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Abstract

The present thesis is an annotated critical edition of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus’ (1391-1425) Seven Ethico-political Orations. It comprises an Introduction and the critical text. The Introduction is divided into two Parts (I-II). Part I provides biographical information on the author, his times and his works. Particular reference is made to Manuel II’s ethico-political works addressed to his son and successor John VIII (1425-1448), namely the Precepts on the education of a prince and the Seven Ethico-political Orations. These works, and other minor ethico-political works, are examined in the wider context of Byzantine political ideology, as expressed in Byzantine mirrors of princes. This is followed by an examination of the circumstances of the composition of the Seven Ethico-political Orations in the light of internal evidence. This Part closes with an analysis of the structure, content, sources, language, style and an overall evaluation of the text.

Part II is devoted to the manuscript tradition. The complete text of the Seven Ethico-political Orations (I-VII) together with the Epistolary Epilogue survive in three codices dated between the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries (Vindobonenses Philologici graeci 42 and 98, Vaticanus graecus 632); Orations I-V are preserved in the sixteenth-century codex Monancensis graecus 411; the Epistolary Epilogue is contained also in the fifteenth-century MS Parisinus graecus 3041, which was owned by the Emperor; and a short section of Oration VII is transmitted in the fifteenth-century codex Vaticanus graecus 266. All extant MSS, together with Johannes Leunclavius’ (Löwenclau) editio princeps and its reprint in the Patrologia Graeca vol. 156, are described and studied codicologically and palaeographically, before their relation is established and the reconstruction of a stemma codicum is proposed. The edition of the complete text, based on the principle MS (Vindobonensis Philologicus graecus 98), is accompanied by an apparatus criticus recording all textual variations and palaeographical observations in the extant codices and the printed editions, an apparatus locorum parallelorum recording parallel passages in other works by Manuel II and an apparatus fontium identifying other sources cited in the text. This is preceded by a brief note on the conventions adopted in the present edition, and a list of abbreviations and signs used in the apparatus criticus.

The thesis closes with full bibliography and facsimiles of selected folios of the extant MSS.
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Introduction

Part I: The author and his work

The author

Born in Constantinople in 1350, Manuel II Palaeologus (1391-1425), the second son of John V Palaeologus (1341-1391) and Helena Cantacuzene (1333-1396), lived in a period of constant political and ecclesiastical turmoil. Manuel’s experience in politics began from an early age. He was first involved in diplomatic negotiations as a child of five, while as a young man he supported his father during his elder brother Andronicus IV’s revolt (1373-1379), which led to their incarceration, together with his younger brother Theodore, by Andronicus in Constantinople (1376-1379). Later on, Manuel’s independent policy against the Turks during his rule as despot in Thessalonike (1382-1387) and subsequent loss of the city, led to his exile by his father to the island of

---


Lemnos (1387-1389)\(^6\). His uneasy relation with Andronicus IV’s son John VII (1370-1408)\(^7\), was an important issue of succession that occupied Manuel, even after 1391 when he secured the imperial throne\(^8\).

Together with the imperial sceptre of his Emperor father, Manuel inherited also John V’s policy. This mainly aimed at preserving central power and authority, maintaining order in the Church, often by personally intervening in ecclesiastical affairs\(^9\), and continuing the negotiations with the papacy over the Union of the Churches, using this as leverage for the much hoped for financial and military help from the West, in the face of the impending Ottoman threat. Pursuing the latter aim Manuel travelled to Western Europe (1399-1403)\(^10\). Accompanied by a large entourage\(^11\) he visited Italy and then France and England where he was received with great honour by King Charles VI (1380-1422) and King Henry IV (1399-1413) respectively, though in the end he returned to Constantinople empty handed, as the promises he received were never fulfilled\(^12\).

---


\(^7\) For a general study on John VII see F. Dölger, ‘Johannes VII., Kaiser der Rhomäer 1390-1408’, BZ 31 (1931), 21-36. I have been unable to consult S. Mešanovic, Jovan VII Paleolog (Institute for Byzantine Studies, Belgrade, 1996). Cf. below, pp. 32-33.


This experience, together with the political perplexities and the deep divisions concerning ecclesiastical Union among his own people, brought him a sense of realism. This becomes evident in the counsel he gave in private to his son John VIII during the negotiations held in Constantinople with the papal envoy in 1422, to be cautious about the Union, always to discuss but never actualize it, fearing that a ‘worse schism’ might divide the Byzantine Church and society, with the Empire thus remaining exposed against the Ottomans. Subsequent events proved that Manuel’s attitude was justified.

Throughout his turbulent life and reign Manuel found a refuge in his studies. Manuel inherited his love for learning from his Empress mother and his grandfather, the theologian and historian Emperor John VI Cantacuzenus (1347-1354). Manuel’s numerous writings, comprising literary, philosophical, ethico-political, rhetorical, theological, religious, liturgical and spiritual works, reveal the level of his


18 Manuel II, Seven Ethico-political Oration, ed. below, pp. 315-474; idem, Precepts, 313A-384D; idem, Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time, ed. E. Legrand, Lettres de l’empereur Manuel Paléologue (Paris, 1893), Letter v0’, pp. 88-89.


Manuel II, Discourse on the transcendence of the Holy Trinity with reference to the all-nation of order, ed. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. 318-325; idem, Letter to Alexius lagoup, pp. 326-373; idem, A Debate between Demetrius Chrysoloras and Antonio d’Ascoli on the question: if it is better to be than not to be, how could Christ say
education and the range of his interests. Composed in a high style of medieval Greek, they testify to Manuel’s familiarity with classical Greek, Scriptural and patristic literature, and his skill in employing Atticized Greek as his linguistic register, a sine qua non for all educated Byzantines, who attempted to imitate, with varying degrees of success, the great classical authors. Some information on Manuel’s formal education is provided in his Letter to Alexius Lagoup, a long epistolary discourse on the study of theology he composed around 1396:

‘Well then, when I was a child it was not possible for me to frequent solely the schools of arts and letters, and concentrate on this only, so that I might surpass all wise men and those who are praised for their learning. But once I went through <my early training in> the Council,
one task came after another, and I needed to change daily many teachers in turn, who taught me many and different disciplines — how to handle the bow and the spear, and how to ride a horse.\footnote{27}

Though in his \textit{Precepts on the education of a prince} (hereafter \textit{Precepts}) Manuel urged his son John VIII to follow similar training in archery, hunting and, more importantly, subjects that would be beneficial for his soul and mind\footnote{28}, there is no sufficient information on what exactly a curriculum, adapted to the needs of the members of the Palaeologan imperial family, entailed\footnote{29}. As is well known, the standard Byzantine curriculum consisted of three stages\footnote{30}: elementary education (ἱερὰ γράμματα), including reading and writing using classical and Christian texts, namely the Psalter and the Scriptures\footnote{31}; secondary education (ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία) comprising the trivium (grammar, poetry and rhetoric) and the quadrivium (mathematics, geometry, harmonics and Aristotle’s \textit{Organon}); and higher education\footnote{33}, which consisted of an in-depth study of poetry, rhetoric, philosophy and mathematics. Higher education was essential for those aiming at high positions in the court and the Church, and indispensable for an


\footnote{28} Manuel II, \textit{Precepts}, 313A-B. Information regarding the military, rhetorical and philosophical education John VIII received by his father, is given by Isidore of Kiev in his \textit{Encomium addressed to the Emperors Manuel and John VIII the Palaeologans}, ed. S. Lampros, ‘Ἀνωνύμου Πανηγυρικὸς εἰς Μανουὴλ καὶ Ἰωάννην ΗΠΠ', ΠΠ III (Athens, 1926), pp. 169-173.


\footnote{33} Constantinides, \textit{Higher Education}, passim.
emperor\textsuperscript{34}. This is stated in Byzantine mirrors of princes\textsuperscript{35}, including Manuel’s Precepts, and in Seven Ethico-political Orations (hereafter Orations)\textsuperscript{36}, where the importance of the study of ethical and didactic texts by the emperor becomes also evident\textsuperscript{37}. Manuel’s strong belief in education is also evident from the reforms he introduced in higher education as part of the re-organising of the University and the Patriarchal Academy\textsuperscript{38}.

Manuel enjoyed the association of a large entourage of teachers, scholars and intellectuals, some of whom parade in his correspondence, including John Chortasmenos\textsuperscript{39}, the mystic Nicolas Cabasilas\textsuperscript{40}, Constantine Ivankos, who must have been one of Manuel’s instructors in literature and rhetoric\textsuperscript{41}, his close friend and ambassador Manuel Chrysoloras, to whom he sent his Funerary Oration to his brother Theodore for comments\textsuperscript{42}, the didaskalos Joseph Bryennios\textsuperscript{43}, Demetrios Chrysoloras\textsuperscript{44},

\textsuperscript{34} Barker, Manuel II, pp. 420-421; cf. N.G. Wilson, ‘The Church and classical studies in Byzantium’, AntAb 16 (1970), 68-77 at 70; idem, Scholars, pp. 2-4; Hunger, Βυζαντινή λογοτεχνία, pp. 130-133; Constantinides, Higher Education, pp. 1-2, 154-155, 159; idem, ‘Teachers’, pp. 41-42.


\textsuperscript{36} Manuel II, Letters, 45, pp. 122-135; Dennis, Letters, p. xlv; Mergiali, L’enseignement, p. 167.


Michael Balsamon, Patriarch Euthymios, the monks David and Damian of Vatopedi, Gabriel Metropolitan of Thessalonike and the theologian Macarios Macres; the last two scholars appear to have collaborated with Manuel over the text of the Oration.

Above all, the teacher, scholar and theologian, Demetrius Cydones, seems to have played an important role in Manuel’s education. Undoubtedly, their relationship was characterised by mutual admiration. Manuel’s comment in his Letter to Alexius Iagoup, that he ‘was able to receive just a spark from the greatest torch’, is possibly an allusion to his mentor Cydones. On his part Cydones expressed his admiration for the young Emperor, who, despite his inadequate formal education, interrupted in the face of ‘difficulties’, was able to develop his literary skills thanks to his own copious efforts. From their correspondence it becomes evident that they remained close relation is evident from their extensive correspondence. See Dennis, Letters, pp. xxxiv-xxxv. Manuel addressed eight letters to Demetrius Chrysoloras (Dennis nos. 33, pp. 90-93, 41, pp. 108-111, 43, pp. 113-115, 44, pp. 116-121, 46, pp. 136-137, 48, pp. 138-139, 50, pp. 142-147, 61, pp. 170-171); cf. F. Conti Bizzarro ed., Demetrio Crisolora, Cento Epistole a Manuele II Paleologo: testo critico, introduzione, traduzione e commentario (Naples, 1984), pp. 17-21.

50. See below, pp. 49-50, 237-240.
51. Barker, Manuel II, pp. 414-420; Dendrinos, Annotated, p. iii. Their close relation is evident from their extensive correspondence. See Dennis, Letters, esp. pp. xxxviii-xl; Loenertz, Correspondance, II, pp. 484-496 for a list of letters addressed to Manuel II; cf. PLP 13876.
52. Manuel II, Letter to Alexius Iagoup, p. 330.11-12: ‘... ἡμιολογοῦ ἐγὼ ὡς ὁ ἄνδρα ἡμῶν ἀνθρώπου ζωήν ἐφήσει, ἀλλὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ πιστοῦ ἰδιώτην μᾶλλον τινὰ σπλήνηρα, ὅπερ οὐ γεγονόμενον οὖν, λαβεῖν ἑαυτὸν.’
closely attached for many years, while their exchange of letters may have been used as part of Manuel’s instruction⁵⁷.

Both a thinker and a man of action, Manuel was described by his contemporary authors as the personification of the Platonic ‘philosopher king’⁵⁸. This dimension of his character and personality is reflected in his numerous compositions, especially his personal Letters, some of which convey his thoughts and views on political events and their protagonists⁵⁹, and his works of moral and political content⁶⁰. The most important of these works are Manuel’s Precepts and the Orations, on which we shall now concentrate⁶¹. The present thesis, comprising a critical edition and study of the Orations, further explores Manuel’s expressed views on imperial authority and the ethical implications of political power in the wider context of the principles of Byzantine political ideology and of the events that shaped his long political career.

---

⁵⁷ Barker, Manuel II, pp. 415-416; cf. Constantinides, Higher Education, p. 17 with n. 82: ‘... even during the absence of the teacher or the pupil the teaching continued by correspondence ...’.


⁵⁹ See Dennis, Letters, pp. xviii-xxi.

⁶⁰ For these works, see above p. 24 n. 18. Apart from the aforementioned works, Manuel’s Panegyric, his Counsel to the Thessalonians, his Dialogue on marriage and the Funeral Oration, should also be considered of political content.

⁶¹ The recent unpublished PhD thesis by F. Leonte, Rhetoric in Purple: The Renewal of Imperial Ideology in the Texts of Emperor Manuel II Palaeologos (Center for Eastern Mediterranean Studies, Central European University, July 2012), pp. 142-243, offers interesting views concerning the nature, structure, content and didactic purpose of the Orations and the Precepts. Some of these views are challenged below.
The Seven Ethico-political Orations

Both the Precepts (preceded by an Epistolary Preface) and the Orations (accompanied by an Epistolary Epilogue) were addressed by Manuel to John VIII (1425-1448). The former text is a set of admonitions the Emperor offers to his son and heir to the throne. In the Epistolary Preface Manuel states that he had composed a version of his Precepts before leaving Constantinople to travel to the West (in December 1399). On his return from the West (in June 1403), however, he revised the text so that his advice, as he says, would be more appropriate for his son who had by then grown up (John was eleven years old in 1403) and moreover that it would be beneficial to all, young and old, irrespective of their financial status and position in society, not only in the present but also in the future. Following the popular form of composition in a hundred chapters (Centuria), the initial letters of which form an acrostichis, Manuel presented his own views on the duties of the Emperor, the good governance of the state, the moral behaviour befitting a ruler, and the virtues and principles that should characterise a Christian emperor. As Manuel stresses in the Epistolary Preface and the acrostichis, these admonitions are offered by the emperor father to his emperor son and not by an author who serves the emperor, thus excluding any flattery.

The Precepts belong to the genre of mirrors of princes (κάτοπτρον ἡγεμόνος, speculum principis), which reflects perceptions of the ideal prince, his principles, virtues and

---


63 Ed. below, pp. 471-474.

64 Manuel II, Precepts, 313A: ‘Ἐν Πελοποννήσῳ σε λιπὼν, ἐξ Ἰταλίας ἐρχόμενος (ὦ πῶς ἐνεγκεῖν ἐδυνήθην;), ἦσθα δὲ παιδίον ἐτι, καὶ παιδείας οὐ συχνῆς μετέχων διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἀλλὰ τέ σοι καὶ τῆς τύχης ἐμποδίζων εἰς τούτου γεγενημένης ὑποθήκης συμβαινούσαι ἐρρύθμιζον· ἐν αἷς ἑτέρας ἐπηγγελλόμην σοὶ δώσειν τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀμείβοντι, τελεωτέρῳ βίῳ πρεποῦσας. Ἀρτι δὲ γε μειράκιῳ γεγονότι, …’.

65 Ibid., 316B: ‘… ἃ συνοίσει μὲν καὶ νῦν, συνοίσει δὲ ἐς τὸ μέλλον καὶ συμβήσεται καὶ νέῳ, καὶ γέροντι, καὶ τύχη πίασῃ, καὶ τάξει, τῶ τε ὅντι, τῶ τε ἐσομένῳ γε βίῳ.’.

66 Ibid., 317B: ‘…οὕτως ἐλευθέρως καὶ πατρικῶς (ὡς ἂν εἴποι τις) ἀποδέδωκα, ὀφείλημά τε καὶ δῶρον …’; ibid., 317A: ‘… κατὰ βασιλέα, καὶ πατέρα, καὶ φίλον …’.

67 Ibid., 320B: ‘Βασιλεὺς, βασιλεί, Μανουὴλ, Ἰωάννῃ, πατήρ, υἱῷ, ψυχῆς, ψυχῆ, καρπὸν, τροφήν, ἐμῆς, τῇ σῇ, ὁποιασοῦν, ἀκμαζούσῃ, ὁ Θεὸς εἴη κοσμήτωρ.’.

68 The personal connection of the author with the recipient of the text is one of the characteristics of mirrors of princes. See Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ Λογοτεχνία, pp. 246-247.

70 Ibid., pp. 255-256; Paidas, Κάτοπτρα, pp. 24, 44-45.
duties. Modelled on Isocrates, and influenced by the ancient Greek tradition and Hellenistic political thought, amalgamated with Christian elements initially introduced by Eusebius of Caesarea, mirrors of princes further developed throughout the Byzantine period. The most representative works of this genre by Byzantine authors were composed by Synesius of Cyrene (4th c.), Agapetus the Deacon (6th c.), Patriarch Photius (9th c.), Emperor Basil I (867-886) (in reality Patriarch Photius) (9th c.), Theophylact Archbishop of Ochrid (12th c.), and by the thirteenth-century scholar and teacher Nicephorus Blemmydes, active in Nicaea, and Thomas Magistros (14th c.).

71 Hunger, Βυζαντινή Λογοτεχνία, pp. 245-256, esp. p. 247. According to Hunger, one of the characteristics of one kind of mirrors is its structure (i.e., the division in many small chapters). The acrostich is another characteristic of the genre, adopted also by Agapetus and Ps-Basil.


76 Some other texts that belong to the genre, as for example Cacumenos’s Strategikon, ed. M.D. Spadaro, Raccomandazioni e consigli di un galantuomo (Alessandria, Italy, 1998), pp. 44-242, will not be examined. Similarly those composed in the form of letter by Demetrios Chomatenos and John Apokaukos, others belonging to monastic florilegia such as the Melissa of Antonios and the Theasuros of Theognostos, and more extensive treatises of political content as for example those composed by Theodore II Lascaris will not be examined in the thesis. For editions and an analysis of the ideas of the aforementioned and other mirrors of princes see Hunger, Βυζαντινή Λογοτεχνία, pp. 247-251; Angelov, Ideology, pp. 187, 191-196. For an analysis of the ideas of Antonios’s Melissa see S. Triantari-Mara, Οἱ πολιτικὲς ἀντιλήψεις τῶν βυζαντινῶν διακοπῆσιν ἀπὸ τὸ δέκατο έως τὸ δέκατο τρίτο αἰώνα μ.Χ. (Thessalonike, 2002), pp. 97-113. For the works of Theodore II Lascaris see Angelov, Ideology, pp. 207ff; cf. M. Paléologou, ‘Deux Traité inédits de Théodore II Doucas Lascaris’, Βυζαντινά 27 (2007), 51-90.

77 Synesius, pp. 5-62.

78 Agapetus, pp. 26-77.


81 Theophylact, pp. 178-211.

82 Blemmydes, pp. 44-116.
who taught in Thessalonike\textsuperscript{83}. The Muses (Μοῦσαι Ἁλεξιάδες Κομνηνίαδες) of Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (1081-1118)\textsuperscript{84}, largely engaged with contemporary events, is another advisory text addressed by an emperor to his son\textsuperscript{85}. Manuel II’s Precepts closes this genre in the Byzantine period, though Byzantine mirrors of princes enjoyed a revival in the Post-Byzantine period, as the manuscript tradition and translations of these texts show\textsuperscript{86}. The principle idea in these works, fundamental also in imperial orations, is that the emperor should primarily be characterized by the four Platonic virtues: courage (ἀνδρεία), prudence (φρόνησις), justice (δικαιοσύνη), and temperance (σωφροσύνη)\textsuperscript{87}. In addition, since the emperor is perceived to be the image of God on earth, an essential principle of Byzantine political theory, he should possess the Christian virtues of φιλανθρωπία, that is, love for mankind, and humility (μετριότης). Devoutness, self-control, generosity and benefaction to his subjects, were also included among the qualities of an emperor\textsuperscript{88}.

Apart from its intrinsic value as Manuel’s ethico-political testament, which reflects his own views on moral and political philosophy, the Precepts, together with the Orations, served an additional purpose. By addressing both works to his own son and co-emperor, John VIII, Manuel aimed at securing the legitimate succession of his son John VIII to the throne, partly against any future claims by Manuel’s other sons\textsuperscript{90}, but mainly against the claims of Andronicus’ son John VII\textsuperscript{91}. Though by the time of the composition of the Orations\textsuperscript{92} Manuel and John VII have already reached a special

\textsuperscript{83} Thomas Magistros, On Kingship, ed. P. Volpe Cacciatore, Toma Magistro. La Regalità. Testo critico, introduzione e indici (Naples, 1997); PG 145, cols. 448A-496C.


\textsuperscript{85} See below, p. 184 with n. 641.

\textsuperscript{86} This is currently investigated by Dr Ch. Dendrinos. Cf. I. Ševčenko, ‘Agapetus East and West: The Fate of a Byzantine “Mirror of Princes”’, RESEE 16 (1978), 3-44; A. Glycofrydi-Leontsini, “‘Teaching Princes’: A vehicle of moral and political education during the Neohellenic Enlightenment’, Classical Russia 1700-1825 3 (2008-2010), 71-90.


\textsuperscript{88} For a general study on the Byzantine concept of φιλανθρωπία as an imperial virtue see D.J. Constantelos, Byzantine Philanthropy and Social Welfare (New York, 1991?), pp. 33-42.

\textsuperscript{89} Cf. Hunger, Βιογραφία Λαογραφικι, pp. 248-256; Dendrinos, ‘Μανουηλ Β’, 160-162.


\textsuperscript{91} Cf. Manuel II, Letters, 33.34-37, pp. 91-93. It has also been proposed that Manuel’s Dialogue on marriage, his marriage and official coronation ceremony, as well as the Scriptural excerpts read on the occasion, had a political scope and intended to secure Manuel’s throne against John VII’s claims, see S.W. Reinert, ‘Political Dimensions of Manuel II Palaiologos’ 1392 Marriage’, in Novum Millennium, Studies on Byzantine history and culture dedicated to Paul Speck, eds. C. Sode et al. (Ashgate, 2001), pp. 291-303.

\textsuperscript{92} See below, pp. 47-50.
agreement (1399), with the help of Marshal Boucicaut, Manuel must have remained sceptical regarding his nephew until the latter’s death in 1408. Manuel was well aware of John VII’s unsteady character, bearing in mind John VII’s revolt against both Manuel and his father John V in 1390, the crowning of John’s son Andronicus (1400-1408?) as co-emperor and his general effort to maintain power, especially after his appointment as a ruler in Thessalonike (1403).

So far the composition of these two works is concerned, it is clear that they are closely connected. An examination of these two texts shows that the themes Manuel discussed in the Precepts formed the basis for the Orations. That the Precepts antedate the composition of the Orations is clear by references in the Orations to specific chapters of the Precepts and not vice versa. For example in the third Oration, when he reflects on the ephemeral nature of human life, addressing his son, Manuel refers to ‘the sixty-second of the chapters I have addressed to you’, that is chapter 62 of the Precepts.

The Orations is a rhetorical work of philosophical content, through which Manuel offers his son genuine advice and warnings free of any attempt to please or flatter him.

---


96 For the events of John VII’s rebellion in 1390, see P. Charanis, ‘The strife among the Palaeologi and the Ottoman Turks, 1370-1402’, B 16 (1942/43), 286-314 at 302-305; T. Koliás, ‘Ἡ ἀνταρσία Ιωάννου Ζ’ ἐναντίον Ιωάννου Ε’ Παλαιολόγου (1390)’, Ελληνικα 12 (1952), 34-64; Barker, Manuel II, pp. 68-79.


100 It should be noted that the Precepts precede the Orations in three of the four codices transmitting the text of the Orations: Vindobonenses phil. gr. 42 and 98 and Monacensis gr. 411. For a description of these MSS see below, pp. 191-224.

101 Oration III 77-78: ‘Ἀκήκοας δὲ τι καὶ παρὰ ἡμῶν περὶ τούτων σαφέστερον εἰρημένον, ἐν τῷ ἐξηκοστῷ δευτέρῳ τῶν προς σέ μου κεφαλαίων’.
similarly to the Precepts\textsuperscript{102}. Strictly speaking the Orations do not belong to the genre of mirrors of princes, for they are not composed in small and succinct chapters but are characterised by their lengthy and complex discussion of ethico-political ideas\textsuperscript{103}. Taking, however, into consideration the principal characteristics of mirrors of princes in terms of content\textsuperscript{104}, then a continuity of thought and thematic links found therein\textsuperscript{105} can be observed in the Orations in which Manuel incorporates tenets of the genre\textsuperscript{106}.

The label ‘ethico-political’ with relation to this particular work\textsuperscript{107} has been disputed by scholars on the grounds that the text is concerned with moral and religious issues at the exclusion of political views\textsuperscript{108}. That ‘ethico-political’ is a fitting title describing the core subject of Manuel’s Orations is clear from their content and aim. In the Orations ethics\textsuperscript{109} and political theory are combined, while at the same time important issues concerning various modes of life and behaviour in pursuit of happiness are also discussed in great detail. In addition, the aim of the Orations, repeated several times by the author, which coincides with that of the mirrors, is to offer primarily advice to the emperor on how to be good and virtuous. As Manuel states the reason he composed this work, despite his heavy imperial duties and responsibilities (\textit{μηδὲ τοῦ καρδή 
ἐπιτρέποντος})\textsuperscript{110}, was his paternal love\textsuperscript{111} and his desire to offer his son some advice for the future\textsuperscript{112}.

\textsuperscript{102} See above, p. 30 with n. 67-69.
\textsuperscript{103} Hunger, \textit{Βυζαντινή Λογοτεχνία}, p. 247; Angelov, Ideology, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{106} Tenets of mirrors of princes and political ideas are discussed separately in the analysis of each Oration below, pp. 53-185.
\textsuperscript{108} Ethical Orations are defined as those involved with the soul, the senses and the morals: \textit{Thesaurus Graecae Linguæ}, ed. H. Stephanus, vol. 5 (Naples, 2008), lemma \textit{ἠθικός}, p. 114. It is proposed that these Orations should be introduced by a hortatory part urging towards virtue, cf. e.g., Stobaeus Anthologium, eds. O. Hense and C. Wachsmuth, \textit{Ioannis Stobaei anthologium}, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1884; repr. 1958), II 7.2.12-13, pp. 39-40. Indeed Oration I is entitled Hortatory to reasoned arguments; and on virtue and the virtuous prince.
\textsuperscript{109} Ethical Orations are defined as those involved with the soul, the senses and the morals: \textit{Thesaurus Graecae Linguæ}, ed. H. Stephanus, vol. 5 (Naples, 2008), lemma \textit{ἠθικός}, p. 114. It is proposed that these Orations should be introduced by a hortatory part urging towards virtue, cf. e.g., Stobaeus Anthologium, eds. O. Hense and C. Wachsmuth, \textit{Ioannis Stobaei anthologium}, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1884; repr. 1958), II 7.2.12-13, pp. 39-40. Indeed Oration I is entitled Hortatory to reasoned arguments; and on virtue and the virtuous prince.
\textsuperscript{109} Ethical Orations are defined as those involved with the soul, the senses and the morals: \textit{Thesaurus Graecae Linguæ}, ed. H. Stephanus, vol. 5 (Naples, 2008), lemma \textit{ἠθικός}, p. 114. It is proposed that these Orations should be introduced by a hortatory part urging towards virtue, cf. e.g., Stobaeus Anthologium, eds. O. Hense and C. Wachsmuth, \textit{Ioannis Stobaei anthologium}, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1884; repr. 1958), II 7.2.12-13, pp. 39-40. Indeed Oration I is entitled Hortatory to reasoned arguments; and on virtue and the virtuous prince.
\textsuperscript{110} Oration V 13; cf. Epistolary Epilogue 4-6.
\textsuperscript{111} Oration VII 33-38, Epistolary Epilogue 1-2.
\textsuperscript{112} Oration III 120, IV 3-4, VII 12-15, Epistolary Epilogue [1, 2a-b, 4].
In terms of composition, Manuel’s *Orations* largely follow the established rhetorical rules. As in the case of Manuel’s *Precepts*, the *Orations* is an advisory text\textsuperscript{113} which combines elements from *mirrors of princes*, *erotapokriseis*, epistolography, and homilies\textsuperscript{114}, attesting to the creative mind of the author. Manuel’s extensive analysis of the themes, as for example of the idea of self-control and control over passions and pleasures\textsuperscript{115}, the emphasis placed on the mortal human nature\textsuperscript{116} and to the virtues of modesty and humility\textsuperscript{117}, adds to the originality of the text.

The compositional unity of the *Orations* was noted also by Leonte, who convincingly argued that they represent an attempt by Manuel to experiment with various rhetorical genres — each *Oration* representing a different one: protreptic (*I*), philosophical (*II*-*V*), homiletic (*VI*-*VII*), and panegyric (*Epistolary Epilogue*)\textsuperscript{118} — collectively forming a *diatribe* ‘defined as a group of lectures or orations on a moral theme characterized by vividness and immediacy in language’, considered to be ‘a *paraenetic* counterpart of protreptic’, and dealing with practical matters guiding readers through successive stages to the development of their moral character\textsuperscript{119}. In this respect, Leonte supports that the arrangement of theoretical themes followed a didactic plan, starting with the model of the ideal virtuous ruler (*Oration I*), followed by philosophical essays (*Orations II*-*VI*) which ‘disengage’ from this model, ‘offering very little actual guidance on aspects of the ruler’s craft’\textsuperscript{120}. As it is clear from the analysis of the *Orations* (below, pp. 113-114).

\textsuperscript{113} It could be proposed that Manuel was also influenced by admonitory (προτρεπτικοί λόγοι) and advisory works (παραινετικοί) aiming namely to urge a youth to the study of philosophy as a means to achieve virtue. Ample admonitory works have been composed by ancient (e.g., Isocrates, *To Demonicus*; Plato, *Euthydemus*; Aristotle, *Protrepticus*; Iamblichus, *Protrepticus*), Christian (e.g., Clement of Alexandria, *Protrepticus*, ed. C. Mondésert, *Clement d’Alexandrie. Le protreptique*; Athens, 1995), pp. 52-193) and Byzantine writers (e.g., Th. Metochites, *Ethical discourse or on education*, ed. I. Polemis, *Θεόδωρος Μετοχίτης, Ηθικοὶ ἢ περὶ παιδείας* [Athens, 1995], pp. 52-275). Cf. M.D. Jordan, ‘Ancient philosophic Protreptic and the problem of persuasive genres’, *Rhetorica* 4.4 (1986), 309-333; L. Benakis ed., *Ἰαμβλίχου Χαλκιδέως έκ της Κοίλης Συρίας Προτρεπτικός επί Φιλοσοφίαν, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Προτρεπτικός τοῦ Αριστοτελοῦς, τά Πνευματικά συμβολικά παραγγέλματα καὶ ὁ Ανώνυμος Σωφρόνης τοῦ 5ου αἰώνος* (Athens, 2012), pp. 11*-28*. The admonitory scope of the *Orations* becomes evident throughout the text as the analysis of each *Oration* shows.

\textsuperscript{114} As already mentioned above, p. 30, the *Orations* are accompanied by an *Epistolary Epilogue*, found also in the codex containing Manuel’s letters, *Par.* gr. 3041. For a description of the MS see below, pp. 224-226. Manuel adopts some characteristics of homilies in *Oration VI* (e.g., the *verbatim* use of Scriptural quotations and its concluding with the Doxology), the abridged version of which formed the *Sermon on St. Mary of Egypt*, see below pp. 126-154.

\textsuperscript{115} Cf. *Orations IV*, V.


\textsuperscript{117} Cf. *Oration VII*.

\textsuperscript{118} See Leonte, *Purple*, pp. 210-226.


Manuel does not actually disengage from the model of the ideal ruler. On the contrary, the whole discussion concerning passions and virtues revolve around the virtuous person and emperor, offering practical advice on how one should think and act in order to attain virtue and reach true happiness. Leonte’s emphasis, however, on the didactic use of these rhetorical compositions of philosophical and moral content as instrument of persuasion for conveying principles of good conduct to the future emperor is undisputed.

The Orations form a good example of Manuel’s rhetorical skills. Rhetoric held a prominent place in Byzantine education and literature, and its study and practice continued uninterruptedly throughout the centuries. As already mentioned, rhetoric formed part of the curriculum of ἔγκυκλιος παιδεία, and was studied in greater depth in higher education. The study of poetry, followed by that of ancient writers, namely Xenophon, Herodotus, Thucydides, Plutarch, was a precondition for the student to continue with rhetoric, ultimately enabling him to compose his own rhetorical texts. The teaching of rhetoric normally began with Hermogenes’ and Aphthonius’ progymnasmata, and continued with Hermogenes’ other treatises included in his rhetorical corpus. Among the rhetorical works studied in Byzantium were those of Menander Rhetor, Isocrates, Aelius Aristides, Libanius, Themistius and Synesius. The number of commentaries on these and several others works, as well as their rich manuscript tradition, further supports their prominent role in Byzantine education. Aristotle’s Rhetoric, though generally avoided because of its difficulty, it was also used, especially from the twelfth century onwards. Until the end of Byzantium the model

---

121 Cf. above, p. 34; below, p. 186-188.
124 Koukoules, Βυζαντινῶν βιος, pp. 113-123; Constantinides, Higher Education, p. 151.
128 Kustas, Byzantine rhetoric, pp. 6-26; Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ λογοτεχνία, pp. 141-159; Wilson, Scholars, pp. 21-22.
remained Demosthenes, the teaching of whose works continued uninterrupted. Manuel often quotes him in his works, expressing his admiration and referring to him either by name or simply as ‘the orator’ (ὁ ῥήτωρ). Alongside the curriculum and the ancient authors, the rhetorical writings of the Fathers, especially of the Cappadocians, were also taught in the Byzantine school. The influence of the majority of the aforementioned authors on Manuel becomes evident in the text of the Orations.

Manuel considered the art of rhetoric a significant skill a scholar should possess, which should be practised from childhood. Such a skill, he says, is not naturally possessed by all men, in the same way that it is impossible for all to be able to perform acrobatics. By associating rhetoric with acrobatics Manuel stresses the difficulty of training and performing it. Moreover, he describes rhetoric as a remarkable tool, which should be used wisely, for it gives its possessor the ability to persuade even if this is untrue. Manuel left a good number of various rhetorical texts ranging from large works to short exercises, including encomium, epitaph, panegyric, ekphrasis, ethopoeia, dialogues, epistles, funeral oration, declamation, and poems in political verse.

The Orations is a rhetorical text. Its length, language, structure, syntax, style, obscurity, the several repetitions, the use of metaphors, allusions, proverbs, and the amalgamation of Christian with classical elements, are some characteristics of Byzantine rhetorical writings which can be identified in the Orations. Following the rhetorical rules Manuel used the confutation or the establishment

---


134 Ibid., 11.1-15, p. 29.


136 Manuel II, What Tamerlane might have said to Bayezid, ed. Legrand, Lettres, pp. 103-104.


138 For the titles and editions of Manuel’s works not mentioned here and for an inventory of his complete works see above, pp. 24-25 with n. 18-23. Cf. Jenkins, ‘Hellenistic Origins’, 44-45.

139 Kustas, Byzantine rhetoric, passim. Cf. Dennis, Letters, p. xx;
(Θεμελίωσις) of a subject, adopting Hermogenes’s and Aphthonius’s instructions for the refutation (ἀνασκευή) and the confirmation (κατασκευή), in order to reach the thesis (γνώμη) in his conclusion. Taking into consideration the definition of refutation and confirmation by Hermogenes and Aphthonius, it becomes evident that Manuel follows these conventions to establish his arguments in almost all the Orations. In some instances he establishes his argument through a series of questions and answers, presenting two opposed views on the same thesis. It should be noted that Orations IV and V are respectively the refutation and confirmation concerning pleasure; Manuel uses the terms κατασκευάζειν and ἐπιχειρεῖν (V 57).

In composing his Orations Manuel followed Ps-Menander’s rules for the composition of a royal speech (βασιλικὸς λόγος). Accordingly, Manuel begins by proclaiming the difficulty of the task he has undertaken and then proceeds with the discussion of the subject-matter. Following Ps-Menander’s instructions Manuel establishes the importance of the four Platonic virtues, the cornerstones one might say of his Orations, and of issues concerning the soul, education and philosophy. In the

---

140 Hermogenes, Progymnasmata, 5.1-20, p. 11. As mentioned above, p. 36 n. 128, several commentaries of the Corpus Hermogennianum, as well as editions and synopsis of both Hermogenes’ and Aphthonius’ works have been compiled in Byzantium, it is therefore impossible to know which of these were used by Manuel. See Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ Λογοτεχνία, pp. 139-159.

141 Aphthonius, Progymnasmata, V-VI, pp. 10-16.

142 Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ Λογοτεχνία, pp. 171-174.

143 Hermogenes, Progymnasmata, 4.1-21, pp. 8-10; Aphthonius, Progymnasmata, IV, pp. 7-9.

144 Translation by G.A. Kennedy, Progymnasmata: Greek textbooks of prose composition and rhetoric (Society of Biblical Literature, Atlanta, 2003), p. 79: ‘Refutation is an overturning of something that has been proposed and confirmation is the opposite. ... You will refute by argument from what is unclear, implausible, impossible; from the inconsistent, also called the contrary; from what is inappropriate, and from what is not advantageous.’ Aphthonius provides similar definitions, ibid., p. 101: ‘Refutation is an overturning of some matter at hand. One should refute what is neither clear nor what is altogether impossible, but what holds a middle ground. Those engaged in refutation should first state the false claim of those who advance it, then add an exposition of the subject and use these headings: first, that it is impossible, but what hold ... impossible and illogical, and finally adding that it is inexpedient.’ In the definition of confirmation, ibid., p. 104, Aphthonius suggests that one ‘should use arguments opposed to those of refutation ... then ... provide an exposition...' .

145 E.g., Oration III 44-65, Oration VII [7c-9d].

146 Ps-Menander, pp. 76-95. As it has already been established, large parts of Ps-Menander’s chapter on the imperial oration (βασιλικὸς λόγος) found in his treatise on epideictic speech, were copied by and incorporated in Joseph Rhakendytes’s or the Philosopher Summation of Rhetoric, ed. C. Walz, Rhetores Graeci, vol. III (Stuttgart, 1834), pp. 547-558, which Manuel most possibly used. Cf. Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ Λογοτεχνία, pp. 150-157; Angelov, Ideology, pp. 52-59; idem, ‘Byzantine imperial panegyric as advice literature (1204-c. 1350)’, in Jeffrey, Rhetoric, pp. 55-72 at pp. 56-57. For an analysis of Joseph’s instructions for the composition of the imperial oration, see also S. Triantari-Mara, ‘Ἡ Ρήτορική ὡς ἐγχειρίδιο πολιτικῆς εὐγνωμίας στον Ὀλυμπίαν Ῥακενδύτη καὶ Φιλόσοφο, Παρακλήσεως 41 (1999), 224-252.

147 Oration V 12-13, Oration VII 26, 78, Epistolary Epilogue 3; cf. Ps-Menander, 368.10-11, p. 76.

148 Plato, Republic, 429a-445d; Ps-Menander, 373.6-8, p. 84.

149 Ps-Menander, 371.24-30, p. 82.
Epistolary Epilogue (65-72) Manuel adopts Ps-Menander’s exordium, wishing his son to have a long and blessed kingship, leaving behind successors to inherit his legacy\(^{150}\).

Manuel appears influenced by the rules of rhetoric, especially those of Ps-Menander, also with regard to the structure of each *Oration* separately. Manuel introduces a new *Oration*, or a new topic within the *Oration*, inserting transitional sentences\(^{151}\), which as Ps-Menander suggests would help the audience to be attentive and assist the author to avoid mistakes or omit ideas\(^{152}\). In several instances Manuel uses words, expressions\(^{153}\), proverbs\(^{154}\) and quotations found repeated in his other works. Cross-referencing within each *Oration* as well as between the *Oration*, also proposed by Ps-Menander as a means to help the audience, is a technique employed by Manuel, sometimes with reference to preceding passages\(^{155}\) and in other instances with reference to passages to


\(^{151}\) E.g., ἄπο ἰ θο τοὺν ἐναγόμενον (VI 372), Ἀρξόμεθα (V 63), Δεὶ δὲ ποιὸν τόνδε μεταγαγεῖν (I 94), 
Pολυπλασιάζω τὸν λόγον (VI 405), προσθήκη (VI 410), Συνιστήμε τὸν λόγον (VI 689).

\(^{152}\) Ps-Menander, 372.14-20, p. 84.

\(^{153}\) These are noted in the *apparatus locorum parallelorum*.

\(^{154}\) ἀκρος δεκπλοι (II 78), ἀνὸν ποσαμόν (I 166), ἀπὸ βαλβίδος (VII 33, VII 281), δοσὶ τοιοῦ (III 273),
Εὔφιστον βίον (II 84-85), κούφη φροντίσ (I 189), ὀστράκῳ μετατειπεστευύον (I 89, VI 586-587), αὐτῳ τῶν (I 293), οὐδὲν ἴπον (I 364, IV 120), οὐδὲν ὑγίες (III 378), ὀφθαλμοὶ γέλωμα (I 445), παθῶν γάρ τε νίτας, 
ἠγάπη (IV 37), παίδες ἱεροκ (I 429, IV 272, VI 541), πάντα λίθον κινεῖ (III 148, IV 193), 
στρέφειν ἃνω καί κάτω (III 228), συντὸνδρόμῳ (I 298-299), τοίχῳ δήλον (I 408, IV 329, VII 515), Ὀδηγόν <τίμειν> (IV 276-280), φρένας απόλυε (I 212-213), χθές καί πρόσημα (I 70).

\(^{155}\) Ακτήσας δὲ τι καί παρ’ ἡμῖν περὶ τούτων σαφείστερον εἰρηκόστην, ἐν τῷ ἐξίσοντα ὑπεύθυνتمويل 151 ἤπειρον πρὸς σὲ μια κεφαλαίων (III 77-78), ἀνυθμεν ἐξετάσαις (IV 309-310), ἀπὸ τῶν πρῶτον εἰρηκὼν (VII 450-451), ἀποδεδεικται (II 39), Ἀρξόμεθα δ’ αὐθές ἐκ τῶν προτερῶν (V 63), Δεδείκται μὲν τὸ προσκείμενον ἡμῖν (III 1), δεδήλωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος (IV 332), δήλον ἴπον γέγονεν ἐκ τῶν εἰρηκῶν (VII 228), 
διαγράφει τὸν ἴπον εἰρηκὼν (IV 336), ἐκ τῶν ἀρτι λεχθέντων (V 16-17), ἔναγχος ἡμῖν εἰρηκόνα (III 232), ἐπείδη γὰρ δεδεικται (V 82), ἴπον γάρ ἐπάνειμα (II 32-33), ἴπον πειρόμενον (V 15), ἴπον ἐνθυπομενον (V 17), ἴπον αποδεικται (V 38-39), ὡς τὸν κατ’ ἀρχάς παρετέθη (I 435-436), καθάπερ εκ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν εἰρηκόνα (II 251), καθάπερ ἴπον προσφείται (III 294), καθάπερ ἡμῖν εἰρηκόνα καταρχας εὐθὺς (II 196), 
καθάπερ καί προσφείται (V 70, 207-208), καθὼς οἱ πρόσθεν ἡμῖν ἐπετέλεσαν λόγον (VII 402), κατ’ ἀρχής εἰρηκόνα (IV 338-339), 
Κατὰ δὲ τοῖς ἴπον ἐνθυπομενες λόγους (VII 324). Μνημηθομενοι δὲ τινος τῶν προσκείμενον (III 198-199) ὁ λόγος γε ἴπον ἐδέχεται (I 114), Ο λόγος δὲ ἴπον εκ ἀρχῆς (III 346), ὁ μοι καί προτέρων εἰρηκόνα (I 508), οὐκ ον ὁ λόγος ἴπον ἐδέχεται (VII 769-770), ὅπερ εκ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν εἰρηκόνα (I 439), ὅποιον ἄρα δεδήλωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος (IV 332), πρὸς ἡμῖν εἰρηκών (III 169-170), προδιαλεξήστες (VI 1), προειρηκότα (VII 353). Σύμψις δε γε τῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατ’ ἀρχής, (V 187), συνυπαντοι ἀπὸ τῶν ἴπον 
ἐπιθέμαν (V 58), τὰ προειρηκένα (VII 73-74), ταῦτα δὲ εἰρηκένας, (V 111), τὸν λόγον ἐνεπιθεμάτα (V 19), τῷ πρὸ τοῖς κατ’ αὐτής εἰρηκών λόγον (V 36), τῷ πρὸς λόγος σε προστητόντα λόγον, εἴπον τι (VII 4), τῶν γάρ εἰ χρῆς μνημηθομενοι λόγους (VI 622), ὡς δ’ διὰ τα πλεονάτα ἐν τοις προσθέν εἰρηκένας (III 316), ὡς ἐγὼν ἀν ἐνεπιθεμάτα (V 5), ὡς εἰρηκένας (IV 63), ὡς...εἰρηκένας (I 138), ὡς...εἰρηκένας γαρ αὐτοῦ τῶν πρῶτον εἰρηκών (VII 450), ὡς ἐρθή γε τοῦτο ζηθέν (V 246), ὡς ἐνεπιθεμάξετα δείξεν (V 158), ὡς καὶ τῷ πρὸ τοῦ ἴπον ἡμῖν εἰρηκένας λόγον (III 9), ὡς ὁ λόγος ἴπον διδάξεις ἐρθή (VII 360), ὡς προειρηκένας (VI 124), Ὑμᾶς’ ὅπερ εἶπον (VI 16), ὅπερ εἰρηκένας (III 210).
follow within the same Oration or in subsequent Orations. This shows that though Manuel may have been composing each Oration at different stages, he considered all Orations interlinked and interdependent as parts of the same work.

Manuel’s literary skills were put in good use in his Orations, where we trace elements of Atticism, including old forms of words and Attic vocabulary, crasis, Attic syntax, the use of dual number, and the frequent use of optative. Manuel however, does not hesitate to go a step further by coining a word (ὀνοματοποιὸν), namely the term μιξοεκούσια (III 208). Following standard conventions Manuel not only attempted to imitate the language and style of classical authors, but often cited them verbatim and used them, either tacitly or naming them, as his sources. Similarly, current events, places and persons were described by Manuel employing classical terminology.

Following the conventions, Manuel expounded on his themes making use of myths, fables, stories, and comparisons to mythological and historical figures, to which were added those from the Christian tradition, both the Old and the New Testament. These were offered to the reader and the recipient of the Orations, namely John VIII, as paradigms, while they occasionally alluded to contemporary events and personalities. In Oration I Manuel explains his method of comparison. Croesus, Xerxes and Gyges are used as examples of rulers to be avoided on account of their vices. On the other hand, Alexander and Cyrus are presented as models for contemporary ruler to imitate, as both are commemorated through the centuries for their glory as a result of their bravery and excellence (II 125-130). Quotations or allusions to Homer are extensively used by Manuel, while

---

156 ἀκολούθως οἶμαι ῥηθέν (III 107), ἐφοίτησα τι προσφυγαίτερον... μετὰ τοῦ καρποῦ (I 142-143), καὶ ὅπως ἦδη φανεῖται (V 2), προοίμιον ὁ λόγος δηλώσει (IV 345), ὡς ἐν τῷ εφεξῆς λόγῳ ὁρίσηται καθαρώτερον (II 112).
158 E.g., γλῶττα (VI 381, VII 28, 99), θάλατταν (I 185), τεττάρων (VI 297), οὐ τάν (V 208, VII 287, 393, 503). Interesting is the use of the noun εὔρινας (VI 389) originating in Sophocles, Ajax 8.
159 E.g., Oration II 102, V 119, 164, VI 197, 617, VII 24.
163 Oration I [1, 6a-b]; cf. below, pp. 53-54, 61-62.
the Homeric figures of Teucrus and Idas (VII 60-61) are presented as paradigms of skilful archers, Odysseus and Nestor (I 61) are used as examples of men of great wisdom and Iros is used to exemplify the poor (I 278), while a detailed description of Ajax’s shield, a symbol of strength, is used by Manuel as a parallel to the power of humility (VII 162-163). In some cases ancient Greek and Biblical figures, are presented in parallel, for example Nestor and Achilles, Solomon and Sampson as paradigms of bravery and prudence (II 79-80), and Teiresias and King David (I 391-392) with regard to their oracular and prophetic gifts. Judas appears, as usually, treacherous (I 388-389).

In the *Epistolary Epilogue* to the *Orations* Manuel compares himself and his son with Moses and his successors, the priests and the Pharisees. His intention here is to stress the legitimacy both of his imperial authority and of his son’s succession to the throne. It is interesting that Manuel refers to Moses instead of David, the typical exemplum of the Byzantine emperor’s God-given authority and succession to the throne.

Throughout the *Orations* Manuel prefers not to refer to David’s authority as a king, but rather to his skill of prophecy (I 392) and his ability as a judge (V 174), frequently quoting from the *Psalms*.

Drawing on Greek mythology and the classical tradition Manuel mentions the Telchines, the Giants, Hercules and the Olympian gods as models of vigour (I 310-312), he refers to the club of Hercules to describe a weapon of great force (IV 215) and to Proteus (IV 234) with relation to the various forms of pleasure. In his vivid description of pleasure in *Oration IV* Manuel refers also to Biblical examples, the Sodomites and the rain of brimstone and fire brought upon them (IV 310-312), as well as to the sinful Jews and Moses’ commandments (IV 313). Manuel uses also proverbs, such as ‘having suffered as a child, I have learned’ (παθὼν γάρ τε νήπιος, ἐγνώ, IV 37-38) mentioning Hesiod as his source, also borrowing from ancient Greek history and mythology, for example the Hydra with reference to difficulties or impossibility (IV 276-280). References to Cadiz (Γάδειρα) and the Atlantic Ocean with the Stelae of Hercules (I 330, V 195-196, VI 258, respectively) are used to denote far distance.

---

164 See below, pp. 176-177, 179-183.

As in the case of mythological and historical figures, in the *Orations* Manuel sometimes
cites quotations from both traditions in parallel\(^{166}\), which conforms with *mimesis* and
were used as a means for the author to affirm his literary ability and education, since
he (and his audience) needed no further clarification of allusions or quotations\(^{167}\).

Following the Byzantine convention, Manuel often quotes passages referring to
authorities, including ‘the poet’\(^{168}\) (Homer), ‘the orator’ (Demosthenes)\(^{169}\), ‘the
comedian’ (Aristophanes), ‘the Apostle’ (Paul), ‘the Theologian’ (Gregory of
Nazianzus), the ‘Golden tongue’ or ‘of the Golden speech’ (John Chrysostom)\(^{170}\). In
some instances, however, he chooses to name the authors\(^{171}\) he cites, especially Plato
and Aristotle\(^{172}\) whom he considers the greatest philosophers\(^{173}\). In the *Orations*, a
philosophical as well as a political text, Manuel appears to have followed the norm
fusing the thought of the Church Fathers with Platonic and Aristotelian theories\(^{174}\),
using philosophical, mainly Aristotelian\(^{175}\), and Christian terms\(^{176}\). It should be noted
that Manuel borrows heavily from Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* in terms of
philosophical views, terminology and expressions\(^{177}\). Though it is possible that he
consulted the paraphrases to this work commissioned by his grandfather John VI
Cantacuzenus\(^{178}\), so far there is insufficient evidence to confirm this hypothesis, which
needs further exploration. It is however certain, that Manuel had at his disposal the


\(^{169}\) Cf. above, p. 37 n. 130.

Logic*, pp. 50-91.


\(^{172}\) E.g., *προσώπεια, ἐξίς, μορφή*.

\(^{173}\) E.g., *αὐτεξούσιον, φιλανθρωπία, ταπεινοφροσύνη*.

\(^{174}\) This is not surprising since Aristotle was valued in Byzantium, and the *Nicomachean Ethics*

\(^{175}\) D.M. Nicol, ‘A Paraphrase of the Nicomachean Ethics attributed to the Emperor John VI
Cantacuzene’, *BSI* 29 (1968), 1-16.
imperial library, housed in the Palace, consisting of ‘many books and ancient writings and histories’. Apart from that, Manuel’s position as emperor gave him access to other public and private libraries in major cities, including Thessalonike. It is well known that Byzantine scholars spared no money or effort to purchase or borrow books, sometimes exchanging them among themselves. Such is the case of a manuscript with Plato which Demetrius Cydones needed and Manuel promised to obtain for him from Mount Athos.

It would be interesting to know to what extent Manuel had his sources at his disposal while composing the *Orations* or whether he referred to them from memory. A different reading in codices V and I preserving *Oration I* might shed some light on this question. Though Manuel explicitly stated that the source for the narration of the story of Croesus is Herodotus, he added that should his reader wish to learn more on this he could look for other sources as well (εἴ τις τε ἄλλος περὶ τούτων ἱστόρηκε, I 84). In codex V, the working copy of the *Orations*, Xenophon is explicitly mentioned as the source for this story (τὸν τῶν μύριων στρατηγὸν ξενοφῶντα). An examination of the story in both Herodotus and Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* shows that Manuel’s presentation is closer to Herodotus, which confirms the alternative reading in the edited codex I. This observation leads to the assumption that it is most likely that Manuel was not paraphrasing the story from a book while composing the *Oration*, but being familiar with it he summarised it from memory.

The *Orations*, as the majority of Byzantine literary works, were composed to be orally delivered in the presence of an audience, the *θέατρον*. This term is used in Byzantine sources to denote a gathering, usually of scholars and intellectuals, who listened to the orator, sometimes the author of a work, and afterwards commented on this work and

---

183 *Oration I* 84 (*app. font.*).
its delivery. This sort of gathering revived during the Palaeologan era, when the term frequently appears in the sources\textsuperscript{186}.

Manuel himself provides information concerning the function and composition of a θέατρον\textsuperscript{187}. As happens nowadays, the public discussion, including questions and criticisms\textsuperscript{188}, following the presentation of a text in front of a ‘well-versed’ audience\textsuperscript{189}, could contribute to the author’s decision to revise his text\textsuperscript{190}. This, however, does not seem to have been the case for Manuel’s Orations, as the working copy (V) and the revised version (I) suggest, with the ‘edited’ version (I) being the one that was most probably delivered in public. We know that Manuel often revised his works before these were published\textsuperscript{191}. It seems unlikely, therefore, that Manuel would revisit his works after these were circulated or publicly presented. It is most probable that the opposite was the case, with Manuel seeking advice and comments from his own literary circle and collaborators, before the work was delivered. This is further confirmed by Manuel’s request to Manuel Chrysoloras, to whom he had sent his Funeral Oration\textsuperscript{192}: ‘erase what is superfluous in the present composition; do not shrink

---


\textsuperscript{189} Manuel II, Letters, 27.2-4, p. 71.


\textsuperscript{191} This is confirmed by letters accompanying his works, for which Manuel requested comments from his circle. See e.g., Manuel II, Letters, 11, pp. 28-31, 62, pp. 172-174, both addressed to Cydones accompanying the Counsel to the Thessalonians and the Dialogue on Marriage, respectively; ibid., 57, pp. 160-163, addressed to Gabriel of Thessalonike accompanied Manuel’s Paracletic canon to our most holy Lady, the Mother of God for aid in the present circumstances. For Manuel’s Letter 52, pp. 148-151 addressed also to Gabriel to whom Manuel send his Sermon on Sin and Penance, see below, pp. 49-50. Cf. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. xviii-xix.

from making changes in it and additions of your own as well.’\textsuperscript{193} It seems that if the \textit{Funeral Oration} was in its final form and already delivered, Manuel would not have asked for Chrysoloras’s comments\textsuperscript{194}.

Manuel refers to his audience several times throughout his \textit{Orations}. He addresses the θέατρον (I 353), the audience (ἀκροατάς V 16, VII 71), the crowd (πλήθος III 123), those present (παρόντων V 54, ὁ παρόντες VI 639), those listening (τοῖς ἀκούσασιν VI 3), those who might read this work (ἐντευξομένων ἱσως τῷ λόγῳ IV 4, ὅσι τοῖς λόγοις ἐντευξομέναι V 24-25). In addition, Manuel asks his audience to be lenient and patient and no to criticize the author on the basis of hasty judgment (Καὶ τοίνυν παραιτούμεθα τοὺς ἀκροατὰς, μηδὲν δυσχερὰ ἐντεθυμῆσθαι περὶ ἡμῶν, μηδὲ προπετείας γραφῆν ἡμᾶς γράψασθαι, VII 71-72), apparently to discourage criticisms and bad reviews\textsuperscript{195}. Manuel’s statement also denotes the literary level of his audience, which must have consisted of highly educated people, including the Emperor’s literary entourage, whose habit of exchanging views on their works is evident in their correspondence\textsuperscript{196}. Though so far there is no direct evidence of the reception of Manuel’s \textit{Orations}, John Chortasmenos seems to have read, or listened to the public reading of the \textit{Precepts} and possibly of the \textit{Orations}\textsuperscript{197}.

The awareness that the publicly presented text would be subjected to criticism by the highly educated circle, familiar with the rules of rhetoric and the ideas of the text, inevitably influenced its style of composition. The members of the audience played also a significant role in the author’s decision not to elaborate certain ideas or identify well-known sources, and conceal information and details concerning contemporary events, instead making use of allusions, since they shared the same background and had knowledge of the historical and political realities of their times\textsuperscript{198}. Accordingly, Manuel mentions his decision not to elaborate on some issues on the grounds that his audience was familiar with the ideas and sources presented (e.g., VI 638-639) as well as

\textsuperscript{193} Manuel II, \textit{Letters}, 56.30-32, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{194} Patrineles and Sophianos, \textit{Μανουὴλ Χρυσολωρᾶ}, pp. 13, 46. Manuel Chrysoloras was full of praise for Manuel’s \textit{Funeral Oration}.
\textsuperscript{197} See below, pp. 51-52.
with the events and personalities hinted at. Similarly, in *Oration I* he states that he will not present a large number of examples in order not to ‘wear out’ the θέατρον (I 353). In *Oration III* he addresses the πλῆθος (III 123) in order to justify his method and decision to discuss only certain matters (III 123-124). Again, in order to facilitate the construction of his argument, Manuel states that he does not wish to speak of some matters to avoid causing public debate\(^{199}\) (ἵνα μὴ τισι δῶμεν ύλην φιλονεικεῖν, IV 106). In one instance, Manuel sets as an excuse his desire to safeguard the audience (προσφαλίσασθαι τούς ἄκροατάς, V 16), and in another he directs a request to them to accept his opinion on a matter (Εἰ δ’ ἄξιωσαιεν δέξασθαι τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τοῦτο γνώμην, VI 302). Manuel refers also to his audience’s aspiration and reaction as a decisive factor for him to deal with the subject of humility (VII 5-10).

Byzantine authors, as indeed modern writers, composed their works not only with their contemporary audience in mind, but also aiming at a wider audience aspiring for their work to be left to posterity. In his *Precepts* Manuel justifies the selection of his themes on these grounds, stating that he wishes to speak of things that would be useful to all both in the present and in the future\(^{200}\). As in his *Precepts*, however, Manuel’s main aim and priority in composing his *Orations* was not to educate the wider audience (including contemporary rulers)\(^{201}\) but his specific addressee. Manuel stresses this both in the beginning (I [8]) and the end of the work (VII [1a-c]; Ep. 6-14, 30-32, 61-64), where he states that his thoughts and admonitions aim at helping his son to become a worthy emperor. By clearly proclaiming his son and successor John VIII as the recipient of the *Orations* Manuel conveyed a strong message to the audience concerning the legitimate succession of his son to the imperial throne, as this audience must have comprised also imperial and Church officials\(^{202}\). It is this political element that enhances the value of Manuel’s *Orations*, reflecting the political climate and realities of the times.


\(^{201}\) See below, pp. 48-49.

\(^{202}\) See the extensive discussion on Manuel’s *theatron* in Leonte, *Purple*, pp. 70-107. Cf. above, pp. 32-33.
Date and circumstances of the composition of the
Seven Ethico-political Orations

It seems that the Orations were composed some time after Manuel’s return from the West in July 1403, when he revised his Precepts, and some time before 1410. Together with palaeographical observations, textual evidence sheds further light on the date and circumstances of the composition of the Orations. The use of the word μειράκιον to describe the age of John VIII in the Epistolary Epilogue (63) to the Orations, repeated in the Epistolary Preface to the Precepts (μειρακίῳ, 313A), helps us to date more precisely both texts. According to the distinction of the ages of man, μειράκιον describes a child between the age of fifteen and twenty-two. Thus taking into consideration this distinction, born in 1392, John was a μειράκιον between 1407-1414. These dates coincide with our proposed termini post and ante quem, for in the Orations the word μειράκιον, as already mentioned, appears in the Epistolary Epilogue, suggesting that the preceding seven Orations (I-VII) were composed earlier, though the possibility that the Epistolary Epilogue was written at an earlier stage, before the completion of the work, cannot be ruled out. The hypothesis that the text was composed between 1403-1410 is further supported by palaeographical evidence. The reading μειράκιον is found only in Par. gr. 3041 (Plate VIII.b), which transmits an early version of the Epistolary Epilogue, composed sometime between these years,

203 See above, p. 30; cf. Dendrinos, ‘Μανουήλ Β’’, 159.
204 Cf. Berger de Xivrey, ‘Mémoire’, pp. 142, 194-197, who proposes 1406 as the year for the composition of the Orations. Khoury, ‘Essai’, 44-45, suggests that the Orations were composed either between 1406-1408, together with the Precepts, or in the following years. Barker, Manuel II, pp. xxx, 344-345 with n. 84, 494, adopts Berger de Xivrey's proposed date, pointing that their composition continued for several years.
207 See below, p. 225-226, 302. The position of the Epistolary Epilogue in P, suggests that it was added in the collection of Manuel’s Letters sometime before 1417.
when John was a μειράκιον, whereas the rest MSS (B, I, V) adopt the word ἀνήρ to denote the age of John VIII at that time.\footnote{Epistolary Epilogue 63.}

Additional evidence on the dating of the Orations is provided in the Epistolary Epilogue in P (ff. 33-34\textsuperscript{v}). This codex contains the complete collection of Manuel’s letters, among which the Epistolary Epilogue (which appears as Letter νγ\textsuperscript{v} in the MS)\footnote{Ed. Legrand, \textit{Lettres, Letter νγ\textsuperscript{v}}, pp. 80-83. See below, pp. 225-226.}. The preceding letter and the one that follows (ed. Dennis nos. 52 and 53, respectively) seem to be linked with the Orations. Letter 53, addressed to the Emperor of Trebizond, Manuel III Comnenus (1390-1417), was accompanying a ‘βιβλίον’ which Comnenus requested from Manuel II\footnote{Dennis, \textit{Letters}, pp. xlviii, 150-153.}. The latter’s reference to a ‘βιβλίον’ points to a text or a collection of texts large enough to be called a book. This enables us to eliminate a number of Manuel’s literary works which are rather short. With the exception of Manuel’s lengthy treatise \textit{On the Procession of the Holy Spirit}, to which he refers as a ‘σύγγραμμα’ both in the treatise itself and in Letter 44 (without naming it)\footnote{Manuel II, \textit{Letters}, 44.40, p. 119. See Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. xviii-xx.}, the only substantial texts in terms of length are Manuel II’s \textit{Dialogues with a Persian}, the \textit{Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore}, and the Orations.

The fact that Manuel II refers to the ‘βιβλίον’ in Letter 53, as one that ‘would prove to be of some usefulness for this life’\footnote{Manuel II, \textit{Letters}, 53.7, p. 151: ‘… λυσιτελὲς εἶναι τῷ διότι τῷ βίῳ. ’.}, further supports our supposition that this book included none other than the text of the Orations. For, among the three aforementioned lengthy texts composed by Manuel II, the one which should be more useful for Comnenus, who also had a son and heir to the throne of Trebizond\footnote{W. Miller, \textit{Tribezond, the Last Greek Empire} (London, 1926), pp. 71-79.}, was the Orations dealing with the virtuous prince. In his Letter 53 Manuel speaks of his own delay to complete and send the ‘βιβλίον’ caused by the pressures of difficult times and asks his recipient to ‘concentrate solely on the thoughts contained in the work and seek nothing further’, and not to ‘scrutinize the arrangement of ideas or expect precision in the choice of words or, in general, any of those graceful, stylistic elements which an essay of this sort might be expected to present’\footnote{Manuel II, \textit{Letters}, 53.8-11, pp. 151, 153 (text), pp. 150, 152 (translation.).}. If indeed this ‘βιβλίον’ contained the
Orations, then the dating of the letter by Dennis to 1409-1410\textsuperscript{215} further supports our proposed terminus ante quem for the composition of the text, which must have been completed by that time and certainly before Comnenus’s death in 1417\textsuperscript{216}. The fact that Manuel considers the text not to be satisfactory is probably an indication of his intention to revise and correct it in the future.

Another piece of evidence concerning the possible dating of the composition of the Orations before 1410 is found in Manuel’s Letter 52. Addressed to Gabriel Metropolitan of Thessalonike, the letter was accompanying Manuel’s Sermon on Sin and Penance or on St Mary of Egypt. The Sermon, which survives in two manuscripts, Vat. gr. 1619 (ff. 15-29v) and in our V (ff. 336-350v), bears the same title as Manuel’s Oration VI\textsuperscript{217}, with the following addition: ‘it is read after the reading of the Life of Saint Mary of Egypt’ (ἀναγινώσκεται δὲ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον, τῆς ὁσίας μαρίας τῆς αἰγύπτιας:†). As Manuel clearly states in his introduction to this work, the Sermon is an abridged version of Oration VI, in order to be more fitting to be read on the day of the commemoration of the Saint\textsuperscript{218}. The composition of Oration VI therefore, pre-dates that of the Sermon. Dennis suggested that Manuel’s Letter 52 must have been composed in Thessalonike sometime between autumn-winter 1408-1410, after Manuel’s visit to the city\textsuperscript{219}. If so, it would seem that at least the first six Orations (I-VI) were composed prior to 1410\textsuperscript{220}. Manuel’s reference to ‘our fruit of labours’\textsuperscript{221} with reference to the Sermon, would suggest Gabriel’s involvement in the composition of this work, for Manuel does not use in his works the majestic plural to refer to himself. In such case, since the sections of Oration VI preserved in the Sermon are identical, it is plausible that Manuel

\textsuperscript{215} Dennis, Letters, p. 152 n. 1.
\textsuperscript{216} Michael Panaretus, Chronicon, ed. O. Lampides, Μιχαήλ τοῦ Παναρέτου περὶ τῶν Μεγάλων Κομνηνῶν, Ποιτικαὶ έρευναι 2 (Athens 1958), pp. 61-81, p. 81: ‘Μηνὶ Μαρτίῳ, τοῦ Ἐχθ ἔτους, ἐκοιμήθη ὁ βασιλεὺς κύριος Μανουὴλ ὁ μέγας Κομνηνὸς ... Ἐβασίλευσε δὲ ἔτη κζ’.’ Though the date of his death is placed on 5 March 1412, further evidence suggests that he must have died in 1417, see Miller, Tribezond, pp. 78-79.
\textsuperscript{217} For the title of Oration VI see below, p. 126.
\textsuperscript{218} For a transcription of the title of the Sermon see below, p. 126 n. 509.
\textsuperscript{219} Dennis, Letters, p. 150 with n. 1.
\textsuperscript{220} For evidence on the unity of the text and the association between the Orations, see above, pp. 39-40; below, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{221} Manuel II, Letters, 52.36, p. 151: ‘... ἤκει σοι δὲ τι παρ’ ἡμῶν ἐκ τῶν πόνων καρπῶν ...’.
composed and revised the Sermon, and consequently Oration VI, with the co-operation of his friend and fellow-scholar Gabriel222.

Moreover, after his brother Theodore’s death in 1407, Manuel decided to abstain from composing other ‘rhetorical works’ (λογικωτέρων ἐγχειρημάτων), leaving some of them half-finished, in order to devote himself entirely in composing his Funeral Oration on his brother223. It is impossible to say whether the text of the Orations was one of those rhetorical works that he left incomplete. If so, then at least six of the seven Orations (I-VI) must have been completed by the time he completed the composition of the Funeral Oration in 1409224.

As already mentioned, we are aware of Manuel’s habit of revising his works225. In the case of the Orations it is possible to follow the stages of revision, since we have both the working copy (V) and the ‘edited’ versions (B1 and I)226. The proposed date for the revision and ‘edition’ of the Orations is confirmed by the dating of the ‘final’ version of the text of the Precepts227. It has already been suggested that Demetrius Chrysoloras’s Hundred Letters228, and its source, namely his Comparison of previous rulers with the present Emperor229, were composed sometime between 1416 and 1422230 and are associated with Manuel’s Precepts231. In Letter 75 of his Hundred Letters Chrysoloras refers to the ‘chapters’ (κεφάλαια) and the ‘many and great orations’ (λόγοι πολλοὶ καὶ μεγάλοι)232. It is plausible that these ‘λόγοι’ are none other than the Orations, which Chrysoloras had already received and read.

222 See above, p. 28 with n. 48.
223 Manuel II, Letters, 56, pp. 158-160. Dennis, Letters, pp. 158-160 with n. 1, suggested that the letter was written sometime between December 1409 and January 1410.
224 Chrysostomides, Funeral Oration, p. 29.
225 See above, p. 44.
226 Cf. below, pp. 255-256, 276-277.
227 Cf. Dendrinos, ‘Μανουὴλ Β’’, 159, 162.
229 Chrysoloras, Comparison, pp. 222-245. For the similarities between the Hundred Letters and the Comparison, see M. Treu, ‘Demetrios Chrysoloras und seine hundert Briefe’, BZ 20 (1911), 106-128.
230 Chrysoloras’s Comparison (p. 242.26) contains a reference to the Hexamillion, the defensive wall of the Isthmus of Corinth, reconstructed by Manuel in 1415. Cf. CBB, I, 22.24, p. 183, 32.33, p. 234, 33.26, pp. 246-247, 35.6, p. 286, 36.13, p. 292, 40.1, p. 314, 42.5, p. 321; Sphrantzes, Chronicon, IV 1-2, pp. 8-10; Chalcocondyles, Historiae (ed. Dakó, I, p. 173.6-14, 203.4-8; ed. Bekker, pp. 184, 216). Thus, the Comparison must have been composed after 1415. On Manuel’s visit to the Morea see below, p. 51 n. 233.
231 See Conti Bizzarro, Cento Epistole, p. 20.
232 Chrysoloras, Hundred Letters, 75, p. 58.
The circulation of a ‘published’ version of the Precepts by 1416 is further supported by the explicit mention of Manuel’s ‘admonitory chapters’ (ὑποθήκαις καὶ παραινέσεσι) by John Chortasmenos in his Encomium addressed to the Emperor on the occasion of his return to Constantinople from the Morea in March of that year (Εἰς τὸν ἁγίον τὸν βασιλέα κυρ Μανουήλ, ὄπηνικα ἐπανήλθεν ἀπὸ τῆς Θεσσαλονίκης). The reference in the Encomium to John VIII’s active participation in discussions with ambassadors, possibly suggests his involvement in the affair with Mustafa in Thessalonike the same year, which according to Chortasmenos, was a good opportunity for John to put into practice his father’s admonitions (παραινέσεσι).

It is possible that Chortasmenos refers in his Encomium to both the Precepts and the Orations. With the phrase ‘πατήρ υἱοῦ, βασιλεὺς γενόμενος βασιλέως’ he clearly refers to the acrostichis of the Precepts, while his statement ‘θαυμασταῖς ὑποθήκαις καὶ παραινέσεσι’ may be a reference to the Precepts and the Orations, respectively. Additional remarks in the Encomium reflect a summary of Manuel’s views in the aforementioned works. Chortasmenos states that through these admonitions the soul of ‘our emperor’, that is John VIII, who is virtuous by nature, is formed by his father, adding that ‘the one who accepts his father’s advice will strive to benefit through his actions’, ideas which form central themes in the Orations (especially Orations II-III).

Chortasmenos’s statements that ‘our emperor is being instructed on the ways to prevail over pleasures’ and that ‘it is not righteous for a ruler to be called such if he is enslaved to passions’ appear to be a reference to Orations IV-V. Manuel’s views in the Precepts and the Orations on the attitude of a virtuous emperor towards pleasure

---

233 Chortasmenos, Encomium, pp. 217-224. The Emperor actually returned from the Morea and not from Thessalonike which was the first stop of his journey. For details of Manuel’s journey (1414-1416) to Thasos, Thessalonike and the Morea, see Barker, Manuel II, pp. 298-318; idem, ‘On the chronology of the activities of Manuel II Palaeologus in the Peloponnescus in 1415’, BZ 55 (1962), 39-55. See also Manuel II, Letters, 58, pp. 164-165, 59, pp. 166-167, 68, pp. 206-218. Cf. Sphrantzes, Chronicon, IV 1-3, pp. 8-11: ‘Τὸν δὲ ιούλιον μήνα τοῦ καὶ ἐκείνου ἔξω ἑξαλέγον ἀπὸ τῆς Πόλεως απῆλθεν ... ... καὶ τῷ κάσι ἔτει, μηνὶ μαρτίῳ ἐπανέστρεψεν εἰς τὴν Πόλιν ...’. Sphrantzes wrongly provides the year 1413 instead of 1414, as the year of Manuel’s departure from Constantinople. Cf. Mazaris, Journey to Hades, eds. J.N. Barry et al., Mazaris’s Journey to Hades, or interviews with dead men about certain officials of the Imperial Court. Greek text with translation, notes, introduction and index (Buffalo: Dept. of Classics, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1975), pp. 80-89. I would like to thank Dr Dendrinos for drawing my attention to Chortasmenos’ Encomium with relation to the dating of the Precepts and the Orations.

234 Barker, Manuel II, 342 ff.


236 Ibid., p. 222.199-194. For the acrostichis of the Precepts see above, p. 30 n. 68.


238 Ibid., pp. 222.214-223.217.

239 Ibid., p. 222.197-200.
(ἡδονή), virtue and vice (ἀρετή and κακία), justice, the emperor’s duty to benefit his subjects\(^{240}\) and the importance of education\(^{241}\) are also echoed in Chortasmenos’ Encomium. This evidence suggests that an ‘edited’ version of the Precepts and of the seven Orations were circulating from 1416, if not earlier.

The terminus ante quem for the composition of the Encomium, namely March 1416, and subsequently of an ‘edition’ of the Orations, could be supported by Chortasmenos’s reference to John as ‘our Emperor’\(^{242}\) and ‘our young Emperor … ruling with his father’\(^{243}\). We know that John was crowned co-emperor after his wedding with Sophia of Montferrat in 1421. However, it is certain that he was already co-emperor (συμβασιλεύς) from the time of his first wedding to Anna of Moscow in 1414\(^{244}\).

Hence, John’s characterization by Chortasmenos as ‘young Emperor’, would point to the earlier date (1416) rather than the later one (1421). Similarly, Manuel’s addressing of John in Oration VII as ‘co-emperor and child’ (VII 528, συμβασιλεύς τε καὶ παιὸ) (the latter word in terms of age, between five and fourteen)\(^{245}\) would suggest that Manuel might have used the term ‘co-emperor’ even before 1414, to secure his succession by his son John VIII. This further supports the proposed terminus ante quem (1416).

It is impossible to say at this stage whether the version of the Orations and that of the Precepts which Chrysoloras and Chortasmenos read is the one preserved in the ‘edited’ version in codices B\(^1\) and I, or indeed in a different MS which has since been lost. As already mentioned, the available evidence suggests that these ‘edited’ versions must have been completed sometime between 1416 and 1425.

\(^{240}\) Ibid., p. 222.181-213.
\(^{241}\) Ibid., p. 223.220-229.
\(^{242}\) Ibid., p. 222.197: ‘... νῦν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἡμῶν …’.
\(^{243}\) Ibid., p. 223.240-242: ‘... δύο γὰρ ὄντες συνέχουσι τὴν ἅλλην ἀρχήν ... ὁ νέος ἡμῖν βασιλεὺς τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τὴν ἐξουσίαν ἀντιλαμβάνει, ...’.
\(^{245}\) See above, p. 47 with n. 205.
Analysis of the Seven Ethico-political Orations

Oration I
Hortatory to reasoned arguments; and on virtue and the virtuous prince

The title of Oration I (Προτετακτικός εἰς λόγους, καὶ περὶ ἀρετῆς καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἀρχοντος) reflects, by way of introduction to the entire work, the aim of the author, namely to use reasoned arguments in order to persuade his audience, his son in particular and his subjects at large, of the need to pursue virtue as a means to achieve true happiness (see [7c]). In the process Manuel offers admonitions (νοουθεσιών χρυσῶν, 65), adopting the comparative approach, using various legendary and historical figures with reference to their personal traits and famous actions (1-7). Thus, by way of antithesis Manuel distinguishes between a good and virtuous person (καλός τε καὶ ἀγαθός) and a mean person (φαῦλος).

The method of comparatio through exempla was part-and-parcel of Greek rhetorical tradition246, and Manuel stresses its effectiveness several times throughout this Oration ([1], [6a-b]). His compliance with Ps-Menander’s rules for the composition of the imperial oration is also clear with reference to the exposition of ideas with clarity and the explanation of the method used, which would be helpful both to the audience and the author247.

In terms of structure Oration I comprises a brief introduction on the main theme and method employed [1], a short exposition of the exempla to be used (4-6), a presentation of the three stories separately [2a-5], each one comprising an introduction, main body and a conclusion, and a more extensive discussion on the comparative method adopted and its use for the reader [6a-b], followed by a description of the virtuous prince [7a-d] and Manuel’s personal appeal to his son [8]. An analysis of each section follows below.

[1] Manuel introduces the Oration by justifying his choice of the subject, considering the importance of reflecting on the ideal ruler [1] and discussing what makes a ruler excellent, essentially his ability to control his thoughts (νοῦ τε βάρος ἔχουσι, 2), to aim at achieving the common interest (πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συνοίσον ὀργώσι, 2), to love what is


good (τῶν τε ἀγαθῶν ἐρῶσι, 3) and honour truth (τῆς ἀληθείας προτιμώσι, 3). Manuel then presents the behaviour expected from an excellent ruler juxtaposing it with that of Croesus, Xerxes and Gyges.

Manuel proceeds to explain the approach and method he chose in order to reach the truth (οὐκ ἔξαμαρτήσειν τῆς ἀληθείας, 11-12), namely by looking first at examples of these famous men and legendary figures from antiquity, concentrating on their behaviour and deeds which reveal their character and personality, before he compares each one of them separately with reference to virtue and the model ruler (7-10) already described (1-3). Thus, Croesus’s avarice, Xerxes’s force and Gyges’s tyranny will be used as examples, to show to what extent a truly virtuous man, who wishes to be beneficial to himself and to society, differs from these powerful rulers.

The space devoted to the narration of each story and the presentation of the examples varies, with Manuel dedicating the larger part of this Oration to the description of Xerxes [3a-4d] and only a single paragraph to Gyges [5], which is indicative of the emphasis Manuel places on each one of them.

He begins with the story of Croesus [2a-2e]. In the process Manuel presents his views on what the appropriate behaviour of a ruler entails, using the positive example of Solon in contrast to that of Croesus [2b-2d]. Antithesis is heavily employed in this section through the constant interchange between the pair: positive/Solon and negative/Croesus.

[2a] Commenting on the catastrophic results abundant wealth had in Croesus’s life, Manuel puts forwards the central idea of the Oration, namely that hope and happiness are false unless they depend on, and are achieved through, virtue. Referring to happiness (εὐδαιμονίαν, 20) (which is fully discussed in Oration II) he reflects on those people whose main aim in life is to accumulate material wealth (θησαυρίζειν, 20) and consider themselves happy when they achieve this, pointing out that contrary to their expectations material wealth becomes the cause of their own destruction and disgrace.

248 Cf. Ps-Basil, 56, pp. 69-70; Theophylact, pp. 183.19-20, 205.30-207.4; Blemmydes, 20-21, p. 50, 75-82, p. 66, 137-140, p. 88 where Blemmydes refers also to the victory of the Hellenes and Xerxes’s flee.
(ὑπηρέτης ἀπωλείας ὁ πλοῦτος, καὶ μεγίστων ὀνειδῶν αἰτίως, 21)⁴⁹. As in the case of Croesus, the disease of avarice (26) blinds the eyes of the soul (ψυχῆς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἀμβλυώττων, 25) causing arrogance (28)⁵⁰. Though the catastrophic results of greed and avarice is not an uncommon theme in mirrors of princes⁵¹, contrary to some authors⁵², Manuel does not discuss this with relation to fiscal and taxation issues, but links it solely with the pursuit of virtue. Having said that, Manuel does follow previous authors by linking greed and avarice with the arrogant man who considers material wealth more important than God, and as a result he accomplishes nothing for he eventually loses this kind of wealth; for only God, he states, and not gold and similar things can bring one’s salvation, happiness, power or authority (21-29). The role of the Divinity in man’s life is central to the Orations, while corruptibility is also raised throughout the work⁵³.

Though Manuel does not offer in his Oration any practical advice concerning the economic role of an emperor, he states that wealth if properly used can be also helpful (18-19). This general remark reflects the view of an experienced man and statesman very much aware of the need of material wealth as a basis for the very survival and moreover the stability and prosperity of a person, family, community and ultimately the State and the society at large. This also reflects the problems Byzantine economy was experiencing at the time⁵⁴.

[2b] Manuel proceeds to relate Croesus’s encounter with Solon, without referring to his source, mainly Herodotus⁵⁵, at this stage. Croesus’s views on his own supposedly excellence based on material wealth (27-28) were expressed to a man who had found true happiness, that is Solon, the law-giver, who was greatly admired in Athens where

---

²⁴⁹ It could be suggested that the description of this behaviour assimilates that of the ἡμίφαυλοι analysed in Oration II [2c-d]; see below, pp. 70-71.

²⁵⁰ For Manuel’s ideas on arrogance see Oration VII; cf. below, pp. 155-175.

²⁵¹ Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 361B-C (ch. 67), 368B (ch. 76); Synesius, 25, pp. 54-56; Agapetos, 7, p. 30; Ps-Basil, 8, p. 52, 27, p. 59, 34, pp. 61-62; Photius, 945-947, p. 31; Blemmydes, 67, 73, p. 64, 90, p. 70; Magistros, 465D-468D (ch. 13).


²⁵⁵ Herodotus, Histories, I 27-34, 86-90.
an abundance of honourable men lived (30-32). It is possible that Manuel’s reference to Athens of the golden age (ἐν ταῖς χρυσαίς Ἀθήναις, 33), a city that excelled in good and virtuous men (καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ, 35) manifested by their deeds, offers an analogy of the classical city-state of Athens in its peak of power and glory with Manuel’s contemporary Constantinople, itself virtually a city-state256, stressing the essential element that makes cities great, namely the virtue of their citizens and rulers, exemplified by the Athenians and Solon.

[2c] Manuel offers Solon as a model of a virtuous, pious, moderate and most wise statesman who did not seek to take advantage of his fellow citizens (43-48). Likewise, the virtuous emperor ought not to exploit his subjects by any means, introducing new taxes for example, which is often stressed in mirrors of princes257. Thus, for Manuel Solon holds a prominent place among other rulers also in his capacity as legislator. By giving his people better laws to replace old ones, Manuel remarks, Solon created better citizens, which in turn made the city safer and gave it advantage over the others (48-53). In his Precepts Manuel succinctly expressed his views on the emperor’s duty to ‘be virtuous and a serviceable lawgiver, an excellent judge, being ruler and lawgiver and judge of himself’258. In contrast, Croesus, who fell victim to his own passion and avarice, became a tyrant who took advantage of others to meet his needs and fulfil his wishes. Manuel adds a psychological dimension in Croesus’s suffering (repeated in similar cases throughout his Oration and other of Manuel’s works), for ‘he whose soul is suffering, does not have a sane mind’ (59)259.

[2d] Manuel proceeds with a description of Croesus’s bitter end and the causes of this, his disregard of Solon’s advice and considering his own material wealth as the cause of his salvation and glory. In contrast, Solon not only did not reject the opinion of wise statesmen, but also adopted their views adding them to his own. Other exempla of such wise men who were involved in public affairs are Odysseus and Nestor (61). These examples testify to the models Manuel followed in his life and government260, and offer

---

256 See above, p. 22 n. 1.
257 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 328D-329A (ch. 16); Synesius, 25.6-7, p. 54; Ps-Basil, 27, p. 59; Blemmydes, 1-5, p. 44.
259 See Oration I 212-213 (app. loc. par.).
260 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 317A-D.
an indirect warning to his son and the audience not to discard his valuable admonitions and advice (νουθεσιῶν χρυσῶν, 65).

Manuel repeats his view that what caused Croesus’s arrogance was avarice and concludes his narration of the story with the incident of Croesus’s capture by Cyrus, who ordered to throw the former to the pyre only to be released on recanting after he recalled Solon’s words (Αθηναίου μεμνημένος Σόλωνος, 74). Interestingly, Manuel makes Croesus cry out ‘Solon’ twice rather than thrice as is reported in Herodotus, explaining that in this way Croesus was expressing his admiration for Solon and was not calling him to come to his salvation (79-81). The image of Croesus repenting and Cyrus saving him from a torturous death reflects the view that one should never give up hope for salvation provided that he realises man’s true purpose in life, at the same time stressing the Christian virtue of φιλανθρωπία.

[2e] Manuel closes the story referring to Herodotus and his ‘Muses’, namely his Histories261 (84), urging his audience to read this work as well as others to learn more about this story. Summarising his views, Manuel recapitulates the main points, namely what pertains the correct use and misuse of material wealth in pursuit of happiness. The moral of this story, he concludes, is sufficient to prove his point (88-93).

[3a] Moving to the next story (Δεῖ δέ ποι τόνδε μεταγαγεῖν, 94) Manuel describes the powerful army of Xerxes, whose military success depended on Fortune and not on virtue, in this case of courage (ἀνδρεία) which is not mentioned by name. Describing the defeat of the Persian army by the Athenians who were far less in number, Manuel stresses the value of their virtue which prevailed against the multitude of the powerful Persians, something Xerxes realised in the end. On the same token, Manuel remarks that virtuous children of poor origin may prove better than those who are noble but lack virtue (109-110)262.

[3b] To prove his initial point, namely that virtue can prevail over numbers and force, Manuel proceeds to examine these events in some detail. The forceful ‘barbaric crowd’ (122-123), its power and military achievements are juxtaposed to the glorious army of the Athenians who based their victory on the Platonic virtues: prudence (φρόνησις),

261 See above, p. 55 n. 255.
262 Cf. below, p. 188 with n. 642.
courage (ἀνδρεία), justice (δικαιοσύνη) and practical wisdom (σωφροσύνη) (129-132). The four cardinal virtues, which the emperor ought to possess, are perennial themes in imperial orations and mirrors of princes.

[3c] Manuel continues with an analysis of a number of subjects, including the expression of the virtues of the Athenians which were manifested in their deeds and behaviour, such as the superiority of peace over war and the importance of avoiding waging offensive war, which does not serve the defence of the homeland, and the honour of facing death in battle in contrast to daintiness (τρυφη καὶ ραθυμίᾳ, 149) and arrogance which characterised Xerxes and his army. He also discusses the major role of family with relation to virtues, which are bequeathed from noble parents to their worthy descendants (140-141), including the virtue of moderation (which he discusses in Oration VII) and the respect owed to paternal mores and advice (which Manuel repeats in the Epistolary Epilogue).

[3d-3e] Manuel proceeds with his own description and interpretation of the capture of Athens and Xerxes’s expectations for the capture of the entire Greece (157-158, 163-166), the battle of Salamis, Xerxes’s defeat, the destruction of his army and of the bridges of the Hellespont (182-189), and finally his flee and his return to Persia (189-261), without identifying his source, namely Herodotus. Throughout this passage Manuel compares Xerxes’s actions and behaviour with those of the Athenians, pointing out those which should be avoided. Manuel devotes an extensive section to the last phase, namely Xerxes’s return to Asia when he experienced a complete change of character (ἀνυπέρβλητόν τε καὶ ἀπαράβλητον ἐκτροπήν, 230). In the beginning the Persian King is described as overbold (152), irrational (153), immoderate in ambition, violent and totally arrogant (162), a fearful and powerful commander, who does not hesitate to impose cruel punishment to his own soldiers (198-204), something

---

263 Cf. Plato, Republic, 429a-445d.
264 Cf. Ps-Menander, 373.6-7, p. 84. See above, p. 32 with n. 87.
266 These admonitions allude to the claims of John VII to the throne and the superiority of Manuel’s son John VIII; cf. Epistolary Epilogue and pp. 176-185.
267 Herodotus, Histories, VII 6-57, VIII 115-118.
unacceptable for an emperor as it is often stressed in mirrors of princes\textsuperscript{268}. Following his defeat he appears as coward, behaving as a slave, ready to deny his own triumphs and authority (172-175), a man demented as a result of his cowardice (212-213), full of anxiety to the extent that he was unable to sleep, to find peace and stand on his feet (191). This section closes with a dramatic scene, with Xerxes crying aloud ‘homeward!’ (οἴκαδ’, 193), just like Odysseus, who longed to return to Ithaca (171).

[4a] What caused Xerxes’s destruction was his lack of virtue (235-238), self-respect and respect towards his own authority (258-261), Manuel remarks. For royal authority, a lawful legacy bequeathed from a father to his son (234-235), which secures stability for the state, should be based on virtue. Indeed, as a public person (249) the emperor should not care only for his own salvation (238-242) but also for that of his people. On the same token the emperor, though an image of God on earth, is a mortal man and a servant of God\textsuperscript{269}. Hence, he ought not be revered as God (243-245; cf. 264-266, 294), Manuel states. Similarly, a virtuous emperor should not pursue honours and pleasures which do not bring true happiness (245-247).

[4b-4c] On his return to Persia, Manuel continues, Xerxes resumed his previous habits that brought instability to his empire (276-277), including lack of knowledge of philosophy, a quality indispensable for an emperor\textsuperscript{270} and the means to achieve moderation (274-276). Manuel also comments on Xerxes’s monstrous physical appearance, unacceptable even for a slave. The disrespect of the principle of mean (286-287), resulting from the fact that he did not really possess education (291-292), and his daintiness as a result of adornment, were the reasons for his cowardice and finally his surrender.

[4d] It was Xerxes’s welcome to Susa as a victor, Manuel carries on, and his being greeted as a god that brought about his arrogance. Referring to the Giants\textsuperscript{271} (Τελχίνι δαιμονι, 310), Hercules and the Olympian gods, all paradigms of great force (311-312), Manuel exemplifies Xerxes’ hubris for believing himself to be superior on the grounds of his imperial authority. Self-knowledge (γνῶθι σαυτόν, 317), respect of the powers of

\textsuperscript{268} Cf. Agapetos, 37, p. 50, 55, p. 64; Ps-Basil, 28, p. 59; Photius, 797-803, p. 27; Theophylact, p. 209.17-20; Blemmydes, 34-44, pp. 54-56.

\textsuperscript{269} Cf. above, p. 55 n. 253; below, p. 98 n. 431.

\textsuperscript{270} Cf. Agapetos, 17, p. 36; Ps-Basil, 54, p. 69; Blemmydes, 6-7, pp. 44-46; Magistros, 496B (ch. 30).

the soul, awareness of the human corruptible nature, acceptance of advice, are qualities that Xerxes lacked. Manuel stresses that noble lineage (291) and imperial authority (314-315), should be accompanied by virtue and education along with moderation deriving from philosophical knowledge. By highlighting Xerxes’ judgement, actions and behaviour as expressions of his character, Manuel pinpoints what a virtuous prince should avoid. At the same time he alludes to the present state of affairs by using the conventional analogy of Athenians/Byzantines and Persians/Ottomans.

[5] Manuel then moves on to the third story, namely that of Gyges, which he considers to be the middle section of the Oration (321). Gyges is used by Manuel as an example of a tyrannical ruler who lacks virtue as well as a paradigm of the results of power if used improperly. According to Plato, Gyges ‘was a shepherd in the service of the ruler … of Lydia …’, who found a gold ring and when ‘he turned the collet of the ring towards himself’ he turned invisible. Using this magic ring, Gyges seduced the king’s wife and with her aid set upon the king and slew him and took over his kingdom. Manuel chooses not to expound on the myth or to describe Gyges, since the story, which appears in a number of ancient sources and collections of proverbs, must have been widely known. Interestingly, Manuel identifies the myth as Lydian (Λύδιον τοῦτον μῦθον, 325) while in codex V a variant reading gives ‘Phrygian’. Manuel asks his audience to honour the legend (τὸν μῦθον μὴ ἀτιμάσαιμεν, 323), namely by considering Gyges’ lack of virtue in pursuing his task at the same time commenting on the origins of royal authority, in Gyges’s case not the one which is God-given or lawfully inherited but one which is seized because of the collet of a magical ring which made him invisible. In other words, Manuel stresses the possibility that royal authority can be usurped through intrigue. Stressing, however, the importance of virtue, which distinguishes an emperor from a tyrant, Manuel comments on authority which is given

274 Plato, Republic, 359d-360d.
276 See Oration I 325 (app. crit.).
to the worthy and well-prepared successor, who should aim at virtue and not at gathering wealth or slaves (330). Gyges was neither happy nor enviable, Manuel remarks, for his achievements simply did not depend on his virtue. Whatever is achieved or partaken with virtue, Manuel concludes, is good and the opposite is not good (332-333).

Tyranny, a term used in mirrors of princes to describe the opposite of the legitimate imperial authority277, is a theme Manuel explores following traditional lines. Virtue, he says, is not characteristic of tyranny, for a tyrant rules by showing no respect towards his subjects, exercising violence and forcing them to unwillingly obey him, which is not at all noble. In addition, this does not secure the stability of his authority for in this way the tyrant cannot earn the support of his subjects who will inevitably start plotting against him, which in turn tallies with his tyrannical behaviour towards them278. This leads Manuel to raise the crucial issue of the emperor’s duty, as imitator of God, to be a model of virtue for his subjects, whom he should respect, protect and benefit. Equally important for Manuel is the fundamental principle that the emperor’s authority depends on his subjects, who will support his reign provided that he treats them appropriately279. Manuel concludes this section by reiterating that tyranny remains unchangeable, being always base and catastrophic.

[6a] The presentation of the stories comes to a close with Manuel summarising their moral, namely that hopes which do not depend on virtue but instead on wealth, weapons and devices are false (347-349; cf. 4-7), and justifying his method of using models in juxtaposition to fulfil his intention (350-351), that is, to present the ideal and virtuous ruler. The aforementioned stories and their protagonists, he says, are sufficient to prove his point and therefore he does not need to belabour the point by adding more. For otherwise he would have run the risk of wearing out his audience (ἵνα μὴ τὸ θέατρον ἀποκναίσωμεν, 353) and cause them to suffer like a shipwreck falling into a sea of endless stories (πέλαγος διηγημάτων ἀπείρων, 355-356).

[6b] This is the appropriate point to complete the Oration, Manuel continues, considering that he has successfully achieved his initial aim by exercising the principal

---

278 Cf. Agapetos, 35, p. 48; Photius, 887-891, p. 29; Theophylact, p. 201.26-203.9.
279 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 373C-D (ch. 85).
of learning the universal by examining the particular (ἐκ τοῦ μέρους τὸ πᾶν εἰδέναι, 361-362). He reiterates that the lessons one should learn from his examples (365-367) could lead to conclusions concerning true happiness and virtue.

[7a] Having accomplished his initial aim to juxtapose the exempla to the excellent ruler (9-12), Manuel proceeds with presenting the excellent man who ought to possess qualities that are contrary to the vices ascribed to Croesus, Xerxes and Gyges. First, Manuel stresses that the moderate, virtuous and wise emperor has a well-balanced soul. This is a crucial element of his character, for as he said earlier (cf. 340-341) a man is defined by his soul. Manuel then discusses what characterises a benevolent ruler, that is, caring for his subjects. This reflects an important principle of Byzantine imperial ideology concerning the emperor’s divine right and his obligation to be an imitator of God280. Similarly, the virtuous emperor should love his subjects seeing to their moral improvement and seeking to earn their trust through persuasion, the power of his words. In this way both the emperor and his subjects should aim at the common interest of society, a statement that Manuel uses as a motif from the very beginning of the Oration (cf. 2). What distinguishes the emperor from his subjects is his duty and authority to take decisions for the people and the state. In order to take the right decisions he needs to possess knowledge and skill combined with intelligence and goodness (381-382). A good emperor, Manuel stresses, should be to his people like a father, friend, helmsman, shepherd, doctor and saviour, characterisations which are usual in mirrors of princes281. The same epithets (cf. 407) he mentions also in his Precepts and in his Panegyric on the recovery of his father from illness282, as well as in Oration VII (405) and the Epistolary Epilogue (43), this time attributing them to God, thus emphasizing the Byzantine perception of the God-chosen emperor.

A novelty introduced by Manuel is his attribution to the emperor of the image of a oikonomos (οἰκονόμος, 377). This is the first time it is used to describe an emperor in a

---

280 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 324B-C (ch. 7); Synesius, 8.4-11, p. 18, 9, pp. 18-20; Agapetos, 1, p. 26, 37, p. 50; Ps-Basil, 10, p. 53; Blemmydes, 7, p. 46, 35, p. 54; Magistros, 449C-D (ch. 2). The idea of the emperor’s divine right is first introduced by Eusebius, Praise, 1.6.32-3, pp. 198-199, 3.5.19-21, p. 202, 4.2.17-19, p. 203; Cf. Dvornik, Political philosophy, vol. 2, pp. 616-623.

281 Agapetos, 10, p. 32 (κυβερνήτης), 19, p. 38 (ἐπιστήμων); Ps-Basil, 30, p. 60 (ἰατρός, ἱπποκόμος, στρατηγός, ἐπιστήμων); Blemmydes, 49, p. 58 (παιδαγός, 149-150, p. 92 (κυβερνήτης); Magistros, 460.26-33 (ch. 8), 476.43-54 (ch. 19) (ἰατρός), 464.19 (ch. 11) (παιδαγός), 469.22-23 (ch. 14) (παιδαγός).

282 Manuel II, Precepts, 372D (ch. 82, ἱπποκόμος, κυβερνήτης, παιδαγός), 373D (ch. 85, παιδαγός, ποιμήν, ἱπποκόμος, διδάσκαλος); idem, Panegyric, 223.11 (ἰατρός, παιδαγός), 224.9 (σωτήρ), 225.15-21 (κυβερνήτης).
Byzantine mirror of princes, but not the only time used by Manuel with reference to an emperor. After Manuel was left partly paralysed following a stroke in October 1422, John VIII took over the then on-going negotiations with the papal envoy Antonio da Massa on the prospects of an ecumenical council which would bring the Union of the Churches. As reported by Sphrantzes, who was present at the incident, having failed to persuade his son to proceed with the negotiations with caution, John left the room in silence. Manuel then turned to Sphrantzes and remarked: ‘my son is a true emperor, though not of our present times. For he expects, and has in mind such great things appropriate for the prosperous times of our ancestors. But today, as if things are pursuing us, our empire does not demand an emperor but a oikonomos (οἰκονόμον).’

Interestingly enough, Manuel’s expressed advice was not followed by his son in this specific case as events show. The use of this term in Oration I, which predates the aforementioned incident, is indicative of Manuel’s sense of realism and his awareness of the political complexities of the times, which according to him necessitated the use of special skills possessed by an oikonomos rather than an emperor.

The fact that in Oration I Manuel describes the emperor using the word oikonomos along with other words which convey authority, care and protection (father, friend, captain, shepherd, doctor, saviour) shows that here he departs from the meaning of oikonomos simply as ‘steward’ or ‘manager’ (as translated, for example, by Nicol and Kiousopoulou respectively) and encompasses a wider meaning, which reflects the

---


287 See above, pp. 47-50.
emperor’s pastoral role imitating in this God. It is in this sense that Manuel’s use of oikonomos can be related with the divine oikonomia, God’s providence.288

[7b] Continuing his discussion on the relation between the emperor and his subjects he states that for the latter who are ‘good and more reasonable’ (χρηστῶν τε καὶ ἐπιεικεστέρων, 388) and obey him because they consider him to be truly virtuous, the emperor will be beneficial, while for those who defy him he can be of no help.289 Presenting clearly his views on the latter group Manuel uses the paradigm of Judas whom even the Saviour was unable to help. This is another example stressing the emperor’s obligation to be an imitator of Christ. Nevertheless, Manuel states, even these ‘traitors’ are unable to obstruct the emperor’s work. His conclusive remark, ‘I say these, not giving an oracle or a prophesy’, echoes Manuel’s personal experience.290 The strong element of ‘imitation’ continues, this time combining the classical and biblical traditions with Teiresias and David (391-392) described as men with oracular and prophetic powers, while Habakkuk (389) is employed to demonstrate the greatness of God’s virtue.291 It should be noted that Habakkuk is not named by Manuel, but appears in the text as ‘the Prophet’ (389). This is unusual, for Byzantine authors generally use this appellation to refer to David. It is possible that Manuel omitted the name of the prophet at this point because he was uncertain of the author of this quotation.292

[7c] Elaborating further his thoughts on the same subject, Manuel states that a city will suffer and be lost for two reasons: firstly, if the ruler is not virtuous and benevolent towards his people; and secondly, if the subjects refuse to obey him (397-400). His statement that a city will be destroyed as a result of the people refusing to comply with the emperor’s decisions, apart from being a general remark on this principle of statesmanship, reflects the divisions in the Byzantine society at the time.293

---

289 Cf. Ps-Basil, 22, p. 57; Photius, 970-973, p. 32.
290 See below, pp. 188-189.
291 Habakkuk 3:3: <his glory> covered the heavens.
292 As already mentioned Manuel may have introduced some citations by memory, see above, p. 43.
Provided that the ruler is evidently virtuous the virtuous people will necessarily follow him, Manuel repeats, for he will be to them like a father, a friend, a helmsman, a doctor, a saviour (403-408; cf. 377-378) and also a benefactor (ἐυεργέτης, 407). Being his people’s caring leader the virtuous emperor is compared with the shepherd, horse-keeper and cattle-driver (ποιμένι, καὶ ἱπποφορβῷ, καὶ βουκόλῳ, 405), whom the animals he takes care of follow wherever he chooses to lead them. In this way, Manuel defines the reciprocal relations and mutual obligations between the virtuous ruler and his equally virtuous subjects. This simple fact is obvious even to a blind person (408), Manuel exclaims paraphrasing ‘the Comedian’ (Aristophanes, Plutus 48), whom he cites throughout the Orations and his other works. Manuel carries on saying that the people’s obedience to the emperor, which leads to their own happiness, is also inspired by the emperor’s piety, his nobility, his protective manner and his duty to ward off any danger in their defence, together with his governing with knowledge (σὺν ἐπιστήμῃ τὸ σκάφος ἄγοντος, 412-413; cf. 381-382). Stressing once more the significance of the principles governing the good relation between the emperor and the people and its good effects, Manuel concludes that the virtuous subjects have no other wish than what would be the best for the virtuous and benevolent emperor. Indeed virtue is the cause of everything good and the reason for happiness. There are also those, Manuel adds, among the subjects who follow their virtuous prince unwillingly (ἄκοντες, 424) and do not really want to partake of the goods resulting from virtue. This provides a link with the next Orations II and III.

Before he closes Oration I Manuel returns to discuss an important quality the emperor should possess, that is his rhetorical skill, namely the ability to persuade his people by expressing his virtue through words capable of securing their support, a precondition that would enable him to work for their own benefit; in the same way

---

294 The relationship between the emperor and his subjects is a new theme introduced in political treatises in the late Byzantine period. Theodore II Laskaris examines the matter in great detail in his works, especially in his treatise entitled ‘Of the same Theodore Doukas Laskaris, son of the most exalted emperor the lord John Doukas, to the lord George Mouzalon, who asked: ‘How should lords behave toward their servants, and how should servants behave toward their lords?’’, ed. A. Tartaglia, ‘Tractatus ad Georgium Muzalonem de Subiectorum in Principem Officiis’, Theodorus II Ducas Lascaris. Opuscula rhetoric (Munich, 2000), pp. 120-140. For an analysis of Laskaris’s ideas see Angelov, Ideology, pp. 212-252.

295 See Oration I 408 (app. loc. par.).

296 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 325B-C (ch. 10), 345C-D (ch. 42); Agapetos, 48, p. 58, 49, p. 60; Ps-Basil, 19, p. 56, 20.3-4, p. 57, 46, pp. 66-67.

that doctors who may possess the skill of their occupation but lack the ability and knowledge of how to convince their patients to receive the medication are unable in the end to benefit them (429-431). The necessity of rhetoric and reasoned arguments (λόγοι) to both persuade and express an opinion (πειθοῦς, καὶ τοῦ δοξάζειν, 433) is emphasised by Manuel in the Oration and other works298, as is the importance of the emperor helping and benefiting his subjects. It is these elements of the virtuous prince rather than ‘gold and the multitude of hands’ (in the sense of numerous workmen or assistants) ‘and machinations’ (χρυσίου, καὶ πολυχειρίας, καὶ μηχανής, 435), Manuel states, that will help him to learn how to improve himself and become more beneficial to himself and his people. Ultimately, Manuel concludes, reiterating his introductory statement (439), the ideal ruler is the one who possesses a virtuous soul.

[8] The last section, addressed directly to John VIII (ὦ φίλτατε, 440), is a plea from the Emperor to his son. Manuel encourages his son to pursue virtue and asks him to consider his arguments and admonitions, which will prove useful to him (440-441). He warns him not to dishonour what he admires (443), for he who praises something and then ignores it and does not pursue it by all means, will cause himself to be ridiculed (ἁφλησει γέλωτα, 445) by those who are prudent299.

Similar to Oration I's views and principles, were expressed by Manuel in his Counsel to the Thessalonians when they were besieged300. There Manuel refers to the need for cooperation between the emperor and the people301, the preference of an honourable death to a shameful enslavement to the barbarians302, the recalling of the people's ancestors identified with the ancient Greeks303, the contempt for cowardice304, and the

298 See above, p. 37. The importance of rhetoric for the emperor is often emphasised in admonitory texts, see Angelov, ‘Emperors’, pp. 105-106.

299 Emphasizing the educational element of the Orations, Leonte, Purple, pp. 197-198, 234-238, suggested that Manuel’s direct speech in this and similar cases echo actual conversations and arguments he had with his son. Though this supposition cannot be ruled out there is no strong evidence to ascertain it either. It seems, however, that these passages in direct speech are not solely addressed to John VIII but also to the reader. The same convention is used by Manuel in his treatise On the Procession of the Holy Spirit (ed. Dendrinos, ch. 49, p. 75), where he introduces a short fictitious dialogue with the recipient of the treatise.

300 For an analysis of the events and a translation of the Counsel to the Thessalonians, see Dennis, Reign, pp. 79-85.

301 Oration I [7b-c]; Counsel to the Thessalonians, 295.3-297.11.

302 Oration I [3c]; Counsel to the Thessalonians, 296.24-299.35.

303 Oration I [3c]; Counsel to the Thessalonians, 297.12-34.

304 Oration I [3a-c]; Counsel to the Thessalonians, 298.25-37, 299.26-28.
success which can be achieved with God’s help\textsuperscript{305}. In addition, the view that people who disagree with the Emperor’s decision can be one of the causes of the sufferings of a city (I, 397-399), echoes a similar idea expressed in the Counsel to the Thessalonians (298.26-299.23), where Manuel openly states that certain Thessalonians were opposing the decision of the Emperor and of the majority of the people not to surrender the city to the Ottomans. It could be therefore proposed that Manuel’s experience during his Despotate in Thessalonike (1382-1387)\textsuperscript{306} is reflected in the Oration. It was in this early period of his political career that, faced with the realities and dilemmas of statesmanship, he was striving to prove himself as a good and virtuous ruler by putting into action all those elements he describes in the Oration.

In comparison to the rest Orations, Oration I incorporates the majority of political ideas concerned with the duties and obligations of the emperor. It seems that Manuel’s choice to discuss practical matters in this Oration shows his intention to devote the other Orations (II-VII) to moral issues\textsuperscript{307}. Manuel’s statement in Oration VII (4-10) that he considers it appropriate to analyse at this point the matter of moderation of which he made mention in Oration I (138-140), indicates a link between these two Orations\textsuperscript{308}. Additional cross references among the Orations confirm the unity of the work\textsuperscript{309}.

\textsuperscript{305} Manuel II, Counsel to the Thessalonians, 300.23-32, 301.13-39
\textsuperscript{306} See Dennis, Reign, passim.
\textsuperscript{307} Cf. Leonte, Purple, pp. 229.
\textsuperscript{308} See below, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{309} On this question see above, pp. 35, 39-50, below, p. 186.
Oration II

Good is naturally loved by everyone, while the evil person is hated even by himself. However, sometimes we love evil, considering it to be good. And on happiness and virtue

The title of Oration II (Ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθόν, πᾶσι φιλοῦμενόν ἐστι φυσικῶς· ὁ δὲ κακός, καὶ ἑαυτῷ μισητός. Φιλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ κακόν ἐστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκεινο νομίζοντες. Καὶ περὶ εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἀρετῆς) presents its central theme, a comparison of the evil (κακός) or base (φαῦλος) with the virtuous man and the way man can reach happiness and achieve virtue (εὐδαιμονία καὶ ἀρετή) using his προαίρεσις, knowledge (γνῶσις) and free will (αὐτεξούσιον).

The structure of the Oration appears to be rather simple. Following some introductory statements on natural goodness and excellence in all men [1a-1b], Manuel presents three types of evil men: the ignorant (οὐχ ἐγνωκὼς), the ‘drone’ (κηφῆσι) and the half-knavish (ἡμιφαύλους) [2a-2d], before he describes the virtuous man and its opposite, the base person [3a-4b]. A wider discussion on happiness and virtue concludes with a recapitulation of the initial observations [5].

[1a] Manuel begins with the general remark that natural goodness exists in all living creatures (1-3), even in irrational ones (ἀλόγοις καὶ ἀναισθήτοις, 5-6). This results from their being created by goodness itself, that is God, Who is akin to His creation (συγγενοῦς, 7), the creator and the beginning of all, the nature that is beyond beginning (ὑπεράρχιος φύσις, 8), the benefactor Who attracts all towards excellence and goodness. All created beings, Manuel continues, tend to be in proximity to their maker in the same way that inferior beings usually tend to be next to the superior ones seeking to become better (14-16). Thus, being close to their Creator human beings can be saved. Therefore, both virtuous and evil men naturally hate evil and love goodness (μισοπόνηρον καὶ φιλόκαλον, 2-3).

[1b] The cause (αἴτιον, 20) of human goodness, Manuel continues, is the harmonious relation existing between man and the Creator. This bond, which remains unbroken,

310 As it will be argued in the analysis of Oration III, pp. 77-79, we have chosen not to translate the term προαίρεσις, for its meaning cannot be explained in a single word.
311 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 344A (ch. 37); idem, Dialogues, IV 42.19-20.
312 Cf. There is none good but One, that is, God (Matthew 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19). This is repeated several times in the text, cf. Oration III 22, VI 50, 64-65, 111-112, 122.
313 Cf. 2 Thessalonians 2:16.
was immortalised with the Resurrection of Christ (23-24). Manuel closes the introductory section repeating that all good was created by goodness, that is God, for the sake of good314, aiming to love and seek goodness and hate and avoid its opposite, that is evil (31-34)315.

[2a] Manuel justifies his statement on natural goodness by pointing out that man often removes himself from what is good and loves its opposite, that is evil (35-36). The causes for this are ignorance (οὐχ ἐγνωκώς) (36-37) and ill judgment (σφάλλονται περὶ τὴν ψήφον, 48-49; cf. 193-196)316. In this sense, some people who believe the evil to be good and the wretched to be happy (47-48) may have a similar aim with those who are good and virtuous (48-50). To clarify his argument Manuel compares the former group with drunkards, for these people are incapable of having a clear mind either when they are drunk or sober (44-47)317, and are deemed unhappy (ταλανίζοντας, 43) since they have become habituated to evil (ἐν ἑξει τῶν κακῶν, 44)318 (here Manuel uses the Aristotelian term of hexas with reference to dispositions with relation to virtue)319, thus depriving themselves of the possibility to become truly virtuous (43-44). It could be suggested that Manuel was influenced in choosing the example of the drunkard by a rhetorical exercise he had composed, entitled Declamation on a drunkard. The behaviour of the drunkards briefly described in the Oration (44-50), resembles to a large extent that of the protagonist of the declamation, the inebriate father, who was affixed to the habit of drinking, to the point that he was considering life without wine not worth living320.

[2b] Another type of evil person is the one Manuel characterises as ‘drone’ (κηφῆσι, 51), a parasite, who belongs to the more base men (φαυλοτέρων, 61). These people

---

314 Cf. Ephesians 2:10; 3 John 1:11.
315 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 337C-D (ch. 29).
317 The view that people might act wrongly because of ignorance and the analogy of the drunkards can be found also in Oration III (104-106, 132-133, 178-179, 183-193) in the discussion concerning involuntary actions.
319 Aristotle, EN 1105b.20-30.
consider themselves happy and excellent (52-53) because they falsely identify happiness (ἐυδαιμονία, 52) with daintiness and easy life (51-62). However, happiness does not depend on indolence, Manuel stresses, but on our soul, for which the base man does not show any care (53-56). Manuel’s description of those parasites and their circle of jugglers, actors, dancers, crowds of flatterers and swarms of insolent men (57-60), reflects ideas and admonitions explicitly mentioned in mirrors of princes, according to which it is unacceptable for the emperor to lead a luxurious mode of life and that he should judge the true character and behaviour of the members of his entourage, his friends and counsels. Manuel expresses his views on these points in greater detail in his Precepts, stressing also the dangers of flattery.

[2c] A third type of evil man is the one Manuel calls ‘half-knavish’ (or ‘partially base’) (ἡμιφαύλοις, 65). As in the case of the ‘drones’, these people are affixed to daintiness and easiness. As a result, they consider one happy when he possesses material wealth and a multitude of slaves in his service (67-68). This type of man reminds of Croesus in the previous Oration I [2a-d]. Similarly, the inability of half-knavish men, who lack virtue and knowledge as a result of their dependence on Fortune (77-78), to capture the essence of things (ἄκροις δακτυλοῖς, 78) reminds of the story of Xerxes in Oration I [3a-4d].

[2d] To the half-knavish type of man Manuel juxtaposes the excellent man, whose behaviour fits that of the virtuous. Addressing his son (and the reader) Manuel stresses that virtuous men are cautious not to become arrogant. At this point, he introduces the notion of unpredictability in life. Using biblical and mythological exempla — Nestor and Solomon as paradigms of prudence, and Achilles and Solomon as examples of bravery (79-80) — Manuel warns that one should avoid comparing himself to those for two reasons: firstly, because Fortune usually changes (Τύχης ἀντιπιπτός, 83), causing

---

321 Cf. Synesius, 11, 12, pp. 23-25; Agapetos, 12, p. 32, 22, p. 40, 29, p. 44, 32, p. 46; Ps-Basil, 23, pp. 57-58, 24, p. 58, 48, p. 67; Photius, 718-747, pp. 24-25; Theophylact, pp. 203.9-17, 26-30, 207.31; Blemmydes, 93-94, p. 72; Magistros, 472C-473C (ch. 16).
322 Manuel II, Precepts, 329A-D (ch. 17, 18, 19), 329D-332A (ch. 20).
323 Ibid., 332A-B (ch. 21).
324 The epithet is found only in Lucian, Twice accused, 8.23. Though Aristotle makes no use of the term, it could be suggested that his description of the evil man throughout Book VII of the Nicomachean Ethics has influenced Manuel’s ideas.
326 Cf. above, pp. 57-60.
suffering to the excellent man; secondly, because human life is unstable (Ἐυρίπιον τόνδε βίον, 84-85). Thus, even a silly, coward and abominable person may appear better than a man who is great and sensible (85-87). ‘You have heard this by those men who have truly experienced it’ (87), Manuel states, evidently alluding to his personal experience with reference to unworthy men who came to possess high offices. Permanent and true glory, Manuel remarks, derives from the Holy Spirit (92-93), contrary to vain and ever-changing glory that lives and dies with the physical body (93-96). Apart from reflecting a common Christian belief this view is a reminder of the emperor’s physical corruptibility, an important theme in mirrors of princes327, repeatedly discussed by Manuel throughout his Orations328.

Virtuous men should not rely on the half-knavish for the latter are unstable people who solely aim at admiring people (rather than principles) and believe that virtue results not from courage but from Fortune. When circumstances change (ὀστράκου μεταπεσόντος, 89), the half-knavish abandon the one whom they previously admired and praised, and think of him as grievous. These base men, Manuel says, admire one’s ability of sailing the boat without pursuing the knowledge of steering it (100-101). Apart from alluding to the emperor as captain of the ship329, these remarks seem to reflect Manuel’s personal experience330.

It should be noted that Fortune (Τύχη) is often used by Manuel with a negative connotation (97-100, 119), expressing the view accepted by Christian thinkers, that it is not Fate and Fortune that define human character and actions and their outcome, but rather Divine Providence, προαίρεσις and free will331. Manuel provides a definition of Τύχη in his Panegyric on the recovery of his father from illness, where he states: ‘The Hellenes call this Tyche, and we too call it Tyche. But for them it was a godess, while for

327 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts 324B-C (ch. 7), 352A-B (ch. 51), 361C-D (ch. 68), 384B (ch. 99); Agapetos, 4, p. 28, 15, p. 34, 21, p. 38, 71, p. 76; Ps-Basil, 4, p. 51, 6, p. 52, 14, p. 54, 38, p. 63, 39, pp. 63-64, 45, p. 66, 50, p. 68, 65, p. 73.
330 Cf. below, pp. 188-189.
us who are pious it has the glory of a mere word, with the sense of success (εὐπραγία) or failure (δυσπραγία)\textsuperscript{332}.

[3a] Manuel continues with a description of the good and more sensible men (ἀγαθοί καὶ οὐνεχέστεροι, 105). These people establish their happiness upon προαιρεσίας and education (παιδεύσει, 106). According to them, true happiness is not achieved through material wealth for this is actually the cause of vice (as we have already seen in Croesus’ case). Man becomes truly happy (εὐδαίμον, 108) because of his soul\textsuperscript{333} (cf. I 340-341), which results from virtue, which in turn is caused by one’s own self and one’s own προαιρεσίας (108-110). The same applies for the evil man, who becomes such for the same reasons (110-112)\textsuperscript{334}. At this point (112), Manuel denotes that προαιρεσίας and self-responsibility, together with the notion of free will, will be further examined in Oration III, which provides evidence on the links between these two Orations\textsuperscript{335}. [3b] Manuel reiterates that excellent men are aware that they cannot exist without virtue (115-117) and that goodness, and therefore true happiness, cannot result from Fortune but from man’s virtue, free will and προαιρεσίας.

[3c] The author then moves on to discuss honour and glory (cf. 92-96) with relation to virtue. Many virtuous men, he says, have experienced grief and harm as a result of their misjudgment of glory. To make his argument on true and everlasting glory clearer, Manuel uses Alexander and Cyrus\textsuperscript{336} as examples of glorious men commemorated through the centuries on account of their glory resulting from bravery and excellence (125-130). What causes glory, Manuel states, namely good deeds, hard work (καρπὸς ἀγωνισμάτων καὶ πόνων, 127-128) and high spirit (πολλὸς φρονήματος, 128)\textsuperscript{337}, contribute to virtue. And true virtue is not involved with temporal and material things, wealth and bodily pleasures (129-130), for virtue is an

\textsuperscript{332} Manuel II, Panegyric, 235-9-12. Translation based on Reinert, ‘Manuel and his Müderris’, p. 49; see ibid., pp. 49-50 for Manuel’s concept on Τύχη. Cf. also Manuel II, Letter to Alexius Iagoup, p. 330.1-5, where he refers to Fortune as his ‘competitor’.

\textsuperscript{333} Cf. Aristotle, EN 1102a.16-17.


\textsuperscript{335} Cf. above, p. 67.

\textsuperscript{336} The exempla of Alexander and Cyrus are frequent in Byzantine rhetorical texts, especially encomia, proposed as paradigms also by Ps-Menander, 371.7, p. 80, 377.8-9, p. 92. Cf. Hunger, Βυζαντινὴ Λογοτεχνία, p. 198.

\textsuperscript{337} Cf. Aristotle, EN 1095b.27-30.
eternal possession (χρῆμα γὰρ ἀθάνατον, 132). This view, which echoes Scriptural
and patristic teachings\(^{338}\), is offered as a fundamental admonition.

[3d] Manuel presents the virtuous man by constantly juxtaposing the base person. The
desire of the virtuous to live (morally) well\(^{339}\) (ζῆν εὖ, 133) and their pursuit of wisdom
and knowledge, he says, shows what is virtue and true happiness. Repeating ideas
analysed in the introduction of the Oration (cf. II 10-14, 28-31, 35-40), Manuel speaks of
the natural tendency of all created beings to be close to their akin good. Summarising
his views, Manuel considers that the virtuous are happy and admired by the truly
virtuous, and though they consider the evil persons worthy of lament (θρῆνων ἄξιος,
137), nevertheless they treat them with compassion (ἐλεεῖται, 141). This last remark
reflects the notion of φιλανθρωπία, a fundamental attribute of the divinity, which
should be imitated by all Christians, especially by God’s image on earth, that is, the
emperor, as stressed in ethico-political texts\(^{340}\).

Manuel continues using his comparative approach and suggests that the manners of
the base man are the opposite of those of the virtuous. Hence, the former people regard
the virtuous miserable and avoid them (136-137). What causes evilness (ἔντελέχειαν
πρᾶξεων μοχθηρῶν, 139) is one’s own wicked actions, his refusal to become good, his
inability to change his disposition, directing it towards what is good and praiseworthy
(139-140); in other words, his evil προαίρεσις (φαύλην προαίρεσιν, 150). Evil men are
hated not only by those who are evil, but also by themselves (142-143), which may
seem as a paradox (αἰνίγματι ἐοικέναι, 149), Manuel remarks. In accordance with the
principle of man’s natural goodness (cf. [1a]), he carries on, it is impossible for man not
to love virtue and hate the wicked (145-147). Therefore, the evil man has his mind
divided into two (ταῖς γνώμαις δίχα τεμνόμενος, 148): on the one hand he is attached
to evil while at the same time, being unable to refuse his innate good nature, he loves
himself. What makes evil prejudicial (ἀσύμφορον τὸ κακόν, 155) is when one
surrenders to it. Hence, if one does not surrender to evil he will remain unharmed (155-
156). At this point Manuel introduces the fundamental view that pleasure ceases and is

\(^{338}\) Cf. e.g., Matthew 7:13-14; Basil of Caesarea, Hortatory homily on the Holy Baptism, PG 31, col. 440.22-
28; Gregory of Nyssa, Eight Homilies on the Beatitudes, PG 44, col. 1213.26-34.

\(^{339}\) Cf. Aristotle, EN 1095a.20-21, 1098b.21-22.

\(^{340}\) For Manuel’s view on φιλανθρωπία see Oration VI. Cf. Constantelos, Philanthropy, pp. 33-42.
inevitably followed by pain. This idea, ascribed by Manuel to Plato\textsuperscript{341} (κατὰ Πλάτωνα, 152-153), is further analysed by Manuel, especially in \textit{Oration IV}\textsuperscript{342}. What is painful is more lasting than what is pleasant, since what is pleasant comes to an end when the physical body dies, whereas the painful remains in the eternal soul\textsuperscript{343}.

[4a] After briefly commenting on the correct use of pleasure by the virtuous (157-158) (which forms the central theme of \textit{Oration V}), Manuel carries on with further analysing preceding subjects. To the instability of the evil persons (159-160, cf. 87-91, 148) he juxtaposes the stability that characterises the virtuous man, causing him to become trustworthy to those who admire him (158-161), which is indeed one of the qualities an emperor should possess\textsuperscript{344}. The virtuous should show compassion towards the evil (cf. 141), for the virtuous loves not only himself and his alike but also the evil men (165-166)\textsuperscript{345}. It is not extraordinary (οὐ θαυμαστόν, 167) to say, Manuel remarks, that in the same way the evil man is hated even by himself similarly the virtuous man is loved even by the evil one. This statement further supports the previous arguments on natural goodness (cf. [1a], 148-150). To justify the manifestation of virtue’s self-evident superiority and the inevitable love it brings, Manuel paraphrases a citation from Matthew (5:14): \textit{A city that is set on a hill cannot be hid} (Ἀδύνατον δὲ κρυβῆναι πόλιν, ἐπάνω ὦ ὄρους κειμένην, 169). Borrowing a familiar image, paraphrasing this time the parable of the Great Supper (Luke 14:15-24) Manuel stresses that God, the source of man’s natural goodness, honours virtue and its servants, and invites all towards the virtuous trying to fill the house (of virtue) with guests so that nobody is deprived of the good meal (169-173) and leave virtue hidden. This image implies that the emperor should ceaselessly seek to improve his subjects and attract them towards him, being a model of virtue, in order to enable them to partake of the same meal, that is, true

\textsuperscript{341} Cf. Plato, \textit{Phaedo}, 60b-c.

\textsuperscript{342} \textit{Oration IV} 62-65, 112-113, 125-126.


\textsuperscript{344} Cf. Agapetos, 11, p. 32, 33, p. 46; Blemmydes, 25, p. 50.

happiness and prosperity. Echoing Scriptural citations and patristic thought, Manuel stresses that God does not accept virtue to remain ineffective (169-170). Actually virtue is proved through actions. Inactive virtue, Manuel continues, is compared with bright gold mixed with soil and with a transparent stone which remains in the dark (174-176). Virtue lacking action is simply inappropriate (ἀρετὴ γὰρ ἀνενέργητος, ἀμωσγέπως ἄκοσμος, 177-178), for it does not benefit. Manuel compares it to a beautiful harp which is useless without a lyre player (178-179). This example comes from Aristotle (or one of his commentators), though Manuel makes no reference to his source. The message, in so far as the political function of the Oration is concerned, is that the emperor should always put his virtue into action in order to benefit his people. Manuel actually defines virtue in terms of its practical function: ‘the good put into practice, with knowledge and will and because of disposition’ (181-182). By the same token the virtuous man is he ‘who considers virtue to be the most excellent, and loves the excellent and pleasantly puts into action what he loves’ (182-183). Hence, truly happy is only the virtuous man, who is admired by the prudent, and enjoys virtuous works, thus reaching perfection. As the Scripture says (κατὰ τὴν Γραφήν, 186), Manuel remarks, man rejoices greatly through good deeds. This description of virtue and the virtuous and truly happy man is followed by an equally brief portrayal of the base, with Manuel repeating his views with relation to the evil’s self-responsibility and the feelings of hatred he causes (187-188).

[5] Manuel concludes this Oration adding that all agree with the simple fact that virtue is good and wickedness is evil (191-192), and reiterates the main points concerning

---

346 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 352B-D (ch. 52); Synesius, 28, pp. 59-60; Agapetos, 19, p. 38, 46, 48, p. 58; Ps-Basil, 19, p. 56, 60, p. 71; Blemmydes, 2, p. 44; Magistros, 492A-493B (ch. 28), 496A-C (ch. 30).
348 Cf. Damascene, 58.172-177, p. 144.
350 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 324D-325B (ch. 9), 328D-329A (ch. 16), 352C-D (ch. 52), 380C (ch. 93); Synesius, 26, pp. 56-57; Agapetos, 6, p. 28, 19, p. 38, 44, p. 56; Ps-Basil, 19, 20, p. 56; Blemmydes, 1-5, p. 44; Magistros, 452B-453A (ch. 4). Cf. above, pp. 62-66.
352 Cf. Ephesians 2:10.
natural human goodness and hatred of evil, the results of ill judgment, and deception and maltreatment caused by the evil (192-196).

Manuel’s discussion revolves around the creation of man in God’s image and likeness as described in Genesis (1:26-27, 2:7). Though Manuel does not identify his sources, his views on the natural goodness of human nature follow those of Nemesius of Emessa, On human nature353, and John Damascene354, Exposition of the Orthodox faith, which reflect in different degree views of Christian anthropology355. Apart from the evident Aristotelian and Platonic influence, it becomes clear also from what follows (cf. VI [4a], [5a]), that Manuel adopts the Christian perception of the human being as a unity of the material body and the immaterial soul, both of which will experience the Advent of Christ.

In comparison to the other Orations this is shorter. It provides the reader with terms, definitions and preliminary descriptions of themes and issues discussed in the Orations that follow, in this way preparing him to better follow Manuel’s more detailed analysis. In this sense Oration II seems to serve as an introduction to the rest Orations (III-VII)356.

353 Cf. W. Telfer ed., Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa, Library of Christian Classics IV (Philadelphia, 1955), p. 222 n. 44: ‘Some fifteenth-century manuscripts contain single chapters, or extracts from Nemesius, showing that he was never wholly forgotten in the East’. Hence it is most possible that Manuel was familiar with Nemesius’ work.

354 John Damascene has already been identified as one of Manuel’s sources in his treatise On the Procession of the Holy Spirit and his Dialogues with a Persian, hence it is not impossible that Manuel used his works also for the composition of the Orations. Cf. Trapp, Dialogue, pp. 25*-26*; Dendrinos, Annotated, p. xxxiii; J.A. Demetracopoulos, Palamas transformed. Palamite interpretations of the distinction between God’s ‘Essence’ and ‘Energies’ in late Byzantium’, in Hinterberger and Schabel, Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History, pp. 263-372 at pp. 327-341.

355 Both Nemesius and Damascene were influenced by Gregory of Nyssa, On the nature of man, PG 44, cols. 124-256. However, there is no evidence of a direct influence of the specific work on Manuel’s Orations.

Oration III

On προαιρεσις and the voluntary. And that the evil person is not so by nature or for external reasons, but he himself is the cause of this

As it becomes evident from the title (Περὶ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἑκουσίου καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, οὐδὲ ἐξωθεν ὁ κακός, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ αἴτιος γίνεται), what permeates Oration III is the discussion of προαιρεσις and the notions of voluntary (ἑκουσίου) [4b, 4c, 6a], involuntary (ἀκούσιον) [3a, 4b], non-voluntary (οὐχ ἑκουσίων) and mixed voluntary (μιξοεκούσιω) [5a-b], with relation to what causes evil (κακὸν or φαῦλον) to a person [2a-2c, 6a-d, 7a-c].

In choosing to examine the specific matters, Manuel’s explicit aim was to educate his son morally (120). He points out that he has no intention of discussing all aspects involving προαιρεσις, but rather those that are most likely to occur in one’s life (115) and those that concern honourable men (193-194), rather than the demented, arrogant (32-33) and senseless people (346-347).

In terms of structure Manuel states that the sequence of subjects compelled him to form many divisions and subdivisions, with the text resembling a scale made of many steps (120-123). Taking ignorance as a point of departure and proceeding with an examination of the themes, he is confident that he will reach his conclusions concerning both προαιρεσις and the notion of voluntary, to demonstrate that these are the foundations of evil (343-346).

In this Oration Manuel uses the method of erotapokriseis [2a, 4d, 6d], thus creating a fictitious dialogue with an imaginary interlocutor in order to proceed with his inquiry often posing rhetorical questions357. Manuel continues using the method of antithesis when comparing the virtuous to the evil. However, contrary to the previous Oration (I and II) where he favoured the method of juxtaposing the virtuous and the evil, this time he chooses to present paradigms of human behaviour he has either himself witnessed (115-120, e.g., 220-230, 266-269) or has learned from others (169-171).

Before we proceed with an analysis of the ideas of the Oration, some clarifications are necessary. We have chosen not to translate the word προαιρεσις, since its meaning

357 Cf. Rhakendytes, Summation, p. 507.20-23.
cannot be explained in a single word, and the translation of the word as ‘choice’ is rejected by the author himself (314-317). Several scholars, especially those involved with the study of Aristotle, have attempted to analyse or translate the term, sometimes in conflicting ways\(^{358}\). It becomes evident that Manuel must have been influenced by Aristotle’s perception of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\)\(^{359}\), as well as by that of the Christian Fathers\(^{360}\). Yet it is extremely difficult to identify the exact sources of Manuel’s ideas, since the notion of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) engaged many Byzantine authors\(^{361}\). Manuel’s contemporaries and members of Manuel’s intellectual circle were also concerned with the matter of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\). Manuel Chrysoloras in his *Discourse* addressed to Emperor Manuel II, highlights the importance of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) when he suggests that it should be the first element praised in a funeral oration, which along with intelligence (\(\varepsilon\pi\iota\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma\)) defines a


\(^{359}\) Aristotle considers \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) to be part of the voluntary, related to virtue and determining of a character. Cf. e.g., *EN* 1111b.5-30, 1139a.23-35; *EE* 1226b.17, 1228a.1-4; *Rhetoric* 1367b.21-23.

\(^{360}\) The majority of the Fathers generally consider \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) to be defining of one’s actions and character. Cf. e.g., Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Holy Spirit, Against the Macedonians*, ed. F. Mueller, *Gregori Nysseni opera*, vol. 3.1 (Leiden, 1958), p. 96.7; Basil of Caesarea, *Homilies in the Hexaemeron*, ed. S. Giet, *Basile de Césarée, Homélies sur l’hexaéméron*, SC, 26 bis (Paris, 1968), Homily 6, 7.1-3, p. 356; John Chrysostom, *Homily to the people of Antioch*, PG 49, Homily 6, col. 86.51-54; Symeon New Theologian, *Catecheses*, eds. B. Krivochéine and J. Paramelle, *Syméon le Nouveau Théologien, Catéchèses*, vol. 1, SC, 96 (Paris, 1963), 4.126-128, pp. 324-326; Maximus the Confessor, *Short Theological and Polemical treatises*, PG 91, col. 16C. Maximus the Confessor was greatly concerned with the matter of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\), see V. Karayiannis, *Maxime le Confesseur, Essence et Énergies de Dieu*, Théologie Historique 93 (Paris, 1993), pp. 146-151. Cf. also Lampes, *Lexicon*, lemma \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\), pp. 1133-1134.

\(^{361}\) Even the tenth-century *Suida Lexicon*, ed. A. Adler, vol. 4 (Teubner: Leipzig, 1935; repr. Stuttgart, 1971), lemma \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) (2376), p. 203, provides a definition that has some similarity to Manuel’s perception of the matter. Nemesius in his *On human nature* (ch. 29-33, 40-41) and John Damascene in his *Exposition of faith* (ch. 38-42) analyse in detail the matters of \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\), the αυτεξούσιον the voluntary and the involuntary. However Nemesius is drawing from Aristotle, and Damascene in his turn from Nemesius, thus a direct influence on Manuel’s thought cannot be confirmed. Yet it should be noted that they are expressing similar to Manuel’s thoughts. For example they suggest that \(\pi\rho\alpha\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\eta\iota\varsigma\) is not the voluntary but part of it (Nemesius, 33, p. 99.20-21) and determining of one’s goodness or evilness (Nemesius, 40, p. 116.3-4, 41, p. 119.8-9; Damascene, 40.14-15, p. 98), referring also to self-responsibility and the results of actions (Nemesius, 29, pp. 93.24-94.11; Damascene, 38.2-12, p. 94). They consider purely involuntary actions those performed in ignorance or under violence (Nemesius, 30, p. 96.14-15, 31, p. 97.5-6; Damascene, 38.15, p. 94, 38.21-22, p. 95) defined also by the agent’s grief (Nemesius, 29, p. 94.11-13, 31, p. 96.23-24; Damascene, 38.12-14, p. 94), and similarly to Manuel they introduce the example of the drunkard (Nemesius, 31, pp. 96.26-97.5; Damascene, 38.22-23, p. 95) and that of a father killing his son at night (Nemesius, 31, p. 97.18-22; Damascene, 38.24-25, p. 95).
man as good and virtuous, proving him such even after his death\textsuperscript{362}. Demetrius Chrysoloras also refers to προαιρέσις and its association to the soul in his *Dialogue on Demetrius Cydones' Antirrhetic against Neilos Cabasillas*\textsuperscript{363} and Manuel's teacher Demetrius Cydones uses the term extensively in works\textsuperscript{364}.

In summary, Manuel considers that everything is a result of προαιρέσις (Ωστε τὸ πᾶν, ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως, 17; cf. 250-251) and that nothing can exist without it altogether (εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκ προαιρέσεως, οὐδὲ ὑπάρχει τὸ σύνολον, 312-313). He stresses that προαιρέσις is not merely choice (314-317) but the result of its constituent elements: knowledge, judgment, deliberation and will (311-360). It is something ‘mixed’, Manuel suggests, consisting of will, judgment and desire\textsuperscript{365}. Moreover, προαιρέσις is not what is defined as voluntary itself, though it forms part of it (140-141, 341-342). Thus, according to Manuel, προαιρέσις is a process where reason and desire meet and determine choice, which in turn determines the action. In the light of these remarks it seems that the best way we could translate Manuel’s perception of προαιρέσις is *committed, deliberative and active predisposition*.

For Manuel προαιρέσις is virtuous when its elements, namely reason, knowledge, judgment, consent, deliberation, will, habit and choice, and all abilities and capacities given to man by God are good. If one’s προαιρέσις is virtuous, by putting it to action, he will necessarily proceed to do good deeds and prove his virtues. The opposite is the case for the base and wicked people. Προαιρέσις, therefore, determines one’s character. Ultimately, what makes people acting in an excellent or base way is their use of free will (αὐτεξούσιον). Thus, it depends on each one of us (ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ αἴτιος γίνεται) whether he will be excellent or base, and whether acting excellently or in a wicked way he will be worthy of praise or blame (22-103).

[1a] Manuel introduces the *Oration* by recapitulating the conclusions drawn from the previous *Oration II*, concerning natural goodness of all living creatures (3), pointing out

\textsuperscript{362} Manuel Chrysoloras, *Discourse addressed to the Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus*, eds. Patrineles and Sophianos, Μανουὴλ Χρυσολωρᾶ, p. 67.16-32.


\textsuperscript{365} Cf. Aristotle, *EN* 1113a.11-12, 1139a.23-34.
that he will proceed with a discussion of the reasons causing one’s excellence or evilness, namely man’s προαίρεσις, the voluntary, one’s self and free will, which were briefly presented in the previous Oration (9). To demonstrate the importance and function of προαίρεσις, Manuel provides the example of the Saints, who have defeated all evil through their own struggles against all violence (11-12). Thus he declares that nothing can stand as an obstacle for us to be good if indeed προαίρεσις is not ill-suffering or enslaved, even if the body is suffering (9-11).

Though the notion of free will (ἀυτεξούσιον) is not analysed in the Orations, Manuel considers it interlinked with προαίρεσις. In fact, his views on προαίρεσις can apply also on free will. Manuel’s perception of free will is presented clearer in his Dialogues with a Persian. Drawing from patristic sources, Manuel states that free will, the power one has to rule over himself, was granted to all human beings by God at the time of the creation. Along with reason, free will is part of the soul and one of the causes on which the necessity to be good and to abstain from evil depends.

[1b] Examining issues associated with προαίρεσις, Manuel begins the discussion of the involuntary. Doing what is good involuntarily (ἀκουσίως καλὸν ποιεῖν, 13) does not honour those who perform the action, he states, for by doing something involuntarily (ἀκοντά ποιεῖν, 14), or suffering something that we do not want, makes us neither good nor base (13-15). What makes man good or evil depends on voluntary will (ἐκουσίῳ θελήματι, 15), which derives from ourselves and not from external causes (17-18). Everything, Manuel stresses, is a result of προαίρεσις (17). To abstain from good is also considered evil (19), for evil exists also in the absence of the good (τὸ...
κακόν, τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ τοῦ καλοῦ ὑπάρχειν 20), Manuel adds, a view that echoes the Church Fathers\textsuperscript{372}.

[1c] After summarising ideas discussed in Oration II—God’s perfection and the inevitable natural goodness of His creations (22-23)—Manuel carries on to elaborate his views on the necessity of virtue to be proven in action\textsuperscript{373} (22-32). The virtuous man, he says, not only wishes good but proceeds further to prove his virtue in action, being always careful not to neglect the good but keep pursuing it with urge, zeal and will (27-28). Otherwise, even this man who seems to be virtuous is not completely such (25-26), since to be solely willing is not sufficient to show the excellence of a prudent man (29-30). At the same time Manuel shows the way the virtuous can prove his excellence, that is through his προαίρεσις (28-29), for it is impossible for a man who wishes to be virtuous not to be such and his actions not to be in accordance with his character (31-32).

Manuel then discusses the opposite of the virtuous, the evil man, who becomes such in his heart (ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ, 34) (Matthew 13:19) for the same reasons, namely his wish and will (βεβουλεύσατε τε καὶ θελήσαι, 34). In this way, he himself is the cause of evil having received and accepted it (35-36). The words of the Lord (cf. 34) confirm this, Manuel stresses. Repeating his views on natural excellence (cf. 22-23) Manuel concludes that pursuing desire is equal to wish to be evil\textsuperscript{374} (τὸ γὰρ ἐμβλέψαι πρὸς τὸ ἔπαιθημᾶν, τούτῳ ἔστιν ἀντικρὺς τὸ θέλειν εἶναι κακόν, 36-37). At this point, using a transitional sentence, Manuel remarks that this Oration does not concern the demented and arrogant people (32-33), showing his intention to speak of the opposite, the excellent and prudent.

[2a] Manuel expounds on the importance of one’s actions being in agreement with his character. He considers it shameful (38) for one to have a virtuous mind while at the same time be unsound and not prepared to resist what is harmful in order to prove in action his inner goodness resulting from his προαίρεσις (38-42). For if one simply


\textsuperscript{373} See Oration II [4a, 4b]; cf. above, p. 75.

\textsuperscript{374} Cf. Aristotle, EN 1111b.12-16.
desires virtue but stands indifferent and neglectful when it is necessary to act, then he is far from perfect as he is remote from virtue (42-44). ‘How can we avoid such things with ease?’, Manuel’s fictitious interlocutor asks (44-45), to which Manuel responds that deceptions of pleasures are powerful and difficult to resist, and that even if one wishes greatly to speculate on this (φιλοσοφεῖν, 47), it is not an easy task to avoid evil. Nevertheless, he proposes, one can avoid evil when exercising zeal and patience (48), as much as it is possible for a man to possess these qualities, so that even if he is conquered by such pleasures, he would not become evil (49-50). Manuel’s statement that these we know from our own experience (46) points to unspecified events in his life.

Manuel suggests that one who might be in such a state would say (56): ‘as a result of the many <pleasures>, which are deceiving and charming, I may slip and surrender myself in endless struggles. These <pleasures> bring along terrible things, extremely violent, of a dreadful nature, to the point that are able to disturb the soul merely by remembering them; these have been the cause of the loss of women, children and everything honourable in this life. If they were brought on us with greater force — for how can one ever stop them? —, I am bound to surrender myself and go wherever they lead me, as if I am bound in chains’ (50-56). Responding to this argument, Manuel says that brave and rational men (ἀνδρῶν ἐν λόγῳ ζώντων καὶ γενναιότητι, 56-57) have experienced similar situations, fearing evil which is dreadful and capable of shaking and striking down most people causing harm to whatever stands against them. As a result, such men felt ashamed and punished themselves, since for the lovers of prudence there is nothing more lovable and desirable than true goodness and virtue (61-62).

