

---

# PROGYMNASMATA

---

*SBL*

Society of Biblical Literature



Writings from the Greco-Roman World

John T. Fitzgerald, General Editor

*Editorial Board*

David Armstrong  
Elizabeth Asmis  
Brian E. Daley, S.J.  
David G. Hunter  
David Konstan  
Michael J. Roberts  
Johan C. Thom  
Yun Lee Too  
James C. VanderKam

Number 10

PROGYMNASMATA  
Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition  
and Rhetoric

Volume Editor  
D. A. Russell

---

# Progymnasmata

## Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric

Translated with Introductions and Notes by

George A. Kennedy

Society of Biblical Literature  
Atlanta

---

# PROGYMNASMATA

Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition  
and Rhetoric

Copyright © 2003 by the Society of Biblical Literature.

All rights reserved.

No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, Society of Biblical Literature, 825 Houston Mill Road, Suite 350, Atlanta, GA 30329, USA.

---

## Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Progymnasmata : Greek textbooks of prose composition and rhetoric / translated with introductions and notes by George A. Kennedy.

p. cm. — (Writings from the Greco-Roman world ; v. 10)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Text in English and Greek.

ISBN 1-58983-061-X (alk. paper)

1. Greek language—Composition and exercises—Early works to 1800. 2. Rhetoric—Early works to 1800. I. Kennedy, George Alexander, 1928– II. Series.

PA257.P76 2003  
808'.0481—dc21

2002155099

---

03 04 05 06 07 08 09 10      5 4 3 2 1

The book is printed in the United States of America  
on recycled, acid-free paper.



---

# Table of Contents

Introduction	ix
Acknowledgments	xvii
Pagination of Theon's Text	xviii
<i>Chapter 1. The Exercises of Aelius Theon</i>	<b>I</b>
1. Preface	3
2. On the Education of the Young	9
3. On Chreia	15
4. On Fable	23
5. On Narrative	28
6. On Topos	42
7. On Ecphrasis	45
8. On Prosopoeia	47
9. On Encomion and Invective	50
10. On Syncrisis	52
11. On Thesis	55
12. On Law	62
13. Reading Aloud and Its Object	66
14. Listening to What Is Read	69
15. Paraphrase	70
16. Elaboration	71
17. Contradiction, or Counter-Statement	72
<i>Chapter 2. The Preliminary Exercises Attributed to Hermogenes</i>	<b>73</b>
1. On Fable	74
2. On Narrative	75
3. On Chreia	76
4. On Maxim	77
5. On Refutation and Confirmation	79
6. On Common-Place	79
7. On Encomion	81
8. On Syncrisis	83
9. On Ethopoeia	84
10. On Ecphrasis	86

11. On Thesis	87
12. On Introduction of a Law	88
<i>Chapter 3. The Preliminary Exercises of Aphthonius the Sophist</i>	89
An Anonymous Prolegomenon, or Introduction, to the <i>Progymnasmata</i> of Aphthonius the Sophist	90
1. On Fable	96
2. On Narrative	96
3. On Chreia	97
4. On Maxim	99
5. On Refutation	101
6. On Confirmation	103
7. On Common-Place	105
8. On Encomion	108
9. On Invective	111
10. On Synchysis	113
11. On Ethopoeia	115
12. On Ecphrasis	117
13. On Thesis	120
14. On Introduction of a Law	124
<i>Chapter 4. The Preliminary Exercises of Nicolaus the Sophist</i>	129
1. Preface	131
2. On Fable	133
3. On Narrative	136
4. On Chreia	139
5. On Maxim	142
6. On Refutation and Confirmation	144
7. On Common-Place	147
8. On Encomion and Invective	154
9. On Synchysis	162
10. On Ethopoeia	164
11. On Ecphrasis	166
12. On Thesis	168
13. On Introduction of a Law	171

<i>Chapter 5. Selections from the Commentary on the Progymnasmata of Aphthonius Attributed to John of Sardis, Including Fragments of the Treatise on Progymnasmata by Sopatros</i>	173
Preface	175
1. On Fable	177
<i>Sopatros on Fable</i>	178
2. On Narrative	182
3. On Chreia	193
4. On Maxim	196
<i>Sopatros on Maxim</i>	197
5. On Refutation	199
6. On Confirmation	201
7. On Common-Place	201
<i>Sopatros on Common-Place</i>	202, 206
8. On Encomion	206
9. On Invective	210
10. On Synchysis	212
11. On Ethopoeia	213
12. On Ecphrasis	218
13. On Thesis	221
<i>Sopatros on Thesis</i>	222, 224
14. On Introduction of a Law	227
Index	229





