

# Flavius Claudius Julian's rhetorical speeches: stylistic and computational approach

Dr. Alexandropoulos Georgios  
ling.george82@yahoo.gr

National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Greece

## ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this study is to examine the rhetorical, political speeches of Julian the emperor using computational tools. For this reason, in this research we apply corpus linguistics techniques for the automatic extraction of word, collocation lists and lexical bundles from Julian's speeches; using corpus linguistics techniques we will draw conclusions about his style and character.*

## KEYWORDS

*Byzantine Greek Literature, Corpus Linguistics, Stylistics, Rhetorical and political speeches.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this study we chose eight rhetorical, political speeches<sup>1</sup> of Flavius Claudius Julian<sup>2</sup> the emperor and we created a corpus<sup>3</sup> of 57, 562 words. In our study we use the Antconc<sup>4</sup> program in order to extract the most frequent words lists, the bigrams, to study the use of the epistemic verb *οἶμαι* (*think*) and the lexical bundles<sup>5</sup> (3 - 6 words). Our classification is based on Biber et al. (2004) and Hyland (2008a,b) models<sup>6</sup>.

## 2. A FEW STATISTICS ELEMENTS IN APPLYING CORPUS LINGUISTICS TECHNIQUES TO JULIAN'S RHETORICAL SPEECHES

### 2.1 FREQUENCY WORDS LIST

It is useful for the purpose of our research to present the most frequent words in Julian's political speeches in order to define the ideological character of his message. Table 1 gives the 10 most frequent words (with stemming) in the total corpus and then in praises and invective speeches.

<b>Frequency words list in whole corpus</b>	<b>Frequency words list in praises</b>	<b>Frequency words list in invective speeches</b>
Θεός (357)	Λόγος (161)	Θεός (331)
Λόγος (244)	βασιλεύς (157)	Λόγος (83)
ἔργον (173)	οἶμαι (91)	ἄνθρωπος (83)

βασιλεύς (173)	ἀρετή (80)	Μωυσῆς (50)
οἶμαι (134)	πόλεμος (56)	ψυχή (47)
ἄνθρωπος (118)	ψυχή (56)	μᾶλλον (43)
ψυχή (103)	ἄξιον (55)	οἶμαι (43)
ἀρετή (92)	ἀρχή (45)	Διογένης (27)
ἄξιον (60)	δίκη (42)	φιλοσοφία (21)
ἀρχή (56)	ἄνθρωπος (35)	Κύριος (18)

No one can deny that both praises and invective speeches represent the theocratic and social character of Julian's policy, since words as *θεός* (*God*) and power are frequently used. In addition, words as *ψυχή* (*soul*), *justice* (*δίκη*) and *ἀρετή* (*virtue*) are combined with the meaning of intellectual and moral value in Julian's political work. In the center of his political thought we can find concepts as *ἄνθρωπος* (*man*) and *φιλοσοφία* (*philosophy*); this can be interpreted on the basis of his philological and religious syncretism. It is also observed that the verb *οἶμαι* (*think*) declines in use in invective speeches, which explains the fact that the ideological position of the orator expresses this time the intertextualistic source such as Moses, Diogenes (*Μωυσῆς*, *Διογένης*); this happens as he wants to be opposed with others through the sources in order to persuade, divide the audience and achieve social, political and religious reformation and reconstruction.

## 2.2 BIGRAMS

**Table 2: The first 30 Bigrams in the praises**

35	32	29	27	27	24	22	20	19	19
καὶ τῶν	καὶ τῆς	μὲν γὰρ	δὲ καὶ	καὶ τὴν	πρὸς τοὺς	τῶν ἄλλων	δὲ οἶμαι	καὶ πρὸς	τῶν ἔργων
18	17	17	17	16	16	15	15	15	15
καὶ τοῖς	παρὰ τῶν	τε καὶ	ἐν τοῖς	καὶ τὰ	τῶν λόγων	ἄν τις	ἐκ τῆς	ὁ δὲ	ὑπὲρ τῶν
14	14	13	13	12	12	12	12	12	12
καὶ τὸ	μὲν οὖν	δὲ τὴν	εἰ καὶ	δὲ τῆς	δὲ ἤδη	δὴ καὶ	οἶμαι μὲν	οἶμαι καὶ	τὰ μὲν

