OXFORD

Hellenistic Oratory

Continuity & Change

EDITED BY
Christos Kremmydas
& Kathryn Tempest

HELLENISTIC ORATORY

This page intentionally left blank

Hellenistic Oratory

Continuity and Change

Edited by
CHRISTOS KREMMYDAS
and
KATHRYN TEMPEST

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University press in the UK and in certain other countries

First Edition published in 2013

Impression: 1

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

ISBN 978–0–19–965431–4

Printed in Great Britain by
MPG Printgroup, UK

Preface

This volume had its genesis in a conversation about future research projects held in the corridor of the Classics Department at Royal Holloway, University of London, at the end of April 2007. The topic of 'Hellenistic oratory' mystified us at first: they were not two words you would expect to find in the same sentence. Yet as we discussed the topic further, we thought there might be ample scope for exploration; gradually our interests evolved into a full-scale plan for a conference: *After Demosthenes, Continuity and Change in Hellenistic Oratory,* held in London, 2–3 July 2009. This conference was generously supported by the Classical Association, the Hellenic Society, the Institute of Classical Studies, and Royal Holloway University of London, for which we should like to give thanks. We are also grateful to a number of senior colleagues for their generous support and encouragement: in alphabetical order, Chris Carey, Mike Edwards, Edith Hall, Jonathan Powell, Lene Rubinstein, and Graham Shipley. They have all been extremely helpful, from the inception of the conference idea through to the arduous process of editing this volume.

The conference would not have been the same without the input of our enthusiastic and insightful participants, who engaged in friendly but lively debates after the papers, during the breaks, and over dinner. We hope that the papers in this volume capture something of the conference's atmosphere. One result of the conference was that it broadened the way we thought about oratory in the Hellenistic period and we wanted that to be reflected in the title of the published collection of papers. As will become clearer in what follows, Hellenistic Oratory should not be defined only by its relationship to its Classical heritage, but is a subject worthy of study in its own right.

Oxford University Press embraced the idea for this volume enthusiastically. We are thankful for the positive feedback we received from the anonymous readers for the Press and believe that the volume has especially benefited from their suggestion that we commission a paper on Polybius and Hellenistic Oratory, an area which for practical reasons we had not been able to include in the conference programme. Sadly, there were other papers which could not be

included within the scope of this volume, but their contribution to the conference and the development of our ideas is hereby acknowledged. In addition to our contributors, whose cooperation and patience throughout has been appreciated, we should like to extend our thanks to three extremely efficient individuals at OUP: Hilary O'Shea, Cathryn Steele, and Taryn Das Neves.

Finally, we should like to single out two people whose support of all kinds has made this project possible: Tasos Aidonis and Katerina Sinopidou. The arrival of Yannis Kremmydas in the midst of the editing process caused a few changes to the original schedule but, on the whole, injected even more fun into what has been a thoroughly enjoyable five years of working together on this project.

London, 1 June 2012 C.K. & K.L.T

Table of Contents

A Note on Abbreviations

The references to ancient writers for the most part follow *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (third edition) and H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, *A Greek–English Lexicon* (ninth edition with revised supplement), Oxford 1996, apart from some abbreviations, such as biblical references, which should be self-explanatory. References to periodicals follow *L'Année Philologique*.

List of Contributors

Christopher Carey is Professor of Greek at University College London.

Angelos Chaniotis is Professor of Ancient History and Classics at the Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton University.

Michael J. Edwards is Chair of Classics at the University of Wales, Trinity St. David.

Edith Hall is Professor of Classics at King's College London.

Christos Kremmydas is Senior Lecturer in Greek History at Royal Holloway, University of London.

Gesine Manuwald is Professor of Latin at University College London.

Gunther Martin is a member of the Institute for Classical Philology, University of Bern.

Stanley E. Porter is Principal and Dean at McMaster Divinity College, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario.

Jonathan G. F. Powell is Professor of Latin at Royal Holloway, University of London.

Lene Rubinstein is Professor of Ancient History at Royal Holloway, University of London.

Graham Shipley is Professor of Ancient History at the University of Leicester.

Kathryn Tempest is Senior Lecturer in Latin Literature and Roman History at the University of Roehampton.

John Thornton is Associate Professor in Roman History at the University of Rome, La Sapienza.

Eleni Volonaki is Lecturer in Ancient Greek Literature at the University of the Peloponnese, Kalamata.

Jula Wildberger is Professor of Classics and Comparative Literature at the American University in Paris.

Introduction: Exploring Hellenistic Oratory

Christos Kremmydas and Kathryn Tempest

ORATORY AND THE *POLIS*

Oratory had always been at the heart of Greek life and culture.[1] The earliest works of Greek literature testify to the importance attached to eloquence and the skill of persuasion:[2] speeches take up more than half of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*,[3] and there are also indications of interest in the use of logical arguments from probability and in the arrangement of speeches into distinct parts with specific functions.[4] Accordingly, it seems that interest in these features was diachronic; it both predated and extended in time well after the Hellenistic period. As the civic institutions of the *poleis* developed throughout the Archaic period, the prominence attached to the art of persuasion was further accentuated.

[1] Throughout this volume, we try to maintain a firm distinction between 'rhetoric' (the systematized and formal study, theory, or art of persuasion) and 'oratory' (the actual oral performance and the practical application of 'rhetoric'). Although the word 'rhetoric' is commonly used with a looser meaning, as if synonymous with the concept of discourse itself, we have attempted, as far as possible, to avoid this ambiguity. Studies on the role of oratory and rhetoric in Greek culture and society are too numerous to list here. Excellent starting points include Kennedy (1963, 1994: 11–29), Habinek (2005), Pernot (2005), Worthington (1994, 2007).

[2] The heroic ideal in Homer is summed up in Phoenix' famous quotation: *μύθων ῥητῆρα, ἔργων πρηκτῆρα* (*Il.* 9.443); on rhetoric in Hesiod's works, see Strauss Clay (2007).

[3] Griffin (2004: 156).

[4] Gagarin (2007).

Athens, by far the best-documented *polis*, emerged in the fifth century BC as a military, political, and cultural powerhouse in the Greek world. Athenian political ideology promoted *parrhesia* ('freedom of speech') and *isegoria* ('equality of speech'), and offered conditions favourable to the cultivation of eloquence. The arrival of the sophists in Athens around the middle of the century further stimulated the intellectual atmosphere of the city.[5] Although modern scholars may debate the point at which the study of persuasion developed into a systematic and formalistic approach,[6] the sophists advanced the study of rhetoric with a view to harnessing its power. Thereafter, rhetorical instruction and oratorical practice were both essential for success in Athenian public life. In the democratic *polis*, a citizen could speak in the law courts, address his fellow citizens in the Assembly, and represent them on diplomatic embassies; meanwhile, public occasions such as state funerals or festivals offered a platform from which civic ideology could be projected by means of epideictic orations.[7]

In the fourth century BC, Athenian democratic institutions were bolstered and there is evidence of more widespread political participation.[8] Some scholars refer to the overwhelming wealth of evidence for Athenian political life as 'the tyranny of the evidence'; this also applies to the available evidence for oratory.[9] The majority of the extant speeches of the Attic orators come from this era, as do the two surviving Greek rhetorical treatises: Anaximenes' *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. But this should not be taken to mean that Classical oratorical culture was peculiar to Athens, nor should we lose sight of the Panhellenic dimension of oratory. It is important to remember, first, that many teachers of rhetoric and indeed a number

[5] On the arrival of the sophists, see e.g. Kerferd (1981) and Kennedy (1994: 7–8, 17–19). *Pace* Wallace (1998), who rightly challenges the consensus view on the role of sophists in fifth-century Athens, a view which he attributes to their stereotyping by philosophers such as Plato in the fourth century.

[6] On the origins of rhetoric and oratory in Greece see the different opinions expressed, *inter alia*, by Kennedy (1963: 56–8), Cole (1991: 23–7), Thomas and Webb (1994), Schiappa (1999), Gagarin (2007).

[7] The tradition of funeral orations is well attested for Athens (see e.g. Loraux 2006); in a Panhellenic setting one should mention the Olympic orations by Gorgias and Lysias; on epideictic oratory in general, see Carey (2007).

[8] See e.g. Sinclair (1988).

[9] Brock and Hodkinson (2000: 4).

of the so-called 'canonical' orators were not Athenian.[10] Secondly, the fact that some of these individuals were itinerant teachers demonstrates that rhetorical principles were being taught elsewhere in the Greek world: Athens is likely to have been just one stop on their travels.[11]

The Athenocentricity of our extant literary sources at one time led to a misplaced assumption which dominated scholarship, namely that oratory died at the battle of Chaeronea alongside Athenian political freedom.[12] But modern scholarship has largely disputed this point. Appropriating the findings of Louis Robert's seminal work on the *polis*, Laurent Pernot has forcefully argued that oratory did not die at Chaeronea because the *polis* did not die either;[13] on the contrary, it continued to operate as a form of political and social organization.[14] Indeed, the situation for the smaller *poleis* had arguably not changed that radically,[15] and the epigraphic evidence attests to the vibrancy with which civic institutions still functioned.[16] Within this intense political activity, oratory occupied a fundamental role.