---

# Introduction

Students of classical, medieval, and early modern literature, and of the history of education, need a knowledge of the system of teaching prose composition and elementary rhetoric practiced in European schools from the Hellenistic period until early modern times. This is described in detail in four Greek treatises that were written in the time of the Roman empire and studied throughout the Byzantine period. They are by, or attributed to Theon, Hermogenes, Aphthonius, and Nicolaus. The only Latin account of the exercises from the classical period is in Quintilian's *Education of the Orator* (1.9; 2.4; 10.5), written about A.D. 94, but a Latin version of the Greek handbook attributed to Hermogenes was made by Priscian about A.D. 500, preserved with his extensive works on grammar, and given some use in medieval schools. In the Renaissance Rudolph Agricola, Joannes Maria Catanaeus, and others made Latin versions of the handbook of Aphthonius and an English adaptation of this was published by Richard Rainolde in 1563. These texts were the common basis for teaching composition in western Europe for several centuries.

The curriculum described in these works, featuring a series of set exercises of increasing difficulty, was the source of facility in written and oral expression for many persons and training for speech in public life. In addition, the compositions inculcated cultural values, as well as understanding of conventional literary forms for those who entered on literature as a career or as an elegant pastime. In classical, medieval, and renaissance literature, fable, narrative, chreia, ephrasis, comparison, speech in character, and other progymnastic forms were often combined in different ways to create epics, dramas, histories, and the genres of lyric poetry. As such, they are comparable to structural features of classical architecture that were artistically utilized in the great public buildings of the Greco-Roman period and were revived in the Renaissance in the West. Not only the secular literature of the Greeks and Romans, but the writings of early Christians beginning with the gospels and continuing through the patristic age, and of some Jewish writers as well, were molded by the habits of thinking and writing learned in schools.

The handbooks of progymnasmata may also interest modern

teachers of composition, for they present a sequence of assignments in reading, writing, and speaking which gradually increase in difficulty and in maturity of thought from simple story-telling to argumentation, combined with study of literary models. As such, the exercises were certainly effective in providing students for centuries with verbal skills that many students in our time seem less often to develop. Because the exercises were so completely structured, furnishing the student with lists of things to say on many subjects, they are open to the criticism that they tended to indoctrinate students in traditional values and inhibit individual creativity. Only Theon, among writers on progymnasmata, suggests that students might be asked to write about their own experiences—something that did not again become a subject of elementary composition until the romantic period. Nevertheless, it would be unfair to characterize the traditional exercises as inhibiting all criticism of traditional values. Indeed, a major feature of the exercises was stress on learning refutation or rebuttal: how to take a traditional tale, narrative, or thesis and argue against it. If anything, the exercises may have tended to encourage the idea that there was an equal amount to be said on two sides of any issue, a skill practiced at a later stage of education in dialectical debate. Although the period of the greatest use of progymnasmata, the time of the Roman empire, was often an age in which freedom of speech was limited, philosophical skepticism also flourished in the schools of the time, and the political context of the exercises looked back nostalgically to the time of democratic Athens.

“Pro-gymnasmata” means “preliminary exercises,” preliminary that is to the practice of declamation in the schools of rhetoric, which boys usually began between the age of twelve and fifteen. The progymnasmata were assigned by Greek grammarians to students after they had learned to read and write as preparation for declamation and were continued in rhetorical schools as written exercises even after declamation had begun. Roman grammarians used similar exercises in Latin, preparing students for declamation. Although Quintilian favored the continuation of written exercises as part of the curriculum in rhetoric, most Roman rhetoricians seem to have given attention exclusively to declamation. The exercises were completed in written form and then often read aloud to the teacher or class; even in the rhetorical schools students usually wrote out their speeches before delivering them, but readers of the handbooks in this volume will note the consistent emphasis on speaking.

Until the fifth century B.C., so far as we know, Greek schools

made no attempt to teach composition to students. Boys and some girls learned to read aloud and copy out canonical texts, especially the Homeric poems, and they memorized poetry and performed it orally on festive occasions. The wandering teachers known as “sophists,” of whom Gorgias and Protagoras are probably the most famous because of their roles in dialogues of Plato, gave speeches which adolescents and young adults transcribed, studied, and imitated to gain facility in argument and style. In Plato’s *Phaedrus* we meet a young man who is studying a speech attributed to Lysias, which he reads to Socrates. In the school of Isocrates in the fourth century the master read his own writings to his students, assigned them subjects for composition, and criticized their work. A course of elementary exercises in composition probably developed in schools in the fourth century. The term *progymnasmata* first appears in chapter 28 (1436a25) of the rhetorical handbook known as the *Rhetoric for Alexander*, probably written by Anaximenes of Lampsacus in the third quarter of the fourth century and preserved with the works of Aristotle. The author says that if students understand the forms and styles of composition as practiced in progymnasmata, they will have a plentiful supply of material for writing and speaking. Aristotle did not discuss preliminary exercises in his treatise *On Rhetoric*, or elsewhere in his voluminous writings so far as we know, but he does discuss rhetorical forms which later appear among the exercises, including fable, maxim, narrative, encomion, vivid description, and thesis.

