



Panel Abstracts Booklet

# Celtic Conference in Classics

## Coimbra 2019

Faculty of Arts and Humanities  
University of Coimbra  
26th - 29th June 2019

### Organization



### Funding



### Partners



**Slot 5: 9:00 - 9:50am**

**Aldo Tagliabue**, University of Notre Dame (US)

*Dreams, Gardens and Inset-Stories in Longus' Daphnis and Chloe: Revisiting the Role of Religion in the Second Sophistic*

Within the 'politics' of the Second Sophistic, Greek religion and gods are usually considered to be in service to other themes; they are either a marker of Greek identity (Perkins 1995, 49), a key component of sexuality (Zeitlin 2008, 101-103), or a cipher for the authors' ephrastic or literary sophistication (Morgan 1994, 75). This subordinate role of religion is somewhat surprising, since the first centuries of the Imperial Era are characterized by major innovations in the field of religion, such as the rise of new transcendent Greek gods like Asclepius, and the development of both mystery cults and Christianity. In this paper, a narratological analysis of Longus' *Daphnis and Chloe* will suggest that in the Second Sophistic religion may acquire a more independent and *theological* function. The sections of the narrative focused on Eros introduce readers to a different view of the novel that goes beyond human temporality and is both providential and divine-like. Morgan 1996 has convincingly interpreted *Daphnis and Chloe* as a *Bildungsroman* that culminates in the protagonists' understanding of Eros as the principle of both human sexuality and nature. I will first argue that the education to Eros discussed by Morgan does not concern the readers of this novel: although the protagonists' *Bildung* is narrated sequentially, the readers are distanced from it by their previous experience of love and their acquaintance with earlier erotic poetry quoted by Longus.

Second, I will suggest that the novel engages and possibly educates its readers at a different level. Specific sections within *Daphnis and Chloe*, namely dreams, inset-stories and gardens, all introduce views of the protagonists' life that are non-sequential. Dreams offer a brief and comprehensive view of their life as controlled by Eros, as a result of which readers acquire a providential perspective on the novel. Similarly, Eros' speech to Philetas in Book 2 introduces both a comprehensive and retrospective view of the protagonists' life in which the same god is in control from its very beginning. Finally, I read the inset-stories and the description of Dionysophanes' garden as counterfactual versions of the protagonists' lives, in which Pan replaces Eros' dominant role among the gods. All of these sections invite readers to look at the entire novel as a religious story in which Eros belongs at the center. Strikingly, in all of these non-sequential sections, the narrative stresses that Daphnis and Chloe lack understanding of these divine-like views: this repeated pattern is a further confirmation that the novel has a special intent in offering its readers a theological education.

At the end of the paper, I will argue in favor of a new vision of 'politics' within the Second Sophistic, one in which religion does not merely function in the service of other themes, such as identity, sexuality and literary sophistication, but has its own independent theological function. This argument will be supported by brief reference to texts like Aristides' *Sacred Tales*, Apuleius' *Cupid and Psyche*, and the *Shepherd of Hermas*. I will also suggest that the aforementioned subordination of religion may be the result of a bias in the present understanding of the 'politics' of the Second Sophistic, which reflects the divide between the disciplines of classics and religious studies.

### Slot 6: 10:00 - 10:50am

**Inger Neeltje Irene Kuin**, Dartmouth College (US)

*Lucian the Lovable Misfit and the Constraints of the Second Sophistic Label*

In the introduction to their 2017 *Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic* Daniel Richter and William Johnson suggest a ‘laundry list’ of typical characteristics of the Second Sophistic as a cultural era, including nostalgia, archaism and purity of language, performance, playfulness, elite *paideia*, and identity. These characteristics, they argue, are ‘good to think with’. In his BMCR review of the volume Martin Korenjak countered that these characteristics are ‘sufficiently vague to be ascribed with equal justification to all periods of Greek or any other culture’; he goes on to argue, perhaps rather harshly, that the Second Sophistic label ‘explains nothing and, worse, highlights certain fashionable facets in a way that detracts attention from the great amount of fundamental research that remains to be done in the field’.

Against this background Lucian of Samosata has been equal parts poster child and misfit of the Second Sophistic. Few authors of the second century CE are as persistently playful and explicitly identity-conscious as he is. At the same time, his insistence on performing dialogues rather than declamations, and, more importantly, his acerbic lampooning of the rhetorical culture of his contemporaries place him on the margins of the movement. In this paper I will argue, taking my cue from Korenjak, that in fact the application of the Second Sophistic label to Lucian has detracted attention from two fundamental aspects of his works.

From Lactantius to Leopardi up to Allinson, Highet, and Renan, religion was the focal point of Lucianic reception. The reason for this is almost too obvious to state: a disproportionately large number of Lucian’s dialogues feature the gods as interlocutors, and many more pieces deal in detail with religious practices and practitioners. Conversely, in the past 50 years--the same period that saw the emergence of Second Sophistic studies--religion has been severely understudied in Lucian scholarship. Simon Goldhill has noted the low levels of interest in religion in recent scholarship on the Second Sophistic generally; in my paper I will explore, specifically in relation to Lucian, why this might be so.

Another fundamental aspect of Lucian’s works that stands in tension to the Second Sophistic label is their initial reception as pieces for popular performance. The dominant view of the Second Sophistic as an elite, hyper-literary culture has caused Lucian’s works to be interpreted primarily as texts written by a member of the elite and read by other members of the elite. Lucian, however, explicitly presents his performances as public events catering to the few *and* the many. The second aim of this paper will be to trace why elite culture became such a pronounced feature of the Second Sophistic as a category, and to suggest an alternative view whereby the literature from the period, Lucian in particular, might be integrated more fully in the popular culture of the Roman Empire.

### Slot 7: 11:10 - 12:00am

**Isidor Brodersen**, Universität Duisburg-Essen [isidor.brodersen@uni-due.de]

*Lucian’s Literary Games: Playing with the Past, Playing with Politics*

When Philostratus coined the “Second Sophistic” in his *Vitae sophistarum*, he made no mention of Lucian of Samosata. In a way, this is understandable: Lucian is hardly a typical *pepaideumenos* of his time. We have no knowledge whether he ever actually made a speech, and in many of his texts, it seems unlikely that the first-person narrator is

to be identified with the author, making it hard to distil facts of Lucian's life with any certainty from his work (cf. BAUMBACH 2017, 13–57; RICHTER 2017, 328).

There can be little doubt, however, that his texts are important sources for our understanding of Imperial Greek literature. Accordingly, in recent years, much has been made of Lucian's identity as a Syrian, a Greek, or a Roman citizen (cf. e.g. SWAIN 1996; RICHTER 2017). Rather than trying to identify the elusive individual perspective of the author, this presentation seeks to shift the focus to the recipients and ask what we can learn about their position within the world of the Second Sophistic. In order to understand the linguistic and literary politics of these texts, their cultural surroundings provide at least as much light as the author's identity.

The authorial figure of Lucian, at first glance, does not concern himself with the politics of the day. Broadly speaking, his interests are linguistic and literary: When he does mention politics or Roman emperors in passing, as in *Hist. Conscr.*, it mostly serves as background for his intellectual endeavours. Thus, his stance toward Roman rule is unclear (cf. SWAIN 1996, 312–329). Here, again, it is important not to believe everything a first-person narrator has to say. For example, in *Alex.* 55, the narrator purports to be friends with a Roman governor. However, to infer from this that the historical Lucian himself moved in these circles (e.g. VICTOR 1997), is problematic at least (cf. BRODERSEN 2018). But in keeping with recent scholarship, this need not be a problem.

