

THE LITERARY CRITICISM OF PHOTIUS

A CHRISTIAN DEFINITION OF STYLE *

The *Bibliotheca* of Photius contains reviews of two hundred and seventy nine Greek authors ranging from the fifth pre-Christian century to his own day. It is inevitable, given the unbroken tradition of Byzantine letters from antiquity, that his desire to appraise the works included in the *Bibliotheca* should be satisfied by the use of terms derived from the rhetorical scholarship of the past. As with other Byzantine critics, the terminology of Hermogenes and, to a lesser extent, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Demetrius, is evident in his pages. However, although some of the formulas are identical, the inspiration has certainly changed. It is refreshing to notice that Photius has recaptured in his critical analyses that aesthetic appreciation of literature which had been stifled by the dry air of rhetorical excesses and is little in evidence directly after the last of the great critics of antiquity, Cassius Longinus, only to re-emerge now in the ninth century in the works of the patriarch of Constantinople. The *forte* of the 3rd century Neo-Platonist was, as Christ-Schmid-Stählin suggests¹, to have combined philosophy, philology, and rhetoric in support of a literary criticism which, though hardly of the calibre of

* The works of Photius are cited from the following editions: *Amphilochia*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 101, cols. 1 - 1189, 1277 - 1296; *Bibliotheca*, ed. I. Bekker, 2 vols. in 1, Berlin 1824 - 25 (by page number, column a or b on the page, and line number); *Epistolae*, Migne, *Patrologia Graeca* 102, cols. 585 - 1024; *Lexicon*, ed. S.A. Naber, 2 vols., Leiden 1864; *Homilies* from *Φωτίου Ὁμιλῖαι*, ed. B. Laourdas, Thessalonica 1959; the *Photian catenae* from the edition of K. Staab, *Paulus Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirche*, Münster 1933, pp. 470 - 652. Some additional letters not included in Migne have been edited by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Epistolae*, St. Petersburg 1896. For the remaining works specific reference to the edition used is given in the notes.

¹ *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* vol. VII. 2. 2., München 1924, p. 891.

the treatise *On the Sublime* wrongly but suggestively¹ assigned to him, and despite the all too frequent evidence of rhetorical pedantry and blind allegiance to the grammatical rule-book², manages to reveal a fine sense of literary appreciation and feeling for style which is not met again until the time of Photius. It is, moreover, appropriate that Longinus should be not simply a rhetorician but a man of general learning and a member of the last great intellectual movement of pagan antiquity, Neo-Platonism; so too Photius, recognized for his universal knowledge and known to the literary historian specifically for the large expression he gives to his rhetorical interests, is part, if not the embodiment, of another intellectual movement, the first extended revival of letters in the Eastern Empire, proceeding now under Christian auspices and supported by Christian thought and a Christian outlook. When we consider also that the history of rhetoric reaches a milestone in the works of the 2nd century rhetorician from Tarsus, Hermogenes, whose concepts were henceforth to exercise an overwhelming influence upon literary criticism, and who epitomizes the victory of "external" over "internal" criticism and the total emphasis on formal virtuosity over disciplined inspiration, Longinus takes on an added significance both in being eclectic as regards the standards which he would have applied to literature³, borrowing from Caecilius, Dionysius, and Hermogenes, and in standing as a corrective to the over-specialization of professional interests by coming to literary studies from a wider vantage point of general learning and not from within the closed circle of exclusively rhetorical training⁴. The phenomenon of Longinus left no seed. The reason may lie partly in the spread of Christianity to its commanding position in the fourth century and its assign-

¹ Op. cit., p. 890.

² See G. Kaibel, Cassius Longinus und die Schrift *Περὶ Ὑψους*, *Hermes* 34 (1899) 107-132; especially 107-111.

³ See Christ-Schmid-Stählin, op. cit., p. 891.

⁴ That Aristotle's theory in the *Rhetoric* and the *Poetics* borrows from his ethical philosophy is well known. Similarly, the spiritual basis of the doctrines in the treatise *On the Sublime* has been pointed out by, among others, F.R.B. Godolphin, *Basic Critical Doctrine of Longinus*, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 68 (1937) 172-183. It would be interesting to determine what, if anything, Cassius Longinus' rhetorical animadversions owe to his Neo-Platonic direction.

ment of many of the best scholars of the age to working out its theological problems, leaving them little time and less interest to attend to the particularized disciplines of antiquity. Concern was centered now on the creation of a new culture rather than on the definition of the established glory of the past. Only when the new Christian culture had been formed in all its particulars—and the consciousness of this completeness appears in the ninth century—in other words, not before the Christian Fathers had themselves come to be regarded as classics (Photius, for example, is the first to attempt a philological criticism upon the works of John Chrysostom in an effort to establish a chronology of his works and to distinguish the genuine from the spurious)¹; only then could a Christian scholarship come into being². It is a scholarship which necessarily borrows many of its methods and much of its terminology from the tradition of Greek letters, but which at the same time subordinates them to the changed outlook and cultural disciplines of a new society. Photius' remarks on style can therefore be studied from two points of view by way of defining his attitude and fixing its historical position: first the stylistic theory, or the underlying presuppositions conditioning his general approach to stylistic questions, and second, the individual tools of stylistic definition inherited from Hellenistic times. We shall try to see which the patriarch uses, which he casts aside as unsuitable to his new purposes, and which he adjusts to his changed requirements. In both instances Photius displays a vigorous originality and injects into the ossified rhetorical tradition a welcome

¹ See *J. C. Baur*, *S. Jean Chrysostome et ses Oeuvres dans l'histoire Littéraire*, Louvain 1907, p 24. See p. 167 *infra*.

² Photius does not and can not write a *Περὶ Ῥητορικῆς*, as Antisthenes in the fourth century does a *Περὶ λέξεως ἢ περὶ χαρακτήρων*, because he does not allow himself, or rather the intellectual climate of the age does not allow him, the distance which such an operation requires. What he does rather in the *Bibliotheca* and elsewhere is to present not a definition of style but an attitude toward style arrived at as part of a larger premise and integrated into a broader cultural pattern. Indeed, the century of Photius, with its truly great creations in art and theology, bears more resemblance to the vigorous ferment of the fifth than to the more quiet and reflective mood of the fourth century B.C. At the same time, Photius is unlike the fifth through being part of a revival of learning and necessarily inheriting the media of presenting and judging it which had accrued through the centuries.

freshness distilled from the new spirit of ninth century Byzantine Christianity.

In a now famous article Wilhelm Schmid had occasion in 1894 to review the history of rhetoric up to late antiquity. He distinguished therein two streams of thought running through the whole and emerging now one, now the other, as each was called for by the circumstances of a particular age¹. Both develop in the fourth century B. C.², with certain traces in the fifth in the person of Gorgias. One issues from Isocrates and his school and is featured by the absolutistic approach to literature, which admits only one ideal of literary style, essentially the kind of prose Isocrates himself writes and the individual characteristics of which within his work, that is to say, the *ιδέαι*, *εἴδη*, or *τρόποι*, form the object of study for his students and followers. It is this conception of exclusiveness, of a single goal or standard, which eventually gives rise to the so-called Atticistic movement, interpreted by Schmid as basically an attempt at the establishment of an ideal of rhetorical virtuosity. The question, to whom of the classical writers of Attic prose to assign the palm of Atticism (*ἀττικισμός*), was finally resolved in favor not of Isocrates but, for reasons which do not concern us here, of Demosthenes³. Hence the importance of Hermogenes, the famous rhetorician from Tarsus of the time of Hadrian, who gives a clear and final⁴ definition of the *ιδέαι* of prose literature explaining them out of Demosthenes, the prose writer *par excellence*, and whose definitions and categories, commented upon by so many after him, were intimately known and widely used by a good number, among them Photius, of Byzantine men of letters.

The other approach to literary criticism was relative. While not, of course, dispensing with a regard for the universally applicable rules of writing or of writing well, the opponents of the Isocratic school laid stress on the principle of what we might call

¹ Zur antiken Stillehre aus Anlass von Proklos' Chrestomathie, *Rheinisches Museum* 49 (1894) 131-161; see especially pp. 152 ff.

² *Ibid.*, p. 155.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 157.

⁴ Only Lachares, of the end of the fifth century, who commented upon Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and perhaps Lachares' students, are said not to have been influenced by his theories. See *Christ-Schmid-Stählin*, op. cit., pp. 1101, 2.

quot homines, tot genera dicendi, and considered more closely the influence of personality upon style. Thus the yardstick in their case was not *ιδέα* but, appropriately, *χαρακτήρ*¹. However, under such a wild variety, as Schmid points out², no single stylistic theory could be formed. This became possible only when the innumerable varieties of human personality were reduced, apparently first by Antisthenes in his *Περὶ λέξεως ἢ περὶ χαρακτήρων*, to a limited number of simple psychological types. Henceforth, one of these two attitudes, *ιδέα* or *χαρακτήρ*, predominates: the excessive particularization of style is corrected by recalling the Isocratic principle and vice versa³, until the emergence of the Atticistic and Second Sophistic movement ends the fluctuation and decides out of inner necessity for Isocrates, whose doctrine is henceforth to prevail, supported by the pontifical dogmatism of Hermogenes and challenged but once, and then with only moderate success, by the eclecticism of Cassius Longinus.

If now we turn to Photius, we become aware of a further development in the history of stylistic theory, signalized by the use of both *χαρακτήρ* and of the Hermogenic *ιδέα*⁴. This co-existence of principles which late antiquity had with such finality dissociated is a distinguishing feature of Photius' work. But

¹ If *ιδέα* = "quality" of style, *χαρακτήρ* may perhaps be best rendered as "type". See [Cicero] *Ad Herennium*, tr. *H. Caplan*, Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1954, p. 252, note b.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 156.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 158.

⁴ The word *χαρακτήρ* in Photius in the meaning of "style" has many equivalents. I reproduce here the list given by *R. Henry*, *Proclus et le Vocabulaire technique de Photius*, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 13 (1934) 620, n. 1, rearranging it to indicate the order of frequency, omitting the wrongly inserted *συνέπεια*, and adding *ἐπαγγελία* and *ιδέα*: *φράσις, λέξις, χαρακτήρ, ιδέα, τύπος, ἑρμηνεία, λόγος, ἀπαγγελία, ἐπαγγελία*.

ἀπαγγελία is rare: 333a25 and PG 101, 597D, but not 492b6 where, the discussion of the Attic orators, codices 259-268, owing much to another source, either Pseudo-Plutarch's *Βίαι τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων* or Caecilius of Cale Acte (see *K. Ziegler*, RE-PW, vol. 20. 1, col. 716, s. v. Photius, for discussion and bibliography), the word means "recitation", possibly through the influence of Photius' source or in recognition of the oral quality of the work involved.

ἑρμηνεία is common in Demetrius, though not as a synonym to *χαρακτήρ*: cf. *Eloc.* 30 Roberts: *περὶ τῶν χαρακτήρων τῆς ἑρμηνείας* as "types

of style". Note the phrase, 116b9: τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας εἶδος.

ἐπαγγελία only once in Photius, 162a16: ἔχει δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τὸ σαφές.

λόγος in this meaning 12a24, 20b8 and 78b11.

συνέπεια should be struck from Henry's list for it means not "style" but "connection of words" (cf. PG 101, 69C: οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως ἐτοιμότερον ἢ τῶν ῥημάτων συνέπεια ἐλευθεροῦσαν ὑπέλθοι ψῆφον τοῦ μηδὲν μάχεσθαι, εἰ μὴ...), which is also its meaning in Dionysius of Halicarnassus *De Comp. Verb.* 23 (179) *Usener - Radermacher*. Indeed, the only other passage which contains the word is in cod. 83 on Dionysius, 15a17, τὸ κομψὸν τοῦ λόγου—τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ τραχύτερον ῥέπουσαν θεραπεύει συνέπειαν, where, since *λόγος*="speech", *συνέπεια* must be subordinate to it in the meaning of "word connection". In this codex Photius uses Dionysius' own vocabulary—*σκληρός*, for example, is rare in Photius, occurring only here, 65a14, and PG 101, 588A, but is peculiar to Dionysius (see *J. C. T. Ernesti*, *Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae*, Leipzig 1795, s. v.)—under a principle which we see operating also in the Proclus cod. 239 (see *R. Henry*, *op. cit.*, pp. 622 ff. and p. 168 note 4 *infra*) of using to a certain extent the terminology of the author under review. The word *συνέπεια* in the Dionysius codex must therefore be inspired by the passage in *De Comp. Verb.* 23 (179). The reading there of *συνέπεια* against the *συνέχρεια* of some MSS is thus confirmed.

ιδέα occurs often in Photius, usually in the plural, to signify the Hermogenic categories of style. It is not less frequent, however, in the singular use as synonymous with *χαρακτήρ* and the terms just treated, in the general meaning of "style" (121b19, 164a15, et al.), for which there is ample precedent (see *Liddell & Scott*, 9th ed., s. v., Sect. 4).