During the Hellenistic period exercises in composition probably began to approximate the forms known from later writers. Both grammarians and rhetoricians doubtless made contributions, and development was parallel to the growing popularity of declamation in rhetorical schools. Although the earliest Latin rhetorical treatises, Cicero’s *On Invention* and the anonymous *Rhetoric for Herennius*, do not directly discuss exercises in composition, there are some passages which seem to reflect knowledge of them. *On Invention* (1.27) and *Rhetoric for Herennius* (1.12) both allude to narrative as an exercise, and they associate “common-place” with denunciation of vice (*On Inv.* 2.77; *For Her.* 2.9), its usual subject among progymnasmata. In addition, in *Rhetoric for Herennius* (4.56–57) there is a description of how to develop the thought in a maxim. Suetonius, writing many years later about education in the second and early first centuries before Christ, reports that Romans practiced exercises in “problems,” paraphrase, address, and characterization (*On Grammarians* 4), and elsewhere he mentions narration, translation, common-place, fable,

thesis, refutation, and confirmation (*On Rhetoricians* 1). He says these exercises “evolved little by little,” but gives no specific dates.

The earliest extended account of compositional exercises is the Greek treatise by Theon, which probably dates from the first century after Christ. Unlike the other handbooks it is addressed to teachers rather than to students and contains chapters on pedagogy. A short handbook attributed to Hermogenes of Tarsus, a famous rhetorician of the second century after Christ, is preserved separately from his genuine writings and may not be his work. The most influential handbook proved to be that by Aphthonius, a student of the great sophist Libanius in Antioch in the second half of the fourth century of the Christian era. Many progymnasmatic compositions from late antiquity and the Byzantine period survive. Best known are those attributed to Libanius, some of which were often included in the renaissance textbooks. Aphthonius’ account of the exercises, each with a brief example, was combined with rhetorical treatises on stasis theory and style by Hermogenes to create the standard rhetorical compendium (the “Hermogenic corpus”) of late antiquity and the Byzantine period. Commentaries on Aphthonius’ *Progymnasmata* were compiled by John of Sardis in the ninth century, John Doxapatres in the eleventh century, and others. Theon’s handbook, although less well known, was translated into Armenian and an Armenian handbook of composition, ultimately based on Aphthonius’ account, also exists. A fourth handbook of composition is the work of Nicolaus of Myra, who taught rhetoric in Constantinople in the third quarter of the fifth century. He draws on the handbooks attributed to Theon and Hermogenes but not on that by Aphthonius. Portions of a handbook by Sopater, either the well-known sophist of the fourth century or another person with the same name, are quoted by John of Sardis. Brief references in late Greek and Byzantine writers indicate that many other Greek handbooks of progymnasmata once existed, and there was doubtless also an oral tradition among teachers, who adapted whatever seemed useful without acknowledging its source. A reference in the first paragraph of Theon’s work to other treatments of the subject indicates that a variety of textbooks already existed in his time. Among later authors to whom progymnasmatic treatises, now lost, are attributed are Harpocration, Minucianus, and Paul of Tyre in the second century, and Epiphanius, Onasimus, Ulpian, and Siricius from the third or fourth century.<sup>1</sup> For an account of the continua-

<sup>1</sup> For lost progymnasmatic handbooks and what survives of Sopater’s work, see Rabe’s edition of Aphthonius, pp. 52–70.

tion of progymnasmata in the Byzantine period, see Herbert Hunger, *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner* (*Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft* 12.5), vol. 1, pp. 92–120 (Munich: Beck, 1978). English translations of examples of chreias by a variety of late classical and Byzantine rhetoricians can be found in volume 2 of Hock and O’Neil’s *The Chreia* (2002).

There is some variation in the number, names, and sequence of the exercises among the extant works, and Nicolaus and John of Sardis comment on what was apparently vigorous controversy among teachers about the right order to follow in teaching. John cites critics whom he calls “eristical sophists.” They apparently criticized the exercises generally, perhaps, like some Roman rhetoricians, favoring exclusive attention to declamation in the schools.