[2b] In a tone of consolation, Manuel proceeds to assure his interlocutor and his audience, that they should not be afraid when confronting evil, for ‘living depends on the soul and truthful opinion’ (66-67), with this pair lying exceedingly above all (68). Therefore, if one is virtuous, Manuel continues, as in the case of the wise men of the past (75-76) and certain holy men of the present (76), his soul will remain unharmed by the dreadful difficulties, while the painful experiences return to themselves, dissolved
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375 Manuel’s views on the negative effects of pleasure are examined in Oration IV; cf. below, pp. 94-107.
like the loud roaring waves of the sea (ὡς τὰ πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάττης κύματα διαλύεται, 72).

Manuel carries on, this time in an admonitory manner, to speak of how careful one should be not to surrender his soul to evil. At this point, Manuel provides evidence of the close connection between the Orations and the Precepts, since he refers his son (and indirectly his reader) to the ‘sixty-second of the chapters I have addressed to you’376. In the Oration he rephrases certain ideas concerning human corruptibility expressed in the Precepts, chapter 62. This theme, mentioned by Manuel in previous and subsequent Orations377, is discussed in the majority of the mirrors of princes378. He first speaks of possible consequences evil can have in one’s life, to the point that it can deprive life itself (78-80), and then proceeds with examining human corruptibility (cf. 225-228). Manuel paraphrases the popular citation from Job (1:21) ‘we come naked and naked shall we return’ (81-82)379, adding that once we are unable to carry around our physical body, we return to mother earth (ἀποδοῦναι γῇ τῇ μητρί, 84). The road leading to physical corruption is short, he states, and this might occur in a moment (84), since nothing is permanent, steady or solid (τί μόνιμον, τί σταθηρόν, τί πάγιον; 86). Manuel wonders about the deception of certain people who think highly of something which is painful or consider something pleasant to be more important than good actions which remain eternally in the soul. Those people, he confirms from his own experience (89-91), are immature, ignorant and childish.

[2c] Using antithesis once more, Manuel speaks of those who oppose evil, namely those who wish to be virtuous. These people, he says, are not conquered or fall easily for they do not enslave the best and highest part of their soul to an inferior bond, and this is because of their virtuous προαίρεσις and of the desiring and passionate part of their soul (ἐπιθυμητικόν, θυμικόν, 96; cf. V 73-74), which Manuel considers as the best part of the soul (95-96) when guided by reason (94-96). The choice of the word ἡνιοχεῖσθαι
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376 Manuel II, Precepts, 357C-D.
378 See above, p. 71 n. 327.
379 Cf. Genesis 3:19; 1 Corinthians 15:47.
(96) echoes the Platonic simile of the chariot of the soul (Phaedrus, 253c-e), which Manuel employs also in the Precepts380.

The virtuous man, he continues, considers childish and ridiculous all that is dreadful and goes astray from the path leading to the truth (97-98). This man also considers shameful whatever does not depend on the efforts to reach the good and virtue (99-100), constantly seeking not to betray the kindness of his soul, which is made according to God’s image (100-101). The virtuous man prevails over all difficulties for he has secured the help of God. In other words, a virtuous man is defined by his relation to God, Manuel concludes, expressing views similar to those analysed earlier in Oration II381.

[3a] Having sufficiently discussed προαίρεσις with relation to the virtuous and the evil, as he says (102-103), Manuel proceeds with examining the notion of involuntary (cf. III 13-15). Actions performed in complete ignorance (κατ’ ἄγνοιαν καθαράν, 104) or because of deception caused by external causes (ἀπάτην θύραθεν, 104), or under violence and compulsion (βιασθέντα, 104) are purely involuntary (ἀκούσιον ἀτεχνῶς, 105)382. As such, Manuel affirms, actions of this nature are not to be blamed (ἁμάρτημα πανελέγκτον, 106; cf. 132-133, 379-380). At this point Manuel explains that for all good purposes he chose to divide the Oration (λόγον διελείπει, 107) to sections, in order to discuss the purely voluntary, the purely involuntary and the mixed voluntary, the ways that they manifest themselves with relation to people who perform actions related to the three categories, distinguishing those who are worthy and admirable from those who are hateful and pitiful (106-112).

[3b] Manuel moves on to explain the scope of his analysis. He states that he chose to speak partly of some matters which are more likely to occur in ‘the multiform and stage-like life’ (τῷ πολυμόρφῳ καὶ σκηνικῷ τῷδε βίῳ, 115)383 and of those he has experienced himself, and events that happen as a result of several causes and various people, as well as of the changing times (115-118). Otherwise, he remarks, given the

380 Manuel II, Precepts, 341C (ch. 35).
381 Oration II, esp. [1a-2b]; cf. above, pp. 68-70.
382 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 336A (ch. 25); Aristotle, EN 1109b.35-1110a.1, EE 1225b.9.
383 Leonte, Purple, p. 197, suggests that πολυμόρφῳ καὶ σκηνικῷ refers to the specific theatron, that is the audience present during the delivery of the work. This expression, however, is used by Manuel to generally describe the world as a stage as attested in other works, see Oration III 115-116 (app. loc. par.).
nature of the subject, the Oration would have continued endlessly, resulting to wearing out his son’s youth and cause dizziness (σου τὴν νεότητα ἀποκαίσας, ἰλιγγιάν προξενήσει, 113-114). Besides, if he were to speak of these matters without an end, he continues, he would appear to love philosophising more than he loves his son, to whose education this work is intended (119-120), while the audience (τὸ πλῆθος, 123) would be frightened by the extent of what would be necessary to be said (τῶν ἀναγκαίων εἰρῆσθαι πέλαγος, 123-124). All these, he remarks, prevented him from stretching out beyond the appropriate, even if it was necessary (128-131). Providing additional reasons, Manuel states that the most useful elements of these themes have been examined in length by Aristotle and Plato (alluding probably to the Fathers). For this reason, he prefers to rely on their thought as he has nothing better to add.

[4a] Manuel returns to the discussion of the involuntary (cf. 104-106). He repeats that sinful actions performed in complete ignorance (κατ’ ἁγνοιαν παντελῆ, 132) should not be in anyway judged or blamed (132-133). Sinful actions performed in full awareness and with precise will (ἐν γνώσει γινόμενα καὶ κατὰ βουλὴσιν ἀκριβῆ, 133) are considered completely voluntary (ἐκούσια παντελῶς, 134) as they result from pure προαίρεσις (133-135). These are clearly voluntary actions and nothing prevents them from being not voluntary and vice versa, for everything voluntary is a result of προαίρεσις, while the reverse is not always necessary. For what is saturated, is both observed and contributes to the component parts, yet the parts do not contribute any more to the more universal (135-139). Linking further the voluntary and προαίρεσις, Manuel stresses that these two elements cause men to be virtuous (139-140). ‘All that is voluntary is such because of προαίρεσις’ (136), he states. He clarifies, however, that προαίρεσις is not the voluntary itself, but part of it384 (140-141; cf. 341-342). The voluntary and προαίρεσις, he concludes, define those men who, by being devoted to these two elements, are always good and excellent (139-140).

[4b] Precisely involuntary (ἀκριβῶς μὲν ἀκούσια, 142) is what the prudent man would never desire, love or want, but on the contrary would think as of great benefit if he were never to meet either in his imagination or in his thoughts (142-145). There are
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384 Cf. Aristotle, EN 1111b.7-8.
indeed cases, Manuel continues, when something dreadful is performed under compulsion and against one’s wish (145-147, cf. 104). The reasons defining such actions as involuntary, he explains, are the agent’s awareness that an action is inappropriate and his wish and attempt to release himself from this grief (147-148).385 The fact that if something dreadful happens to a person, as a result of which he grieves seeking every mean to release himself from it, feeling displeased if he does not cure the evil and pleased once the harm is corrected, confirms that these dreadful things are purely involuntary (147-154).

[4c] Next Manuel discusses the opposite of the involuntary, namely the voluntary (ἐκουσίου, 155). He begins by clarifying that the voluntary is not concerned only with what we voluntarily do being pleased (εὐφραινόμενοι ἐκόντας, 155), but also with what we do not wish to do (ἂν οὐκ ἔθελομεν ποιεῖν, 156) bringing them to ourselves being motivated by a different kind of ‘pleasure’. This kind of actions, Manuel clarifies, may be caused by great violence and force (βίᾳ μεγίστῃ καὶ τυραννίδι, 157) which if absent one would not have performed them. However, Manuel points out, the agent does not perform these actions involuntarily (ἄκοντας πράττειν, 158) but evidently voluntarily (ἐκόντας περιφανῶς, 159), since it is voluntarily that he has set himself in this situation, being forced at the beginning, but later accepting it inside him (159-160). To clarify his statement (160-161) Manuel gives the following example. A person who is a slave to a tyrant is aware that he must act according to the tyrant’s will, otherwise he will be dishonoured and wounded and ultimately be deprived of his life. Therefore this person, being forced by the threatening tyrant, kills the innocent, robs, plunders and does many unholy things. This person even kills with his own hands those who hate the tyrant, fully aware that if he does not perform those actions he will be the one to be killed by the tyrant. As a result, Manuel concludes, the person who hates murder proceeds with committing murder and bares the guilt of his action (155-168). Actually, he has voluntarily become a murderer.386 It could be suggested that here Manuel indirectly refers to the tyrannical behaviour the emperor should strive to avoid and the respect owed towards his subjects, a major theme in mirrors of princes.387

385 Cf. ibid., 1110b.19, 23, 1111a.19-21.
386 Cf. ibid., 1110a.5-18.
387 See above, p. 61.
Manuel gives another example, that of a drunkard, which, as he says, he had heard from someone who asserted that it was a true story (169-171). Having described in detail the situation of a man who becomes over-bold, violent and harmful because he is deluded and inflicted by wine (171-178), he presents the same man once his state of drunkenness ceases and is in a state to judge his shamelessness, crying and lamenting for his evil thoughts and wicked actions (178-180). ‘Does this kind of man not seem to you drunken, because of his own will?’ (180-181), Manuel asks his son and the audience, only to respond that this is quite clear to all (181-182). The action of drinking in this case was clearly voluntary also because it was repeated several times (182-185). While the drunkard might be excused for acting inappropriately whilst he was unconscious with his mind filled with wine (186-187), nevertheless he ought to be blamed, for rather willingly and deliberately chose to become drunk, as he himself ‘filled the cup and the bottle, and brought it to his mouth with both hands’ (188-189).

Hence his original action, done with purpose, intention and knowledge, is voluntarily (185-190), for he was not acting in ignorance. Manuel closes the discussion of the voluntary using one of his favourite citations from Demosthenes (καὶ ὁ τὸ σπέρμα παρασχῶν, αὐτὸς τῶν φύντων αἴτιος, 191) to stress man’s responsibility for his own actions (191-193).

Concerning the ‘non-voluntary’ (οὐχ ἐκουσίων, 196), Manuel identifies the term as Aristotelian stating that it was Aristotle who defined as such what is doubtful and not completely pure of the voluntary or the involuntary (ἀμφιρρεπῆ καὶ μὴ παντελῶς καθαρεύοντα, τοῦ τε ἐκουσίου καὶ ἀκουσίου, 197). Aware of the need to repeat some ideas relating to this subject in order to facilitate the presentation of his arguments (198), Manuel states that some things we do with intention and will while others differently (199-200), and that some of those are not good or virtuous and are done voluntarily but are not known (κατὰ βούλησιν μὲν πεπραγμένα... μὴ γινωσκόμενα, 201-202) while other things are done with knowledge but not with self-impelled (αὐθόρμητον, 203) προαιρεσίως. This again, Manuel concludes, is either done by us, in which case we are responsible for it, or occurs as a result of external causes. Since it has

388 Cf. Oration II [2a]; above, p. 69.
389 Cf. Aristotle, EN 1110b.25-28, 1113b.30-34; EE 1225b.7-14.
390 Demosthenes, On the crown, 159.4. See Oration III 191 (app. loc. par.).
391 Cf. Aristotle, EN 1110a.11-14, 1110b.18.
a power equal to will, it originates from ourselves, even if we are not performing the action or if it is not forced on us.

Aware of his attempt to introduce an innovation, Manuel coins a term (όνοματοποιών, 208), μιξοεκουσία, ‘mixed voluntary’ as one would translate it. Actions brought on us with force and then performed by us are mixed and non voluntary (μικτὰ ἀν εἴη καὶ οὐχ ἐκουσία, 210), he explains, for they are not purely voluntary or purely involuntary but they incline towards both directions (πρὸς ἐκάτερον τὴν ὀφθην ἐχοντα, 211). What Manuel means is that though the cause of some actions is involuntary their end seems to be voluntary (196-211).

[5b] Manuel elucidates his thoughts by making a general statement. People may be forced to do something evil. The resulting pain comes to them uninvited, violent and tyrannical, threatening with misfortune or not even allowing them to live (213-215). Nevertheless, he remarks, if they seek to amend the evil they will be granted forgiveness. Thus, they are worthy of mercy (215-217). Manuel offers some examples concerning non-voluntary and mixed voluntary actions. A man flees the multitude of enemies and is immediately considered coward, while the opposite is the case for the one who prefers death than fleeing (219-221). Those who are poor or ill, once they reach a point in their lives when they are unable to provide for themselves even their daily subsistence, they become beggars (221-228). Or a father kills his son in a nightfight (228-230)392. The prudent man, Manuel remarks, will not resent the poor, but everyone will be compassionate to them (224-225). Similarly he will consider the father who slew his own child worthy of mercy. Mercy and compassion offered by the prudent to those suffering reflect the principle of φιλανθρωπία, which Manuel discusses in Oration VI. Through the presentation of these examples of ‘doubtful faulty acts’ (ἀμφισβητησίμων ἁμαρτημάτων, 231), Manuel stresses that although the involuntary part of some actions is free from blame, having their source in external causes, they should still be considered as voluntary actions since their origin is to be found in the agent’s knowledge and voluntary προαίρεσις (212-238). It is of interest that for the first of the three examples, Manuel does not comment on the behaviour of a prudent man towards the deserter in battle. If one considers that the virtuous man
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392 Cf. ibid., 1111a.12-13; Nemesius, 31, p. 97.18-22; Damascene, 38.24-25, p. 95.
should also be characterised by courage (ἀνδρεία; cf. I 129-132). Manuel’s silence on this suggests that he did not think of desertion under compelling circumstances completely unreasonable. At this point Manuel raises once again the matter of physical corruptibility (cf. 78-91) and uncertainty in human life with relation to Fortune (cf. II [2d])

‘Nature and Fortune is common for all people ... the future is uncertain (ἀτέκμαρτον, 227), and the only thing clear about it, is that it can cause confusion and turn everything topsy-turvy’ (225-228).

[6a] Summarising his thoughts (239), Manuel provides some definitions. Purely voluntary (ἐκούσιον ἀκριβῶς, 241; cf. 134-141) are those actions which result from knowledge and will (γνώμη καὶ βουλή, 239), because of προαιρεσίας, having their origin in one’s self and power

Purely involuntary (ἀκούσιον καθαρῶς, 242; cf. 104-106, 132-133, 379-380) are actions performed in complete ignorance (κατ’ ἄγνοιαν παντελῆ, 241). Virtue is the good and virtuous put into action voluntarily (242-243). Wickedness is the evil done voluntarily (243-244). A fault (ἀμάρτημα) which is not performed intentionally (244-245) is not a great fault, while when performed fully intentionally it is worthy of punishment (κολάσεως ἄξιον, 246) (244-246). A minor evil performed intentionally and with προαιρεσίας surpasses, on account of its quality, even the greatest evils performed involuntarily.

Manuel concludes by repeating that everything is a result of προαιρεσίας (πᾶν ἐκ τῆς προαιρεσίας, 250-251; cf. 17).

He then raises an important question: ‘Since the evil man is such not by nature or because of external reasons, but because of himself (ὁ κακός, οὔτε ἐκ φύσεως, οὔτε ἔξωθεν, ἀλλ’ ἐαυτῷ αἰτίος, 251-252), how is it possible for a prudent man to become the cause of evilness to himself?’ (253-254). [6b] Responding to this question Manuel reiterates his views on natural goodness (analysed in detail in Oration II), namely that not to love the good as much as it is appropriate, but to rejoice with the evil, is not admired by anyone. Neither are men admired for choosing evil instead of virtue, the worst instead of the best, and the harmful over the beneficial, thus turning themselves from virtuous to evil (255-258). The good-natured men among all those who ever
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393 See above, pp. 71-72.
394 Cf. Aristotle, EN 1112a.16-17.
existed, he states, would have never suffered from evil (259). For evil is born out of deception and defect (ἐξαπάτη τε καὶ διαμαρτήμα, 260), having its roots in ignorance and indifference (ἀπαιδευσίαν καὶ ῥαθυμίαν, 261). Being persistent, it makes it impossible for one to be released from it (260-262), and there is nothing worse and more difficult to be amended (264-265) than the soul been captured by passion 397, especially if it belongs to a youth, for they consider it pleasing to remain attached to evil (263-265). ‘To be released from evil and be altered is painful and difficult, and only the work of a courageous soul’ (266-267). On the contrary, Manuel emphasizes, one who is virtuous from the beginning, even if he becomes evil, his nature will remain the same. Summing up his thoughts, Manuel repeats his views on self-responsibility, stating that it is obvious that each human being becomes the cause of evil to himself (270). Drawing attention to these matters enhances the admonitory purpose of the text.

[6c] Manuel proceeds to examine the subject of responsibility (270). It is appropriate to know the good, he says. Some people, however, do not want the good while others want it but it is impossible to possess it, and others though aware of it do not avoid the evil, or avoid it through good actions which however are not continuous. Sometimes people, he adds, appear to be better than their slight passions and other times worse than those (274-275). In all cases, however, each person is responsible for his own evil (271-280). [6d] Often one accepts the evil in his soul by being deceived, considering the evil to be good (281-282), thus performing involuntary actions. Passions come with many deceptions and theatrical tricks, gradually entering the soul, first entering as a slave and later ruling over it (306-309) 398. Manuel’s view is that each person is responsible for surrendering to passions and for accepting them in the soul, since evil occurs because of προαίρεσις (281-285) with pleasure being the motivation for these actions (καρπώσεσθαι ἡδονήν, 289) 399.

Pleasure, Manuel repeats, is followed by pain 400. The path one follows to surrender himself to the evil (284-285) starts with the small and petty evil, considering that we will suffer small damage at the same time enjoying pleasure (287-289). Thus, we surrender ourselves to the foreseen danger and we are altered to the point that we do

397 Cf. ibid., 321C-D (ch. 4).
398 Manuel uses a similar description in his discussion of pleasure in Oration IV 144-145, 155-165.
399 Cf. Manuel II, Dialogues, XXIII 272.34-36; Aristotle, EN 1113a.35; Titus 3:3.
400 Cf. Oration II 151-154, IV 112-113, 125-126.
things which before we would have been ashamed even to listen to (290-292). After surrendering ourselves to the petty evil, neglecting our duty and being captured and tortured by pain, we are laid astray from good judgement (τῶν σωζόντων λογισμῶν, 296), to the point that we love to use the unholy, exalting those whom we should have been ashamed of. He who turns away from the proper, Manuel remarks, surrendering himself to malicious things, falls apart since his reason is blinded (302). This image reflects the examples of Cyrus, Xerxes and Gyges presented in Oration I, alluding also to Manuel’s own experience. To the question, ‘Do men who behave in such a way, against what is proper and then suffer or do something that is not good, seem to you involuntary, deprived of any responsibility?’ (304-405), Manuel replies ‘Not at all’ (303-305), adding that these will not happen to moderate men, for they have awareness of the results of their actions (309-310). The prudent man, therefore, being aware that even the smallest evil could have a dreadful result, prefers not to surrender himself to it.

[7a] Evil, Manuel repeats, has its origin in προαίρεσις (311-312), for if something does not derive from προαίρεσις, it cannot exist (312-313). According to Plato (κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα, 314), he says, evils are inevitable in this mortal life (τὰ κακά, τὸν θνητὸν περιπολούντα φαίνεται κόσμον, 313). For these evils we should blame only man’s προαίρεσις, and not man himself for choosing the evil over the good, since this may be caused because of deception (314-316). This view, which has been analysed in some detail earlier (cf. [6d]), is re-examined (316-317) with reference to ignorance, for otherwise it would be a mistake to declare that evils result only from one’s προαίρεσις (317-319). Ignorance is to ignore evil, Manuel states, adding that ignorance is evil (320) and not a passion, for it would not exist if one is uncouth (ἄγροικος, 321).

[7b] Erring as a result of ignorance (κατ’ ἄγνοιαν ἁμαρτεῖν, 323) is twofold. First, ignorance of certain things can be exempted and one is not blamed if he has not been able to surpass his nature and learn certain things (323-326). For example, it is impossible for all men to know the size of the sky or the earth (326-327). Indeed, some people are capable of learning and possess skills, such as rhetoric and acrobatics (both mastered through a long learning-process, requiring continuous exercise) while others

401 See below, pp. 188-189.
402 Plato, Theaetetus, 176a.
not (327-331). There is another kind of ignorance, the ‘ethical ignorance’, which no man is excused for not possessing\textsuperscript{404}. This kind of ignorance entails elements that depend on our common nature, knowledge and skills. Awareness of high morals and knowledge (336), he continues, do not depend on greatness or education, but rather on will and learning (337), which are able to assist those who possess this kind of awareness. This knowledge (σπουδὴν, 338), Manuel remarks, was created in our soul\textsuperscript{405} to contribute to our improvement (337-339) and if absent results to ignorance of what is best (339-340).

The outcome of this kind of ignorance directs a person to choose the worst (314-316). Here Manuel links ignorance with προαιρεσις, stating that judgment arises from προαιρεσις and the action of προαιρεῖσθαι has been proven to be part of the voluntary (cf. 140-141). Therefore evil is caused by ignorance, lack of education and negligence, thoughtlessness and προαιρεσις. Hence it is voluntary. Manuel’s detailed discussion of ignorance stresses the necessity and importance of knowledge and education for an emperor (332-340), a central theme in \textit{mirrors of princes}\textsuperscript{406}, repeated in the \textit{Orations}\textsuperscript{407}. At this point a short passage concerning the \textit{Oration’s} structure (343-346)\textsuperscript{408} is followed by a reference to the audience of the \textit{Oration}, which as Manuel states consists not of deranged people but of those whose προαιρεσις remains unharmed (346-347; cf. 32-33).

[7c] Elaborating further on views he has previously examined, Manuel remarks that it is not a crime to be unable to surpass our nature or to fail to learn something because of the circumstances of life or Fortune (353-355, cf. 323-328). However, he emphasises, we are responsible if we refuse those which are in our power to know or learn, which derive from within ourselves, as well as from the teachings of others (355-358). For this man who errs out of ignorance, evil will never come to an end, since it does not has its causes in nature or any other occurrence, but it is rather a defect (ἔγκλημα) of his προαιρεσις (358-360).

\textsuperscript{404} Cf. Aristotle, \textit{EN} 1110b.33-1111a.21, 1113b.30-32, 1114a.3.

\textsuperscript{405} Manuel is most probably referring to the intellectual part of the soul, which he analyses in \textit{Oration V} [3a]; cf. below, pp. 111-112.


\textsuperscript{408} See above, p. 77.
[8a] Repeating his views on man’s natural goodness (cf. II), Manuel suggests that Nature and what pertains to it are shared by all human beings. Thus, no one will be honoured or punished on the grounds of nature alone (367-369), for nature remains within limits. Thus it depends on God and man and each one’s self-consciousness, if one is able to perform something or not (361-362). Defining nature as ‘that which is perceived in the general form, the universal man and the entire humanity’ (369-370), Manuel stresses that differences in each person refer not to nature but to all sorts of other reasons, and this is a result of our opinion (γνώμη) (367-371). Returning to προαιρεσις, Manuel states that it can be altered and can vary409, since it can turn some people to angels and others to demons (363-364). Some people act in one way while others differently and some will be admired and others the opposite, for actions are the results either of a courageous soul or of a womanish (γυναικώδους, 366) and soft soul which chooses not to work hard for what is appropriate (364-367). It is on account of those things, which depend on one’s self and προαιρεσις, that man is judged (372-373).

[8b] Manuel concludes the Oration summarising his main views (374-375). He suggests that although evil may result from ignorance it is voluntary and depends on one’s judgement, being linked with his προαιρεσις and his own disposition (προαιρετικῆς γνώμης, καὶ οἰκείας διαθέσεως, 376). Taking, therefore, into consideration what has been said above (377) it is evident that having an evil intention is a petty excuse and there is nothing sacred or good or worthy of consideration in it; on the contrary, Manuel repeats, the purely involuntary error is forgiven. Indirectly addressing a plea to his son and his audience to accept his views as truthful, Manuel ends his Oration confessing that that he has attempted to prove his arguments to the best of his abilities (380-382).

What makes this Oration exceptional is the detailed analysis of προαιρεσις with relation to virtue and the virtuous prince reflected in his actions. This extensive treatment of προαιρεσις, to our knowledge, has no parallel in other Byzantine political texts. In addition, a number of central themes presented here also reflect the close relation of this Oration with Manuel’s Precepts.

Oration IV

On pleasure. That it would have been better if it were not present in this life

Oration IV discusses negative aspects of pleasure (Περὶ ἡδονῆς· ὅτι κρεῖττον ἂν ἦν μηδὲ τὴν ἄρχην συμπαρεῖνα τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ). This Oration is closely linked with the subsequent Oration V (Περὶ ἡδονῆς. Αντίθεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦδε λόγον). These two Orations are composed in the form of thesis and antithesis, respectively. The argument in Oration IV is that pleasure is a strong element in human character and life that it can be detrimental, while in Oration V Manuel discusses the positive aspects of pleasure and argues that it can be beneficial or the opposite depending on its use. In terms of structure, Oration IV consists of a brief introduction on the theme [1], an examination of the origin of pleasure [2a], its association with desire [2a-2b], its connection with pain [2a, 2c, 3a-3c] and its relation to the Original Sin [5a-5b]. In the final paragraphs [6a-c] Manuel summarises his ideas with reference to his opening statements, linking the current Oration with Oration V.

[1] Manuel begins his discussion by pointing out that it is indeed necessary and appropriate to examine certain opinions concerning pleasure (1), though he does not share these views, which he considers irrational. His intention is to please and benefit both his son, whom he directly addresses (using the second person), and his readers. Some people, he says, though holding erroneous beliefs they are not base. It is possible that Manuel refers here to Scriptural and patristic traditional teachings condemning passions incited by pleasure, as for example incontinence and gluttony (ἀκρασία καὶ γαστριμαργία).

These people, Manuel continues, believe that pleasure is tyrannical and rules over

410 See above, pp. 37-38 with n. 144; below, p. 108.
411 It could be suggested that Manuel’s introductory statement where he proclaims his intention to present the negative opinion of some people about pleasure, has some similarity to Aristotle’s introduction to Book X of the Nicomachean Ethics (1172a.28-32) where he states that some ‘…say it is thoroughly bad … for most people, incline towards it and are the slaves of their pleasures …’.
412 Cf. e.g., Titus 3:3: we ourselves also were sometimes foolish, disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts and pleasures, living in malice and envy; Luke 8:14: which fell among thorns are they, which, … are choked with cares and riches and pleasures in this life and bring no fruit to perfection.
human beings (τυραννικὴν καὶ βασιλεύουσαν, 6), offering nothing good and beneficial but being rather exceedingly wicked and maltreating, leads them as captives (5-9). If one were to ask these people the reason for this, Manuel argues, they would answer that pleasure corrupts character and turns virtuous men to base (9-11). It is because of this that Manuel considers it necessary to analyse these views (11-12).

[2a] Manuel presents the thesis: It would have been better if pleasure did not exist at all and was not present in this life and had no existence from the very beginning (13-14). Some share this opinion, he continues, believing that pleasure fills human life with great disorder and sadness, causing great unpleasantness in the soul (14-16)\textsuperscript{414}. Desire and pleasure are interlinked, for it is because of pleasure that we desire many and great things which we hope to get hold of or achieve straightaway (17). This strong desire creates confidence in us that pleasure depends on one’s power (ἐν χερῶι, 18) and that it will suffice to bring us great delight. In reality however, Manuel stresses, we barely achieve little, which possess limited power able to please us only to a limited extent (19-21). Above all, pleasure is inevitably followed by pain, which as already mentioned (cf. II 151-154, III 281-289), causes sadness (21). Longing for something is easy and though desire may cause suffering yet we are not released from this desire. On the contrary we eagerly and constantly seek to be pleased ‘day by day, hour by hour, by every possible mean and every possible way’ (25-26). But those who desire pleasure are actually enslaved\textsuperscript{415}. Overtaken by their unceasing desire to seek the desirable (29-30), they drift away from their aim (namely to be good and virtuous), with dreadful results (26-28).

[2b] Manuel proceeds with examining desire and pleasure in the light of one’s personal responsibility, a concept which he analysed in detail in the previous Oration III. We all consider passion to be dreadful, he affirms, we criticize careless life as evil and surrendering to pleasure as ‘clear madness’ (σαφῆ μανίαν, 32), for this is clearly what it is when one exalts evil and honours its result instead of feeling ashamed (34-36)\textsuperscript{416}. This madness, he continues, is voluntary (ἐκουσίου μανίας, 33) and difficult to control or

\textsuperscript{415} Cf. ibid., IV, p. 7.9, V, p. 11.2, XIV, p. 27.15.
\textsuperscript{416} Cf. ibid., I, p. 2.5-7.
voluntarily put an end on it (32-33). What is entirely unacceptable, Manuel stresses, is one’s inability to acknowledge evil pleasure even if he has suffered from it (36), contrary to Hesiod’s dictum ‘Having suffered as a child, I have learned’ (παθών γὰρ τε νηπίως, ἔγνω, 37). This saying, which in the course of time became proverbial, Manuel says, is important. For though we may seek to end our desire, nonetheless we still endlessly suffer (39-40), since by surrendering to pleasure it is difficult to resist as it becomes violent and threatening (47-51), just like a tyrant. As it is impossible to disobey a cruel and unmerciful despot, similarly it impossible not to hasten wherever pleasure points to (40-42). Those who are captives of pleasure are like reined horses strained tight, Manuel continues. To such an extent pleasure imposes on human beings that it threatens them with sadness if they do not consent to it (45-47). Having said this, it is extremely difficult, Manuel admits, not to fall into pleasure thus proving ourselves solid as iron and diamond (53), showing good character, since pleasure has an attractive nature (51-54).

[2c] Manuel returns (cf. 21) to further develop his views on the close association between pleasure and pain. From personal experience (ἀπὸ τῆς πείρας, 60), Manuel affirms, he considers as the most dangerous and incurable evil to encounter something pleasant and believe that good Fortune has arrived and when the time comes pleasure disappears altogether causing greater sadness with its absence than the joy it was creating with its presence (56-58, 63-65). However, there is a kind of pleasure which lasts offering abundance of all (59) and causes pain through satiety (λυπεῖ τῷ κόρῳ, 59) (58-59, 62-63). In the former case what is pleasant satisfies with its existence while in the latter case it causes distress (65-66). In each case what is harmful is greater than what is pleasing (65-69). These concern cases, Manuel explains, which we wish to come about rather than those which will certainly occur in life, since nothing is certain in life (69-70). Given the uncertainty in life (cf. II [2d], III 225-228) Manuel asks, ‘Who would say that <pleasures> existing for a long time, because of their

417 On ἐκούσιον see Oration III, esp. [4c-d].
418 Hesiod, Works and Days, 218.
419 See Oration IV 37 (app. font.).
421 Cf. ibid., XII, p. 22.1-2.
422 Cf. Plato, Republic, 584a-b.
long presence will never change but remain firmly in the course of life?, in response to which he exclaims ‘Bless me! (βαβαι, 73), adding that ‘if the loss of the possessed occurs, as often happens, then this person who is unable to accept the loss suffers from sadness, which becomes unbearable and prevails’ (70-74). What pertains pleasure, Manuel concludes, stand opposite to us and often become the cause of sadness (74-76).

[3a] The discussion moves to the negative aspects of pleasure, starting from jealousy. Whatever is fond of pleasure, Manuel stresses, is jealous (ζηλότυπον τὸ φιλήδονον, 79) and believes it can harm the pleasures of others. The passion of jealousy is greatly harmful, he explains, since it is the cause of a double grief, for it does not bring happiness to others while at the same time it causes sorrow to the agent (77-81). Those, for example, who would gladly drink the blood of those who envy them, feel unashamed for transgressing the natural and universal laws which dictate what is commonly accepted, such as the love for our fellow human beings (84). Manuel’s reference to the natural and universal laws is similar to that found in the Precepts, where he speaks of the emperor’s duty to live by the law and govern his people according to the law, contrary to those men who are tyrannically ruled by pleasures.

Manuel gives a second example, where a person, motivated by true love, stands as an obstacle to our wishes. In this case, we accuse him and seek to destroy him, therefore acting inappropriately (85-91). Even the mere suspicion of him being against our own desires will make us cause him suffering (91-93). For, those who are completely surrendered to pleasure (ἡδονὰς κεχηνότι, 95), Manuel remarks, are blinded by passion which prevents their mind from judging wisely, to such an extent that they cannot distinguish the person whom they have always considered good and a friend (93-97). The advice Manuel offers, that we should not attack and criticize those who attempt to help us out of love and friendship, evidently serves the political function of the text. For apart from the fact that it is completely inappropriate for an emperor to be...

---

424 Cf. Plato, Philebus, 48b.
427 Manuel II, Precepts, 373C-D (ch. 85).
enslaved to pleasure\textsuperscript{428}, Manuel stresses in a way the significance for an emperor never to abolish his advisors even when they disagree with him\textsuperscript{429}.

Thirdly, Manuel refers to pleasure as a cause of greed. In order to gain what is necessary to reach pleasure, he explains, we gather gold, using sometimes unjust and sordid means. This happens because the person who is a slave to pleasure (99) needs money\textsuperscript{430}, considering everything inferior to pleasure, which results to infinite evils (100-101). Often, Manuel admits, we do things that befit only slaves, and because of what is pleasant we bring harm upon ourselves. We act shamelessly towards those who are superior to us, acting in a way that we would never have done before our enslavement to passion (101-104). Using the word δοῦλος, a topos in this context, Manuel emphasises that this kind of behaviour (which shows avarice and greed; cf. \textit{Oration I}) is inappropriate for an emperor, who is a servant only to God\textsuperscript{431}.

[3b] Manuel carries on to discuss the connection between anger (θυμός) and pleasure. Anger is created by the failure of desires (105-106), while pleasure is responsible for the creation of anger, or at least of its greater part, which possesses those who consider pleasure as their end (τέλος ἡ ἡδονή, 108), which as all know is harmful (107-109)\textsuperscript{432}. Manuel’s decision not to expand the discussion of anger under the pretext that he does not wish to cause a debate (106) raises questions. It is possible that Manuel prefers not to elaborate here on this matter, so that he will not appear as contradicting with the views he intends to present in the subsequent \textit{Oration} regarding the necessity of pleasure for the creation of desire, with the latter being a vital part of the soul (cf. \textit{V} 85-89). It is possible that Aristotle’s perception of anger has influenced Manuel’s views. In his \textit{Rhetoric} (1378a.30-1378b.1-10) Aristotle defines ‘anger as a desire (ὅξεξις) for manifest retaliation in conjunction with pain’ and considers that the person who

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{428} Cf. Manuel II, \textit{Precepts}, 320C (ch. 1), 340D (ch. 33), 374C-D (ch. 85); Synesius, 10.1-4, p. 23; Agapetos, 18, p. 36, 68, p. 72; Ps-Basil, 8, p. 52, 11, p. 53, 62, 63, p. 72; Photius, 840-843, p. 28, 1043-1045, p. 32; Theophylact, pp. 193.27-195.7, 207.5-14; Blemmydes, 8-34, pp. 46-54, 66, pp. 62-64, 90, p. 70; Magistros, 450D-452B (ch. 3), 488B-D (ch. 25).
\item \textsuperscript{429} Cf. Manuel II, \textit{Precepts}, 360C-D (ch. 65); Ps-Basil, 48, p. 67.
\item \textsuperscript{430} Cf. Plato, \textit{Republic}, 589d-e; 1 Timothy 6:10.
\item \textsuperscript{431} Cf. Manuel II, \textit{Precepts}, 324B-C (ch. 7); Synesius, 10, pp. 20-23; Agapetos, 8, p. 30, 68, p. 72; Ps-Basil, 14, p. 54, 39, p. 64.
\item \textsuperscript{432} Cf. Gregory Palamas, \textit{Letter to Xení}, col. 1061A.
\end{itemize}
experiences anger ‘is moved by the anticipated pleasure’ (1378b.1-10, cf. *De anima*, 431a.8-16)\(^{433}\).

Another characteristic of pleasure, Manuel continues, is its ability to persuade with ease those who seek it, convincing them to perform wicked actions and achieve what is difficult, even though these are harmful and bring dishonour (109-110). In this way, what is pleasant and graceful, on which we set our hopes, becomes something different, turning from pleasant to painful, sharing the results (111-113). Moreover, we are more pleased when we hope for, rather than when we achieve what is pleasant. Yet again this mere expectation and pursuit of pleasure appears to be without purpose and consideration (113-116). [3c] Indeed when what is pleasant (called ‘pleasant’ for as long as it is preserved) materializes after a long time, pleasure quickly disappears before it is even completely fulfilled (120). On the contrary, Manuel continues, what is painful and grievous has terrible consequences (νιφάδων μὲν ἦπει δίκην, 120), exists longer, penetrates deeper, acts attentively and is brought upon us with force, causing countless effects that even the greatest pleasure would never give (120-123). Therefore, Manuel concludes, it does not seem a paradox (παράδοξον, 123-124) that pleasure may actually cause distress (124-125).

For this reason, he carries on, we should always bear in mind the matters of the soul, referring at the same time to the Platonic notion (κατὰ τὸν Ἀρίστωνος Πλάτωνα, 126) that sadness inevitably follows pleasure\(^{434}\). Thus pain surpasses the results of pleasure. All those who prefer an easy life are deceived, for while seeking some things they achieve different things. Like the gluttonous fish, which we see suffering when they are caught, wishing to please their mouth and throat with easiness they run into the hook (129-131; this simile is used by Manuel also in his *Precepts*)\(^{435}\). In this way, aiming at pleasure results to maltreatment of everything in us and because of pleasure we suffer greatly (131-134). Even if after some time and with toil and pain we manage to reach pleasure and gain from it (134-136), it becomes the cause of jealousy and the reason of many vices and countless pains, since it does not direct us towards what is best but

---


only to what is attractive (136-138; cf. [3a]). These and many more similar things will happen to the majority of people who are wounded by the arrows of pleasure and are deceived by obeying it, Manuel concludes (138-140).

Apart from Plato, who is explicitly mentioned by Manuel (126), the concept of pleasure and pain was discussed by Church Fathers, including Maximus the Confessor. The notion that pain is an inevitable consequence of bodily pleasure is central in his theology. Pain according to Maximus is always mixed with pleasure, even if those who surrender themselves to pleasure cannot realise it, since they are seized by passions while pleasure overrules and hides pain. Pleasure, for Maximus, is the cause of gluttony, arrogance, vanity, love of money, greediness, madness, profligacy, envy, and everything else that is mixed with pain and causes wickedness. It should be noted that contrary to Maximus who used the word ὀδύνη for pain, Manuel prefers the classical term λύπη.

[4a] Manuel moves on to describe the negative aspects of pleasure ‘its manners, its means, its ways of deception, its diversity’ (147). Some call it a tyrannical passion, a beast in every way, and extremely crafty (Ὑποδύεται τὸ προσωπεῖον, 144) to what is good and beneficial (144-145). As if having a life of its own, the hostile pleasure uses all means, it bewitches, it entices with utter malignity and ruins the good morals. Appearing as a self-called advisor and admiring easiness, it abuses all that is good, for which the body and soul struggle, accusing them to be a cause of sickness. Pleasure causes distress and disorder (152-153) to both body and soul bringing endless confusion and withering (153-154). It is powerful and has the ability to flatter as a servant and give friendly advice and tyrannical orders (155-156). This description draws attention to the caution with which an emperor should listen to his friends and advisors, avoiding flatterers, a common


438 Cf. Plato, Republic, 591c.

439 Cf. Aristotle, EN 1113a.35-1113b.2.
theme in *mirrors of princes*, discussed earlier in *Oration II* [2b]\(^{441}\). Nothing can become an obstacle to the exceedingly shameless pleasure (156-158; cf. 172-173, 283), Manuel stresses. Rest, stillness, calmness (Ἡρεμίαν, ἡσυχίαν, γαλήνην, 159) and similar states, are not some of its features (148-160). Pleasure is wild and untamed, and cannot reconcile, for it does not offer peace but rather deceives suggesting that something is greatly honourable, attacking and controlling even those who were admired by all for their virtue (162-165). In order to emphasise its uncontrollable nature, Manuel compares pleasure to savage animals of the jungle, lions\(^{442}\) and the crocodiles, to those which have rubies and suck blood, to those which wound with their sting and those which shed venom and their bite is incurable (160-162).\(^{443}\)

[4b] Manuel carries on with pleasure’s patience and persistence (166-170). Failing to achieve its aim, to cause destruction in its first attempt, pleasure displays patient endurance (καρτερίαν, 167), being satisfied with pain and appearing indefatigable (168). For when it wishes something greatly, it does not feel any pain but persists to the point that even the most courageous of athletes surrender to it (169-170). Stressing further the power of pleasure and its ability to deceive, Manuel refers to cases when men who were in reality unworthy managed to appear great because of pleasure (170-172). Pleasure is indeed shameless (172-173; cf. 157-158, 283) for being able to select the right time when people surrender to it in order to secretly invade and accomplish with easiness its goal (173-176). Actually, pleasure is like an enemy, Manuel remarks, who after the ceasefire, when the defender is unprepared, plots, strikes fiercely and manages to conquer and prevail over those who have previously defeated it (176-183), who, like children playing with their toys, are unable to defend themselves (183-187). Although we fight against pleasure as it is proper, pleasure fights back, prevails and turns the best of men to slaves (189), for when it finds people neglectful it conceives a plan in order to destroy and rule over them (189-192), machinating every possible means and way to achieve this (192-193). Indeed, pleasure wages an undeclared war against us, striking at night with secrecy when the defendant is unprepared and unguarded. It prefers night-battle, since when one is asleep he cannot realize that he is being attacked before the dagger is pulled out. Thus, pleasure can escape attention and

\(^{441}\) See above, p. 70 with n. 321-323. \\
\(^{442}\) Cf. Cydones, *On despising death*, XII, p. 22.4. \\
conquer suddenly the honourable person, disturbing even the souls of the courageous (196-200). Even if what occurs because of pleasure is not great, it can prevail, since ‘the insignificant that strikes when not expected, is greater than something bigger that is expected’ (τὸ γὰρ παρὰ προσδοκίαν μικρὸν, ἐκπληκτικότερον μεγάλου προσδοκωμένου, 202-203). So, pleasure loves darkness, the moonless night, being pleased when there is thick mist, which makes the visible invisible. In short (207), Manuel says, pleasure loves any cause that has the ability to harm us. Emphasising again its secretive manner, Manuel personifies pleasure with a sniper who hides and shoots his deadly arrows (208-211). Even if pleasure, like the enemy, is detected before attacking without however being prevented to proceed with its plans to attack (211-213), it visibly spreads destruction (211-218). Its vigour is compared to Hercules’ forceful club (Ἡρακλέους κορύνην 215). If pleasure acts in such ways, Manuel concludes, no one should be surprised about its aim (218). His statement that he knows these (actions of an enemy) from his own experience (ἀπὸ τῆς πείρας, 176), as well as the mention that he still holds before him the image (ἀνθέξομαι δὲ τῆς εἰκόνος ἐτι, 177), makes it possible that with the description he alludes to events he had witnessed in his long experience as a commander of the army.

[4c] The most dreadful of all (219), Manuel argues, is that pleasure causes despair in the soul. Given its deceitful nature it examines the situation and devices plans. It does not, and will not, stop plotting. Even if it experiences failures it does not cease but assesses the circumstances and when something dreadful comes from outside it makes its moves considering this an unexpected gift, thus finding the opportunity to strike (220-226; cf. 173-178). Using again similes from the animal kingdom (cf. 160-162), Manuel portrays pleasure as an arrant thief similar to mice and cats, rapacious as wolves, vigorous as bears,446 wicked as tigers, deceitful and petty as weasels and monkeys447, and ever-changing like chameleons (226-233). To emphasise this last feature, Manuel refers to the mythological Proteus448, for like him pleasure has many faces, managing to deceive all men, even the wiser (235), as well as all the creatures of the sea and the birds and animals (234-236).
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445 See below, p. 189.
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447 Cf. Plato, Republic, 590b-c.
448 Cf. Graves, Myths, 33.2, p. 128.
Manuel proceeds discussing pleasure with reference to the Original Sin. He compares pleasure to the serpent (239), arguing that though it is possible for pleasure to feel shame before the serpent, yet again pleasure appears to be more powerful than that (239-241). Two were the reasons for the Fall: the serpent and the fruit (241-242). The latter was the first and primary reason (242), for if the fruit was absent and did not attract, then the serpent would have no motive to act, advise and counsel (243-244). The fruit, beautiful, pleasant and attractive as it were, gave promises to those who would receive it, namely that it would offer pleasure to the mouth (248-250). Indeed, it would be unreasonable for the Creator to envy (φθονεῖν, 246) His creation and completely unlikely for His creation to become god by receiving the fruit (246-248). In fact, Manuel says, the fruit did not promise anything strange or new or impossible, but that it would make what is familiar easier and achievable (250-252; cf. VII 159-160). This shows that what is good in appearance may not be admirable. Yet if it is received, it will appear better in taste than the others (252-253). Manuel concludes that the pleasure that would derive from the fruit has actually contributed to the Fall (253-254).

The power pleasure exercises upon man in cheating, persuading and constraining (255-256), is demonstrated by other characteristics with relation to the Original Sin. Pleasure causes more pain to us than it did to Adam and Eve (τοὺς προπάτορας, 257). If pleasure has managed to defeat and conquer those who were created relatively pure of evils (having bestowed by God the prospect of becoming completely pure), it would act with greater ease against us, human beings, who are like slaves (ὡσπερ ἡμεῖς τὰ ἀνδράποδα, 259) being by nature its captives (having an inclination to sin), and it will lead us to the worst (257-261). Hence the power of pleasure and passions which has ruled over the first human beings (πρῶτως γεγονότων ἀνθρώπων, 262), coming through the middle to the latest generations, can deceive with greater easiness than it was able to do with the previous ones (261-264; cf. VI [5b]).

Manuel adopts the Pauline doctrine of the transmission of the Original Sin (Romans 5:12-14), according to which man suffers because of his own inherited sin, which entered the entire creation at the time of Adam’s transgression, exists in our flesh (cf. Romans 7:1-25) and leads to evil (cf. Galatians 5:19-21). Thus, it depends on each man whether he will seek pleasure and surrender to the flesh and die (cf. Romans 8:5-6) or
cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit (2 Corinthians 7:1) and be delivered from the body of this death (cf. Romans 7:13-25)\textsuperscript{449}. Ultimately, it is a matter of προαίρεσις and free-will. Paul’s doctrine became the basis for the majority of the Christian Fathers who commented on this fundamental subject\textsuperscript{450}.

Carrying on with the description of pleasure, Manuel uses once again the allegory of the enemy (cf. [4b]). Passions attack human beings. In order therefore to resist them, great effort is required on our part. If the enemy was to prevail only once, it would not seem painful. But since it constantly causes man fear and fleeing, then this feeling passes on to a greater degree to the offspring (264-268). Thus, the power of pleasure is greater upon us than it has been upon our ancestors, and by the same token it was greater to them than it was to their own ancestors (268-270).

Manuel’s reference to the Original Sin brings to mind his discussion of this theme in his Dialogues with a Persian. There too, Manuel argues that pleasure was the cause of the Fall and the beginning of death (III 29.39-33.20), with sin being transmitted generation after generation (III 31.5-16), stating however that from then on each person and not the forefathers is responsible for his own sins (III 32.3-35). It should be noted that in the Dialogue Manuel places more emphasis on προαίρεσις and free will (αὐτεξούσιον) with relation to the Fall (III 31.15-30, 32.4-6). While these two terms are not found in Oration IV, they are implied by the notion of self-responsibility. At the same time Manuel provides a link with the following Oration, where he will argue that pleasure can be good or evil depending on its use\textsuperscript{451}. 

[5c] Manuel continues the description of pleasure, pointing that he holds before him an ‘image’ (ἀντέχομαι τῆς εἰκόνος, 272; cf. 177). Referring to pleasure’s deceitful nature, Manuel says that it pretends to be a doctor (ιατρῶν ὑποκρίνεται παῖδας, 272), providing advice for health so that the body is vigorous, seeking however to paralyse the strength of the soul (272-273). Speaking of the pleasure’s persistence, he states that even if it is kept off or driven away, even if it is harmed with a rod, nevertheless it remains the same. Even if you reject it many times or insult it, pleasure answers back. It


loves to resemble the Hydra (276-277), for once one of its heads is cut off many heads grow straightaway (278). If it is defeated and someone wins a prize over it, it will attempt to prove itself worst. Emphasising pleasure’s determination, Manuel paraphrases a Scriptural citation: ‘Even if pleasure becomes a beggar and a fugitive, even if it goes through dry places, it returns again multiplied in the form of the unholy spirit’ (280-282) (cf. Matthew 12:43-45). Pleasure is shameless, impudent, mad and wicked (283), Manuel exclaims, comparing it once again with animals (cf. 160-162, 226-233), using this time a Homeric citation (Iliad 1.225), describing it as having the face of a dog, but not the heart of a deer, for it is ill-willed (284-285).

Pleasure aims at overthrowing the virtuous who resist it. No matter the dreadful, terrible, sad and wicked things it produces, it only seeks to achieve this aim (285-289). It places so much grief in the soul even when we celebrate victory. In fact, when pleasure is defeated, though it would be suitable to sing songs of triumph and rejoice, on the contrary we suffer and feel only grief and sadness because of this victory (291-294). It is not because of the victory that we suffer. For we are aware that pleasure is a passion working for our destruction and even if it is defeated it will never stop fighting against us but on the contrary it will appear more forceful after its defeat (296-301). The reason we grief, Manuel explains, is our awareness that pleasure will exist endlessly (301-303).

[6a] Manuel gradually brings his discussion of pleasure to an end, pointing out his selective approach dictated by the nature of the subject (305-307). Repeating that pleasure is a multiform beast, misleading and maltreating people, using all possible ways, becoming the cause of destruction, he hopes that this text will enable his son, whom he directly addresses, to understand what pleasure is all about (309-310). To further strengthen the imagery Manuel uses two examples (310-314) from the Old Testament, referring to the rain of brimstone and fire brought upon the Sodomites, and the straying of the Jews (ἐν ἐρήμῳ πεσόντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων, 313), alluding most probably to their sinful actions before Moses brought to them the ten

452 Cf. Plato, Politieia, 588c; Graves, Myths, 124, pp. 469-472.
453 The combination of biblical and classical exempla is employed here by Manuel; cf. above, pp. 40-41.
454 Cf. Cydones, On despising death, IV, pp. 7.6, 8.6.
commandments. Manuel’s statement that he shall not waste time recounting these examples is indicative of the audience’s familiarity with the source of the examples. What is worse, Manuel concludes, is that while we are aware of all these about pleasure yet we are unable to release ourselves from it even if we want to, and while some times we have the ability to do so, we are unwilling. Hence in both cases pleasure appears to be by nature evil and an inevitable harm.

[6b] In an attempt to identify those who are most likely to be harmed or benefit from pleasure, Manuel returns to the core distinction among the virtuous and the evil person (cf. I-III). A person is harmed by pleasure, he states, when the ‘eyes of the soul are blind’ and the spell of pleasure softens the power of the soul; then the tempting and attractive elements become more powerful than nature, which is good. Those who are most unlikely to be harmed by pleasure are those who have a solid mind, who possess knowledge by experience, good education, a mind which is not obfuscated by passions, a self-moved will, good judgment, a self-moved will, and always an inclination towards whatever is most beautiful and excellent. Above all, those who are aware of the power of their own free will, realise the greatness and excellence of everything that has its cause in the divine virtue. These elements reflect ideas concerning the virtuous προαίρεσις analysed earlier in Oration III. Nevertheless, Manuel stresses, very few men of this kind can be found, namely those who have the ability to escape the exaggerations of pleasure, who have not experienced distress because of its excess but on the contrary have benefited from pleasure. What distinguishes those from other men affected by pleasure, Manuel remarks, is that they always search for the mean and thus they differ in the way they use pleasure. It is precisely because of the excessive use of pleasure that we become evil, for man cannot become virtuous through excess. The opposite, namely measure, is always excellent (μέτριον ἄριστον) though difficult.

457 Cf. Cydones, On despising death, XXV, p. 44.6-8. See Oration IV 327 (app. loc. par.).
to achieve (329-331). These ideas introduce the central theme of the following Oration V.

[6c] Manuel closes Oration IV, recapitulating the thesis concerning the negative aspects of pleasure (338-339; cf. title, 13-14), the one that cannot be perceived with precision (337) and forces man to excess and the loss of good and virtuous both in the present and in the future (333-335). Next Manuel refers to those who criticize pleasure through words and images (342). He remarks that those people lose a sense of reality, since when they are captured by pleasure, instead of wishing to hide themselves and exercise good judgment, they appear proud and pompous, and blame pleasure. Far from blaming themselves for their own wickedness they accuse pleasure for everything, without sparing even God (μηδὲ Ὁηῶν ἐξιδόμενοι, 344-345). This, Manuel remarks, will be made clearer later on (345), namely in the subsequent Oration. What Manuel considers the worst is that many wise people cause their own destruction by considering easiness and daintiness better than the good and prefer what is presently free of sadness than the hereafter great good (348). Many of these people cannot believe that there are men who are superior than pleasure, for ‘on the whole, we judge from our own affairs those of others’ (350). This brings an end to Oration IV, whose aim was to present opinions of others on pleasure. In the next Oration Manuel presents the antithesis, which represents his own opinion.
Oration V

On pleasure, an antithesis to the previous Oration

Having presented the thesis concerning the negative and often detrimental aspects of pleasure in Oration IV, Manuel proceeds with its antithesis in Oration V (Περὶ ἡδονῆς. Ἀντίθεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦδε λόγον), where he offers his own opinion that pleasure is good and can be either virtuous or evil depending on its use. Employing the phrase κατασκευάζειν ἐπιχειρεῖν (57) to denote the aim of Oration V, Manuel refers to the technical term that defines a constructive reasoning (κατασκευὴ) on a specific subject which in turn defines Oration IV as its refutation (ἀνασκευὴ). This method of cross-examining, prescribed in the προγυμνάσματα, leads to conclusions which present the author’s view. In the process Manuel stresses that it is necessary to structure the sequence of his thoughts on several arguments, taking into consideration previous conclusions. The discussion of pleasure, he remarks, is twofold (δυοῖν συνιστάμενον, 60) with the two interdependent Orations (IV-V) resembling two feet of one substance, necessary in terms of maintaining balance. His intention therefore, is to construct the second ‘foot’ (Oration V) by presenting the opposite to the previous views (62-68). In some instances, Manuel employs the popular method of question and answer, responding to his fictitious interlocutor (e.g., 208-213, 259-260) and by extension to those who share similar views among his audience. Manuel stresses once more the selective approach to the subject (66-68).

Oration V comprises an introduction with a summary of the conclusions of the previous Oration, based on opinions expressed by various people, and a justification of Manuel’s wish to establish his own views and prove their validity [1a]. A clarification of Manuel’s aim and intention in this Oration [1b], is followed by his arguments concerning the origin of pleasure and its relation with God [2a-3a], its association with the soul [3a-3c], what pertains to its existence [4a-4e] and finally its use by those who are virtuous on the one hand and by those who are evil on the other [5a-7b]. Manuel closes his antithesis (or κατασκευὴ) repeating certain views concerning the divine nature of pleasure and its union with the soul [8a] followed by a summary of his views and points of disagreement vis-à-vis the thesis (or ἀνασκευὴ) in Oration IV [8b-c].

---

458 See above, pp. 37-38.
Manuel begins by referring to the previous *Oration* (‘These are such, to those who blame pleasure’, 1), and presenting his aim, that is ‘to attempt to aid pleasure’, which he considers to be just (1-2). Some people have one opinion, others a different one, he states, while others turn away from the correct and truthful one, considering pleasure to be something completely evil and useless (2-4). These people, Manuel affirms, are deceived and need help as much as possible (5-6). Therefore, one should attempt to help and guide those people who are misled (6-7) and in any case to help our fellow human beings to the best of our ability, since to do what is good and right is a universal obligation (7-8). This statement is exactly the opposite of the one put forward in *Oration IV* (82-85) concerning those who transgress the natural laws and do not love their fellow human beings. Similarly, he who defends pleasure attempts to help his fellow human beings, since pleasure should not altogether be considered an enemy (8-9). Hence, Manuel concludes, he who helps pleasure helps also those who are misled, fulfilling therefore his obligation towards his fellow human beings (9-10; cf. 30-31).

Addressing his son, Manuel identifies two additional reasons that compelled him to examine this matter: his imperial office (*σχῆμα*) and his son (*διὰ σέ*) (12), for the sake of whom he composed the whole work (*ἐμαυτὸν εἰς τοῦτον ἀγῶνα καθῆκα*, 12-13), although time not permitting (*μηδὲ τοῦ καιροῦ παντάπασιν ἐπιτρέποντος*, 13). Though Manuel uses the latter expression quite often in his compositions, taking into consideration the proposed date for the composition of the *Orations* (ca. 1403-1410), his statement seems to reflect the difficult situation he was facing in the Empire, both internally and externally, at the time.

Manuel’s choice to discuss pleasure emanates from his wish to set some people free from their wandering, in the sense of confusion on this subject (15), and to safeguard his audience (*προασφαλίσασθαι τοὺς ἀκροατάς*, 16) so that they will not be led astray from the correct view (16-17). Responding possibly to criticisms of people whom he does not name but simply refers to as those who are not thought of highly (*οὐ καλῶς μὲν ἐνθυμηθεῖεν*, 17-18) and are arrogant and ill-disposed (19), Manuel

---

461 See below, p. 179 with n. 616.
462 See *Oration V* 13 (*app. loc. par.*).
463 See above, pp. 47-50.
464 Cf. Manuel II, *Letters*, 44, 51, 63-66, where he alludes to difficulties between the years 1403-1410. For a history of the events of the period, see Barker, *Manuel II*, pp. xxviii-xxxi, 228ff..
stresses that if his sayings are examined with suspicion and are understood wrongly, they will have a harmful effect, since those who form the wrong opinion, instead of curing themselves will become worse (19-23). For this reason, he continues, ‘first we must clear the road and then walk on it’ (23-24). Reassuring the reader of his Orations (ὅσοι τοῖς λόγοις ἐντεύξονται, 24-25) that he does not wish to demonstrate his rhetorical skills or to compose an Oration in which he rejects pleasure (24-27), Manuel alludes vaguely to specific events of his life by stating that although himself has experienced the harmful arrows of incontinence, he does not reject pleasure but seeks harmony in all (28-30). This search of harmony, in the sense of striving for the mean, is a central idea in the Oration.

[2a] Manuel begins to unfold his view that pleasure is good for those who wish to be good, and for those who use it moderately (σεμνῶς χρωμένοις, 33). For if we want this, he continues, pleasure can be something good and noble (καλόν τι καὶ σεμνόν, 33), beneficial in our life and the cause of no evil (32-34). Therefore, pleasure should exist and be present in this life and extend itself in living beings (αὐτὴν ὑφεστάναι καὶ παρεῖναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, καὶ συμπαρεκταθῆναι τῇ τῶν ἐμψύχων ζωῇ, 34-35). The latter statement is exactly the opposite of that made in the previous Oration465. In support of this view, Manuel puts forward his first argument: if something enjoys a divine inclination then inevitably pleasure will be proven to be something good and excellent (37-39), since pleasure is something extremely good and preferable (ἀἱρετόν, 42) for it has in it both good and excellence (42-43). If we were to consider that the truly Good, that is God, has sowed (ἐνέσπειρε, 40) pleasure in the nature of all living beings, it follows that since He is the cause of pleasure, it would have never been wicked or worthless but clearly it should be the contrary (40-42). Manuel proceeds with the following syllogism: pleasure comes from God and everything existing in living beings is given by God, therefore pleasure is good (43-46). Since pleasure exists in everything and is present everywhere, it is given from God; therefore, if the result of pleasure is virtuous then by necessity pleasure is virtuous too (46-48). The principle that God is goodness itself and the source of all good in the creation is fundamental in Christian thought466. Manuel expresses similar ideas in his Dialogues with a Persian, where he

466 Matthew 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19; Ephesians 2:10; James 1:17; 1 John 4:16.
suggests that God has ‘seeded’ pleasure in the senses (using the word ἐνεφύτευσεν instead of ἐνέσπειρε, 40, 70)\(^{467}\). A faithful man (ἀνδρα πιστόν) would not dare say the opposite (49), Manuel remarks, for even the faithless (ἀπιστον, 50) who is able to distinguish and understand the excess and misuse of pleasure by those who do not use it properly would accept that pleasure consists of the proportion in which we partake of it (51-52).

[2b] Aware that these preliminary thoughts need to be further substantiated (51-57), Manuel explains the method he employs. It is essential for the construction of the positive arguments (κατασκευάζειν ἐπιχειρεῖν, 57), he says, to recall the conclusions of *Oration IV* (58), before the arguments are put forward in a logical sequence (59-60). He stresses that the two *Orations* (IV and V), each arguing against and for pleasure respectively, are interdependent and therefore should be examined in parallel. Using the simile of the two *Orations* representing two feet of a single entity, the one steadier than the other, he points that until now he has only walked on one foot (60-62), having examined only one side of pleasure. Outlining the structure of *Oration V* Manuel states that he will begin with the thoughts expressed in the previous *Oration IV*, using it as a foundation, referring to Paul’s saying, *for other foundation can no man lay than that is laid* (1 Corinthians 3:11) (64). In the course of the *Oration* (ὁδῷ βαδίζων ὁ λόγος, 64), with God’s help, the validity of the arguments put forward in favour of a moderate use of pleasure will be proven against the contrary views (66-68).

[3a] Manuel begins by examining desire and its association to the soul and pleasure. As previously stated (cf. V 40, II [1a-b]), nature was granted to all creatures by God and He implanted desire (ἐπιθυμία, 69) to all living beings (69-70). Therefore, to desire (τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν, 70) does not come externally or after the creation of a being or acquired at a later stage (οὐκ ἐστιν ἐξωθεν τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν, οὐδὲ ύστερογενές, οὐδ’ ἐπίκτητον, 70-71). On the contrary, it forms part of the soul and is a natural and undivided power of the tripartite and indivisible soul (τριμεροῦς τε καὶ ἀμεροῦς, 72), Manuel states, referring to the Platonic division\(^{468}\). Since our own logical soul (λογικῆς τε καὶ ἡμετέρας, 73) is given, along with its intellectual and appetitive parts (τὸ λογικὸν τε καὶ θυμικὸν, 74), by God, hence it is evident, Manuel argues, that desire which arises

---


\(^{468}\) Plato, *Republic*, 434d-441c.
from this kind of soul is good (73). If desire is good then pleasure is also good, for desire cannot exist without pleasure and desire would not have been created in the soul (74-78). Without pleasure, he continues, desire would have existed in vain (ματην, 78) and pleasure would not have been active. In addition, to think that something would be created by God in vain is blasphemous (78-80), Manuel remarks. Indeed, men who have a soul and possess reason cannot doubt that the soul comes from God (81-82)469. Desire is set in motion because of delight and pleasure (85-86). For if pleasure did not exist desire would not have arisen (84-85). Thus, if desire is removed the soul will no longer exist, and it is not for the soul to be deprived of some of the elements which were created to establish it (87-89). These views echo the Aristotelian view, that ἐπιθυμία and θυμὸς activate the soul’s appetitive part470. The use of the theory of the tripartite soul and the reference to the terms λογικόν, θυμικόν and ἐπιθυμεῖν (70-74) reflects Manuel’s familiarity with the classical and Christian tradition on this subject. Plato analyses the idea of the ‘innate desire for pleasures’471, while the majority of the Fathers, incorporate in their theology the theories of the division and tripartition of the soul472.

[3b] In order to strengthen his argument, Manuel proceeds to speak of the contrary (90). It is not natural or acceptable for the soul to receive something from outside (προσλαβεῖν τι θύραθεν, 90-91), he says. Similarly it is not possible for the soul to dispose something of its own (τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν, 92). If the soul is of a healthy essence it will never oppose its nature by accepting something from outside or by disposing what is of its own (91-97). Thus, if the soul maintains its essence it will remain good (98-99). Taking these into consideration Manuel puts forth a hypothesis (ἐξ ὑποθέσεως δὲ λέγω, 99-100). He repeats the previous statements, using however the opposite terms. The soul becomes wicked if it accepts something from outside and disposes its own, if

469 In his Dialogues with a Persian (IV) Manuel associates pleasure with God, though there he makes no mention of the tripartite soul and its divine nature.
471 Cf. Plato, Phaedrus, 237d.
it becomes excessive in the acquisition (προσλήψει ὑπερβαλεῖ, 101) and if it becomes imperfect because of deficiency (ἐλλείψει, 101). Manuel then offers another syllogism: if the soul is to be found complete and good (ἄκεραίαν καὶ καλήν, 102) when desire is absent, it follows that it will become extravagant and wicked if desire is added. If, however, we consider the soul to be good and complete, apparently it will seem incomplete if it is deprived of one of its parts among which desire (103-105). Therefore, he concludes, the soul will be good and complete only when nothing is removed from it (ἀφαίρεσιν) or indeed added (προσθήκην) (105-109).

[3c] Having established his view that desire forms an integral part of the soul and that desire exists because of pleasure (110-112), Manuel repeats that pleasure exists in desire and desire is part of the soul, and only when pleasure is present the soul can be preserved (110-114). He reiterates that pleasure enters the soul through the appetitive part (ἐπιθυμητικοῦ μέρους, 115-116; cf. 71-78), becoming a substantial and completely inseparable power of the soul, a view which was expressed and confirmed through arguments (114-115). In this way, Manuel fulfils his promise to present his opinion briefly, with the help of God (116-119; cf. 64-68). Since pleasure has been proven to be co-created with the soul, which is given by God, pleasure is necessarily good, Manuel concludes, adding that this can be further supported (122-123).

[4a] There are many reasons, Manuel says, which show that pleasure can be found pure of evil, provided that we make proper use of it. This is the main principle which he expounds in the rest of the Oration. He considers that if someone desires what is truly pleasing and rightful (ἀληθῶς ἐφετῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖσθαι δικαίων, 126) and rejoices from its pleasure, he would not be blamed but on the contrary he would be greatly praised (125-128). What is truly pleasing and rightful to be desired, he continues, is what God has implanted in our nature, namely virtue and its essence (τὴν ἀρετήν, τὴν ἑαυτῆς σύστασιν, 130). ‘How is it possible’, Manuel asks, ‘for pleasure not to be considered virtuous proving as virtuous those who partake of it with moderation?’ (130-132). Both pleasure and desire exist in the heavenly powers (132), he carries on, who accept no evil. Pleasure, he continues, always exists among incorporeal beings (ἄσωμάτως, 135), and even the angels desire to look into pleasure, which is called infinite and unceasing (ἀπέραντος καὶ ἄληκτος, 134) (132-135) and holy men call
daintiness and merriment (τρυφή καὶ εὐφροσύνη, 136). Pleasure, Manuel adds, exists endlessly in the souls of the righteous (136), who are linked with pleasure through a pledge (καλὸν ἀφαβώνα, 137). Manuel stresses that if one considers admirable the fact that it is possible for man to enjoy a pleasure similar to that enjoyed by an angel in this life and afterlife, we should be aware that we can achieve this by participating in good always in proper time (138-140).

[4b] Pleasure is good for those who are always pure and are granted divine grace (141-143), Manuel remarks, before he proceeds to discuss the opposite view: on the contrary, if bodily desires and our care for them are added to those of the soul, no one would be able to see clearly what is visible or enjoy what is desirable (143-145). Thus he distinguishes between corporeal and spiritual pleasures. What is eternal (ἀϊδίους, 145), he continues, is not at all concerned with the body but desires and is pleased only with what is truly pleasant, desirable and sweet (145-147). Since eternal beings always look upon the royal (divine) beauty (βασιλικὸν κάλλος, 148) and participate in Its light, it enjoys the admirable sight, never experiencing insolence (147-149). Concerning pleasure with relation to mortal human beings (155-156) it is a blessing for one to wish to enjoy the fruits of spiritual pleasure and seek with all his power only what leads to it (149-151). This moderate (σώφρον) pleasure will be partaken of by the moderate (σώφροσι); and even if pleasure arises from other things it will still be shared by the moderate (151-152). For though pleasure might result from things for which we are not responsible, they can still become pleasant, beneficial and good, and not the cause of blame but that of praise by those who are moderate (152-155). Thus pleasure, Manuel says, will not cause any grief to the moderate or harm them in any way but becomes beneficial both in this life and afterlife to those who use it with measure and moderation (μεμετρημένως καὶ σωφρόνως, 156). Considering that he has proved his point (158), Manuel reaches his conclusion: ‘pleasure is good’ (καλὴ ἡ ἡδονή, 158).

[4c] Elaborating further on the use of pleasure, Manuel remarks that if pleasure becomes evil (κακή, 159) it is because of misuse (παραχρήσει, 159) and not honouring or being prepared to honour the principle of the mean (μὴ τιμᾶν τὸ μέτρον, 159-160). What is necessary for those who choose to live with reason (λόγῳ ζῶν αἰσθημένος, 160), namely the moderate people, is to reject the misuse and benefit from pleasure.
with all their senses but not excessively (160-162). Excess is evil (κακὸν δὲ ή ὑπερβολή, 162-163), Manuel stresses, and if one misuses pleasure, nothing good will derive from its use. On the contrary, it will lead to incontinence and inflict (τίς δ’ ἀκρασίας καὶ τοῦ χρωμένου, 163-164)⁴⁷³. The extent of Aristotle’s influence on Manuel becomes evident. He adopts the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean⁴⁷⁴, using at the same time Aristotelian terms such as μέτριον, ἀκρασία, σύμμετρον (30, 52, 243, 372) and more importantly σώφρον (151-152, 201)⁴⁷⁵. If we blame pleasure when we sin, Manuel continues, but we wish to set ourselves free from its affairs we will not be completely blamed for those actions (167-169), since those who sin because of incontinence (ὅτι ἀκρασίαν ἄμαρτάνονται, 170) should be excused, though this is not an easy thing to do (169-171). To do evil is evil, even if the agent is not judged or held responsible for it (171-172), Manuel states echoing his analysis of the voluntary (III [4d]), ‘non-voluntary’ (III [5a]) and ‘doubtful faulty’ (III [5b]) actions in Oration III. Far from considering himself to be speaking from the position of a judge (βήματι τοῦ κριτοῦ παραστῆναι, 173) Manuel criticizes self-appointed judges who reject pleasure and criticize the actions of its captives (172-176). Judgment is solely for God, he emphasizes. Comparisons with David are not unusual in mirrors of princes for they serve to legitimise the emperor’s authority⁴⁷⁶. In this instance, however, Manuel refers to David in order to emphasise the supreme authority of God as the sole Judge (174). In this sense, similarly to David, the emperor, though receiving his authority from God, does not have the power to condemn others for their moral actions. According to Byzantine political theory, the emperor was ‘law incarnate’ (ἔμψυχος νόμος), responsible for issuing laws and the preservation of the law, himself being subject to the law⁴⁷⁷. In mirrors of princes, it is often emphasized that the emperor as an imitator of God, should be characterized by φιλανθρωπία also when exercising the law, aiming to benefit his

---

⁴⁷³ Cf. Manuel II, Dialogues, IV 47.5-6, where he discusses pleasure and its use, supporting that excess is wickedness, whereas the mean is virtue.


⁴⁷⁶ See above, p. 41.

⁴⁷⁷ Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 352A-B (ch. 51); Eusebius, Life of Constantine, 1.11, p. 20, 1.47, p. 40, 2.20, pp. 56-57; Synesius, 6.6-7, p. 15; Agapetus, 1, p. 26, 27, p. 42, 49, p. 60; Ps-Basil, 32, p. 61; Photius, 792-796, p. 26; Magistros, 4568-457A (ch. 6). Cf. Karagiannopoulos, Η πολιτική θεωρία, pp. 30-42.
subjects. Manuel’s reference to the authority of a judge presents views further analysed in the subsequent Oration VI whose core subject is God’s justice.

[4d] Manuel proceeds with an antithesis to the views expressed in Oration IV, addressing his fictitious interlocutor (Ο λόγος δὲ πρὸς ἀντιλέγοντα, 177) and indirectly all those who share those views. If pleasure is such as described earlier and has such force, he says, then even those who wish to escape its excess will appear as foolish (177-179), which is not the case. Thus, rejecting the views against pleasure, Manuel proposes that these statements would have been considered by some not to be truthful (179-180), since the affairs of pleasure are interchangeable (ἐναλλὰξ γὰρ ἔχειν τὸ περὶ ταύτης, 180). To make clearer his view that pleasure is not itself harmful but becomes such because of its misuse, Manuel continues to say that since it is easy for us to be ruled over by pleasure (180-181) it became necessary for the just Judge, God, to set a penalty when we place pleasure above His commandments (181-182). God and man’s own power are stronger than pleasure. If the force of pleasure, which is brought into the soul, were to be undefeated (ἀήττητον, 183), if it were to be held in greater esteem than God’s will, then He would not judge us nor would He have equipped us against pleasure by giving us remarkable commandments and admonitions (θαυμασταῖς ἐντολαῖς τε καὶ παραινέσεσι, 185-186), a reference to the Old and New Testament and the αὐτεξούσιον analysed by Manuel earlier in Orations II and III.

[4e] Proceeding with the refutation of the previous Oration, Manuel expresses agreement or disagreement with some of the ideas put forward. ‘I agree that pleasure is a tyrannical passion and I will not reproach those who describe its manners to be such’, Manuel states (187-189). Addressing once more his fictitious interlocutor, he makes a distinction between continent and incontinent people. Pleasure cannot gain so much power as the one described against all men, he says, but rather only against those who do not bravely resist its attacks (189-191). When pleasure attacks men with great force that they cannot prevail against it, he adds, it is as if a wave which falls upon a skilfully set boulder made of rock manages to destroy it (191-193). Using a similar description to the one found in Oration IV [4a-b], concerning the effects of pleasure in the soul, Manuel remarks that pleasure conquers once and for all the souls with the variety of the desirable, it commands some of the souls while others surrender
to it, it launches the worst things against them, sending them afar, beyond the Straits of Gibraltar (τὸ πέλαγος τὸ Ἀτλαντικόν, τὸ πέρα Γαδείρων, 195-196) (193-196). With great and fearful force pleasure carries away the souls, drowns them and brings upon furious storms with rain, causing them shivering only to hearing its sound (196-198). Manuel closes his description of the harmful effects of pleasure, clarifying that these are caused only when we surrender the (Platonic) reigns of the appetitive part of our soul to pleasure (τὰς ἡνίας ὅλας ἀφῶμεν τοῦ ἐπιθυμητικοῦ τῆς ψυχῆς μέρους, 199; cf. III 96). Once again Manuel refers indirectly to προαίρεσις and self-responsibility that determine one's actions.

[5a] Next Manuel examines the virtuous and reasonable men, who know well how to remain unharmed by the arrows of pleasure and moreover how to benefit themselves from the moderate and necessary pleasure in the proper time (200-201; cf. 151-158). Alluding to the negative aspects of pleasure presented in the previous Oration, Manuel states that the virtuous men mock the incontinent and useless pleasure (202), for it has nothing holy but rather offers in its manifold forms only bodily contentment. In this way pleasure manages to prevail over those who are not sensible or moderate (202-206). ‘As mentioned earlier’ (καθάπερ καὶ προείρηται, 207-208; cf. 51-52, 156-158), he continues, all that concerns pleasure depends on its excessive use (τὸ πᾶν τῆς ὑπερβολῆς, καὶ τοῦ πολλοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἀμετρίας, 206-207) and therefore, it is up to us; in other words it is voluntary (cf. III [4b-c, 6a]). Continuing the dialogue with his fictitious interlocutor who holds the opposing view, the author launches a criticism: ‘You release yourself of any blame and do not consider or accuse at all excess (ἀκρασίαν) and voluntary movement (ἐθελούσιον κίνησιν), but on the contrary you hold responsible pleasure alone even whenever you do something presumptuous or only to derive delight!’ (208-211). ‘I advise you’, Manuel continues, ‘to spare this kind of judgment and keep away from these thoughts, since they are far from truth’ (211-213). To behave in such manner (cf. 208-211), he carries on, is as if it is necessary for one to receive a medicine prepared by excellent doctors and then using the medicine unreasonably he brings the opposite result. In this case, one should blame himself and not the medicine and the doctors who have wisely prepared it (213-216). The same stands for everything we misuse without applying the mean that is proper (217-218),

for they become harmful in every way, either straightaway or at a later stage, or indeed from the beginning to the end (216-219).

[5b] Therefore it is not pleasure that is evil, Manuel affirms, but all misuse (παράχρησις, 220). The natural elements, fire and water (220-221), essential for one’s survival, if misused can become the cause of destruction (220-223). The same applies in the case of air and light, he says. ‘What is better than light or air?’ (223-224). ‘Yet, even those two, which are good, if they are misused, can cause great evil and not be at all beneficial. Similarly <they will not be beneficial> for those who do not partake of them’ (224-226), he stresses. The ray of light, which is most pleasant, gives to the eyes the ability to see and to what is visible the ability to be seen. However, if one receives at once the ray in his eyes he may easily loose his sight. So if the light is used without measure, the ray which enables us to see becomes the cause of losing our vision (226-234). In this way pleasure turns into sadness (233), Manuel concludes, repeating one of the ideas analysed in the previous Orations479. The second example, that of air, presents the opposite of excess, that is, deficiency. Without air we cannot live not even briefly (234-235). If air does not pour around all will be lost (235-236). If again air blows forcefully against and within us (through our ears, nose and mouth) and if our body is unable to send it out warming with natural heat its inwards parts, it will tear them and freeze the natural heat (238)480. As a result, we would gladly wish to be released from it (236-240). Manuel carries on with general remarks that echo Aristotle’s teachings. Order, he says, can be preserved only with proportion (σώζει τὴν τάξιν τῇ συμμετρίᾳ, 243) and both excess and deficiency (πλεονάζον καὶ τὸ ἐλλεῖπον, 245) are harmful in everything481. This applies both on body and soul (246-248). The body is motivated by the soul, which in turn is motivated by προαίρεσις, which since is governed by reason (λόγῳ κυβερνωμένη, 251) moves towards excellence; when it is driven to the opposite it is because of an unreasonable urge (248-251). Once more Manuel emphasizes the role of προαίρεσις which is considered responsible for the disposition of the soul and its actions, and therefore for the correct use of everything, among which pleasure.

480 Cf. Aristotle, Topics, 139b.21, 145b.7-10; Physics, 246b.3-20.
481 Cf. e.g., Aristotle, EN 1104a.1-27, 1106a.26-29, 1106b.15-29, 1109a.20-29, 1115b.31-1116a.10. Cf. above, p. 115.
[5c] On the basis of the aforementioned, either pleasure should not be condemned when we do not apply the mean, going beyond what is appropriate, or the entire creation should be accused on the same grounds, though in the latter case, by dismissing creation we disparage the Creator (252-255). In support of the first view (that pleasure should not be condemned), Manuel refers to self-responsibility, our free will and προαιρεσις, to repeat that ‘the creator of the harmful effects <of pleasure>’ (βλαπτόντων δημιουργός, 255) is one’s self; therefore it is entirely right to blame and consider responsible only one’s self for the things he has caused (255-259). Reiterating one of his axioms, that since everything created by God is good similarly pleasure given to us by Him is for the good (259-261; cf. [2a]), Manuel justifies the existence of pleasure in life, proposing that if absent nothing would have had sense and life, everything that is helpful in life would be painful, and if you take away pleasure none of these would follow pain (261-263).

[6a] Taking examples from our experience (τὰ καθ ἡμᾶς πράγματα, 264) he carries on to discuss the necessity of pleasure for both human beings and animals. ‘If pleasure does not urge us we neither eat nor drink’ (264-265), as happens with admirable people who attempt to repel pleasure, preferring to receive wounds to their body rather than food in their mouth (265-267), an allusion to hermits and monks who attempt to reach the ideal impassibility (ἀπάθεια) by elimination of all the passions of the body and soul. Such actions consist a deviation from what is appetitive and attractive in us by nature (ὁρεκτικὸν τε καὶ ἑλκτικὸν τοῦ πεφυκότος παρεκτραπήσεται, 268). This leads to disrespect towards the loved ones, which Manuel considers of great significance as it will become evident in the Epistolary Epilogue. Even if doctors offer advice, he says, even if friends encourage and the family does everything possible, nothing, not even fear, is able to convince these people to resume their natural habits; but they rather withdraw refusing any advice from their parents. Aware that they will die if they do not receive food, nevertheless they prefer to die by not receiving it (271-272). A similar

---

482 Cf. Manuel II, Dialogues, IV 44.31-33.
483 Cf. ibid., IV 43.35-44.33.
484 For the concept of impassibility see Hatzopoulos, Spirituality, pp. 67-75; Ware, ‘The soul in Greek Christianity’, pp. 59-60. Cf. Lampe, Lexicon, lemma ἀπάθεια, pp. 170-171.
485 Epistolary Epilogue 9-10, 59-62.
description is found in Manuel’s *Dialogues with a Persian* (III), where he speaks again of people who die because of abstinence of food\(^{486}\), refusing their appetitive part.

Manuel then turns to the animal kingdom: ‘When the affairs of reasonable <men> are such, how is it possible that the fish, the bird and the horse would not have done something evil and harsh, if pleasure was not urging them?’ (272-274). The horse eats not because he wants to live but because it is pleased being fed, causing a pleasant feeling to the natural disposition of the throat, which sends the food to the stomach. Animals simply live by receiving food. The same happens with intercourse (277-278). This happens not merely for their race not to be extinct but because they are bewitched (κηλούμενον, 278) by pleasure. Thus, Manuel concludes, it would be appropriate to say that pleasure has its substance in the middle of deficiency and in the process of satiety. This concerns all things (279-281)\(^{487}\). Cydones shares the same view of the necessary pleasures, namely those that cause reproduction and the appetite for food which secures life, and are considered essential in life for animals\(^ {488}\), as well as for the temperate men\(^ {489}\).

\[6b\] It is not only because of the pleasure we feel that our race is in good state (εὖ ἔχει τὸ γένος, 282) but also because of the pleasure animals feel, for these are preserved because of pleasure (cf. 274-279) and it is because of them that we survive. Hence, it is clear that pleasure in animals brings good in our own life. For external things that work with us are excellent because of this (τὰ γὰρ ἔξωθεν ἡμῖν συνεργοῦντα, ἐκείθεν βέλτιστα ἦλθε, 285). From animals, Manuel explains, we take food, garments and many more, and we use them for long journeys, trade, war, hunting, agriculture and harvest, to built houses, harbours and cities (285-289). After the Fall (analysed in *Oration IV*\(^ {490}\)) man lost his self-sufficient and simple life (αὐτάρκη καὶ ἀπέριττον ζωὴν, 290-291)\(^ {491}\). Thus, in a way our own life depends on pleasure (290-294), for if pleasure is removed completely, the genus of animals (τῶν ἀλόγων γένος, 294-295) would be destroyed and along with them all that is necessary for our rational life. Consequently, humanity

\(^{486}\) Manuel II, *Dialogues*, III 29.10-16.

\(^{487}\) Certain views on the animals’ natural tendency to pleasure for nutrition and progression are also found in Manuel’s *Dialogues*, III 36.34-37.40. In the *Dialogue*, however, greater emphasis is placed on the contrast between the rational and the irrational beings in regard to the use of pleasure.

\(^{488}\) Cydones, *On despising death*, III, pp. 5.19-6.5.

\(^{489}\) Ibid., IV, p. 7.10-17.

\(^{490}\) *Oration IV* [5a-5b]; cf. above, pp. 103-104.

would suffer a toilsome and difficult life (294-296). Hence, though human life seems to be opposite to that of animals, it is preserved because of them. In fact, our life would be much more pitiable (ἐλεεινότερον, 298) than the present one, if we were to live without animals (298-299). It would be dreadful, resembling that of beasts, and we would have no way of governing or rule our behavior. As a result, human race would eventually be lost (299-301).

[7a] Manuel’s arguments in favour of the necessity of pleasure are followed by a discussion concerning the evil and virtuous pleasure. Pleasure is twofold: evil and virtuous. Man can benefit from both parts, that is if he wishes to (302-307). If pleasure is good then it will be good for the virtuous (307), but even if it is wicked and plotting (κακὴ καὶ ἐπίβουλος, 307), again it can be beneficial for the virtuous, for the simple reason that it is unable to harm them (307-308). Even the evil pleasure (described in detail in Oration IV), the undignified and wicked one which causes harm (303-305), can become the cause of eternal and moderate pleasures (αἰωνίων καὶ σωφρόνων, 305). Even if pleasure throws its spear against us and the spear hits us, or if it comes with care and patience and we are properly prepared (καλῶς πεφραγμένους, 309), it cannot harm us at all. On the contrary it can benefit greatly those against whom it is plotting (308-311). When its weapon is thrown it will strike against the firmness of the armour and the shield492 crafted with virtue, thus rebounding and injuring evil pleasure (311-313) and at the same time placing on the virtuous an ageless crown (ἀγήρῳ στεφάνῳ, 314) enabling us to enjoy ageless pleasure (313-314). Pleasure harms those who are characterized by incontinence (ἀκρασία, 316), while those who are free from any greediness because of their self-control (δι’ ἐγκρατείας, 317) will receive the crown of victory. These people will enjoy after life and will not wander around in this life (317-318), and this will happen because God is Just (318-319)493. If those who live with incontinence (ἀκρασίᾳ συζήσαντας, 319) are to be judged, then it is equally appropriate for God to reward (μισθοὺς διδόναι, 320) the virtuous who have the awareness of employing the mean in their needs and turn away from everything that is beyond it; and God, Manuel remarks, is well aware that the virtuous are not distracted by pleasure or destroyed by its excess (319-323).

492 Cf. Ephesians 6:16.
[7b] Summarising his views Manuel states that on the basis of what has been said it seems appropriate to consider pleasure to be good for some people and the opposite for others (324-325). To those who behave badly, resembling unstable ships (ἀνερμάτιστα πλοία, 326) and go where desire may take them, pleasure is a dreadful enemy, bold and crafty, using infinite means to serve its purpose. In contrast, for those who are rational and seek true life (331-332), the only proper life for man, pleasure is good, beneficial and permanent (331-335). Referring once more to the corruptibility of human nature⁴⁹⁴, Manuel remarks that physical goods, glory, pleasure and fame are false (ψευδώνυμα, 336) and fall short⁴⁹⁵, for they exist only when they are necessary. The same is the case with the kind of pleasure that coexists with them, which is different than the eternal pleasure and glory (cf. [4a-b])⁴⁹⁶. At this point Manuel closes the discussion in order to draw some conclusions (339-340).

[8a] Following the usual pattern, he repeats some of his introductory statements, namely that the soul and all its parts and powers are given by God, and therefore these are good and virtuous (cf. [2a-3c]). Referring to desire he stresses that it is part of the soul and that it completes it, thus making it good. The appetitive part, that is desire, he continues, is set in motion because of pleasure. Therefore, pleasure is good since it is given by God along with the reasonable and sensible nature (347-349). Challenging his fictitious interlocutor, Manuel asks: ‘What do you have to say, you who slander pleasure?’ (349). [8b] ‘If you are silent, I will tell you something final, which I believe you will be pleased to listen’ (350). Manuel points out that though he confirms his opponent’s beliefs about pleasure, yet he disagrees with the view that pleasure has the ability to harm everyone. For if one were to accept this, Manuel stresses, it would imply that every effort by those who want to fight against it, is vain (351-354). In a compromising tone Manuel urges his adversary to be moderate, imitating him (ἐμὲ πρὸς τοῦτο μιμούμενος, 357-358), and consider that though excessive pleasure is inappropriate and can be harmful even to the προαίρεσις, nevertheless it will be unable to harm those who think and act correctly (354-357), namely the virtuous. Stating that he neither praises nor blames his opponent’s views, Manuel proposes a fair and balanced settlement: if each of them agrees with half of his opponent’s views, they

⁴⁹⁶ Cf. ibid., III 37.35-38.5; Cydones, On despising death, XXV, p. 44.1-14.
will reach an agreement. Therefore he suggests that they should both declare that the necessary and appropriate pleasure is beautiful, good and beneficial, whereas the excessive and inappropriate pleasure is the contrary, and those who use it are immoderate (360-363). Once again Manuel emphasises that even if this occurs it is not because of pleasures but because of one’s self and because of our accepting the damage and surrendering to the misuse of pleasure (364-365). Everything in life can turn to evil, he concludes, if one were to use them beyond what is appropriate (παρὰ τὴν χρείαν, 366). [8c] In this way, both sides are right. ‘The difference is in the words not in the thoughts’, Manuel affirms. ‘If it seems to you good to call pleasure evil because of its misuse, I will not disagree. Just let me consider the moderate pleasure good’ (367-372). The model of thesis-antithesis is now complete with their synthesis.

The views expressed in both Orations IV and V echo Aristotle’s perceptions of pleasure, the existence of different kind of pleasures⁴⁹⁷, and those concerning continence and incontinence, and the doctrine of the mean⁴⁹⁸. The Platonic division of pleasures into ‘genuine and spurious’⁴⁹⁹, true or false⁵⁰⁰, is also present: the ‘false’ pleasure is discussed in Oration IV and the ‘true’ pleasure is examined in Oration V. In addition, Platonic views found in Philebus, the work devoted to a study of pleasure, and the Republic, including the tripartition of the soul, are present in the Orations. It is possible that Manuel adopted these Aristotelian and Platonic views through his reading of Platonic and Aristotelian texts or philosophical compendia and treatises by earlier and contemporary authors who have discussed pleasure. It is most probable that Manuel made use of his own mentor, Demetrios Cydones’ work On despising death, which follows the same method and presents the duality of pleasure. Both the language and paradigms used by Manuel bear great similarity with those used by Cydones in his description of pleasure, also emphasizing the decisive role of προαίρεσις and free will in one’s actions and in accepting pleasure.

As already mentioned in the analysis of Oration IV, generally pleasure has a negative connotation in patristic literature⁵⁰¹. Manuel departs from this view simply because the

⁴⁹⁷ Cf. Aristotle, EN 1173b.28-29; Ross, Aristotle, pp. 233-238.
⁴⁹⁸ See above, pp. 115 with n. 474, 118.
⁴⁹⁹ Plato, Republic, 587b-c.
⁵⁰⁰ Cf. Plato, Philebus, 36e ff.
⁵⁰¹ See above, p. 94 with n. 412-413.
idea of ‘impossibility’ in a text aiming to admonish the virtuous prince is not fitting. Yet it is possible that Manuel has taken into consideration some patristic ideas, namely those of Maximus the Confessor concerned with pleasure’s ‘proper use’. St Maximus expounds on this subject (using the terms παράχρησις, ἐλλείψις and στέρησις) and supports that natural desires, since they derive from God, if directed towards God, can be the cause of eternal, ‘divine and pure pleasure’503, provided that are guided by man’s reason, his virtuous προαίρεσις, and self-control (ἐγκράτεια)504. There is a similarity between Manuel’s fictitious dialogue in Oration V and Maximus’s first Question to Thalassius, discussing whether passions — among which pleasure — are evil themselves or become such through their misuse. Referring to Gregory of Nyssa, Maximus responds that passions can become good for those who are excellent if they use them appropriately to reach divine things505. Apart from that, for Maximus misuse of the powers of the soul is the cause of evil, while their proper use is the cause of love and prudence, since nothing evil is bestowed by God506, a view shared by Manuel (cf. V 40-48, 72-74, 79-80, 120-123, 260-261, 341-349).

Manuel deals with pleasure also in his Precepts. There he describes as base the person who surrenders to pleasures (ch. 1, 320C), aiming only to pleasure, living a life of wickedness in which there is nothing beneficial (ch. 2, 321A). This person is compared with a slave (ch. 78, 369B). In contrast, he considers as virtuous the one who is not easily affected by pleasure (ch. 33, 340D). Similarly, his comparison of those who surrender to pleasure with those who yield to the enemy resembles his description of pleasure as an enemy in Oration IV (196-198). The mixture of bodily pleasure with pain (ch. 49, 349C-D) and the association of προαίρεσις with pleasure (ch. 3, 321B-C) present in Oration IV are ideas found also in the Precepts. In the second chapter (320D-321B), when describing three ways of life, Manuel is also concerned with moderation, and argues that the best is the ‘middle way of life’, adding that pleasure should not be rejected whenever it is not associated with evil, expressing ideas repeated in Oration V. Other views on pleasure are found in Manuel’s Dialogues with a Persian, especially in

502 E.g., Maximus the Confessor, Chapters on love, PG 90, cols. 1008A-B (II 73), 1017C (III 3).
504 Cf. Maximus, Chapters, cols. 973C-D (I 64-66), 1001D (II 56), 1009C-D (II 83), 1052A (IV 15), 1068C (IV 80).
506 Cf. Maximus, Chapters, cols. 1017C (III 3), 1040A-B (III 72), 1064C (IV 66).
Dialogues III and IV, as it becomes evident from the analysis of both Orations. Yet again, in none of the two works Manuel provides such an extensive analysis on the matter of pleasure as he does in the Orations.

Concerning the political function of the text, following tenets of mirrors of princes both Orations (IV and V) stress the moral virtues of an emperor and the necessity for the emperor to abstain from passions and pleasures, because he is chosen by God and for his responsibility to set a model of behaviour for his people.507 ‘It is absolutely necessary for an emperor to rule over pleasures’ (τῶν ἀναγκαίωτάτων τῷ βασιλεί τῆς ἡδονῆς), Nicephorus Blemmydes states in his Royal Statue when discussing issues concerning pleasure. The importance of moderation is also emphasised by authors of mirrors of princes, an idea which Manuel elucidates throughout Oration V. What distinguishes Manuel’s treatment of the subject of pleasure in Orations IV-V vis-à-vis similar texts on this subject by previous and contemporary authors is his comparative approach (thesis-antithesis) in order to reach his conclusions (synthesis), and the importance he places on the subject of pleasure which he discusses at such length.

507 Cf. above, pp. 62-66, 98.
508 Blemmydes, 33, p. 54.
Oration VI discusses sin and despair, their remedy, that is, repentance, through divine Providence, mercy, love and φιλανθρωπία (Ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία τὸ πάντων χείριστον. Δεῖ δὲ μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν, μήτε ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἔτερον, κρίνειν δὲ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ οὐχ ἔτερον. Καὶ τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν. Καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας). In this Oration Manuel’s aim is to offer help and advice to those who divert from what is appropriate in life finding themselves in danger (17, 26-28) and to invite those who may find themselves in despair, himself included, to truly repent (753-757).

Addressing his son (and the reader) Manuel stresses that sin, despair, and repentance express the human condition and thus affect all people, regardless their position in society and their faith (132-133). Oration VI was re-worked by Manuel at a later stage and its abridged version entitled Sermon on Sin and Penance or on St Mary of Egypt509, was to be read in church on the feast day of St Mary of Egypt510, who epitomises repentance. Perhaps it is for this reason that Oration VI incorporates simpler ideas, a large number of Scriptural quotations and fewer philosophical and patristic sources in comparison to the other Orations.

In terms of structure Manuel follows the order of themes as they appear in the title. Manuel regurgitates some points to the extent that he uses the same quotations more than once in the Oration (e.g., 314-315/323-324, 396-397/621-622). The author begins

509 Manuel II, Sermon on Sin and Penance, f. 336: ὃτι ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία, τὸ πάντων | χείριστον· δεῖ δὲ | μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν, μήτε ἑαυτὸν, | μήτε ἔτερον· κρίνειν δὲ ἑαυτὸν, | καὶ οὐχ ἔτερον. καὶ τοὺς | ἡμαρτηκότας, οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν· | καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς | τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας καὶ ἀγάπης, | καὶ φιλανθρωπίας· ἀναγινώσκεται δὲ, | μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον, τῆς ὁσίας μαρίας | τῆς αἰγύπτιας'.

510 Manuel II, Sermon on Sin and Penance, f. 336: ὃ τοίνυν ῥηθησόμενος ἤδη λόγος, ἔστι μὲν ἕκ τῶν | ἡμῶν εἰρημένων πρὸς τὸν υἱόν τε | καὶ βασιλέα, διὰ πάντων ἐνάγουσιν ἑπὶ τὸ κοινή συνόισον, | καὶ τὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐργῶν ἐρώτημα, διὸ ἐτερνεμαίνεσθαι τῇ παρούσῃ ἑορτῇ τῇ ἀγάπῃ τῆς ἡμῶν | πρὸςποιεῖται, οὐ χάξ τὴν ἀρχήν ἐξεδόθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ συνεσταλάμενος ὕπνου τοῦ κόσμου | ὃτι ἐκ πρόσφορος τῷ καιρῷ, καὶ κατάληλθον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς | παρεξομέλειας καὶ ὑπεθέμεθα, ὅδώ βαδίζον | ὁδοὶ ἀνεύρεσθαι.'
Oration VI with a reference to the previous discussion on pleasure, providing at the same time explanations concerning his decision to carry on with the composition of the Orations and the selection of subjects he intends to analyse [1a]. He begins with a discussion of the illness of despair and its cure [1b], he then moves to speak of βούλησις and προαίρεσις [2a-2b], and finally compares human justice and φιλανθρωπία with those of God [2c]. Defining pure repentance [2d] he presents his thoughts on God as Saviour [3a-b], and then discusses sin, judgment and God’s authority as a Judge [3c-5e], before he elaborates further on sin and hatred [6a-6e]. Towards the end he analyses repentance and examines God’s mercy [7a-7c] and φιλανθρωπία [8a-8d]. The Oration closes with a summary of the discussion [9a-9c].

Manuel attempts to guide his reader through the lengthy Oration by providing transitional and parenthetical sentences, and marking the beginning or the end of an argument (e.g., 316-317, 387, 405, 534-535, 605, 689, 785). Though not as extensively as in the previous Orations IV and V, parts of Oration VI are composed in the form a fictitious dialogue (e.g., 173, 385, 456)511. In support of his arguments Manuel also refers to hypothetical situations and uses many examples, Scriptural quotations and parables (670-738). The majority of citations from the New Testament come from Paul, who is referred to either by name (184, 298, 314, 323, 383, 549, 566, 766) or as ‘the Apostle’ (363), ‘the divine Apostle’ (631, 784), and ‘the divine man’ (306, 314, 360).

[1a] Manuel begins Oration VI referring to the previous Oration V about pleasure. Comparing Oration VI with a voyage (πλοῦν, 3), he suggests that if he does not wish to depart from what is appropriate, he should bring forth his arguments with moderation (μετρίως, 2), so that these would be useful to those who may listen. Following the detailed examination of pleasure it is necessary, he says, to discuss despair (3-5), for these two are associated, since incontinence of pleasures (ἡδονῶν ἀκρασίας, 5) results into sins (ἁμαρτήματα, 5) falling upon our souls, and sin causes despair. When sins multiply evil advances and inevitably stretches out infinitely, and when the soul accepts the final wound, harm endlessly advances becoming extremely difficult to

511 Leonte, Purple, pp. 219-220, argues that this lengthy Oration is divided into two parts [1a-6a – 6b-9c] and that the first part devoted to the subject of despair represents the homiletic section while the second part (see below, p. 142) is a direct advice to John VIII concerning ‘the relation with people lower in rank and furthering the implications of other themes approached in the previous part: God’s love and mercy’. Though the division into two parts seems reasonable, the supposition that the second part is solely addressed to John is not correct since it is also addressed to the reader and the audience, which is further confirmed by the fact that Sermon on Sin and Penance includes sections found in the second part [6b-9c], see above, pp. 49, 126, below, p. 153.
be driven out (5-9). Linking further pleasure and despair, Manuel summarises views presented in *Oration IV* and *V*. He speaks of the harmful effects of pleasure (cf. *IV*) and stresses that pleasure has utterly destroyed many people and has wounded others, while some of those who did not choose to fight bravely against it and did not resist its first invasion, have become its captives once and for all, being mocked by those who are capable of realising it (9-12). Among those who have been wounded by the sword of despair, he adds, nobody is able to be cured, since the wound is mortal and incurable (14-15). On the contrary, Manuel states (alluding to *Oration V*), those who wished to resist pleasure and succeeded were offered the crowns of victory (12-14).

[1b] Manuel carries on to repeat the necessity for the discussion of despair to follow that concerning pleasure (cf. 1-5), considering that even those who have the wrong opinion about pleasure (cf. *IV*) should not neglect the previous discussion (cf. *V*), since they are in greater danger of being harmed (18-20). It is easier, he continues, for a person to be reformed. However, no one seized by deep despair has been able to be restored (20-21). It is his aim, Manuel states, to assist to the best of his ability those who are desperate (16-18). Despair is an illness (23; cf. 1-5, 16-18), which corrupts. Therefore, the proper medication should be applied if we are to treat and cure it without causing additional pain, rage and inflammation, for it is our duty to do so (22-29). The medication is not difficult to be found, ‘it is provided by the Saviour’s φιλανθρωπία, the only cure for these illnesses’. It is God the creator, he affirms, Who is the healer (29-33).

[2a] Having established the nature of despair, its causes and cure, Manuel proceeds to identify the means through which one can release himself from this disease, namely through his own βουλής and προαιρεσίας. If one exercises his βουλής to remove the evils he will reach the peak of goodness faster than birds (35-37), he remarks, and our βουλής should be attested through our works (37; cf. *II [4a-b]*), since it is impossible for someone to truly want something and fail to do so. In the opposite case, when we do not want to be cured (38-39) the sufferings of the soul remain within us; had we courageously resisted they would not have come to us in the first place. Highlighting the role of responsibility and προαιρεσίας, Manuel suggests that becoming and remaining evil and similarly being and remaining good depends clearly on each
one of us (cf. III). It is impossible for people who want to be good to be forced and become evil, as it is not possible for those who are wicked due to their evil προαίρεσις not to be altered if they want to (40-44). Therefore, he concludes, ‘if this is true, the medication was found and the illness of despair has withdrawn’ (44-45). Manuel’s fictitious interlocutor asks: ‘How is it possible for him to be cured, the miserable person who has been wounded by all kinds of passions and has been cured many times, and is wounded again and again?’ (45-47). The answer is that we should not consider this person a lost cause, for if he does not accept the fatal wound of despair then this passion is curable for him who wishes to gladly accept the cure (47-49). ‘If things were not such for us’, Manuel remarks, ‘none of us would have been saved, since there is none good (Matthew 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19) according to the divine saying, and none is completely free of sin, or surpasses the others in virtue’. Therefore, he concludes, all human beings need the medication of repentance (φαρμάκου τῆς μετανοίας, 52), and if they take the proper one, then it will endure.

[2b] Repentance is achieved through προαίρεσις and βουλήσις and also with divine φιλανθρωπία. Manuel continues to speak of the role of responsibility, suggesting that though each man is created good and aims towards good (cf. II [1a-b]), he has voluntarily filled his soul with many evils (cf. III), some men surpass by far the appropriate mean (cf. V), and others become wicked, for which reason they are lamentable (θρήνων ἄξιος, 55). Nevertheless, Manuel stresses, if one pursues with dedication (ἐραστὴς μανικώτατος, 57-58)512 his own reform he will be good-hearted rather than senseless, considering φιλανθρωπία to be far better than infinite sin. For, if he believes in God in this way he shall abstain from evil, he will try with all his power to preserve goodness in him, and if he ever faults, nothing would prevent him from returning to the previous state of goodness (54-62).

Manuel moves on to support his views on human sin, confession, penance and God’s forgiveness, through a number of Scriptural citations, adding that these are only a few among many similar ones (in this order: Psalms 129:3, 18:13; 1 John 1:10; Matthew 19:17; Mark 10:18; Luke 18:19; John 10:10; 1 John 1:9; John 3:15; 1 John 1:7) (62-70).

512 Manuel employs the word manic (μανικώτατος, 58) also in Oration VII 315-316, this time in relation to the pursuit of humility, while in previous Orations (III 190, IV 32, 34, 178, 181, 283) it is used in the sense of surrendering to passions.
Confirming God’s omnipotence, Manuel proceeds to state that it is natural to despair when we examine ourselves and our own human affairs (70-71). At this point he briefly introduces another important theme, that of judgment, using a verse from the Psalms (142:2): enter not into judgment with thy servant; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified (71-72; cf. [3c-5e]). He prefers rather to speak of God’s φιλανθρωπία. Those who wish to be saved will be close to God and His φιλανθρωπία. God loves man whom He has created with His own hands out of clay giving him substance. Therefore He wishes for all human beings to be saved (73-75). For these reasons He became incarnate and died for us. For Christ, Who is passionless, was human just like us, Manuel stresses, presenting the greatest example of God’s φιλανθρωπία, namely His incarnation and sacrifice (75-76; cf. 83, 635-653). The mere recollection of Christ’s sufferings, Manuel exclaims, causes to our souls astonishment and awe (76-77). If God wants to save all those who repent He will do so, since He is able to do whatever He wants. Those who have sinned can be saved, provided that they want to repent (τὸ θελῆσαι μετανοῆσαι, 79) and confirm their repentance through their deeds (thus proving in action their virtuous προαίρεσις). Manuel closes this section stressing that repentance, on which salvation depends, is a matter of βούλησις, self-responsibility and προαίρεσις, since God is always φιλάνθρωπος and forgiving (80-81).

[2c] The discussion continues with an examination of human and divine justice and φιλανθρωπία. No one who places his hopes upon the Saviour should despair for his salvation (83-84). For God does not judge our affairs as men do, that is, in terms of human justice (δικαιοσύνη, 85) and φιλανθρωπία. He rather judges in His own terms, demanding from us nothing more than repentance for our own benefit (84-87). If one were to compare human justice and φιλανθρωπία to those of the Saviour, he should not call them such. For our own φιλανθρωπία depends on the law (νόμος, 92), which acknowledges the wrong to the giver even if he is not able to pay off the wounds, resulting to fetter, prison and ultimately death to those who sin. And those who sin, Manuel continues, suffer offence, abuse and suffering more dreadful than slaughter and death, and ‘slapping on the head if they do not bend down’. What is φιλάνθρωπον and just for man is such and therefore it is neither great nor pure but on the contrary it is small and mixed, and involves what it will bring to us rather than benefitting those whom it concerns (87-101). God’s justice and φιλανθρωπία on the
other hand, are rendered to us in order to make us repent when we transgress His law and His commandments. God accepts repentance and does not seek to punish, that is, if one honours Him appropriately (101-104). Clearly, these views reflect the Emperor’s duty to be just, merciful and forgiving in his judgement\(^{513}\), not seeking to punish the sinners but help them to reform, being therefore φιλανθρωπος and meeting his duty as the vicegerent of God on earth\(^{514}\). In the Precepts, where Manuel also distinguishes between human justice and God’s φιλανθρωπία\(^{515}\), this view becomes more evident, since he directly advises on the necessity for the emperor to be compassionate towards the sinners since it is likely for all human beings to sin\(^{516}\).

[2d] Manuel proceeds with his views concerning the honour and obedience owed to God, for it is impossible not to honour Him (105), as he states. It is easy to insult what is from God, yet very difficult to honour Him, because this depends on us. It is possible for great things to bring disgrace while small and petty things can be great and notable, while if something brings honour with exaggeration it does not necessarily bring glory (105-111). To make his views clearer, Manuel refers once again to God’s goodness (111-112; cf. 64-65): ‘For how is it natural for God to punish those who throw themselves in His φιλανθρωπία coming with pure repentance?’, he asks, which leads him to construct a syllogism concerning his perception of pure repentance (καθαρὰς μετανοιας, 116). It would be misleading, Manuel states, for one to say ‘pure repentance’, for repentance presupposes that it is completely pure. Since it is through repentance that we are purified (καθαιρόμεθα, 118), if repentance is not pure it would be impossible to purify us. Repentance, Manuel remarks, is to repent about what has been done and prove this through deeds, and hasten with all thy heart, with all thy soul, with all thy strength (cf. Mark 12:30; Luke 10:27; Deuteronomy 6:5) to Him Who is able to save. This quotation seems to refer to the previously expressed views (ὡς προειρήθη, 124) on βούλησις and προαίρεσις (cf. [2a-b]), adding that the Φιλάνθρωπος is determined by His will, stressing once again God’s acceptance of his repentant beings (116-124).
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[3a] Alluding once again to free-will (αὐτεξούσιον) and προαιρεσις Manuel speaks now of the good will (ἀγαθῆς θελήσεως, 126). Each human being can willingly direct himself towards God, since He is never approached by force (ἀνευ μέντοι τοῦ βιάσασθαι, 128-129; cf. 507-508). With Him one can reach virtue. Yet, as Manuel stresses, it depends on each of us to reach Him exercising good will. Manuel discusses these two elements (i.e., one’s self and God) which determine one’s virtue. Having established the views on God’s justice and φιλανθρωπία, His magnanimity and forgiveness, and man’s free-will, Manuel continues to speak of God’s work and man’s own responsibility for his salvation. For the cure of the soul, only one doctor is necessary, he says, that is God (129-130; cf. 29-31). However the cure of our soul depends also on ourselves. Those who want to become healthy should first realise their illness, secondly they must be aware of the doctor, and thirdly they should wish to be cured by him. Thus, those who have experienced punishments are themselves entirely responsible for this and not God (129-133). However, even then, Manuel explains, God forgives us, because He is Just. It is His goodness that makes us believe in Him in every possible way (135-136; cf. 128-129, 507-508). Therefore, it is wrong for one to be desperate for he has in his own hands the medication, which is no other than repentance, as previously mentioned (138; cf. 52-53). At this point, Manuel makes a parenthesis, stating that this Oration concerns not only the faithful (132-133), which implies that people of different faiths may benefit from it.

[3b] The Saviour keeps His promises to us, Manuel carries on, He manifests Himself once He is called upon acting and comes when not expected, helping all those who wish to be saved and for this reason they seek Him (139-141). Raising the question of one’s responsibility for his own salvation, Manuel asks: ‘Who, if he were just, would not be greatly furious and despair of those who place themselves in the depth of evil, while they could be fearless because of <God’s> mercy and their own power to save themselves through repentance?’ Consequently, we will seek God Who out of mercy uses His power to help those who call upon him, for God can hardly be weak or unwilling to help. Therefore, Manuel concludes, there is nothing else for us to do in order to be saved from our sins, other than to want to genuinely repent (θελήσαι γνησίως μετανοήσαι, 149) (143-149).
Paraphrasing the story of Jonah (Jonah 1:15-16, 2:1-2), he remarks that God, by saving Jonas from the belly of the monster from the depth of the sea, He saved him from the enemy (devil) and the depth of evil (149-151). There was no need for this miracle to be performed. Similarly, we should not demand from God to perform as much as He is able to do for those who are casted by sin and then, wishing to be restored, stretch out their hand to Him (151-154). Expounding on this, Manuel refers further to the Scripture. God has promised to advice all those who ask and seek and knock on the door (cf. Matthew 7:7-8; Luke 11:9-10). He has shown us this, by giving to those seeking, by letting those asking to find what they want, and by opening the door to those who knock on it (155-159). God always gives the promised grace while on our part, Manuel stresses, if we are attached to passions, even if we repent many times, we do not fulfil our own promise, since we fall again to sin (159-163). Though we are able to do what is proper, Manuel continues, we do not always wish to do so. This is not the case with God. Distinguishing between human and divine affairs, he states that when God promises, it is impossible that He will not fulfil his promises. So no one should be desperate, provided that he is not arrogant (164-167). Therefore ‘nobody who is aware of these and is moderate and is persuaded by me (ἐμοὶ πειθόμενος) should be desperate’ (166-167). On the contrary, Manuel continues, if one is pleased with virtuous hopes and lives with virtuous actions, even if someone comes ‘in the eleventh hour in the good vineyard, he will accept to receive the present, which has been fairly given to those who have borne the burden and the heat of the day’ (Matthew 20:9-12) (168-170).

[3c] Manuel moves on to discuss judgment with relation to despair. Pointing that himself is a sinner, Manuel advises everyone not to despair, urging them at the same time not to judge the others for their sins, so that they will not be judged (Matthew 7:1-2), for it depends only to God whether He will forgive or condemn (171-174). It is not just for one to despair inasmuch as it is not just that he is rejected by all, for no one can be just towards the others and be aware of their faults and the disposition of their soul with the same precision as he knows his own faults (176-178). For these reasons, Manuel argues, the best of men do not despair of the others and do not criticize (κατακρίνουσι, 180). This is the attitude virtuous men should adopt: judge themselves whenever they go aside from the appropriate, removing despair which rages against us, and let the Creator to judge the rest (178-183). In support of this Manuel cites Paul
(Hebrews 4:12), God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart (183), and Luke (6:37), judge not, and ye shall not be judged; condemn not, and ye shall not be condemned (184-185). This principle actually forms one of the core ideas of the Oration (cf. 173, 251-252, 346-347, 483-484). Virtuous men, Manuel remarks, should always remember these words, and therefore not judge or hate, or indeed depart from their virtuous nature (cf. II). And even if someone suffers as a result of his own προαιρεσις, again the virtuous men should loath hatred and lament for the sinners (185-188).

Carrying on with the description of virtuous men’s behaviour, Manuel refers to their awareness of God’s forgiveness. They know that Christ was praying for those who crucified Him and that He led the one who betrayed Him to repentance. Manuel does not name Judas but rather describes him as the one who has betrayed Christ for a few pieces of silver, the traitor who handed Him over with a kiss (191-192). In this sense Christ is a model for the virtuous men. For excellent men should care for the sinners and try to cure their sadness, and they should do everything to deliver sinners from evil and rejoice with them when they cure this evil, since they have full awareness of the difficulties involved in this effort (190-199).

[3d] Having completed the discussion on the virtuous men, Manuel proceeds to speak of the opposite: sinners and their behaviour with regard to judgment. Their virtue is corrupted (νενοθευμένης 201), he states, since they are captured by sin although they do not realise it. For they do not cry as being wretched or defend themselves as being ill and while suffering they do not seek help but they rather judge and reject the sinners. Manuel compares this behaviour to that when a member of the body becomes dead and stale, and ultimately man rejects it throwing it to dogs and crows to become food for the demons. Quoting a verse from the Iliad (1.4-5) and referring to Homer as ‘the poet’ (ὁ ποιητής, 207), Manuel suggests that they have made them themselves spoil for dogs and every bird (206-207). Manuel defines this kind of men as those who even though their enemy has shown them mercy, has stretched out his hand to help them, honoured their funerary customs and has performed his duties to them, when this enemy dies they show no mercy to him nor do they offer him burial but on the
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contrary they cut him off (207-211) (which reminds of Achilles’ behaviour towards Hector’s body before Priam’s plead to him, *Iliad* 24.468-675).

Concluding his thoughts Manuel addresses the recipients of the *Oration* in an admonitory tone. He urges all to remember the laws, which however he does not specify. At this point Manuel refers most probably to the natural and universal laws concerning goodness as well as the fundamental principles of the Christian faith. We ought to show greater care for those who are alive and suffer, he states, rather than for those who are dead and need no help. Those who are alive usually forget the good laws necessary for the care of the living and their cure. Whatever the illness, even if it is a serious one threatening with death, if one follows these laws he will be liberated, a state which will be completed with the Advent followed by the final Judgement (211-217).

[4a] Before proceeding with the analysis of judgment, Manuel discusses the soul and its association with God with relation to eternal life following the rising of the dead on Judgement Day (215-217). The soul is eternal (ἀθάνατος, 218) and immortal (αἰώνιος 218) and its death should be perceived as its separation from God (ψυχῆς γὰρ θάνατον δεῖ νοεῖν, τὸ κεχωρίσθαι Θεοῦ, 218-220), Manuel states, adopting the teachings of the Church Fathers. Since God is true life, for the souls which have lost God once and for all and have thrown away true life it will be completely impossible to return to Him. If the soul dies with the most pitiable death, then the body will also be in a dreadful state after its raising on Judgement Day, since it would have lost the very reason that preserves it alive, that is God (218-225).

Stressing that salvation can only come through true repentance Manuel clarifies that the only beings that is impossible to return to true life through repentance are the demons who have lost God
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by affixing themselves to evil (225-227). Through this statement, Manuel provides a link with the previous idea concerning the merciful behaviour of the virtuous: since the death of the soul is the most dreadful thing, those who suffer from illness (evil and despair) should not be hated by the prudent person but on the contrary be worthy of mercy (227-229).

[4b] Manuel returns to the discussion of judgment to present the behaviour of the evil man. He begins with a reference to arrogance (which he analyses in Oration VII). It is appropriate for both the virtuous and the evil, as well as for those who have a mixture of both, not to exalt themselves over others. There are those who fall down because of evil, he says, and those who do what is appropriate alternately (ἐναλλάξ, 232-233), expecting to be received in this way to the heavenly Kingdom (233). These people are grievous and intolerable for they fail to recognise the evil in themselves since their mind is harmed by it. Consequently, they lead a wicked life being totally unaware that they are suffering. These persons, Manuel continues, discern the evilness in someone, in which case they appear to be virtuous, and then accuse this man thus becoming themselves evil. Yet, they erroneously consider themselves to be virtuous while they characterise the one who is suffering as miserable and wretched (ὁ σχέτλιος, ὁ τάλας, 241), considering him responsible for his many punishments to the point that they propose that he should throw himself into the sea. They do not stop when they prove that someone is a sinner and worthy of punishment, but continue using remarkable rhetoric (ῥητορείᾳ θαυμαστῇ, 243) to establish it (242-243), accusing him that his actions are corrupted and mixed with evil (243-247). What follows is a summary of Manuel’s opinion on this type of evil man and his lack of virtue, in the form of question and answer: ‘How is the ambiguous man (ἀμφιρρεπής, 248) evil whereas you are better and virtuous, since you are equal to him in both virtue and wickedness?’ ‘If he is similarly virtuous as you’, he responds, ‘or you are completely evil, you are equal to the one whom you convict; and what is more, you surpass him in wickedness because you hate not being hated and you condemn those with whom you are similar’ (247-252).

[4c] Manuel proceeds further on the same subject. It is easier to incline towards evil, he says, than to its opposite; and though we easily discern the evil in others we do not
have, or do not wish to have, the eyes to see, or the ears to listen to, or the knowledge to understand our own. Even worse is the inability to recognise the excellence of others. We abandon many in distant lands (Ἡρακλείων στηλῶν, 258) and we excel ourselves and become extremely arrogant (ὁφρῶν ἀναπώντες, 259), believing that we have great power. The worst of all, Manuel remarks unfolding gradually his thought, is that we call virtue our evilness and attempt to prove it to everyone. Moreover, we envy the virtuous and call their virtues evil. It is also repulsive, continues Manuel, not to feel ashamed (μηδὲ ἐρυθρᾶν, 265), to consider our actions honourable when in reality we should have covered our face from shame (253-267). Acting in this way, appearing to be wise by judging others, we are unaware that we should be careful with regard to our own affairs. Nothing is worse, useless and harmful than to judge equally our own sins and those of others, Manuel states. No one knows the affairs of the other and every man shall bear his own burden (Galatians 6:5) (270-271). When we judge the others, he concludes, then we turn our own evils to advantages, which may be unbearable (267-273).

Next Manuel touches upon the theme of unforgiving people. There are people, Manuel continues, who, motivated by crudeness and inhumanity (ἀπανθρωπίᾳ, 275), hate those who are wicked and resent them. We should not condemn their behaviour, he advises, but we must feel compassion for them and attempt to improve them. These people are ‘maimed’ (χωλεύειν, 277), on the one hand hating evil and acting correctly while hating their fellow human beings on the other. They should rather consider their own faults and remind themselves that, sharing the same human essence, it is possible also for them to suffer something similar, for such behaviour towards a fellow human being does not lead to virtue (279-283).

[5a] Manuel admits his inability to comprehend this excessive behaviour. In any case this behaviour is not God-loving but clearly the opposite. To reprimand those who have sinned is appropriate when one aims to turn them towards prudence, correcting their faults and not being pleased when they err (284-289). Those who are not truly virtuous, Manuel remarks, act unnaturally. For when they believe that those who sin should be ashamed because they suffer something dreadful while at the same time they think of themselves as great and sensible and on account of their judging they feel...
that they are closer to God, it is then that they become worse than those who criticize, for they are jealous (289-295). Manuel’s view on this is based on the notion of human corruptibility, a central theme in all Orations, also serving, as already mentioned, the political function of text.\(^{522}\) Man, he says, should be aware of his own faults and evils and should realise that his composite existence is made ‘of a slippery clay’ mixing the four opposing elements, which struggle against each other, and hence our constant suffering. Paul (Παῦλος, 298), shares this idea (295-298), Manuel remarks, expressed also earlier (cf. 211-217). Further elaborating on the inappropriate manners of these men, Manuel criticizes their detrimental zeal. He explains that these people reach the point of using as an example ‘Elijah’s good zeal’ (καλὸν Ἑλίου ζῆλον, 299; cf. 3 Kings 19:14), only to assert their purity and to destroy the others (298-301). ‘We will not judge them, for we will not seize the seat (βῆμα) of Christ’ (301-302), Manuel remarks, following his own advice at the same time highlighting the emperor’s virtuous behaviour and the limitations of his authority as a judge. Turning to his audience, Manuel seeks for approval (302), reminding of men’s common natural equality and human corruptibility, paraphrasing Paul’s words (cf. Romans 9:21). Manuel concludes this section with a question: ‘Who believes that he is able to preserve the good morals and remain unharmed in the future? Who among the seers and prophets has revealed to them that they will remain good from the beginning until the end?’ (302-309). The response is given in the paragraph that follows.

[5b] The discussion involves the question of the inevitability of committing sin primarily due to human nature. Though not explicitly expressed here (cf. [8d]), Manuel speaks of sin as part of human character with reference to the Original Sin (cf. IV [5a-5b]). Almost all of those people who are admired for their virtue, Manuel states, being unable at times to avoid what they ought to, have experienced something bad. Only a child and a demented person would claim the contrary, Manuel remarks (310-317). Human affairs are full of uncertainty and only God is free of sin. Therefore, no man should pretend to know the future and remain firm and confident at all times. This life is a road with slippery sides, obstacles and deceptions. For this reason Manuel advises not to be over-bold towards our fellow human beings, or exalt ourselves or indeed
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despair of others. Quoting Plato (*Phaedo*, 69a), whom he identifies by name, Manuel shows that this way does not lead towards virtue (327-328).

[5c] Elucidating further his views on judgment, Manuel stresses that we often become angry at our fellow human beings instead of stretching our hand to help them when they are in need. Being judgmental we become worse than evil, for it is possible for us to suffer the same things that we judge of others, as all men are corruptible. It is inevitable that this kind of actions will be judged by God. To support his view Manuel cites the ‘awesome saying’ (Φοβερὸς ὁ λόγος οὗτος, 331), *out of thine mouth will I judge you, thou wicked servant* (Luke 19:22) (331). Such actions are followed by man’s asking forgiveness from the Saviour. Instead they will suffer the same suffering (335-338), for to be forgiven presupposes that one first knows how to forgive. If one does not forgive it follows that he will not be forgiven by Him, nor will he receive a righteous judgment (δικαίαν δίκην, 339-340). The conscience (συνείδησις, 341) of the person who judges himself and realizes that the others are of the same nature eventually comes in control and thus this person will easily forgive. Seeing that all excuses on which they depend in order to reproach others are rejected and realising that they cannot become brutal judges of decisions made by their fellow human beings they make excuses to annul their decision, and do not accuse their fellow men (338-346). Summarising his thoughts Manuel cites Paul (without identifying him, φησί, 347): *for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself* (Romans 2:1) (346-347). Making use of another Pauline quotation, Manuel states that *judging another man’s servant* (Romans 14:4) is something that one would never do, that is, if he is temperate. Moreover he would never judge unless he was not given the authority by God and the Church (346-349). This statement entails political elements. According to Byzantine political ideology, the emperor receives his authority directly from God, whom he should imitate and obey, being indeed ‘incarnate law’, as already analysed in *Oration V* (cf. [4c])
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view in the Precepts\textsuperscript{525} where he discusses the interdependence between Church and State, proclaiming that the Church, which is guided by God, guides the emperor\textsuperscript{526}.

[5d] Manuel proceeds with analysing further the matter of judgment, associating it with the previously discussed themes of character, προαίρεσις, repentance and amendment (cf. [2a-3c]). ‘Whence do you believe, that the miserable, who has fallen, will never rise up?’, he asks, providing the following answer: Falling can be the cause of rising. Both to rise and the care not to fall depend on the Creator and on the fallen’s προαίρεσις. Similarly, repentance and abstaining from sin depend on προαίρεσις. What helps man to differentiate what should be avoided and what not is also experience. Thus, it is reasonable for one to rise and then never suffer this again since he has learned from his own experience (350-354).

Man easily judges others, which is wrong (355). Since we cannot fully know own affairs hardly are we capable of knowing those of all other people. It would be best, therefore, to pay greater attention to our own evils than those of our neighbours. Even if we were able to understand with precision whether we have done something good or evil, yet we do not know completely the quality or the size of this action, for we know it only partly. Not only this, but since we are incapable of fully knowing our own power it is impossible to be fully aware of the power of others. As Paul said, \textit{but when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part will be done away} (1 Corinthians 13:10), \textit{for each man shall bear his own load} (Galatians 6:5; cf. 270-271). Therefore, each one should judge his own affairs and leave the judgment of others to God (355-363). Interpreting this last citation (Galatians 6:5) Manuel suggests that according to each one’s education, prudence, life, accomplishment and Fortune in the course of time, and of everything that happens in one’s life, the Creator and Despot will set the load, will judge and demand. Adding, \textit{to whom men have committed much, of him they will ask the more} (Luke 12:48), Manuel stresses that each man will be granted God’s grace according to the use of the gifts He grants him (i.e., προαίρεσις, θέλησις, βουλήσις and free-will) (363-371). It is ultimately God alone Who has the authority to judge people, as the Scripture states (κατά τὴν Γραφήν, 371), \textit{for the word of God is quick and

\textsuperscript{525} Manuel II, \textit{Precepts}, 321D (ch. 5), 324B-C (ch. 7), 324D (ch. 8).

powerful, and sharper than any twoedged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of the soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart, for nothing is hidden from His sight, but all things are naked and open (Hebrews 4:12-13) (367-371).

[5e] Having established his views concerning the differences existing in human behaviour and God’s judgment upon each man, Manuel carries on with the same themes. Even if all men from Adam until now were using the same virtues or the opposite they would not achieve the same result. For the sense of honour and the contrary is different in each human being. From honourable or dishonourable actions and behaviour result the multitude of abodes (i.e., states) in the Kingdom of Heaven (αι πολλαι μοναι, 375-376). Therefore, Manuel repeats, it would be best for each one to consider his own sins and not be concerned with those of his brother, since this would be the way for someone to reach the truth. Indeed, while we see clearly the sins of others we do not see our own evils. As John the Chrysostom (χρυσῆ γλῶττα, 381) states, many people become advocates of their own sins, but accusers of those of others527 (381-382). Emphasizing the differences among people, Manuel cites once more Paul: many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep (1 Corinthians 11:30). Continuing with Paul’s words, Manuel attempts to propose a solution: If we would judge ourselves we should not be judged. But when we are judged, we are chastened of the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world (1 Corinthians 11:31-32). Self-censure is good (ἀγαθόν ἐστιν ἡ αὐτομεμψία, 385-386), Manuel concludes, for it sets free the one who is for some reason worthy of judgment, even if we have not judged him.

[6a] Addressing his son (and the reader) (ὦ φίλτατε, 387) he gives the following advice: if we perform something evil then it is wrong to believe that we live as befitting man. Similarly, we should not be condemned with the world (1 Corinthians 11:32), or suffer the rod of God when we experience divine judgment. At this point Manuel provides as a parallel to the strength of the evil the female dogs, whom Sophocles (Ajax 8) called keen-scented (εὔρινας ταύτας εἶπεν ἂν Σοφοκλῆς, 389) and who cut off the noses of beasts. God, as a father whose sons are faulting, is treating men as their educator. Hence, it is good for those who have erred to accept the medication of education,

527 John Chrysostom, Selected Homilies, PG 63, Homily 24, col. 734.43-45.
though it would have been best if they do not err at all so that they would have no need of the medication. Manuel’s reference to God’s role as a father and educator echoes his own role as a father and educator of his son and his subjects, as an imitator of God. Indeed, in mirrors of princes the epithet ‘father’ to describe the emperor is quite common. Proceeding with his counsel, Manuel suggests that it would be best for us to care for ourselves, as the Scripture advises (ὡς ἦ Ἡ Παραγγελία, 395), and not to become arrogant blaming our brothers. For seeing to remove the speck from the brothers eyes we bring a plank to our own eyes (cf. Matthew 7:3-5; Luke 6:41-42) (396-398; cf. 621-622). The only judge is God and the time of judgment is not the present but the future. Therefore, we should not judge the others, since this is God’s domain. Similarly, we should not deem unhappy those who seem to be evil before the end comes, at the same time pronouncing ourselves happy, even if we are so, since no one knows when his life will come to an end. A happy man is not happy from the beginning or the middle of his life, but becomes such by walking the road as appropriate, Manuel suggests.

[6b] ‘I will multiply the Oration, observing that the interest is still vivid’ (405), Manuel exclaims rhetorically, justifying his decision to proceed with his discussion, indirectly referring to his son and the audience, taking for granted that they are intrigued by the matters presented. Thus the expression that follows, ‘you have to fight with patience the most powerful of the enemies’, may have a dual meaning, implying (not without a sense of humour) the patience required on behalf of his son and the audience for reading his lengthy Oration and the patience and effort required by one in order to become virtuous. Manuel reiterates the main idea: while we do not know our own affairs we judge those of the others, and despair of them and easily hate our brothers because they sin, in the process becoming much worse than them. Stressing the division between God and His creation (cf. [2c]) Manuel remarks that God does not hate the sinner (409). Even if one surpasses the sins of the forefather (Adam) and those performed from the beginning until the present, still God does not know how to hate him. For, since divine things are passionless it is impossible to find hatred, the most powerful of the worst of passions, in God (412-413). To examine this further Manuel

---

528 See above, p. 62 with n. 281-282.
529 See above, p. 127 n. 511.
cites the fundamental pronouncement in the First Epistle of John (whom he calls φίλον Ἀπόστολον [414]): God is love (1 John 4:8). Therefore, it is impossible for something hateful to belong to God. Returning to the matters of προαίρεσις and natural excellence arising from God, since He is love, it follows that the evil men which may appear such from the beginning do not become evil because of God but because they have never experienced something better (413-420). Manuel then turns to the opposite group, the virtuous men. Some people, he states, have been performing virtuous works from childhood, leading a life of virtue until old age. Others, however, who have experience and enjoyed the good, unashamedly have brought evil, from which harm was caused, and have exchanged virtue with enslavement to pleasure. For these reasons, Manuel considers the latter much worse than those who were not virtuous from the beginning, becoming themselves hateful to the φιλάνθρωπος God. For these people become abominable to God who hates evil because from virtuous they turn themselves to wicked due to their evil thoughts. Thus, these miserable men become hateful also to their relatives and friends, even to their parents and children and to all people, hating also God only because of their wickedness and evilness.\(^{530}\)

Proceeding with the discussion of the relation of these evil men with God, Manuel asks: ‘How can the one who lies in mud, participate or communicate with God?’ This would be unnatural, Manuel responds, adding the platonic view that it is not rightful for the impure to touch the pure (Phaedo, 67b) (431-432) (this time Plato is not named, but simply referred to as ‘a great man’, μάλα ἀνήρ, 432). Manuel gives an example. He who is in some way ill-disposed towards your friend would have the same attitude towards you. By the same token he who loves your friend becomes also your friend. Similarly, those who hate virtue, which is loved by God, and voluntarily hasten towards the evil are not at all friends to God but clearly His enemies.

[6c] Manuel moves on to examine hatred resulting from our own voluntary evilness. Addressing once more his son (and the reader) (ὦ βέλτιστε, 438), he remarks that though this ‘does not seem sound’ (Οὐχ ὑγιῶς, 438), things divine should not be perceived in human terms (338-340). God never hates him whom He has created in His image with His own hands, and God’s προαίρεσις is not altered (441-444). This is also

\(^{530}\) Cf. below, pp. 144 with n. 531, 188.
the kind of behaviour adopted by people who hate evil (μισοπόνηροι, 444). On the other hand, there are those who do not hate wickedness at all but are captured by it. Virtuous men should feel mercy for the wicked, imitating the righteous God Who will not hate them. As for the evil men, instead of hating the cause of their change and carefully seek to amend the cause of evils, they incline towards the opposite. As a result, Manuel concludes, those who hate those whom they judge become wretched.

To present the opposite views Manuel initiates a fictitious dialogue. ‘If these evil people’, Manuel’s interlocutor states, ‘have voluntarily rejected happiness arising from virtue and have thrown themselves against the arrows of the evil through which death enters the soul, these people are indeed to be pitied, for they resemble those who commit suicide’. Manuel responds by stressing the fact that these people are lamentable for their suffering creates utter misery. Their evil actions are filled with this misery proving that they are hateful. If those who spend their lives in evil works are hated for being so wicked even by their parents, then it is not strange that God hates them since He hates evil (454-466). His remark ‘for I have seen some people hated by their parents’ (εἶδον γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐγὼ πίνας καὶ γονεῦσι μισουμένους, 463-464) seems to be an allusion to the relations between Manuel’s father Emperor John V and his brother Andronicus531. It is natural, therefore, and just to hate evil, Manuel recapitulates, for God hates evil because it is an invention of the devil and He loves virtue which is close to Him. Hence, He loves the virtuous without, however, hating those who have fallen in the depths of evil but showing to them mercy. God does not desert those people but works for their salvation in every possible way (466-469). The last statement highlights the previous discussion on repentance and προαίρεσις, especially the view that one is forgiven only if he truly repents. [6d] Those who are hateful because of their own evil should not be considered as being hated by God, Who is merciful and kind to them. Thus the rejection of what is pure becomes to them the cause of God’s mercy. Emphasising once more the difference between human and divine φιλανθρωπία (cf. [2c, 6b]), Manuel suggests that the person who has caused his own evils, who is considered by some as petty, hated, desperate and worthy of no mercy or φιλανθρωπία, on the contrary is considered worthy of mercy by God the Judge. Referring by name to the prophet Isaiah Manuel quotes (480): whereas thou hast been

531 Cf. above, p. 22 with n. 3-4.
forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee (Isaiah 60:15). Therefore, those men who inappropriately become harsh judges and condemn their fellow human beings actually have no authority to do so, for this belongs only to God (Θεοῦ γὰρ μόνου τούτο γέ, 484). This is clear from what had been said above about self-censure (cf. [5a]). It is through one’s own consciousness (συνείδησις, 485) that one is judged. As for those who lead a happy life, they should not hate those who do not lead a virtuous life but be merciful towards them and seek to care for them aiming at their cure. Those who sin are worthy of mercy and care by God Who judges. Only He can protect them from those who are brutal and have placed them in trial.

[6e] No one would object to the fact that no man is completely pure and sinless (καθαρός τε καὶ ἀναμάρτητος, 497), Manuel exclaims, and even the best of men are likely to suffer something dreadful and for this reason they need the help of God, Who is infinite goodness and φιλανθρωπία itself. God’s φιλανθρωπία, he carries on, is used by some people in a wicked manner while by others is used appropriately. Even if some persist on doing evil God will not do something against His kind and merciful nature but will help them. By nature God is virtuous and a true guardian to all. He always acts in this way, leading all men to repentance and salvation. As already mentioned, God never forces anyone (ὁ μοι καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται, 508; cf. 128-129). Christ, Manuel continues, did not come to us in order to judge but to save the world. The qualities Manuel attributes to God, namely guardian, leader and saviour, echo those which the emperor ought to pursue vis-à-vis his people as God’s image on earth.

Manuel returns to the distinction between divine and human φιλανθρωπία with relation to judgment. ‘You usurp the authority of the judge’, he states addressing his fictitious interlocutor, ‘while you are not well aware of your own evils or those of whom you judge; this is a God-hated work (ἔργον θεομισές, 512) and complete nonsense (513). Man’s authority to judge is not the same as that of God. By assuming this authority in your own right you do not judge according to His φιλανθρωπία. There is nothing holy or virtuous in this, Manuel continues, for if you have been granted this authority by God, you would still be in the same place as those who are

532 Cf. above, p. 142 n. 528.
judged. Moreover, you would have not followed God’s model, for He is kind unto the unthankful and to the evil (Luke 6:35). Man should not rob what belongs to God under the pretext of φιλανθρωπία, Manuel stresses to his interlocutor, but you should have asked from the merciful and φιλανθρωπός One to do so. Since, however, you have not received the authority to judge from God and you turn against your fellow human beings, you appear to do the contrary. Robbing this authority you even called the prodigal loved one a parricide. In this you did not imitate God (alluding to the parable of the Prodigal son: Luke 15:11-32) (523-524; cf. 721-725). To highlight God’s kindness and its distinction from human kindness, Manuel states that even when we become wicked towards Him and towards our fellow human beings, His judgment is full of sympathy, calmness and compassion (Οὐ τὴν συμπαθῆ; οὐ τὴν ἡμερόν; οὐ τὴν πολλῶν οἰκτιρμῶν γέμουσαν; 526-527). You may even hate your self, Manuel adds, but this you will not receive from God, or indeed from the most fair among men (ἐπιεικεστέρων ἀνθρώπων, 529).

[7a] Proclaiming his intention to bring the Oration to an end (τὸν προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἐξεργαζόμεθα λόγον, 534-535), Manuel reiterates his views about God, repentance and forgiveness, using different examples and Scriptural quotations. No one is worthless in the eyes of the Creator, no one is forgotten by the Provider of everything, no one is hated by the Unaffected, or neglected, or any similar thing, Manuel affirms. Each man is in the care of the Guardian, he is in the love of Whom is called Love, he is welcomed whenever he repents for his evils. To emphasise the latter Manuel argues that if one were to deliver all men to evil, he would become a useful tool (χρησίμην ὑλήν, 539) for God’s kindness and φιλανθρωπία to become manifest. As doctors do (παιδεὶς ἰατρῶν, 541) and all those who become virtuous possessing the knowledge of their profession, if there is a problem, proving their knowledge with actions, by curing what is dreadful they appear virtuous as if they have performed a miracle (541-544). Manuel carries on arguing that the greatest proof of God’s immense φιλανθρωπία (544-545) is when one who is virtuous, a vessel of God’s grace (545), becomes a vessel of evil actions (545-546) because of his wicked προαιρεσις, allowing the vessel that is filled with φιλανθρωπία to be shown and outflow. Manuel uses Paul as an example as he was the chosen vessel (ἐκλογῆς σκεύος, 549) (Acts 9:15). Elaborating on Paul’s selection by God and His awareness that Paul would accept his calling and prove
himself worthy of this choice, Manuel states that the Apostle showed the grace he had received through his preaching of the faith. Citing the Lord’s words *bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel* (Acts 9:15), Manuel affirms that Paul has justly followed His commandment since he was the most suitable man to receive God’s mercy (548-553). Manuel also speaks of other God-chosen people who resemble God’s chosen vessels in a great house. Some were prepared for other uses, to receive myrrh for example, or to become boxes for alabaster and the similar gems or precious metals. To these Manuel juxtaposes the vessels of disgrace and dishonour. Everything, Manuel concludes, depends on the judgment of the possessor of the vessels. Ultimately, it is a matter of προαιρεσις and proper use. Insofar as repentance is concerned, while the honourable man is chosen by God as a worthy vessel to receive His grace, he who becomes wicked and then returns with repentance, as he ought to, is more capable of containing the mercy of φιλανθρωπία. Opposite to this are the dishonourable vessels, those people who lead a life in disbelief and do not think correctly, always living in evil and remaining unrepentant (553-564). As in the previous section, Manuel’s reference to the God-chosen vessel is an indirect reference to the God-chosen emperor, the honourable ruler, who has received God’s grace and uses it for the best of his people as an imitator of God. At the same time Manuel’s reference to the disgraceful vessels, that is, men who become such because of their προαιρεσις, may allude to his brother Andronicus, who usurped the throne from their father-Emperor John V533. Those who have done the worse actions, he continues, and then repent will not be dishonoured by God but they will prove themselves useful in order to be made known the manifold wisdom of God by the principalities and powers (Ephesians 3:10) (566-567). Citing the words of Gregory of Nanzianzus, the Theologian (Θεολόγου, 569), Manuel states that it is better for us not to seek for a second cleansing but stand until the first (568-569)534. Manuel offers the following interpretation: if something is good it will constantly remain pure or it will cure the illness while it is impossible to cure an illness with a sin535 (569-571). Thus, it is proper to fight the illness of evil with warm tears (of remorse) and remove it with all our power if we want to keep the cure until the end. In
this way those who suffer from it will find a cure, that is, if they want to, since God is the doctor of all (564-575).

[7b] I say these with confidence (ταύτα λέγω θαρρούντως, 576), Manuel concludes, ‘bearing in mind the immense virtue which exists in the love (of God) towards us, which amazes our mind, reason and intellect’ (576-578). God’s love remains unchangeable and therefore it never experiences regret as it remains immovable (580), ‘for the divinity is motionless and what pertains to it has nothing to repent of’ (τὸ θεῖον γὰρ ἀκίνητον, καὶ τὰ αὐτόθεν ἀμεταμέλητα, 580). God is virtue itself (αὐτοαγαθότης, 581), love itself (αὐτοαγάπη, 581) and φιλανθρωπία, and therefore He will never hate or reject the one whom He loves. The passionless One cannot possibly have passions. As James the Apostle (Θείον Ἰάκωβον, 584) says, God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man (James 1:13) and with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning (James 1:17). To be altered, therefore, and hate those who love you is a human evil, Manuel remarks while the majority of people when the situation changes (δοτράκου μεταπεσόντος, 586-587) they change, too. We move away, he continues, and we do not even provide little help when there is need for those for whose sake we would easily die in the past. On the contrary we would gladly drink their blood, he says (cf. IV 82). Similarly, we act not for the sake of those whom we love or because of Christ and His commandments and all that is virtuous but because we do everything aiming only at what is profitable and pleasant (585-591), Manuel stresses, pointing to selfish and unstable human behaviour, which a virtuous emperor should avoid. If our love is untrue then those who have need of friends receive something either because they have received gifts in the past or because they hope to receive something in the future. This kind of ‘friendship’ is more appropriate for those who are in the trading business (καπήλοις ἐμπορίαν, 595) (cf. II [2a-2d]). This is how one should distinguish God’s selfless love and man’s selfish love (592-596).

