

GREEK DECLAMATION BEYOND PHILOSTRATUS' SECOND SOPHISTIC

WILLIAM GUAST
*Winchester College**

Abstract: This article examines the surviving Greek declamations of the first to third century AD. They are found to be at odds with Philostratus' familiar picture of the genre in respect of their brevity and stylistic simplicity. Explanations in terms of forgery/misattribution, textual adulteration of some form or the youth of the declaimers at the time of composition are rejected, and it is concluded rather that Philostratus' picture of the genre is significantly distorted. Specifically, the *Vitae sophistarum* (1) omit declamations composed for didactic ends in favour of show declamations and (2) even among show declamations focus almost exclusively on the more florid end of the stylistic spectrum.

Keywords: Greek declamation, Second Sophistic, Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists*, *Vitae sophistarum*

While the Second Sophistic is one of the fastest-growing areas in contemporary classical scholarship, the corpus of surviving declamations from the first to third century remains underused, particularly outside of the works of Aelius Aristides.¹ This is unfortunate, for the extant corpus presents a number of challenges to the familiar Philostratean picture of the genre. In this paper, I address two such problems, namely these texts' brevity and stylistic simplicity, and consider to what extent these necessitate modification of received wisdom. It will become clear that Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum* are an artful construct that represent as typical only a part of the wide range of declamatory activity that took place in this period. Such a conclusion has important consequences, for the notion of a 'Second Sophistic' offered by Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum*, albeit diversely conceived of by contemporary scholars, has been key in determining ancient and modern ideas of declamation and sophistry.²

I will lay out the challenges the extant texts present before attempting to reconcile them with Philostratus; first, however, we must survey the texts themselves.

* weg@wincoll.ac.uk. For helpful suggestions on earlier drafts of this paper I am grateful to Ewen Bowie, Malcolm Heath and the anonymous *JHS* referees, who provided two thoughtful and stimulating reports; I am also grateful to Daniela Colomo for allowing me to see her edition of *PSI* II 148, *P.Lond.Lit.* 140 and *P.Oxy.* inv. 115/A (22)b in advance of its publication. This work was made possible by a postdoctoral research fellowship at the University of Bristol funded jointly by the A.G. Leventis Foundation and the Institute of Greece, Rome and the Classical Tradition. I use Rudolf Stefc's new text of Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum* (2016), and cite this work according to Stefc's new numeration and the traditional Olearius page numbers. I cite Hermogenes' *De ideis* according to the edition of Michel Patillon (2012a), and Ps.-Hermogenes' *De inventione* according to the edition of Patillon (2012b). I cite Hadrian of Tyre's

declamations by page and line number in the edition of Eugenio Amato (2009).

¹ Thus there is little analysis of the surviving declamations other than those by Aristides in important works such as Bowie (1970); Kennedy (1974); Russell (1983); Anderson (1993); Swain (1996). Reardon (1971) 104–14 is the longest treatment; Schmitz (1997) 200–05 and Whitmarsh (2005) 37, 70–73 have some sharp observations.

² Norman (1953) 22, writing about Libanius, terms the *Vitae sophistarum* 'the manual of sophistic deportment' (*cf.* Norman (1965) xxvii); Eunapius, in his *Vitae philosophorum et sophistarum*, after citing precedents for writing the lives of philosophers, invokes only Philostratus for writing the lives of sophists (Eunap. *VS* 454). For the importance of the concept of a 'Second Sophistic' in modern studies, see Whitmarsh (2005) 4–5.

I. The corpus

We have 24 declamations from the first to third century, all of which were in fact written in the second century, from the hands of six authors. The best-known and least-studied, as has been said, are the 12 declamations of Aristides (Aristid. *Or.* 5–16).³ Another of our authors who is well known is Lucian, though his four surviving declamations (*Phalaris* 1; *Phalaris* 2; *Tyrannicida*; *Abdicatus*) are not.⁴ In the *Tyrannicida*, a man claims the reward given to tyrannicides after his killing of a tyrant's son drove the tyrant to suicide.⁵ In the *Abdicatus*, a man trained as a doctor opposes his father's attempt to disown him after he refuses to treat his step-mother.⁶ In *Phalaris* 1, the notorious tyrant of Acragas seeks to persuade the Delphians to accept the bronze bull he has sent as an offering; in *Phalaris* 2, which follows on from *Phalaris* 1, an ordinary citizen of Delphi speaks in favour of Phalaris' plea.⁷ We also have a pair of declamations by the famous rhetor, politician and physiognomist Polemo of Laodicea. In these two texts, the fathers of two fighters killed at Marathon, Cynegirus and Callimachus, each argues that it was his own son who fought most bravely of all those who died in the battle, and that he therefore has the right to deliver the eulogy over the dead.⁸ We then have three declamations by the otherwise almost entirely unknown Lesbonax.⁹ In the first extremely short and possibly incomplete piece, an Athenian exhorts his fellow citizens to take vengeance on the Thebans for the destruction of Plataea in 427 BC. Of the second, slightly longer piece, we can say only that it is an exhortation to battle: there is no indication of either time or place. The third piece, of a similar length to the second, is another exhortation to battle, probably set shortly after 413 BC.¹⁰ Finally, we have two declamations by the sophist Hadrian of Tyre and one by the sophist Herodes Atticus. The scenario of Hadrian's first declamation is ably described by the manuscript superscription: 'efforts to put to death a woman convicted of witchcraft by burning end in failure. Another woman promises to burn her, and succeeds in doing so. Hadrian the rhetor moves that this woman be burned also' (Ἀλοῦσά τις γυνὴ φαρμακείας οὐχ οἶα τε ἦν καυθῆναι· ὑπέσχετό τις ἑτέρα γυνὴ καύσειν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔκαυσεν. Ἄξιότ' Ἀδριανὸς ὁ ῥήτωρ καὶ ταύτην καῖναι, 70.1–4). In the second, mercenaries who have destroyed an enemy camp by diverting a river protest when they are denied their pay.¹¹ The declamation ascribed to Herodes Atticus is conventionally known as the *Peri politeias*. In this text, set in the fifth century BC, the speaker attempts to persuade the people of Larissa to join Sparta against the Macedonian king Archelaus I.¹²

Our surviving texts therefore represent a fairly significant body of evidence, all the more so given the importance of many of their authors (several of whom appear in Philostratus). There was perhaps no more important public figure in second-century Greece than Herodes Atticus; in the view of the sophist Hadrian of Tyre, he was the 'King of Words' (τὸν βασιλέα τῶν λόγων, *VS* 2.37.4/586, 2.53.4/598).¹³ His biography is the longest in Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum* and sits in the middle of the work; Graham Anderson rightly judges that he is the central figure round

³ Text in Lenz and Behr (1976); translations in Behr (1981–1986). Commentary on *Or.* 5–6 in Pernot (1981). Discussions: Russo (2016) (*Or.* 7–8); Tomassi (2016) (*Or.* 9–10).

⁴ Text in Macleod (1972–1986); English translations in the Loeb Classical Library (Harmon (1913); (1936)). There are, of course, fictitious speeches in other Lucianic works, such as the *Bis accusatus*, but these are not declamations proper. On Lucian and declamation, see Guast (2018).

⁵ Bompaire (1958) 245–46; Heath (1995) 175–78; Tomassi (2015); Guast (2018).

⁶ Berry and Heath (1997) 409–14.

⁷ Keil (1913); Bompaire (1958) 265–67.

⁸ Reader (1996) offers a text, very literal translation and commentary, but the text is problematic (Stefec

(2013) 113–14) and much of the commentary is aimed at beginners. Stefec's new Oxford Classical Text is to be preferred (2016). Discussions: Boulanger (1923) 92–94; Whitmarsh (2012) 74–76; Guast (2017) 92–94.

⁹ Text and brief Latin commentary in Kiehr (1907). Discussion in Amato and Sauterel (2010).

¹⁰ Kiehr (1907) 7.

¹¹ Texts in Amato (2009); Italian translations in Amato and Ventrella (2009). The latter text was long attributed to the *Babyloniaca* of Iamblichus (*cf.* Russell (1983) 4 n. 9), but an examination of the manuscript shows that this is clearly incorrect (Schneider-Menzel (1948); Borgogno (1973)).

¹² Text and commentary in Albini (1968). For the question of authenticity, *cf.* below.

