, and gives a special color, I think, wherever it occurs; ἔττ' ἔκεισθι εἶναι, smacks of popular language; as opposed to ἔθελω occurs, outside of tragedy, mainly in old and familiar phrases. It may, however, be due to poor MSS., a fact that only too often hampers the interpreter of Lysias. § 9 the rare diminutive οἰκίδιον used endearingly and familiarly. § 10 the rapid change of subjects in the words ἢνα τὸν τυτθῶν αὐτῷ διδῶ καὶ μὴ βοᾷ. § 17 τε postscript, an old Attic usage not common in prose literature, but still lingering perhaps in that natural home of archaic expressions, the language of the common people. § 21 the conversational use of ὅπως with the future indicative, imperatively. Also § 23 the phrase καλῶς αὐτῷ ἐίχεν, repeated in § 39, and equivalent to the polite expression in English, "Thanks, no more," at table. Such expressions and short cuts as ὅς τὸν καὶ τὸν in § 23, and τὸν δεῖνα in § 41, are also conversational. Similarly the ellipsis of κατέφυγεν with πῶς ὑπὸ ἄν in § 27. A very important element of popular speech is to be observed in the play upon words, i. e., figura ἐγγελογικα in § 26, 30, 44 bis, 45, 48, and paronomasia in § 29, 33, 34, 35, 37–8, 45, 47. Akin to these in nature and effect is the use of tautologous and repeated expressions. As an instance of repetition note how in § 4, 25, 38, 40, Euphiletus repeats the phrase, in one form or another, εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τὴν ἐμὴν εἰσιῶν. He seems to dwell on this idea, feeling that his house was his castle, and that the infringement of his household rights was, after all, Eratosthenes' great offence. Other examples of repetition are ἄπαυτα § 5, ἥκον εἰς ἀγροῦ § 11, 13, πάντα μον εἰς τὴν γρήμην κτέ., § 17, πάντα ἀκριβῶς § 19, 20; compare also § 22, 23, narrative, with § 39–41, argument, and § 25 with § 29. Tautology is noticeable in § 5, where the expression ὀδην παραλείπων, κτέ., is unnecessary ex-

1 Cf. p. 37 of this dissertation.


3 Quite wrong Morawski, in article above quoted, in supposing that ὀμάτιον in § 17, 24, 27, is synonymous with οἰκίδιον. It refers, of course, to one of the apartments of the house, not to the house itself.

4 Remarkable slip, that of Berbig's, p. xiii, where he notes ἐφιλάπτος of § 16 as a rare word!

5 Cf. pp. 23, 25, 34 of this dissertation.

6 The repetition of this clause, regarded as spurious by some, is defended by Frohberger as an example of familiar verbiage.
cept for emphasis. Note also § 14 οὐδὲν εἰπτών and σιωπή, ἐξελθὼν, and ἔξω, § 22 οὐκαδε ὡς ἐμέ. In § 26 the words spoken by Euphiletus to Eratosthenes are noticeable for their verbiage, and the excitement marked by their rhythmic flow, for ἀμάρτημα ἐξαμαρτάνειν εἰς τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἐμήν form an iambic octonarius acatalectic, provided you overlook the second foot. A special feature of the tautology of this speech is the unusually frequent repetition of ἐγώ, quite without special emphasis. This too is a well-known characteristic of the simple speech of the lower classes. ἐγώ is found 31 times in this speech, a contrast with 24 in Or. 3, 6 in Or. 16, and 8 in Or. 24.

There are also a number of animated expressions in this speech that are quite in harmony with the seriousness of the subject, and with the character of popular language,—which is sometimes only too forcible and drastic. As examples, note § 14 ὁμοίος ὁ οὐδὲν οὖτος οὐδὲν εἰπτών, § 17 πάντα μοι εἰς τὴν γυνώμην εἰχείς καὶ μεστὸς ἦν ύποψίας, § 45 παροιμία, a rare compound, § 26 οὐκ ἐγώ σε ἀποκτενώ, ἀλλ' ὁ τῆς πόλεως νόμος, § 35 παρὰ τούτους (τοῦς νόμους) ἐλθόντες, and § 49 ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων τοὺς πολίτας ἐνεδρεύεσθαι. In § 36 the expression τοὺς νόμους τῆς μοιχείας χαίρειν ἐὰν δεῖ is animated. In § 44 the polysyndeton with οὕτε gives weight to the statements. In § 47 there is one of those metaphors so dear to the people, “seeing what prizes are offered as rewards of their valor in wrong doing.” The rhetorical adornment of figures is absent, for they are inconsistent with the simplicity of Euphiletus.

