THE SPEECH IN THE COMPOSITE TEXT: STUDIES IN THE MEDIATION PROCESS FOR SOURCES OF RHETORIC IN THE DEIPNOSOPHISTS OF ATHENAEUS OF NAUCRATIS

Fee-Alexandra Haase, United International College in Zhuhai of Hong Kong Baptist University and Beijing Normal University, fahaase@uic.edu.hk

Original scientific paper
DOI: 10.31902/fll.32.2020.8
UDC: 821.14'02:808.51

Abstract: The *Deipnosophists* is a literary work that presents an insight into ancient rhetoric and speech from various perspectives, while its author, Athenaeus of Naucratis, has a mediating function in the process of communicating this knowledge besides other topics of knowledge about ancient cultures to the readers. Being composed of fictive speeches that join the texts of ancient writings in paraphrases and citations in the conversations of the participants during a banquet, the work reveals in different layers information about rhetoric. Rhetoric is present in the composition of the work itself. In the conversation's speech is present as the essential form of this piece of literature and one component of this composite text. But also, the writings of other authors reflect knowledge about rhetoric as the scholarly discipline for speech. We argue that Athenaeus invents and composes here a memory that arranges topics related to the culture of banquets in speeches. The speeches range from the factuality of historical accounts about rhetoricians to the fictional story of the event and its speeches. The *Deipnosophists* blends speeches into each other as conversations of the framing narrative of a meeting of Athenaeus who tells the story of the event to a friend and the speeches of the deipnosophists in the actual event of the banquet. The presentation of the texts of the cited and paraphrased books on rhetoric and anecdotal information about rhetoricians and sophists in the description of the banquet rely on the intensive collection of information recorded in the medium book that the author used for the creation of his own work.

Keywords: Rhetoric, Second Sophistic, Banquet, Hellenism, Epideictic speech, Greek literature, Imperial Rome

I. Introduction:

Rhetoric of Speeches in the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus

How is knowledge about rhetoric communicated? With this question applied to the *Deipnosophists* of Athenaeus, the aim of this article is to analyze the information about rhetoric that Athenaeus provides us in this book that combines a literary form with an encyclopedic knowledge about Greek customs from the classical time to the fictive speakers' actions and sayings that reflect the time of Athenaeus. The field of rhetoric is present in various layers of the text. So Athenaeus has chosen in his unique blend of a framing narrative with a dialogue between Athenaeus and his friend Timocrates who demands an account of this event with the narrative of the event of the banquet and the narratives of the works of authors that are either paraphrased or cited. The framing narrative of a dialogue of two persons who meet and one of them asks for an account of a banquet has been used by Plato in his dialogue *Symposium*. The main account is the event of the dinner of the deipnosophists. References from books are cited by the participants, as Athenaeus mentions in *Book VII* (7.5.) as the technique employed by the participants during the banquet for the subject *Fishes*:

ἀπομνημονεύσω δέ σοι ἅ περὶ ἐκ
 ἄστου ἔλεξαν οἱ δειπνοσοφισταί.
 πάντες γὰρ συνεισήνεγκαν εἰς αὐτ
 οὺς τὰς ἐκ βιβλίων συμβολάς, ὧν
 τὰ ὀνόματα διὰ τὸ πλῆθος παραλε
 ίψω.

I will now recapitulate to you
 what the Deipnosophists said
 about each: for each of them
 brought to the discussion of the
 subject some contribution of
 quotation from books; though I
 will not mention the names of
 all who took part in the
 conversation, they were so
 numerous.

(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

This part, while being inserted into the narrative of the conversations, is as the narrative layer of the report between Athenaeus and the person he met, Timocrates, in *Book I* here continued as framing narrative. As for the subject *Rhetoric*, quotations from speeches of orators, but also other sources providing information about the lives of rhetoricians and their culture exist as another layer. Speech is as unit of spoken uttered words and as rhetorical speech ('λόγος'; 'oratio') present in the text. Athenaeus lets us also in the way his protagonists act and comment on rhetorical issues have a look at the contemporary state of rhetoric in the Hellenic world during the late

second century. The culture of banquets as social gatherings that existed in all parts of the ancient world known to the Hellenic scholars is realized actively during the dinner of the deipnosophists and all of the topics the deipnosophists discuss in their speeches are thematically bound to the banquet. The banquet in Greece is only one aspect of the work reflecting the historical state of the ancient Greek culture. As the main theme chosen by Athenaeus for a cultural history, the author extends this theme even beyond the limits of the Greek culture with information about banquets in other cultures. Athenaeus unfolds its history, while not limiting banquets to literary genres that were exclusively dedicated to banquets. The author connects the banquet to related subjects like food and entertainment in the speeches of the deipnosophists. In Athenaeus' work, several of these writings are quoted that otherwise would have been completely lost. Despite the fictional character of the *Deipnosophists* Athenaeus reveals in his work biographic details of his own origin from the city of Naucratis in the Western delta of the Nile River during the conversation.