Although *φράσις* and *λέξις* are the far more common terms in Photius, I have chosen *χαρακτήρ* as representative because it best fits the historical circumstances and signifies most clearly what Photius understands by style. The bewildering variety of phrases containing combinations of these terms in diverse relationships attests to the fact that Photius does not carefully distinguish the words, but uses them in a multitude of affinities in which now one now another predominates, and which seemingly betray a more general and essential synonymy, the transgressions being usually in deference to the concepts of Hermogenes, as for example in the Damascius codex (see 126a41 quoted *infra*), which contains Photius' most complete stylistic analysis. I append a few examples: 35a6: κέχρηται φράσει σαφει—ἀλλὰ τῷ μέσῳ τῶν λόγων χαρακτήρι χαίρων; 66a5: κέχρηται—τῷ συνήθει τοῦ λόγου χαρακτήρι; 99a16: τοῖς τὸν χαρακτήρα μεταχειριζομένοις τῆς τοιαύτης ιδέας; 165b33: παραλλαγή ιδέας καὶ χαρακτήρος ἰδίωμα; 12a21: φυλάττει δὲ καὶ τούτοις τῶν οἰκείων λόγων τὸν χαρακτήρα καὶ τὸ ἰδίωμα—ὁ δὲ λόγος αὐτῷ πεποιημένος καὶ εἰς ἰδιόζουσαν ἰδέαν ἐκθεσιασμένος; 116b9 ἔστι δὲ τὸ τῆς ἐρμηνείας αὐτῷ εἶδος κατὰ τὴν ἰδιόζουσαν αὐτοῦ τῶν λόγων ἰδέαν; 117a37: ἡ δὲ τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ ἰδέα—ἡ τε γὰρ συνθήκη—καὶ ἡ λέξις—καὶ ὁ νοῦς δὲ τῶν γραφομένων; 119b40: ἡ δὲ φράσις—τῆς ἀφελοῦς ἐστὶν ἰδέας, οὐδὲ τῇ λέξει πρὸς τὴν ἰδέαν ἀλλοτριουμένη—καὶ οὐ καθ' ἓν εἶδος σύγκειται ὁ λόγος; 126a41 (on Damascius): τὴν μέντοι φράσιν ὁ ἀνὴρ κατὰ γε

whereas he applies the Hermogenic definitions¹ and uses them as a practical means of arriving at his general characterizations, the whole approach to his authors is based not on Hermogenes but on the system of emphasis on personality seen in the use of the word *χαρακτήρ*. The *χαρακτήρ* concept is once more applied so

τὸ πλείστον αὐτοῦ τῶν λέξεων—ἔχει δὲ τι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδεῶν, ὅσαι χαρακτηρίζονται λέξεσι—καὶ αἱ τροπικαὶ δὴ διαμορφῶσαι αὐτοῦ τοὺς λόγους—ἀλλὰ σαφῆς ὦν τῷ πλείστῳ μέρει τῶν λέξεων, οὐκέτι καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομίᾳ τοιοῦτος καθέστηκεν—χρῆσις ἂν ἄλλως ὁ λόγος εἶναι δυνατόν—τῶν τεινόντων τὴν φράσιν καὶ διογκούντων λέξεων τε καὶ τῶν ἄλλων μερῶν τῆς τοιαύτης ἰσχύος—τὴν τοιαύτην ἰδιοτροπίαν—ταῦτα μὲν κρῖσις ὡς εἰπεῖν ἀπλῶς γε λόγου, τοῦ δὲ βίον γράφοντος τάχα ἂν εἴη καὶ ἕτερα πλείονα.

I have not seen a work which, from its title, would seem useful to the present discussion: *G. Böhlig*, *Untersuchungen zum rhetorischen Sprachgebrauch der Byzantinen*, Berlin 1956.

¹ The seven *ιδέαι* are all found, with varying frequency: *σαφήνεια*, *ἀξιωμα λόγου καὶ μέγεθος*, *ἐπιμέλεια καὶ κάλλος*, *γοργότης*, *ἦθος*, *ἀλήθεια*, and *δεινότης*. *Ἀλήθεια* in the Hermogenic sense occurs only in cod. 159 on Isocrates (102b11) and cod. 160 on Choricus (102b26). Its virtual exclusion is no doubt due to the fact that Photius time and again uses the word to define religious truth. His Christian feeling may have been offended to see the great principle of religious significance reduced to the status of a rhetorical tool (so too *B. Wyss*, *Photios über den Stil des Paulus*, *Museum Helveticum* 21 [1952], 224). The two passages where it appears were probably written at the same time and are heavily Hermogenic. On *δεινότης* see *B. Wyss*, *op. cit.*, p. 224.

There are, however, many other terms of style which serve Photius' descriptive needs, many of them original with him (see *G. Hartmann*, *Photios' Literarästhetik*, Diss. Leipzig 1929, pp. 29 ff; *E. Orth*, *Die Stilkritik des Photios*, Leipzig 1929, p. 56). More exclusive allegiance to the terminology of Hermogenes is evident in the use of the speech divisions which underlie the creation of the *ιδέαι* (*ἔννοια*, *λέξις*, *σχῆμα*, *μέθοδος*, *συνθήκη*, *ἀνάπαισις*) (see Hermogenes *Περὶ Ἰδεῶν* 222.19 ff Rabe), and which appear as standards of measurement even where the *ιδέαι* themselves are little in evidence. Attention is given also to the division between *πολιτικός* and *πανηγυρικός λόγος*, according to which Hermogenes groups certain classical authors: 98b11 (on St. Basil): *λέξει πολιτικῇ καὶ πανηγυρικῇ δεινός—εἰς τὸ πολιτικόν τε καὶ πανηγυρικόν ῥήτορα γενέσθαι*; 154a4, 116a39 (both on Basil); 165b36 (on Dio Chrysostom); 102b12 (on Isocrates): *μέγεθος δὲ αὐτῷ ὅσον εἰς τὸν πολιτικὸν ἐναρμόζει λόγον*; 490a21 *πρῶτος Ἰσάιος σχηματίζειν ἤρξατο—ἐπὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν τὴν διάνοιαν δ—καὶ Δημοσθένους—ἐπιμήσατο* (Demosthenes being Hermogenes' prime example of the *λόγος πολιτικός* as of every other virtue of speech); PG 102, 861B: *οἱ τοῦ Πλάτωνος λόγοι τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου πεφύκασι γινώμονες*; PG 101, 257D: *πανηγυρικός* (of Gregory of Nazianzus).

as to make the number of possibilities of stylistic expression equal to the number of practitioners of the art of writing, as we shall presently see. If one inquires into the reasons for this new development, one has first to take into account the more material consideration that Photius is gifted with a large literary appetite developed, of course, by his teachers, by the *milieu* of the revival of letters in which he lives, and not least through his own capacities. The effort to satisfy such a craving leads inevitably to a broadening of one's mental horizon directly proportionate to the volume of knowledge acquired. This enlargement of experience by assiduous study and learned intercourse explains in part why he rejects the narrow absolutism and enervating peremptoriness in literary criticism associated with both the Hermogenic outlook and its opposite as it had come to be defined "typologically" in time, and the assumption of new values based on an apprehension of individual personality. If such be the more external aspect of the case, the underlying cause of this new literary orientation must be sought from a deeper source.

There can be no doubt that, as in all areas of intellectual expression, so too stylistic definition stands affected in its larger meaning by the one force which, absent to the pagan commentators, forms the basis of mediaeval culture and impresses itself upon the whole life and thought of the Middle Ages. It is a truism that the new religion of Jesus, supported by its Hebraic connections, refined the idea of personality and came to stress the distinctive qualities of each particular individual in reference to the Deity. Such being the case, it is understandable that a theory of style in a Christian setting, while necessarily following the general patterns of approach suggested by ancient practice, should, in its Cristian definition, take the form which appears in Photius and look upon each author, indeed, each work of an author¹ as a self-contained psychological unit.

¹ Photius correctly points out, in trying to establish the genuineness of certain Demosthenic speeches, a principle of criticism which the generally reproachful and insistent tone of his remarks suggests was often overlooked. Observing that works of different authors show the same style and works of the same author different styles, he says (491a12-13): ἐγὼ δὲ εἰδὼς πολλάκις καὶ λόγους διαφόρων γεννητόρων πολλὴν ἔχοντας τὴν ὁμοιότητα καὶ διάφορον ἐργασίαν λόγων τὸν αὐτὸν ἐγνωκότων γεννήτορα (οὐ γὰρ αἶε καθέστηκεν ἄτρεπτος καὶ ἀναλλοίωτος κατὰ πάντα, ὅσπερ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις,

The area in which the new interpretation of style, considering its religious base, first finds ground to operate is properly religious literature. The natural starting point for this new ideology lies in the Gospel. We may take note of Photius' remarks on the style of St. Paul, on whose works the patriarch expended a great amount of study and who, through the weight of his authority, colors not only Photius' theology but affects also his attitude toward the secular province of literary excellence. After analysing in detail various examples of particular stylistic virtues in the Pauline *Epistles* on the general basis of the Hermogenic categories, Photius concludes by stressing the fundamental, underlying cause of Paul's greatness¹. Of such parts, he says, is the character (*χαρακτήρ*) of the *Epistles* formed. Paul does not write "with studied art" (*τέχνη καὶ μελέτῃ*) but rather through an "ingrained intellectual strength and an energy active in all things" (*ἐμφύτῳ κρᾶτει διανοίας καὶ τῷ περὶ πάντα δραστηρίῳ*), with "a wealth of

οὕτως οὐδὲ κατὰ τοὺς λόγους ἢ ἀνθρωπίνῃ δυνάμει, ἀλλῶς τε δὲ οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς καιριωτάτοις τῶν ἰδιωμάτων τοῦ ῥήτορος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐπ' ὀλίγον ὁρῶν τὴν διαφορὰν, οὐκ ἔχω θαρρῆεν ἀποφῆνασθαι εἰτε Ἑγησίππου πόνος ὁ περὶ Ἀλωννήσου λόγος εἰτε τῆς Δημοσθενικῆς ἐλάττωμα καθέστηκε φύσεως. That these remarks are Photius' own and not those of his source, considering that the passage in question occurs within codd. 259-268, which, as indicated p. 138, note 1 supra, derive much material from another source, is indicated by the contrast between *ἐγώ* and the *φασὶ* shortly before, 491aδ. Note a similar contrast in the Isocrates cod. 260, on which see A. Vonach, Die Berichte des Photios über die fünf älteren attischen Redner. Commentationes Aenipontanae V, Innsbruck 1910, pp. 67, 70. As *φασὶ* in the Isocrates summary, 487a14, is not Photius' own statement but a verbatim quotation from Pseudo-Plutarch (Vonach, p. 66), so too the Demosthenic reference is in all probability a quotation from elsewhere.

The parenthetical passage in the Demosthenic quotation (*οὐ γὰρ ἀστὴ—ἀνθρωπίνῃ δυνάμει*) reads not so much like a principle of literary criticism as like an ethical observation. In fact, the word *ἀστεπτος* seems to have passed into considerations of style not before Photius. It may be connected with the large controversy of the sixth century revolving about the use of the word in Christological definition. See M. V. Anastos, The Immutability of Christ and Justinian's Condemnation of Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, Number Six, Cambridge, Massachusetts 1951, p. 127, n. 9. Photius' remark is significant because it establishes in so many words the relation between style and character by couching the thought in ethical terms and expressing its ethical origin through the clear parallelism of *τὸ ἀστεπτόν—οὕτως*.

¹ PG 101, 601A, B; see also 589C-592B.

inborn knowledge and of superhuman sagacity and judgment," (τὸν πλοῦστον αὐτῷ τῆς ἐμφύτου γνώσεως καὶ τῆς ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀγγιχνοίας καὶ φρονήσεως), all vouchsafed to him by divine grace (χορηγοῦσα ἢ ἀνωθεν χάρις)¹. Not only do Paul's *thoughts* exhibit an inborn (ἐμφυτον) intelligence instilled in him as a gift of the divine, his *style* likewise is characterized by an "inborn beauty of speech" (ἐμφυτον κάλλος τοῦ λόγου)². This gift also proceeds from God, Who, just as He is the creator of the universe, so is He too the craftsman of languages³. Hence its inherent beauty, which Paul has preserved in his writings and used as the proper vehicle for the communication of his inspired teaching. This, in turn, operating through the medium of the "inborn persuasiveness" (ἐμφυτος πειθῶ)⁴ that lingers on the lips of Paul, draws both the technicians of the rhetorical art as well as the unlettered crowd to his Gospel.

These two things, then, the use of ingrained beauty of speech plus the divinely suggested thoughts which it clothes, combine to produce the practical expression of Paul's genius. It is through these that his ultimate purpose is achieved, through these that he hopes to assist the salvation of human souls⁵ and guide them to the light of truth⁶. How is this union effected in reality? Photius' 92nd and 93rd *Amphilochian Questions*, from which we have taken the passages quoted above, discuss the Pauline *lógos* in detail.

¹ PG 101, 601A; also 580C, 584B. For similar sentiments see also the explanation of *I. Cor.* I, 6, 7 in Photius' commentary on Paul, p. 545, 11. 1-10 Staab, and of *II Cor.* 7, 7-9, p. 593, 11. 27-35 Staab; also p. 78 Laourdas. Photius' remarks on the style of Paul have recently been extensively analyzed in a valuable article by B. Wyss, *Photios über den Stil des Paulus*, *Museum Helveticum* 21 (1952) 236-251. Wyss does particular service by citing many parallels to earlier literature. His remarks on Photian ideas of style are more strictly philological and, of course, limited to Paul and are not meant to pose the larger question with which we are concerned, of explaining Photius' views on style in the context of his time.

² PG 101, 584C; see also 576B and, on St. Peter, 557C.

³ PG 101, 577C: ὁ τῆς φύσεως πλάστης, αὐτός καὶ τῶν γλωσσῶν ὁ τεχνίτης.

⁴ PG 101, 581A, B.