In synthesis the same simplicity is apparent as in the thought and language. Hiatus is scarcely avoided, for the average is 1 case in 3.9 lines. In its periodic structure the oration is simple, and the ratio of combined periods to the whole is 8:38; among these there are many loose periods and numerous δίκωλοι.1 Balanced clauses and homoioiteleuta are accordingly hardly noticeable. Cases occur in § 6, 34, 48. Finally the order of words is natural and often emphatic, although in the proem and epilogue, the ornament proper to the opening and close of a speech is to be found, as usual.

The marks of a simple nature found in Euphiletus we have also noted in the speakers of Or. 7, 16, 19, 21. The same trait, united

---

1 Cf. Berbig, xii., with note.
with pathos and vigor, is observable also in Dionysus, the plaintiff of Or. 13, whose other traits are kept in the background, for the speech is of a political character. But it is Or. 32 that presents most points of resemblance with Or. 1. There is the same variety of characters, the same homely, almost naive, simpleness, the same detailed description of family affairs, as there is of the household arrangements in Or. 1, and finally a similar use of the language of the people. Along with his simplicity the speaker betrays a tender feeling of sympathy for the widow and fatherless children, that in turn wins our sympathy, and which probably lead them to put their cause in his hands. Note also his desire to shield the family troubles from public curiosity. His feeling passes into bitterness when he contemplates the cruel behavior of Diogeiton towards his daughter and grandchildren, who were at the same time his wards. This bitterness is enhanced at times by the suspense of long sustained periods, e. g. § 2, 3, 18, by a somewhat tense periodic structure in parts of the argument, and by antitheses occasionally intensified by paronomasia, e. g. § 22, γράμματα, χρημάτων, and by homoioteleuta, e. g. § 19, 22, 25, 29. The synthesis and language are however, plain and natural as a whole, though not without force.

The Clever Man.

We now approach a character of different type, the clever man, of whom the Cripple of Or. 24 is the chief exponent. He is of low position, for he keeps a small shop near the market-place, much frequented by men of unprincipled character, and by his antagonist claims,—and he does not deny it,—by the droll and sarcastic wit of its owner.

1 Note, for instance, the mention of the gods and their justice, § 1, 3, 4, 92, 97.
2 Cf. § 11, first sentence.
3 Cf. Or. 1 § 6 ff., and Or. 32 § 4 ff.
4 Note, for instance, old-fashioned τέ solitium, § 1, 22. Cf. Or. 1 § 17; the repetition of ὁμοπάραμος in § 4, 5, cf. p. 32; the popular tone of οἶνον ποτὲ ψυχήν ἔχων, probably the original words repeated, in § 12.
5 Cf. § 11, 18, and the sympathy and indignation of the words, τὴν ἐαυτοῦ θυγατέρα, ἤπειρ ἵν αὐτῇ μόνα, § 4, "his own, his only daughter."
6 Cf. § 1, 2, 10, 11.
7 § 2 μηδένα τῶν ἄλλων εἰδέναι.
8 Note the irony of the proem, cf. § 22, 23, 25, and the bitterness, e. g. of § 3, 19, 21, 24.
9 § 19, 20.
Poor he is and needy, for his father left him nothing, the support of his mother had devolved upon him, and his business brings but scant returns, so that he is obliged to depend on the pension that the state grants to all whose yearly income is less than three minae (about $50.00). Furthermore, he is well along in years, and of a weak bodily constitution, so that he is scarcely able to attend to the duties of his business, and has to borrow a horse for a journey of any length, and requires the support of two canes.

The salient feature of the Cripple's character is cleverness, which made him appear sagacious, and tended to win the confidence of the audience in a man who could hardly lay claim to positive virtues meriting good-will. He is clever in his arguments, using them so as to turn attention away from the weak points of his case—for we cannot feel that he is altogether worthy or needy. He fortifies his statements with sarcastic remarks that counteract the damaging testimony of his accuser. His cleverness is also evident in a certain witty drollness of humor, that appears in unexpected turns of expression, in a mock pathos, and in an affected imitation of the language and style of men of superior culture and position, with whom the Cripple had come into contact. This last fact is illustrated in a very subtle way, by the use of a somewhat ornamental and elevated style, that cannot but sound ridiculous in the mouth of a man of such humble position. In fact there is throughout a marked contrast of fine language and elevated form, with the trifling importance of the subject, and the insignificance of the interests at stake. The Cripple was probably one of those original characters that frequent the public places of a city, especially after the social upturning of a revolution, and was doubtlessly well known to the senators, who would not be likely to refuse a mere pittance of an obol a day, to a man who was on the whole harmless, and afforded them amusement in their leisure hours. Lysias saw the humor of the situation, and wrote for his client the speech which has come down to us, and which is so unique in literature that modern, as well as ancient critics, would have it that it is not genuine. An opinion that Blass does not support.

