Zilong Guo

Commentary on the Pseudonymous Letters of Aeschines

Themes and Forms in Graeco-Roman Literature

Mohr Siebeck

Themes and Forms in Graeco-Roman Literature

Edited by

Thorsten Fögen, Markus Asper, Cynthia Damon,
Francesca Schironi and Christian Tornau

8

Zilong Guo

Commentary on the Pseudonymous Letters of Aeschines

Mohr Siebeck

Zilong Guo, born 1988; PhD in Classical Studies from the University of Edinburgh; Professor of Classics at the Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations, Northeast Normal University, Changchun, China.
orcid.org//0000-0002-6781-1348

ISBN 978-3-16-164688-1 / eISBN 978-3-16-164689-8
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-164689-8

ISSN 2510-9456 / eISSN 2510-9464
(Themes and Forms in Graeco-Roman Literature)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data are available at *https://dnb.dnb.de*.

Gedruckt auf alterungsbeständiges Papier. Satz: epline, Bodelshausen.

Cover-Picture: late Hellenistic or Roman mosaic disc with the symbols of Apollo, the nine Muses and their mother Mnemosyne. Archaeological Museum of Elis. Creative Commons. Licence: CC BY-SA 4.0.

Mohr Siebeck GmbH & Co. KG, Wilhelmstraße 18, 72074 Tübingen, Deutschland
www.mohrsiebeck.com, info@mohrsiebeck.com

Preface and Acknowledgements

This volume explores the twelve letters attributed to the Attic orator Aeschines. It is based on a doctoral thesis completed at the University of Edinburgh in 2017. The thesis, supervised by Mirko Canevaro and Calum Maciver, provides a detailed commentary on eleven of these letters, with the exception of Letter 10. I passed the viva with no corrections in early 2018, and the examiners, Michael Edwards and Andrew Erskine, kindly recommended the thesis for publication. In subsequent years it has been referenced in Edward Harris' entry on 'Aeschines' for the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* and by ATTALUS. However, I recognise the need for revision and expansion in the commentary. In pursuit of a comprehensive scholarly edition, I have included extensive discussion of Letter 10 and incorporated recent scholarship. It is inevitable that some important references could not be included. For example, David-Artur Daix's edition of Demosthenes' *Oration 19* came to my attention only after the revisions were completed. Readers are encouraged to consult such works independently.

The pseudonymous letters of Aeschines purport to give an account of his sojourn in exile after he was defeated by Demosthenes in a public trial. There is a strong consensus among scholars that all the letters are forgeries, and their date of composition is usually placed, on linguistic grounds, in the first few centuries A. D. Embracing a variety of literary forms, these letters were probably composed by multiple hands and can be grouped into three categories for convenience. Letters 2, 3, 7, 11 and 12 imitate the 'Demosthenic' letters in a manner similar to the rhetorical exercises from Hellenistic times onwards. Letters 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 come to us with features reminiscent of what German scholars would call *Briefromane*, or 'epistolary novels', and have traditionally been accepted as products of the so-called Second Sophistic. Letter 4 is a prose paraphrase of Pindar's victory odes discussing an athletic family from Rhodes. The commentary consists of two parts. The first gives an extensive account of the letters, including their background, history of scholarship and basic characteristics, to seek to present Ps.-Aeschines and the text in their proper historical and cultural contexts. The second part, which constitutes the basis for the reflections developed in the first part, provides the text, translation and commentary in thematic sequence. It begins with the 'Demosthenic' counterparts (Letters 2, 3, 7, 11 and 12) and stylistic comparisons are made throughout. The analysis of the fictional letters (Letters 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10) pays particular attention to their narrative consistency and engagement with other literary genres. The commentary on Letter 4 brings the Pindaric elements to the fore and completes the volume.

The overall focus is on two overlapping aspects of Aeschines' early reception in antiquity: his status as 'the other orator' beside Demosthenes and as an inspiration for later rhetorical education. Existing studies, however, have been more concerned with textual criticism and linguistic analysis and have left the letters largely unexamined in this regard: thus Engelbert Drerup, Karl Schwegler and, most recently, Felipe G. Hernández Muñoz. In his classic work, Jonathan A. Goldstein used the parallel passages in the pseudonymous letters as evidence for authenticating Demosthenes' letters, and scholars are now able to take advantage of a more reliable reference when studying Ps.-Aeschines. Niklas Holzberg has established a set of generic criteria for the *Briefromane* that has fundamentally changed the way we read Ps.-Aeschines: it is now possible to appreciate the literary value of the letters without scrutinising their authenticity. However, these two studies tell us only half the story: while one of them left more remarks on their mimetic intent of Demosthenes' letters, the other focused on the way in which the letters reflect the epistolary narrative. Moreover, following Erwin Rohde, it seems reasonable to characterise the pseudo-historical tale as seen through the letters as a product of the Second Sophistic, although discoveries of new papyri, such as the *Ninus* romance of the first century B. C., have undermined this assumption.

My study builds on these investigations in an attempt to provide the most comprehensive analysis. The study of the 'Demosthenic' counterparts will contribute to a better understanding of Ps.-Aeschines' intertextual engagement with Demosthenes and his successors such as Ps.-Leosthenes, *FGrH/BNJ* 105 F 6. It shows that Ps.-Aeschines owes a great deal to the culture of rhetoric and highlights his importance in the *Nachleben* of Attic oratory. As for the other letters, this study argues that they deserve some place in our accounts of the history of exilic, periegetic and epinician literatures for contextualising a wide range of preexisting literary forms such as the Homeric *Odyssey* (Letter 1) and Pindar's victory odes (Letter 4). However, they seem to preclude any confident judgement about generic consciousness, especially the notion of 'novel', and need to be approached as antedating the Imperial exponents. Contrary to the *communis opinio*, I therefore attempt to bring forward the date of composition to the late Hellenistic period, when there was already ample encouragement for a sophist, as well as for his students, to write pseudonymous letters. The 'traitors' blacklist' (Letter 12) and the term for the Rhodian family of the Diagoreans (Letter 4) support this possibility, as both show marked affinities with Hellenistic sources. Last but not least, the two coexisting, radically opposed interpretations of one's civic orientation in exile will help us to address the stability and change in the political cultures of the post-Classical period or what scholars may call the 'long Hellenistic Age'. Like other literary forgeries, these letters are problematic and fascinating at the same time. They are likely to be byproducts of rhetorical culture, yet they occupy a unique position as very early – and remarkably successful – examples

of how different literary and political trends were interwoven to make, and to remould, a Classic. It is hoped that this study may have done something to reappraise Ps.-Aeschines, who, in all likelihood, is a pre-sophisticated forerunner at a crossroads in the history of Greek literature.

