

## Oxford Handbooks Online

### Miscellanies

Katerina Oikonomopoulou

The Oxford Handbook to the Second Sophistic

*Edited by Daniel S. Richter and William A. Johnson*

Print Publication Date: Dec 2017

Subject: Classical Studies, Ancient Rhetoric and Educational Culture

Online Publication Date: Nov 2017 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199837472.013.25

### Abstract and Keywords

This chapter discusses miscellanies, a type of Second Sophistic writing whose distinguishing features are variety of subject matter and loose organization. The chapter starts out by acknowledging the difficulty of grasping “the miscellany” as a genre: as it argues, socio-cultural approaches to genre are more appropriate than formalistic ones, if we seek to address the question of these works’ readership and appeal. Accordingly, the chapter links miscellanies with imperial Greco-Roman reading culture, by investigating the aesthetic and cognitive advantages of variety (*variatio/poikilia*). Further, it demonstrates that miscellanies actively engage with key ideals and concerns of Second Sophistic culture, such as *paideia* and identity, by constructing differing models of polymathy, and by exploring different facets of identity (class, cultural, or gender).

Keywords: miscellanies, variety, *variatio*, *poikilia*, organization, genre, imperial reading culture, *paideia*, polymathy, identity

---

## 28.1 Second Sophistic Miscellanies: The Problem of Genre

PERHAPS no other type of Second Sophistic writing yields more fruitful ground for appreciating the dynamics of literary experimentation in this period than the miscellany. Although miscellanies were not a Second Sophistic invention (significantly, their origins probably go back to the sophists of the fifth century BCE),<sup>1</sup> the era provided the ideal socio-cultural conditions for these sorts of texts to flourish and become firmly entrenched in the literary landscape. Not accidentally, miscellanies feature in the literary output of two sophists mentioned by Philostratus’s *Lives of the Sophists*, namely Favorinus of

## Miscellanies

---

Arelate (late second century CE), who wrote *Memoirs* and a *Miscellaneous History*,<sup>2</sup> and Claudius Aelian (late second to early third century CE), who produced the zoological miscellany *On the Characteristics of Animals* and a *Historical Miscellany*.<sup>3</sup> They also represent an important segment of Plutarch's oeuvre: the Chaeronean philosopher (mid-first to early second centuries CE) produced miscellanistic collections in question-and-answer format, among the best-known of which is his sympotic miscellany known as the *Table Talk*;<sup>4</sup> a philosophical miscellany, entitled *Stromateis*, was also attributed to him in antiquity.<sup>5</sup> Further, miscellanies were bequeathed to us from members of important intellectual circles of second-century CE Rome, namely Aulus Gellius and Athenaeus of Naucratis, who wrote the *Attic Nights* and the *Deipnosophistae*, respectively. There must have been a veritable boom in the writing of such works during the first and second centuries CE, judging by the number and variety of titles for miscellanistic works in Greek and Latin, to which Aulus Gellius traces back the literary ancestry of his own composition (NA pref. 6–10). We even have the name of a woman writer of a miscellany, Pamphila. We do not know much about her, except that she lived in Nero's time, and was married for thirteen years to a man who was probably quite eminent. As Pamphila herself claims, the rich experiences and knowledge (p. 448) that she gained on her husband's side were distilled into a miscellanistic work, cited under the title of *Miscellaneous Historical Commentaries*, or more simply as (*Historical*) *Commentaries*.

The question of what kind of genre the miscellany is, if it is a genre at all, is far from easy to answer, not least because of our own anachronistic assumptions about the nature and purpose of such works. The first to use the term "miscellany" was the Renaissance scholar Angelo Poliziano in his *Miscellanea* (*Miscellaneorum Centuria Prima*), an unsystematically ordered collection of one hundred notes on various classical texts first published in 1489. Notably, the preface of the *Miscellanea* self-consciously aligns with a tradition of miscellanistic writing that goes back to the Second Sophistic, by mentioning authors such as Aulus Gellius and Aelian as models for the work. For contemporary English-speaking readers, moreover, the term "miscellany" might be associated with popular, or entertainment literature, considering that the publishing landscape abounds with titles such as *Schott's Original Miscellany* (together with *Schott's Food and Drink Miscellany* and *Schott's Sporting Gaming and Idling Miscellany*), or *The Know-It-All*, and includes even parodic miscellanies such as A. Parody's (*sic*) *Shite's Unoriginal Miscellany*.

However, the Second Sophistic writers themselves never refer to their works by employing a term that specifically points to their conception of what we call "the miscellany" as a clearly defined genre. The literary predecessors that Aulus Gellius mentions in his preface, for example, include works entitled *Meadows*, *Horn of Amaltheia*, *Muses*, but also, more intriguingly, titles such as *Problems*, *Moral Letters*, and *Handbooks*.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that he seeks to affiliate with a particular style of writing, characterized by thematic variety and loose organization, which can be found across different genres. Gellius refers to his own text as "commentaries," the polished version of a body of brief annotations he made from his various readings (NA pref. 3). This, however, falls short of serving as a genre indicator. In reality, the *Attic Nights* selectively absorbs or

synthesizes the discourse styles of many different genres (dialogue, memoir, commentary, symposium, biography and autobiography, technical handbook, encyclopaedia, scientific treatise, doxographical collection, lexicon, anthology).<sup>7</sup> The same is true of the remaining texts in our list.<sup>8</sup> With the protean nature of miscellanies as a given, describing their genre on the basis of formal features is impossible. Cultural approaches to genre, on the other hand, can prove much more productive in approaching this issue: these stress that “we need to look beyond the text as the locus for genre, and instead locate genres within the complex interrelations among texts, [ . . . ] audiences, and historical contexts.”<sup>9</sup> In other words, in order to place miscellanies in the social and cultural landscape of the Second Sophistic, we need to look beyond the narrow question of their literary form, and toward an understanding of how their authors’ agendas would have interacted with reader expectations, as well as with the broader historical and cultural milieu of the Greco-Roman world of the high Empire.

Accordingly, in what follows I discuss the aesthetic and cognitive advantages of miscellaneousness, in light of the fact that the defining feature of Second Sophistic miscellanies is their commitment to thematic variation (a feature designated with the Latin term *variatio*, or *poikilia* in Greek), and their deliberate choice to eschew a (p. 449) methodical style of exposition, even when the option to organize their topics systematically is clearly available to them. And, even though we cannot surmise a uniform type of readership for all types of Second Sophistic miscellany, there is no doubt that they were deeply enmeshed in the elite cultural politics of the Second Sophistic.