The politics of Lucian's texts are mostly those of the Greek intellectual elite, and they focus on Greek literature and culture. Of course, linguistics and themes which a *pepaideumenos* of the Second Sophistic was expected to employ are firmly rooted in classical Athens and its Attic dialect. In the *corpus Lucianicum*, this is often presented tongue-in-cheek: Lucian's linguistic texts such as the *Rhetorum praeceptor* (cf. ZWEIMÜLLER 2008) and the *Iudicium vocalium* are fine satirical reflexes of contemporary linguistic tendencies. Likewise, there are texts that take aim at literary or intellectual fashions of the day: In *De mercede conductis* (cf. HAFNER 2017), *Adversus indoctum*, and others, Lucian offers a critique of would-be intellectuals, and in *Alexander*, the butt of the joke are not only the gullible followers of Alexander's oracle, but the Epicureans as well.

It seems, therefore, that Lucian is standing by the sidelines, watching his contemporaries but always staying above the fray. It is just this posture which allows Lucian's audience to position themselves within Imperial Greek society. In reading Lucian's texts, the audience is given a key to placing themselves alongside him: If not in reality, at least in conduct, self-presentation as a true intellectual and distancing oneself from would-be peers is possible. This becomes even clearer when we look at the whole corpus rather than individual texts. Lucian's virtuosic deployment of intellectual humour, playing with the classics, invites his audience to play along.

However, this must not be understood as detachment from politics, as the Second Sophistic has often been seen in the past. Rather, it is an inherently active way of taking part in political, societal and intellectual discourse. Thus, while it may be impossible to ascertain Lucian's personal standing within the politics of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century or the Second Sophistic, it is nonetheless possible to read his texts as commentary on the linguistic and literary politics of the day.

## Bibliography

- Baumbach 2017 = Baumbach, M. / von Möllendorff, P.: Ein literarischer Prometheus. Lukian aus Samosata und die Zweite Sophistik. Heidelberg 2017.  
Brodersen 2018 = Brodersen, I.: Lukians „Wie man Geschichte schreiben soll“ ... und

- andere Geschichten über Redlichkeit. Hamburg 2018 (Mainzer Althistorische Studien 8).
- Hafner 2017 = Hafner, M.: Lukians Schrift „Das traurige Los der Gelehrten“. Einführung und Kommentar zu *De Mercede Conductis Potentium Familiaribus*, lib. 36. Stuttgart 2017 (Hermes Einzelschriften 110).
- Richter 2017 = Richter, D.: Lucian of Samosata. In: Richter, D. / Johnson, W.A. (ed.): *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Oxford 2017, 327–344.
- Swain 1996 = Swain, S.: *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World AD 50–250*. Oxford 1996.
- Victor 1997 = Victor, U.: *Lukian von Samosata: Alexandros oder der Lügenprophet*. Eingeleitet, herausgegeben, übersetzt und erklärt von U. Victor. Leiden [et al.] 1997 (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World 132).
- Zweimüller 2008 = Zweimüller, S.: *Lukian “Rhetorum praeceptor”*. Einleitung, Text und Kommentar. Göttingen 2008 (Hypomnemata 176).

### Slot 8: 12:10am - 1:00pm

**Michele Solitario**, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen

*The Politics of Paradox in the Second Sophistic: Plutarch’s Gryllus, Dio’s Trojan Discourse and Lucian’s Parasite*

The Second Sophistic is known for its multifarious relationship between rhetoric, sophistry and philosophy. Accordingly, in the last decades scholars have focused on the interaction between these disciplines in the literary production of single authors, trying to outline specific tendencies within the shared cultural framework. Particular attention has been devoted to the performances of sophists, to the rhetorical character of philosophical teaching, and to linguistic or stylistic peculiarities (e.g., Atticism). My paper will focus on an often-neglected literary phenomenon of this time: the taste for paradox. In this regard, I will consider three specific examples from different authors.

Plutarch’s *Gryllus* portrays Odysseus on the isle of Circe, as he tries to recast his companions, who have previously been transformed into pigs, in their former human shape. Thereby, Odysseus engages in a debate with one of them, Gryllus, who resists the hero’s intention by explaining the several advantages that the animal condition entails compared to the human one. Thus, the dialogue opens space for critical thoughts about the intellectual and cultural authority, i.e. about the heavy emphasis on language and rhetoric as central constituents of *paideia* and consequently of elite identity.

Similarly, Dio’s *Trojan Discourse* starts from the provocative assumption that Troy was not actually seized by Greeks, but they were rather defeated by Trojans. In doing so, the author questions the reliability of Homer, who was traditionally considered the foremost Greek cultural authority. Moreover, by reversing one of the well-known episodes of the Greek legendary history, Dio triggers a critical consideration of the Greek past, which had indeed a sensible resonance in the contemporary political situation under Roman domination and in view of the new wider circulation of Greek education as well.

Finally, I shall consider Lucian’s *Parasite*. It is a bizarre dialogue between Tychiades and Simon, who succeeds in proving that parasitism is the highest of all art forms. More specifically, he demonstrates that the parasitic technique requires a higher degree of skills and knowledge compared to those learnt in any philosophical school, and that the related lifestyle is preferable to that of any philosopher. Thus, Lucian criticizes the vain preten-

sions of all philosophical schools: through their contrasting ideas, they have undermined the paideutic function traditionally ascribed to philosophy, consequently making her appear as an abstract accumulation of complex and ridiculous concepts.

A parallel study of these works points out the particular use of paradox involved. It is not just a rhetorical refutation (*anaskeuê*) to attack the credibility of a myth or legend from an opposite view as it is described in the *Progymnasmata*. Nor is it a mere literary *lusus*, conceived to entertain the public and to show the rhetorical dexterity of the orator. I will rather show that paradox in these texts performs the function of a didactic instrument, as it deploys a strategy of antidogmatic acculturation in the Greek cultural heritage. Accordingly, it is important to highlight that Plutarch does not claim anywhere that animals are superior to humans in their intellectual ability. Similarly, Dio accepts Homer as a model and teacher in many other essays, whereas Lucian never takes position against philosophy *per se*, which he still regards as an essential discipline. None of the three authors uses paradox in order to deny any value to culture: they rather encourage to reconsider the value of traditional *paideia* from an unusual and challenging perspective.

In sum, these works give an efficient parodic response to the pedantic behavior of the *pepaideumenoí*, who proclaimed their intellectual and cultural authority and made *paideia* a means of self-assertion and empowerment. In this regard, I will elucidate the possible recipients of these texts, the plausible reaction of the audience and, above all, the common strategies used by the authors to solicit the hermeneutic capacity of their addressees, which appears to be the sign of a shared cultural policy of the paradox.

