



Deposited via The University of Leeds.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/391/>

Article:

Heath, M. (1998) Apsines and Pseudo-Apsines (Attribution of Greek rhetorical treatises).
American Journal of Philology, 119 (1). pp. 89-111. ISSN: 0002-9475

Reuse

See Attached

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

Apsines and pseudo-Apsines

Malcolm Heath
University of Leeds

ABSTRACT: Citations of Apsines by name in the treatise transmitted under his name are inconsistent with the traditional attribution. Editors remove the problem by treating these citations as interpolations, but there is no text-critical warrant for this. Since rhetorical technical texts were often misattributed, and there is no compelling internal or external evidence to support the traditional attribution, the traditional attribution should be abandoned. It is then possible to accept that Apsines was the author of [Hermogenes] *On Invention*, sometimes cited under his name. A number of testimonia can be explained on the assumption that [Apsines] was a pupil of Apsines named Aspasius, perhaps Aspasius of Tyre. Internal evidence is consistent with this conclusion.

1. Introduction

In this paper I wish to draw attention to a problem about the authorship of the rhetorical treatise traditionally attributed to Apsines,¹ and to explore the possibilities which open up if we reject that attribution. We know that a great deal of rhetorical literature was in circulation in late antiquity without reliable indication of authorship. Some texts, such as the Anonymus Seguerianus, have survived with no name attached. Others survive with the wrong name: only two of the five parts of the Hermogenean canon are likely to be by Hermogenes himself.² In some cases alternative attributions are found: as we shall see, one of the pseudo-Hermogenean texts (*On Invention*) was also attributed to Apsines. Sometimes alternative attributions are recorded in the manuscripts: the first of the two treatises on epideictic attributed to Menander Rhetor is ascribed in a supralinear variant in one manuscript to ‘Menander or Genethlius’;³ neither attribution is likely to be correct. One manuscript of the short treatise on epicheiremes preserved under the name of Minucianus notes that it is ascribed in another source to Nicagoras;⁴ the confusion may have arisen from a patronymic, since the younger Minucianus was son and father of sophists named Nicagoras. In the case of the pseudo-Dionysian *Art of Rhetoric* we can see a false attribution coming into being: the anonymous author’s references to his own *On Imitation* (364.24, 383.22 Usener-Radermacher) prompted a scholiast to identify him conjecturally with Dionysius of Halicarnassus.⁵ One of the sources used by Georgius, a commentator on Hermogenes of (probably) the fifth century, was ‘an

¹ Text: Spengel 1853, 331-406, revised in Hammer 1894, 217-329; I give references by page and line, in the form <Spengel> = <Hammer>. A new edition of Apsines and the Anonymus Seguerianus by G. Kennedy and M. Dilts is forthcoming; I am grateful to them for allowing me access to their text in advance of publication. I am also indebted to Dominic Berry and Francis Cairns for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.

² Rabe 1913, iii-xiii; Rabe 1931, xix-xxiii analyses the growth of the Hermogenean canon.

³ Russell & Wilson 1981, xxxvii and 226.

⁴ See the apparatus criticus to Hammer 1894, 340.1.

⁵ Usener & Radermacher 1904, xxii.

unascrbed treatise, which they attribute to Aquila' (ἐν ἀνεπιγράφῳ τινι τέχνῃ, ἦν εἰς Ἀκύλαν ἀναφέρουσιν).⁶ Other examples of false or uncertain attribution could be cited. These facts do not warrant indiscriminate scepticism about the authorship of rhetorical texts; but caution is in order, and we should weigh seriously possible grounds for doubting a traditional attribution.

2. Treatise A

The treatise traditionally attributed to Apsines (to avoid prejudging the question of authorship I shall refer to it henceforth as 'Treatise A') discusses the parts of a speech: prologue, narrative, arguments, epilogue. This was a standard format; Syrianus refers to 'a myriad others' who have written on the subject (2.11.6-10 Rabe; cf. *PS* 205.8-10 Rabe). Other extant examples include the epitome of Rufus, the Anonymus Seguerianus, and the pseudo-Hermogenean *On Invention*. In his work on *stasis* Hermogenes himself seems to look forward to such a text when he promises to return to one point in more detail in a discussion of the prologue (53.12f. Rabe). This promise is not redeemed in any extant work of his; Syrianus inferred that Hermogenes had written 'on the parts of the political speech' (2.3.2-7), but evidently had no first-hand knowledge of such a work.

2.1 The traditional attribution

The Apsines to whom Treatise A is attributed is generally identified with Valerius Apsines of Gadara, a friend of Philostratus (*VS* 628). From the *Suda* (A4735) we gather that he studied with Heraclides of Lycia in Smyrna and with Basilicus in Nicomedia, held a sophistic chair in Athens and was elevated to consular rank under Maximinus (AD 235-38).⁷ A complimentary reference to Basilicus in the introduction to the treatise (331.7 = 217.5f.) encourages this identification. But we know of at least three other sophists with the same name. The *Suda* mentions two:

- (i) Apsines of Athens, father of the sophist Onasimus (A4734);
- (ii) Apsines, son of the Athenian sophist Onasimus (A4736).

From Eunapius we know of:

- (iii) Apsines the Spartan, a rival of Julian of Cappadocia and a distinguished τεχνικός (482, with an entertaining anecdote about the rivalry at 483-85).

⁶ Schilling 1903, 694. For Aquila see n.28 below.

⁷ The transmitted text says Maximian (286-310); but Maximinus must be meant, since other entries in the *Suda* make Apsines a contemporary of the sophists Fronto (Φ635), with a *floruit* under Severus Alexander (222-35), and Maior (M46), with a *floruit* under Philip (244-49), and give his pupil Gaianus (Γ9) a *floruit* under Gordian (238-44). On the nature of Apsines' ὑπατικὸν ἀξίωμα see Jones 1971, 29; Rémy 1976/7, 173. Heraclides taught in Smyrna after he was dismissed from the imperial chair at Athens, but the date is uncertain; Avotins 1975 sets his tenure c. 193-209, but notes (324) that this is rather longer than the average: an unidentified incumbent may have held the chair between Heraclides and Hippodromus. Further literature: Hammer 1876 (an over-imaginative work); Brzoska 1896; Eck 1974. Avotins 1971 examines Apsines' distinguished family connections in a discussion of the inscription (*IG* II² 4007 = *SEG* 12.156), which reveals his *gens*.

