Demosthenes

SELECTED POLITICAL SPEECHES

EDITED BY JUDSON HERRMAN

CAMBRIDGE GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS

DEMOSTHENES

SELECTED POLITICAL SPEECHES

EDITED BY
JUDSON HERRMAN
Frank T. McClure Professor of Greek and Latin
Allegheny College, Pennsylvania

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

To the memory of
Albert Henrichs

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Demosthenes, as an emerging political leader between 351 and 341 BC, delivered a series of fiery speeches to the collected citizenry of Athens in its democratic Assembly. In these speeches he attacked the Macedonian king Philip II as an aggressive imperialist bent on destroying Athens and its way of life. The surviving written texts are the only extant examples of actual Athenian Assembly speeches. This volume presents the Greek text of five of these speeches, with introduction and commentary. In them we can see how the foremost politician of the day presented his arguments to the people who made policy decisions in the Assembly, and how he eventually persuaded the voters to support his doomed militaristic position in preference to the more pragmatic stance of accommodation advocated by his political opponents. These speeches are not only invaluable sources for the ideology and political history of this crucial period; they are the best examples of persuasive rhetoric in action from democratic Athens. Demosthenes was an admired master of Greek prose style, and in these speeches he developed a deliberative mode that utilized striking sentence structures and dense metaphorical imagery to build and reinforce his arguments.

The primary audience for this book are advanced students who may have little experience with Demosthenic Greek. The notes are designed to elucidate this difficult text so that they can read and appreciate its distinctive style. Furthermore, since we lack recent commentaries intended for specialists, I have also endeavored to address some of the concerns of scholarly readers; my notes consider political, cultural, and literary history and aim to provide references to key discussions and sources.

The speeches are presented here in the traditional sequence, which places the first *Philippic* of 351 after the *Olynthiacs* of 349/8. I have decided to keep this order because the *Olynthiacs* are shorter, and students may find it more manageable to begin with them before reading the longer *Philippics*. As an accommodation, this volume's notes on the first *Olynthiac* are deliberately simpler and less specialized than the commentaries on the other speeches. Ample cross-references link the notes, and I hope those will forestall any chronological confusion arising from my decision to begin with the *Olynthiacs*.

It has taken me almost as long to write this book as it took Demosthenes to develop the series of speeches. Along the way I have received much help and support, and it is a pleasure to acknowledge friends, colleagues, and benefactors. In 2012 I received support from the Margo Tytus Visiting Scholars Program at the University of Cincinnati, and I wish to thank Getzel Cohen for his hospitality, and the staff of the John Miller Burnam Classics Library, who have welcomed my repeated and ongoing visits to

ABBREVIATIONS

APF	J. K. Davies, *Athenian propertied families, 600–300 BC*. Oxford 1971.
CAH	D. M. Lewis, J. Boardman, S. Hornblower, and M. Ostwald (eds.), *Cambridge ancient history*. Vol. 6: The fourth century BC. 2nd ed. Cambridge 1994.
FGrHist	F. Jacoby, *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. 15 vols. Berlin 1923–1958.
GHI	P. J. Rhodes and R. Osborne, *Greek historical inscriptions 404–323 BC*. Oxford 2003.
GP	J. D. Denniston, *The Greek particles*. 2nd ed. Oxford 1954.
GPM	K. J. Dover, *Greek popular morality in the time of Plato and Aristotle*. Oxford 1974.
GPS	J. D. Denniston, *Greek prose style*. Oxford 1952.
Harris	E. M. Harris, *Aeschines and Athenian politics*. New York and Oxford 1995.
HM	N. G. L. Hammond and G. T. Griffith, *A history of Macedonia*. Vol. 2. Oxford 1979.
IG	*Inscriptiones Graecae*. Berlin 1873–.
K–A	R. Kassel and C. Austin, *Poetae comici Graeci*. 8 vols. Berlin 1983–2001.
LGPN	M. J. Osborne and S. G. Byrne, *A lexicon of Greek personal names*. Vol. 2: Attica. Oxford 1994.
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, and H. S. Jones, *A Greek–English lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford 1940 and 1996. References are to word entries and their sections.
OLD	P. G. W. Glare (ed.), *Oxford Latin dictionary*. Oxford 1982.
PAA	J. S. Traill, *Persons of ancient Athens*. 21 vols. Toronto 1994–2012.
P.Oxy.	*The Oxyrhynchus papyri*. London 1898–. References are to volume and item number. See www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy (accessed August 11, 2017).
Ronnet	G. Ronnet, *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques*. Paris 1951.
Sealey	R. Sealey, *Demosthenes and his time: a study in defeat*. New York and Oxford 1993.
SEG	*Supplementum epigraphicum Graecum*. Leiden, Amsterdam 1923–.
Smyth	H. W. Smyth, *Greek grammar*. Cambridge, MA. 1920.
Wooten	C. Wooten, *A commentary on Demosthenes'* Philippic I: *with rhetorical analyses of* Philippics II *and* III. New York and Oxford 2008.
Yunis	H. Yunis, *Demosthenes. On the crown*. Cambridge 2001.

Greece, Macedon, and the Aegean

INTRODUCTION

1 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.1 The Early Career of Demosthenes

Demosthenes (D.) was born in 384 to a prominent and wealthy family.[1] His father died when he was a child, in 376, and his earliest speeches were prosecutions of his appointed guardians for financial mismanagement of the estate, delivered in the late 360s, after he had reached the age of majority in 366.[2] Although the suits appear to have been successful, much of the money and property could not be recovered, and D. apparently published his early speeches against his guardians as a vehicle to launch his career as a speechwriter (a λογογράφος) for hire.[3] This work was lucrative; D. acquired the means to make substantial tax contributions to the city, both by paying special war levies for several years (the εἰσφορά), and by funding a ship in the Athenian navy as a voluntary trierarch in 357.[4] A few items in the Demosthenic corpus are perhaps speeches of this sort from early in his career; their content provides no reason to believe that D. (if he wrote them) had any ulterior personal or political motive beyond earning his fee.[5]

D. continued to write speeches for others in private court cases in the 340s, while at the same time cultivating a public role as a politician.[6] He composed speeches for several prosecutions in public cases of γραφὴ παρανόμων, in which he charged that other politicians had passed improper measures (3.12n. παθεῖν).[7] Cases of this sort, concerned with the general laws of Athens, were high-profile; D.'s involvement in them signals a move toward a political career. Three of these orations were written for others to deliver in court, but they differ from the private court

---

[1] D. was son of Demosthenes of the deme Paiania: *LGPN* s.v. 37, *PAA* 318625; also *APF* no. 3597. For a general discussion see MacDowell 2009: 14–58. Details of D.'s early life can be gathered from Plutarch's biography (Lintott 2013: 47–81), the anonymous life preserved in [Plut.] *Mor.* 844a–8d (see Roisman et al. 2015: 211–46) and from the Demosthenic speeches against his guardians (or. 27–31, MacDowell 2004: 9–11, 19–83).