¹³ Graindor (1930); Ameling (1983); Tobin (1997).

which the whole work was constructed.¹⁴ Aristides, meanwhile, was one of the most important orators of the second century, and his reputation was still greater after his death;¹⁵ Polemo, too, was another superstar, second only in Philostratus to Herodes himself. Indeed, this triad (Aelius Aristides, Polemo and Herodes Atticus) is singled out in the prolegomena to Aristides' works as part of a 'third crop' (ἡ τρίτη φορὰ) of orators (Lenz (1959) 117.9). Nor was Hadrian of Tyre, one of Herodes' students, much less important, to the point that he has been called 'one of the most famous orators and teachers of the 2nd century'.¹⁶ Lucian, too, should not necessarily be considered a minor declaimer: though his claim to have been among the most expensive sophists (*Apol.* 15) is perhaps to be taken with a pinch of salt, the evidence for his presence in Ionia, Gaul, Antioch, Macedon, Rome, Athens and Egypt, as well as the fact that he was known to Galen, suggest an author of considerable standing.¹⁷ Even Lesbos, practically unknown to us, may have been a significant declaimer: a complimentary reference in the scholia to Lucian compares him to Nicostrotus, another orator obscure today, but whom the theorists clearly regarded highly.¹⁸

II. Two problems

I now lay out two discrepancies between the surviving declamations and Philostratus' picture of the genre.

i. Brevity

The most glaring problem in the extant corpus is the extreme brevity of many of the texts.¹⁹ This brevity contrasts strongly with what is known or surmised about the length of declamations from other sources. The performances reported in Philostratus seem to have been fairly lengthy. The sophist Hippodromus went on declaiming long enough for news of his arrival in Smyrna to get round the town and for all the learned men to have arrived to hear him before he finished (*V S* 2.83.8/619); Varus' error-ridden declamation was so long that Polemo was eventually driven to cut him off in mid-flow (*V S* 1.77.1–5/540–01).²⁰ Furthermore, the sort of elaborate preliminaries to a declamation described in detail in, for example, Philostratus' account of Alexander Clay-Plato's visit to Athens (*V S* 2.26.2–15/571–74) or Aristides' delayed performance before Marcus Aurelius (*V S* 2.35.2–6/582–83) also strongly imply texts of a reasonable length. Aristides tells us of an occasion when he performed from noon to a little before sunset (*Or.* 51.31–41); in fact, he would have started at the fourth hour, roughly ten o' clock in the morning, had a rival not been in the council chamber when he arrived. But demands of the audience for a second performance seem to have made this presentation particularly lengthy (Aristides had to be warned in a dream to eat beforehand), though after the first performance it was already late (40). Elsewhere a doctor in a dream suggests declamation to Aristides as a way of wiling away a few hours before a planned therapeutic bath (51.49–53). Finally, Lucian's bad teacher of rhetoric advises the would-be rhetor to achieve 'fullness' (πληθός) in his speeches by starting with the Trojan War or even Deucalion and Pyrrha (*Rh. pr.* 20): if this satire is anywhere near the truth, then it too points to lengthy productions. The surviving works of the later declaimers Libanius and Choricus are in agreement with this picture. I make the average

¹⁴ Anderson (1986) 82–83.

¹⁵ For Aristides' reputation among his contemporaries, see the complimentary remarks of Galen preserved in Arabic (Schröder (1934) 33) as well as Philostratus' account of his life (not totally positive, but definitely respectful) (Philostr. *V S* 2.34–36/581–85); for other testimonia and Aristides' later reputation, see Schmid in *RE* 2.1 (1895) col. 892.

¹⁶ Janiszewski et al. (2015) 151.

¹⁷ For Lucian's biography, see Schwartz (1965); Baldwin (1973) 7–20; Hall (1981) 1–44; Jones (1986) 6–23. For the Galenic testimony, see Strohmaier (1976).

Lucian's absence from Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum* is puzzling: as Anderson (1986) 87 notes, 'None of the conventional explanations for the omission of Lucian is really convincing.'

¹⁸ Rabe (1906) 189. For the testimonia on Nicostrotus, see Stegemann in *RE* 17.1 (1936) coll. 551–53.

¹⁹ There are some remarks on the length of rhetorical performances in Anderson (1989) 98–99.

²⁰ Philostratus says that it had reached 'late afternoon' (ἐς δειλὴν ... ὀψίαν). If Varus had started in the morning, as Aristides sometimes seems to have done, then this would have been a performance of many hours.

length of a declamation of Libanius 30 pages in Richard Foerster's edition and that of a declamation of Choricus 27 pages in the edition of Foerster and Eberhard Richtsteig.²¹ If we reckon very roughly that it might have taken two minutes to perform what is now a page of Greek, the declamations of Libanius and Choricus would have had average running times of 60 and 54 minutes respectively.²²

Now, some of our extant declamations are fairly long. Aristides' *First Leuctran oration* runs to 36 Greek pages in the edition of Friedrich Lenz and Charles Behr; if we use the same formula as before, then it might have taken somewhat over an hour to deliver. But many of our surviving texts are much shorter. The declamation attributed to Herodes Atticus represents only seven pages of Greek, which is about the length of Lucian's *Phalaris* 1; the three declamations of Lesbonax are six, six and three Greek pages long; Lucian's *Phalaris* 2 is four pages long; the surviving declamations of Hadrian of Tyre are one and two pages long. We are looking here at declamations of between roughly two and 14 minutes in length. Not only is this much shorter than the surviving declamations of Aristides or the later declamations of Libanius or Choricus, but it is even shorter than many *prolaliai*, the informal prefaces that preceded declamations: Lucian's *prolaliai*, which are the only ones that survive for this period, run to between three and eight Greek pages, or between six and 16 minutes.²³ This brevity is particularly striking given that these are written texts. One might have imagined that declaimers would have revised and lengthened for publication shorter works that had originally been delivered orally, as orators in other periods probably did, but our evidence suggests quite the opposite: it is the surviving written texts that are short, while the oral performances we hear about seem to have been much longer.

Such unexpectedly brief declamations form a significant portion of the extant corpus. Of the 16 that are of the expected length, 12 are the work of one declaimer, Aristides; outside of his works, the number of unexpectedly brief declamations is eight out of 12, from the hands of four of our six surviving declaimers, two of whom (Herodes Atticus and Hadrian of Tyre) were definitely major literary figures. This is a real problem.²⁴

ii. Style

In addition to the troubling brevity of many of our declamations, the style of several of them is also much less elaborate than we might have expected. The numerous quotations from different declaimers that we find in Philostratus are almost all in the famous 'Asian' style, full of emotion, rhetorical figures and bold imagery.²⁵ For example, Philostratus describes as characteristic of Varus of Perge's oratory the following extract from a Persian declamation:

ἐφ' Ἑλλησποντον ἐλθὼν ἴππον αἰτεῖς, ἐπ' Ἄθω δὲ ἐλθὼν πλεῦσαι θέλεις· οὐκ οἶδας, ἄνθρωπε, τὰς ὁδοὺς; ἄλλ' Ἑλλησπόντῳ γῆν ὀλίγην ἐπιβαλὼν ταύτην οἶει σοι μενεῖν, τῶν ὁρῶν μὴ μενόντων;

²¹ Foerster (1903–1927); Foerster and Richtsteig (1929).

²² The second of the two *prolaliai* prefixed to five of Choricus declamations' (5–8 and 12) tell us explicitly that these texts were delivered in two halves (with one *prolalia* before each), and we may suspect that the other three declamations for which pairs of *prolaliai* survive (4, 9 and 10) were also so divided. But even the halves of these declamations would have had running times of between 22 and 43 minutes. Cf. Penella (2009) 29–30.

²³ Lucian's surviving *prolaliai* are his *Bacch.*, *Herc.*, *Electr.*, *Dips.*, *Her.*, *Zeux.*, *Harm.* and *Scyth.*, and probably his *Prom. es* and *Dom.* also (Pernot (1993) 550). We do not know that these preceded declamations, but given that Lucian certainly wrote declamations and the clearly prefatory function of his *prolaliai*, it is likely that they

give some sense of the typical length of the genre.

²⁴ The non-Aristidean declamations of more plausible length are Luc. *Tyr.* and *Abd.* (12 and 18 pages respectively, so performance times of 24 and 36 minutes respectively) and Polem. *Cyn.* and *Call.* (12 and 19 pages respectively, so performance times of 24 and 38 minutes respectively).