The lack of published speeches after 322 BC may, at first glance, seem to point to a decline in oratory in the Hellenistic period,[17] but this notion is untenable. Such a pessimistic assessment is now largely

[10] Non-Athenian teachers of rhetoric cited in Aristotle's *Rhetoric* include Theodorus of Byzantium and Thrasymachus of Chalcedon. Non-Athenian orators include Lysias, Dinarchus, and Isaeus.

[11] This point is stressed by Wallace (1998: 206).

[12] An early proponent of this view was Blass (1865: 9–53).

[13] Pernot (2005: 73), cf. Robert (1969: 42): 'La cité grecque n'est pas morte à Chéronée, ni sous Alexandre ni dans le cours de toute l'époque hellénistique.' Cuypers (2010: 324) draws a similar observation.

[14] See e.g. Davies (1995), who convincingly stresses the need to distinguish between problems peculiar to Athens (and other *poleis*) and those peculiar to the city-state system as a whole; also Hansen (2006: 39 ff.). On the *polis* after Chaeronea and in the Hellenistic period see Gruen (1993) with a review of previous scholarship, Gauthier (1993), Billows (1993), Ma (1999), Shipley (2000: 35), Shipley and Hansen (2006), Erskine (2007), and the essays collected in van Nijf and Alston (2011).

[15] On this point, see the arguments of Gruen (1993: 341); more specifically on Hellenistic democracies, see recent studies by Grieb (2008) and Carlsson (2010).

[16] Erskine (2007), Rubinstein, and Chaniotis in this volume all examine the epigraphic evidence attesting to the importance of oratory in civic life during the Hellenistic period.

[17] According to conventional periodization, the Hellenistic period extends from the death of Alexander the Great in 323 BC to the death of the last Ptolemaic Queen, Cleopatra, in 30 BC. Although most of the evidence examined in this volume falls within these chronological boundaries, we have not excluded material dated outside them, if it serves to highlight patterns of continuity in oratorical practice.

considered out of date, Athenocentric, and fallacious. Arguments from silence are also dangerous when we consider the accidents of survival of ancient texts: just because we do not have any texts of Hellenistic orations today does not mean that there were none worth preserving.[18] More recently, therefore, scholars have tended to avoid this narrative of an outright decline by suggesting instead that oratory simply lost functions which were important under the democracy.[19] But even this modified view does not do justice to the evidence. Citizen participation within the *polis* continued to be strong, and it is clear that public oratorical performances remained an integral aspect of life in the Greek *poleis* generally. What is more, the model of the *polis* became even more important as new *poleis* were established by Alexander the Great and his Successors.[20] In all these Hellenistic *poleis*, old and new, men defended themselves in the law courts, speakers addressed their fellow citizens in the assemblies, and embassies were sent to negotiate with other cities and kings, just as in the Classical period.

PART I: HELLENISTIC ORATORY IN RHETORICAL THEORY AND LITERATURE

That there existed numerous opportunities for the pursuit of oratory in the Hellenistic period is thus beyond doubt. Yet the fact that not a single speech survives in full from the end of the fourth century BC until the first century AD means that Hellenistic oratory remains something of an enigma. As a result, a number of questions remain unanswered. How far was oratory influenced by the models of the preceding centuries? Is there a correlation between the evolving theory and the practice of rhetoric? And, seen from a wider perspective, how did the oratory of the Hellenistic period influence the emerging Roman practitioners of the art of persuasion? These are

[18] To take one example to counter this assumption, the speeches of Charisius of Athens, a contemporary of Demetrius of Phalerum, were still extant in Quintilian's day (Quint. Inst. 10.1.70).

[19] Kennedy (1983, 1994: 81–2) has modified slightly his previously held view (1972: 259–60), which accepted the notion of a decline in oratory, but he still seems to perceive a significant loss in its functions; see also Cribiore (2001: 238).

[20] See e.g. Fraser (1996). On the *polis* as model and its further development, see e.g. Ma (2000: 108).

all important questions and, to understand more about the state of oratory in this period, we must examine the available evidence from a number of diverse angles and in a range of genres and settings.

Cecil Wooten first recognized the potential to explore representations of oratory in literature and fragments of papyri with a view to understanding more about the nature of Hellenistic oratory.[21] In a second paper, which focused on Polybius' *Histories*,[22] he suggested that, even if there were fewer opportunities for deliberative oratory before assemblies of citizens under Alexander's Successors, new fora for public speaking had arisen. What is more, he argued that a whole new subspecies of oratory was created by the need for embassies and ambassadors to engage in interstate diplomacy, first with other Hellenistic states and later with Rome.

However, Wooten's thesis and article, both limited in their scope for their concentration on the *Nachleben* of Demosthenes, were followed by a hiatus of two decades in the study of the subject. This is due in part to the scholarly fallacies we have already identified regarding the decline of oratory and the *polis*, but it perhaps also owes something to the additional assumptions generated by Wooten's own conclusion: namely that, with the exception of the speeches delivered by ambassadors, 'oratory seems to have retreated into the rhetorical schools'.[23] As we have seen, most historians of the Hellenistic period would now refute his view that the opportunities for oratory were fewer.[24]

More recently, there has been an increase in scholarly interest in various aspects of Hellenistic oratory. Stanley Porter's influential *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period* surveyed the representations of rhetorical forms in specific literary genres, such as epic, historiography, and drama; it also acknowledged the value of the epigraphic evidence as a valuable source.[25] Yet a comprehensive study of these genres in their interplay has not previously been undertaken.

[21] Wooten (1972).

[22] Wooten (1974).

[23] Wooten (1972: 142).

[24] For a good overview of the range of opportunities for oratory, see Walker (2000: 46–51).

[25] In particular, see the papers collected in Part II of Porter, 'Rhetoric in Practice' (1997: 171–506), and Judge's chapter on the rhetoric of inscriptions (1997: 807–28), with a focus on the epigraphic evidence for five broad types of inscriptions grouped under the headings: oracle and epigram, vow and offering, grace and favour (i.e. tributes received), trust and tribute (i.e. for tributes received), and death and glory (i.e. commemorative).

This volume, therefore, offers for the first time a wide-ranging, interdisciplinary study of the different ways in which Hellenistic oratory can be approached. This is not meant to be a comprehensive companion, but a collection of exemplary essays, exploring previously understudied sources and materials for the oratory of the period, at the same time taking into account current trends in the study of Hellenistic history and rhetoric. In so doing it will throw into relief the dynamic character of Hellenistic oratory. All papers highlight its pervasive influence and examine different manifestations in diverse literary genres and socio-political contexts; they also help demonstrate continuities with paradigms of oratorical practice and rhetorical theory from the Classical period. The chapters are grouped around three main approaches to the ancient evidence: (1) representations of oratory in Hellenistic literature and rhetorical theory, (2) the evidence for the practice of oratory in Hellenistic schools and in the *vita activa* of the Hellenistic *poleis*, and (3) traces of its transmission and influence at Rome and across the Greek East.

In Part 1: 'Hellenistic Oratory in Rhetorical Theory and Literature', the textual evidence for oratory is explored, both with a view to presenting examples of oratory in action and to examining its relationship with the developing rhetorical theory. The importance of oratory is reflected in the role given to speeches in Polybius' *Histories*, and John Thornton begins by distinguishing three types of speeches that were current and relevant in Polybius' world: deliberative speeches addressed to assemblies and councils, exhortations such as a general might give to his soldiers before battle, and ambassadors' speeches reflecting the intense diplomatic activity between Hellenistic cities and federal states. Thornton also makes a virtue of the comparative lack of evidence in Polybius for forensic oratory, emphasizing instead that Polybius often makes his characters speak in a manner that corresponds to the guidelines given for conducting prosecution and defence cases in rhetorical theory. Thus the *Histories* present us with a multi-directional approach to studying oratory, for the centrality of oratory in public life reminds us that the study of rhetoric was intended to train the youth of the upper classes to be effective orators; that is, to become men like Polybius, whose own activity as an orator brings the diplomacy of the Hellenistic period to life.