[2] Or. 27–8: 364/3; or. 29–31: 362/1.　　[3] Carey and Reid 1985: 18–19.

[4] D. 21.157, 161. D. had borrowed money to serve as trierarch in 364/3 (D. 28.17). For these types of service see 1.6n. χρήματα, 2.30n. τριηραρχεῖν.

[5] Usher 1999: 184–9 discusses 41 and 55 as speeches that D. wrote as a λογογράφος prior to his trierarchy in 357. There are, however, stylistic reasons for doubting D.'s authorship of both: McCabe 1981: 170.

[6] Surviving speeches written by D. for the court cases of others in the 340s: or. 39 (348/7) and 38 (346 or later). Other speeches unlikely to have been written by D.: 40 (347), 43 (late 340s), 48 (343/2 or 342/1).

[7] Or. 20 and 24 were written for a different, but related, legal procedure, the γραφὴ νόμον μὴ ἐπιτήδειον θεῖναι. See Canevaro 2016b.

1

cases in that D. is able to discuss issues of public import, such as the public finances, the rule of law, and foreign policy.[8] During this period D. began to address the δῆμος directly on political matters, first in a public prosecution, and in the following years in speeches to the Assembly.[9] These speeches cover a variety of topics, and what links them is D.'s effort as a budding political advisor with the best interests of the city at heart; as in his recent public prosecution speeches, he continues to focus on public finance and foreign policy. In *Against Leptines* (or. 20) he argued against a proposal to curtail honorary exemptions from taxation; he maintained that the financial benefits accruing from the objectionable proposal were small, and that the measure would discourage benefactors and harm the city. In *On the Symmories* (or. 14) D. proposed reforms to the system for taxes and military funding as a response to the threat of Persian interference with Athenian allies.[10] And in *For the Megalopolitans* (or. 16) he argued that it was in the interests of the Athenians to prevent Sparta from dominating neighboring states in the Peloponnese.

At the end of the 350s D. commenced a series of Assembly speeches against Philip, which will be discussed below (Introd. §1.3), after a consideration of Philip's activity during the period leading up to the debates regarding him in Athens (Introd. §1.2). To conclude this account of D.'s activity prior to his focus on Philip, it should be observed that D. continued to address other topics in the Assembly even after taking notice of Philip. Indeed, in *For the Freedom of the Rhodians* (or. 15), delivered in 351/0, the year after the first *Philippic*, he advocated support for exiled Rhodian democrats opposed to the newly established government in Rhodes that was backed by the Persian king. In one brief aside he even suggested that Philip posed little threat to Athens.[11]

In summary, the first decade of D.'s career as an orator finds him engaged with various topics, private and public, both working as a speechwriter for hire and speaking in his own voice on key political issues, including, but not limited to, the question as to how Athens should respond to Philip of Macedon. Although D.'s positions in these early political speeches evince a real effort to serve the city, it is clear that he was not a prominent

---

[8] Public prosecutions written for others: 22 (355/4), 24 (353/2), 23 (352/1); for an overview see Canevaro 2015: 326–8. Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 1.4 presents the chronology for D.'s early public prosecutions and Assembly speeches; for a full discussion see Sealey 1955.

[9] Or. 20 (355/4) is a prosecution. D.'s earliest Assembly speeches are or. 14 (354/3) and 16 (353/2). Or. 13 is Demosthenic in style (McCabe 1981: 170); if it is authentic, it may have been delivered in 353/2. Or it may be a third-century pastiche of Demosthenic material: Sing 2017.

[10] For the symmories see 2.29n. πρότερον.

[11] D. 15.24. Dion. Hal. *Amm.* 1.4 provides the date, which has been doubted (Trevett 2011: 257–8) but is supported by historical detail in the speech (Badian 2000: 31–2).

leader in Assembly debate, and the policies he advocated may not have been realistic or well conceived; his speech *Against Aristocrates* (or. 23) does not notice Philip as a threat to Athenian interests in the Chersonese, and *For the Megalopolitans* perhaps misjudged the political situation in the Peloponnese.[12] These strengths and weaknesses would be visible in his later speeches too, after he focused his attention on Philip.

1.2 Macedon and the Rise of Philip

Macedon was a Greek kingdom extending northwest from the Thermaic Gulf, bordered by Thessaly to the south, Illyria to the west, Paeonia to the north, and Chalcidice and Thrace to the east.[13] It stood apart from other Greek states in various ways: it was ruled by a king, who held sway among a group of lesser tribal kings and leaders; the basis of the status of these men was their ability on the battlefield and in the hunt; settled cities were fewer in number, smaller in size, and established later than elsewhere in Greece. Macedon during the classical period is reminiscent of Homeric Greece, where local warrior kings banded together to fight for the cause of a powerful leader. Athenian critics focus on these distinctive aspects and ignore the Hellenic heritage of the Macedonian royal house; D. characterizes Philip as a violent tyrant opposed to Greek values (1.3n. τὰ δ᾽, 2.18n. τήν, 9.16n. τό).

Philip II was born in 383 or 382, the third son of the Macedonian king Amyntas III.[14] After his father's peaceful death in 369, his two elder brothers ruled in succession. The eldest, Alexander II, was assassinated by a rival for the throne, just a year or two after his father's death. The next son, Perdiccas III, eventually consolidated his rule in 365 after a period of strife, only to die in battle against the Illyrians in 359. Philip inherited a kingdom that was politically unstable and threatened by its neighbors.

The situation was pressing, and from the start of his rule Philip devoted himself to training and leading a capable military force; his position depended entirely on its support. Its effectiveness was demonstrated quickly, as Philip defeated a royal pretender, Argaeus, close to home in 360 or 359, and then led campaigns against the Paeonians and Illyrians in order to secure the state's mountainous borders to the north and west.[15] These regions were the source of the most immediate and urgent threats, and once they had been stabilized, he was able to direct his attention to the east and south. From these quarters there was less fear of imminent

---

[12] Cawkwell 1978: 79–80.

[13] Macedon is the political state, Macedonia the geographic region. On the Greek ethnicity, see 3.16n. βάρβαρος.

[14] For a succinct biography see Heckel 2008: s.v. Philip [1].

[15] *HM* 210–14, Cawkwell 1978: 29–30.

invasion; rather Philip stood to gain material resources along with further stability on his borders.