#### Bibliography

- E. Bowie, *Greeks and Their Past in the Second Sophistic*, in *Past & Present*, Vol. 46 (1970), pp. 3-41
- J. Hall, *Lucian's Satire*, New York 1981
- H.-G. Nesselrath, *Lukians Parasitendialog: Untersuchungen und Kommentar*, Berlin-New York 1985
- G. Vagnone, *Note al testo e all'interpretazione del "Troiano" di Dione di Prusa*, in *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, New Series, Vol. 73, No. 1 (2003), pp. 139-145
- L. Herchenroeder, *Τί γὰρ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸν λόγον; Plutarch's "Gryllus" and So-Called "Grylloi"*, in *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 129, No. 3 (2008), pp. 347-379
- R. Hunter, *The "Trojan Oration" of Dio Chrysostom and Ancient Homeric Criticism*, in J. Grethlein – A. Rengakos (edd.), *Narratology and Interpretation. The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin-New York 2009, pp. 43-61
- Whitmarsh, *Beyond the Second Sophistic. Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London 2013
- R. Hunter, *The Measure of Homer. The Ancient Reception of the Iliad and the Odyssey*, Cambridge 2018

#### Slot 9: 2:30 - 3:20pm

**Anna Peterson**, The Pennsylvania State University  
*Alciphron's Letters and the Politics of Comic Space*

Alciphron's *Letters* confront the reader with a world in which life is hard, happiness fleeting, and desires are left unfulfilled. Although the original organization of the work is unclear, it has been divided by modern editors into four books according to the occu-

pation of the letter writers— fishermen (Book 1), farmers (Book 2), parasites (Book 3), and courtesans (Book 4). It is often observed that the work has much in common with other “sophistic literature” of the period, from the ways in which it repurposes material from earlier literature—most notably New Comedy but also pastoral poetry, mime, and the novel—to the imaginary landscape of Classical Attica that it presents. Since many of the letters are left unanswered, readers must imagine the response for themselves and thus experience in the words of Patricia Rosenmeyer (2004: 280) the “intellectual delight of pretending to be back in the *locus classicus* of Menander’s Athens.”

But what view of fourth-century Attica do these letters in fact create? References to the space inhabited by these characters are interspersed throughout the work. These details have typically been treated as little more than a backdrop intended to imbue the letters with the “*effect du réel*.” Yet the so-called “spatial turn” in the study of ancient literature has brought about an increasing awareness both of the dynamic role that space assumes in literature and of how literature contributes to the production of “cultural spaces” (Fitzgerald and Spentzou 2018). As a range of recent studies have shown, spatial descriptions are more than just a backdrop for the action; rather, they represent “dynamic and multilayered social constructs” in which meaning is created and negotiated by individuals through the variety of ways that they experience a given space (cf. Gilhuly and Worman 2014). This is particularly prominent in the *Letters*, where, as I argue, space becomes a vehicle for exploring and ultimately destabilizing the elite literary culture of the period.

This paper begins from the premise that reading the *Letters* through the lens of our conventional understanding of the Second Sophistic has obscured the socio-economic complexities of the work, which a spatially focused reading helps to elucidate. One theme that runs throughout the corpus is the difference between rural and urban space. A polarity between city and countryside is common in ancient literature and one that, as Ralph Rosen and Ineke Sluiter (2006) note, represented “a sliding scale” onto which issues of politics, culture, and progress were often mapped. The characters of the *Letters* frequently focalize their socio-economic concerns around the spaces they inhabit or hope to. Life is presented as equally hard in the city and in the country, and the text precludes an obvious “spatial organization of value.” Although the *Letters* are ostensibly entertainment pieces, the repeated emphasis placed on the character’s struggles lays bare a harsh reality that is often glossed over by the idealized literary constructs of Alciphron’s models.

This has important ramifications for how we understand Alciphron’s repurposing of his New Comic material. Although Menander is said to have never left Athens, the geographical horizons of his plays can be broad—*Sikyonoï*, *Epitrepontes*, and *Imbrioi* each take place outside of Attica. Moreover, his works had a long history of being exported all over the ancient Mediterranean world both as plays to be performed and as a subject matter for the statuary, frescos, and mosaics that graced elite homes (Nervegna 2013). In contrast, Alciphron constructs a much narrower comic world, one that is located exclusively in Attica. Space in this context thus becomes a further reflection of how Alciphron handles the hypotexts with which he is working. In particular, the exclusively Attic setting brings into relief the degree to which these letters both re-Atticize and re-orient a comic tradition that had become diffuse in terms of where and the ways in which it could be deployed.

## Bibliography

Fitzgerald, W. and E. Spentzou (eds) 2018. *The Production of Space in Latin Literature*. Oxford.

- Funke, M. 2015. "The Menandrian World of Alciphron's Letters." In C.W. Marshall and Tom Hawkins (eds.), *Athenian Comedy in the Roman Empire*, 223-37. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gilhuly, K. and N. Worman (eds) 2015. *Space, Place, and Landscape in Ancient Greek Literature and Culture*. Cambridge.
- Hodkinson, O. D. 2012. "Attic Idylls: Hierarchies of Herdsmen and Social Status in Alciphron and Longus." *JHS* 132: 41-53.
- . 2018. "Typecast? Speaking Names in Alciphron." In M. Biraud and A. Zuacker (eds.), *The Letters of Alciphron: A Unified Literary Work?* 147-167. Brill.
- Nervegna, S. 2013. *Menander in Antiquity: The Contexts of Reception*. Oxford.
- Rosen, R. and I. Sluiter (eds.) 2006. *City, Countryside, and the Spatial Organization of Value in Classical Antiquity*. Brill.
- Rosenmeyer, P.A. 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: The Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge.
- Schmitz, T.A. 2004. "Alciphron's Letters as a Sophistic Text." In B.E. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, 87-104. De Gruyter.

### Slot 10: 3:30 - 4:20pm

**Stephen Trzaskoma**, University of New Hampshire

*Subaltern Elites? Ideological and Political Dimensions of Novelistic Protagonists*

The elite nature of the couples that take center stage in the plots of the extant Greek novels is obvious and much commented upon, as is, with the exception of the case of Longus' protagonists, the emphasis on the loss of that status during the adventures that take place. Even *Daphnis & Chloe* is only an apparent exception—each member of the couple falls from high society as an infant and regains it in the final book, meaning that the basic framework is maintained even if the mechanism and timing differs from the other novels.

In this paper, I briefly explore the nature and ideological dimensions of expulsion from the *beau monde* and the characters' subsequent interactions with the machinery of power in the societies the novels depict. My interest is twofold: first, to discern the major narrative patterns around those encounters; second, to determine whether the division of the novels into pre-sophistic and sophistic is reflected therein. In other words, can we trace a distinctly Second Sophistic political concern in the later novels?

[Friday]

### Slot 11: 9:00 - 9:50am

**Estelle Strazdins**, University of Cambridge

*The Hero of Marathon? Herodes Atticus' Material 'Second Sophistic'*

This paper will (re)consider the efficacy of the 'Second Sophistic' as a) a frame for analyzing imperial Greek culture beyond literature; b) a political strategy within the Greek-culture / Roman-power dynamic; c) a phenomenon that cannot be fully appreciated without examining the futuring aspirations of its expression.

It will focus on Herodes Atticus' material engagement with the cultural memory and historical tradition of the Persian Wars, the famous battles of which were important

ideologically to both Greeks and Romans in the imperial age (Spawforth 1994; Jung 2006). On the one hand, Greeks used these events as exempla of resistance to foreign powers from the fourth century BCE onwards; on the other, Roman governance turned that disruptive potential into one of unification, equating barbarian threats beyond the empire's borders with the Persian threat seen off by the 'classical' Greeks.

Concurrently, Rome promoted classical Athenians and Spartans, who formed the primary resistance to Darius and Xerxes, as positive role models for Roman Greeks in their maintenance of manly vigor despite being rich in culture. This apparently formed part of a larger Roman impetus to keep provincial Greeks focused on their *polis*-based past and ancient territorial rivalries as a means of control (Spawforth 2012). In the culture of the eastern empire, however, references to the Persian Wars were always loaded with the potential to be interpreted subversively instead of as a dutiful expression of collective imperial belonging.