⁵ PG 101, 585A: ἐμφύτου καὶ κοσμίας καὶ βιωφελοῦς τοῦ λόγου σοφίας; also 585D, 601B. So too St. Peter's literary effort is determined by one main consideration, the σωτηρίαν ψυχῶν, PG 101, 557C.

⁶ PG 101, 580D-581A.

The analysis, as we have just remarked, follows largely the pattern of Hermogenes. Isolated units of Paul's speech are selected and defined as examples of the various categories of literary excellence laid down by the rhetorician from Tarsus. In seeking to define the overall compositional quality of Paul's style Photius asserts that the Apostle "presents his thought in a *lucid and firm* style (εὐσήμῳ καὶ σταθερᾷ λέξει) and provides to all the common benefit"¹. The word εὐσημος as a term of style seems proper to Photius alone, despite, or rather, because of its probable association with the εὐσημος λόγος of *I Cor.* 14, 9². The adjective σταθερός carries the meaning of "firm" and "steady," with the ethical implication of constancy and stability, even perhaps of a certain uprightness and nobility, of phrase³. The third term with which we have to deal is ἀγχίνοια, by which Photius defines Paul's mental capacity (see above p. 141).

Let us pass from the Scriptural realm to the testimony which Photius gives on the style of a book by Eusebius of Caesarea entitled *Refutation and Defense*. The style, he says, has "neither charm nor distinct brilliance" and the author is a man "of great learning, although wanting in the shrewdness and firmness of character so necessary to the precise discussion of questions of dogma" (οὔτε ἡδὺς οὔτε λαμπρότητι χαίρων. πολυμαθῆς δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀνὴρ, εἰ καὶ τὴν ἀγχίνοιαν καὶ τὸ σταθηρὸν τοῦ ἤθους, ὡς παρὰ τὴν ἀκρίθειαν τὴν ἐν δόγμασιν ἐνδεέστερος)⁴. Observe how the deside-

¹ PG 101, 585C,D: εὐσήμῳ μὲν καὶ σταθερᾷ λέξει τὸ νόημα παριστῶν, κοινὸν δὲ πᾶσι τὸ ὄφελος προτιθείς.

² See *A. Robertson* and *A. Plummer*, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*², Edinburgh 1914, p. 309, Sect. 9.

³ This notwithstanding the fact that Phrynichus (Sect. 189 Rutherford) would proscribe the personal use of the word, a use which, however, is clearly seen in Philo (of λογισμὸς IV, 40, 1 Cohn and Wendland; of ἦθος III, 20, 10), and is very common in this meaning among Byzantine writers (see the entries in Stephanus' Thesaurus; also The New Phrynichus ed. *W. G. Rutherford*, London 1881, loc. cit.). Photius' three entries for the word in his Lexicon should be ignored, since they equate the word with μόνιμον, στασίμιον, δξύ, and ἰσχυρὸν in a material and not an ethical sense, the entries being derived from Platonic scholia and referring to Phaedrus 242A where the μεσημβρία is characterized as σταθερά and θερμή.

⁴ 4b1-5.

rata of style and thought in the case of Eusebius and St. Paul overlap. Indeed, Photius sees these virtues originally in the Gospel of Luke, for whom he claims a certain influence on Paul¹. The standard, as it must, comes first from the word of God and then applies to the words of men. Further, the common assignment of the word *σταθερός*², in the Eusebius passage to *ἥθος* and in the Pauline passage to *λέξεις*, suggests a natural association between style and character in Photius' mind³. Similarly, after he has given examples of several Pauline beauties of style, by remarking⁴ that they are not the result of an elaborate technique but rather from Paul's "inborn sagacity and judgment" (*ἔμφυτον ἀγχίνουαν καὶ φρόνησιν*), he clearly establishes the reliance of a good style in the sphere of theological discussion upon intellectual and moral virtues. Conversely, the absence of these, one feels, explains the lack of charm and brilliance in the style of Eusebius⁵.

¹ Luke is likewise credited with *εὐφυία ἢ περὶ τὴν ἀγχίνουαν ἐνθεωρουμένη*, and Photius notes that Paul benefited not a little from the evangelist. The text, presumably forming part of Photius' catena on the Lucan Gospel (for further fragments see PG 101, 1213B-1229D) has crept into the manuscript of one of Photius' homilies (see Aristarches' edition, vol. II, p. 247) and is printed in note 13, starting p. 258 in the second volume of Aristarches (*S. Aristarches, Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Φωτίου Πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινίου Πόλεως λόγοι καὶ ὁμιλίαι ὀγδοήκοντα τρεῖς*, 2 vols., Constantinople 1900).

² *σταθερόν* is the late Greek form. See *Liddell and Scott*, 9th ed., s. v. It is a moot point whether either reading should be standardized. The lack of manuscript variants in both cases, Eusebius and Paul, may indicate that the patriarch was not consistent to select the one form over the other.

³ See also PG 101, 249B: *Βεβλιωσις γὰρ καὶ σταθερότης γνώμης τοῦς τε πρὸς μάθειν δρώντας προσεχσετέρους ποιεῖ καὶ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ἐπιρραπίζειν οἷδε τὸ κακοῦργον καὶ ἐπιμοχθον*; PG 102, 796A: *τῷ εὐσταθεῖ τῆς γνώμης τὸ ἀγχίνουον συμπροβαλλόμενον*. The term *εὐσταθής* also operates in both categories; see PG 101, 585: *τὰ τῆς σαρκὸς πιστὰ ἐλπίσματα καὶ εὐσταθῆ καταστήματα* and 588B: *οἷος ἐν τῷ γνωμολογεῖν καὶ εὐσταθῶς ἀποφαίνεσθαι*. Other passages with *σταθερός* 165b2 (of Dio Chrysostom); p. 34, 1.24 Papadopoulos-Kerameus.

⁴ PG 101, 601A.

⁵ For the same charge against this author, this time *à propos* his *Vita Constantini*, see 95b11 ff. Cf. also the remarks on the style of Justin Martyr, 94b32 ff: *ῥητορικῆς τέχνης οὐκ ἔσχε σπουδὴν ἐπιχρῶσαι τὸ ἔμφυτον αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλοσοφίας κάλλος.... ἑητορικὸς* and its by-forms are not always, however, terms of opprobrium suggesting overattention to the artific-

Just as there is detectable in Photius a certain common meeting ground for the concepts of ethics and of literary criticism, characterized by the transference of terminology hierarchically, as it were, within the Christian writings from Scripture to theological literature in general, so too, over the whole of his literary effort it is possible to uncover the existence of a common vocabulary for the expression of the ideals of both literature and the human personality. This suggests a spiritual basis for the patriarch's criteria of literary judgment. The additional fact that these ethical designations occur in his works almost invariably in contexts treating of Christian personages, whether the Virgin Mary or some Church Father, indicates how the idea of personality, developed along the lines of Christian religious thought, becomes for Photius so strongly felt as to guide not only his terminology of style but also his whole outlook toward the subject of literary criticism and the standards which he would require of a well-written piece of literature.

Now, Photius' terminology of literary criticism, as we have noted¹, borrows much from Hermogenes. Hence it is significant that the patriarch culls from the Hermogenic list and stresses

ialities of speech to the detriment of content. The more proper definition appears when Photius praises the work of Dionysius the Areopagite by referring to him as *ὁ ῥήτωρ μὲν τοὺς λόγους, φιλόσοφος δὲ τὰ νοήματα*, μάλλον δὲ καὶ ὁ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς γλώσσης τὴν ἔνωθεν ἀποστάζων χάριν, PG 101, 697D. St. Paul is the *ῥήτωρ ἐκκλησίας*, PG 101, 332C, or *ἀληθείας* PG 101, 689A, 701B. After him in line as *ῥήτωρ ἐκκλησίας* comes Gregory of Nazianzus, PG 101, 700B. For the contrast *φιλοσοφία* (διαλεκτική) — *ῥητορεία* (γραμματική) — note the further breakdown, PG 101, 748C: *τάχος διανοίας καὶ τὸ ἐν φρονήματι συνετὸν καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν θεωρημάτων ὁ πλοῦτος καὶ ῥήτωρ τέχνη*, which arises from the ancient distinction in the terms of the scholastic curricula (cf. Photius' note on Chrysostom, 79a7-9: *τὰ μὲν γραμματικά καὶ ῥητορικά παρὰ Λιβάνιον φοιτῶν ἐπαιδεύετο, παρὰ Ἀνδραγάθειον δὲ τὰ φιλόσοφα*; also on Pamphila, 119b36, 37), see, in a pejorative sense, similar to the Justin Martyr passage, 173a41-173b2 (of Hierocles): *φράσις—σπουδῆ φιλοσόφου πρέπουσα, οὐ μὴν γε τοῖς κεκαλλωπιόμενοις καὶ περιττοῖς ἐξωραϊζομένη χρώμασι τε καὶ ποικίλμασι τῆς ῥητορείας*; in a good sense, implying the proper crasis of the two, as in the case of Dionysius the Areopagite, PG 101, 48D, 49A. Hence Paul is properly a *πνευματοφόρος ῥήτωρ*, PG 102, 164A, who, like the other Apostles, displays in his *λόγος* in happy combination and order of rank *θεία χάρις—νοῦς—γράμματα*, PG 101, 945C.

¹ See p. 138, n. 1 supra. It may help to reproduce here the table of the Hermogenic *ἰδέαι λόγου*:

only those literary qualities which enjoy a common denominator with his conception of Christian ethical conduct and philosophy. We shall see in the following pages what these are. Along with this selection he avails himself of a general Hermogenic principle that the ideal for a work of literature should be attained through the proper mixture, or *crasis*, of the seven categories of style laid down by Hermogenes. This ideal, to be sure, Hermogenes defined as "forcefulness", *δεινότης*. For him, its prime exponent was the Attic orator, Demosthenes. Photius, on the other hand, could not accept the absolutistic principle which *δεινότης* implied, but he could and does have in common with Hermogenes the ancient theory that the key to literary success lies in *crasis*, the harmonious blending of certain clearly defined modes of expression¹. He maintains the same principle in his definition of human characteristics, insisting on a mixture of two or more elements as a basis for proper behavior in thought and action. It is of course true that in the history of criticism, by the nature of the case, most of the terminology of style should be identical with that used to define human character. Personality is, so to speak, the "style" of a man. We are not here concerned with this problem, but rather with the fact, granted the common psychological background, of coincidence in the ideals of 1) style, 2) human behavior, and 3) in religious values. All three are guided by a Christian impetus and subject all to the influence of Christian thought.

Let us examine the admonitions which Photius addresses to the Bulgarian prince, Boris - Michael². The patriarch at Mi-

1. σαφήνεια.
a. καθαρότης. b. εὐκρίνεια.
2. ἀξίωμα λόγου καὶ μέγεθος.
a. σεμνότης. b. τραχύτης. c. σφοδρότης. d. λαμπρότης. e. ἀκμή.
f. περιβολή καὶ μεστότης.
3. ἐπιμέλεια καὶ κάλλος.
4. γοργότης.
5. ἦθος.
a. ἀφέλεια. b. γλυκύτης. c. θριμύτης καὶ δξύτης. d. ἐπισείκεια.
6. ἀλήθεια.
a. βαρύτης.
7. δεινότης.

¹ See p. 143, note 5.

² Letter 8, PG 102, 628A - 696D.

chael's request informs him of his newly acquired obligations as a Christian prince. The letter falls into two parts. In the first, Photius inculcates Michael with the basic tenets of the Christian Faith by giving him the text of the Creed and reviewing for him the work of the Oecumenical Councils. The second section contains advice regarding the performance of his princely role. The incorporation into the same letter of the definition of the Faith and of strictures for princely behavior underlines the religious origin of the latter and shows how centrally interconnected in Photius' mind are orthodoxy in religion and orthodoxy of conduct. Photius' letter is provoked by Michael's conversion to the religion of the Christians; he is writing to Michael' under exclusively Christian circumstances.

The letter opens by stressing the purity of the Christian Faith. The Christian religion is "pure and unblemished" (*καθαρά και ἀμώμητος*)¹; it is "undefiled and pure" (*ἄχραντος και καθαρά*)²; it purges mankind and draws it from error by the beauty of its worship³. While the faith of other peoples is confused and has attained no purity or precision⁴, the Faith of the Christians, as a result of a process of refinement owing to the victory over diabolical attacks in the past, has become most pure, most holy, and very exact⁵ through being sincere and correct and unexceptionable and unalloyed (*εὐλικρινές και εὐθές, ἐξηρημένον και ἀκήρατον*)⁶, so that the slightest attempt at deviation or novelty immediately uncovers and condemns its own falsity and perversity by juxtaposition to truth and correctness. "For", Photius says, "just as in the case of bodies outstanding for their beauty even a small blemish which comes upon them is quickly seen and noted by juxtaposition to the grace of the rest of the body; while in bodies ugly to the sight the marks of disfigurement, through being together with others, would not easily be recognized—they escape notice because of their kinship and similarity with unsight-

¹ PG 102, 628B, 656B.

² PG 102, 629A.

³ PG 102, 628B: τῷ κάλλει τῆς λατρείας καθαρῶς ἐνατενίζεῖν παρέχεται.

⁴ PG 102, 657B, C: ἀδιάκριτα και συγκεχυμένα — και οὐδέν καθαρὸν οὐδ' εἰς ἀκρίθειαν θεοδοκισμασμένον.

⁵ PG 102, 657C: καθαρωτάτη και ἁγιωτάτη και πολὺ τὸ ἀκριβές ἐχούση πίστις.

