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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The best way to introduce Lysias will be, perhaps, to state that he needs no introduction, at least no introduction to the world of classicists. Indeed Lysias has been esteemed and held high in honor among classical scholars all days. He was known to the ancients; he is known to the moderns; and by both ancients and moderns is respected and loved. Of old in the mind of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and in the judgment of the Greek and Roman critics, Lysias was the greatest representative of the plain style in prose composition. Today in the writings of Jebb and Devries, Blass and Bruns; as well as in the commentaries of a small army of less renowned scholars, Lysias is the canon of most characteristics which are good.

There is no need to prove here the rank of Lysias "The Second Demosthenes", no need to postulate Lysias' artistry of rhetoric. Other students in Lysias have done not alone this, but have enlarged on, and and handed down through the written page, their respective animadversions of each and every rhetorical device and characteristic of Lysias. Here rather, we are concerned with the characters of Lysias, for they are the material object of this thesis. The purpose of this thesis is to portray and present in the formal light of comparison and contrast with the characters of Homer and Theophrastus the characters of Lysias.

The plan of the work may well be unfolded here. After a through examination of the manner of character delineation used by Lysias, there will be investigated the reason he employed such a method and the results
he obtained from it. Then will be presented these typical characters, arranged in the order of frequency of appearance in Lysias' speeches, depicting one individual character as the foremost model of particular traits, yet, at the same time, pointing out similar traits in other personages of the speeches. Mantitheus, for example, is the typical example of the Patriotic Man. Now, although the consideration of the Patriotic Man will deal chiefly with Mantitheus, none the less references will be made to the speaker in On The Property Of Eraton and to the defendant in Defense Against A Charge Of Taking Bribes. The process will then be to compare the character with some famous personages of the story told by Homer, or to contrast such a character with any or several characters of Theophrastus. If, indeed, there is found a remarkable contrast between the characters of Homer and Lysias it shall certainly be recorded. In the summary and conclusion will be offered an estimate of what it has meant for a student of Lysias to see the figures of Lysias' orations, whom he has come to love, coupled with the mythical heroes of the bard Homer, and with the men of many foibles who clown, and cower, and vaunt, and pout on the boards in Theophrastus' comedy of manners.

Ethopoia is Lysias' greatest weapon, his style's most valuable attribute. It has urged and impelled his style as has no other property. It graces his every extant speech. Ethopoia is an unusual ability of grasping and delineating character. By character is meant the combination of qualities distinguishing any person or class of persons.

The definition of Ethopoia offered by ancients and moderns agrees with the one stated above. Dionysius, representative of the ancients,
evinces that Ethopoiia at once involves the thought, (διάνοια) i.e., the sense or meaning of a thing; the speech, (λέξις) i.e., the way of speaking or diction and the composition, (συνθέσις) i.e., the compounding of the διάνοια and the λέξις. Dionysius further states that these three always suit those to whom they are ascribed. With K. C. Müller we have no difficulty in concluding that Ethopoiia was delineation of character to Dionysius. We again quote Dionysius:

Μόνον δὲν οὔπότις άρα διάνομένους καὶ λόγους καὶ μέτρια τοὺς λέξιν
καὶ ἑπιτείκης καὶ μέτρια τοὺς λέξιν
καὶ θείων τῶν θρων τοὺς
λόγους ἀλλὰ καὶ θείων λέξιν ἀποφιλωμένοις
τοῖς
τοῖς
θεσίν οἰκεῖαν.

Mr. K. C. Müller, commenting on the attributes of the rhetoric of Lysias, says:

Lysias distinguished with the accuracy of a dramatist, between the different characters into whose mouths he put his speeches, and made everyone, the young and the old, the rich and the poor, the educated and the uneducated, speak according to his quality and condition: this is what the ancient critics praise under the name of Ethopoiia.

William L. Devries, much quoted for his work on the Ethopoiia of Lysias, defines his term as:

a dramatic delineation of character, especially as displayed in speeches written for court by a logographer, who has studied and depicted in the thought, language, and synthesis of the oration, the personality of the client who delivers the speech.

It is apparent, therefore, that Ethopoiia is a proprium exclusively neither of figures of speech nor of figures of thought. Indeed, Ethopoiia is a tie which knots these categories of figures. Is there a clear distinction between Ethopoiia and kindred figures? Ethos, if it is distinct at all,
is scarcely distinct from Ethopoia. There is a philosophical ethos and an oratorical ethos, of which two the former is that universal figure which is at once a spur to virtue and a preventive from sin. It is the ethos commended in the third book of the Republic where Plato argues as to what types of characters qualify as worthy paragons for the youth of the republic. Oratorical ethos is the medium quod by which is made the adaption of the oration to the orator, the audience, and the circumstances of the oration. The oratorical ethos, therefore, involves the race, family, age, principles, lot and pursuits of the persons involved. The ethos involves race, since the speaker will form his oration according as he is a foreigner or compatriot, Jew, Syrian, or Spartan. Age is involved for it is necessary that the language of youth be placed on the tongue of youth, that the language of the aged be placed on the tongue of the aged. Also are not the principles and lot of the character included, since by very nature the speaker differs from his neighbor, being, for example, successful in life or non-successful? The pursuits of the speaker are considered, since a horse-dealer, a rake, a senator, a saint differ in manner of speech.

τὸ πρέπον is appropriateness, and is almost interchangable with ethos. Both figures demand that the oration befit the speaker, audience, and subject matter. Some authors distinguish Ethopoia, saying Ethopoia is a division of, is in subordinate relation to τὸ πρέπον. These authors take Ethopoia in the favorite sense wherein it is limited to the personality of the speaker.

Ethopoia is a delineation, if one may so speak, of the inner and outward character of the speaker. ἑυαρπεια is vividness. What has happened? What are the facts of the case? It is the business of ἑυαρπεια to imprint
these facts so graphically on the senses of the audience as to win the
cardinal points of his case, and, through conversation with
him, grasping such thoughts and expressions as seemed most natural to the
cardinal points of his case, and, through conversation with
him, grasping such thoughts and expressions as seemed most natural to the
client's lips, and finally of ingeniously uniting all of this in a speech
wherein the logographer's art was concealed. Admittedly in this art Lysias
had no rival. To Lysias came the clever, attractive, patriotic, Mantitheus;
came the mother of Diogeiton, pleading for her sons; came the betrayed
husband, noble in his cloak of moral dignity; indeed, to Lysias came many,
many clients whose personalities were worldwide in their differences. They
sought, all of them, a speech, a plea, by which to hold fast to their possessions, or to their lives, or to their honor. So well did Lysias the logographer do his work, so cleverly did he wield the weapon Ethopoia, so nicely did he fit the sentiments of the client to the individual case, so clearly did he express the plea, so easily did he emphasize the personality of the client, that the modern reader, on reading, forgets, as of old the assembled Greeks forgot, on hearing, the logographer, and thinks only of the speaker.

To describe the means of character delineation used by Homer is not easy, since the mode of representation varies almost with the individual character. Objectivity in character is common to Homer and Lysias. Like the logographer Homer is left out of the picture. Homer is but a name; we say Homer, and we mean the Iliad and the Odyssey.

By different critics and scholars the personages of Homer have been claimed respectively as genuine historical figures, as gods walking the earth in the likenesses of men, as heroes of ancient folktale. It is not easy to say who of the critics are correct; perhaps a union of the three is more truly the proper solution. At any rate Homer did not originate all the personalities who crowd his living canvas. Surely the wrath of Achilles was before Homer. Pre-Homeric bards possessed many a character of the Iliad and of the Odyssey. Tradition placed them on the tongue of the blind singer. (Was there, perhaps, an Achilleid, and did Homer make use of it?) Certainly Homer had little opportunity to do any original work in depicting the characters of the traditional heroes, for Homer would not have been allowed by the folk to change at will the characters of their gods and heroes. The characters of Homer, therefore, are primarily the gift of tradition.
Some few characters are developed in a negative rather than in a positive way. Helen, for example, is the Beauty of the poems, yet Homer nowhere attempts to describe her beauty in detail, but impresses it on his audience merely by showing the bewitching effect of her presence upon others. Even the sage old Trojans fall under the spell of her divine bewitchery, and when they see her coming upon the walls, softly speak winged words one to another.

Small blame it is that the Trojans and the well-greaved Acheans should for such a woman long time suffer hardships; marvellously like is she to the immortal goddesses to look upon.7

Homeric epithet has helped much to distinguish characters. In a single word Homer may present a personage, or offer a new view of a personage, or throw a new slant of thought upon a personage antecedently little known. If the scholars of today could penetrate the inner sanctum of the consecrated meanings of the homeric epithets, truly they would see visions and dream dreams as yet undreamed of. So well were the homeric epithets fashioned that, frequently enough, they stood alone, needing no substantive. Zeus, for example, is θεός; Athene is προφήτης; Achilles is ποιητής; Hector, with the creation of whom many able critics credit Homer, has twenty seven different telling epithets in the Iliad alone.

Other characters are delineated by a gradual unfolding, as is Achilles whose personality is the story of the Iliad. Others are described by the direct speech of fellow characters. Yet no matter what the mode of delineation, each character, representing neither a type nor an abstract idea but a living tangible person, seems to live his own life, to speak his own mind, to act from his own volition. Finally, each figure has some trait
so singularly his own that no other poet, no sculptor, no painter can better
distinguish character by features than Homer has by manners.

