

HENRYK PODBIELSKI

PSEUDO ARISTIDES: *ON POLITICAL STYLE*  
*AND ON SIMPLE STYLE.*  
ATTRIBUTION AND THE NATURE OF TREATIES\*

The oldest manuscript which is the main basis for modern editions of the two rhetorical treatises on stylistics and which is connected with the name of Aelius Aristides comes from the 10<sup>th</sup> century and is kept at the National Library in Paris (*Parisinus gr.1741*).<sup>1</sup> The manuscript, which is at the same time the oldest direct testimony to the preservation of these treatises as the work of Aelius Aristides, one of the most eminent representatives of the Second Sophistic, provides the following title at the beginning of the first treatise: Ἀριστείδου περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου (*On political style* by Aristides) and, in a slightly longer version, at its end: Ἀριστείδου τεχνῶν ῥητορικῶν περὶ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου α (*The first part of rhetorical works: On political style* by Aristides). And right after just one line of interval the manuscript provides a similar title of the second treatise which begins at this point: Ἀριστείδου τεχνῶν ῥητορικῶν περὶ τοῦ ἀφελοῦς λόγου β (*The second part of rhetorical works: On simple style* by Aristides). This undoubtedly proves that not only did the Byzantine scribe in the 10<sup>th</sup> century treat the two treatises as works of Aristides, but he also believed them to be parts of

---

Prof. HENRYK PODBIELSKI – emerytowany profesor Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II, e-mail: henpod@kul.lublin.pl

\* The article has been accomplished within the research Project financed by NCN: DS/DEC/2011/03/B/HS2/05442: “Greek Rhetorical Theory and Praxis in Roman Empire (II-V s. A.D.). Translation in Polish and Critical Analysis of Rhetorical Treatises of Pseudo-Aristides, Apsines of Gadara, Anonymus Seguerianus, Libanius and Nicolaus of Myra.”

<sup>1</sup> The manuscript signed P (1741) contains the texts of 16 Greek rhetorical treatises, including Aristotle’s *Poetics* and *Rhetoric*, *The arrangement of words* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On style* by Demetrius of Phalerum. For the most recent analysis of this manuscript in the context of the treatises attributed to Aristides, see M. PATILLON. *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. I: *Le discours politique* pp. LXV-LXXII.

a whole. In order to mark the end of the first and the beginning of the second part, he published the titles of both treatises side by side. Subsequent, relatively numerous direct and indirect copies of the oldest and the most important Paris manuscript, as well as the tradition independent of them and such Byzantine commentators on Hermogenes as Gregory of Corinth<sup>2</sup> (the 12<sup>th</sup> century) and Maximus Planudes<sup>3</sup> (the 13<sup>th</sup> century), consistently attribute the authorship of these treatises to Aelius Aristides. They also cite the first of these treatises as a work entitled *On political style*. In turn, John of Sicily (the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> centuries) in his commentary to Hermogenes' *De ideis* mentions a work of Aristides with the same title, but a less perfect one.<sup>4</sup> As noted by M. Patillon,<sup>5</sup> this title also appears on the margin of the first page of the *Paris Codex* 1741. This raises the question of whether or not one can and should associate the mentioned references to this title with any meaning explaining the history of the text of the treatise in question. Particularly puzzling is the appearance of this title in the commentary by John of Sicily, which might suggest that this treatise was known to him only by this title. At the same time, there is no direct testimony that could confirm the interdependence of these references. In both cases it may be either a reminiscence of the earlier title of this treatise or an expression of the knowledge of its subject which is the consideration of the style in terms of "form/type" (*ideai*). Therefore, it seems acceptable that John of Sicily would use this title as a commentator on Hermogenes' treatise of the same title, or that it would be placed by the scribe on the margin of the first page of the manuscript as a "subheading" informing about the nature of the copied work. Independent appearance of such title in the work of the Byzantine commentator and on the margin of the first page of the treatise in the *Paris Codex* can be explained in an even simpler way: these are the first words of this treatise that announce its subject. Accepting such explanation would also confirm that the treatise *On political style* began in the same way it begins now already at the time when the scholiast wrote about it. Even in this case, however, we cannot be sure whether he used the text preserved as the *Paris Codex* 1741. If he had used this manuscript, he would rather refer

<sup>2</sup> Commentary on Hermogenes *Peri methodou deinotetos* & 124, 126 (p. 1091.13 Walz VII).

<sup>3</sup> A similar commentary to the same paragraphs of this treatise is provided by Planudes (p. 563.14 Walz V). We do not know, however, whether he takes the text of his commentary from Gregory of Corinth, or whether they both draw from a source earlier than the *Paris Codex* 1741 from the 10<sup>th</sup> century or from the manuscript itself.

<sup>4</sup> *Comm.* p. 111.15-23 Walz VI.

<sup>5</sup> PSEUDO ARISTIDES. *Introduction*. p. X.

to the title of the treaty adopted in it: *Peri politikou logou* (*On political style*), instead of the subtitle on its margin *Peri ideon* (*On the forms/types of style*). It should be assumed, therefore, that this treatise functioned as a work of Aristides in the late-Byzantine tradition preceding the formation of the *Paris Codex* 1741, under one title or the other.

#### TREATISE *ON POLITICAL STYLE*, ITS CHARACTER AND ATTRIBUTION

Despite the consistent attribution of both discussed treatises to Aelius Aristides by manuscript writing tradition dating back to the 10<sup>th</sup> century, and despite their thematic complementation, modern publishers, commentators, and contemporary researchers on Aristides' well-preserved oratory work consistently refuse to attribute these treatises to Aristides. They also ascribe putting them together to an unknown teacher of rhetorical art between the end of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century and the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century. These dates are, on the one hand, an expression of the unquestionable fact that both discussed treatises represent an earlier and less perfect phase of stylistic theory than *De ideis* (*On Types of Style*), a work of Hermogenes created in the last years of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century or in the early 3<sup>rd</sup> century. On the other hand, the dates indicate that the treatises could function as school textbooks on rhetorical stylistics until the establishment of *Corpus Hermogenicum* at the beginning of the 6<sup>th</sup> century at the latest. *Corpus Hermogenicum*, which became a textbook of rhetorical art universally accepted in Byzantium, eliminated almost all other rhetorical treatises from school circulation and condemned them to oblivion. Only attribution to Aristides, one of the most eminent rhetoricians and representatives of the Second Sophistic, saved the treatises discussed here from total disappearance.