But if young elite students were being trained in the art of oratory, we may ask: what direction did rhetorical theory take during the Hellenistic period? And to what extent can we detect the influence

of Classical models? For it is symptomatic of the aims of this volume that attention must be given to the systematization, as well as the performance, of oratory. Michael Edwards touches upon both of these questions in his chapter on 'Dionysius and Isaeus'. It has often been noted that the rhetoricians after Aristotle, starting with Theophrastus, worked continually to refine and rationalize the theory which they had inherited. But what is striking is that Theophrastus' treatises were largely concerned with the practical elements of speech. His theory on the four elements of style (correctness, clarity, appropriateness, and ornamentation), to which he added considerations of prose rhythm and figures of thought, is lost and hard to reconstruct with any certainty.[26] But traces of the Peripatetic tradition can be found in many of the later writers, and they continue throughout the Hellenistic period, especially in Demetrius' work *On Style*.[27]

Although it is difficult to determine whether Demetrius' work reflects standard contemporary opinions on matters of style, or to what extent he is being original, Edwards observes that he is the only extant critic to add a fourth style of oratory: the forceful or intense (δεινός). The term may have been coined originally to accommodate an element of speech for which Demosthenes was famous, but it is also later used by Dionysius of Halicarnassus to describe Iseaus' style. Thus, Edwards argues, an interest in the quality of δεινότης meant that both the famous pupil (Demosthenes) and his master (Isaeus) had some form of *Nachleben*; tracing such continuities from the Classical period until Dionysius' time is suggestive of an evolving tradition which placed a keen emphasis on one aspect of rhetorical theory most intimately linked with its practical application: its forcefulness.

The knowledge of the evolving rhetorical theory and Classical Athenian oratorical paradigms suggested by Edwards' paper anticipates the main theme of the next three papers: the awareness of rhetorical forms and the frequent use of oratorical conventions in Hellenistic poetry and drama. First, Eleni Volonaki explores in detail the rhetorical strategies employed by Jason in Apollonius' epic poem, *Argonautica*, and identifies discontinuities between the rhetoric of Apollonius' epic and that of its Homeric prototype. For instance, the

[26] The evidence for Theophrastus' rhetorical works has recently been collected and translated by Fortenbaugh (2005: 512–59).

[27] On a date *c.*270 BC, see Grube (1961: 110–21).

role of direct speech is significantly reduced compared to Homeric epic, but this helps to accentuate the significance of the occasions where *oratio recta* is used. Volonaki's conclusion that Jason's oratory reflects the importance attached to diplomatic discourse is a line of argument which becomes even clearer in Lene Rubinstein's examination of the epigraphic record for inter-*polis* relations in Part Two (see below).

Another central aspect of Volonaki's approach is to consider the narrator's use of rhetorical forms to engage in a dialogue with his reader. In his chapter on Polybius, Thornton makes a similar observation: the author, he suggests, uses oratorical conventions to impose his political judgments upon them. And, in the next paper, Gunther Martin similarly argues that Theocritus' *Idylls* 11 and 17 take advantage of the fact that a rhetorical culture was ubiquitous in his time: it was taken for granted and was expected by his audiences. But, although Theocritus was familiar with contemporary rhetorical theory and conventions, these two *Idylls* toy with the audience's expectations by exposing the failures of mere adherence to rhetorical precepts. According to Theocritus, therefore, a formalistic oratorical approach is ultimately bound to fail: it will not persuade.

The idea that the Hellenistic audience could seemingly both recognize and appreciate rhetorical forms and their subtle manipulation in different literary genres also emerges from Christopher Carey's chapter. He focuses on the comic playwright Menander, whose literary production took place in the twilight of the Classical period and the dawn of the Hellenistic. In examining a selection of Menander's comedies, Carey argues that rhetorical 'markers', as used in formal contexts and as taught in the schools and handbooks, form an integral key to unlocking their comedic effect. Yet the constant integration of rhetorical conventions and comic content ('code-switching' in Carey's words) does more than enhance our appreciation of Menander's comedy; it increases our understanding of his audience and their knowledge.

The last paper in this section emerges naturally and expands upon Carey's suggestion of 'code-switching' by examining, first, a less well-known performed text, Herodas' *Miniamb* 2. This mime presents the speech of Battaros, a brothel-keeper, who brings a δίκη αἰκείας against his rich opponent, Thales, accusing him of stealing one of his women. By a close examination of the speech, Edith Hall demonstrates how Battaros exploits the whole gamut of Classical oratorical

models, tropes, conventions, and figures of speech to accentuate its burlesque of judicial oratory. The existence of this speech reminds us of the need to look for evidence of Hellenistic oratory in a wide range of performative contexts, which is precisely what Hall proceeds to do. As Carey examined the interplay between comedy and oratory in the previous paper, so Hall surveys a number of tragic texts belonging to the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. In so doing she confirms the picture of an inter-generic dialogue but also demonstrates that this dialogue could extend even further: one dramatic text is the Gyges fragment (*POxy* 2382), and it shows that historiography could be encompassed as well.

Thus, Part One explores the presence of oratory in diverse literary genres and highlights the sophistication not just of Hellenistic authors but their audiences as well. While representations of oratorical performances remain part and parcel of the 'action' as portrayed in historical prose, drama, and epic, we also see that a deep awareness of rhetorical conventions and tropes by the wider Hellenistic audience is indispensable for the appreciation of these works of literature. However, this level of sensitivity to rhetorical modalities and the close familiarity with well-known orators of the Classical past would have been impossible without a systematic and rigorous rhetorical education. Rhetorical schools in the Hellenistic period were vibrant and continued to respond to a practical need for instruction in public speaking.[28]

PART II: ORATORY IN THE HELLENISTIC SCHOOLS AND ASSEMBLIES

Part Two highlights the complementary nature of rhetorical instruction and oratorical practice in the life of the Hellenistic *poleis*. The three papers in this part of the volume look at evidence found in two different types of material: para-literary papyri and inscriptions.

Christos Kremmydas' examination of the relatively understudied Hellenistic rhetorical exercises preserved on papyri highlight the continued influence of Attic models of oratory across the Hellenistic

[28] Morgan (1998), Cribiore (2001).

world. The rhetorical schools seem to have laid emphasis on the close study of the Attic orators and the imitation of their style in exercises often based on hypotheses from Greek history. And while Demosthenes' influence as an oratorical paradigm does emerge from the papyri, it is also clear that he did not monopolize the syllabi of rhetorical schools. These papyri also suggest that the broad range of performative occasions (forensic, deliberative, and epideictic) did not change, even though certain types of discourses (encomia) may have gained in currency in this period. Extant rhetorical exercises, which purport to represent symbouleutic speeches, are especially important, as they complement the picture that we get from two further sources about oratory in deliberative contexts. As we have seen, Polybius attaches a great deal of importance to deliberative speeches in his *Histories* and, in particular, speeches delivered in connection with diplomatic embassies. However, the available epigraphic evidence sheds further light not just on the generic conventions employed in this oratorical sub-genre, but more crucially on its function in the wider context of Hellenistic interstate relationships.

Lene Rubinstein's paper starts by examining two kinds of inscriptions: (1) inscriptions recording speeches which clearly delimit the oratorical task set before the ambassadors and the boundaries of their diplomatic brief, and (2) inscriptions recording the response to the oral performance by the ambassadors of the community they visited. The fact that we can even detect differences in the contents of the two documents (where both have survived) throws up a number of methodological considerations about the real nature of the oratorical performances of the ambassadors and their actual effect on the outcome of the embassy. This phenomenon leads Rubinstein to ask a number of related questions: was the ambassadors' own oratorical potential limited by the constraints of their brief, and if so was their role little more than decorative? And was an oratorical performance by the envoys indispensable to the success of the embassy's mission, or simply an optional add-on? In addition, Rubinstein suggests that the evidence for oratorical performances by teams of envoys may point to the dangers they ran in their diplomatic missions; it may thus reflect a desire to spread the risk among a greater number of individuals. Finally, she concludes that the oral performances by ambassadors were paramount to the establishment and perpetuation of a reciprocal relationship of gratitude between two communities. Thus,

the rhetorical strategies adopted by the ambassadors in such oratorical performances were crucial.

The third and final paper of this part also looks at the epigraphic evidence for oratorical performance. Angelos Chaniotis maintains that the *narrationes* of Hellenistic decrees are a useful source for the oratory during this period. Like other contributors to this volume, he emphasizes the cross-pollination of oratory, drama, and historiography, and of politics and theatre. Some of the decrees analysed by Chaniotis seem to suggest that audiences in Hellenistic assemblies, even in the smaller cities, were as fascinated by the public performance of oratory as their Classical predecessors (cf. Thuc. 3.38.4). His insightful analysis of three aspects of these inscriptions leaves us in no doubt as to the importance of oratorical performance and the vitality of oratory in the Hellenistic period: first, an emphasis on the tragic element of *paradoxon* ('swift reversals of fortune'), a focus on visualizing narrated scenes (*enargeia*), and a recurrent attempt to stir the emotions of the audience.