⁶ PG 102, 657C.

liness; just so in the case of the truly most lovely and most brilliant religion and faith of the Christians, if someone deviates from it in the slightest degree, he effects a great ugliness, while the other beliefs of nations, being full of much chaos and ugliness, do not grant to their own believers any consciousness of the deformity which is upon them”.

The same, he continues, holds true in all the crafts and professions, for “in the most precise even the smallest of errors is very easily detected, while among the lowly many things are overlooked and not even judged as errors. And, if you will, also among rulers who are above others in authority, the more so the more people they control, even a slight transgression is taken up and enlarged and bruited about by all; but among those who are subjects and more humble many similar sins are not even perceived to have been done, but are hidden and escape notice, extinguished together with the smallness and meanness of the sinner. Thus”, he concludes, “to the degree to which the Christian Faith and religion transcends and rises above the fancies of the pagans in magnitude and might and beauty and precision and purity and every other perfection, to such a degree—are the sins of foolish and evil men detected forthwith”.

Finally, turning directly to Michael, he advises, “You, then, build up good actions and sobriety of life on your Orthodox Faith, not wood and grass, not stubble, the combustible matter of sin, good only for fuel and serving no other purpose, but gold and silver, the precious prizes of your achievements (the passage is adapted from *I Cor.* 3, 10 - 16); for these things, glorified even through trials, stand forth more pure and more precious”¹.

The passage has been quoted in full order to convey the sequence of argument and to indicate the occurrence throughout of largely aesthetic terminology to describe Christianity. Primarily significant here is the easy transference of the concepts of purity (*καθαρότης*) and beauty (*κάλλος*) from the religious to the personal level. Just as Christianity through being pure and precise attains its “proper beauty” (*οἰκεῖον κάλλος*) and even “brilliance”

¹ PG 102, 658C - 660D: ἐπειδὴν τις καὶ μικρὸν τι διαστροφῆς ἢ καινοτομίας παρσισηνεῖσθαι ἐπιχειρήσῃ, αὐτίκα τὸ διαστραμμένον καὶ κίβδηλον τῇ παραθέσει τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου καταφαίνεται τε καὶ διελέγχεται—ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν κάλλει διαφερόντων σωμάτων καὶ μικρὰ τις ἐπιγενομένη κηλὶς θάττον

(λαμπρότης)¹, so Michael's duty as a Christian prince must be guided by the same considerations: he will build a Christian character upon the foundations of his orthodoxy, and, just as Christianity has after a period of trials come forth more pure, so too will his achievements after similar tribulation be proclaimed more pure and precise.

συνορᾶται καὶ πεφώραται τῇ παραθέσει τῆς λοιπῆς ἐν τῷ σώματι ὡραιότητος, τοῖς δ' αἰσχροῖς τὴν ὄψιν οὐκ ἂν ἐξελεγχθεῖη ῥαδίως τὰ τῆς ἀσχημοσύνης πάθη ἐπισυνιστάμενα (ὀπολανθάνει γὰρ τῆς ἀμορφίας τῷ συγγενεὶ καὶ τῇ ὁμοιότητι), οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν Χριστιανῶν ὡραιότητος ὡς ἀληθῶς καὶ ὑπερλάμπρου θρησκείας καὶ πίστεως, κἄν τὸ βραχύτατόν τις αὐτῆς παρατρέψῃ, μεγάλην ἀσχημοσύνην ἐργάζεται. τὰ δ' ἄλλα τῶν ἔθνῶν δόγματα, πολλῆς ἀκοσμίας καὶ ἀσχημοσύνης γέμοντα, οὐδεμίαν ἔχειν τοῖς οἰκείοις ἐρασταῖς συναίσθησιν διδῶσι: τῆς ἐπιγινομένης αἰσχρότητος. οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων πασῶν τεχνῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν τὸ αὐτὸ κατιδεῖν ἐστίν. ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἀκριβεστάταις καὶ τὸ βραχύτατον τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ῥᾶστα κατάφωρον γίνεται, ἐν δὲ ταῖς τυχοῦσαις πολλὰ παρορᾶται καὶ οὐδ' εἰς ἁμάρτημα κρίνεται. εἰ βούλει δέ, καὶ ἐν μὲν τοῖς ἄρχουσι, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ προέχουσι, μάλιστα δ' οἷς κατὰ πλείονων τὸ κράτος, καὶ τὸ μικρὸν τῶν πταισμάτων εἰς μέγεθος αἴρεται καὶ πᾶσι γίνεται περιβόητον, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἀρχομένοις καὶ ταπεινότεροις πολλὰ τῶν παραπλησίως διαμαρτηθέντων οὐδ' οἷτι ἐπράχθη συνενώσθησαν, ἀλλ' ἐπανεκρύθη καὶ ἔλαθε, τῇ σμικρότητι καὶ εὐτελείᾳ συναποσβεσθέντα τοῦ ἁμαρτήσαντος. ὅσον οὖν μεγέθει καὶ κράτει καὶ κάλλει καὶ ἀκριβείᾳ καὶ καθαρότητι καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ πάσῃ τελειότητι τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι δοξασμάτων ἢ τῶν Χριστιανῶν πίστις καὶ λατρεία ὑπερανέστηκε καὶ ἐξήρηται τοσοῦτον—τὰ ἐξ ἀφρόνων καὶ κακοβούλων ἀνδρῶν ἁμαρτήματα ἐκ τοῦ εὐθέος καταφαίνεται—οὐ τοίνυν—ἐποικοδόμει τῇ ὀρθῇ σου πίστις πράξεις ἀγαθὰς καὶ βίου σεμνότητα, μὴ ξύλα καὶ χόρτον μηδὲ καλάμην εὐφλεκτον τῆς ἁμαρτίας βλῆν καὶ πρὸς καθῆσιν μόνην, πρὸς οὐδὲν δὲ χρησιμεύουσαν ἔστρον, ἀλλὰ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, τῶν κατορθωμάτων τὰ τίμια (the passage beginning from ἐποικοδόμοι is adapted from *I Cor.* 3, 10-16). ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ περὶ (perhaps παρά should be read) πειρασμῶν δοξαζόμενα καθαρωτέρα καὶ τιμιωτέρα διαδεικνύται.

For similar language see PG 102, 696A: τίνες τε τῶν πράξεων ἀνθεῖν τὴν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παρασκευάζουσιν ὡραιότητα, καὶ τίνες αὐτὴν, ὥσπερ σπῆλος καὶ ῥυτίδες, εἰς αἰσχρὰν ὄψιν καὶ ἀσχήμονα μετασκευάζουσιν. See also, in another sphere of thought, the words of the homily delivered on the occasion of the Russian defeat before the gates of Constantinople, in which Photius exhorts the congregation to make the city invincible and at the same time provide for their own salvation through an increase in their spiritual strength, p. 47, 11. 7-12 Laourdas: ταύτας κρηπίδας τῆς ἐπειτα πολιτείας πηξάμενοι, μὴ ξύλα, μηδὲ χόρτον, μὴ καλάμην, βλῆν εὐφλεκτον τῆς ἁμαρτίας, καὶ συνδαπανῶσαν τοὺς πεφορτισμένους ἐπισωρεύσωμεν, ἀλλὰ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον, τὰς εἰλικρινεῖς καὶ καθαρωτάτας τῶν πράξεων, αἷς ἰδὸς πονηρίας οὐκ ἐνέσπαρται, ἐποικοδομήσωμεν...

¹ ὑπερλάμπρου θρησκείας, PG 102, 657D.

Thus, in the beginning of the letter¹, Photius sets the keynote: he will define the Christian religion and the Christian man. "Virtues", he says, "must be affixed to faith, and the good man must be formed through both. For correctness of dogma produces seemliness in way of life, and purity of deeds proclaims divinity of faith, either one of which without the other is very easily wont to slip and be carried off, not bearing alone to inhabit the souls of men"².

Photius then proceeds to point up the connection by reviewing the elements of the Faith as enunciated in the Creed and in the decisions of the Oecumenical Councils. When this is done, he reverts, as he had promised³, having treated of faith (*πίστις*), to discuss the virtues (*ἀρεταί*) related to it. This takes up the larger part of the letter and is introduced by establishing more fully the relation between the purity of faith and the purity of personal action that we have seen described in the passages just quoted⁴.

A similar association of ideas is presented in a letter addressed to Paul, archbishop of Thessalonica. Paul had asked for advice on the treatment of recent converts to the Faith. The patriarch's first reaction is to be severe toward people who have so long resisted the recognition of the one and only Faith and have only now, when the Church has attained its final earthly perfection, sued for entry into its lists. However, he quickly rejects this notion. He would forgive these late comers and even rejoice all the more in their conversion, considering them as prodigal sons. The Church, he remarks, presents the "beauty of truth"⁵ undefiled by "fraudulent embellishments"⁶, and the "might of the Church through profound peace and general con-

¹ PG 102, 628B, 629B.

² PG 102, 629B: δεῖ δὲ τὰς ἀρετὰς τῇ πίστει παραπεπηγῆναι, καὶ δι' ἀμφοῖν τὸν σπουδαῖον καταρτίζεσθαι. καὶ γὰρ δογμάτων μὲν εὐθύτης πολιτείας προβάλλεται κοσμιότητα, πράξεων δὲ καθαρότης τῆς πίστεως ἀπαγγέλλει θεϊότητα. ὃν ἐκάτερον χωρὶς τοῦ ἑτέρου ῥᾶον εἰωθεν ὑπορῥεῖν καὶ παρασύρεσθαι, μὴ ἀνεχόμενον καταμόνας ψυχαῖς ἀνθρώπων ἐγκατοικίζεσθαι.

³ PG 102, 629B: ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων καὶ ἕστερον.

⁴ PG 102, 658C - 660D (p. 147, note 1).

⁵ P. 20, 1. 1, Papadopoulos - Kerameus: τὸ τῆς ἀληθείας κάλλος.

⁶ P. 20, 1. 1, Papadopoulos - Kerameus: κομμωτικῆς χωρὶς περινοίας. So too Paul does not have, PG 101, 584C, σοφίαν λόγων καὶ κράτος λέγειν καὶ δύναμιν, τὴν περίεργον ταύτην καὶ σοβοῦσαν, καὶ κομμωτικοῖς φαρμάκοις καὶ

cord has confirmed and made possible the viewing of its so brilliant and marvellous loveliness"¹. In similar fashion, the converts prove themselves worthy of their new faith by the purity and intensity of conviction by which they espouse their new religion², while their act of conversion, just as the act of acceptance on the part of those who receive them into the pale of the Church, is characterized by λαμπρότης³.

The same figures appear also in the Photian *Homilies*: The patriarch exhorts the congregation to address the Mother of the Word "with rectitude of mind and purity of soul" (γνώμης εὐθύτητι καὶ ψυχῆς καθαρότητι)⁴, or complains "has not our purity been tainted, our brightness darkened?" (ἄρα—ὅκ ἐρρυπάνθημεν τὴν καθαρότητα, οὐκ ἤμαυρώσαμεν τὴν λαμπρότητα)⁵. Consider also his encomium of Constantinople, incorporated into a homily delivered on the occasion of a Russian attack upon the capital in A.D. 860. The city on the Bosphorus is the center of the Byzantine *oecumene*, the mother city of the Christian world of the East, and the capital not only physically, but spiritually, of the Christian kingdom; it is the metropolis not, like Jerusalem, of one nation alone, but of the whole *oecumene*;⁶ and just as the Faith is outstanding "in magnitude and might and beauty and precision and purity and every other perfection" (μεγέθει καὶ κράτει καὶ κάλλει καὶ ἀκριθείᾳ καὶ καθαρότητι καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ πάσῃ τελειότητι)⁷, so too the city which guards and nurtures this *oecumene* made

ἀνθεσι τὸ ἔμφυτον κάλλος τοῦ λόγου νοθεύουσιν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιπλάστοις χρώμασι τὸ μετράκιωδες καὶ ἔκλυτον πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐπιστρέφουσιν.

¹ P. 20, 11. 3-5, Papadopoulos - Kerameus: τὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας κράτος δι' εἰρήνης τε βαθείας καὶ κοινῆς δημοσίας ἐστερέωσε τε καὶ οὕτω λαμπρὰν αὐτῆς καὶ ὑπερφυῆ παρέσχεν δρᾶσθαι τὴν ὡραιότητα.

² See p. 25, 1. 30: Papadopoulos - Kerameus: τῷ τόνῳ τῆς προθυμίας καὶ τῷ καθαρῳτάτῳ τῆς ἐπιστροφῆς.

³ See p. 29, 11. 2 ff. Papadopoulos - Kerameus: ὅση βῆστον ἢ πράξις, ὅση θεῖον, ὅση σωτήριον, ὅση λαμπρόν—τί δὲ λαμπρότερον τοῦς δεσποτικοῦς τοῖς δοῦλοις οἰκτιρμοῦς ἐμὲ καταξιοῦσθαι τοῖς ἑμοδοῦλοις ἐπαρκεῖν καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῆς θείας προνοίας ἀξίωμα ἑμαυτὸν δρᾶν ἀνατρέχοντα, χεῖρα μὲν ὀρέγοντα τῷ κειμένῳ, συνιστῶντα δὲ καὶ συγκατορθοῦντα τὴν μετάνοιαν; see also p. 24, 1. 26 Papadopoulos - Kerameus: τὸ λαμπρόν τῆς ἐκκλησίας δικαίωμα καὶ τὸ λαμπρόν αὐτῶν τῆς καταγνώσεως καὶ ἀφυκτον αἷτιον.

⁴ p. 52 Laourdas.