One of the main reasons for refusing Aristides the authorship of these treatises by modern scholars is the absence of these works in the rich manuscript writing tradition of Aristides' authentic texts until the 14<sup>th</sup> century. The treatises are apparently added and attached to the codices of his writings only after being discovered as numerous copies of the *Paris Codex* 1741.<sup>6</sup> As an argument against Aristides' authorship of the treatise *On political style*, M. Patillon (p. IX-X) also quotes terminology used in this treatise to describe basic stylistic categories: Orator Aristides (*Or.28* Keil), like Her-

---

<sup>6</sup> Cf. M. PATILLON. *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. I s. IX.

mogenes calls them *ideai*, a term which does not appear in the systematic lecture of the discussed treatise (&& 3-140). In turn, the treatise refers to these categories as *aretai*, that is, a name reminiscent of the classical “virtue/quality” of style.<sup>7</sup> The term and its collateral form *eide* are used several times in chapter 12 (& 141-143), which is inspired by the speech of Aelius Aristides, and in the introduction to the treatise (& 1-2), considered by M. Patillon as a work of an unknown teacher of rhetoric, who was to combine two earlier separate studies on the ‘forms/types’ of the political style. The first of these treatises is to be contained in chapters 3-128, covering the analysis of the first seven *forms/types and virtues/qualities* announced in the *Introduction* and illustrated with numerous examples. The second treatise, which includes a brief description of other five categories of style not documented with examples, is contained in just twelve paragraphs (&& 129-140). What’s more, on the basis of Syrianus’ comment (the 5<sup>th</sup> century) extended later by John of Sicily (the 10<sup>th</sup>-11<sup>th</sup> centuries) as a commentary to the critical statement by Hermogenes about his predecessors dealing with *forms/types of style*, M. Patillon makes an attempt to determine the most likely candidates for the authors of the first and the second part of the treatise in question. Let us take a closer look at these sources and the interpretation provided by the French scholar.

Emphasizing the innovativeness and importance of stylistic issues discussed in the treatise *De ideis*<sup>8</sup>, Hermogenes states at the beginning of his work: “To my knowledge, no one has ever elaborated on this problem before us, and those who have, spoke in a disorderly manner and without faith in what they were saying, so everything was mixed up to them. Others who received recognition for the theoretical development of detailed [217] issues about this man (i.e. Demosthenes), to the best of their knowledge, were little or not at all concerned about explaining, in general categories, what the seriousness of style is in itself, what its modesty is, and what its other forms/types are”. It is possible to find the explanation as to whom Hermogenes meant while speaking in plural about the two kinds of his predecessors in the commentary to the statement made by the-above-mentioned Syrianus

<sup>7</sup> This observation is not fully confirmed in the text of the treatise. Except for the preface, where it appears next to *ideai* and the twelfth chapter in which it appears three times, next to the term (*ideai*) used twice, *aretai* appears only once: in 6.1.1. It appears more often (nine times) in the treatise *On simple style* in which the term “ideai” is used five times. This rather indicates the “fluidity” of this terminology both in Aristides, the orator, and in the rhetorical treatises attributed to him.

<sup>8</sup> HERMOGENES. *De ideis* 216-217.

and John of Sicily who extended Syrianus' commentary. Syrianus<sup>9</sup> mentions Basilikos as a representative of the first group ("those who undertook to explain the idea of style") and, comparing him to Hermogenes, specifies that "he does not have this clarity and perfect order, which were used (by Hermogenes) in a distinctive way" (οὐ σὺν εὐκρινείᾳ καὶ τάξει τῇ ἀρίστη, ἧπερ διαφερόντως αὐτὸς φαίνεται κεχρημένος). Syrianus also includes Basilikos as the author of a different work in the second group (those writing about the style of Demosthenes' individual speeches) along with Zeno of Athens "and others similar to them". John of Sicily<sup>10</sup> combines both statements of Syrianus and takes literally his commentary on the first group, mentioning Basilikos as its representative. He specifies Syrianus' opinion on the "commentators" of Demosthenes' individual speeches who occasionally raise the issue of style characteristics such as "seriousness" or "simplicity" which refer directly to Hermogenes. As an example of such "imperfect treatment of these matters" he adds the names of Dionysius and Aristides<sup>11</sup> to Zeno who was mentioned by Syrianus.

The analysis of both commentaries allowed the French publisher to determine two separate authors of the first volume. Basilikos, mentioned by Syrianus, is to be the author of the first part, covering paragraphs 2-128 and illustrated with examples of Attic speakers, and the authorship of the second part, which is incomplete and devoid of examples, is to be attributed to Dionysius who was listed beside Aristides by John of Sicily. Dionysius is identified here not as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, which seems to be suggested by Hermogenes' statement; but Dionysius of Miletus, one of the representatives of the Second Sophistic, a rhetorician from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. This is undoubtedly a fascinating hypothesis, but based on very fragile foundations and on the explicit "over-interpretation" of the late testimony (footnote 11) of John of Sicily referred to above. At the turn of the 11<sup>th</sup> century the treatise

<sup>9</sup> *In Hermogenem Commentaria*. Ed. Hugo Rabe, [Teubner] 1892-1893. Vol. I p. 13, 1-10.

<sup>10</sup> *Comm.* p. 111. Walz VI. Cf. M. Patillon (*Arts Rhétoriques*. Vol. I p. XIX) his translation, and the Greek text and commentary in footnote 27.

<sup>11</sup> Because the statement of John of Sicily is the basis for M. Patillon's attribution to Dionysius of parts (&& 129-140) of the treatise *On political style*, it will be quoted in its entirety in the literal translation: "Beside those who treated (*forms/types of style*) in an unmethodical (χούδη) and unordered (ἀτάκτως) way, there are those who seem to talk about Demosthenes with somewhat more care, like (Hermogenes) spoke, among other things, about Zeno, who worked for some time (on this issue), because only occasionally do they make a reflection on the seriousness or the simplicity of style, and even more on the content (thought), or expression, or some other item, as (done by) Aristides and Dionysius both partially, unclearly and without providing examples."