I am grateful to my teachers, colleagues and students from the Institute for the History of Ancient Civilizations at Northeast Normal University, the University of Edinburgh and other institutions. I would like to thank Matteo Barbato, Douglas Cairns, Raphaëla Dubreuil, Alberto Esu, Benjamin Gray, Lucy Grig, Sven Günther, Paul Jarvis, Péter Kató, Jian Li, Yuanyue Li, Liang Liu, Donncha O'Rourke, Ben Russell, Juan Pablo Sánchez Hernández, Xueliang Shi, Wei Xiong, Matteo Zaccarini, Sara Zanovello, Danchen Zhang, Duoduo Zhang, Hongxia Zhang and Xuqiang Zhang for their invaluable encouragement and assistance. Special thanks to Thorsten Fögen and Tobias Stäbler for their steadfast support in facilitating the publication of this book, and to Qiang Zhang for his unwavering guidance, as well as for providing the new printer that greatly accelerated the revision process of this book.

Contents

Notes on abbreviations and translations

Abbreviations of ancient texts and standard reference works can be found in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th Edition. Other abbreviations used in this volume are listed below.

CAGN	Reardon, Bryan P. (2008): *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (with a new foreword by John R. Morgan), Berkeley.
EAGLL	Giannakis, Georgios K. (ed.) (2014): *Encyclopedia of Ancient Greek Language and Linguistics*, Leiden & Boston.
GE	Montanari, Franco, Madeleine Goh & Chad Schroeder (2015): *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, Leiden & Boston.
GG	Smyth, Herbert W. (1956): *Greek Grammar* (revised by Gordon M. Messing), Cambridge, Massachusetts.
GP	Denniston, John D. (1954): *The Greek Particles*², Oxford.
I. Illion	Frisch, Peter (1975): *Die Inschriften von Ilion*, Bonn.
IMT	Barth, Matthias & Josef Stauber (1993): *Inschriften Mysia & Troas*, Munich.
I. Oropos	Petralos, Basileios Ch. (1997): *Οι επιγραφές του Ωρωπού*, Athens.
IPArk	Thür, Gerhard & Hans Taeuber (1994): *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis. Arkadien*, Vienna.
I. Peraia	Blümel, Wolfgang (1991): *Die Inschriften der Rhodischen Peraia*, Bonn.
*I. Priene*²	Blümel, Wolfgang & Reinhold Merkelbach (2014): *Die Inschriften von Priene*², Bonn.
Lex. Pind.	Slater, William J. (1969): *Lexicon to Pindar*, Berlin.
Lindiaka VI	Blinkenberg, Christian (1937): *Les Prêtres de Poseidon Hippios. Étude sur une inscription lindienne. Lindiaka VI*, Copenhagen.
Lindos II	Blinkenberg, Christian (1941): *Lindos. Fouilles et recherches, 1902–1914. Vol. II, Inscriptions*, Copenhagen & Berlin.
L&S	Lewis, Charlton T. & Charles Short (1879): *A Latin Dictionary*, Oxford.
MP³	Mertens-Pack 3 Online.
OLD	Glare, Peter G. W. (2012): *Oxford Latin Dictionary*², Oxford.
OR	Osborne, Robin G. & Peter J. Rhodes (2017): *Greek Historical Inscriptions 478–404 BC*, Oxford.
PAA	Traill, John S. (1994–2016): *Persons of Ancient Athens*, Toronto.
POG	Richter, Gisela M. A. (1965): *The Portraits of the Greeks* (with *Supplement* in 1972), London.
Priene	McCabe, Donald F., Bart D. Ehrman & R. Neil Elliott (1987): *Priene Inscriptions. Texts and List*, Princeton.
SGDI	Collitz, Hermann & Friedrich Bechtel (eds.) (1884–1915): *Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften*, Göttingen.

The translation of the pseudonymous letters of Aeschines is my own. Unless specified otherwise, all other translations are adapted from the corresponding volumes of the Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, and the Oratory of Classical Greece, University of Texas Press.

Introduction

> Λέγεται δὲ οὗτος πρῶτος ἐκεῖσε σχολάζων τὰ πλάσματα καὶ τὰς λεγομένας μελέτας συνθεῖναι.
>
> While teaching in Rhodes, Aeschines is said to have been the first to have composed fictitious speeches and what are known as oratorical exercises.
>
> (Photius, *Bibl.* 61.20a)

Pseudonymous letters are letters attributed to historical figures but actually written after their lifetimes. They constitute a large proportion of Greek epistolary writings and are also called pseudepigraphic or pseudo-historical letters.[1] Into this category fall the letters attributed to Chion of Heraclea, Euripides, Hippocrates, Phalaris, Philip II, the Seven Sages, Themistocles, Xenophon and some others.[2] Most of these letters originated in a culture of rhetoric, and the extant collections may be the outcome of centuries of composition and circulation in the post-Classical period, especially in the so-called Second Sophistic.[3] Due to