The *Deipnosophists* is more than a literary work of a fictional event. It contains valuable information about the rhetoric of antiquity until the *Second Sophistic* from written sources that are exclusively quoted in this work. This concerns the reference to rhetoricians called orator ('ρήτωρ') and their speeches, but also other sources that describe the lives of rhetoricians in anecdotal ways giving us an insight of their interaction with professionals from other scholarly or artistic backgrounds. The way that Athenaeus narrates details about the performance and interaction between the participating deipnosophists entails descriptions of how orators act in comparisons of the deipnosophists and the performance of a professional orator. While Plutarch's *Dinner of the Seven Wise Men* (Συμπόσιον τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν) is a fictive conversation of the 'seven wise men' Thales, Bias, Pittacus, Solon, Chilon, Cleobulus, and Anacharsis, Athenaeus chooses fictional contemporaries who gather at the banquet. Here the interaction between the participating deipnosophists has both a discursive structure in the tradition of the genre of the didactic dialogue and narrative and descriptive sequences of the text parts of the speeches delivered by single deipnosophists. The references are the argument for their introductory statement that is linked to the discursive frame of the verbal interaction between the participants. The deipnosophists quote or paraphrase their references after the short introductory statement. The topological structure of the whole work ranges subject-wise across different kinds of topics related to the banquet culture like food and drinks from different areas of the world, cookery, banquets in

festivals, and entertainment in banquets. In terms of the arguments, it uses the encyclopedic knowledge from books as support for the topics that the deipnosophists employ in their speeches during the banquet. But this encyclopedic knowledge the deipnosophists provide is a real one. The author of the *Deipnosophists* must have had access to these works. What Athenaeus knew and documented in the *Deipnosophists* shows us that at the end of the second century CE the works of scholars of the age of Pericles and poetic works since Homeric time were known, preserved, and employed as sources for compositions that use the adaption and implementation of these texts into a new literary form during the *Second Sophistic*.

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

II. Research:

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

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

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

Johnson and Richter in *Periodicity and Scope* in *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic* argued that for the Greco-Roman world of the second century CE common characteristic of the *Second Sophistic* of ‘nostalgia for an idealized classical past’, ‘archaism and purity of language’, ‘sophistic performance and contest and display’, ‘paideia and erudition’, and ‘anxieties over self-definition and identity’ should be “explored with nuance, sophistication, and sufficient granularity, and with close attention to tensions, ambiguity, and ambivalence” (3). Kemezis in *Narrative of Cultural Geography in Philostratus’ Lives of the Sophists* analyzed the literary structure of Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists* and noticed that “the salient geographical feature of Philostratus’s story is its emphasis on Athens as the ideal site for sophistic activity”. (5) As shown by Eshleman, Philostratus limits the sophists in his work to the three groups of six academic generations from Nicetes through Herodes Atticus to Philostratus, Polemo and his associates, and Isaeus and his students (397).

Recent research has employed the concept of the *Second Sophistic* as a term for the second half of the first century to the second half of the 3rd century CE applicable to public figures beyond the range of Philostratus’ *Lives of the Sophists*. Anderson stated that there is “no specific branch of ‘sophistic rhetoric’, though again in practice sophists concentrated on ‘epideiktic rhetoric’” (16). As for the *Deipnosophists*, we have here the fictive event of the banquet and the historical accounts of the cited works in a composite of discourses of the deipnosophists that combine documentation, dialectics, and oratory. Whitmarsh noticed that “although eternally aware of the potentially fictive properties of a discourse, Greeks only rarely acknowledged fiction as a genre: partial exceptions can be found in forms of rhetoric and New Comedy, but it was not until the emergence of the novel in the imperial period that one particular literary form became definitively fictive” (14). Recent research has contributed to the analysis of the stylistically complex form of the *Deipnosophists*. Anderson (2008: 347) makes a thematic conjecture between Longinus

who in his *On the Sublime* discusses in chapter 43 food and refers so to the 'world of the *Deipnosophists*'. Williamson in *Culinary Rhetoric and Rhetorical Cookery. Plato was Right After All* noticed that "the deeply rhetorical nature of cooking has been recognized since classic times, particularly in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists*, but the full potential richness of a deeper theoretical linkage between discursive scholarship and the culinary arts remains to be explored" (19).

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

text and the representation of knowledge in the *Deipnosophists*. It is the carrier of the persuasive function of rhetoric. In the following sections, we will analyze how Athenaeus employed speech as the rhetorical means to construct the text of the central event of the *Deipnosophists*, the banquet, and preserve the knowledge of rhetoric.

