

In recent years the study of classical oratory and rhetoric, in particular the speeches of the Attic orators and Greek theoreticians of rhetorical theory, has attracted the interest of serious scholars, among them A., who is known for numerous works on Greek oratory and most of all on Isocrates. Now his bibliography includes a new book on oratory, which constitutes a logical sequel to the author's expertise in the genre and complements his corpus of specialist works in the field.

The monograph is divided into a Preface, 11 Chapters, an extensive Conclusion, which summarizes the previous chapters and thus rounds off the book nicely, and a huge Bibliography, which accommodates the increasing scholarship on rhetoric and oratory. The book has an index of names, concepts and passages at its end and covers 582 pages in total.

The unified principle of this fascinating book is rhetoric as elixir of democracy and individuality. A. invests in the lexical approach, studying ancient moral terms to study conflict and cooperation in Athens. Other distinguished scholars, specializing in Athenian morality and behavior, especially in connection with the question of cooperation and conflict in Athenian society, have attempted to place it within an ideal of rigid, formalized relations. Instead of using a measuring stick to evaluate and detect signs of an established, general framework of morality and behavior, A. examines the orators separately and provides a springboard for the revival of interest in this area of study, which successive classicists can tackle.

I shall offer a survey-summary of each chapter, interspersing occasional comments.

Chapter 1 – Sets the scene in terms of the problems associated with the role of rhetoric. Many theoretical discussions took place in the 4<sup>th</sup> century about rhetoric, which constituted the elixir of life for Athenian democracy and is a mirror of its society in which the competitive values try to integrate to the competitive values of the city. At the same time, the rise of the individual personality comes to the fore more and more, as Isocrates shows by praising Evagoras and Hyperides by praising the general Leosthenes.

Chapter 2 – The contrast between philosophy and rhetoric crystallizes in the 4<sup>th</sup> century. Plato makes a harsh attack against oratory for flattering and deceiving the people, but Isocrates considers man as the yardstick of all good and bad things, offers an unbreakable bond between morality and rhetoric and creates a pedagogic ideal which he calls *philosophia*. Moreover, the intellectual conflict between the traditional oral culture and the written speech finds its champions in Alcidamas, who makes extemporization (*autoschediazein*) a terminus technicus for rhetoric, and Isocrates, who argues for the *akribeia* of written epideictic speeches.

Chapter 3 – The *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which was probably written by Anaximenes of Lampsacus, is a systematic and didactic manual, which systematizes everyday rhetorical practice and testifies to rhetorical rules. In his *Rhetoric* Aristotle put rhetoric under a strict scientific analysis, categorized it as a formalistic art, acknowledged Isocrates's literary artistry and contribution to the development of the rhetorical style, but not that of Demosthenes, considered Athenian rhetorical practice and preached that rhetoric can be moral or immoral according to the aims of the orator.

Through A.'s analysis so far the reader realizes that the texts of Plato, Anaximenes and Aristotle constitute an important part of Athenian discourse on rhetoric, offering an approach that has many things in common with rhetorical practice. This means that there is no absolute line between the philosophers of rhetoric and the actual speakers, and the two should better be imagined as part of a continuum between theory and practice in which the genre of oratory, written if not in fact rewritten, is not distant from pure practice.

Chapter 4 – Plato's *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Apology* and *Menexenus*, Antisthenes' epideictic speeches, Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Agésilas* prove the influence of rhetoric in other literary genres. Caecilius of Kale Akte possibly created the Canon of the Ten Attic Orators, but we hardly know anything else about other orators. A. proves this by offering us an excellent, detailed catalogue of the orators who are mostly known by name. Happy exceptions to this unfortunate rule are the cases of Apollodorus, whose speech *Against Neaira* sheds light on the social, religious and sexual life of the Athenians, Hegesippus, the fierce anti-Macedonian orator, who wrote the speech *On Halonnesus* and Demades, who appears an opportunist demagogue in the sources but has been appreciated positively by modern research.

In chapters 5-11 A. launches his investigation into the specifics of the orators of the 4<sup>th</sup> century B.C., who belong to the Canon: Isocrates, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Isaeus, Lycurgus, Hyperides and Dinarchus. In each of these chapters there is a useful subchapter on the life of each writer.