Of Theophrastus and Theophrastus' method there is not much to say.
Theophrastus succeeded Aristotle as head of the peripatetic school. He was
both philosopher and rhetorician, and it was as both philosopher and
rhetorician that he originated his characters.

By Theophrastus' time the Golden Age of Athens had become well
tarnished. The glory that had been Athens' was no more. The fellow citizens
of Theophrastus had had a glorious past, but had no present glories. They
were forced out of the macrocosm of international controversies into the
small world of municipal men. The Greek studied his own neighbors; the
municipality analyzed its own members. Mingling in such a society, and to
give pleasure to that society, and to impart learning to the members of his
school, Theophrastus wrote the Characters.

Theophrastus was a teacher of rhetoric. The pupils who came to hear
Theophrastus were the finished products of the school of ethics. In ethics
the student learned the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean (Virtue was the
mean), and had defined terms of conduct. In the school of rhetoric the pupils
engaged in descriptions of characters, devoting time especially to the
illustration and definition of character delineation in the equipment of an
orator. The class-work in rhetoric was the union of character delineation and
moral philosophy. Theophrastus always picked his characters from real life.
He found his character in the agora, perhaps watched him in his home, per-
chance dined with him, certainly judged and classified him, and then sketched
him for his class. Each character sketch consisted of a collection of traits
falling under a particular epithet, and was preceded by a definition of the
corresponding noun.

Boorishness is a clownish ignorance of propriety. The Boor is the sort of person who will take a drench and then go into the Ecclesia. He swears that garlic is sweeter than any perfume; he wears shoes too big for his feet; he talks loud.11

Of course Theophrastus enumerates many more traits than these under each head. His is indeed a simple enough method, objectively executed. The author is out of it.

The Characters of Theophrastus were begotten of the Aristotelian doctrine of the mean, a perfectly defined method and a perfectly defined set of terms, and of a municipality of the most active social sense, whose ideals were in the past, whose thoughts were in the present, whose minds were wholly occupied with the question how to live comfortably, conformably, and, if possible, elegantly.12
NOTES ON CHAPTER I
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CHAPTER II
PRESENTATION OF THE CHARACTERS OF LYSIAS

Of all the characters who speak in the orations of Lysias the one most dear to the hearts of the students of Lysias is Mantineus. Mantineus came to Lysias as a client when Lysias was already a reputed logographer of ten years standing. Mantineus wanted a speech. Asserting his right of citizenship, desirous of serving the state in an official capacity, Mantineus had presented himself as a nominee or aspirant for the Senate. In Greece, custom called for the retiring senators to sanction the abilities of the new candidates. Mantineus, thereupon, found his right challenged, either on the ground that he had served as a cavalry man during the reign of the Thirty, or, at least, on the ground that his name was inscribed on the official list as one who had so served.

Lysias heard Mantineus through and bethought himself some thoughts. Certainly to have served the Thirty in any capacity whatsoever was considered after the expulsion of the Thirty, a sin serious enough to make one morally unfit to hold public office. In the eyes of the outgoing senators Mantineus was morally unfit to hold public office. Again Lysias bethought himself of the Athenian juries. Factual proofs were not always sufficient to persuade these juries, numbering as they did anywhere from two hundred to six thousand men. Lysias might have taken a chance. He might have offered the three factual proofs which he had as a means to clear Mantineus' title to the senatorship. The logographer saw his opportunity. He himself was struck by the personality of Mantineus, and he would use this personality as an antidote to his apparent moral unfitness; he would fling it, as a
bulwark of support for his weak factual proofs, upon the emotions of the men of the jury. So Lysias determined to let Mantitheus tell his story in his own straightforward way.

As the plea is delivered and Mantitheus' personal history unrolled, the defendant is seen as a brother, almost too kind, almost too benevolent, almost too sympathetic to his sister and brothers. He is outstanding by reason of his conduct; his decorum is such as to prevent his being classed with those who dice or drink or further dissipate themselves in the excesses of youth. Nor has Mantitheus been involved in trials before. On the other hand, he is the bravest of the brave, the first to charge, the last to retreat. His soldiership has been above reproach. Mantitheus is, perhaps, too eager in putting himself forward; too confident in his own glories; but he is only the more lovable. He himself tells us:

In every other campaign or outpost I have never once failed in my duty, but have adhered throughout to my rule of marching out in the first rank and retreating in the last. Surely it is by such conduct that one ought to judge who are the aspiring and orderly subjects of the State....

In the speech of the confident Mantitheus the reader is struck by his (Mantitheus') bluff, unapprehensive personality, by his fearless good nature, by his candor. Not alone in scattered phrases of his speech are these above-mentioned qualities found; rather they are the constant tone and attitude of the speaker. Mantitheus never wavers for a moment; not for a moment does plain, clear, precise expression desert him. In the analysis of Mantitheus' defense there is found in the initial sentences that note without which Mantitheus would not be Mantitheus,—the note of confidence. Not only does the speaker not rail against his persecutors, as defendants
usually did in those days, but he speaks words of gratitude. He says that he is almost grateful (πολλὰ ἡν αὐτοῖς χάριν εἰχοι ταύτας τῆς κατηγορίας)\(^2\) for now he is compelled to examine the record of his life. It is not difficult to picture the expression, perhaps the smile, of good-natured confidence on Mantiheus' face as he pronounces the quoted words, and adds that he is so confident in himself (ἐγὼ ἐστιν αὐτῷ σφόνδυ ἐμαυτῷ πιστεύω)\(^3\) that he hopes that when he has concluded his defense, his enemies will have become his friends.

Almost immediately Mantiheus presents the arguments for his case. Certainly they are not strong; wherefore Lysias dares not let the case rest on them. They are presented nevertheless, and in the simple, direct language of Mantiheus.

Mantiheus passes quickly from the arguments, a side issue of the defense, into the main defense, the delineation of his character, the literal unfolding and unveiling of his personality, the depiction of his patriotism, which is the interior principle of his external behavior. The main defense is artful. It is purely narrative. It boasts no argument. It owns but slight comment. Indeed, it is simply the life story of the defendant as sketched above; the generous brother, the temperate young man, and above all the eager young soldier in love with the glory of Athens and anxious for the safety of his fellows-in-arms. It was a brief account, this main defense, but so simple and so clearly a record of chivalry that it made its telling impression.

There were two arguments that might have been urged against Mantiheus, points which may seem queer to the modern reader. The defendant
affected long hair, as was then fashionable among knights, and had presumptuously spoken at an early age before the people. Mantineus anticipates both of these attacks and by answering them brings his oration to a close. In response to the first probable point the speaker mentions with quiet irony and humor that surely no one is going to hate him for wearing long hair, — ἀλλ' οὖν εἰ τις ομοία διὰ τούτων μισεῖς and to the second argument he gives his masterly, ingenious apology, already quoted. He concludes this brief apology with a tactful word of compliment to the senators:

ἀμα μὲν τῶν προφόνων ἐνθυμούμενος ὅτι οὐδὲν πέπαυται ταῖς πόλεις πράττοντες ἀμα δὲ υμᾶς ὀρῶν τοὺς τοιούτους μόνους ἀφίουσι νομίζοντας εἶναι ὡστε ὀρῶν υμᾶς ταύτην τῇν ἐνωμὴν ἔχονται τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐπάρθην πράττειν καὶ λέγειν ὑπὲρ τῆς πόλεως.

He then steps down from the platform unexpectedly without a final plea or appeal to the emotions of the jury.

Again what could be more in keeping with the tone of confidence of the oration than the omission of the customary emotional plea? There are no weeping mothers, nor aged fathers, nor heads "white with the hoarfrost of age", nor crying children called upon the platform by Mantineus in order that their tears and appeals might turn the hearts of the jury.

The speech has depended from the beginning to the end upon the unadorned personality of Mantineus. Nor were the tools and devices common to the court speeches of the day employed, for Mantineus studiously avoided all denunciation and attack upon his accusers. He gives expression to no
complaint that he is the target of personal revenge. His language is simple and unadorned, guilty of no abuse, of no approbious terms. Always Mantitheus is the brilliant, ambitious young Athenian, burning to fill the Homeric ideal by distinguishing himself in council as in war; an Alcibiades made harmless by the sentiment of chivalry.

The better to further our depiction of the Patriotic Man we turn to the oration, The Speech on the Estate of Aristophanes. Came the year 390. Nicophemus and Aristophanes, father and son, organized an expedition from Athens to assist Evagoras against Persia. The expedition was a failure; the organizers of it executed, their property confiscated. The act of confiscation found the estate to be far less valuable than was anticipated. The father-in-law of the late Aristophanes was thereupon accused of putting the rest to his own use. The father-in-law further complicated matters by passing away while awaiting trial, whence it fell to the brother-in-law of Aristophanes to ascend the platform and defend his own and his father's honor.

In the oration are distinctly contrasted two patriots: Aristophanes, who would blaze a trail of glory and renown for his fatherland and for himself; and the father-in-law of Aristophanes who was a quiet citizen of the old school.