was considered to be the work of Aelius Aristides, which is proved beyond any doubt by *Paris Codex* 1741. M. Patillon himself (I, p. XIX-XX) admits that “the theory of the *idea of style* ascribed by the Byzantine commentator to Aristides, is the one we now know from the treatises preserved under his name”. In this situation, it is difficult to understand that, by mentioning the accomplishments of Dionysius of Miletus next to Aristides, the same commentator would mean the second part of Aristides’ treatise. There is, in turn, no proof that such treatise survived on its own until the 11<sup>th</sup> century. Accepting M. Patillon’s hypothesis, it would be difficult to understand why, five centuries earlier, Syrianus did not see the allusion to the alleged treatise of Dionysius in the Hermogenes’ text he commented upon. It is also worth remembering that the name of Dionysius in the commentary of John of Sicily concerns the second part of Hermogenes’ statement, where the rhetorician talks about monographic studies of Demosthenes’ style of speech. Due to the nature of their subject, these studies could not deal with ‘forms/types’ of style as such and only occasionally and in a non-methodical way was it possible to deal with the issues of “style forms”. In this context, it is more likely that for the commentator Dionysius is the representative of the monographic studies on the style of Demosthenes’ speeches, and it is rather Dionysius of Halicarnassus, while the mention of Aristides is a reflection of the understanding of the treatise in question in the shape that we now have and whose existence in the 10<sup>th</sup> century is confirmed by the preserved *Paris codex*. The criticism of the “non-standard” argument about the style’s form, an argument which is devoid of examples, is apparently related to the second part of treatise by Pseudo Aristides *On political style*. On the basis of Syrianus’ testimony supplemented by John of Sicily, it can only be said in general who the people criticized by Hermogenes were. On the other hand, these testimonies do not authorize the recognition of these predecessors as the alleged authors of the treaty *On political style* without additional proof. While there is no additional evidence, besides the ambivalent testimony of John of Sicily, to confirm Dionysius of Miletus’ authorship proposed by the French publisher, Basilikos as a possible author presents himself in a completely different way. On the basis of knowledge concerning his writing, Syrianus lists him as a representative of both types of rhetorical writing before Hermogenes. Syrianus’ authoritative statement is fully confirmed by other scholiasts and the *Suda*<sup>12</sup>. The character of Basilikos’ rich

<sup>12</sup> See *Anonimi commentarium in Hermogenis De ideis*, p. 1024-11-14 Walz VII, according to whom Basilikos (the 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> century) was the author of the treatises: *On the forms of style* and *On*

activity as a rhetorician and sophist, at the head of which there is the treaty *De ideis*, and the allusory criticism of him by Hermogenes, which is consistent with the character of the treaty preserved under Aristides' name, make him an almost ideal candidate for the alleged author of the work in question. In this case, however, there remains an issue of how and under what circumstances the treatise of a well-known sophist and rhetorician, whose rhetorical works are repeatedly mentioned by the Byzantine commentators and are known in the 10<sup>th</sup> century to the authors of *the Suda*, could so easily lose its author's identity and become an anonymous treatise. It is also difficult to explain how, thanks to didactic additions taken largely from the authentic writings of Aelius Aristides (& 141-186), at some point between the 6<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> century, the treatise was ascribed, along with the treatise *On simple style*, to the very Aristides.

Appreciating the effort undertaken recently by M. Patillon to solve the difficult issue of proper attribution of the rhetorical treatises ascribed by the manuscript writing tradition to Aelius Aristides, we must at the same time be aware that his suggestion, which brings hope for the final solution, is not an entirely credible and justified hypothesis. It suggests creating one treatise *On political style* from two previously separate treatises and assigning one of them to Basilikos and the other to Dionysius of Miletus, which, as stated above, is not credible or justified. Particularly many doubts must arise from the proposition of attribution of the theoretical part (& 129-140) of the treatise in question, devoid of examples, to Dionysius of Miletus on the basis of the testimony provided by John of Sicily who clearly points out the weak elements of Aristides' work and refers to the shape in which this work survived to our days in *Paris Codex*. In the light of the above-mentioned Hermogenes' statement about his predecessors, and in the light of Syrianus' comment, it would be easier to accept the attribution of the entire "forms/types of political style" part of the treatise (& 2-140) to Basilikos. Since Syrianus' commentary does not mention Aristides among the predecessors of Hermogenes, but mentions Basilikos twice, it can be assumed that our treatise on the forms/types of political style was not yet connected with

---

*topos*. He was also supposed to be the author of commentaries on Demosthenes' speeches. See: SYRIANUS, *Comm.* I p. 13.6 n. (cf. JOHN OF SICILY. *Comm.* p. 435.17-19 Walz VI); *The Suda* (No. 159, p. 460 Adler) mentions his other treatises: Περὶ τῶν διὰ τῶν λέξεων σχημάτων ([*Peri ton lexeon schematon*] *On the figures of language*), Περὶ μεταποιήσεως ([*Peri metapoieseos*] *On the variant of cases*), and Περὶ ῥητορικῆς παρασκευῆς ἢτοι περὶ ἀσκήσεως ([*Peri rhetorikes paraskeues e peri askeseos*] *On rhetorical preparation, or on practice*). On the element of "thought," see SYRIANUS, *Comm.* II p. 180. 9-11 Rabe and ANONYMOUS. *In Hermog.* p. 931.2 Walz VII.

Aristides' authorship in the 5<sup>th</sup> century, and the works of Basilikos were known under his own name. Thus, Syrianus' testimony also indirectly becomes an argument confirming the legitimacy of the long-held doubt of modern research as to Aristides' authorship of both rhetorical treatises attributed to him by tradition. In the light of this testimony, it seems obvious that the above attribution must have taken place between the 6<sup>th</sup> and the 10<sup>th</sup> century, or more precisely: after Syrianus' commentary on Hermogenes' treatise *De ideis*, and before or during the preparation of the Byzantine manuscript in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, a manuscript now known as *Paris Codex* 1741. There is no doubt that the basis for this attribution, strongly emphasized in his introduction by M. Patillon (pp. VIII-IX), consisted of an elaborate "exegetic" part of the treatise, attached to a systematic lecture on the forms/types of political style and determined by didactic needs. The "exegetic" part explains not only the difficulties encountered in practical application and related to the necessity of combining opposing stylistic forms/types into one statement (& 141-143 = Aristides, *Or.* 28 119-120 Keil), but also a series of practical instructions that deal with building the speaker's ethos (& 144-145 = *Or.* 28 179,6-184 Keil), the appropriate length for different types of speeches (& 146-148), combining various generic forms in one speech (& 149-150), the subject of advisory speeches (& 151-159), the subject and the use of "praise" and "rebuke" forms to show off (& 160-164 and 166), warnings against the use of forms of showing off pronunciation in political speeches (& 165), the problem of composition and expressions (& 167-173), instruction (taken from Aristides (*Or.* 34,33 Keil) on the double purpose of speech (I.e. it should be "convincing" and "kindly received"), the model of exercise in composing speech illustrated on the example Aristides' *1st Sicilian Speech* (& 175-181), and exercises in paraphrasing Homer's *Iliad* I 1-44 and *Odyssey* IX 425-436; (& 182-186).