[1] In this book, the term 'pseudonymous' is neutral and is used without emphasising any intention to deceive (*dolus malus*). It refers to works written either as fictions or as forgeries in the persona of historical figures: cf. Rosenmeyer (2001: 195–196). For discussions of other literary pseudepigraphy, see Gudeman (1894: 64–65), Speyer (1971: 13), Syme (1971), Grafton (1990: 3–7), Aune (2009), Martínez (2014: vii–viii) and Higbie (2017: 11–20); see Canevaro (2013: 35–36) for the spurious documents in the Attic orators. There is also no semantic distinction between 'letter' (derived from Old French *letre*) and 'epistle' (derived from ἐπιστολή), although Deissmann (1910: 230) has assumed the latter as a document for literary effect: cf. Stirewalt (1993: 87), Rosenmeyer (2001: 19–20), Gibson & Morrison (2007: 1–4), Ceccarelli (2013a: 13–19), Reinard (2016: 57–66), Fögen (2018) and Sarri (2018: 16–27). For general introductions to the pseudonymous letters, see Costa (2001: xii–xv), Rosenmeyer (2001: 193–233), (2006: 97–103) and Trapp (2003: 27–31).

[2] In some cases they probably survive with individual authentic letters, such as the twenty-eighth letter (Speusippus to Philip II) of the Socratics and the seventh letter of Plato: Gulley (1971), Malherbe (1977: 27–29), Wohl (1998), Natoli (2004) 23–31, Morrison (2013a) and (2023). While Burnyeat & Frede (2015: 3–40) have suggested that such philosophical letter collections are entirely spurious, Sarri (2018: 25) has noted that a third-century B. C. papyrus (*P. Worp* = *Pap. Lugd. Bat.* 33 *fr.* 1, published in 2008) may confirm the authenticity of some Platonic letters, as it contains Plato, *Ep.* 8, 356a.

[3] It is very likely that they are of multiple authorship. The formation of the epistolographic *corpus* of Phalaris, for example, seems to extend from the second century A. D. into the Byzantine period: Russell (1988: 96–97), Trapp (2003: 27–28) and Muratore (2006). The dates of these collections are roughly between the first and second centuries A. D., but that attributed to Anacharsis, a Scythian prince and philosopher, is dated to the Hellenistic period: Section 4.4. For overviews, see *BNP* 4: s. v. 'Epistolary novel' and Trapp (2003: 27–28). See Section 5 for a discussion of the Second Sophistic.

their questionable authenticity and uncertain genre, these letters are often marginalised in modern scholarship.

At the end of the *Corpus Aeschineum* we find a collection of twelve letters. Varying in length from tens to hundreds of words, they purport to give an account of Aeschines' sojourn in exile. However, their presence in the *Corpus* is no guarantee of their authenticity and reliability. There is a strong consensus among scholars that all the letters are 'forgeries', and some are indeed obvious imitations of the letters attributed to Demosthenes.[4] These letters were probably written by several hands, and most of them have been dated, mainly on linguistic grounds, to the second century A. D. They have also been anthologised in various orders and selections by ancient and medieval compilers.[5] Based on the identity of the recipients, they can best be divided into two groups: open letters and private letters. Four of them (*Epp*. 3, 7, 11 and 12) are addressed to the Athenian Council and Assembly and deal mainly with Aeschines' political activities from exile. The remaining eight letters are addressed to historical figures or anonymous addressees and relate to Aeschines' wanderings abroad, in particular his visit to Rhodes and its coastal territory. Other criteria of categorisation are also possible, as these letters cover different literary or scholarly genres. In general, Letters 2, 3, 7, 11 and 12 imitate the letters of Demosthenes and are in some respects comparable to Ps.-Leptines (BKT 7, P. 9781 = MP^3 2511) and Ps.-Leosthenes, *FGrH*/*BNJ* 105 F 6 (= MP^3 2496), two Hellenistic papyri which preserve *meletai* written in the style of Demosthenes, as well as later declamations, since both letters and *meletai* were standards in ancient rhetorical education;[6] Letters 1, 5, 6, 8, 9 and 10 resemble epistolary fictions, usually regarded as typical of the Second Sophistic;[7] and Letter 4 is a Pindaric exegesis of Letter 5 and looks more like a literary showpiece.

---

[4] The authenticity of Letters 1–4 of Demosthenes was demonstrated by Goldstein on the grounds that they fit perfectly in the historical background and do not conflict with the stylistic features of the orator; the imitativeness of Ps.-Aeschines, on the other hand, has occasionally been used by scholars as external evidence for authenticity: Goldstein (1968: 3–34, 64–94, 265–266). See also Section 2.3.

[5] Modern anthologists of Greek epistolary literature have various principles of grouping. Categorisation can be thematic, real/fictitious or public/private; physical, embedded/free-standing; and chronological, Classical/Imperial/Christian. There is overlap, and Rosenmeyer's selection, for example, was organised chronologically with specific thematic chapters: see Costa (2001: xiv–xv), Trapp (2003: 6–34) and Rosenmeyer (2006: 1–9). Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci*, arranged alphabetically, is the only complete collection of Greek epistolary texts. See also R. K. Gibson (2012) and (2013: 390–392).

[6] See Sections 4.1 and 4.4.

[7] In view of the generic ambiguity, I will follow Costa and Rosenmeyer and use the term 'epistolary fictions' or 'fictional letters' instead of *Briefromane* or 'epistolary novels', since the latter claim an ideal form of the genre that cannot cover all pseudonymous letters: see Sections 2.4 and 4.2.