²⁵ Norden (1898) 1.410–16; Anderson (1993) 95–100; Kim (2017) 53–58. Though the term 'Asian' is originally used of Hellenistic prose, the style in question is found in Greek writers throughout antiquity (Kim (2017) 57–58). On Asianism in the Greek Imperial period, see Rohde (1876) 288–91; Schmid (1887) 1.3–5; Norden (1898) 1.126–149; von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1900); Whitmarsh (2005) 49–52; Dihle (2011); Kim (2017).

When you come to the Hellespont you ask for a horse, and when you come to Mount Athos you want to sail. Good sir, do you not know the usual routes? Do you think that after you have thrown this little bit of earth on the Hellespont it will stand still for you, when the mountains do not? (*VS* 2.29.3/576)

On top of the obvious paradoxes (riding over seas, sailing mountains), note also the parallelism of the first two phrases, the jingle of γῆν ὀλίγην, the polyptoton of μενεῖν ... μενόντων and the ditrochaic ending. Similar is the following from Lollianus' declamation denouncing Leptines:

κέκλεισται τὸ στόμα τοῦ Πόντου νόμῳ καὶ τὰς Ἀθηναίων τροφὰς ὀλίγαι κωλύουσι συλλαβαί, καὶ ταῦτὸν δύναται Λύσανδρος ναυμαχῶν καὶ Λεπτίνης νομομαχῶν²⁶

the mouth of the Pontus has been barred by a law, and Athens' food supply is being held back by a few syllables, and Leptines with his laws has achieved as much as Lysander did with his ships (*VS* 1.65.2/527)

Here there is bold imagery again (laws blocking seas, syllables holding back grain shipments), together with jingles (ὀλίγαι ... συλλαβαί ... δύναται), parallelism of structure and sound (Λύσανδρος ναυμαχῶν ... Λεπτίνης νομομαχῶν) and a double cretic ending.

It is not the case that Philostratus intends these quotations to be understood as only the high points of declamations otherwise written in a much more restrained style. On the contrary, Philostratus very frequently introduces his quotations precisely as exemplifications of general judgements on a sophist's style: in one case (*VS* 2.47.5/593) we hear μελετῶντος δὲ αὐτοῦ χαρακτηριστὴρα ποιῶμεθα ... ('let us take as characteristic of his declaiming ...'); in another (*VS* 2.23.3/569) ὡς ἔκ τε τῶν ἄλλων ὑποθέσεων δηλοῦται καὶ μάλιστα ἐκ τῶνδε ('as is clear from other declamations, and especially from the following').²⁷ Even the extracts from those sophists whom Philostratus describes as more restrained in style show this exuberance. Though Alexander Clay-Plato is described as taking great pleasure in τῷ τονῷ ('intensity') and as outstanding at ἐξαλλαγὰς ('variations'),²⁸ he is also said to have blended boldness with κεκραμένην ἐρμηνηίαν ('a watered-down mode of expression') and Philostratus even has Herodes judge him Σκοπελιανὸν νήφοντα ('a sober Scopelian', *VS* 2.26.11–13/573). But one would not have guessed this from his famous ἀλλ' ἀναπέτασον τὰς πύλας, ἀναπνεῦσαι θέλω ('Open the doors! I need to breathe!', *VS* 2.26.10/573). Similarly, Philostratus describes Dionysius of Miletus as having taken on the natural style of his teacher Isaeus, and not, for all that he was μελιχρότατος ('most honey-sweet') in his ideas, a drunkard when it came to pleasure (οὐκ ἐμέθυε περὶ τὰς ἡδονάς), but someone who regulated his sweetness, saying that honey should be tasted with the finger-tip, not the whole hand (*VS* 1.59.2–3/522). Yet in making this claim Philostratus cites the following phrase: <ῶ> αὐτομολήσασα πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους Βοιωτία. στενάξατε οἱ κατὰ γῆς ἥρωες, ἐγγὺς Πλαταιῶν νενικήμεθα ('O Boeotia who went over to the barbarians! Groan you heroes below the earth: we have been defeated near Plataea!', 1.59.4/522).²⁹ If this is only a finger-tip of honey, then one can only imagine what Philostratus thinks was being produced by ἔνιοι τῶν σοφιστῶν ('some of the sophists'), with whom he contrasts Dionysius.

²⁶ I read νομομαχῶν rather than the νομοθετῶν that Stefcic prints here, for the latter looks very much like a gloss on the *hapax* νομομαχῶν.

²⁷ Other examples of this phenomenon: *VS* 1.66.3/528, 2.27.5/575, 2.29.3/576, 2.32.3/580, 2.54.2/598.

²⁸ For τόπος, see Civiletti (2002) 549; for ἐξαλλαγή, see Civiletti (2002) 550.

²⁹ Further examples: in the case of Antiochus of Aegae, in support of the claim that he was the best of the sophists at handling emotions, οὐ γὰρ μονωδίας ἀπεμήκονεν, οὐδὲ θρήνους ὑποκειμένους ('for he did not

deliver long monodies, nor abject lamentations'), Philostratus cites (from a declamation about who will raise a fatherless child) the line ἀπόδος ... τὸ παιδίον, ἀπόδος ἤδη, πρὶν γεύσῃται μητρῷου γάλακτος ('give back the baby, give it back now, before it tastes its mother's milk', *VS* 2.23.3–4/569); Isaeus criticized Dionysius of Miletus for singing in his declamations and mocked a youth for admiring a particularly bold saying of Nicetes (*VS* 1.49/513), yet a quotation from his oratory reveals that he too was capable of highly mannered expression (*VS* 1.50.5/514).

While we may well suspect that not every sophist declaimed like this all of the time, the key point is that the impression Philostratus leaves us with is of declamations that were exuberant in style, full of emotion, bold imagery and rhetorical figures. But this style is strongly at odds with that of most of the extant declamations from this period, which are typically much more restrained. Donald Russell describes the declamations of Hadrian of Tyre and Lesbonax as 'surprisingly ... undramatic';³⁰ for Anderson, Herodes' *Peri politeias* is 'unspectacular'.³¹ As Doreen Innes and Michael Winterbottom judge (of Lucian, and Libanius and Choricus too, but the same judgement would be valid for the other surviving second-century declaimers also): 'They normally eschew bombast and pathos, except in proem, epilogue and *prosopopoeia*. They are not averse to the clever ending, but they are in no way obsessed by point ...'³² All of Aristides' declamations would fit this description also. Typical are passages such as the following:

Εἰ μὲν ἐώρων τοὺς ὑμῖν συμβουλευόντας, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, τὰ βέλτιστα βουλευομένους τῇ πόλει καὶ περὶ ὧν παρεληλύθασι ἐροῦντες, ὀρθῶς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐγνωκότας συμβουλεύειν, ὑποσιωπήσ<ας> ἂν τὴν ἐμὴν κατεῖχον γνώμην· νῦν δὲ ὀρῶν τοὺς τε τῇ Θηβαίων πόλει προστιθεμένους παρὰ τὴν αὐτῶν γνώμην τὰ βέλτιστα γράφοντας, ὑμᾶς τε περὶ τῶν τῇ πόλει συμφερόντων οὐκ ἐπιχειροῦντας λέγειν, παρελήλυθα διδάξων περὶ τε τοῦ παρόντος ὑμῖν πολέμου καὶ τῶν ἐν ὑμῖν αἰεὶ λέγειν εἰωθότων ὡς <οὐ> χρὴ τούτων ἕκαστα πράττειν.

If I saw that those who are advising you, men of Athens, wanted what was best for the city, and that they had determined among themselves to give you correct advice about what they have come forward to talk about, I would have stayed silent and kept my opinion to myself. But as things are, seeing those who side with the city of the Thebans making excellent proposals, contrary to their own opinion, and you not trying to speak about what is advantageous for the city, I have come forward to teach you regarding both the present war and regarding those who have always been accustomed to say to you that there is no need to do each of these things. (Lesbonax 1.1)

νῦν δὲ τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν ἐκ τῶν συμφορῶν ἐπιστάμεθα, τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον οὐδέποθ' ἡμῖν φίλον ἐσόμενον, οὐδὲ διαλλαγὴν ἐσομένην ἐκείνῳ πρὸς ἡμᾶς. οὐ γὰρ ἀδικούμενος ὑφ' ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἀδικεῖν βουλόμενος ἐχθρὸς ἡμῖν ἐστίν. ἔχει μὲν γε χώραν, ἣν ἡμῖν οἱ πατέρες κτησάμενοι παρέδωκαν, ἣν διὰ μὲν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν ἔξει, διὰ δὲ δύναμιν ἄκων ἀποδώσει.

