Preface

Contrary to the idea that most of the fragments of ancient authors have been already collected and edited, a scholar interested in Hellenistic history and literature may find it surprising that a collection of fragments of Hellenistic orators – or oratory – is not something we could at the moment find on the shelves of a library. For a discipline like ancient literature, which is fragmentary at its core, this seems a surprising gap: we can find collections of fragments for poets of all sorts, for dramatists, historians, geographers, orators (Attic, Roman), and for so many more literary genres that it would be natural to assume that, if we do not have a collection of fragments for a certain genre in a certain period, it must be because nothing at all of it has survived.

But fortunately, this is not the case with Hellenistic oratory: the present work constitutes a first attempt to fill this gap and aims at providing the first edition of the fragments of Hellenistic oratory (i.e. of named orators, but also of rhetorical exercises on papyrus), followed a commentary. It will hopefully constitute a first step in the direction of the creation of a comprehensive edition of fragments of Hellenistic orators and oratory, including commentaries on the *testimonia* (which are here not edited but used as sources for biographies), and on those fragments that for reasons of space (and according to the criteria stated below) could not be included in the present work. I have been able to establish a large corpus of testimonia and fragments, both in Greek and in Latin, for 84 orators. For 29 of them, there are fragments, either quoted or paraphrased, from an impressive variety of Greek and Latin sources. To these fragments, I have added 13 rhetorical papyri.

All identified named Hellenistic orators are ordered alphabetically. For those who only have testimonia and no fragments, I provide a succinct but comprehensive biography. For orators who have fragments, I provide a critical text. Depending on the length of each fragment, I choose either to comment line by line (for longer texts) or to give a general commentary on the possible nature of the oration it belonged to (for shorter ones). The same has been done for rhetorical papyri. The commentary on these texts also varies according to the nature of the papyrus: observations on the palaeography or the material aspects are discussed extensively only when relevant to establishing the nature of the text contained in the papyrus or to re-establishing its date; otherwise, just general information is given on these aspects. For longer papyri, I provide a general introduction to the content and the nature of the text, followed by a sentence-by-sentence commentary, while for shorter or badly damaged fragments I only discuss their content and general features. I have not attempted exhaustive commentaries on all the papyri, as if these were *editiones principes*, especially for texts where extenstive discussions already exist (e.g. P.Berol. 9781, on which I do not comment line by line but on block of lines, following Kremmydas), but I chose to discuss issues of reading and supplement, on the basis of my examination of originals or pictures, and offer material relevant to connections with fourth-century oratory.

Finally, the issues arising from the commentary on these texts have enabled me to underline some key topics that constitute different sections of a large introduction to this work, where my editorial criteria and my methodology are also explained.

Acknowledgments

Although my debt of gratitude to the people who helped me throughout this "doctoral journey" seems almost impossible to repay, I will try to find the right words to thank all of them. First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof Gregory Hutchinson, for the genuine passion and interest in my work, for his constant support and encouragement, for his great suggestions and advice, and for sharing with me his profound knowledge of Greek and Latin literature. Then, I would like to thank my examiners, Prof Jane Lightfoot and Dr Kathryn Tempest, for their extremely detailed feedback on this work. A big thanks goes to Dr Peter Thonemann, without whose precious advice I would have never oriented myself in the intricate labyrinth of epigraphy, and who gave me the opportunity to read some valuable unpublished material. I have benefitted immensely from the feedback I received from my transfer and confirmation assessors, Dr. Dirk Obbink, Dr. Barnaby Taylor, and Dr. Guy Westwood, to whom I am extremely grateful. It is difficult to express properly my gratitude to my long-time mentor, Prof Massimo Pinto, who after having supervised my work for more than five years at the University of Bari, has been willing to provide invaluable feedback on this thesis, and has always supported me throughout these years. Prof Antonio Stramaglia and Dr Daniela Colomo have been fundamental to me and my work in the past three years and I cannot but value their help and support immensely. I am also deeply thankful to Prof Malcolm Heath for sharing with me his unpublished catalogue of declamation themes. Dr Mark de Kreij has been so kind as to show me a draft of his (then) unpublished article, and from our discussions of mythological encomia a lot of interesting ideas have arisen. I would like to thank also Dr Marius Gerhardt, the curator of the papyrological collection of Berlin, who found and sent me an old but excellent picture of P.Berl. 9781, which was being restored and was therefore unavailable for scans. Special words of gratitude go to my "team" of language proof-readers: Xavier Buxton, Dr Colin Runackles, Dr Thomas Coward – from whose expertise on Rhodes I have strongly benefited – and Dr William Guast, whom I thank not just as a proof-reader and an excellent scholar to exchange ideas with, but also as the amazing friend he has been in the past two years.

The writing of this thesis would not have been possible without the precious funding of the AHRC and Scatcherd scholarships; I also deeply thank the Craven Committee and Lady Margaret Hall – and in particular my college advisor Dr Amin Benaissa – which have funded several of my peregrinations around Europe and the world, in the attempt to disseminate some of the preliminary results of this work. I thank all those people, who, on these occasions, contributed to the discussions on my papers. In particular, I had a very fruitful exchange with Prof Patrick Finglass, at the Celtic Conference in Classics in Montreal (July 2017), and with Dr Christos Kremmydas, Dr Davide Amendola and Antonio Iacoviello, during the FIEC/CA conference in London in July 2019.

It is from the bottom of my heart that I thank my parents for always supporting their only child, even when she chose to live and work more than 2000 km away from them. Finally, I cannot but thank Prolepsis Association, and the extremely lively community of Classicists and Humanists of Oxford, some of whom I am proud to count among my friends. In particular, I'd like to single out Davide Massimo and Giulia Paoletti for our lively exchanges about our thesis work.

The Fragments of Hellenistic Oratory

Introduction, Text, and Commentary

Table of Contents

Preface.....1
Acknowledgments.....2
Sigla.....5
Introduction
What are the fragments of Hellenistic oratory.....8
1. A chronological approach?.....12
2. Hellenistic oratory and the City.....14
3. Ambassadors' speeches.....20
Between rhetoric and oratory: rhetorical theory and rhetorical schools
1. Teaching rhetoric.....26
2. Theorising rhetoric.....34
3. On style: Atticism, Asianism...and Rhodianism (?).....42
Hellenistic oratory and Rome.....57
History and oratory in the Hellenistic age
1. Orators as historiographers: a Hellenistic identification?.....56
2. Speeches in historiographers.....61
What is distinctive about Hellenistic oratory?.....66
Sources: the Survival of Hellenistic Oratory after 31 BC
1. An overview: from Cicero to Ps-Eudocia Augusta.....69
2. *Lexica*.....72
3. *Gnomologia* and *Florilegia*.....75
4. Rutilius Lupus.....76
5. The Elder Seneca.....79
6. Papyri.....81
Text and Commentary
Named Orators.....85
Rhetorical exercises on papyrus
Suasoriae.....191
Controversiae.....242
Mythological encomia and/or *Progymnasmata*.....245
Dubia.....271

Bibliography.....280

Sigla[1]

Apsines

A Par.Gr.1874, XII saec.

B Par.Gr.174, X saec.

G Gaudianus Gr.14, XVI saec.

Athenaeus

A Marc.gr.447, IX-X saec.

E Laur.Plut.60.2, XV-XVI saec.

Demetrius, *De Elocutione*

P Par.Gr.1741, X saec.

M Marc.Gr.508, XIV saec.

Diodorus Siculus

C Vat.Gr.130, X saec.

D Neapolitanus Suppl.Gr.74, X saec.

V Vat.Gr.996, XI-XII saec

Diogenes Laertius

F Laur.Plut.69.13, XIII saec.

B Naples, Biblioteca Nazionale, III B 29, XII saec.

Dionysius Halicarnassensis

F Laur.Gr.59.15, X saec.

Z = **V** Marc.app.Gr.10.34 (=coll. 1449); **A** Ambr.Gr.267(=D 199 sup.); **I** Estensis α K 5, 15 (=Gr.68). XV saec.

Eusebius Caesarensis

B Par.Gr.465, XIII saec. (ex.)

I Marc.Gr.341, XV saec.

N Neapolitanus II A 16, XV saec.

O Bonon.Univ. 3643, XIII saec.

V Vatopédi 180, XIV saec.

Ps-Herodianus

B Baroccianus 216, XV saec.

E Scorialensis Ψ.IV.4.a, 1571

F Laur.Conv.Soppr.98, XIV saec.

G Vallicellaus 213, XVII saec.

H Hauniensis GKS 1865, 4°, XIV saec.

L Laur.56.16, 1450

P Par.Gr.2929, XVI saec.

M Marc.Gr.512, XIII-XIV saec.

T Vallicellanus 213, XVII saec.

U Vindob.Phil.Gr.263, XV saec.

V Vat.Gr.1733, XVI saec.

W Vindob.Phil.Gr.163, XVI saec.

Photius

A Marc.Gr.450, X saec. (med.)

M Marc.Gr.451, XII saec.

Plutarchus

Moralia

F Par.Gr.1957, X saec (ex.)

G Vat.Barb.Gr.192, X saec. (ex.)

J Ambr.C 195 (Gr.181), XIII saec.

o Par.Gr.1678, X saec. (in.)

R Par.Maz.4458, paulo ante 1300

Vitae

N Matr.Gr.4685 (N 55), XIV saec.

P Vat.Pal.Gr.283, XI-XII saec.

R Vat.Urb.Gr. 97, X-XI saec.

Quintilianus

A Ambr. Ms E 153 sup, XIV cent.

Rutilius Lupus

A Laur.Plut.37-25, XIV saec.

B Laur.Plut.47-31, 47-31, XV saec.

R Riccardianus 153, XV saec.

U Urb.Lat.670 XV saec.

[1] This list contains only manuscripts that appear in the apparatus of fragments included in this edition. **A**^{1}, **B**^{1}, **A**^{2} (et similia) = correctiones; **A**^{m} = marginalia; **A**^{i} = correctiones interlineares; **A**^{pc} = post correctionem.

V Vindob.Lat.179 XV saec.

Schol.*Nub.*

R Rav.Gr.429, XI saec.

V Marc.Gr.474, XII saec.

Seneca (Maior)

A Antuerpiensis 411, X vel XI saec.

B Bruxellensis 9581-95, IX saec.

T Bruxellensis 2025, XIII saec.

V Vat.Lat.3872, IX saec.

α consensus ABV

Strabo

B Athous Vatop.655, XIV saec (med.)

C Par.Gr.1393, XIII saec. (ex.)

D Marc.Gr.9.6, XIV saec.

E Vat.Gr.482, XIV saec.

F Vat.Gr.1329, XIII-XIV saec.

q Par.Gr.1395, XV saec.

Theon

Arm. = **B** Matenadaran 3466, XIII saec.; **A** Matenadaran 8371; **C** Matenadaran. 9826, XVII saec.

Introduction

What are the fragments of Hellenistic oratory?

'Ac tamen, cum esset Demosthenes, multi oratores magni et clari fuerunt et ante fuerant *nec postea defecerunt*" (Cic. *Orat.* 6). Despite what Cicero says, oratory in the Hellenistic age has been for a long time seen as a minor aspect of the social, political, and literary scenery. The idea that oratory quite mysteriously dissolved itself after the battle of Chaeronea in 338, retreating suddenly into the anonymity of rhetorical schools, had been widely accepted and taken for granted for centuries of Classical scholarship, when just such remarks on the stylistic evolution of Greek prose were made,[2] especially concerning the big but mostly conventional distinction between Atticism and Asianism. This view was certainly justified by what some influential ancient sources say about oratory in the Hellenistic age: Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Antiquis Oratoribus* 1-4) says that after the death of Alexander rhetoric and civil oratory lost their spirit and became grossly abused, to the point of reaching almost total extinction, leaving their place to a histrionic kind of oratory, vulgar and disgusting. He laments the move of oratory to Asia, where it became frigid and banal, then, therefore, he thanks Rome for putting an end to this 'dark age', by making every city focus their attention upon her. Similarly, Agatharchides (*apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 250) vigorously attacks the oratory of Hegesias (43; the initiator of Asian style according to Cicero [*Brut.* 286]), Strabo [14.1.41], and Theon [*Prog.* 2.71 Patillon]), while praising, on the contrary, more Attic orators like Stratocles. A sense of hostility, the product of a certain "classicism", based on supposedly authoritative sources, has contributed to the lack of scholarship on oratory in the period.

This gap in the scholarship has started to be filled only recently, when the need for a re-evaluation of oratory in the period has finally emerged.[3] The focus has, however, always tended to be mainly on a few isolated and better-known personalities like, for instance, Democharesof Leuconoe (30), to whom Gabriele Marasco[4] dedicated a monograph, which even included some commented fragments. In 1972 Wooten,[5] in his unpublished doctoral thesis, tried to write an account of the situation of oratory in the Hellenistic period, although he mainly argued that it was still too dependent on Demosthenes and had no typical new elements. Kremmydas' and Tempest's book *Hellenistic*

[2] Still a fundamental reference is Norden (1898). See also the more recent Porter (1997).

[3] Contrary to the widespread belief that the Greek *poleis* lost their independence and political freedom after the battle of Chaeronea, there is evidence for the Athenian institutions where oratory took place (namely the Council, the Assembly, and the courts) continuing to function throughout the Hellenistic era (as also shown by epigraphical evidence), albeit in a slightly different way. On this, see Habicht (1997).

[4] Marasco (1984).

[5] See Wooten (1972). Understandably for an unpublished thesis, this work contains several flaws and naïvetés, not only in the choice of names and fragments but also as regards some odd choices, such as that of studying papyri along with speeches in poetry. Moreover, the whole discussion seems rather biased by the clear aim of the author to demonstrate that oratory throughout the whole Hellenistic period still mainly depended on the model of Demosthenes. Nevertheless, it constitutes the only attempt at a collection of fragments of Hellenistic orators as evidence for the evolution of oratory in the period. It will be, therefore, a firm and constant term of comparison and contrast as regards the metholodoly in collecting and selecting fragments.

Oratory: Continuity and Change,[6] published in 2013, provides, on the other hand, an unbiased approach[7] to the subject; it underlines some aspects of originality, i.e. of "change", alongside those of continuity, as in the title.[8] Despite the importance of the reconsideration of Hellenistic oratory that we owe to this book, in its pages, no role has been given to the actual personalities: the orators – the people who delivered the speeches whose nature we aim to study – still remain out of the picture. Major issues still require investigation: What is Hellenistic oratory? Do we have any fragments left and can they be collected, or are the traces of names and testimonies just too vague and faded away, as the secondary literature may suggest? The answer is fortunately positive. We do indeed have names and fragments, but the need for a theoretical framework and perhaps the still tacit belief that oratory in the period was not interesting enough, have been clear impediments to the compilation of a first collection of fragments.

The growing tendency for the figures of orators and historians to overlap, from the end of the 4th century BC until the end of the Hellenistic era (and beyond), has resulted in many oratorical fragments being edited in collections of fragmentary historians. Both Müller's and Jacoby's collections are filled with testimonia and sometimes fragments of speeches, considered as historical pieces, just because their authors were both orators and historians, and generally mainly known for this latter role.[9] An enlightening example is the school of Isocrates, whose last generation of pupils – most of them were orators and historians at the same time – can be seen as cases of Hellenistic orators, of whom Theopompus of Chios (79)[10] is perhaps the most famous. This equation perfectly applies to other orators outside the context of the Isocratean school and of Athens, if we take as an example for the same period Anaximenes of Lampsacus (5; see Dion. Halic. *Ann.* 2 on his vast production),[11] one of the main historians at the Macedonian court, but also an orator. This tendency is not only true for this early chronological section of the Hellenistic era, as my survey of the sources for Hellenistic oratory will show, but is still valid until the end of the period. One of the last examples is probably Apollonius Molon (12), one of the teachers of rhetoric of Cicero but also an eminent historian. Some of the rhetors who were also active orators in the last section of the Hellenistic era have been included in the recently published *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire*.[12]

---

[6] Kremmydas-Tempest (2013).

[7] The authors immediately acknowledge (and distance themselves from) the prejudices on which previous scholarship has built its reflection on Hellenistic oratory, when they say (p.3): 'The Athenocentricity of our extant literary sources at one time led to a misplaced assumption which dominated scholarship, namely that oratory died at the battle of Chaeronea alongside Athenian political freedom'.

[8] Among other merits, this volume sheds new light on traces of Hellenistic oratory in other literary genres (see the examples in Theocritus, Apollonius Rhodius, Menander and theatre in general), and in the New Testament.

[9] Some were also quite famous, as for instance Neanthes of Cyzicus, *FGrHist* 84 (Laqueur [1935]).

[10] Among the vast bibliography on Theopompus, worthy of mention in relation to his role of orator are Chávez Reino (2009), Flower (1994), and Pownall (2005).

[11] See among the others Brzoska (1894c) Heckel (2006); Nitsche (1906); Susemihl (1981-1892), vol. 1, 140 n.708; 511, n.101; 655; vol. 2, 452-53; 459 n.17; 481 n.93.

[12] Janiszewski et al. (2015).

It is worth spending a few words on two main preliminary issues: when does Hellenistic oratory start and end? And who can be considered an orator in this period? As regards the first question, the modern conventional definition of the period from the death of Alexander to the defeat of Cleopatra at Actium, although useful for the analysis of many historical phenomena, seems rather restrictive for a definition of Hellenistic oratory. The factors that produced changes in oratory in the Hellenistic age are many and diverse: they have to do with style but also and most importantly with the occasions and the audience. A transition between an 'Attic' way of writing or pronouncing speeches and a 'Hellenistic' one is extremely slow: as a result, Democharas (certainly a Hellenistic orator) is probably not much less Attic than Demosthenes. Conversely, Pytheas (72, undoubtedly still an Attic orator) was still politically active after 323 BC. In this rather complex situation, it seems best to leave AD 31 as the ending point, though we should be aware that such a date does not mark immediate substantial changes in the Greek-speaking world. It is the slow pace of this transition that leads one to accept the conventional date of ending, as finding another exact 'turning point' would be almost impossible. At the beginning, however, it seems best to include fragments of speeches dateable after 338 BC, only 15 years before the conventional beginning of the Hellenistic period, when its forerunners can historically begin to be traced.[13] A broad chronological definition can help us to understand better all the steps in this transition from Attic to Imperial oratory – to put it grandly, from Demosthenes to Cicero (and beyond), a process which was far from linear, if we consider that Cicero himself (*Brut.* 325) talks of two different kinds of Asian style, the 'sententiosum et argutum', opposed to the second type 'verbis volucre atque incitatum'.

With regard to the second question, namely 'who can be considered an orator?', the situation is even more complex. It is a fact that fictitious speeches and rhetorical exercises played a crucial role in the evolution and the practice of oratory already during Hellenism (and even before). Therefore, the distinction between actual speeches and fictitious exercises is not always perspicuous.[14] The quotations contained in the Elder Seneca's *controversiae* and *suasoriae* cannot be left aside or dismissed only because of the nature of the work in which they are contained, and most importantly rhetorical exercises, *meletai*, *progymnasmata*[15] tell us a lot about what the actual speeches we do not have anymore must have sounded like.[16] An emblematic case is that of Hybreas of Mylasa (46), for whom we have both fragments from actual speeches and from declamations. Although a distinction between declamations and proper oratory must be made in theory, it is evident that Hybreas' style did not vary according to the category: dramatic features, bold metaphors and rhetorical figures,

[13] It is meaningful that Habicht's masterpiece on Athenian Hellenistic History, *Athen. Die Geschichte Der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit* (Habicht [1995], translated into English in Habicht [1997]), opens with a chapter covering the years between 338 and 323 ('In the Shadow of Macedonian Expansion', Habicht [1997], 6-35). See also Mari (2019).

[14] Moreover, a distinction between delivered speeches and circulated version is always to be considered also for Attic oratory. On Demosthenes see Blass (1893²), Canfora (1989), and Trevett (1996). See also the debate on the *Philippics* as pamphlets in Schwartz (1894c) and Wilamowitz (1907), 73. See also Adams (1912).

[15] See Stramaglia (2010) and related bibliography (112-13).

[16] On this subject see the chapter 'Fra Schola e Forum' in Berti (2007), 29-154.

witty sentences, and even prose rhythm appear in both declamations and political speeches. On top of that, there are a number of papyrus fragments often quickly labelled by their editors as belonging to the category 'rhetorical exercises' which need a re-examination. This is why fragments of *suasoriae* and *controversiae* as well as some relevant rhetorical papyri merit inclusion in a first edition of fragments of Hellenistic oratory. That is the reason for the title of the present work, 'Fragments of Hellenistic *oratory*' (and not simply *orators*): alongside fragments of identifiable personalities, it is crucial to study fragments of rhetorical exercises on papyrus, which constitute a substantial part of our evidence for oratory in the Hellenistic age.

In the light of these premises, a first step is to understand what exactly is the material that can be collected in a first edition. I have been able to count 84 names of Hellenistic orators, twice as many as Wooten counted in 1972. Such a high number derives from a very inclusive criterion, i.e. the choice to consider Hellenistic orators all writers for whom the activity of orator is attested in at least one single source. This reasoning leads to the inclusion of a number of personalities that only have one mention of this kind and for whom only a brief biographical note will be given in the edition. Since this works aim to give an overall idea of Hellenistic oratory, the same degree of importance is given to orators without fragments, as well as to anonymous fragments (i.e., papyri).

From the selection are excluded late Attic/early Hellenistic orators who belong to the canon or for whom a non-fragmentary production exists (e.g., Hyperides, Dinarchus, and Demades), and for those who are attested as active after Chaeronea, but do not have surviving fragments (e.g., Moerocles, Polycrates, Polyeuctus of Cydantidae), or whose extant fragments seem to be earlier than 338 BC (e.g., Hegesippus,[17] and Python of Byzantium).[18] The only exception regarding this criterion is constituted by some of Isocrates' pupils, since his school is crucial for the development of rhetorical teaching and theory (see more in 'Teaching Rhetoric'). A problematic case is that of Phocion, one of the major Athenian political figures of the late 4th century BC: the reason for his exclusion from the selection, perhaps in line with Baiter and Sauppe's choice not to edit his fragments in their *Oratores Attici*, lies in the fact that all the quotations attributed to him (and mostly contained in Plutarch's *Life of Phocion*) seem taken from interventions in the Assembly, rather than from proper long political speeches. Tritle[19] also provides evidence for the fact that Phocion spoke *ex tempore*, so

[17] The case of Hegesippus is quite controversial, as the only witnesses of his post Chaeronea activity are inscriptions (*IG*.II².23, *IG*.II².1623, 185 and 1629, 543, the latter mainly dealing with a decree from 325 about events prior to the battle, so not particularly relevant). The only actual piece of evidence of his oratory after Chaeronea is the speech *On the Treaty with Alexander* (333/332 BC), attributed to Demosthenes but considered spurious by a large consensus of scholars (as well as the speech *On Halonnesus*), but, being a fully preserved speech, this would not constitute a fragment *stricto sensu*, hence it is safer not to include Hegesippus in the selection.

[18] A borderline case is Aristogeiton, with two fragments from a speech *Against Hyperides* (Graegorius Pardus. *Commentarium in Hermogenis librum περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος*. 1272 [Walz. *Rhet.Gr*. 7.2] and Tzetz. Chil. 6.37.96-106), which was written only a few months after the battle of Chaeronea, and do not seem relevant to a discourse on Hellenistic oratory.

[19] Tritle (1988), 26. Within the same discussion (24-26), however, Tritle attempts an analysis of Phocion's rhetorical style, based on his sayings, and on *testimonia* of his oratorical qualities. On Phocion see also Tritle (1992). On his persistence in the rhetorical tradition, see Ferrario (1983) and Dmitriev (2016).

he never wrote or published his public speeches. From this selection are also excluded rhetors for whom the activity of teacher is highly attested, but there is no information about any active oratorical production (e.g., Theodorus of Gaza, Apollodorus of Pergamon)[20]. For reasons of space, biographies of 4th and 3rd century ambassadors only known from decrees on inscriptions are also not provided.[21] Finally, I have left out of this corpus of fragments all the quotations in Greek and Latin rhetorical treatises, which cannot be attributed to any orator and often not even dated.[22]

Lastly, we ought to mention that there is a number of sources which are not entirely fragmentary, namely the speeches reported or paraphrased by historians like Polybius and Livy, which, in the light of their ambiguous nature, are not edited and commented on, even when a biography is provided for those of their authors who appear in Polybius as orators. In accordance with Wooten's choice, there is no biography for Philopoemen, although he pronounces two speeches (Polyb. 11.9; 20.12) because he is a far more articulated political character than other ambassadors included. Moreover, sometimes we find ambassadors mentioned only once in the *Histories* (such as Rositeles and Theodoridas at 22.3), and often in the assemblies of the leagues' generals deliver speeches. At the same time, in other cases, we have speeches from anonymous speakers (see Rhodian speeches at 11.4 and 21.22). In the light of this complex framework, the only statesmen and ambassadors given biographies are those who distinctively appear as good orators. General problems of authorship related to historical fiction and embedded speeches will be brought up in a specific section of this introduction (see p. 61).[23]

1. A chronological approach?

When dealing with such variegated material as the documentation we have for Hellenistic oratory, a criterion for analysing the topic should be chosen carefully. There are two main possible approaches one can adopt to studying Hellenistic oratory – meaning literary fragments, material documents, historical witnesses and any other useful sources –, namely a chronological division of the period aimed at marking points of evolutions and/or continuity, and a geographical criterion, marking difference between areas of the areas conquered by Alexander.

A distinction between Athens/Greek mainland (and islands) and the rest of the Hellenised territories may seem an effective and straightforward angle from which to look at Hellenistic oratory. However, we might then fall into the easy trap of seeing the Greek-speaking world as still

[20] Given the ambiguity that lies in the Greek term ῥήτωρ, the benefit of the doubt should be given for those names for which sources attest the activity of ῥήτωρ but do not specify whether they worked as teachers.

[21] See Bayliss (2011), Tables 1 and 2.

[22] Worthy of mention is, however, a fragment quoted at *Rhet.Her.* 4.68, which, according to Münzer (1934), comes from an actual oration. His attribution to Apollonius Molo or Apollonius ὁ μαλακός (11, 12) seem nevertheless too tentative to include this fragment among those of one of the two Hellenistic orators.

[23] This problem also applies to papyri labelled as rhetorical exercises, which may, in some cases, also be speeches from historians. On this topic, Davide Amendola spoke at the CA-FIEC conference 2019 (5-8 July).

'Athenocentric',[24] a risk that, as seen, must be avoided, when dealing with the Hellenistic era. Wooten (1972) divides the orators for whom he collects fragments according to three main areas, namely Greece (mainland), Asia Minor, and Rhodes. He analyses the witnesses in order to show that on the Greek mainland oratory flourished only in the 3rd century (providing as examples Demochares [30], Cineas of Thessaly [24], Agelaus of Naupactos [3], and Lyciscus of Acarnania [52]), as a natural continuation of the memorable 5th and 4th centuries, when the orators of the canon flourished. Then, oratory gradually disappeared because the centres of rhetoric moved somewhere else. On the contrary, in Asia Minor and Rhodes oratory was not well represented in the first half of the Hellenistic age and became very important in the second when the rhetorical schools were established in Asia Minor, where oratory flourished only in the form of rhetorical exercises (as for Rhodes, even Wooten tends to be more cautious, since the number of sources, especially of actual fragments, is limited).

Undoubtedly, this is what one might deduce from the fragments we have. Nevertheless, evidence for Asia Minor is so fragmentary that it is difficult to draw any conclusions: for instance, the orators from Tralles, and the orator Daphnis, mentioned in Rutilius, are impossible to date precisely, while Alexander of Ephesus is probably to be dated back to the 3rd century. Moreover, as Wooten himself admits when commenting on the fragments he collected,[25] there are witnesses for orators from Asia Minor active in the second half of the 2nd century BC, who practiced deliberative oratory: Diodorus (33) and Xenocles of Adramyttium (83), Diodorus Zonas (34), Euthydemus (39) and the more famous Hybreas of Mylasa (46), Isidorus of Pergamon (47), and Apollonius Molon (12). The latter, in particular, was both a deliberative orator and a teacher of rhetoric – showing that the latter category did not exclude the practice of the former. Similarly, we have a few names of orators from Greece (all listed in Wooten's catalogue) who spoke in the later Hellenistic period: Cassander of Aegina (19), Leon of Athens (51), Alexander the Aetolian (4), Amphicrates of Athens (7), Menedemus of Athens (56).

The discrepancy in the evidence can be explained in the light of the fact that we have much more information about orators outside of Greece between 2nd and the 1st centuries because it is there that the most famous schools were. Consequently, the sources (especially Cicero) were more interested in their oratory, from which they could benefit. This is also the reason why the deliberative orators from the 2nd century BC onwards seem to be connected to Roman politicians (for instance Diophanes of Mytilene [38] and Menelaus of Marathus [57] with the Gracchi, Aeschines of Miletus [1] with Pompey, Apollonius Molon [12] with Cicero). Being both active orators and teachers, they gained fame in Rome and were consequently better known than others.

What is remarkable is the absence of orators in Ptolemaic Egypt – where, as papyrological evidence shows there was no lack schools of rhetoric – to the point that Xenocrates' (81) activity at

[24] On the Hellenistic myth of Athens as the 'school of Hellas' and its 4th-3rd century BC Athenian origin, see Luraghi (2018).

[25] Wooten (1972), 130.

Arsinoe seems to stand out. Besides the randomness affecting the survival of fragmentary literature, one reason for this could lie in the fact that Alexandria, the main intellectual centre of Egypt, seemed to have specialized more in philological and scholarly activity, rather than rhetoric.

In conclusion, considering the complexity of the geography of Hellenistic oratory, it will be perhaps more interesting and useful to see the evolution of oratory from a (mostly) diachronic perspective, in the long path that leads from Attic to Roman oratory.

2. Hellenistic oratory and the City

In order to understand the development of oratory and rhetoric in such a long period as the Hellenistic era, it would be useful to consider the historical evolution of the *polis* and its institutions, and to investigate into why, for a long time, scholars have seen it as no longer functioning or fully active.[26]

It is a fact that the role of the city, after Alexander, changed dramatically, [27] and that the occasions for oratory to flourish changed accordingly. In particular, as Wooten has argued several times,[28] the typology of πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι, the ambassadors' speeches, given the intense inter-polis diplomacy,[29] acquired a new and central role in the oratorical activity of the whole period.[30]

A well- documented reflection on the history of Hellenistic city-states, carried on thanks to the invaluable contribution of epigraphic evidence, is crucial in order to get rid of the widespread misconception that oratory died at Chaeronea. The prejudice its roots in the so-called "Athenocentric" view of Greek history and culture: since Athens undoubtedly changed status after the defeat of Chaeronea, one might assume that democracy died then and there. However, as Porter[31] rightly argues, in translating and quoting Louis Robert, this was not true at all:

[26] We will not dwell on the important and long-debated issue of the evolution of democracy in the Hellenistic world. It will suffice to say that it is necessary to adopt the most widely shared view on the topic, according to which democracy did not die at Chaeronea but what really ended up undermining the independence and autonomy of Hellenistic democratic cities was the Roman intervention. Among the vast bibliography on the topic (including important case studies such as Rhodes, Iasos, Miletus, Kos, showing the vitality of Hellenistic democracies) see Bernhardt (1985); Carlsson (2009); Chaniotis (2010); Errington (2008); Ferguson (1911); Ferrary (1988); Grieb (2008); Jones (1940), 120; Kallet-Marx (1995), 65-74, 330-331; Mann and Scholz (2012); Matthaei-Zimmermann (2008); O'Neil (1995); Quass (1984); van Der Vliet (2012); Wiemer (2013); Will (1979). See also Wallace (2018) about Alexander's reputation as patron of democracy. On the Seleucid empire see also Capdetrey (2007), 191-217; Bickerman (1939); Gauthier (1989); Grainger (1990); Ma (1999); on Attalid empire see Savalli-Lestrade (2001); on the Ptolemaic empire see Bagnall (1976) and Müller (2006); finally on Macedonian cities see Hatzopoulos (1996). On the "special" case of Rhodes, see Berthold (1984) and O'Neil (1981).

[27] See Habicht (1997); Habicht (1995); Habicht (2006); Jones (1957); O'Neil (1997), 103-120 ('Hellenistic Democracy') for the specific case of Athens, which is not to be treated differently from the other Hellenistic cities.

[28] See Wooten (1972), 53-78, and Wooten (1973).

[29] See Ma (2003).

[30] A doctoral dissertation on the rhetorical strategies of Greek envoys in the Hellenistic Period is being written by William Cole at Royal Holloway. Cole's study considers speeches in Polybius and hundreds of Hellenistic inscriptions containing summaries of ambassadors' oratory.

[31] Porter 2005, 76 = English translation of Robert 1969-1990, V, 561.

> The few great cities of Greece simply revert to having practically the same life hundreds of Greek cities had in the Classical period: no importance in world history, but responsibility for their own fate in the midst of wars, dangers, and hostile powers. Indeed, one might say, to the contrary, that Rhodes, or even Byzantium, plays a role in world politics in no way inferior to the role Athens played previously. In the unleashing of wars and princely rivalries, which were added to conflicts among neighbors, the fate–life, liberty, fortune–of each citizen still depends on the policy the assembly of the people will follow, and politicians and orators still have the same importance. It is even more so, if possible, when Rome intervenes in the affairs of the Greek world and subdues it little by little.

Therefore, on the whole, Greek *poleis*, including Athens, carried on having their own institutions and political activity – and consequently deliberative oratory.[32]

Enlightening in this sense are the words of Louis Robert[33], who already in the middle of the twentieth century could see that in principle there was no difference between the social and political role of Hybreas' (46) eloquence in the city-state of Mylasa, and that of Demosthenes in Athens (*'L'éloquence du "rhéteur" Hybreas de Mylasa, par exemple, n'engageait pas moins le sort de sa patrie, entre Rome et les Parthes de Labienus, que celle de Démosthène et d'Hypéride'*). To prove his point about the still vital role of the *polis* and its institutions during Hellenism, Robert provides a couple of famous and solid examples. First of all, the history of the siege of Abydos by Philip in 200 BC (found in Polyb. 16.30, 34), followed by the resistance of the citizens and their self-massacre, which, he argues, must have been deliberated on in assemblies, after long discussions and on the advice of politicians and orators.[34] Then, the abovementioned case of Hybreas and his resistance, conducted together with another orator, Zeno of Laodicea (84), against the Parthians in their respective cities during the invasion of Asia Minor in 41 BC.

Thanks to Hybreas' example it is evident, in my view, that freedom of speech still flourished in Hellenistic oratory: in Hybreas' F3 (Plut. *Ant.* 24), a piece of a speech addressed to Antony to complain about taxes is quoted, and despite the role of power held by Antony, Plutarch says Hybreas spoke vigorously and bravely (πρακτικῶς δὲ καὶ παραβόλως). Plutarch even adds that, although these words were highly "rhetorical" (in the sense of sophisticated) and bold, Antony liked the speech. The

---

[32] It is worth mentioning a 2nd century AD papyrus (PSI 11.1215 = LDAB 4435 = MP3 2098) containing a dialogue on the importance of oratory in a democracy. More evidence of the existence of "places" for deliberative oratory is provided by Shipley (2013) 363. He observes that according to Strabo (9.2.40), who is talking about oratory in the present tense (i.e. in the late Hellenistic age), kings are able to manipulate the city the same way orators did (but through the aid of benefactions or force: [32] A decree of a king addressing the assembly is in *IG*.XII.6 155) and marks a distinction between manipulation through words and that made through other strategies. This means that, if kings did not employ oratory, the place of the poleis where speeches were delivered must have still been the assemblies.

[33] Robert (1951), 36 n.1; Robert (1969), 306-7.

[34] Robert 1967, 25.

idea that deliberative oratory had been further curtailed by the almost complete loss of Greek freedom after the fall of Corinth in 146 BC, which seems true for Aeschines of Miletus (1), exiled by Pompey for speaking "too freely",[35] should be applied to all orators. Hybreas' case can be used as useful evidence to reappraise Momiglianos' view[36] that from the end of the fourth century on, '*parrhesia* as a private virtue replaced *parrhesia* as a political right'. *Parrhesia* was, as argued by Konstan,[37] 'a license to express one's views, whatever the context', and 'as such is not specific to democracy; what characterises a democracy is rather the extension of *parrhesia* to all classes of citizens', i.e., *isegoria*. If *isegoria* was no longer a feature of Hellenistic institutions (at least not all of them), *parrhesia*, intended as freedom of saying whatever an orator wanted to say in public, on the contrary, still seems to have existed in the Hellenistic world.

In a later publication *Claros I: décrets hellénistiques*, Louis and Jeanne Robert,[38] provide epigraphical evidence for the vitality of oratory in the Hellenistic cities: the employment of the verb πείθειν in the decrees of Kolophon for Ptolemaios and Menippos shows, for instance, how the act of persuading, an essential feature of (especially political) oratory in the Classical age, was still the core of Hellenistic oratory.

On top of this, two more points used to prove that oratory was no longer vital after Chaeronea are the notion that in states ruled by kings the scope for oratory was limited, as the main decisions were taken by sovereigns, and that judiciary oratory, though probably still practiced, was not of great importance in the Hellenistic period, considering the scarcity of evidence about it.[39] However, if, on the one hand it is true that sovereigns were in charge of the main political decisions, on the other, it is apparent that they could not take care of minor judicial issues dealing with single individuals. Private judiciary oratory must have kept functioning throughout the whole Hellenistic period in ways that cannot have been too dissimilar from those of the Classical *polis*. Moreover, recently, Benjamin Gray[40] has studied the civic ideas expressed in the laws and decrees of Hellenistic cities, comparing them with Hellenistic historical and philosophical works, and showed that they combined old ideals of civic virtue with new instances of individual freedom.

Mostly on Robert's premises, recent classical scholarship has studied the *polis* in the Hellenistic period.[41] John Ma,[42] highlighting the importance of the Hellenistic city, defined Hellenism 'an age of states, poleis [...] an age of kings; and an age of elephants, gigantic warships, Imperial processions, and stupendous feasting'.

---

[35] Strab. 14.1.7.
[36] Momigliano (1973), 260.
[37] Konstan (2012).
[38] Robert (1989), 39.
[39] See p. 129.
[40] Gray (2017). See also recently Gray (2018) on the presence of elements alternative to Stoicism – and taken from the 4th-century philosophical debate – in Hellenistic (especially honorific) decrees.
[41] Fundamental studies are Fraser (1996), Gauthier (1988), Gauthier (1993), Gawantka (1985), Gruen (1993), Hansen (2006), Ma (2003), Shipley (2006).
[42] Ma (2003), 13.

The material on which this view is constructed is mainly epigraphical and, considering the vast amount and the diverse natura of the inscriptions at our disposal (hundreds of documents), it will be appropriate to simplify our discourse by operating a distinction into four main categories:[43] inscriptions attesting inter-polis diplomacy, inscriptions attesting honorific practices, inscriptions with decrees of the royal courts,[44] inscriptions with legal decrees of the *dikasteria*.[45]

For our purposes, we should concentrate on the first two categories.

1) The first category, a sign of what Porter[46] calls "Hellenistic globalization", is the best represented, and it confirms the crucial role of ambassador's speeches as a "new" and highly represented form of oratory during the Hellenistic age.[47] Among the vast amount of epigraphic material at our disposal, some interesting decrees stand out as particularly revealing about the nature of actual orations. An enlightening example, mentioned and widely discussed by Porter and Ma[48] as well, is a decree from 206/5 BC found by the sanctuary of Leto at Xanthos in Lycia[49], attesting an embassy from Kytenion, which needed financial help for the reconstruction of their ramparts, destroyed by an earthquake. The decree is an account of the Kytenian ambassador's speech and the reply of the Xanthian ambassador.[50] The first one is particularly relevant as it contains various rhetorical features, such as the praise of Xanthos, and the stress on the ties between the two cities, emphasised by a complicated mythological reconstruction of their common roots (this rhetorical strategy is called *syngeneia*[51] and is typical of Hellenistic decrees). The reply of the Xanthian ambassador, though shorter, is still rhetorically very effective, as it contains an excuse for the people for not contributing so generously because of their difficult financial situation, despite their well-known philanthropy.

Many new types of speeches are part of this broad category. As John Ma shows,[52] there were several forms of connections between cities (that might, of course, sometimes overlap):

---

[43] I would like to thank Peter Thonemann for suggesting this division, and helping with dealing in a concise way with the great quantity of Hellenistic inscribed decrees.

[44] Among the vast literature on royal decrees and letters, see recently Bencivenni (2010); Ceccarelli (2018) and Tzifalias-Helly (2010). In particular, Ciccarelli provides an interesting case study with her Magnesian dossier (169) that shows how royal letters and decrees from leagues and cities shared the same purpose: they addressed the same request by the Magnesians (Kern [1900], *I.Magnesia* 16-87; Rigsby [1996], 66-131) and reacted to it in very similar terms Although lexical and syntactical features are different. On letters and *diagrammata* by Macedonian kings, see Mari (2018).

[45] See Wolff (1970[2]). Recently, Grotkamp (2014) and Mélèze-Modrzejewski (2014).

[46] Porter (1997), 52.

[47] See Wooten (1973) about ambassadors' speeches in Polybius. For a broader discussion of interstate diplomacy, see Gauthier (1972), Ager (1996), and Kvist (2003). On epigraphic evidence, crucial is also the detailed analysis of John Ma (Ma 2003).

[48] Porter (1998), 78-79; Ma (2003), 9-13.

[49] See edition and commentary in Bousquet (1988).

[50] The text is translated in English by Porter (1997), 79.

[51] On *syngeneia* see Curty (1995), containing a full list of inscriptions containing the term *syngeneia* and a critical analysis of them.

[52] Ma (2003), 14.

> *syngeneia*, the language of kinship used relate cities (as deployed so grandly, and so unsuccessfully, by the envoys of Kytenion); inter-state arbitration; the recognition of a place's *asylia* (inviolability), freedom from spoliation reprisals, obtained by piecemeal negotiation between a community and the rest of the world; the dispatch of *theoroi* from cities with famous shrines and festivals in order to announce these festivals to other cities, where these envoys were received by specially designated local notables (*theorodokoi*); and the practice of Hellenistic cities asking for arbitrators ('foreign judges') from other cities.[53]

A remarkable example of *asylia*[54] is offered by Cos, which in 246 BC[55] sent a series of embassies to several Hellenic cities in order to obtain the inviolability of the Coan Asclepieion and its festival. These decrees are also examples of how *syngeneia* as common ancestry (along with long-lasting friendship), was one of the main points aiming to convince the other cities to grant *asylia*. Other rhetorical arguments employed in these *presbeutikoi* are the *oikeiotes*, i.e., the stress on the closeness of the two cities, and the mention of *anankaiotes*, intermarriage relationship that could strengthen the idea of common ancestry. Recent studies have demonstrated that these documents may shed light on some other forms of ambassadors' speeches that were not dated to the Hellenistic era before. This is the case with some texts contained in the Hippocratic corpus.[56] In 2013, Eric Nelson[57] argued that the content of the Coan decrees was drawn from the traditions of the Coan *Asclepiadai*, similar to those present in the pseudo-epigraphic speeches, *Presbeutikos* (ambassador speech) and *Epibomios* (speech from the altar), contained in the Hippocratic corpus. Nelson, therefore, argues that these speeches are actually examples of Hellenistic ambassadors' speeches.

Also quite important and typical of the period is the new practice of the city of asking foreign judges to solve internal matters.[58] This does not seem to have been a common practice in the Classical age, although foreign arbitration already existed at the time.[59] These sorts of procedures were not always administered in the same way. Gruen,[60] for instance lists a first series of examples (*Syll*^{3} 471, *Syll*^{3} 599, *Syll*^{3} 683) where cities are called to intervene in disputes between two others. Then, he provides instances of individual judges called from abroad, a practice that seems to have been much more common, and that is witnessed by decrees honouring the foreign judges,[61] which is evidence

[53] See Ma (2003), n.5, for more bibliography about each type.
[54] On *asylia* see Chaniotis (1996) and Rigsby (1996).
[55] See editions in Herzog-Klaffenbach (1952), Segre (1993), Welles (1934), Rigsby (1996).
[56] On the texts contained in the Hippocratic corpus and different questions related to it, see Jouanna (1999), Cantor (2002), Nutton (2004), Schiefsky (2005).
[57] See Nelson (2013).
[58] Specifically, about this issue is Gauthier (1972), Gauthier (1994), but also Gruen (1993). On the case of Iasos, see Crowther (1995).
[59] See Piccirilli (1973).
[60] Gruen (1993), 343-4.
[61] See *SEG* I.363.

for the importance of epideictic oratory in the Hellenistic age. As Gruen rightly argues, this does not mean that assemblies were no longer functioning, but just that a new solution was found for internal quarrels for which a clear solution was not found. What is crucial to stress about this practice is that judges were praised for their impartiality and were usually nominated by the *polis* and rarely by royal delegates, which proves once more how vital and independent the institutions of the city were.

Other well-attested examples of interstate agreements are those dealing with war matters. Inscriptions may attest συμμαχία, as it happens in *Syll*[3] 581, a decree establishing a defensive alliance between Rhodes and Hyerapitna (Crete) in 200 BC; they can be treaties of peace, as in *Syll*[3] 588 for Magnesia and Miletus.[62]

Finally, another characteristic of Hellenistic peer-polity diplomacy is the exchange of *isopoliteia*. This practice consisted of two cities granting each other's citizens civil rights in the respective territories. Naturally, such agreements could have different degrees, as well explained and documented by Gruen.[63]

2) The second category, that of honorific practices, is also quite well represented, and confirms the importance of encomia in Hellenistic oratory. It overlaps with the first one as regards decrees honouring foreign judges, but what makes it characteristic of Hellenism is the practice of inscribing extensive career biographies of city benefactors (who could be both citizens and foreigners) on decrees.[64] Such a habit became common in the late Hellenistic era, from the later 2nd century BC on, particularly in Asia Minor, but overall everywhere, and persisted after the end of the Hellenistic age, to fade away only during the Julio-Claudian era. It is interesting to notice how such a type of decree becomes more popular in parallel to the increase in popularity of encomiastic rhetoric and oratory, while in the past, a mere dedication with name, titles, and reasons of honour would have been sufficient. With regard to this, it is worth mentioning a stele from Maroneia (*SEG*.XXVI.821)[65] containing an encomium of the goddess Isis, dating to 100 BC, around the same period when these honorific praises of benefactors became widespread. It is a monument of praise for the goddess who cured the person who commissioned the inscription; it is, therefore, assimilable to the praises of benefactors. This is not a completely unusual epigraphical type, as the so-called genre of aretology, namely the praise of a god for a miracle, is attested elsewhere and not only on stone.[66] What really makes this inscription relevant to our discussion is its extremely rhetorical style, its prose rhythm,[67] and its structure following the rules of encomia. This is what makes Porter say this is quite a unique example of 'religious rhetoric'.

---

[62] See Gruen (1993), 342.

[63] Se Gruen (1993), 346-7.

[64] Entirely dedicated to Greek euergetism, starting from the 4th century BC, and talking specifically about this phenomenon is Gauthier (1985). On euergetism and democracy, a detailed analysis is in Miller (2016), where a selection of commented honorific decrees can be found.

[65] See edition in Grandjean (1975). See also Porter (1997), 80-1.

[66] There are later papyri containing these sorts of texts.

[67] Papanikolaou (2009).

3. Ambassadors' speeches

The most typically Hellenistic genre of speeches is undoubtedly the ambassadorial speech, but the history and evolution of this genre deserve a deeper analysis. Ambassadors' speeches,[68] however typical of Hellenistic oratory, always existed in Greek literature: they are already to be found in the *Iliad* (3.203-24; 9.182-655), but also in historians from the Classical age, like Herodotus (1.152, 8.140), Thucydides (1.32-43; 68ff.; 2.71; 4.17-20; 6.76-81; 6.82-7), and Xenophon (*Hell.* 3.5.7-15; 6.3.4-17; 6.5.37-8; 7.1.1-11). The highest concentration of ambassadorial speeches are, consistently with the trend according to which they are the Hellenistic oratorical form *par excellence*, in Polybius,[69] as pointed out by Wooten (1973), who counts fourteen ambassadors' speeches in the *Histories*.[70] Among the selection of Hellenistic orators offered in the present work, apart from the orators who pronounced speeches in Polybius' Histories, two more, namely Demetrius of Phalerum (29) and Apollonius Molon (12),[71] are said to have been ambassadors. Further evidence of the importance of the role of ambassador in the Hellenistic age can be found among the selection of rhetorical exercises on papyrus. Although none of them can be considered an ambassadorial speech, in two exercises, ambassadors are mentioned: in P.Schub. 32, where we find a rhetorical question on the Arcadian ambassadors, and P.Mil.Vogl. 3.23, where the role of ambassadors is listed among the remarkable tasks held by Tydeus.

Before investigating the nature and the structure of these speeches, it will be useful to trace a history of the theorisation of ambassadorial speeches. There were mostly two ways of dividing rhetorical material in ancient rhetorical theory. The first one is the Aristotelian well-known tripartition into deliberative, judicial, and epideictic oratory (see Cic. *De inv.* 1.7),[72] while the second is Hermagoras' division of the πολιτικὰ ζητήματα, political questions[73] (on Hermagoras see 'Theorising Rhetoric'), into θέσεις (speeches on abstract and general topics) and ὑποθέσεις (on concrete topics and specific people). The two theories can be combined if the deliberative and judicial genres are combined in a new category of ἀγωνιστικοί or πραγματικοί speeches, dealing with concrete and practical subjects, opposed to the ἐπιδεικτικοί, less connected with reality.[74] Cicero attests to how these two main divisions could be combined, as evident from passages in *De inv.* 1.8, *De or.* 1.141 (by Crassus) and 2.65 (by Antony), despite the boring and old-fashioned standard division in rhetorical handbooks.

Despite these being the main positions on the subject, some rhetoricians thought necessary to add new categories to the Aristotelian triad. Pepe (2013) identifies three possibilities, one of which

[68] On envoys and diplomacy in Ancient Greece see Mosley (1973).
[69] Wiater (2010) and See Zecchini (2005).
[70] 9.28; 9.32; 11.4; 15.1; 15.17; 18.37; 20.12; 21.14; 21.15; 21.19; 21.22; 21.31; 24.9; 30.31.
[71] On the importance of the embassy of Apollonius Molon, see the section on 'Hellenistic oratory and Rome'.
[72] This is the tripartition commonly adopted by modern scholars and therefore employed in this work too.
[73] See Calboli Montefusco (1986).
[74] For a more detailed discussion of divisions in rhetorical theory, see Pepe (2013), 291-335.

includes the ambassadorial speech. The three potential candidates for a 'fourth genre' are the ὁμιλητικὸν γένος (the 'genre of conversation'), the ἱστορικὸν γένος (the 'historical genre'), the ἀντίρρησις (the 'speech in reply'), the ἐντευκτικὸν γένος (the 'kind of speech affable with all people').[75]

It is of this genre that the ambassadorial speech constitutes a category. The first attestation of this genre is in a fragment by Demetrius of Phalerum (29), quoted by Philodemus in the *Rhetoric*:[76]

> καὶ μὴν ὁ Δ[ημ]ήτριος μετὰ τοῦ σοφισ[τικοῦ] γένους τῶν λόγων [προστ]ι[θεὶ]ς τῷ δημηγορικῷ καὶ δικανικῷ τὸν ἐντευκτικὸν ἅπασιν, εἰ μὲν λαμβάνει τὸν τοῖς πλήθεσιν ἐντε[υκτικὸν κ]αὶ τὸν κατὰ πρεσβείαν τοῖς δυνάσταις, ἐχέτω μὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος. ὁ γὰρ ἐκ τούτων ἀγαθὸν γίνεται, μετὰ ταῦτα ἀποψόμεθα. etc
>
> Another point is that Demetrius of Phalerum, along with the sophistic genre of speeches,[77] adds to the deliberative and forensic (kinds) the (kind of speech) serving for encounters with all people. Now, if he takes (this) as the (kind of speech) serving for encounters with the masses and as that (serving for encounters) with rulers in diplomatic missions, let us grant that for the moment. For later we shall see what good comes from them etc.[78]

This passage[79] seems to illustrate part of Demetrius' rhetorical theory, which included a revision of the Aristotelian division into three genres. The ἐντευκτικὸν is divided into types, one for encounters with the masses, and another one for encounters with rulers during embassies, which represents the first rhetorical theorisation of the ambassadorial speech. Demetrius has direct experience of embassies, as shown by the mention of a Πρεσβευτικός attributed to him and mentioned by Diog. Laert. *VS* 5.81 – and perhaps a fragment of it is the one we find at F6 (see edition and commentary),[80] dealing with an embassy of Demetrius on behalf of the Athenians to the arrogant king Craterus.

In the lines that immediately follow, we might find insights about the style that was apt for such a speech. Dorandi's new reading ὁμε῾ι΄λίας, 'conversation', instead of ἀληθείας, 'truth' seems to be more helpful in reconstructing the stylistic conventions of ambassadorial speeches, especially in

---

[75] The ὁμιλητικὸν γένος considers ὁμιλία and διάλογος as rhetorical speeches. "Conversation" is addressed as a rhetorical genre in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1421b17-9; 1445b27-8) but not really developed. Although Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Thuc*. 48.1) and the *Rhetoric* of the Pseudo-Dionysius (336.5) give it a special place, this genre never really managed to enter the canon (see Pernot [1993], 429). The ἱστορικὸν γένος, is first attested at the beginning of the Τέχνη ῥητορική by Rufus of Perinthus, a rhetorician from the 2nd century AD. It is a fact that, with the teaching of Isocrates (see Nicolai [1992], 32 ff., and Nicolai [2004], 74 ff.) and Aristotle, history was an important subject in the formation of an orator. Finally, the ἀντίρρησις (the 'speech in reply'), not a remarkable innovation, that can be found for the first time in John of Sicily's commentary on Hermogenes (*In Hermog. Id.* Walz, *Rhet.Gr.* 6.456).

[76] Phld. Rh. IV, P.Herc. 1007, col. XLIa. 6-18, vol. I, 222 Sudahus = fr.130 Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf = fr.137 Wehrli.

[77] To be considered as epideictic.

[78] English translation by P. Stork, J. M. van Ophuijsen, T. Dorandi.

[79] See Grube (1961) 53; Kennedy (1963) 285; Pernot (1993) 35. More detailed discussions are Dorandi (1997) and in Fortenbaugh-Schutrümpf (2000), 222 (=F130).

[80] Ps.-Demetr. *Eloc*. 289 = fr.12 Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf = fr.183 Wehrli.

the light of the fact that Polybius, the largest source for these kinds of speeches, usually describes them as private encounters where a conversation happens.[81] The word ἐντευκτικὸν is on the whole poorly attested in surviving Greek literature (and never before Demetrius), and Pepe (2013) rightly noticed that it occurs twice in Plutarch (*De Lib. Educ.* 10A; *Alc.* 13.2) in contexts where the theme is the ability to conduct a private conversation. In the former Plutarch is talking about honesty in conversation, while in the latter Phaeax is praised for his attitude to conversing in private.

Before Demetrius, the only trace of ambassadorial speeches in rhetorical theory can be found in the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (2.2) where we read that the people have to deliberate and speak in council and assembly about religion, law, conditions of the city, alliances or treaties with other cities, wars, peace, fiscal revenues: the author discusses what an ambassador should do, but not how he should speak. Very interesting is a passage in Polybius (12.25.2-3), where he, criticising Timaeus' methods of composition (see section on 'Speeches in Historiographers'), talks about his attitude to composing δημηγορίαι, παρακλήσεις πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι, 'public speeches, harangues to soldiers,[82] and speeches of ambassadors', constituting the first attestation of the expression πρεσβευτικὸς λόγος as an independent type of speech. After Polybius, Diodorus Siculus (20.1) considers the πρεσβευτικοὶ λόγοι as part of the ἱστορία.

As seen, ambassadorial speeches existed long before the Hellenistic age, but, back then, they did not have an autonomous status. Not much can be deduced about their categorisation in the abovementioned examples in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon, but some information can be deduced from the mention of ambassadors' speeches in orators. No real ambassadorial speeches are to be found in orators: speeches in Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy* or in Andocides' *On the Peace* do not reflect actual ambassadorial speeches. Of real embassies of Aeschines, Demosthenes, or Hyperides (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 850a) not much is reported, if we except the ridiculous account and summary that Aeschines (2.34-35) gives of Demosthenes' embassy to negotiate the peace with Philip in Pella in 346 BC. Among the fragments of Demosthenes, there are no ambassadorial speeches: this might be because, despite actually pronouncing them, as clear by Aeschines ridiculing them, he (like other orators) chose not to circulate them, as if they were a minor aspect of his activity – and they might also have been shorter. Despite the lack of actual ambassadorial speeches, references to them are not missing in orators. In particular, we can see that Demosthenes and Aeschines tend to use the term δημηγορία (Dem. 7.20; 9.11; Aeschin. 2.79; 3.138, 256) to define this kind of speech.

This means that in the 4th century BC the πρεσβευτικὸς λόγος must have belonged to the γένος συμβουλευτικόν, and it seems to belong to the same category in Polybius and Diodorus, where it is mentioned just after the δημηγορίαι. Something similar can be found in a passage by Philodemus' *Rhetoric*, II. col. 31.4-5 (257 Longo Auricchio), saying '…write such imitations of judiciary (δικαν[ικῶν), deliberative (συμβουλευτικῶν), and ambassadorial (πρ[ε]σβευτικῶν) speeches', where the

[81] See 3.15.4 and 5.67.11.

[82] On speeches to troops, see among others Abbamonte (2009).

ambassadorial speeches are mentioned just after the *symbouleutikoi*, meaning that they were similar categories, although not exactly the same anymore (as evident from the clear division in the fragment of Demetrius quoted Philodemus). One may argue that in the Hellenistic period, the ambassadorial speech began to be independent of the *demegoria*, but still kept similar characteristics to it. It is interesting to note, that in Imperial rhetorical theory this classification changes dramatically: in Menander Rhetor (423.6-424.2.) the πρεσβευτικός is considered epideictic oratory,[83] probably because in the Imperial age the nature of embassies changed, and their political nature was replaced by the necessity of cities and provinces to praise the emperor in order to obtain benefits. This is paralleled by the same kind of evolution of panegyrics, less political in the Isocratean style and more openly praising in the Imperial age.[84] With regard to this, the Hellenistic period constituted a transition, and the still deliberative nature of ambassadorial speeches, shown by the categorisation in Polybius, Diodorus, and Philodemus of these speeches as deliberative (more similarly to the category given by Demosthenes and Aeschines in 4th century Athens, than to the one of epideictic oratory in the Imperial age) shows that democracy in the Hellenistic period was not just a formal concept as some thought.

A further important consideration may arise from the abovementioned passage in Philodemus: here we read that they used to write imitations of judicial, deliberative, and ambassadorial speeches. This means not only that this division was known in rhetorical schools, but also that exercises of declamations in the form of ambassadorial speech were thought and practiced.[85]

As regards the structure of Hellenistic ambassadorial speeches, important insights are given by the speeches (partially or entirely) quoted or paraphrased by Polybius – see more details on specific cases in the biographies of Alexander the Aetolian, Apollonides of Sycion, Callicrates of Leontium, Chlaeneas the Aetolian, Heracleides of Byzantium, Lyciscus of Acarnania, Lycortas, Metrodorus of Scepsis, Thrasycrates of Rhodes. Wooten,[86] when studying these pieces of evidence, identifies a structure typical of ambassadorial speeches, to be found in both Polybius' and older historians:

1) Narration (sometimes preceded by a short *proemium*) going through the history of the relations or kinship between the cities/states/leagues involved, with emphasis on the good past relationships and common mythical ancestors.[87]

2a) Argument persuading the listener that these kinds of relations should stay consistent through time. If possible, a mention of previous oaths and treaties should be made.

2b) Optional insertion of slanderous offences to one's enemy (see Polyb. 24.9; Xen., *Hell.* 6.3. 10-7; Thuc. 1.37-43, 2.71).

---

[83] On the phenomenon, see Pepe (2013), 330-4; Pernot (1993) 94 and 712-3.

[84] See Pernot (1993).

[85] In the Imperial age we have examples declamations in the form of factious πρεσβευτικός, such as Aristides. *Or.* 16 Keil.

[86] See Wooten (1973), 210-2.

[87] On friendship, see among others, Paschidis (2013), Sammartano (2007).

3) Peroration: summary of the previous points and request to act in accordance with the past common heritage.

This structure is not only common to several speeches in Polybius (Chlaeneas the Aetolian and Lyciscus the Acarnanian before the Spartan assembly in Polyb. 9.28-32; Eumenes and the Rhodians before the Senate in Polyb. 21.19-22 among others), but also to speeches in Thucydides and Xenophon (Hermocrates, before the assembly at Camarina in Thuc. 6.76-81; the speech of the Theban ambassadors at Athens, Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.7-15 to mention just a couple),[88] and to Aeschines' speech before Philip at Pella in 346 BC which we find in Aesch. 2.25-30. Here, Aeschines mentions the old friendship between the Macedonians and the Athenians, then mutual services they exchanged, subsequently offers decrees, letters, and texts of treaties to confirm his statements, and finally reminds Philip of his father's friendship with the Athenians.

This structure applies to embassies in which the two parties are in fairly good terms or at least in a neutral situation. When that is not the case, the ambassador usually tries to point out a distinction between the bad actions of a group of people, and the single leaders who opposed the decision to take those actions (see Leon of Athens [51] in Polyb. 21.31 and Astymedes [16] in Polyb. 30.31 before the Roman Senate). After this, they propose good terms of reconciliation, as in the case of Heracleides with Scipio (Polyb. 21.14), very similar to the speech of the Spartans in Athens after the capture of their troops on Pylos (Thuc. 4.17-20). Wooten[89] argues against the possibility of Polybius being influenced by Thucydides, because this must have been a standard strategy in ambassadorial speeches.

Further evidence of these characteristics can be found in inscriptions.[90] The structure of the extract presented in Hellenistic decrees seems indeed very similar to that of the speeches in historians. The same kind of narration already exists for early Hellenistic decrees dealing with ambassadors,[91] but seems even more common in 3rd and 2nd - century inscriptions: Bousquet 1988 (= *SEG*.XXXVIII.1476), with a decree on an embassy of the Dorians in Xanthos, may serve as example. It contains references to the events, which happened in the homeland, and to the common mythical origins of the cities (e.g., Leto, mother of Apollo and Artemis, founded Xanthos and was born in Doris). Another reference to a common glorious past in a decree about an embassy is to be found in *I.Magnesia* 46,[92] where the Magnesians send envoys to the Epidamnians, stressing the importance of their kinship in connection to their common mythical past. Finally, we must mention *IC*.I.24, ll. 3-17, where Herodotus and Menecles, two envoys to the Teians, also attests to the same high value that the two cities give to education.[93]

---

[88] See more examples in Wooten (1973).

[89] Wooten (1973), 212

[90] See Chaniotis (2013a) in Kremmydas and Tempest (2013), Chaniotis (2013b), Chaniotis (2016), Gray (2013), Musti (1963), Rubinstein (2013), Will (1995). See also the forthcoming Amendola (2019).

[91] See, for instance, Callias of Sphettus in *IG*II^2.682.

[92] See Sammartano (2008-9).

[93] See Chaniotis (1988).

Finally, it is essential to notice that many of these ambassadors were not only orators and politicians, but also actors (see, for instance, Demetrius of Scepsis, or Potamon of Mytilene), a sign that the actual performance and the delivery were particularly important for the effectiveness of the embassy.[94]

[94] See Rubinstein (2013).

Between rhetoric and oratory: rhetorical theory and rhetorical schools

1. Teaching rhetoric

Within the broad framework of ancient school and teaching,[95] a crucial role was played by rhetoric, which was the first subject to be taught in schools after grammar,[96] and which students began to study between the age of twelve and fifteen. 'Acquiring the wings of eloquence' was, according to Libanius,[97] the final goal of rhetorical studies. Most of the knowledge we have on the way rhetoric was taught in school comes from Latin sources[98] and Greek handbooks from the Imperial age. It is, however, fair to assume that the structure of rhetorical teaching we find in the Imperial age was already to be found in the schools of the Hellenistic age,[99] and mostly based on Hellenistic rhetorical education. As Russell[100] pointed out, 'Greeks did not learn from Romans – least of all in rhetoric', and there must have been a common source for Latin and Greek Imperial declamations having the same theme.[101] Rhetorical education was widespread and took place not only in famous centres like Athens, Rhodes, or Pergamon, although, however, apparently not every city was considered perfectly well suited to have a rhetorical school.[102]

First of all, teachers introduced their students to the theory of rhetoric and its components: invention, arrangement, style, memory (which probably was a later addition),[103] and delivery. Not much is known about the practice of this kind of teaching, but it is fair to assume that students took notes from their teachers' lectures, or teachers followed handbooks. For instance, some of the

---

[95] Pivotal studies include Bonner (1977); Cribiore (1996); Cribiore (2001); Fernàndez Delgado-Pordomingo-Stramaglia (2007); Gibson (2004), Hugonnard-Roche (2008); Marrou (1948); Morgan (1998); Penella (2011); Too (2001); Vössing (1995).

[96] The most important grammatical treatise for the Hellenistic period is that by Dionysius Thrax. See Lallot (1998²).

[97] *Ep*. 44, 106.2.2, 323.1, 155.2, 660, 1523.1.

[98] We know from Cicero (*Tusc*. 1.17; *Brut*. 309-10) that declamation was practiced extensively. He also talks about declamations in the specific example of his young nephew enjoying the genre (*Q. fr*.3.3.34). His son, aged 21, studied rhetoric in Athens with Gorgias (Cic. *Fam.* 16.21; Plut. *Cic*. 24.6-7. See Gorgias' biography). The Younger Pliny (2.3) talks enthusiastically about the declaimer Isaeus (known to Philostratus, *VS* 1.20 = 512-14), a professional rhetorician from the 1st century AD, when, unlike in Greek schools, declamations were public displays with a competitive tone. Declamation was also a hobby for adults. Quintilian (2.10) insists that declamations should stay as close as possible to the real world, but allows scope for youthful exuberance. An early example of this is in Plut. *Pomp*. 42.5, where we read that Pompey, in Rhodes, listened to different sophists declaiming, among whom was Poseidonius (the famous historian and rhetorician of Apamaea), giving a talk against Hermagoras. On Roman declamation see also Bonner (1969²); Bonner (1977); and Clarke (2002²); Gunderson (2003); and related bibliography.

[99] A lot of rhetorical vocabulary was present in Hellenistic philosophy: for instance, protreptic (exhortation to philosophy), diatribe (on moral subjects), *chreia* (anecdotes, the same term used in *progymnasmata*), and consolation. An interesting practice was that of *thesis*, a debate on a given topic, very similar to rhetorical declamations.

[100] Russell (1983), XI-XXII.

[101] See also Russel-Wilson (1981).

[102] If we understand the verb σοφιστεύειν in Plut. *Luc*. 22.6 as 'teaching', the Athenian rhetor Amphicrates, living in Seleucia by Tigranes, is said to have refused to teach σοφιστεύειν there because 'that dish was too small to hold a dolphin'

[103] Charmadas and Metrodorus of Scepsis (1st-2nd BC) explored the question (*Rhet. Her*. 3.38 and Cic. *De or*. 2.360). From what we know in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (3.28-40), memory was based on mental images associated with one another and evoking to some extent the details to be memorised.

rhetorical exercises on papyrus included in this work, seem, given their material aspects, to have belonged to handbooks rather than to personal scribbled copies.

As for the actual practice of rhetorical exercises, it was structured as follows: before being asked to write declamations on given themes (at earlier stages encomiastic themes, then historical topics for deliberative oratory, or legal matters for judicial speeches), preliminary steps needed to be followed. The first one was that of *progymnasmata*,[104] shorter exercises that prepared students for declamation (and, more broadly, for the study of rhetoric).[105]

Among Kremmydas'[106] selection of Hellenistic rhetorical papyri, at least one is certainly a collection of *progymnasmata*, namely P.Lit.Lond. 138 (=Brit.Libr. 256 = MP3 2515 = LDAB 4325).[107] This papyrus has not been edited and commented on in the present work, since it can be dated precisely to the 1st century AD, but it surely deserves a few words in this introduction, as it is emblematic of the practice of progymnasmatic composition in school context at a very early time. It is an extensive papyrus roll, which we may date back to the 1st century AD thanks to the documents on the *recto*, and contains three declamations and three *progymnasmata.* Stramaglia (167) and Russo (301) agree on the following division of the contents: 1) coll. I-III 4 = a declamation on a δίκη ξενίας; 2) coll. III 5-IV 18 = a declamation on a case of theft; 3) coll. IV 19-V 37 = a *progymnasma* on a law condemning the thieves to pay five times the stolen sum; 4) coll. V 38-VII 21~ 36 = *progymnasma* on the law about the δίκη ξενίας; 5) coll. VII 22~ 37-VIII 20 = *controversia* on δίκή ξενίας; 6) coll. VIII 21-X = *progymnasma* on a law implying the punishment of ἀτιμία. Milne (101) thought the scribe was also the author of the texts, on the grounds of the high number of mistakes and self-corrections, but Russo (303) suggests that the scribe might have here reworked preexisting rhetorical materials. The prevailing tendency is to consider this set of rhetorical exercises as belonging to a school context, due to the

[104] It is difficult to say when progymnasmata began to be a standard practice in rhetorical education. The word is mentioned once and for the first time in Anaximenes' Rhetoric to Alexander 28.4 = 1426a25 (8), where Anaximenes says that the students who understand progymnasmata will have a lot of material for writing and speaking. Nothing of the sort can be found in Aristotle's Rhetoric.

[105] We have some extant handbooks of *progymnasmata* by Aelius Theon (1st AD), Ps-Hermogenes (2nd AD), Aphthonius (4th AD), and Nicholaus the sophist (5th AD). For Aphthonius, the *progymnasmata.* could include exercises like retelling a story (a fable of Aesop - *mythos*, a longer narration, like the Homeric poems, *diegema*), elaborating on a maxim (*gnome*), a commonplace (*koinos topos*), anecdote or a saying (*chreia*), speeches praising (*enkomion*) or blaming (*psogos*) someone or something, refutation (*anaskeue*) or confirmation (*kataskeue*), vivid description (*ekphrasis*), a speech in character (*ethopoiia*), comparison (*synkrisis*), a general question, such as 'should one marry?' (*thesis*), and, finally, the introduction of a law (*nomou eisphora*). See Heath (2002b). For Latin *progymnasmata* the main source is Quintilian (1.9; 2.4; 10.5). There are also *progymnasmata* attributed to Libanius and several Byzantine authors (see Hunger [1978], 92-120), and portions of other handbooks which have not survived entirely (e.g. Sopater, better known for his Διαίρεσις ζητημάτων, a collection of declamations). See Rabe (1926), 52-70. Non-Hellenistic examples on papyrus are discussed in Cribiore (2001), 220-230 and Morgan (1998), 190-226. Fundamental contributions on the subject of *progymnasmata* are Cichocka (1992); Clark (1957); Fernández Delgado (2012); Gibson (2004); Gibson (2014); Hock-O'Neil (2002); Kennedy (1999); Krauss (2009); Lausberg (1998), 532-46; Pernot (1993), 57-8; Pordomingo Pardo (2007); Russel (1980); Webb (2001). A lexicon of *progymnasmata* has recently been published by Berardi (2017).

[106] Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 139-64.

[107] See a recent edition and commentary in Russo (2013).

absence of proper names and the consistent number of corrections (see Russo [2013], 303).[108] Moreover, the second declamation has didactic annotations (explanations on the structure and content of the declamation) which lead to the conclusion that this was a copy belonging to a teacher. It was, moreover, probably a private copy rather than a school book, considering the absence of those elements typical of a school book's layout.[109] Another (though dubious) example of Hellenistic *progymnasmata* on papyrus is P.Mil. Vogl. 3.123 (see my edition and commentary, p. 243), containing three short encomia of mythological characters,[110] considered *progymnasmata* by Cazzaniga (1965), 24-26 due to their short length; the increasing difficulty of the structures in these encomia might be further evidence of this idea.

The next step was the 'declamation' proper (*melete*),[111] which was usually a written exercise, sometimes performed orally as well – but always in the restricted environment of the school. Declamations needed to be carefully thought out rather than written on the spur of the moment, and students had to rely on a variety of memorized quotations from respected literary models, Demosthenes above all. The declamation must then have been memorised and re-written multiple times.[112] Primary evidence for this practice in the Hellenistic period[113] is offered by the rhetorical exercises on papyrus included in this thesis, ranging from the 3rd to the 1st century BC/AD.[114] For the 1st century BC, we also have the quotations in the Elder Seneca's *controversiae* and *suasoriae*[115]. They were fictitious, judiciary, and deliberative speeches, respectively, although this division is clearer in Latin than in Greek, where even forensic speeches had themes taken from the past.[116] Some of these quotations in

[108] On the school context of declamation, see Guast (2019).

[109] In this topic, see Del Corso (2010), 71-110.

[110] On this papyrus and Hellenistic encomia, see De Kreij (2018).

[111] See Russel (1983); Cribiore (2001), 231-8. A brief history of declamation is also to be found in Fairweather (1981), 104-31.

[112] On the exercise of memory and papyrological evidence for it, see Cribiore (2001), 231. On historical themes in declamations see in particular Gibson (2004).

[113] A possible early piece of evidence of a lost Hellenistic declamation is pointed out by Milazzo (2012) who identifies a declamatory theme in the Vita Platonis of Diogenes Laertius (3.23-24), specifically in the anecdote (not attested elsewhere) of Plato defending Cabrias in 366 during the trial in which he was accused of treason and conspiracy with the Thebans. The passage certainly has very peculiar elements, such as the unknown character of Crobilius, the allusion to Plato's military service, and a strange theory of Plato about his equal faith in the polis and in friends.

[114] The oldest historical declamations are from the beginning of the 3rd century: P.Hib. 1.15, an exhortation from an Athenian general; P.Berol. Inv.9781, a counterpart of Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*. Another rhetorical exercise on papyrus dating back to the 3rd century is P.Petrie 1.10, an example of encomiastic oratory. Other less clear examples are discussed in the dedicated section.

[115] See Fairweather (1981), 243-303. Another important source about declamation, similar to that of the Elder Seneca, is Quintilian's *Declamationes Minores*,[115] and the *Declamationes Maiores* wrongly attributed to him. A peculiar feature of these declamations is that they are prefaced by short *sermones*, which are, however, often only vaguely related to the declamation, and obscure. This might reflect an oral preliminary debate between the student and the teacher.

[116] It is worth noting that the distinction between forensic and deliberative speeches (mirrored in the Latin polarity of controversiae and suasoriae), as argued by Kennedy (1997), 49, and Cribiore (2001), 232 (on the ground of papyrological evidence, see n.62) does not, for the most part, apply to Greek declamations, which were divided primarily into historical (mostly based on Athenian history and Macedonian kings, especially Alexander) and fictive (πλάσμα). It must be pointed out that for both Greek and Latin rhetorical theorists, declamation proper is always judicial or deliberative, never encomiastic, although funeral orations could be considered epideictic. See Pepe (2013), 381-4; Pernot (1993), 60; Russell

Seneca belong to speeches by Hellenistic orators, which he had heard in his youth. Given the strong connection between actual oratory and rhetorical exercises, and considering that the present work aims at collecting the 'remains of Hellenistic *oratory*', all these fragments quoted by Seneca are edited and commented on under the name of the orators they were delivered by (i.e., Aeschylus of Miletus, Apollodorus, Gorgias of Athens, Damas, Dionysius of Pergamon or Atticus, Hybreas of Milasa, Lesbocles, Plution, Potamon).

As for the final aim of these exercises, the primary context for the exercise of Greek oratory was the *polis*, despite the socio-political changes that occurred during the Hellenistic age: elections, deliberations, inter-polity interactions, negotiations with kings, assemblies of the federal states, private causes, and cases that required external judges. On the other hand, epideictic oratory – well represented in exercises – flourished massively within kingdoms and oligarchies. Panegyrics slowly transitioned from the πανηγυρικὸς λόγος of Classical period to that of the Imperial age. While the former was more of a deliberative speech with a somewhat protreptic nature providing advice to the addressee, and only interrupted by sections of actual praise, the latter ended up being pure epideictic praise [117]

The selection of fragments and rhetorical papyri included in the present work, however, cannot but confirm the importance of epideictic oratory:[118] some followed the Isocratean tradition and wrote praise of rulers (Theodectes, Theopompus), others only delivered them *ex tempore* (like Lycortas for Ptolemy), some praised political figures (like Potamon, whether his encomia of Brutus and Caesar were exercises or published speeches), others wrote mythological encomia (Caucalus, Matris), Hegesias wrote an encomium of a city (Rhodes), and finally some orators are simply said to have written panegyrical speeches (Neanthes). Rhetorical exercises on papyrus, although the evidence we have is not enough to make a definitive statement, seem to confirm at least the dichotomy of political praises (P.Schub. 32, an encomium of the Thebans) and mythological encomia (P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123 with short encomia of Minos, Tydeus and Rhadamantus, and P.Petrie. 1.10, containing an encomium of Achilles). However, it is safe to assert that rhetorical education was not a sterile exercise but that it provided a solid basis for an active political participation and inclusion in the social dimension of the city.

(1983), 10. Another exercise practiced in rhetorical schools was the *exergasia*, a re-elaboration of words of a famous orator, including additions and clarifications. Finally, is worth mentioning that letter-writing must have found a space in the practice of rhetorical exercises, especially in the progymnasmatic phase (see Theon Prog. 8.115 Patillon, and Nicholaus Prog. 67.2-5 Felten). This issue is discussed at length and with examples found in papyri (some of which Hellenistic) in Stramaglia (1996), 107.

[117] See, for instance, Isocrates' *Philip*, *Archidamus*, *Busiris*, and also the *Panegyric* and *Panathenaicus*, as examples of the former; and Aristides, *Or*. 1.27.46 as example of the latter. See more in Pepe (2013), 329-32. On this transition see Braund (1998).

[118] On Hellenistic encomia see Carey (2007); De Kreij (2018); Pernot (1993), 30-47; Pernot (2015); Russel and Wilson (1982), xi-xxii. On the practice of competitions including prizes for 'prose encomia', see Pernot (1993), 48-50, 84-94. A very interesting is the example of *IG*.VII.418, dating back to the 1st century BC.

The exact origin of these educational practices is not exactly clear.[119] The story according to which Aeschines, self-exiled in the island of Rhodes, founded the first rhetorical school there (Philostr. *VS*. 1.481; Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.19)[120] may be, as a matter of fact, nothing more than a legend. Even if the anecdote were genuine, no information exists to reconstruct what kind of teaching Aeschines employed. He presumably did not employ declamations, since the Elder Seneca (*Controv*. 1.8.16), while quoting a fragment by his homonym Aeschines of Miletus (1, see especially F2) says the latter cannot be confused with the famous Aeschines, since 'at his time the practice of declamation did not exist'. All we have is the information in Ps-Plutarch (*X orat*. 840e), according to which Aeschines reperformed the oration against Demosthenes before the Rhodians in order to show them his rhetorical ability. An interesting yet odd addition to this anecdote can be found in the anonymous lives of Aeschines (Dilts. 2-3), and also in Cicero (*De or*. 3.313), Pliny (*NH* 7.110.1), and Valerius Maximus (*Mem*. 8.10.ext.1), who says that Aeschines read Demosthenes' reply to his speech, and that after the Rhodians had praised Demosthenes' speech, Aeschines stressed how much more powerful it was when it was delivered by its author.

We might perhaps instead identify the forerunners of the rhetorical schools in the 4th century BC school of Isocrates, despite the substantial differences in the cultural environment.[121] It is undoubtedly worth remembering that Marrou described Isocrates as 'the educator of fourth-century Greece and afterward of the Hellenistic <and> then Roman world.'[122] The Isocratean 'officina dicendi' (Cic. *Brut*. 32) was a clear example of the active role of the students in the process of composition: it was centred on the imitation of the master's works, and on the active participation of pupils in the creation of speeches – an example is the *Panathenaicus* (§200 and ff.), where Isocrates implies that his work was discussed and revised with his students. Further proof of the teaching technique of imitation may lie in the fact that, for some of Isocrates' pupils, speeches with the same titles as his are attested (see Isocrates of Apollonia and Theopompus above all). Another point in common with Hellenistic rhetorical schools was its international character: not only Athenians but also students from abroad attended Isocrates' courses (Theopompus of Chios [79], Ephorus of Cyme, Isocrates of Apollonia, Lacrites, and Theodectes of Phaselis in Lycia, Philiscus of Miletus to mention but a few).[123]

Certainly, we cannot talk of Isocrates' school as a place where rhetorical theory was taught, as its aim was mostly to prepare men for political life in Athens. However, Isocrates (*Antid*. 2, 40, 89, 228) describes his teaching as philosophy, which is interesting if we consider that the teaching of rhetoric and rhetorical theory developed in philosophical schools. It is, however, worth noting that

[119] Fictitious speeches are, however, not unknown to Classical literature (see for instance Gorgias' *Palamedes*).

[120] Quintilian says that the 'Attic flavour' there ended up being mixed with foreign ingredients.

[121] A clear overview of the structure and functioning of the school is to be found in Pinto (2015). Earlier works on the subject are Blass (1892^2), 52-63; Burk (1923); Jaeger (1954^3), III, 46-70; Johnson (1957); Johnson (1959); Sanneg (1867). For Isocrates' pupils see Engels (2003). An old but important tool on the subject is Reinhardt (1873).

[122] Marrou (1948), 128.

[123] See Sanneg (1867) and Engles (2003) on this topic.

of his many students (who became not only orators, but also historians,[124] poets, and scholars), Cephisodorus was known for having written a treatise in four volumes in defence of the teaching of his master against Aristotle's accusations, and a didactic work on rhetoric (Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 2.22). Works on rhetorical theory are also known to have been written by Isocrates' pupils Naucratis (Quint. *Inst.* 3.6.3), Philiscus of Miletus (Dion Hal. *Amm.* 1.2), and Theodectes (*Suda* Θ 139 and Dion. Hall. *Amm*. 2.22). Isocrates himself is said to have written *technai*, quoted by Aristotle in the lost *Synagoge technon*, preserved by Syrianus' *excerpta*. The writing of *technai*, however seems incompatible with Isocrates' dislike of 'technography' (see Isoc. 13.12), and so it has been argued by several scholars that these *excerpta* are taken from reflections on rhetoric elaborated by Isocrates in his speeches.[125]

Furthermore, we can perhaps see more traces of these initial forms of the practice of fictitious speech writing in some of the speeches in the Platonic dialogues. The direct 'rival' of the Isocratean school was the school of Plato, and the first more-or-less systematic discussion of rhetoric is to be found in Plato's *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. Moreover, it is with Plato that the Hellenistic philosophical debate on whether rhetoric was an art (τέχνη) or just a practice began.[126] But there is more to say: the back-and-forth mechanism of reply to thematic speeches in some dialogues (the *Symposium* above all) seems to anticipate – if not mirror an actual *ante litteram* practice of the composition of fictitious speeches on given themes in schools. Apart from the Symposium, a perfect early example of the art of declamation,[127] particularly interesting is the case of the three speeches on love in the *Phaedrus*, the first by Lysias, reported by Phaedrus (230e-234c), the second by Phaedrus through the voice of Socrates (237a-241d), and the third by Stesichorus of Himera (244a-252c). The choice of the subject does not seem to be random in relation to the speakers, if we consider that erotic speeches are, in fact, attested for Lysias (Dion. Halic. *Lys*. 1.1 and Ps-Plut. *X orat*. 836b = Phot. *Bibl.* 262.488b).

To this we may add the examples of humorous funeral speeches in the *Menexenus*,[128] both the one improvised by Socrates (234c-235c) and the long, articulate one by Aspasia (326d-349d). These may be examples of the practice of speech writing in the Platonic school. They included not only philosophical speech-writing, if we think of those in the *Menexenus*, which sit between deliberative and epideictic oratory. Further similarities between Plato's and Isocrates' approaches to rhetoric, despite their rivalry,[129] are, as pointed out by Cole,[130] in the basic plan used by the former in the

[124] A chapter in this work is dedicated to the identification of orators and historians in the Hellenistic age.

[125] See edition and commentary in Luzzatto (2013). On this topic see Barwick (1963); Cahn (1989); Thiele (1892); and briefly Kennedy (1963), 71, and Kennedy (1991), 293-4. In favour of the existence of real *technai* is, instead, is Papillion (1995). See also Benoit (1990) on Aristotle, Isocrates and rhetoric.

[126] On Plato and rhetoric see among others Barney (2010); Curran (1986); Jenks (2007); Liebersohn (2005); Miller (2012); Nienkamp (1999); Quimby (1974); Pepe (2013), 20-68; Schenker (2006); Teloh (2008); Whidden (2005). On Plato, Isocrates and rhetorical education, see Benoit (1991).

[127] See Sheppard (2008).

[128] On the Menexenus and its funeral speeches see the recent volume *Speeches for the Dead*: Parker-Robitzsch (2018).

[129] See Howland (1937) on the attack against Isocrates in the *Phaedrus*.

[130] Cole (1991), 127.

Phaedrus, and by the latter in the *Helen* and *Busiris*. All these works criticise a piece of earlier rhetoric (Lysias' speech on love, Polycrates' encomium of Busiris, and Gorgias' *Helen* respectively), and then provide a better treatment of the subject.

The origins of this phenomenon cannot but be traced back to the 5th century BC. It is evident from the abovementioned discussion in the *Phaedrus* that some sort of rhetorical language and vocabulary – the technical terms that Phaedrus and Socrates criticise, but also rhetorical theory and teaching (in particular that of Teisias) – existed long before Plato. Most likely it had its origin in the teaching of the sophists after the Persian Wars (see for instance Pericles arguing with Protagoras about a legal case in Plut. *Per*. 36). In particular, among others, it is worth underlining the passage at 269b, where Socrates ironically imagines the arrogant answer to his criticism of τοὺς ταῦτα γεγραφότας τε καὶ διδάσκοντας ὡς ῥητορικὴν τέχνην ('those who have written and teach these things as the art of rhetoric'). Also very interesting is the passage at 273d-274a, about the distinction between the art of speaking to men and to gods, where only the latter allows the speaker to practice to the point of reaching perfection. Rhetorical teaching by the sophists was essential for the development of later rhetorical theory and teaching: these figures and their 'lectures' were extremely popular. The so-called 'Gorgianic figures'[131] (parallelism, antitheses, rhymes) were likely not simply learned through reading or listening, but it is fair to assume that some explicit theorising and instruction took place. According to certain sources, Gorgias was the teacher of Isocrates (Arist. fr.130 Rose; Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.13) and other prominent personalities of the time (*Suda* γ 388 says he taught Pericles and Alcidamas too; Diog. Laert. 6.2 mentions Antisthenes).

Finally, the most famous and best-fitting surviving example of the practice of fictitious speech composition in the 5th century BC is certainly that of Antiphon's *Tetralogies* – if genuine –,[132] fictitious judicial speeches on murders. It is surely not a case that one of them is exactly the same as the abovementioned case in Plut. *Per*. 36, a sign that rhetorical discussions on model speeches were already happening. The *Tetralogies* are twelve speeches divided in groups of four – two speeches for prosecution and defence (i.e., accusation, defence, reply, counter-reply). An *Art of Rhetoric* is also attested among the works of Antiphon (see frr. 71-76t Thalheim).

Apart from Philostratus' testimony about Aeschines' school in Rhodes, there is at least one other source stating that the origins of the practice of declamation are to be dated back to the late 4th century BC. Quintilian (2.4.41-2) states it was generally agreed that it was at the time of Demetrius of Phalerum that declamation on fictitious themes in imitations of the questions that arise in the courts or assemblies became popular among the Greek. He then adds that he had discussed in another work (probably the lost *De causis corruptae eloquentiae*) the problem of whether it was Demetrius himself who invented the practice. Quintilian however, seems skeptical about this, as he says he cannot find any evidence to support this idea, nor can those who strongly believe it.

[131] See Blass (1887), 47-90; Consigny (1992); and Consigny (2001).

[132] See Blass (1887), 91-148; Decleva Caizzi (1969); Edwards (2000); Gernet (1923); Maidment (1941), 34-47.

Moreover, early evidence of rhetorical declamations and teaching, in general, has been offered by Mirko Canevaro in the conclusions to his study on the documents in the Demosthenic corpus.[133] In his attempt to date the documents embedded in Demosthenes' speeches, Canevaro traces their origin back to different moments of the Hellenistic era. As already argued by MacDowell,[134] Demosthenes had no reason to insert documents in his speeches, and particularly in some of them, if he had private copies of these documents. Ultimately, Canevaro dates the so-called stichometric documents[135] back to the moment in which Democharesassembled the corpus (3rd century BC).[136] He must have either reconstructed documents from Demosthenes' discussions, or found the original document in the archives. We do not know with certainty if declamation was already beginning to be practised at the time of Democharesbut the method in reconstructing these documents certainly closely resembles that of rhetorical composition, although his first-hand knowledge of Athenian laws certainly made them much more reliable than later rhetorical compositions.

Even more intriguing is Canevaro's reconstruction of the origin of non-stichometric documents in the corpus. Thanks to a papyrus from the 1st century BC, P.Oxy. 11.1377, which contains a document found at Dem. 18.167, we know that the origin of these documents must be traced back to the last decades of the Hellenistic age at least. This strengthens the hypothesis, suggested by the two cases of 3rd century BC declamations on papyrus, P.Hib. 1.15 and P.Berol. 9781, that rhetorical declamations on history were widely practised in schools quite early in the Hellenistic age, and that Demosthenes was already quite a popular topic (on the early fortune of Demosthenes see also Cleochares).[137] P.Berol. 9781 in particular shows how detailed the knowledge of laws and decrees must have been in rhetorical schools, and reinforces the idea that non-stichometric documents could have originated in that kind of environment. If the level of accuracy in the reconstruction of these documents (and laws in the case of P.Berol. 9781) was so high, this means that Hellenistic rhetoricians were not only able to reproduce a perfectly Attic style, but also to talk about Attic history and legal practices as if they were still in force. This reasoning opens up the possibility of spurious speeches in the corpora of Attic orators – always considered to have been written by contemporaries of these orators on account of to their perfect Attic style – being the product of Hellenistic rhetors.

[133] Canevaro (2013), 319-43.

[134] MacDowell (1990), 46.

[135] Stichometry is an ancient method of calculating the length of literary works (scribes were paid according to the number of *stichoi*): for prose the unit was the length of a hexameter. In the main manuscripts containing the Demosthenic corpus, there are embedded documents that have an annotated stichometry, and other that do not (called therefore, non-stichometric). The presence of stichometry is crucial to determine whether a document belonged to an ancient edition of the text.

[136] On this see Canevaro (2013), 237-8; Canfora (1974–2000), i, 74-75; Canfora (2006), 115; Canfora (2018); Clauvaud (1976), 241; and Trevett (1996), 441 n. 85; Trevett (2019).

[137] On this topic see Canevaro (2018), mostly focussing on two papyri included in this commentary, namely P. Hib. 1. 15 and P.Berol. 9781.

Whatever its origins, the importance of rhetorical education in the Hellenistic age was undeniable. Confirmation of this can be seen in an honorific inscription from the early 2nd century BC[138] for Menippus, benefactor of his city, Colophon. In the long and detailed description of Menippus' career, honours, and actions, there is a mention of his stay in Athens, where he is said to have had the best teachers, thanks to whom he was able to offer the best example in terms of his *paideia*, essential to his activity as ambassador. Something similar is attested for Menippus' fellow Colophonian Ptolemy, who studied in Rhodes, and for other anonymous students who were the object of honorific decrees mentioning their education,[139] which is always listed as fundamental for their political career.

2. Theorising rhetoric

As we have seen, beginning with the school of Isocrates, the association between the figures of orator and rhetorical theorist (and consequently often also teacher of rhetoric) became increasingly strong, until it became almost taken for granted in the late Hellenistic age. A simple survey of the biographies of named Hellenistic orators provides further support for the association of orators with rhetorical teachers and/or theorists:

- Naucratis (62; 4th BC), an orator, pupil of Isocrates, was the possible inventor of the *stasis*, i.e. the question at issue, the mode of proceeding (Quint. *Inst.* 3.6.3;[140] Cic. *De Or.* 3.173, on rhetorical clauses used by Isocrates).

- Philiscus (67; 4th BC), a late Attic orator, wrote a rhetorical treatise (Dion. Hal. *Ad Ammaeum.* 2.22) and a collection of sayings by Isocrates (*Suda* φ 360).

- Hagnon (42; late 4th BC), a late Attic orator, wrote a rhetorical treatise against rhetoric as an art (Quint. *Inst.* 2.17.15).

- Theodectes son (78; 4th-3rd BC), an orator, wrote an *Ars Rhetorica* in 7 books (*Suda* Θ 139 and Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 2.22).

- Cleochares (25; 3rd BC), whose activity as an orator is witnessed by Rutilius, wrote rhetorical analysis of Demosthenes, and maybe Isocrates (see F4-F5).

- Diophanes of Mytilene (38; 2nd BC), an orator, was the teacher of the Gracchi (Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 8.5).

- Hierocles of Alabanda (45; 2nd-1st BC), brother of Menecles, apart from writing speeches (Cic. *Brut.* 325), was a well-known teacher (Cic. *De Or.* 2.95; *Or.* 231).

- Menecles of Alabanda (55; 2nd-1st BC), an Asianic orator and famous teacher (Cic. *Brut.* 325)

[138] Robert (1989), 63-104.

[139] See Oliver (2006), 131-3.

[140] In this passage, Quintilian says that the term was introduced by Naucratis or by Zopyrus of Clazomene, and he notes that Aeschines used the word in speech *Against Ctesiphon* (206) when asking that Demosthenes speak about the real *stasis* of the case.

- Menelaus of Marathus (57; 2nd BC) a speechwriter who probably taught Gaius Gracchus (Cic. *Brut*. 100).

- Dionysius of Magnesia (35; 1st BC) taught rhetoric to Cicero, who calls him one of the best orators (Plut. *Cic*. 4.4).

- Molon (12; 1st BC), a very famous orator, was the teacher of many illustrious Romans, among them Cicero (Plut. *Cic*. 4.3; *Caes*. 3.1; Cic. *Brut*. 245) and his namesake Apollonius (1st BC) was a teacher of rhetoric as well (Strab. 14.2.13).

- Potamon of Mytilene (71; 1st BC) was a declaimer, a teacher, and rhetorical theorist (he wrote a work entitled *On the Perfect Orator*, according to *Suda* π 2127).

- Matris (54; undated), probably also an orator, is called rhetorician and teacher by Philodemus (*Rhet*., 34.6-24. ed. Sudhaus).

A special place is occupied by Demetrius of Phalerum (29), who wrote several books on rhetoric. According to Cicero (*Brut.* 37–8), he was metaphorically better suited for the wrestling school ('palaistra') than for the arms ('armae'), and he describes him with these words: 'he delighted the Athenians rather than inflamed them, for he came out into the sun and dust (of the public arena) not as one emerging from an army tent but from the shady retreat of Theophrastus, a most learned man'. If we think of the 'palaistra' and the 'armae' and thein the light of Quintilian's comparison (10.1.33) of athletes and soldiers, where the former group is associated with history and the latter with oratory, this statement of Cicero's is particularly meaningful. Demetrius was indeed a historian and his oratory must have been influenced by the rest of his production.

He is said to have been the first to modulate oratory and make it soft and delicate, and he preferred to seem delightful, as he was, rather than serious'.[141] We have several fragments on his rhetorical work, quoted by Philodemus.[142] From the little evidence we have, it is fair to assume that he employed examples from orators and philosophers belonging to the recent past (Demosthenes, Isocrates, Philon, Xenocrates, Lysis are mentioned, although the context is not reconstructable). We also have one fragment (Phld. *De Rhetorica*, I col. XLIa 6 ff. 222 Sudh.) where we have an insight into his rhetorical theory. Here, we read he added the kind 'τὸν ἐντευκτικὸν ἅπασιν' ('affable for all people') to the political and forensic kinds of speech, a genre that applied perfectly to ambassadors' speeches, certainly part of the rhetorical *curriculum.* A mention of ambassadorial speeches as part of the curriculum for rhetorical exercises is in Philodemus, II. col. 31. 4-5 (247, Longo Auricchio), where we read '…write such imitations of judiciary (δικαν[ικῶν), deliberative (συμβουλευτικῶν), and ambassadorial (πρ[ε]σβευτικῶν) speeches'.

[141] Translation by Kennedy (1994), 87-88.

[142] See fragments with translation and commentary in Fortenbaugh, Schütrumph (2000), or the more dated Wehrli (1949), fr.34 and ff. On his style see Norden (1898), 126-9.

There is only one papyrus fragment certainly containing rhetorical theory dating back to the Hellenistic period: P.Hamb. 2.131 (LDAB 6953 = MP3 2302),[143] from the 3rd century BC, which contains a segment on commonplaces against torture of slaves, and another on the epilogue as part of a speech, which is particularly relevant, as it shows that in the 3rd century BC epilogue was already treated under the theoretical headings which became standard in later rhetorical tradition. Another less clear case is P.Freib. 1.3, containing a short quotation from a perhaps fictitious speech on theft, followed by a commentary on the laws regulating the matter. The editors note a striking similarity with a passage in Anaximenes' *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (1422b 6) and, therefore, discuss the possibility of the first part being an example taken from a real legal speech. It is further interesting to note that the structure of the encomia in P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123 and P.Petrie. 1.10 (3rd century BC) seems to reflect that recommended by Ps-Hermogenes *Prog.* 7 (i.e., birth, origin, upbringing, education, features of body and intellect, accomplishments, actions, death, honour *post mortem*), a sign that some forms of rhetorical theory were probably being practised as soon as the 3rd century BC.

Tracing a full history of rhetorical theory[144] would be far beyond the scope of this work. However, it is undoubtedly worth mentioning some key figures in the development of rhetoric during the Hellenistic age.[145] One could see Aristotle's *Rhetoric* as the first great rhetorical handbook or treatise, on which Hellenistic rhetorical theory was based – either in continuity or in contrast to it. Nevertheless, the term 'handbook' might be inappropriate for such a work, as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* attests a form of teaching in the Aristotelian school that was meant to 'recognise' and 'understand' rhetoric, rather than simply use it. The only surviving pre-Aristotelian rhetorical handbook,[146] Anaximenes' *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*,[147] shorter and only slightly different from Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, is rarely quoted by later rhetoricians, and probably survived only because it was originally attributed to Aristotle.

In continuity with Aristotle was his pupil and successor Theophrastus, who, according to Diog. Laert. 5.42-50 wrote twenty books on rhetoric: an *Art of Rhetoric* in one book, and separate studies of judicial, deliberative and epideictic oratory, invention, *enthymemes*, examples, maxims, non-

[143] See Gaines (1989).

[144] A history of rhetoric is in Kroll (1940) and Luzzatto (1988). See Kennedy (1994), particularly chapter 5 ('Hellenistic Rhetoric', 81-101); Pernot (2000), translated in Pernot (2005), particularly chapter 4 ('The Hellenistic Globalization', 57-82); Worthington (2007). Comprehensive works on the history of rhetoric are Gunderson (2009) and MacDonald (2017). Evidence of early rhetorical theories is collected in Radermacher (1951). Cole (1991), 82-3, argues that the first τέχναι were collections of model speeches for pupils. See also Fairweather (1981), 77-103.

[145] A fundamental study in Hellenistic rhetoric (and rhetoric until 400 AD, since 'Hellenism' is used as a broader concept) is offered by Porter (1997).

[146] On rhetoric before Aristotle see Cole (1991). See 'Teaching Rhetoric', on Isocrates' and rhetorical theory. Moreover, there is evidence of discussions about the nature of *techne* in the late 5th centuryin [Hippocrates] *De Arte*.

[147] For fragments see López Cruces-Campos Daroca-Màrquez Guerrero (2005). On the debate about the attribution of this treatise to Anaximenes see among others Chiron in Kennedy (2007), 90-196; Kennedy (2007b); Kroll (1940) 1052-4; Mirhady (2001); Patillon (1997); Wendland (1905).

artistic proof, narration, style, humor, and delivery.[148] His whole rhetorical theory can be read in Cicero's summary in *Orator* 79, where we read that he cared for the purity of language and that he listed four qualities of style: correctness, clarity, appropriateness, and ornamentation. He disliked bold metaphors (Long. 32.3) and continued Aristotle's discussion of prose rhythm. He criticized the excessive use of antitheses and of parallel constructions (Dion. Halic. *Lys*. 14.2–4). He wrote a list of 'genres of style', which can be found in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (4.11 and ff.).

Similarly, in line with Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, is the treatise *On Style* by Demetrius.[149] But this attribution is clearly a later addition, as evident from the simpler version in the subscription of the same manuscript, Δημητρίου περὶ ἑρμηνείας. The date of the work has also been the object of debate (which has not yet reached a conclusion). The two main options are 1st century BC, or, as scholars have recently argued, sometime in the 2nd century, based on the absence of references to theories already present in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Cicero. Aristotle's influence is evident when Demetrius discusses clauses and periods (1-35), prose rhythm (38-43), metaphor (78), frigidity (116), and clarity (191).[150] Another important feature of Demetrius' treatise is the presence of the division into four styles (the plain, the grand, the elegant, and the forceful, illustrated with examples). He also introduced the new distinction into three kinds (historical, conversational and rhetorical), as well as the first attempt at theorisation of a specific epistolary style – a genre that had been widely employed by orators (see Demosthenes and Isocrates above all) but never codified.

The study of rhetoric often took place in philosophical schools, which often took a different position on general and specific rhetorical issues. One of the most generally discussed questions in Hellenistic philosophical/rhetorical debates was the definition of rhetoric and its status of art (τέχνη)[151] – echoes of this discussion are to be found in Quintilian (2.15, 17). The main philosophical schools which dealt with rhetorical theory were those of the Peripatetics (although not on a large scale, despite Theophrastus' writings), the Academics, the Stoics, and (only to a minor extent) the Epicureans.[152] As for the Peripatetics, the main source is Quintilian (12.2.25) who says that it was they who instituted the debate on theses in the practice of rhetoric – in these debates they could certainly benefit from the presence of the entire production of Aristotle (including lost works) and Theophrastus.

More is known about the Stoics. Cicero (*De Fin*. 4.7) says that the Stoics Cleanthes (3rd century) and Chrysippus (2nd century) each wrote books entitled *Art of Rhetoric*, where they showed

[148] It was wrongly attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum because of the superscription of the tenth-century Par. Gr. 1741 and the manuscripts deriving from it See Fortenbaugh-Huby-Long (1985) for sources on his life and work, and Fortenbaugh-Huby-Long (1992), vol. 2, for fragments and translation. See also Fortenbaugh (1994) and Fortenbaugh-Mirhady (1994).

[149] See among others Chiron (1993); Grube (1961); Marpurgo-Tagliabue (1980); Paffenroth (1994); Radermacher (1966); Roberts (1902); Schenkeveld (1964), Schenkeveld (2000).

[150] It is not obvious that Demetrius actually read Aristotle, but he could have used later theory based on Aristotle or Theophrastus.

[151] This discussion has its foundations in Plato's *Gorgias* and Aristotle's lost rhetorical treatise *Gryllus*.

[152] For a more detailed disquisition on the specific issues discussed in the schools see Kennedy (2007), 81-95.

themselves keen on punning syllogisms. More information on Stoic rhetorical theory (probably based on the Stoic philosopher Diogenes of Babylon, from the early 2nd century) is to be found in Diogenes Laertius (7.42-3), from whom we read that they considered eloquence as a virtue and therefore that orators could only be wise men. We also know that they followed a quite standard division of speeches into three kinds (deliberative, forensic, epideictic), and that they were keen on grammatical accuracy, which developed into the theory of tropes, i.e., words used in a novel way because of the lack of words to express a novel concept, or to create an effect of linguistic ornamentation.[153]

Later, at the end of the 2nd century BC, Peripatetics and Stoics[154] became hostile to the study of rhetoric, as did the Academics. All three groups rejected claims to literary excellence through oratory and perceived it as merely functional for lawcourts and assemblies (see Cic. *De or*. 1.46-7); their only recognised contribution to the field of rhetoric is the introduction of the concept of memory by the Stoic philosophers Charmadas and Metrodorus (Cic. *De or*. 2.360), especially the latter (Plin. *NH*. 7.89 says he perfected the theory), although he abandoned the Academy to dedicate himself to the teaching of rhetoric and political life (Strab. 13.1.55). Finally, a few words must be said about the Epicureans. Quintilian (12.2.24) says that Epicurus banished orators and asked his followers to refuse any kind of systematic study of rhetoric. However, there is at least one famous Epicurean orator, Philodemus of Gadara, which shows that Epicurean philosophy admitted some kind of theorisation of poetry and rhetoric.

From the carbonised papyri found in Herculaneum we have (among other works) a good number of fragments of his. They include an earlier handbook called ὑπομνηματικόν that dealt with the differences between philosophers and teachers (and was perhaps based on the ideas of Philodemus' teacher, Zeno of Sidon), and a longer rhetorical treatise *On Rhetoric*[155] in six books, which is not a proper handbook but an attack against pretentious rhetoricians. This was in line with the Epicurean hostility towards rhetoric. The main point of Philodemus is that the only artistic form of rhetoric is epideictic oratory (which has its best example in Isocrates), while excellence in the other two kinds of speech is just the result of practice, which is certainly a peculiar position if we consider that Philodemus lived in Italy and worked for Lucius Calpurnius Piso in Herculaneum, hence in a political context where deliberative (as shown, for instance, by the practice of the *contiones*) and judicial oratory were highly practised. These polemical subjects occupied books 1 and 2, while book 3 was an accusation against the sophists, allegedly incapable of producing good statesmen; book 4 discussed rhetorical invention (the only part of rhetoric recognised by Philodemus, while the others were thought to depend too much on single situations) and style (which, according to Philodemus, needs to be correct, clear, forceful, brief, proper, and ornate). Book 5 talked about unfortunate rhetors and fortunate philosophers, and book 6 talked about philosophical schools teaching rhetoric.

---

[153] For more details and examples see Pernot (2005), 61.

[154] Wildberger (2013) argues however that there was a continued tradition of Stoic rhetoric linking the diatribic speech of the Imperial period to Hellenistic philosophers, and that Stoics were not so ineloquent and hostile to rhetoric.

[155] See among others Chandler (2006); Dorandi (1990); Nicolardi (2018); Ranocchia (2018).

A special place in Hellenistic rhetorical teaching is occupied by Hermagoras of Temnus (2nd BC, a teacher in Rome) and his lost rhetorical handbook, the basis of rhetorical teaching in Rome, whose content is partially reconstructable thanks to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.[156] It prepared students to deliver deliberative declamations, but also and in more detail judicial ones. The aim of the orator, according to this handbook, was "to treat the proposed political question as persuasively as possible" (Sext. Emp. *Math.* 2.62). A crucial concept in Hermagoras' rhetorical theory was the λογικὸν ζήτημα ('rational enquiry'), to which all legal cases came down: the structure of the oration was based on logical proof rather than *pathos*. The ultimate goal was to identify the *stasis*. It could have been a στοχασμός, i.e., the use of circumstantial evidence; a ὅρος, i.e., the definition of what the accused is responsible for; a question κατὰ συμβεβηκός, i.e., the inquiry on the circumstances and on whether they may influence and change the verdict; and μετάληψις, aimed at determining who should judge the case. Another crucial concept was the νομικὸν ζήτημα ('legal enquiry'), that concentrates less on the circumstances of the case and more on the text of the laws. A final species of case is the ἀσύστατα, those lacking a question, because the facts are not sufficient, the two parties are too similar, or the matter simply too obscure.[157] Hermagoras also introduced the concept of *thesis* (already present in Aristotle) into the rhetorical system, and divided questions into *theseis* and *hypotheseis* (general and individual questions). It is possible that Cicero (*De inv.*) and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* depend on Hermagoras' rhetorical theory in listing six parts for an oration (exordium, narration, partition, confirmation, refutation, peroration) rather than four (introduction, narration, proof, conclusion). If *Rhet. Her.* 1.5 (as is probable) also depends on Hermagoras, it is also to him that we owe the division of proemia into honourable, paradoxical, doubtful, and disreputable (*honestum*, *turpe*, *dubium* and *humile*).