Thus we see from the papers in this section that there was a range of orators, declaimers, and oral performers in the Hellenistic period: the variety of the contexts in which oratory was performed, as well as its centrality in the education of the Hellenistic youth, attests to the prominent role occupied by oratory and rhetoric in this period. Thus, at the time when Rome's expansion brought her into the Hellenistic cultural and political sphere, oratory was a vibrant feature of life in the Greek *poleis*.

PART III: CONTINUITY AND CONVERGENCE: FROM GREECE TO ROME

In Part 3 the papers examine the impact and influence of Hellenistic oratory upon the rhetorical practices at Rome and across the Greek East. The precise details of oratory's acclimatization at Rome are impossible to recover with any degree of certainty but a few salient points may be established. Its arrival can be placed in the early part of the second century BC, after Rome's defeat of Macedon. Greek embassies were continually making their way to Rome, while Greek orators and teachers of rhetoric allegedly made an impression on

the native Romans.[29] But it was not just practising orators and the teachers in the rhetorical schools who took an interest in the art of rhetoric; philosophers too, and particularly the Stoics and Peripatetics, were hugely influential on later periods, and these should not be neglected in a study of the continuity and development of Greek oratory.[30]

The interrelationship between rhetoric and philosophy in the Hellenistic age spearheaded a number of theoretical developments, as theorists systematically explored factors such as style and argumentation. We saw earlier, for instance, that it was Theophrastus who established the four 'virtues' of style. 'Genres' of speech also developed at this time: the 'grand', 'middle', and 'plain', to which was added the fourth 'forceful' style, discussed by Edwards. Demetrius' volume *On Style* attests to this development and is especially important because it is only one of two Greek treatises to survive from this period; the other is the *On Rhetoric* composed by the Epicurean Philodemus, which, as Gaines has argued, helped shape Hellenistic theory and the rhetorical development of the late Roman Republic.[31]

Within the standard accounts of Rome's reception of Greek rhetorical practice, prime importance is often attached to the 'philosophers' embassy' of 155 BC. Only six years before, in 161 BC, the Senate of Rome had empowered its magistrates to expel both the Greek philosophers and the rhetoricians from the city, although little is known about the political context of this event.[32] Yet in the year of the embassy, three philosophers—Carneades, Critolaus, and Diogenes, representing the Academic, Peripatetic, and Stoic traditions respectively—arrived in Rome to represent Athens in her negotiations with the Senate.[33] Their appearance returns us to the centrality of ambassadorial speeches in the Hellenistic period. As Rubinstein demonstrated in her analysis of the epigraphic records of speeches

[29] Canali de Rossi (1997) has collected the evidence for Greek embassies to Rome in the Republican period, but a detailed analysis of their stylistic features and oratorical conventions awaits an author.

[30] On the developments of the philosophical schools and their influence at Rome during the Hellenistic period, see e.g. Green (1990: 602–46).

[31] Gaines (2004).

[32] Gellius *NA* 15.11; Suet. *Rhet.* 25.2.

[33] Cic. *De or.* 2.155–60, Plut. *Vit. Cat.* 22–3, Gellius *NA* 6.14.8–10. It is perhaps worth noting that this embassy reflects the continued Panhellenism of oratory, as two of the philosopher/politicians were not Athenian by birth: Carneades was from Cyrene and Diogenes was from Babylon.

delivered in connection with embassies, it is often possible to gain a detailed impression of the kinds of arguments deployed by Hellenistic orators. And in the first essay of this section, Jonathan Powell discusses a range of arguments that might have been deployed by the envoys—arguments which led to the significant reduction of a fine that had been imposed on the Athenians. Furthermore, by questioning the received tradition that Carneades also delivered opposing speeches on justice at Rome, Powell instead directs our focus back to the practical importance of oratory, while simultaneously highlighting the caution required in using later Latin literature to reconstruct our knowledge of the reception of Greek oratory at Rome.

The focus on the transmission of Hellenistic oratory via the philosophical schools is continued in the next paper, in which Jula Wildberger presents the case for accepting that there was a continued tradition of Stoic rhetoric linking the diatribic speech of the Imperial period to its Hellenistic practitioners. While many studies often deny a role in the development of rhetoric to the Stoic tradition—owing primarily to its promotion of substance over form[34]—Wildberger argues against the tendency to view Stoic discourse as stereotypically lacklustre and instead presents a new picture of a mode of persuasion which is often overlooked when examining Rome's debt to Greek oratorical models: that is, a picture of Stoic Greek eloquence presented in the form of diatribic oratory.

To some extent, the account of Rome's encounters with the Greek philosophers and *rhetores* thus far seems to corroborate what Sarah Culpepper Stroup calls the 'influence' model showcased, for example, by Cicero (*De or.* 1.14), who records that, before the dawn of Greek rhetorical training, '[Roman] men were ignorant of the whole discipline and did not realize that there was either a curriculum or rule to the art; they achieved only what they could by natural talent and deliberation'. It presumes that there was some form of native eloquence at the time of the philosophers' embassy in 155 BC,

[34] While this focus on the substance of the speech found some supporters—most famously encapsulated in Cato the Elder's dictum 'rem tene, verba sequentur' (cited by Julius Victor 17: 'hold onto the matter and the words will follow')—it is generally believed that Stoic rhetoric was impractical in its rejection of matters of style, delivery, and argumentation. Thus, for example, Vanderspool (2007: 135) states that 'the Stoics contributed little to the developments in rhetoric, except in the sense that their philosophical perspectives might filter down into arguments and moral judgments'.

and that existing forms of Roman speech mapped onto and were subsequently shaped by the Hellenistic tendency towards systematization.[35]

However, as both Powell and Wildberger point out, our history of the early development of oratory at Rome is largely dependent on the evidence of Cicero, and his agenda in either exaggerating or downplaying the influence of Greek modes of oratory and rhetoric requires some caution.[36] Instead, we need to examine early Roman oratory within its own milieu to gain a more rounded picture.[37] And so it is highly instructive that, in the third paper in this section, Gesine Manuwald considers the evidence found in the fragments of early Roman Republican drama, compared and contrasted to their Greek models.

As Manuwald notes, while a partial explanation for early drama's rhetorical character may be attributed to the Greek dramatic conventions from which it borrowed, passages from our earliest, fragmentary evidence demonstrate strong indications of rhetorical influence in terms of vocabulary, style, structure, and *topoi*. From the time of Ennius (239–169 BC), who was himself contemporaneous with one of Rome's earliest orators, M. Porcius Cato Censorius,[38] it appears that oratory had a recognizable function in Republican life, and that its forms could be embedded into dramatic productions.

In this way, reconstructing the history of the development of Roman rhetoric, as well as the influence of both Classical and Hellenistic models, presents a similar challenge to that of the pre-Classical age: traces of latent rhetoric can be identified in earlier forms of

[35] Culpepper Stroup (2007); cf. Horace's much quoted 'Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio' (*Epist*. 2.1.155–6); for a useful introduction to Rome's meeting with Greek rhetorical culture, see Fantham (2004: 78–81), Connolly (2007).

[36] Malcovati (1976) gives evidence for over one hundred and seventy orators, whom we know of by name, for the period from the early third century BC to the end of the first century BC; almost half of these orators were in the period before Cicero. Also see Steel's (2007) instructive comments on the reliability of Cicero's *Brutus* as a source for the history of early Roman oratory.

[37] See, for example, the overview of the early relationship between Roman comedy and the contemporary state of oratory at the time of Plautus and Terence by Barsby (2007); for its development under Cato and the Gracchi, see Sciarrino (2007).

[38] According to Cicero (*Brut*. 61), Cato was regarded as 'one of the oldest' ('perveterem') and there was no-one else from that age, in Cicero's opinion, whose published speeches were worth mentioning ('nec vero habeo quemquam antiquiorem, cuius quidem scripta proferenda putem').

literature, and drama in particular. The result is that the 'influence' model is not in itself sufficient to explain the transposition of Greek rhetoric into Roman culture. Rather, as Manuwald further demonstrates, oratorical and rhetorical forms and tropes were gradually adapted to Roman dramatic conventions and were utilized even in indigenous genres. What we see in early Roman oratory, then, is a model of both continuity and change, a more symbiotic relationship, as Latin dramatists adapted the Hellenistic art of speaking to the practical realities of Roman Republican life.

