

THE COMPOSITE OF SPOKEN AND WRITTEN SPEECH. THE *DEIPNOSOPHISTS* OF ATHENAEUS AS A MEDIUM OF THE INVENTION AND DOCUMENTATION OF SOURCES ON RHETORIC BETWEEN FICTIONALITY AND FACTUALITY

Fee-Alexandra HAASE

Professor, Ph.D.

(University of Nizwa, Oman)

f.a.haase@gmx.de, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4698-6955>

Abstract

The "*Deipnosophists*" of Athenaeus of Naucratis are a literary work that presents us an insight into ancient rhetoric and speech from various perspectives. Being composed of fictive speeches that join the texts of ancient writings in paraphrases and citations in the conversations of the participants during a banquet, the work reveals in different layers, the composition of the work itself, the conversations, and their writings, especially the ones that focus on rhetorical topics, speech in the essential form of this piece of literature. We argue that Athenaeus invents and composes here a multimedia memory that arranges topics related to the culture of banquets in speeches that range from the factuality of historical accounts about rhetoricians to the fictional story of the event itself that nearly completely consists of speeches as praise of this kind of culture. The "*Deipnosophists*" of Athenaeus comprises both spoken and written aspects of ancient rhetorics and speeches that blend into each other ranging from the framing narrative of a meeting of Athenaeus who tells the story of the event to a friend, the speeches of the *deipnosophists*, and the presentation of the texts of the works paraphrased and cited as speech in the banquet.

Keywords: rhetoric, banquet, hellenism, Epideictic speech, Greek literature, Imperial Rome

Rezumat

Lucrarea „*Deipnosophists*” de Athenaeus din Naucratis este o operă care face incursiune, din diverse perspective, în retorica antică și discurs. Fiind compusă din discursuri fictive, care sunt subsumate textelor unor scrieri antice în parafrază și citări din conversațiile participanților unui banchet, ea dezvăluie, în diferite straturi, compoziția în sine a acestor conversații și scrieri, mai cu seamă, cele ce țin de subiecte retorice și vorbire. Autorul introduce aici o memorie multimedia care aranjează subiecte legate de cultura banchetelor în discursuri care variază de la factualitatea relațiilor istorice despre retoricieni la istorisirea fictivă a evenimentului în sine, care constă aproape în întregime din discursuri de laudă cu referire la cultura în cauză. Lucrarea dezvăluie aspecte atât orale, cât și scrise ce țin de retorica antică și discursuri care se contopesc între ele, de relatarea frapantă a unei întâlniri a lui Athenaeus, pe care acesta o face unui prieten, de prezentarea textelor lucrărilor parafrazate și citate ca discurs de banchet.

Cuvinte-cheie: retorica, banchet, elenism, vorbirea epideictică, literatura greacă, Imperiul Roman

1. Introduction: Rhetoric and the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus – Three Dimensions of Speech

The aim of this article is to analyze the information about rhetoric that Athenaeus provides us in this book that combines a literary form with an encyclopedic knowledge about Greek customs from the classical time to the fictive speakers' actions and sayings that reflect the time of Athenaeus. The field of rhetoric is present in various layers of the text. So Athenaeus has chosen a unique blend of a framing narrative with a dialogue between Athenaeus and his friend Timocrates who demands an account of this event, with the narrative of the event of the banquet and the narratives of the works of authors that are either paraphrased or cited. The framing narrative of a dialogue of two persons who meet and one of them asks for an account of a banquet has been used by Plato in his dialogue *Symposium*. The main account is the event of the dinner of the *deipnosophists*. References from books are cited by the participants, as Athenaeus tells in *Book X*. Among them are both citations from speeches of orators and citations from works providing information about the lives of rhetoricians and their culture.

At each of these three levels of the narrative, speech appears both as spoken uttered words and as rhetorical speech ('λόγος'; 'oratio'). Athenaeus lets us also have a look at the contemporary state of rhetoric in the Hellenic world during the late 2nd century, in the way his protagonists act and comment on rhetorical issues. The culture of banquets as social gatherings that existed in all parts of the ancient world known to the Hellenic scholars is realized actively during the dinner of the *deipnosophists* and all of the topics the *deipnosophists* discuss in their speeches are thematically bound to the banquet. The banquet was only a part of the history of the ancient Greek culture, but as a theme, the banquet was present in a number of literary genres of the past, that were exclusively dedicated to banquets. In Athenaeus' work, several of these writings, that otherwise would have been completely lost, are quoted. Despite its fictional character Athenaeus reveals in his work biographic details of his own origin from Naucratis in the Western delta of the Nile River during the conversation.

The *Deipnosophists* is more than a literary work of a fictional event. It contains valuable information about the rhetoric of antiquity until the *Second Sophistic* from written sources that are exclusively quoted in this work. This concerns the reference to rhetoricians called orators ('ῥήτωρ') and their speeches, but also other sources that describe the lives of rhetoricians in anecdotal ways giving us an insight of their interaction with professionals from other scholarly or artistic backgrounds. The way that Athenaeus narrates details about the performance and interaction between the participating *deipnosophists* entails descriptions of how orators act in comparison with the *deipnosophists* and the performance of a professional orator. Plutarch's *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* (Συμπόσιον τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν) is a fictive conversation of the 'seven wise men', Thales, Bias, Pittacus, Solon, Chilon,

Cleobulus, and Anacharsis. So while Athenaeus chooses fictional contemporaries to gather at the banquet, Plutarch uses the seven wise men. The interaction between the participating deipnosophists has both a discursive structure in the tradition of the genre of the didactic dialogue and narrative and descriptive sequences of the text parts of the single deipnosophists. The references are the argument for their introductory statement that is linked to the discursive frame of the verbal interaction between the participants. The deipnosophists quote or paraphrase their references after the short introductory statement. The topological structure of the whole work ranges subject-wise across all kinds of topics related to the banquet culture. In terms of arguments, it uses the encyclopedic knowledge from books as a support for the topics that the deipnosophists evoke in their speeches during the banquet. But this encyclopedic knowledge the deipnosophists provide is a real one. The author of the *Deipnosophists* must have had access to these works. What Athenaeus knew and documented in the *Deipnosophists* shows us that at the end of the 2nd century CE the works of scholars of the age of Pericles and poetic works since Homeric time were known, preserved, and employed as sources for compositions that use the adaption and implementation of these texts into a new literary form during the *Second Sophistic*.

