

## Introduction

In a letter to Tuccius Cerialis (2.XIX.1–4), Pliny the Younger reluctantly accepted his addressee's request:

You urge me to give a reading of my speech to a group of friends. I will since you ask it, but with many misgivings. I know very well that speeches when read lose all their warmth and spirit (*impetum omnem caloremque*), almost their entire character (*nomen suum*), since their fire is always fed from the atmosphere of the court: the bench of magistrates and throng of advocates, the suspense of the awaited verdict, the reputation of the different speakers, and the divided enthusiasm of the public; and they gain too from the gestures of the speaker as he strides to and fro, the movements of his body corresponding to his changing passions (*ad hoc dicentis gestus incessus, discursus etiam omnibusque motibus animi consentaneus vigor corporis*). (Hence the loss to anyone who delivers his speech sitting down – he is at a real disadvantage by the mere fact of being seated, though he may be as gifted generally as the speakers who stand.) Moreover, a man who is giving a reading has the two chief aids to his delivery (eyes and hands) taken up with his text, so it is not surprising if the attention of his audience wavers when there is no adventitious attraction to hold it nor stimulus to keep it aroused (*Quo minus mirum est, si auditorum intentio relanguescit, nullis extrinsecus aut blandimentis capta aut aculeis excitata*).<sup>1</sup>

One cannot but agree with Pliny's argument. Speeches lose a great deal of their vigor and attractiveness when read outside the context in which they were composed and delivered. The titillating excitement surrounding a live performance, that stimulating quality and manner to which Virginia Woolf refers in the excerpt on the previous page, simply

## 2 Introduction

vanishes. Gestures, intonations of voice and bodily movements, if they exist when the speech is read or narrated, are a shadow of those originally performed by the orator. Similarly, the account of how a speech was delivered shares with the reading of a speech the lack of that heightened anticipation, intensity and expectation of an actual performance. Yet not all is lost. True, the “attraction” and the “stimulus” mentioned by Pliny are not present in a reading or in a report of a speech, but part of what is missing from a live performance can be retrieved by what can be read between the lines of an account of an oratorical display.

This is precisely the aim of this book: to explore what narrations of rhetorical performances from late antique sources can offer us in order to improve our understanding of the issues relating to cultural and religious debates of that time period. By narrating either their own or their antagonists’ performances, late antique authors wrote accounts of rhetorical performances to promote their own interests or to undermine their opponents’ agendas. In these narrations, failure or success in the political, religious and cultural arena are frequently represented as the result of either a proficient or an incompetent rhetorical delivery that foregrounds both the linguistic and extralinguistic techniques designed to persuade and mesmerize late antique audiences.

In the texts that will be explored in this book, the triangulation of live oratorical contests (two competing speakers and the audience), and the coupling of speaker and audience in an individual rhetorical performance, are reduced to the narration of a single author that describes the highlights and downfalls of performers.<sup>2</sup> This type of narration constitutes a topos that can be found in texts throughout Antiquity and in a wide variety of literary genres. In this sense, what I contend in this work is that the exploration of these narrations has the potential to become a hermeneutics of late antique times. References to bodily gestures, expressions and voices accompanying the oratorical register of a performance call for close scrutiny as their mention usually beckons us on to pressing issues related to the author’s world. As will be shown in the analysis of texts by Themistius, Gregory of Nazianzus and Synesius of Cyrene in chapter 2, the appropriation of cultural values, accusations of heresy and the validity of philosophical programs were frequently presented in the guise of oratorical criticism. This type of narrative is felt with an even stronger intensity in the corpus of the sophist Libanius of Antioch, whose works are a true atlas of the oratorical and rhetorical world of the fourth century AD. His reports of oratorical *agones* and

rhetorical performances reflect his efforts and struggles to become and to remain an influential figure in the cultural and political landscape of the Eastern part of the Empire in the second half of the century.

Consequently, narrations of rhetorical performances in late antique texts should not be dismissed as stereotyped and banal. Rather they should be approached as a heuristic category articulated so insistently within Greek and Roman sources because the practice of rhetorical performances “answered the tendency among Greek citizens to generate all forms of cultural capital through symbolic contests among citizens struggling to be seen and known as men”.<sup>3</sup> Repetitive as these narrations may seem to us because of the recurrence of certain topics, the detailed exploration of accounts of rhetorical performances from the late antique period will help dispel the potential sense of *déjà vu* that they could engender in the mind of the reader. A common concern, for instance, in this type of narrative is the assimilation of the ethos of cultural elites to the morally inferior figure of the actor. However, this theme did not have the same implications in Cicero’s circle as it did in the agenda of a late antique philosopher like Themistius.