III. What the *Deipnosophists* Tells Us about Contemporary Rhetoric: Rhetoric, Speech, and Rhetoricians/Orators (ῥήτορες) at the Banquet in the *Deipnosophists*

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

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

‘imitation of a sumptuous banquet’ (‘μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου πολυτελείας’):

καί ἐστὶν ἡ τοῦ λόγου οἰκονομία
μίμημα τῆς τοῦ δείπνου
πολυτελείας καὶ ἡ τῆς βίβλου
διασκευῆ τῆς ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ
παρασκευῆς. τοιοῦτον ὁ
θαυμαστός οὗτος τοῦ λόγου
οἰκονόμος Ἀθήναιος ἡδιστον
λογόδειπνον εἰσηγεῖται κρείττων
τε αὐτὸς ἑαυτοῦ γινόμενος,
ὥσπερ οἱ Ἀθήνησι ῥήτορες, ὑπὸ
τῆς ἐν τῷ λέγειν θερμότητος πρὸς
τὰ ἐπόμενα τῆς βίβλου βαθμηδὸν
ὑπεράλλεται.

(Ed. G. Kaibel)

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

(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

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

τῶν δὲ κυνικῶν εἷς ἦν ὃν
Κύνουλκον καλεῖ· ὃ οὐ μόνον
δύο κύνες ἀργοὶ εἵποντο, ὡς τῷ
Τηλεμάχῳ ἐκκλησιάζοντι, ἀλλὰ
τῶν Ἀκταίωνος πολὺ πλείονες.
ῥητόρων τε ἦν ἄγυρις τῶν
κυνικῶν κατ’ οὐδὲν
ἀπολειπομένη.

(Ed. G. Kaibel)

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

(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

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

<p>τοιούτοί τινές εἰσιν, ὧς ἑταῖροι, οἱ Οὐλιπῖανειοι σοφισταί, οἱ καὶ τὸ μιλιάριον καλούμενον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων, τὸ εἰς [τοῦ] θερμοῦ ὕδατος κατεργασίαν κατασκευαζόμενον, ἱπνολέβητα ὀνομάζοντες. (Ed. G. Kaibel)</p>	<p>Such now, my friends, are Ulpian's companions, the sophists; men who call even the thing which the Romans call miliarium, that is to say, a vessel designed to prepare boiling water in, ἱπνολέβης, an oven-kettle. (Tr. C.D.Yonge)</p>
--	---

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

<p>καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, ὧς Τιμόκρατες, ἀποδίδομέν σοι τὰ τῶν δεῖπνοσοφιστῶν λείψανα καὶ οὐ δίδομεν, ὥς ὁ Κοθωκίδης φησὶ ῥήτωρ Δημοσθένην χλευάζων. (Ed. G. Kaibel)</p>	<p>And we accordingly, O Timocrates, will <i>restore</i> to you the relics of the feast of the Deipnosophists, and will not <i>give</i> them, as Cothocides the orator said, meaning to ridicule Demosthenes. (Tr. C.D. Yonge)</p>
---	--

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

The narrative practice that the host and guests who attended a banquet shared a common topic and presented one after the other during the banquet their speeches about this topic is known from Plato. The *Symposium* of Plato is a meeting with the central topic *Eros*, to which each of the participating speakers contributed. In Athenaeus' work the event, the banquet, and its topic of the speeches are identical, even though its various aspects are discussed to a degree that lets the banquet appear as a symbol of a universal pleasant and cultured lifestyle. The idea to use the knowledge preserved in a library, books about all kinds of knowledge that contribute to the main topic as material of the narratives of the participating dinner sophists not only

shows us the creativity of the invention of the author, but also the presence and availability of this knowledge for scholars like Athenaeus in the second century CE. The banquet takes place in Rome, the center of the Roman Empire, while the culture of Hellenism and its past and other cultures serve as the places the works in the discourses refer to. The readers experience the culture of banquets in the narratives of the speeches, while the actions of the event in Rome are only described to the degree that they build a framing structure. With the praise of the banquet itself as an event, the imperial impact of Rome as the center of the contemporary culture, and the esteem for the locations and local cultures in the world known to scholars at that time, a wide range of persuasive intentions make this work comparable to an epideictic speech. The deipnosophists present a vivid *memoria* of the past and connect this esteemed memory with the present time of the deipnosophists who gather together in the banquet and revive it in their speeches. This blending illusion of a continuity of past cultures and the present culture of Imperial Rome is the persuasive function of the text that is realized by the chosen medium, the speech that revives that past during the event of the banquet.

IV. Banquets as a Theme in Greek Culture and Hellenism

to the *Second Sophistic* in the Speeches of the *Deipnosophists*

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

δεῖπνα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,	The feast for much and varied
πολύτροφα καὶ μάλα πολλὰ, ἃ	food renown'd,
Ξενοκλῆς ῥήτωρ ἐν Ἀθήναις	Given by Xenocles, O Muse,
δείπνισεν ἡμᾶς·	resound.
(Ed. G. Kaibel)	(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

The banquet was a literary motive and topographic place for the presentation of discourses among participants in the Greek culture. Athenaeus' work mentions and quotes several works with the title *Banquet* besides poetic, scholarly and historical works with other titles that entail passages of descriptions of banquets. In *Book I* the poet

Archestratus is mentioned as the author of the writing *The Art of Giving a Banquet* in the translation by Yonge for "Ἀρχεστράτου τοῦ δειπνολόγου" as "Archestratus, the author of 'The Art of giving a Banquet,'" says," quoted in the following passage. The compound 'δειπνολόγος' is actually an expression for the person who employs speech ('λόγος') during the event of a banquet ('δεῖπνον'). In *Book V* the traditions of banquets are described in various cultures beginning with the poetry of Homer in Greece extending to other parts of the world like Germany, Egypt, Persia, and India with quotations from works of authors that entail the banquet as a topic.