But as things are, we are learning our lesson from what has happened – learning that this man will never be our friend, and that there will never be a reconciliation between him and us. For it is not because he has been injured by you that he is your enemy, but because he wants to do you an injury. He has the land which our fathers got and left to us, and which on account of our weakness he will continue to hold, and will only give it back to you under coercion, against his will. (Herodes Atticus *Peri politeias* 6)

Of course, not all extant second-century declamation is like this. Polemo's two declamations on the Battle of Marathon are certainly in the Asian style; Boulanger memorably and fittingly describes the pair as 'a barrage of striking juxtapositions of words, of paronomasia, of anaphora, of chiasmus, of apostrophe, of *prosopopoeia*'.³³ Hadrian's second declamation, too, concerning the mercenaries, is very much in this style. But for the most part the extant declamations are notably more restrained. We thus have a real discrepancy between the style presented as typical in Philostratus' *Vitae sophistarum* and that of most extant second-century declamation.

This discrepancy can be seen most clearly in the cases where we can compare a declaimer's work with the account of his style given in Philostratus (Polemo excepted). Philostratus tells us

³⁰ Russell (1983) 81; *cf.* n. 11.

³¹ Anderson (1993) 99.

³² Innes and Winterbottom (1988) 10.

³³ 'un feu roulant d'alliances de mots, de paronomases, d'anaphores, de chiasmes, d'apostrophes, de prosopopées': Boulanger (1923) 93.

that Hadrian of Tyre was actually criticized as ἐκβακχεύοντα ('raving like Bacchus') in his declamations and describes the sophist as no less than Polemo in his ῥοῖζος ('onrush', *VS* 2.40.2/588–89); he only failed in μεγαλοφωνία (perhaps 'grandeur'), we hear, because he employed the language of tragedy too liberally (*VS* 2.43.1/590).³⁴ This is a fair match for his second declamation, as we have said, but on the whole it is not the style of his first piece, on the poisoner.³⁵ Nor is Philostratus' account of Aristides' style easy to match with that declaimer's extant works, though Philostratus' quotations are all passages said to have been attacked by Aristides' enemies, and Philostratus himself instructs us not to judge the man εἴ που καὶ παρέπτυσέ τι ('wherever he has drivelled a bit', *VS* 2.36.8/585). Arguing against the fortification of Sparta, Aristides is reported to have said μὴ γὰρ δὴ ἐν τείχει ἐπιπτήξαμεν ὀρτύγων ἀναψάμενοι φύσιν ('let us not take on the nature of quails and cower on the wall', *VS* 2.36.4/584); alluding to Philip's loss of one eye during the siege of Methone, he is said to have jested that the one-eyed Arimaspoi of Herodotus were Philip's ξυγγενεῖς ('kinsmen', *VS* 2.36.6/584); and claiming that Alexander had merely inherited his skill in politics from his father, he said pointedly πατρὸς ... τὸ παιδίον εἶναι ('he is his father's lad', *VS* 2.36.5/584). Whether these quotations are representative or not, they nonetheless inevitably give us a rather different impression of Aristides' style from that which we get from his extant declamations – picturesque and spiky rather than dense and refined. Nor would we necessarily recognize Aristides in Philostratus' preferred description of him, as deploying κεκινδευμένας τε καὶ τραγικὰς ἐννοίας ('daring and tragic ideas', *VS* 2.36.7/585).

Only in the case of Herodes is there some agreement between the relatively sober extant declamation and the *Vitae sophistarum*. Herodes' rhetorical skill (δεινότης), Philostratus tells us, creeps up on one rather than pressing hard (ὕεργουσα μᾶλλον ἢ ἐγκειμένη); his πνεῦμα ('force') is οὐ σφοδρόν, ἀλλὰ λείον καὶ καθεσθηκός ('not vehement, but smooth and steady'); he mixes ἀφέλεια ('simplicity') into his speeches (*VS* 2.18.2/564).³⁶ But even so, the match with the *Peri politeias* is far from perfect: his ἀφέλεια is said to have been mixed in to his κρότος (perhaps 'magnificence'), and among his other stylistic qualities is included a κριτιάζουσα ἠχώ ('a Critias-like sonorousness'), where ἠχώ refers specifically to sound effects; he is also described as 'extremely rich in figures' (πολυσηματίστος, *VS* 2.18.2/564).³⁷

With the exception of the case of Polemo, then, and to some degree Herodes Atticus, stylistic simplicity is to be added to brevity as a second troubling discrepancy between Philostratus' picture of declamation and the declamations that we encounter in the surviving corpus.

III. Solutions

In the past, these problems in the declamatory corpus have often met with that most traditional of philological λύσεις: the denigration of the difficult text. The strongest form this response can take is to declare such texts spurious. This approach is represented by attempts to show that the *Peri politeias* is either not by Herodes Atticus or even not a declamation at all, but rather a genuine speech of the fifth century BC, which could excuse its brevity and stylistic quality, depending on the context in which one thinks it was really produced.³⁸ A second, related option, is to assume that problematic texts must be *juvenilia*. Thus Walter Ameling, though concluding that the *Peri*

³⁴ For ῥοῖζος, see Rothe (1989) 114; for μεγαλοφωνία, see Rothe (1989) 102, 124.

³⁵ Thus Rothe (1989) 126: 'Eine besonders von der Tragödie beeinflusste Ausdrucksweise ... kann man an diesem kurzen Textstück nicht ausmachen.' What exactly τὴν δὲ παρασκευὴν τῆς λέξεως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων σοφιστῶν περιεβάλλετο ἠχώ προάγων μᾶλλον ἢ κρότῳ (*VS* 2.43.1/590) refers to is not clear (for discussion, see Rothe (1989) 123–24), but it too is unlikely to be describing anything like the style of Hadrian's first declamation.

³⁶ For δεινότης, see Wright (1921) 568; for πνεῦμα, Rothe (1989) 50, 177; for ἀφέλεια, Rothe (1989) 16–17, 272.

³⁷ On κρότος, see Rothe (1989) 123–24; Civiletti (2002) 526–27. On ἠχώ, see Rothe (1989) 123–24; Civiletti (2002) 527.

³⁸ A great number of scholars have made this argument: they are listed at Albini (1968) 11–12. The most significant contribution is that of Wade-Gery (1945).

politeias is genuine, nonetheless wants to see it as an early work of Herodes.³⁹ Similarly, the self-periodization available in Lucian's works makes it possible to assume that his declamations too must date from earlier in his career.⁴⁰ If we assume that authors are less capable earlier in their careers, then this could excuse these works' brevity and plain style. Finally, one can assume that difficult texts represent a corruption of better, now lost originals, just as some have suggested that the strangely (to our tastes at least) rapid ending to the *Odyseey* might represent an abridgement of an original, full-length ending.⁴¹ So Russell proposes in the case of the declamations of Hadrian of Tyre and Lesbonax that we may be dealing with 'summaries rather than full transcriptions'.⁴²

But almost none of these suggestions inspires confidence. In recent times, most of the scholars who have considered the provenance of the *Peri politeias* have come down in favour of a second-century date; those few who do not are agnostic.⁴³ As Thomas Schmitz says, 'when it comes to rational reasons for not ascribing the speech to Herodes, there are none'.⁴⁴ No manuscript attributes the speech to anyone else. Manuscript attributions, of course, can be wrong; but they are right more often than not, and so the burden of proof is on those who would dispute them. The main arguments against authenticity are two: the declamation's style and its unusual theme. Stylistic judgements are slippery indeed, as Russell cautions,⁴⁵ but in any case, as we have said, the differences between Philostratus' account of Herodes' style and the style of this text are not so large. Obscurity of theme is a somewhat more objective quality, but small yet distinct groups of declamations on unusual themes are to be found both in the extant corpus and in Philostratus.⁴⁶ Furthermore, a declamation set in Larissa seems a natural choice for a man who we hear was devoted to Critias (*VS* 2.18.3/564), given that the fifth-century politician is known to have spent time in Thessaly.⁴⁷ Lucian's periodization of his own career is equally suspect. The sudden 'conversion' from rhetoric to philosophy he alleges is self-promoting, literary and psychologically implausible.⁴⁸ Furthermore, there is actually some evidence that Lucian continued to declaim later in his career, for there are *prolaliai* (which often, but not always, served as prefaces to declamations) that claim to be products of the author's old age.⁴⁹

The suggestion that some of our texts are somehow adulterated versions of now lost originals is perhaps the most promising of these 'traditional' solutions. Yet most of the familiar ancient categories are not appropriate here. Our texts cannot be hypotheses to lost declamations, as the briefest of comparisons, with, for example, Libanius' hypotheses to the speeches of Demosthenes, makes clear: nowhere do we hear the voice of the hypothesizer, nor do we have any technical terminology and

³⁹ Ameling (1983) 119–20.