**Table 3: The first 30 Bigrams in invective speeches**

47	47	35	33	32	31	30	29	28	28
δὲ καὶ	ὁ θεὸς	τῶν θεῶν	καὶ τὰ	τε καὶ	καὶ τῶν	καὶ τὸ	μὲν οὖν	τοῦ θεοῦ	ἐν τῷ
27	25	25	24	23	20	19	19	18	18
ἀλλὰ καὶ	καὶ τὴν	ἐν τοῖς	καὶ τὸν	εἰ δὲ	καὶ ὁ	καὶ τοῖς	μὲν γὰρ	καὶ τῆς	τοὺς θεοὺς

18	18	18	16	16	16	16	16	16	16
τὰ τοιαῦτα	τὸ δὲ	ἐκ τῶν	εἰ μὴ	καὶ τοὺς	παρὰ τοῖς	πρὸς τοὺς	τὸ μὲν	ὑπὲρ τῶν	ὑπὸ τοῦ

**Table 4: The first 30 bigrams in 8 speeches**

91	89	74	61	61	59	57	56	54	49
δὲ καὶ	καὶ τῶν	καὶ τῆν	τε καὶ	ἐν τοῖς	καὶ τῆς	καὶ τὰ	μὲν γὰρ	καὶ τὸ	καὶ τὸν
47	47	45	44	44	44	43	42	41	39
μὲν οὖν	ὁ θεὸς	καὶ τοῖς	πρὸς τοὺς	ἀλλὰ καὶ	ὁ δὲ	ὑπὲρ τῶν	τῶν ἄλλων	καὶ οὐκ	καὶ πρὸς
39	36	36	36	34	33	33	32	32	31
τῶν θεῶν	δὲ οἶμαι	δὴ καὶ	τῶν ἔργων	καὶ τοῦ	καὶ τοὺς	ἐκ τῆς	τὸ δὲ	ἐν τῷ	εἰ δὲ

In general, bigrams are collocations of length "two words" as a pairs of words. Here, they are going to be presented the extracted bigrams lists from Julian's eight rhetorical speeches. The next tables present the top bigrams in terms of their frequency occurrence.

From the above lists we can draw some conclusions. Actually, in table 1 we see that Julian as political speaker uses words such as τῶν ἔργων (*deeds*), τῶν λόγων (*reasons*); these words help him to rely his political praises on deeds and reasons of certain facts in the framework of the evidence. In addition to this, it is clearly seen that verb δὲ οἶμαι (*I think*) is used in order to express his political opinion about the personalities that deserve the praise. Yet, in his invective speeches (table 2) Julian relies on bigrams related with the *god* (ὁ θεός, τοῦ θεοῦ, τοὺς θεοὺς) as he tries to promote a new god and reject the new god of the Christianity in whom byzantine citizens believe. In table 3 we see that the most frequent bigrams contain words like "καὶ" (δὲ καὶ, καὶ τῶν, καὶ τῆν, τε καὶ) as a corollary of their cohesive nature.

### 2.3 Epistemic verb οἶμαι (*think*)

At this point of my research, I will try to describe the functions of the verb οἶμαι (*think*) as it is a verb that remains on the top of the lexical choices (in frequency words list and in bigrams) in Julian's political speeches. Certainly, the use of this verb follows:

- i) Parenthetical use for comment of present or past situations.

τοῦτο δὲ οἶμαι καὶ μάλα εἰκότως συμβαίνει. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐφ' οἷς συνίσασιν αὐτοῖς ἀπολειφθεῖσιν ἀγαθοῖς, τοῖς κεκτημένοις βασκαίνουσιν, ὅτω δὲ τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς τύχης ἐστὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ οἷα οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς προαιρέσεως τῶν ἐκ τῆς τύχης μακρῶν σεμνότερα, οὐκ ἔστιν ὅτου δεόμενος τῷ κεκτημένῳ φθονήσειεν. (*And this is, I think, very natural. For when men are conscious that*

*they lack certain advantages, they envy those who do possess them, but when a man is more brilliantly endowed by fortune than any of his fellows, and by his own initiative has won even higher dignities than fate had assigned him, he lacks nothing, and there is none whom he need envy.)*

(Panegyric in Honor of the Emperor Constantius, Oration I 44cd)

In the above example Julian exposes his opinion for certain situations and simultaneously promotes himself as a modest character. In this way, he gains more supporters as he gives the impression that he respects the different opinion and takes the audience into consideration.

ii) Parenthetical use with impersonal verbs of deontic significance

*προσῆκει δὲ οἶμαι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἐν βραχεῖ διελθεῖν, ὅπως μὴ τῆς ἀρχῆς φανῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς κληρονόμος. (On this point also I think I must say a few words to show that virtue was bequeathed to you as well as a throne.)*

(Panegyric in Honor of the Emperor Constantius, Oration I 7d)

In the above example Julian uses again the certain verb in order to express his opinion in a way that will promote him as political pattern which avoids of impressive words and syntactic choices as he believes that the praise must rely only on the emperor's piety and values.

iii) Combination with infinitive complements of present, future and directional value.

