

SOME EXPLANATORY DIVINATIONS AS A CONTRIBUTION TO THE APPROACH OF THE TEXT OF GORGIAS*

According to "Dießs and Kranz" edition of the prosocratic fragments¹ at the paragraphs 11, 12 and 13 and the relevant pages and lines(2), the text of *Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον* is edited as it stands in D.-K., p. 291. At the relative to §12 apparatus criticus, as far as the lines 12ff.(3) are concerned, the disheartening conviction of the MSS(4) *heillos verderbt* is stated by the editors. However, the crucial passages in order to respond to the nearby edited context -which is provisionally considered by us as sound- could be restored and read as it is reproduced in bolder types and concisely resumed at the relevant Table (see below).

Our readings of the text are indicated attempts among a great many conjectures so far proposed by others. The utility of our readings lies with our aim at presenting a further testified analysis of the gnosiological theory of Gorgias; more concretely, as this Gorgianic theory is exemplified by the paradigm of Helen's innocence who is defended by means of the treatise of the third case in the tetraptych Gorgianic method of probability in *Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον*.

Therefore, what Gorgias might have said at this point is that it is probable for Helen to have been assailed by the eulogist Alexander. In this case of probability Alexander might have exclusively used his weapon of logos peithous in the form of a hymn, and not any other arming/armament or way of physical violence of his to have been applied; this last one has been described at the beginning of the second Gorgianic eikos at #7(5) and in the following phrasing: εἰ δὲ βίᾳ ἡρπάσθη καὶ ἀνόμως ἐβιάσθη καὶ ἀδίκως ὑβρίσθη, δῆλον ἔστι, etc. At #7 the physical violence that is probable to have been exerted on Helen by Alexander was connected with lawlessness and injustice;

in our passage, referring to the third treatise of eikos to Helen's defense, the last two connotations are missing. In the Alexander's eulogistic-laudatory speech of persuasion only the connection of the logos with the concept of violence seems to be kept by Gorgias.

Notes

*A part of this article was presented at the *First World Olympic congress of Philosophy: "Philosophy, competition and good life"* [Athens-Spetses, June 27th-July 4th, 2004].

1. Berlin 1952, 1960, 82. *Gorgias*, B 11.

2. See D.-K., p. 291, 10-15 and p. 292, 1-5.

3. I. e., p. 291, 12-15.

4. A: Crippsianus and Burneianus 75, saec. XIII; X: Palatinus Heidelbergensis 88, saec. XII.

5. I. e., p. 290, 7-8.

Concise Table of restorations:

p. 291 (#11), lines 9-11. Ἡ δὲ δόξα σφαλερὰ καὶ ἀβεβαίος οὔσα σφαλεραῖς καὶ ἀβεβαίοις εὐτυχίαις περιβάλλει τοὺς αὐτῇ χρωμένους.

(#12), lines 11-12. Τίς οὖν αἰτία (sc. ἐναντία) καλύει καὶ τὴν Ἑλένην (sc. δόξαν περιβαλεῖν σφαλεραῖς καὶ ἀβεβαίοις εὐτυχίαις);

lines 12-13. Ὡν (sc. Ἑλένην) ὕμνος (sc. ἀοιδῆς) ἦλθεν ὁμοίως ἄν, οὐ νεύουσιν, ὥσπερ εἰ θυτήριον βία ἥρπασθη.

lines 13-14. Τὸ γὰρ τῆς πειθοῦς ἐξῆν (sc. βία ἥρπασαι τὴν Ἑλένην), ὃ δὲ νοῦς εἴκει τῇ ἀνάγκῃ.

line 15. Ὁ εἶδος ἔξει μὲν οὐ, τὴν δὲ δύναμιν τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει.

p. 291, line 15 - p. 292, lines 1-2. Λόγος γὰρ ψυχὴν ὁ πείσας, ἣν ἔπεισεν, ἠνάγκασε καὶ πιθέσθαι τοῖς λεγομένοις καὶ συναινέσαι τοῖς ποιουμένοις.

p. 292, lines 2-4. Ὁ μὲν οὖν πείσας ὡς ἀναγκάσας ἀδικεῖ, ἡ δὲ πεισθεῖσα ὡς ἀναγκασθεῖσα τῷ λόγῳ μάτην ἀκούει κακῶς.

Cf. p. 292 (#13), lines 4-5ff. Ὅτι δ' ἡ πειθὼ προσιούσα τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐτυπώσατο ὅπως ἐβούλετο, χρὴ μαθεῖν πρῶτον μὲν...δεύτερον δὲ...τρίτον <δὲ> ...

Cf. p. 293 (#14), lines 2-3. οἱ δὲ (sc. τῶν λόγων) πειθοῖ τινι κακῇ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐφαρμάκευσαν καὶ ἐξεγοήτευσαν.