⁴⁰ Thus, for example, Hall (1981) 58–59, 459. For a full discussion of Lucian's 'conversion', with bibliography, see Braun (1994) 279–306. The key passages are *Bis acc.* 32; *Pisc.* 25, 29.

⁴¹ Rutherford (1996) 77.

⁴² Russell (1983) 81.

⁴³ Reardon (1971) 105–06; Kennedy (1972) 581–82; Anderson (1986) 113 (guardedly); Swain (1996) 94–95; Schmitz (1997) 113 n. 61. Russell (1983) 111 describes attempts to date the work to the fifth century as 'one of the curiosities of scholarship'. Anderson (1993) seems to sit on the fence, but then in a footnote opines that neither Morrison (1942) nor Wade-Gery (1945) succeeded in proving a fifth-century date, and concludes 'In the end there seems no reason why Herodes should not have succeeded in attaining an ideal' (99 n. 67).

⁴⁴ 'Rationale Gründe, ihm die Rede nicht zuzuschreiben, gibt es jedenfalls keine': Schmitz (1997) 113 n. 61.

⁴⁵ Russell (1983) 111.

⁴⁶ Thus, for example, we find in Philostratus τῶν Κρητῶν ... τῶν κρινομένων ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Διὸς σήματι ('the Cretans on trial concerning the tomb of Zeus', *VS* 2.23.6/569), τὸν Ἀράσπαν τὸν τῆς Πανθείας ἐρῶντα ('Araspes the lover of Panthea', *VS* 1.61.3/524) and ὁ Σόλων ὁ αἰτῶν ἀπαλείφειν τοὺς νόμους λαβόντος τὴν φρουρὰν τοῦ Πεισιστράτου ('Solon asks that his laws be cancelled after Pisistratus obtains a bodyguard', *VS* 1.78.4/542) (Herodotean, to be sure, but a rare scenario from the Archaic period). Among the extant corpus, on the other hand, besides Herodes' *Peri politeias* we might single out Lucian's two declamations on Phalaris (also from the Archaic period) and Aristides' version of the embassy to Achilles (*Or.* 16) (the only Homeric scenario known from these centuries).

⁴⁷ *Xen. Hell.* 2.3.36; *Mem.* 1.2.24; Anderson (1986) 113.

⁴⁸ Guast (2018) 193–96.

⁴⁹ *Bacch.* 6–8; *Herc.* 7–8.

our texts are in any case too short.⁵⁰ Epitome, that blend of excerpt and paraphrase that preserves the form of the source text,⁵¹ is perhaps more plausible, yet epitomes are generally only made of lengthy historical or technical works, such as the 80 books of Cassius Dio's *Roman History*, or Galen's *Synopsis* of his work on the pulse (of which we have 16 books); there is no parallel for the epitomization of anything as (relatively) short as a declamation, nor for the epitomization of speeches.⁵² The only plausible form of abridgement for a declamation is excerpting, and indeed Amato refers to Hadrian's surviving declamations as *excerpta* (and sometimes also as fragments); Lesbonax 1 also looks incomplete.⁵³ If this excerpting was a Byzantine development, then three of the declamations we identified as unexpectedly brief would no longer be a problem. But the excerption could easily have been contemporary with Philostratus, for papyri have preserved three collections of rhetorical compositions dating from our period that likely include some excerpts (below). If so, then our problem is not really solved for these texts, for we still need a context in which such excerpting and the circulation of excerpts makes sense. Moreover, of the eight shorter declamations in the extant corpus, the other five (from the hands of three authors) are all clearly complete compositions.

Furthermore, when we consider these various solutions together, they seem still more implausible. That one of the texts is spurious is not, *prima facie*, impossible; but that one (Herodes Atticus) is spurious, another four (Lucian) *juvenilia* and another five (Lesbonax and Hadrian) abridgements of some sort – to the point that ten declamations, the entire extant output of four of the six declaimers whose works survive, are all in some way deficient – seems very unlikely. It is time for a more synoptic approach.

The solutions to the problems posed by the extant corpus that we have considered so far all start from the assumption that the Philostratean picture of declamation must be essentially correct and that any discrepancies between it and our corpus are to be explained away as deficiencies of some sort in the surviving texts. Such a privileging of Philostratus is understandable, given that most researchers' first approach to declamation is through the *Vitae sophistarum*. But if we approach the problem afresh, without granting logical priority to either body of evidence and prepared to accept that, in cases of inconsistency, it may be Philostratus whose evidence is distorted, more promising lines of enquiry open up.

There is, for instance, at least one context in which speeches were often very short: education.⁵⁴ *P.Lond.Lit.* 138, a collection of rhetorical exercises, includes three declamations; that this text originated in an educational context is clear from the presence of other, more elementary rhetorical exercises in the same papyrus as well as a rhetor's theoretical comments on one of the declamations.⁵⁵ The loss of the beginning of the papyrus makes it impossible to determine anything other than a lower limit for the length of the first declamation (47 lines), but the second is only 58 lines in length; the loss of the start of the third means that its length was between 21 and 37 lines. Some of these compositions may well be excerpts. *P.Köln* VI 250 is a similar rhetorical collection.⁵⁶ That this text too arose in an educational context is suggested by the presence of at least one and perhaps as many as four elementary rhetorical exercises in the collection, as well as the quality of the script

⁵⁰ On Libanius' hypotheses to Demosthenes' speeches, see Gibson (1999).

⁵¹ Bott (1920); Opelt (1962).

⁵² Opelt (1962) col. 953–54.

⁵³ Amato (2009) LII n. 144; Amato and Ventrella (2009) 156 n. 510, 158 n. 514.

⁵⁴ On the distinction between 'school declamations' and 'show declamations', see Sen. *Con.* 9.pr.1; Dingel (1988) 1; Berti (2007) 149–54; Feddern (2013) 3 and *passim*; Stramaglia (2015) especially 147. The distinction was not necessarily hard-and-fast (Korenjak (2000) 24–26), but one may certainly at least talk of opposing ends

of a spectrum. On the range of venues and occasions for declamation, see Russell (1983) 74–86; Korenjak (2000) 24–33.

⁵⁵ Text published in Milne (1927) 101–18; *cf.* also Kenyon (1898); Stramaglia (2015) 167. Russo (2013) re-edits, translates and comments on the second declamation in the collection.

⁵⁶ Description, transcription and commentary by Maresch (1987). Stramaglia (2003) re-edits, translates and discusses the third declamation in the collection, but some conclusions are significantly revised in Stramaglia (2015) 167–68.

and the numerous errors the text contains. Of the seven compositions on this papyrus, of which at least three and possibly as many as six are declamations, the two compositions whose length can be securely calculated run to ten and 17 lines; those whose length is uncertain have minimum lengths ranging from four to 36 lines; again, some of these compositions may be excerpts.⁵⁷ Compositions are similarly brief in the handbooks preserved through the manuscript tradition. Soter in his *Diaireseis zetematōn* writes miniature declamations punctuated by theoretical comments in his own voice to show how one should tackle various rhetorical scenarios⁵⁸ and in Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* descriptions of the various preliminary rhetorical exercises are followed by brief 'model answers' of between less than one and five pages of Greek.⁵⁹

Such brevity has several pedagogical advantages. Short texts make it easier to identify individual techniques and to comprehend how the whole hangs together; the chance of the student forgetting the preceding theoretical remarks before reaching the end of the composition is also lowered. Very short pieces can even be used by students as building blocks for their own compositions. This use of brevity in Greek rhetoric was not new: the brevity of Antiphon's *Tetralogies* and Gorgias' *Helen* and *Palamedes* is surely also to be attributed to their didactic purpose.