The exegetic supplement whose range of problems has been outlined above and which constitutes for over a quarter of the entire treatise, owes its explanation, to a great extent, to the borrowings from the authentic works of Aristides as can be seen in the annotations provided in brackets. As indicated before, these borrowings from Aristides' *speech* (28, 117-181 Keil) had probably become the basis for assigning this treatise and its sister work *On simple style* to Aristides, as the memory of who their proper authors were was lost in the so-called "dark ages" of Byzantine history (the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> centuries). It is also very likely that thanks to this attribution, which could have occurred in the 9<sup>th</sup> century along with the revival of culture and interest



in school rhetoric,<sup>13</sup> these treatises, as the work of a famous rhetorician, or then ascribed to him, had a better chance of surviving beside the standard and widely commented Hermogenes' textbook. Thanks to this attribution, they undoubtedly found a place in a carefully prepared Byzantine codex from the 10<sup>th</sup> century which included all the most important ancient Greek works on rhetoric and poetics. However, the question of who and when made these additions using, inter alia, knowledge of Aristides' works, remains an open issue. Byzantine philologists perceived the similarities of the text of the treatise with Aristides' views and the way they were expressed in his *Speeches*,<sup>14</sup> and apparently considered these similarities a sufficient basis for attributing to him the authorship of the entire treatise and of an analogous treatise on the forms of simple style. Modern researchers, however, have been consistently refusing Aristides this authorship for almost a hundred years now.<sup>15</sup> M. Patillon even uses the textual similarity of the treatise in question with the authentic works of Aristides and the use of the *1<sup>st</sup> Sicilian Speech* as a model for the "composition" exercise (& 175-181) as arguments against his authorship. He considers it more probable that this entire part was added by users of this treatise in school environments, rather than by its author (p. IX). Bearing in mind the intentional didactic character of the discussed treatise, it can not be ruled out that its final exegetic part could have been the work of one of the teachers or students who used this textbook, regardless of whether its author was, as the tradition wants, Aelius Aristides, or, as it is now believed, Basilikos who was a generation younger than Aristides. However, more can be said about the time of composition of this supplement. The basis for this is provided by the similarities of paragraphs 141-143 with the text of Aristides' speech quoted above (28. 119-20 Keil) and at the same time with an analogous statement on the same subject provided by Hermogenes (*De ideis* 279.14 n), and paragraphs 151-159 with a commentary to Hermogenes' "pragmatic status" (*De statibus*) signed with the name of Syrianus.<sup>16</sup> A thorough analysis of three parallel texts: Aristides', Hermo-

<sup>13</sup> At this time, we observe a revival of commentary activity concerning Hermogenes' *On rhetorical exercises*, which is manifested in the preserved commentaries by John of Sardes.

<sup>14</sup> In the speech *Περὶ τοῦ παραθέγματος* (*[Peri tou parathegmatos] On speech modulation*) (Or. 28. 119-120 Keil) on the skill of combining in one speech the opposing forms of a style = & 141-143 and on the topic of building the "greatness" of the speaker (ARIST. 28, 179.6-180.4 and 187.27-188. 5 = & 144-145).

<sup>15</sup> For example: W. SCHMID. Die sogenannte Aristidesrhetorik, RhM 72:1917-18, pp. 238-244.

<sup>16</sup> The commentary (pp. 701-702.21 Walz IV) is signed with Syrianus' name, but this text does not contain the proper, separate commentary on Hermogenes' *De statibus*. Ed. H. Rabe. Attribution to Syrianus is not quite certain.

genes', and Pseudo Aristides' (& 141-143) on the skill of combining opposing 'forms/types of style' provided by M. Patillon (pp. XV-XVI) undermined<sup>17</sup> Hermogenes' dependence on the text of our treatise adopted by W. Schmid. It showed, in one of the comparable examples, the direct borrowing of Aelius Aristides' text by Hermogenes and the author of the treatise<sup>18</sup>; and, in another example, a common prototype for Aristides and Hermogenes in Plato's text<sup>19</sup>. Therefore, it turned out that there is no basis for recognizing Hermogenes' dependence on the text of our treatise and for confirming the early pre-Hermogenes dating of the analyzed supplement. Also, the other parallel of the text of our treatise (& 151-159) to the text of the commentary signed by Syrianus (pp. 701-702.21 Walz IV) mentioned above does not give strong grounds for the dependence on the text of the 5<sup>th</sup> century commentator adopted by M. Patillon. After all, it was a common practice for commentators to use the texts of the existing treatises, and not the other way round. It should rather be assumed that in Syrianus' times, the treaty in question existed already in the form in which it has been handed over to us by the manuscript writing tradition. Therefore, it cannot be ruled out that in the commentary to Hermogenes discussed above (*De ideis* 216-217)<sup>20</sup> Syrianus, while pointing to Basilikos as the predecessor criticised by the rhetorician, had in mind Basilikos' treatise in the currently preserved form: with the lack of examples in the second part and with the addition of the supplement on "forms/types of political style," which was later attributed by Byzantine copyists to Aristides.

To sum up the above inquiries, it can be concluded that due to the refusal of modern scholars to attribute the treatises *On political style* and *On simple style* to Aelius Aristides, the most likely candidate for the author of the first

<sup>17</sup> HERMOGENES. *De statibus* pp. 125-127.

<sup>18</sup> Hermogenes' statement, adapted to the course of his argument (280.3-4), reads: ἔνθα δὲ τόλμης δεῖ, κάλλος καὶ τὸ κεκοσμημένον ἅμα πιθανότητι, [*entha de tolmes dei, kállos kai to kekosmenon hama pithanoteti*], while Aristides' original: οὐ μὲν ἀκριβείας δεῖ, ἐνταῦθα ὄραν προστιθείς [*hou mèn akribeias dei, entautha horan prostitheis*] and the text of Pseudo Aristides: οὐ μὲν ἀκρίβεια, ἐνταῦθα ... [*hou mèn akribeia, entautha ...*].

