



Notes on Marcus Antonius Polemo Declamations 1.15—17 and 2.21

Author(s): Craig A. Gibson

Reviewed work(s):

Source: *Classical Philology*, Vol. 105, No. 2 (April 2010), pp. 213-216

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/655631>

Accessed: 02/04/2012 07:14

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Classical Philology*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

- Griffin, A. 1992. Ovid's Universal Flood. *Hermathena* 152: 39–58.
- Gruen, E. 2004. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Hilhorst, A. 1999. The Noah Story: Was It Known to the Greeks? In *Interpretations of the Flood*, ed. F. G. Martínez and G. P. Luttikhuisen, 56–65. Leipzig.
- Koenen, L. 1976. Egyptian Influence in Tibullus. *ICS* 1: 127–59.
- Lightfoot, J., ed. and trans. 2003. *Lucian: "On the Syrian Goddess."* Oxford.
- Myers, K. S. 1994. *Ovid's Causes: Cosmogony and Aetiology in the "Metamorphoses."* Ann Arbor, Mich.
- Reed, J. D. 1997. Ovid's Elegy on Tibullus and Its Models. *CP* 92: 260–69.
- Ryder, T. T. B. 1967. Ovid, the Flood, and Ararat. *G&R* 14: 126–29.
- Speyer, W. 1986. Spuren der "Genesis" in Ovids Metamorphosen? In *Kontinuität und Wandel: Lateinische Poesie von Naevius bis Baudelaire; Franco Munari zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. F. Wagner et al., 90–99. Hildesheim.
- Tarrant, R. J., ed. 2004. *P. Ovidius Nasonis "Metamorphoses."* Oxford.
- Thomas, R. 1982. Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (64.1–18). *AJP* 103: 144–64.
- . 1986. Virgil's *Georgics* and the Art of Reference. *HSCP* 90: 171–98.
- West, M. L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod: "Theogony."* Edition with prolegomena and commentary. Oxford.
- . 1997. *The East Face of Helicon*. Oxford.
- . 2004. The Flood Myth in Ovid, Lucian and Nonnus. In *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*, ed. J. A. López Férez, 245–59. Madrid.

NOTES ON MARCUS ANTONIUS POLEMO *DECLAMATIONS* 1.15–17 and 2.21

Among the few preserved writings of the famous second-century C.E. sophist Marcus Antonius Polemo is a pair of declamations in which the fathers of two Athenians killed in the battle of Marathon compete for the right to deliver the state funeral oration over the dead.¹ The premise is a fictitious law: "there being a law at Athens that the father of the man who died most bravely in a war delivers the funeral oration" (νόμου ὄντος Ἀθηναίων τοῦ ἄριστα ἀποθανόντος ἐν πολέμῳ τὸν πατέρα λέγειν τὸν ἐπιτάφιον).² In *Declamation* 1, Euphorion, the father of Cynegirus, argues that he deserves to deliver the speech because his son died when the Persians whose ship he was trying to prevent from fleeing the battle cut off his hands. In *Declamation* 2, the unnamed father of the polemarch Callimachus argues that, in addition to considerations of his son's superior rank, he is entitled to deliver the speech because his son died after being shot by so many arrows that his corpse remained standing. This note offers a new interpretation of the argument about rank and privilege in *Declamation* 1.15–17, which I argue has been misunderstood by previous translators and commentators.³ It will help clarify not only the argument of this section, but also the argument intended to counter it in *Declamation* 2.21.

In *Declamation* 1.14–17, the father of Cynegirus argues that the father of Callimachus has no right to deliver the funeral speech merely on the basis of his son's

I wish to thank Jeffrey Beneker, Jason Osborne, Joshua D. Sosin, and the editor and anonymous readers of *CP* for their helpful suggestions.

