I

Evidence, definitions, origins

Graecus rhetor, quod genus stultorum amabilissimum est.
'A Greek rhetor, the nicest kind of fool.'

Seneca

1

Pretending to be someone else, and composing imaginary speeches in character, is an essential part of most literary activity. It is important not only in drama, epic and fiction, but also, at least in ancient times, in lyric poetry, history and philosophy. But it also has an educational function. Where public speech is important (as in the Greco-Roman world), it is important to train people in its skills. What better way than by inventing situations and giving one's pupils parts to play? And, since what is taught in school has at least some impact on what people do elsewhere, the practice, like other rhetorical practices, may be expected to have an influence on literature; and it is for this reason that scholars other than specialist students of rhetoric have found it of interest.

In Latin literature, therefore, this sort of exercise, under the name of *declamatio*, has been much studied; indeed, it has a recognized place in the histories of literature.[1] It is received wisdom that, somewhere in the second half of the first century B.C., it suddenly became very popular and influential. The main evidence for this is the work of the elder Seneca,[2] a collection of excerpts from the *Controversiae* (imaginary court cases) and

[1] Bonner (1949) ch. 8; D. W. T. C. Vessey in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (1982) II.499; Winterbottom (1980) 59–61.

[2] The most convenient and informative edition is Winterbottom (1974). The two most recent monographs (Sussman 1978, Fairweather 1981) complement each other.

Suasoriae (imaginary deliberative speeches) which he had heard from the famous declaimers of his youth and finally wrote down for his sons in his old age. Seneca is a beguiling author. His gossipy charms give a seductive introduction to this corner of the literary world. Here are portrayed many enthusiasts, some eccentrics, and some who were figures of significance in the literary life of the time: notably, of course, the young Ovid, in whose poetry rhetorical techniques are peculiarly obvious and all-pervading.[3]

It is, I think, Seneca, particularly in the more 'literary' parts of his work, who is mainly responsible for the view that 'declamation' had a powerful influence on poetic practice and on other forms of literature. There is no doubt that this is true enough of certain poets, Ovid and Juvenal in particular, but also Lucan. These all display evident signs of declamatory experience, and frequently write with precisely the type of sharp wit that one associates with declamation. But the way in which this influence is usually described is misleading. Critics talk of figures, *loci communes*, methods of transition and features of style; thus J. de Decker's famous *Iuvenalis Declamans*[4] sees the contribution of the declaimers to Juvenal as lying in these, and in the example they set of a loose form of composition, admitting every kind of rhetorically attractive purple patch. Now Seneca does give this impression. His concentration is on detail rather than organization, on *sententiae* and *colores* rather than on planning and argument. But the essence of the exercise is not here at all. What is really specific to declamation, rather than to other forms of rhetorical exercise, is its firm organization. What the young men learned at this stage in their education was how to shape the effective elements of a case into a planned whole, in which descriptions and *loci communes* did indeed have a place, but a determinate one which they were not supposed to exceed.[5] So Seneca has, I think,

[3] For Ovid, see esp. *Contr.* 2.2.8–12. Ovid was friendly with Seneca's close friend Junius Gallio (*Suas.* 3.7). That he was heavily influenced by rhetorical teaching is obvious and well known (e.g. Bonner [1949] 149). In reverse, Seneca's interest in poetry should be noted: see esp. *Suas.* 1.19, 6.24, where he cites poetical passages as examples of the treatment of a set theme.

[4] *Iuvenalis Declamans* dates from 1913, but lies behind much more recent work.

[5] Cf ps.-Dionysius, *Ars rhetorica* 10 (372 U–R): ἐνίοις κἀκεῖνο ἁμάρτημα, αἱ καλούμεναι ἐκφράσεις, πολλαχοῦ τὸ χειμῶνα γράφειν καὶ λοιμοὺς καὶ λιμοὺς καὶ

fathered an error: the rhetorical features we find in the poets are not, as a rule, due specifically to declamatory experience, but to rhetorical training in general. Whether Seneca knew better may be debated. A certain mystery surrounds his apparent ignorance of the main stream of Greek rhetorical teaching. But it is of course perfectly possible that he took the general principles of the exercise for granted, and omits the fundamental theory of 'types of issue' (*staseis*) not out of ignorance, but because he chose to concentrate rather on the sort of detail which he felt would be attractive and memorable.