Finally, two more figures are worth mentioning when it comes to rhetorical teaching at the end of the Hellenistic era: Apollodorus of Pergamon[158] and Theodorus of Gadara,[159] from whose followers derived the opposition of Apollodoreans and Theodoreans (Quint. *Inst.* 2.11.2; 3.1.18).[160] According to the *Suda* (θ 151), Theodorus (who was also the author of historical works and political pamphlets)[161] wrote rhetorical works entitled Περὶ τῶν ἐν φωναῖς ζητουμένων, Περὶ θέσεως, Περὶ διαλέκτων ὁμοιότητος καὶ ἀποδείξεως, and Περὶ ῥήτορος δυνάμεως (a book Περὶ ἱστορίας probably dealt with the theory of historical writing). He was the teacher of the future emperor Tiberius, and from Quintilian we know this teaching happened in Rhodes (and therefore he preferred to be called Rhodian). Apollodorus was even more involved in Roman questions than Theodorus: he was chosen by Caesar to be the tutor of young Octavian, whom he followed for the rest of his life, and founded a

[156] See Heath (2002a) Fragments are collected by Matthes (1962) and Woerther (2012). See also Kennedy (2007), 97-101.
[157] For more on the *stasis* in judicial speeches in Hermagoras, see Heath (1994) and Kennedy (2007) 98-101.
[158] See Ballaira (1968); Brzoska (1894a); Granatelli (1982).
[159] See Stegemen (1934). All testimonia and a full updated biography are in *BNJ* 850
[160] Fragments of both rhetors are collected by Granatelli (1991). On their rivalry, see Grube (1959) and Schanz (1890). On the cultural journeys of both see Granatelli (1981).
[161] I employ the term pamphlet for short treatises dealing with controversial issues.

school in Rome.[162] He wrote a Τέχνη (Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.18), which was dedicated to Matius, a friend of Caesar, and was later translated into Latin by Valgius Rufus. Both rhetors followed the precepts of Hermagoras, but ended up developing slightly divergent theories,[163] which well fit in the debate on Atticism and Asianism. Theodorus considered rhetoric an art (τέχνη), whereas Apollodorus saw it as a science (ἐπιστήμη), and consequently Apollodorus' conception of rhetoric was more formal and dependent on rules (like the analogists in the controversy against the anomalists). For instance, Apollodorus strongly required an inflexible order for the four parts of a judicial speech. In contrast, Theodorus was not rigid about the division of the speech into four fixed sections, and admitted the presence of *pathos* not only in the *prooemium* but anywhere in the oration. These two rhetors and their divergences clearly had a significant role in the lively discussion of style which characterised Late Republican Roman rhetoric, and which will be the object of the following section of this chapter.

Another aspect of rhetorical theory which might have its origin in the Hellenistic era is the scholarly and literary discussion of great rhetorical models from the past. It has its most famous example in Dionysius of Halicarnassus'[164] treatise *On the Attic Orators*[165] (Περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ῥητόρων, in particular the extant part *On the Admirable Style of Demosthenes*, Περὶ λεκτικῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος),[166] which, as well as the rest of Dionysius' rhetorical production,[167] also has a role in the debate on Atticism and Asianism. This fashion is not dissimilar from that of Caecilius of Calacte's work,[168] whose canon Dionysius followed – they both embodied the product of Apollodorus' teaching. It is interesting to note that – as much as Dionysius if not more – Caecilius devoted special attention to Demosthenes,[169] dedicating very specific treatises to him, including two comparisons, one with Aeschines, and another with Cicero. The focus on Demosthenes as a model does not seem to be an innovation by Dionysius and Caecilius, but has its roots in the Hellenistic age.

---

[162] Probably one of his students was Caecilius of Calactes, famous for his treatise on the ten orators, where he established this canon. Dionysius of Halicarnassus also studied with him.

[163] They were not extremely different, but their followers perceived them as strongly opposed. Most differences were in the terminology employed (see Quint. Inst. 3.5.34-35; 11.3, 27).

[164] On Dionysius and his Peripatetic educational and rhetorical background, see Bonner (1911); Wooten (1994).

[165] See Bruss (2013). On his rhetorical theory see Artés Hernández (2013); De Jonger (2008); Reid (1996); Ronnet (1994); Russel (2001). On rhetoric and history in Dionysius see Fox (1993); Fox (2001); Irwin (2015); Nicolai (2017).

[166] On Demosthenes and Dionysius see, among others, Cronjé (1986); Wooten (1989).

[167] *The Art of Rhetoric*, *The Arrangement of Words*, *On Imitation*, *On the Character of Thucydides*, and his rhetorical letters.

[168] His fragments (*FGrHist* 183) are collected by Ofenloch (1907); Augello-Metelli (2006); and Woerther (2015), but also nicely discussed in Kennedy (2007) 364-9. Among his rhetorical works were *On the Style of the Ten Orators* (on whether this is the starting point for the creation of the canon see Douglas [1956] and Worthington [1994]), *On the Sublime*, *On Rhetoric and Rhetorical Figures*, *Alphabetical Selection of Phrases*, *How the Attic Style Differs from the Asian*, *On Things Said by the Orators in Accordance with or Contrary to History*, *Demonstration that Every Phrase of Elegant Language Has Been Spoken*, *Against the Phrygians* (about Asianism). Specifically, on Demosthenes he wrote *A Comparison of Demosthenes and Aeschines*; *On Demosthenes: Which of his Speeches are Genuine and Which False*; *A Comparison of Demosthenes and Cicero*. On Caecilius see also Roberts (1897).

[169] On Demosthenes' rhetorical reputation in Antiquity' see Cooper (2000).

Apart from the very early receptions of Demosthenes that can be found in declamatory themes (as in the 3rd century P. Berol 9781)[170], one ought to remember the attention that philologists devoted to the figure of Demosthenes:[171] Didymus of Alexandria (1st BC) wrote the famous commentary on Demosthenes which is found in P.Berol 9780.[172] Moreover, there seem to be traces of studies on the style of Demosthenes and Attic orators already in the Peripathetic school.[173] But what is probably the most ancient work on Demosthenes is attested among the production of a Hellenistic orator, namely Cleochares of Myrlea (25), active in the 3rd century BC. From F3 and F4, we know that he wrote a treatise on Demosthenes (using rhetorical figures, as evident in F4) and that he employed a comparison between him and Isocrates. We also know about Democharesʼ (see T3?) discussion of Aeschines and his voice, although this reflection probably belonged to his *History*, and Polyeuctus, who compared Demosthenesʼ and Phocionʼs style (see F3 and commentary). These examples – Cleochares above all – show how a tradition in rhetorical theory that sees the Attic orators, and particularly Demosthenes, as models, and compares them with other orators (from the past or the present), is to be traced back at the beginning of the Hellenistic age, and seems to have developed steadily throughout the whole period, resulting in the elaborate analyses of Caecilius (the first to propose a comparison between a Greek and a Roman orator) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Moreover, if one assumes the anecdotes told by Cicero, Valerius Maximus, and Pliny about Aeschines reciting Demosthenesʼ speech before the Rhodians and praising his oratorical qualities are true, this may be a sign that the use of his oratory as model began when he was still alive. His style was appreciated by his contemporaries, even when they were his opponents. Perhaps it is along the lines of Demosthenesʼ example that Cicero too became a topic for declamations (see Seneca *Controv.* 7.2; Suas. 6.7) and a model for rhetorical theory,[174] as shown by Caecilius' comparison, as well as the one by [Longinus], *Subl.* 12.4.[175]

This overview of Hellenistic rhetorical theory, however provisional, raises important questions. If we compare pre-Hellenistic rhetorical theory, as exemplified by Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, to those later rhetorical theorists whom we use as sources for Hellenistic theory (e.g., Cicero, the author of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and Quintilian), we may note a shift from rather general discussions on rhetoric, towards specific and hyper-technical theorisations. This is also mirrored by the high number of practical examples and quotations in later rhetoricians, compared to the more general precepts in Aristotle. A first point of fiscussion is whether it was during the Hellenistic age that rhetorical theory somehow evolved into a more technical science[176] (if we except the more general

[170] See Canevaro (2018) and Kremmydas (2007).
[171] And not only to Demosthenes: the biographer Hermippus of Smyrna (3rd BC) wrote on other Attic orators.
[172] See Diels-Schubart (1904), Harding (2006), Pearson-Stephens (1983).
[173] See Lossau (1964), 22-65 ('Die Stellung der frühen Peripatetiker zu Demosthenes').
[174] See La Bua (2019).
[175] Longinus attacked Caecilius' lost *De Sublime*. Among others see Innes (2002)
[176] Criticism against the employment of excessively technical rhetorical term was already in Gorgias' *Palamedes* and particularly in Plato's *Gorgias* and *Phaedrus*. See also Connolly (2017) and Cuypers (2010).

philosophical debates on the definition of rhetoric as an art or a science), building on a debate often purely academic, concerned with terminology (as may seem from the controversy between Theodorians and Apollodoreans) and originating in an atmosphere of rivalry and intellectualism. If so, one may consequently raise a second question, however difficult it is to answer: was this debate actually functional to teaching or was it rather a form of obsessive scholarship?

3. On Style: Atticism, Asianism…and Rhodianism (?)

The debate about the Attic and Asianic style is a much better-codified phenomenon as regards the Imperial age[177] (see Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.16-26). But when one tries to trace back its origins to the Hellenistic age, it becomes a more controversial and less clear issue, which is summarised by the following question: shall we talk about the opposition of Atticism to Asianism, or of Asianism to Atticism? I.e., did the so called 'Asianic' orators perceive themselves as such, and were they stylistically homogeneous?[178]

The controversy seemed already less vivid in the Elder Seneca, who used the term *asianus*, only for four Greek declaimers, and one Latin.[179] There is no trace of the debate before the publication of the *Brutus* and *Orator* in 46 BC. The controversy is absent in *De Oratore* (published in 55 BC) – where it could have been however omitted in the light of the date in which the work is set, 91 BC – and, more interestingly, in the *De Inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Poirot (1896), 93 suggested that the whole controversy might have been the result of the publication of the *De Oratore*, where Cicero praised the use of figures of speech and rhythm (52-208). What the Atticists (whose most important representatives were Licinius Calvus and Brutus) regarded as bad style was the use of prose rhythm,[180] elaborate sentences, and sophisticated figures of speech. They took as models Attic writers like Lysias, Thucydides, and Xenophon (*Brut*. 24-32, 76, 287-9), to whom Cicero opposed Demosthenes,[181] who was able to practise all sort of styles (plain, middle, grand), and who, however, became an absolute model for later Atticist rhetoricians such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Caecilius. However, it would be simplistic to state that Cicero simply despised Atticists, and his opinion about Brutus was probably more complex. He rather chose to find a middle ground by identifying himself more with Rhodian orators.[182]

There is no early source for an Atticist – and not even an Asianist – *movement* in Greece before Cicero's theorisation (Dionysius and Caecilius being the first proper attested Greek Atticisist

[177] See a very good summary in Kim (2017). The modern debate originated in the early 20th century with Norden (1898), 131-52, 218-21, Wilamowitz (1900a), and Blass (1905). See also Leeman (1963), 91-111.
[178] The two main different views are those of Wooten (1972), 109-127 and Wooten (1975), who argues that there is no Greek antecedent to Atticism and that Asianism was just a reaction to the Atticist movement; and Hutchinson (2013), 93-4, 234-8, who, on the contrary, sees evidence of Greek models for Asianism.
[179] Fairweather (2007), 244.
[180] On prose rhythm see among others Dewing (1910); Hucthinson (2018).
[181] On the influence of Demosthenes on Cicero see recently Tempest (2019).
[182] See Wisse (1995).

theorists), and Norden's idea that Neanthes (63)' treatise *On Rhetorical Affectation* (Pseudo-Eudocia Augusta's *Violarium*. 712) represents the first trace of the controversy cannot be supported by any evidence. The attribution of the treatise to Neanthes is in fact made by mistake, as this information is taken from the *Suda*, and particularly from the entry on Callinicus, a rhetorician and sophist from the 3rd century AD. To this, we should add that the orator who is regarded as first example of Asianic style, namely Hegesias of Magnesia (43)[183] regarded himself as an imitator of Lysias (Cic. *Brut*. 226), who would later become the Atticist model *par excellence*. Nevertheless, his style, consistently with his label of 'first Asianist', was indeed full of figures of speech and his prose was rhythmical (as shown by Norden [1898], 134-7), at least as regards his historical work. There is no reason to believe his oratorical style was different, although his fragments, which show however a good number of metaphors, rhetorical questions, and various stylistic features, are only transmitted in Latin, see F1-4.[184] Furthermore, he was unlikely to have been the proper 'initiator' of an Asianist movement, but rather just one of the highest points of a developing style, which was diverging from the plain and elegant Attic of Lysias, but already had some precedents, such as Charisius (22), who according to Cicero (*Brut*. 286-7) was a model for Hegesias himself. Other examples of artificial style and massive employment of figures of speech are the extant fragments of Cleochares (25; in particular F4), and this is why Wooten (1972), 8, believed he could also have been a model for Hegesias.

However, it might be simplistic to imagine the evolution of the Asianic style as a 'chain of models' imitating one another. There is no doubt that a new style developed throughout the whole Hellenistic age, but it is entirely possible that these orators did not perceive themselves within a movement or even within a process of change, and simply adopted a style that was becoming more and more widespread. There are examples of this new style on stone and on papyrus, proving that it was very common and broadly employed. The most famous example is perhaps the inscription on the monument of Antiochus I of Comnagene (1st BC), defined by Berry and Heath as 'bombastic', with 'cola' forming metrical patterns (i.e., *clausolae*).[185] There is also an earlier example of a letter of Ptolemy II to Miletus, dating from about 261 BC[186], proving that the 'bombastic' style of the 1st century BC already existed two centuries before. As for the papyri, we might mention P.Oxy. 2.216 (1st BC) as the earliest example of this sort of style, considering the abundance of rhetorical questions, and the almost paratactic prose, made of paced questions and short sentences.[187] It is within this framework of self-perception that the concept of 'fashionable taste' finds its place in the discussion of Asianic style: before any form of prescribed theorisation, this style must have developed spontaneously in

[183] Strab. 14 1.41; Theon *Prog*. 2.71 Patillon.

[184] See Staab (2004).

[185] This and more Ptolemaic inscriptions of the sort are translated in Norden (1898), 140-55. On rhythm in Hellenistic inscriptions see Papanikolaou (2009) and Papanikolaou (2012).

[186] In Bradford Welles (1934).

[187] This is however not to be found in all the papyri analysed in the present work. P.Schub. 32, dating back approximately to the same period has a much simpler and less artificial style.

the language following new habits and new fashions, and only later the need to theorise the phenomenon must have been felt.

It is nevertheless unlikely that such a broad and articulated reflection on Atticism and Asianism like the one in Dionysius could be entirely based on Cicero and other Roman sources. Although there is no trace of any early Asianist or Atticist movement in the Greek speaking world, or any consciousness of a change in style in early Hellenistic orators like Hegesias, it is not at all implausible that at later stages of Hellenistic oratory – namely the first century BC – a form of stylistic debate was beginning to establish itself, at the same time, or probably even earlier than it became a Roman polemic. It is worth noting, however, that in Rutilius' treatise *De Figuris sententiarum et elocutionis*, an epitomised translation of the 1st century BC treatise of Gorgias of Athens (teacher of Cicero's son), there is no trace of the controversy.

A crucial passage in understanding this phenomenon is Sen. *Controv*. 5.21, where we read about the early Imperial declaimer Craton 'venustissimus homo et professus Asianus, qui bellum cum omnibus Atticis gerebat', where 'Asianus' was not anymore an insult, but had already become a distinctive label used by Asianists to call themselves.[188] It is, therefore, not implausible that criticism of Cicero came from the Greeks too, and that he needed to respond by saying that he was the greatest Asianist, the same way Demosthenes was a model for Greeks (*Brut*. 35; and particularly *Orat*. 23).[189] This claim would be in open opposition to Calvus' Atticism, by proving that Demosthenes, used as an alternative model to Lysias by Atticists like Calvus (see Sen. *Controv*. 7.4. 8 and Plin. *Ep*. 1.2.2), could also be a model for Asianists. A crucial point of the controversy, therefore, probably dealt with the problem of who, between the Atticists and the Asianists, were better at rendering Demosthenes' rhetorical strength.[190] Moreover, Cicero added an Isocratean component to his style, which was completely absent in other Asianists (*Orat*. 40).

In the light of these data, the question arises of what exactly Cicero meant by 'Asianic style'. It is worth considering in detail a famous passage from the *Brutus*:

> Genera autem Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis, qualis in historia Timaeus, in dicendo autem pueris nobis Hierocles Alabandeus, magis etiam Menecles frater eius fuit, quorum utriusque orationes suntin primis ut Asiatico in genere laudabiles. aliud autem genus est non tam sententiis frequentatum quam verbis volucre atque incitatum, quali est nunc Asia tota, nec flumine solum orationis sed etiam exornato et faceto genere verborum, in quo fuit Aeschylus Cnidius et meus aequalis Milesius Aeschines In his erat admirabilis orationis cursus, ornata sententiarum concinnitas non erat. Haec autem, ut dixi, genera dicendi aptiora sunt adulescentibus, in senibus gravitatem non habent. (Cic. *Brut*. 325-6)

[188] See extensively Hutchinson (2013), 234-8.
[189] See Dugan (2005), 309-14.
[190] On this, see Lebeck 1970, 83-97 and Narducci (1997), 130.

> Of the Asiatic style there are two types, the one sententious and studied, less characterized by weight of thought than by the charm of balance and symmetry. Such was Timaeus the historian; in oratory Hierocles of Alabanda in my boyhood, and even more so his brother Menecles, both of whose speeches are masterpieces in this Asiatic style. The other type is not so notable for wealth of sententious phrase, as for swiftness and impetuosity–a general trait of Asia at the present time–combining with this rapid flow of speech a choice of words refined and ornate. This is the manner of which Aeschylus of Cnidus and my contemporary Aeschines of Miletus were representatives. Their oratory had a rush and movement which provoked admiration, but it lacked elaborate symmetry of phrase and sentence. Both of these styles, as I have said, are better suited to youth; in older men they lack weight and dignity.[191]

Two main problems are posed by this passage. The first one is the meaning of *asiaticus*. One may assume that Cicero is intending the adjective as geographical rather than stylistically. This is evident from the different usage of the two terms *asiaticus* and *asianus* (as employed by Seneca to define style, and reproducing the Greek ἀσιανός). It is a fact that rhetorical schools developed massively outside Athens and especially in Asia Minor as proved by the provenance of many orators in the present corpus, not only those mentioned by Cicero, but several others. It is, therefore, very probable, as argued by Wooten, that the so-called Asianic style developed in Asia Minor and immediately spread to the rest of Greek speaking areas (and perhaps only later in Athens), and thus defined a wide variety of styles, having the same general characteristic of rhythm and complexity in common – a consideration which would make all Hellenistic orators, except those of the first generation, Asianic. The same reasoning is applied by Cicero in the *Brutus* (225-6) when talking about the term 'Attic': he says Charisius, Democharis, Demetrius of Phalerum are as Attic as Lysias. This point on a geographical distinction, however, only seems to apply to oratory: while the orators named as examples by Cicero are all from Asian contexts, the only historian mentioned, namely Timaeus of Tauromenion, is from Sicily, was exiled in Athens, and is therefore all but geographically Asian. Moreover, from what we know from his fragments (*FGrHist*. 566), his style was not rhythmical as usually happened in Asian style. We can imagine that at the time of Cicero, when the whole discussion of style was still of recent development, the adjective *asiaticus* covered both the stylistic and the geographical meaning.

Finally, it is to this variety of sub-styles that the second issue posed by this passage relates: Cicero talks about two different Asianic styles, one more balanced and symmetrical, the other more impetuous. The distinction seems to be based on examples contemporary to Cicero (apart from Timaeus, the people mentioned are from the 1st century BC). The whole discussion arises by the fact that Cicero is describing Hortensius as an example of both kinds of Asianic styles.[192] This distinction

[191] Translation by Hendrickson-Hubbell.

[192] We do not know what kind of rhetorical education Hortensius received, but he probably had connections with Menecles (see biography in Malcovati [1976-79⁴]).

would help to explain an apparently inconsistent definition by Quintilian of Charisius' style (F1b), where he talks about sentences being 'longa περιόδοις', apparently in contrast with his pre-Asianic and slightly artificial style characterised by short sentences. It is possible that the distinction that Cicero talks about here had its routes in the early Hellenistic era, and Charisius was an exponent of the first type of Asianic style. Norden (1898), 138-47 identifies this second type of Asianism with that of 1st century BC inscriptions (i.e., those on the statues of Antiochus of Comnagene's tomb), which he sees as a later Hellenistic phenomenon.

A final mention is deserved by an alleged third style, Rhodianism[193] (Quint. *Inst.* 12.10.18), most likely another version of the Asianic style, or rather something between Atticism and Asianism, which became more famous because of the school of Rhodes, and because of the fact that Cicero studied with Rhodian rhetoricians, such as the two Apollonii from Alabanda (not originally Rhodian but attracted by the fame of the school), both Asianic in style. According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Din.* 7-8) Rhodians were imitators of Hyperides,[194] but did not achieve the gracefulness of the Attic orator. This information could point towards seeing Rhodianist orators, criticised by Dionysius who objected to their Asianism despite some Attic traits (see also Cic. *Brut.* 51 'Atticorum similiores'), as examples of 'mild' Asianism, which is consistent with Cicero's attribution of Molon's style to the first, more balanced, Asianic style. Philostratus (*VS* 1.18.509) considered Rhodian oratory as a mixture of Attic and Doric style, because of Aeschines' alleged school. This does not undermine the importance and uniqueness of Rhodian oratory,[195] the only one worth considering equal to Attic orators according to Tacitus (*Dial.* 40.3). It is fair to assume that its fame was already widespread in the 3rd century BC if Hegesias wrote an encomium of the city (*Lindian Chronicle* 2B.33-4, 64-5). A specific trait of the school was probably the importance given to the delivery (Cic. *Brut.* 316).

The fragments collected in the present work, due to their short length or to the fact that they are sometimes translated or paraphrased, cannot patently reflect all the above-mentioned changes in style. However, some new characteristics are evident. The most remarkable example is that of Hybreas (46), in whose fragments (F1, F4, and F7) we find rhythmic closes. Worthy of a mention are also Cleochares (25) and its employment of *polyptoton*, and P.Oxy.2.216, and its paced rhetorical questions.

[193] See Portalupi (1957) and the rather impressionistic view on the matter by Leo Enos (2004). On Rhodianism and Cicero, see Cazacu (2013). See also Hutchinson (2013), 101-8, and in particular 106. Horwat (1997), 69-105, talks at length of Rhodian rhetoric, when providing a context to Hyperides' Rhodian *Nachleben*. A book on 'Intellectual Life and Learning on Rhodes (168BC-AD44)' is expected from a highly valuable research project based at the Università Ca' Foscari in Venice and carried out by Thomas Coward.

[194] See Horváth (1997), an unpublished thesis of Hyperides' *Nachleben*.

[195] See the 1st-century orators Molon, Aristocles, Artamenes, Philagrius, but also earlier ones such as Astymedes, Thrasycrates, and maybe Sosicrates.

Hellenistic oratory and Rome

In the last segment of the Hellenistic age, the growing power of Rome influenced the politics – and therefore the context of political speeches – of the whole Mediterranean. This is particularly true for the Greek speaking world, towards which Rome always had an attitude of respect (even after the conquest of Corinth in 146 BC). Moreover, the high value that Romans gave to Greek eloquence is shown by the choice of several important political figures of the Roman Republic to employ Greek teachers of rhetoric. If we consider the data found in the biographies of the orators which are the object of the present work, we can see that twenty-three orators have had some form of contact, as politicians or as teachers (or both) with Rome.

In the first category, that of politicians, we find first of all several ambassadors who spoke in or about Rome:

- Alexander the Aetolian (4), ambassador in Rome (Polyb. 18.10) and to the Romans (34.23) in 195, when in Corinth, with regard to the war against Sparta, he spoke against the Athenians and advised Flamininus to lead his legions back to Italy (of this speech Livy provides an extract). He was again ambassadors in Rome in 188 (Polyb. 21.25) during the Aetolian war.

- Apollonides of Sicyon (10) (Polyb. 28.6) who in 169 was ambassador of the Achaean league, speaking against an alliance with Rome aimed at opposing Perseus, though advising against an open opposition to the Romans.

- Astymedes (16), a Rhodian orator who was ambassador in Rome in 167 BC, during the war between Rome and Perseus of Macedonia (broken down in 171), and aimed at showing the Romans that the Rhodians were not hostile to them or favourable to Perseus.

- Callicrates of Leontium (17), about whom in Polib. 24.10 we read that in 180 BC, he spoke during a debate in the Achaean assembly about a letter from Rome about the recall of the Spartan exiles. Callicrates suggested obeying the Romans, but the line which prevailed was the opposite, supported by Lycortas (Polybius' father, 53). The following embassy was led by Callicrates himself and two more ambassadors. According to Polybius, the outcome of the embassy was excellent, and the speech reported at 24.11 impressed the Senate, which accepted Callicrates' advice and sent a note of personal thanks to him, saying that 'everybody in the various states should be like Callicrates' (24.12).

Cineas of Thessaly (24), sent by Pyrrhus to Rome after his victory at Heracleia in 280 (Plut. *Pyrrh.* 18; *App. Samnitica.* 10.4; Cass. Dio. 9.31-32). Despite, an initial division of the Senate about whether to accept or not Cineas' conditions (to grant the immunity for Tarentum in exchange of freedom for the Roman prisoners), they voted unanimously to send away Cineas and to continue the war until Pyrrhus was in Italy (a full account is in Plut. *Pyrrh.* 18-21 and Cass. Dio. 9.39).

- Heracleides of Byzantium (44), who according to Polybius (21.13-15), Livy (37.34-36) and Diodorus Siculus (29.7) was sent from Antiochus III as ambassador to treat the peace with Scipio in Rome when the Romans crossed the Hellespont, but obtaining no positive results.

- Leon of Athens (51) who pronounced a very effective speech aimed at persuading the Romans to make peace with the Aetolians after Antiochus had been driven from Greece in 189 BC-

- Xenocles of Adramyttium (83), who spoke to the Roman Senate in defence of the cities of Asia (Strab. 13.1.66), allegedly speaking against the "Mithridatism"; orators who were not ambassadors but speak about Rome are also Aeschines of Miletus, hostile to Pompey, to the point of going into exile because he spoke too boldly against him.

- Agelaus of Naupactos (3), who did not speak in Rome and was not an ambassador but, addressing Philip V, described Rome through the very effective metaphor for the 'clouds gathering in the West to settle upon Greece'.

- Hybreas of Mylasa (46), who, when in 41/40, Labienus and the Parthians tried to invade Asia Minor, opposed him with Zeno of Laodicaea, causing a revolt – we have part of the speech Hybreas directed to Labienus (F2) but when Labienus conquered Mylasa, Hybreas escaped to Rhodes only to return in 39 to rehabilitate himself and the city, after Labienus had been defeated by Venditius. Hybreas also spoke against Antony (Plut. *Ant.* 24) to protest against the taxes he had imposed on Asia Minor, and obtaining a positive outcome.

- Finally, there is the interesting case of Potamon of Mytilene (71), who not only was an ambassador to Julius Caesar in 48 BC (and probably again later to him and Octavian) but is also said to have written an *Encomium of Brutus* and an *Encomium of Caesar*, and to have competed with Theodorus of Gadara and Antipater (9) to obtain the role of teacher of the future emperor Tiberius, which eventually went to Theodorus (although Tiberius showed he held a great opinion about Potamon and his teaching, see *Suda* π 2127).

To the second category belong those orators who were teachers of famous Roman politicians:

- Diophanes of Mytilene (38; Strab. 13.2.3) who, according to Plutarch (*Ti. Gracch.* 8.5), was exiled from his hometown and went to Rome where he was one of the tutors of Tiberius Gracchus and incited him to become tribune and work on agrarian reform (38).

- Menelaus of Marathus (57), who according to Cicero (*Brut.* 100), was the teacher of Gaius Gracchus. The list is made longer by the various rhetoricians with whom Cicero studied both during his trip to Asia Minor, and in Rome.

- The most important of his teachers was certainly Apollonius Molon (12),[196] who was the teacher of rhetoric of many more illustrious Roman personalities, such as Caesar (Plut. *Cic.* 4.3 Plut. *Caes.* 3.1), T. Manlius Torquatus (Cic. *Brut.* 245). He is the only Hellenistic orator who, apart from being a teacher to Roman politicians, was also an ambassador in Rome in 81 (Cic. *Brut.* 307) to defend the control of Rhodes over the near islands (granted by Sulla after the first Mithridatic war) and was the first speaker to address the Senate in Greek with no translation (Val. Max. 2.2.3); see more in his biography (12).

[196] See Davies (1968) on Molon's teaching to Cicero, and more generally Cazacu (2013). See Chamouzas (2016) for a more general and rougher overview on Molon and Rhodes. On Greek rhetoric in Augustan Rome see Migliario (2012).

Other famous orators with whom Cicero studied are Apllonius ὁ μαλακός (11) who is said (*De Or*. 1.75) to have later discussed philosophy with Q. Mucius Scaevola in Rhodes in 21 BC; Dionysius of Magnesia, with whom Cicero said he studied rhetoric in Asia Minor (Plut. *Cic.* 4.4) and that they travelled together (Cic. *Brut*. 316); Menippus of Stratonicea (59), defined by Cicero (*Brut*. 315) 'princeps […] tota Asia illis temporibus disertissimus', and who was one of the orators with whom he studied between 79 and 77 BC, during his permanence in Asia (Plut. *Cic*. 4.4); the abovementioned Xenocles (83), again one of those Cicero studied with during his trip in Asia Minor (on this see also Plut. *Cic.* 4.4 and Strab. 14.2.25). He also mentions Hierocles (45) and Menecles of Alabanda (55), to whom he listened (*De Or*. 2.95), and Menedemus of Athens (56), who was Cicero's guest in Rome (*De Or*. 1.85-88), see biographies.

An excellent account of the ways foreign (including Greek) diplomacy took place in the Roman Senate is to be found in Pina Polo (2013), who underlines the special character of some Greek embassies.[197] A first general point regards the places where and how these embassies took place. The chosen place was always the Senate, the council of many kings (βασιλέων πολλῶν συνέδριον) according to Cineas (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 18), and never a *contio*, despite the evidence of an exception that in the end did not take place for Jugurtha (Sall. *Jug*. 33-4).[198] Before embassies were received, the Senate deliberated on what kind of treatment the ambassadors deserved to receive (Polyb. 6.13.7), they usually happened at the beginning of the year (when the consuls were in Rome), and priority was given to allies. A second important point must be made about the language that had to be used: senators were not prepared to decode any language other than Latin, therefore interpreters were absolutely necessary.[199] This was true for Greek speakers as well, despite the high consideration that Romans had for Greek culture and language.[200] There is, however, an exception, namely that of Apollonius Molon, who was the first to address the Senate in Greek with no translation (Val. Max. 2. 2. 3). After him, this did not become a general practice, but began to be accepted.

What is crucial to investigate is the extent to which Greek eloquence was decisive in persuading the Roman Senate.[201] Historians like Polybius and Livy quote entire sections of speeches delivered by Greek speakers and only summarise others.[202] A positive outcome was not the absolutely obvious conclusion of Greek embassies, as we have seen, for instance, for the case of Cineas of Thessaly, a powerful and persuasive orator, who even deserved to be compared to Demosthenes (*Pyrrh*. 14), but who however did not succeed in negotiating peace, and was therefore sent away; or

[197] For epigraphical evidence of Greek embassies to the Roman Senate see Canali De Rossi (2002).

[198] For more on this episode see Pina Polo (2013), 247-8.

[199] See Cic. *Div*. 2.13; *Fin*. 5.89. Roman senators always spoke in Latin, even when they could speak Greek perfectly. See Pina Polo (2013), n.24.

[200] See Dupont-Valette Cagnac (2005).

[201] See, on the contrary, examples of embassies being successful because of the orator's fame rather than eloquence, in Pina Polo (2013), 255-6.

[202] The only exception in the embassy of the Saguntians in 205 BC of which Livy (28.39) reproduces the speech. However, Pina Polo (2013) convincingly argues that it might have been pronounced in Greek.

Heracleides of Byzantium, eventually scorned by Scipio (Polyb. 21.14 and Liv. 37.35). Opposite cases are that of Leon of Athens, praised for his eloquence and very apt similes, fundamental in achieving his political goals (Polyb. 21.31.6; Liv. 38.10.4.), and that of Callicrates about whom we know that the outcome of his embassy was excellent, and the abovementioned speech reported at Polyb. 24.11 impressed the Senate tremendously. The strong connection between Greek eloquence and persuasion seems to be even stronger after *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit*. If we consider for instance the case of Hybreas of Mylasa and his speech against Antony, we will see how eloquence and style might have had a crucial role in determining the outcome of a request. In Hybreas' F3 (Plut. *Ant*. 24.7-8) we read that he pronounced an ardent public speech to protest against Antony and the imposition of high taxation on Rhodes, and that Antony, well disposed towards him, accepted his requests. If the information given by Plutarch is true,[203] there is evidence that this positive disposition of Antony was influenced by Hybreas' rhetorical ability and style: at the beginning of the passage we read λέγων εἰπεῖν ἀγοραίως μὲν ἐκεῖνα καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνίου ζῆλον οὐκ ἀηδῶς, where ἀγοραίως most likely refers to Hybreas' style, not unpleasant to Antony, who preferred the Asianic style (Plut. *Ant*. 2.8), like that of Hybreas, characterised by hyperboles, short sentences, and metaphors (see commentary on F1-3 in particular).

A special mention with regard to this subject is deserved by the famous embassy of the three philosophers of 155 BC, when Athens sent the Academic Carneades, the Stoic Diogenes of Babylon (who, however, condemned rhetoric as a profession),[204] and the Peripatetic Critolaos to Rome as ambassadors regarding the controversial question of Oropos: Athens had made raids in Oropos, whose inhabitants had subsequently asked for Rome's help, obtaining from her a condemnation of the Athenians.[205] The aim of the embassy was therefore for the Athenians to be exempted from the fine imposed on them by Rome. In the end, thanks to the eloquence of the three famous speakers, it was reduced from 500 to 100 talents. It was on this occasion that Cato demanded the expulsion of the philosophers as corruptors of the Roman youth. The embassy became in fact a case, crowds gathered into the Curia (Cic. *De or*. 2.115) in order to listen to the three philosophers, who were displaying different oratorical skills and representing different styles (Gel. 6.14.9). According to Cicero and Pausanias, but also other sources, Carneades also gave some public lectures. Powell (2013)[206] argues, however, that most of these additional details are just literary fiction aimed at making the embassy an iconic moment. What is really important to stress about this embassy is the relevance that oratorical skills had in obtaining a positive verdict from the Senate: Carneades in particular was famous for his oratory, alongside his philosophy, as witnessed by Diogenes Laertius (9.62), who said that rhetorical teachers (not only philosophers) dismissed their students in order to send them to listen

[203] Pelling (1988), 181 does not believe this information is genuine, as the taxation seems to be too high, and there is no other evidence of a tribute being imposed twice, as said in the fragment.
[204] P.Herc.1004 (Philodemus' *Rhetoric*, uncertain book).
[205] See Gell. 6.14.8-10 ; Plut. *Vit. Cat. Mai.* 22 ; Plin. *NH*. 7.112 ; Ael. *VH* 3.17; Lact. *Div. inst*. 5.14; Macr. 1.5.14; Paus. 7.11.5.
[206] See Powell (2013) in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 220-47.

to him, which was probably one of the reasons why he was chosen as ambassador for such a delicate issue.

It can be argued that the contact between Rome and Greek eloquence triggered an interest in the Romans towards rhetoric, ac Cicero, referring to the frequent Greek embassies in Rome, after the defeat of Macedonia in 197 BC, says in the *De Oratore* (1.14):

> Nam postea quam imperio omnium gentium constituto diuturnitas pacis otium confirmavit, nemo fere laudis cupidus adulescens non sibi ad dicendum studio omni enitendum putavit; ac primo quidem totius rationis ignari, qui neque exercitationis ullam vim neque aliquod praeceptum artis esse arbitrarentur, tantum, quantum ingenio et cogitatione poterant, consequebantur; post autem auditis oratoribus Graecis cognitisque eorum litteris adhibitisque doctoribus incredibili quodam nostri homines discendi studio flagraverunt.
>
> When our empire over all the waves had been established and enduring peace made leisure possible, there was hardly an ambitious young man who did not think he should strive with all zeal for the ability to speak. At first, ignorant of the whole study, since they did not realize the existence of any course or exercises or rules of art, they did what they could with their own native ability and reflection. Afterward, when they had heard Greek orators and become acquainted with Greek literature and had studied with learned Greeks, our countrymen took fire with an incredible zeal for speaking.[207]

This admiration for Greek eloquence obviously resulted in the engagement of Greek rhetors as teachers from Roman politicians, as noted above through the examples of the Gracchi and the emperor Tiberius, who had Greek teachers in Rome, or Caesar,[208] Cicero, and Torquatus, who also travelled to attend rhetorical schools abroad.[209] These rhetors were apparently not simply teachers, but also had the power to advise and influence the political conduct of their students, as shown by the example of Tiberius Gracchus, whose tutor, Diophanes of Mytilene (38)– together with the philosopher Blossius, Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 8.4) – had a role in his political decisions. Cicero also stresses the fact that the rhetorical education of Tiberius resulted in his 'orationes nondum satis splendidas verbis, sed acutas prudentiaeque plenissimas' (*Brut.* 104). This is also true for his brother Gaius, whose fine rhetorical abilities, probably the result of Menelaus' teaching, are shown by one of his few extant fragments (fr.61 Malcovati),[210] which quotes and adapts a passage by Euripides (*Med.* 503-5). It is fair

[207] Translation by Kennedy (2009).
[208] On Caesar's education, see Kahn (1986).
[209] On the ambivalence of some Republican orators (Cato, Crassus, Antony) towards Greek rhetorical models see Eckert (2018).
[210] I quote from Malcovati's edition, but I am aware that it will be soon replaced by the more comprehensive edition deriving from the work of the *The Fragments of the Republican Roman Orators* (FRRO) project directed by Catherine Steel.

to assume that these teachers taught rhetoric not only following older models, but also by sharing their own stylistic reflections and examples.

Although we do not know much about Pompey's rhetorical training,[211] it is worth mentioning that he was attracted by a public declamation in Rhodes, as attested by Plutarch (*Pomp.* 42.5), where we read that 'he listened to all the sophists and gave them each the gift of a talent. Poseidonius wrote up the talk he gave before him, which he had written in reply to the rhetor Hermagoras about the principles of research'.

Cicero's own rhetorical studies were deeply characterised by Hellenistic rhetorical culture: many were the orators he studied with, either in Rome or in Asia Minor and Rhodes.[212] The figure who seems to have been predominant in his education undoubtedly is Apollonius Molon. J. Davies[213] has studied how Molon's Asianism – probably similar to that of Menecles, i. e. 'sententious and studied, less characterised by weight of thought than by the charm of balance and symmetry' (*Brut.* 325) – must have had strong influence on Cicero's style, leading him from an almost excessively impetuous form of Asianism (that of Aeschylus of Miletus and Aeschines of Cnidus, *Brut.* 326) towards a more balanced and moderate kind of Asianic style. Davies provides a lengthy list of interesting and pertinent examples of the evolution of Cicero's style before and after his trip to Rhodes and his contact with Molon, through several main points: the tendency of his phrasal *abundantia* to become subtler and fuller of variations; his clausal parallelisms becoming less repetitive and more focussed on stressing different shades of meaning; the reinvigorating presence of linguistic variations; the ability to make passages more concise.

An evolution of Cicero's style is also determined by his role in the controversy between Asianism and Atticism. Cicero's style, famous for its parallelisms and prose rhythm[214] was surely Asianic. He never chose to turn to Atticism in order to please the growing tendency that affirmed itself through time (as argued above, probably before the publication of the rhetoric trilogy) – whose position is embodied by Atticus and Brutus, who, in the *Brutus*, sees Atticism as the only possible style for statesmen and politicians. However, Cicero adapted and softened his Asianism probably also in the light of Molon's teaching. This is also argued by Heath and Berry,[215] who compare an early speech by Cicero, namely *Pro Roscio Amerino*, to a later one, the oration *Pro Milone*, and note that a number of Asianic features of the first speech disappear in the second. Nevertheless, this did not affect prose rhythm, a feature which, despite its Asian origin, became more than acceptable and

[211] See Van der Blom (2016), 113-45

[212] Rhodian rhetoricians were essential in the education of Roman orators. Caplan (1970) argues that it was the Rhodian teaching that brought rhetoric to Rome and that the *Rhetorica ad Herrenium* is just a Roman version of a Rhodian manual of rhetoric.

[213] Davies (1968).

[214] See among others Berry (1996); Hutchinson (1995); Hutchinson (2018), 1-10; Nisbet (1961); Zieliński (1904); Zieliński (1914).

[215] Heath and Berry (1997).

welcome later on.[216] Perhaps a better example than the *Pro Milone*, Cicero's last judicial speech – worked and reworked several times, to the point of becoming a model –[217] are the *Philippics*, where the very many short 'broken' sentences and rhetorical questions show an Asianic turn in Cicero's style.

As regards prose rhythm, this is a feature whose development we mostly owe to Cicero. Despite Dionysius' claim that Demosthenes wrote rhythmically (*Dem*. 48-51; *Comp*. 25.185), one cannot say Demosthenes (and 4th century Attic oratory in general)[218] was rhythmical in the way Cicero's prose (based on Hellenistic prose) is, despite his taking distance from Asian orators like Hegesias (*Orat*. 29; *Opt. Gen*. 6-13). It is difficult to state whether Cicero had any predecessors in establishing a Latin prose rhythm. When he quotes older orators in the *De Oratore* they sound rhythmical, but the quotations were probably adjusted in order to fit into the whole rhythm of Cicero's prose, while Republican orators quoted by Gellius, on the contrary, do not sound rhythmical at all (see fragments in Malcovati): this may therefore be the proof that Cicero marked a turning point,[219] and was the first to introduce this kind of Hellenistic-based prose rhythm in Rome; and this feature was meant to be much more than just a Hellenised fashion, since it lasted in Roman writing.[220]

The penetration of this new "Hellenistic" style into Latin prose, which reached its climax with Cicero and the Asianic orators of the late Republic (Hortensius, Caesar, Antony among the most famous),[221] must have had different stages. If we look at the fragments of Latin Republican orators (in Malcovati's *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Reipublicae*) we will be able to see certain typically Hellenistic rhetorical figures also in earlier orators.[222] It is remarkable that among the fragments of M. Porcius Cato, the strongest opponent of hellenisation, we find several examples of the sort: he employs anaphoras in fr.34 'alio frumentum, alio legatos, alio litteras, alio praesidium', and fr.155 'utrubi bona, utrubi mala gratia capiatur, utrinde iram, utrinde factiones'; asyndeton and repetitions in fr.58, where there is also a polyptoton in 'bonis, bono…boni' (the same figure is in Rutilius 1.10, with examples by Charisius [20] and Cleochares [25]);[223] but also less common rhetorical figures,

---

[216] On prose rhythm in general, see for pre-Hellenistic prose De Groot (1918); Dover (1997), 160-86; and Vatri (forthcoming); Hutchinson (2013), 93–4, 106; 235-8 and Papanikolaou (2009) for Atticism, and the Hellenistic age. For more see the extensive bibliography in Hutchinson (2018).

[217] See Heath-Berry (1997) on this point.

[218] On the avoidance of hiatus in Demosthenes and Isocrates, see Blass (1893²), 105-12, Blass (1901), and Usher (2010). See also the forthcoming 'The Nature and Perception of Attic prose rhythm', in *Classical Philology* by A. Vatri.

[219] The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is also rhythmical but is probably based on Cicero.

[220] See Hutchinson (2018), 9-10.

[221] However not much is to be found in their fragments, apart from a vaguely artificial figure in Caesar fr.44: 'morte memoria deleri debetis', with two alliterations close one another.

[222] On Republican orators and their rhetoric see Calboli (1982), Calboli (1996), Corsaro (2017), and Illuminati (1948).

[223] 'dixit a decemviris parum bene sibi cibaria curat esse. iussit vestimenta detrahi atque flagro caedi. decemviros Bruttiani **verberavere, videre** multi mortales. **quis** hanc contumeliam, **quis** hoc imperium, **quis** hanc servitutem ferre potest? nemo hoc rex ausus est facere: eane fieri **bonis, bono** genere gnatis, **boni** consultis? ubi societas? ubi fides maiorum? insignitas iniurias, plagas, verbera, vibices, eos dolores atque carnificinas per dedecus atque maximam contumeliam, inspectantibus popularibus suis atque multis mortalibus, te facere ausum esse? set **quantum** luctum, **quantum**

like the homeoteleuton (or even homoioptoton), in fr.223 'siticines et liticines et tubicines': homeoteleuton and homoioptoton are discussed by Rutilius at 2.13-14, and for the latter a Hellenistic example, that of Sosicrates is provided; as for anaphora, although we do not find it in Rutilius, he discusses very similar rhetorical figures such as the *epibolè* and *epiphora* (1.7-8, of which examples from Hegesias and Sosicrates and are given) and the *diaphor*a (1.12). It has been noted that Cato's oratory was also dependent on Demosthenes,[224] so these resemblances should not surprise excessively.

An example from the late 2nd century BC can be found in a fragment (fr.9) by M. Aemilius Scaurus, where he says 'patriae parricida' employing a *figura etymologica* (which in the ancient theorisation might have fallen under the category of polyptoton). Another remarkable example of very Hellenistic usage of rhetorical figures and rhetorical questions is to be found in Lucius Licinius Crassus, again a detractor of rhetoric, if we think about the edict of 92 with which he had Latin rhetoricians expelled from Rome (although in *De Oratore*, Cicero makes him speak in favour of a Greek rhetorical education and of rhetorical teachers who are also actors).[225] Fr.32 contains several rhetorical figures and an anaphora of 'quando' ('quid igitur? Quando ages negotium publicum? Quando amicorum? Quando denique?'); but the most striking example is fr.45a, where we find an almost obsessive anaphora of 'quid' and 'tu', as well as an extremely paced flow of rhetorical questions.[226] It is worth noting also the pathetic tone of a fragment of Gaius Gracchus, who in fr.58 in fr.61 overuses rhetorical questions, and in the latter lets himself indulge in a form of "rhetoric of desperation" ('quo me miser conferam? quo vortam? in Capitoliumne? at fratris sanguine redundat. an domum? matremne ut miseram lamentantem videam et abiectam?') unknown to Attic oratory,[227] and closer to a Hellenistic taste (cf. for instance P.Yale 2.105, Hegesias' F1 and F4, and Myron's F2).

This process of assimilation of a different culture does not seem too different from the one that occurred to Greek models in Roman comedy: if it is a fact that both Plautus and Terence mainly used New Comedy as primary model, it is also true that only in Plautus we still find some Classical and specifically Aristophanic comic traits (rude and dirty jokes, sometimes even slightly political, mixed with more balanced examples of funniness), while Terence fully follows Hellenistic more

---

gemitum, quid lacrimarum, **quantum** fletum factum audivi! servi iniurias nimis aegre ferunt: quid illos, bono genere gnatos, magna virtute praeditos, opinamini animi habuisse atque habituros, dum vivent?'.

[224] On Cato's rhetoric, see Astin (1978), 131-56; Pepe (1958); Sblendorio Cugusi (1987); Van der Blom (2016), 204-47. His fragments are also collected by Sblendorio Cugusi (1982).

[225] On how and why Antony and Crassus dissimulated their knowledge of Greek rhetoric, see Corsaro (2017).

[226] "Brute **quid** sedes? **quid** illam anum patri nuntiare vis tuo? **quid** illis omnibus, quorum imagines duci vides? **quid** maioribus tuis? quid L. Bruto, **qui** hunc populum dominatu regio liberavit? **quid** te agere? cui rei, cui gloriae, cui virtuti studere? patrimonione augendo? At id non est nobilitatis. sed fac esse, nihil superest; lubidines totum dissupaverunt. an iuri civili? est paternum. sed dicet **te**, cum aedes venderes, ne in rutis quidem et caesis solium tibi paternum recepisse. An rei militari? qui numquam castra videris! an eloquentiae? quae neque est in **te** et, quidquid est vocis ac linguae, omne in istum turpissimum calumniae quaestum contulisti! tu lucem aspicere audes? **tu** hos intueri? **tu** in foro, tu in urbe, tu in civium esse conspectu? **Tu** illam mortuam, **tu** imagines ipsas non perhorrescis? quibus non modo imitandis, sed ne collocandis quidem tibi locum ullum reliquisti".

[227] This sort of rhetoric, in the Classical age, belonged more to tragedy than to history and oratory: see Soph. *Aj*. 455-80, where the enumeration of possibilities that are not feasible rhetorical reminds of the one in Scaurus' fragment.

moderate models of comicality. Similarly, we might argue that, despite Demosthenes being a constant and indispensable model for oratory, slowly newer styles began to catch on and to influence Roman oratory, and it is only with Cicero that a substantial 'jump forward', in the direction of a fully Hellenistic style, was made.[228] It is true, however, that repetitions like those in these fragments are also to be found in comedy (see for instance the polyptoton of *alius* in Plaut. *Merc.* 837, similar to the on in Cato's fr.34). Therefore, the question remains open on whether these rhetorical figures came from an overblown Hellenistic tradition, or instead Latin was characterized by them regardless.

Finally, among Roman intellectuals there was clear awareness of the philosophical debate on rhetoric, as proved by the complexity of the discussion in Cicero's rhetorical trilogy, *Brutus*, *Orator*, *De Oratore*, the latter above all, and in particular the passage at 1.83-93. Here, Antony refers to a conversation he had with Menedemus of Athens (56) arguing against the idea, shared by both Charmadas the Academic and the Stoic Mnesarchus, that the teaching of rhetoric is useless alone and should therefore always be accompanied by philosophy. In order to disprove this and affirm rhetoric is a distinct science, Menedemus quotes Demosthenes.

[228] This is corroborated by Tempest (2013).

History and oratory in the Hellenistic Age

1. Orators as historiographers: a Hellenistic identification?

The close relationship between rhetoric and historiography has been established and analysed since Antiquity.[229] As said above, one of the four additional genres to the Aristotelian division in deliberative, judicial, and epideictic oratory, according to Pepe's categorisation, is the ἱστορικὸν γένος (the 'historical genre'). The categorisation of this new genre is to be traced much later than the Hellenistic age, as it is first attested in the Τέχνη ῥητορική by Rufus of Perinthus, a rhetorician who lived in the 2nd century AD.[230] In this passage (Spengel. I.463.5-15), Rufus says that 'Historical is the kind in which we narrate with ornament facts as they happened'. In her long discussion of the ἱστορικὸν γένος, Pepe[231] suggests it was in the Hellenistic age that precepts about history writing and historiographic style – already sketched by Thucydides in the subdivision of the πραχθέντα ('facts happened') into λόγοι ('speeches') and ἔργα ('deeds')[232] – were consolidated and became part of rhetorical theory and handbooks. She provides the relevant examples of Cicero[233] in *Leg.* 1.2.5 where he defines history 'opus oratorium maxime', and *De or.* 2. where he defines it 'munus oratoris', of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Thuc.* 9.1), who calls works of historians ῥητορικαὶ ὑποθέσεις, and finally of Quintilian (2.18.5) who places history 'in parte oratoria'.

History found, therefore, its place within the framework of rhetorical theory, as shown by Thucydides' biographer (and probably author of a commentary on Hermogenes)[234] Marcellinus,[235] who ascribes history (in line with an apparent common tendency) to the deliberative genre (following Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1359b18, and 1368a29-31 but also the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 1424b35).[236] However, he admits the possibility that it could be ascribed to the epideictic as it praises those who are best at war, and concludes that only Thucydides combined all the three genres by inserting *demegoriae*, the funeral oration (panegyric), and even an example of judicial speech with the speeches of the Plataeans and the Thebans in the third book.

As for the attribution of historiography to the epideictic genre,[237] the roots of this theorisation can be traced back to Isocrates, in whose praises history has a strong and crucial role,[238] and we see

---

[229] Among the vast modern bibliography on the relationship between rhetoric and historiography, see Bosworth (2003); Butti de Lima (1996); Leeman (1963); Lopez Eire (2008); Nicolai (1992); Nicolai (2008); Pernot (2005); Wiseman (1979), Woodman (1988); Zangara (2007).

[230] Pepe (2013), 315, shows that despite the claims of some later rhetoricians that this fourth γένος was theorised by Aristotle, there is no evidence to support such an idea, not only in the works of Aristotle himself, but also in the rhetorical works of Cicero and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who never mention a fourth historical genre.

[231] Pepe (2013), 303-17.

[232] See Canfora (1999), 22 on rhetorical elaboration in Thucydides.

[233] On Cicero and historiography, see Woodman (2008-9).

[234] On the identification, see Cagnetta (1986), 60; Oomen (1926), 74; Russell (1981), 197.

[235] *Vit. Thuc.* 41-2.

[236] See Ferreri (2007), 76–80 and Nicolai (1992), 42-5.

[237] About the attribution from Cicero on, see Pepe (2013), 311-7.

[238] See Nicolai (2004), 75-84.

this in the *Panegyric*, where Athens is praised in the light of its history (21-88).[239] Unsurprisingly, then, Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1367b 28)[240] talks about πράξεις and ἔργα as the main object of ἔπαινος and ἐγκώμιον. Moreover, interesting information about this issue is in Polybius and his polemic against Timaeus of Tauromenius (12.28.8).[241] In particular, Polybius refers to a statement by Timaeus, dismissing the idea of Ephorus of Cyme, who had allegedly stated that more genius and industry are required for epideictic rhetoric than for history. According to Polybius, Timaeus' affirmation of history's superiority over epideictic oratory is wrong, and a better distinction should be made between historians who narrate personal experiences thanks to direct participation, and those who compliled history through second-hand sources.

As Pepe argues, the assimilation between epideictic oratory and historiography was also due to the practice of public recitations from historians:[242] theorists must have then felt the necessity to establish a clear distinction between the two, as evident again from Polybius (16.18.2), when he criticizes Zeno of Rhodes, too keen on style – which should be on the contrary left for the ἐπιδεικτικαὶ συντάξεις (meant to impress an audience) – and not enough on facts, the actual focus of a historian. Extremely useful to our discussion is Polybius' mention (10.21.2-8 = *FGrHist* 173 T1) of a separate work of his on Philopoemen: it was a three-book encomiastic biographical work,[243] different from the account he gives of Philopoemen in the *Histories*. He calls it ἐγκωμιαστικὸς and that differs from the *Histories* for having a more amplified account of Philopoemen's achievements, and for not being as balanced and impartial as a work of history – κοινὸς ὢν ἐπαίνου καὶ ψόγου, where ἔπαινος, the balanced historical praise, is opposed to ἐγκώμιον, the rhetorical one.[244]

The relationship between oratory/rhetoric and historiography has provided wide points of discussion in at least two main directions, on the one hand, as discussed above, the theorisation of history within rhetorical theory, and on the other the role of speeches in historiography. On the other hand, still in need of more investigation is the apparent overlap between the 'professions' of orators and historiographers, starting from the Hellenistic age. As noted in the methodological premises to this work, many of the fragments that constitute the corpus of this edition were found in the collections of historical fragments by Müller and Jacoby. We must not attribute this confusion to oversights of the two illustrious Classical scholars, but rather to their aim of sketching a comprehensive profile for each of the historians whose fragments they collected: since some of them were also orators and rhetoricians, a substantial number of oratorical fragments were edited in their collections. As one can assume from an overview of the biographies of the orators included in our corpus, not all Hellenistic orators were just orators, but several of them wrote other kinds of works,

[239] On Isocrates and history ,see the chapter 'The Heritage of Isocrates' in Finley (1975), 192-214; and Marincola (2014).
[240] See Ferreri (2007), 85 and Nicolai (1992), 102. On rhetorical theory dealing with this subject see Sacks (1986), 393-4.
[241] See Nicolai (1999), 283.
[242] See Momigliano (1982)
[243] On this work, see *BNJ* (173) T1; Errington (1969), 235-6; Pédech (1951), 235-6; Walbanck (1957-70), 2, 21-3.
[244] Cf. Luc. *Hist. Conscr.* 9.59.

mostly history and philosophy. A concise bullet list of these orators can help our reflection on this issue:

- Aeschines of Miletus (1): according to Diogenes Laertius (2.64) πολιτικὸς συγγραφεύς; his treatises of politics could have been somewhat **between history and philosophy**.

- Alexander of Ephesus (5): according to Strabo (14.1.25) he was an orator, politician and **historian**, and wrote poems on heavenly bodies and on geography.

- Alcimus (6): potentially identifiable with the Sicilian historian (*FGrHist/BNJ* 560) author of the **historical work Σικελικά** (Ath. 7.322a).

- Anaximenes of Lampsacus (8): famous historian of Alexander, author of and ***History of Philip***, ***History of Alexander***, and ***History of Greece***.

- Apollonius Molon (12) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 728): author of a treatise against the Jewish (*Praep. Evang*. 9.19; Joseph. *Ap*. 2.16-7; 48; 25), somewhere **between history and philosophy**.

- Cephisodorus (21): maybe author of a ***History of the Sacred Wars*** (- Cephisodorus: maybe author of a ***History of the Sacred Wars*** (Aristot. *Eth. Nic*. 3.11.46 = *FGrHist* 112)

- Cineas the Aetolian (24): author of a ***History of Thessaly*** (Steph. Byz. ε 180, δ 146; Schol.Pind.*Pyth*. 10.85a; Strab. 7.7.12) and of military treatises (Cic. *Ad Fam*. 9.25.1).

- Demetrius of Phalerum (29) (*FGrHist/BNJ 228*): according to Diogenes Laertius (5.75-82) he wrote over 50 works on a wide range of subjects; political, historical, ethical, constitutional, judicial, philosophical (in particular), poetical, rhetorical, and miscellaneous. As for **history** we have a *Register of Archons* (*FGrHist* 228.44), a *Historical Preface* (45), *On the Ionians* (46); but also **military history**: *On Strategies* (47); **political treatises**: *On Lawmaking at Athens* (1), *On Constitutions in Athens* (2), *In Defence of the Constitution* (3) *On Leadership of the People* (4), *On Politics* (5), *On Laws* (6), *On the Ten Years* (7), *The Sworn Assembly* (8), *A Denunciation of the Athenians* (9); **biographical history**: *Ptolemy* (29), *Phaidondas* (30), *Maidon* (31), *Kleon* (32), *Artaxerxes* (34), *Aristides* (35), *Aristomachus* (36), *Dionysius* (37), *Antiphanes* (38), *Aristaichmus* (39).

- Democharес (30) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 75): author of a ***History*** **in 21 books** (narrating contemporary events, and very rhetorical, see Marasco [1984], 87-109).

- Dionysius of Pergamon or Atticus (36): Strabo (13.4) says he was also a **teacher of philosophy and historian**.

- Hegesias (46) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 142): author of an extremely rhetorical ***History of Alexander*** (Strab. 11.1.16), and of a work entitled ***The Philatenians*** (Maiuri [1925], 14-15, XI.18), but also two works entitled *Alcibiades* and *Aspasia* (dialogues or biographies).

- Metrodorus of Scepsis (60): a philosopher before he became an orator (Strab. 13.1.55; Plut. *Luc*. 22).

- Neanthes of Cyzicus. (63): **mainly a historian** (*FGrHist* 84).

- Philiscus of Miletus (67) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 337b): the author of a **biography** of Lycurgus (*Suda*, φ 360)

- Polyaenus of Sarids (65): author of the *Parthian Triumph* (*Suda*, π 1955).

- Potamon of Mytilene (71) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 147): author of a work on the *Samians* (*Suda* π 2127).

- Sosicrates (73): probably identifiable with the *FGrHist* 461, author of a ***History of Crete***.

- Theocritus of Chios (76) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 760): according to *Suda*, θ 166, he wrote a ***History of Libya***, and ***Chreiai***, probably biographical anecdotes.

- Theodectes the Younger (78): author of ***Barbarian Customs*** (*Suda* θ 139)

- Theopompus (81) (*FGrHist/BNJ* 115): more **famous** as **historian** than as orator: *FGrHist/BNJ* 115 (*Epitome of Herodotus*, *Philippika*, *Hellenika*).

To these we may add the doubtful case of Myron (61), identified by many scholars (although not in this work) with Myron of Priene.

If the massive presence of philosophical production for these orators is easily explainable in the light of the role of philosophical schools in the teaching of rhetoric, their historiographical production seems to be deserving of a deeper analysis. The gap between rhetoric and philosophy began to be closed already with Isocrates, and this is perfectly explained by the words of Dionysius of Halicarnassus who calls Isocrates' rhetoric 'φιλόσοφος ῥητορικὴ' (*De Ant. Or.* 1), and says he is superior to all other orators for his philosophical purpose (*De Isoc.* 4; 12). Isocrates himself (16.18) tells us that philosophy is what makes complete the education of the students.

As regards history and historiography, the framework is less straightforward: none of ten Attic orators of the canon has attestations of a historiographical production, and for other minor Attic orators it is only[245] attested for Androtion, a pupil of Isocrates, who was also known as Atthidographer;[246] if we look at 5th century historians, despite their active political activity (as, for instance, Thucydides' role of στρατηγός) no corpus of orations (or fragments of them) has survived in both direct or indirect tradition. It is, however, worth remembering that Thucydides knew well how to compose speeches[247] (we cannot but mention his admiration for Antiphon, see Thuc. 8.68), and he must have been highly admired by Demosthenes if the anecdote in Lucian (28.4) according to which Demosthenes copied eight times Thucydides work, is to be considered true.

The identification of 'history maker' and 'history writer' goes back to Thucydides. This tradition continues with Xenophon (directly involved in the events he narrates in the *Anabasis*), and this is certainly still true for the Hellenistic age, and is illustrated not only by the famous example of Polybius and his political activity followed by history writing in the 2nd century BC, but also by apparently minor figures like that of the historian Hieronymus of Cardia, who served Eumenes, Antigonus Monophthalmos, and Demetrius Poliorcetes. Such an identification, as a matter of fact, was destined to last for a long time, if we think of Roman historiographers who played important political

[245] We need to except the rhetorician Zoilus, teacher of Demosthenes, philosopher, commentator of Homer, and historian, but not an orator strictly speaking. The most recent and complete overview on his activity, including his fragments and testimonies, is *BNJ* 71.

[246] See *FGrHist* 324, and on his *Atthis*, Jacoby (1949). See also Moscati Castelnuovo (1980).

[247] See speeches in historiographers. On the use of rhetorical precepts in Thucydidean and Herodotean speeches, see Pelling (2012),

roles (Sallust[248] and Tacitus being the most famous examples). Any rate, in the Classical age, even when historians took an active part in the history they wrote, the 'professions' (and consequently the literary production) of orators and historians, seemed to be quite distinct. It is again in the Isocratean *officina dicendi* that the origins of this phenomenon can be traced back. As seen above, his school, meant to shape future political leaders and defined by Isocrates himself as 'philosophical', provided an education not only to many orators and philosophers, but also to historians, the most famous being Ephorus of Cyme and Theopompus of Chios – the latter a Hellenistic orator as well – and the Attidographer Androtion. We have also seen how strong and important historical-biographical elements were in Isocrates' encomiastic production.[249]

If we look at the historical works of the orators listed above, we can place most of them in categories that can be traced back to the Isocratean production and teaching. First of all, we have historical-philosophical pamphlets (maybe following the model of the *Against the Sophists*), like that of Molon *Against the Jews*; and political treatises (whose main Isocratean examples are the *Panegyric*, the *Panathenaicus* and the *Plataicus*), such as the many instances attested for Demetrius of Phalerum (undoubtedly following the peripatetic tradition, and not only Isocrates) and perhaps the production of Aeschines of Miletus. What seems to play a key role in this discourse is the genre of the historical biography. In this category fall the many titles attributed to Demetrius, Philiscus' biography of Lycurgus, Hegesias' *Aspasia* and *Alcibiades*, but also the tendency of works of history to be dedicated to a single personality. The various histories of Alexander and /or Philip by Hegesias, Theopompus, and Anaximenes, but also the interest in biographical anecdotes in Theocritus's *Chreiai* are signs of the sharp development of this genre in connection to oratory, in the Hellenistic age, following a tradition that begins with Isocrates and Xenophon and their biographical encomia (such as the *Euagoras* for the former, and the *Agesilaus* for the latter).

As Oliver notes,[250] the interest in biography was accelerated by the affirmation of charismatic figures like Alexander and his successors, as shown by the nature of the historical production about them, tending to focus on their single personalities, and being therefore more similar to biographies (see Cleitarchos, Ptolemy, and Aristoboulus for Alexander; Timaius for Pyrrhus; Demetrius of Byzantium for Antiochus I Soter and Ptolemy II Philadelphus). These biographies ended up focussing on a specific aspect, usually education,[251] on the example of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*.[252] The historical biography is, however, a genre in which some ambiguity lies: as seen above, for Polybius' *Philopoemen*, although related to history, it was seen by him as separate from objective historiography and

[248] Oratory and history, however, in Sallust do not overlap but are consequential.
[249] See Pinto (2006), 67-69.
[250] Oliver (2006), 116.
[251] On the importance of education in the biography of famous personalities, see epigraphic evidence in the section on 'Teaching rhetoric'.
[252] See Onesicritus, *How Alexander was educated*; Marsyas of Pella, *Education of Alexander*; Lysimachus, *About the Education of Attalos*.

more similar to rhetoric and specifically to encomia, which makes more meaningful the reflection that relates biographical history to Hellenistic orators.

However, not all the examples listed above wrote political and philosophical treatises, or biographies – we have Theopompus' *History of Greece*, a *History of Sicily* by Alcimus, a contemporary history by Democharas, a *History of Crete* by Sosicrates, a *History of Libya* by Theocritus, *Barbarian Customs* by Theodectes, and many more works by Neanthes. It is clear that a newer and deeper interest in history must have characterised the education of Hellenistic orators, so profoundly that many of them wrote history. It will not surprise that it is again in Isocrates that such a clear interest in history is to be found: he indeed advises to study history in order to take the best decisions (2.35). Dionysius (*De Isoc*. 13) tells us that Isocrates influenced historians as well as orators. It is undeniable that Isocrates' style and the function of his speeches were better suited for reading than for an oratorical display, all characteristics that make him closer to historians.[253]

More reasons for this overlap can be attributed to social changes: a less stable situation from a political, geographical, and also financial point of view might have led orators to try different activities (it is not at all implausible that orators became teachers of rhetoric to gain more money). On top of that, the new globalised cultural environment made people perceive that different spheres of the intellectual activity (history, oratory, philosophy, rhetorical theory, but as evident from some orators like Theocritus of Chios and Matris, also poetry) could go together and required more flexibility from authors. Or perhaps, some form of Aristotelian view of writing made them believe that they could potentially write in any genre. It is worth mentioning the passage of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (3.3.10) where the anonymous author says he could attempt to write 'de re militari aut de administratione rei publicae'.

This Hellenistic identification of oratory and historiography was destined to last and evolve over the centuries, if we think that Marcus Porcius Cato, a great orator of the early Republican age, was also the author of the *Origines*, and that still in in the 1st-2nd centuries AD, one of the main Roman historians, Tacitus, had enough interest in rhetoric and oratory to write a *Dialogus de oratoribus*.

On the whole, it must be noted that the 'profession' of orator in the Hellenistic world has changed in a way that made it more fluid. A substantial number of orators are also broadly intellectuals: as seen above most of them are also rhetoricians and teachers, philosophers (philosophers are often sent as ambassadors as it happened in 155 BC), poets, and historians.

2. Speeches in historiographers

The role of embedded speeches in ancient historiography has always raised scholarly interest, especially as regards the debate on the authorship of these orations.[254] This is a crucial issue in the present work, when deciding how to treat speeches of Hellenistic orators that are transmitted

[253] See the recent Nicolai (2017).

[254] A recent volume on speeches in historiography is Pausch (2010). For Greek historiography, see a chronological overview, with a special focus on Polybius, in Walbank (1965). See also Fornara (1986) and Marincola (2007).

(quoted or paraphrased) by historians, specifically Polybius and Livy. The first ancient historian to address this problem was Thucydides (1.22.1)[255] with his famous statement that he cannot remember the exact words of the speeches he inserts in his history, even when he heard them himself, he tried to write 'what was [...] demanded of them by the various occasions, of course adhering as closely as possible to the general sense of what they really said'.[256] Moreover, it has been noted[257] that the speeches in Thucydides, despite following the precepts of the Aristotelian *Rhetoric* and of the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, never sound like 5th or 4th century genuine speeches as regards argumentation and style. These speeches, therefore, are an attempt by Thucydides to either express through his own words what a certain historical character would have said in a crucial moment, or to reconstruct what he believed (or remembered) was really said. This historical method was criticised since Antiquity, as shown by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Thuc*. 16-18; 37-41), who was critical of other historians who adopted similar methods, like Philistus (*Pomp*. 5.6) or who, like Xenophon, made everyone speak philosophically (*Imit*. 6.3.2). In the Latin world, Pompeius Trogus reprimended Sallust and Livy for their insertion of excessively long direct speeches.[258]

As regards historians between Thucydides and Polybius, their tendency was to adopt more freedom in writing and embedding speeches in historiography. Xenophon[259] wrote speeches mainly to express his own views, and even when the speakers seem to be conveying their own view, it has been demonstrated that the speech was invented by Xenophon. An opposite view is expressed by Callisthenes (*FGrHist* 124, F4), who says that speeches must be apt and faithful to the personality of the character who is speaking. It is with regard to this tendency of inserting "fake" speeches that Polybius wrote his attack on the historiography of Timaeus of Tauromenion (*FGrHist* 566). In the famous passage of the *Histories* (12.25), Polybius says that Timaeus inserted speeches in his history with 'total disregard of truth', without attempting to reconstruct the words really said, and making the words apt to the circumstances as if he were composing a declamation, while, according to Polybius, the role of history is to ascertain what the actual words were.[260] Moreover, similar criticism by Polybius towards other historians is to be found at 2.56.10 (Phylarcus), 3.20.1-6 (Sosylus and Chaireas). Finally, on top of the abovementioned Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus (20.1-2) criticised other historians for their use of speeches, and even when admitting that speeches are

[255] On the vast debate on Thucydides' speeches and the meaning of the statement at 1.22.1, see among others recently Paussch (2010); Scardino (2007).
[256] Translation by Crawley (1910).
[257] Jones (1957), 66-7.
[258] Iust. 38.3.11 (quam obliquam [scil. orationem] Pompeius Trogus exposuit, quoniam in Livio et in Sallustio reprehendit, quod contiones directas pro sua oratione operi suo inserendo historiae modum excesserint). See Ballesteros Pastor (2013).
[259] See Breitenbach (1950), 102, 125.
[260] On Polybius' historical method, with a focus on speeches and this polemic see among others Baron (2009); Baron (2013), 55-88; Boncquet (1982-3); Candau (2017); Nicolai (1999), 281-301; Pearson (1986); Pédech (1964), 255-302; Sacks (1981); Vercruysse (1990), 17-38; Walbank (1962); Wiater (2014); Wiedemann (1990).

needed in order to give variety to the narration (he employs some),[261] he said that too many of them interrupt the interest of the readers, and, like Polybius, he condemned the vanity of those who want to gain success as both historians and orators, by displaying their rhetorical abilities in embedded speeches.[262]

The words of Polybius against Timaeus have been interpreted variously by scholars, usually to prove or disprove that speeches in Polybius are to be considered as genuine fragments of the people who pronounced them:[263] Wooten,[264] for instance, sees them as insight into the real nature of Hellenistic oratory. The truth lies somewhat in between the two options: Polybius himself (29.12) felt the necessity to justify himself for repeating the same words and adapting them to his style when describing battles and reporting speeches. As Wooten himself admits,[265] 'These speeches are written in the same style which Polybius uses in the narrative sections of the work, which indicates that he is not quoting in the speeches but at the most recording what arguments, figures, and commonplaces were used on a given occasion. [...] The style is basically plain and straightforward, lacking in rhetorical flourish and schematization'. Therefore, even when accepting that Polybius was being always faithful to his own goals of truthfulness and authenticity in reporting speeches, it is clear that he cast them in his own words, even incurring the risk of using the same words twice. With regard to this, it is also interesting to note a passage at 25.1.6-7, where Polybius, still stressing the importance of recording what was really done and said, tells us that there is no need for rhetorical abilities in reconstructing improvised speeches by politicians, as they did not necessarily have in advance a clear idea of the words they were going to say in a certain situation.

The situation is, however, less straightforward as regards successions of speeches pronounced at gatherings of the main leagues, and speeches pronounced by Greek ambassadors to the Senate, two categories in which most of the speeches of Hellenistic orators fall. A preliminary observation must be made about the fact that, in general, speeches pronounced by Greeks, are predominant in Polybius' history. Moreover, as argued by Walbank,[266] these speeches, which, unlike others (for instance those of Hannibal and Scipio at the Ticinus battle), are not paired to obtain an effect of artificial equality, are rhetorically more vivid and emotional than others. This has brought scholars like Wooten, Pédech, Kennedy, and Walbank himself to consider them "authentic". In particular, Pédech (1964), 265-6, believed Lyciscus' and Chleaeneas' speeches could be truly authentic; he also discussed possible identifiable sources for these speeches,[267] such as Polybius' direct involvement in

[261] See Pesely (1985); Vannotti (1990).
[262] Many argue that programmatic proemia like this one (as well as other sections, including some of the embedded speeches) in Diodorus are taken from his source Ephorus. On the subject see Andrewes (1985); Meister (1973-74); Pearson (1984); and above all Porciani (2013).
[263] See in particular, Pédech (1964), 259-76, and Walbank (1965).
[264] Wooten (1973) and Wooten (1974).
[265] Wooten (1974), 237.
[266] Walbank (1965), 11-18.
[267] Pédech (1964), 259-76.

the affairs of the Achaian league from 18 to 167 BC, his knowledge of Aratus's *Memoir*, his possibility of accessing Perseus' library. Only in one case, however, (30.4.11) Polybius mentions a published version of a speech (Astymedes, 16), but the speech is not quoted by Polybius on this occasion, and we only find a reshaping of it in Livy who reports it entirely (45.21-25). Kennedy,[268] along the same lines, stresses that it must have been easy for Polybius to access archives of the league and to remember the recent and relatively short history that he was narrating. However, Pédech (276) admits that these speeches must have been summaries of the originals, and Walbank rightly points out that they must have been 'worked over', as is clear from the fact that Lyciscus' speech is twice as long as Chleneas', which shows Polybius' own point of view on the events. According to Wooten,[269] Chlaeneas' speech must have been the closest to the tone of the original, considering the amount of exclamations and rhetorical questions.

It would be, therefore, more interesting and useful to see these speeches as important witnesses of the activity of these orators, giving insights into the content and the structure of these orations, rather than to consider them genuine pieces of Hellenistic oratory. A study of the sort has been done by Wooten (1974), who identifies twenty-nine Greek speeches: four in direct discourse (5.104, 9.28-31, 9.32-39, 11.4-6, of which Wooten provides a detailed rhetorical analysis),[270] ten beginning in indirect discourse and then switching to direct discourse (21.10, 19-21, 22-23, 31; 22.8, 24.8, 9, 12, 13; 30.31), and the others (5.58, 83 [two] 11.9, 15.28, 18.36, 37; 20.12, 21.14, 22; 23.17 [two], 24.9, 28.7, 38.12) only indirectly summarised. Then, Wooten classifies them typologically: thirteen deliberative, eleven ambassadorial, and five exhortations to troops (which, following his reasoning, are not to be considered examples of Hellenistic oratory).[271] As seen, Wooten identifies a common structure for these speeches) including a proemium, and an argumentation (rather than a narration), but rarely a formal peroration (to be found only in 5.104, 9.32, 11.6, 30.31). This, however, does not mean perorations were not common in Hellenistic oratory, but simply shows that Polybius, as a historian, was less interested in them than he was in the argumentation, which was on the contrary very useful to the development of his narrative. Finally, Wooten singles out commonplaces and Demosthenic parallels in Polybius's speeches,[272] in the attempt to corroborate his idea, already expressed in his doctoral thesis from 1972, that Hellenistic oratory was still mainly dependent on the model of Demosthenes.

The same kind of reasoning made for Greek historians, can be applied to Latin historiography, which inherited this complex historiographical tradition.[273] Of the many examples, it is appropriate

[268] Kennedy (2008²), 32-37. See also Welzhoffer (1880).
[269] Wooten (1974), 240.
[270] Wooten (1974), 238-41. However, fully reported speeches are not necessarily the most accurate, and they are usually given in full length for dramatic reasons (especially when they are given in pairs).
[271] On the Aristotelian tripartition of oratory, and the ambassadorial speech (but not the exhortation to troops), as a fourth genre, see Pepe (2013), 291-335.
[272] Wooten (1974), 248-51.
[273] On embedded speeches in Roman historiographers, see general studies such as (1964), Ullman (1927).

to spend a few words on the only Latin historiographical source for Hellenistic orators, namely Livy. It is a fact that Livy's main source for Hellenistic history was Polybius himself, which means that he was the source of speeches as well, especially in the first decade. On the other hand, in books 21-30, a comparison of Livy's speeches with the corresponding ones in Polybius, shows how Livy worked interpretatively if not creatively on them, by contracting, re-writing, and re-assessing them, going beyond the simple operation of translation.[274] Not unlike other historians, Livy adapts his sources to his historiographical and political necessities, by emphasizing or reducing the importance of certain rhetorical elements when talking about Romans or enemies. It is interesting that the speech by the Rhodian orator Astymedes (16) before the Roman Senate in 167 BC is quoted entirely in Livy, but is not quoted at all by Polybius. Surely, Livy had other sources than Polybius when he wrote this speech. This finds confirmation in the fact that some of his speeches present *verbatim* the exact same translated text as those in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*, and considering that the two authors are surely independent, they must have had access to the same sources, most likely older annalists. The case of Astymedes is particularly problematic because Polybius (30.4.11) says that Astymedes published the speech. Therefore, some commentators have taken into account the possibility that Livy had an original copy of it and could therefore provide a trustworthy translation of the original speech. This seemed to be corroborated by what Livy says shortly after at 45.25, about Cato's reply to this speech: 'non inseram simulacrum veri copiose, quae dixerit, referendo: ipsius oratio scripta extat, originum quinto libro inclusa'. But, if the published copy of Astymedes' speech had been available to Livy, he would have omitted it the same way he did for Cato's. It is, therefore, very likely that the sources for this speech were again annalistic.

[274] See examples in Miller (1964), 51-55.

What is distinctive about Hellenistic Oratory?

In the light of the fragments collected in the present work and the discussion carried out throughout the Introduction, one final and crucial research question arises: what is distinctive about Hellenistic oratory?

The key features that emerge from the fragments can be summarised as follows:

1) The theorisation of ambassadorial speeches and the centrality of this type of speech

As argued, the fragments contained in Philodemus' *Rhetoric*, one of which is attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum constitute the earliest evidence of the theorisation of ambassadors' speeches. It is remarkable that it is to a Hellenistic orator that this innovation is attributed. It is also worth noting that the emphasis on the role of ambassadors is also in P.Schub. 32 (though briefly), and in P.Mil.Vogl.3.123 (where Tydeus is praised for his ambassadorial mission), one of the earliest examples of Hellenistic encomia (3rd century BC), that might show how this theorisation already had some influence on progymnasmatic – or broadly declamatory – practices.

2) **The new role of encomia**

The well-known vitality acquired by encomia in the Hellenistic age finds early evidence in some of the rhetorical exercises on papyrus contained in this work. P.Petr.1.10, P.Mil.Vogl.3.123, and P.Schub.32 are all examples of encomiastic production. The former two are encomia of mythological characters, while the latter of the city of Thebes. Thanks to the first two papyri, we can notice that the Imperial theorisation of the division of encomium in specific sections (see Ps-Hermog. *Prog*. 7) was already employed as early as the 3rd century BC. As regards encomia of cities, the one in P.Schub.32 is not an isolated case in Hellenistic oratory, since we have an attestation of an *Encomium of Rhodes*, by Hegesias (43) in *Lindian Chronicle* 2b.5; 10, and potentially also by Myron (68) in *Lindian Chronicle* c.65-8; c.1. This evidence shows that Imperial rhetorical theory and practice as regards encomia must be seen in continuity rather than in opposition to the theory and practice of Hellenistic oratory and rhetoric.

3) Prose rhythm and other changes in style in Hellenistic oratory

If for Hegesias of Magnesia (43), the 'inventor' of Asianism, the evidence for rhythmical prose, as shown by Norden, is limited to the fragments of his historical work (as his oratory only survives in Latin quotations), thanks to some fragments of Hybreas (46), we see how prose rhythm found its place both in actual public speeches (F1) and in declamations (F4 and F7). On the contrary, prose rhythm is never found in rhetorical exercises on papyrus.

As regards, other stylistic features, worthy of a mention are also Cleochares (25; F2, F4) and its employment of *polyptoton*, not as widely employed in earlier Attic oratory. Changes in style are also shown by P.Oxy.2.216, with its paced rhetorical questions, short sentence and "nervous" prose.

If textual evidence appears limited, due to the shortness of the fragments at our disposal, a reflection on style can be strengthened by the study of some late Hellenistic inscriptions, as seen above for the stele from Maroneia (*SEG*.XXVI.821). Inscriptions are extremely useful tools for reconstructing rhetorical practices and styles in the Hellenistic period. Angelos Chaniotis has already provided a good account of narrations in Hellenistic decrees as a source of Hellenistic oratory, showing the contamination of oratory with drama and historiography, especially when dealing with kinship and common ancestors (this feature was crucial in ambassadorial speeches). Among them, *IOSPE*3.I.2-352 ll. 5-39, a decree from Chersonesus in Tauris praising Diophantus, a general of Mithridates VI, who fought against the Scythians in 120 BC, constitutes a particularly interesting case, since, as Chaniotis shows, there is a continuous narrative probably reflecting the words pronounced by an orator in the assembly. Chaniotis notices that the narrative resembles the dramatic contrasts in historiography, with the juxtaposition between the attacks of the enemy and the valorous struggle of Diophantus. More traces of Hellenistic oratory, and specifically of Hellenistic attention for details are in *IOSPE*3.I.2.32, a decree of Olbia for the benefactor Protogenes (late 3rd century BC), where the orator gives details on shapes and sizes of parts of the city, and where Chaniotis notices a strong presence of emotional language.

With regard to the attention to detail in Hellenistic oratory, it is also worth mentioning an unpublished inscription from Teos, where the demos of the Abderites honours that of the Teians. Its text has been kindly provided to me by its editor Peter Thonemann (who is going to publish it with Mustafa Adak); it describes in detail a colossal bronze statue of the demos of the Teians, on which the decree will be inscribed. Next to it, there will be a Nike crowning the demos with an ivy-wreath, and, in front of the statue, there will be an altar.

Other famous examples of stylistic features found in inscribed text and probably mirroring actual speeches[275] are the inscription on the monument of Antiochus I of Commagene (*OGI* 383; *IGLSyr* 1.1; 1st BC) and a letter of Ptolemy II to Miletus, dating from about 261 BC, both containing elements of Asianic style. Finally, worthy of mention is an inscription (IG.V.2.268 = Syll^3 783, 1st BC) commissioned by the Demos Antigoneias to write a long prose encomium for two benefactors of the city, which contains prose rhythm and was defined by Papanikolaou as a 'monument of Hellenistic prose'.

[275] Finally, another famous decree showing traces of actual oratory is the so called 'Decree of Chremonides' (Syll.3 434/5 = *IG*.II3.1.912 = *IG*.II^2.686-7 = *SEG*.XXXIII.112 = *SEG*.XCI.52), from 268 BC, marking the beginning of the Chremonidean war (267-261 BC), aimed at building an alliance between Athens and Sparta (and respective allies) in order to fight Antigonus Gonatas. The assimilation of Antigonus and Philip II allowed an exploitation of Demosthenic models, in particular of Demosthenes' speech On the Crown. The decree is full of statements of Panhellenic pride and unity, echoing the yearning to fight for Greek freedom in Dem. 18 (especially §98), but also in Hyperides' Against Diondas (the fragments in the Archimedes' palimpsest).

4) The development of the comparison of famous personalities as a technique in rhetorical theory

As argued, another Hellenistic novelty seems to be the scholarly and literary debate on great rhetorical models from the past, which resulted in the famous developments made by Caecilius of Calacte (the first to propose a comparison between a Greek and a Roman orator), and Dionysius of Halicarnassus' (Περὶ τῶν Ἀττικῶν ῥητόρων, Περὶ λεκτικῆς Δημοσθένους δεινότητος). It is with Cleochares of Myrlea (25), active in the 3rd century BC, that rhetorical theory based on Demosthenes seems to develop. From two of his fragments (F3-4), we know that he wrote a treatise on Demosthenes, and one of them (F3) shows that he employed a comparison between him and Isocrates. Other early examples of comparisons between oratorical models are in Democharas (30; T3?) when he discussed Aeschines and his voice, and Polyeuctus. (70), who compared Demosthenes' and Phocion's styles (F3?).

This overview seems to confirm that Hellenistic oratory – to quote Kremmydas and Tempest – has elements of continuity with Classical and Imperial oratory, but it also involves substantial changes with regard to the former. We see how new features such as prose rhythm only appear gradually throughout the centuries, similarly to other changes in style: Demosthenes is still widely seen as a model and imitated (see P.Berol. 9781 above all, but also P.Hib. 1.15), but a new type of paced prose, embellished by more artificial rhetorical figures establishes itself (see especially P.Oxy. 2.216). Similarly, ambassadorial speeches, which aquire a new independent status, have their origin in 4th century foreign diplomacy. The vibrancy of Hellenistic oratory is also shown by the vitality Hellenistic rhetorical theory, on which Imperial theorisation appears to build up, as well shown by P.Petr.1.10. We can, therefore, consider Greek oratory as a continuum that goes from 5th century speeches to Imperial Greek declamation and sees, in the Hellenistic age a period of both consolidation and transformation, in which orators and rhetoricians produced substancial and valuable pieces of work, whose extant fragments (attributed and anonymous) this works aims at collecting and studying.

Sources: the survival of Hellenistic oratory after 31 BC

1. An overview: from Cicero to Ps-Eudocia Augusta

As stated, the corpus of fragments and biographies (*testimonia* are not edited but contribute to sketching biographical profiles) in the present work includes a high number of orators, more than 80. Of the orators included in the list, some just have one or two *testimonia*, others have many *testimonia* and a few fragments, yet others do not have *testimonia* but several fragments,[276] and, finally, some very lucky cases have a long list of *testimonia* and fragments. The last is the case of orators who became famous for different reasons throughout the centuries, such as Demetrius of Phalerum (29) for his political activity (although the majority of his fragments are not oratorical), Theopompus of Chios (79) as historian, and to a minor extent Demochares (31) for his family relationship with Demosthenes, and Hegesias of Magnesia (43) for his influence on later rhetorical theory and prose style. A significant point must be made about the great variety of sources that transmit these fragments: one is even a direct source, namely the papyrus that constitutes the only fragment for Philiscus; but the great majority are predictably quotations from literary or historical works from any time and genre: Greek and Latin rhetoricians, both Classical and Late-Antique (precisely from Cicero to some medieval scholia to Hermogenes). Among them, the most relevant rhetorical sources are undoubtedly Dionysius of Halicarnassus and the treatise de *Figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* by Rutilius Lupus, to whom a separate subsection is dedicated, historians and biographers (especially Plutarch[277] and Diodorus Siculus),[278] philosophers (a lot of information is derived from Diogenes Laertius), geographers (from Strabo[279] to Stephanus of Byzantium,[280] including the fragments of Agatharchides[281]), lexica[282] and encyclopaedias (from the 2nd century AD Harpocration[283] to the Byzantine *Suda*[284]), anonymous gnomologies,[285] and many others[286]. This variety of sources tells a lot about the circulation and the transmission of these texts or information about orators over a long period of time, that covers sixteen centuries, if we count the extremely late witness from the Pseudo-Eudocia,

[276] Such as Myron (61, F1-2 =. Rutilius. 1.1; 1.20).
[277] Mostly *testimonia*, but also a few fragments: *Ant.* 24 for Hybreas (46, F3) and *Prae. ger. reip.* 802e for Pytheas (72, F3a).
[278] Almost exclusively *testimonia*, except for Matris (54, F2) at 1.24.4.
[279] Among the many *testimonia* (in some cases the only *testimonium*), one fragment: 14.2.24 for Hybreas (46, F1)
[280] *s.v.* Κορώπη for Demetrius (although the genre is not absolutely clear, therefore the fragment has not been edited).
[281] A fragment of Stratocles (75, F3) *apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 250.447a.
[282] Interesting is the case of a fragment of Charisius (22, F4)in Phot. *Lex.* α 209 from an otherwise non attested speech *Against Socrate*s.
[283] Essentially *testimonia*.
[284] Among the various *testimonia*, the abovementioned fragment by Democleides (31, T1).
[285] The *Gnomologium Vaticanum* with the *Sententiae* 253-60 for Demetrius and 307-8 for Hegesias (see more below), and one *testimonium* for Xenocles of Adramittium (83) in the *Florilegium Monacense* (Monac. Gr. 429), 220.
[286] Worthy of mention are also Athenaeus (main source for several orators), Eusebius of Caesarea (also source for a fragment of Democharesin *Preap. Ev.* 15.2.6), the *Chronicum Lindium*, and scholia to different authors.

a forgery from the 16th century: an anthology (*Violarium*) falsely written under the name of the empress Aelia Eudocia Augusta.[287]

How should we then proceed in the compilation of this list of names and witnesses? Part of this job was begun by Wooten in his doctoral thesis, where he listed forty orators divided geographically (twelve from Greek mainland, twenty-four from Asia Minor and four from Rhodes). But, as stated, this list is, on the one hand, still extremely partial as it excludes several orators, whereas, on the other hand, it includes rhetoricians for whom the activity of teacher is widely documented, but no witness of actual oratory exists (e.g., the abovementioned Apollodorus of Pergamon). Some other names, at least for the earlier part of the Hellenistic age, can be found in the seemingly outdated but still excellent tool represented by David Ruhnken's *Historia Critica Oratorum Graecorum*, where some more late Attic/early Hellenistic orators are listed. An interesting case is a certain Democleides, mentioned only in the *Suda* (ω 263) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Din*. 11.73-78). In the former, a fragment of this orator (it seems to be from a speech against Democharesi) – in the version given by Timeus of Tauromenion –, is quoted, while the latter opens up the possibility of the existence of a speech in defence of Ermia of Atarneus attributed to Democleides (31, T1) or Menesaechmus (58, T3).

Similarly, for the early part of the period, the collection of the fragments of the Attic orators made by Baiter and Sauppe has been extremely useful.[288] Furthermore, as argued above, the absence of an edition of Hellenistic orators is also due to the overlap between the role of the historians and the orators starting from the end of the 4th century BC which resulted in many Hellenistic orators therefore ending up only in the collection of historical fragments. Thus, a systematic analysis of the main collections of fragmentary historians has been necessary, with specific attention to the biographical *testimonia*: for some of them, information about their activity as rhetoricians and orators is clearly given. It is the case with the famous Anaximenes (8), Theopompus (79), and other pupils of Isocrates, but also of other less known personalities such as Neanthes of Cyzicus (63) and Polyaenus of Sardis (69). Then, it is worth looking at all the names mentioned in the Greek and Latin rhetorical works. The main source is, as said, the treatise of Rutilius Lupus, of whose eleven orators eight were listed in Wooten's thesis.[289] The ninth is Demetrius of Phalerum (29), excluded for no specific reason, the tenth is Pytheas (72), probably considered still "too Attic" by Wooten, but in my opinion still worth being included in the edition, considering that all his fragments refer to orations that were surely pronounced after the battle of Chaeronea. Finally, the eleventh is Sosicrates (73),

[287] Ps-Eudocia Augusta, *Violarium.* 712, where about Neanthes of Cyzicus we read he was a rhetorician and pupil of Philiscus and that he wrote a treatise *On Rhetorical Affectation* and many panegyric speeches. This is a piece of information quite probably taken from the *Suda* (in the entry on Callinus), but here wrongly attributed to Neanthes.

[288] Additional yet indispensable tools are the works by Friedrich Blass: *Die Attische Beredsamkeit* and also *Die griechische Beredsamkeit in dem Zeitraum von Alexander bis auf Augustus* where a few of these orators find some space in the discussion.

[289] They are Charisius (22), Cleochares (25), Daphnis (28), Democharesi (31), Hegesias (43), Isidorus (47), Myron (61), Stratocles (75).

not mentioned elsewhere as an orator but dateable to the 2nd century BC. Fundamental sources are also the rhetorical treatises of Cicero,[290] and, above all, the whole oeuvre of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It is in his works that we find some isolated names mentioned as orators active in the Hellenistic era: this is the case of the otherwise unknown Aristocles, Artamenes, and Sosigenes.[291]

This is a list aiming at including all names, even those with only testimonies and no fragments. Therefore, in order to work on such a variegated selection of material, a precise method should be identified as to proceed gradually in the edition and commentary. The criterion that seemed to be most effective is the one of "concentric circles", which I developed with thanks to the precious suggestions of Gregory Hutchinson. This means the editor should first include fragments where they can identify an exact quotation of an actual speech, or the place where an actual quotation was and got lost: therefore, I label as fragments (F in the edition) all exact quotations, but also the Greek quotations in the Elder Seneca that are no longer legible. The number of examples for this category is surprisingly high. First of all, we have the twenty-four fragments transmitted in a Latin translation by Rutilius for Charisius, Cleocares, Daphnis, Demetrius of Phalerum, Democharis, Hegesias, Isidorus of Pergamon, Myron, Pytheas, Sosicrates and Stratocles. For Charisius, we also have one fragment contained in Photius, for Cleochares we have two more fragments in Greek (one transmitted by Photius and one by Ps.-Herodian), for Democharis there are two more fragments transmitted by Athenaeus, for Hegesias there may be a further fragment transmitted by Plutarch; Pytheas has four more fragments, contained in Plutarch, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Athenaeus, and finally Stratocles has a fragment quoted by Agatharchides (contained in Photius' *Bibliotheca*).

To these orators, we can add Aeschines of Miletus (1), Damas (27), Dionysius of Pergamon or Atticus (36), Gorgias of Athens (41), Lesbocles (50), Plution (68), and Potamon (71), whose fragments are in the Elder Seneca's *Declamations*, as well as Hybreas of Mylasa with eight fragments from the Elder Seneca (some in Greek, others in Latin), two from Strabo and one from Plutarch. Then, we have Democleides, with only one fragment in the *Suda* and perhaps a second one in Dionysius of Halicarnassus; Philiscus of Miletus, with one papyrus fragment, the late Attic orators Philinus and Polyeuctus, the panegyrist Matris, the abovementioned Molon, and the two slightly more complex cases of Theopompus and Demetrius of Phalerum, where quotations from orations and historical works can be easily confused. For Theopompus, moreover, there is the case of some letters from exile, which are literary products on the border between oratory and private communication, that are not included.[292]

The second 'concentric circle' includes paraphrased fragments, such as those of Caucalus, Democleides, and Matris, for whom we only have paraphrases, or Demetrius of Phalerum's T1-2, and Democharis' T-3. In the edition, these are called testimonia (T), but should not be confused with the

[290] For instance, Cicero (*Brut.* 316, 325) is the only witness for Aeschylus of Cnidus (2), defined an excellent example of Asianic style.

[291] All three orators are mentioned at Dion. Hal. *De Din.* 12.8.3. Only Aristocles (14) has another witness (Strab. 14.2.13).

[292] The case is perfectly explained and argued in Ottone (2005).

testimonia used to compile orators' biographies, which only have references to an orator's life and works, without paraphrasing them or giving detailed information on their content.

Then, radiating out from the centre, a third circle will include unclear fragments (usually signaled by a question mark, such two of Philinus' fragments [66, F3-5?]). A fourth concentric circle (one not included in this work, as argued above), would contain speeches taken from the works of historians, particularly Polybius and Livy, and a potential fifth may go as far as including small and not always clear attestations of possible orators mentioned in decrees contained in inscriptions, such as Agyrrus of Collytus, Demades of Peania, Euchares of Conthyle, Phythius of Thoricus,[293] of whom the majority were ambassadors. Given the incredibly high number of decrees containing mentions of orators, including all these names in this selection would go far beyond the scope of the present work. The only orator attested solely thanks to an inscription whose biography is included in the thesis is Themistocles of Ilion (77, *SEG*.XXXIII.1184.8-24) who is said to have been a wandering rhetorical speaker.

2. *Lexica*

A lot of interesting information regarding Hellenistic orators – and in some cases even fragments –is contained in lexicographical works: the *Lexicon of the Ten Orators* by Harpocration (2nd century AD), Photius' *Lexicon*, and the *Suda*.[294] As regards Harpocration, unsurprisingly, his lexicon mostly gives information about late-Attic orators: for some, it is just essential biographical information (as for Neanthes [63] at ν 114), sometimes it mentions non-oratorical works of Hellenistic orators (Democharesʼ [31] *Dialogues* at ι 25, and Demetriusʼ [29] *Laws* at ε 134). In other cases, it gives us titles of speeches for which we have no fragments (such as Isocrates of Apollonia's [48] *To Demonicus* at ε 77, Pytheas' [71] oration πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἀπολογία at α 19 and κατὰ ʻΑδειμάντου at ο 25, Anaximenes' [8] *Against Phryne* at ε 173), and in one lucky case, we have a fragment of Philinus' [66] speech *Against the Statues of Sophocles and Euripides* (θ 18 = F1).

It is in Byzantine lexica, however, that we find the highest amount of information. As known, the compilation of overarching and extremely comprehensive lexica and encyclopaedias after the so-called 'Macedonian renaissance' of the 9th and 10th centuries is part of a vast phenomenon conventionally labelled by most scholars as 'encyclopaedism'. Regardless of the name we choose to give to this phenomenon, it has been convincingly shown that its aim was not to achieve historical and philological rigour, but to save as much knowledge from the past as possible, in the majority of cases in a rather antiquarian spirit and with little attention to the sources or the authenticity of the information included. A remarkable interest in the Classical Antiquity in Byzantium had already risen in the 9th century, but it spread and grew stronger in the 10th, and among its different expressions (in the literature of any kind) it contributed to the creation of a massive lexicon like the *Suda* – perhaps

[293] See Bayliss (2011), Table 1 and Table 2.

[294] There is also an instance in the 5thcentury *Lexicon Rhetoricum Cantabrigiense* (337, 347, 350 Nauck) about Demetrius of Phalerum's *Laws*.

the only Byzantine lexicon which could rightly be called an encyclopaedia. The material it contains is not the fruit of a critical analysis of the sources (or at least it is not in most cases). The compilers of the *Suda* put together heterogeneous materials, often already in the form of epitomes, sometimes contained in scholia and annotations.[295] It very often derives its information from other lexica, such as the 5th-century lexicon of Hesychius, or Photius' lexicon, although this operation was probably not always as mechanical as one might suppose, as is shown by Theodoridis in his edition of Photius' lexicon.[296] For Attic orators, in particular, the entries in *Suda* mostly derive from Harpocration.[297]

Among the vast quantity of information contained in Byzantine lexica (the *Suda* in particular), a possible effective focus could be on isolated nuggets of information, namely those we find only in Byzantine lexica and nowhere else. With the concept of "isolated information" we intend the mentions of Hellenistic orators whose existence is witnessed only by Byzantine lexica, but also cases of Hellenistic authors already known to us thanks to other sources and for other reasons, but whose

[295] See Tosi (2011).

[296] Theodoridis (1998), XXXIV (Das Verhältnis des Lexicons des Photios zum Lexicon des Suidas). Here Theodoridis, despite hypothesizing that the *Suda* depends from Photius' Lexicon, shows examples of philological interventions in the text from its compilers. Against the perhaps simplistic idea of a direct dependence of the *Suda* from Photius, arguments were already brought by Wentzel (1895), 477-87.

[297] On the orators in Photius and the *Suda* see Roisman-Worthington-Waterfield (2015).

activity as orators is attested only by these lexica (as for Neanthes). These nuggets are classified in the table below:

	Suda	**Photius**
Antipater (9) 1st BC	θ 151	
Caucalus (20) 4th-3rd BC		*Lex.* λ 271
Democleides (31) 4th-3rd BC	ω 263	
Isocrates Pupil (48) 4th-3rd BC	ι 653; θ 138	
Neanthes orator (63) 4th-3rd BC	ν 114	
Polyaenus of Sardis (69) 2nd BC	π 1955	
Theocritus of Chios (76) 4th BC)	θ 166	
Theodectes son (78) 4th-3rd BC	θ 139	
Charisius' speech *Against Socrates* (22, F4)		*Lex.* α 209

The *Suda* is evidently the main container of isolated information on Hellenistic oratory. However, worthy of a few words are the two cases transmitted by Photius' *Lexicon*. One is a *testimonium* about Caucalus of Chios (20), brother of the more famous Theopompus, and remembered only here and in Athenaeus (10.412b); the second one is a very interesting mention of a speech *Against Socrates* attributed to Charisius of Athens (p. 105), which is not mentioned by any other source.

It could be useful to look at other instances contained in the *Suda* regarding Hellenistic orators and see how many of them derive their information from earlier sources. If we start looking at the few direct quotations of orators we find in the lexicon (namely π 443, σ 544 and ω 263), we can see that two out of three, namely two quotations from Demetrius of Phalerum's historical works (π 443 and σ 544), can be found identical in Photius' lexicon (respectively at π 302 and σ 288) and both instances are to be traced back to Harpocration (the exact same quotes are at π 31 and σ 21).

Similarly, the information contained in φ 360, a biographical entry on Philiscus of Miletus, is taken from Hesychius' lexicon (fr.7. 1025). Generally speaking, biographical entries tend to contain a combination of information taken from previous sources, as for example α 1898 (a biography of Anaximenes) mostly deriving from Pausanias, and δ 429 (a biography of Demetrius of Phalerum) that contains nothing more than what is known from other sources (mainly Diog. Laert. 5.75-85). A minor detail on Democharesʼ life, already known to Polybius, is also at α 4083. Other biographical entries, on the other hand, contain some original elements, like the notion of the job of Pytheas' father in his biography at π 3125. On the whole, the content of these entries seems to be nothing

more than an accumulation of ancient knowledge, dragged on for centuries until it converged in the *Suda*. Nevertheless, as shown in the table, some aspects of originality are undeniable. The entries in the table are interesting exactly because they do not derive their information from other lexical material known to us, and their sources appear to be quite obscure (except for the entry on Democleides, where Timaeus is explicitly mentioned as source). It is only thanks to the *Suda* that we know Neanthes of Cyzicus was not only a historian, but an orator as well, and that Theocritus of Chios was an orator as well as a poet; it is only in the *Suda* that we read about a 1st century orator and historian from Sardis named Polyaenus; it is thanks to the information contained in the *Suda* that we can date the orator Antipater (only known by Dio Chrys. *Or*. 18.22) with certainty to the 1st century BC; the titles of the young Isocrates' speeches are only listed in the entry in the *Suda* dedicated to him; and finally, it is in the *Suda* that we find the only mention of the young Theodectes, orator, and son of the more famous tragedian.

3. *Gnomologia* and *Florilegia*

Among the many sources for Hellenistic orators, there are gnomologies and anthologies of *sententiae*. Apart from the 5th – century *Florilegium* by Stobaeus, we have the *Gnomologium Vaticanum* (Vat. Gr. 744), and the *Florilegium Baroccianum* in the version contained in the codex Monac. Gr. 429). Most of the material is in the *Gnomologium Vaticanum*, a 14th century collection of sayings and anecdotes of ancient Greek philosophers and famous personalities of the past transmitted by the 15th century codex Vat. Gr. 743 and considered the most complete example of a group of gnomologies. The quotations contained in these gnomologies and *florilegia* have no explicit source nor is the work from which they are quoted ever mentioned. The type of information they contain is a literary form that lies between biography and historiography: the *apophthegmata*, or *sententiae*, in other words, maxims of famous people, in our case of Hellenistic orators. These types of maxims are also attested for some Attic orators: in Clavaud's edition of Demosthenes' fragments we find a final section containing *apophtegmata*, and the same is to be found in the edition by Mathieu and Brémond of Isocrates' fragments.

As regards Hellenistic orators, the fragments of these *apophthegmata* are not edited as part of the corpus of the present work, in the light of their ambiguous nature and the very low probability that many of them belonged to speeches. It is moreover worth remembering that most of these sentences are attributed to other authors by different sources.[298] The nature and the origin of these sayings and the collections that contain them is not treated here, as this would go beyond the scope of

[298] See critical editions of the sources.

the present work. The sentences contained in *gnomologia* and *florilegia* can be, however, classified as follows.

Anaximenes (8): Stob. *Flor.* 2.8.17; 3.38.44-5; 4.25.37; 33.21-2a; 50c.91 (moral *sententiae*); 1 witty sentence in *Gnom. Vat.* 61.
Demetrius of Phalerum (29):[299] Stob. *Flor.* 3. 12. 18 (a *sententia* on liars); 7 *sententiae* in Diog. Laert. 5.82 (maxims on moral and, politics, witty phrases, sometimes a generic Athenian context is given); Arethas, *Ep.* 39 (a moral maxim on decision making); *Gnom. Vat.* 253-60 (on moral and politics; 255 being a shorter variant of one of the sentences in Diogenes); 2 witty phrases in the *Florilegium Monacense* 188, 78-79 Meineke. More of Demetrius' sayings are to be found in Polyb. 29.21.10; Strab. 3.2.9, Plut. *Cons. ad Apoll.* 6.104b, Ath. 5.177e-f, 6.233e, Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 2.6, [Plut.] *Regum.* 30-31.[300] The *Chreiai* attributed to him by Diogenes Laertius (5.81) can also be ascribed to this category.
Hegesias (43): 2 witty phrases in *Gnom. Vat.* 307-8.
Pytheas (72): one moral sentence in Stob. Flor. 4.41.55, and one witty reply in [Plut.] *Regum.* 49
Theocritus of Chios (76): Stob. *Flor.* 3.36.20, *Gnom. Vat.* 338, negative judgment on the redundant style of Anaximenes.[301] See Franco (1991) for a commentary on his *sententiae*.
Theopompus (79): Stob. *Flor.* 3.16.16, a moral *sententia*.
Xenocles of Adramyttium (83): *Florilegium Monacense* 220 Meineke, a moral *sententia* on poverty.

On the whole, this is interesting material, which, although it does not belong in an edition of fragments of oratory, adds elements to the history of the fortune of Hellenistic orators and their biographical tradition, and will surely deserve deeper investigation.

4. Rutilius Lupus

Publius Rutilius Lupus,[302] a Roman rhetorician whose activity can be placed in the age of Tiberius, is one of the most important sources for fragments of Hellenistic orators: he quotes 24 fragments attributed to 11 orators (Charisius F1-3, Cleochares F1-2, Daphnis F1-2, Demetrius F1-2, Demochares F1-2, Hegesias F1-5, Isidorus F1, Myron F-13, Pytheas F1-2, Sosicrates F1-2, Stratocles F1-2). His treatise *De Figuris sententiarum et elocutionis* (*schemata dianoeas et lexeon*)[303] is a translation, adaptation and reduction (from 4 books to 1, according to Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.102, although we have two

[299] These and more of Demetrius' *sententiae* are edited and commented on in the section 'Sayings' in Fortenbaugh-Schtrümpf (2000). One of the fragments quoted by Rutilius (1.1, here edited) is considered a *sententia* by the editors.
[300] To these, we should add the *Sententiae septem sapientium*, collected by Demetrius, according to Stobaeus (*Flor.* 3.1.172) and among which Demetrius himself is mentioned as wise man by Stobaeus.
[301] See Parmeggiani (2013) on these two fragments and a similar one in Ath. 1.21c.
[302] About Rutilius see Barabino (1967), who provides a thematic commentary; Brooks (1970), who provides a line-by-line commentary; for minor points see Leff (1973); Martin (1948); Odgers (1935); and finally, the majestic commentary by Ruhnken (1768). See also Welsh (1972), reviewing Brooks (1970).
[303] This treatise, alongside Numenius' one (2nd AD), is at the basis of the 4th-5th-century rhetorical poem *Carmen De Figuris*.

books in the whole manuscript tradition of Rutilius)[304] of a Greek equivalent (περὶ σχημάτων), written by Gorgias of Athens, a 1st century BC rhetorician, tutor of Cicero the younger in 44 BC.[305] He must have been a declaimer as well (41), considering a mention in Sen. *Controv*. 1. 4. 7, where the fragment quoted has been lost in transmission. The total lack of references to Asianism and Atticism leads one to believe that Gorgias was not particularly interested in classifying the people he quoted from.

Rutilius himself (2.2) calls Gorgias his source, and at 1.5 he also replaces Gorgias' Greek example with a Latin one, Proculeius, who, being a friend of Augustus, allows us to set a *terminus post quem* for Rutilius' activity, which probably began at the end of the Augustan empire and flourished under Tiberius. In Quintilian's list of authors of treatises *de figuris* (9.3.86), Rutilius is placed after Dionysius and Caecilius and before Cornificius and Visellius. Quintilian also mentions him at 9.2.102, when he says he was a contemporary of Gorgias and earlier than Celsus, which does not add much to the reconstruction of his life's chronology.