Whatever resistance may have been put up against the Greek teaching of oratory in the second century BC, it had become so well established at Rome by 92 BC that the censors were alarmed at attempts to teach the subject *in Latin*, thus prompting a second edict directed against Roman rhetoricians.[39] From this point on, we also gain a clearer picture of Hellenistic oratory's influence at Rome in the shape of two rhetorical treatises: Cicero's *De Inventione* and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* of unknown authorship.[40] Each treatise owes a great debt to the work of the second-century rhetorician Hermagoras of Temnos.[41] His major contribution lay in the field of *stasis* theory, an elaborate system for finding the point at issue in a variety of argumentative situations: the very precision of his doctrine suggests it was effective as a pedagogical tool and demonstrates that the developments in the Hellenistic period were evolving in a manner that was especially pertinent to the practising orator.[42]

Scholars have long recognized that Cicero was influenced by Hellenistic rhetorical theory: Berry and Heath have demonstrated Cicero's adherence to the rules he had enshrined in the *De Inventione* in two of his forensic speeches, *Pro Roscio Amerino* and *Pro Milone*. The *progymnasmata*, too, may have helped shape and define the

[39] On the edict against Latin teachers, see Suet. *Rhet.* 25.2; Gellius, *NA* 15.11.2. For discussion, see Kaster (1995).

[40] See Corbeill (2002) for a discussion of these texts, their dates, and use for reconstructing the Roman rhetorical education of Cicero's day.

[41] On Hermagoras and *stasis* theory, see Heath (1994).

[42] It should perhaps be noted that this was not the assessment of most twentieth-century scholarship. Compare, for example, Clarke's dismissal of the Hellenistic rhetoricians as 'a narrow circle of professionals disputing among themselves on minor matters of classification and little concerned with the broader aspects of their art' (1996: 7).

presentation of Cicero's oratorical works.[43] However, although forensic oratory, with which rhetorical theory was primarily concerned, was adapted easily to Roman legal practice, the potential impact of Hellenistic symbouleutic oratory is less easy to determine.

Conversely, as the discussion by Kathryn Tempest shows, when we consider the peculiar features and circumstances of Cicero's speech *Pro Marcello*—delivered before Caesar in 46 BC—its form and function may best be explained as an example of 'Hellenistic oratory' at Rome. By looking at the themes, *topoi,* and argumentative strategy of the *Pro Marcello*, Tempest traces a number of features in the speech that can be traced back through the Greek and Hellenistic symbouleutic tradition: a focus on Caesar's virtues, divinity, and an increased awareness of the *paradoxon,* all contribute towards Cicero's strategy as he makes a virtue of embedding Greek epideictic elements within an essentially deliberative oration. Thus, the *Pro Marcello*, which stands at a halfway mark in the history of Greek and Latin panegyric, may be seen to offer evidence for both the appropriation of the Greek oratorical tradition and its subsequent Romanization.[44]

The end of the Hellenistic period is traditionally dated to the point when the last Greek-speaking kingdom, Ptolemaic Egypt, was integrated into the Roman Empire: after the Battle of Actium in 31 BC and the subsequent death of Cleopatra VII in 30 BC. During this period Greek language and culture had spread far and wide throughout the Hellenistic kingdoms. Yet, insofar as the approach taken in this volume aims to offer exemplary essays on the development of Hellenistic oratory, we must also examine how it continued and developed in other forms as well, across the Greek East, after the traditional terminus point in Hellenistic studies. The last paper of this volume, therefore, brings together different strands already touched upon by previous contributions and simultaneously adds an interdisciplinary approach by taking the example of Paul of Tarsus as a case study. For, although we do not have much direct evidence for his rhetorical ability, a growing body of scholarship would like to posit Paul as one of the great rhetors.

[43] On the influence of Hellenistic rhetorical theory, see Berry and Heath (1997). The study by Frazel (2010) considers a range of *topoi* and argumentative patterns that can be traced, through Cicero's *Verrines*, to Greek progymnastic exercises.

[44] For a collection of influential essays tracing the origin and development of Latin panegyric and its connection with the Greek tradition, see Rees (2012).

In this chapter, Stanley Porter first evaluates older and current trends in New Testament rhetorical criticism before examining how the Hellenistic rhetorical culture of Greece and Rome influenced one of the most famous apologists of the new Christian faith, Paul of Tarsus. Paul stood between Greek, Roman, and Jewish culture and this was evident in the systematic education he received in Hellenistic Tarsus and in Jerusalem, as well as in his oratorical practice in the public realm before Greeks and Romans (e.g. his speeches at the Areopagus and before the Romanized Jewish King, Agrippa). And while Paul's letters reveal elements of rhetorical form and argumentation, and have attracted greater scholarly attention, it is his orations, which, according to Porter, can be studied more profitably from a rhetorical perspective: Paul's speeches demonstrate an awareness of conventions, forms, structures, and arguments according to the rhetorical situation they are addressing. Furthermore, in his analysis of the speeches in Acts, Porter traces a number of continuities between past models of rhetoric, as well as charting how those models changed in line with the need for a new audience. Deliberative, epideictic, and judicial genres are still discernible, he argues, but they now existed respectively to fulfil the functions of missionary speeches, in order for Paul to set himself up as an example of praise, or to defend his past actions. Oratory, Porter shows, was based on the general outlines of rhetorical handbooks, and combined consistency with the need for flexibility.

The volume closes with an afterword by Graham Shipley, who places this collection of essays within the wider scholarly context, provides a 'bird's eye' view of the papers, and highlights some of the key contributions they make, while at the same time adding further examples of Hellenistic oratory in action. He reiterates some of the key points emerging from this volume, namely that oratory during the period was vibrant, ubiquitous, and sophisticated. Finally he stresses the point that, as in the area of Hellenistic politics, it is impossible to identify a clear break from the oratory of the Classical period. He thus throws into relief a key theme emerging from this volume, continuity in terms of the function and practice of oratory.

Shipley claims that this collection of specialized studies reaps the rewards of a resurgence of scholarly interest in all things Hellenistic in the last three decades and the resulting advancements in our understanding of politics and society during this period. We hope that this volume in turn will enhance scholarly appreciation of a key area of Hellenistic life and culture.

This page intentionally left blank

Part I

Hellenistic Oratory in Rhetorical Theory and Literature

This page intentionally left blank

1

Oratory in Polybius' *Histories*

John Thornton

1. INTRODUCTION

In 167 BC, a Rhodian embassy persuaded the Roman Senate not to declare war on the republic of Rhodes, which was accused of having attempted to mediate between Rome and Perseus. At Rhodes, the Senate's answer was received with a sense of relief; a new embassy was sent to Rome, bringing a gift of money as a token of gratitude, with the task of trying to obtain a treaty of alliance. Proud of his achievement, Astymedes, the ambassador who had avoided the war, published the speech he had delivered to the Senate on behalf of his city. Polybius maintains that all the Greeks, both at Rome and those in the mainland, would have condemned the Rhodian orator's strategy. In order to obtain the senate's forgiveness, he had employed the common rhetorical devices of *auxesis* ('amplification') and its opposite, *tapeinoun* ('to lessen'):

> In comparing and judging the relative values of kindnesses and assistance rendered to the Romans, he attempted to discredit and belittle (ταπεινοῦν) the services of other states, while he magnified (ηὔξανε) those of Rhodes, exaggerating them as much as he could. In regard to offences, on the contrary, he condemned those of the others in a bitter and hostile spirit, but tried to cloak those of Rhodes, so that when compared, the offences of Rhodes might seem to be little and deserving of pardon, but those of her neighbours great and quite inexpiable, although, as he said, the offenders had all been pardoned.[1]

[1] Polyb. 30.4.13–14 (English translation by W.R. Paton). For the place of αὐξῆσαι καὶ ταπεινοῦν ('to amplify and depreciate') in the epilogue, cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1419b 19–24.

The Achaean Polybius maintained with disdain that Astymedes' behaviour was similar to that of a conspirator who denounces his accomplices (30.4–5).

Thus, important political speeches were still circulating in the Hellenistic Age, and they aroused strong reactions in a public spread out all over the Mediterranean world. Publishing the text of his speech, Astymedes opened a dialogue with his readers; one of those readers, Polybius, used his *Histories* in order to reply to him. No less adept at rhetoric than the Rhodian orator, Polybius employed a *paradeigma* ('example') to show that his interlocutor had used base and ignoble arguments.

This fascinating passage, which provides a significant clue to Polybius' judgment on Roman imperialism,[2] testifies to the persistent vitality of oratory, its practical efficacy, and the debate it aroused, even beyond the limits of the genre. Some years later, Astymedes appeared before the senate again, and finally obtained an alliance with Rome. Polybius reports his speech extensively, and argues that this time the Rhodian ambassador behaved better than in 167, because he gave up accusing the other Greeks and just invoked forgiveness (30.31). It is of course more than possible that the criticism of his former speech had contributed, in part, to Astymedes' change of strategy, and thus this dialogue with the public could have influenced the orator.