## 28.2 Variety, Pleasure, and Learning

Miscellanies are texts that can significantly enrich our understanding of Greco-Roman imperial reading culture, not only because of the attitudes to written texts and to reading that they encode, but also because the problem of how they themselves were read remains open.<sup>10</sup> According to Goldhill, miscellanistic texts like the *Table Talk* or Aelian’s *On the Characteristic of Animals* are written in what he calls an “anecdotal form”: they are made of discrete, self-contained, and easily memorable units of knowledge, culled from many sources, which can be read in any order.<sup>11</sup> Yet it is hard to imagine how most of these texts could have been read in a piecemeal fashion, given that the reader would have had no way of locating specific information within them: with rare exceptions, miscellanies lack tables of contents, and disperse related pieces of information, rather than unifying them under a single rubric.<sup>12</sup> This feature stems from their self-conscious commitment to the principle that knowledge communicated to the reader in a haphazard fashion offers certain advantages over knowledge that is presented methodically. The notion is counterintuitive enough for its rationale to require justification, and the self-reflexive pronouncements the different authors offer to this end are important entryways into their work’s literary and intellectual aims.

## Miscellanies

---

For starters, miscellanistic authors underscore the role pleasure plays in the reception of their texts. For Pamphila, according to Photius's summary of her proem, "it was not difficult to divide them [sc. her topics] according to kind, but she considered mixture and variety more pleasant and graceful than [arrangement according to] one kind."<sup>13</sup> This statement leaves no doubt as to Pamphila's command of her material and ultimate control over her text. Mixture and variety serve her aim to maximize the pleasure her reader will derive from her text. Similarly, Aelian, in the epilogue to the *Characteristics of Animals*, claims that he deliberately mixed together the diverse material he had collected, because he was seeking to make his text alluring to its readers, and sought to escape the tedium arising from monotony. His text, as he concludes, resembles a colorful meadow or wreath of flowers, both similes highlighting the fact that the work is a mosaic of heterogeneous material that crops up, as it were, or is weaved together, with no particular system. The reader is meant to derive enjoyment from the work precisely because of this feature. In addition, the similes serve as an acknowledgment of a wider tradition of writing miscellanies (they recall some of the titles for miscellanistic works that Gellius cites in his preface).<sup>14</sup>

It is no accident that both authors attribute monotony to the orderly or systematic arrangement of topics: by doing so, they seek to carve a distinctive niche for their own (p. 450) works, differentiating them from technical and scientific treatises on the one hand (we can think of the orderly progression of Aristotle's *History of Animals*, for example, which groups its themes together according to categories, such as internal organs, or reproduction, and proceeds overall in a methodical fashion),<sup>15</sup> and encyclopedic compositions like Pliny the Elder's *Natural History* on the other.<sup>16</sup> Their desire to please their readers through variety certainly betrays the influence of the world of sophistic oratory: the sophists' ability always pleasantly to surprise their audiences through the *poikilia* of their themes or the variegated style and rhythm of their speeches is repeatedly praised by Philostratus.<sup>17</sup> Aelian himself, Philostratus informs us, admired Herodes Atticus because he was "the most varied among the orators" (VS 2.625).

Entertainment however was not the sole effect envisaged for variety, but the concept was probably also yoked to an edificatory aim. A neat parallel from the preface to the fourth book of Seneca the Elder's *Judicial Declamations (Controversiae)*<sup>18</sup> elaborates on this aspect in an instructive way: the passage postulates that variety, achieved through the alternation of declaimers and the *sententiae* that they have used, keeps the reader more engaged than the exhaustive presentation of one declaimer at a time. This strategy aims to elicit a variety of emotional and intellectual responses: suspense, pleasure, excitement, and curiosity, conceived as the desire to know the unknown (*Controv.* 4. pref. 1). These are important not only for keeping the reader focused on the reading process as it takes place at a given moment in time, but also for ensuring that the text remains inviting for him in the future.

The *Judicial Declamations* were expressly written as a record of declamatory case studies for the education of Seneca's sons,<sup>19</sup> while the link of miscellanies to the world of education is far from self-evident. Their didacticism can become more transparent,

## Miscellanies

---

however, if we consider more closely what forms variety actually takes within each text. Significantly, authors of Second Sophistic miscellanies do not conceive of variety as simply a random mixture of topics, but tie it to cognitive faculties, such as memory and recollection, or anchor it in the events that mark the progression of their own life cycle. Plutarch, for example, informs his Roman addressee Sosius Senecio at the end of the preface to the second book of *Table Talk*, that the sympotic conversations that make up this book “have been written in a haphazard manner, not systematically but as each came to my memory” (*Quaest. conv.* 2, pref. 629D). Aulus Gellius, in turn, construes his text’s haphazardness as the textual imprint of his lifestyle, wholly devoted to literary-intellectual activity:

I have employed a haphazard order of arrangement for my material, which I had previously followed in collecting it. For every time I had taken in my hands any Greek or Latin book, or had heard anything worth remembering, I used to keep notes of things just as I liked, of whatever kind, without distinguishing and without separating [sc. my topics]; and I used to put those notes away as an aid to my memory, like a kind of storehouse of letters, so that when at a given point I would need an item or word which I happened suddenly to have forgotten, and the books from which I had taken it were not at hand, I could easily find and bring it out. Now (p. 451) in these commentaries there is the same diversity of subject which also existed in those original notes which I had made in brief, without order or structure, from the various things I heard or read. (*NA* pref. 2–3)<sup>20</sup>

Strictly speaking, the order of material within Plutarch’s *Table Talk* reflects the author’s pattern of recollections, functioning as the textual record of his memories of past sympotic conversations.<sup>21</sup> Similarly, the order of material within Gellius’s *Attic Nights* follows that of the notes he had taken from his various readings. The sequence of subject matter within those original notes in turn correlated with Gellius’s patterns of study and reading, his social interactions, and his personal taste (which affected his criteria of selection of memorable things). The coterminousness of life and text is put forward in yet more assertive terms toward the end of the *Attic Nights*’ preface: “The number of books,” Gellius continues, “will advance together with the progress of life itself, however great it may be” (*NA* pref. 24). In fact, as Gellius adds at the end of the same section, the only kind of lifespan extension that he can plausibly envisage is intimately tied to his ability to carry on with the writing of his commentaries: “I do not wish to be given a longer lifespan,” he says, “than it allows me to retain my ability to write and take notes.”