In light of the above, the epistolographic *corpus* of Ps.-Aeschines is a bewildering literary collection to define, yet it provides evidence and contextual information about the development of the oratorical, exilic and epinician literatures. In particular, they reveal two overlapping aspects of Aeschines' early reception: as 'the other orator' alongside Demosthenes, and as an inspiration for later rhetorical education, thus shaping an outline of the orator's afterlife in antiquity.[8] For these reasons, the pseudonymous letters deserve more study than they have received, and the fruits of such study promise to be important. Existing studies, however, have been almost unproductive, being more concerned with textual criticism and linguistic analysis and comparison. The text of Ps.-Aeschines has been reworked five times since Rudolf Hercher's *Epistolographi Graeci* in 1873.[9] In the style of the German doctoral dissertations of the time, Karl Schwegler compiled the lexical items of Ps.-Aeschines with a grammatical exposition. His morphological/syntactic remarks, on which my linguistic analysis is based, can be tested and to a large extent replaced by new tools such as the *TLG*. Moreover, some of his arguments are unconvincing and incomplete.[10] It is time to reexamine and reevaluate the letters. Before giving an account of their role in the history of ancient Greek literature (in Section 5), this introduction will first discuss the following aspects.

1. the background; that is, why the letters were considered authentic and canonised in antiquity.
2. the history of research; that is, how the letters have been challenged and rejuvenated by modern scholarship.
3. the spuriousness and the imitativeness; that is, the basic qualities of the letters.

Secondly, by shedding light on the context from which the letters emerged, it will investigate:

4. the possible author(s) and the date(s) of the production of the letters.

---

[8] In his standard discussion, Harris (1995) has focused on Aeschines' life and the political history of his time, but left his reception history almost untouched. While Kindstrand's laudable 1982 work is the only one that can be compared with those for Demosthenes, such as Drerup (1923), C. D. Adams (1927), Lossau (1964), C. A. Gibson (2002) and Pernot (2006), it has only scratched the surface of the letters on pp. 27, 56–57, 76 n. 30 and has failed to apply ancient criticism to the actual text of Aeschines: Edwards (1984: 210).

[9] Blass (1908: 288–314, a posthumous second edition, with additional notes by Drerup, Paul Wendland and – in the revised edition of 1978 – Ulrich Schindel), Drerup (1904), Martin & de Budé (1927–1928, 2.123–143), García Ruiz & Hernández Muñoz (2012) and Hernández Muñoz & García Ruiz (2022). The pseudonymous letters of Themistocles have also received more philological and linguistic attention: Vicente Sánchez (2006a), (2006b), (2009) and Hanink (2009).

[10] Schwegler (1913: 20–73). Cf. also the pseudonymous letters of Chion of Heraclea with Düring (1951: 7–9).

1. The letters of Aeschines? A background

The detection of the (in)authenticity of works attributed to Aeschines goes back to the time of Augustus, when Caecilius of Calacte, a Sicilian rhetorician, rejected the genuineness of the *Delian Speech*.[11] Although Philostratus and Photius accepted this assessment, they considered the letters to be unequivocally authentic. It would therefore be rash to discuss the spuriousness of the letters at the outset, without looking retrospectively at their testimony to see what intellectual milieu might have provided a fertile ground for the production of the pseudepigraphic writings, on the one hand, and led the critics to believe in their authenticity, on the other.[12] Four historical and literary factors are mainly responsible for this. First, the letter is a versatile medium. Epistolary writing was widespread in private and public life in Classical Athens, and it sometimes replaced oratory. It is therefore highly likely that Aeschines did indeed write letters. Equally important is the influence of the biographical tradition, real or fictitious, which establishes a strong link between his legend in exile and the rise of 'Rhodian oratory', a rhetorical style somewhere between Asianism and Atticism.[13] It is almost certain, therefore, that Aeschines actively showcased his eloquence in the final years of his life. Gradually, and in the eyes of ancient critics such as Philostratus and Photius, Aeschines' later work came to be represented by the epistolographic *corpus*. Despite a gap of several centuries between Philostratus and Photius, the inclusion of these letters in the manuscript tradition of the *Corpus Aeschineum* suggests that they affirmed themselves as authentic in the *Nachleben* of Aeschines.

1.1 Epistolary writing in Classical Athens

In Demosthenes' *On the False Embassy*, Aeschines was accused of having ghostwritten the letter from Philip brought back by the Second Embassy. This

[11] According to Demosthenes, 18.134–136, Aeschines was initially elected as the state advocate to defend the Athenian administration on Delos, but was replaced by Hyperides (*frr.* 67–75 Jensen) on suspicion of treason. Nevertheless, he may have written a speech (undelivered and not preserved). The speech in question may have been misattributed to Aeschines or, as Caecilius argued, to a homonymous figure: see Anonymous, *FGrH*/*BNJ* 401a–d ad hoc. Ps.-Plutarch (*X orat.* 840e = Caecilius, *fr.* 127a Ofenloch) cites Caecilius as his source when discussing the teachers of Aeschines, and we can conclude that Caecilius is the first known scholar who specialised in Aeschines: cf. *Vita Aeschin.* 3.6–7 Dilts (= Caecilius, *fr.* 126a Ofenloch) with Kindstrand (1982: 39–44). However, only Photius (*Bibl.* 61.20a = Caecilius, *fr.* 127 Ofenloch) refers directly to Caecilius: cf. Philostratus, *VS* 1.510 and *Vita Aeschin.* 2.5 Dilts (= Caecilius, *fr.* 126b Ofenloch); see also Section 1.3.2.

[12] Another reason is that epistolary writings did not attract much attention from ancient critics such as Didymus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Harpocration and Libanius. Some speeches of Demosthenes, for example, were often considered by them to be inauthentic, but no one suspected his letters: Blass (1887–1898: 1.56–63) and Goldstein (1968: 7–8).