Table 1  
Order of Treatment of Progymnasmata in Extant Treatises

Exercise	Theon	Hermogenes	Aphthonius	Nicolaus
<i>Mythos</i> , Fable	2	1	1	1
<i>Diégēma</i> , <i>diégēsis</i> , Narrative, narration	3	2	2	2
<i>Khreia</i> , Chreia, anecdote	1	3	3	3
<i>Gnômê</i> , Maxim	1 <sup>2</sup>	4	4	4
<i>Anaskeuê</i> , Refutation	3	5	5	5
<i>Kataskeuê</i> , Confirmation	3 <sup>3</sup>	5	6	5
<i>Topos</i> , <sup>4</sup> <i>Koinos topos</i> , Topic, Common-place	4	6	7	6
<i>Enkômion</i> , Encomion	7	7	8	7
<i>Psogos</i> , Invective	7	-	9	7
<i>Synkrisis</i> , Comparison	8	8	10	8
<i>Ethopoeia</i> , <i>prosôpopoeia</i> , Characterization, Personification	6	9	11	9
<i>Ekphrasis</i> , Ecphrasis, description	5	10	12	10
<i>Thesis</i> , Thesis, proposition	9	11	13	11
<i>Nomos</i> , Law	10	12	14	12

<sup>2</sup> Treated as a form of the chreia.

<sup>3</sup> Refutation and confirmation are discussed by Theon in connection with narrative.

<sup>4</sup> Used only by Theon.

## A NOTE ON THE TRANSLATION

Words in parentheses in the translations are additions or explanations by the translator.

The term *hypothesis* occurs frequently in the progymnasmata and, at the risk of some confusion to readers, has been retained in the translation. The word usually refers to themes of declamation on judicial or deliberative subjects, occasionally also epideictic, as practiced in schools of rhetoric. These themes identified specific laws and circumstances or historical individuals and contexts on which rhetoricians and their students composed and delivered complete speeches. *Hypotheses* differ from *theses* in that a *thesis*, which is one of the progymnasmatic forms, deals with a proposition without specifying persons and circumstances and was not required to have all the conventional parts of a complete *hypothesis*.

The hyphenated word “common-place” has been adopted in order to distinguish *koinos topos*, one of the progymnasmatic forms, from other meanings of “commonplace.”

As in the translator’s versions of other Greek rhetorical works, a semi-colon is regularly used before “for” to indicate the presence of an enthymeme: i.e., a minor premise or an example in support of a proposition.

For a list of 725 fable themes in the Aesopic tradition, see the appendix to the Loeb Classical Library volume of Babrius and Phaedrus, edited and translated by B. E. Perry, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

This list includes general resources for study of classical rhetoric and works cited in footnotes by author and short-title. Additional books and articles are fully identified when cited in the notes.

Allinson, Francis G., tr., *Menander: The Principal Fragments*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Burtt, J. O., tr., *Minor Attic Orators*, vol. 2. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Butts, James R., *The “Progymnasmata” of Theon: A New Text with Translation and Commentary*. Dissertation, Claremont Graduate School, 1986.

Diels-Kranz: Hermann Diels and Walther Kranz, eds., *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 7th ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1951–54.

Dilts and Kennedy: Mervin R. Dilts and George A. Kennedy, eds.,

- Two Greek Rhetorical Treatises from the Roman Empire: Introduction, Text, & Translation of the Arts of Rhetoric Attributed to Anonymous Seguerianus and to Apsines of Gadara.* Mnemosyne Supplement 168. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Edmonds, J. M., tr., *Elegy and Iambus*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Felten, Joseph, ed., *Nicolai Progymnasmata*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.
- Foerster, Richard, ed., *Libanii Opera*, 12 vols. 1903–22; rpt., Hildesheim: Olms, 1963.
- Gangloff, Anne, “Myths, fables, et rhétorique à l’époque impériale,” *Rhetorica* 20 (2002) 25–56.
- Giannantoni, Gabriele, ed., *Socraticorum Reliquiae*, 4 vols. Rome: Bibliopolis, 1983–85.
- Heath, Malcolm, tr., *Hermogenes On Issues*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Hock and O’Neil: Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O’Neil, eds., *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: Volume I. The Progymnasmata*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986; Volume II. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.
- Jacoby, Felix, ed., *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, 3 Parts. Leiden: Brill, 1923–63.
- Kaibel, G., ed., *Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Berlin: Weidmann, 1890.
- Kennedy, George A., *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton University Press, 1983.
- , *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Kock, Theodor, ed., *Comicorum Atticorum Fragmenta*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner, 1880–1888.
- Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study*, translated by Matthew T. Bliss et al. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Martin, Josef, *Antike Rhetorik: Technik und Methode*. Munich: Beck, 1974.
- Matsen, Patricia P., Philip Rollinson, and Marion Sousa, eds., *Readings from Classical Rhetoric*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1990.
- Morgan, Teresa, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Nauck, Augustus, ed., *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. 2nd ed., Leipzig: Teubner, 1889.