On concluding the reading of the speech we feel we know well this glowing brand of patriotism, this Aristophanes who sought always to be concerned with public affairs, who spent whatever money he had (and borrowed more for this selfsame purpose) in the pursuit of renown,

'Αριστοφάνης δ' οὐ μόνον τῶν ἱδίων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν Κοινῶν ἐβούλετο ἐπιμελεῖσθαι καὶ εἰ τῆς ἀυτῆς
Voluntarily Aristophanes had voyaged through a sea of perils to prevail upon Dionysius, despot of Syracuse, not to dispatch naval aid to the Spartans. Again, when the Cyprians prayed aid against the Persians, the ardor of Aristophanes was without limit.

In these enterprises Aristophanes unstrung his purse, gave all of his own resources, begged and borrowed more of his acquaintances. Not until the speech is half over does the speaker actually come to the point. Thereupon we learn that never at all was the estate of Aristophanes of great value, since Aristophanes was a poor man until four years before his death. On the other hand, these four years were times of intense patriotic activity wherein Aristophanes did no easy thing, for, though he had no funds to start with, he twice produced tragedies, on his father's account as well as his own; he equipped a warship for three successive years; he was a contributor to special levies on many occasions; he purchased a home for fifty minae, and bought eighty acres of land. No, Aristophanes was not a wealthy man (the speech concludes), rather a too generous patriot who gave all for his fatherland, that fatherland which responded by putting him to death untried, and (shame upon shame) not delivering his body for burial.

Patriotism in the late father-in-law took the form chiefly of monetary service to the state. In the first place, the father-in-law as a
married-man-to-be chose as his bride a dowerless lady, but a lady of a fine
family and lofty reputation that he might propagate a family which would
carry on the noble blood in the state. He sought for himself, for his family,
for the state, not gold but honor. In time, when his children were of age
to marry, this noble father made alliance with poor families who stood high
in the esteem of the state, and scorned people of wealth who were of less
orderly and less self-respecting character. For fifty long years the life of
the father-in-law has been a life of devotion to the state, both with purse
and person,

\[ \text{Ο Πατὴρ καὶ τοῖς χρήμασι καὶ τῷ σώματι}
\text{τῇ πόλει ἐλατουργεῖ!} \]

As this picture-plea flashes on, the father-in-law is seen as the intimate of
the great Conon or as taking on himself great burdens of state, yet seeking
no office. He brought honor to Athens in the horserace, equipped warships.
Indeed, he spent more than was necessary, yet in every individual case where
he desired to spend more than was necessary it is found that it was something
designed to bring honor to the city,

\[ \text{ὅσα ἐὰς ἢς τῶν ἀμαρτήσεως ἀναλίσκειν, πάντα φανὰρ τοιαύτα ἐθέληκεν}
\text{καὶ τῇ πόλει τιμῇ ἐμέλλεν ἔσεσθαι!} \]

In the twenty-first oration, Defence against a Charge of Taking
Bribes, we meet patriotism again in the guise of pecuniary service to the
state. Herein even the defendant's name is not known nor is the charge of
which he is attempting to free himself. Although it is decidedly tiresome to
be reading constantly of monies spent in service to the state, yet the enumer-
ation of the amounts so spent by the defendant proves in this speech rather
interesting. The speaker seems to glory in the large sums he has spent on dramatic and choric performances, on the equipment and conduct of vessels of war, on various naval and athletic contests, on religious missions and processions. After enumerating each of the above services, the speaker adds the specific cost of each. He points out that it is, after all, the spirit that counts. True enough he has delighted in the discharge of public duties (δημοσία δὲ λγυρουργῶν ἵδομαι) but it is his character as a private citizen which ought to be the reason for his acquittal. For the speaker has borne the most onerous of public services, which is to maintain throughout one's life an orderly and self-respecting behavior, neither overcome by pleasure nor elated by gain, but evincing such a character that one is free from complaint or the thought of persecution in the mind of any fellow citizen.

We may bring to a close the depiction of the Patriotic Man by mention of the speaker of the thirty-first oration, Against Philon. The senator who delivers this attack is a man of the dignity befitting his rank, stern and determined, who will stoop to no petty recriminations. He has simply come forth to assist the state by blocking the advent of Philon, a vile coward and undutiful son distrusted by his own mother, into the senate.

It is time now to discuss the note which is found second most frequently in the orations of Lysias. This is the note of simplicity. Euphiletus, the defendant in On the Murder of Eratosthenes, is Lysias' finest example of simplicity. He is artless, innocent of subterfuge, free from affectation, sincere, and unsophisticated in word and act.

Euphiletus had killed Eratosthenes of Oe, whom he had surprised in the presence of witnesses in the act of adultery with his (Euphiletus') wife.
The law of Dracon had made legitimate such an act of homicide, allowing the husband to kill his wife's seducer, if taken in the act suddenly, and not by premeditation. Euphiletus' defense is an answer to a charge of wilful murder placed against him by the family of the slain Eratosthenes. So effectively does the defense bring out the beautifully simple character of Euphiletus that the reader feels that the defendant would have won his case even if he had not had, as he actually did have, witnesses and Dracon's law on his side.

The character of Euphiletus is manifested by the mosaic of modest words. His statements are candid, he speaks directly, always to the point. His artlessness and unsophistication show him to be a man without guile. He has nothing to hide, nothing that he wishes to hide. He tells us in the words of his wife that his conduct could have been more chaste,

"Yes, so that you," she said, "may have a try here at the little maid. Once before, too, when you were drunk, you pulled her about." 14

Euphiletus' sincerity is evident in his response:

"And at that I laughed." (καὶ ἔχει ἐμὲ ἐπέλαυν) 15

Can the reader doubt the unconstrained truthfulness of a man who will of his own accord vouch such information in the public court, even if the defendant's conduct was in accord with the existing moral canons of Athens?

Euphiletus was a poor man, yet he did not act for the sake of wealth so as to raise himself from poverty to riches,

οὔτε χρημάτων ἐνεκα ἐπραγά ταῦτα
ἴνα πλούσιος ἐκ πεντος ἔνωμαι. 16

All Euphiletus seeks to gain is the requital according to law. Eratosthenes of Oe, captured on the bed of Euphiletus' wife, confessing his guilt, threw himself on the mercy of Euphiletus, and begged his captor to accept money in
recompense for his dishonor. Euphiletus' reply is again indicative of his character:

οὐκ ἐμὴν ἡ ἀποκτενῶ αὖλα ἐν τῷ πόλεως νόμοις οὐν συ παραβάνων περὶ ἐλαττονος, τῶν ἁμονῶν ἐποιήσω, καὶ μᾶλλον εἶδον τοιούτων ἁμαρτήματα ἐς ἀμαρτάνειν εἰς τὴν ἱματικὴ τὴν ἐμὴν καὶ εἰς τοὺς παιδάς ἡ τοῖς νόμοις πείθεσθαι.

It is not I who am going to kill you, but our city's law, which you have transgressed and regarded as of less account than your pleasures, choosing rather to commit this foul offense against my wife and my children than to obey the laws like a decent person." 17

Only a great man, a good man, a man of probity, will find such words on the tip of his tongue during a time of crisis.

It was a heavy blow to Euphiletus to find that his wife was false to him. His laches was not evident, but his lack of sophistication and his simplicity are shown in the tale he tells. In the speech is sensed a note of mourning as Euphiletus looks again on the early days of his married life; his wife, the most excellent of wives (παρόν Ἡλεισία); his wife, a clever, frugal housekeeper, who kept everything in the nicest order, into whose hands, the hands of the mother of his child, Euphiletus placed everything. He trusted her, presuming they were in perfect intimacy (οἰκειότητα μείζον). Euphiletus recounts that his dwelling is of two stories, with the woman's quarters above, the men's below. He tells how he loved his false wife, and when their child was born, in order that each time the child had to be washed the wife might avoid the risk of descending the stairs, Euphiletus used to live above, and the woman below. Unwittingly, through his care for his wife,
Euphiletus set the stage for the frequent acts of adultery between his wife Eratosthenes of Oe. Things went on like this for a long time, but Euphiletus never suspected, but was simple-minded enough to suppose that his own was the most chaste wife in the city. Poor simple Euphiletus! His defense is the cry of a broken-hearted, wronged husband. To such a man who might have lived by blackmailing Eratosthenes, or who might have killed Eratosthenes privately and so hidden his family's dishonor, but who exacted his requital that all adulterers of the city, on seeing the sort of reward in store for such transgressions, might be less inclined to sin against their neighbors,—to such a man, indeed, the closing sentence of the oration is well fitted:

εἴ ὃς ἄρα νῦν καὶ περὶ τοῦ σώματος καὶ περὶ τῶν χρημάτων καὶ περὶ τῶν άλλων ἀπαίτων κινδυνεύω ὅτι τοῖς τῆς πόλεως νόμοις ἐπεθομένω.