Cf. p. 293 (#15), lines 4-5. καὶ ὅτι μὲν, εἰ λόγῳ ἐπίεσθη, οὐκ ἠδίκησεν ἀλλ' ἠτύχησεν, εἴρηται.

From the aspect of paleography and textual criticism, the following marked phrases of the #12, p. 291, could be reread –instead of the edited ones– with the least possible changes made in the MSS original text:

line 13: ἦν added

line 13: οὐ νέουσαν instead of οὐ νέαν οὔσαν

line 13: θυτήριον instead of βιατήριον

line 14: βίᾱ (dativus) instead of βίᾱ (nominativus)

line 14: εἶκει τῇ ἀνάγκῃ instead of καίτοι εἰ ἀνάγκη

line 15: ὁ εἶδος instead of ὁ εἰδὼς

line 15: ἔξει μὲν οὖν, instead of ἔξει μὲν οὖν,

We shall proceed to give our main justifications in defense of our conjectures, as they can be testified by the ancient sources and the Gorgianic both text and *modus dicendi*; so we shall try to keep the pace of the above exposed conjectures, as follows:

. In lines 12-13: The τίς οὖν-sentence could stand as an elliptical interrogative clause which is supplemented from the last period of #11 (lines 10-12) -by means of the figure of speech called βραχυλογία ἐξ ἀναλόγου ("brachylogy in proportion")- as follows: (lines 12-13) Τίς οὖν αἰτία (sc. ἐναντία) καλύει καὶ τὴν Ἑλένην (sc. δόξαν περιβαλεῖν σφαλεραῖς καὶ ἀβεβαίαις εὐτυχίαις);. In the so to be understood text the infinitive περιβαλεῖν is the object of the main verb καλύει; the subject of the infinitive is the accusative δόξαν (because of the heteroprosopia) and the words Ἑλένην and εὐτυχίαις are its objects -direct and indirect, respectively. Thus the οὖν-inferential interrogative sentence stresses the logical impotence of any objection whatsoever to our regarding Helen as one among "the many" people who

would fall into slippery and uncertain success because of their having followed the dictate of their opinion (of their δόξα).

. In line 13: ἤν is added. The relative pronoun ἤν (sc. 'Ελένην) is added by us to the edited text –right after the word 'Ελένην and the question mark (marking the end of the main clause) also added by us- as an easily rejected by the copyists dittography because of the homoiophony of the phrase Ελένην ἤν; further, the pronoun ἤν (sc. 'Ελένην) is taken to introduce a main clause without any connection with the previous main sentence by means of a particle. This figure of speech called προσβολή stresses the importance of what follows, and that is exactly given in the form of a breaking parable –instead of a dogmatic statement- in which Helen is portrayed as a victim of logos peithous.

In the so formed new main sentence the accusative ἤν (sc. 'Ελένην) is depended on ἤλθεν ἄν, being the object of this verbal form of probability –constructed in the indicative of aorist with ἄν. This structure of ἐρχεσθαι with the aprothetic accusative of person in Gorgias is an echo from the syntax of lyrical poetry; more precisely, it is in accord with the already since Pindar existing syntax of the verb as is clearly attested at the end of *Isthmionici*, II, 48: ταῦτα, Νικάσιππ', ἀπόνειμον, ὅταν / ξεῖνον ἐμὸν ἡθαῖον ἔλθης. Such a nude / blatant accusative of person not simply denotes the end of a motion, but intensively stresses the personal contact and the psychological direct affliction in a moral attack of the type either of an insult or an affection, either towards the destruction or the restoration; this nuance of a psychological approach is more underlined when the subject of the so constructed verb ἐρχεσθαι is an abstract noun, as it stands in lyrical passages from Sophocles (*Philoct.*, 141: when the Χορὸς is addressing Νεοπτόλεμος. σὲ δ', ὃ τέκνον, τόδ' ἐλήλυθεν / πᾶν κράτος ὠγύγιον) and Euripides (*Hippol.*, 1102-04: Χορὸς Κυνηγῶν. ἦ μέγα μοι τὰ θεῶν μελεδήμαθ', ὅταν φρένας ἔλθῃ, / λύπας παραιρεῖ; cf. also Thes., s.v. ἐρχομαι, Liban. vol. 4, p. 779, 5: καὶ δευτέρα τις ἤλθέ με κακοπραγία, nisi leg. μοι). Such syntactical, stylistic and semasiological data inherited from the lyrical past of hymns and choric poetry facilitate our suggestion that Helen's mental state has been assailed by Alexandre's logos peithous as if she has become infatuated with the truthfulness of his argumentation.