[7c] Continuing his argument, inspired by the Acts (20:35), Manuel states that our Creator is more pleased in giving rather than we are of receiving. The satisfaction from benefiting, motivated by virtue, never ends while God will never ask for repayment from His created beings since they cannot exist without His grace. As a result, His love towards us is stable since nothing else motivates it than His immense kindness and
virtue. To be led by true selfless love and to seek to benefit others without expecting any reward, is not an uncommon theme in mirrors of princes\textsuperscript{536}.

God’s love for man does not originate from external sources but is self-moving (ὑφ’ ἑαυτῆς κινεῖται, 608-609), it is always necessary and ceaselessly offered to us despite our own wickedness. Thus, the Saviour offers love, the treasure He has brought from Heaven and which is free from envy, to all and not only to the virtuous people. By being close to God, no man would have been deprived of this kindness though those who are virtuous would outflow everywhere in the whole oecumene resulting to all becoming rich and effortlessly being filled with goodness. The reference to oecumene\textsuperscript{537} at this point, rather than pointing to the oecumenical status of the Byzantine Emperor, should be understood as an allusion to the universal status of the Christian principles and message of love. To them gave He power to become the sons of God (John 1:12), Manuel remarks, stressing the human potential of knowing God. When one sees goodness being self-moving and then rejects it, this should be considered a crime not of those who have God’s grace but of those who have not accepted it from the beginning or have disgraced it after receiving it. Thus, goodness is great and permanent and it is given easily if one wants it. To become, therefore, virtuous or evil depends on our own προαίρεσις.

\[8a\] Recalling some previous thoughts of his (622) regarding God’s role as a doctor of the souls and the proof of His love for humanity culminating with His sacrifice (cf. [2b],[3a]), Manuel states that God never overlooks any man but cares for each one’s salvation, providing the appropriate medication and cures the inflamed wounds cutting off the decaying parts and reducing the worst (621-626). God punishes man for his sins with kindness and φιλανθρωπία not because He wants any of his creatures to suffer but because He constantly seeks to benefit both those who live well and those who do not (cf. 390-395), with his power on the right hand and on the left (2 Corinthians 6:7). Even when He neglects to provide sun and rain it is because He sees the benefit and provides things accordingly and timely in various ways, bringing us to completion by giving us the possibility to live well (626-635). Due to His φιλανθρωπία, He was incarnated and suffered for the salvation of humanity. He was humiliated and died for

\textsuperscript{536} Cf. above, pp. 62-65.
\textsuperscript{537} For the term oecumene, see ODB, vol. 3, p. 1518.
the sake of all. His death on the cross, the insolence, the disgrace, the mocking, the
blasphemy, the spitting and the strokes He suffered, the placement of the crown of
thorns and the reed hitting Him on the head, His passion, and all that was brought
upon Him by the uncontrollable envy of the murderers is clear proof of his His
immense goodness, His incomparable kindness, His incapability of sinning. Nobody
else is responsible for the blood that dropped down His holy face when He was hurt by
the reed and for the twists of the thorny crown of the salvation but us. Christ suffered
for those who were His enemies, the people who judge, for the sake of whom He
became man and was born of a woman, accepting to suffer in flesh in order to free us
from passion, mortality and sin for which man solely is to blame (638-653).

[8b] All these are proofs of His love for us which cannot be expressed or explained. For,
God could remain in Heaven and not become man. From there simply through a single
word and a single sign He could set free our race from the bonds of the devil and his
tyranny, and in this way benefit us without suffering or becoming human. His
incarnation and suffering in flesh is a result and proof of His true desire for mankind
(ἀληθής ἔρως, 661) as the lover does not accept the loved one to suffer something
unless he suffers it too (661). Manuel’s reference to the platonic simile538 of the
lover/loved (660-661) is placed here in a Christian context. Maximus the Confessor, for
example, calls love the movement towards goodness and speaks about the motionless
God, moving all and causing the movement towards Him because of his great love539
(576-580). Similarly, the idea of the necessity of God’s incarnation and death as an
expression of his abundance of love towards mankind as well as His Resurrection as
the victory over death is a fundamental Christian teaching540. Manuel considers this
love to be the primary reason of the Saviour’s communion to man. It is possible to find
this kind of love not only towards God but also towards fellow human beings, for the
sake of whom men are pleased to die suffering greatly. This kind of love, the one that

538 Cf. Plato, Symposium.
539 Cf. Maximus, Various texts on Theology, cols. 1384B-1388A; N. Matsoukas, Κόσμος, Ανθρώπος,
Κοινωνία κατά τὸν Μάξιμο Ομολογητή (Athens, 1979), pp. 128-135.
158.19-159.20; Symeon New Theologian, Hymns, ed. A. Kambylis, Symeon Neos Theologos, Hymnen,
also S. Ramfos, Φιλόσοφος και θείος ἔρως: ἀπὸ τὸ Συμπόσιον τοῦ Πλάτωνος στοὺς Ἰμνους θείων
ἔρωτας τοῦ ἁγίου Συμεών, τὸ ἐπίκλημν Νέου θεολόγου (Athens, 1999), pp. 159-252.
contains the element of sacrifice, is the highest, Manuel states. It is the same love reflected in the parable of the Good Shepherd (John 10:11-18) (671-672) who placed his life in danger in order to save the lost sheep (668-675).

Nothing can surpass the Lord’s power, because it is triple, Manuel remarks. He has the power of leading and creating, caring and benefiting, as well destroying (cf. 390-395, 626-635). The Lord reigns, Manuel firmly declares citing the Psalms (92:1). Ruling over men is constrained if it ignores the Creator, while with knowledge it seeks to be in accord with and be ruled by Him (675-681). These views clearly reflect the idea that the emperor should let himself be guided by God. Emphasising the necessity of God’s presence in our life and work, Manuel cites further passages from the Psalms adding that anyone who knows the voice of the Shepherd and follows His footsteps will lie down in green pastures and rest beside still waters, he will not fear evil nor will he walk following Fortune through the valley of the shadow of death (Psalms 22:1-4). Returning to the parable of the Lost Sheep (Luke 15:3-7; John 10:11-16) (ἀνθέξομαι γὰρ τῆς παραβολῆς, 685), Manuel remarks that if a man is mistaken and lost he will not be abandoned but he will be found by God and carried on His shoulders, for He is so pleased simply by finding a single sheep than taking care of the many who always stay in the fold. Such is God’s love and forgiveness. [8c] In his search for the single lost sheep He did not hire others (μισθωσάμενος, 692) to find it nor did He place this responsibility to slaves or friends, or even the angels, but He did this himself (692-694). ‘I believe this should teach us’, he concludes, ‘that we should not only do what is necessary but do it in the best possible way and we should not to be corrupted by glory or pleasure and consider safety better than what is good and appropriate’ (694-696). Not only this, he adds with reference to the same parable, but in this way He shows the immense love He has for, and offers to each one of us. His love for the single lost sheep was such that he went through mountains, groves and impassable places which to Him seemed accessible and passable (696-700). In the same way we have to consider that the search for the ‘lost sheep’ is necessary and though all that follows would be difficult what is required will be brought to the one who seeks. For what was more important after finding the sheep was not to bring it back to the many but carry it to His shoulders. The moral of the parable, Manuel says, is that God cares much for our

541 See below, p. 189.
own safety, that the lost will be found even if they are misled by evil, and that though they will not return easily nevertheless they will come back through the care of the Good Shepherd, for sometimes one is not so eager or indeed unable to return and for this reason he is carried by Him.

[8d] Continuing his discussion of the central theme of the Oration, man’s repentance and God’s forgiveness and φιλανθρωπία, Manuel uses additional parables, including those of the lost coin (716-721; Luke 15:8-10), the Prodigal son (721-725; Luke 15:11-32), of the woman with the alabaster (725-728; cf. Matthew 26:6-13; Mark 14:3-9; Luke 7:36-50), of the Pharisee and the Publican (731-736; Luke 18:9-14), citing Hezekiah (736-738; 4 Kings 19:1, 3, 20), and the scene with the thief on the cross (741-743; cf. Luke 23:40-43). Referring to the Original Sin (cf. IV[5a-5b]), Manuel explains that Paradise was lost not because Adam and Eve sinned against the Creator but because they despaired of their own salvation. For otherwise, Adam would not have sinned because of Eve and Eve would not have sinned because of the devil, whom both considered responsible for the sin. But having had confessed the sin and denounced themselves they would seek cure (745-750). Hence, no one should be desperate but, through repentance, seek to be forgiven by the φιλάνθρωπος God.

[9a] Manuel considers he has provided sufficient arguments in order to meet his task (751-752). Repeating some of his introductory statements he stresses that his aim was to advise everyone, particularly himself, of the need to repent and ask forgiveness from Him Who heals from all evil with His grace and without any expectation for repayment (753-757). This grace is given first with the baptism and repentance allows the grace of the baptism (τῷ λουτρῷ) to help man each time he uses it appropriately. Thus, God is good not only towards those who are good but also towards those who are not (764-768). Though Manuel does not analyse the symbolism of the sacrament of baptism it should be understood as perceived by Paul and the Fathers, namely as man’s victory over death, the rebirth and purification of the soul, through which one is given the hope of Resurrection542. There is an element of grief in those who repent and receive God’s endless φιλανθρωπία, Manuel remarks, namely that they realise they

have been insolent to Him Who has been so good and forgiving to them (771-773). If they have not been defiled in the first place, leading an unholy life, they would not need to repent for their sins and turn to God in order to receive His grace. ‘I would advise everyone and above all my own soul’, he declares, ‘not to wish to do these <sinful acts>, for many tears and sorrows will be necessary in order to return to the good path, while possessing those through which one is pleased to be pure and live purely, we can enjoy eternal pleasures that the eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man’ (1 Corinthians 2:9). [9c] Summarising some of his thoughts Manuel speaks once more of God’s infinite and endless φιλανθρωπία (785-790), which gives humankind hope to be delivered from sin. The magnitude of God’s φιλανθρωπία is hard to grasp (790-797). The Oration closes with the doxology, as is usual in Sermons: ‘Glory be to the Him and to the Father and to the Holy Ghost, to the ages. Amen’.

This lengthy Oration apart from its thorough analysis of the role of true repentance as the way to cure man’s despair resulting from sin, stresses the virtue of φιλανθρωπία, love for mankind, which has a long tradition in classical Greek and particularly Byzantine culture543. As an image of God on earth the emperor should be above all φιλάνθρωπος, being motivated by unselfish love for his subjects and fellow human beings. The emperor’s awareness of his own mortal nature and the superiority of God Whom he should serve, emphasized in this Oration, forms a central theme in the majority of mirrors of princes544.

It is noteworthy that several sections (paragraphs, sentences and words) were eliminated in the abridged version published by Manuel under the title Sermon on Sin and Penance or on St Mary of Egypt545. The sections omitted in the Sermon concern the comparison between divine and human justice and φιλανθρωπία (86-101), man’s corruptible nature (282-283), people who offer no help to their fellow human beings (329-331), God as Judge (338-341), man’s προαίρεσις (357-371), the Original Sin (372-379), the appropriate behaviour and just punishment (387-394), abstinence from sin (413-437, 580-585), the discussion concerning the ‘chosen vessel’ (553-567). The criterion
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544 See above, p. 138 n. 522.
545 See above, p. 126 n. 509-510.
for these omissions is not clear. As in the previous *Oration* VI and the *Precepts* (ch. 1-7, 320B-324C), where Manuel mentions, without however analysing, God’s providence and φιλανθρωπία, the incarnation and the crucifixion, human corruptible nature, and man’s hatred and authority to judge. In addition, Manuel uses in both works the citation from John (1:12) (τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι, 615-616)\(^{546}\) as well as the idea that though the best life is the hardest it is the one that gratifies and the only appropriate for those who want to be virtuous (320-322)\(^{547}\). In general, with the exception of certain ideas which may echo Manuel’s personal experience and allude to events of his life and reign\(^{548}\), *Oration* VI lacks originality more than the rest, since it discusses fundamental notions and principles of the Christian faith. It is the next *Oration* (VII) that is more interesting.

\(^{546}\) Manuel II, *Precepts*, 337C (ch. 29).
\(^{547}\) Ibid., 321C-D (ch. 3-4).
\(^{548}\) See below, pp. 188-189.
Manuel devotes this *Oration* on humility and partly on love (Περὶ ταπεινοφοροῦντος ἐκ μέρους δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης), emphasising the superiority of humility (or moderation, using both terms interchangeably) among virtues and considering it equal to love, with the two forming a pair of fine balance, each one perceived as the beginning and the end of the circle of virtues [4a]. Similarly to the previous *Orations*, Manuel aims ‘to provide something that would be helpful’ to the formation of John’s moral character (1-2) and to shape, through the *Orations* as well as through the *Precepts* (12), John’s character and judgment, inspire him towards virtuous works for the soul (12-15), and help him to understand the necessity of humility in order to act appropriately (325-326). *Oration VII*, especially the introduction [1a-e], underlines the ethico-political character of the text, in the sense that Manuel considers it to be a presentation of virtues, humility being the most important, that are necessary for the formation of the moral development and completion of the virtuous man and emperor (18-20).

In comparison to the previous ones, *Oration VII* comprises a lengthier introduction [1a-e]. It seems that this is due to the fact that it serves also as a conclusion to the entire work and hence the need for the author to recapitulate and further comment on his aim and motivation. The introduction is followed by an analysis of the subject matter, namely humility, arrogance, love and God [2a-5b], with Manuel initiating also a dialogue with a fictitious interlocutor [7c-9d], a discussion of the theme of judgment (extensively analysed in *Oration VI*) [9a-d], through which he highlights his own views concerning humility, and finally a conclusive paragraph [10].

Constantly emphasising the difficulty involved in an attempt to discuss humility (26-32, 47-70, 325-327), Manuel provides examples to support his arguments, using Scriptural quotations and mythological exempla (e.g., 61, 161-165). Similarly to previous *Orations*, Manuel addresses directly his son and his audience inviting them to a fictitious dialogue. Concerning his method, as Manuel himself points out, what is presented here as a praise of humility can serve at the same time as a blame of its opposite, that is arrogance (139-147). This highlights Manuel’s ability, for a successful argumentation and presentation of the characteristics of humility presupposes a
carefully chosen plan. Throughout *Oration VII* Manuel makes references to previous *Orations* (4-5, 13, 73-74), to the *Precepts* (12, 38) as well as to conclusions arising from the other *Orations* (228, 360, 402, 450-451), with sentences indicating the beginning and end of subjects (e.g., 11, 94, 316-317, 434-435, 522), thus facilitating his argumentation.

[1a] Justifying the theme of *Oration VII*, the last of the *Seven Orations* (ὁ τελευταῖος ἡμῖν λόγος οὗτος, 2-3), Manuel points out that it is natural for the virtue of humility to be analysed and praised at this point, as it was similarly examined in the last chapter of the *Precepts* 549 (Τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸ ύστερον, 1), since the general aim of both works is moral development (εἰς ἠθῶν σπουδαίων ἐπιμέλειαν, 1-2). Supporting further his decision to devote this *Oration* to humility, he uses as a pretext the interest his audience has (supposedly) expressed about it (6-7), when he first mentioned it in the ‘hortatory Oration’ (I 138-144) 550. His priority was different at that stage and therefore he chose to discuss it at length in this final *Oration*, as this is the right time (10).

[1b] Manuel carries on to justify his decision to present the matter of humility at this stage stressing the necessity and importance of the theme in association with his general aim. ‘To speak last of the wholly virtuous humility’, he remarks, ‘did not occur <to me> accidentally, but because it follows the matters previously presented’ (11-12). This confirms that Manuel considered the *Orations* as interlinked, forming a complete text on the subject of virtues (cf. 73-75). Manuel moreover associates the aim of the specific *Oration* with the general scope of the text by directly addressing John. Both works addressed to John, namely the *Precepts* (ἐν τοῖς κεφαλαίοις ἐκείνοις, 12) and the *Orations* (ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τοῦδε λόγοις, 13), were composed by Manuel to help shaping his son’s character, encouraging his disposition for what is best and moulding his love for virtuous works. It is for this reason that, having discussed all other virtues which contribute to the creation of an accomplished virtuous man and emperor, he considers it necessary to discuss the highest among virtues, humility (12-20; cf. 120) 551. Stressing the importance of humility, Manuel states that he who has acquired excellence will not be beneficial to himself unless he has gained everything through humility, ‘the light and guardian of all that is good’ (πασῶν ἄρετῶν λαμπτήρα τε καὶ φύλακα τῶν
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550 *Oration I* 142-143: ‘Περὶ ἧς γέ μετριότητος, ἐροῦμέν τι προὐργιαίτερον κατὰ σχολὴν μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ, συναισφομένου τοῦ κρείττονος.’
ἀγαθῶν πάντων, 17-18). Paraphrasing Demosthenes, whom he describes as one of the ancients admired for his wisdom (23-24) and with whom no one ever disagreed (ἀντερεῖν, 25), Manuel states that ‘it is clearly far more difficult to keep and preserve what is good until the end than to obtain it in the first place’ (20-21).

Similarly to Oration V (V 12-13; cf. Ep. 3-6), Manuel confesses that he undertook the composition of the Oration instead of escaping the task (καθῆκα ἐμαυτὸν εἰς ὃν ἐχρῆν ἀποδιδράσκειν ἀγῶνα, 26), this time given the difficulty involved in the discussion of humility. Nevertheless he decided to do so because he considers it possible to say something appropriate about this virtue which ‘flies high’ and lifts up and exalts those who act virtuously and are not arrogant (28-30). Following the rhetorical convention, Manuel adds that he does not underestimate the magnitude of this attempt (τὸ μέγεθος τῆς νῦν ἐπιστολῆς, 30) nor does he overestimate his own ability (ἡ ἐμαυτὸν ἄγνοϊν, 30), stressing his awareness of this citing Plato (Phaedrus, 228a): ‘if I don’t know Phaedrus, I have forgotten myself’ (31-32).

[1c] The primary reason he chose to proceed with his venture, Manuel says, is his affection for his son (33-34). It is the same feeling that urged him to compose the Precepts and the epistles (τὰ πρὸς σὲ κεφάλαια σὺν ἐπιστολαῖς, 38), referring most probably to the Epistolary Preface to the Precepts and the Epistolary Epilogue to the Orations, since, to our knowledge, no epistles addressed to John VIII were published by Manuel. His firm belief in John’s virtue, Manuel states, encouraged him to discuss things that are truly pleasant in life (34-35). Similarly to the Epistolary Epilogue, where this becomes more evident, Manuel’s statements about John’s virtue and excellence also serve political reasons, namely to stress his personal qualities and his legitimacy as heir apparent to the throne. Thus, Manuel was determined to offer these ethicopolitical works admonishing his son and successor in a critical period (cf. V 13), despite his heavy duties and responsibilities which do not permit the emperor, ‘to whom a host is entrusted, and upon whom rest so many cares’ (Homer, Iliad 2.25, 2.61), to turn his
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552 Demosthenes, Olynthiacs 1, 23.6-24.1.
553 Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 316C-317C.
554 See above, pp. 32-33; below, pp. 176-184.
555 There is a similarity between these and Manuel’s statements found in his letter 44, ed. Dennis, Letters, pp. 116-121. It could also be suggested that Manuel indirectly responds here to criticisms leveled against him concerning his involvement in literary matters, see below, p. 189 with n. 647.
eyes elsewhere\textsuperscript{556}, as indeed a captain does when at sea facing alone the waves (41-42), duties and responsibilities which hold him ‘firmly in chains’ (43-46).

[1d] Manuel begins his discussion of humility by justifying his decision to deal with such a perplex theme. Many and important things have been said about it both by ancient and contemporary authors (ἐν τοῖς πάλαις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς νῦν, 46-47), he remarks, and although they have examined it to a great extent no one has discussed it in a comprehensive way covering all its aspects. This angelic virtue is above any praise and description (49-50). Nevertheless, this should not discourage one to discuss it; on the contrary (53-56). Therefore, Manuel carries on, it is possible even one who is not a learned man (οὐκ εἰς λόγους εὐδοκιμούντων, 57), like himself, to say something not entirely unbefitting to its greatness\textsuperscript{557} (56-59). To support his view, Manuel introduces a metaphor. He speaks of an event he had witnessed, when a certain person who was not admired for his skill in archery had to face a wild animal and this opportunity proved him better than the legendary Teukros and the old Idas and other great and skilful archers (60-62). ‘Everyone must contribute’ (δεῖ τοὺς ἅπαντας συνεισφέρειν, 62; cf. 55-56), Manuel exclaims, for if each one adds his own contribution and all is gathered together, as in the case of a collection (ἀνάξ ἐξ ἑράνου, 64), and all those who speak about humility are brought together, something worthy could be said about it. What pertains humility actually resembles a riddle (αἴνιγμα, 66), he claims, for this virtue appears great from things that are unworthy of admiration and whenever one praises it he falls short of words (69-70).

[1e] Addressing his audience, which was one of the reasons that determined his decision to deal with this theme (cf. 5-10), Manuel makes a plea (cf. [1d]) not to criticize or write a hasty review of his compositions given his own inability and the greatness of his theme (71-73). Apart from being a topos\textsuperscript{558}, befitting especially the theme of humility, this statement provides evidence of the tradition of composing written reviews of rhetorical works\textsuperscript{559}, as for example in the case of Manuel’s Funeral Oration by

\textsuperscript{556} Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 377C-D (ch. 90); Agapetos, 2, p. 26, 10, p. 32, 19, p. 38, 26, p. 42, 46, p. 58; Ps.-Basil, 39, pp. 63-64, 52, pp. 68-69; Magistros, 468D-469C (ch. 14).

\textsuperscript{557} Cf. Climacus, Scala, col. 988.42-45 (ch. 25).

\textsuperscript{558} Cf. below, p. 179 n. 615.

\textsuperscript{559} See above, pp. 43-46.
Manuel Chrysoloras\textsuperscript{560}. It is only right, the Emperor continues, for his readers to approve of his views on this as they have done in the previous \textit{Orations} (73-75) having been driven together with him in this sea (of arguments) allowing themselves to be persuaded on difficult issues (75-76). There is another aspect to be taken into consideration (77-78), Manuel adds, namely his motivation to proceed with his task, namely his love for his son. Manuel does not name John, but refers to him as ‘the excellent child who holds the sceptre in his hands’ (παιδὸς γὰρ φίλτρον, καὶ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ σκῆπτρον ἐχόντος ἐν χεροίν, 77). The reference to the imperial sceptre clearly stresses John’s status as co-emperor, confirming once more his legitimate succession to the throne (cf. 528). John was crowned co-emperor most probably from the time of his first wedding to Anna of Moscow in 1414. This date is supported by our proposed \textit{terminus ante quem} (1416) for the ‘edition’ of the \textit{Orations}\textsuperscript{561}.

Using the conventional image of an athlete launching himself to a contest (ἄθλον ἀπεδυσάμεθα, 78)\textsuperscript{562}, Manuel states that his aim was not simply to honour humility but to direct his son in the search for humility, ‘so that <humility> would become dear to the child, seeming to him the best, and would be loved and sought for in every way by him who should seek for it (ἰχνεύοντι, 82) with attention. In this way, its possession will become graceful and pleasant, it will be sought with care and will be laboriously safeguarded’ (80-84).

Speaking of the necessity of humility in life, Manuel remarks that having a spiritual possession (κτήμα πνευματικόν, 86) it will never cause fear or sadness while if the soul is harmed and one does not have humility causes great suffering (84-87). Closing his introduction Manuel expresses the hope that, having put much effort (he uses the Homeric πόλλ’ ἐμόγησα, Ὀμηρικῶς εἰπεῖν, [91]), his sayings will benefit his son and his readers accordingly (87-93). Manuel’s introduction, which in a sense serves as a conclusion to the \textit{Orations}, is followed by a preamble to \textit{Oration VII} and its subject.

[2a] Once again Manuel emphasizes his own inadequacy and the innate difficulty involved with his undertaking (94-100; cf. [1d-e]). The discussion of humility raises a remarkable fear in us, he says, and because of this, one may be advised to return to


\textsuperscript{561} See above, p. 52 with n. 244.

\textsuperscript{562} Cf. \textit{Oration V} 12-13, VII 26, \textit{Epistolary Epilogue} 3.
subjects that are within our own powers and avoid tackling this awesome theme, for
the greatness of humility defeats us entirely and makes the mind seem loose (ἔκλυτον, 98). Only a little child, he adds, would be carried away far from what is appropriate
with ungovernable boldness and think that there is an earthly tongue that can ascend
to the height of humility. ‘What can I say about it, which is magnificent, that would
seem close to what is appropriate to be said?’, he asks, before he proceeds to describe
humility, despite his expressed reservations. Only something pious, great and brilliant
expressed with exaggeration would be able to adorn this virtue, which he describes as
aerial, ethereal, existing above heaven in the bosom of the Father and treasured by the
Saviour since it is necessary to exist whenever Christ is present (101-107), as there is an
exceeding desire for it in Him which existed in Him before He was born to us (107-
108). To confirm his view on the divine nature of humility, Manuel adds that if Christ’s
humility and love for this virtue was not true, He would not have been incarnated
and bowed heaven citing from the Psalms (17:10) (κατὰ τὸν Προφήτην, 109). Moreover,
Christ would have never been separated from the Father and suffer for us things that
are unbearable even for slaves, Manuel says alluding to thoughts expressed in Oration
VI. Therefore, he concludes, what pertains to our subject-matter is placed above
heaven (ὑπερουράνιον, 113), for ‘humility, having ascended to heaven, has brought
Christ to us, which confirms that whenever He is, humility is also present’ (112-114).

[2b] Humility is just and loved, divine and greatly praised, in every way well-ordered
(κοσμία, 119), superior, attracting everyone with its enormous beauty and making
them its ‘lovers with moderate madness’ (ἔφαστὰς μετὰ μανίας σώφρονος, 121). Clarifying μανία (used also in Oration IV 32, 34, with reference to the voluntary
yielding to pleasures)⁵⁶³, Manuel wonders whether one can use this word to describe
the desire for humility since humility is always found in the opposite direction (i.e.,
exercise of reason, prudence and abstinence from desires) (121-122). Actually, Manuel
continues, humility joins together many things that are considered to oppose it (122-
123), for example arrogance (ἐπαφοσιν, 124). Evil that is contrary to humility is
arrogance and though arrogance is called proud (ὕψηλη, 124) yet wherever it exists
everything is more base (ταπεινότερον, 125) crawling on the ground (χαμερπέστερον, 125) for whenever arrogance appears it conquers the souls and sends them to the

⁵⁶³ Cf. also Oration VI 57-58; see above, p. 129 n. 512.
lowest pit (βάραθρον, 126) (123-126). Using the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican (cf. Luke 18:9-14), which will be also used further below (732-736), Manuel refers to the Pharisee’s prayer to stress that prayer without humility is no prayer at all (126-129).

Then Manuel offers a parallel for humility. Moderation (μετριότητι, 129) is a synonym of humility, he explains, and from its name it appears to be of the lowest (κατωτέρω, 131). However, with humility one attains living highly (ὑψοῦ τὴν οἴκησιν κεκτημένη, 131), since it ‘raises the poor out of the dust, and lifts the needy from the dunghill’ (cf. 1 Kings 2:8; Psalms 112:7) (131-132). The power of moderation becomes evident in the aforementioned parable of the Pharisee and the Publican from Christ’s sayings, Manuel states, For every one that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted (Luke 18:14) (132-133). Thus, though a paradox, it is possible to madly desire humility with moderation (μανικώτατον ἔρωτα μετὰ σωφροσύνης, 133), in the sense that we seek it moderately. All that pertains to humility actually appear to be a paradox (παράδοξα πάντα, 135), Manuel suggests, for while we seek humility yet we are so far from it being captured by arrogance (ὑπερηφανίᾳ κεκρατημένους, 138).

[2c] Before he proceeds with discussing its unique attributes (ἰδιωμάτων, 139), Manuel remarks that those who speak of humility should not belabour the point but speak humbly (συνεσταλμένως, 142) aiming to fulfill what is appropriate, attempting in this way to safeguard himself against any possible criticism of omissions. At the same time, he indirectly points to his own rhetorical ability. What we use to compose humility’s praise (ἐξυφαίνομεν ἔπαινον, 143-144) we also use to complete arrogance’s criticism (ψόγον, 144), an undertaking which entails great difficulty if one considers the choice of words, since these two (humility and arrogance) are opposed, and what adorns the one disgraces the other, and what disgraces the one clearly praises the other (139-147).

[3a] Next Manuel discusses the functions of humility: it drives the passions out of the soul and being attentive to the faithful it works miracles, becoming destructive and averting for the demons; it protects the powers of God, which would not have remained in the light if humility was separated from them, and shows the falling of Lucifer (ἑωσφόρον, 152) from the great light as a result of his thinking beyond what is
Manuel himself being wounded by the arrow which the devil throws continuously against us, the Emperor considers that all men are in a similar state. Indeed, he states, evil (i.e., arrogance) can be absolutely harmful unless moderation (μέτριον, 155) is brought forth to defeat it. Thus, arrogance would destroy even the angels while the contrary, moderation (humility; cf. 129-130) will inevitably do the opposite, that is reunite man with the Creator. It should be noted that this section of Oration VII (153-156) bears similarities with the discussion of the negative characteristics of pleasure in Oration IV. Referring once again to the Original Sin, Manuel considers that it was arrogance that caused the destruction of Adam and Eve who imagined they were equal to God (ἰσοθεΐαν γὰρ φαντασθέντες, 159), thus falling from Paradise and removing themselves from God, a sin they transmitted to mankind (160-161; cf. IV [5a-b], VI [8d])565. Turning to Greek mythology Manuel compares the power of humility with Ajax’s shield made of seven skins566, which made impossible for the arrows of the enemies to harm him (161-165). Humility is more powerful than this shield, Manuel says, for it is made of a single material (μονοειδής, 165). It is a power of the soul567 able to save those who possess it from whatever dreadful they might counter (165-167). Those who have humility, Manuel remarks, should be confident also because of all the other benefits which the labour of virtue will bring, since with humility these are proven good and without it they prove to be the contrary (167-169).

Manuel proceeds with the presentation of the benefits of humility. It forms an unassailable lever against thieves (171-172), it constrains the plotters in every way turning them to moderate even if they do not want to, leading them to despair. From the rapacious and the thieves, and from all shameless people, humility does not attempt to remove what they acquired with moderation, thus proving all the means used against it useless. Humility is an unbroken and remarkable seal (176-177) deeply impressed on man, securing the treasures that are gathered from virtuous works and driving away those who act in a wicked way (176-180). Manuel also remarks on the stability and power of humility, resembling those people who secure everything they
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564 Cf. Isaiah 14:12-14.
565 Cf. above, pp. 103-104.
567 Cf. Climacus, Scala, col. 989.1 (ch. 25).
possess and those who stand fortified against tyrants holding in their hands all kinds of weapons which enable them to successfully defend themselves if they are attacked (180-184). In the same way, when we are attacked by demons humility counter attacks them and does not let them plunder the benefits gained by virtue. And when demons attack the good ‘storehouses’ of moderation (ἐν ταῖς καλαῖς ἀποθήκαις τῆς μετριότητος, 186-187) they are proved useless. Manuel uses another simile which possibly echoes his own experience in government and warfare: ‘humility has concealed its bearers who have meticulously preserved order at times when we were not allowed to stay fearless. It has enabled spear-bearers to exceed themselves, whose love for honour co-exists with the passion in their soul, their extensive experience in war and their impulse and power of lions. Then <humility> left the troop to those who are appointed guardians and to whom it is not permissible to rest’ (187-192).

[3c] If we were to take everything into account, Manuel continues, then humility would appear to surpass all, even those for which a battle would have been fought, those that are much loved by their owners and those which others would love to possess (193-195). Not only this, he adds, but even if the soul were to assume the royal garment (πορφύραν, 196) and rule over passions, then humility would be the appropriate cloth for it (195-197). This remark stresses the importance of the emperor possessing humility. Humility exists in people who possess all virtues (ἀρετῶν ἅπαν σύνταγμα, 200). To them humility shines forth its own magnificence gratifying them (197-201). All characterizations attributed to humility fall short of fully describing it. The greatest characteristic of humility, Manuel declares, is its association with the Saviour (Σωτῆρι συντρόφῳ, 205). For this reason, it exceeds in all measure in comparison to everything considered to be good. It is impossible for one who possesses humility not to benefit.

[4a] Manuel discusses further humility in association with love. He considers humility to be greater than the other virtues and equal with love (ἀγάπη δὲ ὁμότιμον, 212-213). Love is inextricably related to humility as in a perfect circle whose beginning is love and humility is its end (215). In this way the beginning and end is the same and completely inseparable from each other. In order for love to exist humility should also

569 See below, pp. 174-175.
be present and *vice-versa*. If humility is absent then love is also missing (215-221). If this pair is absent (ξυνωρίδος ἀπούσης, 222) then all virtues (ἀρετῶν ἀπαν σύστημα, 222) would never have existed in man, since if the beginning and the end are absent then what is between them cannot be truthful. When love is absent humility is also missing. If this union (συζυγίας, 225) does not exist in us then none of the virtues can exist, he repeats, and in their absence what is thought to be done with virtue does not at all partake of virtue (222-228).

[4b] Having established his views on the importance of humility and its relation to love, Manuel carries on to analyse further love with relation to God. The blessed love (μακαρίαν ἀγάπην, 229) is a firm foundation and a secure basis supporting the rock of Christ (πέτρας αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ, 230), the root of all the goods, penetrating in great depths and reaching heights unsearchable by human beings. Humility is indeed very close to God, to the extent that He is called love per se (αὐτοαγάπην, 232). Love appears to be the gathering of all virtues (ἀρετῶν ἄθροισμα, 233) and while the other virtues are linked to one another they all depend upon love. Thus in order for everything to be appropriate, whatever is greatest, best, most beautiful, honoured and holy, should be gathered and be brought forth to love. All virtuous things are attached to love and anything that is even partly good cannot be such if it does not reach the summit of humility (232-239). Humility is the sum (κεφάλαιον, 239) of all that is good and nothing is more humble than the measure of moderation (μετριότητος μέγεθος, 240) and honour and the height of love. Humility is a proven treasure-store for all the goods gathered from the seeding of love (242). Either way, Manuel declares, humility is excellent: ‘if we consider its ends nothing would be better than it, or if we were to use it until the end it would never have failed its cause’. Humility itself is virtuous, peaceful and most gentle with characteristics attributed to God (243-246). [4c] It is virtuous, he explains, for many other reasons due to which it is considered and it truly is the treasure-store of all the other goods, since without humility, it would be completely impossible for man to remain good or even to become good in the first place (247-249). It provides us the good since it lifts us quickly towards the peaceful and gentle Guardian and Despot (εἰρηνικώτατον καὶ πραότατον κηδεμόνα τε καὶ δεσπότην, 250-251). The greatest proof of humility is that God, by bringing it to a marvelous

---

570 Cf. Climacus, Scala, col. 997.6 (ch. 25): Ἡ ἱερὰ ξυνωρίς, ἀγάπη καὶ ταπείνωσις. 
point, motivated by enormous love, has lifted us up from the gulf of the earth to
heaven through the incarnation and sacrifice of Christ and nothing is more blessed
than this. Citing Paul, *I give my body to be burned, and have not love, it pro-
fileth me nothing* (1 Corinthians 13:3), Manuel stresses the importance of humility adding that the
Saviour has taught us to be humble by deed rather than by word. Paraphrasing Luke
(17:10), he states that he is an *unprofitable servant* even when he is found to have
fulfilled all His commandments. The use of the epithets ‘guardian’ and ‘despot’ (250-
251) appear in *mirrors of princes*571 with relation to the emperor’s duty to be such
towards his subjects, faithfully following the Lord’s commandments (πληρῶν καὶ
πάντα τὰ ἐκείνου προστάγματα, 258), while the use of the word ‘servant’ serves as a
reminder of his relation to God and his mortal nature572, and hence his need to always
strive to reach humility (255-258).

[4d] Using beautiful metaphors Manuel describes the importance of love and humility.
Love is the mother, he says, the nurse, the root, the foundation, the beginning of the
formation of virtues, and the creator and coach of all those who pursue virtue.
Without love nothing of those that are useful for our souls can be done (261-264).
Similarly, humility resembles a road and its end, a pillar and a castle (265) of all the
other goods. It is the peak of virtues, the harbour of salvation and the place where we
find security (264-269). This pair (love and humility) exists in balance (269). For, if love
was absent nothing virtuous would have taken place and similarly if humility was
absent nothing good resulting from love would have been preserved in us but would
have departed straightaway. The absence of love and humility resembles winter
flowers (272) which lack brilliance and scent, whose untimely fruit fades before it
reaches perfection, becomes formless and is unable to last (272-274)573.

[5a] This pair ascends man to the Kingdom of Heaven (cf. Psalms 54:7). ‘They seem to
me similar to the *wings of the good dove*, that is the Spirit, with which David has wished
to *fly away and be at rest*’ (277-278), Manuel exclaims, adding that ‘perhaps some will
think that we do not place fear (φόβον) before love’ (278-279). Fear is a passion, he
continues, which cannot be praised even though it cooperates with the best part of our

571 See above, p. 62 with n. 281-282.
soul and arises from God. Thus, fear cannot be included among the virtues and therefore it is hardly appropriate to expound on it here (286-292), he says. Thus he gives a short analysis of the concept of the ‘fear of punishment’ (κολάσεως φόβου, 281) shared by the the (unnamed) Fathers (θείοι διδάσκαλοι, 280). According to them pious men begin to rise up towards virtue and are initially moved towards it because of this ‘fear’, marching through other thoughts arrive to the admirable love of the future pleasures and placing their fear in it they reach the love for God. For fear cannot exist in both (love for future pleasures and love for God) but it is necessary for the one to withdraw when the other is about to be present. The idea that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge (Proverbs 1:7) has been commented upon by many Fathers (280). For example, John Climacus (7th c.) states that when fear enters the soul love begins\(^\text{574}\). According to Symeon the New Theologian (10th c.) God’s grace is given and becomes visible to those who have fear through faith\(^\text{575}\); he who has true faith has also true fear of God and because of that fear he follows His commandments, whereas he who is not afraid of God is senseless; and by fearing God one may reach the love of God\(^\text{576}\). Maximus the Confessor considers this fear to be the motive for the formation of virtues for it is the initial motive in our struggle against passions, and in the beginning of the path towards God fear exists from our awareness of the sin\(^\text{577}\). According to these views, at a preliminary stage man is still a slave of passions without, however, rejecting God, since a precondition for the arising of this kind of fear is our acceptance of the faith. He who believes has fear. Fear brings humility and humility brings calmness. Thus, this ‘fear’ should be rather interpreted as anxiety not to fall from God’s grace and be deprived of His love. It seems that such ideas are echoed in Manuel’s views, which, as he points out, he chose not to elaborate (287-292).

[5b] After this parenthesis Manuel returns to the discussion of virtues and their link with love and humility. God joins man in his struggle to reach virtue. For this reason He should be a partaker of those pains if man wishes to achieve something. God holds all the other virtues, beginning from love, together with humility, which is necessary if

\(^{574}\) Ibid., cols. 1088.26-30, 1092.26-29 (ch. 26).

\(^{575}\) Symeon New Theologian, Ethical Orations, 10.104-110, p. 266.


one wishes to be truly virtuous and preserve his virtues. In addition, God, Who is virtuous, accepts and preserves the uncorrupted crowns of victory (στεφάνους ἀφθάρτους, 298) on the heads of virtuous men who are gratified by love. These crowns are plaited by all other virtues (αἱ δὲ ἀλλαὶ ἄρεται τούτους πλέκουσι, 299), while (the personified) moderation places them on the heads of those who are worthy. Hence, the only virtue that can offer the crowns is moderation which is expressed as follows: ‘to perform exaltations but have completely modest thoughts, and perform great actions without being at all arrogant, following a road that leads to the heights while you think you lay down’ (301-303). Clarifying his thoughts Manuel states that it is not modesty to be unaware that one is doing what is virtuous but to know very well what is virtuous in order to understand that virtues are superior to our own works (303-305). He considers as humble the one who does not perform petty or lamentable actions but wishes to ‘bend down the head’ (κάτω που κύπτειν, 306) and not be arrogant. On the other hand he who is arrogant is insane. Referring to προαίρεσις Manuel stresses that there is nothing moderate or virtuous in doing the virtuous without knowing it with precision or without having pure προαίρεσις, since what is done in complete ignorance is done per force (cf. III [7b-c]). In this sense, προαίρεσις is considered here as the factor that distinguishes humility and arrogance (cf. 381-391, 414-444).

[6a] Addressing his son and imaginary reader (ὦ φίλτατε, 312), Manuel initiates a fictitious dialogue declaring that they should be in agreement with his opinion of the necessity for humility to be admired. He then justifies his decision to further discuss the matter. Emphasising his personal effort to become ‘a manic lover’ (μανικώτατον ἐραστήν, 315-316; cf. 121, 133) of humility, he refers to the necessity of humility in order for someone to reach completion emphasizing that it is crucial to discuss also the ways (τρόπους, 317) through which one would benefit from humility (313-318; [7a]). Before doing so Manuel continues to speak of the difficulties involved in search of humility, which he considers a difficult task (δυσπόριστος κομιδή, 318), even for those who have great desire to pursue it, since what is loved and sought after does not necessarily follow and is not always provided to the lovers, while many of the things sought after cannot be easily found, while they are sometimes given to those who have not struggled for them at all. Particularly when it comes to the most beautiful things,
he remarks, these are difficult to be achieved. It is for these reasons, Manuel states, that he considers it his duty towards his son (323) to speak of the means through which humility can be achieved.

[6b] Addressing again his son (and his reader) (ὦ ἵκηθε, 325), Manuel demonstrates his confidence that what is appropriate will be found and what he desires for him and for everyone else will be achieved. Stressing again the difficulties involved in the discussion of humility (cf. [1b]), Manuel states that ‘wishing to avoid satiety’ he will limit himself (327-328). To support his views he makes use of John Climacus’ ideas, whom he characterises as a great man, not one of Christ’s disciples (328-329), as he says to avoid confusion with John the Evangelist, whom he quotes several times throughout the text of the Orations. Manuel stresses his intention to only present John Climacus’ thoughts without quoting him (330-331). According to John, arrogance is thorny (τριβόλῳ ἐοικέναι τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν, 329). If one performs a good deed arrogance will follow if he attempts to exalt the deed with applause; and even if arrogance is driven away from the beginning, even if it is defeated many times, it returns worse as it is extremely crafty. It enters secretly and quietly seeds its weed (ζιζάνιον, 338) into the souls of those who are virtuous but remain satisfied by their actions and seek nothing more. When this ‘weed’ exists in the soul it carries along the illness of arrogance. Now, if the one who suffers does not realise that he is ill then he will not seek to be cured, and he who suffers from arrogance will consider that there is nothing worse than being humble (325-343). [6c] Asserting further his thoughts on the ‘thorny arrogance’, Manuel adds that even if someone humbles himself he is still considered arrogant if he has awareness of his disgrace but not of his pride. When one realises his arrogance from the very beginning and scares it away hating it profoundly, blaming himself for his arrogance and at the same time praising himself because he has managed to defeat it, then this man cannot be considered humble. Nothing beneficial arises from this kind of behaviour. Having reached his starting point (ὅθεν ἠρξάμην ὡσπερ ἐν κύκλῳ κατήντηκα, 347-348), Manuel repeats that arrogance is thorny (348; cf. 329) having a steep sting (κέντρον ὄρθιον, 348)579 difficult to avoid even by those who are very sensible. Referring to his personal experience, without however

578 Climacus, Scala, col. 949.35-36 (ch. 22): ‘τὴν τρίβολον, ὄρθον τὸ κέντρον ἵσταται’.
579 Cf. ibid., col. 949.35-36 (ch. 22).
mentioning details, Manuel says that to prove his point he could have brought forth many witnesses who have experienced the sting of arrogance (349-351). It becomes clear, Manuel concludes, that humility is wealth (πλοῦτον, 352) difficult to be found even by virtuous men. These views should not be considered as being ‘constructed’ (οὐ κατασκευαστέον, 351) to simply support the argument, in other words invented by the author to serve the aim of the text, but should be considered truthful. Manuel then summarises his previous thoughts and advises that one should act virtuously but avoid thinking greatly of his actions, and while having moderate thoughts he should not become arrogant (351-355).

[7a] Having explained the difficulties involved in the pursuit of humility, Manuel continues to speak of the appropriate and the inappropriate way one should pursue humility. ‘It seems to me’, he says, ‘that there is only one way to rise up to humility’, that is, to consider God and His good deeds (356-357), for it does not depend on one’s self to record the character of these deeds and rule over this passion. Stressing the conclusions of the Oration (ὁ λόγος ἤδη διδάξας ἔφθη, 360) Manuel states that self-proclaiming humility is indeed the cause of arrogance. To illustrate this he introduces an idea which he attributes to John Chrysostom (χρυσορρήμονα, 361), namely that arrogance is extremely evil, to the point that ‘it is clearly better not to do anything good for which you will be judged than to succeed something and consider yourself superior’ (361-363)580. Returning to his previous statement (cf. 356-357), Manuel says that one can be purified from every wandering by standing far from the reach of the dangerous arrows which the resourceful arrogance throws against us. He who considers these true will not be deceived or set himself in danger.

The provider of all that is good is God and people receive what is good from Him (367-369), for Christ said, without Me ye can do nothing (John 15:5). [7b] His words are enough to prove the truth, Manuel affirms, and therefore there is no need to use arguments and examples to present our thoughts or seek advocates to confirm their truthfulness. For where God, ‘truth itself’ (αὐτοαλήθεια, 375), is present, it is blasphemous to attempt to defend His words. This statement releases Manuel from extending his Oration to explain fundamental and familiar Christian ideas and principles. Still,

pointing out that he will examine the view that resulted from the previous thoughts in a few words (379-380), Manuel poses a rhetorical question: ‘Who does not know that what belongs to man is not good and what belongs to God is good?’ What belongs to man, he explains, stands for what lacks an inclination to God and what belongs to God is provided by Him for our contentment. To be abandoned and to experience His rage is the result of our own behaviour and not the work of God (380-383; cf. VI 129-133, [6a], [8a]). Citing from the Epistle of ‘the brother of God’ (Ἀδελφόθεον, 384), He cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth He any man (James 1:13), Manuel proceeds to speak of the division between human and divine affairs (cf. VI [2c, 5e, 6b, 6e]). God is by nature good towards man, while acting wickedly is a human characteristic and results from προαίρεσις. Having established God’s superiority, Manuel returns to the central matter. Therefore, it is evident, he suggests, that it is more preferable and extremely virtuous to perform good deeds with humility. It also seems good, he continues, when one achieves virtuous things not to become arrogant. No man should ever think himself highly or superior towards his fellow man, or be high-minded, for he Who makes everything possible for us is God581 (383-391).

[7c] Then a dialogue begins with a question posed by Manuel’s fictitious interlocutor: ‘What does He contribute to our own?’ (392). ‘My good friend’ (ὦ τᾶν, 393), Manuel responds citing from the Scripture, ‘he contributes, since you do not have that thou didst not receive’ (1 Corinthians 4:7), since all things are of God, for it is He who worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure (Philippians 2:13). For in Him we live, and move, and have our being (Acts 17:28). Manuel carries on analysing the citations. He suggests that on the whole the souls, bodies and actions which aim towards God and everything that is useful are given to man by God. Thus, what is given and what is desired to be gained, exists in us because of God (θεότετον ἡμῖν, 398), Manuel remarks, referring also to Christ’s sacrifice (399-402; cf. VI 75-76, 83, 635-653). Hence, he advises, we should seek God’s grace and not care to become arrogant. All things are of God (2 Corinthians 5:18), already established above (κατός οί προσόθεν ἡμῖν ἄπεδειξαν λόγοι, 402; cf. V 44). God is the cause of everything virtuous in us, being the Creator, protector, steward and provider of all that happens to us (404-406; cf. I 377-378, 407; Ep. 43). Paraphrasing

581 Cf. Climacus, Scala, col. 968.27-34 (ch. 23).
Demosthenes (τῷ ῥήτορι, 403)\textsuperscript{582}, Manuel stresses that the cause of growth (in man) is the provider of the seed (i.e., God) (ἐίναι τῶν φύντων αἴτιον, τὸν παρασχόντα τὸ σπέρμα, 403)\textsuperscript{583}. And even those who suffer from arrogance will realise that they can achieve nothing without God.

[8a] Manuel’s interlocutor counter-argues that if one compares his own actions to those of someone else, he would understand that they are greatly different. Some actions would lead to the ge-hinnom (ἐις γέενναν, 416), the place of future judgment, while the most useful ones would rise one up to the Kingdom of Heaven, the place of everlasting joy in the blessed gathering next to the Saviour (414-417). This depends on each one’s actions (417-418). If these actions are evil he ‘shall be abased, if they are good he shall be exalted’ (cf. Matthew 23:12) (418-419). Indirectly referring to προαιρεσις, self-responsibility and judgment according to one’s virtue or wickedness, analysed in previous \textit{Orations}, the interlocutor speaks of the common human nature. He asserts Manuel’s previously presented thoughts\textsuperscript{584}, that we are all of one mixture (419-420), created by the hand of God in a single form, some resembling birds and living in the angelic city (πολιτείαν ἀγγελικὴν, 421)\textsuperscript{585}, while others crawling like snakes throwing upon people their evilness. Therefore, some people are evil while others are virtuous and do not act in a similar way. Hence, they cannot all be considered to be the same. For these reasons, it seems reasonable, Manuel’s imaginary interlocutor continues, that those who gape to the evil and the lovers of good possess self-awareness and realize that due to their actions they are better or worse in comparison to one another, and that some of them are humble while others are arrogant (419-428).

[8b] In response Manuel says that he agrees with most of what was said (429-430) and proceeds to indicate the points of agreement and of divergence. It is clear, he states, that there is great difference in the means that some things are done in comparison to others. Indeed, the virtuous man performs good actions and similarly the base man does evil deeds. It is also true that both the virtuous and the evil man possess self-awareness and realize the result of their actions, as mentioned above (434; cf. 416-417).

\textsuperscript{582} See above, pp. 36-37.
\textsuperscript{583} See above, p. 87 n. 390.
\textsuperscript{584} Cf. e.g., \textit{Oration II} [1a-b], VI 295-298.
\textsuperscript{585} In patristic thought, the phrase angelic city is used in reference to the monastic life, since monks strive to imitate the angels and set themselves free of every sin. See Lampe, \textit{Lexicon}, lemma ἀγγελικός, p. 9, lemma πολιτεία, p. 1113.
Undoubtedly, arrogance and humility depend on our awareness of our virtue or evil (cf. 425-428). However, if we accept this view, Manuel remarks, it would be impossible to trace humility in any human being (434-438), for everyone has self-awareness but humility or arrogance do not result from it, for if it did then all virtuous men who possess this awareness would classify themselves as modest, thus loosing completely their humility and becoming arrogant (439-442). ‘And yet’, Manuel continues, ‘you are aware that the humble and the modest can be found among mortal men who have proven that they belong to the Kingdom of Heaven’ (442-444), referring to holy men. [8c] Dismissing his interlocutor’s conclusion as ‘false and completely out of place’ (445), Manuel repeats that even if Hell comes upon those who are wicked from the beginning, those who live in virtue and are aware of this would not necessarily be humble, and for this reason it is possible to consider them also evil since they will not possess humility or something else that would be able to save their soul (445-449). If humility was not such (cf. [8a]), no human being would have been possibly saved, which is not true if one considers that many have been so ‘their number surpassing that of the stars’ (449-452; cf. 442-444). Therefore, the conclusion of Manuel’s interlocutor ([8a]) is absurd (ἀτοπον, 455; cf. 445).

[9a] Bringing the discussion to an end, Manuel lowers his tone. He directly addresses his son (φίλατατε, 463) warning him that if ever one of those close to him considered that he is beloved by God he should not act similarly but he should be humble and grief for men who act in this way. Contrary to those who live carelessly and negligently, Manuel stresses, he who is virtuous should not be high-minded (μὴ υψηλοφρόνει, 466), for his superiority should not result from the baseness of others but simply from his own actions (463-467). Manuel carries on to provide examples in support of this view, pointing out that this is evident in this case (467-468). The reward of men who are victorious comes not from the failure of others but from their own achievements. Thus, it seems inappropriate to compare those who like athletes have stripped off arrogance (ὑπερηφανίαν ἀπεδύσαντο, 470) with the others. The former are like champions crowned with an olive-branch wreath (τὸ γέρας κότινος, 471), for their wrestle is against flesh and blood (Ephesian 6:12). It is natural, Manuel concludes, that those champions of humility are superior to the rest. Those who fight against the principalities and the powers <of the darkness> (Luke 12:11; Colossians 2:15; Ephesians
6:12) are simply incomparable. [9b] These powers are sent to destroy us, fighting and striking from the unseen so that they make us compete against them, waging war against us. Even if they appear better in the struggles against one another our prize is brilliance and immortality while theirs is ‘hell and darkness and the outer fire’ (γέεννα, καὶ σκότος, καὶ πῦρ ἔξωτερον, 491). Their struggle is not spiritual, it is not a fight for temperance (οὐσφροσύνης, 492), humility and the alike. Therefore, virtuous men should not consider these evil powers worthy rivals, for instead of fighting one another as rivals do, they often work together with all their force.

[9c] Returning to the simile of the athletes (cf. 471-475), Manuel remarks that it is not reasonable to determine the excellent athlete by comparing the spiritual works of others. He then carries on to speak about the judges of the contests and the contestants (ἄγωνοθέτας, καὶ ἄγωνιζομένους, 500-501), and those who are just judges both to themselves and to the others. It is proper, he says, that the judges of the athletes are not themselves contestants but they sit on the throne and signal the beginning of the competition. ‘When you think’, he says, ‘that you are good enough to have both roles (that of the athlete and judge of the contest), and become self-appointed judge of the contest, then you compete against the one who has not stripped off <arrogance> (οὐκ ἀποδυσάμενον); and you exalt yourself placing the crown of victory on your head with your own hands’, which is a shameful act. [9d] No one should consider himself worthy of setting the straight path and of crowning the souls of his fellow men, for this belongs solely to God, the Judge (Κριτῆς, 510) of the struggles of the flesh, Who understands everything with accuracy and knows precisely who among those who struggle are worthy to be saved. Presenting some thoughts regarding the authority to judge, analysed in detail in the previous Oration VI, Manuel argues that he who shares this belief (God being the only true judge) will be lifted up to the throne of the Judge (θρόνον ἀναβιβάσει, 513), for in the spiritual and the invisible competition the only judge is the Saviour, which is self-evident (τυφλῷ γὰρ δῆλον, 515). Thus, it is proper to attribute the power and authority to judge only to the Saviour and not to compare ourselves to the others. Summarizing his views, Manuel repeats the central idea of the Oration: no one should be high-minded (ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, 519), even if he attains virtue. The subject of divine judgement, the warnings against judging oneself and pre-judging fellow human beings [9a-d], serves also the political function of the text expressing the
appropriate behaviour of the emperor at the same time reminding his dependence from God.

[10] Closing the Oration Manuel addresses his potential critics (cf. 71-73), stating that great men should not ridicule others (καταγελάτωσαν, 523) and should not consider themselves to be virtuous, for they know that He that judgeth me is the Lord (1 Corinthians 4:4). He who sits on the imperial throne, namely our Saviour, Manuel concludes, is the Judge who places the crown of victory to the excellent men. Turning to his co-emperor and son (συμβασιλεύ τε καὶ παῖ, 528) Manuel affirms that Christ will place the crown of (spiritual victory) on his head both here on earth, possibly referring to his future crowning as sole Emperor by the Patriarch, and in heaven with reference to John’s moral qualities.

Admonitions concerning the necessity for the emperor to seek humility and moderation and avoid arrogance in association with his human corruptible nature and the obedience owed to God is a standard theme in mirrors of princes. However, Manuel’s Oration VII is unique in terms of the depth and extent to which he examines these in comparison to the Precepts, his Dialogue VI and the Letter to Alexium Iagoup (pp. 355-358). In the latter work Manuel uses the word ταπείνωσις (p. 355.11-12; cf. VII 17-20) and μετριότης (cf. VII 129) instead of ταπεινοφροσύνη (p. 355.15-356.12; cf. [8a-9d]).

Manuel stresses the necessity for an emperor to avoid arrogance in his Precepts, where he suggests that the emperor should not exalt himself and consider himself superior because of his authority, since in this way he will be hated by his subjects and become

---

586 See above, p. 52.
588 Cf. Agapetos, 13-14, p. 34, 21, p. 38, 33, p. 46, 71, p. 76; Ps-Basil, 14, p. 54; Blemmydes, 95-104, pp. 72-76; Magistros, 449C-D (ch. 2).
589 Manuel II, Dialogues, VI 68-69.
590 Cf. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. 426-427.
an enemy to God (ch. 77, 368C-D), and that he should remember that his authority and all graces are granted to him by God, and therefore he should seek to be distinguished for his humility always bearing in mind his mortal human nature (ch. 7, 324B-C; cf. VII 255-258, 419-420). Similarly, the view that God achieves everything for us and we achieve everything with His help (VII 203-210, [5b], [7b]), appears in both texts as a reminder of the emperor’s averting of arrogance (ch. 13, 328A-B, ch. 29, 337C-D). In addition, Manuel’s warning that the emperor should not be arrogant and judge himself worthy of his crown, accepting the praising of others, as analysed extensively in Oration VII [8a-9d], reminds of similar ideas in the Precepts (ch. 77, 368C-D). The idea of the superiority and equal value of the virtues of humility and love [3d-4c], is also shared by the two works, both of which use the Pauline dictum but have not love, it profiteth me nothing (1 Corinthians 13:3) (ch. 73, 365B-C; VII 256). The fact that both the Orations (cf. VII 1-4) and the Precepts591 culminate, and close, with the subject of humility, is indicative of its significance for Manuel.

John of Climacus (328-331) is clearly identified by Manuel as one of his sources for the subject of humility. Apart from using similar phraseology (τρίβολός ἐστιν αὕτη, καὶ τὸ κέντρον ὀρθον ἔχει, 348, cf. 329), there are also other similarities with John’s Scala Paradisi including Chapter 22, On the multiform vanity (Περὶ τῆς πολυμόρφου κενοδοξίας592), Chapter 25, On humility (Περὶ τῆς τῶν παθῶν ἀπωλείας τῆς υψίστου ταπεινοφροσύνης593) and Chapter 23, On arrogance (Περὶ τῆς ἀκεφάλου ὑπερηφανίας594). Love is also praised by John as the most important of all virtues in the last Chapter (Περὶ τοῦ συνδέσμου τῆς ἐναρέτου τριάδος ἐν ἄρεταις595), though no similarity is evident between his and Manuel’s treatment of this subject. Further research on the vast literature on the subject among Christian writers would possibly reveal additional sources that Manuel may have consulted.

591 Manuel II, Precepts, 384C-D (ch. 100)
592 Climacus, Scala, cols. 948D-957A.
593 Ibid., cols. 988A-1004B.
594 Ibid., cols. 965B-972A.
595 Ibid., cols. 1153D-1161A.
Epistolary Epilogue

The Seven Orations close with an Epistolary Epilogue (Ἐπίλογος ἐπιστολιμαῖος). As it has already been noted, the Orations are not introduced by a preface but by Oration I entitled Hortatory to the reasoned arguments. The Epistolary Epilogue to the Orations appears as Letter 53 (νγ') in Par. gr. 3041 (P), Manuel’s codex comprising the complete collection of his letters⁵⁹⁶. The Epistolary Epilogue does not provide a summary of the ideas presented in the Seven Orations, but instead emphasizes the aim of the work (repeated throughout the Orations) namely to benefit John VIII (2), and offer advice that would contribute to his moral education (7-8). At the same time Manuel stresses the motive for the composition of his Orations, that is his love for his son (1-2; cf. VII [1c]). Contrary to the Orations this time Manuel makes no mention of his audience but addresses solely his son. In my view, the reason for this is not that the Epistolary Epilogue is written in the form of a letter addressed only to its recipient, for as it has already been reported, letters were also intended to be orally delivered, and references to the θέατρον can be found in several of Manuel’s letters⁵⁹⁸. It seems that by addressing the Epistolary Epilogue solely to his son Manuel made clear one of his main, yet undeclared, aims of the text, that is, to demonstrate the legitimate succession to the throne by his son John VIII⁵⁹⁹.

Though the Emperor was also in the habit of writing lengthy letters as it becomes evident from his published correspondence⁶⁰⁰, the Epistolary Epilogue is concise. It comprises an introduction presenting its aim and justifying its composition [1], followed by the main part consisting of a praise of John’s qualities and direct advice [2a-b] as well as comparisons to Scriptural exempla [3a-b], and finally concludes with an exaltation of fatherhood and a proclamation of John’s virtue and Manuel’s happiness [4].

In order to emphasise John’s virtue and at the same time his own authority as father and emperor, Manuel uses the method of juxtaposition, as he did in Orations I and II. This time he chooses Scriptural examples, the Pharisees and the scribes and more

---

⁵⁹⁷ See below, pp. 224-226.
⁵⁹⁸ See above, pp. 43-45.
⁵⁹⁹ See above, pp. 32-33.
importantly Moses, and their relation to God. Manuel offers direct admonitions to his son, as befits the advisory character of the *Epistolary Epilogue*, with some statements entailing the preventive element and others expressing positive advice and encouragement.\(^{601}\)

[1] Manuel introduces the *Epistolary Epilogue* with a general remark concerning the previously discussed matters and straightaway reminds his son (ὦ φίλτατε, 1) of the aim of his entire text, namely to offer something graceful intending to persuade and benefit him (1-2)\(^{602}\). The *Epistolary Epilogue*’s introduction bears great similarity to the introductory paragraphs of *Oration VII* [1a-e]. Manuel specifies his motive for the composition of the text, that is, his enormous love (φίλτρον ὑπερφυές, 1-2) for his son (cf. *VII* 35-37)\(^{603}\). If his love was not so great, he stresses, he would not have undertaken this work, this ‘struggle’ (ἀγώνα, 3; cf. *V* 12-13, *VII* 26), nor would his zeal have lasted until the end. On the contrary, he says, he would have turned away from the composition from the very beginning since the affairs of the State were often very pressing, or he would have stopped the composition in the middle since many dreadful things, which he does not specify, appeared one after the other. These statements enhance the importance of Manuel’s undertaking, which reached completion despite the circumstances. Similar statements concerning Manuel’s preoccupation with his official duties and the disruption of the writing process are present also in the *Precepts*\(^{604}\) and in his letter (44) addressed to Demetrius Chrysoloras\(^{605}\), where Manuel alludes to external and internal difficulties he was facing at the time.

Repeating once more his aim (cf. 1-2), namely to contribute to his son’s moral character (ἠθῶν σου διακόσμησιν, 8) Manuel encourages John not to dishonour his counsels (8-9) both for his own benefit and for proving them worthy of his father’s labour (6-7). Manuel advises John to honour his parents and his ancestors as well as his own self and his educators (9-10). He should try to prove that his teachers’ hopes for him are

---

\(^{601}\) Cf. e.g., οὐκ ἀτιμάσαι βουλεύσαιο (8-9), τιμήσαις (9), ὑποτετάχθαι θελήσαις, καὶ δείξαις ἔργοις αὑτοῖς (19), μὴ κατασχίσῃς μου τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὰς παραινέσεις (20-21), μὴ δὴ τηνάλλως ἡμᾶς ἀποφήναις, τοὺς ὑπὲρ σοῦ λόγους τούτους ἀναλωκότας (27-28).

\(^{602}\) Cf. *Oration III* 120, IV 3-4, *VII* [1a, 1c]: Manuel II, *Precepts*, 313B.

\(^{603}\) Cf. Manuel II, *Precepts*, 316D.

\(^{604}\) Ibid., 316A.

\(^{605}\) Ed. Dennis, *Letters*, pp. 116-121.
well founded. Indeed, from an early age, Manuel continues, when John was still a child playing (12), his teachers had foreseen his excellence. This statement stresses John’s innate qualities and virtue, necessary for the future monarch. As already mentioned, the importance of education for an emperor is also emphasised in the Precepts (316C), underlining its moral aspect.\footnote{Cf. Oration I 291, II 106, III 332-340, IV 319, VI 393. See above, pp. 26-27.}

Manuel closes his introduction by expressing the hope that should his son follow his advice, with God’s help he would succeed in making the remaining of his life pleasant and prove his father’s efforts to educate him worthy. Entailing hope as well as assurance Manuel indirectly validates his decision for his succession by his son. The help of God in this (συναιρομένου Θεοῦ, 13) is a reminder of the divine source of imperial authority\footnote{Cf. above, p. 62 n. 280.} at the same time stressing (as in the Precepts) that the emperor can achieve happiness only if he is in proximity with God.\footnote{Manuel II, Precepts, 321D-323A (ch. 5).}

[2a] Having spoken earlier of John’s parents, ancestors and the teachers (9-10), Manuel underlines the important elements of royal ancestry, upbringing and education\footnote{Cf. Oration I 291, 314-315, III [7b]; cf. also above, p. 92 with n. 405-407.} (15-16) as preconditions for the virtuous emperor. He suggests that if these elements, along with his admonitions and everything else he has offered to his son, are properly comprehended by his son, they will be considered appropriate for him and being proven good and virtuous by his own deeds they will demonstrate that his son is worthy of his father’s expectations.\footnote{Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 317C-D.} In an attempt to stress this, Manuel makes a direct appeal towards his son: ‘in order for the appropriate to be achieved with virtue, do not disgrace my wishes and my advice’ (20-21).

[2b] Providing additional reasons in order to confirm John’s excellence and suitability for the succession to the imperial throne, Manuel highlights his confidence that John will be dear (προσφιλής, 22) both to God and to his people (22) and expresses some thoughts concerning the relation between the emperor and his subjects, a theme frequently discussed in mirrors of princes.\footnote{See above, pp. 62-65.} Though the emperor reigns over men the fact remains that he himself is a human being (βασιλεύειν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι,}
22-23), Manuel remarks. Hence the difficulty of the task (δυσχέρες, 23), which he is confident his son will easily fulfill proving his own excellence and glory (εὔκλειαν), for as he is obedient to his parents he will also be obedient to God, which will make his subjects follow him. In this way Manuel highlights the emperor’s duty to be faithful and pious and his responsibility to be virtuous in order to lead his people towards good (ἀγαθὸν)612. Otherwise, the subjects will contrive against the wicked emperor (26-27), a theme repeatedly mentioned in mirrors of princes, analysed by Manuel in the Precepts613 and in Oration I614. The Emperor then directs a request and warning to his son, expressing his concern about John’s virtue and his ability to fulfill his imperial responsibilities, asking not to prove him wrong (27) thus making him seem as if he has wasted his words, implying that it is essential for John to follow his advice. Manuel admits that himself is aware of his ‘inability’ to teach through his text (29) Thus this does not suggest that the text lacks didactic purpose, for the author’s expression of his own inadequacy was simply a rhetorical convention615.

[3a] Repeating, in the form of advice, his belief that it is not fitting for his son to disobey those that are truthful (30-31), Manuel adds that he considers it appropriate for John to follow the admonitions, also on account of his imperial office (τῷ πρὸς σὲ σχῆμα τούτῳ, 30)616, thus confirming John’s status and authority as co-emperor and at the same time safeguarding his succession to the throne.

Manuel continues stressing the importance of the matters discussed in the Orations and John’s obligation to follow his father’s advice only if he believes them to be in accordance with his father’s deeds (34-35). He gives a parallel in the parable on the abuse of authority (Matthew 23:2-12) by the ‘old scribes and the Pharisees’ (πάλαι ιερεῖς καὶ Φαρισαῖοις, 32), who were sitting on Moses’ see (Μωσέως καθέδρας, 33) and were inappropriately inconsistent with their own teachings, thus underlining the necessity for the emperor to prove his words by deeds, demonstrating in this way

612 Cf. Oration I[7a-d], II[4b].
613 Manuel II, Precepts, 352B-D (ch. 52), 373C-D (ch. 85).
616 Manuel uses the word σχῆμα to refer to the imperial office also in Oration V 11-12, and throughout his other works. Cf. e.g., Manuel II, Letters, 38.26, p. 103, 44.36-37, p. 119; idem, Funeral Oration, pp. 85.9-10, 153.17, 223.17-18; idem, Dialogue on marriage, 30, p. 62. See also Dennis, Letters, p. 4 n. 3.
truth, stability and consistency\textsuperscript{617}. With reference to Moses’ see, Manuel states that himself occupies a see from which he offers his son advice which derives from both the Old and New Testament (36-37) and are reflections of those two Testaments (the Jewish and the Christian) which are truthful. The imperial throne, Manuel continues, is superior to that of Moses, for it is the image of that of God (πὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰκονίζουσα, 39-40) ‘if it is permissible to say’ (εἰ μὴ τολμηρὸν εἰπεῖν, 40). He explains that his own authority as a father is far superior to any other\textsuperscript{618} and similar to that of God, since the father is the ruler of the child and his despot by nature as well as his creator, emperor, provider, teacher (Οὐ δημιουργός; οὐ πατής; οὐ βασιλεὺς; οὐ προνοητής; οὐ διδάσκαλος, 43), attributes associating God with man. As it has already been noted, these attributes are frequently found in mirrors of princes to denote the emperor’s relation and appropriate attitude towards his subjects\textsuperscript{619}, stressing at the same time the importance for the emperor to be an ‘imitator of God’.

[3b] Manuel continues the juxtaposition of the ‘sees’ proclaiming the superiority of his own, and thus of the imperial throne in general, on the grounds that his throne resembles that of God, a fundamental principle of Byzantine political ideology concerning the divine origin of Byzantine imperial authority and of the God-chosen emperor\textsuperscript{620}. On the contrary, he states, the scribes and the Pharisees hold the throne of Moses which is inferior to his own (45-47). To avoid criticism he adds that that his statement should not be considered as bold since his intention is not to compare himself to Moses, who was ‘seeing God’ (θεόπτην, 48), but merely the two thrones. It seems that Manuel refers to Moses’ God-given throne to stress once more the legitimate succession of his primogenitus John. As already mentioned, it is interesting that Manuel does not follow the common Byzantine tendency, especially in encomiastic works and mirrors of princes, to resemble the emperor with David\textsuperscript{621}, but rather to Moses. Comparisons to kings of the Old Testament, namely David and Solomon were used by authors of mirrors of princes in order to emphasise the divine origin of imperial authority, and the emperor’s devoutness and orthodoxy\textsuperscript{622}. A

\textsuperscript{617} Cf. above, p. 75.
\textsuperscript{618} Cf. Manuel II, Precepts, 316D-317A.
\textsuperscript{619} See above, p. 62 with n. 281-282.
\textsuperscript{620} See above, p. 178 n. 607.
\textsuperscript{621} See above, pp. 41, 115.
\textsuperscript{622} Cf. Dvornik, Political philosophy, vol. 2, pp. 644-645.
comparison with Moses was introduced for the first time by Eusebius in his Life of Constantine, where he compared Constantine I to the Prophet. It is possible that by using the example of Moses, not so much to juxtapose his qualities to his own or his son’s virtues, Manuel implies the abuse of authority by Moses’ successors, the scribes and the Pharisees, and thus give a warning to his son and the reader of the Epistolary Epilogue about the results of the possible abuse of imperial authority by illegitimate claimants of the imperial throne.

Examining this statement further, Manuel proceeds to explain that God has granted authority both to himself (the Byzantine emperor) and to Moses, who was similarly a leader and a teacher. The dominion in both cases belongs to God, which demonstrates that imperial reign is superior to hegemony, a declaration consistent also with mirrors of princes emphasizing the superiority of imperial reign as the political system approved and blessed by God. To the Byzantines the distinction between βασιλεία and ἡγεμονία lays namely in the idea that the absolute ruler, the God-chosen Byzantine emperor is characterised by virtue and φιλανθρωπία in seeking the welfare of his people and his state. This is the kind of emperor Manuel wishes for his son to become. Manuel’s declaration serves also a defense of imperial rights in a period of political and social changes, with the Byzantines gaining awareness of different
political systems, namely the Italian republics, and the Byzantine aristocracy and rich middle class increasingly gaining power\(^\text{628}\). At the same time Manuel highlights the superiority of his imperial authority possibly having in mind also the past events of the Zealot movement in Thessalonike (1342-1349)\(^\text{629}\). It should be noted that Manuel does not comment on the superiority of autocracy through juxtapositions of the ideal emperor to the tyrant, a theme on which he has elaborated in the beginning of the work (I [5]).

Having attributed the previous statement of God’s authority (51) to Peter (κατά τὸν ἀπόστολον Πέτρον, 51) (cf. 1 Peter 5:11), Manuel states that the present teachings, namely his advice to his son, are more perfect than the Mosaic Law (Νόμον, 53), since they depend upon the New Testament (Νέας Διαθήκης, 53) which completed the Old Law (52-53). For this reason, he concludes, imperial authority is much more prominent than the one of the scribes and the Pharisees over the people of Judea, and superior to the prominence Moses has granted to them. Manuel’s paternal and imperial relation with his son (τὸ πρὸς σέ μου σχῆμα, 53-54), stresses yet again John’s legitimate succession. As Moses passed on his authority to the scribes and the Pharisees and God did the same to the Byzantine emperor, so does Manuel to his son and successor.

Discussing paternal authority, Manuel states that even though Moses was a prophet still, as a human being, it was inevitable to fall in a multitude of faults, since he was not speaking to his sons in order to persuade them but was merely a prophet and he performed miracles. The authority of fatherhood is much more firm than prophecy, Manuel remarks, for prophecy often proved unsuccessful while fatherhood has never failed (56-60). Similarly, in his attempt to excel fatherhood over prophecy in the Precepts, Manuel makes use of examples from ancient Greek mythology, speaking of the oracles of Teiresias and Kalchas\(^\text{630}\). Moreover, Manuel argues, though probably children rarely disobey their father, if they do so these are irrational people who also lack good manners (61-62). Manuel is confident that his son is not such a person but, as


\(^{629}\) For an analysis of the events in relation to the significance of safeguarding the imperial regime, see Nicol, Church and society, pp. 20-29. For the events see Nicol, Last Centuries, pp. 194-235; J.W. Barker, ‘Late Byzantine Thessalonike: A Second City’s challenges and responses’, DOP 57 (2003), 5-33.

\(^{630}\) Manuel II, Precepts, 316D.
he has foreseen, he is excellent and worthy to reign. That John is a sensible man  
(νουνεχής τε γάρ ἄνηγ, 63) is clear from the reverence and affection he has shown to  
his parents. Indeed, John is described in the contemporary sources as being an  
obedient son having a close relation with his parents, especially with his mother631.

Closing his Epistolary Epilogue Manuel emphasizes the importance of experience over  
merely examining thoughts, for in this way we understand things better. It is  
impossible for one who has not yet become a father to be precisely aware of the  
greatness of fatherhood (65-67). Turning to John he expresses his hope and desire for  
his son to experience fatherhood632, God permitting, and understand how important a  
father is to his children (67-69). Manuel’s hopes were never materialized. John’s first  
wife, Anna of Moscow, died in 1417633, while his second marriage to Sophia of  
Montferrat ended sometime in 1426634, and similarly to the first his third wife Maria  
Comnena died in 1440635, with none of the three offering him a child and heir to the  
throne636.

In his final statement (69-72) Manuel offers a summary of his Epistolary Epilogue. He  
proclaims that everyone should consider him happy on account of his fatherhood and  
especially because he is the father of a virtuous son. Once more Manuel emphasizes  
John’s excellence as successor to the throne, stating that being good and virtuous by  
birth and having received good education his son would prove to be a good emperor  
(70-71). Manuel’s statement underlines the fulfillment of his own role as a father, who  
gave birth, educated and prepared his son for the throne through his own example and  
his admonitions. In this way, Manuel highlights the significance of this work which is  
linked with the future of the Empire for it prepares the future emperor. The Epistolary  
Epilogue further justifies the ethico-political nature of the text discussing elements of  
moral nature linked with imperial authority, offered by a father to his son and  

632 Cf. Manuel II, Dialogue on marriage, 894-956, pp. 110, 112. The necessity for the Emperor to have  
children in order to secure his throne is one of the arguments the Empress-Mother brings forth in the  
Dialogue.
633 CBB I, 97.4, p. 639; Sphrantzes, Chronicon, V 2, p. 12; Ducas, Historia, XX 3.3-7 (ed. Grecu, p. 135; ed.  
Bekker, p. 98).
634 Sphrantzes, Chronicon, XIV 2, p. 30; Ducas, Historia, XX 6 (ed. Grecu, pp. 137-139; ed. Bekker, pp. 99-  
635 CBB I, 97.8 p. 640, 98a.12, p. 645; Sphrantzes, Chronicon, XXV 3, p. 86; Ducas, Historia, XXXI 7, (ed.  
636 Cf. Gill, Personalities, pp. 105-106; Nicol, Church and society, p. 54.
therefore being free of any flattery. The only elements of praise are those which, according to Manuel, prove John’s virtue, a precondition for an emperor.

As it becomes evident from the analysis, several tenets of mirrors of princes can be traced in the Epistolary Epilogue, where the influence of Manuel’s Precepts is clear. Actually the Epistolary Epilogue bears distinct similarities to the Epistolary Preface of the Precepts. Though no reference to specific texts is mentioned by Manuel, as it is stated in the Precepts he had studied royal speeches. For the composition of the Epistolary Epilogue it could be suggested that Manuel used Photius (Ps-Basil), Hortatory Chapters, being also an admonitory text addressed from an Emperor-father (Basil I, 867-886) to his son and heir (Leo VI, 896-912). In the Hortatory Chapters Photius takes Basil’s place as a father and addresses Leo. While discussing common themes of mirrors of princes (the divine origin of the imperial authority, the moral aspects and character of the emperor, his due behaviour towards his subjects, the choice of friends and counsels), the author stresses also his relation to the recipient of the chapters and his authority as a father and emperor (1, p. 50). He calls him a beloved child (1.5, p. 50) to whom he offers advice having also the authority of a father (47, p. 57, 50, p. 70). Similarly to Manuel, he asks from his son not to disgrace him thus proving that he has struggled in vain (2.20-22, p. 50) but to show respect towards him and confirm his virtue (6, p. 52).

Of interest is also Ps-Basil’s statement concerning the endowment of the royal crown (στέφανος) which God has granted to the emperor and he is now offering to his son (20, pp. 56-57), as well as his aspiration that his son will become virtuous making him happy and also his hope that Leo will become a father himself offering advice to his own children (66, p. 73). The Muses by Emperor Alexius I Comnenus (Μοῦσαι Ἀλεξιάδες Κομνηνιάδες), is another advisory text addressed from Alexius to his son John. However, no distinct similarities to Manuel’s Epistolary Epilogue can be found since it mainly comprises advice concerning military issues and events of the First

---

637 See above, pp. 30, 33-34.
640 See above, p. 31 n. 80.
Crusade. Only the first verses of the second *Muse* (II 7-18, p. 360), where Alexius expresses his hope for his son to become a worthy emperor following the paternal advice, echo Manuel’s advice. The two aforementioned works, as indeed other *royal speeches* and *mirrors of princes*, served as a repertoire of principles and ideas, from which Manuel drew for the composition of his *Orations*. 
Conclusions

The *Seven Ethico-political Orations* were composed by Manuel II as a moral testament to his son, co-emperor and successor John VIII in particular and his people in general, irrespective of one’s education, social and economic status. The aim of this lengthy work is to offer advice on how a Christian and moral way of life may lead us to true happiness, bringing us closer to God, thus fulfilling our purpose in this life. In the process the author discusses philosophical theories and theological views concerning human character and behaviour, concentrating on a number of aspects he considers of greater significance, drawing also from his own experience. Taking as a point of departure the concept of goodness and virtue (and their opposites), Manuel analyses the factors — voluntary, non-voluntary, mixed voluntary and involuntary — that shape human actions, which are motivated by pleasure and pain, emphasizing the role of man’s *προαιρεσις*, free will and self-responsibility. Human beings are created in the image of God and hence they possess the potential to attain His likeness through exercising their free will, letting themselves be guided by the moral principles of Christian love, humility and *φιλανθρωπία* (in this order). Ultimately, what shows a man’s true character is his actions. This is at the core of Manuel’s thought. Self-awareness and the acceptance of virtue as the way to perfection, is not enough. Man has to prove that he is in the right path through his actions. In this way the post-lapsarian human condition is redeemed and can fulfill its purpose, that is, to reach perfection.

Acting as successive steps each *Oration* prepares the reader for the next stage of his quest for true happiness. Starting from the basic concepts of virtue and goodness the author proceeds to analyse the nature of evil, and discusses how man can resist and defeat evil by following his true self and applying the principle of the mean in all his thoughts and actions. In this way, provided that man is prepared to forgive others and repent for his own faults and sins, which presuppose humility, he should not despair but entrust himself entirely to God’s love, providence and *φιλανθρωπία*.

These themes, their treatment and comparative approach are part-and-parcel of Byzantine moral discourses and *mirrors of princes* composed before and during this period. In this sense Manuel’s *Orations* lack originality. Drawing mainly on Aristotle,
Plato, the Scriptures, Maximus the Confessor, Nemesius, John Damascene, John Climacus, John Chrysostom and his contemporary authors, including Demetrius Cydones, Manuel produces a synthesis of their views, at the same time providing examples which help the reader to visualise the various theoretical and moral ideas. What seems to be unique in the Orations among similar texts is the extent to which the author analyses the various theories and views (especially on humility), to which he adds his own opinion and advice, and the degree of emphasis he places on προαίρεσις, a notion that permeates his thought.

The Seven Ethico-political Orations also express Manuel’s perception of the authority, duties and responsibilities of the emperor, which reflect traditional principles of Byzantine political ideology. The emperor as a human being is equal to all fellow human beings as all are created by God. What distinguishes him is his special place as the divinely appointed ruler, whose power and authority emanate from God himself. Though an autocrat, the emperor should govern his people with humanity and with their welfare in mind, for otherwise he would become a tyrant, which is contrary to all Christian principles and moral dictations. He should be, therefore, characterized by the four Platonic virtues —courage, prudence, justice, and temperance— and in addition the Christian virtues of humility and φιλανθρωπία, as well as εὐσέβεια (in the sense of orthodoxy in terms of Christian faith rather than merely piety) and generosity. In this way, the emperor becomes a benefactor to his people contributing to their moral improvement. Education is a sine qua non for the emperor, which not only enhances his self-awareness and increases his compassion for his people but also helps in controlling his own passions. Material pleasure itself is not by necessity evil, for it secures the survival of all beings and may act as an incentive for good actions and improvement in life. However, this material pleasure, unless is accompanied by moderation and virtue, can lead to destruction. Exercising good judgment and moderation man should pursue only pleasures that lead to virtue and bring true happiness. These precepts should be followed by all and especially the emperor, Manuel concludes, who acts as the model for his people.

Reading the Orations one gets a feeling of the author’s character and personality. The complex moral and philosophical paths through which Manuel guides the reader
reveal a rich inner world where moral questions are at the heart of human existence. His thought is permeated by an awareness of man’s imperfect nature, which is the reason that man often departs from his true purpose, that is, the pursuit of virtue and goodness in his search for God. The text reflects also a hopeful character, confident that despite innate or external obstacles, personal limitations and natural deficiencies, one can indeed find fulfillment in this world. Not even the Original Sin, transmitted from generation to generation, can prevent man’s redemption (IV [5b]). Manuel constantly advises us not to despair, but let ourselves free to follow our true good nature, exercising our own free will and judgment. In this effort we are not alone, for we are led by moral principles and virtuous men, who act as compasses in our journey in this life. Above all, we are in communion with God, to whom we entrust ourselves. Other aspects of Manuel’s character that find expression in the Orations are his sensitivity, his sense of honour and fairness, and above all his compassion for his fellow human beings. For Manuel forgiveness and understanding are fundamental qualities, as is education, which enhances human life, lifting up man from a state of ignorance that leads to vice and misery, to a higher state of existence.

Though no specific references to historical events are made in the Orations it seems that Manuel’s description of the behaviour of certain men who succumb to evil because of their προαίρεσις (cf. III, esp. [6c-d]) echoes his experience with his brother Andronicus IV and his nephew John VII. The examples of the arrogant tyrants Croesus, Xerxes and Gyges (I), the explicit mention of the qualities an emperor should possess (I 291, 314-315), the reference to certain noblemen who lack nobility of character (I 109-110)642, and to those self-righteous people who prefer to judge others rather than themselves (VI), hypocrites (VII) and those whose heart is full of hate for other people (IV 79-85) and in turn become hateful to their own relatives and friends (VI 427-429), all these references should be viewed in this light. Similarly, Manuel’s advice with regard to how careful the emperor should be in choosing his friends and counsels (II 57-60) and to the need for the emperor to be aware of those who obstruct his work (I 390-392) also echo to his bitter experience. Manuel’s general remark on the ever-changing nature of Fortune and
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the dependence of certain people on Τύχη rather than virtue (II [2d]), must reflect his thoughts on his own eventful life and his relation with Andronikos and his circle. One is tempted to read behind the Xerxes story (namely the fate of the great and arrogant King who ended up been hunted down) (I [3a-4e]) the defeat of Bayazid and his powerful army in Ankara (28 July 1402)\textsuperscript{643}. The same can be said with relation to Manuel’s remarks on the lack of agreement and concordance among the people in the face of danger (I [7a-7d], IV [4b]), as happened during the siege of Thessalonike in 1387\textsuperscript{644}. In addition, Manuel’s vivid and detailed descriptions of (inner) battles (IV [4b]) are most probably based on his own experience as a general (IV 176-177).

In some instances in the Orations Manuel appears to be responding to criticisms leveled against him on the grounds that he was accepting a rising class of uneducated and immoral men in his court (I 33-35, 109-110)\textsuperscript{645}, that he was personally and inappropriately intervening in ecclesiastical affairs (VI 346-349)\textsuperscript{646} and that he was neglecting his official duties in order to devote himself to his literary endeavours (VII 43-46)\textsuperscript{647}.

Above all the Orations show Manuel’s awareness of his pastoral role. Manuel uses the parable of the Lost Sheep (VI [8c]) emphasizing the fact that the shepherd did not entrust the search for the lost sheep to somebody else but he himself went out to the wilderness to search for it and save it. This parable may allude to Manuel’s journey to the West, when he became a self-appointed ambassador to solicit help from the West\textsuperscript{648}.

It is clear that the Orations, together with the Precepts, send a strong political message to Manuel’s opponents, propagating the legitimacy of his son and successor to the throne, in an attempt to secure the unity of the Empire after a period of civil war. Despite the similar aim and subject matter of these two works, the Orations have a more

\textsuperscript{643} For the events of the battle of Ankara see Barker, Manuel II, pp. 200-216.

\textsuperscript{644} See above, p. 22 n. 5.


\textsuperscript{646} See above, p. 23 n. 9.

\textsuperscript{647} Cf. Mazaris, Journey to Hades, p. 56.22-25. Similarly, Manuel responds to criticisms concerning his engagement with theological studies in his Letter to Alexius lagoup and his Letter to Asanes (Dennis no. 31, pp. 75-79). See Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. vii-viii, 420-424.

\textsuperscript{648} See above, p. 23 with n. 10-12.
philosophical approach, serving as the ethico-political testament of the Emperor. As all writings in every period of human history the *Orations* reflect not only their author but also the world in which he lives and operates. In this sense the *Orations* reveal the fears, anxieties, hopes and ideals of Byzantine society in a critical period, when the very survival of the Empire was at stake with the Ottoman armies *ante portas* and the additional pressures of the internal rivalries. Facing these realities Manuel asks the essential questions about man and the world, and the true meaning of life. In the process he introspects and explores the enduring elements in human nature that makes life worth living. In this sense Manuel’s *Seven Ethico-political Orations* were as appealing and useful in fifteenth-century Byzantium as indeed they are for us today!
Part II: The manuscript tradition

Description of the extant manuscripts

The complete text of the Seven Orations is preserved in three MSS dated between the fifteenth and sixteenth century: Vindobonensis philologicus graecus 42 (ff. 41-138v) (B), Vindobonensis philologicus graecus 98 (ff. 31-106) (I), Vaticanus graecus 632 (ff. 255v-335) (V). The sixteenth-century codex Monacensis graecus 411 (ff. 152-203v) (M) transmits only Orations I-V. Short sections of the text survive in two fifteenth-century codices: Vaticanus graecus 266 (ff. 240rv) (Va) and Parisinus graecus 3041 (ff. 33-34v) (P). The text was first published by Johannes Leunclavius (=Löwenclau) (L) and was reprinted in the Patrologia Graeca vol. 156 (PG). All MSS and printed editions are described palaeographically and codicologically in some detail, before their relations are examined and a stemma codicum is constructed on the basis of a palaeographical and textual examination of the text.

B  Vindobonensis Philologicus graecus 42 (examined through microfilm)\(^{649}\).

15\(^{th}\) century; parchment (ff. 43-48v, 105-112v); 16\(^{th}\) century; paper (ff. <I> + 1-42v, 49-104v, 113-153 + <II>; blank ff. 40/1-40/2, 84/1); 305/308x210mm; 1 (20-22)

Contents: The codex contains exclusively works by Manuel II Palaeologus.

1. (ff. 1v-2v) Table of contents\(^{650}\):

+ βιβλίον παραινετ(ικόν). τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου | καὶ φιλοχρίστου μανουὴλ τοῦ παλαιολόγου, πρὸς τ(όν) ἐρασμιώτατον υἱόν | αὐτοῦ κ(αί) βασιλέα, ἰωάννην τὸν παλαιολόγον· ἐν ὦ περὶ ἐξεκπεράτωσα τάδε·

Επίστολη προοιμιακή, τῶν ἐφεξῆς κεφαλαίων, ἢ ἀρχ(ῆ) | ἐν πελοποννήσῳ σε λοιπάντων· Κεφάλαια ἐκατ(ὸν), ἢ ἀρχ(ῆ), πίοι τοῖς ἀν(θρώποις) διάφοροι λόγος προσεπτ(ικός) εἰς Λόγους· καὶ περὶ ἀρετῆς κ(αί) ἀγαθοῦ ἀρ(χ) ὄσιος, ἢ ἀρχ(ῆ) Τοῦ καλ(ῶς) ἑπίστασθαι λέγειν:

\(^{649}\) The MS has been described by H. Hunger and W. Lackner, Katalog der griechischen Handschriften der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek, Part I, Codices historici, Codices philosophici et philologici (Vienna, 1961), pp. 166-167.

\(^{650}\) The title of Manuel’s Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time is omitted from the table, though the work is found in ff. 139-139v. An omission is also observed in the title of Oration VI, l. 2.5, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θ(εο)ῦ προνοίας, after καὶ περὶ μετανοίας before καὶ ἀγάπης.
Ἔτερος, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν, πάσι φιλούμενον ἐστὶ φυλήσικος· ὁ δὲ κακὸς, κ(αί) ἐαυτῷ μισητός· φιλούμεν δὲ | καὶ τὸ κακὸν ἐστὶν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κακεῖνο νομίζοντες· καὶ | περὶ εὐδαιμονί(ας) κ(αί) ἄρετῆς, ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) Ἐγώ νομίζω, κ(αί) πάντ(ας) οἶμαι.

Ἔτερος περὶ προσαρέσεως, κ(αί) ἐκουσίου· κ(αί) ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ φῦλονως, οὐδὲ ἔξωθε(ν) ὁ κακὸς. ἀλλὰ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ αἳ-τιος γίνεται(αἱ). ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) διδευκτ(αί) μὲν ὡς ἄροτομοι τὸ προκεκίμ(ενον)

Ἔτερος περὶ ἡδονῆς· ὅτι κρείττον ἄν ἢ μὴ δὲ τὴν ἀρρ. χὴν σὺμπαρżeναι τῷ βιω τουτῷ· ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ἀλλὰ γ(αρ) γίγνομενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον.

Ἔτερος, περὶ ἡδονῆς ἀντίθεσις, εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦ δὲ λόγον | ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) Ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν τὰ παρὰ τῶν μεμφομέν(ων)· ἢ

Ἔτερος, ὅτι ἢ μὲν ἀμαρτία· τὸ πάντ(αν) χείριστον· δει | ὅτε μηδέν ἀπογινώσκειν, μήτε ἐαυτόν, | μήτε ἔτερον· κρῖνεν δὲ ἐαυτόν κ(αί) οὐχ ἔτερον· καὶ τοῖς | ἡμαρτημότας οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐλέειν· καὶ περὶ μετα-Ιννοιας, κ(αί) ἀγάπης κ(αί) φίλανθρωπ(ίας) ἢ ἡ ἀρχή(ή) περὶ ἡδονῆς | προδιαλεχθὲτες·

Ἔτερος, περὶ ταπεινοφοβούνης· ἐκ μέρους δὲ καὶ | περὶ ἀγάπης· ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ὁ τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸ ὑστατὸν.

Ἐπιλογος ἐπιστολιμαίος ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ταῦθ' ἡμῖν ὁ φιλτάτε.

Εὐχὴ δοξολογίαν ἔχουσα πρὸς θ(εό)ν· σὺν ὀμολογία | τ(ῆς) εὐσεβείας· εἰτα, δείσον σύγκεκριμαμένην εὑ-χαρίστα κ(αί) ἐξομολογήσει· συνάγουσα δὲ πρὸς τό | τέλει τὰ εἰσηγώμενα· λήγει εἰς πιστίν· ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) δοξά τῷ δειξαντί τῷ φίλος.

Κεφαλαία κατανύκτικα, εἰς τὰς ἔξ ἐντολὰς | τοῦ χ(ιστο)ῦν. ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) Διὰ τὸ μὴ εἰναι με ἀξιο(ν)

Κανών παραβλῆτ(ικός), εἰς τὴν ὑπεραγιάν ἡμῶν δὲ-ισποινάν θ(εοτό)κον, ὑπὲρ τῶν τὸν | περιστάσεων ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ἀπασά τάξις κ(αί) ἡλικία πίστων:

Εἱμος εἰκών, ἐν ὑφαντῷ παραπατᾶσαμετά | ὑγιείας· ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ἡς ὀφρα· κ(αί) δηλοι τά ἀνθῆ. 

Τίνας ἀν εἰτε λόγους, ὁ τῶν περπον τε | καὶ σκύβων | ἐξηγούμενος τῶ τύφανοντί τῶν τούρκων, μεγάλα τε | ἱκαι σοβαρὰ φθεὶρομένω, κ(αί) ἀφορήτω ὃντα ταῖς ἀπει-λαίας ἡμῖνα εὑ ἐπορτε, τραπέντι δὲ πρὸς τούναν | τόν μετα τῆν ἔτην· ἡ ἀρχὴ(ή) ἡς ἐοίκε τὸ πόρωθοθεν ἵολον

Ἐν εἰδε ψαλμο, περὶ κεφανοῦ τοῦ ἀγαφηνο, | ὅταν ἐπεσκέψατο ὁ θ(εό)ς τ(όν) λαὸν | καὶ διὰ τῶν εὐθρῶν αὐτοῦ, τ(όν) παντοδαπ(όν) | ἀπέκτεινε θῆρα: ἡ ἀρχὴ υψίστος ο κ(ύριος) ἐν ἀρχή: τ

i. (ff. 3-6) Epistolary Preface which precedes the Precepts, +Επίστολή προοιμιάκη, τῶν ἐφεξῆς κεφαλαίων:- cod. Inc. Εν πελοποννήσῳ σε λίπαν ἐξ ἱταλί(ας) ἐρχόμενος ..., des. ... ὁ δ’ ἁγαθός, ἐξ ἀπάντων:+

ii. (ff. 6v-40) Precepts on the education of a prince, + βασιλείεσ, βασιλεί. μανουήλ, ἰωάννη, πατήρ, νίω. | ψυχής, ψυχή, καρπόν, τροφήν. ἐμής, τῇ σή. ὑποικόσουν | ἀκμαζόωσῃ ή ὁ θ(εός) εἰς κοσμήτωρ:- ὦμοι ἐκατόν κεφάλαια:

On the top and left hand margin the following instruction was added:

ἀνάγκασε καινοφρετή τὴν ἀκροστίχιδα γενέσθαι, τὸ δεῖν ἐν αὐτῇ πολλὴν ἐννοι(αν) εἶναι· σύνταξαν οὖν, | ὡδ' ὁ βασιλεῖς | μανουήλ κ(ai) π(ατήρ)ηρ, | τῶ βασιλεί ἰω(άννη) | κ(ai) νίω, καρπόν τῆς | ἐμής ψυχής, ὑποικοσουν τροφὴν τῇ | σή ψυχή ἀκμαζόωση, δίδομι | δηλονότ(ι) ή ὁ θ(εός) εἰς κοσμήτωρ:- cod. Inc. Φιότο τοῖς ἄν(θροποι)ς διάφοροι οἱ μέν, φορνήσει κ(ai) παιδεύει καὶ χορ-Ιστότητι ..., des. ... πάνυ ἄσδιας ἀφαιρεθής, | ὀσπερ κάρκειν σύμβεβηκεν:+

(ff. 40/1v, 40/2v) blank


i. (ff. 41-52v) Oration I, προφρετ(τικός) εἰς λόγους, καὶ περὶ ἁρετῆς κ(ai) | ἁγαθοῦ ἄρχοντος:+ cod. Inc. <Δ>οῦ καλὸς ἐπιστασθαί λέγειν, οὐδὲν ἀν γένοιτο μείζον ..., des. ... κ(ai) ὀφλήσει γέλωτα II παντὶ δικαίῳ νοῦν ἐχουσίν :-

(ff. 53v) blank

ii. (ff. 54-60) Oration II, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἁγαθὸν, πάση φιλούμενον ἐστὶ φυσικῶς:- ὁ (δὲ) κακὸς, κ(ai) ἐαυτῷ μισητός· φιλούμεν (δὲ) κ(ai) τὸ κακὸν | ἐστὶν ὅτε, ἁγαθὸν κάρκειν νομίζοντες· κ(ai) περὶ εὐ-ὕδαιμον(ας) κ(ai) ἁρετῆς:- cod. Inc. <Ε>γὼ νομίζω, κ(ai) πάντας οἴμαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ συνθέσθαι ..., des. ... καθάπερ ἦμιν εἰρήται καταρχὰς εὐθὺς:-

iii. (ff. 60v-72v) Oration III, περὶ προανέφεσεως, καὶ ἐκουσίου· κ(ai) ὅτι | οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, οὐδὲ ἐξωθεν ὁ κακὸς, | ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ αἰτίος γένθε(α)ι:- cod. Inc. <Δ>ἐθεικαί μὲν ὡς ἱγουμαι τὸ προκείμενον ἦμιν ἰκανῶς ..., des. ... καὶ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἰσχύν:+
iv. (ff. 73-84v) *Oration IV*, περὶ ἡδονῆς· ὅτι κρείττον ἂν ἦν μὴ δὲ | τὴν ἁρχήν σύμπαρεῖνα τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ: cod. Inc. ἀλλὰ γ(ἀγ) γίγνομενόν ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον ..., des. ... ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν ὅλων εἶναι νομίζομεν +

(f. 84/1) blank

v. (ff. 85-97) *Oration V*, περὶ ἡδονῆς ἀντίθεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸ | τοῦδε λόγον:+ cod. Inc. Ταυτὶ μὲν οὐν, τὰ παρὰ τῶν μεμφομένων τὴν ἡδονήν ..., des. ... ἀγαθὸν | τὴν σύμμετρον ἡδονήν λέγειν:

vi. (ff. 97-118) *Oration VI*, ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία, τὸ πάντων χείριστον· | δεῖ (δὲ) μηδένα ἀπογιγνώσκειν, μήτε | ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἑαυτῶν· κρίνειν (δὲ) ἑαυτῶν, | καὶ οὐχ ἑνίκων· καὶ τοὺς ἡμάρτηκότας οὐ | μοιεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔλεειν· καὶ περὶ | μετανοίας(ας), | καὶ τῆς τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης | καὶ φιλανθρωπίας:

vii. (ff. 119-136) *Oration VII*, περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης· ἐκ μέρους | δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης:+ cod. Inc. <Τ>ῶν κεφαλαίων τὸ ὕστατον, | ἅ σοι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποδέδοται ..., des. ... καὶ καλοὺς ἀγῶνας τούτους ἐνεστησάμην:


5. (ff. 140-146) Morning prayers, + euché, doxologían ἐχοῦσα πρὸς θ(ε)ν, σὺν | ὀμολογία τῆς εὐσεβείας· εἶτα δέησιν | συγκεκριμένην εὐχαριστεῖα651 καὶ | ἔξομολο-γήσει· συνάγουσα δὲ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῷ εἰρή-μένα, λήγει εἰς πίστιν· | όφειλε δὲ λέγεσθαι, τοῦ ὑπὸν ἐξαναστάσι καὶ μάλιστα (ὡς) ὰτε | προκειται | τῶν ἀχράντων κοινωνείν μυστή-ριων· καὶ ἐπειδὴ μὴ δυνώμεθ(α) ὑπ' ἄσχο- | λίας εὐλόγου, τὰς όφειλομένας τὲ καὶ συνή-θεν ἀντεύξεις ἀποδιδόναι τῷ | θ(ε)ῳ· οἷμα γ(α)ρ τὸ ἐν αὐτάς ἀναγκαίων: κάντανθα ἄφο- | σιοῦσθαι: cod. Inc. <Δ>δέξῃ τῷ δειξαντι τῷ φῶς· δόξα ἐν ψύψους θ(ε)ῳ ..., des. ... σὺν τῷ παναγίῳ | σου πν(εύματι), εἰς τοὺς αἱ ὄνας· ἀμήν: Ed. Leunclavius, Praecepta, pp. 422-437; | repr. PG 156, cols. 564-574.

6. (ff. 146v) Other morning prayers652, cod. Inc. εὐχαριστώ σοι τῷ θ(ε)ῳ καὶ π(ατ)ρὸι· | ..., des. ... προσβείει· εἰς τής θ(εοτό)κου, καὶ πάντων σου τῶν ἀγίων | ἀμήν: Ed. Leunclavius, Praecepta, p. 438; repr. PG 156, cols. 573-576.


8. (ff. 147'-150) Paracletic canon to our most holy Lady, the Mother of God for aid in | the present circumstances, κανὼν παρακλητ(ικός), εἰς τὴν ὑπεραγίαν ἡμῶν | δέστοιναν θ(εοτό)κου, ύπερ τῶν νῦν περιστάσεων: cod. Inc. <Δ>πασά τάξις καὶ | ἡλικία πίστων, τῇ μήτηρι βοήσωμεν..., des. ... ἐξ αὐτῶν ὡς πάλαι τοῖς ἡμᾶς | φύσασον ἐδώκας: Ed. Legrand, Lettres, pp. 94-102653.


651 F. 140.3: εὐχαριστεῖα for εὐχαριστία. Itacisms are often observed in sections of codex B copied by | scribe B. See below, pp. 266, 280, 297, 304.
652 The second prayer is not introduced by a new title, however, the Morning Prayers end with the word | ἀμήν, followed by a colon and a cross (+), indicating the end of this text and the beginning of the | following Prayer.
653 According to Dennis, Letters, 57, pp. 160-163, the Canon was sent by Manuel to the Metropolitan of | Thessalonike Gabriel and Simon the Protos of the Holy Mountain with an accompanying Letter (57). The | letter is dated by Dennis in 1411-1412.
10. (ff. 152v-153) What Tamerlane might have said to Bayezid,  
† τίνας ἂν εἶπε λόγους, ὁ τῶν περσῶν τε καὶ σκύθων ἐξηγούμενος τῷ τύραννοντί | πρὸς τοὺν ἀντίον μετὰ τὴν ἤτταν:~ cod. Inc. <Ως έοικε τὸ πόρρωθ(εν) ἐν ἀρχῇ... des. des. des. ... καὶ νῦν άρθρον οὗτος πόνους ἰησαυμένους: Eds. Leclercq, Lettres, pp. 102-104; Leunclavius, Praecepta, pp. 446-448; repr. PG 156, cols. 579-582.


---

656 Lambeck, Commentariorum, pp. 341-344.
657 1. Manuale Palaeologus imperator<or> | Parænetica capita centum ad filium suum | Ioannes Palæologum, cum epistola proemiali. fol. 3 | – Orationes septem ethico-politicae ad eiusdem filium
In 1557 the MS came to the possession of Johannes Sambucus, as it is confirmed by his ex-libris (JOAN(NIS) SAMBUCI) on the top centre margin of f. 3. A note in the lower margin of the same folio states that the codex was bought by Sambucus for seven ducats: ‘Samb(ucus) ex Sophiani αὐτοχείρῳ Manuel(is) curavit suppl(eri) 7 aur(eis) 1557’. Scholars have offered different interpretations of this note. According to Gerstinger, Sambucus had in his possession the two sets of parchment folios, which he falsely identified as emperor Manuel II’s autograph, and asked his friend Michael Sophianos, the Greek scribe with whom he was collaborating, to complete the codex in his scriptorium, copying the missing texts on paper, a work for which he paid him seven ducats. The hypothesis that Sophianos was at that stage the owner of the autographed parchment folios and that Sambucus ordered the completion of the codex on paper was proposed by Meschini. It is attested that Sophianos used to buy autographs, complete them and sell them with a profit, as these were considered of superior value.

It seems, however, that both interpretations are not correct. A collation of the 15th-century scribal hand (B') (Plate I) of the parchment folios containing sections of Oration I (ff. 43-48) and Oration VI (ff. 105-112) with Manuel II’s autograph corrections and...
notes in Paris. gr. 3041⁶⁶³ (Plates XX, XXI), shows no similarity between the two hands. In fact hand B¹ is similar, if not identical, to that of Isidore of Kiev who copied codex I⁶⁶⁴. A textual examination of these sections shows that B¹ represents an early revised version of the text transmitted in V⁶⁶⁵. The small number of the extant parchment folios and the lack of further evidence make it impossible, at this stage, to identify the codex which they originally formed part of, that is, if this codex has survived.

A collation of Michael Sophianos’s hand with hand B², which copied the larger part of the codex (ff. 1-42v, 49-104v, 113-153), shows that though very similar, these two hands are not identical⁶⁶⁶. It has been suggested that a scribe who belonged to Sophianos’s scriptorium, or to a scriptorium of his close friends and collaborators, might have been responsible for the copying of the missing Orations in order to complete the text adding also other works⁶⁶⁷. Sophianos’s involvement in the production or acquisition of codices owned by Sambucus is attested in Vind. hist. gr. 52, f. 1: ‘Ex Michaelis Sophiani codice vetustissimo descriptus Patavii 1557 pro Sambuco’, and in Vind. phil. gr. 30, ff. 124-155: ‘μιχαῆλος σοφιανός’⁶⁶⁸. As it has been pointed out by Meschini, though the copyist of Vind. hist. gr. 52 has not been yet identified, it is certain that he is not Sophianos. The same is the case with Vind. phil. gr. 30, copied by Arnoldus Arlenius, Camillus Zanettus, Camillus Venetus and Bartholomeus Zanettus, all of whom belonged to the latter’s scriptorium⁶⁶⁹. This evidence together with the extensive spelling errors in B² seem to further support our view that the hitherto unidentified scribe B² must have been a non-native Greek collaborator of Sophianos.

⁶⁶³ See below, pp. 225, 236-237.
⁶⁶⁴ See below, pp. 210-212 (Plates V-VI).
⁶⁶⁵ See below, pp. 255-256, 276-277.
⁶⁶⁶ For Sophianos’s hand, see H. Omont, Facsimilés des manuscrits grecs des XV° e et XVI° siècles (Paris, 1887; repr. Hildesheim, 1974), Table 37; Repertorium, vol. 2, no. 393, 2C pl. 218.
⁶⁶⁷ Meschini, Sofianos, pp. 103-105, excluded the possibility that B is an autograph of Sophianos. The scribal hand (B²) is very similar to the copyist of Ambr. Q 114 sup., part C, ff. 49-88v, which belonged to G.V. Pinelli, a collaborator of Sophianos in Padua. In fact the Ambrosianus codex has similar decoration with B. Meschini also suggested that other codices and scribal hands should be examined, especially from the scriptoria of Camillus or Bartholomeus Zanetti and G.V. Pinelli. Meschini mentioned other cases of codices falsely attributed to Sophianos.
⁶⁶⁸ The collaboration of Sambucus with Michael Sophianos rules out possible confusion among Michael, Manuel, Nicolaos, Ioannes, or Theodoros Sophianos. Details on each one of them can be found in Meschini, Sofianos, pp. 94-105. See also Vogel and Gardthausen, Griechischen, pp. 199, 356-357; Canart, ‘Scribes’, 81.
A palaeographical examination of the text in B and I shows that B² copied the remaining sections of Orations I and VI and Orations II-V, VII and the Epistolary Epilogue together with the other works by Manuel II from I⁶⁰. The close relation between B and I is confirmed by the fact that B contains five of the six missing works in I⁶⁷, considered to have been lost, since they are found in the original table of contents in I but not in the codex. Thus, it is possible that I was complete when scribe B² copied Manuel’s works from it⁶⁷².

Johannes Leunclavius (=Löwenclau) used for his edition codex B, which belonged to Sambucus’s library, as noted on the cover page of the Leunclavius edition⁶²³. On the top right hand corner of B, f. 3, a note, added according to Gerstinger⁶²⁴ by Sambucus’s hand, states: ‘Emmanuel(is) palaiolog(i) ad fili(um) dedi vertendu(m) leonclaio’. The fact that Leunclavius and Sambucus were close friends, and the observation that Leunclavius often wrote in a mixed language, combining Greek, Latin, German and Italian, signing sometimes as ‘Leonclavio’ and other times as ‘Lewnklaw’, makes it is plausible that the abovementioned note (‘Samb[ucus] ex Sophiani αὐτοχείρῳ Manuel[is] curavit suppl[eri] 7 aur[eis] 1557’) written in Latin mixed with Greek, as well as the second annotation on the top corner, were introduced by Leunclavius, who was in the habit of introducing marginal notes and instructions in the MSS he used for his editions⁶⁷⁵.

With the exception of Manuel’s Chapters of Compunction (ff. 146v-147) which is copied in two columns, all works in B are written in single columns of ca. 20-22 lines. Particularly in the text of the Orations, the number of lines varies in some cases⁶⁷⁶, while on ff. 42v and 49v we observe an intentional attempt by B² to cover the whole written surface by using wider letters so that the text continues without interruption in the parchment

⁶⁰ See below, pp. 255-305.
⁶¹ See below, p. 205.
⁶³ See below, p. 249 with n. 843 (Plate XXII).
⁶⁶ E.g., f. 42, 15 lines; f. 42v, 14 lines; f. 49v, 27 ½ lines; f. 50, 19 lines.
folios (ff. 43-48, 105-112), which are written in single columns of 27 lines of about 48-52 letters per line. The margins and written surface in all parchment folios are the same. All texts were written continuously, with the exception of the Precepts, where a colon and a cross (:+), or a colon and a wavy dash (:~) were added at the end of each one of the hundred chapters.

All folios in B were numbered in Indian numerals by a later hand on the right-hand top corner. Two hands have numbered the folios. The numbers added by the first hand were crossed out and replaced by new numbers added by the second hand on top of them. This is observed from f. 4 onwards up to f. 40/2, throughout the text of the Precepts. Some of the numbers that have been crossed out are still visible. The difference between them by two numbers suggests that the confusion, and subsequent deletion, was caused either because the Epistolary Preface or the table of contents, were added at a later stage, or because neither of these were originally numbered. The text of the Precepts is followed by two blank folios numbered 40/1v and 40/2v. From f. 41 until f. 84 only the first hand has numbered the recto folios in Indian numerals on the right-hand top corner. From f. 85, after the numbering of a blank folio as 84/1, the second hand appears again crossing out the original numbers and adding the new ones, possibly because of miscalculation of the following extant parchment folios. In a single case (f. 137) there is a double deletion of the numbering (both numbers 136 and 138 were crossed out).

The codex bares limited decoration. A decorative floral pattern is found on the first folio of the Epistolary Preface of the Precepts (f. 3), very similar to the decorative shapes on each side of the title of Oration V (f. 85). In addition, simple decorative headbands introduce the titles of Oration II (f. 54) (Plate II) and Oration III (f. 60v). The headband introducing the table of contents (f. 1v) is in red ink (Plate IV), possibly an indication that at a later stage the rubricator would add vignettes and headbands in red ink. This suggestion could also be supported by the fact that although the first major initials E and B, in the Epistolary Preface and in the first chapter of the Precepts, respectively, both occupying the space of 3 lines, are ornamented and in red ink, in the remaining 99


\footnote{Hunger and Lackner, Katalog, p. 167.}
chapters the initials have not been executed\textsuperscript{679}; only the accents and breathings are visible at the beginning of the first word of each chapter in the text. On the verso folios the small-sized guiding letters are visible on the left hand margin, while on the recto folios the guiding letters are not present as the folios were trimmed. Similarly, in the text of the \textit{Orations} and in the other works in the codex, the major initials were not executed and only their accents and breathings are visible, with the exception of the letter $\alpha$ introducing the first word ($\acute{\alpha}l\lambda\acute{\alpha}$) of \textit{Oration IV} (f. 73), which was possibly added by the scribe, and the initial T introducing the first word $\tau\acute{\alpha}v\tau\iota$ of \textit{Oration V} (f. 85) (Plate III).

All titles appear in minuscule letterforms. It is worth noting that in the title of \textit{Oration II} (f. 54) there is a correction by overwriting a letter to correct an error caused due to confusion of sound ($\kappa\acute{a}k\omega\varsigma$ from $\kappa\circ\kappa\omega\varsigma$) (Plate II). A cross introduces the titles of some texts\textsuperscript{680}. Other smaller signs of the cross on the centre top margin of several recto folios were placed possibly to mark gatherings\textsuperscript{681}; some of these crosses are missing as the page was trimmed to fit the dimensions of the codex.

On the top centre margin of the parchment folios the scribal hand $B^1$ has added the number of the \textit{Oration} and the number of the total leaves: $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\varsigma\alpha$, $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\lambda\alpha$ $?$ which however is not visible in all folios because the ink has faded, and most of the folios have been trimmed. It should be noted that this convention is observed also in $I$\textsuperscript{682}. Apart from the abovementioned cases where red ink was used, it seems that hand $E$, which copied ff. 85$^{c}$, used a different colour of ink (Plate III). Different ink colour, which has faded, must have been used also by hand $B^1$. The marginal glosses and notes in both parchment and paper folios appear to have been made in the same ink colour used for the copying of the text in each case\textsuperscript{683}.

A total of six hands contributed to the copying and correcting of the text in $B$:

\textsuperscript{679} It is however possible that the $\alpha$ introducing chapter 2 (f. 6$^v$) and the moon-shaped sigma (c) introducing chapter 3 (f. 7) are also in red ink.
\textsuperscript{680} Ff. 1$^v$, 2$^v$, 3$^v$, 6$^v$, 54, 140, 152.
\textsuperscript{681} Ff. 3, 7, 15$^v$, 24, 30, 35, 38, 57, 70, 76$^v$, 77, 86, 92, 95, 102, 116$^v$, 125$^v$, 144, 151. The titles of Manuel’s \textit{Orations} must have been preceded by a cross, though only those on ff. 41, 54, 60$^v$, 73, 85 and 137 are still visible.
\textsuperscript{682} See below, pp. 211-212.
\textsuperscript{683} These observations should be ascertained by an in situ examination of the MS.
Hand B, an elegant hand, copied the parchment folios (43-48, 105-112v). Minor corrections\(^{684}\) in this part of the codex as well as the marginal notes and glosses\(^{685}\), were introduced by the same scribe, with the exception of two cases, where superscribed Greek numbers were added in the interlinear space to denote transposition of word order. Whether these numbers were added by scribe B\(^2\) or by a different hand, should be ascertained by an examination of the colour of ink\(^{686}\) (Plate I).

Hand B\(^2\) copied the larger part of the codex (ff. 1-40, 41-84v, 86-153). Most of the marginal and interlinear corrections and glosses were introduced by the same hand. It is possible that the correction of αὐτόπως in the text by adding the correct word ἀτόπως on the left hand margin of f. 58r.12 adding a cross (†) as a reference mark, was introduced by a slightly different hand, characterised by a more upright ductus. If so, this hand (B\(^3\)) was responsible for some corrections (especially of letters, accents and breathings) in the part of the codex copied by B\(^2\) (ff. 1-42v, 49-104v, 113-153)\(^{687}\) (Plate II).

Hand C copied a single leaf (ff. 85r-v). Though very similar to hand B\(^2\), C differs in the design of certain letterforms (ι, μ, π, ρ, φ)\(^{688}\). Hand C introduced three corrections in these two folios\(^{689}\), while in two instances hand B\(^2\), or another hand (B\(^3\)) as mentioned above, introduced interlinear additions\(^{690}\), which point to the fact that this folio formed part of the codex and was not added at a later stage (Plate III).

Finally, hand D, very similar but not the same with hand B\(^2\), copied the table of contents (ff. 1v-2v) (Plate IV).

The codex was bound by Gerard van Swieten in 1754.

\(^{684}\) E.g., f. 110.7, γίγνεται from γίνεται (VI 475); f. 111r.19-20, ἀπωμέτερα from ἀπωμέτερα (VI 562).

\(^{685}\) F. 46v, γρ(άφε) υψ’ ὄν (l 223); f. 48, δι(αίων) (l 287-289); f. 106v, γρ(άφε) ἄγνοιαν (VI 314); f. 110r, ἐπὶ γε (VI 497); f. 117, γρ(άφε) ἐκπυκάσθαι θεόμενην (VI 571).

\(^{686}\) F. 109r.17, τοῦ καθαροῦ ἐφάπτεσθαι μὴ superscribed β’, α’, γ’ (VI 432); f. 111r.18, ἐξ ἔς πάντων, superscribed β’, α’ (VI 536).

\(^{687}\) The hand possibly responsible for some corrections is identified as B\(^3\) in the palaeographical examination of the text. All corrections, additions and deletions are listed below, pp. 264, 265, 279, 297. Once more, this should be ascertained by a close \textit{in situ} examination of the ink used in these corrections.


\(^{689}\) F. 85r.4, δὲ ἄλλως from διάλλως (V 3); f. 85r.5, πίς from ταῖς (V 3); f. 85r.15, προστίθηκε from προστίθηκε (V 10).

\(^{690}\) F. 85v.10, μὲν (V 21); f. 85v.13, προστίθηκεν from προστίθηκε (V 23). See below, p. 264 with n. 897.
I Vindobonensis philologicus graecus 98 (examined through microfilm)

15th century; parchment; ff. <I-VI> + 175 (blank: ff. 125/1, 125/2, 176-178)

Contents: The codex contains exclusively works by Manuel II Palaeologus.

1. (ff. 1-2) Table of contents: Πίναξ άκριβῆς τῆς βιβλίου:

Toû εὐστεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχρίστου βασιλέας μανουηλ τοῦ παλαιολόγου(ου) ἐπιστολή προοιμιακή τῶν ἐφεξῆς κεφαλαίων: ἡ ἀρχ(ή) ἐν πελοποννήσῳ σε φύλλα(α) βζ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ κεφάλαια εἰκάτον, πρὸς τὸν ἐαυτοῦ ὑιόν κ(αί) βασιλέ(α) κ(ύριον) ἰω(άννη) ! τὸν παλαιολόγον(ον). ἀν ἡ αἰκροστίχες, βασιλεύς, βασιλεί. μανουηλ, ἰω(άννη). ! π(ατής), ἰω(άννη)· ψυχῆς ψυχή, κατον, τροφήν ἐμῆς τῇ σῇ ὀποιασοῦν ἡ ἄρχαζουση· ἡ ὁ θεός εἰς κοσμήτωρ: ἡ ἀρχ(ή) βείοι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις φύλλα(α) κδ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον πρώτος· προοιμιακὸς εἰς λόγους· (καί) ! περὶ ἀρετής, καὶ ἀγαθοῦ ἀρχοντος: ἡ ἀρχ(ή) τοῦ καλ(ῶς) ἐπίστασαι· φύλλ(α) εζ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον δεύτερος· ὁτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν, πάσης φιλούμενον ἐστὶν φυσικῶς· ὃ δὲ κακός, (καί) ἐαυτῷ· μιστῆς· φιλούμ(εν) ! δέ· (καί) τὸ κακὸν ἐστὶν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκεινον νομίζοντες· κ(αί) περὶ εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἀρετής: . ἡ ἀρχ(ή) ἐγὼ νομίζω· (καί) φύλλα(α) δζ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον τρίτος, περὶ προαιρέσεως (καί) ἐκοινοῦν· καὶ ὧν τις, ἐκ φύσεως, οὐδὲ ἐξωθεὶν ὁ κακός· ἀλλ’ αὐτός· ἐαυτῷ· (!) περὶ γίνεται: . ἡ ἀρχ(ή) δεδυκται μὲν ὡς φύλλ(α) θ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον τέταρτος, περὶ ἱδρυνῆς· ὃ ἐκεῖτον· ἔν τιν, μὴ δὲ τὴν ἄρχην σύμπαρειν τῷ βιῶν τούτῳ: ἡ ἀρχ(ή) ἀλλὰ γὰρ γιγνόμενον φύλλα(α) ηζ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον πέμπτος, περὶ ἱδρυνῆς ἀντιθέσεις· εἰς τὸν πρὸ τούτῳ λόγον· ἡ ἀρχ(ή) ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν τὰ φύλλα(α) θ’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐκτος, ὃ ἡ μὲν ἀμαρτία, τὸ πάντων· δεῖ δὲ μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν, μὴτε ἐαυτῷ, μὴτε ἐτερον·· δὲ κρίνειν δὲ ἐαυτοῦ, καὶ οὐχ ἐτερον· (καί) τοῦς ἡμερησίακος οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐλεείν· (καί) περὶ μετανοιάς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας, (καί) ἀγάπης· (καί) φιλαν(θωρήτ)ί(ας): !ὁ ἀρχ(ή) περὶ ἱδρυνῆς προδος<λει〈θέντες>· φύλλα(α) ιθ’·

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον ἐβδομος, περὶ ταπεινοφοβίσων· ὃς καὶ δὲ καὶ περὶ ἐγκατέστασις: ἡ ἀρχ(ή) τοῦ κεφαλαίῳ(ον) τὸ φύλλα(α) β’

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ πρὸς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπίλογος ἐπίστολιμαιος· ἡ ἀρχ(ή) ταυθ’ ἡμῖν ὁ φύλλα(α) β’
Τού αὐτοῦ ὡς ἔξ ἐσπευνοῦσιν ἀρχοντος, πρὸς εὔνους ὑπηκόους | τοὺς ἐν ακμῇ: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) | τὸ ὕμνον συνοίησον ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τού αὐτοῦ εὐχὴ, δοξολογίαν ἔχουσα πρὸς θ(εοῦ)ν, σὺν ὁμολογία | τῆς εὐσεβείας- εἶτα, δήπον συγκεκριμένην ἐυχαριστία | (καὶ) ἐξομολογηθῆσαι συνάγουσα δὲ πρὸς τῷ τέλει | τὰ εἰρήμενα, ἧ λήγει εἰς πιστών: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) δόξα τῷ δείξατεν ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ διάλογος, πρὸς τὴν κυρίαν αὐτοῦ δεσποιναί | καὶ | μητέρα: ἡ περὶ γάμου: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ὡς μήτερ, εἰ ποτὲ ἄλλα(ὡς) ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ γεμίστου κ(υ)ρ(οῦ) γεωργίου προθεωρία τ(οῦ) ἐπιταφίου λόγο(ου) | (καὶ) τοῦ ἱερομονάχου κυρ(οῦ) ἰακώσαφ περὶ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος | τοῦ αὐτοῦ λόγου: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) περιπαθὲς μὲν ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐπρεπεστάτου καὶ φύλοχστου βασιλείας μανουὴλ | τοῦ παλαιολόγου, λόγος ἐπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν αὐτῶν τὸν δεσποτήν τὴν πορφύρογέννητον κύριν | θεόδωρον | τὸν παλαιολόγο(ου), ἰησοῦς, ἐπιδημήσαντος εἰς πελοπόννησον | τοῦ βασιλέως: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ἀλλά τι (καὶ) φθείρει καὶ ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἵνας εἰκόνας, ἐν ὑπαντο παραπετάσιμαι ἀρχηγοῦ: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ), ἦρως ὄρα: (καὶ), ὑπ' αριθμὸν α' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ, τίνας ἐν εἴπε λόγους ὡς τῶν περοῦν τε καὶ | σκεῦθον ἐξηγοῦμενος τῷ τύπαναιντι τῶν τούρκων, | μεγάλα τε (καὶ) σοφαρά φθειρομένω, (καὶ) ἀφοροῦν | ὡς τοῖς ταῖς | ἀπελεύθερα ἑνα καὶ ἐπιστατεῖν ὡς πρὸς τού ἐνταυτίσθην | μετὰ τὴν | ἡπτὰν: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ), ὡς εὔκοκλο τὸ πόρφυροθ(εν), ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐν εἴδει ψαλμοῦ, περὶ κεραυνοῦ τ(οῦ) ἀγαρινοῦ, ὡς ἐπεσκεπή πιστῶσιν ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ), διὰ τῶν ἤχθρόντων αὐτοῦ, τῶν παντοδαποῦν | ἐπεκτείνει θῆρα: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ), ὡς τοῦ κ(υρίος) ἐν ἀρχῇ: ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ χρυσολωφά κύρων Δημητρίου, πρὸς τῶν ἀντανών δεδέκεικναν | ἀποροῦντα- ὡς ἐπειδὴ ὅ τον μὴ ὁντὸς κρείττον, πῶς ὁ κ(υρίος) ἐπιτέθη περὶ τοῦ ἱοῦ, ὅτι καλὸν | ἠν αὐτῶ εἰ ὁντὸς ἐγεννηθή: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ἀποροῦνται σοι ἀς | ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ ἀντανόν πρὸς τὰ εἰρήμενα τῷ χρυσολωφά κύρων Δημητρίου | ἀντίφησης: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ἠμοι ἐξρήσει, ἀριθμὸν α' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ βασιλέως μανουὴλ τοῦ παλαιολόγου, σαφής ἔν σχετικὰ τῶν | εἰρημένων ἐξ ἐκατέρω τῶν ἀρχὴ διαλεχθένων: (καὶ) ὡς ὁντὸς εἴναι | τοῦ ὁριου διδάξει | τίθης δὲ καὶ λόγους καὶ λογίσμους, ἡν τὴν δόξαν συντόμω ὡς ἀγαθή συνίστων: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ταύτα σχεδὸν ὡς παράσπερν ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατάλαλα κατανικτικά, εἰς τὰς ἐξ ἐντολὰς τὸς σ(ωτῆ)ρ(ος) χριστοῦ: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) διὰ τὸ μὴ εἶναι με | ἀριθμὸν ε' ὑπ' Τοῦ αὐτοῦ καταλαλοῦκας, εἰς τὴν ὑπεραγίαν δεσποιναν θ(εότο)κον ὑπὸ τῶν | κατὰ καιροὺς περιστασεων: ἡ ἀρχὴ(ἡ) ἀπασα τάξεις καὶ ἀριθμὸν α' β'
As it is evident from the table of contents, six additional works were originally included in the manuscript: *A depiction of Spring in a Dyed, Woven Hanging; What Tamerlane might have said to Bayezid; On the death of Bayezid in the form of a psalm; A debate between Demetrius Chrysoloras and Antonio d’Ascoli on the question: if it is better to be than not to be, how could Christ say to Judas that it would be better for him if he had not been born* [Matth. 26:24]?, followed by a clarification by the Emperor*; *Chapters of Compunction; and the Paracletic canon to our most holy Lady, the Mother of God for aid in the present circumstances*. 

(f. 2v) blank


i. (ff. 3-5v) *Epistolary Preface* which precedes the *Precepts*, ἐπιστολὴ προοιμιακὴ, τῶν ἐφεξῆς κεφαλαίων: (in marg. sup. scr. ἐπιστολὴ[η] προοιμι[ακὴ]θη, φύλλ(α) βζ’”) cod. Inc. Ἐν πελοποννήσῳ σε λατών ..., des. ... ὁ δ’ ἀγαθὸς, ἐξ ἀπάντατον:

ii. (ff. 6-30) *Precepts on the education of a prince*, βασιλεὺς, βασιλεὶ· μανουὴλ, ἰωάννη· πατήρ, υἱῶ· ψυχῆ· ψυχῆ· καρπὸν· τροφήν· ἐμῆς· τῇ σῇ· ὀποιασοῦν ἀκμαζοῦσῃ· ὁ θ(εὸ)ς εἴη κοσμήτωρ: (in marg. sup. scr. κεφάλ(α) ο’) φύλλ(α) κΔ’) cod. Inc. Βίοι τοῖς ἀν(θρών)οις διάφοροι ... , des. ... ὥσπερ κάκεινῳ σύμββηκεν :+

(f. 5v) the same hand added the following instruction concerning the reading of the acrostichis: ἠνάγκασε καινοπρεπὴ τὴν ἀκροστιχία γενέσθαι, τὸ δὲν ἐν αὐτῇ πολλὴν ... ὁ δὲν εἰναι-σύνταξαν ὀνὸν ὡς: ὃ βασιλεὺς μανουὴλ (καὶ) π(ατ)ὴρ, τῷ βασιλεὶ ἰωάννῃ (καὶ) υἱῶ, καρπὸν τῆς ἐμῆς ψυχῆς ὀποιασοῦν, τροφήν· τῇ σῇ ψυχῇ ἀκμαζοῦσῃ· δίδωμι δηλονί· ὁ θ(εὸ)ς εἰς κοσμήτωρ:

(f. 30v) blank


---

691 Five out of these six ‘missing’ works are found in codex B, which indicates that at the time of the composition of B, I contained all these works, see above, p. 199.
693 For the editions of these works see above, pp. 195-196.
i. (ff. 31-41) Oration I, :προσφεττικός εις λόγους. (και) περὶ ἀφετής (και) ἀγαθοῦ ἄρχοντος: (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος(ος) α', φύλλα(α) i"') cod. Inc. Τοῦ καλῶς ἐπίστασθαι λέγειν, οὐδὲν ἀν γένοιτο μείζον ..., des. ... καὶ όφλησει γέλωτα παντὶ δικαίῳ νοῦν ἔχουσίν :-

ii. (ff. 41'-46) Oration II, :ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν, πάσιν φίλουμένων ἐστὶ φυσικῷ· ὁ δὲ κακὸς, (και) ἐαυτῷ λ' μισήτ(ος)-φιλούμενος δὲ (και) τὸ κακὸν ἐστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκεινο νομίζοντ(ες)-κ(αί) περὶ εὐδαιμονίας(ας) (και) ἀφετής: (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος(ος) β' Ι(ησοῦ) C (χιστῶ) C + NI KA φύλλα(α) Δζ"') cod. Inc. Ἐγὼ νομίζω, καὶ πάντας οἵμαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ σύνθεσθαι ..., des. ... καθάπερ ἡμῖν εἰρήσαται καταφάξας εὐθὺς :-

iii. (ff. 46'-55) Oration III, :περὶ προσφέρεσεως, καὶ ἐκουσίου· καὶ ὡτι οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, λ' οὐδὲ ἐξωθεν ὁ κακὸς-ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ αἰτίος γίνεται: (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος Γ' φύλλα(α) Θ') cod. Inc. Δέδεικται μὲν ὡς ἠγούμαι τὸ προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἰκανός ..., des. ... καὶ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν ἠμετέραν ἰσχύν :-

iv. (ff. 55'-63') Oration IV, :περὶ ἠδονῆς, ὅτι κρείττον ἢν ἢν, μή δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν συμπαραίνει τῷ ... βίῳ τούτῳ: (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος Δ' φύλλα(α) η"') cod. Inc. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ γιγνόμενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον ..., des. ... ύπέρ τὴν τῶν ὅλων εἶναι νομίζομεν :-

v. (ff. 64-72') Oration V, :περὶ ἠδονῆς ἀντίθεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸ τούτῳ λόγον: (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος(ος) ε' φύλλα(α) Θ') cod. Inc. Ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν, τά παρὰ τῶν μεμφομένων τὴν ἠδονήν ..., des. ... ἀγαθὸν τὴν σύμμετρον ἠδονῆν λέγειν ::

vi. (ff. 73-91') Oration VI, :ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἀμαρτία, τὸ πάντων χείριστον· δεὶ δὲ μηθένα ἀπογινώσκειν, μήτε ἐαυτὸν μήτε ἔτερον· κρίνειν δὲ ἐαυτὸν καὶ οὐχ ἢ ἔτερον· (και) τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας, οὐ μισείν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μεταφοράς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φύλανθ(θεοῦ)(ας)- (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος(ος) ζ' φύλλα(α) Ιθ') cod. Inc. Περὶ ἠδονῆς προδιάλεχθεντες ὡς οἷοι τ' ἠμέν ..., des. ... αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα ἄμα τῷ ποιητῇ καὶ ἀγῶν χιστῶν, εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας· ἀμήν : :+

vii. (ff. 92-104) Oration VII, :περὶ ταπεινοφοβοσύνης· ἐκ μέρους δε καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης + (in marg. sup. scr. λόγος(ος) ζ' φύλλα(α) ιβ') cod. Inc. Τῶν


5. (ff. 107-111) Morning prayers, :εὐχή, δοξολογιάν ἔχουσα πρὸς θ(ε)ω, σὺν ὀμολογία τῆς εὐσεβείας: εἰς, δέησιν συγκεκραμένην εὐχαριστία καὶ εξομολογήσει: συνάγωσα δὲ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τὰ εἰρημένα, λήγει εἰς πίστιν : - (in marg. sup. scr. εὐχ(η) φυλλ(α) ε’) cod. Inc. Δόξα τῷ δειξατί τὸ φῶς· δόξα ἐν ψιστοῖς θ(ε)ω ... des. ... σὺν τῷ παναγίῳ πν ἐυμ(ατι), εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας· ἀμήν : + Ed. Leunclavius, Praecepta, pp. 422-437; repr. PG 156, cols. 564-574.


7. (ff. 112-125v) Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage, :τ(οὗ) αὐτ(οῦ) διάλογος, πρὸς τὴν κυρίαν αὐτ(οῦ) δέσποιναν (καὶ) μητέρα· ἐπὶ περὶ γάμου: (in marg. sup. scr. διάλογος φυλλ(α) ϑΔ’) cod. Inc. Ω μήτερ, εἰ ποτε ἄλλας εἶχον δόξης περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ..., des. ... ἐν’ οὐκαδ’ ἀπέλθοι τὸ γέρας ἔχων: + Eds.

---

694 As in B (see above, p. 195 n. 652), also in I the second Prayer is not introduced by a new title. However, the colons after αὐτήν and the introduction of the second prayer with a major decorative initial E, indicate the beginning of another prayer. In the table of contents the Prayers appear as a single work, under the title Τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐχή δοξολογίαν ἔχουσα πρὸς θ(ε)ων, σὺν ὀμολογία τῆς εὐσεβείας—εἰς δέησιν, συγκεκραμένην εὐχαριστία | (καὶ) εξομολογήσεις: συνάγουσα δὲ πρὸς τῷ τέλει τὰ εἰρημένα | λήγει εἰς πίστιν : :.

i. (ff. 126-127) George Gemistos, Preface to Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus’ Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore, : προθεωρία τ(ο)ύ παρόντος λόγου: (in marg. scr. κυρ(ο)ύ | γεωργί(ου) τοῦ γε | μέλιστ(ο)ύ) (in marg. sup. scr. προθεωρία φύλλ(α) β’) cod. Inc. Περιπαθὲς μὲν τό προοίμιον ..., des. ... μετά τέχνης ἀναγινώσκοντι θεωρεῖν :-

ii. (f. 127v) Hieromonk Ioasaph, Note on the character of the Funeral Oration, :περί τοῦ χαρακτήρος τ(ο)ύ λόγου1 (in marg. scr. τ(ο)ύ | ἱερομονάχ(ου) κυρ(ο)ύ | ιωάσαφ) cod. Inc. Ὅσα μὲν ὡς ἐν προθεωρίᾳ λόγῳ ..., des. ... τῶν γεγραμμένων, τό ἀναγινώσκοντι ἐννοεῖν :-

iii. (f. 127v) Manuel Palaeologus, Epigram on the Funeral Oration, :τ(ο)ύ βασιλέως: cod. Inc. Ἡκὼ πενθήσων ..., des. ... συνεισενεγκεῖν ὅλως εἰχον:-

iv. (ff. 128-175v) Funeral Oration, The Funeral Oration of the most devout and Christ-loving Emperor Manuel Palaeologus in memory of his brother the Porphyrogenitus sire Theodore Palaeologus the Despot. It was delivered when the Emperor visited the Peloponese :τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου (και) φίλοχοστουβ(ου) βασιλε(ως) μανουήλ τοῦ παλαιολ(ο)γ(ου) λόγος ἐπιτάφιος | eis τὸν αὐτάδελφον αὐτοῦ δεσπότην τοῦ πορφυρογέννητον, θεόδωρον τ(ον) παλαιολ(ο)γ(ον) | ὄρθεις, ἐπιδημήσαντος εἰς πελωπόννησον τοῦ βασιλέως:- (in marg. sup. scr. ἐπιτάφιος φυλλ(α) μη’) cod. Inc. Ἀλλὰ τί καὶ φθέγξωμαι πρὸς ύμᾶς ..., des. ... ἀπὸ τοῦ μέρους γένοιτο δῆλον :+

v. (f. 175v) Matthew Chrysocephalos, Epigram on the Funeral Oration, :τ(ο)ύ κυρ(ο)ύ ματθαιοῦ τ(ο)ύ χρυσοκεφάλου: cod. Inc. Ἡκὼ σὲ πάντ’ ἀρίστε ..., des. ... δύναντ’ ἂν ὅλως:
vi. Demetrios Magistros, *Epigram on the Funeral Oration*, τ(οῦ) κύρου δημητρίου τοῦ μαγίστρου: cod. Inc. Ἡλυθὼν ἀνδρ(ῶν) φέρτατε ..., des. ...
ἀξία τίσαι: -

(ff. 176-178) blank

The codex appears under number 98 in Nessel’s catalogue (1690) and under number 88 in Lambeck’s catalogue. As in codex B, a yet unidentified hand added in the bottom margin of the paper folio 1, following the table of contents, the inscription: ‘Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensi Codex manuscriptus Philosophicus Graecus N. 88.’ A table of contents in Latin, providing us with the titles of the extant works of the codex was copied in the front pastedown leaf. In the bottom margin of the same folio, a note provides us with the numbers under which the codex appears in both catalogues: ‘Nessel. Philosoph. et. Philolog. XCVIII | Lambec. Philosophicus. LXXXVIII’. On the top margin of folio I, the same hand added ‘Phil. gr. 98’, whereas in the bottom margin of folio IV a different hand added the numbers ‘XCVIII 17’. The codex was described in detail by Hunger.

I belonged at some point to cardinal Bessarion, although the folio that contained this information and the ex libris are missing. A note added on f. Vi ascertsains that the codex was bought in Venice for the Imperial Library of Vienna in 1672 for 180 florins: ‘Codex hic manuscriptus Graecus pro Augustissima Bibliotheca Caesarea Vindobonensi emptus est Venetiis A. 1672 florenis 180.’ It has already been suggested that I, together with codices *Vaticanus Barberinianus graecus* 219 (olim II. 40,
Codex I, represents the revised ‘edited’ version of all of Manuel’s texts preserved in the MS\textsuperscript{707}, including the \textit{Seven Ethico-political Orations}. I incorporates all the corrections, deletions, additions, and marginal notes of V, which must have been a working copy\textsuperscript{708}. Variant and different readings between the two codices would suggest that Isidore corrected or revised the text with the approval, or at the instruction, of the author\textsuperscript{709}. A collation of I with B\textsuperscript{1}, shows great similarities. Though an identification of B\textsuperscript{1} with Isidore’s hand should be ascertained by further evidence, it is clear that B\textsuperscript{1} is an earlier revised version of V. This would suggest that I and V are linked through B\textsuperscript{1} or indeed

\textsuperscript{703} Chrysostomides, \textit{Funeral Oration}, p. 39; Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. lxii-lxiii.

\textsuperscript{704} Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, p. lxiii n. 357: ‘Most probably they must have ceased to be in the possession of the Cardinal before the Act of Donation of his collection to Venice, for they are not included in the early inventories of the Marciana Biblioteca, compiled in 1468 and 1474’.


\textsuperscript{706} See Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. bx-bxii.

\textsuperscript{707} This is also the case in the \textit{Dialogue on marriage}, where I (under siglum V) is considered to be the revised version of the \textit{Dialogue} found in \textit{Par. gr.} 3041, see Angelou, \textit{Manuel Palaiologos}, p. 20.

\textsuperscript{708} See below, pp. 234-243.

\textsuperscript{709} Of special interest is \textit{Oration VI}, which in I has a completely different structure and several variant readings from the version V. See below, pp. 276-294.
another version as the small number of the extant folios of \( B^1 \) makes it impossible to draw safe conclusions on this\(^{710} \). \( I \) has very few spelling mistakes, marginal and interlinear additions, all in Isidore’s hand\(^{721} \). For these reasons, \( I \) is used as the principle MS in the present edition.

The date of the completion of \( I \) cannot be precisely placed, since no colophon exists in the codex. However, if we consider that \( I \) was the ‘final’ version, prepared under imperial instruction to be used as a presentation codex, then it was completed before Manuel’s death in 1425\(^{712} \).

