Aspects of Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire

Pierides
Studies in Greek and Latin Literature

Series Editors:
Philip Hardie, Stratis Kyriakidis,
Antonis K. Petrides

Pierides

Studies in Greek and Latin
Literature

Volume VIII

Aspects of Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire

Edited by

Consuelo Ruiz-Montero

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ILLUSTRATIONS

Contributors

Mario Andreassi (1969) graduate in Greek and Latin Grammar (1993) and Doctor of Philosophy in Greek and Latin Philology (1998), is currently Associate Professor of Greek Language and Literature at the "Dipartimento di Studi Umanistici", University "Aldo Moro" (Bari), where he teaches courses on Greek literature ("Cultura Letteraria della Grecia Antica") and grammar ("Grammatica Greca"). His published research ranges across many fields of Greek literature: humorous literature (*Philogelos*), epigram (Meleager), popular mime (*Moicheutria* and *Charition*), fictitious biography (*Vita Aesopi*), epistolography (Alciphron), Imperial rhetoric (Himerius).

Ewen Bowie, now an Emeritus Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, was Praelector in Classics there from 1965 to 2007, and successively University Lecturer, Reader, and Professor of Classical Languages and Literature in Oxford University. He has published on early Greek elegiac, iambic and lyric poetry, Aristophanes, Hellenistic poetry, and many aspects of Imperial Greek literature and culture. He recently completed a commentary on Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe* (CUP) and edited a collection entitled *Herodotus. Narrator, scientist, historian* (de Gruyter 2018). He has co-edited collections of papers on Philostratus (CUP 2009) and *Archaic and Classical Choral Song* (de Gruyter 2011).

Angelos Chaniotis is Professor of Ancient History and Classics at the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton. His current research on the social and cultural history of the Hellenistic World and the Roman East focuses on memory, emotion, and identity. He is editor of the *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum* and of the inscriptions of Aphrodisias. His books include *War in the Hellenistic World*: *A Social and Cultural History* (2005) and *Age of Conquests*: *The Greek World from Alexander to Hadrian* (2018).

José Antonio Fernández Delgado has been Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Salamanca (1991-2017) and at the University of Extremadura (1987-1991). He has made research at Birkbeck College (London), Christ Church College (Oxford), Freie Universität Berlin, Harvard University, Fondation Hardt, and Humboldt Universität Berlin, with grants from the British Academy, Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung

and the Spanish Ministry of Education and Science; he has directed many projects of research and has participated in international conferences in many European universities; he has published ten books and more than one hundred fifty papers in prestigious international journals and volumes.

Jacqueline E. Jay (Ph.D. 2008, University of Chicago) is Associate Professor of History at Eastern Kentucky University. She is the author of *Orality and Literacy in the Demotic Tales* (Brill, 2016). In addition to her work on ancient Egyptian literature, her current research projects focus on the publication of Demotic ostraca and graffiti.

Ioannis M. Konstantakos studied classical philology at the universities of Athens and Cambridge and is now Professor of Ancient Greek Literature at the National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. His scholarly interests include ancient comedy, ancient narrative, fiction, folklore, and the relations between Greek and Near-Eastern literatures and cultures. He has published four books and numerous articles on these topics. He has also given many lectures, conference papers and seminars in Greek and European higher institutions. He has received scholarships from the Greek State Scholarships Foundation and the "Alexander S. Onassis" Public Benefit Foundation. In 2009 he was awarded the prize of the Academy of Athens for the best classical monograph published within the previous five years. In 2012 he was a finalist for the Greek state prize for critical essay.

Francesca Mestre is Professor of Greek Philology at the University of Barcelona. In 1991 she published her PhD thesis (defended in 1985) on essay as a literary genre in Greek literature of the Imperial period (*L'assaig a la literatura grega d'època imperial*, Barcelona 1991). Her main field of research is the literature and culture of the hellenophone part of the Roman Empire. She works on authors like Dio Chrysostom and Philostratus (she has also published translations of these in Catalan and Spanish), and Lucian, the editing and translating of whose complete works she has been working on since 2000. She has published several articles and chapters of collective books, and coordinates the work of the "Graecia Capta" research group at the University of Barcelona. She published (as co-editor with P. Gómez), *Lucian of Samosata. Greek* Writer *and Roman Citizen* (2010), and *Three Centuries of Greek Culture under the Roman Empire* (2014).

Loreto Núñez studied Classical Philology, Hispanic and comparative literature and has a PhD in comparative literature. She was visiting researcher at Kyknos, Research Centre for Ancient Narrative Literature at the University of Wales-Swansea, the Swiss Institute in Rome and the

Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa. Currently, she is deputy assistant professor in comparative literature at the University of Lausanne. She has published mainly on the ancient novel and the Second Sophistic; in 2013, she published *Voix inouïes. Étude comparative de l'enchâssement dans* Leucippé et Clitophon *d'Achille Tatius et les* Métamorphoses *d'Apulée*, Saarbrücken, 2 vols. She also worked on the reception of the ancient novel in 16th and 17th century Spanish and French literature, the (re)writing of Greco-Roman myths, fairy tales, and translating for children.

Alexia Petsalis-Diomidis researches on the cultural history of space and objects in ancient Greece; her work evokes intimate cultural histories, often of marginalised groups. She also writes about Classical reception of material culture in Europe *c*.1760-1830. She is the author of *Truly beyond Wonders: Aelius Aristides and the Cult of Asklepios* (OUP, 2010), and ten chapters and articles. She is currently co-editing two volumes on the reception of Greek vases; she is also working on two longer term projects, on Greek votives, and on the experience of the marvellous. She studied Classics at Oxford (MA 1991) and History of Art at The Courtauld Institute of Art (MA 1995 and PhD 2001). She is currently Lecturer in Classics at the University of St Andrews; previously she has held a Leverhulme Special Research Fellowship, and has worked at Corpus Christi College, Oxford and King's College London.

Consuelo Ruiz-Montero studied Classical Philology at the Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona, and holds a PhD from the Universidad de Salamanca (1979). She is currently Professor of Greek Philology at the Universidad de Murcia. Her research interests include Greek rhetoric (mainly Greek theories on style), *koine* Greek, and mainly the Greek novel, on which she has published two books (*La estructura de la novela griega. Análisis funcional*, Salamanca 1988; *La novela griega,* Madrid 2006), and many chapters and articles on the different aspects of the genre. Currently she is especially focused on the study of the papyri of the Greek novel.