Therefore a whole array of nuances and shades of difference will emerge the moment we approach these texts with the attention they deserve. Either in the shape of portrayals of actual performances or narrated as rivalries between *pepaideumenoí*, these scenes reflect the growing importance of being in the spotlight in a society in which competition was a prevailing ideal that demanded constant effort from late antique elites in order to construct their public personae.<sup>4</sup> This notion of competition had been an unmistakable characteristic of ancient Greek society, which was persistently manifested in a performance culture that also loomed large in late antique society,<sup>5</sup> where the ideal of a successful career in the cultural and political milieu was partly imagined as the result of increasing one’s presence in the public scene.<sup>6</sup> Therefore, the taste for oratorical contests resulting from the ever-present agonistic element that pervaded Greco-Roman culture paired very well with the debates and disputes in which late antique *pepaideumenoí* were involved.

However, the copious presence of accounts of rhetorical performances in late antique literature has been largely overlooked in modern scholarship. In recent decades, the importance of the performative dimension of Greek rhetoric from previous periods has been explored with particular emphasis on its role in both rhetorical and non-rhetorical

4 *Introduction*

domains. Strategies of self-presentation, the creation of cultural communities, sexual identities and the political allegiances of elites have been the principal themes addressed by modern scholars when analyzing accounts of rhetorical performances. Thus, Gunderson's fear that "oratory as practice and performance tends to be neglected, or treated only as an afterthought, both in the canonical texts of antiquity and in much modern scholarship on ancient rhetoric"<sup>7</sup> has been tempered by the appearance of studies on the importance of rhetorical delivery in Imperial literature, particularly in the context of the Second Sophistic. The underlying assumptions of these works converge on the same point: rhetorical performances were not only displays of oratorical *savoir faire* but also functioned as a tool for demonstrations of authority, as well as a platform for the discussion of social, cultural and political values.<sup>8</sup>

Unfortunately, this fruitful line of research begins to fade as we come closer to late antique times and to works produced in the context of the Third Sophistic. Even though the differences and correspondences between late antique texts and their literary predecessors have been identified, the analysis of narrations of rhetorical performances, reflecting the conditions of the third to the sixth centuries, remains largely uncharted for several reasons.<sup>9</sup> To begin with, the premise that the dynamics and implications of rhetorical performances were the same in Late Antiquity as in previous centuries has prevailed for a long time. This assumption should be questioned, since the cultural, political and religious conditions of those periods differed greatly. This should make an impact in turn on the scholarly consensus which regards rhetorical performances as a mechanism for the construction of the social image of the self. In relation to this, the challenges posed by the Christianization of the Empire, an event that entailed the integration of various cultural and religious constituents into a different discourse, has added new difficulties (and opportunities) to the task of analyzing the accounts of late antique rhetorical performances. Finally, exploring in detail the overwhelming number of sources which survive from Late Antiquity is an obstacle that is difficult to overcome. In addition, a great number of these accounts are not translated or properly edited to high philological standards.<sup>10</sup> It is unsurprising, then, that a reassessment of late antique literature and rhetoric has been called for in order to respond to the questions which arise from the dynamics of rhetorical performances in an unstable time period.<sup>11</sup>

It should be noted from the start that in this work I do not intend to reconstruct how pieces of late antique oratory were actually delivered.<sup>12</sup> With similar words and an analogous spirit to Pliny's letter at the beginning of this introduction, O. Taplin's appraisal of our understanding of Greek tragedy can be extended to the study of oratorical displays in Late Antiquity: "we miss the tone of voice, nuance, pace, stress; and we miss facial expression, gesture and the physical posture and the positioning of the speaker and addressee".<sup>13</sup> But when it comes to narrations of rhetorical performances in late antique literature we are offered a privileged insight into the authors' tenets and agendas thanks to the description of rhetorical styles, the use of non-verbal elements, and the circumstances in which a speech was delivered. Such narrations can be approached as semiotically fruitful texts that, more often than not, accommodate subtexts addressed to pressing issues of the period.<sup>14</sup>

Accordingly, it is my intention to go beyond the anecdotal aroma in which the accounts of rhetorical performances are steeped in order to ascertain what they actually meant to convey in the context of late antique cultural, political and religious disputes.<sup>15</sup> In chapter 2, for instance, I will make the case that Themistius' attacks against showy orators had more to do with his interest in the advancement of his political career than with a collegial inclination for rhetorical advice. Similarly, Gregory of Nazianzus' condemnation of bishops with a penchant for bombastic performances was an important part of his religious agenda. The strongly biased elements of these texts demand a literary and historical analysis capable of enabling us to look into the religious and social transformations that late antique society underwent without being misled by the narrators' self-interest. In this sense, modern scholarship has recently turned its attention to dialogues and biographies, two literary genres not entirely unrelated to the dynamics and significance of rhetorical performances, in that the content of the texts should not be taken at face value but understood as narrative constructions in the service of personal agendas.<sup>16</sup> Therefore, shedding light on accounts of rhetorical performances will be particularly useful in determining how an author wanted to generate his own image as well as those of others in his attempts to construct reality on his own terms.