To the east, the city of Amphipolis was strategically located not far from the mouth of the river Strymon; it was one of the few places where armies could cross, and the river provided access to valuable mines and timber. The Athenians had founded a military colony there in 437/6, only to lose it in battle with the Spartan general Brasidas in 424; they aspired to reestablish their presence in the years leading up to 357 (2.2n. πόλεων). To this end, they had supported the pretender Argaeus, and their fleet had gained control of the important northern port of Methone.[16] Philip was eager to reduce their influence in the region, and, according to D., he took advantage of their interest in Amphipolis by offering control of the city to them if they did not interfere with his assault on it, and if they would refrain from aiding their ally Pydna when Philip proceeded to march on it (1.5n. Ἀμφιπολιτῶν, 2.6n. τῶι). If there was such an agreement, Philip declined to keep it.[17] After his capture of Amphipolis his position was stronger, and the Athenians became tied down with the Social War.[18]

Philip took the opportunity to subdue and detach three key maritime positions from the Athenian alliance. Between late 357 and early 354 he gained control of Pydna and Methone, which were in the heart of Macedonian territory, just south of the royal cities, while also moving against Potidaea, on the Chalcidice (1.9nn.). He formed an alliance with the Chalcidian League, and by offering the League control of Potidaea he sought to reduce the prospect of Athenian influence in the Thermaic Gulf (2.1n. τάς).

In the late 350s Philip extended Macedonian control further south. Several considerations may have motivated him: he may have worried that conflicts between Thessaly and Pherae could destabilize his southern frontier; or he may have been drawn by the military capability of the large and skilled corps of Thessalian cavalry; perhaps he saw the potential advantages that the port of Pagasae offered. His support of the Thessalians in the third Sacred War against Pherae and Phocis prolonged that conflict and enabled him to pursue his goals in the north without worrying about interference from the south.[19] As part of this effort on behalf of Thessaly, he suffered his first military setbacks with a pair of losses to the Phocian general Onomarchus in 353. But after regrouping over the winter he gained a decisive victory at the battle of the Crocus Field in 352, which extended his sphere of influence into Thessaly and allowed him to gain and keep control of Pagasae (2.7n. Θετταλούς, 2.14n. νυνί).

[16] Heskel 1996.

[17] On the alleged pact see de Ste Croix 1963. D. consistently refers to Philip's seizure of Amphipolis as the beginning of war with Athens: 4.25n. Φιλίππωι.

[18] Cf. 3.28n. οὕς.   [19] On the third Sacred War see Introd. §1.3.

These conflicts brought Philip into direct contact with central Greece, and that narrative will be continued in the next section. In conclusion to this account of Philip's activity over the years leading up to the first *Philippic*, we should add that Philip was considering expansion to the east too already in the 350s. In 356, after the capture of Amphipolis, Philip had established a settlement at Philippi in Thrace; later, in 352, after the victory at the Crocus Field, he initiated a siege of Heraion Teichos, on the shore of the approach to the Hellespont, but is reported by D. to have abandoned the mission due to illness (1.13nn. τούς and ἠσθένησεν). Philip's activity in central Greece and Thrace anticipates his direction in the 340s.

1.3 D., Athens, and Philip

Following Philip's victory over Onomarchus in 352, before his attempt on Heraion Teichos, he marched on the pass at Thermopylae, where he was met by Athenian forces and rebuffed without an engagement (1.13n. πάνθ᾽, 1.26n. ἐάν). Philip also provoked the Athenians in late 352 with raids on their territories in the northern Aegean, at the islands Lemnos and Imbros, and on the coast of Attica itself at Marathon (4.34nn. εἰς Λῆμνον and εἰς Μαραθῶνα). His support of the Thessalians in battle against Pherae and Phocis involved him closely in the affairs of central Greece; these states had been opponents in the third Sacred War since 355 (3.8n. ἀπειρηκότων). Philip's role in ending that war in 346 will be considered below in this section as a defining moment in his relations with Athens, and in the career of D.

These provocations and, more generally, the future threat that Philip posed to Athenian interests, were the context for the debate in Athens at which D. delivered his first *Philippic* in 352/1.[20] At the start of the speech D. describes it as his first foray into the question of policy regarding Philip, and there is no clear indication of a precise point in time for the debate. Philip had not yet attacked Olynthus, but the Chalcidian League was increasingly wary of his intentions after he failed to keep his promise regarding Potidaea (D. 4.4, 2.1n. τάς), and they provoked him by harboring his step-brothers, rivals for the throne.[21] D.'s proposal to locate a permanent fleet in the north was unrealistic and unfeasible, due to the lingering financial pressure in the aftermath of the Social War. Instead, the Athenians decided to dispatch a small fleet with Charidemus at this time, though its departure was seriously delayed (D. 3.5).

Such a small force was unable to prevent Philip's operation against the cities of the Chalcidian League, and during the year leading up to his

[20] For the date and context see Badian 2000: 33–4, Cawkwell 2011: 370–7.
[21] *HM* 315, Harris 46.

siege of Olynthus in 349/8 he conducted an offensive campaign against
the smaller cities of the League (2.1n. δύναμιν, 9.26n. δύο). After these
cities were reduced, Olynthus was in a very weak position. D. presents their
appeals for an alliance with Athens as an opportunity to stop Philip in
the north and prevent him from renewing his attempts on central and
southern Greece (D. 1.2–9, 25). The Athenians made a formal alliance
with the Chalcidian League, and approved three separate forces to come
to the aid of Olynthus that year (3.6n. παντί). D.'s three *Olynthiac* speeches
address the question of aid for the Chalcidian League during the siege of
Olynthus.[22] The Athenians' first two forces appear to have achieved little,
and the third fleet arrived too late.[23] Philip destroyed the city and enslaved
its inhabitants.[24]

After destroying Olynthus, Philip was in firm control of neighboring
regions. He had already shown interest in extending his reach into Thrace,
a territory with abundant natural resources and access to the Hellespont.
The Athenians had long laid claim to the Chersonese, which was vital
for the security of the grain trade from the Black Sea on which the city
depended, and Athens had recently made an alliance with various kings in
the region.[25] Philip saw that diplomacy could smooth his path in Thrace,
but the Athenians were slow to respond to his overtures. However, in
346 the Athenian politician Philocrates passed a decree in the Athenian
Assembly to initiate the peace process; after a period of protracted negoti-
ations, Philip and the Athenians agreed to peace and an alliance.[26] D. was
one of the ambassadors who negotiated the terms, and for a brief period
he put aside his hostility to Philip and supported the peace.[27]

At the same time, Philip took a role in the Sacred War. His previous
support for Thessaly aligned him with Thebes in opposition to Phocis.
When in mid-346 the Phocian leader Phalaecus was forced to flee cen-
tral Greece after being abandoned by his Athenian allies, Philip granted
him safe passage. The Phocians had no choice but to surrender and agree

---

[22] It is tempting to take D.'s three *Olynthiacs* as documents from the three debates
in which the Assembly decreed to send forces to support Olynthus. However, the
speeches are too vague about their precise context and specific proposals to permit
such an assumption. Discussions of the chronology have pointed to changes in tone
and focus among the three speeches, but none of these differences amount to
compelling evidence for a particular sequence; they could be placed in any order.
See Tuplin 1998: 276–80.

[23] Sealey 138–43, Cawkwell 2011: 381–7.