. In line 13: the reading ὑμνος is retained by us as the subject of the verb ἤλθεν ἄν. The word ὑμνος could mean ὑμνος ἀοιδῆς –as in *Odyssey* 8, 429(1)-

which according to Pandazides' Lexicon must be rendered ὕφος ᾧδῆς. Ὕμνος is used here personified instead of its agent, Alexander himself who is supposed to have pronounced the hymn in his attacking and persuasive address to Helen's intellect. That such a hymn –in fact a eulogizing text in verse and melody(2)- could refer to people –particularly to the deeds of old people, men and women- and not exclusively to gods is well attested in the oldest of the Homeric hymns addressed to Apollo (Ὕμνος εἰς Ἀπόλλωνα 160-61(3)). That also the motion in the phrase ὕμνος ἔρχεται functions on the base of its emotional affects to the addressed is shown by phrases encompassing ἤχος, as in *Iliad* 10. 139: τὸν περὶ φρένας ἤλυθ' ἰωή, or *Odyssey* 17. 261: περὶ δέ σφεας ἤλυθ' ἰωή, or by phrases expressing capturing by emotions, as in the phrases ἤλθεν ἄχος (in *Iliad* 22. 43) and ἤλθεν ἱμερος (24. 514). Besides, that a hymn can capture the φρένας is attested in lyrical parts of tragedy as in Aeschylus, *Eumen.*, 306: Χορός. καὶ ζῶν με δαίσεις οὐδὲ πρὸς βωμῶ σφαγεῖς. ὕμνον δ' ἀκούσῃ τόνδε δέσμιον σέθεν, and 331-33: (ἐφύμνιον α) ἐπὶ δὲ τῷ τεθυμένῳ / τόδε μέλος, παρακοπά, / παραφορὰ φρενοδαλῆς, / ὕμνος ἐξ Ἑρινύων / δέσμιος φρενῶν, ἀφόρ- / μικτος, αὐτὰ βροτοῖς, or in Euripides, *Alc.* 359: (in plural and not in a lyrical part) Ἀδμήτος. εἰ δ' Ὀρφῶς μοι γλῶσσα καὶ μέλος παρῆν, / ὥστ' ἡ κόρην Δῆμητρος ἡ κείνης πόσιν / ὕμνοισιν κηλήσαντά σ' ἐξ Αἰδου λαβεῖν, / κατῆλθον ἄν.

In our text therefore, Gorgias could use the word ὕμνος (ἀοιδῆς) to the effect of a hymn manipulated by Alexander and incorporating his assaulting mechanism, i.e. all probable capabilities of a subtle and strategic attacker(4).

Notes

1. (ὄφρα) δαίτι τε τέρπηται καὶ ἀοιδῆς ὕμνον ἀκούων; with the lines 499sq. the Demodocus' song of the Trojan Horse is following.

2. *LSJ*, s.v. ὕμνος, frequently in Pindar in phrases as follows: ὕμνος πολύφατος, ἐπικώμιος; Θῆρωνος Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ὕμνον, etc.

3. μνησάμενοι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἡδὲ γυναικῶν / ὕμνον ἀείδουσιν, θέλγουσι δὲ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων, OCT, 1946: Th. W. Allen.

4. Cf. the relevant phrases of Bacchylides: ὑφαίνει τις ὕμνον; ὕμνος γεραίρει τινά; φαίνει τις ὕμνον, γεραίρων φίλιαν, in connection with the healing of the soul by means of hope and with the delightful songs (see the following passages respectively Bacchylides (*Epinikoi*), Snell-Maehler, Teubner, Leipzig 1970, 5. 9-10: ἡ σὺν Χαρίτεσσι βαθυζῶνις ὑφάνας / ὕμνον ἀπὸ ζαθέας νάσου / ξένος ὑμετέραν / ἐς κλυτὰν πέμπει πόλιν, / χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας / κλεινὸς θεράπων; 6. 10-16: σὲ δὲ νῦν ἀναξιμόλπου / Οὐρανίας ὕμνος ἔκατι Νίκας, / Ἀριστομένειον / ὦ ποδάνεμον τέκος, / γεραίρει προδόμοις ἀοι- / δαῖς, ὅτι στάδιον κρατήσας / Κέον εὐκλέεζας; 13. 220-31: ἐλπίδι θυμὸν ἰαίν[- / τῇ καὶ ἐγὼ πύσυνος / φοινικοκραδέμενος [τε Μούσαις / ὕμνων τινὰ τάνδε ν[ερόπλοκον δόσιν / φαίνω,

ξενίαν τε [φιλά- / γίλαον γεραίρω, / τάν (sc. δόσιν) ... / τερψιπέεις νιν ἄ[ο]ιδαι / παντί
καρύζοντι λα[ῶ]ι, al.

In other words, Alexander could be conceived and pictured by Gorgias as a ὕμνοπóλος or a ἀοιδοπóλος, i.e. χρώμενος ᾧδῃ ποιητικῇ ἐμμελείᾳ συντεθείσῃ (according to the explanation given in Thesaurus, s.vv. ὕμνοπóλος, ἀοιδοπóλος), in order to seduce Helen (to his erotic proposals). Alexander might have acted against Helen's intellect as an efficient user of a hypnotizing aoide composed of persuasive and eulogizing words in verse and accompanied by melody so that it became a hymn.