---

1 § 6.  
2 § 16.  
3 § 6.  
4 § 10.  
5 § 11.  
7 Cf. § 25.
We shall now see that in thought, language and synthesis, this speech fulfils the conditions required to produce cleverness and sarcasm and humor, to which, in this case, mock pathos and ornamental language contribute. Cleverness appears particularly in the argument, whose all-pervading note is sarcastic irony. § 1–3 are extremely caustic, closing with a rhetorical question, whose effect is heightened by *homoioiteuta*, and by the use of the future indicative with *ei* in the protasis, a form of condition commonly employed in threatening or disagreeable relations. In § 9 the allusion to an exchange of properties is the means of a triumphant proof that he is crippled financially, and its sarcastic humor is enhanced by the emphatic position of the words, and by the rhythmic flow of the clause that marks the climax: *ei γὰρ ἐγὼ | κατασταθεὶς χορηγὸς τραγῳδοῖς*. Note also the sting involved in the *hyperbole*, *σαφέστατα μόνος ἀνθρώπων*. In § 12, by a clever *reductio ad absurdum*, the speaker proves the weakness of the argument that he is not crippled physically, and the references to the two Athenian customs regarding heiresses and the archonship in § 13, 14, are full of sarcasm and humor. Note the emphatic order of the words throughout the two sections, and the sting of the *hyperbole* in § 13, *τῶν ἀπαντῶν ἀνθρώπων*. The attack on his character he cleverly rebuts by arguing, in § 15–18, that his accuser cannot possibly make such statements in earnest, but is jesting. In § 19, 20 we have the neatest piece of argumentation in the speech; it is his means of parrying the insinuations as to the character of his shop. *συμπλοκή* is the name of this form of argument, which is recommended by the rhetoricians, who likewise praise the figure, *procatalepsis*, which is to be found in § 24, 25. By a series of rhetorical questions and their answers, introduced by *πότερον ὅτι* and continued by *ἀλλὰ ὅτι* in the questions, and by *ἀλλὰ οὔ* in the answers, the cripple in a few terse sentences effectually disposes of all the arguments that he can imagine will be brought against him. Another mark of the speaker’s sarcastic cleverness is his repetition and parodying of the words of his opponent, *e. g.* § 5 τὴν ἐκ τῆς τέχνης εὐπορίαν, § 10 περὶ τῆς

¹The full-toned form *κατασταθείς* is safely read only here in Lysias. *Cf. Frohberger, ad loc.* It seems to have been employed in this place for rhythmic effect. *Cf. Or. 21.1, καταστάς κτέ.*
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Note how he harps on λίαν in § 15, 16, 25. This rather rare adverb undoubtedly heightens the sarcasm, and the very rare πραόνως in § 15, if it is the correct reading, probably has the same effect. The fifteenth section is in fact the crown of this sarcastic par抱怨 of terms and the proof of its ironical intention. In § 18 note the gibe at his accuser in the words ὀσπερ τί καλὸν ποιῶν. Also in § 21 τί δεὶ περὶ τῶν ὀμοίως τοῦτο φαύλων σπουδάζειν, where a play is made upon the double meaning of φαύλος, "insignificant" and "morally worthless." Finally the very last words of the speech, i. e. § 27, are a fling at his opponent.

Furthermore, in the construction of the speech signs are not wanting of the way in which the delivery made the arguments effective to an unusual degree. Note for instance the effect produced in § 1 by a pause after ἤ and before φθόνον, used παρ' ὑπόνοιαν for ψόγον, or some such word. Then see how he dwells on φθόνος in the following sections, and observe the emphatic position of ὦτος towards the end of § 1, the order of the words in the first sentence of § 9, the hyperbaton of ἔγω at the close of the first sentence of § 13, the hyperbaton of ᾧμῶν in § 21, 27. These are only instances of a number of cases. In § 6 pauses at the proper places would produce a striking effect.