In this paper, I am not going to analyse the speeches reported in the *Histories*,[3] nor to investigate the sources from which Polybius derived them as a way of trying to measure the correspondence between the historian's version and the words as actually pronounced.[4] Neither will I discuss Polybius' theory on speeches, and its relation with that of Thucydides.[5] I want rather to start by trying to establish the occasions on which political debate was attested in the *Histories*, and the issues decided by oratory in Polybius' society (§ 2). In this way, I will try to measure the vitality of Hellenistic democracies, and of the oratory that guaranteed their running. Afterwards, I will go on to investigate Polybius' own oratorical activity, at least in a couple of cases (§ 3). Further, I will examine the effects of the

[2] Thornton (2010a: 72–6). On Astymedes' speech, see Pédech (1964: 295), Eckstein (1995: 96–8; 223).

[3] For a list of speeches in the *Histories*, see Ziegler (1952: 1524–7).

[4] See Pédech (1964: 259–76), Wooten (1974: 235), Baronowski (2011: 149–51).

[5] Pédech (1964: 257–9), Walbank (1965: 249–53), Nicolai (1999), (2006), Marincola (2007: 123–6), Foulon (2010: 146–7).

globalization of rhetoric[6] on Polybius' work. Rhetorical strategies are applied to historiographical polemics (§ 4), and are used to impose a political judgment of the most dramatic and controversial events in the relations between the Greek world and Rome. The close link between historiography and oratory in Polybius' activity will thus suggest the need to investigate the meaning of the *Histories* as a voice in the diplomatic dialogue between Greece and Rome. Thus it will lead to the conclusion that Polybius put his considerable rhetorical skills into the service of a political objective, inducing the Romans to exercise their power with leniency (§ 5).

2. POLITICAL DEBATES AND ORATORY IN THE *HISTORIES*

At 12.25a3, a well-known passage of his polemic against Timaeus, Polybius says that the speeches 'as it were, sum up events and hold the whole history together'. He distinguishes three kinds of speeches: deliberative speeches (*demegoriai*), exhortations (*parakleseis*)—especially those addressed by the generals to their troops before the battle—and ambassadors' speeches.[7] The importance of speeches in historiography is widely acknowledged and can be traced back to epic. The three genres of *logoi* singled out by Polybius reflect the characteristics of the period narrated in the *Histories*, from 220 (or rather from 264, if we take into account the *prokataskeue*, the first two books, which begin with the First Punic War) to 146 BC.

Hegemonic wars, both at Mediterranean level and on a regional scale, along with the great battles that decided them, required the addition of generals' harangues to soldiers (*parakleseis*).[8] Polybius often mentions them, beginning with the first two books. The themes of these short exhortations were so expected that Polybius could just say that the general pronounced 'words suitable to the occasion'

[6] Pernot (2000: 82–114).
[7] Marincola (2007: 127).
[8] See Wooten (1974: 243) for an analysis of Greek generals' speeches in Polybius; see also Nicolai (1999: 292). For the recent debate on the historians' *parakleseis*, Nicolai (2006: 83–5), Marincola (2007: 128–9), McGing (2010: 88–9).

(τὰ πρέποντα τῷ καιρῷ, or τοῖς καιροῖς: cf. always in the *prokataskeue*, 1.32.8, 45.3, 60.5, 2.64.1). His readers could imagine their content according to their own experience and rhetorical education, which was not dissimilar to the historian's own training or even to that of the general who had addressed his men.[9]

To Polybius' contemporaries, the *paraklesis* would have appeared a necessary element of every significant battle. The anonymous author of the second decree in honour of Apollonius of Metropolis introduced the fight in which Apollonius met his fate, with more than ten of his fellow-citizens, attributing him a *paraklesis* worthy of him and his city; and prudently reported its probable content as a thought to be attributed to the commander.[10] Beginning with book 3, after the limits of the *prokataskeue*, in which the summary style (*kephalaiodos*) prevented him from reporting long speeches,[11] Polybius does, however, sometimes make explicit the 'words suitable to the occasion' (τὰ πρέποντα τοῖς παροῦσι καιροῖς), such as before the battle of Ticinus, where he attributes a couple of speeches to Hannibal and P. Cornelius Scipio (3.62–4).[12]

Hannibal put on a spectacle so that his men would become convinced of the need to win or perish, by considering the misfortunes (ἀλλότρια συμπτώματα) which he had brought before their eyes.[13] Significantly, giving lessons through the misfortunes of others was the task Polybius attributed to the *pragmatike historia* (1.35). The statement that wise men should learn from the past is one of the examples of *gnomai* in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (11.3)[14] and Polybius

[9] Cf. Pédech (1964: 278), Walbank (1965: 245, 254).

[10] A, ll. 31–3: 'And finally, when the action was about to be completed, he urged on his fellow-soldiers as was fitting for him and our city, and thinking it honorable, after contending on behalf of his city and his fellow-citizens and the freedom that had been restored, to have as his grave-monument the glory and honor that would come to him . . . ', translation by C.P. Jones. For discussion, see Dreyer and Engelmann (2003: 6–7), Jones (2004: 472–3).

[11] Cf. for instance Pédech (1964: 279), Nicolai (2006: 80).

[12] Pédech (1964: 279), Walbank (1965: 253–4), Nicolai (2006: 86–7). A similar couple of speeches appear also before the battle of Cannae (3.108.2–109.13; 111) on which see Usher (2009: 490–2).

[13] Thornton (2010b: 54–5).

[14] 'It is characteristic of sensible people to use the examples of their predecessors and to endeavour so to escape the errors arising out of imprudence' (English translation by H. Rackham). Pani (2001: 74 n. 42) observes that this motif is attested already in Hesiod.

attributes it to Aemilius Paulus in the speech delivered to his council in front of their captive, king Perseus (29.20.4).[15]

For minor states, it was necessary to establish relations with the superpowers contending for hegemony and to take sides in their wars. Hence an intense diplomatic activity ensued, with vigorous internal debates within Hellenistic cities and federal states. This fact accounts, at least in part, for the preponderance of ambassadors' speeches in Polybius' *Histories*.[16] Besides the already cited speeches of Astymedes from 167 and 164 BC—the first of which Polybius did not really report extensively—it will suffice to mention only a few: i) Agelaus of Naupactus' speech at the peace conference in 217 BC, with which, according to Polybius, began the *symploke* ('interconnection') between the affairs of Italy and Africa, on the one hand, and Greece and Macedon on the other (5.104);[17] ii) the pair of speeches delivered by the Aetolian Chlaeneas and the Acarnanian Lyciscus at Sparta in 210 (9.28–31; 32–9);[18] iii) the speech of Thrasycrates of Rhodes at an Aetolian congress in 207 (11.4–6);[19] iv) the opposing speeches of the king of Pergamon, Eumenes II, and the Rhodian ambassadors to the Senate in 189, regarding the Asian settlement north of Taurus after Antiochus III's defeat (21.18–24);[20] v) the Achaean Callicrates' speech at Rome in 180 (24.9);[21] and, vi) among those speeches known only through Livy,[22] that of Lycortas, Polybius' father, to the Roman legate Appius Claudius in 184 (Liv. 39.36.6–37.17),[23] and that of the Macedonian ambassadors to the Aetolians in 199 (Liv. 31.29.3–16).[24]

[15] 'The difference, he said, between foolish and wise men lies in this, that the former are schooled by their own misfortunes and the latter by those of others' (English translation by W. R. Paton).

[16] See Zecchini (2005: 11–12).

[17] Pédech (1964: 264, 296), Walbank (1965: 257), Deininger (1971: 25–9), Deininger (1973), Mørkholm (1974), Wooten (1974: 238–9), Schmitt (1989), Vollmer (1990: 96–107), Levy (1994), Golan (1995: 55–74), Champion (1997), Champion (2004b: 55), Nicolai (2006: 81–2), Usher (2009: 493–4).

[18] Pédech (1964: 265–6, 285–6, 296–7), Walbank (1965: 258–9), Deininger (1971: 29–31), Wooten (1974: 239–40), Champion (2004b: 55), Usher (2009: 494–502).

[19] Pédech (1964: 268–9; 297), Lehmann (1967: 136–55), Deininger (1971: 32–3), Wooten (1974: 240–1), Champion (2004b: 56), Usher (2009: 502–4).

[20] Pédech (1964: 298–9), Usher (2009: 504–6).

[21] Deininger (1971: 138–40), Ferrary (1988: 290–4), Didu (1993: 23–4), Eckstein (1995: 203–6), Golan (1995: 75–7, 92–3), Nottmeyer (1995: 21–8), Usher (2009: 508).

[22] Pédech (1964: 277–8), Walbank (1965: 248, 254 n. 80).

[23] Deininger (1971: 123–4), Nottmeyer (1995: 45–6), Champion (2004b: 197–8, 223–4), Thornton (2006: 177–8), Desideri (2007: 176–7).

[24] Pédech (1964: 266, 298), Champion (2004b: 56).