As said, the two books we have are an epitomised version of Gorgias' treatise. They seem also unfinished and have *lacunae*, as the whole section of *figurae sententiarum* (*schemata dianoeas*) is missing, therefore it is possible that they are themselves an epitomised or incomplete version of an intermediate longer version by Rutilius. The place to be assigned to the missing *figurae sententiarum* has been the object of debate.[306] A summary of the content is in Quintilian (9.2.101-107) that lists fourteen *schemata* by Rutilius. It has been conjectured, adding the other common *figurae sententiarum* to these fourteen, that the missing part must have included around 40 figures, meaning they would have covered two books, like the *figurae verborum*, which are in total 41 (and presented in an unsystematic order).[307]

As seen for the case of Proculeius, Rutilius sometimes replaced the original Gorgian examples with Latin quotations (see 1.2, where there is a line by Ennius) when it was impossible to render into Latin the Greek rhetorical figure quoted by Gorgias. Besides orators (Lysias, Isocrates, Lycurgus, Demosthenes, Dinarchus, and Hyperides,[308] and from our eleven Hellenistic orators), we have quotations from Greek historians (Aristobulus and Lycon), and philosophers (Plato, Aristotle, and Theophrastus), who, however, do not count more than one example each.

One may question whether Latin translations should be considered actual quotations and proper fragments, despite what features of the style might have been lost in translation, and therefore want to apply this reasoning to Rutilius: should his quotations be excluded by an edition of fragments of Hellenistic orators, because his translations might have been made remembering the text by heart? As for the general question, we should safely consider translations as real quotations,

[304] The text 'unum' in Quintilian, is probably to be emended in 'usus' (*quattuor libros in usum suum trastulit*).
[305] Cic. *Fam*. 16.21.6; Plut. *Cic.* 24.6. See Münscher (1912).
[306] On these problems, see among others Birt (1913), 324; Brooks (1970), xii-xiv; Dzialas (1860), 35; Draheim (1974), 3; Krieg (1896), 3; Münscher (1912), 1606. A good overview is in Barabino (1967), 10-11.
[307] For a classification of these figures and a commentary on each of them see Barabino (1967), 13-74
[308] On Rutilius' treatment of Attic orators of the canon, see Barabino (1967), 77-133.

for the same principle according to which, for instance, we consider actual Galen the Arabic translations of some of his works. It is standard and common practice to include Latin translations of Greek quotations in editions of fragmentary texts. In the specific case of Rutilius, this criterion is even more valid, as in his treatise there are quotations from extant speeches of Attic orators that can be verified, and the verification confirms that the translation is extremely faithful (especially in the many instances by Demosthenes), rarely altering the original, and not at all made out of a text 'remembered by heart'. When the text is rather a paraphrase, this happens because Rutilius is creating an element of linking between his observations and the actual quotation.[309] It is not absolutely clear if all the examples quoted by Rutilius were already present in Gorgias' treatise, or were added by the Latin rhetorician who had his own editions of the texts (quite unlikely is the possibility that he was using Latin translations circulating in Rome).

A significant and substantial exception in the correspondence of Rutilius' translations to original texts is constituted by most of the quotations of Lysias, where we find alterations and inversions of roles,[310] possibly deriving from different versions of his speeches that Gorgias might have possessed – or even written himself – as teaching tools,[311] or in some cases possibly from Romanised versions. Therefore, it is difficult to say whether Rutilius had read the whole orations he quoted, or he was working on manuals containing selections of relevant (and modified) passages, arranged thematically. Some passages are anonymous: it seems implausible, as Barabino believes, that Rutilius was inventing examples, but it is perhaps more plausible that Rutilius (or Gorgias) found them in thematic anthologies and manuals without attribution (either because a name was omitted in the book, or because they belonged to models of rhetorical exercises by anonymous teachers). In only one case, the second quotation at I.11, I admit the hypothesis that the fragment belonged to the aforementioned Hegesias. The fragment is quoted within the discussion of the same figure as the previous one attributed to Hegesias; this also happens for consecutive quotations of Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lysias, at and I.16-17; I.19; II.9, and II.8 respectively, referring to the same rhetorical figure (while other anonymous examples are usually given alone). I, therefore, chose to edit in this work, although with hesitation, because of the lack of explicit linking elements like the phrase 'item eiusdem' (which, however, we do not find for Demosthenes' consecutive fragments at I.16), and the presence of the adversative 'sed'. Even if not by Hegesias, this quotation will not look misplaced in the present work, since, of all the anonymous quotations in Rutilius, it is the only one that patently comes from a speech or a rhetorical exercise (a forensic speech, real or fictitious, given the invocation to the

[309] On these problems, see Barabino (1967), 75-133 with a full list of commented examples. For some instances, Barabino attempts a back-translation in order to reconstruct Demosthenic expressions.

[310] Barabino (1967), 94-115.

[311] It is not unusual for Greek rhetoricians to manipulate texts for teaching purposes. See, for instances, the many versions of frr.18 Burtt (= 27-28 Jensen) of Hyperides' speech *Against Aristogeiton*, quoted by several rhetoricians (including Rutilius).

judges), while others, mostly *sententiae*, could fairly be taken from historians or philosophers as well.[312]

Finally, adaptations of words defining Greek institutions in Latin terms are interesting to notice: at 1.17, for instance, Rutilius translates as *Quirites* what must have been ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι in the lost Demosthenic original.[313] Some minor variants may depend on the different edition Rutilius was using (as stated, whether in full or – most likely – in an anthology form) and on the influence of the Ciceronian theory of translation, 'non verbum pro verbo [...] sed genus omne verborum vimque'.[314]

On the whole, it is interesting to notice that Gorgias, through Rutilius, might report an earlier view than the one that led to the canonisation of the ten orators,[315] considering that we have so many fragments from Hellenistic orators, and no fragments at all for four of the orators of the canon (Antiphon, Isaeus, Andocides, Aeschines). The main view, which established a canon (perhaps beginning from Caecilius' treatise *On the Style of the Ten Orators*), ended up influencing negatively the transmission of non-canonical later orators, already considered degenerate by Dionysius. This process of disappearance of non-canonical oratory from the textual tradition must have been, however, gradual, if Harpocration, in the 2nd century AD, though writing a *Lexicon of the Ten Orators*, still quoted several examples of Attic orators outside the canon (such as Philinus, quoted verbatim three times, see fragments).

5. The Elder Seneca

Another fundamental source for fragments of Hellenistic orators are the Elder Seneca's *Declamations*, divided into ten books of *controversiae* and one of *suasoriae*, both internally structured, after Seneca gives the topic at the beginning, into *sententiae*, the orators' witty sentences, *divisiones*, i.e. the way arguments were structured, and *colores*, the strategies employed by orators to win. Among the many Latin declaimers quoted in the Elder Seneca's *Declamations*, there are a number of Greek declaimers.[316] Considering the somehow 'autobiographical' (rather than technical) nature of Seneca's work, one should not be surprised if the Greek rhetors included in Seneca's selection were mainly teachers of rhetoric he might have encountered and listened to personally when they taught in Rome (as it is very unlikely that Seneca travelled to meet them), as stated by Seneca himself

[312] 2.3, in the second person singular, containing a moral judgment about age; 2.5, a sentence about virtue and pleasure; 2.6, a moral sentence about greediness, in verse; 2.13, a moral sentence about dealing with adversities; 2.14, a political judgement about the laws; 2.15, a moral statement about wealth, poverty, and good measure, and a second one about benefits and damages, and their consequences. They all seem very similar to the sentences contained in *gnomologia*.

[313] Stephanus' emendation into *Athenienses* is groundless, as it would alter Rutilius' intentions as a translator and rhetorician. Moreover, in *Rhet.Her*. 2.38, we find the addressing formula 'quirites' in an anonymous quotation that has been identified as Greek thanks to a parallel with Herodian (Walz *Rhet.Gr*. 8.603).

[314] Cic. *De opt. gen. or*. 14.

[315] On the canon and its origins, see Douglas (1956); Smith (1995); Worthington (1994).

[316] See Bornecque (1902), including a still unsurpassed comprehensive catalogue of biographies, listed alphabetically (142-201). See also Buschmann (1878).

(*Contov*. 1.*Pr*.1), and more rarely authors of *sententiae* and rhetorical exercises he read in manuals.[317] It is worth noting that Greek declaimers' quotations[318] are usually placed at the end of the declamation (for both *controversiae* and *suasoriae*), after the *colores*.

Francesco Citti[319] has studied Greek declamations in Seneca, and has attempted a thematic classification of them, and an analysis of Seneca's reception of their style. He also compiled an extremely useful table containing all names of Greek declaimers listed alphabetically, and, for each, we are given Seneca's *testimonia*, fragments, and quotations lost in translation; it includes 34 orators (with the unexplained omission of Apollonius Graecus), plus Furius Saturninus, a Latin orator to whom Seneca attributes a Greek *sententia* – which gives the total number of 15 testimonia and 102 fragments[320] (101 counted by Citti, plus the forgotten one attributed to Apollonius), plus 26 fragments lost in transmission.[321]

Starting from this table, and with the precious aid of Bornecque's list of biographies, I have been able to identify who, of these thirty-five declaimers, can be considered a Hellenistic orator. It has been possible to exclude the following orators with certainty, based on their chronology, which places them between the Augustan and the Tiberian age:[322]

Adaeus (Asianic orator, whose acme was between 20 and the 10 BC), **Aemilianus** (active under Tiberius), **Artemon** (a later imitator of Nicetes – therefore Asianic, however liked by Seneca), **Attalus** (a Stoic philosopher, teacher of the younger Seneca), **Craton** (open opponent of Atticism, a friend of Augustus when he was already emperor), **Diocles Charistius** (much liked by Seneca, so probably Atticist, most likely Augustan), **Dionysius** (son of the preceptor of Cicero's sons, therefore Augustan), **Glycon Spiridion** (greatly appreciated by Seneca, mostly active under Tiberius), **Hermagoras** (highly appreciated by Seneca, a pupil of Theodorus of Gadaras, he lived long enough to meet Quintilian), **Hybreas the Younger** (son of the more famous Hellenistic orator Hybreas, 46), **Menestratus** (born around 25 BC, according to Bornecque), **Nicetes** (though active in 33 BC according to Jerome's *Chronicle* [162.16-19 Helm] – very often extremely unreliable – he was mostly active

[317] On this problem see Calboli (2003), 78-87; Fairweather (1981), 56; Fairweather (1984), 530; n. 69, as regards the lack of Greek in Seneca's education. See also Russell (1983), 3, stating, on the contrary, that Seneca was aware of his omissions. More broadly, see also Berti (2007), and Blass (1865). An interesting analysis of memory, oblivion, and written sources in Seneca's *Declamations* is in Santorelli (2019).

[318] Quotations are absent for books 3-6 and 8, which only survived through a family of manuscripts in which quotations are deleted. See Winterbottom (1974) xix, xxviii; and Winterbottom (1983), 356.

[319] Citti (2007).

[320] The text, written in capital and in *scriptio continua* is desperately corrupt (see apparatus of edited fragments), due to the ignorance of the Greek alphabet by western scribes, who 'draw' the Greek mixing capitals and minuscules.

[321] See, in particular, Controv. 1.4, where all Greek passages (most of them by Hellenistic orators, such as Damas, Gorgias, and Hybreas, and Nicetes are omitted.

[322] Detailed biographical information, with sources, for each orator, can be found in Bornecque (1902), 142-201.

in the age of Tiberius, and there is evidence that Seneca himself heard him), **Sabinus Claudius** (from the Augustan age, not to be confused with Sextus Claudius, Antony's teacher).

A second group of Greek declaimers which will not be included in the present work is made up of those orators who are only mentioned in Seneca, and are therefore not datable, or that, even when mentioned elsewhere cannot be dated with certainty. Considering that most of the declaimers he quotes are Imperial, and the probability of Seneca quoting declamations he directly listened to rather than older rhetors quoted in rhetorical handbooks, it would be farfetched to assume that all isolated rhetors in Seneca can be Hellenistic. Their names are: **Agroitas of Marseille** (probably Asianic), **Barbarus** (defined vulgar), **Dorion**, **Euctemon**, **Glaucippus of Cappadocia**, **Grandaus** (Asianic), **Metrodorus** (not to be identified with the homonym from Scepsis, 60), **Miltiades**, **Nicocrates**, **Pammenes**, **Pausanias.** To these names, an anonymous rhetorician is to be added (*Contr.* 7.1.25).

Thus, this selection leaves us with the following names of late Hellenistic orators (all from the 1st century BC): Aeschines of Miletus (1, F1), Apollonius Graecus, perhaps Apollonius of Alabanda (11, F2?), Damas (or Damascus) Scombrus (27, F1-4), Dionysius of Pergamon or Atticus (36, with no direct quotations from declamations), Gorgias (41, F1-2, lost), Hybreas (46, F4-8, F10-11, plus F9 lost), Lesbocles (50, F1), Plution (68, F1), and Potamon (71, F1 lost).

6. Papyri

The 13 papyri included in the selection of the present work are taken from a longer list containing 23 papyri compiled by Christos Kremmydas in 2013, and included in his book chapter entitled *Hellenistic Oratory and the Evidence of Rhetorical Exercises*.[323] This list is, however, too inclusive and marred by a series of inaccuracies and *naïvetés*. I have, therefore, decided to leave out of the selections nine papyri (yet still interesting for our discourse), for the following reasons:

P.Köln 1.9 = **P.Colon. inv.3327 (MP3 2505.1; LDAB 2476):**[324] a rhetorical exercise full of expressions that find parallels in Isocrates, which dates, however, to the late 1st century AD, if not early 2nd century. Despite being quite a good copy, antedating it to the Hellenistic age is not an obvious choice.

P.Schub. 33 = **P.Berl. inv 11492** + **BKT 9.141** =**P.Berl. inv.21237 (MP3 2514; LDAB 4421):** an alleged lawcourt speech, to be dated between the end of the 1st and the 2nd century AD.

P.Lit.Lond. 138 = **Brit.Libr. inv.256 (MP3 2515; LDAB 4325):** a collection of *progymnasmata* from the early 1st century AD (see more above). Although papyri from the early 1st century AD are usually included in our selection, this case must be excluded because it is preserved together with

[323] Kremmydas (2013).

[324] Kramer-Hübner (1976).

some dating documents, and most importantly, thanks to marginal annotations, has been identified as an authorial copy; therefore the text is not to be considered older than its materials.

P.Hamb. 133 =inv.16r (MP3 2520; LDAB 4459): a legal speech against a certain Zoilus, to be dated between the 1st and the 2nd century AD.

P.Bingen 3 = P.Med. 71.86f (MP3 2531.01; LDAB 7984): identified as a praise of Augustus by Kremmydas (based on the mention of Σεβαστός, I assume), but actually either a passage by Diothogenes Pithagoricus,[325] or a medical receipt.[326] It is a very small papyrus, to be dated back to the 1st century AD.

P.Köln 1.10 = inv.4701r + 6.249 = inv.4722r (MP2 2531.1;[327] LDAB 428): a funeral oration for Marcus Vipsanius Agrippa, therefore necessarily later than 12 BC. It does not really give information on declamation, but rather on educational practices in general, as it seems to be a translation from an original Latin.

P.Freib. 3. = inv.9 (MP3 2535; LDAB 6903): a piece of rhetorical theory (see 'Teaching Rhetoric') from the 2nd-1st century BC.

P.Freib. 6 =inv.35 I (MP3 2536; LDAB 6854): a fragment from the 2nd-1st century BC, that however contains such a short text ('As…Remembers the first, the second, and the third, big… sum of money') that calling it oratory or rhetoric would be too farfetched.

PSI Laur. inv.22012 = (MP3 2557, LDAB 6852): wrongly considered by Kremmydas as a rhetorical *techne*, this 2nd century BC papyrus contains a text whose genre is uncertain. The *editor princeps*[328] calls it 'frammento allocutorio'. It seems a speech taken from a novel (as it mentions Dionysius and Aphrodite) rather than a piece of oratory.

P.Vindob. inv. G.29820 (MP3 2559.2; LDAB 25024): a fragment from the 1st century AD that presents a very uncertain text. The two main editors and commentators, Leone[329] and Sijpesteijn[330] choose different readings that, in some cases, vary the interpretation substantially – Leone, in fact, considers this a fragment of oratory, while Sijpesteijn rather sees it as a document. The words τη πατριδι (l. 14), δικαιω (l. 19) and τον κληρον (l. 22) are used indistinctively by the two editors to corroborate one or the other hypothesis.

As evident from this prospectus, the papyri left out from the selection are those that date back to a period later than the early 1st century AD[331] (with the sole exception of MPER III. 29 = P.Vindob.

[325] Andorlini-Luiselli (2001).
[326] Daris (2000).
[327] Wrongly 2531.2 in Kremmydas (2013).
[328] Gallavotti (1939).
[329] Leone (1978).
[330] Sijpesteijn (1979).
[331] A selection of rhetorical papyri from the late 1st and/or early 2nd century AD would go far beyond the one given by Kremmydas, as it would include more papyri such as P.Oxy. 3.44 (MP3 2545; LDAB 2949), P.Palau.Rib.Lit. 25 (MP3 2548.02; LDAB 4548), P.Aberdeen 117 (MP3 2784; LDAB 4261), P.Aberdeen 118 (MP3 2533; LDAB 4542), P.Harris 1.14 (MP3 2249; LDAB 4276), P.Harris 1.19 (MP2 2634; LDAB 4430), PSI 2.54 (MP3 2553; LDAB 4447), P.Laur. inv.III/283 B (MP3

inv. G 26747, that could be from the second half of the century, but being written in a scruffy student's handwriting, is most likely a copy of an earlier text); those containing rhetorical theory; those that can be dated precisely after 31 BC (such as P.Lit. Lond. 138 and Agrippa's funeral oration); those patently belonging to other genres;[332] and finally those too short to be certainly attributed to a genre.[333] An important oversight in Kremmydas' list regards PSI inv. 22012, listed as rhetorical *techne*, but actually a political speech.

The 13 edited pieces are, therefore, papyri from the 3rd century BC to the 1st century AD for which a rhetorical and oratorical content is clearly identifiable. For some, a doubt remains on whether they were rhetorical speeches or rather embedded orations in history. Since, by contrast with speeches embedded in historiography excluded by the corpus of the edition, for these cases it is difficult to provide a certain answer about their genre, it will still be worth commenting on their text. I have personally inspected P.Hib. 1.15, P.Oxy. 2.126, P.Petrie 1.10, P.Petrie. inv.F98; I worked on high definition digital reproductions for P.Yale 2.105, P.Schub.32, MPER III.29, P.Köln 7.288, P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123, P.Heid. Siegmann 192, P. Heid. Siegmann 193; P.Berol. 9781 was, unfortunately, under restoration, and I could only obtain an old black and white picture. I could not obtain new scans of PSI Laur. inv.22013, therefore I worked on older pictures for it as well.

2539.01; LDAB 4451), all classified as oratory. Worthy of particular mention is also the so called Demades Papyrus (P.Berol. inv. 13045 = BKT VII 13-31), from the 2nd century BC, containing a philosophical speech on the forms of government, followed by a rhetorical dialogue between Demades and Dinarchus, most likely to be attributed to a school environment. A new edition with commentary is expected in 2022 by Davide Amendola for De Gruyter.

[332] If PSI Laur.inv. 22012 is to be considered rhetorical, so should be, for instance, P.Oxy. 6.868 (MP3 2630; LDAB 4263), from the 1st century BC, somewhat between oratory and novel, but not mentioned by Kremmydas.

[333] If one wants to include highly uncertain fragments such as P.Freib. 6 and P.Vindob. inv.G.29820, one should add P.Hib 2.229 (MP3 2843; LDAB 6980), from the 3rd century BC, containing 7 fragments belonging to 2 columns, and, based on the few isolated words it contains, be identified as oratorical or philosophical prose. It seems to me rather a dramatic narration of some episode of the *Odyssey*, as Odysseus, walls, enemies, and barbarians are mentioned.

Text and Commentary

Named Orators

(1) Aeschines of Miletus

Biographical note: Aeschines was an orator active in the 1st century BC, a noble man born in Miletus according to Strabo (14.1.7), who also says they were contemporaries. He was dead by 46 BC, since Cicero in the Brutus (*Brut*. 248ff.) says that only Caesar and Marcellus, of the orators in discussion, are still alive, and then (*Brut*. 325) talks about him ('meus aequalis') in the past, when discussing his Asianic style. He says that Aeschines belonged to the kind of Asianic orators who did not distinguish themselves for the presence of witty sentences but for the frequency of words ('aliud autem genus est non tam sententiis frequentatum quam verbis volucre atque incitatum, quali est nunc Asia tota, nec flumine solum orationis sed etiam exornato et faceto genere verborum'). We know from Strabo about Aeschines' hostility to Pompey, a strong opposition that led to the orator's exile because he spoke too boldly against Pompey (παρρησιασάμενος πέρα τοῦ μετρίου πρὸς Πομπήιον Μάγνον). This piece of information means that Aeschines was a politically active orator and not just a declaimer, as one could assume from the elder Seneca (*Controv*. 1.8. 11; 16) who is the only direct source for Aeschines' works. Seneca never employs the adjective 'Milesius' to define Aeschines, but the identification seems still solid (although denied by Blass [1865], 64, n.4). Aeschines is also probably to be identified with the one mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (2.64), called πολιτικὸς συγγραφεύς in the list of famous people named Aeschines, which would imply that Aeschines of Miletus also wrote some treatise on politics. There is also a rhetorician called Aeschines, named as the author of an epigram in the *Anth.Pal.* 6.330, as noted by Reitzenstein (addendum to Brzoska, col. 1063: 'Vielleicht von ihm ist das Epigramm Anth. Pal. 6.330').

On Aeschines see: Blass (1865), 64; Bornecque (1902), 145; Brzoska (1894a); Janiszewski (2015), 12 (29); Wooten (1972), 31-2.

F1 Sen. *Controv.* 1.8.11

His ergo omissis illi qui amantem patrem induxerant hoc genere egerunt: 'non possum pati, non possum desiderium tui sustinere.' Hoc loco Aeschines ex novis declamatoribus, cum diceret: 'non me gloria cupidiorem tui fecit, non omnibus admiranda virtus'; 'confitebor' inquit 'adfectus patris, quos ut quisque volet interpretetur: οὕτως ἂν καὶ δειλὸν ἐφίλουν.' Videbatur hic, dum indulgentiam exprimit, non servasse dignitatem patris.

omissis : missis **V**, *corr*. **V**^{2} | induxerant : induxerunt B | desiderium : desiderii **V** | novis *Faber*: bonis **α** | οὕτως : ΟΥΤΑϹ **A** | δειλὸν *Bursian* : ΛΤΙΑΟΝ **AV** : ΤΙΛΟΝ **B** : ἀπαλὸν *Gertz* : ἄτιμον *corr. recentior* **T** | hic : his *Otto*

This fragment belongs to the controversia entitled *Qui ter fortiter fecerit, militia vacet*, and it deals with a father who tries to prevent his son from joining the army for a foruth time, but the son refuses and loses his inheritance (see parallel in Calp. Flacc. 15). Aeschines is here speaking in favour of the father. His argument is the unconditional nature of a father's love for this son: not even the lack of glory or virtue will be able to make this love cease, and the father miss his son less. This theme is found only in the Elder Seneca, and could fall in a broad category of declamation themes on parents' rights (on this topic see Vesley [2003], broadly on fathers and sons in declamation see Rayment [1952] and Lentano [2005]). The tone is overall rather pathetic, and Aeschines uses extremely vivid sentences, such as οὕτως ἂν καὶ δειλὸν ἐφίλουν. It is worth noting the repetition of 'non possum pati' at the beginning of the first quotation, in order to make the statement more dramatic; the following climax ('non gloria…non […] virtus') also contributes to the pathos of the situation. Seneca's judgement of Aeschines' choice to employ this pathetic tone was not positive, as he would this way portray the father (whom he is defending) in an undignified way. This judgment must have been shared by others, as the impersonal 'videbatur' shows.

What stands out about this fragment is that it is not entirely in Greek or in Latin translation, as normally happens for Greek declaimers in the Elder Seneca. This seems therefore to be a Latin translation of Aeschines' original speech, containing a quotation in Greek, perhaps from another author. Probably Seneca, in order to mark a distinction between Aeschines' words and this quotation, decided to leave only the latter in the original language.

F2 Sen. *Controv.* 1.8.16

Aeschines, non ille orator – tunc enim non declamandi studium erat – , sed hic ex declamatoribus novis dixit, cum denuntiaret filio periculum et praesagiis tangi se diceret: ἔστιν τι πατὴρ εἰς υἱοῦ τύχην μαντικώτατον.

non ille…sed hic *del. Haase* | studium: stidium **A** | novis Schott. : nobis **α** | periculum : operaculum **A** : opericulum **B** : prericulum **V** | se : si **T** *ante correctionem* | ἔστιν: ECIN **AV** : eTIN **B** | τι : **T A** : TH **V** : ΠΗ **T**| πατὴρ εἰς υἱοῦ τύχην *Gertz* : HATHP IC TIOY TYXHM **α** | υἱοῦ : TOY **CVa** | μαντικώτατον : ΜΛΝΤΙΚWΤΑΤΟΝ **α** : ΜΝΗΤΙΚWΤΑΤΟΝ **A** | τι πατὴρ εἰς υἱοῦ τύχην : ἡ πατρός που ψυχὴ *coni. Kiessling*

This fragment belongs to the same *controversia* as F1. Here Aeschines, impersonating the father, tries to convince the son not to go to war by saying that a father is the only one who can predict future bad luck for a child. For more on father and sons in declamations see F1.

(2) Aeschylus of Cnidus

Biographical note: Not much is known about the 1st century BC orator Aeschylus of Cnidus, listed by Cicero alongside Aeschines of Miletus as an example of the 'second type of Asian style' (*Brut.* 325). We also know Cicero met him in 78 BC, when they travelled together in Asia Minor (*Brut.* 316).
On Aeschylus see: Brzoska (1894b); Janiszewski (2015), 12 (30); Wooten (1972), 32.

(3) Agelaus of Naupactus

Biographical note: The only source for Agelaus of Naupactus is Polybius (4.16), where Agelaus is said to have negotiated an alliance between the Illyrians and Aetolians (he was, therefore, a politician and diplomat). Polybius (5.103-4) reports the speech that Agelaus pronounced before Philip V of Macedonia in the Spring of 217 BC, meant to persuade him to end the social war that had been carried on against the Aetolians since 220. This speech (or at least the re-elaboration that Polybius provides of it) is particularly interesting because it acknowledges Rome as the real enemy of the Greeks. Rome is described with the very effective metaphor for the 'clouds gathering in the West to settle upon Greece': ἀπὸ τῆς ἑσπέρας νέφη προσδέξηται τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα τόποις ἐπιστῆναι, according to Wooten to be seen in parallel with Demosthenes (9.33), where Philip is compared to a hailstorm. On the nature of embedded speeches in Polybius' *Histories* see pp. 61-5.
On Agelaus see: Wilcken (1894); Wooten (1972), 15-16.
On Agelaus' speech, see: Champion (1997); Mørkholm (1967).

(4) Alexander the Aetolian

Biographical note: Alexander, called ὁ Ἴσιος, was an Aetolian orator who lived between the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd century BC. Most of the information that we have about him is contained in Polybius' *Histories*. Alexander was the leader of the Aetolian league and the richest man in Greece (13.1; 21.26); for this reason, Wooten (1972), 20 assumes he was politically conservative. He was against the constitutional reforms made by Dorimachus and Scopas in 205 (Polyb. 13.1): the legislators proved themselves to be inadequate, showing that Alexander's concerns were after all not simply the result of his alleged conservative views. He was fiercely anti-Macedonian and opposed Philip V. As ambassador, he spoke against him in 197 at the congress of Nicaea; of this speech, Polybius (18.3) quotes (or rather paraphrases) a long extract in which he uses the example of Alexander against Darius to prove that the Macedonians have always been hungry for new conquests.

After this, he was ambassador in Rome (Polyb. 18.10). Polybius (18.36) also quotes an extract from his speech at the conference in Tempe, after Philip's defeat at Cynoscephalae in 197, where he

proposed that Philip should be ejected from his throne. On this occasion, he dissuaded everyone from staying friends with Philip (Polyb. 18.19; App. *Mac.* 7.1) From Livy (34.23) we know that he was also an ambassador to the Romans in 195, when in Corinth, discussing the war against Sparta, he spoke against the Athenians and advised Flamininus to lead his legions back to Italy (of this speech Livy also provides an extract). He was again ambassador in Rome in 188 (Polyb. 21.25), during the Aetolian war (no more about the content of his embassy is known). The last piece of information about his life is again in Polybius (21.26) where we read that in 189 the Aetolians sent envoys to Athens and Rhodes, after Antiochus was defeated by the Romans, and Alexander was in charge of an embassy seeking peace. He and the other ambassadors were imprisoned by the Epeirotes and asked for a ransom. Alexander refused to pay it and was kept prisoner, but was in the end liberated by the Romans. In this passage we read that he was an old man at the time, which allows us to conjecture he was born around the mid 3rd century BC.

There is an Alexander Καλυδώνιος mentioned in inscriptions (*IG*IX-1^2 1.30-31), who was an Aetolian general in 196/5, and is probably to be identified with Alexander Isius. According to Livy (32.33), Alexander's eloquence was highly esteemed, and Polybius (18.3) says he was a good speaker. At 18.4, Polybius also adds that at the end of Alexander's arangue, Philip said that the speech was Αἰτωλικὸν [...] καὶ θεατρικὸν. According to Walbank (1957-79), 2, 556, this may be a faithful version of Philip's views on Alexander's oratory, rather than 'mere Polybian' abuse. The adjective "theatrical" must refer to the powerful and dramatic delivery of the speech, while Αἰτωλικὸν probably reflects Philips's view of Aetolian rhetoric as violent and aggressive.
On Alexander the Aetolian, see: Wilcken (1894b); Wooten (1972), 19-20.

(5) Alexander of Ephesus

Biographical note: for the life and activity of Alexander of Ephesus we have two sources: Strabo (14.1.25), who tells us that his surname was Lynchnus, that he was an orator, politician (active in Ephesus) and historian, that he wrote poems on heavenly bodies and on geography (fragments are in Sieder [2017], 54-65), and that he was active between the times of Apelles and Strabo's time. His surname Λύχνος (lamp), according to Meineke (1843), 371 n.1, and Radt on Strab. 14.642C 8ff, could have been related to the idea of hard work made overnight being a sign of diligence (see Pytheas' F3a-b). The second source is Aurelius Victor (*Origo Gentis Romanae* 9), who says Alexander wrote a *Marsic War* (but this is considered spurious). Cicero (*Att.* 20.22) might be referring to him when he mentions a bad poet named like him. These pieces of information do not allow us to date his life and activity very precisely, and all we can say is that he lived between the 3rd and 2nd century BC.
On Alexander see: Janiszewski (2015), 18-19; Knaack (1894); Meinecke (1843), 371-7; Wooten (1972), 26-7.

(6) Alcimus

Biographical note: an orator called Alcimus is mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (2.114) as the first orator of all Greece (καὶ τὸν ῥητορικὸν Ἄλκιμον, ἁπάντων πρωτεύοντα τῶν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι ῥητόρων): a similar statement by Dionysius of Halicarnassus is in *Pomp*. 1.5, where he says that the first (πρωτεύοντας) among all orators and philosophers are Isocrates, Plato and Demosthenes. Alcimus should be dated to the 3rd century, considering that Diogenes Laertius lists him as a contemporary of Stilpo (a philosopher from Megara, contemporary of Theophrastus), who is said to have won him over. The identification with another Alcimus mentioned by Diogenes (3.9-17) is unclear; this Alcimus is said to have written four works (seemingly dialogues) dedicated or addressed to Amyntas (πρὸς Ἀμύνταν), of which some rather lengthy fragments are quoted by Diogenes as pointing out the assistance received by Plato from Epicharmus. This latter Alcimus is more likely to be identified with the homonymous Sicilian historian (*FGrHist* 560) author of Σικελικά (Ath. 7.322a An identification is, however, not to be ruled out entirely. Jacoby indeed includes the orator Alcimus as *FGrHist* 560 T1.

On Alcimus see *FGrHist/BNJ* 560; Schwartz (1894a)

(7) Amphicrates of Athens

Biographical note: Two ancient sources give us information about an orator from Athens called Amphicrates. Plutarch (*Luc.*22) and [Longinus] *Subl.* 2.2. In Plutarch, we read that he left Athens in 88 when Sulla took it, and fled to Tigranes to Seleucia on the Tigris, which allows us to date his life and activity between the 2nd and the 1st. century BC. Plutarch also informs us that he was initially close to Cleopatra, wife of Tigranes, then he became unpopular at the court and therefore let himself starve to death. According to Plutarch (*Luc.* 22.6) he refused to teach rhetoric (if σοφιστεύειν actually means 'teaching' in that context) in Seleucia because 'that dish was too small for a dolphin', implying that Seleucia was not well suited for that kind of sophisticated activity. It is again from Plutarch that we know that Amphicrates was a declaimer, since he was asked to speak publicly in the court and was against the idea. The second source, Ps.-Longinus, gives more information about his rhetorical abilities: he is compared to Hegesias, so was perhaps akin to Asianic in style. We do not have fragments of his speeches, but of his work περὶ Ἐνδόξων Ἀνδρῶν (Ath. 13.576c; Diog. Laert. 2.101), probably dealing with Athenian history (we find anecdotes about Themistocles and Theodorus).

On Amphicrates see: Schwartz (1894b); Susemihl (1891-1892), II, 372; Wooten (1972), 21.

(8) Anaximenes of Lampsacus

Biographical note: one of the main literary and historical figures of the late 4th century BC, Anaximenes of Lampsacus was a famous orator, historian (*FGrHist* / *BNJ* 72), and rhetorician, active at the Macedonian court, and particularly well known for having been Alexander's teacher and for having accompanied him during his campaigns – after which he wrote a *History of Alexander*. He studied with Diogenes the Cynic and Zoilus. He was highly regarded at the Macedonian court and was an extremely versatile author: Dionysius of Halircarnassus (*De. Is.*19) says he wrote history, treatises on poetry, rhetorical handbooks, and political debates and speeches. Considering the immense amount of his production, a biography that takes into account his activity as a whole would be beyond the scope of this work, therefore what follows is a short account of his rhetorical and oratorical activity.

As regards his oratorical activity, we know he wrote a speech *Against Phryne* (according to Diodorus Periegetes quoted by Ath. 13.591e, and Hermippus quoted by Harp. ε 173), a *hetaira*, who had had relationships with Hyperides (who according to Athenaeus wrote a speech on her behalf) and Praxiteles. He also appears to have written a *Helen* (Schol. Isoc. *Hyp.Or.*10), to which Isocrates' speech, which criticises the author of the encomium of Helen for having written more a defence than an encomium (Isoc. 10.14), should have been a reply. In the scholium, we read that Machaon stated Isocrates wrote in reply to Anaximenes rather than Gorgias. Two interpretations are possible: Anaximenes' work could have been in the style Gorgias' *Helen*, and it was indeed about him that Isocrates was speaking at 10.14; or, as Blass thought ([1898²], 66) the information in the scholium is wrong. Jebb's idea that Anaximenes was the real author of Gorgias' *Helen* (Jebb [1893], 98. n.3) sounds merely speculative.

What is extant of his rhetorical production, namely the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, generally attributed to him, constitutes the only surviving pre-Aristotelian rhetorical handbook (see Introduction). Finally, it is generally agreed that the orations 11 and 12 of the Demosthenic corpus, namely the *Reply to the Letter of Philip* and the *Letter of Philip* are taken from his *History of Philip*. On this topic see among others: Canfora (2006); Hammond-Griffith (1979) 714-16; Hammond (1995); Wüst (1938), 127-34.

On Anaximenes see: Brzoska (1894c); Brunt (1976); *FGrHist* 72; Jacoby (1923); Körte, (1906).

On the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* see: Chiron (2002); Kennedy (2007), 270; Kroll (1940), 1052-4; López Cruces *et al.* (2005); Mirhady (2011), 450-1; Patillon (1997); Wendland (1905).

(9) Antipater

Biographical note: entry θ 151 in the *Suda* contains information about a certain Antipater, a contemporary of the famous Theodorus of Gadara (see Introduction), with whom he stood in competition in sophistic contests. Antipater is also mentioned in the 18th speech of Dio Chrysostom, but the

only two surviving witnesses are clearly independent, for Chrysostom simply lists him among other orators and recommends his style to his students (indicating that his orations were still available at the time). Just a few lines before, Chrysostom referred to these orators as τῶν νεωτέρων καὶ ὀλίγον πρὸ ἡμῶν, which could easily confirm a similar age for Antipater and Theodorus. The witness in the Suda is extremely important because it is the only source allowing us to date Antipater to the 1st century BC thanks to the mention of Theodorus of Gadara, apparently his contemporary. Some (Brzoska [1894] and Cohoon [1939], 222, n.4) have identified this figure with Antipater of Damascus, father of the better-known Nicolaus of Damascus. Antipater of Damascus died in 43 BC, and would be therefore compatible with the information contained in our sources. However, no other evidence exists to identify the two personalities and no oratorical, or rhetorical activity is attested for Antipater of Damascus, so the identification remains doubtful.
On Antipater see: Brzoska (1894d); Janiszewski (2015), 34.

(10) Apollonides of Sicyon

Biographical note: Apollonides of Sicyon was active in the 2nd century BC, and we have information about him thanks to Polybius, who reports two of his speeches. At 22.11, we read his words, as leader of the Achaean league, against the idea of accepting a large sum of money from Eumenes II of Pergamon in 186 BC, fearing that they would become subject to the king. The second speech (28.6) dates back to 169 BC and Apollonides, as ambassador of the Achaean league, spoke against an alliance with Rome to oppose Perseus, though advising against an open opposition to the Romans.
On Apollonides, see: Wilcken (1895); Wooten (1972) 16-17.

(11) Apollonius ὁ μαλακός

Biographical note: Apollonius, nicknamed ὁ μαλακός was born in Alabanda (like the homonymous Molon, with whom he also shared the same teacher, Menecles, Cic. *Brut*. 325), around the middle of the 2nd century BC (Strab. 14.2.13). We can date his activity thanks to Cicero (*De Or.* 1.75) where he is said to have discussed philosophy with Quintus Mucius Scaevola in Rhodes in 121 BC (Scaevola was praetor in Asia Minor that year), so Apollonius must have moved from Alabanda to Rhodes before that date. About Apollonius, Scaevola, and philosophy, Cicero also says they talked about Panaetius and that Apollonius' attitude towards philosophy was contemptuous. Cicero (*De Or*. 1.126) also gives information about his teaching style, when he says that Apollonius did not take students in whom he did not perceive natural ability and attitude towards rhetoric. Another source about him is *Schol. Vet.* Ap. Rhod., Ἀπολλωνίου βίος, p. 2 (ed. Wendel), where we read that he σοφιστεύει ῥητορικοὺς λόγους, which may mean that he used to teach with rhetorical declamations,

or that his style was "sophistic". About his style, probably full of witty sentences, all we know is in the quotation made by Strabo (14.2.26) where he compared Alabanda to an 'ass laden with panniers of scorpions', referring to the fact that Alabanda is located at the foot of hills joined together in a way that looks like an ass laden with panniers, and to the abundance of scorpions in the city. Seneca (*Controv.* 7.3) mentions an Apollonius Graecus, who could be identified with him.
On Apollonius, see: Schmid (1895); Wooten 1972 (44-5).

F1 Strab. 14.2.26

Ἀλάβανδα δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ μὲν ὑπόκειται λόφοις δυσὶ συγκειμένοις οὕτως ὥστ' ὄψιν παρέχεσθαι κανθηλίου κατεστρωμένου. καὶ δὴ καὶ ὁ μαλακὸς Ἀπολλώνιος σκώπτων τὴν πόλιν εἴς τε ταῦτα καὶ εἰς τὸ τῶν σκορπίων πλῆθος, ἔφη αὐτὴν εἶναι *σκορπίων κανθήλιον κατεστρωμένον*· μεστὴ δ' ἐστὶ καὶ αὕτη καὶ ἡ τῶν Μυλασέων πόλις τῶν θηρίων τούτων καὶ ἡ μεταξὺ πᾶσα ὀρεινή.

κατεστρωμένου **q**: κατεστραμμ- **BCDEF** | καὶ post. *om.* **F** | τὸ *om.* **F** | τῶν *om.* **E** | κατεστρωμένον *Xylanter* : κατεστραμμ- *codd.* | μεστόν *post* κατεστρωμένον *suppl. Herwerden* | Μυλασέων : μυλασσ- **D**^{pc}

We do not know whether this fragment belonged to a speech or not. From the small quotation Strabo makes about the description that Apollonius gave of the city of Alabanda, we can certainly imagine his style was full of witty metaphors and vivid images, consistently with the characteristics of the style of the school of Rhodes to which he belonged.

F2? *Controv.* 7.4.5

<In epilogis vehemens fuit Apollonius Graecus: 'At periculosum est' :> Nihil non, et domi manere et flere'.

In…Graecus *in* α *post* passurum (*3.10*) *leguntur, transp. Kiessling et Müller* | epilogis : ephilogis **V** : nephilogis **AB** | at periculosum *suppl. Weber.* : periculosum est? *Müller* | manere : maneret α

The attribution of this fragment to Apollonius of Alabanda is doubtful (although not entirely excluded by Bornecque [1902], 149), since the good opinion that Seneca seems to express about him, would contradict Seneca's dislike for Asianic tendencies of style. The theme of the *controversia* to which this fragment belongs is the following: 'Liberi parentes alant aut vinciantur. Quidam, cum haberet uxorem et ex ea filium, peregre profectus est. A piratis captus scripsit de redemptione epistulas uxori et filio. Uxor flendo oculos perdidit. Filium euntem ad redemptionem patris alumenta poscit; non remanentem alligari volt'. The harsh conclusion given by Apollonius to this *controversia* evidently aims at diminishing the wife's role, and ironically depicting her as crying at home to be as dangerous as her son's return. To Apollonius' harshness and lack of empathy for the mother, Seneca opposes Latro's gentle attitude towards her in his concluding words. The same topic is found also in

Ps.-Quint. *Inst. Decl.* 16 (with tyrants instead of pirates). This *controversia* falls in the broad category of parents' rights (see Vesley [2003], Rayment [1952], and Lentano [2005], and discussion of Aeschines' F1).

(12) Apollonius Molon

Biographical note: Apollonius Molon was born in Alabanda where he was pupil of Menelces, but studied in Rhodes (see Strab. 14.2.13) with his namesake Apollonius ὁ μαλακός (also from Alabanda and pupil of Menecles [55]), and there he became one of the most important and influential teachers. According to Strabo, it was the older Apollonius who called him ὁ μόλων when he arrived in Rhodes. He was the teacher of rhetoric of many illustrious Roman personalities, such as Cicero, Caesar (Plut. *Cic.* 4.3 Plut. *Caes.* 3.1), and T. Manlius Torquatus (Cic. *Brut.* 245). Although he is said not to have known Latin, he was an ambassador in Rome in 81 (Cic. *Brut.* 307) to defend Rhodes' control on nearby islands (granted by Sulla after the first Mithridatic war) and was the first speaker to address the Senate in Greek with no translation (Val. Max. 2.2.3). After these events, the Caunians revolted against Rhodes and Molon wrote a speech *Against the Caunians*, which Strabo could still read. He also wrote on rhetorical theory (Quint. *Inst.* 3.1.6), history (a pamphlet *Against the Jews* whose fragments are in Euseb., *Praep. evang.* 9.19; Joseph. *Ap.* 2.16-17; 48; 258 = ff. 1-3 *BNJ*), and works on Homeric philology (Porph. *Quaestionum Homericarum*. 1.5).
As regards his style, he was very keen on delivery technique (Cic. *Brut*. 316), and as evident from F2, he liked witty phrases and phraseology, but according to Dion. Halic. *Din*. 8, like the Rhodians, who were imitators of Hyperides, he did not achieve the gracefulness of the Attic orator. Considering the high esteem that Cicero had about him, his Asianism must not have been so extreme.
On Apollonius Molon see Davies (1968); *FGrHist*/BNJ 728; Schmid (1895b); Weissenberger (2006).

F1. Schol. *Nub.* 144c

τούτῳ καὶ ἡ Πυθία δοκεῖ τὸν περὶ τοῦ Σωκράτους χρησμὸν εἰπεῖν·
'σοφὸς Σοφοκλῆς, σοφώτερος δ' Εὐριπίδης·
ἀνδρῶν δὲ πάντων Σωκράτης σοφώτατος'. **RV**
Τοῦτου ᾽Απολλώνιος ὁ Μόλων ἐν τῶι Κατὰ φιλοσόφων ἐψεῦσθαί φησι· τοὺς γὰρ Πυθικοὺς χρησμοὺς ἑξαμέτρους εἶναι καὶ <ἀ>εί. ἔστι δὲ παρὰ κωμικῷ τινι

συγκεχωρίσθαι τῷ χρησμῷ δύναται.

Ὅτι δὲ ἄλλοι διὰ τριμέτρων πλείους εἰσὶ χρησμοί, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ πεζῷ λόγῳ λεχθέντες τῇ Πυθίᾳ, δῆλον. **V**

τούτῳ **Ald.** : τοῦτο **RV** | Πυθία Ald. : -ὼ **RV** | ἀνδρῶν δὲ πάντων **R Ald.** *Sud.* : δ' ἁπάντων *schol. Plat. Ap*. 21a : σοφὸς δ' ἁπάντων **V** | σοφώτατος **Ald.** *schol. Plat.*: σοφώτερος **R** *Sud.* : ὁ θηβαῖος **V** | τοῦτου **V** : τοῦτον τὸν χρησμὸν **Ald.** |

Ἀπολλώνιος : *om.* **V Ald.** | τῷ : τῇ **Ald.** | καὶ ἀεί *Holwerda* : καὶ εἰ **V** : καὶ **Ald** : εἰ καὶ ἔστι παρὰ κωμικῷ τινι ὁ χρησμὸς *Koster* | συγκεχωρίσθαι : πῇ συγκεχωρίσθη *Ald.* | συγκεχωρίσθαι τῷ χρησμῷ δύναται : *intra cruces posuit Holwerda qui in apparatu* εἰ συγκεχρῶσθαι τοῖς νεχροῖς δυνήσεται *dubitanter proposuit* (cf. *Diog. Laert. 7.2 = Sud. αι 76; σ 1313*) | δῆλον : δῆλοντι **V** : *om.* **Ald.**

It is not easy to state whether Molon's work *Against the Philosophers* was a speech or rather a polemical treatise. The content of the fragment is not helpful with regard to this, but the number of earlier examples of speeches against the philosophers (Democharés, *In Defence of Sophocles against Philon*, see Democharés' T1-2 and F3-F4, Theopompus' *Attack on the Teaching of Plato*, see 79), as well as the earliest examples of Isocrates' *Antidosis* and *Against the Sophists*, but also Aristotle's lost *Protreptic*, can be used as evidence in favour of the possibility of this being the only surviving fragment of Molon's oratorical activity. If so, this speech would be the only 1st century BC specimen of the subgenre of oratory against the philosophers. Speeches against the philosophers also became popular during the Second Sophistic (see for instance Luc. *Hermot*. and the lost *Against the Philosophers* by Dio Chrysostom), and were also practised by Christian writers (Tert. *De praescr. haeret.* 7, Lactant. *Div. Inst.* 3; Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 14). A speech against the philosophers is also preserved in the 3rd century AD papyrus P.Oxy. 7.3659. Moreover, it is no surprise that Molon was involved in a polemic against the philosophers if we consider that Cicero (*De or.* 75) said that the school of Rhodes, and Molon in particular, was used to mocking philosophy rather than respecting it, and Diog. Laert (*VS* 3.34) says Molon was hostile to Plato. It is actually not to be excluded that Diogenes' quotation of Molon at 3.34 (which, unlike Jacoby, I chose to edit as a proper fragment, see F2) was part of Molon's speech *Against the Philosophers*.

What is interesting about this fragment is the peculiar fact that Molon seems to be employing some scholarly argument against Socrates. It is impossible to determine if the speech was deploying various scholarly arguments, and there are no parallels for the sort in other speeches. The attribution of the sentences in the scholium is not exactly clear, but what Molon seems to be questioning is the statement by the Pythia saying that Socrates was the wisest: in order to do so, Molon said that the standard metre for oracles was the hexameter, while the oracle in question is in some sort of trimeters, so it must have been distinct from the response. The final statement, probably by the scholiast, about the presence of oracles in trimeters and in prose is consistent with Plutarch (*De Pyth. or.* 19), who said the last oracles were in prose.

F2. Diog. Laert. 3.34

Ἀλλά τοι Μόλων ἀπεχθῶς ἔχων πρὸς αὐτόν, 'οὐ τοῦτο', φησί, 'θαυμαστὸν εἰ Διονύσιος ἐν Κορίνθῳ, ἀλλ' εἰ Πλάτων ἐν Σικελίᾳ'.

μόλον **F**: μολῶν **B**: Τιμολέων *Nauck per litt. ad K. Lehrs missas* (*vid. Dorandi 2013*) | ἔχον **F**

In this quotation, Molon seems to be criticising Plato and his "mission" in Sicily, by saying that rather than exporting philosophy, he was just wasting his time. The reference to Dionysius (the famous tyrant of Syracuse at the time of Plato's stay) being in Corinth is probably made because it was there that the tyrant died in miserable conditions, after the invasion of Sicily by Timoleon (see Diod. Sic. 15.70; Plut. *Tim*. 15). The two situations are associated in order to show that Plato's plan of a government of philosophers had predictably failed to the point that Dionysius, the one who was supposed to be the enlightened tyrant, was forced to die in misery and away from his country. There is a hostile tradition to Plato's Sicilian experience, seen as a way for the philosopher to benefit from the wealth and luxury of the island: Diogenes Laertius (3.9) and Onetor (in a treatise entitled *Whether a wise man should make money*, see Philostr. *VA* 35.1) say Plato went to Sicily just because of the financial benefits he would gain. On this see Sanders (2008), 100, n.221

Diogenes Laertius does not say where this sentence of Molon's comes from. Jacoby does not edit it at all, while Wooten (1972), 46, does not believe the speech *Against the Philosophers* was an oration, but rather a treatise. Given the lack of context, there are two main possibilities for the origin of this quotation: that it was a *sententia* attributed to the orator (similar to those attributed to Anaximenes, Demetrius or Hegesias), or that this attack on Plato was part of his speech *Against the Philosophers*. Considering the scarcity of material preserved for Molon, the absence of attestations for a collection of *sententiae* of his, and the hostile tradition to Plato and his school in connection to the Sicilian "mission", I am inclined to consider this as belonging to the *Against the Philosophers*.

(13) Ariobarzanes of Cilicia

Biographical note: an orator called Ariobarzanes from Cilicia is mentioned by Philostratus (*VS* 1.19) alongside Xenophron of Sicily and Peithagoras of Cyrene (see biographies). All we know about him is that he lived between the 4th century BC and the 1st AD. He (like the other two) was not skilled in the art of invention and expression of ideas, but 'in the scarcity of first-rate sophists, was sought after by the Greeks of their day'. To describe this situation, Philostratus employs the metaphor for men seeking pulses for lack of corn – a similar metaphor for the same concept is in Libanius (*Or* 1.8), who talks about men eating bread made of barley when other kinds are missing, referring to his own educational experience with bad sophists.
On Ariobarzanes see: Janiszewski (2015), 52; Schmid (1895c); Wooten (1972), 39.

(14) Aristocles

Biographical note: a Rhodian orator named Aristocles is mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Din*. 8.13), among Rhodian orators who did not have the grace of Hyperides. If he is to be identified with the homonymous Rhodian grammarian mentioned by Strabo (14.2.13), we can date him to the 1st century BC, as Strabo calls him 'of my own time'. If they are the same person (which is not unlikely considering that rhetors in Rhodes were often also grammarians), he also wrote a grammatical commentary on Hippocrates (Erotian 32.10 Klein), and a περὶ ποιητικῆς (Ammonius 178, who quotes a fragment about the difference between ἐπικήδιον and θρῆνος). Wentzel (1895), 936-7, attributes to the Rhodian Aristocles all the grammatical fragments attributed to characters named Aristocles and also the treatise on music and a letter to Apollodorus, both mentioned by Athenaeus (14.620e; 4.140b-c). The chronology is in favour of an identification of our Aristocles with the grammarian mentioned by Varro (Ling. 10.10).
On Aristocles see: Crook (1995), 69-70; Janiszewski (2015), 55; Wentzel (1895).

(15) Artamenes

Biographical note: the only source for the orator Artamenes is Dionysius of Halicarnassus, where he is listed among some Rhodian orators. If he was a contemporary of the orators he is named with, we should place him in the 1st century BC.

(16) Astymedes

Biographical note: Astymedes was a Rhodian orator principally known for his embassy to Rome in 167 BC, during the war between Rome and Perseus of Macedonia (begun in 171), aiming at showing the Romans that the Rhodians were not hostile to them or favourable to Perseus – according to Polybius (27.6), Astymedes had already advised the Rhodians to take the Roman side. A version of the speech pronounced in 167 (Polyb. 30.4-5; Diod. Sic. 31.5) is preserved in its entirety by Livy (45.21-25). Polybius informs us of two more embassies to Rome, one in 164 (31.6) to re-establish an alliance, and a second one in 153, when he was admiral during the war against Crete (33.14).
Nothing is known about his style, although the question regarding the speech contained in Livy is controversial: since it is known from Polybius (30.4.11) that Astymedes published the speech, it has been assumed that, when the historian embedded it in his history, he had an original copy of it and could, therefore, provide a trustworthy translation of the original speech. This assumption is also based on what Livy says at 45.25.4 about Cato's reply: 'non inseram simulacrum veri copiose, quae dixerit, referendo: ipsius oratio scripta extat, Originu-m quinto libro inclusa'. However,

this rather proves the contrary: if the oration had been published and circulating (as Cato's), Livy would not have needed to write it down entirely.
On Astymedes, see: Wilcken (1895b); Wooten (1972), 43-4.

(17) Callicrates of Athens

Biographical note: there is an isolated mention of an Athenian orator called Callicrates (F1). According to the fragment, he was a contemporary of Dinarchus and wrote a speech *Against Demosthenes*.
On Callicrates, see: Ruhnken (1768), XC.

F1 Dion. Hal. *Din.* 18
Κατὰ Δημοσθένους παρανόμων·'εἰώθατε, ὦ ἄνδρες'. οὗτος ἐν τοῖς Περγαμηνοῖς πίναξι φέρεται ὡς Καλλικράτους. ἐγὼ δ', εἰ μὲν ἐκείνου ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδα (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνέτυχον τῶν Καλλικράτους οὐδενί)· ὅτι δὲ πάμπολυ τῶν Δεινάρχου λόγων ἀφέστηκεν, εὐτελής τε ὢν καὶ κενὸς καὶ οὐκ ἀπέχων ἰδιωτικῆς φλυαρίας, πείθομαι.

Περγαμηνοῖς Vettori : πεπερταμηνοῖς *codd.*

According to Dionysius, a speech Against Demosthenes containing the sentence (perhaps the beginning) 'εἰώθατε, ὦ ἄνδρες' was ascribed to an otherwise unknown orator named Callicrates. The context might be that of the Harpalus trial, but there is no evidence to state this with certainty. If we trust Dionysius' opinion about what he could read of this speech (which he found attributed to Dinarchus), Callicrates was a bad orator, almost like an unprofessional speaker.

The expression ἐν τοῖς Περγαμηνοῖς πίναξι refers to the Pergamene *Pinakes*, like those in Alexandria, which are however attested only by Dionysius (Din. 1, 11) and Athenaeus (8.336e)

(18) Callicrates of Leontium

Biographical note: Callicrates was the son of Theoxenos of Leontium (*Syll.*^{3} 634). He was an active politician in the Achaean league in the 2nd century BC. Polybius provides us with substantial information about his career and activity. At 24.10 we read that in 180 BC, during a debate in the Achaean assembly about a letter from Rome as to the recall of the Spartan exiles, Callicrates and Hyperbatus suggested obeying the Romans, but the line which prevailed was the opposite, supported by Lycortas. The following embassy (dealing with the same issue) was led by Callicrates himself and two more ambassadors. According to Polybius, the outcome of the embassy was excellent, and the speech reported at 24.11 impressed the Senate, which accepted Callicrates' advice about the Spartan

exiles, and sent a note of personal thanks to him, saying that 'everybody in the various states should be as Callicrates' (24.12). Consequently, he was made *strategos* of the league in 180, and then restored the Achaean and Messenian exiles. Polybius' perhaps biased judgment about him (since he was the son of Callicrates' opponent Lycortas) is rather negative: he says (24.10) that Callicrates was open to bribery, that he overawed the people with the threat of Romans' hostility.

From Livy (41.23, where a piece of a speech is reported) we know that Callicrates prevented an alliance with Perseus – this speech contains particularly colourful language, which does not refrain from direct attacks and bold comparisons, such as the one between the king and wild beasts (see by comparison Cic. *Phil.* 2.30; 4.12).

His oratorical skills were once again convincing, and the alliance did not take place. In the autumn of 169, he spoke against the request of help from Ptolemy Philometor and Ptolemy Physcon against Antiochus, 'alleging that they ought not to meddle in such affairs at all, and certainly not at that time, but should reserve their undivided forces for the service of Rome'. (Polyb. 29.23.4, transl. Shuckburgh). Callicrates' line prevailed against Lycortas, and therefore Ptolemy did not receive help from the league. When in 167, Rome defeated Perseus at Pydna, among the various embassies sent to congratulate the Romans, there was one by Callicrates, who, according to Polybius (30.13) and Livy (45.31), accused some of the Achaeans of having tried to turn the League against Rome. They were arrested and, consequently, the League sent ambassadors to persuade the Romans to free them (Polyb. 31.8), but the Senate refused. Callicrates' reputation in the League, however, remained unrivalled. He also refused to interfere in the Cretan War between Crete and Rhodes (Polyb. 31.16). The last piece of news about Callicrates is in Pausanias (8.11-12): in 157/56 the Oropians asked the League to help them remove the Athenian cleruchs. This is the second instance of an accusation against Callicrates regarding bribery, as Pausanias says the Oropians bribed the Macedonian Menalchidas, who would give half of the bribe to Callicrates. But when he did not share the bribe, the two states became rivals, and Rome interfered dissolving the League. During an embassy to Rome about this problematic political situation in 150, Callicrates fell ill and died.

In the light of his biography, Callicrates seems to have been a controversial figure, despised by Polybius (who was probably biased against him – his father Lycortas also had all of Callicrates' statues destroyed, Polyb. 37.5) but also by Pausanias; on the other hand, Livy offers a more neutral portrait of him.

On Callicrates, see: Seck (1924); Spence et al (2016), 161; Wooten (1972), 17-19.

(19) Cassander of Aegina

Biographical note: Cassander of Aegina is mentioned by Polybius (22.11) along with Apollonides of Sycion (10), whom he supported in the opposition to accepting Eumenes' money in 186 BC. In the

small extract of his speech reported by Polybius, he also asks for the liberation of Aegina from the Achaean league.
On Cassander, see: Stälhelin (1919); Wooten (1972), 19.

(20) Caucalus of Chios

Biographical note: brother of the more famous Theopompus (79), Caucalus of Chios was an early Hellenistic orator (4^{th}-3^{rd} century BC). We have information about him thanks to Athenaeus (10.2), who says he wrote an *Encomium to Heracles.* The textual situation of two more sources is confused: Photius (*Lex.* λ 271) and Pausanias (Ἀττικῶν ὀνομάτων συναγωγή, λ 16) transmit the same lexicographical material under the entry Λήμνιον κακὸν βλέπων. Caucalus' (according to Pausanias) or Caucasus' (according to Photius) explanation is the fact that the Lemnian women offended Aphrodite, and, consequently, great evils are called 'Lemnian'. It is difficult to state whether this information was contained in the *Encomium of Heracles*, another encomium, or a completely different kind of work. As for the *Encomium of Heracles*, what we know from Athenaeus is that Heracles was challenged to a drinking contest by Lepreus, the same theme employed in Matris' encomium (see Matris [54]).
On Caucalus, see: *FGrHist /BNJ* 38; (1921); Horster (2016).

T1. Ath. 10.412b
Μᾶτρις δ' ἐν τῶι τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐγκωμίωι καὶ εἰς πολυποσίαν φησὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα προκληθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Λεπρέως, καὶ πάλιν νικῆσαι. τὰ αὐτὰ ἱστορεῖ καὶ ὁ Χῖος ῥήτωρ Καύκαλος, ὁ Θεοπόμπου τοῦ ἱστοριογράφου ἀδελφός ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐγκωμίῳ.

νικῆσαι *Berardi* : νικηθῆναι *codd.* : <τοῦτον> νικηθῆναι *Hutchinson* : <ἐκείνον> *Obbink*

The only reference we have about Caucalus' *Encomium of Heracles* depends on what Athenaeus previously said about Matris' encomium, of which we have two fragments (see Matris [54]). It is surely unusual that an encomium contained the narration of an unflattering episode like that of a drinking contest. We should, therefore, question the nature of this piece and perhaps think it included a component of playfulness and irony. For a more detailed discussion of the question and on textual problems, see Matris' F1.

(21) Cephisodorus

Biographical note: Cephisodorus was a pupil of Isocrates, and was therefore active in the early Hellenistic age. He was a rhetorical theorist and orator (Dion. *Hal. Ep. ad Amm*. 2.22), and we know from

Dion. Hal. (*De Isoc.* 18.4) and Athenaeus (2.60d-e.; 3.122b; 8.354c) that he wrote a treatise in four books in defence of his teacher against the attacks of Aristotle (in particular the claim that Isocrates' work as a logographer was not important). The treatise also contained criticism of Plato, and sees Aristotle as following Plato without innovations (Dion. Hal. *Pomp* 1.16; Numenius in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* 14.69f.). He was probably the author of rhetorical theory for students (Dion. Hal. *Ep. ad Amm.* 1.2). He might be identified with the author of a historical work on the Sacred Wars (Aristot. *Eth. Nic.* 3.11.46 (= *FGrHist* 112).

On Cephisodorus see: Gerth (1921b); Reinhardt (1873); Ruhnken (1768), LXXXII.

(22) Charisius

Biographical note: Charisius' rhetorical activity must be placed at the end of the 4th century BC, since according to Cicero (*Brut.* 286) he was a contemporary of Democharis. Cicero also gives information about his oratorical activity and style: 1) he wrote speeches for others, so he was apparently a logographer; 2) he was an imitator of Lysias and a model for Hegesias. His style, therefore, probably lay somewhere between the simplicity of Lysias and the Asian style of Hegesias. According to Quintilian (10.1.70), some of Charisius' orations were wrongly ascribed to Menander. In so saying, he uses a present tense 'putant', which may mean that at his time some of Charisius' orations could still be circulating (but this could also just be an ironic observation of Quintilian about Menander's 'rhetorical' speeches in his comedies).

On Charisius, see: Barabino (1967); Blass (1898²); Ruhnken (1768); Susemihl (1891-2), II.461; Thalheim (1897); Wooten (1972); Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 877, 994. On F2, see D'Angelo (2005).

F1a. Rutilius 1.10

Item Charisii: 'Pater hic tuus nunc denique est, ut egestatem tuam debere alere videatur? Patrem nunc appellas, quem prius egentem auxilio tuo ut alienum deseruisti? Patris tui filius es ad potiundas opes, cuius ad senectutem violandam crudelissimus hostis fuisti? Nimirum nullo consilio filios procreamus; nam maiorem partem ex illis doloris et contumeliae capimus.'

<rationem> *Steph.* | nunc *codd.* : hunc *Steph.* | patris **V** : patri **A B Ald. Basil.** | tui Quint. *Inst.* : tu *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | nullo **A V Ald.** : nunc **B** | doloris et contumeliae **codd. Ald. Basil:** dolores et contumeliae *Meiser* : dolores et contumeliam *Sim.*

F1b. Quintilian. 9.3.36

Est et apud Rutilium longa περιόδοις, sed haec initia sententiarum sunt: 'Pater hic tuus? Patrem nunc appellas? Patris tui filius es?'

Rutilius quotes this fragment in the section dedicated to *polyptoton*, soon after the example taken from Cleochares (25). Here Charisius declines the noun 'pater' employing the nominative ('pater hic tuus'), accusative ('patrem') and dative ('patri'). This, along with the choice of relatively short sentences (as Barabino [1967], 137 notices), is an evident indication of Charisius' tendency to employ figures of speech that would become typical of the Asianic rhetorical style (as one can also see in Cleochares' F2 and F4). This confirms Cicero's statement regarding Hegesias as the initiator of the Asianic style, imitating Charisius. Examples of polyptoton of the word πατήρ are attested in fourth-century prose (especially in Plato), although they are less strong in Attic oratory as we can see in Dem. 57.21.4, where polyptoton does not have the same rhetorical strength as the one in this fragment. Worth mentioning are also Is. 3.64.2 and 1.20.3-15, although in this case, as in Demosthenes, there is not the same striking effect we find in Charisius' fragment. Similarly, we have several examples in Latin literature, especially rhetorical works – particularly interesting are the examples in the Elder Seneca (*passim* in *Controv.* 1.1, 4, 6-8; 2. 1, 3; 7.1-8; 9.1-6; 10.1-6) which show the extensive use of this figure associated with the word 'pater' in the declamations, which are probably not far from the last examples of Hellenistic orators.

The structure of the argument contains an accusation regarding a specific case, that of a neglected father, followed by a general statement, a sort of *gnome* on the pains related to parenthood. It is a rhetorical device widely used in Hellenistic and Imperial literature (see, for instance, Luc. 7.445-55). An example in Attic oratory can be identified in Isoc. 21.6 where the accusations to Euthynus are followed by a general statement on the connection between crime and profit (here, though, the statement is meant to reinforce the argument against Euthynus much more evidently than in Charisius' F1); in Classical literature, a similar example can be found in Eur. *Med.* 515-519, when Medea, after accusing Jason, ends her speech with an address to Zeus about the impossibility of identifying a counterfeited man, and also at lines 569-75, when Jason, answering, concludes his defence with a general observation on the uselessness of women (in this case, though, even if general, the statement is filtered by Jason's point of view). Also, there is a tendency in Attic orators to adduce examples of personal relationships as mirrors of a general natural law (Is. 8.15; And. 1.50; more on this subject is in Schmitz [2000]).

The *topos* of children being disrespectful towards their parents is widely employed in Greek and Latin literature: particularly relevant are Soph. *OC.* 1355-1360, where Oedipus is blaming his son Polyneices for having ruined him, and the many parallels in Aristophanic comedies (*Nub.* ll. 1297-1302; 1321-1344; 1399-1444;[334] *Vesp. passim*). The theme of the disrespect for old people that becomes

[334] Ironically, the father-beating in the Clouds happens in the context of a school aiming at teaching rhetoric.

cruelty ('ad senectutem violandam crudelissimus hostis') may remind of the famous scene in the Aeneid (2.526-58) when Neoptolemus is killing the aged Priam (see a vivid representation on Naples, MN 2422, Kalpis by the Kleophrades painter).

This fragment probably belonged to a forensic speech, where Charisius, in order to enhance the accusations against the defendant, underlined his bad behaviour towards his father. It has been shown that it was a right of a father to be fed and housed by his son or sons during his old age, a right which also prevented the sons from being physically violent with their fathers and from neglecting their burial. This right was also protected by a γραφὴ γονέων κακώσεως (see more details on the legal procedure in Harrison [1998], 77-8.) The *topos* of bad behaviour towards parents is widely present in Attic oratory (see also Barabino [1967], 137), as we can see in Lys. 31.21 (when Lysias says Philon's mother was convinced that he would not perform his last duties even on the ground of their relationship); Is. 5.39 (where Isaeus is accusing Dicaeogenes of having forgotten his mother); Dem. 24.201-2 (Demosthenes here says that Timocrates has abandoned his father with no civil rights and sold his sister); Din. 2.18 (here Dinarchus says Aristogeiton did not even pay for his father's funeral). Given the presence of this *motif* in different kinds of speeches, it is not entirely convincing, as Wooten seems to be, that this fragment comes from an inheritance case. The possibility of this fragment belonging to a declamation is not to be excluded, if we believe the information in Quintilian (2.4.41) according to which rhetorical declamations were already practised – or at least began to be practised – at the time of Demetrius of Phalerum. Cases of *controversiae* involving fathers and sons are widely present in the declamations of the elder Seneca.

nam maiorem…capimus: Charisius employed a proverb from the philosopher and elegiac poet Evenus (5th century BC) saying ἢ δέος ἢ λύπη παῖς πατρὶ πάντα χρόνον (fr.6 West), that we can also find in Plut. *De Amore prol.* 497a; Artemidorus. I.16; Hermias. *In Platonis Phaedrum Scholia*. 3.250.10-12 (see Ruhnken, 39). Similar statements on family and children can be found in the sophist Antiphon (D57, Laks-Most [2016]), who states that children bring worries and take away youth from men. With regard to this topic, it is impossible not to mention Eur. *Med.* 250 and the famous words of Medea 'I would rather stand three times with a shield in battle than give birth once', as well as the anapests on the troubles deriving from children in *Medea*'s chorus (1090-115).

patris: it is noteworthy that the dative 'patri' of the manuscripts was corrected to 'patris' by Stephanus following the general rule and, in particular ,the text of Quintilian ('patris tui'), where he is quoting a shortened version of Rutilius' fragment. See more in Brookes (1970), 64-5.

hostis: with this meaning of 'personal enemy', 'hostis' is attested in Latin, though less frequently than with the usual meaning of 'public enemy' (see *OCD*, s.v. 'hostis', compared to 'inimicus', the more frequent word for 'personal enemy'). There are two possible options to back-translate 'hostis' into Greek: πολέμιος and ἐχθρός, a public and a personal enemy (see the difference in Plat. *Resp*. 5.470a).

Given the slightly higher number of attestations of 'hostis' as public enemy, one may be inclined to consider πολέμιος preferable. To reinforce this idea, we might imagine Charirius decided to use the image of the public enemy in order to make an emotive impression, especially considering that the disrespect for an elderly man could be seen as an act of violence against the law and the public moral.

F1b *longa* περιόδοις: in Quintilian's quotation of this fragment, we find a rather unexpected definition of Charisius' style, 'long with sentences'. Unlike Russell (2001), I follow the reading of **A**, and choose not to emend περιόδοις in περίοδος. The latter would be rather inconsistent with the actual stylistic features of this fragment, whose sentences are relatively short (see Barabino [1967], 137). As it is unlikely that Quintilian had a very different text of Rutilius's treatise, 'longa' clearly does not refer to the length of the single περίοδοι but to the number of them, as the initial three questions overall express the same concept. Accodring to Winterbottom (1970), 164 (who also accepts the reading περιόδοις), the subject of 'longa' should be 'retractatio'.

F2. Rutilius 2.6

Item Charisii: 'Existimate, quaeso, rem publicam hic adesse et pro vestra libertate supplicem vobis accidere, simul liberos vestros, matres familias amplexam tenere, parentes vestros aetate confectos ad se applicare, redigere vobis in memoriam, qualem se a maioribus acceperitis, obsecrare pro sacris ac delubris deorum immortalium, pro parentum monumentis, pro vobis ipsis et salute vestra: haec si praesens agat, ut dixi, res publica, quid animi sitis habituri, quaero.

vobis **codd. Ald. Basil** : genibus *coni. Ruhnken* | accidere *Gesner* : accedere *codd.* **Ald. Basil** | simul *Ruhnken* : simil et *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | matres *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : et matres *Ruhnken* | familias **A B Ald. Basil.** : familiam **V** | vestros **Ald. Basil** : nostros *codd.* | vobis *in margine exemplaris editionis Basileensis* : vos *codd.* | pro sacris **Ald.** : sacris *codd. Basil.* | agat *Jag.*: agit *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : ageret **Steph.**| res publica **B V Ald. Basil.** : res publicas **A** | sitis habituri *Madvig*, *Boot*: estis habituri **B V Ald.** : estis habitum **A** : essetis habituri *Steph.*

In this fragment, placed in the section about *prosopopoia*, Charisius offers us the vivid picture of a personified Republic, which pleads for the freedom of its citizens, embraces everyone, and beseeches the gods. We can, therefore, conjecture that this fragment belonged to a political speech (as Blass [1898^{2}], 351, n.5 also argues; Wooten [1972], instead, believes this is from a forensic speech). As for F1, we cannot exclude that this is just part of a rhetorical exercise. Similar personifications are in Cicero: *Red. Sen.* 39; *Red. Pop.* 10 where a personified Italy takes him on its shoulders; *Cat.* 1.18, where we have a personification of the concept of *patria* as the common parent ('patria quae communis est parens omnium nostrum'); *Planc.* 12, where Cicero used the personified image of the Roman *populus*; and *Div. Caec.* 19 where Cicero makes Sicily speak. A different kind of personification is *Mil.* 78, when Cicero makes Clodius speak and act as if he were still alive. It is fair to assume that the 'res publica' in this fragment was a translation for the Greek πόλις: we do not have any other examples

of personified πόλεις in Attic oratory, although personifications of the State and the *demos* are very recurrent in Greek art (for Athens see Smith [2011]). Other interesting examples of personification of Athens are in Aesch. *Eum*. 1003 and ff., when Athena, impersonating the city, guides the Eumenides towards their new place, and the personified Demos, one of the main characters in Aristophanes' *Knights*. The only relevant example of personification of the πόλις in prose is in Thucydides: 2.31, where the city is said to be 'in full bloom' (ἀκμαζούσης); 6.14, where the Athenians are called 'a physician of their country' (τῆς δὲ πόλεως βουλευσαμένης ἰατρὸς), and 7.64, where the πόλις is embodied by its citizens. On Thucydides and the personification of the πόλις see Smith (1918), 241-50. It is easy to notice that none of these examples has the rhetorical pathos that the personification of the Republic aims to have in this fragment, this shows how a rhetorical figure like the personification must have evolved pathetically in Hellenistic prose.

supplicem vobis accidere: Ruhnken (1768), 96 points out that in Latin 'accidere supplicem' is always accompanied by 'genibus' or 'ad genua', absent in the manuscripts, but, as he explains soon after, we should be careful in emending 'vobis' with 'genibus' or restoring a presumably lost 'genibus', because we should bear in mind that Rutilius was translating from the Greek of Gorgias, and the Greek way of saying 'come pleading' is simply προσπίπτειν. Therefore, there is no actual need to emend the text in this point.

redigere vobis in memoriam: the construction 'redigere vos in memoriam' contained in the manuscripts seems a bit odd. The normal use of this phrase is 'redigere in memoriam alicuis' (see *OLD* and *TLL* s.v. memoria), so we should rather expect 'redigere in vostram memoriam' or 'redigere vobis in memoriam', which I print, as a slip from vobis to vos is easier to explain in the process of copying. Ruhnken prefers not to correct the text adducing Cicero (*Flac.* 25) as an example: 'revocarem animos vestros ad Mithridatici belli memoriam', although the constructions of these two verbs are not so easily comparable. In Cic. *Phil.* 2.18 we find 'redigere in memoriam nostram', which supports the incompatibility of the two constructions. The Greek equivalent could have been ἀναμιμνήσκειν, which takes the accusative or the genitive and might, therefore, explain the accusative 'vos'.

F3. Rutilius 2.16

Charisii: 'Alter eorum erat in dando benignus, alter [erat] in accipiendo astutus. Hunc omnes conquirebant * * * ne ab eo viderentur. Huius enim pudor erat omnibus iucundus, illius autem impudentia ipsi suavis, ceteris amara.'

alter **V** : alter erat **AB Ald. Basil** | hunc omnes conquirebant, <illum vitabant> *Steph.*: hunc omnes concurrebant *Ruhnken* : hunc omnes ubi videbant alio adibant; in illo omnes causas omnes conquirebant, ne ab eo viderentur *Jan.* : hunc omnes requirebant : illo conspecto de via decedebant, ne ab eo viderentur *Halm. dub.*

Here, in the section on ἀντίθετον (antithesis), we see the contrast between two people, a decent and generous man against a selfish and impudent one. The content of the fragment is not exactly perspicuous, nor is the genre. Barabino (1967), 137 has no doubts in saying that this fragment belongs to a forensic speech, imagining this is a comparison between two private citizens. A more cautious approach is perhaps to be preferred, given the short length of the fragment and the total lack of any other elements to determine the exact content. Although it seems likely that it comes from a forensic speech, this might also have been a comparison between two public figures in a political speech, as for instance in Polyeuctus' F2a-c, where he compares his own conduct to Demades', and Pytheas' F4, where Demosthenes and Demades are compared. I do not seem to find linguistic arguments in favour of the attribution to a forensic or a deliberative speech.

Hunc…viderentur: it is worth considering the textual problem at line 2. A blank space has been intentionally left where something is clearly missing. Ruhnken imagines a possible correction '<ad> hunc omnes conquirebant ne ab eo viderentur'. Barabino accepts Stephanus' suggestion ('flagitiosum', according to Ruhnken) of restoring <illum vitabant> after 'omnes', a textual choice that seems coherent.

F4. Phot. Lex. α 2091

<Ἀντίγραφοι διαθῆκαι>· Χαρίσιος ἐν τῷ πρὸς Σωκράτην· "ἔχουσαι μὲν τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον, ἀλλήλαις δὲ ἦσαν ἀντίγραφοι".

This fragment is the only attestation of a speech *Against Socrates* pronounced by Charisius. Given the lack of information about Charisius' life, it is difficult to make much speculation about the exact possible content of this speech. It must have been an epideictic speech directed against the followers of Socrates' philosophy, but the nature of the accusations is obscure. It is probably to the followers of Socrates that this fragment refers: here they are compared to ἀντίγραφοι, copies of one another, a metaphor aiming at expressing how repetitive and non-original Socratic philosophy became: Socrates' followers, according to Charisius, were all the same, and probably all tried to be similar to Socrates himself.

This is an unparalleled metaphor, but in Isocrates' *Against the Sophists* (12), a slightly similar concept can be found with regard to the exact same target, the sophists. Here Isocrates is not attacking them (not so much Socrates but those among his followers who charged money to teach philosophy and rhetoric) for their philosophy, but for the way they teach their students to deliver speeches. They use the technique of the analogy, employing the same rhetorical strategy for every speech, which goes against the extreme variability of the situations for which a speech can be written. It is not to be excluded, therefore, that Charisius was, in this fragment, talking about the sophists' rhetorical teaching rather than their philosophy. Finally, it is worth remembering that a speech attacking the Socratic school is also attributed to Democharis (*In Defence of Sophocles against Philon*, see

Democharesʼ T1-T2 and F3-F4), although the nature of the accusation must have been here very different, as they were based on the idea of philosophers being tyrants, see F6. Also, an *Attack against the Teaching of Plato* is attested for Theopompus (79). Theopompusʼ fragment quoted by Arr. *Epict. diss*. 2.17. 5-6 is particularly interesting in relation to Charisiusʼ fragment (although it is not edited here because it is to be dated before Chaeronea), since from what we read Theopompus blamed Plato for being simply an imitator of other philosophers like Aristippus, Anthisthenes, and Bryson of Heraclea. In the same tradition, we find Molonʼs *Against the Philosophers* (FF1-2).

(23) Chlaeneas the Aetolian

Biographical note: there are two sources for Chlaeneas the Aetolian: Polyb. 9.28-31; 10.41, and Liv. 26.24. Chlaeneas was sent by the Aetolians to the Spartans in 211 BC in order to excite them against Philip V. The speech is almost entirely reported by Polybius (9.28-31), and from his reconstruction, we read that it was centred on the concept of Macedonia being the origin of all the slavery in Greece. Chlaeneas "reviews" all the Macedonian kings who did harm to Greek cities, showing good mastery of the Greek history of the 4th and 3rd century BC. The discourse smoothly shifts from the past to the present, with a personal attack against Philip V (to be blamed for his ἀσέβεια and his περὶ τοὺς Μεσσηνίους ἀθεσία καὶ παρασπόνδησις). Wooten (1972), 56, shows that this speech has the typical structure of the ambassadorial speech (see also Cassander of Aegina, Lyciscus of Acarnania, and Thrasycrates of Rhodes).
On Chlaeneas, see: Wooten (1972), 56-62.

(24) Cineas the Thessalian

Biographical note: most of the information we have about Cineas the Thessalian is contained in Plutarchʼs *Life of Pyrrhus*. Plutarch says he had a reputation of great wisdom, and that he was an ἀκηκοὼς of Demosthenes. In other cases (see Diog. Laert. 9.21) the same verb is employed to define pupils, but we cannot be sure about this case as there is no solid tradition witnessing pupils for Demosthenes. However, the idea is already present in Aeschines (1.175), who imagines Demosthenes boasting to his pupils, and in Aesch. 1.173 Aeschines says that Demosthenes has also brought some of his pupils' (τινὲς τῶν μαθητῶν) into court with him.

Certainly, according to Plutarch (*Pyrrh*. 14), Cineas must have heard Demosthenes speak. Stähelin (1919b), however, believes Demosthenesʼ ἀκηκοὼς is a different person from this orator. Cineas was also apparently the only one who was worth being compared to the great Attic orator as regards eloquence and style, and Plutarch says, quoting Euripides (*Phoenissae*, fr.517) that he

confirmed the saying according to which everything can be won over by eloquence. He was an adviser of Pyrrhus in Epirus and was sent by him as ambassador to many cities (*Phyrr*. 14-15); and according to Plutarch, *Phyrr*. 14, Pyrrhus used to say that more cities had been won for him by the eloquence of Cineas than by his own arms. Plutarch reports a dialogue between Cineas and the king, in which Cineas tried to persuade him not to make war against Italy (Cass. Dio. 9.40.5) but obtained no success. After his victory at Heracleia in 280, Pyrrhus sent Cineas as ambassador to treat with Rome (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 18; App. *Samnitica*. 10.4; Cass. Dio. 9.31-32). Despite an initial division of the Senate about accepting or not Cineas' conditions (to grant the immunity for Tarentum in exchange of freedom for the Roman prisoners), they voted unanimously to send away Cineas and to continue the war until Pyrrhus was in Italy (a full account is in Plut. *Pyrrh*. 18-21 and Cass. Dio. 9.39). There is disagreement between Plutarch and Appian (Plut. *Pyrrh*. 18; App. *Samnitica*. 10.4) on whether a second embassy took place before or after the battle of Ausculum (279 BC). Diodorus (23.6) does not mention a second embassy at all. It was after one of these embassies that Cineas reported to Pyrrhus that the Roman Senate was a 'council of many kings' (βασιλέων πολλῶν συνέδριον) and was therefore unbeatable. The last mention of Cineas is in *Pyrrh*. 21, when we read he was sent as an ambassador in Sicily in 278.

Extra information about him can be found in Cicero, who says he was Epicurean (*Cato*. 43), and that he wrote a treatise on military science (*Ad Fam*. 9.25.1); he also epitomised Aeneas Tacticus' books, according to Aelian (*Tactics* 1.2). Moreover, Pliny (*Nat Hist*. 8.88) shares the interesting anecdote that Cineas knew all the names of the senators when he went in Rome for his embassy.
Finally, he was also a historian, and wrote a *History of Thessaly* (Steph. Byz. ε 180, δ 146; Schol.Pind.*Pyth*. 10.85a; Strab. 7.7.12).
On Cineas see: Derow, (2016); Garoufalias (1979), 55-96; 193-8; Glover (1927), 178-203; Stähelin (1919b); Wooten (1972), 13-15; 43-44.

(25) Cleochares

Biographical note: Cleochares must have been born around 300 BC in Myrlea (Bithynia), according to Strabo (12.4.9). In this passage, the manuscripts actually contain Κλεοφάνης, with the exception Vat.Gr.2306 that has a lacuna before νης. His rhetorical activity most likely took place in Athens in the 3rd century BC, as known from Diogenes Laertius (4.40-1, where the name Cleochares is a correction for the wrong Leochares), who says Cleochares was an admirer of Arcesilaus, Democharés, and Pythocles. We do not have much information about his works. It is fair to assume he was interested in rhetorical theory and that, besides his speeches, he wrote a rhetorical treatise about Demosthenes (and maybe also Isocrates), as we can see from FF. 3-4. His association with Democharés is further confirmation of his admiration for Demosthenes. From the confusion that seems to have affected

his name in most of the manuscript tradition, we can probably deduce his fame had faded away relatively early.
On Cleochares see: Auschlitz (1921); Barabino (1967), 135-6; Lazzeri (2018); Ruhnken (1768), 37; Susemihl (1891-1892), II, 462; Wooten (1972), 7-9; Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 820, 877.

F1. Rutilius 1.2
Cleocharis: 'Sed cum ad supplicium sumendum se confirmaret, multa simul eum revocabant: officia, consuetudo, tempus, existimatio, periculum, religio, quae singula proprias ei cogitationes ad remorandum subiciebant.'

Cleocharis **Ald.** : Clechari *codd.* : Clearchi **Basil.** | proprias **B R V Ald. Basil** : propriae **A** | ei *Steph.*: esse *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | ad remorandum **Basil.** : ad removendum *codd.* **Ald.** | subiciebant **Basil.** : subiiciebant *codd.* **Ald.**

This fragment belongs to the section on συναθροισμός, i.e., the association and accumulation of various things in a rhetorical discourse, a very popular figure already in Attic oratory and Classical prose more broadly (see also Quint. *Inst.* 8.4.27). This fragment seems to deal with the different reasons that could help the defendant to escape his punishment. A famous example of συναθροισμός in Attic oratory is in Dem. 18.71, where Demosthenes lists all nefarious actions by Philip: 'annexing Euboea and making it a basis of operations against Attica, attacking Megara, occupying Oreus, demolishing Porthmus, establishing the tyranny of Philistides at Oreus and of Cleitarchus at Eretria, subjugating the Hellespont, besieging Byzantium, destroying some of the Greek cities, reinstating exiled traitors'. As often happens for Rutilius' quotations of Hellenistic orators, the short length of the fragment does not allow a substantial comprehension of the content and therefore impedes a clear placement of the fragment in one of the three main categories of oratory. It could come from a forensic oration (Barabino [1967], 36 has no doubts about it), but we have no further evidence for it.

Some of Barabino's assumptions seem arbitrary. First of all, she translates 'ad supplicium sumendum' as 'a subire la pena', but the Latin phrase 'supplicium sumere' actually means to inflict a punishment (see OLD, s.v. s*umo*, 6b = 'supplicium sumere' with relevant examples), rather than to undergo it (which would be 'dare supplicium', see *OLD* s.v. *poena*, 1b) as Barabino's translation would imply. Translating 'ad supplicium sumendum' as 'receive the punishment' would be not only grammatically incorrect, but also illogical: if the subject has second thoughts calling him back, he must have been the one making the decision of inflicting the punishment, while the receiver would have no reasons to have scruples. Moreover, Barabino takes for granted that 'supplicium' means 'capital punishment', whereas it could actually mean different kinds of punishments (see Barkan [1936] and Cohen [2015], 211-35; *OLD*, s.v. *supplicium*). A similar phrase is at *Res Gest.* 25.3: 'dominis ad supplicium sumendum tradidi' ('I delivered to their masters for punishment').

F2. Rutilius 1.10

Cleocharis: 'Nam vehementer admiror, Lacedaemonii, si praeter hunc quemquam existimatis esse, cui ob hos casus iure succensere debeatis. Hic est enim, qui vobis exploratam spem victoriae est pollicitus. Hunc vos non solum in consilio dando ceteris anteposuistis, sed etiam in conficiendo negotio principem praefecistis. Huic omnium vestrum fortunas universi commisistis. Ab hoc igitur uno pristinae pollicitationis rerumque gestarum <rationem> reposcere debetis.'

quemquam *codd.* : quempiam **Ald. Basil.** : existimatis *in margine exemplaris editionis Basileensis et Steph.*: existimatus *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | ob hos casus coni. *Ruhnken* : ob has causas *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | exploratam *Halm* : imploratam *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : exploratae *Ruhnken* | anteposuistis *codd.* **Ald.** : praeposuistis **Basil.** | praefecistis *codd. Ald. Basil.* : fecistis *in margine exemplaris editionis Basileensis* | vestrum **Basil.** : nostrum *codd.* **Ald.** | universi *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : universas *Meiser* | uno **A B Ald. Basil.** : *om. V* | rationem *suppl. Steph.*

Here, Cleochares is quoted with regard to his use of polyptoton, since, in addressing the Spartans, he declines 'hic' in the nominative ('hic est enim' etc.), accusative ('hunc vos' etc.) and dative ('huic omnium vestrum' etc.). We can imagine the original Greek could have been οὗτος. The use of polyptoton, as evident from Charisius' F1, is a sign of Cleochares' tendentially Asianic and artificial style (despite his presumed tendency to imitate Demosthenes). This must have been a common rhetorical figure in Cleochares, considering he employed it also in F4, on the name of Demosthenes. Regardless of the style, these accusations to the Spartans to have made wrong political choices (by favouring some unidentifiable character) sounds very much like Demosthenes telling the Athenians off for having underestimated the danger of Philip, as for instance in Dem. 4.10 (πότ' οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, πόθ' ἃ χρὴ πράξετε; ἐπειδὰν τί γένηται; ἐπειδὰν νὴ Δί' ἀνάγκη τις ᾖ. νῦν δὲ τί χρὴ τὰ γιγνόμεν' ἡγεῖσθαι; ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ οἴομαι τοῖς ἐλευθέροις μεγίστην ἀνάγκην τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν πραγμάτων αἰσχύνην εἶναι.). This technique of underlining the people's responsibility in a disastrous political situation is rhetorically particularly effective, as it puts the audience at the centre of the debate, and provides them with the belief that a future positive turn of events may still be dependent on their will. Because of the address to the Spartans, it is very likely that this fragment belonged to a political speech or a rhetorical exercise on a political topic. Wooten (1972), 11 tries to make hypotheses about the identity of the 'hic' in question: 1) Chremonides the Athenian, who, in 267 BC, persuaded the Spartans to join the Athenian revolt against Antigonus Gonatas; 2) Cleomenes III who completely changed the Spartan government and was defeated at Sellasia in 222 or 221 BC by Antigonus Doson (not a very strong hypothesis, since Cleomenes was born around 300 BC); 3) a Macedonian king, maybe Philip.

<rationem> reposcere: as regards the supplement 'rationem', it is worth remembering that *consensu codicum* there is no word between 'gestarum' and 'reposcere' and the first to re-establish a full meaning for the sentence was Stephanus. Ruhnken (1768), 37, is not entirely convinced of its validity but

admits it has parallels in Latin literature. Similar uses of *reposcere rationem* are Caes. *BG*. 5.30.3 ('rationem reposcent') and Livy 39. 37.10 ('rationem reposcitis').

F3. Phot. *Bibl.* 176.121b

Κλεοχάρης δὲ ὁ Σμυρλεανός, ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἰσοκρατικῶν ἁπάντων, οἶμαι, λέγων (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν Δημοσθένην συγκρίσει μὴ τὰ πόρρω αὐτοῖς παρασχεῖν) φησὶ *τοὺς μὲν Δημοσθενικοὺς λόγους τοῖς τῶν στρατιωτῶν ἐοικέναι μάλιστα σώμασι, τοὺς δὲ Ἰσοκρατικοὺς τοῖς τῶν ἀθλητῶν*.

ἐν τῇ **A** : *om.* **M**

In the chapter dedicated to Theopompus, Photius, in denying Theopompus was inferior to his teacher Isocrates, quotes a brief passage from what seems to have been a rhetorical work on Demosthenes' style or on Attic oratory in general, or less likely a speech involving the mention of Demosthenes and Isocrates. In this work, Cleochares compared Demosthenes' and Isocrates' styles by saying that the orations of the form look like soldiers and those of the latter like athletes. We know that in Phot. *Bibl.* cod.265.493b and its probable source Pseudo Plutarch (*X orat*. 845d), the exact same comparison was attributed to Philip II. For some reason, this different piece of information converged in the codex dedicated to Theopompus. An explanation could be that Photius followed two different sources (Pseudo Plutarch for chapter 265 and another unknown source for chapter 176) without verifying them properly. But it is also entirely possible that both the bits of information (whether independent or not) are correct, and that Cleochares simply took the comparison from Philip, or in one of his rhetorical works he attributed this quotation to Philip and Photius forgot to specify it.

A literary comparison involving athletes and soldiers (although in a different context) is in Quintilian (10.1.33) where athletes ('athletarum toris') are associated with history and soldiers ('militum lacertis') with oratory, which is not inconsistent with Cleochares' comparison, if we think of Isocrates' oratory as much more 'historical', meant to be read rather than recited, unlike that of Demosthenes. Something similar is found in a fragment by Euripides' (288 Kannicht, from the *Autolycus*) where we read that cities should honour good statesmen and not athletes. The same concept is expressed by Democharesin F4, where we read that no perfect soldier can be made out of Socrates, once again a form of criticism of the philosophical (and therefore also Isocratean) way of being an orator or politician.

This fragment is particularly important in the history of rhetorical theory as it constitutes the first attestation of a literary comparison between orators, a rhetorical practice that would soon be widely employed by later rhetoricians, such as Caecilius, who compared Demosthenes to both Aeschines and Cicero. It also confirms that the canonisation of Demosthenes as a model for rhetorical theory was as least as old as the 3rd century BC (on this see Introduction, and commentary on P.Berl. 9781).

Σμυρλεανός: this is the only attestation of the wrong name Smyrlea (present in the manuscripts **A** and **M**, Σμυρλέος in the latter) for Myrlea, the old toponym of the city in Bithynia, refounded by Philip V with the name of Apamaea.

F4. Ps-Herodian. *Rhet. Gr.* p. 97. Spengel (= 40 ed. Hajdù)

Πολύπτωτον δέ, ὅταν ἤτοι τὰς ἀντονομασίας ἢ τὰ ὀνόματα εἰς πάσας τὰς πτώσεις μεταλαμβάνοντες διατιθώμεθα τὸν λόγον, ὡς παρὰ Κλεοχάρει· ‘Δημοσθένης ὑπέστη Φίλιππον· Δημοσθένους πένης μὲν ὁ βίος, μεγάλη δ’ ἡ παρρησία· Δημοσθένει πολλῶν διδομένων οὐδὲν οὔτε πλῆθος οὔτε κάλλος ἄξιον ἐφάνη προδοσίας· Δημοσθένην Ἀλέξανδρος ἐξήτει· τὸ διὰ τί παρ’ αὐτοῖς λογίζεσθε· ἀδίκως ἀπέθανες, ὦ Δημόσθενες.’

ὅταν **ζBL**θ : *coniecerat Villoison* : ὅτε **B**^{i} | ἤτοι **HW** : ἢ τὸ **F** : ἢ **BELMPUV** | ἀντονομασίας **LU** *s. l.* : ἀντωνομασίας **EFPUV** : ὀνομασίας **MBHW** : ἀντωνυμίας *Allatius in codd.* **GT**, *Wilamowitz, Antig. v. Karystos, Berol. 1881, n.12* | μεταλαμβάνοντες : μεταβάλλοντες **HWM** : παραλαμβάνοντες **L** | διατιθώμεθα *codd.* : συντιθέμεθα **M** | Κλεοχάρει *codd.* : κλεοχάρμω **M** | Φίλιππον **MFBELMPUV** : φιλίππῳ **HWA**^{2} *s.l.* | δημοσθένην **BUPEV** : δημοσθένη **HW** : δημοσθένει **MFL** | ἐξήτει · τὸ *coni. Spengel*: ἐξητεῖτο **FBA**^{m} : ἐζητεῖτο **HWMLEVUP** : ἐζήτει. τὸ *Bekk.* | αὐτοῖς *Dindorf* : αὐτοῖς ω | λογίζεσθε **MFUP** : λογίζεσθαι **HWEV** : λογίζοιστε : **BPU** *s.l.* : λογίζεσθ() **L** | ἀδίκως *bis* **HWA**^{2} *i.m.* | *ante* ἀπέθανες *add.* τε **U**, τὸ **P**

This fragment is quoted by Ps-Herodian in his treatise *De Figuris* (and with several corruptions in its *epitome* = *40 ed. Hajdù) in the section regarding polyptoton. We can see here the full declension of Demosthenes’ name. From a stylistic point of view, as we saw for F2, there is a full display of an articulate and artificial use of the figures of speech, typical of the Asianic style, which would be further confirmation that Cleochares’s style was probably far from Demosthenes’, although he admired him – and this admiration is totally evident from this fragment. Wooten (1972), 8 proposes a comparison between Cleochares’ style in this fragment –with its short, antithetical, and rhythmical phrases – and that of Hegesias, establishing a possible dependence of Hegesias’ Asianism from Cleochares. However, despite its undeniable Asianic, or anyway certainly non-Classical features, I do not seem to find prose rhythm in this fragment.

The typology and the content of the speech from which this extract is taken are very difficult to determine, since the quotation is once again given merely as an example of a rhetorical figure. It is probably safe to exclude a forensic speech, but all the other options are plausible: in particular, it could have been a rhetorical exercise for schools (maybe to memorise declensions), or rhetorical theory, perhaps the same work as the one in F3. What is clear from this fragment is, on the same lines as F3, that Demosthenes had been definitely been canonised as a positive model, not only as an orator (as clear from F3), but also as a politician, at the time of Cleochares – most likely as a consequence of Democharesʼ rehabilitation of his uncle, just a few decades before.

ἐξήτει· τὸ διὰ: Lazzeri (2016-2017) has argued in favour of the reading of codices **F** and **B**, ἐξητεῖτο. This is not implausible, and Lazzeri provides interesting linguistic parallels to support this idea, the overall meaning does not change substantially: in both cases, Cleochares says Alexander asked for Demosthenes (the meaning of ἐξαιτέω is the same in the active and middle voices), and then addresses the audience asking them to figure out the reasons by themselves.

(26) Crates of Tralles

Biographical note: Diogenes Laertius (4.23) mentions an orator called Crates of Tralles, who was a pupil of Isocrates. Not much is known about him, but it is fair to accept Ruhnken's conjecture (1768), LXXXVI of attributing to him the λόγους δημηγορικοὺς καὶ πρεσβευτικούς that in the same passage by Diogenes are ascribed to the homonymous philosopher from Athens (head of the academy in the 3rd century BC). Menagius (*Comm. in Diog.* 4.23) wrongly identifies him with a character mentioned by Lucian (*Rhet. Praecep*t. 9), who is actually the sculptor Critias. Friedrich Blass (1865) 35, 72, 101, was convinced that he was not a pupil of Isocrates, as Diogenes says, but just an imitator.
On Crates, see: Blass (1865), 35, 72, 101; Gerth (1922), Ruhnken (1768), LXXXVI.

(27) Damas/Damasus Scombrus

Biographical note: not much is known about Damas or Damasus of Tralles, called Scombrus (i.e., mackerel). The only witness to him is in Strabo (14.1.42), where a certain Damasus Scombrus is said to have been one of the most famous orators born in Tralles, along with Dionysocles. It is difficult to determine when exactly he lived but it is fair to assume he was active during the late Republic, if he lived shortly after Dionysocles (most likely a contemporary of Apollodorus of Pergamon) as said by Strabo. A few short fragments of his survive in Seneca's *Declamations*, where he is called Damas, but he is recognisable for his peculiar nickname "Scombrus". Considering his origin, he was most likely an Asianist.
On Damasus, see: Bornecque (1902), 164-5; Janiszewski (2015), 83; Migliario (2007), 25; Wooten (1972), 27 (but here Wooten does not seem to identify Damasus and Damas).

F1. Sen. *Suas.* 2.14
In hac ipsa suasoria non sane refero memoria <dignam> ullam sententiam Graeci cuiusquam nisi Damae: ποῖ φεύξεσθ', ὁπλῖται, <ἐπὶ τὰ> τείχη;

dignam *suppl. Kiessling* | ποῖ φεύξεσθ' *Berardi* : ποῖ φεύξεσθε *Haase* : TIeY ΦeTZeTCe **α** : ΦeTZeZCe **A** | τι οὖν *Gertz* | ὁπλῖται *Müller* : otilita **α** : ὅπλα *Haase.* : ὅπλα τὰ *Bursian* | ἐπὶ τὰ *suppl. Håkanson* | τείχη : teIXN **BV**

The theme of this *suasoria* is the discussion among the 300 Peloponnesians at Thermopylae on whether to retreat or not, after having discovered that other contingents of Greek soldiers (each of them of 300 people) were retiring instead of facing such a desperate situation. These debates among various contingents (not really all of 300 soldiers) are attested by Herodotus (7.219), who also states that Leonidas decided to remain. The expression of 'fleeing to the walls' indicates the exhaustion of every possible means of escape, and therefore here ironically points out the impossibility for the hoplites to leave the battle. The examples quoted by Seneca are various but that of Damas is said to have been the only *sententia* worthy of mention, which shows Seneca's good opinion about the point Damas made here. Potamon's lost fragment could have occurred in the same *suasoria* (see F1). As for the topic, this is one of the two *suasoriae* in the Elder Seneca dealing with the Persian Wars (the other one is 2.5: 'Xerxes threatens to return unless the trophies of the Persian War are removed; the Athenians deliberate'), plus a *controversia* (9.1), involving Miltiades (see Hybreas' F8). This is also the only declamation in Seneca which involves the Spartans. Both the Persian Wars, and Spartan history in general (with obvious overlap) are a popular topic in declamations: see, among the many others Himerius 5; Apsines. 1.11, 38; 10.12 [219, 225, 305 Spengel]; Philostr. *VS.* 575 for Persian Wars; and Philostr. *VS.* 514; 584; Aristid. 31; 32; 33-37; Apsines 233; 310; 330; 337; Cic. I*nv.* 1.55, 68-70, 73. However, this seems to be the only attested example dealing with the Thermopylae episode. We must notice that the topic of Thermopylae does not seem to be extremely popular in Attic oratory: a few examples are in Isocrates (4.90; 5.148; 12.187), one instance in Lysias' *Epitaph* (30) and one attestation is in the pseudo-Demosthenic *Against Neaera* (59.95).

As often for the Greek passages in Seneca, the manuscript tradition offers a terribly damaged textThe Greek text is, in most cases, the result of modern restorations. An example here is ὁπλῖται, Müller's restoration for the manuscript reading 'otilita' (*consensu codicum*). Unlike the rest of the quotation, whose Greek is reconstructable, here the restoration is not obvious, and Haase and Bücheler have suggested ὅπλα as a possible alternative solution. Similarly, Bursian restores ὅπλα τὰ. In this case, we should intend φεύξεσθ' as a transitive verb. The overall meaning would not change substantially.

F2. Sen. *Controv.* 2.6.12

Damas Scombrus: ἐστυγημένην ἀσωτίαν ἀσωτεύῃ.

Scombrus *Schott* : combrus **AV**^{2} : cumbrus **BV** | ἐστυγημένην *Thomas* : CTHTHMeNNN (MEHN **T**) **α** | ἀσωτίαν ἀσωτεύῃ *Bursian* : AeTIΛN (aN **A**) aCUOTeYHN (TYN **A**) **B**

The theme of the *controversia* is 'pater et filius luxuriosi', and it is about a son who accused his father of madness because he had decided to live like a libertine (and the son already lived the same way). Damas' *sententia* is meant to be pronounced by the son, who is accusing his father of not enjoying the lifestyle of a debauchee. This peculiar declamation subject is to be found only in Quintilian 11.1.79 ('in scholis luxuriantem patrem luxuriosus ipse iuvenis accusat').

ἐστυγημένην: this is Thomas' restoration for the desperate text CTHTHMeNNN. This verb makes sense considering the previous quotation of Agroitas of Marseille (a Greek rhetorician contemporary of Seneca, who taught in Rome, see Brzoscka [1893]) in which the speaker is the father who says he does not enjoy his debauchery.

F3. Sen. *Controv.* 10.4.21

Damas Scombros dixit: πάλαι μὲν ἐκθέτοις κίνδυνος ἦν τὸ ῥιφῆναι, νῦν δὲ τὸ τραφῆναι.

Damas Scombros : ΔAMAC CKOMBPOC **α** | dixit *om.* **B** | πάλαι : nΛaΛI **A** | ἐκθέτοις : eKeeTOIS **BV** | κίνδυνος ἦν τὸ ῥιφῆναι : KINΔYNOΣ HN ΓOPIΦNaI **α** | δὲ : Λε **α**

The theme of this *controversia* involves a man accustomed to crippling exposed children, consequently making them beggars and taking a fee. He is accused of harming the State. There are no attestations of a similar theme in Greek and Latin declamations. Nevertheless, this is said to have been a very famous *controversia* among the Greeks (*Controv.* 10.4.18), and on this topic, many things appear to have been said – most of them in 'bad taste' ('corrupte'). Damas' quotation, certainly against the man, refers with bitter irony to the fact that being exposed after birth (considered dangerous) would still be better than being born and crippled.

Interestingly, the *consensus codicum* **ABV** (the oldest manuscripts of Seneca) have Damas' name correctly written in Greek, unlike all other mentions in Seneca.

From a stylistic point of view, it is interesting to note that ἦν τὸ ῥιφῆναι would be a rhythmic clause if τὸ were long, which would be true in Attic Greek but not in later authors.

F4. Sen. *Controv.* 10.5.21

Damas corruptissime: δικαίως, Προμηθεῦ· διὰ τί γὰρ πῦρ ἔκλεπτες ἀνθρώπῳ;

Damas : damnas **AV** | Προμηθεῦ *et seq. om.* **V** | διὰ τί γὰρ πῦρ ἔκλεπτες ἀνθρώπῳ : aIΛ TI TaP nYR eKΛenTeC aNeTPOWOC **A**

The theme of the *controversia* is the following: 'The Athenian painter Parrhasius purchased an old man from among the captives from Olynthus, put up for sale by Philip, and took him to Athens. He tortured him, and using him as a model, painted a Prometheus. The Olynthian died under the

torture. Parrhasius put the picture in the temple of Minerva; he is accused of harming the State'. The scenario is entirely fictional, as the painter Parrhasius was almost certainly not alive when Olynthus was conquered in 348 BC. As regards the quotation provided by Seneca, Damas here speaks against Parrhasius, as all the Greeks did (§ 20). The wordplay is here about the words πῦρ and ἄνθρωπος, 'fire' and 'man', the two gifts given Prometheus, and also the two things that played a role in Parrhasius's crime, if we infer (as most Greek orators in this *controversia* seem to do) that Parrhasius used fire as an instrument of torture on the slave: hence the very bad taste of Damas' sentence, depicting a cruel scene. What Damas seems to mean with his question is that it was not worth stealing fire if it were going to be used by men as an instrument of torture. Themes dealing with painters were quite common in Greek and Latin declamation: see among others Syrianus *Stas*. 130.6-9; 131.11-16; 134.10-14; 134.22; 135.14; Walz *Rhet.Gr*. 4. 645; 5.96-7. These kinds of topics broadly belong to a category including artists and orators who are accused (mostly of impiety) and charged because of something they did in their artistic or rhetorical activities, such as painting defeats, pronouncing encomia of death and leading the people to commit suicide (for orators see among others Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.458; 631; 5.80; 8.407; Fortunatianus 92; 94; Apsines 1.37 [= 224 Spengel]).

F5. Sen. *Suas.* 1.13

Damas ethicos induxit matrem loquentem, cum describeret adsidue prioribus periculis nova supervenisse: ***

ethicos : eticos **AB** : eticus **V** | nova **B²** : novas **α** | supervenisse **B²** : supervenisset **AB**

The Greek quotation here has not survived. The theme of the *suasoria* was 'deliberat Alexander, an Oceanum naviget' (although the title is only a later addition in the manuscripts and the beginning is actually lost). Damas most likely described Olympias' worries about Alexander's sailing. Damas, as well as most declaimers in this *suasoria*, raises doubts about sailing the ocean, which is the only infinite thing on earth. Another example in declamations of a mother asking her son not to fight is to be found in P.Petrie 1.10 (see commentary), an encomium of Achilles where Thetis tries to prevent Achilles from avenging Patroclus. The whole *suasoria* contains a debate about the question of the nature of the Ocean (see also Plution, F1, Quint. *Inst.* 7.2.5.; 4.2 and Tac. *Agr*. 10.6). Stramaglia (2003), 226, n. 39, hypothesises that the same theme is in P.Köln 6.250, from the 2nd-3rd century AD, a papyrus containing several *ethopoiai* on Alexander (and only a few other topics), including one about a person trying to dissuade Alexander from doing something dealing with navigation (see also Citti [2007], 92-94).