At the time Philostratus wrote his *Lives of the Sophists* the word 'sophist' ('σοφιστής') was not a general term for an expert but used for the 'orators' ('ρήτορες'), the professors of rhetoric, in the Roman Imperium who were public figures. In the preface to *Book I* Philostratus wrote that the old sophistic practice must be considered philosophical rhetoric ("τὴν ἀρχαίαν σοφιστικὴν ῥητορικὴν ἡγεῖσθαι χρὴ φιλοσοφοῦσαν") due to its dialectical approach. Philostratus, slightly older than Athenaeus, coined the term of the *Second Sophistic* for the oratory practice of the 'orators' ('ρήτορες') in the Roman Empire from Emperor Nero onwards. The contextual meaning of the sophist in the time Athenaeus wrote his *Deipnosophists* was positive. While it can be even seen as an overarching conceptual term for professionals of rhetorical activities in his work, in the dialogues orators are called 'ρήτορες', when they appear as the sources of works quoted or as persons in scholarly works.

2. The *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus and Rhetoric of the *Second Sophistic*

While Athenaeus is not named by Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists*, the *Second Sophistic* is the cultural movement that in many aspects frames the contents, style, and context of the *Deipnosophists*. So T. Whitmarsh (Whitmarsh, 2013, p. 14) in the *Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic* asked 'What of a text like Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*?' The recourse to the classical works of Greek culture and its restructuring to a new kind of composite work that is a bridge between the fictive event of the banquet and the factuality of the ancient writings that are in most of the texts present, can be seen as a formal feature of writings of the *Second Sophistic*. In the way of a biographical account, the concept of the *Second Sophistic* was used by Philostratus. So it does

not apply to Athenaeus who is not recorded in his *Lives of the Sophists*. E. Bowie (Bowie, 2008, p. 69) in *The Geography of the Second Sophistic. Cultural Variations in Paideia* noticed that too little is known about Imperial Naucratis that had four sophists from late 2nd to early 3rd century who are recorded in the work of Philostratus, while this profession was in Alexandria absent and it is not known how these sophists “related to that rather different sort of scholarly figure, Athenaeus”.

W. A. Johnson and D. S. Richter [Johnson & Richter, 2017, p. 3] in *Periodicity and Scope* in *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic* argued that for the Greco-Roman world of the 2nd century CE common characteristic of the *Second Sophistic* of ‘nostalgia for an idealized classical past’, ‘archaism and purity of language’, ‘sophistic performance and contest and display’, ‘paideia and erudition’, and ‘anxieties over self-definition and identity’ should be “explored with nuance, sophistication, and sufficient granularity, and with close attention to tensions, ambiguity, and ambivalence”. Kemezis (Kemezis, 2017, p. 5) in *Essence et Presence de la Seconde Sophistique. Narrative of Cultural Geography in Philostratus’ Lives of the Sophists* published in *Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times. Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son Époque* analyzed the literary structure of Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists* with the notice that “the salient geographical feature of Philostratus’s story is its emphasis on Athens as the ideal site for sophistic activity”. As shown by K. Eshleman (Eshleman, 2008, p. 397), Philostratus limits the sophists in his work to the three groups of six academic generations from Nicetes through Herodes Atticus to Philostratus, Polemo and his associates, and Isaeus and his students.

Recent research has employed the concept of the *Second Sophistic* as a term for the second half of the first century to the second half of the 3rd century CE applicable to public figures beyond the range of Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists*. G. Anderson (Anderson, 1993, p. 16) stated that there is “no specific branch of ‘sophistic rhetoric’, though again in practice sophists concentrated on ‘epideiktic rhetoric’”. As for the Deipnosophists, we have here the fictive event of the banquet and the historical accounts of the cited works in a composite of discourses of the deipnosophists that combine documentation, dialectics, and oratory. T. Whitmarsh (Whitmarsh, 2017, p. 14) noticed that “although eternally aware of the potentially fictive properties of a discourse, Greeks only rarely acknowledged fiction as a genre: partial exceptions can be found in forms of rhetoric and New Comedy, but it was not until the emergence of the novel in the imperial period that one particular literary form became definitively fictive”. Recent research has contributed to the analysis of the stylistically complex form of the *Deipnosophists*. G. Anderson (Anderson, 1993, p. 347) makes a thematic conjecture between Longinus who in his *On the Sublime* discusses in chapter 43 food and refers so to the ‘world of the *Deipnosophists*’. O. M. Williamson (Williamson, 2013, p. 19) in *Culinary*

Rhetoric and Rhetorical Cookery. Plato was Right After All noticed that “the deeply rhetorical nature of cooking has been recognized since classic times, particularly in Athenaeus’ *Deipnosophists*, but the full potential richness of a deeper theoretical linkage between discursive scholarship and the culinary arts remains to be explored”.