All the works contained in the codex are written in single columns of 25 lines\(^{713} \) per column and about 48-54 letters per line. The folios are of varying size 278/280 x 195/198 mm\(^{714} \). Beginning from the table of contents (f. 1) a single hand has numbered continuously in Indian numerals all recto folios on the right-hand top corner. In some folios the original numbering, most probably in Isidore’s hand, is still visible (e.g., ff. 10, 14, 15, 16, 38, 39, 40, 113, 136). Each recto folio of each \textit{Oration} bears a separate Greek number beginning each time from \( \alpha' \), with half folios also indicated (e.g., f. 46, \( \Delta\zeta'' \), is the fourth and half folio of the second \textit{Oration})\(^{715} \). The same method of numbering was applied in all works contained in the codex\(^{716} \). The total number of leaves containing each work and the title of the text appear on the top centre margin of each recto folio, apart from \textit{Oration II, III, IV} and the \textit{Epistolary Epilogue}, where the title of the \textit{Oration} is found on the verso folios: \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \alpha' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \zeta\gamma'' \), \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \Gamma' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \Theta' \), \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \Delta' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \eta\zeta'' \), \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \epsilon' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \Theta' \), \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \zeta' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \iota\Theta' \), \( \lambda\varphi\gamma(\varphiz) \zeta' \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \psi\beta' \). Only the number of leaves, \( \phi\vartheta\lambda\lambda(\alpha) \beta' \), appears in the \textit{Epistolary Epilogue} (Plates V, VI.a-b). The same system is found also in other codices.

\(^{710}\) See above, p. 198.

\(^{711}\) All the errors and additions are provided in detail in the palaeographical examination of the text below, pp. 255-305.

\(^{712}\) See above, pp. 50-52.

\(^{713}\) With the exception of the folios containing the last section of each work, which have fewer lines and which Isidore considers as half (\( \zeta'' \)) (ff. 5-20 lines, 30-18, 41-23, 46-10, 55-24, 63-23, 72-9.1/2, 91-11, 104-10.1/2, 106-7.1/2, 111-5, 125-8.1/2, 179-21). In \( I \) each work begins on a fresh page.

\(^{714}\) Hunger and Lackner, \textit{Katalog}, p. 205.

\(^{715}\) The visible numbers are: \textit{Oration I}: ff. 31-\( \alpha' \), 32-\( \beta' \), 33-\( \gamma \), 34-\( \Delta \), 35-\( \Sigma \), 36-\( \sigma \), 38-\( \eta' \), 39-\( \theta' \), 40-\( \iota' \), 41-\( \zeta'' \); \textit{Oration II}: ff. 42-\( \alpha' \), 43-\( \beta' \), 44-\( \Gamma \), 45-\( \Delta \), 46-\( \zeta'' \); \textit{Oration III}: ff. 47-\( \alpha' \), 48-\( \beta' \), 51-\( \epsilon' \), 55-\( \theta' \); \textit{Oration VI}: ff. 57-\( \beta' \), 58-\( \Gamma \), 59-\( \Delta \), 60-\( \epsilon' \), 61-\( \sigma \), 63-\( \eta' \); \textit{Oration V}: ff. 64-\( \alpha' \), 65-\( \beta' \), 66-\( \Gamma \), 67-\( \Delta \), 68-\( \epsilon' \), 70-\( \zeta' \), 71-\( \epsilon' \), 72-\( \theta' \); \textit{Oration VI}: ff. 73-\( \alpha' \), 78-\( \epsilon' \), 79-\( \zeta' \), 80-\( \eta' \), 81-\( \theta' \), 83-\( \iota' \), 86-\( \alpha \), 88-\( \epsilon' \), 89-\( \alpha' \), 91-\( \theta' \); \textit{Oration VII}: ff. 92-\( \alpha' \), 93-\( \beta' \), 97-\( \sigma' \), 100-\( \theta' \), 101-\( \iota' \), 102-\( \iota' \).

\(^{716}\) E.g., \textit{Precepts}: ff. 10-\( \epsilon' \), 12-\( \eta' \), 14-\( \theta' \), 15-\( \iota' \), 16-\( \iota' \), 18-\( \alpha \), 19-\( \alpha' \), 22-\( \alpha' \), 25-\( \kappa' \), 26-\( \kappa' \), 29-\( \kappa' \); \textit{Morning Prayers}: ff. 107-\( \alpha' \), 108-\( \beta' \), 109-\( \Gamma' \), 110-\( \Delta' \), 111-\( \epsilon' \).
copied by Isidore. In the text of the Precepts the number of each chapter in Greek numerals is also indicated on the left-hand margin on the recto folios and on the right-hand margin on the verso folios.

The text of the Orations is written continuously and no division of paragraphs is indicated. Each Oration is introduced by a foliated major initial, occupying the space of 3-5 lines. Similar initials introduce George Gemistos’s Preface and the Funeral Oration, the Epistolary Preface as well as the majority of the chapters of the Precepts, whereas some chapters were introduced by ‘panelled’ initials. Breaking from his conventional style, the artist designed a second type of calligraphic initials, by combining palmettes in simple knots or plaits without filling the formed space with ink, including Π (f. 73) introducing Oration VI (Plate VI), and some of the initials introducing the chapters of the Precepts, as well as the initial Ω (f. 112) introducing the Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage. Of great beauty is the initial Ε in f. 41, depicting a flower, which occupies the space of about 8 lines (Plate VI). Zoomorphic are initials Υ, which introduces the seventh chapter of the Precepts (f. 7), and Ρ (f. 13) resembling a dragon, introducing the thirty-second chapter. In the text of the Funeral Oration minor ornate initials distinguish paragraphs.

The text of the Precepts, the Funeral Oration and all Seven Orations are introduced by headbands and headpieces of various types in red or red-violet ink, whereas no decorative element precedes the beginning of the Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time, the Morning prayers or the Dialogue with the

---


718 Initials A (f. 55), Δ (f. 46), E (f. 41), Π (f. 73), T (ff. 31, 64, 92, 105).


720 Initial A (f. 128).

721 Initial E (f. 3).

722 A (ff. 6, 8, 9, 13, 22, 23, 24), B (ff. 6, 7, 8, 9, 13, 22, 23, 24), Z (f. 27), T (f. 21), Ω (f. 30), E (ff. 16, 19, 29), Δ (f. 26), Θ (f. 16), Κ (ff. 16, 19, 23, 28), Λ (f. 22), Ν (f. 22), Π (f. 25), Σ (f. 16), Τ (f. 15), Υ (f. 16), Ω (f. 29).


724 A (f. 11), C (ff. 19), D (f. 20), E (f. 19), K (f. 24), L (f. 16), M (f. 16), N (f. 19), Π (f. 17), Ε (f. 16), Ω (f. 16).
Empress-Mother on Marriage. On f. 3, a plain curved floral branching-scroll pattern\textsuperscript{726} precedes the Epistolary Preface of the Precepts. A more complex pattern that covers the space of 3 lines, consisting of a rounded complex of a cable moulding ending in floral patterns, bearing pointed symmetrical floral patterns in its four endings, is found on the first folio of Oration I (f. 31) (Plate VI.a). A similar headband introduces the text of the Precepts (f. 6), consisting of interlaced bands contained in a rectangular pattern, bearing a pointed trefoil flower in the corners and a floral design in the upper margin engaged to the headpiece. The rectangular shape with the floral design is similar to that found on the first folio of Oration VII (f. 92) (Plate V), though the pattern of the headpiece consists of a curvilinear braid. Similar headpieces of a rounded plait pattern contained in a rectangle bearing pointed floral designs in the four corners are designed on ff. 46\textsuperscript{v} and 128. In these two patterns though, two almost identical floral designs found in the upper margin are not engaged to the headband\textsuperscript{727}. The two floral drawings decorating the upper margin are designed in red ink\textsuperscript{728} and are found on the left and right side of the upper margin of the headpiece of the first folio of Oration II (f. 41\textsuperscript{v}), surrounding in a way the cross found in the centre. The base of the cross has ornamental floral finishings, and in its four corners the initials Ι(ησοῦ)C Χ(ριστοῦ)C ΝΙ KA (Plate VI.b). The headpiece consists of a guilloche pattern, with all the open twists filled with ink. On ff. 55\textsuperscript{v} and 73, the simple wavy floral branching-scroll pattern, occupying the space of about 2 lines, is almost identical with the decoration of the four corners of the rectangle in which the patterns are contained resembling a trefoil flower on f. 73 and a spike on f. 55\textsuperscript{v}\textsuperscript{729}. The simplest headband of the codex is found on f. 64, and occupies the space of a single line. It consists of two joined straight lines decorated with both simple and complex circular knots, with two endings in the shape of a spike-like flower.

A comparison of the decoration, especially of the headbands and initials, of I with that of the three aforementioned codices with which it must have formed a collection\textsuperscript{730}, has led to the suggestion that apart from the copying of the text, Isidore must have also

\textsuperscript{726} Similar to Crypten. 161 (Z.δ.1), f. 3 and Vat. Barb. gr. 219, f. 29\textsuperscript{v}. See Dendrinos, Annotated, p. lxiv, pl. XXVII.c.

\textsuperscript{727} Similar to Vat. Barb. gr. 219, f. 93\textsuperscript{v}. See Dendrinos, Annotated, p. lxiv, pl. XXV.

\textsuperscript{728} Hunger and Lackner, Katalog, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{729} Similar to Crypten. 161 (Z.δ.1), f. 12. See Dendrinos, Annotated, pl. XXVI.

\textsuperscript{730} See above, pp. 209-210.
been responsible for the ornamentation of the codices\textsuperscript{731}, for we know that he acted as a rubricator in a number of codices he copied\textsuperscript{732}.

The text was written in brown ink which has faded in the course of time. Major initials, decorative headpieces\textsuperscript{733}, the titles and the punctuation signs marking the beginning and end of each text (\ldots , \ldots , \ldots and : : -), as well as the abbreviated form of the name of the speaker in the \textit{Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage}, were executed in red ink\textsuperscript{734}.

The codex was bound by Gerard van Swieten in 1755.

\textbf{M Monacensis graecus 411}\textsuperscript{735} (examined through digital images)

16\textsuperscript{th} century; paper; ff. \textit{1-I-V} + \textit{1α-v} + \textit{1β-203}\textsuperscript{736} + \textit{204-205} + \textit{VI-X}\textsuperscript{737}; 299/301x206/209mm.

\textbf{Contents:} The codex contains works by \textit{Pseudo-Caesarius}, \textit{Diadochus of Photice} and \textit{Manuel II Palaeologus}. The codex consists of three Parts.

\textbf{Part I}

(ff. 1α-v) blank

(ff. 1β-83α') \textit{Pseudo-Caesarius, Erotopokrisi}\textsuperscript{738}, +πεύσεις προσαχθεῖσαι υπό κωνσταντίνου θεοχαρίστου \ldots άνδρέων γρηγορίου δόμνου ισιδώρου λεοντίου \ldots ἐπὶ σικρίτῳ καισαρίῳ τῷ ἀδελφῷ τοῦ ἀνδρέου γρηγορίου \ldots ὑπὸ κωνσταντινουπόλει διδάσκων ἐπὶ ἐτη εἴκοσι \ldots + cod. Inc: πεύςις-\ldots οἱ τὴν μεγάλην και εὐρύχωρον διαπλέοντες θάλασσαν \ldots ...

\textsuperscript{731} Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. lxiv-lxv n. 363.
\textsuperscript{732} Mercati, \textit{Notizie}, p. 522.
\textsuperscript{733} Hunger and Lackner, \textit{Katalog}, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{734} Cf. Angelou, \textit{Manuel Palaiologos}, p. 20; Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. lxiv, lxv.
\textsuperscript{735} The codex has been described by I. Hardt, \textit{Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bavaricae}, vol. IV (Munich, 1810), pp. 264-269. R. Riedinger, \textit{Pseudo-Kaisarios. Überlieferungsgeschichte und Verfasserfrage} (Munich, 1969), also provides information about the codex, pp. 81-93.
\textsuperscript{736} Hardt, \textit{Catalogus}, p. 264, reports 203 numbered leaves, numbering only the written folios; Riedinger, \textit{Pseudo-Kaisarios}, p. 81, counted a total of 215 written and blank folios.
\textsuperscript{737} The folio falsely bears number X, since it is number 9 in the sequence. It is however possible that f. IX existed and was removed for some reason before the binding.
\textsuperscript{738} Hardt, \textit{Catalogus}, p. 265, suggests that at some point additional \textit{Questions} were extant in the codex.

(ff. 83b-83d) blank

Part I consists of the following gatherings740: (α')4 1-7, (β')4 8-15 (+1/1), (γ')3 16-21, (δ')4 22-29, (ε')3 30-35, (στ')4 36-43, (ζ')4 44-51, (η')4 52-59, (θ')4 60-67, (ι')4 68-75, (ω')4 76-82 (76/1), (ιβ')3 83α-83d. The number of the gathering in Greek numerals appears on the centre bottom margin of the first folio of each gathering. However, most of these numerals have been trimmed, with the exception of the following which are still visible: f. 8: β', f. 16: Γ', f. 22: Δ', f. 44: ζ, f. 52: η', f. 60: θ', f. 68: ι', f. 83a: ιβ'.

The watermarks identified in the paper are similar to those attested on documents dated to the 16th-century741.

A total of four hands are identified in Part I:

Andreas Darmarios742 copied the larger part of the text: ff. 1-15v, ff. 22-83α743 as well as the marginal note in the bottom of f. 21v. A number of marginal notes and glosses were also added by Darmarios (ff. 1β, 4, 13v, 17v, 19v, 47v, 49v, 65, 77v and 80). In several cases he added a catchword of the following folio on the right-hand corner of the lower margin of the last folio of a gathering (ff. 7v, 21v, 29v, 35v, 43v, 45v, 51v, 58v, 59v, 63, 67v,


740 Cf. Riedinger, Pseudo-Kaisarios, p. 81: 'Nr. 1: 1-2 quaternio (1-15); 1, Nr. 2: 1 Ternio (16-21), Nr. 4: 1 Quaternio (22-29), Nr. 5: 1 Ternio (30-35), Nr. 6: 6 Quaternionen (36-82/76/1), Nr. 12: 1 binio (83-83/3)/.

741 Briquet, Filigranes, vol. I, no. 193 (Tirolo, 1560), no. 552 (Reggio d' Emilia, 1566); vol. II, no. 4854 (Udine, 1564); cf. Riedinger, Pseudo-Kaisarios, pp. 82-83.


743 Riedinger, Pseudo-Kaisarios, p. 81.
75v and 82v) to indicate the beginning of the next. It is possible that the addition of the catchword in the bottom margin of f. 15v was placed by Darmarios to indicate to the next抄写ist the word he should begin with.

Michael Myrokephalites, Darmarios’s collaborator, copied ff. 16v-21v. Their hands are very similar, and the collaboration of the two scribes in the copying of the text of the Erotapokriseis is also the case in codex Vind. theol. gr. 105.

Hand C, possibly a later hand, added marginal notes in ff. 7, 13v, 18v, 19v, 23, 25, 28v, 30v, 33v, 36v, 37, 38v, 44v, 45, 47 and 69. All erroneous words in the text were underlined, and hand C added the correct word in the margin. It is probable that these corrections were introduced by C after he had collated the text of M with another MS or an edited version of the Erotapokriseis.

Hand D added marginal notes on folios 4, 48, 67 and 83av. A terminus post quem for the intervention of hand D in the codex is the year 1866, when the PG edition was published, since all notes to columns and lines refer to Migne’s edition in the Patrologia Graeca, volume 38.

Part II:


744 For Myrokephalites see Vogel and Gardthausen, Grießchen, p. 315-316; Bick, Schreiber, p. 106; Patrineles, ‘Ἐλημένες Κωδικογράφοι’, 99; Kresten, ‘Schreiber’, p. 8; idem, ‘Darmarios’, 179-182 and pl. 4.g, 4.h, 5.a, 5.b; Repertorium, vol. 1, no. 284, 1A pp. 153-154, 1B p. 126, 1C pl. 284.
745 For a comparison of the two hands, see Kresten, ‘Darmarios’, 181-182; idem, ‘Schreiber’, p. 11 n. 17, pointed out that their collaboration was already established by the time of the Council of Trent (1562); cf. Repertorium, 1A p. 29.
746 Riedinger, Pseudo-Kaisarios, pp. 81-82, 85, suggested that the two MSS are complementary to each other.
The watermark of an anchor, similar to Briquet, vol. I, no. 552 (Reggio d’Emilia 1566) has been identified749.

Part II was copied by four different hands:

The text of the Chapters was copied by a single scribe, Michael Myrokephalites750, who added also the marginal notes on ff. 89, 95v and 109, probably after collating his copy to his exemplar.

Hand E appears on ff. 91v, 99v, 107v and 115v. As in the case of the text of the Erotapokriseis, catchwords were added in the bottom margin of the last folio of the gathering. Hand E added the catchword vertically on the right-hand corner of the folio. It is possible that scribe E is no other than Myrokephalites, though this supposition should be ascertained on the basis of further evidence.

A third hand (F), which cannot be identified from the corrections he introduced, has underlined some words in the text (e.g., ff. 97, 104v and 109).

It seems that another hand (G) added a single correction on the word Φωκῆς (for Φωτϊκῆς) by adding τϊ in the interlinear margin (f. 84.1) The erroneous word Φωκῆς, also found in the transcription of the title in Weis-Liebersdorf’s apparatus criticus (p. 4), would suggest that the addition of τϊ must have been introduced after 1912 when Liebersdorf’s edition was published.

---

747 É. des Places used for his edition only the early MSS, hence he makes no mention of M. Similarly J.E. Rutherford re-edited the Chapters adding two early MSS without using M, pp. 8-11. For an edition of the Chapters depending on later MSS, Des Places, p. 76, refers to Weis-Liebersdorf’s edition.

748 J.E. Weis-Liebersdorf ed., Διαδόχου ἐπισκόπου Φωτικῆς τῆς Ἡπείρου τοῦ Ἑλληνικοῦ Κεφάλαια γνωστικά ρ’, Sancti Diadochi Episcopi Photicensis de perfectione spirituali capita centum (Leipzig, 1912). Weis-Liebersdorf used codex M in his edition (under siglum E), though he did not describe the codex.

749 Riedinger, Pseudo-Kaisarios, p. 83.

750 See above, p. 216 with n. 744.
Part III comprises works by Manuel II Palaeologus

1. (ff. 118v–) Table of contents:

† βιβλίον παραγεν(ίκον) τού εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχριστιστού μανουήλ τοῦ παλαιολόγου, πρὸς τόν ἰερασμώτατον ὑόν αὐτοῦ καὶ βασίλεα, ἰωάννην τόν παλαι Ιολόγον:— ἐν ώ περιέχεται τάδε:—

Ἐπιτομὴ προοιμίακη, τῶν ἐφεξῆς κεφαλαίων. ἡ ἀρχή | ἐν πελοποννήσῳ σε λοιπῶν :

Κεφάλαια ἕκατον, δὲ ἀκροστίχίδος, ἡ ἀρχή, βιοι τοῖς ἀν(θρώπ)ίοις :

λόγος προτεττ(ικός) εἰς λόγους· κ(αὶ) περὶ ἀρετῆς, κ(αὶ) ἀγαθοῦ ἄρχουν· τος, ἡ ἀρχή, τοῦ καλῶς ἐπισταθαι λέγειν ·

Ἐτερος, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν, πάσι φιλούμενον ἐστὶ φυσικ(ως)· ὁ δὲ κακὸς, κ(αὶ) ἐαυτῷ μισητός· φιλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ | κακὸν ἔστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκειν νομίζοντες· καὶ 1 περὶ εὐδαιμονίαις(ας) κ(αὶ) ἀρετῆς. ἡ ἀρχή. Ἑγὼ νομίζω. –

Ἐτερος, περὶ προσαρίσσεως, κ(αὶ) ἐκουσίων· κ(αὶ) ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ | φύσεως, οὕτω ἔσωθεν ὁ κακὸς, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ἐαυτῷ ἀπίστως γίνεται(ας): ἡ ἀρχή δεδεικται μὲν ἢν ὅγου τό:

Ἐτερος, περὶ ἡδονῆς· ὅτι κειεττὼν ἢν ἢν μὴ δέ τὴν ἀρχή | χήν σύμπαρεναι τῷ βῶ τοῦτος·

ἡ ἀρχή. ἡ ἀρχή γ(ας) γέγονος ἐστι καὶ προσήκον .

Ἐτερος, περὶ ἡδονῆς ἀντιθεσις, εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦδε λόγον: ἡ ἀρχή· ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν τὰ παρά τῶν μεμφομένων:

Ἑτερος, ὅτι η ἢμι ἄμαρτια, τὸ πάντ(ων) χευριστον· δέ | μηδένα ἀπογίνοσκειν, μήτε ἐαυτὸν, μήτε ἔτερον· δέ | κρίνειν (δέ) ἐαυτόν, καὶ οὐ ἐτερον· καὶ τους ἡμαρτηκότας οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ' ἔλεειν· καὶ περὶ μετανοιας.731 καὶ αἴ γάπτης· καὶ φίλανθρωπ(ης) ἀρχής· ἡ ἀρχή. περὶ ἡδονῆς προδι·

Ἕτερος, περὶ ταπεινοφορίαν, ἐκ μέρους· δὲ καὶ περὶ | ἀγάπης: ἡ ἀρχή, τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸ ὅστατον :

Ἑτυλογος ἐπιστολίματος· ἡ ἀρχή ταῦθ' ἡμῖν ὅ:

Εὐχὴ δοξολογίαν ἔχουσα πρὸς θ(εο)ν, σὺν ὁμολογίᾳ | τῆς εὐσεβείας· εἰτα, δεηην σὺγκεκαμέμενην εὐχαριστίαν καὶ ἐξομολογήσει· σύναγοσκα δὲ πρὸς τό τέλει | τά εἰρημένα· λήγει εἰς πιστίν: ἡ ἀρχή, δόξα τῷ | δείξαινε τό φῶς:

Ἐφαρος εἰκόνων, ἐν ὕψαντω παραπετάσματι ὁγία(ης)· ἡ ἀρχή, ἡ ἀρχή, ἡ ἀρχὴ. ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ δηλοὶ τά ἀνθῆ:

Τίνας ἀν έπι λόγους, ο τῶν περὶ τῶν, τε καὶ σκοτών | εξηγοούμενος τῷ τύραννοντί τῶν 

731 The omission from the title of Oration VI of the phrase καὶ τῆς τοῦ θ(εο)ῦ προνοίας, after καὶ περὶ μετανοιας before καὶ ἀγάπης, is the same as the one observed in f. 2.5 of B, which further confirms the M is an apographon of B. See above, p. 191 n. 650; below, p. 256.
The text is too fragmented to be transcribed accurately.
The remaining Orations VI and VII, the Epistolary Epilogue, as well as Manuel’s Morning prayers, A depiction of Spring in a Dyed Woven Hanging, What Tamerlane might have said to Bayezid, On the death of Bayezid in the form of a psalm, though appearing in the table of contents, are not found in the codex. In an attempt to explain this omission, Hardt suggested that these works might have been bound in another codex, or were altogether lost or destroyed, or perhaps the scribe did not copy them because they did not exist in the exemplar, or he simply omitted them754. Due to lack of evidence none of the aforementioned suggestions can be confirmed, though it is clear that the scribe intended to copy all the works listed in the table of contents.

The palaeographical examination of the text shows that M copied directly B. As it becomes evident M did not initially intent to copy all the works found in B, since the Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time, the Chapters of Compunction and the Paracletic canon to our most holy Lady, the Mother of God for aid in the present circumstances, all extant in B, are not included in the table of contents in M. Given Darmarios’s acquaintance to Johannes Sambucus, and his collaboration with scribes from the circle of Michael Sophianos755, including Nicolaos Choniatis and Bartolomeus Zanetus756, it is possible that he had access to B. This

---

754 Hardt, Catalogus, p. 269: ‘Hae igitur orationes aut cum alio codice colligatae sunt, aut in antigrapho iam defuere, aut omissae, aut omninò perditae’.

755 See Kresten, ‘Schreiber’, p. 8. The possibility that Sophianos owned at some stage codex B, has already been proposed, cf. above, p. 197.

proposition, along with the dates of Darmarios’s activity in Padua, Venice and Augsburg, would suggest that the codex, or at least part of it, was most probably copied somewhere between 1560 and 1570, before Darmarios left for Spain in 1570. The fact that the three texts of M appear in Wolf’s 1575 catalogue further supports this hypothesis.

The ex libris of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek appears on the front pastedown leaf, preceded by the shelf mark: ‘Cod. graec. 411, | 411’. The codex is listed in Hieronymus Wolf’s 1575 catalogue. The contents appear per author in a different order than the present one: Pseudo-Caesarius’s Erotapokriseis (Quaestiones propositae Caesario, Gregorii Theologi fratri.) appears under item no. 124, Diadochus’s Hundred Gnostic chapters (Diadochi, Photicae Epiri episcopi capita illuminantia.) under no. 122, and Manuel’s Precepts (Palaeologi Imp. admonitiones ad filium.) under no. 123. On the left-hand margin of the catalogue an as yet unidentified hand added number ‘411’ next to numbers ‘123’ and ‘124’, and number ‘50b’ next to ‘122’. In Elias Ehinger catalogue (1633), the paper codex, under no. XIV, is classified in the category of Greek theological manuscripts of the Augsburg Library. Ehinger gives the title of the Erotapokriseis and of the Hundred Gnostic Chapters and a more detailed description of Manuel’s works, providing the titles of the Precepts and of the five extant Orations. Leunclavius’s edition of Manuel’s works (Basle, 1578), a copy of which was found in the same library, was classified in the category of philosophical works, under no. XI.

Two hands have been identified in Part III:

Hand A copied the texts of the Precepts and the Orations, as well as the table of contents. All the marginal and interlinear additions, the marginal glosses and notes, and corrections found in this Part were introduced by the scribe himself (Plate VII).

On ff. 163v.7, 174.22, 179.16, 178v.9, 180.21 and 197.9, the euphonic ν at the endings of some words followed by a consonant was underlined to indicate that this was

---

757 Kresten, ‘Schreiber’, pp. 7-9; Repertorium, vol. 1, 1A p. 29.
759 H. Wolf, Catalogus graccorum librorum, manuscriptorum Augstanae Bibliothecae (Augsburg, 1575).
761 Ibid., p. 779.
762 The marginal glossa o(ημείωσ)αι on the left-hand margin of f. 124 needs to be further examined. The scribal hand cannot be identified yet.
763 See below, pp. 258-275.
erroneous. It cannot be confirmed whether hand A made these corrections after re-examining his copy and comparing it with the exemplar, or if they were executed later by a corrective hand. The possibility that the corrective hand was C identified in Part I, which also underlined errors, cannot be ruled out.

Andreas Darmarios's hand is identified also in Part III. Darmarios added in red ink the titles of four of the five extant Orationes in ff. 164v, 170v (Plate VII), 182 and 192v; and copied the last folio of the codex (f. 203v).

All four texts included in the codex are written in single columns. The Erotapokriseis appear in single columns of 24 lines per column and of about 38-42 letters per line, and the Hundred Gnostic Chapters in single columns of 27 lines and of about 42-50 letters per line. The texts of the Precepts and the Seven Orations are written in single columns of 26 lines per column and about 46-53 letters per line.

A single hand numbered continuously in Indian numerals all recto folios on the top right-hand corner. A different hand added folio numbers 1α, and the letter β next to the extant original number 1, as well as number 76α and the letter β next to the original number 76, probably because originally the blank folio 1α and folio 76α were not numbered. The same hand added letter α next to the folio number 83, and numbered the subsequent blank folios as 83β, 83c and 83d, as well as the blank folios found after the end of the text of the Seven Orations, 204 and 205. A third hand numbered in Latin numerals the blank fly-leaves found at the beginning (I-V) and at the end (VI-X) of the codex. A fourth hand added in parentheses, Indian numerals 206, 207, 208 and 210 under the Latin numbers found at the end of the codex, thus continuing the original numbering of the codex. The omission of number IX (209) might be due to an error, though it is also possible that the folio bearing that number was removed. As it has already been stated gatherings were also numbered in Greek numerals, the majority of which were trimmed.

The title of the Erotapokriseis (f. 1v) is introduced by a decorative headband in red ink, consisting of a curvilinear braid pattern, occupying the space of a single line. A cross of

---

764 See above, p. 216.
765 Hardt, Catalogus, p. 264.
766 Therefore: VI (206), VII (207), VIII (208), X (210).
767 See above, p. 215.
invocation was added on the top centre margin and at the beginning and the end of the
title. Each question was introduced by the word πεῦσίς followed by a colon and a
wavy dash (ː ~) and each answer by the word ἀπόκρϊσις followed by the same symbol.
The colon and the dash were also placed at the end of each paragraph. The questions
and answers formed paragraphs, which were all introduced by simple major initials in
red ink. In some instances foliated major initials were designed. The last lines of the
text (f. 83αv) were copied in a triangular form, followed by crosses.

A headband consisting of curvilinear scrolls with floral endings, occupying the space
of two lines, introduces the title of the Hundred Gnostic Chapters (f. 84). No other
decorative elements are extant in Part II, apart from the foliated initials introducing
each one of the hundred chapters, also made in red ink. A single hand added the
number of each chapter on the right-hand margin of the recto and the left-hand margin
of the verso folios. As in the case of the text of the Erotapokriseis, the end of the text was
copied in a triangular shape, with three dots (· : : ) forming a decorative shape placed at
the beginning and end of each line.

Similar decoration in red ink is found in Part III. A headband consisting of a plain
curved floral branching-scroll pattern introduces the table of contents, following the
initials Ι(ησού)C + Χ(ριστό)C added on the top centre margin of f. 118. A cross of
invocation introduces the title of the table, while the first letter of all the titles in the
table is in red ink. A major foliated initial E introducing the Epistolary Preface to the
Precepts is almost identical to the initial E found in f. 138v introducing the fifty-eighth
chapter of the Precepts. All the chapters are introduced by simple major initials, with
the exception of three foliated initials (f. 123-E, f. 124-B, f. 125v-E). Similar initials,
though larger in size, occupying the space of about 3 lines, introduce the five
Orations. A cross of invocation precedes the titles of Orations II (f. 164v), III (f. 170v)
and IV (f. 182) all copied by Darmarios, as already mentioned. A simple headband
occupying the space of a single line, consisting of a pattern of a single wavy line with
trefoil floral endings, introduces the title of Oration V (f. 192v). As in the previous texts
found in this codex, in the last folios of the Precepts and of each Oration, the last lines
form a triangular shape. Though it cannot be confirmed whether the same rubricator

768 F. 1β: O; f. 1βv: Π; f. 31v: E; f. 39v: O.
769 T (ff. 152, 192v), E (f. 165), A (ff. 170v, 182).
designed all the initials found in the codex, the great similarity among them, leads to
the assumption that they must have been made in the same scriptorium.

Ignatius Hardt reported that the codex was in an excellent condition\textsuperscript{770}. The codex was
bound with dark leather cover, bearing metal corner-pieces in the four corners. The
boards of the codex were decorated with floral engravings. The shelf number ‘Cod. Gr.
411’ was inscribed on the spine, while the inscription ‘Questiones propositae Caesarii
Gregorii Theologi fratri (&) Palaeologi imperatoris admoniti suis ad filium 13’, followed by
the mark ‘p.23. n. 14’, added on the front cover.

\textbf{P \hspace{1em} Parisinus græucus 3041} (examined through microfilm)

14th-15th century; paper; ff. 283; 294x215 mm.

The codex is divided in two Parts.

\textbf{Part I} (ff. 1-136\textsuperscript{v}), which has been described in detail\textsuperscript{771}, contains works by \textbf{Manuel II
Palæologus} (ff. 1-105), including his \textit{Letters} (1-63), other rhetorical and literary texts,
among which the \textit{Moral dialogue with the Empress-Mother on marriage} (ff. 89-103\textsuperscript{v})\textsuperscript{772},
religious works and the \textit{Epistolary discourse on the study of theology addressed to lord
Alexius lagoup}\textsuperscript{773}. The last section of Part I (ff. 105-136\textsuperscript{v}) contains the \textit{Synaxarion of the
whole year in verse} by \textbf{Christopher of Mytilene}, \textit{Question 127 to Antiochus of Pseudo-
Athenasius’s of Alexandria}, a translation by an anonymous translator of a Latin
prayer attributed to \textbf{St Augustine}, a miscellany of texts, including a synoptic account
of the Seven Ecumenical Councils, compendia on the heresies of Arius and of Paul of

\textsuperscript{770} Hardt, \textit{Catalogus}, p. 264.

\textsuperscript{771} For descriptions of this MS see H. Omont, \textit{Inventaire sommaire des manuscrits grecs de la Bibliothèque
xxi-xxiv; Bevegni, \textit{Manuelis Palæologi}, pp. xii-xiv; Angelou, \textit{Manuel Palæologos}, pp. 13-22; cf. Laoudas,
‘Συμβουλευτικὸς’, 293-295. See also Ch. Dendrinos ed., \textit{Manuelis Palæologi imperatoris Apologia de
Processione Spiritus Sancti, Tractatus de Ordine in Trinitate, Epistula ad dominum Alexium lagoup}, CCG, 71
(Turnhout, forthcoming). Information concerning the binding, the watermarks, the gatherings, the
numbering of the codex, as well as information about the scribes and Manuel’s autograph, together with
the contents of the codex, can be found in the detailed description provided by Dendrinos, \textit{Manuelis
Palæologi Apologia}, pp. 39-59. I would like to thank Dr Dendrinos for providing me with notes from the
forthcoming book (the pages provided are those of the notes).


\textsuperscript{773} Ed. Dendrinos, \textit{Annotated}, pp. 326-373.
Samosata, and liturgical works by anonymous authors, some of which are attributed to Manuel II. Among the collection of Manuel’s Letters, the Epistolary Epilogue to the Seven ethico-political Orations is found in ff. 33-34 v appearing as Letter vγ. As it has been pointed out, the Epistolary Epilogue and the Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time which appears as Letter vθ (ff. 35 v-36), are not in reality letters (Plate VIII).

Angelou observed that two very similar hands contributed to the copying of Part I. Scribe A copied ff. 2-21, 39-104, and scribe B ff. 1 r-v, 22-37, 38 r-v, 105-136. The two scribes can be distinguished by the different accentuation method they applied. On the folios containing works by Manuel II, a third hand introduced corrections, additions, deletions and revisions, the nature of which lead to the assumption that they belong to the Emperor’s own hand (ff. 1-4, 5 v, 7, 8, 18 v, 19, 20 v-21, possibly 26 v, 30 v, 32 v-v, 38 v-v, 46 v-v, 50, possibly 51, 65 v-v, 68, 74, 88, 89 v, 90 v-v, 91, 92 v-v, 94 v-95 v, 96 v, 98-103 v). Manuel’s intervention in the codex has not been questioned by scholars since it was firstly observed by Boissonade in 1844. For this reason Par. gr. 3041 is considered to be one of the principle MSS of Manuel’s writings, since it contains his autograph corrections (Plates XI-XIII, XX, XXI).

The Epistolary Epilogue (ff. 33-34 v) was copied by scribe B, and it is included in the section of folios (ff. 22-37) preserving letters composed sometime after 1399 when Manuel left to the West and after his return in 1403, but before 1417, date of the last letter (60) included in this part codex. These dates provide further evidence concerning the dating of the Epistolary Epilogue, and subsequently of the dating of the
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774 Cf. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. 445-446.
776 Barker, Manuel II, p. 429; Dennis, Letters, p. xxii; Dendrinos, Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia, pp. 44-45.
778 Cf. Boissonade, Anecdotα nova, p. 249 with n. 1; Berger de Xivrey, 'Mémoire', pp. 3-4; Barker, Manuel II, p. 426; Dennis, Letters, p. xii; Angelou, Manuel Palaiologos, p. 14; Dendrinos, Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia, pp. 41 with n. 172, 43.
779 For Manuel’s autograph see below, pp. 236-237.
780 Angelou, Manuel Palaiologos, p. 15-17; Dendrinos, Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia, p. 43.
781 Manuel II, Letters, 60, pp. 166-169. The numbering of Part I is also indicative for its dating, see Angelou, Manuel Palaiologos, pp. 14-16; Dendrinos, Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia, pp. 42-44, has observed that there are five numbering systems.
Orations, since it is most probable that the Epistolary Epilogue was composed after the completion of all seven Orations. As it has already been suggested the Epistolary Epilogue in P is an early version\(^{782}\) (Plate VIII).

**Part II**\(^{783}\) (ff. 137-283) contains Nicetas Choniates’s History\(^{784}\), and sections of George Acropolites’s History. Six hands have copied the second Part of the codex, which contains several marginal notes and corrections\(^{785}\).

V **Vaticanus graecus 632 (olim 428)\(^{786}\)**

15\(^{th}\) century; paper; III + 430 (+ ff. 174a-c, 321a-b, 351a-b); 222x148 mm.

This miscellaneous codex was copied by eighteen different scribes\(^{787}\), and consists of three parts: Part I (ff. 1-254) contains works mainly by Nicolas Cabasilas and other authors from Manuel II Palaeologus’s intellectual circle, Part II (ff. 255-419\(^{v}\)) comprises works by Manuel II, and Part III contains a Funeral Oration on Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus by an anonymous author\(^{788}\).

**Part I** (ff. 1-255) contains theological and liturgical works. It has been suggested that this part of the codex must have been composed sometime between 1391 and 1431\(^{789}\).

1. (f. 1) Table of contents.
   
   (f. 1\(') blank

\(^{782}\) See above, pp. 47-48; below, p. 302.

\(^{783}\) Part II has been described by J.A. van Dieten ed., *Nicetae Choniatae Historia*, CFHB, XI/1 (Berlin, 1975), pp. xxxvi-xxxvii (codex K), xli (codex Y). Van Dieten proposes that the codex was compiled sometime between 1350-1425.


\(^{785}\) Dendrinos, *Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia*, p. 58.


\(^{788}\) Ibid., pp. 429 with n. 37, 435-436, noted that though Devreesse and Chrysostomides distinguished two Parts, the codex is actually divided in three parts, since ff. 420-430 are of different paper and were added to the codex at a later stage.

\(^{789}\) Ibid., p. 430.
2. (ff. 2-11) Theodore Bishop of Andida, Preface to the Commentary on the Holy Liturgy, +Theodóroʊ ἑπισκόπου ἀνδίδων. προθεωρία κεφαλαίωσις περὶ | τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ ἱερογυνία γίνομεν(ν) συμβόλων καὶ μυστηρίων. | πονηθείσα ἐξ ἀξυόσε(ως) τοῦ θεοφιλεστάτου(ν) ἐπισκόπου(που) φιλτεί(ας): cod. Inc. Εἰδέναι πάς ὀφείλει πιστὸς ..., des. mut. ... τῆς θείας πλευρᾶς[--- PG 140, cols. 418-468]

3. (ff. 12-69) Nicolas Cabasilas, Explanation of the Holy Liturgy, † τοῦ σοφῶ(τα)τ(ον) κ(αι) μακαρίωσι(ται)τ(ον) κύρι νικόλαου τοῦ καβάσιλα, ἐρμηνεία κεφαλαίωδος εἰς τὴν | θεία(αν) ἱερογυνία(αν): κεφ(άλαιον) α': Τίς ο ν(οίς) τ(ῆς) ἱερογυνί(ας) ὀλης ὡς ἐν κεφαλαιών: cod. Inc. Τῆς ἀγίας τελετῆς ..., des. ... πρέπει ἢ Θ(ε)ω, | πάσα δόξα τιμή καὶ προσκύνησις, ... νῦν καὶ ἂει ... ἀμήν:+ Eds. S. Salaville, R. Bornert, J. Guillard and P. Périchon, Nicolas Cabasilas, Explication de la divine liturgie, SC, 4 bis (Paris, 1967), pp. 56-307; PG 150, cols. 368-492

(ff. 69v) blank

4. (ff. 70-95) Nicolas Cabasilas, Encomium on St Demetrius, † τοῦ ἐν ἀληθ(εία) σοφωτ(α)τ(ον) κ(αι) μακαριώσι(τα)τ(ον) κύρι νικόλαου τοῦ καβάσιλα. | ἐγκώμιον εἰς τῶν ἁγίων πανένδοξον τοῦ χριστοῦ μεγαλομάρτυρ(ν)α | κ(αι) θαυματοποι(ν) κ(αι) μυροβλήτην δημιουργία(ν): cod. Inc. Πολλῶν ὄντων (καὶ) μεγάλων ..., des. ... αὐτὸς δεδεμένος | ὡς δόξα ... νῦν (καὶ) ἂει ... ἀμήν:+ BHG 543; ed. Th. Ioannou, Μνημεία Ἁγιολογικά (Venice, 1884), pp. 67-114.

5. (f. 96) Nilus Cabasilas, Metropolitan of Thessalonike, Letter to his nephew Nicolas Cabasilas, ἐπιστολή τοῦ θε(σιαλονίκης) τοῦ καβάσιλα τοῦ ἁγι(ου) τοῦ κύρι νειλ(ου), πρ(ος) τ(ον) αὐτοῦ ἀνεψι(ν) τ(ον) ἁγί(ου) κύριν νικόλα(ου) τ(ον) καβάσιλ(α):+ cod. Inc. +περὶ τῆς ἐννοίας(ας) τῶν συγγραμμ(α)τ(ων) σου ..., des. ... μετὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἱσασθαι τοῦ χριστοῦ:+ Ed. S. Lampros, Ἀναγραφῇ ἔργων Νικόλαου Καβάσιλα καὶ Δημητρίου Κυδώνη ἐν τῷ Παρμισιακῷ κώδικι 1213', Νέους Ἐλληνομνήμονας 2 (1905), 305-306.

(ff. 96v-97) blank

7. (f. 98-111v) Nicolas Cabasilas, *Sermon on the Passion of Christ*, † τοῦ ἐν ἀληθ(εία) πανοσφόφου κ(αi) παμμάκαρος κubits(η) | νικολ(άου) τοῦ καβάσιλ(α), λόγ(ος) εις τὰ ἀγιοι(α) κ(αi) σωτ(ησία)ια πάθη τοῦ κ(υριού)u | κ(αi) θ(εού)υ κ(αi) σωτηρ(ος)ος ἡμ(ῶν) ι(ησο)οῦ χ(ριστοῦ)υ: εὐ(λ)ό(γησον) π(ι)ερευς: cod. Inc. Ἄκουε οὐ(ραν)ὲ ..., des. ... τοῦ μονογενοῦς τραύματος· ὅτι αὐτῶ πρέπει πᾶσα δόξα ... ἀμήν: BHG\(^a\) and BHG\(^w\) 414g; ed. B.S. Pseutongas, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα ἑπτὰ λόγοι τὸ πρῶτον νῦν ἐκδιδόμενοι* (Thessalonike, 1976), pp. 92-112.


10. (ff. 136v-143v) Nicolas Cabasilas, *Sermon on the Ascension*, τοῦ αὐτ(ού) λόγ(ος) εἰς τ(ήν) ἀνάληψιν τοῦ κ(υριο)υ κ(αi) θ(εού)υ καὶ σωτηρ(ός)ος ἡμ(ῶν) ἑπὶ τῶν θ(εοτό)κα διαιῶνος ἀδάμεν. σὺν τῷ ἀνάρχῳ σου π(ι)ερευς ... ἀμήν: Ed. Pseutongas, *Νικολάου Καβάσιλα*, pp. 112-123.


13. (ff. 159-166v) **Nicolas Cabasilas, Against Usurers, Τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατὰ τοκϊζόντων: | Εἰσίν οἱ φασὶ τὸν ἀναιροῦντα ..., des. ... πολλῶν ὑπεύθυνος ὤν :+ PG 150, cols. 728-749.

14. (ff. 166v-174v) **Nicolas Cabasilas, Encomium on St Theodora of Thessalonike, τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὴν ὁσίαν μητέρας μύροβλύτη σοφωτάτη τοῦ κυρίου ... ἀμήν): ·:· BHG 1741; PG 150, cols. 753-772.


Part I consists of the following gatherings\textsuperscript{790}: Section I: 1 and 2-11; Section II: (\(\alpha'\))\textsuperscript{i} 12-19, (\(\beta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 20-27, (\(\gamma'\))\textsuperscript{i} 28-35, (\(\delta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 36-43, (\(\epsilon'\))\textsuperscript{i} 44-51, (\(\zeta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 52-59, (\(\xi'\))\textsuperscript{i} 60-67, (\(\eta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 68-69; Section III: (double numbering) <\(\alpha'\)>(\(\theta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 70-77, (\(\beta'\))(\(\iota'\))\textsuperscript{i} 78-85, (\(\gamma'\))\textsuperscript{i} 86-93, <\(\delta'\)> 94-97; Section IV: (\(\alpha'\))\textsuperscript{i} 98-105, (\(\beta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 106-113, (\(\gamma'\))\textsuperscript{i} 114-121, (\(\delta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 122-129, <\(\epsilon'\)>\textsuperscript{i} 130-137, <\(\zeta'\)>\textsuperscript{i} 138-145, (\(\zeta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 146-153, (\(\eta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 154-161, (\(\theta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 162-169, (\(\iota'\))\textsuperscript{i} 170-174a-c; Section V: (\(\alpha'\))\textsuperscript{i} 175-182, (\(\beta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 183-190, (\(\gamma'\))\textsuperscript{i} 191-198, (\(\delta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 207-214, (\(\delta''\))\textsuperscript{i} 199-206, (\(\epsilon'\))/(\(\zeta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 215-222, (\(\zeta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 223-230, (\(\eta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 231-238, (\(\theta'\))\textsuperscript{i} 239-246, (\(\iota'\))\textsuperscript{i} 247-254.

This Part of the codex was written on western paper with watermarks similar to those attested on documents dated in the 14\textsuperscript{th} and 15\textsuperscript{th} century\textsuperscript{791}.

The following hands have contributed to the copying of the texts found in Part I:

Hand A\textsuperscript{792} copied large parts of the codex, ff. 1-30, 96\textsuperscript{r}-v, 98-168\textsuperscript{v} (except f. 153\textsuperscript{v}, lines 1-15, 18-25 and f. 163, lines 20-23), 169\textsuperscript{r}-174\textsuperscript{v}, 175-254 (Plates IX, XVII, XVIII).

Hand B copied ff. 30\textsuperscript{r}-69. The suggestion that this hand belongs to the monk Dositheos, probably identified with Dositheos Karantenos, has been rejected on the basis of textual evidence\textsuperscript{793}.

Hand C copied ff. 70-95\textsuperscript{794} (Plate IX).

Hand K, which belongs to George Scholarios, copied f. 97\textsuperscript{795} (Plates X, XI, XIV, XV, XVIII).

Hand R copied ff. 153\textsuperscript{v}, lines 1-15 and 18-25. As mentioned above, the remaining lines were copied by hand A.

Hand D copied lines 20-23 on f. 163, while hand A copied the remaining lines. F. 169 was also copied by hand D.

\textsuperscript{790} Ibid., pp. 429-430.

\textsuperscript{791} Briquet, \textit{Filigranes}, vol. III, no. 3661 (Venice, 1438), no. 6544 (Genova, 1420) (ff. 12-69), no. 7690 (Colle, 1427) (ff. 2-11); vol. IV, no. 8122 (Genova, 1410) (ff. 98-174); no. 15490 (Lille, 1389) (ff. 175-254), no. 15753 (Genova, 1410) (ff. 70-97); cf. Devreesse, \textit{Codices}, p. 42; Dendrinos, \textit{‘Unpublished’}, p. 429 with n. 38.

\textsuperscript{792} See below, pp. 237-240.

\textsuperscript{793} Dendrinos, \textit{‘Unpublished’}, pp. 427-428.

\textsuperscript{794} Ibid., p. 425, has suggested that the hand belongs to Leo Atrapes. Nevertheless, this view has been re-examined, see Dendrinos, \textit{Manuelis Palaeologi Apologia}, p. 18 n. 71. Though very similar the hand is not the same. See below, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{795} Devreesse, \textit{Codices}, p. 40. For George Scholarios, see \textit{Repertorium}, vol. 1, n. 71, 1A p. 61, 1B p. 35, 1C pl. 71; vol. 2, no. 92, 2A pp. 54-55; vol. 3, n. 119, 3A p. 61; \textit{PLP} 27304; see below, p. 240.
Part II (ff. 255-429') comprises solely works by Manuel II Palaeologus.


f. 255 +προστρεπτικὸς εἰς λόγους· (καὶ) περὶ ἀρετῆς (καὶ) ἀγαθοῦ ἀρχοντος:+ λόγ(ος) ας (in marg. sup.)

i. (ff. 256-267') *Oration I*, +προστρεπτικὸς, εἰς λόγους, (καὶ) περὶ ἀρετῆς (καὶ) ἀγαθοῦ ἀρχοντος: λόγ(ος) πρώτος (al. man. scr. deinde λόγ(ος) πρώτος) | τοῦ ἀοιδίμου βασιλέως κύριον τοῦ παλαιωλ(ό)γ(ου). πρό(ὐ) τόν ἑαυτοῦ αὐτοῦ ό(άνν)η(ν) τόν βασιλ(έα)ν: cod. Inc. <T>ον καλώς ἑπίστασθαι λέγειν, οὔδεν ἀν ..., des. ... καὶ ὁφλήσει | γέλωτα παντὶ δικαίῳ νοῦν ἔχουσίν :+:

ii. (ff. 268-273') *Oration II*, ὅτι τὸ μέν ἀγαθὸν, πάσι φιλούμενον ἐστὶ φυσικ(ῶς) ὁ δὲ | κακός, κ(αὶ) ἐαυτῷ μισητός· φιλούμ(εν) (δὲ) κ(αὶ) τὸ κακὸν ἑστὶν | ὅτε ἀγαθὸν κάκειν νομίζοντες· (καὶ) περὶ εὐδαιμονίας | κ(αὶ) ἀρετῆς :+ (in marg. sup., al. man. sc. λόγ(ος) βς†) cod. Inc. ἐγὼ νομίζω καὶ πάντας οἴμαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ σύνθεσθαι ..., des. ... καθάπερ ἡμῖν εὑρη(αί) καταρχάς | εὐθὺς :+

(f. 274') blank: λόγ(ος) Γ': (in marg. sup.)

(f. 274') *Political verse in demotic Greek*, + τῶν εὐτυχοῦντων· πάντας ἀν(θρωπ)οι φοίλοι· τῶν διστυχοῦντων· οὔδ' αὐτός, ὁ γενήτωρ +

iii. (ff. 275-283) *Oration III*, + περὶ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἑκουσίου· καὶ ὁπικαὶ ὁκαὶ ἀλλ' ἀτοῦ ἐαυτῷ ἁπάντως γίνεται (in marg. sup., al. man. sc. +λόγος Γς+:) cod. Inc. διδεικται μὲν ὡς ἡγοῦμαι τὸ προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἰκανῶς ..., des. ... καὶ γέγονε κατὰ | τὴν ἡμετέραν ἰσχὺν :+

(f. 283') blank

iv. (ff. 284-290') *Oration IV*, Ὑπερὶ ἡδονῆς ὑπακοῆς καὶ[κιόντην?] ταύτην τινῶς κακίστην εἶναι τῷ βιῷ λέγοντι καὶ ὑπακοῆς | τούναντιον ἑστὶν ἀγαθὴ τὸ καθ' αὐτὴν· αἱ δὲ παραχρῆσεις κακαί· ὅπερ ὅν | ἡμετέροις ἐγκλήμα, τῇ ἡδονή
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λογιζόμεθα, et ante scr. et del. Ἡπείρι ἡδονής καὶ ὡς ἐδει γε μη δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ὁ μεν συμπαρείναι τῷ βιῶ τούτῳ, et ante scr. et del. ὅτι κρείττον ἂν ἦν μηδὲ τηναρχὴν συμπαρείναι τῷ βιῶ τούτῳ, et ante scr. +περὶ ἡδονής ὅτι κρείττον ἂν ἦν μηδὲ τηναρχὴν συμπαρείναι τῷ βιῶ τούτῳ: (in marg. sup., al. man. scr. +Λόγος Δεκάτης) cod. Inc. ἢ ἄλλα γὰρ γιγνόμενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον ..., des. ... ύπέρ τὴν τῶν ὅλων εἶναι νομίζομεν (ἐν ἑαυτῷ).:

v. (ff. 291-300v) Oration V, ἢπείρι ἡδονής ἀντίθεσις· εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦ δε λόγον. (al. man.) (in marg. sup., al. man. scr. +λόγος ετ') cod. Inc. <Τ>αυτὶ μὲν οὖν τὰ παρὰ τῶν μεμφομένων τῆς ἡδονῆς ..., des. ... ἀγαθὸν θὸν τὴν σύμμετρον ἡδονὴν λέγειν:

vi. (ff. 301-321v) Oration VI, titulus illeg. (in marg. sup. +λόγος στ') cod. Inc. Περὶ ἡδονῆς προδιαλεχθέντες ὡς οἷοί ἦμεν ..., des. ... αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, ἀμήν:

(f. 321a-b) blank

vii. (ff. 322-333v) Oration VII, +περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης· εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦ δε λόγον. (al. man.) (in marg. sup., al. man. scr. +λόγος ζτ') cod. Inc. Τὸν κεφαλαίων τὸ ὑστάτον ἅσοι παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποδέδοται ..., des. ... καὶ καλοὺς ἀγῶνας τούτους ἐνεστησάμην:

viii. (ff. 333v-335) Epistolary Epilogue, titulus om., cod. Inc. <Τ>αὐθὲν ἡμῖν ὁ βασιλεὺς τὸν υἱὸν, οἷον ἂν τὰς νοοεῖς τῶν υἱῶν, οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μετανοίας· καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προφορικῆς ἡδονῆς, καὶ φιλανθρωπίας· αὐτῷ δὲ, μετὰ τὸ ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὸν βίον, τῆς ὀσίας μαρίας τῆς αἰώνιας αἰώνιας: (in marg.
sup., al. man. scr. +<λόγος η'> <φύλ>λα iς) cod. Inc. Ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὁ τῆς ὁσίας ἡμῖν τὸν βίον... des. τῆς τοῦ σ(ωτῆ)ρ(ο)ς φιλαν(θρωπίας)· αὐτῶ η ἀβάζα... ἀμήν:+ BHG and BHGα 1044c.


(f. 351a-b) blank


i. (ff. 352-354) George Gemistos, Preface to Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus' Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore, προθεωρία τοῦ παρόντος λόγου:~ (al. man. add. in marg. τοῦ γεμιστοῦ κυρ(οῦ) γεωργ(ίου)) cod. Inc. Περὶπαθὲς μ(εν) τὸ προοίμιον... des. ἀναγινώσκοντι, θεωρεῖν:~

ii. (ff. 354) Ioasaph, Bishop of Ephesus, Note on the character of the Funeral Oration, περὶ τοῦ χαρακτήρος τοῦ λόγου:~ (al. man. add. in marg. τοῦ ἐφέσου κυρ(οῦ) ἰωάσαφ·) cod. Inc. Ὑσα μ(εν) ὡς ἐν προθεωρία... des. ἀναγινώσκοντι, ἐννοεῖν:~

iii. (ff. 354v) Manuel II Palaeologus, Epigram on the Funeral Oration (al. man. add. in marg. τοῦ βασιλέ(ως) κυρ(οῦ) μαν(ουήλ)) cod. Inc. Ἡκὼ πενθήσων... des. συνεισενέγκειν ὅλ(ως) εἶχον:~

iv. (ff. 354v) Demetrios Magistros, Epigram on the Funeral Oration (al. man. add. in marg. κυρ(οῦ) δημητρ(ίου) τοῦ μαγίστρου) cod. Inc. Ἡλυθον ἀνδρῶν φέρτατε..., des. οἴκωμι ἄξια τίσαι

v. (f. 355) Matthew Chrysocephalos, Epigram on the Funeral Oration (al. man. add. in marg. κυρ(οῦ) ματθαίου τοῦ χρυσοκεφάλου) cod. Inc. Ἡκὼ σὲ παντί ἀφίστε... des. δύναντ' ἀν ὅλ(ως):~

(f. 355v) blank

vi. (ff. 356-419v) Manuel II Palaeologus, Funeral Oration on his Brother Theodore, τοῦ εὐσεβεστάτου καὶ φιλοχρϊστου βασιλέ(ως) κυρ(οῦ) μανουηλ.timedelta: 1
παλαιολόγου, λόγος ἑπιτάφιος εἰς τὸν αὐτάδελφον αὐτοῦ | δεσπότην
πορφυρογέννητον, κύρ(ι)ν θεώδωρον τὸν παλαιολόγον· ὤθειες, | ἐπίδημησαντος εἰς πελοπόννησον τοῦ βασιλέως :- cod. Inc. Ἀλλὰ τί καὶ
φθέγξωμαι ..., des. ... γένοιτο δῆλον :+

Part II consists of the following gatherings796: <β'> 255-266, (γ') 1 267-273 [f. 274 blank
bearing number δ' on the recto], (δ') 1 275-282+ f. 283, (ε') 1 284-291, <θ> 1 291-299, (C') 1
300-307, (ζω') 1 308-315, <η' > 1 316-321a-б, (θ') 1 322-335, (ι') 1 336-343, (ω') 1 344-351,
(αβ')/(ασ') 1 (double numbering) 351a-357, (βω') 1 358-365, (γω') 1 366-373, (δω') 1 374-381,
(εω') 1 382-389, (ζω') 1 390-397, (ζω') 1 398-405, (ηω') 1 406-413, (θω') 1 414-419.

This Part of the codex was written on paper with watermarks similar to those attested
on documents dated to the 14th and 15th century797.

The following hands have been identified in Part II:

Hand C798 copied Orations I (ff. 256-267v) and II (ff. 268-273v), as well as ff. 352-419v
which include the Preface, the Note on the character, the Epigrams of the Funeral Oration
and the text of the Funeral Oration. In Oration I, the majority of corrections, deletions,
and additions were made by hand C. Given the large number of errors due to
confusion of sound in Orations I and II (e.g., f. 257v.16: κενᾶς from καινᾶς [I 65]) which
were later corrected most probably by hand C and the fact that the word κάλλιον
was crossed out and replaced by its synonym βέλτιον (f. 266.16 [I 381]), shows that the text
was dictated to scribe C rather than copied from an exemplar. This is confirmed by the
addition of words in both margins by hand C (f. 271.10-12: εὐθὺς γίνεται, ὡς ἐν τῷ
ἐφεξῆς λόγῳ ὑποθῆκεται καθαρώτερον and εἶναι, τῷ γὰρ ἀληθῶς θέλειν, ἔπεται καὶ
tὸ ἐνεργεῖν [II 111-113]). The nature of some additions and corrections makes it
difficult to tell whether these were made by hand C or the corrective hand A, or indeed

351a: δ'/ας') by two different hands suggests that this Section was added to the codex at a later stage’. Section XV includes ff. 351a-b- 419v.
no. 3661 (Venice, 1438) (ff. 284-297, 416-417); vol. IV, no. 8968 (Florence, 1410) (ff. 300-315, 325-335), no.
11678 (Fano, 1373) (ff. 275-282, 316-321); cf. Devreesse, Codices, p. 42; Dendrinos, ‘Unpublished’, p. 429 with
n. 38.
798 Hand C copied also copied ff. 70-95. See above, p. 230 n. 794.
a different corrective hand⁷⁹⁹ (Plate IX). A similar hand seems to have added in *Oration III* the particle τε in the interlinear margin over the word ὥς (for ὥστε: f. 275.13 [III 11]) (Plate X).

Hand O⁸⁰⁰ copied verses on demotic Greek found in two lines on f. 274v.

Hand J copied *Oration III* (ff. 275-282v), with the exception of the last lines on f. 283.1-10, *Oration VII* (ff. 322-333v) and the *Epistolary Epilogue* (ff. 333v-335). Hand J is careful and disciplined, and seems to belong to a trained calligrapher. The titles of the two *Orations* were also added by the same hand (J), though no title was placed on the *Epistolary Epilogue* following the end of *Oration VII* (f. 333v). In comparison to the text copied by other hands, the sections copied by J are relatively free of deletions, erasures and additions (Plate X). Hand J added notes on the left-hand margin of f. 276v.²⁰ and f. 328v.²², the latter preceded by the word κείμ(ε)ν(ον)⁸⁰³, as well as a correction in f. 334v.¹³, where the name πέτρον replaced another erased word (possibly παῦλον?) (*Ep.* 51). Overwritten letters on f. 276v.²³ may be attributed to the same hand, together with several other similar corrections of words and accents/breathings⁸⁰⁵, and additions⁸⁰⁶. If so, taking into consideration the nature of these small additions and corrections, some of them due to *homoioiteleuton* (*Oration VII*, f. 329.12-13: τουτὶ δὲ τὸ γίγνόμενον, εἰρήσεται· καὶ ἅπερ ἂν εὐξαίμην περί σοῦ, ταῦτα πράξεις. [VII 326]), it seems that J was not dictated the text but copied it from another MS, before he checked and corrected his own text.

Hand D copied the last ten lines of *Oration III* in f. 283 (which was added to the codex at some stage)⁸⁰⁷, as is the case of f. 163 in the previous Part I⁸⁰⁸. It appears that this

---

⁷⁹⁹ See the marginal additions: f. 265.19 γε (I 347), f. 273.7 the abbreviated δὲ (II 180), and f. 263v ὥρισαν (I 287-289), f. 260v.11 together with the correction of ἐκατοντά (I 173).

⁸⁰⁰ Dendrinos, ‘Unpublished’, p. 429. Hand O is very similar to hand M (ff. 429v, 430v) which copied political verses on demotic Greek. See below, p. 242.

⁸⁰¹ After τοῖς, a reference sign and τοῖς τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων were added on the left-hand margin. The τοῖς in the margin was deleted, and he deleted the οὐς following τοῖς in the text (III 89).


⁸⁰³ F. 328v.20: κείμ(ε)ν(ον) (VII 307-308).

⁸⁰⁴ F. 276v.23, ὥσθ’ ὁ τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγων ἔχει from ὥστε τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγει [.] ἔχειν (III 91).

⁸⁰⁵ E.g., f. 333v.16, συγκρίνων from συγκρίναι and ἐγκρίνων from ἐγκρίναι (VII 516). Whether the correction of accents was made by hand J remains to be ascertained by an *in situ* examination of the MS.

⁸⁰⁶ E.g., f. 322v.3, συμφεγγόμενος from συμφεγγόμενος (θ added in the interlinear margin). It is impossible to distinguish the hand that added the letter.


⁸⁰⁸ See above, p. 230.
unattractive hand belongs to a novice, possibly a student of scribe A, as their cooperation over the copying of these two folios show.

Hand E copied Oration IV (ff. 284-290v). The nature of some corrections in these folios, suggest that these were introduced while dictating or composing, rather than copying the text from an exemplar. For example, in the phrase τὰς τε τῶν ἄλλων εὐτυχίας οὐ φέροντα, κ(α)ι τὰς οἰκείας ὀδυρόμενον ἐστὶ δυστυχίας, the last word is preceded by the first three letters of the opposite word (εὐτυχίας) which were crossed out (ἐστὶ) in order to write the correct word (δυστυχίας) (f. 285v.8 [IV 82]). Similarly, in the phrase καὶ εἰ ταῖς ὑπερβολαῖς τῶν ἀσκίσεων ἡδίστων the last word is preceded by the opposite word (χειρίστων) which was crossed out in order to write the correct word (ἡδίστων) (f. 290.8 [IV 329]). In a third case, the word βάθος was corrected to πάθος by overwriting the first letter of the word (f. 285v.6 [IV 80]). Apart from that, the word πανχοῦ was corrected by overwriting the last two letters and adding the letters ταχοῦ (f. 289v.17 [IV 313]), thus writing the correct form of the word: πανταχοῦ. Finally, the crossing out of the first λύκοι in the phrase ἐπεὶ κ(α)ὶ λύκοι μύες καὶ αἴλουροι. κ(α)ὶ πάν τοιοῦτον κλεπτώσατον. λύκοι τε κ(α)ὶ ἀπαν ἄσπακτικ(ὸν) cannot be explained in terms of homoioteleuton (f. 288.18 [IV 226]), but seems to have been chosen for stylistic reasons, namely to avoid repetition. The same hand added the phrase ὅτεν ταυτι διαπράττομεν in the bottom margin of f. 287 (IV 175) and possibly another phrase in the top margin of f. 286 which is illegible as the folio was trimmed (Plates XII, XIII).

This hypothesis is further supported by evidence concerning stages of revision in the title of Oration IV (f. 284) made by the same hand (Plate XI): (1) the original version of the title, Ἄρει ἡδονής ὅπως κα[κίστην?] ταύτην τινός κακόντην εἰναι τῷ βίῳ λέγοντα καὶ ὅπως ἔστιν ἀγαθή τῷ καθότι αὐτὴν αἱ παραχρήσεις κακαί· ὅπερ ὅν ἡμέτερον ἔγκλημα, τῇ ἡδονῇ λογιζόμεθα·, was deleted. (2) The whole title was crossed out by diagonal lines, keeping only the two first words: Ἄρει ἡδονής. (3) The phrase καὶ ὡς ἐδεί γε μὴ δὲ τὴν ἄρχην ὁ φαινει συμπαρείναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ: was added on the right hand margin and then crossed out. (4) After the first two original words, Ἄρει ἡδονής, he placed a diagonal line linking these with the phrase ὅτι κρεῖττον ἄν ἄν μηδὲ τηναρχὴν συμπαρείναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ added above the line. (5) The same hand wrote anew the complete and final version of the title,
The nature of these corrections suggest either the close collaboration between the scribe and the author, or that these were autograph corrections. A comparison of hand E with that identified as the Emperor's hand in Par. gr. 3041 (ff. 1-4, 5v, 7v, 8, 18v, 19, 20v-21, possibly 26v, 30v, 32v, 38v, 46v, 50, possibly 51, 65v, 68, 74, 88, 89v, 90v, 91, 92v, 94-95v, 96, 98-103v) shows that they are identical\(^809\) (Plates XX, XXI).

Hand F copied Oration V (ff. 291-299v), and introduced corrections, additions and deletions throughout the Oration (Plate XIV). It is not clear whether hand F was copying from another MS. For example, in f. 297.21 the word ἐνεργούμενα (V 245), present in a different place of the sentence in the line above, was crossed out. This word does not appear in the other extant MSS. Also in f. 298v.24-25, hand F crossed out the word τελεῖ at the end of the line and added in the left margin of the following line the word λυσιτελεῖ (V 306).

Oration VI was copied by two consecutive hands. Hand G copied ff. 301-315v and hand H ff. 316-321v. The title of the Oration (f. 301) is illegible (Plate XV), probably because it was written in different ink colour which has faded. The only legible word, possibly written by hand G, is φιλανθρωπία. The copying of the Oration by two very similar hands might be due to the extensive length of the text. Most of the corrections and additions in the sections copied by G and H were made by the respective scribes. The interventions in the text of Oration VI include corrections of errors mainly due to confusion of sounds, such as the deletion of διάφυγείν after διέφυγον ἃ φύγειν (f. 307.14 [VI 311]), or dittography (ἀλλων ἀλλων) by hand H in f. 320v.18 (VI 737) (Plate XVI), and addition of marginal notes and instructions\(^810\).

Hand A\(^811\), identified to belong to Macarius Macres\(^812\), is found throughout the text of the Orations. A collation of Macres’s hand identified in Vat. gr. 1107 (ff. 50v, 137v, 140v),

---

\(^{809}\) According to Dendrinos, *Annotated*, p. xlvi, the corrective hand in Vat. gr. 1107, f. 140v seems to be very similar to Manuel’s hand. However a closer examination of the two hands shows that though very similar they are not identical.

\(^{810}\) The marginal additions are listed below, pp. 278-279.

\(^{811}\) Cf. above, p. 230.
323\(^8\) with hand A in our V, shows that the two are identical. Thus, a number of corrections, deletions and interlinear additions, as well as marginal notes and superscripted letters used to denote transposition of word order\(^9\), found throughout the text of the *Oration* were introduced by Macarius, in a similar way as in *Vat. gr.* 1107, which suggests collaboration between Manuel II and Macres\(^1\). Evidence confirms their relation. The anonymous author of Macarius Macres’s *Vita* remarks on the Emperor’s high esteem for his friend and fellow-theologian\(^2\). Similarly, in his *Letter to the Metropolitan of Thessalonica Gabriel* (Dennis no. 52), Manuel asks Gabriel to show a work of his to the right people, including ‘the good and virtuous friend Macarius’ who is no other than Macres\(^3\).

The copying of ff. 300\(^-\text{v}\) (Plate XVII) containing part of Oration V, resembles the case of the copying of a single leaf in the *Epistolary Preface* of the Precepts in *Vat. gr.* 1107 (ff. 137.1-137\(^-\text{v}\).28)\(^4\). As it has been pointed out, Macres seems to have been in the habit of removing a single leaf from MSS containing Manuel’s works, possibly to keep it as a memorabilia of his friendship with the Emperor, replacing it with another leaf that he added in the codex on which himself copied the missing text. It is possible, that as in Manuel’s treatise *On the Procession of the Holy Spirit*, and on the discourse *On the Order in the Trinity* in codex *Vat. gr.* 1107 Macres acted as a corrector\(^5\), he undertook the same task in V, especially in the text of the Seven Ethico-political Orations. It should be

---

812 See above, p. 28 n. 49.  
814 All these are noted in the palaeographical examination below, pp. 264-265, 279, 297, under corrections introduced by V\(^\text{Hand A}\).  
819 Cf., p. xlv. On Macres’s activity as a collaborator of other scholars, contributing in the copying process of a text, for comments on his interventions and samples of his hand see Dendrinos, ‘Scholars’, pp. 31-33, with figures 4, 8a-b, 12-15. Dendrinos examines here the copying by Macres of ff. 9-87 in MS D. gr. 268 (*Ivan Dujićev Centre for Slavo-Byzantine Studies, Sofia*), which preserves Joseph Bryennius’ autograph theological works.
stressed that the majority of these corrections were adopted in the ‘edited’ version of the *Orations* in I, which was composed under Manuel’s instructions.

The numbering of *Orations I-II* placed by Macres in the top margin of the first folio of the first two *Orations* (λόγος α in f. 255 folio bearing only the title of *Oration I* and λόγος πρώτος in f. 256, and λόγος β in the top centre margin of f. 268), presently in faded ink, and his intervention in all *Orations*, further supports the assumption that Part II was at some point in Macres’s possession. It seems that all Seven *Orations* were originally numbered by Macres, while the Greek number Η (<λόγος> η<ς>), which is still visible on f. 336, and indicates the *Sermon on Sin and Penance*, apparently considered to be the eighth in the series of Manuel’s *Orations*, is very similar to Macres’ letterforms (Plate XVIII.a-d).

Macres’s hand (A) is identified in all the *Orations* as follows:

**Oration I:** Macres introduced interlinear additions and corrections in ff. 263.12, ἵν (266); 262.17, οὐκ ἄν (233); 258.13, σωτηρίαν820 (80); 261.19, τὴν (199); 260v.11, χαίρειν (173). It is possible that he superscripted letters α, β used to denote transposition of word order in f. 259v.16 (139-140).

**Oration II:** He introduced an interlinear correction in f. 269v.12, ἀν(θρώπιν)ιν (61) and an interlinear addition in f. 272.22, αὐτοὺς (155). He probably added on the left bottom margin of f. 271.22 the phrase ὅσα γε εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν φέρει (121-122), which is preceded by a sign (Plate IX).

**Oration III:** It is likely that hand A made two interlinear additions in f. 282v.12, τοῖς (364) and f. 278.1, γοῦν (145), and added the instruction σημ(είωσαι) in f. 276v (91).

**Oration IV:** The interlinear addition of the word αἰδοῖ in f. 287.17 (172) and probably the addition of the phrase παρὰ προσδοκίαν over an erasure in f. 287.22 (178) seem to have been made by hand A.

---

820 As it has been observed by Dendrinos, ‘Scholars’, p. 31 (and fig. 13) Macres expanded the contracted form of the word πνεῦμα by adding the missing letters. Hence the addition in the interlinear margin of the word σωτηρίαν over the contracted form σ(ωτηρίαν) in f. 258.13, and a collation of the scribal hand of MS D. gr. 268 with hand A, further supports the proposition that the corrective hand A belongs to Macres. Similar ‘stylistic revisions’ and interventions to those observed by Dendrinos, pp. 31-32, are for example those noted in V ff. 271.22, 295.2, 330.10-11.
Oration V: Hand A introduced interlinear additions of the words γὰρ (ff. 297.16 [241], 299.23 [325]), γε (f. 293v.2 [94]), δ’ (f. 299.16 [318]), ἐστι (f. 295.2 [154]), τὴν (f. 299v.23 [344]) and οἶμαι (f. 292.14 [48]). He also added letters in the interlinear margins (f. 294v.7, ἀραβῶνα (137); f. 300.5, διαβάλων (349); f. 296v.17, συνεπηρέασθη (223); f. 298.3-4, παραπίνεσθει (271)) as well as marginal notes and additions (f. 295.2, γράφεται (153); f. 296v.4, ὥν (213), and probably f. 294.6-7, γνωμικὸν (118-119)). As mentioned above, the last folio of Oration V (f. 300r-v) was copied by Macres, who also seems to have added the letter E on the top centre margin of f. 300, indicating the number of the Oration (Plate XVII).

Oration VI: It is possible that hand A made some interlinear additions in f. 313.15, καὶ (435); f. 317.24, οἰκία (553); f. 318.20, ταύτης (601); f. 317.22, τε (551).

Oration VII: Macres most probably introduced the interlinear addition of the word τὴν (f. 324v.2 [116]), and of the letters αί as a correction of the word ἀκούσεσθε (f. 322.7 [6]), as well as the addition of superscribed letters α, γ, β, δ to denote transposition of word order (f. 330.10-11, εἰπεῖν τὸ τὸν σ(ωτή)ρα τούτον ἡμᾶς εἰρήκειν, per sscr. α’, γ’, β’, δ’ [371]).

Hand K, identified as that of George Scholarios’s, most probably copied the title of Oration V (f. 291) as well as the addition ‘τοῦ ἀοιδίμου βασιλέως κύριος μανουήλ τοῦ παλαιολόγου (117), πρὸς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ γιον ἰωάννην τὸν βασιλεύτων (f. 301), and +λόγος ζτο: placed on the centre top margin of f. 322, were also added by Scholarios in different ink (Plates X, XI, XIV, XV). Scholarios’s autograph on f. 97v, and the possible numbering of the aforementioned Orations may suggest that at some stage the codex was owned by him or by a member of his intellectual circle.

---

821 It seems almost identical to the addition on f. 261.19.
822 See above, p. 230.
823 Scholarios executes ligature λό in several ways. See Repertorium, vol. 1, no. 71, 1C pl. 71. See also f. 97v in V.
Hand I copied the Sermon on Sin and Penance or On St Mary of Egypt (ff. 336-350v) and the accompanying Letter to Gabriel Archbishop of Thessalonica825 (ff. 350v-351v).

Hand Q, added the names of the authors in the margins of ff. 352, 354v-v and 355, possibly in different colour of ink.

Three yet unidentified hands are found in Part II:

A hand very similar to hand C, added on the top centre margin of f. 255 the title of Oration I +προτετεκτικός, εἰς λόγους, (καὶ) περὶ ἀρετῆς (καὶ) ἀγαθοῦ ἄρχοντος: (Plate XVIII.a).

On the top centre margin of the blank folio 274, which preceded the beginning of Oration III, a hand has added λόγ(ος) Γ:

On the top right hand corner of f. 336 another unidentified hand has added the total number of folios of the Sermon (<φύλιϚ> (Plate XVIII.d) and similarly on f. 356, possibly the same hand, added the total number of folios the Funeral Oration occupies: (φύλιϚ) Εδ).

Part III (ff. 420-430)826


(f. 428) blank

2. (f. 428v) A list of names in two columns.

(f. 429) blank

3. (f. 429v) Political verse in demotic Greek, Γαλήτρεμα χ | Γάλη κέμα φώδιστον πολίν ώραίον μου χιλιδόνιν

(f. 430) blank


4. (f. 430v) **Political verse in demotic Greek**, Γάλη κρέαμ φώδιστον πουλιν ὡραϊν μου χηλιδόνιν | ἀήδωνα μου ἀείλαλε τρυγόνα διομματοῦσα | μόνογενης σε ἐγέννησε ἡ εὐγενὴς σου μήτηρ·

Part III consists of a single gathering. The only watermark identified represents a tower (similar to Briquet, vol. II, no. 15888 [Troyes, 1409])

Four hands have been identified in Part III:

Hand L copied the *Funeral Oration on Emperor Manuel II Palaeologus* (ff. 420-427v) and on the same folios a later hand (P) has ‘re-inked’ faded letters and accentuation signs.

Hand M added verses in demotic Greek found in ff. 429v and 430v, whereas hand N, datable to the sixteenth or seventeenth century, wrote in f. 428v a list of names in two columns.

The codex, now preserved in the Vatican Library, appears for the first time in the inventory of the Greek MSS collection compiled in 1548 by Marcello Cervini and Guglielmo Sirleto under no. 431. The codex, or perhaps only Part I, must have been bought by the Vatican Library in January 1549. At a later stage the codex was rebound. As mentioned above, the double numbering of the gatherings of ff. 351a-b-419v would suggest that this section was added to the codex at a later stage. The fact that no reference to Part III is found in the early inventories indicates that it was added afterwards.

A single hand has numbered all recto folios on the right-hand top corner of the page in Indian numerals continuously. Some of the original Greek numerals are still visible (e.g., f. 255: δ; f. 268: 0), though the majority were either trimmed or faded, which is

---

828 A transcription of the list is provided by Dendrinos, ‘Unpublished’, p. 435.
829 On f. 1, bottom margin, a later hand added ‘Vat. 632’. The stamp of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana is found on the right hand bottom corner of ff. 1 and 275.
832 See above, p. 234.
also the case with the gathering numbers\footnote{E.g., f. 274 the letter δ' is visible in the bottom margin.}. The first folio of each Oration bears its number\footnote{See above, pp. 239-240.}.

The text of the Oration is written continuously with no division of paragraphs. Each Oration is written in a single column of varying line numbers, Oration I: 23 lines (except 24 lines: ff. 256\textsuperscript{r}, 257, 259; and 20 lines: ff. 256 and 267\textsuperscript{v}) of about 40 letters per line; Oration II: 25 lines, 40 letters per line; Oration III: 28 lines, 48-50 letters per line; Oration IV: 23 to 28 lines (23 lines: f. 284; 25 lines: f. 290; 26 lines: ff. 284\textsuperscript{v}, 285\textsuperscript{r}, 287\textsuperscript{v} and 289; 27 lines: ff. 286\textsuperscript{v} and 289\textsuperscript{v}; 28 lines: ff. 286 and 288\textsuperscript{r, v}, 3 lines: f. 290\textsuperscript{v}) with 55-62 letters per line; Oration V: 25 lines (except 21 lines: f. 300; 14 lines: f. 300\textsuperscript{v}) with 40-48 letters per line; Oration VI: 22 lines: ff. 301-3145\textsuperscript{v} (except 20 lines: f. 301) of 38-42 letters per line and ff. 316-321-30 lines of 40-50 letters per line; Oration VII and Epistolary Epilogue: 28 lines (except 26 lines: f. 322, and 8 lines: f. 335) of 48-50 letters per line.

No decorative elements appear throughout the text of the Oration, apart from three simple curvilinear patterns of wavy lines with floral endings found in the top margin of f. 275 and three crosses on f. 301, which were trimmed. A small pattern consisting of circular knots, occupying the space of two letters was placed in the first line of the text of Oration III (f. 275) (Plate X). The major initial T introducing the text of Oration I (f. 256), probably executed in different ink, is no longer visible. This is also the case with the initial T introducing Oration V (f. 291). Though the title of Oration VI, possibly written in different ink, has faded, the major foliated initial Π introducing the text is still visible (f. 301). A simpler, plain initial T designed in dark ink introduces Oration VII. No major initial was used to introduce the text of Oration II (f. 268) and III (f. 275), though their titles are preceded by a simple cross as in the case of the title of Oration IV, which begins with a minuscule large-sized alpha.

On the basis of this evidence it is clear that Manuel’s Oration in V represent working copies of the text, with Oration IV being an autograph.

\textit{Va} \hspace{1em} \textit{Vaticanus graecus 266 (olim. 178)}\footnote{Examined through printed facsimiles}
14th and 15th century; parchment (f. I); paper (ff. <VI> + 240 + [209v]); 263x198 mm

The codex comprises works by Aristotle and fragments of Aenigmata Pythagorica, Iamblichus, Protrepticus, Diogenes Laertius, Vitae philosophorum, and Paul of Evergetis, Florilegium.

1. (f. I) Fragments:

   i. Aenigmata Pythagorica, ἀειδ' εὐξυνετοῖσι (?). θύρας δ' ἐπίθεσθε βέβηλον κακοφραδ(έων?) | βεβήλων οὐσία λαχνήνετα περι ... ἄχναις | τὸν κάλαθον κατιόντα χαμαι.


   iv. Iamblichus, Protrepticus, 1c, ἐν ὁδῶ μὴ σχίζε ξύλα· ἐν τῇ ὁδῇ τῆς ἀρετῆς καὶ τὴν χωρίστην ζωῆν ἐπιτηδεύσων μὴ διάλυστε τὸν ψυχικὸν δεισμόν τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ τοῦ σώματος φθείρας τὸ ζῶον: ἐπὶ μέτρου μὴ κάθου· μὴ σκάπτε (?) καὶ περικάλυπτε περινοία τὸ δίκαιον ... τῶν ψυχικῶν δυνάμεων.

2. (f. Iv) Table of contents, πίναξ ἀκριβῆς τῆς παρούσης πυκτίδος. περὶ χρωμάτων οὐ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἀπλὰ τῶν χρωμάτων – περὶ ψυχῆς α' β' γ': ἵτετε περὶ ὀσμῆς· περὶ φυτῶν· περὶ ζώων ἱστορίας· τὰ μετέωρα· περὶ γενέσεως καὶ φθορῶς· περὶ οὐρανοῦ.


(f. IIv) blank

---


837 Mercati and Cavalieri, Codices, p. 350.
4. (f. III) Table, copied by a seventeenth/eighteenth-century hand.

(f. IIIv) blank

5. (ff. IV) Manuel II Palaeologus, Precepts on the education of a prince\(^{338}\), Chapters 96-100 (incomplete). Chapter 96: Inc. mut. —[γενοσάμενος τού χρηστού, ἔπειτ’ αὐθίς αὐτῶν ἐκδοίφ φαύλοις ...], des. ... ὀίς οὐ χρὴ δουλεύνοντα. Chapter 97: Inc. Ἡν τις ἱσχυρίζηται τῶν ἀνθρώπων, des. ... κινδυνον ἕκαστον εὐτελίζοντες. Chapter 100: ὁ cod. Inc. Ρημάτων ὁλίγων δύναμις, ῥᾶστα, des. mut. ... ἔλεον τὸν πλάστην ἐργαζόμενος[--- Ed. J. Leunclavius, Praecepta, pp. 128, 130-133; repr. PG 156, cols. 318C-D, 384C-D.


(f. Vv) blank

7. (f. VIv) Note by Nicolas Maiorani or by another contemporary hand: ‘Aristotelis de corib: (sic) paruis n(atur)alib: de a(n)i(m)al: et a(n)i(m)a’.


\(^{338}\) Ibid., p. 350, did not identify these chapters as being part of Manuel II’s Precepts. They considered them to be from a work of a hundred ascetic chapters, the initials of which formed an achrostichis. They suggested that it was part of the chapters from Callistus Cataphygiotes’s On Union with God Life of Theoria, PG 147, cols. 836-941, which however do not form an achrostichis.

vi. (ff. 36-46v) On sense, with scholia. A different hand added in the margin in f. 41v, ἄρχη τοῦ δευτέρου βιβλίου τῶν περὶ αἰσθήσεως. Ed. Ross, Parva naturalia, pp. 436-480


(ff. 66v-67) blank


(ff. 117v) blank


839 Ibid., p. 348.

(ff. 212v, 226v, 227 upper part, 239v) blank

8. (ff. 240rv) Manuel II Palaeologus, Seven Ethico-political Orations, fragment from Oration VII\(^{840}\) Inc. … ὅταν εὑρεθῶ πληρῶν …, des. … τῶν ἐφωμένων ἄλλα. Ed. below, pp. 456-459 (Plate XIX). Several possibilities have been proposed concerning this single leaf\(^{841}\). It seems that either Va formed part of another codex, or its scribe copied only the specific lines from another MS. The relation of Va with V cannot be confirmed at this stage.

Two monocondyles were added, possibly by subsequent owners of the codex or parts of it:

(f. 1) Αἰσιτοτέλους φυσικὰ | μελιτινιώτου.

(f. 1v) ο μελιτινιωτ(ης) | ο γα.ρᾶς (γαβρᾶς?) | ιωα ο γα.ρᾶς | ιωανης | ... ας ο επι του κανικλειου (?).

L Johannes Leunclavius (=Löwenklau), ed., Imp. Caes. Manuelis Palaeologi Aug. Praecepta educationis regiae, ad Ioannem filium (Basle, 1578)


   i. Epistolary Preface which precedes the Precepts. Ἐπιστολὴ προοιμιακὴ τῶν ἑφεξῆς κεφαλαίων, pp. 12-23.

   ii. Precepts on the education of a prince. ΚΕΦΑΛΑΙΑ ΕΚΑΤΟΝ Δ’ ΑΚΡΟΣΤΙΧΙΔΟΣ. ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΙ, ΜΑΝΟΥΗΛ, ΙΩΑΝΝΗ, ΠΑΤΗΡ, ΤΙΩ, ΨΥΧΗΣ, ΨΥΧΗ, ΚΑΡΠΙΟΝ, ΤΡΟΦΗΝ, ΕΜΗΣ, ΤΗ ΣΗ, ΟΠΟΙΑΣΟΥΝ, ΑΚΜΑΖΟΥΣΗ, Ἡ Ο ΘΕΟΣ ΕΙΗ ΚΟΣΜΗΤΩΡ, et scr. in marg Σύνταξον

---

\(^{840}\) Ibid., p. 350, wrongly stated that it is a fragment preserving part of Oration VI.

\(^{841}\) See below, pp. 294-295.


ii. Oration II, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΣ ὌΠΙ ΤΟ ΜΕΝ ΑΓΑΘΟΝ ΠΑΣΙ ΦΙ!-λούμενον ἐστὶ φυσικῶς· ῥ (δὲ) κακός καὶ ἑαυτῷ μισητός, φιλοῦμεν (δὲ) κ(αί) τὸ κακὸν ἐστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκειν νομίζωντες, και περὶ εὐδαιμονίας, κ(αί) ἀρετῆς, pp. 174-192.

iii. Oration III, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΡΙΤΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ΠΡΟΑΙΡΕΣΕΩΣ, ΚΑΙ ΕΚΟΥ· ὍΤΙ οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, οὐδὲ ἐξωθὸς, ἡ τοὔcraper περὶ εὐδαιμονίας, κ(αί) ἀρετῆς, pp. 192-227.

iv. Oration IV, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΤΕΤΑΡΤΟΣ, ὍΤΙ θΕΟΝ ἔστι φυσικῶς· (δὲ) τηναρχὴν συμπαρεῖναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, pp. 228-260.


vi. Oration VI, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΚΤΟΣ, ΠΕΡΙ ΗΜῈΝ ἉΜΑΡΤΊΑ, ΤῸ ΠΆΝ-των χείριστον. δε (δὲ) μηδένα ἀπογίνωσκειν, μήτε ἐπιφανεβεγραφαίαν, μήτε ἐπείρον κρίνειν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν· καὶ περὶ μετανοίας. καὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ προνοίας, κ(αί) ἀγάπης, κ(αί) φιλανθρωπίας, pp. 294-367.

vii. Oration VII, ΛΟΓΟΣ ΕΒΔΟΜΟΣ, ΠΕΡΙ ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΦΡΟΣΎΝΗΣ, ΕΚ | μέρους (δὲ), καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης, pp. 366-413 (Plate XXII).


3. Oration as from a benevolent ruler to his well-disposed subjects in a critical time, Ὡς εξ εὐμενοὺς ἄρχοντος πρὸς εὐνοικοὺς ὑπηκόους τοὺς ἐν ἀκμῇ, pp. 420-423.

5. *Other morning prayers*, Ἀλλη τοῦ αὐτοῦ εὐχὴ ἑωθινή, p. 438.


8. *What Tamerlane might have said to Bayezid*, Τίνας ἄν εἶπε λόγους ὁ τῶν περσῶν τε καὶ σκυθῶν ἐξηγούμενος τῷ τυραννούντι τῶν τούρκων, μεγάλα τε κ(ai) σοβαρά φθεγγομένῳ, καὶ ἀφορίζῳ ὄντι τ(αίς) ἀπειλαῖς ἧνικα εὐ ἐπραττε, τραπέντϊ (δὲ) πρὸς τούναντίον μετά τ(ήν) νίσχην, pp. 446-449.


On the cover page of his edition Leunclavius, who also translated the text into Latin, states that he depended on a single MS originating from Johannes Sambucus’ library, namely B. From a collation of B and L, it seems that in some instances Leunclavius differs from B, introducing also a few marginal notes. Omissions and typographical errors are also observed, most probably because of misreadings (Plate XXII).


*Seven Ethico-political Orations*, Manuelis Paleologi ad Ioannem filium Orationes VII Ethico-politicae.


---

843 Leunclavius, *Praecepta*, cover page: ‘EX IO. SAMBUCI V.C. BI·bibliotheca· IOAN. LEUNCLAUIO· interprete’.

844 It should be noted that in most instances L adopted some medieval spelling conventions observed in codex B, as for example the separation of the word μὴ δὲ, and the erroneous use of iota subscript (e.g., κάκείνους (II 42), κάκείνων (II 49), κάκεινο (III 102), κάκον (VI 138) κάκείνοις [VII 10]).
ii. Oration II, ΛΟΓΟΣ Β’. Ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν πάσι φιλούμενόν ἐστι φυσικῶς· ὁ δὲ κακὸς καὶ ἑαυτῷ μισητός. Φιλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ κακὸν ἐστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκεινο νομίζοντες. Καὶ περὶ εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἄρετῆς, cols. 409-420.

iii. Oration III, ΛΟΓΟΣ Γ’. Περὶ προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐκουσίου· καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, συνὲ ἔξωθεν ὁ κακὸς, αὐτὸς ἀλλ’ ἑαυτῷ αἴτιος γίνεται, cols. 419-442.

iv. Oration IV, ΛΟΓΟΣ Δ’. Περὶ ἡδονῆς· ὅτι κρεῖττον ἦν μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν συμπαρεῖναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, cols. 441-462.

v. Oration V, ΛΟΓΟΣ Ε’. Περὶ ἡδονῆς· Αντίθεσις εἰς τὸν πρὸ τοῦδε λόγον, cols. 461-484.

vi. Oration VI, ΛΟΓΟΣ Ζ’. Ὅτι η μὲν ἁμαρτία τὸ πάντων χείριστον· δεὶ δὲ μηδένα ἀπογινώσκειν, μήτε ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἑτερόν· καὶ τοὺς ἡμαρτηκότας οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐλεεῖν· καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας, cols. 483-528.

vii. Oration VII, ΛΟΓΟΣ Ζ’. Περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης· ἐκ μέρους δὲ, καὶ περὶ ἀγάπης, cols. 528-558


In 1866 J.P. Migne reprinted Leunclavius’ edition of Manuel’s works in the Patrologia Graeca, vol. 156, cols. 385-561. In the PG some of the mistakes in L were corrected, while others were repeated, since Migne did not collate the text with B, and new ones were introduced.
Palaeographical and textual examination of the text

Manuel II’s *Seven Ethico-political Orations* and the *Epistolary Epilogue* survive in different groups of MSS. For this reason the text of the *Orations* and the *Epistolary Epilogue* are examined separately. *Orations* I–V are examined together (Section I), *Oration* VI forms a second group (Section II), while *Oration* VII and the *Epistolary Epilogue* are examined independently (Sections III–IV). All *Orations* (I–VII) and the *Epistolary Epilogue*, edited by Leunclavius (L) on the basis of B, were reprinted in *PG*.

In all extant MSS the text of the *Orations* was copied in minuscule mixed with certain capital letters continuously; no paragraph division is indicated. Each *Oration* is introduced by its title, with one exception in V, where the title of the *Epistolary Epilogue* is omitted. In three MSS (B, I and M) the text is preceded by a table of contents.

A similar punctuation system was followed by all scribes to indicate different degrees of pause: lower point (.), middle point (·), upper point (·), comma (,), middle comma (,), and wavy dash (:~). To mark the end of a title or that of an *Oration*, with the exception of the folio Va, all scribes employed similar signs or a combination of them: a colon (:) by B, I, P and V; a colon and a dash (-) by B and I; a colon and a wavy dash (~) by B, M, and in a single case I and V; a colon and a cross (+) was employed by all scribes; a colon followed by a dash together with a colon and a cross (-:+) and two colons followed by a wavy dash (:~) by I; a cross (+) to mark the end of the text of the *Orations* and a colon and a semi colon (:) by V to indicate the end of the title of the first *Oration*; a colon and a cross (+) by hand K that numbered *Orations* III, IV and V in V (f. 275, + inquiret Τετελείωμαι f. 284, + inquiret Δεινόντος f. 291, + inquiret Εκκλησίας f. 283, 284, 290, 300, 321, 335 and in f. 267 (+:+) .

---

847 See above, p. 247.
848 B: f. 136v; I: ff. 31, 41v, 46v, 55v, 72v; P: f. 33; V: ff. 256, 284.
849 B: ff. 54, 73, 97, 118v, 119; I: ff. 41, 46, 55, 63v, 64, 73, 104v.
850 B: ff. 52v, 60v; I: f. 104; M: ff. 164v, 170v, 182, 192v, 203v; V: f. 322.
851 B: ff. 41, 72v, 84v, 85, 97, 136, 138v; I: f. 92; M: ff. 152, 164, 170, 181v, 192; P: f. 34; V: ff. 255, 268, 273, 283, 284, 290v, 300v, 321v, 335 and in f. 267v (+:+) .
852 I: f. 91v.
853 I: f. 106.
854 V: f. 333v.
855 V: f. 256.
added by a single hand (K), possibly that of George Scholarios\textsuperscript{856}, at a later stage. In addition, a colon and a colon with a dash (f. 301, +λόγος στ\textsuperscript{ς}; f. 322, +λόγος ζ\textsuperscript{ς:ς}) were placed by a yet unidentified hand that numbered Orations VI and VII in V.

Single marginal quotation marks (haplē) (·) are found only in Oration VI in B, I and V to indicate Scriptural citations\textsuperscript{857}. Round brackets are used by B\textsuperscript{2} (dated to the 16\textsuperscript{th} c.) in a single case to denote a parenthesis\textsuperscript{858}. All scribes used the mark of interrogation (?)\textsuperscript{859} always to indicate a direct question. I adopted a more extensive punctuation system, possibly to facilitate not only the reader, but also the speaker who would deliver the Orations aloud in front of an audience.

Concerning accentuation, all scribes consistently employed acute, grave and circumflex. Following the Byzantine convention, they did not always place acute on oxytones followed by a punctuation sign\textsuperscript{860}, accentuated enclitics, personal pronouns, the indefinite pronouns τις, τι and the particle τέ\textsuperscript{861}. In a small number of cases they distinguished the indefinite relative pronoun ὁ τι from the conjunction ὁτι by placing a diastole (ὁ, τι)\textsuperscript{862}. Similarly, in a single case they distinguished ὁτε from ὁ, τε\textsuperscript{863} and in two other instances τότε from τό, τε\textsuperscript{864}. Occasionally, they placed double accent on ἄν, κἂν, δὲ, μὲν, μὴ and χρὴ for rhetorical emphasis or stressing an antithesis; I employed this convention far more extensively\textsuperscript{865}.

\textsuperscript{856} See above, p. 240. Plates X, XI, XIV, XV, XVIII.b.

\textsuperscript{857} B: ff. 99-\textsuperscript{ς}, 103; I: ff. 74-\textsuperscript{ς}; V: f. 303.

\textsuperscript{858} B: f. 101v.

\textsuperscript{859} B: VI 118; BI: VI 533, 764, 773; BIMV: I 327, 335, 384, III 181, 285, 305, IV 230, 231, 233, V 226; BIPV: Ep. 43; BIV: VI 106, 154, 513, 524, 526-\textsuperscript{ς}, 527; BM: IV 9; BV: VII 494; IV: VI 118; V: VI 46, 335.


\textsuperscript{861} The accentuated enclitics are noted in the apparatus criticus. The enclisis of the particle ἓν, though not noted in the apparatus criticus, is employed in our edition. On this convention see J. Noret, 'L’accentuation de τε en grec byzantin', B 68 (1998), 516-518; idem, 'Quand donc rendrons-nous à quantité d’indéfinis, prétendument enclitics, l’accent qui leur revient?', B 57 (1987), 191-195.

\textsuperscript{862} ὁ, τε: B: VI 95; BI: VI 187, 795; BIM: IV 321, V 22; I: V 322; IV: IV 224; ὁ, τε: I: VII 265.

\textsuperscript{863} ὁ, τε: BI I 347.

\textsuperscript{864} τό, τε: IV: VI 351; BIPV: Ep. 13.

\textsuperscript{865} B: ἄν (I 90, 195, 302; VI 523), κἂν (I 285); BI: ἄν (I 233; VI 384); BM: ἄν (I 406); I: ἄν (I 175, 233; II 92, 156; III 55, 207, 253; IV 32, 33, 82, 201; V 66, 67, 183, 200, 297; VI 19, 50, 65, 68, 665; VII 2, 93, 108, 183, 222, 376; Ep. 2), κἂν (I 329), μὴ (VI 184, 185), χρὴ (VII 122); IV: ἄν (V 168); V: ἄν (VII 196); δὲ (III 166, 278; V 344); μὲν (III 363); μὴ (III 205, 372); VA: ἄν (VII 295). On this convention see K. Oikonomos, ‘Ἀγαθὸν τὸ ἐπιτονείν’, B 75 (2005), 295-309.
Following the medieval convention the copyists joined words used adverbially\textsuperscript{866}, often employing a subscribed hyphen (\textemdash) to indicate that they should be pronounced as one word\textsuperscript{867}, while they separated μηδὲ and its elided form μηδ\textsuperscript{868}. B, I and M employed this more often than V and P, while Va did not use it at all. Apostroph was consistently used to mark the elision of a vowel. In separating the syllables, the scribes have largely followed the rules of syllabic division and in several cases a hyphen (\textemdash) has been placed on the right-hand margin to indicate this\textsuperscript{869}. A double dot (diplé stigmê) over iota and upsilon was frequently placed by the copyists over the second of two consecutive vowels to distinguish sounds in a diphthong, and in other instances to distinguish the two letters when joined in ligature. B and M have the tendency to place both single and double dot\textsuperscript{870}, where no real diairesis is meant.

Concerning mute iota, B, especially B\textsuperscript{2}, and I subscribe it quite often, while M uses it more extensively\textsuperscript{871}. It should be noted that the use of mute iota in B, I and M is

\textsuperscript{866} B: καθυπερβολήν (VII 38), τομηματικόν (III 308), μηδπουστικάν (VI 282), μηδποιάν (VI 306), παρουσή (VI 422), πεπτικήν (VI 705), πηναρχή (VI 40), πηναρχήν (VII 777), παρουσία (Ⅱ 730), παρουσίαν (Ep. 39); BΙΜ: επιμερήμαστον (Ⅳ 58), κασαρχά (I 357), προσκρόγιον (Ⅳ 20), πηναρχήν (Ⅶ 78), τοισόλος (Ⅱ 53), τοισόλον (Ⅳ 26), τοισόλον (Ⅳ 26); BΙΜΜ: απαρχή (V 219), δηλονουσια (I 408), διαπέπανον (Ⅱ 64; Ⅳ 53), διαπανοῦ (I 28; Ⅲ 142; Ⅳ 71, 88; V 291), εξαρχής (Ⅲ 251, 287), επιτοπολί (Ⅲ 336, Ⅳ 350), καθόσον (Ⅲ 244), κατακαρήκος (Ⅳ 278), κατακαρήκος (I 370; Ⅲ 128; Ⅲ 282; Ⅳ 339; V 187), καταιγισμό (Ⅳ 163), παρακολού (I 244), συναίμα (I 345), ταπαλία (Ⅳ 75), πηναρχήν (Ⅲ 116; Ⅲ 308; Ⅳ 14; Ⅳ 338; V 98, 185), πηναρχήν (V 77-78), πηναρχήν (I 168, 398; V 439), τοκαρασίας (I 435), τοπαισμάτα (I 316; Ⅱ 176-177; Ⅲ 142; V 85), τοπαισμάτα (I 233), τοπαισμάτα (Ⅲ 172), τοπαλίλον (I 375; Ⅲ 313; V 238), τοπαισμάτα (I 65), τοπαισμάτα (Ⅲ 33-34); BΙΠΠ: τεταρχή (Ep. 4); ΒΙΠ: διαπανοῦ (Ⅳ 185), εξαρχής (I 439; Ⅲ 346; Ⅲ 129; Ⅳ 415, 424-425, 753; Ⅶ 288, 446), επιτοπολί (Ⅳ 257), καθμερής (I 315), ιονδήξεια (I 210), ταπαλία (Ⅳ 215, 450-451), πηναρχήν (V 618; Ⅶ 21-22; 249), πηναρχήν (Ⅶ 333), τεταρχή (Ⅶ 251), τεταρχή (Ⅶ 286); ΒΙΜ: εξαρχής (Ⅱ 262), καθίσμα (Ⅲ 247); ΒΙΜΜ: εξαρχής (Ⅳ 61, 359); Β:\: έφανείται (Ⅱ 158), καταπαλί (Ⅱ 207); Ι:\: καταηγιών (I 143), παρακολού (V 209; IV 422); Ι:\: εξαρχής (ΙV 253-254; V 94; IV 622; Ⅶ 79), καταηγιών (I 360), μηδέτερον (I 390), παπατάδας (I 26), παρακολού (Ⅳ 171); V:\: διαφαράξεων (Ⅲ 130-131), καθήκων (Ⅲ 290), προσβάλλον (Ⅲ 209), πηναρχήν (V 777).

\textsuperscript{867} The linking hyphen is indicated in the apparatus criticus. On the use of hyphen in Greek MSS, see D.J. Murphy, ‘Hyphens in Greek Manuscripts’, GRBS 36.3 (1995), 293-314.

\textsuperscript{868} B:\: μη δια \\

\textsuperscript{869} E.g, B:\: 77.21-22: ποτέ-ις; M:\: f. 160.24-25: κατα-ικεχεριμένον.

\textsuperscript{870} E.g., Diple stigmê: ΒΙΜΜ:\: φυσικομετέχειν (Ⅱ 78); Single dot: B:\: εξέλοντι (Ⅲ 4); M:\: γίνομεν (Ⅲ 112); Diaeresis mark: ΒΙΜΜ:\: δια-κερ-μένον (IV 7); BΙΜΜ:\: δια-κερ-μένον (I 395), περισσάται (IV 75), προϊόν (Ⅳ 345), χρυσομοιών (I 45); BΙΜ:\: δια-κερ-μένον (Ⅶ 151); περισσάται (Ⅶ 120), προφορομετέχει (Ⅵ 74); B:\: δια-κερ-μένον (11 103).

\textsuperscript{871} E.g., B:\: εργού (Ⅳ 313), λητήτσα (Ⅳ 741), λητήτσα (V 209), προφορομετέχει (Ⅲ 11); B:\: επέτη (I 249), ἀρχηγὴ (I 62), ὀςτό (I 278); ΒΙΜ: ἀρχηγὸ (III 328), ὄσι (Ⅱ 41); ΒΠ:\: ἐσοπτή (Ep. 22); B:\: ἐνείδη (V 243), ἑπιτύχον (Ⅱ 90), ἐπιτύχον (Ⅱ 292), ὅπω (Ⅱ 42), ἔνθεμα (Ⅳ 184); Ι:\: αναλείψει (Ⅳ 158), ἀποκοινίσεις (I 313), ὕψι (Ⅲ 38), ὀφθήσει (Ep. 18), ἀκούσει (Ⅱ 329); ΙΜ:\: ποιούσε (Ⅳ 204), ὀφθήσει (V 23); M:\: ἀνέγερα (V 314),
sometimes erroneous\textsuperscript{872}. The copyists of V omitted mute iota, with the exception of hand F which employed it in two instances in Oration V\textsuperscript{873}, while hands G and H that copied Oration VI used it more extensively\textsuperscript{874}.

In copying this lengthy rhetorical text all scribes employed conventional ligatures, abbreviations, suspensions and superposition of letters. They also used contracted forms of \textit{nomina sacra} and their derivatives.

In all MSS, numerous corrections, additions, marginal notes and emendations were introduced either by the main scribes, or by corrective hands\textsuperscript{875}. All MSS contain spelling and grammatical errors, errors in accentuation, omissions, additions and transpositions, as well as variant and different readings. All these observations are listed in detail below, separately for each section.

\textsuperscript{872} B: κάκεινα (VII 203), κάκεινο (VI 355, 570, 706), κάκεινος (VII 10), κάν (VI 214); BI: κάκει (VI 777; VII 529), κάκεινη (VII 114, 162), κάκείνο (VI 125, 588, 604; VII 219); κάκεινοι (VI 332), κάκείνον (VI 611), κάκεινος (VI 249; Ep. 50), κάκεινον (VII 488), κάκείνος (I 77), καμιοι (Ep. 44), κάν (II 79; III 320; IV 84; VI 138, 246; VII 522), κάν (VI 250), κάνταςθα (I 152), κάτι (VI 307); BIM: κάκεινο (III 221, 234; IV 291), κάκεινος (V 226), κάκείνος (II 42), κάν (III 9); BM: κάκεινο (I 253; II titulus, 57; IV 129), κάκεινον (V 298); I: κάκεινο (VI 569; VII 164, 203, 287), κάν (I 61\textsuperscript{1}-3, 107, 329; II 3, 117; III 10, 47, 69, 250; IV 124, 166, 273, 274\textsuperscript{1}, 287, 281; V 172\textsuperscript{2}; VI-51, 54, 93, 193, 415, 502; VII 85, 333, 344, 436; Ep. 20); IM: κάκεινα (V 17); κάκεινη (V 47); M: κάκεινον (II 49).

\textsuperscript{873} V: (V 23, 267).

\textsuperscript{874} V: αὐτῷ (VI 245), θεῷ (VI 414, 427), νακάν (VI 94), ὀμοίῳ (VI 737), προσηθοθα (VI 11), τῇ (VI 143, 218, 540, 751), τῷ (V 414, 425, 665, 725), ώ (VI 326, 346, 367, 370, 583).

\textsuperscript{875} Not all corrective hands can be identified at this stage, especially in cases of corrections in accentuation and spelling by overwriting letters. An in situ examination of the MSS and ink used by the various hands will shed more light on this. A question mark (?) has been placed against the corrective hands which we cannot identify with certainty at this stage.
Section I

*Orations I-V* survive in four MSS: B, I, M and V.

V contains an early version of the text copied by six different scribes: *Orations I-II* by hand C (ff. 256-267v and ff. 268-273v), *Oration III* by hands J (ff. 275-282v) and D (f. 283), *Oration IV* by hand E possibly identified with that of Manuel II’s 876 (ff. 284-290v), and *Oration V* by hands F (ff. 291-299v) and A (ff. 300v). Corrections, interlinear notes, marginal additions and deletions throughout the text, introduced both by the scribes and by the corrective hand A, identified with that of Macarius Macres, which intervened throughout the codex 877, and possibly other corrective hands (e.g., ff. 260v.11, 265v.19, 269v.20, 272v.7, 273v.7, 275v.13, 276v.23, 276v.20-21, 277v.15, 298v.3, f. 292v.12), indicate that V must have been the working copy of *Orations I-V*.

B was copied by a 16th-century hand (B2) but also includes seven parchment leaves (originally a gathering with a missing folio at the front which was torn vertically) preserving a section of *Oration I* (ff. 43-48v) 878 this time copied by a single 15th-century hand (B1). The text in these parchment folios would suggest that hand B1, which is very similar if not identical to that of Isidore, represents an early revised version of V, since the text of *Oration I* in B1 incorporates all additions and corrections found in V. The exemplar of B1 has not yet been traced, if it survives, though as it has already been pointed out, it is possible that B1 was copying from I 879.

I represents the final ‘edited’ version of *Orations I-V* copied by Manuel’s chief scribe Isidore, later Metropolitan of Kiev. For this reason I is the principal MS in our edition. Isidore’s intervention in I was minimal. The few corrections have been introduced by himself, who, one assumes, after he completed the copying, collated the text with the copy he had in front of him. The question arises as to whether V or B1 was the prototype for Isidore. Though I closely follows B1 there are differences between the two transmissions, which further supports our assumption that B1 was an early version of the text and I the final revised version which met the author’s approval.

876 See above, pp. 236-237.
877 See above, pp. 237-240.
878 B1 copied also ff. 105-112v; preserving a section of *Oration VI*. See above, p. 202.
879 See above, p. 199.
Finally, M which transmits only *Orations I-V* is an *apographon* of B. This is clear from the errors and all the marginal additions found in B which are repeated in M. The nature of a large number of additional, elementary spelling and grammatical errors in M shows that the scribe must have been a foreigner<sup>880</sup>. The printed editio princeps (L) was based on B while PG is a reprint of L.

The relations of the MSS are represented in the following *stemma codicum*:

![Stemma Codicum](image)

All the corrections found in V (listed below according to their form) were adopted by I, B and M (corrected letters are underlined) unless stated otherwise:

**I. Corrections introduced by the main scribes**

(a) The main hand in each Oration introduced *emendations by crossing out or erasing words and phrases*, occasion ally giving instructions for substitutions and adding marginal glosses:

**V**: *Oration I*: f. 257v.17, he crossed out σ(ωτηρίας) and added σωτηρί(ας) on the left hand margin (I 65); f. 258.11-12, ἐκκέκαπται from ἐκκέκαυται, he crossed out ἐκκέκαυται and added ται on the left hand margin (I 78); f. 265.21, ἀθροίσματι

<sup>880</sup> Cf. above, pp. 221-222.
from ἄθροίσμασιν, he crossed out ἄθροίσμασιν and added τι in the interlinear margin (I 348); f. 266.16, he crossed out πάλιν and wrote next to it in the text βέλτιον (I 381); f. 266.2, he erased σωτῆρος and wrote σ(ωτή)ρ(ος) (I 389)

Oration IV: f. 285v.8, he wrote and crossed out εὐτυχίας and then wrote the opposite δυστυχίας (IV 82); f. 286.16, he wrote and crossed out καλλίον, after παντάπασι (IV 116); f. 288.6, he crossed out επὶ and wrote κατὰ in the interlinear margin (IV 214); f. 288.18, he wrote and erased λύκοι before μύες (IV 226); f. 290.2, he wrote and deleted ἁγιάζει before θαυμάζει (IV 322); f. 290.8, he wrote and deleted ἄληκτος and wrote the opposite ἀξίσιον (IV 328); f. 54.2 κακῶς from κακῶς (II 80)

(b) A number of errors due to confusion of sound were corrected by simply overwriting or altering letters. With the exception of some words, traces of the letters corrected are still visible:

B: f. 89.17, ἄληκτος from ἄληκτος (V 134); f. 56v.2, ἀνδρειώτερον from ἀνδρειωτέρον (II 80); ff. 65v.8, 87v.20, αὐτῆς from αὐτῶς (III 158, V 89); f. 79v.21, ἀφεῖναι from ἀφῆναι (IV 209); f. 77v.21, γοητεύει from γοητεύει (IV 149); f. 83v.21, ἐκπίπτομεν from ἐκπίπτωμεν (IV 335); f. 96v.21, ἐπικυρώσας from ἐπικυρώσας (V 351); f. 62v.2, ἔτοιμαθά from ἔτοιμαθά (III 54); f. 79v.8, ὥδε from εἴδε (IV 185); f. 52v.20, ἡμιούμενα from ἡμιούμενα (I 143); f. 83v.14, ἱσχυρώτερον from ἱσχυρώτερον (IV 328); f. 54v.2 κακῶς from κακῶς (II titulus)882; f. 74v.5, ξύλο from ξύλῳ (IV 47); f. 62v.4, ὀντῶς from ὄντως (III 60); f. 69v.9, οὕτως from οὕτως (III 284); f. 63v.3, παλαιώτερον from παλαιωτέρων (III 76); f. 91v.5, παρακεκόστεσσι from παρακεκόστεσσι (V 186); f. 95v.14, πρωτότυπος from πρωτότυπος (V 330); f. 85v.5, τῆς from τῶς (V 3)883; f. 90v.5, τῷ from τῷ (V 171); f. 56v.1-2, φορμισμετέρον from φορμισμετέρον (II 80)

BV: B f. 41v.20, V f. 256v.19: ἁγιάζει from ἁγιάζει (I 15); B f. 68v.7, V f. 280v.15, δοκῇ from δοκεῖ (III 250)

881 For a discussion of all the emendations in Oration IV see above, pp. 236-237. Plates XII-XIII.
882 Plate II.
883 Plate III.
Μ: f. 152.22, ἀχομοτείαν from ἀχομοτείαν (I 15); f. 176v.11, βούλει from βούλη (III 208); f. 176v.2, γινώμενα from γινώμενα (III 203); ff. 199-199v.24-1, διαφθείρῃ from διαφθείρῃ (V 222); f. 200v.22, δυνηθήναι from δυνηθέειναι (V 270); f. 181v.2, εἰδεί from εἴδη (III 369); f. 201v.18, κακῶς from κακῶς (V 299); f. 195v.3, μέρος from μέρος (V 79); f. 193v.14, νοσήσουν from νοσησοῦν (V 22); f. 181v.13, οἰκεῖας from οἰκέας (III 376); f. 156v.1, ὀνείροπολήσας from ὀνείροπολήσας (I 165); f. 176v.4, πάλιν from πάλιν (III 204); f. 163v.22, παρετέθῃ from παρετέθη (I 436); f. 190v.8, ταύτῃ from ταύτῃ (IV 274); f. 191v.1, τρόπων from τρόπων (IV 320); f. 183v.12, τῷ from τῷ (IV 58); f. 179v.22, τῷ from τῷ (III 315); f. 194v.5, ὅδι from ὅδει (V 61); f. 177v.2, ὁσπερεὶ from ὡσπερεὶ (III 235)

MV: M f. 175v.2, V f. 278v.3, ἑκατόκχον from ἑκατόκχον (III 169)

V: f. 299v.2, ἀκοντίσθη from ακοντίσθη (V 308); f. 282v.20, ἀναφέρονται from ἀναφαύρονται (III 371); f. 282v.15, ἄνδρείας from ἄνδρες (III 366); f. 270v.16, ἄνδροωτέραν from ἄνδροωτέραν (II 80); f. 259v.6, ἄνδριαν from ἄνδριαν (I 130); f. 289v.10, αὐτῇ from αὐτῷ (IV 275); f. 259v.20, βασίβαρικὴ from βασίβαρικοῖ (I 123); f. 280v.23, βλάστην from βλάστην (III 258); f. 295v.13, βούλευτό from βούλευτό (V 181); f. 264v.21, γίγας from γίγας (I 311); f. 276v.4, διηνεκέσθην from διηνεκέσθην (III 51); f. 289v.5, δραστικωτέρα from δραστικωτέρα (IV 269); f. 258v.20, δομῇ from δομῆ (I 104); f. 259v.23, ἐγχύς from ἐγχύς (I 125); f. 267v.18, ἐκείνης from ἐκείνης (I 422); f. 278v.2, ἐκὼν from ἐκῶν (III 168); f. 260v.21, ἐλησσοντον from ἐλησσοντον (I 182); f. 293v.15, ὑλιτίς from ὑλιτίς (V 104); f. 257v.16, ἐλπίδας from ἐλπίδας (I 65); f. 295v.5, εὐθήνας from εὐθήνας (V 175); f. 298v.5, ἔχῃ from ἔχει (V 272); f. 286v.3, ἠδέων from ἠδέων (IV 102); f. 275v.18, ἔφιγμον from ἔφιγμον (III 16); f. 277v.14, ἀποτυχεῖσθαν from ἀποτυχεῖσθαν (III 133); f. 294v.15, ἡπτανοσθίσθαι from ἡπτανοσθίσθαι (IV 145); f. 289v.21, καταπαλαίθαι from καταπαλάθαι (IV 285); f. 257v.16, κενάς from καμάς (I 65); f. 296v.20, κοσμίως from κοσμίως (V 205); f. 267v.14, κρείττον from κρείττον (I 438); f. 285v.2-3, λευσαξίσθαι from λευσαξίσθαι (IV 75884); f. 265v.21, λέγων from λέγων (I 348); f. 264v.17, λογισάμενος from λογισάμενος (I 308); f. 260v.9, λόγων from λόγων (I 153); f. 278v.22, μεθή from μέθει (III 185); f. 295v.5, μεμετόχισθος from μεμετόχισθος (V 156); f. 299v.22, μέρει from μέρη (IV 344); f. 295v.12, νομίζεις from νομίζεις (V 180); f. 267v.22, ϒιθ from ἡπ (I 426); f. 277v.1, ὄλος from ὄλος (III 97); f. 271v.22, ὄντως from ὄντως (II 122); f. 289v.11, ὄσκας from ὄσκας (IV 276); f. 294v.5, οὐσίωδης from οὐσίωδης (V 116);

884 Plate XIIa.
f. 270.21, ὀφθὲς from ὀφθεῖς (II 84); f. 260.16, παμπληθῇ from παμπληθεὶ (I 158); f. 280.21, παρὼν from παρὼν (III 278); f. 297.21, τίγμιον from τιγμωμέν (V 265); f. 264.19, πλῆθος from πλῆθῳ (I 310); f. 282.15-16, προαυρομένης from προαυρομέναις (III 367); f. 267.14, προτιμήσαιτο from προτιμήσατο (I 418); f. 260.23, πυκνή from πυκνή (I 184); f. 289.17-18, σοδόμτας from σοδόμταις (IV 311)885; f. 298.10, συναναισεῖται from συνανεῖσται (V 295); f. 259.17, τῆς from τοῦ (I 120); f. 288.23, τίγμοι from τίγμοι (IV 231); f. 295.6, τολμηρῶς from τολμήρως (V 175); f. 264.11, τοῦτο from τούτῳ (I 322); f. 270.23, τῷ from τῷ (II 102); f. 263.14, ύπερηφανίας from ύπερηφανείας (I 287); f. 284.21, ύποφυμένη from ύποφυμένη (IV 43); f. 296.9, φάρμακαν from φάρμακαν (V 216); f. 282.17-18, φεῦζεται from φεῦζει τέ (III 368); f. 256.13, φιλαργυρίας from φιλαργυρίας (I 26); f. 289.25, φρόνημα from φρόνημα (IV 318); f. 295.2, ὑφέλιμα from ὑφέλιμα (V 154)

(c) In cases of words containing double consonants, corrections were introduced usually by erasing or placing the additional letter above the line:

**B:** f. 59.13, κάλλιστα from κάλιστα (II 163)

**M:** f. 154.13, ἐφύσατο from ἐφύσατο (I 79); f. 156.14, πολλῶν from πολλῶν (I 156).

**V:** f. 279.7, ἀμφωφητῇ from ἀμφωφητῇ (III 196); f. 280.5, ἀπαλλάξαι from ἀπαλλάξαι (III 266); f. 260.21, ἐλησιστον from ἐλησιστον (I 182); f. 295.12, ἐναλλάξ from ἐναλάξ (V 180); f. 256.12 παραβάδλωμεν from παραβάδλωμεν (I 10); f. 277.23 ύπαλλάττων from ύπαλλάττων (III 116)

(d) A number of corrections were introduced in spaces previously erased. In some cases it is possible to distinguish traces of the original letters (though some are visible only by ultraviolet light):

**B:** f. 61.2-3 ἀποφήναι from ἀποφής(α)ι (III 30); f. 72.7, ἐνι from ἐν(*) (III 362); f. 78.6, ἐργάζεσθαι from ἐργάζει(*)σθαι (IV 154); f. 73.7, ύπολαμβάνεται from ύπολαμβάνεται (IV 19)

**M:** f. 157.20, ἐπειγόμενον from ἐπειγόμεν(α)ν (I 197); f. 200.23, παραγενέσσιν from παρεγενέσσιν (V 271)

**V:** f. 295.12-13, αἰσθήσεων from αἰσ(*)σεων (V 161); f. 289.18, ἀναίσχυντον from ἀναισ(*)μντον (IV 173); f. 282.23, διατεθεὶς from διατεθεϊς (III 373); f. 272.3, ἑαυτοὺς
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(II 143); f. 286v.18, ἔξοισομεν from ἔξοισ(.)μεν (IV 149); f. 268v.11-12, θεωροῦντι (II 23); f. 284v.2, ὀσμηέραι from ὀσ<αι ἰρμέραι (IV 25); f. 259v.22, πάντας from <ἄ>παντας (I 144); f. 289v.17, παντοδαπὴν from παντοδαπ(.) (IV 310)886; f. 271v.25 συμπεπλεγμένους from συμπ(.)πλεγμένους (II 124); f. 293v.12, συνεστακέναι from συνεστα(.)κέναι (V 85); f. 259v.9, συνέψεται from συν(.)ψεται (I 133)

(e) A number of significant corrections involved word endings:

**B**: f. 75v.22, ὡς from ὡστε? (IV 75)

**V**: f. 288v.25, ταύτα from ταύτη (IV 233)

(f) Corrections of accents and breathings:

**B**: f. 88v.3, άειδήποτε from άειδήποτε (V 93); f. 73v.9, αἰχμαλώτων from αἰχμάλωτων (III 7); f. 61v.16, ἀληθές from ἀληθές (III 24); f. 94v.7, αὕτω from αὐτῷ (V 277); f. 69v.20, ἐλεύθεροι from ἐλεύθεροι (III 291); f. 90v.2, εὐφροσύνα from εὐφροσύνα (IV 153); f. 77v.21, καὶ from καὶ (IV 133); f. 78v.11, μεταπήδαν from μετὰ πήδαν (IV 157); f. 75v.16, πάνυ from πάνυ (IV 86); f. 67v.2, προβαλέσθαι from προβαλέσθαι (III 216); f. 85v.15, προσήκειν from προσήκει (V 10); f. 201v.21, τάλλ' from τ' ἄλλ' (V 286); f. 82v.6, τοσαυτάκες from τοσαυτάκες (IV 276); f. 74v.4, τοῖς from τοῖς (IV 46); f. 64v.5, τούτων from τούτων (III 110); f. 59v.14, τούτω from τούτω (II 164); f. 70v.9 τῶ from τῷ (III 315); f. 91v.14, ὑπερβολής from ὑπέρ βολής (V 206)

**M**: f. 189v.4, αἰσθητικῶν from αἰσθητικῶν (IV 237); f. 198v.19, ἀκολαστοῦ from ἀκολαστοῦ (V 202); f. 171v.15, ἀληθοὺς from ἀληθοῦς (III 26); f. 152v.13, ἀμβλυῶτων from ἀμβλυῶτων (I 25); f. 194v.2, ἢν from ἢν (V 45); f. 168v.2, διαπραττομένων from διαπραττομένων (II 142); f. 198v.2, δομίεια from δομίεια (V 191); f. 199v.20, ἔφ' from ἔφ' (V 219); f. 155v.7, ἤττω from ἤττω (I 113); f. 167v.9, καθάπερ from κάθαπερ (II 110); f. 154v.11, κάκεινας from κάκεινας (I 77); f. 189v.5, κακοθειεῖαν from κακοθηθεῖαν (IV 238); f. 167v.3, μεταπεσόντος from μετὰ πεσόντος (II 89); f. 183v.16, μετατραπείσης from μετὰ τραπείσης (IV 60); f. 171v.26 παθῶν from παθῶν (III 49); f. 185v.18-19, περιπεμφοῦνιν from περιπέμφοισα (IV 130); f. 185v.1, προσδοκῶμενον from προσδοκηκῶμενον (IV 119); f. 195v.20, προσλαβεῖν from πρὸς λαβεῖν (V 90); f. 182v.8, πρὸς_άλλουν from πρὸς_άλλον (IV 20); f. 159v.17 πορτέων from πρὸς_τέρων (I 267); f. 160v.25, τελέχιν from τελέχιν (I 310); f. 162v.12, τῶ_σύνολον from τῶ_σύνολον (I 375); f. 886 Plate XII.c.
184.24, τοῦς² from τοὺς (IV 83); f. 175.16, τούτῳ from τούτῳ (III 162); f. 191.18, χείριστον from χειριστῶν (IV 314)

V: f. 259r.4, ἄθλα from ἄθλα (I 129); f. 295.11, αἰσθουμένους from αἰσθουμένους (V 160); f. 296.15, ἀναγκαίαν from ἀναγκαίων (V 201); f. 282.26, ἀνδρὰς from ἀνδρᾶι (III 351); f. 270.24, ἀνδρίσιν from ἀνδρίσιν (II 86); f. 293.25, αὐτάς from αὐτάς (V 93); f. 271.20, αὐτεύξονυτίτως from αὐτεύξουσιντίτως (II 120); f. 289v.17, γεγονούν from γεγονοῦν (IV 310)887; f. 298v.5, διατούτῳ from διὰ τοῦτο (V 291); f. 279.7, δὲ from δὲ (III 195); f. 281r.10, διαμαρτία from διὰ ἁμαρτία (III 316); f. 292.15, διάματι from διάματι (V 49); f. 294.18, δικαίαν from δικαίαι (V 127); f. 277.24, δραματοποιῶν from δραματοποιῶν (III 116); f. 298.20, ἐκβεβηκώμια from ἐκβεβηκάμια (V 284); f. 294v.19, ἐνεστὶ from ἐν ἐστὶ (V 148); f. 276v.6, ἐξηκοστῷ from ἐξηκοστῷ (III 77); f. 261v.12, ἐπάναγκες from ἐπάναγκες (I 211); f. 298.14, ἐπειδὰν from ἐπειδὴ ἄν (V 279); f. 291.9, ἐστὶ from ἐστὶ (V 7)888; f. 270.22, ἐφοιτὸν from ἐφοιτῷ (II 84); f. 286.28, εὐφοιάναι from εὐφοίαναι (IV 129); f. 294v.15-16, θεωρήσαμεν from θεώρησαμεν (V 145); f. 287.8, κατατάωτῳ from κατὰ ταύτῳ (IV 163); f. 266.9, κακῷ from κακῷ (I 375); f. 282.24, μή from μῇ (III 350); f. 285.24, μηδέτερο from μηδέτερο (IV 71); f. 266v.4, μηδετέρῳ from μηδὲ ἓτερῳ (I 390); f. 261v.16, μηδόλος from μηδὲ ὄλος (I 214); f. 275.4, μόνην from μὸνην (III 3); ff. 261.12, 262v.8, 264v.2, μονονοῦ from μονονοῦ (I 194, 245, 314); f. 290.14, ὅπως from ὅπως (IV 336); f. 275v.5, ὑμὴν from ὑμὴν (III 27); f. 297v.19, οὕτωνος from οὕτωνοι (V 263); f. 262v.5, παθῶν from παθῶν (I 242); f. 263v.3, παρῆς from παρῆς (I 278); f. 284.15, παλαί from παλλήν (IV 15)889; f. 294.14, προάται from προάται (V 123); f. 286.17-18, προσαγορεύσαμεν from προσαγορεύσαμεν (IV 118); f. 299v.5, προφοτύπωσα from προφοτυπώσα (V 330); f. 257v.2, προοίη from προοίη (I 54); f. 257v.13, προφήτηκεν from προφήτηκεν (I 63); f. 257.6, 278v.19, προφήγων from προφήγων (I 39, III-182); f. 276v.18, προφορογιαίτερον from προφορογιαίτερον (III 87); f. 262v.17, προμηθεῖ from προμηθεῖ (I 252); f. 262.12, προστρέψει from προστρέψει (I 229); f. 278v.10, προσέχοντα from προσέχοντα (III 175); f. 289.9, ὃβδομον from ὃβδομον (IV 274); f. 266v.11, σκοπεῖτω from σκοπεῖτω (I 397); f. 284v.13, σχολικῶτατον from σχολικῶ (IV 36); f. 295v.12, τάληθες from τάληθες (V 180); f. 298.23, τάλλα from τάλλα (V 286); f. 279v.8, τεθνάναι from τεθνάναι (III 220); ff. 264v.7, 285.13, 287.16, τὴν from
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(g) Corrections or additions by adding letters and words in the margin and interlinear space:

B: f. 51.1, ἁρχόνται (I 399); ff. 77v.3, 89.7, τε (IV 136, V 127); f. 85.4, δὲ ἄλλως from δάλλως (V 5); f. 77.26, δέονταν from δέον (IV 134); f. 74v.2, ἐθέλομεν from ἐθέλεμεν (IV 45); f. 96.1, ἢ (V 336); f. 89v.5, κεκαθαρμένους from κεκαθαρμένους (V 141); f. 79v.8, καύφον from φον (IV 200); f. 58v.10, μὴ (II 146); f. 86v.3, αἴμα (V 45); f. 56v.22, ὁπόταν from ὁ πάνταν (II 94); f. 90.12, πάραν (V 160); f. 54v.12, τῆ (II 21); f. 82v.10, τί (IV 294); f. 57v.2, τρεπομένης from τετρομένης (II 96); f. 77.22, τῶν from τὸ (IV 134)

I: f. 57.23, τε (IV 80); f. 66v.10, μὲν (I 317, V 113); f. 42v.7, προσκόπτειν from προσκόπτειν (II 46); f. 62v.5, σώματι from σώμα (IV 273); f. 65v.12, τε (V 72); f. 70.2, τό (V 258); f. 60.13, τῶν (IV 196); f. 65.1, τοίτο (V 41)

M: f. 192.7, ἀγεννῶς from ἀγεννῶς (IV 342); f. 199v.13, ἀπολέομαι from ἀπολέσει (V 230); f. 160v.17, ἀτιμάσαμεν from ἀτιμάσαμεν (I 323); f. 198v.21, γένομαι from γένηται (V 203); f. 192.16, εὐστερφός from εὐστερφός (IV 348); f. 187v.16, ἔχω from ἔχει (IV 195); f. 165v.2, ἔχων from ἔχαν (III 34); f. 203v.15, εὶ (V 367); f. 157.1, ἀλλατταν from θάλασσαν (I 186, although the superscribed σὸ was not crossed out); f. 165v.24, καὶ ἀλλήλοις...ἀν εἰπ...τὸ...δὲ...φιλείσθαι...τὰ...μην...κεκαθαρμένους (II 30-31); f. 157v.13, μεγαλοπρεπεῖας from μεγαπρεπεῖας (I 210); f. 167v.16, μὴ δὲ from μὴ (II 116); f. 189v.9, μηδεπώποτε from μηδεπώποτε (IV 258); f. 174.14, τουαῦτα (III 126)

V: f. 296v.5, ἂν (V 213); f. 294.22, δηλονότι (V 130); f. 271v.10-12, ἐνθισεῖς γίνεται, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἐφεξῆς λόγῳ ὁσβήσειται καθαρώτερον and εἰσί, τῷ γὰρ ἀληθῶς θέλειν, ἐπεταί καὶ τῷ ἐνοχεῖν (II 111-113)890; f. 290.1, ἔχουσιν (IV 321)891; f. 275v.22, θέλειν (III 19); f. 282v.19, καθόλου from καθόλ (III 369); f. 269v.5, καὶ (II 56); f. 287v.17, μᾶλα αὐτικα (IV 199); f. 269v.7, νομίζουσιν from μικροῦσιν (II 57); f. 287, ὅθεν ταυτί

---
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διαπράττομαι (IV 175)\(^{892}\); f. 276.16, ὄντως from ὄντος (III 61); f. 266v.8, οὐδὲ from οὐ (I 393); f. 273.22, οὕτως from οὗτος (II 190); f. 261r.21, πάντως (I 213); f. 285.16, πλησιμονὴς from πληνῆς (IV 63); f. 288.4, ποιεῖ (IV 212); f. 259r.15, πόρφυραν (I 139); f. 281v.17, συμβαστέον from συμβαστεον (III 321); f. 289.8, σώμα from σῶ (IV 273); f. 282v.28, τῷ (III 377); f. 272.22, τὸ from τῷ (II 155); f. 276v.20-21, τὸς τῶν ἀντιλεχόντων (III 89); f. 296v.10, τῶν (V 217)

(h) Corrections by **overwriting or altering letters** in the text:

**B:** f. 66.13, ἀναφώρησιν from ἀναφώρησιν? (III 176); f. 95.9, ἐπεβούλευεν from ἐπιβούλευεν (V 311); f. 97.1, ἡδονής from ὡδονής (V 368); f. 73r.22, θέλωντος from θέλωντος (IV 29); f. 81v.21, λέγω from ἦλέγω (IV 271); f. 83r.11, ὄρθολμον from ὄφθαλμον (IV 327); f. 52.4, πειθώ from πειθώ (I 431); f. 71.16, τὰ from τῷ (III 336); f. 81v.10, τούτως from τούτως (IV 263); f. 82v.6, τούτων from ταύτων? (IV 291); f. 71.9, ὑπὸ from ἀπὸ (III 331); f. 88v.1, φημι from φημι (V 107); f. 77v.4, φθόνον from φθόνον (IV 137)

**M:** f. 198v.1, αὐτῆς from αὐτῆς (V 191); f. 199v.24, αὐτὸν from αὐτὴν (V 238); f. 172v.21, ἀφελόθαι from ἀφελόται (III 79); f. 188v.1, ἐλείν from ἄλειν (IV 217); f. 178v.13, ἐμβολοθετέον from ἐμβολοθετέον (III 275); f. 183v.11, ἐπιδείκτικενα from ἐπιδεικτικέναι (IV 57); f. 175v.18, κωκός from κωκός (III 179); f. 199v.10, μιθαμάς from μιθαμᾶς (V 229); f. 170v.18, νευκηκότα from νευκηκωκότα (III 12)\(^{893}\); f. 159v.26, νευοσήκει from νευοσήκει (I 293); f. 165v.4-5, οἰκέωσες from οἰκέωσει (II 18); f. 192v.9, πλαναμένους from πλαναμένους (V 6); f. 184v.25, ὑπ' from τῷ (IV 82); f. 167v.4, ὑπεξσάλης from ὑπεξσαλῆς (II 90)

**V:** f. 290.9, ἄγαθοὺς from ἀμάθους (IV 330); f. 295.3, αἰτία from ἀντία (V 154); f. 279v.18, ἀποκεχώρεται from ἀποκεχώρετα (III 229); f. 265v.21, αὐτῶς from αὐτός (I 367); f. 279.27 αὐτόκλητον from αὐτόκλητον (III 213); f. 288v.17, γεῦσαι from (....)ν (IV 253); f. 299.20, διακεφαλεῖας from διακεφαλεῖας (IV 321); f. 287.10, δύσην from δύσας (IV 166); f. 286.21, δραμάτητος from δραμάτητος (IV 122); f. 291v.25, εἰργασται from εἰργασταὶ (V 38); f. 289.4, ἐγγόνοις from ἐγγόνους? (IV 268); f. 278.19, ἐκόντες from ἐκόντας (III 159); f. 299.5, ἐπεβούλευεν from ἐπεβούλευεν (V 311); f. 294v.18, εὐφραίνεσθαι from (.....)φραίνεσθαι (V 146); f. 270.21, ἦτταν from ἦτταν (II 84); f.

---
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290.7, θέλγνων from θ(.)γνων (IV 328)894; f. 278v.25-26, κρατήρα from κρ(.)τήρα (III 188); f. 265v.18, μετιέναι from μετείναι (I 365); f. 284v.18, ξίφος from ξί(.)ος (IV 41); f. 281.23, ὀλγαφός from ὀ(λ).γαφός (III 303); f. 285.4, ούτω from ούτος (IV 52); f. 285v.6, πάθος from βάθος (IV 80)895; f. 276.2 παθῶν from (.)παθῶν (III 49); f. 296v.10, πάνθος from πάντα (V 21); f. 289v.17, πανταχοῦ from πανχοῦ (IV 313)896; f. 298v.5, πλείστον from π(λ.)είστον (V 291); f. 269v.24, οὐν from ὀφν (II 69); f. 298v.4, τήν from τα? (V 290); f. 286.8, 289.7, τοὺς from τοῖς (IV 108, 271); f. 280.14, ὑπερβολής from ὑπερβολής (III 249); f. 292.14, ὑποσχέσεως from ὑπο(σχέσεως (V 48); f. 289v.11, φθάσασι from φθάσασι (IV 303); f. 276v.23, ὅσθε' ὄ τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγων ἔχει from ὅστε τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγων ἔχει (III 91)

(i) Superscribed Greek numbers to denote transposition of word order:

B: f. 70v.15-16, προαιρέσεως] εἶναι] μόνης] superscribed α, γ, β (III 319)

II. Corrections introduced by corrective hands

The corrective hands V, Vhand A, B and M introduced further additions or corrections. In V some corrections were introduced by a yet unidentified corrective hand, whereas others were introduced by the corrective hand A, which belongs to Macarius Macres, and intervened in all the Orations.