In the following pages, rhetoric and oratory are understood as the symbiotic branches of the art of persuasion.<sup>17</sup> There are, of course, differences between these terms but the use of "rhetorical performances" and "oratorical performances" throughout this work will refer to the

## 6 Introduction

act of delivering a speech in front of an audience. Therefore, they will serve as a designator to cover a wide range of speech acts and oratorical displays in which delivery tactics and techniques deriving from *hypókrisis* or *actio/pronuntiatio* (respectively the Greek and Roman terms for “rhetorical delivery, performance”) were articulated.<sup>18</sup> From declamations and extempore orations to epideictic speeches, school exercises, Imperial addresses, homilies, or rhetorical *agones*, late antique narrations of this type of “highly somatic form of communication”<sup>19</sup> contained references to elements present in theoretical treatments of *hypókrisis* or *actio/pronuntiatio* and, in a broader sense, in the notion of performance. In fact, as Serafim has rightly underlined, “performance is a protean notion, elusive in meaning and with a wide range of applications”.<sup>20</sup>

My understanding of rhetorical performances in Late Antiquity will also engage with James Fredal’s definition of rhetorical performances as a cultural practice comprising a cluster of values within a cultural or a religious paradigm in which an individual and a community interacted.<sup>21</sup> Rhetorical performances, therefore, will be considered not only as a calculated means of persuasion whose elements were codified in rhetorical treatises. More importantly, narrations of these performances can be regarded as instruments of self-presentation encompassing verbal and non-verbal strategies deployed to advance the agendas of elites.<sup>22</sup> In this sense, they were used as markers of identity that invited conscious manipulation of one’s own image as well as that of others by capitalizing on highly biased accounts of how messages were oratorically conveyed at public speaking occasions and oratorical displays. As the sociologist Erving Goffman put it in his influential study on social interaction and communication strategies,

we should not analyse performances in terms of mechanical standards, by which a large gain can offset a small loss, or a large weight a smaller one. Artistic imagery would be more accurate, for it prepares us for the fact that a single note off key can disrupt the tone of an entire performance.<sup>23</sup>

It is precisely the presence of that “single note off key” which endows late antique narrations of rhetorical performances with the ability to vividly illustrate disputes and disagreements concerning political, social and religious issues in the form of rhetorical and oratorical

criticism. This is why, throughout this book, particular attention will be paid to narrations of unsuccessful rhetorical performances, understanding “unsuccessful” as the inappropriate or deficient use of some of the elements of an oratorical performance. The wrong use of stylistic effects, the misuse of bodily gestures, the inappropriate tone of voice to declaim a specific part of a speech, the disorderly internal organization of the arguments, or the failure to memorize the speech were all indicative of a speaker’s failure to master oratory. The relevance of these flaws transcended the performative dimension of speeches and pointed to a failure in the transmission of the speaker’s message that led to a rupture with his audience. As Whitmarsh put it,

the role of the audience, however, was not simply to analyze language and intellectual content, but also to scrutinize the sophist’s physical person. The body was the principal site of the issues, and the anxieties, that clustered around sophistic performance.<sup>24</sup>

This interest in highlighting the authors’ accounts of his peers’ and opponents’ oratorical fiascos is also explained by the very nature of the sources. Ancient authors devoted very little time to describing and commenting on their own performances, while praise and critique of the performances of one’s peers in different types of oratorical practices were far more common. In this sense, a recent publication on performance studies has stated that “it is extremely rare to find a speaker commenting explicitly on aspects of his own performative style”.<sup>25</sup> It should also be borne in mind that putting into good practice the dicta of rhetorical theorists in the hope of delivering a speech successfully was a far from easy task.<sup>26</sup> These factors help explain why it was very frequently the case that sophists, philosophers or bishops based their literary strategies on drawing the attention of their audiences to “a feature of the opponent’s appearance . . . claiming that it demonstrates the opponent’s reprehensible character and his guilt”.<sup>27</sup>

Whereas allusions to conformity to elements codified in rhetorical textbooks are scarce, the list of *vitia orationis* (or, as Bers put it, *evitanda*)<sup>28</sup> deviating from canonized practices of rhetoric is long and relates to the issues of the period. In late antique texts we are presented with the tiring histrionics of the dilettantes that populated the cultural arena as well as magic spells cast to ruin a rival’s performance in public *agones*. In the accounts of these performances, sophists are shown

## 8 Introduction

competing with each other to gain the applause of the audience, curry favor with influential figures or trying to overcome stage fright while declaiming. Philosophers, in turn, are portrayed quarrelling among themselves in order to advance their views on the role of philosophy in society. Similar examples can be found in Christian texts. A number of priests and bishops are presented as desperately craving their flocks' applause regardless of the accuracy of their interpretation of the Scriptures, preaching in a sophisticated and theatrical manner. By following the sources' presentation of these performances as fiascos and jarring displays of failed eloquence, I hope to show the value of reports of oratorically flawed performances and of *vitia orationis* as rhetorical deviations that were meant to signal an anomaly not only within the rhetorical canon but also in terms of cultural habits.<sup>29</sup> The emphasis on the study of a "rhetoric of anti-rhetoric", to put it in Hesk's terms,<sup>30</sup> is therefore based on the idea that pointing to others' oratorical and rhetorical flaws and mistakes served as a vehicle for self-promotion by drawing the audience's attention to the interruption in the transmission of a message or a set of values on the performer's side.