F6. Sen. *Controv.* 1.4.10

In hac controversia dixit Damas *** habet aliquid corrupti haec sententia

Damas **D²** *Schott* : amas **α**

The quotation by Damas has been lost in transmission (like the rest of Greek quotations in this *controversia*, see Hybreas' F11, and Gorgias' F1-2). The theme of this *controversia* deals with the law (see Bonner [1949], 119-21) according to which if someone catches an adulterer with his mistress in the act, he can be free if he kills both, and this also applies to a son finding his mother in the act (see Bonner [1949], 121-2). The specific case is the following: 'A hero lost his hands in war. He caught an adulterer with his wife, by whom he had a youthful son. He told the son to do the killing. The son refused. The adulterer fled. The husband now disinherits his son' (transl. Winterbottom). The same topic is in Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.250.14-16. All we know about Damas' *controversia* is that he spoke for the husband, and that the quotation which got lost must have been somehow decadent ('aliquid corrupti'), although Seneca had just a few lines earlier described the Greek sentences as better than brilliant (the 'pulcherrime dicta' of the Latin have to yield, 'cessuri sint', to those of the Greeks). Perhaps the "decadence" of Damas' sentence was similar to that in the pathetic image in the following *sententia* by Latro, where the father tragically complains to Fate that he had not lost his eyes in the moment he found out about the adultery.

(28) Daphnis

Biographical note: of this orator, nothing is known to us except what we can deduce from his only surviving fragment, the one quoted by Rutilius Lupus. Considering Rutilius' dependence on Gorgias' treatise, we can at least establish a *terminus ante quem* for Daphnis, i.e., the 1st century BC, when Gorgias is supposed to have written his work. It has been said that Daphins was an imitator of Demosthenes, on the basis of some similarities between this fragment and a passage of Demosthenes' oration *On the Crown*. Wooten has also made the hypothesis that Daphnis was from Byzantium, since he seems to be speaking of personal sacrifices in F1 (see commentary).
On Daphnis see also: Barabino (1967) 137-8; Broszka (1901); Ruhnken (1768), XCIII; Wooten (1972), 27; Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 878.

F1. Rutilius. 1.15
Daphnidis: 'Quid autem me convenit facere, Byzantii? Subire publicae causae iudicium, magno nomini adversariorum fortiter resistere, non vereri periculum, diligenter †posteritatis crescere†, non minas extimescere, constanter in causa pro vobis perseverare. Omnia feci, vestrum commune commodum spectans. Tamen non desunt, qui ex tantis meis officiis aliquid velint vituperare.'

Daphnidis **Ald.** : Daphnis *codd.* **Basil.** | : me *om.* **V** | nomini *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : molimini *Ruhnken* : numero Bardili : conamini *Frotscher* : agmini *Haupt.* | diligenter †posteritatis crescere† **codd. Ald. Basil.** : diligenter

posteritati consumere *Toup* : diligenter protervitatem compescere *Jacobus* : diligenter pro veritatis causa esse *Haase* : ingens posteritatis ore crescere *Maehly* : diligenter pro veritate disserter *Halm* : diligentem prosperitatis vestrae esse *Haupt* | feci **A Ald. Basil.** : fieri **B V**

This passage is quoted in the section on διάλυσις, a rhetorical synonym for asyndeton (see Alex. Rhet. *De Figuris*. 32; Herod. *Rher.Gr*. 4.99.19 Spengel). The fragment is composed of a series of questions directed towards the people of Byzantium, not connected by any conjunctions. It seems to belong to a political speech addressed to an assembly of people in the city of Byzantium (on the democratic government in Byzantium see Robinson [2011], 146-9). The orator seems directly involved in the matter, as he always speaks in the first person, talks about *his own* opponents, and mentions his unrewarded efforts and sacrifices ('omnia feci') for the city. Thus, the possibility that the speaker was a citizen of Byzantium (Wooten [1972], 27) is surely a consistent one. It is, however, difficult to use this information to date Daphnis, since Byzantium appears to have been a democracy at least from the 4th century to the end of the Hellenistic age. Moreover, as for fragments by orators whose background and age are uncertain, we cannot exclude the possibility that this quotation is taken from a declamation.

From a formal point of view, the fragment does not give us enough elements to have a view on Daphnis' style, since asyndeton was a very common figure of speech even in Attic oratory and more broadly in Attic prose (see Denniston [1952], 99-123). As regards the content and phraseology, the parallel between this passage and Demosthenes' speech *On the Crown* (301 ff.) is very interesting: here, we have a sequence of questions whose structure and content are strikingly similar to those in Daphnis' speech. Demosthenes starts with τί χρῆν τὸν εὔνουν πολίτην ποιεῖν, not too distant from 'Quid autem me convenit facere'; ταῦτα τοίνυν ἅπαντα πέπρακται τοῖς ἐμοῖς ψηφίσμασι καὶ τοῖς ἐμοῖς πολιτεύμασιν (302-3) also resembles the 'omnia feci' of Daphnis; moreover, Demosthenes' disappointment in those who made him look guilty is paralleled in the last sentence of the fragment. If this was a declamation employing the speech *On the Crown* as a model, the setting could be the one mentioned at paragraphs 87-88, where Demosthenes talks about the facts of 341-340 BC, when Philip asked for the help of the people from Byzantium, but they refused because they were allies of the Athenians, and Philip consequently besieged their city, which was then liberated by the Athenians. Therefore, considering the presence of themes and phrases of the speech *On the Crown* in this fragment, it is not farfetched to imagine that this could have been a declamation drawing its topic and vocabulary from Demosthenes' speech.

†posteritatis crescere†: various emendations have been proposed for this *locus desperatus* (see Barabino [1967], 138). Ruhnken's advice is, however, worth taking into account: 'Sed satius fuisset tacere, quam tam absurda in medium proferre. Non nihil nunc ingenio assequimur, quod veri quadam specie blandiatur. Sed veram lectionem vel alii nobis auctiores, vel nosmetipsi fortasse alio tempore reperiemus' (53-4).

(29) Demetrius of Phalerum

Biographical note: Demetrius of Phalerum is one of the most prominent historical characters of the early Hellenistic age. Therefore, it would be superfluous to provide here details of his political activity.[335]

Besides his political role, he was also an extremely prolific writer, especially as a philosopher (he was a pupil of Theophrastus, see Cic. *De Fin.* 5.54) and historian (*FGrHist* 228) as known from the main source about his production (political, biographical, poetical, oratorical and rhetorical, historical, philosophical, gnomic), namely Diogenes Laertius (5.75-82), who gives a summary of his life and career, and finally a list of his works. The list consists of the following: 1. *On Lawmaking On Lawmaking at Athens* (books 1-5); *On Constitutions in Athens* (1-2) *On Leadership of the People* (1-2); *On Politics* (1-22); *On Laws* (1); *On Rhetoric* (1-2); *On Strategies* (1-2); *On the Iliad* (1-2); *On the Odyssey* (1-4); *Ptolemy* (1); *On Love* (1); *Phaidondas* (1); *Maidon* (1); *Kleon* (1); *Socrates* (1); *Artaxerxes* (1); *Homer* (1); *Aristides* (1); *Aristom-acu*s (1); *Protreptic* (1); *In Defence of the Constitution* (1); *On the Ten Years* (1); *On the Ionians* (1); *Ambassadorial Address* (1); *On Trust* (1); *On Grace* (1); *On Fate* (1); *On Magnanimity* (1); *On Marriage* (1); *On the Opinion* (1); *On Peace* (1); *On Laws* (1); *On Pursuits* (1); *On the Right Moment* (1); *Dionysius* (1); *Chalcidian Speech* (1); *A Denunciation of the Athenians* (1); *On Antiphanes* (1); *A Historical Preface* (1); *Letters* (1); *The Sworn Assembly* (1); *On Old Age* (1); *Matters of Justice* (1); *Aesopic Fables* (1); *Practical Maxims* (1).

Diogenes also says his style was of a philosophical manner, mixed with rhetorical power and force. To the abovementioned titles, the inscription of titles in the library of Rhodes (Maiuri [1925], 14-15, XI.1.1-7) also lists a *Boeotian Speech* and an *Aristaichmos.* A new and detailed edition of all fragments by Demetrius, including *apophthegmata* and sayings (see Introduction) is in Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf (2000); the previous main edition was the one by Wehrli (1968). A commentary on *testimonia* and fragments is also in *BNJ* 228. However, despite Demetrius' fame as an orator (Cic. *Brut.* *9.37*; 82.285; *De O*r. 2.23.94; *Off.* 1.1.3; *Orat.* 26.91; Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.41; 10.1.33; 80; Anon. Segu. 128), not much of his oratorical production survives – and even the fragments edited in the present work could still be rather ambiguous (whether the *Apology of Socrate*s should be identified with the dialogue *Socrates* is still debated) and attributed to historical or philosophical works (see F1-F2 quoted by Rutilius). His contribution to rhetorical theory was certainly extremely valuable, as clear from his fragments quoted by Philodemus (*FGrHist* 228.14, 46-48), and others (Plut. *Dem.* 9.3, where we read he criticised Demosthenes' style; Tzetz. Schol. *Chil.* 5.209). He was also the first to theorise the genre of the ambassadorial speech, a genre that he practised himself, since according to Diognes Laertius,

[335] For a clear and concise outline see above all Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf (2000), 347-80. See also Banfi (1998/1999); Banfi (2010); Gagarin (2000); Muccioli (2015); Gehrke (1978); O'Sullivan (2009).

he wrote an *Ambassadorial Oration* (a fragment might be the one in Demetr. *Eloc.* 289). Diogenes says his rhetorical theory contained examples of public and ambassadorial speeches.

His style has been highly commented on: according to Cicero (*Brut*. 37-38), it was metaphorically better suited for the wrestling school than for speaking, and he was the first to make oratory soft and delicate and he preferred to seem delightful, as he was, rather than serious.
On Demetrius (as an author and philosopher) see among others: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-42), 73; *FGrHist/BNJ* 228; Fortenbaugh-Schütrumpf (2000); Gehrke (1978); Haake (2012); Wehrli (1968); Williams (1987).

F1. Rutilius 1.1

Demetrii Phalerei: 'Nam quod beneficium tempore et cupienti datur, gratum est; utilitas enim ac voluntas accipiendi honorem dantis facit ampliorem. At quod sero et non desideranti datur, ingratum est; amisso enim tempore utilitatis cadit accipiendi cupiditas.'

ac **A B V Ald. Basil.** : et **R** | accipiendi *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : accipienti *Ruhnken* | dantis *codd.* **Ald.** : dati **Basil.** | facit **A**^{2} **Ald. Basil.** : faccia **A**^{1} **B R V** | At…est **Basil.** : at…dari datur *codd.* **Ald.** : at quod sero datur gratum est *Simon* | utilitatis **A B R Ald. Basil.** : utilitas **V**

This passage is quoted in the section on προσαπόδοδις, a term never attested with a rhetorical meaning before Rutilius (in Greek we mostly find προυπάντησις, in Latin *preaoccursio*). It normally means *redditio*, but in Rutilius (and in *Carmen De Figuris*, 67) it indicates the division of a thought according to a symmetrical order, as Demetrius does here: 1a) he explains that right time and willingness to accept it make a benefit welcome; 2a)he explains the relationship between usefulness and willingness to accept it; 1b)he explains what happens when the moment is not right and there is no will; 2b) he tells how a lack of usefulness cancels the willingness to receive. This kind of reasoning was typical of rhetorical schools, and so was the philosophical *topos* of the connection between benefit and right moment (see Sen. *De Ben.* 2.1.2). Therefore, we must consider the possibility that this fragment might not belong to an actual speech of Demetrius, but rather to a rhetorical/philosophical work (we can see, among the others, a work *Of Favour* in the list contained in Diog. Laert. 5.80), or one of the examples (authentic or not) incorporated in his rhetorical manuals.

F2a. Rutilius 2.16

Aliud est item quod superiori infertur, sed consequenter, ita uti fecit Demetrius Phalereus: 'Nobis primis dii immortales fruges dederunt: nos, quod soli accepimus, per omnes terras distribuimus. Nobis maiores nostri rem publicam <liberam> reliquerunt: nos etiam socios nostros de servitute eripuimus. Itaque et amplissimus nobis honos ab omnibus habetur, et propter huius honoris dignitatem superbiae nostrae nemo vestigium experitur.'

primis *Quint. Inst.* (*vide infra*) : primum *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | liberam *suppl. Sauppe post* rem publicam, *Bardilii ante r*em publicam | reliquerunt **Ald. Basil.** : relinquerunt *codd.* | huius **B Ald. Basil.** : huiusmodi **V** | superbiae nostrae nemo **B V Ald. Basil.** : superbientem nemo **A** | vestigium *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : fastidium *Jacobus*

F2b Quint. *Inst. Inst.* 9.3.84

Nec semper, quod adversum est, contraponitur: quale est apud Rutilium, 'nobis primis dii immortales fruges dederunt: nos, quod soli accepimus, in omnes terras distribuimus'.

This fragment is considered as an example of a third kind of antithesis after the contrast of opposites (as in Charisius F3) and the juxtaposition of opposites (as in Isidorus F1). Demetrius' fragment is considered rather as an example of a consequence of the second type of antithesis ('rem publican <liberam>' against 'servitute' and 'honos' against 'superbiae'). We have no elements to determine the context of the speech, which could have been either a political speech or a rhetorical composition taken from his rhetorical theory. It is also possible that this is part of Demetrius' *On the Legislation of Athens* in five books, or O*n the Constitutions of* Athens, both listed by Diogenes Laertius (5.80.) Fortenbaugh [1999] does not insert these fragments among those belonging to the *Legislation* or the *Constitution*, nor in any other sub-sections in the main section entitled *Politic*s (166-206) but prefers to consider it (along with F1) just as a *testimonium* of the stylistic figures used by Demetrius (221-2). The fragment has some sort of encomiastic character, as it praises the State, its ancestors and their actions, and the honours given to the city and its dignity (see Stratocles F1).

T1. Diog. Laert. 9.15

Δημήτριος δέ φησιν ἐν τοῖς Ὁμωνύμοις καὶ Ἀθηναίων αὐτὸν ὑπερφρονῆσαι, δόξαν ἔχοντα παμπλείστην, καταφρονούμενόν τε ὑπὸ τῶν Ἐφεσίων ἐλέσθαι μᾶλλον τὰ οἰκεῖα. μέμνηται αὐτοῦ καὶ ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ.

αὐτοῦ **BPF**: < δ'> αὐ- *Marcov.*: ταὐτοῦ vel τούτου *Mouraviev, REG 98 (1985) 132* | δημήτριος **FP**^{4}: δημόκριτος **BP**^{1}**(Q)**.

T2. Diog. Laert. 9.37

Δημήτριος δὲ ὁ Φαληρεὺς ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ μηδὲ ἐλθεῖν φησιν αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀθήνας. τοῦτο δὲ καὶ μεῖζον, εἴγε τοσαύτης πόλεως ὑπερεφρόνησεν, οὐκ ἐκ τόπου δόξαν λαβεῖν βουλόμενος, ἀλλὰ τόπῳ δόξαν περιθεῖναι προελόμενος.

καὶ *om.* **F** | εἴγε *codd* : ἤ γε **B** : ὑπερῆγε **F**^{1} | ἐκ τόπου : τοῦ τόπου *Suda δ 448* | ἀλλὰ τόπῳ : ἀλλὰ τῷ τόπω *Sud.* | περιθεῖναι : περιθῆναι **F** | προελόμενος **PF**^{2}, Sud.: προσελ- **B** : βουλ- **F**^{1}

T3. Diog. Laert. 9.57

τοῦτόν φησιν ὁ Φαληρεὺς Δημήτριος ἐν τῇ Σωκράτους ἀπολογίᾳ διὰ μέγαν φθόνον μικροῦ κινδυνεῦσαι Ἀθήνησιν.

As Jacoby already stated (*FGrHist* 228, 40-45) the identification between the *Apology of Socrates* mentioned in his fragments 31-33 and the *Socrates* mentioned in Plut. *Arist.* 1, (*FGrHist* 228, 43) is all but certain. A *Socrates* is mentioned in the list of Demetrius' works that Diogenes Laertius (5. 82-83) provides and, considering its position in the list, it seems rather a dialogue than a speech. Jacoby, who, despite his doubts, chose to treat the two works as the same, considered fragments of this alleged dialogue called *Socrates* also Plut. *Arist.* 5.9, 27.1, and Ath. 12.556a, on the ground of their content. Accordingly, Fortenbough and Schtrümpf edit the fragments of the *Socrates* and of the *Apology* as a single work (frr. 88-95).

As regards the *Apology of Socrates*, the biographical sources about Demetrius do not mention such a speech or give information referable to it. Rhetorical works on Socrates like this should not surprise, as Socrates had already become mythologised by Demetrius' time (see Beck [1986]). The most famous apologies were those by Plato and Xenophon, and probably originated a debate on the figure of Socrates. An apology of Socrates is attested for Lysias too (*Or.* 127 Carey), while in contrast to these apologies, Isocrates shaped his *Antidosis* on the *Apology* of Plato, and there are works on philosophers attested for Hellenistic orators (e.g. Charisius, Democharis, Theopompus). A work with the same title is attested for Theodectes (father), who was active just a few decades before Demetrius (two not particularly interesting fragments are edited in Baiter-Sauppe [1839-43], II.32.2.1-2), which is peculiar, considering that Theodectes was a pupil of Isocrates, and therefore not a supporter of Socratic philosophy. On the more famous examples of apologies of Plato and Xenophon, see the recent commentary by Denyer (2019).

From the very little information one can deduce from the three testimonia we have, it is fair to assume that the apology included information about other philosophers, at least Heraclitus, Democritus, and Diogenes of Apollonia. A fairly solid hypothesis (as Fortenbough and Schtrümpf [2000] 105-8 also say) is that this apology could have been a reply to Democharis' speech *In Defence of Sophocles against Philon*, where he attacked the philosophers and the Socratic method. What we deduce from these testimonia is the idea that there was some hostile between the philosophers and Athens, a city which often opposed them. This was already Dover's position (Dover [1975]), but was rejected by O'Sullivan (See O'Sullivan [2008], and O'Sullivan [2009], 229-232), who maintains that Demetrius' self-representation as patron of philosophers would contradict an involvement of his in a dispute like the one in which Democharis was involved, and that the term 'apology' was rather added to the actual work entitled *Socrates*. Therefore, this work would have been simply a (positive, hence apologetic) biography of the famous philosopher. A controversy between Demetrius and Democharis is, however, attested by Polybius (12.13.7), and it is absolutely plausible that Demetrius wrote a speech on the law promoted by Sophocles according to which the Socratic schools should be closed, and in defence of which Democharis spoke. What we have in these testimonia are biographical anecdotes about the philosophers Democritus and Diogenes of Apollonia.

F3. Demetr. *Eloc.* 289

πολλάκις δὲ ἢ πρὸς τύραννον ἢ ἄλλως βίαιόν τινα διαλεγόμενοι καὶ ὀνειδίσαι ὁρμῶντες χρῄζομεν ἐξ ἀνάγκης σχήματος λόγου, ὡς Δημήτριος ὁ Φαληρεὺς πρὸς Κρατερὸν τὸν Μακεδόνα ἐπὶ χρυσῆς κλίνης καθεζόμενον μετέωρον, καὶ ἐν πορφυρᾷ χλανίδι καὶ ὑπερηφάνως ἀποδεχόμενον τὰς πρεσβείας τῶν Ἑλλήνων, σχηματίσας εἶπεν ὀνειδιστικῶς ὅτι: *ὑπεδεξάμεθά ποτε πρεσβεύοντας ἡμεῖς τούσδε καὶ Κρατερὸν τοῦτον*. ἐν γὰρ τῷ δεικτικῷ τῷ τοῦτον ἐμφαίνεται <ἡ> ὑπερηφανία τοῦ Κρατεροῦ πᾶσα ὠνειδισμένη ἐν σχήματι.

ὁρμῶντες **PM** : ὁρμώμενοι *rell.* | λόγου *Finckh* ὅλου *codd.* | ἀποδεχόμενον **PM** : ὑποδεχόμενον *rell.* | πρεσβεύοντας **PM** : πρεσβεύοντα. *rell.*

It is not certain whether the speech Demetrius pronounced during an embassy to the arrogant Macedonian Craterus, and from which this quotation is taken, was the *Ambassadorial Oration* mentioned by Diogenes Laertius. The use of τοῦτον referred to Craterus ('that Craterus') is used ironically to indicate the arrogance of the despot. If it belongs to the *Ambassadorial Oration*, this fragment would constitute the earliest, however extremely short and fragmentary, example of Hellenistic ambassadorial speeches. The sentence seems to be a witty and extravagant (and therefore in line with a new Hellenistic style) beginning of a speech.

(30) Democharès

Biographical note: Democharès was born in the Attic deme of Leuconoe, between 355 and 350 BC (according to calculations made on his mother's age and based on Dem. 28.3-4). His father was Laches of Leuconoe and his mother Cleobule, sister of Demosthenes (Dem. 27.14-16). He was an Athenian politician, orator, and also historian (on his activity as historian see Marasco [1984] 87-109). Democharès opposed Demetrius of Phalerum first and then, less aggressively, Demetrius Poliorcetes. He died before the archonship of Pytharatos in 271/270 BC, when according to the decree in Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 847d-e, his son Laches (probably an orator and politician himself) proposed to honour his father Democharès. From the same decree, we also know he was exiled in 303 BC (on the exile see Marasco [1894]. 63-83) and then called back to Athens. Literature last allows us to trace him alive in 280/279 when, as we read in the decree in Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 847c-e, he proposed to honour his uncle Demosthenes.

With regard to his activity as an orator we only have little information: he apparently made a speech to denounce Antipater's order that the Athenian anti-Macedonian orators (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 847d-e) surrender to him in 322, evidently a failed attempt, considering that the Athenians, in the end, decided to surrender. Apart from this speech, which has not survived, we have evidence for two other orations: a defence of Sophocles of Sunion against Philon (307-306), a politician who wanted to impose state control over philosophical schools (see F3-4, T1-2; an attestation is also in Pollux. 9.42), in which he probably attacked Aristotle and his school and accused the philosophers of

wanting to become tyrants (see F6). Marasco (1945) dates it to the 307/306. We also know about Democharesʼ proposal to honour his uncle (on his admiration for Demosthenes see Plut. *Dem.* 30, where Plutarch said Democharesin his *Histories* wrote a different version of his uncleʼs death). We have information on his style from Cicero (*De Or.* 95; *Brut.* 286) who, in the former passage, says Democharesʼ speeches lacked vigour, and in the latter opposes him to Charisius. According to Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 847c-d, his oratory was inferior to no otherʼs. His *Histories* were also written in a very rhetorical style according to Cicero (*Brut.* 286).

He is known for being the main ‘candidate’ for the role of first assembler of the Demosthenic corpus (see among others Canevaro [2013], 237-8; Canfora [1974–2000], i, 74-75; Canfora [2006], 115; Clavaud [1976], 241; and Trevett [1996], 441 n. 85).

On Democharesse: Asmonti (2004); Baiter Sauppe (1893-42), II.62; Barabino (1967), 137-8; Blass (1893²), 337-41; *FGrHist/BNJ* 75; Marasco (1984); Ruhnken (1768), XCI; Susemihl (1891-1892), I, 552-8, II, 461-2; Swoboda (1901); Wooten (1972), 9-13; Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 877-78.

F1. Rutilius 1.2

Item Democharis: ‘Nam quis haec simul universa perpeti possit, timorem, morbum, senectutem, contumeliam, inopiam, vim? quarum quaevis una res per se satis est gravis ad deficiendum.’

quis haec **B R V Ald. Basil.** : quia hoc **A** | quaevis **R V Ald.** : quivis **A** : quis **B Basil.** | res per se satis **A B R² V Ald. Basil.** : res satis **R¹** | ad deficiendum *Ruhnken* : ad efficiendum **B R V** : ad officiendum **A Ald. Basil** : ad perferendum *Steph.*

This fragment belongs to the section on συναθροισμός (on this figure see also Cleochares F1), a figure of speech very common in Demosthenes (see e.g., Dem. 18.71, cf. Barabino [1967], 54 for more parallels). Here, Democharesliststa series of different misfortunes. They are listed within a rhetorical question followed by a reinforcing statement, which also provides an implicit answer: no-one could bear so many sufferings together. The elements at our disposal are not enough to say much on Democharesʼ style or to reconstruct the context. The kind of speech is also almost impossible to determine. Barabino (1967) 136, points out that this fragment and F2 contain a sort of reflection on the human ability to bear pain, sorrow, age, violence that we do not find in any other passages in Rutilius. Wooten (1972), 12, believes it comes from a forensic speech. Susemihl (1891-1892), 55, n.172 believes this fragment and F2 belonged to the oration *In Defence of Sophocles against Phil*on, but there seems to be no evidence to prove it.

F2. Rutilius 1.20

‘Item Democharis: “Nihil enim valebat assidua pro fratre ac misericors deprecatio, cum iudicaret tyrannus, cuius crudelitas omnem naturae necessitudinem exstinguebat.”’

This quotation is about ἀναγκαῖον, a rhetorical figure (first attested in Rutilius as a figure and not simply a *topos*, see Barabino [1967], 69-70 and Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.106) aiming at showing a 'necessity' of some sort. In Democharesʼ case, it regards the natural impossibility for a tyrant not to be cruel. It is evidently about the judgment of a tyrant on his brother – or better against him – and focusses on the stronger role that cruelty plays in the actions of a tyrant compared to that of natural affinity. The tone is sententious and gnomic. This quotation could belong to a political speech or a rhetorical exercise, and, as Barabino (1968), 136 notes, its philosophical content is not typical of any other passages of Rutiliusʼ. Susemihl (1891-1892), 555, n.172 believes this fragment and F1 belonged to the oration *In Defence of Sophocles against Philon*, because of the mention of tyranny (of which the philosophers were accused), but there is no strong evidence to confirm it. Tyrants were very frequently protagonists of Greek and Latin declamations; cruelty is always a component of these themes, but it is never opposed to family relationships the way it is in Democharesʼ fragment. In Sopater *DZ*. 28; 67, a father kills his sons who are tyrants, but the situation is the opposite and cannot work as a useful parallel for this case.

————

*It is worth mentioning a curious episode dealing with Democharesʼ fragments in Rutilius. All the main *codices* containing Rutiliusʼ treatise have a *lacuna* between 1.5 and 1.6 (see Ruhnken [1768] XXI). In 1837 Karl Schöpfer published a series of *Adnotationes Criticae* on Velleius Paterculus and added to them the mention of a fragment in 'vetustissima membrana' (dating back to the ninth century) which he claimed to have found nine years earlier, hidden in a volume and containing a section of Rutiliusʼ book 1. This allegedly included the missing part between §§ 5 and 6 (for a detailed description see Brooks [1970], 100-1. On the subject, see also Marasco (1984), 147, 213-4). At the end of the apparently missing section there was a fragment of Democharesʼ: 'Demochari: erravistis, erravistis viri si putavistis praemio corrigendos esse homines nequam'. This discovery was accepted in Jacobʼs edition (Jacob [1937], 27), by Baiter and Sauppe (1839-43) II.62.2.2), and in 1972 Wooten commented on it as authentic in his dissertation. However, Haase (1856) successfully and convincingly debunked this fraud (after all, if it is true that *nomen est omen*, then we cannot entirely blame Schöpfer for following his destiny of "fabricator").

————

F3. Ath. 5.187d

ἀλλ' οὔτε ἐκ θύμβρας, ἔφη Δημοχάρης, *λόγχη οὔτ' ἐκ τοιούτων λόγων ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίνεται.*

F4. Ath. 5.215c

τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν οἱ ἀπὸ φιλοσοφίας στρατηγοί. περὶ ὧν Δημοχάρης ἔλεγεν· 'ὥσπερ ἐκ θύμβρας οὐδεὶς ἂν δύναιτο κατασκευάσαι λόγχην, οὐδ' ἐκ Σωκράτους στρατιώτην ἄμεμπτον'.

Δημοχάρης *Ruhnken* : δημοχάρης κράτης **A** : δημόχαιν **C**

F3 is probably an adapted or reduced version of F4, maybe due to the fact that Athenaeus was quoting with the only aid of his own memory. Both fragments constitute a comparison between a spear and a noble man/soldier. The attack in F4 is clearly against the Socratic school, and this is why some scholars have assumed it (and consequently F3 as well) may have been part of Democharesʼ speech *Against Philon* (see Wooten [1972], 13; Korhonen [1997]). This idea is based on two *testimonia* about the above-mentioned speech. 1) Ath. 11.508f-509b = T2, where the oration for Sophocles is explicitly mentioned (‘ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Σοφοκλέους πρὸς Φίλωνα’), and Athenaeus remarks Democharesʼ attacks on Plato. 2) Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* 15.2.6 (F6), where Eusebius says that Demochares, in his accusation against the philosophers, spoke not only against Aristotle but ‘ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους’, an expression that could broadly include Socrates and all his pupils. Since in F4 the accusations are aimed at the Socratic method, it is not unlikely that this fragment could come from the speech *Against Philon*. Marasco (1984), 118, 176, underlines the fact that immediately after, Athenaeus quotes a passage from Plato (*APolib.* 28e) where he comments on Socratesʼ activities as a soldier during the Peloponnesian war. So, since Plato praised him for this (*Laches*. 181b), Marasco believes this fragment could be part of a polemical response of Democharesto Platoʼs good opinion about Socrates as a soldier.

From a stylistic point of view, Wooten notices a not entirely convincing parallel with the metaphors Demosthenes employs to describe Philip. This would probably imply a forced comparison between Demosthenes and Democharesʼ style in order to establish a dependence of the latter from the former. But unfortunately, we do not have enough elements to come to such a conclusion. The opposition of philosophers to soldiers is in line with Cleocharesʼ F3 on the comparison between Isocrates and Demosthenes, where the speeches of the former are said to resemble athletes, while those of the latter soldiers: Isocratesʼ oratory was more philosophical, and therefore the object of criticism of orators like Democharesand Cleochares, supporters of the Demosthenic way of making oratory.

T1. Euseb. *Prep. Ev.* 15.2.6

τὴν μὲν γὰρ Δημοχάρους κατηγορίαν κατὰ τῶν φιλοσόφων τί χρὴ λέγειν; οὐ γὰρ Ἀριστοτέλην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους κακῶς εἴρηκεν. ἔτι γε μὴν αὐτὰς τὰς διαβολὰς σκοπῶν ἄν τις ληρεῖν αὐτὸν φαίη. λέγει γὰρ ἐπιστολὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἁλῶναι κατὰ τῆς πόλεως τῆς Ἀθηναίων καὶ Στάγειρα τὴν πατρίδα προδοῦναι Μακεδόσιν αὐτόν, ἔτι δὲ κατασκαφείσης Ὀλύνθου μηνύειν ἐπὶ τοῦ λαφυροπωλείου Φιλίππῳ τοὺς πλουσιωτάτους τῶν Ὀλυνθίων.

τί *add.* **V**^{1} | ἔτι γε : εἰ γε **V** | αὐτὰς : αὐτοῦ **BV** | ἁλῶναι Ἀριστοτέλους ἁλῶναι **B** | λαφυροπωλείου **N**^{a}**V** : λαφυροπωλίου **ON**^{1}**D** : λαφυροπωλ **B** : λαθυροπωλείου **I**^{b} | Φιλίππῳ *codd.* : Φιλίππους **I**^{b}

This testimonium, although not quoting an exact passage of an oration, gives us an idea of the content of Democharesʼ speech *Against the Philosophers*. One of the targets of his accusations was clearly Aristotle. Part of the attack was based on Aristotleʼs decision to leave Athens and betray his hometown, and on an alleged report on the wealthiest Olynthians he made for Philip. Firstly, Democharesused some alleged letters of Aristotle to prove the philosopher wanted to betray Athens. Whether these letters existed or not is difficult to say, but even if Democharesthose who were in charge of the propaganda against him) came into possession of real letters of Aristotle, their content could have easily been manipulated and reinterpreted in order to make them seem anti-Athenian. As regards his betrayal of Stagira, the reference is probably to the first time he left for Atarneus in 347, when, after the destruction of Olynthus, the anti-Macedonian party had become stronger, while the philosopher was, as known, close to the Macedonians, being Alexanderʼs preceptor. This choice is compared by Democharesto a betrayal. Another possibility is that the reference is to 323, when Aristotle went to Macedonia after an accusation against him related to his friendship with Ermias, tyrant of Atarneus (on this see Marasco [1984] 171-2). As Marasco points out, the theme of a betrayal in favour of the Macedonians was very popular in anti-Macedonian propaganda: Demosthenes himself used it (8.40; 9.53; 18.295), but it is completely absent in Aristotleʼs biographical tradition. Finally, as for the accusation of having reported the wealthiest Olynthians to Philip, Marasco believes it is chronologically inconsistent, as in 348 (when Olynthus was destroyed), Aristotle was still in Athens and left for Atarneus a year later.

T2. Ath. 11. 508f-509b

Εὐαίων δ' ὁ Λαμψακηνός, ὥς φησιν Εὐρύπυλος καὶ Δικαιοκλῆς ὁ Κνίδιος ἐνενηκοστῷ καὶ πρώτῳ Διατριβῶν, ἔτι δὲ Δημοχάρης ὁ ῥήτωρ ἐν τῷ ὑπὲρ Σοφοκλέους πρὸς Φίλωνα, δανείσας τῇ πατρίδι ἀργύριον ἐπὶ ἐνεχύρῳ τῇ ἀκροπόλει [καὶ] ἀφυστερησάσης τυραννεῖν ἐβουλεύετο, ἕως συνδραμόντες ἐπ' αὐτὸν οἱ Λαμψακηνοὶ καὶ τὰ χρήματα ἀποδόντες ἐξέβαλον. Τίμαιος δ' ὁ Κυζικηνός, ὡς ὁ αὐτὸς Δημοχάρης φησίν, χρήματα καὶ σῖτον ἐπιδοὺς τοῖς πολίταις καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πιστευθεὶς εἶναι χρηστὸς παρὰ τοῖς Κυζικηνοῖς, μικρὸν ἐπισχὼν χρόνον ἐπέθετο τῇ πολιτείᾳ δι' Ἀριδαίου. κριθεὶς δὲ καὶ ἁλοὺς καὶ ἀδοξήσας ἐν μὲν τῇ πόλει ἐπέμενε παλαιὸς καταγεγηρακώς, ἀτίμως δὲ καὶ ἀδόξως διαζῶν. τοιοῦτοι δ' εἰσὶ καὶ νῦν τῶν Ἀκαδημαικῶν τινες, ἀνοσίως καὶ ἀδόξως βιοῦντες. χρημάτων γὰρ ἐξ ἀσεβείας καὶ παρὰ φύσιν κυριεύσαντες διὰ γοητείαν νῦν εἰσιν περίβλεπτοι· ὥσπερ καὶ Χαίρων ὁ Πελληνεύς, ὃς οὐ μόνῳ Πλάτωνι ἐσχόλακεν ἀλλὰ καὶ Ξενοκράτει. καὶ οὗτος οὖν τῆς πατρίδος πικρῶς τυραννήσας οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἀρίστους τῶν πολιτῶν ἐξήλασεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς τούτων δούλοις τὰ χρήματα τῶν δεσποτῶν χαρισάμενος καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων γυναῖκας συνῴκισεν πρὸς γάμου κοινώνιαν, ταῦτ' ὠφεληθεὶς ἐκ τῆς καλῆς Πολιτείας καὶ τῶν παρανόμων Νόμων.

Εὐαίων : εὐάγων **AE** | ἐνενηκοστῷ : ἐν ενηκοστῷ **A** : ἐν εἰκοστῷ *Musurus* | ἀφυστερησάσης *Wilamowitz* : ἀποστερήσας **A** : ἀφυστερησάς **E** | καὶ ἀδοξήσας *del. Wilamowitz* | παλαιὸς : πλούσιος *dubitanter Kaibel in apparatu* πολιὸς *Olson* | καταγεγηρακώς *Kaibel* : καὶ γεγηρακὼς **AE**

This fragment is the principal witness to the theme of the speech *In defence of Sophocles against Philon* as an attack against the Academic school for its tyrannical ideas. This claim is based on the fact that people who were members of the Academy ended up becoming tyrants (i.e., Euaion of Lampsacus, Timolaus of Cyzicus and Chairon of Pellene, the latter also accused in the pseudo-Demosthenic speech *On the Treaty with Alexander* 10), although, as Marasco points out (163), there is no evidence for a link between the Academic philosophy and tyrannical ideas. On these three tyrants, see information in Marasco (164-8). The final reference is to some of Chairon's measures that to Democharesresembled the γῆς ἀναδασμός of the Platonic *Republic.* A detailed commentary on the measures and on why, on a more careful analysis, they did not actually resemble it, is in Marasco (1984), 167-8.

T3? Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 840e

ἐγένετο δ' εὔφωνος, ὡς δῆλον ἔκ τε ὧν φησι Δημοσθένης καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Δημοχάρους λόγου.

This fragment attests the existence of a (non-identifiable) speech of Democharesw here he talked about Aeschines' beautiful voice. The other passage used as a proof is Dem. 18.259, 308. Marasco (205), on the basis of the witness of *Vita Aeschin*. 2.7 and Harp. ι 25 (both on Democharestalking about Aeschines' past as actor) finds it plausible to think of a mistake by Ps-Plutarch, as in Harpocration's instance the mention of Aeschines is attributed to the *Dialogues* and not to a speech like here. However, there are no other attestations of Democharesd' *Dialogues*, and they could just be the result of a confusion of Harpocration. Therefore, Marasco believes (following Susemihl and Swoboda, Dem. col 2866) that this information was contained in the *Histories*. Blass (1898[2]), 307 believed the *Dialogues* mentioned by Harpocration could be an actual work of Democharesand, therefore, found it plausible to attribute this fragment to them, while Müller (*FHG*, II, 447) thought this testimonium could be taken from an oration.

(31) Democleides / Democles

Biographical note: The only two attestations of the existence of an orator named Democleides (probably to be dated between the end of the fourth and the beginning of the 3rd century BC) are *Suda* ω 263 (quoting Timaeus of Tauromenion) and Dion. Halic. *De Din.* 9.24; 11. 73-78. The former source (probably quoting a fragment from a speech against Democharesis) definitely independent of the latter. Dionysius, in the first instance, simply lists Democleides' name among other Athenian writers, whereas in the second, he questions the attribution of an *Apology of Hermias* to Dinarchus by saying it could have been pronounced by 'Democleides, Menaesechmus or one of the sort'. Sundwall (1906) 12 identified this orator with the homonymous archon of 316/15 BC (see Diod. Sic.

19.17). Ruhnken (1768), XCI-XCII, does not exclude the possibility that Democleides is a corruption for the commoner Athenian name Democles. An attic orator called Democles is attested in Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 842e, where he is said to have been a pupil of Theophrastus, and was the object of a lost oration of Dinarchus (Bk. Antiatt. 113.7 = ρ 3 ed. Valente: ῥαχίζει· ἀντὶ τοῦ μεγάλα ψεύδεται. Δείναρχος Κατὰ Δημοκλέους), and mentioned by Vitruvius (7.14), who says he wrote a treatise on machinery (but perhaps this is another person). The chronology would be consistent, as Dinarchus and Demochares were contemporaries. His political position is less clear, since we only know he was an opponent of both of Demochares and Dinarchus. No further proofs can be found to identify the two characters. It is very plausible, howver, to identify Democleides with the Damocleides mentioned in the catalogue of the library of Rhodes (Maiuri [1925], 14-15, XI.2.26-8), to whom a περὶ γενέσ[εως Πρὸς Ἀλέξ]ανδρον is ascribed.

On Democles/ides, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1939-43), II.65; Ruhnken (1768), XCI-II, Sundwall (1906); Thalheim (1905).

T1. *Suda* ω 263

Ὦι τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ οὐκ ἔξεστι φυσῆσαι: Τίμαιον ἐν λῇ ἱστορεῖν, ὡς οἱ περὶ Δημοκλείδην κατὰ Δημοχάρους εἶπον, ὅτι μόνῳ αὐτῷ πάντων Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἔξεστι τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ φυσῆσαι, ὡς μὴ καθαρεύοντι τοῖς ἄνω μέρεσιν. Δοῦρις δὲ ἐν τῇ δεκάτῃ Πυθέαν κατὰ Δημοσθένους τὸ ὅμοιον εἰπεῖν.

Τίμαιον...ἱστορεῖν : Τίμαιος... ἱστορεῖ *Jacoby*

The *Suda* reports this fragment from Timaeus of Tauromenion quoting Democleides/Democles in the entry entitled 'he who is forbidden to blow the sacred flame', a proverbial expression (see Diogenianus 8.7). Despite what is known about Timaeus' habit of making up the speeches he embedded in his History, we can include this testimony as genuine, since it does not seem to be taken from a reported speech, but from a quotation inserted into the historical narration. The same information taken from Timaeus is quoted in *Suda* δ 472 and Polybius 12.13, where it is said that Demochares was unworthy to blow the sacred flame because of his obscene sexual habits. It is to those habits that the fragment of Democleides refers when it says Demochares' upper parts (probably his lips) were impure. The theme of impure lips in connection to oral sex is important in Greek and Roman literature, see e.g., Artem. (1.79.7), Mart. (1.94; 2.15 21,3.17, 87; 9.63), Ps.-Man. 4.311f., 6.592 (see among others Krenkel [1980] and Richlin [1992]; see also Hurowitz [1989] for impure lips in Jewish literature). This kind of insult was apparently common in the oratory of that period, since Duris (*FGrHist* 76. F8) attributes the same taunt to Pytheas against Demosthenes. Accusations of obscenity were not uncommon in Athenian oratory, as witnessed by Demosthenes' fourth letter, *Upon the slanders of Theramenes*, and similar offences are also found in Aeschines' *Against Timarchus* (especially § 130, where Timarchus is described as 'a whore'). A problem about this fragment regards its actual attribution to Democleides/Democles, which entirely depends on the meaning of οἱ περὶ

Δημοκλείδην. In fact, following David Whitehead (see translation in the *Suda Online*, http://www.stoa.org/sol/), we have translated it 'Democleides and his associates'. This could therefore be a fragment of a speech in which Democleides/Democles attacked Democharesreporting an opinion he shared with his associates. However, Radt (1980), when discussing Fr.162 of Aeschylus' *Niobe*, showed the expression οἱ περὶ + accusative can often just mean the person mentioned in the accusative. Therefore, οἱ περὶ Δημοκλείδην can also simply indicate Democleides. A different possibility is that this quotation may simply refer to a private debate, but the mention of attacks against Demosthenes makes it more probable that this was part of a speech.

T2?. Dion. Halic. *De Din.* 11.13

Ἑρμίᾳ ἐμπορίου ἐπιμελητῇ περὶ τῶν κατηγορηθέντων ἀπολογία· 'δέομαι ὑμῶν, ὦ ἄνδρες.' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ χαρακτῆρος εὕροι τις ἂν οὐκ ὄντα τὸν λόγον Δεινάρχου (ὑδαρής τε γὰρ καὶ ἀσθενὴς καὶ ψυχρός ἐστιν), ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ἄν τις θείη Δημοκλείδου ἢ Μενεσαίχμου ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν τοιούτων τινός.

Ἑρμίᾳ *Sylburg* : εἰ μία **F** | ἐπιμελητῇ *Sylburg.* : ἐπὶ μελέτη **F** | Μενεσαίχμου *Sylburg.* : Μενεσέχμου **F**

This uncertain *testimonium* might open to up the possibility of the existence of a speech in defence of Hermias of Atarnaeus attributed to Democleides. This speech might have been in opposition to Democharesʼ *Against the Philosophers*, in which, as evident from F5, Democharesw as attacking Aristotle for betraying Athens, and therefore probably also for his friendship with Hermias. Not much more can be said about it, considering its attribution is doubtful. On the whole, Dionysius' opinion about Democleides' style does not seem flattering.

(32) Democritus of Pergamon

Biographical note: the only mention of an orator called Democritus of Pergamon is in Diogenes Laertius (9.49), where among the six notable people named Democritus he lists 'a native of Pergamum who made his mark by rhetorical speeches'.

(33) Diodorus of Adramyttum

Biographical note: our only source for the life of Diodorus of Adramyttum is Strabo (13.1.66), where we read he was a general, philosopher, and rhetorician. He was in favour of Mithridates, and when the king of Pontus attacked Adramyttum, he helped him by killing all his opponents. Later he lost the favour of the king, and therefore let himself die of starvation in Amassa.
On Diodorus, see: Willrich (1905); Wooten (1972), 33.

(34) Diodorus of Sardis (Zonas)

Biographical note: Diodorus of Sardis (called Zonas) is known to us thanks to Strabo (13.4.9), who tells us he was active during the Mithridatic war. Diodorus was in favour of the Romans and was therefore accused by Mithridates of having encouraged resistance. He had a homonymous son or grandson who wrote history, poems, and orations. Diodorus is likely to be identified with the homonymous epigrammatist of the *Greek Anthology* (6.98, 106; 7.365, 404; 9.226, 312, 556).
On Diodorus see: Reitzeinsten (1905); Wooten (1972), 33.

(35) Dionysius of Magnesia

Biographical note: all we know about an orator called Dionysius of Magnesia is that Cicero studied rhetoric with him in Asia Minor (Plut. *Cic*. 4.4) and that they travelled together (Cic. *Brut*. 316). Cicero also says he was one of the best Asianic orators.

(36) Dionysius of Pergamon (Atticus)

Biographical note: Dionysius of Pergamon was a pupil of Apollodorus and was therefore active in the 1st century BC. Strabo (13.4.3) says that he was surnamed Atticus, perhaps on the basis of his general tendencies in style, and was a celebrated scholar, an able teacher of philosophy, a historian, and composer of orations. There is an Atticus mentioned in Quintilian (3.1.18), who was the best interpreter of Apollodorus' views, and it is fair to assume this person could be identified with Dionysius. He does not seem to be the same Dionysius mentioned in Sen. *Contr*. 1-4-11 (as Stebnicka in Janiszewski [2015], 95 maintains instead), who was the son of another Dionysius, the teacher of Cicero's son. The Elder Seneca (*Controv*. 2.5.11) quotes a comment he made in Latin about a point made by Gallio in the *controversia* with the following theme (see Hybreas' F6): 'a woman was tortured by a tyrant for her husband's sake because she was suspected of knowing about her husband's plans to kill him. The husband kills the tyrant but, in the end, divorces the woman because she cannot bear a child, and she sues him for ingratitude (transl. Winterbottom)'. This cannot be seen as a proper fragment as it is some sort of meta-declamation, but it is nevertheless interesting to mention, as this theme is attested only in this *controversia* by Seneca. It falls into the vast category of declamation themes involving tyrants, and, in particular, tyrannicide, although here the focus of the case is on the ingratitude of the man. Among the many declamations on tyrannicide (see Kohl [1905]), we can mention *exempli gratia* Lucian *Tyrannoktonos*; Fortunatianus 96; Lib. *Decl*. 43; Cic. *Inv*. 2.44; Sen.

Controv. 3.6; Sen. *Controv.* 4.7 – also in Quint. *Inst.* 5.10.36; Sen. *Controv*. 5.8 – also in Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.98; Quint. *Inst.* 7.7.5.
On Dionysius, see: Blass (1865), 156; Bornecque (1902), 165-6; Janiszewski (2015), 95; Wooten (1972), 34.

(37) Dionysocles of Tralles

Biographical note: the only source for an orator called Dionysocles from the city of Tralles is Strabo (14.1.42), where the orator is mentioned alongside Damasus Scombrus (27) as a citizen of Tralles. Nothing else, not even a rough date, can be reconstructed for this orator. Wooten suggests he was an Asianist, considering his origin.
On Dionysocles, see: Janiszewski (2015), 99; Radermacher (1903); Wooten (1972), 27.

(38) Diophanes of Mytilene

Biographical note: Diophanes was an orator and rhetorician from Mytilene (Strab. 13.2.3) who, according to Plutarch (*Ti. Gracch.* 8.5), was exiled from his hometown and went to Rome where he was one of the tutors of Tiberius Gracchus (together with the philosopher Blossius of Cumae, although Cicero, *Brut*. 104, only mentions the former), and incited him to become tribune and work on agrarian reform. Diophanes' fame should have been still big at the time of Plutarch, who says that many writers talked about Diophanes' relationship with Tiberius. He died when Tiberius fell in 132 BC and his followers were arrested, and put to death.
On Diophanes, see: Münzer (1905); Wooten (1972), 29.

(39) Euthydemus of Mylasa

Biographical note: Euthydemus, eminent orator from the city of Mylasa in Caria, active in the 1st century BC, and respected in the whole Asia Minor, is mentioned by Strabo (14.2.24) only in relation with his contemporary and rival Hybreas (46). Strabo says Euthydemus was richer and more famous than Hybreas in their hometown, but his notoriety for being tyrannical did not do him honour. He died after Hybreas was back in Mylasa in 39 BC, after his self-exile in Rhodes; Hybreas subsequently overcame Euthydemus in wealth and power. Information about their rivalry can be found in Hybreas' F1. According to Susemihl he might have died during the Parthian wars. His style was probably Asianic.

On Euthydemus, see: Brzoska (1909); Habicht, (1984); Janiszewski (2015), 130; Susemihl (1891-1892), II, 499; Wooten (1972), 35.

(40) Glaucippus

Biographical note: son of Hyperides, Glaucippus was an orator like his father (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 848d= Phot. *Bibl.* 266.495b). Plutarch (*Phoc.* 4.2) says he wrote a speech against Phocion, full of evil things about him. A hypothesis by Schaefer is that this is the oration mentioned by Ps-Plutarch (850e) about a trial which happened in 305/304 BC – and wrongly attributed to Hyperides (who had died in 322) – where an accusation was levelled against Midias, son of Midias of Arginunte, for having proposed to honour Phocion.
On Glaucippus, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.69; Davies (1971); Orsi (2002); Ruhnken (1786), LXXXIX; Schaefer (1854); Thalheim (1910).

(41) Gorgias of Athens

Biographical note: the source of Rutilius' *De Figuris Sententiarum et Elocutionis*, Gorgias of Athens was a rhetorician from the 1st century BC. He was the teacher of Cicero's son until 44 BC, when Cicero forbade their contact (Cic. *Fam.* 16.21. 6; Plut. *Cic.* 24.6-7). As argued about Rutilius (see Introduction), in his rhetorical work, there is no trace of the controversy between Atticism and Asianism. From the Elder Seneca, we know he was also a declaimer, as mentioned at *Controv.* 1.4.7, where both his quotations have been lost in transmission. The attribution to him of an *Onomastikon biblion* (Poll. *Onom.* 9.1) is uncertain.
On Gorgias, see: Barabino (1967); Bornecque (1902), 169-79; Brooks (1970); Münscher (1912).

F1 Sen. *Controv.* 1.4.7
Gorgias inepto colore, sed dulci: …

F2. Sen. *Controv.* 1.4.7
Gorgias egregie dixit:…

All we know about these lost fragments is that they belonged to the *controversia* about the son ordered by his handless father to kill his mother, following the rule according to which a man could kill his adulterous wife only with his bare hands, but the son refuses and loses his inheritance. This topic has a parallel Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.250.14-16.

The Greek quotations have all been lost in this *controversia* (see also Hybreas' F11, and Damas' F6), but we can assume, from Seneca's judgement, that he liked Gorgias' *color*, perhaps silly but charming ('inepto [...] sed dulci').

(42) Hagnon/Hagnonides

Biographical note: an orator called Hagnon or Hagnonides was active at the end of the 4th century BC. He was involved in the Harpalus affair and accused by Dinarchus (according to Hyp. 1.40; Dion.Hal. *Din*. 10). After 322, he avoided the exile thanks to Phocion, who was, however, later executed under Hagnon's instigation (Plut. *Phoc*. 33-7; Nep. Phoc. 3.3). Hagnon was put to death in 317. (Plut. *Phoc*. 38). Diogenes Laertius (5.37) says he prosecuted Theophrastus for impiety, but as a result he should himself escape punishment. Quintilian (2.17.15) alludes to a book of Hagnon on rhetorical theory, in which from the very title he proclaimed that he was going to indict rhetoric.
On Hagnon, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), 70; Berve 1926 (n. 176); Heckel (2006) 128-9; Ruhnken (1768), LXXXIX-X; Sundwall (1894).

(43) Hegesias of Magnesia

Biographical note: Hegesias was born at Sipylos in Magnesia (Dion. Hal. *Comp*. IV. 28-30), from a modest family (*Gnomologium Vaticanum* ex Vat. Gr. 743. 307.10, p. 247 ed. Sternbach); and lived probably around 250 BC (see Susemihl (1981-2), II, 464, n.39 for more details). He is considered to have been the initiator of the Asian rhetorical school, corruptor of the Attic style (Strab. 14.1.41; Theon *Prog*. 2.71 Patillon) and according to Cicero (*Brut*. 286-7) an imitator of Charisius, but at the same time an orator who attempted to sound like Lysias with poor results (Cic. *Orat*. 226). He was not only an orator but also a historian: he wrote a *History of Alexander*, as attested by Strab. 11.1.16 (for more on the 'rhetorical' nature of his history see Norden [1958^5], 134-7; Staab [2004]). The fragments on Thebes quoted by Agatarchides (*apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 250.446a-447a), Dion. Hal. *Comp*. 4.18, and Plut. *Alex.* 3.5-9 seem to be from his *History of Alexander*, but the possibility of them being part of an epideictic discourse, though weak, is not to be excluded (see Staab [2004], 138-48; an encomium of Thebes is attested in P.Schub. 32, see commentary). The *Lindian Chronicle* (2b.5; 10) mentions an *Encomium of Rhodes*, and the catalogue of the library of Rhodes (Maiuri [1925], 14-15, XI.1.8-10) mentions a work called *The Philathenians* (a name attributed to orators who took Athens' side in the conflict with Macedonia; on this see Staab [2004]), and two possible dialogues entitled *Aspasia* and *Alcibiades*. Not much is known about his life, work and orations, as most of the information we know about him focuses on his style.

On Hegesias see: Barabino (1967), 140-1; Blass (1865), 9-53; *FGrHist/BNJ* 142; Hutchinson (2014); Radermacher (1912); Ruhnken (1768), XCII; Sternbach (1930); Susemihl (1891-2), I, 552-8, II, 464-6; Wooten (1972), 23-26; Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014) 878, 882-4.

F1. Rutilius 1.7

Item Hegesiae: 'Miseremini mei, iudices, quem coniurata tanta vis inimicorum oppugnat; miseremini solitudinis, cui ne in summo quidem tempore periculi liberos adhibere ad communem calamitatem deprecandam licitum est; miseremini senectutis, quae me etiam sine ceteris malis graviter defatigat.'

miseremini solitudinis **A B R Ald. Basil.** : miseremini solit. **V** | cui ne **A R V Ald. Basil.**: quin ne **B** | in summo…periculi *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : in summo…tempore *Ruhnken.* | deprecandam *Ruhnken* : decernendam *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : deterrendum *Sim.*

This first fragment quoted by Rutilius is given out of context in the section on ἐπιβολή, which is the repetition of a word at the beginning of several clauses, in this case, the repetition of 'miseremini' three times. Hegesias writes in the first person: since the sources do not give enough information about detailed circumstances of his life, it is not possible to determine whether this fragment belonged to a forensic speech involving Hegesias directly or, as Wooten (1972), 4, thinks, it is from a declamation. Rutilius' Latin translation probably does not allow us to see the typical traits of Hegesias' style, which, from Greek fragments probably belonging to his historical works (Strab. 9.1.16; Agatharchides. *De mari Erythraeo.* 5.21 = Phot. Bibl. 250.445b-447b, *Comp*. 4.18.20), appears to be characterised by short sentences and an obsessive attention to prose rhythm, to the point that he sometimes inserted extra words just to make the clause more rhythmical. As attested by Cicero, Hegesias' style, the first example of Asianism, was far from Attic regularity, and so he must have made often use of metaphors, wordplays, and articulated features. We cannot say that his use of ἐπιβολή is an indication of this stylistic tendency, because this was one of the most widely employed figures of speech in Attic oratory (see examples in Barabino [1967], 24), although this repetition of 'miseremini' is probably more extreme, and full of *pathos* than we are used to seeing in Attic oratory. Nevertheless, we can see a parallel in the fragment quoted by Agatharchides. *De mari Erythraeo.* 5.21, where he says ὄνομα κατελάβομεν, πόλιν καταλιπόντες, using the same rhetorical figure as in this fragment. Moreover, as Hutchinson (2014), 36, notices, parallels for this use of 'miseremini' (or other forms of 'misereor') can be found in Latin literature: Cic. *Flac.* 106, where the context is very similar and the repetition 'miseremini' is also directed to 'iudices'; and Sen. *Phaed.* 623, where Phaedra is desperately trying to appeal to Hippolytus. The Greek equivalent of 'miseremini' might have been ἐλεέω, and our sentence was perhaps something like 'ἐλεεῖτε, ἄνδρες δικασταί' (although there are no parallels for this phrase in Greek literature). Hutchinson (2014), 38, also provides a parallel from Apollonius Rhodius (2.218-39), when Phineus makes his appeal to the Argonauts: here we do not

find the same rhetorical figure of repetition as in Hegesias, but there are two consecutive imperatives that have similar meanings ('χραίσμετέ μοι, ῥύσασθε δυσάμμορον ἀνέρα').

If this quotation were from a declamation, the potential themes it could have belonged to are various. If 'ne in summo quidem tempore periculi liberos adhibere ad communem calamitatem deprecandam' means that he speaker was not allowed to have *his* sons to send away the common disgrace, perhaps this could be attributed to the category of declamations dealing with children abandoning parents – although we are not sure whether the sons in this fragment are away from their father by their own choice or for other reasons. Other declamations on abandoned parents are attested in Sen. *Controv*. 7.5 and Ps-Quint. *Inst. Decl. Maj*. 16. However, this sentence could also simply mean that the speaker did not have any sons and was therefore alone in his old age.

F2. Rutilius 1.11

Item Hegesiae: 'Sed instigabat multitudinis animum ad bellum inferendum concitatus iracundia furor: furor, inquam, non ratio, sine qua nihil umquam populus ex sententia gessit.'

sine **A V Ald. Basil.** : sint **B**

This fragment belongs to Rutilius' paragraph on ἐπανάληψις, i.e., the repetition of a word at the beginning or in the middle of a sentence, like ἐπιβολή very common in Attic oratory (see Barabino, [1967], 30). In this case Hegesias repeats the word 'furor' (its Greek equivalent was perhaps μανία or ἄνοια) at the end of the first sentence and at the beginning of the second. As for F1, no context is given, and it is challenging to determine where this short quotation could derive from. It could be from a deliberative speech, from a declamation (as Wooten [1972], 25 thinks), but also from a historical work, since, as we have seen, the styles of Hegesias' orations and that of his *Histories* were very similar (Rutilius, along with orators quotes some historians, see Introduction). Madness and war are also verbally associated by Aristophanes (*Lys*. 343: ἀλλὰ πολέμου καὶ μανιῶν ῥυσαμένας Ἑλλάδα καὶ πολίτας). The tone of this statement sounds slightly undemocratic; similar criticism of the masses is to be found in Thucydides (e.g., 2.65; 6.63, see Fliess [1959], Pope [1988], and Raaflaub [2006]).

F2bis? Rutilius 1.11

Sed plurium verborum iteratio est huius modi: 'At ego in his aerumnis amicis sum spoliatus omnibus; <amicis, inquam, spoliatus sum omnibus,> iudices; qui non quod me odissent, sed quod inimicorum factionem pertimuissent, me in malis deseruerunt.'

huius modi **Basil.** : eiusmodi *codd.* **Ald.** | aerumnis **A V Ald. Basil.** : erumni $\mathbf{B^1}$: erumnis $\mathbf{B^2}$: erumpnis **U** | amicis…omnibus *Halm* | iudices : *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : vid **U** | pertimuissent *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : pertimescunt *coni. Jac.* | deseruerunt **B Ald. Basil.** : desuerunt **A V**

This fragment comes immediately after F2 but may be from a different work of Hegesias. It could also be from another orator, as Wooten and Barabino maintain: they do not attribute it to Hegesias, since Rutilius does not repeat the name of the orator when quoting the new fragment. As argued in the Introduction, the fragment is quoted within the discussion to the same figure as the previous one attributed to Hegesias, and this also happens for consecutive quotations of Demosthenes, Hyperides, and Lysias (while other anonymous examples are usually given alone). I, therefore, edit it among Hegesias' fragments, despite the absence of the phrase 'item eiusdem' (which, however, we do not find for Demosthenes' consecutive fragments at 1.16), and the presence of the adversative 'sed'.

The repetition here regards the words 'amicis' (if the restoration by Halm [1863] is to be trusted) and 'omnibus'. Even if this fragment is an *adespotum*, it is still worth taking into account because it probably derives from a Hellenistic speech (political, because of the mention of or the 'inimicorum factionem', or forensic), or at least, from a rhetorical exercise (although the topic does not seem reconstructable).

F3. Rutilius 2.2

'Hegesiae: 'Diversa studia adulescentium animum adverteramus, tametsi fratres erant, uno atque eodem sanguine orti. Alter in studio laudis versabatur et industriae <ac> virtutis viam gloriosam, sed laboriosam sequebatur: alter in augenda pecunia occupatus et habendi cupiditate depravatus summas divitias summam virtutem existimabat. Hic nimirum magis erat laboriosus, qui laborem condendi, non utendi causa suscipiebat'".

adverteramus *codd.* **Basil.** : advertamus **Ald.** | erant *codd.* **Ald.** : erunt **Basil.** | in studio *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : in stadio *Ruhnken* | industriae <ac> virtutis *Halm* : industra virtutis *codd.* : industriae virtutisque *Ruhnken* : industriae virtutis viam *Maehly* | augenda $\mathbf{A}^2$ **B Ald. Basil.** : augendam A' : agenda **V** | laborem condendi **A B Ald. Basil.** : condendi laborem **V**

This fragment is placed Rutilius' section on ἀλλοίωσις (transmutation), a rhetorical figure meant to mark a distinction between two things (and is attested for the first time in Rutilius). This passage is a contrast between two men (similar in the content to Charisius' F3), a virtuous person, and his greedy brother. As evident from 'adverteramus', it is not a speech when one brother is accusing the other, since someone else is speaking. As we noticed in Charisius' F3, this kind of comparison would well fit a forensic speech, but other options are still possible. In this case, particularly, given what we know about Hegesias' literary production, it may as well derive from a rhetorical declamation. As always for Hegesias' fragments quoted by Rutilius, Wooten (1972), 24 believes true the latter hypothesis because this kind of comparison offers the possibility to employ a wide range of stylistic features (antitheses, parallelisms), and was very common in Roman declamations (see Bonner

[1969], 67; for Roman declamations on brothers who do not get along see see Sen. *Controv*. 1.1; Quint. *Inst.* Decl. Min. 321; 328; Calpurnius Flaccus 21). Declamations opposing brothers are also attested in Greek Imperial literature (see, for instance, Apsines 1.76 [234 Spengel]). Staab (2004), 131, n.26 underlines the similarity between this comparison and the one in Plut. *Per*. 36.2; 9, where the two sons of Pericles prove to have different attitudes, and therefore suggests this fragment may be part of a work of Hegesias' entitled *Aspasia* (attributed to him according to the *testimonium* of Inscription nr. 11, col. 1.8 in Ampolo-Erdas-Magnetto (2014).

F4. Rutilius 2.10

'Item Hegesiae: "Non haec est, ut vulgari verbo appellatur, calamitas. Quid igitur? Quod proprium <nomen> imponam, nescio, nisi illud unum, tantam esse aerumnae magnitudinem, ut omnem fortunae superbissimam crudelitatem ingens miseria superarit."'

Hegesiae **Basil.** : Egesiae *codd.* : *om.* **Ald** | haec **B V Ald. Basil.** : hoc **A** | <nomen> imponam *Halm* : imonam *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : imponam <nomen> *Ruhnken* | superbissimam **B V Ald. Basil.** : foi superbissimam **A** | ingens miseria *Halm.* : ingenii miseria *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : ingenti miseria : *Ruhnken*

This passage is quoted by Rutilius as an example of ἀπορία, which is the rhetorical device used when orators interrupted their speech to ask themselves how to continue or how to express the next concept (it was very common in Attic oratory too, see Barabino [1967], 40). Here Hegesias pauses in order to think about the 'proprium nomen' to give to the calamity he is talking about. As usual, the fragment is given out of context, but it is fair to suggest that the quotation is from a deliberative speech. Staab (2004), 142, n.71, believes this is about the destruction of Thebes in 335 (described in some of the quotations in Agatharchides. *De mari Erythraeo.* 5.21). But he does not explicitly say if he thinks they should be attributed to a historical or a rhetorical work. Finally, we can notice a similarity between this passage and Dem. 18.22, where Demosthenes says he cannot find an epithet bad enough for Aeschines (εἶτ' ὦ–τί ἂν εἰπών σέ τις ὀρθῶς προσείποι), but we should be cautious in saying this is a sign of Demosthenes' influence on Hegesias (see Wooten [1972], 25). The topic of bad fortune is not unknown to Hellenistic oratory, as proved by Myron's F2 and Stratocles' F3.

From a stylistic point of view, it is worth noting Hegesias' employment of extreme emotional language (as noted already by Hutchinson [2014], 38), similarly to F1.

ingens…miseria: 'ingens' is Halm's correction for 'ingenii', the *lectio* in the manuscripts. Ruhnken (1768), 119 prefers 'ingenti' agreeing with 'fortunae'.

(44) Heracleides of Byzantium

Biographical note: Heracleides of Byzantium was a Greek orator active in the 2nd century BC. The main sources for his life and activity are Polybius (21.13-15), Livy (37.34-6) and Diodorus of Sicily (29.7). According to our sources, he was sent from Antiochus III as ambassador to treat for the peace with Scipio in Rome when the Romans crossed the Hellespont. In his speech, he was instructed to say that Antiochus offered 'to surrender the territories of Lampsacus and Smyrna as well as Alexandria (Troas), which were the original cause of the war, and any other cities in Aeolis and Ionia of which they might wish to deprive him, as having embraced their side in the war; and in addition to this to promise an indemnity of half the expenses they had incurred in their quarrel with him' (Polyb. 21.13, transl. Shuckburgh). An extract of the speech is in Polybius (21.14) and Livy (37.35). Scipio scorned the proposal, and Antiochus got ready for the battle.
On Heracleides, see: Otto (1912); Wooten (1972), 28.

(45) Hierocles of Alabanda

Biographical note: Hierocles (2nd-1st century BC) was the brother of Menecles of Alabanda, orator, and teacher of rhetoric of both Apollonius ὁ μαλακός and Molon. He is often referred to by Cicero (who also says he listened to both him and his brother in *De Or.* 2.95) as an example of Asianic style (*Or.* 231). According to Cicero (*Brut.* 325), Hierocles was less talented, when he mentions both the brothers as examples of a type of Asian style 'sententiosum et argutum', opposed to the second type 'verbis volucre at incitatum'.
On Hierocles see: Radermacher (1913); Janiszewski (2015), 177; Wooten (1972), 30.

(46) Hybreas of Mylasa

Biographical note: most of the information we have about Hybreas comes from Strabo (14.2.24) from whom we know he was active in the 1st century BC (Strabo says he was his contemporary), born in Mylasa in Caria to a simple family, and that he was a pupil of the rhetor Diotrephes of Antioch, the city where he studied rhetoric. According to ancient sources, he was very eloquent (Val. Max. 9.14; Jer. *Chron.* 16, 162. Helm). In Mylasa, he had a notable rival in politics, the orator Euthydemus, who was wealthy and more famous in their hometown (although his behaviour was considered to a certain extent tyrannical) and who died after Hybreas had returned to Mylasa and became richer and more powerful. His political career progressed quickly, and he became *agoranomos*. When in 41/40 BC, Labienus (the Roman general who occupied province of Syria with the Parthians) and the

Parthians tried to invade Asia Minor, Hybreas and Zeno of Laodicea opposed him causing a revolt – we have part of the speech Hybreas directed to Labienus (F2). Then, when Labienus conquered Mylasa, Hybreas escaped to Rhodes only to return in 39 to rehabilitate himself and the city, after Labienus had been defeated by Venditius. More on Hybreas is known by Plutarch (*Ant.* 24), who informs us about Hybreas' good relationship with Antony, but also reports a fervid and impetuous speech he pronounced before Antony to protest against the taxes imposed on Asia Minor. Plutarch also says that Antony's response to this very 'rhetorical' oration (intended negatively) was apparently very positive. From the Elder Seneca (*Suas.* 7.14), we also know Hybreas had a homonymous son, rhetor, and advocate in the province of Asia, who pleaded a case before Cicero in 29. The Elder Hybreas' *sententiae* were very famous – as we can also see from the substantial number of these *sententiae* that Seneca himself inserts in his *Declamations* (*Controv.* 1.23; 2. 5.20; 7.4.10; 9.1.12; 6.16; *Suas.* 4.5). They are all quoted as examples of Asianism. Due to the large number of quotations of Hybreas in Seneca's works, some think he might have taught in Rome for a period, while others prefer to imagine the one who was actually a teacher in Rome was the Younger Hybreas. Different positions on the question are well summarised in Migliario, (2007), 23-24, n.65. An option that would explain Hybreas' fame in Rome without imagining he worked there is that his *sententiae* circulated in an edited form (see Berti [2007], 175, n.2).

On Hybreas, see: Bornecque (1902), 172; Delrieux - Ferriès (2004); Janiszewski (2015), 177; Migliario (2007) 23-24; Noè (1996); Radermacher (1914); Wooten (1972), 35-38; Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 884.

For epigraphical evidence about Hybreas' political career: *PIR*² IV.2.102.234; *SEG* XLII.997.292-3; a discussion is in Marasco (1992), 37-59.

F1. Strab. 14.2.24

ἐπαινοῦσι γοῦν τοῦτο τοῦ Ὑβρέου ὅπερ δημηγορῶν ἐπὶ τελευτῆς εἶπεν 'Εὐθύδημε, κακὸν εἶ τῆς πόλεως ἀναγκαῖον· οὔτε γὰρ μετὰ σοῦ δυνάμεθα ζῆν οὔτ' ἄνευ σοῦ'.

This fragment, quoted by Strabo in the section of his *Geography* about Mylasa, where he narrates the events of Hybreas' life, belongs to the final part of the public speech Hybreas pronounced against his rival Euthydemus. It is undoubtedly a witty and provocative sentence. We can notice a sophisticated rhetorical expedient involving an oxymoron – perfectly in tune with Hybreas' Asianic style – meant to stress the contradictory and controversial role of Euthydemus in the city of Mylasa. As Strabo says, despite the goodwill that the citizens of Mylasa had for Euthydemus, they recognised his tyrannical inclinations and applauded Hybreas after this speech. The connection between Euthydemus and the city from Hybreas' words appears like a relationship of symbiosis, or even parasitism. The image of the necessary evil is not an unknown to Greek literature: see in particular Eur. *Med.* 1243, when Medea calls δεινὰ κἀναγκαῖα [...] κακά her resolution to kill her children, but also Men. *Epit.* 1105. A similar image is also in Suet. *DA* 89, where he quotes a speech by Metellus (fr.6

Malcovati). It is interesting that the concept of not being able to live either with or without someone is mostly employed in contexts related to love (see Ov. *Am.* 3.11b, 39), while in this fragment is applied to a political enemy.

On the shortness of this quotation (and of F2), Wooten (1972), 37 says it could be related to the fact that Hybreas' work could have been circulating in the form of *sententiae*.

It is interesting to note that we find rhythmical closes: 'τῆς πόλεως ἀναγκαῖον'; 'μετὰ σοῦ δυνάμεθα', and 'οὔτ' ἄνευ σοῦ'.

F2. Strab. 14.2.24

ὁ δ' Ὑβρέας καὶ προσπαρώξυνε φωνῇ τινι μειράκιον εὐερέθιστον καὶ ἀνοίας πλῆρες. ἐκείνου γὰρ ἀνειπόντος ἑαυτὸν Παρθικὸν αὐτοκράτορα 'οὐκοῦν' ἔφη 'κἀγὼ λέγω ἐμαυτὸν Καρικὸν αὐτοκράτορα'.

εἰπόντος **F**

A few lines after the passage containing F1, Strabo quotes another bright and sarcastic sentence by Hybreas. It could have been a sentence pronounced independently, but we should not exclude the hypothesis that it belonged to a political speech, the one he pronounced in 41/40 BC when Labienus (whom Strabo sees as a foolish boy rather than a general) and the Partians came to Asia Minor and were about to conquer Mylasa, and Hybreas was guiding the opposition. The very short quotation Strabo gives us is a witty and sharp ironic comparison between Labienus and Hybreas himself as 'imperatores' of their respective factions, and it aims at denigrating Labienus' fictitious power by putting the emphasis, at the same time, on Hybreas' modesty, through a hyperbole. The hyperbole also creates a comical effect as we consider how small a hypothetical empire of Caria (that of Hybreas) would look in comparison to that of Parthia. As said for F1, Wooten (1972), 37 believes the shortness of this fragment is related to the circulation of Hybreas' works in the form of *sententiae*. Hybreas' provocative boldness (if not impudence) is also attested in the anecdote quoted by Valerius Maximus (9.14) where he says that when Hybreas was in Sicily, the Proconsul said he wondered why the man looked so like himself, and remarked that his father had never gone to that province. At that point, Hybreas said: 'But mine went to Rome'.

F3. Plut. *Ant.* 24.7-8

τέλος δὲ ταῖς πόλεσι δεύτερον ἐπιβάλλοντος φόρον, ἐτόλμησεν Ὑβρέας ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀσίας λέγων εἰπεῖν ἀγοραίως μὲν ἐκεῖνα καὶ πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνίου ζῆλον οὐκ ἀηδῶς· 'εἰ δύνασαι δὶς λαβεῖν ἑνὸς ἐνιαυτοῦ φόρον, δύνασαι καὶ δὶς ἡμῖν ποιήσασθαι θέρος καὶ δὶς ὀπώραν;' πρακτικῶς δὲ καὶ παραβόλως συναγαγών, ὅτι μυριάδας εἴκοσι ταλάντων ἡ Ἀσία δέδωκε, 'ταῦτα' εἶπεν 'εἰ μὲν οὐκ εἴληφας, ἀπαίτει παρὰ τῶν λαβόντων· εἰ δὲ λαβὼν οὐκ ἔχεις, ἀπολώλαμεν.'

Ἀσίας **PR** πατρίδος $\mathbf{P^mR^m}$

This is the only long passage from a speech of Hybreas and is quoted by Plutarch in the *Life of Antony* as an example of the positive attitude that Antony had towards the orator of Mylasa, since he was well disposed to listening to his protests and accept his advice even after such an ardent public speech – which Antony is moreover said to have liked because of its rhetoric. The speech contains elaborate hyperboles ('make summer twice', 'make harvest-time twice'), and from a stylistic point of view, we can also notice a tendency to use short sentences included in a very rational framework ('if…then'; 'if not…then'). This fragment confirms what is evident in F1 and F2, namely how Hybreas' oratory, bold and never euphemistic, was keen on hyperboles and excesses. Pelling (1988) 181, does not believe the anecdote is genuine because it seems unlikely that Asia could have paid the high sum of 200,000 talents, and there is no other source for the imposition of a second tribute in 40 BC (as implied by Plutarch), so he prefers to date the story to 33 BC during the events Plutarch narrates in *Ant.* 56.1.

Regardless of the time when this episode happened, this fragment shows that freedom of speech was not at all dead in Hellenistic oratory: despite the role of power held by Antony, Plutarch says Hybreas spoke vigorously and boldly (πρακτικῶς δὲ καὶ παραβόλως). Plutarch even adds that, although these words were highly rhetorical and bold, Antony liked the speech (πρὸς τὸν Ἀντωνίου ζῆλον οὐκ ἀηδῶς), perhaps in the light of his style: we know that Antony had a strong predilection for Asianic oratory like that of Hybreas. Plutarch, shortly after, adds that this speech made a powerful impression upon Antony, and that he amended his decision. Plutarch attributes this choice to Antony's weakness, 'simplicity of nature, and slowness of understanding', but he also adds that 'when he perceived his errors, he showed keen repentance'. Finally, Plutarch says that he was easily captivated by praises and flattery in bold speeches; however, this does not seem to apply to the case of this fragment, as the words of Hybreas' are not at all flattering, but simply bold. Therefore, Antony's choice to reconsider his former decision after Hybreas' speech shows what a crucial role style and delivery played in political decision-making still at this late stage of the Hellenistic age.

F4. Sen. *Suas.* 4.5

Hybreas in hac suasoria dixit: οἷον ἔσχηκε Βαβυλὼν μάντιν ὀχύρωμα.

Hybreas: hyb **A** | ἔσχηκε…ὀχύρωμα *Muretus* : eCXN BaBYauIN aNTIN OXYRWMa **α**

The theme of this *suasoria* is the decision of Alexander the Great on whether to enter Babylon or not, based on the prediction of an augur about a possible future danger. It is a topic attested only here and constitutes one of the many examples of Greek and Latin declamations dealing with Alexander, and more broadly 4th century BC Macedonian history (on Alexander see among others Apsines 2.9 [245-6 Spengel], 311 Philostr. *VS* 538, 542, 620; P.Oxy 24.2400; Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 5. 210; 7.521-

2; Quint. *Inst. Decl. Min.* 323; Sen. *Suas.* 1.4; for more see Kohl [1905]). The choice of this topic is based on the actual historical fact of Alexander's death in Babylon in 323 BC and on the information (contained in Plut. *Alex*. 73 and Arr. 8.16.5) according to which the Chaledonian astrologers had warned him not to enter the city. This quotation of Hybreas is given at the end of the *suasoria* without a clear link to the previous discussion. It is not clear whether Hybreas was speaking in favour or against Alexander entering Babylon, as this sentence is just remarking that the augur's prediction must be seen as a form of protection for Babylon against Alexander's conquest. The content is also historically incorrect: Alexander had already conquered Babylon in 331, so the warnings of the augur could not have been a real warranty of protection (a fortress) against the Macedonian king.
In the phrase ἔσχηκε Βαβυλὼν μάντιν ὀχύρωμα, we find two rhythmical closes.

F5. Sen. *Controv.* 1.2.23.
Hybreas, inquit, cum diceret controversiam de illo qui tribadas deprehendit et occidit, describere coepit mariti adfectum, in quo non deberet exigi inhonesta inquisitio: ἐγὼ δ' ἐσκόπησα πρότερον τὸν ἄνδρα, <εἰ> ἐγγεγένηταί τις ἢ προσέρραπται.

tribadas τ : tribus adas **α** | exigi : exigit **V** | ἐγὼ δ' : εγωα **A** : εσωα **BV** | ἐσκόπησα *Müller* : eZNCOΠNCe **A** : eZNCOΠHCe **V** : CZNCOΠHCa **B** : ἐσκόπησ' ἂν *Kiessling* | τὸν ἄνδρα : TON anapa **α** | εἰ suppl. *Bursian* | ἐγγεγένηταί : ΓeΓeNNTaI **α** : γεγέννηται *Bursian* | προσέρραπται : ΠPOCePPaTITaIe (eIe A) **α**

This fragment is quoted at the end of a *controversia* entitled 'Sacerdos prostituta', the prostitute priestess, about a maid, kidnapped by pirates, sold and made a prostitute, who kills a soldier that refused to give her alms. In the end, she is accused, acquitted, and seeks for priesthood. Hybreas is mentioned as an example of those Greek declaimers who, according to Scaurus (Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus, last of the Scauri, Roman rhetor died in 34; more information is in Von Rohden [1893]), allowed themselves every license in speaking and (negatively) influenced Roman oratory in this sense. A very similar, although not exactly identical declamation theme is in Syrianus *Stas.* 126.2-10 (where the captured a woman is a priestess, who cannot be reintegrated in her office after the kidnapping and murder). We do not even know for sure if Seneca actually listened to Hybreas declaiming. If he did not, his knowledge of a full Greek sentence could derive from a consultation of a written work, possibly the collection of *sententiae* hypothesised by some scholars (see a complete overview of the problem Migliario [2007], 24, n.65).

As summarised in the introduction which precedes the quotation, the *controversia* from which the quotation comes was a different one. From the context and the content of the quotation, it seems to be coming from a declamation theme which was quite popular in Greek declamations, namely the one about a man who finds a eunuch with his wife, and kills him as an adulterer, so he is prosecuted for murder. This *controversia* is also attested by Syrianus *Stas.* 100.17-20; 115.3-4, 9-10, 19-20; 116.3-23; plus 114.1, 12-19; and Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.236-7, 486, 505-7, 515, 524, 532-6, 541-2, 547-8, 580,

585; 7.217, 405, 437-8, 440-1, and 7.259 where the eunuch is prosecuted. This constitutes an interesting variant of the theme, since instead of the eunuch, we find that the adultery happens with another woman ('triabas', 'lesbian'). The need to look if the man was 'genuine or fake' ('ἐγγεγένηταί τις ἢ προσέρραπται) might in this case refer to a fake penis. The excessive 'license to speak' of which Scaurus accused the Greek orators is here in the 'inhonesta inquisitio' the husband (defended by Hybreas) was forced to make to the alleged lover's genitals.

As regards the corrupted Greek text, for this fragment particularly problematic are ἐσκόπησα, a sensible restoration for the CZNCOPHCa, and ἐγγεγένηταί/γεγέννηται for ΓeΓeNNTaI.

F6. Sen. *Controv.* 2.5.20

Hybreas dixit: †ἀνάξαις† οὖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἄκραν ἐπιών, καὶ εἰ εὐτολμεῖς, νῦν λαβὲ τὸ ξίφος.

ἀνάξαις *Burs* : αNαTTαIC **α** : ἀνάβαιν' *dubit. Müller* : ἀναστὰς *vel* ἀνάστηθι *Gertz* : ἀναπήδα *Jonas Palm* | ἐπὶ : eTI **a**: eΠ **BV** | τὴν ἄκραν ἐπιών : ΠHN (NHN **A**) aKPaM eTNWN **α** | εὐτολμεῖς *Gertz* : eYTOYMeIC **α** | ἐπιθυμεῖς *Bursian* | νῦν λαβὲ τὸ ξίφος : NYN aaBe TO ZKΦOC **α**

This quotation is apparently out of context in a *controversia* whose theme (not attested elsewhere) is a woman who was tortured by a tyrant for her husband's sake because she was suspected of knowing about her husband's plans to kill him. The husband kills the tyrant but, in the end, divorces the woman because she cannot bear a child, and she sues him for ingratitude. The reference to the castle and the sword might be to the husband killing the tyrant.

The tone of the final imperative sounds rather melodramatic, in line with Hellenistic taste.

The textual choices accepted are Müller's, but the situation is desperate, therefore, the meaning is totally uncertain. The first word (ἀνάξαις which I prefer to obelise) is particularly difficult to restore. The text in the manuscripts is αNαTTαIC, and the restoration which best resembles the text is Bursian's ἀνάξαις, but this form of the verb ἀναξαίνω is not attested. Müller doubtfully proposes ἀνάβαιν', Gertz ἀναστὰς, and Jonas Palm ἀναπήδα.

F7. Sen. *Controv.* 7.4.10

Hybreas in hac controversia dixit: τέκνον, κἄν με φεύγῃς, καταλήψομαί σ' ἐπαιτοῦσα. Hoc quibusdam corruptum videbatur, Romanius tamen ***

τέκνον : ZeKNON **α** | φεύγῃς : ΦeYTNC **α** | καταλήψομαί *Kiessling* : KataNYOMaI **α** KataNYΨOMaI **BV** | ἐπαιτοῦσα: eπΠTTOYCa **α** : ἐπιτυχοῦσα *Schenkl* : ἐπιπίπτουσα *Thomas* | Romanius : romanis **B** : romanus **V**

This *controversia* is entitled 'mater caeca filium retinens' and it is about a wife who is asked a ransom by her husband, captured by pirates. She becomes blind because of her weeping and asks her son for help, and then asks for him to be imprisoned because he is not willing to stay with her. The same declamation theme is found in Quint. *Inst. Decl. Maj.* 16. This *controversia* falls in the broad category of parents' rights (see Vesley [2003], Rayment [1952], and Lentano [2005], and discussion of Aeschines' F1). Here, Hybreas is speaking for the mother, who seems to be threatening her son by saying she will have the power to gain him back. On the contrary, in favour of the son was the Greek declaimer Apollonius, maybe the one from Alabanda (see F2). This opinion was probably not shared by Romanius Hispo, a Latin rhetorician and advocate of the early Imperial Period (fragments collected in Balbo [2007], 333-8; on his life and work see Gerth [1914]). 'corruptum' is, however, followed by a lacuna that may have possibly contained further explanations on the reason for this bad taste.

The two possible variants for ἐπαιτοῦσα (a restoration for the manuscript reading επΙΙΤΤΟΥCa), ἐπιτυχοῦσα ('having found you') proposed by Schenkl and ἐπιπίπτουσα (attacking you), proposed by Thomas, do not alter the overall meaning significantly. I chose to elide σε in σ'ἐπαιτοῦσα, in order to make the close rhythmical.

F8. Sen. *Controv.* 9.1.12

Hanc Hybreas aliter dixit sententiam: σὲ δέ, μοιχέ, τί ποιήσω; μὴ καὶ σοῦ Καλλίας πατήρ ἐστιν;

σὲ *Berardi* : σοὶ *codd.*| δέ, μοιχέ, τί : a XXeIxE πI **α** | μὴ : ΛΛΝ **A** : MH **B** | Καλλίας πατήρ : KaΛaIaC ΠΥHR **α** | materia : materiam **AB**

The title of the *controversia* in which this fragment is quoted is 'Cimon ingratus Calliae', another declamation on the theme of adultery, although with historical characters as protagonists. It can therefore be classified into two big declamation categories, the one on adultery and that on Persian Wars (on *suasoriae* on the Persian Wars see Damas' F1). It is attested only in Seneca. The story is about the famous Cimon, the son of Miltiades, who gave himself as a substitute for his father's dead body, so that it could be buried. Callias ransomed him from the state and paid for it; Callias then gave his daughter in marriage to him, but after some time, Cimon caught her in adultery and killed her. He was then accused of ingratitude towards Callias. This quotation shows Hybreas' ironic wit: here he probably impersonated Cimon and recreated the scene of the crime, imagining Cimon's uncertainty in killing his wife's lover or not. The tone is clearly satirical, as we have seen often happens in Hybreas, not only in his declamations but also in actual speeches (see F1 and F2).

'σὲ δέ, μοιχέ, τί': this is a restoration for the meaningless reading a XXeIXe πI. Müller's dative, commonly accepted, is perhaps slightly odd and may be replaced by an accusative σὲ, following the most

frequent construction of the double accusative of ποιέω with people, while the dative is mostly used for things (see *LSJ*, B2).

F9. Sen. *Controv.* 9.1.15.
Hybreas dixit: συγγνώμην ἔχε μοι . . .

ἔχε *Müller* : eXO **A** : eXG **BV** | μοι : MOY **α**

This very small fragment is contained in the same *controversia* as F8 (see commentary). Unfortunately, there is a lacuna, and the quotation is incomplete, so we only know Hybreas' addressing words 'pardon me', used to apostrophise the listener.

F10. Sen. *Controv.* 9.6.16
Dixit, inquit, Hybreas: τί οὖν; ἐψεύσατο κατὰ τῆς ἰδίας θυγατρός; οὔκ· ἀλλὰ κατὰ τῆς ἐμῆς.

ἐψεύσατο : ΨeYCaTO **V** | κατὰ : KaTaTa **α** | ἰδίας θυγατρός : ΙΛΙΛC ΘΥTaTROC (OY- **A** eY- **B**) **α** | ἀλλὰ : aMa **α** | ἐμῆς : MHC **a**

The title of this *controversia* is 'filia conscia in veneno privigni': a boy dies and his father accuses his new wife (the stepmother) of poisoning him. According to the law, a woman who poisons a man should be tortured until she confesses the names of her accomplices, so the woman confesses she was helped by her own daughter. The girl must be executed, but her father defends her. The topic is also to be found in [Quint. *Inst.*] *Decl. Min.* 381 and Calpurnius Flaccus 12. Declamations on stepmothers were extremely common in Greek and Latin rhetoric, as evident among (many) others by Lucian's *Apokeryttomenos*; Herm. *Stas.* 56.15-20; Sopater *DZ* 5; Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.86.14-19, 211.17, 447-50; 5. 86, 140.20; Libanius *Decl.* 49; Quint. *Inst. Decl. Maj.* 1-2; Decl. Min. 338, 350, 373; Sen. *Controv.* 5.3, 4; 9.5; Calpurnius Flaccus 35. See Kohl (1905) for a longer list.
This *sententia* of Hybreas' is mentioned with regard to the assertion of Pompeius Silo (Silo' fragments are collected in Balbo [2007] 123-5; on his life and work see Walde [2001]) that all the declaimers wanted to say something new at the point when the stepmother named her daughter as her accomplice. The speaker here is the girl's father, and the tone is the witty one typical of Hybreas. His words have two possible interpretations: 1) the speaker is implying that the mother who accused her own daughter is not worthy of being considered a mother, therefore, the only real parent of the girl is her father; 2) the mother accused the girl because she is the daughter of *that* man she is no longer married to, and, therefore, was not considering her a daughter anymore. Immediately after, we read Arellius Fuscus' Latin translation of the sentence (on Arellius Fuscus see Sussman [1977] and Von

Rohden [1895-1896]) and Seneca comments that Arellius was not surprisingly an admirer of Hybreas' since they shared their Asianic style.

F11. Sen. *Controv.* 1.4.11
Hybreas hunc sensum optime dixit: ***

Hybreas : ybreas A

The text here presents a lacuna, so the actual quotation is missing (as all Greek sentences in this *controversia*, see Damas' F6, and Gorgias' F1-2). The *controversia* is entitled 'fortis sine manibus', 'the hero without hands', and its theme is the case of a man with no hands who finds his woman with another lover. He would go unpunished if he killed both with his hands, but being without hands, he can ask his son to do it on his behalf. The son does not accept to kill his mother, so he loses his inheritance. See a parallel in Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.250.14-16. The 'well put' concept is the arrogance of the deceiver who may insinuate himself as the actual father of the son.

(47) Isidorus of Pergamon

Biographical note: not much is known about Isidorus of Pergamon. The only source about him is Diog. Laert. 7.34, from whom we know Isidorus belonged to the school of Pergamon and that he, like Cassius (a Sceptic philosopher), attacked Zenon. Diogenes also says he was interested in Athenodorus of Tarsus' activity as a librarian in Pergamon (see von Arnim [1896]); he should have lived, therefore, in the 1st century BC.
On Isidorus see: Barabino (1967), 43; Janiszewski (2015), 182-3; Kroll (1916); Ruhnken (1768), XCIII.

F1. Rutilius 2.16.
Isidori: 'Non ille stultitia aut furore impulsus tam graves labores frustra subibat, sed ex acerbitate laboris iucundos voluptatis fructus sibi parabat.'

non **A Ald. Basil.** : nam **B V** | subibat…parabat **A** : subibit…parabit **B V Ald.** : subiret…parabat **Basil.** : subierat…parabat *coni. Halm dub.*

The only extant fragment of Isidorus of Pergamon is placed in Rutilius' section on ἀντίθετον. Here the contrast is between stupidity/fury and hard work. As with most of the fragments quoted by Rutilius, we have no context, and the shortness of the fragment does not allow us to make definitive hypotheses, but we can assume this fragment could have dealt with a private matter and therefore belonged to a forensic speech. However, considering that Isidorus belonged to the school of

Pergamon, it is also entirely possible to see this fragment as part of a declamation. As regards the content of the fragment, the man described in it is said not to be as silly as to undertake fatigues in vain, but wise enough to work hard with the expectation of a reward. This moral commonplace on the value of hard work, which in the end brings the reward of pleasure, is widely present in ancient Greek literature, beginning from Aesop's fables (above all Aes. 2, *The Ant and the Grasshopper*, and 254, *The Hare and the Tortoise*).

It is interesting to notice the use of the imperfect 'subibat' to emphasise the planning, and the linguistic contrast between negative 'acerbitate' and the positive 'iucundos [...] fructus'.

(48) Isocrates of Apollonia

Biographical note: a fairly well-known personality is the orator Isocrates of Apollonia, mentioned at *Suda* ι 653 as orator, son of Amyclas, the philosopher of Apollonia in Pontus, pupil, and successor of the great Isocrates. According to the *Suda*, he also studied with Plato. He took part in a rhetorical contest with Theodectes, an orator, and tragic poet who was also a pupil of Isocrates (Solmsen [1934]), Theopompus of Chios, and Erythraeus of Naucratis, for the composition of the funeral speech for Mausolus (see Hornblower [2005^{3}]). The *Suda* also lists some of Isocrates' speeches and other works: *Amphictyonic Speech*, probably a political speech dealing with events of the Sacred Wars – it is interesting that speeches with the same title are attested for Philiscus and Theodectes, both pupils of Isocrates too; *Protreptic*, some kind of epideictic speech; *On Not Making a Tomb for Philip*, probably against Philip's project of having a gigantic tomb, as big as a pyramid, attested in Diod. Sic. 18.4.2-6; *On Being Resettled*, probably on immigration and colonization. A similar title is attested as spurious for the elder Isocrates, by Zosimus' *Vita Isocratis* (36-38). Then, a speech *On His Own Constitution*, probably a political speech, maybe similar to the *Areopagiticus*, as regards the discussion of the types of constitution, or perhaps dealing with Isocrates' rights as citizen (we do not know whether he had become an Athenian or not). This *Suda* entry is particularly rich in information, and especially useful is the list of titles of speeches, which allows us to place Isocrates among the Hellenistic orators, since we know he survived Philip who died in 336.

According to Harpocration (ε 77), he also wrote panegyrics *To Demonicus,* where an administered oath was mentioned. According to Firicel-Dana, this is just an assumption by Harpocration, who attributed a spurious speech by the elder Isocrates to his favourite pupil. One of the few other mentions of a homonymous pupil of Isocrates is again in the *Suda* at the entry θ 138, where, talking about Theodectes, the lexicon repeats the exact same information given here about the rhetorical contest for the funeral of the king Mausolus. Firicel-Dana (2001-3), 41-63 offers a collection of all the *testimonia*, which is possible to find on this figure, even when the identification is only alleged. Friedrich Blass (1892^{2}), 450 identified this Isocrates with the pupil mentioned at 11-14 of Speusippus' *Letter to Philip*, and so did von Scala (1892), 112. The hypothesis is not taken into consideration by

Bickermann and Sykutris in their detailed commentary on the letter (Bickermann-Sykutris [1928]. The whole question is well summarised in Natoli [2014], 54-55).
On Isocrates see: Blass (1892²), 450; Firicel-Dana (2001-2003), 41-63; Natoli (2004), 54-5; von Scala (1892), 102-21.

(49) Laches of Leuconoe

Biographical note: Laches was the son of Democharis (31) and was therefore active in the 3rd century BC. He was the one who proposed in 270/271 BC to erect a statue for his father Democharis in the market-place, and to grant table and diet in the Prytaneium for himself and the eldest of his progeny successively (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 847d-e).
On Laches, see: Swoboda (1924).

(50) Lesbocles

Biographical note: not much is known about the declaimer Lesbocles (Strab. 13.2.3), apart from the fact that he was a contemporary of Potamon (71), and that he too had a school in Rome (Sen. *Suas.* 2.15). From Seneca we know that (unlike Potamon) he stopped declaiming after the death of his son. A fragment of his is quoted by Seneca (*Contr.* 1.8.15)
On Lesbocles see: Bornecque (1902), 178; Janiszewski (2015), 213

F1. Sen. *Contr.* 1.8.15
[...] a Lesbocle Graeco tenerius, qui dixit sic: κείσομαι· ὡς τεῖχος, <ὡς> τάφρον ὑπέρβηθι καὶ πατέρα.

Lesbocles : males bode **A** : ma Lesbocle **BV** | <ὡς> *suppl. Gertz* | ὑπέρβηθι : YITePBHΘI (-HeI **A**) **α** | πατέρα : ITΛTePA **AB**

The theme of this *controversia* deals with the law according to which anyone who has acted heroically three times shall be exempt from military service (this law is also in Calp. Flacc. 15). The case is about a father who tries to stop his son, who has acted heroically three times and wants to go to fight a fourth time, but the son refuses and gets disinherited (see Aeschines F1 for more). This declamation falls into the category of those dealing with parents' rights (see Vesley [2003], Rayment [1952] and Lentano [2005], and parallels in Aeschines' F1 and Apollonius' F2).

Seneca describes Lesbocles' sentence as too feeble, in comparison to the one by Latro, considered too strong by Plancus. His version of the same concept was the following: 'non permittam exire, iniciam manus, tenebo, novissime ante limen exeuntis cadaver hoc sternam: ut ad hostem

pervenias, patrem calca'. Lesbocles expression of this concept (having to walk on someone's body before obtaining what one wants) is less articulated and rather plain, while Latro's description is longer and more vivid.

(51) Leon of Athens

Biographical note: Leo was an Athenian pro-Roman orator active in the first half of the 2nd century BC. He was opposed by a certain Apollodorus, who wanted to welcome Anthiocus to Greece, letting him enter through the Piraeus. According to Livy (35.50.3), Leon drove Apollodorus into exile for this reason. Livy mentions him a second time (38.10.4), as the son of Hicesias, who 'is said to have created something of an impression by his eloquence; employing the familiar simile of a calm sea which is disturbed by the winds, likening to it the Aetolian people, he said that as long as they had remained faithful to the Roman alliance they had been quiet with the natural calmness of the race' (transl. Sage). This was meant to persuade the Romans to make peace with the Aetolians after Antiochus had been driven from Greece in 189 BC. Polybius (21.31) quotes a longer version of the speech, but he attributes it to Damis, probably a philosopher that was at the time a resident of Athens. This probably derives from a corruption of Polybius' text. This poetic simile is an example of the complexity and refinement of the Hellenistic rhetorical style.
On Leon's family, see Habicht (1961)
On Leon, see: Deininger (1968); Ferguson (1911), 286-8; Wooten (1972), 19.

(52) Lyciscus of Acarnania

Biographical note: our source for Lyciscus of Acarnania is Polybius (9.32-39), who reports his speech in reply to Chlaeneas (23), when he came to persuade the Spartans to join the Aetolians against Philip V of Macedonia. According to Wooten (1972), 52 this speech, being very lively, full of exclamations, rhetorical questions, and emotional tones (as opposed to the 'generally flat and rather colorless speeches in Polybius') might reflect the tone of the original. As for the speeches of Chleaneas, Cassander and Thrasicrates, Wooten sees this as an example of the pattern of the ambassador speech: apology, refutation of the charges, attack, appeal.
On Lyciscus, see: Wooten (1972), 57-62.

(53) Lycortas

Biographical note: Lycortas, born in Megalopolis, was the son of Thearidas (Syll.[3] 626) and the father of Polybius. He was general of the Achean league, and promoted a form of resistance to Rome, defending Achaean independence from Rome (189 BC), but his opponents Callicrates (18) and Aristaenus prevailed with their pro-Roman views. Most of the events dealing with his life and political career are narrated by Polybius (28.3.7; 6.3-5; 22.3.5-9; 24.6.3-7; 29.23-25) and Livy (39.36). Among the speeches reported by Polybius, the most interesting is the one at 22.12, when Lycortas, received by king Ptolemy, talked about an oath of alliance, delivered a panegyric of the king, and praised his goodwill towards the Acheans. This is a fine example of the importance of panegyrical rhetoric in the actual practice of oratory in the 2nd century BC. Another small extract from a speech by Lycortas is at Polyb. 24.10, and is about the question of the letter from Rome as to the recall of the Lacedaemonian exiles (180 BC).
On Lycortas, see: Stähelin (1927).

(54) Matris

Biographical note: not much is known about Matris, an orator and rhetorician whose only attested work is an *Encomium of Heracles* (see F1 and F2). Considering that the earliest source is Diodorus of Sicily (F2), he must have been active before the 1st century BC. A witness by [Longinus]. *Subl.* 3.2 associates his writing style with that of Amphicrates and Hegesias, which would make him Asianic, and it would be therefore unlikely to date his activity before the 3rd century BC. Further information about his life and activity is in Philodemus (*Rhet.*, 34.6-24. Sudhaus), who is reporting the point of view of Diogenes of Babylon, which would push the *terminus ante quem* to the 2nd century BC. Philodemus' witness is also interesting because Matris is mentioned as a rhetorician and teacher of rhetoric; he is here also associated with Isocrates, unlikely on the ground of their style, but more probably for their role as teachers. His city of origin is still object of debate: Athenaeus considers him Athenian (Ath. 44d), but this source has been emended by Kaibel into Θηβαῖος in the light of the witness of Photius (*Bibl.* 190.148) in the chapter about Ptolemy Hephaestion (= Ptolemy Chennos) and his *New History.* Here the historian mentions a hymnographer called Matris from Thebes, who had composed a hymn to Heracles, sung in Thebes, and dealing with the son of Zeus and Hera. The identification of the two Matrises is possible not only in relation to the content of the hymn and the encomium, but also because in Photius' passage, Ptolemy says Matris ate myrtles throughout his whole life. Matris was indeed known for a peculiar diet: in Sen. *Ep.* 3.2. we read 'Paratum fuit nobis Matris <in> morem, nusquam sine caricis numquam sine pugillaribus'. Moreover, as Pernot points out (46), it is entirely possible that the word hymn was used broadly, and could here indicate an encomium in prose, the one of which we have fragments (Wilamowitz [1900] 3, n.4, also thought the same).

Contrary to this opinion are Hobein and Wünsch, Pernot also adds that, if Matris was called *hymnographos*, he must have written more works of this kind. The two witnesses on the *Encomium of Heracles* are quite vague and give little information about its style and the structure of his work, but briefly mention some bits of the content. Therefore, it is difficult to say if it was still somehow influenced by the kind of encomium that was typical of Gorgias and evolved to Isocrates, a model that was apparently followed in schools, as shown by P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123 (see discussion), or, on the other hand, it was already more similar to Imperial epideictic oratory (see Introduction).
On Matris, see: *FGrHist/BNJ* 39; Banchich (2016); Dieterich (1900) = Dieterich (1911), 162-3; Hobein (1928); Holzer,(1881); Hubbell (1916); Pernot (1993), 46-7; Schwartz (1957), 55; Watt (1982); Wilamowitz (1900); Wünsch (1914).

T1. Ath. 10.412b

Μᾶτρις δ' ἐν τῷ τοῦ Ἡρακλέους ἐγκωμίῳ καὶ εἰς πολυποσίαν φησὶ τὸν Ἡρακλέα προκληθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Λεπρέως, καὶ πάλιν νικῆσαι.

νικῆσαι *Berardi* : νικηθῆναι *codd.* : <τοῦτον> νικηθῆναι *Hutchinson* : < ἐκείνον> *Obbink*

This testimonium informs us that one of the episodes of Heracles' life mentioned in Matris' encomium was the famous contest he took part in against Lepreos, about drinking and eating, where Heracles won several times. No information is given to reconstruct what version of the myth Matris followed. It is, however, peculiar that an encomium contained the narration of an unflattering episode like that of a drinking contest (we do not find it in any of the Imperial encomia of Heracles); we should, therefore, question this piece and perhaps think it included a component of playfulness and irony. It is interesting to see what Quintilian says at 3.7.6: 'quaedam vero etiam in defensionis speciem cadent, ut si in laude Herculis permutatum cum regina Lydiae habitum et imperata, ut traditur, pensa orator excuset. sed proprium laudis est res amplificare et ornare'. Just before, Quintilian was speaking about the necessity for proofs when writing panegyrics, while he is here pointing out that sometimes the author needs a defence or a justification for some of the actions of the praised character; the example Quintilian uses is that of Heracles (although in reference to another episode of his life). It was not therefore completely unusual for panegyrist to include negative episodes in their speeches, provided that they were somehow justified. This could have been the case of Matris with Heracles, whose drinking contest against Lepreos could have been mentioned with a touch of irony. This episode, moreover, was not apparently so unusual in Heracles' panegyrics, as we read in what follows in Athenaeus' quotation, where the author says that Caucalus of Chios (20, especially F1) talked about the same topic.

We should perhaps hypothesise a textual problem in the expression πάλιν νικηθῆναι, as it implied that Heracles was defeated. However, according to the two other main sources on Lepreus'

myth (Paus. 5.5.4 and more extensively Ael. *VH.* 1.24), as well as to the previous section in Athenaeus, it was he, and not Heracles, who lost and, after several competitions in different disciplines, (always won by his opponents, hence the πάλιν), got killed. It is absolutely implausible that Matris and Caucalus employed a strange reversed version of this myth, especially because they were writing an encomium; we should, therefore, assume some textual problem not noted by his editors so far. Different options seem possible: either an accusative Λεπρέα has been omitted because of the nearby genitive, or, as Gregory Hutchinson and Dirk Obbink respectively suggested me, it was a τοῦτον or an ἐκείνον that have been omitted (justified with a *saut* from the final ιν in πάλιν to the νι in νικηθῆναι); alternatively an easier and more straightforward option is that the passive infinitive νικηθῆναι could be a corruption for the active νικῆσαι, wrongly influenced by the preceding προκληθῆναι. All modern editors and translators, although they do not not alter the text, translate the sentence making clear that Lepreus (and not Heracles) was defeated, and, therefore, slightly change the syntax of the passage. Douglas Olson, for instance, translated the text as follows: 'Matris in his *Eulogy of Heracles* claims that Lepreus also challenged Heracles to a drinking-contest and lost there as well'; he changes the logical subject from Heracles to Lepreus, and, therefore, makes the construction of Ἡρακλέα προκληθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ Λεπρέως active. It is clear, therefore, that editors have noted the presence of a mistake in the sense of this sentence, but decided to only point that out in their translations. However, I believe it necessary some form of textual clarification.

T2. Diod. Sic. 1.24.4

τὸν δ' ἐξ Ἀλκμήνης γενόμενον ὕστερον πλείοσιν ἔτεσιν ἢ μυρίοις, Ἀλκαῖον ἐκ γενετῆς καλούμενον, ὕστερον Ἡρακλέα μετονομασθῆναι, οὐχ ὅτι δι' Ἥραν ἔσχε κλέος, ὥς φησιν ὁ Μᾶτρις, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐζηλωκὼς προαίρεσιν Ἡρακλεῖ τῶι παλαιῷ τὴν ἐκείνου δόξαν ἅμα καὶ προσηγορίαν ἐκληρονόμησε.

δόξαν **D**^{a} **C** : δύναμιν **V** | ἅμα *om.* **V**

This testimonium informs us that Matris' *Encomium of Heracles* explained the name given to the hero (who was initially called Alcaios) in relation to Hera (Ἥρα and κλέος, therefore "Hera's glory"). Heracles acquired glory when he was just a baby because of the goddess, who sent two giant snakes into his room in order to kill him, and he was able to strangle them (unlike his brother Iphicles). Hera also drove him mad, and made him kill his children, a crime because of which he became glorious, having had to go through the twelve labours in order to atone for it. This can be a clue that the Hellenistic predilection for etiology was not just typical of poetry and of Hellenistic mythography in prose, but also of a certain type of epideictic oratory. Diodorus is rejecting this etymology (which he will inconsistently accept at 4.9) in favour of another one implying the existence of another older mythical Heracles (see Diod. Sic. 3.74 and 4.9; Paus. 5.7.6; 14.7; Strab. 8.3 on the legend). The 'ancient Heracles' whose reputation the famous Heraclesmanaged to acquire is a Heracles Idaeus Dactylus, a less known mythological character, who is said to have founded the Olympic

Games at the time of Chronos. Much later in Heracles' life, Holzer (1881) believed that the passages in Diodorus' book 4 (8-39), where we find a narration of Heracles' life, were inspired by Matris' encomium. As Pernot (1993) 46 also points out, the character of the passage seems indeed rhetorical, and the narration does not have digressions. Pernot believes that the first part is inspired by Matris, as it has the following typical elements: a rhetorical beginning (8), the honours given by the gods (14), paradoxical events (9-10). If this theory is correct, following Pernot's idea (47), this encomium rather resembles a historical biography than the praise of a God, which would somehow be in line with the atypical traits found in F1.

(55) Menecles of Alabanda

Biographical note: Merocles (2nd-1st century BC) was the brother of Hierocles of Alabanda (45). He was an orator and the teacher of rhetoric of both Apollonius ὁ μαλακός, and Molon. Like his brother, he is often referred to by Cicero (*De Or*. 2.95) as an example of Asianic style whos prose rhythm lacks variation (*Or*. 231). According to Cicero (*Brut*. 325), Menecles was more talented. He is used as an example of Asianic style 'sententiosum et argutum', opposed to the second type 'verbis volucre at incitatum'). Wooten (1972), 30, following Jander (1913), 26-30, believes Menecles (or a pupil of his) is the author of P.Yale 2.105, but this assumption seems to be based on some wrong readings.
On Menecles, see: Fiehn (1931a); Janiszewski (2015), 250; Wooten (1972), 30.