(a) Corrections and additions in the margin or the interlinear space:

B: f. 58v.12, ἀτόπως (II 148); f. 95v.3, ἐπτόηται from ἐπτόηται (V 322); f. 85v.10, μὲν (V 21); f. 85v.13, πρέπεις from πρέπει (V 23)897

V: f. 265v.19, χε (I 347); f. 273v.7, δέ (II 180); f. 277v.15, σκωμάτων from σκωμάτων (III 133); f. 269v.20 σφάλλονται from σφάλλον (II 48); f. 276v.23, τε (III 92); f. 298v.3, τῆς (V 290); f. 263v. ἀφ(α)οῦ (I 287-289); f. 275v.13, ὀστε from ὀς (III 11)

Vhand A: f. 287v.17, αἰδοῖ (IV 172); f. 269v.12, ἀν(θρώπ]ιον from ἀν(θρώπ)ιον (II 61); f. 294v.7, ἀφαβόνα from ἀφαβόνα (V 137); f. 272v.22, αὐτοῦς (II 155); ff. 297v.16, 299v.23, γάρ (V 241, V 325); f. 293v.2, κε (V 94); f. 294v.6-7, γαθο(μικόν) (V 119-120); f. 278v.1, γοῦν
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(III 144); f. 299.16, δ’ (V 318); f. 300.5, διαβάλλων from διαβάλλω (V 349) 898; f. 295.2, χρ(αφέ) ἔστι (V 153); f. 295.2, ἔστι (V 154); f. 263.12, ἦν (l 266); f. 296v.4, ὄντων (V 213); f. 292.14, οίκη (V 48); f. 267v.16, ὀπαστηθῶν (l 440); f. 271.22, ὅσα γε εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν ψυχῆς (II 121-122) 899; f. 262.17, οὐκ ἂν (l 233); f. 298.3-4, παραινέσεσιν from παραινέσεσι (V 271); f. 276v.24 σημεῖοι(ατα) (III 91-92); f. 258.13, συνεπιρεύση, above the contracted form σ(ωτη)ρίαν (I 80); f. 296v.17, συνεπιρεύση from συνεπιρεύση (V 223); ff. 261.19, 299v.23, τὴν (l 199, V 344); f. 282v.12, τοῖς (III 364); f. 260v.11, χαίρειν from χαίρει (l 173)

(b) Corrections by overwriting or altering letters in the text:

B?: f. 68.9, τῆς (III 236, underlined as a mistake)
V: f. 292v.12, ἄρκουντας from (..)ρκοῦντας (V 66)

(c) Corrections by overwriting word endings:

M?: f. 178v.9, δυσὶ from δυσὶ (III 273 ν underlined as a mistake); f. 197.9, ἐνεστὶ from ἐνεστὶν (V 148); f. 174.22, ἔστι from ἐστὶ (III 132); f. 179.16, ἔστι from ἐστὶν (III 294); f. 180.21, ἔστι from ἐστὶν (III 331); f. 163v.7, ἔχειν underlined as a mistake, since in the other MSS is ἔχαι (l 426)
V?: f. 260v.11, ἐάσαντα from ἐάσαντας (l 173)

(d) Superscribed Greek numbers used to denote transposition of word order:

V: f. 259v.16, τῶν ἀγαθῶν πλεονεξίας], superscribed α, β, (I 139-140)

(e) Corrections introduced in spaces previously erased:

V: f. 272.7, βῆλυρίαν (II 145)
V: f. 287.22, παρὰ προοδοκίαν (IV 178)

III. Errors

1. Errors due to confusion of sounds

(a) Itacisms (affecting ι, ει, η, οι, υ):
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B: γένοιται for γένηται (V 203); ὀφιλόμενον for ὀφειλόμενον (V 10); τής for τοίς (III 236)

BIM: πασινεῖ for πασιν (I 153)

BIMV: ἀνδρίαν for ἀνδρείαν (I 130, IV 172, 351); ἀνδρεῖα for ἀνδρεία (II 72)

BM: διακεχημένος for διακεχυμένος (V 322); ἡδὺ for ἡδεῖ (IV 125-126);

λελυπεῖσθαι for λελυπῆσθαι (IV 75); μεμετρίμενως for μεμετρημένως (V 156);

ὀρχιστὰς for ὀρχηστὰς (II 57); πάντη for παντί (IV 105); σεμνηνόμεθα for σεμνυνόμεθα (III 299)

BIMV: παμπληθὶ for παμπληθεὶ (I 158)

M: ἀπέστη for ἄπεστι (I 336); ἀπολέσ for ἀπολέσει (V 230); ἀρχηστεῖαν for

ἀρχηστιάν (I 15); ei for ἢ (I 382); ἐλθεῖᾳ for ἐλεληθεὶ (I 144); ἐντελέχειαν for

ἐντελέχειαν (II 139); εὐφράσθησεν for ἤφρασθεύσεται (IV 43); ἔχει for ἔχοι (I 426);

ἡριθρίασεν for ἠρυθρίασεν (I 221); μηδεμίαν for μηδεμίαν (III 25); νομισθήσεται for νομισθήσεται (III 235);

πάντει for πάντες (IV 182); πάτει for πάττεις (IV 275); σοὶ for σὺ (V 351); φήμη for φήμη (I 95)

V: ἀρκιβῇ for ἀρκιβεί (I 184); ἀνθρωπεῖαν for ἀνθρωπεῖαν (III 324); ἀποφαίνει for

ἀποφαίνου (I 258); ἐπανέλθη for ἐπανέλθες (IV 270); ἠριθρίασεν for ἠριθρίασεν (I 221);

καιρῶς for καιρὸς (V 14); κιβδηλώτητα for κιβδηλότητα (III 25); πλανωμένοις for πλανωμένοις (V 9);

συγγεγονίας for συγγεγονυίας (V 232); τής for τοῖς (I 266); τῷ for τῷ (IV 370);

τοῖς γιγνομένοις for τίς γιγνομένης (III 216-217); ὑπερηφανεῖας for ὑπερηφανίας (I 287)

(b) Confusion of ε and α:

B: ἐπετεῖν for ἐπανέλθες (III 224)

BM: ἐξαπάτηται for ἐξαπάτη τε (III 260)

I: καταπαλέσαι for καταπαλαίσαι (IV 285); ύστε for ύστε (IV 311)

(c) Confusion of o and ω:

B: ἔχων for ἔχον (II 34); καιρῶς for καιρός (V 14)

BM: γεγενημένων for γεγενημένον (I 126); κατωρθωκέναι for κατωρθωκέναι (I 16); κιβδηλώτητα for κιβδηλότητα (III 25); πλανωμένοις for πλανωμένοις (V 9);

τοιούτων for τοιούτων (IV 52); τῷ for τῷ (III 379); τῷ for τῷ (IV 167)

BMV: ἐκόν for ἐκῶν (III 168); τῷ for τῷ (II 194)
I: ἐναντιότατα for ἐναντιώτατα (IV 157); κομάσει for κωμάσει (III 54); κομώντων for κομώντων (I 109)

M: διαφέρονται for διαφέρωνται (IV 85); ἱσχυρότερα for ἱσχυρότερα (III 41); συγγνώμης for συγγνώμης (III 216); τὸ for τῶ (IV 125-126, V 310); τοσοῦτον for τοσούτων (IV 135)

MV: κατορθωκότα for κατωρθωκότα (I 326)

V: ἀπολείας for ἀπωλείας (IV 310); καλῶς for καλός (I 385); ἄβυσον for ἄβυσσον (I 279); ἀμφιρρεπὲς for ἀμφιρεπὲς (III 109); ἐμελέν for ἐμελλέν (I 213); στερρῶς for στερρότητί (V 311); συγγνώμης for συγγνώμης (III 216); ψαμώδους for ψαμμώδους (I 206)

(e) Double for single consonants:

M: κόρας for κόρας (I 176)

2. Errors in breathings

(a) Faulty breathings:

B: αὑτῶν for αὐτῶν (IV 230)

BM: αὑτοῦ for αὐτοῦ (III 59)

BMV: αὐτοὺς for αὐτοὺς (IV 344)

I: ἐν ἀλλάξ for ἐναλλάξ (V 180)

M: αὐτοῦ for αὐτοῦ (I 282); ἐφίκει for ἐφίκει (V 297); οὐκ ἔτι for οὐκέτι (IV 266); προς ὀλίγον for προς ὀλίγον (IV 20)

V: ἀλίς for ἀλίς (III 103); ἀλίσκεται for ἀλίσκεται (III 91); μὴ δ’ ὁπωσιῶν for μηδοπωσιῶν (VI 282)

(b) Omission of breathing in crasis:

BIM: προὔπτον for προὔπτον (III 290)
BIMV: προφυγιαίτερον for προφυγιαίτερον (I 143; III 87); προύπτον for προύπτον (I 420); ταυτό for ταυτό (V 147, 359); ταυτόν for ταυτόν (III 140, V 224, 368); ταυτώ for ταυτώ (III 269)

BIV: προὔβη for προὔβη (I 54); προὔθηκεν for προὔθηκεν (I 63); προὐκαλεῖτο for προὐκαλεῖτο (III 35); προὐφόγον for προὐφόγον (I 39, 232, 369, III 124, 181, IV 100); προὔπτε for προὔπτε (I 252); προὔτρεπε for προὔτρεπε (I 229); προὔχοντα for προὔχοντα (III 175); ταυτά for ταυτά (III 118)

V: τακεῖθεν for τἀκεῖθεν (V 47)

(c) Omission of breathings:

I: τὰ ἀκεῖθεν for τάκεῖθεν (V 47)

3. Errors in accentuation

(a) Faulty accentuation:

BI: οὐά for οίά (IV 158)

BIMV: ἀνδριάσιν for ἀνδριᾶσιν (II 86); εὐφράναι for εὐφρᾶναι (IV 129); περάναι for περάναι (II 134); ποτέ for ποτε (IV 220, 311)

BM: ἀκαρεῖ for ἀκαρεῖ (I 272); βιαζομένου τοῦ for βιαζομένου τοῦ (III 146); εὐφράναι for εὐφρᾶναι (II 82); οὐδὲ μίαν for οὐδεμίαν (V 127)

BMV: αὐτῇ for αὐτή (V 121)

IMV: οὐδὲ πιάπτε for οὐδεπιάπτε (IV 123)

M: πρὸς νοσήσουσιν for προσνοσήσουσιν (V 22); ὁξάδον for ὁξάδον (IV 274); φῆς for φής (V 368)

V: ἀποπλύναι for ἀποπλύναι (III 176); ἐνδεία for ἐνδεία (V 243); ἐπι πλέον for ἐπί πλέον (III 137); ἐστίν for ἐστίν (V 76); ἓ for ἢ (V 128); καθάραι for καθάραι (V 24); κομιδή for κομιδή (III 51, V 293); μὴ δὲ πιάπτε for μὴ πιάπτε (IV 258); μὴ ποτε for μὴ ποτε (III 318); ταραχή for ταραχή (IV 227); ὠσε for ὠσέ (IV 311)

(b) Omission of accents:

BI: διὰ for διά (III 50)

BIMV: διὰ for διά (V 291)

BM: φημι for φημί (V 107)
4. Other errors

**BM:** αὐτόπας for ἀτόπας (II 148); δεικνείσθαι for διϊκνεῖσθαι (II 103); οὐκ ἐτ’ for οὐκέτ’ (III 44); συνεπιστήμη for σύν ἐπιστήμη (I 412); ψυχίαις for ψυχαῖς (IV 219)

**BIM:** ἐξάλοιτο for ἐξήλατο (I 74)

**BMV:** συμπεπλεγμένους for συμπεπληγμένους (II 124)

**M:** αὐτεξούσιν for αὐτεξούσιον (II 121); δεδεττομένου for δεδιττομένου (I 225); ἐξϋπερυπερηφανίας for ἐξ ὑπερηφανίας (I 287); ἔπαισι for ἔπαισε (V 192); ἐπεδέκνυτο for ἐπεδείκνυτο (I 56); ἠπάντηνται for ἠπάτηνται (V 5); κάπερ for καθάπερ (I 194); σοφερῶν for σοβαρῶν (IV 339); συναθυρούντων for συναθυρόντων (IV 184)

5. Erroneous words

**B:** εἰ for εἰς (III 173); ταύτην for ταύτη (V 9)

**BM:** αἰτιος for αἰτιοι (I 24); αὐτὴ for αὐτής (V 131); αὐτῶ for αὐτῶν (III 138); βιολόμεθα for βιολοίμεθα (V 34); ποιεῖν for ποιεῖς (V 213); τὸ for ταῖς (IV 278)

**I:** τοῖς for ταῖς (IV 230); τὸ for τὸν (I 13)

**M:** ἀληθοὺς for ἀγαθοὺς (III 26); ἀναγκαῖον for ἀναγκαῖα (III 129); ἀνατροφή for ἀνατροπή (IV 150); ἀνομάλαι for ἀνάμολα (IV 230); βαδίζειν for βαδίζοι (III 303); ἔδοξεν for ἐδειξεν (V 329); εἰπὸν for εἶπον (IV 25); εἴψομεν for εἴποιμεν (IV 145); ἔξουσίας for ἐξ Ασίας (I 185); ἔτερον for ἔκατερον (V 306); κατ’ for καθ’ (V 333); κλῆρον for κλήρον (I 277); μικρὰ for μικρὰ (II 88); ὡς for ὡς (V 110); ὑγιής for ὑγιής (I 400); ὅτε for ὅτι (I 385); παραλόγον for παρὰ λόγον (I 153); ταύτα for ταύτα (I 290); πῦρ for πῦρ (IV 32); τὸ for τὸ (I 290); φυσικῶς for φυσικῶς (II 151); χρῶ for χρώτο (V 217); ψυχήν for ψήψιν (II 49)

**V:** ἀποτελειτωκῶς for ἀποτελειτώ (I 213)

6. Dittography

**M:** τῆς τῆς (I 255)

IV. Readings
1. Omissions

**BM**: δ’ (V 318); δή (I 405); ἐστίν (III 344); καὶ μὴ τῷ πλεονασμῷ βαρύνθηναι τε καὶ καταπεσεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὀφεληθῆναι (IV 324-325); μὴ (V 225); σή (III 305); σου (III 113); ὡς (II 43)

I: γε (III 69); ἡ (V 135); καὶ (II 160)

**M**: ἐλάφους (I 179); καὶ(Ι 162; III-128); καὶφος (III 84); ὁ<φελεία> (V 14)

V: ἀν (IV 296); αὐτής (V 89); βιβλία (I 409); γε καί (II 94); εἰναι (IV 18); ἐναντιώτατα (IV-157); ἐστίν (I 334); ἕ (V 336); καὶ (I 11, III 269); καὶ ἱσα Θεῶ (I 245); οἱ (IV 315); πρὸς ἡμᾶς (IV 206); τὲ (I 84; I 245); τὸ ἑαυτοῦ (IV 122); τοῦ (I 341); τοῦτον (I 325); φενακισθεὶς (III 284); ὦ τὰ (V 208)

2. Additions

**BM**: περὶ (IV 305, before τῆς ἡδονῆς)

**BMV**: ἐν (III 370, after ἑκάστοις); πᾶσα (I 104, before δύναμις)

**M**: ἐν (I 53, before οἷς)

V: γὰρ (I 67, after οἷς); γε (I 410, after οἷς; I 180, after τούτων; V 37, after θείας); δειλίας, εἰ δὲ βουλεῖ γε νωθρείας ἢ καί for ὑπὸ (I 210, after ὑπὸ); ἐκείνος (I 23, after λίθοις); περὶ (V 177 before ταύτης); ποτὲ (I 210, after μόλις); καὶ (III 344, after διὰ); μὲν (III 128, after γὰρ); τε λέγω (III 87, after ψυχῆς); τὴν (I 257, after ψυχήν); τὶ (I 319, after πολὺ); τὸ (III 320, before πάθος); τοῖς (III 364, before δαίμοσιν); τὸν (II 153 before πλάτωνα, V 177 before ἀντιλέγοντα)

3. Marginal glosses and notes

**BIM**: γρ(άφε) λυσιτελέστερον (I 1)

**BIMV**: ὡρ(αῖον) (I 287-289)

**BM**: γρ(άφε) ὑψ’ ὄν (I 223); γρ(άφε) ὡς τηνικαῦτα ὡδίους δυνάμενα κακουργεῖν (IV 229)

I: γρ(άφε) ἡδονῆς (IV 305)

4. Lapsus calami

I: μονοῦ for μονονοῦ (I 63)

M: ζήν αὐτὸ and then ζ (III 67)
V: μόνον οὔ for μονονοῦ (I 29)

5. Different readings

BM: ἀπ’ for ἄπ’ (V 24); ἔστι for ἔνεστι (V 289); κάγαθός for καὶ ἀγαθός (I 386); ὀπόσης ὁ λέγων ἐβούλετο for ὀπόσην αὐτὸς ἐβούλου δεικνύναι (V 190); παρέσται for ἀπέσται (III 238)

BMV: γε for τε (II 181)

I: τὴν for μή (I 88); καθαρῶς for παντελῶς (III 196); οὕτος for οὕτω (IV 52); τιμήθεις for τιθείς (I 22); τουτοί for τούτοι (I 194)

M: δὲ for ἀν (IV titulus); οὐκ ἂν for κἂν (I 263); προσισταταὶ for προσίστασθαι (IV 91); συμπεφυκέναι for ξυμπεφυκέναι (V 77); ὑπάρχουσαν for ἐνυπάρχουσαν (V 283); ὑπὸ for ἀπὸ (IV 254)

MV: ἐκδεδωκὼς for δεδωκὼς (III 51)

V: ἀγαθότατος τε καὶ κάλλιστος τῷ ὁμιλεῖν, ἀγαθάκια as διείστα (IV 104); ἀμέτοχα for μὴ μετέχοντα (I 111); αὐτὸς ἢ for ἀναγκαίως δείκται (IV 99); ἀνατρέψας, ἐτοιμον for περιτρέψαι, εὐκολον (III 39); ἀντίκατον διαστάτουμεν for ἀντίκατα πονοῦμεν (IV 39); ἀνόρμιστα for ἀνεμιστιστα (V 326); ἀποκαλυπτήμενον for ὀλοκλήρον (V 104); ἀποδεικνύται for ἀποδόται (V 26); ἀπολυλατηρίων for διαφθοραίη (III 175); αὐτῷ for τά ἐκ τῆς (V 288); αὐτὸς for τωs (V 179); ἀφαίρεσθαι for ἀφελέσθαι (III 79); αὐξίδος οὐρανοῦ οίμαι δοξάζειν for οὐρανίας οίμαι δοκείν αὐξίδος (I 319);

βαραθρώθη για τραχείαν (Ι 207); βελτιών for βελτίω ποιεῖν (III 338); βουλεύειν for συμβουλεύειν (IV 244);

γένοιτο περὶ πλείστου for μέγα δόξειν (III 87); γνώειν ὅπως πείσασθαι for εἰδεῖν ὅπως πείσουν (I 429-430); γνώσεως for φιλονήσεως (I 77);

δὲ δυνήσθαι for οἷόν τε εἶναι (I 395); δὴ for δὲ (I 116); διαφθοραίη for διαφθορά (IV 74); διαστάει for αὐτός (V 105); δικαίως οὐ γενναῖος, μὴ γενναῖος μὴ γενναῖος (I 101-102); διορθωμένον for διορθώσεως λαβόντος (III 148); δουλεύεις προστήξει ἑαυτὸν for ἑαυτὸν ἐκδόσι τις (III 284);

ἐγὼ δ’ ἂν φαίνη γιὰ καὶ μὴν παντὶ που δῆλον (V 105); εἰκόνα for ἠδονής (IV 305); εἰσίναι τα ὑπεισδύεται (III 308); εἴη for ἥττο (I 113); εἴτε προβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὰ
πρόσωνν το έπτα τα πρόσω χωρήσομεν (III 127-128); ἐκείνοι ταλανίζουσιν (II 16) ἐκουσιούν (III 123); ἤμιν ἄμφην (V 282); ἐν τῇ ταυτότητι καὶ τῇ καταστάσει ἐν ταυτῷ (III 16-269); ἔναν γεγονόν τοις πρόσθεν (III 216); ἔναν γεγονόν ἦν προεχθῇ (III 294); ἐνοχὴν ἐνυθύνας (III 305); ἐνικε ἐν ἐν (I 375); ἔσπασθῆ ἐν ἀπάτῃ (III 315); ἔσπασθῆ ἐν ἀπάτῃ (III 59); ἐπανεὐθεύνεσθαι ἐν ἑπανήξει (III 289); ἐπαινεῖκος ἐν τῇ ἁλῆ (I 129-130); ἐπαινεῖκος ἐν τῇ ἁλῆ (I 129-130); ἐπαινεῖκος ἐν τῇ ἁλῆ (I 129-130); ἐπανεὐθεύνεσθαι ἐν ἑπανήξει (III 289); ἐπαινεῖκος ἐν τῇ ἁλῆ (I 129-130); ἐπαινεῖκος ἐν τῇ ἁλῆ (I 129-130);

...

...
μεταπηθάν ἀπὸ περάτων εἰς πέρατα: ἀκρα ἐναντίως ἐχόντων ὅποι ὀφειν αὐτή κάλυμμα, οὐκ εἴργον, οὐ προσιστάμενον, ὡς μὴ ὁρίος ἐς τά ἐναντίωτα μεταπητάν (IV 156-157); οὐχ ὅπως ὁ οὐ μόνον (I 136-137, V 282); οὐχὶ καλὸν ὁ οὐκ ἄει τοιοῦτον (III 268);

παγιωθέν ὁ παγέν (IV 38); παρά προσδοκίαν ὁ ἀπροόπτως (IV 178); παρείναι τέ καὶ ὁ παρόντα (III 79); περιέσται κακοπραγήσας ὁ παρὸς πράξας περιέσται (I 398); περιστήρεται ὁ καταστήσεται (III 353); πίχεις ὁ πιθήκοι (IV 233); πλάνην ὁ δόξάν τινα οὐκ ὁρόθην (V 20); πλάνης δουλεύονσιν ὁ ἢπάτητα (V 5); πλάτος ὁ μήκος (III 124); πλατύτερον ὁ διὰ πλειόνων (III 316, IV 11, V 56); πόρωθεν αὐτῷ κατελθούσαν ἐκ τῶν προγόνων ὁ ἐκ πατρὸς αὐτῷ κατελθούσαν μεγίστην οὔσαν (I 234-235); πράξας ὁ ποιήσα (V 123); πράξαιμι ὁ ποιήσαμι (III 113); πραυσὲς χωρίον καὶ καθαρὸν ὁ πεθάνον ὁμαλὸν τε καὶ λεῖον, καὶ μηδὲν τί δυσχερές (I 209-210); προσεδραιῶσαι ὁ ἐτί καὶ μᾶλλον συντήσαι (V 59); προτερήματα ὁ πλεονεκτήματα (I 437); προτιθεμένοις ὁ προτιμῶσι (I 3); προτιμήσαι ὁ τιμήσαι (I 418); προτίμησιν ἔχει τοῦ δι’ ἑνός, ὡς ἐξημεσεῖας ἐκδαισυμένου ὁ ἐκδαισυτερόν πον τοῦ δι’ ἑνός, ὡς ἐξ ἠμεσεῖας παὶ βεβηκότοσ (V 61); πῶς ὁ ἢ ἡ τι τῶν ἑδεόν (III 87);

ἄρθυμον ὁ ἠδεσθαί (IV 25);

σκοτόμαιναν ὁ ἱλέγγουσ (II 47); σκωμμάτων ὁ μέμψεως (III 133); σου ὁ γε (V 187); συμπτώμασι τις καρκικος μᾶλλον δὲ που καὶ τραπείσας ὁ τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων συμπτόμασι: μᾶλλον δὲ που καὶ τραπείσας (II 95-96); συναθελόντων ὁ συναθυρόντων (IV 184); συνέψεται ὁ περιληφθήσεται (I 133);

tά γὰρ δὴ καθάπατα ἀπλὰ, τοιαῦτα ὁ δή ψυχή, οὐ δύνανται τί μέρος ἀφαίρεθηναι τῶν αὐτῶν φυσικῶς προοῦν ὅς ὅπου γε τὸ μέρος αὐτῶν, ἔκει τὸ πᾶν ἀτεχνώς-κάν ἀφαίρεθη τι φύσις ἀπλῆ, οὐκ ἐστὶ τῷ ὑπολειψθέν διασώζεσθαι ὁ ὁ γὰρ ἐστὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀφαίρεθείσαν τι τῶν αὐτῆς, ἐν ἑ γέγονε καταστάσει μεῖναι (V 88-89);
tερατοποιοῦσθαι τῷ θαυματουροῦσθαι (II 57); τῆν ὁ τοὺς (II 46); τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ τὸν μῦθον (I 323); τὶ βεβηκός τοῦ τούτος (III 86); τὶ καὶ σκόμμα ὁ καὶ ἐπιτίμησιν (I 263); 
tινὲς ὁ δὲ ἄσέληνον μέμψει (I 208); τοῦ ὁ τῶν λυπηρῶν (III 86); τὸν ὁ τῷ (IV 90); τὸν τῶν μυρίων στρατηγὸν ξενοφωνότα ὧν ἱ τίς τε ἄλλος περὶ τούτων ἵστορησε (I 84); τοῦ ὁ τοῦ ὁ τίτουλος; τοῦτος σφόδρα ὁ τοῦτοι (I 194); τῶ
συνεχεί τούτων κόρῳ for τῇ συνεχεί τούτων μέθῃ (II 44); τῷ συνεχῶς τούτῳ γίνεσθαι τῷ δεινῷ for συνεχῶς ἡμῖν τούτῳ τοῦ δεινοῦ γιγνομένου (IV 27);

ὑγείαν for υγείαν (IV 273); ύπερ τοῦ λυπεῖσθαι γε παντώς for ἐστιν ἐτερόν τι τῶν πάντων, ύπερ οὗ δῆποτεν αὐτῇ ἄν κινηθείη (V 86-87); ύπουλώς for κατὰ μικρόν (III 308); ύφάλως for ύπουλώς (III 308);

φθίσιν for φθορὰν (III 85); φρύξ for ποιμὴν (I 322);

χοϊκώτερον for ὑλικώτερον (II 15); χρὴ παριστᾶν for δεικνύναι χρὴ (I 393-394)

6. Variant forms of the same words

BIM: οὐδὲ for οὐδὲν (III 378)

BM: ἀπολαύσοντα for ἀπολαύσαντα (I 406); γιγνόμενον for γιγνόμενον (III 249);

γιγνόμεθα for γιγνόμεθα (IV 329); μικρὸν for μικρῶ (I 90); πάντως for πάντων, ὑπὲρ τοῦ λυπεῖσθαι γε παντώς (V 47);

telέσειν for telέσαι (IV 251)

BMV: γίνεται for γίγνεται (III 248); οὐ θέλομεν for οὐκ ἐθέλομεν (III 156); οὐδὲν for οὐδὲ (V 83)

I: λίθω for λίθων (I 206); τὰ for τοῖ (III 137); τυραννοῦντος for τυραννοῦν (V 181)

M: βλάψοντι for βλάψαντι (III 40); γενόμενος for γενόμενον (V 181);

γιγνόμεθα for γιγνόμεθα (III 258); διαπτύοντες for διαπτύοντας (V 26); εἰς for ἐς (I 355);

ἐμποιεῖν for ἐμποιοῦν (IV 153); εἰς for ἐς (III 52); ἐς for εἰς (IV 148)

V: ἀδικήσαιεν for ἀδικήσουσιν (V 22); αἰσχυνοίμεθα for ἠσχυνόμεθα (I 292);

ἀλλὰ for ἀλλὰ (III 268-269); ἀνηγμένοις for ἀνηνεγμένοις (III 352); ἀπολάγει for ἀπαλάγεω (III 283); ἀπηρυθριάκος for ἀπηρυθριώμενον (IV 173);

διακείμενος for διακείσθαι (I 445); διαπραττομένη for διαπράττειν (IV 175);

δοκεῖ for δοκῶ (III 286); δουλεύων for δουλοῦσθαι (I 367); δυσάμεθα for δύσανται (IV 349);

δυσάμεθα for δυσάμεθα (IV 349); δυσάμεθα for δυσάμεθα (IV 229); εἴη for ἐδέλεω (I 444); εἰς εἰς ἐξεγρόμενον (III 59);

ἐξεληλακότας for ἐξεληλακότας (I 325); ἔθελων for ἐθέλων (I 444); ἔγγερθεις for ἐγγερθείς (IV 261);

ημᾶς for ἡμᾶς (IV 3); θαυμάζεις for θαυμάζεις (I 443);

καταπαλαιῶσαν for καταπαλαιῶσαν (IV 187); καταιρηθῶσαν for καταίρωσα (I 8);

κείνου for ἐκείνου (V 184); μεγάλα for πάντω λοιπῶς, φαύλαν καὶ γελοίων
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9. Superscribed Greek numbers

7. **Word endings (addition or omission of ν or ο)**

   **BM**: ἕοικε for ἑοίκεν (IV 179); ἐτέραν for ἔτέρα (V 20)

   **BMV**: σώζει for σώζειν (V 243)

   **I**: οὗτω for οὕτω (III 200); τείνει for τείνειν (II 32)

   **M**: νομίζω for νομίζον (V 2); παράγμασι for παράγμασιν (III 237); τοῦτο for τούτον (I 325)

   **V**: ἀνδράσιν for ἄνδρασι (III 139); ἐκείνης for ἐκείνη (IV 146)

8. **Order of words**

   **BM**: ἐπεκτεινόμενον καὶ πηγνύμενον for πηγνύμενον καὶ ἐπεκτεινόμενον (III 262)

   **M**: ἂν οὐν for οὕν ἂν (IV 323)

   **V**: εἶναι πάντων ἁριστον for πάντων ἁριστον εἶναι (II 182-183); ἐκπληκτικότερον μικρὸν for μικρὸν ἐκπληκτικότερον (IV 202); κάλυμα τι τῶν πάντων for τι τῶν πάντων κάλυμα (III 4); μοι γὰρ for γὰρ μοι (I 88); τῆδε πη γὰρ for καὶ γὰρ τῆδε πη (I 11); τοσοῦτον ὑπ’ ἐκείνου λιμαζόμενον for ὑπ’ ἐκείνου λιμαζόμενον τοσοῦτον (III 163-164); τοῦτο πάλαι for πάλαι τοῦτο (IV 240)

9. **Superscribed Greek numbers** to denote transposition of word order:
Section II

Oration VI forms Section II and survives in three MSS: B, I, and V.

V contains an early version of the Oration, whereas the final, ‘edited’ version is found in B and I. B² copied the larger part of the Oration while B¹ copied a small section of the Oration (lines 218-621) on the parchment folios 105-112. The fact that the version of the Oration contained on the parchment folios is very similar to that found in I, further supports our assumption that the two were related or followed the same tradition. Thus, it seems that B¹ represents the first ‘edited’ version and as in the case of Oration I, B¹ represents the intermediate tradition between V and I. The fact that the text in B² is similar to I (with the exception of some additional errors which should be probably attributed to the scribe) enforces the possibility that I was the exemplar for B².

As it has already been suggested, hands G and H that copied Oration VI in V, most probably used another MS as their exemplar. At some stage extensive changes were introduced in B¹ and I, which must have been authorised by the author. Whole sections, paragraphs, single lines or words have been transposed from their original place (i.e., their position in V) to other parts of the text, while words, Scriptural and patristic citations were added, sentences were elaborated or in some instances eliminated in order to clarify or strengthen an argument, or for reasons of rhetorical emphasis. In addition, certain words were altered and more classicized forms were introduced, which were adopted in the revised versions (B¹ and I). All these changes have been recorded in the apparatus criticus. Oration VI and its revised version is a good example of the stages of revision all seven Orationes must have been gone through, for though V is considered a working copy, it is possible that earlier copies and versions of the text existed.

---

900 See above, p. 199.
901 See above, p. 237.
The corrections and additions in I were introduced by Isidore, and in B by the main scribes (B¹ and B²)\(^902\). In V hands G and H introduced the majority of the corrections in the sections they copied, while most possibly the corrective hand A made a few interlinear additions\(^903\). As with Orations I-V the printed editio princeps of Oration VI (L) was based on B while PG is a reprint of L.

All these observations are listed in detail below.

On the basis of these observations the following stemma codicum is proposed:

I. Corrections introduced by the main scribes

(a) The main hand introduced an emendation by crossing out a single word:

V: f. 307.14, he wrote and crossed out διαφυγεῖν after ἔδει (311)

(b) A number of errors due to confusion of sound were corrected by simply overwriting or altering letters. With the exception of some words, traces of the letters corrected are still visible:

\(^902\) With the exception of the correction on f. 101.13, ἔστι from ἐστιν (117), which cannot be confirmed at this stage whether it was introduced by a corrective hand B² or by the main scribe B².

B: f. 114v.20, αὐτῷ from αὐτῷ (678); f. 116v.18, βεβιοκότα from βεβιοκότα (736); f. 100.6, δήκιοισύνη from δήκιοισύνη (85); f. 99.15, δόξῃ from δόξη (62); f. 118.21, οἰμωμένοι from οἰμωμένοι (785); f. 103v.8, πάθῃ from πάθη (187); f. 98v.17, παραγένηται from παραγένηται (48); f. 115v.11, πλίοσι from πλίοσι (700); f. 117.10, προσπάθορας from προσπάθορας (746); f. 117.2, συνιστενεγκείν from συνιστενεγκείν (740)

V: f. 321r.11, δεικνύον from δεικνύον (786); f. 314.9, ἐπισέρχεται from ἐπισέρχεται? (458); f. 303.20, περαιόντες from περαιόντες (196); f. 306.3, χαλέυειν from χαλέυειν (277)

(c) A correction was introduced in a previously erased space:

B: f. 111v.19-20, ἀτιμόστερα from ἀτιμώστερα (562)

(d) Corrections of accents:

B: f. 115v.12, ἀναγκαία from ἁναγκαία (701)
I: f. 79v.1, πειρᾶθαι from πειρᾶθαι (277)

(e) Corrections by adding letters, words and sentences in the margin and interlinear space:

B: f. 110v.7, γίγνεται from γίγνεται (475); f. 116v.4, δόξειν from δόξειν (711); f. 110v.3, ἢ ποὺ, γε (497); f. 114v.11, ἤ (672); f. 117v.6, μέγας from μόνων (759); f. 98v.11, συμμαχίας from βοηθείας (27); f. 102.18, τουτούιν from τουτούι (151)
I: f. 75v.2, γε (106); f. 75, καὶ παραθείνεται τοῖς τοῦ Σωτῆρος, μὴ δὲ αὐτῷ τούτων ἐθέλειν δικαιοσύνην τὲ καὶ φαλανθραπίαν (90-91); f. 79v.11, μῆ δὲ from μῆ (265)
V: f. 316v.9, δὲ ἄν ἄν εἶχες ἐπανεκάθηναι παρὰ τοῦ δόντος τὸ κοίτειν (514-515); f. 311v.16, διὰ τίς ὅτι καὶ τὸ τιμήσαι τῶν τοῦ (106); f. 311v.21, μικρά τις αὐτῇ καὶ φαινωτάτης, δόξειν ἄν μεγάτη (109-110); f. 305.4, ὁ ἀμφιφρετής, σὺ δ', ἐκεῖνο πάντα ὡς καὶ τὴν δρεπάνην, καὶ τὴν πονηρῶν, ἐφέσπενος, βέλτιστος ἃν εἶχες καὶ ἀγαθὸς, ἢ γὰρ κάκεινος ἀγαθὸς οὐκώς σου, ἢ καὶ σὺ πάντως κακός (248-250); f. 310.15, οἷόν τε βλέπειν, ἐπιστεύονται ἔχοντες τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τὴν δοκάν. Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, κατὰ τὸ πλάσας τοὺς ἡμέρας, καὶ καὶ τῆς καρδίας τῆς ὁ παράνοια, ἀλλ' ὁ μέλλων. Μὴ γαίρην τάλλοντοι ἀναπάωμεν, μάλλον δὲ (397-400); ff. 315.13, τε (503); f. 303.13, τὸν προφητικότα, τὸν φιλάματι παραδεδωκότα (192); f. 314v.5, τόινυντόν μισούμενος τε καὶ ἀπογνωσκόμενος, ὡς μηδὲ (477); f. 319.1-2, τῶν ἠβρεων, καὶ δόσα
τότε παρηκολούθησε τῷ παραλόγῳ θυμῷ τῶν φονών ἐκ τοῦ φθόνου καθαρμάτων (642-644)

(f) Corrections by overwriting or altering letters in the text:

B: f. 113.19, αὐτῶν from αὐτοὺς (632); f. 100.16, ἄκοις from ἄκως (91); f. 118.1, γλώσσα from γλώσσι (771); f. 99.13, δύναμις from δύναι (61); f. 102r.6, ἡμῶν from ἡμῶν (157)

V: f. 320r.22, ἀκαρεῖ from ἀκαρεί (742)904; f. 314.6, ἐλεεῖσθαι from ἐλεῆσθαι (455); f. 305r.5, καὶ (264)

(g) Superscribed Greek numbers to denote transposition of word order:

B: f. 111.18, ἔξης] πάντων] superscribed β’, α’ for πάντων ἔξης (536); f. 109. 17, τοῦ καθαροῦ] ἐφάπτεσθαι μὴ superscribed β’, α’, γ’ (432)

II. Corrections introduced by corrective hands

The corrective hands Vc, Vhand A(?), and Bc introduced further additions and/or corrections:

(a) Corrections introduced by adding letters or words in the margin:

Vhand A(?): f. 313.15, καὶ (435); f. 317.24, οἰκία (553); f. 318.20, ταύτης (601); f. 317.22, τε (551)

(b) A correction by overwriting or altering letters in the text:

Vc(?): f. 309.22, εἰ from οἱ (372)

(c) A single correction involved word endings:

Bc(?): f. 101.13, ἐστι from ἐστιν (117)

III. Errors

1. Errors due to confusion of sounds

(a) Itacisms (affecting ι, ει, η, οι, υ):
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BI: οἶδε for εἶδε (783)
BV: λάβοι for λάβη (763)
I: αὐτοῖς for αὐτής (658); τοῖς for τής (658)
V: ἀνεδύσαντο for ἀνεδήσαντο (14); ἐκπληρῆς for ἐκπληροῖς (512); ἐλθο for ἐλθη (360); ἐμπορεία for ἐμπορείας (595); ἤ for οἳ (447); κτήσεως for κτίσεως (370); πατραλίαν for πατραλοίαν (523); φητα for φητεία (243); στοιχίων for στοιχείων (297); συνεδείν for συνιδείν (284); συνοίσει for συνήσει (63); ύγειώς for ύγιῶς (438)

(b) Confusion of o and ω:
I: δικαιώτεροι for δικαιότεροι (430); ἴσως for ἴσος (250);
V: ἀπώληται for ἀπόληται (69); ὀργίζωμεθα for ὀργίζομεθα (329); προσκόμματα for προσκόμματα (321); προτείνομεν for προτείνομεν (330); σηπομένου for σηπομένου (189); τῷ for τὸ (323); ύπωπιάζων for ύπωπιάζων (318)

(c) Single for double consonants:
V: ἀποτινύναι for ἀποτιννύναι (481); κόρης for κόρρης (98)

d) Double for single consonants:
BI: ἐλώρια for ἑλώρια (206); πατραλλοίαν for πατραλοίαν (523)

2. Errors in breathings

(a) Faulty breathings:
V: ἐλώρια for ἑλώρια (206)

(b) Omission of breathing in crasis:
BIV: προὔθηκε for προὔθηκε (732); προυκαλεῖτο for προὔκαλεῖτο (762)

3. Errors in accentuation

(a) Faulty accentuation:
BI: οὐκ ἔτι for οὐκέτι (564)
BI: μὴ τὲ for μῆτε (281); προσπαροξῦναι for προσπαροξῦναι (25); συνάδον for συνάδον (439)
I: κατὰ δίκης for καταδίκης (386)
V: ἀνασπάσαι for ἀνασπάσαι (449); διὰ τι for διάτι (106); μὴ δ' ὅτι for μηδοτιοῦν (306); φάναι for φάναι (206, 371)

4. Other errors

B: σιχή for σιγή (23); φλίλτρον for φίλτρον (698)
V: ἀφιστήκειμεν for ἀφεστήκαμεν (258); βδελύζονται for βδελύζονται (188)

5. Erroneous word

BI: γνησίοις for γνησίαις (27)

6. Dittography

V: ἄλλων ἄλλων (737)905

IV. Readings

1. Omissions

Sentences and words in B and I, which do not exist in V

(a) Emphasis:

εἰ δὲ βούλει βδελυττόμενος (466-467); Εἰ δὲ καὶ υπὸ ἐνίων μισοῖτο οἱ τὸν βίον ἀναλίσκοντες ἐν οὐκ ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις, —εἴδον γὰρ ἐγὼ τινας καὶ γονεύσι μισουμένοις ὡς φαύλους ὄντας—, μὴ διὰ τοῦτο κακῶς νομίσῃς, ὡς ἀρα δεῖ καὶ τὸν Θεὸν πολλῷ γε μάλλον αὐτοὺς μισεῖν, ἀτε μισοπόνηρον ὄντα (463-466);
καὶ ἄθλιον παντάπασιν (223-224); καὶ διὰ ταύτα (178);
οὐμένουν οὐδαμῶς (792); οὔτε μὴν ἐθέλομεν ἔχειν (255);
πανταχῇ τὸ αὐστηρόν ἐπαινοῦντι (530); πολλῷ γε μάλλον ὁ Θεός, ἐν τῷ χρήστος εἶναι, ἀφνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτόν, οὐ δύναται (502-503);
τε καὶ ἀγαθωσύνη (602); τινες ἀνθρώπων (274); τῶν δεξιῶν φημὶ καὶ ἀριστερῶν, κατὰ τὸν Θείον Ἀπόστολον, ὀρθῶς βιοῦντας καὶ μή (630-631);
ἔβριν τε καί (68);
ὡς δεῖ (102)
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(b) Clarification:

εἰς γὰρ τὸ θέλειν ἀφορᾷ καὶ τὸ δυνατὸν ὁ φιλάνθρωπος, ὡς προείρηται (123-124); εὐθὺς αὐτὸν (103);

ἡ γὰρ συνήθεια, τὸ κακὸν πολλάκις ἤδυ ποιεῖ, (711-712);

θρήνων μὲν ὅτι πολλῶν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἀξίως ὡς ἀληθῶς γέγονεν, ὅτι καλὸς καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθοὶς δημιουργηθεῖσσες, ὁ δὲ πολλῶν ἐκῶν κακῶν τὴν ἐαυτὸν ψυχὴν ἐνέπλησεν, ὡς οὔδες εἴτερος. Πλὴν καὶ οὗτός γε αὐτὸς, ἂν ἔραστής μανικώτατος τῆς ἱδίας διορθώσεως γένηται (55-58);

καὶ δεικνύντας τὴν μετάνοιαν ἔργοις (120); καὶ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τοῦ θαύματος παρ' αὐτοῖς, οὐ διορθοῦνται τὸ χαλεπῶτερον (543-544); καὶ μόνῳ, καὶ τούτῳ γε τῶν κουφοτέρων εἶναι δοκοῦντων (240); καὶ πολλάκις πάλιν τέτρωται. Καὶ πώς ἂν ἔχοι διορθωθῆναι; Μὴ ἀπογνῶμεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον (46-47); καὶ συχνὸν τὸ δάκρυον καταχέουσαν (727);

γε λέγω τῶν θελόντων σωθῆναι (73);

μάλλον δὲ εἰ τις ἀκριβῶς ἐθέλει σκοπεῖν, ἡ σφῶν αὐτῶν συνείδησις, καὶ τότε σφᾶς γε κρινεῖ (484-485); μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων (286); μή γὰρ εἰσέλθης εἰς κρίσιν μετὰ τοῦ δούλου σου, ὅτι οὐ δικαίωσες εἰς τὸν θεό (71-72); μὴ τούτῳ πράξαντες; Οὔτ' οὐκ ὅσως βεβιώκεσαν, ἐπτάκται τῇ μεταγνώσει τῶν ἐργῶν καὶ τῇ πρὸς τὸ ἁγαθὸν νεώσει, ἔλεως πεπερασμένος, καὶ πολλάκις πάλιν τέτρωται. Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι διορθωθῆναι; Μὴ ἀπογνῶμεν τὸν ἄνθρωπον (46-47); καὶ συχνὸν τὸ δάκρυον καταχέουσαν (727);

Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα δείκνυσι τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ, ἄρρητον τινα καὶ ἀκατανόητον οὖσαν (654-655); τὴν ἰατρείαν ἀσμένως δέξασθαι· εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτον
εἶχε τὸν τρόπον τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς, οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς πάντως ἐσώθη, ὡς γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός κατὰ τὸν θείον χρησμόν, οὐδ’ ἀμαρτίας ὄντως ἐξευθείας, κἂν ὑπερβάλλῃ πολλῷ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰς ἀρετήν. Δεήσει τοῖνυν ἁπάσι τοῦ φαρμάκου τουτουί, τῆς μετανοίας φημί, καὶ τούτου καταλλήλου τετυχῆκόσι, τὸ εὐεκτεῖν εὐθὺς ἔπεισι (49-53); τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος φιλανθρωπίας (796-797);

φησιν ὁ Σωτήρ (184);

ὡς κὰν τοῖς φθάσασιν εἰσηται (739-740); ὡστ’ οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀπογνώσει, εἱ μὴ ὁ ἀπογινώσκειν νομιζοῦν ἄξιον εἶναι. Μηδὲις οὖν ταῦτα γινώσκατο καὶ σωφρόνων, ἐμοὶ πειθόμενος ἀπογνώσει, ἀλλ’ ἐκείνων πρέπει ἐν καθαρωτάτῃ τῇ ἀριστῇ ὁδῷ εἰς τὸν καλὸν ἀμπελῶνα, ἐκεῖ περὶ τὴν ἐνδεκάτην ἐξουσίαν εἰς τὸν καλὸν ἀμπελῶνα (166-170)

(c) Justification:

ἔδωκε γὰρ αὐτοῖς φησὶν ἐξουσίαν, τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι (615-616); εὑ γὰρ ποιῶν ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὴν παραβολὴν ἢδη ταύτην (671-672);

Καὶ διὰ ταύτα, τοῖς βιοῦν ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρίστην ὁδὸν ἐπιστρέφαται ἢδη ταύτην (604-610);

οὔτε λήψεται ποτὲ κόρον εὐεργετῶν ἀγαθότητι κινούμενος, οὐ γὰρ ἐκείνῳ προσγένηται τι ἀπό τῶν αὐτοῦ δημιουργήματός, οὔτε ἄν παραζάντων ἑκείνων ἡστινοσοῦν χάριτος (598-560);
τὸ τε γὰρ γεγονέναι, τὸ τε διαμεμενὴκέναι κακοὺς, καὶ αὐ τὸ ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι, καὶ
dιαφέρει, οἴκοθεν σαφῶς τοίς ἀνθρώποις· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ καλοὺς ἐθέλοντας εἶναι,
tινὶ τῶν θύραθεν βιασθῆναι, κακοὺς γενέσθαι, οὐδὲ φαύλους γεγονότας διὰ
κακίστην προαίρεσιν, εἶτα μὴ διορθωθῆναι τούτο θελῆσαντας. Καὶ εἰ τούτῳ γε
ἀληθές, εὑρήσεται τὸ φάρμακον, καὶ ή τῆς ἀπογνώσεως ύπεχώρησε νόσος. «Ναι»
φησιν, «ἀλλὰ οὗτός γε ὁ σχέτλιος (40-45); τῶν γὰρ εἰς ἐκείνουν πεπιστευκότων οὐ
λογίζεται τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, Παῦλος εἶπε. Ταύτην δὲ δῆτον τὴν χάριν, δίδωσιν μὲν
άπαξ τὸ βάπτισμα, δίδωσι δὲ ἡ μετάνοια, ἐκεῖνο γε βοηθοῦμεν τῷ λουτρῷ, ὡσακις
ἀν οἱ γνησίως ἐκεῖνη χρῆσαι, ὡστε ἐκεῖνος ἀγαθὸς, καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς μὴ
τοιούτοις. Καὶ πῶς οὐ πάντας χαίρειν δεῖ (765-769); τῶν δεξιῶν φημι καὶ ἀριστερῶν,
cατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀπόστολον, ὡς δέντι ἄρος βιοῦντας καὶ μή (630-631);

Ὡς φησιν ὁ Θεὸς διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ὅτι διὰ τὸ εἶναι σε
ἐγκαταλελειμμένην καὶ μεμισημένην, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ βοηθῶν σοι (479-480); ὡστε
βέλτιον ἂν ἦν εἰ τοῖς ἰδίοις μᾶλλον προσεῖχομεν, ἡ τοῖς τῶν πέλας κακοῖς (356-357)

(d) Rhetorical forms:

Εἰ τοῖνυν θέλει πάντας σωθῆναι μετανοήσαντας, δύναται δ' ὅσαπερ θέλει,
οὐδὲν τοῖς ἐν ἁμαρτίαις πρὸς τὸ σωθῆναι, ἢ τὸ θελῆσαι μετανοῆσαι,
καὶ ὡστε δέ ξενιὰ τῇ μετανοίᾳ, ἕργα δεῖξαι τῆς μετανοίας (77)

καὶ πῶς οὐ πάντας χαίρειν δεῖ (765-769); τῶν δεξιῶν φημι καὶ ἀριστερῶν,
cατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀπόστολον, ὡς δέντι ἄρος βιοῦντας καὶ μή (630-631);

Καίτοι, τί πολλὰ φημὶ πάθη (239);

Λέγω δὲ βούλησιν νῦν, τὴν διὰ τῶν ἔργων μαρτυρουμένην· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ
ἔστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς θελήσαντας, ἀποτυχεῖν τοῦ σκοποῦ (37-38);

οὐδὲ γὰρ λέγω τὴν σήν (499); Οὐδὲν ἄρα λείπεται τοῖς μὲν ἐν ἁμαρτίαις πρὸς τὸ
σωθῆναι, ἢ τὸ θελῆσαι γνησίως μετανοῆσαι (148-149);

tοὺς γε δοκοῦντας εἶναι κακοὺς ταλανίζωμεν (401)

(e) Omission of single words:

B: διατί (118)

V: αἱ γλῶσσαι (771); βαρεῖς (234); γάρ (38,270,340,351); γε (590); δ' (401); δεὶ (769);

δηλαδὴ (791); εὐθύς (523); ἡμεῖς (125); ἡμῶν (697); ἰσως (262); καὶ (265,660,675); μὲν
(230,380); μεταμελομένους (143); μὴ (431); νῦν (86); ὁ Σωτήρ (611); οἰδε (247); οἴμαι
ἀπογνώτωσαν ἀνθρώπων θέλειν ἐπιλανθάνονται τισίν τὸ (237, after τ ὑπὲρ (230); εἴη V B Additions αὐστηρὸν διὰ, γὰρ (550); παῦλος (778, before 284, before 384, after 616); αὐταῖς τὴν ἡμετέραν γεγονότας ἐκείνων ταῦτα ἀποθανεῖται· 285 λογίζεται πράγματα θεὸς καὶ ἁβύσσω ἐν ἀμαρτίας, οὐ λογίζεται αὐτός τὰ ἀμαρτήματα παύλος εἶπεν, ἐπειδὰν ἐθέλοις δηλονότι μισήσεις τῶν ἡμῶν 613); καὶ διὰ ταῦτα (466, before Θεός); καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἢ ταύτης γνώσεως; (386, after αὐτομεμψία); καὶ μὴν που, τις ἐλπιδάκως ἐπὶ πολυ τῆς κακίας χαριζεσθαι γε δόξει τοῖς, εἰ πάθοι τι τοῦ ἀπεκτών καὶ ἀποθάνειται οὗτο τῆς κοινῆς ἀσθενείας ἐπιλανθάνονται (274, after πράττομεν); καὶ τὴν προθυμίαν πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀσπάζεσθαι προθυμομένων γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸ χρέος ἢπαν καταβαλείν, εἰ ὑπερνικώς τὸ ὁφελόμενον τὴν ἡμετέραν ισχύν, οὐδὲν τούτο λογίζεται εἰς γὰρ τὸ θέλειν ἁφορά, οὐκ εἰς τὴν ἐκτίσιν ὁ φιλάνθρωπος· οὐδὲ γὰρ δεῖται γε παρ’ ἡμῶν, οὐδενός (123, after δέχεσθαι); καὶ τοῖς καὶ Θεός αὐτός, πρὸς ταῦτα ἢπαντα, τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος τότε κρινει (178, after πράγματα); κατὰ (683, before τύχην); κατὰ τὴν ἐνίον δόξαν κακῶς εἰδότων (412, after εὑροὶ τις); μακρὰς γνησίως (772, before μετανοήσαντας); μὲν (506, after τὸ); μὴ δὲ ἀπογνώτωσαν (303, after κατακρινέτωσαν); νοοῦντων (161, after μεταμέλειαν μὲν);

2. Additions

Mainly sentences in V, which do not exist in B and I.

B: αὐτὸν before καταχέουσαν (727); τε (775, after ἑλε; 630, before δεξιῶν)

BV: ἀεὶ (168, before πράξεσιν); γὰρ (306, after ἄλλα); ἐπεμψεν (692, after μισθωσάμενος); μὲν (5, before γὰρ); τοιοῦτον (294, before κακῶν)

V: ἀλλὰ (36, before καί); ἀπαγορεύσει (176, after ἄλλοις); ἀπαντες πῶς γὰρ οὐχ ἀπαντας χαίρειν δει, ὅταν ἐκεῖνος ἀγαθός, καὶ τοις ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς μη τοιούτοις· τοῖς γὰρ σεσημένοις ἐν ἀμαρτίας, οὐ λογίζεται αὐτοὶ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα παύλος εἶπεν, ἐπειδὰν ἐθέλοις δηλονότι ταῦτα ἀπονίψασθαι (771, after ἀνθρώποισι); αὐτοὶς (237, after αὐταῖς); αὐτῷ γὰρ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν ἁβύσσον τῶν καλῶν ὄντι, τι ἀν τῶν πάντων ἐξεσωσθεῖ, μήτοι γε τὰ πταίσματα τῶν ἀνθρώποισι (793, after γενέσθαι);

γὰρ (284, before ἐγώ, 384, after εἰ); γε (612, after τό); γοῦν (179, after οἰ); εἰ (778, before τὸ πλήθουν); ἐκεῖνον (648, after ἀλαστόρον); ἐν ἀπασι θαυμάζων τὸ αὐστηρόν (527, after μισήσεις); ἐπεί, μὴ δὲ τὰ αίτη ταύτης οἴον τε (601, after κινηθῆναι); ἐσομένους (54, after γεγονότας); εὐφρενεῖν (655, after γὰρ)

και (188, before διακρύουσιν; 125, before γὰρ ἐπειδὰν); καὶ άραν (632, after ἡμιον); και διὰ ταῦτα (466, before Θεός); καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀμαρτίαν, ἢ ταύτης γνώσεως; (386, after αὐτομεμψία); καὶ μὴν που, τις ἐλπιδάκως ἐπὶ πολυ τῆς κακίας χαριζεσθαι γε δόξει τοῖς, εἰ πάθοι τι τοῦ ἀπεκτών καὶ ἀποθάνειται οὕτω τῆς κοινῆς ἀσθενείας ἐπιλανθάνονται (274, after πράττομεν); καὶ τὴν προθυμίαν πολλάκις ἀντὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀσπάζεσθαι προθυμομένων γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸ χρέος ἢπαν καταβαλείν, εἰ ὑπερνικώς τὸ ὁφελόμενον τὴν ἡμετέραν ισχύν, οὐδὲν τούτο λογίζεται εἰς γὰρ τὸ θέλειν ἁφορά, οὐκ εἰς τὴν ἐκτίσιν ὁ φιλάνθρωπος· οὐδὲ γὰρ δεῖται γε παρ’ ἡμῶν, οὐδενός (123, after δέχεσθαι); καίτοι καὶ Θεός αὐτός, πρὸς ταῦτα ἢπαντα, τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος τότε κρινει (178, after πράγματα); κατὰ (683, before τύχην); κατὰ τὴν ἐνίον δόξαν κακῶς εἰδότων (412, after εὑροὶ τις); μακρὰς γνησίως (772, before μετανοήσαντας); μὲν (506, after τὸ); μὴ δὲ ἀπογνώτωσαν (303, after κατακρινέτωσαν); νοοῦντων (161, after μεταμέλειαν μὲν);
ὁ γὰρ ἀνακρίνων με φησὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐστί, καὶ (270, after κρίνειν); οίμαι (68, after πάθος); οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνων ἐλέους τεῦξονται, οίς οὐ πάντη τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἀνατέραται, υπὲρ καταπεπάτηται παντελῶς πᾶς θεσμὸς χρηστότητος (490, after διανοούμενοι); ὑπότε (125, before δὲ κάκειν);

παντελῶς (144, before ἀπεγνωκότας); πειραμένω (751, after ἐξαρκέση); πολλὰ (203, before περινοστοῦντες);

ὁς λαμβάνομεν παρ’ αὐτῶν, ἢ παρέχομεν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἡμέτερα, δέον τούναντίον ποιεῖ· μημονεύοντας τῶν λόγων του κυρίου ἱροῦ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παύλου παραίνεσιν· καὶ μακάριον ἦγείσθα τὸ διδόνα, ἢ λαμβάνειν· τοσούτον δὲ ἀπέχομεν ὥδε πράττειν, ἢστ’ (592, after ἀληθευνούσης);

σοβαρῶν τε καὶ (761, before δυναμένων);

tὰς αὐτῶν χερσὶ (542, after παρῇ); ταῦτα (674, before πεποίηκεν); ταῦτα ποιεῖν (695, after τρόπω); τὴν τε πρόνοιαν τοῦ ποιμένος, καὶ (705, after δεικνύναι); τὲ (246, after δυσπορίστων, 652, after πολλῶν); τὴν (540, before ἑαυτῆς); τὶν (335, after αἰτήσονται); τὰς αὐτῶν χερσὶ (542, after παρῇ); ταῦτα τοῖς ἄλλοις κατακρίνων αὐτὸς (340, after φεύγεται); τούτους δὲ (771, after οὐδεὶς);

ὦν ἀγαθός τε καὶ ὑπεράγα ὅσον οὐδεὶς ἐξειπεῖν νῦν λέγειν (621, after Δεσπότης); ὡς εἰπεῖν (293, after γὰρ); ὡς ἕοικε (590, after ἐκεῖνος)

3. Transposition of paragraphs/words

V: ἀλλ’ ὁ δεῖνα καὶ συμφέρον-ἐπισυμβαίνοντα πράγματα] transposed after εἰρηται, below 508 (134-178); ἔναμορτας παραστηρίσης-παρ’ ἦμων οὐδενός] transposed below 405-406 (62-115); αὐτῶν transposed after πέσειν, 351 (351);

ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ μὴ βούλεσθαι ἰαθῆναι, τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς παθήματα ἐπιμένειν εἰσοθεν ἦμιν, ὡς ἄν ἀντιστῶμεν γενναίως, οὐδὲ τὴν ἁρχὴν εἰσκωμάζει transposed before ἀλλ’ ὁ δείνα-κοφυθήν], above 34-37 (38-40);
καὶ πολλῶ-ἔτέρφων] transposed after κατ’ αὐτόν, above 402 (406-407); κάν
πάσαν...] transposed after παρ’ ἡμῶν οὐδενός, above 115 (409);
νοσοῦντες ζῆλον οὐ κατ’ ἐπίγνωσιν transposed before δοκοῦσι-πάσχειν] above
274 (275);
ὸ γὰρ Θεὸς-τρόποις] transposed after ἐπλάσεν above 443 (466-469); οἱ μὲν-όντες]
transposed after Ὡστε-ἐάλωσαν] below 312-313 (311-312); οἱ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀριστο-
cataκρίνει] transposed after δίδοται, above 127 (178-180);
πρόσεστι δὲ κἀκεῖν τὸ ἀγαθόν, transposed after παρελθεῖν-ὁπότε, above 62
(125);
Ὡς νῦν γε ...] transposed after πράγματα, above 178 (508); ὡσιν transp. after κάν
246 (246)

4. Marginal glosses and notes

BI: γρ(άφε) ἄγνοιαι (314); γρ(άφε) δακρύων θερμ(ῶν) (571)

5. Different readings

(a) Condensed sentences/words, elaborated later (in B, I), without altering the
meaning:

V: αὐτὸν for Θεὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς (792); αὐτὸν for τὸν αὐτοῦ νόμον (102);
ἐξύφορισαν for πρὸς αὐτούς, ἐξυφορίσασθαι (773); εὐ τε ποιοῦσι καὶ μή, ἀναγκαίως δὲ
tauti diateλέσει pάnta pοιων, δε δή καὶ γέγονε κατ’ αὐτοῖς, καὶ ύπερ τούτων for
καὶ αὐθίς γε πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῶν ὀργαντα, ἐπὶ καίρων τινα παῦτα ἐπέχει, καὶ
όλως, οὐ διὰ μιᾶς ὀδοῦ, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν τε καὶ διαφόρων, καὶ πραγμάτων ἐναντίων
ἐστιν οὖ, πρὸς ἐν τι τέλος ἡμᾶς ἐνάγει, τὸ ἦν ὀρθῶς δυνηθήναι. Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἀλλας
eικῶς ἦν πράττειν, ό ύπερ ἀπάντων (632-635);
καὶ ἱλέω πρὸς αὐτούς ὡμιματι βλέπειν παρασκευάζον for λέγω δὴ τὸ τυχανείν
αὐτοὺς ἐλέους, τὸ γάρ δὴ σφόδρα τούτους μισεῖσθαι, παρ’ ὄν ἦκιστ’ ἐχρήν, τούτ’
esti τὸ τὸν Θεὸν παρασκευάζον πρὸς αὐτούς εὐμενέστερον βλέπειν (472-474);
μὴ δόλως ἀρκεῖν τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φιλανθρωπία for τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ περὶ τὸ γένος
φιλανθρωπία ἀπείρῳ γε παντάπασιν ὥση, μὴ δύνασθαι τι τῶν πάντων
ἐξισωθήναι, ἢ γοῦν ἐκείνη παραβληθήναι, μήτοι γε τὰ πταῖσμα τῶν ἀνθρώπων,
ὡς ἐστὶ πεπερασμένα τὰ πάντα. Καὶ ὅτε τοὐθ’ ὡς ἔχει, οὐδαμῶς ἀρκέσειν ἂν
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αὐτῇ (787-790); μηδεὶς οὖν ταῦτα γινώσκων καὶ σοφρονῶν, ἐμοὶ πειθόμενος, ἀπογνωμένος ἀλλ’ ἐως ἃν τις εἰπή τῇ ἑκείνῳ ὑφὶ πολλῶν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ἥρων τρόπων, σῶσαι τὸν ἀνθρώπον ὁ Σωτήρ, ἐσώσατε δ’ οὖν σαρκωθεὶς: πρέπον οὖν ἐπὶ γενέσθαι, πολλῶν μὲν ένεκα καὶ μεγάλων, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ, ύπερφήνους οὕς. Καὶ ταὐτ’ εἰδὼς πάς ὀστισοῦν τῶν προβάτων ἑκείνων, ἀ δή τῆς αὐλῆς ἥστα τῆς δεσποτικῆς, σκιρτάτω χαίρων καὶ φαιδρινόμενος, ἄν μὲν γὰρ ἢ τῇ (666-670);

οὐ γὰρ κρίνοισι ἐπειδὴ ἀμαρτώσητοι καὶ ἀνατιθέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ὑπὲρφυοῦς οὔσης. Καὶ ταῦτ’ έξετάζοντες ὑπὲρφυοῦς οὔσης, ἀλλ’ ἐκεῖνοι αὐτοῖς εἰδόται πᾶσι οὐκ ἐπεί άμαρτον.

οὐκ εἰκόνωσιν τὸ κακὸν ὑπὲρφυοῦς οὔσης, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ἐθέλειν ἀνατιθέναι τὰ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἀνοήτων τοῖς ἀνοήτοις γίνεται, οὐδὲν ΄άλλα ἐγένετο νόσος· οὐδὲν δὴ τούτου ἀρετῆς ἐν τούτῳ περιῆν, ἥ ν ἀμαρτώσητος. Κριτικὸς γὰρ ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, ὁ μακάριος ἐφη Παῦλος (182-184); οὐδὲ γαρ τὸ κάρφος (397);

παύλος for καλῶς γε διαστέλλων ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου· ἐκεῖνος (549);

ταυτὶ σαφηνίζοντες ὑπὸ τοῦ προβάτου τῆς ἀρετῆς, μὴ άρετῆς εἴη, ἀλλὰ κακῶς ἐθέλειν ἀνατιθέναι τὰ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῶν ἀνοήτων τοῖς ἀνοήτοις γίνεται, οὐδὲν ΄άλλα ἐγένετο νόσος· οὐδὲν δὴ τούτου ἀρετῆς ἐν τούτῳ περιῆν, ἥ ν ἀμαρτώσητος. Κριτικὸς γὰρ ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, ὁ μακάριος ἐφη Παῦλος (182-184); οὐδὲ γαρ τὸ κάρφος (397);

καὶ τοιοῦτον ἢ γραφὴ γέμει· ἄρα λέγεται ἐκεῖνος ἀνατιθέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ὑπὲρφυοῦς οὔσης. Καὶ τοιοῦτον ἢ γραφὴ γέμει· ἄρα λέγεται ἐκεῖνος ἀνατιθέναι τὸ πρᾶγμα ὑπὲρφυοῦς οὔσης.
όσοι δὲ νενοθευμένης αὐτῆς μετέχουσιν, τοὺς μοχθηρία πολλὴ συζήσαντας καὶ κακοπέθεια συντρόφοις ὄντας, καὶ φαύλῳ μὲν ἀεὶ πολιτευμένους, μηδὲν δὲ μηδὲ πῶς τῶν ἑπαινετῶν διαπεπχοθέτες ὧς τῶν ἑπαρτίας κατειλημμένους (200-201); οὗ γὰρ δὴ τούτῳ σκοπεῖ θρήν, ὅτι μισητοὶ καθεστάσι τις τῶν ψυχῶν καὶ συγγενῶν, ἀπανθρωπία πολλή συζώσῃ, καὶ τὰ βάθος ἔχοντα ἐπὶ πόλεως ὑρώσων ἀλλ᾽ ὁ τι τοῦτο γε αὐτῷ, πολλῷ τῶν πάντων ἐλεινότεροι κρίνονται τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ θεῷ. Τὸ γὰρ δὴ τούτους σφόδρα μισεῖ θαυμάζει παρ᾽ ὅν ἡμιστ᾽ ἔχρην, μᾶλλον δὲ, παρ᾽ ὃν ἔχρην καὶ τῆς ἐως ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀλογήσαι, τοῦτ᾽ ἐστί, τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῖς διαλλάττων ὑπὲρ Τοσοῦτοι δ᾽ οὐ προσήκε οὐμίζειν ὡς καὶ τῷ Θεῷ μισητοὶ καθεστάσιν, ὃσοι δὲ τὴν ἑν σφίς κακίαν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἔχουσι μίσος, ὀσωπερ καὶ τοῦναντίον εὐλογον εἶναι (470-472);

τῷ ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι τῷ ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς (757); τῶν νοσοῦντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἔλεος, καὶ κηδονταὶ γε πόσον δοκεῖς ὑπὲρ καὶ κηδονταί (194)

(c) Same meaning, different single words:

Β: ὑπέρ ὑπὸ (286);

V: ἀεροβατεῖν for κρατεῖν (260); ἀνέδραμε for ἀνέλθοι (37); ἀπόχρη for ἀρκέσει (740); αὐτῇ for ἐκείνην (501); αὐτοῖς for τοῦτοις (203); γὰρ for γούν (503); γὰρ for οὕν (115,794); γούν for δ᾽ οὕν (658); δὲ for γὰρ (277); δὲ for γε (498); δεινὰ for χαλεπά (701); δὴ for τοῖ (741); δικαστὴ for κριτῆ (479); δύνασθαι for μόνον (76); ἐι for ἀν (770); εἰσθάνει for εἰκός (500); εὔφρονυμεν for πράττομεν (274); ἐπαινεθήναι for θαυμαζεσθαί (515); ἢ γὰρ for ἠσθόν (474); ἡττονοῦν for ἡττονονου (213); καλῶν for ἄγαθῶν (615); κηδεμονίας for φιλανθρωπίας (545); λήθην for ἀγνοιαν (314); λοιπὸν for νομίζομεν (260); ὅταν for ὅποιν (329); οὗ γὰρ for οὐδέ (84); παῖντων for κοπτόντων (159); παντελῶς for παντάπασιν (148, 513); περὶ for ἐπί (515); ποι for πο (612); προσοίσει for προσάγει (625); προοδοκωμένων for ἐλπιζομένων (593); συντρέχουσιν for ἀμύνουσιν (202); τὴν αὐτοῦ for ἀκριβή (796); τοιαύτας for τούτων (777)

(d) Same meaning, different sentences:

V: ἀλλ᾽ ἄν for ἄν γὰρ (47); ἀλλὰ πεπτωκε φησιν καὶ ἀνέστη μυριάκις καὶ νῦν γε πεπτωκάς οὕτως πολὺ τι χείρον ἢ πρόσθεν, ἀσπερεὶ νεκρός κεῖται, συχνὸν τινα
χρόνον ἦδη καὶ οὔδὲ δοκεὶ θελήσειν ἢ δυνήσεσθαι ποτὲ στήναι ὁρθὸς ἐπὶ τῶν ποδῶν· παρὰ σοι ὡ βέλτιστε κριτῇ οὐ παρὰ θεῶ τὸν οὖν ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην ἐκείνον, μήτε κρίνειν εὐχερῶς, μήτ’ ἀπογινώσκειν, εἰ σωφρονοῖς· οὐ γὰρ δὴ παρὰ τῇ σῇ ἐξουσίᾳ ὑπάρχει παρὰ δὲ τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ κειμένου προαιρέσει ποτὲ τὸν γοῦν ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην εὐκείνον, μηδαμῶς μηδέποτε κρίνειν εἰ σωφρονοῖς, εἰ μὴ πρὸς ἀπερίφεξας ἐξουσίαν, ἀφ’ ὧν προσήκε, δηλονότι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Πάθεν δὲ καὶ σεαυτόν πείθεις, ὡς οὖν ἀναστησεται ποτε πεπτωκῶς ὁ σχέτλιος οὕτων (36-351); ἀν δικαίως ὁ γε γε τῶν πάντων (143); ἀπογινώσκεις εἰκῆς ἀντακρίνεις ἐκείνου (251); ἀτε γνησίαν ἔαυτῷ ὑπὸ ὁδικήν ὅποις αὐτῷ (467); ἀποσυνόσον ἡρώτα ἐντὸς ἐπεδείκνυτο (729);

γοῦν καὶ σοὶ ὁ γοῦν δῆ (136);

διότι, τοῦ μὲν σώματος ἡ νέκρωσις, τῷ τῆς ψυχῆς κεχωρήσθαι γίγνεται. τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς, τῷ θεοῦ γὰρ θάνατον δεῖ νοεῖν τὸ κεχωρίσθαι Θεοῦ (218-219);

ἐκάστου ὁ γε ἐκάστῳ (176-177); ἐκείνους κρίνεις ὁ γε αὐτοὺς κατακρίνειν (483-484); εὐθὺς τυχάναι παρὰ τῶν υπολειφθέντων μελῶν τῷ σώματι ὑπὸ καὶ παρ’ ἐκείνων αὐτῶν ἔστιν ὅτε τῶν ἀποτεμόντων αὐτῷ τυχάναι (210-211); ἔχειν ὁ γε ἐστιν (778);

ἡ ψήφος δὲ ἡ γὰρ ψήφος δὲ τῆς (238);

καὶ ἀπειράκις ἀπειρῶς ὁ γε αὐτὴν μυρίακας (792-793); καὶ υπερβάλλη πολλῷ τῷ μέτρῳ ἡ τῆς διορθώσεως ἐρασίτης ὅτι Καὶ τις ἀνθρώπων ὑπερελάτη πολλῷ τῷ μέτρῳ (54, repeated lin. 409-410);

μάλα γε ὣδε γὰρ ἄν στερεῖται (281-282); μὴ ἀπογινώσκαν τὸν ἀνθρώπον ἐντὸς ὁ γε ταῦτα πρὸς τὸ ἀπογινώσκειν (35); μὴ τοῖς γε κρίνειν τὸν ἐπαγγελματίαν μηδένα, καὶ υπερβάλλῃ πολλῷ τῷ μέσῳ τὰς τῶν ἀπάντων κακίας· εἰπερ ἀγάπης τινας ὁ γε ἐσχάτων ὁ γε ἡμεῖς καὶ κατακρίνομεν, καὶ ἀπογινώσκομεν, καὶ εὐχερῶς μισοῦμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἑπειδὰν ἀμάρτωσι, ἥμισυ (407-408); μήτε τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν παραφυμα συντρφοστὸν ἀντιτίθεναι τιμὴν ζητεῖν, ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἢμι, μήτε τιμωρήσασθαι ἑπειδῆ, οὕτως ὁ γε τὸ λαβεῖν αὐτὸν παρ’ ἡμῶν καί ὅτι πράξαμεν κακῶς, τὴν ἦν ὁδείμον τὸ δικαὶ τῷ τίμη ζητεῖν, εἰ μὴ τὴν ἱσόρροσον ἐκείνῃ ποτὲ ἄντεσεν κακεύειμεν. Ἑπει καὶ ἄλλως τοῦτο ἀδύνατον (103-105); μόνης ἐκείνους ὁ γε τὸς μόνης (744);

οὕτως ὁ γε τῷ μόνῳ (758); οὕτως ὁ γε τὸς ἀπενίψατο ὁ γε πρὸς τῷ ἀπονύπασθαι (36);
παύλου τούτο ὑπὸ ἡ τοῦ Παύλου (383); πῶς ἂν δικαίως ἀπογνώ, εἰ μὴ παραπληξίας τις εἰ ἤτο τῶν τάς φρένας ἀπολωλότων, λήθην ὡς δικαίως λαβόν τῆς ἀνωτάτω φυλανθρωπίας· οὐ γὰρ τὰ εἰκότα φορνήσει περὶ τῆς ἀνεξερεύνητου μεγαλεύσης ὑπὸ τὰ εἰκότα φορνήσει περὶ τῆς ἀνεξερεύνητου μεγαλεύσης, εἰ μὴ παραπληξίας τις εἰ, καὶ τῶν τάς φρένας ἀπολωλεκτῶν (532-533);

οφας αὐτᾶς ὑπὸ εαυτᾶς (779);

ταύτην οὐ δίδωσ, οὐδὲ γούν ἐν ἵσῳ τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς ἀνδράς διαπράξασθαι ὑπὸ τὸ καθαρὸς τε καὶ ἀναμάρτητος; Οὐδὲ γούν ἐν ἵσῳ τῶν ἁγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν διαπράξασθαι ταύτην δίδωσ (497-498); τὴν ἐκείνου φυλανθρωπίαν ὑπὸ τὸ τῶν περὶ Θεοῦ νοουμένων (793-794); τὸ γὰρ ἵσορροπον ὑπὸ τὴν γὰρ ἵσορροπον ἔκτισιν (738); τοῖς τῶν ἁδελφῶν πλημμελήσασθαι ἐπιχαίρειν ὑπὸ πλημμελούντων τῶν ἁδελφῶν κατεπαίρεσθαι (395-396); τούτων ἔνεκα ὑπὸ ὡς μᾶλλον (259); τὸ προθυμεῖσθαι μόνον καὶ βούλεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῖς βουλομένων (48); τῶν πάντων ἀπογινώσκουσιν ὑπὸ κατακρίνουσιν (186);

ὑποστάς τινα πράγματα ὑπὸ μυρία πράγματα ὑποστάς (637);

ἀστ’ ἐκείνος ἀξίως ἀπογινώσκεως μόνος, ὁ ἀπογινώσκειν νομίζων ἀξίων εἶναι, τόν καὶ συχνοῖς τοῖς πάθεσι περιπεπτωκότα ὑπὸ ταῦτ’ οὐν γινώσκοντες, ὡς παρόντες, πάντων εὐθέστερον τοῦτον κρίνωμεν, τὸν εὐχερῶς κατακρίνοντα (638-640)

(e) Similar words:

V: ἀπαντα ὑπὸ πάντα (623); ἀπαντα ὑπὸ πάντων (536); μεταμέλειαν ὑπὸ μεταμελομένων (161); μήτε ὑπὸ μή (387); οὐδέπω ὑπὸ οὐδέποτε (675); πάντων ὑπὸ ἀπάντων (228); τεῦξεται ὑπὸ ἐπιτεῦξεται (374); τὴν ἀνάστασιν ὑπὸ τὸ ἀναστῆναι (223); τοῦτος ὑπὸ τοῦτούς (151)

(f) Alteration of meaning:

V: ἀπαντα σὺν τῷ καιρῷ πράττων ὡστε καὶ ὑπὸ καὶ τοῖς μὲν φλεγομένους τῶν τραυμάτων (625);

δὴ τῷ λόγῳ ὑπὸ μοι (753); δήλον οὖν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων, ὡς τοῖς πρὸς αὐτόν ἐπιστρέφοντας, ἐκείνος ἀσμαν词条 λέξεις δέχεται τῇ ἱδίᾳ δικαιοσύνῃ τοῖς πορεύσας ὑπὸ δὲ Θεοῦ ὡς ἁγαθὸς, δέχεται τὸ προθυμεῖσθαί ταύτην εἰσφέρειν, ὡσπερ ἄν εἰ ἑδυνάμεθα τοῦτο πράξαι προθυμομεμένων γὰρ ἡμῶν τὸ χρέος ἄπαν ἔκτισαι, εἰ
ὑπερνικῴη τὸ ὀφειλόμενον τὴν ἡμετέραν ἰσχύν, οὐδὲν τούτο λογίζεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ
deitai pαρ’ ἡμῶν οὐδενός, ἡ ὄν ἐσμέν κύριοι (111-115);

ἐξ ἀνάγκης for ἀπαντα (153); ἐπείδη, καὶ εἰσκωμάζει τὸν τρόπον τούτον οὐδὲ
γὰρ δύναται καθ’ ἡμῶν, ἂν θέλομεν for ὡς ἂν ἀντιστώμεν γενναίως, οὐδὲ τὴν
ἀρχὴν εἰσκωμάζει (39-40); ἐπὶ τὰ χείριστα for οὕτω (265);

ἡ τῆς ψυχῆς ιατρεία, τῶν ἐφ’ ἡμῖν ἔστι, καὶ ραδία. ἔστι γὰρ ἐκ τῆς θελήσεως
ἀνοίξις τοῦ γοῦν θελήσα τὴν ιατρείαν, τί ὀδίου εἰπέ μοι for εἰ δὴ καὶ υπερβολὴ της
δόξει τὸ εἰρημένον (62); ἡμῶν αὐτῶν for δοκοῦν (591);

καὶ φιλανθρωπίας for τε καὶ κοινωνίας (663);

οἴμαι δὲ for καίτοι (116); οὐ συγγενέσιν, οὐδ’ οἴστισινοι ἄνω ἄπαντων for οὐ
τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῖς (693);

πολλάς δ’ ἡθίμοις ψυχάς αὖδι προϊασθεῖν ἡμῶν, εἰπεν ἂν ὁ Ἄμηρος for ἱςως δ’
ἀν καὶ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι (730-731); περί ἂν ὡς λέγομεν ὡς’ οὖδεὶς ἐν
ἀπογνώσει ἁλ’ ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐλπίς ἄπαντες for Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῇδε ἤμῖν δὲ ἄρα
βέλτιον, μὴ δευτέρας δεηθήναι καθάρσεως, ἀλλὰ στῆναι μέχρι τῆς πρώτης, κατὰ
tὴν τοῦ Θεολόγου φωνὴν ἤδη δὴ κάκεινο μὲν, μένειν ἐν ψυχῇ ἂντιστῶμεν, ἄλλα
ἰαθῆναι νοσήσαντας καὶ γὰρ κάκεινο πάνω δεινόν, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπεφήνατο,
ἀντιμετρεῖν ἁμαρτίαν διαρθρωσιν. Δεῖ μὲν ὁν δακρύων θερμῶν, καὶ τὴν τῆς κακίας
ἄγωνισθαι νόσον, ὥστε ὑπερβολὴ τὸ εἰρημένον (62); ἡμῶν αὐτῶν for δοκοῦν (591);

καὶ φιλανθρωπίας for τε καὶ κοινωνίας (663);

οἴμαι δὲ for καίτοι (116); οὐ συγγενέσιν, οὐδ’ οἴστισινοι τῶν ἄπαντων for οὐ
τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῖς (693);

πολλάς δ’ ἡθίμοις ψυχάς αὖδι προϊασθεῖν ἡμῶν, εἰπεν ἂν ὁ Ἄμηρος for ἱςως δ’
ἀν καὶ τῶν δοκοῦντων εἶναι (730-731); περί ἂν ὡς λέγομεν ὡς’ οὖδεὶς ἐν
ἀπογνώσει ἁλ’ ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐλπίς ἄπαντες for Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τῇδε ἤμῖν δὲ ἄρα
βέλτιον, μὴ δευτέρας δεηθήναι καθάρσεως, ἀλλὰ στῆναι μέχρι τῆς πρώτης, κατὰ
tὴν τοῦ Θεολόγου φωνὴν ἤδη δὴ κάκεινο μὲν, μένειν ἐν ψυχῇ ἂντιστῶμεν, ἄλλα
ἰαθῆναι νοσήσαντας καὶ γὰρ κάκεινο πάνω δεινόν, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπεφήνατο,
ἀντιμετρεῖν ἁμαρτίαν διαρθρωσιν. Δεῖ μὲν ὁν δακρύων θερμῶν, καὶ τὴν τῆς κακίας
ἄγωνισθαι νόσον, ὥστε ὑπερβολὴ τὸ εἰρημένον (62); ἡμῶν αὐτῶν for δοκοῦν (591);
τὸ πρὸς ἐκείνους ἡμῖν γίνεται φίλτρον for αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν αὐτῷ (590-591);
τοῖς ὀργῶσι πάθεσι for τὰς δὲ σηπεδόνας ἐκκόπτει, τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ χείρω νομὴν
συστέλλων. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ (626); τοῖς πολλοῖς for τὴν ἀρετὴν (732); τῶ δοκεῖν πάντα
ισχύειν for ἐφ’ οἷς ἐχρῆν ἐγκαλύπτεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἁν τις τὰς ἀρετὰς μετει
λῆσθαι· οὐ μὴν ἄλλα (626); τοῖς πολλοῖς for τὴν ἀρετὴν (732); τῶ δοκεῖν πάντα
ἰσχύειν for ἐφ’ οἷς ἐχρῆν ἐγκαλύπτεσθαι, ὥσπερ ἁν εἰ τις ἀνὴρ ποιῶν ἐκεῖνα
παρρησιάζοιτο, δι’ ὧν ἂν ἔμελλε στεφανωθήσεσθαι (265-267); τῶν γὰρ τῆς αὐτῆς
μετειληχότων ουσίας, ὀλισθαινόντων· πιπτόντων· κεῖσθαι καὶ τιμῶν ἐθελόντων,
eἰρήσθω γάρ μοι τὸ ὑπερβάλλον for μᾶλλον δὲ οἶδα καλῶς, ὡς οὐ θεοφιλής τις
οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφῶς τοὐναντίον (285-286);
φαίνη τοὐναντίον, ἐν οἷς μισεῖς καὶ οὐκ ἐλεεῖς τὸν βεβλημένον συχνοῖς πάθεσιν;
ὥστε σοι τοὐγχείρημα, ὀλέθριον παντελῶς for μήτε παρὰ Θεοῦ τὸ κρίνειν λαβών,
καὶ ὁμόσε χωρῶν, κατ’ ἄμφιταναντία φαίνῃ ποιῶν (520-521)

6. Variant forms of the same words

I: χρείας for χρείαν (762);
V: ἀλλ’ for ἀλλὰ (265, 623); ἀναστῆναι for ἀναστήσεσθαι (353); ἀνοίγεσθαι for ἀνοιγήσεσθαι (353); ἀναστῆσθαι for ἀναστήσεσθαι (353); ἀνοίγεσθαι for ἀνοιγήσεσθαι (353); αὐτῶ for αὐτοῦ (441); αὐτῶν for αὐτοὺς (326); βεβιωκότα for βεβιώσαντα (736); βοήσεις for ἐβόησας (523); δείκνυται for δείκνυσι (796); διαπραξάμενοι for διαπράξαντες (565); ἐπιλανθανόμενον for ἐπιλανθανόμενος (640); ἐχοντας for ἐχοντες (398,769); ἀδικοῦντες for ἀδικηκότες (483); κατακρίνειν for κατακρίνουσιν (113); κρίνεσθαι for κρινόμενος (478); κρίνεσθαι for κρίνεσθαι (478); οἰ for αἰ (219); οὐ for οὐ (219); ωσιν for ὤσι (246); πειραθῆναι for πειραθήσεσθαι (354); πορεύομενος for πορευθῆ (481); σωζεῖν for σώσει (506)

7. Word endings (ν or σ)

I: δεικνύει for δεικνύειν (455)
V: ἀπώλεσε for ἀπώλεσεν (730); εἰσίν for εἰσι (234); ἐστιν for ἐστίν (228); τύχην for τύχη (683); φέρει for φέρειν (679); ὡςι for ὡσιν (246)

8. Order of words
Section III

Oration VII survives in four MSS: B, I, V and the folio Va which contains a small, but important section of the Oration.

As it has already been suggested, hand J, which copied Oration VII in V (ff. 322-333v), must have done so from an earlier copy of the text. It seems that Va, containing marginal and interlinear additions and corrections, the majority of which were adopted by B, I and V, must have originally belonged to a working copy of Oration VII.

There are three possibilities: (1) that Va formed part of the exemplar of V; (2) that Va did not form part of a codex containing Oration VII, or indeed all Seven Orations or a number of them, but that its scribe copied these specific lines of the Oration VII (258-320) from another tradition (β); and (3) that V and Va are linked through an intermediary tradition (γ). The latter hypothesis is strengthened by the fact that there are two cases where Va and V are different (variant reading and word order). As it has been already suggested, I represents the ‘final’ version of the text and was the

---

906 See above, p. 235.
907 Plate XIX.
exemplar for the copying of the text for $B^2$. Though in *Oration VII* there are no parchment folios copied by $B^1$, it is possible that similarly to the previous *Oration I* and *VI*, a copy of *Oration VII* by $B^1$, which represents the intermediary tradition between $I$ and $V$, existed at the time of the revision by Isidore. As with the previous *Oration (I-VI)* the printed *editio princeps* of *Oration VII* (L) was based on B while PG is a reprint of L.

The following *stemma codicum* shows these relations:

![Diagram of stemma codicum](image)

I. Corrections introduced by the main scribes

(a) The main hand introduced an **emendation by crossing out** a phrase:

$V$: f. 329.12-13, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ γίγνομεν, εἰρήσεται· καὶ ἅπερ ἂν εὐξαίμην περῒ σοῦ, ταῦτα πράξεις (326)

(b) A number of errors due to **confusion of sound** were corrected by simply overwriting or altering letters. With the exception of some words, traces of the letters corrected are still visible:
B: f. 133v.4, ἐπιγνώντας from ἐπιγνώντας (447); f. 133v.1, ἐπιδειξαμένων from ἐπιδειξαμένων (444); f. 129v.13, ζώντων from ζόντων (329); f. 122v.19, τοῖς from τῆς (104); f. 128v.3, χωρὶ from χωρὶ (291)

V: f. 324v.17, εὐχαριστάν from εὐχαριστεῖαν (127); f. 328v.10, ζητούσας from ζητεῖσα (276); f. 324v.22, ἱδρούν from ἱδροῦν (131); f. 330v.21, οἶδεν from οἶδεν (380); f. 332v.11, τοῖς from τῆς (113); f. 332v.11, προτεθειμένα from προτεθειμένα (489); f. 329v.7, τεταπείνωμαι from τεταπείνωμαι (344)

(c) A number of corrections were introduced in spaces previously erased. In some cases it is possible to distinguish traces of the original letters (though some are visible only by ultraviolet light):

B: f. 130v.12, αἴρομαι from ιρομαι (344); f. 120v.5, νῦν from ν(..) (48)

V: f. 323v.2, ἀκροατὰς from ἀκρατὰς (71)

(d) A single error involved word ending:

B: f. 119v.6, ὡς from ὡσθ (4)

(e) Corrections of accents and breathings:

B: f. 132v.19, καλῶν from καλῶν (425); f. 133v.8, μηκέτι from μη κετ (449)

V: f. 323v.11, ἀθλον from ἄθλον (78); f. 327v.26, ἀνάπαυσις from ἀνά παύσις (266); f. 327v.11-12, αὐτοκατάπτησι from αὐτο ἀγάπην (232); f. 333v.16, ἐγκρίναι from ἐγκρίναι (516); f. 329v.9, ἐξῆς from ἐξῆς (230); f. 322v.24, καταπολύ from κατάπολυ (20); f. 326v.13, οἰστις from οἰστις (189); f. 333v.16, συγκρίναι from συγκρίναι (516); f. 322v.23, τελευτῶν from τελευτῶν (20); f. 326v.12, τινί from τίνι (210)

(f) Corrections by adding letters and words in the margin and interlinear space:

B: f. 135v.15, ἐγκρίναι from ἐγκρίναι (516); f. 127v.17, καυθησομαι from καυθησομαι (256); f. 127v.22, τῷ (259)

I: f. 102v.19, μὲν (452); f. 99v.20, τῷ (319)

V: f. 328v.22, ἐπεὶ τὸ μέτριον ἀγαθόν (310-311); f. 328v.20, κείμενοι (307-308)

(g) Corrections by overwriting or altering letters in the text:

B: f. 135v.8-9, ἀνταγωνισταῖς from ἀντ(.)γωνισταῖς (496); f. 123v.19, διώσταμένης from διώσταμένοις (151); f. 122v.13, εὑρήσει from τεὑρήσει (115); f. 134v.9, καθ’ from
κατ᾽ (481); f. 123v.12, κατασχύναι from καὶ αἰσχύναι? (146); f. 134v.6, μὲν from μὴν? (463); f. 120v.10, πράγματι from πράσματι (36); f. 121v.17, προπετείας from προπετείας (72); f. 132v.14, ταῦτα from ταὐτα (422); f. 129v.16, φαίνῃ from φάνη (316); f. 125v.10, φιλοτιμία from φιλοτίμη (189)

V: f. 329v.16, πράγμα from πράγμα (351)

(h) Superscribed Greek numbers used to denote transposition of word order:

B: f. 119v.17, ἀντερεῖν] πρὸς αὐτήν], superscribed β’, α’ (25)

II. Corrections introduced by corrective hands

The corrective hands V, V^hand A(?), Va^ and B^ introduced further additions or corrections:

(a) Corrections introduced by adding letters or words in the margin and interlinear space:

V^v(?): f. 322.3, συμφθεγγόμενος from συμφεγγόμενος (3)

V^hand A(?): f. 322v.7, ἀκούσεσθαι from ἀκούσεσθέ (6); f. 324v.2, τὴν (116)

Va: f. 240v.15, πῶς γὰρ (304); f. 240v.20-21, ὡς πετασθῆναι καὶ καταπαῦσαι (278)

(b) A single correction involved word ending:

B^v(?): f. 127v.2, ἐστί from ἐστιν (245)

(c) Superscribed Greek numbers used to denote transposition of word order:


III. Errors

1. Errors due to confusion of sounds

(a) Itacisms (affecting ι, ει, η, οι, υ):

B: ἐπεῖ for ἐπί (322); ἐπιδεδειγμένα for ἐπιδειγμένα (474); προτεθηκότων for προτεθεικότων (279)

BV: δεῖ for δή (313)
V: ἀπέκρυσε for ἀπέκρυψε (187); ἔχει for ἔχοι (25,180)
VVa: ἀηδής for ἀειδής (274)

(b) *Confusion of ε and α:*
   
   B: εἰργάσωμαι for εἰργάσω (315); συναιροῦντας for συνεροῦντας (456)
   I: δύνασθαι for δύνασθε (370)

(c) *Confusion of o and ω:*
   
   BV: κατορθωκότος for κατωρθωκότος (390)
   V: καυθήσομαι for καυθήσωμαί (256)

(d) *Single for double consonants:*
   
   V: χαρίεσα for χαρίεσσά (82)

(e) *Double for single consonants:*
   
   V: προσρήματα for προσρήματα (208)

2. Errors in breathings

(a) *Faulty breathings:*
   
   B: αὐτῶν for αὐτῶν (336)
   V: αύτο ἀλήθεια for αὐτοαλήθεια (375); ἔωσφόρον for ἑωσφόρον (152)

(b) *Omission of breathing in crasis:*
   
   BIV: προσθημήθημεν for προσθημήθημεν (72); ταὐτὸν for ταὐτόν (214, 216)

3. Errors in accentuation

(a) *Faulty accentuation:*
   
   BI: κρηπίδα for κρηπίδα (229); ποτὲ for ποτε (389); στεφανῶσαι for στεφανώσαι (528); τελευτῶν for τελευτῶν (19)
   BIV: ἀπάδον for ἀπάδον (57, 237)
   BV: ταυτὰ for ταῦτα (459)
   V: άθλον for άθλον (480); ἡδή for ἡδη (34); ισχύσαν for ισχυσαν (409); καταισχύναι for καταισχύναι (146)
(b) *Omission of accents:*

I: ἐστίν for ἔστιν (155)  
V: μὴ δείν for μὴ δεῖν (141); σοι for σοι (10)

4. Other errors

B: μηδεῖν for μὴ δεῖν (141); πρόστρέποντι for προτρέποντι (4); συμφεγγόμενος for συμφθεγγόμενος (3)  
I: πραττομένας for παραταττομένας (481)  
V: υπερμαχήσιαι for υπερμαχήσιεν (194)

5. Erroneous words

B: ἔξενεχθῆ for ἔξελεγχθῆ (409); κἀκεῖνα for κἀκεῖνο (203); σαυτοῦ for αὐτοῦ (505); ταύτους for τούτους (447); τὰς for τὰ (484); τὸν for τὸ (53)

6. Omissions

B: καὶ (116); τὸν (197)  
I: τὸν (217)  
V: αὐτῶν (95); εἶναι (323); καὶ τὰ ταῦτα λέγω, ὅπου καὶ τοῦ διὰ μαρτυρίου θανάτου, τὸν Θεὸν αἰτιατέον ἐστί, καὶ τὴν μεγίστην αὐτῷ καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου χάριν εἰδέναι ὑφείλομεν, εἰ τις ἁρμοδίως σκοπήσει; καὶ οὐκ οἰητέον τούτου χάριν, αὐτὸν ὑφειλετῆν ἢμῖν καθιστάναι; Τὰ γὰρ πάντα ἐκ Θεοῦ, καθὼς οἱ πρόσθεν ἢμῖν ἀπέδειξαν λόγοι (399-402); οὐκ (320); τῷ καὶ κριτῆς (514); ὡς (4)  
Va: καὶ μὴ (306); τῆς (270)

7. Additions

B: σαφῶς (402, before ἀπέδειξαν)  
BV: τοῦ (412, after ἀπὸ)  
V: παμπληθὲς (515, after περίεργον); τὸ (222, before τῶν)  
VVa: γε (313, after δὲ)

8. Marginal glosses and notes

B: γρ(άφε) τῶν ἀποκειμέν(ων) (282)
9. Different readings

V: ākrōs for ēs ākrōn (519-520); ālēthēs ēn for ās ālēthēs (373); āμιντήρion for òplon (183); antítattēsthai for ámýnestei (183); āpāsēs for ákrotātēs (134); ástroßēn tēs ágātēs kλάδωn for tēs ágātēs eúthēion πtōrōn (242-243); aútōchēr for tais aútou χερι (505);

βιαζόμενου, ύπερβολήν δὲ λέγω τό εύλογον for μεθ’ εαυτῆς τό εύλογον ἔχουσαν βιαζόμενον (38-39);

γε for ἦ (30); γένοιτο for προσγένοιτο (222);

ἐαυτὸν for αὐτὸν (509); ἐαυτοὺς ἀλλήλους ἡμᾶς συγκρινειν for ἀλλήλους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς παρεξετάζειν (518); ἐγεγόνει tē for γέγονε (34); ἔγνων for συνήκα (5); εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀφοσιώσασθαι tι περί tῆς εἰς ἀλλήλας γνησιότητος for καὶ tῆς εἰς ἀλλήλας γνησιότητος εἰπεῖν tι, καὶ ἀφοσιώσασθαι ἦν (288-289); εἰς ἡμᾶς ὡστε for ὡς ἡμᾶς (113); εἰκένην for αὐτῆς (52); ἔλασαν for συνελάσαν (75); ἔγαγες ὁ λόγος ἐφθη διδάξει for ὁ λόγος ἀδίδαξε διδάξει (360); ἐνάρετος for σπουδαῖος (522); ἐνάρετος αὐτὸς ἐξεγένου for σπουδαῖος αὐτός γέγονας (467); ἔξεστι for ἔνεστι (195); ἐπιστρεψεις for ἀπονοίας (26); ἐνέπιστρεψεις for ἐγχειρήσεως (30); εὐρήκεια for ἐπευρηκέναι (204); ἐφ’ ὅπερ ἢν ἔθελοι κινεῖσθαι for οἷς ἢν ἔθελησε χρῆσθαι (42-43); ἐὼκεσαν for ἑόκεσα (421);

ἴδρυσιν for οἰκήσιν (131); ἰπταμένης for πετομένης (29); ἰτέον for ἀκτέον (353);

καθεσθῆται for καθίσαι (502); καὶ μὴ for μὴ πάνυ (209); καίπερ γὰρ ἔκεινης οὐσῆς for οὐσῆς οὐν ἔκεινης (239); καλεῖν ἀντιπάλους, εὐλόγω κλήσει for εὐλόγως ἀντιπάλους καλείν (493-494); καλὸν for καὶ (249); καλὸν ἢττους for ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν χείρους (426); κατά πάρεγγον for ἐν παρέγγῳ (4-5); κατατολμᾶν for τολμᾶν (76); ’κεινοῦ for ’κεινῆς (376); κράτιστόν for νικῶν (96);

λέγειν πλατύτερον for μακρότερον λέγειν (139); λέγοντας for λέγειν ἐπιχειροῦντας (53);

μετὰ τῶν ἁγιάλων διπταμένη for τοῖς ἁγιάλωις συνδιαιτωμένη (49); μεθ’ ύπερβολήν for καθ’ ύπερβολήν (38);
ocrates (238); ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀγωνοθέτης for κριτής μὲν γὰρ (510-511); ὁπόταν for ὦ τοῖς (510-511); ὁμὲν γὰρ (510-511); ὅπως for ὥστε (360); ὁπόταν for ὅπερ (499); ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀγωνοθέτης for κριτής (510-511); ὁπόταν for ὅπερ (499); ὅσω for ὥστε (360); οὐ διεπραξάμην τὸ σφίσι χάριεν παρεκφερόμενος ὅποι τύχοι for αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐχαρισάμην, ὡς μὴ ἐκφεροίμην ὅποι ἀν τύχοι (7-8); οὐχ ὅπως for οὐ μόνον (91); ὅφελοι for ὤφελον (347); ὀχυροῖ for ἀσφαλίζεται (178); παμπληθὲς for παντάπασιν (445); παροχέα for δοτῆρα (405); πᾶσαν ὑφαλότητα for ἅπαν ὕφαλον (334-335); πλατύτερον for μακρότερον (6,117); πράξας for ποιήσας (204); προνοητὴν for κηδεμόνα (405); σκῶμμα for μέμψιν (211); συγκριθῆναι for παραβληθῆναι (472); συγκρίναι for παραβαλεῖν (480); συνείη for προσῆ (199); συνελεῖν for συνελόντα εἰπεῖν (193); ταῦτα for τοιαῦτα (325); τῆ ταυτότητι for τῶ καθεστηκότι (150); τοῦτο for τοσοῦτο (522); τούτο for πρὸς τοῦτο (374); τῶ γὰρ for τὸ γὰρ (145); ύπερασπιστὰς for ὑπασπιστὰς (188); ὑνήσαμεν for ἑαυτῷ (209)

VVa: εἰδέναι καλῶς ποιῶν (303-304); θηρεῦσαι for θηρᾶσαι (319); οἷόν τι πέρας καὶ ὀδὸς καὶ κατάντημα for οἱονείς τις ὀδὸς καὶ πέρας (265); ὡς δὲ for oὐτω (270); ὀσπερ for ὠσπερ (260)

Va: ἀποκειμένων for μελλουσῶν (282)

10. Variant forms of the same words

BV: μεγίστη for μεγίστης (360); πάντων for πάντα (524); φάσκειν for φάσκον (411); φυλαζεῖι for φυλάξασθαι (21)

V: δυνηθεῖεν for δύνασθαι (184); ἔδραισε for ἔδραίσως (267); ἐφεῖν for εἰπεῖν (72); ἐφηρεισμένον for ἐφηρεισμένην (230); μόνως for μόνον (8); οἴον for οἴα (208); παρεληλύσασθαί for παρεληλύσασθαι (452); πράξαντες for πράξαντας (439); συστῆσασθαί for συστήσασθαι (373); τὰ τόξα for τοῖς τόξοις (61); ταύτην for ταύτη (330); ψυχήν for ψυχή (195)

VVa: δέξασιν for δέξασθαι (297); τηρήσαις for τηρήσαι (297)

11. Order of words
V: μοι τοίνυν for τοίνυν μοι (356); οὖν ἀν for ἀν οὖν (201); οὕτως λόγος for λόγος οὕτως (3)

VVa: μοι γὰρ for γὰρ μοι (318); ὡσπερ συνελόντας ἡμᾶς εἰπεῖν for συνελόντας ἡμᾶς εἰπεῖν ὡσπερ εἰ (260)

Va: σκοπεῖν χρή κάκεινο for σκοπεῖν κάκεινο χρή (287)

12. Word endings

B: ἐστι for ἐστιν (260), μέλει for μέλεις (294)
I: εἴ for εἴς (61)
V: τοξικῆς for τοξική (60)

Section IV

The short Epistolary Epilogue survives in four MSS: B, I, P and V.

The Epistolary Epilogue was edited by Legrand as Manuel’s Letter νγ’908 solely on the basis of Par. gr. 3041 (P). As mentioned above, the word μειράκιον in P, which in the rest codices is replaced by the word ἁνήπο (62), shows that P contains an early version of the Epistolary Epilogue909. Thus, V possibly copied the Epistolary Epilogue from an intermediary tradition (β). I and B are closely linked. As in all Orations (I-VII) the printed editio princeps of the Epistolary Epilogue (L) was based on B while PG is a reprint of L. These observations are reflected in the following stemma codicum:

```
α
1403-1417 P
  β
1403-1410 V
1416-1425 I
Post 1557 B
1578 L
1866 PG
```

I. Corrections introduced by the main scribes

(a) Some errors due to **confusion of sound** were corrected by simply overwriting or altering letters. With the exception of some words, traces of the letters corrected are still visible:

- **B**: f. 137v.14, ἡς from ἐς (38)
- **V**: f. 334r.14, τελεότεραι from τελε<ω>τεραι (52)

(b) Some **corrections were introduced in spaces previously erased**. In some cases it is possible to distinguish traces of the original letters (though some are visible only by ultraviolet light):

- **P**: f. 33.17, ὀφθήση δὲ πάντως (18)
- **V**: f. 334r.13, πέτρον (51)

(c) One correction involved **word ending**:

- **P**: χείρω for χείρω (11)

(d) Corrections by **adding letters and words in the margin**:

- **B**: f. 138.15, τοῦ (54)
- **P**: f. 33v.22, πολλῶ (52); f. 34.5, σε (64)

(e) Corrections by **overwriting or altering letters** in the text:

- **B**: f. 138.5, αὐθαδείας from αὐσαδείας (47); f. 137v.5, καθεστείσιν from καθεστείσιν (32); f. 136v.20, οἰεί from ἐιεί (13)
- **P**: f. 33.25-26, ἀναλωκότας from ἀνηλωκότας (28); f. 34.4, νουνεχές from νουνεχ(...) (63)

(f) **Superscribed Greek numbers** to denote transposition of word order:

- **P**: f. 34.5, τὸ εἰκὸς] λογίσασθαι σε] εὐχερές superscribed β α γ (64)

II. Errors

1. Errors due to confusion of sounds

(a) **Itacisms** (affecting τ, η, ο, υ):
BPV: ἦπερ for εἴπερ (18)
V: αὐθαδίας for αὐθαδείας (47); ἀφιστήκειν for ἀφειστήκειν (31); βούλιοι for βούλει (37)

(b) Single for double consonants:
B: γεγενηκότας for γεγεννηκότας (9)
BIPV: τηνάλως for τηνάλλως (27)
BV: γεγενηκότας for γεγεννηκότας (64)

(c) Double for single consonants:
PV: φαρισσαίοι for φαρισσαῖοι (45); φαρισσαίοις for φαρισαίοις (32); φαρισσαίων for φαρισαίων (54)

2. Errors in accentuation

(a) Faulty accentuation:
P: φύναι for φῦναι (15)
V: φῦσαι for φύσαι (70)

(b) Omission of accents:
BIP: οἷον for οἷόν (58)
V: κἀν for κᾶν (19)

3. Other errors
V: ἀφιστήκειν for ἀφειστήκειν (31)

4. Omissions
I: ε<ι>θύς (4)
V: πολλῶ (52); σε (64)
P: τε γὰρ (62)

5. Additions
V: δὴ (15, after ἄλλα); λέγω (36, after νομοθεσίας); τοῖς (24, before γονεύσι)
6. Marginal note

**BIP:** γνω(μικόν) (66-67)

7. Different readings

**P:** μειράκιον ὁν for ἄνηρ (63); οὐ μόνον for οὐχ ὅπως (15)

**PV:** ἤρκεσε for διήρκεσέ (3)

**V:** ἀκριβῶς for ἀκριβέστερον (48); ἀνηλωκότας for ἀναλωκότας (28); οὐ μή for οὐχ ὅπως

8. Variant forms of the same words

**B:** ἡδὺς for ἡδύν (6); πείσαι for πεῖσαν (1)

**BP:** θ(εο)ῦ for θ(εὸ)ν (45)

**P:** αὐθάδειαν for αὐθαδείας (47); νουνεχές for νουνεχής (63); τόλμην for τόλμης (47)

9. Order of words

**V:** λογίσασθαι σε τὸ εἰκὸς for τὸ εἰκός λογίσασθαι (64)
Editio

Manuelis II Palaeologi imperatoris ad Joannem filium

Orationes VII Ethico-politicae
The present edition

The present edition of Manuel II Palaeologus’ *Seven Ethico-political Orations* is based on the principal MS I, though occasionally readings from B and V have been preferred.

Conventions in punctuation, accentuation and spelling largely followed by I, have been adopted. Though the edition largely follows the punctuation system of I, occasionally further intervention was considered necessary to enhance the clarity of the text. Scriptural, patristic and classical citations, as well as proverbial expressions, are marked by italicised characters. Parts of delivered speech are included in double inverted commas « », and proper and geographical names are capitalized.

The comma after κάν, ἀν, as well as double accents placed by all scribes on these words for rhetorical emphasis, have been omitted. Similarly, the diastole in ὁ, τι has been omitted, except from cases where the word is followed by a particle (e.g., ὁ, τιπερ). Acute accent has replaced the grave on oxytones followed by a punctuation sign. The accentuated personal pronouns, the indefinite pronouns τίς, τί, and the particle τέ have been treated as enclitics.

Joined words used as adverbial expressions (e.g., περιπλείστου, τοπρὶ ν etc.) have been separated, while μὴ δὲ and μὴ δ' have been joined. The iota subscript has been tacitly introduced. The diaeresis sign, used by all scribes with great frequency over iota and upsilon, has been retained only over the second of two consecutive vowels not forming a diphthong.

Each *Oration*, accompanied by the respective Greek number, appears on a fresh page, with its heading in bold letters. Each *Oration* is divided to paragraphs and each paragraph number accompanied by a letter appears in square brackets (e.g., [1a]).

Finally, the apparatus is divided in three sections:

a. *apparatus locorum parallelorum* with references to parallel passages by Manuel II Palaeologus

b. *apparatus fontium* with references to sources and parallel passages

c. negative *apparatus criticus*, recording all variant and different readings, emendations, corrections, additions, omissions, lacunae, erasures, deletions and marginal glosses extant in the MSS, Leunclavius’ edition and the PG.

---

910 When the author makes use of common phrases, we are obliged to refer to the classical text, though the author refers to these and other citations by memory.
Sigla Codicum

B  Codex Vindobonensis philologicus graecus 42 (ff. 41-138v)
I  Codex Vindobonensis philologicus graecus 98 (ff. 31-106)
M  Codex Monacensis graecus 411 (ff. 152-203v)
P  Codex Parisinus graecus 3041 (ff. 33-34v)
V  Codex Vaticanus graecus 632 (ff. 255v-335)
Va Codex Vaticanus graecus 266 (ff. 240v-v)
L  J. Leunclavius (=Löwenklau), Imp. Caes. Manuelis Palaeologi Aug. Praecepta educationis regiae, ad Ioannem filium (Basle, 1578), pp. 134-419
PG  Patrologia Graeca 156, cols. 385-561

Abbreviationes

acc.  accentus  in ras.  in rasuram
add.  addidit, -erunt  inc.  incipit
al.  alii, alibi  inf.  infra
al. man.  altera manus  lac.  lacuna
ca.  circa  lin.  linea, -am
cf.  confer  litt.  littera, -ae
cod.  codex  om.  omissit, -erunt
codd.  codices  p.  pagina
del.  delevit  post cor.  post correctionem
des.  desinit  scil.  scilicet
dittogr.  dittographia  scr.  scripsit, -erunt
eras.  erasit  sign.  signum
f.  folium  sscr.  superscripsit, -tum
ff.  folia  sup.  supra
illeg.  illegibilis  titul.  titular
in marg.  in margine  transp.  transposuit
in marg. inf.  in margine inferiore  v  versum (folium)
in marg. sup.  in margine superiore  vid.  vide
**Signa Typographica**

线 ( ) 代表在文本中直接抄写时，手稿中连续的页码，同时表示第二页的开始和前一页的结束。

( ) 表示在装订中，字母或字符通过省略或悬空在手稿上。

[ ] 表示在装订中，边沿。（在装订中）

< > 表示在装订中，角。（在装订中）

**Sigla Sacrae Scripturae**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act.</th>
<th>Actus Apostolorum</th>
<th>Luc.</th>
<th>Evangelium secundum Lucam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apoc.</td>
<td>Apocryphal Books</td>
<td>Marc.</td>
<td>Evangelium secundum Marcum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col.</td>
<td>ad Colossenses Epistula</td>
<td>Matth.</td>
<td>Evangelium secundum Matthaeum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cor.</td>
<td>I ad Corinthios Epistula</td>
<td>1 Petr.</td>
<td>I Petri Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Cor.</td>
<td>II ad Corinthios Epistula</td>
<td>Phil.</td>
<td>ad Philippenses Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deut.</td>
<td>Deuteronomium</td>
<td>Prov.</td>
<td>Proverbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ec.</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
<td>Ps.</td>
<td>Psalms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph.</td>
<td>ad Ephesios Epistula</td>
<td>1 Regn.</td>
<td>I Regnorum liber (I Samuel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod.</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
<td>2 Regn.</td>
<td>II Regnorum lib. (II Samuel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal.</td>
<td>ad Galatas Epistula</td>
<td>3 Regn.</td>
<td>III (I) Regnorum liber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen.</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
<td>4 Regn.</td>
<td>IV (II) Regnorum liber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab.</td>
<td>Habacuc</td>
<td>Rom.</td>
<td>ad Romanos Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb.</td>
<td>ad Hebraeos Epistula</td>
<td>1 Tim.</td>
<td>I ad Timotheum Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iac.</td>
<td>Iacobi Epistula</td>
<td>2 Tim.</td>
<td>II ad Timotheum Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iob</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tit.</td>
<td>ad Titum Epistula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ioh.</td>
<td>Evangelium secundum Iohannem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ioh.</td>
<td>Iohannis Epistula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ion.</td>
<td>Iohannis Epistula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is.</td>
<td>Isaias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Abbreviations used in the apparatus fontium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chrysoloras, Comparatio</td>
<td>Demetrius Chrysoloras, Comparatio veterum imperatorum et nunc imperatoris Manuelis Palaeologoi, ed. S. Lampros, 'Σύγκρισις παλαιῶν ἀρχόντων καὶ νέων, τοῦ νῦν αὐτοκράτορος Μανουήλ Παλαιολόγου', ΠΠ ΙΙΙ, pp. 222-245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constantinus Manasses, Chronicum</td>
<td>Constantinus Manasses, Breviarum Chronicum, ed. O. Lampsides, Constantini Manassii Breviarum Chronicum, CFHB, XXXVI/1 (Athens, 1996), pp. 5-358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cydonius, De contemnenda morte</td>
<td>Demetrius Cydonius, De contemnenda morte oratio, ed. H. Deckelmann, Demetrii Cydonii De Contemnenda morte Oratio (Teubner: Leipzig, 1901; repr. 1987), pp. 1-44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrillus Alexandrinus, De exitu animi</td>
<td>CPG 5258, PG 77, cols. 1072-1089</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregorius Nazianzenus, In Sanctum baptisma</td>
<td>CPG 3010, PG 36, cols. 360-425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Joannes Chrysostomus, De virginitate, 68.15-16 CPG 4684, Eclogae i-xlviit ex diversis homilias, PG 63, cols. 567-902

Joannes Chrysostomus, Expositiones in Psalmon (iv), col. 57.40-41 CPG 4413, PG 55, cols. 39-498

Joannes Chrysostomus, In Genesim (Hom. 14), col. 114.44 CPG 4409, PG 53, cols. 111-118

Joannes Chrysostomus, In Genesim (Hom. 23), col. 197.4 CPG 4409, PG 53, cols. 196-206

Joannes Chrysostomus, In Mattheum (Hom. 55), col. 540.30 CPG 4424, PG 58, cols. 539-549

Joannes Climacus, Scala paradisi CPG 7852, PG 88, cols. 632-1164


Libanius, Declamationes, 48.1.8.14-15  
---, Epistulae  
---, Progymnasmata, 10.5.17  
Macarius, CparG II  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Ad Alexium lagoup  
---, Ad benevolos subditos  
---, Ad David et Damianum  
---, Ad ebriosum  
---, Ad Thessalonicenses  
---, Canon deprecatorius  
---, De insomniis  
---, De matrimonio  
---, De ordine in Trinitate  
---, De processione  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Epistula proemialis ad sanctissimis inter monachos sacerdotes et spiritualibus patribus David et Damianum, cod. Vat. gr. 1107, ff. 315-322  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Canon deprecatorius ad sanctissimam dominam Deiparam pro praesentibus periculis, ed. Legrand, Lettres, pp. 94-102  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Epistula ad Andream Asanem de insomniis, PG 156, cols. 87-92  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Dialogue moralis cum matre sua de matrimonio, ed. A. Angelou, Manuel Palaiologos, Dialogue with the Empress-Mother on Marriage, BV, XIX (Vienna, 1991), pp. 60-117  
Manuel II Palaeologus, De ordine in Trinitate, ed. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. 318-325  
Manuel II Palaeologus, Tractatus de processione Spiritus Sancti, ed. Dendrinos, Annotated, pp. 1-317
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Citation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In nativitatem Christi</td>
<td>Manuel II Palaeologus, <em>Oratio in nativitatem Christi</em>, cod. Vat. gr. 1619, ff. 299v-46v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel II Palaeologus</td>
<td>Praecepta educationis regiae ad filium Johannem, capit centum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manuel II Palaeologus</td>
<td>Responsio Antenoris ad Ulyssem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximus Confessor</td>
<td>Capita de caritate, col. 1016.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyssenus,</td>
<td>Contra Eunomium, III 2.81.2-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In Canticum canticorum, V 137.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Basilius</td>
<td>Capitula Admonitoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylactus Achridensis</td>
<td>De regnum educationis, p. 207.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Λόγος Α'
Προτερπτικός εἰς λόγους, καὶ περὶ ἀρέτης καὶ ἀγάθου ἀρχοντος.

[1] Τοῦ καλῶς ἐπίστασθαι λέγειν, οὐδὲν ἄν γένοιτο λυσιτελέστερον ἀρχοντὶν ἐθέλουσιν ἀγαθοῖς εἶναι, νοῦ τε βάρος ἔχουσι καὶ πρὸς τὸ κοινὴ συνοισίαν ὀργῆς, τῶν τε ἀγαθῶν ἔρωσι, καὶ μηθὲν τῆς ἀληθείας προτιμῶσι. Τοῦτο τοιοῦτο τοῖς ἀνδράσι, κρείττον ἀτεχνὸς ἢ πλούτειν, καὶ τοὺς τοῦ Κροίου θησαυροὺς εἰς ἀσφαλείας λόγον πολὺ νικῶν, ἤχυροτερον τῆς Ξέρξου πολυχειρίας, αφενὸνς Γόγου τῆς μυθικῆς σὺν τῷ καλῷ βιαστήρεσι, καὶ ὅλως τοιῶν ἀνυπομέτερων τε καὶ τιμώτερον, ὅσον οὐδ᾿ εἰπεῖν ἂν εἰ τῶν εὐχερῶν. Σκοπῶμεν δὴ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀνδρῶν ἐκαστὸν καὶ τί ποτε δεδένηται κατορθώσαι, δὲ ἂν γε νενομίσασι μέγα τι καὶ γενναίαν δυνάμεις δεδοκαίναι. Ἐπειτα τὸν λόγον εὐθὸς καὶ τοιοῦτο παραβάλωμεν, ὅταν γε καὶ τάλλα τοιούτων ἀρχοντα, οἷον εὕθες ἐπροσωμασάμεθα καὶ γὰρ τηδέ περὶ διακρίνοντας, οὐκ οἴμαι γε ὅραδις ἡμᾶς ἐξαμαρτήσιν τῆς ἀληθείας.

[2a] Ὁ μὲν οὖν πολὺ ἐκεῖνος χρυσός, τὸν ἐπ᾿ αὐτῷ μέγα φρονοῦντα Κροίου, ψευδῆνα τῶν ἑλπίδων ἀπέφηνε, καὶ γέγονεν ἀντικυραίος αὐτῷ, συκίνη ἐπικουρία η ἐπί χρήματι ἐλπίς, οὕτως νεκροίς κειμένοις δὲ ἀχρηστίαν καὶ μὴν καὶ διὰ τοῦτον ἀπόδολω, πρὸς τὸ μηθὲν κατωρθοκεῖνα τῶν κατ᾿ ἑλπίδα. Καίον δὲ οἴμαι μηθὲν, μηθὲν ἀπεικός, εἰ περιέστηκεν αὐτῷ πρὸς τοναντιόν ἡ δόξα, μηθαμώς ἐπ᾿ ἀρετῆ, ἀλλ᾿ ἐπὶ μετάλλους τεθαρισκοῦτι ταυτί γὰρ τοῖς χρυμένοις αὐτοῖς ὡς χρή, μετ᾿ ἐπιστήμης ἀνδρὶ προπούσῃ, δοκεῖ τι κάλλιστον εἶναι τῷ βῶ τούτῳ. Εἰς τούτω αὐτῷ δὲ μόνον ὀρώσι τὸ θησαυρίζειν, καὶ εὐδαιμονιάν καὶ τέλος τοῦτο νομίζουσιν,


315
ὑπηρέτης ἀπαλείας ὁ πλοῦτος, καὶ μεγίστων ονειδῶν αἰτίως. Ο δὲ γε καὶ πρὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ θησαυρίζειν οίμαι τιθείς, καὶ εἰς μόνον τὸν χρυσὸν ἀνησυχημένος ὑπάρχον, χρυσὸν ἐκείνον τὸν ἐοίκοτα λίθος, τοὺς ὑποκεκαλυμμένους συχνοίς ὑδασίν, οἱ πρὸς οὐδὲν ὄνησουσιν, εἰ μὴ που καὶ γένοιτο ναυαγίων αἰτίως, ἡλαξονεύσατο πάν ἀνύσειν· τοὺς γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς φθαλαμοῦς ἀμβλυώτων ὁ Κροῖς τῷ τῆς φυλαγγυίας νοσήματι, ποροφόρῳ τῶν παρὰ πόδας κειμένων οὐκ ἐδύνατο βλέπειν· θέν δὴ καὶ τὸ κατοροφώζχαι πολῶν ἐκείνω χρυσῶν, σωστίας, καὶ τρυφῆς, καὶ βασιλεῖαν ἐνόμιζε, καὶ πολὺς ἦν διὰ τοῦτο, κατὰ πάντων ἐπαιρόμενος, καὶ μηδαμώς κοιμώμενος, μηδέ κραυταλῶν οὐν, μονονοῦ παρεφθέγγετο.

30 [2b] Καὶ ταῦτα γε πρὸς ἄνδρα διαλεγόμενος, ὥς γε πρὸς εὐδαμονίαν την ἀληθῆ, γέλους ἢν σαφῆς ὁ χρυσὸς, εἰ τις δὴ καὶ λίθους, ὀλίους τέχνη χρυσοὺς ἐργασάμενος, φέρων ἐτίθει τοῦτῳ πρὸ τῶν ποδῶν. Νομοθετής Αθηνών οὖσις, Σόλων προσαγορευόμενος ἦν, ἐν ταῖς χρυσαῖς Αθηναίας θαυμαζόμενος, θαυμαστῶν τῷ τηνικάτα γεμούσας ἀνδρῶν. Καίτοι, πῶς οὖκ ἀξίων πάντας θαυμάζατ; Τὸ γὰρ ἐν τοσοῦτο καλῶς τε καὶ ἀγαθῶς ἀνάρατον ἐμπεπλημμένους πολλῶν καλῶν τε καὶ ἀγαθῶν, ἕνα τινὰ καθ' ὅτιον τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερελάσασα μικρὸν δὲν κινδυνεύει παρέχειν διαπιστεῖν ἀλλ' οὕτως γε καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς, μετὰ τὸ θείον σεβάσμας οὐ τῷ χρυσὸν κεκτῆθαι καὶ χορηγεῖν, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν ἐκείνῳ πολὺς χρυσός, οὐδὲ γε προὔργου τάργυσιν, εἰ μὴ καλῶς ἀθροίζοιτο, καὶ κρείστον ἀναλίσκετο, καὶ

35 ἐκάτερον σὺν τῷ καρφῷ γίγνοιτο· οὕτω γὰρ αὐτῷ τάνδρι, οὕτῳ μὴν τοὺς πειθομένους


αὐτῷ οὖν περισπούδαστον ἦν τὰ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ψήγματα, ὥσπερ ὁ Κροῖςος δοῦλος ὄν, ἤγειτο κύριος εἶναι.

[2c] Ὄθεν οὐδὲ μηχανὴν ὁ Σόλων ἐξεζήτησεν εὐρηκέναι τοῖς πολῖταις τοὺς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὸ δυνηθῆναι χρηματίζεσθαι πάντα τρόπον· οὖν ταύτην δὴ φημι τὴν μεταλλικὴν, οὔτε μὴν τὴν χρυσοποιϊκὴν καλουμένην. Ὅθεν οὐδὲ μηχανὴν ὁ Σόλων ἐξεζήτησεν εὑρηκέναι τοῖς πολίταις τοῖς αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τὸ δυνηθῆναι χρηματίζεσθαι πάντα τρόπον· οὔτε ταύτην δὴ φημι τὴν μεταλλικὴν, οὔτε μὴν τὴν χρυσοποιϊκὴν καλουμένην.

50 ἦν τὰ τοῦ χρυσοῦ ψήγματα, ὥσπερ ὁ Κροῖςος δοῦλος ὃς, τῷ δὲ νόμους ἀγαθοὺς ἐπὶ πολλοῖς τε καὶ καλοῖς ἐφθασόν, πολῖται πάντα ἀγαθοὺς τεθεικέναι. Τοσούτῳ δὲ ὕπερήλασαν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οἱ παρὰ τοῦδε γεγενημένοι, ὥσπερ τελευταῖοι αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι, καὶ διαιωνίσαι τῇ πόλει· ἔδοξαν γὰρ τοῖς δι᾽ οὓς ἐγένοντο, κόσμου μὲν τὸν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς δημοσίου, καὶ μέγιστος μεγίστοις ἀνὴρ ἀνδράσι, νῦν γε πᾶσιν ἔτι δοκεῖ, τῷ δὲ νόμους ἀγαθοὶ ἐπὶ πολλοῖς τε καὶ καλοῖς ἐφθασόν, πολῖται πάντα ἀγαθοὶ τεθεικέναι. Τοσούτῳ δὲ ὑπερήλασαν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους οἱ παρὰ τοῦδε γεγενημένοι, ὥσπερ τελευταῖοι αὐτοὺς γενέσθαι, καὶ διαιωνίσαι τῇ πόλει· ἔδοξαν γὰρ τοῖς δι᾽ οὓς ἐγένοντο, κόσμου μὲν τὸν παρ᾽ αὐτοῖς δημοσίου, καὶ μέγιστος μεγίστοις ἀνὴρ ἀνδράσι, νῦν γε πᾶσιν ἔτι δοκεῖ, τῷ δὲ νόμους ἀγαθοὶ ἐπὶ πολλοῖς τε καὶ καλοῖς ἐφθασόν, πολῖται πάντα ἀγαθοὶ τεθεικέναι.
Σόλωνος παραινέσεις καὶ τὰ βουλεύματα, ἃ κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κἂν Νέστωρ, κἂν Ὀδυσσεύς, κ.HandleFunc(
ὅτι ἐπὶ τῶν Ἑυλόντα ἐφητίπωτο, τούτως συγκαθησομένος· ἐώς γάρ τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῳ σοφίαν, καὶ πρὸς ἐφητεύονσαν.

[2ε] Ἐξεστι δὲ σοι καθαρώτερον γνώναι τὰ περὶ τῶν ἥρμον ἱστορικῶς, καὶ τὰς Ἡροδότου, Ἱούσιας. Ταυτὶ μὲν οὖν ἀρκούντως ἕμμεν ἔχει, ὡσκα καὶ σοφίαν μικρὸν ὑμνῆται, καὶ ἐξελέγχα τὸν πλοῦτον μηδὲν ἀλήθεις ὁντα, εἰ μὴ δὲ ἔτερον τι συνάγοιτο, καὶ δὲ ἐκεῖνο πάλιν σκορπίζομεν καὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις εἰκάτερον, οὐ διὰ θυμον, οὐδὲ ὑποενδυόμενo μὴ σώφρονα, ἀλλὰ ἐπεῖσον, δὲν ἔχειν ἀρκούντως ἡμῖν ἔχει, ὡσκα καὶ σοφίαν μικρὸν ὑμνῆσαι, καὶ ἐξελέγξα τὸν πλοῦτον μηδὲν ἀληθῶς ὁντα, εἰ μὴ δι᾽ ἄλλον τις ἀπαλλάττομαι λόγου.

[3α] Δεῖ δὲ που τῶν μεταγαγεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν Ξέρξου στρατιάν τὴν πολλὴν, τὴν φρίττειν παρασκευάσασαν δύναμιν, καὶ πάντα σείσασαν πέρατα τῇ φήμῃ τε καὶ τοῖς ἀπειλαῖς, ἵνα τοῖς διὸν ἐπενεχθέρεν πολλαχοῦ γῆς, ἔνθα μὴ ἦν ἀρετή, οἷα μὲν ἐδίδου θαρρεῖν τῷ συνειλοχότι ταύτῃ λαμπραῖς ἐλπίσιν, οἷα δὲ ἐπεῖτα παρέσχε μεταμέλειαν. Εἰκότως· ἐκ μὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς τῶν κατορθωμάτων, μεῖον παρέσχε τεκμαίρεσθαι τῶν ήδη γεγενημένων, ὅτι δὲ τῳ τῆς Τύχης, οὐκ ἀρετῆς ἦν, τοὺς κατὰ ταύτης ἑπαφομένους, οὐκ ἀλήθεις γε μάντες ἀπέφηνε. Πῶς

89. ἐξ ὀνύχων] cf. Dialogi XIX 239.19 — 89-90. ἐξ ὀνύχων-ὕφασμα] cf. Dialogi V 56.36; Oratio funebris 109.6


γὰρ ἂν κρατήσειν ἀρετῆς Τύχη, ἢν μὴ τὸ θείον ὀργίζεται καὶ περιορίζεται; Καὶ τούτῳ γέγονεν δὴ, ὡς ἦτον μὲν καὶ τοῖς προλαβοῦσιν κατορθώμασι τῶν Ἑλλήνων μάλιστα δὲ κατάδηλον γέγονεν, ἣνικα δὴ τοῖς Αθηναίοις προσέβαλεν ἢ Περσικὴ δύναμις, δριμὺς μὲν οὐδὲν καθάπερ λέων ἐλάφος, ἐπειτ' ἔχρητο τοῖς ποσίν ὡς ἀπὸ λεόντων φυγοῦσα, δίκην ἐλάφον τῶν μηδ' ὑλακὴν ἐνεγκεῖν δυναμένων. Ἐμαθε δὴ τότε καλῶς, ἐξ ὧν ἡ βασιλεύς, ὡς οὐ τὸ πλῆθος, ἀλλ' ἀρετὴ τὸ νικῶν ἐστὶ πανταχῆ καὶ οὐ χρὴ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς κἂν ὦσιν εὐαρίθμητοι, τοὺς πολλοὺς παραθεῖναι εἰ δὲ καὶ πάντων ἐξῆς κρατήσαιιν τῶν τερμάτων, καὶ γὰρ τοι καὶ πενία μετ' ἀρετῆς, τιμιωτέρα τῶν πλούτῳ κομώντων ἄνευ...
έσεθαι γὰρ τῶν αὐτοχτόνων, εἰ καὶ τίνος αὐτῇ πολέμου δεήσει πρὸς συστηνασσόν τῶν ἀπάντων, ἢ καὶ πρὸς πάντας ἐξῆς ἀνθρώπους, αὕτη τοῖνυν ἢ πλῆθος ἢ βαρβαρικὴ, ἢ λογισμὸς ἢπας ἢπητη, ὀλίγων πάνυ σφαιριώτων ἢπητεῖ τα, πολλῶν γε μέντις γερών ἢπων Αθηναίων οὕτω παῖδες, οὕς πολλῶν τε καὶ λαμπρῶν
tetwuchkotas stefanion tois palai chrónous kai tois éggus, óplion empeiría kai
gennaísteta, ou'd' o theukaiota polémos toutous ekeínion esterén pellió mén ou'n
kaláioi kai meióiis tôn fthasántion, autós ge toutous ev poion ekósmpse kefhalh'n
edei gar autôn kalóllai kai meiéw twn pró autóu geganímenon 7 apántw, éautù te
kai tòis àmisstúsasa paréchein áthla katallhla. Aidoúmenon mén filotimian tìn
álthi, gennaísteta laumpruvoménnan épéiakw, aidoúmenon de anărreas úperfría,
sowphrosuní méno megísti kekosoménnan, phronísethai dé omía to kat' autínu
épideitegménnan, kai aei sín tò dikaiw poireuménnan, áma ge tais ùp' autàs àrestai
to gár dé meirkwteron, ãnagkaicas pásias periplifikhíseta tò gennikatérw kai
synggevei.

135 [3c] Oútò dé prós pásan àrestén ãkontes Athnainoi, étimw mén eirímnuv prò tò
plêthra pámppollla ãhês kerdhána, tòus dé úbriwontas kai pleunéistas anërwrapów, ou'
mónon tís osfeteras autón ãhês kai tòw patríw ãwów, allá kai pانتos ãmwnwnto
tou 'Ellhnikou. Kai tauta dé píkountes diastetelékasi, meta pósis oíei metwýstos,
pórrotthen méno ãégmenes ek tòn proýgonon metá pásas prophyrgaménê pleonéías

140 tòw ágathów, kattowúsí dé dikaiów, óstere teis khpówrois khprótois ekýwonois, khprótois

129-132, filotimian-árestaí] cf. Præcepta 316C — 130-132, gennaístetai ... anărreas ... sowphrosuní ... phronísethai ... sín tò dikaiw] cf. Oratio funebris 121.18

130-132, gennaístetai ... anărreas ... sowphrosuní ... phronísethai ... sín tò dikaiw] cf. Platonem, Politétia 429a-445d; Aristotelem, Politía 1323a.28, al.


suññepís(á) post cor. V — 136-137, ou mónon] ou ãhê oûtes V — 137, ãhôlon LPG — 139, pórorðhíen post cor. (ex pórothn et x. ex sup. lin.) V: próorðhíen PG — 139-140, tòw agathów pleonéías per ssr. ð', α' al. man.V — 140, óstere BIMVL

321
ζηλοῦσι γονέας· ᾑδεσάν γὰρ· ὡς ταυτησὶ μὴ παροῦσῃ, οὐδ' ἀπαν τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς χρῆμα οἶνον τε συνοίσειν ἀνθρώπω. Περὶ ἤς γε μετριότητος, ἐροῦμεν τι προοίμωματον κατὰ σχολήν μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ, συναισμοφένου τοῦ κρείττονος. Νῦν δὲ τῶν προκειμένων ἐχώμεθα. Ἐδει μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ πάντας ἑλεληθῆκας βασιλέας τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς περιόν, αὐτὸν γοῦν βασιλέα μὴ λεληθέναι, μηδὲ νομίζεις πλῆθείς κρατῆσαι, προαιρομένους πολέμῳ πίπτειν, πρὸ τοῦ δεδέχθαι τι τῶν αἰσχρῶν· ἐδειξε γάρ ὁ χρόνος τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦδε, πολλῷ γε κρείττον ἀσπαζομένους τὸ μεθ’ ὅπλων ἀγωνιζόμενους τεθνάναι υπὲρ τῶν σφίσι διαφερόντων, ἢ τινὲς ἀσπαζόμεναι πανηγύρεοι, τρυφῇ καὶ ὠάθυμῳ προσπηλομένοι.

Ὁ δὲ τῇ τῶν εὐτυχημάτων κραιπάλῃ, καὶ τῇ μανίᾳ τῶν αὐτῷ ἐροῦμεν τί προὐργιαίτερον κατὰ σχολὴν μετὰ τοῦ καιροῦ, συναιρομένου τοῦ κρείττονος. Νῦν δὲ τῶν προκειμένων ἐχώμεθα. Ἐδεί, μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ πάντας βαρβάρους τὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς περιόν, αὐτὸν γοῦν βασιλέα μὴ λεληθέναι, μηδὲ νομίζειν πλήθει κρατήσειν, προαιρομένους πολέμῳ πίπτειν, πρὸ τοῦ δεδέχθαι τι τῶν αἰσχρῶν· ἐδειξε γάρ ὁ χρόνος τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦδε, πολλῷ γε κρείττον ἀσπαζομένους τὸ μεθ’ ὅπλων ἀγωνιζόμενους τεθνάναι υπὲρ τῶν σφίσι διαφερόντων, ἢ τινὲς ἀσπαζόμεναι πανηγύρεοι, τρυφῇ καὶ ὠάθυμῳ προσπηλομένοι.
μεμαθηκότας, ὀρχεισθαί τε καὶ ἀκκίζεσθαι, γυναικώδεις καὶ τὴν φύσιν, καὶ τὴν γνώμην, καὶ τὴν παύειν ὑπάρχοντας· ὁ σοβαρός καὶ ὑπερνεφών καὶ γεγαυμωμένος, ὁ τοσαῦτα ἐμβατεύον εἰς τὰ Ἐλλήνων πράγματα, ὡσα καὶ τὴν τῶνδε γῆν τοῖς Σατράπαις διανέμειν εἰς ἀρχήν, ὡσπερ ἀν εἰ ταύτην πάλαι προεἰλήφην, ὡσπον οἶκοθέν σπουδὴ ἐπὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα γῆν ἔτρεχεν, ὀνειροπολήσας τὰς ἐκεί νίκας, καὶ τα ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἐγερθήσομενα τούτω τρόπαια, τοσοῦτον ἄνω ποταμῶν παλινδρομών ἀνεδείκνυτο, οὐδὲ γούν αὐτὴν τὴν πρώτην οἶος τε γενόμενος ὑπενεγκείν προσβολῆν ὡσπόν γὰρ δὴ τὴν ταχύτητην ἐπ’ ἐκείνους ἤμαυνε, τοσοῦνδε τούτως αἰσχρῶς διέφευγεν, σῶμα καὶ γνώμην καὶ ψυχὴν πρὸς τούναντιν ἀπαν τραπεῖς, καὶ πᾶσιν ἡν ἀφόρητος τῇ σπουδῇ. Ἐπεθύμησε γῆς Περσίδος, ἐπεθύμησε τοῦ ταύτης κατοικοῦ, κατὰ τὸν Ὀμήρου 1 πλανῶμενον Ἐδούσεξ ἄν ἢ τι χεῖρον καὶ κατοικοῦν, φίλον αὐτῷ δέξασθαι, εἰ μόνον εἰ ὑπὸν οἶκοθέν. Ὡς ἐγὼ γούμαι τὸν ἄνδρα τούτων ὥστε μεταβάλειν, ὡστε χαίρειν ἐανανταστεφάνους τε καὶ θρίαμβον, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῆς νίκης πᾶσαν λαμπρότητα, μηδὲν θαυμάζειν ἔτερον, πλὴν φυγῆς ἀνδραπόδοις σῶκ ἀν πρεπούσῃς. Ὁθεν οὐδ’ ἀπεικός, εἰ τις ἐδοκεῖ ἐκείνουν ἰδεῖν τὰς ἐν τῇ γυναικωνίτι κόρας, στέργειν κατὰ κόρης, τυφθήσεσθαι παρ’ αὐτῶν ἔνεκα τῆς γυναικώδους αὐτοῦ φυγῆς· τῷ γάρ αὐτίκα τετράφθαι τὴν φυγήν καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς, καὶ τοσοῦτον ὀρροδεῖν ὅσον ἐνόμιζε φοβεῖν, ἤγειτο ὁ μὴ δεῖν ποδῶν πρὸς τὴν σικάδε φυγῆν, μηδ’ ἵππων αἰσχροντον ἐλάφους ἀρετή δρόμου, ἀλλά πτερον ἀτεχνως, καὶ τούτων ὀρινόν ἐκείνων, τῶν ἐπὶ κοιφότητι τῶν ἀλλων

165. ἐχθρῶν-τρόπαια[ cf. Oratia gratulatoria 224.11 — ἄνω ποταμῶν] Ad Alexium lugup 349.14, 364.5; De matrimonio 171; Dialogi i 13.34, III 34.10, IV 48.40, VI 73.31, VII 89.39; Epistulae 6.51; 19.24; 57.8; Oratio funebris 199.28

166. σοβαρός-ὑπερνεφών[ cf. Agapetus, Capitula Admonitatoria 71.1; Nicephorum Blemmydem, Regia status 96.1 — 166. ἄνω ποταμῶν] Euripides, Medea 410; Demosthenes, De falsa legislatio 287 (433); Zenobius, CparG II, II.56; Apostolius, CparG II, II.92 — 170-171. ἐπεθύμησε-Οδυσσεὰ[ cf. Homerum, Odyssey 1.57

πλεονεκτούντων.

[3e] Ἡγάστα ἂν ὁ γεννάδας, σχεδία διαβήναι τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον, ὡς οὐκ ἐνόν αὐτῷ νήχεσθαι. Οὕτως ἀφ’ ἐτέρου πρὸς ἐτέρου, μᾶλλον δὲ πρὸς τούναντίων μετέβαλεν· οὕτως νέων συνόδῳ πάνω πυκνῷ, καὶ ἀκριβείς γε τούτων προσπαθομηγής τὴν τοσαυτὴν καὶ τοιαύτην θάλασσαν γεφυρώσας, οὐκ ἀξίων τὴν ἐξ Ἀσίας πρὸς τὴν Εὐρώπην διαβαίνω, τὴν αὐτὴν αὐτῷ γενέσθαι τοῖς πρὸ αὐτοῦ, μικροπρέπεστερον τε καὶ ταπεινότερον τῶν ἄργυρων ἡμῶν καὶ σκευασίων διεδίδασκεν, ἀμεταστρεπτὶ τὸν δρόμον· ἢπεῖν ἂν οἶμαι διωλοθήσας τῶν οὐκέτι διωκόντων αὐτὸν τὰς χεῖρας, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων, κοῦφη τις ἢ ἐκεῖνῳ φροντίς· αὐτὸ γε τούτο διώκων ἢν, τὸ ἀποδιδάσκειν, τὸ φεύγειν, τὸ τὴν πρὸς ἐωρεῖαν, σύντονον τε καὶ ἄληκτον αὐτῷ γέγενσθαι· τὸ μὴ καθεύδειν, τὸ μὴ ἱσταθαι· τὴν πρὶν γάρ φιλὴν Εὐρώπην — ἢ πᾶς οἶεις· τὸτε μεμίσχεσκ. Ὅλον οἶκοι τὸν νῦν εἶχε θέων· «οίκαδ» ἐβοί, οἴκαδε τὸν δρόμον εἰργάζετο, τείναν τῷ χείρε τοῖς πρόσω, καὶ μονονοῦ κονδυλίζων τουτοῦ κοιμῆθη βωσῶμεν. Ὡς αὐτοῦς καὶ τῇ βοή καθάπερ μάστιγι προστελαμών, τῷ μηδενὶ τῶν πάντων ἀρκείσθαι, ὡς δήν αὑροφαντὸν διασφεδνήσαι πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα οὗτον δεὸν τούτοις θαυμάζειν τῆς ἐπιμελείας τοῦ δρόμου, ὅτι δὴ καὶ τούτοις εἴχον κατόπιν τῶν οὕτως ἐπειγόμενον. Ὁ δὲ καὶ τούναντίων σαφῶς ἐποίει, καὶ διαφερόντως αὐτοὺς ἐμέμφετο τῇ γάρ αὐτῶν ταχυτητα, βραδυτήτα πως ἀπέφαινεν ἢ πρὸς τὴν φυγήν προθυμίᾳ·
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182-186. ἡγάστα· διαβήναι] cf. Herodotum, Historiae VII 6-57, VIII 115-118


324
ποίων — οὐ γὰρ ἀνέκτον γε πάντως αὐτοίς, μὴ τὸν αὐτὸν ἀνύειν ὅρομον τῷ βασιλεῖ, τῷ ἵσῳ τοῦτῳ φῶς παρατραπείσα, καὶ παντελῶς τὴν πρώτην σὺν αὐτῷ σφάς αὐτοὺς ἐκδεδοκόσι τῇ φυγῇ—, τοὺς δ’ οὐκ ἄρκοιντας ἀκολουθεῖν, τούτους δ’ ἐς κόρακας ἀποτέμπων, ἄξιον καὶ οἱ προσήκον πράττειν ὁ γενναῖος ἐνόμιζεν· ὁδὸς γὰρ ἦν τῆς φυγῆς, ὅλας τὰς ἤνικας ἐφέσι, ὥραν εἰς μόνον τὸν καιρὸν, καὶ μὴ πρὸς ἐτερον βλέπων. Ἀλλὰ μὴν αὐτὸ πεδίου, τὴν ὀρεινὴν, ἀντὶ δὲ φακαίων, τὴν λίθον γέμουσαν, ἀντὶ δὲ λείας ὀδοῦ, τὴν τραχείαν καὶ σκολιὰν ἡλαυνε, τὴν νύκτα μὲν ἡμέραν λογιζόμενος, αὐτὴν δὲ σκοτομίνην, ἀκτίνα μᾶλα ἀστράτουσαν. Καὶ ταῦτα, τίς ποτ’ ἀνδρῶν; Ὁ μεσημβρίας σταθεράς, αἰθρίας ὀσύς, πεδίου ὁμαλῶν τε καὶ λείαν, καὶ μηδὲν τι δυσχερές, σχολὴ καὶ βάδην ὑπὸ μεγαλοπρεπείας καὶ τύφου, μόλις πορευόμενος καὶ μὴν δείχναν φαγεῖν, ἢ τί τῶν ἐπάνωγκες πράττειν, ἐλαύνοντα γε σὺν τὸ κατεπείγον αὐτὸν ἐργαζέσθαι. Ὅτω τοις δειλία τὰς φρένας ὀσύς ποτ’ ἀπόλλω, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ περί τοῦ καλοῦ τε καὶ καθηκοντος ἐμελλεν· οὐτῳ πάντη λογισμον ἀποπτεκών τηλικῷ μὴν ὁπρὸς τῷ μηδόλως αἰσχύνεσθαι, οὐδ’ ὑπελογίζετο τῶν διψῶν οὐδὲν· οὐ πῶς, οὐ θερὰς, οὐκ ὀλισθῶν, οὐκ βοῦβορον, οὐκ σκόπελου, οὐ βοῦβορον, οὐκ λιμῶν, οὐκ ἀδείαν αὐτὴν πάντα ἑστὶ τῇ δυσχερῷ, πάντα πανήγυριν τὰ δεινά. Μηδὲν πλὴν ἄθηναν φοβερὸν, μηδὲν ψευδότον ἀνεν αὐτῶν· μόνοις τούτοις, πάντας δειν πρωτείων πάντως παρασχορείν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τοὺς τοῦτο πράττοντας, μηδαμῶς αἰσχύνεσθαι. Τί χρή πολλὰ λέγειν; Σεμνα μὲν πάντα τὰ ἀκοσμα, κέρδος δὲ ζημίαν πάναν ἐνόμιζεν,
ei σώσ ἐπαναστρέψειεν οἴκαδε. Οὐκον ήρυθρίασεν, ἐτέρῳ παντάπασιν ἐξ ἄλλου
πάντη φανόμενος, οὐδ' ἤγειτο χαλεπόν, εἰ ὅροφῳ χείρῳ πάσχουν ἐκείνων, ἃ μικρῷ
πρόσθεν ἤπειρει τοῖς ἁφ' ἐκείνῳ τοίς, ἐκείνῳ οὐδ' ἀποκολύτων γεγενημένης. Τῆς
οὕτως ἐς τὴν αὐτοῦ πρόσθεν ἐκείνοις, ἀνθρώπων, μηδενὸς
dedepoménou, οὐκ ἐκ βυθοῦ καταδύονται ως ἀφανισθῆναι τοίς τέλμασιν. Οὕτως δὲ
ἡμέρας οἴκαδε, οὔκον ἠρυθρίασεν, οὔτε πάντῃ φαίνεται, οὐδ' ἡγεῖτο χαλεπόν, εἰ ὁρῷτο χείρῳ πάσχων, ἃ μικρῷ
πρόσθεν ἠπείλει τοῖς ἀφ' ὧν ταῦτ' ἔπασχε. Καίτοι, τί ποτ' ἂν αἴσχιον εἴποις, τῆς
οὕτως ἐς ἄκρον μεταβολῆς, οὕτως ἀθρόον γεγενημένης; Γένος βατράχων, μηδενὸς
dedepoménou, οὐκ ἠρεμεῖ, μηδὲ τὸν διώκοντα βλέπων, ἢ σκιάν ὁρῶν ἐκείνου, ἢ φωνῆς ὅλως ἀκούων.
Ἰσώς γε παρεμυθεῖτο τὸν ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα πάσχοντα, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ προὔτρεπε πρὸς
tὴν ἀνυπέρβλητον τε καὶ ἀπαράβλητον ἐκτροπήν, τὸ τοὺς συναλαζονευομένους
αὐτῷ πρότερον, τὸ τε συμφεύγοντας ὁρᾶν, οὐδὲν ἐκείνου σχολαίτερον. Πάντων γὰρ
προὔργου γέγονεν αὐτοῖς ἡ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον ἐπάνοδος.