Most of the texts surveyed in this book have been drawn from the works of fourth and fifth-century AD authors. Although this is not the place to deal with the extremely relevant yet unresolved question of religious labels in Late Antiquity, I would like to give a brief justification of my usage of the terms "pagan" and "Christian". Both words have been used as umbrella terms in order to cover a wide and heterogeneous variety of religious groups. In the case of "pagan", it is a label created and mostly used by Christians entailing contradictions and inaccuracies that would normally preclude its use. However, as current scholarship reveals, the alternative terminology to "pagan" (e.g., "Hellenes", "polytheist") only makes things more complicated. I concur with C.P. Jones when he estimates that "'Paganism' is potentially misleading, but less so than the alternatives that have been proposed". In the same vein but with a more optimistic view on the possibilities of the word "pagan", Watts advocates its use, thus following Alan Cameron's unapologetic endorsement of the term: "in most cases 'pagan' is the simplest, most familiar, and most appropriate term, and I make no further apology for using it".<sup>31</sup> No less problematic is the term "Christian", which falls short of acknowledging the different and even contradictory creeds designated by it.<sup>32</sup> If approaching religious identities as stable and fixed constructs has now given way to new historiographical



models,<sup>33</sup> establishing clear-cut literary and cultural models based on religious affinities must likewise be deemed an unreliable criterion.<sup>34</sup> An appreciation of the value of the content and form of Classical *paid-eia* was shared by both pagans and Christians alike.<sup>35</sup> In the context of this cultural continuum, the interaction among the authors whose works are explored in this book was fluid as they belonged to the same cultural background and, in some cases, came to maintain personal and professional relationships. In this book, therefore, I will follow Urbano's motivation in using the terms "pagan" and "Christian" as "an intracultural differentiation, rather than intercultural differentiation".<sup>36</sup>

Competition for the maintenance of social influence and prestige, as well as for the advancement of different cultural and religious programs, was the main issue with which the narrations of rhetorical performances were engaged in late antique literature. But in order to fully understand the implications of these accounts, it is first necessary to become acquainted with the theory and practice of rhetorical delivery in the Greco-Roman world. Consequently, in the first chapter of the book ("Theory and Practice of Rhetorical Performance from Classical Antiquity to Imperial Times"), I will look into how *hypókrisis* and *actio/pronuntiatio* were systematized in ancient rhetorical theory.<sup>37</sup> Although these concepts were mentioned and dealt with in the most influential works and treatises on rhetoric both in Greek and in Latin, Quintilian's book XI of his *Institutio Oratoria* remains the most comprehensive source on the particulars of rhetorical performance that has come down to us. The majority of the theoretical precepts on *hypókrisis* and *actio* share a notable concern for the clear delimitation of the boundaries of rhetorical performances in order to avoid overlaps with other forms of performativity – especially with acting. In the second part of this chapter I will offer an overview of some of the most relevant narrations of rhetorical performances in Greco-Roman literature in order to ascertain what topics these accounts addressed. Previous literary models worked as subtexts upon which narrations of rhetorical performances in Late Antiquity capitalized, so this outline will be relevant for the purposes of this book given the palimpsestic nature of late antique literature.

The next chapter ("Charlatans, Philosophers and Philostratean Bishops in Late Antique Literature") will aim to describe the rhetorical scene of the fourth century AD and to provide a first approach to the main issues that revolved around the narrations of rhetorical performances from that period. Inclusion and exclusion from cultural and