[13] See Sections 1.2.2 and 4.4.

was a serious accusation, and Aeschines vigorously denied it. He claimed that the ambassadors were with Philip in Thessaly at the time, whereas Demosthenes implied that he had sailed down the river Loedias, which is in Macedon, to meet Philip.[14] In the 'crown trial', he was again accused of having assisted Philip in writing a letter that provided a pretext for Macedon's intervention in the Sacred War against Amphissa.[15] These accusations reflect the importance of epistolary writing in the Athenian political scene.[16] First, epistolary writing is an important medium of everyday documentation in the Greek world. The Athenians kept archival letters in the Metroon as public documents. When arguing their legal cases, litigants were accustomed to citing letters as supporting evidence. The letter is also a regular form of public communication and became a routine type of official decision in the Hellenistic monarchies.[17] Second, in Classical Athens, open letters were commonly read to the people and associated with public speaking ability.[18] In the *First Philippic*, for example, Demosthenes used 'epistolary forces' (τὰς ἐπιστολιμαίους ταύτας δυνάμεις) to refer to 'paper armies', namely the military force promised in writing but never sent.[19] But in exile he used δι᾽ ἐπιστολῆς (Demosthenes, *Ep*. 4.2) to indicate that epistolography was an appropriate way of expressing public opinion.[20] The latter expression can be found in the same context in Ps.-Aeschines:

---

[14] Demosthenes, 19.36–40, 45 and Aeschines, 2.124–127: see MacDowell (2000a: 222). The details of Philip's letter are uncertain, but 'tactful' (ἐπιδέξιος: Aeschines, 2.124) might suggest that Athens was told to pursue its own interests at the expense of other Greek cities: Carey (2000: 109 n. 67).

[15] Demosthenes, 18.155–157 with Usher (1993: 227). Notice, however, that the two orators are portrayed by historians as 'a couple of liars', so their accounts of historical events are not straightforward and should be approached with caution: Cawkwell (1978: 92). On the method for evaluating the reliability of statements in the orators, see Harris (1995: 7–16), endorsed by Paulsen (1999: 57).

[16] Ceccarelli (2013a: 278) and (2013b: 94).

[17] On the practical aspects of epistolary writing, see *SEG* 42.1750, Stirewalt (1993: 4–15), Sickinger (1999: 121, 135–138, 166–169), (2013), Rosenmeyer (2001: 19–24), Jordan (2003: 30–35), Bearzot (2003: 302–303), (2014: 100–102), Bagnall & Cribiore (2006: chh. 8–9), Muir (2009), Eidinow & Taylor (2010), Ceccarelli (2013b), (2013b: 101–179, 265–330, 335–356), Harris (2013b), Reinard (2016: 78–98), Fögen (2018) and Sarri (2018). Letter 6, for example, takes the form of a recommendation letter: see the prefatory note on it; see also *Epp*. 6.1 n. 4 and 7.Tit. n.

[18] Cf. [Demetrius of Phalerum], *Eloc*. 223: 'Artemon, the editor of Aristotle's *Letters*, says that it is necessary to write in the same manner both a dialogue and a letter; a letter is like one of the two sides of a dialogue' (Ἀρτέμων μὲν οὖν, ὁ τὰς Ἀριστοτέλους ἀναγράψας ἐπιστολάς φησιν, ὅτι δεῖ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ τρόπῳ διάλογόν τε γράφειν καὶ ἐπιστολάς· εἶναι γὰρ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν οἷον τὸ ἕτερον μέρος τοῦ διαλόγου). See also Malherbe (1988: 12), Trapp (2003: 317–318), Kennedy (1994: 89–90), Ceccarelli (2013a: 281) and Hodkinson (2013: 330). To some extent, Letters 3, 7, 11 and 12 are written in accordance with the precepts of *demegoriae*: see Section 4.1.

[19] Demosthenes, 4.19; LSJ: s. v. ἐπιστολιμαῖος. Cf. Ceccarelli (2013a: 276–277) and (2013b: 94).

[20] Cf. Plutarch, *Them*. 23.4: 'he [the exiled Themistocles] was not present, but he defended himself by writing' (οὐ παρόντος, ἀλλὰ διὰ γραμμάτων ἀπολογουμένου). In general, however, the orator would prefer to deliver a formal speech in person, since the letter, as a written

> Ἀκούω δὲ τοὺς μὲν αὐτοῦ παρόντας, τοὺς δὲ καὶ δι᾽ ἐπιστολῶν κινεῖν τι τῶν τῆς πόλεως πραγμάτων, ἕτοιμος ἤδη τὰ δοκοῦντα τῇ πόλει συμφέρειν, ὡς μόνον ἔξεστίν μοι, δι᾽ ἐπιστολῶν λέγειν.
>
> Since I learn that some in person in the city, and some by letter are disrupting the affairs of the state, I am now ready to contribute what is appropriate to the city and to speak in the only way I can, by letter. (*Ep*. 11.2)

The evidence above shows the significance and popularity of epistolography in Classical Athens. Isocrates and Demosthenes used this form of writing to discuss issues similar to those raised in their deliberative speeches. Isocrates wrote a letter to the Mytileneans asking for the safe return of his grandchildren's teacher, and Demosthenes is reported to have written a letter before committing suicide.[21] In fact, nine letters of Isocrates and six of Demosthenes have survived, and virtually all of them are authentic.[22] According to ancient critics, another canonical orator, Lysias, wrote some erotic letters for amusement.[23]

Last but not least, although he was not a professional speechwriter, Aeschines may have written some unpublished works.[24] Later biographers have given different descriptions of his sojourn in exile, but claimed that he gave lectures for

---

discourse, may lack vividness: see Demosthenes, *Ep*. 1.3–4, Isocrates, *Ep*. 1.1–3 with DeWitt & DeWitt (1949: 201 n. 1), Papillon (2004: 248 n. 2), Garnjobst (2006: 26) and Ceccarelli (2013a: 290).

[21] Isocrates, *Ep*. 8.1. Demosthenes is said to have drunk the poison from a reed pen while pretending to write a letter home, and another story has him writing a letter to Antipater: Plutarch, *Dem*. 29.3–4, 30.1 and [Plutarch], *X orat*. 847a.