The next best example of the Simple Man is to be found in Against Diogeiton. Diodatus, an Athenian citizen, was killed in the battle of Kyzikas. Before going to war he entrusted, in addition to his great fortune, his two sons and daughter to Diogeiton, at once their uncle and grandfather, for Diodatus had married his own niece, the daughter of Diogeiton. When, under false pretenses, Diogeiton had acquired from the widow the documents necessary for full control of Diodatus' fortune, he demanded that the woman and the children shift for themselves. There is little need to point out details of simplicity in the character of the speaker. He is very like to Euphiletus. The most outstanding effect of the defendant's simplicity is the pictures he paints, one of Diogeiton's life, the other of mother-love. The one principle of Diogeiton's life is shown by his own conduct to be greed,
from the time when he married his own daughter to his brother to keep hold of his increasing property to the day when with hollow professions of regret and with shameless lies he turned his grandsons out of doors.

The picture of mother-love is brought out by the simple quotations of the mother as she pleaded for her children before Diogeiton. The effect could not have been obtained if he had used means other than this very simple one.

Next in line is the Clever Man, of which type the chief exponent is the ever-popular Cripple. The sorry plight of the Cripple may prove more entertaining if the Clever Man (in Against Themnestus) is first seen. The speaker in this latter case is much like the Cripple, and yet much different from him. Both are clever, but have not the same type of cleverness. They are not of the same grade of society. Whereas the speaker of the case, Against Themnestus, is a high-born, high-spirited man speaking in defense of his life-prized honor, he is clever only in as much as he treats the arguments of Themnestus to a heavy barrage of indignant irony and ridicule. A great deal of thought is wasted on word quibbles, yet this absurdity (for the speaker deliberately makes this quibble patently absurd) amuses the court, and serves to make Themnestus a tragic target for shafts of ridicule and criticism.

Themnestus had argued that what was said was not libel. He said "slew"; the law convicted one who said "murdered". The speaker replies by asking Themnestus what the difference is in being called a father-beater or a mother-beater, and in being called one who struck father or mother. The law mentions one who throws away his shield; what about the man who "flings"
away his? The quick wit of the speaker is apparent in his explanations of obsolete words in the laws of Solon; this all helps to make Themnestus more absurd and stupid. The bitter sarcasm of the defendant is evident when he suggests that Themnestus' ignorance of law is the result of his not attending the Court of the Areopagus, the most august tribunal of Athens, and when he terms Themnestus a past master (δεινὸς ἐι καὶ μεμελέτηκας) in the use of words. The speaker concludes his oration by a clever reference to his judges, which shows at once his quick wit, adroitness, and good nature. Themnestus had been acquitted in a previous trial of the charge of throwing away his shield. The speaker concludes that he is not yet aware that the judges punish the witnesses of the deed, but pardon those who have done the throwing away.

It is the Cripple, however, who closely approaches personified cleverness. He is a man of little character, a proprietor of a rogues' rendezvous near the Agora,

a lusty rascal, a character about the Agora, and the delight of the young men of the sporting set, who make his shop their resort. When the news leaked out that the Cripple was in danger of losing his state allowance, the patrons of his shop united in sport to gain for the Cripple the best legal aid in the state. Lysias was hired, and on seeing the jest entered into the fun.

In Athens cripples, who because of bodily ailments could not earn their daily bread, were granted a state allowance of an obol a day. Yearly the list of the crippled was scrutinized by the Senate, at which scrutiny those found undeserving of the pension were denied the obol. The Cripple
had been accused of being undeserving of his allowance. Briefly the case amounted to this: the defendant acknowledged a trade; he was not a cripple.

The Cripple steps upon the dias to deliver his memorized speech. The "lusty rascal" is very solemn; his speech boasts a flow of rhetoric and learning. He is clever, and by his cleverness blindfolds the court to his own vulnerable points, and frustrates the thrusts of his accuser with enough humor and sarcasm, with enough wit and irony, to make anyone wilt.

To one who even hastily runs through the speech, constant delight is had, now by a caustic turn, now by a searing volley of words from the Cripple. In the opening words the Cripple solemnly expresses his gratitude for this excuse for rendering an account of his life, when the audience is well aware that he has much to hide. He then passes into a flow of high rhetoric, which he caps by challenging his accuser to an exchange of property pointing out that he is indeed a financial cripple. In answer to the charge that because he mounts borrowed horses, he is an able-bodied man, the Cripple responds, first, by spurning the accuser who has dared to mention such a thing in seriousness, feeling neither awe of fortune nor shame before the court.

οὐτε τὴν τύχην ἰείς ὡτε ὑμᾶς αἰσχυνθεῖς. 20

As to his horsemanship, of course he uses himmies for long journeys. Isn't he a cripple? Does he not use two crutches also? Why not advance the use of two crutches to prove him able-bodied, for he uses crutches and horses for the same reason?

Oh, this accuser!

So utterly has he surpassed the whole human race in impudence that he tries with his single voice
to persuade you all that I am riding and am not classed as disabled. 21

The Cripple concludes that, if he is not disabled, why has he been barred from drawing a lot as one of the nine archons. 22 And there is true irony and pathos in his voice as he remarks that his infirmity is disputed with him by his adversary as eagerly as if it were an heiress.

In response to the charge that he is insolent, savagely and utterly abandoned in behavior, the Cripple wonders if the accuser needs such dreadful terms to tell the truth, and could not speak the truth in gentle terms. He further answers the charge by presuming that his accuser is, at best, jesting.

The Cripple then defends himself against the imaginary charge that he was an aide to the Thirty, and furnished much humor as he told of his voluntary exile to Chalcis, in which he shared the perils of the people. He concludes with another earnest appeal for his obol.

Mention has already been made of Eratosthenes of Oe, who was killed by Euphiletus when he was discovered by Euphiletus in the act of adultery with the latter's wife. The setting for the Immoral Man has already been furnished in the oration, On the Murder of Eratosthenes.

Eratosthenes was in the bloom of youth (νεανισκον). 23 Apparently lewdness and debaucherries were characteristics of his from an early age. He must have been a handsome Greek and must have had personality, for he debauched not only the wife of Euphiletus but many others besides; he made an art of it:

ōs ōu mónon tīn τὴν γυναῖκα
diepharkev ālla kai āllaς pollaς
ταύτης ἕτ' ἐξει.
Eratosthenes saw Euphiletus' wife for the first time at a funeral, and immediately set out to seduce her. He approached the maid of the wife, and apparently knew the proper way to manage such intrigues for he soon had access to the wife for his own evil purposes. That this passionate rake had attractive qualities can not be denied, for Euphiletus' wife deliberately entertains him again and again, while his spurned and castoff women seek to lure him back. The old woman who figures in the speech calls Eratosthenes \textit{o \dot{a} \nu\gamma\dot{p}} which Devries translates "the gentleman." 26

Eratosthenes is the typical rake. Faithful to none of his lady loves, he wanders about seeking further unlawful and sensual pleasures. He is a coward as well, for, when Euphiletus surprises him on the bed of his wife, he falls on his knees in fear and begs for mercy. He acknowledges his guilt, but seeks his life in return for a pecuniary recompense.

Another follower of the life of the passions is the speaker in the oration, Against Simon. The speaker is defending himself against a charge of wounding with intent to kill, the penalty of which was banishment and state confiscation of property. The speaker and Simon both desire a slave boy for unnatural purposes. Their amorous rivalry leads to a street brawl. The speaker is a man of middle age. He admits his attitude is rather senseless for a man of his age, is vexed that he has to wash his dirty linen in public, but seems perfectly at ease with his own conscience. He feels that he can be as immoral as he wishes, provided he is so in private.

The next character to be considered is the Young Man. Nicias, the Athenian General, had two brothers, one of whom died childless, while the other died leaving two sons. These two sons inherited the property of Nicias.
and on reaching the age when they could perform the duties of the state were brought to law by Poliochus, who wished to obtain a verdict for the confiscation of their property. The elder son is the speaker, the Young Man.

The speaker seems to be an inexperienced youth, for, though he seems zealous enough, he has no personal glory as yet of which he may boast. Instead he confines himself to a sort of hero worship, dwelling on the glory of his house, the deeds of his ancestors and late family. The language, too, is that of a young man. Devries points out that the lack of brevity and the repetitions are the signs of youth, as are also the lack of rhetorical figures, lack of invention, the simple arrangement. 27 There is a tone of manliness running through the speech, such as we would expect a young man to show; at the same time there is much pathos.

The Unfaithful Wife has already been mentioned. She is the wife of Euphiletus. On first meeting she appears to be the chastest wife in the city, the most excellent of wives, the clever, frugal housekeeper. Her fall seems to be due to her weakness for an attractive personality and an oily tongue; these two attributes being the property of Eratosthenes. She realized her guilt, yet remained faithful to her paramour rather than to her husband. No doubt she had a fondness for dress and for pretty things, since Euphiletus speaks of her using face powder even when in mourning for her brother.

The Slave Girl is typical of her own class. There is nothing remarkable about her. She performs the duties of the household, goes to market, tends the baby. She is loyal to neither mistress nor master, but seeks her own good. She listens to the seducer, Eratosthenes, and for a premium gains for him admittance to the wife of the house. For a while only
is she loyal to the authors of the intrigue, until Eratosthenes is found out. Seeing on which side her own bread is buttered, the Slave Girl turns traitor to the seduced and unfaithful wife. She denies Eratosthenes the opportunity of escape, for fearing torture from Euphiletus, she deliberately does not warn the debaucher of his proximate capture.