religious communities, as well as the construction of public personae, were concerns expressed through accounts of oratorical displays. Particular attention will be paid to the late antique philosophical texts that dealt with these themes by exploring the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy. As thorny as in Plato's times, the tension between these two disciplines was at the core of the writings of two fundamental figures of the period, the philosophers Themistius and Synesius, the latter of whom was also bishop of Cyrene. An analysis of some of their texts will help us understand the extent to which reports of bombastic rhetorical performances played a major role in their exploration of the relation between rhetoric and philosophy. It will also shed light on their efforts to avoid undesired associations between the figure of the philosopher and of other characters in the public scene such as actors. Turning to the Christian milieu, while it is true that our knowledge of the adaptation of secular rhetoric to the early and late antique Christian discourse has clearly improved in recent decades, studies on the relevance of rhetorical performances in a Christian context are still missing.<sup>38</sup> Textbooks composed for the formation of priests, together with references to the inappropriate use of oratorical techniques scattered in homilies, letters and orations, very frequently contained instructions for Christian elites on how to accommodate the pagan rhetorical legacy in their teaching and preaching. Given the ubiquitous presence of oratorical performances in ecclesiastical and religious practices, these works endeavored to sketch out the figure of the ideal Christian orator by offering advice on how to bridge the divergences between what Christian texts dictated regarding oratorical strategies and what late antique audiences expected to hear and see from their spiritual leaders. This topic greatly concerned Gregory of Nazianzus, who frequently equated bad oratory with religious dissension. The risks of unwanted associations also arose in the Christian milieu, in which garrulous figures whose oratory was designed to please audiences instead of providing spiritual comfort were soon assimilated to heretics and pagan sophists.

The third chapter ("All the World's a Stage: Libanius' Life as a Rhetorical Performance") is entirely dedicated to Libanius of Antioch. The fact that his works contain an abundance of narrations of rhetorical performances, and the centrality of his figure in the late antique cultural arena, justify his selection as the main case study in this book. His oeuvre can be considered a compendium of the cultural, political and religious atmosphere of his times. In fact, his letters, speeches,

declamations and school exercises soon became rhetorical models that persisted throughout Byzantine times. Few topics, no matter how trifling they may seem to us, are absent from his letters and orations. It comes as no surprise that his reports of rhetorical performances contain a wide range of subject matter. The first pages of this chapter will be devoted to contextualizing the importance and reception of Libanius' activities as a teacher of rhetoric and as a sophist. From tips to improve his students' performative skills to his reactions at their defections from his school to his stratagems to defeat peers, these texts will offer us a view of the role of *hypókrisis* in the late antique cultural milieu. His *Autobiography* (*Or.* 1) will take center stage in the main section of this chapter. It would be impossible to deal in detail with the breadth of all the themes addressed in this oration as it is a multi-layered text composed at different stages of his life. Accordingly, this chapter will focus on the accounts of rhetorical performances which served Libanius as the templates against which his agenda was developed. Meant to showcase a ubiquitous cultural figure, these accounts are deeply biased and, occasionally, may seem as spiritless as Pliny's reading of his speech. Nevertheless, delving into the "imaginability of his performances"<sup>39</sup> will prove, I believe, a rewarding scholarly effort in order to understand the use of a widely used topos in late antique literature.

## Notes

- 1 Translation taken from Radice (1969).
- 2 On the concept of triangulation in rhetorical contexts, see Papaioannou; Serafim and da Vela (2017: 1).
- 3 Fredal (2006: 26). Roisman's definition of oratorical *agones* (2005: 67) should also be borne in mind in this context: "Contests (singular, *agōn*) of various sorts were a legitimate and valued means of proving men's worth, increasing their honor and prestige, and, no less important, putting their defeated rivals to shame".
- 4 Van Hoof (2013) is a vital reference to understand the relevance of the ideal of competition among late antique elites. For a philosophical approach to the concept of "rivalry" in the Greco-Roman world, see Gill (2003). On the performance and display of *paideia* in Imperial times, see Lauwers (2011).
- 5 Barker (2009: 2–19); Goldhill (1999: 2–3). Taplin (1999: 33) describes Athenian society of the Classical period as "extraordinarily performanceful". See also Hawhee's (2004: 16) stance on the study of the agonistic nature of the ancient Greek culture: "an aim of this exploration, though, is less to consider agonism's teleological, victory-driven side, and more to

12 *Introduction*

the foreground the agonistic encounter itself. For rhetoric, this encounter-gathering side of agōn constitutes the more pervasive agonal dynamic”.