[24] On current excavations at Olynthus see sites.lsa.umich.edu/olynthos-project
(accessed August 11, 2017). Cf. 9.26n. Ὄλυνθον.

[25] *IG* II² 127 = *GHI* no. 53. Cf. 9.16n. βασιλεύς.

[26] For the detailed terms see 9.1n. τήν.

[27] In late 346, in *On the Peace* (or. 5), he advises the Athenians to abide by the
arrangement they have made with Philip and to wait for the right moment to go to
war (5.17 ὁ μέλλων πόλεμος).

to the harsh terms set by the Amphictyonic Council. Philip probably welcomed the advantages granted to the Thebans, while the Athenians saw their hopes and expectations thwarted (9.11nn. εἰς and ἤριζον). In addition to this tension, the Athenians were frustrated by Philip's renewed activity in Thrace beginning earlier that year (9.15nn. Σέρριον and τούς). The peace had become an embarrassment to Athens, and in later years, D., among others, denied his own culpability during the peace process and accused his fellow ambassadors of corruption. The year 346 marked an important development in D.'s policy: he began to blame his political opponents in Athens for Philip's success (9.53n. μισῆσαι).

To Philip, the resolution of the Sacred War offered a new basis for power in central Greece. He assumed the seat of Phocis on the Amphictyonic Council, and at the Phocians' behest he sent a deputy to preside at the Pythian Games in 346 (9.32n. τίθησι). He was given special privileges in consulting the oracle at Delphi, which was a mark of his new standing in Greece (9.32n. τήν). More significantly, he now had control of Thermopylae, which made it possible for him to intervene readily in Greek affairs (9.32n. Πυλῶν). He demonstrated his power in central Greece by reorganizing the political system and installing military garrisons in Thessaly by 344 (9.26nn. οὐχί and τετραρχίας). He took an interest in the Peloponnese, where he sought to diminish the power of Sparta by supporting Argos and Messene (9.17n. τά). Outside of Athens, Philip came to be seen as a powerful ally, who could guarantee the independence and autonomy of smaller cities.[28]

D. presents these activities as evidence of Philip's disregard for the peace, but his perspective did not win approval in the Assembly until later. In 344 he went on a diplomatic mission that seems only to have prompted Argos, Messene, and Philip himself to complain to the Assembly about Athenian meddling and collusion with Sparta.[29] On that occasion D. delivered the second *Philippic* (or. 6), in which he decried Philip's plans to isolate Athens, and complained that the peace had helped Philip and was a hindrance to Athens (e.g., D. 6.7, 28–36). In the aftermath of this debate disagreement about the Athenian commitment to the peace grew. Philip proposed modifications that were rejected in Athens; furthermore, there were new efforts to undermine public confidence in the peace: Philocrates was prosecuted as a traitor in 343, and in the same year D. accused his political opponent Aeschines of corruption during the negotiation of the peace.[30] Philocrates fled Athens, and Aeschines was narrowly acquitted; this is an indication of how closely divided the city was over the issue.

Athenian dissatisfaction did not hinder Philip's efforts in Greece. According to D., in 343 Philip installed his partisans in the Peloponnesian

---

[28] Cawkwell 1963: 203. Cf. Plb. 18.14 on the Peloponnesians and Philip.
[29] Harris 110–12.   [30] Harris 112–15.

city of Elis and, closer to Athens, at Megara (9.17nn. τά and Μεγάρων),
and he was behind political revolutions in Euboea that began at this time
(9.33n. τοὺς μέν, 9.58n. Ἱππόνικον, 9.59n. Φιλιστίδης). In early 342 Philip
descended from Epirus toward the Ambracian Gulf on what was likely an
exploratory mission; the Macedonians did not try to hold the position after
the Athenians displayed their readiness to resist the incursion into western
Greece (9.27n. πρότερον). Philip instead turned his attention to Thrace,
and that brought him into direct conflict with the Athenians, who had sent
their general Diopeithes to protect a military colony in the Chersonese in
343 (9.15n. οὔπω).

Philip's campaigning in Thrace from 342 added greatly to the ten-
sion with Athens arising from the recent political revolutions in various
Greek cities. This tension is the background to the two speeches that D.
delivered in the first part of 341. In *On the Chersonese* (or. 8), he defends
Athenian activity in the region (9.2n. τούς), and then, not much later,
in the third *Philippic*, he insists that the Athenians should regard Philip's
activities as open warfare, and that they should send diplomats around
Greece and mobilize a sizable force to join Diopeithes and fight Philip.
Unlike in his earliest speeches against Philip, with the third *Philippic* D.
succeeded in convincing the Athenians to follow his advice. At the end
of 341, by D.'s proposal, embassies were dispatched, and an alliance was
made with Callias of Chalcis that removed the tyrants in Euboea (9.71n.
εἰς, 9.59n. οἵπερ).

Direct engagement with Philip was soon to follow. The third *Philippic*
marked a turning point in D.'s career. The δῆμος followed his call to aban-
don the peace and commit to war with Philip. The king himself adopted a
more aggressive stance too, first in 340 by attacking Athenian allies along
the grain route at the Hellespont and impounding an Athenian trans-
port ship, and then in 339 by invading central Greece and threatening
Athens.[31] D.'s most glorious political act, in his own view at least, was bro-
kering the alliance between Thebes, Athens, and other Greeks who fought
Philip at Chaeronea in 338 (D. 18.153, 211–26). The result was a disaster
for Athens, but the city stood by D.; he received honorary crowns and was
chosen to give the funeral oration over the many who had died in battle.[32]
The defeat ended Athens' role as a leading power in Greece. Yet, for the
rest of his career, D. defended the policy of military resistance that he had

---

[31] Harris 124–33, Sealey 187–98, *HM* 566–81, 585–603.
[32] *On the Crown* (or. 18) is spoken in defense of a proposal to crown D. made
by Ctesiphon after the battle. In that speech he refers to a similar decree before
the battle, sponsored by Demomeles and Hyperides (D. 18.223–4). An extensive
fragment of Hyperides' speech regarding that crown has been recovered from the
Archimedes Palimpsest (Carey et al. 2008). D. was proud of his selection as orator
over the war dead (18.285), and the funeral oration preserved in the Demosthenic
corpus (or. 60) is likely to be authentic; see Herrman 2008.

long espoused in the *Olynthiacs* and *Philippics* by arguing that the Athenians had no alternative but to fight for the liberty of Greece, just as they had done in the Persian Wars.[33]

2 ASSEMBLY SPEECHES

Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, a handbook on persuasive discourse, distinguishes three types of oratory, which differ according to the speaker's purpose and institutional context: forensic (or dicanic) speeches present accusations or defenses regarding past actions in a courtroom context; display (or epideictic) speeches praise or blame the present condition of their subject in the context of a formal ceremony or a rhetorical performance; deliberative (or symbouleutic) speeches advocate policy regarding future events at a political meeting such as the Athenian Assembly (Arist. *Rh.* 1.3.1–2 [1358a–b]).