Eunapius' Apsines the Spartan may well be identical with the *Suda's* Apsines son of Onasimus, since the *Suda's* entry on Onasimus (O327) describes him as 'of Cyprus or Sparta' and lists a technical work πρὸς Ἀψίνην (addressed, presumably, to his son) among his writings.⁸ An older theory which identified Apsines of Gadara with the father of Onasimus has generally been abandoned on chronological grounds, since the *Suda* gives the reign of Constantine as Onasimus' *floruit*.⁹

(iv) A letter of Libanius (962), addressed to one Sopolis, refers to his son Apsines in terms which imply that he was a sophist, ὡσπερ καὶ ὁ πατήρ, οἶμαι δὲ καὶ ὁ πάππος. A sophist named Sopolis is mentioned very disparagingly by Eunapius (487) as one of the contenders for the chair vacated by the death of Julian of Cappadocia; his son in turn became a sophist (Eunapius 497). But Julian died before 336, and the successful contender for his chair, Prohaeresius, was born in 276; a Sopolis old enough to aspire to this chair would be extremely old in 390 (the date of Libanius' letter). Eunapius' Sopolis is perhaps the grandfather mentioned by Libanius.¹⁰

2.2 The problem

The problem with the traditional attribution of Treatise A is that it repeatedly refers to Apsines by name, citing his declamations to illustrate particular technical points. These citations are indistinguishable in form from the author's illustrative references to speeches of Aristides and Demosthenes (e.g. 348.20f. = 243.5f.; 352.1 = 248.7; 356.23f. = 255.12f.; 362.17 = 264.10f.). The third person is not customary when rhetoricians cite their own speeches or declamations as models; pseudo-Hermogenes (208.17f., 209.7-9) and pseudo-Menander (335.23-30 Spengel) both use the first person. The author of Treatise A is happy to refer to himself in the first person elsewhere; see, for example, the introductory remarks on the scope for making a contribution of his own to the subject (ἴσως δ' ἂν τι καὶ αὐτὸς συνεισενεγκεῖν ὡς εἰς κοινὸν ἔρανον δυνηθείην οὐκ ἀχρεῖον οὐδ' ἀνωφελές 331.11-13 = 217.10-12) and the later cross-reference to what is presumably a work on figures (τί δ' ἐστὶν ἡ προσωποῖα ἀλλαχόθι που δεδηλώκαμεν 386.5f. = 299.6f.). The third-person self-citations would therefore be surprising.

Perhaps, then, they are not self-citations. There are two alternatives: either the references to Apsines have been interpolated, or Treatise A is not by Apsines.

⁸ See *PLRE* I.89f.; Cartledge & Spawforth 1989, 182. The description of Onasimus the father of Apsines as σοφίστης Ἀθηναῖος may simply indicate where he practised (on multiple and ambiguous ethnics see Rabe 1931, lviii n.1); the Doric form of his name implies that he was not Athenian by origin. The identity of ὁ Σπαρτιάτης σοφίστης ὁ τῷ πίνειν εὐπορώτερος εἰς λόγους γινόμενος mentioned by Libanius *Or.* 4.7 (1.289.5f. Foerster) is not known.

⁹ The identification of the father of Onasimus with Apsines of Gadara was accepted by Hammer 1876, 6f.; Brzoska 1896, 277f.; Geiger 1994, 224. Rohde 1901, 341 n.1 suggests that Onasimus' father may have been the son of Apsines of Gadara; *contra* Millar 1969, 16 n.39. Cartledge & Spawforth 1989, 182 note the possibility of some other family connection with Apsines of Gadara.

¹⁰ Penella 1990, 91 (date of Julian's death), 83 (Prohaeresius' birth); 94f. on Sopolis, accepting the identification with Libanius' addressee.

Hammer opts for interpolation,¹¹ and accordingly brackets Apsines' name, or passages including Apsines' name, wherever it appears; so too do Kennedy and Dilts (though their excisions differ in detail from Hammer's). But if this view is to be accepted, it can only be on the basis of confidence in Apsines' authorship and scepticism about the self-citations; there are no internal text-critical grounds for deletion in these passages. It is true that the manuscripts are in some disarray in these passages; but that is true in many other passages as well (the text is in a deplorable state of preservation), and a brief review will show that these variants are not evidence of systematic editorial intervention.

(i) In three passages the reference to Apsines appears in both of the primary manuscripts:¹²

356.7-9 = 254.15-18: ὡς ἐν τῷ Λυσάνδρῳ Ἀψίνης, Λύσανδρος ἀρχὴν ὑποδείξας καλήν, ἢ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐκείνου· ὁ Λυκοῦργος ὁ θεὸς τὸν περὶ τῆς ξενηλασίας νόμον κρίνεται.

358.15-17 = 258.5-7: ὡς ἔφη Ἀψίνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Μειδίου γεγενῆσθαι, ἐπειδήπερ ἔμελλεν αὐτὸν ἐγκωμιάσειν.

359.25f. = 260.6-8: ὡς ἐν τῷ Λυσάνδρῳ Ἀψίνης ἠθικῶς ἤψατο τῆς διηγῆσεως μάλα τὴν πρώτην ἐπαινέσας· ἐνδοξον γὰρ ἦν τὸ πρόσωπον.

(ii) In two passages the omission of the reference to Apsines in one of the manuscripts can be explained as haplography:

354.14-18 = 251.20-252.3: οἶον ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἑρμῶνι Ἀψίνης ἢ πάλιν ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ζητήματι· γράφει τις τὸν Κόνωνα μετὰ τὴν ἀνάστασιν τῶν τειχῶν τῶν αὐτῶν τιμῶν Ἀρμοδίῳ καὶ Ἀριστογείτονι τυγχάνειν.

τῷ Ἑρμῶνι Ἀψίνης ἢ πάλιν ἐν ἐκείνῳ om. B

368.20 = 273.14 (with apparatus): ... ἐνθυμούμενος. ὅπερ αἰτιῶνται Ἀψίνην, ὅτι ἐν καταστάσει ταιαύτη γνώμην ἐξετάζει· τοῦτ' ἔστι τὸ χρῶμα ὅπερ καὶ ἐστὶ τῶν πραγμάτων. ὥσπερ δὲ... κτλ

ὅπερ αἰτιῶνται... τῶν πραγμάτων om. A

(iii) In one further passage Apsines' name is omitted in one manuscript; but this leaves the subject of the verb unspecified, and if accepted would require further emendation:

355.6-9 = 253.2-5: καὶ πάλιν ἐπ' ἐκείνου· Σκύθαι πόλιν ὄκησαν, καὶ νοσοῦντων αὐτῶν ἀξιοῖ τις αὐτοὺς ἀφίστασθαι τῆς πόλεως· καὶ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τῷ κατὰ ἀντεξέτασιν Ἀψίνης ἐχρήσατο.

Ἀψίνης om. A; κέχρηται B, χρηστέον Bake

(iv) One final case (364.10-365.2 = 267.4-268.7) is more complex;. The two manuscripts read:

¹¹ Hammer 1876, 14, 16, 31f.: no arguments are offered, however.

¹² A = Par. 1874 (12th c.); B = Par. 1741 (10th c.).

A ἔστι μὲν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις παραδείγματα, ἔστι δὲ καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ὡς ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ διηγήματι...

B ἔστι μὲν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχαίοις παραδείγματα, εὕρηται δὲ καὶ παρὰ Ἀψίνῃ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ ζητήματι...