Furthermore, as Cecil Wooten observed, the *demegoriai* are often about diplomatic affairs: what answer should be given to foreign ambassadors, or what instructions should be given to ambassadors sent abroad.[25] As evidence of this it will suffice only to mention Critolaus' words in 38.12.7–11,[26] or the dramatic speech by which the Achaean *strategos* Aristaenus, in 198, persuaded the Achaeans to abandon the Macedonian alliance and join Rome (transmitted only through Livy 32.20.3–21.37).[27]

As Andrew Erskine has recently observed, Polybius does not actually mention forensic speeches among those to be found in historiography.[28] However, the precepts suggested by the rhetorical handbooks as appropriate to defence (*eidos apologetikon*) are sometimes applied in the *Histories* and Polybius also applied the rhetorical precepts as prescribed for defence speeches. In 4.14.7, Aratus of Sicyon, accused before an Achaean assembly (*synodos*) by his political opponents of causing the Achaean defeat at Caphyae, asked for pardon in a manner which is very similar to the strategy recommended by the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (4.9) for a defence speech when it was not possible to deny the accusations. Astymedes' speech, too, employed rhetorical devices suitable for apologetic aims; these same precepts appear in the *Histories* when the author addresses his readers. In 7.14, the *Rhetoric to Alexander* suggested asking pardon by invoking 'the passions to which all mankind are liable, that divert us from rational calculation'; in 27.9–10, Polybius tried to justify the Greeks' joy upon the news of Perseus' victory in the battle of Callicinus with the natural impulse to take the underdog's side. He maintained that it would have been possible to win over the Greeks again to the Romans' side by persuading them with rational arguments. Thus, Polybius appears to master the weapons codified by the rhetorical tradition, and he employs them in his dialogue with his readers.

Forensic speeches were not extraneous to the political life of the Hellenistic world, nor to the *Histories* which reflect it. The undisputed dominion (*aderitos exousia*) achieved by the Romans from the end of the Macedonian kingdom in 168 BC, turned the Senate into the tribunal of Mediterranean politics, contributing to the tendency

[25] Wooten (1974: 237).

[26] Pédech (1964: 292–3), Deininger (1971: 231), Didu (1993: 129–32), Nottmeyer (1995: 143–4), Thornton (2006: 177–8).

[27] Deininger (1971: 40–6), Eckstein (1987: 143–4), Golan (1995: 81–4).

[28] Erskine (2007: 274); see also Marincola (2007: 128) on the rarity of forensic speeches in historiography.

towards the mixture of forensic and ambassadors' speeches.[29] Before the Senate at Rome, not only could speakers defend their cities, as Astymedes did twice, but they could also accuse their rivals (as, for example, the ambassadors of the Bithynian king Prusias and the cities of Asia did against Eumenes of Pergamum in 164: 30.30.2, 4). In any case, the fact that forensic speeches, with all the accuser's and the defendant's tricks, only appear indirectly in Polybius' work, through *demegoriai* and *logoi presbeutikoì*, may also depend, at least in part, on the peculiar tradition of the *Histories*. From book 18 onwards, most of the fragments come from the *excerpta de legationibus*,[30] which helps to explain the under-representation of the internal political struggles of Greek states, along with their resulting trials.

However, there are indications of the vitality of political struggle not only with regard to foreign affairs, but also with regard to traditional themes of the internal conflict in Greek cities: the problems of debt and of distribution (and redistribution) of wealth. After the battle of Sellasia, Megalopolis, having been destroyed by Cleomenes III in 223, had to be refounded. Some wanted to reduce the perimeter of the city's wall, in order to be able to complete the fortification and to defend it efficiently in case of danger. In order to fight depopulation, they had also proposed 'that landowners should contribute one third of their estate, to make up the number of additional citizens required'. Other citizens strongly opposed both the reduction of the city's size and the contribution of their lands. Thus, the laws proposed by the Peripatetic philosopher Prytanis, sent to the city by the Macedonian king Antigonus III, were hotly debated. The dispute ended only in 217 thanks to Aratus' mediation (5.93).

At Messene, in the period narrated in the *Histories*, an oligarchic regime had been abolished, and democracy established. There had been trials, banishments, and confiscations of property (7.10.1). In Aetolia, in 206/5, Dorimachus and Scopas were elected legislators with the task of introducing measures in favour of the debtors; their proposals aroused the strenuous opposition of the rich citizen Alexander, whose arguments are reported by Polybius in 13.1a.[31] In

[29] See Connolly (2007: 148) for the mixture of the different genres in Attic oratory.

[30] De Boor (1903). In general, on the *excerpta Costantiniana* and relevant bibliography, see Roberto (2009).

[31] 'Alexander of Aetolia, during the legislation of Dorimachus and Scopas, opposed their proposal, showing from many instances that where this weed once took root it never stopped its growth until it had inflicted the greatest disaster on those who had

Boeotia, a philo-Macedonian and democratic political group had suspended the administration of justice, in order to benefit the debtors. But they, too, met with strong opposition from the propertied classes, who tried to take advantage of the Roman victory over Antiochus III to force the courts into resuming their work. As at Megalopolis, here, too, Polybius speaks of strong conflicts (*amphisbetesis*, 'dispute', 22.4). The proposal of the *euporoi*, the well-to-do, 'that a final end must be put to all the disputes between the citizens', necessarily had to be presented and debated in the assembly. In 207, the *strategos* Philopoemen delivered a speech to the Achaeans, vigorously attacking those who took better care of their dress than their arms:

> He begged them to regard general daintiness in dress as being fit for a woman and not for a very modest woman, while the richness and distinction of armour is suited to brave men who are determined to save both themselves and their country gloriously.[32]

His *paraklesis* was so successful that, at the end of the meeting, the exhalted audience forced the most elegant citizens to abandon the *agora* (11.9). This episode provoked Polybius to reflect on the efficiency of oratory—particularly when an exemplary life conferred authority to the orator's words (11.10.1–6; again in 23.12.8–9 Polybius praises the extraordinary effectiveness of the oratory of Philopoemen, who did not court the favour of the masses but addressed them with *parrhesia*, 'frankness').

The cases of Molpagoras of Cius and of Chaeron at Sparta confirm the vitality of political struggle in the cities and the effectiveness of Hellenistic democratic institutions, still able to intervene in the distribution of wealth. In both cases, Polybius' narrative is overly biased: he presents a political action which changed the traditional property relations in terms which could be considered tyrannical. However, both at Cius and at Sparta, there are indications which could suggest putting Molpagoras' and Chaeron's political adventures in a democratic context: both leaders had the possibility to intervene in land property only through popular consent, which was obtained by the

once introduced it . . . ' (English translation by W. R. Paton). Cf. Pédech (1964: 295 n. 197).

[32] Polyb. 11.9.7 (English translation by W. R. Paton). Cf. Pédech (1964: 295), Eckstein (1995: 163).

traditional weapon of oratory in the democratic assemblies and courts. These cases clearly indicate the vitality and power of Hellenistic democratic institutions.

However, Polybius denies the most socially incisive policies 'the finest of names', 'freedom and democracy' (6.57.9), and rather qualifies them in terms of a state of disorder, *kachexia* (20.4.1, 6.1, 7.4), misgovernment, *kakopoliteia* (15.21.3), or mob-rule, *ochlokratia* (in the book on constitutions, 6.4.4–6, 10). In the framework of his universal history, it was not possible to look closely at the internal political conflicts of any Greek polis. The transmission of the text of the *Histories* must have further contributed to the loss of any information Polybius might have given on this theme. Yet, despite this, the *Histories* still testify to the dramatic seriousness of the decisions taken by Hellenistic assemblies: not only in the field of foreign affairs, as at Abydus besieged by Philip V (16.30–4),[33] or at Selge attacked by Achaeus' troops (5.74–6), but also on the most heated issues of social policy. Hellenistic politicians, therefore, must have been able to persuade not only the superpower authorities, as the Rhodian Astymedes had done, but also the city assemblies, as the Aetolian Alexander had done. The Colophonian decree in honour of Polemaeus introduces him as ambassador and adviser (*πρεσβεύων μὲν καὶ συμβουλεύων τὰ συνφορώτατα*: col. II, ll. 3–4).[34] These were the aims of the rhetorical education of the scions of the Greek upper classes. Polybius was one of them, as was Apollonius of Metropolis, or the Colophonian Polemaeus and Menippus. He was perfectly aware of the difficulties inherent in the relationship with the masses. During a civil conflict (*stasis*), it was necessary to teach, to tame, and to correct them through the power of speech (1.67.5).[35] Unsurprisingly, when reporting a speech, he often highlights the arguments which had most contributed to the audience's persuasion (12.25i.8; 36.1.7).