These doubts concerning Seneca encourage investigation of the Greek tradition itself. Everything about the exercises makes it clear that they were a Greek invention, dating back well before Seneca's time. They continued well into the Byzantine era. Most of our Greek evidence is indeed much later than Seneca; but the coincidences between it and the Roman evidence can only be due to a common source. Greeks did not learn from Romans – least of all in rhetoric.

2

The surviving Greek evidence is in fact very extensive, and ranges over many centuries. It is, however, a small fraction of what once existed. On certain centres and periods, we are fairly well-informed (Athens and the Ionian cities in the second century of our era, Antioch in the fourth, Gaza in the sixth) but it was not only in the places we know, but throughout the Greco-Roman world that this art of declamation flourished, both dominating education (moral as well as rhetorical) and playing a large part in the development of literature. We have, on the one hand, finished speeches, meant to endure; on the other, instructions and summaries by teachers in the schools.

(i) To the former category belong a certain number of papyri,

παρατάξεις καὶ ἀριστείας . . . τοῦτο δὲ τὸ πάθημα ἀνθρώπων ἀγνοούντων ὅτι καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαίροις τῶν ἀγώνων ἔστι φαντασίας κίνησις ἱκανὴ καὶ οὐ δεῖ ἔξωθεν λόγοις φαντασίας ἐπεισκυκλεῖσθαι. ('Some suffer also from the fault of what are called 'descriptions', i.e. frequent depiction of storm, pestilences, famines, battles and heroic actions . . . This is the error of people who do not see that there is sufficient excitement of the imagination in the essential points of the dispute, and there is no need for imaginative visualizations to be wheeled in to the speech from outside.')

some Hellenistic in date, which testify to the composition of *suasoriae* and historical *controversiae* from quite an early period: *P. Hibeh* 15 (third century B.C.) advocates action against Alexander,[6] *P. Berol.* 9781 (same period) contains a speech meant to form part of the Leptines case known from Demosthenes.[7] But then there comes a long gap. Our next group of actual texts is from the Second Sophistic. There are three *suasoriae* – one with a definite historical setting, two vague exhortations to battle – attributed to Lesbonax of Mytilene;[8] there are the declamations of the famous sophist Polemon of Laodicea in which the fathers of two heroes of Marathon dispute the honour of delivering the funeral oration over the fallen; and there is at any rate one piece, of a fairly sensational kind, by Adrian of Tyre.[9] There are also some light pieces by Lucian, notably the speeches for and against the acceptance of Phalaris' bull at Delphi; and the entertaining 'Court of the Vowels' in which Sigma charges Tau with robbing him of all words spelt with double *tau*.[10] Here grammar and rhetoric join forces for the schoolboy's delectation. But these are small things compared with the elaborate historical declamations of Aristides. Some call these 'Lesereden', as though they were to be read and not delivered; and indeed the density of the thought suggests this.[11] The most famous set is the 'Leuctrian'

[6] *P. Hibeh* 15 is published also in Jacoby, *FGrHist* 105A6, though it is clearly a rhetorical exercise and not part of a history. There are many later papyri of declamations: see Jander (1913), R. A. Pack, *The Greek and Latin Literary Texts from Graeco-Roman Egypt*, ed. 2 (1965), nos. 2495–2559, and esp. *P. Yale* 1729 (= *Yale Papyri* II no. 105, ed. S. H. Stephens), an important historical declamation dated to the first century A.D.

[7] See below, ch. 6, n. 5.

[8] Ed. F. Kiehr (1907); see Reardon (1971) 106. Philostratus' account of Polemon is in *Lives of the Sophists* (= *VS*) 530ff (= 106ff Wright).

[9] Adrian: Philostratus, *VS* 585ff (= 222ff Wright). Text of declamations in Hinck's Polemon, also in *RG* 1.526ff. The only genuine piece is fr. 1, about a suspected woman poisoner and another woman who promises to burn her and is therefore herself suspected of poisoning. Other pieces assigned to Adrian come from Iamblichus' *Babyloniaca*, a romance (ed. E. Habrich [1960] fr. 1.35.101).

[10] On Lucian's *Phalaris* see B. Keil, *Hermes* XLVIII (1913) 494ff; J. Bompaire (1958) 265ff.