(56) Menedemus of Athens

Biographical note: an orator from Athens called Menedemus was Cicero's guest in Rome (*De Or.* 1.85-88): this passage by Cicero constitutes the only source we have about him. According to it, he had recently been Cicero's guest in Rome, therefore just before 55 BC, when the *De Oratore* was written. In this long passage, Menedemus argues against the idea of Charmadas the Academic that the teaching of rhetoric is useless alone, but should always be accompanied by philosophy. To disprove this, he quotes Demosthenes. This conversation finds its place within the long debate and rivalry between philosophers and rhetoricians (see Introduction).
On Menedemus, see: Fiehn (1931b); Wooten (1972), 21-2.

(57) Menelaus of Marathus

Biographical note: the only source about Menelaus of Marathus is Cicero (*Brut*. 100), where he is mentioned in relation to Gaius Gracchus and called a speechwriter and teacher (perhaps one of his teachers of rhetoric). Considering his Syrian provenance, he must have been an Asianist.
On Melelaus, see: Kroll (1931); Wooten (1972), 29-30.

(58) Menesaechmus

Biographical note: Menesaechmus was an Attic orator, also active at the beginning of the Hellenistic age. He was opposed by Lycurgus (Ps-Plut. *X ora*t. 832d) for having neglected his duties as leader of the festival legation to Delos. But when he was placed in charge of the financial administration, he condemned Lycurgus (who died shortly after) and his sons (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 842e-f, and Dem. *Ep.* 3). He was one of Demosthenes' accusers, and Demosthenes wrote lost a speech *Against Menesaechmus*, or *Delian Speech* (Ps-Plut. *X ora*t. 846c). His style is called insipid by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Din.* 11.82-83).
On Menesaechmus see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.64; Fiehn (1931b); Ruhnken (1768), LXXVII.

F1. Dion. Halic. *De Din.* 11.14
Ἀφαιροῦμαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὑπὲρ Μενεσαίχμου λόγους ἀμφοτέρους αὐτοῦ, ὧν ὃ μέν ἐστιν περὶ τῆς Δήλου θυσίας· 'ἱκετεύομεν ὑμᾶς καί […]'

περὶ **F** : ὑπὲρ *Radermacher* | ὑμᾶς *Sylburg* : ἡμᾶς **F**

F2. Dion. Halic. *De Din.* 11.15
[…] ὃ δὲ πρὸς Περικλέα καὶ Δημοκράτην, οὗ ἡ ἀρχή· 'νομίζομεν, ὦ ἄνδρες' διά τε τὸν χαρακτῆρα (ὑδαρὴς γὰρ καὶ κεχυμένος καὶ ψυχρός) καὶ ὅτι ὁ λέγων αὐτούς, ὧν οὔτε ἄδοξος καὶ μετὰ Λυκοῦργον τὴν διοίκησιν τῶν δημοσίων χρημάτων παραλαβών, ἐξητασμένος δὲ πολλάκις αὐτός, ὡς ἐν τοῖς λόγοις περὶ ἁπάντων μηνύει, καὶ ἐν ἰδίοις καὶ ἐν δημοσίοις ἀγῶσιν οὐκ ἂν ἦν ἀδύνατος, ὥστε Δεινάρχῳ λογογράφῳ χρήσθαι.

αὐτούς *Radermacher* : ἀυτός **F** | λογογράφῳ *Sauppe* : λογογραφεῖ **F**

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, when discussing Dinarchus' *spuria*, tries to debunk the information (not otherwise attested) according to which Dinarchus was also a speechwriter for Menesaechmus. Dionysius' judgement of Menesaechmus' oratory is very harsh, as he says that these speeches, unlike those by Dinarchus, had an insipid, diffuse, and cold style. The first speech mentioned is the one at F1, *On the Delian Sacrifice*, a defence against the accusations of Lycurgus (Κατὰ Μενεσαίχμου εἰσαγγελίᾳ, Harp. α 237, where Lycurgus accused him of neglecting his duties in Delos), from which Dionysius reports a slightly dramatic phrase, though not particularly indicative

of Meneaechmus' style: 'We beseech you'. This is not a remarkable phrase, which we find in oratory quite often: see among others Is. 17.37; Isoc. 14.56; Lysias 42.55; Dem. 42.32; 43.83; 57.70; Aesch. 3.156; Hyp. 1.6. col. 26. l. 17; Lyc. 1.150; and even Dinarchus (6.21), to whom Menesaechmus is opposed stylistically. Even more unremarkable is the short quotation from the speech *Against Pericles and Democrates*, in which we only know Menesaechmus said 'We consider, men…'. The speech probably contained some accusations against an older Attic orator, Democrates (active before Demosthenes) and pro-Macedonian (see Baiter-Sauppe [1839-43], II.59, and Blass [1893²], 288), who claimed free provisions in the Prytaneion (Hyp. 4. 3) as descendent of Armodius and Aristogeiton. It is difficult, however, to establish his connection to Pericles.

T1. Dion. Halic. *De Din.* 11.73-78
See text and commentary on Democleides T1.

(59) Menippus of Stratonicea

Biographical note: Menippus of Stratonicea (Caria), defined by Cicero (*Brut*. 315) 'princeps […] tota Asia illis temporibus disertissimus', was one of the orators with whom he studied between 79 and 77 BC, during his residence in Asia (Plut. *Cic.* 4.4). Menippus is also mentioned by Diogenes Laertius (101), and Strabo (14.2.25), who says Menippus was born in the generation before his and that he was called Κατοκᾶς, an otherwise unattested nickname.
On Menippus, see: Schissel (1931); Wooten (1972), 38.

(60) Metrodorus of Scepsis

Biographical note: Metrodorus of Scepsis was active between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st century BC. He was younger than Demetrius of Scepsis, according to Strabo (13.1.55), who, according to Plut. *Luc*. 22, is one of the main sources about his life. He was initially a philosopher, then became involved in politics and rhetoric. He worked at the court of Mithridates where he 'was treated with exceptional honour, being appointed to the judgeship from which there was no appeal to the king'. He was ambassador to Tigranes, king of Armenia, in order to obtain his help against the Romans. When Tigranes asked Metrodorus' opinion about the request, he replied that as an ambassador, he would advise in favour of it, but as a man, he would advise against it. Therefore, Mithridates, when knew this, put him to death (although Strabo admits the possibility that Metrodorus died from disease), but then the king repented and organised a splendid funeral for him. More information about him is in Diog. Laert. 5.84, who discusses Metrodorus' friendship with the philosopher Demetrius, from the same city. He was famous for the power of his memory, remembered by Cicero

De Orat. 2.88 (Cicero also talks about him in *De Orat*. 360-375 and *Tusc. Disp*. 1.59) and Quint. *Inst.* 10.6.4. Cicero mentions him together with the philosopher Charmadas, which has led some scholars to think he was affiliated to his academy. He is probably the same Metrodorus whom the Elder Pliny (*Nat. Hist*. 34.16) mentions as μισορομαῖος because of his hatred for Rome. As for his style, according to Strabo, it was new and dazzling, therefore perhaps Asianic. Athenaeus says he wrote a treatise *On the Art of Training* (12.552c-d), where he discussed Hipponax's physical shape. He apparently also wrote a book on the habits of animals entitled Περὶ Συνηθείας (Strab. 16.4.16; Ath. 9.391d).
On Metrodorus see: *FGrHist* 184; Kroll (1931b); Marastoni (2007); Müller, FHG, 204-5; Wooten (1972) 28-29.

(61) Myron

Biographical note: nothing is known about Myron, and the only two mentions of him are the two fragments quoted by Rutilius, which allows us just to date him before the 1st century BC. The only two studies about him are Barabino (1967), 143, and a short biographical note in Drexler (1933). The identification with the historian Myron of Priene (*FGriHist* 106), taken for granted by Jacoby and Christesen (2016) is not at all obvious. This claim is made on two grounds. The first is that the *Messenian History* by Myron of Priene was written in a rhetorical style (Schwartz [1899], 453) – however, this is a *petitio principii*, as it is based the assumption that the fragments quoted by Rutilius are by Myron of Priene. The second is that Pausanias (4.6.34) says that in his other works, Myron did not aim at being credible, a characteristic which Pearson (1962), 411, finds relatable to a rhetorician. The same reasoning can apply to the mention of an *Encomium of Rhodes* attributed to a certain Myron in the *Lindian Chronicle* (c.65-8; c.1). Higbie (2003), 125, suggests he might be Myron of Priene, but nowhere is the term Priene found in the inscription. Moreover, the age in which Myron of Priene lived (late 3rd century BC) does not seem perfectly compatible with the mention of Chremonides (possibly the Athenian statesman active in the first half of the century) in F1. I am therefore inclined to consider the orator Myron as a different person from the historian from Priene.

On the chronology and possible solutions to the contradiction, see Pearson (1962), who thinks F1 is a fragment of history and talks about past events, and Mazzarino (1965-6), I, 493, who thinks Myron was relying on Spartan themes circulating a few decades after the war.
On Myron, see: *FGrHist/BNJ* 106.

F1. Rutilius 1.20

Hoc schema tunc prodest atque omnis eius utilitas in eo est, cum volumus ostendere necessitudinem aut naturae aut temporis aut alicuius personae, quem ad modum fecit Myron: 'Amicus meus

fuit Chremonides et opinione omnium magis familiaris, et pro salute eius quaecumque potui feci. Sed posteaquam maior vis legis nostrum auxilium ab illius periculo removit, calamitatis ac luctus eius particeps eram. Nam opitulandi facultas omnis erepta iam fuerat'.

Chremonides *vel* Cremonides *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : Chaeremonides *Steph.*

The fragment is quoted by Rutilius as an example of ἀναγκαῖον. The necessity here expressed is that of the law, which impedes Myron (or the person on whose behalf Myron is talking) to help his friend Chremonides in a moment of misfortune. If Myron lived in the 3rd century BC and this Chremonides was the famous Athenian statesman and general who promoted an alliance with Sparta and Ptolemy II against Antigonus of Macedon (hence the so-called Chremonidean War, see Introduction), the reference to Chremonides' misfortune could be about the negative outcome of the named war for the democratic party led by Chremonides (see Habicht [1997], 147-53). He needed to leave Athens and go to Egypt to the court of Ptolemy as refugee, when Athens fell in the hands of Antigonus Gonata. The same believes Sartori (1970), who, however, is firmly convinced the fragment is by Myron of Priene, but, as noted, the identification is more than doubtful.

If we chose not to identify the mentioned Chremonides with the historical character, one might say this fragment could have been part of a private speech, either involving Myron directly or written for another person. Another possibility, then, is that, if Myron was active after the 3rd century BC, this quotation was taken from a declamation. However, there is no declamation theme to which I am able to refer this fragment, and no declamation about the historical character of Chremonides or his contemporaries exists, so this remains a rather weak possibility. Finally, considering the personal involvement of the speaker, Pearson (1962), who, believing this is a fragment by Myron of Priene, thinks it belonged to his *Messenian History*, but this idea appears not otherwise supported.

As regards the content, here, the speaker is trying to persuade the audience of his good and moral behaviour, even when the circumstances were averse to it. To do it, he employs a *topos* not unknown to Attic oratory, that of close friendship (some examples are in Is. 4.5; Dem. 59.15; Isoc. 21.21).

F2. Rutilius 2.1

Ita uti fecit Myron. 'Haec mulier nuper fuit locuples, potens, in amore atque deliciis necessariorum; ornatus eius opibus abundabat; magnus ancillarum [quae sequebantur] comitatus; <ab omnis beata> appellabatur. Nunc contra subito et gravi casu adflicta vix mediocris ancillulae dignitatem retinet. O fortuna, quam vehementer te rerum varietas oblectat, et quam magno odio est tibi beatae vitae perpetuus et constans fructus!'

uti *Gesner* : ut is *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : ut his *dubitanter Halm* | potens **A Basil.** : et potens **B V Ald.** | ornatus eius opibus *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : ornatus ei ex opibus *Jac.* | magnus ancillarum comitatus; ab omnis beata

appellabatur *Meiser* : magnus ancillarum quae sequebantur comitatus appellabatur **A Ald. Basil.** : magnus ancillarum quo sequebantur comitatus appellabatur **B V** : magnus ancillarum quae sequebantur comitatus *Womerius ad Petr. 17* : manus ancillarum sequebantur *Ruhnken* : magnus ancillarum quae sequebantur, comitatus; a cunctis, qui obviam essent facti, comiter appellabatur *Jac.* : magnus ancillaruma quae sequebantur comitatus apparebatur *Maehly*

This quotation belongs to Rutilius' section on μετάβασις – a change of subject – a rhetorical term used for the first time in Rutilius. In this fragment we see a sudden change of topic when the orator stops describing the loss of good fortune by the woman he is talking about, and addresses the personified fortune (most likely the τύχη in the original), although still in reference to what he was commenting on before. The *topos* of the Τύχης μεταβολή is one of the most popular in the Greek and Latin literature of all the times and genres (especially in dramatic literature and most of all in the New Comedy, see Haviland [1984], on the capriciousness of fortune, see also Polyb. 30.10). In oratory, we find it in Dem. 1.11, where Demosthenes links fortune and misfortune respectively to gratitude and the lack of it. Another instance, although having a slightly different meaning, is in Aeschin. 3.232, where Aeschines is asking the Athenians if they have replaced the favour of their lost fortune with the favour of Demosthenes. A similar topic, dealing with the consequences of bad fortune, can be found in Hegesias' F2bis and F4. According to the little information we read in this fragment, this could have been a private speech or a declamation in defence of woman or someone connected to her. However, I do not seem to find any attestation of a declamation theme dealing with a rich and happy woman falling into disgrace. The final appeal to fortune, which hates a constantly happy life and plays with human lives, confers a dramatic and pathetic tone on the speech. This closure, perfectly in line with Hellenistic rhetorical tendencies, also has a strongly sententious character. It is worth mentioning that the downfall of a formerly happy man is one of the strategies that Cicero recommends as an emotional appeal (*Part. Orat.* 57).

quae sequebantur comitatus appellabatur: the discussion regarding the textual problems in this sentence is presented in Barabino (1968), 178. A full account of the textual situation is also in Ruhnken (1768), 57.

(62) Naucratis of Erythrae

Biographical note: Naucratis, from the Ionian city of Erythrae, was a pupil of Isocrates (Cic. *De Orat.* 2.94). He was the author of an epitaph (Dion. Hal. *Rhet.* 6.1), possibly (but not certainly) the one mentioned in the *Suda* (ι 653), which he wrote for the competition against Theodectes, Theopompus and Isocrates of Apollonia, as funeral oration for Mausolus (also mentioned in Gell. 10.18.6 and Phot. *Bibl.* 176.120b.30). Ruhnken (1768), LXXXIV connects this information with that in Plut. *Cim.* 19.5,

according to which a certain orator called Nausicrates (not otherwise known) talked about Cimon praising him; the connection between these two bits of information is, however, uncertain and otherwise difficult to prove. Dionysius' opinion about him is not particularly positive, as he (*De Is.* 19) simply considers Naucratis (as well as other pupils like Theodectes, Theopompus, Ephorus, Philiscus) a bad imitation of his teacher Isocrates. A better judgement about him is in Cicero (*Or.* 172), who briefly praises Isocrates and his pupils Ephorus and Naucratis. Naucratis also worked on rhetorical theory: Quintilian (3.6.3) mentions him as one of the possible inventors of the rhetorical term στάσις, while Cicero (*De Orat.* 3.173) says he talks about Isocrates introducing rhythmical closes in prose.

On Naucratis, see: Ruhnken (1768), LXXXIV; Wendel (1935).

(63) Neanthes of Cyzicus

Biographical note: a mention is deserved by entry ν 114 in the *Suda*, about Neanthes, a historian and orator from the 3rd century BC: 'Neanthes of Cyzicus, a rhetor, pupil of Philiscus of Miletus'. Neanthes was a quite well-known personality in Antiquity, but only as a historian. Here, the *Suda* is the only witness for his rhetorical activity and for his relationship to Philiscus (orator and pupil of Isocrates) if we exclude the information contained in Pseudo-Eudocia Augusta's *Violarium* (712) where Neanthes is said to have been a rhetor and pupil of Philiscus and to have written a treatise *On Rhetorical Affectation* and many panegyrical speeches. This is another piece of information quite probably taken from the *Suda* (in the entry on Callinicus, a rhetor and, sophist from the 3rd century AD), but wrongly attributed to Neanthes. Jacoby identified two Neanthes of Cyzicus, an elder (*FGrHist* 84) and a younger (*BNJ* 171), and considered this mention in the *Suda* as a reference to the elder, although he offered no commentary on the latter. The relationship with Philiscus witnessed by this entry of the *Suda* is crucial in order to establish this distinction: Philiscus most likely died before 300 BC, while the historian Neanthes is said to have composed a history of Attalus, who reigned from 241-197 BC. Therefore, Jacoby's assumption appears to be correct, and the rhetorician Neanthes, pupil of Philiscus of Miletus, is to be rightly identified with the elder. The attribution of historical and philosophical fragments to one or the other character is, however, still debated (on the subject see Fuentes González [2005] and Schorn [2007]).

On Neanthes, see: *FGrHist*/*BNJ* 84; Laqueur (1935).

(64) Peithagoras of Cyrene

Biographical note: an orator called Peithagoras of Cyrene is mentioned by Philostratus (*VS* 1.19) alongside Xenophron of Sicily and Ariobarzanes of Cilicia (see biographies). All we know about him is that he lived between the 4th century BC and the 1st AD, and that he (like the other two) was not skilled in the art of invention and expression of ideas, but 'in the scarcity of first-rate sophists, was sought after by the Greeks of their day' (see the short commentary on Ariobarzanes [13]).
On Peithagoras, see: Kroll (1937); Wooten (1972), 39.

(65) Philagrius

Biographical note: an orator called Philagrius is listed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*De Din*. 8.13) as one of the Ῥοδιακοὶ ῥήτορες, whose style is to be opposed to the excellent Attic of Hyperides. Considering that Molon (12) is also in the list, it is fair to assume that he was active between the 2nd and the 1st. century BC.
On Philagrius, see: Solmsen (1938).

(66) Philinus

Biographical note: Philinus was an Attic orator who was also active after the battle of Chaeronea, as he is known to have opposed Lycurgus' proposal to honour the three tragedians with statues (Harp. θ 18 = F1), which dates back to 330 BC. Another fragment taken from the beginning of an uncertain speech is transmitted by Clement of Alexandria, while two uncertain quotations (F3?-F4?) are in Harpocration, where the attribution of the speeches *Against Dorotheus* and πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας is questioned.
On Philinus, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.57; Blass (1893²), 288-9; Ruhnken (1768), LXXV-LXXVI; Treves (1938).

F1 Harp. θ 18

Φιλῖνος δὲ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Σοφοκλέους καὶ Εὐριπίδου εἰκόνας περὶ Εὐβούλου λέγων φησὶν 'ἐκλήθη δὲ θεωρικόν, ὅτι τῶν Διονυσίων ὑπογύων ὄντων διένειμεν Εὔβουλος εἰς τὴν θυσίαν, ἵνα πάντες ἑορτάζωσι καὶ τῆς θεωρίας μηδεὶς τῶν πολιτῶν ἀπολείπηται δι' ἀσθένειαν τῶν ἰδίων'.

εἰκόνας *Maussac* : εἰκόνος *codd.*| *ante* Σοφοκλέους *coni.* Αἰσχύλου καὶ *Valesius ex vita decem oratorum 811f, Sauppe fr.319 et Dindorf (p. 154) ex Vita Lycurgi* | ἀπολείπηται *Phot. et Suda* : ἀπολίπηται *codd.*

From this fragment, taken from a speech in which Philinus was against the building of the statues to the three tragedians, Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides (of which only the last two are

mentioned in the title given by Harpocration), we can deduce Philinus was against Lycurgus, the one who promoted the motion, and probably sympathised with Eubulus, whose democratic and equalitarian spirit seems to be praised in this short quotation. In this speech, Philinus explained the reason for the name 'theoric'. It was a public Athenian fund aimed at being given to poor people so that they could take part in public representations during festivals (on the history of the *theorikon* see Plut. *Per*. 9.1; Plat. *Gorg*. 515e; see also Böckh [1851], 170; and Kondrat'uk [1989]). This speech could have been a *demegoria*, but also a speech delivered before the *nomothetai* or the *dikasetrion*.

F2. Clem. Al. *Strom.* 6. 2.20.8 (Früchtel)

Πάλιν Δημοσθένους εἰπόντος 'ὅση μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, σπουδὴ περὶ τουτονὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ παραγγελία γέγονεν, σχεδὸν οἶμαι πάντας ὑμᾶς ᾐσθῆσθαι'. Φιλῖνος [τε] ὁμοίως· 'ὅση μέν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, σπουδὴ καὶ παράταξις γεγένηται περὶ τὸν ἀγῶνα τουτονί, οὐδ' ἕνα ὑμῶν ἀγνοεῖν ἡγοῦμαι.'

From this fragment of Philinus', it is evident that he was very much in line with Demosthenes' and Aeschines' oratory. In this passage, Clement of Alexandria is listing a series of pairs of quotations that authors have 'stolen' from each other. This quotation by Philinus, in particular is almost identical to Dem. 19.1 (which is mentioned by Clement), but also to Aeschin. 3.1 (Τὴν μὲν παρασκευὴν ὁρᾶτε, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ τὴν παράταξιν ὅση γεγένηται, 'see, Athenians, how much attention and partisanship has been created'), both constituting the beginnings of the speeches. Clement, unfortunately, does not provide more information about the speech from which this quotation is taken. Based on the comparison with Demosthenes' oration *On the Crown* and Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon*, it is safe to assume this was the beginning of the speech. It is interesting to note that the same kind of opening was used for public speeches – those by Demosthenes and Aeschines – and private ones, as the one from which this fragment comes from seems to be, considering the address to the judges and the mention of a trial. Lexical choices are typical of Attic oratory: παράταξις is widely employed by Demosthenes (e.g., 9. 49; 44. 1) and Aeschines (3.1, 88, 151); and ἀγνοεῖν in the second person plural to address the judges or the people is extremely common in oratory both political and private (see for instance Isoc. 3.37; 4.3; 8. 114; 11. 73; 12. 15; Dem. 1.16; 3.14; 7.13; 8.13; 56.48; Aeschin. 1.111; 3.84, 205; Din. 5.6).

Finally, it is worth noting that in the 2nd century AD, Clement was still able to quote from Philinus; it is fair to assume that he was relying on anthologies of relevant passages, probably rhetorical handbooks in which beginning of speeches (and various sections of oratory) were anthologised typologically or thematically. On this, applied to Demosthenes' scholarship, see Gibson (2002), 15.

F3? Harp. ε 100

Ὑπερείδης γοῦν ἢ Φιλῖνος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δωροθέου, προειπὼν τὸν ῥαπίσαντα Ἱππόνικον ἐπὶ κόρρης γραφῆναι ὕβρεως, ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ὥσπερ ἐξηγεῖται τοὔνομα λέγων ‘ἔπειτα Ἱππόνικος ὑπ' Αὐτοκλέους μόνον ἐρραπίσθη τὴν γνάθον, ἐγὼ δ' ὑπὸ τούτων τῶν τριχῶν εἱλκόμην, κονδύλους ἔλαβον’.

γοῦν *Bekker* : οὖν *codd.* | τὸν ῥαπίσαντα *Sauppe* : ῥαπίσαντα τὸν *codd.* | ἐξηγεῖται…λέγων : ἐξηγούμενος…λέγει **C** | ἔλαβον : τ' ἔλαβον **N**

The other sources about a speech *Against Dorotheus* are Pollux (3.74.14) where it is attributed to Hyperides only (the fragment quoted says ὥσπερ τὸ ἀτιμότατον θεραπόντιον, ‘as the most dishonourable little henchman’) and the *Lexicon Cantabrigiense* (78.21), which again only attributes this fragment to Hyperides. It is impossible to tell whether this attribution was the consequence of a prejudice deriving from the canonisation of the ten orators, with the consequence of uncertain quotations being attributed to them. It is only Harpocration, the only source previous to the canon, that admits the possibility of this quotation being by Philinus. The author was here providing a vivid description of the fight, with an asyndetic style that seems somehow to be mimicking the speed of the action, and adding, therefore, vividness to the brutal treatment reserved for the speaker.

F4? Harpocration κ 70

Κοιρωνίδαι: ἔστι Λυκούργῳ λόγος οὕτως ἐπιγραφόμενος ‘Κροκωνιδῶν διαδικασία πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας,’ ὃν ἔνιοι Φιλίνου νομίζουσιν.

οὕτως : οὗτος **A**

Another very uncertain fragment to be attributed to Philinus is the one quoted by Harpocration, at κ 70. Here, a very short and not extremely meaningful sentence is attributed to either Lycurgus or Philinus. There is evidence that the Διαδικασίᾳ Κροκωνιδῶν πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας was actually by Lycurgus, as Harpocration himself attributes the speech to him (θ 7; κ 3; π 114; σ 20). The only other *testimonium* that attributes this speech to Philinus is Athenaeus (10.425b, see F5?.). To make the attribution even more complicated, there are two more instances in Harpocration (ε 72 and ι 8) in which the oration is said to have been by Dinarchus, but it is likely that Dinarchus opposed Lycurgus and/or Philinus in this dispute. This dispute opposed the two tribes of *Krokonides* and *Koironides*, most likely about matters related to the Eleusinian mysteries. The most recent reconstruction of this dispute is in Fabbri (2016), but no firm position is taken by Fabbri as regards the attribution of the speech to Philinus or Lycurgus. The same reasoning applied to F3, can work here: Lycurgus was a more famous author, and it would have been easier to attribute the quotation to him. In this case, however, it was already Harpocration who seemed inclined to attribute the speech to Lycurgus, although he appears to be unaware of the canon.

F5? Ath. 10.425b

ἦν ἡ ἀρχὴ εὐτελής, ὡς ὁ ῥήτωρ φησὶ Φιλῖνος ἐν τῇ Κροκωνιδῶν διαδικασίᾳ. καὶ ὅτι τρεῖς ἦσαν οἱ οἰνόπται, οἵτινες καὶ παρεῖχον τοῖς δειπνοῦσι λύχνους καὶ θρυαλλίδας.

This quotation is taken from the abovementioned Διαδικασίᾳ Κροκωνιδῶν πρὸς Κοιρωνίδας. It mentions the worthless office of the οἰνόπται (Hesych. ο 332 = Eupol. 205 KA; Phot. Lex. ο 332), a board of three officials in Athens who had to provide lamps, wicks, and other things needed for festivals. We can imagine these officers had a role in the Eleusinian mysteries, but the reference to them in this speech could have been made for other reasons or during a digression.

(67) Philiscus of Miletus

Biographical note: Philiscus of Miletus (Hesychius Hist. *Fragmenta.* 7. 1025-1027) is one of those orators whose work can be dated between the Classical and the Hellenistic period. We do not know exactly when he was born. It was probably around 400 BC, because he is said to have been a companion of Lysias' in Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 836c. The *testimonia* tell us he was a pupil of Isocrates (*Suda* φ 360, where we read he compiled a collection of sayings by his master; Cic. *De Or.* 2.94; *Vita Isocratis.* 1.81-87), teacher of Timeus of Tauromenius and Neanthes of Cyzicus (*Suda.* ν 114; τ 602). He wrote a *Mylesian Speech* and an *Amphictyonic Speech*. It is assumed he died after 324 because of a fragment of his *Life of Lycurgus* where he connects Lycurgus' great political success to the Platonic school: therefore, if Philiscus was able to write a *Life of Lycurgus*, its protagonist should have died before then, and since Lycurgus died in 324, Philiscus must have been still alive at the time. His works were very diverse and eclectic (*Suda* φ 360). Beside his work on Lycurgus, he wrote a rhetorical handbook in two books (*Suda* φ 360; Dion. Hal. *Ad Ammaeum.* 2); and other works dealing with rhetoric, including a funerary epigram to Lysias (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 836c).

His orations were most likely all forensic since he was a metic and could not actively participate in Athenian political life. Therefore, the two political speeches mentioned by the *Suda* were probably political treatises in the style of Isocrates. Some confuse him with the historian Philistus (Suda φ 365): on this problem, see Solmsen (1938). For more on his biography, see Engels (2016).
On Philiscus, see: Bollansée et al. (1998); *FGrHist/BNJ* 337b; Engels (1998); Engels (2016); Solmsen (1938b); Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 690, 794.

F1. P.Oxy. 41.2944. col.2

[...]ς ὥστε καὶ τ[ῶν] ἑτ[έ-
ρωθι γεγονέναι δοκ[ου-
σῶν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνον ἐνί-
ας μετενηνέχθαι τῶ[ν
ἀποφάσεων. Φιλίσκος [5]
γοῦν ὁ Μιλήσιος ὑπὸ
τοῦ διαμφισβητηθέν-
τος ὑπὸ τῶν γυναικῶν παιδίου γέγρα-
(10) φεν· ὅτι σκηπτομέ-
νων ἀμφοτέρων τε- [10]
κεῖν προστάξαι τὸ μ[έ-]
ρος ἑκατέραι διατέμ[νειν]

6 ὑπὸ *pap* : ἐπὶ *vel* ὑπὲρ *apud Turneri* | διατέμ[νειν] *Turner* : *vel* διατέμ[νοντα διαδοῦναι] *Turner*

This fragment attributed to Philiscus is preserved in a papyrus dated by Turner (on the ground of palaeography) between the 1st and the 2nd century AD. As far as we can understand from the text, it should have been a commentary on the – possibly wrong – attribution of an ἀπόφασις to an unknown ἐκεῖνον. The mention of Philiscus' fragment is not perfectly clear in connection to the question of the attribution. Probably, in one of his works, Philiscus dealt with a matter regarding an attribution and compared it to the case of two women, both claiming to be the mother of a child (a theme not attested in Greek and Latin declamations). A possible hypotheis is that this fragment belongs, as the word ἀπόφασις suggests, to Philiscus' Ἰσοκράτους ἀποφάσεις (a more meaningful emendation for ἀπόφασις in the manuscripts) named in *Suda* φ 360, considering that of *apophthegmata* was a genre that was highly popular for Hellenistic orators (see Introduction).

The interesting problem is that this judgment is much more than a saying of Isocrates: it is actually a story that circulated in ancient Indian and Jewish literature, as we read in the Bible, 1. *Kings*. 3.16-28 (on this, see Mélèze-Modrzejewski [1988]). If so, this means that the collection of Isocratean sayings also contained maxims belonging to other people and traditions. This may be an attestation of the circulation of a Greek version of this story (otherwise unknown in surviving Greek literature) in the 4th century BC, or of some interest of Philiscus in eastern knowledge. Mélèze-Modrzejewski sees the coastal cities by Phoenicia as places of transmission for the story. Another possibility is that the quotation comes from an actual oration by Philiscus, who might have used this story as a comparison in a forensic speech dealing with a private dispute. See also Engels (2016).

(68) Plution

Biographical note: an orator called Plution is only mentioned together with Theodorus of Gadara, Apollodorus of Pergamon, Antipater (9), and a certain Conon, by Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 18), who lists these orators, and recommends their style to his students (showing that their orations were still available in some form at his time). Along with the same orators, he is mentioned by Jerome (*Chronic.* 33 BC = 162.16-19 Helm). We can, therefore, date him and his activity as declaimer to the 1st century BC. Westerman (1833), 188, however, believed he lived between Augustus and Hadrian, but this seems unlikely if he was already active in 33 BC.
On Plution, see: Bornecque (1902), 191; Stegemann (1951).

F1. Sen. *Suas.* 1.11
Plution dixit: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μέγιστόν ἐστιν, ὅτι αὐτὸ μὲν μετὰ πάντα, μετὰ δὲ αὐτὸ οὐθέν

αὐτὸ : ΛΟΤΟ **AB** : aOTO **V** | μὲν : aUIN **AB** : aCHN **V** | μετὰ1 : HeTa **α** : NeTa **A** | μετὰ2… οὐθέν : ΜΛΝΤa Λe ΛΥΤΟ OYONN (-NH **V**) **α**

The *suasoria i*n which this fragment is found is the one on the deliberation of Alexander on whether to sail the ocean or not (see Damas' F2), although the beginning of the text is corrupt and the title is only supplied by a later hand. As the other declaimers who speak on this *suasoria*, Plution advises against sailing the ocean, considered the only infinite thing on earth. The whole *suasoria* contains a debate about the question of the nature of the Ocean (see Sen. *Controv.* 7.7.19; Quint. *Inst.* 7.2.5.; 4.2 and Tac. *Agr.* 10.6). Stramaglia (2003), 226, n.39, hypothesises that the same theme is to be found in P.Köln 6.250, from the 2nd-3rd century AD), a papyrus containing several *ethopoeiai* on Alexander (and only a few other topics), including one about a person trying to dissuade Alexander from doing something dealing with navigation (see also Citti [2007], 92-94).

(69) Polyaenus of Sardis

Biographical note: information about an orator from Sardis called Polyaenus is at *Suda* π 1955. We read he that lived at the time of Caesar and wrote 'judicial speeches and outlines of cases (i.e., of advocates' speeches)'; he was also a historian, as he wrote three books of *Parthian Triumphs*. The common opinion about this Polyaenus is that he is probably to be identified with a contemporary author of epigrams contained in the *Greek Anthology*, since in the famous manuscript Marc. gr. Z. 481, which belonged to Maximus Planudes and contained the so-called *Anthologia Planude*a, in book 9 – the one on 'declamatory epigrams' – we find *Ep.* 1 which is attributed to a certain Πολύαινος, then *Ep.* 7 to Ιούλιος Πολύαινος, and *Epp.* 8 and 9 to 'the same author'. Moreover, this poet appears to be dateable to the 1st century BC on the ground of his style (furthermore his name Ιούλιος would confirm a Roman origin). The *Suda* is the only place where we find information about his actual rhetorical

and oratorical activity, as well as historical. Nevertheless, we should be once again very cautious in identifying the two figures: in the manuscript of the *Greek Anthology* which belonged to Maximus Planudes (***APl***) we read σαρδιανός next to Πολύαινος but the surname was only added by Planudes in the 13th century, and he could have easily derived this information from the entry in the *Suda*.
On Polyaenus, see: Peek (1952).

(70) Polyeuctus of Sphettus

Biographical note: Polyeuctus of Sphettus (not to be confused with Polyeuctus of Cydantidae) was an Attic orator who was active in the early Hellenistic era (late 4th century BC). He was anti-Macedonian, therefore close to the positions of Demosthenes and Lycurgus. On his relationship with them see Dem. 9.72; Ps-Plut. *X orat*. 841e; and Din. 1.100. These passages provide evidence that Polyeuctus supported Demosthenes during Harpalus' trial. During the Theban revolt of 335, Alexander asked for his extradition (Arr. *Anab*. 1.10.4; Plut. Dem. 23.4. *Suda* α 2703). He was sent to Arcadia (Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 846c) during the Lamian war, and a decree (Schwenk [1985], 82) witnesses his proposal to honour Theophantus. The last information about his life is in 318/7, when he proposed the granting of Athenian citizenship to the inhabitants of Epidamnus and Apollonia [*I.Epidamnos* T 513]. We know Dinarchus pronounced several speeches against him (Dion. Hal. *Din*. 5, and particularly 10, where the themes and beginnings of these speeches are listed). The only surviving fragment belonging to a speech of his is the one edited as F1, allegedly from a speech against Demades. There is also a fragment in Aristotles' *Rhetoric* (3.1411a.22) where a saying of Polyeuctus about a paralytic is quoted because of a witty metaphor it contained, a sign that his style must have been sophisticated
On Polyeuctus, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.43; Blass (1893²), 151-2; Ruhnken (1768), LXXX-LXXXI; Schaefer (1952); Treves (1952).

F1. Apsines, *Ars Rhetorica* 10.6, Dilts-Kennedy (p. 387 Spengel)

Ἔτι ἀναμνήσομεν ἐξ ὑποτυπώσεως τινὸς μέλλοντος γίνεσθαι πράγματος, ὡς Πολύευκτος ἐν τῷ κατὰ Δημάδου. ἐγράφη μὲν γὰρ ψήφισμα χαλκῆς εἰκόνος τῷ Δημάδῃ, ὁ δὲ κατηγορεῖ τοῦ ψηφίσματος. ὅσα οὖν ἦν αὐτῷ διὰ πλειόνων εἰρημένα εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν τοῦ ὅτι μὴ ἦν ἄξιος τῆς τιμῆς τυχεῖν ταύτης, ταῦτα κεφαλαιωδῶς ἀνέμνησεν ὑποτυπῶν τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ ἀνδριάντος. 'τί γάρ", φησί, "σχῆμα ἕξει; τὴν ἀσπίδα προβαλεῖται; ἀλλὰ ταύτην γε ἀπέβαλεν ἐν τῇ περὶ Χαιρώνειαν μάχῃ· ἀλλὰ ἀκροστόλιον νεὼς ἕξει;' ἔπειτα πυνθάνεται, 'ποίας; ἢ τῆς τοῦ πατρός; ἀλλὰ βιβλίον, ἐν ᾧ φάσεις καὶ εἰσαγγελίαι ἔσονται γεγραμμέναι; ἀλλὰ νὴ Δία στήσεται προσευχόμενος τοῖς θεοῖς, κακόνους ὢν τῇ πόλει καὶ τὰ ἐναντία πᾶσιν ὑμῖν ηὐγμένος; ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑπηρετῶν;' οὕτως μὲν οὖν ἀνέμνησε κεφαλαιωδῶς, ἐξ ὧν αὐτὸν ἐδείκνυεν οὐκ ὄντα τῆς τιμῆς τυχεῖν ταύτης ἄξιον.

ἀναμνήσομεν *Finckh* : ἐπαναμνήσομεν **AB** | ἐξ : ἢ ἐξ **B** : καὶ ἐξ *Baiuli* | γίνεσθαι **B** : γενέσθαι **A** | κατηγορεῖ **AB** : κατηγορῶν *Sauppe, Diels-Kranz* | οὖν *om.* **B** | εἰς τὴν κατασκευὴν **A** : κατὰ **B** | ἣν **A** : ἢ **B** | ταύτης *om.* **B** | προβαλεῖται **G** : προβέβληται **AB** | νεὼς **A** : νηὸς **B** | εἰσαγγελίαι **B** : ἐπαγγελία **A** | ηὐγμένος **A** : εὐχόμενος **B** | μὲν οὖν *om.* **B** | ταύτης τυχεῖν **A** : τυχεῖν ταύτης **B**

In this passage, contained in the section *On Epilogue* of Valerius Apsines' *Ars Rhetorica*, the rhetorician of Gadara quotes a long passage from a speech κατὰ Δημάδου by Polyeuctus, where he opposed the idea of attributing the honour of a public statue in the Prytaneum to Demades (see Din. 1.101) after his negotiations with Alexander in 335 (aimed at receiving a better treatment than Thebes, which had been just destroyed). Considering the section of Apsines' work in which this passage is quoted, this must have been the end of the speech. The attack is built on an ironical description of the future statue, portrayed by Polyeuctus as having all the flaws of Demades, and specifically missing the qualities he did not possess. It will not have a shield, since Demades abandoned it during the battle of Chaeronea; it will not have a ship, since Demades did not have a ship of his own; and it will not portray him praying, since he had been shown to be impious towards the city of Athens. On the *topos* of the abandoned shield as a sign of extreme shame, see the saying 'τέκνον, ἢ ταύταν ἢ ἐπὶ ταύταν', contradicted for the first time by Archil. fr.8 West. However, this poetic *topos* cannot be compared to the actual shame that fell upon the man who threw away his shield or left battle, such as the one that we find in Lysias' *Against Theomnestus*, where the prosecuted has lost the right to speak in court by having cast away his armour.

The whole argumentation is constructed on a fine series of rhetorical questions. According to Blass, they are reminiscent of Hyperides (see Blass [1893²] 152). The witty tone seems consistent with the information contained in Aristotle (*Rhet*. 1411a.20-22) about a saying of Polyeuctus' containing a witty metaphor about a paralytic (τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐν πεντεσυρίγγῳ νόσῳ δεδεμένον 'that he could not stay quiet, although Fortune had bound him in a five-holed pillory of disease'). As regards this saying, it is probably just anecdotal, and very unlikely to constitute a fragment of a lost speech.

This description of a statue indulging in details seems to show a very Hellenistic taste for *ekphrasis* and minutiae. An interesting parallel is a Hellenistic unpublished inscription from Teos, whose text has been kindly provided to me by its editor Peter Thonemann (who is going to publish it with Mustafa Adak). The decree contained in the inscription, similarly to this fragment by Polyeuctus, goes in details about what a colossal bronze statue of the *demos*, on which the decree will be inscribed, is going to have (see Introduction). The taste for realism and details in sculpture – shown in this case by the mention of a shield and the prow of a ship, could show the affirmation of the realistic features, which would become characteristic of later Hellenistic sculpture (on portraits in particular, see Richter [1995], 35-42). However, we do not have examples of such complex votive sculptures; the famous portrait of Demosthenes (Copenhagen, NyC 436a) is, for instance, certainly very realistic with its pensive look and crossed hands, but nevertheless simple and still.

F2a. Herodian. *Rhet. Gr.* II p. 99. Spengel (= 46 ed. Hajdù)

σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἔλαβες, Δημάδη, δῶρα παρὰ Φιλίππου, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον· καὶ σὺ μὲν συνέπινες αὐτῷ κατὰ τῆς πόλεως εὐωχουμένῳ, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ συνέπινον· καὶ σὺ μὲν συνηνέχθης τοῖς ἐκείνου πρέσβεσι συνομνύμενος, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ συνηνέχθην.

ἔλαβες : ἔλαβας **U** *corr. s.l.* | Φιλίππου : Φιλίππῳ **UP** | συνέπινες : ἔπινες σὺν **M** | τῆς πόλεως : τῇ πόλει **F** | εὐωχουμένῳ : εὐωχουμένων **FHW** | πρέσβεσι : πράξεσι **W** | συνομνύμενος ὀμνύμενος **F**

F2b. Alexander Rhetor *De Fig.* III, p. 37 Spengel

σὺ μὲν γὰρ ἔλαβες, ὦ Δημάδη, δῶρα παρὰ Φιλίππου, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον, καὶ προέπινες αὐτῷ κατὰ τῆς πόλεως εὐωχούμενος, ἐγὼ δ' οὐ συνέπινον.

F2c. Zonaeus, *De Fig.* III, p. 169 Spengel = F3d Anon. *De Fig.* III, p. 186 Spengel

[Ἀντίθετον] καθ'ἕτερον δέ, ὅταν ἀντιδιαστέλληται κατάφασις ἀποφάσει, ὡς τὸ *σὺ μὲν ἔλαβες δῶρα, ἐγὼ δ' οὐκ ἔλαβον*.

ὡς *Zonaeus* : οἷον *Anon.*

Fragments 2a and 2b (a slightly shorter version of 2a) belonged to the speech *Against Demades*, and inform us that such speech (on which see also F1) contained accusations against Demades, saying he was corrupt and took gifts from Philip, and conspired with Macedonian ambassadors. In the version contained in F2b the accusation of 'feasting' (εὐωχ-έω)is referred to Demades himself and not simply to Philip as in F2a. It is fair to assume that the short fragment quoted in F3c refers to the same sentence. This fragment, with slight variations, is always quoted by rhetoricians within a discussion of the rhetorical figure of the ἀντίθετον; the criticism of Demades is made stronger by a contrast with Polyeuctus himself, who proclaims to have done none of the things he accuses Demades of. The contrast is expressed with a repetition of ἐγὼ δὲ after each statement, creating tension in the listeners. The same structure can be found in Dem.18.180, where Demosthenes is opposing his conduct to Aeschines': σὺ μέν γ' οὐδὲν οὐδαμοῦ χρήσιμος ἦσθα· ἐγὼ δὲ πάνθ' ὅσα προσῆκε τὸν ἀγαθὸν πολίτην ἔπραττον.

F3? Plut. *Phoc.* 5.1

ὡς γὰρ ὁ Ζήνων ἔλεγεν, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον εἰς νοῦν ἀποβάπτοντα προφέρεσθαι τὴν λέξιν, οὕτως ὁ Φωκίωνος λόγος πλεῖστον ἐν ἐλαχίστῃ λέξει νοῦν εἶχε. καὶ πρὸς τοῦτ' ἔοικεν ἀπιδὼν ὁ Σφήττιος Πολύευκτος εἰπεῖν, ὅτι *ῥήτωρ μὲν ἄριστος εἴη Δημοσθένης, εἰπεῖν δὲ δεινότατος ὁ Φωκίων*.

This passage belongs to Plutarch's discussion of Phocion's style and predilection for short but punchy sentences. It is difficult to determine whether this statement of Polyeuctus was taken from an oration or was rather an anecdote. It is definitely plausible that this fragment belonged to a speech where Polyeuctus was opposing Demosthenes and Phocion and their virtues to orators who belonged to other hostile parties. It is certainly interesting that Phocion, though the evidence is in favour of him not writing and publishing speeches, is compared to Demosthenes, whose speeches we know were probably published (a good discussion of this topic is in Trevett [1996] and related bibliography at n.2). This is an interesting example of a comparison between orators, a rhetorical technique that became very widely employed in later rhetorical theory, but was already present in the Hellenistic age as evident from Democharesʹ T3 on Demosthenes and Aeschines, and Cleocharesʹ fragment (F3) on Demosthenes and Isocrates.

(71) Potamon of Mytilene

Biographical note: the earliest attestation of Potamon's activity dates back to 48 BC, when he was part of a successful embassy to Julius Caesar on behalf of Mytilene (always allied to Pompey before) in order to obtain his goodwill (*IG*.XII.2.25 col. a 1-14; *IG*.XII 2.35 col. b 14-26 = Syll.^{3} 764; *IG*.XII.2.154, see Radicke [1999], 282-5), and this was followed by two more embassies. More epigraphical evidence about his family origins and political roles can be found in Radicke (1999), T6a-f. An entry of the *Suda* (π 2127) gives information on his rhetorical activity, although it wrongly postpones his *acme* to the time of Tiberius. But, even admitting that he lived until ninety as stated by Lucian (*Macrob*. 23), he must have flourished between the time of Caesar and Augustus and died around 15 AD, only in the first year of Tiberius' principate. From this entry, we know that he taught rhetoric in Rome, and that works attributed to him were *On Alexander of Macedonia*, *Samian Memories* (however, Ὅρους Σαμίων could also be intended as a geographical work on borders, or a work on definitions), an *Encomium of Brutus*, an *Encomium of Caesar*, and a treatise *On the Perfect Orator*.

It is certainly peculiar that a citizen of Mytilene wrote local history about Samos: Radicke (1999), 286 says it could be a supplement of Douris' work. Radicke has assumed that Potamon's work *On Alexander* was rhetorical, perhaps a collection of his *suasoriae* on Alexander, but considering that Potamon wrote history, it is not implausible that the title on Alexander refers to some sort of historical biography – as it seems from the only fragment we have belonging to it, Plut. *Alex*. 61.3, containing an anecdote that recurs similarly in Theopompus, *FGrHist* 115 F340.

The two encomia of Brutus and Caesar are certainly interesting: the former must have been an earlier work, perhaps dating back to Brutus' visit to Mytilene (Cic. *Brut.* 71.250); the latter may refer to Julius Caesar or Caesar Augustus, so it could have been written after Pharsalus or after Actium. A Mytilene inscription (in Sherk *TDGR* 4.83), containing a letter by Julius Caesar with a copy of a decree of the senate concerning Mytilene and inscribed on a great monument in honour of Potamon, supports the identification with Julius Caesar.

About his activity as declaimer, our source is the Elder Seneca (Suas. 2.15-16), who gives information on the anecdote according to which Potamon and Lesbocles (51), who both had schools in Rome, lost their children the same day, but only Potamon held regular classes the day of the funeral. Then, Seneca quotes a fragment, but it has been lost in transmission. The *Suda* (θ 151) also says Potamon was a rival of Theodorus and Antipater, and took part in a contest of eloquence, won by Theodorus, who became the teacher of rhetoric of the future emperor Tiberius. On the identification of Potamon of Mytilene with namesakes who wrote philosophy and scholarly works. see Hatzimichali (2011), 67-80.

On Potamon, see Blass (1865), 165; ; Bornecque (1902), 192; Cichorius (1888), 62-64; *FGrHis/BNJ* 147; Parker (1991), 115-29; Quass (1993), 143; Radicke (1999); Stegemann (1953), 1023-1027; Susemihl II (1892), 512-515.

F1 Sen. *Suas.* 2.16

Potamon, cum suasoriam de trecentis diceret, tractabat quam turpiter fecissent Lacones hoc ipsum, quod deliberassent de fuga, et sic novissime clausit:...

Diceret V^2 : dicere α

The theme of this *suasoria* is an episode according to which, at the Thermopylae, some Peloponnesians thought it would be better to escape and go back home. Potamon, in this lost quotation was clearly emphasising the cowardice of these people, compared to the bravery of the 300 Spartans who stayed and lost their lives, and stresses that merely to discuss escaping is ignominious. Potamon was probably following Herodotus (7.207), when he said that some 'Peloponnesians' considered escaping, while Leonidas decided to stay. To the same *suasoria* belongs Damas' F1 (see commentary for more information about Seneca's declamations on Persian Wars and Sparta).

(72) Pytheas

Biographical note: Pytheas was an Attic orator who continued to be active in the early Hellenistic period (4th century BC). His origins were poor (as we read in *Suda* π 629), and his mother was from Aegina (Din. 1.104). According to Plutarch (*Prae. ger. reip.* 804b), Pytheas, answering a citizen who accused him of being too young to speak against the honours decreed to Alexander, said καὶ μὴν

Ἀλέξανδρος ἐμοῦ νεώτερός ἐστιν, ὃν ψηφίζεσθε θεὸν εἶναι, stating himself to be older than Alexander. We can deduce that he was born before 356 (see Gärtner [1963], 367 and Blass [1893²], 284 on this point). We have information about his political activity in Demosthenes' *Ep*. 3 (29-3) from which we know he was favourable to Demosthenes and an opponent of Philip in 324 but, after Alexander's death, he moved to Macedonia (*Suda* π 629; Plut. *Dem*. 27) and then opposed Demosthenes during the Harpalus trial in 323 (Ps-Plut. *X orat*. 846a; Dem. *Olyn*. 29; Dion. Hal. *Is.* 4; Dur. fr.21 = *Suda* ω 263). He also served Antipater opposing Hyperides and Leosthenes in the Hellenic League.

We know he spoke against the honours for Alexander before 324 (*Prae. ger. reip.* 804b). We also know some other titles of his: πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἀπολογία (Harp. α 19; according to Gärtner [1963] 168, pronounced after 324); κατὰ Ἀδειμάντου (Harp. ο 25, most likely pronounced before Chaeronea, and therefore not included in this selection), plus an oration *Against Symmias* (Hyp. fr.162. Jensen). Plutarch (*Phoc*. 21.2; Ps-Plut. *X orat*. 847c) mentions a debate between Pytheas and Phocion: Gärtner [1963], 368) tries to reconstruct the context, and imagines it took place during an assembly of the People aiming at deciding whether to send naval help to Alexander or not. Finally, Phylarcus (*FGrHist* 81, F 75 = Plut. *Dem*. 27) says Demosthenes and Pytheas spoke against each other before the Assembly of the Arcadians. We also know that Pytheas was opposed by Dinarchus (frr. 5-6 Burtt). His rhetorical education was not rigorous (Waltz *Rh. Gr*. 4.39-40); therefore, his style was probably not particularly appealing – he was not included in the canon, despite the qualities (λάλον ὄντα καὶ θρασύν, 'audacious' and 'loquacious') that Plutarch attests in *Phoc*. 21.2.

On Pytheas, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.51; Barabino (1967), 139-40; Blass (1893²), 283-8; Gärtner (1963); Ruhnken (1768); Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 775, 817.

F1. Rutilius 1.14

Pytheae: 'Ille hunc pone constrictum trahebat, hic autem vociferabatur. Concursus vero non mediocris, cum tantum non omnes opitulari vellent, sed nemo auderet. Neque ibi magistratus aderat nec circumspicientes, quo potissimum confugeremus, reperiebamus, sed uno tempore nos et praesens et futurum malum perturbabat. Nam praesens tempus acerbitatis erat plenum, reliquum vero timoris.'

Pytheae **Basil.** : Pythiy *vel* Pithiu *codd.* : Pythiae **Ald.** | pone *Jac.* : poena *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : pro catena *Ruhnken* | concursus *codd.* **Ald.** : concussus **Basil.** | tantum non *Haase* : tamen *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | omnes **Ald. Basil.** : omnis *codd.* | ibi *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : enim *Jac.* | uno tempore **Ald. Basil.** : uno tempere **A V** : uno tempore B | acerbitatis **A² B V Ald. Basil.** : acerbitas **A¹**

This fragment is quoted by Rutilius in the section about πολυσύνδετον, the use of many conjunctions, in this case *autem, sed, neque, nec, sed, et, et, nam*. It does not seem to belong to one of the titles of Pytheas' we know from the sources, but it is apparently a quotation from a trial for violence (κατὰ βίαν), as both Blass (1893²), 286 and Gärtner (1963), 368 maintain. Blass, moreover, sees this as

proof that Pytheas was also a logographer. Barabino (1967), 140, notices a similarity between this passage and Lysias' fragment 279 (Carey) from the speech *Against Tisides*, a fragment that is also mirrored in another passage quoted by Rutilius (1.13). The fragment in Rutilius 1.13 seems to be part of a different version of the oration *Against Simon*, with significant variations that make it more similar to the content of the fragmentary oration *Against Tisides* (more details on the differences and similarities between the Greek text and Rutilius' Latin fragment are in Barabino [1967] 95; on the problems of Rutilius altered quotations, see Introduction). In Lysias' fr.279, Archippus is grabbed by Tisides, tied to a chair, and then whipped.

Pytheas' fragment is composed of a first part in which the situation is described in detail both from a visual/auditive, i.e., the 'shouting out', and from a psychological point of view, followed a statement about the orator's (or the people's) concern about the present and the future (most likely translating παρών and μέλλων). This dichotomy extremely common in Attic oratory (e.g.. Isoc. 7.18; 17.52; Dem. 18.192; 20.16; Aeschin. 3223), and generally in Attic prose (e.g., Thuc. 5.86; Plat. *Tim*. 72a; *Leg*. 647e), but also in Polybius' *Histories* (3. 4, 51; 8. 24) and later writers (Aristid. Εἰς τὸν Σάραπιν 55.21-22), as well as in Latin rhetorical literature (among others Cic. *Dom.* 12; *Fin.* 1.59). The absence of names and references to events makes this passage very difficult to date.

F2. Rutilius 1.11

Verbum sic iteratur. Pytheae: 'Quid contra tot res tamque evidentes dicere potes, Demosthenes? Cognitum enim est, <te> rem publicam venalem habuisse, cognitum est.'

Pytheae *Ruhnken* : Pythiae *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | tamque **A Ald.** : iamque **B V Basil.** | Demosthenes *codd.* **Basil.** : Demosthenis **Ald.** | <te> *Steph.*

The figure of speech with regard to which Rutilius quotes this fragment of Pytheas' is ἐπανάληψις, namely the repetition of a phrase to reinforce the concept, in this case, the repetition of 'cognitum est'. This kind of rhetorical figures was very common in Attic oratory (see Barabino, [1967], 30), where the 'you all know' is widely attested in different sets of phrases. The question is well summarized in Hesk (2000), 227-30. This fragment clearly belonged to Pytheas' speech *Against Demosthenes* delivered on the occasion of Harpalus' trial in 323 (for commentary on this speech see also F3-F7).

<te> rem publicam venalem habuisse: this indirect statement can be intended in two ways. If 'te' is the subject of 'habuisse', it means 'you treated the State as for sale' (with a possible allusion to bribe-taking on behalf of the State); if, on the contrary, 'te' is the object, it is to be intended as 'the state had you as someone for sale', meaning 'you were corrupt'.

F3a. Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 802e

Ὁ μέντοι λόγος ἔστω τοῦ πολιτικοῦ μήτε νεαρὸς καὶ θεατρικός, ὥσπερ πανηγυρίζοντος καὶ στεφανηπλοκοῦντος ἐξ ἁπαλῶν καὶ ἀνθηρῶν ὀνομάτων· μήτ' αὖ πάλιν, ὡς ὁ Πυθέας τὸν Δημοσθένους ἔλεγεν, *ἐλλυχνίων ὄζων καὶ σοφιστικῆς περιεργίας ἐνθυμήμασι πικροῖς καὶ περιόδοις πρὸς κανόνα καὶ διαβήτην ἀπηκριβωμέναις*.

αὖ **oGFJ²**: οὖ **S** | Δημοσθένους **oGFJ²**: Δημοσθένην **JS** | ὄζων *Reiske* : ὄζειν *codd.* | πικροῖς *codd.* : πικρὸς *Reiske* | καὶ *om.* **J, S** *suppl.* **J²** | ἀπηκριβωμέναις **FJ²** : ἀπηκριβωμένος **JS** : ἀπηκριβωμένοις **oG**

F3b Plut. *Dem.* 8.3
καὶ Πυθέας ἐπισκώπτων ἐλλυχνίων ἔφησεν ὄζειν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐνθυμήματα.

This fragment probably belongs to the speech κατὰ Δημοσθένην pronounced in 323 for Harpalus' trial. If this hypothesis is correct, from this quotation of Plutarch, we know that this speech not only contained attacks on Demosthenes as a politician and as a man, but also criticised his rhetorical style describing it as too sophisticated and precise. This does not contradict the information we have about Pytheas' rhetorical background, far from the sophistication of the rhetorical schools, much less learned than Demosthenes, who was too different from Pytheas' stylistically, and became, therefore, the object of his criticism and – we can suppose – of his envy. Pytheas' description of Demosthenes' style employs, however, a rather sophisticated metaphor, according to which Demosthenes' arguments are like precise and well-defined drawings, measured by rule and compass.

ἐλλυχνίων ὄζων: this is the earliest attestation of the idiom 'the smell of the lamp' to indicate a strenuous overnight work, which, however, does not produce great results. The expression entered English language in 1579, when Thomas North translated this passage. The same concept can be found in many Greek and Latin passages with a more positive connotation (i.e. an overnight work implying diligence): among others, Artem. 2.70; ps.-Manetho, 1.8; Call. *Ep.* 9.507, 27.4 (cf. Cinna [fr.13 Hollis] about Aratus' poems); Lucr. 1.142; Cic. *Paradoxa* 5 (where the result of the hard work is the *Brutus*); Plin. *NH Praef.* 18; ps.-Virg. *Ciris* 46; Persius 5.62 ; Stat. *Theb.* 12.811; Firmicus Maternus 8.33.4. See more in Tore (1964), 97-98, 'Nocturnal studies' in Latin prose prefaces. The same concept could be the origin of Alexander of Ephesus' nickname Λύχνος (5), according to Meineke (1843), 371 n. 1 and Radt on Strab. 14.642C 8ff. Something similar is also in Cic. *Brut*. 312, where Cicero describes the many cases he took on after *Rosc. Am*: 'deinceps inde multae, quas nos diligenter elaboratas et tamquam *elucubratas* adferebamus'.
The accusation is repeated in F3b. Here, we also read Demosthenes' sharp answer: 'your lamp and mine, oh Pytheas, are not privy to the same pursuit.' The same anecdote is reported by Lucian, *Encomium of Demosthenes*, 15.

σοφιστικῆς περιεργίας: the first attestation of περιεργία in a rhetorical sense is in Isoc. 10.2, where it means 'futile affectation'.

F4. Ath. 2.44f

καὶ Πυθέας γοῦν φησιν· 'ἀλλὰ τοὺς νῦν δημαγωγοὺς ὁρᾶτε [Δημοσθένη καὶ Δημάδην] ὡς ἐναντίως τοῖς βίοις διάκεινται. ὃ μὲν γὰρ ὑδροποτῶν καὶ μεριμνῶν τὰς νύκτας, ὥς φασιν, ὃ δὲ πορνοβοσκῶν καὶ μεθυσκόμενος κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἑκάστην προγάστωρ ἡμῖν ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἀνακαλεῖ.'

[Δημοσθένη καὶ Δημάδην] *del. Kaibel* | ἀνακαλεῖ : ἀνακυκλεῖται *Musurus*

If this fragment is, as it seems, part of Pytheas' speech *Against Demosthenes*, it adds more information to our knowledge about the content of this oration. Apparently, Pytheas' accusation during Harpalus' scandal, did not simply involve Demosthenes (as a person, orator and politician, as evident from F5 too) but also other orators: here Demosthenes is described as sober, while Demades is a debauchee that comes drunk to the assemblies. This comparison between the two orators probably aimed at showing that even the less suspicious orators, like the sober Demosthenes, can be dangerous demagogues. The mention of Demades is further confirmation that this quotation is from the speech *Against Demosthenes*, since we know Demades was suspected of conspiring with Harpalus along with Demosthenes, Phocion, and Hyperides, and was finally prosecuted (Din. 1.89). It must be from this part of the speech that the accusation attested in *Suda* ω 263 comes, where we read Pytheas, like Democleides to Demochares, said Demosthenes was forbidden to blow the sacred flame because he was impure in his upper parts (*FGrHist* 76. F8; see commentary on Democleides' T1).

Similar accusations are in Aeschines' *Against Ctesiphon* (246), where Ctesiphon is called πονηρὸς καὶ πορνοβοσκός, and in *Against Timarchus*, where Timarchus and Hegesander are described as μεθυσθέντες. The term προγάστωρ, instead, is not otherwise attested in Attic oratory and Attic prose in general, while it became more popular in Imperial prose (see Lucian, *Philopseudes* 18, 24; *Bacchus* 2). The most famous example of this kind of offence is in Alcaeus' poetry, in fr.129.21 Lobe-Page, where he calls Pytthachus 'potbelly' (ὀ φύσγων). In general, these kinds of accusations dealing with immorality are quite popular in the speech *Against Timarchus* (see in particular § 130) but also in Dem. *Ep*. 4.

F5. Dion. Halic. *De Is.* 4.4.4

δηλοῖ δὲ τοῦτο τῶν ἀρχαίων τις ῥητόρων ἐν τῇ Δημοσθένους κατηγορίᾳ Πυθέας, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ. *πονηρίαν γὰρ τῷ Δημοσθένει καὶ κακίαν τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων πᾶσαν* ἐνοικεῖν φήσας κατὰ τόδε τὸ μέρος οἷον εἰς διαβολὴν ἐπιτίθησιν, ὅτι τὸν Ἰσαῖον ὅλον καὶ τὰς τῶν λόγων ἐκείνου τέχνας σεσίτισται.

φήσας *Sylburg, Radermacher* : φησὶ **Z** : φῆσαι **F** | ὅλον *codd.* : οἷον *Radermacher*

This fragment is also part of Pytheas' speech *Against Demosthenes*. The object of his criticism is here Demosthenes as a person more than as a politician or an orator. He is described as full of πᾶσαν πονηρίαν and κακίαν, both words that mainly refer to his morality. Then, Pytheas adds the second part of the antithesis about Demosthenes being full of Isaeus' λόγων τέχνας, i.e., the vice of a particular individual, on top of *all* human vice. This confirms his bad opinion about Demosthenes' rhetorical techniques, but also informs us that Pytheas had a bad opinion about Isaeus as an orator too. This is not surprising since Isaeus, who studied rhetoric with Isocrates (Dion Halic. *De Is*. 1, Ps-Plut- *X orat*. 839e), is also said to have been Demosthenes' teacher (Plut. *Dem*. 5; *Suda* ι 620). The speech *Against Demosthenes* must have had a conspicuous section – or several passages – dealing with Demosthenes' rhetoric: as seen for F3, Pytheas was strongly critical of Demosthenes' rhetorical techniques, considered too refined and sophisticated, just like those of Isaeus. The passage falls into Dionysius' discussion of Isaeus' elaborate style, compared by Dionysius to a painting not very well drawn but full of 'detail and a subtle interplay of light and shade', effective because of the many nuances of colour which it contains', and opposed to Lysias' oratory, clearer in the outline but made with simple colours. It seems clear from F3 and F5 that Demosthenes' oratory and style were a constant reason for Pytheas' criticism.

F6. Plut. *Dem.* 20.2

ἐν δὲ τῇ μάχῃ καλὸν οὐδὲν οὐδ'ὁμολογούμενον ἔργον οἷς εἶπεν ἀποδειξάμενος, ᾤχετο λιπὼν τὴν τάξιν, ἀποδρὰς αἴσχιστα καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ῥίψας, οὐδὲ τὴν ἐπιγραφὴν τῆς ἀσπίδος ὡς ἔλεγε Πυθέας αἰσχυνθείς, ἐπιγεγραμμένης γράμμασι χρυσοῖς· ἀγαθῇ τύχῃ.

This fragment, describing Demosthenes' cowardly conduct during the battle of Chaeronea, also informs us that Pytheas described the shield that Demosthenes held during the battle, which displayed a not so brave message, and showed Demosthenes was relying on good fortune rather than bravery, virtue and actual skills. According to Pytheas, this very pretentious shield, inscribed with gold (on golden letters cfr.Asclepiades 4 G-P = *AP* 5.158), was not living up to the expectations it created. This description probably belonged to the long set of accusations Pytheas made in his speech *Against Demosthenes* (see F2-F5). Demosthenes' inconsistency in his political choices is also arraigned in Ps-Leptines' oration contained in P.Berl.9781 (see commentary).

F7. Plut. *Dem.* 27.5

λέγεται δὲ τότε τὸν μὲν Πυθέαν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι *καθάπερ οἰκίαν, εἰς ἣν ὄνειον εἰσφέρεται γάλα, κακόν τι πάντως ἔχειν νομίζομεν, οὕτω καὶ πόλιν ἀνάγκη νοσεῖν εἰς ἣν Ἀθηναίων πρεσβεία παραγίνεται.*

This fragment is part of the speech Pytheas pronounced against Demosthenes in the debate they had at the assembly of Arcadians, probably in 323. Apparently, Demosthenes joined and supported the Athenians ambassadors (while he was then still in exile) Hyperides and Polyeuctus, who had failed to persuade the Arcadians to join the anti-Macedonian resistance (on the important role of embassies in Hellenistic oratory see p. 20). Pytheas was, on the contrary, on the side of Antipater, along with Callimedon (an enemy of the *demos* according to Plut. *Phoc*. 27.9, and known as 'stag-beetle'). According to Plutarch, Demosthenes, in line with Pytheas' image of the house to which ass's milk is brought, answered that ass's milk is given to restore health, and the Athenians came to bring salvation to the sick. Therefore, Demosthenes won this dialectic fight and was apparently called back from exile. This fragment confirms the opinion given by the *Suda* of Pytheas' oratory as θρασύν: a comparison with asses' milk – a notorious symbol of luxury (cfr.the legends regarding Cleopatra's and Poppaea's donkey milk baths) sounds indeed very bold and peculiar, and it can be found nowhere else in Greek and Latin oratory and rhetoric.

F8. *Suda* ω 263

Ὦι τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ οὐκ ἔξεστι φυσῆσαι: Τίμαιον ἐν λῇ ἱστορεῖν, ὡς οἱ περὶ Δημοκλείδην κατὰ Δημοχάρους εἶπον, *ὅτι μόνῳ αὐτῷ πάντων Ἀθηναίων οὐκ ἔξεστι τὸ ἱερὸν πῦρ φυσῆσαι, ὡς μὴ καθαρεύοντι τοῖς ἄνω μέρεσιν*. Δοῦρις δὲ ἐν τῇ δεκάτῃ Πυθέαν κατὰ Δημοσθένους τὸ ὅμοιον εἰπεῖν.

Τίμαιον...ἱστορεῖν : Τίμαιος... ἱστορεῖ *Jacoby*

On this fragment, see Democleides' T1. The slander mentioned here is probably taken from Pytheas' speech *Against Demosthenes*.

F9. Harp. α 19

Ἀγραφίου· [...] Πυθέας ἐν τῇ Πρὸς τὴν ἔνδειξιν ἀπολογίᾳ.

This is the only fragment from the *Apology against the Endeixis* included in this selection, since according to Gärtner (1963), 368, following Blass (1893^{2}), 286, it was pronounced after 324 BC, as it must have been a defence against the speech *Against Aristogeiton* by Lycurgus, in debt with the State. The assumption is based on Harpocration's list of instances, which along with Pytheas includes Demosthenes (we find the word ἀγράφιος at 14.15; 52), Dinarchus' lost speech A*gainst Theocrines*, and Lycurgus' *Against Aristogeiton*. Not much can be said about it, considering that this is the only attestation of such a speech. The word ἀγράφιος refers to the missed registration of a debtor in the register, which is the reason for the indictment.

(73) Sosicrates

Biographical note: Rutilius is the one and only witness we have for an orator called Sosicrates. If the Philip mentioned in F1 is the one who was the king of Macedonia between 221 and 179 BC, we would be able to place his life and work in the 2nd century. There is also a historian called Sosicrates who lived in the same period (*FGrHist* 461) and was born in Rhodes. If an identification of the two characters were possible, the Rhodian origin of the historian would be consistent with Sosicrates' rhetorical abilities. This would not contradict the possibility of a direct involvement of the orator in events regarding Philip V of Macedonia, since Philip (with the Aetolian league and other forces) waged war against Rhodes (and subsequently other allies) in the so-called Cretan War (205-200 BC) at the end of which Rhodes acquired part of the territory of Crete. This hypothesis would also be supported by the fact that the historian Sosicrates is said to have written a *History of Crete* (Strab. 10.4.2; Ath. 6.261e, 263f, 13.561f). But, according to F1, the speaker, although blaming Philip, seems to have been – at least in the past – on the side of the king, which might seem to invalidate the previous argument. Nevertheless, we could imagine that this speech was embedded in a historical work (the *History of Crete* perhaps), and Sosicrates was here just quoting or paraphrasing the words of another orator. Moreover, it was not uncommon for orators to be also historians in the Hellenistic period as shown by famous examples that cover the whole period, like Theopompus and Anaximenes (for the early Hellenistic era) and Apollonius Molon (for the later part of the period). The historian Sosicrates also wrote a work on the succession of philosophers (in 3 books according to Ath. 163f; see also 10.422c-d) Regardless of the identification of the two characters, if it is correct to date Sosicrates' activity to the 3rd-2nd century BC, his style must have probably been Asianic.

Much less likely is the possibility of F1 fragment referring to Philip II, which would make Sosicrates a contemporary of Demosthenes. It is true that Rutilius largely quotes from that period, but considering that the documentation about orators of that age is massive, it would be quite unlikely to have just one reference to an otherwise unknown orator named Sosicrates, especially in a later treatise like that of Gorgias. As a matter of fact, earlier Hellenistic orators quoted by Rutilius (Charisius, Cleochares, Demetrius of Phalerum, Democharis, Pytheas, Stratocles) always have fragments quoted by other sources as well, which is not the case for later orators (Daphnis, Isidorus, Myron), who are quoted by Rutilius only.

On the orator Sosicrates, see: Barabino (1967); Blass (1865), 64-65; Ruhnken (1768); Wickert (1927). On F2, see D'Angelo (1992).
On the historian Sosicrates, see: Laqueur (1927).

F1. Rutilius 1.8

Sosicratis: 'Non enim alius quis est, cuius opera in has difficultates inciderimus, sed initio ad bellum suscipiendum nos primum impulit Philippus, deinde in ipso belli labore ac periculo deseruit nos Philippus, novissime nunc calamitati nostrae proinde atque culpae succensuit idem Philippus.'

inciderimus *codd.* **Ald.** : inciderim **Basil.** | initio *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : invitos *Ruhnken* | nos **B Basil.** : vos **A R V Ald.** | nunc *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : huic *Ruhnken* | proinde atque **Basil.** : atque *codd.* **Ald.** | succensuit *codd.* **Ald.** : successit **Basil.**

This fragment is quoted by Rutilius when he introduces the figure of ἐπιφορά, the repetition of a word at the end of a sentence, which is not very common in classical Attic oratory (see Barabino, 1967, 26, nn. 89–92). The ἐπιφορά in this fragment is rhetorically particularly effective since it is constituted of the name of Philip. This was most probably a public oration pronounced against Philip V of Macedon, although the occasion for this is difficult to determine. As suggested, if we identify Sosicrates the orator with Sosicrates the historian, this could be part of an embedded speech in the *History of Crete*, pronounced by an understandably irate Cretan orator, who had been deluded by Philip—after all, at the end of the war, Crete lost part of its territory. Blass (35) believed this quotation was part of a historical work, but he did not establish any connection with Sosicrates the historian. On the other hand, although possible, it seems unlikely that this quotation belonged to a *suasoria*, as, Philip V and events related to him do no seem to have be a very popular topic for declamations. We have only one example of a Roman *suasoria* where he is mentioned is at Cic. *inv*. 1.17: 'Whether an army should be sent to Macedon to help allies against Philip, or retained in Italy to maximise forces against Hannibal'. In the absence of further evidence, the hypothesis that this came from a historical work seems plausible.[336]

A striking parallel for this passage can be found at Cic. *Phil.* 2.55, where the ἐπιφορά of the word Antonius—who is, like Philip, the one to blame—resembles the same figure in this fragment. This comparison would be very interesting because it could attest to the survival of Sosicrates' orations in Cicero's time (or at least to the survival of their traces), and that would be one of the proofs of the many non-Demosthenic influences on Cicero's oratory. Thus, this fragment perfectly works as an example of how much certain almost forgotten sources can tell us about the survival—if not the influence—of Hellenistic oratory, especially in Roman oratory.

F2. Rutilius. *Schemata Lexeos*. 2.13

Item Sosicratis: 'Nam qui secundis rebus libenter adsentantur, iidem, simul ac se fortuna contristaverit, primi insidiantur.'

[336] *utrum exercitus in Macedoniam contra Philippum mittatur, qui sociis sit auxilio, an teneatur in Italia, ut quam maximae contra Hannibalem copiae sint*.

adsentantur *Halm*: assentiuntur *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** | iidem **Ald** : idem *codd.* **Basil.** | simul ac **A B Ald. Basil.** : simulat **V** | contristaverit *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : contra flaverit *Ruhnken*

This short passage by Sosicrates is quoted by Rutilius in his section on ὁμοιόπτωτον, a figure of speech in which different parts of the sentence end with the same inflection. In this case, it involves the verbs 'adsentantur' and 'insidiantur', both passive voices of a present third person plural. No context is given for this fragment, and it is very difficult to make hypotheses on the speech it belonged to. It could have been either a public or a private speech.

We can notice the *topos* of the Τύχης μεταβολή, one of the most popular in the Greek and Latin literature of all the times and genres (especially in dramatic literature and most of all in New Comedy (see Haviland [1984]) and in oratory in particular in Dem. 1.11, about fortune, misfortune, good and bad luck, and Aeschin. 3.232, about the favour of fortune opposed to the favours of Demosthenes (see Myron F2).

(74) Sosigenes

Biographical note: the only attestation of an orator called Sosigenes is Dion. Hal. *Din.* 12.8.3. Not even his exact age can be reconstructed.

(75) Stratocles

Biographical note: Stratocles, son of Euthydemus, was born in the Attic deme of Diomea between 360 and 350 BC (*IG*.II.794; a detailed discussion of the date is in Blass [1893²], 333). He was one of Demosthenes' opponents, acting as prosecutor in the trial of Harpalus (Din. 1.1; 20; Phot., *Bibl.* 250.447a). One of his most famous political acts was the decree in honour of Lycurgus (*IG*.II².457 and Ps-Plut. *X orat.* 852a). He was also enthusiastically favourable to Demetrius Poliorcetes and praised him as the liberator of Athens from the oligarchy. As a consequence, Stratocles' political influence decreased after Demetrius was defeated at the battle of Ipsus in 301 BC (Plut. *Demetr.* 11; 12.1; 24; 26; Diod. Sic. 20.46.2), but he apparently recovered it around 294, when Demetrius had regained control of Athens. Details on the peculiar decrees he proposed to honour Demetrius and his father Antigonus can be found in Plut. *Demetr.* 11; 24; 26. Nevertheless, after 294, when Demetrius tried to diminish the differences between political parties, Stratocles was ready to oppose him – even if there is no information about him after 292. Although Stratocles' activity as an orator must have been vast, the only three actual fragments of his speeches are the two quoted by Rutilius, and the one quoted by Agatharchides in Photius' *Bibliotheca*. His style was apparently still very Attic, as Agatharchides (Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250.447a) opposes him to Hegesias. A negative opinion about his oratory is found in

Plut. *Prae. ger. reip.* 789e (the adulatory content of his speeches and his style is further discussed by Blass [1893²], 334-5). Cicero (*Brut.* 43) says Stratocles, like Clitarchus, invented an account of Themistocles' death. Since there is no attestation of non-oratorical production for Stratocles, it is fair to assume this account must have belonged to a speech.
On Stratocles, see: Baiter-Sauppe (1839-43), II.63; Barabino (1967), 143; Blass (1893²), 332-5; Fiehn (1945); Ruhnken (1768).

F1. Rutilius. *Schemata Lexeos.* 1.9
Stratoclis: 'Quaeritis novam rationem administrandae rei publicae. At reperire <ea> meliorem, quam a maioribus accepistis, non potestis. Quaeritis maximis sumptibus faciendis, quo modo ne tributa conferatis. At consiliis consumptas aerarii opes, quas cupitis augere, <servare> non potestis. Quaeritis, quem ad modum scelere contaminatis hominibus parcatis. At ignoscendo nocentibus innocentium salutem custodire non potestis.'

reperirem <ea> *vel* <eam> meliorem quam *Halm* : reperire meliorem quam *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : meliorem reperirem quam *Ruhnken* : meliorem quam ea est quam *Simon* | quo modo ne tributa *codd.* **Basil.** : quo ne tributa **Ald.** : quomodo tributa *Steph.*| at **R² Ald.** : a **A B R¹ V Basil** | consumptas *Halm* : captas *codd.* **Ald. Basil.**: captis *vel* capiendis *Ruhnken* : fractas *Jac.* | captis *Sauppe* : raptas *Maehly* : captandis *Simon*| quas cupitis *codd.* **Ald. Basil.** : quae capitis *Madvig* (*etiam* quas capitis *possis*) | <servare> *Haase*

This fragment is quoted in Rutilius' section about κοινότης, the repetition of the same word or phrase at the beginning and at the end of each sentence, in this particular case the question 'quaeritis' and the answer 'non potestis'. Figures involving repetition were among the most widely employed figures of speech in Attic oratory (on κοινότης see examples in Barabino [1967], 27). The fragment appears to be a praise of the πάτριος πολιτεία, a theme which is not uncommon in Attic oratory. For more on the subject see Mossé (1978) and Rossi (1971), and on Demosthenes specifically Witte (1995). It is fair to assume the quotation comes from a public speech. We can divide it into two main parts:

1) a *laudatio temporis acti*, meant to discourage any changes regarding the administration of the State (the πόλις) and of its financial resources: Stratocles is not just praising the past, but also trying to preserve present conditions. References to the past are common in Attic oratory in general (see above all Nouhaud [1982], but also Clarke [2008], Westwood [2017], Westwood [2020]), although the distant past is mainly seen as too far from the present; as a consequence, most examples are drawn from relatively recent history (with the exception of Isocrates, who often employs references to the mythical past, see Clarke [2008], 261-75). The Persian Wars are also widely employed for their exemplarity. Exactly as in this fragment by Stratocles, in Demosthenes, we find instances in which the period of the Persian Wars is seen as a moment in which ancient good habits (now lost) were still followed: see Dem. 9.3.36-37 on Athenian hatred of bribery; 18.203-6, for lack of servility in

the past. Other passages where this period is seen as exemplary are Lyc. 1.80, 104, 108, 122. Also worthy of mention are references to Solon (on which see Carey [2015]): see Dem. 20.90, 93-4, 102-4, where the orator compares Solon's legislative procedures with contemporary ones, and Dem. 18. 6, where the spirit of justice of Solon's laws is compared to the lack of it in Demosthenes' time. Moreover, in Dem. 14.1, when opening his speech, Demosthenes states concerning the ancestors that no other men have been able to surpass their achievements; something similar is also found at Dem. 13.16. Such patriotic nostalgia is also found in Dem. 10.46, where Demosthenes blames the Athenians for having 'deserted the place in which the ancestors left them'. Of the various references to the past that we find in Aeschines, particularly vivid and relevant to this passage, is the one at 3.259 where he imagines the tombs of the ancestors lamenting when they see what honours are being proposed for Demosthenes. Similar examples, dealing with a greater past, and with a specific focus on the administration of the state are also in Isoc. 7.16, 50, 62; 8.47-8, 54-5, 65 (about ancient military habits) and 12.161-2. The *laudatio temporis acti* will remain typical of oratory of all times: exemplary is the very famous Ciceronian exclamation 'O tempora, o mores' (*Verr*. 25). On *laudatores temporis acti* in Roman literature see Hunt (1944-1945) and Roller (2018).

2) A negative opinion about the tendency to forgive crime lightly, followed by a more general statement on the matter: easy forgiveness brings danger to the innocent. A similar concept is expressed in the Lycurgus fragment quoted by Rutilius at 2.18 ('nocentibus parcitis'), a quotation clearly taken from a private speech, given the address to the 'iudices'. Another possible parallel is to be found in P.Hib. 1.15 (Col.2. ll.1-12, see commentary), where the concept of forgiveness seems instead to have a positive connotation, within the discussion of amnesty as a form of propaganda to obtain support for the Lamian War. This parallel is also interesting because, if the restoration τῶν [προ]/γ̣[όν]ῳν in the papyrus is correct, then the reference to the ancestors would be a further common point between the two texts.

There are no specific elements to place this fragment in a determined historical moment or context, but it exemplifies well Stratocles' political views: the new way of administering the πόλις could refer to Cassander's oligarchic government, and 'the one inherited from your ancestors' surely means Athenian democracy. Therefore, the fragment is probably from a speech pronounced before Demetrius reestablished democracy in Athens.

* * * *non potestis*: the manuscripts have a lacuna at this point. Logical and fairly convincing is Haase's restoration 'servare', accepted also by Barabino (1967), 160.

F2. Rutilius 2.20

Stratoclis: 'Nam vehementer eorum vitiis invehi non licebat, reticere omnino non expediebat, suspiciose loqui potissimum placebat.'

This quotation belongs to Rutilius' reflection on τάξις, a rhetorical feature aiming at emphasising the last word of each sentence. In this case, the effect is achieved by placing the verb always in *disiunctio* at the end of the sentence. The context is extremely obscure as well as the oratorical category – we can only imagine it was a public speech, considering the information that the sources give us about Stratocles' life, activity, and political background. If so, here, Stratocles may be talking about his political enemies. He is criticising a situation of tension when the only possible option is to talk suspiciously, since there is no space for an open opposition, nor is it useful to ignore a problem by being silent. Unlike for the rhetorical figure of *adynaton* (see Rowe [1984]), here a third option is given, ('talking suspiciously'), although it does not seem to be helpful to the resolution of the conflict. An interesting example of *adynaton* in oratory is in Dem. 19.287, where the metaphor for the 'water flowing upstream' (which became proverbial, see Santini [1997]) is employed to stress the impossibility of the situation.

vitiis invehi: as Ruhnken notes (1768), 35, this is a peculiar use of 'inveho' in a metaphorical way. It is normally constructed with the dative of agent or with in+accusative, when meant as it is here. The possible Greek equivalent could be κατηγορέω, constructed with the genitive.

suspiciose loqui: this is the only occurrence in Latin literature of 'suspiciosus' with 'loquor'. Examples of 'suspiciosus' with *verba dicendi* are in Cicero (*Brut.* 34; *Q.Rosc.* 56.7) and the Elder Seneca (*Controv.* 2.1.34). A Greek equivalent might be ὕποπτος, although attested as predicative of a *verbum dicendi* only in Plut. *Arat.* 20.3.

F3. Agatharchides *apud* Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 250. 447a

Εἰσάγει δὲ μετὰ σαφηνείας καὶ τῆς πρεπούσης λόγῳ κοσμιότητος εἰς τὸν ὅμοιον εἰπόντας τόπον Στρατοκλέα μὲν οὕτως· Ἁροῦται καὶ σπείρεται τὸ Θηβαίων ἄστυ, τῶν συναγωνισαμένων ὑμῖν τὸν πρὸς Φίλιππον πόλεμον.' Ἅμα, φησί, τὸ πάθος τῆς πόλεως εὐσήμως ἐξέθηκε, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἠτυχηκότων φιλίας ὑπεμνήσθη· τὸ δεινὸν γὰρ εὐνοίᾳ παρατεθὲν ἐμβριθεστέρους εἴωθε τοὺς οἴκτους ποιεῖν.

λόγῳ **A** : *om.* **M** | εἰπόντας **AM** εἰπόντα **A**^{2}

This fragment is quoted by Agatharchides in one of his passages contained in Photius' chapter about him in the *Bibliotheca.* Here Agatharchides is talking about cities that, despite their glorious past, have been destroyed, and about how these events have been narrated by people who escaped danger. The examples used are those of Olynthus and Thebes. For both, Agatharchides inserts other quotations and paraphrases from works of orators (Demosthenes, Aischines, Hegesias). Once again, the quotation is very short, surely from a public oration not immediately easy to contextualise. The value of ἀροῦται and σπείρεται is not positive here but rather negatively sarcastic. We can state this because there is a particularly interesting similarity between this passage and that of Dinarchus

(1.24): ἀροῦται καὶ σπείρεται τὸ Θηβαίων ἄστυ τῶν κοινωνησάντων ὑμῖν τοῦ πρὸς Φίλιππον πολέμου. ἀροῦταί φημι καὶ σπείρεται. Dinarchus, however, is not mentioned here, either because Agatharchides was not aware of the passage or because he forgot about it. As mentioned above, Dinarchus is a rich source of information for the early stages of Stratocles' career and, in particular, on the investigation concerning Harpalus. In the speech *Against Demosthenes*, Dinarchus says that most of the things regarding this matter have already been explained in detail by Stratocles (Din. 1.1). Therefore, we can assume this quotation is from the speech Stratocles pronounced against Demosthenes on this occasion, and that the part about ploughing and sowing was quoted by Dinarchus with the precise aim of recalling the words of Stratocles that the Assembly had heard not long before.

Here Stratocles shows sympathy with Thebes, always good towards Athens and other allies in general. In this, he is similar to Phocion (Plut. *Phoc.* 17.2-4), who, after the destruction of Thebes, declaring himself ready for self-sacrifice on behalf of Athens, also showed pity towards Thebes. Theban qualities are widely praised in oratory: see Dem. 18.215, where Demosthenes thanks the Thebans for their courage, loyalty, and wisdom, demonstrated in 338 when they welcomed an Athenian force into their city. An encomium of the Thebans on papyrus is in P.Schub. 32 (see detailed commentary for more information on Thebes and declamations).

(76) Theocritus of Chios

Biographical note: the only mention of the poet Theocritus of Chios as an orator is in the *Suda* θ 166, where we read that he was a rhetor, a pupil of Metrodorus (a pupil of Isocrates), that he was a political opponent of Theopompus, and that he wrote *Chreiai,* a *History of Libya* and some letters. Although the *Suda* is the only biographical entry for this character, an identification with the Theocritus of Chios, from whom the more famous Hellenistic poet, Theocritus of Syracuse, wanted to be distinguished (*AP* 9.434), has been already established. A series of fragments (of his witty sentences against the Macedonian kings, on which see Plut. *De liberis educandis* 11a-c) have already been collected and commented on by Franco (based on the fragments collected by Müller, *FHG* II. 86-7). Strabo (14.1.35) calls him σοφιστής when talking about notable personalities from Chios, and says he was a political opponent of Theopompus. The reasons for this rivalry can be traced back to their common Isocratean background, but on this problem, a *testimonium* by Athenaeus (6.230e-f) is more enlightening: it says Theopompus, in his *Letters to Alexander*, complained about Theocritus' ostentation of his wealth, when he was in the past miserable and poor. Of his *Chreiai*, two are preserved by Plutarch (*Quaest. Conv.* 2.1.631e; *De Vit*. 14.534b). We know his political views were opposed to monarchy, as he was very hostile to Alexander (Plut. *De Lib. Ed.* 11b), and he belittled the king's claim to divinity (Clem. Al. *Protreptikos* 10.97). Theocritus also refused to appear before Antigonus Monophthalmus (Plut. *De Lib. Ed.* 11b; Macrob. *Sat*. 7.3.12) and called the king a Cyclop. As a consequence, he was executed.

On Theocritus, see: *FGrHist/BNJ* 760; Franco (1991); Laqueur (1934); Roller (2016); Teodorsson (1990).

(77) Themistocles of Ilion

Biographical note: the only attestation of an orator called Themistocles of Ilion is in *SEG* XXXIII.1184.8-24. It is an unparalleled kind of inscription, erected in 196 BC, and attesting the resolution of Xanthos to grant 400 drachmae to Themistocles of Ilion, a wandering orator. The inscription says Themistocles arrived in Xanthos and gave a display of his rhetorical ability. This is a Hellenistic attestation of a figure, that of "travelling declaimer" (with the obvious antecedent of the wandering sophists, see Montiglio [2005], 114-7), which became important later, in the period of the Second Sophistic. This is also an important testimony of the value attributed to rhetors in the 2nd century BC, if we consider that the Xanthians wrote this decree for Themistocles on a stele at the shrine of Leto, and then sent a copy to Ilion.

(78) Theodectes (son)

Biographical note: Theodectes, son of the homonymous pupil of Isocrates, is mentioned only in the *Suda* at θ 139, where the information given could help in solving a problem in the chronology of his father's life and activity. In the *Suda* we read: 'Theodectes of Phaselis, rhetor, son of the foregoing, he wrote an *Encomium of Alexander of Epirus*, historical monographs, *Barbarian Customs*, an *Art of Rhetoric* in seven books and many other monographs' (transl Whitehead, *SudaOnline*).

The elder Theodectes is a better-known literary figure of the 4th century BC (author of tragedies, orator and rhetorician, see Fragments in *TrGF* 1, 227-37; on the literary figure see also Blass [1892²], 441-7; Radermacher [1939]; Brown [1996³]). This entry in the *Suda* constitutes the only mention of a homonymous son, orator, and historian, and the lexicon has an entry on the elder Theodectes as well at θ 138. From the entry in the *Suda*, we are told the elder Theodectes died at the age of 41, while his father was still alive, and the inhabitants of Phaselis honoured him with a statue, which was decorated with garlands by Alexander the Great on his way to the East (Plut. *Alex*. 17.674a). These two pieces of information seem incompatible. In fact, if the elder died at the age of 41, he must have died around the 340, long before Alexander started his expedition. It is therefore highly possible that the compilers of the *Suda* confused these events and data: the orator who died at 41 was more probably the son. It is difficult, however, to determine whether the association with Alexander is to be referred to the father or the son.

As regards his production, the information given in the Suda suggests that he followed the pattern of the Isocratean school in being both an orator and historian. The *Encomium of Alexander*

of Epirus too seems consistent with the Isocratean production too. He also seems to have followed his fathers' interest in rhetorical theory (although the Elder wrote in verses, see *Suda* θ 138).
On Theodectes see: Blass (1892²), 445; *FGrHist* 113; Radermacher (1939); Solmsen (2016).

(79) Theopompus of Chios

Biographical note: Theopompus, son of Damasistratus of Chios, was one of the most notable political and historical figures of the 4th century BC. His birth date is debated: the *Suda* (α 172) and Photius (*Bibl.* 176. 120b) give different information, the former saying he was born at the end of the 5th century and the latter stating he was born around 370 BC. More neutral is the testimony of Cornelius Nepos (*Alc.* 7.11.1), who reports that Theopompus was born after the death of Alcibiades. He went into exile at some point between 370 and 340 BC, and wrote *Letters to Alexander* (or *Chian Letters*) to be called back to Chios (see *Suda* ε 3953.; Dion. Halic. *Pomp.* 6; Ath. 13.586c). It is not certain if these epistles are the same texts that are quoted under the name of *Advice to Alexander* (Cic. *Att.* 12.40.2; Ath. 6.320f) and *Epistle to Alexander* (Ath.13.509a-e). Theopompus is mainly known as a pupil of Isocrates (and peer of Ephorus) and a prolific historian: among his many historical works, it is worth remembering his *Hellenika* (*FGrHist* 115 F5-F23) and *Philippika* (see Ottone-Chavez Reino [2018]).

Although the majority of his fragments (more than 250) are from his historical works, the sources clearly state he was also famous for his activity as an orator: Quint. *Inst.* 10.1.74; *Suda* α 172; θ 138; θ 166; Phot. *Bibl.* 176.121a, from whom we know Theopompus wrote more than 20,000 lines of epideictic speeches; Gell. *NA*. 10.18.6; Dion. Halic. *Pomp.* 6; *De Isaeo*. 19; Fronto, *Ep.* 2.11.2 van den Hout; Philostr. *VS*. 1.506; Cic. *Orat*. 207. His style of historiography was accordingly very rhetorical. The titles for which we have fragments or substantial information are the *Encomium of Philip* (Theon. *Prog.* 9.110.27-32 Patillon); *Encomium of Alexander* (Theon. *Prog*. 2.68.24-28 Patillon; *Suda* ε 3953); *Attack on the Teaching of Plato.* Of the latter fragments are quoted by Ath.11.508c-d, Diog. Laert. *VS* 6.14 and probably also Arr. *Epict. Diss*. 2.17.5-6, but are not included here as they can be dated to 344-3 BC thanks to the *Letter of Speusippus to Philip*, where Speusippus accused Theopompus of attacking Plato in a work). We also know of a *Corinthiakos* (Maiuri [1925] XI, 1, 13-15), of which *Schol. Vet.* Pind. *Ol.* 13.32b and Plut. *De Herodoti Malignitate*. 871b may potentially be considered fragments. Other titles we know are *Reproach to Alexander* (*Suda* ε 3953); *Lakonikos; Olympiakos; Letter to Philip* (for some scholars it would be the same work as the *Encomium* mentioned in Didymus' *On Demosthenes* 5.21 = P.Berol. 9780 [cfr.also Maiuri]; on the identification see comment to F2); *Panathenaikos;* and a work on Euagoras (Maiuri). It is unclear if the work *On the Wealth Stolen from Delphi* (Ath. 12532d-e.; 13.604f-605d) is a speech or part of his historical work. The speech *Mausolos* appearing in

the catalogue of the library of Rhodes is to be identified with the funeral speech witnessed in *Suda* θ 138.
On Theopompus (as an orator), see: Chávez Reino (2009); Flower (1994); *FGrHist/BNJ* 115; Pownall (2005); Zimmermann-Rengakos (2014), 774, 794 (orator and rhetorician).

F1. Theon, *Prog.* 9.110f Patillon
'Predicting the future from what has passed beforehand is useful' ὡς [τε] εἴ τις λέγοι περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου τοῦ Μακεδόνος, τί δ' ἂν ἔπραξε τηλικαῦτα καὶ τοσαῦτα ἔθνη καταστρεψάμενος, εἰ μικρὸν ἔτι ἐπεβίω χρόνον; καὶ ὡς Θεόπομπος ἐν τῷ Φιλίππου ἐγκωμίῳ, ὅτι εἰ βουληθείη Φίλιππος τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐμμεῖναι, καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης πάσης βασιλεύσει.

'Predicting the future from what has passed beforehand is useful' *versio ex Arm.* : χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τὸ εἰκάζειν ἐκ τῶν παρεληλυθότων τὰ μέλλοντα *vertit Patillon*.

This is the only exact quotation from a work (allegedly a speech) entitled *Encomium of Philip*. The (1986), 111-12 believes this work has to be identified with the *Letter to Philip* mentioned by Didymus, and that they both belong to a (possibly historical) work entitled *Philip* to be dated back to 346. Another option is the one given by Shrimpton (1991), 6, who maintains that the *Encomium* was written in 343 BC to please the Macedonian king and become the tutor of the young Alexander. Flower (1994), 39 believes, instead, that this was actually part of the *Philippika*, an embedded 'set speech of praise delivered by someone'. The confusion here clearly derives from the variety of titles that Hellenistic scholars often gave to the same work while compiling their lists, which vaguely described the content and did not really consider the titles given by the authors (when they existed). Scholars, therefore, rightly try to be cautious in considering isolated attestations of similar works as different pieces of an author's production.

Nevertheless, in this case, a helpful parallel can be found in Isocrates, Theopompus' teacher. Among his vast rhetorical production, we have the *Philip*, one of his most famous epideictic speeches, but also two letters addressed to the Macedonian king They are *Epp*. 3-4, whose authenticity is, however, debated: see, among the others, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1893) 395-97, and Mathieu (1924). In the epistolary collection of Isocrates, we tend to consider most of the letters – including *Ep.* 2 – authentic and the others uncertain but not definitely spurious. Despite the difference in the length between the *Philip* and the letters (155 paragraphs against the 24 of *Ep*. 2), the letters resemble the speeches in many aspects (Mathieu [1924], 36). It is very likely that the letters, in the same way as the speeches, were discussed in the school between Isocrates and his pupils (the most recent and comprehensive overview on the Isocratean school is found in Pinto [2015]; an extensive discussion of Isocrates' work is Nicolai [2004], *passim*). Theopompus must have been used to this kind of discussion and perhaps developed a personal interest in imitating his teacher's production at many levels. In this framework, the *Encomium of Philip* and the *Letter to Philip* could fairly

be Theopompus' counterparts to Isocrates' *Philip* and letters to Philip. A possible confirmation of this hypothesis may be found in the catalogue of the library of Rhodes (Maiuri [1925], XI, 1, 13-15), where Maiuri initially restored Isocrates instead of Theopompus precisely because of the striking overlap between the titles in the list and the production of Isocrates. Therefore, the similarity between Isocrates' and Theopompus' titles makes more likely the possibility that the *Encomium* and the *Letter to Philip* were distinct works. If so, it is fair to assume that the *Encomium* was an epideictic oration not very different from Isocrates' *Philip* in terms of its structure, its oratorical style, aims, and maybe also its themes.

In this fragment, Theopompus is envisaging Philip's dominion over all Europe, basing his assertion (i.e., the prediction of the future) on past events (i.e., the long list of Philip's previous victories). The praise of potential future actions based on the past seems to be a typical rhetorical strategy for encomia, as pointed out by Pernot (1993), 715-17 ('L'éloge au futur'), and mentioned in rhetorical theory (see *Rh. Al.* 35.14; Arist. *Rhet.* 1.1358b.20), and goes back to Pindar (*Pyth.* 1.35-38). This sort of rhetorical strategy must have been common in encomia of Alexander, as clear from the quotation immediately preceding Theopompus' (and from *Rh. Al.* 35.14), and in general of young people (see *Dem.* 61.22 and Alex. Noum. 1.15-18). Other notable examples are Is.5.57-71 (where this feature is used more to strengthen an exhortation than simply a praise of Philip), Plin. *Paneg.* 17, and Cic. *Marcell.* 11-12. A similar concept is also in Sallust (*Cat.* 2.4-6), who states that 'dominion is easily secured by those qualities by which it was at first obtained'.

F2. Ath. 6.230e-f

Θεόπομπος δ' ὁ Χῖος ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον συμβουλαῖς περὶ Θεοκρίτου τοῦ πολίτου τὸν λόγον ποιούμενός φησιν· 'ἐξ ἀργυρωμάτων δὲ καὶ χρυσῶν πίνει καὶ τοῖς σκεύεσιν χρῆται τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης ἑτέροις τοιούτοις, ὁ πρότερον οὐχ ὅπως ἐξ ἀργυρωμάτων [οὐκ] ἔχων πίνειν ἀλλ' οὐδὲ χαλκῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκ κεραμέων καὶ τούτων ἐνίοτε κολοβῶν.'

οὐκ *del. Cobet*

A συμβουλευτικὸς πρὸς Ἀλέξανδρον is attested in this fragment, in Cicero (*Att.* 12. 40. 2, who says he has read Aristotle's and Theopompus' συμβουλευτικὸς) and probably in the catalogue of the library of Rhodes (where we only read Συμβουλευ[τικὸς πρὸς]). It is highly unlikely that this *Advice to Alexander* is to be identified with the *Letters to Alexander* (known to Dion. Halic. *Pomp.* 6 as ἐπιστολαὶ Χιακαί, and mentioned by the *Suda* ε 3953 and Ath. 13.585c, the only one who quotes a piece of any of these letters; on the *Epistles about Chios* see Ottone [2005]).

Unlikely is also the identification of this speech and the *Epistle to Alexander* mentioned in Ath. 13.595a-e, which seems close in content to the fragment in Ath. 13.586c (i.e., Harpalus' dissolute life, a quite understandable focus in a work like the *Deipnosophists*) and, therefore, probably to be included in the *Epistles about Chios*. The identification of *Advice to Alexander* with the epistles

(strongly defended by Lane Fox [1986], 117-18) depends on the content of this fragment and the information given by the *Suda* ε 3953. In the *Suda* we read that the *Epistles about Chios* were sent from Theopompus to Alexander mainly to discuss matters related to his native Chios, from which he had been exiled and to which he was seeking to return, and the topic of this fragment clearly deals with Theopompus' difficult relations with Chios. Here, Theopompus criticises his rival Theocritus (76), another orator from Chios (who was also known to have mocked the Macedonian kings, as we read in Plut. *De liberis educandis* 11.a-c), which may easily lead us to think Theopompus is here discussing questions regarding Chios.

But if we carefully read the entry in the *Suda*, it will not be difficult to understand that this is a separate work: φυγὰς δὲ γενόμενος ὁ Θεόπομπος ἱκέτης ἐγένετο τῆς Ἐφεσίας Ἀρτέμιδος· ἐπέστελλέ τε πολλὰ κατὰ Χίων Ἀλεξάνδρωι, καὶ μέντοι καὶ αὐτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον ἐγκωμιάσας πολλά. λέγεται δὲ καὶ ψόγον αὐτοῦ γεγραφέναι, ὃς οὐ φέρεται. One may be inclined to identify the ψόγος here mentioned with the συμβουλευτικὸς. If so, this work is clearly different from the epistles against Chios, mentioned immediately before. From this testimonium, it emerges that Theopompus' production regarding Alexander was wide and varied: there were not only some letters and a reproach, but also several praises (ἐγκωμιάσας πολλὰ) – among which this advice could also belong (although the separate mention of an *Encomium to Alexander* and an *Advice* in the catalogue of Rhodes does not support this hypothesis).

What is evident from this fragment is that Theopompus is trying to discredit his rival in the eyes of Alexander, advising him that Theocritus is a corrupt politician. It is difficult to date this advice. If it was written, as the letters, as a means to be repatriated, then it should be dated between his exile around 370/360 and his return in 334 BC. This speech was probably once again in tune with Isocrates' speeches of advice (and or praise) to sovereigns (*Euagoras*, *Nicocles*, *To Nicocles*, *Archidamus, Philip*), more similar to short treatises than orations (on this point see again Nicolai [2005], *passim*). Moreover, according to the list of books in the catalogue of Rhodes, along with the *Encomium to Alexander* and the *Advice*, a speech Πρὸς Εὐαγόραν is mentioned, which would enhance the possibility of Theopompus being accustomed in writing speeches addressed to sovereigns, in the style of his teacher Isocrates (see F1).

The tone of this fragment seems rather satirical, with its sharp criticism of Theocritus' new pretentious habits compared to his past simple ones.

(80) Thrasycrates of Rhodes

Biographical note: Polybius (11.4-6) reports a full speech by the Rhodian ambassador Thrasicrates, who had come to Aetolia to persuade the Aetolians to stop fighting with Philip. It is an interesting case as the speaker does not belong to either of the two peoples involved in the war, and has,

therefore, a more subdued tone. Nevertheless, the speech is highly persuasive and employs fine metaphors (worthy of mention is that of the fire, which is difficult to stop once lit, like war).
On Thrasycrates, see: Dreyer (2002), 33-39; Wooten (1972) 58-9, 75.

(81) Xenocrates

Biographical note: a homonymous kinsman and fellow-citizen of the philosopher Xenocrates of Calcedon (pupil of Plato and successor of Speusippus, see Gärtner [1972], and Dörrie [1967]) is mentioned as an orator by Diogenes Laertius (*V*4.15). Diogenes attributes to him a speech entitled *Arsinoetic*, about the deceased queen Arsinoe, co-regent of the Ptolemaic reign of Egypt at the beginning of the 3rd century BC.
On Xenocrates see: Dörrie (1967); Pernot (1993), 44.

(82) Xenophron of Sicily

Biographical note: an orator from Cilicia called Xenophron of Sicily is mentioned by Philostratus (*VS* 1.19) alongside Ariobarzanes of Cilicia and Peithagoras of Cyrene. All we know about him is that he lived between the 4th century BC and the 1st AD, and that he (like the other two) was not skilled in the art of invention and expression of ideas, but 'in the scarcity of first-rate sophists, was sought after by the Greeks of their day' (see comments on Ariobarzanes [13])
On Xenophron, see: Jsniszewski (2015), 279; Wooten (1972), 39.

(83) Xenocles of Adramyttium

Biographical note: Xenocles was active between the 2nd and the 1st century BC. He was an Asianist and is mentioned by Cicero (*Brut*. 316) among those he studied with during his trip in Asia Minor (on this see also Plut. *Cic.* 4.4 and Strab. 14.2.25). He addressed the Roman Senate in defence of the cities of Asia (Strab. 13.1.66), allegedly speaking against "Mithridatism". Of his work, nothing is extant except for a saying on the educational worth of poverty (*Florilegium Monacense* [Monac. Gr. 429], 220.
On Xenocles,: Wooten (1972), 38-9.

(84) Zeno of Laodicea

Biographical note: Zeno was an orator and politician of the 1st cent. BC from the city of Laodicea. Information about him comes from Strabo (12.8.16 and 14.2.24). He was a benefactor of his city and father of Polemon, who became king of Pontus and Bosphorus in 14 BC. In 41/40, together with Hybreas (46), he opposed the Parthians and Labienus.
On Zeno see: Blass (1865), 71; Gärtner (1972).

Suasoriae

1) P.Hib. 1.15 = Brit.Libr. inv. 1825 = P.Lit.Lond. 136 (MP3 2496; LDAB 6983)
Hibeh, 3rd century BC (in.)

Editions
Grenfell and Hunt (1906), 55-61; Jacoby *FGrHist* 2.105.F6.

Bibliography
Fuhr (1906) col. 1414; Jander (1913), 31-33; Körte (1913), 237; Nicolai (2008); Kremmydas (2013), 156-59; Powell-Barber (1923).

Text

Col.1
]
].τα̣χ̣
].
]τ̣ε
].α. [5]
]....
]....
]τα̣
].κραν
]ῃν [10]
].
].
]γαρ
]ῃ
] ω̣τ̣ι̣α̣ν [15]
]. . να
]π̣ανει
]. τ̣ων
]την
]. . των [20]

]. ζηνι̣αν
]. . θ̣. .
].τ.
]. . . .
]τας [25]
.εὐ]α

Inspexi | 7 ε̣ν̣ι̣] *Grenfell-Hunt* | μ]ι̣κραν Gr*enfell-Hunt* | 10 *legi* η̣ν : ο̣ν *Grenfell-Hunt* | 16 ν̣α̣να *Grenfell-Hunt* | 21 ζηνι̣αν *fortasse* Τροιζηνίαν *Berardi* : ζημι̣αν *Grenfell-Hunt* | ροι εμ̣οι Grenfell-Hunt

Col.2

. . .
ρ̣ ε̣ρ̣ τ̣οτέρους συμμάχους
ἔξετε καὶ φανερὸν ἅπασι
καταστήσετε, διότι τὸ τῆς
πόλεως ἦθος οὕτω μακρὰν [5]
ἀπέχει τοῦ κακῶς τινα ποεῖν
τῶν μηθὲν ἀδικούντων
῾Ελλήνων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς
φανερῶς ἐξημαρτηκότας
ἀθώιους ἀφίησιν διὰ τὴν [10]
ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλανθρω-
πίας. μάλιστα δὲ λογί-
ζεσθε πρὸς τῶν θεῶν, ὦ ἄν-
δρες ᾽Αθηναῖοι, [δ]ιότι τὸ βρα-
δύνειν τοῖς νῦν καθεστῶ- [15]
σιν ἥκιστα συμφέρον ἐστίν.
ὀξεῖς γὰρ εἰκὸς εἶναι τοὺς ἐ-
κ τῶν μεταβολῶν καιρούς·
ὧν ἀντιλάβεσθε καὶ παύσασ-
[[σ]]θε προσέχοντες τοῖς τὴν [20]
ῥα<ι>θυμίαν ἀσφάλειαν
ἀποκαλοῦσιν – καὶ μὴ φοβη-
θέντες π̣[αρεξωθ]ε̣ῖ̣τ̣ε
τὴν σωτηρίαν, ἀλ[λὰ] καὶ θαρ-

σήσαντες τοιαῦτα βουλ[ε]ύ- [25]
σασθε, δι᾽ ὧν μηδέποτε μ[η]θὲν

Inspexi | 19 ἀντιληψεσθε *ante correctionem* | 23 π̣[αρεξωθ]ε̣ῖ̣τ̣ε *Jacoby* : τ̣.[. . . . .]ε̣ιτ̣ε *Grenfell-Hunt*

Col.3

α̲ [*ca. 17*] ν̣.