For both authors, then, the meandering format of the miscellany is anchored in a concrete lifestyle and thought paradigm, which idealizes continuous learning derived from various practical activities of life, as much as from bookish erudition. In this sense, the didactic value of variety lies in its ability to draw readers into the miscellanistic text’s colorful contents not (or at least not exclusively) for the sake of gaining factual knowledge, but in order to extrapolate models of life and thought from them. Further, the emphasis on the role of recollection is particularly significant, in that it affirms

## Miscellanies

---

miscellanies' relevance to the culturally pivotal process of preserving and codifying knowledge through memory, thus enabling its sharing and transmission.<sup>22</sup>

A characteristic example from the tenth book of Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistae* will illustrate this function of variety. As it is proclaimed, the book is a digression on Heracles's gluttony, which breaks the continuity of the topic treated up to that point (Ath. 411a), namely, objects used for washing before and after dinner (408–411a). The rationale for the digression is offered through two poetic quotations, which open and close the book, respectively: their common topic is that poets ought to entertain their audiences through a great variety of themes, such that they resemble the variety of dishes at a feast (ποικίληεὐωχία).<sup>23</sup> In fact, the quotations are paradigmatic for the *Deipnosophistae* as a whole, as the variety of sympotic conversations that the work purports to record mirrors the variety of dishes at the banquet of Larensis, the Roman fictional host.<sup>24</sup> Book 10's contents showcase how this is effected: the digression on Heracles's gluttony quickly broadens out to an investigation of the gluttony of other mythical heroes, famous personalities, even entire peoples (Boeotians, Pharsalians, Thessalians) (411a–417b). Next, examples of frugality are mentioned by way of contrast (418a–421a), and lead to a condemnation of excess at banquets (421a–422d). Following on from this, the dinner phase of Larensis's banquet is concluded, and the drinking phase (the symposium) begins: appropriately, the banqueters enquire after the vocabulary that is used to refer (p. 452) to the end of the feast, by citing relevant texts (422e–425f), before their attention turns to wine: they discuss its appropriate dosage and use (426d–433b), recall examples of famous drunkards (433b–443c), issue a condemnation of drunkenness (443b–445b), and explore the vocabulary that is used by various authors in order to speak about wine drinking and drunkenness (445c–f). The book finishes with a further digression, on riddles and word games played at the symposium (448b–459b).<sup>25</sup>

The overarching link between these topics, the various stages of the banquet, is clear enough, but there are also subtler threads that connect them: association, analogy, antithesis, a movement from the particular to the general, or the reverse. All are rooted in mental processes that are triggered in the characters who participate at Larensis's banquet, as they engage in dialogue with one another. Ultimately, they are subject to the control of the external narrator, Athenaeus, whose voice introduces and closes book 10 through the poetic quotations that praise variety.<sup>26</sup> Above all, the ability to draw links between such diverse themes relies upon the banqueters' profound knowledge of the literature of the past, gained through extensive reading from the archive (the library).<sup>27</sup> Variety is thus connected with a model of feasting, wherein material and intellectual entertainment complement one another, rather than being mutually exclusive. The banqueters appear as the embodiments of this happy conjunction, as they take simultaneous pleasure in eating, drinking, and talking, and treat the symposium as an opportunity for wider reflection on the past, the correct way to live, and the uses of luxury.<sup>28</sup> Further, as in Gellius, variety is linked to a lifestyle paradigm associated with the love of scholarship and learning. But, unlike Gellius, Athenaeus's deipnosophists mainly

engage with books, whose contents they seem to have consumed as avidly as the dishes at their host's table. Their manner of engagement with knowledge is thus firmly rooted in the practices and legacy of the great Hellenistic scholars of the library of Alexandria.<sup>29</sup>

### 28.3 Models of Polymathy

Second Sophistic miscellanies cover a truly impressive range of topics: across their pages historical anecdotes alternate with often lengthy quotations from longer historical works; explanations of the origins of customs, often culled from very obscure antiquarian writings, can be found side by side with knowledge extracted from scientific treatises; and accounts of miraculous natural phenomena or exotic locations can comfortably coexist with the pedantic lexical analyses of grammarians, the classifications of rhetoricians, or the theories of philosophers. Even in the case of works such as Aelian's *On the Characteristics of Animals*, where the zoological theme monopolizes the text, the richness of the information that is provided is truly astonishing ranging from marvelous stories about the cleverness or extraordinary courage of animals, to descriptions of the animals' biological functions in the style of Aristotle (whose biological writings constitute an important source). Miscellanies exude polymathy, and (p. 453) this fact suggests their agendas were in some way connected with the Second Sophistic ideal of the *pepaideumenos*. What exactly is the socio-cultural value that they attach to polymathy, however?

In fact, miscellanies do not promote learning as an ideal in an unqualified sense, but distinguish between different types of polymathy, depending on who represents it, and what sort of engagement with knowledge it entails. In Plutarch's *Table Talk*, for example, learning lies at the very heart of one's ability to practice philosophy.<sup>30</sup> The paternity of this attitude is attributed to the philosopher Aristotle, who allegedly argued that "polymathy provides many starting-points" (sc. for philosophical enquiry, 734D).<sup>31</sup> Further, chapter 9.14, the very last chapter of the work, whose topic is the Muses, the patron-goddesses of knowledge, says that the Muse Polymnia "belongs to the part of the soul that enjoys learning and is dedicated to memory, which is why the Sicyonians call one of their three Muses Polymathy" (746E). In this context, polymathy is intrinsically connected not just with the love of learning, but, equally importantly, with the capacity to remember what one has learned. By contrast, when polymathy involves the sterile reproduction of knowledge in order simply to make an impression, it is rejected out of hand. The people who usually exhibit this latter type of polymathy are teachers of rhetoric or grammar, who tire their audiences with their long strings of quotations, and are the objects of mockery as a result.<sup>32</sup> The prejudice against them is both social and intellectual, targeting on the one hand the social aspirations they fostered based on their professional credentials, and rejecting, on the other, the exclusive or esoteric nature of their expertise, which contravened miscellanies' commitment to an ideal of knowledge

that is accessible or communicable beyond the bounds of specialism.<sup>33</sup> This ideal also underpins the *Table Talk*, whose dialogues underscore the role of philosophical enquiry as a way of life, and not as the exclusive domain of theoretical philosophers.