The *Deipnosophist* is an artifice and the language used in the speeches is by no means ordinary speech. Ch. Jacob (Jacob, 2013) in *The Web of Athenaeus* described the various layers of the narration of the *Deipnosophists* and characterized in *Chapter XIII. Words and Things* the language employed by the *deipnosophists* as a language that “does not correspond to” the “common” Greek (the *koinē*) spoken in the imperial period, but as one that “has been reconstructed by the work of the grammarians, philologists, and lexicographers of Alexandria, but which also constitutes a relevant object of reflection for the rhetors and prose-writers of the Second Sophistic, in search of stylistic and linguistic norms”. Paulas (Paulas, 2012, p. 403) in *How To Read Athenaeus’ Deipnosophists* noticed the interactive dimension of the rhetoric that Athenaeus employs requiring ““readerly” engagement involving inter- and intratext” that “renders Athenaeus’ text both meaningful and pleasurable to read”. The “understanding this way of reading and its rhetoric enables modern readers to see the *Deipnosophists* as a literary work rather than merely a repository of knowledge”. S.D. Olson (Olson, 2018, p. 423) in *Athenaeus’ “Fragments” of Non-Fragmentary Prose Authors and their Implications* pointed out that “we can generally tell the difference between Athenaeus’ quotations (which appear to be more or less reliable) and his paraphrases (which are not)”. L. Romeri (Romeri, 2014, p. 17) acknowledged the interactivity of the text with its praising function stating that “in Athenaeus’ project there is a real work of reappropriation of the quoted texts and that this work corresponds to the author’s will to celebrate and to preserve a certain Greek knowledge, thus leading the quoted texts to interact”. The uniqueness of the communication style during the banquet in the *Deipnosophists* has been described by Ch. Jacob (Jacob, 2013) in *Chapter XI. How to Speak at Table?* as “the result is a coded dialogue, regulated by a series of rules and constraints, which draws multiple and sophisticated effects of meaning out of a virtuoso game of decontextualization and recontextualization, of effects of form and prosody created by the mixing of dialects, metrical structures, literary genres, levels of discourse, and forms of knowledge”. Speech is an integral element and overarching means for the composition of the different elements of the text and the representation of knowledge in the *Deipnosophists*. It is the carrier of the persuasive function of rhetoric. In the following sections, we will analyze how Athenaeus employed speech as rhetorical means to construct the text of the central event of the *Deipnosophists*, the banquet, and preserve the knowledge of rhetoric.

3. The *Deipnosophists* about Contemporary Rhetoric: Rhetoric and Rhetoricians/Orators (ῥήτορες) at the Banquet in the *Deipnosophists*

The *Deipnosophists* is a work that transforms the knowledge of ancient writings into vivid dialogues of the conversation in various speeches exchanged between a group of men that joint a dinner party in Rome. As a reminiscence of the past of Greek culture, the banquet theme is in various topics of the speeches unfolded. Unlike the abstract logical instructive dialogues of dialectic philosophy whose most prominent representative is the Platonic dialogue, Athenaeus' dialogues are full of detailed information about the lifestyle, habits, and relationships of persons and the speeches of the *deipnosophists* entail for the most part narratives. Athenaeus builds bridges between the massive use of original quotations in the extant books of *Deipnosophists* and the proclaimed vivid dialogues they represent in a quite simple way explained in *Book VI*. The speakers at the banquet arrived prepared for their speeches with available quotations from books to be used in their performances. The *Suda* describes in its entry for Athenaeus of Naucratis the author as a grammarian (γραμματικὸς) who lived in the time of Emperor Marcus Aurelius and "wrote a book with the title *Deipnosophists* (Δειπνοσοφισταί), in which he records how many of the ancients had a reputation for munificence in giving banquets" ("ἔγραψε βιβλίον ὄνομα Δειπνοσοφισταί: ἐν ᾧ μνημονεύει, ὅσοι τῶν παλαιῶν μεγαλοψύχως ἔδοξαν ἐστιάειν", Tr. Malcolm Heath). Athenaeus appears in the *Deipnosophists* as a person we can identify as factual providing us with information about the place he came from, the Greek emporium Naucratis on the Canopic branch of the Nile River. Athenaeus provides not only details about the local food of the city (11.61.) but also lets the participating *deipnosophists* cite works like the *History of the Foundation of Naucratis* of Apollonius' of Rhodos or Naucratis (7.19.).

In *Book I* (1.1.) Athenaeus is described as one of the persons that attends the banquet with the appearance of an orator. His work is 'an arrangement of the speech' (τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομία) in the form of an 'imitation of a sumptuous banquet' (μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου πολυτελείας):

"καὶ ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομία μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου πολυτελείας καὶ ἡ τῆς βίβλου διασκευὴ τῆς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ παρασκευῆς τοιοῦτον ὁ θαυμαστός οὗτος τοῦ λόγου οἰκονόμος Ἀθηναῖος ἡδιστον λογόδειπνον εἰσηγείται κρείττων τε αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γινόμενος, ὥσπερ οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ῥήτορες, ὑπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν θερμότητος πρὸς τὰ ἐπόμενα τῆς βίβλου βαθμηδὸν ὑπεράλλεται" (Ed. G. Kaibel).

"And the arrangement of the conversation is an imitation of a sumptuous banquet; and the plan of the book follows the arrangement of the conversation. This, then, is the delicious feast of words which this admirable master of the feast, Athenæus, has prepared for us; and gradually surpassing himself, like the orator at Athens, as he warms with his subject, he bounds on towards the end of the book in noble strides" (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

Athenaeus in *Book I* (1.2.) wrote that a group of rhetoricians (‘ρήτορων’) was present at the banquet, but records none of them by name:

“τῶν δὲ κυνικῶν εἷς ἦν ὃν Κύνουλκον καλεῖ· ὃ οὐ μόνον δύο κύνες ἀργοὶ εἶποντο, ὡς τῷ Τηλεμάχῳ ἐκκλησιάζοντι, ἀλλὰ τῶν Ἀκταίωνος πολὺ πλείονες. ῥητόρων τε ἦν ἄγυρις τῶν κυνικῶν κατ’ οὐδὲν ἀπολειπομένη” (Ed. G. Kaibel).

“Of the Cynics, there was one whom he calls *Cynulcus*, who had not only two white dogs following him, as they did Telemachus when he went to the assembly, but a more numerous pack than even Actæon had. And of rhetoricians there was a whole troop, in no respect inferior to the Cynics” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

In *Book II* (2.20.) is noticed that Athenaeus after having delivered this lecture on the topic water like rhetoricians (‘ὥσπερ οἱ ῥήτορες’) stopped his speech and then started again. The host of the banquet, Laurentius, is described as a speaker in the way of an orator (‘φησὶν ὁ παρὰ τῷ ῥήτορι Λαρήνσιος’) (2.35.). From the description of the participating grammarian and text-centered philologist Ulpian we learn in *Book III* that he was surrounded by sophists who are depicted as the inventors of uncommon meanings for words (3.54.):

“τοιούτοί τινές εἰσιν, ὧ ἑταῖροι, οἱ Οὐλπιάνειοι σοφισταί, οἱ καὶ τὸ μιλίαιον καλούμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων, τὸ εἰς [τοῦ] θερμοῦ ὕδατος κατεργασίαν κατασκευαζόμενον, ἱππολέβητα ὀνομάζοντες” (Ed. G. Kaibel).