. That ὕμνος and ὕμνεῖν, as their synonymous ὑμέναιος and ὑμεναίειν, could refer not only to nuptials but also to the initiation to Aphrodites' and Eros' works, we are taught mostly by lexicographers(1). Besides, ὑμέναιος as γαμικὸς ὕμνος was used to denote not only the aoide that recreates but also the nuptials itself, as the later philology shows(2), and as is also testified by the passage from Euripides' *Helen* 722: νῦν ἀνανεοῦμαι τὸν σὸν ὑμέναιον πάλιν / καὶ λαμπάδων μεμνήμεθ' ἅς τετράροισι / ἵπποις τροχάζων παρέφερον.

In this sense but also from the syntactical point of view, the conjecture made by Suess *Ethos* (p. 53, Leipzig 1910) at this very point "Ὑμέναιος ἦλθεν ὁμοίως <ὥς> ἄνουν νέαν οὖσαν ὥσπερ εἰ βίᾳ θηρίον, βίᾳ ἡρπάσθη" is very close to the conjectures we are attempting to prove valid in the same passage.

That point of Gorgias', i.e. the persuasive character of a hymn, is very important to be stressed, since by Gorgias' hint to the use of a hymn -obviously limited to the sphere of poetry- he considers poetry not only amusing and τέρπουσα but also "convincing and argumentative logos in verse". Besides, one is not to forget the following two points: a) the meaning of addressing the gods by a hymn is so intended as to convince them and attract their good will towards the addressees; and b) the convincing and argumentative character of poetry is also well attested by the latest of all the Homeric hymns addressed to Hermes(3); there, the use of eikos and the argumentation of probability is well displayed in the self-defense of baby Hermes against the accusations of his brother Apollo in presence of the father of all Zeus.

So, what is said in our text is that any persuasive and melodious-suave words in verse were probable to have been addressed by Alexander in the manner of a coward-like and subtle strategy, as if by an enemy attacking Helen's insufficient arming, her ignorant intellect and her unsuspecting state

of mind. This function of *peitho* is exemplified at #13 (p. 292, 4-5) of our text as follows: "Ὅτι δ' ἡ πειθὼ προσιούσα τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐτυπώσατο ὅπως ἐβούλετο. In analogous passages to that of Xenophon(4), the compound verb in the syntax of *προσιέναι* τῷ ἐχθρῷ means "to manage unseen and in a cunning way to effectively attack the enemy, so catching him by surprise and without giving him the chance to respond by using or improving his defense media".

In the recently mentioned Gorgianic passage of #13 (p. 292, 4-5), the persuasion is the privileged attacking enemy who captures and enchains the *logos*; then, *peitho* and *logos* compiled in one as a professionally manipulated and effective tool chisels and shapes the exact pattern aimed at the soul behavior of the listener.

Notes

1. By Pollux 3, 37: ὑμῆσαι τὸ τὸν ὑμέναιον ᾄσαι, and in *Lex. Rhet.* in Bekker, *Anecdota*, p. 312; 17: Ὑμέναιος ὁ ἐν τοῖς γάμοις ᾄδόμενος ὕμνος. Ὑμέναιος γὰρ ἐστὶ πρόπολος Ἀφροδίτης καὶ Ἑρώτων; cf. etiam *Procl. ap. Phot. Bibl.*, p. 321, 19: Αἰολικῇ παραπλέκοντας τὴν εὐχὴν διαλέκτω, οἷον ὑμεναίειν (but see also *Thes.*, s.v. ὑμεναίω, col. 91) καὶ ὁμονοεῖν τοὺτους ἀεὶ ὁμόσε ναίοντας.

2. Cf. *Thes.*, s.v. ὑμέναιος, col. 90, *Athen. I*, p. 6A, de *Philoxeno*: ἔσας ὑμέναιον ... πάντας ἐψυχαγώγησε. Ubi ut ὑμέναιον ᾄδεν dicit, ita alibi γαμικὸν ὕμνον ᾄδεν ... *Hesychio* ὑμέναιος est non solum ἡ ἐπιγάμιος ᾠδή, *Nuptiale Carmen*, sed etiam ipse γάμος.

3. Ὑμνος εἰς Ἑρμῆν 367-386, and 387-396.

4. *Anab. I. 8. II*; *Cyr. paed. 2. 4. 12*; *7. I. 24*.

. In line 13: The adverb ὁμοίως is differently interpreted by us and not in direct connection with the cluster of retained particles ὥστερ εἰ "as if" as they are introducing the second member of the present Gorgianic parable. In our passage, Helen has been taken in her full human nature as one among "the many" (οἱ πολλοί) who are not privileged with the three time-staged knowledge -the remembrance of the past and the comprehension of the present and the foresight of the future; so people, being in the unprivileged state of ἀγνώως νοῦς or ἄνους ψυχῇ are satisfied to rely on their opinion (δόξα) instead of the knowledge (γνώσις). In the same way Helen's νοῦς is taken by Gorgias not equipped with the stability of the knowledge (e.g. of what the "speech of persuasion" meant), and she does exactly as "the majority of the people" (οἱ πολλοί) do: "she also gives the opinion as a consultant to her soul". This last one has been stated in the conclusion of #11 with the following

phrasing: ὥστε περὶ τῶν πλείστων οἱ πλείστοι τὴν δόξαν σύμβουλον τῇ ψυχῇ παρέχονται.