⁵ p. 2 Laourdas.

⁶ p. 35 Laourdas.

⁷ PG 102, 660B.

brilliant by the Christian bond excels in beauty and greatness and brilliance¹. Finally, we may note the qualities used to describe the character of the Virgin Mary:² her life is righteous, her behavior dignified, her mode of life pure (τὴν ἀκρίθειαν τοῦ βίου, τῆς ἀναστροφῆς τὴν σεμνότητα, τὸ καθαρὸν τῆς διαίτης), and she issues "from brilliant stock" (τὸ ἐκ λαμπροῦ γένους προελθεῖν).

Enough passages have, I think, been cited to indicate Photius' underlying unity of approach in the description of the Christian society in which he lives and the ideal of individual Christian character comprising its membership. The phraseology can, to be sure, be produced elsewhere: the emphasis, for example, on cleanliness of heart can be reproduced *ad infinitum* from passages throughout the whole of Christian literature, and *καθαρότης* is in reality a stock religious admonition. But the appearance of the term in the historical context of the ninth century and its express association in Photius' letter to the Bulgarian prince and elsewhere with the definition of the Church, which has reached a zenith of perfection and purity following the great upheavals of the heresy of iconoclasm, give to the word an added significance and compel us to interpret it not within the limiting circle of ethical prescription alone but as part of a broader historical and philosophical picture. Much the same applies to the other phrases we have met in the passages quoted above: their prosaism disappears when they are viewed properly, from the standpoint of the Byzantine intellectual atmosphere in which they were written.

If we summarize Photius' discussion of these precepts, we distill the following list:

- | | | |
|---|---------------|--------------------------|
| 1. καθαρότης | } acquired by | τὸ εὐλικρινές, εὐθές, |
| 2. ἀκρίθεια | | ἔξηρημένον, καὶ ἀκήρατον |
| 3. κάλλος (ἠραιότης, κοσμιότης—ἀκοσμία, ἀσημησοσύνη, αἰσχροτήτης) | | |
| 4. λαμπρότης | | |
| 5. μέγεθος | | |
| 6. κράτος | | |
| 7. σεμνότης | | |
| 8. τελειότης | | |

Turning now directly to Photius' stylistic criticism, we become aware of the operation of fundamentally the same set of

¹ p. 35, ll. 6-9 Laourdas: οἰκουμένης ὁπόσων χριστιανῶν λαμπρῶναι θεσμός—κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει καὶ λαμπρότητι δεσπέζουσιν.

² PG 101, 164D.

values. The association of style and character comes forth most clearly in an area of literature which traditionally by its very nature serves to reveal the personality of its author. Epistolography occupies a large amount of Photius' literary effort. Not only are we in possession of a large body of his correspondence, but both in his own letters and when he speaks of the correspondence of others we find a liberal sprinkling of remarks on the nature of the *genre*, from which it is possible to extract a definite theory of epistolography¹. As Harmann points out², what determines the choice of epistolographical models and the judgment upon them is not so much the style as style, but the personality of the author, and particularly the religious content. In a letter taken up with the discussion of various letter-writers of the past, Photius condemns Plato, Aristotle, and Demosthenes, gives light approval to the Hellenistic examples, the famous letters of Phalaris, those of the Roman Brutus, and the correspondence of Libanius, and then continues, "But if you want, along with the style, to acquire the usefulness also of many other important things, the pleasant Basil will suffice for you and the unrivalled craftsman of beauty, Gregory, and Isidore, the varied Christian Muse, who is worthy of being considered the canon of priestly and ascetic conduct as he is of speech, and anyone else with the same conviction who has managed to fit their style to his own letters"³.

We may note that by an easy shift the quality of the utterance is transferred to the author. It is not the *style* of Basil which is pleasant, but Basil himself; nor Isidore's style, but Isidore himself, the Christian Muse, who is "varied". Further, the discussion of the style naturally and almost, as it were, uncon-

¹ This has been done by *B. Laourdas*, Παρατηρήσεις επί τοῦ χαρακτήρου τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ Φωτίου, Ἑταιρ. Βυζ. Σπουδῶν 21 (1951) 74-109.

² *G. Hartmann*, Photios' Literarästhetik, Diss. Leipzig 1929, p. 50.

³ PG 102, 861D: εἰ δὲ βούλει σὺν τῷ χαρακτήρι καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων καὶ μεγάλων συλλέξαι ὠφέλειαν, ἀρκήσει σοι Βασίλειος ὁ γλυκὺς καὶ ὁ κάλλους εἰ τις ἄλλος ἐργάτης Γρηγόριος καὶ ἡ ποικίλη καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας ἀδελφῆς μοῦσα (to distinguish him from the pagan Neo-Platonist, Isidore. See *I. A. Fabricius*, Bibliotheca Graeca, Hamburg 1790, vol. 1, p. 702) Ἰσιδωρος, ὅς ὡσπερ λόγων οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἱερατικῆς καὶ ἀσκητικῆς πολιτείας κανὼν ἐστι χρηματίζων ἀξιοχρεῶς, καὶ εἰ τις ἕτερος μετὰ τῆς ὁμοίας προαιρέσεως τὴν ἐκείνων ἰδέαν ταῖς ἰδίαις ἐπιστολαῖς ἐνεδυναμώθη μορφώσασθαι.

ciously brings to Photius' mind (note the *ὡσπερ - οὕτω*) the way of life of the Christian authors he recommends. The importance of the passage lies more in this tacit association than in any attempt, at best awkward, to relate pleasantness, beauty, and variety (*γλυκύτης, κάλλος, ποικιλία*) to exclusive and definite Christian virtues.

Photius' pattern of thought is indicated also in his short statement regarding some letters of St. Basil which he had read. Not only do they show the admirable nature of the man's character; they can serve also as a model of letterwriting¹. Here against the same concomitance of personal and literary *ethos* is apparent.

This agreement, seen so clearly in epistolography, manifests itself more widely to embrace Photius' attitude toward literature as a whole, as is suggested by the existence of a common vocabulary shared by Christian ethics and literary aesthetics. One should, however, beware of establishing any hard and fast equations. Photius' terminology, granted the originality of much of his expression, can not be expected to exist in a self-created vacuum. The meeting of two separate streams of thought, each with its own set of expressions, produces not so much a complete coincidence as a similarity of outlook reflected, now in identical terms, now in synonymity of vocabulary. For example, *σαφής* can properly be pronounced in Photius only over style; its equivalent, ethically speaking, is most closely *καθαρός*, which can serve both for style and for character. In effect, we are dealing with a common ideological background, and the employment in both spheres of thought of similar, though not always identical, terms, albeit drawn from different sources, one from the heritage of Christian religious expression, the other from the storerooms of Hellenistic literary discussion, provides but the means of detecting the ideological areas in which the two sets of values overlap and should not be taken to imply a single instrument made to do service for both.

Looked at from a negative point of view, the catalogue of Hermogenic² terms of literary criticism given above,³ as it ap-

¹ See 98b30-33: *εἰς ὧν τό τε ἦθος ἔστι τοῦ ἀνδρός, ὁποῖον ἦν ἀξιάγαγαστον, χαρακτηρίσαι, καὶ κανόνα λαβεῖν—ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος.*

² For a list of rhetorical terms in common between Photius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus see *G. Hartmann, Photios' Literarästhetik*, p. 32.

³ See p. 138, note 1.

pears in Photius, is conspicuous by the virtual elimination of those qualities of style which, while they form part of the system of Hermogenes, yet find little or no place in Photius' pages, probably through being alien to his ethical ideal. *Ἀκμή*, which signifies a certain deliberate aggressiveness of speech¹ and *σφοδρότης*, "briskness" or "robustness", are absent. *Βαρύτης*, "sternness", a subdivision of *ἀλήθεια*, which is eliminated for other reasons² is omitted. *Τραχύτης*, "harshness", occurs, but, except in the special case of the codex on Damascius, 181, where Photius follows closely in the footsteps of Hermogenes, it meets with disapproval³. *Ὁξύτης* is absent and its synonym, *δριμύτης*, refers not, as in Hermogenes, to sharpness of style but to cogency of argument⁴. *Ἐπιείκεια*, "mildness" does not appear.

St. Paul on occasion has *μεσιότης*, "fullness", and *περιβολή*, "expansiveness"⁵; *ἐπιμέλεια* is used in a non-Hermogenic sense

¹ See *J. C. T. Ernesti, Lexicon Technologiae Graecorum Rhetoricae*, s. v. However, Photius appears to insist on *ἀκμή* in speaking of the need to keep always in mind "with vigor" (τῷ μακρῷ αἰῶνι σὺν ἀκμῇ παραπεμπόμενα) the Iconoclastic evil. See *C. Mango, The Homilies of Photius*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1958 p. 287, n. 8.

² See p. 138, note 1.

³ Damascius: 126b2, but see 55a22, 65a19, 156b30. Note also PG 102, 744A: οὐ γὰρ αἱ λέξεις βαρύνουσι τὰς ἐννοίας, τὰς δὲ λέξεις τραχεῖς καὶ δυσφόρους τὸ πικρὸν τῆς διανοίας μᾶλλον ἐργάζεται. ὅτε δὲ καὶ λέξεις ταῖς διανοταῖς ὁμολογεῖ καὶ τὸ βαρὺ τῆς ἐννοίας τῷ τραχεῖ συντρέχει τῆς λέξεως...

⁴ I. e., *ἐπιχειρήμασι*. See 52b5, 88b2, 98a34, 154a11, 165b13. How far Photius is, if not from the terminology, yet surely from the outlook of Hermogenes may be clearly seen in his indiscriminate use of the rhetorician's vocabulary of style for also the other categories of narrative, whether content in general or specific units of thought or expression. The desiderata are the same through being controlled by the same mental vision. Thus, see 164a16: τὸ τῶν νοημάτων ἀπλούστερον; PG 101, 604A: τῆς ἀπορίας ἀπλήν καὶ σύντομον τὴν λύσιν; PG 102, 913B: οἷα λέγομεν ἀπλᾶ καὶ σαφῆ συνεισιχοῦμαι; 508b5: λαμπρότερον τὴν τῶν νοημάτων ἰσχὺν; 95b15: τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἐρμηνείαν ἡδονῆς καὶ χάριτος; 66a19: τὸ ἡδὺ φέρουσαι αἱ πλεῖσταί περὶ οἱ 109a10: ταῖς δὲ διανοταῖς πλεῖστον ἔχει τοῦ ἡδέος; PG 102, 696B: ἡδὺς ἐν λόγοις, τοὺς τρόπους ἡδύτερος; 19b20: ἡ κατὰ διάνοιαν γλυκύτης; 94b34: ἔμφυτον αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλοσοφίας κάλλος; 154a10: διήκει τὸ δριμὺ μετὰ τοῦ πιθανοῦ πολλαχῶς τῶν ζητημάτων ταῖς λύσεσι; 165b13: δριμὺς τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασι, et al. See *G. Hartmann, Photios' Literarästhetik*, p. 34, for further discussion.

⁵ See PG 101, 572D: πολλή τις τῷ μεγάλῳ Παύλῳ ἡ χρῆσις τῶν περιβολῶν; 102b23 (on Choricus); et al. Also, on *II Cor.* 7, 7-9 Staab p. 593, 5 (*μεστοποιεῖν*), and on Eph. 2, 1, Staab p. 614, 22 (*μεστοῦν*).

to mean over-elaboration in contrast to the Photian ideal of "naturalness", (*αὐτοσχέδιον*)¹; while *δεινότης* "forcefulness", is usually reserved not for Hermogenes' pinnacle of style, but used in the more ordinary sense of "good at" something².

What then remains of Hermogenes' list after the expulsion of these concepts is as follows: *σαφήνεια, καθαρότης, εὐκρίνεια, ἀξίωμα λόγου καὶ μέγεθος, σεμνότης, λαμπρότης, κάλλος, γοργότης, ἦθος, ἀφέλεια*, and *γλυκύτης*³. If, now, one reads the description of the style of St. Paul in Photius' *Amphilochia*⁴, one will find there mentioned and examples given of each of these qualities⁵. Additional designations throughout the description are: *εὐσημος, κόσμιος, δρθός, παιδρός, ώραῖος, σύντομος*⁶. Paul's style has 1) clarity, 2) elevation, 3) dignity, 4) brilliance, 5) beauty, 6) vigor, 7) character, and 8) pleasantness all duly compounded and so properly mixed' as to produce the inimitable ideal of the *Epistles*.

The concepts here approved for good style apply not only to Scripture, but, with minor variations to accommodate the needs of each *genre*, to the whole of literature. Laourdas has extracted the conditions for good epistolography from Photius'

¹ See 930B7-9: μὴδὲν ἐπιμελὲς ἐπιθεικνόμενος, ἀλλ' ὡς εἴη αὐτοσχέδιον.

² See 11a25, 98b12, 488b19. *δεινότης* and *κάλλος* are what guide the selection of excerpts from the *Panathenaicus of Aristides* (see 400b8-10). Selections from Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius* are also made on the basis of *κάλλος* (see 331a38).

³ Clarity, purity, limpidity, nobility and magnitude, dignity, brilliance, beauty, vigor, character, artlessness and pleasantness.

⁴ PG 101, 576B-602B.