- 6 Cameron (2014: 23); Cribiore (2007: 229–231); Leyerle (2001: 49–50).
- 7 Gunderson (2000: 2).
- 8 The literature on this topic is extensive: Anderson (1986: 43); Borg (2004: 157); Bremmer (1992: 27); Corbeill (2004: 111–117); Díez (2003); Edwards (2013); Eshleman (2012); Gleason (1995: 166–167, 1998); Gunderson (2000: 87); Katsourēs (1989<sup>3</sup>); Korenjak (2000); Papaioannou, Serafim and da Vela (2017); Stehle (1997: 71–169); Van Hoof (2010: 211–212).
- 9 Kennedy (2003).
- 10 An example can be found in Greenwood (2016).
- 11 Van Hoof (2010: 219–220): “late antique literature is still waiting for its Maud Gleason, its Thomas Schmitz, or its Tim Whitmarsh to carry out such an examination”. See also Johnstone (2001: 123).
- 12 Fredal (2001: 255, 256–257): “Any attempt to reconstruct rhetorical action based on theories of delivery or texts of the speech can be provisional and partial at best . . . Scholarly consideration of the speech has thus focused exclusively on the question of whether the speech was actually delivered. This perspective remains tied to a view of delivery as an appendage, a final element dependent on an already finished text (and, if not finished, therefore not delivered). But the more interesting question arises out of evidence of the speech’s imaginability, seeing rhetorical action as a constitutional feature of the speech throughout the composing process”. An attempt to reconstruct a theatrical performance can be found in Green (2002). Vatri’s opinion (2017) that a comprehensive morphosyntax analysis of the texts can help us reconstruct some gestures of a performance should not be overlooked.
- 13 Taplin (2003<sup>2</sup>: 2).
- 14 Van Nuffelen (2014c: 301) correctly notes that “the ‘rhetorical’ subject of a speech can differ substantially from its ‘real’ subject”. For a brief overview on the different scenarios in which delivery was involved, see Katsourēs (1989<sup>3</sup>: 15–20).
- 15 Recent contributions to the study of late antique literature have shown that the dynamics of cultural and religious disputations were an integral element of numerous debates in the establishment of cultural and religious orthodoxy in which both form and content were equally important. See, for instance, Cameron (2014: 15–17); Lim (1995); Van Nuffelen (2014a).
- 16 See especially Cameron (2014); Urbano (2013); Van Hoof (2014: 38); Van Nuffelen (2014b).
- 17 See Schenkeveld’s (2007: 25–26); Berry and Heath (1997: 393).
- 18 On declamations and other oratorical forms as literary genres, see Johansson (2006: 15). Also Russell (1983: 4). Pernot (2006) has broadened the scope of the concept and has claimed the importance of the rhetorical dimension of religious acts such as prayers and hymns.

- 19 Vatri (2017: 318). See also Schmitz (1999: 75).
- 20 Serafim (2017: 15).
- 21 Fredal (1998: 3, 12–13). See also Goffman (1971: 26–27).
- 22 See Bergmann’s complaint (1999: 9) of those philologists whose “text-centered readings tend to neglect the essential role of physical sites, special effects, choreography, props and visual representations”.
- 23 Goffman (1971: 60).
- 24 Whitmarsh (2005: 24–25).
- 25 Kremmydas; Powell and Rubinstein (2013: 3). See also Cole (1991: ix); Hall (2004: 146): “while Cicero had clear ideas about the kinds of gesture that the orator should *not* use, he did not apply any detailed theoretical analysis to the gestures that he *did* employ”. In a similar vein, see Flower (2013: 22–23).
- 26 Fantham (1982: 262): “let the reader practice Quintilian’s eight-point description for a calm and dignified pose as he stands waiting to address a crowd of strangers. He should stand upright, with the legs even and slightly apart (the left foot may be advanced slightly), keep his knees straight, shoulders relaxed, look serious (but not gloomy, staring, or slack), hold his arms a little away from his sides, with the left hand as prescribed above and the right extended a little in front of the *simus*, in an unobtrusive gesture: he is now ready to begin”.
- 27 Shapiro (2011: 1).
- 28 Bers (2009: 9).
- 29 On what audiences expected to hear, it is always important to remember Bowie’s comparison (2004: 72): “like the provision of food and lodging in MacDonald’s, Starbucks and Holiday Inns, a sophistic declamation might be expected to be similar in form and content wherever in the Greek world its audience was gathered”. Also Hesk (1999: 207).
- 30 Hesk (1999).
- 31 Cameron (2011: 15–32, especially 32); Jones (2012: 1–8, especially 6); Watts (2015: 1 n.2, 6); Whitmarsh (2017: 238). Also Stenger (2014: 269–270, 279–285).
- 32 Sandwell (2007: 11).
- 33 Quiroga (2015).
- 34 Roberts (1989: 6): “aesthetic, and particularly stylistic, preferences do not follow religious affiliation”.
- 35 See Watts (2017: 17): “Most fourth- and fifth- century Alexandrian Christians and pagans did not understand religious differences in the same way that modern communities do”.
- 36 Urbano (2013: 6).
- 37 Though with a different purposes, Shi (2008: 113–136) also surveys the presence of *hypókrisis* in rhetorical treatises.
- 38 Penner and Vander Stichele (2009) are one of the few comprehensive treatments of the topic.
- 39 Tempest (2017: 176).