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

γράφει:"). Here Athenaeus uses the verb 'γράφει' ('he/she writes') as an alternative to the verb 'φησί' ('he/she says') for the introduction of the author's work (11.107.).

In *Book XIII* Athenaeus wrote that the Stoic philosopher of the third century BCE Persaeus the Cittiaean made an account with the title *Recollections of Banquets* ("καίτοι Περσαίου τοῦ Κιτιέως ἐν τοῖς Συμποτικοῖς Ὑπομνήμασιν", (13.86.)). Aristotle's student Aristoxenus is quoted from his book *Promiscuous Banquets* ("Ἀριστόξενος ἐν τοῖς Συμμίκτοις Συμποτικοῖς ὅμοιον, φησί,", (14.31.)). The word 'Δεῖπνον' is used for the title of literary works in the *Deipnosophists*. Philoxenus' play with the title *Banquet* is mentioned several times ("καὶ Φιλόξενος δ' ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ φησὶν", (9.77), "Φιλόξενος δ' ὁ διθυραμβοποιὸς ἐν τῷ ἐπιγραφομένῳ Δείπνῳ", (15.33.), "ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ ὁ Κυθήριος Φιλόξενος ἐν τῷ Δείπνῳ", (14.50.)). Timachides is an author who is quoted three times from his several books comprising work *Banquet* ("Ἐσπερίδων δὲ μῆλα οὕτως καλεῖσθαι τινὰ φησι Τιμαχίδας ἐν δὲ Δείπνων", (3.23.) and "Τιμαχίδας δὲ ἐν τοῖς Δείπνοις τὸ ρόδον φησὶ τοὺς τοῦ καλεῖν εὖομφον ἀντὶ τοῦ εὖοσμον", (15.29.), and "Τιμαχίδας δ' ἐν τετάρτῳ Δείπνου καὶ θήσειόν τι ἀναγράφει καλούμενον ἄνθος", (15.32.)).

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

Greek Rhetoric and Roman Oratory as Speech Topic:

The Social Status of Rhetoricians / Orators in the *Deipnosophists*

Reading the *Deipnosophists* as a media composite of different texts from a time before the concept multimedia in its contemporary definition was used means to acknowledge the media that existed at the time Athenaeus flourished for communication: they were spoken and written speeches that were in the rhetorical theory highly differentiated, produced as artifices of different genres, and reflected in scholarly writings of different fields of expertise. Recorded in Greek books once written in the past and well-preserved in late antiquity of the Imperium Romanum, these texts enabled Athenaeus to produce his literary composite. Despite its fictionality, we can show that the conversations of the banquet as Athenaeus' unique invention refer to contemporary rhetoric. The factual scholarly work and literary artifacts that appear in the conversations refer to the past of the oratory culture as a means of documentation. The citations of the books often are introduced with the word 'φησί' ('he/she says') marking the beginning of the paraphrase or original text quotation as a speech. So in the

conversational speeches of the banquet, the texts of the written works quoted are introduced as a speech by their respective author. Both kinds of speeches, the spoken and written, that are delivered during the banquet, are the implementations of the framing speech that Athenaeus delivers to his friend as the recollection of this event in the frame narrative.

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

καὶ Σοφοκλῆς δέ τις ψηφίσματι
ἐξήλασε πάντας φιλοσόφους τῆς
Ἀττικῆς, καθ' οὗ λόγον ἔγραψε
Φίλων ὁ Ἀριστοτέλους γνώριμος,
ἀπολογίαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Σοφοκλέους
Δημοχάρους πεποιηκότος τοῦ
Δημοσθένους ἀνεψιοῦ.
(Ed. G. Kaibel)

And a certain man named
Sophocles, passed a decree to
banish all the philosophers from
Attica. And Philo, the friend of
Aristotle, wrote an oration against
him; and Demochares, on the
other hand, who was the cousin of
Demosthenes, composed a
defence for Sophocles.
(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

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

καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι δ' οἱ πάντα ἄριστοι
ἐξέβαλον τοὺς σοφιστὰς τῆς
Ῥώμης ὡς διαφθείροντας τοὺς
νέους, ἐπεὶ οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως
κατεδέξαντο. ἐμφανίζει δ' ὑμῶν
καὶ τὸ ἀνόητον Ἀνάξιππος ὁ
κωμωδιοποιὸς ἐν Κεραυνουμένῳ

And the Romans, who are in
every respect the best of men,
banished all the sophists from
Rome, on the ground of their
corrupting the youth of the city,
though, at a subsequent time,
somehow or other, they admitted

λέγων οὕτως· οἴμοι, φιλοσοφεῖς.
ἀλλὰ τοὺς γε φιλοσόφους ἐν τοῖς
λόγοις φρονοῦντας εὕρισκω
μόνον, ἐν τοῖσι δ' ἔργοις ὄντας
ἀνοήτους ὁρῶ.