A's 'us' is followed by a series of first person plural verbs; B's 'Apsines' is followed by a series of third person singular verbs. Here we must be dealing with deliberate alterations to the text in one or other manuscript (over and above accidental errors of transmission, such as A's διηγήματι, which occur in both manuscripts). The possibilities are:

(a) A's καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ὡς preserves the original text: this was corrupted (or deliberately altered) in B to καὶ παρὰ Ἀψίνῃ, and the verbs were changed to the third person to fit;

(b) B's καὶ παρὰ Ἀψίνῃ preserves the original text: this was corrupted in A to καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ὡς, and the verbs were changed to the first person to fit;

(c) an original text reading (e.g.) καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν, ὡς Ἀψίνῃς or καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν, ὡς παρὰ Ἀψίνῃ has undergone different corruptions in the two branches of the tradition: the loss of the name in A has also prompted a systematic change to the first person.¹³

It is not self-evident that (a) is the correct solution. But even if it is, the original absence of Apsines' name from this passage would not prove that Apsines' name was originally absent elsewhere: it is possible that the author cites a declamation of his own here (using the conventional first person) and Apsines' declamations elsewhere (under their author's name).¹⁴

The manuscript variants therefore do not provide convincing evidence that Apsines' name was absent from the treatise at an earlier stage of the tradition. It does not follow that the name did appear in the original text; the earliest stage of the tradition recoverable by text-critical methods may be a redacted version of the treatise. The fact remains that bracketing Apsines' name in the treatise's title would be a less radical intervention than bracketing it in these six or seven passages. We should resort to the more radical solution only if other evidence strongly confirms the attribution of Treatise A to Apsines.

2.3 Internal evidence

Two pieces of internal evidence might be adduced. First, there is the admiring reference to Basilicus in the opening paragraph (331.7 = 217.6f.); as we have seen, Apsines of Gadara is known to have been a pupil of Basilicus. However, he cannot have been the only pupil of Basilicus to have gone on to teach rhetoric; and we should note in any case that this reference is included not simply out of *pietas*, but

¹³ In context παρ' ἡμῶν may mean either 'in my work' or 'among us moderns, as distinct from ancients'; cf. e.g. [Herm.] *Inv.* 165.1 ('me') vs 175.14 ('us rhetoricians, as distinct from philosophers').

¹⁴ The author may also be citing his own work in the first person at 367.17-22 = 271.22-272.2; but Bake's ἀντιπαραστήσομεν (ἀντιπαρεστήσαμεν B, ἀντιπαρέστησα A) is persuasive.

because the author wishes to build on Basilicus’ methodology. Secondly, there is the author’s probable reference to his own work on figures (386.5f. = 299.6f.); Apsines’ work on figures is well-attested.¹⁵ But he was not the only rhetorician to write on that subject; and we may note (for what it is worth) that the figure in question, προσωποιῖα, is not included in Tiberius *On Figures*, for which Apsines appears to have been an important source.¹⁶ The internal evidence is not compelling, therefore.

2.4 External evidence

The external attestation is as follows:¹⁷

(i) One of the prolegomena to Hermogenes (*PS* 293.1 Rabe), possibly dating to the fifth century,¹⁸ refers to Apsines ‘on proems and proofs’. This is not an adequate title for Treatise A, which deals with narrative and epilogue as well, but it could be accepted as shorthand for all four parts.¹⁹ However, the reference gives no more than a title, showing only that Apsines was credited with a text in what was (as we have seen) a standard format; it falls short of proof that he was credited with Treatise A in particular.

(ii) Syrianus includes Apsines in a list of those who have written ‘on the parts of the political speech’ (2.11.3-10). He twice (2.64.12-15, 170.19-22) cites a passage from Treatise A (348.12-23 = 242.14-243.6) as from Apsines’ ‘treatise (τέχνη) on the parts of the political speech’.²⁰

(iii) An anonymous commentator on Hermogenes (*RG* 7.689.6-8 Walz) cites 389.12-14 = 304.4-9 as from Apsines’ τέχνη; the term γνωσιγραφία is highly distinctive. A sixth-century date is probable.²¹

Syrianus, therefore, provides the earliest definite attestation, in the fifth century.

But two other external testimonia complicate the question:

(iv) Syrianus (1.36.21-37.8) also cites two ‘figured’ subjects (that is, declamation themes in which the speaker has a covert purpose in addition to or even

¹⁵ Tiberius *Fig.* 3.75.17f., 79.15, 79.27 Sp.; *RG* 5.465 n.30; *RG* 7.1023.20f.; sch. Aeschines 3.105 229 Dilts.

¹⁶ Solmsen 1936; Ballaira 1968.

¹⁷ One testimonium which need not detain us is Plethon’s claim (*RG* 6.583.8-584.1, cf. 585.1) that Hermogenes plagiarised Apsines: this is a confused echo of Gregory of Corinth (*RG* 7.1091.14-16; also in John Diaconus: Rabe 1908, 133), referring not to Apsines but to Aristides (i.e. to the parallels between Hermogenes *On Ideas* and pseudo-Aristides).

¹⁸ Rabe 1931, lxxvi-lxxxv argues that this text is a redaction (by the compiler of the composite commentary of *RG* 4) of prolegomena by the (probably) fifth-century commentator Marcellinus.

¹⁹ Ms B gives the title as τέχνη ῥητορικὴ περὶ προομίου, conflating the subtitle of the first section.

²⁰ The first of these citations is accurate, but the second confuses προκατάστασις (with which the passage is in fact concerned) with κατάστασις. For a factor that may have contributed to the confusion see n.42 below.

²¹ Keil 1907a.

contradicting the overt intent) under Apsines' name.²² Syrianus gives the themes in very cryptic form, and we have to look to pseudo-Hermogenes *On Invention* for a clearer exposition. In both themes a father is rumoured to be sleeping with his son's wife. In one theme the son catches a cloaked adulterer with his wife, but lets him go unpunished; the father disinherits him for this; the son, since an open accusation of incest against his father would be offensive, can only insinuate that his father was the adulterer (Syrianus 1.37.1-3 ~ [Hermogenes] 210.8-18). In the other theme the son's wife is pregnant; an oracle says that the child will kill his father, but the son refuses to expose the child; the father disinherits him (Syrianus 1.37.3-8 ~ [Hermogenes] 207.18-209.11). The themes in question are not unique to pseudo-Hermogenes; Philostratus mentions Polemo's handling of the theme of the cloaked adulterer (*VS* 542),²³ and variants appear in a number of other sources. But close correspondences in phrasing (1.37.2f. = 210.14f.; 1.37.5-8 = 209.9-11) prove that Syrianus is citing pseudo-Hermogenes, especially in view of the latter's claim to have originated the method of treatment in the theme concerning the exposure of the child (208.15-18).

(v) A fragment of Syrianus' contemporary Lachares preserved in a commentary on Hermogenes *On Ideas* (*RG* 7.931.14-23) cites another, unrelated passage in pseudo-Hermogenes (183.17-184.7) as the work of Apsines.²⁴

So we now have two works attributed to Apsines, and it is necessary to investigate the relationship between them.