For observe:

ἔμοι γὰρ ὃ μὲν πατὴρ κατέλυσεν - - - ὦτέν
τὴν δὲ μητέρα τελευτήσασαν - - - πέπαιναι τρέφων κτέ.
παῖδες δὲ μοι - - - ὦτω εἰσίν κτέ.
τέχνην δὲ κέκτημαι - - - βραχέα κτέ.
τὸν διαδεξόμενον δ' αὐτὴν - - ὦτω κτέ.
πρόσωπος δὲ μοι - - - οὐκ ἔστω

In the last and the third before the last of these cases the hiatus distinctly points to such a pause as I have indicated.

The wit and humor of the Cripple admits a more exact division under the three heads of thought, language and synthesis. As for the thought, there is a real wit that must have appealed to an Athenian audience, in many of the allusions already mentioned under cleverness. Note particularly § 9, 12, 13, 14. Humor is also apparent in the unexpected substitution of ἕθονος for ψόγον in § 1, before noted, and in § 6 the play of thought is very amusing, as there is a mock pathos contrasting with the insignificance of the subject. The climax is reached at the end of the section with the words ὑπὸ τῇ δυναμενῶν τύχῃ, as this personification of Τύχη by the use of ὑπὸ heightens the pathos. Note also the change from the anticipatory form of condition in the protasis to the ideal in the apodosis. Other examples of this mock pathos may be found in § 7, 10, 22. In § 4, 5 note the play upon δύναμις, and the position of δύναμένων before rather than after ἄνθρωποισ, where it naturally belongs. The contrast of serious thought and insignificant subject is brought out at the end of § 7, where the Cripple hints at danger that may ensue to the State if he is not treated justly. The same effect is produced by the use of commonplaces, e. g. in § 3, 10, 15–18, and of serious conventional phrases, e. g. in § 21, and of question and answer in § 23–25. In § 25 very amusing it is to hear the poor and infirm Cripple defending his humble self from the charge—imaginary in his case—so often brought in those days against men of power and position, namely, that he had taken part in the cruelties of the tyrannous Thirty. But the acme of all this seriousness of expression, this mock pathos, this ornamental treatment of trivial matters, is reached in § 26, almost at the close of the speech. For the Cripple states that his plea does not concern the financial interests of the state—no, nor the administration of any public office, but merely an obol, miserable pittance of a wretched Cripple! In all this wit we have found none of the coarseness that some critics affect to see.

The language of the Cripple enhances the humor of the speech by an affectedness that appears in words unusual and odd, in a frequent use of a sententious phraseology, and in an occasional use of ornamental figures. In treating this question it must be borne in mind that Lysias' pure Attic prevents the introduction of any very strange expressions, and therefore we cannot expect to find rare words in this
speech, but rather words that appear unusual and out of their sphere in the mouth of a man of low position. The following words may be noted:

§ 3. ἰάσθαι. A proverbial metaphor, sententious in effect.
§ 6. διαδεξόμενον. Technical, not belonging to popular speech.
§ 7. ἐλεημονέστατοι. Only a half-dozen cases in classic Greek.

It appears to have been called into use here as a contrast with ἐλεενός below.

§ 7. ἀθυμήσαι. Rare and affected, belonging to the elevated style.

Possibly used here for assimonance with ἄδικησαι.


§ 10. ξυτείν. Same effect as last named.


§ 15. πραόνως. Very rare, if indeed it is the correct reading for πράως. The authorities quote only two other instances, from Aristophanes and Aelianus.

It is, however, in the phraseology that the largest number of opportunities are open for affectedness. § 3. Note the combination of full sounding and elevated terms in the sententious phrase οἱμαὶ δεῖν κτέ. The balanced construction enhances the sententiousness.

§ 6. Legal phraseology is employed: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὧ μὲν πατὴρ κατέλειπεν κτέ. Here ornamentation is apparent in the alliteration in τρέφων τρίτων ἔτος τοντὶ. § 7. The combination of pairs in the full form of the comparative lends a swing to these sententious antithetical sentences. § 9. The rhythm of the sentence εἰ γὰρ ἐγώ κτέ. has been noticed. § 10. The sententious thought is colored by fine writing and the combination of full-toned and affected terms.

§ 15–18. Repeated instances of the combination of fine terms. § 23. Note the full tone given by the use of superlatives. § 24. In ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαύτας κτέ. we find a pompous statement of the fact that he is not so bad as he is represented. The ornateness and consequent affectedness of the speech is heightened by the use of pairs, and even of triplets. Cf. § 7, 8, 10, 15, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25. In the use of figures of speech we may note only the combined use of hypophora and epanaphora in § 23–25, comparing § 15, 16. These add to the
ornamentation of the speech, and render the speaker’s statement clear and emphatic as well.