ἀλλ̣[ὰ] ἤδ̣[η μέμν]η̣σ̣θε τῶν

[προ]γ̣[όν]ω̣ν, ὧν τ̣[οῖ]ς μὲν ἄλ-

λοις ἐπ[αινεῖν ἱκα]ν̣όν̣, ὑμῖν

δὲ μ[[ε]]ιμ̣ε̣ῖ̣σ̣θ̣α̣ [ι προσ]ῆκόν ἐστιν. [5]

κ̣ [α]ὶ λογί̣ζ̣ε̣σ̣θ̣έ̣ [με ἥ]κ̣ ι̣σ̣ τ̣᾽ ἂν

ἐ̲ν̲ Τ̣ α̣ ι̣ν̣[άρῳ καθή]μενον

καὶ μηθενὸς ὑσ̣ τ̣[εροῦν]τ̣α

τ̲ῶ̲ν̲ ἐν τῇ πόλει σ̣...ν̣ῶν,

οὕτως ἂμ φιλοκινδύνως ἐπι- [10]

στῆναι τ[ο]ῖς πράγμασιν, εἰ μὴ

τὰ τῶν καιρῶν ἠπιστάμην

κατεπείγοντ[α] καὶ κρίσιν ἑώ-

ρων οὖσαν τῆς ἡμετέρας

σ̲ω̲τηρίας. καὶ τ[*ca. 7*] [15]

-

τῶν ἐφοβούμην [*ca. 8*]

καθεστηκότων [*ca. 8*]

ἐν ὑμ[[ε]]ῖν αὐτοῖς [*ca. 9*]

καὶ̲ ταπεινὸς ὑπ̣[ολ]η̣φθε̣ί̣ην,

ὡς μηθὲν τῶν συμφερόντων [20]

π̲ρ̲οιδεῖν ἂν δυνηθείς.

ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν προ[ο]ρῶ τὰ μέλ-

λοντα καὶ παρακαλῶ πρὸς τὰ

πράγματα ὑμᾶς καὶ [[παρα-

καλῶ]] τὴν τύχην, ἣν [25]

Inspexi | 2-3 ἀλλ[ὰ] ἤδ[η μέμν]ησθε τῶν /[προ]|γ[όν]ων, ὧν *Jacoby* | 4 ἐπ[αινεῖν ἱκα]νόν *Jacoby* | προσ]ηκόν *Jacoby* : καθ[ηκον *Grenfell-Hunt* | λογίζεσθέ Jacoby : λογιζεσθα[ι *Grenfell-Hunt*

Col.4

[*ca. 13* μὴ κα

τ]αλείπειν – καὶ δέομαι

μάλιστα τῶν ⁽ν⁾εωτέρων

τῶν παρ᾽ ὑμ[[ε]]ῖν ἐκ παιδὸς τὰ

περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἱκανῶς [5]

παιδευθέντων, ἀκμάσαι

ποτὲ ταῖς ⁽διανοίαις⁾ καὶ χρή-

σασθαι τοῖς οἰ[κ]είοις σώμασιν

εὐκαίρως τὴν ἀπόδειξιν

ποιησαμένους τῆς αὐτῶν [10]

ἀρετῆς – ἵν[α] νομίζωνται

καὶ τὸν ἄλλον χρόνον

ἡσυχάζειν μὴ δι᾽ ἀνανδρίαν,

ἀλλὰ δι᾽ εὐλάβειαν. καὶ μή-

θ᾽ <ἡμ>εῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες ᾽Αθηναῖοι, [15]

χωρὶς τῆς ὑμετέρας δυνά-

μεως ἐπὶ τὰ πράγματα

καταδεέστερον βαδίζωμεν,

μήθ᾽ ὑμεῖς ἀναγκάζησθε

δυοῖν θάτερον, ἢ ποεῖν ἑτέρ[ο]ι[ς] [20]

τὸ κελευόμενον ἢ μετ᾽ ἐλάτ-

τονος στρατοπέδου κινδυ-

νεύειν, ἡμῶν ἄλλως πως

Inspexi | 19 καὶ ῥάιθυμος *Jacoby*

Col.5

ἀ.[*ca. 18*]

καὶ ταῖς ἐμ[*ca. 12*]

ἀποχρήσασθε καὶ τὴν ἐν

τῷ πράττειν ὀρθῶς ἀσφά-
λειαν ἔλεσθε μετὰ πλειόνων [5]
τὴν σωτηρίαν ὑμ[[ε]]ῖν αὐτοῖς
παρασκευάζοντες, ὡς
ἀνάξιόν ἐστιν, ὦ ἄνδρες
Ἀθηναῖοι, τῶν ἐν Μαραθῶνι
καὶ Σαλαμῖν[ι] κινδύνων δια- [10]
τελεῖν ὑμᾶς τὸ σύνολον
ἀπογινώσκοντας τὴν ἡ-
γεμονίαν – ἢ νομίζοντας
ταύτην ἔσεσθαί ποτε ὑμῖν
ἀπὸ ταὐτομάτου μηδ' ὁτι- [15]
οὖν αὐτοῖς πονοῦσιν.
ἐγὼ μὲ[ν] οὖν ἐπεὶ στρατηγοῦ
ἦν μὴ τῆς ἰδίας ἀσφαλείας καὶ
χειροτονίας φροντίζει[ν...]
ἀλλὰ τῆς ὑμετέρα[ς σωτη]- [20]
ρίας, τοῦτο πράττων [προσε]-
λήλυθα προτάξας ἐμ[αυτὸν]
ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερ[ίας]

Inspexi | 1 ἀ[πολομένων. σωφρονεῖτε οὖν *Jacoby* | 2 ἐμ[αῖς βουλαῖς] *Jacoby* | 18 ης *supra lineam*, τ[[ε]] *ante correctionem* | 20-21 σωτη]ρίας *Grenfell-Hunt*

Col.6

. . .
ϙϙθ[
ἐκ . [
τ̣ο̣ι̣τε . [
ὁ καιρός [.]α̣ι̣ . [*ca. 10* [5]
ἐλθεῖν επὶ τ . [*ca. 10*
ριων καὶ τὴν̣ [*ca. 10*
ὑμᾶς εκκρ[υ *ca. 11*
τήν τε τῆς πόλεως ἀρχη-
γέτιν δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους [ἐγ- [10]

χωρίους θε[*ca. 3*]ο̣υ[*ca. 2*] . α̣ι[*ca. 2*
ἔσεσθαι ε̣χ[*ca. 11*
ταῖς ἐλπίς δ[*ca. 9*
μνημης λα̣[*ca. 12*
δουλείας φε̣ . [*ca. 12* [15]
ἐλευθερίας ο̣ . [*ca. 9*
νον ειρ̣. . . [*ca. 11*]. Ἀθη-
ναίους ὑπερ[*ca. 10*
θεοὺς ε̣ρισαι μ[*ca. 9*
γα̣ . ε̣ινητ[*ca. 12* [20]
ὑπηκόους ὄντ[ας *ca. 8*
ξεται μεγα̣[*ca. 11*
[*ca. 3*]ικα[

Inspexi | [ἐγ]/χωρίους *Grenfell-Hunt*

Commentary

This fragment comes from the cartonnage of a mummy, which allows us to date it quite precisely to the beginning of the 3rd century BC, as the documents found with it are not later than the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Grenfell and Hunt (1906), 55 narrow down the chronology to 280-40 BC. The *terminus post quem* for the text is 323 BC if we accept the restoration at line 58; alternatively, it is safer to put it broadly at the end of the 4th century BC. Edwards (in Powell-Barber [1929], 17) sees the 'correct, if colourless, language of the piece' as further evidence for this date. The text we have is placed on seven columns plus seven isolated fragments (named A-G), written on the parallel side to the fibres. Since these isolated fragments only present a few letters, which do not add any relevant information to our discussion, I have chosen not to edit them. The handwriting is a medium size, rather elegant, and firm capital, and there are *paragraphoi* and horizontal dashes as punctuation. There is some illegible writing on some parts of the *verso*. There are also some interlinear corrections, and they appear to be written by the same hand that wrote the text. Col.1 presents some traces of legible words, but no relevant sentence is reconstructable. I inspected the papyrus – hence some different readings from Grenfell and Hunt, and Jacoby – and I follow Jacoby for most of the supplements.

The theme of this piece of oratory is an exhortation from an Athenian general, most likely Leosthenes, (the first identification is due to Blass and all scholars tend to agree) after the death of Alexander. This idea is based on the allusion to a sudden political change (l.43), the role of the general as champion who is undertaking a risk for the cause of freedom (l.63), and on two concepts that were typical of the propaganda related to the Lamian war, namely that of freedom leading to hegemony – that recurs throughout the whole speech – and that of amnesty, traceable in the first lines

(both ideas are present, for instance, in Demosthenes' *Ep.* 1, *On Political Harmony*, especially the latter at §§ 6-9). However, the setting is still doubtful, as it is also based on the supplement at line 58: ἐν Ṭ̣α̣ι̣ν̣[άρῳ καθή]μενον (since Cape Taenarum is the place where Leosthenes collected mercenaries, see Diod. 18.9), where most of the readings are uncertain. It is a topic not otherwise attested in declamations. For this and other reasons, Körte has considered this fragment as a speech belonging to a historical work (in particular, by Anaximenes or Theopompus, whose works we know contained many embedded orations). So does Jacoby, who edits it as an anonymous historian (*FGrHist.* 105. F6). A parallel case can be constituted by PSI Laur.inv. 22013 (MP3 2558; LDAB 6773), that according to the analysis of Pintaudi and Canfora (2010) is a piece of history – if not of a historical novel – but the possibility of it being a declamation should not be absolutely ruled out (see Stramaglia [2015], 169). On the Florence papyrus, see discussion below.

At first glance, the very patriotic tone certainly appears to be strongly Demosthenic, but Kremmydas, criticising Wooten's excessive efforts to demonstrate that this text is 'almost like a compendium of Demosthenic commonplaces', has well shown how this speech also contains a set of novelties that differ from Attic oratory. Examples quoted by Kremmydas are the *hapax* εὐα]ρ̣ ε̣σ̣τ̣ο̣τέρους συμμάχους at l.27, and the expression διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας (ll.35-37) similar to Aischines' *Ep.* 5.1), quite possibly another rhetorical exercise.

On the whole, the style and the phraseology are very often consistent with Attic oratory in general (see for instance the references to the Athenian φιλανθρωπία and to καιρός, extremely common in Demosthenes and all Attic orators), rather than with Demosthenes specifically, while an echo of Isocrates (8.145) is at lines 82-83 (ἀκμάσαι ποτε ταῖς διανοίαις). Kremmydas also notices the employment of Aristotelian artistic means of persuasion: he sees logical arguments at lines 37-45 and 55-75 prevailing over *pathos*. This would also be mirrored in the portrayal of Leosthenes as a wise and balanced character rather than the leader of the democratic city embodied by Demosthenes. This is another sign – according to Kremmydas – that times had changed and that during the Hellenistic era the victory of individualism over the community was also evident in the way of composing speeches.

Col.1. l.21 ζηνι̣αν: the only longer legible sequence of letters in col.1 is ζηνι̣αν, which I very cautiously suggest to read Τροιζηνίαν, since Troezen was one of the cities which joined the Lamian war (Paus 1.25.4).

Col.2. ll.1-12: the general here insists on the argument of Athens' friendliness and goodwill towards other cities. The strategy he proposes is that of helping those cities which behaved badly towards Athens in the past, but are now threatened by the Macedonians, and should as a consequence become grateful allies (see parallels in Dem. 1.7-15; 2.2 about the Olynthians). Athens' kindness is even called excessive. The term employed for excess is ὑπερβολή, whose value can oscillate between a

positive (see for instance Isoc. 11.14 where it means perfection, or Thuc. 6.31.6, where it means superiority) and negative sense (see for instance Dem. 27.38, where it means an excess of rapacity).

Col.2. l.2 εὐα]ῤ ἐ̣ᾳ̣ τ̣οτέρους συμμάχους: as noted by Kremmydas (2013), 158) this *iunctura* never occurs in Greek literature.

Col.2. l.4 διότι: the conjunction διότι used as ὅτι to introduce an indirect statement is not extremely common: in oratory, we have parallels only in Isocrates (4.48), Isaeus (3.50). Another example is in the letter of Philip included in the Demosthenic corpus (12.18), that is probably to be attributed to Anaximenes' *History of Philip* (see Canfora [2006]).

Col.2. l.5 πόλεως ἦθος: this expression, 'the character of the city', has only three attestations before Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 2.75.3.6), and all of them are in speeches by Demosthenes. They are in 20.13, where the πόλεως ἦθος is described as honest and truthful; in 22.64, as an exhortation to the citizens to imitate the spirit of their city; and in 24.170-1, where Demosthenes says that the character of the city is 'a spirit of compassion for the helpless, and of resistance to the intimidation of the strong and powerful; it does not inspire brutal treatment of the population, and subservience to the potentates of the day'.

Col.2. ll.10-12 διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλανθρωπίας: as noted by Kremmydas (2013), 158 the only Attic parallel is from a letter spuriously attributed to Aeschines (*Ep.* 5.1). On this epistle and the spurious epistolary collection attributed to Aeschines in general, proved to consists essentially of rhetorical exercises, see Radermacher (1904) and Schwegler (1913).

Col.2. ll.1-12 .εὐα]ῤε̣ᾳ̣τ̣οτέρους...φιλανθρωπίας: it is worth noting that the first sentence of this rhetorical piece οὕτω μακρὰν | ἀπέχει τοῦ κακῶς τινα ποεῖν | τῶν μηθὲν ἀδικούντων | Ἑλλήνων, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς | φανερῶς ἐξημαρτη- κότας||ἀθώιους ἀφίησιν διὰ τὴν | ὑπερβολὴν τῆς φιλανθρω|πίας looks like a reversal of what is said in Stratocles' F1: 'Quaeritis, quem ad modum scelere contaminatis hominibus parcatis. At ignoscendo nocentibus innocentium salutem custodire non potestis'. As noted for Stratocles, this *topos* was not unknown to Attic oratory, and a similar concept was expressed in a fragment of Lycurgus quoted by Rutilius at 2.18 ('nocentibus parcitis'), although in this papyrus this concept rather seems to have a positive connotation, as it is likely to be about amnesty as a form of propaganda to obtain support for the Lamian War. Particularly interesting with regard to this parallel with Stratocles is also the possible reference to the ancestors: if τῶν [προ]||γ̣[όν]ῳ ν is actually the right restoration, then we would find another interesting similarity between this fragment and Stratocles' F1 where we read 'At reperire <ea> meliorem, quam a maioribus accepistis, non potestis'. On the theme

of the praise of the πάτριος πολιτεία in the literature of the 4th century, see Mossé (1978) and Rossi (1971).

Col.2. ll.12-16: the general is here urging the Athenians to be practical and quick and act against the enemy. If the interpretation according to which this speech was pronounced by Leosthenes is correct, the change that is not likely to last (ll. 40-41) is the temporary weakening of the Macedonian empire due to Alexander's death.

Col.2. ll.17-22: again, an encouragement – intensive rather than redundant – to the Athenians to act bravely and revolt and not to trust those who prefer a mild but inefficient approach. This seems to contradict what the genral says in ll. 1-12, where a mild approach is encouraged. The apparent inconsistency can be explained by considering that the general is only suggesting a mild approach towards cities that are threatened by the Macadonian. On the contrary, the Macedonians and their current allies must be opposed harshly.

Col.2. ll.20-22 προσέχοντες...ἀποκαλοῦσιν: a parallel for this expression is in Isocrates (15.305) where it is used in a similar context, as here Isocrates is talking about the difficulty of giving up a life of ease in order to be ready to serve the city. Examples of ῥαιθυμία employed in a similar context are also in two historical fragments of Hellenistic orators, namely Anaximenes (*FGrHist*. 72. F11a.123) and less clearly Theopompus (*FGrHist*. 115. F129), both about the duality between good actions and inaction. A reflection on the concept of calling bad things by good names is in Thuc. 3.82.4, where the term ἀσφάλεια interestingly also appears: 'Words had to change their ordinary meaning and to take that which was now given them. Reckless audacity came to be considered the courage of a loyal ally; prudent hesitation, specious cowardice; moderation was held to be a cloak for unmanliness; ability to see all sides of a question inaptness to act on any. Frantic violence became the attribute of manliness; cautious plotting, a justifiable means of self-defence'.[337] Given the wide fortune of Thucydides (see Fromentin-Gotteland [2015] and particularly Hornblower [2010]), it does not surprise to see his work as a model for oratory in the 3rd century BC.

Col.2. ll.22-25: the exhortation to take action is here concluded with an appeal to the Athenians to fight fear, the deterrent for salvation. On fear and other emotions in Greek and Latin rhetoric, see Konstan (2007).

[337] Translation by Dent (1910). The Greek text is the following: καὶ τὴν εἰωθυῖαν ἀξίωσιν τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐς τὰ ἔργα ἀντήλλαξαν τῇ δικαιώσει. τόλμα μὲν γὰρ ἀλόγιστος ἀνδρεία φιλέταιρος ἐνομίσθη, μέλλησις δὲ προμηθὴς δειλία εὐπρεπής, τὸ δὲ σῶφρον τοῦ ἀνάνδρου πρόσχημα, καὶ τὸ πρὸς ἅπαν ξυνετὸν ἐπὶ πᾶν ἀργόν: τὸ δ' ἐμπλήκτως ὀξὺ ἀνδρὸς μοίρᾳ προσετέθη, **ἀσφαλείᾳ** δὲ τὸ ἐπιβουλεύσασθαι ἀποτροπῆς πρόφασις εὔλογος.

Col.3. ll.2-15: the orator develops his argument by passing from a general encouragement to bravery and courage, to a list of concrete examples. In the first place, the commonplace of the ancestors (ll.53-54), secondly himself and the brave action he is currently undertaking (at Taenarum, if we accept the supplement). His own case is not simply given as an example of virtue but also aims at providing reassurance to the audience, by placing the general in the same position as the rest of the Athenians: if he were not sure of the very low risk and the safe situation, he says, he would not be exposing himself to any danger by fighting.

Col.3. ll.2-3 μέμν]ησθε τῶν [προγ]όνων: the expression is quite common in Attic oratory (Is. 56.4; Dem. 18.186; 19.16.2; 307.6; 311.8; Aeschin. 1.182; 2.74-75; Isoc. 16.24; Lys. 16.20).

Col.3. l.7 ἐν Ṭα̣ι̣ν̣[άρῳ καθή]μενον: if this uncertain reading were correct, we would have confirmation that this speech is thought as pronounced by Leosthenes. See Engels (2005).

Col.3. l.10 φιλοκίνδυνος**:** not largely attested, the word φιλοκινδύνος is typical of oratory and rhetoric.

Col.3. ll.15–24: the core of the argument is still the speaker himself, who is now talking about his strategic ability to understand what is to come. The argument is structured in two logical sections: the first one starts in the damaged section of the papyrus, and seems to express the hypothetical (but non-factual) situation of the orator not being able to foresee the future events, whereas the second reassures the audience with the statement that the orator is indeed capable of predicting what is about to happen. The only logical conclusion of the argument is, therefore, that the audience can trust him and finally act against the Macedonian power.

Col.3. l.18: Jacoby's supplement ἐμ[αῖς βουλαῖς] makes sense in the context but seems too short to fit the gap.

Col.3. ll.23-24 νῦν προορῶ τὰ μέλλοντα: contrary to what Kremmydas says ([2013], 159, 'expression not to be found in the Attic orators'), this is a quite common expression in Attic oratory (see Lys. 69.7; Dem. 18.149; 19.31, 223.11; 20.20; 23.109; fr.29.4).

Col.4. ll.3-14: the exhortation now turns specifically to the young component of the audience. The formulation becomes more articulated: first of all, the orator states that the young Athenians (who are τὰ | περὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἱκανῶς | παιδευθέντων, with a praise of the Athenian training in war) are both mentally and physically ready to undertake such a task. Then, to reinforce his argument and to persuade them even more strongly, he addresses their pride and says that their future brave actions will

prove that their past inaction was due to prudence and not to cowardice. Youth was surely an added value in war, for the Spartans even more than for the Athenians. Interestingly, Lycurgus (1.107) talking about Spartans' conduct in war, quotes an elegy of Tyrtaeus (fr.10 West), where youth is mentioned three times (ll.15, 22 and 29).

Col.4. ll.6-7 ἀκμάσαι...ταῖς διανοίαις: Kremmydas (2013), 159 finds reminiscences of Isocrates (8.145: τοῖς δὲ νεωτέροις καὶ μᾶλλον ἀκμάζουσιν...παραινῶ καὶ παρακελεύομαι τοιαῦτα), but they seem to be vague.

Col.4. l.8 τοῖς οἰκείοις σώμασιν: see parallels in Dem. *Epitaph*. 24.3 and Aeschin. 3.78.5.

Col.4. l.14 εὐλάβεια: similar praises of εὐλάβεια in opposition to boldness can be found in Demosthenes 19.262 and particularly in 21.10. Contrary to what is said in this passage, εὐλάβεια and ἀνανδρία are associated by Aristotle (*De Virtutis et Vitibus*. 1.1251a.14) where they are listed together as companions of cowardice, an association that will survive in later lexicography.

Col.4. ll.14-24: at this point, the orator reinforces his argument by anticipating the two possible disastrous alternatives to taking action: the Athenians will either be forced to obey someone else – contrary to the concept of hegemony, always present in Athenian propaganda (see commentary on P.Oxy. 2.216) – or risk perishing for the lack of forces.

Col.4. l.18 καταδεέστερον: the neuter comparative of καταδεής used adverbially and meaning 'inadequately' is first attested in Isocrates and widely employed by him (e.g., 5.18.7; 6.67.7; 7.8.4; 10.12.5). Here, it rather has a quantitative than a qualitative meaning, as the orator is pointing out the risk of an inadequate number of soldiers, and surely does not want to diminish the value of the Athenians in battle (which would contradict the previously praised training in war).

Col.5. ll.1-16: the orator re-proposes the theme of σωτηρία (l.105, before at ll.49 and 66) and associates it to ἀσφάλεια (l.103, stability, caution), a security guaranteed by the right conduct, which is the one recommended by the orator. This is followed by a reference to the valorous actions of the Athenians at Marathon and Salamis, so great that it would be unbelievable for the Athenians not to be in charge now (again the term used is ἡγεμονίαν, – on which see commentary on P.Oxy. 2.216). Then, the orator goes back to the main theme of this section, which is safety, and reminds his audience that the only way to have it is to make efforts in order to obtain it, as it will not come spontaneously.

Col.5. ll.9-10 ἐν Μαραθῶνι καὶ Σαλαμῖνι: one of the most widespread commonplaces in Attic oratory (and not only Attic) is the reference to past glorious victories of Athens against the Persians in the battles of Marathon and Salamis. See, among many others, Dem. 9.3.36-37; 14.311.6, 312.8; 18.203-6; Aeschin. 2.75.5; Isoc. 5.147.3; Lyc. 1.80, 104, 108, 122. References to the glorious past are very common in oratory (see Stratocles' F1).

Col.5. ll.17-23: here we have the conclusion of the argument about safety. The general takes responsibility for it, and declares he is willing to put the safety of the Athenians before his own security. The opposition is again that of σωτηρία (of Athens) and ἀσφάλεια (of the general). The general is ready to give up not only ἀσφάλεια, but also of his χειροτονία, as he takes the risk not being elected because of the firm positions he is declaring in this speech. The argument is concluded with the orator's statement that he is in the frontline for the common freedom.

Col.5. l.23 κοινὴ ἐλευθερία: The expression κοινὴ ἐλευθερία and similar *iuncturae* are widely attested in Attic orators. In Isocrates (14.5) the common liberty is mentioned in opposition to servitude. In Demosthenes we find this *iunctura* twice: in 15.30 where the Athenians are called common champions (κοινοὶ προστάται) of everyone's liberty, and in 59.96 (although spurious), where those who fought during the Persian wars are said to have established the peace for all the Greeks. Another similar attestation is in Lycurgus (1.50) where the dead of Chaeronea are called ὑπὲρ <τῆς> κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας προκινδυνεύοντες. The last two examples show how the concept of a valorous and memorable death in war was considered the price of κοινὴ ἐλευθερία: further and clearer evidence is in Hyperides' *Epitaphios,* where this concept recurs with this meaning three times (7.40; 9.20; 13.40), and in the spurious epitaphios attributed to Lysias (44). Furthermore, Lysias uses the expression in the *Olympic* oration in the sense of 'depositing the peace' that is very similar to that of Ps-Demosthenes' 59.96.

2) BKT. 7.4–13 = P.Berol. 9781 (MP3 2511; LDAB 762)
Hermoupolis, 3rd century BC

Editions
Kunst (1923), 4-13.

Bibliography
Canevaro (2018), Cavallo (2009), 37; Edwards (1929), 120-1; Körte A. (1924); Kremmydas (2007).

Text

Col. 1

φῃ]μὶ προ [- - -]δ̣ε̣
οὐκ . . . ε[
γε κατὰ ταῦ[τα *ca. 10*]ν
ἐρρήθη τὸν τρόπ[ον *ca. 10*]ον
εἰδέ̣[ν]αι ἀδ̣ῦ̣ν̣[ατον *ca. 5* γ]ὰρ [5]
τῷ̣ν τοιού̣[των *ca. 10*]ει
ἀ̣[νέ]χεται . [
τὸν δῆμον [
συνδίκους κ[αὶ τῷ̣ μὲν βουλο-]
μένῳ προσ[*ca. 16*]το. [10]
πλεῖστον διαφ[έρει
τοῦ τοὺς ἄλλῳ̣[ς *ca. 14*]
κατακέχρη[νται . . .
[συ]νδικίαι κ[*ca. 13*].
[.]ᾧ̣[.]ε τω[*ca. 15*] [15]
τονο[*ca 16*]
π̣οφῄ[*ca. 15*]ν
τὸ[ν] δῆ[μον *ca. 16*]ν
[ν]όμον οὐκ [. .]τ̣[. .] *ca. 10*]
ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ἀλ[λοις *ca. 10* σ]υν- [20]
δικεῖν πλὴν ἄ̣π̣[αξ περὶ] δὲ [νόμ]ων
θέσ̣ε̣ως ἢ δοκι[μασίας κ]α̣ὶ π̣[ο]λλά̣
κις διδόναι· [*ca. 12*]γ̣α̣ι τ[ο]ύ-
των. οὗ̣τοι γε [ἐ]π[ὶ *ca. 10*]ω[ς
[σ]υνεδίκησαν·ὁ γ[ὰρ . . . . Δημ]ο- [25]
σ̣θ̣ένης δεῖξαι ε̣[*ca. 15*]
[το]ύτων κα̣[*ca. 17*]
[δ]έ̣δοται ἀρχ̣ὴν [*ca. 6* ν]ό̣μ̣[ος]
[πα]ραβαίνε̣τα[ι]· ε̣ἰ̣ τ[*ca. 8*]
[ὁμ]οίως πλὴν ἅπαξ̣ οὐκ̣ ἔ̣φ̣[η] [30]
γ̣[*ca. 15*] μὲν [
[αἴ]τ̣ιοι, οὐχ οἱ κα̣ὶ δ̣ι’ ἀ̣γ̣ά̣γ̣κ̣η̣ν̣ μ̣[οι]
[πε]ισθέντες· ἔτ[ι τ]ο̣ίνυν παγγ[ε-
[λοι]όν ἐστιν ὀνειδ̣[ι]ζειν μὲ̣[ν] Ἀ̣ρ[ισ]τ̣[ο]-

[φ]ῶντι, ἐφ’ οἷς σε̣[μνύ]νεσθαι δ̣ί̣καιον ἦν], εἰ τῆς ἀτ̣[ελεία]ς μετ[ὰ] τῶν [ἄ]λλων τετευχὼς οὐχ ὁρᾷ τὸ ἴδι̣ον ἐ̣πὶ τῷ μὴ τὴν πόλιν ἐλ[ασσ]ῶ̣σαι, νο̣μίζειν δ’ ὅτι λο[ιδ]οριῶν ἡσση-θ̣ε̣ὶς ἡ χάριτ[ος *ca. 6*]ταί τι τῶν

1 φη]μὶ *Kunst* | 2 [εἰπ]ε[ῖν *Kremmydas* | 3 ὀ]ν *Kremmydas* | 4 αὐτ]ὸν *Kremmydas* | 5 ἀδ̣ύ̣ν̣[ατον *Kremmydas* | 8 [χειροτονῆσαι νῦν αὐτοὺς] *Kremmydas* | 10 προσ[φέρειν αἱρεῖσθαι *Kremmydas* | 12 πως ἡρομένους οἵ *Kremmydas* | 15-16 [τ]ῷ̣[δ]ε τῶ̣[ι τρόπῳ τούτων χειρο/ύμενον οὐ δίκαιόν ἐστιν ἀ *Kremmydas* | 17 π̣οφή̣[νασθαι νῦν παρανομεῖ]ν *Kremmydas* | 18 δῆ[μον . . . κατὰ τοῦτον τὸ]ν *Kremmydas* | 19 [ν]όμον οὐκ [ἔσ]τ̣[ιν] *Kremmydas* | 20 τοῖς ἀλ[λοις οὐκ ἐξεῖναι *Kremmydas* | 23 ἐξεῖ]νᾳ̣ι *Kremmydas* : . . .]νῆι *Kunst* | 24 τούτοις δικαί]ω[ς *Kremmydas* | 25 ὁ γ[ὰρ ἄρτι *Kremmydas* | 26 ἐ̣[πεχείρησεν ἄδικον *Kremmydas* | 27 κᾳ̣[τηγορεῖν ὡς ὅτε ὁ δῆμος *Kremmydas* | 28 ἀρχὴν [οὐδεὶς *Kremmydas* | 29 ε̣ἰ̣ (*sic*) τ[ις ἡρέθη] *Kremmydas* | 31 γ̣[άρ (*sic*) οἷς οὐκ εξῆν] [οὗτοι] μὲν [εἰσὶν (*sic*)] *Kremmydas* | 30-40 ἡσση/θ̣ε̣ὶς (*sic!*) *Kremmydas* | 40 χάριτ[ος προήσε]ταί *Kremmydas*

Col. 2

τῇ̣ [*ca. 6*]μ̣[*ca. 6*]ων, καὶ >
τ̣ῆ̣ς μ̣[ὲν] γν[ώμης ἐπα]ινεῖν αὐ- >
τ[ό]γ̣, ὅτι ἐ̣τ̣ᾴ̣[ξατο τά]λαντα πέν-
τε, ἀνθ’ ὧν [Γέλαρχος] εἰς τοὺς ἀπὸ
Πειραῶς [*ca. 9.*]ι, ψέγειν >
δ’ ὅτι οὐ π̣ε̣[ριεῖ]δ[ε] τ[ὴν π]όλιν ἐπὶ >
τῷ τὴ[ν αὐτὴν πολλ]ο̣ὺς ἔχειν
μέχρι π[αντὸς ἀτέλει]ᾳ̣ν· καὶ >
>
μὴν οὐδ[έ Λεωδάμας] ἀ̣δικεῖ >
πε[ι]θόμε[νος τούτῳ τ]ῷ̣ νόμῳ
συνδικεῖγ̣, ο̣ὐ̣[δ’ εἰ μά]λ̣ιστα γρα-
ψάμενο̣[ς] τὴν Χ̣αβ̣[ρίᾳ δ]οθεῖσαν
ἀτέλεια[ν] οὐχ εἶλεν· ἄλλου μὲν
γὰρ ἔχοντος, Χα[βρ]ίαν ἀφηρῆσθαι
δε̣ι̣νὸν [ῃ *ca. 12*]ε ταλάντων
ὁ π[α]ῖ̣ς αὐ̣[*ca. 8* σπ]είσεται, συγ-
γνωσ[τὸν καὶ τότε] μὲν ἦν κα-
τ̣ή̣γορο[ς], γ̣[ῦν δὲ ὑπὸ τῆ]ς π̣όλεως
εἴρηται·[*ca. 9* μὲ]γ̣ ο̣ὖν ἀ-

ναγκα[ίως νῦν ἐσπ]ούδακεν ὅ- >
σῳ καὶ τ[. . . .] αὐτοὶ[[ς]] “οἵ” [[ἐν]]δόν-
τες, ὅτι ἐξῃ[πατή]θησαν, ᾐ̈σθοντο
καὶ τῷ δ̣υ̣[ναμέ]νῳ φανερὰν
τὴν ἐκε̣[ίνων κα]κουρ[γ]ί̣αν ποι-
ῆσαι ἐπέτρεψα̣[ν· ο]ὐ̣ το[ίνυ]ν οὐδὲ
>
Κηφισόδοτ̣[ον . . . . τ̣[. . . .] φη-
μὶ ἤ ταῦθ’ ἃ [*ca. 9*]εστιν
δὲ τὸ τῇ δε̣ι̣ν[ότη]τι [τοῦ λέ]γειν
εἴπε[ρ] ἔστι̣ τ[ο]ι̣ῳ̣[ῦ]τ̣ο[ς], ἐ̣π[ὶ σωτ]ηρίᾳ
τῆς π̣όλεως χρῆσθαι·ε̣[ἰ γ]ὰ̣ρ̣ ἀπε- >
χθάνεσθαί̣ τ̣ισι δεῖ, τοῖ̣[ς ὀλί]γοις, οἵ
πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα τοὺς π̣[ολλ]οὺς βλά-
πτουσι, δεῖ, οὐ τοῖς πολλοῖς, οἳ τοῦ-
το ἓν μόνον ζητ̣ο̣ῦ̣[σ]ι̣, μὴ ἀδικεῖ-
σθαι· ἀλλὰ μὴν Δεινίας ἔμοιγε δ̣ο-
>
κεῖ πο̣[λὺ κρ]εῖσσον [ἢ ο]ὗ̣τος αὐτῷ
παραινεῖ βεβουλεῦσθαι· τὸ γάρ, ἔνθα
δεῖ τῶν εἰσοισόντω̣[ν], μὴ ζητεῖν,
ἀνθ’ ὧν ὑπῆ[ρ]ξε τιμὰς αὐτῷ δοθῆ-
ναι ἀλ̣[λὰ] κ̣[αὶ] τοὐναντίον τοὺς ἐ-

1 τῇ [πόλει] συ]μ̣[φερόντ]ων *Kremmydas* (*sic*) : σ̣υ̣[μφερόντων] *Kunst* | 5 Πειραῶς [παρεσχήκε]ι | 6 π̣ε̣[ριεῖ]δ[ε] τ[ὴν π]όλιν *Kunst* | 8-9 *Kunst leg.* | 13 ἀτέλειαν : ἀτὲλοια[ν] *pap. et Kremmydeas* | 14 ἀφηρῆσθαι : ἀφειρῆσθαι *pap. et Kremmydas* 15 [ἢ[ν]] ἄν εἴη, ὅτε δ]ὲ (*sic!*) *suppl. Kremmydas* | 16 αὐ[τοῦ τινῶν σπ]είσεται *Kremmydas* | 19 [συνδικεῖν μὲ]ν̣ *Kremmydas* | 19-20 ἀ/ναγκαί̣ω̣[ς *Kunst* | 21 τ[έως] *Kremmydas* : τ[ὸ πρὶν] *Kunst* | 21 “οἵ” *leg. Wilcken* | 26 ἄλλο] τ̣[ι δρᾶν] *Kremmydas* | 27 ἃ [προσήκει· *Kunst* : ἃ [προσήκει· ἔξ]εστιν *Kremmydas* | 29 εἴπε[ρ] ... ἐ̣π[ὶ σωτ]ηρίᾳ *Kunst* | 32 π̣[ολλ]οῦς *Wilcken*

Col. 3

πὶ τὴ̣[ι] πᾴ̣[ν]τ̣ω[ν τ]ῶν πολιτῶν βλᾴ̣-
β̣ῃ τ̣[ὴ]ν̣ ἀτέ̣λ[εια]ν ἔχοντας σπεύ-
δει[ν ἀ]φαιρεῖσ[θ]α̣ι̣ φιλοπόλιδος καὶ

σώφρονός ἐστιν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔργον,
εἰ, οἷς [ἔ]γγωκε[ν] περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ >
τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας παῦσαι βεβού-
ληται· ἀλλ’ [ε]ὖη[θ]ές ἐστι θαυμάζειν,
εἰ τοὺς ἔξω [τοῦ π]ράγματος ὄντας
καὶ ο[ἷς οὐδὲν] δ[ι]αφέρει οὕτως ἢ ἐ-
κείνως τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐκβῆναι πλὴν
οἱμ[ι] τοῦ μὴ προδεδωκέναι δο- >
κε]ῖν τὴν πί[σ]τ[ι]ν, ἣν αὐτοῖς ὁ [δῆ]- >
μος ἐ[πί]στευσεν, ἀποτρέπειν τῆς
συνδικίας ἐπιχειρεῖ παραινέ[σ]ε- >
[σι κ]αὶ ἀπειλαῖς, ὅστις γε κἀμὲ τ[ὸ]ν
[το]ῦ [τον εἰσ]ε[νε]γκ[ό]ντα τὸν ν[όμ]ον
λ[*ca. 10*] κίνδυνος ἐπ[. . . .]ί-

[*ca. 16*] τ[ι] αὐτοῦ τοῦ [. .
. . .εἰσενη]νοχέναι δοκεῖ. [. . .
α[*ca. 12*] ἀποφαίν[ειν]
πε[*ca. 13*]ς συμφορᾶς ἧσ[σο]ν
[[ἂν]] γ[έν]οιτ’ ἄν; καίτοι εἰ τῷ διὰ το-
σαύτ[ας π]ροφάσεις ὀφείλοντι σπου-
δάζ[ειν σ]ὺν κα[ὶ] τοῖς ἡρημένοι[ς]
ὑπὸ τ[οῦ δή]μου συν[δ]ίκοις ὅμως ἀποστα-
τέον [. . . .] ὦ Δημόσθενες, ποιῶ
δίκαιο[ν, εἰ] κα[ὶ [βο]υ[λ]ὴν συνεβού- >
λευσ[α .]η[*ca. 14* εμίαν εὔλο-
γον [*ca. 6*]κ[. . . . ὑπὲρ] τοῦ νόμ[ου].
οὔτε γὰρ [. .] γε περὶ δό[ξης] ἢ τῆς ἐπι-
τιμ[ί]ας κινδυν[εύ]ων ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἦ-
κεις οὔτε ὑπὸ β[ουλ]ῆς αἱρεθεὶς ἢ δή-
μ[ο]υ δεινὸν νο[μί]ζεις ψεῦσαι τῶν
ἑλομένων τὰ[ς ἐ]ν σοὶ ἐλπίδας, ἀλ-
λὰ καὶ τοῖς ὑπὸ σοῦ πεπραγμένοις
καὶ ἐφ’ οἷς σ[εμ]νύνηη μέγα, ἐναν-
τία ποιεῖς κατηγορῶν τοῦ νόμου·

—

ἢ τῶν πρ[ί]ν σοι φιλοτιμιῶν ἐπιλ[έ]-

ληsαι ἡνίκα ὁρῶ̣ι κατὰ [τ]ὸν πα-
λαιὸν νόμο̣ν ̣συ̣νε̣κ̣καίδεκα αἱρου- [40]
μένους ἐπὶ ̣τ̣ὴν τριήρη καὶ τούτους
τὸ ἴσον ἕκαστον σ[υ]ντελοῦντας >

17-18 λ̣[οιδορεῖ ᾧ̣ καὶ] κίνδυνος ἐπ[ιτιμ]̣ί/[ας εἰ παράνομόν] *Kremmydas* : δ̣[ιαβαλλει . . . . .] κίνδυνος ἐπ[. . .] *Kunst* | 18 τ̣[ι] αὐτοῦ *Kremmydas* | 18-19 [νό-][μου εἰσενη]ν̣χέναι δοκεῖ *Kremmydas* : . . . εἰσενη]ν̣χέναι *Kunst* | 19-20 [τοι-]α[ῦτα δὲ ἀδίκως] *Kremmydas* | 21 πε[ρὶ τούτων ποιά]ς *Kremmydas* : ο]ὐδεμ[ιᾶ]ς *Kunst* | 24 ἠρημένοι[ς] : εἰρημένοι[ς] *pap. et Kremmydas* | 25 "ὅμω̣ς" *Kunst* | 26 [ἐστ]ι̣ *Kremmydas* | 28 μ]η̣[δέποτε μηδ]εμίαν *Kremmydas* | 29 [νῦν εἰρη]κ[έναι] ὑπὲρ] τοῦ νόμ[ου] *Kremmydas* | 30 σὺ *suppl. Kremmydas*

Col. 4

τῷ̣ πολλὰ κεκτ[ημέν]ῳ̣ τὸν ὀ-
λίγα, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἀπ̣[όρο]υ̣ς [ἐπιτ]ρι-
βομένους, τοῖς εὐπό[ροι]ς δὲ κατὰ
πολλὴν ῥ̣αστώνην τ[ε]λουμέ- >
νας τ̣ὰ̣ς λειτουργίας νόμ̣ον εἰσ- [5]
ήνεγκας εἰς τὸν τριηρ[αρ]χικὸν
συντελεῖν μὲν ὥ̣σπερ π̣ρ̣ό̣τ̣ερο̣ν̣
[εἰς τὰ]ς τριηραρχ̣ίας, μηκέτι δὲ
ἴ[σον] ἕκαστον, ἀλ̣[λ]ὰ πρὸς τ̣ὰ̣ τι-
[μή]ματα τῶ̣ν̣ [ο]ὐσιῶν τὸν [10]
πολλὰ κεκτημέ[ν]ον [π]ολλά,
τὸν ἧσ[σ]ῳ̣ κατὰ λό[γ]ο[ν], ἐ[ξ] οὗ μι-
ᾶς κα[ὶ] δ[υο]ῖν ἐφάν[η] τ̣ριήρ̣α̣ρχος
ὁ πρότερο̣ν̣ ἔκτος ̣καὶ δ̣[έ]κατος
συντελής·καὶ κριθ̣εὶς παρανό- [15]
μων ἀπέ̣φυγες· ε[ἰκ]ό̣τως, οὐ γὰρ
τὸ τῶν ὀλίγων κ[αὶ π]λ[ουσί]ων εἴ-
λου οὐδ' ἵνα μὴ ἀ[π]ε̣[χθάνῃ] τισὶ
προ̣[ὔ]δωκας τοὺς [πολλοὺς]· τ[ότε]
μ̣[ὲν] οὖν̣ καλῶς ἐφ[αίνου τ]αῦ- [20]
τ̣α ποιῶν καὶ ἀξί[ως ἐπ'] ᾳ̣ὐ̣-
τοῖς σεμνύνεσθαι· νῦ[ν μ]έντοι
γε ἀπορῶ, τί παθὼν τἀναν̣τί-
α̣ βιάζ̣η̣· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ᾳ̣ὐ̣δ̣[ρὸ]ς ἐ̣-

[πὶ] τῆς ᾰ̣ὐτῆς γνώμ̣[ης] μέ[νο]ῡ̣τος
[π]ᾰ́λαι μὲν καὶ μηδ[ενὸς ἄλ]λ̣ου
[*ca. 6*]ος αὐτὸν ἄρχ[ειν το]ὺ̣ς
[πλο]υ̣[σίου]ς ᾰ̣́γειν εἰς τ̣ὸ [*ca. 7*]
[*ca. 6*], νῦ̣ν̣ δὲ μᾶ[λλον τοῖς]
[.]ᾰ̣υ[*ca. 7*]ου[.]ι συγχ[*ca. 6*]α[.
τ̣[ό]τ[ε μὲν] κατὰ τῶν̣ [ὅ]σ̣α κ[αὶ π]έ-
νξτε[ς δ]ιδόντων, μηδὲν πλ̣[έον]
διδό[ντ]ων γε ἀγανακτεῖν καὶ
νόμο[ν] εἰσφέρειν, νυνὶ δὲ ὅ̣π̣ως
πλουτοῦντές τινες πρὸς τῶ̣[ι]
π̣ᾰ̣ρελθόντι χρόνῳ μηδ̣ὲ τοῦ
λοιποῦ μηδὲν εἰσοίσουσι σ̣π̣ο̣υ- >
δάζειν̣ κ̣αὶ ἡμῶν κατηγο[ρε]ῖ̣ν.

—

εἰ γάρ ποτε νομοθετεῖν̣ ἔδ̣ει, νῦ̣[ν]
ἔδει, καὶ εἴ, περὶ τῶν εἰς τὰς λ̣ε̣[ι]-
τ̣ο̣υ̣ργίας ἀγομένων, ἀλλ’ οὐχ ὑ̣- >
πὲρ τοῦ τἀναντία τοῖς πρ̣ο̣[τ]έ̣ρ̣οις

18 ἀ[π]ε̣[χθάνῃ] *Kremmydas* : ἀπε̣[χθάνῃ] *Kunst* | 19 [πολλόυς] *Kunst, Kremmydas* | 27 [βιάζοντ]ος *Kremmydas* | ἄρχ[ειν το]ὺ̣ς *Kunst* | 28 τ̣ὸ [: τ̣ὸ [ποιεῖν τὰ] *Kremmydas* | 29-30 [συντελεῖν / τὰ δίκαια *Kunst* : [ποιεῖν τὰ/δίκαια] *Kremmydas* | 29-30 [δίκαια], νῦ̣ν̣ δὲ μᾶ[λλον τοῖς] [τ]ᾰ̣ύ[τῃ πλουτ]οῦ̣[σ]ι συγχ[αίρειν, κ]α[ὶ *Kremmydas* | 32 πλ̣[έον] *Kremmydas*

Col. 5

ποιεῖν· ἀ[λλ’] ἄ̣ρα δήλη τῆς μεταβολῆς
ἡ πρόφασ[ις]· ἡνίκᾰ̣ μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ εἷ̣[ς
ἦν ὁ δώσ̣ων χρήματά σοι, τὸ δίκᾰ̣[ιον
καὶ τὸ λυσιτ̣ελὲς ἑ[[ν]]ώρα{ι}ς καὶ μετη[ι]-
εῖς, ὁπότε δὲ ἔσχες τοὺς παρέξ̣ο̣ν-
τας, οὕτῳ τ̣ε̣ περιῆλθέν σε ἡ πλε-
ονεξία κ[αὶ κ]ατίσχυσε τοῦ ἐν σοὶ λο-
γισμοῦ, ὥστε καὶ συμφέροντος κᾰ̣ὶ
νόμων καὶ δ̣ικαίῳν καὶ πάντων
ὁμοῦ περιιδεῖν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ εἴ σοι ἐν
ἀδιαφ̣ό̣[ρ]ῳ [π]ᾰ́ντ[α] ταῦτά ἐστιν ἔ̣νε-

κᾳ̣ τοῦ τᾰ̀ς ἰδίους πλεονεξίας ἐᾳ̣
πλείοᾳ̣[ι τ]ῆς ἁπάντων σωτηρίας
τίθεᾳ̣θᾳ̣[ι], τᾳ̣[ύ]τοις “γ’” οὐ κατολιγωρ[η-]
τέον ἑαᾳ̣τῶν· ἔστιν δὲ καὶ πρὸς [15]
αὐτοὺς ᾳ̣[ἰ]πεῖν τοὺς ἀτελεῖς πολλᾰ̀
καὶ μᾰ́[τ]ρια ὑμῖν, ὦ ἄνᾳ̣ρες Ἀθ̣[η]-
ναῖοι· ε[ἰ μ]ᾰ́ν τις πένης ἐστίν, οὐ-
δὲᾳ̣ διᾲ̣ [τοῦτ]ο ἀναλώσει μᾶλᾳ̣[ον],
ἂν τὴν ᾲ̣[τέλει]αν ἀφαιρεθῇ· οἱ [πλου-] [20]
τοῦντ[ες δ’ οὐ . .]ς [ἄδ]ικον πε[ίσον-]
ται μικρᾲ [ἀπ]ᾲ̣ πολλῶν ἀναλίσκ̣ᾳ̣ν-
τες· ὃν μὲν ἐκαρπώσαντο χρό- >
νον, ἀφείησιν αὐτοῖς καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀ-
ναγκασθῇ[σ]ετ[α]ι περὶ ἐκείνου λει- [25]
τουργεῖᾳ̣, [ὑ]π̣ᾲ̣[ρ δ]ᾲ̣ τοῦ μέλλοντ[ος]
ὁ νόμος εἰᾳ̣[ενήνε]κ[τ]αι, ἐν ᾧ̣ τῶν
ἀναλωμᾰ́[των μετα]λήψονταί τι
δόξαν[τες *ca. 7* κ]ᾲ̣ι φιλοπό-
λι̣δ̣ες εἶναι, [βλάβ]η[ν] <δ’ ἄν> οὐδ’ ὁτῳ̣οῦ̣ᾳ̣ν [30]
ποιοῖντο· ὑμεῖ[ς μ]ὴ [. . .]τ̣ρέψητε τοῦ-
το ἐνθυμηθέν[τ]ες, [ὅτ]ι πάλαι μὲν
ταῖς προσηκούσαις γ[ν]ώμαις ἐρει-
σθέντα τὰ πράγμαᾳ̣τᾳ̣ τοῖς προγόᾳ̣ᾳ̣ι̣ς
ἡμῶν, εἰ καί τι ἔλαᾳ̣τον συνέβαι- [35]
νε γίνεσθαι διὰ τοὺς ὕστερον οὐ- >
κ ὀρθῶς πολιτεᾳ̣ομένους, ὅμως ἀ-
ναφέρειν μέχρ[ι] τινὸς ἠδύνατο·

—

νῦν δὲ π̣ᾰ́ντων ὁμοῦ τῶν ἀγόν-
των ἐπὶ τ̣ὸ χεῖρον αὐτὰ κατισχυ- [40]
σάντων καὶ αἱ γᾳ̣ῶμαι κεκάκων-
ται καὶ δέος ἐ̣σ̣τί̣, μὴ ὥσπερ ἐγ με-

21 οὐ . .]ς : οὐδ’ ὡ]ς *Kremmydas* 29-30 δόξαν[τες σώφρονες κ]ᾲ̣ι φιλοπό/λι̣δ̣ες *Kunst, Kremmydas* : δόξαν[τες σώφρονες χρῆστοι *coni. Kremmydas* | 30 [βλάβ]η[ν] *Kremmydas, Kunst* | 31 [ἐπι]τ̣ρέψητε Kunst [ἀνα]τ̣ρέψητε *Kremmydas*

Col. 6

γάλ[ω]ν [[τῶν πρὶν]] καὶ λαμπρῶν >
τῶν πρὶν ἡμῖν ἔ.ργων καὶ πρα-
γμάτων εἰς ταπεινὰ [καὶ] ἀσθενῆ
τὰ τῆς πόλεως ἦκται διὰ τὴν ἐ-
νίων πλεονεξιαν, οὕτως μὴ θε- [5]
ραπ[ευ]θέντα πολὺ χείρονα, μᾶλ-
λον δὲ ἀνήκεστα γένηται· ἓν δ' ἔ-
τι τοῦτ' εἰπὼν καταβήσομαι· ἥ-
κομεν γὰρ ἡμεῖς μὲν οὐ χρήμα-
τα, οὐ δόξαν, οὐκ ἄλλο τι αὐτοῖς [10]
λυ[σιτ]ελὲς ποριζόμενοι διὰ τοῦ >
νόμου πλὴν ὃ κοινῶς μεθ' ὑ-
μῶν ὠφεληςόμε[θ]α· τί γὰρ ἡμῖν
ἰδία[ι] πλέον, εἰ ἡ ἀτέλεια ἀφαιρε-
θήσεται, ὅτι μὴ πολλοὺς αὐτοῖς [15]
ἐχθρούς, οἷς οὐ πρὸς ἡδο[ν]ὴν ποι-
οῦμεν, καταςκευάζειν· οὗτοι
δὲ τἀναντία· [ἵ]να γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἐξ-
ᾖ κἀί μοι μ[ηδεὶς] ὑμῶν πρὸς
Διὸς χαλεπήν[η]ι καὶ παρὰ τῶν [20]
τὴ[ν] ἀτέλεια[ν ε]ὑρομένων χρή-
ματα πολλὰ λαβεῖν κα[ὶ] παρὰ
τῶν ὕστερον βουλησομένων
τυχεῖν αὐτῆς, τῶν τε νῦν αὐ-
τοὺς καὶ τῶν [α]ὖθις ἐλπίδων [25]
οὐ βούλονται ἀ[π]οστερεῖν· ἡ δὲ
[π]όλ[ις] καὶ οἱ ἐν [αὐτῇ] πένητες >
μ[εταξ]ὺ τῆς τ[ε ὑ]μετέρ[ας] ὑπὲρ
[αὐτῶ]ν φιλοτ[ιμ]ίας κα[ὶ τ]ῆς τού-
τω[ν] πλ[ε]ονεξ[ίας] κἀθ[ά]περ ἐν [30]
ξυ[ρ]ῷ, φασὶ δε . ε . κ[. .]ει [.] τα- >
λαν[τ]ευόμενο[ι δέ]ονται[ι] κ[α]ὶ ἱκε-
τεύ[ο]υσιν ἅπαντας ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑπα-

χθῆι̣ναι ταῖς τ[ού]τ̣ων τέχναις·

—

ἐπεί τοι εὖ εἰδέ̣ναι χρή, ὅτ̣[ι] καὶ αὐ- [35]
τοὺς προδώσε̣τ̣ε̣ ε̣ἰς ἀνήκεστον
ὕβριν τούτοις κ̣[α]ὶ τὴν ὁμοφρο-
σύ̣νην τὴν πά[ν]τ̣ας ἀνθρώπους
σώζουσαν <καὶ> ἰσό[τη]τ̣α τὴν ἅπαν-
τ' ἐκεῖνα τὰ σεμ̣[ν]ὰ φυλάττου- > [40]
σαν, λέγω δὴ θυ[σί]ας, π̣ομπὰς θεῶν,

39 <καὶ> *add. Kunst.*

Col. 7

ὕμνους, τἄλλ' ἃ καὶ π̣[όλεις] καὶ χώρ[ας]
σῴ̣[ζε]ι, ἐφήσετε αὐτ̣[οῖς] ἀνατ̣ρέψα̣[ι]·

—

ἐμοὶ μὲν οὖν εἴρη̣τ̣[αι] κ̣αὶ περὶ τ[οῦ]
νόμου τὰ δίκ[αι]α κα̣ὶ̣ περ̣ὶ̣ τ̣ῆς πό̣-
λεως, ἃ συνοίσει· ἀνάβη̣τ̣ε̣ δ̣ὲ̣ καὶ ο̣[ἱ] [5]
σύνδ̣ικοι καὶ μεμν[ημ]έ̣μ̣[οι τῆς
σπουδῆς, μεθ' ὅσ̣ης ἐχειροτ̣ό̣ν̣[ησ]ε̣[ν]
ὑμᾶς ὁ̣ δῆμος, τ̣α̣ύ̣τ̣η̣ν̣ τε̣ σώζε̣[τε]
καὶ μὴ διαψεύσητε τὴν π̣ίστ[ιν]
>

Commentary

This long papyrus fragment from Hermoupolis represents a very early example of rhetorical activity in Egyptian schools, as it dates back to the 3rd century BC. It is a *suasoria* aiming at reconstructing the counterpart of Demosthenes' speech *Against Leptines.* Leptines' law – the one according to which no one except for Harmodius and Aristogeiton's descendants should be exempted from paying liturgies – was widely used in Greek *meletai* as shown by Aristides (*Or*. 53-54, which, however, might be the work of the Byzantine author Thomas Magister), Apsines 1.64; 3.7 (232, 252-3 Spengel-Hammer), Syrianus. *Stas*. 162.24-25 (on the lack of corn supply because of the law, on which see also Philostr. *VS*. 527), Walz. *Rhet.Gr*. 4.717-8, see also Kohl (1915) 262-4. Kremmydas (2007) has provided a full and detailed literary and linguistic commentary on this text and has also re-edited it with some

corrections to the *editio princeps* of Kunst, and his own supplements. I have not had access to the original (under restoration), therefore I chose to follow the more conservative text by Kunst, unless stated in the apparatus.

When this text was initially published, its Attic style aroused the hope of many scholars of having found an unedited original piece of Attic oratory. But Kremmydas' observations (27-28) about the detachment of the author from the Athenian socio-political and legal context well show these are destined to remain hopes and nothing more: Kremmydas highlights the anachronistic allusion to the trierarchic reform (18.102-6), which was approved more than ten years later this trial, at lines 119-146; the dependance of Ps-Leptines' statement about his ἐπιτιμία (at lines 110-111) on Demosthenes' *Against Leptines* (144); the continuous references to the σύνδικοι which was not at all common in Athenian law court practice (see Rubinstein [2000], 131-47); the scarcity of personal attacks; the excessive focus on Demosthenes. Kremmydas admits the possibility that this piece is the work of a learned forger who wanted this speech to circulate alongside *Against Leptines* in the same way Demosthenes' and Aeschines' speeches about the process on the crown circulated together, rather than just a simple school exercise. However, in his opinion, a more convincing hypothesis is that this is the composition of a teacher as a model for his students, and this exemplar in particular would be the copy of an advanced student (as shown by some super-linear corrections). This long fragment tells us a lot about Demosthenes' *Nachleben* in the 3rd century BC, about the still lively attention dedicated to his model one century after his death, and the relevance of his oratory in the rhetorical schools of the period, despite the undeniable changes that oratory was inevitably undergoing already in the early Hellenistic era. It also shows how well and in detail information about Attic legal practices was employed in rhetorical schools, producing very accurate results (despite some anachronisms and mistakes); Canevaro (2013), 340, makes an on-point comparison between this practice and the one that led to the creation of the non-stichometric documents in the Demosthenic corpus.

The obvious Demosthenic model of this piece is the speech *Against* Leptines, but also the one *On the Crown*.

From a stylistic point of view, what strikes the reader is the use of very long sentences, only occasionally alternating with short ones – in an almost excessive imitation of the Demosthenes' style. The language and style are overall Attic, the vocabulary is that of Attic forensic language, and the author seems to have a predilection for conditional constructions, and participial sentences in general. Kremmydas notices that the employment of infinitival constructions is a sign of the fact that despite the strong Attic tendencies of the author, the Greek language was evolving towards the *koinè*. Finally, Kremmydas points out that towards the end of the speech we find medical terminology (κεκάκων/ται ,col.5. ll.41-42; ἀσθενῆ, col. l.3; θε/ραπ[ευ]θέντα, col.6. ll.5-6; ἀνήκεστα, col.6. l.7), which is often found in Demosthenes (see Wooten [1979]).

Kremmydas's division of the speech (which shows parallels in the structure with Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*) explains its content very well:
1) The *syndikoi* (commissioners)[338] of Leptines' law, their participation.
2) Leptines' position opposing Demosthenes'.
3) Demosthenes' inconsistent political actions.
4) Demosthenes' greediness.
5) Concerns of the *ateleis* (those immune from liturgies).
6) Principles on which the judges should decide.
7) Conclusion. Leptines says the *syndikoi* should think about the good of the city and not private profit.
8) *Synkidoi* are invited to speak.

Col.1. l-19: the text in this initial section is badly damaged. According to Kremmydas' reconstruction, it must have been about the legitimacy of the participation of the *syndikoi* in the trial.

Col.1. ll.19-30: for an interpretation of the passage in the light of Kremmydas's supplements, see Kremmydas (2007), 38. This interpretation sees this as 'an alternative explanation' of the law on iteration of service as *syndikoi* cited by Demosthenes at 20.152 in order to highlight the illegality of their participation in this trial.

Col.1. ll.32-33 δι' ἀνάγκην μ[οι]/ [πε]ισθέντες: this expression to indicate supporters has parallels in Demosthenes (20.144). The element of necessity is used in contrast with the allegation of bribery which [πε]ισθέντες might seem to imply.

Col.1. l.35-Col.2. l.3: the order with which Leptines presents the *syndikoi* is slightly different from that in Demosthenes' *Against Leptines*, as he presents Aristophon, the most recognisable, first.

Col.1. l.39 λο[ιδ]οριῶν: the term λοιδορία (and related verb λοδορέω, see col.3. l.17) is widely attested in Attic oratory (Antiphon, Andocides, Isaeus, Lysias, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Dinarchus, and Hyperides).

Col.1. l.33-Col.2. l.18: Aristophon is praised for his civic spirit, as he cared more for the State than for his own *ateleia*. This praise mirrors Demosthenes' mild criticism mixed with elements of praise of him at 20.148-9.

[338] In Athens, five *syndikoi* were elected by the assembly with the purpose of defending a law against accusation of γραφὴ παρανόμων. See Rubinstein (2000).

Col.2.30-31 ε̣[ἰ γ]ὰ̣ρ̣ ἀπε/χθάνεσθαί τ̣ισι δεῖ: the same expression is in Dem. 20. 150, but the meaning of the sentence that follows is quite different: Demosthenes is suggesting that Cephisodotus' enemies are those who injure the people, not those who give benefits to them, while Leptines adds they should be few who are oppressed by the many.

Col.2. l.35-col.3. l.7: the positive opinion about Deinias opposes Demosthenes' negative image of him at Dem. 20.151.

Col.2. l.38. τῇ δει̣ν[ότη]τι [τοῦ λέ]γειν: with this expression, Leptines is praising the oratorical skills of Cephisodotus. Kremmydas notes that δεινότης is usually used in Attic orators with reference to opponents (Dem. 18.243; 19.126; Lyc.1.31; Aeschin. 2.43), while here Leptines is on the side of Cephisodotus. Both passages use the verb παραινέω.

Col.3. l.3 φιλοπόλιδος: see Demosthenes (18.20).

Col.3. ll.7-27: This passage either shows an attempt by the writer to twist the actual events in order to stress his point, or (less probably) his ignorance of the facts: Leptines talks about the danger that he is facing for having proposed the law, while Demosthenes does not incur any risk. This claim was debunked by Demosthenes (20.144), when he said the legal period had elapsed, and now the main concern would be with the law, as its proposer would run no risk.

Col.3. ll.27-29: according to Kremmydas's reconstruction (see apparatus), this sentence was meant to state that Leptines never served in the *boulé*.

Col.3. l.34-Col.5. l.15: this entire section moves the focus from Leptines and the *syndikoi* to Demosthenes, and includes an attack on Demosthenes' present and past (in the undocumented view or the writer) conduct, based on the two main points of his inconsistent and contradictory political behaviour, and his greediness that led him to put his own interests before the State. The invective is strong and carried on at length. In arguing that Demosthenes, in opposing the law, is inconsistent, Leptines uses as an example the trierarchic reform proposed by Demosthenes in 340 BC, which stated that only the three richest people of each *symmoria* should pay naval charges (on trierarchic laws see Gabrielsen [1994]). If Demosthenes were consistent, according to Ps-Leptines, he would certainly not object to a reform that goes in the same direction (that of favouring the many), as the trierarchic reform of 340. But this accusation shows a patent anachronism, as Demosthenes' *Against Leptines* was pronounced at the beginning of Demosthenes' career, in 355/4, around 15 years before the trierarchic reform, when Demosthenes was not as famous as he was in 340, and did not attract all the public attention and scrutiny that Ps-Leptines is implying he attracted.

Col.3. l.39-Col.4.24: The trierarchic law is described in great detail, which shows that the author of the speech, despite his confusion about the chronology of the events he talks about, was at least very well informed about legal practices (see the comparison with non-stichometric documents in the Demosthenic corpus in Canevaro [2013], 340). Kremmydas believes that the detailed knowledge of the trierarchic law that the author of this piece appears to have might have derived from Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (103-5). From this idea, a further observation arises: was the readership of Pseudo-Leptines able to identify references to Demosthenic speeches? If the readership was simply that of rhetorical schools, it is fair to assume that, at an advanced level, references to a text that had already become canonical in school teaching, such as the speech *On the Crown*, were for the most part identifiable.

Col.4. l.4 ῥᾳστώνην: according to Kremmydas, this is a peculiar word, taken from Dem. 18.45. The term, however, is widely attested in Demosthenes (6.27; 10.7; 20.28; 24.69; 45.5; *Ep.* 3.44) but also in Lysias (24.10; 49.85) and Isocrates (4.36; 9.45). Therefore, it seems a rather common word in oratory.

Col.4. ll.5-6 νόμον εἰσήνεγκας εἰς τὸν τριηρ[αρ]χικὸν: in the ψήφισμα inserted in Dem. 18.105 we read εἰσήνεγκε νόμον [εἰς τὸ] τριηραρχικὸν, where εἰς τὸ has been deleted by Boeckh, because it implies that Demosthenes' law concerned a trierarchic fund, which would not make sense. We could therefore choose either to delete the εἰς τὸν (where the masculine rather than neuter can be explained with the influence of νόμον) in this case as well, or better to accept that the author of this speech based his consideration on a forged document, like the decree in question. Considering Canevaro's fascinating hypotheses on the origin of non-stichometric documents like this one in Dem. 18.105, in relation to rhetorical schools (i.e., the environment in which this text must have originated), we might imagine that a common source presenting the same expression as the decree, νόμον εἰς τὸ τριηραρχικὸν, was known to the author of this speech. Canevaro (2013), 269, prints the text without deleting εἰς τὸ.

Col.4. ll.17-38: Demosthenes' inconsistent behaviour is expressed through continuous opposition of past and present (ll.19, 26, 31 τότε, ll.22, 29, 34 νῦν).

Col.5. ll.1-15: this section contains allegations of bribery against Demosthenes. Kremmydas considers it improbable that Demosthenes was bribed to oppose Leptines' law – especially considering that he was at the beginning of his career at the time of the trial, and he was not so famous as to be worth bribing in order to take a stance against a law. A better explanation would be that Aeschin. 1.3. 165-6; 3. 82, and Din. 1. 43, both accusing Demosthenes of bribery during the Harpalus's affair, were the sources for this kind of accusation against him.

Col.5. ll.15-30: this section seems to answer to Dem. 20.120-4 about the injustice of immunity being taken away from those who had it. But Ps-Leptines argues back that the reform is not retroactive. However, Leptines' law did, in a way, impose new financial burdens on those who had immunity in the past, so it was in truth to a certain extent retroactive. For more information about retroactivity in ancient laws see Kremmydas (2007), 45.

Col.5. l.31-Col.6. l.7: this plea to the judges re-proposes themes and commonplaces present in the rest of the speech, especially the decline in reputation of the State, due to the greediness of some politicians. Attic oratory is full of these kinds of references to πλεονεξία as avarice/greediness rather than just ambition. Among many instances, we find it employed in a similar way in Isoc. 8.7, 55; 12. 133; Is. 8.2; Andoc. 4.13; Dem. 18.64; 19.1; 26.25; 44.28; 45.67; 51.22; 60.11; Aeschin. 3.94; Hyp. 5.8. References and comparisons to the past are also quite common in Attic oratory (see Nouhaud [1982], but also Clarke [2008], and Westwood [2017]; cf. also Stratocles, F1).

Col.5. ll.33-34 ἐρει/σθέντα τὰ πράγματ̣α̣: a late expression, never attested in Classical Greek.

Col.6. l.7-Col.7. l.9: this section constitutes the peroration. The first-person plural is to be assumed as the collective voice of the *syndikoi* rather than a *pluralis maiestatis*.

Col.6. ll.8-9: ἓν δ' ἔ/τι τ̣οῦτ' εἰπὼν καταβήσομαι: this is an opening rhetorical formula also found in Dem. 20.154; 21. 184; *Exord*. 6.2.8.

Col.6. ll.11-17: this rhetorical question is particularly effective, as it ironically calls a benefit a negative situation, namely that of the hostility of some people towards the proposers, which the law will probably attract.

Col.6. ll.30-31 ἐν / ξυ[ρ]ῷ: the image of the city being on the edge of a razor between ambition and greediness is rhetorically particularly effective. The expression ἐν ξυρῷ appears to be quite late and is not attested elsewhere in Greek oratory. Kremmydas (47) hypothesises a confusion with the proverbial expression ἐπὶ ξυροῦ ἀκμῆς.

Col.6. ll.31-39: with the introduction of the term ὁμοφροσύνη (unity of mind) the author reaches a peak in his tone, mirroring Demosthenes, who instead uses ὁμόνοια at 20.12, 110.

Col.7. l.7 ἐχειροτ̣ό̣γ̣[ησ]ε̣[ν]: χειροτονέω, with the meaning of 'appointing' or 'voting', is well attested in Attic oratory, especially Demosthenes.

Col.6. ll. 8-9 τήν τε τῆς πόλεως ἀρχηγέτιν: given the following mention of 'the other gods', the reference is probably to Athena.

3) P.Yale 2.105 = P.CtYBR inv. 1729 = P. Dugit (MP3 2495, LDAB 4409) Thebes, Egypt, 1st century BC/1st century AD

Editions

Egger (1862); Egger (1863), 175-96; Jander (1913), 118; Samuel (1965); Samuel (1976); Stephens (1985).

Bibliography

Hobson (1963-1964); Dorandi (1991) 19; Stephens (1983).

Text[339]

Col. 1

]. . . . . ẹịṣ̣ạ̣ς μ[*ca. 5*]των πώποτε
]. . . . . ọυς τοὺς [τῆς] ἀνδραγαθίας καὶ τῆς
]. . . . . ẹṿḍ̣ύṣ̣ας ạ̣π̣ [. . .]. ως καὶ νῦν μ̣ὲṇ
]. . . . . ν οὐ δεῖ στήλην τὸν ἴδιον εαν
]. . . . . μ̣ε̣ι̣ ṇ̣ῦν ουδ . [. . .] . . κλ̣ạ̣ύσουσι ἐλθόν- [5]
]. . . . . ọṵ[. . .]ẹ̣ι̣δες αὐτῶν καὶ ἐκ
] . στη . . . . . .[. . . . .]οτε π̣ά̣ṇṵ τήκ̣ε̣ι̣ς
] . . . . . .[. . . .] . . . . [. . . .] . συνγνώμην εἶχες[
]ẋ . . . . [. .] . . . νον [. . . .]του θάπτειν τοὺς [
]. . . . . [. .] . . . . . [. . . .] . τοὺς φιλίους ἤ̣ξ̣ẹ̣ι̣ [10]
] . . . . . τοι . . . [*ca. 5*] . ς ἀπολογία πρὸς ταῦ-
τα δ]ημόσια μνήμα-
τα] . . . . . [.] . ṣι ἔχ̣ε̣σ̣θαι του[
] . ι̣ṣ . . . . . ṣμη μίαν ἀποπνεῖ μακρὰν στρατευ-
στρα]τήγ̣ọṇ. . . . . ἐκομίσθ̣ṇ̣ṣ̣ạ̣ν εἰς τὴν πεῖραν. [15]
] . λ. . . . . ι̣ουν σὺ κἀν λιπαρήσας ạ̣π̣’ ạ̣ṷ̣τ̣(ῶν)
] . . . . . χειν κατασταθεὶς οὐδὲ εἰδ̣ὼ̣ṣ̣ ὅ̣τ̣(ι)
] ἐξυβριζ . . . . [. .] . . . φας σαυτῷ ἐπειδήπερ τῆς πόλεως
]υρ . . . . . ṇ πρῶτον οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ τρὶς
] . α αυτ̣ . . . . . κ̣ạ̣τηγορεῖταί σου ὡς ἀπολογίαν. ἐτυ- [20]

[339] Readings by Youtie are in Samuel (1976) and readings by Koenen, Pearson, and Parsons are in Stephens (1985).

]ωτατη . . . . . αἱρήσομαι. αὐτὴ δὲ ἡ ἀπολο-
]μ̣ι̣ον . . ου . . . . . [.] . . ου τότ̣ε̣ ἐκεῖ̣νοι ταφῆς ἔτυχον
] . . τῶν ἀδικη[μάτων] [[περὶ]] τῆς τιμωρίας δέχονται κ̣η̣λ̣ί̣-
δα] . . . . . μηδὲ π̣α̣θ̣εῖν ἠθέλησαν ἀδικ̣ί̣α̣ν̣
] . τρόπον . . . . [. .] οὐδὲν εἶπεν ἀλλ’ εἰ μὴ ἐ̣θ̣α̣- [25]
]στρατηγῷ υ . . . . . [. . . . .] . . ἐπ’ αὐτῷ τοῦτο ἦν
] . . ων π̣ο̣λ̣ . . . . [. .] . . [*ca. 9*] . . τα π̣οιεῖν ἀλλὰ
]φ̣[. . .] . ο̣υ̣ν̣ . [

1 ε̣ι̣σ̣α̣ς *Egger, Jander* : ε̣ι̣π̣ε̣ς *Samuel* | 3 μ̣ὲ̣ν *Stephens*: α̣π̣ε̣ν *Egger, Jander* | 4 οὐ δεῖ στήλην τὸν ἴδιον εαν *Stephens* : οὐδεὶς τα [.] . ην τὸν ἴδιον ἐ̣α̣ν *Samuel* : οὐδεὶς τασ[ ]ην το ἀίδιον *Egger* :]ην το ἀίδιον *Jander* | 5 κλα̣ύσουσι *Youtie* : κλέπτουσι *Egger, Jander* | ἐλθόν Youtie: *Egger, Jander* | 7 οτε π̣ά̣ν̣υ̣ τήκ̣ε̣ι̣ς Samuel : ἐνηστεχυίας Egger, *Jander* | 8 συνγνώμην *Samuel* : α̣ν̣ γνώμην Egger, *Jande*r | 10 ᾗξ̣ε̣ι̣ *Samuel* : αξι *Egger, Jander* | 12-13 δ]ημόσια μνήμα/τα *Samuel* | 13 σ̣ι ἔχ̣ε̣σ̣θ̣αι *Samuel* :]οσι . . χῶσθαι *Egger, Jander* | 14 αποπ̣νι (ἀποπνεῖ) *Koenen* : απογνι (αποκνεῖ) *Youtie* | μακρὰν *Samuel* : μακρὸν Egger, Jander | 15 στρα]τήγ̣ο̣ν̣ *Stephens* | ἐκομίσθη̣σ̣α̣ν *Samuel* : νομισθεῖσαν Egger, Jander | 16 λιπαρήσας ἀ̣π̣’ α̣ὐ̣τ̣(ῶν) *Stephens* : λιπαρήσας . . μ(εν) *Samuel* | 17 εἰδὼς ὅ̣τ̣(ι) *Stephens* : εἰς ὤ̣ετο *Egger, Jander* | 20 κ̣α̣τηγορεῖταί σου ὡς *Samuel* | 21 αἱρήσομαι *Samuel* | 22 ου τότ̣ε̣ ἐκεῖ̣νοι *Stephens*: . . . νου τότ’ ἐκεῖνοι *Egger, Jander* : τ̣ο̣σ̣ούτ̣ο̣υ̣ς ἐκεῖνοι *Samuel* | 23-24 κηλει (κηλῖ)/δα *Youtie*

Col. 2

ἠγ]ω̣νίσατο σὺ δὲ μηδ̣ε̣ . . . [*ca. 14* δι]καστήριον. δι’ ο̣[ὓς εὐτυ]χ̣ῆ̣ νίκην ἔχ̣ο̣μεν (τί ἥ̣δ̣ι̣ο̣ν;) καὶ δι’ οὓς αὐτὸς σὺ περιγ̣ε̣ν̣ό̣-
μ̣]ε̣νος ἐλήλυθας οὗτοι νῦν . [*ca. 12*] . . . . ν̣ε̣σ̣χατ̣ [.] χ̣ει̣ ω̣νι (εἰσὶν) ἀπολελειμμ(έν)οι· ἵνα δὲ τεκμήριον ὑμῖν
γ̣έ̣ν̣[η]ται ὅτ(ι) οὗτος οὐχ ὥς φη(σιν) ἵνα̣ . [*ca. 10*] . [. .]χανε ἀγωνίζωντα̣ι τὸ κήρυγμα ἐποίησεν ἀλλ’ ἀληθῶς ὑβρί-
ζειν κ(αὶ) ἀδικεῖν ἐπηρμ(έν)ος σκέψασθ[ε] τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· <ἐ>νενική<κε>μεν ἤδη καὶ τὰ τῆς μάχης ἐξελήλυθει οὐκέτι δ’ ἦν
πρόφασις οὐδεμία βεβαιοῦν τοιαύτας ἀπειλάς. οὐκοῦν ἀναλαβεῖν ἔδει καὶ θάπτειν τὴν μ(ὲν) ἐκ τοῦ κηρύγματος ὠφέλειαν κ̣ε̣- [5]
καρπωμ(έν)ον ἤδη ἀδικίαν δὲ μήπω{ς} πραττόμ(εν)ον; ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἐποίησε τοῦτο· ὥσπερ δὲ δέον οἷς οὐδὲ κηρύπτειν ἔδει τού-

το[ι]ς ἐμμένειν, ἐπέθηκε τέλος τα[ῖς] ἀπειλαῖς καὶ ἀτάφους εἴασεν αὐτούς, δεινότερον πρᾶγμα ποιῶν ἢ τὸ τυμβω-
ρ]υχεῖν νενόμισται· οἱ μ(ὲν) γὰρ π̣[ερ]ισυλῶντες τὰ σώματα οὐ τὸ παντάπασι ἀτάφους εἶναι κατεργάζονται ἀλλὰ τῇ γῇ

γο]ῦν ἐῶσι· οὑτοσὶ δὲ μηδὲ ταφῆς [ἀ]ῤ[χὴ]ν ἐκείνους τυχεῖν παρεσκεύαζεν. καίτοι οὐχ ὁ̣ῖ χείριστοι τ̣(ῶν) στρατευομ(έν)(ων) εἰσὶν
οἱ] ἐ̣ν ταῖς παρατάξεσιν ἀ(πο)θνήσκυντες οὐδ' ὧν ὀλίγον λόγον ἔχειν ἄξιον ἀλλ' ὅσ̣ῳ δι' ἀρετὴν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν φιλοκ̣ά̣λ̣ι̣ῳ̣ [10]
θρ]ά̣σ̣ει πεπρωτεύκασι καὶ τὴν εὐδοξίαν ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν αἱροῦνται ὥστε οὐδὲ καταφρονεῖν ἄξιον οὗ δεῖ τῶν μ(ὲν) ἐν
π̣ο̣[λ]έ̣μοις πεπτωκότων καὶ τοῖς ἰδίοις κινδύνοις τὰ δημόσια αὐξησάντων. οὗτοι δ' οὖν `καὶ´ πάντων ἥ̣τ̣τ̣ο̣ν̣ι̣ τ̣ύ̣χ̣ῃ ο̣ὐ̣κ̣
ἀ̣[θ]λ̣ίως ἐξεληλύθεσαν πώποτε καὶ ἆθλον τῇ νίκῃ μ̣ε̣μ̣ε̣ρ̣ι̣σ̣μένο̣ν̣ ἀριστεύοντες ἀπέθανον λαμπρότατα· καιτ
. ¦
. . . .] . . . . τῶν καιρῶν . . . . [. . . .] καὶ τῶν κ̣ίνδύνων `τῇ´ τύχῃ <αὐτ>{.}ῇ̣ ἐπόμ(εν)<ος> ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐν μέσῳ πελάγει καὶ τὰς ν̣α̣ῦ̣ς
ἀ]ν̣τ̣έταττε τοῖς πολεμ[ίοις]. οὐκ ἀπέτρεψε δὲ τ(ο)ὺς στρατιώτας το<ῦ> μὴ γενναίους γενέσθαι οὔτε ἡ θά- [15]
λ[α]ττα μετεωρίζοντα τὰ σκάφη οὔτε κίνησις ὁρμὴ νεὼς οὔτε στρατηγοῦ κήρυγμα φοβερώτατον, ἀλλ' ὁ̣π̣ό̣-
τ[ε] προσέμιξαν τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐπεμβαίνοντες ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς κ(αὶ) τὰς ναὺς ἀναδούμ(εν)οι τὰς ἐκείνων καὶ τὰ
π[λ]ηρώματα ἀποσύροντες, οὕτως ἔπιπτον ἄνδρες ἀγαθοὶ γινόμενοι καὶ οὐχ ὅτι μὴ ταφῆναι ἀλλὰ
μ̣[η]δ' ἀποθανεῖν ἄξιοι. [ὁ] δ̣ὲ στρατηγὸς ἀψευδεῖν ᾤετο δεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς κεκηρυγμένοις καὶ κατέλιπεν αὐτῶν
τὰ] σ̣ωματα ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάττης περὶ τὰς ναῦς εἱλούμενα καῖ τῷ̣ κλύδωνι μόνον οὐκ ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς [20]
ἀνατιθέμενα πάλιν ἀπεωθεῖτο ὁ στρατ<ηγ>ὸς. καίτοι τί περὶ νεκρῶν μόνον κατηγορῶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἢ̣
περὶ σωμάτων ὀλοφύρομαι; ἦν τις ἄρα ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ τετρωμένος μόνον καὶ ἡμιθανής ἀ̣λ̣λ̣ὰ̣ ο̣ὐ̣κ̣
αὐτῶν φροντίδα ἐποιήσατο `ὁ στρατηγὸς´ ἀλλ̣ὰ̣ ἀ̣πέπλεεν ἐστεφανωμ(έν)α̣[ι]ς τριήρεσι ἐπὶ τῶν κυμάτων
αὐτοὺς καταλιπών. προσέτι δ̣' ἦν τις αὐτῷ̣ καὶ πολλὰ ἐπιθειάζων . . . . . τ̣ι̣ . . . . . η̣ι . . . . . .
ὁ δὲ ἔσπευδεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν καὶ ἤπειγεν καὶ κατέλιπεν ἑν τῇ θαλάττῃ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς μ(ετὰ) τ̣ῷ̣ν̣ σωμάτ̣ω̣ν̣ [25]
καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἔθαψε τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ζῶντας ἐφόνευσεν. εἰ δέ τις ἄρα καῖ π̣α̣ρ̣ιούσης νε-
ὼς τῆς κώπης ἐπελάβετο τοῦτον ἀπερ<ρ>ίπτ̣ε̣ι̣· πάλιν δ̣ὲ̣ κ̣α̣μάτων ἡττώμ(εν)οι πεσόντες ἐπν[ί]γ̣η̣[σαν].
π̣ε̣ρ̣ι̣έπλευ̣σ[ε δέ τ]ις τριήραρχος ἐξ ἐκείνων καὶ τοὺς πεπτωκότα̣ς̣ [*ca. 5*] . . ἀ̣ν̣ἑ̣καβεν . . . ἡ̣γ̣ε̣μ̣ώ̣ν̣
.] . . η̣ν̣[. . . . .] . . . ἐκείνων νεκροὺς μὴ κ̣ε̣ῖ̣σθαι τι . [*ca. 5*] . . . . . ἐν τῇ μ(ὲν) [. . .] . νῶ
ca. 50] . [*ca. 50* [30]
. . . . . .
. . . . .]ς̣ ν̣α̣υ̣ς̣ . . ε[. . .]ν καταλείπων ἐν θαλάττῃ . . . . . [*ca. 5*]οι δε . . . . . νται . . . . . .μμε-
νον τὰς ναῦς στρέφοντες καὶ πλεόντες ὡς ἡμᾶς μετὰ κενῶν πληρωμάτων . . . . . [
ἐπ' ἐκείνης τῆς θέας οἱ στρατευόμ(εν)οι μόνοι κατεπενθήσαμεν καὶ τὴν ὄψιν οἰκτρῶς ἠνέγκ[α-
μεν. οι . [ ] δὲ καὶ περὶ τὸν κ̣α̣τ̣ά̣πλουν τὸν ε̣ἰ̣ς̣ τ̣ὴ̣ν̣ π̣ό̣λ̣ι̣ν̣ ἦ̣ν̣ ἀπήντων ἕκαστος κομιούμ[ε-
νος ἢ ζῶντα τὸν οἰκεῖον ἢ νεκρὸν ἵνα θάψῃ καὶ δημο[σ]ίᾳ̣ τὰ πρὸς τὸν τάφον καὶ . . . ας ἐπὶ τοὺ̣[ς [35]
λ̣ι̣μ̣ε̣ί̣ν̣α̣ς̣ ἐκόμιζεν ἐπὶ πομπῇ τῶν ἀπολωλότων. ὡς δὲ περὶ τὴν ἐκκο̣μ̣ι̣δ̣ὴν̣ καὶ ο̣ . δ̣ε̣ι̣ . [

εφέρετο τεθνεώς·. . . . . ησαν ὑπὸ ἀγνοίας καὶ τοιοῦτοι λόγοι· ‘εὐτυχῶς νενικήκαμεν
οὐδὲ εἷς ἀπέθανεν’. ὡς δὲ `τὰ´ καⲕὰ τούτου στρατηγήματα διηγήσαντο οἱ ἀπονοστήσαντες, οἵⲁ ⲁὐ[τοῖς
ἦν οἰμωγή, οἷος δὲ τρόπος τῶν τοὺς οἰκείους ἀποβεβληκότων· ο̣ὐ̣ⲕ ἐ̣π̣ὶ̣ τὰ δημόσια μνήματα ἐφοί-
των οὐδὲ τὴν συνήθη τιμὴν τοῖς ἀπὸ πολέμου θαπτομ(έν)οις ἐκομίσαντο ἀλλ’ ἢ φασίν· [40]
ἐναγιοῦντες ἐπὶ θάλαττ̣αν καὶ ‘κατὰ τῶν κυμάτων ἐ̣γ̣χ̣ε̣ό̣μεθα’ καὶ ‘στεφάνους ἀνάπτω-
μεν ἐπὶ πετρῶν’. φεῦ, ὦ στρατιῶται καλοί, διεσκέδασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ ἄνεμος π̣α̣ν̣τ̣αχ̣ο̣ῦ̣ ⲕ̣α̣ὶ̣ μ̣[ετὰ
τῶν ναυαγίων ἐξεφέρεσθε καὶ ὡ̣ⲥ τοⲥ̣αῦτ’ ἐ̣ν̣έτυχον ὑμῖν ἐλυμήνατ̣ο̣ τοι̣οῦτος ὑμῖν. μή που
ἀντὶ τῆς ἀνδραγαθίας . . . ἐ̣ν̣τάφιον ὑμῖν . . . . . .κύματα καὶ στήλη ῥαχίαι. ἐπίγραμμα
δὲ ὑμῖν ὁ στρατηγὸς ἐπέγραψεν. ‘ὀυ θάπτω’. [45]

2 ἐλήλυθας *Samuel* : ἐλήλυθες *Egger, Jander* | οὗτοι νῦν *Stephens* : οὐ τοίνυν *Jander, Samuel* | 3 οὗτος οὐχ ὥς *Parsons* : τοῦ λόγου χ̣ὡς S*amuel* | 4 <ἐ>νενική<κε>μεν *Youtie* | 5 τοιαύτας *Samuel* : τοίαδε *Egger, Jander* | τὴν μ(ὲν) *Samuel* | 6 ἤδη Samuel | μήπω{ς} *Samuel* | 6-7 τού/το[ι]ς ἐμμένειν *Samuel* | 8 οἱ...π̣[ερ]ισυλῶντες *Samuel* | 9 [γο]ῦν *Youtie* : [ἔχε]ι̣ν *Pearson* | [ἀ]ρ[χὴ]ν *Youtie* | τ(ῶν) στρατευομ(έν)(ων(*Stephens* : ἐστρατευ{ο}μ(ένοι) *Samuel* | 10 [οἱ] ἐν *Egger Jander* : [καὶ] ἐν *Samuel* | 10-11 φιλοⲭ̣ά̣λ̣ῳ *Parsons* | /[θρ]ά̣σ̣ε̣ι *Youtie* : φιλο[κιν/δύν]ως *Egger, Jander* | 11 οὗ δεῖ *Youtie* | 12 δημόδια αὐξησάντων *Samuel* | οὗτοι δ’ οὖν *Samuel* : οὗτοι δὲ *Egger, Jander* | ἥ̣τ̣τ̣ο̣ν̣ι̣ τ̣ύ̣χ̣η *Koenen* | 13 ἀ̣[θ]λ̣ίως *Stephens* : ⲕ̣αⲕ̣ῶⲥ *Jander, Samuel* | μ̣εμ̣ε̣ρ̣ι̣σ̣μένο̣ι̣ *Stephens* : μεμερισμένοι *Parsons* : πεπαρασμένοι *Youtie* | καιτ . ι *Stephens* : καὶ τῷ *Samuel* : καὶ τὸ *Egger, Jander* | 14 <αὐτ>{.}ῆι ἐπόμ(εν)<ος> . . . . .*Stephens* : <αὐτῆι ἑπόμενος *Egger* : <ἦ>αὐτῆι ἑπόμενος *Youtie* | τὸ μὴ γενναίους *Samuel* : τὸ μήπω μείους *Egger* | 16-17 ἀλλ’ ὁπό/τ[ε] *Samuel* : ἀλλὰ ὅ/τε *Egger, Jander* | πλ[η]ρώματα *Youtie* : π[ερι]στρώματα *Egger, Jander* | 21 στρατ<ηγ>ὸς *Youtie* | ἡμᾶς ἢ *Samuel* : υμεισ ι *pap.* | 22 ἡμιθανής *Samuel* : ἡμιθνής *Egger, Jander* | ἀ̣λ̣λ̣ὰ̣ ο̣ὐ̣ⲕ *Youtie* | 24 δ’ ἦ̣ν̣ τις *Koenen* : μ̣ε̣ν̣ τις *Youtie* | επιθιαζων (ἐπιθειάζων) *Samuel* | 25 ἤπειγεν *Samuel* : ἀπεῖπεν *Egger, Jander* | μ(ετὰ) τῶν σωμάτων *Egger, Jander* : μ(ετὰ) τὰ σώματα *Samuel* | 26-27 καὶ π̣αριούσης νε/ὼς *Samuel* | 27 ἐπελάβετο *Samuel* : ἐπέλαβεν *Egger, Jander* | ἀπερ<ρ>είπει *Stephens* : απερειπται (ἀπέριπτε) *Samuel* | πάλιν δ̣ὲ̣ κ̣αμάτων ἡττώμ(εν)οι *Youtie* : [κμά]των *Jander* | ἐπν[ι]γῆ[σαν] *Youtie* | 28 π̣ε̣ριέπλευ̣σ̣[ε δέ τ]ις *Stephens* : [π]εριέπλεε̣ν̣ [δὲ] εἷς *Youtie* 29] . . . ἐκείνων νεκροὺς μὴ κ̣ε̣ῖ̣σθαι *Samuel* : τοὺς ἐκείνων νεκροὺς μὴ κ[αίε]σθαι *Egger* | 31 καταλείτων *Youtie* | 32 ν̣ον τὰς *Stephens* : μ̣ο̣ν̣ τὰς *Samuel* : αν τὰς *Egger, Jander* | ὡς...π̣λ̣ηρωμάτων *Youtie* | 33 θεὰς *Youtie* | κατεπενθήσαμεν *Youtie* : κατεσώθησαν μὲν *Egger, Jander* | 33-34 ἠνέγκ[α]μεν *Samuel* | 34 περὶ τὸν κ̣α̣τ̣ά̣πλουν *Youtie* | π̣ό̣λ̣ιν ην *Samuel* : [Αἰ]γίνην *Egger* | 35 ἢ νεκρὸν *Samuel* | 36 καὶ ὃ ἔ̣δ̣ει *Samuel* | 37 ἀγνοίας *Egger, Samuel* | εὐτυχῶς νενικήκαμεν *Samuel* | 38 καⲕὰ *Pearson* : κατὰ S*amuel* | οἵⲁ ⲁὐ[τοῖς *Stephens*: οἵⲁ λυ[γρὰ] *Samuel* | 39 οὐⲕ *Samuel* : ο̣ὐ̣δ *Jander* | 40 ἀλλ’ ἢ *Samuel* | φασίν *Koenen* | 41 ἐ̣γ̣χ̣ε̣ό̣μεθα (ἐγχεώμεθα) *Stephens* : ε̣ἰ̣λ̣ε̣ό̣μεθα *Samuel* | στεφάνους *Samuel* | 42 ὡⲥ τοⲥ̣αῦτ’ *Stephens* : ὡⲥ τόⲥ̣αι *Samuel* : καὶ τότ’ ἄρ *Egger, Jander* | ἐλυμήνατ̣ο̣ τοι̣οῦτος *Koenen* : τοσοῦτο{ς} *Samuel* | στήλη ῥαχίαι *Samuel*

Commentary

This papyrus consists of twenty fragments, ten of which constitute two columns, and the *verso* seems blank. The text is to be dated back to the 1st century BC/AD on the ground of palaeography (see Stephen [1985], 54), as the ‘minute cursive’ in which it is written is found in documents dated

between 50 BC and 100 AD. Stephens notes that this kind of 'crabbed' and 'idiosyncratic and variable in shape' handwriting together with long lines is also found in *hypomnemata* and therefore suggest a private use for this copy. Moreover, we find some abbreviations which differ from those normally used in documents and are more similar to those in *hypomnemata* (Stephens [1985], 54). It is difficult to say whether this is a copy of a previous text or an extemporaneous composition (as supposed by Samuel [1976], 58 and Dorandi [1991], 19), as the spelling mistakes could also originate from the inability of the scribe to decipher a portion of text. Stephens (1985), 54-55, in particular, provides a piece of evidence for the latter hypothesis, as at col.2 l.14 there is a gap that could derive from the scribes' necessity to collate the text with another copy. I have not been able to see the original papyrus and, therefore, I mostly follow Stephens' edition, by whom I accept a number of supplements too.

The circumstances described in this exercise are strikingly similar to those of the battle of Arginusae, a very popular topic for μελέται, as also attested by another papyrus, PSI inv.22013, the nature of which (oratory, history, or novel?) is still debated; the theme of Arginusae is well analysed in Stephens (1983). Before Samuel showed that this long fragment belongs to the genre of rhetoric, its first editor Egger thought it was it was a historical account of the Arginusae trial. As well demonstrated by Stephens (1985), 55, this is not at all probable, because of the several differences between the events described here and the actual process as attested by the surviving historical sources (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.1-35; Diod. 13.101-2; Plat. *APolib.* 34b-c). The trial is here against only one general, not six; it takes place in a *dikasterion* and not in the assembly; the prosecutor seems to be one of the men abandoned by the general and not Callixenus; the dead are not buried because of a proclamation of the general stating that they would not be buried unless the battle were won, and not because of the storm; the storm occurred during the battle and not after it.

Given these data, it is more likely that this piece belonged to a declamation that had a loose connection with the main theme of the battle of Arginusae and could allow the composer to talk about the trial employing a certain amount of imagination. Exercises whose link with actual historical facts is quite weak are in fact attested in rhetorical handbooks (Powell-Barber [1929], 114-24) and examples relating to Arginusae are in a lost declamation by Aristides attacking Callixenus for not burying the dead, and mentioned by Philostratus (*VS.* 584), Libanius *Decl.* 45.1.55, Ps-Hermogenes (Περὶ ἰδεῶν 1.6.7-8 Patillon = 244-5 Rabe), Syrianus' commentary to Hermogenes, (Περὶ πραγματικῆς II. 176.2-4 Rabe), John of Sicily's commentary on Hermogenes (*In Hermog. Id.* Walz. *Rhet.Gr.* 6.215.1-6), an anonymous commentator to Hermogenes (Walz. *Rhet.Gr.* 7.2.959.3-15), and a sketch found in Sopatros, Διαιρέσεις ζητημάτων (Walz 8.223.11-15). The most interesting difference between P.Yale 2.105 and all these examples is that this papyrus appears to be the only one where the general is accused and not defended. There are also examples of declamations in which the topic is whether to bury the Arginusae generals (Walz *Rhet.Gr.* 4.734, 736). Another uncertain example of a declamation topic dealing with this process is, as said, in PSI Laur.inv. 22013 (see discussion below).

Whatever the exact date of this text is, we can say this is the earliest surviving example of the Arginusae theme for declamations. We do not know for how long this declamation circulated before it was copied – as stated above, the palaeographical data tend to exclude the possibility of an autograph and therefore the 1st century AD as a certain date – and if we consider the possibility that it was part of a handbook, it might have circulated for more than one century. Stephens' idea is that the piece should be dated around the 1st century BC, mainly because she notes that the author had a familiarity with the text of Thucydides, which was very popular in that period. She also notes occurrences of vocabulary that was widespread in the 1st century BC, but, on her own admission, this cannot be used as strong evidence to date the papyrus, since it is based on too narrow a selection of examples of rhetorical prose. Stephens identified other clues for a possible date in the similarity between the description at col.2 l. 12 and the description of the funeral of Pelopidas (Plut. *Pel.*24) – which would set 346 BC as t*erminus post quem* – and the possible adherence of the focus on a single legal issue like this to the stasis theory, formulated by Hermagoras in the 2nd century BC (see Introduction), but these two pieces of evidence are perhaps slightly arbitrary.

The oration seems well constructed and stylistically accurate. It seems to include two of the rhetorical features theorised by Cicero (*De Inv*. 1.98) for the conclusion of a speech – and widely present in rhetorical handbooks – namely the *conquestio* and the *indignatio*, when, in the end, the speaker tries to inspire pity for the victims (*conquestio*) and to blame the general (*indignatio*). The κήρυγμα mentioned at col.2 ll. 3-6, according to Stephens, recalls the one in Sophocles' *Antigone* (8; 161) against Polyneices. Most of the *topoi* of consolation during public funeral orations can be found in this text: the excellence of the dead people (presented throughout the whole text) and the value of their sacrifice for the public good (10-14), their unheard cries for help while the general sails away (14-27), the pathetic and sad image of the relatives waiting for them, believing that no one died and tragically finding out that in the end that nobody is on the ships (32-44). The ending (44-45) is full of bitter irony as it closes the oration with an epitaph metaphorically written by the general: οὐ θάπτω, 'I will not bury you', as Quintilian says (8.5.11) *'et addita in clausula est epiphonematis modo non tam probatio quam extrema quasi insultatio*'. Parallels with Attic oratory can also be found. An interesting one is at lines 9-13, where the opposition between virtue and fate recalls the words in Hyperides' 6.24. Stephens (1985), 68 notices how the absence of words referring to the Athenian democracy and citizenship, widely present in Hyperides, can be a good indicator that this piece was written for an audience of people who could not identify soldiers as fellow citizens. Another similarity underlined by Stephens, although less strong, is at line 6, where the use of verb καρπόω may be reminiscent of a pseudo-Demosthenic passage (Ps-Dem. 59.19).

The vividness of certain images, such as the drowning soldier grabbing the oar, or the dark irony in the relatives expecting their dear ones and imagining that no loss had occurred, and the inventiveness of the piece as a whole – as said, full of variants compared to the narration of historians – may open a reflection on inventiveness in Hellenistic oratory. Rather than labelling it 'decadent' in a simplistic way, it could be said that certain pathetic or unrealistic aspects of Hellenistic

declamations were connected to the possibility of "playing" with history in non-realistic contexts like that of composing school exercises (see, for instance, the otherwise unattested scenario presented in P.Schub. 32). A certain amount of fiction, moreover, already belonged to 4th century Attic oratory, as shown by Westwood (2020), 27-33. This allowed a certain display of cleverness, even when playing around with, say, funeral practices and funeral orations, as in this case (for a wider discussion of funeral orations, see Loraux [1981]). On *enargeia* (vividness) in *ekprhrasis* in rhetorical theory and practice see Webb (2009), 87-106.

Col.1: the placement of the three fragments composing it is extremely uncertain. Lines 1-7 (left fragment) clearly join with lines 1-9 (right), the fragment with ll. 8-11 (left) joins ll. 1-7 (left), but ll. 8-11 in the middle is not clearly placed.

Col.1. l.2 τοὺς [τῆς] ἀνδραγαθίας: a parallel for this expression is at col.2. l.18. It is typically applied to men dying in battle and showing their valour (see Adkins [1960]).

Col. 1. ll. 11-12 ἀπολογία πρὸς ταῦ/[τα: the speech in defence is the one by the general against his prosecution for abandoning his men without a burial.

Col. 2. l.11 σκέψασθ[ε] τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον: not uncommon in oratorical style. See parallels in Isoc. 8.131; 12.41

Col.1. ll.12-13 δ]ημόσια μνήμα/[τα: Stephens's interpretation is that the speaker may be implying that the general not only abandoned his men but prohibited a public burial, accusing them of cowardice (as probably implied at col.2. ll.9-13). The same concept is repeated at col.2. l.39.

Col.1. l.19 πρῶτον οὐχ ἅπαξ ἀλλὰ τρὶς: to confirm Stephens's assertion (based on an observation of Pearson) that this is a rhetorical commonplace (see Dem. 22.69; 4.47; 24.177, Din. 3.1, 16) there is the example of P.Schub. 32, ll.23-25, 'οὐ γὰρ] / ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δὶς [ἀλλὰ] / πολλάκις', probably to be dated back to the same period as P. Yale. 2.105.

Col.2. l.1 δι]καστήριον: as pointed out above, the Arginusae trial took place in the Assembly. This is the only attestation of a version where it takes place in the court.

Col.2. l.1 (τί ᾗδ̣ι̣ο̣ν;): a kind of rhetorical question quite common in Attic oratory (see Dem. 5.15; 8.24; 18.112.).

Col.2. l.2: .ν̣ε̣σ̣χατ̣ . [.]χ̣ε̣ι̣ ᾠνι**:** as Stephens (1985), 67 suggests, this was probably ἐν ἐσχάτῳ[ι] χ̣ε̣ι̣<μ>ῶνι, although the μ is missing in the text.

Col.2. l.6 ἀδικίαν δὲ μήπω{ς} πραττόμ(εν)ον: Stephens' reconstruction is that the general had based his own defence on the fact that his proclamation was meant to force his men to fight more courageously, and then did not bury them (and so committed ἀδικία) because they had shown cowardice.

Col.2. ll.9-13 καὶ...λαμπρότατα: this generic statement about the bravery and the immense value of those who fight for their country and die in battle gaining eternal glory, and where valour is opposed to fate, is typical of epitaphs. The absence of references to Athens, Greece, ἐλευθερία or δῆμος in general are, in Stephens' opinion, a reason to exclude an Athenian origin for this piece, or at least to suggest a context in which soldiers were not fellow citizens. One may see by contrast Hyp. 6.24, where the commonplaces are the same, but the focus is on the universal liberty of Greece.

Col.2. l.11 ὥστε...οὗ δεῖ: the construction is very difficult, but the reading suggested by Youtie, unlike other places of the papyrus, is fairly clear. Two emendations are suggested by Stephens (who, however, prints the text following Youtie's reading): οὐ<δὲ> δεῖ or οὐδὲν.

Col.2. l.13 ἆθλον...λαμπρότατα: a parallel is in Plutarch's description of Pelopidas' death (Plut. *Pel.* 34). Like the men in this oration, Pelopidas is said to have fought bravely against Alexander at Cynoscephalae, and so was honoured with a splendid funeral. Stephens' idea is that Plutarch and the author of our papyrus were imitating a common source, maybe a speech like those embedded in Thucydides' history. To reinforce her idea, Stephens quotes Diodorus (15.80.5) on the death of Pelopidas. However, the only actual parallel between the passage of Plutarch and l. 13 of this papyrus is the construction of ἀποθνήσκω with the participle of ἀριστεύω. Stephens also makes the peculiar observation that the assonance between μεμερισμένον in our papyrus and μεμιγμένην in Plutarch reinforces her point. Nevertheless, given the richness of commonplaces in ll.9-13 (and in general in this speech), it might be farfetched to imagine a common lost source, and it is perhaps simpler to imagine this was a construction common to topics of the sort.

Col2. ll.13-14: Stephen's suggestion for reconstruction is καίτοι [ἀμελ]ήσ̣α̣ς τῶν καιρῶν ([the general] was negligent of the opportunities...) and requires a full stop after λαμπρότατα.

Col.2. l.15 ἀπέτρεψε δὲ τ(ο)ὺς στρατιώτας το<ῦ> μὴ γενναίους γενέσθαι: Stephens conjectures το<ῦ> because ἀποτρέπω is never constructed with a double accusative.

Col. 2. l. 19 στρατηγὸς: the repetition of the title (also at ll.14, 21, and 23) stresses the role of the general, who should have behaved according to his responsibilities and buried his men.

Col.2. l.20 σωματα...είλούμενα: this expression seems reminiscent of Herodotus (8.12.1), where we read about a storm that wrecked the Persians off Euboea.

Col.2. l.22 ὀλοφύρομαι: Stephens's claim that this word is rare in Attic prose does not seem to be true, as the verb is well attested in Athenian writers such as Thucydides (6.78), Lysias (20.34; 29.4), and Plato (*Resp*. 329a). Interestingly, it often belongs to funeral orations (Thuc. 2.34, 44.1; Lys. 2.37, 61, 71, 77, 81; but also Plat. *Menex*. 248b).

Col.2. ll.24-26: the sentence follows a climax. The general ignores a wounded man, then someone calls for help, and finally, another man tries to hold an oar. This description is without doubt highly dramatic and pathetic, and the image of a person grabbing the oar makes it even more 'declamatory', patently fictitious. Pathetic descriptions of the sort can be found in the fragments of Timotheus' *Persians*, narrating the Persian defeat at Salamis, and in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (636-80), when the messenger employs very vivid images to describe the fall of Troy.

Col.2. ll.25: καὶ...ἐφόνευσεν: the structure of this sentence is chiastic, in order to create an opposition between the living and the dead.

Col.2. ll.28-31: this section has been badly damaged by a horizontal tear. It was most likely a turning point between the description of the events of the battle and the aftermath, when the enemy picked up their dead (striking that the enemy are better than the general!) and the general leaves.

Col.2. ll.31-32 . . . . . .μμε/νον: Stephens' possible restoration τὸ λε̣λει̣μμένον ('what was left') seems plausible.

Col.2. ll.32-34: from these lines, it seems that a few men (who would become the witnesses of those terrible events and, therefore, the speaking subject of this speech) were waiting for the general who was sailing away, and wept at the sight of their companions being left dead or dying.

Col.2. l.32 κενῶν πληρωμάτων: a very rhetorically effective oxymoron, stressing the valour of the men, who, despite being depleted, still show the signs of their fighting.

Col.2. ll.34-38: the image described is very vivid and tragic. After a battle, relatives were used to waiting for their family and expecting to collect their bones from a group coffin (one for each *phyle*), then they gathered and in groups reached the place where the burial would take place (see Jacoby [1944]). The tragic paradox of the case described here is that the relatives, when they did not see any coffin, thought the battle had not produced any victim, and they, therefore, rejoiced, without knowing that the bitter truth was that almost nobody has survived. Some dramatic literary descriptions

of messengers bringing bad news about the outcome of a battle could be seen as models for this paragraph. It is worth mentioning Dem. 18.169, where the orator describes the scene of a messenger bringing the news of Elatea having been taken, and of the Council members sitting at supper and rising immediately at the news.

Col.2. l.34 οι . [ ] δὲ: perhaps, as Stephens suggests following Pearson, οἵα implying ὄψις, meaning 'what a view it was…'. A similar construction is at ll. 38-39.

δημοσίᾳ… . .φας: Stephens hesitantly suggests τᾰ́φας, based on Thuc. 2.34 (δημοσίᾳ τάφας).

Col. 2. l. 36 ἐκόμιζεν: here, we find a singular verb where we would expect a plural. Stephens tries to explain it as an anacoluthon.

Col.2. l.38 στραταγήματα: the tactic of the general was to make a proclamation denying burial in order to make his men fight more bravely.

Col.2. ll.39-40 οὐδὲ…ἐκομίσαντο: a similar construction in in Thuc. 2.35.1 (ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐκ τῶν πολέμων θαπτομένοις).

Col.2. ll.41-43: according to the Athenian customs, the rites are performed at the sea's edge. Descriptions of these rites are in Sopatros (Walz, *Rhet.Gr.* 8. 226.28-30, 227.10-12), Plut. *Arist.* 21, for Platae, and *IG*^{3} 1006.26 for Marathon. On the procedure, see also Luc. *Bis Accusatus* 22.

Col. 2. ll. 41-42 στεφάνους…πετρῶν: sea cliffs are treated like stelae (see l.44, where it is explicit).

Col.2. l.42 φεῦ…καλοὶ: the person addressing the good soldiers seems to be the prosecutor who is pronouncing the speech rather than the relatives lamenting their losses.

Col.2. ll.42-43 διεσκέδασεν…ἐξεφέρεσθε: similar word choices are in Thuc. 1.54.1, where Thucydides is talking about the Corcyreans dead in a shipwreck, but I do not see the 'imitation' that Stephens alludes to.