<sup>19</sup> In this case, the greatest similarity is observed between the text of Aelius Aristides: Ὀμηρον δὲ, εἰ βούλει, ποιητῶν ἐξαιρῶ λόγου ("from the poets, if you like, I will skip Homer") and the text of our treatise: Ὀμηρον δὲ ποιητῶν ἐξαιρῶ λόγου ("and from the poets I will skip Homer"). However, it is difficult to talk about Hermogenes' text's dependency on any of them: Ἐξαιρῶ μέντοι τοῦ λόγου τὸν ῥήτορα ("of course I will skip the rhetorician [Demosthenes]"), since this structure is already used in his dialogues by Plato: *Symposium* 176 C: Σωκράτης δὲ ἐξαιρῶ λόγου ("I will skip Socrates"), cf. *Phdr.* 242 b: Σιμίαν ἐξαιρῶ λόγου ("I will ignore Simmias").

<sup>20</sup> See: above pp. 251-252 and footnotes 6-7.

treatise (if not the whole of the treatise, then undoubtedly of the two parts on the forms/types of style) in the light of ancient sources can only be the rhetorician Basilikos, called “divine” by his eminent student Apsines. The division of the lecture on the forms/types of style into two separate works by two different authors introduced by the last publisher of this treatise, M. Patillon, seems unjustified. Patillon divides the lecture on style into Basilikos’ lecture, which is richly illustrated with examples from Demosthenes’ speech (& 3-128); and theoretical reasoning on forms/types of political style signaled in the introduction by Dionysius of Miletus (129-140), a reasoning which is unfinished, chronologically earlier, unillustrated with examples, and unconfirmed by any credible tradition.

In accordance with the above findings, we treat the lecture contained in paragraphs 1 to 140 as an integral whole regarding the subject of the “forms/types” of political style. The rest of the treatise (& 141-186), the content of which has been presented above<sup>21</sup>, we consider as a supplement, added to this lecture by the principal of rhetorical school and the author of the treatise (Basilikos) alone or by an anonymous teacher of rhetoric who used the treatise. The integrity of the lecture about the forms/types and virtues of political style also seems to be confirmed by its composition.

In the light of the thesis (& 1-2) formulated at the beginning of the treatise, its subject includes “the forms/types and virtues constituting political style which are the basis for the evaluation of the style and which ascribe great value to the style. The style is composed from them as if from separate parts, but it unites them all and presents itself as a perfect whole.” Each of the twelve forms/types of this style mentioned in the next sentence is discussed in separate chapters. All aspects and elements of the first seven forms/types are richly illustrated with examples taken from Attic speakers, especially from Demosthenes’ speeches. The other five forms/types are limited only to a short characterization of each form and the manner of their creation. Therefore, we observe a huge disproportion in length: the first seven chapters fill 128 out of the total number of 140 paragraphs, leaving only 12 paragraphs to discuss the other five forms/types not illustrated with examples. It seems to me that the missing of examples and use of a dozen or so words in the second part that do not appear in the part illustrated with examples, but which are generally in common use<sup>22</sup> cannot be a sufficient basis

<sup>21</sup> See: above, p. 256.

<sup>22</sup> For instance: ἀπαλλάττειν, ἀποβλέπειν, ἀποσχίζειν, δελοῦν, ἐπίνοια, ἐναργής, ἐπιστροφή, μικτός, μῦθος and other similar terms, whose entire list (25 words in total) is quoted by M. Patillon (*Arts Rhétoriques* T. I p. XIII).

for recognizing, along with M. Patillon, the existence of two separate sources of the treatise in question. It is not enough evidence to prove that originally there were two different treatises by various authors, later connected by an anonymous teacher of rhetoric into a whole by adding the foreword. The lack of support of theoretical statements on the creation and functioning of the discussed forms/types of style with relevant examples in the final part of the treatise can be justified in two ways: either the author failed to provide them for some reasons or the examples were omitted during the transfer or rewriting of the text. It would be difficult to understand, however, why Basilikos, whom M. Patillon calls the author of the first part of the lecture richly illustrated by examples (& 2-128), did not include in his argument about political style such forms/types of the style as *clarity* and *purity*, the most sought after elements of any public speech, or *elegance* and *sweetness*, without which no speech would have the grace expected by the listeners. Similarly, it seems incredible that Dionysius of Miletus, the alleged author of the second source, omitted such basic elements as: *seriousness*, *abundance*, *strictness*, *violence* or *credibility* while talking about the forms/types or virtues of political style.<sup>23</sup> It is also surprising that both these “separate sources” complement each other perfectly and adopt the same basis for creating each form/type of style from the same three structural elements, which are: the content element – “thought” (γνώμη [*gnome*]), the element of form introducing the thought – “figure” (σχῆμα [*schema*]) and language structure – “expression” (ἐπαγγελία [*epangelia*]). And for this reason, the division of the argument on forms/types of style into two parts by separate authors, Basilikos and Dionysius of Miletus, adopted by M. Patillon, does not seem possible.

Similar difficulties are encountered when trying to determine the alleged author of the treatise *On simple style*. Apart from attributing it to Aelius Aristides by the manuscript writing tradition, there is no ancient and medieval testimony to his authorship. After negating this attribution, one can at best point to a more or less likely candidate for the author of this treatise from among the Sophists before Hermogenes. It can be done on the basis of internal evidence contained in the treatise.

In the form in which the manuscript writing tradition has passed it to us, the treatise appears to be a continuation and supplementation of the theory of “stylistic ideas (*forms/types*)” initiated in the treatise *On political style*. This

---

<sup>23</sup> M. PATILLON. *Arts Rhétoriques* T. I. Notice p. 13) proposes the following title Dionysius’ non-certified treatise: Περὶ ἀρετῶν τοῦ πολιτικοῦ λόγου (*On the virtues of the political style*).