**Bibliography**

- Anderson, G. (1986), *Philostratus: Biography and Belles Lettres in the Third Century A.D.*, London: Croom Helm.
- Barker, E.T.E. (2009), *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bergmann, B. (1999), “Introduction: The Art of Ancient Spectacle”, in B. Bergmann and C. Kondoleon (eds.), *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*, Washington (DC): National Gallery of Art, 9–35.
- Berry, D.H. and Heath, M. (1997), “Oratory and Declamation”, in S.E. Porter (ed.), *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period. 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, Leiden: Brill, 393–420.
- Bers, V. (2009), *Genos Dikanikon. Amateur and Professional Speech in the Courtrooms of Classical Athens*, Cambridge (MA): Harvard University Press.
- Borg, B. (2004), “Glamorous Intellectuals: Portraits of *Pepaideumenoí* in the Second and Third Centuries AD”, in B. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 157–178.
- Bowie, E. (2004), “The Geography of the Second Sophistic: Cultural Variations”, in B. Borg (ed.), *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, Berlin-New York: De Gruyter, 65–83.
- Bremmer, J. (1992), “Walking, Standing, and Sitting in Ancient Greek Culture”, in J. Bremmer and H. Roodenburg (eds.), *A Cultural History of Gesture*, Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press, 15–35.
- Cameron, Al. (2011), *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cameron, Av. (2014), *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge (MA): Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Cole, T. (1991), *The Origins of Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore-London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Corbeill, A. (2004), *Nature Embodied: Gesture in Ancient Rome*, Princeton (NJ)-Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- Criboire, R. (2007), *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- Díez Coronado, M.A. (2003), *Retórica y presentación: historia y teoría de la “actio”*, Logroño: Gobierno de la Rioja.
- Edwards, M. (2013), “*Hypokritês* in Action: Delivery in Greek Rhetoric”, in C. Kremmydas; J. Powell and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Profession and Performance. Aspects of Oratory in the Graeco-Roman World*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, 15–25.
- Eshleman, K. (2012), *The Social World of Intellectuals in the Roman Empire: Sophists, Philosophers, and Christians*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Fantham, E. (1982), “Quintilian on Performance: Traditional and Personal Elements in *Institutio* 11.3”, *Phoenix* 36.3: 243–263.
- Flower, R. (2013), *Emperors and Bishops in Late Roman Invective*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fredal, J. (1998), *Beyond the Fifth Canon: Body Rhetoric in Ancient Greece* (PhD), Ohio State University.
- Fredal, J. (2001), “The Language of Delivery and the Presentation of Character: Rhetorical Action in Demosthenes’ *Against Meidias*”, *Rhetoric Review* 20.3–4: 251–267.
- Fredal, J. (2006), *Rhetorical Action in Ancient Athens: Persuasive Artistry from Solon to Demosthenes*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Gill, C. (2003), “Is Rivalry a Virtue or a Vice?”, in D. Konstan and N. Keith Rutter (eds.), *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 29–51.
- Gleason, M.W. (1995), *Making Men: Sophist and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome*, Princeton (NJ)-Chichester: Princeton University Press.
- Gleason, M.W. (1998), “Elite Male Identity in the Roman Empire”, in D.S. Porter and D.J. Mattingly (eds.), *Life, Death, and Entertainment in the Roman Empire*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 67–84.
- Goffman, E. (1971), *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, London: Penguin.
- Goldhill, S. (1999), “Programme Notes”, in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1–29.
- Green, R. (2002), “Towards a Reconstruction of Performance Style”, in P. Easterling and E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 93–126.
- Greenwood, D.N. (2016), “Christianizing Translations in the Loeb Editions of Julian and Libanius”, *Translation and Literature* 25.2: 222–227.
- Gunderson, E. (2000), *Staging Masculinity: The Rhetoric of Performance in the Roman World*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Hall, J. (2004), “Cicero and Quintilian on the Oratorical Use of Gestures”, *The Classical Quarterly* 54.1: 143–160.
- Hawhee, D. (2004), *Bodily Arts: Rhetoric and Athletics in Ancient Greece*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hesk, J. (1999), “The Rhetoric of Anti-Rhetoric in Athenian Oratory”, in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 201–230.
- Johansson, M. (2006), *Libanius’ Declamations 9 and 10*, Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Johnstone, C.L. (2001), “Communicating in Classical Contexts: The Centrality of Delivery”, *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 87.2: 121–143.