3. Treatise A and Treatise H: a hypothesis

The pseudo-Hermogenean *On Invention* (henceforth 'Treatise H'), cited as a work of Apsines by Syrianus and Lachares, cannot be by the same author as Treatise A, transmitted under Apsines' name: the two works differ profoundly in style, and there are important differences in terminology and doctrine. In view of the proliferation of sophists named Apsines noted earlier, one might try to rescue both attributions by assuming that different homonyms are in question (noting, especially, that Eunapius' Apsines was a τεχνικός). However, Syrianus specifies Apsines of Gadara when he cites Treatise H, but not when he cites Treatise A; so it is Treatise A that would have to be reassigned to another Apsines. Yet we have already seen that Apsines of Gadara is most likely to be the Apsines to whom Treatise A is attributed. It is probable, therefore, that at least one of the attributions to Apsines is wrong.

The attribution of Treatise H to Apsines of Gadara ought not to be dismissed out of hand.²⁵ There is nothing inconsistent with Apsines' authorship internal to

²² Cf. Anon. *RG* 7.950.3-10 (transcribed from Syrianus); John of Sicily *RG* 6.197.27-31 (probably also derived from Syrianus).

²³ ὁ μοιχὸς ὁ ἐγκεκαλυμμένος (Cobet's correction of the transmitted ἐκκεκαλυμμένος is certain). For declamations on related themes cf. Sen. *Contr.* 8.3; Calp. Flaccus *Decl.* 49 (with Sussman *ad loc.*); Libanius *Decl.* 39 (cf. Russell 1996, 169-77).

²⁴ On Lachares see Graeven 1895.

²⁵ E.g. Rabe 1913, vii: 'Apsinis nomen illi inscriptum erat, aperte coniectura inventum'.

Treatise H, and the testimony of Syrianus and Lachares would surely have been accepted as satisfactory evidence of the treatise's authorship if it were not for the conflict with the 'known' authorship of Treatise A; but, as we have seen, the authorship of Treatise A is open to question. The problem cannot be resolved by appealing to the authority of the manuscript superscription. We have already seen that these superscriptions are often faulty. In any case, Syrianus and Lachares presumably had access to a manuscript of Treatise H with an ascription to Apsines. The fact that this manuscript has left no descendants, while a manuscript of Treatise A with an ascription to Apsines has left descendants,²⁶ is no evidence at all of the falsity of the one ascription or the correctness of the other. But if either attribution is open to suspicion as mere conjecture, it is surely the attribution of Treatise A to Apsines: there is nothing in Treatise H that is likely to have prompted a conjectural attribution to Apsines in particular; by contrast, it is obvious why someone confronted with an anonymous copy of Treatise A might have been prompted to associate it with the rhetorician whose name repeatedly appears in it. We should therefore be willing to consider the possibility that Apsines was the author of Treatise H, and that Treatise A is not the work of Apsines but of another unidentified rhetorician.

Further testimonia may give a clue to the identity of the author of Treatise A. A scholion to Demosthenes (20.4 *16a*, 99.1f. Dilts)²⁷ cites 'Apsines and Aspasius' in what at first sight appears to be a reference to Treatise A (369.27-370.4 = 275.10-20). However, the appearance may be misleading. 'Apsines and Aspasius' are cited jointly by Syrianus as well (1.66.7-67.3), but this reference does not correspond to anything in Treatise A as we have it. Both of these joint citations are concerned with Demosthenes *Against Leptines*, and we know from Photius (codex 265, 492a27-40 Bekker) that 'Aspasius the rhetor' worked on that speech. An expression of the form 'Apsines and Aspasius' may imply 'Apsines mediated by Aspasius'; compare, for example, Syrianus' references to 'Evagoras and Aquila' (2.41.11f., 55.6, 56.21, 60.24, 128.23; order reversed at 2.35.2f.), which are probably references to the teaching of Evagoras as mediated by Aquila.²⁸ If that is the case here, then the citations of 'Apsines and Aspasius' in the Demosthenes scholia and in Syrianus may both refer to a commentary on *Against Leptines* composed by Aspasius on the basis of lectures by his teacher Apsines.

We can infer from the citation in the Demosthenes scholia that this commentary shared material with Treatise A; this fact could be explained in two ways. If Apsines did write Treatise A, it would not be surprising that it had material in common with a commentary by one of his own pupils; but we have already seen that there is a difficulty in attributing Treatise A to Apsines. We

²⁶ That both A and B have a common ancestor later than the archetype is shown by the shared dislocation at 344.10-16 = 236.12-18, which (as Volkmann saw) can be corrected from the hypothesis to Isocrates 8.

²⁷ The source of this scholion is likely to be Menander of Laodicea, as I shall argue in a detailed study of Menander currently in preparation; this would imply a date for the citation around the end of the third century.

²⁸ Keil 1907b; revised chronology in Schenkeveld 1991.

should therefore be willing to consider the alternative possibility: that the unidentified author of Treatise A is in fact the Aspasius who wrote the commentary on Demosthenes. An Aspasius is also cited in the scholia to Aeschines (1.83 /83 Dilts); it is reasonable to assume that he is the same Aspasius who commented on Demosthenes.²⁹

Can we identify this Aspasius more precisely? We know of three rhetoricians of this name from the *Suda*. Aspasius of Byblos (A4203) dates to the time of Hadrian, and can therefore be ruled out on chronological grounds;³⁰ so can Aspasius of Ravenna (A4205),³¹ a contemporary of Apsines and certainly not one of his pupils. This leaves Aspasius of Tyre (A4204). The *Suda* tells us that he wrote, as well as a history of Epirus (of which nothing more is known) and other unspecified works, a *περὶ τέχνης ῥητορικῆς*; this could be Treatise A. The tendency of students in Athens to attach themselves to a sophist connected with their place of origin³² strengthens the possibility of an association between Aspasius of Tyre and Apsines of Gadara ('the Phoenician', as Philostratus calls him). But in the absence of chronological data, and since we cannot rule out the possibility that there were other rhetoricians named Aspasius unrecorded in the *Suda*, the identification cannot be regarded as certain.

We have not yet exhausted the testimonia to Aspasius. It was noted above that Syrianus cites the theme of the cloaked adulterer from Treatise H under the name of Apsines; but an anonymous commentator on Hermogenes (*RG* 7.951.23-27) cites the same theme under the name of Aspasius (7.951.26f. = Syrianus 1.37.2f. = [Hermogenes] 210.14f.).³³ If the anonymous commentator were citing the theme from Treatise H, the implication would be that Aspasius was the author of that treatise rather than of Treatise A; this would leave the attribution of Treatise H to Apsines unexplained and the original problem concerning the attribution of Treatise A unresolved. But there is reason to believe that the anonymous commentator is not citing the theme from Treatise H: for this scholion (unlike the

²⁹ Dilts *ad loc.* refers to the Aristotelian commentator Aspasius; but the passage cited (119.3f. Heylbut) is hardly relevant.

³⁰ Schmid 1896 refers the testimonia to commentaries on Demosthenes and Aeschines to Aspasius of Byblos (noting ὑπομνήματα in the *Suda*'s bibliography); but this does not provide an explanation of the joint citation of Aspasius and Apsines.