With such a disposition of mind Helen was one of "the many" people who for many things function according to their opinion and not to their knowledge, and so they become easily and uncritically persuaded by the person who knows the τέχνη πειθοῦς. That sort of similarity of Helen to "the many" people could be represented by the adverb ὁμοίως; this ὁμοίως is the same ὁμοίως that was used in the much-disputed previous passage of #11: οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως ὅμοιος ᾗ ὁ λόγος and is resumed here. There, it was stated that the effective power of the speech of persuasion could not be so catalytic in formulating an almost "pathetically" /passively accepted aspect to the audience in an equalizing way (ὁμοίως) and exactly as it was intended to become by the conductor of the speech (λόγος ὅμοιος), if all the people operated well equipped with all the three time-staged knowledge: the remembrance of the past and the comprehension of the present and the foresight of the future.

Helen's mental ethos, therefore, has undergone a certain change μεταβολή only under the attack of Alexander's persuasive hymn. That means that Helen is assumed by Gorgias to have been prompt and ready to resist to any change of her present state: e.g. to the thought of leaving behind Menelaos and her family and running away. So, in the Gorgianic probable fact, Helen was steadily keeping that ethos all the time during the arrival and the simple presence of Alexander at the Spartan Royal Megaron; she is supposed to be unwilling οὐχ ἐκοῦσα, οὐ νέουσα to any change of her family life before that ὕμνος (those melodious argumentatively structured words of nuptial and erotic peitho) was pronounced by Alexander.

Alexander's hymn drastically persuaded Helen's ignorant intellect -her δοξάζοντα καὶ μὴ γινώσκοντα νοῦν- to the effect that she responded to him by a theoretical πάθος that became a practical πάθος in two stages: first she obeyed Alexander's words (#12, p. 292, lines 1-2: πιθέσθαι τοῖς λεγομένοις); and then she acted in the way of a "beaten" and drugged and enchanted heart consenting to follow Alexander in praxis (#12: συναίνεσαι τοῖς ποιουμένοις). In fact, the main point of the third treatise of eikos to Helen's defense is Helen's eventual consent to materialize Alexander's propositions; in other words, her disposed unwillingness was transformed by persuasion to consent (to συναίνεσις), i.e. to practically following her abductor away from Greece. So the constructive power of persuasion construed in formulating the theo-

retical consent into practical consent acquires its highest quality, i.e. its material substance of necessity and ἀνάγκη.

Here the contrary to the didactic and advisory persuasion, the malicious speculative persuasion (ἡ κακὴ πειθὼ) must be meant; i.e. that kind of logos which is supplied with an opportunistic siren-like resonant suavity. The last one could be accomplished by the order and the repetition of words, syllables and vocals, by rhythm and prosody and by melodious accompaniment. This explanatory analysis of ours is in accord with what is confirmed by Gorgias' recapitulation of the third eikos at #14 (p. 293, 2-3) of our text: οἱ δὲ (sc. τῶν λόγων, a genitivus partitivus) πειθοῖ τι κακῇ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐφαρμάκευσαν καὶ ἐξεγοήτευσαν. With these words Gorgias could be referring to the essence of the third case of defense for Helen's innocence (by means of eikos and the argumentation by probability), meaning that the intellectual heart of Helen was drugged by the words of a bad nature of persuasion which was directed by a cunning disposition from the part of its unjust user Alexander.

In line 13: οὐ νεύουσιν(1) is our conjecture for the reading οὐ νέαν οὔσαν. The taken for granted initial resistance of Helen's "ethical noos" to the idea of her commitment to Alexander's good figure appearance or other advantages of his -apart from that of logos- is needed to be stressed by Gorgias so that the forced by logos peithous consent of Helen to the eulogistic propositions of Alexander to praxis becomes the highlight of the power of logos. That is exactly the thinking for the explanation of the proposed by us conjecture οὐ νεύουσιν -from the semantic point of view. Thus, Helen did not yield at first -by logical way of behavior and her ethos- to Alexander; the hymn of Alexander reached her and attacked her οὐ νεύουσιν being in the intellectual and ethical state of refusing and not consenting willingly, i.e. "of not submitting readily by some kind of inclination to changing her life-status". Eventually, she became affected, enchanted and swept off her mind because of the φαρμακεία καὶ γοητεία τῶν λόγων, i.e. τοῦ ὕμνου τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου.