*τούτω γὰρ οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πάντων διοίσειν τὸν λόγον. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων ἴστανται, ἀποχρῆν οἰόμενοι πρὸς τὴν τελείαν εὐφημίαν τὸ τούτων μνησθῆναι, ἐγὼ δὲ οἶμαι δεῖν περὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν τὸν πλεῖστον λόγον ποιήσασθαι, ἀφ' ὧν ὀρμώμενος ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἦλθες. τὰ μὲν γὰρ πλεῖστα τῶν ἔργων, σχεδὸν δὲ πάντα, τύχη καὶ δορυφόροι καὶ στρατιωτῶν φάλαγγες καὶ τάξεις ἰπέων συγκατορθοῦσι, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἔργα μόνου τέ ἐστι τοῦ δράσαντος, καὶ ὁ ἐκ τούτων ἔπαινος ἀληθῆς καθεστῶς ἰδιός ἐστι τοῦ κεκτημένου. οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ ταῦθ' ἡμῖν σαφῶς διώρισται, τῶν λόγων ἄρξομαι. (For some limit themselves to your exploits, with the idea that a description of these suffices for a perfect panegyric, but for my part I think one ought to devote the greater part of one's speech to the virtues that were the stepping-stones by which you reached the height of your achievements. Military exploits in most cases, nay in almost all, are achieved with the help of fortune, the body-guard, heavy infantry and cavalry regiments. But virtuous actions belong to the doer alone, and the praise that they inspire, if it be sincere, belongs only to the possessor of such virtue. Now, having made this distinction clear, I will begin my speech.)*

(Panegyric in Honor of the Emperor Constantius, Oration I 5ab)

In the certain example Julian's purpose is to create a praise relied on the virtue mostly; the verb *οἶμαι* accompanied by the infinitive *διοίσειν* exposes the orator's commitment and intentionality to focus on virtue and not in army achievements. In the second case the verb *οἶμαι* accompanied by the infinitive *δεῖν* appears to the surface the orator's political comment, as through this utterance empowers the directionality and deontic character of his message. No one can ignore the presence of the first personal pronoun *ἐγὼ* before the verb *οἶμαι* as a means of political orator's involvement and notification of his opinion in social level. Through this structure he leads the audience to the thought that they must follow him as he is a political person who does not insist on deeds, as others do, but in virtue and piety.

## iv) Parenthetical use in subordinate clause

ὅστις οὖν ἂν ἐθέλη Κυνικός εἶναι καὶ σπουδαῖος ἀνὴρ, αὐτοῦ πρότερον ἐπιμεληθεῖς, ὥσπερ Διογένης καὶ Κράτης ἐξελαινέτω μὲν τῆς ψυχῆς ἅπαντα ἐκ πάσης τὰ πάθη, ὀρθῶ δὲ ἐπιτρέψας τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν λόγῳ καὶ νῶ̅ κυβερνάσθω. κεφάλαιον γὰρ ἦν, ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι, τοῦτο τῆς Διογένους φιλοσοφίας. (Then let him who wishes to be a Cynic, earnest and sincere, first take himself in hand like Diogenes and Crates, and expel from his own soul and from every part of it all passions and desires, and entrust all his affairs to reason and intelligence and steer his course by them. For this in my opinion was the sum and substance of the philosophy of Diogenes.)

(To the Uneducated Cynics 201d)

The expression of his political thought about the Cynic philosophy will further legitimize his views on the undermining of the social fabric because of the Modern Cynics. The subordinate clause ὡς ἐγὼ οἶμαι encompasses Julian's view and the main clause through the evaluative expression κεφάλαιον γὰρ ἦν establishes and guarantees the value of these as a kind of review about the content of the original Cynics.

#### 2.4 Lexical bundles

At this point of our research, we will try to find the lexical bundles and define their functions. The below tables give us information about the most frequent bundles in Julian's rhetorical, political speeches after the exclusion criteria (ex. lexical bundles ending in articles, lexical bundles with random numbers, fragments of other bundles, random section titles, lexical bundles without meaning).