³¹ Cf. Phil. *VS* 627f., who names Pausanias and Hippodromus as his teachers and mentions *inter alia* Philostratus of Lemnos' criticisms of Aspasius' epistolary style; hence the testimonium in John of Sicily *RG* 6.94.10-14 (ὡσπερ ὁ Πολέμων καὶ ὁ Ἀσπάσιος καὶ ὁ τῆς Γάζης Προκόπιος ἀκαίρως μὲν καὶ κατακόρως χρώμενος ταῖς τρόποις καὶ ἐπιθέτοις ἐν τοῖς λόγοις, ὑπεραττικίζων δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς) must refer to this Aspasius (*contra* Schmid 1896): cf. the fragment of Philostratus in [Lib.] *Charact. Epist.* 9.33.15-17 Foerster = 19.14f. Weichert: δεῖ γὰρ τὴν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς φράσιν τῆς μὲν συνηθείας ἀττικωτέραν εἶναι, τοῦ δὲ ἀττικισμοῦ συνηθεστέραν.

³² See Eunapius 487f.; Lib. *Or.* 1.16 with Norman *ad loc.*

³³ The source of the scholion is unknown. This commentary is a composite; of the three scholia on the passage of Hermogenes in question, one (see n.22 above) is transcribed from Syrianus (and reproduces his attribution of the theme to Apsines) but the provenance of the others cannot be established. In the fifth and sixth centuries, commentaries by Phoebammon, Paul of Caesarea and his pupil John are attested: cf. Keil 1907a.

other two notes on the same passage of Hermogenes preserved in the same composite commentary) makes no reference to the explanatory matter in which the theme is embedded in Treatise H. The commentator may therefore be drawing on a different text, either (i) a source of Treatise H, or else (ii) a text dependent on Treatise H:

(i) Treatise H makes no claim to originality in the treatment of this example (unlike that concerning the exposure of the child); so it is possible that the author borrowed the example from an earlier text. If so, then the Aspasius in question could not be the Aspasius whom we have postulated as a pupil of Apsines; an earlier Aspasius is needed, and we should note that the *Suda* attributes a work on figured speech (περὶ στάσεων ἐσχηματισμένων) to Aspasius of Byblos.³⁴ But this would make it entirely coincidental that the name Aspasius appears again in connection with Apsines, which is perhaps implausible.

(ii) The alternative assumption, therefore, is more attractive: i.e. that the anonymous commentator on Hermogenes was citing a text derived from Treatise H. This fits our hypothesis admirably: Apsines quoted a figured declamation of his own in Treatise H, and his pupil Aspasius subsequently used the same declamation to illustrate a work on figured speeches, just as he cited Apsines' declamations in Treatise A.

The work whose existence we have just postulated may in fact survive in part. The essay on figured speeches transmitted under Apsines' name is a composite text.³⁵ The body of the essay (407.26-414.11 = 331.7-339.23) is a fragment written in the same style and manner as Treatise A; an obscure and corrupt passage (414.3-9 = 339.15-21) alludes to themes based on the rumour that a father is sleeping with his son's wife, without precisely reproducing either of the themes which Syrianus cites from Treatise H. Prefixed to this fragment (407.4-16 = 330.3-331.6) is an extract from the chapter on figured speeches in Treatise H (204.17-206.11); this extract concludes with an example based on the rumour that a father is sleeping with his son's wife, but it does not include either of the two themes cited by Syrianus. This combination of material from Treatise H with material by the author of Treatise A is confusing, but probably coincidental; the prefix may have been added in an attempt to turn the fragment into a self-standing text, and the attribution of the resulting composite to Apsines was presumably deduced from the likeness of the body of the fragment to Treatise A. However, if Treatise A is by Aspasius, as we have hypothesised, then the body of the fragment will be the remnant of the work on figured speeches by Aspasius postulated in the previous

³⁴ The form of the title is surprising: in normal usage it is not a *stasis* but a speech, problem or question that is figured; perhaps we should read περὶ στάσεων, <περὶ ῥημάτων> ἐσχηματισμένων. Schmid 1896 referred the testimonium from *RG* 7.951.23-27 to Aspasius of Byblos, on the inadequate grounds of μελέται in the *Suda*'s bibliography.

³⁵ Text: 417-24 Spengel = 330-39 Hammer. If the Aspasius in question is Aspasius of Tyre, then the treatise on figured speeches is probably included in the ἄλλα in the *Suda*'s list of his writings; but there is also a possibility that the περὶ ἐσχηματισμένων attributed in the *Suda* to Aspasius of Byblos (see previous note) has been attributed to the wrong Aspasius.

paragraph, and the anonymous commentator on Hermogenes will have been citing a lost portion of this text.

The hypothesis that has emerged from our investigation of the external evidence, therefore, is as follows: (i) that Treatise H (pseudo-Hermogenes *On Invention*) is by Apsines; and (ii) that Treatise A and the fragment on figured speeches (the works traditionally attributed to Apsines) are by a pupil named Aspasius (perhaps Aspasius of Tyre), whose commentaries on Demosthenes and Aeschines are also cited in our sources.

4. The relationship between Treatise A and Treatise H

To test the plausibility of the hypothesis, we must examine the relationship between the two texts: are there any signs of a teacher/pupil relation? There are indeed connections, some of them in details which do not immediately strike the eye. For example, Treatise H (129.16-130.2) and Treatise A (334.15-17 = 221.17-19) both take the view that Demosthenes *Against Meidias* is concerned with a charge of impiety; contrast the alternative (and more accurate) view that the case is concerned with δημόσια ἀδικήματα, which is found (for example) in Hermogenes (63.6-13).³⁶ But it was noted earlier that there are also important differences of terminology and doctrine between the two treatises.

We must be cautious in evaluating these differences. It would be wrong to assume that a sophist's pupils would reproduce his doctrine passively once they had established their own professional independence. That would make it impossible to account for the development of rhetorical theory over time; yet such development occurred. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that the second and third centuries AD were a particularly creative period. It is no coincidence that very little technical rhetorical literature in Greek survives from before the latter part of the second century; earlier texts were rendered obsolete by the innovative developments in theory of that era. We know too that it was not unusual to study with more than one teacher (as Apsines himself studied with Heraclides and Basilicus); even an uncreative rhetorician might be expected in these circumstances to produce an eclectic system significantly different from that of any one of his teachers. Moreover, the introduction to Treatise A makes it clear that this author had ambitions to make his own contribution to the subject. Significant differences between the two treatises are only to be expected, therefore, and the question to ask is not how far the two treatises coincide in terminology and doctrine, but whether there are significant connections between them and whether their differences can be understood as reflecting a plausible evolution in rhetorical theory.

These are questions which we cannot expect to answer with any confidence. The loss of earlier technical literature makes it difficult to assess the origins of a given technical term; and since only a tiny fraction of the rhetorical literature that

³⁶ Cf. MacDowell 1990, 424f. The scholia to this speech derive from more than one source, and preserve traces of both interpretations.

went into circulation in the second and third centuries is extant, any inferences about the evolution of terminology which we draw from the texts which have survived must be highly conjectural. It is reasonable to ask whether there is some plausible account of the development of rhetorical theory in this period which would make our hypothesis about the authorship of the two treatises consistent with the internal evidence for the relationship between them (and if the hypothesis helps us to construct such an account, that may count in its favour). But the limitations of our evidence mean that a plausible, not a demonstrable, account is the most we can ask for. A full comparison of the two texts exceeds the scope of the present paper; I offer instead three exploratory probes.