Herodes Atticus employs this interpretative ambiguity to his benefit by manipulating artefacts, monuments, and memorial landscapes associated with the Battle of Marathon in 490 BCE to create a framework for his own commemoration. The kinds of messages he sets in stone, moreover, are provocative in the context of the Roman empire and reveal an interest in his future memory that surpasses his concern for his standing in either contemporary Athens or the empire at large.

Focusing on Herodes' redeployment of casualty lists from the Marathon  *Soros*  to his Peloponnesian villa at Loukou and his arrangement of a triad of portrait busts of himself, Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Verus at the Sanctuary of Rhamnoussian Nemesis, I will demonstrate that: a) the play with tradition and innovation, whereby the past is emulated, repurposed, and contested, that is a feature of 'Second Sophistic' literature is also a trait of Roman Greek material art; b) the fascination with classical Hellenism evident in 'Second Sophistic' cultural output is regularly used to create a context for personal commemoration and is thus aimed as much at posterity as the present; c) granting imperial Greeks a stake in the future empowers their cultural and political messages in the present.

## Bibliography

- Butz, P., 'The Stoichedon Arrangement of the New Marathon Stele from the Villa of Herodes Atticus at Kynouria', in J. Bodet and N. Dimitrova (eds), *Ancient Documents and their Contexts* (Leiden 2015), 82-97.
- Galli, M., *Die Lebenswelt eines Sophisten: Untersuchungen zu den Bauten und Stiftungen des Herodes Atticus* (Mainz am Rhein 2002).
- Janko, R., 'The New Epitaph for the Fallen at Marathon', *ZPE* 190 (2014), 11-12.
- Jung, M., *Marathon und Plataiai: Zwei Perserschlachten als 'lieux de mémoire' im antiken Griechenland* (Göttingen 2006).
- Olson, S., 'Reading the New Erechtheid Casualty List from Marathon', in G. Colesanti and L. Lulli (eds), *Submerged Literature in Ancient Greek Culture* (Berlin 2016), 41-66.
- Papaioannou, M., 'Villas in Roman Greece', in A. Marzano and G. Métraux (eds), *The Roman Villa in the Mediterranean Basin* (Cambridge 2018), 328-76.
- Petrakos, B., *Ο Δήμος του Ραμνούντος: σύνοψη των ανασκαφών και των ερευνών, 1813-1998. I. Τοπογραφία* (Athens 1999).
- Petrovic, A., 'The Battle of Marathon in Pre-Herodotean Sources: on Marathon Verse-Inscriptions (IG I<sup>3</sup> 503/504; SEG LVI 430), in C. Carey and M. Edwards (eds), *Marathon – 2,500 Years* (London 2013), 47-53.

- Proietti, G., 'La memoria delle Guerre Persiane in età imperiale: il classicismo di Erode Attico e la "Stele dei Maratonomachi"', *Annario della Scuola Archaeologica di Atene* 90 (2012), 97-117.
- 'The Marathon Epitaph from Eua-Loukou: Some Notes about Its Text and Historical Context', *ZPE* 185 (2013), 24-30.
- Spawforth, A., 'Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford 1994), 233-48.
- *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution* (Cambridge 2012).
- Spyropoulos, G., *Η Έπαυλη του Ηρώδη Αττικού στην Εύα/Λουκού Κυνουρίας* (Athens 2006).
- *Οι Στήλες των Πεσόντων στην Μάχη του Μαραθώνα από την Έπαυλη του Ηρώδη Αττικού στην Εύα Κυνουρίας* (Athens 2009).
- Tentori-Montalto, M., 'Nuove considerazioni sulla stele della tribù Erechtheis dalla villa di Erode Attico a Eva-Loukou', *ZPE* 185 (2013), 31-52.
- 'La stele dei caduti della tribù Erechtheis dalla villa di Erode Attico a Loukou – Eva Kynourias (SEG LVI 430): la datazione e l'epigramma', *ZPE* 192 (2014), 34-44.
- Tobin, J., *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens* (Amsterdam 1997).

### Slot 12: 10:00 - 10:50am

**Maria Vamvouri**, University of Lausanne

*Multi-local and In-between Identities in Second Sophistic Literature of Exile. A Greek Answer to Roman Power?*

According to Tim Whitmarsh (2001), early Imperial works on exile position themselves against the literary tradition of democratic Athens while at the same time evincing a competitive and combative relationship to Roman power. My paper goes a step further by examining the specific philosophical proposals and discursive devices through which treatises on exile by Musonius, Dio, Plutarch, and Favorinus undermine the autocratic power of emperors who banish their enemies. I show that in all these texts, those in exile have to adopt a de-centralized position in order to balance and put into perspective their condition and their identities. The exiled individual thus stands between two realities and endorses different provisional identities, which are constantly re-invented. This in-betweenness and the peripheral positioning it creates are responses to unilateral confinement and exclusion, but they also highlight the plural vision an individual might adopt in a multi-cultural world. Thus, while the construction of multi-local and de-centered identities within the discourse reflects the social reality of cosmopolitization (Moatti 2007), it also conceals a critical stance both towards the closure of space experienced by the banished, and towards the regime responsible for the exile.

I will also explore these texts' meaningful silences about contemporary policies related to displacement and exile. The failure to mention the Roman present observed in writings on exile imply a competitive and combative relationship not only to Roman power, but also to the sophisticated legal system and policy that regulated social status in the Roman Empire, including that of the exile. The treatises on exile, like the philosophical currents in which they are inscribed or by which they are inspired, offer a counterpoint to the laws and policies that sought to control mobility, citizenship, and social identities, and represent a particular response to the administrative system that implemented those restrictions.

The critical and subversive elements that are skilfully concealed in the exile literature of

the early principate are, I believe, what permits them to be appropriately treated as part of the “Second Sophistic”, if we understand ‘sophistic’ as recalling the way in which the classical sophists rejected transcendent truths and subverted traditional views (Jarratt 1987). To describe the Imperial writings on exile as “Second Sophistic” literature implies that they bring certain tensions to light in their subversive responses to the social realities of Roman power.

### Bibliography

- E. Amato (ed.), *Le traité Sur l'exil de Favorinos d'Arles. Papyrologie, philologie et littérature*, Rennes, 2015.
- M. W. Gleason, *Making Man, Sophists and Self. Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton, 1994.
- S. C. Jarratt, « The First Sophists and the Uses of History » *Rhetoric Review* 6, 1987 : 67-78.
- C. Moatti, « De la *peregrinatio* comme stratégie intellectuelle dans l'Empire romain au IIe siècle de notre ère », in *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome. Italie et Méditerranée, Résidences d'ambassadeurs et immunités diplomatiques (XVIe-XXe siècle). La mobilité intellectuelle en Méditerranée, de l'antiquité à l'époque moderne*, 119, 2007: 29-136.
- J. L. Moles, « The Career and Conversion of Dio Chrysostom », *JHS* 98, 1978 : 79-100.
- , «Le cosmopolitisme cynique», in M.-O. Goulet-Cazé, R. Goulet (eds.), *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements : actes du colloque international du CNRS* (Paris, 22-25 juillet 1991), Paris, 1993 : 259-280.
- , The Thirteenth Oration of Dio Chrysostom: Complexity and Simplicity, Rhetoric and Moralism, Literature and Life », *JHS* 125, 2005 : 112-138.
- H.-G. Nesselrath, « Later Greek Voices on the Predicament of Exile : From Teles to Plutarch and Favorinus », in J. F. Gaertner (ed.) *Writing Exile : The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Leiden, Boston, 2007 : 87-108.
- J. Opsomer, « Is a Planet happier than a Star ? Cosmopolitanism in Plutarch's *On Exile* », in Ph. A. Stadter, Luc Van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)*, Leuven, 2002 : 281-295.
- Ph. A. Stadter, « Introduction : Setting Plutarch in his Context », in Ph. A. Stadter, L. Van der Stockt (eds.), *Sage and Emperor: Plutarch, Greek Intellectuals, and Roman Power in the Time of Trajan (98-117 A.D.)*, Leuven, 2002 : 1-26.
- S. Swain (ed.), *Dio Chrysostom. Politics, Letters, and Philosophy*, Oxford, 2000.
- M. Vamvouri Ruffy, «The Construction of a Cosmopolitan Space in Plutarch's *De Exilio*», in A. Georgiadou, K. Oikonomopoulou (eds.), *Space, Time and Language in Plutarch*, Berlin, Boston, 2017: 237-246.
- G. Ventrella, T. Grandjean, L. Thévenet (eds.) *Œuvres. Discours olympique, ou sur la conception première de la divinité (Or. XII) et À Athènes, sur sa fuite (Or. XIII)*, Paris, 2017.
- T. Whitmarsh, «'Greece is the World': Exile and Identity in the Second Sophistic», in S. Goldhill (ed.), *Being Greek under Rome. Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, Cambridge, 2001 : 269-305.
- , *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire. The Politics of Imitation*, Oxford, 2001.