That the synthesis of this speech is affected is apparent throughout. Of hiatus there is a certain avoidance, for there is but 1 case in each 12.3 lines. This is specially marked when we compare such orations as 1, 3, 4, 5, 19, 23, 26, 27, whose average is 1 case in 3.6 lines Teubner. The construction of the sentence, which is on the whole simple and unconstrained, is often ornamental however, especially in the use of balanced antitheses. Antitheses are noteworthy in § 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27. In § 15–18 there is a succession of antitheses long drawn out. Cf. § 8. The balance is particularly noticeable in § 2, 13. At the end of § 18 the word βουλόμενος is repeated for the express purpose of preserving the balance of the clauses, as the syntax and the sense do not require its repetition. In several cases these balanced antitheses receive further ornament from the use of homoioteleuta. Cf. § 3, 7 bis, 20, 23. In § 7 ἀδικήσαι and ἀδυνῆσαι are cases of contrasted assonance. As for the order of words in the clause, it is natural or emphatic with occasional exceptions, e. g. § 6 γενέσθαι, § 19 ὡς ἐμέ, § 21, 27 ὑμίν.

Contrasting with the Cripple is the plaintiff of Or. 10. Alike in their sense of humor, they differ in that one displays the ready wit of the low born, the other the sarcastic humor of indignant high spirit. Alike in their earnest pleading of an insignificant case, they differ in that the Cripple is urged on because his bodily sustenance is endangered, the speaker of this oration, because his honor is at stake. Again, they are both rhetorical, but with one it is the affectation of the low born, with the other it is the vigorous and indignant language of a man of high spirit. And this is the broad line of the difference, one is cringing, the other disdainful, high spirited.

This high spirit is shown by his disregard of petty things,1 and yet in this case he cannot brook animadversions on his character, even when spoken in wrath and haste. Furthermore, although the justice of his case is self-evident, still he will leave no stone unturned in his attack, and subjects Theomnestus’ arguments to a fire of criticism and ridicule that left him absolutely no ground to stand
The Clever Man.

upon. His instructing "stupid" Theomnestus in the interpretation of the laws is to be noted, and also his boldness in not sparing even the judges themselves. He is not afraid to express his admiration for the condemned Dionysius, and his devotion to his father arouses in him a spirit that evokes vigorous and often indignant language. The elevation of language noticeable especially in § 21–32 is, then, a marked characteristic of his high spirit. Note the avoidance of hiatus, 1 case in each 21 lines of § 21–32, 1 case in each 3 lines § 1–21, 1 case in each 7 lines being the Lysianic norm. A few rhetorical figures heighten the effect, especially the hypophora in § 23, the procatelepsis in § 6, 30, alliteration in § 27, 31, many rhetorical questions, and apostrophes to the judges and to Theomnestus. Also the effect of elevation is enhanced by such unusual words as ἄπροφλος, § 27; ἀναράς, § 28, and expressions as in § 21, 26, 29, add to the force of his statements. The high spirit of the speaker is specially noticeable in his sarcastic and often contemptuous humor, and he displays the greatest ease in making Theomnestus ridiculous. His interpretation of obsolete words in the laws was calculated to amuse his audience. In the Δαίσταλείς, a fragment of Aristophanes, a father amusingly examines his son on the hard words in Homer, and the son retorts by questioning his father on the archaic words in Solon's laws. This proves such an examination a recognized means of amusing Athenians. But in this case more than that was accomplished,—Theomnestus was made absurd. Bitter sarcasm is likewise apparent in § 9, 23, and antitheses often give point to the caustic language. Hyperbole is used with effect in § 3, ὀσύνεδον, σχέδου, not σχεδώ ταρ, in § 5, an articular infinitive in § 12, and ironical expressions in § 9 bis, 14, 15, 24, 29,—all are used with effect. In § 30 the argument is humorous, the reference to the judges, bold, as we have seen. In § 20 σιδηροῦσι is a popular metaphor of a kind rare outside of Demosthenes, Aeschines and Deinarchus, and very sarcastic.

Like this speaker and the Cripple the public prosecutor of Or. 30 rests the force of his arguments largely on sarcasm, e. g. § 2 ἀντὶ μὲν Σόλωνος αὐτῶν νομοθέτην κατέστησεν, § 7 ὅτι - - - γεφύσωμαι, and § 26, 27. The sarcasm is heightened by the usual feature of

1 σκαίδος § 15.  
2 § 3, 24, 30.  