⁵ Except *σεμνότης, ἀφέλεια* and *γλυκύτης*. It is, however, possible to suppose that they are assumed under their larger headings, *σεμνότης* under *μέγεθος*, and *ἀφέλεια* and *γλυκύτης* under *ἦθος*. Too, *ἀφέλεια* may be involved in the *αὐτοσχέδιον, εἴμφυτον, ὁ κοινόν* so often predicated of Paul throughout. *γλυκύτης* may be paralleled in *ἡδονή*: Paul is *ἡδονῆς σωτηρίου βρύουσα πηγὴ*, PG 101, 589D; see also PG 102, 765A. In the only other stylistic description of Scripture, Luke is credited with *τὸ λαμπρὸν τῆς συνθέσεως*, p. 258, n. 13, vol. II Aristarches. See p. 143, note 1.

⁶ See PG 102, 592D: ὡς περ γὰρ τὸ λεπτολογεῖν τῷ δυσθεωρήτῳ προσαρμόζεται, οὕτω τὸ σαφὲς ἂν μὴ διὰ τοῦ συντόμου πρόσειαι, τοῦ μαθητῶντος ἢ τοῦ διδάσκοντός γε πάντως εἰς κατηγορίαν περισταταί. Hence, often, *σαφῆς τε καὶ σύντομος*, 3b9, 84b36, 164a40, et al.

⁷ Note the stress on *συγγενής*, PG 101, 585A; *σύμμετρον, ἐναρμόνιον*, PG 101, 585D; *κέκραται*, PG 101, 588C; *κεραννόμενον*, PG 101, 589A.

remarks as *βραχύτης*, ("conciseness"), *σαφήνεια*, *χάρις* ("charm"), and *ἀπλότης*¹, and a glance at the useful table given by Hartmann for the historians² indicates that the patriarch's historiographical ideal is again: *σαφήνεια*³, *καθαρότης*, *λαμπρότης*, *κάλλος*, *μέγεθος*⁴, and *χάρις* or *τὸ ἡδύ*⁵.

¹ Παρατηρήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ Φωτίου, Ἐπετ. Ἑτ. Βυζ. Σπουδῶν 21 (1951) 81. *ἀπλότης* is a virtue peculiar to exegesis: 95a22 (Clement): ἀπλοῦς δὲ κατὰ τὴν φράσιν καὶ σαφής ἐστι καὶ ἐγγὺς τοῦ ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ καὶ ἀπεριέργου χαρακτήρος; 154a25 (St. Basil): διήκει τὸ ἀπλοῦστερον καὶ καθωμιλημένον τῶν τε λέξεων καὶ τῆς συνθήκης πρὸς τὴν τῶν πολλῶν ἀκοὴν διατυπούμενόν τε καὶ ταπεινούμενον, καὶ μόνης τῆς τῶν ἀκροατῶν σωτηρίας καταστοχαζόμενον; 95a41 (Polycarp): γέμουσα πολλῆς νοουθεσίας μετὰ σαφηνείας καὶ ἀπλότης κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν τῆς ἐρμηνείας τύπον; et al. An excess of *ἀπλότης*, however, reduces into meanness and vulgarity: 78b28 (George of Alexandria): ἀπλοῦς καὶ εἰς πολλὴν χυδαιότητα κατενηνυγμένος; see also cod. 203 ou Theodoret.

² G. Hartmann, Photios' Literarästhetik, pp. 29, 30.

³ For a full definition of *σαφήνεια*, with special reference to historiography, see the Arrian cod. 92, 73a3-18: καινοπρεπῆς δὲ συνθήκη λόγου μάλλον ἢ λέξει, καὶ οὕτως ὥστε μὴ ἂν ἄλλως μῆτε σαφέστερον μῆτε ἀναργέστερον τὸ διήγημα δηλωθῆναι. εὐρήμη δὲ καὶ εὐήχη καὶ τῆ τῶν λέξεων ἀποκεχρημένος στρογγύλω, καὶ τὸ λεῖον ἔχει τῆ μεγέθει συγκιρνάμενον. καὶ ἡ καινότης τῶν λέξεων οὐχὶ ἐς τὸ πόρρω νεωτερίζεται, ἀλλ' ἔγγιστά τε καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐμφατικώτατον, ὡς σχηματισμὸν εἶναι λέξεως ἀλλ' οὐχὶ ἐναλλαγὴν συνήθους ὀνόματος, διὸ καὶ τὸ σαφές συνφέλλεται οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆ διασκευῆ καὶ τάξει καὶ καταστάσει μάλιστα τοῦ διηγήματος, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καὶ τῆς σαφηνείας τὸ ἐντεχνον. ἡ γὰρ τοι χρῆσις ἢ κατὰ τὰς εὐθείας τῶν περιόδων καὶ τοῖς ιδιώταις πρόσσεσι μάλιστα, καὶ εἰς ὁπιότητα καὶ ταπεινότητα λίαν καταβιβάζει τὸν λόγον, ἕκρας μάλιστα γινομένη, ὅπερ οὗτος, εἰ καὶ τοῦ σαφοῦς εἶναι δοκεῖ, οὐ προσήκατο.

⁴ The absence of *μέγεθος* in the epistolographical requirements indicates perhaps that letter-writing is lower on the literary scale than historical composition, which through the importance of its subject matter demands a stylistic loftiness and stature dispensable to the other literary genre. *καινοπρέπεια* can contribute toward *μέγεθος* or *τὸ μεγαλεῖον*: 54b39 (of the historian, Malchus): καὶ οὐδὲ αἱ καινοπρεπεῖς αὐτῶ (sc. λέξεις), δοαὶ τὸ ἐμφατικὸν καὶ εὐχρον καὶ μεγαλεῖον ἔχουσι, παραβλέπονται.

⁵ One meets *ἡδύ*, *ἡδονή*, or *γλυκὴ* often in Photius' reviews in combination with *ἐπίχαρις*, *χάρις*, *χαρίεις*: see 7a34, 9b22, 11a25, 95b15, 97b36, et al. Thence the phraseology does other service too: PG 101, 921A: Ἰουδαίους ἡδύ τε καὶ ἐπίχαρι καλεῖν τὸν θεὸν ἑαυτῶν πατέρα; and, significantly, note the use of these and other phrases in the description of paradise, PG 101, 136A: φυτῶν μὲν γὰρ ἄνθη καὶ κάλλη, ποταμοὶ τε καὶ νάματα τὸ χωρίον περιβρέοντα, καρπῶν τε ὀρώων ποικιλία καὶ βοτανῶν φύσεις ἡδύ τε καὶ ἐπίχαρι πνέουσαι, καὶ διὰ πάντων τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς κοσμούμενόν τε καὶ ὀραϊζόμενον, καὶ ἄερος κρᾶσις εἰς καθαρότητα καὶ διαύγειαν ἀνηπλωμένη καὶ τὰς πρώτας

It seems unnecessary to try to establish an equation between ethical and literary qualities in each of these concepts. Clearly, the inspiration in both cases is the same. Indeed, the lack of a tight, complete correspondence between them reveals the spontaneity of their association in Photius' mind. Style and ethics have much in common not so much because Photius would deliberately have it so, but because the wellspring of thought is the same and they are governed both by the same, fundamentally religious, outlook.

In order to establish this relationship we have limited ourselves to observing the fortunes only of the Hermogenic literary measurements. The reasons for this restriction are twofold: first, because the clearly defined and systematized structure of Hermogenes makes it easier to trace the subsequent fortunes of his system (its great attraction for the Byzantines may lie, in fact, in this very simplicity: it possessed eminently both the virtues and the vices of a good text-book, at once clear and arbitrary or inadequate), and second, because in very fact the *Περί Ἰδεῶν* is the main source for Photius' critical vocabulary. Photius' vocabulary of style, when it is not of his own creation, is inherited from the fields of Hellenistic criticism, the richest tenant of which was probably Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Some idea of his contributions may be gained from the notes to the preceding pages. His terminology, at least from a numerical point of view, is more in evidence in Photius than that of Hermogenes. However, Dionysius remains more in the background because he did not create a ready *system* of criticism. The terms which Photius takes from him are not central to Photius' approach as a whole to the definition of style, but rather confirm and support the patriarch's outlook. They consist largely, as a glance at Hartmann's list will show¹, of synonyms or subdivisions of the basic Hermogenic formulae. The same explanation applies to Photius' debt to Demetrius' *Περί Ἐρμηνείας*, which is less in evidence in his pages than either Hermogenes or Dionysius².

ἀκτίνας ὑποθεχομένη τοῦ ἡλίου, πῶς οὐχὶ τὸ χωρὶον ἔλον ἀποτελοῦσι τερπνότητος τε καὶ ἡδονῆς, ὅση γοητεύει τὰς αἰσθήσεις, πάντων φέρειν τὸ ἀκρότατον;

¹ G. Hartmann, *Photios' Literarästhetik*, p. 32.

² The exact contribution of these and other minor figures has been indexed by E. Orth, *Die Stilkritik des Photios*, Leipzig 1929, pp. 1-56,

As a Christian attains his characteristic perfection by the proper alliance of his words with his thoughts and these in turn with his deeds, guided all by the principles of Christian action and of right belief, so too written expression, if it is to display any literary excellence, must contain within itself a happy combination of those elements of style and content which have in the course of the history of Greek literature been marked out as forming the ingredients of properly compounded written discourse¹. The *λόγος* must strike a balance, must not only avoid the lapse into one extreme or the other — this is the negative aspect, — but also, positively speaking, endeavor to blend the parts into a right

and may perhaps be treated in a work unfortunately inaccessible to me by *R. Henry*, *Essai sur le vocabulaire technique de la rhétorique du patriarche Photius*, Diss. Liège 1931.

¹ It seems superfluous to list all the innumerable instances which bear out this assumption. An indication of their extent may easily be gathered by consulting Orth's index (see previous note), especially pp. 59-133, under the terms compounded with *συν-*, such as *σύγκριμαι*, *σύγκρατος*, *σύμμετρος*, *σύμφωνος*, *συνδιαπλέκω*, *συνεφέλω*, *σύνθεσις*, *συντίθημι*; also *μίγνυμι*, *καταμίγνυμι*, the frequent use of *μετά* with the genitive, *κεράννυμι*, *σύν* with the dative, and the like. See, for example, on the works of a certain monk from Rome, Cassianus, 161a20: *ἔστι δὲ αὐτῷ οἰκεία τοῖς διανοήμασι καὶ τὰ ῥήματα, τό τε σαφές ἀποτίλλοντα καὶ τό ῥαδίως ταῖς ψυχαῖς καὶ ἀνεπαχθῶς ἐγχαράσσεσθαι τὴν χάριν κληρωσάμενα, ἅμα καὶ τοῦ συμπαίθειν καὶ ἔλκειν αὐτάς πρὸς τὸ σπουδαζόμενον, καὶ οὕτω πάντα σαφῶς τε καὶ δεξιῶς κέκρται καὶ διαμεμύρωται, ὥστε, 3b32 (on a treatise of Gregory of Nyssa): τὸ δὲ κάλλος τοῦ λόγου καὶ ἡ σύγκρατος λαμπρότης γλυκύτητι κἀνταῦθα διαπραπῶς ἐπιδείκνυται. Consider also the interest shown in an otherwise unknown treatise, *Περὶ Πολιτικῆς*, cod. 37, cast in the form of a dialogue, of which Photius notes, 8a8-12, "They (i. e., the interlocutors) hold that the constitution which they propose should be a combination of the three forms of government, monarchy, aristocracy, democracy. Each of these is to contribute what is genuine and sincere to the formation of the ideal constitution". The excellence of a narrative is, of course, not limited to its style but extends also to content, to the importance and wealth of information and discussion which it provides. See p. 154, note 4. For Photius this category is covered by the term *πολυμάθεια*: see 90a40 90b1: ἡ βίβλος τῷ τε λαμπρῷ καὶ τῇ σεμνότητι καὶ ἔτι τῷ καθαρῷ καὶ συντόνῳ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ ἀρετῇ τοῦ λόγου καὶ πολυμαθείᾳ. "Polymathy" must not exist divorced from the other components of narrative, but must fit the general requirements of a particular work; hence 89b6 ff: ἡ φράσις ἀνθηρὰ καὶ εἰς ὄγκον ἡρμένη σύμμετρον μετὰ τοῦ ἠδέος, καὶ ἡ πολυμαθεια ἐμπρέπουσα.*

and harmonious whole¹. It must, if one may be permitted the term, be orthodox, admitting no heretical deviation in either direction, but following the middle path². At the same time, to define such a desideratum in unequivocal terms would be to assign a rigid and absolute creed of style against which every piece of literature would be measured and its shortcomings noted. Nothing is further from Photius' purpose. While recognizing a general area of good style, affected by the general considerations of *σαφήνεια*, *καθαρότης*, and the rest, he is even more careful to acknowledge the individual circumstances which affect each composition and to appraise each work as a distinctive unit. Hence it is impossible to draw up a system such as appears in the rhetorical handbooks of Greek literature, where not only is each quality of style laid down *ex cathedra*, but also the grammatical phrases and figures of speech are strictly set. In Photius we must think rather of balance, of a certain fluid composure rather than a rigid canalization such as the stylistic philosophy of Hermogenes³ demands.

¹ The two elements appear neatly juxtaposed, 126b24: τῆς συμμέτρου κράσεως καὶ τὸ πρέπον ἐχούσης.