Antonio Stramaglia (1967) is Professor of Latin at the University of Bari. He has worked on Greek and Latin fiction (Apuleius, papyrus fragments…); the supernatural in classical literature; ancient paradoxography; "comics" and other forms of interaction between text and image in Greece and Rome; school in antiquity, with special emphasis on declamation; Roman satire (Juvenal); Galen; Terence. Among his books: *Res inauditae, incredulae. Storie di fantasmi nel mondo greco-latino* (Bari 1999); *Giovenale, Satire* 1, 7, 12, 16. *Storia di un poeta* (Bologna 2008, corr. repr. 2017); *Phlegon Trallianus. Opuscula De rebus mirabilibus et De longaevis* (Berlin – New

York 2011, Bibliotheca Teubneriana); commentaries to five of [Quintilian]'s *Major Declamations* (Cassino 1999-2017). He is currently preparing a new critical edition of the *Major Declamations* for the Loeb Classical Library; and of Apuleius's *Operum deperditorum reliquiae* for the Oxford Classical Texts.

Harold Tarrant studied at Cambridge and Durham UK, and taught Classics for thirty-eight years in Australian universities. After retiring to live in the UK from 2012 he remains Professor Emeritus at the University of Newcastle Australia. Recent publications include *Proclus: Commentary on Plato's Timaeus*, vols 6, Cambridge 2017; François Renaud and Harold Tarrant, *The Platonic Alcibiades I*: *the Dialogue and its Ancient Reception*, Cambridge 2015; and (edited with D. A. Layne, D. Baltzly, and F. Renaud) *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*, Leiden 2018.

ABBREVIATIONS

BCH   *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, Athens 1877-

BGU   *Aegyptische Urkunden aus den königlichen Museen zu Berlin, Griechische Urkunden,* Berlin 1895-1976.

CGL   G. Goetz (ed.), *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum,* 7 vols*,* Leipzig 1888-1923.

CIG   *Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum,* 4 vols, Berlin 1828-1877.

CIL   *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum,* Berlin 1863-.

Corinth   B. D. Meritt, *Corinth*, VIII.1, *Greek Inscriptions,* 1896-1926*,* Cambridge Mass. 1931.

Cos   D. Bosnakis and K. Hallof (eds)*, IG* XII 4.2. *Inscriptiones Coi Insulae,* Berlin – New York 2012.

Epet. Het. Ster. Mel. *Ἐπετηρίς Ἑταιρείας Στερεοελλαδικῶν Μελετῶν*, Athens 1968-

FD   Bourguet et alii, *Fouilles de Delphes,* III, 1-6, Paris 1929-1985.

FGrH   F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker,* 15 vols, Berlin 1923-1958.

GVI   W. Peek, *Griechische Vers-Inschriften,* Berlin 1955.

I.Aphr.   C. Roueché, J. Reynolds and G. Bodard, *Inscriptions of Aphrodisias*, London 2007. (http://insaph.kcl.ac.uk/iaph /2007/html).

I.Beroea   L. Gounaropoulou and M. B. Hatzopoulos, *Ἐπιγραφὲς Κάτω Μακεδονίας (μεταξὺ τοῦ Βερμίου Ὄρους καὶ τοῦ Ἀξιοῦ Ποταμοῦ). Τεῦχος Α΄. Ἐπιγραφὲς Βεροίας,* Athens 1998.

IC   M. Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae I-IV,* Rome 1935-1950.

ID   F. Durrbach, P. Roussel, P. Launey and J. Coupry, *Les inscriptions de Délos,* 6 vols, Paris 1926-1972.

I.Didyma   A. Rehm and R. Harder, *Didyma*, II, *Die Inschriften,* Berlin 1958.

I.Ephesos   H. Wankel, R. Merkelbach et alii*, Die Inschriften von Ephesos I-VII. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 11-17, Bonn 1979-1981.

IG   *Inscriptiones Graecae,* Berlin 1873-.

IGRR   *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas pertinentes,* Paris 1911-1927.

IGUR   Luigi Moretti, *Inscriptiones Graecae Vrbis Romae,* Rome 1968-1990.

I.Herakleia L. Jonnes, *The Inscriptions of Heraclea Pontica*, *with a Prosopographia Heracleotica* by W. Ameling (*IGSK* Band 47), Bonn 1994.

IK *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien,* Bonn 1972-.

ILS H. Dessau, *Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae*, 3 vols, Berlin 1892-1916.

I.Napoli E. Miranda, *Iscrizioni greche d'Italia*: *Napoli*, 2 vols, Rome 1990 and 1995.

I.Oropos B. C. Petrakos, *Οἱ ἐπιγραφὲς τοῦ Ὠρωποῦ*, Athens 1997.

IOSPE I² V. Latyshev, *Inscriptiones antiquae orae septentrionalis Ponti Euxini Graecae*. vol. I. 2nd ed.: *Inscriptiones Tyrae Olbiae Chersonesi Tauricae Aliorum Locorum a Danubio usque ad regnum Bosporanum,* St. Petersburg 1916.

I.Pergamon M. Fraenkel, *Die Inschriften von Pergamon,* I-II, Berlin 1890-1895.

I.Priene F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin 1906.

I.Side J. Nollé, *Side im Altertum. Geschichte und Zeugnisse* I: *Geographie, Geschichte, Testimonia, griechische und lateinische Inschriften. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 43, Bonn 1993.

I.Smyrna G. Petzl, *Die Inschriften von Smyrna* I-II. *Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien* 23-24, 3 vols, Bonn 1982-1990.

I.Thespiae P. Roesch, *Les inscriptions de Thespies,* édition électronique mise en forme par G. Argoud, A. Schachter, et G. Vottéro, Lyon 2007 [2009²]

Laographia *Λαογραφία*: *Δελτίον τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Λαογραφικῆς Ἑταιρείας,* Ἀθῆναι 1909-

LDAB *Leuven Database of Ancient Books* (http://www.trismegistos.org/ldab/).

LIMC *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, Zurich – Munich (later: Düsseldorf) 1981-1999.

LS C. T. Lewis and C. Short, *A Latin Dictionary*; *founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund′s Latin Dictionary*; *revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten*, Oxford 1879.

LSJ⁹ H. G. Liddell, R. Scott and H. S. Jones, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford 1940, with revised supplement ed. by P. G. W. Glare, Oxford 1996.

MAMA VIII W. M. Calder and J. M. R. Cormack, *Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua VIII. Monuments from Lycaonia, the Pisido-Phrygian Borderland, Aphrodisias,* Manchester 1962.

***O. Bodl.* II**   J. G. Tait and C. Préaux, *Greek Ostraka in the Bodleian.*
        Library at Oxford and other various collections, II, London 1955.

OLD   P. G. W. Glare, *Oxford Latin Dictionary*, Oxford 1968-1982.

P. Berol.W. Schubart, *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses,* Bonn 1911.

PG   J.-P. Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, Paris 1857-1963.

P.Köln *Kölner Papyri*, 1976-.

P.Lips. L. Mitteis, *Griechische Urkunden der Papyrussammlung zu*
        Leipzig, Leipzig 1906 (Milano 1970).

P.Lit. London H. J. M. Milne, *Catalogue of the Literary Papyri in the*
        British Museum, London 1927 (Milano 1977).