<b>Table 5: Frequency and function of the first 10 lexical bundles in praises</b>		
<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Lexical bundles</b>	<b>Function</b>
9 repeats	δὲ οἶμαι καὶ	Personal stance - text oriented
6	ὃ δὴ καὶ	Referential expression - Precision text oriented
5	πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς	Referential expression - text oriented
5	πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον	Place reference - text oriented
4	καὶ περὶ τούτων	Referential expression - text oriented
4	πολὺ δὲ πλέον	Referential, comparative reference - text oriented
4	τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον	Time reference - text oriented
4	ὑπὲρ μὲν τούτων	Referential expression - text oriented
3	δι' ἀσδηποτοῦν αἰτίας	Causative expression - text oriented
3	δὲ οὐκ οἶδα	Personal stance - speaker oriented

<b>Table 6: Frequency and function of the first 10 lexical bundles in invective speeches</b>		
<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Lexical bundles</b>	<b>Function</b>
7 repeats	εἰ μὲν οὖν	Referential expression - hypothetical view - text oriented
7	εἶπεν ὁ θεός	Report expression - text oriented
7	μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ	Discourse organizer - emphasis - text oriented
7	πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς	Reference - text oriented
6	πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα	Referential expression - Imprecision - text oriented
5	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός	Report expression - text oriented
5	τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν	Referential expression - text oriented
5	ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	"Place" reference - text oriented
5	ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ	Reference - text oriented
4	κύριος ὁ θεός σου	Title - text oriented

<b>Table 7: Frequency and function of the first 10 lexical bundles in whole corpus</b>		
<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Lexical bundles</b>	<b>Function</b>
13 repeats	δὲ οἶμαι καὶ	Personal stance - Speaker oriented
13	ὃ δὴ καὶ	Reference - Text oriented
11	μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ	Discourse organizer - emphasis- Text oriented
11	οὐ γὰρ δὴ	Disoucrse organiser -Text oriented
7	εἰ μὲν οὖν	Referential expression - hypothetical view - Text oriented
7	ὑπὲρ μὲν τούτων	Reference - Text oriented
6	ναὶ μὰ Δία	Oath for special conversational occasion - Text oriented
6	πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα	Referential expression - Imprecision - Text oriented
5	καὶ εἶπεν ὁ θεός	Report expression - Text oriented
5	οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως	Personal stance - Speaker oriented

The above tables give us the opportunity to define the functions of the lexical bundles in Julian's political speeches. In table 5 we note that the most frequent lexical bundle contains the verb *οἶμαι* (*think*); this can be interpreted cause of the praise's nature. In praises Julian tries to expose his personal opinion about the elements of the political virtue. In blames this lexical bundles of personal stance are not appeared since this time Julian focus on intertextualistic source which expresses simultaneously his opinion. New lexical bundles and new functions are appeared in blames, such as report, imprecision etc. In whole corpus we note again that the lexical bundles with referential and stance functions are on the top; this gives us the capability to say that Julian

leads to express his thought through his speeches and for this reason the verb *οἶμαι* is on the top of the most frequent words, bigrams and most frequent lexical bundles. Julian as political speaker uses mostly lexical bundles oriented to his political text's organization; actually, in praises the most frequent lexical bundles express personal stance (lexical bundles orientes to speaker) but most of the others are oriented to the text adopting Hyland' models. In his invective speeches uses mostly lexical bundles oriented to text organization. In whole corpus it is noted that Julian uses mostly text oriented lexical bundles even though lexical bundles oriented to his political opinion with verbs such as *οἶμαι*, (*think*), *οἶδ* (*know*). The certain notes give us the opportunity to understand that Julian promotes himself as an emperor who knows very well what says and why. He promotes his political opinion through personal stance lexical bundles but he uses them in a moderating way, because he wants to persuade through arguments. He is not arrogant and everything he does is a product of rationality and deep consideration.

Julian uses also some other prefabricated sentences in his speeches (see table 8), even though they do not occur very often in his text production, as their frequency is very limited. This does not mean that these expressions cannot operate as formulaicity, but it enables us to understand that Julian as text producer had a variety of formulaic choices and was interested to remain his text productivity and informativity. This makes his political texts so important for the byzantine literature.