Col.2. l.44-46 ἐπίγραμμα…θάπτω: the rhetorically effective mention of the harsh metaphorical epitaph decided by the general for his soldiers constitutes a perfect ending for the whole speech. On this kind of epitaphs see Quint. *Inst.* 8.3.5.29.

4) P.Schub. 32 = P.Berol. inv.7445 (MP3 2507, LDAB 4265)

Fayoum?, 1st century BC/1st century AD

Editions

Schubart (1950)

Bibliography

Merkelbach (1958), 126, Nr. 1153.

Text

εὐδαιμονία[*ca. 5*
τέρους ἀλλὰ[*ca. 4* τ-]
οὺς εἰληφότας[καὶ]
δικαίως ἂν ἀ[ποκο-]
μισάμενοι τ[*ca. 5*
ἂν διὰ τούτου[*ca. 4*
τοῖς εὐεργ[ετήμασι]
σῶσαι τὴν π[όλιν]
προθυμηθέ[ντες· ἀλ-]
λὰ τοὺς ἐξ Ἀρ[καδίας]
πρεσβεύοντ[ας·]
καὶ τούτοις π[*ca. 4*
μὲν καὶ πρ[ῶτοι Θη-]
βαῖοι πανδ [ημεὶ βε-]
βοηθήκασι[ν. τὰ δὲ]
τελευταῖα Μ[εγαλό-]
πόλιν συνοικ[ίζειν]
Λακεδαιμόνι[οι κε-]
κωλύκασι δο[*ca. 4* ·
καὶ μὴν οὐδ[ὲ ἄλ-]
λοις δυνατὸν[*ca. 4*
γιας τυχεῖν Θη[βαίων]
ὀλιγωρήσασι[ν, οὐ γὰρ]
ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δὶς [ἀλλὰ]
πολλάκις ὑπ[ὲρ ἄλ-]
λ]ων οὗτοι φαν[ήσον-]
ται] πολεμήσαν[τες]
καὶ πολλὰ μὲν [χρή]-
ματα δαπαν[ήσαν-]

τες οὐκ ὀλίγ[ους δὲ τῶν] [30]
πολιτῶν [...
...

5 τ[ὴν... *Schubart* | 6 καὶ *Schubart* | 7 εὐεργ[ετήμασι] *Schubart* | 12 π[άλαι] *Schubart, Merkelbach* | 17 συνοικ[ίζειν] *Berardi* : συνοικ[ίσαι] *Schubart*: συνοικ[ίσαντες] *Merkelbach* | 19 δόλοις *coni. Schubart* | 20 οὐδ' [ὧν παρ' ἄλ-] / λοις *Merkelbach* | 21 fortasse εὐλο]γίας *vel* χορη]γίας *Berardi* : συνερ]γίας *Schubart, Merkelbach* | 22 Θη[βαῖοι] *Merlelbach* | 23 ὠλιγωρήκασι[ν *Merkelbach* | 31 ἀπολέσαν/τες *Schubart*

Commentary

This fragment appears to be a piece of an oration containing an encomium of the Thebans, according to the editor princeps, Schubart, most likely a *suasoria* in defence of their courage. Location and date are rather uncertain, as it was almost surely purchased, with the obvious consequence of a total loss of its archaeological context. I accept several readings and supplements by Schubart and Merkelbach, and in certain instances I provide my own. Schubart dates the papyrus to the 1st century AD on the ground of palaeography (although he does not provide examples to support it), but this is a date it is worth discussing. The handwriting undoubtedly has some elements of the severe style ('strenger Stil', 1st-2nd century AD) with narrow ε, θ and σ, very small ο, and rather wide η, κ, μ, ν, and ω. Nevertheless, the serifs at the upper ends of the υ and at the base of the υ and τ look earlier: see among others some Ptolemaic papyri as P. Berol. 13270; P. Berol 18088; P. Petrie. 5-8; they are also present in the 2nd BC papyrus P.Laur.inv. 22013 (see commentary). Moreover, significant similarities can be found in a much earlier papyrus, namely P.Hibeh. 1.15 (see commentary)– dating back to the first half of the 3rd century BC –, another rhetorical piece containing an exhortation to be attributed to a general (perhaps Leosthenes). Here, we find similarly narrow ε and σ (but not θ), wide η, ν and κ (whose upper stroke is quite high, as in our papyrus), υ is quite open (although without the base and the curled ends), ξ is written in two traits, and β has a similar small upper bow.[340] However, the closest parallel for the handwriting (including, to a minor extent, the serifs in υ and τ) is to be found in PSI 9.1088 – dated to the beginning of the 1st AD solely on the ground of palaeography – which contains a rhetorical text, i.e. part of Isocrates' *Panegyricus.* In light of these observations and in the absence of more elements, we can provisionally hypothesise a date between the 1st century BC and the 1st AD for this papyrus.

To place this fragment in the correct historical and rhetorical framework, the material conditions of the papyrus may constitute a helpful element. The text is written on the *recto* (the parallel side to the fibres) of a papyrus roll whose *verso* is blank. The column is extremely narrow (10-12 letters), with a very wide upper margin and the remains of a left margin. The handwriting is very accurate and firm, the letters are spaced and clearly legible, there are no corrections, and the end of each

[340] Rather different are α (more cursive in P.Schub. 32) ω (open in P.Hibeh. 1.15) and φ (sharper in P. Hibeh. 1.15).

sentence is marked by a *paragraphos* placed under the first letter of the line containing the last word of the clause (ll. 9, 15, 20, 27). All these elements most definitely allow us to think of a book – a school manual if not even a more refined copy –, a finely produced book, rather than an extemporaneous exercise (on the subject see Cribiore [1996], 97-118), a hypothesis which is consistent with the possibility of a longer circulation for this text. A parallel can be seen in P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123, a collection of *progymnasmata* of sophistic encomia of mythological characters (see commentary): the handwriting (according to the editors to be dated back to the 3rd century BC on the ground of palaeography) is rather accurate, the grammar overall correct, and there are *coronides* and *paragraphoi*. Furthermore, papyrologists commonly accept as a general rule the fact that very narrow columns – as in this case – are on average typical of oratory (see Turner and Parsons [1987], 7), although Johnson (2004), 153-4 has shown that narrow columns are also widely employed for history and philosophy.

Given these data, the hypothesis that this constitutes a piece of a roll containing speeches from actual orators is still to be taken into account, and considering the material conditions of the fragment, it seems more plausible for it to be a piece of oratory or embedded oratory in history than a draft of no value. To strengthen this hypothesis there is the above-mentioned PSI 9.1088 containing Isocrates, which has a similar handwriting and *mise en page* (although the Isocrates' papyrus lines are longer).

Moreover, at the top of the very wide upper margin traces of ink are clearly visible, the handwriting is different from that of the text (the few visible strokes look bigger) and it is very difficult to decipher what is written. At a first glance, one may think of a marginal note or a title, but the ink looks different, and the fibres of the papyrus appear somehow erased at about half of each letter, as if the written word were neatly cut horizontally – moreover in correspondence of the traces of the second letter, just a few millimetres below, one can see another small trace of ink, perhaps part of the erased letter. A possibility is that the otherwise completely blank papyrus chosen as writing support for the book containing this oration had some sort of previously written text in that point, and the scribe tried to erase it manually (although unsuccessfully) in order to leave space for the upper margin. This would confirm the refined nature of this book, meant to be a good-looking copy and not just a scribbled manual.

The ideas evoked in this speech are typical of panegyrical oratory: the eagerness of the Thebans to help other cities, their moral and material commitment not only in their own causes but also in others'. A famous archetype for an encomium of the Thebans is in Demosthenes' oration *De Corona* (215), where the orator thanks the Thebans for three qualities: their courage, their loyalty, and their wisdom, all virtues that they showed in 338 when they welcomed an Athenian force into their city. A similar concept is in Stratocles' F3 (see commentary), where Agatharchides (*apud* Phot. *Bibl.* 250.447a) quotes a fragment of Stratocles where he talked about the friendship between Athens and then Theban, then fallen in disgrace. If the reconstruction is correct, the episode used here as an example of their courage is their support to the foundation of Megalopolis by the Arcadians (Diod.

Sic. 15.72.1-4) – the city was founded as a centre of power to oppose the Spartans between 371 and 368 BC, under the encouragement of the Theban general Epaminondas.

The text we have is not entirely clear as there is no historical source saying that the Spartans ever tried to prevent this foundation as the fragment seems to state – if the incomplete word Λακεδαιμονι[...] is to be intended as a nominative. If this piece is really a rhetorical exercise, it is then possible that this unrealistic scenario was part of the theme of a *suasoria*. If Λακεδαιμονι[...] is, on the contrary, to be intended as an accusative[341] with the Thebans as subject, we would need to think of a different meaning for συνοικίζω, maybe as 'join' (in a non pacific way) rather than 'colonise', with reference to the battle of Megalopolis of 331 BC, when the Spartans were defeated by the Macedonians to whom Megalopolis was allied. Since Thebes was destroyed on order of Alexander in 335 BC and consequently could not play any role in the matters related to the battle of Megalopolis, the first option is to be preferred. If instead, we see this as a papyrus containing history, we cannot exclude the possibility that this constitutes the only attestation of a historical fact (i.e., the Spartans trying to prevent the foundation of Megalopolis), unknown to other sources.

Examples of *suasoriae* on Thebes are widely documented: see among others Hermog. *Inv*. 3.15.60-80 Patillon = 169.18-170.17 Rabe; Philostr. *VS.* 595-6; Walz. *Rhet.Gr*. 4.249-50; Sopater Walz 8, *Division of Questions.* 41.239.1- 249.9; Walz *Rhet.Gr*. 7.510-1; Apsines 1.61 (231 Spengel-Hammer). If we exclude those dealing with the destruction of the city in 335 BC, there is still a good number of examples. Worthy of mention is, for instance, that by Philostratus (*VS.* 2.15.2) where Ptolemeus of Naucratis is said to have chosen a theme which was too remote from the historical reality, namely 'The Thebans accuse the Messenians of ingratitude because they did not welcome their refugees when Thebes was destroyed by Alexander'. Another remarkable example of how the theme of Thebes remained of interest throughout the centuries are Aelius' Aristides fictitious speeches to the Thebans (*Or*. 9-10) and his Leuctran orations (11-15), and the *suasoria* about Leuctra in Cic. *Inv*. 2.69-70. Particularly interesting is a parallel in Libanius' *Decl.* 24,[342] where we read about an embassy to the Spartans dealing with the question of the Messenians. However, in none of them is the episode of Megalopolis' foundation mentioned. Worth mentioning in relation to the presence of Thebes in declamations is also P.Oxy. 75.5025, a piece of oratorical prose to be dated between the 2nd and the 3rd century AD and most likely imagined to be delivered to the Amphictiyonic Council or included in a historical work (see P.Oxy. 75, p. 18); here a city is mentioned and the editor, Hatzilambrou, has

[341] Merkelbach suggestions that the Spartans are the object of συνοικ[ίσαντες] (agreeing with Θηβαῖοι) is unlikely for the reasons stated above.

[342] Νόμος ἐν Λακεδαίμονι τὸν εἴσω τριάκοντα ἐτῶν μὴ δημηγορεῖν. Θηβαῖοι τὴν ἐν Λεύκτροις μάχην νικήσαντες πρέσβεις πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους πεπόμφασι πόλεμον ἀπειλοῦντες, ἢν μὴ Μεσήνην ἀφῶσιν αὐτόνομον. λε γόντων ἀφεῖναί τινων Ἀρχίδαμος νέος ὢν ἔτι παραινεῖ τὸν πόλεμον δέξασθαι. πέπεικε. τροπὴ γέγονε τῶν δυσμενῶν καὶ γράφεταί τις παρανόμων Ἀρχίδαμον.

conjectured this might well be Thebes (due to a series of possible references to the myth of Oedipus). If so, this would constitute another example of Thebes and its role in historical declamations.

From a stylistic point of view a few observations can be made: (οὐκ) ἅπαξ οὐδὲ δὶς is never attested before the 4th century BC and more and more common from the 2nd century AD on. Moreover, it is remarkable to see the use of three forms of perfect (εἰληφότας, βε-]βοηθήκασι[ν, κε-]κωλύκασι, καὶ μὴν οὐδ[ὲ, αι / πολεμήσαν[τες), a verbal mood that tended gradually to disappear in Hellenistic prose as explained in detail by Chantraine (1926), 214-52 [*Les parfait a l'époque hellénistique*]), for which reason we would not expect to find it so well represented in a text dating back to the 1st century BC/AD. But at least two explanations are possible: 1) the composer of this rhetorical piece wanted to adopt a style as similar as possible to Attic; 2) as is the case of many papyrus fragments, this could fairly be the copy of an earlier text, that might have circulated for a long time before it was copied. Schubart leaves the date of the text open to any possibility by placing the events related to the foundation of Megalopolis as *terminus post quem*.

l.1 εὐδαιμονία: it is difficult to say what εὐδαιμονία referred to, but it is worth noting the term is never linked to Thebes in extant Greek literature.

ll.3-5 οὐς... ἀ[ποκο-] / μισάμενοι: the positive connotation given by the adverb δικαίως may imply the subject are the Thebans, here praised.

ll.7-9 τοῖς...προθυμηθέ[ντες: the positive connotation of these people 'eager to save the city', suggests that this is most likely about the Thebans (see Dem. 18. 250).

ll.9-11 ἀλ-] / λὰ]...πρεσβεύοντ[ας]: the syntactical role of ἀλ-] / λὰ] τούς ἐξ Ἀρ[καδίας / πρεσβεύοντ[ας] is not perfectly clear. If it were an accusative of respect, the construction would be particularly odd. Schubart's hypothesis (63) of it being a nominal clause, perhaps to be translated as a question 'but what about the Arcadian ambassadors?', is perhaps more sensible. There is no possibility of making πρεσβεύοντ[ας] agree with the incomplete participle προθυμηθέ[..., because the sign of *paragraphos* under the π of προθυμηθέ clearly marks the end of the sentence at that line, unless we consider that *paragraphos* misplaced. But it is perhaps better to adopt the cautiousness recommended by the lex Youtie: 'iuxta lacuna, ne mutaveris', especially considering the accuracy with which this text appears to be written and paginated and the exact correspondence of all the *paragraphoi* to actual pauses in the text.

ll.12-15 καὶ τ...βοηθήκασι[ν: the episode in which the Thebans helped the Arcadians is most likely to be placed during the war against the Spartans (368-70 BC), when Epaminondas and the Thebans supported the Arcadians in the foundation of Megalopolis.

ll.15-19 τὰ δὲ ...κωλύκασι δο[: as explained above, the meaning of this sentence, in the light of our knowledge of Greek history, is unclear. Although the sentence is syntactically perfect, there is no attestation of the Spartans preventing the foundation of Megalopolis. See the general discussion for possible hypotheses to explain the incongruity, and for the reasons why the only possible supplement for Λακεδαιμονι[is the nominative Λακεδαιμόνιοι.

l.17 συνοικ[ίζειν]: I chose to restore the the present infinitive, while Schubart restored the aorist συνοικ[ίσαι]. Merkelbach proposed a participle συνοικ[ίσαντες], which would make the sentence more meaningful if we also restored an accusative for Λακεδαιμονι[...] ('The Thebans, having founded Megalopolis, prevented the Spartans from...'), but, unfortunately, there is hardly enough space to restore seven letters, three of which (*alpha*, *ny*, and *tau*) quite large.

ll.19-20 οὐδ[ὲ ἄλ-] / λοις: Merkelbach restored οὐδ[ὧν παρ' ἄλ-] / λοις, again not acceptable due to the lack of space. Therefore, the simpler solution οὐδ[ὲ ἄλ-] / λοις is to be preferred.

ll.20-23 καὶ...ὀλιγωρήσασι[ν: although the object of the sentence is missing, the sense is easily understandable. The author blames those who unreasonably esteem the Thebans little, by saying that it will be difficult for them to obtain something, presumably something with a positive connotation. A possibility could be 'cooperation', if we accept Schubart's supplement συνερ]γίας, consistent with the idea of mutual assistance as the main topic of the oration. Considering the space in the lacuna (four or five letters, depending on their size), at least two other sensible options can be taken into account: 1) 'abundance/assistance/fortune', if we restore χορη]γίας; 2) 'plausibility/praise', if we restore εὐλο]γίας.

In all three cases, the meaning restored is consistent with the sense that the sentence is supposed to have, as they all have positive connotations. Also, for all of them, we find parallels for the construction with τυγχάνω. They are quite late for συνεργία (the earliest are Joseph. *AJ*. 6.219.3, and Cassio Iatrosophista. *Questiones et Problemata*, 10.9, then the expression becomes very popular in Late-Antique and Byzantine Christian literature) and εὐλογία (the earliest is Philo. *Questiones in Genesim*. 4. fr.227.2, and consistently all the attestations are Christian, with the meaning of 'blessing'). Much more interesting are the attestations of χορηγία with τυγχάνω. Apart from the earliest in Dem. *Ep*. 2.12.3, where χορηγία has its original concrete meaning of 'equipping of choruses', worthy of mention are two attestations in Aristotle (*Polib.* 1.1255a.14, about the way virtue can lead to obtaining resources, and in fr.3. l.2 of the *Protreptic*, where it refers to estimable people), and one in Speusippus' *Letter to Philip*. 12.12, referring to Theopompus and the assistance that Philip provided to him. With the meaning of 'assistance', χορηγία, not too differently from συνεργία, seems also to fit quite well the atmosphere of the oration and its focus on the ability of the Thebans to assist others – but not those who esteem them little. Moreover, considering the financial nature of the original

χορηγίαι, the presence of the word χρήματα at ll. 29-30 seems to be particularly consistent with this context.

ll.22-23 Θη[βαίων] / ὀλιγωρήσασι[ν : Merkelbach prefers ὠλιγωρήκασι[ν. This is perhaps on the basis of the presence of other perfects. Next, he restores Θη[βαῖοι] as subject. However, although the first letter of the verb is uncertain, there is no space for κ after η, and to me σ (much smaller than κ in this type of handwriting) is evident, although slightly erased. Moreover, with Θη[βαῖοι] as subject, the syntax of the sentence would be this way overly complicated.

ll.23-25 οὐ γὰρ… πολλάκις: see P.Yale 2.105, col.1. l.19, for rhetorical commonplaces of the sort.

ll.24-31: the last legible sentence of the papyrus, consistently with the rest of the oration, focuses on the altruism of the Thebans, and underlines in an almost redundant way how much and how often they were ready to offer their help to other cities.

ll.27-28 χρήματα: this point about the financial nature of the help provided by the Thebans corroborates the hypothesis of χορήγιας as supplement at ll. 21-22, as the original meaning of the term is the liturgy (financial assistance) given from a chosen wealthy citizen to the city for the creation of a tragic or lyric chorus. Furthermore, χορήγια and χρήματα appear associated twice in Demosthenes: Dem. 8.70.7, and Dem. *Ep*. 2.12.3, where the construction for χορήγια is the same as in this speech.

ll.29-30 οὐκ ὀλίγ[ους δὲ τῶν] / πολιτῶν: it is safe to restore the correlation of μὲν (l.28) and δὲ (in lacuna at l.31) because both of space-related and grammatical reasons. At this point, one might expect the speaker to praise Thebes not only as a state, but also for its citizens and the active participation of many of them (οὐκ ὀλίγ[ους) in public matters and causes.

5) P.Oxy. 2.216 = P. CtYBR inv. 7445 (MP3 2508; LDAB 4411)
Oxyrhyncus (Bahnasa), 1st. century AD

Editions

Grenfell and Hunt (1899), 33-34; Jander (1913), 33-34; *FGrHist*. 153. F8.

Bibliography

Croenert (1902); Kremmydas (2013), 147-48; Powell-Barber (1929), 114-24 Robinson (1953), 273; Stramaglia (2015); Wilamowitz (1900b).

Text

Col. 1

[*ca. 20*]

ἀπὸ μιᾶς ἐπιστολ[ῆς ἀπει-
λῆς δουλείαν ἀντ᾽ ἐ[λ]ευ-
θερίας ἀντικαταλλ[άσ]σε-
σθαι; καὶ ποῦ τὸ περιμάχη-
τον οἴχεται φρόνημα
τῆς ἡ[γ]εμονίας; ἐπιζητῶ
γάρ, ε[ἰ] μή τι διαμαρτάνω
τῷ λο[γι]σμῷ. φησὶν ἡμῖν
πολεμ[ή]σειν καὶ ἡμεῖς
ἐκ[είνῳ *ca 7*] *ca 2* ων| *ca. 3*
[*ca. 13*]ᾳ γῃ ᾳλ
[*ca. 13*]δενει
[*ca. 12*]και ὑπερ
[*ca. 17*]ει
.....
.....
[*ca. 17*] με

Inspexi | 1 [βούλεσθε οὖν] *Jander* | 2-3 ἀπει/λῆς *Grenfell-Hunt* : ἀπεῃ/λην *pap.*| δουλείας *Jander*

Col. 2

[*ca. 20*
. .]ῃ ἀπολωλ̣έ̣κα[μεν; ποῦ
τὰ] τείχη τῆς πό[λεως πέ-
π̣τ̣ωκεν; τίς αἰχμ[άλωτος
ἡμῶν γέγονεν; [*ca.* 3-4] πεζο-
μαχοῦντες ἢ ναυμ[αχο]ῦντες
λελείμμεθα; ἐντ[αῦ]θα γὰρ
ἄνθρωποι περιγεγ[ρα]μμέ-
νοι πάσας τὰς ἐλπί[δα]ς τῷ
τῆς ἀνάγκης καιρ[ῷ] δουλεύ-

σουσι. ἡμῖν τ δ, ἀπόρθητός
ἐστιν ἡ δημοκρατία· ὁμονο-
οῦμεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους · τοῖς νό-
μοις ἐνμένομεν· καρτερεῖ[ν
ἐ[ν] τοῖς δεινοῖς ἐπιστάμε- [15]
[θ]α· τὴν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τά-
ξιν οὐκ ἐνκατ[α]λείπομεν.
ἐν τοῖς ὅπλοις νικήσας
ν ε ανι κ ευέσθω, ταῖς δ' ἀπὸ
τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἀπειλαῖς [20]
τοὺς βα[ρβ]άρους ἐξαπατάτω.
ἡ δὲ τῶν' Αθηναίων πόλις
ἐπιτάττειν, οὐχ ὑπ[ακ]ούειν
[*ca. 9*]· καὶ δ[ικά]ζ̣ε̣[ιν
.....

Inspexi 1-2 [τίνα τῶν συμμάχων *Jander* : τὰς ναῦς μῶ]ν *Wilamowitz* | 2 ποῦ *Grenfell-Hunt*: πότε *Jacoby* | 24 ἐπίσταται] *Wilamowitz*

Commentary

This short fragment belongs to a remarkably well-preserved papyrus. This edition – the result of my inspection of the object – follows the *editio princeps*, but also accepts supplements by its other main editors, Jander, Jacoby, and Wilamowitz. It is most likely an excerpt from an exercise whose theme is the defence of the Athenian hegemony after the threat received by letter – from Philip according to Grenfell and Hunt (1899), 33, or from Alexander, according to Wilamowitz (1900b), 35, n.4, Crönert (1902), 526-7, Jander (1913), 33-34, n.43, and Stramaglia (2015), 169. As pointed out by Kremmydas (2013), 148, this is one of the cases in which there has been debate on the nature of the text: as often happens, it has been mistaken for a piece of history in the form of oratory (maybe an embedded speech) by Jacoby and Robinson (1953), 273 who considered it as a fragment of a lost 'historian of Alexander'. Also, it was quite oddly considered as an actual Attic oration, specifically one by Demades, by J. O. Burtt, the Loeb editor of *Minor Attic Orators*, and Vittorio De Falco, who edited Demades' fragments in 1931. But already at the beginning of the twentieth century, scholars (the *editores principes* but also Croenert and Wilamowitz) recognised this as a rhetorical exercise.

Grenfell and Hunt talk about a 'florid, Asiatic style', a vague description that could perhaps be explained by the "nervous" prose of this text, mostly paratactic and made of short sentences, paced questions and almost no connecting particles, a surely different style from the Attic of Demades. With regard to the style, Edwards (in Powell-Barbers [1929], 119) contrasts this speech with

Demosthenes' 11, an answer to a letter of Philip – numbered as speech 12 (although probably both were taken from Anaximenes's *History of Philip*). This piece (either Demosthenic or written in a Demosthenic style) is an oration whose content appears similar to that of this papyrus fragment but whose style looks 'better calculated', in a typically Attic way. Moreover, as Kremmydas also points out, it would be extremely strange for a speech by Demades to be circulating in the 1st century AD when both Cicero (*Brut*. 36) and Quintilian (2.17.3; 12.10.49) state they know no speech of his.

These kinds of theme are not uncommon for rhetorical exercises, as witnessed by another papyrus fragment, P.Lit.Lond. 139 (from the 2nd century AD), whose title, ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ παραχωρεῖν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῆς ἡγεμονίας, is perhaps one of the reasons why Stramaglia believes the threats mentioned here are from Alexander rather than Philip. Kremmydas uses Isocrates' letters to Philip and Alexander, and Demosthenes' speeches 11 and 12 (a reply to Philip and a letter from Philip), as elements to reinforce its idea of this fragment as a rhetorical exercise, but I do not think these pieces are relevant to the discussion, as there is no certain proof Isocrates' letters are rhetorical exercises (see Mathieu [1924]), and, as regards those two letters in Demosthenes' corpus, it has been quite convincingly argued that they were embedded speeches in Anaximenes' *History of Philip* that ended up in the Demosthenic corpus (see Canfora [2006]).The theme of the piece resembles that of the pseudo-Demosthenic oration *On the Treaty with Alexander*, a speech aiming at pushing the Athenians to react against Alexander in order to gain back their freedom.

As for the language and syntax, the characteristics of this papyrus seem to point towards an Asianic style, although both Wilamowitz and Crönert prefer to be cautious and call it more modestly, 'post-Attic'. On the wide use of the perfect tense (ἀπολωλ̣έ̣κα[μεν, γέγονεν, λελείμμεθα, περιγεγ[ρα]μμέ|νοι, πέ]|π̣τ̣ωκεν) we can make the same considerations as for P.Schub. 32. Finally, as for P.Schub. 32, antedating the text is here an actual possibility, in light of the material conditions and palaeography: although the quality of the product seems inferior to that of P.Schub. 32 (the *verso* of this papyrus contains some documents), the clarity of the handwriting and the low number of interlinear corrections (by the first hand) may lead us to consider this as a copied exercise (maybe from a book) rather than an extemporaneous one.

Col.1. ll.1-5: the piece starts with two rhetorical questions, through which the general is asking the Athenians whether they will be so weak as to accept the blandishments of the Macedonian king (apparently sent by a letter). He stresses the importance of hegemony for the Athenians, a theme that is central in Athenian propaganda and not unknown to oratory, in which it is widely employed in the 4th century BC. Isocrates, in particular, uses it massively, especially in the *Panegyricus, Panathenaicus* and in the oration *On the Peace*, *passim* – but also in the *Archidamus* (6.110.10) and *Areopagiticus* (7.17.5). However, he always uses it with a different Panhellenic perspective (see Pownall [2007], 3-25). More focused on Athens is evidently Demosthenes (10.6.7; 18.65.8 with reference to Philip stealing the hegemony and power from other cities; 20.68.10; 59.96.6); similarly, Aeschines,

although supporting the opposite argument to Demosthenes (2.72.3; 3.58.8; 129.13; 134.5). Hegemony is also a key concept in Hyperides' *Epitaph* (col. 5.9; 37; col. 6.28 Jensen), and can be found in Lycurgus (1.108.4), and in Demades (fr.87. 11.5; 122 Burtt).
From a stylistic point of view, it is worth noting the brevity of these questions (just subject and verb), that create a pressing rhythm (although the prose is not rhythmical), stylistically consistent with the characteristics of the Asianic style.

Col.1 ll.3-5 δουλείαν...ἀντικαταλλάσσεσθαι: the expression 'exchange slavery for freedom' is not attested elsewhere before Late Antiquity. The only other attestation is in Sopater Rhetor, Διαίρεσις Ζητημάτων, 8.161.8 Walz (ἀπήλασε δουλείας ἀντ' ἐλευθερίας), a particularly interesting example, considering that it is contained in Sopater's collection of rhetorical exercises (both *controversiae* and *suasoriae*), although in the context of a private case. The construction is never attested with the verb ἀντικαταλλάσσομαι (the most similar occurrences are in John Damascenus [95.1164.48. Migne], τῆς ἁμαρτίας δουλείαν ἀντὶ τῆς αὐτεξουσίου ἐλευθερίας ἠλλάξατο, Niceta Stethatus, [*Orationes*. 2.46.4] καὶ ἐλευθερίας καὶ οἵαν ἀνθ' οἵας δουλείαν ἠλλάξατο, and Nicephorus Basilaces [*Progymnasmata*. 56.53], καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας δουλείαν ἀλλάσσομαι). This is not a highly attested but a particularly interesting verb, as the earliest attestation is in Isocrates (5.135.4 and 6.109) and seems, on average, widely employed (always with its usual meaning of 'exchanging') in oratory. We have an attestation in Aeschin. 3.92, one in Lycurg. 1.88, and four in Dinarchus (one of those Attic orators who, in our broad definition, were Hellenistic already). There are two occurrences in the speech *Against Demosthenes*: at Dem.1.2, in a rhetorical context not too far from that of this papyrus, when the orator is speaking directly to the Athenians to warn them against a dangerous exchange between common safety and the promises of Demosthenes (μηδὲ τὴν κοινὴν σωτηρίαν ἀντικαταλλάξασθαι τῶν τοῦ κρινομένου λόγων), and at Dem.1.14, in the decree (referring to εὐεργεσία with the meaning of 'letting the good service outweigh the case'). The third and fourth occurrences are in the speech *Against Philocles*: at 6.17 (where the same decree of 1.14 is repeated), and 6.21, with the usual meaning of letting something good or important (such as the laws, the decrees, the assembly) be overshadowed by something bad or irrelevant, like in this case the personal regard to Philocles (μηδὲ <ἀντι>καταλλάξασθαι τὴν πρὸς τούτους χάριν τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν τοῦ δήμου <ψηφισμάτων> καὶ τῶν τῆς βουλῆς ἀποφάσεων).

Col.1 ll.8-9 εἰ μή τι διαμαρτάνω τῷ λογισμῷ: this is a rhetorical expression of modesty whose aim is to sympathise with the audience. It is not found in Attic orators. The verb διαμαρτάνω in relation to λογισμός is attested in Aristotle (*Mag. mor*. 2.6.8) as an imperative, and in a fragment of the Stoic philosopher Cleanthes (515.10 Pearson) in a negative imperative. As a form of modesty, we find it for the first time in Aelius Aristides (Ὑπὲρ τῆς πρὸς Λακεδαιμονίους εἰρήνης, 392.19, in a context related to Attic history and politics).

Col.2. ll.1-6: again, we find a long series of rhetorical questions. They have the aim of reminding the Athenians that their democracy and political power is still strong enough (no ally has been lost, the walls are still there, nobody has become a prisoner, and no one has been left behind) that they do not need the aid of an enemy like Alexander (or less likely Philip). Once again, as for ll.1-5, these rhetorical questions are a clear sign of a developing Asianic style.

Col.2 l.3 τὰ] τειχη τῆς πό[λεως: the image is that of the long walls of Athens. The Μακρά Τείχη were built between 459 and 457 BC under the guidance of Themistocles – after the destruction of the first walls by the Persians in 480 – and tragically destroyed in 404 by the Spartans, but built once again in 393 (see 'Long Walls' in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, by Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth). This image is dear to historical propaganda and is widely found both in history (from Herodotus to Xenophon and beyond) but also in oratory (among many others, see Andoc. 1.80; 101; 3.11; 23; 39; Lys. 13.14; 28.11; 34.3; Isoc. 3.11; 4.40; 5.64; 14.19; 18.13; Din. 1.37; Lycur. 1.16-17; Dem. 6.24; 9.58; 18.96; 19.61, 180, 312; 20.68, 74.5; Aeschin. 2.77; 3.27). In this passage the fall of the walls is used as a metaphor for the total destruction of the city, as they were symbols of power and security (on the role of the long walls compared to that to the walls of Troy see Goldhill [2007]). The orator is here addressing his audience with a rhetorical question 'when did the walls fall?' implying that the city (and its democracy) is still strong and safe, and the *status quo* should not be altered by the intrusion of Alexander in Athenian politics.

Col.2. ll.9-10 τῷ τῆς ἀνάγκης καιρῷ: καιρός in this context means 'cause', 'reason', which is here the ἀνάγκη, the necessity that forced many Athenians to give up their hopes and be reduced to slavery, because of the Macedonians. On the usual meaning of καιρός ('right moment') and its the fundamental role of in Attic oratory see Usher (2004).

Col.2. ll.11-12 ἀπόρθητός ἐστιν ἡ δημοκρατία: this is the only attestation of the adjective ἀπόρθητος referred to democracy. It is not a well-attested adjective in Greek literature (a sign of the sophisticated style of this piece), and does not appear to be typical of a specific literary genre: there are instances in Homer (*Il.* 12.11), dramatists (Aesch. *Pers.* 348; Eur. *Med.* 827; *Hec.* 906), poets (Bacchyl. *Ep.* 9.52, Ap. Rhod. 4.1028), historians (Hdt. 6.28.4; 7.141.18; *Hell.Oxy. Fragmenta Londinensia*. D. col.21.3; *passim* in Diodorus), orators (Lys. 69.7.5; Aeschin. 1.180.12; Din. 1.73.5) to mention but a few. In Lys. 33.7 in particular, it refers to Sparta, a city unravaged yet unwalled. What is striking is that this word is in almost all instances (if we except some cases of Christian authors who use it with reference to God, faith, and other religious concepts) used in connection to πόλις, although in most cases (including the three instances of orators) it refers to the physical safety of the city (πόλις is used interchangeably with χώρα – mainly Attica or Laconia – or specific parts of the city, such as τείχος). It never refers to abstract concepts or institutions as in the case of this fragment (it refers to θεωρία in Anaximenes. *Rhet. ad Alex*. Proem. 9.7, but the concept there is less abstract).

Col.2. ll.11-17: the orator is now expressing a series of concepts whose aim is to reassure his audience about the favourable conditions of Athens without a new interference of the Macedonian king. Democracy is untouched, the people live in harmony, freely, and know how to face problems.

Col.2. ll.16-17 τὴν… ἐνκατ[α]λείπομεν: this concept reconnects to the one expressed at ll.3-5, as if it were answering the rhetorical question by stating that the Athenians are not willing to abandon their freedom. The same verb, expressing a similar concept, is found in the pseudo-Demosthenic reply to the letter of Philip (Dem. 11.22.8-9), where Demosthenes is imagined to be saying that the Athenians should never renounce the deeds of their ancestors and the interests of their city just to please the Macedonians. The verb καταλύω is used by Thucydides (8.68.4), in a similar context, and with reference to the freedom that the Athenians, who were never dominated by others, would not under any circumstance give up.

Col.2. l.16 ἐνκατ[α]λείπομεν: the Attic should be ἐγκαταλείπομεν, but the variant with ν might reflect the pronunciation of gamma nasal.

Col.2. ll.18-21: here the orator is trying to undervalue the possible future achievements of the Macedonian king, by convincing his audience to let him do as he wants with other cities. He also tries to diminish the value of the promises made by the king, by remarking they were made through letters and not only to the Athenians. An interesting contrast is in Demosthenes 4.19, where the orator complains that the Athenians make uncontrolled use of epistolary communication to hire mercenaies, in opposition to the real army of the Macedonians: μή μοι μυρίους μηδὲ δισμυρίους ξένους, μηδὲ τὰς ἐπιστολιμαίους ταύτας δυνάμεις. The origin of νεανικευέσθω is unclear. It seems to be a form (third person of the present imperative) of νεανικεύω, not attested anywhere else in Greek literature. It could be a variant of νεανικέω ('to be youthful', in a positive way, only attested in Eupolis fr.109 *PCG*), which would not make much sense in this context, unless we meant it in a negative sense 'let him act foolishly, childishly'. Otherwise, we should consider it an altered form of νικάω (shifts from verbs ending in -αω into -εω and vice versa are extremely common in Ptolemaic papyri, see Mayser-Schmoll [1970^2], I.2, 117), meaning 'win recently' or 'win again'. Grenfell and Hunt translate it this way, but do not justify their translation, leaving the text as it is. If the first option is to be preferred, the protagonist of the speech cannot but be Alexander.

Col.2. l.21 βα[ρβ]άρους ἐξαπατάτω[ι: see parallel in Polemon (*Decl.* 2.11.12).

Col.2. ll.22-24: again, the orator underlines the theme of the hegemony of Athens, a city known for its ability to command and not to be commanded.

6) MPER III.29 = P.Vindob. inv. G26747 (MP3 2509; LDAB 4401)
Dimeh, 1st century BC/1st century AD

Editions
Oellacher (1939)

Bibliography:
R. Cribiore (1996), 259-260, plate LVII (347).

Text

F1

]λ̣η [*ca. 5* λ]έγω μονο̣ . [*ca. 4-6*]
]εσηβησα δ’ ὁρμηθην [*ca. 4-6*
]ἄρξαντα βασιλείᾳ̣[ς] φθ̣[*ca. 5*
οὐδεμίαν λέλοι]πεν̣ ναῦν, οὐδ̣ένα ἀπολώ[λεκε] στ̣ρα-
τιώτην *ca. 6*]γῆν ἄπ<ε>ιρ<ο>ν, ποταμῶ[ν [5]
]πάθη περισ̣σ̣ῷ̣[ν] ἀν̣δ̣ρ̣ῶν
ε̣μοις πολλὴν μεδ̣ε̣[
]πολλὴν δ’ ἀνοικτητ̣. [
]π̣ερι̣ *ca. 6* εμου μέρη ταδε̣ [
]μικρὸν δ’ οὐθὲν ἐμ[.]α̣υ̣. [[10]
Ἰσσ]ό̣ς, Ἄρβηλα, Γράνικος καίπ̣ερ̣ νῦν
]ε ἐπὶ τὰ δὲ̣ ὑπάτων ἐθνῶν . . η
]δα καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ ῥ̣α[. . .]σ̣ι̣
Ἀ]λ̣έξανδρον ἅμα τοῖς φεύγ[ουσ]ι
]. . . . [. . .]επόμ[ενον. .]. . [15]

1 δ supra lineam | ὁρμητην *ante corretionem*

F2

]τῷ̣ π[
]ζομε[ν] βελ̣[
]νταμ . κα ειδ[
]νεμη[γ]αντου[

]ι μακαρτατισε[[5]
]τῶν ὁ γὰρ ελ[
.]μυρι<ά>δες ι
]σχηματ[
]τα μετα[

5 ἄπ<ε>ιρ<ο>ν *Oellacher*: απιραν *pap.*

Commentary

The theme of this 1st-century declamation is one of Alexander the Great's campaigns, considering the mentions of Ἰσσός, Ἄβηλα, and Γράνικος. From what we can read, the actions of Alexander and of his army are praised (l.6. περισ̣σ̣ῷ̣[ν] ἀ̣ν̣δ̣ρ̣ῶν; l.12 τὰ δ̣ ὑπάτων ἐθνῶν) but the exiguous quantity of the surviving text does not allow us to reconstruct more about the content. The text is disposed in two columns on a badly rubbed surface. Some letters are visible in the *verso*, probably written by the same hand. Since the two papyri that compose the fragment are poorly preserved, we cannot well reconstruct its specific context and find parallels for similar *suasoriae*. Oellacher (1939), 50, hypothesises the speaker is a general. My edition is based on the inspection of a high quality picture and reproduces Oellacher's text, unless stated otherwise.

An interesting observation is based on palaeography: the handwriting is informal and uncertain, which probably means this is an exercise written by a student. Cribiore (1996), 260, describes the hand with these words: 'rapid, large letters, sometimes very clumsy, adorned by finials', and admits the possibility that the text could have been simply copied and not originally composed by a student, which would allow us to antedate the text slightly. Oellacher sees the clumsiness of the handwriting and what he calls 'inadequate attempts of improvement' in shaping the letters as indicators that this was written by a person at elementary school level. If this is indeed a rhetorical exercise, it would constitute another rather early attestation of the theme of the campaigns of Alexander in the *suasoriae* (see among others Sen. *Suas.* 1, and perhaps P.Oxy. 2.216, on which see discussion above). Oellacher also takes into account the possibility of this being a *progymnasma*, although in the surviving progymnasmatic collections (those of Ps-Hermogenes, Theon, Libanius, Aphtonius, and Nicholaus) the many *progymnasmata* on Alexander never mention the three battles here cited. Given the damaged conditions of the text, not much can be said about the content or the style.

Controversiae

1) P.Köln 7.288 =inv.813 (MPR 2514.01, LDAB)
Unknown location, early 1st century AD

Editions
Gronewald - Maresch (1991), 22-23.

Text
ναι̣.̣οσ[*ca. 7* νε-]
ανικὸν μαρ[τυ *ca. 6*]
[.]ον δικῶν [*ca. 8*]
καὶ κόρη μαγ[είρου *ca. 3*]
οὗτος οὖν λέλ[ηθεν ἡ-] [5]
μᾶς ἄμ' ἐναγ[ὴς καὶ μά-]
γος ὢν καὶ γό[ης καὶ ἄ-]
[μ]ᾳ̣ πονηρὸς [*ca. 9*]
[μ]ᾳγείρου γο[η *ca. 7*]
[.] . α δεῦρ ἐλ[*ca 6*] [10]

1 εἶ]ναι *ca. Gronewald et Maresch* | 4 *fortasse* παῖς *Gronewald et Maresch* | 5-6 ἡ-]μᾶς aut ὑ-]μᾶς *Gronewald et Maresch* | 8 fortasse [καὶ υἱὸς] *Gronewald et Maresch* | 10 [εἶ]τ̣.α δεῦρ' ἐλ[θὼν *fere Gronewald et Maresch*.

Commentary

The text contained in this papyrus fragment, although obscure, has been classified by its editors as 'Gerichtsrede', a forensic speech. I provide a text based on the observation of a high quality picture, and I chose to include supplements by *Gronewald* and *Maresch* in the apparatus. Kremmydas (2013) has inserted it in his list of rhetorical exercises, but, as often happens, it is almost impossible to tell with certainty whether this was a piece of an actual oration or a *controversia*. The main reason why this seems a judiciary speech are the words μά-]γος, γό[ης and πονηρὸς, used as insults in Attic oratory (see Aeschin. 2.153; 3.137; Dem. 19.109; Din. 1.95, only to mention the cases where these three words occur in combination). Gronewald and Maresch also consider worth remembering the bad cook Mnesitheus, mentioned by Aeschines (1.158). However, we do not find any other *controversiae* in the elder Seneca that deal with a cook as in this case, nor is there anything similar in other Greek and Latin declamations. With regard to the presence of magic in this piece, we can quote the words of Quintilian (2.10.4-5) who says: 'sint ergo et ipsae materiae quae fingentur quam simillimae ueritati, et declamatio, in quantum maxime potest, imitetur eas actiones in quarum exercitationem reperta est. Nam magos et pestilentiam et responsa et saeuiores tragicis

nouercas aliaque magis adhuc fabulosa frustra inter sponsiones et interdicta quaeremus'. In this passage, he criticises the fashion for choosing topics dealing with magic and cruelty for *controversiae* (a few paragraphs earlier, he was saying that themes of declamations should be as close as possible to reality). The element of magic was not unknown to Imperial declamations, as attested among others by Ps-Quint. *Inst. Decl. Maj*. 10.1, Lib. *Decl.* 41, Philostr. *VS*. 619, Syrianus *Stas*. 96.11-22, 166.9-13, Sopater *DZ* 12. If this is a fragment of a declamation, it would be a very early example, if not a precursor of this 'fashion'.

Mythological encomia and/or Progymnasmata

1) P. Mil. Vogl. 3. 123 (MP3 2525.2; LDAB 7011)
Egypt (uncertain location), 3rd century BC (in)

Editions
Cazzanniga (1957); Cazzaniga (1965); De Kreij (2018).

Bibliography

Colomo (2013); Crisci (2001), 299; Fernandez Delgado (2012); Pernot (1993) 43-44, 58, 154 n. 130, 703 n. 203; Russel (1998), 23; Stramaglia (2003), 228.

Text
Fr.A

Col. 1

. . . . . .
[ ] . χρη
[ ]. ϙτους [5]
[ ]
[ ]φ ᾳσαν
[ ]
[ ]. .[. . .] .ῳν
[ ]υτων δ̣ε̣ τούτου [10]
[ ]. . .πα . . νος
[ ]ων
[ ]
[ ]. ου τὴν
[ ]μενου [15]
[ ]νασιαν
[ ]
[ ]ν δόξης
[ ] .υχ[.]κενα[.]
[Ç] [20]
[εἰς Μίνω]
[εὐ]γενής

[ ]ἐ<κ> Διὸς
[ ]
[ ] [25]
[ ] .
[ ]
[ ]ῠτων
[εὐ]ϙεβέστατος
[ ] .ταμᾳ [30]
[ ]νεταῐ.
[ ]ευς
[ ]η
[ ]πι
[ ]. λιν [35]
[ ]
. . . . . .

7 φᾳσαν *leg. De Kreij* :]καν *leg. Cazzaniga 1957:* φ[.]ᾳ .αν: *Cazzaniga 1965* | 22 εὐ]γενής *De Kreij* :]μενης *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 29 εὐ]ϙεβέστατος *Cazzaniga 1957 in adn.*

Col. 2

φᾳίνετ[α]ι γᾲρ[*ca. 8*].
ναῦν . [[ε]] . .[.] .αμ ν[ ]
[τού]του δὲ κάλλιον οὐδὲν
[κατ]ᾳ[σ]κεύασμα γεγένηται
[διὰ γ]ᾲρ τού<του>ς {του}τούς τε βαρ- [5]
β[ά]ρ[ου]ς καταπολεμοῦμεν
[κα]ὶ βο{ι}ηθοῦμεν ἀλλήλοις
τ[αχ]έ{ι}ως.
ὥϙπερ οὖν τοὺς νῦν θαλατ-
τοκρατοῦντας εὐδαιμονίζομεν, [10]
οὕτως δικαίως ἂν τὸν πρῶτον
θα[λ]ατ̣τοκρατ[[ουν]]`ήσαν´τα {ὁ Μίνως}
σφόδρ’ ἂν ἐγκωμιάζοιμεν.
π[ρ]ὸς δὲ τ̣ο̣ύτοις ἁπάσας τὰς
ν̣[ήσ]ο̣υς λέγεται κτίϲαι καὶ γε- [15]
[νέσ]θαι πασῶν ὁ̣ κτίστης

[ὥσ]π̣ερ οὖν τ̣ο̣ὺ̣[ς] μίαν πόλιν
[κτί]σα̣ν̣τας ἐ[πα]ινο̣ῦ̣μεν, οὕτως
[κἄ]ν τὸν πάσας τὰς νήσ̣ους
[κτίσ]αντα καθ' ὑπερβολὴν
ἐπ̣α̣[ι]νοῖμεν. ἔτι δ̣ὲ πρὸς τούτ[ο]ις,
ζῶ̣ν̣ [...] μὲν ὑπὸ πάντων ἐθαυ-
μά[ζ]ε̣το,
τελευ̣τήσας δὲ παρὰ Πλούτωνι
μεγίσ[τ]ας ἔχει τιμάς·

καὶ οὐ[χ]ὶ μό̣νον ζῶν ἁπάντων
κύριος ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τελευτήσας
τῆς αὐ̣τ̣ῆς ἔτυχε παρὰ Πλού-
Ç τωνος τιμ̣ῆ̣ς.

—

εἰς Ῥαδάμανθυν
πρῶτο̣<ν> μὲν ο̣ὖ̣ν̣ ὅτι εὐγενής·
φαίνεται γὰρ ἐ<κ> Διὸς γεννηθείς·
ἔπειτ' ἐν τόπῳ τοιούτῳ
ὃ̣ν̣ Ζεὺς μάλιστ' ἠγάπησεν·
φ[α]ίνεται γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸ̣ς τραφεὶς
[αὐτ]ό̣θ̣ι.
[*ca. 5*] Εὐρώ̣π̣ην εἰς τὸν τόπον
[*ca. 6*]ναπ̣ .[. . . .] ε̣ν δ̣η̣λ̣ο̣ν̣[
.....
.....

8 τ[αχ]έ̣{ι}ως *De Kreij*: ᾰ̣[νδρ]ε̣ίως *Cazzaniga 1957* | 16 γε|[νέσ]θ̣αι *De Kreij*: γε|[γονέν]αι *Cazzaniga 1957* | δε]σ̣π̣ότης *Cazzaniga 1957* | 19 [κἄ]ν: *De Kreij*: [ἂν] *Cazzaniga 1957* | 29 τῆς δ̣ό̣ξης... τίμας *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 35 ι σ[...]. *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 36 [αὐτ]ό̣θ̣ι *Cazzaniga 1965 in adn.* | 38 νδ. . αρης *leg. Cazzaniga 1957*

Col. 3 + Yale papyrus (col. 1)

[ ]ν̣ α̣ὐτοῦ

. .[ ]ο̣ . . [ ]
. .[ ]ρ̣ι̣
. .[ ]ν̣
ασ̣.[ ]α̣ [5]
μ .[
μ̣ .[ ].
κοσμ̣[ ]
πλε̣ι̣[ ]ο̣υ̣
ε̣ξ[ ] [10]
το .[ ]
του̣[ ].
σαν̣[
και .[
θ. .ν[[15]
του[

ουτ̣[
αυτ[
[
[[20]
εθε[
. . .[
επι[
μ[
. .[[25]
εινα̣ . . . .[
τουτ[.]ν ω[
ε̣̆τ̣ι̣ δ̣ὲ . . . . [
κατα . [.] . [
εἰ γὰρ τ̣ . . [[30]
κελε. . ι̣ . . .[
σ̣εθελειγενε̣[
φήσειεν .[
πρ̣ὸ̣[ς δ]ὲ̣ τ̣ο̣υ̣[τοις
κ[ ] . .ω̣νν.[[35]
σ[ ] . . . φ . ν̣[

. [ ] . . ṿ .[
[ ] . [
Ç[ ]
[εἰς Τυδέα]
[ ]

9 ηλε̣ *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 15 οιν *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 22 λ *Cazzaniga 1957* | 28 σῳ νε̣ρ[ ]̣.. *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 33 φησε[.]εν *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 34 πρ̣ὸ[ς δ]ὲ̣ τ̣ου̣[τοις *suppl. De Kreij*

Fr.B

Col. 1

[
.[
. . .] .[ ]. . [
ẋα̣ . [ ]. ε̣ . [
τωμ[ ] .τ᾽ ἀ[μ [5]
φ̣οτε[ρ]. . . . α ẋ[α
τέ̣σχ̣η̣ẋεν̣ [
ἔτι τ̣όίνυν ἀδελφὸς
Μ̣ελεά̣γρου τ̣οῦ κρατίστου
παρὰ π̣ᾶσιν ὁ̣μολογου-
με̣ν[*ca. 5*] [. .]οὐ̣ẋ ἱρ̣ῶν
ἐγέ̣[νετο]
δη[*ca. 9*] . ὁ μὲν
με[τὰ] τ̣ῶ̣[ν ἀρ]ιστέων
τὸν ὗν [κατ]έκτεινεν,
ὁ δ̣ὲ̣ ẋα̣[τὰ τὸν π]όλεμον τῶν
ἐπί] Θ̣[ήβας σ]τρατευσάντων
ἐπὶ]ẋ[ου]ρος ἐγένετο· ἔτι δ[ὴ
σ]υ̣μ[φ]υ̣γὰς ὢν κηδεσ-
τὴ]ς ἐγέ̣νετο᾽ Αδράστου
το]ῦ̣ μ̣εγίστου βασίλειαν [
γήμας
[*ca. 8*]υς τυχόντα̣ς̣
[*ca. 6*]ẋηδεύσαντας

[*ca. 6*]. .τουτ.[.]ουτος. [25]
[*ca. 8*] . πεντήκοντα
[*ca. 5* ἐνα]ῳτιῳν ἀπολέσας
[*ca. 8*]ἄδειαν τοῖς αὐτοῦ
[*ca. 6* πα]ρεσκεύασεν
[*ca. 8-9*]αὐτοῦ πολίτας [30]
[*ca. 8*] . κακῶς πάσχοντας
[*ca. 8* α]ὐτοῖς φιλέταιρος
[*ca. 8*]ρος γὰρ ὢν πο-
[*ca. 7* ὥι]ετο δεῖν πρότερον
[*ca. 9* ἀ]γαγεῖν [35]
[ ] . [. .] . . . . [

ca. 6 missing lines

11 οὐ χείρων *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 13 ὁ μὲν *De Kreij* : ζομεν *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 14 ἀρ]ιστέων *De Kreij* : ἀρ]ιστειῶν *Cazzaniga 1957* | 17 τὸν π]όλεμον τῶν | [ἐπὶ Θήβας σ]τρατευσάντων *Cazzaniga 1957 in adn.* |. 18 ἐπίκου]ρος ἐγένετο *De Kreij* : π]ροσεγένετο *Cazzaniga 1957* | ἔτι δ[ὴ *Stramaglia apud De Kreij*: ἔτι δ[ὲ leg. *Cazzaniga 1957* | 19]. πασων *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 21 ...ῳτου. *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 23 τυχόντα *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 24 ἐπ]ιτηδεύσαντας *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 25]ουτο *leg. Cazzaniga 1957,*]τι[ ] ον *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 29 πα]ρεσκεύασεν *Cazzaniga 1957* | 33 το *leg. Cazzaniga 1957*

Col. 2

φιλεταίρους ἂν ὑπολαμβά[νοι-
μεν εἶναι δικαίως· ὅπερ Τυ[δεῖ
[σ]υμβέβηκεν.
[.]. [ ] τοίνυν πεπαιδευμέν[ος,
μ[ὴ ο]ὖν, πρεσβευτὴς ἐλθὼν [εἰς [5]
[Θήβ]ας καὶ καταλαβὼν αὐτ[οὺς
ἀγωνιζομένους,
ἁπάντων τῶν ἀγωνισμάτ[ων
τὰ πρωτεῖα λαβών, ἅπαντ[ας
ἐνίκησεν; [10]
καίτοι τὸν ἄνδρα, κατὰ `μ[ὲ]ν´ σύν[εσιν
ὑπὸ τῶν ’Αργείων προκριθέ[ντα
καὶ πεμφθέντα πρεσβευτή[ν,
κατὰ δὲ τὴν τ[ῦ] σώματος

συμμετρίαν καὶ παιδείαν [ἀ- [15]
πάντων περιγενόμενο̣[ν,
πῶς οὐ χρὴ πεπα[ι]δ̣ευμένο̣[ν
εἶναι νομίζειν;
ὅ̣τι θεοφιλής· τούτου γὰρ ἡ Ἀ[θη-
νᾶ φαίνεται πλεῖστον λόγον [20]
ποιουμένη,
καὶ διὰ τὴν πρὸς τοῦτον
φιλίαν καὶ τὸν υ<ἱ>ὸν αὐτοῦ π̣[ερὶ
πλείστου ποιουμένη.
ἔτι <δὲ>, τῶν ἄλλω̣ν διὰ τὸ γένος [25]
ὀνομαστῶν γ̣ενομένων,
οὗτος δι' αὐτὸν καὶ τὸ γένος
ἔνδοξον κατέστησεν.
πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, πλ̣ειόνων
Ἀδράστῳ θυγατέρων γενο- [30]
μένων, τὸν ἐκ τούτου γενό-
μενον ἄριστον ὄντα πάντων
[ ]ευρήσομεν.
[ἔστ]αι δῆλον ὅτι δι' αὐτὸν, ἀλλ' ο̣[ὐ
[διὰ τ]<ὴν> μητέρα, Διομήδη̣ς [ὀνο- [35]
[μασ]τὸς ἦν.
[καί]τ̣οι ὥσπερ τῶν ἵππων[τοὺς
[*ca. 6*] . . ὺ κ̣ρ̣άτιστο̣ὺ̣ς. εἶναι .[
[*ca. 8*] . . .ῳ αὐτοῖς ὁμοιοτ[
[*ca. 11*]. . ς γεννῶντα . [[40]
[*ca. 9*]ἄλλων.

2 Τυ[δεῖ *Hutchinson* : τύ[χηι *Cazzaniga 1957* | 4 [οὐ] τ̣οίνυν *Cazzaniga 1957* | 5 [μὴ ο]ὗν *De Kreij* : [ἀλλ' | ὁ μὲ]ν *leg. Cazzaniga 1957* | 14 τ̣ο̣[ῦ] σ̣ώματος *De Kreij* : πρ̣α̣γματε̣ί[αν καὶ leg. *Cazzaniga 1957* | 25 ⟨δὲ⟩ *Cazzaniga 1957* | 35 τ]ὴμ *pap.* | 34-36 suppl. *Cazzaniga 1957* | 37 *Cazzaniga 1957 in adn.* | 38 κ̣ρ̣ατίστο̣ὺ̣ς. *leg. De Kreij* : [κρ]άτιστ̣ο̣ὺ̣ *leg. Cazzaniga 1957*.

Commentary

This papyrus consists of two main fragments, one minor fragment, to which we should attach another small one (P.CtYBR inv.4573, from the Yale collection), recently identified by De Kreij as part of P.Mil.Vogl. 123 (see edition and detailed palaeographical commentary in De Kreij [2018]); in

total, they preserve five columns. The papyrus fragments contain three short encomia of mythological characters, namely, Minos, Rhadamanthus, and Tydeus. I essentially follow the most recent edition by De Kreij,[343] who had the opportunity to have a close look at a much clearer and polished version of the papyrus and was therefore allowed to correct several misinterpretations and oddities in Cazzaniga's *editio princeps.* Only in a few cases, my supplements differ from his; therefore, an account of different readings is given in the apparatus; as for the less legible and more damaged columns I have not attempted supplements, but excellent points of discussion about them can be found in De Kreij's commentary, which provides possible restorations even for the most desperate passages, and compares them with supplements provided by previous editors. A detailed description of the material conditions is given by Cazzaniga (1957) and (1965), Fernandez Delgado (2012), and De Kreij (2018). On the whole, the handwriting – according to the editors to be dated back to the 3rd century BC on the ground of palaeography – is particularly accurate, the orthography is always correct, there are *coronides* and *paragraphoi* (clearly marking a syntactic break, and rarely misplaced), which lead to suppose these two fragments were part of some sort of school handbook.

Only the encomium of Rhadamanthus has been fully preserved – in 45 short lines – while the length of the other two has been reconstructed on the ground of the number of lines that are contained in each column and the width of the margins, see Cazzaniga [1965], 24-26. The short length of the encomia seems to suggest they were *progymnasmata*. Cazzaniga also points out that relatively wide margins are reconstructable, to the point of considering this book a luxury edition. On the other hand, De Kreij's position is probably more reasonable and not vitiated by the enthusiasm of the first editor: the margins are not at all wide, the intercolumnia small, the handwriting, though regular, has several undulating points (see De Kreij [2018]). Moreover, Colomo's idea (Colomo [2013], 70) that this may be a student's draft copied out by a scribe later (hence the clear script) is surely to be taken into serious account. It is clear that these texts are a very important –and quite early – attestation of the relevance of encomia as part of the rhetorical education in the Hellenistic world. A contemporary school exercise is the ostracon P. Berol. inv. 12318, containing a moral lesson, probably following Ps-Hermogenes' instructions in *Prog*. 9-10; see Fernandez Delgado and Pordomingo (2012).

It is from the Hellenistic age that the "rhetoric of praise" – "la rhetorique de l'éloge" as Pernot (1993) calls it – began to become essential to rhetorical education, and it is in this period that the seeds for the great Imperial epideictic oratory were planted (a detailed discussion with examples is in Pernot [1993], 42-50). The origins of this kind of oratory are undoubtedly in the encomia of Gorgias and, particularly, of Isocrates, whose school was fundamental in the formation of the first generation of Hellenistic orators. Cazzaniga shows, however, that these three short encomia are not entirely consistent with the Isocratean tradition and his formulation of concepts (especially that of *Euagoras*

[343] I warmly thank Mark De Kreij for his suggestions and for letting me read in advance the draft of his paper on this papyrus: (De Kreij [2018]).

and *Busiris*), and also not always with his style, despite their 'elegant Attic'. It is fair to assume that all pieces were written by the same author, as they all have short sentences and frequent syntactical parallels. At a more detailed analysis, the formulation of concepts here is more similar to that of the sophistic: concise, apodeictic, clear. The arguments are laid out in an extremely simple way, following an almost obvious and somewhat redundant logic of premise and consequence.

A final very interesting point of discussion of the style is the presence of some sort of prose rhythm. Cazzaniga (1965), 49, identifies several rhythmic correspondences in endings of some clauses: in fr.A col.2 ll.9-10 and 11-13 in parallel with ll.17-18 and 18-21; in fr.A, col.2, ll.21-25 in parallel with 26-29; and finally more limitedly in fr.B, col.2, ll.20-21 in parallel with 23-24. We could argue, however, that these instances are more simply examples of euphonic parallels, as the ending of the phrase at line 29 (fr.A col. 2) certainly excludes prose rhythm. The author certainly cares about euphony, especially in the encomium to Minos, as shown by the frequent anaphoras and polyptota: the anaphora of τελευτήσας (A2, ll.25, 28), the polyptoton of the verbs θαλαττοκρατέω (10-12) and ἐπαινέω (18-21), the name Πλούτων (24-29) and the substantive τιμὴ (25-29). Moreover, we notice an expressive use of hyperbaton with adjectives, as in μεγίσ[τ]ας ἔχει τιμάς (25), or τῆς αὐτῆς ἔτυχε παρὰ Πλούτωνος τιμῆ̣ς. (29-30).

Other relevant examples of rhetorical exercises dealing with mythological subjects are P.Petr. 1.10, a proptreptic speech based on the example of Achilles and Patroclus, particularly interesting because it also dates back to the 3rd century BC (see discussion below), and P.Vindob. inv.G29789, a much later piece (3rd-4th century AD) containing three *progymnasmata*, one encomium, and one ethopoea about several mythological characters.

De Kreij's (2018) observations on the structure of these encomia and on their linguistic and stylistic features seem very solid. First of all, following Fernàndez Delgado (2012), 241-3, he shows how these encomia follow the structure given by rhetoricians, Ps-Hermogenes *Prog*. 7 in particular (i.e., birth, origin, upbringing, education, characteristics of body and intellect, accomplishments, actions, death, honour *post mortem*). If we except Rhadamanthys (for whom we only have birth and origin), here is what we have for the other two characters (see detailed scheme in De Kreij [2018]): Minos has birth, accomplishments, actions, honour after death; while Tydeus has birth, upbringing, characteristics of intellect, education, honour. It is worth noting that the example of Achilles in P. Petrie. 1.10 (see commentary) follows the same scheme.
The second brilliant point made by De Kreij (2018) is about the increasing complexity of these pieces: as noted above, the Minos encomium is particularly redundant not only in the content but also from a linguistic point of view, as the quite simple parallels and obvious arguments (for instance 'as we praise those who founded a city, so we praise to the extreme the one who founded all the islands') are expressed through rather simple constructions, mainly coordinations. On the contrary, Tydeus' encomium not only expresses a much wider range of concepts and arguments, but also employs more advanced constructions like a genitive absolute, and more advanced stylistic features like rhetorical questions. To support De Kreij's theory that the increasing complexity of the pieces was not

random but meant to mark a progression in the teaching, we have Colomo's reflection (Colomo [2013], 71) about P.Köln. 6.250, P.Mil.Vogl. 1.20 and P.Lit.Lond 193 containing different levels of difficulty for their exercises.

It is worth discussing some specific features of the legible encomia. As for the encomium of Minos, the association between his *thalassokratia* and that of Athens finds parallels in the Greek historiography of all times and, in particular, in Herodotus (3.122), Thucydides (1.4 and 1.8 where Minos' role of coloniser is emphasised as it happens in this papyrus). Moreover, the idea of Minos as coloniser and founder of many cities reminds us of the Callimachus' *Aetia*, in frr. 43-43b-c Harder, dedicated to the foundation of cities in Sicily. The association of the brothers Minos and Rhadamanthus as examples of good legislators is on the whole widely employed in the entire Greek literature from Homer to Byzantine authors (in later authors, the *topos* becomes even proverbial). Among the many attestations, in particular, in Attic oratory we find this parallel in Demosthenes (18.127) and Isocrates (21.205). Finally, particularly interesting is an instance in Theon (*Prog.* 5.96.3 Patillon), who mentions the two characters as relevant in rhetorical themes (an overview of all the passages containing reference to the pair are in Cazzaniga [1965], 46). What remains of Rhadamanthus' encomium is, unfortunately, not sufficient for a more detailed analysis.

The encomium of Tydeus, with regard to the enunciation of the virtues of the protagonist of the piece, seems to be somehow influenced by Isocrates' 11 (24; 35; 41) and 9 (45), 10 (31), and also by the pseudo-Isocrates (1.7). Cazzaniga also notices similarities with the "sophistic" speech of Adrastus in Euripides' *Suppliants* (901-08) and the description of Tydeus in Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes* (376-94). The mention of Tydeus' φιλεταιρία, not a standard part of encomia according to the rhetoricians, is noteworthy. In Aristotles' *Rhetoric* (1364b) we read a full analysis of the term and on how it is a virtue to love friends more than money, and at 1389a37 we read more about the substantive φιλεταίρος where φιλόφιλοι and φιλέταιροι are almost synonyms. Almost identical is the use of φιλεταίρος in Plato (*Lys*. 211e). The concept seems to have evolved from his earlier attestation in Thuc. 3.82.4, where the connotation verges on the concept of alliance ('in the interest of the party') rather than proper friendship (see Gomme [1945], 374). Despite the absence of *philetairia* in the rhetorical theorisation of encomia, this theme was probably popular in rhetorical exercises, as also shown by P.Petr. 1.10 (see discussion below), initially seen as a protreptic speech about Achilles' φιλεταιρία. This quality was associated with Achilles and his relationship with Patroclus in *progymnasmata*, as evident from the encomium of Achilles in Libanius, *Prog.* 8.3.19, but also in his *ethopoea* entitled Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐπὶ Παρόκλῳ κειμένῳ; (*Prog.* 11.3.11). See also Konstan (1997) on friendship in the ancient world.

Tydeus' encomium here omits part of the myth in which Athena, Tydeus' tutelar deity, refused to give him a remedy providing immortality because of the stratagem of Amphiaraus, who made Tydeus destroy the head of Melanippus and eat his brain, which disgusted the goddess, who eventually left him to his mortal fate and imminent death (Schol. *ad Pind. Nem.* 10.12; Eustath. *ad Hom.* p. 1273; Schol. AbT ad *Il.* 5.126; Apollodorus, 3.76-77). With regard to this episode, almost the reverse of

a praise of Tydeus – a very negative view of his whole life – is to be found in Soph. fr.799 Radt, where Odysseus, speaking to Diomedes, tells him he will not narrate to him things like those belonging to the story of his father, who left his homeland, lived as a foreigner in Argos, and finally committed the atrocious crime of eating the raw flesh of Melanippus, beginning from his head. Since there are no important variants to the myth regarding this episode, it is fair to assume that the author voluntarily neglected to mention this part in order to stress only the good qualities of Tydeus. It is typical of rhetorical exercises to manipulate the myth (or history) by adding, changing, or omitting details of it, in order to strengthen an argument or just to make a witty point.

What strikes about these encomia as a whole is they are all dedicated to characters who are somehow at the borders between divinity and humanity: both Minos and Rhadamanthus are the sons of a mortal (Europa) and Zeus, while Tydeus, despite being mortal, is known for the myth according to which Athena was about to give him the gift of immortality. With regard to Minos and Rhadamanthus, particularly important is a passage of Isocrates (9.13) where we read Ὁμολογεῖται μὲν γὰρ τοὺς ἀπὸ Διὸς εὐγενεστάτους τῶν ἡμιθέων εἶναι, 'it is agreed that among the demigods the noblest are the sons of Zeus'. The reference is here to the noble birth of Evagoras, according to Isocrates, a descendant of Aeacus, who was along with Minos and Rhadamanthus, one of the judges among the dead.

The term here employed by Isocrates is εὐγενεστάτους, the superlative of εὐγενής, used to describe Rhadamanthus in the only legible section of his encomium. The concept of εὐγένεια as noble birth is also used here to praise Tydeus. The idea is not unknown to progymnasmatic literature, as one can see from Libanius' description of a good encomium: it should have εὐγένεια, noble and notable birth as first quality, immediately followed by notable πολιτεία (110.2. and 111. 13 Spengel). The association of εὐγένεια and noble πολιτεία survives until Aristides' *Panathenaicus* (103.7), and most interestingly in the section on the *synkrisis* (113.3) where he lists εὐγένεια – interestingly followed by παιδεία, as in the encomium of Tydeus – as the most fundamental quality. The association of εὐγένεια and παιδεία is found again in Aristides (Πανηγυρικὸς ἐν Κυζίκῳ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ, 241.11). These two concepts are present also in Libanius' *Progymnasmata* (8.1.4), the encomium of Diomedes, son of Tydeus, in which we read about Adrastus, that he ἀξίως μὲν ἐπαιδεύετο τῆς εὐγένειας; and finally, in the *synkrisis* of Achilles (10.2.2). The concept of εὐγένεια is recurrent in Libanius: in *Or.* 40.10.3, εὐγένεια is listed as first of a series of good qualities, and in *Or.* 28.13.3 it is again mentioned along with παιδεία. In the speech contained in P.Petr. 1.10 the reference to the noble birth of Achilles is once more immediately followed by the notions about his education. We can finally note that εὐγένεια and the related adjective are widely employed in Libanius' vast literary production. Finally, the rhetor Nicholaus also talks about εὐγένεια in his discussion of the *synkrisis* (59.20 Felten). This was clearly a key concept in encomiastic literature, not only in its late developments and theorisation (as in the *progymnasmata* of the above-mentioned Imperial and late antique rhetors), but also in some earlier examples: Isoc. 10.44 and Gorgias (11.22) in relation to Helen, and Isoc. 11.10 in relation to Busiris.

For the two legible encomia, we can notice the use of the second person plural, a possible indicator of a feeling of Panhellenic identity in the composer. Detailed palaeographical observations can be found in De Kreij's commentary. For minor variant readings, see apparatus.

A Col. 1: see observations in De Kreij (2018).

A Col.2. ll.1-8: the traces of the sentence at ll. 1-2 allow us to understand the subject of the paragraph were ships. The author proceeds by praising their fundamental role ('no better arrangement has been made') for the Cretans in the fight against the barbarians on the sea, as they make operations quicker.

A Col.2. l.7: the inserted ι should not surprise, as it is quite a common spelling variant in papyri (see Mayser-Schmoll [1970^{2}], I.1.89).

A. Col.2. ll.8-13: here we find the first syllogistic argument meant to praise Minos. Since all those who have the hegemony on the sea are called happy, and Minos had the hegemony on the sea, we should then call him happy. The structure is extremely simple and almost banal. On the sources for the role of Minos as *thalassokrator* see general discussion.

A Col.2. l.12 {ὁ Μίνως}: this is a glossa that penetrated the text. As De Kreij points out, it is a very odd one, as there should be no doubt about the identification of Minos as the protagonist of this encomium. De Kreij's convincing idea is that the glossa was in the margin of the following column, when Minos could have been mentioned in relation to Rhadamanthys.

A. Col.2. ll.14-21: the syllogistic structure of the argument is identical to that at ll. 8-13, although the sentences are slightly more complex and longer. The statement about Minos here precedes the general one: since Minos founded the islands and ruled on them, and we praise the founders of cities, then Minos should be praised. The author reinforces the conclusion, adding that Minos deserves the maximum praise, as he did not simply found a city, but several islands. About his role as coloniser see general discussion.

A Col.2. ll.21-29: the conclusive section of the encomium is the typical praise of the honours reserved to the character after his death. There is a parallel between the admiration Minos received during his life and the high regard Pluton had for him. The structure here, although still equally simple, differs from that of the two previous arguments. See also De Kreij's observations about the variation in the construction. As for the similarity between this description (ll.24-25) and that of Aeacus in Isoc. 9.15, see Cazzaninga (1957), 167.

A. Col.2. ll.31-35: this is the little we can read about Rhadamanthys' encomium. It starts with the usual statement about the character's εὐγένεια, justified with Rhadamanthys' birth from Zeus. The author then validates this point, adding that he was born and raised in a place (Crete) that was also dear to Zeus. It might seem rhetorically odd that a weaker point (namely that Crete was dear to Zeus) should be used to validate a stronger one (that he was Zeus' son), but this is probably a way for the author to show his cleverness.

A. Col.2. l.37: Europa was Rhadamanthys' mother.

A Col. 3 + Yale fragment: see technical observations in De Kreij (2018).

B. Col.1. ll.7-10: part of the encomium of Tydeus was apparently a comparison with his brother Meleager (see *Il.* 4. 399-400 and Eur. *Suppl.* 904-5), to whom he is said to be equal and not weaker. The details of the comparison follow soon after.

B Col.1 ll.9-11: see supplements in De Kreij (2018).

B. Col.1. ll.12-17: the actions of the two brothers are compared. Meleager gained his glory for killing the Calydonian boar, while Tydeus had a central role in the war against Thebes.

B Col.1. l.13 με[τὰ] τ̣ῶ̣[ν ἀρ]ιστέων as De Kreij also points out, this is quite a rare expression that usually refers to the Argonauts, and in particular to the boar hunting, as in this case.

B. Col.1. ll.17-21: the mythological episode mentioned here, aiming at strengthening Tydeus' position in comparison to his brother, is his marriage to Deipyle, one of Adrastus's daughters (see also col. 2, ll. 29-33).

B Col.1. l.18 σ]υ̣μ[φ]υ̣γὰς: συμφυγάς is a very rare substantive, with only nine attestations in the whole Greek literature (never before Thucydides), and one third of the attestations are in Is. 16.14.3; 26.5; 19.38.5. Similarly, συμφεύγω is never attested before Euripides and overall poorly attested in the Classical age.

B. Col. 1. ll. 22-35: possible supplements are listed and explained by De Kreij (2018).

B. Col.1. ll.30-31 κακῶς πάσχοντας...φιλέταιρος: it is here that the theme of *philetairia* is introduced for Tydeus. This quality must have been central in his encomium as it presumably goes on until (or is repeated) at B col.2. l.1. On the concept of *philetairia* and its role in encomia see also P.Petrie.1.10.

B. Col.2. ll.1-3: this is possibly the conclusion of the previous section, as *philetairia* is mentioned a second time here and is attributed to Tydeus. Other editors tended to agree in supplementing τύ[χηι, where I chose the restore Τυ[δεῖ, suggested by Gregory Hutchinson, and which would constitute the first case of the name appearing in the encomium, making explicit the attribution of *philetaria* to Tydeus. This supplement is to be preferred, as the phrase 'so it happens by chance', if we restored τύ[χηι, would not make particular sense in this context. De Kreij has accepted this suggestion in his 2018 edition.

B. Col.2. ll.4-10: following the usual structure of encomia, the author mentions Tydeus' education (see l.4) and actions, namely his role as ambassador, the prizes he won, and his involvement in the war against Thebes. They are presented through a long rhetorical question, introduced by a series of participles. It is worth noting that among the important roles Tydeus had, the author mentions that of ambassador, the most typically Hellenistic type of orator.

B. Col.2. l.4 [.]. [ ]ṭοίνυν: De Kreij's supplement ἔτι seems a reasonable solution in the light of the parallel at B col.1. l.7. This would solve the contradiction between the notion of Tydeus being educated (l. 15) and the odd presence of the opposite concept, according to Cazzaniga's restoration οὐ. On the praise of Tydeus' *paideia*, Cazzaniga argues this is an Isocratean reconsideration of the character – a warrior with no education, according to Homer (*Il.* 4.399-400), and Aeschylus (*Sep*t. 377-94). De Kreij adds that this emphasis on the *paideia* of non-intellectual characters is typical of *progymnasmata* (see Pernot [1993], 44 and Pordomingo Pardo [2007], 419).

B. Col.2. ll.11-18: the praises of Tydeus' education (see l.4), of his great deeds, and of his physical appearance, are here intertwined in another long and complex rhetorical question.

B. Col.2. l.11 καίτοι: as argued by De Kreij, this does not seem adversative but 'rather logical or perhaps simply progressive', as very often happens in Isocrates.

B. Col.2. ll.14-15 τ̣ο̣[ῦ] σ̣ώ̣ματος συμμετρίαν: De Kreij's new reading σ̣ώ̣ματος̣ is supported not simply by a cleaner papyrus – 'the traces leave no doubt', he says – but also by Ps-Hermog. *Prog*. 7 and Theon. *Prog*. 9.110.6 Patillon. It makes much more sense than Cazzaniga's πραγ̣ματε̣ί[αν, also because the simple quality of συμμετρία without further specification would have been a very strange concept to praise. For parallels in physiognomic literature see e.g. Adamantius *Phys*. 2.5

B. Col.2. ll.20-24: here starts a new – and quite typical – section of the encomium, namely that about the benevolence that the Gods had for Tydeus. After stating that the aforementioned qualities were

dear to the gods, the author talks specifically about the good feelings that Athena, his tutelar deity, had for him and his son (it is omitted though that the goddess refused to give him a remedy providing immortality). In order to say that Athena thought highly of Tydeus and held his son in high esteem, two separate but similar constructions are used (see observations in De Kreij).

B. Col.2. ll.25-28: the author is here emphasising the typically encomiastic element of noble birth (especially noble among the notable births of many others), which is normally at the beginning of encomia. We do not know if its placement here works as a postposition, or as a strengthening repetition of something said at the beginning, in the damaged section.

B. Col.2. l.27 οὗτὸς δι' αὑτὸν: see parallels for the notion of self-made man in Isoc. 9.45, Theon (*Prog*. 4.76-77 Patillon) and P. Berol. 12318, a rhetorical exercise with a philosophical content, preserved on an *ostrakon*.

B. Col.2. ll.29-33: here, the author is probably praising Diomedes, Tydeus' son, in order to show that his descendent was a good man like his father. The meaning of this passage is particularly obscure. De Kreij's litteral translation is 'although many daughters were born to Adrastus, we will find that the one (son) born from him (sc. Tydeus) was the best of all'. But he admits that the comparison between the daughters of Adrastus and the son of Tydeus is not particularly meaningful, and that the sentence looks elliptical. What seems to be missing is a phrase like 'αὐταῖς γενομένων', which would complete the sense by clarifying that Diomedes (the praised son of Tydeus and Deipyle, one of Adrastus' daughters) was the best of all the children born by these women. Unfortunately, the construction, as it is, does not allow this translation, and we have, therefore to hypothesise a mistake or an incomplete thought whose logic is missing.

B. Col.2. ll.34-37: in order to reinforce the link between the glory of Tydeus and that of his son, here we read that Diomedes owed his fame to his father rather than his mother. The supplement [ὀνομασ]τὸς seems convincing.

B. Col.2. ll.37-41: see possible supplements in De Kreij (2018).

2) P.Petr. 1.10 = Brit. Libr. inv.490 = P.Lit.Lond. 137 (MP3 2523, LDAB 6998)
Gurob, 300-250 BC

Editions

Petrie (1891), 31-32.

Bibliography

Jander (1913), 21-22; Milne (1922) 165-6; Powell and Barber (1929), 117-8; Wooten (1972) 94-7.

Text

Col. 1

]ν̣
].δι̣α̣ [5]

]ἀκιν[δυν- [10]
]..συμ
ἀν]δρεί̣α̣
]ε̣ι̣..
]ε̣κακ
]υμεν
]πον αλλα [15]
]ʂαιμην

]. .
]
]ʂη
]. [25]

].
]οντ̣
]ν . ταʂ
]ι̣π̣ . . [30]
. . . . .

10 ἀκιν[δυν- *Berardi*

Col. 2

. . ἐπανώρθωσεν.
ἐπ’ ἀνδρείαν τοίνυν τίς καλλίον-
ᾳς παρακλήσεις καταλέ[ξε]ιεν;
τὰς μὲν γὰρ ἄλλας ἐάσω, δεδι-
ὼς μὴ τῷ μήκει τῶν λόγων [5]
ἐνοχλήσω καί, τοῦ ποιητοῦ πα-
ρακαλοῦντος, ἐγὼ καὶ τοὺς προσ-
έχοντας ἀποτρέψω.

—

μιᾶς δὲ μόνον μνησθήσομαι τῆς
ἐ]πιφανεστάτης. τίς γὰρ [10]
προτροπὴ μείζων εὑρεθείη
τῶν περὶ Αχιλλέα πεποιημένων;
ὃ]ς γεγονὼς μὲν ἐκ Πηλέως τε
καὶ Θέτιδος ὑπαρχούσης δὲ μοναρχίας
αὐτῷ Θετταλῶν, πεπαιδευμένος δὲ [15]
παρὰ Χίρωνι καὶ Φοίνικι, πάντων δὲ
τῶν ἐνδοξοτάτων, τῶν καλλίστων
αὐτὸς [ἐκτ]ήσατο [χά]ριν ὑπαρχόντων
κ̣α̣ὶ̣ τ̣ο̣ κ̣α̣λ̣λ̣ο̣ν̣ αποθ[*ca. 20*
. ζηὴ . . μ̣ η ν̣ ι̣ . . . . ϙ̣ κ̣α̣τ̣ὰ̣. . . . . [20]
. τηὴ ο. . . π̣ο̣θ̣ε̣ν̣. . . υ̣ . . . τ̣τ̣ . .
. . τ̣[*ca. 30*
. . . . . εν . . ι̣να η̣
. . . . . εἰμαρ-
μένης τοὶ . . . . σ. . . . . συμπολεμῶν. [25]

—

ἣν ἔλ̣ε̣ξ̣εν ἡ μήτηρ, ᾗ τἀληθῆ
προσῇν λέγειν ὅπερ θεὸς καὶ προ-
ν̣ο[ῆσ]α̣ι τὸ μέλλον. ἀλλ’ ὅ̣μ̣ω̣ς
μ̣η̣τ̣ρ̣ὸς καὶ θεοῦ παραίνεσις οὐκ [ἀ-
πέτρεψεν αὐτὸν μὴ βοηθῆσαι [30]
τεθνεῶτι Πατρόκλῳ.
ἀλλ]ὰ τούτων πῶς ἂν εὑρεῖν δύν-
αιτο ζητ]ῶν διανοίας καλλίονάς
τε καὶ παρακ]λήσεις μείζονας ἐπ’ ἀν̣-
δρείαν;[*ca. 12*]ἑταιρείας [35]

. . . . .

3 καταλέ[ξε]ι̣εν *Petrie* | 15 πεπαιδευμένος *leg. Milne* : .....μενος *Petrie* | 16 παρὰ...πάντων *leg. Milne* : .. ραχιε νικαν νεων δε *Petrie* | 17 καλλίστων *leg. Milne* : πλειστων *Petrie* | 18 [ἐκτ]ήσ̣ατο [χά]ρ̣ιν *Berardi dubitanter* : αυτος ...σατο...: *Petrie, Milne* | ὑπαρχόντων *leg. Milne* : το]ινυν αρχ *Petrie* | 19 *om. Petrie* | 20 ϙ̣ κ̣α̣τ̣ὰ̣ *non leg. Petrie* | 21-24 *non leg. Petrie* | 24 σ *non leg. Petrie* | 26 ᾗ *Berardi* : ἣν *pap.* | ἣν ἔλεξεν ἡ μήτηρ *Milne* : ημ...μεν?.....ην ταληθη: *Petrie* | 28 *sic Milne* : ν̣οο[υσα τ]ο μελλον *Petrie* | 30 *sic Milne*

Col. 3

πρόνοιαν ἔχειν. καὶ τοὺς μὲν
πλείστους ἴδοιτ' ἂν οὐδ' ε''μ μετέ-
χωσι τῶν̣ προκ̣ε̣ι̣μένων ἀγαθῶν
ποιεῖν ἀξιοῦντας, Ἀχιλλεὺς δὲ
καὶ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀποστε- [5]
ρούμενος τοὺς μεγίστους κινδύνους
ὑπέμεινεν, μόνος δή τῶμ πώποτε
γεγενημένων ὑπὲρ ἑταίρου τεθνεῶτος
ἀποθανεῖν τολ̣μ̣ή̣σ̣ας καὶ νομίσας δεῖν μὴ
πενθεῖν Πάτροκλον ἀλλὰ αὐτὸν συμ- [10]
πενθεῖσθαι μετ' ἐκείνου. καὶ τὰς μὲν̣
ἄ[λλ]ας ἑταιρείας ἁπάσας ὁ θάνατος
δια[λύει], ταύτην δὲ μείζω καὶ φανερω-
τέ[ραν ἐ]ποίησεν – χρὴ δὲ φιλέταιρον
εἶν[αι νομί]ζειν οὐ τὸμ πολλὰ τοῖς [15]
φίλοις [*3-4* πεπρ]αγματευμένον,
ἀλλ' ὃς ἂν μ[ηδε]μίαν χάριν ἀπολ̣α̣[βεῖν
μέλλων π[ροαί]ρηται κινδυν[εύειν.
οἱ μὲγ γ[ὰρ *ca. 20*
λέγουσι [*ca. 20* [20]
πολλω[*ca. 25*
παρὰ δ[*ca. 25*
παν[*ca. 30*
τατ[*ca. 30*
πετ[*ca. 30* [25]
οτι του[*ca. 25*
ἡγεμονικῶν[*ca. 20*

—

τῶν ἰδίων οιν[*ca. 28*
καὶ πολ[λοῖς σ]υμβαίνει[*ca. 10*
—
εξεθη[*ca. 25*]η [30]

—
κ[*ca. 30*

. . . . .

2 ε$^{\text{ῃ}}$μ : *recte* ἦν | δεη τωμ *pap* : *recte* δὴ τῶν | 15 τομ *pap* : *recte* τὸν | 16 πεπρ]αγματευμένον *Berardi* : [……]ματευμενον *leg. Petrie* : διαπεπρ]αγματευμένον *coni. Stramaglia* | 17 μ[ηδε]μίαν l*eg. Milne* : μ[……]ην *Petrie* | ἀπολᾳ[βεῖν *Stramaglia* : ἀπολι[πεῖν Petrie | 18 π[ροαί]ρηται leg. *Milne* : [αιρ]ηται *Petrie*

Commentary

This text belongs to a fairly long papyrus fragment (extracted by Flinders Petrie from the cartonnages of Ptolemaic mummies found by him at Gurob in 1889-90) containing 3 columns – the first one only preserves some traces of the final letters, 'too fragmentary to be worth transcribing' according to Flinders Petrie, but however quite legible (and not useless to the study of this text) – and it dates back to the 3$^{\text{rd}}$ century BC according to palaeography and the documents with which it was found. From what we can observe (and what Petrie was able to see) the palaeographical aspects are particularly interesting because this papyrus, with its elegant squared letters, represents a rare variety of the formal hands in the Ptolemaic age. Considering some meaningless supplements (see l.51) and unnecessary *lacunae* (see l.27) left by Petrie (not always replaced or filled by Milne, see apparatus) I assume the two scholars saw a much dirtier and less polished papyrus. This might be the reason why Petrie only provided an almost diplomatic transcript (words are spaced, but accents and diacritics are absent).

As for the text, Petrie believes appropriate to call it a προτρεπτικὸς λόγος – a sub-category of epideictic oratory – in other words, an exhortation to philosophy (the most famous example would probably be the lost Aristotelian *Protreptic*), presumably on the ground of the double mention of the word παράκλησις and of προτροπή. Surely, a crucial role in the development of this rhetorical genre was played by Isocrates with those of his orations aimed at being "specula principium", such as those to Nicocles, but also to Philip (a kind of oratory that apparently attracted attention, considering the spurious *To Demonicus* too), but also with his orations dealing with the theme of philosophy and *paideia* (*Against the Sophists* above all). On protreptic literature and especially on Isocrates' role see Collins (2015). In this case, what we have is an exhortation on the subjects of φιλεταιρία and ἀνδρεία, using the examples of Achilles' devotion to Patroclus. However, although some protreptic elements

can be found in this text (see detailed commentary below), I would not go as far as labelling it 'protreptic', as it definitely seems more of an encomium of Achilles and his virtues.

A short passage in Plato's *Apology* (28c-d) seems to be at the heart of the development of the topic in this oration: the virtue praised in the speech is Achilles' courage and devotion to Patroclus, despite the warnings of his mother Thetis, who could foresee the tragic outcome of Achilles' revenge. In Plato's *Apology,* we find Thetis' exhortation against Achilles' action (Ὦ παῖ, εἰ τιμωρήσεις Πατρόκλῳ τῷ ἑταίρῳ τὸν φόνον καὶ Ἕκτορα ἀποκτενεῖς, αὐτὸς ἀποθανῇ – αὐτίκα γάρ τοι), followed by Achilles' clear refusal to change his mind (as he feared more to die as a coward than not avenging friend: πολὺ δὲ μᾶλλον δείσας τὸ ζῆν κακὸς ὢν καὶ τοῖς φίλοις μὴ τιμωρεῖν). The same episode is the core of this speech, where Thetis' exhortation is simply alluded to (ll. 26-31), or, as I suggest, it was made explicit in the damaged section that immediately precedes (which would explain the reading of a relative pronoun at the beginning of l.26), and Achilles' revenge is the main reason why he is praised as φιλεταίρος.

Therefore, if we read the papyrus unbiased by Petrie's label of 'protreptic', it will be evident that, since Achilles is here used as an example of virtues, this speech rather has the characteristics of an encomium. As a matter of fact, despite the tone and the strong elements of exhortation towards a good behaviour towards friends, the continuous praises of Achilles overshadow the proptrepic nature of the piece and make it a clear example of encomiastic literature. Furthermore, the structure of the speech perfectly matches Ps-Hermogenes' example, as we find – in the exact order given by the rhetorician (*Prog*. 7) – birth, country, education, acts and accomplishments, death, honour after death. This is a sign that this kind of rhetorical theory must have existed and been followed already in the 3rd century BC.

The *editor princeps* assumes the speech is pronounced by Thetis, but I do not find any relevant textual evidence to support this idea (see detailed commentary below). As Petrie also notices, the choice of this specific mythological theme should not surprise, since it was very popular in Greek literature (even treated by Aeschylus in his lost tragedy *Myrmidons* = frr. 131-42 Radt), as also shown by Aeschines (1.142-52) and Aristotle (1359a). Furthermore, φιλεταιρία was a typical characteristic of Achilles in encomia, especially with reference to his relationship with Patroclus: striking evidence is in the encomium of Achilles in Libanius, *Prog*. 8.3.19, but also in his ethopoeia entitled Τίνας ἂν εἴποι λόγους Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐπὶ Παρόκλῳ κειμένῳ; (*Prog*. 11.3.11). Moreover, as argued in detail above, since the theme of φιλεταιρία (as well as ἀνδρεία) is also present in P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123 (fr.2, col.2. line 1, see discussion above) at the beginning of the extant part of the encomium of Tydeus, it is evident that this must have been a common *topos* of rhetorical exercises containing encomia. Finally, the choice of Achilles, a demigod, as the object of this encomium appears consistent with the considerations arising from P.Mil.Vogl. 3.2 about the semi-divine nature of the protagonists of these encomia, although Achilles was probably a common subject regardless of this apparent trend.

Further doubts on the nature of this piece may arise in the light of its beginning, ἐπ' ἀνδρείαν τοίνυν τις καλλίονᾳς παρακλήσεις καταλέ[ξε]ι̣εν. Considering the short length of the text we have, it is

not totally implausible to assume that Achilles might not have been the main protagonist of the encomium, and that this could have been a longer encomium of courage (the ἀνδρεία in the initial rhetorical question), of which Achilles was just one of the various examples. A small element of support to this idea comes from the only entirely reconstructable word in column 1, ἀν]δρείᾳ (l.12); from these considerations comes the supplement]ἀκιν[δυν- at l.10. If we compare this short passage with the encomium of Tydeus in P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123, where φιλεταιρία is also praised as a virtue, we can see how this quality follows that of courage (Tydeus is first said to have fought against Thebes, and then to have been a φιλέταιρος). The beginning of col.1, however, seems in favour of the idea of Achilles being the main protagonist of the encomium, since the author is rhetorically asking what better subject he could find, and says he will concentrate on the most remarkable one. In conclusion, it is safe to assume this was not a protreptic speech on friendship, but more likely an encomium of Achilles and his virtues (following Ps-Herm. *Prog*. 7) of which our fragment emphasises ἀνδρεία and φιλεταιρία. The mention of ἀνδρεία in the previous section and in the opening sentence of this fragment (which seems to be its *exordium*), might open to the possibility of this papyrus belonging to a collection of encomia of different characters who showed (among other qualities) to have courage.

Finally, some general stylistic considerations can be made. The author of this piece clearly paid attention to rhetorical figures, as evident from the rhetorical questions and the initial *praeteritio*. Moreover, Petrie (1891), 32, and Barber (1929), 118, have noted the avoidance of hiatus and has considered it as further confirmation of a date posterior to Isocrates' teaching. Nevertheless, Petrie also argues that the omission of ἄν before the optative (ll.3 and 11) could be a sign of older prose, a rule which was, by his own admission, not so rigidly respected, and the absence of the particle in this passage could be absolutely random. According to Petrie, stylistically, an interesting aspect of this text is the care of its author for euphonic clauses, a sign of the attention paid in the schools to prose rhythm; I assume Petrie was simply talking about general aspects of euphony (see the alliteration at l.9) rather than proper prose rhythm, which I do not find in this fragment. With regard to the style, Wooten, who inserts this papyrus in the section of his dissertation about rhetorical exercises, sees Demosthenic elements in some of the expressions employed in this text (e.g. the use of rhetorical figures, the abstract τὸ μέλλον at l.30, the antithesis at l.40). However, all these points seem rather weak and vitiated by Wooten's intent to demonstrate that Hellenistic oratory was still mainly dependant on Demosthenes.

Col.2. l.1 ἐπανώρθωσεν: this could be the end of a previous sentence whose general content is impossible to reconstruct.

Col.2. ll.2-4 ἐπ' ἀνδρείαν... ἐάσω: The panegyrist starts with a rhetorical question: who can have pronounced finer exhortations to courage (than Homer)? The beginning is followed an *excusatio* about the author's rhetorical abilities: the poet (perhaps Homer) has encouraged the treatment of many subjects, but our author will modestly focus on Achilles. This *excusatio* seems to be reminiscent of

the beginning of Lysias' *Funeral Speech* (2.1), where he explains how difficult it is for the orators to compose speeches with short notice, first of all, because it is hard to praise the great deeds of the dead properly, but also because Lysias will have to compete with the great orators who in the past have made similar praises. Lysias, however, is confident that the abundance of great actions will provide him enough material for an original speech.

Col.2. l.2 παρακλήσεις: the first attestation of παράκλησις as general exhortation or address is in Thucydides (8.92.11) if we exclude an attestation in Aesop (30.1.7) where it simply indicates an address to the gods. On the other hand, with the meaning it has in this papyrus, it first appears in orators: Isocrates (1.5), or the author of this spurious speech, distinguishes between παράκλησις (a 'hortatory speech' commonly translated 'protreptic' speech) and the παραίνησις, the moral treatise he is writing to Demonicus. Παράκλησις is also the word Isocrates employs to define his speech *Evagoras* (76) and to refer to his encomium of Athens in the *Panathenaicus* (236), although in this last example these words are imagined to be uttered by the panegyrist of the Spartans. Worthy of mention are also two passages by Aeschines: Aeschin. 1.117, where the orator expresses his intention to write a λόγος which is a παράκλησις τῶν πολιτῶν πρὸς ἀρετήν; and Aeschin. 2. 180, where he is not talking about a speech, but connects the term παράκλησις to the concept of virtue (τὴν τῆς σωφροσύνης παράκλησιν). Harpocration (s.v. παράκλησις) says it is a synonym of προτροπή (see col.2. l.11) and quotes a fragment of Lycurgus' Περὶ τῆς ἱερείας, where the term seems however used simply with the general meaning of 'exhortation' or 'plea'. Moreover, predictably, the term is employed in the fragments of Aristotle's *Protreptic* (7.2). Finally, it is mentioned in Anaximenes' *Rhetorica* (1.3.3) in his definition of προτροπὴ (see col.2 l.11).

Col.2. ll.4-10 δεδιώς μὴ…ἀποτρέψω: the author here explains the criterion at the basis of his choice of this specific topic: the great examples of bravery in Homer are so many and varied, that an encomium taking into account all of them would be way too long and would eventually bore the readers who will get distracted. Thus, he chooses the most remarkable and noble example of courage, namely Achilles.

Col.2. ll.5-6 τῶι μήκει…ἐ]πιφανεστάτης: the verb ἐνοχλέω is an extremely popular verb in Attic oratory but also in later rhetors. With reference to μῆκος we find it rather late: in Libanius, *Or.* 25.31.3, where the formulation is very similar to the one in our papyrus (σεσίγηται τοῦ μὴ τὸ μῆκος ἐνοχλῆσαι τοῖς ἥκουσιν); *Ep.* 559.3.6, where τὸ μὴ μάταιον μῆκος ἐνοχλεῖν τῷ κάλλει is praised; then in John Chrysostom, 51.132.12, whose context is again very similar to that of our papyrus (ὥστε μὴ ἐνοχλῆσαι τῷ μήκει, εἰς ἑτέραν ταῦτα διάλεξιν ὑπερθέμενοι καταπαύσομεν τὸν λόγον), and 57.41.42, once again not far from the context of P.Petrie. 1.10 (Ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ δόξωμεν πολὺ μῆκος ποιοῦντες ἐνοχλεῖν, ταῦτα παρέντες ἐπὶ τὰ κατεπείγοντα ἴωμεν); and finally in Nicholas Mistikos, *Ep.* 13. 41, still about the fear of annoying

because of the length of a speech (οὐδ' ἡμεῖς πλέον ἐγνώκαμεν ἐκτείνειν τὸν λόγον οὐδ' ἐνοχλεῖν σε τῷ μήκει τοῦ γράμματος, ἀλλὰ μόνην ἐυχὴν προσεπιτιθέαμεν) .

Col.2. l.6 ἀποτρέψω: although widely attested in oratory, in Attic orators ἀποτρέπω has never exactly the same rhetorical value of 'turning away a certain audience', that it has here. In Demosthenes, in particular, it is usually employed with the meaning of 'being deterred from saying' (see for instance 21.104.3; 200.2; *Ex*. 23.2; 32.3; *Epit.* 26.4). The reference to Thetis and Achilles is here evident. The context in which the verb is used is different and the concept expressed is the opposite of the one at l.6 – here the speaker is afraid of dissuading, while in Isocrates, the failed dissuasion is a reason of pride –, but the idea of a speech being able (or not able) to dissuade its audience is somehow similar. With the meaning of 'dissuade' rhetorically, ἀποτρέπω is used by Aristotle (*Rhet*. 1391b.9).

Col.2. ll.6-7 τοῦ ποιητοῦ παρακαλοῦντος: the "poet" is probably Homer. The meaning of παρακαλέω is here 'encourage' and this genitive absolute most likely means that Homer – the poet by definition – offered such a great variety of potential subjects for praise, by providing many great examples in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

Col.2. ll. 10-12: the rhetorical questions here work as a link between the opening *praeteritio* and *excusatio*, and the actual praise of Achilles' φιλεταιρία.

Col.2. l.11 προτροπὴ: as substantive προτροπὴ is first attested in Democritus' frr. 125 and 181, and it is never used by orators. It usually means 'exhortation', and its definition is given by Anaximenes (*Rhet.* 1.3.3). With the meaning of 'exhortation to virtue' we find it in Plato ([*Clit.*] 408d) and we also see it employed in Aristotle's *Protreptic* (fr.7.3), and in his *Rhetoric* as opposed to ἀποτροπή (1358b.8, 1360b. 10, 1415a.6), similarly to Anaximenes' *Rhetorica* (among the others, 1.2 and 7.7). In Aristotle's *Divisiones* (21. col. 1) it is considered a type of speech (τῆς ἄρα ῥητορείας ἐστὶ τὸ μὲν ἐγκώμιον, τὸ δὲ ψόγος, τὸ δὲ προτροπή, τὸ δὲ ἀποτροπή, τὸ δὲ κατηγορία, τὸ δὲ ἀπολογία), as well as in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ars. Rhet*. 4.3.2).

Col.2. ll.13-18: the praise starts with the canonical introduction of the character, in which his birth, country, and education are listed. If my supplement at l. 18 is correct, it seems safe to assume that a brief mention of some of his pre-Trojan actions must have been made too, soon after. The space given to these characteristics is considerably shorter if compared to more typical encomia dedicated to single characters (see by contrast P.Mil.Vogl. 3.123), but this is understandable if we consider φιλεταιρία and ἀνδρεία as the main focus of the encomium.

Col.2. l.15 πεπαιδευομένος: on the different versions of the myth about the education of Achilles see Robbins (1993).

Col.2. ll.15-18 πεπαιδευομένος δὲ… ὑπαρχόντων: the subject of the unreadable]ῃσ̣ατο is clearly Achilles. I suggest the supplement αὐτὸς [ἐκτ]ῃσ̣ατο [χα]ρ̣ιν, with the meaning of 'he acquired the favour for all that is most honourable and splendid.

Col.2. ll.19-25: the papyrus becomes brown and abraded at this point, and almost nothing of the extant letters is legible. In the light of what follows, it can be conjectured that Thetis' admonition to Achilles (perhaps something similar to the one in Plato's *Apology* [28c.5] might have found its place here. This idea can be corroborated by the only legible word of the section, namely εἱμαρμένης, destiny, perhaps Achilles' tragic destiny that his mother announced to him when she tried to persuade him to desist from vindicating Patroclus.

Col.2. ll.26-31: the author explains here that not even the exhortation (allegedly in the previous damaged section) of his mother (also a goddess who could predict the future) was stronger than his desire to avenge Patroclus.

Col.2. ll.26-28: ἣν ἔλ̣ε̣ξ̣εν…μέλλον: a combination of Milne's reading (1922) and Petrie's (1891), ἣν ἔλεξεν ἡ μήτηρ ἣν τἀληθῆ does not make the syntax very easy to follow. The first relative pronoun could refer to the εἱμαρμένη, foreseen by Thetis in her speech (therefore, I would translate 'this destiny recounted his mother' rather than the vague 'these things said his mother'). Less clear is the second ἣν, which I would emend into a dative ᾗ (perhaps written as an accusative because of the close ἣν just at the beginning of the sentence). In this way, what follows acquires a clearer meaning: '(his mother) for whom it was possible to tell the truth, and as a god also to foresee the future'.

Col.2. l.27 θεός: rather than a reference to a helping god, θεός is here predicative for μήτηρ (same at line 29), meaning that Thetis was advising Achilles both as a mother and as a goddess. Θεός is attested by Greek authors both for male gods and for goddesses as synonym of θεά, in particular in Plato's *Apology* – in the passage that seems to be at the basis of this rhetorical exercise, it is used with reference to Thetis (28c.5, θεὸς οὖσα).

Col.2. l.29 παραίνεσις: the meaning of this word here is simply that of 'exhortation', namely the exhortation of Thetis to her son not to vindicate Patroclus, as she, as a goddess, could foresee his future death. Consequently, this is not proof that Thetis is the one who is pronouncing this speech, as Petrie assumes, perhaps in the light of the rhetorical meaning of παραίνησις as exhortative speech.

Coll.2-3. ll.32-36: again, we find a rhetorical question as linking element between the narration of the episode of Achilles and Thetis and the specific praise of φιλεταιρία. The author uses a hyperbole

to introduce the topic, asking what could ever be better and more praiseworthy than showing devotion to a friend.

Col.2. ll.33-34 διανοίας...μείζονας: The concept of the 'better exhortation' comes back here in an almost circular composition: compare καλλίονᾳ̣ παρακλήσεις (col.2. ll.2-3) with διανοίας καλλίονάς τε καὶ παρακ]λήσεις μείζονας here.

Col.3. ll.1-11: the author here reaches the core of his speech by praising Achilles' love and devotion to Patroclus. The argument is structured following a parallel: on the one hand, we have 'the others', who claimed to have accomplished good actions but in fact did nothing, while on the other hand, there is Achilles, who took his devotion to the extreme by sacrificing his own life to avenge his friend and to join him.

Col.3. l.2 ε$^{\eta}$μ: The superscript η is a replacement for the ε (either in correction or as a variant). I believe this stands for ἦν, as μ is frequently confused with ν, and it is here explicable as an assimilation before the following μ (similarly at col.3, ll. 7, 15, it is an assimilation before a labial consonant. But for the phenomenon in general, see Mayser-Schmoll [1970^{2}], 1.154, 169ff.). This appears to be the only solution that makes the construction grammatically possible.

Col.3. l.3 προ̣κ̣ει̣μένων: the reading is very unclear, but, although redundant, this seems the only fitting word (see parallels in Hdt. 9.82; Plat. *Resp*. 555b.9; Arist. 1393a.14).

Col.3. ll.10-11 συμπενθεῖσθαι: used here in correlation and opposition to πενθεῖν, this compound verb is not extremely common – 69 attestations in the whole of Greek literature, most of which are later than the 4th century AD. It is never attested in the passive voice as here, but always means actively 'to mourn together', 'to share the grief', specifically the grief for the city or the dead of the city in the orators (Isoc. 8.87; Lycurg. 1.43; Dem. 60.33).

Col. 3.ll. 11-14: the conclusion of the encomium is a statement on death and friendship. That of Achilles and Patroclus is a superior kind of friendship, since, contrary to all the others, it will not end with death but will grow stronger thanks to it.

Col.3. ll.14-18: in what seems to be the final section of the speech (or at least of the part related to Achilles and Patroclus) the author ends his reflection with a general statement on φιλεταιρία, not too different from the one in Arist. 1364b. On friendship in the ancient world, see Konstan (1997).

Col.3. l.16 [πεπρ]αγματευμένον: although it is hard to say what is missing in the short space after φίλοις (a short adverb perhaps, or a δια-, as suggested by Stramaglia, see apparatus), the new reading πεπρ]αγματευμένον (α and γ are currently clearly legible in the papyrus) instead of Petrie's meaningless μεματευομενον re-establishes a perfect sense for this sentence.

Dubia

1) P. Heid. Siegmann 192 [inv. 1132] (MP3 2538; LDAB 6960)
Egypt (location non specified), ca. 250 BC

Editions
Siegmann (1956).

Bibliography
Kremmydas (2013), 147.

Text
]ο̣λλῃ τὴν ἀ[...
].[...] ν̣ με εἰς τὰ π̣ι̣.[.
]να[..] . λ̣α̣β[.]α ἐπιλα[μ-
]ω αὐτοῦ̣ τῆς ἀσπίδο̣[ς
] . ιαγ καὶ τύπτω αὐ̣[..
]να, ἐάν δε πάλιν π̣ρ̣ [..
] πρόσωπον καὶ ἐμὰς
] [π]ό̣λει [ἐ]π̣ιλαμανβάνη-
] η [.....]μος μ [..] κ [...
]σ̣[

1 '*vel*]αλ, *vix*]βαλ' *Siegmann* | 2 'πιλ[*vel* γρα'[*Siegmann* | 4 αυτος *coni. Siegmann* | 5]γι *vel*]τι *Siegmann* | '*vel* αρ[*vel* ατ[*vel'* αφ[*Siegmann* | 6 '*vel* πυ[, *vix* πι'[*Siegmann* | 9 '*vel*]δος *vel*] λος' *Siegmann* | 10 '*vel*]ε'[*Siegmann*

Commentary

When Ernst Siegmann first published this small papyrus fragment in 1956, he classified it as 'Attischer Redner', assuming it was a piece of an unknown forensic speech, probably thanks to the similarity of the language that Demosthenes employed to describe the attacks of Conon's son to Ariston in the oration *Against Conon* (31). The brevity of the text it contains should rather prevent us from an attribution that may be completely arbitrary. Kremmydas' ideas that this is a piece of Hellenistic forensic speech or more probably a rhetorical exercise are both possible, but we cannot exclude that it was part of a speech taken from a historical work. The first person τύπτω (l.5) and the likely mention of a city (l.8, [π]ό̣λει) certainly leave space for some wishful speculation on its attribution to the category of oratory.

2) P. Heid. Siegmann 193 [inv. 1103a] (MP3 2539; LDAB 6956)
Hibeh, 3rd century BC

Editions
Siegmann (1956), 38-9.