P.Oxy. B. P. Grenfell, A. S. Hunt, et alii, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*,
        London 1898-

PSI   G. Vitelli, M. Norsa et alii*, Papyri greci e latini* (*Pubblicazioni*
        della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei papyri greci e latini in
        Egitto), Firenze 1912-

RE   A. Pauly, G. Wissowa and W. Kroll, *Real Encyclopädie d.*
        klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart 1893-1980

SEG   *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Leiden 1923-

TAM   *Tituli Asiae Minoris,* Wien 1901-

TLL   *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, Leipzig 1900-.

ViP   *U. Horak, Verzeichnis illuminierter edierter Papyri, Pergamente,*
        Papiere und Ostraka (*ViP*), in ead., *Illuminierte Papyri,*
        Pergamente und Papiere, I, Wien 1992, 227-261.

PREFACE

Orality in the Roman Empire – an age of sophisticated literature and widespread literacy – is a topic that deserves greater attention and further research. The purpose of this book is to expand our knowledge of how Greek texts circulated in the Roman Empire. We are interested in the study of three main aspects of orality: orality of origin (the production of the text), orality of representation (the enunciation of the text), and orality of dissemination (the spread of the text). We will examine orality as the 'product' of literary creation, which is different from the orality that led to the written texts of the archaic period. The papers presented here analyse both Greek literary works and contemporary inscriptions, the ways they were disseminated and their contact with material culture, together with Egyptian and Latin literary works. For this reason, the interdisciplinary character of the volume may prove of interest to a wider audience than that of ancient Greek scholarship.

The starting point for this book was an international conference held at the Roman theatre in Cartagena (Murcia) on the 29-31 May 2014 on the topic of *Orality and Greek Literature in the Roman Empire.* Funding for the conference was provided by the University of Murcia and the *Región de Murcia*'s "Fundación Séneca", and the "Dirección General de Investigación Científica y Técnica del Ministerio de Economía, Industria y Competitividad". I am grateful for the participation of all those who attended, especially of those scholars who came and delivered papers. Most of these papers are published here. José Antonio Artés Hernández and José Antonio Molina Gómez helped me in organising the conference. I should also like to express my gratitude to the Director of the Cartagena Theatre, Elena Ruiz Valderas, for her generosity in allowing us to use this magnificent venue. I would also like to extend our thanks to my colleague Lawrence Kim from Trinity University at Texas for his collaboration in the preparation of this volume.

Fundamental to my research have been the stays at the *Institut für Klassische Philologie* of the University of Munich, the *Kommission für Alte Geschichte und Epigraphik* of the *Deutsches Archäelogisches Institut* (Munich), and as a Visiting Professor at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. My deep gratitude to Professors Ernst Vogt (†), Johannes Nollé, and Ewen Bowie for making these stays possible and for their constant support. I would also like to mention here my friends Bettina, Bonnie and Lee, who

xvi   Preface

made my stay at Oxford in the latter stages of preparing this volume such an enjoyable one.

The anonymous reader has offered us invaluable suggestions, and encouragement, for which we are so grateful.

Last but not least, my most sincere thanks to the editors of the *Pierides* series, Professors P. Hardie, S. Kyriakidis and A. Petrides, for their continuous support and academic assistance.

I do not wish to conclude without expressing my most heartfelt thanks to Eleni Peraki-Kyriakidou for her generous and efficacious help.

INTRODUCTION

CONSUELO RUIZ-MONTERO

1. *Orality*: *The Concept and its Beginnings in Greece*

Orality was the backbone of ancient Greek culture throughout its various periods [1] complemented and interpenetrated by the 'visual'. [2] Both are evident in what has been called a 'performative culture', which admits various forms, both public and private. [3] In the Archaic age pan-Hellenism was expressed through religious festivals that included songs with dances

---

[1] Orality is still relevant today and is a characteristic trait of Mediterranean culture. To give an example, I would like to refer to 'trovos', that is, improvised verses typical for Murcia, see Flores Arroyuelo (1977). Evans [(1991) 99, 121] mentions some African comparanda, albeit not without reservations (p. 267). Thomas [(1992) 114, n. 36] reported that long messages are still transmitted in verse in 'Somali nomads'. Hunter and Rutherford [(2009) 14-16] give some non-Greek parallels on travelling singers and poets. On orality and literacy in the ancient world the proceedings of a biennial series of international conferences have been published, starting with the volume edited by Worthington (1996). Unfortunately, I was unable to see the last volume, N. W. Slater (ed.) (2017) *Voice and Voices in Antiquity*, Leiden. It is not my intention here to discuss this controversial topic, nor the relations between orality and writing, questions I shall deal with in passing.

[2] Cf. schol. vet. in Hes. *Theog.*: ὁρῶντες γὰρ καὶ θαυμάζοντες προφερόμεθα λόγους (266a2) T.

[3] See the introduction by Beard (1991), Thomas [(1992) 120] for types of songs, public festivals and private symposia. Evans [(1991) 130] refers to the presence of *logioi* in Ionian or Dorian 'panegyreis' before they appear in 'pan-Hellenic festivals'. 'Travelling poets' were a very significant group, as were the 'travelling historians', the 'intellectuals' and the 'performers': see the introduction in Hunter and Rutherford [(eds) (2009)], where the papers included are focused mainly on the Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic periods, yet, according to the editors, the "travelling poets, and honorific decrees for them, continue to be well attested in the Roman Empire" (p. 8). On p. 22 they note the importance of this phenomenon for the Greek world, mostly overlooked, and add that "it would have looked very different to those who were actually there". Petrides [(2014) 106-107] insists on the 'theatrical mentality' of Hellenistic life, which appears from 4th century B.C. onwards.

and music, epideictic speeches, processions and rituals, all of which constituted 'performances' to be seen and heard: in other words, one attended a 'spectacle', a *theatron*, a habit which was kept alive even, and especially, during the Empire. Both orality and visuality functioned together, as can be detected in literature: Archaic epic, which is the major literary representation of oral culture, made its narration visual with vivid descriptions,[4] and the lyric poets compared them with the plastic arts. This becomes a *topos* that Horace brilliantly describes as *ut pictura poesis* (*Ars* 361). Along with this, the importance of visualisation in historiographical descriptions is also well-known, as is the fact that it continued later.[5]

'Orality' is a heterogeneous and polysemic concept, whether it is employed to characterise a certain society or to classify certain uses of spoken or written language as media. 'Orality' is usually understood or defined in regard to various procedures for writing a text, which leads to a differentiation of styles and genres.[6] Obviously, however, the term 'oral' presupposes its opposite, and in this sense, as Bakker observes,[7] this term "cannot be separated from our own literate perspective".