(Ed. G. Kaibel)

them. And Anaxippus the comic
poet declares your folly in his
Man struck by Lightning, speaking
thus—

Alas, you're a philosopher; but I
Do think philosophers are only
wise

In quibbling about words; in
deeds they are,
As far as I can see, completely
foolish.

(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

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

Classic Rhetoricians / Orators ('ῥήτορες') of the Periclean Age as Speech Topic in the *Deipnosophists*

The Platonic Circle I: Gorgias

Gorgias is a well-known person in the *Deipnosophists* with the profession of an orator ('ῥήτωρ'). So in *Book V* Athenaeus writes that Antisthenes' dialogue *Archelaus* was written against Gorgias the orator ('ῥήτωρ') (5.63.). Its source is Antisthenes' second treatise called *Cyrus*, in which the dialogue *Archelaus* is mentioned. The dialogue *Gorgias* of Plato appears in several places ("Πλάτων ἐν Γοργίᾳ συγκαταλέγων", ((3.78.), (11.115.), (11.118.)). Athenaeus in *Book V* (5.58.) quotes from the dialogue *Gorgias* to show how carefully Plato composed his dialogues. An anecdote tells that Gorgias himself ("ὁ Γοργίας αὐτὸς") said to his friends that Plato knew how to write iambs well after he read the dialogue about him (11.113.). Other anecdotal details about the life of Gorgias come from Clearchus who wrote in his *Lives* that Gorgias for more than eighty years used his full intellectual capacities and from Demetrius of Byzantium who recorded that Gorgias lived over hundred years because, as Gorgias stated, he never pleased anyone except himself. (12.71.). The expression 'I spoke in Gorgias-like language' ('ἐγὼ Γοργιεῖοις ῥήμασιν εἶπω') appears in a quotation of

the *Banquet* of Xenophon (11.111.). Gorgias appears to be the name-giving person of a book with the title *Gorgias* written by Hermippus (11.113.). In *Book XIII* Athenaeus recorded that Gorgias wrote a treatise on Courtesans (“ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἑταιρῶν”, (13.70.)) and a treatise about the courtesans of Athens (“πάντων τούτων συγγεγραφότων περὶ τῶν Ἀθήνησι Ἑταιρίδων”, (13.21.)).

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

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

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

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

<p>οἷω δ’ ἐχλίνεν ὃν ἔσχατον ἔχρη Ἀπόλλων ἀνθρώπων εἶναι Σωκράτη ἐν σοφίῃ Κύπρις μηνίουσα πυρὸς μένει. ἐκ δὲ βαθείης ψυχῆς κουφοτέρας ἐξεπόνθησ’ ἀνίας, οἰκί’ ἐς</p>	<p>And with what fiery power did Cypris, in her wrath, heat Socrates, whom Apollo had declared to be supreme among all men in wisdom! Yea, though his soul was deep, yet he laboured</p>
--	--

Ἀσπασίης πωλεύμενος·
(Ed. G. Kaibel)

with lighter pains when he visited
the house of Aspasia;
(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

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

Rhetoricians / Orators (‘ρήτορες’) from the Alexandrian Canon of Ten Greek Orators as Speech Topic in the *Deipnosophists*

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

The most famous orator of the classic Greek past praised in writings of late antiquity is Demosthenes. In the *Deipnosophists* many of his speeches are cited. The attribute ‘orator’ (‘ρήτωρ’) is given to Demosthenes in several places ((2.22.), (3.57.), (6.62.), (8.31.), (13.31.), (13.54.), (13.63.), (14.3.), (14.53.)). Cothocides is called ‘orator’ (‘ρήτωρ’) in a quote ridiculing Demosthenes (6.3.). Demosthenes’ contemporary rival Hypereides appears also in several places of the *Deipnosophists* with the profession ‘orator’ (‘ρήτωρ’) ((3.90.), (6.92.), (8.27.), (12.77.), (13.58.), (14.6.)). Lysias has the attribute ‘orator’ (‘ρήτωρ’) throughout the conversations ((12.48.),