idea is expressed not only in the first words of the treatise containing author's information on the subject, which could be attributed to the later editor of the text, but also, to a greater extent, in the confrontation of the discovered properties of the simple style with the simultaneously perceived forms of the political style, visible almost throughout the entire text. Recognizing this confrontation, M. Patillon concludes that the author of the treatise in question must also be the author of the treatise *On political style*; however, not of the one that the manuscript writing tradition attributed to Aristides, but of an unpreserved one whose author could be Aelius Harpokration. French publisher used the latter name in his study "out of convenience" (*pour commodité*) to name the author of the published text *On simple style*.<sup>24</sup> The *Suda*<sup>25</sup> ascribes works on Herodotus and Xenophon and a treatise *On the forms of style (De ideis)* to Aelius Harpokration, a "sophist." The last work could have been the treatise in question: *On simple style* or a textbook on *Rhetorical art*, to which *Anonymus Seguerianus* probably referred many times. In turn, Anonymous commentator of Hermogenes' work *On Issues* claims that in the commented point of "legal issue" (pp. 349.25-350.1) Hermogenes' explanation is opposed to by Harpokration,<sup>26</sup> which allows us to assume that he was an active rhetor already in the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD. The above trace of contact between the activities of Hermogenes and Harpokration is at the same time a valuable implication indirectly confirming Harpokration's alleged authorship of the treatise in question. The fact that Hermogenes knew this treatise and was inspired by it in his own theory of forms/types of style is for M. Patillon<sup>27</sup> unquestionable. Of the three candidates to be named the author of the treatise *On simple style*, who are: Zeno of Athens, proposed by W. Schmid as the author of the commentary to Xenophon; Hadrianos of Tyrus (c. 113-193), a student of Herodes Atticus; and Aelius Harpokration, a contemporary of Hermogenes; the most arguments are indeed in favour of Harpokration. In the case of Zeno, there is no confirmation in the *Suda* that he was the author of *De ideis*. In the case of Hadrianos of Tyrus, it should be assumed that he created the treatise in his late old age, since it was undoubtedly created after the treatise of Pseudo

<sup>24</sup> See: PSEUDO-AELIUS ARISTIDES. *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. II: *Le discours simple*. Texte établi et traduit par Michel Patillon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2002 "Notice" p. 15 note 34.

<sup>25</sup> See: ADLER 4013: Ἀρποκρατίων, ὁ Αἴλιος χρηματίσας σοφιστής.

<sup>26</sup> See: p. 547.31-548.1 Walz VII.

<sup>27</sup> M. PATILLON (PSEUDO-AELIUS ARISTIDE *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. II p. 17, footnote 33:) "Il n'est pas douteux qu'Hermogène connaissait notre traité. Il peut très bien avoir à son tour situé sa théorie des *ideai* par rapport à celle d'Harpokration."

Aristides *On political style*, associated with the authorship of Basilikos, for whom the most active period falls at the end of the 2nd century AD. A tombstone inscription from the 3rd century, which reads: “Harpokration, speaker in words, philosopher in mind,”<sup>28</sup> is probably devoted to Harpokration in question. The inscription can be a testimony to the rhetorician’s popularity and recognition for his wisdom. Since he was such an acclaimed and popular author, there is serious doubt as to whether the treatise *De ideis*, functioning under his name until the 10<sup>th</sup> century and known in the *Suda* as his work, could be in the very 10<sup>th</sup> century included among the most important rhetorical treatises in the manuscript drawn up in the Byzantium (*Paris codex 1741*) as the work of Aristides *On simple style*. As can be seen, finding the alleged author of this treatise is rather impossible in the current situation. In the form in which the Byzantine tradition passed the treatise, if it was not Aristides’ work (which cannot be ruled out entirely), it could be assigned to Aristides only together with the treatise *On political style*, in the case of which the basis for this attribution could have been due to its exegetical part, which referred to Aristides’ speeches.<sup>29</sup> At the time of their attribution to Aristides, both treatises had to be considered as the work of one author, as evidenced by the introductions preceding them. Particularly eloquent is the Introduction of our treatise, which begins with the words: “Since we have already explained the forms/types (*ideas*) of political style and its virtues (*aretas*), you should also hear about the forms/types of simple style. Nothing deserves more to be explained than the properties of humble and simple style, and the way it differs from the political and agonistic style.”

The above announcement of the meticulously carried out lecture in the treatise *On simple style* is at the same time an accurate summary of the issues raised in the treatise *On political style*. In the introduction to the latter one can read: “I am providing you here with the forms/types and virtues that make up the political style.” The above “Introductions” unambiguously and directly indicate one author of both treatises and the continuation of lecture in the treatise *On simple style*. If they had not been a testimony to Aristides’ authorship already attributed to him, but had been a work of an unknown teacher of rhetoric, they could have played a significant role in the attribution of both works to Aristides. The theory of “stylistic categories”, consistently referred to as “ideas/forms/types” and further developed in the treatise

<sup>28</sup> See: B. PUECH, quoted by M. Patillon: PSEUDO-AELIUS ARISTIDE, *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. II p. XXII, footnote 36.

<sup>29</sup> See above, p. 257 and footnote 13.

*On simple style*, did not constitute any obstacle for Byzantine scholars in this attribution. More important, I believe, was noticing that both treatises are significant “evolutionary links” in the development of the doctrine on the forms of style preceding Hermogenes, which is expressed, among others, by the gradual expansion of the number of “variable elements” forming the “form” of style. While in the treatise *On political style* three such factors are taken into account: “thought” (γνώμη [*gnome*]), “figure” (σχῆμα [*schema*]) and “expression” (ἀπαγγελία, λέξις [*appangelia, lexis*]), in the treatise *On simple style* there are five such elements: “thought” (νόημα [*noema*]), “the way the thought is used” (μεταχείρισις [*metacheirisis* – ‘implementation’]) and “expression” (λέξις [*lexis*]), which is divided into three elements: “word” (ὄνομα [*onoma*]), “figure” (σχῆμα [*schema*]) and “rhythm” (ῥυθμός [*rhythmos*]). Hermogenes<sup>30</sup> includes eight factors: “thought” (ἔννοια [*ennoia*]), its “implementation” (μέθοδος = μετ-όδός [*methodos*]) and “expression” (λέξις [*lexis*]) divided into six elements: “word selection” (ἐκλογή [*ekloge*]), “figures of language” (σχήματα [*schemata*]), “parts of a sentence” (κῶλα [*kola*]), “arrangement of words” (σύνθεσις [*synthesis*]), “cadence” (ἀνάπαυσις [*anapausis*]) and “rhythm” (ῥυθμός [*rhythmos*]). Thus, it is not difficult to notice that the evolution of the doctrine of “stylistic ideas” is manifested in the most visible way in the gradual increase in the number of criteria which are separate aspects of “expression”. The addition of a new element, that is the “rhythm”, is an important innovation in comparison to the treatise *On political style*. Rhythm is understood as the “fluency of the statement heard by the recipient”, characteristic especially for the simple style. Hermogenes also takes up and develops observations in this field, distinguishing the arrangement of words and cadence that constitute rhythm. The treatise *On simple style* also enriches the theory of “stylistic ideas” with the concept of “implementing” thought (*metacheirisis*), treated as an “element” typical rather of political style (& 4). And this point was further developed in the theory of Hermogenes, who introduced it to the group of elements of political style regarding the “implementation of thought.”