The Homeric epic is traditionally cited as the prime example of 'orality' in all its aspects, namely that of 1) origin, 2) medium, and 3) destination. The first category concerns the production of the text and affects both the author and what we call the 'matter', i.e., the literary content. The second category deals with both the performance of the text (and so is related to its transmission, as well) and the way in which the text is represented or enunciated, determining whether we call it 'real' or 'fictitious' orality. Finally, the third category is solely concerned with the transmission and /or reception of the text. The orality of the Homeric epic has been labelled as total or 'primary' orality, because it comprehends all three aspects, i.e. oral production, transmission, and reception or

---

[4] The description of Achilles' shield at *Il.* 18.478-608 has served as a model for later rhetoricians in terms of *enargeia* and *evidentia.* For Pindar and Simonides see Beard (1991); Thomas (1992) 114-115.

[5] On the *enargeia* of Ctesias see Demetr. *De eloc*. 212-216. Polybius (2.56.6-12) criticises the excesses in Phylarchus' historical account, striking in this way the difference between historical and tragical narration. On the relationship between history and oral performance, see below, section 2.

[6] See Gnilka (1990); Blänsdorf (1996); Fruyt (1996) who prefer the terms 'oralité'/ 'scripturalité' or even better 'littérarité', the latter including the meaning of 'literacy'. On orality and its types see also Bakker (1999) 29-30. He distinguishes a 'medial' use of the term 'oral' as opposed to 'written' discourse, from a 'conceptional' use of 'oral' as opposed to 'literate' discourse.

[7] Bakker (1999) 33.

destination.[8] Yet these categories can be combined, and some of them are indeed intertwined in Greek literature. Homer stands at the peak of 'orality', although the role that writing played in the composition of such extensive and complex works as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is debatable. The Greco-Roman literature of the Empire would thus constitute the opposite case, the opposite pole of orality. In this instance, orality entails mainly the presentation /enunciation and the reception of the text. But such an opposition is only apparent, and it would be misleading to see the 'oral' and the 'literate' aspect of Greek literature as antagonistic, rather than regarding them as complementary, with different relationships according to ages and genres.[9]

      This is why some scholars suggest the term 'secondary' orality, and ignore the possible oral composition of a work, prioritising instead factors like enunciation, performance and reception or destination. Such scholars prefer the terms 'aurality' and 'aural', given that Greek texts were meant to be read or performed aloud as verbal art for the ears, either in public or in private. [10] For this purpose, euphony and certain stylistic devices and repetitions were used, in addition to rhetorical devices such as *ekphrasis* and digression.[11] From this point of view the performance of poetry, drama, and oratory was both oral and aural**.** Moreover**,** this hypothesis has also been suggested in regard to Plato's dialogues, which imitate storytelling and heroic tales in an intellectual context of banquets and show the formal marks of oral composition described above, these being presented as oral 'enunciations'.[12]

---

[8] Rossi (1993).

[9] See Bakker (1999) 30-31: they "can be seen as the two poles or extremes of a continuum, with numerous gradations in between … In practice, most discourses will display both oral and literate features in varying ratios ..."; p. 36: "In the Greek archaic period writing must have been so different from our notion of writing, so 'oral' in fact, that the simple dichotomy between 'orality' and literacy breaks down". He proposes to label Homer's poetry as 'special speech', to replace Parry and Lord's 'oral poetry'.

[10] J. Russo (1978); Rossi (1993); see further above n. 6 and the discussion by Parker (2009) 186-229: Talking about Latin 145
poetry he argues that 'aural' does not make poetry 'oral'.

[11] Trenkner (1960) 74-78; Wheeler (1999) 115; Núñez (2006); Mestre (this volume). For 'ring compositions' in other 'non-literate' cultures see Evans (1991) 104.

[12] On Plato see Tarrant (1996). On Plato's reception in the Imperial age see Trapp (1990); Tarrant (1999); on Apuleius, De Jong (2001); Hunter (2006), and Graverini (2010): below, n. 91.

In the Imperial age, the 'Second Sophistic' movement was "another typically Greek manifestation of orality"[13] that consciously continued to use both the oratorical and dramatic practices of the past. Poetry remained linked to oral performance in the Hellenistic and later periods,[14] yet the oral representation was also preferred in later fictitious presentations of prose works such as Greek novels and Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*,[15] and was one of the most used methods in Imperial literature, whose taste for narrative should be emphasised and is a characteristic shared with epitaphs.[16] This kind of literary practice at the diegetic level created an extraordinary complexity. Indeed, the *Incredible things beyond Thule* by Antonius Diogenes is a prime example of the interplay between oral and written communication, although the device itself was not without antecedents.[17] Such cases are examples of mimetic orality which are consistent with rhetorical theory and practice. In the following pages, we offer a diachronic overview of oral performance and Greek prose literature.

2. *Oral Performances in the Classical and Hellenistic Period*

The practice of *epideixis,* 'display', seems to date back to the speech *On Concord* delivered by Gorgias in Olympia, a declamation labelled as 'reading' (*anagnosis*) by Plutarch (*Mor.* 144B), like Lysias' speech, also delivered in Olympia (*Vit. decem orat.*, *Mor.* 836D). As Del Corso has observed, however, both authors belonged to an oral-aural society and gave their speeches without using texts.[18] According to Diogenes Laertius (9.54), among the books that Protagoras read publicly was that *On Gods*, as sophists and philosophers used to do in the past, a practice which constituted a complement to religious activity based on orality.

It is well-known that Gorgias attempted to make speeches in prose similar to poetry, and to do so he used stylistic devices, such as formulas

---

[13] Thomas (1992) 123; Hunter and Rutherford (2006) above, n. 1.

[14] See Chaniotis (2009a). On the way in which Ovid's *Metamorphoses* followed the conventions and devices of oral communication in ancient epic see Wheeler (1999), esp. pp. 48-60.

[15] On Greek novels see Núñez (2006) and the studies edited by Rimell (2007). On the possibility that Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* was performed orally, see May (2007) with further references, Keulen (2007b) and Núñez (this volume). On public recitations of Ovid see Wheeler (1999) 36-37, and below, n. 65.

[16] The phenomenon has also been observed in decrees starting from the 4th century B.C.: Chaniotis (2010).

[17] For Diogenes see Ruiz-Montero (*forthcoming*).

[18] Del Corso [(2005) 63-94] is fundamental for our topic; esp. p. 69.

and repetitions at all linguistic levels.[19] This conscious union of the formal functions and methods of poetry and prose continued to be used in subsequent periods and should be taken note of when studying the oral performances of the Imperial period.

On the other hand, although from the 5th century B.C. there were already archives in Athens, oral transmission continued alongside the existence of written texts.[20] This was true both in public speaking and in oral discourse concerning the narration of historical events. Herodotus begins his work with a reference to his *historías apódeixis,* an expression meaning "oral performance of his 'research' either recited from memory (though not necessarily repeated word for word), or read from a written text".[21] This double practice can be also observed in the different types of informants – of exceptional memory – and in the Egyptian sources quoted by Herodotus (2.77, 100, 125). Furthermore, some common points have been detected between Herodotus and Xenophon in terms of the way they both blend authentic storytelling with an already 'mimetic' oral presentation of the scene.[22] Traditions also existed of public readings of a speech by Democritus of Abdera.[23] Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Isoc*. 2 and 13) admits that the speeches of Isocrates, due to their style, are more suited to reading than to the representation or declamation observed in Demosthenes (*Dem*.