“Such now, my friends, are Ulpian's companions, the sophists; men who call even the thing which the Romans call miliarium, that is to say, a vessel designed to prepare boiling water in, ἱππολέβης, an oven-kettle” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

The sophists are called here ‘producers of many names’ (‘πολλῶν ὀνομάτων ποιηταί’) and several examples of how they produce new words or use old words with new meanings based on homophony are given. In *Book VI* (6.3.) Athenaeus continues the frame narrative of the beginning of the *Deipnosophists* that depicts the situation of his meeting with Timocrates who urges him to recall the event of the banquet of the deipnosophists with a reference to the speech of the orator (‘ρήτωρ’) Cothocides saying that he intends to restore the relicts of this feast to Timocrates like Cothocides:

“καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ὦ Τιμόκρατες, ἀποδιδόμεν σοι τὰ τῶν δεῖπνοσοφιστῶν λείψανα καὶ οὐ δίδομεν, ὡς ὁ Κοθωκίδης φησὶ ῥήτωρ Δημοσθένην χλευάζων” (Ed. G. Kaibel).

“And we accordingly, O Timocrates, will restore to you the relics of the feast of the Deipnosophists, and will not give them, as Cothocides the orator said, meaning to ridicule Demosthenes” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

An account (‘ἀπόδοσις’) of the event is the self-declared aim of the author. Athenaeus in *Book VIII* (8.47.) mentions that one of the participating guests at the dinner, Democritus, esteems Aristotle, other philosophers, and rhetoricians (‘τῶν ἄλλων φιλοσόφων τε καὶ ῥητόρων’).

The practice that the host and guests who attended a banquet had selected topics they presented one after the other during the banquet, is known from the *Symposium* of Plato, the central topic of which is *eros*. In Athenaeus' work the event, the banquet, and the topic of the speeches are identical, even though its various aspects are discussed to a degree that lets the banquet appear as a symbol of a universal pleasant and cultured lifestyle. The idea to use the knowledge preserved in a library, books about all kinds of knowledge that contribute to the main topic as material of the narratives of the sophists participating at the dinner, not only shows us the creativity of the invention of the author, but also the presence and availability of this knowledge for scholars like Athenaeus in the second century CE. The banquet takes place in Rome, the center of the Roman Empire, while the culture of Hellenism and its past and other cultures serve as places the works in the discourses refer to. The readers experience the culture of banquets in the narratives of the speeches, while the actions of the event in Rome are only described to a degree that allows to build a framing structure. Between praise of the banquet itself, the imperial impact of Rome, and the esteem for the locations and local cultures in the world known to scholars at that time, the range of this work as an epideictic speech is open to interpretations. The deipnosophists present a vivid *memoria* of the past and connect it to the present time of the deipnosophists in their speeches. This blending illusion of continuity is the persuasive function of the text that is realized by the chosen medium, the speech.

4. Banquets as a Theme in Greek Culture and Hellenism to the Second Sophistic in the Speeches of the Deipnosophists

The banquet that Athenaeus here constructed imitates a banquet with representative participants that contribute to the conversation being well-prepared for their particular topic with their citations from classic books in order to demonstrate their expertise. One of the topics is the history of the banquet culture itself. In one case, in *Book IV*. (4.13.), an orator, Xenocles, is mentioned as the host of a banquet in the description of Plutarch about an Attic banquet the parodist Matron narrated. Its host, the rhetorician Xenocles (Ἐενοκλῆς ῥήτωρ), is in the following poetic invocation formula for the Muse mentioned:

<p>“δεῖπνα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλὰ, ἃ Ξενοκλῆς ῥήτωρ ἐν Ἀθήναις δείπνισεν ἡμᾶς” (Ed. G. Kaibel).</p>	<p>“The feast for much and varied food re- nown'd, Given by Xenocles, O Muse, resound” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).</p>
--	---

The banquet was a literary motive and topographic place for the presentation of discourses among participants in the Greek culture. Athenaeus' work mentions and quotes several works with the title *Banquet* besides poe-

tic, scholarly and historical works with other titles that entail passages of descriptions of banquets. In *Book I* the poet Arcestratus is mentioned as the author of the writing *The Art of Giving a Banquet* (Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ δειπνολόγου) that is quoted during the banquet. The compound 'δειπνολόγος' is a reference to rhetorical speech (λόγος) about the event of a banquet (δείπνον). In *Book V* the traditions of banquets are described in various cultures beginning with the poetry of Homer in Greece extending to other parts of the world like Germany, Egypt, Persia, and India with quotations from works of authors that entail the banquet as a topic.