The Assembly (ἡ ἐκκλησία) met in the open air at the Pnyx, a hill near the Agora and Acropolis in central Athens. Meetings were held at least 40 times per year, and the Assembly was the main democratic body in Athens, making policy decisions on a wide range of topics, including war and peace, public finances, and foreign diplomacy.[34] The agenda for each meeting was set in advance by the Council (ἡ βουλή), a group of 500 annually appointed representatives of the citizenry, and a rotating subset of the Council officiated at the Assembly meetings (9.6n. πρυτανευό-μενοι); any citizen could debate or propose motions to be decided upon by the collective body of citizens in attendance (ὁ δῆμος), who typically numbered at least 6000 (cf. 2.29n. ῥήτωρ). Decisions were determined by majority vote, as demonstrated by a show of hands, but extensive debate and other institutional measures were designed to achieve a large degree of consensus among voters.[35] Meetings began with a public sacrifice (2.1n. τήν), and then speakers were invited to address the points on the agenda, with priority given to older speakers; in practice, there seems to have been a small number of 10 or 20 frequent contributors at any particular time, and a large number of men who spoke more rarely (4.1n. οἱ).

The surviving texts of the Attic orators preserve examples of the three types of speeches distinguished by Aristotle, but deliberative oratory is the least well represented.[36] The Demosthenic corpus includes 15 speeches addressed to the Athenian Assembly, and those works are the

---

[33] Yunis 2000.

[34] General background: Hansen 1991: 125–60, 1987. Frequency and schedule of meetings: E. M. Harris 2006: 81–120.

[35] Canevaro 2018, 2019. See also 3.4n. θορύβου, 9.38n. τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους.

[36] The bulk of these texts are forensic speeches; surviving display speeches include the Athenian state funeral orations and most of the writings of Isocrates.

best sources for the nature of Assembly speeches, though there are serious limitations to their value as evidence: most speeches were written by a single politician; they concern a narrow range of topics; and they are chronologically concentrated, covering a relatively brief span of time. Let us consider these difficulties, and then look at other sources of information on oratory in the Assembly, before concluding with a brief assessment of what we can learn from these speeches.

13 of the 15 Assembly speeches in the Demosthenic corpus were composed by D.[37] The two remaining speeches must have been included in the corpus by an early scribe or editor because they concern war with Philip (or. 7) or his son Alexander (or. 17), or simply because they are Assembly speeches. They are similar in policy and outlook to the other speeches by D., though they differ in style and tone. Or. 7 addresses the same points as does the second *Philippic*, and it adopts an even more aggressive stance toward Philip in 344 (cf. 9.72n. Ἡγήσιππος). Or. 17 is later, probably from 331, and it too calls for the Athenians to abandon the terms of their alliance with Alexander and go to war.[38] Thus all these Assembly speeches reflect the perspective of D. and his political allies in opposition to Macedon. Or. 17 is the only surviving speech that was delivered after the period from 354 to 340.

No earlier Assembly speeches survive among the works of the Attic orators,[39] and it is likely that D. was innovative in his decision to circulate written versions of the speeches he made in the Assembly.[40] The surviving speeches must have been selected deliberately: they are thematically linked and represent two important phases of D.'s career. Or. 13–16 were designed to establish a place for D. among the politicians of Athens; older speakers spoke first at Assembly meetings, and in these written speeches the young D. takes an opportunity to show how he handles key questions of finance and international relations. Or. 1–6 and 8–10 all focus on Athenian policy regarding Philip, spanning the period from D.'s first speech on the topic to the outbreak of war in 340, during which he emerges as the leading politician opposed to Philip. We do not have later Assembly speeches by D., from the period after the

---

[37] D.'s Assembly speeches leading up to the third *Philippic* were surveyed above; on or. 13–16 see Introd. §1.1, and for or. 1–6 and 8–9 see Introd. §1.3. The fourth *Philippic* (or. 10) is also by D., and was delivered not long after the third *Philippic* in 341. For the authenticity of these see McCabe 1981: 170–1, 196–7.

[38] Herrman 2009a: 180–2.

[39] Andoc. 3 purports to be an address to the Assembly regarding peace with Sparta in 392/1 (or possibly 387/6). However, the speech uses anachronistic terminology, and its extensive historical account is based on Aesch. 2; it should be regarded as a rhetorical fabrication written after 343, probably after the fourth century. See E. M. Harris 2000.

[40] See further Introd. §4.

defeat at Chaeronea in 338, nor is there any reason to suppose that D. ever published more Assembly speeches than those that survive today.[41] D. passed many motions in the Assembly for various sorts of proposals that are not addressed or attested in the surviving speeches, e.g., decrees of honors and citizenship, alliances, embassies, and infrastructure repair.[42] Beyond these, he must have contributed to debate regularly. The surviving speeches are packaged to present a vivid picture of D.'s position on a few key questions regarding finance, foreign policy, and Philip; they do not provide a representative or comprehensive view of his political career.

Nor do later Assembly speeches survive from other orators, though there are some paltry testimonia for later fourth-century items, whose authors presumably followed D.'s model in circulating their works.[43] Beyond the texts of the Attic orators, there are additional works that are relevant to Assembly speeches: the historians Thucydides and Xenophon recreate Assembly debates of the late fifth and early fourth centuries, and the rhetorical works of Aristotle and Anaximenes provide contemporary practical guides for the preparation of deliberative speeches.

Thucydides, writing at the end of the fifth century, explains his method for reporting speeches in his account of the Peloponnesian War: they are historical reconstructions intended to reflect the actual content of speeches as delivered when possible, while also including material that the historian imagines would have suited the occasion.[44] He does not provide clear indications of what is reported and what is created, and it is impossible for a critic to know how closely this material reflects actual practice in the Assembly. The Assembly speeches in Thucydides are carefully crafted instruments designed to express and epitomize the qualities that define the characters in the narrative. In this regard they are comparable to the speeches in Homer or Athenian tragedy; although speakers have their own individual styles, these appear to be a literary creation of Thucydides rather than a representation of speeches as actually delivered.[45] Further, the Assembly speeches in Thucydides are consistently shorter than surviving deliberative speeches; this is evidence that they

[41] Hansen 1989: 286–9.

[42] Hansen 1989: 41–2 provides the evidence for 39 decrees; a supporting speech exists for only one of these, the first *Philippic*.

[43] Hansen 1989: 286–94 collects the evidence for at most six speeches from the last half of the fourth century.

[44] Thuc. 1.22.1 ὡς δ᾽ ἂν ἐδόκουν ἐμοὶ ἕκαστοι περὶ τῶν αἰεὶ παρόντων τὰ δέοντα μάλιστ᾽ εἰπεῖν, ἐχομένωι ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῆς ξυμπάσης γνώμης τῶν ἀληθῶς λεχθέντων, οὕτως εἴρηται ("[speeches] are presented in accordance with what I think each speaker would have been likely to say about his respective affairs. I have kept as close as possible to the overall intention of what was really said").