A less visible but not less important factor in this evolution is constituted by different understanding of the essence and function of these elements in each of the three treatises above which mark out the subsequent stages of the evolution. In the treatise *On political style*, the elements of “content,” “form” and “expression” evoke second-degree elements, that is, “virtues”

<sup>30</sup> See HERMOGENES. *De ideis* I 1.125 n.

also called “forms/types” [*ideai*] of style. The presence of these “virtues” only on the third level constitutes the properties of “political style.” However, in the treatise *On simple style* the above elements are treated as a direct material which distinguishes simple style from political one. The “forms/types of style” are not mentioned as indirect elements that constitute the material and distinguishing mark for kinds of style. They clearly have the character of a “supra-generic” category, which in certain combinations can occur in all styles. This might be confirmed by the fact that the author of the treatise did not hesitate to include five forms (except for “ethical style” & 28-52) from Pseudo Aristides’ canon on political style<sup>31</sup> in the six analysed “forms/types” of simple style. Treating them as “supra-generic” categories, he thus made a fundamental progress in the doctrine of stylistic “ideas”. This soon allowed Hermogenes to give the properties of style described by this term the meaning close to Plato’s ‘ideas’.

The concept of stylistic “ideas,” which was different in many points and better developed in the treatise *On simple style* than in the treatise *On political style*, seems to exclude the possibility of assigning these treatises to one author. Both treatises differ even more in the nature of the lecture they provide. In the basic part of the treatise *On political style* (& 2-140) there is a pedantically ordered lecture that follows the same criteria and the same outline typical for school rhetoric. It is a lecture on twelve “virtues” (“ideas”) of political style. Consistently comparing the “simple style” of Xenophon’s works with the “political style” of Demosthenes’ speeches, the author of the treatise *On simple style* devotes only the central part of his lecture to his innovative approach to the theory of “stylistic ideas.” This part (& 28-76) is methodologically the best structured part and follows the explanation, using numerous examples, of how individual elements of the style allow to distinguish between simple and political style (& 2-27). The subject of the second part of the treatise, which covers over a half of the second part of the treatise, includes, above all, the characteristics of Xenophon’s simple style which is opposed to the political style of the Attic speakers (& 84-140). The author of this treatise appears to us as an experienced literary critic and a subtle observer of stylistic phenomena.

Considering the clearly-pre-Hermogenes doctrine of stylistic categories contained in both of our treatises and Hermogenes’ excellent knowledge of

<sup>31</sup> These include: “seriousness” (σεμνότης [*semnotes*] & 53-58), “abundance” (περιβολή [*peribole*] & 59-63), “sweetness” (γλυκύτης [*glykytes*] & 64-68), “beauty” (κάλλος [*kallos*] & 69-71), and “truth” (ἀληθινόν [*alethinon*] & 72-76).



them confirmed by J. Rutheford's research,<sup>32</sup> as well as innovation and great literary culture of their authors, it can be said that if the treatises functioned as anonymous works in teaching rhetoric, then teachers of rhetoric or Byzantine scholars had difficulty finding a better candidate for their author among Greek rhetoricians of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD than Aelius Aristides.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

## PRIMARY SOURCES AND TRANSLATIONS

- ANONYME DE SÉGUIER: *Art du discours politique*. Texte établi et traduit par Michel Patillon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2005.
- AELII ARISTIDIS SMYRNEI: *Quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. II: *Orationes XVII-LIII*. Ed. B. Keil. Berolini: apud Veidmannos 1898.
- P. AELII ARISTIDIS: *Opera, quae exstant omnia*. T. I: *Orationes I-XVI complectens*. Ed. F.W.Lenz, Ch.A.Behr. Leiden: Brill 1976-1980.
- ARISTIDES: *The Complete Works*. Vol. I-II. Translation and comments: Ch. Behr. Leiden: Brill 1981-1986.
- PSEUDO-AELIUS ARISTIDE: *Arts Rhétoriques*. T. I: *Le discours politique*. T. II: *Le discours simple*. Texte établi et traduit par Michel Patillon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2002.
- Corpus Rhetoricum I. Anonyme- *Préambule à la rhétorique*, Aphthonios – *Progymnasmata*, en anexe Pseudo-Hermogène – *Progymnasmata*. Textes établis et traduits par Michel Patillon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2008.
- Corpus Rhetoricum II. Hermogenes, *Les états de cause*. Textes établis et traduits par Michel Patillon. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 2009.
- HERMOGENIS: *Opera*. Ed. H. Rabe. Leipzig [Teubner] 1913. Repr. Stuttgart: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri 1969.
- HERMOGENE: *L'Art Rhétorique: Exercices préparatoires, Etats de cause, Invention, Catégories stylistiques, Méthode de l'habileté*. Traduction française intégrale, introduction et notes par Michel Patillon. Préface de Pierre Laurens. Paris: [L'age d'homme] 1997.
- HERMOGENES: *Sztuka retoryczna. Opracowanie przekład i komentarz*: Henryk Podbielski. Lublin: TN KUL 2013.
- JOHANNES SICILIOTA: *Ἐξηγήσεις εἰς ἰδέας τοῦ Ἑρμογένους*. In: *Rhetores Graeci*. Ed. Ch. Walz, VI s.56-504.
- PSEUDO-LONGINUS, PSEUDO-ARYSTYDES, ANONYMUS SEGUERIANUS, APSINES: *Trzy greckie stylistyki i dwa traktaty retoryczne z okresu Cesarstwa Rzymskiego*. Opracował i przetłumaczył Henryk Podbielski. TN KUL Lublin 2016 .
- Rhetores Graeci, ex codicibus [...]*. Edidit, suis aliorumque annotationibus instruxit, indices locupletissimos adiecit Ch. Walz. Vol. I-IX. Stuttgartiae–Tubinge sumptibus J.G. Cottae 1832-1836.
- SYRIANI: *In Hermogenem Commentaria*. Voll. I-II. Ed. Hugo Rabe. [Teubner] 1892-1893.

<sup>32</sup> Appendix C. *The Relation 'Peri Ideon' and 'Peri Aphelous Logou'*. W: *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age. Idea-Theory in its Literary Context*. Oxford 1998 pp. 119-123.