(12.76.), (13.34.), (13.93.), (13.94.)). An anecdote is told about Lysias who was desperately in love with Lagis the courtesan, whose panegyric was written by Cephalus the orator (ῥήτωρ) (13.62). In his oration against Philonides Lysias says that Nais was the mistress of Philonides (13.62.). In *Book V* a speech of Lysias is quoted (5.45.) with the remark that philosophers often are more inclined to evil speaking than comic writers with examples from writings of Aeschines, the pupil of Socrates, and his negative disposition displayed when laughing at Lysias the orator. (5.62.). Antiphon is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (Ἀντιφῶντι δὲ τῷ ῥήτορι λόγος) who wrote a speech *On Peacocks* (9.56.). Lycurgus is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) who wrote an *Oration against Demades* (11.51.). For Aeschines the professional title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is used three times in the *Deipnosophists* (6.41.), (8.22.), (13.30.). According to Demosthenes' oration about the False Embassy, Epicrates who was nicknamed Cyrebion was the son-in-law of Aeschines (6.41.) Aeschines' speech against Timarchus is mentioned (13.30.). Since the orators Isocrates, Demosthenes, Hypereides, Lysias, Lycurgus, Antiphon, and Aeschines are mentioned in the *Deipnosophists*, while the names of Andocides, Dinarchus, and Isaeus lack, we can assume that Athenaeus did not take into account the Alexandrian *Canon of Ten Greek Orators* who were selected by Aristophanes of Byzantium and Plutarch in his *Lives of the Ten Orators*.

Rhetoricians / Orators (ῥήτορες) of the Forth Century and Third Century BCE as Speech Topic in the *Deipnosophists*

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

Θεόφιλος δ' ἐν ἱατρῷ ἅμα σκώπτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ἐν λόγοις ψυχρόν· πᾶς δὲ φιλοτίμως πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶν νεανίσκων ... ἐγγέλειον παρατέθεικε. τῷ πατρὶ τευθὶς ἦν	And Theophilus, in his <i>Physician</i> , ridiculing his coldness of expression, says—"And the slave put before the young man himself with great eagerness a
---	--

χρηστή. πατρίδιον, πῶς ἔχεις πρὸς
κάραβον; ψυχρός ἐστίν, ἄπαγε,
φησί· ῥητόρων οὐ γεύομαι.
(Ed. G. Kaibel)

little eel: his father had a fine
cuttle-fish before him. 'Father,'
says he, ' what do you think of
your crawfish ' 'It is cold,' says
he; 'take it away, —I don't want
to eat any orators.'"
(Tr. C.D. Yonge)

Who qualified for Atheneaus to be called an 'orator' (ῥήτωρ)? The 'brazen poet and orator' (ῥήτωρ) Dionysius Chalcus wrote a speech advising the Athenians to adopt a brazen coinage that Callimachus notices in his list of *Oratorical Performances* (15.9.). Caecilius is an 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) who has written a panegyric on Hercules (10.2.). Philinus as an 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) wrote a debate on the Croconidae (10.25.) About Aristophon the orator (ῥήτωρ) Athenaeus writes that he proposed in the archonship of Euclides a law that everyone who was not born of a woman who was a citizen should be classified as a bastard (13.38.). Nicarete the courtesan was the mistress of Stephanus the orator (ῥήτωρ) (13.65.). Stratocles is called an 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) who kept as his mistress a courtesan whose name was Leme in Gorgias' treatise on Courtesans (13.70.) The nephew of Demosthenes Demochares has the professional title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (11.119.). In a reference to Leon of Byzantium who was a student of Aristotle a Python of Byzantium is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (12.74.). Baton of Sinope who wrote a treatise on Thessaly and Haemonica (14.45.) is called twice 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) ((14.34.) and (14.45.)). For Cephalus the title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is used (13.62.) when mentioning that he wrote a panegyric for the courtesan of Lysias Lagis. The only rhetorician of the Augustan Age who is called 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is Caecilius ((6.104.), (11.15.)). As for rhetoricians of the second century CE, Herodes Atticus carries the professional title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) (3.55.). Occasionally orators as a group of professionals are cited by Athenaeus in works of Greek poetry. So in *Book X* (10.73.) a speech from Antiphanes' play *Sappho* is cited asking how an orator can be declared mute ("ῥήτωρ ἄφωνος"). From the *Knights* of Aristophanes a passage is quoted in *Book III* (3.47.) that mentions orators (ῥήτορες). In *Book XIII* (13.60.) the narrator says that Herodicus in *Book VI* of his *Essay on People mentioned by the Comic Poets* wrote that a courtesan according to the orators (ῥήτορες) was called Sestos. In the *Deipnosophists* the title 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) is used for representatives of this profession from its earliest beginnings like Gorgias to orators of the 2nd century CE in the age of Imperial Rome like

Herodes Atticus. The continuity of this term to distinguish the 'orator' (ῥήτωρ) from other professions shows the ongoing knowledge about this profession, its past, and its representatives at a time and place that has a distance to the classical time of Greek rhetoric. Athenaeus' work is a contribution to the understanding of the history and theory of rhetoric as a documentary source of historical texts. It also reflects the contemporary state of written achievements that convey rhetorical elements into writing of complex compositions. These compositions combine narrative layers within speeches. The work employs one rhetorical figure extensively: The *fictio personae*. It is used for a revival of the deceased authors. In the quoted sources of their writings that are now uttered in the voices of the speeches of the participating deipnosophists the esteem for the authors of the past is expressed with this vividness of the event of the imaginized banquet.