The Mother is the last character of Lysias to be considered. The one woman character in Lysias who is in every sense of the word a lady and a gentlewoman is the Mother who figures in the speech, Against Diogeiton. The strongest note in her character is that ever-beautiful note, mother-love. Bravely she gives evidence against her own father lest her beloved children lose their patrimony. We admire her nobleness of feeling, her tears earn love, as she claims that the father raises his step-children in opulence, and applauds him in it (Kai tauna mev kalws poies). But more to be admired is her love which formulates the words graven on her heart:

But you are wronging my children.

She rises to a height of pathos as she exclaims why, by the gods, does he do this evil.
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CHAPTER III
COMPARISON OF THE CHARACTERS OF LYSIAS AND HOMER

1. Paris and The Immoral Man

It is difficult to give a just estimate of the character of Paris. The recognized commentators, for the most part, disagree as to the worth of Paris, and quote apparently contradictory texts. Just as Lysias' Eratosthenes of Oe was a young man of many attractions, beauty and personality, so, certainly is Paris. Paris is ἱερων, and he is called this five times in the third book alone. He is cursed by Hector who taunts him with being εἴδος ἀριστεῖ, and οὐνεκα καλὸν εἰδοσ ἐπ'i. Paris was the lovely troubadour, but Hector tells him that no longer will his harp, and the gifts of Venus, and his hair, and figure avail him,

οὐ θευ τοι ξραίσμη Κίδαρις Τὴν τε ἄσπ Αφριάττης

η τε κόμη το' τε εἴδος. 4

That Paris was like Eratosthenes in that he was desirable by women is attested not alone by Helen's desertion of Menelaus and her elopment with Paris, but by the love of Venus who speaks of him as shining both in beauty and attire (Καλεὶ τε οἴδαξ ἦν καὶ εἴσοιν) 5.

Eratosthenes and Paris were both guilty of the most terrible sins in the Greek category of crime; they both violated hospitality. Each entered another man's home, therein to seduce the wife thereof. In each house was left a wronged husband and a dishonored child.

Was Paris also a coward? Scott says no. 6 Paris may be said to be a moral coward, for he lacked moral courage when he risked (and lost) the life of his nation, the fame of his house, and faced the possibility of his
mother and sisters being sold into slavery in order that he, the god-like Paris, might hold fast to his lady-love. Hector boldly calls Paris a coward; it is a white-faced and skulking Paris who hears Hector, even as it was a white-faced and skulking Eratosthenes who knelt to Euphiletus. "O cursed Paris" Paris is to Hector. Let the long-haired Acheans laugh with scorn who suspected that Paris was a champion,

\[ \text{Ποὺ \ Καρξαλαόουσι \ Καρη \ Κομόντες \ Αχαίοι} \]
\[ \text{φάντες \ ἀριστίηᾳ \ πρόμοιν \ ἐμεναί} \]
\[ \text{--- ἀλλ' \ οὐκ \ ἔστι \ Βιῆφρεοι \ οὐδὲ \ τίς \ ἀληθείᾳ.} \]

for there is neither strength in his soul nor any nerve.

Later after Paris is goaded by Hector to fight in single combat with Menelaus, he fails. Venus to the rescue! Venus wraps her darling Paris in a cloud and so saves him from Menelaus. The goddess then places Paris on his couch exhaling perfume, εὐώδει Κηώσεντι.

Helen, driven by wrathful Venus to Paris, calls him a bag of wind, a boaster,- Paris! who boasted he was champion, superior to Menelaus in might, in hands, and at the spear:

\[ \text{傧 \ μὲν \ δὴ \ πρὶν \ γεύχε \ ἀρησφίλον \ Μηνελαον} \]
\[ \text{ὑπὶ \ τε \ βίος καὶ \ χερῶς καὶ \ ἐξεκα \ φέρτερος \ εἴναι.} \]

Hector and The Patriotic Man

In every other campaign or outpost I have never once failed in my duty, but have adhered throughout to my rule of marching out in the first rank and retreating in the last.

These were the words of Maptitheus, The Patriotic Man, but may well be placed in the mouth of Hector. Hector says of himself:

I have learned to be always brave, and to fight in
the foremost ranks among the Trojans, seeking to gain both my father’s great glory and my own. 12

Hector, therefore, boasts, as Mantitheus boasted, that his soldiership was above reproach. And well might Hector boast, for his very enemies speak in awe of the Trojan hero, and pray the gods that they may be delivered from him. Thus did Agamemnon pray before the council of the people that he might cut away Hector’s coat of mail around his breast, split asunder with the brass; and around him may many comrades, prone in the dust, seize the earth with their teeth. 13

Achilles, in his wrath at the loss of Briseis, taunts Agamemnon and tells that a longing desire for Achilles surely will come upon all the sons of the Acheans at some future day, when many dying shall fall at the hand of the man-slaying Hector. 14

In the catalogue of the Trojan forces which follows the Catalogue of the Ships we read:

The Trojans in the first place were under the command of great, helmet-nodding Hector, son of Priam. With him far the most numerous and bravest troops were armed, ardent with their spears. 15

Paris and Helenus, brothers of Hector, give evidence of the latter’s bravery and good soldiery. In the battle which takes place in the fifth book Helenus, the seer, tells Aeneas and Hector:

Aeneas and Hector, since upon you chiefly of the Trojans and Lydians the labor devolves, because you are the bravest for every purpose both to fight and to take counsel, stand here and stay the forces before the gates. 16

And the cowardly Paris when Hector has flayed him with words begs Hector to stop, and adds that ever is Hector’s spirit unwearied; and in his breast an intrepid heart,

\[\text{αἰεὶ τοι Κρατήρ} \quad \text{― \text{― \text{―}}} \]
\[\text{ἐὼς τοι ἐνὶ στῇ θεσσιν ἀτάρβητος νόος ἔστιν.}\]
Hector's soldiery is further attested not alone by the above compliments of friends and foes, but is demonstrated in a practical manner by Hector himself. His success in battle is evidenced by the fact that of the fifty-three named Greeks slain in the Iliad, Hector slew twenty-eight. Well does he deserve the tribute Homer pays to him in the closing lines of the Iliad:

<math>\text{\begin{verbatim}
\text{ώσ ο} \text{οί δαμφιέπων τάφον έκτορος ιπποδάμωιο}
\end{verbatim}>
and so they held the funeral of Hector, the knight. Indeed Hector was a knight, sans peur et sans reproche.

Mantitheus was a family man. Acknowledged is his sympathetic care of his brothers and sisters. He was always kind, ever courteous; he did nothing in excess. Was Hector, too, a family man? The answer is quick on the tongue of every one who has read Homer. Such a one will point at once to the farewell scene in which Homer paints the unforgettable canvas of the love of Hector and Andromache. Hector in that scene is πατήρ τε φίλος; and Andromache is the revered mother, the πόνια μήτρ. Hector is obedient to his brother Helenus when this seer commands Hector to go to the city, έκτωρ δ' ου τι κατινήτων ἀπίθανον. And even to Paris Hector is "honored brother (διον ἀδελφόν)." The final motive which determines Hector to fight Achilles is the sight of his suffering brother Polydorus (who was the youngest and dearest of them all).

But when Hector perceived his brother Polydorus holding his intestines in his hands, and rolled on the earth, a darkness was at once poured over his eyes, nor could he any longer be employed afar off, but advanced toward Achilles, like unto a flame, brandishing his sharp spear.
Hector's love for mother and father is proved by the fact of his defense of them outside the city walls. Priam and Hecuba plead with Hector not to be rash; but the will of Hector is not to be moved, despite the terms of endearment and the entreaties of the parents. Priam calls him "Hector, beloved son;" while Hecuba terms him: Εντορ, τεκνων ημοι, while τεκνων 28 φιλου θαλοσ. 29 Εκτωρ, έμώ θωμώ πάντων πολυ φιλτατε. 30 Helen approaches the dead Hector to say:

Ο Ηκτωρ, far dearest to my soul of all my brothers-in-law,.............never have I heard from thee a harsh or reproachful word; if others of my brothers-in-law or sisters-in-law reproached me, then, thou, admonishing him with words, didst restrain him, both by thy gentleness and thy gentle words.31

Just as Hector is greatly like to Mantitheus in outstanding soldiery and in love of family and state, so he is like Mantitheus also in candidness of speech, in which likeness his bluff and unapprehensive personality appears. Hector does not spare Paris when he informs him that the beautiful but cowardly Paris is afraid to fight.32 Before Hector returns to the city to bid farewell to Andromache, he rallies the Trojans by a single, brief sentence, in which he packs a lot of meaning. He tells the Trojans that they are brave, that they are far-famed, that it is time for them to be men, that they are all friends, and that they should call to mind their past acts of daring and of valor:

Τρωες υπερ θυμαι τηλεκλειται τ’ έπικουροι ἄνερες έστε, φιλοι, μνησασθε τις θούριδος ἀληθος.
When Helen would soothe Hector as he blazed with anger at the sight of Paris, Hector responds courteously enough, but in plain and precise words, inviting her to make Paris go out to the battle and fight. Even in his farewell to his wife Hector minces no words. He tells her that he knows the city with its people will fall, that she, his wife, may be the slave of another, and that he, Hector, will die. He then plunges into battle. On the occasion previous to Polydamas' public exhortation to the Trojans not to attack the Greek ships, Hector tells Polydamas that he is crazy: ἐπείτα θεοὶ φρένας ἔλεσαν αὐτῷ. Also in the fight between Achilles and Hector, Achilles invites Hector to come to his death. Hector tells Achilles not to terrify him with words as though he were a little boy. Hector says that he, too, can revile and reproach, yet that is not fighting. He tells Achilles that he, Achilles, is the better man, but to be on his guard for Hector also has a sharp-pointed weapon.