- Page, Denys, ed., *Poetae Melici Graeci*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962.
- Patillon, Michel, *La Théorie du discours chez Hermogène le rhéteur*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1988.
- Patillon, Michel, and Giancarlo Bolognesi, eds., *Aelius Théon: Progymnasmata*. Edition Budé. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1997.
- Porter, Stanley F., ed., *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Age, 330 B.C.–A.D. 400*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Rabe, Hugo, ed., *Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.
- , ed., *Hermogenis Opera*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913; reprinted, 1969.
- , ed., *Ioannis Sardiani Commentarium in Aphthonii Progymnasmata*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1928.
- , ed. *Prolegomenon Sylloge*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1931.
- Radermacher, Ludwig, ed., “Artium Scriptores (Reste der voraristotelischen Rhetorik,” *Sitzungsberichte der Oesterreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophische-historische Klasse*, 227, 3. Vienna: Rudolf M. Rohrer, 1951.
- Spengel, Leonardus, ed., *Rhetores Graeci*. 3 vols., Leipzig: Teubner, 1854–56. Vol. 1, pt. 2, reedited by Caspar Hammer. Leipzig: Teubner, 1894.
- van Dijk, Gert-Jan, *AINOI, LOGOS, MYTHOI: Fables in Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic Greek Literature, with a study of the Theory and Terminology of the Genre*. Mnemosyne Supplement 166. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Walz, Christian, ed., *Rhetores Graeci*. 9 volumes. London and elsewhere, 1832–36; reprinted, Osnabrück: Zeller, 1968.
- West. M. L., ed., *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*. 2 vols., Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Wooten, Cecil, tr., *Hermogenes On Types of Style*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1987.



---

## Acknowledgments

In revising this work, I am particularly indebted to Professor D. A. Russell for numerous corrections and suggestions based on a lifetime of experience with later Greek texts. In addition, D. M. Schenkeveld, Malcolm Heath, and Edwin Carawan have provided welcome corrections and suggestions. For remaining faults I am myself responsible.

---

### Pagination of Theon's Text

References by scholars to Theon's text ordinarily make use of page numbers in volume 2 of Spengel's *Rhetores Graeci*. Modern editors, however, have rearranged the order of the chapters and are followed in this respect in the translation. The result is that a passage may be difficult to find on the basis of its Spengel number. A collation of Spengel pages and pages in this translation is therefore provided here.

Spengel Pages	Pages in the Translation	Spengel Pages	Pages in the Translation
59-72	3-15	109-115	50-55
72-96	23-42	115-118	47-49
96-105	15-23	118-119	45-47
106-109	42-45	120-130	55-64

---

## Chapter I

# The *Exercises* of Aelius Theon

*The author of this treatise is identified in the manuscripts simply as Theon. The tenth-century Byzantine encyclopedia, Suda, has an entry for Aelius Theon of Alexandria, identifying him as author of a treatise on progymnasmata as well as works on rhetoric and commentaries on Xenophon, Isocrates, and Demosthenes. Certainty is impossible, but this Aelius Theon of Alexandria is the leading candidate for author of this work.<sup>1</sup> When he lived can only be approximately determined. The latest authors to whom he refers are (ch. 11) Theodorus of Gadara and (ch. 14) Dionysius of Halicarnassus, indicating he was writing no earlier than the late first century B.C. Quintilian cites the views of a certain Theon on stasis theory (3.6.48) and of "Theon the Stoic" on figures of speech (9.3.76).<sup>2</sup> If either of these references is to the author of the progymnasmata, he must have been active earlier than the publication of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria* in A.D. 95. Thus the treatise may have been written at almost any time in the first century after Christ. It is the consensus of scholarly opinion that it is, in any event, the earliest surviving work on exercises in composition, certainly written sometime between the Augustan period and the flowering of the Second Sophistic in the second century after Christ, and it shows the system of instruction still in a stage of experiment and development. The Attic writers of the fifth and fourth centuries are regarded as the classic models for imitation by students, a development of the first century B.C., but included among them are the historians Theopompus, Philistus, and Ephorus, largely ignored by later rhetoricians. Theon seems to have a special interest in Thucydides, which may be a reflection of Thucydideanism in the Augustan period. On the other hand, there is no mention of Aelius Aristeides, who by the end of the second century had come to be regarded as an equal to the classical writers of the distant past and is cited in the work attributed to Hermogenes.*

<sup>1</sup> See W. Stegemann in Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie* V.A.2, coll. 2036-37.