**Slot 13: 11:10 - 12:00am**

**Aitor Blanco Pérez**, University of Navarra [ablancop@unav.es]

*The Second Sophistic and Roman Onomastics*

Names are fundamental for assessing the spread of Roman citizenship in the Empire. The eastern provinces under Rome's rule saw an increase in the number of Greek-speaking individuals enfranchised: soldiers, athletes, and, naturally, intellectuals.

On his way to address the Asian Council in Pergamum, a 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD author recounts how he had a dream following a visit to a temple of Apollo in Mysia. Telesphorus, the son of Asklepios, had appeared to him carrying a letter with oracles previously given for a girl called Philoumene and copied from her entrails. In the reverie, a vision of healthy and diseased intestines served to explain the recurrent stomach ache of the writer, his divine salvation but also revealed the inscription of his own name: Αἴλιος Ἀριστείδης (*Orat.* LI [*Sacred Tales* V] 22-25). Even if Aelius Aristides is one of the most prolific authors of the so-called 'Second Sophistic' the record of his full anthroponym in both his works and later compilations such as Philostratus' *Lives* and the *Suda* became rather exceptional. Indeed, there is only one other instance in which the sequence Aelius Aristides appears and it is connected to another letter, in this case sent to the emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus (*Orat.* XIX 1). By contrast, one honorific statue base probably from Smyrna and set up by a group of Egyptian Hellenes records in full a Πόπλιος Αἴλιος Ἀριστείδης Θεόδωρος. The first three elements of the sequence must correspond to a Roman citizen referred to with his *tria nomina*.

My paper seeks to study both the ways in which Roman nomenclature was locally adopted by Greek authors such as Aelius Aristides and how socially significant the display of their names might be in the epigraphic and literary materials of the period. Instead of using onomastics as an index of status to be instrumentalised by historians, I propose to analyse this phenomenon as a cultural practice that is accommodated to different contexts and helps to illuminate what citizenship meant to some of those who possessed it.

## Bibliography

- Ando, Clifford. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
- Blanco-Pérez, Aitor. 2016. "Nomenclature and Dating in Roman Asia Minor: (M.) Aurelius/a and the 3rd Century AD." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 199: 271-293.
- Bowersock, Glen Warren. 2004. "Artemidorus and the Second Sophistic," in Barbara Borg, ed., *Paideia: The world of the Second Sophistic*: 53-63. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bowie, Ewen L. 1982. "The Importance of Sophists." *Yale Classical Studies* 27: 29-60.
- Bowie, Ewen L. and Elsner, Jaś. 2009. *Philostratus*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chaniotis, Angelos. 2013. "Second Thoughts on Second Names in Aphrodisias," in Robert Parker, ed., *Personal Names in Ancient Anatolia*: 207-229. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Downie, Janet. 2013. *At the limits of art: A literary study of Aelius Aristides' Hieroi logoi*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ferrary, Jean-Louis. 2008. "L'onomastique dans les provinces orientales de l'empire à la lumière du dossier des mémoriaux de délégations de Claros." *Cahiers du Centre Gustave Glotz* 19: 247-278.
- Goldhill, Simon. 2001. *Being Greek Under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jones, Christopher P. 1986. *Culture and society in Lucian*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Jones, Christopher P. 2001. "Philostratus' Heroikos and its Setting in Reality." *The Journal*

- of Hellenic Studies* 121: 141-149.
- Mócsy, András. 1970. "Das Namensverbot des Kaisers Claudius." *Klio* 52: 287-294.
- Ni Mheallaigh, Karen. 2010. "The game of the name: onymity and the contract of reading in Lucian," in Francesca Mestre and Pilar Gómez, eds., *Lucian of Samosata: Greek writer and Roman citizen*: 83-94. Barcelona: UB.
- Petsalis-Diomidis, Alexia. 2010. *Truly Beyond Wonders: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Puech, Bernadette. 2002. *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Paris: Vrin.
- Quet, Marie-Henriette. 2003. "Le sophiste M. Antonius Polémon de Laodicée, éminente personnalité politique de l'Asie romaine du II<sup>e</sup> siècle," in Mireille Cébeillac-Gervason and Laurent Lamoine, eds., *Les élites et leurs facettes: les élites locales dans le monde hellénistique et romain*: 401-443. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses universitaires Blaise-Pascal.
- Raggi, Andrea. 2014. "Adriano e le concessioni della cittadinanza romana nella provincia d'Asia." *Mediterraneo Antico* 16.2: 471-500.
- Rizakis, Athanasios. 1996. "Anthroponymie et société: les noms romains dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire," in Athanasios Rizakis, ed., *Roman onomastics in the Greek East: Social and political aspects*: 11-29. Paris: Diffusion de Boccard.
- Salway, Benet. 1994. "What's in a Name? A Survey of Roman Onomastic Practice from c. 700 B.C. to A.D. 700." *Journal of Roman Studies* 84: 124-145.
- Swain, Simon. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, classicism, and power in the Greek world, AD 50-250*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- von Staden, Heinrich. 1997. "Galen and The 'Second Sophistic.'" *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 68: 33-54.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. 2005. *The Second Sophistic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

#### **Slot 14: 12:10am - 1:00pm**

**Janet Downie**, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

*What is a City For? Dio Chrysostom on the Politics of Urban Space*

Over the course of the first and second centuries CE, cities of the Roman Empire witnessed an impressive building boom – especially in the highly urbanized Greek East. Communities constructed and renovated distinctly Roman architectural features such as bath complexes and invested heavily in the monumental elaboration of key political, economic and social spaces within the urban center. Much of this building activity was financed by local elites as a form of civic euergetism, and the urban fabric became, more than ever, a theater for elite display. The inscriptional record supports this picture, offering abundant examples of individuals celebrated publically for their contributions. However, the celebratory inscriptional record mostly obscures what Christopher Jones has described as the shadow side of these prestigious sponsorship projects: competition, financing problems and, especially, conflicts between donors and the *demos*. Shedding light on this democratic dynamic in a series of recent publications, Arjan Zuiderhoek has argued that city assemblies in Asia Minor were major players in civic affairs, including when it came to public building projects. The power of the assembly is clear, indeed, in three speeches delivered by Dio Chrysostom in his home city of Prusa, Bithynia: *Orations* 40, 45, and 47 expose the difficulties Dio encountered in convincing his fellow

citizens to approve his plans for new building in the city. The speeches explore the politics of urban development from the perspective of an elite individual in the process of tense negotiation with his local community.