For works exclusively dedicated to a particular banquet the title *Banquet* (Συμπόσιον) is used in the conversations. The classic writing with the title *Banquet* has survived under the title *Symposium* for the dialogue written by Plato about a symposium attended by Socrates and other scholars who discuss the common topic of love from various perspectives. The *Banquet* (Συμπόσιον) of Plato is mentioned as the title of several books in the *Deipnosophists* ((5.5.), (5.7.), (5.18.), (5.57.), (11.108.), (11.114.)). Additionally, an unknown treatise on *Laws of Banquets* written by Plato is cited, describing that under the dominion of Lacedaemon, no drinking parties existed even during the time of the Dionysiac festival of Bacchus (5.43.). The title for the work *Banquet* written by Xenophon entails the word 'συμπόσιον' (Ἐενοφῶντος Συμπόσιον) and is mentioned in several parts of the *Deipnosophists* ((5.13.), (15.34.), (11.111.), (14.3.)). Among the deipnosophists, it was known that the rivaling philosophers Plato and Xenophon had both written works with the title *Banquets* (Συμπόσια): "Συμπόσια μὲν γὰρ γεγράφασιν ἀμφότεροι" (11.112.). Even Aristotle is quoted as the author of a today unknown *Banquet* (Συμπόσιον) ("Ἀριστοτέλης δ' ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ φησὶν") (15.16.). In *Book VI* (6.2.) Athenaeus tells that laws for banquets were laid down by Xenocrates in the *Academy* and later Aristotle continued with these guidelines for banquets. Heraclides of Tarentum appears twice as an author of a treatise with the title *Banquet* (Συμπόσιον) with a quotation: ("ὁ δὲ Ταραντῖνος Ἡρακλείδης ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ φησί:", (2.76.) and "Ἡρακλείδης ὁ Ταραντῖνος, ἄνδρες φίλοι, ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Συμποσίῳ φησί", (3.91.). In *Book III* Yonge translates a title of a quoted book of Lynceus 'an account of the Banquet of Ptolemy', while the original text does not use a capital letter ("ἀναγράφων γοῦν τὸ Πτολεμαίου συμπόσιον φησιν οὕτως:") and so the original text indicates an event rather than a book (3.58.). A work with the title *Symposium* (Συμπόσιον) of a philosopher, Meleager the Cynic, is quoted ("καὶ Μελέαγρος δ' ὁ κυνικός ἐν τῷ Συμποσίῳ οὕτως γράφει:"). Here Athenaeus uses the uncommon verb 'γράφει' ('he/she writes') instead of the common verb 'φησί' ('he/she says') for the introduction of the author's work (11.107.).

In *Book XIII* it is noticed that the Stoic philosopher of the 3rd century BCE Persaeus the Cittiaean wrote an account with the title *Recollections of Banquets* ("καίτοι Περσαίου τοῦ Κιτιέως ἐν τοῖς Συμποτικαῖς Ὑπομνήμασιν", (13.86.)). Aristotle's student Aristoxenus is quoted from his book *Promiscuous Banquets*

("Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τοῖς Συμμίκτοις Συμποτικοῖς ὅμοιον, φησί," 14.31.)). The word 'Δείπνον' is used for the title of literary works in the *Deipnosophists*. Philoxenus' play with the title *Banquet* is mentioned several times ("καὶ Φιλόξενος δ' ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ φησὶν", (9.77), "Φιλόξενος δ' ὁ διθυραμβοποιὸς ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ", (15.33., "ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Κυθήριος Φιλόξενος ἐν τῷ Δείπνῳ", (14.50.)). Timachides is an author who is quoted three times from his several books comprising work *Banquet* ("Ἐσπερίδων δὲ μῆλα οὕτως καλεῖσθαι τινὰ φησι Τιμαχίδας ἐν δὲ Δείπνων", (3.23.) and "Τιμαχίδας δὲ ἐν τοῖς Δείπνοις τὸ ρόδον φησὶ", (15.29.), and "Τιμαχίδας δ' ἐν τετάρτῳ Δείπνου καὶ θήσειόν τι ἀναγράφει καλούμενον ἄνθος" (15.32.).

5. Rhetoric and Rhetoricians/Orators ('ρήτορες') in the Cited and Re-Narrated Books of the *Deipnosophists*

Reading the *Deipnosophists* as a multimedial composite of different texts from a time before the concept multimedia in its contemporary definitions was used means to acknowledge the media that existed at the time Athenaeus flourished: Written and spoken speeches that were in the rhetorical theory highly differentiated, artifices of different genres, and scholarly writings of different fields of expertise. Recorded in Greek book once written in the past and well-preserved in late antiquity of the Imperium Romanum, these texts enabled Athenaeus to produce his literary composite. Despite its fictionality, we can show that the conversations of the banquet as Athenaeus' unique invention refer to contemporary rhetoric. The factual scholarly work and literary artifacts that appear in the conversations refer to the past of the oratory culture as a means of documentation. The citations of the books often are introduced with the word 'φησὶ' marking the beginning of the paraphrase or original text quotation as a speech. So in the conversational speeches of the banquet, the texts of the written works quoted are as a speech introduced by their respective author. Both kinds of speeches, the spoken and written speech that are delivered during the banquet, are the implementations of the framing speech that Athenaeus delivers to his friend as the recollection of this event in the frame narrative.

5.1. Greek Rhetoric and Roman Oratory in the *Deipnosophists*

As a practice of rhetoric in the mythos, in *Book I* (1.28.) during the discussion about banquets in Homer's poetry it is noticed that the Trojans honored at the end of their banquets Mercury to whom the 'tongue' ('γλῶσσα') as instruments of 'interpretation' ('ἑρμηνεία') was dedicated. Athenaeus in *Book XIII* wrote about rhetoric in the time of Aristotle that Philo wrote a 'speech' ('λόγος') against Sophocles who was defended by the cousin of Demosthenes Demochares caused by Sophocles' release of a decree that banned philosophers from Attica:

"καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δὲ τις ψηφίσματι ἔξηλασε πάντας φιλοσόφους τῆς | "And a certain man named Sophocles, passed a decree to banish all the philoso-

Ἀττικῆς, καθ' οὗ λόγον ἔγραψε
Φίλων ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος,
ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους
Δημοχάρους πεποιηκότος τοῦ
Δημοσθένους ἀνεπιού” (Ed. G.
Kaibel).

phers from Attica. And Philo, the friend of
Aristotle, wrote an oration against him;
and Demochares, on the other hand, who
was the cousin of Demosthenes, composed
a defence for Sophocles” (C.D. Yonge
(trans.)).