3. POLYBIUS AS ORATOR

Ancient readers of the *Histories* especially appreciated the political dimension of Polybius' activity. Plutarch (*Prae. ger. reip.* 814 c–d)

[33] Robert (1967: 25) quoted by Pernot (2000: 105).
[34] Robert and Robert (1989: 12).
[35] Thornton (2010b: 38–9).

suggested that the governing classes of the Greek *poleis* should imitate Polybius (and Panaetius), who had benefited their countries through the friendship of Scipio Aemilianus. The Colophonian Polemaeus, too, had already behaved in this same way (col. II, ll. 24–31).[36] Polybius himself proudly remarked that his friendship with Scipio was well known even beyond the borders of Italy and Greece (31.23.3). At Megalopolis, the verses which accompanied the portrait of Polybius, seen by Pausanias in the second century AD, mentioned his activity in favour of the defeated Greeks after the Achaean War even before his famous historical work (8.30.8–9; cf. also 37.2). Commenting on this inscription, Pausanias also mentioned the friendship between Polybius and Scipio. It seems that even the short entry on Polybius in the list of Hellenistic historians partially preserved in *POxy* 4808 referred to this friendship. The name of Scipio has been reasonably integrated near the word *συνεστράτευε* ('went on campaign with').[37] As late as the fourth century AD, Ammianus Marcellinus still mentioned an episode of the campaign against Carthage in which Polybius collaborated with Scipio Aemilianus (24.2.14–17 = Polyb. 38.19a). However this may be interpreted, the author of the text on the papyrus certainly praised Polybius' political experience.

In the ancient world, and still in the Hellenistic age, political activity was inconceivable without oratorical activity. In 180 BC, still under the legal age, Polybius had been elected member of an Achaean embassy to Ptolemy V, even though the diplomatic mission was cancelled due to the sudden death of the king (24.6). Only during the Third Macedonian War, at last, do we have proof of intense political and oratorical activity by Polybius. In the autumn of 170, in a meeting of Lycortas' party behind closed doors, he was the first to take sides with Archon's cautious proposal, which acknowledged the need 'to act as circumstances enjoined, and neither give their enemies any pretext for accusing them' (28.6.8). In the same meeting, it was also decided that Archon would be a candidate for *strategos* and Polybius for hipparch. As hipparch, the orator Polybius first collaborated with Attalus of Pergamon in having the honours, which the Achaeans had revoked, restored to his brother king Eumenes (28.7.8–14). In the summer of 168, he presented an offer of Achaean

[36] Robert and Robert (1989: 13); Thornton (1998: 596–7 with note 65).
[37] Beresford et al. (2007: 31).

full military alliance to Marcius Philippus. Then on his return from this mission, at Marcius Philippus' request, he persuaded the Achaeans not to send Appius Claudius Cento the five thousand men he had asked for. This way, he was well aware that he was furnishing 'those who wished to accuse him to Appius with a good pretext' (28.13.7–14). In the winter of 169/8, first at Corinth and then at Sicyon, he spoke repeatedly, albeit unsuccessfully, in favour of sending the Achaean troops then asked for by Ptolemy VI and Ptolemy VIII for the war with Antiochus IV (29.23–25).

Of the speeches Polybius delivered during the Third Macedonian War, the most indicative both of the vitality of the Achaean democracy and of the historian's oratorical skills is probably that in favour of the restoration of King Eumenes' honours (28.7.8–13).[38] Eager to collaborate with the Romans and their friends, Archon and Polybius encouraged Attalus of Pergamon to send an official embassy to the Achaean League on his brother's behalf: they would help the ambassadors to achieve their aim. After the ambassadors' speech, the orientation of the assembly was undecipherable. The leaders who opposed restoring the honours to Eumenes II immediately stood up and took the floor. Polybius did not report their speeches. Instead, he denounced their underlying motives for opposition, which in his eyes were all of a personal nature. In this way, he employed the old rhetorical device of *diabole*, developed in order to discredit witnesses in courts, as theorized for instance in Chapter 15 of the *Rhetoric to Alexander*.[39] However, the same accusation, which Polybius must have already made during the debate in the assembly, before transplanting it to the *Histories*, could also be levelled against the promoters of the restitution of the king's honours. The *strategos* Archon had to move very cautiously: the expenses incurred, so it would seem, for the election campaign, might have raised the terrible suspicion that he was speaking in favour of the king because he had been corrupted by Pergamene gold. Achaean laws strictly forbade 'the receiving of gifts, no matter on what pretext, from a king' (22.8.3).

[38] Pédech (1964: 283, 289–90), Usher (2009: 509–10).

[39] 15.5: 'Another thing to consider is whether the witness is a friend of the man for whom he is giving evidence, or in some way connected with his act, or whether he is an enemy of the person against whom he is giving evidence, or a poor man; because witnesses in these circumstances are suspected of giving false testimony, from motives in the one case of favour, in the other of revenge, and in the other of gain' (English translation by H. Rackham).

Some years earlier, refusing a gift offered to him by the Spartans, Philopoemen had shown his awareness that the suspicion of corruption could ruin a politician's credibility (20.12.6–7).

Thus, the attitude of the assembly was swung by Polybius' speech. Faithful to the methodological principles he had repeatedly affirmed in the *Histories* (36.1.7; 12.25i.8), Polybius reported only the decisive argument through which he became attuned with public opinion, revealing the very reasons that assured his success in winning over the *plethos* in the debate. With virtuoso skill, he had accused the Rhodian judges[40] of judging not according to justice and right, but from motives of personal hostility (*echthra*) against Eumenes. He turned the *diabole*, the same weapon that he had already employed against his political opponents, and with which they were ready to threaten Archon, also against the judges.

Polybius read out the decree that assigned the task of revoking the improper and illegal honours to the Rhodian judges; at this point, he added a comment of his own: *οὐ μὰ Δί' ἁπάσας*. Not all the honours previously granted to the king were to be considered improper and illegal; rather a selection should be made, abolishing only the honours that proved to be such. The two Rhodian judges, driven by personal resentment against Eumenes, had abolished all the honours indiscriminately. They acted against the spirit of the Achaean *dogma* and against justice. The dignity of the Achaeans, Polybius claimed, demanded a return to the letter of the decree, or rather, as we would say, to his (re)interpretation of it. Convinced, so it would seem, that they had been betrayed by the Rhodian judges, the members of the assembly passed a decree entrusting to the magistrates—in all likelihood, none other than Archon and Polybius—the following task: 'that all the honours conferred on King Eumenes should be restored, except those which either contained anything that did not become the Achaean League or anything illegal'. In the light of these circumstances, I fully concur with Walbank's conclusion 'that few were found to be either improper or illegal'.[41]

In such a way, Polybius was able to represent skilfully the revocation of a significant political decision as the return to the authentic

[40] Identified by Dixon (2001: 170–2) with two of the Rhodian judges who acted as arbitrators between Epidaurus and Hermione (*IG* iv^2 1.75, Fragment B, ll. 25 and 27). On the procedure, see Habicht (2008).

[41] Walbank (1979: 336).

spirit of the provision, a provision which had previously been betrayed for base personal motives. The sheer ability of the orator, in his capacity to present his proposal as the one most consistent with Achaean honour, seems to have been the determining factor in influencing many of them to approve his bill. Others who approved Polybius' decree must surely have been aware of how much was at stake and how important it was for the ruling group to send a favourable sign to Rome. For the latter group, Polybius' speech was a life raft and they leapt upon it. Not only did his speech cloak what could have potentially been viewed as an about-turn, but the historian's oration helped justify their decision by projecting it as an honourable restoration of Achaean dignity.

4. ORATORY AND HISTORIOGRAPHY IN POLYBIUS

In the *Histories*, therefore, it is possible to read at least the summaries of the speeches delivered by the author, and so we could even maintain that Polybius is the Hellenistic orator we know best, and most directly. Polybius was at the same time an historian and a shrewd orator,[42] used to addressing both Greek assemblies and Roman authorities. Unsurprisingly, in his work the oratorical form seems to be the most natural way to treat political themes. Thus, the comparison between Philopoemen and Aristaenus' policies on the question of the Achaean relations with Rome is introduced as a couple of opposing speeches—fictitious speeches, as Pédech and Walbank rightly point out.[43] Also, his explanation for the Greek crowds' enthusiasm at the Macedonian victory at Callicinus culminates in a fictitious speech composed according to the rhetorical rules (27.9–10). The historian assumes the Greeks' defence, as in a speech to the Senate.[44] In 2.35.2–10, justifying the space he had reserved for the Gallic Wars, Polybius openly affirms the exhortative function of his account, a kind of *paraklesis* as it were: remembering the results of past fights, the Greeks should not let themselves be frightened by the

[42] See Champion (2004a).

[43] Pédech (1964: 417; cf. 299–300), Walbank (1979: 265); see also Ferrary (1988: 294–9), Thornton (1995), Eckstein (1995: 202–3).

[44] Thornton (2001: 131–48).