* Cf. Or. 24 § 24, 25.
speeches in public prosecutions, the rhetorical figures of thought, e. g. apopiosis, § 2; exaggeratio, § 3, 4, et mult. al.; procatalepsis, § 7; hypophora, § 26, 27. To this effect also contribute frequent antitheses, e. g., § 16, 27; paronomasia, § 21, 29, 30; homoiooteleuta, § 21, 31; and bold compounds, § 22 περικαταρ-ρέωντα, ἀπ. εἰρ., and § 35 μισοπονηρεῖν.

The Man of Low Birth.

The orations of Lysias are not without other examples of low born adventurers like the Cripple, though none of the others are delineated with anything like the same detail. Agoratus, the defendant of Or. 13, was the son of a slave and gained the rights of citizenship in a “shady” sort of way. He was an “informer” by profession, and he was a party to many political jobs. One of these resulted in the judicial murder of a number of citizens, and was the cause of this suit. Another man raised from slavery to citizenship was Nicomachus, the copyist of Or. 30, who had acquired such familiarity with the laws that he was one of those entrusted with their revision, but failed to comply with the statute limitations, and so got into trouble. This bold fellow, the prosecutor declares, actually had the audacity to set himself up as law-maker in Solon’s stead!1 An adventurer of low order we also find in Pancleon of Or. 23, who was a mere runaway slave according to the plaintiff. But the most infamous of all the characters portrayed by Lysias is Eratosthenes of Or. 1, whom we may study as a type of the immoral man.

The Immoral Man.

Eratosthenes of Oie was a young Athenian hardly come to man’s estate,2 yet already familiar with the evil ways of the world. For he not only had a mistress, but had made it his profession to debauch women.3 When once he had seen a woman that took his fancy he knew how to take prompt and effective measures to secure his ends. For Euphiletus’ wife he saw at her mother-in-law’s funeral, and by means of the maid-servant, whose services he probably obtained by means of a bribe, he soon had access to her for his own evil pur-

1 Cf. Or. 30 § 2. 2 § 37, ἑαυτίσκος. 3 § 16.
The Immoral Man.

poses. Euphiletus refers to him contemptuously throughout. In § 8, 11, 45, ἄνθρωπος is the term he finds most fit for him, while ἐκείνος, “that notorious wretch,” is the term he applies to him in § 15, 25, 27, 29, 38. πειανίσκος is the word he uses as describing him in § 37,—in scorn, for it is a word that appears to have been used properly of half grown boys. Eratosthenes must have been decidedly more than a half grown boy to have had opportunity to debauch a number of women, and thus become a roué by profession. In this same section, 37, Euphiletus speaks of him as τὸν τὴν γυναῖκα την ἔμην διαφθείραντα, another mark of his contempt. The old hag does not appear to have shared this contempt, but merely hated him, for she terms him ὅ ἄνηρ, which may, perhaps, be rendered “the gentleman.”

We may further note that Eratosthenes was not without his share of that fickleness common among characters of his type. For he had abandoned his mistress for his new “flame,” the wife of Euphiletus, and he had had amours with many women. A craven, too, he was, and did not pretend to make any defence; as indeed how could he, seeing that he was caught in the very act? When Euphiletus knocked him down, bound his hands behind his back, and asked him what he meant by his outrageous conduct, he acknowledged his wrong deed, and besought and entreated him to spare his life and accept a compensation in money. He is accordingly the typical rake familiar to us in the plays of Plautus and Terence.

A man of like passions, but of a different type, is the speaker of Or. 3, who indulges himself in the privacy of his own home, and dislikes troubling the public with his private peccadillos, which he considers entirely his own affair so long as others do not suffer from them. He regrets that he is now obliged to force his habits upon public notice, but being obliged, he is perfectly frank, without being disgustedly particular in the detailed narration of his affairs. It is quite true, he acknowledges, that he was possessed of a passion for the youth, and that such feelings do not befit his years, but he is guiltless of the charge brought against him by

---

1 Cf. Liddell and Scott, sub voce. 2 § 16. 3 Ibid. 4 § 25. 5 § 3. 6 Ibid. Cf. § 10. 7 § 4.
Simon. It was, too, his anxiety to avoid public scandal that led him to leave the city, and though injured and wronged, he kept quiet.\(^1\) The speech is quiet and dignified, as befits a man no longer young,\(^2\) and of some wealth and good family position.\(^3\) It is plain that he has no elevated moral ideals, and in language and thought he does not depart from the norm. His arguments in defence of his habits are the commonplace ones.\(^4\) The style is rather more periodic than usual,\(^5\) which is suited to the dignified character of the speaker. To the weight and dignity of the speech also contribute a number of pairs unusually large for Lysias, 16 in all.\(^6\) Figures are not conspicuous, nor is there any humor, though this is a distinctive trait of Lysias. There is however a slight irony in § 28 τούτο ἐστιν ἡ πρόνοια, and sarcasm in § 44 ἐράν τε καὶ συκοφάντειν.