Rhetorical handbooks are also a context where declamations are almost always written in a plain style. Many, to be sure, have some spirited moments in the Demosthenic manner, but none of the handbooks known to us from the manuscript tradition contains genuinely 'Asian' declamations, and of declamations preserved on papyri only one of the few that hint at Asian character shows signs of having been written or used in an educational context (*PKöln* VI 250). Such stylistic plainness offers similar didactic advantages to those afforded by brevity; again, it enables teachers and students more easily to focus on the lower-level skills of invention and arrangement. This finds some confirmation in a remark by the author of Ps.-Hermogenes' *De inventione* that in some examples he has just given he has used a simple style in order that the thoughts, being bare (*γυμνά*), will be clearer (*Hermog. Inv.* I 1.8).

So did some of our shorter and plainer extant declamations serve such didactic ends? Herodes' declamation would certainly make appropriate teaching material. After his introduction, the speaker announces that he will first show that war against Archelaus is good and second that it is necessary (4), two of the headings expected in this sort of case.⁶⁰ The speech then falls into two halves focusing on these two headings in turn (5–18, 19–33), with the transition clearly signalled and the structure of the whole reiterated in chapter 19; the arguments themselves are generally given sensible but brief amplification. Similarly, Hadrian of Tyre's first declamation approaches its case in accordance with second-century rhetorical theory.⁶¹ Lesbonax's second declamation is an exhortation to troops

⁵⁷ A third collection of declamations is preserved in three fragments – *PSI* II 148; *P.Lond.Lit.* 140; *P.Oxy.* inv. 115/A (22)b (cf. Stramaglia (2015) 167) – to be published shortly by Daniela Colomo.

⁵⁸ Innes and Winterbottom (1988); Weissenberger (2010).

⁵⁹ Patillon (2008) 47–162.

⁶⁰ The issue (cf. n. 61) is 'pragmatic' (*πραγματική*), the Greek Imperial successor to deliberative oratory in the Aristotelian scheme: see Heath (1995) 129–34.

⁶¹ As the debate hinges on the question 'who exactly is a witch?', its 'issue' (*στάσις*, i.e. key point in dispute) is 'definition' (*ὄρος*); the speaker then deploys many of the prescribed 'headings' (of argument, *κεφάλαια*) for such a case. (For 'issues', see Heath (1995); for the issue of 'definition', see Heath (1995) 101–15.) The speaker first anticipates that the defence will use a strict 'definition' (*ὄρος*) of witchcraft which does not catch the defendant's act: 'the law does not seek vengeance from those

women who possess the skill but from those who have used it for evil' (*οὐ τὰς κεκτημένας τὴν τέχνην ὁ νόμος, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐπὶ κακῷ χρησαμένας ἀπαιτεῖ τιμωρίαν*, 70.5–6). To this the speaker responds with a more capacious 'counter-definition' (*ἀνθορισμός*): witchcraft is the mere ability to do witchcraft (*τὸ δρᾶσαι δύνασθαι*, 70.10), evidenced in this case by the defendant's successful execution of the other witch. The speaker justifies his definition with reference to the text of the law and the 'law-giver's intention' (*γνώμη νομοθέτου*) inferred from that: the law-giver, we are told, refers 'not to the woman who has poisoned but to the poisoner' (*οὐ τὴν φαρμακεύσασαν εἰπὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν φαρμακίδα*, 70.8). The speaker then argues that his more capacious definition of the crime captures what is really important in this case: the defendant's intention to do harm, as evidenced by her learning of such skills (70.10–15) and the need to avoid suffering harm by taking action first (70.16–18).

before battle so generic that it is almost an *ethopoeia*; one imagines that its arguments could easily be reused by students in a great many contexts. Though the speaker of the third (another exhortation to battle) eventually reveals his identity (Athenian), his opponents (the Spartans) and a dramatic date (413 BC), the arguments are not much more specific, and one wonders whether the text was not meant to go together with the second declamation to offer a lesson in making the same case twice, a common rhetorical exercise.⁶² Finally, Lucian's *Tyrannicida* and *Abdicatus* combine a non-Asian style (if not particular brevity) with theoretical correctness, so much so that Malcolm Heath uses them in his demonstrations of the workings of Greek Imperial rhetoric, in preference to the longer and more complicated works of more famous declaimers such as Libanius.⁶³

In a display oration in the Philostratean mould, such brevity and clarity might seem pedestrian; in an educational text, however, they would be quite appropriate. If some of our texts are excerpts from now-lost full declamations, their brevity and stylistic plainness would not be the result of some unintended corruption, but rather the consequence of deliberate didactic choices. If the teaching embodied in such texts seems too basic for the distinguished orators to whom they are attributed, we should remember that Libanius produced a collection of model *progymnasmata*, which represent a more basic stage of education, and that many of the theorists who wrote textbooks on *progymnasmata* were in turn capable of writing much more advanced works.⁶⁴ Quintilian, too, stressed that good teachers will not think elementary teaching beneath them (2.3).

Thus a more positive and more convincing explanation for the brevity and plain style of many of the extant declamations is that they came into being in a didactic context.⁶⁵ But what then are we to do with the evidence of the *Vitae sophistarum*? While many of Philostratus' sophists teach, none of them write textbooks and their teaching is usually confined to style, a more advanced topic. But external evidence makes it clear that it is Philostratus' picture that is distorted.⁶⁶ The *Vitae sophistarum* consistently pass over sophists' documented teaching and theorizing. Most strikingly of all, Philostratus in his life of Hermogenes omits entirely this declaimer's hugely important theoretical output.⁶⁷ No theoretical works are mentioned for Hadrian of Tyre either, though we know from the *Suda* that he wrote three books on the 'distinctive features' (ιδιωμάτων) of the 'issues' (it is not inconceivable that our texts were once part of this work), as well as five books on types of style.⁶⁸ The sophist Lollianus too seems to have authored many theoretical texts, but this is only hinted at in Philostratus' account in a reference to 'didactic classes' (ξυνοουσίας ... διδασκαλικάς, *VS* 1.65.4/527).⁶⁹ Finally, the brief but complimentary biography that Philostratus bestows on Rufus of Perinthus is also silent on this sophist's surviving *Ars rhetorica*.⁷⁰ Other

⁶² Cf. Aristid. *Or.* 9–10; *VS* 2.26/571–74, 2.83/618–19 (both rather showier); Lib. *Decl.* 3–4, 19–20; *Narr.* 18–19, 21–22, 23–24, 33–34, 35–36; *Sent.* 1–2; *Eth.* 8–9, 12–13; *Descr.* 13–14.

⁶³ Heath (1995) 175–78; Berry and Heath (1997) 409–14; cf. Bompaire (1958) 242–46; Reardon (1971) 110. In Guast (2018) 200–01 I argue that the *Tyrannicida* also gently mocks the practice of declamation and suggest that its brevity may contribute to the satire.

⁶⁴ Thus the *Suda* records for Aphthonius a commentary on Hermogenes (α 4630), for Nikolaos an *Ars rhetorica* (ν 395) and for Theon a range of more-or-less theoretical works, including an *Ars rhetorica* and a *Questions about the Composition of Discourse* (Ζητήματα περί συντάξεως λόγου, θ 206). The authorship of Ps.-Hermogenes *Progymnasmata* is ultimately unknown (for a consideration of the possibilities, see Heath (2003) 158–60).

⁶⁵ Of course, brief models are not the *only* type of speech useful in a didactic context; there is naturally also a place for full worked examples, and many sophists declaimed regularly to their students. Quintilian, indeed, disapproves of teachers who only have their students tackle the easier or more attractive parts of a theme (10.5.21–3). The lengthy declamations of Libanius and Choricus may be such full worked examples.

⁶⁶ Civiletti (2002) 595.

⁶⁷ Heath (2004) 36–38. Patillon (1988) 13–17 revives Athanasius' view (Rabe (1931) 181.7–9) that Philostratus' sophist and the author of the surviving theoretical works must be different people, but, as I show, Philostratus habitually neglects the theoretical output of his subjects (cf. Heath (1998) 46–47).

⁶⁸ s.v. Ἀδριανός (α 528).

⁶⁹ Schissel (1927); Heath (2004) 227.