As a result of such a logos peithous imposed by Alexander, Helen became a manageable and an easily manipulated mental and psychological whole, having been drugged by logos-hymn of Alexander and dragged to a similar state to that of a victim. We could compare Helen's state to that of an animal dragged to the altar by means of a slipknot that is a ἀγκύλη, a βρόγχος, i.e. ἀνάγκη. In our case, Helen is dragged to the altar of the materialized wishes

of her abductor Alexander by means of a well and melodiously composed, of an arbitrary and psychologically imposing logos; in other words, by means of an ἀναγκαῖος λόγος pronounced in verse and melody by her sacrificer.

En passant, we could compare Helen's involuntary or innocent -but nevertheless self-destructive acting and yielding into the δύναμις τοῦ ἀναγκαίου λόγου- to the same intellectually moral necessity imposed on the young and obedient Agamemnon's daughter Iphigeneia. Iphigeneia was also deceived by false marriage promises and then taken by surprise; so having come to the plight of insufficient data-knowledge, she yielded into the δύναμις of an equally ἀναγκαίου λόγου. In this case, the logos peithous has been professed -for the sake of the Achaian army- by Iphigeneia's own father. Iphigeneia -unequipped with knowledge- was faced with the dilemma either to follow the order of her physical survival, i.e. the nomos of physis, or the order of her social survival, the nomos of "the many people"; both her mother and her father represented the two nomoi respectively. Iphigeneia consented to be sacrificed; so her young inexperienced ignorant "noos" worked with insufficient to a gnosis elliptical time-staged "gnome" and so she fell to uncertain happiness that of sacrifice.

In order to conclude about the literary defense of these two eminent victims of πειθῶ, we would say that the immorality of logos of bad peithous is attacked to Helen's defense by Gorgias' psychological analysis about "gnome", knowledge and persuasion; but for the sake of Iphigeneia and the recovery of nature-physis against society-nomos, it is the "koine gnome" (*communis opinio*), the public opinion itself, and the poetry of old attic drama which formulized the line for the heroine's defense; in effect, they recounted Iphigeneia's escape and rescue from the sacrificial utility by the intervention of the virgin deity of Artemis.

Now, if we take into consideration that the chronology of *Elenis engomion* is set about 414-413 BC (between the presentations of Euripides' *Troades* and *Helen*) and that the presentation of Euripides drama *Iphigeneia in Tauris* was set -according to some aspect- in just the previous years in Athens, we can justly gather the following: in the case of the Gorgianic argument of probability by logos peithous for Helen's innocence, a hint is underlain to the similarly victimized daughter of Agamemnon after her having been persuaded to be directed to the altar for her compatriots sake. Both the heroines were abducted to the same direction of an Asian territory by an invisible -so divine- power machine: either by the persuasive or a miraculous resumption.

One must also underline that –in following the Gorgianic climactic treatise of *eikos* at its third stage in the present epideictic speech- we find out that the abductor Alexander is also elevated to a highly intellectual standard as is explained in the following lines: a) through his advantage of being capable to use efficient *peitho* towards his victim's consent to *praxis*; and b) through his manipulating *ἔλλογον βίαν* –instead of imposing physical violence- by means of a *logos* so well composed and effectively pronounced that it became enforcing the other soul to action. So Alexander has been elevated by Gorgias to a higher standard than his barbarous origin would permit. Besides, we must stress the obvious: that Gorgias speaks one way or another having steadily the athenian rhetorical and cultural standards of the fifth century in his mind.

Note

1. Cf. the exact opposite concept referring to *concent* caused by awe and respect, e. g., in Homeric Hymn *Eis Ἑρμῆν* 395: νεῦσεν δὲ Κρονίδης, ἐπεπείθετο δ' ἀγλαὸς Ἑρμῆς; cf. also, *ibid.*, 521 (*concent* supported by promise): (sc. Ἑρμῆς) ὑποσχόμενος κατένευσε / μή ποτ' ἀποκλέψειν ὅς' ...; *ibid.*, 524: Λητοῖδης κατένευσεν ἐπ' ἄρθμῳ καὶ φιλότῃ / μή ... ἔσσεσθαι; *ibid.*, 519 (*concent* confirmed by oath): θεῶν μέγαν ὄρκον ὁμόσσαι, / ἥ κεφαλῇ νεύσας ἦ ...; *ibid.*, 536: (sc. Ἀπόλλων) πιστωθεὶς κατένευσα καὶ ὤμωσα καρτερὸν ὄρκον.

. In line 13: our conjecture is *θυτήριον*. It is important to elucidate that the Gorgianic parable under consideration functions in its two members *ὕμνος ἦλθεν ὁμοίως ἂν - ὥσπερ εἰ θυτήριον βία ἡρπάσθη* as follows: in the first member of the comparison the causative factor the complex *logos+melos*, viz. hymn, acts as the moving subject which is causing *φαρμακείαν καὶ γοητεῖαν* to the *νοῦς*; thus it directs the establishment of the personality of Helen to the state of a victim; in the second member of the comparison Helen is substituted by the *γένος*, the genre of a victim; thus the Helen-victim is that which suffers the *ἄρπαγῇ* and the abduction by Alexander.