[45] Tompkins 2013: 457–60, 1993: 111, 1972: 214.

have been reworked by the historian. He employs a selection of speeches delivered over a number of years to create a specific narrative arc, and the knowledge that comes with hindsight motivates him to stress connections that must have been less clear or developed in the immediate debates.[46] For example, Thucydides uses speeches to draw a contrast between the generalships of Pericles and Cleon, and his omission of other Assembly speeches during the period between their commands distorts the record and creates an anachronistic link between these two; similarly, his presentation of the Assembly debate regarding the punishment of Mytilene in 427 is written so as to provide a deliberate contrast with the discussion of Melos in 416.[47] The speeches of D. provide a single viewpoint from a wider debate, and in a similar way Thucydides chooses not to present a range of different opinions, but instead tends to give polarized speeches that represent extreme positions.[48]

    The argumentation of Thucydides' Assembly speeches is frequently similar to D.'s approach. Both authors suggest that speakers in the Assembly were more likely to rely on arguments of expediency or advantage than on ethical considerations.[49] For example, in Thucydides' Mytilenian debate both Cleon and Diodotus address the question of justice and expediency in their speeches, but Cleon wins the day with his analysis of the advantage for Athens in punishing the revolutionary allies.[50] Similarly D. stresses the benefits that his proposals will bring to Athens in preference to appeals to justice or other ethical considerations.[51] It is true that D. often reminds the Athenians of their duty to act, but this obligation is presented as the means to preserve the city and bring advantage to it, not as a moral imperative (2.3n. προτρέπειν). D.'s speeches present a wider array of argumentation than one finds in the more streamlined Assembly speeches in Thucydides. In particular, D. often employs extended accounts of historical precedents and examples to make his point (e.g., D. 2.14, 3.24–6, 4.24, 9.36–46), whereas the Assembly speeches in Thucydides generally lack historical examples.[52]

    Aristotle and Anaximenes each composed rhetorical handbooks that are contemporary with the speeches of D. These do not preserve evidence

---

[46] Marincola 2007: 121–2, S. Hornblower 1987: 55–66.

[47] For a catalogue of speeches in Thucydides see W. C. West 1973: 7–15.

[48] Cf. Thuc. 3.36.6: there were many speeches about Mytilene, but only two are presented.

[49] Speakers may stress τὸ συμφέρον more than τὸ δίκαιον, but the concepts are interrelated rather than antithetical: Low 2007: 160–73.

[50] On justice (τὸ δίκαιον and related terms), cf. 3.39.3, 40.3, 44.4, 47.5; on expediency (τὸ ξυμφέρον and related terms), cf. 38.1, 39.3, 40.4, 44.2–3, 47.5.

[51] Heath 1990: 391–6; cf. 1.1n. τό, 9.16n. τό.

[52] References to the Persian Wars come in addresses to audiences outside Athens: e.g., Thuc. 1.73.2, 3.10.2–6, 5.89, 6.83.1; Connor 1984: 93 n. 32.

for particular deliberative speeches; rather they are guides for prospective orators studying persuasive discourse in the Assembly, informed more by theory than by experience of actual speeches.[53] Although they give much specific advice for budding orators, they provide an extremely vague and abstract view of debate in the Assembly. Still, these guides are helpful for situating the speeches of D. within a broad context of deliberative speech. For example, Anaximenes outlines a variety of topics for speeches to the Assembly: public religion, law and institutions, international alliances, peace and war, and public finance ([Arist.] *Rh.Al.* 2.2 [1423a]; cf. Arist. *Rh.* 1.4.7 [1359b]). This comprehensive list confirms that the preserved speeches of D., in which war is the dominant theme and finance and alliances appear to a lesser extent, are a focused and select group.

The rhetorical handbooks recommend certain themes for arguments: persuasive speakers ought to address questions of justice, law, and advantage, and consider whether actions are noble, satisfying, and manageable.[54] Whereas the deliberative speeches in Thucydides are concerned primarily with justice and expediency, Xenophon's *Hellenica* illustrates a wider interest in other approaches, with attention to the feasibility and opportunity for particular policy proposals.[55] Xenophon's Assembly speeches are like Thucydides' in that they are crafted to fit a historical narrative,[56] but in this regard they are more varied and align with D.'s approach. For example, D. highlights the theme of καιρός in the *Olynthiacs*, and the first *Philippic* presents an extended argument for the means of achieving D.'s proposed goals (1.2n. καιρός, D. 4.28–30).

The Demosthenic Assembly speeches are our best sources for the nature of democratic debate in fourth-century Athens. They create a vivid picture of one politician's position regarding a few key policy areas, and they illustrate its development over a number of years. But the background to the picture is in many respects quite blurred. The specific historical moment for each of the surviving speeches is hard to pinpoint, and it is unclear how they fit into a particular debate and how they respond to other participants. Only the first *Philippic* puts forward a proposal for the approval of the δῆμος (4.16–22), and that was unsuccessful. Other evidence for Assembly debate in the historians and rhetoricians confirms that D.'s speeches address typical topics with suitable arguments, but it is very

[53] Cf. Trevett 1996b. At least the disengagement from actual Assembly speeches means that the evidence in the rhetorical handbooks is not likely to be based on the surviving texts of D. and the historians.

[54] [Arist.] *Rh.Al.* 1.4 (1421b) τὸν μὲν προτρέποντα χρὴ δεικνύειν ταῦτα ἐφ' ἃ παρακαλεῖ δίκαια ὄντα καὶ νόμιμα καὶ συμφέροντα καὶ καλὰ καὶ ἡδέα καὶ ῥᾴδια πραχθῆναι ("the advisor must show that his recommendations are just, advantageous, noble, pleasant, and easy to accomplish"). Aristotle's discussion is more diffuse but includes similar themes; cf. Usher 2008: 1–2, Heath 1990: 395–6.

[55] Usher 2008: 11–13.   [56] Gray 1989: 137–40.

difficult to judge how the audience responded. Early in his career D.'s proposals appear to have had little effect on Athenian policy, but by the late 340s his opposition to Philip won wide assent. These speeches played an important part in bringing about this change in direction, but new military and political realities must have influenced the δῆμος too.

3 LANGUAGE AND STYLE

In his Assembly speeches D.'s distinctive deliberative mode is characterized by the periodic structure of his sentences, rhythm and sound, rhetorical figures, metaphorical imagery, and variation in word choice and tone.