⁷⁰ *VS* 2.53/597–98. For the *Ars*, see Patillon and Brisson (2001).

declaimers, too, are known from the *Suda* to have also written theoretical works.⁷¹ Furthermore, even when teaching and aspects of theory other than style are mentioned in the *Vitae sophistarum*, they are denigrated. One Phoenix the Thessalian, whose biography in Philostratus runs to less than a page of Greek, and who is said to have been better at rhetorical invention than style, is judged by Philostratus οὔτε θαυμάσαι ἄξιός οὐδὲ αὖ διαβαλεῖν πάντα ('worthy neither of being admired nor on the other hand of being altogether slandered', *VS* 2.62.1/604). The biography of Secundus, again said to have been better at invention than style, is similarly brief, and Philostratus mentions a nickname of 'Wooden Peg' (ἐπίουρος) that mocked this sophist's lowly social origins (*VS* 1.82–83/544–45). Philostratus downplays all of this activity to focus on the much longer and more florid public 'show' declamations that his subjects produced.⁷² But if my thesis about the educational origin and function of many of the extant declamations is correct, then we should restore such teaching to the heart of the work of even the most prestigious sophists.⁷³

But a didactic context can hardly explain the lack of Asian style in the case of the declamations of Aristides. Neither these pieces' length, nor the great density and difficulty of their argumentation, nor the kinds of performances that Aristides himself describes correspond with such a context. These are clearly declamations for public performance. Here we seem to be up against a different, more straightforward Philostratean distortion: it seems that Philostratus suppresses declamations written in a plainer style. Thus what we identified as a single problem presented by the extant corpus – stylistic plainness – seems to have two distinct causes: first, that many of our texts were composed for didactic ends rather than for the public performances that Philostratus valorizes; second, that, even within the subgenre of show declamation, Philostratus privileges the bombastic 'Asian' pole of the stylistic spectrum.⁷⁴

IV. Conclusions

What would Greek declamation look like without Philostratus? How, indeed, given Philostratus' powerful influence on the tradition (*cf.* n. 2), might Greek declamation have developed differently had it not been for Philostratus? It has long been known that the *Vitae sophistarum* are tendentious in many ways. They unfairly pass over Hellenistic declamation; they are obsessed with Herodes; they omit or disparage major declaimers.⁷⁵ This article has argued on the basis of the extant second-century corpus that there are further major distortions in Philostratus' picture of the genre. First, the *Vitae sophistarum* neglect declamations that were written in the context of teaching. Such declamations seem typically to have been much shorter and plainer in style than the show declamations with which Philostratus is concerned. Furthermore, in addition to neglecting the stylistically plainer declamations written for teaching purposes, Philostratus *also* neglects the stylistic range *within* the public show declamations on which he focuses, presenting florid Asianism as the norm and misrepresenting the more sober style of declaimers like Aristides. But on the basis of the extant corpus and other evidence, it is possible to reconstruct a very different picture of the genre, one in which rhetorical education forms an important part of declaimers' work alongside show declamation, and in which even show declamations could be considerably more sober in style than those of the flamboyant Polemo. The corpus of surviving declamations thus reveals how the *Vitae sophistarum* focus on only one part of the declamatory activity of this period; in short, they remind us that the *Vitae sophistarum*'s 'Second Sophistic' is very much a *Philostratean* Sophistic.

⁷¹ Ἀριστοκλήης (α 3918), Ἀσπᾶσιος (α 4203), Γαϊανός (γ 9), Μητροφάνης (μ 1010), Παῦλος (π 809).

⁷² For the distinction between 'school declamations' and 'show declamations', see n. 54.

⁷³ On the primacy of teaching, see Kennedy (1974).

⁷⁴ If some of our briefer texts are in fact Byzantine excerpts (*cf.* above) from longer show declamations rather than teaching texts, then it may be that the plain

style that some of them display should be taken as further evidence for a wider range of styles among show declamations.

⁷⁵ Hellenistic declamation: Swain (1991) 152. Herodes: Anderson (1986) 82–85. Omissions and disparagement: Bowersock (1969) 110–17; Anderson (1986) 84 n. 50, 87–88.

Bibliography

- Albini, U. (1968) [*Erode Attico*] ΠΕΡΙ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΑΣ: *introduzione, testo critico e commento* (Florence)
- Amato, E. (2009) *Severus sophista Alexandrinus: Progymnasmata quae exstant omnia* (Berlin and New York)
- Amato, E. and Sauterel, N. (2010) 'L'utilisation de l'histoire dans les déclamations de Lesbonax le sophiste', in P.-L. Malosse, M.-P. Noël and B. Schouler (eds), *Clio sous le regard d'Hermès: l'utilisation de l'histoire dans la rhétorique ancienne de l'époque hellénistique à l'antiquité tardive: actes du colloque international de Montpellier (18–20 octobre 2007)* (Cardo 8) (Alessandria) 47–54
- Amato, E. and Ventrella, G. (2009) *I Progimnasmata di Severo di Alessandria (Severo di Antiochia?)* (Berlin and New York)
- Ameling, W. (1983) *Herodes Atticus* (Hildesheim)
- Anderson, G. (1986) *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century AD* (London)
- (1989) 'The pepaideumenos in action: sophists and their outlook in the early empire', *ANRW* II 33.1, 79–208
- (1993) *The Second Sophistic* (London)
- Baldwin, B. (1973) *Studies in Lucian* (Toronto)
- Behr, C.A. (1981–1986) *P. Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works* (2 vols) (Leiden)
- Berry, D.H. and Heath, M. (1997) 'Oratory and declamation', in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 BC–AD 400* (Leiden) 393–420
- Berti, E. (2007) *Scholasticorum studia: Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale* (Pisa)
- Bompaire, J. (1958) *Lucien écrivain: imitation et création* (Paris)
- Borgogno, A. (1973) 'Da un'autopsia del cod. Laur. gr. 57, 12', *RhM* 116, 127–28
- Bott, H. (1920) *De epitomis antiquis* (Marburg)
- Boulanger, A. (1923) *Aelius Aristide et la sophistique dans la province d'Asie au IIe siècle de notre ère* (Paris)
- Bowersock, G.W. (1969) *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- Bowie, E.L. (1970) 'The Greeks and their past in the Second Sophistic', *P&P* 46.1, 3–41
- Braun, E. (1994) *Lukian, Unter doppelter Anklage: ein Kommentar* (Frankfurt)
- Civiletti, M. (2002) *Filostrato: Vite dei sofisti. Testo greco a fronte, introduzione, traduzione e note* (Milan)
- Dihle, A. (2011) 'Greek classicism', in T. Schmitz and N. Wiater (eds), *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and their Past in the First Century BCE* (Stuttgart) 47–60
- Dingel, J. (1988) *Scholastica materia: untersuchungen zu den Declamationes minores und der Institutio oratoria Quintilians* (Berlin)
- Feddern, S. (2013) *Die Suasorien des älteren Seneca: Einleitung, Text und Kommentar* (Berlin)
- Foerster, R. (1903–1927) *Libanii opera* (12 vols) (Leipzig)
- Foerster, R. and Richsteig, E. (1929) *Choricii Gazaevi opera* (Leipzig)
- Gibson, C.A. (1999) 'The agenda of Libanius' hypotheses to Demosthenes', *GRBS* 40, 171–202
- Graindor, P. (1930) *Un milliardaire antique: Hérode Atticus et sa famille* (Cairo)
- Guast, W. (2017) 'Accepting the omen: external reference in Greek declamation', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 63, 82–102
- (2018) 'Lucian and declamation', *CPh* 113.2, 189–205
- Hall, J. (1981) *Lucian's Satire* (New York)
- Harmon, A. (1913) *Lucian* 1 (Loeb Classical Library 14) (Cambridge MA)
- (1936) *Lucian* 5 (Loeb Classical Library 302) (Cambridge MA)
- Heath, M. (1995) *Hermogenes On Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford)
- (1998) 'Hermogenes' biographers', *Eranos: Acta Philologica Suecana* 96, 44–54
- (2003) 'Theon and the history of the Progymnasmata', *GRBS* 43.2, 129–60
- (2004) *Menander: A Rhetor in Context* (Oxford)
- Innes, D. and Winterbottom, M. (1988) *Sopatros the Rhetor: Studies in the Text of the Διαίρεσις ζητημάτων* (BICS Supplement 48) (London)
- Janiszewski, P., Stebnicka, K. and Szabat, E. (2015) *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- Jones, C.P. (1986) *Culture and Society in Lucian* (Cambridge MA)