So, the otherwise not cross-referred to reading of the MSS *βιατήριον* could be replaced by our conjectural reading *θυτήριον*; this word means sacrificial thing, victim, i.e. *θύμα*, and suits the text justly for the recapitulated following reasons: a) it exemplarily corresponds to the meaning and thought of the Gorgianic broader context in ##11-15; b) it is well attested in Euripides (*Iphig. Taur.*, 243: Βουκόλος. ἤκουσιν ἐς γῆν ... διπτυχοὶ νεανίαι, / θεῶ φίλον πρόσφαγμα καὶ θυτήριον / Ἀρτέμιδι.); and c) it saves us from the useless resonance of *βια-(τήριον) βία* and the strange to Gorgianic

style anti-climax-like procedure "first derived word and then word-source of derivation".

. In line 14: our conjecture is βίᾱ, *dativus modi*. Through the restored dative βίᾱ instead of the nominative βία -apart from the meaning of "indefensively, inequippedly, swiftly" on the part of the Helen-victim's response- we gain two important recollections: *a*) the νόμος βιαίους, as means of punishment of the seducers; and *b*) the praxis of guilt itself which is hinted to, i.e. the forced sexual intercourse (βιαιὰ συνουσία) towards an extra-marital ὁμόναιος-γάμος with the seducer. In fact the latter imposed either by physical force or by seduction is projected at the background of the whole Helen-Alexander scene as a double-faced crime which -speaking in dicanic terms- used to be highly punished according to the attic legislation of the 5th century (cf., e.g., Lysias' Ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἐρατοσθένους φόνου).

In conclusion of the last two Gorgianic eikos, firstly the physical force exerted by the lawless and unjust Trojan man is referred to at the treatise of the second eikos to Helen's defense (#7); secondly the process of seduction by the eulogistic hymn is referred to at the treatise of the third eikos for the heroine's defense (#12). Besides, the following recollection is inevitably figured in our mind: the identification of the mentally violated female (ἄνους Ἑλένη) -and not actually consenting commitment of Helen to her abductor- with the abduction of an unreasonable and innocent victim (ἄλογον ὄν) dragged for slaughtering by the physical force of a man.

. In line14: τὸ γὰρ τῆς πειθοῦς ἐξῆν is retained by us. The last referred to by us recollection is explained in the following two γὰρ- and δέ-sentences of the #12; the articulate substance-like phrase τὸ τῆς πειθοῦς is meant to denote τὸ βίαιον or τὸ κράτος τῆς πειθοῦς, i.e. the violence or the power of persuasion as exerted on Helen's intellect by Alexander's hymn. The power of the persuasion could have the authority, the ἐξουσία, to snatch, to abduct Helen (and this is exactly meant in the unfolded sentence ἐξῆν τῷ τῆς πειθοῦς βιαίῳ ἀρπάσαι Ἑλένην) by astonishing violence (sc. βίᾱ ἀρπάσαι τὴν Ἑλένην). The personified peitho -needless to note that its feminine subtlety is also hinted at by the Greek nomenclature- was capable to carry Helen off her logical process and married ethical character, thus violating her resistant disposition to any change of her life status. So Alexander's hymn was a persuasive assault against "Helen not beckoning" Ἑλένην οὐ νεύουσιν but dragged away.

. In line 14: εἵκει τῇ ἀνάγκῃ is conjectured by us. After the verbal form ἐξῆν a comma is needed; then, this elliptical dogmatic γάρ-sentence is explained by a gnomic and apophthegmatic δέ-phrase with its general concept of submitting to ἀνάγκῃ already known to the tragedy. So the intellect (ὁ νοῦς) gives way to ἀνάγκῃ as if to the necessity of circumstances and physical ἀρχόνῃ. The proposed by us conjectural reading εἵκει τῇ ἀνάγκῃ came to proceed by the reordering of the vocalization of the phrase καίτοι εἰ ἀνάγκῃ; that sort of anagrammatism or anasyllabism in the members of a phrase might have been caused commonly in the case of a dictated copying of the manuscripts.

The restoration εἵκει τῇ ἀνάγκῃ is from the aspect of meaning a highly adequate accomplishment to the so far given explanation of the Gorgianic thinking at this point. Furthermore, the occurrence of exactly the same construction in a well attested passage of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 1071 (Χορός. Ἦθ', ὦ τάλαινα, ... / εἵκουσ' ἀνάγκῃ τῇδε καίνισον ζυγόν) comes to the defense of our emendation. Not to stress that Gorgias owes more to his contemporary old attic drama than to Homer. In fact, Gorgias remains - despite his few remains- our only positive textual witness of the resonant influence of the old attic tragedy, especially of Aeschylus and Euripides, in the 5th century, since not only his contemporary historians Herodotus and Thucydides but also the old attic rhetors systematically ignore the leading cultural fact of old attic drama.