3.1 Sentence Structure and Word Order

D. constructs his periods in a variety of styles. The most elaborate are built on a frame of complex subordination (hypotaxis, or λέξις κατεστραμμένη); an initial main clause introduces a dependent clause that leads to further levels of subordination in a series (2.5n., 4.17n. δεῖ, 9.2n.);[57] these sentences stress the contingencies in D.'s political analysis, and they carry along the audience by "rising to a crescendo, and sinking again gradually to a quiet close."[58] At other times D. avoids subordination and instead uses a pair of syntactically parallel clauses or cola,[59] often linked by sound, sometimes to draw connections (4.33n. τῶν, 2.13n. τά), or alternatively to emphasize a point of contrast (2.3n. ὁ, 4.3n. παραδείγμασι), or again to encompass a range of possibilities (1.18n. εἴτε γάρ, 2.9n. ὅταν). This sort of parallelism stands out as D. frequently varies his constructions to avoid monotony (1.10n. εὐεργέτημ', 3.25n. ἐπί, 9.7n. μήποτε). A third common sentence structure is the tricolon, in which a sequence of three elements creates an effect of abundance: a period may comprise three main clauses (4.28n. τάλαντα); subordinate clauses may have three linked verbs (1.15n. δέδοικα); genitives absolute are placed in groups of three (3.8n. οὐδέ, 9.6n. πόλεις); a clause may contain three objects (1.6n. καί, 1.28n. τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, 2.13n. εἰσφέροντας). Often the third item is a capping phrase, a broadly general term following two specific items, creating an effect of comprehensiveness (1.24n. πρεσβευομένους, 2.13n. εἰσφέροντας, 9.21n. πάνθ'). In general, D.'s complex structures may serve a larger goal: some of his most elaborate sentences are crafted so that the syntax reflects the content of what is described (4.17n. δεῖ, 9.14n. ἐκλύσας).

[57] Here and throughout this section references to D.'s speeches are not comprehensive, but rather *exempli gratia*.

[58] *GPS* 7 on Hdt. 1.1.1.

[59] Here and in the notes "colon" is used to designate a grammatically complete segment of a sentence, an element that is punctuated with a raised dot; a clause may be main or subordinate, and is defined as a unit built around a finite verb.

D. mitigates the risk of overwhelming or tiring his audience by varying the pace. He follows long, difficult periods with shorter and simpler constructions (2.7n. ὅλως, 4.43n. ἀλλά, 9.27n. καί). He is particularly fond of brief rhetorical questions that engage the audience and take the place of more ponderous arguments (2.3n. διά, 4.2n. τί). Sometimes he imagines an audience member addressing such questions to him, so that his own presentation depicts the audience's involvement (1.14n. τί). He also strings together items in a manner that is easier to follow (parataxis, or λέξις εἰρομένη); the effect of this style is an accumulation of detail, or an impression of either the rapidity, or alternatively of the delay, involved in a sequence of actions or events (1.12n. τὸ πρῶτον, 4.8n. ἀλλά, 4.17n. εἰς). These series are often marked out with an abundance of connectives that contribute to this effect (polysyndeton; 4.4n. Πύδναν, 4.36n. ἅμα). Conversely, at other points D. accelerates his pace and adopts a more jarring tone by omitting connectives (asyndeton; 2.25n. μελλόντων, 4.29n. ἐγώ, 9.65n. καλήν).

Within his sentences D. employs several techniques of syntax and word order for varied effect. Extended articular infinitive phrases function as highly flexible substantive noun units that can incorporate their own subjects, objects, and adverbial modifiers. D. can pack significant content into these long infinitival phrases, which may then function as the subjects of much simpler main clauses (1.4n. τό, 2.1n. τό), or be incorporated in prepositional phrases (3.26n. ἐκ, 4.43n. τήν). A pair of infinitives at the start of successive clauses can highlight antithetical ideas (1.10n. τὸ μὲν … ἄν, 2.5n.). A series of infinitives in apposition may provide an emphatic answer to a simple question or allusive assertion (2.5n. τοῦ, 9.18n. τίσιν, 9.22n. τό), or serve as a means for the presentation of sequential points in a list of parallel examples or arguments (2.6–7n.). Articular infinitive phrases are a prominent and characteristic feature of D.'s Greek; these speeches are the culmination of a trend toward increased use of infinitives throughout the classical period.[60]

D. uses word order to convey emphasis and help the audience follow his presentation. We have just observed that he may put antithetical infinitives at the start of clauses, and similar placement of other items achieves the same contrasting effect (2.3n. ὁ). More generally, initial position may stress a particular word (2.8n. καιροῦ, 2.16n. κοπτόμενοι, 4.1n. τότ'), or introduce a major theme or specific example (4.11n. Ὀλυνθίοις, 4.28n. χρήματα). The initial position can spotlight a key point (4.44n. εὑρήσει), or outline a difficult sentence by marking important items that are to be understood in a series of subsequent clauses (9.3n. ὑμεῖς, 9.4n. εἶθ'). Conversely, D. frequently delays material until the end of a sentence for the

---

[60] Cf. Dover 1997: 34–6.

opposite effect, to leave it hanging in the air as a closing comment (1.16n.
συμβούλου, 1.19n. στρατιωτικά, 3.7n. ὁπωσδήποτε, 3.9n. δήπου, 3.18n.
ἑλέσθαι).

   Artful word order also occurs between the initial and final positions
of periods. D. links clauses and stresses key terms by pulling them from a
subordinate into a main clause (prolepsis; 1.21n. τὰ πράγματα). He fre-
quently separates adjectival modifiers from their nouns in order to hold
the audience's attention as they wait for the delivery of the delayed mate-
rial (hyperbaton; 1.8n. τήν, 2.1n. δαιμονίαι, 3.24n. πολλά).[61] At other
times he fuses different elements of a clause into a single expression by
means of an interlocked word order (synchysis; 2.8n. συμφέρον, 3.2n.
τοῦθ᾽, 4.51n. ἐπὶ τῶι). Short phrases are juxtaposed within or between
sentences to express succinct pointed criticism or to make subtle sugges-
tions to the audience (1.16n. συμβούλου, 2.6n. θρυλούμενον, 3.12n. μή,
4.37n. οἱ), and similar ordered placement of a series of items in a chias-
tic sequence helps the audience follow the structure of extended trains of
thought (2.26n. ὥστε, 3.1n. εἰς, 9.13n. τούτους).

3.2 Rhythm and Sound

Fourth-century prose stylists employed certain sound effects to catch the
ear of a listening audience. Isocrates was famous among critics for avoid-
ing hiatus, the pause that resulted from ending one word with a vowel
immediately before another that started with a vowel, and in his rhetor-
ical writings he explicitly acknowledges this tendency.[62] D. occasionally
imitates Isocrates (4.15n. ἡ, 9.47n. ἁπάντων), and some of his choices
regarding word order can be explained by the desire to avoid hiatus (1.1n.
προθύμως, 2.7n. τὴν γάρ, 2.8n. συμφέρον, 4.34n. τοῦ). Isocrates prior-
itized euphony and relied on various devices to achieve this goal, and
many of these are employed, though more sparingly, by D.: isocolon bal-
ances clauses of equal length (2.29n. ὑμεῖς, 4.5n. οὐδέν, 4.33n. τῶν, 9.6n.
πόλεις); homoioarchon marks a series of clauses or list items with the same
sound at the start (1.1n. προθύμως, 4.5n. οὐδέν, 9.73n. συγκαλεῖν), often
in conjunction with homoioteleuton, or rhyming endings (2.13n. πολλήν,
3.26n. ἐκ).