These speeches, however, do more than simply expose these fraught political dynamics. They also offer some glimpse of what was at stake ideologically and of the kinds of meanings people attached to the physical landscape of the city as a political space. The three Prusa orations occupy a point of intersection between theory and practice, because here Dio sets material building projects in the context of larger scale questions about civic aspirations in an Imperial world.

The paper has three parts. In the first part, I argue that Dio presents the physical landscape of the city not as a stage for performance, but as a process of political engagement in its own right. In the second part, I isolate the three main metaphors or concepts Dio develops to characterize his relationship to his city: founder, lover, and laboring servant. These rhetorical tropes are, to varying degrees, standard in civic oratory of the period, but Dio uses them to make strong claims about his engagement and commitment to the city-as-commons. In the third part of the paper, I argue that these metaphors are complicated by Dio's fourth, and perhaps dominant, mode of self-presentation as Odysseus the wanderer – a perpetual outsider in the Stoic tradition, occupying a liminal space between the city itself and further structures of regional and imperial power. The figure of Odysseus connects the city orations to Dio's philosophical reflections on civic community in the *Euboicus* and *Borystheniticus*. However, whereas those texts are imaginative and abstract reflections on civic ideals, in the Prusa orations, Dio is forced to deal directly with a non-idealized political process that is worked out concretely in the material context of urban space.

#### Bibliography

- Jones, C. P. 1978. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Boston, MA: Harvard.
- Swain, S., ed. 2000. *Dio Chrysostom: politics, letters, and philosophy*. Oxford.
- Zuiderhoek, A. 2009. *The Politics of Munificence in the Roman Empire: Citizens, Elites and Benefactors in Asia Minor. Greek Culture in the Roman World*. Cambridge, UK.
- . 2008. "On the Political Sociology of the Imperial Greek City." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 48(4): 417-445.

#### **Slot 15: 2:30 - 3:20pm**

**Daniel Jolowicz**, University of Cambridge

*Contexts for Latin in the Greek East*

The question of whether Greeks of the imperial period (especially the first two centuries CE) read Latin poetry at all—and if so, for pleasure?—is a live and thorny one. The traditional scholarly position is that they did not. In this paper I address the question of whether Greeks of the imperial period, especially in the east, acknowledged the existence of a poetic corpus written in Latin. I shall assess evidence in a variety of media (inscriptional, papyrological, architectural, literary) in an effort to establish in what type of contexts the Greeks may have been exposed to Latin poetry, and how and where they responded to it.

### Slot 16: 3:30 - 4:20pm

Jeff Ulrich, Rutgers University

*The Politics of "Apuleius: the Latin Sophist": An Interrogation of a Misfit Classification*

Apuleius has always been slippery or difficult to pin down to a particular movement or intellectual current. Of North African descent, and writing in a vernacular of Latin that is barely recognizable as Latin, Apuleius defies categorization, and has consequently found a much more natural home in the "Second Sophistic" than in his own Imperial Latin era. When one steps back to analyze the situation, however, it is rather odd that Apuleius is much more frequently associated with the likes of Lucian, Dio Chrysostom, or Plutarch than with his own contemporary or near-contemporary authors, such as Tacitus, Suetonius, or Aulus Gellius. And so, major interventions in Apuleius studies analyze *The Greek World of Apuleius* (Sandy 1997) or speak of *Apuleius: the Latin Sophist* (Harrison 2000), rather than seeing him on a spectrum with Fronto or early Christian writers, such as Tertullian, both of whom were likewise from North Africa. Major reasons for this may be Apuleius' literary "gamesmanship" (Winkler 1985) and his archaizing style, although the Archaic Latin he reproduces is more Plautine (May 2006) than Ciceronian (and therefore, is something of a false analogy to what the so-called Second Sophists are doing). But more subtle and in my view, all the more pernicious, is an ideological reason for grouping Apuleius in with the great resurgence of Hellenism: by doing so, we can dissociate him from Roman culture and thus, from political, philosophical, and religious movements that are taking place in Rome. Apuleius, "the Latin Sophist," is transformed (much like his asinine character) into yet another anxious intellectual on the periphery of the empire, performing his *paideia* for a price.

Ultimately, this misfit classification of Apuleius speaks to a larger political purpose for the terminology of the "Second Sophistic" writ large: namely, the sweeping dismissal of philosophical and/or "serious" concerns in texts that constantly allude to, refer to, and manipulate philosophical intertexts. Homer, Plato, and Herodotus become mere sources of "play," and we – anxious intellectuals of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, trying to perform our own *paideia* in a world increasingly uninterested in our work – can happily find images of ourselves in the "Second Sophists," and feel pleasure at recognizing the likeness. When Vergil alludes to Homeric intertexts, but reworks them in a new context, it is political, philosophical, ideological; but when our beloved "Second Sophists" do this same activity, it is nothing more than a sprinkling of culture to make high-brow readers feel good about reading low-brow texts.

In this paper, I will interrogate the failure of Apuleius studies to see the deeply philosophical implications of allusion and intertext by analyzing the opening and closing passages of the *Metamorphoses* – a ring-composition of seemingly playful allusions, which turn out to be deadly serious. Indeed, the opening contract – *lector intende; laetaberis* – and the closural baldness of the main character have long been read as invitations to shallow reading, to mere *divertissement* (Trapp 2001; van Mal-Maeder 1997), and to satirical mockery of Lucius. However, closer analysis will demonstrate that the Prologue is implicated in a discourse that goes all the way back to Plato's *Symposium* – a discourse of "attentive reading" and careful investigation – and moreover, that this discourse has its analogues in Gellius and Fronto. In a similar vein, the concluding line of the *Metamorphoses*, which most scholars have pointed to as the example *par excellence* of the novel's ultimate shallow and satirical character, is in fact a direct translation of a line from Plato's

*Phaedrus* – a moment where Socrates uncovers *his* bald head to declare a Palinode to *Erōs*. With this previously unrecognized allusion, we can say that the retrospective reading Jack Winkler so famously popularized is, on more careful inspection, a Palinodic reading – an opportunity to redeem the text from the clutches of those who would so carelessly toss aside its rich and complicated appropriation of the past. Hellenism in the “Second Sophistic” is not some empty gesture of display, but authors deploy this nostalgic reworking of the past to force their readers to scrutinize and engage with the present. If Apuleius is indeed a “Latin Sophist,” then the word “Sophist” must mean something very different from how we usually understand it.

#### Works Cited

- Harrison, S. J. 2000. *A Latin Sophist*. Oxford University Press.
- May, R. 2006. *Apuleius and Drama: The Ass on Stage*. Oxford University Press.
- Sandy, G. 1997. *The Greek World of Apuleius*. Leiden.
- Trapp, M. 2001. “On Tickling the Ears: Apuleius’ Prologue and the Anxieties of Philosophers.” In A. Kahane and A. Laird. eds. 2001. 39-46.
- Van Mal-Maeder, D. 1997. “*Lector, Intende: Laetaberis* - The Enigma of the Last Book of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*.” In *Groningen Colloquia on the Novel* 8. 87-118.
- Winkler, J. J. 1985. *Auctor & Actor: A Narratological Reading of Apuleius’ Golden Ass*. Berkeley and London.