[4a] Ταύτης οὐκ ἂν ἔλλαξατο βασιλεύς, οὐδ' ὧν χωρὶς οὐκ ἂν ἠξίου τὸ πρὶν βιῶναι. Ταύτης πάντα δεύτερα ἦγε, καὶ βασιλείαν αὐτήν, κλῆρον δικαιότατον, ἐκ πατρὸς
αὐτῷ κατελθοῦσαν μεγίστην οὖσαν. Τοιαῦτα ἀλήθειαν πάντων γὰρ προὔργου γέγονεν αὐτοῖς ἡ πρὸς τὸν οἶκον ἐπάνοδος. Πείθει δειλίᾳ τρώσασα νοῦν, ἀκράτῳ φόβῳ κατασχεθέντα, ῥᾳδίως ἀνταλλάττεσθαι
megάλων καὶ πάνυ λαμπρῶν, φαύλων καὶ γελοίων πράγματα, καὶ τά δυσχερείας μεστὰ

226. πώποτε-ἀνθρώπων] Delucidatio imperatoris 123.29, 131.11; Dialogi XIX 236.9-10, XXIV 280.7; In Mariam
Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 343v.6; vid. Oratio III 259, VI 410

καὶ μισητέα, καὶ βδελικτά, ὡς τὰ τούτοις ἑναντία, σὺν εὐφροσύνῃ δέχεσθαι, πρὸς μόνην ἀποβλέποντα τὴν τοῦ λυποῦντος ἀπαλλαγήν. Τοῦτο παθὼν βασιλεύσ, βασιλείαν μὲν αὐτὴν παρὰ φαύλον θέμενος, τὸ προσκυνεῖσθαι μικρὸν ἡγούμενος, μικροῦ καὶ ὑπὸ πάντων ἐθνῶν, παρ' οúdeν τι λογιζόμενος, τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν ὑπ’ αὐτὸν μονονοῦ καὶ ἰσα Θεῶ θεραπεύσεσθαι, ἐσοφῶν τε ἀλογῆςας, καὶ πανηγύρειςας αἰς ἔχαμε, βασιλεία τε καὶ λοιπα, καὶ παραδείσους ἐκείνους περιδῶν, ἀ καὶ τοῦ παντός προετίμα· οἴμαι δὲ καὶ νήσουν ἐκείνων, ἀς τοῖς μάκαρον ἀπένειμαι οἱ τότε παραπαίοντες, ἀσφοδελῶν τε λειμώνων καὶ Ἡλυσίου πεδίου, καὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἀπάντων, τὴν ἰδιότου μορίαν ἐπήνει, καὶ στέργειν ἄτομος ἢ δουλεῖαν καὶ πάντα φέρειν, μόνον εἰ σῶζοιτο. Λίθων δὲ ἐκείνων τῶν παλλῶν τε καὶ καλῶν καὶ μεγάλων οἰς ἐκεῖσεμομοτε, καὶ πλατάνου τῆς χρυσῆς, καὶ δὴ καὶ τύφου παντός ἐπιληπθημένος, ἤσπαζέτο τε πενίαι καὶ προὑτίθει σχήματος μόνον, οὐκ ἀθανασίαν αὐτῷ παρέχοντος. Καὶ μὴν εἰκότως ἂν τὶς εἴποι κάκειν, ὅτι δὴ καὶ ταύτης ἐνόμιζεν ἤνικα παρὰ πάντων ἐκολακεύετο μεθέξειν διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν· ἔσεσθαι γὰρ αὐτὴν ἐκείνον, ἐπιδιδοῦσαν αἰτὶ πρὸς ᾽αλμείνων, ἐπιμελείαι τῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀμετῆς εἴνεκα, γέφυραν καὶ κλίμακα τῆς ἐπειδημένης ἀθανασίας, καὶ αὐτὴν γε πάλιν γέρας τῆς βασιλείας, μετὰ μικρὰν τὴν ἐνθάδε διατριβή, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐνή ἑπταντα ψυχὴν, τὴν γνώμην ἵσχειν ἀκίνητον. Ωστε τὴν μὲν βασιλείαν εὐθύς, καὶ ὅτιπερ σεμονὸν αὐτὴν ἀποφαίνοι χρῆμα, ἔξωσε τῆς μνήμης τὰ ταύτης δὲ ἱδεά καὶ τερπνά, ἀπερ αν’ οἴμαι τούτων προτιθέναι καὶ ἀμβροσίας καὶ νέκταρος, τῶν λογισμῶν διεώσαστο τελέως, καὶ
αμωσγέτως, οὐδὲ ἐμέμνιστο τῆς πρὸ τῆς ἐμπλήκτου παραφοράς.

[4b] Ὡς ἔγογκι ὸμα, εἰ τις αὐτῷ περὶ βασιλείας καὶ τῶν ἐκείνης ἁγαθῶν την καύτα διαλέγοιτο, κἂν ἐπαχθέστατος δόξαι, καὶ που καὶ ἐπιτίμησιν τινα παρ’ αὐτοῦ δέξασθαι. Καίτοι καὶ ἐδέχετο καὶ ἡσπάζετο, καὶ συχνοὶ ἱμεῖβετο δώροις, ὅποτε παντελῶς ἀσωφρόνιστος ἦν, εἰ τινες ἐκεῖνον ἐτίμησαν, ἵπτο τοὺς ἐν οὐρανῶ πολιτευμένους, καὶ τοις αὐτοθῇ χάριτος ἀπολαύσωσιν. ΑΛΛ’ οὐχ ὁ πρῶτος Σέρξης ἦν, μετεννεγμένος ἐκ τῶν προτέρων πρὸς τάναντία, ὁ ταῦτα τότε διαπραττόμενος, ὁ πολὺς, ὁ μέγας, ὁ θρασύς, ὁ υπερόπτης, ὁ υβριστής, ὁ κινδυνεύων ἡς γε ἐφαίνετο, καὶ πρὸς τὸ θείον ἣ ἡ κεχρησθαί τισιν ἀμίλλασις, ἀλλ’ ἐτερῶς τις τοῦ πάλαι Σέρξου, καὶ πάντη ἐξόντι τὸ γὰρ δὴ πρὸς γην κύπειν μεταμελεῖα τὴν κεφαλὴν βαφυνόμενον, οὐκ ἦν τῆς προτέρας υπεροφίας, ἢ γε σύντροφος ἐκείνος, καὶ ἣ χωρίς, οὐδὲ ἐν ἀκαρεί τοῦ χρόνου τοῦτον ἦν θεάθησαι. Ὁστε τὴν ὕλην ὁ αὐτὸς Σέρξης μένον —οὐ γὰρ ἐνήν τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλεῖν— τὸ εἰδὸς ἀκρος ἀμείψας, πάντας γε παρείχε θαυμάζει, οὐ διόσφιδον, οὐδὲ μετριάζων —πόθεν—. Τούπαντισιν οὐκ ὃν, ὡς μή γεγευμένος φιλοσοφίας μετατάξειν διδασκοῦσιν —ταύτης γὰρ οὕτως ἔρημος ὁν— οὕτως ἀκόσμος ἐχρήσατο ἰ ζε μεταβολή, ὡς ἀποκρύψαι ταύτη πολύποδας, καὶ λήρων ἀπαντᾶς ἀποφήναι τοὺς χαμαλέοντας· καὶ γὰρ ὅ ἡρως οὕτοις, μᾶλλον δὲ ὃ καὶ τούτους αὐτοὺς παρὼν τοὺς ἡρωᾶς ἡς γε ὑπατείς, καὶ Ἰοῦ τότε τοῦ πένητος, ταπεινότερον ἐφρόνησεν. Οὕτως ἦ εἰ ἀιθέρος πρὸς ἀβυσσον ἀποπέπτωκε·

κατενεγκών μὲν τὴν ὀφρυν, κατενεγκών δὲ ὅγκον καὶ φρόνημα, ὥς μὲν τὴν


272. ἐν ἀκαιε-χρόνου Aristophanes, Plutus 244 — 278. Ἰοῦ-πένητος cf. Homerum, Odyssea 18.6, 25

λεοντήν, ὤψας ὑπὲρβεθεῖναν, καὶ ὅλως οὕτω μεταβαλὼν ἀκριβῶς πρὸς ἔτερον ἐξ ἐτέρου, ὡς μισήσαι τὸν αὐτὸν βιον, καὶ δίκαιος παρ' αὐτὸς αὐτὸν τρόπον δὴ τινα λαμβάνειν τῆς προτέρας ἀπονοίας καὶ ματαιότητος, εἰ καὶ μὴ γνώμῃ καθαρά καὶ ἐθελουσῶ ταῦτ' ἐπράττεν.

285 [4c] Ὅν δὲ ἐν τῷ σχήματι, καὶ ποιῶν ἃ κἀγν ἠχύνετο δούλος, ἀλλόκοτον τι τέρας ἐφαίνετο· τιμᾶν γὰρ δὴ τὸ μέτρον ὡς δεὶ καὶ προσέχειν ἐαυτῷ μηδεπώστερο μεμαθηκός δὲ ἄνθρο, ἐξεύκειλεν μετατραπεῖς ἐξ ὑπερθανασίας καὶ ὄβρεως, εἰς ταπεινότητα δούλους πρέπουσαν, ἀκραν ἐξ ἀκρας σὺν ἀκοισμία. Οὕτως ἀπαν βάρβαρων καὶ ἀπαίδουν, εἰ μὲν εὐπραγεί, τοις ταπεινοτέροις ἀφορήτω, εἰ δ' ἀσθενήσειν αὐτῷ τὸ γε παρέχον ὑφρίειν, ὅραδος ὀισεὶ καὶ δούλων σκώμματα. Καὶ δὴ καὶ οὕτως βασελείας, τουτοῦτος μὲν τὸ γένος ὁν, καὶ τῆς ἃς ἀληθῶς παιδείας ἀμέτοχος, μόνης τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ σώζεσθαι γεγονώς, τὰ τοιαύτα χαλεπά νενοσήκει, καὶ ἐναντιώσειν ἀκρας ἐνεπεπτώκει· ὡς ὅκ ϖ χ ἦν βιωτόν, εἰ μὴ δωροφοίτο καὶ προσκυνοῖτο παρὰ τε τῶν ἀστυγειτῶν καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν πάντων, τῶν τε πέρεξ τῆς Περσίδος καὶ τῶν ποροφώτων καθημένων ἕθνων, οὕτους αὐτὸς δὴ γυμνοθείς τῷ πολέμῳ, πάσης ὡς εἰπεῖν τῆς ὑποίας, ἐπειδ' ἕκοι ἀπεβάλετο ὑπὲρ τα ἐκεῖνα τὰ λαμητρα, καὶ βασιλικὴν σκεύην ἀπασαν, ὡς εἶναι ταὐτή κουφώτερος καὶ οἷον δύνασθαι φέρεσθαι ἐφ' ἵππων, μάλα κομιδὴ ταλαπωρησάντων συντόνω ἰδρύμων ἡ ποῦ γε, καὶ οἷεύκικτος ὑπήνεγκεν ἑυχερώς παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν, εἰς οὓς οὐδ' ἄν ἠμισον συχνός ὅραν, βεβλημένος ύπό τοῦ τύφου. Οὕτω πας αὐτῷ τὰ πρὶν εἰς

286. τιμῶν-μέτρον] cf. Dialogi VII 80.16; Epistulae 27.10; In Mariam Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 337v.17-18; Oratio IV 331, V 159-160, 218, VI 54, VII 310-311, al. — 291. αὐτῆς παιδείας] cf. De processione 22.8, 224.9; Oratio gratulatoria 228.12-13; Oratio IV 319 — 293. οὐξ-βιωτόν] De processionis 295.15; Oratio funebris 235.33; Praecepta 361B; cf. Ad Alexium lagopus 357.12, 369.8; Dialogi XI 141.3; XLI 251.19; Epistulae 31.27; In dormitionem Deiparae 561.19; Praecepta 345A; Oratio IV 188 — 298-299, συντόνω δρύμων] Praecepta 380A; cf. Dialogi XII 153.33; Epistulae 45.156

293. οὐξ-βιωτόν] Euripides, Ion 670; Aristophanes Plutus 197, 969; Demosthenes, In Midiam 131 (557), al.

τούναντίον ἀντέστραται· τὸ γὰρ περὶ τῇ ψυχῇ δεδιέναι τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὅτι ἂν ἐνθυμηθῇ τις ἀηδές, καὶ λυπεῖν, καὶ δάκνειν δυνάμενον.

[4d] Ἐπειθὲν ἐφίεσθαι ψιλὸν ὀφθῆναι τοῖς οἴκοι μένουσι, καὶ τῷ πάρα τὸ εἰκᾶς εὐπρός τῶν πώποτε γεγενημένων αὐτῷ λαφύρων, μηδὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἀνθρώποι δεδιέναι τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὅτι ἂν ἐνθυμηθῇ τις ἀηδές, καὶ λυπεῖν, καὶ δάκνειν δυνάμενον.

305 ἕπειθὲν ἐφίεσθαι ψιλὸν ὀφθῆναι τοῖς οἴκοι μένουσι, καὶ τῷ πάρα τὸ εἰκᾶς εὐπρός τῶν πώποτε γεγενημένων αὐτῷ λαφύρων, μηδὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἀνθρώποι δεδιέναι τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὅτι ἂν ἐνθυμηθῇ τις ἀηδές, καὶ λυπεῖν, καὶ δάκνειν δυνάμενον.

310 Πλὴθεὶ δὲ τοσαύτης δυνάμεως ἢττος γένοιτο, Τελχίνι δαίμονι φθονερῷ κατακεχρημένοι, ὥσπερ τις Γίγας, ἢ Ἡρακλῆς, ἢ ἐξ Ὀλύμπου κατιὼν ἐπιεικῶς τῶν ἄλλων καταφρονῶν, ὥσπερ τις Τελχίνι ἀντέστραται. Ἐπειθὲν ἐφίεσθαι ψιλὸν ὀφθῆναι τοῖς οἴκοι μένουσι, καὶ τῷ πάρα τὸ εἰκᾶς εὐπρός τῶν πώποτε γεγενημένων αὐτῷ λαφύρων, μηδὲ ἐκεῖνοι ἀνθρώποι δεδιέναι τοιοῦτον ἄνθρωπον ὅτι ἂν ἐνθυμηθῇ τις ἀηδές, καὶ λυπεῖν, καὶ δάκνειν δυνάμενον.
[5] Ωρα δ’ ἀν εἴη καί τοῦ Γύγου κατόρθωμα παραγαγόντας εἰς μέσουν, βασάνῳ τοῦτο προσαγαγεῖν. Οὕτως τοῖνον ποιήμα μὲν ἣν τὴν τύχην, Αὐδᾶν δὲ τῷ αννος γέγονε, στροφὴ σφενδόνης ὡς γέ φασιν, εἰ τέως γε τὸν μῦθον μὴ ἀτίμασαμεν. Οὐκοῦν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ σφενδόνῃ μηχανήν, θεωμάσαμεν ἀν δικαίως, εἰ δοῦ ἰς τὸν ἀνδρό̂ν μῦθον ὡς ἀληθεστατον δέξασθαι τὸν δὲ δὴ περάννατα καὶ κατωθικότα τῇ μηχανῇ, οὐκ ἀν ποτε δίκαια ποιοῦντες, ευδαιμόνα νομίσαμεν καὶ ζηλωτόν τινα εἶναι. Διατι; Ὅτι τὸ τῆς μηχανῆς ἀποτέλεσμα οὐ κυρίως ἀγαθῶν, οὐδὲ εὐδαιμόν, οὐδὲ ἐξηλωτὸν γε νοῦν ἔχουσιν· ὃ γὰρ οὐκ ἐξ ἀρετῆς, οὐδὲ ἀγαθὸν κυρίως, εἰ δὴ καὶ τὰ ἢφιχα πάντα τοῦτο κεκράξονται. Κάν ὁ ταύτης ἁμοιος ἀρξας, εἰ τι καὶ 325

Γαδείρων ἐστὶν ἐπέκειναι, ἀθροίσα μὲν πάντα πλοῦτου, ἀθροίσα δὲ ἀνδρόποδα, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοῦ βίου τερτια, εἶτα ἐαυτῷ πάντα δω, κατορθισθαί χοῦνόν ὅπωσον βουλεῖ, λήρος τοῖς μετέχουσιν ἀρετῆς· τὸ γὰρ πεπαγμένον ἡ μετεχόμενοι, εἰ σὺν ἀρετῇ καλῶν, εἰ δὲ μὴ τουναντίον. Ο Γύγης δὲ οὐκ ἀρετῇ τετυράνηκε. Καὶ τούτῳ δῆλον αὐτὸθεν· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν οὐδέν κοινὸν ἀρετῇ πρὸς τυραννιᾶ, οὐδ’ ἐνι 330

τυραννεύοντας γενώμη τῶν τυραννουμένων τοῦτο ποιέν. Πώς; Ὅτι βιαζόμενος ἀρχεῖ καὶ ἱνα βια, ἀπεστὶ γνώμη. Ωςτε σωμάτων κεκράτηκῃ μηχανὴ τινὶ καὶ τέχνῃ, ἐθνος ἑνὸς καὶ μὴ βουλομένου, καὶ τούτων οὐ γενναίων ὑπέρ τους γείτονας, εἰ μὴ τις εἰποι καὶ τουναντίον—τοῦτο δὲ οὔτε σεμνὸν, οὔτε μόνιμον, τῶν τυραννηθέντων ἀκόντων εἰς τοῦτ’ ἐλθόντων. Ανευ δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων, εἰ ἀκριβῶς θεωρήσεις τις, 335

ἀνθρώπων Γύγης οὐ βεβαισθεύκεν·—εἰτερ ἡ γνώμη ἤ μὲν ζυγῆς, κυρίως δὲ ἀνθρώπως
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30, Γαδείρων ἐπέκειναι] cf. Pindarum, Nomen, 9,69; Gregorium Nazianzenum, Funeris Oratio in Basilii Magni, XXIV 1,3; Constantinum Manassem, Chronicum, 6620; Apostolium, CprG II, XVI,19, al. — 334-335. οὐ γάρ—ποιεῖν] cf. Aristotelem, Politica 1276a,9-11, 1279b,5-6, 1310b,11-20; Isocratem, Ad Demonicum 36, al.

ἡ ψυχή, ῥο τυραννὸς ὄν, τοσοῦτον ἀπέσχε τοῦ τάς τῶν τυραννηθέντων
gνώμας κερδάναι, ὅσον καὶ ἀκόλουθον ἦν παρά πάντων αὐτὸν μισεῖσθαι, καὶ
ἐπιβουλεύεσθαι πάντα τρόπον. Ταῦτα δὴ τὰ τυραννίδος ἁγαθά, καὶ τήδε
συμφωνοῦμεν τε καὶ συνεπιδιδόντα τὸν πάντα χρόνον, καὶ τελευτῶντα πρὸς
αισχυτὸν τι, συνάμα ταύτῃ διαλυόμενα.

[6a] Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ εἰ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ λόγου καθαρῶς ἐπέτρεπεν ἱστορεῖν, εἶχον ἔλεγξαι
tοῖς διηγήμασι πολλῷ γε βέλτιον ἡν' νῦν, ὡς ὃ τε χρυσίῳ πάνυ θαρρῶν, ὃ τε σιδήρῳ
μέγα φρονῶν καὶ λεῶν ἀθροίσματι, ὃ τε μηχαναῖς ἐλπίζων, καὶ τουτοίσι ψιλοῖς
εἰρίχοντο, καὶ εἰ τὶς τούτοις ἐφάμιλλος μὴ προσούσης ἄρετής, ἐξηπάτηται. Ἐπεὶ δὲ

νῦν οὐ προηγούμενον τοῦθ' ἡμῖν, ἀλλ’ ἀποδεικνύναι πιεύσαθαι ταῖς παραθέσεσιν,
ὡς ἄρχουσιν ἐθέλουσι ἀγαθοῖς εἶναι, πάντων ἁμεῖνον ἂν εἴη σοφία πρὸς τὸ
περαίνειν ἃ βούλοιντο, ἡγήμεθα μάλα συμβαίνειν τῷ προκειμένῳ σκοπῷ; μήτε

αὐτοῖς ἱστορίαις, μήτοτε πρὸς πέλαγος διηγήματος ἀπείρων τὸ προκείμενον ἡμῖν
ἐμπεσόν, ναυαγήσῃ.

[6b] Καὶ δὴ καλῶς μοι δοκεῖ συμπεπεράνθαι τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς ἡμῖν βούλημα· ὡς γάρ τι
παράδειγμα λαβόντες ἤδη τοὺς ἄνδρας τούτους, ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς ἁπάντων, καὶ
τὰς ἱστορίας τὰς περὶ τούτων ἱκανῶς ἀφοσιωσάμενοι, πᾶσάν τε περιεργίαν

παρέντες, κατὰ καιρὸν ἀπαλλαττόμεθα, ὡς ἐμέ γε περὶ τούτου νομίσαι. Καὶ γάρ τοι


μεμιμήμεθα ὀρθῶς διαπραξάμενοι τοὺς ἀργυρογνώμονας, οίς γε ἐδοξε ἑκ τοῦ μέρους τὸ πᾶν εἰδέναι. Καὶ οἷς χρήναι ἵ ἀγαπᾶν τῇ μεθοδῷ ταύτῃ ἐς γᾶρ οἱ τοῖς ὀλοίς ἐδοξαν πολὺ τοὺς ἄλλους παρενεγκείν, τούτοις ἀτεχνῶς τὸ λαμπρὸν τετελεύτηκε πρὸς οὐδὲν ἰερὸν —τοιὸ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τοῦναντιόν, τῷ μὴ γνησίῳς, 

μηδὲ καλῶς τὸ τῆς ἁρετῆς μετιέναι χρήμα—, σχολὴ γ’ ἀν ἄλλοι τῶν ἐλασσόνων ἀληθῶς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ εἰς οἰασθήνυς μηχανῆς σφίσι γε αὐτοῖς δουλοῦσθαι μὴ βουλομένους ἀνθρώπους.

[7a] Ὡστε δεῖ τῶν ἱστοριῶν ἀφὲμενο, ἅτε καὶ παρὸν σοι ταύτας εἰδέναι παρὰ τῶν προὔργου τοῦτο πεποιηκότων, πειραθῆναι τουτοισὶ τοῖς ἀνδράσι παραβαλεῖν ἐκεῖνο δὲ τὸν ἄριστον ἄνδρα, ὃν ἐξ ὑποθέσεως ὑπεθέμεθα κατ' ἀρχὰς εὐθύς, λέγω δὴ τοιοῦτος βασιλεὺς ἢ ὅλως ἄρχων τινῶν, ἐρρωμένως ἔχων τὴν ψυχήν, καὶ ὡς χρὴ φιλῶν ὧν ἄρχει, θέλων τε αὐτοὺς ὁρᾶν ἐν οἷς ἂν γένοιτο τὴν γνώμην ἀμείνους, καὶ ζητῶν ἅπαντα τρόπον δι' ὧν εὖ πείσονται παρ' αὐτοῦ· ἔπειτα καὶ τῇ δυνάμει τῶν λόγων πείθων αὐτούς, μήτ' ἀλαζονείας τὸ σύνολον, μήτ' εἰρωνείας ἁπτόμενος —ἀμφότεροι γὰρ κακῶ—, ὡς εἴη μὲν οἷός ἐστιν ἐθέλει δ' ὅπερ ἐθέλει· ὁ δὴ τοιοῦτος, οὐδένα λήσει τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὡς ὦν γε τυγχάνει τὰ πρὸς αὐτούς, καὶ πατήρ, καὶ οἰκονόμος, καὶ φίλος, καὶ κυβερνήτης, καὶ ποιμήν, καὶ ἰατρός, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἔσται μὲν αὐτοῖς σωτήρ, ἔσται δὲ παντοίως ὠφέλιμος, ἐν ἅπασι καιροῖς τε καὶ περιστάσεσι, γινώσκων μὲν τὸ πᾶσι συνοίσον βέλτιον πάντων ἐκείνων, θέλων δὲ αὖ τοῦτο σφίσιν, ἢ σφίσιν αὐτοῖς.
ἐκεῖνοι, πρὸς δὲ τὸ περάνα τὸ δόξαν βέλτιον εἶναι, ἐπιστήμην κεκτημένος, σπουδῇ καὶ εὐφυίᾳ συνελεγμένην, ἢν οὐ ρᾴδιως ύπερβαλεὶ, οὐδὲ τῷ τῶν ἄπαντων ὁμοίῳ, λέγω δὴ τῶν ὑπὸ χείρα, ἀκριβεστάτα συγκροτηθεῖσα πρὸς ἐν τι χρήμα: ὡςθ᾽ ύποληπτέον ἢμίν ίΛ αν εἰς ὑπέρ αναγκαίων νοῦν ἔχουσι. Τι τούτο;

385 [7b] ὡς οὐ πάλιν τελευτήσῃ πεπεισμένους τοὺς ἀρχομένους περὶ τοῦ ἄρχοντος, ὅτι καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ, καὶ τὰ κατ᾽ αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοῦτο, οὐδὲν ἄν εἰς τὸ προσπευτάμενον μεθέξειν αὐτοὺς, πολλάν τε καὶ μεγίστων ἁγαθῶν. Ταυτὶ δὲ λέγω περὶ χρηστῶν τε καὶ ἐπιεικεστέρων ἀνθρώπων· τὸν γὰρ Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους, οὐδὲ τὸν Σωτῆρος ἀρετῆ, οὐρανοὺς ἐκάλυψε κατὰ τὸν Προφήτην, ὄφθησιν.

390 ὡς ἄρα τὰ ἀλήθε τοὺς ἀρχομένους περὶ τοῦ ἀρχοντος, ὅτι καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς ἐστι, καὶ τὰ κατὰ αὐτὸν καὶ τὰ κατὰ τοῦτο, οὐδὲν ἄν εἴη τὸ προπρεβλαμένον. ἐπειδὴ δὲ λέγω περὶ χρηστῶν τε καὶ ἐπιεικεστέρων ἀνθρώπων· τὸν γὰρ Ἰούδαν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους, οὐδὲ τὸ Σωτῆρος ἀρετῆ, ὠφέλησεν.

[7c] Καὶ σκοπείτως τις ὡς ὁ ἐν τῇ πόλει κακῶς πράξαι τὸ πρῶτον, καὶ καταντήσει πρὸς τί χρηστότερον πέρας. Καὶ τοῦτο λέγω, οὐ μαντευόμενος, οὐδὲ διαφώνομεν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ Τειρεσίου τοῦ παλιοῦ, τὸ δὲ Δαβὶδ βασιλέως. Ἐμοὶ δὲ θάτερον μὴ γένοιτο, οὐ γὰρ Θεῷ φίλον, θάτερον δὲ μέγιστον μέν, οὐ δεικνύναι χρῆ, ὡς ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς· δῆλον γάρ. Οὐ μὴν θάτερον οὐδὲ τεκμαιρόμεθα τοῦτο, ὡς ὅτι εἶναι ἐξηπατῆσαι· πολλὰ γὰρ τοιαῦτα συμβαίνει τοῖς διϊσχυριζομένοις περὶ τοῦ πράγματος ἀπὸ τεκμηρίων, οὐκ ἀλλ' ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη λογισμῶν τοῦτο λέγομεν.
παντάπασιν ἀγαθὸν εὑρεθῆναι· τὸ μέντοι δεύτερον, μικρὸν καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἂν εἴπομεν. Ἀγαθὸ ὑποκοιμηθοῦν τῷ ἀρχοντὶ, ἀγαθοὺς ὄντας πείθει· τὸ μέντοι δεύτερον, μικρὸν καὶ ἀναγκαῖον ἂν εἴπομεν. Ὑποκοιμηθοῦν τῷ ἀρχοντὶ, ἀγαθοὺς ὄντας πείθει· εἰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ ταῖς ἀπολαύσεις· εἰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ ταῖς ἀπολαύσεις· εἰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ ταῖς ἀπολαύσεις· εἰ γὰρ πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ ταῖς ἀπολαύσεις,
οὐκ ἄξιος, τὸ εὐπραγεῖν οὐκ ἀφέλιμον—, αἰτίασθαι δὲ τούς λόγους οὐχ ἦτον, ἢ τὴν ἀρετήν· οίδε γὰρ οἱ πειθόντες ἀπολαύειν τῶν ἐκείνης ἀγαθῶν, ὡς εἰγε τούτο μὴ βουλοῦντο, οἴδ' ἀφελήσονται παρ' αὐτῆς, μὴ μετασχόντες τὰν αὐτῆς ἀγαθῶν πῶς γάρ ἀκοντες;

425 [7d] Ὡστε δὲ τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀρχοντα, καὶ ἀγαθῶν τινῶν προϊστάμενον, καὶ τὰ περὶ λόγους ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, ἰν' ἔχοι πειθέιν αὐτούς, ἔφ' οίς ἂν βέλτιον εἴπη πράττειν, ἵνα μὴ χρηστὸς μὲν εἰπ' χρηστῶν δὲ ἀρχή. ἦν ἀφερευόμενας δ' ὅμως ἔχουν αὐτούς, καὶ μὴ εἰκονίς οίς γνοίη πρὸς τὴν σφετέραν αὐτῶν ἄφθοναν, οὐδέν εἰκείνους ὀνήση. Ἐπεὶ καὶ παιδές ἱστρόν, ἐστον δὲ τὴν τέχνην ἀγαθοί, εἰ μή καὶ δεξίοι τινες εἰεν, καὶ εἰδεὶν ὅπως πεῖσον τὰ παρ' ἐκείνων δέχεσθαι χάρμακα, οὐδένα δὲ τῶν πάντων ἀφελήσουν· δεὶ γὰρ οίμα, προηγεῖσθαι δόξης μὲν χρηστῆς πειθῶ, ταυτῆς δὲ δύναμιν λόγων, εἰ μέλλει τις ἀπὸ τινὸς ἀναγκαίως ἀφελήσθαι, δυναμένου τούτο δρᾶσί, καὶ προσέτει θέλοντος· ἄσθ' οἱ λόγοι, καὶ πειθοῦς, καὶ τοῦ δοξάζειν ἀγάθα, ἀγαθὸν υπήκοον περὶ ἀγαθὸν ἀρχόντων, αἱτοι σαφῶς ἀναπέφανται. Καὶ εἶεν ἂν χρυσίου, καὶ πολυχειρίας, καὶ μηχανῆς, ἀπὸ δὴ πρὸς σύγκροι έμιν τὸ κατ' ἀρχάς παρετέθη, ἁμείνους πρὸς ἀφέλειαν ἀρχούσι, καὶ ὁ νῦν ἔμιν διαξωγαφαύμενος ἄρχων, εἰς τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ πλεονεκτήματα τὰς ἀγαθὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχων ἀνησυχώμενας, κρείττων που πάντως ἀν εἴη τῶν ἐπὶ ταῖς ἔξω δυνάμεσιν ἐπερειδομένων, ὅπερ εἴ ἀρχής ἔμιν εὕρηται.

430 [8] Καλὸν σοι τοῖνυν, ὃ φιλτατε, ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελοῦμενον, μὴρ' ὅπωσιτούν ἀμελεῖν


435. παιδές ἰστρῶν] Lucianus, Quomodo historia conscribenda sit 7.22; cf. Cydonium, Epistulæ 265.98

τῶν λόγων, ὅταν τε ἀπλῶς χρηστῶν καὶ πρὸς τὰ χρηστὰ συνεργοῦντων, ὡς οὐδ’ ἂν ἐν οἷμαι τῶν πάντων. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ εἴπερ σοι τὰ εἰρημένα καλῶς γε ἔχειν ἰσως δοκεῖ, ἔχου τῶν καλῶν δεδομένων, μη’ ἀτιμάζειν ἀπερ θαυμάζεις· ὥς γὰρ ἐπαινῶν τι χρήμα, εἰτ’ ἀμελῶς πρὸς αὐτὸ διακείμενος, καὶ μὴ θηρεύειν ἐθέλων τούτο σπουδῆς τε πάση καὶ παντὶ τρόπῳ, γραφὴν ἀνοίας ἀποίσεται, καὶ ὁφλήσει γέλωτα παντὶ δικαῖο
νοῦν ἔχουσιν.

445. ὁφλήσει γέλωτα] cf. Ad Alexium lagoup 356.14-15, 360.2; De insomniis 89.58; De processione 23.11; Dialogi VII 80.25-26, XV 139.28, XVII 221.3, XXIV 284.11; Epistulae 28.14; 45.240; Oratio funebris 97.2, 266.29

445. ὁφλήσει γέλωτα] cf. Euripidem, Medea 404; Aristophanem, Nubes 1035; Plato, Phaedo 117a, Alcibiades I 121b, Politeia 451a, 506d; Cydonium, Epistulae 213.13-14, 242.12-13, 264.69, 298.6, 384.16, 436.10, al.

Δόγχος Β’

Ότι τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν πασί φιλούμενον ἐστὶ φυσικὸς, ὅ δὲ κακὸς καὶ ἐαυτῷ μισητὸς.

Φιλοῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὸ κακὸν ἔστιν ὅτε, ἀγαθὸν κάκεινο νομίζοντες.

Καὶ περὶ εὐδαιμονίας καὶ ἀρετῆς.

[1a] Εγὼ νομίζω, καὶ πάντας οἴμαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ συνθέσθαι, μὴ μόνον τὸν σπουδαῖον καὶ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν φαύλον καὶ πονηρὸν ἀνθρώπων, μισοσύγχρονον καὶ φιλόκαλον εἶναι αὐτή τῇ φύσει κἂν τὰς εἰς τοσοῦτον κακίας ἔξενεξῆ, ὡς μὴ περαιτέρω προβῆναι δύνασθαι, ὅτε δὴ πρὸς τοῦχοντος αὐτῆς ἀφυγμένος, καὶ ἐαυτὸν τῆς πονηρίας βδελύττεσθαι τὸν τοιοῦτον. Μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀλόγοις καὶ ἀναισθήτοις ἄγαθήν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, εὖ ἀγαθοῦ τὸ εἶναι λαβοῦσαν. Καὶ τούτο ἐστὶ τὸ θυμολύμενον, ὡς ἀρα πάντα ἐφίεται τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τε καὶ συγγενοῦς. Εἰ δ’ ἄν τούτό γε, ἢ πάντων μὲν ἀρχὴ καὶ ὑπεράρχιος φύσες, πάντων δὲ δημιουργός, καὶ συνέχουσα, καὶ εὐοικοῦσα δύναμις, ὅλη τινὶ γνησιότητος καὶ ὑπεροχῆς καὶ ἀγαθωυνής, πρὸς ἐαυτὴν ἐπιστημονή τὸ πᾶν ἐθέλει γὰρ τῷ πεφικότα, κινοῦμεν τὸ δημιουργηθὲν τε καὶ ποιηθὲν, μὴ μακρὰν εὐφυίσκεσθαι τοῦ Δημιουργοῦ τε καὶ Ποιητοῦ τὸ γὰρ οἴκενον, ἐπὶ τὴν προστὴν αἰτίαν ἀνατρέχειν φιλεῖ, καὶ τοῦ προοοομένου καὶ συνεχοντος μηδαμῶς ἀφίστασθαι, τὸ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ μὴ δυνάμενον περιείμεναι. Καὶ τὸ ἠτόν εἶναι παρὰ τῷ κρείττονι, βαθμοῦ καὶ τάξεως μείζονος τεῦξεσθαι προσδοκῶν, καὶ κοινωνεῖν τοῦ θειότερον τὸ ὑλικότερον, ὅπως ἄν τῇ μετουσίᾳ λαμπρύνοντο καὶ ὅλως τὸ τοῖς ὀλίος ὑποδεέστερον, οἶκοθεν ἐπετίγεται τρέχειν παρὰ τὸ προσθενεῖαι καὶ τελέσαι δυνάμενον, ὡς γὰρ δὴ ταῖς πρὸς Θεόν ἐγγύστερε τε καὶ οἰκεώστε, τὸ περεύσει καὶ σωζόσθαι γίνεται, οἷς καὶ μετέχειν ἀγαθοῦ, τὸν ἰσον τρόπον, ταῖς διαστάσεις καὶ τοῖς χωρισμοῖς, τὸ διεφθάρθαι καὶ μηκέτ’ εἶναι.

[1b] Τὸ δὲ αἰτίον, θαυμαστὴ τις ἀρμονίᾳ τῶν αἰτιῶν τε καὶ γεγονότων, πρὸς τὸν


8-9. δημιουργοῦ-δύναμις καὶ 11-12. Ποιητοῦ cf. Joannem Damascenum, Expositio fidai 43.10-12
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αἵτινοι καὶ πεποιηκότα ἀρρητος μὲν τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς κοινωνίας καὶ τῇ τῆς ἀγαθωσύνης ἐκχύσει, ἀρρητος δὲ διὰ τὸν συνδήσαντα καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἐνώσεως, ὅλιγον ἄριστο γενωσκομένη, τοῦ πηλοῦ προοισταμένων τῶν θεωροῦντι Πνεύματι, φανερομένη δὲ καθαρώτερον, ἀπαθανατίσθει διὰ τῆς Ἀναστάσεως. Φυλητόν γοῦν εἶναι φημί, οὐ μόνον γε τὸ ἀπειρὸν ἀγαθὸν, καὶ τὴν ἀστραπὴν τοῦ κάλλους, καὶ τῆς ἁρμακίας, καὶ τῆς χάριτος, ἤτε ἐκεῖνῳ ξυμπεφυκέναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάν ὧ πέτεστι καλὸν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν, διʼ αὐτὸ τὸ ὑπεράγαθον καὶ ὑπέρκαλον, καὶ τὸ πρὸς αὐτὸ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῖν συγγενεῖς διὰ γὰρ τὴν κοινὴν ἀναφορὰν τε καὶ σχέσιν, ὡς ἂν τις εἰποί, τὴν πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον καὶ ὑπερτέλειον ἀγαθὸν, πάντα ἀγαθῶνται καὶ φιλεῖται, ἔχοντα πρὸς ἀλλήλα σχετικῶς τὰ γὰρ ἀπλῷ τινι συγγενῆ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἂν εἴη τὸ δὲ φυλείσθαι τὰ συγγενεῖς, οὐδὲ λόγου δεῖται δεικνύναι. Πάντας μὲν οὖν τοὺς ἀγαθούς καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγαθῷ δημιουργηθέντας εἰς ἑνάν τείνειν σκοπόν —ἤδη γὰρ ἐπάνειμι — τὸ φιλεῖν τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ μισεῖν τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον, καὶ διώκειν τὸ καλὸν, καὶ τὸ ἀλλᾶς ἔχον φεύγειν.  

Συμβαίνει δὲ καὶ τοῦτον πολλάκις καὶ γὰρ φιλοῦμεν τὸ κακὸν ἐστιν ὡς καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ὡσπερ φεύγομεν. Οὐχ ὅτι τοις τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἑγκνωκός ὁ ἀγαθὸν, ή ἀγαθὸν, ἀποστρέφεται, ή φυλεῖ τὸ πονηρὸν ἢ πονηρὸν τοιοῦτον αὐτὸ ἐπιστάμενος —πόθεν; Πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεὶ —, ἀλλʼ ὅτι τὸ κακὸν, ἀγαθὸν ἤγειται' ἡ φύσις γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀποδείκνυται ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ τε καὶ ἀγαθὴ, καὶ τὸ συγγενεῖς ἔτούσα, καὶ τάλλοσιν ἄπαν φεύγουσα. Πλὴν καὶ οὕτως ἔχουσης τῆς ἄλθειας, ἰδοὺ ἄν τοῖς πολλοῖς  

31. οὐδὲ-δεικνύναι Dialogi VII 78.34, X 124.25, XV 195.20; Delucidatio imperatoris 124.12, 131.32 — 31-32. Πάντας-δημιουργηθέντας In Mariam Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 337v.20; cf. Oratio VI 56 — 35. Συμβαίνει-πολλάκις vid. Oratio IV 113  

τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ χείρω τῶν κρειττόνων προαιρουμένους, καὶ ὡς αὐτὸ τοῦτον εἰς τὰ κακά μεταβαλλόντας, ἢ εἰς ἑκείνους τὰς κακῶς γεγενήσθαι τῶν ὄπως ἁληθῶς ἀγαθῶν, ἀλλὰ πάντως τοῦτα καθαρῶς δύνασθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐπειδὴ καὶ ταυτης τῆς μέθης ἀπαλλαγεῖν, προσκόπτειν αὐθέν ἐκείνως εἰσήλθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἁθλίους εὐδαιμόνας· σφάλλονται μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὴν ψυχήν, συνάδει δὲ κάκεαν τὸν σκοπός, τῶν ὃς ἁληθῶς ποιοῦμεν τὰς ἀποφάσεις.

περὶ τὴν τοῦ καλοῦ τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ κρίσιν. [2b] Παρὰ γὰρ τοῖς καλουμένοις κηφῆσι, λέγω δὲ τοῖς τὴν ῥαστώνην τιθεμένοις εὐδαιμονίαν, οἵδε τῶν πάντων κρατοῦντις καὶ πάντων ἁληθῶς ἁριστοὶ, οἷς ἀν τοὺς ὅλους εἰς ἡλίκιον εἰμίφθητος, εὑμαρῶς τὰ τῇ δεῖ πάντα ἐφάρμοσθαι, καὶ τοὺς Ἀλλοὺς τοὺς στοιχείους εὑροῖν τοὺς δυνατοὺς εὐεργετεῖν, ἀπὸ τὸ πλουτεῖν τὸ δύνασθαι κεκτημένου.

57-58. μήμοιο-παρασίτοι] cf. Dialogi ΙΙΧ 293.1, XI 141.23-24


Αὐτὸι μὲν οὖν αἱ κρίσεις τῶν φαντοτέρων περί τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον, καὶ οὕτω ἵνα τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ὁρίζονται. Ἐξελεινὸς δὲ ἀνθρώπος καὶ ταλανίζεσθαι δίκαιος, τοῦτοι τοῖς μοχθηρίᾳ συζώσαν οὕτος δοκεῖ, ὡς ἰμπάτειν ἔξεσθιν, οἷς ἀν ἤρθείες διὰ παντὸς, ἢ πενίας οὐ συγχωροῦσης, ἢ τῆς ἡβείς παρακαμασάσης, ἢ τινος τῶν θύραθεν συμπτωμάτων ἀπείροντος. Παρὰ δὲ τοὺς ἡμιφαύλους, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, καὶ τινὸς φιλοτιμίας μετέχοι, τῶν τῇ τρυφῇ καὶ ὀθωμαῖα προσηλωμένου, μακαρίωτερος δήποτε φαίνεται, ο ὁμοίως ἀνδραπόδων καὶ οἰκετῶν πληθής, καὶ τὴν ἀλλήν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀφθονίαν, καὶ πολὺ ἁγορίζων ἀφειδῶς ἀναλυσάμενον, τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀνώτερως γνώμονος, καὶ τῇ δυνάμει τοιοῦτοι κατορχοῦμενος, κατὰ οὐν αὐτῶ χωροῦντων τῶν βουλευμάτων, διέ ἤγνισαούν φοράν τε καὶ Τύχην, ἢ τὸ μὴ γενναίον ἴσος ἔχειν ἀντίπαλον. Οὐ γάρ ἐκ τῆς γνώμης τῶν εὑροσύνων, καὶ τοῦ γενναίου σφίσι φρονήματος, οὐδὲ ἐκ τῆς πολλῆς ἀνδρείας, καὶ τῆς τοσαύτης φρονήσεως, καὶ τῆς περὶ τὰ πρακτέα σπουδής τε καὶ γενναιότητος, καὶ συλλήβδην τῆς λοιπῆς ἀρετῆς· οὐκοὶ οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων καὶ τοῦ τρόπου, οὐδὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑλῆς τῶν ἀνὰ χεῖρας πραγμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐκ τοῦ τῶν ἀνταγωνισθῆναι βασάνισειν, ὡς ἀρετής τε καὶ ἐπιστήμης, ἢ φαυλότητος καὶ ἀπαιδευσίας μετήχει· ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἐκβάσεως μόνης τοῦτοι τὰ πράγματα κρίνεται, τὴν ἀρετὴν μετροῦν τοῖς εὐπροσεθεισιν, ἄριστος δὲ διακύκλος τῶν πραγμάτων ἐφαπτομένους.  

Καὶ οὐτω τὴν σαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀσύγκριτον ἀποφήνῃ, ὡς εἶναι μὲν τῆς Νέστορος καὶ Σολομώντος φρονιμωτέραν, εἶναι δὲ τῆς Ἀχιλλέως καὶ Σαμψών άνδρειοτέραν,
γέμουσά τε ἀρετῶν, ὡς φοβησαί μὲν ἐναντίον, εὐφράναι δὲ ὕπερμαστα γενναῖοι, ἢ τὰ πρακτέα διενεργῇς, ὡς φοβῆσαι τὸν Ἐυρίπον τόνδε βιόν, καὶ γέγονε τίς πολλάκις κρείττων ἀνδρός σπουδαίοι καὶ νοῦς ἔχοντος, μηδ' ἀνδριάσιν ἀπεξεσμένοις εἰς εἶδος ἀνδρὸς γενναίου, «ὁ εὐήθης, ὁ δειλός, ὁ μιαρός», ἀκήκοας παρὰ τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων. Οἳ δή τινα θαυμάζοντες κατορθοῦντα, καὶ τῆς γενναιότητος ἀγάμενοι σφόδρα, καὶ ἐγκώμια μακρὰ κατεργάζονται, ὡς αὐτὸν ἐκμιμηθοῦντος, ὡς ἀνθρώπων ὁποῖον ἠκούσατε, ἀνθρώπων τῆς ὑπ' εὐφράναι ἡγούμενος, ὡς ἀληθῶς τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων. Πολλὰ δ' ἂν γένοιτο τοιαῦτα περὶ τὸν Ἐυρίπον τόνδε βιόν, καὶ γέγονε τις πολλάκις κρείττων ἀνδρὸς σπουδαίοι καὶ νοῦς ἔχοντος, μηδ' ἀνδριάσιν ἀπεξεσμένοις εἰς εἶδος ἀνδρὸς γενναίου, "ὁ εὐήθης, ὁ δειλός, ὁ μιαρός" ἀκήκοας παρὰ τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶν τοιούτων ἀνθρώπων. Οἳ δή τινα θαυμάζοντες κατορθοῦντα, καὶ τῆς γενναιότητος ἀγάμενοι σφόδρα, καὶ ἐγκώμια μακρὰ κατ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργοῦντες, ὡς αὐτὸν ἐκμιμηθοῦντος, ὡς αὐτὸν ἐκμιμηθοῦντος, ὡς αὐτὸν ἐκμιμηθοῦντος.
I μὴ γενναίοι, μηδὲ II γενναίως τάγαθον ὅποι ἔχει διακρίνειν οἶοι τε ὠντες, τῷ μή περαιτέρῳ τῆς ὁφέως τήν σφῶν διάνοιαν δικαιούσθαι δύνασθαι καὶ τῷ γε ἀληθεύσεσθαι φάναι, μηδὲ γοῦν αὐτὰ τὰ φαινόμενα θεωροῦντες ἐγκέστερον τε καὶ καθαρώτερον.

Oἱ δ' ἄγαθοι καὶ νουνεχέστεροι τῶν ἄνδρων τῷ ὅλῳ τε καὶ τῷ παντὶ, τῇ προαιρέσει καὶ τῇ παιδείᾳ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας λογίζονται τό γὰρ εὐφορεῖν τε καὶ μή, οὐ προηγουμένη φροντίς πρὸς τὴν ἀληθῶς εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτοῖς νομίζεται, ἐπειδή καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς εὐφοίας, κακία μᾶλλον ἢ καλοκαγαθία καρποῦται. Ὅς ὁ εὐδαιμών διὰ τὴν ψυχὴν τούτ' ἀν εἶ, ἢ δὲ ψυχὴ διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐν τῷ κατ' αὐτὴν μένει ἢ ἐπανέρχεται, ἢ δ' ἀρετή τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως. Καθάπερ οὖν ὁ βουλόμενος κακός εἶναι, ἀναγκαίως γίνεται, αὐτῷ γὰρ τούτῳ τῷ θέλειν εὐθὺς γίνεται, ὡς ἐν τῷ ἔφεξης λόγῳ ὑπῆρξεται καθαρώτερον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἄγαθος βουλόμενος εἶναι, τῷ γὰρ ἀληθῶς θέλειν, ἐπεται καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν, οὐκ ἐσθ' ὅπως οὐ γενήσεται.

Ως τε εἴτεν ἄν δείησαι, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, περὶ ζωῆς τε καὶ ἀρετῆς γνώμην δοῦναι τοὺς ἄγαθοὺς ἄνδρας, ὡς ἐδει μὴ δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν γενέσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ὅπως ἐς τετέθην ἀρετής. Οὐ δὲ ἄγαθὸς βουλόμενος εἶναι, πάσαις ἀνάγκαις γενήσεται, κἂν οὐκ εὐμενοὺς πειρᾶται τῆς Τύχης προοικασμένης οἱ πανταχῇ, καὶ τοῖς ἐγχειρήσασθε τὸ γὰρ ἄγαθον, οὐ τὴν πάντων. Τύχης, οὐδὲ τοῖς συμπτώμασι δὴ καυσόν καὶ τῶν τοιούτων καρπῶς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἀρετής τε καὶ αὐτεξουσίοτητος, ἡ γενέσθαι εἰργόν τι, τῶν πάντων οὐδὲν.
ἐστὶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἦν ταύτη προαίρεσις, οὐδὲ αὐτεξούσιον, ὅσα γε εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν φέρει, οὖντος γε τοῦ καλύπτοντος.

125 τῶν φευκτῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ· λυτήσηται γάρ δυνάμενοι καὶ δακεῖν τοὺς συμπεπληγμένους τοῦ τῷ βίῳ, οὐ τὸ γε σεμινότερον, ἀφορμαί εὑκλεῖαν φέρουσαν. Δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ εὐκλείαν λέγω τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρου, τὴν Κύρου, τὴν τῶν τιοῦτων, ἂν οὐκ ἐν λήθῃ γέγονε τοῦνομα, πάλαι τῶν σωμάτων λυθέντων· ἐκεῖνη γὰρ ἡ δόξα, ἡ διαφέρεσα μέχρι δεύορα, καρπός τις ἡ ἀγανακτικά, καὶ πῶνον, καὶ πολλοῦ φρονίματος, ἐφ’ οίς ἐχρῆν δεικνύναι τὸν ἄνδρα, μίτης φιλοσώματον οὖντα, μίτης χρήσασθαί ἐπτομέμενον, μίτης ἠδοναῖς κεχρήντα, μίτης μὴν αὐτὸ τὸ ἦν εὐδοξίας προτιθέντα. Ταύτα δὲ κλάδου τῆς ἁρετῆς, ἢ τοὺς μετασχούσαν αὐτῆς γνηρίως, εἰκάσως ἄν τηρήσει τῶν ιδρύσαν τοὺς καρποὺς ἀθανάτους· αὐτῇ γε πρὸς ὑστὸν οὐσία τοιαύτῃ. γρήγαρ ἄθανατον.

130 [3d] Ἀνδράσει τοιούτων ἁγαθοῖς, οῖς γε ἡ ἐπιθυμία τὸ ἦν εὖ, προσοούσης γε σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτοῖς καλῶς περάνω δυναμένην, εὐχερῶς τὸ συγγενές καὶ τὸ μὴ τοιοῦτον γνωρίζεται, τοῖς δὲ μὴ μετέχουσαν ἁγαθοῦ, καὶ ἡ τούτῳ γνώσις οὐκ εὑρίσκεται. Οθὲν ὃν αὐτοὶ μακαρίζουσιν, ἀθλιον ἐκεῖνοι ἤγονται, καί ἐξηλόσιν ἐκεῖνοι, φεύγουσιν οὖρ. Εἰεν πολλῶν δὲ ὥθησαι ἄξιος τοῦτοις φαίνεται ἐκεῖνος μάλιστα πάντων, ὃ μὴν ἂν ἁγαθὸς αὐτός, καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς λυμαινόμενος, καὶ δι’ ἐντελέχειαν πράξεων μοχθηρῶν, μίτης ἠθελῶν χρηστοῦς γενέσθαι, μίτης δυνάμενος ἀμείψα την ἦν, πρὸς τι τῶν ἐπαινοῦμένων τε καὶ καλῶν. Οὕτως κομιδή


132. αὐτῇ-ἀθανάτου] cf. Joannem Chrysostomum, In Genesim (Hom. 23), PG 53, 197.4; Pseudo-Basilius, Capitolia Admonitoria 1.11

κακία σύντροφος ὁν, παρά μὲν τῶν ἔλεεται —λέγω δὴ τῶν οὐκ ἐλέους ἄξιων, ἀλλ’ ἐγκομίου—, παρὰ δὲ τῶν μισεῖται, τῶν μισητέα διαπραττομένων, καὶ μισοῦντον ἕαυτος, εἰ καὶ παράδοξον εἰπεῖν· ὁ γὰρ καθάπαξ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος, πρὸς τὸ τόις εἰδοῖσιν αὐτῶν μισεῖσθαι καὶ διαβάλεσθαι, καὶ ἕαυτῷ μισητός ἔτοι τρόπον δὴ τινα, μισήσαντι τῷ συνειδότῃ τὴν βεβηληρίαν. Απας γὰρ ἄνθρωπος, τὸ πονηρὸν ὡς ἀλλότριον —ἡ γὰρ κακία τίθητε—, οὐ δύναται μὴ μισεῖν, ἄστερ καὶ τὴν ἀρετήν, ἐπειδὴ αὐτῶν καλώς καταμάθῃ ἀγαθόν, καὶ οἱ γνήσιοι, οὐ δύναται μὴ φιλεῖν. Ὁ τοῖνυν μοχθηρία συζών, ἀτόπως ἀγαν διάκειται, ταῖς γνώμαις δίχα τεμνόμενος, καὶ κινδυνεύει τὸ κατ᾿ αὐτῶν, αἰνίγματι έσκέναινα ϕιλεῖ τε γὰρ ἀμα αὐτῶν, τῷ μὴ τῆν φύσιν ἀρνητασθαί δύνασθαι, καὶ τρόπόν έτερον μισεῖ, διὰ τὴν φαύλην προαιρεῖσιν, καὶ ζωὴν μεταμέλειν ἐκεῖνω παρεχομένην, ἐλκει δηγνεκας. Τὸ γὰρ μὴ κατὰ καρφὸν χάριν, λυπεῖν ἄναγκη μετέπειτα, λήξαντι γὰρ ἀκολοουθεῖ τουναντίον, κατὰ Πλάτωνα. Καὶ τοῦ ἴδεος τὸ λυπηρόν διαφέρεστερον, ἐκεῖνο μὲν γὰρ τῷ βῷ τοῦτο συντελευτά, ἢν ἐπὶ μήκιστον ἠλθεῖ χρόνον, τὸ δὲ λυποῦν, συμπαραμένει τῇ ψυχῇ.

Οὕτως ἀσύμφορον τὸ κακόν, λέγω δὴ τὸ τοῖς κακοῖς ἡμᾶς αὐτῶς ἐκδιδόναι· εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἔμαυτῶν ἐκδοθην τοῖς οὐκ ὄνησοντος, οὐκ ὁ ἐκεῖνα δύναι βλάπτειν.

[4a] Ο μέντοι χρηστός ἄνθρωπος, φιλεῖ μὲν καθαρῶς αὐτῶν, τῆς περὶ τὰ πράγματα γνώμης, ἥδομενος δὲ διατελεῖ ἡρωνῆν σύν τῷ καλῶ, τοῖς τῆς εὐθύτητος τρόποις· οὐ διαφερεῖ τοὺς λογισμοὺς, ὃσπερ ὁ φαύλος ἐκεῖνος, ἀλλ’ ἐστιν ὁ αὐτὸς αἰε, καὶ ἕαυτῷ, καὶ τοῖς εἰδοὶς σύμφωνος ὅν, οἷς γὰρ θαυμάζουσι τοῦτον, τὴν δόξαν αὐτῷ


151-152. τὸ γὰρ μὴ-τοῦναντιόν] cf. Platonom, Phaedo 60b-c

πιστοῦνται. Καὶ μὴν ὁ πάντα ἄγαθὸς, φθόνοιν μὲν ἀνώτερος ἐστὶν, μίσους δὲ ἐκτὸς ἐστι, καὶ οἰονον ἀπέχθειαν παρ’ οὐδέσι κέκτηται τῶν σωφρονοῦντων ἄνθρωπων, ἀλλ’ ἔχει πάντας ἐξής ἐκείνους, καὶ βουλομένους καὶ εὐχομένους αὐτῷ τὰ κάλλιστα τε καὶ τιμώτατα, διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς τελειότητα, ἢ τε τοῦτο γίγνεται κόσμος, καὶ ὄψ’ ὡς τὸ ἱππὸν αὐτὴ λαμβάνει. Καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον καὶ ὑπερφυὲς φιλοῦμενος ἐστιν οὕτως. 1165  

Πάντας, ἀλλ’ ἔχει πάντας ἑξῆς ἐκείνους, καὶ βουλομένους καὶ εὐχομένους αὐτῷ τὰ κάλλιστα τε καὶ τιμώτατα, διὰ τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς τελειότητα, ἢ τε τοῦτο γίγνεται κόσμος, καὶ ὄψ’ ὡς τὸ ἱππὸν αὐτὴ λαμβάνει. Καὶ τὸ δὴ μέγιστον καὶ ὑπερφυὲς φιλοῦμενος ἐστιν οὕτως. 1165  

ὃς ἐκατοστὸν· καθάπερ γὰρ ὁ πονηρὸς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἑαυτῷ μισητός ἔστι διὰ τὴν κακίαν, τουτονὶ τὸν τρόπον, ὁ ἄγαθὸς καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν φαύλων φιλεῖται, φανεῖς ἐκείνος οἰός ἐστιν. Ἀδύνατον δὲ κρυβῆναι πόλιν, ἐπάν οὖρος κειμένην. Ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν οὐκ ἀνεπίδεικτον μένειν· αὐτὴν τε οἶμαι τιμῶν, καὶ τὸν αὐτὴς τρόφιμον, καὶ πρὸς ἔτι παρακαλῶν εἰς τὸ ἄγαθον ἅπαντας· ἀναγκάζει γὰρ πάντα τρόπον, ἵν’ ἐμπλήσῃ δαιτυμόνων αὐτῷ τὸν οἶκον, ὡς μηδένα στερηθῆναι τῆς καλῆς θοίνης.
εἰκόνα. Τούτο δὲ ἐστὶ κυρίως ἢ ἀρετὴ, τὸ διενεργοῦμενον ἀγαθὸν κατὰ τε γνώσιν, 
καὶ πρόθεσιν, καὶ ἔξεν καὶ ἐνάρετος ἄνηγ, ὁ τὴν ἄρετὴν νομίζον πάντων ἀριστον 
εἶναι, καὶ φιλῶν τὸ ἀριστον, καὶ ποιῶν ὁ γε φιλεῖ, καὶ ἱδέως τούτο πράττων. Οὕτως 
εὐδαίμων ὡς ἀληθῶς, οὕτως ζηλωτός εὑ φρονοῦσι τούτ' ἄνηγ, τούτο τελεώτης ἢ παρ' 
ἡμῖν, ἢ μακαρώσης τοῦ τῆς βίου, ὅτι σεμνὸν, ὅτι μέγα. Καὶ εἰ ταύτα ἀληθῆ, πῶς οὐ 
μέγα ἀνθρωπός, κατὰ τὴν Γραφήν, ἀγαθοὶς ἐργοὺς χαίρων; Καὶ τούναντίον φαύλον 
t, ὁ τὴν κακίαν ποιοῦμενον ἐαυτῷ βίον, ἢν μὲν ἀπεχθανόμενος καὶ βδελυκτός τοῖς 
eidόσιν αὐτὸν ἁπασιν, ἢν δὲ ἢ καὶ τοὺς λογισμοὺς κεκτημένον ἠσσεπὲ ελέγχους, καὶ 
tοις συνειδὸς δικαίον ἀδέκαστά τε καὶ ἀπαραίτητα.

185 [5] Ὄτε τοιοῦν ταῦτ' οὕτως ἔχει, δηλονότων πέφυκεν ἀπασιν ἀνθρωπός εἶναι μὲν 
μισοπόνηρος, εἶναι δὲ φιλόκαλος. Καὶ συμφώνως ἔχουσιν ἁπασιν, ὅτι καλὸν ἢ 
ἀρετὴ, καὶ κακὸν ἢ πονηρία. Περὶ δὲ τὰς κόσμους διαμαρτᾶνουσι, καὶ διαιροῦνται τοὺς 
βίους. Ἔνιοι ἤγουμένοι τὸ κακὸν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι, τῶς τὰς κακίας τὰς ἀρεταῖς 
παραπετηγέναι, καὶ τὸ παύλοτα μετέχειν ἄγαθον, ὡς θεόθεν υπηργημένα, 
ὅπερ ἁπασιν τοὺς πολλοὺς, καὶ τοὺς μὴ προσέχοντας θέλειν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν 
ἀπώλειαν ἔλκον, παραπετέιει τε καὶ λαβάται, καθάπερ ἷμιν εἰρηται κατ' ἀρχὰς εὐθὺς.


186. ἀγαθοῖς ἐργοῖς] cf. Eph. 2:10

οὕτως post cor. (ex οὕτως et scr. ω sup. lin.) V — 194. τῷ BMV: τῷ LPG — 196. τῷ eodd. — καταρχάς 
BMVLPG
Πέρι προαιρέσεως καὶ ἐκουσίου καὶ ὧτι οὐκ ἐκ φύσεως, οὔτε ἐξώθεν ὁ κακὸς, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ αἴτιος γίνεται.

[1a] Δέδεικται μὲν ὡς ἤγοιμαι τὸ προκείμενον ἡμῖν ἰκανῶς, καὶ πέρας ὁ λόγος εἰλήφη προσήκον αὐτῷ. ἔστι δὲ λοιπὸν φάναι, διατί, οἱ μὲν τοῦτο, οἱ δὲ ἐκεῖνο γενόμεθα, μᾶς τιμῆς καὶ φύσεως ἥξιμομένοι. Καὶ φαμέν, διὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν μόνην τῷ γὰρ ἀγαθῷ ἐθέλοντι εἶναι, καὶ τάγαθάν διώκοντες, οὐδὲν τί τῶν πάντων κάλυμα ἐσται, ὡς μὴ εἶναι ἀγαθῶς. ἀλλ’ οὐ δυκαίᾳ παραίτησις τῷ μὴ σπουδαίῳ γεγενημένῳ, ἐκὼν γάρ εἶναι οὐ γίνεται· εἰ γὰρ καὶ πολλὰ ἡμῖν ἐπιφύεται τῶν δεινῶν, ἄστερ αὐτόματα καὶ αὐτόμαλα, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲν αὐτῶν ἀν ἐτὶ οὕτω βιωτάτων καὶ τυραννικῶταν, ὡς καὶ τῆς θελήσεως ἡμῶν ἀρέξαν· εἰ γὰρ ἀν ταύτη γε ἐπὶ ποτὶ ἀνηρμημένον ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον, ὡς κἀκεῖνο τῷ τούτῳ ἡμῖν εὔρηται λόγω. Τῆς δὲ προαιρέσεως μὴ νοσούσης, μηδὲ δουλοθείσης καθάπατα, κἀκεῖνο τὸ πάθος κακόν τὸ σῶμα, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἐμποδών ἐσται, ὡστε ἀγαθοὶ εἶναι καὶ δηλοὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγάνων σκάμματα, νευκιρκότα πᾶν βιαον.

[1b] Συνίστηται δὲ μοι τὸν λόγον καὶ τοῦναντίον. Τὸ γὰρ ἀκουσίως καλὸν ποιεῖν, οὐ στεφάνων τοὺς ἐργαζομένους· τὸ τοῦναντίον ἀκουσίως, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲθέλειν ἀν ἐργάσηται τῶν κακῶν, ὡστε τὸ πάντων σῶμα, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἐμποδών ἐσται, ὡστε ἀγαθοὶ εἶναι καὶ δηλοὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγάνων σκάμματα, νευκιρκότα πᾶν βιαον.
Ο δὲ ἀγαθὸς ἄνηρ —ἐπειδή τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλειον, ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὁ Θεός, ἐν ὦ μηθὲν ἀτελές—, οὐ στήσει μόνῃ, οὐχ ἕξει.

25 Ὁ δὲ ἀγαθὸς ἀνήρ —ἐπειδὴ τὸ ἀγαθὸν τέλειον, ἀγαθὸς γὰρ ὁ Θεός, ἐν ὦ μηθὲν ἀτελές—, οὐ στήσεται μέχρι τοῦ θέλειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περαιτέρω προβήσεται, καὶ δειξεῖ τὸν άνδρα αὐτοῖς ἔργοις, συνιστῶν τοῖς πράγμασιν, ὡς τὸ θέλειν ἀληθές ἐν αὐτῷ,

μηδεμίαν κιβδηλότητα κεκτήσας· ἄλλως γάρ, ἂν δεξιεῖν ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ πάντως. "Δεῖ δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι σπουδάζοντας, μηδαμῶς πρὸς τἀγαθὸν ἐλλιπῶς ἔχειν, ἀλλ' εἶναι μὲν ἀκμάζουσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὁρμὴν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸ, καὶ προθυμίαν, καὶ βουλήσει, ἄλλος γάρ, ἂν δόξειεν ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ πάντως. "Δεῖ δὲ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι σπουδάζοντας, μηδαμῶς πρὸς τἀγαθὸν ἐλλιπῶς ἔχειν, ἀλλ' εἶναι μὲν ἀκμάζουσαν ἐν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ὁρμὴν τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸ, καὶ προθυμίαν, καὶ βουλήσει, ἄλλος γάρ, ἂν δόξειεν ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ πάντως."
καὶ δεῖξαι τοῖς ἔργοις, ὡς ἰσχυρότερα τὰ ἑφ’ ἡμῖν καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως, τῶν ἑξωθὲν ἐπαγομένων ἔξης ἀπάνταν: εἰ γὰρ τις έθελε τὸ ἀγαθὸν οὐτωσίν ἄπλως, ἔπειτα δεῖχσαν πράττειν, ὁ δ’ ὀλιγώρως διάκειται II καὶ ἰμελημένως, πολὺ τῆς τελείότητος ύστερών, οὐκέτ’ ἐστίν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ, ὁ γε τέλειον. «Ἀλλὰ πῶς ἂν ταῦτα ὀδίως διαφύγομεν:» φησί. Τοῖς γὰρ διὰ τῶν ἠδονῶν ἐξαπατώσαι καὶ ὑποσαίνουσι πράγμασιν, οὐκ ἀγενής τις πάντωσι ἡμῖν, ὡς ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων ἔχουμεν γνώναι ἄλλος γὰρ, ἄλλος ἀλίσκεται, κἂν ὁπόσον θέλῃ φιλοσοφεῖν, καὶ οὐδεὶς τῶν ὅλων ἀνώτερος. Οὐδὲ ἐγὼ ὀδίως φησί, ἀλλὰ σπουδὴ καὶ καρτερία μεγίστα τὰ κακὰ διαφέγγειν δύνασθαι, ὅσον ἀνθρώπων δυνατόν, καὶ τοσοῦτον, ὡστε εἰ που καὶ ἀλοίπη παθών, μὴ διὰ τούτο κακὸν εἶναι. «Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν πολλά», φησί, «τῶν φενακικόταν τε καὶ κηλοῦνταιν, διαλειθήσαμ’ ἂν ἰδοὺς, ἐμαυτὸν διδοκικός διηνεκέσταν ἄγως· κυμῆς ἐγὼ ἐπάγματα δικυνηρά, βιωτάτα μὲν ἐς ἄκρον, οὕτω δὲ φύσει φοβερά, ὡς καὶ δοκεῖν τὰς ψυχὰς αὕτη καὶ μόνῃ τῇ μνήμῃ, δ’ ὃν γνωτίσκει, παιδίας, τὰ τιμωτάτα αὐτό τὸ ἔνη ζημιούμεθα, εἰ μετὰ σφοδρὰς κομάστειν ύστης —πῶς ἂν ὑποσταῖν ἀειδήποτε;—, ἀλλὰ μὴ παντάπασιν εἶξαμι, καὶ οὕτε ἂν ἀγάγοι, δεδεμένος παραπλησίων ἐφεψάμεν;», ἔρει τις ἰδοὺς τοιαῦτα ἀνθυποφέρεσθαιν. Ἀκούσται δὲ παρ’ ἀνθρώπων ἐν λόγῳ ἠδονών καὶ γενναίότηταν: «Οὐδὲν οὕτος φρονεῖς, οὔτε λέγεις, ὃ μὴ κἂν ὧν ὀνειρικῶς ἀνήρ μετέχων λόγου καὶ γενναίότητας, ἢγείρεσθαι τοὺς πάνυ δυκάις, καὶ δίκην γε τὴν γιγνομένην ἐξαγομένος παρ’ αὐτὸς αὐτοῦ εἰληφῆ: τοῖς γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀκράσιν, οὐδὲν τι δυνατώτερον τε καὶ φοβερότερον τοῦ ὄντως δυνατοῦ τε καὶ φοβεροῦ,
ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τοῖς ἔρωσις σωφρόνως ἐρασμότερον τε καὶ ποθεινότερον, τοῦ ὅτις τε καὶ ἀγαθοῦ δεῖνα μὲν γὰρ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν τὰ τοιοῦτα ἔστων δὲ καὶ καταπλήξαι καὶ καταστέσαι σφόδρα δυνάμενα τοὺς πολλοὺς, καὶ ζημιώσαι πάνθ' ἐξῆς. Ἡ μετὰ τοῦ ζῆν τὰ παρόντα τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀνθυσταμένους, ἴνα σου τῶν ὑπερβολῶν μηδεμίαν ἀφελήσῃ.

[2b] Οὐ μὴν τοιαῦτα γε ὅταν, ἔστων δὲ καὶ πλεῖον εἰ βούλῃ, ἀντάξια δή τι οὖσαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἔστων δὲ καὶ καταπλῆξαι καὶ κατασεῖσαι σφόδρα δυνάμενα τοὺς πολλούς, καὶ ζημιῶσαι πάνθ' ἑξῆς. ἦν, μετὰ τοῦ τῆν τὸ παρόντα τοὺς ἀνθισταμένους,» ἵνα σου τῶν ὑπερβολῶν μηδεμίαν ἀφελήσῃ.

[2b] Οὐ μὴν τοιαῦτα γε ὅταν, ἔστων δὲ καὶ πλεῖον εἰ βούλῃ, ἀντάξια δή τι οὖσαν μὲν γὰρ καὶ πέρα δεινῶν τὰ τοιαῦτα· ἔστων δὲ καὶ καταπλῆξαι καὶ κατασεῖσαι σφόδρα δυνάμενα τοὺς πολλούς, καὶ ζημιῶσαι πάνθ'.
ἵπποι ματίων, καὶ ταυτήν ἵππος αὐτίκα μάλα γενησομένην, τούτως τί μόνιμος, τί σταθηρός, τί πάγιος; Πώς ἂν ή τί τῶν λυπηρῶν ἐν φρονούσι μέγα δόξειν, ἢ τί τῶν ἴσων προσθηριασθῆναι, ψυχής καὶ δόξης ἀθάνατα διαμενούσης ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔργων; Καὶ τοίνυν κατὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνων, οἷστις γνῶσις καὶ φρόνημα παιδαρίοις παραπλήσια —τοῖς τῶν ἀντιλεγόντων δ’ ἐντεῦθεν θερεσισμοὶ λόγως,— οὐκ ἀγεννησθὲν αὐτίκα μάλα γενησομένην, τούτῳ ἐπειγόμενος εἰς φθοράν, καὶ ταύτην ἴσως αὐτίκα μάλα γενησομένην, τούτῳ ἐπειγόμενος εἰς φθοράν, καὶ ταύτην ἴσως αὐτίκα μάλα γενησομένην, τούτῳ ἐπειγόμενος εἰς φθοράν.
καταπατεῖσθαι τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς εὐγένειαν, εἰκόνος οὐσίας τοῦ Πλάσαντος. Πως οὐκ ἔσται πάντων περιγενέσθαι, τὸν Θεόν συλλήπτορα κεκτημένοις; Αλλὰ τούτων μὲν ἄλλος, φησί τις αὐτοῖς γὰρ ως ἔχοι, οἶμαι.

[3α] «Τὸ δὲ κατ’ ἄγνοιαν καθαράν, ἢ ἀπάτην θύραθεν ἐπιγενομένην, ἢ τὸ βιασθέντα, εἶδε πολλὴ καὶ ἀκαταμάχητως δυνάμει, εἰ δὴ ἀκούσαν ἄτεχνος, καὶ ποιεῖ τὸ ἀμαρτημα παντελῶς Πλὴν δήποτε ΒΜ — II ἀνέγκλητον». Τούτ’ ἄν ίσως εἰσί τις πρὸς τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ἀκολούθως οἶμαι ὅτι, ἀναγκαζεὶ πάντως ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον διελεῖν καὶ παραδοῦναι σαφέστερον, ὡς περὶ τῆς προορέσεως μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τί ποτ’ ἐστίν ἐκεῖνο τὸ καθαρός ἐκοίσιον, καὶ τί τὸ ἐναντίον καὶ ποιον ἄθετος ἐπιμικτον καὶ ἀμφιρρεπές, καὶ τίς ταῦτα γίγνεται τρόποις, καὶ τί ποιοῦντες, τίνοις ἐσμέν ἄξιοι, καὶ τίς θεαμαξόμεθα, καὶ τίς μισοῦμεθα, καὶ τίς ἐλεοῦμεθα, τῶν ὁποιοδήποτε παρ’ ἡμῶν γινομένων.

[3β] Πλῆν εἰ τούτο ποιήσαμι, εἰς ἄπειρον ὁ λόγος ἐξενεχθείς, εἴ δ’ ὅτι σου τὴν νεότητα ἀποκραίσας, ἰλιγγαν προζενήσει τὸ γάρ κατὰ μέρος πειράσαθι φραζείν, ὁσαπερ ἐνδέχεται συμπεπέσει τῷ πολυμόρφῳ καὶ σκηνικῷ τοδε βιώ, καὶ ὁσαπερ ἡμῖν αὐτός δείκνυσι, πυκνά τὸ προσωπείον ὑπαλλάττων καὶ μονονούχι δραματοποιών, ἀλλοτε ἄλλων παρεμπιστότων, διαφόρων ἀφορμῶν καὶ προσώπων ἑνεκα, καὶ προσέτι τῶν καιρῶν παντοδαπῶς μεταβαλλομένων. Ωστε μηδὲ συνχωρεῖν ταῦτα νοεῖν διηνεκῶς περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ πράγματα, παντελῶς ἄν εἰς ἑξ’ τοῦ προσηκοντός οἶμαι δοξομέν γὰρ φιλοσοφεῖν φιλοτιμεῖσθαι μᾶλλον, ἢ σ’ ὑπὸς ἦθος παιδεύειν. Η


μὲν γὰρ ἀκολουθία τοῦ λόγου, καταναγκάζει διαφέρεις τε πολλὰς καὶ ὑποδιαιρέσεις δεικνύναι, καὶ βαθμοὺς πολλοὺς ποιεῖν, καὶ οίονει τινα τούτων κλίμακα ἀποφήγατον φοβεῖ δὲ μάλα τὸ πλήθος, καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῶν ἀναγκαίων εἰρήσθαι πέλαγος. Ὅθεν δὴ τὸ προὔργου λέγειν περί τῶν τοιούτων εἰς µήκος

Αριστοτέλους καὶ Πλάτωνος, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων εἶναι νοµίσας, τούτους αὖ πάλιν εἴσω τὰ γε τοιαύτα φιλοσοφεῖν, ὧν τὴν ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν ὁντινοῦν ἐκείνων ἀνειόν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ μόνον ὡς ἐνεστὶν ἀφοσιωσάμενοι τὰ περὶ τῶνδε, εἶτ' ἐπὶ τὰ πρόσω χωρήσομεν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸ σχῆμα τῆς ὁμιλίας, καὶ ἡ τοῦ λόγου κατ' ἀρχὰς ὁρμή, ἐφέρει τοσοῦτον ὑπερεκτεῖνεσθαι, πάσαις ἑπόμενον ταῖς παρεκδρομαῖς, κἂν ἀναγκαῖαι τὸ κατ' αὐτὰς λέγεσθαι. Ἀρκτέον δὴ καὶ πειρατέον ὡς οἷόν τε, διὰ βραχέων ἀποδοῦναι τὸν λόγον. [4a]

Τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὰ μέν ἐστι κατ' ἄγνοιαν παντελῆ, καὶ εἶεν ἂν ἐλεύθερα δίκης ἠστινοσοῦν καὶ μέμψεως, τὰ δὲ ἐν γνώσει γινόμενα κατὰ βούλησιν ἀκριβῆ, ἅτινα οὐ δεῖ τοι αὐτοὶ δεικνύναι κατασκευῆς, ὡς ἀρ' ἑκούσια παντελῶς, ἅτε προαιρέσεως ἀκραιφνοῦς ὄντα· τὰ γὰρ δὲ τοιαύτα σαφῶς ἑκούσια, καὶ οὐδὲν κωλύει τὸ μὴ καὶ τὸ ἐμπαλιν εἶναι· λέγω τὸ καὶ πᾶν ἑκούσιον τῆς προαιρέσεως γίνεσθαι, οὐ γὰρ πανταχοῦ τὸ ἀντιστρέφον ἀπαιτητέον· τὸ γὰρ ἐπιπλέον, καὶ συνθεωρεῖται, καὶ συνεισφέρεται τῷ σφῶν αὐτῶν μέρει· τὰ μέρη δὲ οὐκέτι τῷ καθολικοτέρῳ. Τοιοῦτον δὲ τὸ ἑκούσιον καὶ ἡ προαίρεσις ἔδοξε τοῖς περὶ τὰ τοιαύτα ἐσχολακόσιν, ἀνδράσι πάντα ἀγαθοῖς καὶ σπουδαίοις. Εἶναι μὲν γὰρ τὴν προαίρεσιν οὐ ταὐτὸν τῷ ἑκουσίῳ, ἀκολουθία - καταναγκάζει cf. Delucitadio imperatoris 124.3, 131.23-24; Dialogi IV 46.31; Oratio III 107-130 - 24; Dialogi III 36.35, VI 69.22, VIII 102.23, IX 147.24, XX 242.5, XXII 265.22, XXIII 272.28, XXIV 285.14, XXVI 301.30; cf. Ad ebriosum 291.4, al.; vid. Oratio V 37 — 128, σχῆμα-ὁμιλίας cf. Oratio I 346


354
ἐκείνου δὲ τι μέρος.

[4b] Ἀλλ' ἀκριβῶς μὲν ἀκούσια, νομισθήσεται ὅσα δὴ τις οὐχ ἦγεται θελητὰ τὸ παράπαν εἶναι τοῖς εὐ φρονούσι· καὶ διὰ τούτο, οὔτε φιλεῖ, οὔτε πράττειν αὐτὰ βουλεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ τι κέρδος νομίζει τὸ μηδὲ συγγεγονέναι τουτοσὶ μηδαμῶς μηδέποτε, μηδὲ καθ' ἤτοι ἄνωτυπον παράπαν, ἡ γοῦν ἐπίνοιαν λογισμῶν. Ἡν δὲ τι πράττειν ἀναγκασθῇ μηδὲν ὅλως βουληθείν, παλλή περιουσία δυνάμεως, σφόδρα βιαζομένου τοῦ πράγματος, ἢ προσώπου, δυνατὰ πολὺν τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, οὔτε φιλεῖ, οὔτε πράττειν βουλεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ τι κέρδος νομίζει τὸ μηδὲ συγγεγονέναι τουτοσὶ μηδαμῶς μηδέποτε, μηδὲ καθ' ἤτοι ἄνωτυπον παράπαν, ἡ γοῦν ἐπίνοιαν λογισμῶν. Ἡν δὲ τι πράττειν ἀναγκασθῇ μηδὲν ὅλως βουληθείν, παλλή περιουσία δυνάμεως, σφόδρα βιαζομένου τοῦ πράγματος, ἢ προσώπου, δυνατὰ πολὺν τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, οὔτε φιλεῖ, οὔτε πράττειν βουλεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ τι κέρδος νομίζει τὸ μηδὲ συγγεγονέναι τουτοσὶ μηδαμῶς μηδέποτε, μηδὲ καθ' ἤτοι ἄνωτυπον παράπαν, ἡ γοῦν ἐπίνοιαν λογισμῶν. Ἡν δὲ τι πράττειν ἀναγκασθῇ μηδὲν ὅλως βουληθείν, παλλή περιουσία δυνάμεως, σφόδρα βιαζομένου τοῦ πράγματος, ἢ προσώπου, δυνατὰ πολὺν τοῖς εὖ φρονοῦσι· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, οὔτε φιλεῖ, ο 대하여, [4c] Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἑκουσίου φαμέν, ὡς οὐ μόνον ἃ ποιοῦμεν εὐφρα
ινόμενοι ἑκούσια,

ἀλλὰ καὶ εκεῖνα πάντως ἃ οὐκ ἐθέλομεν ποιεῖν, δι' ἄλλην δὲ ἡδονὴν ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ἐπάγομεν· καὶ γὰρ τὸ πράττειν τινὰς ἐκεῖνα, ἔστω δὲ βίᾳ μεγίστῃ καὶ τυραννίδι, ἅπερ ἂν αὐτῆς ἀπούσης οὐκ ἂν ἔπραττον· οὐκ ἔστιν ὅμως ἄκοντας πράττειν, ἀλλὰ τοὐν αντίον ἑκόντας περιφανῶς, εἴπερ ἑκόντες ἑαυτοὺς εἰς ταυτηνὶ τὴν βίαν εἰσήγαγον, τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ βιασθῆναι οἴκοθεν αὐτοὶ παρεισαγαγόντες. Καὶ γένοιτ' πάντα-κινεῖ cf. Epistulae 68.119; Oratio IV 193 — κινεῖ-μηχανὰς cf. De insomniis 90.30-31 — 150. φαιδρῷ-προσώπῳ Epistulae 9.22; In dormitionem Deiparae 565.43; cf. Dialogi VIII 95.26; Oratio IV 293

148. πάντα-κινεῖ cf. Epistulae 68.119; Oratio IV 193 — κινεῖ-μηχανὰς cf. De insomniis 90.30-31 — 150. φαιδρῷ-προσώπῳ Epistulae 9.22; In dormitionem Deiparae 565.43; cf. Dialogi VIII 95.26; Oratio IV 293


ἀν ἐκείθεν καταφανές. Ο γὰρ τυράννῳ μισθοῦ δουλείων, εἰδὼς ὡς ἔστιν ἀνάγκη πράττειν τὸ τούτῳ δόξαι, ἢ μετ’ αἰσχύνης καὶ πληγῶν αφαιρεθῆναι τὸ ἐξ’ ἐπειτ’ ἀνελεῖν ἄθωσς, λωποδυτεῖν, ἱεροσυλεῖν, πάν ἀνόσιον ποιεῖν, ὡς’ ἐκείνου βιαζόμενος τοσοῦτον, ὡς καὶ τὸ ἐξὸς ἐπισείομενον αὐτῷ καθοράν δυνὸν ἐνεκα’ ἢ τοῦ ταῖν χεροῖν ἀποσφάξαι τοὺς ἀδίκως τῷ τυράννῳ μισομένους, καὶ πάντα πράττειν τὰ ἀθεσμα, ἢ τοῦ τοῖς αὐτοῦ μολυνθηκαί τὸ ἐξὸς αἵματ’, ὁ δὲ μισεῖ μὲν μάλα τὸν φόνον, δεδόσθω γὰρ, πράξει δ’ οὖν δόμας τὸν φόνον, καὶ τὸ ἄγος ταῖν χεροῖν ἐνεργήσει. Πῶς οὖν ἔκών γε δήμιος ὁ τοιοῦτος γέγονε; [4d] Καὶ μὴν καὶ ἑτερον ἐγὼ γε ἡκοίμι, ὅ γε μὴ πάντων διέστηκε του πρὶν ἡμῖν εἰρημένον, εἰ μὴ τῷ πολλῷ χείρον εἶναι ἐκείνου, 150’ καὶ δόξαι μὲν εὑ ὦ ὀίδα καίνον τὸ πράγμα, ἀληθεὶς δὲ ἰσχυρίζετο εἶναι ὁ τούτῳ λέγων’ ἔλεγε γὰρ, ἐπιθυμῆσαι τινα ἀπὸ θυμοῦ τὸ πρῶτον ἀζέμενον, εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ μείζονα ἐξευρίσκω, καὶ δεδώς τὸ ὑπερέχον τάνδρος, οὐκ ἐτόλμα. Ἐξεύρη δ’ ὅπως ἐξοίσει εἰς παραφορὰν ἑαυτὸν καὶ θρασφύτητα ἀκαθέκτων· ἐμφορηθεὶς γὰρ ἀκρότου πολλοῦ, ἐπὶ τῷ τάς φρένας διαφθαρήσας, καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ἁρχῇ λαβεῖν, καὶ τὸν μὲν προοῖχον τιμή ταῖς ὀφεισιν ἀποπλύναι, ἔχειν δὲ ἀναχώρησιν, τὴν εἰς’ ἀνακτηθεῖν, εἴτε βακχεῖαν φίλον τινὶ λέγειν, πράττει μὲν τὸ δόξαι ἀδεῖς, παρήγγειτε δὲ πολλῶ, πάντα ἐμβολοῖτεν καὶ τετυφωμένον. Δίκας δ’ εἰσπραττόμενος τῆς ἀνασχυντικάς μετὰ τὴν μέθην καὶ τὴν κραυπαλίνην, κλαιόν καὶ οἰμώσιν ἡσθάνετο, κακῶς μὲν ὄντος βεβουλευμένος, κακῶς δὲ μάλα ταλμῆσας. Ο γοῦν τοιοῦτος ἀνθρωπος, οὐκ ἂν σοι δόξῃ πάροινος


356
εἶναι, τοῦτ’ αὐτῷ βουλῇ καὶ γνώμη γεγενημένος; Πάνω μοι δοκῶ, καὶ πάντας οίμαι
συνθέσθαι τῇ δόξῃ ταύτῃ. Οὐχ οὕτως δὲ μόνον οἴμαι ὁ προῴργοι τὸ προεπηλάκειν
ποιησάμενος, εἰτ’ ἐπὶ τῶδε μεθυσθῆται βολήσας, ἀλλ’ ὁ καὶ μὴ τούτῳ βουλόμενος,
pολλάκις δ’ οὖν μεθυσθεῖς, καὶ μετὰ τὴν μέθην ὑβρίσας, εἶτα πάλιν χρώμενος τῇ
μέθῃ καθάπερ πρὸ τοῦ, πάροινον ἀν εἰπ’ καὶ ὑβριστῇ; εἰ γὰρ καὶ καθ’ ἂν
προεπηλάκειν ὥραν, μικροῦ δὲ ἔξω φρενῶν ὑπῆρχε κατακλυσθέντος τε καὶ
ὑποβρυχίου γεγενημένου τοῦ νοῦ τῷ οἴνῳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ προφάσει τῆς ὕβρεως, ἑκὼν
προσέδραμε πάντως· καὶ τὸν κρατῆρα καὶ τὴν φιάλην αὐτὸς ἐνέπλησ
e, καὶ τῷ
στόματι προσενήνοχε ταῖν χεροῖν, καὶ ἔπιεν οὐ μάλλα διψῶν, οὐδ’ ὅσον κορεσθέντα
πάτει τὴν δίψαν, ἀλλ’ ὅσον εἰς μανίαι διασκεδάζεται οὐκ ἔστω 
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185. ἔξω φρενῶν] Ad Alexium lagoup 357.15; Ad ebriosum 286.6; In Mariam Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 338.24; Oratio funebris 233.18; vid. Oratio VI 80 — 191. καὶ ὁ-αἴτιος] Epistulae 62.11-12, cf. 11.24-25; De processione 212.2-3; cf. Oratio VII 405


καθαρώτερον εἰπεῖν. Ἡστι τοίνυν οὐκ ὁλίγα τῶν οὐ καλῶν, οὐδὲ ἀγαθῶν, κατὰ 
βούλησιν μὲν πεπραγμένα ὅποια δ' ὄντα τυγχάνει, μή γινοσκόμενα· ἔτερα δὲ 
γινόμενα μὲν ἐν γνώσει, οὐ μὴν κατὰ προαιρέσειν αὐθόρμητον, εἴποι τις ἃν. Καὶ 
ταῦτα πάλιν, τέμνεται δίχα· ἢ γὰρ παρ' ἡμῶν οὐκ ἠκούσαν ταῦτα 
pοιήσαν καὶ μὴ—περὶ ὧν οὐ γινοσκόμενον λέγειν, ἀποδέδοται γὰρ ἱκανῶς οἴμαι—, ἢ 
θύραθεν ἀπανθήσεσθαι ὑπ' ὁτουοῦν, τὴν ἰχνήν ἐφάμιλλον ἔχοντος τῇ βουλήσει, εἴτε παρ' 
ἡμῶν πράττεται, οὐκ ἂν πραττόντων οὐκ οὔσης βίας μεγίστης. Ταῦτα δ' ἂν εἴ 
μειοεκούσα, εἰ διδοκι τις κάμε ὁνοματοποιοίν εἰναι, εἰ δὲ βουλεῖ γα καινοτομήσαι 
τι συμφοράν δυνηθησάν περὶ τὰ ὁνόματα ταῦτα· ὅσα γὰρ πρὸς βίαν ἄν ἡμῖν ἐπάγεται, εἴτε 
pαρ' ἡμῶν πράττεται, μικτά ἂν εἰ καὶ οὐχ ἐκούσα, ὅσπερ εἰρηται, μὴ πρὸς θάπτε 
ροσχερῶς τῶν μερῶν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ξανάρκησαν τὴν ὁπτὴν ἔχοντα. II 
[5b] Ὅσοι τοίνυν οὐδαμῶς εἰσήνεγκαν τι παρ' ἑαυτῶν πρὸς τὸ τὴν ἀνάγκην ἐλθεῖν, 
τὴν ἢ παθεῖν αὐτούς, ἢ πράξαι τι κακὸν ἀναγκάζοντας, ἔπειτα ἀυτόκλητον 
τι δεινὸν ἐπέλθοι, βιαιότατον ὅλως ὁν καὶ τυραννικῶτατον, συμφοράν 
τε ἀπειλοῦν οὐχ 
ύπεροπτέαν δοκοῦσαν, ἢ βιον ὅλως οὐκ ἐπιπέδεστα ἢ 


8. 207. ἄνι bis acc. I — 208. μὲν ἐκούσια M — βούλη post cor. (ex βουλη) M — τὶ 


πρὸ τοῦ τῇ φυγῇ χρήσασθαι; Δείκνυσι δὲ κάκεινο τοῖς γὰρ πενία πιεζομένοις ἢ τῶι
νόσῳ τετρυχωμένοις, ὡστε μηδαμώς δύνασθαι τὰς γοῦν ἐφήμεροι τροφὰς
πορίζεσθαι, ὥστε τοῖς γὰρ πενίᾳ πιεζομένοις ἤ τινι νόσῳ
tetarχομένοις, ὥστε μηδαμῶς δύνασθαι τὰς γοῦν ἐφήμεροι τροφὰς
πορίζεσθαι, ὥστε τοῖς γὰρ πενίᾳ πιεζομένοις ἤ τινι
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226-227. μέλλον ἀτέκμαρτον] cf. Dialogi V 60.12; Epistulae 3.33; Oratio funebris 191.19; Præcepta 316A; Oratio IV 303-304 — 228. στρεφεῖν κάτω] cf. Ad Alexium lagous 339.15; Ad ebrion 303.20; De matrimonio 672; De processione 85.14, 114.7, 142.5, 156.11; Dialogi XIV 188.24, XXI 255.3; Præcepta 339D; vid. Oratio V 210 — 232. ἐναγχος ἐπετεῖν] cf. Gregorium Cyprium, CapitG II, L.I.61
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καὶ ἔξοψισας, τοῦτο εἶναι τὸ παρ’ ἡμῖν ἐκούσιον ἀκριβῶς. Τὸ δὲ κατ’ ἁγιολαν παντελῆ, οὕτθ’ ὑπάρχειν ἐκούσιον καθαρῶς, καὶ τὸ μὲν καλὸν τε καὶ ἁγαθὸν ἐκούσιος γεγονόμενον, τοῦτο εἶναι τὴν ἀρετήν. Τὸ δ’ ἑναντίον παντάπασι τῷ καλῷ ἐκούσιος γεγονόμενον, τοῦτο εἶναι τὴν κακίαν, καὶ καθ’ ὅσον μὲν τῆς γνώμης τὸ πεπραγμένον οὔκ ἔστι, τοσοῦτον μηδ’ εἶναι ἀμάρτημα, ὑπόσον δὲ γε ταύτης ἐστὶ, τοσοῦτον καὶ κολάσεως ἀξίουν. Τὸ γὰρ δὴ σμικρὸν κακῶν, γνώμη διαπρατόμενον, μέγα ἄν δικαιῶς παρενέγκαι τῇ καθ’ αὐτό ποιότητι, καὶ τὰ πολλὰ μεγέθει τοῦτο παρενεγκῶντα, ἐπειδὰν ἀκούσια ταύτῃ ἐπέλθη, καὶ γίγνεται πως εἰς μέμψεως λόγον, τὸ βραχὺ τῇ προαιρέσει γεγονόμενον κακῶν, μεῖζον μεθ’ ὅσης ὑπερβολῆς τοῦ ἀκούσιος ἡμῖν συμβαίνοντος, κάν ὅτι μέγιστον εἶναι τοῦτο δοκή. Ὑστε τὸ πάν ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως, καθάπερ εξ ἀρχῆς ἡμῖν εἰρήται. Καὶ ὁ κακὸς, οὕτε ἐκ φύσεως, οὕτε ἐξοθεν, ἀλλ’ οὕτω αἰτίου: δύον γὰρ θάτερον ἀναγκαίων, ἥ ὁικόθεν, ὑπερβολῆς ἢ μηδαμῶς εἶναι κακῶν, μηδ’ ἂν ἕνα τῶν πάντων. Καὶ πῶς ἃν γένοιτο, φησίν. αἰτίος ἐαυτῷ τῶν κακῶν, δοκῶν γε δὴ πως σωφρόνισεν ἄνθρωπος;

250 [6b] Τῷ μὴ φιλεῖν τὸ ἁγαθὸν ὅσον ἄξιον, ἀλλὰ τοῖς κακοῖς χαίρειν, καὶ τοῦτο μηδεὶς ἀναμαζέτων οὐ γὰρ τῷ αἰρεῖσθαι τὸ κακόν ἢ κακὸν πρὸ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. ἡ πρὸ τοῦ καλλίστου τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἢπερ αἰσχρὸν, καὶ μέντοι καὶ τὸ βλάπτον πρὸ τοῦ συνοίσθην, εξ ἁγαθῶν γινόμεθα τοῦντιστον. Πῶς γὰρ; Οὐ μοι δοκοῦσιν οὐδ’ οἱ πάντων εὐθέστεροι τῶν πώποτε γεγονόμενων ἀνθρώπων, τούτ’ ἂν νοσήσαι τὸ νόσημα, ἀλλ’ ἐξαπάτη τε καὶ διαμαρτή τοῦτο τὸ κακὸν φύεται. Ρίζαν


δὲ καὶ ἀφείαν ἔχον τὴν ἀπαθευσίαν καὶ ὀθυμίαν, τῷ χρόνῳ δήποτε τρεφόμενον καὶ πηγνύμενον καὶ ἐπεκτεινόμενον, πρὸς ἀντιτυπίαν τοῦ κρείττονος, δυσαπάλλακτον τοῦ λοιποῦ γίνεται τοίς ἢδη κεκρατημένοις· τοῦ γὰρ προειλήφθαι ψυχής, καὶ μάλιστα τὰς νέων, ὡς πάροικοι, οὐδὲν ἂν γένοιτο χεῖρον, οὐδὲ χαλεπώτερον εἰς δοφθοσιν. Ἐμμείνα τοῖς κακοῖς πρὸς ἀντιτυπίαν τοῦ κρείττονος, δυσαπάλλακτον τοῦ λοιποῦ· τὸν ἀπειλημμένον πρὸς ἀντιτυπίαν τοῦ κρείττονος, δυσαπάλλακτον τοῦ λοιποῦ·

153 ἢσος οὐδὲ χρή λέγειν. Πῶς οὐχ ὑπεύθυνος οὕτως ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν κακῶν ἡ ἀτεχνῶς γίνεται, ἢδων τῇ παρ' ἀυτῷ διαθέσει πρὸς τὰ δυνάμειν· καὶ πάσιν τρόποις ἐναντίον εὐάλωτον εἰκονεῖσαι παρασκευάζων, καὶ παρὰν διαφυγεῖν, ὁ δὲ τῷ μὴ ἀπόλλυται, εὐχρέως καὶ κοῦφον ἡγούμενος καθυφεῖναι τοῦ καλοῦ, καὶ

270. αίτιος-γίγνεται] cf. Oratio III 251-252
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Ἀλλ' ἄθρει δή μοι καὶ τῇδε. Ἐάν τις τὸ κοινότατον κακὸν εἶναι νομιζόμενον ὑποτιθεῖν τῷ κακῷ ὑπενδοῦναι, ἄν καὶ τῇ κακῇ ἐργαζόμενον συνεχῶς, τίς ἐπειδὴ τῷ κακῷ χρῆσθαι, ἄρα οὐκ ἔστιν τῇ καπνῷ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ τῇ κακῇ, ψυχῆς δὲ τῆς κακῆς. Ἐάν τις τῷ κακῷ τῇ κακῇ ἑργαζόμενον ἔργα ἐπελεύσηται τῇ κακῇ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδὴ τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα τῇ κακῇ, καταράμεθα τῇ κακῇ, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδὴ τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδὴ τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδὴ τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ οὕτως ἐπειδή τῷ κακῷ καταράμεθα, καὶ τῷ κακῷ ἑργαζόμενον, οὐκ ἐστὶ ο话语权．
λυμαίνομένοις σφόδρα τὸν νοῦν καθάπαξ ἔσωτον ἐκδεδωκότα, οὐκ ἀπεικός, τετυφλωμένους ἔχοντα τοὺς λογισμοὺς παραπαίειν, ὅπως δὲ περιούσιον καὶ βαδίζω. Αρ' οὕτως ἔχοντες ἀνθρώπου, λίαν ὀλιγώρος περὶ τά δέοντα, εἶτα τι πάσχοντες, ἢ ποιούντες, ὅπερ ἐν μοιρὰ τῶν οὐ καλῶν, ἄκοντες σοι δόξομεν ὑπὸ εὐθύνας εἶναι; Οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ γὰρ συμβάινον τῇ σῇ φρονήσει, κἂν οὕτω γε εἰς ἄνδρας τελῆς. Ἐι γὰρ δὴ καὶ ἔρχεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς τὰ πάθη μετὰ πολλῆς, ὡς ὁ τε ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς καὶ τῆς ὑποκρίσεως —ἀλλ' αὐτὸ γε τοῦτο ἡμᾶς οὐ λέγηθε πάντως—, ὡς ὑπούλως ἔρχεται, καὶ εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς κατὰ μικρὸν ὑπεισοῦσται, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσδύντα δουλοπρεπῶς, ἐπείτα κατάρχει δεσποτικῶς. Καί ὁ τὸ τέλος εἰδῶς, καὶ τὴν ἄρχην οὐκ ἀποσοβῶν, δικαίως ἄν εὐθύνοιτο καὶ περὶ τοῦ τέλους.

[7a] Αλλ' οὖν ὁμιλεῖς φανεῖται πάσην ἀνθρώπους, ὡς τὰ δοκοῦντα κακά, εἰ μὲν ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς, ἐκ τῆς προαφέτησες τὴν ἀρχὴν ἔχει εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐκ προαφέτησες, οὐδὲ ὑπάρχει τὸ σύνολον. Ἀλλὰ μὴν τὰ κακά τὸν θυνητὸν περιπαλούντων φαίνεται κόσμον, κατὰ τὸν Πλάτωνα. Ὡσε ἄναγκαιον εἰς ταύτα αἰτιάσθαι τὴν προαφέτησιν μόνην, οὐ τῷ αἰφείσθαι τὸ κακὸν πρὸ τοῦ ἁγαθοῦ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἀλλ' αὐτῇ τε καὶ διαμαρτίᾳ, ὡς δὴ δία πλείονον ἐν τοῖς πρόσθεν εἰρητᾶ παρ' ἡμῶν, καὶ νῦν αὖθις εἰρήσται. Ἀγνοα δὴ τὶς ἄγνοια τὸ κακὸν, εἰ δὲ συντόμως εἰπεῖν. Χρῆ δὲ τούτῳ τὸ κατ' ἄγνοιαν, σαφέστερον ἀποδοῦναι, μὴποτε δόξουμεν τις ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς περιπιπτεῖν, ἀν' ὁν ἀπεφηγάμεθα τὰ κακά τῆς προαφέτησις μόνης εἶναι ἔπειτ' ἡμέναν ἄνθρωπον, ἄγνοια τὸ κακὸν οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο πάθος, οὐκ ἔστιν ἐνταῦθοι καὶ

---


313. τὰ κακὰ-κόσμον] cf. Platonem, Theaetetus 176a.4-8; Cydonium, Epistulae 5.165-166
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δοκή, εἰ μὴ παντάπασιν ἀγροικὸς ἐγώ. Καὶ δὴ συμβιβαστέοιν ὡδὶ τὸν λόγον, οὐδὲ πρὶν ἀσυμβατον ὄντα τοῖς γε καλῶς θεωρῆσαι.

[7b] Φησί αὐτά τὸ κατ’ ἄγνοιαν ἀμαρτεὶν δι受损 γε δῆποιθεν εἶναι. Καὶ θάτερον μὲν συμβαίνει, τῷ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ ἀγνοοῦμενα, ἢ κοινὴ τὴν ἀνθρωπείαν φύσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην καὶ δεξιότητα, ἢ τὴν τινὸς που δύναμιν μερικῶς, πρὸς τὸ τοῦτο ἢ ἐκείνο μαθεῖν ἢ γνῶναι. Μην ὁμοῖο μὲν πάντες, οὐκ ἴσης οὐρανοῦ τε φύσιν καὶ μέγεθος, τὰ τε ὑπέρ τῶν, καὶ ὑπὸ γῆν: ὁ δείνα δὲ οὐ πέφυκεν εἶναι ἀνθρωπικός, ἢ ὁρχείσθαι ἀπ' σχοινοῦ τεταμένης, ἰδιόνε δεδεμένος τοὺς ὁφθαλμοὺς, ὡς τινας ὀφύμεν ποιοῦντας. 

Καὶ ὅποι μὲν ὑπέρ ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ουδὲ λέγειν περὶ τούτοις ἀνάγκη, καὶ τυφλὸ γὰρ δῆλον φασίν, ὡς οὐτ' ἐστὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, οὔτε λόγον τῆς ἀγνοιας ὁφείλομεν· ὅσα δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγνοεῖται, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν γινοσκεται, δῆλον ὡς ἐστὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν. Εἰς δὲ δὴ πάντα, τὴν κοινὴν φύσιν καὶ γνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστήμην καὶ δεξιότητα, οὐδ' ὁπωσοῦν μοι δοκῶ, τὴν δὲ τινῶν ἀπαιδευσίαν καὶ καταφρόνησιν πρὸς τὸ καλὸν τε καὶ ἀγαθὸν, αἰτιατέον ἡμῖν ἐστὶ τὸ γὰρ μήτε πεπαιδευμένον εἶναι, μήτε σπουδαῖον, ἀλλ' ἀγνοεῖν τὰ συνοισοντα, λέγω δὴ τὰ τοῖς ὁμοίοις οὔκ ἀγνοοῦμενα, ἐκ τοῦ ὁλιγώρας ἔχειν πρὸς τὰ χρηστότερα τῶν ἡθῶν καὶ τὰ τῆς γνώσεως αἴτηα, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ γίνεται. Βουλήν τε λέγω καὶ μάθεσιν, ὡσείς τισι δυναμένην τοὺς κεκτημένους, καὶ δὴ καὶ τηλικάτην σπουδὴν ὑπὸ τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῖν πέφυκε βελτίων ποιεῖται, συνελέγουσαν τὰ βελτίστα πανταχόθεν· καὶ εἰ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ μανθάνειν τε καὶ συνελέγει τὰ χρηστότερα.
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συμβαίνει. Ἡ δὲ κρίσις προαιρέσεως, τὸ δὲ προαιρετικότητα τοῦ ἑκουσίου δέδεικται μέρος τοῦ κακού, ἡ δὲ κρίσις προαιρέσεως, τὸ δὲ προαιρεῖσθαι τοῦ ἑκουσίου δέδεικται μέρος· τὸ κακόν, ἔστι μὲν δι' ἄγνοιαν, ἔστι δὲ δι' ἀπαιδευσίαν καὶ ὀλιγωρίαν, ἔστι δὲ δι' ἀβουλίαν τε καὶ προαιρεῖσθαι, ἔστι δὲ δι' ἀβουλίαν τε καὶ προαιρεῖσθαι, ἔστι δὲ ἑκούσιον. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ ἀναλύειν επελθοῦμεν, ἐκ τῆς ἀγνοίας ἀρξάμενοι, ὅπερ ἐστιν ἡ κορυφή, διὰ τῶν μέσων ὁδεύοντες, εἰς τὴν προαιρεσίν σαφῶς καὶ τὸ ἑκούσιον καταντήσομεν, ἃ δὴ ῥίζα τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἀτεχνῶς. Ὁ λόγος δὲ ἡμῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὐ περὶ παραφρονούντων ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν μόνον, οἷς τὸ προαιρετικὸν ἐν ὑγείᾳ ἀλωβήτου τοῦ φρονεῖν μένοντος.

345 [7c] Οὐ μὴν ὃς ἂν μὴ πάντα γνῷ, εἰ καὶ σωφρονεῖ, ὑπὸ αἰτίαν καὶ μέμψιν ἔσται, καὶ τοῖς γε δίκην ὄφλουσιν ἐγγεγράψεται, ἢν μὴ πάντ' ἐκείνοις ἢ τὴν ἰσχὺν ἐφάμιλλος· οὔκοιν οὐδ' ὁ μὴ γινώσκων ἐν ἴσῳ τοῖς θαυμαζομένοις ἐν γνώσει· ὁ γὰρ μὴ δυνάμενος ἐφικέσθαι πρὸς ἐμπειρίας ἀκρότητα, ἥτις ἂν ἐξῃρημένοις ἀνδράσι γένοιτο, μόνοις ἀνηγμένοις εἰς τὴν τῶν καλῶν κορυφὴν πᾶσι τρόποις, οὐκ εἰς ἐνοχὴν καταστήσεται. Ἐγκλημα γὰρ ἡμῖν, οὐχ ὅπερ ὑπερβαίνει τὸ πεφυκὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον, οὐδ' ὅσα γε μὴ δέδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ βίος μαθεῖν, οὐδ' ἅπερ οὐκ ἐπέτρεψε καιρός, ή σύμπτωμα τι καὶ Τύχη· ἀλλὰ δι' ἐκεῖνα μόνον ἀποδώσομεν εὐθύνας ἑξῆς ἅπαντες, ὅσαπερ ἐξὸν ἡμῖν εἰδέναι οὐ μήτε εἰδέναι σπουδάσομεν πόνοις ἡμετέροις, μήτε μαθεῖν ἐθελήσομεν παρὰ τῶν εἰδότων· τοὺς γὰρ τοιούτους, οὐ παραιτήσεται τὸ ἁμαρτεῖν κατ' ἄγνοιαν, ἔστι γὰρ οὐ φύσεως, οὐδέ τινος τῶν θύραθεν συμπτωμάτων, ἀλλὰ προαιρεσίς ἐγκλημα.
[8a] ἡ δὲ γὰρ φύσει ἐν ὀροὶς μένει, καὶ παρατίθεται πρὸς Θεόν, καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, καὶ τὴν ἑκάστου ἵππησίαν, ἔτι μὴ ἐνή ποιεῖν τὰ καὶ τὰ. Ἡ δὲ προαίρεσις δύνατ' ἄν μεταβεβλήθησαι καὶ πεποικίλθησαι. Διό τις μὲν ἄγγελοι, τοὺς δὲ δαίμονις αὐτοῖς ἐγγεγράφθαι ποιεῖ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ αὐτά, παρὰ μὲν τὸν ἐνεργεῖται, παρὰ δὲ τῶν οὐδαμῶς, καὶ δὴ καὶ παρὰ τῶν αὐτῶν τοῦτε μὲν ἄγαν 
θαυμάζεται, τοτε δὲ τούναντιν' καὶ ταῦτ' ἀνθρέπσια οἴμαι ψυχῆς, ἢ γυναικῶδος καὶ μαλακῆς, μὴ ποιεῖν προαίρομενην, ἐφ' οἷς προσήκεν. Ἡ φύσις δὲ πάση κοινή, καὶ τά ταύτης ἡμῖν κοινά καὶ ὑπέρ αὐτῆς, οὐδές οὔτε στεφανώσεται, οὔτε φεύξεται τινὰ δίκην λέγω δὲ φύσιν νῦν τὴν ἐν τῷ καθόλου εἴδει θεωρομένην, τὸν καθόλου ἀνθρωπον, τὴν ἀνθρωπότητα πάσαν· αὔ γὰρ ἑκάστοις διαφοραί, οὐ πρὸς τὴν φύσιν ἀναφέρονται, ἀλλὰ γνώμη γίνονται πάντως, πολλαῖς τε καὶ πολυειδέσιν αἰτίαις. Ὡσπερ δὲντιρός καλώς τε καὶ μὴ διαθείνω, περὶ τούτων δὴ καὶ μόνον ὀφθήσει δίκην, δικαίως οἴμαι, μὴ διατεθέ.vn τυχόν ἔχοντι καὶ ἔδει. Εἰεν.

[8b] Δεὶ δὲ οἷμαι, τὸ πάν εἰπόντας συντεταγμένοις τε καὶ συντόμοις, ἐνταῦθα στηρισθή τὸν λόγον. Καὶ φαμέν δ' ἁγνοοιαν μὲν τὸ κακόν γίνεσθα, ἐκουσίον δ' ὅμως εἶναι καὶ προαιρετικής τινος γνώμης, καὶ οἰκείας διαθέσεως. Ὡσπερ δὴ κακῷ γεγονοτί γνώμη, τὸ τῶν καλουμένων περιστάσεων ἀπαν ἄθροισμα, καὶ πάσα τούτω πρόφασις, καὶ παρατίθεσις, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, ψιλή τις σκέψις, καὶ τὸν λόγον. Καὶ φαμὲν δι' ἄγνοιαν μὲν τὸ κακὸν γίνεσθαι, ἑκούσιον δ' ὅμως εἶναι καὶ ὀφλῆσει δίκη


[2a] Τολμῶσι τοῖνεν εἰτείν —ο καὶ εἰς Θεον ἀνατρέχει—, ὡς ἢν ἀν κρείττον μηδόλος εἶναι, μηδὲ παρεῖναι τάδε τῷ ὑφεστάναι την ἡδονήν τὸν γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνοις βίον, ταραχῆς καὶ ἁθυμίας πολλῆς ἐμπυθήσομεν, καὶ πολλήν τὴν ἁθυμίαν τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν καταχέει. Διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἡδονήν, πολλῶν μὲν καὶ μεγάλων ἐπιθυμοῦμεν τυχεῖν, αὐτίκα δὲ μάλα ἐλπίζομεν αὐτῶν τευχείσας ἀπὸ γὰρ τοῦ σφόδρα ἐθελείν, ἐν χερσὶν εἶναι νομίζουμεν τὸ ἐκ διαμέτρου πολλάκις ὑπ’ ἐν, καί τούτων ἐκαστὸν, εἰς μεγαίστην ἐπαρκείστεν ὡς ὀλίγων δὲ καὶ σμικρῶν καὶ µόλις ἐπιτυγχάνομεν, καὶ τούτων αὖ πάλιν, ἀδρανές τι καὶ πρὸς ὀλίγον ἡμᾶς
ἐνορίαι, ἡμέραι, τὰ πόνον ἔχομεν, στῆσαι τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ζητοῦντες, ἡμεῖς δὲ τῇ ζητήσει τοῦ τότε θέλοντος κατεχόμεθα, καὶ τῇ προτέρᾳ σπουδῇ, εὐθέως".

[2b] Δοκεῖ μὲν οὖν εἶναι δεινὸν τὸ πάθος, καὶ κακῶς τὸν ὀρθὸν πάντας λέγομεν βίον, καὶ σαφῆ μανίαν ἀποκαλοῦμεν, τὸ ταῖς ἁμοῦ ἀκεχολόθως οὐκ ἄν δὲ εὐκάλυψι τὸν εὐθυμοῦμεν; οὐδὲ ἂν ἐκόντες παυσάμεθα τῇ ἑκουσίᾳ μανίας διακαίωμαι ἄν κεκλημένης. Πῶς γὰρ οὐ μανία σαφῆς, οταν συμπαθήμεθα τῷ κακῷ, καὶ τῷ κατόπιν αὐτῆς οἶμαι μηδένα λεληθέναι τῶν πάντων. Ὅπως δὲ τινὶς ἄρα καὶ ἀπαραιτήτως τῇ ἑπώμεν ἐγνώ, καὶ τὸ ἔπος ὑγιὲς δόξαν, καὶ τὸ ἔπος ὑγιὲς δόξαν.
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24. διαμαρτητέον ἐπίληπτον] cf. Epitulæ 8.14; Oratio funebris 117.3, 205.3 — 32. σαφῆ μανίαν| Epistulæ 68.80; Oratio funebris 278.13-14 — 34. μανία σαφῆς| De insomniis 90.62-63; De processione 6.12; Dialogi XI 134.18; Oratio gratulatoria 230.17 — 35. ἐρυθριῶντας καλύπτεσθαι| cf. Dialogi VI 74.10; In Mariam Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 652, f. 341v-24-25; Oratio VI 265-266 — 38. χρώμῳ παγένει| cf. Dialogi XI 133.35 — ὁδὸν βαδίζον; Præcepsit 348C: cf. Oratio III 284, V 64

34. μανία σαφῆς| Cydonius, Epitulæ 94.15, 275.5 — 37. παθὼν-ἐγνώ| Hesiodus, Opera et dies 218; Diogenianus, CprG I, II.31; Gregoryus Cyriacus, CprG I, L54, cf. III.61; cf. Zelenom, CprG I, II.14; Apostolium, CprG II, XV.22

δεσπότου, ξίφος ἐπισείοντος, καὶ τὰ καὶ τὰ ἐπιτάττοντος, οὐκ ἔνεστιν ἀπειθεῖν, οὕτως εἰκεῖν πάντας ἀνάγκη καὶ τρέχειν ὅποι οὖν ἢ ἡ ἡδονή νεύσειεν· ἐφεστῶτος γὰρ τοῦ πάθους, καὶ διακελευμένου τῷ ψυχομόντι τοῦ παρ' ἡμῖν περικότος, πρὸς τῖνος ἀπόλαυσιν τε καὶ μετοχὴν τῶν δοκοῦντων ἐφετῶν εἶναι καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὰ μεθελκόντων ἐτί δὲ προσαπειλοῦντος λυπήσειν, εἰ μὴ κατανεῦειν ἐθέλω, οὐδὲν ἄλλα ἄρον διαπράξασθαι, ἢ ἐφέπεσθαί τε καὶ ἀγεσθαι, κατὰ τοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ χείλους δεδεμένους τῶν ἵππων, καὶ στρεβλουμένους τινὶ ξύλῳ. Πρὸς γὰρ δὴ δάκνον ἡδονής —τί γὰρ ταυτήσῃ σιδηροῦς, τίς ἀδάμας;—, ἡμεῖς ἆνθη φανῆσαι, καὶ διὰ παντός κεῖσθαι βουλήσεσθαι, τὴν διόρθωσιν παντάπασιν ἀπογνούς.

47. ἑρῶται εἰς τὸν θρόνον ἢ ἐπιπλήθον τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς πείρας ἄρρητος κακοῦ, μεῖω ἡ τῆς δόξης μετατραπείσης ἢ ἐπιπλήθον τῶν ἀνθρώπων.
λύπην εἶναι τῆς εὐφροσύνης, καὶ τῆς φθασάσης ἡδονῆς τὸν ἐπιγεγονότα κρατῆσαι μετάμελον, καὶ πλεονεκτηθῆναι καὶ ἀντατῆθηται ταύτην ἐκείνου. Τό γὰρ ἣδυ μετὰ τὸν κόρον ἀναφέρον, ὡς εἰρήκαμεν, καὶ ἀλγύνει μᾶλλον τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς πλησμονῆς, ἢ παραμεθεῖται τὸ μέτριον τῆς τρυφῆς, καὶ λυπεῖ τὸ διαφέρεστερὸν τῆς ἀπουσίας, ἢ χαρίζεται ἡ παρουσία, ὡς τάχυτα ἡμᾶς παρατρέχουσα. Ὄστε τὸ τέρπον, ἐνὶ τῷ μέρει χαριζόμενον τῷ παρεῖναι, διττῶς ἡμᾶς αἰνά, τῷ μὴ παραγεγονότας ταχέως καὶ ἡττηθῆναι καὶ ἁπεστάναι καὶ ἐν ἐκάστῳ δὲ τούτων πλέον τὸ δάκνον, ἢ ἐν τῷ τέρπειν τὸ χαριζόμενον. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῶν ἔλπιζομένων ἡμῖν ἡδέων, ἢ τῶν μὴ πάντῃ βεβαίων, εἰ καὶ παρεῖεν. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἤδη παρόντων συχνόν γε δήπουθεν χρόνον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο νομιζομένων μηδέποτε μεταβήσεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐσεσθαί γε ἑδραίων τῇ παρεκτάσει παντὸς βίου, τί ἄν τις εἴποι; Εἰ γάρ τι τούτων ἀποβαλεῖν τοὺς κεκτημένους συμβαί — συμβαίνει δὲ συνεχῶς —, βαβαί ὡς ζημίαν μὴ φέροντας, διαφθαρῆναι τῇ λύπῃ. Ὅστε τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς χρῆμα, εἰς τοὐναντίον ἡμῖν περὶϊσταται, καὶ διὰ τούτου τὸ λελυπῆσθαι συμβαίνει.

[3a] Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ φθονεῖν ἠδικηκόσιν οὐδέν, πλὴν ὅτι μᾶλλον ἡμῶν τρυφᾶν δύνανται, εἰγε βούλοιτο τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀγαθοῖς καταχρώμενοι, σαφῶς ἐκεῖθεν ἡμῖν ἐπιγίγνεται. Πρὸς γὰρ ζηλότυπον τὸ φιλήδονον, καὶ νομίζει ζημιοῦσθαι ταῖς ἑτέρων ἀπολαύσεις· τουτὶ δὲ τὸ πάθος, σφόδρα γε λυποῦν ἐστίν, ὃν ἂν σχέτλιον ἕλοι· οἰμώττειν γὰρ διπλῇ.


προξενεῖ, τὰς τῶν ἄλλων εὐτυχίας οὐ φέροντα, καὶ τὰς οἰκείας ὠδυρόμενον ἠδικοῦσαν αἰσχυνούντας, οὐτέ τοὺς τῆς φύσεως αἰσχυνούντος, οὐτέ τοὺς ἀπανταχοῦ γῆς κειμένους ἐν τι κοινώς ἐπιτάττοντας, τὴν τῶν πλησίον ἁγάπην, κὰν πολλοῖς τοις ἐτέροις πρὸς ἀλλήλους διαφέροντας. Καὶ μὴ εἰ τις φίλτρῳ κινούμενος, ἐμποδὼν ἡμῖν γένοιτο τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, οὐ πάντως τῆς φύσεως αἰσχυνόμενον νομοὺς, οὔτε τοὺς ἁπανταχοῦ γῆς κειμένους τὸν ἄλληθρος φιλοῦντα, καὶ διὰ τὸν εὐτυχικὸν πολλῆς τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς παραφρασία, τοῦναντίων ἢ προσήκει ἡμᾶς παραουροῦντας ἄργους ὑπερείμεθα καὶ τῷ παραρθησίῳ πολλοὶ τῷ φίλτρῳ, καὶ τῷ μεθ' ὑποστολῆς παραινοῦντας, ὡς τῷ μὴ δέχεσθαι τὰς παραινέσεις κακῶς αὐτὸς κακῶς αὐτὸν διαθεῖναι; Εὐχερῶς δὲ ὑποπτεύεται, καὶ ὁ μηδαμῶς τοιοῦτος, μηδὲ συνειδὼς αὐτῷ τι τοιοῦτον, ὁποῖον τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς ὑπερείμεθα, εὐθυγιάδικος καὶ φίλος, καὶ εἰ τις πάντα ἀγαθὸς ἐκεῖνος νομίζει τοιοῦτον· τυφλοὶ γὰρ μάλα τὸ πάθος, καὶ οὐκ ἐὰν τὸν λογισμὸν ὀρθὴν ἐξενεγκεῖν ψῆφον. Καὶ μὲν δὲ καὶ χρυσίον ἀθροίζειν καταδεχόμεθα, ἀδίκως τε καὶ ἀγεννῶς ὅτε, ὡς δυνηθῆναι κτήσασθαι τὰ πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπιτήδεια· ὅ γὰρ δοῦλος τῶν ἡδονῶν, ἀναγκαίως δεῖται χρημάτων, καὶ ὁ τὸ χρηματίζειν προὔργου θέμενος, πάντα δεύτερα νομίζει τοῦ πλουτεῖν, ὅπερ ἀναγκαίως δεῖται.
αἰτίον ἐστιν ἀπείρων οἴμαι κακῶν.

[3b] Ὡς μὴν ἀλλὰ κάκειν πάσχομεν τὸ δεινόν. Πυκνὰ τὰ δούλοι πρὸ σαράνταμεν καὶ δάκνοντά τινα ἄφθονον τῶν ἤδειν ἐνεκεὶ καὶ ἀναισχυντούμεν πολλάκες, εἰς οὓς οὐδέ τις ἀναβλέψων ἐπιθυμεῖν, οὖν ἀδραπόν πάσχομεν πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντι ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντη ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντη ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντη ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει.

[3c] Τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον οὐχ οὕτω· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἡδύ που παραγενόμενον, ὀψὲ καὶ χρόνου μήκεσι, καὶ περιόδοις ἐκτεταμέναις, μονόν οὐδὲ καὶ ἀπέπτη· καὶ τὸ προσδοκώμενον σβέννυται πρὸ τοῦ φανῆναι τελέως, οὕτω ταχὺ πρὸς ἀπαλλαγήν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἱερὸν φασί· τὸ δὲ ἀλγύνον τε καὶ λυποῦν, ὅσονος μὲν ἂν ἐπιβλαβῆ, καὶ δάκνοντας τὰ ἑνεκεῖ, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντη ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει. Καὶ μὴν πάντη ποὺ δῆλον, τὸν θυμόν ἐκ τῆς ἀποτυχίας τῶν ἐπιθυμῶν φύεσθαι, καὶ ἡδονάς γίνεσθαι, καὶ παντελῶς ἑνεκεῖν, ἀσύμφορα πάντες ἑκατοντάς τὰ ἄτοπα, πάντα τὰ δυσχερὰ πρὸ τοῦ δουλωθῆναι τῷ πάθει.
δὲ διαφέρετεν, εἰσόδευτα δὲ βαθύτερον, προσκύνεται δὲ ἀκριβέστερον, καὶ
tοσοῦτον ἐπεὶ τα ὑπεύθυντος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιδείκνυται, καὶ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ποιεῖ,
ὅπως ὀφελητῇ τὸ πάντων ἤδιον ἐχαρίστατο. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ εἰ μὴ παραδόξων
λέγειν, ἴ γάρ τῷ ἱδεθαί, αὐτοῦ γε πάλιν ἐνεκα τοῦ ἱδεός, ἀνίας ὧσις
μετέχομεν, ἢν ἀκριβῶς θεωρήσωμεν οὐδὲ γὰρ οἷον λεληθέναι τὴν ψυχήν, ἃς 
τῷ ἠδίῳ τὸ ἄνυπρον ἀναγκαίως ἀκολουθεῖ, κατὰ τὸν Ἀρίστονος Πλάτωνα. Οὕτω 
tοῖς ὀλίσι πλεονεκτεῖ τῶν τῆς ἱδονῆς, τὰ τῆς λύπης. Καὶ φενακαζόμενοι πάντες οἱ
φασιμότερον ἔχων οἰκούμενον, ἅλλα μὲν διώκομεν, ἄλλοις δὲ ἀλισκόμεθα, ὅπερ
ὁρόμεν πάσχοντας τοὺς ἀγαν λίγοι τῶν θρησκευόμενοι ἱσχύων εὑρόμανε γὰρ
ἐθέλουσι τῇ τροφῇ τὸ σῶμα καὶ τὸν λαμόν, ἀντὶ δὲ τούτον, περιπτείροισιν αὐτὰ τῷ
σιδήρῳ. Τοσοῦτον ἦμιν περίσταται πρὸς τουναυσίν ἠ ἱδονή, Οὕτω διὰ τῶν ἡμῶν ἦμιν
λυμαίνεται τὸ πρὸς τὴν τροφὴν κεχιηνέας καὶ ἵνα τὸ πάν εἰσιμι, ὑπὲρ συχνῆς
ὁδονής, καὶ παθεῖν πάν ὅσιον, καὶ πάνθ’ ὃμοι διαπράξασθαι πρόθυμοι πάντες
ἐσμέν, μηδὲ τὸ τυχόν ὑπὲρ τῶν δεόντων καταδεχόμενοι φέρειν. Καὶ τέλος, εἰ διὰ
τοσοῦτον ἀναράκτων καὶ τηλικοῦτων κακῶν, χρόνον καὶ μόχις αὐτὴν κηραίθηκε,
λαμπρὰς γαὶ δὴ τὰς ἀμοίβας εὐθὺς ἦμιν ἀποδίδωσι γίγνεται γὰρ παρατίκως καὶ
φθόνον παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ νοσημάτων ἦμιν πολλάκις, καὶ τὰ μυρία δεινά σοὶ γὰρ
πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον ἄφορον ἡμᾶς συνωθεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ θέλγων ἀπλῶς. Τοσαυτά τε
καὶ πλεῖον τυχόν παρὰ τῶν πολλοίς τοις βέλεσι βεβλημένων ύπ’ ἱδονῆς,
processione 23.4, 113.15, 202.10; Epistulae 4.2, 52.13; vid. Oratio VII 32 — 129-131. 7ος ἄγαν-σιδήρων[ cf. Dialogi
293.21; Ad Thessalonicenses 297.37-38; Oratio II 129, IV 95, VII 425 — 136. Λαμπρὰς-αμοίβας[ cf. Dialogi XVII
220.3 — 139. βέλεσι βεβλημένων] cf. Oratio V 200-201, VII 153
130-135. τοσοῦτον καὶ τηλικοῦτων κακῶν, χρόνον καὶ μόχις αὐτὴν κηραίθηκε,
λαμπρὰς γαὶ δὴ τὰς ἀμοίβας εὐθὺς ἦμιν ἀποδίδωσι γίγνεται γὰρ παρατίκως καὶ
φθόνον παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων, καὶ νοσημάτων ἦμιν πολλάκις, καὶ τὰ μυρία δεινά σοὶ γὰρ
πρὸς τὸ βέλτιστον ἄφορον ἡμᾶς συνωθεῖ, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ θέλγων ἀπλῶς. Τοσαυτά τε
καὶ πλεῖον τυχόν παρὰ τῶν πολλοίς τοις βέλεσι βεβλημένων ύπ’ ἱδονῆς,
140. διαβαλλόντων αὐτὴν ἔστιν αἰκούειν.

121. προσκύνηται] καλλάττα ἐ — 122. δριμύτητος post cor. (ex δροabies? εὶ το ἑαυτοῦ) deest V — 123.
oúde πάστορ ποιμ. — 124. αὐτῶν L — 125-126. τῷ ἱδή B: τῷ ἱδή M — 129. εὐφόραν post cor. (ex εὐφόρανα)
V: εὐφόραν BML — 130. περιπτείροισιν post cor. (ex περιπτείροισιν) M — 131. οὐτοὶ LPG — 133. καὶ post
cor. (ex καὶ) B — 134. τῶν post cor. (ex τὸ εἰς σερ. v sup. lin.) B — 30. δεόντων post cor. (ex δεόν εἰς σερ. tōn) sup.
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Οι τοὺς ἕναντίους ἀκούοντες λόγους, παντοδαπὰς ἐπάγουσιν ἀντιθέσεις. Τυραννικῶτατον πάθος αὐτὴν καλοῦντες, καὶ παντοδαπὸν θηρίον, καὶ ἀμα ἴσον, ὡς οὐδ’ ἂν ἐν τῶν ἀπάντων γόνω, γὰρ αἰεὶ χαίρει, ἐν οἷς καὶ μᾶλλον πάσιν λυμαίνετας ἀσθενεῖς γὰρ διαζωγαφοῦντες αὐτὴν, ὑποδύεται φασὶ τὸ προσωπεῖον πάνυ πυκνά, τοῦ καλοῦ τε καὶ συνοίσοντος. Καὶ τί ἂν πρῶτον εἴπομεν, τί δὲ ὅταν τῶν ἐκείνης τρόπων, τὰς μηχανὰς, τὰς πλοκὰς, τὰς ποικιλίας ἐξείποι; Πειρᾷ μὲν ἅπασι τρόποις ἡ δυσμενὴ, ὡς γὰρ ἔμψυχον αὐτὴν, νῦν πως εἰς μέσον ἐξοίσομεν· γοητεύει δὲ —πῶς οἴει;— δελεάζει δὲ κακοηθείᾳ ἐσχάτῃ, καὶ πᾶσιν γίνεται πάντα, πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν τῶν χρηστοτέρων ἠθῶν· σύμβουλος αὐτόκλητος ἐπεισὶ, καὶ τὴν ῥᾳστώνην θαυμάζουσα, κακίζει πάνθ’ ἃ δίδωσιν ἁγγεῖα σώματι καὶ ψυχαῖς, νοσοποιαίτε τῇ τε γὰρ σαρκί, τῷ τε πνεύματι, συχνὴν τινα ἀλήθειαν καὶ ταραχὴν ἐμποιεῖν αὐτὰ λέγει, καὶ μυρίαν τρικυμίαν ἐπάγειν, καὶ διηνεκῆ μαρασμὸν ἐργάζεσθαι. Δοκεῖ δὲ πάνυ πιθανὴ, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰ εὐχερὰ παραινεῖν τὴν ἱσχὺν ἔχουσα· κολακεύει μάλα δουλοπρεπῶς, διακελεύεται φιλικῶς, δεσποτικῶς ἐπιτάττειν, οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται. Οὐδὲν αὐτῇ κώλυμα, οὐκ εἰργον, οὐ προσιστάμενον, ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως ἐς τὰ ἐναντιώτατα μεταπηδᾶν, οὐκ οἶδεν ἐρυθρᾶς αἰσχύνης οὐδὲ μέμνηται. Τί γὰρ ἀναιδείᾳ πρὸς αἰσχύνην κοινόν; Ἀτρεμεῖν οὐχ οἷά τε, οὐδὲ γὰρ πέφυκεν· ἠρεμίαν, ἡσυχίαν, γαλήνην, εἴ τι τοιοῦτον, οὐδαμῶς ἐπίσταται, οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅλως μεμάθηκε. Κροκοδείλους, λέοντας, πᾶν θυμῷ κρατοῦμεν, ἡ λύτη διαβαίνει. Καὶ τίνα πρὸς τὴν ὐποδύεται ἀντιθέσιον ἀντιθέσιον ἐπείς, καὶ τὴν ῥᾳστώνην θαυμάζουσα, κακίζει πάνθ’ ἃ δίδωσιν ἁγγεῖα σώματι καὶ ψυχαῖς, νοσοποιαίτε τῇ τε γὰρ σαρκί, τῷ τε πνεύματι, συχνὴν τινα ἀλήθειαν καὶ ταραχὴν ἐμποιεῖν αὐτὰ λέγει, καὶ μυρίαν τρικυμίαν ἐπάγειν, καὶ διηνεκῆ μαρασμὸν ἐργάζεσθαι. Δοκεῖ δὲ πάνυ πιθανὴ, ἀπὸ τοῦ τὰ εὐχερὰ παραινεῖν τὴν ἱσχὺν ἔχουσα· κολακεύει μάλα δουλοπρεπῶς, διακελεύεται φιλικῶς, δεσποτικῶς ἐπιτάττειν, οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται. Οὐδὲν αὐτῇ κώλυμα, οὐκ εἰργον, οὐ προσιστάμενον, ὡς μὴ ῥαδίως ἐς τὰ ἐναντιώτατα μεταπηδᾶν, οὐκ οἶδεν ἐρυθρᾶς αἰσχύνης οὐδὲ μέμνηται. Τί γὰρ ἀναιδείᾳ πρὸς αἰσχύνην κοινόν; Ἀτρεμεῖν οὐχ οἷά τε, οὐδὲ γὰρ πέφυκεν· ἠρεμίαν, ἡσυχίαν, γαλήνην, εἴ τι τοιοῦτον, οὐδαμῶς ἐπίσταται, οὐδὲν γὰρ ὅλως μεμάθηκε. Κροκοδείλους, λέοντας, πᾶν θυμῷ κρατοῦμεν, ἡ λύτη διαβαίνει.
κατεχόμενον, πάνα αἰμοβόρον, ἀπαν κεντρότυπον, ἰοβόλον, δάκνον ἀνίατα, τῇ
θηριωδίᾳ παρῆνεγκεν. Απτθασόν ἐστι καὶ αἵμερον, καὶ καταλλαγὰς ἀποσείεται οὐ
gὰρ ἀγαπᾷ τὸ ἴσον ἔχουσα σπείσασθαι ἀνθ’ ὧν βιαζομένη κατὰ ταὐτὸ καὶ
ἐξαπατώσα, πολλοὺς εἶναι τι δοκοῦντα μέγα εἰς γενναιότητα, καὶ παρὰ πάντων
θαυμαζομένους ἐπ’ ἀφετὶ, κατήνεγκεν αὐτὴ προοβολῆ, καὶ ἐξήλεγξε. II

Κἂν οὐ καταστρέψῃ τῇ πρώτῃ πείρᾳ, καὶ παρασύρῃ χειμάρρου δίκην, ἀλλ’ αὐτῇ
καὶ καρτερίαν πολλὴν ἐνδείκνυται, καὶ τῷ πονεῖν ἄγαν τέρπεται, καὶ ὅλως γε διὰ χρόνου,
tοῖς γενναιοτάτοι τῶν ἀθλητῶν ὑπενδίδωσι. Ἑώρακε τις αὐτήν, πρωτείων πύκταις παραχωρήσασαν, πύκταις
ἐκείνοις, ἵνα ἱδρῶτες τε καὶ πόνοι, παρ’ οὐδὲν νομίζονται διηγωνισμένοις, οὐ τῷ
ταὐτῇ, αἰδεσθῆναι τὴν ἀνδρείαν τῶν κρατησάντων. Τί γὰρ δὴ κοινὸν αἰδοῖ, πρὸς
ἀπηρυθριακός τι καὶ ἀναίσχυντον; ἐκείνη γὰρ ὡς ἔοικεν, οὐ δέδοικε τοὺς
πολλάκις αὐτῆς κρατήσαντας, οὐκ ὀρρωδεῖ τοὺς νενικηκότας, οὐ τοὺς μακρὰν τινα


δίκην ταύτην εἰσπράξαντας, τῆς εἰς ἐκείνους ταύτης μανίας· ἀλλὰ τὸ πίπτειν συνεχῶς παιδίαν λογιζόμενην, ὁρθὴ ταχέως εὑρίσκομένη, τοῖς αὐτοῖς καὶ πάλιν ἐπιχειρεῖ, ὡσπερ μηθαμώς ἠπτηθεῖσα. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄθυμμάτων οἱ παιδεῖς, εἰ ὡθησιῶ τῶν συναθυρόντων καταβληθείσων, πρὸς πάλην αὖθις ἀνίστανται, καὶ ἐτοίμως ἔχουσι συμπλακῆναι τοῖς κατενεχθούσι πολλάκις· καὶ ἢδε οὐδὲν κορέν ἱναται καταβεβλημένην, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ ταῖς συμπλοκαῖς ἐπαγγέλλεται, τῶν συνεχῶς κατασταλαίοντων. Ὡς ὁφελῶν γε καὶ ἡμεῖς, τὸν ἵστον τρόπον ἴδουμεν τοὺς πρὸς ἐκείνην ἁγώνας· οὕτω γὰρ φιλονεικεὶ πρὸς τὰ καθ' ἡμῶν, ὡς μηδὲ βιωτὸν ἠγείσθαι ἕαν μὴ ἔξη, καὶ τοὺς κρείπτους ἀγεῖν περιφανῶς ὡσπερ ἀνδράποδα. Κάν ὑπενδύω τις μικρὸν πρὸς τὰς ἐκείνης ὅρμας, ἢ νεότα τι πρὸς καταλλαγάς δόξη τοῦτο τὸ μικρὸν ἀρτάσασα, τὸ πᾶν εὐθύς οἰνοποτε, καὶ μελετά τινα δόλον, πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἡμεληρίων καθαίρεσιν, καὶ τῶν ἐν σπονδαῖς γεγονότων κρατήσας θέλει. Καὶ περὶ τοῦ πῶς, ὁ λόγος αὐτὴ βραχύς. Θεόν πάντα δὴ κάλων, ἀπαντά λίθων, καὶ τοιαύτην ἀπασιν παροιμίαν, εἰποὶ τις ἂν οἶμαι δικαίως περὶ τῶν ἐκείνης μηχανημάτων παρήγγειλε γὰρ ἀτεχνώς, ὅτου ἂν τις ἔχοι μνηθῆναι δυστρόπου τε καὶ εὐμηχάνου τοὺς κακουργῶν. Ακήρυκτον μὲν ἡμῖν ἐπάγει τὸν πόλεμον, τρώει βουλομένη πρὸ τοῦ φανήναν νικοτομαχιάν δὲ φιλεί, ὡς καταδαρθάνουσιν ἐπιστήναι ὡς φθάσαι τὸν πολέμον, πρὸ τοῦ γυμνόσαν τὸ ἕξος. Πώς γὰρ ἂν ἐκείνην διέλαθε, τόσον τιμᾶν ἄξιον τὸ καταλαβεῖν αἰφνιδίως; Καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ τοῦτο δεινόν καὶ γενναιοτάτων ψυχὰς κληνῆσαι. Κάν ἢ τι κούφον τὸ προσπεσόν, μᾶλλον ἂν ἐσχύσειεν

196. ἀκηρυκτον πολέμων] cf. Herodotum, Historiae V 81.7
θροήσαι, καὶ τοὺς ὁυκ ἀν ὄβδιως τοῦτο παθόντας, ἢ τι γινωσκόμενον τοὺς ἀγεννεστέρους· τὸ γὰρ παρὰ προσδοκίαν μικρὸν, ἐκπληκτικότερον μεγάλου προσδοκομένου. Ἐφα τοῦ σκότους, νυκτός αὐτῆς ἀστελήνου, ὁμίληθα χαίρει παχεία, ἀόρατον ὄρατον τὸ ὄρατον γε ποιούση. Συνόδος οἵμαι ταύτην ἀγάλλεσθαι τουτοι τῶν λαμπροτάτων ἀστέρων, ὡς ταύτη γε τοῦ σώματος τῆς σελήνης, τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τοῦ ἕλιου μέσολαβοῦντος, μὴ δύνασθαι τὸ ἵδιον τὰς αἰκίνας Πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐργάζεσθαι. Συλλήβδηθεν, ὅπερ αἴτιον τοῦ λεληθότως δύνασθαι βλάβην ἡμῖν ἐμποιῆσαι τὴν ἡδονήν, φίλον αὐτῇ· εἰωθὸς γὰρ μάλα καὶ σύντροφός, ἀφεῖναι λάθρα βέλος, ἀφεῖναι δὲ πᾶν τὸ πλήξον, ἀφεῖναι δὲ ὁ δίδωσιν ἐλπίζειν μᾶλα δυνήσεσθαι καμίαν τρόσα πληγῆν, καὶ ὁλὸς πάντες ἐργάζεται κρύφα τὰ καθ’ ἡμῶν, ἀποκλίνει τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐργάζεσθαι. Καὶ τὸ δὴ φοβερώτερον πάντων, καὶ μονονοὺ ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀπόγνωσιν ἐμποιοῦν· ἀποκλίνει τὴν πρὸς τὸν σκοπὸν συντεινόντων.


219. ψυχαῖς-ἐμποιοῦν] cf. Nyssenum, In Canticum cantorum V 137.7; Platonem, Phaedo 115e

201. ὁυκ ἀν ὄβδιως τοῦτο παθόντας, ἢ τι γινωσκόμενον τοὺς ἀγεννεστέρους· τὸ γὰρ παρὰ προσδοκίαν μικρὸν, ἐκπληκτικότερον μεγάλου προσδοκομένου. Ἐφα τοῦ σκότους, νυκτός αὐτῆς ἀστελήνου, ὁμίληθα χαίρει παχεία, ἀόρατον ὄρατον τὸ ὄρατον γε ποιούση.
μόνου γὰρ ἂν εἰς Θεοῦ τὸ παντελῶς ἀήττητον—, οὐ καταπίπτει, οὐκ ἀμελεί, οὐκ ἀπαγορεύει, οὐδὲ μακρὰν ἀφίσταται, ἀλλὰ περινοστεῖ καὶ ἐπιβουλεύει—πῶς οἷς τοιαύτης οὐχ ὅπως οὖν ὁ πάθος, οὐδὲ ἑγγύα ταῖς ἀποτυχίαις, κἂν ἀριθμοῦ κρείττου γένοιτο· παρατηρεῖ δὲ τοὺς καιρούς, καὶ ὅταν θύραθέν τι δεινὸν ἐπέλθο, τότε καὶ ἥδε κινεῖται, ἕρμαιον ἡγησαμένη τὸ συμπεσόν. Ἐπεὶ καὶ μῦες, καὶ αἴλουροι, καὶ πάντα τοιοῦτον κλεπτίστατον, λύκοι τε καὶ ἃπαν ἁρπακτικόν, ταραχῇ καὶ ζάλῃ χαίρει, καὶ ῥαγδαίοις ὑετοῖς, καὶ ἀστραπαῖς καὶ βρονταῖς ἐξαισθοῖς, καὶ ὅσα τρικυμίαν ψυχαῖς ἐντήκει, ὡς ταύτῃ γε δυνησόμενα κακουργεῖν, ἀλλὰ δὴ βλεπόντων εἰς ἕτερα τῶν τὰ αὑτῶν φυλαττόντων, ἰταμότης ἐν ταῖς ἄρκτοις καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις. Τί δὲ ἡ ἀποφρὰς αὕτη, ὀξυθυμία παρὰ τοῖς τίγρισι, καὶ εἴ τι τούτοις ἐφάμιλλον; Ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ τίς πραότης; Ὕπουλά τινα θηρία —ταυτὶ δὲ λέγω τὰ εὐτελέστερα—, κερδώ, καὶ πίθηκοι, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, πολλῷ γε ταῦτα ὑπερηκόντισεν ἡ ἡδονὴ πρὸς τὸ ὕφαλον· χαμαιλέων γίνεται, Πρωτεὺς ἄλλος· ζηλοῖ πᾶν τὸ κακόηθες καὶ μεταβάλλειν αὐτίκα δυνάμενον· καταγελᾷ πρὸς τὸ ἀπατᾶν, τῶν σοφωτέρων εἰς τοῦτο, ἐναλίων θ' ἅμα καὶ πτηνῶν καὶ τετραπόδων ἁπάντων.