² This mean of style appears in Photius' frequent use of such phrases as πλεον τοῦ προσήκοντος, πλεον τοῦ θεόντος, ἐς τὸ πόρρω, λίαν, κατὰ κόρον, et al. Its religious overtones appear clearly in an important passage in one of the homilies p. 136, ll. 8-9 Laourdas, where Photius, remarking that "moderation is the best of all things", glories that "it has prevailed in the thoughts of some who are alien to our religion" (μέτρον γὰρ πάντων ἄριστον—θυραυλοῦσιν ἰσὶ τῶν ἡμετέρων ὀργίων εἰς λογισμοῦς ἔλθεῖν ἐξενίκησεν). The context makes it clear that he is speaking of heretics and not of the conversion of the barbarian peoples. There may also be a veiled reference to the party of Theodore the Studite who, though an iconodule, held an extremist position in theology and in ecclesiastical politics (see *E. J. Martin*, *A History of the Iconoclastic Controversy*, London, SPCK, 1930, pp. 150-211 passim). Photius' complete silence about this other major figure of the day may indicate opposition to the methods and presuppositions of one who, like himself, was technically an image-worshipper.

³ It is for this reason that Photius, as a general proposition, rejects the use of the excursus, whether in exegetical or historiographical literature: it is *ἄκαιρος* and makes the narrative unclear, drawing the mind from the course of the argument or discussion: see 164a27 ff. (Theodoret), 123a30 ff. (Theodore of Antioch), 164b31 ff. (Procopius), 121a35 ff. (Theopompus), 73a1 ff. (Arrian); also, on Libanius, 67b17 ff., and a good statement of his position in the Galen cod. 164, 107b4-16: ὅσα γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς λέξεως

Along with the principle of relative judgment before the characteristic circumstances of each case we become aware of another device which marks Photius' desire to refrain from any arbitrary pronouncement on an ideal style. Such is the psychology, I submit, behind his propensity for couching his comments in negative terms, for using words—there are a good many—compounded with alpha privative¹, and for his frequent recourse to litotes: not a mark of *Nachlässigkeit*, as Hartmann complains², but of reticence born of the realization of the nature of style. Moreover, the general virtues of speech such as *λαμπρότης*, *σαφήνεια*, and the rest, are credited to an author not on the basis of the employment of this or that grammatical or rhetorical device; they are truly general and posited of the whole of the narrative. Conversely, the failure to achieve stylistic excellence depends not on the failure to use these devices, but on the intemperate use of the necessary ingredients of narrative as a whole. Hence the sense of wholeness and individuality, coupled with the feeling for the "mean" of style, is the distinguishing feature of the Photian view. It is also revealing that nowhere in his words will one find any suggestion for the improvement of an author's style. Such suggestions are of course implicit in the very criticism, but the fact that they are apparent only negatively, so to speak, is perhaps again a mark of his reticence and his readiness to work with what he has before him and not try to refer his material to some pre-established absolute criterion³.

καὶ συντάξει καθαρὸν—καὶ εὐκρινές—εἰ καὶ ἐν πολλοῖς αὐτοῦ τῶν συγγραμμάτων ἀκαιρολογίαις καὶ παρεκτροπαῖς καὶ τῶν τῶν περιόδων οὐχοινοτενεῖ φροντίζων τὰ βιβλία συγγεῖ καὶ σκοτοῖ τῶν γεγραμμένων τὸν νοῦν τὴν τε σύμφρασιν οἰοεῖ διακόπτων, καὶ εἰς ἀκηθίαν ἀγων διὰ τοῦ μακροῦ λήρου τὸν ἀκροατήν. ὦν τέως τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἀπήλλακται. However, Photius is not prevented from approving the use of the excursus in the case of the historical efforts of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, remarking that the considerable number of digressions relieves and refreshes the reader and prevents him from becoming tired of history. The charm of Dionysius' style with the mixture of detail and digression corrects a tendency toward roughness: see 65a15 ff. For another explanation see *G. Hartmann*, *Photios' Literarästhetik*, p. 23, who thinks that Dionysius is here seen not as a historian but as a rhetorician.

¹ See the list in Hartmann, *op. cit.*, p. 42.

² *Loc. cit.*

³ Thus, Photius does not set up any canons of authors such as

A typical comment, which neatly expresses this attitude, is given on Germanus, 8th century patriarch of Constantinople, and on his

were established in the Hellenistic age and helped to exclude or caused the neglect of other representatives of the same *genre*. The only canonical set in the *Bibliotheca* is that of the Attic orators; which is not Photius' own creation, but incorporated from older sources. Photius often speaks of an author as a *κανών* (Herodotus, 19b17: *κανών Ἰωνικῆς διαλέκτου* — ὡς Ἄττικῆς Θεουκυδίδης; also 45a17-19; Aeschines, 20b25: *κ. μετὰ γε τοὺς πρώτους Ἄττικοῦ λόγου*; Dio Cassius, 35b33: *Θουκυδίδης ἐστὶν αὐτῷ δ κ. Malchus, 54b41: κ. ἱστορικοῦ λόγου*; Libanius, 67b19: *κ. καὶ στάθμη λόγου Ἄττικοῦ*; St. Basil, 98b29: *ἐπιστολαὶ—ἐξ ὧν ἐστὶ κανόνα λαβεῖν ἐπιστολιμαίου χαρακτήρος*; Germanus, 292a32: *εὐσεβῶν δογμάτων κ. ἀπαρέγκλιτος*; St. Paul, PG 101, 589B: *ὡς αὐτὸ τοῦτο κ. καὶ τύπον κάλλους ἀληθινοῦ τοῖς συνορθοῦσι προκίεσθαι*; St. Paul, PG 101, 592A: *κ. εὐγλωττίας*. See also, on St. Basil, 116a39: *τὸν ὄλον λόγον πολιτικοῦ λόγου εἰκόνα ποιούμενος*). In the Phrynichus cod. 158, Photius refers to Phrynichus' notice that Marcianus, the critic, despised the letters of Plato and Demosthenes and considered the letters of Brutus *κανόνα τῆς ἐν λόγῳ ἀρετῆς*, 101a18, while later on, 101b4, he notes that Phrynichus considered the best *κανόνας καὶ στάθμας καὶ παράδειγμα* of *εἰλικρινοῦς καὶ καθαροῦ καὶ Ἄττικοῦ λόγου* to be Plato, Demosthenes, the nine Attic orators, Thucydides, Xenophon, Aeschines the Socratic, Critias, and Antisthenes; of the comedians, Aristophanes and his group when they use Attic; and of the tragedians, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides; and that Phrynichus thought that of all these, Plato, Demosthenes, and Aeschines in his seven *Dialogues* were the best. In all instances, except perhaps in the special case of St. Paul, who stands in the final analysis inimitable as a Scriptural author, Photius means by *κανών* a good representative or a good model for imitation of a particular kind of *λόγος*. The author in question is sometimes coupled with other writers in an exaggerated term of approbation: thus Malchus, 54b41, is *κανών ἱστορικοῦ λόγου*, but at the same time Arrian, 72b40, is *οὐθενὸς τῶν ἀριστα συνταξαμένων ἱστορίας δεύτερος*, and Herodian, 86a1, *ταῖς κατὰ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἀρεταῖς οὐ πολλῶν ἐστὶ δεύτερος*, while Agatharchides, 171b9, is *ζηλωτῆς Θεουκυδίδου—τῷ μεγαλειῷ δὲ μὴ δευτέρου τοῦ λόγου τῷ σαφεῖ παρελαύνει τὸν ἄνδρα*.

On the other hand, the age of Photius and the in many ways similar scholarly and encyclopaedic efforts of the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogennitus mark the first extended attempt toward a Christian scholarship. We have noted that Photius is the first to practice textual criticism upon the work of St. John Chrysostom (see pp. 134, 167). Further, the concern for epistolography evinced in such passages as 101a18 in the Phrynichus codex just discussed and in one of the patriarch's letters in which he criticizes the letters of Demosthenes and Plato while preferring those of Phalaris and Brutus, but admires above all the efforts of the Christian writers, Basil, Gregory, and Isidore (PG 102, 861B-D; see pp. 155, 156 and *B. Laourdas, Παρατηρήσεις ἐπὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος τῶν ἐπιστολῶν τοῦ Φωτίου, Ἐπετ. Ἐτ. Βυζ. Σπουδῶν* 21 (1951) 74-109 passim for other epistolographical references) helps establish a sort of new canon

polemic against certain Origenistic views¹: "In the present work the author is pure and lucid; he makes effective use of figures of speech and his phrasing has charm but does not generate into empty glitter; he is excellent at grasping the elements of a proposition as well as developing his points; in building up his case or in his use of technical or rhetorical arguments he does not include anything beyond what is necessary or omit anything which should be mentioned".

Consider also the criticism of the historian, Herodian:² "His style is clear, brilliant, and charming; his diction avoids extremes, being neither too much given to Atticism, which violates the natural grace of ordinary language, nor so careless as to degenerate into meanness to the sacrifice of all the rules of art. He does not take a pride in what is superfluous, nor does he omit anything that is necessary". Further, Nicephorus is "clear and free from redundancies, his choice of words excellent, and the composition neither too loose nor too compressed"³, while Phlegon of Tralles "though not too mean or ordinary, does not always preserve the Attic character"⁴.

of epistolography. We can see the suggestion of such a canon in Codex Ambrosianus Graecus 81, which contains the treatises of Proclus and Demetrius on epistolography and collections of letters mainly from the Second Sophistic period, and includes 110 letters of Photius himself, who thus is obviously regarded so soon after his death (the codex is 10th century) by the compiler of the manuscript as on a par with the leading letter-writers of the past (see *B. Laourdas*, *The Codex Ambrosianus Graecus 811 and Photius*, *Byz. Zeitschr.* 44 [1951] 320-372).

¹ 292a23-31: ἔστι μὲν οὖν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐν τῷ παρόντι λόγῳ καθαρὸς τε καὶ διειδῆς καὶ τὰς ἐν ὀνόμασι τροπὰς εὐστόχως ὑποβαλλόμενος καὶ τὴν μὲν φράσιν ἡθύνων, οὐκ ὑφελκόμενος δὲ πρὸς ψυχρότητα, γενναῖος μὲν τοῦ ἐπιβαλεῖν τῇ προθέσει, δημοῖος δὲ διελθεῖν τὰ ἀγωνίσματα, καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἀναγκαίου μηδὲν ἐξώθεν παραπλέκων, οὐδὲν δὲ τῶν ὀφειλόντων ῥηθῆναι παραρῶν, οὔτε ταῖς κατασκευαῖς, οὔτε τοῖς ἐπιχειρήμασιν, οὔτε τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασιν.

² 85b37-42: ἔστι δὲ τὴν φράσιν σαφῆς καὶ λαμπρὸς καὶ ἡδύς, καὶ λέξει χρώμενος σῶφρονι, μὴτε ὑπεραττικίζούσῃ καὶ τὴν ἔμφυτον ἐξυθριζούσῃ χάριν τοῦ συνήθους, μὴτε πρὸς τὸ ταπεινὸν ἐκλελυμένη καὶ τὴν ἔντεχνον ὑπερορώσῃ γνῶσιν, οὔτε δὲ περιττολογίαις ἔστι σεμνυόμενος οὔτε τι τῶν ἀναγκαίων παραλιμπάνων.

³ 33b19-22: τὴν φράσιν ἀπέριττός τε καὶ σαφῆς, καλλιλεξίᾳ τε καὶ συνθήκῃ λόγου οὔτε λελυμένη οὔτε αὖ πάλιν συμπεπιεσμένη περιέργως κεχρημένος.

⁴ 84a35-7: τὴν φράσιν οὔτε λίαν χαμαιπετῆς οὔτε τὸν Ἀττικὸν ἐς τὸ ἀκριβῆς διασώζων χαρακτηρᾶ. See also 98a36 ff., cod. 191 passim, 156b28 ff., 165b25 ff., et. al. Most of these references are taken from *G. Hartmann*, *Photios' Literarästhetik*, p. 42.

We are now in a position to sum up the argument of the preceding pages. The conflation of political and ethical values seen both implicitly and explicitly established in Photius' admonitions to the new Christian prince, Boris-Michael, and elsewhere in his works, finds an echo in the criteria for good style that can be gleaned from the remarks in the *Bibliotheca* and in those *Amphilochia* which discuss the language of St. Paul. The picture of Photius' aesthetic outlook thus produced has a make-up half religious, half historical: religious, in the sense that the individual features of this composition are characteristically Christian principles, for which the interest in St. Paul, and, in some measure, in Luke, helps solicit a more explicit and subtle definition; historical, in the sense that they are pointedly peculiar to the culture of the ninth century. Indeed, in an article which undertakes to define the "representation of the intelligible" in Byzantine art, Grabar has called attention to a correspondence between certain ideas expressed in the literature and the characteristics of ninth century art¹. Grabar speaks of the eurhythmic compositions, simple and limpid, the purity of silhouette, the sense of balance, the respect for the human figure coupled with its integration into an ensemble; in short, of the remarkable unity of the image as a whole². One need not belabor the obvious connection with the principles of literary style just derived from Photius' criticism.

Behind the stylistic equations that are suggested by comparing the ideals of art and literature in the ninth century lies the basic outlook, prompted by the historical situation of the period of Photius, which directs the hand of the artist as well as the pen of the literary critic. The *Bibliotheca* by its very composition is in the same spirit. It contains reviews of a large number of books, each treated as a unique phenomenon of time and authorship in the literary past, each regarded with the dignity proper to it as a self-contained literary expression and its author as a distinct literary personality, each judged in its own setting, yet all contributing to and all forming part of a composition in time as members of a large canvas which contains the record of the literary and historical events of the past. Photius does not

¹ A. Grabar, *La Représentation de l'Intelligible dans l'Art byzantin du moyen âge*, Actes du VI^e Congrès Intern. d'Études Byzantines, Paris 1951, vol. 2, pp. 127-43.