The speaker of Or. 4 got into trouble about a slave girl, for whom he had a passion, and not a youth, as in the last case. The speech is too fragmentary to allow us to draw any conclusions as to ethos. We may note however that the style is natural, and that more liveliness and vigor is displayed than in Or. 3; as instances of this vigor observe the brief, forcible sentences of § 5, and the compounds of § 8, 9, δύσερος, ὄξυχερος, πάροινος, βαινδαιμονία. The natural simplicity of the speech is shown by the absence of rhetorical figures, and by only a few cases of the most inevitable ornamental figures, and by an easy structure of the sentences. The proportion of combined periods to the total number of rhythmic periods is but as 4 to 24.

The characters of the Lysianic fragment 75, quoted by Dionysius, and especially Tisis and Pytheas, move in the same sphere of society as those in Or. 3, 4. The rows described in all three of these orations are certainly of a very lively nature.

The Young Man.

We saw that the speaker of Or. 19 betrayed the modesty of youth, and based his claims rather upon the merits of his father and brother-

\(^1\) Cf. § 10, 30. \(^2\) Cf. § 4. \(^3\) § 47. \(^4\) E. g. § 4. 
\(^5\) Outside of the proem, which shows the usual care in sentence structure, there are 11 combined periods in a total of 46 rhythmic periods in this oration.
\(^6\) In § 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 17 bis, 26, 29, 37, 39 bis, 42, 43, 45 bis.
in-law than upon his own. Similarly the speaker of Or. 18 is too young to have done any great deeds, to have developed any prominent individual traits. So he dwells on the deeds of his family, and such personal ethos as appears in only that of youth. We note this in his pathetic expression of his thought, liveliness, warmth of feeling, elevation, family pride, occasional humble tone, repetitions, lack of brevity. In his synthesis it appears in a use of ornamental figures including homoioteleuton, balance, antithesis, and of a somewhat artistic method in the structure of his periods. There are, however, none of those rhetorical figures that lend ornament to the thought, which is plain and direct like the language, though this last is not without a few rare words and phrases that are to be expected in young men. Avoidance of hiatus in this speech gives an earnest, terse effect, as in the case of the young Mantitheus of Or. 16. In a certain lack of invention and in a simple arrangement the inexperience of youth again appears. The real effectiveness of the speech is due indeed to this seeming lack of devotion, which appeals to that sympathy that it is the speaker’s object to evoke. And so through all the speech Lysias has given him the characteristics of inexperienced youth.

We might naturally expect to find resemblances here to Aristotle’s description of the characteristics of youth in his Rhetoric, II. 12. But he dwells mainly on the weaknesses of youth, which the orator of course withholds from view. There are some similar traits however, and, naturally enough, there are striking correspondences with the traits of that profligate young man, Eratosthenes of Oie.

1 § 10, 21; cf. Jebb, 231. 2 § 2 ff. 3 This speech is “emphatically an appeal to pity,” says Mr. Jebb, p. 232; as instances note § 10, 21–23, 25–27, which also show liveliness and warm feeling. 4 E.g., in § 2–8, his glorification of his family, which is expressed in ample, flowing terms. 5 § 17, 20; cf. Blass, 529, ad fin. 6 Cf. § 1 ἐν προσήκοντες κτέ., with § 21 καὶ τῶν προγόνων κτέ., and with § 24 τῶν γὰρ προσηκόντων κτέ., and cf. § 8 καὶ τοις τίνες κτέ. with § 12 καὶ τοις δεινῶν, κτέ. 7 As examples of these, § 2, 7, 15, 18, 19, 20, 21. 8 There are 11 combined periods in a total of 31 rhythmic periods. 9 § 17 εἰ τῶν ἄρτοιν ἐκπίπτοντο, § 19 μισθωσυλάκων, and ἄργης ἀθώς προσφάτου, § 25 ἐφημα τῆς ἡμετέρας. 10 1 case in 17.5 lines.
Lysias has not left us without typical women as well as men. Or. 1, which has already given us the stock characters of the new comedy, the injured husband and the rake, also supplies a life-like picture of an unfaithful wife and of the servile maid servant, together with the conventional *meretrix*, and her old hag of a slave woman, and, as the special property of this piece, a genuine bawling baby.\(^1\) His wife Euphiletus describes as having been, in the early days of their married life, a good housekeeper, a thrifty and careful manager, in short the best of women,\(^2\) and the most faithful wife in Athens.\(^3\) She does not seem, however, to have had much moral strength, for she appears to have given way easily to the blandishments of Eratosthenes.\(^4\) A woman of humble position, she was probably flattered by the attentions of such a polite man about town, and like so many weak and silly women, she yielded to temptation. She appears also to have been devoid of much natural affection. Not to mention her willingness to bring disgrace on husband and child, we have it recorded that she did not observe the conventional period of mourning for her brother.\(^5\) And surely no true mother would have had her helpless little baby fretted, pinched, perhaps, by the servant girl, in order that she might pursue her forbidden pleasures undisturbed.\(^6\) Cunning she was too, and fertile in resource. Her husband she kept in the most profound and unsuspecting ignorance of her guilt even after it had become public property;\(^7\) and, as we have seen, she cleverly pressed the baby's crying into service at an opportune moment, and had ready replies for inconvenient remarks. And thus with a few strokes Lysias drew a complete picture of a weak, cunning woman.