4.1 προκατάστασις

One striking feature of Treatise H is that the second book, on narrative (διήγησις), is more concerned with the preliminary to the narrative (προκατάστασις) than with the narrative itself (ten Teubner pages on the προκατάστασις are followed by six pages on the narrative proper). The reason for the apparent disproportion is clear from the introductory chapter: the narrative is concerned with the crucial facts of the case, which are given in the theme itself, so that there is relatively little scope for 'invention' (in the technical sense of the term) beyond the effective elaboration of those facts (108.20-109.2; cf. *PS* 176.2-4); it is technically more difficult to devise an appropriate way of setting that narrative in a favourable context (cf. 109.15-19).

Two points are worth noting about the treatment of προκατάστασις in Treatise H. First, its method: the author identifies different species of theme (109.15f. ἐπεὶ τῶν προβλημάτων εἶδη ποικίλα...: in the following chapters he discusses themes concerned with proposed migrations, legislation, war and peace, impiety, murder and crimes of violence, crimes against the public interest, and rewards for tyrannicide and heroism), and for each species he identifies an appropriate approach to the προκατάστασις. This is similar to (though less refined than) the method of 'dividing τὰ ὁμογενῆ' which the author of Treatise A identifies as his own contribution to the theory of the proem (331.15f. = 216.13f.: ὁμογενῆ δὲ λέγω ὅσα κατὰ τι συμβεβηκὸς ὁμοιά ἐστὶν ἀλλήλοις), and is parallel to the treatment of narrative in Treatise A (354.5-7 = 251.10-12: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν καθολικώτερον ἐπὶ πασῶν διηγήσεων, νῦν δὲ ὡς περ εἰώθαμεν περὶ τῶν γενικῶν διηγήσεων εἰπόμεν: the first species is that of themes involving a request for a reward). It is possible that these parallels reflect a pupil's extension of his teacher's methodology.

A second point to notice is the care with which Treatise H introduces the term προκατάστασις. In later rhetorical literature the term is treated with complete familiarity, and is evidently commonplace.³⁷ But when it is formally introduced in

³⁷ See Sopater *RG* 8.58.1-11 (reading τῷ προκαταστατικῷ at 58.7: see Innes and Winterbottom *ad loc.*), 80.21-27; Marcellinus *RG* 4.54.23-26 (Sopater *RG* 4.48.8-14, 415.5f. surprisingly has προκατάστασις but not κατάστασις: the text may be in error); sch. Dem. 19.9 *35ab*, 36; 24.5 *18a*; 24.8 *22*; 24.10 *26a-27b*; 24.17 *44e*; Troilus *PS* 52.11f.; Olympiodorus *In Gorg.* 12.1.

Treatise H it is glossed (τὴν προκατάστασιν τῆς διηγήσεως... τὴν καὶ προδιήγησιν καλουμένην 109.3f.), and the periphrastic προκατάστασις τῆς διηγήσεως occurs frequently thereafter (113.15f. etc).³⁸ Might the term be a relative novelty? The word does not seem to be attested in this sense at an earlier date, and there is some evidence of its use in a different sense. In the Anonymus Seguerianus we read that the proem is the προκατάστασις of the speech (244); the source here is Harpocration (243), who dates probably to the end of the second or the early part of the third century.³⁹ Rufus, too, uses the term in connection with the proem (ἡ δὲ γνώμη σεμνοτέρων τὴν προκατάστασιν τοῦ λόγου ποιεῖ 402.10f. Hammer). If the author is Rufus of Perinthus, known to us from Philostratus (*VS* 597f.), the text dates to the second century; the only other indication of its date is the author's apparent familiarity with a doctrine of Minucianus (405.4f.: συνεστᾶσι δὲ αἱ ὑποθέσεις ἐξ αἰτίου καὶ συνέχοντος καὶ κρινομένου),⁴⁰ which is consistent with a late second-century date.⁴¹

Treatise A stands close to Treatise H in this respect. It treats the προκατάστασις separately both from the proem and the narrative, but the narrative section of a speech is called διήγησις; the term κατάστασις has not yet displaced διήγησις in this sense,⁴² as it does in many later rhetoricians (e.g. Syrianus 2.64.20-65.3, 127.6-15; Sopater *Division of Questions* 3.9 etc; Troilus *PS* 52.12f.). That development could be seen as a logical extension of the new usage of προκατάστασις. Treatise A would (if that is so) still be at a relatively early stage in this development; but its detailed catalogue of twelve kinds of προκατάστασις might be seen as an attempt to take the new doctrine beyond the stage achieved in Treatise H. Again, therefore, it is at least plausible to see Treatise A as the work of an innovative pupil building on the doctrine of Treatise H.

³⁸ At 109.12 there is something to be said for προκαταστήσαντας... τὴν διήγησιν (Pa) rather than προδιήγησιν (Rabe, with the other manuscripts).

³⁹ The dating assumes that he is the Harpocration whose dissent from Hermogenes' views on incomplete simple conjectures are cited in *RG* 7.349.24f., 350.29 (see also 547.31f.); but more than one sophist named Harpocration is known. An early third-century date for the Anonymus Seguerianus is probable in any case: see Graeven 1891, xxv-xxxiii.

⁴⁰ On the theory referred to here and its significance see Heath 1994a, 125f.; the link between Rufus and Minucianus was already noticed by Schissel 1927 (with a different reconstruction of Minucianus' doctrine). For the date of Rufus' treatise see Schissel 1926, 370 n.2 ('in die Wende des 2. und 3 Jhs., oder in den Anfang des 3 Jhs'); for the chronology of Rufus of Perinthus see Ameling 1985. The identification of Minucianus proposed in Heath 1996 implies a somewhat later date than that generally accepted.

⁴¹ Comparable are [D. H.] 273.23. 287.19, 21 Usener-Radermacher (from the chapters on epideictic which, in view of the reference to Nicostratus at 266.14, cannot be earlier than the latter part of the second century).

⁴² Indeed, προκατάστασις and κατάστασις seem to be used as equivalents; e.g. 353.28-354.4 = 251.3-9, distinguishing ἀφήγησις (διήγησις B) from κατάστασις: ἡ δὲ κατάστασις... προκαθίστησι τοὺς ἀκροατὰς πῶς δεῖ ἀκούειν τῶν πραγμάτων. This undifferentiated use of the terms may explain Syrianus' confusion in citing this passage (see above); in his day προκατάστασις and κατάστασις were definitely distinct.

4.2 ὑποφορά and ἀντίθεσις

My second example concerns a difference in terminology between the two treatises. Treatise H notes in its discussion of the argumentative section of the speech that one can either bring forward an argument of one's own and corroborate it, or else bring forward an argument for the opposition and provide a refutation, or λύσις (132.10-12). In the latter case, a complex structure can be used to present the opposing argument and its refutation (133.24-134.14): πρότασις (e.g. 'My opponent may say...'), ὑποφορά (stating the opposing argument), ἀντιπρότασις (e.g. 'But this is easily refuted...'), ἀνθυποφορά (which presents the refutation itself).