---

[19] Plato superbly imitates the style in Agathon's speech in *Symp.*194e4-197e8.

[20] See Thomas (1992); Woolf (2013) 13; Martínez and Senseney (2013) 407. On Pisistratus' library, alleged by some ancient sources to have been the first one in Athens, see Woolf (2013) 10 ('a myth'); Jacob (2013) 78-80; Handis (2013) 368. Perilli [(2007) esp. 50-51] underlined the importance of archives in sanctuaries as repositories of certain books on philosophy, technical sciences and medicine, and the role of these sanctuaries for the transmission of knowledge and teaching. In the same vein, focusing on written documents in Classical and later periods, De Martino [(2013) 112, n. 6] is very useful for sources on *paideia* and readers (not only women). I thank Antonio Stramaglia for calling my attention to this article.

[21] Evans (1991) 94; see also pp. 98-111 on oral and written Herodotus' sources; Asheri, Lloyd and Corcella (2007) 8: "exposition of the enquiries"; 72-73: "publication (oral?)" or "performance". The Spanish lexicon *Diccionario Griego Español* II, quotes *IC* 3.4.9.93 (Itanos, 2nd century B.C.): (ποιη)τῶν καὶ ἱστοριογράφων ἀποδείξεις. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Dem.* 22.26) refers to the *hypokrisis* of Demosthenes using the verb *apodeiknumi.* See Del Corso [(2005) 14] for *apodeixis* as a synonym of *epideixis*: also below, n. 33. On Herodotus and oral performance see also Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) 176, quoting Lucian *Herodotus or Aëtion* 1-3; 177, n. 6, referring to Dio Chrys. 37.7.

[22] Beard (1991) 161. Gray (1989) thinks of private readings aloud of Xenophon's works and concludes that his *Hellenica* was meant for learned circles that were, however, less demanding than Socratic ones; see also Kelly (1996).

[23] See the information provided by Del Corso (2005) 68-70.

22.6). Moreover, Isocrates himself quotes in his *Philippos* (5.25-26) that there are speeches 'which are spoken' (*legomenoi*)*,* and these are real, and then there are other fictitious 'which are read' *(anagignoskomenoi)*. Isocrates distinguishes between different modes of reading. The *Philippos* constitutes an early testimony of the spread of the practice of 'recited reading' in the Greek world, which is so well documented in late Republican and Imperial Rome. In *Panath*. 12.246 Isocrates also makes a distinction between 'casual' readers (τοῖς μὲν ῥαθύμως ἀναγιγνώσκουσιν) and 'accurate' readers (τοῖς δ' ἀκριβῶς διεξιοῦσιν), who are his target audience (136). In *Antid.* 15.136, he opposes public rhetors and speakers who excel at private gatherings, *idioi syllogoi*.[24] Plutarch (*Mor.* 840D) refers to the fact that Aeschines read his *Against Ctesiphon* publicly in Rhodes long after the trial itself was held. Plutarch again called this a declamatory reading (*anegno ... epideiknumenos*)*.*[25]

In philosophical tradition, the practice of reading is also accepted as a mimesis of an oral context, and Xenophon (*Memor*. 1.6.14) and Plato refer to private readings and discussions of both poetry and prose in small groups.[26] Thus, oral teaching coexisted with teaching in writing. This 'dynamic tension' between orality and literacy referred to by Havelock lasted throughout Antiquity.[27]

The reading of dramatic works seems to have already existed in the 4th century B.C. Aristotle (*Rhet*. 1413b12-14), when dealing with the types of *lexis* ('style') mentions among the *anagnostikoi* Chaeremon and Licymnius as poets suitable to be read.[28] In the same vein Demetrius (*De elocut.* 193),

---

[24] Del Corso (2005) 86-87, 89; Beard (1991) 140; Gagarin (1996).

[25] Del Corso [(2005) 65, n. 10] argues that this reading would be impossible without the help of a book. Cicero (*Brut.* 191): Antimachus of Colophon read (*legeret*) his *Thebaid convocatis auditoribus,* Plato among them; Diod. Sic. 15.6: Dionysius the Elder of Syracuse read verses to his guests, among them Philoxenus: see Pennacini (1989). On post-delivery publication of forensic oratory see Hubbard (2008): "speeches as orators' attempts … not of what they actually said ... but rather what they would like to be remembered as saying" (*Introd.* 3). See Slater (2008) on Augustus' *Res Gestae,* a work "originally designed to induce repeated re-performance of a first-person narrative…"

[26] Puchner (2010) stressed Plato's relationship with dramatical genres. On the performance of Plato's dialogues see below, nn. 90, 91.

[27] Havelock cited by Cambron-Goulet (2012) 212-216.

[28] βαστάζονται δὲ οἱ ἀναγνωστικοί, οἷον Χαιρήμων (ἀκριβὴς γὰρ ὥσπερ λογογράφος), καὶ Λικύμνιος τῶν διθυραμβοποιῶν. Del Corso (2005) 108, n. 44. It has already been observed that Aristotle (*Po.* 1450b18-19) also favoured this type of performance where *mythos* is more significant than *opsis*: see Rossi (1993) 104; Charalabopoulos (2012) 135, n. 57, and the interesting discussion by Petrides (2014) 102-110.

in referring to the use of conjunctions states that because of the way Menander uses them, his work "is staged", whereas Philemon (361-262 B.C.) "is read".[29] Accordingly, what Apuleius reports (*Flor.* 16.6-10) that Philemon interrupted his *recitatio* at the theatre because of the rain, should not necessarily be taken as an anachronism.[30]

Inscriptions from Delos and Delphi dating from the third to the 1st century B.C. attest to almost daily public *akroaseis* ('recitations') and *anagnoseis* ('readings') and not always in the context of poetic *agones*. In other inscriptions *deixeis* are used as synonyms for *akroaseis* and *anagnoseis*, probably poetic in nature; *akroaseis*, however, are also attested in Delphi in relation to prose writers in general, historians, philosophers, rhetoricians and grammarians, and in Haliartus in relation to physicians.[31] Among other performances, Chaniotis cites itinerant historians (ἱστοριογράφοι) of ancient or contemporary events attested in honorific decrees, among which a πολεμογράφος αὐδά, that is, "the written accounts of war", besides narrations of miracles, foundational legends, local myths and stories about the sanctuary and the city.[32]

There are also testimonies regarding *proekdoseis* at the Peripatetic school and Epicurus' public readings, *epideixeis* and the possible *deixeis* of Theophrastus, who refers to two types of readings, the *panegyreis*, which were read at solemn official celebrations, and those addressed to a restricted *synedrion*, in which 'corrections' of a text, *epanorthoseis*,[33] were possible, and whose roots, according to Diogenes Laertius (3.35-37), go back to the

---

[29] Μένανδρον ὑποκρίνονται, λελυμένον ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις, Φιλήμονα δὲ ἀναγινώσκουσιν: see *Rh.*1413b19-32 on the use of asyndeton. This opinion is accepted by Chiron, the French editor of Demetrius (1993) 122, n. 258.