- Keil, B. (1913) 'Über Lukians *Phalarideen*', *Hermes* 48, 494–521
- Kennedy, G.A. (1972) *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton)
- (1974) 'The Sophists as declaimers', in G.W. Bowersock (ed.), *Approaches to the Second Sophistic* (University Park PA) 17–22
- Kenyon, F. (1898) 'Fragments d'exercices de rhétorique conservés sur papyrus', in H. Weil (ed.), *Mélanges Henri Weil: recueil de mémoires concernant l'histoire et la littérature grecques* (Paris) 243–48
- Kiehr, F. (1907) *Lesbonactis sophistae quae supersunt* (Leipzig)
- Kim, L. (2017) 'Atticism and Asianism', in D.S. Richter and W.A. Johnson (eds), *The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic* (Oxford) 41–66
- Korenjak, M. (2000) *Publikum und Redner: ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit* (Zetema Monographien 104) (Munich)
- Lenz, F.W. (1959) *The Aristeides Prolegomena* (Leiden)
- Lenz, F.W. and Behr, C.A. (1976) *P. Aelii Aristidis opera quae exstant omnia* (Leiden)
- Macleod, M.D. (1972–1986) *Luciani opera* (4 vols) (Oxford)
- Maresch, K. (1987) '250. Rhetorische Übungen', in M. Gronewald, B. Kramer, K. Maresch, M. Parca and C. Römer (eds), *Kölner Papyri (P.Köln)* 6 (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. Sonderreihe Papyrologica Coloniensia 7) (Opladen) 116–26
- Milne, H.J.M. (1927) *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the British Museum* (London)
- Morrison, J.S. (1942) 'Meno of Pharsalus, Polycrates and Ismenias', *CQ* 57–78
- Norden, E. (1898) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (2 vols) (Leipzig)
- Norman, A.F. (1953) 'Philostratus and Libanius', *CPh* 48, 20–23
- (1965) *Libanius' Autobiography (Oration I): The Greek Text, Edited with Introduction, Translation and Notes* (Oxford)
- Opelt, I. (1962) 'Epitome', in T. Klauser and E. Dassmann (eds), *RAC* 5 (Stuttgart) 944–73
- Patillon, M. (1988) *La théorie du discours chez Hermogène le rhéteur: essai sur les structures linguistiques de la rhétorique ancienne* (Collection d'études anciennes 117) (Paris)
- (2008) *Corpus Rhetoricum 1: Anonyme: Préambule à la rhétorique; Aphthonios: Progymnasmata; en annexe: Pseudo-Hermogène: Progymnasmata* (Collection des universités de France série grecque 460) (Paris)
- (2012a) *Corpus Rhetoricum 4: Prolégomènes au De ideis; Hermogène: Les catégories stylistiques du discours (De ideis); synopsis des exposés sur les ideai* (Collection des universités de France série grecque 491) (Paris)
- (2012b) *Corpus rhetoricum 3.1–2: Pseudo-Hermogène: L'Invention; Anonyme: synopsis des exordes; Anonyme: scolies au traité Sur l'invention du Pseudo-Hermogène* (Collection des universités de France. Série grecque 485) (Paris)
- Patillon, M. and Brisson, L. (2001) *Longin: Fragments, Art rhétorique; Rufin: Art rhétorique* (Collection des universités de France série grecque 413) (Paris)
- Penella, R.J. (ed.) (2009) *Rhetorical Exercises from Late Antiquity: A Translation of Choricus of Gaza's Preliminary Talks and Declamations* (Cambridge)
- Pernot, L. (1981) *Les Discours siciliens d'Aelius Aristide (Or. 5–6): étude littéraire et paléographique: édition et traduction* (New York)
- (1993) *La rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde gréco-romain* (2 vols) (Paris)
- Rabe, H. (1906) *Scholia in Lucianum* (Leipzig)
- (1931) *Prolegomenon sylloge: accedit Maximi libellus De obiectionibus insolubilibus* (Leipzig)
- Reader, W.W. (1996) *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo* (SBL Texts and Translations 42 Graeco-Roman 12) (Atlanta)
- Reardon, B.P. (1971) *Courants littéraires grecs des IIe et IIIe siècles après J.-C.* (Paris)
- Rohde, E. (1876) *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (Leipzig)
- Rothe, S. (1989) *Kommentar zu ausgewählten Sophistenviten des Philostratos* (Sammlung Groos 38) (Heidelberg)
- Russell, D.A. (1983) *Greek Declamation* (Cambridge)
- Russo, G. (2013) 'L'uomo che rubò a se stesso: una declamazione con notazioni didattiche (*P.Lond. Lit.* 138, coll. III 5–IV 18)', *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 59, 301–25

- (2016) ‘Modelli storiografici e ideologia nelle *Orazioni* 7 e 8 di Elio Aristide’, in L. Pernot, G. Abbamonte and M. Lamagna (eds), *Aelius Aristide écrivain* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 19) (Turnhout) 97–118
- Rutherford, R.B. (1996) *Homer (Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics 26)* (Oxford)
- Schissel, O. (1927) ‘Lollianos aus Ephesos’, *Philologus* 82, 181–201
- Schmid, W. (1887) *Der Atticismus in seinen Hauptvertretern von Dionysius von Halikarnass bis auf den zweiten Philostratus* (4 vols) (Stuttgart)
- Schmitz, T. (1997) *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit* (Zetema Monographien 96) (Munich)
- Schneider-Menzel, U. (1948) ‘Jamblichos’ *Babylonische Geschichten*’, in F. Altheim (ed.), *Literatur und Gesellschaft im ausgehenden Altertum* (Halle) 48–92
- Schröder, H. (1934) *Corpus medicorum graecorum* (Supplement I) (Leipzig)
- Schwartz, J. (1965) *Biographie de Lucien de Samosate* (Collection Latomus 83) (Brussels)
- Stefec, R.S. (2013) ‘Die Überlieferung der Deklamationen Polemons’, *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 55, 99–154
- (2016) *Flavii Philostrati Vitas sophistarum: ad quas accedunt Polemonis Laodicensis declamationes quae exstant duae* (Oxford)
- Stramaglia, A. (2003) ‘Amori impossibili: PKöln 250, le raccolte proginnasmatiche e la tradizione retorica dell’ “amante di un ritratto”’, in B.-J. Schröder and J.-P. Schröder (eds), *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 176) (Munich) 213–39
- (2015) ‘Temi “sommersi” e trasmissione dei testi nella declamazione antica (con un regesto di papiri declamatori)’, in L. Del Corso, F. De Vivo and A. Stramaglia (eds), *Nel segno del testo: edizioni, materiali e studi per O. Pecere* (Papyrologica Florentina 44) (Florence) 147–78
- Strohmaier, G. (1976) ‘Übersehenes zur Biographie Lukians’, *Philologus* 120, 117–22
- Swain, S. (1991) ‘The reliability of Philostratus’s *Lives of the Sophists*’, *ClAnt* 10, 148–63
- (1996) *Hellenism and Empire* (Oxford)
- Tobin, J. (1997) *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens: Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines* (Amsterdam)
- Tomassi, G. (2015) ‘Tyrants and tyrannicides: between literary creation and contemporary reality in Greek declamation’, in E. Amato, F. Citti and B. Huelsenbeck (eds), *Law and Ethics in Greek and Roman Declamation* (Law and Literature 10) (Berlin) 249–67
- (2016) ‘Sulla coppia di declamazioni *Πρὸς Θηβαίους περὶ τῆς συμμαχίας* di Elio Aristide (*Or.* 9–10)’, in L. Pernot, G. Abbamonte and M. Lamagna (eds), *Aelius Aristide écrivain* (Recherches sur les rhétoriques religieuses 19) (Turnhout) 119–145
- von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1900) ‘Asianismus und Atticismus’, *Hermes* 35, 1–52
- Wade-Gery, H.T. (1945) ‘Kritias and Herodes’, *CQ* 39, 19–33
- Weissenberger, M. (2010) *Sopatri Quaestionum divisio. Sopatros: Streitfälle: Gliederung und Ausarbeitung kontroverser Reden* (Würzburg)
- Whitmarsh, T. (2005) *The Second Sophistic (Greece & Rome New Surveys in the Classics 35)* (Oxford)
- (2012) ‘Resistance is futile? Greek literary tactics in the face of Rome’, in P. Schubert (ed.), *Les grecs héritiers des Romains* (Entretiens sur l’Antiquité classique 59) (Geneva) 57–85
- Wright, W.C. (1921) *Philostratus: Lives of the Sophists. Eunapius: Lives of the Philosophers* (Loeb Classical Library 134) (Cambridge MA)