Gellius, in turn, keeps distance from the useless accumulation of knowledge: he criticizes other writers of miscellanistic works because they test their readers' patience, offering very little that is actually useful or pleasurable.<sup>34</sup> Gellius's own motto is Heraclitus's saying "polymathy does not teach sense." As he explains, his *Attic Nights* is the fruit of selective reading and excerpting, with a dual aim: to encourage some readers to develop a desire for liberal erudition (meaning: erudition that befits a man of social and moral distinction),<sup>35</sup> as well as to urge them to contemplation of the "useful arts" (NA pref. 12); and, for those readers too busy to pursue study of any sort, to furnish a handbook of sorts, which will help them exhibit adequate knowledge of words or things in their daily interactions (NA pref. 12). Gellius's rejection of polymathy results from his pedagogical objective, which is to invite Roman readers traditionally averse to the excessive theoretical pursuits of the Greeks into the world of knowledge.<sup>36</sup> Gellius's conception of what constitutes useful learning is very specific, however: it includes only elements of theoretical erudition falling within the sphere of philosophy or science, paired with a more practical sort of knowledge of language or key facts. Gellius himself, in his selective habits of excerption, emerges as a model of a balanced engagement with the world of learning for his Roman readers.<sup>37</sup>

(p. 454) Aelian might well have been one of the authors in Gellius's black list, had he been his predecessor or contemporary: a Roman who chose to write in Greek, Aelian is self-consciously devoted to theoretical pursuits, and, as a result of this stance, embraces polymathy. As he stresses in the preface to the *Characteristics of Animals*:

And to know in depth the characteristics particular to each [sc. animal], and how the investigation of animals has attracted no less interest than that of man, requires an educated mind, which possesses a great deal of learning.

According to this, command of a great deal of information on the numerous characteristics of a vast number of animals, together with knowledge of previous scholarship dedicated to the topic, are the prerequisites for the success of Aelian's project, whose goal is to prove that animals are not wholly devoid of reason or intelligence, and that their study is no less valuable than that of humans. In other words, Aelian yokes polymathy to the fulfilment of a clearly defined research goal, which, as Smith argues, aims to take a position on a broader philosophical debate on whether animals possessed reason or not.<sup>38</sup> Later on, in his epilogue, the author further remarks that his love of learning, and his desire to enhance his personal knowledge by expending intense intellectual labor on the investigation of animals have been key motives behind the compilation of his zoological miscellany. Unlike Gellius, Aelian has not attempted to set limits to the amount of scientific information contained within his work: "I have not omitted what I have learned, nor been lazy," he assures his readers. His theoretical interests in fact set him apart from other men (meaning especially Romans?), whose main

aim in life is to gain money and social distinctions. Instead, Aelian seeks to emulate men like wise poets, scientists dedicated to the investigation of nature, and historians of the past. These three categories signal the triple literary allegiance of the *Characteristics of Animals*, emblematic of its effort to excel in variegated style as well as in breadth of content.<sup>39</sup>

Last but not least, Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistae* valorizes polymathy as an indispensable attribute of true scholarship: the work memorializes great erudite men of the past because they exhibited mastery in their field of knowledge, as well as deep familiarity with the intellectual legacy of their predecessors. Understood in such terms, polymathy is a quality of epic stature, attached to men of great learning like a Homeric epithet. The adjective πολυμαθής, usually in its superlative πολυμαθέστατος ("most learned"), is reserved for men such as the Mauretanian historian-king Juba, the epic parodist Archestratus of Gela, the Hellenistic scholar-poet Nicander of Colophon, the Stoic philosopher Chrysippus, and, above all, the philosopher Aristotle, citations from whose works are frequently introduced with the formula "the most learned Aristotle" (ὁ πολυμαθέστατος Ἀριστοτέλης).<sup>40</sup> The men who take part in Larensis's dinner party are themselves praised as polymaths (1 epit. 1c-f), both in the sense that they excel in their own field, and because, as we have already seen, they are able to revive the past by citing quotations from an incredible variety of sources and genres (poetic and prose) from memory, to suit the conversation topic at hand.

(p. 455) The different statements the works articulate on the nature and value of polymathy are intrinsic to their cultural agenda: the knowledge that miscellanies so meticulously gather was intended to have a social impact, rather than simply be enjoyed or appreciated for its own sake. This is apparent from Gellius's concern to save his readers from the embarrassment caused by ignorance at social situations. Symposia were perhaps the most important occasions on which readers of miscellanies would have had the opportunity to share and communicate the factual knowledge they had acquired from them. But knowing facts was not enough: symposia were places where character and social behavior were intensely scrutinized, so ultimately what would have played a far more important role in asserting readers' belonging in the social world of true *pepaideumenoι* was the broader examples of cultured life miscellanies offered. It is therefore no accident that Plutarch, Athenaeus, and, in part, also Gellius, use the symposium as a literary device for communicating knowledge.<sup>41</sup>

## 28.4 *Paideia*, the World and Identity

Broadly speaking, most of the material contained within miscellanies falls under the following main categories: the natural world and the place of humans in it, ethnography and the comparison of cultures, gender and social class, morality, the public role of the individual. Virtually every piece of information falling under these general rubrics can yield the opportunity to explore wider systems of prejudices, beliefs, and values that surrounded concepts, objects, practices, phenomena and natural beings (plants, animals, humans). Precisely because of this, miscellanies can be approached as media for accessing the cultural imagination of the intellectual communities that created and used them.<sup>42</sup> So far, our discussion of variety and polymathy has allowed us to connect miscellanies' form and content with central issues in Second Sophistic culture: memory, the social value of *paideia*, the performance of knowledge. In this section I wish to discuss further the ways in which they allowed imperial readers to reflect on their place in the wider world, as humans, men or women, old or young, members of certain cultural or political communities, citizens, professionals, or intellectuals. In other words, I wish to understand what sort of contribution miscellanistic texts might have made to the exploration of identity, taking into account the broader significance of this issue and in the Greco-Roman imperial context.<sup>43</sup> Below I discuss some comparative examples that help illustrate what I mean, on a topic that is quite popular in Second Sophistic miscellanies, namely, the consumption of wine.