[11] On Aristides' speeches as *Lesereden*, see W. Morel, *RE* XV.1.497. Aristides himself (*Or.* 50.26) reports a divine command given him 'to weave speech with bare thought as with words', and uses the term πολύνοια of this. It is natural

speeches, in which advocates of support for Thebes oppose supporters of Sparta and of neutrality in the Athens of 370 B.C. Notable also are the 'Sicilian' speeches, based on the events of 415–413, and the 'Embassy to Achilles', in which the speaker seeks to turn Achilles' anger against the Trojans and not against his own people.[12] Aristides became a classic, and later rhetors often answered and developed his themes. Among them was Libanius of Antioch, the greatest orator and teacher of the fourth century, in whose extant works are no less than fifty-one declamations, only a handful of them not genuine.[13] Some of these are historical (the 'Apology of Socrates' is the most elaborate[14]), some serious *plasmata* – fictitious cases – and some frankly comic; these last, in which morose old men and misers parade their bizarre characteristics in absurd situations, are the most attractive of the collection, and have had a certain influence on modern literature; Ben Jonson's Morose in *The Silent Woman* seems to come from *Declamation* 26. Whether it is because of this frivolity, or because of some more arcane lack of technique, Libanius had a poor reputation with some of his successors: Eunapius thought him 'feeble' and ignorant of what every schoolboy knows.[15] His contemporary Himerius, less urbane and Attic in style, but more forceful and grandiose, is known to us largely from the excerpts in Photius, though a few extracts have survived independently.[16] He taught at Athens, and had influential pupils; moreover, he lays claim to some family connection with Plutarch, almost three centuries before him. Finally, a pleasing surprise. Choricius of Gaza, who lived in the

to connect this with his deliberately packed thought, reminiscent often of Thucydides' speeches.

[12] Boulanger (1923) ch. 5, esp. 157ff; G. A. Kennedy in Bowersock (1974) 20ff; Reardon (1971) 99ff. The Sicilian speeches have been well edited by Pernot (1981); for the 'Embassy of Achilles' see Kindstrand (1973) 215ff. Aristides was much studied by the later declaimers: see (e.g.) *RG* VIII.188, 346 (Sopatros).

[13] The *Declamations* are in vols. V–VII of Foerster's Libanius. See now Kennedy (1983) 150ff.

[14] See Markowski (1910).

[15] Eunapius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, 496.

[16] Wernsdorf's commentary (1790) still usefully supplements the modern edition by A. Colonna (1951). Kennedy (1983) 141ff concentrates on the epideictic speeches.

sixth century, may well be judged the best of these writers.[17] He is a great stylistic virtuoso, able to write elegant and classical Attic with full observance of the accentual clausulae of his own day. Furthermore, he delights and instructs not only by his actual speeches but by the elegant prefaces in which he lays bare the secrets of his art.[18]

(ii) Choricius' work is both educational and literary, evidence perhaps of how hard it is to separate the two. Much of our knowledge of school practice, however, comes from technical treatises which do no more than allude to or briefly narrate the problems which the pupil is set. Most of these treatises are concerned with *staseis*, that is to say 'types of issue'. Once again, the Hellenistic material is mostly lost: Hermagoras of Temnos, the most important early authority, is known only from allusions in later texts.[19] *Ad Herennium* and Cicero's *De inventione*, however, tell us a good deal: both are purely Greek in inspiration, except that they often take their examples from Roman affairs. Our main Greek source is much later. It is Hermogenes of Tarsus, a youthful prodigy of the time of Marcus Aurelius, worn out by the age of twenty-five.[20] So far as we can see, he made few substantial innovations, but codified and illustrated the theory in a form that became classic; his predecessors, and his contemporary rival Minucianus,[21] fade from the scene; his later commentators,

[17] Gaza had become a Christian city under Bishop Porphyrius (396–420), whose *Life* (by Mark the Deacon) is among the most revealing documents of the age. In the fifth and sixth centuries it developed a flourishing literary and philosophical life; besides Choricius, Procopius, Johannes and Aeneas were notable; see now Kennedy (1983) 169ff.

[18] For later declamation, see Hunger (1978) 1.93ff. The many references to declamation in the later commentaries on Hermogenes testify to a familiarity with the idea of this sort of exercise, but not necessarily to much practice of it.