A's knowledge of the ancient source material is encyclopaedic. The author gives exhaustive references to literary sources and cites the pertinent modern scholarship in each case. The biographical chapters have the right emphasis on discussion rather than mere duplication of the arguments of other scholars, because A. critically appraises the *bios* and career of each one of the orators, emphasizing the vices and virtues of each of these men. In some cases the author questions the source tradition and offers novel arguments. In a second subchapter A. offers summative introductions to the works of the orators, which are particularly useful to novice students of rhetoric but also important for professional readers. In the cases of Isocrates and Demosthenes he adds one more chapter. In particular, A. records the trend of earlier research until the «renaissance» of Isocrates in recent years, and addresses the issue of authenticity of Demosthenes' speeches, arguing that the «published» speeches cannot be much different from those delivered in court or the Assembly. Then A. comes to the speeches. Writing a book on the texts of the orators is necessarily a process of selection, exclusion and emphasis, but A.'s analysis of many of the speeches is a laborious task and forms an important aid to their study. The author introduces the situation and gives a summary of the speeches. A takes into account the period in which each orator lived, identifies the date, issues, and people involved in each speech, provides us with a detailed and careful reading of the individual speeches and offers a valuable assessment of the arguments, methods and aims of the orators by interpreting their specific argumentation, thought and language. A. demonstrates the effort of the orators to convince their audiences that moral principles and actual behaviour could constitute a single, inseparable whole. A third subchapter is devoted to the style of each speech. In his discussion of the opinion of the ancient critics regarding the orators, A. surpasses in many cases the valuable analysis of Jebb (*The Attic Orators from Antiphon to Isaeos*, New York 1962). In a fourth subchapter he supplies a concise discussion of the manuscript tradition, the important philological subject of the textual transmission of the texts and the reception of each orator. It is important to note that A.'s analysis of Apollodorus, Hegesippus and Demades along with the orators of the Canon supplies the readers with a complete conspectus of all the surviving orators.

It is noteworthy that A. cites several long passages from the rhetorical texts and then offers delightful translations. In most places A. keeps close to writers' words and phrasing and accurately conveys the vigor of the original. This choice of the author serves the didactic purposes of his work. All readers, but especially beginning students of rhetoric, will find this exposition of particular service, because they will not have to interrupt

their reading to search their own libraries for the passages being discussed. This is also useful because it helps them check the arguments of the author. So an academic teacher could well advise his pupils to read the book and thus have the benefit of instruction from a specialist such as the author.

I shall offer a survey-summary of the rest of the chapters of the book.

Chapter 5 – Isocrates' speeches represent the new trend of the 4<sup>th</sup> century for literacy and were destined for publication in intellectual circles; the ideal leader, the internal political stability, the concord of the Greeks and the expedition against the Persian are the orator's main themes; he combines in himself the Athenian patriot with the panhellenic advisor, searches for the harmonization of competitive with moral values and represents the humanitarian ideal of the balanced development of the individual, whose influence is present until today. Isocrates remains consistent in his ideas equally when he refers to the Athenian democratic community or the Greek monarchs. In *On the Team of Horses* he turns Alcibiades' apology into an encomium and presents him as a highly individual personality who works for the benefit of the city. *Helen* and *Busiris* are rhetorical exercises in which the orator presents his political, moral and religious ideas and uses the myth to serve his own purposes. *Evagoras* is a unique text because Isocrates praises a contemporary historical person in a way that combines the values of choral lyric poetry and the political virtues of funeral orations. In *On the Antidosis* the orator emphasizes the importance of the social distinction of the orator and the citizen, but acknowledged the issue of the estrangement of the individual from the city, as the case of his pupil Timotheus shows. In the *Panegyricus* he argues that the Isocratean rhetorical *paideia* defines the mental superiority of Athens in the Greek world and presents an ideal *patrios politeia* of Athens and Sparta, where the leaders of the past led their cities to victory in the Persian wars. In *On the Peace* he turns against the immoral, imperialistic Athenian foreign policy and in the *Philip* he sees the Macedonian king who can incarnate the orator's panhellenic ideal. The authenticity of the orator's periodic style is based on an approach of poetry and prose so that the style of the epideictic speech is superior to that of the dicanic one. This chapter deserves special attention, because it fully restores Isocrates to his rightful place as a serious philosophical and political thinker.

Chapter 6 – Oratory comes to its peak with the political orator Demosthenes, who defends the democratic ideology actively and fights with passion for Athens' leading role in Greece, fights Philip and preserves his prestige even after the defeat at Chaeronea. His characteristics are *hypokrisis* and elaboration of speech, his distinctiveness was *deinotes*. As an orator he met the ultimate renown, while his politics is ambivalent for his crit-

ics, as his life was. A. is praiseworthy for his analysis of the arguments and rhetorical figures that Demosthenes uses to achieve his goal in each speech.