Let us begin with a typically scientific investigation of the practice of wine drinking, from Plutarch's *Table Talk*. Chapter 3.3 of this work compares the constitutions of old men and women in terms of their respective responses to wine drinking. The answer argues that, despite being avid drinkers, women get drunk far less easily than older men, for several reasons: their excessively moist body, which causes the wine to be diluted; their greedy manner of drinking, which causes a great quantity of wine to be expelled (p. 456) from their body before it is properly absorbed; the many passages in their body (the result of the biological function of menstruation), which cause fluids to drain quickly (650A-C). In all these respects women are fundamentally different from men, especially old men, whose bodies are extremely dry.

Next, Gellius (10.23) and Athenaeus (10.440e-f) explore Roman culture's regulations concerning women's drinking. As both authors mention, according to Roman custom women were not only not allowed to drink wine (except wine made from raisins), they also had to prove their sobriety by kissing their husbands and male relatives. The sources of this information, and the respective contexts in which it is found, are completely different, however: Gellius attributes it to writers of Rome's old customs, one of whom was Marcius Porcius Cato, with the aim of demonstrating that Roman women of the past "lived an abstemious life" (NA 10.23.1). This point is further demonstrated by citing Cato on the punishments that were inflicted by law: drunkenness in women was punished as severely as adultery, for which husbands had the right to kill their own wives without a

## Miscellanies

---

trial (10.23.3–5). Athenaeus, in turn, derives the information from the Greek historian Polybius, who emphasizes that Roman women's uncontrollable drinking habits justified the imposition of an elaborate detection mechanism. Significantly, Athenaeus cites an additional (Greek) explanation for the custom, which takes it back to a certain episode in Heracles's adventures (441a–b), and moreover places it in the middle of a longer section on examples of men, women, and communities who became notorious for their love of wine (433b–443c). Immediately after discussing Roman practice, the text cites passages from various works which illustrate "what Greek women are like when they get drunk." (441bff.).

Lastly, chapters 2.37–38 of Aelian's *Historical Miscellany* offer a comparative examination of different communities' regulations concerning the consumption of wine: the legislation of Zaleucus in Epizephyrian Locri (a Greek city in southern Italy), probably the earliest legal system in the Greek world, decreed that drinkers of unmixed wine were punishable by death, unless they were following doctors' orders. Next, we learn that in cities like Massalia and Miletus, women were only allowed to drink water, Miletus in fact forming an exception from the rest of Ionia. "Why should I not mention," Aelian concludes, "Roman custom as well? How would I not be justly reproached as unreasonable, if I recorded the customs of Locri, Massalia, and Miletus, but left aside those of my own country?." In Rome then, Aelian goes on, women, slaves and noble men up to the age of thirty-five were not allowed to drink wine.

In all these texts, the exploration of wine drinking as a cultural practice prompts reflection on a broader cluster of interconnected issues, which embrace gender, social class, cultural differences, the problem of nature versus culture, morality and self-control, and the social scrutiny of private life and behavior. In each text, the discussion is framed in such a way that the material is presented from a different standpoint, and the role of the narrative voice is crucial in this respect. It is notable, for example, that the scientific investigation found in Plutarch does not treat wine drinking by women as a problem per se, despite the well-known fact that women were discouraged from participating in symposia. One explanation for this may be that the speaker in this (p. 457) particular dialogue, Mestrius Florus, was more tolerant of the habit, as a Roman.<sup>44</sup> Another may be that the moral dimension of the issue is put to the side, for the sake of foregrounding its scientific aspect. The persuasiveness of the scientific explanation may actually be enhanced by the fact that it is offered by a Roman, because it shows that scientific discourse can function as a kind of cross-cultural conceptual currency. The gender bias is evident all the same, with the analysis presenting women as the biological "other" of men (stressing their biological and anatomical differences), and imputing an uncontrollable manner of drinking to all of them collectively.

Within the *Attic Nights*, by contrast, the narrator "Gellius" makes no secret of his cultural bias: his aim is not simply to prove the claim, made by early Roman writers, that Roman women of the past lived a life of self-control, it is also to show that Roman custom and legislation acted wisely in ensuring this remained the case: this is apparent from the way the chapter connects the laws governing wine drinking by women with the laws

## Miscellanies

---

punishing adultery committed by women. In Athenaeus, on the other hand, the work's complex narrative texture entails that the voice of Democritus, the character who speaks in this section of book 10, fuses into the voice of the source that he cites, Polybius. In fact, Democritus appears simply to juxtapose testimonies from different authors, offering no interpretation of his own. Yet the contrast between the tight control exercised on Roman women for their drinking, and the uncontrollable drinking of Greek women emerges clearly enough from the material itself, and the comment in 441b, "what Greek women are like when they get drunk" (given by the narrator) reinforces that impression, thus revealing an implicit pro-Roman bias.<sup>45</sup>

In Aelian, finally, the narrator assumes a dual perspective, both Greek and Roman: on the one hand, he acts like as a Greek historian who delves into Greek local history and, on the other, as a Roman who seeks to compare the practices of his own culture with those of the Greeks. Moreover, Aelian's imperial perspective is especially noticeable in the geographical movement of his text, from the western (Locri and Marseilles) and eastern fringes (Miletus), to the imperial center (Rome). Importantly, Aelian's ambivalent cultural self-positioning<sup>46</sup> aligns him with Second Sophistic men like Favorinus, another Latin speaker who chose to write miscellanies (as well as other works) in Greek.<sup>47</sup> This fact places miscellanies at a particular privileged position in literary history, as works which fully embody the cross-cultural dynamic of Greco-Roman imperial society.

These examples illustrate just how complex are the narrative surface and cultural outlook of Second Sophistic miscellanies. Beyond the examples we have just examined, the technique of alternating different topics within the same work would have had the effect of constantly pushing readers to shift perspectives, alternately identifying with (or, conversely, distancing themselves from) different approaches and attitudes to a huge variety of issues. We may thus speak of a certain kind of intellectual pluralism as the sort of epistemological outlook that directly emanates from the variety of miscellanies' contents and their generic fluidity.<sup>48</sup> This feature may in part also stem from the fact that the miscellanies' intended imperial readership was probably itself very diverse. The audiences they addressed must have been as heterogeneous in their cultural and (p. 458) social outlook as Plutarch, Gellius, Favorinus, Aelian, and Pamphila themselves, and may have included women, as well as men. Those readers' own class, gender, education and cultural or ethnic background, and self-positioning against the realities of the Greco-Roman imperial world would have had the final say in how they would interpret different aspects of miscellanies' contents.