[22] Letter 5 of Demosthenes is controversial because it suggests an influence of Plato on the young Demosthenes. However, scholars have argued that the student-teacher relationship is possible: see Plutarch, *Dem*. 5.7 (= Hermippus of Smyrna, *FGrH/BNJ* 1026 F 49) and [Plutarch], *X orat*. 844b with Pernot (2006: 21–60) and MacDowell (2009: 21–22); see also Allen (2010: 90–160), Hunter (2012: 24–37) and Giaquinta (2019a: 73–76) for Plato's influence on Attic oratory. On the whole, there is no hard evidence of its forgery or authenticity. On the letters of Demosthenes, see Blass (1887–1898: 3.1.439–455), Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1898: 496–498), DeWitt & DeWitt (1949: 196–269), Goldstein (1968), Clavaud (1987), Worthington (2003), (2006: 99–134), MacDowell (2009: 408–423), Westwood (2016), (2020: 73), Giaquinta (2019a) and Berardi (2020b). On those of Isocrates, see Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1898: 492–496), L. F. Smith (1940), Signes Codoñer (2002), Nicolai (2004: 120–127), Papillon (2004: 245–281), Sullivan (2004), Garnjobst (2006) and Ceccarelli (2013a: 286–292). See also C. P. Jones (2017: 43–44) for a brief summary.

[23] Lysias, *frr*. 451–463 Carey. The authenticity of the extant letters is disputed: Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lys*. 1, 3, [Plutarch], *X orat*. 836b, *Suda*: λ 858 and ο 292; see also Baiter & Sauppe (1839–1850: 2.209–210), R. C. Jebb (1883–1893: 1.311–312), Blass (1887–1898: 1.374) and Roisman, Worthington & Waterfield (2015: 133). Similar to the erotic letters is the Lysianic speech quoted, or forged, by Plato (*Phdr*. 230e–234c): Benner & Fobes (1949: 4), Dover (1968: 69–71), Döpp (1983), Floristán Imízcoz (2000: 187–205, 216, 353–356), Nails (2002: 193), Yunis (2011: 97–104) and Berardi (2020a).

[24] Cf. Blass (1887–1898: 3.2.185). Carey (2000: 12) has suggested that the three surviving speeches were his entire published work.

a fee.[25] By his own account, Aeschines wrote several homoerotic poems.[26] His interest in short pieces is also evidenced by his adaptation of poems and by two epigrams attributed to him. In *Against Timarchus*, he quotes and paraphrases at length the works of Homer, Hesiod and Euripides.[27] Of the two epigrams, one is dedicated to Asclepius, concerning Aeschines' recovery from illness, and the lettering of the surviving fragment can be dated to the third century B. C. or later.[28] The other consists of four hexameters and is inscribed on a grave stele of Cleobulus, Aeschines' maternal uncle, dating from the fourth century B. C.[29] Given the prevalence of epistolography in his time, it is not impossible that Aeschines wrote some kind of letter. And since ancient commentators must have found it quite likely that Aeschines wrote letters, there was no *a priori* reason to doubt the authenticity of the letters found in his *Corpus*.

1.2 Aeschines as seen through the biographical tradition

The ancient biographical tradition was often concerned with the prime of life of famous people, and our knowledge of their young and old ages comes overwhelmingly from anecdote. Similarly, the biographical tradition of Aeschines contains a mixture of fact and fiction, and is thus the product of literary cross-fertilisation.[30] But we can isolate two main stages in the tradition. It could be argued that the accounts of Aeschines' political career in Athens have always been in the shadow of Demosthenes. As for his sojourn in exile, Aeschines is described as a figure with more independent – and admirable – qualities. Both aspects are echoed in the pseudonymous letters.

1.2.1 The other orator: activities before his defeat in court

In view of the great influence of Demosthenes, Plutarch relegates Aeschines to the realm of 'the orators who opposed Demosthenes' (ῥήτορες ἐπεμβαίνοντες τῷ Δημοσθένει).[31] Similarly, the biographical tradition of Aeschines, especially

[25] See Section 1.2.2.

[26] Aeschines, 1.135–136: '[Diopeithes of Sounium] says he will display all the erotic poems I have written to individuals […] as to the poems which they say I have written, some I acknowledge' (φησὶν ὅσα πεποίηκα ἐρωτικὰ εἴς τινας ποιήματα […] περὶ δὲ τῶν ποιημάτων ὧν φασιν οὗτοί με πεποιηκέναι, τὰ μὲν ὁμολογῶ). See Fisher (2001: 281), Hernández Muñoz (2009: 256–258) and Hernández Muñoz & García Ruiz (2022: 61 n. 144).

[27] Aeschines, 1.128–129, 144, 147–152: Fisher (2001) ad loc. Further on the poetic (re)citations, see *Ep*. 4.2 n. 7.

[28] *Anthologia Graeca*, 6.330 (= *CEG* 2.776): *Ep*. 1.4 n. 7.

[29] *SEG* 16.193 (= *CEG* 2.519): cf. Aeschines, 2.78. See also Harris (1995: 23–27), Lucas de Dios (2002: 69, 129), Fowler (2008: 95–98) and Foster (2017: 45–47).

[30] Kindstrand (1982: 67) and Harris (1995: 17).

[31] I. e. Aeschines, Demades, Sosicles, Philocrates, Diondas and Melantus: Plutarch, *Dem*. 21.1 with Lintott (2013: 67–68). See also [Plutarch], *X orat*. 840b: καὶ πολιτευόμενος οὐκ ἀφανῶς ἐκ τῆς ἐναντίας μερίδος τοῖς περὶ Δημοσθένη.

when it comes to his personal life, is based on the speeches of Demosthenes.[32] This is evident in the most informative biography by Ps.-Plutarch, which paraphrased many of Demosthenes' speeches but cited Aeschines' speeches only once.[33] Furthermore, in *On the Crown*, Demosthenes employed pairs of antithetical clauses to outline the various stages of Aeschines' life, spanning from his role as a teaching assistant to his career as a public clerk, actor and ultimately a politician. This invective assumes the form of a narrative chronicling Aeschines' early years.[34]