Chapter 7 – Aeschines puts emphasis on the exploitation of common sense for the conviction of Timarchus, poses as a defender of democracy and representative of the useful rumour when he faces Demosthenes' accusations of bribery, is a moralist, emotional and passionate, reversing Demosthenes' image as a useful individual to Athens when he accuses him as unworthy of taking a crown for his service to Athens. The author offers a very careful and balanced approach to Aeschines' rhetoric, which points out the danger of comparing him with Demosthenes in order to assess him.

Chapter 8 – Dionysius of Halicarnassus judged Isaeus as an immoral orator, who wanted to trick his hearers even when he took up honest and fair cases, but the truth is that he was a professional orator, a specialist in inheritance law and adoptions who made ends meet through his logographic activity without caring so much about the moral dimension of his art. Isaeus objects to the validity of a will by turning the jurors' attention to the intentions of the man who wrote the will (Isae. I), defends an adoption (Isae. II), treats the difficult issue of an inheritance without a will (Isae. VIII) and innovates by reading and commenting on laws (Isae. XI).

Chapter 9 – Lycurgus is the politician who tried to restore Athens to its old glory and became a merciless public attorney who used rhetoric as one of several means to teach his fellow citizens, passionately criticized the general Autocles who lost the battle of Chaeronea; in his formal, serious and grand speech *Against Leocrates* Lycurgus showed his religiosity and castigated this man's decision to abandon the city in the time of danger.

Chapter 10 – The works of the famous anti-Macedonian orator Hyperides are almost lost. He underestimated and ridiculed the accusation of Polyeuctus against Euxenippus and posed as a man experienced in law and politics, presented Lycophron as an honest and simple man, peaceful citizen who ridiculed his opponent Ariston; in his funeral speech Hyperides' emphasis on the general Leosthenes is strongly influenced by Isocrates, who had chosen to praise contemporary individuals.

Chapter 11 – Dinarchus constitutes the end of the rhetoric of the classical era. Due to his fame, he undertook to write prosecution speeches for the Harpalus case. In his *Against Demosthenes* he made a harsh and passionate attack against the famous orator, he borrowed passages from Aeschines and analyzed the concept that the advisors and leaders of the state are responsible for the city's misfortune or happiness; he castigated Aristogeiton as a son and citizen; uttered *hybreis* against Philocles and argued for a common front between his rhetoric and the demos against the demagogues.

As a whole, the book is founded on a perfect familiarity with all the literary evidence, and epigraphic included, when this serves the author's arguments. Moreover, it builds on an enormous bulk of studies on rhetoric. Its careful pedigree of scholars from 1800 through the most recent publications is most impressive. It includes several 'position' statements about controversial issues but it still remains comprehensive in its engagement with these scholarly controversies. The author manages to deal with all things useful or necessary to a better understanding of his subject under discussion and at the same time he expresses his opinion clearly and holds strong views on all matters, making several new and valuable observations. All in all, the book reveals immense erudition.

A few notes on points of detail. (1) p. 30, n. 26. Regarding the Athenian defeat at Aegospotami and the references to it by using euphemism add A. Kapellos, Xenophon and the Execution of the Athenian Captives at Aegospotami, *Mnemosyne* 66 (2013), 465-468, and A. Kapellos, *Lysias 21: A Commentary*, Berlin - Boston 2014, 98-99. (2) pp. 76-77. For the treatment of Isocrates in Pl. *Phdr.* 278e-279b add R.B. Rutherford, *The Art of Plato*, London 1995, 250-251. (3) p. 225. On A.'s excellent comment on Isocrates' reference to athletics it would be worth including Kyle's analysis on the subject (D.G. Kyle, *Athletics in Ancient Athens*, Leiden 1987, 127-131, 134-135). (4) p. 234. In Isocr. VIII 29 the orator says that the Athenians forced the Greek cities συντάξεις διδόναι. A. translates the word as φόρους (*tributes*). The translation of the word is ambivalent, but I think we should translate it literally as εισφορές (*contributions*) because of the ideological difference that the words φόροι and συντάξεις denoted for the Athenians and their allies in the Second Athenian League. Among the guarantees offered to prospective members of the League in the decree of Aristoteles (*IG II<sup>2</sup> 43, TOD 123*), was that they would pay no φόρος (l. 23), but they were expected to make a contribution to the League treasury and the sum of these συντάξεις helped operate the navy and meet other necessary expenses. According to Plutarch *Vit. Sol.* 15, 2, the Athenians covered up unpleasant things with auspicious names, so they made a euphemism by calling τούς δὲ φόρους συντάξεις, while Harpocration, *s.v.* σύνταξις, says that the Athenians ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ τούς φόρους συντάξεις, ἐπειδὴ χαλεπῶς ἔφερον οἱ Ἕλληνες τὸ τῶν φόρων ὄνομα, Καλλιστράτου οὕτω καλέσαντος, ὡς φησι Θεόπομπος ἐν ἱ Φιλιππικῶν. Thus, Isocrates, aware of the Athenians' use of the euphemism, kept the word συντάξεις to express his disagreement about the collection of these contributions (D. Whitehead, Ο ΝΕΟΣ ΔΑΣΜΟΣ, *Hermes* 126, 1998, 182-183), even if they were not exactly like the φόροι of the Athenian hegemony of the 5<sup>th</sup> century. (5) pp. 230-231. I may disagree with A. that Pericles in Thuc. II 63, 2-4, creates the image