<sup>2</sup> There are possible indications of Stoicism in the work; e.g., the distinction between *erotêsis* and *pysma* in the discussion of the *chreia*, a distinction which Diogenes Laertius 7.66 attributes to the Stoics. On other possible Stoic influences, see G. Reichel, *Quaestiones Progymnasmaticae* (Leipzig; Teubner, 1909) pp. 23-30.

Sometime in later antiquity Theon's work was edited, and the order of the chapters was rearranged to make it conform more closely to the system of exercises described in the handbook of Aphthonius, the most commonly used work on progymnasmata in late antiquity. This edited text is what has been preserved in Greek manuscripts, of which at least seven survive. The earliest, Laurentianus plut. 55.10, dates from the thirteenth century. The manuscripts include a few scholia, chiefly consisting of quotations from John of Sardis's commentary on Aphthonius that are relevant to Theon's discussion. John, probably writing in the early ninth century, cites Theon's treatise specifically in several passages and borrows from it without acknowledgement in others. Later commentaries on Aphthonius by John Doxapatres, Maximus Planudes, and an anonymous writer preserve material that originated with Theon but do not identify the source.<sup>3</sup> The Greek text was first printed in 1520 at Rome in the edition of Angelo Barbato and again, accompanied by Libanius' examples of progymnasmata and Latin translations, in the edition of Ioachim Camerarius in Basel in 1541, which was intended for use in schools. Another early edition, with Latin translation, and including Quintilian 2.4 and the treatise by Aphthonius, was published by Daniel Heinsius in 1626. The work is also found with progymnasmata by Libanius in the *Praeludia Oratoria* of Frédéric Morel (1606–7).

Two manuscripts in classical Armenian, copied in the seventeenth century from lost earlier versions, preserve the original order of the text as well as five and a half chapters at the end of the work where the Greek is lost; they also assist correction of the Greek text in some passages.

The term "progymnasma" occurs once in Theon's text (below, p. 5), but he prefers the simpler terms "gymnasma" or "gymnasia," while nevertheless making it clear that he regards the exercises as "preliminary" to the declamation of rhetorical hypotheses. The first few exercises he discusses are intended for quite elementary students of composition in grammar schools. This is especially clear from the pattern practice in grammatical inflection given by recasting a chreia through changes of number and case, a valuable exercise for elementary students. More-advanced exercises, especially those in refutation and confirmation, prepare the student for argumentation in declamation. Probably Theon, like some other Greek teachers and unlike Roman practice, taught both grammar and rhetoric. His work is, however, addressed to teachers, not to students. Alone among the Greek authors of progymnasmata he describes classroom methods consisting of oral reading, lis-

<sup>3</sup> See Patillon's edition of Theon, pp. cxx–cxxxiv and 113–20.

tening, memorizing, paraphrasing, elaborating, and contradicting what has been read.

The translation published here was initially made from the text printed in Leonard Spengel's *Rhetores Graeci*, vol. 2, pp. 59–130, for long the only text available to scholars. Numbers in brackets in the translation refer to pages in Spengel's edition, which remain the standard form of reference to the text. Subsequently, the translation was revised to incorporate some suggestions in the text, and especially restoration of the original chapter order, made by James R. Butts in his 1987 PhD dissertation at the Claremont Graduate School, which includes an English translation and notes. It was revised a second time after the publication of what is now the best edition of the text, that by Michel Patillon in the *Budé* series, the first edition to incorporate evidence for the text from the Armenian version.

[vol. 2, p. 59 Spengel]      I. PREFACE

The ancient rhetoricians, and especially those who have become famous,<sup>4</sup> did not think one should come to rhetoric at all before grasping philosophy to some extent and being filled with the greatness of mind that comes from this source. Now, however, most students are so far from appreciating such studies that they rush into public speaking without even getting a knowledge of what are called general studies;<sup>5</sup> and what is most boorish of all, they proceed to debate judicial and deliberative hypotheses<sup>6</sup> without having been practiced in the proper way—as the proverb says, “learning pottery-making by starting with a big jar.”<sup>7</sup> Let others write about whatever else is needed by one who is going to practice rhetoric. I shall now try to give an account of what it is necessary to know before undertaking the treatment of hypotheses in order to be properly trained, not that others have not written about these matters, but hoping that I too can contribute no little benefit to those intending to speak in public. We<sup>8</sup> have not only invented some additions to the exercises (*gymnasmata*) as described by others, but also we have tried to give a definition of each, so that, when asked what each of them is, one

<sup>4</sup> E.g., Isocrates, Plato, and Aristotle, perhaps also Theophrastus and others.