The note without which Mantitheus would not have been Mantitheus was confidence. The same may be said of Hector. Confidence shines through all the speeches of Hector, confidence, at least, that Hector will do his bit. Although Hector sees defeat looming up for the Trojans, he is confident that even when he is slain his wife shall be:

the wife of Hector who was the bravest in battle of the horse-taming Trojans, when they fought around Ilium.

As the Greeks so the Trojans were raised on superstitions. Still when Polydamas would have had the battle stopped because the omen of the bird and the snake was against the Trojans, Hector says that he heeds not such things as winged birds, that Hector knows but one augury, the best, to fight for his country (ἐῖς οἰκύνος ἄριστος, ἀμμύνεσθαι περὶ πατρῆς).
Helen of Troy and the Wife of Euphiletus

How like the wife of Euphiletus is Helen of Troy! Married women, faithful wives are they when they first appear. Euphiletus said of his wife, "It is true that in the early days, Athenians, she was the most excellent of wives." So, too, must have been the wife of Menelaus for she is found at her loom, busily interweaving scenes of the labors of the Greeks and Trojans,

η δὲ μέγαν ἱστῶν εἴφαινεν
dίπλακα πορφυρέτην, πολέας δ' ἐνέπασσεν ἀέθλους
Τρώων θ' ἰπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν ἀλκοχιτῶνων
οὐς ἔθεν εἶνεκ' ἐπάσχου ἔπ' Ἀργος παλάμαμων.

Homer really intended Helen to appear as a good housekeeper (οἰκονόμος) for there is a similar scene in the Odyssey wherein Helen is still the same active house-wife she was at her first appearance in the Iliad. Helen enters the room in which Menelaus is receiving the unknown Telemachus, and she, beautifiul as Artemis, entering the room is attended by maidens who carry her wool and spinning,

ἐκ Ἐλένη θαλάμοιο θυώδεος ὑφορόφοιο
ηλυθεν Ἀρτεμίδι κρυψῆλακάτις εἰκυῖα
tῇ δ' ἀρ' ἀμί Ἀφρότηθι κλισίζην εὐτυκτὸν ἐθηκέν
Ἀλκίππη δὲ τὰπητα φέρεν μαλακοὶ ἔριοι.

In the Odyssey Helen is also the careful provider,

Ἑλένη δὲ παρίστατο φωριαμοίν
ἐνθ' ἐσαί οἱ πεπλοὶ παμποίκελοι ὅποι καὶν αὐτῇ.

Helen, too, was false to her husband and child. Both wives live in adultery, and both risk the loss of husband, home, and child. Helen bemoans
her lot:

Oh, that I had chosen death before I followed thy son hither, leaving my home, my friends, my darling child. 44

Great beauty was common to both women. Helen is famed even in the verse of today for her surpassing loveliness. In the Iliad she is not described because, as most authors agree, Homer wishes all men to find her beautiful. Helen is made by Homer to represent not this or that type of beauty, but all beauty. Helen is sprung from Jove, 86 Helen is a divine woman, whom the Trojan leaders, though disgruntled, yet compare in countenance to the immortal goddesses. 48 The wife of Euphiletus, indeed, was beautiful enough to command the attention of Eratosthenes, a connoisseur of women, when said wife was without ornament during the funeral of her mother-in-law. Another indication of her beauty is the statement of Euphiletus that he felt he ought to keep watch on her, though he thought her to be the chastest wife in the city.

They are alike also in this that neither blamed the seducer who wrecked their lives. Each stepped wilfully into an unclean alliance, each admitted her own guilt, and each blamed only self. No wimper is heard from the wife of Euphiletus, though she most certainly must have spurned Eratosthenes when he fell on his knees, begging for life and mercy, and not death at the hands of Euphiletus. Helen of Troy shows contempt for Paris when he fails utterly in the duel with Menelaus, and wishes he had perished at the hands of the Greek chief,

\[ \gamma' \lambda \nu \theta \varepsilon \varepsilon \kappa \text{ πολέμου ώς ωφελεσ αυτοθ' ολέσθαι}. \]

In spite of these scenes both women may be said to have remained loyal to their second loves.
Hephaestus and the Cripple

Hephaestus was the god Vulcan. The Cripple was the proprietor of a wine shop in the Agora. Yet the Cripple and Hephaestus are much alike. Both were lame, lame of both legs. The Cripple used two crutches to lean upon in walking; Hephaestus employed two golden maidens.

The words of the Cripple's plea were received with joy by the Athenian court, for "it would be a most unAthenian Senate which would fail to cap an hour's fun with a vote of jolly confidence in the pauper". It seems that the Athenian court must have rocked with laughter as the Cripple gave his oration. A change in the location, with Hephaestus in the Cripple's place, gives us a similar scene. Hephaestus is addressing the court of the gods in an attempt to allay the ire of Juno and to prevent the wrath of Jove. He humorously tells the court his experience with Jove, and pictures himself flying through the air to land on Lemnos when Jove, having seized him by the foot, cast him from the heavenly threshold:

The continuation of the scene with Vulcan calls to mind the Cripple in his wine shop. Since the Cripple was the delight of the young men who made his shop their resort, the rascal's shop must have echoed the joyous laughter of the crowd, as the Cripple, lame of both legs, bustled about, pouring wine for his patrons. And Hephaestus,—well, the scene is famous:

But Hephaestus, beginning from left to right, kept pouring out for all the other gods, drawing nectar from the goblet. And the inextinguishable laughter arose among the immortal gods, when they saw him bustling about through the mansion.
The Mother and Hecuba and Andromache

The chief characteristic common to these three women is suffering because of motherhood, suffering because their loved ones suffer. Mother-love in Lysias has been pictured. Mother-love in Homer is found in the words and acts of Andromache and Hecuba. When Andromache pleads with Hector to hold back from the fight she places her child first and herself last,

\[ \text{oud' leiaireis pai'da t\epsilon \nu\gamma p\alpha \chi o\nu \kappa' \epsilon' \mu' } \]

She pleads that Hector will not make her child an orphan:

\[ m' \pi' a\text{'d' oph\alpha \nu\kappa' o\nu} \theta' \gamma' s' \]

and when her plea to stay Hector fails, she smiles bravely through her tears, and rests the boy upon her fragrant bosom,

\[ \gamma' d'\alpha' r\mu' m' \nu' \gamma' w' d'\varepsilon'a\tau\alpha' k'\omicron' \pi' \omega' \]

In the last glimpse of Andromache in the Iliad heartache is hers. Astyanax, her son, must suffer, for Hector is dead. Her wailing is not for herself. Mother-love has conquered wifely grief, and her sorrow is for her boy:

O Hector, thou leavest thy boy, yet so young, to whom we, unfortunate twain, gave birth. Thou canst neer help him again, Hector, for thou art dead; nor can he help thee. For even if he shall survive the mournful war of the Greek, yet hereafter he will own labor and hardship. Others will rob him of his fields. The day of bereavement makes a boy destitute of his contemporaries. He is always dejected, and his cheeks wet with the dew of tears. The boy, in want, shall go to the companions of his father, pulling one by the cloak, another by the tunic; and some of these pitying shall present him with a very small cup; and he will moisten his lips, but not wet his palate. Him also someone, enjoying both parents, shall push away from the banquet, striking him with his hands, and reviling him with reproaches. Then will the boy Astyanax return weeping to his widowed mother, he who, formerly indeed, upon his father's knee, ate marrow
alone, and the rich fat of sheep; but when sleep came
upon him, and he ceased childishly crying, used in
sleep to lie in the arms of a nurse, in a soft bed,
full of delicacies. But now, indeed, Astyanax shall
suffer many things, missing his dear father. 59

This lament and the final lamentation of Andromache during the
funeral of Hector brings to mind the lamentations of the Church, Rachel
weeping for her children, the weeping of the prophets over Jerusalem.

Like Andromache, like Hecuba! Hecuba was a mother, the mother of
nineteen children (ἐννεακαίδεκα μὲν μοι ἵς ἐκ νησίων ἦν). 60 When
Hector returns to the city before the farewell scene with Andromache, Hecuba
is ἱππόδωρος μητέρ, who hangs upon Hector's hand, 62 and begs her son to rest,
and refresh himself. 63 Later, just before Achilles slays Hector, Homer writes:

Hector's mother, wailing, shed tears, laying bare
her bosom, and with the other hand laid forth her breast;
and weeping, addressed Hector with winged words, "O my son,
Hector, reverence these things and pity me. If ever I
gave thee the grief-lulling breast, remember these things,
O dear son; and come within the walls, repelling Achilles,
but do not stand a foremost adversary against him. Un-
fortunate Hector, if he kills thee, I may not mourn thee
on the couch, my dear boy, to whom I myself gave birth,
nor may thy richly dowered wife; but far away from both of
us, the swift dogs will devour thee at the Greek ships. 64

Once more Hecuba addresses Hector in the Iliad, but it is the slain Hector
she addresses, lamenting the dearest of all her sons. In her grief her
Mother's heart takes solace from the thought that the gods loved Hector and
cared for him in his sufferings, and love and care for him in death.