## CRITICAL SOURCES

- Classical Rhetorics and Rhetoricians: Critical Studies and Sources. Ed. M. Ballif, M.G. Moran. Westport: CT, Praeger Publishers 2005.
- BEHR CHARLES A.: *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales*. Amsterdam: Hakkert 1968.
- HEATH M.: *Apsines and Pseudo-Apsines*. „*American Journal of Philology*” 119(1998) s. 89-111.
- HORST VAN DER P.W.: *Aelius Aristides and the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill 1980.
- PATILLON M.: *La théorie du discours chez Hermogène le rhéteur. Essai sur la structure de la rhétorique ancienne*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres 1988.
- PUECH B., PERNOT L.: *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrien 2002.
- RUTHEFORD J.: *Canons of Style in the Antonine Age. Idea – Theory in its literary Context*. Oxford: Clarendon Press 1998.
- SCHMID W.: *Die sogenannte Aristidesrhetorik*. „*Rheinisches Museum für Philology*” 72:1917/1918 s. 113-149; 238-257.

PSEUDO-ARYSTYDES: *O STYLU POLITYCZNYM I O STYLU PROSTYM*.  
 ATRYBUCJA I CHARAKTER TRAKTATÓW

## Streszczenie

Głównym, analizowanym w artykule problemem jest sprawa autorstwa pochodzących z II wieku po Chr. traktatów *O stylu politycznym* i *O stylu prostym*. Traktaty te zachowały się w przechowywanym w Bibliotece Narodowej w Paryżu, sławnym bizantyjskim rękopisie z X wieku *Parisinus gr.* 1741, jako dzieła jednego z najwybitniejszych przedstawicieli Drugiej Sofistyki, żyjącego w latach 117-180 Eliusza Arystydesa, autora ponad 50 zachowanych mów. Po wyjaśnieniu głównych przyczyn odmówienia mu autorstwa tych traktatów przez nowożytnych badaczy przedstawiona jest szerzej podjęta przez M. Patillona próba znalezienia ich rzeczywistych autorów, jakiej dokonał w swym najnowszym wydaniu i naukowym opracowaniu tych traktatów w serii „*Belles Lettres*” (2002). Jego ustalenia stały się dla autora artykułu bezpośrednią inspiracją do ponownej analizy w kontekście historyczno-literackim świadectw komentatorów bizantyjskich: Syriana (V wiek) i Jana z Sycylii (X wiek). W świetle tej analizy okazało się, że nie ma podstaw do przyjętego przez M. Patillona podziału traktatu *O stylu politycznym* na część obejmującą wyjaśnienie pierwszych siedmiu „idei” (& 2-128), jako dzieła *De ideis* sławnego sofisty Basilikosa (II/III wiek) i na część drugą, obejmującą krótkie, teoretyczne wyjaśnienie pozostałych pięciu „postaci” stylu, jako dzieła mało znanego sofisty Dionizjusza z Miletu. Na podstawie świadectwa Syriana istnieje wprawdzie pewna możliwość przyjęcia, że autorem całego wykładu o „postaciach” *stylu politycznego* (& 2-140) był Basilikos, ale w tym przypadku należałoby wcześniej wyjaśnić, w jaki sposób jego traktat *De ideis* znany w V wieku Syrianiowi i w X wieku Księdze *Suda* tak łatwo utracił swą tożsamość autorską, stał się utworem anonimowym i w tym samym X wieku został przepisany w Bizancjum pod innym tytułem jako dzieło Arystydesa. Analogiczne trudności wiążą się z proponowaną przez M. Patillona atrybucją traktatu *O stylu prostym* sławnemu Sofiście Eliuszowi Harpokrationowi, jako autorowi traktatu *O postaciach stylu*, którego dzieła retoryczne funkcjonowały w kulturze bizantyjskiej pod jego własnym imieniem. Jeśli podwa-

żamy bizantyjską atrybucję tych traktatów Arystydesowi, musimy je więc raczej nadal traktować jako mu przez tradycję przypisane dzieła anonimowego autora.

**Słowa kluczowe:** Arystydes; Pseudo-Arystydes; Basilikos; Harpokration; Hermogenes; styl polityczny; styl prosty; postacie i zalety stylu.

PSEUDO ARISTIDES: *ON POLITICAL STYLE* AND *ON SIMPLE STYLE*  
ATTRIBUTION AND THE NATURE OF TREATISES

Summary

The main problem analysed in the article is the authorship of two treatises from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD: *On political style* and *On simple style*. The treatises have been preserved in *Parisinus gr.* 1741, a famous Byzantine manuscript from the 10<sup>th</sup> century kept at the National Library in Paris, as works of Aelius Aristides, one of the most eminent representatives of the Second Sophistic. Aristides lived in the years 117-180 and was the author of over 50 preserved speeches. After explaining the main reasons why contemporary scholars refuse to accept Aristides as the author of the treatises, the article presents more extensively M. Patillon's attempt to find real authors of the treatises, made by the scholar in the latest academic edition of the treatises published within „Belles Lettres” series in 2002. His findings have been a direct inspiration for the author of this article to analyze again the testimonies of Byzantine commentators: Syrianus (5<sup>th</sup> century) and John of Sicily (10<sup>th</sup> century) in historical and literary context. In the light of this analysis it turns out that there is no basis for the division of the treatise *On political style*, adopted by M. Patillon, into part covering the explanation of the first seven “ideas” (& 2-128), treated as Basilikos' (a 2<sup>nd</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup>-century sophist's) work *De ideis*, and the second part including a brief theoretical explanation of the remaining five “forms” of style, treated as the work of Dionysius of Miletus, a little-known sophist. On the basis of Syrianus' testimony there is a certain possibility that Basilikos was the author of the entire lecture on the “forms” of *political style* (& 2-140). But, in this case it should be explained first how the treatise *De ideis*, which was known to Syrianus in the 5<sup>th</sup> century and was included in the *Suda* in the 10<sup>th</sup> century, easily lost its author, became an anonymous work and in the very 10<sup>th</sup> century was copied in Byzantium under a different title as Aristides' work. Similar difficulties are connected with the attribution of the treatise *On simple style* to Aelius Harpokration which was proposed by M. Patillon. Aelius Harpokration was a famous sophist whose rhetorical works, including *On forms of style*, functioned in Byzantine culture under his own name. Even if we question Byzantine attribution of these treatises to Aristides, we must continue to treat them as works of an anonymous author attributed to Aristides by tradition.

**Key words:** Aristides; Pseudo-Aristides; Basilikos; Harpokration; Hermogenes; political style; simple style; forms/types and virtues of style.