It is told in *Book XIII* that in the Roman Empire sophists were either banned from Rome as persons who corrupt the youth or admitted, but nevertheless, the Romans are praised as ‘the best in every respect’ (‘Ῥωμαῖοι δ’ οἱ πάντα ἄριστοι’). The *Deipnosophists* adds here a quote from the poet Anaxippus who mentions that for him “philosophers are only wise in quibbling about words” (“τοὺς γε φιλοσόφους ἐν τοῖς λόγοις φρονοῦντας”), while being ‘foolish’ (μόνον) ‘in terms of the deeds’ (“ἐν τοῖσι δ’ ἔργοις”) drawing on the discussion about the relation between words and things:

“καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι δ’ οἱ πάντα
ἄριστοι ἐξέβαλον τοὺς σοφιστὰς
τῆς Ῥώμης ὡς διαφθείροντας
τοὺς νέους, ἐπεὶ οὐκ οἶδ’ ὅπως
κατεδέξαντο. ἐμφανίζει δ’ ὑμῶν
καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον Ἀνάξιππος ὁ
κωμωδιοποιὸς ἐν Κεραυνουμένῳ
λέγων οὕτως· οἶμοι, φιλοσοφεῖς.
ἀλλὰ τοὺς γε φιλοσόφους ἐν τοῖς
λόγοις φρονοῦντας εὐρίσκω
μόνον, ἐν τοῖσι δ’ ἔργοις ὄντας
ἀνοήτους ὁρῶ” (Ed. G. Kaibel).

“And the Romans, who are in every respect
the best of men, banished all the sophists
from Rome, on the ground of their corrupt-
ing the youth of the city, though, at a subse-
quent time, somehow or other, they admit-
ted them. And Anaxippus the comic poet
declares your folly in his *Man struck by
Lightning*, speaking thus—Alas, you’re a
philosopher; but I Do think philosophers are
only wise In quibbling about words; in
deeds they are, As far as I can see, complete-
ly foolish” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

The practice of banning philosophers and rhetoricians was common in many cities across Greece during the time of Socrates with reference to Chamaeleon’s book on Simonides (13.92.). This contrasting comparison of ancient Greek and Roman politics dealing with philosophy and sophistry and rhetoricians who supported or acted against them describes rhetoricians as public figures involved in political affairs.

5.2. Classic Rhetoricians/Orators (ῥήτορες) in the *Deipnosophists* of the Periclean Age

5.2.1. The Platonic Circle I: *Gorgias*

Gorgias is a well-known person in the *Deipnosophists* with the profession of an orator (ῥήτωρ). So in *Book V* is noticed that Antisthenes’ dialogue *Archelaus* was written against Gorgias the orator (ῥήτωρ) (5.63.). Its source is Antisthenes’ second treatise called *Cyrus*, in which the dialogue *Archelaus* is mentioned. The dialogue *Gorgias* of Plato appears in several places (“Πλάτων ἐν Γοργίᾳ συγκαταλέγων”, ((3.78.), (11.115.), (11.118.)). Athenaeus in *Book V* (5.58.) quotes from the dialogue *Gorgias* to show how carefully Plato composed his dialogues. An anecdote tells that Gorgias himself (“ὁ

Γοργίας αὐτὸς”) said to his friends that Plato knows to write iambs well after he read the dialogue about him (11.113.). Other anecdotal details about the life of Gorgias come from Clearchus who wrote in his *Lives* that Gorgias for more than eighty years used his full intellectual capacities and from Demetrius of Byzantium who recorded that Gorgias lived over hundred years because, as Gorgias stated, he never pleased anyone except himself. (12.71.). The expression ‘I spoke in Gorgias-like language’ (‘ἐγὼ Γοργιεῖοις ῥήμασιν εἶπω’) appears in a quotation of the *Banquet* of Xenophon (11.111.). Gorgias appears to be the name-giving person of a book with the title *Gorgias* written by Hermippus (11.113.). In *Book XIII* it is recorded that Gorgias wrote a treatise on Courtesans (“ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἑταιρῶν”, (13.70.)) and a treatise about the courtesans of Athens (“πάντων τούτων συγγεγραφότων περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι Ἑταιρίδων”, (13.21.)).

5.2.2. The Platonic Circle II: Aspasia in a Dialogue with Plato as Quoted by Herodicus the Cratetian in the *Deipnosophists*

In *Book V* of the *Deipnosophists*, Athenaeus cites and re-narrates a dialogue between Aspasia and Plato (5.61.). The source for it is Herodicus the Cratetian. Aspasia is not called an orator, but a ‘wise instructor of rhetorical speeches of Socrates’ (‘ἡ σοφὴ τοῦ Σωκράτους διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων’):

<p>“Ἀσπασία μέντοι ἡ σοφὴ τοῦ Σωκράτους διδάσκαλος τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων ἐν τοῖς φερομένοις ὡς αὐτῆς ἔπειν, ἅπερ Ἡρόδικος ὁ Κρατήτειος παρέθετο, φησὶν οὕτως” (Ed. G. Kaibel).</p>	<p>“Aspasia, indeed, who was the clever preceptress of Socrates in rhetoric, in these verses which are attributed to her, which Herodicus the Cratetian has quoted, speaks thus—” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).</p>
--	--

In the following dialogue, Aspasia advises Socrates to charm Alcibiades with his voice as a strategy for the beginning of love (‘φιλίας ἥδ’ ἀρχή’) in order to win the love of Alcibiades. The following part is a combination of a dialogue between Socrates and Aspasia and a narration of events. Aspasia is called ‘instructor in love affairs’ (‘ἐρωτοδιδάσκαλον’) for Socrates. The following narrative about the unsuccessful approaches of Socrates towards Alcibiades refers to the Platonic dialogue *Protagoras*. *Book V* (5.62.) mentions among the writings of the philosopher Aeschines a work with the title *Aspasia*. Details about the life of Aspasia are recorded in various sources. So Socrates is supposed to have spent time with Aspasia’s flute-playing woman as told by Xenophon in *Book II* of his *Memorabilia*. (5.63.). In *Book XIII* (13.71) it is mentioned that Socrates went to the house of Aspasia:

<p>“οἷω δ’ ἐχλίνεν ὃν ἔσοχον ἔχρη Ἀπόλλων ἀνθρώπων εἶναι Σωκράτη ἐν σοφίῃ Κύπρις μηνίουσα πυρὸς μένει. ἐκ δὲ βαθείης ψυχῆς</p>	<p>“And with what fiery power did Cypris, in her wrath, heat Socrates, whom Apollo had declared to be supreme among all men in wisdom! Yea,</p>
--	---