VI. Athenaeus' *Deipnosophists* as a Composite of a Mediated Culture of the Past

Danesi defined in the *Dictionary of Media and Communications* multimodality as the "use of several channels to access the same information" and "the mixing of media forms" (204). The term 'multimedia' is modern and commonly applied for a computer system "that allows the user to manipulate and use different types of media, such as text, sound, video, graphics, and animation." (Danesi 203). Athenaeus' work was technically limited to the medium of the handwritten book as a means and device of communication that allowed information to be systematically arranged, recorded, and communicated. Elements of multimodality are present both in dialogues and quotations from literature as written speech in the *Deipnosophists*. Structurally the work employs as a unit of a written text a fictional sound of the speeches and writing as quotes from the ancient scriptures that in most cases are not altered in the speeches. Despite the fact that this work contains no images, with its visual appeal to bring evidence by details of the *mise-en-scene*, the place of the banquet, the work requires the reader to follow the imagination of the event of the banquet. As a narrative about an event in a chronological process of its description it adds elaborated details about the actions, behaviour and the interactions of the speakers, and the course of the dishes and entertainment program. At the same time the reader can consider the quoted text parts as a type of documentation of ancient works or as text parts of the conversation of the deipnosophists in the tradition of the discursive method of the scholarly dialogue that existed in ancient Greece. The reader can

interactively chose the mode of the usage of the selected text parts of the work or the whole text. The reader can interpret and use it as a fantastic fictional narrative, a fictive account of events during the time of the Roman Empire that provides clues about the politics and culture of Rome, a kind of dialogue, or a reference work that accumulates knowledge of the past as means of instruction, or as a means for the motivation to be actively involved in world of banquetery.

Like often employed at the beginning of the Platonic dialogues, it is not a in the dialogue involved person who demands to know what happened during this event of the meetings of the *deipnosophists*. This demand causes as report the following account of what happened. As a communicative action of response, the writer has in order to tell what has happened the function of a mediating person. Deeply rooted in the antique culture, it is a memory that Athenaeus presents here, and not for example an outlook into the future. Its characteristics as a medium that collects, records, and communicates information stem from the abundant variety of books it employs and combines together in the narrative. What is projected here as part of the current Roman culture aims at the presentation of memorable things in the settings of the contemporary time. Personal details, character traits, or life of the participants of the banquet are not of importance. What characterizes them most is their contribution to the knowledge about the subjects of their talk. They are means for the representation of the knowledge preserved in the writings and the event.

As mentioned, multimediality is a modern term of communication as the process of sharing, not a principle of rhetorical speech or the handwritten book. Multimedial features are present in the text of Athenaeus in the symbolic system of writing. In this system visual, acoustic, graphic, and interactive modes are presented for embedding and sharing what the text presents to the reader from various perspectives: The culture of the banquet. Athenaeus places himself right at the beginning of the text as a medium of the report, when the reader is told that he will give an account. Throughout the main text, as collector and medium of the works cited, Athenaeus is the one who conveys and mediates in his account a composite of the past. Even the scene chosen is a reference to the past of banquetery. His role as one of the participant *deipnosophists* can be understood as a rhetorical means of evidence. The participating *deipnosophists* are stock characters that bring us portraits of their professions. The perspective of the ancient professions like grammarians, philosophers, and poets is in the writings of the subjects reflected that are discussed in the conversations. The text is a composite of different text elements. It

employs both as material sources the books of ancient authors and the invented speeches of Athenaeus as components of the books of his work that combine imagination and scholarly knowledge of the author. The the mixing of media forms as a characteristic of multimodality takes here place in the system of writing in the combination of speech present in the dialogues of the deipnosophists, and writing, the books that are implemented as a part of the speeches. That Athenaeus has a mediating and reporting function is a necessary means for the communication of information about the ancient cultures, in our case the knowledge about rhetoric. The framework Athenaeus created here contributes to the history and theory of rhetoric with its genuine and unique approach to let the deipnosophists act in their speeches establishing a discursive network. It also shows that speech has changed at the time of Athenaeus from a canonical order of handbooks to an apparent simple conversational talk with massive quotations that actually presents knowledge about antiquity in its most direct way as an artifice.