[30] As Hunink (2001a) presupposes in his commentary *ad loc.* Apuleius says that Philemon *fabulas ... in scaenam dictavit* (*Flor.* 16.6), and insists on his reading: *recitabat partem fabulae ... relicum tamen ... deincipiti die perlecturum* (*Flor.* 16.10-11). Both Philemon and Menander were praised by Quint. 10.1.71-72. May [(2006) 59-63] argues that Apuleius is here a witness of contemporary discussions on comedy, which seems more likely.

[31] See Del Corso (2005) 75-76. Pennacini [(1989) 254] has a number of references to sources on *recitationes* in Rome in the 3rd and 2nd century B.C. regarding Livius Andronicus and Ennius (*praelegebant*).

[32] See Chaniotis [(2009a) 259-262] with a very useful terminological study. For the special meaning of some words in inscriptions see below Ruiz-Montero (ch. 5, n.78). Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) documents that reading historical works in public was a continuous practice and that under Roman rule the number of decrees issued in honour of the travelling historians declined, although it increased again in the times of the Antonines, in the context of the Second Sophistic (p. 181).

[33] Del Corso (2005) 76-83. Theophrastus is quoted by Diogenes Laertius 5.37.

Socratic schools and to orators, such as Isocrates, a matter to which we have already referred. Vitruvius describes intense activity at the Museum in Alexandria at an annual festival in honour of the Muses.[34]

On the other hand, the presence of public *anagnostai* is well documented in inscriptions from Smyrna, Cos and Priene from the second and first century B.C. Furthermore, we learn of the existence in other cities of public clerks, of an apparently low social status, corresponding to that of *grammateus*.[35] It is also worth remembering that Alexander was called 'lover of reading' (φιλαναγνώστης), and that he was accompanied by readers and historians, who would read their own works to him. This laid down a precedent for the literary-minded courts of Alexander's successors, where there were still philosophers and poets. Here we cannot go into depth in the matter, but one can at least keep in mind the public readings or *proekdoseis* of the Alexandrian poets.[36]

Although reading aloud was the dominant form of reading in the ancient world, silent reading is also attested from the 5th century B.C.[37] and that it began to gain ground in the 3rd century B.C., to become the prevailing mode of reading from the 2nd century A.D. This meant the triumph of the 'culture of the book', whose dissemination is further proven by the frequency with which books appear in iconography, and which is one of the strongest signs of the transformation in cultural practices from the Classical age onwards, in both the public and private spheres.[38] Nevertheless, reading in groups did not disappear, and, as W.A. Johnson observes concerning Aulus Gellius' circle of learned readers, this kind of reading is more common.[39]

Parker[40] stresses the importance of silent reading, which occurred even in the presence of other people. Groups of readers and scholars did include women, although they were in a minority. Women also figure in the

---

[34] Del Corso (2005) 71, nn. 30, 31. On p. 72 he comments *ID* 1506 on literary *akroaseis* by a young man in *ekklesiasterion* and in theatre: these are public readings of eulogistic hymns he composed, labelled *anagnóseis.* Cf. above, n.21.

[35] Del Corso (2005) 87-93. In Priene public and private *grammateis* are mentioned along with an *antigrapheus*: p. 88, n. 97.

[36] Plutarch *Alex.* 8.2; *Mor*. 328D. Athenaeus (*Deipn.* 537d) mentions that after the performance of actors at a banquet, Alexander himself performed *apomnemoneusas* an episode of Euripides' *Andromeda*. More data in Del Corso (2005) 90-91.

[37] Aristophanes (*Ran.* 52-54) is usually cited as the first testimony to silent reading, but see the commentary by Dover (1993). On silent reading see W. A. Johnson (2000).

[38] Del Corso (2005) 99-113.

[39] W.A. Johnson (2009) 323.

[40] Parker (2009) 195-198. See also Ach. Tat. 1.6.6.

iconography and in Hellenistic epitaphs; however, their presence in literature and culture in general grew later.[41]

The *akroaseis* were held in rooms called *akroaterion, akousterion, odeion, deikterion,* or in the *gymnasia*, the *bouleuterion* or the *ekklesiasterion*.[42] 'Audible readings' were also performed during the *deipnon,* the main meal, and during the *symposion*.[43] As we shall see, it was a common and characteristic practice among the elite in the Imperial period, and reading was performed during or after these events.

3. *The Imperial Age*

The practice of public reading reached its peak in the Imperial era and was one of the main characteristics of the literary culture of the period, that is, the culture of the Second Sophistic. At Rome, where the culture was "very

---

[41] See Del Corso [(2005) 110, n. 50] for an instance of a female teacher (such cases are more frequently attested during the Empire). Diogenes Laertius (3.46) refers to two female disciples of Plato, and Epictetus to the female audience interested in the study of his *Republic*. Moreover, the fact that in the novels of Chariton and Achilles Tatius the heroines frequently appear reading letters, a young girl reading a book, apparently in silence, can be seen in Lucian (*Im.* 9.2). The culture of Charicleia is also emphasised in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica* (2.33.5). Isidora, Antonius Diogenes' sister, to whom he dedicates his novel, is also a *philomathes* (Phot. *Bibl.* 166.111a24) but the level of the cultural background and the narrative complexity of his work prevent us from considering this datum as a proof of a *mass* of women reading novels. The level of literacy in the Empire is a complex and much discussed topic, but the figures provided by Harris [(1989) 259] on literate individuals in Rome, "in the tens of thousands" (400.000 in the 2nd century, 10% educated readers, ca. 40.000 or more readers) do not seem to be very far from reality and are accepted by Dix and Houston [(2006) 709], although the 'transversal reading' proposed by Cavallo (1989), which is more optimistic, cannot be ruled out entirely. See also Thomas (1992) 150-157. Valette-Cagnat [(1997) 17-19] accepts Harris' figures too, but saves us from simplistic conclusions; nor Zelnick-Abramovitz [(2014) 193, n. 54] is optimistic.

[42] Del Corso (2005) 66. See above, n. 33 for the *deikterion* in relation to Theophrastus.