<b>Table 8: Non recurrent lexical bundles</b>	
<b>Lexical bundles</b>	<b>Function</b>
ξυνελόντι δὲ εἰπεῖν	Summarization - Directive speech act
ἐνταῦθα παραβάλωμεν	Contrast - directive speech act
σκοπεῖν δὲ [...] ἄξιον	Evaluation - directive speech act
ἐκὼν ἀφήμι	Clarification - representative speech act
ὑπὲρ δὲ [...] σκεπτέον ἔτι	Emphasis - directive speech act
Ἄλλ ἐπανίωμεν ἐπ' ἐκεῖνο πάλιν	Focus - directive speech act

In table 8 we see some non-recurrent lexical bundles with certain rhetorical function. It could be said that Julian had the opportunity to choose a new one each time from the lexicon of these phrases because the byzantine Greek language had a very high level productivity. These prefabricated sentences were introduced into the text in order to help the speaker to satisfy his communicative goal.

Some examples:

*Ἐνταῦθα παραβάλωμεν, εἰ βούλεσθε, τὴν Πλάτωνος φωνήν. τί τοίνυν οὗτος ὑπὲρ τοῦ δημιουργοῦ λέγει καὶ τίνας περιτίθησιν αὐτῷ φωνάς ἐν τῇ κοσμογενεῖα σκόπησον, ἵνα τὴν Πλάτωνος καὶ Μωυσέως κοσμογένειαν ἀντιπαραβάλωμεν ἀλλήλαις. (Now, if you please, we will compare the utterance of Plato. Observe then what he says about the creator, and what words he makes him*

*speak at the time of the generation of the universe, in order that we may compare Plato's account of that generation with that of Moses.)*

*(Against Galilaeos 49a)*

The lexical bundle *ἐνταῦθα παραβάλομεν* as a means of involvement is a directive speech act, which helps Julian to ensure the hypothetical equality between speaker and hearer. In this way the audience feels that it can participate into the text's production. So, Julian uses a variety of prefabricated sentences<sup>7</sup>, with certain structure and certain communicative goal. This happens because the byzantine Greek language has such a flexibility to promote the communicative goal of the speaker.

### 3. CONCLUSIONS

Through the above analysis we can understand that Julian uses lexical choices that contain words of evaluative and directive character as to promote his political opinion. Besides this, the adopted methodology enables us to study his personal style, which relies on the philosophical and religious syncretism. The lexicogrammatic structures inform us about the content of his speech acts and the frequency of certain lexical bundles. The only thing that remains for future work is to do similar researches in other authors of the Byzantine Greek literature as to extract statistical and linguistic information.

### REFERENCES

- [1] For the text of these speeches see Wright, W. C. (1912-1913). The works of the emperor Julian. London: Loeb Clas. Libr.
- [2] For more information about his life and his rhetoric see Fouquet, C. (1985). Julien, la mort du monde antique. Paris: Belles Lettres, and Alexandropoulos, G. (2012). Text and context in Flavius Claudius Julian's political speeches: coherence, intertextuality and communicative goal. PhD Thesis. University of Athens. Edition in Lincom (forthcoming).
- [3] For more details about corpora see Biber, D. (1988). Variation across speech and writing. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, McCarthy, M. J. (2004). Touchstone: From corpus to coursebook. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press., Stubbs, M. (1996). Text and Corpus Analysis. Computer-Assisted Studies of Language and Culture. Oxford: Blackwell., Teubert, W. (2000) Corpus Linguistics – A Partisan View. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,4:1, 1-16.
- [4] Antconc is a freeware concordancer software program (<http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/software.html>). Anthony, L. (2006). Developing a freeware, multiplatform corpus analysis toolkit for the technical writing classroom. IEEE Transactions on Professional Communication, 49(3), 275-286.
- [5] For more details about lexical bundles see Biber, D., Conrad, S. & Cortes, V. (2004). If you look at...: Lexical bundles in university teaching and textbooks. Applied Linguistics 25 (3), 371-405.
- [6] Hyland, K. (2008a). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. English for specific purposes, 27(1), 4-21., Hyland, K. (2008b). Academic clusters: Text patterning in published and postgraduate writing. International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 18(1).
- [7] Granger, S. (1998). Prefabricated patterns in advanced EFL writing: collocations and formulae. In: Cowie, A. P. (Ed.), Phraseology. Clarendon Press, Oxford, pp. 145-160., Wray, A. (1992) The Focusing Hypothesis: The Theory of Left Hemisphere Lateralised Language Re-Examined. John Benjamin's, Amsterdam, Wray, A. (1998). Protolanguage as a holistic system for social interaction.



Language & Communication 18, 47-67. , Wray, A. & M. Perkins (2000). The Functions of formulaic language: an integrated model. Language & Communication 20 (2000), 1 – 28.