<sup>5</sup> *Enkyklia mathēmata*: grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music, or other similar subjects.

<sup>6</sup> Themes of declamation; a speech.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Plato, *Gorgias* 514e and *Laches* 187b.

<sup>8</sup> Like Aristotle and many teachers, ancient and modern, Theon often uses the first person plural of himself; beginning in the next paragraph he will also use it to include students.

can say, for example, that *mythos* is “fictitious discourse imaging truth”; and we have made clear their differences from each other, and we have included starting points (*aphormai*)<sup>9</sup> for each of the compositions, and we have further shown how one might make use of each most carefully.

[60] There is no secret about how these exercises are very useful for those acquiring the faculty of rhetoric. One who has expressed a **diégêsis** (narration) and a **mythos** (fable) in a fine and varied way will also compose a history well and what is specifically called “narrative” (*diégêma*) in hypotheses<sup>10</sup>—historical writing is nothing other than a combination of narrations—and one who can refute or confirm these is not far behind those speaking hypotheses, for everything that we do in judicial hypotheses is there as well: first, there is prooemion and narrative; then we try to meet each of the things said in the narrative and fable and to put each to a test; next we take thought how we shall best arrange each of the epicheiremes,<sup>11</sup> and we amplify and disparage and do other things that would be too long to mention here. Surely the exercise in the form of the **khreia** (or anecdote) not only creates a certain faculty of speech but also good character while we are being exercised in the moral sayings of the wise. What is called **topos** (common-place) and **ekphrasis** (description) have very clear benefit, since the ancients have used these everywhere, all historical writers using ekphrasis very frequently and orators using common-place. And **prosôpopoeia** (personification) is not only an historical exercise<sup>12</sup> but applicable also to oratory and dialogue and poetry,<sup>13</sup> and is most advantageous in everyday life and in our conversations with each other, and (understanding of it) is most useful in study of prose writings. Thus, we praise Homer first because of his ability to attribute the right words to each of the characters he introduces, but we find fault with Euripides because his Hecuba philosophizes inopportunistly.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, the exercise of **synkrisis** (comparison)

<sup>9</sup> This term appears repeatedly in Theon’s treatise. It refers to the resources, materials, or topics for discussion useful in composition.

<sup>10</sup> Contrary to what Theon says, *diégêsis* is the usual technical term for a “narration” as part of a speech; cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.16, Anonymous Seguerianus, ch. 2, and Apsines, ch. 3. *Diégêma* becomes the more common word for the exercise in narrative; cf. the usage in Hermogenes and Aphthonius.

<sup>11</sup> I.e., the arguments.

<sup>12</sup> I.e., offering practice in the composition of speeches, a regular feature of ancient historiography.

<sup>13</sup> I.e., to all genres in which characters are imagined as speaking.

<sup>14</sup> E.g., her speeches in *Hecuba* 251–95, 585–628, and 786–845.

is useful in judicial speeches when we compare [61] either wrongs to wrongs or good deeds to good deeds, and similarly in encomia when we contrast good deeds. The advantage (of practice in comparison) for deliberative speeches is also very clear, for speeches of advisers are concerned with which policy is preferable. What would one say about **thesis**? It differs not at all from hypothesis except that it lacks specific persons and place and time and manner and cause; for example, the thesis whether it is appropriate for those who are besieged to send an army abroad and the hypothesis whether it is appropriate for the Athenians when besieged by the Peloponnesians to send an army to Sicily. Similarly, attack on and defense of **nomoi** (laws) is not the least part of an hypothesis. The finest Demosthenic speeches are those in which there is a question about a law or decree; I mean *On the Crown* and *Against Androtion* and *Against Timocrates* and *Against Leptines* and *Against Aristocrates*. It made little difference that Aristocrates introduced a decree rather than a law. I am not overlooking **enkômion**, which is a species of hypothesis. There are in fact three species of hypothesis: encomiastic, which the Aristotelians called epideictic,<sup>15</sup> dicanic (judicial), and symbouleutic (deliberative). Since we have become accustomed often to assign the writing of encomia even to young students, I have placed it among the preliminary exercises (*progymnasmata*) and for the present have deferred an accurate technical description of it to some appropriate place,<sup>16</sup> while here limiting my teaching to a rather simple account.