[19] Hermagoras: D. Matthes, *Lustrum* III (1958) 58–214, 262–78.

[20] See, besides Jäneke (1904), Kennedy, *ARRW* 619–33. On Hermogenes' stylistic doctrine (*Peri Ideōn*), see Hagedorn (1964). Life in Philostratus, *VS* 577 (= 204 Wright): he was said to be ἐν παισὶ μὲν γέρων, ἐν δὲ γηράσκουσι παῖς ('an old man among children, a child among the ageing').

[21] Minucianus of Athens, distantly related to Plutarch, flourished *c.* 150; a younger Minucianus, of the same family, was active as a teacher in the third century, and is probably the author of the extant treatise on *epicheirēmata* (340ff Sp.–H.).

who treat his words as they would a classical text, include the philosopher Syrianus[22] and the rhetor Sopatros, under whose name is preserved a vast collection of 'questions' which is the most important source of all. This Sopatros, who taught at Athens, had a son (or pupil?) called Carponianus, and alleges some connection with Himerius.[23] His collection comprises over eighty themes, arranged according to *stasis* and (for the most part) worked out in great detail. The arrangement is mainly Hermogenes', but in some respects he apparently follows Minucianus.[24] We supplement this tradition, in which *stasis*-theory is always the guiding principle, from one or two rhetors who have other concerns: Apsines[25] and ps.-Dionysius[26] are the chief of these.

[22] Syrianus, the teacher of Proclus, wrote commentaries on large parts of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, as well as on Hermogenes. Proclus' debt to Syrianus is discussed with particular reference to the theory of poetry by Sheppard (1980).

[23] The clues to Sopatros' life and career are slight. Carponianus (*RG* VIII.78) is apparently a military man in imperial service (not in *PLRE*); unless the address υἱέ indicates an intellectual or spiritual 'son' or pupil (a Christian usage, with a clearly religious flavour, to which I know no Greek parallel from rhetoric or other secular arts, though for Latin *mi fili* cf Gellius 13.20.5, Apuleius, *Apology* 72.3, 97.1), he really was the author's son. Rhetors naturally often bred rhetors (cf n. 21, n. 25, and Himerius with his son Rufinus). The connection with ὁ σοφὸς ὁ ἡμέτερος Ἰμέριος ('our wise man, Himerius': so C at *RG* VIII.318.29 [see Preface]) means no more, in my judgement, than that Sopatros taught at Athens, not that he had any particularly close relationship with Himerius. It cannot therefore be used to prove a fourth-century date, and the great *Diaireseis Zētēmatōn* ('Divisions of Questions': this form and meaning of the title is to be preferred to that given by Russell and Wilson, *Menander Rhetor*, 226) may well be a good deal later. Boulanger (1923) 456 n. 3, confidently says 'fin du VI^e^ siècle', but this can hardly be right – it would put him later than Choricius. Whether the Sopatros of the *Diaireseis* is the same as the author of notes on Hermogenes given under this name in *RG* IV and V is an open question, with a good deal to be said against the identification. He is anyway distinct from the philosopher Sopatros of Apamea, a pupil of Iamblichus, who may be his grandfather.

[24] His order of the types of 'antithetical' cases (*antistasis*, *metastasis*, *antenklēma*, *syngnōmē*) is said to be Minucianus' (*RG* V.173). Note also the position of *pragmatika* following *metalēpsis* (*RG* VIII.286).

[25] Valerius Apsines of Gadara (third century A.D.) also taught at Athens and also had a son (Onasimos) to follow him in his profession. Text of his *technē*, 217ff Sp.–H.; cf Kennedy, *ARRW* 633ff.

[26] Text in Dionysius, *Opuscula* 2.253–387. Translation of chapters on epideictic in Russell and Wilson, *Menander Rhetor*, 362ff; other short extracts in Russell (1981) 183f, with discussion, ibid. 9ff. For the chapters dealing with declamation,

We thus know a good deal about the practice of declamation in the Greek schools of the late Empire. For the earlier period – the heyday of the Second Sophistic in the second century A.D. – we have, as well as the contemporary declamations of Aristides and others, the instructive and amusing anecdotal tradition preserved in Philostratus' *Lives of the Sophists*.[27] And we have also, of course, the Latin sources: not only can inferences about Greek practice be drawn from Seneca, Quintilian[28] and Calpurnius Flaccus,[29] but Seneca names and quotes some twenty-five Greek rhetors of Augustan or earlier date.[30] What he says is tantalizingly

see D. A. Russell in *Entretiens Hardt* XXV (1979) 113–34; see also below, ch. 3, p. 72. The sections on *logoi eschēmatismenoi* ('figured speeches') are also important; cf K. Schöpsdau, *Hermes* CXVIII (1975) 122f. See also below pp. 72f.