## 16 Introduction

- Jones, C.P. (2012), “The “Fuzziness” of Paganism”, *Common Knowledge* 18:2: 249–254.
- Katsourēs, A. (1989), *Ρητορική ύπόκριση*, Ioannina: Panepistemio Ianninon.
- Kennedy, G. (2003), “Some Recent Controversies in the Study of Later Greek Rhetoric”, *American Journal of Philology* 124.2: 295–301.
- Korenjak, M. (2000), *Publikum und Redner: ihre Interaktion in der sophistischen Rhetorik der Kaiserzeit*, Munich: C.H. Beck.
- Kremmydas, C.; Powell, J. and Rubinstein, L. (2013), “Introduction”, in C. Kremmydas; J. Powell and L. Rubinstein (eds.), *Profession and Performance: Aspects of Oratory in the Graeco-Roman World*, London: Institute of Classical Studies, 1–14.
- Lauwers, J. (2011), “Reading Books, Talking Culture: The Performance of *Paideia* in Imperial Greek Literature”, in E. Minchin (ed.), *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 227–244.
- Leyerle, B. (2001), *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage*, Berkeley-London: University of California Press.
- Lim, R. (1995), *Public Disputation, Power, and Social Order in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Papaioannou, S.; Serafim, A. and da Vela, B. (2017), “Introduction”, in S. Papaioannou; A. Serafim and B. da Vela (eds.), *The Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 1–9.
- Penner, T. and Vander Stichele, C. (2009), “Rhetorical Practice and Performance in Early Christianity”, in E. Gunderson (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ancient Rhetoric*, Cambridge (MA)-London: Cambridge University Press, 245–260.
- Pernot, L. (2006), “The Rhetoric of Religion”, *Rhetorica* XXIV.3: 235–254.
- Quiroga Puertas, A.J. (2015), “Nuevas aportaciones metodológicas a la retórica e historiografía tardo-antigua”, *Talia Dixit* 10: 75–89.
- Radice, B. (1969), *Pliny. Letters, Books 1–7. Panegyricus*, Cambridge (MA)-London: Harvard University Press.
- Roberts, M. (1989), *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*, Ithaca (NY): Cornell University Press.
- Roisman, J. (2005), *The Rhetoric of Manhood: Masculinity in the Attic Orators*, Berkeley-London: University of California Press.
- Russell, D.A. (1983), *Greek Declamation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandwell, I. (2007), *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schenkeveld, D.M. (2007), “Theory and Practice in Fourth-Century Eloquence: The Case of the Speaker as a Teacher of the Demos”, in C.D.



- Mirhady (ed.), *Influences on Peripatetic Rhetoric: Essays in Honour of William W. Fortenbaugh*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 25–35.
- Schmitz, T. (1999), “Performing History in the Second Sophistic”, in M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. N. Chr.*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 71–93.
- Serafim, A. (2017), *Attic Oratory and Performance*, London: Routledge.
- Shapiro, J.P. (2011), *Speaking Bodies: Physiognomic Consciousness and Oratorical Strategy in 4th Century Athens* (PhD), The University of Michigan Press.
- Shi, W. (2008), *Paul’s Message of the Cross as Body Language*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stehle, E. (1997), *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greek: Non Dramatic Poetry in its Setting*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press.
- Stenger, J.R. (2014), “Libanius and the ‘Game’ of Hellenism”, in L. Van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius. An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 268–292.
- Taplin, O. (1999), “Spreading the Word Through Performance”, in S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (eds.), *Performance Culture and Athenian Democracy*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 33–57.
- Taplin, O. (2003<sup>2</sup>), *Greek Tragedy in Action*, London-New York: Routledge.
- Tempest, K. (2017), “Oratorical Performance in Pliny’s *Letters*”, in S. Papaioannou; A. Serafim and B. da Vela (eds.), *The Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 175–197.
- Urbano, A.P. (2013), *The Philosophical Life: Biography and Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity*, Washington (DC): Catholic University of America Press.
- Van Hoof, L. (2010), “Greek Rhetoric and the Later Roman Empire: The Bubble of the Third Sophistic”, *Antiquité Tardive* 18: 211–224.
- Van Hoof, L. (2013), “Performing *Paideia*: Greek Culture as an Instrument for Social Promotion in the Fourth Century AD”, *The Classical Quarterly* 63.1: 387–406.
- Van Hoof, L. (2014), “Libanius’ *Life* and *Life*”, in L. van Hoof (ed.), *A Critical Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7–38.
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2014a), “The End of Open Competition? Religious Disputations in Late Antiquity”, in D. Engels and P. Van Nuffelen (eds.), *Religion and Competition in Antiquity*, Brussels: Latomus, 149–172.
- Van Nuffelen, P. (2014b), “A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople Under the Theodosian Dynasty”, in L. van Hoof and P. van Nuffelen (eds.), *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD: Performing *Paideia*, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 201–217.



Proof

18 *Introduction*

Van Nuffelen, P. (2014c), “Not the Last Pagan: Libanius Between Elite Rhetoric and Religion”, in L. van Hoof (ed.), *Libanius: An Introduction*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 293–314.

Vatri, A. (2017), “Public Performance and the Language of Antiphon’s Speeches”, in S. Papaioannou; A. Serafim and B. da Vela (eds.), *The Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*, Leiden-Boston: Brill, 304–319.

Watts, E. (2015), *The Final Pagan Generation*, Oakland (CA): University of California Press.

Watts, E. (2017), *Hypatia: The Life and Legend of an Ancient Philosopher*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2005), *The Second Sophistic*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Whitmarsh, T. (2017), *Battling the Gods: Atheism in the Ancient World*, London: Faber and Faber.

Taylor & Francis  
Not for distribution



Proof