A certain Apollonius is the extreme case in this respect. He repeated the slanders of Demosthenes, such as ὑπογραμματεύειν ('to serve as an under-secretary') and τριταγωνιστής ('bit-part actor').[35] Demosthenes mocked Aeschines' parents, deliberately calling his father Τρόμης ('Trembler') instead of his real name Ἀτρομήτος. To imitate this abuse, Apollonius changed Glaucothea's godlike name to Γλαῦκις.[36] Aeschines' own accounts, however, were routinely adapted or copied *verbatim*.[37] Of these accounts, Apollonius made special mention of 'erotic passion' (ἐρωτικός) to imply Aeschines' homoerotic relations within the *gymnasia*. However, Aeschines himself employed this term to draw a distinction between noble homosexuality and lasciviousness in Athenian culture.[38] This case illustrates how certain biographers, while referencing Aeschines' speeches, interpreted them through the lens of Demosthenes' largely negative perspective.

As we can see, the image of 'the other orator', although often twisted, distorted and even lost under the political and oratorical supremacy of Demosthenes, remains fixed in the later biographical tradition.[39] In 330 B. C., Aeschines

---

[32] Harris (1995: 7–16), Carey (2000: 8–9), Worman (2004) and (2008: 213–274).

[33] Cf. [Plutarch], *X orat.* 840e (ὡς δῆλον ἔκ τε ὧν φησι Δημοσθένης καὶ ἐκ τοῦ Δημοχάρους λόγου), 840f (ὥς φησι Δημοσθένης), 841a (ὥς πού φησι Δημοσθένης) and 840f (ὥς φησιν αὐτός [Aeschines]).

[34] Demosthenes, 18.257–262 with Goodwin (1901: 164): cf. *Ep.* 12.1.

[35] Cf. Demosthenes, 18.180, 258, 261, 19.129, 237 and 246–248.

[36] *Vita Aeschin.* 2.1–2 Dilts: 'Atrometus, whom, some people say, was called Tromes before and later adding a syllable, called by the name of Atrometus instead of Tromes, but he was born a slave […] Aeschines' mother was Glaucothea, or, as some say, Glaukis, whom they claim spent her early years as a courtesan, sitting in a brothel near the shrine of the hero Calamites (Ἀτρομήτου, ὅν φασι πρότερον Τρόμητα καλούμενον ὕστερον συλλαβῆς προσθέσει ἀντὶ Τρόμητος Ἀτρόμητον προσαγορευθῆναι, γεγονέναι δὲ τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς δοῦλον […] μητρὸς δὲ ἦν ὁ Αἰσχίνης Γλαυκοθέας ἤ, ὡς ἔνιοι, Γλαυκίδος, ἥν φασι τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν ἡταιρηκέναι καθεζομένην ἐν οἰκήματι πρὸς τῷ τοῦ Καλαμίτου ἡρῴῳ): cf. Demosthenes, 18.129–130 and Aeschines, 2.78. All aspects of Aeschines' biography, including his death (see below), are viewed with suspicion: see also Harris (1988: 211–212), Eidinow (2015: 17) and Forsdyke (2021: 172).

[37] E. g. Aeschines, 2.78, 147–149 and 167–169. See also Dilts (1992: 4–5).

[38] *Vita Aeschin.* 2.9 Dilts: […] λέγεται δέ ὁ Αἰσχίνης ἐρωτικὸς γεγονέναι. Cf. Aeschines, 1.135–137 with Fisher (2001) ad loc.

[39] For a parallel in the tradition of literary criticism, cf. Caecilius, *frr.* 126a Ofenloch (= *Vita Aeschin.* 3.7 Dilts) and 128 Ofenloch (= Photius, *Bibl.* 61.20b). See also Blass (1887–1898: 3.2.189), Kindstrand (1982: 39–44, 59–64), Innes (2002: 180) and Porter (2016: 188–189).

was overwhelmingly defeated by Demosthenes and failed to secure the essential one-fifth share of the judges' votes.[40] Faced with humiliation and partial disenfranchisement, he chose to leave Athens in voluntary exile.[41] There is no extant account of these events by Demosthenes; the question arises: can a tradition about Aeschines' remaining years develop independently from Demosthenes? To some extent the answer is no. For example, a commonplace about Aeschines' exile is that he read the *Against Ctesiphon* in Rhodes and praised Demosthenes' defence speech.[42] Speaking of the death of Aeschines, moreover, Apollonius still managed to mention Demosthenes by remarking that 'Aeschines died during Antipater's purge of democracy – when those opposed to Demosthenes submitted – he had lived seventy-five years' (ἐτελεύτησε δ' Αἰσχίνης ἀναιρεθεὶς ὑπὸ Ἀντιπάτρου καταλυθείσης τῆς πολιτείας, ὅτε καὶ οἱ περὶ Δημοσθένην ἐξεδόθησαν, βεβιωκὼς ἔτη οε').[43] However, the biographical tradition was interspersed with several imaginary stories of dubious reliability.[44] Particularly in their diverse accounts of his wanderings, later biographers portrayed a non-political dimension of Aeschines.

1.2.2 The master of oratory: sojourn in exile

The theme of displacement recurs in a wide variety of literary sources, especially in the biographical tradition.[45] In the case of Aeschines, there are notable parallels with Gorgias of Leontini, who left Sicily and renovated Athenian oratorical education and practice, and Apollonius Rhodius, who left Alexandria for Rhodes to teach: all of these figures are credited with introducing certain literary trends.[46] The most widespread story about Aeschines' exile is its connection with the ensuing popularity of Rhodes as a destination for Republican rhetoricians. Specifically, ancient authors related the following scenarios.

---

[40] For δικαστής, I use the translation 'judge' instead of 'juror' or 'dicast' in refer to one who gives legal judgements: Harris (2008: xi–xii), (2013a: 249 n. 10) and Diggle & al. (2021: 379).

[41] See Section 3.1.