## 28.5 Conclusion: The Miscellanies' Intellectual Legacy

## Miscellanies

---

In comparison with other forms of Second Sophistic writing, such as the novels, biographical texts, or declamatory writings, miscellanies may seem far less exciting, not least because they appear to contemporary readers as hopelessly fragmented, pedantic, repetitive, or intellectually shallow. I hope I have shown that, contrary to such an impression, miscellanies are in fact a genre of Second Sophistic writing that is perfectly suited to its rich intellectual landscape. I have argued that we can gain a better understanding of miscellanies as a genre, if we focus closely on three key aspects: their commitment to the aesthetic of variety, the different models of polymathy that they advocate, and the different ways in which they prompt their readers to explore identity. Scholarship is thankfully already turning to this direction, with a number of important studies of individual texts having been published in recent years

## Further Reading

Our understanding of the full range and characteristics of Greco-Roman antiquity's compilatory and miscellanistic literature is very uneven, but **Bartol 2005**, and **König and Whitmarsh 2007**, offer excellent starting-points towards a contextual study. **König 2007**; **Morgan 2007a**, 257–273; 2007b; 2011; and **Oikonomopoulou 2013a** explore different aspects of the structure of such works. Plutarch's *Table Talk* is by far the most comprehensively studied Second Sophistic miscellany, with **Teodorsson's commentary, 1989–1996**, greatly facilitating its detailed investigation. **Klotz and Oikonomopoulou 2011**, and **König 2012** examine the *Table Talk's* literary background, sympotic philosophy, and relationship to Plutarch's wider oeuvre. **Montes Cala, Sánchez Ortiz de Landalluce, and Gallé Cejudo 1999**; and **Ribeiro Ferreira, Leão, Tröster, and Barata Dias 2009** additionally furnish some useful essays on the text's sympotic themes. **Holford-Strevens 2003** is an indispensable introduction to Aulus Gellius's *Attic Nights*. Further, **Henry 1994**, **Vessey 1994**, and Holford-Strevens and **Vardi 2004** address key questions concerning its intellectual content and pedigree. Lastly, **Keulen 2009** and **Heusch 2011** examine its satirical portraits of intellectuals and links with Roman memory culture, respectively. **Jacob 2013** is now the best introduction to the rich literary and intellectual fabric of Athenaeus's *Deipnosophistae*, while the Italian commentary of **Canfora 2001**, and the wide-ranging volume of essays edited by **Braund and Wilkins 2000** allow a more focused (p. 459) investigation of the work. Further, **Zecchini 1989** and **Lenfant 2007** discuss specifically its treatment of historical sources. Aelian's miscellanies are very understudied by comparison, but the recent new critical edition of the *Characteristics of Animals* by **García Valdés, Llera Fueyo, and Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén 2009**, paired with **Smith 2014**, are bound to make a positive impact on its understanding. On Aelian's *Historical Miscellany*, **Wilson 1997**, and **Lukinovich and Morand 2004** offer useful introductions. The fragments of Favorinus's miscellanies can be consulted in **Barigazzi 1966** and **Amato 2010**. Lastly, our knowledge of Pamphila's miscellany relies exclusively on the indirect tradition: the main sources are Photius,

## Miscellanies

---

Diogenes Laertius, and Aulus Gellius, and the fragments can be consulted in Müller (*FHG* 3.520).

## Bibliography

Amato, E. 2010. *Favorinos d'Arles, Œuvres III: Fragments*. Paris

Barigazzi, A. 1966. *Favorino di Arelate, Opere: Introduzione, testo critico e commento*. Florence.

Bartol, K. 2005. "Per Una Morfologia della *Poikilografia* Antica." *Eos* 102: 210–223.

Beall, S. 2004. "Gellian Humanism Revisited." In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, edited by L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, 206–222. Oxford.

Braund, D., and J. Wilkins, eds. 2000. *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*. Exeter.

Canfora, L. 2001. *I Deipnosofisti. I Dotti a Banchetto*. 4 vols. Rome.

Clement, P. A., and H. B. Hoffleit, eds. and trans. 1969. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume VIII*. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Doody, A. 2010. *Pliny's Encyclopedia: The Reception of the Natural History*. Cambridge.

Edwards, C., and G. Woolf. 2003. "Cosmopolis: Rome as World City." In *Rome the Cosmopolis*, edited by C. Edwards and G. Woolf, 1–20. Cambridge.

Eshleman, K. 2013. "'Then Our Symposium Becomes a Grammar School': Grammarians in Plutarch's *Table Talk*." *Syllecta Classica* 24: 145–171.

Fairweather, J. 1981. *Seneca the Elder*. Cambridge.

Frazier, F. 2000. "Les visages de la rhétorique contemporaine sous le regard de Plutarque." In *Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Plutarch*, edited by L. Van der Stockt, 183–202. Leuven

García Valdés, M., L. A. Llera Fueyo, and L. Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, eds. 2009. *Claudius Aelianus: De Natura Animalium*. Berlin.

Goldhill, S. 2009. "The Anecdote: Exploring the Boundaries between Oral and Literate Performance in the Second Sophistic." In *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, edited by W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, 96–113. Oxford.

Harrison, G. W. M. 2000. "Problems with the Genre of Problems: Plutarch's Literary Innovations." *CPhil.* 95, no. 2: 193–199.

## Miscellanies

---

Henry, M. M. 1994. "On the Aims and Purposes of Aulus Gellius." *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1918–1941.

Heusch, C. 2011. *Die Macht der 'Memoria'. Die 'Noctes Atticae' des Aulus Gellius im Licht der Erinnerungskultur des 2. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Berlin.

Holford-Strevens, L. 2003. *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*. Rev. ed. Oxford.

Horster, M. 2008. "Some Notes on Grammarians in Plutarch." In *The Unity of Plutarch's Work: "Moralia" Themes in the "Lives," Features of the "Lives" in the "Moralia"*, edited by A. G. Nikolaidis, 611–624. Millennium Studien 19. Berlin and New York.