   Other elements of sound and rhythm were not explicitly discussed
by D.'s contemporaries, but they contribute to the distinctive style of
D.'s Greek. Alliteration, the repetition of consonants, stresses key points
(2.23n. πολεμοῦσι, 3.36n. καὶ … κατέλιπον, 9.38n. ποιεῖν). Clausulae,
or rhythmic patterns at the ends of sentences, do not appear as recurring

---

[61] Cf. Vickers 1988: 298–9.
[62] McCabe 1981: 17–22, Kennedy 1963: 73, 209. See below (Introd. §6.3) on
elision and *scriptio plena* in the MSS of D.

features in D.'s speeches (as they do in Cicero's), though he does have distinctive tendencies.[63] D.'s prose sometimes slips for a moment into a metrical mode, with an extended sequence or cluster of poetic rhythm, but in this regard it is not unusual, and most examples should be regarded as unintentional, without a deliberate effect.[64] That is not to say that D. is unaware of all such effects; he changes his pace and avoids monotony by varying his rhythm, and these changes can reinforce the sense and imagery (2.3n. διά, 2.13n. πολλήν). One metrical tendency is so pronounced that it serves as a criterion to distinguish authentic from inauthentic works in the Demosthenic corpus: D. avoids sequences of three or more short syllables to a much greater extent than do other contemporary prose writers ("Blass's Law").[65]

3.3 Rhetorical Figures

Rhetorical figures (σχήματα) include the techniques of verbal arrangement already discussed, such as antithesis, asyndeton, hyperbaton, and isocolon; metaphor, a defining aspect of D.'s thought, will be discussed below (Introd. §3.4). This section considers a miscellany of other devices, pertaining both to D.'s wording and to his thought; all of these are linked in that they follow schematic verbal and logical patterns in order to convey meaning and feeling.[66] They are the elements of rhetorical eloquence.

D. employs various sorts of phrasing, in addition to word order, to underscore his message: combined negatives stress a positive point (litotes; 1.27n. οὐδεμιᾶς, 4.36n. οὐδέν, 9.11n. ἤριζον), result clauses emphasize the extremeness of a quality or action (hypostasis; 3.1n. τά, 4.37n. ὁ). Verbal paraphrases frequently stress the Athenians' obligation to do their duty (2.3n. προτρέπειν). D. expresses vehemence through repetition of the verb εἰμί (epanadiplosis; 1.19n. ἔστιν, 2.10n. οὐ, 4.18n. εἰσί), marks key themes by repeating them in close sequence (1.19n. ἔστιν, 2.23n. οὐ), and links successive clauses by repeating an initial key word (anaphora; 9.68n. πόλλ'). On a larger scale, he often marks the close of an extended argument or section of a speech by echoing or repeating the opening words (ring composition; 1.11n. τι, 3.26n. εὐδαιμονίαν, 4.42n. ἅ).

[63] McCabe 1981: 138 observes that D. closes periods with the rhythm long-short-short-anceps more than do other authors. However, this clausula is not stressed in such a way that the audience would have taken special note of it, and D. himself may not have been conscious of this tendency.

[64] See Dover 1997: 160–82, 9.20n. ἐάν. Sandys' commentaries frequently observe such instances; e.g., on 4.10, 8.31, 9.20.

[65] McCabe 1981: 1–4; his study demonstrates that the difference between D. and others is statistically significant. See also Yunis 25.

[66] Vickers 1988: 305–22 argues for the perennial expressive vitality of rhetorical figures. Lausberg 1998 is a voluminous guide.

There is a continuum connecting specific rhetorical devices with larger methods of presentation, and on a structural level D. organizes his thoughts and arguments themselves according to rhetorical patterns. He frequently addresses his audience and uses the vocative emphatically to emphasize particular items or mark segments of the argument (apostrophe; 1.14n. ἵνα, 2.4n. μεγάλα, 4.1n.).[67] He engages the audience by imagining exchanges between them and himself (hypophora; 1.14n. τί, 1.26n., 3.16n. τίνα). He poses riddles and presents paradoxes to hold their attention and demonstrate his ability to apprehend the political situation (1.4n. τοῦθ', 1.11n. γάρ, 4.2n. ὅ, 9.5n. παράδοξον); he similarly points to the absurdity of existing Athenian policies by combining opposite terms (oxymoron; 2.6n. θρυλούμενον, 9.55n. καί). He makes telling assertions with quick references to material he is unwilling or unable to argue more carefully (paraleipsis; 1.13n. παραλείπω, 2.4n. ταῦτα, 3.27n. οἷς, 9.21n.). He creates an air of spontaneity by correcting himself (epidiorthosis; 2.2n. μᾶλλον, 3.14n. οὔτ' ἄν, 9.24n. μᾶλλον), breaking off his thought mid-sentence (aposiopesis; 3.27n. οἷς, 9.54n. οὐκ), changing the syntactical construction (anacolouthon; 1.24n. πῶς, 4.28n. χρήματα), or inserting parenthetical asides (1.3n. ἀξιόπιστος, 4.17–18n., 9.35n. ἐῶ) or exclamations (9.31n. Ἡράκλεις, 9.65n. καλήν).

3.4 Metaphorical Imagery

Among the most striking characteristics of D.'s language in these speeches is his use of personification, simile, and metaphor. This type of imagery is a distinctive feature of D.'s Assembly speeches; the expression in these speeches is more bold than that of his forensic speeches.

D. breathes life into his arguments by personifying abstract concepts such as opportunity, fortune, the political circumstances, or the Athenian δῆμος, and by invoking them in support of his proposals (1.2n. καιρός, 3.1n. τά, 3.30n. πράττειν) or as divine agents responsible for Athenian successes and failures (2.2n. τῶν, 9.38n. ἡ). Similes make an explicit comparison for the purpose of explanation or illustration, and D. often frames his policy discussion in everyday terms that the audience can easily understand: his comparisons look to the marketplace (9.39), sports (4.40n. οὐδέν), public religious festivals (18.122), or household finance (1.15n. τόν, 9.30n. ἄξιον), material familiar to his Athenian listeners.[68] He is particularly fond of medical similes, which emphasize his role as a knowledgeable advisor (2.21n., 3.33n. τοῖς, 9.29n. ὥσπερ). Rarely he presents a vivid comparison with the natural world, a type of simile more common in Homer than in Assembly speeches (9.33n. ὥσπερ).

---

[67] On the use of the vocative for emphasis, see Fraenkel 1965: 30–49.
[68] Ronnet 176–82.