κουφοτέρως ἐξεπώνησ' ἀνίας, οἰκί' ἐς Ἀσπασίης πωλεῦμενος" (Ed. G. Kaibel).

though his soul was deep, yet he laboured with lighter pains when he visited the house of Aspasia" (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

In *Book V* (5.63.) it is recorded that the work *Aspasia* of Antisthenes attacks the sons of Pericles Xanthippus and Paralus. In *Book XII* about the life of Aspasia it is noticed that Pericles lived with her. Aspasia is called a courtesan from Megara ('Ἀσπασίας τῆς ἐκ Μεγάρων ἐταίρας', (12.45.)). In *Book XIII* it is told that Aspasia was the friend of Socrates ('Ἀσπασία δὲ ἡ Σωκρατική') and imported great numbers of beautiful women so that Greece was filled with her courtesans with a reference to the *Acharnenses* of Aristophanes. Aristophanes is here the source for the account that the Peloponnesian war was initiated by Pericles' love to Aspasia (13.25.). In *Book XIII* (13.56.) it is narrated that according to the account of Clearchus *Amatory Matters* Pericles caused a state crisis in Greece due to his relation with Aspasia. In *Book XIII* (13.37.) it is noticed that the name of a courtesan belonging to Cyrus the Younger was changed from Milto to Aspasia.

5.2.3. Rhetoricians / Orators (ῥήτορες') from the Alexandrian Canon of Ten Greek Orators

Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* does not refer to the Attic orators of the Alexandrian Canon of Ten Greek Orators in a referential or systematic way, but the names of seven of these orators appear in the conversations. The contemporary philosopher of Plato Isocrates, a student of Gorgias, is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ') ((3.94.), (13.21.)). Athenaeus in *Book XIII* (13.62.) writes that Isocrates is the 'most modest of all the rhetoricians' ('ὁ τῶν ῥητόρων αἰδημονέστατος') who had a mistress named Metanira with a reference to the *Letters* of Lysias, while Demosthenes in one of his speeches says that this mistress belongs to Lysias.

The most famous orator of the classic Greek past praised in writings of late antiquity is Demosthenes. In the *Deipnosophists* many of his speeches are cited. The attribute 'orator' (ῥήτωρ') is given to Demosthenes in several places ((2.22.), (3.57.), (6.62.), (8.31.), (13.31.), (13.54.), (13.63.), (14.3.), (14.53.)). Cothocides is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ') in a quote ridiculing Demosthenes (6.3.). Demosthenes' contemporary rival Hyperides appears also in several places of the *Deipnosophists* with the profession 'orator' (ῥήτωρ') ((3.90.), (6.92.), (8.27.), (12.77.), (13.58.), (14.6.)). Lysias has the attribute 'orator' (ῥήτωρ') throughout the conversations ((12.48.), (12.76.), (13.34.), (13.93.), (13.94.)). An anecdote is told about Lysias who was desperately in love with Lagis the courtesan, whose panegyric was written by Cephalus the orator (ῥήτωρ') (13.62). In his oration against Philonides Lysias says that Nais was the mistress of Philonides (13.62.). In *Book V* a speech of Lysias is quoted (5.45.) with the remark that philosophers often are more inclined to evil speaking than comic writers with examples from writings of Aeschines, the pupil of Socrates, and his negative disposition displayed when laughing at

Lysias the orator. (5.62.). Antiphon is called 'orator' ('ρήτωρ') ('Ἀντιφῶντι δὲ τῷ ῥήτορι λόγος') who wrote a speech *On Peacocks* (9.56.). Lycurgus is called 'orator' ('ρήτωρ') who wrote an *Oration against Demades*. (11.51.). For Aeschines the professional title 'orator' ('ρήτωρ') is used three times in the *Deipnosophists* (6.41.), (8.22.), (13.30.). According to Demosthenes' oration about the False Embassy, Epicrates who was nicknamed Cyrebion was the son-in-law of Aeschines (6.41.), Aeschines' speech against Timarchus is mentioned (13.30.). Since the orators Isocrates, Demosthenes, Hypereides, Lysias, Lycurgus, Antiphon, and Aeschines are mentioned in the *Deipnosophists*, while the names of Andocides, Dinarchus, and Isaeus lack, we can assume that Athenaeus did not take into account the Alexandrian *Canon of Ten Greek Orators* who were selected by Aristophanes of Byzantium and Plutarch in his *Lives of the Ten Orators*.

5.2.4. Rhetoricians / Orators ('ρήτορες') of the 4th and 3rd Century BCE

Demades is called 'orator' ('ρήτωρ') ((3.55.), (13.61.)) who said that Aegina was the "eyesore of the Peiræus," and that Samos was "a fragment broken off from the city" (3.55.). Axionicus' work *Lover of Euripides* is the reference for calling Callias the orator ('ρήτωρ') a gambler (8.27.). For the fatness of the orator ('ρήτωρ') Python of Byzantium his fellow-citizen Leon is used as the reference (12.74.). Callimedon is called 'orator' ('ρήτωρ') ((3.57., (3.64.)). The play *Ponticus* of Alexis mentions the orator ('ρήτωρ') Callimedon (3.57.). Athenaeus in *Book VIII* (8.28.) employs the word 'rhetoricians' ('ρήτόρων') in a quote from the source *Physician* of Theophilus in a wordplay of the homophonic pun between 'κάραβος' ('crawfish') and Callimedon's nickname Carabus:

“Θεόφιλος δ’ ἐν Ἰατρῷ ἅμα σκώπτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγοις ψυχρόν· πᾶς δὲ φιλοτιμῶς πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν νεανίσκων [...] ἐγγέλειον παρατέθεικε. τῷ πατρὶ τευθὶς ἦν χρηστή. πατριδίων, πῶς ἔχεις πρὸς κάραβον; ψυχρὸς ἐστίν, ἄπαγε, φησί· ῥητόρων οὐ γεύομαι” (Ed. G. Kaibel).