There are clear antecedents for this use of the terms ὑποφορά and ἀνθυποφορά. In Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Demosthenes* 54) ἀνθυποφορά refers to a speaker's answer to his own question; the usage of Tiberius *On Figures* is similar (3.77.5-15 Spengel); compare the Latin *subiectio* or *suggestio* (*Rhet. Her.* 4.23; Quint. 9.2.15). Closer to Treatise H is the epitome of Rufus (407.4-8 Hammer), in which ἀνθυποφορά is used of the technique in forensic oratory of putting forward an argument of the opposition which is then countered, and ὑποφορά of the same technique in deliberative oratory. Origen also uses the term ἀνθυποφορά for an objection put forward in need of refutation (e.g. *Comm. in Joh.* 1.143, 2.177, 6.26).

By contrast, Treatise A does not use these terms at all: in place of ὑποφορά and ἀνθυποφορά we find ἀντίθεσις and λύσις. This usage is already well-attested in the second century. There is evidence that Zeno used the term in this sense in his commentary on Demosthenes (sch. Dem. 1.5 36b),⁴³ and it is found in pseudo-Aristides (41.8-15, 50.5-10, 66.4f. Schmid) and Hermogenes (238.6-15, 313.6f., 356.19f., 369.5, 379.10). Syrianus (2.12.5-13) reports that some took ἀντίθεσις and λύσις as standard parts of the speech (giving a five-part scheme instead of the more common four-part scheme, which treats them as aspects of the ἀγῶνες or πίστεις).⁴⁴ Some scholia to Demosthenes exhibit a more delicately discriminated usage, in which ἀντίθεσις designates an objection to one's own position put forward in order to introduce a whole head of argument, while ἀνθυποφορά is an objection which concedes part of one's own position but takes issue with a particular aspect of it (see e.g. 1.14 105c; 2.9 64b; 20.3 14b; 20.98 226). There are grounds for associating this more complex terminology with Menander, towards the end of the third century;⁴⁵ it is also found in the essay on insoluble ἀντιθέσεις by Maximus, perhaps a fourth-century work (*PS* 439.16, 441.11, 445.8).⁴⁶

In the Demosthenic scholia this usage of ἀντίθεσις and ἀνθυποφορά co-exists with the incompatible terminology of Treatise H (e.g. 7.3 12; 21.25 91a; 21.26

⁴³ On the identity and date of this Zeno see Heath 1994b.

⁴⁴ Cf. *PS* 212.8-10, 214.4-8. Contrast the five- and six-part schemes known from earlier sources, in which the arguments are divided into *probatio* (*confirmatio*) and *refutatio* (*confutatio*, *reprehensio*): e.g. Cic. *Inv.* 1.19; *Rhet. Her.* 1.4; Quint. 3.9.1-5.

⁴⁵ See n.27 above.

⁴⁶ On the authorship and date see Rabe 1931, cxv-cxxvi.

93a).⁴⁷ The terminology of Treatise H is embedded in a stratum of the scholia which accepts that text as an authentic (and authoritative) work of Hermogenes, and which is therefore relatively late.⁴⁸ A possible inference would be that the ὑποφορά-terminology of Rufus and Treatise H (based on a long-standing term for the question-and-answer figure) was increasingly displaced from the latter part of the second century onwards by the ἀντίθεσις-terminology, but regained ground once it had acquired prestige from the misattribution of Treatise H to Hermogenes. The difference between Treatise H and Treatise A would then be readily intelligible: the author of the latter has preferred a more up-to-date terminology.

4.3 ἀντιπαράστασις

We have looked at one case in which Treatise A and Treatise H share their terminology, and one in which their terminology is different; in our third probe we will find conflicting uses of a shared term.

The speaker responds to an ἀντίθεσις by solving the objection it poses in a λύσις. In Treatise H there are three kinds of λύσις (136.20-140.8): in ἔνστασις the objection is rebutted directly ('you killed him', 'I did not kill him'); in ἀντιπαράστασις it is conceded but shown in some way not to have the consequence claimed by the opposition ('I did kill him, but in self-defence'); the 'forcible' (βίαιος) solution turns the objection against itself. The terms ἔνστασις and ἀντιπαράστασις are found in Alexander of Aphrodisias (*In Met.* 518.27f., 588.3) and later commentators on Aristotle and Plato. They are used by Hermogenes (48.14-49.6 etc), and therefore also by his commentators. They also appear in Sopater's *Division of Questions* (71.28,⁴⁹ 160.14, 163.28-31, 291.19f. etc), and frequently in the scholia to Demosthenes (19.202 426; 19.205 427; 20.116 277; 21.169 567ab; 22.6 27a; 22.36 105a; 24.145 288ab, 289ab etc).

Treatise A has a different terminology. Here we find two main types of refutation, known as λύσις κατὰ ἀνατροπήν and λύσις κατὰ μέθοδον (365.15-18 = 268.21-269.2); the term ἀντιπαράστασις is applied to one of the many sub-categories of λύσις κατὰ μέθοδον which the treatise goes on to catalogue (ὅταν μὴ δυνάμενοι ἀνελεῖν τὸ παρὰ τοῦ ἀντιδίκου πάντη ἀντιπαραστήσωμεν αὐτῷ ἕτερον, ἢ καλὸν ἢ κακόν 366.27f. = 270.21-23). This terminology is much rarer. Marcellinus uses these terms to explain ἔνστασις and ἀντιπαράστασις on their first appearance in Hermogenes (*RG* 4.379.11-15), but not elsewhere. The λύσις κατὰ ἀνατροπήν is found once in the Demosthenes scholia (16.11 3), but not the λύσις κατὰ μέθοδον (contrast the less specific usage at e.g. 24.108 215c θαυμαστικῆς δὲ οὔσης τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀντίθεσιν

⁴⁷ The fourth element in the complex structure described by Treatise H is sometimes called λύσις in the scholia, rather than ἀνθυποφορά, but not always. Hence ἀνθυποφορά is sometimes used in the scholia for a partial objection, and sometimes in the diametrically opposed sense of the refutation of an objection.

⁴⁸ This usage is also found in *RG* 4.266.6, 577.5, 578.8; Sopater *Division of Questions* 356.18-23.

⁴⁹ Walz's text is incomplete here; read μετάληψις <κατὰ ἀντιπαράστασιν τοῦ διώκοντος> (see Innes and Winterbottom *ad loc.*).

μεθόδου, ἔτι θαυμασιωτέρα ἢ κατὰ τὴν λύσιν μέθοδος); the same is true of Sopater's *Division of Questions* (241.4).

Marcellinus' explanatory use of the terms κατὰ ἀνατροπὴν and κατὰ μέθοδον suggests that they were felt to be more transparent than ἔνστασις and ἀντιπαράστασις. If so, we can understand why the author of Treatise A might have wished to adopt the alternative terminology in the context of his attempt to develop a more elaborate classification of λύσεις.⁵⁰ But the innovation (if that is what it was) does not seem to have succeeded in displacing the established terms.