of a city-tyrant, which is violent and arbitrary. Pericles acknowledged that the empire which the Athenians ruled was nothing short of a tyranny (ὡς τυραννίδα γὰρ ἤδη ἔχετε αὐτήν). The great politician made this argument because the Athenians did not refuse their hegemonic rule but their rule was moderate, since they treated their allies with justice because of him. The Corinthians had no reason not to call Athens τύραννον ... πόλιν (I 122, 3) and urged the Spartans to fight against the πόλιν τύραννον (I 124, 3), but Thucydides' readers knew that this accusation was not true yet. Pericles' successor Cleon did not believe that Athens should rule with moderation, but characteristically urged a course of violence-death to the Mytileneans and said to his fellow citizens that τυραννίδα ἔχετε τὴν ἀρχήν (II 37, 2), cf. V. Hunter, *Athens Tyranny: A New Approach to Thucydides*, *CJ* 69 (1973-1974), 120-123. Isocrates refers to the Athenian ἀρχήν (VIII 69), but it is not necessary that he has Pericles in mind. (6) p. 311, n. 76. For dating Demosthenes' *Olynthiacs* add C.J. Tuplin, *Demosthenes' Olynthiacs and the Character of the Demegoric Corpus*, *Historia* 47 (1998), 276-320, especially 276-291. (7) p. 366. For the revision of the speeches of Dem. XIX and Aesch. II before publication see also T. Hubbard, *Getting the Last Word: Publication of Political Oratory as an Instrument of Historical Revisionism*, in E.A. Mackay (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greco-Roman World*, Leiden 2008, 183-200. (9) p. 370, n. 33. For N. Worman, *Insult and Oral Excess in the Disputes between Aeschines and Demosthenes*, *AJP* 125 (2004), 1-25, see now the improved version of this paper in N. Worman, *Abusive Mouths in Classical Athens*, Cambridge 2008, 213-274. (10) p. 371. For the importance of rumour in Aeschines' argumentation S. Gotteland, *La rumeur chez les orateurs attiques: vérité ou vraisemblance?*, *AC* 66 (1997), 93-94, 107, 112-118, would strengthen A.'s analysis. (11) p. 563. For E.M. Harris, *Open Texture in Athenian Law*, *Dike* 3 (2000), 27-79, see now E.M. Harris, *The Rule of Law in Action in Democratic Athens*, Oxford 2013, 175-212.

A. chooses to create a separate bibliography for each chapter; this has the merit that readers can have a panoramic view of the academic development on each subject. On the other hand, A. cannot but repeat citing the same bibliography in other parts of his book. For instance, in p. 524 (bibliography for chapter 3) A. cites 2 papers on the *Rhetoric ad Alexandrum*, which he cites again in p. 359 (bibliography for chapter 7).

The Index includes references to the titles of the speeches cited, but I think that it would be useful for the reader if the author also cited the section numbers within the speeches.

The book has been impeccably proofread: I noticed only «Junis» instead of «Yunis» (p. 62, n. 2).



But remarks like mine are not meant to detract from A.' achievement. The book teaches its lesson well and lives up to the high standard it sets for itself. A. has done us an immense service with this book, which can be used with great profit by advanced students and professional readers alike. It is, in fact, absolutely indispensable for a thorough understanding of Greek rhetoric during the 4<sup>th</sup> century. It will be a great benefit for all if the book is translated in English.

AGGELOS KAPPELLOS  
*University of Ioannina, Greece*  
agkap75@yahoo.gr