*After this list of exercises and indication of the utility of each, Theon turns to a brief description of pedagogical methods, which is a unique feature of his handbook. He will return to the subject in chapters 13–17.*

**Anagnôsis** (reading aloud), as one of the older authorities said—I think it was Apollonius of Rhodes<sup>17</sup>—is the nourishment of style; for we imitate most beautifully when our mind has been

<sup>15</sup> In *Rhetoric* 1.9.33 Aristotle defines encomion as a subdivision of epideictic concerned with praise of deeds.

<sup>16</sup> Whether Theon ever wrote a full discussion of encomia is unknown. Perhaps it would have included discussion of praise of kings, officials, and festivals, not envisioned in school exercises; cf. D. A. Russell, “The Panegyrist and Their Teachers,” in *The Propaganda of Power*, ed. by Mary Whitby (Leiden: Brill, 1998), p. 26.

<sup>17</sup> Probably not the famous poet but the rhetorician Apollonius Molon with whom Cicero studied; cf. *Brutus* 312 and 316.

stamped by beautiful examples. And who would not take pleasure in *akroasis* (hearing a work read aloud), [62] readily taking in what has been created by the toil of others? But just as it is no help to those wanting to paint to look at the works of Apelles and Protogenes and Antiphilus unless they themselves put their hand to painting, so neither the words of older writers nor the multitude of their thoughts nor their purity of language nor harmonious composition nor urbanity of sound nor, in a word, any of the beauties in rhetoric, are useful to those who are going to engage in rhetoric unless each student exercises himself every day in writing.

Despite what some say or have thought, *paraphrasis* (paraphrase) is not without utility.<sup>18</sup> The argument of opponents is that once something has been well said it cannot be done a second time, but those who say this are far from hitting on what is right. Thought is not moved by any one thing in only one way so as to express the idea (*phantasia*) that has occurred to it in a similar form, but it is stirred in a number of different ways, and sometimes we are making a declaration, sometimes asking a question, sometimes making an inquiry,<sup>19</sup> sometimes beseeching, and sometimes expressing our thought in some other way. There is nothing to prevent what is imagined from being expressed equally well in all these ways. There is evidence of this in paraphrase by a poet of his own thoughts elsewhere or paraphrase by another poet and in the orators and historians, and, in brief, all ancient writers seem to have used paraphrase in the best possible way, rephrasing not only their own writings but those of each other. While Homer says (*Odyssey* 18.136–37), “Such is the mind of men who live on earth / As the father of men and gods grants it for the day,” Archilochus,<sup>20</sup> rephrasing the lines, says, “Such, Glaucus, son of Leptines, is the mind / Of mortal men as Zeus brings it for the day.” And again, Homer has spoken of the capture of a city in this way (*Iliad* 9.593–94): [63] “They kill the men, and fire levels the city, / And some lead off children and others deep-zoned women.” Demosthenes (19.65) adapts it thus, “When we were on our way to Delphi, necessarily we saw all these things: houses destroyed, walls thrown down, a place deserted by those in the prime of life, few women and children, and pitiful old men.” Aeschines (3.157) treats it thus: “Look at their dis-

<sup>18</sup> The opponents of paraphrase are unknown. Quintilian (1.9.2 and 10.5.5) recommends the practice.

<sup>19</sup> In ch. 3, below, Theon explains that a question (*erôtêsis*) can be answered yes or no, whereas an inquiry (*pysma*) requires a longer response.

<sup>20</sup> Frag. 131, ed. West.



---

sample content of Progymnasmata: Greek Textbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric (Writings from the Greco-Roman World)

- [click Rilke's Book of Hours: Love Poems to God](#)
- [download online Just Another Major Crisis?: The United States and Europe Since 2000](#)
- [The Steel Kiss \(Lincoln Rhyme Series, Book 12\) pdf, azw \(kindle\)](#)
- [download Finding God Through Sex: Awakening the One of Spirit Through the Two of Flesh pdf, azw \(kindle\), epub](#)
  
- <http://creativebeard.ru/freebooks/The-Complete-Guide-to-Northern-Praying-Mantis-Kung-Fu.pdf>
- <http://www.shreesaiexport.com/library/Scar-Tissue.pdf>
- <http://www.mmastyles.com/books/The-Steel-Kiss--Lincoln-Rhyme-Series--Book-12-.pdf>
- <http://yachtwebsitedemo.com/books/Finding-God-Through-Sex--Awakening-the-One-of-Spirit-Through-the-Two-of-Flesh.pdf>