The servant girl of this same speech, a maid of all work, waiting on the table,\(^8\) going to market,\(^9\) or tending the baby\(^10\) as occasion demanded, is typical of her class in her servility, and is

\(^1\) Sex not indicated. \(^2\) § 7. \(^3\) § 10. 
\(^4\) § 8. \(^5\) § 14. \(^6\) § 11. 
\(^8\) Cf. Frohb. on § 16. \(^9\) § 8, 16. \(^10\) § 11.
remarkably accommodating to those that require her services. Eratosthenes readily makes use of her to gain access to her mistress, she takes care that the baby shall cry so as to conceal her mistress' escapades, and if we are to take the words of her mistress in earnest in § 13, she seems to have been the occasion of some peccadillos on the part of Euphiletus himself. When later he learned that she knew about his wife's conduct and threatened her with condign punishment unless she told him the whole truth, she was at first true to her mistress, and declared she knew nothing. But when Eratosthenes was mentioned she was entirely overcome, and fell at Euphiletus' knees, obtained a pledge from him that she should not be punished, and told him the whole story. From this time she was servilely obedient to her master, dreading what would befall her if she dared disobey. In accordance with his commands she kept the whole matter secret, and when Eratosthenes again came to the house, promptly informed her master. When he placed her in charge of the door while he went out for his neighbors, faithfully she performed her duty, and did not give, as she might easily have done, warning to Eratosthenes so that he could escape. With this incident her connection with the story is ended.

There is little to be said about the old hag, πρεσβύτης ἀνθρώπος, sent by her mistress to disclose Eratosthenes' true character to Euphiletus. She speaks briefly and to the point, and then leaves. She shows herself a good servant in that she shares her mistress' hatred for Eratosthenes, as becomes a faithful slave. The meretrix does not herself appear upon the scene, but is represented by her servant. Her motives for undeceiving Euphiletus were not of the loftiest, but they were most natural. The discarded mistress is angered at the desertion of her paramour to another and probably younger woman, and takes the most effective means within her reach for securing her revenge.

After these unsavory characters glad are we to make the acquaintance of the only other woman known to us through Lysias, the mother in Or. 32. In her devotion to her children the good woman overcomes her repugnance of appearing before the court of the

---

men of her family, and brings charges against her own father, that heartless Diogeiton. Though she speaks of her stepmother’s children growing up in affluence while her own are in want, yet she shows no petty feeling. Womanly pathos she displays, however, and in a most natural way, heightened by a few figures and pointed by references to the gods. In her language Lysias has taken care to give that staccato effect, that δριμυτης, which is characteristic of woman’s speech. As marks of this, note the large preponderance of finite verbs in her speech, the ἀσυνδετον in § 16, the polysyndeton in § 17. Another mark of the speech of women, the conservators of old, familiar usages in language, is θελω for ἐθελω in § 13. Compare page 32 of this dissertation.

It is pleasant to end with the contemplation of the character of such a true woman a study that began with that noble Athenian, Mantitheus.

1 Cf. Froh. on § 11. It was not considered proper for a woman to speak publicly before men.  
2 § 12–17.  
3 § 17.  
4 E. g. § 16.  
5 E. g. epanaphora in § 16, 17.  
6 § 13, 17.  
7 Cf. Prof. Gildersleeve in Amer. Jrn. Phil. IX. 151.  
8 Ibid. 144.
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