'Εκτόρ, ἐμῶ θυμῶ πάντων πολὺ φίλητε παιδών,
ἡ μὲν καὶ ἰσός περ ἐὼν φίλος ἡσθα θεοίσιν.
θείο δ' ἀρ' οί κήδοντο καὶ ἐν θανάτοιο περ' άση
άλλους μὲν ἄρ παιδάς ἐμῶς πόδας ἐκὼς Ἀχιλλεύς
It is a most Christian touch, this solace that one's dear dead are with the gods, and loved by the gods. It is a true sign of Motherlove.
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CHAPTER Four

THE CHARACTERS OF THEOPHRANDUS

Devries mentions in his chapter on the Patriotic Man that Theophrastus has an amusing description of the Man of Petty Ambition (μικροφολογμα) that contrasts with the Man of Noble Ambition who is portrayed in the orations of Lysias. Upon examination this statement is found to be very much a verity. Mantineus was the model for the Man of Noble Ambition, the Patriotic Man. The Patriotic Man of Lysias had as his glorious goal, the service of his country. He is not rash nor boastful, rather his character is distinguished by confidence, sincere faith in his love of country, and straightforwardness. Petty Ambition is something very opposite this idea of patriotism.

Theophrastus defines Petty Ambition as a mean craving for distinction. The Man of Petty Ambition pats himself on the back in a roundabout way; he is showy, ostentatiously overrating those things on which he founds his honor. For example, should the Man of Petty Ambition sacrifice an ox, he will take the skin of the forehead and nail it up over the doorway connecting the vestibule and the court of the house. He will bedeck it with great garlands —there opposite the entrance— in order that those who come in may see that verily he has sacrificed an ox.

Kaὶ Βοῦν Θύιας ὅ το ρομετωμαίον ἀπαντακαί ὧς εἰς ὀδὸν προσπᾶττα λόγιαν ὁ τεᾶμασι μεγάλους περὶ κύριας ὀπώς οἶ ἐπιοντες ἰδωσιν ὅ τι Βοῦν ζέθυσε.
Jebb suggests an apt comparison for this form of ostentation in Aristophanes' Acharnians, 989, where the Ostentatious One has thrown out feathers before his door as a sample of his fare, i.e. to inform passersby that he has had fowl for dinner.

Mantitheus spoke of his love for and his care of his family. It was a quiet attention he gave them. He served his family and kept the knowledge of his service within the family circle. Such a course is not compatible with the temperament of the Man of Petty Ambition, for he is essentially the forerunner and progenitor of the modern social climber, the rude, almost boisterous, parvenu or mushroom aristocrat. He will take his son to Delphi that the youngster might have his hair cut because it is modern to patronize the barbers of Delphi. Or when invited to dinner he will try to procure the seat next to the host.

Mantitheus, we recollect, wore his hair long in the style of the knights. He apologized for it before the court, since he did not wish to appear to be a decadent, but merely dressed in the fashion of his class. He did not affect anything, and in the matter of clothes and personal appearance had nothing in common with the peacock glorying in its manycolored fan. The peacocklike Man of Petty Ambition, on the other hand, takes care always to be attended by an Aethopian (\(\varepsilon\pi\mu\epsilon\lambda\gamma\theta\varphi\nu\alpha\iota\delta\iota\varphi\omega\delta\kappa\iota\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\omicron\upsilon\hat{A},\theta\omicron\upsilon\psi\iota\epsilon\omicron\tau\alpha\iota\)). He will have his hair cut very frequently, and will keep his face white; he will change his clothes, too, while they are still fresh, and will anoint himself with unguent.

Now certainly we are not condemning the fact that the Man of Petty Ambition smiles a set of pearly white teeth to the world,—or keeps
himself neat and clean. What we do condemn is his motive which is in sordid contrast to the motives of Mantitheus. The masculinity of the character of the Man of Petty Ambition suffers a setback when we observe that he uses χρίμα a thick perfumed unguent instead of ελαιόν, which latter Socrates is reported to have said is the only oil or perfume fitted for a man to use.

Horace, too, bemoans

Pastillos Rufillus olet, Gargonius hircum nil medium est. 4

In contrast to the straightforwardness of Mantitheus who did not seek to make impressions as would be foreign to his candidness the Man of Petty Ambition presents a streak of modified treachery and false suggestion. For whenever the Man of Petty Ambition took part in a procession of the knights he would send his slave home with most of his accoutrements, but kept his noisy spurs which shone and jingled beneath his long cloak. He trusted to the jingle of his spurs subtly to tell of his high rank. "Vanity, also it is, to court honors, and to lift up one's self on high." Surely Thomas A'Kempis would censure the added subtlety of the vanity of the Man of Petty Ambition.

Again in contrast to the patriotism of Mantitheus and his unselfish devotion to the State, the Man of Petty Ambition plays a sad role. He would buy from the President of the Senate the right of announcing a sacrifice to the people. Adorning himself in a shining cloak of white, and putting a wreath on his own brow, he will come forth to the people and say, "Athenians, we, the Presidents of the Senate, have been sacrificing to the Mother of the Gods, meetly and auspiciously; receive ye her god gifts." How different is his from Mantitheus' attitude toward the Senate and the
people: "antitheus who apologized for his presence in public, -and whose
appeals to the Senate were tactful and sincerely complimentary.

THE SIMPLE MAN versus THE FLATTERER

The character of Lysias presented second was the Simple Man. He
was "a man in whom homeliness was combined with the moral dignity of a
citizen standing on his rights." Euphiletus, the defendant in On The
Murder Of Eratosthenes, was chosen as the finest example of simplicity.
Eratosthenes' moral elevation and dignity were pointed out; he was artless,
innocent of subterfuge, free from affectation, sincere, and unsophisticated
in word and act. While Euphiletus might well be compared, as Mamttheus
was, with the man of Petty Ambition, the Flatterer will furnish just as
fitting a comparison and contrast. "Flattery may be considered as a mode of
companionship degrading but profitable to him who flatters," says
Theophrastus.

Euphiletus' character was made manifest in the modesty of his
words, in the chastity of his diction. The Flatterer, however, is intro-
duced as an obsequious wordy man, an almost parasite, who, in return for his
industry, obtains a livelihood. Pretending personal devotion the
will say as he walks with another, "Do you observe how people are looking at
you? This happens to no man in Athens but you. You were complimented
yesterday in the porch. 'More than thirty persons were sitting there; the
question was started, who is our foremost man? Everyone mentioned you first
and ended by coming back to your name.' Thou Flatterer! How unlike you are
to Euphiletus. Euphiletus, go higher. Your homely simplicity, Euphiletus,
your plain and direct thought, your simple and unaffected language, make you
the peer of the Flatterer.

The code of honor of Euplileetus must bring shame to the cheek of
the Flatterer. Euphiletus ever honored his spouse. No word of complaint
had he for his false wife who tricked him to become the mistress of another.
He blamed the seducer, saying of his spouse, "she was a good wife." To his
friends he was always thoughtful and hospitalable. He dined Sostratus, not
regaling him with luxurious dainties, but seeing that he was well satisfied.
The Flatterer is of a different type. One would like to kick him down the
stairs for his false benevolence and cringing fondness. He will buy apples
and pears, and bring them in and give them to the children in the father's
presence; adding, with kisses, "Chicks of a good father." He is the first
of the guests to praise the wine (his praise is overpraise); and to say as
he reclines next to his host "How delicate is your fare" and "Now this -how
excellent it is." A good glimpse of the Flatterer at work is found in
Horace's description of Momentanus:

Nomentanus erat super ipsum, Parcius infra,
ridiculus totas semel absorbere placetas;
Nomentanus ad hoc, qui, si quid forte laterer,
indice monstraret digito; nam cetera turba,
nos, ingquam, cenamus avis, conchylia, piscis,
longe dissimilem noto celantia sucum,
ut vel continuo patuit, cum passeris atque
ingustata mihi porrexerat illa rhombi.
post hoc me docuit melimela rubere minorem
ad lunam delecta.

Euphiletus was a man without guile. He told his story without
evasions or omissions, telling even of the one blot on his own escutcheon.
He was not buying from the court. The Flatterer, on the other hand, though
he would not hesitate to blot his eschutcheon, would so do it that indirectly
he might give glory to him who is the object of his toadyism. Again the
indidious flatterer evidences his guile by so doing, with bold grace, the
office of slaves. He will take the cushions from the slaves in the theatre,
and spread them on the seat with his own hands. Euphiletus might have done
this in all sincerity. The Flatterer does it mindful that

Small things take triflers; many have owed a place
to smoothing cushions with a dexterous grace.7

In short the Flatterer is unlike Euphiletus in that the former might be
observed saying and doing all things by which he conceives that he will gain
favor.