5. Conclusion

The first of our probes produced evidence of a common approach in the two treatises, with Treatise A arguably developing both the method and the doctrine of Treatise H further; this provides some support for the hypothesis of a teacher/pupil relation. The second and third probes offer no positive support to the hypothesis, but are consistent with it: in the second probe the use of different terms could be explained as the adoption by Treatise A of a more up-to-date terminology; in the third probe a conflicting use of a single term may reflect an intelligibly motivated innovation in Treatise A. In all cases it is possible to see Treatise A as trying to move beyond the teaching of Treatise H. For the reasons already stated, it is not possible to prove that the explanations of the differences between the treatises suggested here are correct; the hypothesis about the relationship between the two treatises which I have advanced therefore remains unproven. But the possibility that these explanations are correct is sufficient to keep the hypothesis in contention.

I hope therefore to have shown in this paper that there are grounds for questioning the traditional attribution of Treatise A to Apsines. If we conclude that Treatise A is not the work of Apsines, two further steps can be taken. First, the main obstacle to accepting the attribution of Treatise H to Apsines is removed. This does not prove that Treatise H is the work of Apsines (for this attribution is also subject to the general proviso urged in my introduction, and is not helped by the fact that its earliest source, Syrianus, is *ex hypothesi* unreliable in the case of Treatise A); but the hypothesis can no longer be dismissed out of hand. Secondly, it now becomes possible to give an economical explanation of some otherwise puzzling testimonia by adopting the hypothesis that Treatise A, together with the fragment on figured speeches, is the work of a pupil of Apsines named Aspasius (perhaps Aspasius of Tyre). The conjunction of these two hypotheses can be tested against internal evidence for the relationship between Treatise H and Treatise A and external evidence for the development of rhetorical theory in the second and third centuries AD. I have argued that the hypotheses survive the test; but this

⁵⁰ The unusually emphatic first person at 370.21 = 276.11, ἡμεῖς δὲ τοὺς τόπους τῶν λύσεων σοὶ παρεχόμεθα, may imply a claim to originality in this classification.

conclusion, based on a small number of instances, must be regarded as provisional and as an invitation to further research.⁵¹

Bibliography

- Ameling Walther 1985. "Der Sophist Rufus", *Epigraphica Anatolica* 6:27-33.
- Avotins, Ivars 1971. "Prosopographical and chronological notes on some Greek sophists of the empire", *CSCA* 4:72-80.
- Avotins, Ivars 1975 . "The holders of the chairs of rhetoric at Athens", *HSCP* 79:313-24.
- Ballaira, G. 1968. *Tiberii de figuris Demosthenicis libellus cum deperditorum operum fragmentis*. Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo.
- Brzoska, Julius 1896. "Apsines", *RE* 2:277-83.
- Cartledge, Paul & Spawforth, Antony 1989. *Hellenistic and Roman Sparta*. London: Routledge.
- Eck, Werner 1974. "Apsines", *RE Suppl.* 14:53.
- Geiger, Joseph 1994. "Notes on the Second Sophistic in Palestine", *ICS* 19:221-30.
- Graeven, H. 1895. "Ein Fragment des Lachares", *Hermes* 30:289-313.
- Graeven, Johann 1891. *Cornuti artis rhetoricae epitome*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Hammer, C. 1876. *De Apsine Rhetore*. Prog. Guntianum.
- Hammer, C. 1894. *Rhetores Graeci* I.2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Heath, Malcolm 1994a. "The substructure of *stasis*-theory from Hermagoras to Hermogenes", *CQ* 44:114-29.
- Heath, Malcolm 1994b. "Zeno the rhetor and the thirteen *staseis*", *Eranos* 92:17-22.
- Heath, Malcolm 1996. "The family of Minucianus?", *ZPE* 113:66-70.
- Jones, C.P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

⁵¹ Ian Rutherford points out to me that Treatise H presents idea-theory in a less developed form than Hermogenes *On Ideas* (see further Rutherford 1997). This can be accommodated: Basilicus wrote on idea-theory before Hermogenes (Syr. 1.12.24-13.4), and it is perfectly plausible that Apsines was content with his teacher's treatment of this subject: there is no evidence that Hermogenes' original and highly sophisticated contribution had much immediate impact (by contrast with *On Issues*, which we know already to have been the subject of commentaries in the third century). If Treatise H is influenced by Basilicus' stylistic theory, then pseudo-Aristides cannot (as some have conjectured) be Basilicus. But there are other candidates: of the works on idea-theory known from the *Suda*, Hadrian of Tyre's, in five books, is too long (A528) and those of Metrophanes (M1009) and Tiberius (T550) are too late; but Aelius Harpocration (A4013) cannot be excluded, and there may have been other, unattested works on this subject (Basilicus' is concealed in the *Suda* behind καὶ ἄλλα τινά).

- Keil, Bruno 1907a. "Pro Hermogene", *Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen* 1907:176-222.
- Keil, Bruno 1907b. "Zwei Identifikationen", *Hermes* 42:548-63.
- MacDowell, D.M. *Demosthenes Against Meidias*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Millar, Fergus 1969. "P. Herennius Dexippus: the Greek world and the third-century invasions", *JRS* 59:12-29.
- Penella, Robert J. 1990. *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the Fourth Century AD*. Leeds: Francis Cairns.
- Rabe, Hugo 1908. "Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften: 5. Des Diakonen und Logotheten Johannes Kommentar zu Hermogenes Περὶ μεθόδου δεινότητος", *RM* 63:127-51.
- Rabe, Hugo 1913. *Hermogenes*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rabe, Hugo 1931. *Prolegomenon Sylloge*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Rémy, Bernard 1976/7. "Ornati et ornamenta quaestoria, praetoria et consularia sous le haut Empire Romain", *REA* 78-79:160-98.
- Rohde, Erwin 1901. *Kleine Schriften* I. Tübingen & Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Russell, D.A. & Wilson, N.G. 1981. *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Russell, D.A. 1996. *Libanius: Imaginary Speeches*. London: Duckworth.
- Rutherford, Ian 1997. *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schenkeveld, D.M. 1991. "The philosopher Aquila", *CQ* 41:490-95.
- Schilling, Ludwig 1903. "Quaestiones rhetoricae selectae", *Jahrbuch für classische Philologie* Suppl. 28:663-778.
- Schissel, Otmar 1926. "Die rhetorische Kunstlehre des Rufus von Perinth", *RM* 75:369-92.
- Schissel, Otmar 1927. "Ein Minukianzitat in der Redelehre des Rufus". *PW* 47:828-31.
- Schmid, Wilhelm 1896. "Aspasios (3)", *RE* 2:1723.
- Solmsen, Friedrich 1936. "Tiberius (2)", *RE* 6A:804-7.
- Spengel, L. 1853. *Rhetores Graeci* I. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Usener, Hermann & Radermacher, Ludwig 1904. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula* II. Leipzig: Teubner.