(p. 460) Jacob, C. 2000. "Athenaeus the Librarian." In *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 85–110. Exeter.

Jacob, C. 2001. "Ateneo, o il Dedalo delle Parole." In *I Deipnosofisti: I Dotti a Banchetto*, edited by L. Canfora, 1: xi–cxvi. Rome.

Jacob, C. 2013. *The Web of Athenaeus*. Translated by A. Papaconstantinou. Center for Hellenic Studies Series 61. Washington, DC.

Johnson, W. A. 2009. "Constructing Elite Reading Communities in the High Empire." In *Ancient Literacies: The Culture of Reading in Greece and Rome*, edited by W. A. Johnson and H. N. Parker, 320–330. Oxford.

Johnson, W. A. 2010. *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities*. Oxford and New York.

Keulen, W. 2004. "Gellius, Apuleius, and Satire on the Intellectual." In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, edited by L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, 223–245. Oxford.

Keulen, W. 2009. *Gellius the Satirist: Roman Cultural Authority in "Attic Nights"*. Mnemosyne Supplement 297. Leiden and Boston.

Klotz, F., and K. Oikonomopoulou, eds., 2011. *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's "Table Talk" in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*. Oxford.

König, J. 2007. "Fragmentation and Coherence in Plutarch's *Sympotic Questions*." In *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*, edited by J. König and T. Whitmarsh, 43–68. Cambridge.

König, J. 2011. "Self-Promotion and Self-Effacement in Plutarch's *Table Talk*." In *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's "Table Talk" in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*, edited by F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou, 179–203. Oxford.

König, J. 2012. *Saints and Symposiasts: The Literature of Food and the Symposium in Greco-Roman and Early Christian Culture*. Cambridge.

## Miscellanies

---

König, J., and T. Whitmarsh, eds. 2007. *Ordering Knowledge in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge.

König, J., and G. Woolf. 2013. "Encyclopaedism in the Roman Empire." In *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by J. König and G. Woolf, 23–63. Cambridge.

Lenfant, D., ed., 2007. *Athénée et les Fragments d'Historiens: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (16–18 Juin 2005)*. Paris.

Lennox, J. 2010. "Bios and Explanatory Unity in Aristotle's Biology." In *Definition in Greek Philosophy*, edited by D. Charles, 329–355. Oxford.

Lukinovich, A. 1990. "The Play of Reflections between Literary Form and the Sympotic Theme in the *Deipnosophistae* of Athenaeus." In *Sympotica: A Symposium on the Symposion*, edited by O. Murray, 263–271. Oxford.

Lukinovich, A., and A.-F. Morand 2004. *Élien: Histoire Variée*. Paris.

Louis, P. 1964. *Aristote: Histoire des Animaux*. Vol. 1. Paris.

Maisonneuve, C. 2007. "Les *Deipnosophistes* d'Athénée: Repères dans une structure complexe." In *Athénée et les Fragments d'Historiens: Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (16–18 Juin 2005)*, edited by D. Lenfant, 387–412. Paris.

Meier, C. 2004. "On the Connection between Epistemology and Encyclopaedic *Ordo* in the Middle Ages and the Early Modern Period." In *Schooling and Society: The Ordering and Reordering of Knowledge in the Western Middle Ages*, edited by A. A. MacDonald and M. W. Twomey, 93–114. Groningen Studies in Cultural Change 6. Leuven.

Minar, E. L., Jr., F. H. Sandbach, and W. C. Helmbold, eds. and trans. 1961. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume IX*. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Mittell, J. 2001. "A Cultural Approach to Television Genre Theory." *Cinema Journal* 40, no. 3: 3–24.

(p. 461) Montes Cala, J. G., M. Sánchez Ortiz de Landalluce, and R. J. Gallé Cejudo, eds. 1999. *Plutarco, Dioniso y el Vino: Actas del VI Simposio Español sobre Plutarco, Cádiz, 14–16 de Mayo de 1998*. Madrid.

Morgan, K. A. 2004. *Myth and Philosophy from the Presocratics to Plato*. Cambridge.

Morgan, T. 2004. "Educational Values." In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, edited by L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, 187–205. Oxford.

Morgan, T. 2007a. *Popular Morality in the Early Roman Empire*. Cambridge.

Morgan, T. 2007b. "Reading Moral Miscellanies." *SCI* 26: 135–153.

## Miscellanies

---

Morgan, T. 2011. "The Miscellany and Plutarch." In *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's "Table Talk" in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*, edited by F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou, 49–76. Oxford.

Murphy, T. 2004. *Pliny the Elder's Natural History: The Empire in the Encyclopedia*. Oxford.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2011. "Peripatetic Knowledge in Plutarch's *Table Talk*." In *The Philosopher's Banquet: Plutarch's "Table Talk" in the Intellectual Culture of the Roman Empire*, edited by F. Klotz and K. Oikonomopoulou, 105–130. Oxford.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2013a. "Plutarch's Corpus of *Quaestiones* in the Tradition of Imperial Greek Encyclopaedism." In *Encyclopaedism from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, edited by J. König and G. Woolf, 129–153. Cambridge.

Oikonomopoulou, K. 2013b. "Ethnography and Authorial Voice in Athenaeus' *Deipnosophistae*." In *Ancient Ethnography: New Approaches*, edited by E. Almagor and J. Skinner, 179–199. London and New York.

Olson, S. D. 2006–2012. *Athenaeus: The Learned Banqueters*. 8 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Ribeiro Ferreira, J., D. Leão, M. Tröster, and P. Barata Dias, eds. 2009. *Symposion and Philanthropia in Plutarch*. Coimbra.

Richter, D. S. 2011. *Cosmopolis: Imagining Community in Late Classical Athens and the Early Roman Empire*. Oxford.

Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén, L. 2000. "Are the Fifteen Books of the *Deipnosophistae* an Excerpt?" In *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 244–255. Exeter.

Rolfe, J. C., ed. and trans. 1927. *The Attic Nights of Aulus Gellius*. 3 vols. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Romeri, L. 2000. "The *λογόδειπνον*: Athenaeus between Banquet and Anti-Banquet." In *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 256–271. Exeter.

Romeri, L. 2002. *Philosophes Entre Mots et Mets. Plutarque, Lucien et Athénée Autour de la Table de Platon*. Grenoble.