[Saturday]

#### Slot 17: 9:00 - 9:50am

**Daniel Richter**, University of Southern California

*Aristocratic and Cosmopolitan Ethics in the Early Roman Empire*

In this paper, I argue that an aristocratic impulse lies behind much ancient cosmopolitan thought. The rejection of ethnic identity, in the context of the classical and late classical *polis*, can also serve to sever the ties of the elite to its own local community; in other words, if the discourse of autochthony democratizes noble birth (in the words of Josh Ober), a cosmopolitan ethic has the potential to substitute what is really a more traditionally aristocratic attitude towards social class and localism.

To take an example that I hope will elucidate what I am after here: Philostratus tells us that the Gallic sophist Favorinus bequeathed to his friend the Athenian Herodes Atticus a slave by the name of Autolekythos – an entirely black Indian who used to entertain the sophists by speaking bad Attic Greek (VS 490). Herodes and Favorinus – the Athenian and the self-described “barbarian” Gaul – self-identify as Hellenes because they participate equally in an elite, intellectual world from which the slave Autolekythos is excluded. The pleasure that the sophists derive from their exclusion is a function of the reification of the abstract boundaries that define the boundaries of the cosmopolitan intellectual community in which Favorinus and Herodes both participate.

The criteria according to which such cosmopolitan communities are defined can and must shift dependent upon context – for Zeno in third-century BCE Athens, the primary criterion is philosophically defined virtue; for the sophists, *paideia*, manifest in a mastery of a highly literary Attic Greek; for Paul, as we shall see at the end of this paper, it is a Christian inflected understanding of pneumatic participation in the body of Christ.

### Slot 18: 10:00 - 10:50am

Scott DiGiulio, Mississippi State University

*Otium, Roman Identity, and the Politics of Greek Learning in the Noctes Atticae*

The conventional view of the Second Sophistic connects imperial Greek literature to the classical past, eliding much of the contemporary political environment and excluding Roman culture and literature. However, many of the tendencies of Second Sophistic authors, especially their focused attention on the use of the literary past to negotiate a distinct cultural identity in their contemporary political environment, are not exclusive to the Greek world. Indeed, in this regard Latin authors of the High Empire are of a kind with the Greek authors of the period, demonstrating a similar set of attitudes, including archaism and an apparently reverence for the past (Marache 1952), as well as reading and reacting to the works produced by imperial Greek authors.

As has been increasingly recognized, Aulus Gellius demonstrates the cultural attitudes of the Second Sophistic perhaps more than any other Latin author of the High Empire (Holford-Strevens 2003, Gunderson 2009, Keulen 2009). In his miscellany, the *Noctes Atticae* (NA), he integrates prevalent Greek intellectual currents into his broader literary project. From the outset, Gellius inscribes the contemporary Greek intellectual scene within his work, through features such as the title (Vardi 1993), the recurrent presence of the sophists Favorinus and Herodes Atticus (Beall 2001, Howley 2018), and setting portions of the work in Athens. Yet, despite this apparent Hellenizing, Gellius nevertheless marks his project as something distinctly Roman, as he incorporates the political realities of the Roman world into his intellectual project. Gellius fashions a distinctive identity which harmonizes *otium* and Greek learning on the one hand with quintessentially Roman *negotium* on the other.

Throughout the NA, Gellius juxtaposes Greek and Roman models of intellectual endeavor (Keulen 2009, Howley 2014, 2018), often staging debates between characters representing these opposing approaches (e.g. 2.22, 2.26). Elite Romans must negotiate between these two poles, as demonstrated in two scenes set during Saturnalia (18.2, 18.13) in which a group of young Romans engage in Greek -style games of sophisms (Egelhaaf-Gaiser 2018). The Romans cannot fully give themselves over to such *otium*, even at Saturnalia, as they focus on honing their mental acuity. Like the nights in Athens in which they take place, these games are a venue for the young men depicted by Gellius to negotiate their Roman identity and intellectual practices, especially vis-à-vis their Greek peers.

Likewise, Gellius uses the figures of the imperial tutor Fronto and the grammarians Sulpicius Apollinaris and Antonius Julianus as ciphers for the appropriate balance of *otium* and *negotium*. Across four chapters near the end of the work (19.8-10, 19.13), Gellius illustrates a paradigm of *otium studiosum*, reflecting upon the role of philological inquiry in the Antonine period. While his characters model habits of mind that produce intellectual refinement, Gellius makes use of these scenes to interrogate the nature of Roman leisure and learning, situating it between the anxieties of the archaic past and the integration of Hellenism. Fronto, Apollinaris, and Julianus all offer examples of constructive *otium* by exploring the Latin language and literature to cultivate the intellect. Yet there is an implicit challenge to the paradigm when these scenes are read against each other, as the tensions between the linguistic inquiries and the settings of the *commentarii* are opposed to one another. While Gellius illustrates several instances of intellectual inquiry, he nevertheless imparts a degree of triviality to the enterprise; while these scenes

of *otium* illustrate one means of self-improvement, other models are needed to complete the image of the scholar and gentleman.

#### Bibliography

- Beall, Stephen M. "Homo Fandi Dulcissimus: The Role of Favorinus in the *Attic Nights* of Aulus Gellius." *AJPh* 122.1 (2001): 87-106.
- Egelhaaf-Gaiser, Ulrike. "Saturnalian Riddles for Attic Nights: Intratextual Feasting with Aulus Gellius." *Intratextuality and Latin Literature*. Eds. S. J. Harrison, S. Frangoulidis and T. D. Papanghelis. Berlin and Boston: Walter de Gruyter, 2018. 431-447.
- Gunderson, Erik. *Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2009.
- Holford-Strevens, Leofranc. *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. 1988. Revised ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Howley, Joseph A. "Heus tu, rhetorisce? Gellius, Cicero, Plutarch, and Roman Study Abroad." *Roman Rule in Greek and Latin Writing: Double Vision*. Eds. J. M. Madsen and R. Rees. Leiden: Brill, 2014. 163-192.
- . *Aulus Gellius and Roman Reading Culture: Text, Presence, and Imperial Knowledge in the Noctes Atticae*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Keulen, Wytse. *Gellius the Satirist: Roman Cultural Authority in Attic Nights*. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Marache, René. *La Critique littéraire de langue latine et le développement du goût archaïsant au II<sup>e</sup> siècle de notre ère*. Rennes: Plihon, 1952.
- Vardi, Amiel D. "Why Attic Nights? Or What's in a Name?" *CQ* 43.1 (1993): 298-301.

#### Slot 19: 11:10 - 12:00am

**Chiara Monaco**, University of Cambridge

*The Greek Lexicographers and the Politics of Language Purism*

If we understand the Second Sophistic as a political and cultural Greek movement active in a Latin panorama, one of its most striking aspects is the linguistic ideology that stands behind it. For the participants in the Atticist movement, the theory of mimesis implies the imitation of the classical canonical sources. Thus, Atticism requires a broad-ranging effort: the detailed reproduction of morphology, syntax and vocabulary of six hundred years before.

Horrocks (1997) summarises the political essence of linguistic Atticism: 'Atticism might best be thought of not as a well-defined body of doctrine but as a state of mind inculcated by the educational system and reinforced by the practice and prejudice of the aristocracy'. The most efficient expression of the so-called 'negative Atticism' meaning the practice of avoiding words, forms, and even meanings unattested in classical Attic (Kim 2017; also Kim 2010) is represented by the lexica. What is missing in the contemporary scholarly conversation about the Second Sophistic is an analysis of the ideology that underpins the construction of these lexica.