. In line 15: our three underlined conjectures are ὁ εἶδος ἔξει μὲν οὐ. After the way we have completed the sense of the text, the phrase τὸ τῆς πειθοῦς βίαιον or κράτος is supposed to be resumed through a relative pronoun ὃ -in the position of the edited article ὁ-, thus introducing a main clause divided into two antithetical μὲν-δέ sentences. In fact, by means of the μὲν-δέ sentences Gorgias expresses his dialectically construed rhetorical inference in introducing it unconnectedly/asyndectically to the previous protasis by the schema of προσβολή; therein he is emphasizing the apex of his apophthegmatic statement about the might of logos peithous as the following rendering of ours gives: "the violence or power (τὸ τῆς πειθοῦς βίαιον or κράτος) exerted on a person's intellect through persuasion is not logical for us to expect it (thus the use of the future tense of a logically obligatory inference: ἔξει οὐ) to have any sort of material form (i.e. εἶδος, μορφή, species)".

In other words, our further proposed readings in the μὲν-sentence

are the substantive εἶδος instead of the participle εἰδώς, and the particle of negation οὐ instead of the inferential particle οὐν. What we suppose that Gorgias stresses here is the following: the violence or power of persuasion is not a sort of corporal gesticulation on either part -user of violence and victim of violence; yet it has the same might and force (τὴν δύνανται τὴν αὐτὴν) exactly as the necessity (i.e. the physical violence, the ἀνάγκη) or as the gallows (the ἀρχὸν) have direct destructive power and efficiency on the victim.

In fact, the persuasion process exerts the same violence on ignorant intellect towards the indulgence and yielding of the person into a destructive good luck exactly as a physical attack causes destruction. So, because of a person's inadequacy of knowledge, the persuasion causes a sort of catalytic distraction of the person's course towards the certainty, the stability and the fullness of the three-time staged knowledge, thus destroying the capability of one's criticism. But for this Gorgias has already spoken in #11.

Consequently, an outside factor-actor, i.e. the persuasive argumentation and suavity of orator-abductor and wellknower, is pictured by Gorgias as superior to the insufficient power of the being seduced person's opinion. As a result of this, the being persuaded person -once again- forms an opinion elliptical in time-stages and confines his opinionative knowledge in one or two time-stages. Let us say that one uses only the present view of the matter; this means that one lacks the chance, the time or the presence of mind and knowledge to use his criticism. So, a person's suffering by the process of the persuasion-πάθος means one's non sufficient equipment in knowledge and one's inadequacy to categorize the current issue under the scrutiny in all of the three time-stages of knowledge: of its archaeological or historical, its temporary and its future qualities.

In the case of Helen because of the might, the swiftiness, and the abrupt force of persuasion exerted on her by Alexander, the global thinking and valuation of all the stages -of the previous and present state and the future consequences- concerning Helen's relation towards her abductor is distracted, so that those deficiencies make her fall into slippery and unsafe success or happiness. Since Helen does not have the three time-staged qualities of knowledge, those of the past, the present and the future, she yields into temporary happiness that is slippery and uncertain. However, her commitment to Alexander does not entangle her volition or her will; so her doings cannot be considered a crime, since there is no space of free will and choice or intention from her part. On the contrary, Helen is entangled

in the guileful tricky and technical use of the well-proved and melodiously composed poetical speech because of her elliptical knowledge and inadequacy to cope with the powerful argumentative ethical speech of Alexander. So, Helen's yielding into temporary happiness is caused by her ignorance, and her action to follow Alexander is the effect of her atychia; in fact it is an atychema, the symptom of a slippery and uncertain eutychia. This is exactly what Gorgias recapitulates at #15 (at the very beginning of the treatise of the fourth eikos to Helen's defense, when analyzing the probability of Helen's ἔρως to the attractive posture of Alexander) as follows: καὶ ὅτι μὲν, εἰ λόγῳ ἐπείσθη, οὐκ ἠδίκησεν ἀλλ' ἡτύχησεν, εἴρηται; this statement is found lying in close correlation with the end of #11 (p. 291, 9-11): ἡ δὲ δόξα σφαλερὰ καὶ ἀβεβαίος οὕσα σφαλεραῖς καὶ ἀβεβαίοις εὐτυχίαις περιβάλλει τοὺς αὐτῇ χρωμένους.

Furtheron, our rendering and understanding of the above essentially connected passages is as follows: "and it has been argued by us that if Helen was persuaded by the speech, the eulogizing and melodious ἐγκωμιαστικός λόγος of her abductor, she did not commit a crime but had a bad luck, since she slipped into unsafe happiness because of two reasons: *a*) because of her ignorance, her elliptical and insufficient knowledge and her compulsory trusting of her own opinion; and *b*) because of the knowing power of persuasion exerted by Alexander on her sensible-intellectual poor arming".