[27] Cf Bowersock (1969) 1–16, Reardon (1971) 115ff.

[28] A commentary on the *Minor Declamations* by M. Winterbottom is near publication; the *Major Declamations* have much less claim to come from Quintilian's school, but are fuller and more entertaining.

[29] Calpurnius Flaccus gives very brief statements of themes and salient points. A much later set of Latin declamations by Ennodius, bishop of Pavia in the early sixth century, seems to contain a good deal of Greek material, despite the general decline in knowledge of Greek in the West at that time.

[30] Bornecque (1902) lists all the declaimers in Seneca, including the Greek ones, and uses earlier work. It may suffice here to mention some who are especially notable (for refs. to Seneca, see the Index in Winterbottom's edition). (i) Adaios, 'rhetor ex Asianis non proiecti nominis', probably the same as an epigrammatist from Macedonia known from *Anth. Pal.* 7.51, 238, 240, 694; a quotation from his 'Tyrannicide released by pirates' (*Contr.* 1.7.18) shows poetical words (ταχινός, ἀντιάω). (ii) Aemilianus, perhaps the man mentioned by Plutarch, *De defectu* 17. (iii) Artemon, from whom Sen. quotes a blatantly 'Asianic' passage, *Suas.* 1.11, on Alexander: βουλεύομεθα εἰ χρὴ περαιοῦσθαι. οὐ ταῖς Ἑλλησποντίαις ᾐόσιν ἐφεστῶτες οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ Παμφυλίῳ πελάγει τὴν ἐμπρόθεσμον καραδοκοῦμεν ἄμπωτιν· οὐδὲ Εὐφράτης τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐδὲ Ἰνδός, ἀλλ' εἴτε γῆς τέρμα εἴτε φύσεως ὅρος εἴτε πρεσβύτατον στοιχεῖον εἴτε γένεσις θεῶν, ἱερώτερόν ἐστιν ἢ κατὰ ναῦς ὕδωρ. ('We are debating if we must cross. We are not standing on the shore of the Hellespont nor by the Pamphylian sea, awaiting the punctual tide; this is no Euphrates or Indus; be it earth's end or nature's bound, oldest element or gods' origin, it is a water too holy for ships.') (iv) Dorion, the author of a metaphrasis of parts of Homer (*Suas.* 1.12) as well as declamations: an extravagant writer, characteristically employed (*Contr.* 10.5.23) on the theme of 'Parrhasius using the prisoner of war as a model for Prometheus in torment': τίς Οἰδίπους ἔσται, τίς Ἀτρεύς; οὐ γράψεις γὰρ ἂν μὴ μύθους ἴδῃς ζῶντας ('Who will be your Oedipus or your Atreus? You won't paint them unless you have seen the myths in the flesh.') (v) Gorgias, the teacher of Cicero's son, and probably author of

brief, but enough to show two things: the rhetors of that time, especially those labelled *Asiani*, indulged rather more in daring conceits than their successors did, and also allowed themselves somewhat more moral licence in the choice and treatment of their themes. The gang-rape of the young male transvestite who is thereafter banned from speaking in public is the sort of thing which later taste seems to have rejected, though homosexual prostitution does play a part at all periods. To Seneca, the Greek rhetors were 'the most lovable kind of fools'; his general contempt for them keeps coming through.[31]