With several important publications, Strobel (2005, 2009 and 2011) has contributed to our understanding of the structure and the organization of the lexicographical material. Now, my aim is to better understand the logic behind the construction of the Atticistic lexica. The lexicographers cannot only be seen as fervently stubborn collectors of words who had lost the contact with the actual literary production as described in Lucian and Athenaeus (Tribulato 2016). Rather, they triggered a process of active normativization of

an allegedly pure language with the intention to create a privileged connection between the Greek elite and the classical past. Therefore, they are deeply ideological and actively involved in the politics of canonicity and distinctiveness with the aim of imitating the classical authors in order to signal membership in a “cultured” elite distinguished from the “ignorant” masses.

The ideological prescriptivism transforms the lexica into real polemical pamphlets that address a central question of the Second Sophistic: the question of “correct” language. What is interesting about these lexica is their tendency to construct an artificial language that is not modelled on the classical texts but turns out to be a preconception for which the lexicographers find evidence in the classical authors. Classical literature then was arbitrarily used according to the needs of the lexicographers (that is for the language they wanted to reproduce) and to accommodate the tendencies of two linguistic parties: on the one hand those siding with the so-called Antiatticist who defended the literary *koiné* and tried to preserve contemporary usages finding evidence in the Classical and Hellenistic literature. On the other hand those siding with Phrynichus and Moeris who censored the perceived impurities of the literary *koiné* and substituted them with an artificial Attic language on the basis of a very selected canon of Attic authors.

Therefore, in order to investigate the role of the lexica my paper will be structured into two parts. In the first part I will analyse the lexicographical mechanisms used to construct and validate a specific kind of language by focusing on the following aspects: the mystification of the ancient sources that were used according to the intent of the lexicographer, the absence of any kind of critical sensitivity in the treatment of literary materials, the mistaken usages of certain expressions considered out of context, the omission of passages and the abuse of the idea of first attestation and comic usage. In the second part I will analyse to what extent the lexica affected the literary and non-literary production. The use of the lexica cannot only be examined in the production of the more Atticistic authors like Aelius Aristides, Lesbonax, Herodes Atticus or even Lucian who imitated classical authors. Rather, I will try to reconstruct the compromise that authors like Philostratus and Aelian found between the literary *koiné* and the use of rare atticizing expressions like nominative, absolute, unaugmented pluperfect or expression like ἀπνεῖσθαι ‘to be sleepless’ – never attested anywhere but coined by Phrynichus in the *Praeparatio Sophistica* 9,1. The pervasiveness of the Atticistic debate is even more evident when similar cases are found in the New Testament or in non-literary papyri (Connolly 1983). A critical evaluation of the materials mentioned is meant to contribute to the analysis of the language politics of the Second Sophistic.

Connolly, *Atticism in non-literary papyri of the first seven centuries CE*.

Horrocks, *Greek: a History of the Language and its Speakers*.

Kim 2010, *The Literary Heritage as Language: Atticism and the Second Sophistic*

Kim 2017, *Atticism and Asianism*

Strobel 2005, *The Lexicographer of the Second Sophistic as Collector of Words, Quotations and Knowledge*.

Strobel 2009, *The Lexica of the Second Sophistic*.

Strobel 2011, *Studies in Atticistic Lexica of the Second and Third Centuries*.

Tribulato, *Herodotus’ Reception in Ancient Greek Lexicography*.

**Slot 20: 12:10am - 1:00pm**

**Lawrence Kim**, Trinity University (US)

*The Politics of Style in the Second Sophistic: Classicizing and Anti-Classicizing Prose*

One of the hallmarks of Second Sophistic culture is its so-called ‘classicism’, an attitude toward the past focused upon a ‘classical’ era that valorizes a certain set of idealized abstract qualities (e.g., moderation, restraint, clarity, harmony) felt to characterize ‘classical’ culture and be worthy of literary and behavioral imitation. Such classicism naturally affected prose style; the best-known Imperial Greek writers—e.g., Dio, Plutarch, Aristides, Lucian—adopt styles that are generally considered classicizing, that is, modeled on classical authors and viewed by moderns as ‘moderate’. These authors also consistently criticize what they consider ‘bad’ style as violating or transgressing ‘classical’ norms, denigrating it as extravagant, ostentatious, unrestrained, verbose, repetitive, and overly rhythmic. Similar terms were used at the beginning of the Imperial era by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, to describe ‘Asian’ oratory, the decadent *post-* and *anti-*classical style developed in the Hellenistic period, and rejected by the classicizing movement of Dionysius’ own time (Hidber 1996).

Nevertheless, several Imperial Greek writers—e.g., novelists like Achilles Tatius, or orators like Favorinus of Arles—employ a style that revels in mannerisms (e.g., rhyme, short clauses, repetitive sounds and rhythms) associated with ‘Asian’ rhetoric (Norden 1898). This begs the question: if classicism were indeed so dominant and overarching in the Second Sophistic, why would these authors have adopted such an un-classical style? And what of the popular oratorical performances of the Imperial sophists, the *content* of which was certainly classicizing (re-enacting historical scenes from the classical past), but which were enacted in a flamboyant, ostentatious, and generally un-classical manner (Gleason 1995; Connolly 2001)?

In the past few years, several scholars have suggested that Greek classicism, rather than a means of expressing dissatisfaction with Roman rule (e.g., Bowie 1970, Schmitz 1999), may have actually been sponsored and foisted on Imperial Greece *by* Roman emperors. Under Augustus (27 BCE -14 CE), precisely when Dionysius was celebrating the Greek classicizing revival and the defeat of ‘Asian’ rhetoric (both of which he attributed to Roman influence), we can see evidence of policies promoting the ‘classical’ culture of ‘old’ mainland Greece in contrast to that of the ‘new’ post -classical Greeks of Asia (Hose 2010; Spawforth 2014), policies that were reinforced under Hadrian (117-138 CE) through institutions like the Panhellenion, which privileged ‘old’ Greek cities at the expense of ‘new’. I argue in this paper that, if Imperial Greek classicism was indeed a reflection of the desires of the Roman elite, then the adoption of *non-*classicizing styles and behaviors could be seen as attempts at resistance, not merely against the hegemonic classicism that we see in so many Greek authors of the period, but also against the political and cultural imperatives of Rome (see Whitmarsh 2013 for the theoretical frame).

## Bibliography

- Bowie, E. L. (1970) “Greeks and their Past in the Second Sophistic,” *P&P* 46, 3-41.
- Connolly, J. (2001) “Reclaiming the Theatrical in the Second Sophistic,” *Helios* 28, 75-96.
- Gleason, M. W. (1995) *Making Men. Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Hidber, T. (1996) *Das klassizistische Manifest des Dionys von Halikarnass*. Stuttgart.
- Hose, M. (1999) “Die zweite Begegnung Roms mit den Griechen oder: Zu politischen Ursachen des Attizismus,” in G. Vogt-Spira and B. Rommel, eds. *Rezeption und Identität*.

- tität. Die kulturelle Auseinandersetzung Roms mit Griechenland als europäisches Paradeigma*, 274-288. Stuttgart.
- Norden, E. (1898) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jh. v. Chr. Bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Leipzig.
- Schmitz, T. (1999) "Performing History in the Second Sophistic," in M. Zimmermann, ed. *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh n.Chr.*, 71-92. Stuttgart.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. (2011) *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2013) "Resistance is futile? Greek literary tactics in the face of Rome," in L. de Blois, ed. *Les grecs héritiers des Romains*, 57-86. Geneva.