² *Ibid.*, p. 141.

write a *Summa Theologiae*, nor can he produce a treatise such as that of his great theological predecessor of the eighth century, John of Damascus, with the grandiose title, *Fount of Knowledge* (Πηγὴ Γνώσεως)¹. St. John's work can be considered a kind of handbook or guide to orthodoxy for believers who, distressed and confused before the storm over the worship of images, might dismiss their feeling of instability and find some reassurance and support in a summary definition of the Faith. But in the middle of the ninth century, despite some vestiges of iconoclasm, the Church had no longer need of such theological medicine. It had emerged triumphant over its enemies, proud and confident of the stability and harmony of its existence under God. Photius comes upon the scene as the first encyclopaedist of Byzantium, not a dry pedant, but one who has absorbed well the lessons of the past and can set the events of history in their proper perspective without the need of apologia for his theological convictions.

One final point may be considered: where, in view of the principles of good style by which Photius measures the works he discusses and which he recommends to his readers, does he stand in the history of criticism? Just as in the history of art the recourse, during the Macedonian revival, to classical models served only as a method for realizing the style of this middle period of Byzantium under Christian inspiration², so too in philological analysis most of the principles Photius uses are taken from within the Atticistic movement, which in turn had derived its standards from the works of classical antiquity. We have seen how Photius avails himself of the terminology of Hermogenes while rejecting such a conception as ἀλήθεια as a division of style because, with its deeply religious overtones, its use in stylistic definition is offensive to his Christian taste³. Such a procedure is indicative of his whole attitude toward the classics. Guided by his interest in what is "useful" (χρήσιμον), he culls from them facts and terminology, while his language is full of classical turns of phrase. Photius is steeped in the classics and uses them for his

¹ The title, *Bibliotheca*, which carries its own presumption, is not Photius' own but was assigned to his work in the Renaissance. See *E. Martini*, *Textgeschichte der Bibliothek des patriarchen Photios von Konstantinopel*, Leipzig 1911, pp. 39, 47.

² *A. Grabar*, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

³ See p. 138, note 1.

own purposes. One detects no longer that apologetic or polemic tone of the earlier Fathers. The classics have by now been woven into the educational pattern, and the new feeling results not from a belated recognition of their serviceability, but from a confidence born of the realization that Christianity had come of age. Conscious of its maturity and superiority, the finally defined and established religion of Jesus accepted their utility and, as it were, cited them not to argue with them but, half deferentially, to show them wherein they erred. While making full use of the externalities of classical learning, Photius shuns completely, when he does not correct, the philosophical presuppositions. That is to say, he shows no interest in Herodotus' conception of history: he could learn nothing from it, for he had his own, to him superior, Christian views on the subject. So too in the realm of style, the need felt during the Atticistic movement for the definition of a classic leads ultimately to the easy system of Hermogenes and to his exaltation of Demosthenes as the classical author *par excellence*, against whose standard the history of literature was measured and in relation to whom the work of an author stood or fell to the degree to which it approached or receded from the artificially created absolute of the Greek orator. With Photius all this changed. Each author, each work of an author, is judged now only in relation to his historical setting; the majestic censure which is essentially an adjunct of the Hermogenic method retires before a more unassuming and more profound attempt at a critical understanding of literature. Under the spur of the Christian conceptions of individual dignity and historical process there is forged a wholly new and original Christian theory of style paced by a delicate sense of balance and proportion. The pyramidal structure of Hermogenes is levelled and replaced by a historical relativism the ideal of which consists in an avoidance of excess and an approximation to a golden mean. Once again the tools of stylistic analysis have been retained, but this time to serve a different master.

The structure which Photius erects in the ninth century, however, does not last for long. I hope at some later time formally to prove what I can now only categorically assert, but what will be apparent to anyone reading in Photius' works. Photius has tried himself to apply the rules of good writing that he seeks in others. One of these requirements is "clarity" (*σαφήνεια*), which is supported in his pages by the fact that so much of the pa-

triarch's effort is pedagogic and expository in nature. The difficulties one meets in reading him come not from any intrinsic obscurity of expression but partly from the difficulty besetting the modern reader in trying to make his way through the still largely uncharted waters of ninth century Byzantine Greek, partly from the fact that our own techniques of writing are so different. If one turns to the production of his two most famous though, at least in this respect, hardly successful pupils, Photius stands forth as a model of clarity. The works of Leo the Wise, particularly his sermons, with their almost deliberate torturing of the language for the sake of rhetorical effect, stand at the other pole¹. In the case of Arethas, archbishop of Caesarea, things had gone so far that, having actually been accused of "obscurity" (*ἀσάφεια*), and presenting his defense in an extant treatise entitled, "In Answer to Those Who Have Accused Us of Impiety, Containing also a Discussion of our Style of Writing" (*Πρὸς τοὺς εἰς ἀσάφειαν ἡμᾶς ἐπισκώψαντας, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τίς ἡ ἰδέα οὐ μέτιμεν λόγου*)²,

¹ Text in PG 107 and *Λέοντος τοῦ Σοφοῦ Πανυγηρικοί* (sic) *Λόγοι*, ed. Acacius, Athens 1868.

² Text edited by *J. Comperness* in *Didaskaleion* 2 (1931) 183-88; also by *S. Kougeas*, *Ὁ Καισαρείας Ἀρέθας καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ*, Athens 1931, pp. 139-143. See the judicious remarks of Comperness, who in the *Prolegomena*, p. 181, rightly expresses surprise and indignation "wie ein Gelehrter wie Arethas, der den besten Teil seines Lebens auf das Studium der attischen Prosaisten verwendet und die Vorschriften der Redelehrer nicht bloss kennen gelernt, sondern nach Ausweis der besten Hss. auch durch sein beliebtes *ῥηαῖον* zur Nachahmung empfohlen hat, in diesen schlimmsten Fehler verfallen konnte. Wer von der Lektüre des Photios kommt, sollte es nicht für möglich halten, dass Arethas, der doch eine der anhänglichsten Schüler des grossen Meisters reiner und geschmackvoller Diktion war, in einem völligen Gegensatz zu seinem Lehrer steht". We are in the case of Arethas before the paradox of a person ridiculing the classical texts out of misdirected Christian convictions, yet spending his life transcribing, studying, and commenting upon them. The rather stuffy cleric from Caesarea, however, who in the famous extant Lucianic scholia (ed. H. Rabe, Berlin 1906) vents his illiberal spleen against the "pagan stupidities and wickednesses" (see a list of his castigations collected by Rabe, p. 336) of Lucian, seems to have cast aside the lesson of his master, by whom Lucian is judged in his context (though Photius too derives an understandable pleasure in condemning Lucian's attacks on pagan religion and philosophy) as an excellent satirist and a fine stylist, and who by and large forbears from any criticism except that Lucian's style does not fit his subject matter (codd. 128, 129).

he treats us to the grotesque spectacle of answering his detractors in a style which does nothing less than prove their accusation.

As the Photian fundamentals of good style fell on barren ground, so too there disappeared the principle of personal and historical "propriety" (*οἰκειότης*) which guides the patriarch's critical analyses. Literary criticism comes once more under the shadow of the absolutistic method, but this time the idealized author is Christian. We are, in other words, by the eleventh century before a kind of Christian classicism, at a time when the great Fathers of the Church have taken on the aura of a classic. If the application of scholarly analysis is one of the marks of this development, as it was in the Hellenistic age, we can see the movement initiated already by Photius, who, as already noted¹, is the first to study the text of St. John Chrysostom as a philological document. On the other hand, although Photius is unreserved in his praise of such figures as SS. Chrysostom, the two Gregories, Basil, and other leading authors of the Church, he never sets them off against others, nor does he use them as an ideal measuring-stick for literature. Rather, he admires them in their own right. If the Photian analysis of the style of the Apostle Paul suggests the opposite, we must bear in mind that to a truly Christian critic Paul must stand apart, for he commands reverence as a Scriptural author. In any case, he does not, as Demosthenes, offer himself for comparison or imitation, but exists on a higher plane, sacred, and, in the final analysis, inimitable. By the time of Michael Psellos, however, the careful balance and historical vision which are the hallmark of Photius' literary criticism, as indeed of his whole outlook toward life, give way before the conceptions of the learned philologist, who raises, not Demosthenes, but Gregory of Nazianzus as the pacemaker of literary style, in relation to whom all authors are to be judged. We have, edited by A. Mayer, the monograph of Psellos on Gregory to make this plain². On almost every page of the text Psellos attempts to support his thesis by drawing comparisons supposedly fatal to almost every classical author imaginable. In his zeal for his dar-

¹ See p. 134.

² Edited with introduction and commentary by *A. Mayer*: Psellos' Rede über den rhetorischen Character des Gregorios von Nazianz, Byz. Zeitsch. 20 (1911) 27-100 (text pp. 48-60).

ling he is led to impossible judgments against, among others, Plato and Thucydides.

In such a situation one comes quickly to realize how intimately the history of Byzantine life and letters is connected with the attitude toward the classics. Psellos' purpose is to mark off Gregory as the apex of a literary development built up from the beginnings of Greek literature: hence the comparison of Gregory even with poets such as Sappho, Archilochus, Anacreon, and others, with whom the "theological style" (*θεολογικός χαρακτήρ*)¹, of the Church Fathers had nothing in common. To achieve this goal Psellos uses, as did Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the monograph form and employs largely Dionysian vocabulary, not realizing, as Mayer points out², that the technical terms do not suit something with a quite different literary development. This is the fault inherent in the "comparative" (*σύγκρισις*) method of literary criticism which Photius, the only other Byzantine author before Psellos³ to write a monograph, however small, on a single author—for such, of course, are the individual codices of the *Bibliotheca*,—properly uses only in the case of objects legitimately matched. Though Photius also makes use of the Hellenistic terms of literary criticism indiscriminately over the whole range of Greek literature, yet his feeling for *genre*, his selection of terms proper to an author in the discussion of that author's style⁴, prevents him from falling into the excesses of Psellos.

¹ See the title of the work: *Τοῦ ὑπερτίμου Ψελλοῦ λόγος σχεδιασθεὶς πρὸς Πόθον βεσιάρχην ἀξιόσπαντα αὐτὸν γράψαι περὶ τοῦ θεολογικοῦ χαρακτήρος.*

² Op. cit., pp. 61, 63.

³ Mr. Ihor Ševčenko has kindly informed me of a 14th century tract by Theodore Metochites, entitled, *Ἐπιστολία καὶ κρίσις τῆς τῶν δύο ἡγήτων ἐδοκιμήσεως, τοῦ τε Δημοσθένους καὶ Ἀριστοῦ* (Vind. Phil. Gr. 95, fols. 356-364), mentioned in another connection by Ševčenko, *A New Fragment of Sappho?*, *Annals of the Ukrainian Academy of Arts and Sciences in the United States* 1 [1951] 152), which again, as against Psellos, uses the correlative system of criticism.

⁴ Photius uses *σκληρός* 65a14, not part of his stylistic vocabulary, in speaking of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, because the term is common to Dionysius; likewise *ἀδρός*, *ισχνός*, *μέσος*, *πλάσμα*, et al., in speaking of Proclus, cod. 239 (see *R. Henry*, *Proclus et le Vocabulaire technique de Photius*, *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire* 13 [1934] 622 ff.). Too, the Damascius cod. 181, is written along Hermogenic lines, probably in deference to the Neo-Platonic regard for the rhetorician of Tarsus (see *Christ-Schmid-Stählin*, *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur*⁶, vol. VII. 2. 2, p. 934). See p. 136, note 4.

Christianity and classical culture: these are the two points between which wavered the intellectual scale of Byzantium. The uneasy union resulting from the syncretistic efforts of the fourth century leads during the first golden age of Byzantium to the representative confusion of Procopius. The historian of the period of Justinian, as Downey points out¹, displays an attitude which, far from being a categorical expression of either pagan or Christian belief, is, rather, typical of a time when paganism was far from dead, yet still existed in a society whose members, including Procopius, were for the most part Christian. There follows the iconoclastic controversy in centuries relatively dark to us through the absence of texts and artistic monuments, and immediately afterwards the Christian-classical revival paced by Photius, which in the domain of letters extends into the tenth century with the transcriptive and text-critical efforts of Arethas and the further encyclopaedic compilations promoted by the Emperor Constantine Porphyrogenitus. By the eleventh century the classics, as seen in the case of Psellos, have gained the upper hand; for, although the learned Byzantine sets up a *Christian* author as the perfect literary model, he sees him as the end of a development in *classical* literature and judges him in classical terms. Indeed, Psellos himself is known to us primarily as a classical philologist².

Finally in the fourteenth century the great Hesychast movement may be viewed as in part a struggle between those Byzantines who had by this time almost entirely lost interest in Christian questions, who concerned themselves only with classical subjects and were appropriately stigmatized as "Greeks", such as Georgius Pletho Gemistus, and their vigorous adversaries, the monks of Athos, who believed, with some right, that they were engaged in a belated struggle with paganism. Yet for a brief moment in the ninth century Photius, while naturally preferring his Christian convictions, is able to establish a fine balance between the two great contenders, and under the aegis of a relative pragmatism peculiar to the spirit of Eastern Christianity of his time, to call the classics into useful service within a Christian society.

University of Buffalo, U.S.A.

GEORGE L. KUSTAS

¹ G. Downey, *Paganism and Christianity in Procopius*, *Church History* 18 (1949) 89-102, especially p. 99.

² On Psellos see K. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*², München 1897, pp. 433-444.