[43] Del Corso (2005) 114-125. Particularly interesting among the data he cites are certain symposium anthologies found in Elephantine and Tebtunis papyri, aimed at an Egyptian middle or upper middle class audience, which include 'paraliterary' poetry and texts that are of a licentious nature; he links them to literary texts like Theocr. 14 and *AP* 5.138 (pp. 117-121).

bookish" (Salles, p. 96),[44] the practice of public reading was widespread. The book was at the epicentre of the culture of this age, an age in which literacy peaked, in whatever way we define this. Orality, however, and the book were not opposed, since "oral performance is a *sine qua non* of self-representation in this period", based on the *paideia* (p. 98). Furthermore, rhetorical performance was a fundamental aspect of social life. The 'orality' of the Second Sophistic was clearly based on 'literacy'. "Literacy does not in any way preclude oral performance, but *grounds* it ... Oratory's oral performance is fully informed by reading and writing" (p. 98). Literary culture and orality were the two sides of the same coin during this period. This phenomenon has been particularly studied in relation to Latin literature, where *declamatio* and *recitatio* were common and essential practices.[45] We will therefore include Roman data in our discussion. However, from what we have seen so far and what we shall see, these practices also characterised the Greek literary culture of the Empire.

3.1 *Public Performances*

The performative character of the Greek culture under the Empire was not a new phenomenon, as we have seen, but its manifestations were much more varied and extensive than before.[46] Inscriptions document several types of contests, *agones*, sporting, musical, and literary, for poetry and for prose.[47] Many such contests are attested throughout the cities of the Empire, but the

---

[44] Salles [(1992) 184] mentions "la bibliomanie effrénée des Romains". Goldhill (2009) underlines the interest in "anecdotal form" of the Second Sophistic, and defines "anecdote" as "the muthos of literate culture ... where the literate and the oral meet" (p. 111). See Johnson [(2010) 110-114] on the "centrality of literary texts" for the educated Roman society of the 2nd century A.D.

[45] The subject is very broad; for its origins, development and main traits see Quinn (1982); Pennacini (1989); Fedeli (1989); Salles (1992); Valette-Cagnat (1997); Parker (2009); W.A. Johnson (2009). See, however, the reservations of Parker (2009), who reacts against the idea that Roman poets wrote primarily for performance. Although his study is focused on poetry, he admits that prose does not differ from it (p. 215, n. 121). Parker is right in considering that one cannot speak of Imperial Roman society as an 'oral society' comparable to ancient Greece: see above, n. 9. Nevertheless, as we wrote earlier, 'oral society' should be seen as complementary to the 'textual society', both spheres being interdependent. Yet Parker's data are highly valuable for our discussion here.

[46] Already Plato (*Tim.* 21b) mentions traditional contests with prizes for recitation (*rhapsodias)* for young people, referring to Solon's poetry.

[47] See Wörrle (1988); Roueché (1993); Manieri (2009); Petrovic (2009); Aneziri (2009); Chaniotis (2009a) and this volume; Nervegna (2013) 80-118.

demand for local peculiarities is another trait of the age.[48] The presence of *θεάματα καὶ ἀκροάματα /ἀκούσματα,* spectacles and hearing performances, was typical in these contests which included among their prose oral performances *encomia* and historical and mythical narratives.[49] There are further references to *poiemata*, a poet of a New Tragedy, an actor in a New Tragedy, a poet of a New Comedy, an actor in a New Comedy, comic performers (*comoedoi*), tragic performers (*tragoedoi*), a satyr-playwright, a *rhapsode,* a tragic chorus, and *homeristai.*[50] The mention in inscriptions of dramatic performances of mimes and pantomimes, which enjoyed the greatest success, is particularly interesting.[51] Pantomimes, *biologoi,* and *homeristai* are attested in papyri and inscriptions, and these performers acted at private symposia too.[52]

Although the literary genres alluded to in inscriptions[53] cannot always be clearly identified, these performances, given their public and official

---

[48] See below, n. 121 for coins.

[49] The expression *θεάματα καὶ ἀκροάματα* is already found at Xenophon (*Symp.* 2.1); and Lucian (*De salt.* 68). For a Roman testimony see Cicero (*Arch.* 20). See the data first provided by inscriptions of Aphrodisias in Roueché [(1993) 1-30; esp. pp. 15-21] for *ἀρχαιολόγοι*, probably mime actors specialising in old stories. Rutherford [(2013) 271] dealing with the pan-hellenic festival in honour of Artemis Leucopriene (207 B.C.) at Magnesia on the Meander, mentions the possibility that *theoroi* carried with them a small library and even that they performed the poetic texts for the benefit of their audience.

[50] See Chaniotis and Bowie in this volume.

[51] Moreover Roueché (1993) 15-30; on pantomime see Hall and Wyles (2008) with an anthology of sources in an appendix (pp. 379-419) and a comprehensive bibliography. The following studies are also indispensable: Lada-Richards (2007); Webb (2008); the collective volume edited by Easterling and Hall (2002). Lucian's treatise *De saltatione* is the most important ancient document on the subject. For collective studies on Imperial mime see Beacham (1991); Csapo and Slater (1994); Webb (2013). See also below n. 81.

[52] Nervegna (2013) 187, n. 190: festival in honour of Cronos; n. 193: on *ethologoi* ("caricaturists"). On inscriptions about *homeristai* see Merkelbach and Stauber (vol. 2, 2001) 323-324. On p. 242 they list a total of ten actors and mimes.

[53] An inscription from Cos published by Bosnakis (2004) and dated to the 1st century A.D is interesting, since it refers to a *ποιήτρια κω*[*μωδίας*] *ἀρχαίας* who has won several public games, and who may be a writer of comedy, although we cannot know for certain (see Bowie in this volume, p. 75, n. 25). If she is indeed the author, she would be the only known author of this dramatic genre. Bosnakis notes that in the inscriptions the technical expression *ἀρχαία κωμῳδία* does not appear to designate Aristophanic comedy, but that *παλαιὰ κωμῳδία* refers to both the 'Old' and the 'New'. Rutherford [(2009) 243] refers to this poetess along with other late poetesses

nature, were an important way of orally circulating texts and, to a significant extent, of transmitting literary heritage, as we shall see. The dramatic performances were often reworkings of pieces from Classical times, although we must not exclude original works, and there was no shortage of contemporary genres, as can be seen from the treatment of certain novels that were reworked and adapted for mimes and pantomimes. Lucian (*De salt.* 54; *Pseudol.* 25) mentions the names of the protagonists of the novels *Ninus* and *Metiochus and Parthenope*, Aesop is a mime character, and the props of a mime called *Leucippe* are preserved. This very important fact clearly indicates that the novel was part of the 'official' culture of the time.[54] In turn, novels occasionally alluded to these dramatic spectacles: Achilles Tatius introduces theatrical episodes (3.15-22) citing Homerists in his plot (3.20.4), Longus refers to a mimic dance (2.23), and the *Life of Aesop* (*rec.*