Text
Col. 2
ἄδικόν ἐστιν [
το τῆς νόσον κᾳ̣[
δίκαια τάδε[
καὶ γονέᾳς τιμ̣[ᾶν
προστάττοι γ̣ο[[5]
καὶ μὴ λαμβαν[
π̣ομ πλησίο̣ν ν[
πουν ἀδ[ί]κων . . [
ᾳ̣σει ἀδικ[
· ·]αντι πεπογ̣[θ [10]
· ·]νο ἔπαθεγ̣ ᾳ̣[
πε]π̣ληγμέγ̣[
· ·] · ᾳ̣τ[
……

2 τη *in rasura* | 4 *'vix -νευς vel -νεις' Siegmann* | *coni.* τιλ[vel τιν[. Siegmann | 7 *'vix* τομ *vel* ποη' *Siegmann* | 8 *coni.* πων *vel* τουν *Siegmann* | 9 ἅπ̣ερ *sed etiam* θ]ρασει *Siegmann* | 'vel κ..γα' *Siegmann* | ἀδικ[ώτατ *Siegmann* | 10 *'vel* ποι[' *Siegmann* | 11 *coni.* θειλ[. *Siegmann*

Commentary

Similarly to P.Heid. 192, when Siegmann edited this papyrus fragment, he added the heading 'Attischer Redner'. In this case, however, he chose to put a question mark after the title. From the few reconstructable words, all we can possibly say is that it included a theme related to family, perhaps the necessity of the children to honour their parents (l. 4) when they are ill (l.2). If so, this could be a piece of a declamation involving a theme on parents' rights (widely attested, see Vesley [2003]). Siegmann admits, however, that this could also fairly be a piece of philosophical dialogue. A compromise between the two possibilities is that it was part of a rhetorical exercise or *progymnasma* with a philosophical or moral theme, as is possible for the 1st-2nd century AD P.Köln 1.9, which also deals with family matters. Although Kremmydas has listed it among rhetorical exercises, the

evidence for a rhetorical content in this fragment is rather limited. Finally, it is worth noting that the handwriting is quite firm, there are a couple of corrections (an erasure at line 2, and an interlinear adding at line 8), and a sign of *paragraphos* at line 2.

3) P. Petrie inv. F 98 (MP3 2559.1; LDAB 7502)
Fayoum, 300-250 BC

Editions
Wouters (1977).

Text
Col. 1
[*ca. 9*]ναχεσθαι
[*ca. 12*]̣ ταλλα
[*ca. 10*]ς συγγνω
[*ca. 7*]̣η σοι απε̣. ει
[*ca. 8*]̣ πρότερον [5]
[*ca. 7*]α̣ λέγεσθαι
[*ca. 9*]εμον ἐπει̣
[*ca. 10*]̣οι μὲν ἐν
[*ca. 16*]

Col. 2
ὁμιλεῖν. ἐμὲ δ' ὅτι πολὺ
πλείω σοι π̣ροσφερομένο̣ς
εὔνοιαν̣ κ̣αὶ̣ πίστιν ἐκεί-
νων διατελῶ πάντα
τὸν χρόνον, οὐδὲ προση- [5]
[*ca. 4*]α̣[*ca. 3*]ν εἶναι νομί-
ζεις. καὶ τούτων ὀυ-
θενὸς ἐν̣ [οὐ]θενὶ χείρων
[*ca. 6*] . . [. .]. . . . π̣ . .
. . . . . .

6 α[ὐτῶ]ν *coni. Wouters*

Commentary

This is a small papyrus fragment, taken from a mummy cartonnage. It is composed of two relatively narrow columns (15-20 letters) separated by a space of 0.5 cm, there is a short upper margin of 1.1 cm, the verso is blank, the handwriting (to be dated to the 3rd century BC) is particularly elegant and clear, and we find a *paragraphos*, marking either the end of a section or of a sentence, all signs of the possibly refined nature of the book that contained this text.

The editor of the fragment, Wouters, has classified it as part of a speech or a letter because of words like συγγνώμη (l. 4) and εὐνοίαν καὶ πίστιν (l. 12), which may allude to a political context. He seemed to notice a certain 'euphony and rhythm' in the only legible sentence of the fragment, which led him to think of this as a rhetorical piece. If not a speech, this could be, in his opinion, a 'letter, composed in a very rhetorical style'. Although we do not have examples of rhetorical exercises in forms of letters in rhetorical handbooks, there is a huge amount of spurious letters attributed to ancient characters. There are famous examples, such as the epistles of Phalaris in Bentley (1697), but also well as later rhetorical papyri containing fictitious letters (e.g., PSI 12.1285 and P.Fay.19, from the 2nd century, and P.Oxy.217 and P.Berol. inv.21261r from the 3rd, but also the collection of 2nd century BC fictitious epistles contained in P.Hamb.129). To these we may add, the many epistles contained in miscellaneous manuscripts (most of them collected by Hercher [1873]). All these examples are clear proofs that letters written in a rhetorical style were part of rhetorical training. More evidence is shown by the τύποι ἐπιστολικοί attributed to Demetrius and Libanius, the treatise *De epistulis* of Philostratus, P.Bon.1.5, a 3rd century AD papyrus fragment, containing examples of letters of various kinds. Therefore, Wouters' hypothesis can surely be taken into account.

4) PSI Laur. inv.22013 = (MP3 2558, LDAB 6773)
Egypt (uncertain location, perhaps Oxyrhynchus?), 2nd (ex) / 1st (in) century BC

Edition
Gallavotti (1939).

Bibliography
Cavallo-Maehler (2008), 63, pl. 3; Pintaudi-Canfora (2010); Stramaglia (2015), 169.

Text

Col.1
αῤ.[
ρᾳ [

ο[
.[
ε_ [[5]
π[
υ . [
ευ[

φορ̣[
πω[[10]
αλλο̣[
μεις [
στρατ[
διδοντ[
. ω[[15]
υποπ [
νος εμ[
δαιμο̣ν̣[
δουνε[
ποις υ .[[20]
ειν̣ πρ [

ητοις (.[
πικραν[
δεναγ̣α̣[
των [[25]
τα̣[
π .[
τω[
λει[

Col.2

] προσδεχόμεθα ὡς
]χειμῶνος εἰς εὐδίαν
]χ ὅπως χάριν ἔχειν
ἐ]πὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἄγεσθαι
]αθαίρο[[ι]]ντο τίς οὖν ἔτι [5]
]εὔνοιαν ἐνδείξεται

]ιρας τῶν ἰδίωι γινο-
]ς ἀρήγειν προαιρήσεται.
]φ[ίλοι]ς βουλευώμεθα
]ὺς φίλους πατέρας [10]
]ὺς δόντες ἀλλ᾽ ἐχθροί
]τα τὴν συμφορὰν
]ἡμεῖς δ᾽ ἐκείνων ταῖς
]γώμεθα οὐκ ἀνθρω-
]ρ[ήμ]άτων [ἐ]πὶ τῆς [15]
]χαλεπώτερα διανο-
]ς δὴ γένεσθε πάυ καὶ
] ἀπειπαμένων ἐξα-
]λος καὶ στήσας μέσους
θ]εοὺς καὶ δομονας [sic] ἐπικα- [20]
μ]αρτύρηται λέγων [ ] ἐγὼ
]ε καὶ θεοὶ πάντας τούσδε
]πχειρίους γενομένους
] πολῖται δὲ καὶ σύμμα-
]ριδόντες [ ] χρημάτων [25]
]μενοι [ ] ἀναιρεῖν κελευ-
]ναυαγοὺς γῆς λαβομένους.

2 [νικήσαντας. τοῦ δὲ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 3 [μεταστάντα οὐ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 4 [οἷοι γένεσθε ἦσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 5 [οὗ ἂν τοῦ ἄγους ἐκ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 6 [ἐν τῷ παρόντι] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 7 [ἐκ τοὺς αὐτόχε] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 8 [μένους; μηδεὶ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 9 [πῶς δ᾽ ἂν τοῖς] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 10 [παραμυθεῖσθαι τ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 11 [οἳ τῇ πατρίδι τοὺς] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 12 [γε ὑπάρξονται ἰδόν] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 13 [ἀζήμιον οὖσαν] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 14 [ἀπάταις ὅπως μὴ παρα] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 15 [πείως γὰρ ἕνεκα χ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 16 [μάχης προσεφέροντο] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 17 [ηθέντες τραχεῖ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 18 [τότε μὲν τῶν πρυτάνεων] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 19 [νέστη ὁ Θράσυλ] *Canfora Pintaudi* | 20 [ναύτας τινὰς] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 21 [λούμενος ὧν ἂν] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 22 [μὲν ἔφη ὦ Ζεῦ τ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 23 [ὑμῖν παρέχω ὑ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 24 [νῦν δὲ μάρτυρας] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 25 [χοι ὄντας καὶ ὑπε] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 26 [τῶν ἐκεῖ ἀλλ᾽ ἄσ] *Canfora-Pintaudi* | 27 [όμενοι τοὺς] *Canfora-Pintaudi*

Commentary

This papyrus has two columns, it is written only on the *recto*, either by two hands or by two different *calami*, in a very clear, not overly elegant, slightly cursive handwriting to be dated between the end of the 2nd and the beginning of the 1st century BC (see parallels in Cavallo [2008], 60, who goes further, and establishes the early 1st century BC as the definitive date). The text is grammatically

correct and just a small number of corrections (from the same hand) are present. Signs of *paragraphos* are extremely frequent (8 in col.1), and blank spaces are left next to them. It is because of these spaces, found in col.2 that we can assume a fairly high number of *paragraphoi* were there too. For a detailed description of the material aspects and reconstruction of column length and width, see Bastianini-Canfora (2010), 82-86. The two editors present a number of supplements and conjectures, which, even though often convincing, I chose to include only in the apparatus.

The text contains part of an oration that probably deals with the process of the Arginusae. In the first edition of this papyrus fragment, Gallavotti (1939), 259, identified it as rhetorical exercise, but also possibly a historical narration. The opinion of the most recent contributors on the papyrus is split. Bastianini and Canfora, who provide consistent supplements, on the basis of the parallels with Xenophon, and of the very dramatised style of the piece, as well as the change of speaker, believe this is a piece of history with an embedded speech, perhaps part of the histories of Ephorus, Theopompus, Duris, or someone else unknown (see discussion in Bastianini Canfora [2010], 89-93). On the contrary, Stramaglia (2015), 169 rather sees it as a declamation, on the ground of the many parallels for μελέται on the Arginusae theme (see P. Yale. 2.105, and Stephens [1985]). Perhaps by mistake, Kremmydas (2013), 160, classifies it as a rhetorical *techne*. The dramatised structure, with a quotation of another speaker (maybe Thrasyllus), or even a change of speaker (another function the *paragraphoi* could be for) should perhaps more support the hypothesis that this was an embedded and re-arranged speech in a Hellenistic historical work. An orator (even if just in the form of a made-up character in a rhetorical exercise) directly quoting another speaker may seem a less probable option, but is not at all unparalleled in Attic oratory. We can mention Aesch.2.37, 43; 3.166-7, 209, 211, where he quite frequently quotes parts of Demosthenes' conversation and speeches. Demosthenes also quotes absent speakers at 19.22, 194-5, 320, 324). And there is also the case of Isoc. 12.235-63, the rather long discourse of Isocrates' Spartan former student, who spoke in favour of Sparta. See Trevett (1995), on the use of direct speech in the Attic orators.

Col.1 ll.1-2: the people here welcomed as 'winners', seem to be the generals of the Arginusae battle. The expression is to be seen as an ironical admonition towards those who called winners and honoured these generals, instead of punishing them for letting the others die.

Col.1 ll.2-5: the speaker, then, provides a context to his previous statement and to the charges against the generals. When the weather got better after the battle, the generals did not acknowledge the efforts of those who died, and subsequently, when back in Athens, had the effrontery to show up at the burial of the victims, as if to atone for their immoral behaviour.

Col.1 l.2 τοῦ δὲ] χειμῶνος εἰς εὐδίαν: the almost proverbial expression 'to turn the winter into fine weather' and vice versa is used both literally and metaphorically throughout the whole of Greek literature. The earliest attestation is in Pindar (*Ist.* 7.6.38), whoile the only attestation in oratory is in

Antiphon (2.2.1), and it occurs only once in historiography (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.14). Canfora uses this passage by Xenophon as evidence that this piece belonged to a historical narration similar to that of Xenophon, who just at the end of the first book of the *Hellenics* had narrated the Arginusae trial. Surely it corroborates the hypothesis that this fragment deals with this trial, since, as known (Xen. *Hell.* 1. 7. 4), the generals blamed the bad weather for the tragedy.

Col.1 l.5 [οὗ ἂν τοῦ ἄγους ἐκαθ[αίρο[[ι]]ντο: Canfora's restoration ἄγους makes sense in relation to the supplement ἐκαθ[αίρο[[ι]]ντο, and well fits the context (as providing burial for the people dead in war was not only a civil but also a religious obligation, see Jacoby [1944]). However, it is worth noting that the expression is never attested in oratory or history, and is more widely attested after the 1st century AD.

Col1. ll.5-8: this first rhetorical question creates a crescendo of pathos and tension culminating at l.17. The speaker here does not refrain from harsh words against the generals. They are called 'murderers of their own men', and to the rhetorical question, whether they are deserving of benevolence, the obvious answer is explicitly given: nobody would be benevolent towards such people.

Col.1. l.6 εὔνοιαν ἐνδείξεται: a very common expression in Attic oratory, never attested in historians from the Classical age, but increasingly common after Anaximenes and then widely employed by Diodorus and Plutarch.

Col.1 l.8 ἀρήγειν προαιρήσεται: the verb ἀρήγω is never attested in oratory, but massively employed by Xenophon.

Col.1 ll.9-10: the second rhetorical question is about the parents of dead soldiers, who cannot be consoled by anyone, not even by their friends. The mention of the 'dear fathers' is further evidence that the topic of the speech could be the Arginusae trial, considering the information in Xenophon (*Hell.* 1.7.8) where the historian narrates that trial happened during the feast of Apaturia, and the absence of the dead sons was more evident to the fathers. Canfora justifies his choice of the verb παραμυθεῖσθαι in the light of the aforementioned passage by Xenophon, where he also said that in the occasion of the Apaturia fathers and friends reunited to stay close one another.

Col.1 ll.11-17: we see there is here a variation in the rhetorical structure, as the second question, unlike the first, is not followed by a short obvious answer, but by an explanation of the consequences of these fathers' resentment, if the crime of the generals does not find its right punishment. Then, it follows an exhortation to the Athenians not to let themselves be persuaded by the generals to believe a false version of the events. Finally, in order to underline their abject nature, the orator remembers that the generals did not take part in the battle for good reasons but for their thirst for

wealth, which would constitute a further reason for the Athenians – again addressed directly – to be harsh in their judgment against them.

Col.1 ll.14-15 ἀνθρω[πείως: a rather rare adverbial use of ἀνθρώπειος (only ten attestations in Greek literature, only two in the Classical age: Thuc. 5.103, Aristoph. *Ran*. 1058).

Col.1 ll.15: χ]ρ[ήμ]άτων: this is perhaps the Spartan treasure mentioned by Xenophon (*Hell*. 1. 6. 37). See l. 25.

Col.1 ll.17-21: this is a transitional paragraph aiming at linking the previous speech to the one that follows, allegedly pronounced by Thrasyllus (see l.19). This seems to be the principal proof that these are embedded speeches in history.

Col.1 l.19 ὁ Θράσυλ]λος: Canfora's reading is undoubtedly interesting, despite the λ being uncertain. Given the context, this seems the only plausible name, as Thrasyllus was one of the five generals who did not escape the trial and attempted a defence (Xen. *Hell*. 1.7.5).

Col.1. ll.21-24: the speech starts with the usual invocation to the gods. The orator then presents his witnesses.

Col.1. l.24: παρέχω … δὲ μάρτυρας: Canfora's restoration is well supported by Xen. *Hell*. 1.7.7, where it is stated that the accused generals physically brought their witnesses to the trial.

Col.1. ll.24-27: in this section, the general (maybe Thrasyllus) praises the witnesses he brought (pilots and other ship-companions, according to Xen. *Hell*. 1.7.7). They are praised because they did not take part in the battle for money, but because they were good citizens and comrades, and were ready to help carrying the victims, as an act of obedience. This can be read in opposition to the accusations to generals at ll.14-16: while they are attacked for being greedy, their defence is based on the unselfishness and patriotic spirit of their witnesses. It is notable that it is with a praise, one of the typically Hellenistic forms of oratory, that this speech begins.

Col.1. l.25 χρημάτων: see l.15.

Col.1 ll.26-27 [τῶν …λαβομένους: even if we ignored the supplements, there would be enough textual evidence (ναυαγοὺς γῆς λαβομένους) in these two lines to support the idea of this piece being about the Arginusae trial.

Bibliography

Citations throughout the thesis follow *OCD*, when possible.

Abbreviations:

BNJ = *Brill's New Jacoby*, Worthington I. (ed.), Brill Academic.

BNP = *Brill's New Pauly. Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*, Cancik H., Schneider H., Landfester M. et al. (eds.) (2002–2010) Leiden and Boston.

FGrHist = *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Jacoby F. (1926-30), Berlin.

FHG = *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum,* Müller K. (1841-72), Paris.

IC = *Inscriptiones Creticae*, Guarducci M. and Halbherr F. (1935), Rome.

I.Epidamnos = *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Epire : Inscriptions d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia* (Études épigraphiques, 2), Cabanes P., Drin, F., Chatzopoulos M. and Masson, O. (1995), Athens.

IG = *Inscriptiones Graecae*, Various eds. (1873–), Berlin.

IGLSyr. = *Inscriptions Grecques Et Latines De La Syrie*, Various eds (1929), Paris.

I.Magnesia = 'I.Magnesia'. Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum. Ed. A. Chaniotis, T. Corsten, N. Papazarkadas, R.A. Tybout. Brill Reference Online. Web. 24 Sept. 2019.

IOSPE^{3} =, *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae et Latinae*, Latîshev V. (1965^{3})Saint Petersburg.

LSJ = *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae Project, The online Liddell-Scott-Jones Greek-English lexicon*, Liddell H. G., Scott R., Jones H. S., McKenzie R. (2011), Irvine, CA.

OGI = *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae: Supplementum sylloges inscriptionum graecarum*, Dittenberger W. (1960^{2}) Hildesheim.

OLD = *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Glare P.G.W. (ed.) (2012^{2}), Oxford.

RE = *Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft, neue Bearbeitung unter Mitwirkung zahlreicher Fachgenossen, I–XXIV, I A–X A, Suppl. I–XV, Register*, Wissowa G.G., Kroll W., Witte K. andZiegler K. (eds.) (1839–1980),Stuttgart–München.

SEG = *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Various eds. (1923-), Leiden, Alphen and Amsterdam.

Syll^{3}. = *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, W. Dittenberger (ed.) F. Hiller von Gaertringen (rev. ed.) (1915-24^{3}), Leipzig.

TDGR = *Translated documents of Greece and Rome*, Sherk R. K. (Ed.) (1983-88),Cambridge.

Frequently cited editions:

Aelius Aristides = *P. Aelii Aristidis opera quae exstant omnia, volumen primum: Orationes II, III, IV*, Behr C. A. (ed.) (1978),Leiden.

Anaximenes = *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, Chiron P. (ed.) (2002), Paris.

Apsines = *Two Greek rhetorical treatises from the Roman Empire : Introduction, text, and translation of the Arts of rhetoric, attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara* (Mnemosyne, bibliotheca classica Batava. Supplementum. 168), Dilts M. R., Kennedy G. A, (eds.) (1997), Leiden.

Cleanthes and Zeno = *The fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes with Introduction and Notes*, Pearson A. C. (ed.) (1891), London.

Demades = *Demade oratore : Testemonianze e frammenti*, De Falco V. (ed.) (1954²), Naples.

Gnomologium Vaticanum = *Gnomologium Vaticanum e Codice Vaticano Graeco 743* (*Texte und Kommentare ; Bd. 2*), Sternbach L. (ed.) (1963), Berlin.

Hermogenes = *Hermogenis opera*, Rabe H. (1976) (ed.), Leipzig.

Corpus rhetoricum (*Aphthonius, Hermogenes*), Patillon M. (2008) (ed.), Paris.

Hyperides =, *Hyperidis Orationes sex cum ceterarum fragmentis*, Jensen C. C. (ed.) (1963²), Stuttgart.

Minor Attic Orators = *Minor Attic orators*, Maidment K. and Burtt J. (ed.) (1941), London and Cambridge, Mass.

Lysias = *Lysiae Orationes : Cum fragmentis*, Carey C. (ed.) (2007), Oxford.

Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta Liberae Rei Publicae =Malcovati E. (ed.) (1976-1979),⁴ Turin.

Ps-Herodian = Ps.-Herodian, *De figuris : Überlieferungsgeschichte und kritische Ausgab*e (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker ; Bd. 8-9), Hajdú K. and Hansen Dirk M. (eds.) (1998), Berlin and New York.

Rhetores Graeci = *Rhetores graeci*, 3 voll., Spengel L. and Hammer C. (eds.) (1894), Leipzig.

Rhetores Graeci, 9 voll., Walz C. (ed.) (1823-6), Tübingen, Stuttgart and Paris.

Rutilius Lupus = *P. Rutilii Lupi Schemata dianoeas et lexeos, testo e traduzione,* Genoa.

Theon = Patillon M. and Bolognesi G. (1997). *Aelius Théon. Progymnasmata*, Paris.

References:

Journal abbreviations follow either *L'Année Philologique* or commonly accepted variants.

Abbamonte G. (2009), 'Discorsi alle truppe: documenti, origine e struttura retorica', in Abbamonte G. (ed.), *Discorsi alla prova: atti del quinto colloquio italo-francese « Discorsi pronunciati, discorsi ascoltati : contesti di eloquenza tra Grecia, Roma ed Europa » : Napoli - S. Maria di Castellabate (Sa) 21-23 settembre 2006*, 29-46, Naples.

Adams C. (1912), 'Are the Political "Speeches" of Demosthenes to Be Regarded as Political Pamphlets?' *TAPhA* 43, 5-22.

Adkins A. W. H. (1960), *Merit and responsibility : a study in Greek values*, Oxford.

Ager S. (1996), *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 BC*, Berkeley.

Amendola D. (2019), 'Presbeutikoi and Enteuktikoi Logoi in Hellenistic Interstate Relations: Some Further Thoughts from an Epigraphical Perspective (c. 306-205 BC)', *Ktèma* 44, 5-21 (forthcoming).

Ampolo C., Erdas D., Magnetto A. (2014), *La gloria di Athana Lindia*, *ANSP* (Lettere) serie 5.6/1, 325-62.

Andorlini I. and Luiselli R.(2001), 'Una ripresa di Diotogene Pitagorico, « Sulla regalità », in PBingen 3 (encomio per Augusto ?)' *ZPE* (136), 155-66.

Asmonti L. (2004), 'Il retore e il gabelliere: Il ruolo di Democare di Leuconoe nella trasmissione dell'ideale democratico', *Acme*. 57, 25-42.

Astin A. E. (1978), *Cato the Censor*, Oxford.

Augello I. and Matelli E. (2006), *Frammenti di critica letteraria, retorica e storiografia*, Rome.

Auschlitz H. (1921), '*Kleochares*' in *RE* XI. 1, col.672.

Bagnall R. S. and Derow P. (2002[2]), *Greek Historica Documents: The Hellenistic Period*, Chicago.

Bagnall R.S. (1976), *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*, Leiden

Baiter G. and Sauppe H. (1839-43), *Oratores Attici*, Zurich.

Balbo A. (2007), *I frammenti degli oratori romani dell'età augustea e tiberiana*, Alessandria.

Ballesteros Pastor L. (2013), *Pompeyo Trogo, Justino y Mitrídates: comentario al « Epítome de las Historias Filípicas »* (*37,1,6-38,8,1*), Hildesheim and Zürich.

Barkan I. (1936), *Capital Punishment in Ancient Athens*, Chicago.

Barney R. (2010), 'Gorgias' Defense: Plato and his Opponents on Rhetoric and the Good', *The Southern Journal of Philosophy* 48(1), 95-121.

Baron C. A. (2009), 'The use and abuse of historians: Polybius' Book XII and our evidence for Timaios', *Anc. Soc.* 39, 1-34.

Baron C. A. (2013), *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography*, Cambridge and New York

Barwick, K. (1963), 'Das Problem der Isokrateischen Techne', *Philologus* 116, 43- 60.

Bayliss A. J. (2011), *After Demosthenes: The Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens*, London.

Beck F. (1986), 'Traditional Elements in the Pedagogy of Socrates', *QUCC,* 22. 1, 107-129.

Bencivenni A. (2010), 'Il re scrive, la città iscrive. La pubblicazione su pietra delle epistole regie nell'Asia ellenistica', in *Studi Ellenistici* 24, 149-71.

Benoit W. (1990), 'Isocrates and Aristotle on Rhetoric', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly,* 20(3), 251-59.

Benoit W. (1991), 'Isocrates and Plato on Rhetoric and Rhetorical Education' *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 21(1), 60-71.
Bentley R. (1697), *Dissertation upon the epistles of Phalaris, Themistocles, Socrates, Euripides and upon the fables of Aesop*, London in Dyce A., *Richard Bentley: The Works, II, edited by Alexander Dyce* (*London 1836*).
Berardi F. (2017), *La retorica degli esercizi preparatori: Glossario ragionato dei Progymnásmat*a, Hildesheim, Zürich and New York.
Berry D. H. (1996), '*The value of prose rhythm in questions of authenticity: the case of* De optimo genere oratorum *attributed to Cicero*' in Cairns F. and Heath M. (eds.), *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar. 9,: 1996 : Roman poetry and prose, Greek poetry, etymology, historiography*, 47-74, Leeds.
Berry D. H. and Heath M. (1997), 'Oratory and Declamation', in Porter (1997), 393-420.
Berthold R. M. (1984), *Rhodes in the Hellenistic age*, Ithaca (N. Y.).
Berti E. (2007), *Scholasticorum Studia, Seneca il Vecchio e la cultura retorica e letteraria della prima età imperiale*, Pisa.
Berve H. (1926) *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage*, Munich.
Bickerman E. J. (1939), 'La cite grecque dans les monarchies hellenistiques' *RPh* 65, 335-49. Reprinted in Bickerman E. J.(1988), Religion and Politics in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. Como, 213-30.
Bickermann E.J. and Sykutris J. (1928), *Speusipps Brief an Köning* Philipp, Leipzig.
Birt D. (1913), *Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriss des antiken Buchwesen*, Munich.
Blass F. (1865), *Die Griechische Beredsamkeit in dem Zeitraum von Alexander bis auf Augustus*, Berlin.
Blass F. (1887²), *Die attische Beredsamkeit* I, Leipzig.
Blass F. (1892²), *Die attische Beredsamkeit* II, Leipzig.
Blass F. (1893²), *Die attische Beredsamkeit* III.1, Leipzig.
Blass F. (1898²), *Die attische Beredsamkeit* III.2, Leipzig.
Blass F. (1901), *Die Rhythmen der attischen Kunstprosa: Isokrates-Demosthenes-Platon*. Leipzig.
Böckh P.A (1851), *Die Staatshaushaltung der Athener*, Berlin, 1851².
Bollansée J., Engels J., Schepens G. and Theys E. (1998), *Felix Jacoby, Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker continued, part four: Biography and Antiquarian Literature, IV A Biography, Fascicle 1: The Pre-Hellenistic* Period, Leiden.
Boncquet J. (1983), 'Polybius on the Critical Evaluation of Historians', *AncSoc*, 33-34, 277-91.
Bonner S. F. (1969²), *Roman Declamation in the Late Republic and Early Empire*, Liverpool.
Bonner S. F. (1977), *Education in Ancient Rome. From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*, London.
Bornecque H. (1902), *Les déclamations et les déclamateurs d'après Sénèque le père*, Lille.
Bosworth A. B. (2003), 'Plus ça change … : ancient historians and their sources', *CA* 22(2), 167-97.
Bousquet J. (1988), 'La stèle des Kyténiens au Létôon de Xanthos', *Revue des Études Grecques*, CI, 12-53.
Bradford Welles C. (1934), *Royal correspondence in the Hellenistic period*, New Heaven.
Braund, S. (1998), 'Praise and Protreptic in Early Imperial Panegyric: Cicero, Seneca, Pliny', in Whitby. M. (ed.), *The Propaganda of Power*, Leiden.
Breitenbach H. R. (1950) ,*Historiographische Anschauungsformen* Xenophons, Freiburg (Schweiz).
Brown A. L. (1996³), 'Theodectes' in *OCD*, 1499.
Brunt P. A. (1976), 'Anaximenes and King Alexander I of Macedon', *JHS* 96, 151-3.
Brzoscka J. (1893), 'Agroitas', *RE*, I.2, col.903.

Brzoska J. (1894a) ,'Aischines (19)', *RE* I, coll.1062-3.
Brzoska J. (1894b), 'Aischylus (15)', *RE* I, col.1085.
Brzoska J. (1894c), 'Anaximenes (3)', *RE* I, coll.2086-98.
Brzoska J. (1894d), 'Antipatros (28)', *RE* 1, coll.2516-7.
Brzoska J. (1901), 'Daphnis', *RE* IV.2, col.2146.
Brzoska J. (1909), 'Euthydemus (14)', *RE 6*, col.1505.
Bugh G. R. (2006), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*, Cambridge.
Burk A. (1923), *Die Pädagogik des Isokrates als Grundlegung des humanistischen Bildungsideals : Im Vergleich mit den zeitgenössischen und den modernen Theorien dargeste*llt (Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums ; Bd.12, Heft 3-4), Würzburg.
Buschmann J. (1878), *Charakteristik der griechischen Rhetoren beim Rhetor Seneca*, Parchim.
Butti de Lima P. F. (1996), *L' inchiesta e la prova: immagine storiografica, pratica giuridica e retorica nella Grecia classica*, Turin.
Cagnetta M. (1986), 'Per una edizione critica della Vita di Tucidide di Marcellino', *BollClass* 7, 59-80.
Cahn M. (1989), 'Reading Rhetoric Rhetorically: Isocrates and the Marketing of Insight', *Rhetorica* 7.2, 121-144.
Calboli G. (1982), 'La retorica preciceroniana e la politica a Roma' in Ludwig W. (ed.), *Éloquence et rhétorique chez Cicéron. Sept exposés suivis de discussions*, 41-108, Vandœuvres-Genève.
Calboli G. (1996), 'Gli oratori romani nel passaggio dal II al I sec. a. C.', in *Per Enrica Malcovati: atti del convegno di studi nel centenario della nascita :* (*Pavia 21-22 ottobre 1994*), 105-24, Como.
Calboli G. (2003), 'Seneca il Retore tra oratoria e retorica', in Gualandri I. and Mazzoli G. (eds.), *Gli Annei: una famiglia nella storia e nella cultura di Roma imperiale : atti del convegno internazionale di Milano-Pavia, 2-6 maggio 2000*, 73-90, Como.
Calboli Montefusco L. (1986), *La dottrina degli status nella retorica greca e romana*, Hildesheim.
Canali De Rossi F. (2002), *Iscrizioni storiche ellenistiche. 3, Decreti per ambasciatori greci al senato*, Rome.
Candau J. M.(2017), 'Speeches of Historians and Historiographical Criticism : Timaeus' Speeches in Polybius' Book XII', in Iglesias-Zoido J. C. and Pineda V. (eds.), *Anthologies of Historiographical Speeches from Antiquity to Early Modern Times: Rearranging the Tesserae*, 63-78, Leiden and Boston.
Canevaro M. (2013), *The Documents in the Attic Orators: Laws and Decrees in the Public Speeches of the Demosthenic Corpus*, Oxford.
Canevaro M. (2018), 'Demosthenic Influences in Early Rhetorical Education' in Canevaro M. and Gray B. (2018), 73-93.
Canevaro M. and Gray B. (2018), *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*, Oxford.
Canfora L. (1974–2000), *Discorsi e lettere di Demostene*, 3 vols, Turin.
Canfora L. (1989), 'Discorso scritto/discorso reale in Demostene', in Marcel D, *Sapere e scrittura in Grecia*, Rome and Bari, 109-117.
Canfora L. (1999), *Il mistero Tucidide*, Milan.
Canfora L. (2006). 'Falsi demostenici e storia del corpus', in Roscalla F. (ed.) *L'autore e l'opera, attribuzioni, appropriazioni, apocrifi nella Grecia antica,* Atti del convegno internazionale (Pavia, 27-28 maggio 2005), Pisa.

Canfora L. (2018) .'Afterlife' in Martin,G. (2018), *The Oxford Handbook of Demosthenes* (Oxford handbooks), 453-62, Oxford.
Canfora L., Pintaudi R (2010), 'PSI Laur. inv. 22013 : retorica o romanzo?', in Bastianini G., Casanova A. (eds.), *I papiri del romanzo antico : atti del convegno internazionale di studi, Firenze, 11-12 giugno 2009*, Firenze, 81-93.
Cantor D. (2002), *Reinventing Hippocrates*, Aldershot and Burlington (Vt.)
Capdetrey L. (2007), *Le pouvoir seleucide. Territoire, administraton, finances d'un royaume hellenistique (312–129 avant J.-C.)*, Rennes.
Caplan H. (1970), *Of eloquence. Studies in Ancient and Mediaeval Rhetoric*, Ithaca (N. Y.).
Carey C. (2007), 'Epideictic Oratory', in Worthington (2007), 236-52.
Carey C. (2008), 'Fragments of Hyperides' « Against Diondas » from the Archimedes palimpsest', *ZPE* 165, 1-19.
Carey C. (2015), 'Solon in the orators', *Trends in Classics*, 7.1, 110-28.
Carlsson S. (2009), 'Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek City-States', *Historia Einzelschriften* 206, Stuttgart.
Cavallo G. (2009), *La scrittura greca dei papiri: una introduzione*, Pisa.
Cavallo G. and Maehler H. (2008), *Hellenistic Bookhands*, Berlin and New York.
Cazacu, A. M. (2013), 'Rhodianism in Cicero's Writings', in *Contemporary Readings in Law and Social Justice* 5(2), 956-62, New York.
Cazzanniga I. (1957), 'Frammenti di Encomia a Minosse, Radamanto e Tideo', *SIFC* 29, 133-73.
Cazzaniga I. (1965), 'Frammenti di Encomia a Minosse, Radamanto e Tideo', *Papiri dell'università di Milano* 3, 21-49.
Ceccarelli P. (2018), 'Letters and Decrees Diplomatic Protocols in the Hellenistic Period' in Ceccarelli et. al. (2018), 148-83.
Ceccarelli P., Doering L., Fögen T., and Gildenhard I. (2018), *Letters and Communities : Studies in the Socio-Political Dimensions of Ancient Epistolography*, Oxford.
Chamouzas A. (2016), 'Hellenistic Rhodes, Rhetoric and Diplomacy: Molon Apollonius', *Electryone* 4, 1-9.
Champion C. (1998), 'The Nature of Authoritative Evidence in Polybius and Agelaus' Speech at Naupactus', T*ransactions of the American Philological Association*, 127, 11–128.
Chandler C. (2006), *Philodemus On rhetoric. Books 1 and 2 : Translation and Exegetical Essays*, New York and London.
Chaniotis A. (1996), 'Conflicting Authorities: Asylia between Aecular and Divine Law in the Classical and Hellenistic poleis', *Kernos* 9, 65-86.
Chaniotis A. (2010) 'Illusions of Democracy in the Hellenistic World', *Athens Dialogues* (http://athensdialogues.chs.harvard.edu/cgi-bin/WebObjects/athensdialogues.woa/wa/dist?dis=43).
Chaniotis A. (2013a) 'Affective epigraphy: emotions in public inscriptions of the Hellenistic age', *Mediterraneo Antico*, 16(2), 745-60.
Chaniotis A. (2013b), 'Paradoxon, Enargeia, Empathy: Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Oratory', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 202-16.
Chantraine P. (1926), *Histoire du parfait grec*, Paris.

Chávez Reino A. L. (2009), 'Teopompo orador : primeros apuntes', in Gazzano F., Ottone G., Santi Amantini L., *«Ingenia asiatica» : fortuna e tradizione di storici d'Asia minore : atti della prima giornata di studio sulla storiografia greca frammentaria : Genova, 31 maggio 2007*, 89-122, Tivoli.
Chiron. P. (ed.) (1993), *Démétrios. Du style*, Paris.
Cichocka H. (1992) 'Progymnasma as a Literary Form', *SIFC* 10, 991-1000.
Cichorius C. (1888), *Rom und Mytilene*, Leipzig..
Citti F. (2007), 'La declamazione greca in Seneca il Vecchio' in Calboli Montefusco L. (ed.), *Papers on rhetoric. 8,: Declamation : proceedings of the seminars held at the Scuola Superiore di Studi Umanistici : Bologna* (*February-March 2006*), Rome, 57-102.
Clark D. L. (1957), *Rhetoric in Greco-Roman education*, New York.
Clarke K. (2008), 'Persuasion and Plausibility: History and Rhetoric in the Polis' in Clarke K. (ed.) *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis*, Oxford.
Clarke M. L. (2002[2]), *Rhetoric at Rome: a Historical Survey*, London.
Clavaud R. (1976), 'Histoire du texte de Démosthène (Discours d'apparat, Prologues)', *QS* 2, 239-54.
Cohen D. (2015), 'Crime, Punishment, and the Rule of Law in Classical Athens', in Gagarin M. and Cohen D. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Greek Law,* Cambridge and New York.
Cohoon J. W. (ed.) (1939), *Dio Chrysostom* II, London and Heinemann.
Cole T. (1991,) *The origins of rhetoric in ancient Greece*, Baltimore.
Collins J. H. (2015), *Exhortations to Philosophy: The Protreptics of Plato, Isocrates, and* Aristotle, Oxford
Colomo D. (2013), 'The Avis Phoenix in the Schools of Rhetoric: P. Mil. Vogl. I 20 and P. Lit. Lond. 193 rivisited' in *Segno e Testo* 11, 29-78;
Connolly J. (2007), 'The New World Order: Greek Rhetoric in Rome', in Worthington I. (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric,* Malden, 139-65
Consigny S. (1992), 'The Styles of Gorgias', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 22(3), 43-53.
Consigny S. (2001) *Gorgias: Sophist and Artist*, Columbia.
Cooper C. (2000), 'Philosophers, Politics, Academics: Demosthenes' Rhetorical Reputation in Antiquity', in Worthington I. (ed.) *Demosthenes. Statesman and Orator*, 224-45, London and New York.
Corsaro C. (2017), 'Oratori e pubblico tra II e I sec. a.C.: Crasso, Antonio e la cultura greca', in Matino G., Flaviana F. and Grisolia R., *La lingua e la società. Forme di comunicazione letteraria fra antichità ed età moderna*, Naples.
Crawley R. (1910), *Thucydides. The History of the Peloponnesian War* (Everyman's library. Classical), London.
Cribiore R. (1996), *Writing, Teachers and Students in Greco-Roman* Egypt, Atlanta.
Cribiore, Raffaella (2001), *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*, Princeton.
Crisci E. (2001), 'Per uno studio paleografico e bibliologico dei più antichi libri greci', *Atti 22 C.I.P.*, Florence.
Croenert G. (1902), 'Literarische Text mit Ausschluss der christlichen, APF 1, 526-7.
Cronjé J. (1986), *Dionysius of Halicarnassus, De Demosthene. A critical appraisal of the status quaestionis. Followed by a glossary of the technical terms*, Hildesheim.
Crowther C. V. (1995), 'Iasos in the Second Century BC. 3,: Foreign Judges from Priene' *BICS* 40, 91-138.
Curran J. V. (1986), 'The Rhetorical Technique of Plato's Phaedrus' *Ph&Rh* 19, 66-72.
Curty O. (1995), *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques: catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme ΣΥΓΓΕΝΕΙΑ et analyse critique*, Genève.

Cuypers M. (2010) 'Historiography, rhetoric, and science: rethinking a few assumptions on Hellenistic prose', in Clauss J. and Cuypers M (eds.), *A Companion to Hellenistic Literature,* Malden, 317-36.
D'Angelo R. M. (1992), 'Un esempio di vera laus: (Rutilio Lupo 1, 13)' *Siculorum Gymnasium* 45, 67-70.
Daris S. (2000), 'I quartieri di Ossirinco: materiali e note' *ZPE* 132, 211-21.
Davies J. K. (1968), 'Molon's Influence on Cicero, *CQ* 18, 303-14.
Davies J. K. (1971), 'Ὑπερείδης Γλαυκίππου (I) Κολλυτεύς', in Davies J. K. (ed.), *Athenian propertied families*, Oxford 519-20.
De Groot D. A. W. (1918), *A Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm*, Groningen.
De Kreij M. (2018), 'The Practice of Praise P.Mil.Vogl. Iii 123 + P.Ctybr Inv. 4573 and the Hellenistic Encomium', *Segno e Testo* 16 (in print).
Decleva Caizzi F. (ed.) (1969), *Antiphontis Tetralogiae*, Milan.
Deininger J. (1968), 'Leon (24a)', *RE Suppl.* X.1. coll.874-6.
Delrieux F. and Ferriès M. C. (2004), *Euthydème, Hybréas et Mylasa : une cité grecque de Carie dans les conflits romains de la fin du Ier siècle a.C. 1*, *REA* 106 (1), 49-71.
Denniston J. D. (1952), *Greek Prose Style*, Oxford.
Denyer N. (2019), *Plato and Xenophon: Apologies of Socrates*, Cambridge.
Derow P. (2016), 'Cineas (2), Thessalian orator and author.' *Oxford Classical Dictionary.* Ed. Retrieved 23 Jul. 2018, from http://classics.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780199381135.001.0001/acrefore-9780199381135-e-1583.
Diels H. and Schubart W. (eds.) (1904), *Kommentar zu Demosthenes nebst Wörterbuch zu Demosthenes' Aristocratea*, Leipzig.
Dieterich A. (1900), 'Matris Cena', in *Strena* Helbigiana, Leipzig 49-50 = Dieterich A. (1911) *Kleine Schriften*, Leipzig, 162-3.
Dmitriev, S. (2016), 'Killing in Style: Demosthenes, Demades and Phocion in Later Rhetorical Tradition', *Mnemosyne*, Ser. 4, 69. 6, 931-54.
Dorandi T. (1990), 'Per una ricomposizione dello scritto di Filodemo sulla Retorica', *ZPE* 82, 59-87.
Dorandi T. (1991), 'Den Autoren über die Schulter geschaut Arbeitsweise und Autographie bei den Antiken Schriftstellern', *ZPE* 87, 11-33.
Dorandi T. (1997), 'Senocrate nel giudizio di Demetrio del Falero', in Günther, H-C., Rengakos A. and Vogt E. (eds.), *Beiträge zur antiken Philosophie: Festschrift für Wolfgang Kullmann*, 271-78, Stuttgart.
Dorandi T. (2013), *Diogenes Laertius. Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (ed.), Cambridge.
Dörrie H. (1967), 'Xenocrates' (4), *RE* XVIII (1967), coll.1512-28.
Douglas, A. E. (1956), 'Cicero, Quintilian, and the canon of ten Attic orators' *Mnemosyne* 9, 30-40.
Dover K. J. (1975), 'The freedom of the intellectual in Greek society,' *Talanta* 8, 36-39
Dover K. J. (1997), *The evolution of Greek prose style*, New York and Oxford.
Drexler H. (1933), 'Myron', *RE*, XVII.1. col.1123-4.
Dreyer B. (2002), 'Die Thrasykrates-Rede bei Polybios (11, 4-6) und die Bezeichnung der "Opfer" im römisch-aitolischen Vertrag von 212 v. Chr. Zur inhaltlichen Ergänzung der Inschrift von Thyrrheion (Akarnanien) IG IX 1^2, 2 Nr. 241 = StVA III 536 vor der sog. Klausel a' *ZPE* 140, 33-39.
Dugan J. (2005), *Making a New Man: Ciceronian Self-fashioning in the Rhetorical Works*, Oxford and New York.
Dupont F. and Valette-Cagnac E. (2005), *Façons de parler grec à Rome*, Paris.

Dzialas G. (1860), *Quaestiones Rutilianae*, Bratislava.
Eckert A. (2018), 'Roman Orators between Greece and Rome: The Case of Cato the Elder, L. Crassus and M. Antonius', in Gray et al. (2018), 19-32.
Edwards M. J. (2000), 'Antiphon and the beginnings of Athenian literary oratory' *Rhetorica* 18(3), 227-43.
Edwards M. J. (2013), 'Dionysius and Isaeus', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 44-49.
Edwards W. M. (1929), 'Διάλογος, Διατριβή, Μελέτη', in Powell-Barber E. A. (1929), 111-4.
Egger E. (1862), 'P.Yale 2.105', *Rev.Arch.* 6, 39-152
Egger E. (1863), *Mémoires d'histoire ancienne et de* philologie, Paris.
Engels J. (1998) 'Philiskos of Miletos, in Bollansée J., Engels J., Schepens G. and Theys E. (eds.), *Biography: The Pre-Hellenistic Period. Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker continued IVA-1*, 356-75, Leiden.
Engels J. (2003), 'Antike Überlieferungen über die Schüler des Isokrates', in Orth W. (ed.), *Isokrates: Neue Ansätze zur Bewertung eines politischen Schriftstellers*, 175-94, Trier.
Engels J. (2005), 'Leosthenes', *BNP* 7, 411-2.
Engels J. (2016), 'Philiskos of Miletos (337B)', in Worthington I., *Brill's New Jacoby*, Brill Reference Online. Web. 8 Mar. 2019.
Errington R. M. (1969), *Philopoemen*, Oxford.
Errington R. M. (2008), *A History of the Hellenistic World: 323-30 BC*, Oxford.
Erskine A. (2007), 'Rhetoric and Persuasion in the Hellenistic World: Speaking up for the Polis', in Worthington (2007), 272-85.
Fabbri L. (2016), 'Considerazioni sulla Κροκωνιδῶν διαδικασία', *Studi e Materiali di Storia delle Religioni* 82.1, 401-4.
Fairweather J. (1981), *Seneca the Elder*, Cambridge.
Fairweather J. (1984), 'The Elder Seneca and Declamation', *ANRW* 2.32.1, 514-56.
Ferguson W. (1911), *Hellenistic Athens : An Historical Essay*, London.
Fernandez Delgado J. A. (2012), 'Modèles progymnasmatiques de l'époque hellénistique : P. Mil. Vogl. III. 123', *Actes 26 C.I.P.*, Geneva.
Fernández Delgado J.A., Pordomingo F. and Stramaglia A. (eds.), *Escuela y literatura en grecia antigua*, Cassino.
Ferrario, M. (1983), 'Focione nella Retorica di Filodemo', *Cronache Ercolanesi* 13, 105-11.
Ferrary J. L. (1988), *Philhellénisme et impérialisme. Aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Paris.
Ferreri L. (2007), 'Il fatto storico e l'esempio: alcune riflessioni sul rapporto tra storiografia e retorica nel mondo antico', *Incidenza dell'Antico* 5, 61-93.
Fiehn C. (1931a), 'Menedemos' (12), *RE* XV. 1, col.795, 1931.
Fiehn C. (1931b) ,'Menesaichmos', *RE* XV.1, col.849.
Fiehn C. (1945), 'Stratokles' *RE*, IVa.1. col.269-71.
Finley M. (1975), *The Use and Abuse of History*, London.
Firicel-Dana M. (2003), 'L' orateur Isokratès d'Apollonia du Pont, le successeur d'Isocrate', *Studii Clasice* 37-39, 41-63.

Fix U., Gardt A., Knape J. (2009), *Rhetorik und Stilistik / Rhetoric and Stylistics . Ein internationales Handbuch historischer und systematischer Forschung / An International Handbook of Historical and Systematic* Research, Berlin and Boston.

Fliess P. (1959), 'Political Disorder and Constitutional Form: Thucydides' Critique of Contemporary Politics', *The Journal of Politics, 21*(4), 592-623.

Flower M. A. (1994), *Theopompus of Chios. History and Rhetoric in the Fourth Century BC*, Oxford.

Fortenbaugh W. (1994), *Theophrastus, the Characters and Rhetoric*, in Fortenbaugh-Mirhady (1994), 15-35.

Fortenbaugh W. and Mirhady D. C (1994), *Peripatetic Rhetoric after Aristotle*, New Brunswick and London.

Fortenbaugh W. W. and Schutrümpf E. (2000), *Demetrius of Phalerum: Text, Translation, and Discussion*, Oxford.

Fortenbaugh W., Huby P. and Long, A. (1985) ,*Theophrastus of Eresus : On his Life and Work* New Brunswick.

Fortenbaugh W., Huby P. and Long, A. (1992), *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* (Philosophia antiqua), 2 vols., Leiden, New York and Cologne.

Franco C. (1991), 'Teocrito di Chio', *Athenaeum* 79, 445-58.

Fraser P. M. (1996), *The Cities of Alexander the Great*, Oxford.

Fromentin V. and Gotteland S. (2015), 'Thucydides' Ancient Reputation', in Lee C. and Morley N. (eds.), *A handbook to the reception of Thucydides*, 14-25, Chichester.

Fuentes González P. P. (2005), 'Néanthe de Cyzique', in Goulet R. (ed.), *Dictionnaire des Philosophes Antiques* 4, 587-94, Paris.

Fuhr K. (1906), *Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift*, Berlin.

Gagarin M. (2010), *Greek Rhetoric*, Oxford.

Gagarin M. and Lanni A. (2014), *Symposion 2013 : Papers on Greek and Hellenistic Legal History* (*Cambridge MA, August 26-29, 2013*) = *Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte* (*Cambridge MA, 26.-29. August 2013*) (*Akten der Gesellschaft für Griechische und Hellenistische Rechtsgeschichte ; Bd. 24*), Wien.

Gaines R. N. (1989) 'On the rhetorical significance of P. Hamb. 131', *Rhetorica*, 7, 329-40.

Gallavotti C. (1939) 'Tre papiri fiorentini', *RFIC* 67, 259-260.

Garoufalias P. (1979) *Pyrrhus King of Epirus*, London.

Gärtner H. (1963), 'Pytheas', in *RE*, XXIV. 1. coll.366-269.

Gärtner H. (1972), 'Zenon (8)', *RE* XIX, col 140.

Gauthier P. (1972), *Symbola. Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Nancy.

Gauthier P. (1985), *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs* (*iv^e-i^er siècle avant J.C.*). *Contribution à l'histoire des institutions.* Paris.

Gauthier P. (1989), *Nouvelles inscriptions de Sardes II*, Geneva.

Gauthier P. (1993), 'Les cites hellénistiques', in M. H. Hansen (ed.) *The Ancient Greek City-State*, 211-31, Copenhagen.

Gauthier P. (1994), 'Les rois hellénistiques et les juges étrangers: à propos de décrets de Kimôlos et de Laodicée du Lykos' *JS* 2, 165-95.

Gawantka W. (1985), *Die sogenannte Polis : Entstehung, Geschichte und Kritik der modernen althistorischen Grundbegriffe der griechische Staat, die griechische Staatsidee, die Polis*, Stuttgart.

Gehrke H.J. (1978), 'Das Verhältnis von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des Demetrios von Phaleron' , *Chiron* 8, 149-3

Gernet L. (ed.) (1954), *Antiphon, Discours, suivis des Fragments d'Antiphon le Sophiste.* Paris.
Gerth B. (1914), 'Romanius', in *RE*, XXV, coll.1063-4.
Gerth B. (1921), 'Kaukalos', *RE* XI.1, col.57.
Gerth B. (1921b), 'Kephisodorus (6)', Re, XI.1, coll.227-9
Gerth B. (1922), 'Krates' (10), *RE* XI.2, col.1633.
Gibson C. A. (2002), *Interpreting a Classic: Demosthenes and his Ancient Commentators*, Berkeley and London.
Gibson C. A. (2004), 'Learning Greek History in the Ancient Classroom: the Evidence of the Treatises on Progymnasmata' *CP* 99(2), 103-29.
Gibson C. A. (2014), 'Better Living through Prose Composition?: Moral and Compositional Pedagogy in Ancient Greek and Roman progymnasmata', *Rhetorica* 32(1), 1-30.
Glover T. R. (1927), *Democracy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge.
Goldhill S. (2007), 'What's in a Wall?' in Kraus C., Goldhill S., Peet Foley H. (eds.), V*isualizing the tragic : drama, myth, and ritual in Greek art and literature Essays in honour of F. Zeitlin*, 127-47, Oxford.
Gomme A., Andrewes, A. and Dover, K. (1945), *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford.
Grainger J. D. (1990), *The Cities of Seleukid Syria*, Oxford.
Grandjean Y. (1975), *Une nouvelle arétalogie d'Isis à Maronée*, Leiden.
Gray B. (2013), 'The Polis Becomes Humane ?: φιλανθρωπία as a Cardinal Civic Virtue in Later Hellenistic Honorific Epigraphy and Historiography', in Mari M. and Thornton J. (eds.), *Parole in movimento: linguaggio politico e lessico storiografico nel mondo ellenistico : atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 21-23 febbraio 2011*, 137-62, Pisa.
Gray B. (2017), 'Freedom, Ethical Choice and the Hellenistic Polis', *History of European Ideas* (44), 719-42.
Gray B. (2018), 'A Civic Alternative to Stoicism: The Ethics of Hellenistic Honorary Decrees' *CA* (37.2), 187-235.
Gray, C., Balbo, A., Marshall, R.M.A., Steel, C.E.W. (2018), *Reading Republican Oratory: Reconstructions, Contexts, Receptions*, Oxford.
Grenfell B. P. and Hunt A. S. (1899), *The Oxyrhyncus Papyri,* vol. II, Oxford.
Grenfell B. P. and Hunt A. S. (1906), *The Hibeh Papyri*, vol. I, Oxford.
Grieb V. (2008), *Hellenistische Demokratie : Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Grossen* (Historia), Wiesbaden.
Gronewald M. and Maresch K. (1991), *Kölner Papyri*, vol. VII.
Grotkamp N. (2014), 'The Ptolemaic Dikasterion', in Gagarin-Lanni (2014), 347-60.
Grube G. M. A. (1961), *A Greek critic : Demetrius On style,: Transl. with an Introd., Notes & 2 Append. : The Language of Demetrius and The Rhetorica ad Alexandrum and its Language*, Toronto..
Gruen E. S. (1993), 'The Polis in the Hellenistic World', in Rosen R. and Farrell J.(eds.) *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in Honor of Martin Ostwald*, 339-5, Ann Arbor.
Guast W. E. (2019), 'Greek Declamation beyond Philostratus' Second Sophistic', *JHS*, 1-15(forthcoming).
Gunderson E. (2003), *Declamation, Paternity, and Roman Identity: Authority and the Rhetorical Self*, Cambridge.
Gunderson E. (2009), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, Cambridge.
Haase F. (ed.) (1856), *De Fragmentis Rutilio Lupo a Schöpfero suppositis*, Breslau.

Habicht C. (1961), *Inschrift des Periodoniken Leon*, in Kunze-Götte, Er., Habicht C., Mallwitz A. and Willemsen F. (eds.), *VII. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia: Frühjahre 1956 bis 1958, E. Buschor zum 75. Geburtstag*, 218-23, Berlin.
Habicht C. (1984), 'Zur Personenkunde des griechisch-römischen Altertums. Euthydemos von Mylasa', *BASP* 21, 69-72.
Habicht C. (1997), *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, Cambridge, Mass – London.
Habicht,C. (1995), *Athen: die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischer Zeit*, Munich.
Halm C. (1863), *Rhetores Latini minores*, Leipzig.
Hammond N. (1995), 'Philip's Letter to Athens in 340 B.C' *Antichthon 27*, 13-20.
Hammond N. and Griffith G. T. (1979), *History of Macedonia* vol.2, Oxford.
Harding P.E. (2006), *Didymus. On Demosthenes.* Oxford.
Harrison A. R. W. (1998), *The Law of Athens, vol. I, The Family and Property*, London-Indianapolis.
Hatzopoulos M.B. (1996), *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. I, Paris.
Haviland P. (1984), 'Metabolai Tyches. Aléatoire, temps, responsabilité dans la comédie grecque nouvelle', *Quaderni di Storia*, 19, 179-202.
Heath M. (1994), 'The Substructure of Stasis-theory from Hermagoras to Hermogenes', *CQ* 44, 114-29.
Heath M. (2002a), 'Hermagoras: Transmission and Attribution' *Philologus* 146(2), 287-98.
Heath M. (2002b), 'Theon and the History of the Progymnasmata, *GRBS*, 43 (2), 129-60.
Heckel W. (2006), *Who's who in the Age of Alexander the Great : Prosopography of Alexander's empire. Malden,* Oxford.
Hense O. (1919), *Teletis reliquiae*, Tubingen.
Hercher R. (1873), *Epistolographi Graeci*, Paris.
Herzog R. and Klaffenbach G. (1952), *Asylieurkunden aus Kos*, Berlin.
Hesk J. (2000), *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
Higbie C. (2003), *The History behind the Chronicle. The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*, Oxford.
Hobein H. (1928), 'Matris', *RE* 14, coll.2287-98.
Hobson D. W. (1963-1964), 'P.Yale Inventory 1729' *BASP* 1, 10-11.
Hock R. F. and O'Neil E. N. (1986), *The Chreia in ancient rhetoric, I: The Progymnasmata,* Atlanta.
Holzer E. (1881), *Matris: Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik Diodors*, Tübingen.
Hornblower S. (2010), 'The Fourth-Century and Hellenistic Reception of Thucydides. In Thucydidean Themes', in Hornblower S. *Thucydidean themes*, 287-333, Oxford.
Horwat L. (1997), *The 'Nachleben' of Hyperides*, Unpubl. Diss. London.
Howland R. (1937), 'The Attack on Isocrates in the Phaedrus', *CQ* 31.3-4, 151-159.
Hubbell H. (1916), 'Isocrates and the Epicureans', *CP* 11, 405-18.
Hugonnard-Roche H. (2008), *L' enseignement supérieur dans les mondes antiques et médiévaux: aspects institutionnels, juridiques et pédagogiques : colloque international de l'Institut des traditions textuelles* (*Fédération de recherche 33 du CNRS*), Paris.
Hunger H. (1978), *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner*, Vol. 1, Munich.
Hunt E. (1944-1945), 'Laudatores temporis acti', *CJ* 40, 221-33.

Hurowitz V. (1989), 'Isaiah's Impure Lips and Their Purification in Light of Akkadian Sources' *Hebrew Union College Annual,* 60, 39-89.
Hutchinson, G. O. (1995), 'Rhythm, Style, and Meaning in Cicero's Prose', *CQ* 45(2), 485-99.
Hutchinson G. O. (2013), *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*, Oxford.
Hutchinson G. O. (2014), 'Hellenistic Poetry and Hellenistic Prose', in Hunter R - Rengakos A - Sistakou E. (eds.), *Hellenistic Studies at Crossroads: Exploring Texts, Contexts and Metatexts*, 14-31, Berlin.
Hutchinson G. O. (2018), *Plutarch's Rhythmic Prose*, Oxford.
Illuminati L. (1948), *L'eloquenza romana prima di Cicerone, II: Catone ad Ortensio Ortalo*, Messina and Ferrara.
Ines D. C. (2002), 'Longinus and Caecilius: models of the Sublime' *Mnemosyne* Ser. 4, 55(3), 259-84.
Jacob F. (1937), *P. Rutilii Lupi, De figuris sentiantiarum et elocutionis libri duo, in usum scholarum*, Lübeck.
Jacoby F. (1923) ,'Der Alexandergeschichte des Anaximenes', *Hermes* 58, 457-8.
Jacoby F. (1944), 'Patrios Nomos: State Burial in Athens and the Public Cemetery in the *Kerameikos*, *JHS* 64, 37-66.
Jaeger W. (1954[4]), *Paideia : The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 voll. Oxford.
Jander K. (1913), *Oratorum et rhetorum graecorum fragmenta nuper reperta*, Bonn.
Janiszewski P. et al. (2015), *Prosopography of Greek Rhetors and Sophists of the Roman Empire*, Oxford.
Jenks R. (2007), 'The Sounds of Silence: Rhetoric and Dialectic in the Refutation of Callicles in Plato's «Gorgias»', *Ph&Rh.* 40(2), 201-15.
Johnson R. (1957), 'A note on the number of Isocrates' pupils', *AJP* 78, 297-300.
Johnson R. (1959), 'Isocrates' methods of teaching' *AJP* 80, 25-36.
Johnson W. A. (2004), *Bookrolls and Scribes in Oxyrhynchus*, Toronto.
Jones A. (1940), *The Greek city from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford.
Jones A. (1957), *Athenian democracy*, Oxford.
Jouanna J. (1999) *Hippocrates.* Baltimore.
Kahn A.D. (1986), *The Education of Julius Caesar. A Biography, a Reconstruction*, New York.
Kallet-Marx R. M. (1995), *Hegemony to Empire: the Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C*, Berkeley.
Kennedy G. (2008[2]), *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World, 300 B.C.-A.D. 300*, Eugenem (Oregon).
Kennedy G. A. (1959), 'The Earliest Rhetorical Handbooks' *AJP* 80,169-78 ,
Kennedy G. A. (1963), *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*, Princeton.
Kennedy G. A. (1994), *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton.
Kennedy G. A. (2007), *Aristotle. On Rhetoric. A Theory of Civic Discourse,* New York.
Kennedy G. A. (ed.) (1991), *Aristotle: On Rhetoric*, Oxford.
Kennedy George A. (1999), *Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition Introductory to the Study of Rhetoric : Writings by or attributed to Theon, Hermogenes, Aphtonius, Nicolaus : together with an Anonymous Prolegomenon to Aphtonius, Selections from the CommentaryAattributed to John of Sardis, and Fragments of the Progymnasmata of* Sopatros, Fort Collins (Co.).
Kern O. (1900), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, Berlin.
Kim L. (2017), 'Atticism and Asianism', in Richter-Johnsons (2017), 41-66.
Knaack G. (1894) 'Alexandros (86)', *RE* I, col.1448.

Kohl. R. (1915), *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis : dissertatio inauguralis*, Paderborn.
Kondrat'uk M. A. (1989), 'The theorikon. Vestnik drevnej istorii', *JAH* 188, 137-44.
Konstan D. (1997), *Friendship in the Classical World* (Key themes in ancient history), Cambridge.
Konstan D. (2007) 'Rhetoric and emotion', In Worthington (2007), 411-25.
Konstan D. (2012). 'The two faces of « parrhêsia » :: free speech and self-expression in ancient Greece', *Antichthon* 46, 1-13.
Korhonen T. (1997), 'Self-Concept and Public Image of Philosophers and Philosophical Schools at the Beginning of the Hellenistic Age', in Frösén J. (ed.), *Early Hellenistic Athens: Symptoms of a Change*, Helsinki.
Körte A. (1906), 'Anaximenes von Lampsakos als Alexanderhistoriker', *RhM* 61, 476-80.
Körte A. (1913), 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen', *AFP* 6, 223-68.
Körte A. (1924), 'Literarische Texte mit Ausschluß der christlichen', *APF* 7, 227.
Kramer B. and Hübner R. (1976), *Kölner Papyri* (Band 1), Cologne.
Krauss M. (2009), 'Exercises for Text Composition (Exercitationes, Progymnasmata) / Übungen zur Textgestaltung (exercitationes, progymnasmata)', in Fix-Gardt-Knape (2009), 1396-405.
Kremmydas C. (2007), 'P. Berl. 9781 and the Early Reception of Demosthenes', *BICS* 50, 19-48.
Kremmydas C. (2013), 'Hellenistic Oratory and the Evidence of Rhetorical Exercises', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013).
Kremmydas C. and Tempest K. (2013), *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*, Oxford.
Krenkel W. A (1980), 'Fellatio und irrumatio' *WZRostock* 29 H.5, 77-88.
Krieg T. (1896), *Questiones Rutilianae*, Leipzig.
Kroll W. (1916), 'Isidoros' (17), in *RE* IX.2. col.2064.
Kroll W. (1931a), 'Menelaos (12)', *RE* XV.1, col.833.
Kroll W. (1931b), 'Metrodorus (23)', *RE* XV. 2, coll.1483-3.
Kroll W. (1937), 'Perithagoras (3)' *RE* XIX.1, col.192.
Kroll. W. (1940), 'Rhetoric', *RE* Suppl. VII, coll.1039-138.
Kunst K. (1923), *Rhetorische Papyri im Auftrage der Berliner Papyruskommission* (Berliner Klassikertexte ; Heft 7) Berlin.
Kvist K. (2003), 'Cretan Grants of Asylia – Violence and Protection as Interstate Relations', *Classica et Mediaevalia* 54,185-202.
La Bua G. (2019), *Cicero and Roman Education: The Reception of the Speeches and Ancient Scholarship*, Cambridge.
Lallot J. (1998[2]), *La Grammaire de Denys le Thrace*, Paris.
Lane. Fox R. (1986), 'Theopompus of Chios and the Greek World', in Boardman J. and Vaphopoulou and Richardson C. E. (eds.), *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios, 1984*, 105-20, Oxford.
Laqueur R. (1927), 'Sosikrates' (1), in *RE*. III.1. coll.1160-5.
Laqueur R. (1934), 'Theokritos', *RE* II, ser. 5, coll.2025-27.
Laqueur R. (1935), 'Neanthes', *RE* XVI.2, coll.2008-10.
Lausberg H. (1998), *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: a Foundation for Literary Study*, Leiden.
Lazzeri M. (2017-8), 'Una nota critico-testuale a Ps-Hrd. Fig.40 Haidù (su un frammento di Cleocare), *BollClass* 37-39, 105-20.

Lebeck W. D. (1970), *Verba prisca. Die Anfänge des Archaisierens in der lateinischen Beredsamkeit und Geschichtsschreibung*, Göttingen.
Leeman A. D. (1963), *Orationis ratio. The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians and Philosophers*, Amsterdam.
Leff M.C. (1973), 'The Latin Stylistic Rhetorics of Antiquity' *Speech Monographs*, XL, 273-9.
Lentano M. (2005), '«Un nome più grande di qualsiasi legge»: declamazione latina e «patria potestas»', *BStudLat,* 35.2, 558-89.
Leo Enos R. (2004), 'The Art of Rhetoric at Rhodes: An Eastern Rival to the Athenian Pepresentation of Classical Rhetoric', in Lipson C. S. and Binkley R. A. (eds.) *Rhetoric before and Beyond the Greeks*, 183-96, New York.
Leone A. (1978), 'Un probabile frammento di oratoria attica P. Vindob. G. 29.820' *Studia Papyrologica* 17, 55-57.
Liebersohn Y. Z. (2005), 'Rhetoric: Art and Pseudo-art in Plato's « Gorgias »', *Arethusa* 38(3), 303-29.
López Cruces J. L., Campos Daroca J., Márquez Guerrero M. A. (eds.) (2005), *Anaximenes de Lampsaco testimonios y fragmentos* (*Retórica a Alejandro*), Madrid.
López Eire A. (2008), 'La influencia de la retórica sobre la historiografía desde el Helenismo a la Antigüedad Tardía', *Talia Dixit* 3, 1-32.
Loraux, N. (1981), *L'invention d'Athènes : histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la "cité classique*, Paris and New York, Mouton.
Lossau, M. (1964), *Untersuchungen zur antiken Demosthenesexegese*, Hamburg.
Luraghi N. (2018), 'Stairway to Heaven. The Politics of Memory in Early Hellenistic Athens', in Canevaro-Gray (2018).
Luzzatto M. T. (1988), 'L'oratoria, la retorica e la critica letteraria dalle origini ad Ermogene', in Montanari F. (ed.), *Da Omero agli Alessandrini. Problemi e figure della letteratura greca*, 207-56, Firenze.
Luzzatto M. T. (2013). 'I segreti della « techne »: Isocrate nella dossografia aristotelica', *Bollettino dei Classici / Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei*, Ser. 3a. 34, 3-36.
Ma J. (1999), *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, Oxford.
Ma J. (2003), 'Peer Polity Interaction in the Hellenistic Age', *Past and Present* 180, 9-39.
MacDonald M. (2017), *The Oxford Handbook of Rhetorical Studies*, New York.
MacDowell D. M (ed.) (1990), *Demosthenes: Against Meidias*, Oxford.
Maiuri A. (1925), *Nuova silloge epigrafica di Rodi e Cos*, Florence.
Mann C. and Scholz P. (2012), *Demokratie' im Hellenismus : von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren?*, Mainz.
Marasco G. (1984), *Democare di Leuconoe: politica e cultura in Atene fra IV e III sec. a.C.*. Florence.
Marasco G. (1985), 'Cherone di Pellene: un tiranno del IV secolo a.C.', in Broilo F. (ed.), *Xenia. Scritti in onore di Piero Treves*, Rome, 113-4.
Marasco G. (1992), *Fra Repubblica e Impero*, Viterbo 1992.
Marastoni S. (2007), *Metrodoro di Scepsi*: retore, filosofo, storico e mago, Alessandria.
Mari M (2018), 'Powers in Dialogue. The Letters and diagrammata of Macedonian Kings to Local Communities', in Ceccarelli et al. (2018), 122-46.
Mari M. (2019), *L'età ellenistica. Società, politica, cultura*, Rome.

Marincola J. (2014), 'Rethinking Isocrates and Historiography', in Parmeggiani G. (ed.) *Between Thucydides and Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*, 39-61, Cambridge (Mass.).
Marincola J. (Ed.), (2007), *A companion to Greek and Roman historiography*, Oxford-Malden (Mass).
Marrou H-I. (1948), *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris.
Martin, J. (1948), 'Zu den Rhetores latini minores', *Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft*, III, 316-20.
Mathieu G. (ed.) (1924), *Isocrate. Philippe et Lettres a Philippe, a Alexandre et a Antipatros, texte et traduction, avec une introduction et des notes*, Paris
Matthaei A. and Zimmermann M, (2008), *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus* (Hellenistische Polis als Lebensform vol. 1), Frankfurt am Main.
Matthes D. (ed.) (1962), *Hermagorae Temnitae testimonia et fragmenta.* Leipzig.
Mayser E. and Schmoll H. (1970²), *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit : Mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*, 2 voll., Berlin.
Mazzarino S. (1965-6), *Il pensiera storico classico*, Rome and Bari.
Meineke, J. (1843). *Analecta Alexandrina, Sive Commentationes De Euphorione Chalcidensi, Rhiano Cretensi, Alexandro Ætolo, Parthenio Niccæno*, Berlin.
Mélèze-Modrzejewski J. (1988), 'Philiscos de Milet et le jugement de Salomon: La première reference grecque à la bible', *BIDR* III . ser. 30 = 91, 571-97.
Mélèze-Modrzejewski J. (2014), 'Dikasteria: A Panhellenic Project? A Response to Nadine Grotkamp', in Gagarin-Lanni (2014), 361-4.
Merkelbach R. (1959), 'Literarische Texte unter Ausschluß der christlichen,' *APF*, 16, 82-129.
Migliario E. (2007), *Retorica e Storia: Una lettura delle* Suasoriae *di Seneca Padre*, Bari.
Migliario E. (2012), 'Intellettuali dei tempi nuovi: retori greci nella Roma augustea', *Quaderni del Dip.to di Lettere e Filosofia di Trento* 2, 109-23.
Milazzo A. M. (2012), 'Un tema declamatorio nella « Vita Platonis » di Diogene Laerzio' in Calboli. Montefusco L. (ed.), *Papers on rhetoric.* 11, 154-64, Perugia.
Miller D. (2012), 'Rhetoric in the light of Plato's epistemological criticisms', *Rhetorica*,30(2), 109-33.
Miller J. (2016), 'Euergetism, Agonism, and Democracy : the Hortatory Intention in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Athenian Honorific Decrees' *Hesperia* 85.2, 385-435.
Miller N. (1964), 'Dramatic Speech in Tacitus', *AJP* 84, 279-96.
Milne H. J. M (1922), 'Readings from Papyri', *CR* 36.
Mirhady D. C. (2011), *Aristotle Problems Books 20-38. Rhetoric to* Alexander, Cambridge MA.
Momigliano A. D. (1983). *Problèmes d'historiographie ancienne et moderne*, Paris.
Momigliano, A. D. (1973). 'Freedom of Speech in Antiquity', in P.P. Wiener (ed.), *Dictionary of the History of Ideas: Studies of Selected Pivotal Ideas*, 2, 252-63, New York.
Montiglio S. (2005), *Wandering in ancient Greek* culture, Chicago.
Morgan T. J. (1998), *Literate education in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds*, Cambridge and New York.
Mørkholm O. (1967), 'The Speech of Agelaus at Naupactos, 217 BC', *Classica et Medievalia* 28, 240-53.
Mørkholm O. (1974), 'The Speech of Agelaus, Again', *Chiron* 4, 127-32.
Morpurgo Tagliabue G. (ed.) (1980), *Demetrio. Dello stile*, Rome.
Moscati Castelnuovo L. (1980), 'La carriera politica dell'attidografo Androzione', *Acme* 33, 251-78.

Mosley D. J. (1973), *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient* Greece, Wiesbaden.
Mossé C. (1978), 'Le thème de la patrios politeia dans la pensée grecque du IV^e siècle', *Eirene* XVI, 81-89.
Mueller K. (2006), *Settlements of the Ptolemies. City Foundations and New Settlement in the Hellenistic World.* (Studia Hellenistica 43), Leuven.
Müller C. (2011), 'Autopsy of a Crisis: Wealth, Protogenes, and the City of Olbia in c. 200 BC', in Archibald Z. H., Davies J. K. and Gabrielsen V. (eds.) (2011), *The Economies of Hellenistic Societies, Third to First Centuries BC*, 324-44, Oxford.
Münscher K. (1912), 'Gorgias (9)', *RE* VII.2, coll.1604-1619.
Münzer F. (1905), 'Diophanes (4)' *RE* V, coll.1048-9.
Münzer F. (1934), 'Eine Probe rhodischer Beredsamkeit in lateinischer Fassung?' *Philologus* 89.1-4, 217-27.
Musti D. (1963), 'Sull'idea di συγγένεια in iscrizioni greche', *ASNP* 33, 225-39.
Narducci E. (1997), *Cicerone e l'eloquenza romana: retorica e progetto culturale,* Rome.
Natoli A. F. (2004), *The letter of Speusippus to Philip II: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary : with an Appendix on the Thirty-first Socratic Letter Attributed to Plato,* Stuttgart.
Nelson E. D. (2005), 'Coan Promotions and the Authorship of the Presbeutikos', in Van der Eijk P. (ed.), *Papers read at the XIth International Hippocrates Colloquium University of Newcastle upon Tyne, 27-31 August 2002*, 209-35, Leiden and Boston.
Nelson E. D. (2013), 'Coan Asylia: Small-state Diplomacy and the Hippocratic Legend' in De Angelis F. (eds.) *Regionalism and globalism in Antiquity : Exploring their limit*s (Colloquia Antiqua Series 7), 247-66Leuven.
Nicolai R. (1992) *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*, Pisa.
Nicolai R. (1999), 'Polibio interprete di Tucidide: la teoria dei discorsi', *Seminari Romani di Cultura* Greca 2(2), 281-301.
Nicolai R. (2004), *Studi su Isocrate*, Rome.
Nicolai R. (2008), 'L'uso della storiografia come fonte di informazioni: teoria retorica e prassi oratoria', in Iglesias Zoido G. C., *Retórica e Historiografía. El discurso militar en la historiografía desde la Antigüedad hasta el Renacimiento*, 157-8, Madrid-Caceres.
Nicolai R. (2017), 'Historians' Speeches in Rhetorical Education: Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Selection from Thucydides', in Iglesias-Zoido J. C. and Pineda V. (eds.), *Anthologies of historiographical speeches from Antiquity to early modern times: rearranging the tesserae*, 42-62, Leiden and Boston.
Nicolardi F. (2018), *Filodemo. Il primo libro della retorica*, Naples.
Nienkamp J. (1999), *Plato on rhetoric and language: four key dialogue*, Mahwah (N. J.).
Nisbet R. G. M. (ed.) (1961), *In L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio*, Oxford.
Noè E. (1996) 'Un esempio di mobilità sociale nella tarda repubblica: il caso di Ibrea di Milasa', in Gabba E., Desideri P. and Roda S. (eds.), *Italia sul Baetis. Studi di storia romana in memoria di Fernando Gascò*, 56-64, Turin.
Norden E. (1898), *Die antike Kunstprosa : Vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*, Stuttgart.
Nouhaud M. (1982), *L'utilisation de l'histoire par les orateurs attiques*, Paris.
Nutton V. (2004), *Ancient medicine*, London.
O'Neil J.L. (1981), 'How democratic was Hellenistic Rhodes?', *Athenaeum*, LIX, 468-73.
O'Neil, J.L. (1995), *The origins and development of ancient Greek democracy* (Greek studies), Lanham.
O'Sullivan (2008), 'Athens, Intellectuals, and Demetrius of Phalerum's "Socrates"', *TAPhA* 138.2, 393-410.

O'Sullivan L. (2009), *The regime of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens, 317-307 BCE*, Leiden and Boston.
Odgers M. M. (1935), 'Quintilian's Rhetorical Predecessors', *TAPhA*, 66, 25-36.
Oellacher H. (1939), *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Nationalbibliothek in Wien*, vol.2, Wien, 49-50.
Ofenloch E. (ed.) (1907) ,*Caecilii Calactini Fragmenta*, Lipsiae.
Oliver (2006), 'History and Rhetoric', in Bugh (2006), 113-35.
Oomen G. (1926), *De Zosimo Ascalonita atque Marcellino*, Münster.
Orsi D. P. (2002), 'Iperide e Glaucippo: uno o due discorsi contro Focione?', *AncSoc* 32, 29-41
Otto W. (1912), 'Herakleides (31)', in *RE* VIII.1 coll.464-5.
Ottone G. (2005), 'Alessandro, Teopompo e le 'ἐπιστολαί πρὸς τοὺς Χίους' ovvero autorità macedone e strumenti di interazione con la comunità polemica fra pubblico e privato' in Gazzano F. and Amantin L. S. (ed.) *Dalle parole ai fatti: relazioni interstatali e comunicazione politica nel mondo antico*, 61-108, Rome.
Ottone G. and Chàvez Reino A.(eds.) (2018), *Teopompo di Chio. Filippiche* (*Fozio, Biblioteca, cod. 176*)*; testo critico e introduzione*, ("Themata", 21), Tibur.
Paffenroth K. (1994), *A Note on the Dating of Demetrius's On Style*, *CQ* 44, 280-1.
Papanikolaou D. (2009), 'The Aretalogy of Isis from Maroneia and the Question of Hellenistic « Asianism »' *ZPE* 168, 59-70.
Papanikolaou. D. (2012), '*IG* V.2, 268 (= *SIG*^{3} 783) as a monument of Hellenistic prose' *ZPE* (182), 137-56.
Papillion T. (1995), 'Isocrates' Techne and Rhetorical Pedagogy', *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 25, 149-63.
Parker H. and Robitzch J. M. (2018)*, Speeches for the Dead : Essays on Platos Menexenus* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde; Band 368), Berlin and Boston.
Parker R. W. (1991), '*Potamon* of Mytilene and his Family', *ZPE* 85, 115-29.
Parmeggiani G. (2013), 'Una nuova testimonianza di Anassimene di Lampsaco: Gnom. Vat. sententia 348 su Teocrito di Chio contro la «lexis» di Anassimene', *RFIC* 141.1, 210-7.
Paschidis P (2013), 'Φίλοι and φιλία between Poleis and Kings in the Hellenistic Period' in Mari M. and Thornton J. (eds.), *Parole in movimento: linguaggio politico e lessico storiografico nel mondo ellenistico : atti del Convegno internazionale, Roma, 21-23 febbraio 2011*, 283-98, Pisa.
Patillon M. (1997), 'Aristote, Corax, Anaximène et les autres dans la Rhétorique à Alexandre' *REG* 110(1), 104-25.
Pausch D. (2010), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie.* Berlin-New York.
Pearson L. (1962), 'The Pseudo-History of Messenia and Its Authors', *Historia* 11, 397-426.
Pearson L. (1986), 'The speeches in Timaeus' history' *AJP* 107, 350-68.
Pearson L. and Stephens S. A. (eds.) (1983), *Didymi in Demosthenem commenta,* Stuttgart.
Pédech P. (1951), 'Polybe et l'Éloge de Philopoemen', *REG* 64, 82-103.
Pédech P. (1964), *La méthode historique de Polybe*, Paris.
Peek W. (1952), 'Polyainos' (7), *RE* XXI, coll.1431-2.
Pelling C. B. R. (ed.) (1988), *Plutarch. Life of Antony*, Cambridge.
Pelling C. B. R. (2012), 'Aristotle's «Rhetoric», the «Rhetorica ad Alexandrum», and the speeches in Herodotus and Thucydides', in Foster E. and Lateiner D. (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus* 281-325, Oxford.
Penella R. J. (2012), 'The « progymnasmata » in Imperial Greek Education', *CW* 105(1), 77-90.
Pepe C. (2013), *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity,* Leiden and Boston.

Pepe L. (1958), 'Catone Maggiore e la scuola di Frontone', *GIF* 11, 12-25.
Pernot L. (1993), *La Rhétorique de l'éloge dans le monde Gréco-Romain*, 2 voll., Paris.
Pernot L. (2000) ,*La rhétorique dans l'Antiquité,* Paris.
Pernot L. (2005), *Rhetoric in Antiquity*, transl. by W. E. Higgins, Washington (D. C.).
Pernot L. (2015), *Epideictic Rhetoric: Questioning the Stakes of Ancient Praise*, Austin.
Pesely G. E. (1985), 'The speech of Endius in Diodorus Siculus xiii,52,3-8', *CP* 80, 320-1.
Petrie F. (1891), *The Flinders Petrie Papyri,* vol. I, Dublin.
Piccirilli L. (1973), *Gli arbitrati interstatali greci, I: Dalle origini al 338 a. C.*, Pisa.
Pina Polo F. (2013), 'Foreign Eloquence in the Roman Senate' in Steel-Van der Blom (2013), 247-66,
Pintaudi R. and Canfora L. (2010), 'PSI Laur. inv. 22013: retorica o romanzo?' in Bastianini G. (ed.), *I papiri del romanzo antico. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi* (*Firenze, 11-12 giugno 2009*), Florence, 81-93.
Pinto P. M. (2006), *La biblioteca di Isocrate. Note sulla circolazione dei libri e sul lavoro intelletuale nel IV secolo a.C*, *Segno e Testo* 4, 51-70.
Pinto P. M. (2015), 'L'école d'Isocrate : un bilan', Bouchet C. and Giovannelli-Juanna P. (eds.), *Isocrate, entre jeu rhétorique et enjeu politique actes du colloque international de Lyon, 5-7 juin 2013*, Lyon, 319-29.
Pope M. (1988). 'Thucydides and Democracy' *Historia: Zeitschrift Für Alte Geschichte,* 37, 3, 276-96.
Porciani L. (2013), 'Eforo e i proemi di Diodoro: per una ridefinizione del modello storiografico' *ASNP* Ser. 5a 5 (1), 197-216.
Pordomingo Pardo F. (2007), 'Ejercicios preliminares de la composición retórica y literaria en papiro: El encomio', in Fernández Delgado-Pordomingo-Stramaglia (2007), 405-53.
Portalupi F. (1957), *Sulla corrente rodiese*, Turin.
Porter S. E. (1997), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period*, Leiden
Powell J. and Barber E. A. (1929), *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature, second series*, Oxford.
Powell J. F. J. (2013), 'The Embassy of the Three Philosophers to Rome in 155 BC', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 220-47.
Pownall F. S. (2005). 'The rhetoric of Theopompus', *Cahiers des études anciennes* 42, 255-78.
Pownall F. S. (2007) 'The Panhellenism of Isocrates', in Hecke W., Tritle L. A., Wheatley P. V. (2007) *Alexander's Empire: Formulation to Decay*, 13-25, Claremon.
Quass F. (1984), 'Zum Einfluss der römischen Nobilität auf das Honoratiorenregime in den Städten des griechischen Ostens' *Hermes* 112, 199-215.
Quass F. (1993), *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens*, Stuttgart.
Quimby R. W. (1974), 'The frowth of Plato's Perception of Rhetoric', *Ph&Rh* 7, 71-79.
Raaflaub K. A. (2006). 'Thucydides on Democracy and Oligarchy', In Rengakos A. and Tsakmakis A. (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Thucydides*, 189-222, Leiden.
Radermacher L. (1903), 'Dionysokles', *RE*, V.1, col.1007.
Radermacher L. (1904), 'Rec. E. Drerup, Aeschinis quae feruntur Epistolae Leipzig 1904', *Literarisches Zenralblatt* 43, 1432-3.
Radermacher L. (1912), 'Hegesias', *RE*, VII.2, col.267.
Radermacher L. (1913), 'Hierokles (19)', in *RE* VIII.2, col.1487.
Radermacher L. (1914), 'Hybreas', in *RE* IX.1. coll.29-31.

Radermacher L. (1939), 'Θεοδέκται', *Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse / Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 76, 62-69.
Radermacher L. (1951), *Artium scriptores. Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik*, Wien.
Radermacher L. (ed.) (1966), *Demetrius. De Elocutione*, Stuttgart.
Radicke J. (1999), 'Potamon of Mytilene (1085)', in: Schorn S. and Schepens G. (eds.) *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker* Part IV, Leuven.
Radt S. (1980), 'Noch einmal Aischylos, Niobe Fr.162 n.² (278 M.)', *ZPE* 38, 47-58.
Ranocchia G. (2018), 'Philodemus' On Rhetoric was in 20 Books' *JHS* 138, 202-8.
Rayment S. Ch. (1952), 'Three Notes on the Roman Declamation' *CW* XLV, 225-8.
Reinhardt C. (1873), *De Isocratis aemulis*, Bonn.
Reitzeinsten R. (1905), 'Didorus (35)', *RE* V, coll.660-1.
Rhodes P. and Lewis D. (1997), *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford.
Richlin A. (1992), *The garden of Priapus : sexuality and aggression in Roman humor*, Oxford
Richter D. S. and. Johnson W. A. (2017), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, New York and Oxford.
Richter G. (1955) *Greek portraits : A Study of their Development*, Berchem and Bruxelles.
Rigsby K. J. (1996) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World,* Berkeley and Los Angeles.
Robbins E. (1993), 'The education of Achilles', *QUCC,* 45, 7-20.
Robert L. (1951), *Études de numismatique grecque*, Paris.
Robert L. (1967), *Monnaies grecques : types, légendes, magistrats monétaires et géographie*, Geneva.
Robert L. (1969), *Opera minora selecta : épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, Amsterdam.
Roberts W. R. (1897), 'Caecilius of Calacte', *AJP* 18(3), 302-12.
Roberts W. R. (ed.) (1902), *Demetrius. On style*, Cambridge.
Robinson C. A. (1953), *The History of Alexander the Great,* vol. 2, Providence.
Robinson W. (2011), *Democracy beyond Athens, Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age,* Cambridge.
Roisman J., Worthington I. and Waterfield R. A. H. (2015), *Lives of the Attic Orators : Texts from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius, and the Suda*, Oxford.
Roller (2018), Models from the Past in Roman Culture: A World of Exempla,
Rossi R. F. (1971), 'Patrios politeia. Tra propaganda e ideale', *Index* 2, 187-218.
Rowe G. (1965), 'The Adynaton as a Stylistic Device', *AJP* 86.4, 387-96.
Rubinstein L. (2000), *Litigation and Cooperation: Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens*, Stuttgart.
Rubinstein L. (2013), 'Spoken Words, Written Submissions, and Diplomatic Conventions: The Importance and Impact of Oral Performance in Hellenistic Inter-polis Relations', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 166-200.
Ruhnken D. (1768), *P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis libri duo*, Leiden.
Russell D. (1981), *Criticism in Antiquity*, Berkeley.
Russell D. (1983) ,*Greek Declamation*, Oxford.
Russell D. (1998), 'The Panegyrists and their Teachers', in Whitby M. (ed.) *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
Russell D. (2001) (ed.), *The orator's education.: Books 9-10*. Cambridge and London.
Russell D. and Wilson N. (eds.) (1981), *Menander Rhetor*, Oxford.
Sacks K. S. (1986), 'Rhetoric and speeches in Hellenistic historiography', *Athenaeum* 64, 383-95.

Sammartano R. (2007), 'Sul concetto di « oikeiotes » nelle relazioni interstatali greche', in Daverio Rocchi G. (ed.), *Tra concordia e pace: parole e valori della Grecia antica : giornata di studio : Milano, 21 ottobre 2005*, 207-35, Milan.
Sammartano R. (2009), 'Magnesia sul Meandro e la « diplomazia della parentela »', *Hormos* N. S., 1, 111-39.
Samuel D. H. (1965), *A Greek Rhetorical Papyrus in the Yale Collection*, Unpubl. Diss. Yale.
Samuel D. H. (1976), 'P.Yale.2.105', in *APF* 24-25, 55-84.
Sanders L. J. (2008), *The legend of Dion,* Toronto.
Sanneg P. (1867), *De schola Isocratea*, Halle.
Santini L. (1997), 'Demosth. or. 19, 287 e la tradizione paremiografica', *MH*, 5.1, 48-52.
Santorelli B. (2019), 'Memoria e oblio in Seneca padre' in Capasso M. (ed.), *Quattro incontri sulla Cultura Classica. Dal bimillenario della morte di Augusto all'insegnamento delle lingue classiche*, 485-506, Lecce.
Sartori F. (1970), 'L'ateniese Cremonide alla corte dei Tolomei', in De Rosa L. (1970)*, Ricerche storiche ed economiche in memoria de Corrado Barbagallo*, 445-56, Naples.
Savalli-Lestrade I. (2001) 'Les Attalides et les cites grecques d'Asie mineure au IIe siecle' in Bresson A. and Descat R. (eds.) *Études* 8, 77–92, Paris.
Sblendorio Cugusi M. T. (ed.) (1982), *Cato. Orationum reliquiae*, Turin.
Sblendorio Cugusi M. T. (1987), 'Oratoria e retorica in Catone' *AAT* 71, 22-61.
Scardino C. (2007), *Gestaltung und Funktion der Reden bei Herodot und Thukydides*, Berlin and New York.
Schaefer A. (1854), 'Des jüngeren Meidias ehrendecret für Phokion', *Philologus* 9,163-6.
Schaefer A. (1952), 'Polyeuktos (5)', in *RE*, XXI.2. coll.1616-23.
Schenker D. J. (2006), 'The Strangeness of the « Phaedrus »', *AJPh* 127-1, 67-87.
Schenkeveld D. M. (1964), *Studies in Demetrius On style*, Amsterdam.
Schenkeveld D. M. (2000), 'The Intended public of Demetrius' « On style »: the Place of the Treatise in the Hellenistic Educational System', *Rhetorica* 18(1), 29-48.
Schiefsky M. J. (2005), *Hippocrates on Ancient Medicine*, Leiden and Boston.
Schissel O. (1931),'Menippos (11)', *RE* XV. 1, coll.893-4.
Schmid W. (1895a), 'Apollonios (84)', *RE* II, coll.140-1.
Schmid W. (1895b), 'Apollonios (85)', *RE* II, coll.141-4.
Schmid W. (1895c), Ariobarzanes (8), *RE* II, col.835.
Schmitz T. A. (2000), 'Plausibility in the Greek Orators', *AGP* 121, 47-77.
Schorn S. (2007), '"Periegetische Biographie" – "Historische Biographie": Neanthes von Kyzikos (*FGrHist* 84) als Biograph', in Erler M. and Schorn S. (2007) *Die griechische Biographie in hellenistischer Zeit,* Berlin, 115-56.
Schubart W. (1950), *Griechische literarische* Papyri, Berlin.
Schwartz E (1899),'Tyrtaios', *Hermes* 34, 427-68 .
Schwartz E. (1894a), 'Alkimos (18)', *RE* 1. 2, col.1543-44
Schwartz E. (1894b), 'Amphicrates (4)', *RE* 1, coll.1903-4 .
Schwartz E. (1894c), *Demosthenes erste Philippika*, Marburg.
Schwartz E. (1957), *Griechische Geschichtschreiber*, Leipzig.
Schwegler K. (1913), *De Aeschinis quae feruntur epistulis*, Gießen.
Schwenk C. (1985), *Athens in the Age of Alexander. The Dated Laws & Decrees of the Lykourgan era, 338-322 B.* C, Chicago.

Seck F. (1924), 'Kallicrates' (7g), in *RE* Suppl. IV, coll.859-62.
Segre M.(1993), *Iscrizioni di Cos: 1, Testo : 2, Tavole*, Rome.
Sheppard A. (2008), 'Rhetoric, drama and truth in Plato's « Symposium »', *The International Journal of the Platonic Tradition*, 2(1), 28-40.
Shipley D. G. J. and Hansen M. H. (2006), 'The *polis* and Federalism', in Bugh (2006), 52-72.
Shipley G. (2013), 'Hellenistic Oratory in Context', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013).
Shrimpton G. S. (1991), *Theopompus the Historian*, Montreal and Buffalo.
Sider D. (2017), *Hellenistic Poetry. A Selection*, Ann Arbor.
Siegmann E. (1956), *Literarische Griechische Texte der Heidelberger Papyrussammlung*, Heidelberg.
Sijpesteijn P. J. (1979), 'P. Vindob. G. 29.820. Ein literarischer Papyrus ?', *ZPE* 34, 128-30.
Simon J. (1868), 'Zur Kritik der Rhetores Latini', *Philologus* 27, 642-59.
Smith A. C. (2001), *Polis and Personification in Classical Athenian Art*, Leiden.
Smith A. C. (2003), 'Athenian Political Art from the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BCE: Images of Political Personifications,' in Blackwell C. W. (ed=., *Dēmos: Classical Athenian Democracy* (Mahoney A. - Scaife R., edd., *The Stoa: a consortium for electronic publication in the humanities* [www.stoa.org]) edition of January 18 2003).
Smith C. F. (1918), 'Personification in Thucydides', *CP*, 13, 241-50.
Smith R. (1995), 'A New Look at the Canon of the Ten Attic Orators' *Mnemosyne* 48(1), 66-79.
Solmsen F. W. (1934), 'Theodektes', *RE* V.2, col.1734.
Solmsen F. W. (1938a), 'Philagrios (1)', *RE* XIX.2, col.2102.
Solmsen F. W. (1938b), 'Philiskos' *RE* 18. 2. coll.2384-7.
Spence I. G., Phang S., Kelly D. and Londey P. (2016), *Conflict in Ancient Greece and Rome: the Definitive Political, Social, and Military Encyclopedia*, Santa Barbara.
Staab G. (2004), 'Athenfreunde unter Verdacht. Der erste Asianist Hegesias aus Magnesia zwischen Rhetorik und Geschichtsschreibung', *ZPE* 148, 127-150.
Stagemann W. (1951), 'Plution', *RE* XXI. 2, col.988.
Stähelin F. (1919a), 'Kassandros', *RE* X. 2, col.2313-4.
Stähelin F. (1919b),'Kineas (2-3)' *RE* XI.1, coll.473-6.
Stähelin F. (1927),'Lycortas', in *RE* XIII.2. coll.2386-9.
Steel C. E. W. and Van der Blom H. (2013), *Community and Communication: Oratory and Politics in Republican Rome*, Oxford.
Stegemann W. (1953) 'Potamon (3)', *RE* XXII.1, col.1023-1027.
Stephens S. A. (1983), 'The Arginusae Theme in Greek Rhetorical Theory and Practice', *BASP* 20.3-4, 171-80.
Stephens S. A. (1985), 'P. Yale. 105', *Yale Papyri in the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library*, vol. II, Yale, 53-74.
Sternbach L. (1930), 'Contribution à l'étude d'Hégésias de Magnésie', *BAPC*, 1930, 43-4.
Stramaglia A. (1996), 'Fra "consumo" e "impegno": usi didattici della narrativa nel mondo antico', in Pecere O. and Stramaglia A. (eds.) *La letteratura di consumo nel mondo antico*, 99-166, Cassino.
Stramaglia A. (2003)M 'Amori impossibili. PKöln 250, le raccolte proginnasmatiche e la tradizione retorica dell' "amante di un ritratto" [tavole 1-5]', in Schröder B. J. and Schröder J. P. (2013), *Studium declamatorium: Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, Münich/Leipzig, 213-39.

Stramaglia A. (2015), 'Temi sommersi e trasmissione dei testi nella declamazione antica (con un regesto di papiri declamatori)', in Del Corso L., De Vivo F. and Stramaglia A. (eds.) *Nel segno deltesto. Edizioni, materiali e studi per Oronzo Pecere,* 147-78, Florence.
Sundwall J. (1894), 'Agnonides', *RE* I, col.2209.
Sundwall J. (1906), *Epigraphische Beiträge zur sozial-politischen Geschichte Athens im Zeitalter des Demosthenes*, Leipzig.
Susemihl F. (1891-2), *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, Leipzig.
Sussman A. P. (1977), 'Arellius Fuscus and the Unity of the Elder Seneca's *Suasoriae*', *RhM,* 70, 303-23.
Swoboda K. M. (1901), 'Democharès' *RE* VIII, coll.2863-7.
Swoboda K. M. (1924), 'Laches (7)', *RE* XII.1, col.339.
Teloh H.(2008), 'Rhetoric, Refutation, and what Socrates Believes in Plato's « Gorgias »', in Cleary J. J. and Gurtler G. M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy. 23,: 2007*, 57-82, Leiden and Boston.
Tempest K. (2019), 'Meidias and the Mute Witness: Cicero's Debt to Demosthenes in the *Verrines* Reconsidered', *GRBS* 59, 215-41.
Teodorsson S. (1990), 'Theocritus the Sophist, Antigonus the One-Eyed, and the Limits of Clemency', *Hermes* 118, 380-2.
Thalheim T. (1897), 'Charisius', *RE* III. 2. col.2147 (1897).
Thalheim T. (1905), 'Demokles (11)', RE V. col.133.
Thalheim T. (1910), 'Glaukippos' (4), *RE* VII.1. col.1401.
Theodoridis C. (1998),*Photii patriarchae lexicon. 2,: E*-M, Berlin and New York.
Thiele G. (1892), 'Das Lehrbuch des Isokrates' *Hermes* 27, 11-21.
Todd S. C. (2009), 'Hypereides « Against Diondas », Demosthenes « On the crown », and the Rhetoric of Political failure, *BICS* 52, 161-74.
Too Y. L. (2001), *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, 289-316, Leiden and Boston.
Tore J. (1964), *Latin Prose* Prefaces, Stockholm, 1964.
Tosi R. (2011), 'Tradizione lessicografica ed enciclopedismo bizantino', in Fossati C. (ed.) *Giornate filologiche genovesi. L'Enciclopedismo dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*, 49-58, Genoa.
Treves P. (1938),'Philinos (4)', *RE* XIX.2. col.162175-9.
Treves P. (1952), 'Polyeuktos (4)', *RE* XXI.1. col.1613-16.
Trevett J. (1995), 'The use of direct speech by the Attic orators'. In De Martino F and Sommerstein A. H. (eds.), *Lo spettacolo delle voci*, Bari, 123-45.
Trevett J. (1996), 'Did Demosthenes Publish His Deliberative Speeches? *Hermes*, 124. 4, 425-41.
Tritle L. A. (1988), *Phocion the Good*, London.
Tritle, L. A. (1992) ,'Plutarch's Life of Phocion : an analysis and critical report, II, 33, 6' in Haase W. and Temporini-Vitzthum H. (eds.), *ANRW = Rise and decline of the Roman world : Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, II, 33, 6, 4258-97.
Turner E. and Parsons P. (1987²), *Greek Manuscripts of the Ancient World,* London.
Tzifalias A. and Helly B. (2018), 'Inscriptions de la Tripolis de Perrhébir. Lettres Royales de Démétrios II er Antigon Dôsôn', *Studi Ellenistici* XXIV, 78-125.

Usher S. (2004) ,'Καιρός in Fourth-Century Greek Oratory', in Edwards M. J. and Reid C. (eds.) *Oratory in Action*, 52-61, Manchester.
Usher S. (2010), 'Eurhythmia in Isocrates', *CQ* 60.1, 82-95.
Van der Blom H. (2016), *Oratory and Political Career in the Late Roman Republic*, Oxford.
Van Der Vliet E.C.L. (2012), 'The Durability and Decline of Democracy in Hellenistic Poleis' *Mnemosyne* 65.4-5, 771–86.
Vannotti. G. (1990), 'I discorsi siracusani di Diodoro Siculo', in *RIL* 124, 3-19.
Vercruysse M. (1990), 'À la recherche du mensonge et de la vérité : la fonction des passages méthodologiques chez Polybe' in in Verdin H., Schepens G. and Keyser E. de (eds.), *Purposes of history : studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries B.C. : proceedings of the international Colloquium Leuven, 24-26 May 1988*, 17-38, Leuven.
Vesley, Mark Eric (2003), Father-son Relations in Roman Declamation, *AHB* 17, 158-80.
Von Arnim H. (1896), 'Athenodorus', *RE* VII. 2, col.2045.
Von Rohden P. (1894), 'Mam. Aemilius Scaurus', in *RE* I.I. col.583.
Von Rohden P. (1895-1896), 'Arellius Fuscus', in *RE* II. col.635.
Von Scala R. (1892), 'Isokrates und die Geschichtschreibung', *Verhandlungen der 41. Versammlung deutscher Philologen und Schulmanner*, 102-21, Lepzig.
Vössing K. (1995), 'Non scholae sed vitae : der Streit um die Deklamationen und ihre Funktion als Kommunikationstraining', in Binder G. and Ehlich K. (eds.), *Kommunikation durch Zeichen und Wort*, 91-136, Trier.
Walbank F. W. (1957-79), *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Oxford.
Walbank F. W. (1962), 'Polemic in Polybius' *JRS* 52, 1-12.
Walbank F. W. (1965), *Speeches in Greek Historians*, Oxford.
Walde C (2001) 'C. Pompeius Silo' in Der Neue Pauly X, col.115.
Wallace S. (2018), 'Alexander the Great and Democracy in the Hellenistic World', in Canevaro-Gray (2018).
Watt W. (1982), 'Notes on Seneca's Letters', *CQ* 2 32, 399-403.
Webb R. (2001), 'The « progymnasmata » as practice' in Too (2001).
Webb R. (2009), *Ekphrasis, imagination and persuasion*, Farnham.
Wehrli F. (1949), *Demetrios von Phalerum*, Basel.
Weissenberger M. (2006), 'Molon [2] ', *BNP* 9, 130.
Welles C. B. (1934), *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic period. A Study inGgreek Epigraphy*, New Haven.
Welsh M. (1972), 'P. Rutilii Lupi De figuris sententiarum et elocutionis. Ed. with prolegomena and comm. by E. oks, jr' (Book Review), *Gnomon*, 44(8), 776-80.
Welzhoffer H. (1880), 'Die Reden bei Polybios', *Jahrb. f. cl. Phil* 50, 539-44.
Wendel C. (1935), 'Naucratis' (2), *RE* XVI.2, coll.1952-4.
Wendland P. (1905), *Anaximenes von Lampsakos; Studien zur ältesten Geschichte der Rhetorik*, Berlin.
Wentzel G. (1985), 'Aristocles (18)', *RE* II, coll.935-7.
Westwood G. (2017), 'The Orator and the Ghosts: Performing the Past in Fourth Century Athens', in Papaioannou S., Serafim A., Da Vela B. (eds.), *The Theatre of Justice. Aspects of Performance in Graeco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*, 57-74, Leiden and Boston.
Westwood G. (2020), *The Rhetoric of the Past in Demosthenes and Aeschines: Oratory, History, and Politics in Classical Athens*, Oxford.

Whidden C. (2005), 'True Statesmanship as True Rhetoric in Plato's « Gorgias »', *Polis* 22.2, 206-9.
Wiater N. (2010), 'Speeches and Historical Narrative in Polybius « Histories » : Approaching Speeches in Polybius', in Pausch D. (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*, 67-107, Berlin and New York.
Wiater N. (2014) 'Polybius on Speeches in Timaeus: Syntax and Structure in Histories 12.25A', *CQ* 64.1, 121-35.
Wickert I. (1927), 'Sosikrates' (2), *RE* IIIA.1. col.1165.
Wiedemann T. (1990), 'Rhetoric in Polybius', on Verdin H., Schepens G., and Keyser E. de (eds.), *Purposes of history : studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries B.C. : proceedings of the international Colloquium Leuven, 24-26 May 1988*, 289-300, Leuven.
Wiemer H.U. (2013), 'Hellenistic Cities: the End of Greek Democracy ?', in Beck H. (ed.) *A Companion to Ancient Greek government*, 54-69.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff von, U. (1893), *Aristoteles und Athen*, Berlin.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorff U. von (1900a), 'Asianismus und Atticismus', in *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin Wilamowitz- Moellendorff von, U (1900b), 'Review of B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part II, London 1899,'*, *Göttingischer Gelehrte Anzeigen* 162.1, 29-58.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorf von, U. (1907), *Die griechische Literatur des Altertums*, Berlin and Leipzig Wilcken G. (1894) 'Angelaos (9)' *RE* I, col.770.
Wilcken G. (1894b), 'Alexandros (32)', *RE* I, coll.1142-3.
Wilcken G. (1895), 'Apollonidas (21)', *RE* II, col.119.
Wilcken G. (1895b), 'Astymedes' in *RE* II. col.1869.
Wildberger J. (2013),' Stertinian Rhetoric: Pre-Imperial Stoic Theory and Practice of Public Discourse', in Kremmydas-Tempest (2013), 249-75.
Will E. (1979), *Histoire politique du monde hellenistique* (*323–30 av. J.-C.*), Nancy.
Willrich H. (1905), 'Didorus (28)', *RE* VI, col.660.
Winterbottom M. (ed.) (1974), *Declamations, I: Controversiae, Books 1-6*, Cambridge (Mass.).
Winterbottom M. (1970), *Problems in Quintilian* (BICS 25), London.
Winterbottom M. (1983), 'Declamation, Greek and Latin', in *Ars rhetorica antica e nuova. xie Giornate filologiche genovesi, 21-23 febbraio 1983*, 57-76, Genoa.
Wiseman T. P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics. Three studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Liverpool.
Wisse J. (1995), "Greeks, Romans, and the Rise of Atticism.", in Abbenes J.G.J., Slings S.R., and Sluiter I. (eds.), *Greek Literary Theory after Aristotle*, Amsterdam, 65-82.
Witte J. (1995), *Demosthenes und die Patrios Politeia : von der imaginären Verfassung zur politischen Idee*, Bonn.
Woerther F. (ed.) (2012), *Hermagoras. Fragments et témoignages*, Paris.
Woerther F. (ed.) (2015) *Caecilius de Calè-Actè. Fragments et témoignages*, Paris.
Wolff H. (1970[2]), *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*, Münich.
Woodman A. J. (1988), *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography. Four studies*, London.
Woodman A. J. (2009), 'Cicero on historiography: *De oratore* 2.51-64', *CJ* 104(1), 23-31.
Wooten C. (1972), *A Rhetorical and Historical Study of Hellenistic Oratory*, Unpubl. Diss.
Wooten C. (1973), 'The Ambassador's Speech. A Particularly Hellenistic Genre of Oratory' *QJS* 59, 209-12.
Wooten C. (1975), 'Le développement du style asiatique pendant l'époque hellénistique', *REG* 99, 94-104.
Wooten C. (1979), 'Unnoticed Medical Language in Demosthenes', *Hermes* 107.1, 57-60.

Wooten C. (1989) ,'Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Hermogenes on the style of Demosthenes', *AJP* 110, 576-88.
Wooten C. W. (1974), 'The Speeches in Polybius. An Insight into the Nature of Hellenistic Oratory' *AJP* 45, 235-51.
Worthington I. (1994), 'The Canon of the Ten Attic Orators', in Worthington I. (ed.), *Persuasion: Greek Rhetoric in action*, 244-63, London.
Worthington I. (2007), *A Companion to Greek rhetoric*, Oxford.
Wouters A. (1977), 'Fragment of a Speech or of a Letter', *AncSoc* 8, 213-15
Wünsch R. (1914), 'Hymnos', *RE* IX.1, coll.140-83.
Wüst F. R. (1938), *Philipp II. Von Makedonien und Griechenland 346-338*, Munich.
Zangara A. (2007), *Voir l'histoire: théories anciennes du récit historique : IIe siècle avant J.-C.-IIe siècle après J.-C.*, Paris.
Zecchini G. (2005), 'Ambasciate e ambasciatori in Polibio', in Torregaray P.E. and Santos Y. J. (eds.), *Diplomacia y autorrepresentación en la Roma antigua*, 12-23, Vitoria.
Zieliński T. (1904), *Das Clauselgesetz in Ciceros reden: Grundzüge einer oratorischen Rhythmik*, Leipzig.
Zieliński T. (1914), *Der constructive Rhythmus in Ciceros Reden*, Lepizig.
Zimmermann B. and Rengakos A. (2014), *Die Literatur der klassischen und hellenistischen Zeit*, Munich.