“And Theophilus, in his *Physician*, ridiculing his coldness of expression, says—“And the slave put before the young man himself with great eagerness a little eel: his father had a fine cuttle-fish before him. ‘Father,’ says he, ‘what do you think of your crawfish?’ ‘It is cold,’ says he; ‘take it away, — I don’t want to eat any orators” (C.D. Yonge (trans.)).

The ‘brazen poet and orator’ ('ρήτωρ') Dionysius Chalcus wrote a speech advising the Athenians to adopt a brazen coinage that Callimachus notices in his list of *Oratorical Performances* (15.9.). Caucalus is an ‘orator’ ('ρήτωρ') who has written a panegyric on Hercules (10.2.). Philinus as an ‘orator’ ('ρήτωρ') wrote a debate on the Croconidae (10.25.) It is noticed about Aristophon the orator ('ρήτωρ') that he proposed in the archonship of Euclides a law that everyone who was not born of a woman who was a citizen should be classified as a bastard (13.38.). Nicarete the courtesan was the mistress of

Stephanus the orator (ῥήτωρ) (13.65.). Stratocles is called an 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) who kept as his mistress a courtesan whose name was Leme in Gorgias' treatise on Courtesans (13.70.) The nephew of Demosthenes Demochares has the professional title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (11.119.). In a reference to Leon of Byzantium who was a student of Aristotle a Python of Byzantium is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (12.74.). Baton of Sinope who wrote a treatise on Thessaly and Haemonica (14.45.) is called twice 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) ((14.34.) and (14.45.)). For Cephalus the title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is used (13.62.) when mentioning that he wrote a panegyric for the courtesan of Lysias Lagis. The only rhetorician of the Augustan Age who is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is Caecilius ((6.104.), (11.15.)). As for rhetoricians of the 2nd century CE, Herodes Atticus carries the professional title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (3.55.). Occasionally orators as a group of professionals are cited in works of Greek poetry. So in *Book X* (10.73.) from Antiphanes' play *Sappho* a speech is cited asking how an orator can be declared mute ("ῥήτωρ ἄφωνος"). From the *Knights* of Aristophanes a passage is quoted in *Book III* (3.47.) that mentions orators (ῥήτορες). In *Book XIII* (13.60.) it is told that Herodicus in *Book VI* of his *Essay on People mentioned by the Comic Poets* wrote that a courtesan according to the orators (ῥήτορες) was called Sestos. In the *Deipnosophists* the title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is used for representatives of this profession from its earliest beginnings like Gorgias to orators of the 2nd century CE in the age of Imperial Rome like Herodes Atticus.

References

- Anderson, Gr. (1993). *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. Routledge.
- Anderson, Gr. (2008). Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic. In W. Dominik & J. Hall (Eds), *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric* (pp. 339-353). John Wiley & Sons.
- Bowie, E. (2008). The Geography of the Second Sophistic. Cultural Variations. In Barbara E. Borg (Ed), *Paideia. The World of the Second Sophistic* (pp. 65-85). Walter de Gruyter.
- Eshleman, K. (2008). Defining the Circle of Sophists. Philostratus and the Construction of the Second Sophistic. *Classical Philology*, 103(4), 395-413.
- Jacob, Ch. (2013). *The Web of Athenaeus*. (Arietta Papaconstantinou. Trans.). Ed. Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. Center for Hellenic Studies with Harvard University Press. CNN. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn3:hul.ebook:CHS_JacobC.The_Web_of_Athenaeus.2013.
- Johnson, W. A., Richter, D. S. (2017). Periodicity and Scope. In D. S. Richter, W. A. Johnson (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic* (pp. 3-11). Oxford University Press.
- Kemesis, A. (2017). Essence et Presence de la Seconde Sophistique. Narrative of Cultural Geography in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*. In P. Fleury (Ed),

Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times. Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son Époque (pp. 3-22). University of Toronto Press.

Olson, S. D. (2018). Athenaeus' "Fragments" of Non-Fragmentary Prose Authors and their Implications". *American Journal of Philology*, 139(3), 423-450.

Paulas, J. (2012). How To Read Athenaeus' Deipnosophists. *American Journal of Philology*, 133 (3), 403-439.

Romeri, L. (2014). Citation et Recontextualisation. Le Cas des Philosophes et des Historiens chez Athénée de Naucratis". *Kentron*, 30, 17-32.

Whitmarsh, T. (2013). *Beyond the Second Sophistic. Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley University of California Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2017). Greece. Hellenistic and Early Imperial Continuities. In D. S. Richter, W. A. Johnson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. (pp. 11-24). Oxford University Press.

Williamson, O. M. (2013). Culinary Rhetoric and Rhetorical Cookery. Plato Was Right After All. *Acta Iassyensia Comparationis*, 11(1), 19-22. http://www.literaturacomparata.ro/Site_Acta/Old/acta11/AIC_11_Williamson.pdf

Texts

Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists*. (1927). (Ch. B. Gulick, Trans.). Harvard University Press. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0405%3Abook%3D13%3Achapter%3D92>.

Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists. Or Banquet of The Learned of Athenaeus*. (1854). (C.D. Yonge, Trans.). Perseus Project of Tufts University. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2013.01.0003:book=5:chapter=pos=398&highlight=rhetoric>.

Digital Athenaeus. *Athenaei Naucraticae Dipnosophistarum Libri 15*. G. Kaibel (Ed.). Project directed by Monica Berti at the Alexander von Humboldt Chair of Digital Humanities at the University of Leipzig. <http://www.digital-atheneus.org/tools/KaibelText/index.php#urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0008.tlg001.perseus-grc2:5>.

Philostratus the Athenian. *Vitae Sophistarum*. (1871). Flavii Philostrati Opera. Vol. 2. C. L. Kayser (Ed.). Teubner. Perseus Project of Tufts University. <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a2008.01.0596>.

Whitehead, D. (Ed.), *Athēnaios. Αθήναιος*. (Malcolm Heath, Trans.). In *Suda Online*. The Stoa Consortium. <https://www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-cgi-bin/search.cgi>.