3

So far, I have been using the Latin-derived term 'declamation' and its subdivisions *controversia* and *suasoria*. *Declamatio*, as its name suggests, should originally denote an exercise in delivery rather than in composition. Perhaps, therefore, as a late Greek–Latin vocabulary suggests, the Romans used the word to represent the Greek *anaphōnēsis* (ἀναφώνησις).[32] If so, it means properly a voice exercise, such as orators and actors used to keep themselves in trim. But a natural semantic development led to its being used for the speech composed to be delivered in training, not for the delivery of it. The English word 'exercise' has a

the treatise on 'fingers' of which we have a partial Latin version by Rutilius Lupus (ed. E. Brooks, 1970). (vi) Hermagoras (not the earlier Hermagoras of Temnos, the main author of '*stasis*-theory'), a pupil of Theodorus: *Contr.* 10.1.15 attributes to him the notable phrase κτίσωμεν ἰδίᾳ, ὦ πένητες, πόλιν ('Poor Men, let us found a city on our own' (cf below ch. 2, §3)). (vii) Hybreas of Mylasa, a powerful man in Caria, whose rococo 'Asianic' style pleased Antony (Plutarch, *Ant.* 24) and who continued active in politics in the thirties. (viii) Lesbocles of Mitylene, less successful rival of his fellow-countryman Potamon, who served on embassies to Rome in Caesar's time and again in 25 B.C., and wrote encomia of Brutus and Caesar; between them, these sophists, with the poet Crinagoras, established Lesbos as an important literary centre (Bowersock [1965] 11, 36, 86). (ix) Nicetes, famous for his *impetus*. Little is known of these apart from what Seneca tells us; but widespread practice of declamation is certain.

[31] *Contr.* 5.6 (gang-rape); 10.5.25 (fools).

[32] *CGL* III 351.65 (Hermeneumata Stephani): declamatio ἀναφώνησις. Cf Bonner (1949) 20 and (1977) 73. For ἀναφώνησις as a voice exercise, see Galen, *De sanitate tuenda* 1, Plutarch, *Mor.* 1071C.

similar ambiguity; so has the nearest Greek equivalent, *meletē* (μελέτη).[33]

But *meletē*, when it means an actual composition, is usually limited in its denotation both by content and by construction. Not everything delivered by way of exercise is a *meletē* in this strict sense. Two conditions must be fulfilled: it has to be the reproduction either of a forensic speech or of a deliberative one; and it has to be a complete oration, not just part of one.

The first limitation means that encomia and other 'epideictic' forms do not count. This is made clear by Menander[34] at the beginning of his treatise on epideictic speeches, where he excludes from his subject the display of practical oratory which the 'sophists' make, because they are 'not a demonstration (*epideixis*) but practice in cases (*meletē agōnōn*)'. *Meletē* does, however, apply indifferently to exercises in the other two branches of rhetoric, the forensic and the deliberative. Seneca's sharp division into *controversiae* and *suasoriae* is not stressed by the Greek teachers. They find a place for deliberative speeches in the *stasis*-system devised for classifying forensic cases, and they prefer to subdivide them, if they have to, into the historical and the fictitious (*plasmata*).[35]

The second limitation is more important. The *meletē*, as a complete speech, is a more advanced exercise than the *progymnasmata*, the earlier stages of instruction in which the pupil was taught to compose what might become elements in the final

[33] Note also certain uses of the verb μελετᾶν: (i) 'to take the part of', e.g. μελετῶμεν τὸν Πάτροκλον (Choricius 38, init.); (ii) 'to deliver' a speech, e.g. Δημοσθένης τὸν ⟨περὶ⟩ παραπρεσβείας μελετῶν (*RG* IV.76.30); (iii) 'rehearse', e.g. Chariton 5.5.6, where Dionysius, about to appear in court, gets up early ἵνα μελετήσῃ τὴν δίκην.

[34] Menander Rhetor 331.16 Sp.: ἃς γὰρ ἐπιδείξεις λόγων πολιτικῶν οἱ σοφισταὶ καλούμενοι ποιοῦνται μελέτην ἀγώνων εἶναί φαμεν, οὐκ ἐπίδειξιν. ('The demonstrations of public speeches composed by the people known as sophists I regard as practice for real cases, not as true epideictic.')

[35] Deliberative speeches fall under *stasis pragmatikē* (below, p. 63). Hermogenes' rival, Minucianus (*RG* IV.181), proposed a division of subjects into *panēgyrika*, *dikānika*, *ēthika*, *pathētika*, *mikta* (i.e. epideictic or encomiastic, forensic, character-subjects, emotional, mixed), using what we may call the dominant tone of the piece as the basis of classification. For the division into imaginary and historical themes, see (e.g.) Philostratus, *VS* 481 (below n. 77).