THE CRIPPLE VERSUS THE PATRON OF RASCALS

The Cripple of Lysias and the Patron of Rascals of Theophrastus
are much alike. They might be the same character denoting different
tendencies. Our beloved Cripple was "a lusty rascal, a character about the
Agora." He was of the people, yet not common. His brain, his clever
versatility keep him the center of alert young men. "He was the delight of
the young men of the sporting set who made his shop their resort." He
mingled with his betters, and bettered his betters in quip and repartee.
The Patron of Rascals has a different soul. He seeks the society of unfor-
tunates, mingles with those who have lost lawsuits and those declared guilty
of crimes. He is low and common and is not desirous of bettering himself,
but of being the big frog in the little pool of depraved men, -considering-
that, if he associates with such persons, he will become more a man of the
world and will inspire greater awe.

The Cripple is sagacious; by his wit he won the confidence of his
customers. He was somewhat the playactor with his mock pathos and his affected imitation of the language and style of men of superior culture. By his droll and sarcastic wit he hurt no one. The Patron of Rascals, on the contrary, is not clever but sly. His is neither wit nor droll sarcasm, but sarcasm soured by sordid contacts. Speaking of honest men he will add, "So-so" (equivalent to the American "O Yeah") or say, "What an honest fellow!" Yet of a fellow rascal he speaks only well. He will applaud rascality as frankness. He will remark his fidelity to his friends when such fidelity is merely the sociability of one who can not rise in the social scale because he is content to be low. He is a low politician, a fixer of cases. He herds his gang of confederates to combine to bring up or defeat an action in the lawcourt.

Finally, if the Cripple was a rascal, he at least kept his rascality to himself. We would certainly hesitate to term him "criminally inclined". Not so the Patron of Rascals. He wills to be the Peck's bad boy of evildoers. His glory is to be intimate with evildoers; his sympathy (and thiscolleratly could never be said of the Cripple) is with rascality. He is therefore, a rascal himself, but a rascal without the bright rainbow of good wit and healthy humor that arches the character of the Cripple.

THE IMMORAL VAN VERSUS THE FLATTERER

Though Eratosthenes of Cé was in the bloom of youth, his characteristics were lewdness and debaucheries. Indeed, strained as the characters of Theophrastus seem to be, he has not depicted anyone so bold, so churlish, so depraved as Eratosthenes. The Character who closest appeals Eratosthenes is the Flatterer. Eratosthenes must have been a flatterer, a
genius in subtleties. How he must have smoothed the selfapprobation of Euphiletus' wife; how gently and finely must he have fanned the flames of her lust. He would chide only her virtue; for her vice have only earnest commendation, for it was of her vice, not of her virtue, that he had use.

Flattery, after all, is closely connected with friendship; it is the kiss of betrayal. Flattery is false friendship, fawning hypocrisy, dishonest civility, base merchantdise of words, a plausible discord of heart and lip, and this -all of this- was for Eratosthenes the key to the heart of Euphiletus' wife. By flattery Eratosthenes made her virtuous heart lustful, through flattery he pretended love and friendship.

Surely the flattery of Eratosthenes was a mode of companionship degrading but profitable to him who flattered. Yet Eratosthenes has none of the harsh angles and coarseness of Theophrastus' Flatterer, who used to laugh heartily at a frigid joke, and stuff his cloak into his mouth as if he could not repress his amusement. Briefly, Eratosthenes may be observed saying and doing all things by which he conceives that he will gain favor with the added distinction that he does it gracefully and with polish.

Eratosthenes has in him some of the Shameless Man, for shamelessness is neglect of reputation for the sake of base gain. This shame for the sake of gain was, of course, merely a bonum apparens, and, for Eratosthenes, a bonum delectabile. That he neglected his reputation is evidenced by the trust he put in the slave girl, and by his actual reputation as it existed on the tongue of the hag.

A last bit of similarity between Eratosthenes and the Characters of Theophrastus is to be found in the Coward. The cowardice of Eratosthenes has been studied at length in the comparison of him with Paris. The Coward
portrays the shrinking of the soul through fear.

THE YOUNG MAN VERSUS THE BOASTFUL MAN

In the mind of Theophrastus boastfulness was pretension to advantages which one does not possess. The Young Man of Lysias is anything but the above. The Boastful Man would brag of his money-lending business, of the vastness of his trade at school, of the extent of his personal gains and losses, all tales of the long bow. The Young Man delivered his speech in 396, and who speaks of himself as a child in 403, has done no great deeds. But he does not pretend to have done them. Whereas the Boastful Man busies himself in fashioning vain tales of the heroic deeds he pretends to have performed, the Young Man dwells on the deeds of his family. Jebb says that the speech of the Young Man is "emphatically an appeal to pity".8

The Young Man's pride on his family is noted, and his expressions of it. The Boastful Man has none of this. He is bombastic in expressions of self appreciation. He could never be sincerely pathetic, for he is all front. Finally the two differ in this, that even the daily conversation of the Boastful Man is full of ornament and of rhetorical figures, while the language of the Young Man is plain and direct as are his thoughts.
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CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The statement of the plan of this paper read that in the conclusion an estimate would be made of the figures of Lysias' Orations coupled with the Homeric heroes and the Characters of Theophrastus. No longer should be doubted the ability of Lysias to depict character. Surely Homer, The Poet of Perfect Taste, as Horace names him must be conceded to be a master of the art of character delineation. As a matter of fact many scholars insist on building actual history on Homer's characters, while others, with Lear, insist that the Homeric characters are at least genuine figures of history and not of folklore. Quintilian adds that it is a mark of ability even to appreciate Homer. And Lysias, indeed, has come very close to Homer as a delineator of character. How close he has come has been shown.

How much alike were Eratosthenes of Oe, the Immoral Man, and Paris. If one allows for the difference of medium by which the characters are made known to him, he can not but be amazed by the similarity between Eratosthenes and Paris. Though Paris is depicted by the song of an epic poet, and Eratosthenes by the court plea of a logographer, yet they are alike fundamentally in the fact of their many personal attractions, their beauty and personality. From the respective texts it is apparent that they were both desired by women, were violators of hospitality (a cardinal sin in the Greek category of crime), were seducers of another's wife, were cowards.

Hector and the Patriotic Man were coupled as being similar in devotion to the State. Not only was their patriotism above reproach, but
it was an ideal for which each labored. If the word is used in the good 
sense as meaning frank and open, it can be said that they were alike in 
their bluff personalities. Both Antitheus and Hector were somewhat loud 
and free, but because of their fearless goodnature and confidence of spirit 
neither annoyed nor gave pain to others. Family life was precious to both 
of them. Pro aris et focis!

A pleasant likeness is that between the god, Hephaestus, and the 
Clever Man. Lame of leg, but agile of wit; wags, they both were. Each was 
the center of a happy throng which they made happy by their happy tongues.

The woman characters of Lysias stand out well in the light of 
comparison with the immortal ideals of motherlove as personified by Hecuba 
and the wife of Hector. So well did Lysias portray this trait that the 
commentators of every century have not failed to applaud him for it. On the 
other hand his Immoral Woman is what Helen of Troy could have been if she 
had been placed on the lower level and in the same circumstances.

An explanation of the origin of the Characters of Theophrastus 
has been given. It is rejected by many students, conceded by others. In 
the main, the why and the wherefore of the Characters of Theophrastus are 
disputed points. The point here to be emphasized is that the Characters are 
taken from real life. H. J. Rose remarks:"The Characters are drawn not from 
Menander's or any one else's plays, but from Athenian streets and houses. 
They are generalized and simplified, but never unreal". And Croiset 
applauds the shrewd psychology of Theophrastus. He names Theophrastus a keen 
observer, a naturalist in the world of morals.

Behind the ridiculous failings of the Characters of 
Theophrastus is found the normal man. It is the normal man of Lysias (each
and every character of Lysias who stands in contrast to the overdone
Characters of Theophrastus. The Flatterer is an evident contrast to Paris
and Eratosthenes of Oe. The coarseness of the Flatterer contrasts with the
amenities of Paris and Eratosthenes. In this contrast the Flatterer stands
as one boldly defiant of decency and dishonest of civility. The Flatterer
was also at odds with the outward demeanor and apparent respectability of
Eratosthenes and Paris.

The same holds true of the Man of Paddy Ambition who bought the
public eye. What could he know of devotion to the State, of the ideal of
patriotism? He could not hope to appreciate "Pro aris et focis". His mean
craving for distinction, his sordid love of family were foreign to Hector
and Dantitheus.

In conclusion let it be stated that Lysias has done something
great in so depicting the characters of his clients. Lysias so identified
himself with his clients that the reader feels that it is not the speech of
a paid logographer, but the very words of the litigant; no orator, but the
words of an honest man strung to eloquence by his grievous wrongs, or to
ironical wit by the sheer absurdity of the villains who attack him. Perhaps
Homer is a greater artist in character portrayal in itself; perhaps, too,
Theophrastus is a keener observer of the defects of mankind, but, on the
whole, Lysias in the use of his prime instrument, Ethopoia, is
unsurpassed.
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