Sandbach, F. H. 1969. *Plutarch: Moralia, Volume XV (Fragments)*. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Smith, S. D. 2014. *Man and Animal in Severan Rome: The Literary Imagination of Claudius Aelianus*. Cambridge.

## Miscellanies

---

Teodorsson, S.-T. 1989–1996. *A Commentary on Plutarch's "Table Talks"*. 3 vols. Göteborg.

Thompson, D. 2000. "Athenaeus in his Egyptian Context." In *Athenaeus and His World Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 77–84. Exeter.

Too, Y. L. 2000. "The Walking Library: The Performance of Cultural Memories." In *Athenaeus and His World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 111–123. Exeter.

(p. 462) Vardi, A. 2001. "Gellius against the Professors." *ZPE* 137: 41–54.

Vardi, A. 2004. "Genre, Conventions, and Cultural Programme in Gellius' *Noctes Atticae*." In *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*, edited by L. Holford-Strevens and A. Vardi, 159–186. Oxford.

Vessey, M. 1994. "Aulus Gellius and the Cult of the Past." *ANRW* 2.34.2: 1863–1917.

Wilkins J. 2000. "Dialogue and Comedy: The Structure of the *Deipnosophistae*." In *Athenaeus and His World. Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, edited by D. Braund and J. Wilkins, 23–37. Exeter.

Wilson, N. G. 1997. *Aelian: Historical Miscellany*. Cambridge, MA, and London.

Zecchini, G. 1989. *La Cultura Storica di Ateneo*. Milan.

## Notes:

(1.) It might go back to the sophist Hippias, who wrote a work entitled Συναγωγή (DK 86B6), probably a kind of miscellany or anthology (also characterized as an "encyclopaedia": see K. A. Morgan 2004, 95–96.

(2.) Frs. 32–93 Barigazzi.

(3.) Philostr. *VS* 1.489–492 (Favorinus); 2.624–625 (Aelian).

(4.) Harrison 2000; Oikonomopoulou 2013a.

(5.) Fr. 179 Sandbach. The work is considered spurious.

(6.) *NA* pref. 6–10. See Holford-Strevens 2003, 30–47; Vardi 2004, 159–165.

(7.) Vardi 2004, 179–186.

(8.) Jacob 2001 and 2013, 31–39, 95–107; Lukinovich and Morand 2004, xxi–xxv; Wilkins 2000.

## Miscellanies

---

- (9.) Mittell 2001, 7.
- (10.) On the reading culture of the high Roman Empire, see Johnson 2010.
- (11.) Goldhill 2009.
- (12.) Gellius's *Attic Nights* is the only miscellany that includes a table of contents (see pref. 25). Cf. Doody 2010, 1-10, 92-131, on Pliny the Elder.
- (13.) Phot. *Bibl. Cod.* 175, 119b, ll. 31-33.
- (14.) Smith 2014, 47-66.
- (15.) Lennox 2010; Louis 1964, xx-xxxiii.
- (16.) On Pliny's structure, see Murphy 2004, 29-48. On the not so clear-cut boundaries between miscellanies and encyclopedias, see König and Woolf 2013, 52-58.
- (17.) VS 1.496, 528; 2.573, 590.
- (18.) Fairweather 1981, 125-126.
- (19.) 1. pref. 1.
- (20.) All translations from ancient texts in this chapter are my own, but the Loeb translations were consulted throughout. On Gellius's preface, see Holford-Strevens 2003, 30-36; Vardi 2004, 165-179.
- (21.) On the different roles assumed by "Plutarch" (the narrator) within the *Quaest. conv.*, see König 2011.
- (22.) Heusch 2011, 49-301; Jacob 2000 and 2013, 75-83; Johnson 2010, 118-120; König 2012, 30-120; Oikonomopoulou 2011; Too 2000.
- (23.) See *Deip.* 10.411b and 10.459c, with the notes in Olson (2006-2012), respectively.
- (24.) Lukinovich 1990. On the (tense) relationship between food and conversation within the work, see Romeri 2000 and 2002, 253-290.
- (25.) Maisonneuve 2007, 402-403.
- (26.) On the work's narrative structure, see Jacob 2013, 9-12, 27-30; Rodríguez-Noriega Guillén 2000.
- (27.) Jacob 2000 and 2013, 55-69; Too 2000.
- (28.) Romeri 2000 and 2002, 253-290.
- (29.) Jacob 2000 and 2013, 71-83; Thompson 2000.

## Miscellanies

---

- (30.) Cf. *Quaest. conv.* 5.7, 680C-D.
- (31.) See *Quaest. conv.* 8.10, 734C-E, and Oikonomopoulou 2011, 108-112.
- (32.) Cf. *Quaest. conv.* 5.3, 676C-F. See Eshleman 2013; Frazier 2000; Horster 2008.
- (33.) Vardi 2001.
- (34.) *NA* pref. 11. See also 9.4, 14.6.
- (35.) Beall 2004, 214-215; Heusch 2011, 372-373; Keulen 2004, 236-239.
- (36.) Beall 2004, 206-215.
- (37.) Holford-Strevens 2003, 36-47.
- (38.) Smith 2014, 11-13.
- (39.) Smith 2014, 13-16.
- (40.) 3.83b (Juba); 7.324b (Archestratus of Gela); 3.126b (Nicander of Colophon); 13.565a (Chrysippus); 9.398e, 11.505c, 15.692b, 15.696a (Aristotle).
- (41.) See, e.g., Gellius, 11.17, and also Johnson 2009 and 2010, 120-130, on social occasions where the reading of texts takes place in Gellius.
- (42.) Smith 2014. Cf. Murphy 2004, 6-11.
- (43.) On Roman imperial cosmopolitanism, see Edwards and Woolf 2003; Richter 2011, 7-9, 135-206.
- (44.) König 2012, 26-27.
- (45.) See König 2012, 103-119, and also 52-59 (on the Bakhtinian concept of polyphony, and its applicability to the texts of Plutarch and, especially, Athenaeus). See also Oikonomopoulou 2013b.
- (46.) Smith 2014, 67-99.
- (47.) See note 2 above. Also, Holford-Strevens 2003, 98-130 (on the role of Favorinus in the *Attic Nights*).
- (48.) Cf. Meier 2004.

**Katerina Oikonomopoulou**

Katerina Oikonomopoulou (University of Patras)