[42] E. g. Cicero, *De or.* 3.56.213, Valerius Maximus, 8.10.3, ext. 1, Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 7.30.110, Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.7, Pliny the Younger, *Epp.* 2.3.10, 4.5.1, [Plutarch], *X orat.* 840d–e, Philostratus, *V S* 1.510, Photius, *Bibl.* 61.20a, 264.490b, *Vita Aeschin.* 3.3–4 Dilts and Jerome, *Ep.* 53.2. See also Section 1.2.2.

[43] *Vita Aeschin.* 2.12 Dilts.

[44] Cf. *Vita Aeschin.* 2.7 Dilts (= Caecilius, *fr.* 127c Ofenloch): 'although some people say that Aeschines was a disciple of Plato and Socrates, they are wrong' (φασὶ μέντοι τινὲς αὐτὸν ἀκουστὴν γενέσθαι Πλάτωνός τε καὶ Σωκράτους, ψευδόμενοι). On Aeschines and his teachers, see Kindstrand (1982: 68–75). But this aspect provides little insight into the pseudonymous letters.

[45] See Gaertner (2007a) and Section 5.

[46] *Vitae Ap. Rhod.* A, B Wendel and Quintilian, *Inst.* 3.1.12. See also Bremi (1829: 41), Kindstrand (1982: 75) and Enos (2004: 190–192). Cf. Philostratus, *V S* 1.481, in which Aeschines is contrasted with Gorgias.

(i) Aeschines fled Athens in the late summer of 330 B. C.[47] According to Ps.-Plutarch and Philostratus, he retired to Ephesus, a pro-Macedonian city on the coast of Ionia, to await the return of Alexander, who was then campaigning in Asia. However, he did not meet the king before his death in 323 B. C. The seven-year in between are not recorded in the extant sources, but there is good reason to believe that the exile was spent in Asia Minor. Philostratus reports that Aeschines settled in Rhodes and the Rhodian *Peraea* in Caria (Καρίᾳ δὲ ἐνομιλήσας καὶ Ῥόδῳ), where he is known to have previously delighted the satrap Mausolus (d. 353/2 B. C.) by an improvised speech. He lived as a sophist (i. e. a professional rhetorician) in Rhodes and Ionia (περὶ Ῥόδον καὶ Ἰωνίαν σοφοστεύων), according to Plutarch;[48] here 'Ionia' may be a rough reference to the island cities of Asia Minor.[49]

(ii) After the death of Alexander, Aeschines went to Rhodes and was active in rhetorical education. We find numerous sources for this story, with the earliest being Cicero. Other Roman authors who provided evidence for this story include Valerius Maximus, the Plinies and Quintilian. Curiously, they all mentioned Aeschines' performance of the *Crown* speeches and his praise of Demosthenes. Although Pliny the Younger called it an anecdote (*vero falsum putamus illud Aeschinis*), it was repeated by many Greek authors and the plot developed as they retold the story. Three sayings make it clear that Aeschines established a rhetorical school: Ps.-Plutarch deduced that Aeschines 'founded the Rhodian school' (τὸ Ῥοδιακὸν διδασκαλεῖον κληθέν), which is echoed in *Vita* 3 by the expression Ῥοδιακὸν διδασκαλεῖον συνέστησε; the second is Philostratus, and he reports that Aeschines 'transformed Rhodes into a sophists' thinking-shop' (σοφιστῶν φροντιστήριον ἀποφήνας τὴν Ῥόδον); and the third is an anonymous biography preserved on a papyrus (second to third century A. D.) which reports that 'what happened next is his establishment of a school in Rhodes' (γενό[μενος δὲ ἐν] Ῥ[όδῳ] σχολήν […]), and this finds a parallel in Photius as ἐν δὲ τῇ Ῥόδῳ σχολὴν καταστησάμενος ἐδίδασκεν.[50]

---

[47] That is, after the 'crown trial'. As we read in Aeschines, 3.254, the trial took place a few days before the Pythian festival (ἡμερῶν μὲν ὀλίγων μέλλει τὰ Πύθια γίγνεσθαι), which was celebrated sometime in September: see also Gwatkin & Shuckburgh (1890: 245), Wankel (1976: 25–37) and MacDowell (2009: 383).

[48] Plutarch, *Dem.* 24.3, [Plutarch], *X orat.* 840c–840d, Philostratus, *V S* 1.481–482, 509 and Photius, *Bibl.* 61.20a. Cf. Gwatkin & Shuckburgh (1890: xlvi), Kindstrand (1982: 75), Hornblower (1982: 337) and Roisman, Worthington & Waterfield (2015: 184–185, 280 n. 9).

[49] According to the geographical organisation of the Athenian Tribute List, the Ionian and Carian districts were combined into one called 'the Ionian' (Ἰωνικὸς Φόρος) in 438/7 B. C. Cf. Thucydides, 2.9.3–5 with Meiggs (1972: 306–307) and Constantakopoulou (2007: 80 n. 74). See also Section 1.3.1 and *Ep.* 12.11 n. 2.

[50] Cicero, *De or.* 3.56.213, Valerius Maximus, 8.10.3, ext. 1, Pliny the Elder, *Nat.* 7.30.110, Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.7, Pliny the Younger, *Epp.* 2.3.10, 4.5.1, Plutarch, *Dem.* 24.3, [Plutarch], *De Alex. fort.* 343d, *X orat.* 840d–e, Philostratus, *V S* 1.509–510, Jerome, *Ep.* 53.2, *Vitae Aeschin.* 1.4–6, 3.3–4 Dilts, *P. Oxy.* 1800, Photius, *Bibl.* 61.20a, 264.490b, *Suda*: αι 347 and 348. See also

Indexes

Numbers refer to pages of the Preface and the Introduction; commentaries are cited by specific letter sections and notes.

Index of References

Inscriptions

Papyri

Index of Greek and Latin Terms

Index of Names

Index of Subjects