---

and sees her as a "poetess probably specialising in ancient comedy". De Martino [(2011) 166-167] also considers the possibility that she is an 'adattatrice', and adds: "naturalmente non dobbiamo pensare ad una collega di Aristofane o Menandro, ma più semplicemente ad un' autrice di canovacci di mimo, ed 'arcaica' potrebbe avere un valore generico, non tecnico". Pliny (*Ep.* 6.21) does not mention any works written by women, but says that Vergilius Romanus had written a comedy in the 'Old' style, and, before this, other comedies in imitation of Menander: cf. Csapo and Slater (1994) 37-38; May (2006) 14; Nervegna (2013) 100-117. See Bowie [(2007) 50, n.1] on the opposition of Aelius Aristides to the introduction of an 'Old' type of comedy in the *Dionysia* of Smyrna, and this volume, n. 25. In Ruiz-Montero (2013) types of comedies are discussed in connection with Antonius Diogenes, who calls himself an author of a κωμῳδία παλαιά. According to Bosnakis [(2004) 102], an inscription from Aphrodisias listing prizes in a talent contest *(CIG nº 2759)* mentions a καινὴ κωμῳδία, a *"nova fabula, non iterata",* compared to a ἀρχαία κωμῳδία, which is translated as *repetita fabula*, but "non antiqua, qualis est Aristophanea". In the same inscription there is a καινὴ τραγῳδία, which should be similarly interpreted. The ἀρχαία in this inscription can thus encompass three types of comedy. The inscription is published in Roueché (1993), 173-174, nº 53. See also the discussion by Nervegna (2013) 100-117. When dealing with the topic of new versions of plays, on p. 97 she thinks that the diaskeuaí in D. Chrys. 32.94 are new versions of contemporary comedies, works presented initially as "new plays and later revised to be performed again as new plays".

[54] On the connections between novels and mime and pantomime: Mignogna (1996) and (1997); Andreassi (2001) and (2002). For a comparison between Lucian's *On Dance* and the Greek novels see Ruiz-Montero (2014a). The greater part of the pantomime contents mentioned by Lucian belong to traditional mythology. As for mimes, they derive mainly from comedy and Euripidean tragedy.

G 23) alludes to the movements of the hands in pantomime.[55] Although no pantomime libretto has been preserved, they must have existed, albeit perhaps written for each performance. Moreover, given the contents of pantomimes and the technical skills required, the authors of such scripts must have been of a certain educational level, as were the audience, who recognised the stories told through dance. This is a further proof of the oral circulation of these contents and of the existence of a 'gestural grammar' with which the audience was also well acquainted.[56]

Parker rejects the idea of an 'oral circulation' of literature, on the grounds that a text is known to have been performed later for others. He gives two examples in which the original texts have been altered and concludes that they are presented, but not circulated orally. Dio's works, however, provide some useful information: he mentions that some of his speeches will be delivered again in the future before other audiences (11.4-6; cf. 57.11); that he is repeating a written speech (30.6-8); and that his speeches are disseminated and changed (42.4-5). These changes in texts are proof enough of their oral circulation, although they do not preclude the existence of a previous written text, or the possibility that they were written down after a performance, no matter what the genre involved was: Libanius (*Or.* 1.113) informs us that ten copyists (*bibliographoi*) wrote down his speech, so that it could reach the main cities of the Empire, and that one of the scribes was bribed to alter the text. Likewise, some of Lucian´s observations (*How should one write history* 5, 7, 10, 51) seem to support the view that oral performance of historiographical works was still considered the best way of dissemination and that historians achieved praise and honour through their readings.[57] In the 4th century A.D., Libanius is very proud still of the fact that the prologues to his speeches are sung everywhere and that his audience is able to memorise his speeches after hearing them only once (*Or.* 1.55). He even states that his students could reconstruct their teacher´s entire speech from the small passages each one

---

[55] On mime at rhetorical school see Webb (2008) 96 ff. Parker [(2009) 213-214] states that we read nothing about mimes because it was "a score for public or private performance" [in Kenney's words (1982) 12], except for literary mimes.

[56] The influence of pantomime on high literature has been described by Zanobi (2014) for Senecan theatre, and by May (2006) and Kirichenko (2010) for Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*.

[57] These are the conclusions of Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) 183; see p. 184 for historiography as a performative genre, no less than poetry or drama, and her observations on the process of writing down oral local traditions, which are then broadcast again in oral presentations.

of them could remember (*Or.* 3.17). Parker is right, however, when he asserts that a public reading does not indicate a lack of private reading.[58]

We will not spend long here on the nature of the oral performance typical of the orators of the Second Sophistic, whether or not such performances involved previously prepared speeches or were simply improvised. In any case improvisation presupposes many previous readings.[59] The success enjoyed by *recitatio* or 'public reading' at Rome is well-known, as was the success of another type of performance, the *declamatio.*[60] Recitation, however, was omnipresent and was regarded as a kind of entertainment that competed with other forms to which we have previously referred, as they often shared certain performance venues, such as the theatre.[61] Valette-Cagnat even considers it likely that certain *recitationes* in Rome were 'dubbed' by a pantomime to facilitate comprehension, similar to how the songs of Nero were 'mimed' by a *hypocrita.*[62]

In Petronius' *Satyrica* the poet Eumolpus recites (*recitantem*) the verses that he had previously probably invented and composed, in – among other places – a theatre (90.5) and in baths (91.3). Interestingly, besides epic

---

[58] See Parker [(2009) 195-198] with many references; he does not believe that a book could reach *ultimos Britannos* by means of wandering poets, a mime adaptation, or other people who could memorise a "distant *recitatio*", but only "in the form of a written text" (pp. 214-215). Zelnick-Abramowitz [(2014) 193] also admits that the performance of historical works was not intended as a substitute for written texts.

[59] Theon [*Prog. praef.* 60, Spengel; also ch. 13-14 (Kennedy)] underlines the importance of *anagnosis* and *akroasis* (cf. Cic. *Arch.* 18: *dicere ex tempore*): Kennedy (2003). See also Bowie and Mestre in this volume.

[60] *declamatio* and r*ecitatio* constitute a very broad subject, but for their origins, development and main features, see Funaioli (1914); Quinn (1982) 168-175; Pennacini (1989); Fedeli (1989); Salles (1992); Valette-Cagnat (1997); Parker (2009); White (2009); W. A. Johnson (2009).

[61] See the data in Korenjak (2000) 36, 41-65. Valette-Cagnat [(1997) 163-164] links the *recitatio* with Pliny's dictating to his secretary of what he had previously prepared in his head (*Ep.* 9.36.7), a procedure that Valette-Cagnat calls 'oral writing'. *Dictatio* would be followed by *scriptum, recitatio,* and *rescriptum, novum*, that is, the work already finished and presented to readers. She labels the phenomenon 'littérature de la voix' in Rome (167), with osmosis between the written and the spoken word.

[62] Valette-Cagnat (1997) 119. On pp. 160-161 she distinguishes between *recitatio,* which is serious, and the Greek *akroama*, whose function was merely the entertainment of dinner guests, although she states that both categories were not strictly maintained, according to Roman satirist's complaints. When dealing with the performance of poetry, Parker [(2009) 203-206] also mentions Martial's insistent refusal to perform at banquets.