Works Cited

- Anderson, Graham. "Rhetoric and the Second Sophistic." *A Companion to Roman Rhetoric*, edited by William Dominik and Jon Hall. Williston: John Wiley & Sons, 2008, pp. 339-353.
- Anderson, Graham. *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- "Athênaios. Ἀθήναιος". Tr. Malcolm Heath. *Suda Online*, edited by David Whitehead. The Stoa Consortium, www.cs.uky.edu/~raphael/sol/sol-cgi-bin/search.cgi. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists. Or Banquet of the Learned of Athenaeus*, translated by C.D. Yonge. London: Henry G. Bohn, 1854. Perseus Project at Tufts University, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2013.01.0003%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D1. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Athenaeus. *The Deipnosophists*, translated by Charles Burton Gulick. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1927. Perseus Project at Tufts University, <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A2008.01.0405%3Abook%3D1%3Achapter%3D1>. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Bowie, Ewen. "The Geography of the Second Sophistic. Cultural Variations." *Paideia. The World of the Second Sophistic*, edited

- by Barbara E. Borg. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008, pp.65-85.
- Danesi, Marcel. *Dictionary of Media and Communications*. Armonk, NY and London: M.E. Sharpe, 2009.
- Digital Athenaeus. *Athenaei Naucratis Dipnosophistarum Libri 15*, edited by G. Kaibel. Project directed by Monica Berti at the Alexander von Humboldt Chair of Digital Humanities at the University of Leipzig. *Digital Athenaeus*, www.digitalatheneus.org. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Eshleman, Kendra. "Defining the Circle of Sophists. Philostratus and the Construction of the Second Sophistic." *Classical Philology*, vol. 103, no. 4, 2008, pp. 395-413.
- Jacob, Christian. *The Web of Athenaeus*, translated by Arietta Papaconstantinou, edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies with Harvard University Press, 2013, <https://chs.harvard.edu/CHS/article/display/5257>. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Johnson, William A.; Richter, Daniel S. "Periodicity and Scope". *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*, edited by Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 3-11.
- Kemezis, Adam. "Narrative of Cultural Geography in Philostratus' Lives of the Sophists." *Essence et Presence de la Seconde Sophistique. Perceptions of the Second Sophistic and Its Times. Regards sur la Seconde Sophistique et son Époque*, edited by Pascale Fleury. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017, pp. 3-22.
- Olson, S Douglas. "Athenaeus' "Fragments" of Non-Fragmentary Prose Authors and their Implications." *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 139, no 3, 2018, pp. 423-450.
- Philostratus the Athenian. *Vitae Sophistarum. Flavii Philostrati Opera*, edited by Carl Ludwig Kayser, vol 2, Leipzig: Teubner, 1871, Perseus Project at Tufts University, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a2008.01.0596. Accessed 5 May 2020.
- Romeri, Luciana. "Citation et Recontextualisation. Le Cas des Philosophes et des Historiens chez Athénée de Naucratis." *Kentron*, vol. 30, 2014, pp. 17-32.
- Paulas, John. "How To Read Athenaeus' Deipnosophists." *American Journal of Philology*, vol. 133, no. 3, 2012, pp. 403-439.

- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Beyond the Second Sophistic. Adventures in Greek Postclassicism*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press, 2013.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. Greece. "Hellenistic and Early Imperial Continuities." *The Oxford Handbook of the Second Sophistic*. Ed. Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2017, pp. 11-24.
- Williamson, Owen M. "Culinary Rhetoric and Rhetorical Cookery. Plato Was Right After All." *Acta Iassyensia Comparationis*, vol. 11, no.1, 2013, pp. 19-22, literaturacomparata.ro/Site_Acta/Old/acta11/AIC_11_Williamson.pdf. Accessed 5 May 2020.

GOVOR U KOMPOZITNOM TEKSTU: UČENJA U PROCESU POSREDOVANJA IZVORA RETORIKE U GOZBI SOFISTA ATENEJA IZ NEUKRATIJJE

Gozba sofista je književno djelo koje pruža uvid u antičku retoriku i govorništvo iz različitih perspektiva, a njegov autor Ateneja iz Neukratije ima posredničku ulogu u procesu komuniciranja čitaocima, uz sva druga, i tog znanja. Sačinjeno od fiktivnih govora koji se u razgovoru učesnika gozbe pridružuju tekstovima u antičkom maniru – u parafrazama i citatima – djelo otkriva različite slojeve informacija o retorici. Retorika je prisutna u komponovanju samog djela. U konverzaciji je prisutna kao esencijalni oblik ovog književnog djela i kao komponenta složenog teksta u cjelini. Ali i u pisanju drugih autora znanje o retorici razumije se kao vještina govora učenih ljudi. Tvrdimo da je Atenej izumio i ovdje prezentovao sjećanje koje sistematizuje teme u vezi sa kulturom gozbi u govorima. Govori sežu od dokumentarnih istorijskih tekstova o retoričarima do fikcionalnih priča o događajima koji takođe inkorporiraju govore. *Gozba sofista* miješa različite govore, kako razgovore okvirnog narativa o susretu sa Atenejom koji priča o događaju, tako i govore sofista na aktuelnoj manifestaciji gozbe. Prezentacija tekstova o citiranim i parafraziranim knjigama o retorici i anegdotske informacije o retoričarima i sofistima u opisu gozbe temelje se na intenzivnom sakupljanju informacija pohranjenih u medijumu knjige koju je autor koristio za sopstveni rad.

Ključne riječi: retorika, Drugi sofizam, gozba, helenizam, epideički govor, grčka književnosti, carski Rim