Εἴ τι τῶν ὅλως αἰσθητικῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ὑφήλιον ἐξύμνηται εἰς πονηρίαν καὶ κακοήθειαν, λῆρος ἐκείνῃ νομίζεται εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀποβλεπούσῃ· μόνον γὰρ τοῦτο θαυμάζει, ὃ δὴ λογικὴν ψυχὴν ἀπατῆσαι δύναται τὴν ταχίστην. Τὸν ὄφιν ἴσως αἰσχύνεται, ὡς πάλαι τοῦτο δεδυνημένον, πλὴν καὶ τούτου μοι δοκεῖ ἰσχυροτέρα ἡ ῥάπτουσα δόλους.
δονή. Δυσίν γὰρ ὄντων, δι’ ἀ προτάσας τὸν ὁφειν λέγω καὶ τὸν καρπον, πρῶτον τε αἴτιων ὁ καρπὸς καὶ μείζων, ὡς γέ μοι φαίνεται τοῦ καρποῦ γὰρ μὴ παρόντος, μηδὲ τὰς ὁψεις ἐφελκομένου πρὸς τὴν ἐαυτοῦ θέαν καὶ κατανόησιν, τί ποτ’ ἢ εἴχεν ὁ ὀφειν δράν, τί καὶ παραίνειν, τί καὶ συμβουλεύσεως: Τούτον δὲ ἀποστάντος, εὐχέρεας ἢ εἴχεν κλατήνη τῇ ὀρασίτητι τοῦ καρποῦ, οἳ τῷ θηρῷ πιστεύσαντες σαθρὰ τίνα παραινέσαντι: οὔτε γὰρ φθονεῖν εἰκὼς ἢν τὸν πεπουργοῦν τῷ πλάσματι, καὶ τό, Θεόν Ἡ γενέσθαι τὸν ἐκ πηλοῦ, καρπὸν τινὸς μεταλῆψει, παντελῶς ἀπίθανον. Φραίσς δὲ ἢν ὁ καρπός, καὶ γοητεύειν μάλα δυνάμενος, καὶ χορσάς ἐπαγγελιὰς προτείνων τοῖς αὐτῶν μεταληψομένους, ὡς γὰρ εὐφρανεῖ τῷ στόματι προσφερόμενος, καὶ ὄλος ἠστει τῶν ὁραίων πάντων ἡδῶν· καὶ οὐδὲν ὑπέσχητο ξένον, οὐδὲ καινόν, οὐδ’ ἀπίθανον, ἀλλ’ οἰκεῖον ἐχόν τελέσαι, καὶ εὐχέρες, καὶ γεγονόμενον: τὸ γὰρ δὴ καλὸν εἰς ὀφίν, οὐθεματοῦν, εἰ ὑποληθείη φανητεσθαι βέλτιον τῶν ἄλλων εἰς γεύσιν. Ὡσπο πρὸς τὸ πεπωκέναι τούς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὐκ ὀλίγα συνεβάλετο καὶ ἢ ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ ἐλπισθεύσα ἡδονή.

245 [5bh Ἀλλ’ ἀθρεῖ μοι καὶ τίδε τὴν ἡδονήν, καὶ πόση τὶς ἢ ταυτίς ἴσχυς καθ’ ἡμῶν ἔστιν, εἰς τὸ ἀπατᾶν, εἰς τὸ πείθειν, εἰς τὸ βιάζεσθαι πολλῷ γὰρ εἶναι χαλεπωτέραν φημι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἢδη, ἢ πρὸς τούς προπάτορας πάλας ἢ γάρ τοις ὑπάγαστοι εὐγάσατο πρὸς τοὺς μηδαμῶς μηδεπώποτε ὡς ἕκεινς κρατιθέντας, ὡς δὴ καὶ σχεῖν ἠτανόησιν τούς, ὡσπερ ἤμεις τὰ ἀνθραπόδια, τί ποτ’ ἢν καὶ δράσει πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτίς, ὡς εἰπεῖν, αἰχμαλώτων φύντας, καὶ πρὸς τὸ χειριστὸν
έλημακοτάς, τῇ παρὰ τῶν φυσάντων διαδοχή: Ὡσθ’ ἢ ταύτης δύναμις, καὶ ἢ τῶν παθῶν εἰς ἄρχης κρατήσασα τῶν πρώτως γεγονότων ἀνθρώπων, ἐπειτα διὰ τῶν μέσων κατούσα πρὸς τοὺς ἐσχάτους, ὡςον ἔχει τούτοις ἐμπαιξείν, ἢ τοὺς πρὸ αὐτῶν γεγονός. Τὰ γὰρ ἀνθρώπεια πάθη, πολεμίων σώζονοι σχῆμα, οἷς τὸ κρατήσας καταρχὰς τῶν ἀνθισταμένων, μετὰ μεγίστων γίνεται τῶν κινδύνων· εἰ δ’ οὖν ἀπαξ γένοιτο τῶν ἀντιπάλων περιγενέσθαι, οὐκετὶ φαίνεται χαλεπόν, τοὺς αὐτοὺς φοβεῖν καὶ τρέπειν, καὶ δεικνύει νότα διδοῦνα, καὶ τὴν δειλίαν ταυτην, μετὰ προσθήκης παραπέμψεσθαι τοῖς ἐκγόνοις. Ὡσθ’ ἢ ταύτης καθ’ ἐμῶν δύναμις μείναι ἐστι καὶ δραστικότερα, ἢ πρὸς τοὺς ἡμέτερους προγόνους, καὶ ἐτὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἐκείνους, ἐως ἃν εἰς τοὺς προπάτορας ἐπανέλθουσι.

[5c] Ἀλλὰ μὴν ἔκεινη γε πρὸς τοὺς εἰρημένους, λέγω δὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν — καὶ ἢ τὸ ἀντέχομαι τῆς εἰκόνος τῶν τῶν ἰατρῶν υποκοίμηται παῖδας παραγενέται τὰ πρὸς ύγίειαν, ἢν δὲ τῶν σώματι σφριγεῖαν, καὶ τὸν τῆς ψυχῆς παραλύσεως τόνον. Κάν ἢ ἀποσοβιθῇ, κάν ἢ ἀποκρούθῃ, κάν ἢ ρᾷδον δέξηται κατα κορυφής, καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, λήτης αὐτής· καὶ διαπεράσθη τοὺς καὶ τοῦτο μυράκις, συχνοὶ τις πάστες ὢδοις, ὄλως ὀσάκες ὑποβολῆς τοιαύτας αὐτή προσβάλλεις. Φιλοτιμεῖται τὴν Ἰάκχον παρενεγκείν, καὶ τοῦτο γε, μεθ’ ὅσης ὑπερβολῆς· ἢν τηλεῖρθη τὴν κεφαλήν, πολυκέφαλος εὕθεις ἀναφαίνεται καὶ ἠττηθῇ τὴν κράτος, καὶ τρόπαιόν τις ἢ τούτης ἐγείρητο μάλα λαμπρὸν— ἐφῃσθο γὰρ μοι καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ὑπερβάλλον· ἔκεινη δὲ τὸ καθ’ αὐτὴν χαλεπωτέρα πειράται φαίνεσθαι· καὶ ἀλήτης γένεται καὶ φυγαῖ.
κἂν πρὸς ἀνύδρους πορευθῇ τόπους, πάλιν ἐπανέρχεται ἐαυτῆς πολλαπλασίων, 
κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα εἰκεῖν τοῦ ἀκαθάρτου πνεύματος. Οὕκοιν γε διαλιμπάνει ταυτί 
ποιοῦσα καὶ ἐτι χείρω· οὕτως ἀναιδές, καὶ ἀναίσχυντον, καὶ μανικοῦν, καὶ κακόηθες.

Πάντα πράττει σὺν ἰταμότητι, κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχει, κραδίην δ' οὐκ ἐλάφοιο, ἀλλ' οἷς 
πολὺς ὁ κότος ἐνὶ στήθεσι πέλει· πρὸς ἕν τι βλέπει, πρὸς ἓν ὁρᾷ, τὸ καταπαλάσαι 
τοὺς ταυτησὶ φανέντας ἀμείνους· φιλονεικεῖ τὴν ἧτταν ἀνακαλέσασθαι, καὶ 
πολλῷ τῷ περίοντι γενέσθαι κρείσσων· τούτων δεύτερα πάντα τίθησι, καὶ εἰ κατορθῶσε 
μόνον, οὐδὲν ὑπολογίζεται τῶν δεινῶν, οὐ τῶν φοβερῶν, οὐ τῶν σιχθέαν πάντων ὁμοι.

Καίτοι τί λέγω ‖ 

αἰσχίστων, ὅπου γε καὶ τούτοις ἐγκαλλωπίζεται, καὶ μᾶλλον χαίρει δ' αὐτῶν, ἢ 
tούτων ἀνείκαστον θυμόν, καὶ ἀπαράμιλλον ἔριν ἡμεῖς τέως λυπούμεθα, ἤστη 
ἄτοπον πάσχομεν ―δεῖ γὰρ διορθώσασθαι τὸ ῥηθέν―, οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὸ νικῆσαι 
λυπούμεθα· ἦν γὰρ ἂν ταύτῃ τὸ πάθος περιφανῶς ἀλλόκοτον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν ταύτης 
λύτταν τὴν καθ' ἡμῶν, καὶ τὸν ἀνείκαστον θυμόν, καὶ τὴν ἀπαράμιλλον ἔριν 
ὁρῶντες· καὶ ὡς πάντα ἂν γένοιτο, καὶ πάντα πάθοι ῥᾳδίως, πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν 
καθαίρεσιν ἀφορῶσα, οὐ μᾶλλον εὐφραινόμεθα, ἢ δικαίως ἀσχάλλομεν. Ἴσμεν γάρ, 
ἴσμεν αὐτήν, μηδαμῶς γε λήξουσαν μάχης τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς· ἀεὶ γὰρ δήπου, καὶ 

Epistulæ 6.62; vid. Oratio VII 286, Epilogus 39 — 291-292. λύπην-ψυχαῖς| cf. Oratio IV 219 — 293. σκιρτᾶν- 
φαιδρότητος| cf. Epistulæ 15.31; Oratio III 150 
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πολεμήσει, καὶ συμπλακήσεται φανερώς μετά τὴν ἡτταν δεινότερον· αλγοῦμεν
tοίνυν τῷ δέει τῶν ὑφορωμένων πραγμάτων, ἢ δὴ ταύτῃ ἔγνωμεν παρεξομένην
διηνεκῶς, ἢ χαίρομεν τῶν νεκρικῆκενα. Πάντες γὰρ τοῖς θθάσαι, τὸ μέλλον γε
dικαίως τεκμαίρονται.

305 [6a] Ἑώς ὧδε τὰ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἔσται, ἐπεὶ μὴ δεῖ περαιτέρω. Οὗτε γὰρ ἐς τάκοιβες ἐλθείν
μοι δοκεῖ ᾗδεῖν εἰς αὐτοὺς καθαρῶς εἰπεῖν δυνηθῆναι πλήν ἐκεῖνο γε 
μόνον ἐπιλεκτέον. Πολύμορφον τι γέγονεται τέρας, παντοδαπαῖς ἰδέαις παράγουσα, 
kαι λυμαινομένη πόσον δοκεῖς, καὶ ἵνα τὰ ἐλάσσω παρῶ, εὕροις ἂν τὴν ἡδονήν, 
tὸ κατ' αὐτὴν ἄνωθεν ἐξέτασας, ἀπωλείας ἕνεκα παντοδαπὴ γεγονυῖαν. Αὕτη τὰς νιφάδας τοῦ πυρὸς
ὕσε ποτὲ Σοδομίταις, ἀβύσσους γῆς ἀνέῳξε, καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, ὡς
κατακλυσθῆναι καὶ φύσιν ἄλογον, οὐκ ἐνεχομένην ὥσπερ ἡ ἡμετέρα· σὺ δέ μοι
λογίζου τοὺς ἐν ἐρήμῳ πεσόντα τῶν Ἰουδαίων· τὰ ταύτης πανταχοῦ κατορθώματα,
ἵνα καὶ ἀνθρώπους οὐβουλόμεθα. Ζ' ἑκατέρωθεν κακὸν καὶ
ἀπαραίτητον βλαβερὸν ἡ ἡδονὴ πέφυκεν εἶναι.

310 [6b] Λέγω δὲ πάντως ἐκείνοις, τοῖς μὴ βεβηκσ τε καὶ πάγιον κεκτημένοι φρόνημα,
καὶ πεῖραν πραγμάτων παντοδαπῶν, καὶ παιδείαν ἀγαθήν, καὶ νοῦν ἀθόλωτον
πάθεσι, καὶ τρόπον δόξης ἐρῶντα, καὶ ἀεὶ τὴν

XX 248.24 — 313. ἡδονῆς] in textu et γρ(άφε) ἡδονῆς in
marg. I τὰ τῆς εἰκόνος BMLPG — 308. ἠγαμαιμονένη L — 310. ἀπολεί(ας) V —
φρόνημα post cor. (ex φρόνιμα) V — 320. τρόπον post cor. (ex τρόπων) Μ

382
τὴν αρχὴν ἐκπίπτομεν ἡδίστων καὶ ὁπόσον μέτριον ἄνθρωποι ἰσχυρότερον δοκοῦσιν τε καὶ ἀρίστοις αὐτάς γείσαντες, ὅπως τι ἄρχας εἶπεν, τε καὶ ἄριστοις καλλίστοις ἔγνωσαν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἢς ἐφελθῆναι, καὶ μὴ τῷ πλεονασμῷ βαρυνθῆναι τε καὶ καταπτεσθεὶς, ἀλλ’ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀκριβῶς, τῷδε ἐνταῦθα μὴ βαρυνθῆναι τῷν πλεονασμῷ, καὶ μὴ ἄρκοσμον κατ᾿ οἶμαι οὖσαν βιαζόμεθα ὁπόσον μέτριον ἄνθρωποι ἰσχυρότερον δοκοῦσιν τε καὶ ἀρίστοις αὐτάς γείσαντες, ὅπως τι ἄρχας εἶπεν, τε καὶ ἄριστοις καλλίστοις ἔγνωσαν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἢς ἐφελθῆναι, καὶ μὴ τῷ πλεονασμῷ βαρυνθῆναι τε καὶ καταπτεσθεὶς, ἀλλ’ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀκριβῶς, τῷδε ἐνταῦθα μὴ βαρυνθῆναι τῷν πλεονασμῷ, καὶ μὴ ἄρκοσμον κατ᾿ οἶμαι οὖσαν βιαζόμεθα ὁπόσον μέτριον ἄνθρωποι ἰσχυρότερον δοκοῦσιν τε καὶ ἀρίστοις αὐτάς γείσαντες, ὅπως τι ἄρχας εἶπεν, τε καὶ ἄριστοις καλλίστοις ἔγνωσαν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἢς ἐφελθῆναι, καὶ μὴ τῷ πλεονασμῷ βαρυνθῆναι τε καὶ καταπτεσθεὶς, ἀλλ’ ὀφθαλμὸν ἀκριβῶς, τῷδε ἐνταῦθα μὴ βαρυνθῆναι τῷν πλεονασμῷ, καὶ μὴ ἄρκοσμον κατ᾿ οἶμαι οὖσαν βιαζόμεθα ὁπόσον μέτριον ἄνθρωποι ἰσχυρότερον δοκοῦσιν τε καὶ ἀρίστοις αὐτάς γείσαντες, ὅπως τι ἄρχας εἶπεν, τε καὶ ἄριστοις καλλίστοις ἔγνωσαν μὲν εἰς τὴν ἢς ἐφελθῇ
μηδὲ κρίνειν ἐπιστάμενοι πρεπόντως οἴμαι τὰ πρέποντα, τὴν ἡδονὴν διαβάλλουσιν, λόγους τε προτιμῶντες, καὶ εἰκόνας πλάττοντες, τάλλα μὲν ἵσως οὐκ ἄγεννως, πρὸς ἐν τί δὲ βλαβερῶς, ἃς ἀν ἔγαγη φαίην· τῆς γὰρ σφῶν αὐτῶν κακίας, αἰτιῶνται μὲν αὐτοὺς οὐδαμῶς, ἢ μικρὸν τι σοφὸν ποιοῦντες, τὴν δὲ ἡδονὴν κατὰ πάντα, μηδὲ

345 Θεοῦ φειδόμενοι, ὡς προὶ ὁ λόγος δηλώσει. Τοῦτο μοι δοκεῖ κάκιστον εἶναι τῶν αὐτοῖς εἰρημένοιν, οὔτω πάντες μὲν σοφοὶ πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν αὐτῶν ἀπώλειαν, ὡσι δὴ τὴν ὕβαιναν, ὥσι τὴν ὑβαίνην αὐτὴν τοῦ καλοῦ προκρίνομεν, καὶ τὸ αὐτικὰ ἀλυποὶ τῶν ἐσύστερον μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν προτιμῶμεν. Οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τῶν τοιούτων, οὐδὲ πείθειν ἑαυτοὺς δύνανται, ὡς ἁφθῆ γε τις ἀνθρώπων, κρείττων τῶν ἡδονῶν· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῶν ἡμετέρων, ἡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ τ’ ἀλλότριον κρίνομεν, καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἡμῶν ἀνδρείαν ἀναφανέν, ὑπὲρ τὴν τῶν ὀλικὸν εἶναι νομίζομεν.
[1a] Tauti μὲν οὖν τὰ παρὰ τῶν μεμφομένων τὴν ἡδονὴν. Ἐγὼ δὲ ταὐτὴ πειράσωμαι βοηθεῖν, δίκαια νομίζων ποιεῖν, καὶ ὡσεὶ ἡδή φανεῖται. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς, οἱ μὲν οὕτως ἔχουσι γνώμης, οἱ δὲ ἄλλως, καὶ τινὲς τελέως ἐκτρέπονται τῆς ὀρθῶς ἐπὶ τάληθες φερούσης, κακὸν τι καὶ ἀπύμφορον ταύτην εἶναι νομίζοντες· οὐτοί δὲ ἦτάτηται, ὡς ἐγὼ πάντως ἀν ἰσχυρισμαῖν πάντως θαρσοῦντος. Πῶς οὐκ εἰςακένουν αὐτοὶ βοηθεῖαν ὅση δυνατῆ; Εἰ γὰρ τὸ πλανᾶσθαι λίων κακῶν, τὸ δὲ πλανωμένους ὀρθῶν πειρᾶσθαι, βοηθεῖν αὐτοῖς ἔστι καὶ τὸ βοηθεῖν τοὺς ὀμογενέσθεν εἰς δύναμιν, ἀπασι χρέος κοινὸν καλὰ καὶ δίκαια ποιεῖ, ὅ τά εἰκότα ἀμύνον τῇ ἡδονῇ, καθ’ ὃ γε μέρος οὐκ ἔδει πολεμισμένην ὁ γὰρ ταύτῃ βοηθῆν, βοηθεῖ τοὺς πλανωμένους, καὶ ἀποδίδωσι χρέος, πάσιν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ὁφειλομένοιν. Ποτ’ ἐμοὶ τούτῳ προσφείκει, οὐ μόνον ἄστεροι τοῖς ἄλλοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ διπλῆς τῆς προσθήκης· τούτῳ μὲν διὰ τὸ σχῆμα, τούτῳ δὲ καὶ διὰ σέ, δι’ ὅν γε δητουθέν ἐμαυτὸν εἰς τοινοί τὸν ἀγάνα καθήκα, μηδε τοῦ καιροῦ παντάπασιν ἐπιτρέποντος· εἰ μὴ τὰς ἀν τοὺς τούτου φαί, ὡς οὐδεὶς ἄν εἰξῆ κακῶς δικαίως, τοὺς ἐπ’ ὀφελεία ἡ γεγονόμενος οὕτως ἀγάνας.

15 [1b] Βουλομαι δὲ τινος πλάνης ἐλευθεροῦν ἐνίοις ἡδη πειρώμενος, προσφάλισθησαί τοὺς ἄκροτας, ὡς μὴ πειραθεῖν ἑτέρας πλάνης, ἐκ τῶν ἀρτὶ λεχθέντων, κακὸν τὸν ἡδη ρηθῆσθων· ἐστὶς γὰρ ἀν τινες, οὐ καλῶς μὲν ἐνθυμηθεῖν δ’ οὖν ὁμοίως, ὡς ὑπ’ ἑκέινην δειξεί βουλομένους ἐμαυτὸν, καὶ κακοθῆς ἀλαζονεύσασθαι, τοινοῖ τὸν λόγον ἐνεστησάμην. Καὶ εἰ τὰ παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀπλῶς τ’ ἱερομενεῖν μεθ’ ὑποψίας ἀδίκου λάβοιες, δόξαν τινα οὐκ ὀρθὴν ἐφ’ ἑτέρα

---


κάλλϊστος εἴργασται

[2a] Φημι οὖν εἰναι τὴν ἱδονὴν ἁγαθόν, τοῖς ἁγαθοῖς εὐθέλουσιν εἶναι, καὶ τοῖς καλῶς τε καὶ σεμνῶς χρομένοις αὐτῇ, καλὸν τι καὶ σεμνὸν ἀντικρύ, τῷ τῇ βίῳ συστατικῶν ἡμῖν, καὶ μηδενὸς γε πρόξενον τῶν κακῶν, εἰγε ημεῖς βουλομέθα: καὶ ἐδει γε αὐτὴν υφεστάναι καὶ παρείναι τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, καὶ συμμαρκαστήναι τῇ τῶν ἐμψύχων ζωῇ τα γὰρ ἐναντία φημὶ τῷ πρὸ τούτῳ κατ’ αὐτῆς εἰρημένῳ λόγῳ. Καὶ εἰ ταῦτα ἀληθῆ —ἐκτὶ δὲ ὡς ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος διὰ βραχέων αὐτίκα δείει—, εἰ τῆς θείας ῥοσῆς ἀπολαῦσιν, τὸ πάν τῆς ὑποθέσεως εἰργασται, καὶ καλὸν καὶ βέλτιστον τῇ τῆς ἱδονῆς ἡμῖν ἀποδέδεικται χρήμα. Ἐν δὲ τῷ πάνῳ βραχυτάτων ἀρκέσειν ἡμῖν. Εἰ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο σκοπησαμεν, ἀς ὁ τῷ ὄντι ἁγαθός τῇ τῶν ἐμψύχων φύσι ταῦτην ἐνέσπειρε, καὶ
σύμπερ ἐκείνος αἰτίως, II οὐκ ἂν ποτ’ εἰς τούτο κακῶν, οὐδ’ ἀπόβλητον, ἀλλὰ τούναντι μοι σαφῶς καλὸν τε σφόδρα καὶ αἰτετόν· φανεῖται πάντως ἡ ἡδονή, ἀγαθόν τι καὶ καλὸν καθ’ αὐτὴν οὕσα, κατὰ τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ λόγου. Ὄτι δὲ θεόθεν ἡ ἡδονή, οὐδὲν ὑμεῖς ἐπισκεφθηκαίρους πάντ’ αὐτὸν σαφῆς ἡ ἡδονή, παῦετο τοῖς οὖσι, καὶ τοῦτο γε δόγμα κοινόν, κοινὸν καὶ τοῦτο γένος· ἀν οὖσα δόγμα, ὡς ἡ ἡδονή καλὸν. Καὶ δῆλον αὐτόθεν· ἡ γὰρ οὖσα ἐστι τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς χρῆμα, ἡ παρ’ οὗ τὰ πάντα κάκειν ἀλλ’ ἐστι γε πάντως ἡ ἡδονή, θεόθεν ἄρα· καὶ τάκειθεν, ἀγαθὰ, ἀγαθὴ ἀρα. Οὐ τοῖνυν σοὶ πλειόνων οὖσα δεῖσθη, πρὸς τὴν τῆς ὑποοχέσσως ἐκτισθ’ οὗ γὰρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐστιν, ἀνθρά πιστὸν διάραι στόμα τολμήσαι πρὸς τούναντιν· οὖσα δὲ μηδ’ ἀπωτόν, ἔχοντα γε νοῦν διαφάνειαν, καὶ λογιζόμενον τὰς ὑπερβολὰς καὶ τὰς παραχώρησις τοὺς οὐ καλῶς χρωμένους εἶναι τῆς δὲ ἡδονῆς τὴν σύντασιν αὕτης εἶναι τῇ συμμετοχής τῆς μεταλήψεως.

[2b] Ὑπεκατέστη εἰςπειν, πρὸ τοῦ βαδίσας ἐφθασάς, ὅ τινι τῶν θείων ἀνθρώπων εἰρήνη, ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ταχυτήτα θέλοντα διείσα. Οὖσα δὲ τινὰς τῶν παρόντων, σαφέστερον ἐθέλειν ἀκούσαι, καὶ χρῆναι τούτους παραμυθησάσθαι μοι δοκεί ὅσον ἱκανόν· Ὄθεν δὴ διὰ πλειόνων ἐκθέμενος τὸν λόγον, ὅρθως γε ἔχον διείσα τὸ δόγμα, ἀνάγκαις οὖσα πρεποῦσας. Καίτοι δοκεῖ μοι λίαν σαφές κατασκευάζειν ἐπιχειρεῖν, καλὸν δὲ ὅμως εἰπεῖν καὶ τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸ συνιστάμενον ἀπὸ τῶν ἧδη ὑπερβολῶν, διὰ κοινῆς, ὡς εἰπεῖν, ἐννοιας καὶ ἀξιωματος, ἐτι καὶ μᾶλλον συνιστάς καὶ τὰ τῶν λόγων ἀκολούθων ἐν διαφόροις ἐπιχειρησαί τὸ γάρ δειον συνιστάμενον, δῦ δὴ τινὰς, ὡς
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εἰπεῖν, ἔχων πόδας, ἐδραύτερον που τοῦ δ’ ἔνος, ὡς εἰ ἡμισείας πως βεβηκότος,
ὡσπερ ἐδραύτερον που τοῦ δ’ ἔνος, ὡς εἰ ἡμισείας πως βεβηκότος, ἔπειτα ἔνι ποδί. Εἰ δὲ καὶ πλείστον ἐπερείδεται, πολὺ γε τοῦτ’ ἀμείνων. Καὶ δὴ σκοπῶμεν ὑδ. Ἀρξάμεθα δ’ αὐθίς ἐκ τῶν προτέρων —θεμέλιον γὰρ ἂλλον οἰδεῖς δύναται θείναι παρὰ τὸν κείμενον, ἔφη Παῦλος,— καὶ ὡδ’ ἐφ’ ὑδ. Θεοῦ
συναρμομένου, συντόμως τὸ γιγνόμενον ἀποδώσει, ἀποδείξας μὲν ἐκεῖνα, ὡς δὲ
δειχθέντωσον, οὐκ ἂν ἀρκούντως ἔχειν τὰ ὡροθρόμενα δόξαι· σιωπῆσας δὲ πολλά,
καὶ μὴ λεχθέντα φυγὴ τοῦ κόρου, οὐκ ἂν ἐνέγκαι οἶμαι τῷ προκειμένῳ
σκοπῷ. [3a] Εἰ γοῦν ἡ φύσις τῶν ὄντων παρὰ Θεοῦ, καὶ ἡ ἐπιθυμία πάσιν τοῖς
ἐνέσπαρται, καθάπερ καὶ προείρηται, καὶ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἐξαθεῖν τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν, οὐδὲ
ὑποτεκενεῖς, οὐδ’ ἐπίκτητοι τὰς ὑποτεκένες, καὶ μέρος γε τι ταύτης, εἰ βούλει λέγειν, τῆς τριμεροῦς τε καὶ ἀμεροῦς —λέγω δὲ νῦν περὶ
τῆς λογικῆς τε καὶ ἡμετέρας—, δηλονότι ἀγαθὸν ἡ ἐπιθυμία, ἅτε δὴ παρὰ Θεοῦ τῇ
ψυχῇ δεδομένη, οὐχ ἥττον, ήττον τὰ ἀδελφὰ αὐτῆς μέρη, τὸ λογικὸν τε καὶ ὅμως
καὶ μὴ λεχθέντα φυγὴ τοῦ κόρου, οὐκ ἂν ἐνέγκαι οἶμαι τῷ προκειμένῳ
σκοπῷ.
Θεῷ γεγονέναι—ὁ τίς ἀν εἴποι, ψυχήν τε ἔχων καὶ τοῦ μετέχων;— καὶ τὴν ἡδόνην τῇ ψυχῇ θεόθεν εἴναι πιστευεῖν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ δέδειξα, ὡς οὖν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἔχον 85 εἶναι, οὖν δὲν τίνος ὁλος ὄντος, ἐφ᾽ ὃς ὄπερ ἄν καλῶς ἐπεδείκνυτο αὐτὸ γε τούτῳ οὖσα ἐπιθυμία, δήλον ἀν εἴπη σάιν ἐξῆς, ὡς καὶ τῆς ἡδόνης μηδαμός οὔσης, οὖν δὲν τῇ ἐπιθυμίᾳ γε ἔδει τὸ παράτατα συνεστακέναι πρόδηλον γὰρ ὡς ἐπιθυμία δὲν εὐφροσύνην καὶ ἡδόνην ἔχει τῇ κίνησιν· οὔ γαρ ἐστίν ἐτέρον τι τῶν πάντων, ὑπὲρ οὖν δὴ πουθουθαν αὕτη ἀν κινηθεῖ· οὕτω δὲ ἐπιθυμίας θάνης ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀρθείσης, καὶ παντελῶς ἐκ μέσου γεγενημένης, οὖν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χρὴμα παρέμεμεν ἀν—οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν τῇ ψυχῇ ἀφαιρεθεῖσθαι τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐν ᾗ γέγονεν καταστάσει μεῖναι.

90 [3b] Δήλον δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου οὖν γὰρ εἰκός, οὖν ἐνδεχόμενον προσλαβεῖν τι θύραθεν τῇ ψυχῇ, ὡστε καὶ μάλλον ψυχὴν γενέσθαι· οὐκοῦν οὖν δέθηκεν δυνατὸν ἑκάτερον ἀποβάλειν κατὰ τὸ ἀποβαλεῖν φημαὶ· ὡστε καὶ μᾶλλον ψυχὴν γενέσθαι· οὐκοῦν οὐδὲ ἀφαιρεθεῖσαν τι τῶν αὑτῆς, ἐν ᾗ γέγονε καταστάσει μεῖναι. οὗ δήπου αὕτη ἂν κινηθεῖν· οὕτω δὲ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀρθείσης, καὶ παντελῶς ἐκ μέσου γεγενημένης, οὖν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χρήμα παρέμεμεν ἀν—οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν ἐτέρον τι τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐν ᾗ γέγονεν καταστάσει μεῖναι.

95 οὖν εὐαίτης ποτε κατά τὴν φύσιν γενέσθαι οὐσὶν τοῦ οὐ κατὰ τὸν νόον μετέχον· ὃς δὴν ἂτοντας, ἀποβάλειν τῶν αὐτῶν· εἰ γὰρ θύμας ἔζει γε τὶ καθ’ αὐτὴν ἢ τῇ ἐπιθυμίας· ἀποβαλλεῖν τὰ τοῦ αὐτῆς, ἢ καὶ ἐξωθησθῆν προσλαβοῦσα, δήλον ὡς οὐχ ἄκριται ἀν εἶχεν ἐν τῇ καθ’ αὐτῆς μένουσα, ἀλλὰ νῦν γε μένουσα ἐφ’ ὄπερ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγεγόνει, ἐν τῷ ἀκρῷ τοῦ καθ’ αὐτὸν μένει. Ὁμως πάσιν φανερῶν, ἢ τὸ τε μάλλον κακῶς ἔζει—ἐξ ἐπιθυμίας· ὡστε καὶ τὰ τοῦ αὐτῶν οὐδὲ ἀποβάλειν οὕτω δὲ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀρθείσης, καὶ παντελῶς ἐκ μέσου γεγενημένης, οὖν τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χρήμα παρέμεμεν ἀν—οὐ γὰρ ἐστίν ἐτέρον τι τῶν αὐτῶν, ἐν ᾗ γέγονεν καταστάσει μεῖναι.
μὲν γὰρ προσλήψει ύπερβαλεῖ, τῇ δὲ ἐλλείψει ὡσπερεί τινα πῆραν ὑποστήσεται. Καὶ μὴν εἰ ἦν τὴν ψυχήν αἰκεραίαν καὶ καλὴν εὐφεθήναι τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀποφύγει, περιττῇ πως καὶ αἰχμὰ γένοιτ' ἄν, τῇ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας προσθήκῃ εἰ δὲ νῦν αὐτὴν καλὴν καὶ ὀλόκληρον ὁρῶμεν, εὐδηλὸν ἂν εἰπή σαφῶς, ὡς ἦν αἰσχρότατη καὶ ἐλλιπὴς τῇ τοῦ μέρους ἀφαιρέσει, τῇ δὲ ἐλλείψει ὡσπερεί τινα πῆραν ὑποστήσεται.  

Καὶ μὴν εἰ ἦν τὴν ψυχὴν ἀκεραίαν καὶ καλὴν εὑρεθῆναι τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἀπούσης, περιττῇ πως καὶ αἰσχρὰ γένοιτ’ ὄν, τῇ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας προσθήκῃ· εἰ δὲ νῦν αὐτὴν καλὴν καὶ ὁλόκληρον ὁρῶμεν, εὐδηλὸν ἂν εἴπῃ σαφῶς, ὡς ἦν αἰσχρότατη καὶ ἐλλιπὴς τῇ τοῦ μέρους ἀφαιρέσει; Μᾶλλον δ’ ἀναγκαῖον σαφῶς ἡμᾶς, καὶ πολεμίως ἔχειν ἐκάτερον τῇ ψυχῇ, δηλαδή καὶ τὴν προσθήκην, καὶ τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν, ἐν μὴ περιττῇ τῷ προσλάβῃ, μὴ τῇ περιττῇ τῷ ὀλόκληρῳ.

[3c] Οὕτως τῷ γέγονεν γέγονε τῇ μηδὲ περιττῇ τῇ ὁλόκληρῳ, καὶ εἰς τὸ μήτε περιττόν τι προσλάβῃ, μήτε πηρωθῇ τὸ ὁλόκληρον. Ὧστ’ οὐδὲ ταύτης ἀπουσίας, οἄν τέ ἐστι διασώζεσθαι τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς χρῆμα, εἴπερ τῇ μὲν ἡδονῇ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν, ταύτῃ δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁ λόγος γε ἡμῖν ἔδειξε συναναιρομένην· ταυτὶ δὲ εἴρηταί μοι καὶ κατεσκεύασε, ἵν’ ᾖ τοῦτον φανερόν, ὡς ἄρ’ ἐμπέφυκε τῇ της ἡδονῆς μηδαμῶς οὔσης. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἅλις ἔχει τὰ περὶ τούτου, καὶ δέδεικται ἡ ἡδονὴ ἀποβολήν φημι καὶ τὴν πρόσληψιν. Μᾶλλον δ’ ἀναγκαῖον σαφῶς ἐστί, καὶ πολεμίως ἔχειν ἑκάτερον τῇ ψυχῇ, δηλαδή καὶ τὴν προσθήκην, καὶ τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν, ἐν μὴ περιττῇ τῷ προσλάβῃ, μὴ τῇ περιττῇ τῷ ὀλόκληρῳ.
ἐνεπεφυκὼν μὲν τῇ ψυχῇ, θεόθεν δὲ αὐτῇ δεδομένη, ἀγαθὴ δὲ ἀναγκαῖος — τὰ γὰρ ἐκ Θεοῦ τουματα —, φέρει καλὴν αὐτὴν ἀποδείξεων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν μετὰ λογισμῶν, ἢ οἷον τε γενόμεθα τοῦτο ποιήσαι.

[4a] Πολλαχόθεν μὲν ὅσον ἦσται κατασφανές, ὡς δύναται ἡ ἤδονή καθαρεύοντα κακῶν εὑρεθήναι, εἰ τις γε ἐκείνη χρότῳ ὡς δέον χρῆσθαι. Τὸ γὰρ ὅμια ἐφίεσθαι καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖν τῶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐφετῶν καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖσθαι δικαίων, καὶ ταῖς ἀπὸ τούτων αὕτης ἡ ἤδοναὶ ἐπαγάλλεσθαι, οὐδεμίαν γε δικαίαν δέξατ’ ἄν μέμψιν, ὅπως γε καὶ τούτων, πολλοὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν ὥς ἡμῶν γὰρ ἔτημεν ἡ ἐπισομβαίνουσα τοῖς ἤδονοις, δὲ ἐκείνο γε καὶ μένουν, ὃ τῇ φύσει δέδοται ζητεῖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐθύς —姮ινρντο τὸν Θεὸν—, τὴν ἀρετὴν, τὴν ἐαυτὴς σύστασιν. Πῶς οὖν ἂν εἰς δικαία ἡ ἤδονή ἀγαθὴ νομιζέσθαι, καὶ καλοὺς ἐργαζομένη τους αὐτῆς καθαρεύοντος, Ἀυτίκα γοῦν ἐν ταῖς ἐπισομβαίαις δυνάμεσιν, ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται τι τῶν οὖν ἄγαθῶν εἶναι, εὕρος ἂν ἀμφότερα, καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φημὶ καὶ τὴν ἴδιον, εἰς ἄπωθεν ἐφηνί ἄγγελοι παρακυψάτο παρακυψάτο καὶ ἀπέραντοι καὶ ἀλητοὶ καλεῖται ἡ ἤδονή, ἡ τοῖς αἰσθαμάτοις ἁπάντως ἀρχή παρὰ τῶν ἄγων ἀνδρῶν, καὶ τρυφή καὶ εὐφροσύνη προσαγορεύεται, καὶ εἰ τι τοιοῦτον— αὐτῆς καὶ δικαίων ψυχαῖς πρὸς τῖς δυνάμεις ἐν ἔνθεν παρακυψάτο, καὶ ἀπολαυόμεθα τὸν εἰς καθαρεύοντα αὐτῆς καὶ ἀρχῆς ἑαυτῆς ἡμῶν δικαίων.

Εἰ δὲ τις μέγα νομίζει, τὸ τὴν αὐτὴν τοῖς αἰσθαμάτοις τρυφῆν ἡμᾶς ἔχειν, καὶ ἀπολαυόμεθα τὸς ἀείς ἀρχῆς αὐτῶν μετὰ τὴν ἐνθένδε ωθὴν, ἀκούσατο γε κάκεινο, 140 ἀς καὶ ἔνταθ’ ἡμῖν ἐξεστὶ τούτον μετέχειν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.

132. ἐποικονομίας δυνάμεσιν cf. DIALOGI XI 126.25, 126.28, XIV 172.11, 175.1, 179.2, 184.27, XX 243.4, 245.34 — 134. ἄγγελοι παρακυψάντων cf. De processione 205.8
132. ἐποικονομίας δυνάμεσιν cf. Eph. 1:20 — 134. ἄγγελοι παρακυψάντων cf. 1 Petr. 1:12 — 136. τρυφής-ἐὐφροσύνης cf. Nysseum, De vita Mosis II 247.3-9; Joannem Chrysostomum, De confessione pretiosae crucis, PG 52, 844.47; In Mattiheum (Hom. 55), PG 58, 540.30; Eulogiae (Hom. 38), PG 63, 852.26, al.
[4b] Τοίς γὰρ εἰςπάξα καθαροῖς, ἢ κεκαθαρμένοις, χάρις ἐκείθεν ἐπιφοίτα, ἢ γε μέλλουσι συνείναι τὸν πάντα χρόνον, εἰ καὶ ἀδρανέστερον πως καὶ αμυδρότερον ἐνταύθα τοῦτο γίγνεται: διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐπιπροσθῆναι ἢδη σῶμα τῇ τῆς ψυχῆς θεωρία, καὶ τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦτο πάθη, καὶ τὰς διὰ ταῦτα φροντίδας, οὐδὲν ἀν δῆπτον καθαρώς τῶν θεωρητῶν θεωρήσαμεν, ἢ τῶν ἐφετῶν ἀπολαύσαμεν. Τοίς γε μὴν αἰδίους μηδὲνος τοιούτου παρεναχλούντας, καθαρωτέρων ἐφείται ἐπιθυμεῖ καὶ εὐφραίνεσθαι τὰ ἐπιθυμητά τε καὶ εὐφραντά, ταύτῳ δ’ εἰπεῖν τὰ ἤδεα’ οἶδεν, ἀei μὲν θεωροῦσιν ὡς ἐνεστὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν κάλλος, καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ¤ άστράπης κοινώτι γίνονται, καὶ τῆς βαίμαστης ἀπολαύσουν ὄρας: κόρον δὲ οὐτε ἔλαβον, οὕτε λήψονται. Μακάριον οὖν ἄν εἰ ταυτὴν ἡμᾶς ἔθελεν καρστούθηκα τὴν ἠδονήν, καὶ διώκειν ὡποία δύναμις, ὡσα πρὸς ἐκείνην μονὴν ἐνάγει. Καὶ εἰ τις δ’ ἄν ἐτέρα σώφροσιν φανεῖν, μεθεκτή ἄν εἰ τοῖς σώφροσι, σωφρόνως γὰρ τοῖς σώφροσιν ἢ σώφρονς μεταληφθήσαται καὶ ὁσαπερ ἔξεστι ποιεῖν τῶν οὐκ εἰς εὐθύνας ἡμᾶς ἀγόντων, ἀλλ’ εἰεν μὲν εὐφρόσυνα, εἰεν δὲ ὑφέλια, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς προσόστατα τῶν ἐν αἰτία καὶ μέμψε, καλά τε δήπου καὶ ἀγαθά, καὶ ἑπανεῖτα τοῖς γε νῦν ἔχουσι. Τοιούτων γὰρ τὸ χρῆμα τῆς ἠδονῆς-οἷς αἱ μεμετημένως συγγένειοι καὶ σωφρόνως, πρὸς τῷ μηδαμῶς ἐκείνους λυπήσαι, ὡς καὶ τι Ἴμιώσαι, ἐχαρίσατο τε καὶ ἄνησεν, ἐνταύθα, ἢ ἐκεῖ, ἢ καὶ ἐν ἁμοστέραν ταῖν ἴων. ὡστε καλὴ ἡ ἠδονή, ὡς ἰσχυρίζωμεθα δειεῖν.

[4c] Εἰ δὲ κακῇ τινὶ γένοιτο, τῇ ἐκείνου ἄν γένοσθα παραχρῆσθαι, καὶ τῷ μὴ τιμᾶν τὸ μέτρον, ἢ μὴ βουλεύσθαι δεί γὰρ τοὺς λόγως ζῆν αἰσθαμένους, πάσαν παραχρησιν

141. χάρις-ἐπιφοίταν [Dialogi XI 140.18 — 149. κόρον-ἐλαβον] cf. Ad ebrionum 288.9; Dialogi IV 44.1, VII 80.34, 94.6, XIV 180.5; In dormitionem Deiparae 557.25; In Mariam Aegyptiacam, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 346.6; Oratio VI 598 — 150. καρστοῦθαι-ἐδονην [cf. Epistolae 67.110; Oratio V 161, 202 — ὡποία δύναμις] vid. Oratio I 313, VI 17, VII 497; cf. Oratio VI 60-61, 572 — 159-160. μεμετρημένως [cf. Epistolae VII 18-17, 94.12; Epistolae 27.10; Oratio I 286, V 253, VI 54, VII 310

150. καρστοῦθαι-ἐδονην] cf. Platonem, Politia 548b; Libanium, Progymnasmata 10.5.17; Joannem Chrysostomum, De virginitate, 68.15-16; In Genesim (Hom. 14), PG 53, 114.44; Cyclonium, Epistolae 389.23; De contemnenda morte VI 12.27-28, al.

διαπτύσαντας, τοσοῦτον καρποῦσθαι τῆς ἡδονῆς διὰ πασῶν τῶν αἰσθήσεων, ὅσον τὸ ἐνδέον ἐναπληροῦν, καὶ μὴ περαιτέρω χωρεῖν. Ἐπει δι’ ἄρα τις κακῶς —κακὸν δὲ ἤ ὑπερβολή—, οὐχὶ τοῦ καλῶς πρὸς χρῆσθαι ἡμῖν δεδομένου, τῆς δ’ ἀκρασίας καὶ τοῦ χρωμένου γίνεται σαφὸς τοῦγκλημα. Μηδεὶς οὖν τὰ οἰκεῖα κακά, ἐμοὶ συμβούλῳ χρώμενος, ἀνατιθέτω τῇ ἡδονῇ· πριαίμην γὰρ ἐγώει πολλοῦ τὸ μὴ μέλλειν εὐθυνεῖσθαι τῆς ἡδονῆς ἔνεκα· ἐμοὶ γὰρ μᾶλλον τῶν πάντων συνήνεγκε ἂν τοῦτο. Νυνὶ δὲ τούτο οὐκ ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τοῦντίον ἐστίν· εἰ γὰρ ἦν τὴν ἡδονὴν αἰτιᾶσθαι ὅταν ἁμαρτάνωμεν, καὶ ταύτῃ γε πραγμάτων ἡμᾶς ἀπηλλάχθαι, οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς δίκην εἰσεπράττετο τῶν εἰσπραχθησομένων γε πάντως. Οὐ μὴν άλλ’ εἰ καὶ τούτῳ γε ἦν, ‖ παραιτεῖσθαί γε δικαίως τοὺς δι’ ἀκρασίαν ἁμαρτάνοντας, ἦν μὲν οὐδ’ ἂν οὕτω κοῦφον τὸ δυσχερές· τῷ γὰρ ἐργαζομένῳ τὸ πονηρόν, αὐτό γε τοῦτο κακόν, κἂν μὴ δῶ τινα δίκην, κἂν οὐ καταστῇ πρὸς εὐθύνην. Πλὴν ἐμοὶ συνήνεγκεν ἂν τὸ μὴ τῷ βήματι τοῦ κριτοῦ παραστῆναι, ὥστε δίκην ὑποσχεῖν τῶν οὐ καλῶς πεπραγμένων —ὅτε γάρ ἐστιν ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ Δαβίδ, τὸν κριτὴν παραιτουμένου, ὡς ἕρμαιον ἂν τοῖς τῆς ἡδονῆς δούλοις.


174-175. ὅτε-γένοιτο] cf. Ps. 50:3-11

τυραννοῦν αὐτῆς, λήρος εἰ βούλοιτο τις. Καὶ τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ ποιοῦν τὸν δίκαιον κριτήν
εἰσπράττειν γε ἣμας δίκην, ἐπειδὰν εἰκίνθην θῶμεν πρὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ προσταγμάτων·
ἐπεὶ ἤν τὸ ταύτης ἰσχυρον, ἀήττητον, εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς εἰσκωμάσαν, οὔτ' ἂν δίκην ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἐλάμβανεν ὁ κρίνων Θεός, εἰ δὲ ἠδονὴν παρευδοκιμεῖτο τὸ εἰκίνθην θέλημα,
οὔτ' ἂν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἥμας κατ' εἰκίνθην ὧπλιζε ταῖς θαυμασταῖς ἐντολαῖς τε καὶ
παραπέμποι.

[4e] Σύμφημι δὲ γε τῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατ' ἀρχάς, ὡς ᾧ ἀφ' ἠδονὴ τυραννικώτατον
πάθος, καὶ τὴν περὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα οὐδαμῶς μέμφομαι, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπάδει τοῦ ταύτης
τρόπου. Οὐ μὴν δὲ κατὰ πάντων ἔξης ἀνθρώπων τοσαύτην κέκτηται δύναμιν,
ὡς μηδὲν εἶναι λοιπὸν, ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατ' ἐκείνης ὥπλιζε ταῖς θαυμασταῖς ἐντολαῖς τε καὶ
παραινέσεσι.
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 Plaintiff δέ γε τῷ λόγῳ τῷ κατ' ἀρχάς, ὡς ᾧ ἠδονὴ τυραννικώτατον
πάθος, καὶ τὴν περὶ ταύτης εἰκόνα οὐδαμῶς μέμφομαι, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀπάδει τοῦ ταύτης
τρόπου. Οὐ μὴν δὲ κατὰ πάντων ἔξης ἀνθρώπων τοσαύτην κέκτηται δύναμιν,
ὡς μηδὲν εἶναι λοιπὸν, ἢ τὴν ἀρχὴν κατ' ἐκείνης ὥπλιζε ταῖς θαυμασταῖς ἐντολαῖς τε καὶ
παραινέσεσι.
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[5a] Πλὴν ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀρετῆς καὶ λόγῳ καθωπλισμένων, οὐδ' ἂν οὐδὲνα τρώσειε τὸ

__________


κείνης ὑποσῳφίν βέλος. Ος οἱ γε ἀνδρεῖς εὐ ἴσθι, τὴν σῶφρονα καὶ ἀναγκαίαν ἱδρυν ἡν τῷ καθώ καρποφόρου, ταυτης τῆς ἀκολαστοῦ, τῆς ἑπὶ ἁρείαν καταγελώσιν, ὡς οὐδὲν ἱερὸν οὐσίας, ἐπειδὰν παντοδαπὴ μὲν γένηται, προτείνῃ δὲ σὺν μὴχανή τε καὶ ποικιλία πάν ὄπως κάλλιστον τε καὶ ἱδρυτὸν ταῖς τού σώματος αἰσθήσεωι, δὲ ἄν ἱσχεῖ καὶ περιγγένεται, εἰ μὴ κοσμίως αἰσθάνοντο τουτων τῶν αἰσθητῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἱδρυτοῖς ἱδύνοντο μετὰ λογισμοῦ. Μοτε τὸ παῖν τῆς ὑπερβολῆς, καὶ τοῦ πολλοῦ, καὶ τῆς ἀμετρίας, καὶ ταυθ’ ἡμέτερον ἐγκλημα, καθάπερ καὶ προείρηται, σὺχ ὡς αὐτῷ σοι δοκεῖ. Σιν μὲν γὰρ, ὡ τάν, ὡς οὐκ, σαυτῶν αἰτίας ἑλευθεροῖς, καὶ τήν ἀκροσίαν οὐδὲν λογίζῃ, καὶ τήν ἐθελούσιον κίνησιν, παρ’ οὐδὲν τίθης μονήν δὲ τὴν ἱδρυν ἄνω καὶ κάτω στρέφεις, αἰτιώμενος ἀπλῶς πρὸς ἀπερ ᾗν ποτὲ σοι πραχθεῖ εἰς αὐθάδειαν καὶ τέρψιν. Καὶ παρακινο ὁι φείδεσθαι τῶν τοιουτῶν κρίσεων, καὶ μακρὰν ἀπέχεσθαι τουτων τῶν λογισμῶν, πόρρον που καὶ τούτων ὄντων τῆς ἀληθείας ποιεῖς γὰρ παραπλήσιον, ὠσπερ ᾗν εἰ φάρμακον ἔδει σε τῇ πτωκέναι, ὑπὸ ταυτῶν ἁρίστων ἐσκευασμένον, εἰτ’ ἀκαίρως αὐτὸς χρησάμενος τῷ φαρμάκῳ, πρὸς τοῦτον εἰκάτον σοι τοῦ βουλήματος, ἀψεῖς σαυτὸν ἐπιπλήττειν, σὺ δὲ διαβάλλεις τὸ φάρμακον, καὶ τοῖς ἐκείνῳ σοφῶς κεράσαντας. Οὐ μόνον δὲ τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἱατρῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλι’ οίς χρώμεθα, εἰ χρότι τις οὐ καλώς, οὐδὲ μετὰ τοῦ προσήκοντος μέτρου, βλαβέρα ἃν γένοιτο πάντα τρόπον, ἢ αὐτοκαὶ, ἢ μετέπειτα, ἢ καὶ ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς ἄχρη τέλους. Τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐστίν, ἐγ’ ὥτι οὐκ ἐστίν.

169 [5b] Ὡς ἀρ’ ἡ ἱδρυν τὸ κακῶν, ἀλλ’ ἡ παραγχορίς ἐπὶ τῶν ἁπάντων. Ἐπεὶ καὶ πάρ’ ἀρχῆς.
τῇ παραχρήσει κακόν, καὶ ὑδωρ, καὶ ἅπαν χρῆμα· αὐτὰ γὰρ τὰ ἀναγκαῖα, καὶ ὑπὲρ τὸ δέον συνεπιρρέεσθαι μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ὑπερβολῆς. Τί μὲν εἰπέ μοι φῶς, τί δὲ ἀέρος βέλτιον; ΑΛΛ' ἂν καὶ τοίσδε παραχρησώμεθα, μέγα τι γίγνεται κακόν, καὶ ταύτων τοῖς μὴ μετέχουσι τούτων πάσχομεν· ἀφόρητον γὰρ ἀμφοῖν τὸ δεινόν, ἡμῖν κἀκεῖστιν. Καὶ πῶς; Ἐγὼ λέγων ἀκτίς, ὃ πάντων ἦσον, παρέχει μὲν τοῖς ὁφθαλμοῖς, ἐνεργεία τὸ ὅραν ἔχειν, παρέχει δὲ τοῖς ὁρατοῖς, αὐτὸ τοῦτ' εἶναι καὶ φαίνεσθαι μόνη γὰρ ἂν ἦν δυνάμει τὰ καλὰ καὶ ὁ ὁφθαλμός, αὐτὸ τοῦθ' ὁ περάσκας καλὰ καὶ ὁ ὁφθαλμός, μηδαμῶς ποὺ τῆς ἀκτίνος τὸ ἑαυτῆς χορηγοῦσις. ΑΛΛ' εἰ τις τὰυτήν ἁμέσως ὅλην τοῖς ὁφθαλμοῖς δέξατο, ὑπὲρ δὲ τὸ ὅραν ἔστι, δι' αὐτῆς ἡμῖν καὶ τὸ ὅραν ἀπολέσαμεν.
ἀγαθᾶ, μετὰ καυροῦ πεπραγμένα, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀνέν τούτου, καὶ μέλη γὰρ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ὅσοι χρήται ταύτι, ἀγαθᾶ τὸ καθ’ αὐτά, καὶ ἐπ’ ἀγαθῶ γέγονε. Καὶ μέντοι γε καὶ σώζειν τὴν τάξιν τὰς ἀγαθὰς μελέτην καὶ τὰ δ’ αὐτῶν ἐνεργούμενα, νομίζεται κακὰ εἶναι, μηδαμὴ μηδαμῶς ὄντα. Τὸ γὰρ πλεονάζον καὶ τὸ ἐλλεῖπον, τούτ’ ἐστι τὸ βλάπτον ἀπανταχοῦ, ὡς ἐφθηγμένον ταῦτα δ’ ἐστι μὲν διὰ τῶν ὁργάνων τούτων ἐνίοτε γεγομένα, ἐστι δὲ διὰ τὴν ὕλην, ἢ παρέχει τοῖς ὁργάνοις, τουτέστι τοῖς μέλεσιν ἐνεργεῖν, ἐστι δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γνώμην. Οὐ μὴν ἐκείνοις μέμψαιτ’ ἂν τις σέ μικαίως ἐπ’ οὐδενοῖς τῶν ἀπαντῶν οὔτε γὰρ τὴν ὕλην ἀψυχοῦν οὔτε δὲ τὰ μέλη, ἀλλὰ τὴν καυνοῦσαν ταύτα ψυχὴν, ἢ κινεῖται προαρτέστη ἐπὶ τὰ βελτίω μὲν λόγῳ υπερονομαμένη, ἐπί τὰ χείρα δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀλογώστερον τὴν ὑμητήν ἐχοῦσα.

[5c] Ὅστε δυοῦν θάτερον, ἢ μηδὲ τὴν ἡδονὴν διαβλητέον ἂν εἴη, παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀτιμασθέντος τοῦ μέτρου, ὡς περαιτέρω τοῦ γεγομένου προβεβηκότων, ἢ καὶ τὰς κατ’ ἐκεῖνον ἐνεργεῖαν ἐξής τὴν κτίσιν, τὸν ἰσότυπον τὰς κατ’ ἐκεῖνον ὑφήλειαν, τὸν Ποιητὴν διασυμφωνεῖν· ὁ γὰρ τῶν βλαπτόντων δημιουργός, αἴτιον ἀντικρυς τῶν κακῶν, ἅπερ ἀναγκαίως ἂν παρ’ ἐκείνων γένοιτο· καίτοι οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖοι ἂν αἰτιασόμεθα, δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἐκκρούσασθαι. Εἰ δὲ τοῦτο ἄτοπόν σοι δοκεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἂν δέξαιο λέγειν, καλὰ γὰρ ἅπαντα φήσεις τὰ ἐκ Θεοῦ, ἄτοπον καὶ τὸ τὴν ἡδονὴν διασύρειν, ὑπὲρ ἀγαθοῦ πλούσιον τὸ τὸν Ποιητὴν διασυμφώνησαι· ὁ γὰρ τῶν βλαπτόντων δημιουργὸς, αἴτιον ἀντικρυς τῶν κακῶν.
σαφῶς ἡμὶν δεδομένην· οὐδὲν γὰρ ταύτης ἀπούσης εἰχέν ἀν συνίστασθαι τῶν ἐν αἰσθήσει τε καὶ ζωῆς πάντα γὰρ ἐπίσονα, τὰ τῇ ζωῆ βοηθοῦντα, κἂν ἀφέλης τὸ ἤδι, οὐδὲν ἐκείνων ἐφάφηται οὐτίνοισιν πόνον ἔχοντος.

[6a] Συνίστησι δὲ μου τὸν λόγον, τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πράγματα· ἡμεῖς γὰρ οὔτ’ ἐσθίομεν, οὔτε πίνομεν, τῆς ἡδονῆς μὴ προτερπομένης. Καὶ τὸ θαυμάσω δίκαιων, ἐπειδὰν ύπερκορεῖσθαι τῶν τροφῶν γενομέθα, καὶ τὰ ἡδίστα πάντα ἀποστρεφόμεθα, καὶ μάλλον ἀν ἐλοίμεθα πληγᾶς τῷ σώματι δέξασθαι, ἢ τῷ στόματι τροφῆν. Ἐδὲ καὶ τὸ παρ’ ἡμῖν ὀρηκτικὸν τε καὶ ἐλκτικὸν τοῦ πεφυκότος παρεκτραπῆσται, παραπιέζοντων μὲν ἰατρῶν, παρακαλοῦντων δὲ φίλων, πάντα ποιοῦντων τῶν συγγενῶν, οὐδεμία μηχανή γένοιτ’ ἀν ἰκανή, οὐδὲ φόβος, ὡς ἀναπείπτεται δυνηθῆναι, ταῖς τῶν κηδομένων παραγενόμεθα εἰςαί ἄλλ’ εἰδότες ὡς τεθνηδόμεθα εἰ μὴ λάβωμεν τροφῆν, ἡμεῖς δὲ θνήσκομεν μὴ λαβόμεν. Ὅταν τούτων οὔτως ἔχῃ τὰ τῶν λογικῶν πράγματα, ὁ ἰχθύς, καὶ τὸ πτηνόν, καὶ ὁ ἰππός, πῶς ἀν τὸ δέδοκα μοιχθήρων ἢ ἐργοδε, μή τῆς ἡδονῆς εἰς τούτο παρακαλοῦσθαι; Ἐσθίει γὰρ τὸ ἄλογον, οὐχὶ τοῦ 275 ζῆν ἐνεκα — πόθεν; πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ—, ἄλλ’ ὁπιτερ τρεφόμενον ἤδεται, ἦδυ ποιοῦντος τοῦ λαμβὸν φυσικὴ τινι διαθέσει, τὸ δὲ αὐτοῦ πρὸ τῆς γαστέρα καταπατεμόμενον· ἐπισυμβαίνει δὲ αὐτῷ τὸ ἐξ ἀπὸ τῆς τροφῆς· καὶ τὸν ἰσον πάλιν μὴ γυναῖ τρόπον· οὐ γὰρ ἵνα μὴ τὸ γένος ἐκλείψη, ἄλλ’ ὡς κηρύσσουμεν ὡπὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς, ἐπειδὰν ἡγήσηται μὲν ἐνδεια, οὐ φθάσῃ δὲ πλημμονή. Ότε ἑξεστὶν εἰπεῖν 270 εἶναι τὴν τῆς ἡδονῆς σύστασιν ἐν τῷ μέσῳ ἐνδεια καὶ πλημμονῆς χρόνω ἐπὶ I 170


παντὸς ἐφεξῆς πράγματος.

[6b] Καὶ μην οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ἐμὴν ἡδονήν εὗ ἔχει τὸ γένος ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐνυπάρχουσαν τοῖς ἀλόγοις ἐπεὶ γὰρ ταύτα δὲ ἡμᾶς γέγονεν, διὰ δὲ τὴν ἡδονήν αὐτὰ διασώζεται, φαίνεται σαφῶς καὶ ἢ τῶν ἀλόγων εἰς ἀγαθὸν ἐκβεβήκη τῷ ἡμετέρῳ βιῶ· τὰ γὰρ ἔξωθεν ἡμῖν συνεργοῦντα, ἐκείθεν βέλτιστα ἔχει. Τις ἂν εἴποι τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων ἡμῖν τροφὰς, τὰς περιβολὰς, τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων χρώμεθα, στελλόμενοι τε μακρὰς ὁδούς, καὶ ἐμπορευόμενοι καὶ θηρεύοντες καὶ γεωργοῦντες, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς γεωργίας συλλέγοντες, τὰ τε ἔξωθεν συνεργοῦνται, ἐκεῖθεν βέλτιστα ἔχει. Τίς ἂν εἴποι τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων τροφὰς, τὰς περιβολὰς, τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων χρώμεθα, στελλόμενοι τε μακρὰς ὁδούς, καὶ ἐμπορευόμενοι καὶ θηρεύοντες καὶ γεωργοῦντες, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς γεωργίας συλλέγοντες, τὰ τε ἔξωθεν συνεργοῦνται, ἐκεῖθεν βέλτιστα ἔχει. Τίς ἂν εἴποι τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων τροφὰς, τὰς περιβολὰς, τὰς παρ᾽ ἐκείνων χρώμεθα, στελλόμενοι τε μακρὰς ὁδούς, καὶ ἐμπορευόμενοι καὶ θηρεύοντες καὶ γεωργοῦντες, καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῆς γεωργίας συλλέγοντες, τὰ τε ἔξωθεν συνεργοῦνται, ἐκεῖθεν βέλτιστα ἔχει.
308. ἀκοντίσεις-δόρου cf. Oratio IV 214 — 314. ἀγήρῳ στεφάνῳ cf. Dialogi VI 67.13-14; Epistulae 67.185-186 —
319. δίκη-εὐσπάττεις cf. Oratio IV 181, V 169, 182 — 320. μισθοὺς διδόναι Epistulae 41.32; Dialogi VII 85.5

308. ἀκοντίσεις-δόρου cf. Homerum, Ilia 5.533; Odyssea, 22.265, al. — 314. ἀγήρῳ στεφάνῳ cf. 1 Cor. 9.25 —


ήφασμενον.

[7α] Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ εἰκεῖνο τις ἢ τὸτε τῇ ἡδονῇ, ἡσυχασμένον, τὸ καὶ παρ᾽ ἐκατέρας θυελθήσαν
καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὕτη ἡ ἡδονή, λέγω δὲ νῦν τὴν ἄσέμνον, τὴν
αισχρίστην, ἢ παρὰ τῶν χρηστοτέρων κακῶς ἀκούει, ως ὁ 
τι περι κεφάλαιον ἐστὶ τῶν
κακῶν, εἰγε ἡμεῖς βουλομέθη, γένοιτο ἢ ἡμῖν πρὸς εὐνοοῦν 
και σωφρόνων μετὰ δόξης ἀπολαύσεων. Ὡστε καθ᾽ ἐκάτερον 
μέρος ἡ ἡδονὴ λυστελεί τοῖς 
βουλομένοις· εἰ μὲν ἐγαθὴ ἐστιν αὐτῷ γιὰ τοῦτῳ, εἰ δὲ 
κακὴ καὶ ἐπίβουλος —ο τι 
οὐσά γι τοιαῦτα—, οὐδὲν ἠνοικέν εἰ γὰρ ἐκείνη καθ᾽ ἡμῶν ἀκοντίσει τὸ δόξο, εὑροὶ δὲ ἠμῶς 
τὸ δόξο, ἀκριβῶς τε καὶ καλῶς 
περαφαγμένους, προσοχὴ καὶ 
καρτέρα τῇ γιγνομένῃ.

πρὸς τῷ μηδαμῶς μηδὲν παραβλάψαι, ἢ δὲ καὶ ὄνησαν ἐς 
τὰ μᾶλλον οἷς γε 
ἐπεβουλεύειν· ὅταν γὰρ το ταύτης ὅπλον ἀφεθέν, ἀντικροουθῆ στεφάνῳ τε 
θῷρακος καὶ ἀσπίδας, ὅν ἐστι τεχνίτης ἡ ἀρετή, καὶ τῇ ἑαυτοῦ φορὰ 
ἀντεπιστρέψῃ 
πρὸς τὴν ἐκπέμψασαν, ἐκείνην μὲν ἐργάζεται τραυματιὰ, πληγή 
καυφία, ἡμῖν δὲ 
ἀκουσά χορηγεῖ ἀγήρῳ 
στεφάνῳ 
καὶ 
ἐκ 
τῶν 
ἀγήρῳ 
τοῖς 
ἐπεβούλευεν, 
τῇ ἡμῖν 
καθ᾽ ἡμῶν, 
καὶ 
θανάτου 
προσεκτήσατο 
κέντρον 
διὰ 
τὸ 
λυχνοῦς 
τὸ 
παρ᾽ 
ἡμῖν, 
ἐκ 
τῆς 
ἀρχηθὲν 
ἀκρασίας 
κληροδοχούμενον, 
ὁ δὲ 
ἐγκρατείας ἐλεύθεροι τῆς ἀπλησιάς ἀναφανέντες, 
δικαῖος στεφανώσονται, 
καὶ 
ἐπεφραγμένους 
ἀκρασίας, 
ἀποστεί 
τοὺς 
καὶ 
τό 
στεφάνῳ 
ἐς 
ἡδονὴ 
ζωῆ 
καὶ 
τῷ 
ἀγάθῳ, 
εἰδώ 
μᾶλλον 
αὐτῷ 
προσηκεῖ 
τοὺς 
γιγνομένους 
μισθοὺς 
διδόναι 
τῶν 
ἀγάθοις, 
εἰδώ.
μέτρα θείναι ταῖς χρείαις, καὶ παντὸς τοῦ ὑπὲρ ταύτας ἀποπηδῶσιν· ὡς οὐκ ἐπτόηνται περὶ τὴν τρυφήν, διακεχυμένως ἐχοντες πρὸς ὁ τι ἐν ποι τῶν ὑπὲρ τὴν χρείαν καλῶν φανείη.

[7b] Κατὰ δὲ τούς ἢδη ὤηθέντας λόγους, προσήκει νομίζειν τὴν ἧδονήν, τοῖς μὲν ἀγαθὴν εἶναι, τοῖς δὲ τούναντιν. Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ κακῶς φερομένοις κατὰ τὰ ἀνερμάτιστα πλοῖα, ὡς ἄν ποτὲ τύχῃ πνεῦσαι τὴν ἔφεσιν, ἄντικρυς πολέμις ἐστι θρασύς τε ἅμα καὶ ὕφαλος, μυρίαις τε πειρώμενος μηχαναῖς οἷς συμπλέκετα, καὶ ἀπλῶς ἐκείνων πάντων διασώζων τὸν τύπον, ὅσαπερ ἡ ταύτης εἰκὼν ὑπὸ τῶν γραψάντων αὐτὴν ἔδειξεν· ἐξ ὧν δὴ πάντων συνάγεται, ὡς τὸ νικῆσαι πρόδηλον ἐχεῖ ἡ τῆς εἰκόνος πρωτότυπος, ἀνθ' ὧν γε πρὸς ἀντίπαλον ἀποδύεται εὐεπιχείρητον καὶ νωθρόν. Τοῖς δὲ λόγον ποιοῦμεν, τῆς ὡς ἀληθῶς ζωῆς, καὶ μόνης προσηκούσης ἀνθρώποις, ζῶσί τε προσήκοντι σχήματι καὶ λογισμῷ τὰ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἰθύνουσι πράγματα, ἀγαθὴν τε εἶναι καθ' αὑτὴν, καὶ αὐτοῖς πρόξενον ἀγαθῶν μεγίστων, τὸν τῇ δε βίον ἀμείψασι, προσέτι δὲ καὶ ἡδονῆς ἀληθεστάτης τε καὶ μονίμου μετὰ δόξης γιγνομένης τῷ τότε βίῳ. Ὡς τά γε παρόντα ἀγαθά, καὶ ἡ λαμπρότης ἅπασα, καὶ ἡ δόξα, ψευδώνυμα τινὰ καὶ μικρὰ, καὶ μόγις που τῇ χρείᾳ συμπαραμένοντα, καὶ πάντα δὲ ἐκεῖνα, ὅσα ζητητέα ἡμῖν εἰσίν, οὐ μᾶλλον γε αὐτῶν ἕνεκα, ἢ ἑτέρων, τοιαῦτ' ἂν εἴη· οἷς γε, σύστοι ἐστι καὶ τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς χρῆμα. Νομίζομεν δὲ καλὸν εἶναι, ἐνταῦθα τὸν λόγον κεφαλαιώσαντα, ὥσπερ ἐν συμπεράσματι ἀποδοῦναι.
Εἶναι μὲν οὖν φήμι τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτῆς μέρη, ὡς ἂν τις εἴποι, καὶ τὰς
dυνάμεις, παρὰ Θεοῦ. Πῶς γὰρ οὖ; Εἶναι δὲ καλὰ καὶ ἀγαθά, ὡς ἠ τοῦ Θεοῦ τούτο
gὰρ πάσας ἄναγκας. Καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν αὐτήν, ἢ τὴν ψυχὴν τελειοῦσαν τῷ
παρ’ ἑαυτῆς μέρει, καὶ κατὰ τούτο ἀγαθὴν· τὸ γὰρ ἀτελές, οὐκ ἐπιστεύειν. Ως δὲ καὶ τὴν
ηδονὴν ἔχειν, ἢ τε τὸν βίον ἦμιν συνιστήσῃ, καὶ δὲ’ ἢ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν ἐνεργὸν ἐστὶν ἐν ἦμιν, καὶ οὐχ ὡς νεκρὸν ὀνείωσεν κείμενον, δυνάμει μόνον τὸ ἐαυτοῦ κεκτημένον.
Καὶ ἐπειδήπερ ταῦτ’ οὕτως ἔχει, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τέλος ισχεῖ, καὶ ἀγαθὸν τὸ τῆς
ηδονῆς ἦμιν ἀναδείκνυται χρῆμα τῶν τε ἀλλών ἐνεργὸν, καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δεδομένον,
tῇ τῇ λογικῇ καὶ αἰσθητικῇ φύσει, τί δὴ φῆς ὁ τὴν ἑπονὴν ἀπλῶς διαβάλλων;

Εἰ γὰρ σιωπᾷς αὐτός, ἐρῶ σοι τελευταῖον ἐγώ, ὅπερ ἂν ἡδέως ἀκούσαις οἶμαι.
Ἐγώ σου τοὺς λόγους ἐπικυρώσας, δι’ ὧν σὺ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἡδονῆς μικροῦ συντόμως
ἀνεξωγράφῃς· ὅτ’ ἂν τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἡδονῆς μικροῦ συντόμως ἀνεξωγράφήσῃς· ὅτ’ ἂν τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἡδονῆς μικροῦ συντόμως ἀνεξωγράφης εἶναι γε τί μόνον ἀποκυρώ, τὸ κατὰ πάντων τοσοῦτον νομίζειν αὐτὴν
dύνασθαι, ὡς μικροῦ μάταιον εἶναι πάνταν ἀνθρωπότητα προἀρέσειν τοῖς ἑξῷν ἀγαθοῖς οἰκεῖν ἀγαθοῦς οἰκεῖν. Εἰ γοῦν καὶ αὐτῷ σοι ταῦτα δοκεῖ καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθεῖν

usahaan, τὴν ἡδονὴν ςυνιστήσῃ, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας τέλος ἰσχεῖ, καὶ ἀγαθὸν τὸ τῆς
ηδονῆς ἦμιν ἀναδείκνυται χρῆμα τῶν τε ἀλλών ἐνεργὸν, καὶ ὡς ἀπὸ Θεοῦ δεδομένον,
tῇ τῇ λογικῇ καὶ αἰσθητικῇ φύσει, τί δὴ φῆς ὁ τὴν ἑπονὴν ἀπλῶς διαβάλλων;

Ἐγώ σου τοὺς λόγους ἐπικυρώσας, δι’ ὧν σὺ τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἡδονῆς μικροῦ συντόμως
ἀνεξωγράφης· ὅτ’ ἂν τὴν εἰκόνα τῆς ἡδονῆς μικροῦ συντόμως ἀνεξωγράφης εἶναι γε τί μόνον ἀποκυρώ, τὸ κατὰ πάντων τοσοῦτον νομίζειν αὐτὴν
dύνασθαι, ὡς μικροῦ μάταιον εἶναι πάνταν ἀνθρωπότητα προἀρέσειν τοῖς ἑξῷν ἀγαθοῖς οἰκεῖν ἀγαθοῦς οἰκεῖν. Εἰ γοῦν καὶ αὐτῷ σοι ταῦτα δοκεῖ καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθεῖν

ὡφέλιμον, τὴν ἀναγκαίαν καὶ κοσμίαν ἠδονήν ἀνακηρύττοντές τε καὶ ἀποφαίνοντες· τὴν δὲ πλεονέξουσαν τε καὶ ἀκοσμόν, τοῦνατιν, οὖ ταῦτα, οὐδὲ ἄγαθην, οὐδ’ ὡφέλιμον· καὶ τούς αὐτὴ γε χρωμένους οὔκ ἐν καρφῷ, οὖδ’ ἐν μέτρῳ, μὴ παρ’ αὐτῆς, ἀλλ’ οἴκοθεν τὴν βλάβην δεχομένους, ως σφάς αὐτοὺς ἐκδεδωκότας ταῖς παραχρήσεσιν. Ἐπει καὶ πάντα τοῦ βιου τὰ ἀγαθά, εἰς κακόν ἄν, ως εἰπεῖν, μεταβαλον, εἰ τις γε παρὰ τὴν χρείαν αὐτοὺς χρώτο. [8c] Αγε οὖν εἰ σοι δοκεῖ, συμβώμεν ἀμα τοῖς λόγοις· τοὺς γὰρ λογισμοὺς ἢμῖν, εἰς ταῦταν εἶναι νομίζω· ἄ γὰρ σὺ φής τῆς ἠδονῆς εἶναι, τὴν ὑπερβολήν καὶ τὴν πλεονέξιαν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀπολαυστῶν πάντων, ταῦτ’ ἐγὼ φήμι ἡμέτερα εἶναι. Ὡστ’ ἐν λόγοις ἢμῖν ἡ διαφορά, οὐ τοῖς λογισμοῖς. Αλλ’ εἰ τί σοι καλὸν δοκεῖ, τούτο καλεῖν ἠδονήν, τὴν δ’ αὐτὴν παράχρησιν, οὐ διοίσομαι. Μόνον δός μοι καὶ αὐτός, ἀγαθὸν τὴν σύμμετρον ἠδονήν λέγειν.

368-369. ὑπερβολήν-πλεονεξίαν ταῖς Oration V 159

'Ὅτι ἡ μὲν ἁμαρτία τὸ πάντων χείριστον. Δεὶ δὲ μηδένα ἀπογιώσκειν, μήτε ἑαυτὸν, μήτε ἑτέρον, κρίνειν δὲ ἑαυτὸν, καὶ οἰχ ἑτέρον. Καὶ τοὺς ἁμαρτηκότας οὐ μισεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐλεεῖν. Καὶ περὶ μετανοίας, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας, καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας.

[1a] Περὶ ἡδονῆς προδιαλεχθέντες ώς οἱ οἱ τ' ἤμεν, ἀποδεδώκαμεν τὸν περὶ ταυτησὶ λόγον· καὶ εἰς γε μῆν μαντελώς τοῦ πρόποντος ἀποπεπτωκέναι, ἀλλὰ μετρίως γοῦν καλῶς τὸν περὶ τῆς ἐγχειρήσεως πλοῦν δόξαι τοῖς ἀκούσασιν ἤνικέναι. Δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς οἴμαι περὶ ἑκείνης διεξιόντας, καὶ περὶ ἀπογιώσκεως διαλέξασθαι, εἰ μέλλομεν ποιεῖν τὸ προσήκον. Απὸ γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀκρασίας, τὰ ἁμαρτήματα εἰς τὰς ἡμετέρας ψυχὰς κατασκήπτει, ἀπὸ δὲ συχνῆς ἁμαρτίας ἀπόγνωσις, καὶ εἰς ἑκείνης, ἐτέρα μείζων καὶ οὕτω γε προβαῖνον τὸ κακόν, ἀναγκαῖον εἰς οὐδὲν ἐκταθῆναι, καὶ τὴν τελευταίαν πληγὴν τὰς ψυχὰς δέξασθαι, χωρούσης γε αἰὲ τῆς λύμης ἐς τὸ δεινότερον τε καὶ δυσαπαλλακτόρευον· Ἡ ἡδονή πολλοὺς μὲν πάντων καθῆκεν, πολλοὺς δ' αὖ εἰργάσατο τραυματίας, καὶ ἐνιοὶ τῷ μὴ κατ' ἄνδρας ἀγωνίζεσθαι προῃρῆσθαι, οὐδὲ τὴν πρώτην εἰσβολὴν ὑπέστησαν, ἀλλ' αἰχμάλωτοι καθάπαξ γεγονότες, παρὰ τῶν ὁρώντων ἐσυρττότε· ἔπειτα θελήσαντες, οὐ μόνον τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἥττης αἰσχύνην ἀπετρίψαντο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς νίκης στεφάνους ἀνεδήσαντο· τῶν δὲ βεβλημένων τῷ ξίφει τῆς ἀπόγνωσεως, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδένα θεραπευθῆναι· καιρία γὰρ ἡ πληγὴ καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἰάσιμος.

οὐδεὶς δ' ἀπὸ συχνῆς ἀπογνώσεως ἐπανῆκε. Δοκούμεν δὲ μηδὲν εἰκῆ βούλεσθαι, μηδὲ μετέχειν ταυτην τὴν ἐγχείρησιν ὅγκον τινος, ἢ θραύστησι: εἶναι γὰρ γεγονόμενον, μὴ σιγὴ παραδοσιμένη ἐκεῖνη τὴν νόσον, ἢτις ἦσσα συγγενοῦστ' ἀν τὸν χρόνον, τοὺς τῇ ἀτεχνών διαφθείρει. Δει δ' ἐπιθείναι τῷ τραύματι καταλληλὴν οἶμαι φάρμακον, εἰ μέλλοιμεν αὐτῷ καταστελλέειν τε καὶ ἱάσθαι, ἀλλὰ μὴ προσπαροξύνων τοῖς ἐναντίον, οἰκοθεν ὅργον καὶ φλεγμαίνον. Καὶ ἀπλῶς δὲ πάνυ εὖς, οὕτω γε βοηθητέουν ταῖς γνησίαις βοηθείαις, καὶ οὐκ ἀπαδούσας τὸν χορήγοντος τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν συμμαχίας· ἄλλως γὰρ ἀν εἴη, μηδ' ἐγχείρησιν ἁμείνουν, βλάψαι γὰρ ἀν οὐκ ὄνησα τοὺς ύψ' ἡμῶν γε δὴθεν βοηθούμενος. Οὐ χαλεπόν δὲ οἴμαι εὔφειν τὸ καταλληλόν τοῦτο φάρμακον· χορηγεῖ γὰρ οἰκοθεν αὐτῷ ἢ τῷ Σωτήρος φυλανθρωπία, ἢ μόνη πάντων ἰστρός τῶν γε τοιούτων ἀροφτημάτων, ἢ τὰ ἀμαρτήματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοιοῦτον ἔλαττον ἔχει, ὡσον οὐδ' ἐστιν ἑνημηρημέναι. 'Ὡστ' ἀπὸ βαλβίδος φασί, τὸ ἐξημώμενον ἡμῖν εὑρηται.

[2a] ἂλλ' ὁ δείνα γε φησίν, ύψους ἀπερφάγη καὶ κατηνέχθη, καὶ γέγονε τι πτώμα δεινον ἀπαίσ τοις τούτον ὀφθοί. Καὶ τί ταύτι πρὸς τὸ ἀπογγώνα; Βουλήθηκαι δει μόνον, καὶ πρὸς τῷ ἀπονιψαθαι τὰ κακὰ, καὶ πτηνῶν ἀν τάχιον ἐπ' αὐτην τὴν τῶν καλῶν ἀνέθδοι κοροφήν. Λέγω δὲ βουλήθησαν νῦν, τὴν διὰ τῶν ἔργων μαρτυρουμένην· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν οὐκ ἐστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς θελήσαντας, ί ἀποτυχεῖν τοῦ σκοποῦν ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ μὴ βουλεσθαι ἱαθῆναι, τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς παθήματα ἔπιμενεν εἰσθέν ἡμῖν, ὡς ἄν αν ἀντιστώμεν γενναίως, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν εἰσκομάζει· τὸ τε γὰρ γεγονέναι, τὸ τε
διαμεμενήκεναι κακούς, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ διαφέρει, οἴκοθεν σαφῶς τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· οὐ γὰρ ἔστι καλοίς εὐθέλοντας εἶναι, τινὶ τῶν θυραδῆν βιασθῆναι, κακοῖς γενέσθαι, οὐδὲ φαινόμενοι γεγονότας διὰ κακίστην προαίρεσιν, εἰτὰ μὴ διορθωθῆναι τοῦτο θελήσαντας. Καὶ εἰ τοῦτο γε ἐληθείς, εὑρήσει τὸ φαρμάκου, καὶ ἢ τῆς ἀπογνώσεως ὑπεχώρησε νόσος. «Ναί», φησιν, «ἀλλ᾿ οὔτος γε ὁ σχέτιος, τραυματιας γέγονε πάντων ἐξῆς τῶν παθῶν, καὶ πολλάκις ιαθεῖς, πολλάκις πάλιν τέτρωσαί. Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχω διορθωθῆναι·» Μὴ ἀπογνώνημεν τὸν ἀνθρώπον· ἂν γὰρ ἡ καιρὰ μὴ παραγένηται, τὴν ἀπόγνωσιν λέγω, ἰάσιμον γε τὸ πάθος τοῖς βουλομένοις τὴν ἀρετὴν ἀσφαλῶς δέξασθαι· εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτον εἶχε τὸν τρόπον τὰ καθ᾿ ἡμᾶς, οὐδ᾿ ἂν εἰς πάντως ἐσωθῆ, ὡς γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀγαθὸς κατὰ τὸν θείον χρησίμων, οὐδ᾿ ἀμαρτίας ὄντως ἐλεύθερος, κἂν ὑπερβάλῃ πολλῷ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰς ἀρετήν. Δεήσει τοῖνυν ἄπασι τὸ φαρμάκου τουτοῦ, τῆς μετανοίας φημῆς, καὶ τοῦτον καταλήψῃ τετυχηκόσθη, τὸ εὐκείτειν εὐθὺς ἐπειπά.

[2b] Κἂν τὶς ἀνθρώπουν ὑπερελάσῃ πολλῷ τῷ μέτρῳ, ὅμως τοὺς ὄντας καὶ γεγονότας ἐπὶ κακία βεβοημένους, θηρῆναν μὲν ὅτι πολλῶν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἄξιος ὡς ἀληθῶς γέγονεν, ὅτι καλὸς καὶ ἐπ᾿ ἀγαθοῖς δημιουργηθεῖς, οὐκ ἐπὶ πολλῶν εἰκὼν κακῶν τὴν ἐαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐνέπλησεν ὡς οὐδές ἐτερος. Πλὴν καὶ οὕτως γε αὐτὸς, ἢν ἐρασίτης μανικώτατος τῆς ἰδίας διορθώσεως γένηται· εἰ μὲν ἀπογνώς— εὐθῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνόητος, τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν τὴν ἀπόγνωσιν λέγω· ἐναντίον ἀμαρτίας πέρας ἐχούσης ἥττω νομίσας. Εἰ ἂν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐλεύθερος, κἂν ὑπερβάλῃ πολλῷ τοὺς ἄλλους εἰς ἀρετήν. Δεήσει τοῖνυν ἄπασι τὸ φαρμάκου τουτοῦ, τῆς μετανοίας φημῆς, καὶ τοῦτον καταλήψῃ τετυχηκόσθη, τὸ εὐκείτειν εὐθὺς ἐπειπά.


56-57. πολλῶν-ἐνέπλησεν] cf. Ps. 106:9

δύναμις, οὐδὲν καλώσει τούτων ἐπανόρτωσα, τὴν προτέραν κατάστασιν ἐπαναλαβεῖν, ἢ καὶ πολλῷ παρελθεῖν, εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπερβολὴ τις δέξοι το εἰρημένον. Ὁ πάθος, καὶ τἀ πάθη, τὰ ταῦτα, τὰ πάθη, τὰς ἀμαρτίας· καὶ τὸν Θεὸν καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην συνήσεις, εἰς ἐκ τῆς θελήσεως· τὸν θελῆσαι τὴν ἱατρείαν· ἤτοι τίς ράδιον εἴπέ μοι· ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην, δύναται σωθῆναι. Καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν πασί, ἡμᾶς ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἐὰν ἵνα καθαρίζει ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἁμαρτίας τις μὴ γίνεται εἰς τὴν σωτηρίαν. Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἔχομεν, καὶ περισσότερον ἔχομεν. Καὶ ἐὰν ἠλθεν, οὐδέν κωλύσει τοῦτον ἐπανιόντα, τὴν προτέραν κατάστασιν ἐπαναλαβεῖν, ἐὰν ἥσσος ἡμᾶς, καὶ μηδὲν λέγω τῶν θελόντων σωθῆναι· φιλεῖ τε γὰρ ὃν ἔπλασε χερσὶν δικαιωθήσεται ἐνώπιόν σου πᾶς ζῶν ἐστιν, ὁ τὴν σωτηρίαν ἀπογινώσκων, τῶν ὑπόχρεων ταῦτα παθεῖν, ὃ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς θελήσεως· τοῦ γοῦν θελῆσαι τὴν ἰατρείαν, τί ῥάδιον εἴπέ μοι· ὅταν δὲ εἰς τὸν Θεόν καὶ τὴν ἐκείνην, δύναται σωθῆναι. Καὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν πασί, ἡμᾶς ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφῇ ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἐὰν ἦν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἦν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἦν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἦν ὁμολογῶμεν τὰς ἁμαρτίας.
ἀπεγνωκότων μὲν δι’ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὰς πράξεις;

[2c] Ἐρχόμενοι δ’ οὖν ἵπποι καὶ ἐλπίσαν ἵππα τοῦ Σωτῆρα, καὶ ἀπερ οὕτως πέπονθεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σταυρωθέν ἠμέτερα, οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπεῖα δικαιοσύνη τοῦ καὶ φιλανθρωπία, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἁγιά κρινεί, μηδὲν τι παρ’ ἡμῶν ἀπαιτούν νῦν, ἢ τὴν γιγνομένην μετάνοιαν, πρὸς τὸ τὸ ἡμῖν λυτελὴς ἀφορῶν· οὐ δι’ ἑαυτὸς καὶ ταύτην ἐπὶ ζῶντων, οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ τῶν ἁριεῖν γένοιτ’ ἀν αὐτῶ χρήσιμων. Ημεῖς δὲ πάντες ἐξῆς φρονοῦμεν ἐξ ἑαυτῶ νῦν, ἢ τὴν γιγνομένην μετάνοιαν, πρὸς τὸ τὰ τὰς τῶν ἀχρείων γένοιτ’ ἂν αὐτῶ χρήσιμων. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμῖν κρινεῖ τὰ ἡμέτερα, οὐδὲ ἀνθρωπεῖα δικαίοσύνῃ τὲ καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἱδιᾷ κρινεῖ, μηδὲν τι παρ’ ἡμῶς ἀπαιτοῦν

83. σιωπῶ τὰς ὕβρεις, τὰς λοιδορίας, πᾶν ὅ τι φέρον αἰσχύνην πολλῇ περιουσίᾳ θυμοῦ γιγνόμενον, ἃ τοῖς ταλαιπώροις ἐκ εἰνός πολὺ δακνηρότερα φαίνεται σφαγῆς αὐτῆς καὶ θανάτου. Οὕτω τὰ τοῖς ἡμετέρας φιλάνθρωπα καὶ δίκαια, οὐδὲν οὐ μέγα, οὐ καθαρόν, ἀλλὰ μικρὰ τινά καὶ συγκεχυμένα, καὶ πρὸς τὸ τό ἡμῖν αὐτῶν συνοίσον ἀφορῶντα μᾶλλον, ἢ τὸ πρὸς οὕς

82. ζώντων ἐλπίσα] cf. 1 Petr. 1:3 — 95. ὅμως οὗτος] cf. 1 Petr. 3:9
γίγνεται. Θεού δὲ γένοιτ' ἂν οἴμαι δικαιοσύνη τε καὶ φιλανθρωπία, τὸ
μεταμελομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς δεῖ, ἐφ' οἷς γε ἑξευρίσαμεν εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ νόμον τῇ
παραβάσει τῶν ἑντολῶν, εὐθὺς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, καὶ μή ἣντειν τιμωρήσασθαι, εἰ μὴ
τὴν ἱσόρροπον ἐκείνῳ τιμὴν ἀντετειθεὶμεν.

105 [2d] Ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄλλως τοῦτο ἀδύνατον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς Θεὸν ὑβρίσαι εὐχερές, τιμὴ
dέ γε τοῦτον ἡμᾶς ὡς δεῖ, ἐφ' οἷς γε ἐξυβρίσαμεν εἰς τὸν αὐτοῦ νόμον τῇ
παραβάσει τῶν ἐντολῶν, εὐθὺς αὐτὸν δέχεσθαι, καὶ μὴ ζητεῖν τιμωρήσασθαι, εἰ μὴ
τὴν ἰσόρροπον ἐκείνῳ τιμὴν αὐτὴν καὶ φαυλοτάτην

110 δόξειν ἂν μεγίστη καὶ περιφανεστάτην ἢν δὲ καὶ πάσαν εἰσενέγκου τιμὴν μεθ' ὅς
ἀν τὶς ὑπερβολής, οὐ δύναται τις ἐποιῆσαι, εἰ μὲν αὐτὴν εἰσφέρει, ἄντω δὲ μικρὰ τὶς αὐτὴ καὶ φαυλοτάτην,

115 ὥστε καὶ ἄλλως τοῦτο ἀδύνατον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰς Θεὸν ὑβρίσαι εὐχε
ρές, τιμῆσαι
dέ γε τοῦτον ἀμήχανον. Διάτι; Ὅτι καὶ τὸ τιμῆσαι τοῦτον, ἐκεῖθεν ἡμῖν. Ὅστε καὶ τὸ
πραξάν τοὺς μεγίστους, εἰ μὲν ἀτιμίαν εἰσφέρει, ἄντω δὲ μικρὰ τὶς αὐτή καὶ φαυλοτάτην,

120 πεπραγμένον, καὶ διενεχόμεθα τὴν τὸν δόξαν Θεῷ νομιζομένων προσφέρειν, γενόιτ' ἂν εἰκότως
ἡμῖν οὐκ ἐκκοπή τινος χρέους, ἀλλὰ προσθήκη. Ὅλως δὲ τὰ τῶν ἐλαχίστων πρὸς
τοὺς μεγίστους, εἰ μὲν ἀτιμίαν εἰσφέρει, ἄντω δὲ μικρὰ τὶς αὐτή καὶ φαυλοτάτην,
τρέχειν εὔς ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου, καὶ εὔς ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου, καὶ εὔς ὅλης τῆς ἑσύνος σου, φησίν ὁ παλαιός νόμος. Ο δὲ Θεὸς οὐτωσ ἑστίν ἄγαθός, ὡς καὶ τὴν ὀπωσδὲν μεταμελεῖαι ἐπεικῶς δέχεσθαι εἰς γὰρ τὸ θέλειν ἄφορά καὶ τὸ δυνατὸν ὁ φυλάνθρωπος, ὡς προείρηται.

[3a] Πρόσεστι δὲ κάκεινο τὸ ἄγαθόν· ἐπειδὰν γὰρ ἡμεὶς ὁλίγον τι προεισενέγκαμεν τῆς ἄγαθῆς θελήσεως, αὐτίκα πως ἡμῖν παραγίγνεται ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὁσπῆ, καὶ τὸ τελέως θελήσαν παρ' ἑαυτῆς διόταται. Καὶ τὶ λέγω ἐπειδὰν προεισενέγκαμεν, ὅπως καὶ η ὑπολογήμενος ἐναγεῖ πρὸς τάγαθων ὁ Δημιουργὸς ἔπεσεν τρόπος, ἀνέω μέντοι τοῦ βίασασθαι, ὡς ὁ προσήκον ταύτη γενέσθαι; Ἡ γὰρ τῆς ψυχῆς θεραπεία, ἢ που τὸν ἰατρὸν εἰδέναι, καὶ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἐθελῆσαι δραμεῖ, τοὺς γε ύγείας ἐφιεμένους. Ὡστε οἱ πειραθήκημεν τῶν κολάσεων—ὁ λόγος δὲ νῦν οὐ περί τῶν πιστῶν μόνον—αἰτία τῆς αὐτός αὐτοῖς αὐτοῖς γε πάντως, οὐχ ὁ Θεὸς· συγχωρεῖ δὲ τοῦτο γενέσθαι, οὐ διὰ τὸ δίκαιον μόνον, ἀλλ' ὁπρὶ καὶ συμφέρον τι οἰκονόμοι,

[3b] Ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Σωτῆρ ἡμῖν ὑπεπεράσσεται, ἔπαθανομένοις, εὐθὺς παρέσχεσθαι, καὶ

πάρεστι ή τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ βοηθεῖ φανερῶς πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν ταύτην βουλήσα


410
τὰς τοὺς αὐτὸν ἐκάρτουσι. Τις εἰ μὴ σφόδρα μαίνοιτο, δίκαιος ἄν εἰς ποτὲ, καὶ τοὺς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ βυθῷ τῶν κακῶν κειμένους ἀπογινώσκειν, ἐλέῳ μόνῳ θαρροῦντας, καὶ τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ προῖκα σώζοντος μεταμελομένους; Ἡστήν γαλήνας γε τῶν πάντων ἀπογινωστέον ἡμῖν ἄν εἰς, εἰ μὴ τοὺς σοφὰς γε αὐτοὺς ἀπεγνωκότας πολλῆ μανία δία γὰρ σωρὸν ἀμαρτημάτων παντοδαπῶν, εὐρήτως παντάπασιν ἀπογινώσκει, ἐως ἃν μὴ τὴν παρουσίαν ἔρχησιν ἀποδώμεθα ἑθελοῦσι μὲν γὰρ τὸν Θεόν ὑπὸ ἐλέους κανοῦμεν τῇ δυνάμει χρήσασθαι ύπέρ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπικαλουμένων, ἐπειδὰς εἰκός ἐστὶν οἴμας ἀτονίσατε δὲ ποτὲ θελήσαντα τι διαπράξασθαι, παντάπασιν ἀδύνατον. Ἡ Οὐδέν ἀρα λείπεται τοῖς ἐν ἀμαρτίαις πρὸς τὸ σωθῆναι, ἢ τὸ θελῆσαι γνησίως μετανοῆσαι. Ο τοῖνυν καὶ τὸν Ἰωνᾶν θηρὸς γαστρὸς ἀναρπάσας, καὶ θαλαττοῦ βυθοῦ, δύναται καὶ τοουσίν ἀνελίκουσα τῆς τῆς γαστρὸς τοῦ ἐχθροῦ, καὶ τοῦ τῆς κακίας βυθοῦ. Καίτοι τὸ τοῦ Ἰωνᾶθαύμα ἢν, καὶ οὐκ ἢν ἀνάγκη τοῦτο ποιῆσαι οὐ γὰρ ἀπατήσομεν αὐτὸν ὧσα δὴ καὶ δύναται, ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἀπαντα, τὸ δὲ τοῖς καταβληθεῖσιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας, ἐπείτα θελήσαντι ἐπαναρθήθησαι χεῖρα ὀρέγειν, σαφῆς ἀνάγκης. Πῶς ὅτι τούτ' αὐτὸς ἐπηγγείλατο, ἐν οἷς αἰτεῖν τε καὶ ζητεῖν, καὶ κροεῖν ἀπασί παραινεῖν οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοὺς πολλοὺς σεαυτήγκηκεν, τὸ δὲ ἀπὸ τούτων ἐκβησόμενον σεαυτήγκηκεν, ἐν ἀδηλίᾳ τούς λογισμοὺς ἀφεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ἡμῖν ἐδείξε, προσθεῖς τῇ μὲν αἰτήσει τὴν δόσιν, τῇ δὲ ζητήσει τὴν εὑρέσιν, καὶ τὸ τὰς θύρας ἀνοιγήσεσθαι μέλλειν τοῖς τῶν κοπτόντων κρούμασι. Χάρις μὲν οὖν τὸ ἐπάγγελμα, πάντων δὲ τῶν ἐν ἀνθρώπους ὀφθαλμῶν ἀσφαλεστέραν τὴν ἀπόδοσιν ἔχει ἔφρ ἡμῶν μὲν γὰρ

150. Ἰωνᾶν] cf. Epistulae 67.151-152 — 154. χείρα ὀρέγειν] De Matrimonio 249; cf. Ad ebriam 286.26; De processione 44.8; Delicadatio imperatoris 130.14; Dialogi XIV 185.19, XXI 257.35, XXV 291.18; In Mariam Aegyptiam, codd. Vat. gr. 1619, f. 18, Vat. gr. 632, f. 339-8; Epistulae 38.28; Præcepta 337C; vid. Oratio VI 208 — 158-159. αἰτήσεως̣μυμάται] cf. Oratio gratulatoria 231.13-14
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τῶν προσηλωμένων πολλοίς πάθεις, καὶ μεταμελομένων μὲν οὐκ ὁλιγάκις, πρὸς δὲ
dικαίαν ἔκτισιν ἀδυνατούντων πολλάκις, εἰκός ἐστι καὶ χάριν καὶ ὀφλήμα μὴ
ἀποδοθῆναι. Ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο γένεται τὸ δεινὸν· δυνάμενοι γὰρ ἐστί καὶ τὸ πρότυπον
ἔργασάθηκαν, οὐ βουλόμεθα. Ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα χώραν οὐκ ἔχειν ὅπου γάρ Θεός
ἐπαγγελλόμενος, οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως οὐκ ἐκτελέσει, καὶ δὴ ταῖς ὑποσχέσεσι τέλος
ἰσχεὶ, ὡστ' οὐλείς ἐν ἀπογνώσει, ἄξιον εἶναι. Μηδεὶς

dυνάμενοι γὰρ ἔστι τὸ πρέπον
ἐργάσασθαι, οὐ βουλόμεθα. Ἐπὶ δὲ Θεοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα χώραν οὐκ ἔχειν ὅπου γάρ Θεός

[3c] Ἐγὼ τοὺς πάντας ὑπερελάσας ἐπὶ κακοῖς, οὐκ ἐμαυτὸν ἀπογνώσομαι, καὶ
diὰ τοῦτο οὖν ὑπερελασάν τῶν ἁπάντων, ὡς ὄφελόν γε καὶ σὲ τὸν ἄπταιστον,
ἵνα μὴ κρίνων τοὺς ἄλλους αὐτὸς κριθ

κατακρινεῖν τὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἄριστοι, οὔτ' ἀπογινώσκουσι τοὺς οὐκ ἀπογνόντας, οὔτ' εὐχερῶς
catakρίνουσι· τοῦτο γὰρ κεκρίκασιν εὔλογον εἶναι, σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς κατακρίνων, οὔτ' εὑχερῶς
catakρίνουσι τοῦτο γὰρ κεκρίκασιν εὐλογικὸν εἶναι, σφᾶς μὲν αὐτοὺς κατακρίνειν

eκάστῳ] ἐκάστος V — 178. Post πράγματα scr. κατοί κ(α)(ι) θ' θε' αὐτοῦ, πρὸς τάτα ἀπαντα, τὸ τῶν

412
ἀπείδαν ποὺ τοῦ προσήκοντος παρεξέλθωσι, μακρὰν ἐλαυνομένης ἀπασὶ τρόποις τῆς καθ᾽ ἡμῶν λυττώσεως, τοὺς δὲ ἐτέρους κρίνειν εὰν τὸν Δημιουργόν, ὡ μηδὲν τῆς κτίσεως ἀβατον. Κριτικὸς γάρ ἐνθυμήσεως καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας, ὁ μακάμος ἐφε Παύλος. Μὴ κρίνετε, φησίν ὁ Σωτήρ, καὶ οὐ μὴ κρίθητε. Μὴ καταδικάζετε καὶ οὐ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε. Τοῦτον τοῖς τῶν φιλῶν διὰ παντὸς μεμνημένοι, οὐδ’ ὄντινοι κατακόρυφοι. οὐδε μισοῦν —ἀπαγε!—, οὐδὲ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ὑμὸς χαρῆσουσιν κατὰ τῆς κοινῆς φύσεως: κἂν δὲ τὴ πάθη διὰ προαίρεσιν, ἀλλὰ τὴν μὲν μοχθηρίαν βδελύζονται, τοὺς δὲ ἁμαρτάνοντας δακρύσουσιν. Ὡ ποιεῖν εἰώθαμεν, μέλους ἡμῖν σηπομένου πονῆρῳ ἔλκει, ἢ ἡνίκα τὶς νοσεῖ τῶν μᾶλατα συνηθῶν καὶ συγγενῶν. Εἰδότες δὲ καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρωσάντων εὐδέμουν, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἐναγωγῶν πρὸς μετάνοιαν, τὸν ἰ ὅλιγος ἀρχιερίους αὐτὸν πεπρακότα, τὸν προδεδωκότα, τὸν φιλήματι παραδεδωκότα, τὸν κἂν ὅτι γένηται διαμενοῦντα κακόν, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχοντες, καὶ κήδονται τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων, καὶ πειράζονται θεραπεύειν τὸ λυποῦν, καὶ γίνονται, καὶ πράττουσιν ἀπαντα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κακοῦ λύσιν, καὶ χαίρουσι, μηδὲν περαίνοντες. Εἰκότως· εἰ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τἀλεξιτήρια φάρμακα τὸ διενοχλοῦν χωρεῖ, δέος ἐστὶν οὐ μικρόν, μὴ ὑπερνικῆσαν τῷ χρόνῳ εἰς τοὺς τῆς ἀπογνώσεως βυθούς, τὰς τῶν ἑαλωκότων ψυχὰς παραπέμψῃ, πρὸς οὓς οὐδεὶς πω κατελθὼν ἐπανῆκεν.

Οὕτως οἱ ἀκίβδηλον τὴν ἀρετὴν κεκτημένοι. Ἀλλ’ οἷς γε ταύτης μέτεστι μέν, κριτικὸς καταδικασθῆτε. Ὁ ποιεῖν εἰώθαμεν, μέλους ἡμῖν σηπομένου πονῆρῳ ἔλκει, ἢ ἡνίκα τὶς νοσεῖ τῶν μᾶλατα συνηθῶν καὶ συγγενῶν. Εἰδότες δὲ καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρωσάντων εὐδέμουν, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἐναγωγῶν πρὸς μετάνοιαν, τὸν ἰ ὅλιγος ἀρχιερίους αὐτὸν πεπρακότα, τὸν προδεδωκότα, τὸν φιλήματι παραδεδωκότα, τὸν κἂν ὅτι γένηται διαμενοῦντα κακόν, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχοντες, καὶ κήδονται τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων, καὶ πειράζονται θεραπεύειν τὸ λυποῦν, καὶ γίνονται, καὶ πράττουσιν ἀπαντα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κακοῦ λύσιν, καὶ χαίρουσιν ἀνύοντες, καὶ ἀνώντες, μηδὲν περαίνοντες. Εἰκότως· εἰ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τἀλεξιτήρια φάρμακα τὸ διενοχλοῦν χωρεῖ, δέος ἐστὶν οὐ μικρόν ηνίκα τὶς νοσεῖ τῶν μᾶλατα συνηθῶν καὶ συγγενῶν. Εἰδότες δὲ καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν σταυρωσάντων εὐδέμουν, καὶ διὰ πάντων ἐναγωγῶν πρὸς μετάνοιαν, τὸν ἰ ὅλιγος ἀρχιερίους αὐτὸν πεπρακότα, τὸν προδεδωκότα, τὸν φιλήματι παραδεδωκότα, τὸν κἂν ὅτι γένηται διαμενοῦντα κακόν, ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν ἔχοντες, καὶ κήδονται τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων, καὶ πειράζονται θεραπεύειν τὸ λυποῦν, καὶ γίνονται, καὶ πράττουσιν ἀπαντα πρὸς τὴν τοῦ κακοῦ λύσιν, καὶ χαίρουσιν ἀνύοντες, καὶ ἀνώντες, μηδὲν περαίνοντες. Εἰκότως· εἰ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν πολλὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τἀλεξιτήρια φάρμακα τὸ διενοχλοῦν χωρεῖ, δέος ἐστὶν οὐ μικρὸν, μὴ ὑπερνικῆσαν τῷ χρόνῳ εἰς τοὺς τῆς ἀπογνώσεως βυθούς, τὰς τῶν ἑαλωκότων ψυχὰς παραπέμψῃ, πρὸς οὓς οὐδεὶς πω κατελθὼν ἐπανῆκεν.
νενοθευμένης δ’ οὖν ὁμοὶ, τοὺς ἐν ἀμαρτίαις κατελημμένους, σύχ ὡς σχετίως δικαίωσυν, οὐδ’ ὡς νοσούσι τούτους ἀμύνουσιν, οὔτε παρεχοχόμενοι, τά συνοίσοντα διδάσκουσιν καὶ περινυστούντες, ἠτροῦν θηνοῦν βοήθειαν τούτους εἰσαγαγεῖν. Ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐκραγέν τι μέλος τοῦ ὅλου σώματος, καὶ νεκρόν καὶ ἔωλον γεγενημένον, ἀπαγορεύοντι τε καὶ ἀπορρίπτουσιν, σπάγγαμα κυσι τε καὶ κόραξιν, ἢ το γε ὀικεῖτερον φάναι, βοόμα δαιμοσιν’ αὐτοῖς δ’ ἐλάῳ τετήχε κίνεσαν οἰωνοὶ τε πᾶσιν, εἶπεν ἀν ὅ ποιητῆς. Καὶ ταῦτα τίνας ὡς καὶ ἐκχρός ἠλέησεν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ χείβα γε κειμένοις ἠξιεῖν ἄν, καίτοι καὶ νεκροὶς ἀνθρώποις ἔθος τιμᾶν, καὶ πολλά τα νομίζομεν ἐπ’ αὐτῶς ἀνάγκη τελείν, καὶ μέλος δε αὐτὸς τιμήν, καὶ ἀποθανὸν καθ’ οἴνον δή τινα τρόπον, καὶ ἔλεος, καὶ ταφῆς, καὶ παρ’ ἐκεῖνον αὐτών ἔστιν ὅτε τῶν ἀποτελόμενων αὐτὸ τυγχάνει. Καὶ ἔδει γε μεμνημέναι τῶν νόμων τούτων, πολλῷ γε μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῶν ζώντων τε καὶ νοσοῦντων, ἢ τῶν μηδαμῶς αἰσθανομένων ἠστινοίς βοήθειας· οἱ δὲ ἐνταῦθα τῶν καλῶν ἐπιλανθάνονται νόμων, ἑνθα πάντων μάλιστ’ ἐχθρῆς μεμνημέθης, καὶ εἰ πάντων ὁμοὶ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐπιλανθάνοντοι· οὐ μόνον ὅτι ζώντων ἐπιμελήσθονται καὶ ἰασίμων ὡς τὰ πολλά, ἀλλ’ ὅτιπερ καὶ νόσων ὁμοί νοσοῦσιν, ἀπελευθέρων αὐτῶν σώματι θάνατον, ὡς καὶ ἀναγκαῖος ἡμῖν ἐστι, καὶ ἔπευξιν αὐτόμας καὶ ποτὲ λυθήσεται τῇ Ἀναστάσει.

[4a] Ἀλλὰ τῇ ψυχῇ, ἣς ἀθανάτος ὁ θάνατος ἐστίν, αἰώνιος γάρ· ψυχῆς γὰρ θάνατον ἐπείκειαν ἂν ὁ ποιητὴς. Καὶ ταῦτα τίνας; Οὓς κἂν ἐχθρὸς ἠλέησεν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἀναγκαῖον τε καὶ νεκροὺς ἀνθρώπων ἔθος τιμάντων, ἀναγκαῖον, περινυστοῦσιν, ζητοῦσιν ὁθενοῦν βοήθειαν ἂν εἰσαγαγεῖν. νενοθευμένης δ’ οὖν ἕμως ὁμοί, τοὺς ἐν ἁμαρτίαις κατελημμένους, οὐχ ὡς σχετλίους βοήθειαν ποιητὴς scil. Homerus ἀμύνο — 208. χεῖρά—ἀφεξέν· cf. Oratio VI 154

207. ποιητής] scil. Homerus — 208. χεῖρά—ἀφεξέν· cf. Oratio VI 154


ἐπανελθεῖν, ἀμήχανον παντελῶς. Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, ἀποθανόντι μὲν τῷ σώματι, οὐκ ἔνεστιν 
ἐπανελθεῖν, ἀμήχανον παντελῶς. Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, ἀποθανόντι μὲν τῷ σώματι, οὐκ ἔ
δει τὸν Θεόν ἀπολαλεκότος. Οὐτῶ καὶ οἱ δαίμονες, τὴν γὰρ ἀληθινὴν ζωήν ἀπολέσαντας, οὐκ ἔ
δει εἰς τὸ μέρος τῆς ζωῆς ἐκείνας ἐκεῖνον θάνατον, καὶ τὸ σῶμα μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ὡσπερ ἐ
τοῦ ζωογονοῦντος ἐστιν ὡς γὰρ οὔ; — τοῦ ἔσεσθαι τούτου, τὸ κυρίως ζῆν, λέγω δὴ τὸν ἔσεσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῖς. Ἡν 
μὲν οὖν οἶμαι προσῆκον ἐπιεικῶς, τοὺς κεκτημένους μὲν ἀρετήν, κεκτημένους δὲ κακίαν, καὶ οἷον ἀναμὶξ ἄ
μφω, μὴ τῶν ἄλλων κατεπαίρεσθαι διὰ τὸ χρηστότερον μέρος. Τῆς δὲ κακίας ἕνεκα κάτω κύπτειν, οἵ δ' ἐ
αλλὰς θέτουσι τὸ προσῆκον, διὰ γὰρ τὸ μέρος τῆς ἀρετῆς, μονονοὺ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὀνειροπολοῦντες, βαρεῖς εἰ
σι καὶ ἀφόρητοι, μηδὲν τοὺς ἄλλους εἶναι νομίζοντες· αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν κακίαν ‖
αὐτῶν ὡς σχέτικος, ὁ τάλας, πολλὰ ἔτερα, «καὶ ὡς σύ, ποιας κολάσεσιν ὃν ύπευθύνοις, οὐ καταποντίζεις σεαυτόν». Οὐ τοιοῦν ἀπαλλάττονται πρὸ τοῦ τῶν ἀνθρώπων δείκαι μυρίων ὁντα κολάσεσιν ἀξίων, ὑπότερια θαυμαστῇ πρὸς τούτο χρώμενον εἰτε γὰρ νοθεία τίς ἐστι τὸ διαβαλλόμενον, εἰτ' ὁλεγορία πρὸς τάγαθον, ἢ τιτερ ἄν τῶν ὀπισοῦν ὁκαλῶς, ἔξαιροφυν αὐτὸ μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς; τὰς δ' ἐνυπαρχόκοις αὐτῷ ἀρετάς, κάν τῶν ἄγαν δυσπορίστων καὶ δυσκατορθώτων ὡς ἀνθρώπως, νενοθεμένας οἴδε καλούσι διὰ τήν τῆς κακίας ἐπιμελίαν εἶτα, «Πῶς ἐκεῖνος μὲν κακός ὁ ἀμφιρρετής, σὺ δ' ἐκεῖνῳ πάντα ἄν καὶ τήν ἀρετήν, καὶ τήν πονηρίαν ἐφάμιλλος, βέλτιστος ἂν εἶς καὶ ἀγαθός; Ἡ γὰρ κάκεινος ἀγαθός ὡμοίως σοι, ἢ καὶ σὺ πάντως κακός, ἵστος ὡς ἐκεῖνῳ τῷ παρὰ σοι καταδίκῳ. Καὶ μὴν κἄν τούτῳ πλεονεκτεῖς εἰς τὸ πονηρόν, ὅτι μισεῖς ὡς μισοῦσαις, καὶ κατακρίνεις ἑκεῖνους, υφ' ὥν οὐ πάσχεις αὐτός τά ἴσα». [4c] Ἀλλ' ὡς ἐσικευ, εὐχηρεστερὸν πρὸς τά κακά ὑπόμενοι, ἢ πρὸς τάναντια τούτοις τά μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων, ὀδέως ὁρῶμεν, πρὸς δὲ τά σκεία κακά, οὐτε ὀφθαλμὸν ἔχουμεν, οὔτε οὖς, οὔτε γνώσιν, οὔτε μὴν εθέλουμεν ἔχειν. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτερον ἐστίν ἰδεῖν ἐν ἢμῖν γινόμενον, οὐδὲν ἀμείνον 1 τοῦ προτέρου, εἰ μὴ καὶ πολλῷ χεῖρον τά μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἄλλων πλεονεκτήματα, ὡς ἐπὶ τό πλεῖστον, οὔδε γινώσκομεν. Πολλὰ δ' ὁν ἀφετήκαμεν, ὅσῳ καὶ τῶν Ἡρακλείων στηρλῶν τά ὑπερβορεία μέρη, ἢμιν αὐτοίς ἀνατίθεμεν, καὶ τήν ὀφρίν ὡς μάλιστα ανασπῶντες, κρατεῖν δοκούμεν, καὶ οὔτε μετά τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἶναι νομίζομεν, ἀλλ' ἐν ὑποχαινοῦ


τινὶ μόρα. Καὶ ὁ δὲ χειριστὸν πάντων, αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν κακίαν τὴν ἐν ἡμῖν, ὑπέρ ταῖς τῶν ἄλλων ἱσως ὑπάρχουσαν, ἀρετὴν προσαγορεῦομεν, καὶ ποῦ καὶ πειρώμεθα, ταύτῃ ὑπέρ ταῖς τῶν πάντων ἀποδεικνύοναι. Οὐ μήν γε μέχρι τοῦτον ἱστάμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ φθονοῦμεν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνθράσι, καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων ἀρετὰς κακίας ἀποκαλοῦμεν· πρὸςτετὶ δὲ τι καὶ βδελυκτὸν τὸ μηδὲ ἐρυθρίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναίδην οὐτοὶ χωρεῖν ἐφ’ οἷς ἔχον ἐγκαλούπτεσθαι, ὡσπερ ἐν εἰ τις ἄνη ἐκεῖνα παρορμαζότο, δὲ ἀν ἐμελεῖ στεφανωθήσεται· καὶ ἐοίκαμεν σοφοῖς εἰς τὸ κατακρίνειν τοὺς ἄλλους, τὰ δὲ καθ’ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιμελῶς πράττοντες, οὐδαμῶς αἰσθανόμεθα. Οὐ τί ποτ’ ἀν χεῖρον φανείη, ὅπου γὰρ ἀσύμφορον τε καὶ βλαβέρον, ἐν ἰσω τὰ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμαρτήματα κρίνειν οὔτες γὰρ οἶδε τὰ τὸ τέρον, καὶ ἐκατός τὸ ἱδιὸν φορτὶν βαστάσει· ὅταν τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις βαρέως ἐπικειμέθα, καὶ οὕτω ἄπαχτητοι δικαστὶ μικρὸ τοῦ γιγνομένου παρεξελθοῦσι, τὰ δ’ ἡμέτερα κακὰ οὐδὲ φορητὰ τυχὸν ὄντα μετεγκυντρίζωμεν εἰς πλεονεκτήματα. Πῶς οὐκ ὡσπερ ἔξετίπτης τὰ καθ’ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν πράττομεν; Δοκοῦσι δὴ μοι τινὲς ἀνθρόπων, δεινὸν τι πάσχειν, νοσοῦντες ἡλιόν σὺ κατ’ ἐπιγνώσιν, καὶ γὰρ ὡμότητι κεκινήθαι, καὶ ἐπανθρωπίᾳ γεμοῦσῃ μίσους, ἐν οίς μισοῦτοι τους φαύλους ὄντας καὶ ἀποστρέφονται. Δέν αὐτοὺς ἑλείν, καὶ διορθούσθαι Π πειράσθαι οἴμαι γὰρ χωλεύειν αὐτοὺς τῷ κρέιττον μέρῃ, εἰ τῷ μὲν εἶναι μισοπόνηροι, καλῶς τε καὶ εἴ ποιοῦσι, τῷ δὲ μισεῖν τε καὶ παροράν τὸ ὁμοφέρες τάναντα. Καὶ τοῦ περ ἔχρην αὐτοὺς τῶν ἱδιῶν μεμημένους παραπτωμάτων, εἶεν δ’ ἀν ἰσως πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα, εἴτε καὶ εἰς τὴν κοινὴν οὐσίαν


ὁρῶντας τοῦτο του κράματος, μήτε τι ξένον νομίζειν εἰ πέπτωκέ τις, μήτε ὥσπερ ἔρεθαι τῷ δεινῷ τι πεπουθέναι τὸ μάλα γνήσιον· τὸ γὰρ μηδ' ὁπωσοῦν ἐπικάμπτεσθαι ἀθλίους γεγονόσιν ὁμοφυέσιν, μή οὐκ ἁρετής ἦ.

[5a] Ταύτην ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ οὐ δύναμαι καλῶς συνιδεῖν, εἰ θεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ μὴ πᾶν τοῦναντίον· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδ' ἡδέσθαι τῷ δεινῷ τι πεπονθέναι τὸ μάλα γνήσιον· τὸ γὰρ μηδ' ὁπωστιοῦν ἐπικάμπτεσθαι ἀθλίους γεγονόσιν ὁμοφυέσι, μὴ οὐκ ἁρετής ἦ. Ταύτην ἐγὼ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν οὐ δύναμαι καλῶς συνιδεῖν, εἰ θεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ μὴ πᾶν τοῦναντίον· μᾶλλον δὲ οἶδα καλῶς, ὡς οὐθεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφῶς τοῦναντίον· δάκνεσθαι μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων, γεγονόμενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον, καὶ γέγονεσθαι πας σωφρονειτέρους, τοῖς ἐκείνους παραπτώμασι παιδευομένους, οὐκ οὕτως ἀρετῆς ἦν. Ταύτην ἐγὼ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν οὐ δύναμαι καλῶς συνιδεῖν, εἰ θεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ μὴ πᾶν τοῦναντίον· μᾶλλον δὲ οἶδα καλῶς, ὡς οὐθεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφῶς τοῦναντίον· δάκνεσθαι μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων, γεγονόμενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον, καὶ γέγονεσθαι πας σωφρονειτέρους, τοῖς ἐκείνους παραπτώμασι παιδευομένους, οὐκ οὕτως ἀρετῆς ἦν. Ταύτην ἐγὼ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν οὐ δύναμαι καλῶς συνιδεῖν, εἰ θεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ μὴ πᾶν τοῦναντίον· μᾶλλον δὲ οἶδα καλῶς, ὡς οὐθεοφιλής τις οὖσα τυγχάνει, ἀλλὰ καὶ σαφῶς τοῦναντίον· δάκνεσθαι μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων, γεγονόμενον ἐστὶ καὶ προσήκον, καὶ γέγονεσθαι πας σωφρονειτέρους, τοῖς ἐκείνους παραπτώμασι παιδευομένους, οὐκ οὕτως ἀρετῆς ἦν.
διακείσθων· ἡμείς δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἂν ποτὲ κρίνοιμεν, οὐ γὰρ τὸ Ἑρστοῦ καθαρπάσομεν βῆμα. Εἰ δὲ ἀξιώσαιν δέξασθαι τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὸν εἰς τούτο γνώμην, οὐ γὰρ τὸ Χριστοῦ καθαρπάσομεν βῆμα. Εἰ δὲ αξιώσαιν δέξασθαι τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὸν εἰς τούτο γνώμην, μὴ γὰρ θαυμαζόμενοι δι' ἀρετὴν σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, οὐχ ἅπαντα διέφυγον ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, ὡς ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

οἶς δουλεύοντος ὡς ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

 retroflecto. ἡμεῖς δὲ αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἂν ποτὲ κρίνοιμεν, οὐ γὰρ τὸ Χριστοῦ καθαρπάσομεν βῆμα. Εἰ δὲ αξιώσαιν δέξασθαι τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὸν εἰς τούτο γνώμην, μηδὲν γε τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

305 οἶς δουλεύοντας ὡς ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

καὶ διαμενοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς; Τίς μάντεων, τίς προφήτης, συμπαραμενεῖν αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τέλους τὴν ἀρίστην πολιτείαν ἐμήνυσε; 

καὶ μὴν οἱ θαυμαζόμενοι δι' ἀρετὴν σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, οὐχ ἅπαντα διέφυγον ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτοὺς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

καὶ διαμενοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς; Τίς μάντεων, τίς προφήτης, συμπαραμενεῖν αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τέλους τὴν ἀρίστην πολιτείαν ἐμήνυσε; 

καὶ μὴν οἱ θαυμαζόμενοι δι' ἀρετὴν σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, οὐχ ἅπαντα διέφυγον ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτούς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

καὶ διαμενοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς; Τίς μάντεων, τίς προφήτης, συμπαραμενεῖν αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τέλους τὴν ἀρίστην πολιτείαν ἐμήνυσε; 

καὶ μὴν οἱ θαυμαζόμενοι δι' ἀρετὴν σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, οὐχ ἅπαντα διέφυγον ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτούς ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων, 

καὶ διαμενοῦσιν ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς; Τίς μάντεων, τίς προφήτης, συμπαραμενεῖν αὐτοῖς ἄχρι τέλους τὴν ἀρίστην πολιτείαν ἐμήνυσε; 

καὶ μὴν οἱ θαυμαζόμενοι δι' ἀρετὴν σχεδὸν ἅπαντες, οὐχ ἅπαντα διέφυγον ἃναπτείνειν αὐτοὺς, οὐδὲν, ἂν ὁ τῶν πάντων κατακρινέτωσαν, ὡς νομίζειν ἑαυτο任教ν ἐλευθέρους παθῶν ἐκείνων,
βίος οὗτος ὁδός ἐστι, καὶ ἔχει μὲν ὀλίσθους ὅτι πολλούς, ἔχει δὲ προσκόμματα, καὶ
πλάναι τούτῳ φύονται συχνὰ, πολλὰ τὰ προσωπάμενα κεκτημέναι. Καὶ εἴη ἀν σοι
καλὸν σου γενοῦται, τὸ μηδὲν σαυτῷ συνείδοτι, μετὰ τοῦ Παύλου φθεγξασθαι 

325
οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι. Καὶ τῶν μὲν ὀπισθεν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι, τοῖς δ' ἐπεκτείνεσθαι,
καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν μὴ θρασύνεσθαι, μηδὲ κατεπαίρεσθαι, μηδ' ἀπογινώσκειν

330
αὐτοὺς, ἀλλ' ἔαν καὶ τὰ σαυτοῦ καὶ τὰ ἐτέρων κρίνειν Ἐκεῖνον, ὡς τὴν κρίσιν πάσαν
dέδωκεν ὁ Πατήρ· γὰρ ἕναντι τούτου ὄρος, μή ὁ δικαίος ὁ ἄρητος ἐργατὸν, εἰπεν
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ἀν ὑπὲρ τῶν Πλάτων.
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[35] Ἀλλὰ τί ταῦτα φημὶ, ὅπου καὶ εἰκῇ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὀργιζόμεθα πολλάκις, καὶ
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οὐδ' τῶν μὲν ὀπισθεν ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι, τοῖς δ' ἐπεκτείνεσθαι, καὶ κατὰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν οὔτως συχνὰ, πολλὰ τὰ προσιστάμενα κεκτημέναι. Καὶ εἴη ἄν σοι καλὸν οἶμαι,
τὸ μηδὲν σαυτῷ συνειδότι, μετὰ τοῦ Παύλου φθεγξασθαι οὐκ ἐν τούτῳ δεδικαίωμαι.
ἐαυτὸν κατακρίνει, ο οῦς οἷος ὁμοίως χωρῶν· ἢ γὰρ συνείδησις, ἔλεγχος γίνεται ταῖς ψυχαῖς, καὶ οὐδὲ ἤδιος οἶμαι παρατείνεσθαι ταυταία συγχωρεῖ. Ἐπεὶ καὶ πάσαν ἐφθηκαν πρόφασιν ἀποβεβληκυῖαι, τὴν ὑπὲρ σφῶν παραιτησομένην, αἱ γὰρ κατὰ τῶν ὁμοίων ἀποφάσεις, ὃν οὐδὲ κρίται καθεστᾶσιν, ὑμότητος οὕτω πλήρεις, τὴν ἐπὶ τὰς προφάσεις ἀναφορὴν καταφυγῆς, καὶ ἢ παρ᾽ αὐτῶν γε ψήφους κατὰ τῶν ἀλλῶν ἐκφερομένων, ἐμφράττει τούτοις τὸ στόμα· ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίνεις τὸν ἕτερον, σεαυτόν, φῆσι, κατακρίνεις· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ πράσσεις ὁ κρίνων· τὸν γοῦν ἀλλότριον οἰκέτην ἐκεῖνον, μηδαμῶς μηδέποτε κρίνεις εἰ σωφρονοίς, εἰ μή πρὸς ἅπερ εἰλήφας ἐξουσίαν, ἢφ᾽ ἂν προσήκη, δηλονότι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ τῆς Ἐκκλησίας.

Πόθεν δὲ καὶ σεαυτὸν πείθεις, ὡς οὐκ ἀναστήσεται ποτὲ πεπτωκὼς ὁ σχέτλιος ὑποσί; Τό τε γὰρ τῆς πτώσεως αὐτὸν ἀναστῆναι, τό τε μηκέτι πεσεῖν, οὐ τῆς δυνάμεως τῆς σῆς καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας, τῆς δὲ τοῦ πάντων Δημιουργοῦ, καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως τοῦ κειμένου· οὐκ ἀπεικὸς δὲ τοῦτον καὶ ἀναστήσεσθαι, καὶ μηκέτι πειραθῆναι τῶν δεινῶν, τῷ πεπονθέναι μεμαθηκότα, ἅττα δὴ φευκτέα καὶ μή. Πείθου μοι κἀκεῖνο σοι λέγοντι, τῷ τοὺς ἄλλους εὐχερῶς κατακρίνοντι· οὐδὲ τὰ σαυτοῦ γινώσκειν οἷός τε εἶ, μήτοι γε τὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων, ὥστε βέλτιον ἂν εἰ τοῖς ἰδίοις μᾶλλον προσείγομεν, ἢ τοῖς τῶν πέλας κακοῖς· ὁπόταν γὰρ καὶ γνοίημεν ἢ καλὸν τι πράξαντες, ἢ τοὐναντίον, ἀλλ’ οὔτε τὴν τοῦ ἔργου ποιότητα, οἵα τίς ἐστι παντάπασιν ἴσμεν, οὔτε τὸ μέγεθος, ὥστε ἐκ μέρους γινώσκομεν. Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ τὸ τέλειον, τότε τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται, εἶπεν ἂν ἡ θεία κεφαλὴ Παῦλος.
Ὁ μὴν ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ τὴν ἡμῶν αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἐπιστάμεθα· καὶ πῶς ἂν τὴν τῶν ἑτέρων
calῶς δυναίμεθα γνῶναι; Ἐκαστὸς γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον φορτίον βαστάσει, τὸν αὐτὸν
Ἀπόστολον ἵσμεν λέγοντα. Τοῦτο δέ ἐστι δεικνύμενον, ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἐκάστου
παιδείαν, καὶ φρόνησιν, καὶ βίων, καὶ ἑπιτήδευμα, καὶ τὰς καιροὺς φορᾶς τε καὶ τύχας,
καὶ μὲν δή, καὶ τὰ θύραθεν ἐπισυμβαίνοντα πάντα, ἐπιθήσει τὸ φορτίον ὁ
Δημιουργὸς καὶ Δεσπότης, καὶ κρινεῖ καὶ ἀπαιτήσει πρὸς ταῦτα βλέπων, τῶν
βεβιωμένων τὴν ἀκρίβειαν· ὥστε εἴτε ἀγαθοῖς, εἰτέ φαύλοις χρήσαιν, οὐ τῶν αὐτῶν
ἐπιτεύξονται· ἀλλ’ ἑκάστῳ καὶ τὸ γέρας, καὶ τοὐναντίον, τοιοῦτον δήπουθεν ἔσται,
ὡς μηδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἁρμόττειν· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν αἱ
πολλαὶ μοναί, ἃς ὁ Σωτὴρ
εἴρηκεν. Ὡστ’ ἀγαπητὸν ἂν εἴη, τὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀφέντας πολυπραγμονεῖν
ἁμαρτήματα ὡς ὑπὲρ ἀνθρωπίνην ὄντα κατάληψιν, τὰ οἰκεῖα βασανίζειν καὶ
ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τὰ ἡμέτερα παρατιθέναι, οὐ τοῖς ἡμετέροις τὰ τῶν ἑτέρων. Καὶ εἴῃ γε
τοῦτο ποιοῦντας, μὴ πολὺ τῆς ἀληθείας διαμαρτάνειν, ἀλλ’ ἡμεῖς γε τοὐναντίον· ἐπὶ
μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων οξυδορκοῦμεν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἡμέτερων κακῶν ἁμβλυώττομεν.
οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων συνήγοροι γίνονται, τῶν δ’ ἀλλοτρίων κατηγοροῦν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ἡμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἀρρωστοὶ, καὶ κοιμώνται ἰκανοί, ὡς ὁ τοῦ Παύλου φωνὴ ὡς δὴ καὶ τοῦτο φησίν ὑψηλότερον τι κατασκευάζων, εἰ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἔκρινόμεθα. Κρινόμεθα δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Ὁρᾷς ὅπόσον ἀγαθὸν ἐστίν ἡ αὐτομεμψία; Τὸν καταδίκης άξιον αἰτίας ἐλευθεροῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔκρινόμεθα, φησί. [6a] Μὴ τούτων, ὦ φίλτατε, πρὸς σὲ γὰρ αὖθις ἐπαναστέφω, εἴ τῶν πεπραγμένων τοιῶν κακῶν πολυπραγμονῶμεν, ὡσπερ αἱ τὰ θηρία ῥινηλατοῦσαι λάκαιαι —εὔρινα ταύτας εἶπεν ἂν Σοφοκλῆς—, μὴθ’ ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς δικαιῶμεν ὀρθῶς δοκοῦντες βεβιωκέναι· ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν, ἢ τῆς ῥάβδου πειραθῶμεν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅπως καὶ τύχωμεν εὐμενεστάτης τῆς θείας δίκης· τότε γὰρ ὡς άξιον αἰτίας ἐλευθεροῖ, οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔκρινόμεθα, φησί. Καλὸν μὲν οὖν πεπλημμελήκοτας, τοῦ τῆς παιδείας τυχεῖν φαρμάκου, ἄριστο δὲ μὴ πταίσαντας ἐκείνου μὴ δεηθῆναι, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα καλὸν ἡμᾶς, ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς γε μόνοις προσέχειν, ὡς ἡ Γραφὴ παραινεῖ· καὶ μὴ πλημμελούντων τῶν ἀδελφῶν κατεπαίρεσθαι, μὴ δὲ τὸ κάρφος τοῖς τῶν πέλας ὀφθαλμοῖς, περιπροσθοῦσαν ἔχοντες τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς τὴν δοκόν. Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, κριτὴς ὁ Πλάσας οὐχ ἡμεῖς, καὶ καιρὸς τῆς κρίσεως οὐχ ὁ παρών, ἀλλ’ ὁ μέλλων. Μὴ γοῦν τἀλλότρια ἁρπάζωμεν, μᾶλλο δὲ τὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, εἰ θέλομεν τὸ ἴδιον· μηδὲ πρὸ τοῦ τέλους.
τούς γε δοκοῦντας εἶναι κακοὺς ταλανίζωμεν, ἡμᾶς δ' αὐτοῖς μακαρίζωμεν, κἂν ὤμεν ἐρ' οἷς ὑπομείναι τῇ εἰς τοὺς ἄρετας, οὐκ ὑπὸ τῶν μέσων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς ὅδον καλῶς διανύσας καθίσταται.

405 [6b] Πολυπλασιάσω τοῦ λόγου, πολὺ τὸ πάθος κρατοῦν ὁρῶν· δεῖ γὰρ καρτερώτερον τοῖς τῶν ἐχθίστων ἰσχυροτέροις, οἳ γὰρ τὰ οἰκεῖα οὐκ ἴσμεν, καὶ πολλῷ γε μᾶλλον τὰ τῶν ἑτέρων ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν, καὶ ἀπογινώσκομεν, καὶ εὐχερῶς μισοῦμεν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς, ἐπειδὰν ἁμάρτωσι, χεῖρον πολλὰκι αὐτῶν διακείμενοι. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς αὐτοὺς οὐ μισεῖ. Κἂν πᾶσαν τὶς τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑπερελάσῃ τῶν πώποτε γεγενημένων ἀνθρώπων, προσθήσω δ' ὅτι καὶ πάντων τῶν ἁμάρτων οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅπως μισοῦμεν ἐκείνῳ γένοιτο· ἐν γὰρ τῷ τῶν ἅλων Θεῷ, πόρῳ που παθῶν ἐστιν τῶν ἀρχῶν, ὡς ἀν μίσος εὑροί τις, δὴ δράσις χειρὸς, οἳ γὰρ τὰ οἰκεῖα οὐκ ἴσον, καὶ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὰ τῶν ἑτέρων ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν, καὶ ἀπογινώσκομεν, καὶ εὐχερῶς μισοῦμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἐπειδὰν ἁμάρτωσι, χεῖρον πολλὰκι αὐτῶν διακείμενοι. Οὔτε τῷ ἀρχοντεῖ τοῖς τῶν ἑτέρων ἰσχυροτέροις, οἳ γὰρ τὰ οἰκεῖα οὐκ ἴσμεν, καὶ πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὰ τῶν ἑτέρων ἡμεῖς κατακρίνομεν, καὶ ἀπογινώσκομεν, καὶ εὐχερῶς μισοῦμεν τοὺς ἀδελφούς, ἐπειδὰν ἁμάρτωσι, χεῖρον πολλὰκι αὐτῶν διακείμενοι. Oὐκ ἀν πᾶσαν τὶς τῆς ἁμαρτίας ὑπερελάσῃ τῶν πώποτε γεγενημένων ἀνθρώπων.
γήρως σὺν ἀρετῇ τὸν βιον διήνυσαν· ἐπειτα τὰ ἀγαθά, οἷς συμβεβιώκεσαν, οἷς ἔτρυφον, ώσπερ τι ρίψαντες ἄγος, παρ' οὐδέν μὲν θέμενοι τὴν αἰσχύνην, παρ' οὐδέν δὲ τὸ κακὸν καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τούδε βλάβην, τὴν πρὸς τὰς ἡδονὰς δουλείαν, τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος ἠλλάξαν· καὶ διὰ ταῦτα, πολὺ τι χεῖρους γεγόναι τῶν οὐκ ἀγαθῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γεγονότων. Οὐ μήν γε τούτων ἑνεκα, τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ μισῆσι, καὶ τῷ βορβόρῳ καλινδουμένῳ, τίς ἂν εἴη μετοχὴ ἢ κοινωνία πρὸς Θεόν; Τῷ γὰρ μὴ καθαρῷ, φῆσι τις μάλα ἀνήρ, ἐφάπτεσθαι τοῦ καθαροῦ, μὴ οὐ θεμιτὸν εἴη τῆς πονηρίας. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τόνδε τὸν τρόπον, ὁ γὰρ φιλῶν τὸν φίλον, καὶ αὐτῷ φίλος δήπου γίνεται, καὶ οὕτωι τοῖνυν μισοῦντες τὴν ἀρετὴν φίλην οὖσαν τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τῷ κακῷ προσδεδραμηκότες ἑκόντες, οὐκέτι φίλοι τῷ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ σαφῶς ἐχθροί».

Οὐχ ὑγιῶς, ὦ βέλτιστε, συνεπέρανας· αἱ γὰρ προτάσεις ἀληθεῖς, τὸ δὲ συμπέρασμα ταῖς προτάσεσιν, ἐπὶ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ πραγμάτων, οὐ συναδόν εὑρεθήσεται. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τὰ καθ’ ἡμᾶς πράγματα, ὀρθῶς ἂν ἔχοι τοιαῦτα λέγειν·
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ὅσα δὲ εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἤκει, αξίως δὴπουθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ λεκτέον ἂν εἴη, καὶ νοητέον, ἀξίως δὲ ἁν εἰς Θεῷ, τὸ μηδέποτε μισεῖν ἵνα μισθοῖς εἰσέρχωσι τοῖς ἰδίαις  τεχνών ἐπιλασθεν' οὐ γὰρ δὴ μεταβαλὼν τὴν προαίρεσιν, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι μετέβαλεν, ὡς μάλιστα ἰμαρτηκὼς. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μισοῦντες τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτω μοι δοκούσιν ποιεῖν. Ὅσοι δὲ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔχουσιν γνώμην, καὶ τὴν κακίαν μὲν οὐκαίμως, τούς δὲ ἵνα ταύτας κεκρατημένους σφόδρα μισοῦσι, δέον γε αὐτοὺς ἐλεβελθεῖν, ὑπὲρ τούς ἀλλούς ἀπαντᾶν, μὴ μᾶλλον μισεῖς δίκαιοι, οἳ ὧσιν ἀδίκους οἴδε μισοῦσιν ἀντὶ γὰρ τοῦ τὴν εἰκότας ἐπλασθεν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ μεταβαλὼν τὴν προαίρεσιν, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι μετέβαλεν, ὡς μάλιστα ἡμαρτηκώς. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μισοπόνεροι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὕτω μοι δοκοῦσι ποιεῖν. Ὅσοι δὲ τὴν ἐναντίαν γνώμην, καὶ τὴν κακίαν μὲν οὐδαμῶς, τοὺς δ' ὑπὸ ταύτης κεκρατημένους σφόδρα μισοῦσι, δέον γε αὐτοὺς ἐλεεῖν, ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους μισεῖν, διότι δὲ τὸν τὴν ἐκείνων ἔκτροπὴς, καὶ ζητεῖν ἐπιμελῶς. Τούτων μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν λόγον, ἢ σμικρὸν ἴσως ποιοῦνται, καὶ δηλοῖ, τὰ τούτων εἰρημένα· τὸν δὲ ταῖς ὕβρεσι πλύνουσι, καὶ κωμῳδοῦσι, τὸν δὲ ταῖς ὕβρεσι πλύνουσι, καὶ κωμῳδοῦσι, τὸν δὲ ταῖς ὕβρεσι πλύνουσι, καὶ κωμῳδοῦσι, ὅπως δὲ εἴη, τοὺς τούτους μισεῖν κρίναντες δι' ἡντινοῦν αἰτίαν ἢ πρόφασιν. Τοσοῦτον γὰρ οἶμαι ἐνδεῖν τὰ παρὰ σοῦ εἰρημένα, τούτους ἀποφῆναι δικαίους μισεῖσθαι, ὅσον καὶ δεικνύεισθαι σαφῶς, τὸν ἐλεεῖσθαι αξίους ὄντας· εἰ γὰρ ἑκόντες ὡς σὺ φῄς, τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρετῆς εὐδαιμονίαν διέπτυσαν, καὶ τοῖς πεπυρωμένοις τοῦ πονηροῦ βέλεσιν ἑαυτοῦς περιέπειραν, δι' ὧν ὁ τῆς ψυχῆς ἐπεισέρχεται θάνατος. Πῶς οὐ πάντα πάντων ἐλεεινότεροι, καθάπερ καὶ τῶν ἄλλως φονευθέντων οἱ αὐτόχειρες, καὶ τούτων αὖθις, οἱ δῆθεν σώφρονες; Τὸ μὲν δὴ τοιαῦτα πάσχειν, ἄκρως δυστυχεῖν ἐστι, τοὺς δὲ τοιοῦτος δακρύουμεν· ἄξια γὰρ τὰ

---
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τούτων κακά, ὄντα δυστυχίας μεστά, οὐ μόνον γε οὐ μισητέους αὐτούς δεικνύναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προγενεστέρα πολύς ὁμοίος εἰς ἐκεῖνοι πρὸς αὐτούς ποτε ταύτα ἦν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ υπὸ ἐνίων μισοῖντο οἱ τὸν βίον ἀναλίσκοντες ἐν οὐκ ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις—εἴδον γὰρ ἐγὼ τινας κακά, ὄντα δυστυχίας μεστά, οὐ μόνον γε οὐ μισητέους αὐτοὺς δεικνύναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προγενεστέρα μίση λύειν, εἰ δὴ καὶ πολλὰ τὶς πρὸς αὐτούς ποτε ταύτα ἦν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ ἐνίων μισοῖντο οἱ τὸν βίον ἀναλίσκοντες ἐν οὐκ ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις—εἴδον γὰρ ἐγὼ τινας κακά, ὄντα δυστυχίας μεστά, οὐ μόνον γε οὐ μισητέους αὐτοὺς δεικνύναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προγενεστέρα μίση λύειν, εἰ δὴ καὶ πολλὰ τὶς πρὸς αὐτούς ποτε ταύτα ἦν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ ἐνίων μισοῖντο οἱ τὸν βίον ἀναλίσκοντες ἐν οὐκ ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις—εἴδον γὰρ ἐγὼ τινας κακά, ὄντα δυστυχίας μεστά, οὐ μόνον γε οὐ μισητέους αὐτοὺς δεικνύναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ προγενεστέρα μίση λύειν, εἰ δὴ καὶ πολλὰ τὶς πρὸς αὐτούς ποτε ταύτα ἦν.
καὶ δίκην αὐτούς ἀποτινυνάρη προσήκη, μάλα γε πολλήν ὀδύ ἐτίσαν, τουσοῖ τοῖς ἐπαχθέδει κρίτας τῷ τοὺν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, ὦτι καὶ οἱ παρ' αὐτῶν λαμβάνοντες ταύτην, ἀδικούντες λαμβάνουσιν, οὐδαμόθεν ὁν αὐτοῖς προσήκον αὐτοῖς κατακρίνειν Θεοῦ γὰρ μόνον τοῦτο γε. Μάλλον δ' εἰ τις ἄκριβός ἐθέλει σκοπεῖν, ἢ σφόν αὐτῶν συνείδησις καὶ τότε σφάς γε κρίνει. Οὐ μὴν γε ὑπὸ πάντων ἐξῆς μιὰ τούτους ἐξενήτεικαι ψήφος: οἱ γὰρ τὴν ορθὴν βαδίζοντες πρὸς τὸν εὐδαίμονα βίον, τούτους δὴ τοὺς παρὰ τὸν πολλῶν μισουμένους διὰ τὴν οὐκ ἀγαθὴν πολιτείαν, ἐλεοῦσί τε —πῶς οἶει,— καὶ μεγίστης ἀξιόωσι κηδεμονίας, πρὸς τὴν αὐτῶν διόρθωσιν ἀποβλέποντες, βαθύτερον τε ἀμα ὑψηλότερον πολὺ τῶν ἄλλων διανοοῦμενοι. Ὁσθ' ὅπερ ἐήτων, ἄξιοι φειδοῦς τιχεῖν καὶ κηδεμονίαις παρὰ Θεῷ κρίνοντι, οὐ μόνον γε διὰ τοὺς ῥηματέρους ἐκείνους, τοὺς οὐκ ἐν δίκῃ δικάζοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοὺς τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ χρωμένους, ὡς ὁ προσήκον παρελθέιν τὴν αὐτῶν χρηστότητα, τὴν ἐπέκεινα παντὸς πέρατος.

καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο γε, οὐδεὶς ἀντεξει: εἰ γὰρ οἱ βέλτιστοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, πάντα ἀν ραδίως ὑποσταίει τὰ δεινά, εἰγε ἐξῆν εκείνους ἐπανορθώσασθαι, ᾧ ἀπερφος χρηστότης τε καὶ φιλανθρωπία, τί σοι δοκεῖ περὶ τούτῳ διαγνώσαι τε καὶ θελῆσα: Τῇ ποὺ γε ὁ καθαρὸς τε καὶ ἀναμάρτητος; Οὐδὲ γοῦν ἐν ἵνω τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν διαπράξασθαι ταύτην δίδως: Ἰσός γε ταύτην ἐθέλεις, τὴν τῶν μιμησάμενην φαιλόσητα —οὐδὲ γάρ λέγω τὴν σήν,— ῥομôτη τινι χρηστάζειν καὶ τούναντιν ἢ κέκληται, παρὰ τὸ εἰκὸς αὐτῆ πράττειν ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκείνη γε, ἀλλὰ πολλαχθέθεν εὕρησης.
ἴσθι, καὶ βοηθήσει τουτοις, καὶ παρέξει συνδρομήν ἀπασαν, τὸ γε εἰς ἐκείνην ἦκον ἀποτελθησόντα κάν ἐπιμένον οἰκεῖοι τοῖς κακοῖς, πολλῷ γε μᾶλλον ὁ Θεός, εἰ ἐν τῷ χρυστός εἶναι ἀρνήσεται γὰρ ἐαυτῷ, οὐ δύναται. Ο γοῦν ἀληθῶς κηθεμὼν τε καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐ πρός τοὺς μὲν καὶ ποτὲ, πρός δὲ τοὺς οἰδίποτε, ἀλλ' οὗτοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πάντας τὰ αὐτῶν διατέλεσε ποιῶν· καὶ ἐσται διὰ πάντων, αὐτὸ γε τοῦτ' ὃ πέρυκεν εἶναι, ἀγαθός καὶ κηθεμὼν ἀπάσαν· καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου μέρος ἀπάντας σώζει, διὰ πάντων αὐτοὺς ἔναγγελον, ἐπὶ τὸ μετανοῆσαί τε καὶ σωθῆναι, ἀλλ' καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βιάζεσθαι, ὃ μοι καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. Ὁ τὸν κόσμον' εἰ δὲ ἐκείνος οὐκετέ κρίνει, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ χρηστὸς εἶναι· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτόν, οὐ δύναται. Ὁ γοὺν ἀληθῶς κηθεμὼν τε καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐ πρὸς τοὺς μὲν καὶ ποτὲ, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς οὐδέποτε, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πάντας τὰ αὑτοῦ διατελέσει ποιῶν· καὶ ἔσται διὰ πάντων ἑξῆς, αὐτὸ γε τοῦτ' ὃ πέφυκεν εἶναι, ἀγαθὸς καὶ κηθεμὼν ἅπασι· καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου μέρος ἅπαντας σώζει, διὰ πάντων αὐτοὺς ἐνάγων, ἐπὶ τὸ μετανοῆσαί τε καὶ σωθῆναι, ἄνευ μέντοι τοῦ βιάζεσθαι, ὃ μοι καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. Ὁ τὸν κόσμον' εἰ δὲ ἐκείνος οὐκετέ κρίνει, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ χρηστὸς εἶναι· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτόν, οὐ δύναται. Ὁ γοὺν ἀληθῶς κηθεμὼν τε καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐ πρὸς τοὺς μὲν καὶ ποτὲ, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς οὐδέποτε, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πάντας τὰ αὑτοῦ διατελέσει ποιῶν· καὶ ἔσται διὰ πάντων ἑξῆς, αὐτὸ γε τοῦτ' ὃ πέφυκεν εἶναι, ἀγαθὸς καὶ κηθεμὼν ἅπασι· καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου μέρος ἅπαντας σώζει, διὰ πάντων αὐτοὺς ἐνάγων, ἐπὶ τὸ μετανοῆσαί τε καὶ σωθῆναι, ἀλλ' καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν βιάζεσθαι, ὃ μοι καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. Ὁ τὸν κόσμον' εἰ δὲ ἐκείνος οὐκετέ κρίνει, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ χρηστὸς εἶναι· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτόν, οὐ δύναται. Ὁ γοὺν ἀληθῶς κηθεμὼν τε καὶ ἀγαθός, οὐ πρὸς τοὺς μὲν καὶ ποτὲ, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς οὐδέποτε, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς πάντας τὰ αὑτοῦ διατελέσει ποιῶν· καὶ ἔσται διὰ πάντων ἑξῆς, αὐτὸ γε τοῦτ' ὃ πέφυκεν εἶναι, ἀγαθὸς καὶ κηθεμὼν ἅπασι· καὶ τὸ ἐκείνου μέρος ἅπαντας σώζει, διὰ πάντων αὐτοὺς ἐνάγων, ἐπὶ τὸ μετανοῆσαί τε καὶ σωθῆναι, ἄνευ μέντοι τοῦ βιάζεσθαι, ὃ μοι καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται. Ὁ τὸν κόσμον' εἰ δὲ ἐκείνος οὐκετέ κρίνει, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ χρηστὸς εἶναι· ἀρνήσασθαι γὰρ ἑαυτόν, οὐ δύναται.
Θεοῦ τὸ κρίνειν λαβὼν, καὶ ὁμός χωρὸν, κατ’ ἄμφω τάναντια φαίνη τοιῶν· είτα
σὺ κάτι τῆς ὁυσίας διαρπαγείας, ἢ καὶ πολλοστὶ τοὺς ταύτης μέρος, ἔστω δὲ καὶ
υπὸ τῶν φιλτάτων αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἂν ἐνέγκαια, ἀλλ’ ἐβόησα εὐθὺς «τὸν πατραλίαν,
τὸν ἀσωτόν» ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐδὲ γούν ῥὰ ἴσα δίδας, ἀλλὰ κακῶς διακείμενος καὶ
tὰ πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἀνθρώποις, τίνα ἂν ἐλοιο ψήφον παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ
δέξασθαι, ἢ καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων αὐτῶν; Οὐ τὴν συμπαθή; οὐ τὴν ἣμερον; οὔ
tὴν πολλὰς οἰκτίμων γέμουσαν; Αλλὰ σὺ μὲν ἰῶς καὶ σεαυτὸν μισῆσαι, παρὰ δὲ
τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Θεοῦ, οὐκ ἐνε ἐν τούτῳ παθεῖν, οὐκοιν οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν
ἐπιεικεστέρων ἀνθρώπων· δεινὸν γὰρ ὄντως δεινὸν, εἰ ἃ σοὶ νῦν προφέρουσιν ἔτεροι,
pantaxh τὸ αὐστηρὸν ἐπανυώνυντι, αὐτὰ γα ταῦτα πάθουν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐπὶ το σοὶ
dikάξειν ἐλθόντες· τὸ τοῖνυν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὡς φιλανθρωπίας ἰχνὸς καὶ τὸ
βοήσεταιν, οὐ τὰ εἰκότα φρονήσει περὶ τῆς ἀνέξερευνητοῦ μεγαλειότητος, εἰ μὴ
παραπλῆξ τις εἰ καὶ τῶν τὰς φρένας ἀπολωλεκτῶν;

[7a] ΑЛΛ’ ἡμεῖς, ὅ φιλτατε, πάσι τοῖς τοιούτοις χαίρειν εἰπόντες, τὸν προκειμένον

533. φρένας ἀπολωλεκτῶν]< In Marian Avgiiriaca, cod. Vat. gr. 632, f. 345.6; vid. Oratio I 212-213, V 27, VII
27, cf. Oratio I 59, III 174-175, VI 235 — 534, χαίρειν εἰπόντες] Epistulae 21.7; Dialogi XXV 291.1; cf. Dialogi IV
χρηστότητι-φιλανθρωπία] vid. Oratio VI 496

534. χαίρειν εἰπόντες] cf. Platonom, Phaedo 64c.1, 82d.3; Cydonium, Epistulae 350.98, al. — 537-538. ἀγάπη-
καλουμένου] cf. 1 Ioh. 4.8, 4:16

535. ἡμῖν εὐεργοσφόμες II λόγον. Οὐδεὶς ἀπόβλητος τῷ Δημιουργῷ, οὐδεὶς ἐν λήθῃ τοῦ
προνοούντος πάντων ἐξῆς, οὐδεὶς ἐν μίατι τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς, οὐκ ἐν ἀμελείᾳ τινι, οὐκ ἐν
οὐδεὶ τῶν τοιούτων. Πάς ἐν φροντίδα τοῦ κηδεμόνας, πάς ἐν ἁγάτη τοῦ τοῦτ’ αὐτῷ
καλουμένουν, εὐπρόσδεκτος πάς ὥστινοι, μεταμελθεῖσιν ποτὲ τῶν κακῶν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ
τοὺς πάντας παρηγεγκεὶ τις ἐπὶ κακοῖς, τὸν δὴ τοιούτων εἰκότως χρησίμην ἔλην,
eipoi tis ἂν γεγενήσθαι τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ χρήστοτητι καὶ φιλανθρωπία, πρὸς ἐαυτῆς

sign. interrogationis BIVLPG — 527. Post γέμουσα sign. interrogationis BIVLPG — post μισήσεις τοῦ δὲ τοῦ ἄνω
τοῦ ἀσωτοῦ V — 530, πανταχὴ-ἐπανυώνυντι] deest V — 532-533. οὐ-ἀπολωλεκτῶν] πᾶς ἂν
δικαίως ἀπογνώσει, εἰ μὴ παραπλῆξ τις εἰ τῇ κατ’ αὐτῶν τὰς φρένας ἀπολωλεκτῶν, λήθην οὐ δικαίως λαβὼν τῆς
ἀνεξερευνητῆτο τὴν ἐπαφής φιλανθρωπίας· οὐ γὰρ τὰ εἰκότα φρονήσει περὶ τῆς ἀνεξερευνητῆτο μεγαλειότητος V — 533. 
sscr. β’, α΄: εὐθὺς ἀπαντά V — 537. πάντως] πάντως V — 540. τῆς V — ante εαυτῆς sc. τῆν V
ἐπίδειξιν. Οὖν καὶ παίδες ἱατρῶν, καὶ πάντες οίς ἐπιστήμης δυνάμει μὲν ἀγαθοὶ, ἢν
dὲ καὶ ἡ ὑλή παρῆ, τότε λοιπὸν καὶ ἐνεργεία τὴν ἐπιστήμην δεικνύντες, τοῦθεν ὅτε
eἰσίν ἀγαθοὶ πάσι φαίνονται, καὶ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τοῦ θαύματος παρ' αὐτοῖς, ο繄
dιορθοῦνται τὸ χαλεπώτερον. Τοῦτ' ἀρ' ἡ μείζων ἐπίδειξις τῆς ἀνεκάστου
φιλανθρωπίας, τὸ τὸν σκεῦος χρηματίζοντα τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος· εἴτ' σκεῦος
gεγονότα τῆς ἐνεργείας τοῦ πονηροῦ διὰ κακισθήνην προαίρεσθιν, ἄγγος πλήρες
ἂναδείξει τῆς ἐκλογησίας ἐκείνης, ἢς ἡ πρὸς πάντας ἐκχυσὶ τὴν ἠκεανοῦ
παρατρέχει, ὦσον οὐχ ὃδε χειμάρρους. Τοιμήσει σ' ἀν τις οἴμαι τούτον εἰπεῖν, καὶ
ἐκλογῆς εἶναι σκεῦος, καλὸς γε διαστῆλλον ἀπὸ τοῦ Παύλου ἐκείνος μὲν γὰρ τοῦτο
ἐκλήθη, δ' ἢν εὐδεῖατο χάριν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τῆς πίστεως κηρύγματος· τοῦ γὰρ βαστάσαι
φησὶ τὸ ὀνόμα μου ἐνώπιον ξένων καὶ βασιλεῶν τινων τε Ισραηλ' οὕτως δὲ τὴν κλήσιν
tαῦτην δίκαιος ἡτοὶ κληθήναι, ἀς μηδενὸς ὄντος ἐπιτησιμετέρου ἔτερου, τὸν ἔλεον
dέξασθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ. Πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ τὰ σκεῦη ἐν τῇ μεγάλῃ οἰκίᾳ, φησὶ τὸ σκεῦος τῆς
ἐκλογῆς, οὐ πάντα ἀπὸ πρὸς τὴν αὐτήν, ἀλλ' ἔτερα γε πρὸς ἄλλας χρείας ἠτοιμαστό
tε καὶ κατασκευάστο, καὶ πρὸς μὲν μύρον δοχὴν, ἀλαβαστρὰ τε καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ
ἐκ Ἡ τοιαύτα τῶν περιμαχητῶν μετάλλων ἔτερα πρὸς δὲ τὰς χρείας τὰς κατωτέρας,
tα ταυταῖα κατάλληλα τε καὶ συμβησομένα, ἐστὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλα σκεῦη πρὸς ἄτιμαν,
οὐδὲν κατὰ τὴν ὑλὴν ἔλαττο τῶν τιμωτέρων ἐκείνων· καὶ ταῦτα γίνεται πάντα,
κρίσει δικαῖα τοῦ κεκτημένου τὰ σκεῦη. Εἰδ' ὅ' ὅ μὲν ἀγαθός ἀνήρ ἐκλελεγμένος
τῷ Θεῷ, ὣσπερ τι σκεῦος τίμιον πρὸς τὸ τὴν αὐτοῦ χάριν δέξασθαι ὁ δὲ κακῶς


431
γενόμενος, εἰτ' ἐπανελθὼν διὰ μετανοίας ἐφ' ὁπερ ἐδει, τῶν ἄλλων πάντων χωρητικότερος τοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐλέους· τὰ δὲ ἀτιμώτερα σκεύη εἶναι ἀν αἰμα ἐκείνοι, οἱ τε τὸν βίον διήνυσαν ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ καὶ δόγμασιν οὐ καλοίς, καὶ οἰς τὸ ζῆν ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς ἔργον ἢ διηνεκές, τὸ δὲ μεταμεληθήναι ὡς οἱ τὰ χείριστα μὲν διαφαραξάμενοι, εἰτὰ μετανοία συναπελθόντες, οὐκ ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ παρὰ Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν χρείᾳ μεγίστῃ τοῦ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας ἐλέους· τὰ δὲ ἀτιμότερα σκεύη εἶεν ἂν οἴμαι ἐκεῖνοι, οἵ τε τὸν βίον διήνυσαν ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ καὶ δόγμασιν οὐ καλοῖς, καὶ οἷς τὸ ζῆν ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς ἔργον ἢ διηνεκές, τὸ δὲ μεταμεληθῇ· ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀπεφήνατο, ἀντιμετρεῖν ἁμαρτίᾳ διόρθωσιν. Δεῖ μὲν οὖν δακρύων θερμῶν, καὶ τὴν τῆς κακίας ἀγωνίζεσθαι νόσον, ὡσ ὄν γε πάντως ἄδηλον, εἰ μενεῖ τὴν θεραπείαν τὸ τέλος, πλὴν ἐν ἀγαθαῖς ἐλπίσι καὶ οἱ δεινόν τι νοσοῦντες ὁπόσον βούλει, Θεῷ τῷ πάντων ἰατρῷ σφᾶς γε αὐτοὺς ἐπιρρίψαντες, καὶ τὸ προθυμεῖσθαι θεραπεῦναι εἰσενεγκόντες.

Καὶ ταῦτα λέγω θαρρούντως, εἰς τὴν ἀνυπέρβλητον ὁρῶν ἀγαθότητα, εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐκείνης ἀγάπην, ὑπερεκπλήττουσαν καὶ νοῦν, καὶ λόγον, καὶ πᾶσαν ἔννοιαν, εἰς τὸ τῆς θείας βουλῆς καὶ φύσεως ἀμετάτρεπτον· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τούτου πρὸς ἐκείνο τῆς ἀκινήτου φύσεως ἔρως μετατεθῆσεται, καὶ πάθοι δύο ταυτὶ Θεός, μετάμελον τε καὶ κίνησιν· τὸ θεῖον γὰρ ἀκίνητον, καὶ τὰ αὐτόθεν ἀμεταμέλητα.
τοίνυν ἡ αὐτοαγαθότης τε καὶ φιλανθρωπία, καὶ αὐτοαγάπη, μισήσει γέ ποτε καὶ ἀποστραφθεῖται τὸν αὐτὴ τοσσοῦν πεφιλημένον, ὅσον οὐδ' ἐνθυμηθήναι ὀόν τε οὐ πειραθήσεται τίνος πάθους ὁ ἄπαθης, παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἐν παραλλαγῇ, ἢ τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα, κατὰ τὸν θείου Ἰακώβου, ὃς δῆτο καὶ τούτο φησίν ο Θεός, ἀπειραστός ἐστι κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐδένα. Ἀνθρώπου ποτέ τοῦ κακοῦ, μεταβεβληθθαί τε καὶ μισεῖν τοὺς πρὸ τοῦ πεφιλημένους· οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὡστε παρ' αὐτῶν χρείας και καλούμενος καταβαλλόμεθα· εἰ γὰρ λέγειν κάκειν, ὡς καὶ τοῦ αἵματος αὐτῶν ἡδέως ἄν τινες πίοιεν. Καὶ τὸ αἶτιον πάνυ σαφές· οὐ γὰρ δι' αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους οὕς γε φιλοῦμεν, οὐδὲ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν καὶ τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἡδύ, πάντα πράττομεν. Ὁ δὲ γε πλάσας ἡμᾶς Θεός, χαίρει τῷ διδόναι μᾶλλον, ἢ ἡμεῖς λαμβάνοντες· καὶ οὐδὲ λήψεται ποτε κόρον εὐεργετῶν ἀγαθότητι κινούμενος, οὐ γὰρ ἵν' ἐκείνῳ προσγένηταί τι ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτοῦ δημιουργημάτων, οὐδὲ ὡς ὑπαρξάντων ἐκείνων ἡστινοσοῦν χάριτος. Πῶς γάρ; Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα, οὐδὲ τὴν ἀγάπην ἐκείνου τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς.
τῶν ἐνδεχομένων ἦστι κινηθήναι· ἐπείδη γὰρ εἰς τὸ ἁγαπάν τε καὶ ἐν ποιεῖν, τὸ κινοῦν οὐδέν ἦστιν ἔτερον, ἣ ἢ ἀπειροῦ ἐκεῖνον χειροτότης τε καὶ ἁγαθωσύνη· ταύτην δὲ πάσα ἀνάγκη ὲςαυτῶς ἦσεν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν εἶναι. Φανερὸν ἄπασι γίγνεται, ὡς ἦσται καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰς ἐκεῖνον, ὡσαύτως ἦστιν καθιεν τὸ κινοῦν· καὶ τοῦτο παντὶ ποι ἔστο δῆλον —ἐκ περιοσίας δὲ νῦν ἐρῶ— ὅταν γὰρ τὰ τὴν ἁγάπην ἡμῖν κινοῦντα, μηδὲ ὡσαύτως κινηθῆρ, τότε καὶ ἡμεῖς δηλοῦμεν παντάποιεις παραγώς ἠστάμαθα ἐν τῷ ἁγαπάν, καὶ εἰ ἐσθ' ἡμῶν τοῦτο γίγνεται, πολλῷ γε μάλλον ἔπει Θεοῦ. Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἁγάπη, οὐκ ἔξωθεν πάντως, ἀλλ' ἑαυτῆς κινεῖται, ἀνάγκη ταύτην ὡσαύτως ἔχειν τὸν πάντα χρόνον, καὶ τὰ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἔδωκε γὰρ αὐτοῖς τέκνα Θεοῦ γενέσθαι. Εἰ δὲ τἀγαθόν τις ὁρῶν ὥσπερ αὐτομολοῦν, εἶτα διαπτύει τοῦτο καὶ ἀποστρέφεται, οὐ λογιστέον τοὔγκλημα, τῷ δὲ διδόντι τὴν χάριν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν δεξαμένοις, ἢ καὶ μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν ἀτιμάσασι καὶ παρωσαμένοις· οὕτω μὲν ὂν ἁγαθόν, οὕτω δὲ μέγα, καὶ προσέτι μόνιμον, καὶ ῥᾳδίως ἐπιδιδοῦν, εἰ τις τοῦτο βούλοιτο.
καὶ τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς Δεσπότης, καὶ τὸν τὴν μεγάλην δοκόν ἐκεῖνον, καὶ τὸ κάρφος ἔχοντα τὸ μικρόν —τῶν γὰρ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μνήσθησομαι λόγων—, οὐ περιούσιαν ποτε, ἀλλὰ πάντα πράξει καὶ πραγματεύσεται ύπερ τῆς αὐτῶν σωτηρίας γίγνεται γὰρ παντοδαπὸς ἐπίκουρος ἡμῖν, καὶ νῦν μὲν τούτο τὸ φάρμακον, νῦν δὲ ἐκεῖνο προσάγει, καὶ τοὺς μὲν φλεγμαίνουσι τῶν τραυμάτων, τὰ τῆς παραμυθίας προσάγει, τὰς δὲ σηπεδόνας ἐκκόστει, τὴν ἐπὶ τὰ χείρω νομὴν συστέλλων. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς σὺν τῶ καιρῶ πράττων ὕπερ τούτων νοµήν συστέλλων. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ μέμψεται γε πολλάκας τοῖς ἀρρωστοῦσιν, καὶ ἐπιπλῆξει τούτους δεήσαν, καὶ ποι καὶ τοῖς αὐστηροτέροις βοηθήσας χρῄζεται, μετὰ τῆς συνήθους αὐτῶν χρηστότητος καὶ φιλανθρωπίας. Οὐ δὴ τελείης κακῶς ἔχειν, οὐς ἐξ ὧν ὄντων παρῆγαγεν, καὶ ταῖς έαυτοῦ χερσὶν ἐπάλατον, ἀλλ’ εὐ ποίησε τούτους δυνηκοὺς, διὰ πάντων τῶν δεξιῶν φημὶ καὶ αὐστηροῦν, κατὰ τὸν θείον Ἀπόστολον, ὅρθως βιοῦντας καὶ μή ὁπερ ἀμέλει καὶ υπέτον καὶ ἤλιον τούτοις παρέχει, καὶ αὐθίς γε πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῶν ὄρος, ἐπὶ καιρόν τινα ταῦτα ἐπέχει, καὶ ὅλως, οὐ διὰ μιᾶς ὀδοῦ, ἀλλὰ πολλῶν τε καὶ διαφόρων, καὶ πραγμάτων ἐναντίων ἐστί τὸν, πρὸς ἐν τη τέλος ἡμᾶς ἐνάγει το, ζήν ὅρθως δυνηθήναι. Καὶ πῶς ἄν ἄλλος εἰκὸς ἕν πράττειν, ὡς υπέρ ἄπαντος ἀπέθανε, σταυρόν μὲν ὑπομεινάς καὶ γύμνοντας, πράγμα κακωφύοις διωρισμένον, αἰσχυνής δὲ παντάπασιν ἀλογήσας, καὶ μυρία πράγματα ὕποστας πρὸς ὠρίζειν μυρίαν ἐξευρημένα, μόνος ἕκεινος πρέποντα τοῖς ἐξευρημένοις εἰς αὐτόν; Ταῦτ’ οὖν γινώσκοντες, ὦ παρόντες πάντων εὐηθέστερον τοῦτον ἐξευρημένα, μόνοις ἐκείνοις πρέποντα τοῖς ἐξυβρίσασιν εἰς αὐτόν; Ταῦτ’ οὖν διαφόρων, καὶ πραγμάτων ἐναντίων ἐστίν οὐ, πρὸς ἐν τη τέλος ἡμᾶς ἐνάγει το, ζήν ὁτ’ οὖν γινώσκει τοῖς ἐξυβριστοῖς καὶ ἐπιπλήξει τούτους δεῆσαν, καὶ πολλὰς τὰς σηπεδόνας ἐκκόπτει, τὴν ἐπ’ ἐπίλανθανομένον τὴν ἐπιστατὴν φιλανθρωπίας, τῆς ἀνεικάστου ἔπαθος, της ἀναστάτου φιλανθρωπίας, της αὐτοῦ ἀμελείς.
ἀγαθωσύνης, τῆς ἀνυπερβλήτου χρηστότητος, τούτῳ ἀναιρετῷ ἁμαρτίας ἀπάσης, καὶ τοῦ δε' ἡμᾶς ἐκείνου θανάτου, τῶν ὀνειδῶν, τῶν παθημάτων, τῶν ὕβρεων, καὶ ὥσις τότε παρηκολούθησε τῷ παραλόγῳ θυμῷ τῶν φονών τῶν ἁμαρτίων τῆς θεϊκῆς κεφαλῆς αἵματος, τῶν ὕβρεων τῶν παθημάτων, τῶν ὕβρεων, καὶ κάλαμος κατὰ κορυφῆς παίων' ἡ που κατέστατο τοῦ μακαρίου τότε προσώπου, τῆς τῆς θεϊκῆς κεφαλῆς αἵματος, τρωθείσης οἶμαι καὶ τῷ καλάμῳ κατακρίτων ἀνθρώπων, ἄνθρωπον ὁ σωτήριος ἡμῖν χερσὶ τῶν ἀλαστόρων ἐπλάκη στέφανος.

Βαβαὶ ὅσ' ἔπραξεν, ὅσ' ὑπέστη, ὑπὲρ ἐχθρῶν, ὑπὲρ κατακρίτων ἀνθρώπων, δι' οὓς καὶ γέγονεν ἄνθρωπος, ἐκ γυναικὸς γεννηθείς, σάρκα καὶ πενίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν καταδεξάμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παθεῖν δυνηθῆναι, ἵν' ἡμᾶς ἐλευθερώσῃ πάθος, καὶ δεινῶν ἀθανάτων ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος, ὥν τὸ γένος ἦν ὑπόχρεῳ ὑμεῖς, ἀντὶ πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων ἁμαρτημάτων.

[8b] Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα δείκνυσι τὴν εἰς ἡμᾶς ἀγάπην αὐτοῦ, ἄρρητον τινα καὶ ἀκατανόητον οὖσαν· ἐδύνατο μὲν γὰρ τὸν οὐρανόν τε οἰκῶν, καὶ μηδαμῶς ἀναλαμβάνων τὸ ἡμέτερον, καὶ λόγῳ μόνῳ καὶ νεύματι, τῶν τοῦ διαβόλου δεσμῶν καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ τυραννίδος, λύσασθαι τὸ γένος ἡμῖν καὶ διὰ πάντων εὐεργετεῖν· παθεῖν δὲ οὐκ ἂν εἶχε, μὴ τῆς αὐτῆς οὐσίας, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμετέρας οὐσίας, οὐκ ἠρκέσθη γε θατέρῳ, λέγω δὴ τῷ εὖ ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θάτερον προσέθηκε, τὰ δὲ ἡμᾶς ἐκείνου παθήματα διὰ τῆς σαρκός. Τοιοῦτον

648. βαβαὶ vid. Oratio IV 73
γὰρ ὁ ἀληθὴς ἔρως, οὐκ ἀνέχεσθαι ποιεῖ τὸν ἐρωτα, εἰ μή διὰ τὸν ἐρωμενον πάθοι.

Καὶ τούτῳ μοι δοκεῖ τὸ κεφάλαιον εἶναι τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς τοῦ Σωτῆρος συνγκαταβάσεως τε καὶ κοινωνίας· εἰ γὰρ ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐστὶν εὑρεῖν τοιοῦτον τὸν ἐρωτα, καὶ οὕτω ὑπὲρ τοῦ Θεοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων, χαίροντες τινες τεθνασι πολλὰ παθόντες, πᾶς οὖν ἃν ἁμοσέως τούτο, τῷ τῆς ἁμοσα ἁγαθοτητος ἐρωτα. Διὰ πολλῶν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ἤδυνατο τρόπων σώσαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ὁ Σωτήρ, ἔσωσε δ' οὖν σαρκωθείς πρέπειν ἃν οὕτω γενέσθαι, πολλῶν μὲν ἕνεκα καὶ μεγάλων, μάλιστα δὲ τῆς πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἡμᾶς ἁγάπης ἀυτοῦ ὑπερφυοῦς οὔσης. Καὶ ταῦτ' εἰδὼς πᾶς ὁστισοῦν τῶν προβάτων ἐκείνων, ἂν μὲν γὰρ ᾖ τῇ μάνδρᾳ συνδιαιτώμενος, καὶ πληρῶν τὸν ἀράθμον τῆς θρυλλουμένης ἐκατοντάδος — εὐ γὰρ ποιῶν ο λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὴν παραβολὴν ἢ θαυμαθα—, ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ποιμένος ἀψυχοῦσατο, τοῦ καλοῦ τε καὶ τὰ προβάτα κτησαμένου πολλῷ τιμήματι· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν τὴν ψυχὴν τέθεικε καὶ τὸ ἴδιον ἐξέχειν αἷμα, καὶ ἐσώατο τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον πεποίηκεν οὐδέπωτε καὶ πρὶν ὄντα ξένα. Τί γὰρ καὶ παραδραμεῖται τὴν αὐτοῦ δεσποτείαν; τριπλὲ γὰρ πάντων δεσπότης οὗτος ἐστὶ τῷ παραγαγεῖν καὶ δημιουργῆσαι, τῷ προνοεῖν τε καὶ εὖ ποιεῖν, τῷ δύνασθαι καὶ νεύματι διαφθεῖραι. Τὸ δὲ μυστήριον γέγονε τὸ φρικτὸν, ἵν' ἐν τῇ ἐπιγνώσεις ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὴν παραβολὴν ἤδη ταύτην — ἐν τῷ παραγαγεῖν καὶ δημιουργῆσαι, τῷ προνοεῖν τε καὶ εὖ ποιεῖν, τῷ δύνασθαι καὶ νεύματι διαφθεῖραι. Τὸ δὲ μυστήριον γέγονε τὸ φρικτὸν, ἵν' ἐν τῇ ἐπιγνώσεις ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὴν παραβολὴν ἤδη ταύτην — ἐν τῷ παραγαγεῖν καὶ δημιουργῆσαι, τῷ προνοεῖν τε καὶ εὖ ποιεῖν, τῷ δύνασθαι καὶ νεύματι διαφθεῖραι. Τὸ δὲ μυστήριον γέγονε τὸ φρικτὸν, ἵν' ἐν τῇ ἐπιγνώσεις ὁ λόγος ἡμᾶς ἐνήγαγεν ἐπὶ τὴν παραβολὴν ἤδη ταύτην — ἐν τῷ παραγαγεῖν καὶ δημιουργῆσαι, τῷ προνοεῖν τε καὶ εὖ ποιεῖν, τῷ δύνασθαι καὶ νεύματι διαφθεῖραι.
τε καὶ ζητεῖ τὸ βασιλεύεσθαι παρ' αὐτοῦ. Ὄστις μὲν οὖν τὴν τοῦ ποιμένος φωνὴν
οίδε, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ κατ' ἰχνος πορευομένῳ, ἐν χλοερᾷ τῇ πόᾳ κατασκηνώσει, καὶ ἐπὶ
οὐ φοβηθῆσαι κακά, οὐδὲ ἂν ὁ Τύχη
πορευόμενος ἐν µέσῳ σκιᾶς βασιλεύσῃ. Ὅστις μὲν οὖν τὴν τοῦ ποιμένος φωνὴν
οἶδε, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ κατ' ἰχνος πορευομένῳ, ἐν χλοερᾷ τῇ πόᾳ κατασκηνώσει, καὶ ἐπὶ
οὐ φοβηθῆσαι κακά, οὐδὲ ἂν ὁ Τύχη
πορευόμενος ἐν µέσῳ σκιᾶς βασιλεύσῃ. πορευομένῳ εἶναι, ἐν χλοερᾷ τῇ πόᾳ κατασκηνώσει, καὶ ἐπὶ
οὐ φοβηθῆσαι κακά, οὐδὲ ἂν ὁ Τύχη
πορευόμενος ἐν µέσῳ σκιᾶς βασιλεύσῃ. 

685 γένηται —ἀνθέξαι γὰρ τὴς παραβολῆς—, οὐδὲ ὁικῶν ἀκολούθησαι, ἀλλὰ
σπουδὴ ζητηθῆσαι, καὶ εὐρεθὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀφείλει, καὶ τοῖς µὴ
πεπλανημένοις ὀµοταγὲ ἐσται. Καίτοι καὶ µειζόνως χαίρει τῷ ἑνί τοῖς
πολλοῖς ἐκείνοις, τοῖς ἐν τῇ µάνδρᾳ τοῖς ἀεὶ σὺν αὐτῷ κατασκηνώσεται, καὶ ἐπὶ
ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεται, καὶ οὐ φοβηθήσεται κακά, οὐδὲ
Τύχη πορευόμενος ἐν µέσῳ σκιᾶς θανάτου
· ἐὰν δὲ πλάνης πειραθῇ, καὶ ἀπολωλός ποτε
―ἀνθέξομαι γὰρ τῆς παραβολῆς―, οὐδὲ οὕτω τέως ἀμεληθήσεται, ἀλλὰ
σπουδῇ ζητηθήσεται, καὶ εὑρεθὲν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀφείλει, τοῖς µὴ
πεπλανημένοις ὀµοταγὲ ἐσται. 

690 τρόπον πορεύσεται, ὡς ἀφεῖναι μὲν ἐκεῖνα τὰ πολλά, ἐπὶ δὲ τὴν τοῦ ἑνὸς ζήτησιν
ἐξελθεῖν, οὕτω τὴν αὐτοῦ σωτηρίαν τοῦ παντὸς ἡγεῖται ἀξίαν εἶναι. Καὶ δηλοῖ τὸ
μηδενὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα τοῦτο πιστεῦσαι· οὐ γὰρ πολλοὺς
µισθωσάμενος, οὐδὲ ἀνέθηκε τὴν τοῦ ἔργου ἐπιμέλειαν, οὐ δούλοις, οὐ φίλοις, οὐ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ'
ἑαυτῷ γε μόνῳ τὸ πᾶν ἐθάρρησε· παιδεύων ἡμᾶς ὁ
καὶ τῷ βελτίωνι τρόπῳ, καὶ μήτε δόξαν τὴν φθειρομένην, μήτε
τρυφήν, μήτε
ασφάλειαν τοῦ καλοῦ καὶ πρέποντος προτιθέναι. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν
tῆς ἀγάπης ταύτῃ δεικνύς, ἣν πρὸς ἕκαστον ἡμῶν οὗτος ἔχει, τὴν εἰς ἀλλήλους
σφόδρα ἀνάπτει· τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἤκμαζεν ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ τοῦ ἑνὸς φίλτρον, ὡς ἅπαν ὄρος,
pᾶν ἄλσος, πᾶν ἄβατον, βάσιμον αὐτῷ φαίνεσθαι, καὶ μάλα κοῦφον νομίζειν
ἀχθοφορεῖν, ἵν' αὐτὸ τὸ πλανηθὲν τοῖς πλείοσι συναριθμηθῇ. Εἴποι τις ἂν οἶμαι,
θαυμάζει τούτο τό ἡγούν, ὡς ἡ μὲν ἐξής ἀναγκαία, καὶ τά ἐν αὐτῇ χαλεπά, ἀκολουθῶς ἐπέεισι, καὶ δει πῶς φέρειν τόν γε ἔμεθούντα. Τί δέ ἐν τοῦ κατεπείγον, μετὰ τό εὑρήθηναι τό πρόβατον, οὐκ ἀγεσθαί κατά τά πολλά, ἀλλ' ἐπί τόν ὀμον κομίζεσθαι, καίπερ τοσαίτα παρεσχήκος ἦ πράγματα, μόνον τών ἄλλων προβάτων;

705 Καὶ δοκεὶ τούτο δεικνύναι, ὅσον περὶ πλεῖστον ποιεῖται τήν ἡμετέραν ἀσφάλειαν, προσετή δὲ κάκεινο μαθεθῶν ἔσεστιν ἀπό τοῦτο, ὅτι τό πλανώμενον εὑρήθεν, πολὺ τετραχωμένον ὑπήρχεν, ἐκ τῶν τῆς πλάνης οίματος κακῶν, καὶ ἢ οἶόν μὴ δύνασθαι ῥαθὼς ἐπανέρχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ποιμένος δεόμενον ἑπικουρίας εἰς τοῦτο ἴσως οὖν πρόθυμον ἦν τοσοῦτον πρὸς τὴν αρίστην ἐπάνοδον, ἢ γὰρ ἀν ἐχρῆτο τοῖς ποιοῖς, ὅσον οἶόν τε. Επειδὴ δὲ τούτο μανθάνομεν, οὐδὲ γοῦν σμικρὸν τι βαδίσαν, δόξειν ἀν εἰκότως, ἐτί πῶς τοὺς λογισμοὺς δίχα τεμνόμενον εἶναι ἡ γὰρ συνήθεια, τό κακὸν πολλάκις ὑδυ ποιεῖ, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ὁ θέλων τοῦτον σωθῆναι, ἐπὶ τῶν ὀμον κομίζων, τοῖς ποιοῖς ὑπὲρ ἐκείνου προθύμως κέχρηται, καὶ ἀπλῶς πρὸς ἀπαντά ἀπερ ἐχρῆν μὲν ἐκεῖνο, οὖν ἢ δὲ δύναμιν ταῦτα πράττειν, οἴκοθεν αὐτῶς

710 συνεισφέρει.

[8d] Πάσας τις οὖν τή μεταγνώσθη σαρκίσθησι, προσετοῦ μετὰ λαμπρῶν τῶν ἐλπίδων, τῷ καλῷ τούτῳ ποιμένι, τῷ καὶ τήν ἀπολυμένην δραχμήν ζητήσαντι, καὶ κομίζησιν πρὸς τήν ἐυρεσίν ἐκεῖνης καὶ χειράν ἐνδειξαμένῳ τοσαύτην ἴνα ταύτην ἐπανεκτήσατο, ὡς συνοδεύον ὑπὲρ ὑπὲρ ἐν ἐν τῷ ὀρύττειν εὐφύεσκοντες ἢ ἐν τῷ ἑκατέρου 

720 ἀγαθής τινος Σύχης, ὥστεν ἢ καὶ τό χρυσόν ἄδρον, καὶ οἴδα τῶν πενήτων καὶ


717-719. ἀπολυμένην-ἐπανεκτήσατο] cf. Luc. 15:8-10

μακρὰν δὲ πάνυ φιλαργυρίαν νοσούντων. Τῷ μηδ' ἀναμείναντι τὸν ἄσωτον οἰκαδ' ἐλθεῖν, ἐπειδήπερ ἔγγοι τούτον ἐρχόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἐκείνου θεαν τε καὶ συννάντησιν ἐξελθόντα, καὶ ὑποδεξαμένων τούτον πολλή τιμή, καὶ ταῖς συχναίς περιπλοκαίς θεαμαστόν ἐνδειχμένω τὸν πρὸς ἐκείνον ἐρωτά τε καὶ πόθον, καὶ κοινὴν πανήγυριν τὴν ἐκείνου σωτηρίαν ποιησαμένην. Τῷ μηδαμώς βδελυξαμένῳ τὴν ὀνομαστὴν τότε πόρνην, ὁρῶσάν τε αὐτὸν καὶ ἁπτομένην αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῶν άχραντος πόδας καταφιλοῦσαν, καὶ συχνὸν τὸ δάκρυον καταχέουσαν, καὶ ταῖς θριξὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐκμάττουσαν τὸν ὑπὸ πολλῆς εὐλαβείας. Καίτοι διὰ πάντων ἐκείνων, οἷς τὸν σώφρονα ἐκείνον ἐρωτα καλῶς ἐπεδείκνυτο, ἀκολασταίνουσα τὸ πρὶν τοὺς πολλοὺς ἀπώλεσε, ἴσως δ' ἂν καὶ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι τι. Ὅ δ' οὐκ ἀπεσείσατο ταύτην, οὐδὲ ἀναιδῆ προσεῖπε καὶ ἰταμόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ Φαρισαίου προὔθηκε, τοῦ πολλοῦ νομίζομεν τὴν ἀρετήν, καὶ κατ' αὐτῆς ἐγκώμια τινα εἴρηκεν· οὗτος δὲ καὶ τοῦ τελώνου τὴν ταπείνωσιν εἴγ' ἐχρῆν οὕτω καλεῖν τὴν τῶν ἰδίων κακῶν ἐπίγνωσιν ἀντιτιθεὶς τοῖς πολλοῖς ἐκείνου πλημμελήμασι, κατήγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ δεδικαιωμένον, ὑπὲρ τὸν καλῶς μὲν βεβιωκότα, μεγάλα δὲ φρονήσαντα τῷ καλῶς βιοῦν. Δέχεται τοῦ Ἐζεκίου τὰ δάκρυα, καὶ τοῦ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν ὁμοίῳ τρόπῳ γεγενημένην, ὡς ἄλλων ἀριστείας ἠσμενίσατο. Τὴν γὰρ ἰσόρροπον ἔκτισιν ζητεῖ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῶν μετανοούντων, τὰ δὲ ἔργα κατὰ δύναμιν, ὡς κἂν τοῖς φθάσασι εἴρηται. Ὡς ἂν μηδαμῶς ἐξῇ συνεισενεγκεῖν καὶ ταῦτα, ἀρκέσει τούτῳ καὶ γνώμη
μόνη. Οὕτω τοι καὶ τὸν λῃστήν αὐθημερόν ἐδέξατο, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ αὐθωρόν, εἰ δὲ
βουλεῖ γε καὶ ἐν ἀκαρεί, ἀρμοδία στόματος μόνη, δι’ ἣν οὐδὲν ὑπέστη δεινόν, οὐδ’
ην εἰκός φοβηθῆναι τί γάρ καὶ πλέον ὄν ἐπασχε, καὶ αὐτής τῆς ἀποφάσεως τοῦ
θανάτου; ἈΛΛ’ ἐπειδή φωνῆς ἦν Κύριος τότε μόνης, ταύτην πιστῶς εἰσενηνοχώς,
αὐτὸν ἐκέρδαν τὸν Παράδεισον, ἄθλον μακάριοι ἀφωρισμένον, ὅν γε οἱ
προπάτορες ἀπώλεσαν, οὐκ οὖν ὑπέστη δεινόν, ὅτι οὐκ θαρσεῖν· τί γὰρ καὶ πλέον ὧν ἔπασχε,
καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀποφάσεως τοῦ θανάτου; Ἀλλ’ ἐπειδή φωνῆς ἦν Κύριος τότε μόνης, ταύτην πιστῶς εἰσενηνοχώς,
τῶν ἰατρῶν νόμους, τοιαῦτα τῶν δυναμένων ἀμύνειν· ἀλλ’ αὐτῶς ἄρει παρεξήγημον·
τοὺς χρείαν έχοντας αὐτοῦ, προσκαλεῖτο, παρεκάλει, μετεδίδου παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ, καὶ
eυ ποιῶν γε πάντας εξῆς, εὐθὺς αὐτῶν ἀπηλλάττετο, ἵνα μὴ μισθὸν ἄκων λάβῃ.
Τίνα δὴ τούτον; Τὴν ἐκείνων ἐνθημένην μετὰ κρότων γηγομένην, χαίρωμεν τοῖς
όμοις πάντες τῶν γὰρ εἰς ἐκείνον πεπιστευκότοντας, οὐ λογίζεται τὰ ἀμαρτήματα,
Pαῦλος εἶπε. Ταύτην δὲ δήποτε τὴν χάριν διδοσί μὲν ἀπειδή, τὸ βάπτισμα, διδούς δὲ ἢ
μετάνοια ἐκείνων ἐν βοηθούμενῳ τῷ λοιπῷ, οὐκέκαί οὐ τῆς γνησίως ἐκείνην χρήσατο,
νωστε ἐκείνος ἀγαθὸς, καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς καὶ τοῖς μὴ τουσίων.

[9b] Καὶ πῶς οὐ πάντας χαίρειν δεῖ, τοιούτων ἐχοντας Δεσπότην, οίνον ὁ λόγος ἦμιν

δεῖξε; Μάλλον δὲ οἶον οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς ἐδείξε δόξος, οὐδ’ ἂν συνήλθον ὅμοι καὶ τῶν
ἀγγέλων καὶ τῶν ἄνθρωπων αἱ γλώσσαι. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ ἔστιν ἐν τι καὶ λυπεῖν ἄξιον
tούς εἰς ἀμαρτίας μετανοήσαντας, καὶ τῆς ἀπειροῦ φιλανθρωπίας τετυχηκότας
τοῦτο; Τὸ μεμνήσθαι εἰς οἶνον οίνος πρὸς αὐτοὺς, ἐξυβρίσας. Καὶ τι ἂν ἦσαν, μή τούτο
πράξαντες; Οἱ γὰρ οὐχ ὀσίως βεβιώκαν, ἐπεὶ τὰ μεταγινώσκε τῶν ἐργῶν καὶ τῇ
πρὸς τὸ ἀγάθον νέυστε, ἵππο πεπείρανται τοῦ ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ψιθυριθέντος, καὶ τοιούτων
eὐ πεπονθαί παρ’ αὐτοῦ, ὡς ἐν ἐξαιντῳ, πόσης ἂν ἠξίωντο τιμῆς, μὴ
umινθὲν την ἐν τούτῳ ἄξιον· Εἰ δ’ ἐνεστὶ κάκει τὰς τούτων ψυχὰς λύπην ἤγηναν ὅλως
ἰσχεῖν, τούτ’ ἂν οἶμαι τὸ πλῆττον, ὅτι τὸν σφόδρα φιλήσαντα ἐλύπησαν
αἱ γλώσσαι, καὶ τοῖς κακοῖς μολύνωσα ἐαυτὰς. Καὶ διὰ ταύτα, τοὺς πάσαν ἃν
παραινέσαμι, καὶ πρὸ γε πάντων τῇ ἐμαυτοῦ ψυχη, μὴ ταύτα πράττειν ἄμας


442
ἐθέλειν, δι’ α’ δεήσει πολλών δικαίων και στεναγμών, ἐπὶ τὴν αριστήν ὁδὸν ἐπιστρέφασιν· ἀλλ’ ἐκείνων ἐχεσθαι, οἷς ἂν εἰς καθαρώς ἥσσοι τῷ τε καθαρῶς βιοῦν, τῷ τε ἐλπίζειν τεῦξεσθαι αἰωνίων ἀπολαύσεως, ἂ ὅφθαλμος σὺν εἴδε, καὶ σὺς σὺν ἥκουσι, καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνεβη, κατὰ τὸν θείον Ἀπόστολον.

785 [9c] Ἐνταῦθα δὲ μοι τὸν λόγον οἰομένῳ δεῖν καταλῦσαι, εἰρήσταται τι περὶ τῆς ἀνοσιάτητος φιλανθρωπίας βραχύ μὲν πάνω, καλῶς δ’ οὖν ὁμᾶς τὸ πᾶν δεικνύον ὡς ἔμοιγε παρίσταται τοῦ σκοποῦ. Λέγοι δὴ τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ περὶ τὸ γένος φιλανθρωπίας ἀπείρῳ γε παντάπασιν οὕτω, μὴ δύνασθαι τι τῶν πάντων ἐξισωθῆναι, ἢ γούν ἐκείνη παραβληθῆναι, μήτοι γε τὰ πταίσματα τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ὅν ἐστὶ πεπερασμένα τὰ πάντα. Καὶ ὅτε τοῦθ’ οὕτως ἔχει, οὐδαμῶς ἀρκέσειν ἂν αὐτὴ πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτῆς ἀκριβεσθήσεται ἐπιδειξεῖν, τὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίαν ἀνηρηκέναι πάντων ἀνθρώπων, δηλαδή τῶν εἰς Θεὸν ϕιλανθρωπίας, οὕτως οὐδαμῶς, σὺν’ εἰ δυνατόν ἢν αὐτὴν υἱομάκες ἀεύτης μείῳ γενέσθαι, οὐ νοὺς ἀνθρώπινος ἐφικνεῖται πρὸς τι τῶν περὶ Θεον νοομημένων, οὐδ’ ἑγγύς. Πάν οὖν ὁ μέγα τε καὶ σεμνὸν, εἴτ’ ὄνομα, ἢ τ’ τι ποτ’ ἀν καὶ εἰς, νοῦ καὶ ἕξουσία καὶ περικότι πλασθῆναι τε καὶ νοσθῆναι δυνάμενον, εἰσό πάπτον δείκνυται πρὸς ἀκριβὴ κατάληψιν τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος φιλανθρωπίας. Αὐτῷ ἢ δόξα ἁμα τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας, ἀμήν.


783-784. ἀ-ἀνεβη] 1 Cor. 2:9

Δόγματα Ζ'

Περί ταπεινοφροσύνης: έκ μέρους δὲ καὶ περί ἀγάπης.

[1a] Τῶν κεφαλαίων τὸ ὡστατον, ἄ σοι παρ᾽ ἡμῶν ἀποδέδοται εἰς ἡθῶν σπουδαίων ἐπιμέλειαν, περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης διελέγετο. Εἰκότως ἂν οὖν γένοιτο καὶ ὁ τελευταίος ἡμᾶς λόγος οὗτος, εἰκεῖν ὑπερθεγγομένος, τῷ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκεῖνω ἀρετὴν ἑξυμενεῖν. Οὐ μὴν άλλα καὶ ἐν τῷ πρόσ βάς τοῦ λόγου παρενεχθεῖε. Συνήκα δ᾽ οὖν ποιήσας μετάφρασιν τὴν ἁκοὴν τῶν παρόντων, ἀρκεῖν ὡς νομίζονταν ἀκούσεσθαι τι μακρότερον περὶ τουτοῦ τοῦ καλοῦν ἐγὼ δὲ τότε μὲν αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἑχαρισάμην, ὡς μὴ ἐκφερομὴν ὅποι ἂν τῶν, ἀλλ᾽ ἐξερχόμην ἐφ᾽ ὅπερ ἔδει, τὸν προκειμένου μόνου ἑχόμενος, καὶ ὑποσχομένους ἑρεῖν μετὰ τοῦ καμπὸ. Καὶ δὴ μοι τελεσθῆντος τοῦ πρῶν διαύλου, ἡμῖν ὡρὰ κάκεινος χαρίζεσθαι, καὶ σοι τὸ δέων ἀποτελήσων.

[1b] Τὸ δὲ ὡστατον εἰπεῖν περὶ τῆς πάντα ἀγαθῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης, οὐ κατὰ τῶν γέγονεν, ἀλλ᾽ οὕτω δόξαν ἀκολούθον εἰναι ἑπειδὴ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς κεφαλαίοις ἐκεῖνοις, καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τοῦ δέ λόγοις, ἐπιτάσσεται μὲν σοι τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλ᾽ αἰνεῖν, ἀκούσεις δὲ τὴν γνώμην πρὸς τὰ βελτίω, καὶ τὸν ἐρωτὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἔργων ἐπετύπωσιν διὰ πάντων ἐν ταῖς τῆς φύσεις σου δυνάμεις ὁ δὲ τὰ καλὰ κτησάμενος πάντα, οὐδὲν ἐαυτόν ὄνησεν, εἰ μὴ καὶ τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην προσεκτήσατο, ἄλλοις γε ταύτην μόνην μάλιστα πασῶν ἀρετῶν λαμματηρὰ τε καὶ φύλακα τῶν ἀγαθῶν πάντων. Ότε τούτων ταύτα ἐπιστήσῃς καὶ άνθρωποι σιγῶσαν, ἐοι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθῶν τελευτῶν, καὶ περὶ τῆς καλλιστῆς τῶν ἀρετῶν ταυτησὶ διελθεῖν. Ἐπεὶ τοι καὶ σάφεις ἐστι κατὰ πολὺ

---


20-22. ἐπι-κτρισαθαί] cf. Demosthenem, Olynthica 1.23.6-24.1

χαλεπώτερον τὸ γε φιλιάξασθαι τάγαθα καὶ διασώσασθαι μέχρι τέλους, τοῦ τὴν ἀρχήν ταύτα κτήσασθαι καὶ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην εἰπτε μὲν τις τῶν πάλαι θαυμαξομένων ἐπὶ σοφία —Δημοσθένης οὗτος ἐστίν, οὐ μετὰ μνήμης ἀγαθῆς, ὁ διὰ μέσον πάς χρόνος διαστηθήκηκε τούνομα—, ἐφάνη δὲ ἐκ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀληθευτάτη, καὶ οὐδ' ἂν εἰς εἰχοι πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀντερείν. Ὁ χρὴ δὲ οἴμαι θαυμαζέειν, εἰ καθήκα εμαυτὸν εἰς ὅν ἔχοχαν ἀποδιδράσκειν ἀγῶνα· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀπονοίας κατενεχθέντες, τὰς φρένας ἀπολωλεκότες, ὡς καὶ τοῖς ἀδύνατοις ἐπιχειρεῖν, καὶ οἴεσθαί γε γλῶτταν χαμαίζηλον, δύνασθαί τι περὶ ἐκείνης προσῆκον εἰπεῖν, τῆς ὑψοῦ μὲν πετομένης, ὑψοῦ δὲ ἐπαιρούσης οἳ τἀγαθὸν ἐργαζόμενοι, οὐκ ἴσασιν ἐπαίρεσθαι. Οὐ τοίνυν ἢ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς νῦν ἐγχειρήσεως, ἢ ἐμαυτὸν ἀγνοῶν, ἐνταῦθα τόλμης ἐξελήλυθα· οὐδὲ γὰρ Ἄριστωνος Πλάτωνα. Σὺ δέ μοι πάντως, οὕτως φίλτατε, καὶ τὸ περὶ σὲ μέγα φίλτρον, ὑπόθεσί μοι τοῦ τολμήματος ἤδη γέγονε· σὲ μὲν γὰρ εἰ μὴ ἴδοιμι πάντα ἀγαθὸν ἄνδρα, οὐδὲν τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τερπνῶν ἡγησαίμην ἄν ποτε τῶν τερπνῶν εἶναι· τὸ φίλτρον δὲ γε τοσοῦτον, ὅσον με καὶ παροτρύναι πράγμασι παντά πασι μείζοσιν, ἢ κατὰ τὴν ἰσχύν ἐγχειρεῖν. Τοῦτο μοι τὸ φίλτρον εἰργάσατο, τοὺς τε λόγους τούτους τοὺς πολλούς, καὶ τὰ πρὸς σὲ κεφάλαια σὺν ἐπιστολαῖς· τοῦτο, καθ’ ἑπερβολὴν μεθ’ ἑαυτῆς τὸ εὔλογον βιαζόμενον, εἰς τοῦτο με πραγμάτων ἐξήνεγκεν, ἐν καιροῖς οὐ ‖ συγχωροῦσι τὸν ἐπὶ τῶν οἰάκων καθήμενον, ἄλλοσέ ποι τοὺς


31-32. οὐδὲ Πλάτωνα cf. Plato, Phaedrus 228a
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όφθαλμον τρέπειν, ἢ πρὸς μόνας τὰς τῶν κυμάτων ἐπιφοράς· ὃ γὰρ λαοὶ τ’ ἐπιτεταγμέναι, καὶ τῶσα μέμηλε, εἰπεν ἄν ὁ ποιητής, οὐ ώδεῖς δύναται οἷς ἄν ἐθέλησει χρῆσθαι· αἱ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν ἀσχολία, πρὸς ἑαυτῶς τὸν νοῦν ἑπιστρέφουσα, ὥσπερ τίνα δειμώνιτα πεδοῦσαι τούτων, ἀσφαλῶς διακατέχουσιν πέδας δ’ ἂν οἶμαι καὶ δειμα δικαίως πάς τις νομίσει, τάς αἰεὶ κατεπειγούσας ἀνάγκας.

[1] Πολλῶν δὲ ὄντων καὶ μεγάλων τῶν περὶ ταπεινοφορίας προειρημένων καὶ ἐν τοῖς πάλαι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς νῦν, οὐδεὶς οὐδέποτε τὸ πᾶν εἰρήκε. Καίτοι τοῖς παρ’ ἑαυτῶν λόγοις, πῶς οἴει ταῦτην ἐκόσμησαν; ΑΛΛ’ ἢδε τοῖς ἀγγέλους συνδιαιτωμένη, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ὑπερβολῆς, ὑπέρκειται τῶν κατ’ αὐτῆς ἐγκωμίων. Ἰσμεν τοῖς εἰκονίς μὲν καλῶς εἰπόντας, εἰ τις εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ τὴν τῶν λόγων ὑσχίν ἀπίδου ίσων ήσμεν δὲ καὶ ταὐτὴν τὴν ἁρετὴν ποιῶν κατόπιν τῆς προθυμίας ἀποδεικνύσαν, τοὺς γε περὶ αὐτῆς τι λέγειν ἐπιχειροῦσιν· ὥστε φανερὸν ἦμιν γίγνεται, μηδ’ ὄντων διψάσθαι τὸ κατ’ αἴσιν εἰπέν· ἁρετῇ γὰρ οὐσία καθ’ αὐτῆν, οὕτω καλῇ, οὕτω λαμπρῇ, οὕτω πάντα ἀγαθῇ καὶ βελτίστῃ, τίς ἄν ἐξεσθείη ποτὲ λόγος· Οὐ μὴν γε διὰ τοῦτο προσῆκε σηγήν τοῖς ἀπάντας ἄγειν, ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἀπαντήσις, λέγειν τε καὶ συνεισφέρειν τὸ κατὰ δύναμιν. Τέχνη τις περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ τῶν οὐκ εἰς λόγους εὐδοκομοῦσαν, ἐρεὶ μὴ πάμπαν ἀπάντων τοῦ ταὐτῆς ὑφών, καὶ ἄλλος αὐτῆς ὁμοίως, καὶ πάλιν ἑτέρῳ ίσῳ· οὐ γὰρ ἀπεικότας τὸν δεῖνα ἐνὶ ταῖς μέρει ταὐτὴν κοσμήσατ’ ὑπὲρ τοὺς μείζους. Εἰδον τούτι γιγνόμενον ἑτί τῶν ἀπάντων, καὶ τετυχθοτα θηρίου μὴ πάνυ θαυμαζόμενον ἑτὶ τοιχίη, ἀμείνον οἶμαι.
καὶ Τεύκρου, καὶ Ἰδα τοῦ παλαιοῦ, καὶ εἰ τις ἄλλος ἐπὶ τοῖς τόξοις μεγίστην ἔκτηται δόξαν. Ὡστε δεί τοὺς ἀπαντας συνεισφέρειν, ὅταν τὸ πᾶν ενδείξασθαι τὰ τῶν μειώνων οὐκ ἐξαρκή κἂν προσθῶσιν ἑκατοστὸς τὰ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῶν καὶ συνενεχή τὰ πάντων ὡς ἔξ ἐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐν γε δέδει στομα τὰ τῶν εἰπόντων, ἐλθοῦν ἄν ἐγγὺς οἱ περὶ ἐκείνης εἰπόντες, τοῦ λέγειν ὅλως ἁξιον περὶ τοῖς τόξοις δόξαν. Συμβαίνει δὴ τι δοκεῖν αἴνιγμα, τὸ περὶ τῆς γεγονός οὐκ ἐξαρκῇ· κἂν προσθῶσιν ἕκαστος τὰ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῶν καὶ συνενεχθῇ τὰ πάντων ὡς ἐξ ἐρανοῦ, καὶ ἕν γε δόξῃ στόμα τὰ τῶν εἰπόντων, ἔλθοιεν ἂν ἐγγὺς οἱ περὶ ἐκείνης εἰπόντες, τὸν λόγον ἄξιον ἄλλῃ δύνασθαι· ὥστε σαφῶς αἰνίγματι τῶν εἰπόντων, ἐι δὴ τοῖς μὴ γινομένοις ἐπαίνοις, τὸν γιγνόμενον στέφανον ἑαυτῇ περιτίθησι.

Καὶ τοῖνυν παραιτοῦμεθα τοὺς ἀκροατάς, μηδὲν δυσχερὲς ἐντεθυμῆσθαι περὶ ἡμῶν, μηδὲ προπετείας γράψασθαι, εἰ προὐθυμήθημεν εἰπεῖν περὶ τοῦ ταύτην ἐτύχοντος καὶ ἀρετοῦ καὶ συνεισφέρειν τοὺς ἅπαντας συνεισφέρειν τὸ πᾶν ἐνδείξασθαι τὰ τῶν μειζόνων οὐκ ἐξαρκῇ· κἂν προσθῶσιν ἕκαστος τὰ παρ᾽ ἑαυτῶν καὶ συνενεχθῇ τὰ πάντων ὡς ἐξ ἐρανοῦ, καὶ ἕν γε δόξῃ στόμα τὰ τῶν εἰπόντων, ἔλθοιεν ἂν ἐγγὺς οἱ περὶ ἐκείνης εἰπόντες, τὸν λόγον ἄξιον ἄλλῃ δύνασθαι· ὥστε σαφῶς αἰνίγματι τῶν εἰπόντων, ἐι δὴ τοῖς μὴ γινομένοις ἐπαίνοις, τὸν γιγνόμενον στέφανον ἑαυτῇ περιτίθησι.
καλλίστη τούτω φανείσα, καὶ ζητηθῇ διὰ τὸ φιλεῖσθαι, καὶ εὑρεθῇ ποιοί πάντως αὐτῷ, σπουδαίως ταῦταν ἱσχευνον, καὶ ἡ κτήσεις γε αὐτῆς, χαρίεσσά τις γένηται καὶ ἡδίστη, διὰ τὴν μετὰ σπουδῆς ζήτησιν, καὶ φιλαξθῇ φιλοπόνος, τῶν ἐνεκα πάντως τοῦ γάρ ὡς ἔτυχεν εὑρεθέντος, οὐδὲ πολύ τι δάκνον, ἢ λυπηρόν, ἢ στέρησις καθιστάται, εἰ καὶ ταχὺ μεταστασία, ὁ γε καὶ συχνῶς φυλεὶ γίγνεσθαι. Κάν ἢ τὸ κτήμα πνευματικόν, στηρνοῦ πινοῦ δύην πολλάκις ἀφίπτεται τῆς ψυχῆς, καὶ οὐδὲ αἰσθάνεται ὁ μὴ σὺν πόθῳ κτησάμενος, δεινόν τι πεπονθώς. Εἰς δὲ σοι τῷ φιλτάτῳ, κατὰ τὰς ἐλπίδας εἴκοσι τὰ παρ᾽ ἡμῖν εὑρημέναν καὶ εἰ δόξησιν Ἰησοῦς, καὶ τὰ δεόντα εὑρήκεινα περὶ ταυτῆς τῆς ὑλῆς εἴπτε, μήτε μὴν τὰ εὑρηθέντα καλῶς ἀρμόσαι πρὸς ἀλλήλα, μήτε εἰρηκέναι ταῦτα σὺν κόσμῳ, ὡστε ἐρρωμένως ἔχειν ἐφ᾽ οὐς ὑπερβολῆς, ἡ στέρησις καθίσταται, εἰ καὶ ταχὺ μετασταίη, ὡστε ἐρρωμένως ἔχειν ἐφ᾽ οὐς ἐμόγησα, Ἡμῖν δ᾽ ἐνταῦθα γενομένοι τοῦ λόγου, δίκαιος τε ἐπέρχεται θαυμαστός, καὶ ἀποστηθῶν παραινεῖ εἰς τὴν ἴμητεραν αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἀφορῶσι, καὶ τὸ τοῦ πρᾶγματος μέγεθος· ἐνταῦθα γάρ τὸ δυσχερές οὕτων νικών ἐστι μεθ᾽ υπερβολῆς, ἡς οὐδὲν ἐτερον λύει τὸν ψυχῆς, καὶ χαυνοῖ τοὺς λογισμοὺς, καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλυφάνειν. Τίς γὰρ οὗτοι παις ἐστίν, ἢ πόρρω που τοῦ δέοντος ὑπὸ θράσους ἀνακαθέκτων αὐτῆς παρασυρεῖς, ωστε φιλεῖσθαι δύνασθαι πανταχόθεν, καὶ οἷς οὐκ ἄν ἔτερος.

[2α] Ἡμῖν δ᾽ ἐνταῦθα γενομένοι τοῦ λόγου, δίκαιος τε ἐπέρχεται θαυμαστός, καὶ ἀποστηθῶν παραινεῖ εἰς τὴν ἴμητεραν αὐτῶν δύναμιν ἀφορῶσι, καὶ τὸ τοῦ πρᾶγματος μέγεθος· ἐνταῦθα γάρ τὸ δισχερές οὕτων νικών ἐστι μεθ᾽ υπερβολῆς, ἡς οὐδὲν ἐτερον λύει τὸν ψυχῆς, καὶ χαυνοῖ τοὺς λογισμοὺς, καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν ἀκλυφάνειν. Τίς γὰρ οὗτοι παις ἐστίν, ἢ πόρρω που τοῦ δέοντος ὑπὸ θράσους ἀνακαθέκτων αὐτῆς παρασυρεῖς, ωστε φιλεῖσθαι δύνασθαι πανταχόθεν, καὶ οἷς οὐκ ἄν ἔτερος.

91. πολλ' ἐμόγησα cf. Dialogi III 32.12 — 98. τίς-παις | Ad ebriosum 292.16; De processione 201.1; Oration funebris 185.12; cf. Ad Alexium lagop 351.8-9

που τοῦ προσήκοντος εἰρηκέναι δόξει; Οὐδέν γὰρ ὁμαί σεμνόν, ἢ μέγα, ἢ λαμπρόν, μεθ’ ὅς δυνατά τις υπερβολής εἰπεῖν, ὁ μὴ ἀν πρὸς τοῦναντίον περιστῇ τῷ
bounceμένῳ ταύτην κοσμεῖν, τὴν ἀέριον, τὴν αἰθέριον, τὴν οὐράνιον, τὴν υπερουράνιον, τὴν ἐν τοῖς κόλποις τοῦ Πατρός νῦν οἰκοῦσαν, εἰτερ ὁ Σωτήρ ἡμῖν, ὁ
θραυσὸς ἐκείνης ἀπάσης, υπερουράνιος ἀληθῶς, καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρός ἡ ἐστι κόλποις· ἐστι γὰρ πάσα ἀνάγκη, ὅπου τοῦ Χριστὸς εἰπεῖ, ἐκεῖ καὶ ταύτην εἶναι
dηνεκῶς. Καὶ ἢν ἀμέλει ἐν αὐτῷ ὁ ταύτης ἔρως ὑπερφυῶς, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς ἡμῖν ἐκεῖνον γενέσθαι· εἰ μὴ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἡμῖν ἐπεδήμησε μετὰ τῆς
σαρκός, κλίνας μὲν τοὺς οὐρανούς, κατὰ τὸν Προφήτην, μηδαμῶς δὲ χωρισθεῖς τῶν
tαπεινών κόλπων, οὐδ’ ἐν παράσχειν υπὲρ ἡμῶν ἀπαντά, ἢ καὶ τοῖς δούλους οὐ
φορητα. Υπὸ ὁπερ εἰπον, υπερουράνιον ἀποδέδεικται τὸ χρῆμα τῆς
tαπεινοφροσύνης. Άρχον δὲ καὶ κατ’ ἐκεῖνον τὸν τρόπον· υπὲρ χαρακτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀναβεβηκυῖα, παρὰ τοὺς οὐρανούς ἁπάντα ταῦτα ἐν τοῖς δούλοις οὐ
φορητα. Υπὲρ γὰρ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἀναβεβηκυῖα, τὸν ἡμᾶς κατήγαγε· μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτῷ
ὑπερουράνιον ἀποδέδεικται τὸ χρῆμα τῆς
tαπεινοφροσύνης. Θεῖον τοίνυν καὶ πολυύμνητον κλίνας οὐρανούς] cf. Ps. 17:10; 2 Regn. 22:10
ἐν τοῖς κόλποις· ἐστι γὰρ πάσα ἀνάγκη, ὅπου τοῦ νῦν οἰκοῦσαν, ἤδη λέγωμεν, ἵνα καὶ διὰ πλειόνων αὐτὴν κοσμήσαιμεν· τὸ γὰρ πλείονος χρῆμα, ἡταπεινοφροσύνη, πολλαχόθεν οὐκ αὐτῇ κοσμίᾳ, καὶ σύν
tαπεινοφροσύνης, πολλαχοῦσα κοσμίᾳ, καὶ σύν

109. κλίνας-οὐρανοίς] cf. Dialogi XIV 279.3
ἔραστάς μετὰ μανίας σώφρονος, εἰ καὶ τῷ ὄνοματε τούτῳ, ὃν τε ἐναντίῳ καθάπαξ, δοκεῖ μὴ δύνασθαι συνελθεῖν. Καὶ τούτῳ οἴμαι, οὐ χρῆ θαυμάζειν· πολλὰ γὰρ πάντως ἕπτ' αὐτῆς ἀντικείοντας δοκοῦντα συνερχέσθαι ἀστήρ καὶ τῇ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἐναντίῳ διακειμένη κακία, τὴν ἔπαρσιν λέγω· ἦς μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς ἱλήσεως ὑψηλή, ἢς οὐδὲν ἀν γένοιτο ταπεινότερον, οὐδὲ χαμερπέστερον, ὅπου καὶ οἷς γε σύνεστι, καταβάλλει τὰς τούτων ψυχὰς, καὶ παραπέμπει πρὸς τὸ κατώτατον βάρωθρον· καὶ ἔτη τὰ Φαρισαίον ἐκείνον κατενεχοῦντα βραχέα ἐν όμημα, εὐχαριστιάν μὲν ἔχοντα πρὸς Θεόν, διὰ τὴν αὐτήν συνούσαν ἀρετήν, ἔχοντα δὲ τι καὶ ύπερήφανον, μεμιγμένον εἴποι τις ἀν, λελιθωτός ταῖς γιγνομέναις εὐχαριστίαις. Τῇ δὲ μεταφυτή, πρόσεστι μὲν τὸ τῆς ταπεινώσεως ὄνομα, καὶ ταυτηθεὶς τῆς κλήσεως, τί ἀν καὶ γένοιτο κατωτέρω; Αὐτῷ ύποι τὴν οἴκησιν κεκτημένην, ἐγείρει μὲν ἀπὸ γῆς τὸν πένητα, ἀπὸ δὲ κοπτικὰς ἀνίσθησιν τὸν πυρόχον. Καὶ μαρτυρεῖ μοι τῷ λόγῳ, τὸ παρὰ Θεοῦ πρὸς τὸν τελώνην γεγενημένον. Ὡστε καὶ τὸν μανικώτατον ἔρωτα μετὰ σωφροσύνης ἀκροτητῆς ἐπὶ ταύτης συνελθεῖν, ὥσπερ ἄδυνατον· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναι τὰ αὐτῆς, ὥσπερ αὐτοὶ παράδοξα πάντα. Καὶ μὴν καὶ τούτῳ γε καίνον οἴμαι· ταύτης γὰρ ἐπιδημούσης τοῖς φίλοις ἐν ἐθέλωσιν, ἢ ἐξ ἐναντίας κακίας, μὴ βουλομένους τῷ ταύτῃ ἔχουσιν ἐπεισέχοντας τοσοῦτον γὰρ ἀπέχομεν ταύτην ἐθέλειν ἡμῖν παρείναι, ὡσπερ ἐν τῷ ἐσχατῳ προσπηλακίζεσθαι νομίζωμεν, εἰ ὑπερήφανον κεκρατημένους ἡμᾶς τὶς εἴποι.

[2e] Βουλομένως δὲ μοι μακρότερον λέγειν καὶ περὶ τῶν ταύτης ἱδωμάτων — ἐδόκει γὰρ καὶ τούτῳ προσηκεῖν τῷ περὶ ταπεινοφορούσης λέγοντι— ἐπῆθεν ἔτερος

---
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λογισμὸς ἐν τῷ μεταξὺ, καὶ ἐδοξέν ἐπικρατέστερος εἶναι ὁ δὲ λογισμός, μὴ δεῖν ἐπεκτείνεσθαι περὶ ἑκείνης λέγοντας, παρὸν συνεσταλμένος εἰπόντας, τὸ δὲν ἀποτελήσωσα δὲ ἐν γὰρ δήπου τὸν ύπέρ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης ἐξοφαίνομεν ἐπαίνον, καὶ τὸν κατὰ τῆς ἑπάρσεως ἐξεργαζόμεθα ψόγον ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτὰ ἀντίκεινται, καὶ τὰ περὶ αὐτῶν λεγόμενα δηλονότι —τὸ γὰρ τὴν ἑτέραν κοσμήσαι, κατασκηνοῦν τὴν ἑτέραν ἐστίν— ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐμπαλινὸν ὁ γὰρ τῆς ἑτέρας ψόγος, τῇ ἑτέρᾳ σαφῆς ἐπαίνος γίνεται.

195v [3a] Ἡ τοῖνυν ἡμῖν προκειμενὴ κοσμεῖσθαι τὰ μὲν πάθη τῶν ψυχῶν ἐξελαύνει, βασιματουργεῖ δὲ κομιδὴ πιστοῖς ἀνδραζί συνοῦσα, καὶ γίνεται τοῖς δαίμοσιν ὀλέθριος τις καὶ ἀποτρόπαιος. Τὰς περὶ Θεον δυνάμεις ἐν τῷ καθεστηκότα τηρεὶ—οὐ γὰρ ἄν διέμενον ἐν τῷ φωτισμῷ, αὐτῆς ἑκείνης διωσταμένης— καὶ δείκνυσι τὸ πεπτωκέναι τὸν ἐωσφόρον ἀπὸ τῆς ἄγαν λαμπρότητος, υπέρ τὸ σχῆμα φρονίσαντα. Τούτῳ τῷ βέλει τρωθεὶς αὐτός, καὶ καθ᾽ ἡμῖν ἀφίησιν αὐτὸ συνεχῶς, νομίζων ἐσεσθαί οἱ κατὰ παντός, ἐκ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ κακῶν τὴν δόξαν ταύτην λαμβάνων καὶ μέντοι γε, καὶ βλάπτουν ἐστίν ὡς οὐδὲν ἔτερον, ἐὰν μὴ τὸ μέτριον προβλήθην, ἀπαρακτον αὐτῷ δειξῃ. Ὡστε ἡ μὲν ἐπαρσίς καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἀπόλλυσι τὸ δὲ ταύτης ἑναντίον, τὸ μέτριον, ἀναγκαίως τάναντία διαπράξεται, καὶ ἐπανασώστει τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τὸν Πλάσαντι, ὡς τοὺς προγόνους ἀπώλεσεν, ἢ ἐξ ἑαυτῆς τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ κακίας ἵσθειαν γὰρ φαντασθέντες, ἐκπίπτουσι μὲν ἑκείνοι τοῖς Παραδείσου καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ δὲ γε τοῖς συμβάν, ἀκολουθοῦς καὶ τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν


451
ἐπισυμβαίνει παισίν· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν νύσσαν τὸν πῶλον. Ἡ τοίνυν ταπεινοφροσύνη, καὶ τῆς Αἰαντος ἀσπίδος ἀμείνων προβεβλημένη ἦν μὲν γὰρ κάκεινη τοιαύτῃ βύρσαις ἐπτὰ κατασκευασμένη, οία τὰ τῶν πολεμίων βέλη, μηδὲν ὀντα δειξαν οὐ μὴν κάκεινο παρείχε ταρακείν, ὡς ἀρ' οὐδὲν ἐσταὶ μηχάνημα, τὸ δυνησόμενον ποτε ταύτην βλάψαι. Ἡ δὲ ταπεινοφροσύνη, μονοειδῆς τὶς οὕσα καὶ ἁπλῇ τῇ ψυχῇ δύναμις, εἰτ’ οὖν ἔξεις, διασώκει τοὺς αὐτὴν κεκτημένους, ἀφ' ὅσιν ἀκινήτω ἐνθυμηθῇ κατασκευασμένη, ἦν μὲν γὰρ κἀκείνη τοιαύτη, βύρσαις ἑπτὰ κατασκευασμένη τὰ τῶν πολεμίων βέλη, μηδὲν δὲ δεῖξαι· οὐ μὴν κἀκεὶνο παρεῖχε θαρρεῖν, ὡς ἄρ' οὐδὲν ἔσται μηχάνημα, τὸ δυνησόμενόν ποτε ταύτην βλάψαι. Ἡ δὲ ταπεινοφροσύνη, μονοειδῆς τις οὖσα καὶ ἁπλῆ τῇ ψυχῇ δύναμις, εἴτ' οὖν ἕξις, διασώζει τοὺς αὐτὴν κεκτημένους, ἀφ' ὅσων ἂν φοβερῶν ἐνθυμηθῇ οἷόν τε· οὐ μόνον δὲ τοῖς εἰς αὐτὴν γε τεθαρρηκόσι πάντ' ἂν γένοιτο τὰ προειρημένα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες έξεῖς οἱ καρποὶ, οὓς οὖς τῆς ἀρετῆς φέρουσι πόνοι, εἰ σὺν αὐτῇ καὶ καλοὶ, ἀνει δὲ ταύτης οὐκέτι.


ἐξασφαλίσαι ἄν τις αὑτὸν καὶ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ πάντα, εἰκὼν τις μᾶλλον ἐμφερεστάτη, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἑκείνων, οἳ περὶ τοὺς τυραννεύοντας ἰστανται καταπεφραγμένοι, ἰστανται ὄπλον ἔχοντες ἐν χεροῖς, ὡς ἄν γενναίως ἀμύνεσθαι δύναντο, εἰ τινὲς ποτε κατ’ αὐτῶν ἐλθοντε καὶ ἢδη γὰρ τοῖς δαίμοσιν ἐπειδὰν ἐπέλθωσι καθ’ ἑμῶν, ἀντεπερχομένην οὐκ ἐὰν τοῖς λήσασθαι τὰ ἐξ ἀρέτης ἢμιν περιγενόμενα κέρδη ἢν γὰρ καλῶς εὐρεθῆ ταῦτα συμπεφορημένα ἐν ταῖς καλαῖς ἀποθήκαις τῆς μετριότητος, ἀλλὰ δὴ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐκείνων, οἳ περὶ τοὺς τυραννεύοντας ἱστανται καταπεφραγμένοι, ἅπαν ὥσπερ, ὡς ἄν γενναίως ἀμύνεσθαι δύναντο, εἰτινὲς ποτε κατ’ ἀὐτῶν ἐλθοντε καὶ ἢδη γὰρ τοῖς δαίμοσιν ἐπειδὰν εἴτε τῶν ἔλθοιεν· ὡς οὖν συγχωροῦσιν ἀτρέμας ἱστασθαι ὑπερηκόντισε δὲ δορυφόρους, οἷστις προσβολαὶ καὶ μέθοδοι. Ἀπέκρυψε μὲν ὑπασπιστὰς ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη, τοὺς ἀκριβῶς τὴν τάξιν διατηρήσαντας, ἐν καιροῖς οὐ συγχωροῦσιν ἀτρέμας ἱστασθαι ὑπερηκόντισε δὲ δορυφόρους, οἷστις φιλοτιμία παρενεγκεῖν θερμότητι τε ψυχῆς, καὶ συχνῇ πείρᾳ πολέμου, ὥστε καθεύδειν οὐκ ἔξεστιν, ἐχουσὶν ἡ σχῆμα φυλάκων ὃς ἕξεστι ἐἰπεῖν τὸν περὶ ταύτης διαλεγόμενον, ὡς μὲν ἀτεχνῶς, πολύ τι κρείσσων ἐκείνων ἥδε, τῶν εἰς ἀσφάλειαν ἐξευρημένων ἀνθρώπων, ἑστι δὲ οἶς ἂν προσή ὑπερβοῦσα τοῖς κοσμοῦσα, καὶ τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἀπὸν σύνταγμα μετὰ πολλῆς σεμνότητος καὶ

200-201. σεμνότητος-μεγαλοπρεπείας] cf. Praecepta 372 C
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μεγαλοπρεπείας φαιδρύνουσα, τῷ ἕαυτῆς ἱδώματι καὶ τῷ πεφυκότι. Εἰκότως ἂν οὖν ἔχω ἐδέχαται ὅ τι τῷ ἑαυτῆς ἰδιώματι καὶ τῷ πεφυκότι. Εἰκότως ἂν οὖν δέξαιτο ὁ νῦν ἡμῖν ὑμνούμενη τὰς περὶ αὐτῆς εἰρημένας προσηγορίας ἁπάσας. Οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ, εἰ κἀκεῖνο δυνατὸν ἦν, ὅσας σεμνὰς ὅσας ἀγαθὰς, ὅσας προσφιλείς ἐξευρηκέναι καὶ προσδιδοντι τῇ μετριότητι, ἴσως μὲν ὁ τούτο ποιήσας, κατώρθωκέ τι τῶν οὐ ραδίων· τῇ δὲ τῷ Σωτῆρι συντρόφῳ, ἵν' ἀντὶ πάντων τούτων εἴπομεν, οὐδὲν προσήνεγκε μέγα· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸ μέγα τινί, μέγα ἂν εἴη καὶ πᾶσιν. Οὕτως οὖν τὶς ταύτην ὑψηλότεραν, μὴ πάνυ καλῶς ἐμπορεύσατο; Η' ποιὰν ἄλλην τῶν ἁρετῶν ἐρεῖ τινι, ὅτι δὲ καὶ πασῶν τινι φίλον ταύτην προθεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν δικαίως οἶμαι δέξατο μέμψιν.

[4a] Εγὼ δὲ ταύτην τὴν ἁρετὴν μείζων μὲν τῶν ἄλλων ὑπολαμβάνω, ἀγάπη δὲ ὡς ὑμῖν τοῖς ὑψηλοτέροις. Εἴποι δ' ἂν τις, ταύτας οὐκ ἀπεικότως ἄλλης τῶν ἁρετῶν ἔχειν γνησίως, ὡς μικροῦ ταύτων εἶναι δόξαι, οἷς γε θεωρητικότερον ὁ νοῦς ἐμβατεύει τοῖς πράγμασιν ταύτον εἶναι ὑψηλότερον. Αρχὴ γὰρ δήπου ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ τῶν ἁρετῶν ἐστὶ κύκλου, ἡ δὲ μετριότης τὸ τέλος· καὶ τῶν κύκλων, αἱ ἀρχαὶ καὶ τὰ τέλη, ταὐτόν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ ἐπειδή τὸ τοῦτο τὸν λόγον παντελῶς ἀχώριστο· καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη, καὶ τὸ μέτριον· ὡστε ὡς δὲ κἀκεῖνο σαφές· ἵνα γὰρ οὐ πάρεστιν ἡ ἑτέρα, καὶ τὴν ἑτέραν ἀπεῖναι τῶν ἀναγκαίων. Οὐκ ἔστι τοίνυν θάτερον εἶναι, ἢ νοηθῆναι κἂν ὅτι γένοιτο, θατέρου γε ἡμῶν ἐμπόρεύσῃ τὰς ἀρετὰς ταύτας ἀμείνω.
μὴ ὄντος ἢ νοουμένου· ἂν οὖν ἀπῇ τὸ ταπεινόν, καὶ τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀπεστὶ χρῆμα. 
Ταῦτας δὲ τῆς ξυνωρίδος ἀπούσης, οὐδὲ ἂν ἀπῄ τὸ ταπεινόν ἀπῆ, ποτὲ περιήχοι, ἢ τοὺς μηδεμίους ὄντως, καὶ τὰ διὰ 
κατὰ τοῦτον πάντα, τὸ γε δοκεῖν μεθ’ ἐαυτῶν ἴσους ἐχουσίν, ὥπε τὸ ἀληθῶς εἶναι. Συμβαίνει 
δὴ τὴν μὲν ἀγάπην ἀπείναι, ἂν μὴ παρῇ καὶ τὸ μέτριον· ταῦτας δὲ τῆς συζυγίας ἡμῖν 
οὐκ οὔσης, μηδεμίαν ἀρετὴν προσεῖναι, καὶ τῇ τούτων αὐ̣ ἀπουσίᾳ, μὴδὲ 
ἀρετῆς μετέχειν τὸ γε δοκεῖν περιάρχησθαι κατ’ ἀρετὴν. Ότι μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τῆς 
δὴ ἠδή γέγονεν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων.

[4b] Δεῖ δὲ ἡμᾶς τὴν μακαρίαν ἀγάπην, κρηπίδα καὶ θεμέλιον ἀσφαλές εἰδέναι, 
ἐρημειυμένην ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὄντας τὸν ἀγαθὸν ἔξη ἀπάντων, 
δικνουμένην ἐς βάθος μέγα, καὶ ὑφασκόντων ἀνεξερεύνητοι, εἰπερ τα μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ 
τοιαῦτα ἡ δὲ τοσοῦτον ἐν τῷ Θεῷ, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτοαγάπην ἐκείνον λέγεσθαι. Καὶ εἰ 
δεῖ τὸ πᾶν εἰπεῖν, συνυπολήμενος τὸ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἄθροισμα, καὶ ἀλλήλων 
ἐχονται πάσαι, ταυτής δὲ τῆς συζυγίας ἡμῖν 
οὐκ οὔσης, μηδεμίαν ἀρετὴν προσεῖναι, καὶ τῇ τούτων αὐ̣ ἀπουσίᾳ, μὴδὲ 
ἀρετῆς μετέχειν τὸ γε δοκοῦν πεπράχθαι κατ’ ἀρετὴν. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τῆς 
δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀγάπην ἀπεῖναι, ἂν μὴ παρῇ καὶ τὸ μέτριον· ταῦτας δὲ τῆς συζυγίας ἡμῖν 
οὐκ οὔσης, μηδεμίαν ἀρετὴν προσεῖναι, καὶ τῇ τούτων αὐ̣ ἀπουσίᾳ, μὴδὲ 
ἀρετῆς μετέχειν τὸ γε δοκεῖν περιάρχησθαι κατ’ ἀρετὴν. Ότι μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τῆς 
δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀγάπην ἀπείναι, ἂν μὴ παρῇ καὶ τὸ μέτριον· ταῦτας δὲ τῆς συζυγίας ἡμῖν 
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καὶ ἀξιώματος· καὶ γὰρ ἐστὶ καὶ καθ’ αὐτὴν ἁγαθὸν ἢ ταπεινοφροσύνη, καὶ θησαυρὸς ἀποδέδεικται τῶν συνελεγμένων ἡμᾶς καλῶν, εἰκὸς τῆς ἁγάπης εὐθείας πτώθων. Ὡσπερ’ ἡ ἁγαθὸς ἀξιώματος· καὶ γάρ ἐστι καθ’ αὑτὴν ἁγαθὴ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη, οὐκ ἐστὶν ἀποτυχεῖν τοῦ σκοποῦ· ἁγαθὴ μὲν γάρ ἐστι καθ’ αὐτὴν, ὡς εἰρηνικὴ τε καὶ πραοτάτη, ὁ δὴ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἱδιόν.

[4c] Ἁγαθὴ δὲ αὐτὴ καὶ ἄλλων ἠνεκὰ πλείστων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο θησαυρὸς πάντων ἔξης τῶν καλῶν καὶ εἰρηνική, καὶ ἔστι, ἐπειδή ταυτίς χωρίς, παντελῶς ἀδύνατον ὁ δῆμος· εἰ γὰρ τὴν ἁγαθὴν γεγονέναι, ἵσμεν δὲ αὐτὴν καὶ τοῦτο χορηγοῦσαν ἡμᾶς τὸ καλὸν· πρὸς γὰρ τὸν ἁγαθὸν τὸν εἰρηνικῶτατον καὶ πραότατον κηδεμόνα τε καὶ δεσπότην ἡμᾶς τὴν ταχίστην ἀναβιβάζει· ταύτην γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ὑπερφυῶς διανύσας, ἐξ ἀγάπης ἀμηχάνου κινηθείς, ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ βαράθρου τῆς γῆς ἀνήγαγεν εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, ἑπομένου αὐτῷ κατʼ ἱχνος· ἐὰν γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνῃ χωρίς ἀσφαλῶς, πῶς ὡς ὁ δῆμος καταλήψεται; Ὅτι τί μακαριώτερον γένοιτʼ ἄν; Καὶ διὰ ταῦτα, ἐὰν παραδῶ τὰς σάρκας μου ἵνα καυθήσομαι, ἁγάπη δὲ μὴ ἔχω, οὐδὲν ὑπερέχω· καὶ γινώσκειν παρὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος δεδίδαγμαι, τοῦ ἐργαζόμενος κατὰ τὸν εἰρηνικόν καὶ πραοτάτον, ἐκεῖνος τε καὶ δεσπότης ἡμᾶς τῇ καθ’ αὑτὴν ἁγαθῇ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, ὁ δὴ Θεοῦ ἐστὶν ἱδιόν.

256. ἁγαθὴν-ὡφελοῦμαι] cf. Præcepta 365C.


καὶ τὸ ἱδίον. Ἐστι μὲν ἡ ἀγάπη μήτηρ τε ἁμα, καὶ τροφός, καὶ ὦλα, καὶ κρητίς ἀντίκρους τῷ τῶν ἁρετῶν συστήματι, ἀρχή τε τοῖς οδευοντι πρὸς ἁρετὴν ἁπάσα, καὶ πλάστης, καὶ ἀλείστης, ὡς ἂν τις εἴησαι, καὶ ἀπαξεπλωῦς πάντων τοιούτων, οὐ χωρίς, οὐκ ἔνεστι γενέσθαι τι τῶν χρηστῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις ψυχαῖς· ἐστὶ δὲ ἡ ταπεινοφορύσην σίονει τις ὄδος, καὶ πέρα, καὶ ὃ τι περὶ ἄν γένοιτο ἡ νοοῦτο ἐφεσμα καὶ φυλακτήριον ἑκοβίζει πάντων ἐξ ἐς τῶν καλῶν, λήδει τε τῶν ἁρετῶν καὶ ἁνάπαυσις, καὶ σωτηρίου λιμήν, καὶ χωρίον ἁσφαλεῖς, οὐ γε δεὶ μὴ περαιτέρῳ χωρεῖν, ἀλλ’ ἐδραίους ἱσταμένους ἐνταῦθα τοὺς ἁμιστεὰς εὔφρανεσθαι, ταῖς ἐξπία τῶν ἀποκειμένων αὐτοῖς γερῶν. Καὶ μήν καὶ κατὰ τόδε, ἱσόροπος ἔστιν ἡ ἐννοιος αὐτή ὡς γὰρ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀπούσης, οὐδὲν ὑπητοῦ τῶν ἁρετῶν γένοιτο ὅπου καὶ τῆς ταπεινοφόρυσὴς ἀφετηρίας, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν παραμενεῖ τῶν τῆς ἀγάπης καλῶν, ἀλλὰ αὐτίκα σχετίζεται καταφρονώντα περὶ αὐτά, κατὰ τὰ χειμερινά τῶν ἁνθέων, ὅπερ εἰς μακρὸν ἡ λαμπρότης, καὶ τὸ εὐώδες ἄδραός, καὶ ὁ μὴ σὺν ὠρα καρπός εἰ ποῦ γε καὶ γένοιτο, καὶ τελεφυάσθῃ, ἐξίτηλος τις καὶ ἁείδης, καὶ διαφρέκτη ὑμῶν δινάμους. Ταύτης μὲν οὖν ἁμισύστειν ὅ ὁμοίων ἐστιν αὐταῖς, εἰγε θαυμέος μαθείν, ἐκεῖνο ἂν εἰς μᾶλλον πάντων ὡς ἐμοί θρόσω παράσταται περὶ τῶν." [5α] Δοκούσι μοι πτέρυγας εἶναι ἐκεῖνα τῆς καλῆς περιστεράς, δηλαδὴ τοῦ Πνεύματος, ὅν ὁ Δαβίδ ἐπεθύμησεν, ὡς πεπαχθῆναι καὶ καταπαθᾶναι. Ἀλλ’ ἴσως γε τινὲς ἡμῶν ἐπιληφθοῦνται, ὡς ἡ ἁγάπης προτεθεικῶν ἡ τῶν φόβων. Ἀπειδή 275 φασίν οἱ θείοι διδάσκαλοι, ὡς οἱ ἐυπεθεῖς ἄνδρες ἀρχόμενοι πρὸς ἁρετὴν ἀνάγεσθαι,


πάντα τού τῆς κολάσεως φόβου, ὡς ἀπὸ βαλβίδος ὀρμῶνταν εἰτά δὲ ἄλλων ὑδεύοντες λογισμῶν, καταντώσαν εἰς θαυμαστὸν τινα ἔφοβα τῶν μελλούσων ἀπολαύσεων, καὶ ταύτη γε τόν φόβον ἀποθέμενοι, τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεόν ἀγάπης ἐπιλαμβάνονταν οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἄμωρ παρείναι, ἀλλ’ ἀναγκαῖον ὑποχωρῆσαι τὸ ἔτερον, εἰ μέλλει παραγίνεσθαι θάτερον. Ταύτι μὲν οὖν ἐκεῖνοι τὰ περὶ τοῦν φιλοσοφοῦντες, καὶ πλείον καὶ καλλίω πολλῷ τῷ περιοντὶ διδάσκοντον ἐγὼ δ’ ἄν εἴπομι ταύτα πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιληψομένους ἱστοι τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλ’ ὡ τάν, σκοπεῖν κάκειν χρή ὅ γὰρ ἔμι κατοικός ἐξ ἀρχῆς περί ἀρετῶν καὶ τῆς εἰς ἀλλήλας γνησιότητος εἰπεῖν τι καὶ ἀφοσιώσασθαι ἢν, οὐ περὶ παθῶν λέγειν καὶ ἐπειδήπερ τὸν φόβον πάθος οὐκ ἔπαινεντον οἶδα τὸ καθ’ αὐτὸν, εἰ καὶ συνεργεῖ πρὸς τὰ βέλτιστα κατὰ Θεὸν γινόμενος, οὐκ ἐν τῷ χρῷ τῶν ἀρετῶν τούτων ἡζώσα τάξει. Εἰκότως οὖν σεσήγηται διὰ ταύτα.

285. Θεοῦ σοι τοῖνυν συναιρομένοιν πρὸς τοὺς υπέρ ἀρετῆς ἀθλοὺς, δεῖ γὰρ ἐκεῖνον μερίτην εἶναι σοι τώνδε τῶν πόνων εἰ μέλλεις τι κατορθώσειν. Ἐξὼν τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετᾶς, ἐκ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀρχόμενος, ἀποκεῖ ἔχων τῆς μετριότητος, δε’ ἦν ἀν σχοίης ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀγαθός γενόμενος, ἐναπομεῖναι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς εἶναι τε τούτους καὶ δοκεῖν, οἷος ἄν δέξασθαι τῇ κεφαλῆ καὶ τηρῆσαι, τοὺς τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἀνδράσιν ἀποκειμένους στεφάνους, ἀφθάρτους ὑπέρ ἄρετας, ὁμώ τὸν ἴχθυν μὲν παρέχει τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης συνεργεῖς ἀρετῆς, ἐνεργοῦντος χρῆμα· αἱ δὲ ἄλλαι ἀρεταῖ τούτων πλέκουσι, τὸ δὲ γε μέτριον ἐπιτίθησαν αἷς ἀν ἀρωμὸς ἐν τῷ στεφαλαίς· ὡστε καὶ μόνη τῶν ἀρετῶν στεφθῆτες.
ἐργάσομαι 303—305, τοῦτον ἐραστήν ταύτης θαυμάσας ἀγαθόν ἀλλὰ πράττοντας συνεὑρίσκεται τὸ μὲν γὰρ πάντως ἄγνωσι, τὸ δὲ τις βία ποιεῖ τούτων δὲ οὐδέπερον ἑστιν ἀγαθὸν, οὐκόν οὐδὲ μέτριον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μέτριον ἀγαθὸν.

[6a] Ἀλλʼ ἐρείς, ὃ φύλατε, πρὸς ἡμᾶς δίκαιον γὰρ, ὡς τὴν ταπεινοφοβίαν πολὺ βασιλεύσαι, ὧν δὴ βασιλεύσαι τεθαυμάζεται. Ὁ σοφὸς δὲ ταύτην ὑπερφηδύνεσθαι, πολὺν τὸν ταύτης ἐρώτα καὶ πρὶν ἐντετηκότα μου τῇ ψυχῇ, πολὺν γὰρ οὐδὲ ἄξιον τῶν μετέχοντός ἐστιν οἷον, ἀλλʼ οὐδὲ έκενίον γε μέτριον, οὐδὲ ἀγαθόν, τὸ ποιεῖ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἡ μηδαμίας ἐπιστάμενον, ἡ μὴ καθαρὰ προαγράφεσθαι τὸ μὲν γὰρ πάντως ἄγνωσι, τὸ δὲ τις βία ποιεῖ τούτων δὲ οὐδέπερον ἑστιν ἀγαθὸν, οὐκόν οὐδὲ μέτριον, ἐπεὶ τὸ μέτριον ἀγαθὸν.


εὑρίσκεται τοῖς ζητοῦσιν· ἐνια δέ τισι παραγίνεται, μηδ' ὄντινον υποσταί πόνον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν, καὶ μάλιστ' ὅταν ἢ τῶν καλλίστων, οὐχ οὗτα φιλεῖ γίγνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὦσιν ἡ τιμή ταυτά ὑποστᾶσι πόνον καὶ δυσπόριστα. Χρεών εἰναι σοι τοινὸν υπολαμβάνω, ὡς ὁ κατασκεύασμα ταυτίνη φοράζειν.

6b] Ἀλλὰ σοὶ μὲν, ὦ γαθέ, τοιαῦτα λέγοντι, τὸ γιγνόμενον εἰρήσεται, καὶ ἅπερ ἂν εὐδαίμονον περί σοι, ταῦτα πράξεις· τοιτ δὲ τὸ γιγνόμενον, χαλέπων ἐμοὶ λέγειν, καὶ εἰχόν γε δεικνύων τὸ δύσκολον, πολλοῖς τισιν ὀίμαι τρόποις. Τὸν κόρον δὲ βουλομένος φέουσαι, ἐφ' ὁσονδε. Εἰτέ τις μέγας ἀνήρ, Ἰωάννης τούνομα — ἢν δὲ τῶν ζώντων τῷ Θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς—, τριβῶλον ἐσκέκαι τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν. Καὶ δὴ προσαγορεῦσας αὐτὴν ταυτίνῃ, εἰτα καὶ καλῶς εἰπὼν, ἑδειξεν ἐφ' ὁσονδε. Εἶπε τις μέγας ἀνήρ, Ἰωάννης τοὔνομα — ἦν δὲ τῶν ζώντων τῷ Θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτοῖς —, τριβῶλον ἐσκέκαι τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν. Καὶ δὴ προσαγορεῦσας αὐτὴν ταυτίνῃ, εἰτα καὶ καλῶς εἰπὼν, ἑδειξεν ἐφ' ὁσονδε. Ἐρω τὸν ἐκείνου σκοπόν, ἢ τὰ ῥήματα — ἢν δὲ κατορθουμένων ἐνια ἐκείνη παρελθοῦσα κροτεῖ καὶ μετὰ βοής ἤξειρε τοῦρ γεγονὸν ἢν ἂν καὶ τῶν οὐ ῥᾳδίως κατορθομένων οὐ οὔτω φιλεῖ γίγνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅσῳ πράξητεν δοκεῖ, τοσούτῳ καὶ δυσπόριστα. Χρεών εἶναι σοι τοίνυν ὑπολαμβάνω, ὡς ὁ κατασκεύασμα ταυτίνη φοράζειν.


κρείττον οίμα, ἢ οἰαθήνη σιών τε εἶναι τοῦ γὰρ ταπεινούθαι νομίζειν τὸν ὑπερηφανιαν νοοῦντα, τι χεῖρον; Ἡ πώς ξητήσει τὴν ίασιν, ὁ μηδὲ πάσχειν ὑπολαμβάνων;

[6c] Ωστε κὰν ταπεινωθὼ πάλιν αἴρομαι, εἰδοὺς ὡς τεταπείνωμαι, καὶ ὑπερφρονήσας οὐδὲ αἰσθάνομαι κὰν γνῶ τὴν ὑπερηφανίαν εὐθύς, καὶ ἀποσοβήσω μάλα μισήσας, καὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἡ ἐμαυτὸν μέμψωμαι, οὐτ' ἀγνοήσω πάλιν ταπεινωθείς, καὶ ἡ ἐπεξεργασία τοῦ ἐμαυτὸν καταρθοῦντα· ἢ δὴ παθὼν ὡς μὴ ὄφελον, οδὴν ἡεξάμην ὁσπερ ἐν κόκλῳ κατίνημα. Ωστε τριβολὸς ἐστιν αὐτῇ, καὶ τοῦ κέντρου ὁσπίζων ἐστιν, καὶ τοὺς πολὺ τι βάρος νοῦ κεκτημένους· καὶ πολλοὺς ἂν εἶχον μάρτυρας ἀναστῆσαι τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου, αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς βεβλημένους τῷ δὲ τοῦ λόγου ἐπὶ τὸν τρόπον, ᾧ ἄν τις πρᾶξας τὸ ἀγαθὸν διαφύγοι τὸ περὶ αὑτοῦ δοξάσαι τι μέγα, καὶ τὸ μέτρια φρονήσας, μὴ ὑψωθῆναι, ὃ καὶ χαλεπῶτερον δέδεικται τοῦ προτέρου.

[7a] Δοκῶ τοίνυν μοι μίαν τὴν ὁδὸν εἶναι τὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἀναβιβάζουσα· τὸ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν δηλονότι, τὰ καλῶς πραττόμενα ἀναφέρει· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἔστιν ἑαυτοῖς τε ἀναγράφειν τὰ πεπραγμένα, καὶ λογισμοῖς κρατῆσαι τοῦδε τοῦ πάθους. Ὁ γὰρ κατορθῶσαι νομίζει σαφῶς ἡμῖν ὑπερηφανίας μεγίστης πρόφασις, ὡς ὁ λόγος ἤδη διδάξας ἔφθη. Τοῦτο δὲ τοσούτῳ κακόν, ὥστε καὶ ἐμαυτὸν μέμψωμαι τῇ ὁδῷ κατῆντηκα, ὥστε τριβόλος ἐστιν αὕτη, καὶ τὸ κέντρον ὄρθιον ἔχει, καὶ χαλεπὸν ἐκεῖνο διαφυγεῖν, καὶ τοὺς πολύ τι βάρος νοῦ κεκτημένους· καὶ πολλοὺς ἂν εἶχον μάρτυρας ἀναστῆσαι τοῦδε τοῦ λόγου, αὐτοὺς ἐκείνους τοὺς βεβλημένους τῷ δὲ τοῦ λόγου ἐπὶ τὸν τρόπον, ᾧ ἄν τις πρᾶξας τὸ ἀγαθὸν διαφύγοι τὸ περὶ αὑτοῦ δοξάσαι τι μέγα, καὶ τὸ μέτρια φρονήσας, μὴ ὑψωθῆναι, ὃ καὶ χαλεπῶτερον δέδεικται τοῦ προτέρου.
τὸν χρυσορρήμονα που διδάξει, βέλτιον σαφῶς εἶναι μὴ πράξαι τι τῶν καλῶν, καὶ ὑπὸ δίκην ἑαυτὸν μεγίστην ὑπολαμβάνειν, ἢ καταρθοῦντα οἴεσθαι τῶν Θεῶν καὶ σιχ ἐαυτῷ, εἰ μέλλει τις μετράζειν· αὕτη ἡ δόξα ἄπαντος ἀληθείας ἐς ἄκρον, καὶ ὑπερκεῖσθαι. Ὥστε λογίζεσθαι χρὴ τὰς ἀγαθὰς πράξεις τῷ Θεῷ καὶ οὐχ ἑαυτῷ, εἰ μέλλεις μετριάζειν· αὕτη ἡ δόξα καθαρεύει μὲν πλάνης ἁπάσης, ἔχεται δὲ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐς ἄκρον, κινδύνων δὲ ἐκτὸς ἕστηκε καὶ βελῶν, ἃ καθ' ἡμῶν ἀφίησιν ἡ πολυμήχανος ἔπαρσις· οὔτε γὰρ ἀπατηθῆναι, οὔτε κινδυνεῦσαι οἷόν τε, τὸν ἐφ' ὁτῷ θαρρήσαντα. ‖ Τί δὲ ἀληθέστερον τοῦ δοξάζειν εἶναι μὲν πάντων τῶν ἀγαθῶν δοτῆρα τὸν Θεόν, εἶναι δὲ πάντας ἀνθρώπους ἐκεῖθεν δεχομένους ἀγαθά; Καὶ δηλοῖ τὸ τῷ Σωτῆρι πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς εἰρημένον, ἢ ἀνθρώπων οἰς ὑπερκεῖσθαι, ἢ ἀνθρώπων οἰς ἀληθεῖστερον ἀληθεῖας, ἢ ἀνθρώπων ὑπερκεῖσθαι. ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπων ἀληθεῖστερον ἀληθεῖας.
καὶ καλὸν; Λέγω δὲ ἀνθρώπινον μὲν τὸ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥοπῆς παντάπασι ψιλὸν ὁν, Θεοῦ δὲ τὴν ἐκείνου πρὸς ἡμᾶς εὐδοκίαν· τὸ γὰρ ἐγκαταλελείφθαι, καὶ τῆς ὁργῆς αὐτοῦ πειραθῆναι ἤμετερον, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐργον Θεοῦ ἐκείνος γὰρ, ἀπείραστός ἐστιν κακῶν, πειράζει δὲ συνεδένα, κατὰ τὸν Ἀδελφόθεον. Ὡστε τὸ καλὸν ποιεῖν ἀτεχνῶς παρά Θεοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, τὸ δὲ κακῶς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως μόνης· καὶ εἰ καλῶς ποιεῖται ἀτεχνῶς παρὰ Θεοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, τὸ δὲ κακῶς ἐξ ἀνθρώπων καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως μόνῃς...
σφειλομεν, ει τις ακριβως σκοπησειε, και ουκ οιστεον τουτου χαριν, αυτων σφειλετην
ημιν καθισταναι; Τα γαρ παντα οθ Θεου, καθως οι προσθεν ημιν απεδειξαν λογου ει
γαρ τω οθτορι δοκει ειναι των φυντων αιτιων, τον παρασχοντα το στερμα, και ο
λογος ήν ου περι Θεου, αλλα περι ανθρωπων, πως ουχι των εν ημιν αγαθων παντων
tον Θεον αιτιατεν, οντα μεν δημιουργον, οντα δε κηδεμωνα, και ταμιων, και δοτηρα
παντων εξης των εις ημας αει γινομενων; Ου μην αλλ' εν γε ετι λειπεται βελος τω
υπερηφανιαν νοσουσι, και τουτο γε διεταν μεν κεκενωται γαρ αυτωις η φαρετρα,
οιν δε παρεχειν ελπιδειν ως άρα τρωσειν αφεθεν, μηδεν ισχυσαν φανη, αλλ' απρακτον εξελεγχη
tοις καθ' ημων αφιεσιν ειν αν ο λογος ουτος καλος αυτωις; Ου μην ετι λειπεται βελος
tοις νοσουσι, και τοτο γε ουσα των σπερματων φυντων αιτιων, τον παρασχοντα το
σπερμα, και ο λογος ου περι Θεου, αλλα περι ανθρωπων, πως ουχι των εν ημιν
αγαθων παντων τον Θεον αιτιατεν, οντα μεν δημιουργον, οντα δε κηδεμωνα, και ταμιων, και

dημιουργίας, οινον δε παρεχειν ελπιδειν ως άρα τρωσειν αφεθεν· ουκουν καθενον εν
tοις καθως ανθρωπων και οντων τον σπερματαν, μηδεν ετι λειπεται βελος τοις
υπερηφανιαν νοσουσι, και τοτο γε διεταν μεν κεκενωται γαρ αυτωις η
φαρετρα, οινον δε παρεχειν ελπιδειν ως άρα τρωσειν αφεθεν· ουκουν καθενον εν
tοις καθως ανθρωπων και οντων τον σπερματαν, μηδεν ετι λειπεται βελος τοις
υπερηφανιαν νοσουσι, και τοτο γε διεταν με

[8a] Ει δε δη ταμα προς τα δεινος, και τα 'κεινου προς τα σα, και όλως τα ημετερα
προς αλληλα συγκριθειη, πολυ τι το διαιρονται εν τουτοις θεωρησομεν. Επει τα μεν
eis γεννου, τα δε χρηστωτερα προς αυτων αναβιβαζε τον χωρον, εν ο φαιδροτης
εστιν αληκτος, και μακαιριων χορος περι τον Σωτηρα. Ου τοινυν των ενδεχομενων
εστιν, οτιον με αρετημαθειν· ουτωςοι εν τημεροις ανθρωπων ετι λειπεται βελος τοις
υπερηφανιαν νοσουσι, και τοτο γε διεταν μεν κεκενωται γαρ αυτωις εν
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έσεϊςι πτηνοὶ καὶ πολιτείας ἀγγελικῆς ἐπιδείκνυνται, οἱ δὲ μετὰ τῶν ὁφεὼν ἔρτουσι, καὶ ὑπερακοντίουσι τὴν αὐτῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μανίαν. Ὄταν ταῦτα τοῦτον ἔχῃ τὸν τρόπον, καὶ οἱ μὲν ὡσι κακοὶ, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἐκεῖνοις τρέχοσιν, πῶς εἰκὸς ἢστα φρονεῖν, τοὺς οὐκ ἢστα πράττονται; Ὡν γὰρ ὁ βίος διέστηκεν, οὐδὲ ἂν αἱ γνώμαι συνέλθοιεν. Ὡστε καὶ οἱ πρὸς τὰ κακὰ κεχηρότες, καὶ οἱ τῶν καλῶν ἑρασταί, σφάς γε αὐτοὺς ἐπιγνώσοντα, οἱ μὲν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀνθρώπων χείρους, οἱ δὲ γε κρείττους ἐκεῖνον ὄντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἐργῶν· τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ τοὺς μὲν ταπεινοῦσθαι, τοὺς δὲ αἰρεῖσθαι· πῶς γὰρ ἄλλως;

[8b] Εγὼ δὲ ταῦθ᾽ ἂ σὺ φῆς ὁ διαμαχόμενος μου τῷ λόγῳ, ἀγεννὴ παντάπασιν οὐκ ἂν εἴποιμη, μὴ πάνυ δὲ συνάδειν πρὸς τὸ ἐπηρέασθαι ἀπαντᾷ· οτι μὲν γὰρ διαφέρει πολλῷ τῷ μέσῳ τὰ τῷ δεινὶ πεπεραγμένα πρὸς τὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις, καὶ ὡς τὰ βελτίω καλὸν τὸν γε ποιοῦντα ἐργάζεται, καὶ αὐτὸ ὁμοίως κακὸν τὰ χεῖρον, παντὶ πον ἤδην. Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ ἀληθεῖς, ὡς ἐπιγνώσκουσι σφάς αὐτοὺς οἱ τοιοῦτοι, καὶ ὡς τοὺς μὲν ἢ γέεννα, τοὺς δὲ ὁ χορὸς ἐκδέχεται τῶν μακαρίων ἀνθρώπων. Τὸ δὲ ἐκ τούτων συμπεράσμα, ἂς τοῦτ᾽ ἐστίν ἐπαιρεῖσθαι καὶ ταπεινοῦσθαι τὸν ἀνθρώπον, τὸ εἰδέναι έαυτῶν ὅταν ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν, οὐκ ἀναγκαίον εἶναι ἡ λοιπῇ, κἀγὼν τινὶ εὐφίσκηται, συχνῇ τινὶ δουλεύοσιν πλανής ἢ γὰρ ἀναγκαίον τοῦτο, καὶ καλῶς συνεπεράνθη σοι τὰ προτεταγμένα, οὐδαμῶς ἢν ταπεινοφοβοῦσιν εὗρειν ἐν οὕδει τῶν ἀνθρώπων· πάντες γὰρ ἐπίστανται σφάς αὐτούς, καλὸν τι πράξαντας ἢ κακὸν. Καὶ εἰ τοῦτ᾽ ἢν ἐπαιρεῖσθαι τοὺς ἐν ἀρετῇ ζῶντας, τὸ σφάς αὐτοὺς ἐπιστασθαι ἢ σὺ φῆς, πάντες οἱ
γε σώφρονες ἐαυτοὺς ἐπιγνώσκοντες, πάντως ἂν μέγα ἐφόνουν, καὶ τὸ τῆς
tapetinofrosoúntas ἐξαπόλωλε χρήμα. Ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ἁγνοεῖς, ὡς τὸ ταπεινὸν
tε καὶ μέτριον ἐν οὐκ ὀλίγων εὑρίσκεται τῶν ἐν θυτικῷ τοῖς σώματι, τὴν ἀσωμάτως
προτίπουσαν πολιτείαν ὀλίγου δεῖν ἐπιδειξαμένων.

445 [8c] Ὡστε σοι ψευδές τὸ συμπέρασμα, καὶ προσέτι παντάπασιν ἄτοπον· εἰ γὰρ τοὺς
μὲν ἢ κόλασις διαδέχεται, τοῖς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὁμοίμι φαύλους, τοὺς δ’ ἀρετὴ συμπέραστας,
eἰτ’ ἐπιγνώσκας ἐαυτοὺς ἐναρέτους, οὐκ ἔνεστι τὰ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης ἐξαπόλωλε ἐν ὑπὸ, ὡς’ ἐν
ἀνθρώπως τὸν σωθησόμενον. Ἐπεί τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης μηκέτ’ ὑπὸ, οὐδ’ ἂν εἰς
dητούθεν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀτομόν, ὡς’ ἐξετιν εἰδήναι ἱπτός ἀπό τῶν πρὶν
εἰρημένων, ἀλλὰ μὴν οἱ σεσωσμένοι, καὶ τὸν τῶν ἀστημῶν ἀριθμὸν τῷ πληθεί
παρεληλύθαι. Καὶ οὐ αὐτὸς εἰρῆς, ὡς τοὺς μὲν φαύλους ἢ κόλασις, τοὺς δ’ ἐκ
χορός ἐκδέχεται τῶν μακάρων ἄνδρων. Ἡστε σοι καὶ ταῖς θέσεσι διαμάχεται, οἷς γε
δοκεῖς αὐταῖς ἐπαμύνει, καὶ γίγνεται πάντοθεν ἱπτός, ὡς ἄγαθὸν ποιεῖν καὶ
μή ὑψηλοφρονέναι ἀτομόν ἀρα σοι τὸ συμπέρασμα, καὶ κατὰ τόνδε τὸν λόγον· ἓρ
cαι καὶ πολλοὺς ἅν ἔχοις τοὺς συνεροῦντας, ἀλλ’ οὐδέν σοι πρὸς βοήθειαν ἤ τοῦτων
συμμαχία, αὐτοὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν τυχάνοιον οἱ ἐγκεκλημένοι I τῷ νυνὶ λόγῳ, ὥστ’ οὐκ
ἐξετιν εἰκίναις συλληπτοράς σοι τῶν λόγων εἶναι. Τὸ πάθος μὲν τοιάῦτα λέγουν
κράτιστον ἀπέφηνας, πρὸς ὅ γε, καὶ αὐτός σοι ταῦτα φρονῶ. Οὐ μὴν ἀγίτησον
παντελῶς τούτ’ ἂν ἐγαγόη φαίην, ὡτε μὴν αὐτὸς ἀπεδείξας γε αὐτό, εὐλόγῳ
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κρατοῦν δυνάμει, οὐκ ἀρ’ οὔδε τοὺς ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ κρατούμενος ἁθώνις γε ὅντας σὺν δική, ἡ γὰρ ἀν ἐκράτει πάντων ἔξης. Εἰεν.

[9a] Σὺ δὲ γε πάντων ἐμοί, φίλτατε, εἰ μὲν τίς σοῦ ποτε τῶν πλησίον, τὸ τῷ Θεῷ φίλον ποιεῖ, σοι δὲ μὴ τοῦτο πράττοιτο, ταπεινοφορόντει καὶ πένθει, δεὶ γὰρ εἰδέναι τῆς σαυτὸν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα καλὸν εἶναι ἢν δὲ τούναντιν δοξ, ὅθ’ ἁθώμως ξόν καὶ ἡμελημένως, σοῦ γε τὰ γάρ τὰ πάντα παρεξετάζεσθαι μὴ ὑψηλοφορόνειν οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὴν ἐκεῖνου κακίαν σπουδάει αὐτὸς γέγονας, ἀλλ’ ἀπλῶς διὰ τὰς τράχειες. Καὶ τοῦτο ὤδηλον ἐντεῦθεν οὐ γὰρ στεφανοῦσθι καίνεται τοῖς ἀνθρώπως ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν πέλας καταπτώσεως, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων κατορθωμάτων φαίνεται τοῖς, μὴ ὁμὸν τ’ εἶναι τοῦτος πρὸς ἀλλήλους παρεξετάζεσθαι, ὅσοι πρὸς τὴν ὑπερφανίαν ἀπεδώσαντο, τοὺς γὰρ ἀθλητάς ἐκεῖνους, οἷς τὸ γέφας κότινος, καὶ ὅ τ’ ἡ πάλη πρὸς αἰμα καὶ σάρκα, εἰπεν ἂν τῷ Θεῶν Ἀπόστολος. Εἰκός ἐστι καὶ παραβληθῆναι καλῶς ἀλλήλοις δείκνυς γὰρ τὸν εὐδοκημότα ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἄλλους, πλεονεκτήματα τινα ἐπιδεδειγμένα τοῖς ὀρθαλμοῖς τῶν ὀρότων, ὑμῖν δὲ σώματος φημί, καὶ γυμνάσια, καὶ πειρὰ τῶν γε τοιοῦτον ἀγωνισμότων ἢν δὲ καὶ τὸ ακριβές μὴ παράπασι τῇ ψήφῳ παρη, οὐ λιῶν εὐσκίνδυνον τὸ ἀμάρτημα οὐ γὰρ λυμαίνεται ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ὠλίγην δὲ τίνα δόξαν καὶ σβεννυμένην αὐτίκα, ἡ χαρίζεται τοῖς οὐκ ἀδείας ισως λαβείν, ἥ ἀποστερεί τυχόν, οἷς ἀποδοῦναι ταύτην προσήκεν. Ἡ Ἐκείνου δ’ οὐ τὸ πολεμεῖν πρὸς τὰς ἀρχας ἐστὶ καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, τοῦτος δὲ πώς ἢν τις ἔχοι, καὶ πρὸς τίνας ὅλως παραβαλεῖν; Πότερον πρὸς τοὺς ἀποδυσαμένους εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν αὐτοῖς ἀθλον, ἡ πρὸς εἰς.
ταυτασὶ τὰς καθ’ ἡμῶν παραταττομένας δυνάμεις;

[9b] ἈΛΛ’ ἐμοίγε δοκεῖ, μηδ’ ὁπωστιοῦν εἶναι τῶν γιγνομένων, δοξάσαι θάτερον τοῖνδε γενέσθαι οίνῳ τε εἶναι ἐχθίστους ἡμῖν, τὰς πονηρὰς λέγω δυνάμεις, εὐλογων νοεῖν τε καὶ λέγειν ἀνταγωνιστῶν δὲ τόπον ἐπέχειν τὰ πρός ἡμᾶς, οὐδαμὸς· οὔτε γὰρ ἀθάνατον, οὔτε εἰς τὸ γέρας ὁρῶν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἡμῶν ἀπλῶς καταστροφῆς ἐφίενται, καὶ τῷ ὑβρίσαν χαίρουσιν, οὐ τῷ τιμηθῆναι. Καὶ οἵδε μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς τε καὶ βάλλουσιν, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀλλήλοις ὁρῶμεθα ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· πόλεμος τοῖνυν φοβερὸς μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε κἀκείνων ἐστίν· οὐκ ἔρις, οὐδ’ ἀγών, οὐδ’ ἀθλον, ὁπόταν καταστροφῆς ἐφίενται, καὶ τῷ ὑβρίσαν χαίρουσιν, οὐ τῷ τιμηθῆναι. Καὶ οἵδε μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς τε καὶ βάλλουσιν, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀλλήλοις ὁρῶμεθα ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· πόλεμος τοῖνυν φοβερὸς μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε κἀκείνων ἐστίν· οὐκ ἔρις, οὐδ’ ἀγών, οὐδ’ ἀθλον, ὁπόταν καταστροφῆς ἐφίενται, καὶ τῷ ὑβρίσαν χαίρουσιν, οὐ τῷ τιμηθῆναι. Καὶ οἵδε μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς τε καὶ βάλλουσιν, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀλλήλοις ὁρῶμεθα ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· πόλεμος τοῖνυν φοβερὸς μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε κἀκείνων ἐστίν· οὐκ ἔρις, οὐδ’ ἀγών, οὐδ’ ἀθλον, ὁπόταν καταστροφῆς ἐφίενται, καὶ τῷ ὑβρίσαν χαίρουσιν, οὐ τῷ τιμηθῆναι. Καὶ οἵδε μὲν ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοῦς τε καὶ βάλλουσιν, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἀλλήλοις ὁρῶμεθα ἀνταγωνιζόμενοι· πόλεμος τοῖνυν φοβερὸς μεταξὺ ἡμῶν τε κἀκείνων ἐστίν· οὐκ ἔρις, οὐδ’ ἀγών, οὐδ’ ἀθλον, ὁπόταν καταστροφῆς ἐφίενται, καὶ τῷ ὑβρίσαν χαίρουσιν, οὐ τῷ τιμηθῆναι.
ἀγωνιζομένους, καὶ κριτᾶς εἶναι, καὶ δικαιοῦντας ἑαυτοὺς κατὰ τῶν πλησίον· ἀλλ' ἐδει γε τὸν κρινοῦντα τοὺς αθλητάς, ἐτερ' ἐπιτρέψαι τούτους ενάρξασθαι. Συ δ', ὦ τᾶν, ἀρκεῖς καὶ ἀμφοτέρος τοῖς σχήμασι, καὶ κάθη μὲν ἀγωνοθέτης αὐτόκλητος, διαγωνιζὴ δὲ πρὸς τὸν οὐκ ἀποδυσάμενον ἐπὶ σέ, περιτίθης δὲ σου τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν στέφανον ταῖς αὐτοῦ χερσὶ σεμνυνόμενος· καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνῃ σαυτὸν κοσμῶν αἴσχιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, εἴγε καὶ κόσμον δεῖ καλεῖν, ὧ γε τις ἑαυτὸν κοσμεῖ ἐξω τοῦ προσήκοντος καὶ τοῦ γενομένου, ἀλλὰ μὴ προπηλακισμὸν ἀντικυρ. 505

Καίτοι, τίς ἄξιον ἡγήσαιτ' ἂν αὑτὸν εἶναι, εὐθύνει τε καὶ στεφανοῦν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ὁμογενῶν, ὁ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ προσήκει πάντες ἂν φαῖεν; Κριτὴς μὲν γὰρ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἀγῶσι καὶ φαινομένοις, ἐκεῖνος ἄν οἶμαι γέ γενοιτο, ὁ πεῖραν ἔχων τῶν τοιούτων ἀκραβή, καὶ πολλῷ τῶν ἀγωνιζομένων ἀμείνω αὑτῇ γὰρ ἡ δόξα, τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὸν τοῦ κρίνειν θρόνον ἀναβιβάσει. Ἐν δὲ τοῖς πνευματικοῖς καὶ μὴ φαινομένοις, ἀγωνοθέτης τε καὶ κριτὴς ὁ Σωτῆρ ἐστι μόνος. Καὶ ἀποδεικνύναι τοῦτο πειρασθαι, περίεργον, καὶ τυφλῷ δῆλον φησί. Καὶ ταῦτ' εἰδὼς ὁ θεῖος Ἀπόστολος, ἐκεῖνον ἀφῆκε τὸν λόγον· ὥστε καλόν τε καὶ ἀσφαλές μόνῳ τῷ Σωτῆρι διδόναι τὸ πάντας κρίνειν, καὶ ἀλλήλοις ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς παρεξετάζειν· ἐπεί δ' ὡς ἐγωγ' ἂν φαίην, διὰ πάντων ἀποδέδεικται, μηδένα δεῖν ὑψηλοφρονεῖν, εἰ καὶ τῶν ἐς ἄκρον ἀφιγμένων, καὶ πρὸς αὐτά τὰ τέρματα πάσης ἀρετῆς εἴη· καὶ τοῦτ' ἄν οἶμαι ὑπέρεται τ' ἂν αὐτὸν εἶναι, εὐθύνει τε καὶ στεφανοῦν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ὁμογενῶν, ὁ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ προσήκει πάντες ἂν φαῖεν; 510

Κριτὴς μὲν γὰρ ἀγωνοθέτης αὐτόκλητος, διαγωνιζὴ δὲ πρὸς τὸν οὐκ ἀποδυσάμενον ἐπὶ σέ, περιτίθης δὲ σου τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν στέφανον ταῖς αὐτοῦ χερσὶ σεμνυνόμενος· καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνῃ σαυτὸν κοσμῶν αἴσχιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, εἴγε καὶ κόσμον δεῖ καλεῖν, ὧ γε τις ἑαυτὸν κοσμεῖ ἐξω τοῦ προσήκοντος καὶ τοῦ γενομένου, ἀλλὰ μὴ προπηλακισμὸν ἀντικυρ. 515

Καίτοι, τίς ἄξιον ἡγήσαιτ' ἂν αὑτὸν εἶναι, εὐθύνει τε καὶ στεφανοῦν ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ὁμογενῶν, ὁ δὲ μόνῳ τῷ Θεῷ προσήκειν πάντες ἂν φαίεν; Κριτὴς μὲν γὰρ ἀγωνοθέτης αὐτόκλητος, διαγωνιζὴ δὲ πρὸς τὸν οὐκ ἀποδυσάμενον ἐπὶ σέ, περιτίθης δὲ σου τῇ κεφαλῇ τὸν στέφανον ταῖς αὐτοῦ χερσὶ σεμνυνόμενος· καὶ οὐκ αἰσθάνῃ σαυτὸν κοσμῶν αἴσχιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων, εἴγε καὶ κόσμον δεῖ καλεῖν, ὧ γε τις ἑαυτὸν κοσμεῖ ἐξω τοῦ προσήκοντος καὶ τοῦ γενομένου, ἀλλὰ μὴ προπηλακισμὸν ἀντικυρ. 520


502. καθίσαι] καθεσθῆναι L — 505. τοῖς σχήμασι] αὐτοῖς συνιστανόντων] 2 Cor. 10:12

πάς ὁστισοῦν υγιαίνων, υγιῶς ἔχειν ὁμολογήσειν. ¶

[10] Ἡστημι τὸν λόγον ἐνθάδε, τοσοῦτον ἐπειπών· κἂν ἃς λίαν σπουδαίοι τινὲς ἀνθρώποι, μήτε τῶν ἄλλων καταγελάτωσαν, μήθ' ἕαυτος παρατίθηος ἀγαθοῦς εἶναι. Ὁ γὰρ ἀνακρίνων μὲ φησίν, ὁ Θεὸς ἐστιν· ὃς οἶδε μὲν τὰ πάντα ἀκριβῶς, οὗ δίδωσι δὲ τὰ γέφρα, εἰ παρελήλυθε τις τοὺς ἄλλους τρέχον, ἀλλ' οίς γε ἐξεγένετο καταλαβεῖν ἐκείνον τὸν χώρον, ὡς τὰ βραβεῖα ἔστηκε, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ βασιλείου θρόνου καθήμενος ὁ Σωτήρ ἡμῖν, στεφοθέτην ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἀριστεῦσι παρέχει. Αὐτὸς σου τὴν φίλην κεφαλῆν, ὡς συμβασιλεῦ τε καὶ παι, οὗ μόνον ἐνταυθός στεφανῶσαι, ἀλλὰ κάκει τῷ καλῷ στεφάνῳ τῶν μακαρίων, ὑπὲρ οὗ καὶ τοὺς πολλοὺς, οὐκ οἶδα δ' οὕτως καὶ καλοὺς, ἀγώνας τούτους ἑνεστησάμην.


524. Ὅ-ἐστιν] 1 Cor. 4:4 — 524-527. ὃς οἴδε-παρέχει] cf. 1 Cor. 9:24-25

522. τοσοῦτον] τοὺς' V — σπουδαίοι] ἐναρέτηοι V — 524. πάντων BVLPG — 528. στεφανάσατε BILPG
[1] Taiv' ἡμί, ὁ φίλτατε, σὴν χάριν εἰρήνην, καὶ τὸ πείσαν εἰρηκέναι, φίλτρον ὑπερφυές. Εἰ μὴ γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἦν, οὐκ' ἀν ὑπὲρ τῆς ὀψελείας τῆς σῆς πρὸς τούτοι τὸν ἀγώνα ἀπεδευσάμην, οὐδ' ἀν διήρκεσέ μοι τὸ προθυμεῖσθαι μετὰ τοσάττης ἀκμῆς ἀχρὶ τέλους ἀλλ' ἢ τὴν πρώτην ἂν εὐθὺς ἀπετηθῆναι, συχνῶν μοι τῶν προσυπατήσιμων ἐπικειμένων, ἢ περὶ τὰ μέσα ποιν, ἀλλατηθήσασι τῶν δεινῶν ὕψουμ. Εἰ δὲ μοι τὸν ἀθλὸν τούτον ἦδον γενέσθαι, καὶ τῶν πόνων ἄξιον, ὁ καλῶς εἰβῆσθαι, σοῦ γ' ἐθέλοντος, εἰ γὰρ αὐτῶς τὰς παρατάσεις ἐκείνας, καὶ ὁσα δὴ τοῖς λόγοις τούτους ἐμπεριείλημαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν ἠδον σου διακόσμησιν, οὐκ ἀτιμάσαι βουλεύσαι ἀλλὰ τιμήσας μὲν ἡμᾶς τοὺς γεγεννηκότας, καὶ τοὺς εἰ ἄν ἡμεῖς ἐφυμέν, τιμήσας δὲ σαυτόν καὶ τοὺς παιδευτὰς ἀπάντας, ἐν τῷ τοῦτῳ καὶ μόνῳ, τῷ μὴ χείρῳ τῶν ἐλπίδων φαντάζι, ἀς δὴ πάντες ἔφεσαν περὶ γε τὰ βελτίων μαντεύονμεν, ἐτι τῶν παῖδων ἀθύροντος. Εἰ τοῖνυν ταῦτα γένοιτο, συναιρομένου Θεοῦ, τὸ τε λοιπὸν τῆς ἐμῆς ζωῆς, ἢδον — πὼς οἰε; κατασκευάσεις, καὶ λαμψοὺς μοι τοὺς μισθοὺς ἀποδοτεῖς.

15 [2a] Οὐχ ὡς ποτὲ τοινὶ τῶν ἵδρωτων, ἀλλ' καὶ τοῦ παρ' ἡμῶν φύσιν, καὶ τοῦ τραφήναι βασιλικώς, καὶ πεπαιδεύσασι, καὶ τετιμήθησι, καὶ ἀπλώς τῶν ὑπὲρ σοῦ καὶ πεπραγμένων ἔξης ἀπάντων, οὐκ ὀλίγων ἰσως ὄντων, οὐδὲ σιμιρῶν. Ταυτι μὲν σοῦ εἴπερ ἐφήν έκβησθαι, εἰ κατὰ τὰς ἐλπίδας ἡμίν ὀφθήσῃ ὀφθήσει δὲ πάντως, εἰ τοῖς ὑπὲρ σοῦ λεγομένωι τούτως ὑποτεταχθαί θελῆσαις, καὶ δείξαις ἔργοις αὐτοῦς, τὸν ως ἀληθῶς ὑπακούοντα: καὶ τοῦτο γένοιτο τάγαθον, καὶ τῇ τῶν τρόπων ἀρετῇ, μὴ
κατασχύνῃς μου τὰς εὐχὰς καὶ τὰς παραινέσεις.
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[2b] Εὖ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ Θεῷ καὶ τοις ἀνθρώποις προσφελῆς ἐσθ. ἣ καὶ τὸ βασιλεύειν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπων ὄντι, ο δὴ δυσχερές ποιεῖ τὸ ὁμοφυές, ἡσυχαστά ἂν σοι γένοιτο πάντως, καὶ πρὸς καλὸν καὶ εὐκλειάν ἀποβῆσαι ὅ γὰρ γονεύσῃ πειθόμενος, δηλοντι καὶ Θεῷ τῷ δὲ τοιούτῳ ἀρχοντι, δικαίως ἂν ἔσῃ, ὅτι καὶ ἐποίησάς τις τὸ βασιλεύειν ἀνθρώπων ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι, ὃ δὴ δυσχερὲς ποιεῖ τὸ ὁμοφυές, ῥᾷστα ἂν σοι γένοιτο πάντως, καὶ πρὸς καλὸν καὶ εὐκλειάν ἀποβήσεται· ὁ γὰρ γονεύσῃ πειθόμενος, δηλοντι καὶ Θεῷ· τῷ δὲ τοιούτῳ ἄρχοντι, δικαίως ἂν οἱ ὑπ' αὐτὸν πείθοιντο· τὸ δὲ τούτους ἄγεσθαι κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνου σκοπόν, πᾶν ἀγαθὸν ἐργάζεται, ὅπερ οὖν καὶ τοὐναντίον, τὸ μὴ πειθέσθαι. Μὴ δὴ τηνάλλως ἡμᾶς ἀποφήναις, τοὺς ὑπὲρ σοῦ λόγους τούτους ἀναλωκότας, μηδὲ ζήτει τοῦθ' εὑρεῖν ἐν εὐμοί, τὸ ποιῆσαι τέ φήμι καὶ διδάξαι· ἴσμεν γὰρ οὖν γὰρ ἡμᾶς αὐτούς, οὐκ ὄντας γε τοιαύτης δυνάμεως.


32-33. ἰερεύνας-καθήδρας] cf. Matth. 23:2


472
ἔχοντος, ἄρχων ὁ πατήρ ἐστὶ τῷ παιδί, καὶ δεσπότης, εἰς αὐτής τῆς φύσεως. Ταῦτα δὲ ἴμιν ο Θεός. Εἰρήνηδω δὲ πως καὶ φανερώτερον τί οὖν δή τα τοῦ Θεοῦ πρὸς ἡμᾶς; Οὐ δημιουργός; οὐ πατήρ; οὐ βασιλεύς; οὐ προνοητής; οὐ διδάσκαλος; Ταυτὶ δὲ πάντα κἀμοὶ πρόσεστιν, ὅσα τὰ πρὸς σέ.

ἐκ τοῦ θρόνου κάθημαι, τοῦ τὸν Θεοῦ εἰκονίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας· αὕτη δέ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλάττων, καὶ μηδεὶς καταγνώτω τόλμης, μηδ' αὐθαδείας· οὐ γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν πρὸς τὸν θεοπτῆν συγκρίνω —πόθεν; ἄπαγε—, τὰς δὲ καθέδρας ἁπλῶς. Καὶ σκοπῶμεν ἀκριβέστερον, εἰ δοκεῖ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ θεόθεν ἀμφοτέροις τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐμοί τε λέγω καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ —καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος, ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος—, ταυτὶ δὲ πάντως ὤστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου κάθημαι, τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν εἰκονίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας· αὕτη δέ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλάττων, καὶ μηδεὶς καταγνώτω τόλμης, μηδ' αὐθαδείας· οὐ γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν πρὸς τὸν θεοπτῆν συγκρίνω —πόθεν; ἄπαγε—, τὰς δὲ καθέδρας ἁπλῶς. Καὶ σκοπῶμεν ἀκριβέστερον, εἰ δοκεῖ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ θεόθεν ἀμφοτέροις τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐμοί τε λέγω καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ —καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος, ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος—, ταυτὶ δὲ πάντως ὤστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου κάθημαι, τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν εἰκονίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας· αὕτη δέ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλάττων, καὶ μηδεὶς καταγνώτω τόλμης, μηδ' αὐθαδείας· οὐ γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν πρὸς τὸν θεοπτῆν συγκρίνω —πόθεν; ἄπαγε—, τὰς δὲ καθέδρας ἁπλῶς. Καὶ σκοπῶμεν ἀκριβέστερον, εἰ δοκεῖ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ θεόθεν ἀμφοτέροις τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐμοί τε λέγω καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ —καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος, ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος—, ταυτὶ δὲ πάντως ὤστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου κάθημαι, τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν εἰκονίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας· α郤δέ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλάττων, καὶ μηδεὶς καταγνώτω τόλμης, μηδ' αὐθαδείας· οὐ γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν πρὸς τὸν θεοπτῆν συγκρίνω —πόθεν; ἄπαγε—, τὰς δὲ καθέδρας ἁπλῶς. Καὶ σκοπῶμεν ἀκριβέστερον, εἰ δοκεῖ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ θεόθεν ἀμφοτέροις τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐμοί τε λέγω καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ —καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος, ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος—, ταυτὶ δὲ πάντως ὤστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου κάθημαι, τοῦ τὸν Θεὸν εἰκονίζοντος, οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς τε καὶ Φαρισαῖοι, ἐπὶ τῆς Μωσέως καθέδρας· α郤δέ, τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐλάττων, καὶ μηδεὶς καταγνώτω τόλμης, μηδ' αὐθαδείας· οὐ γὰρ ἐμαυτὸν πρὸς τὸν θεοπτῆν συγκρίνω —πόθεν; ἄπαγε—, τὰς δὲ καθέδρας ἁπλῶς. Καὶ σκοπῶμεν ἀκριβέστερον, εἰ δοκεῖ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ θεόθεν ἀμφοτέροις τὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἐμοί τε λέγω καὶ τῷ Μωσῇ —καὶ γὰρ κἀκεῖνος, ἡγεμὼν καὶ διδάσκαλος—, ταυτὶ δὲ πάντως ὤστ' ἐγὼ μὲν ὅπερ εἶπον, ἐπὶ τοῦ θρό

---


50-51. ταυτί-έξουσία] cf. 1 Petr. 5:11; Matth. 28:18 — 51. βασιλεία-ήγεμονίας] cf. Aristotelem, Política 1272a.8, 1285b.18,1286b

Πατράσι δὲ ἀπειθεῖν, ἕνι μὲν, σπάνιον δὲ, καὶ βεβοημένων ἀνθρώπων, οὐ νοὺν καὶ τρόπους ἀγαθούς κεκτημένων· ἀλλὰ ταυτηνὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ τὸν θρόνον, οἷσθα μὲν εὐ οἶδα καλῶς· νουνεχῆς τε γὰρ ἀνήρ, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας καὶ στοργῆς τῆς πρὸς τοὺς γεγενηκότας ἡμᾶς, λογίσασθαι σε τὸ εἰκός, εὐχερές ἐστιν οἴμαι. Ἀμήχανον δὲ συν ἀκριβῶς εἰδέναι, ὥσπερ ἡ πατρότητι ἕστιν νίκη, τὸν μηδέπω γεγονότα πατέρα· τῷ γὰρ τῶν πραγμάτων γεγευσθαί, βέλτιον ἐκεῖνα γινώσκομεν, ή τῷ λογισμῷ ἐξετάζειν. Δοιᾶ σοι δὲ Θεός, καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς πράγμασιν ως τάχιστα ἐπιγνώναι, τί ποτὲ πατήρ ἐστι πρὸς τοὺς παιδας· ὃ καὶ ἐλπίζω, καὶ εὔχομαι, καὶ ταῖς ἐλπίσιν εὐφραίνομαι, καὶ σοῦ γε μᾶλλον ως οἴμαι. Δός δὴ πάντα, ὦ φίλτατε, εὐδαίμονά με νομίζειν· ὥσπερ τῷ καλὸν φῦσαι καὶ ἀγαθόν, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῷ παιδεύσαι, καὶ τοιοῦτον ἀποφηναί βασιλέα τὸν υἱόν, οἷον ἂν οἱ νουνεχεῖς τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν, εὐξαίμντο.

63. νουνεχῆς-ἀνήρ] cf. Oratio funebris 153.6
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