1. On Polemo's life and writings, see Reader 1996, 7–46.

2. Greek text from Reader 1996, 98. All translations are my own unless otherwise noted.

3. Possinus 1637; Orellius 1819; and Reader 1996, 203–6. I was not able to see Possinus' edition and am dependent on Orellius' reprinting of his paraphrase.

position as polemarch. He points out that the position of polemarch is an office allotted by chance, not proof of bravery (14), and that no law or custom grants this automatic right to the fathers of polemarchs (15). He goes on to say: (15) . . . βελτίων γε μὴν καὶ δικαιότερος εἰπεῖν χρῆναι λέγειν ὅστις ἀριστεύει. (16) ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ Μιλτιάδην ἀμφισβητεῖν ἔδει τοῦ λόγου. W. W. Reader's translation is problematic: "(15) . . . Whoever has [shown] [the] bravest [deeds] [is] more qualified and more suited to speak, [indeed] to have to do the speaking. (16) It was necessary for Miltiades to wrangle the matter with [the one] determining these things."⁴

First, in the phrase εἰπεῖν χρῆναι λέγειν, Reader takes χρῆναι λέγειν as a rhetorical aside to εἰπεῖν, rather than part of a more natural chain of syntactic dependencies, and he does not clearly distinguish the aorist εἰπεῖν from the present λέγειν. The phrase εἰπεῖν χρῆναι λέγειν means "to assert that he ought to speak." Second, Reader suggests emending the "anomalous form" ἀριστεύειν to ἀριστεύειν, "[the] bravest [deeds]."⁵ But ἀριστεύειν without the definite article makes for awkward Greek. Moreover, ἀριστεύειν is simply the accusative singular of ἀριστεύς ("war hero"), a very common character in Greek declamation.⁶ The word ἀριστεύς does not occur elsewhere in Polemo,⁷ but it may be implicit in, perhaps even defined by, the law quoted at the beginning of the pair of declamations: "the man who died most bravely" (τοῦ ἀριστα ἀποθανόντος). In *Declamation* 1.15, the speaker states that "whoever has a war hero" [sc. as a son] should give the funeral speech. It was never a question which speaker had shown the bravest deeds (the brave were dead), but which speaker had a hero for a son. The claim at the end of *Declamation* 1.15, then, is that "Whoever has a war hero [as a son] is the better and more justified person to assert that he ought to speak." Rank alone did not grant that right.

The next section takes the argument about rank one step further, by appealing to the fact that even the great Miltiades was not using his superior rank to claim the right to speak. Reader's translation of the first sentence in *Declamation* 1.16 is again problematic: ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ Μιλτιάδην ἀμφισβητεῖν ἔδει τοῦ λόγου, "It was necessary for Miltiades to wrangle the matter with [the one] determining these things."⁸ Reader suggests that "[the one] determining these things" is Callimachus, who cast the decisive vote to send Athenian troops to Marathon without delay.⁹ But he was left troubled by τοῦ λόγου meaning "the matter," a meaning that it has nowhere else in Polemo's declamations.¹⁰ Moreover, there is no compelling reason for the speaker to mention a conflict between Callimachus and Miltiades here; it simply does not make sense in the context. The root of the problem is grammatical: Reader has apparently

4. Reader 1996, 107. Possinus (1637, in Orellius [1819], 21, 23) paraphrases: "Ac idem tamen censeo ejus in hoc potissimum habendam esse rationem, qui primas in bello virtutis tulit. Nunc qui eos sibi fines circumscripterit, eum video ad justissimam de hoc dicendi munere contentionem Miltiadem provocasse." Orellius comments only on the phrase ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ (see below).

5. Reader 1996, 203–4. Cf. Possinus, "qui primas in bello virtutis tulit."

6. On the *aristeus*, see Russell 1983, chap. 2 ("Sophistopolis, or the World of the *Aristeus*"), esp. 24–25.

7. Polemo uses the noun ἀριστεύειν (*Decl.* 1.32, 44; 2.28) and the verb ἀριστεύω (*Decl.* 2.27). For his various terms for valor, see Reader 1996, 189, 192, and 275.

8. Reader 1996, 107.

9. Reader 1996, 204–5. The deciding vote is mentioned in *Decl.* 2.49. Cf. Hdt. 6.109–10 with the discussion of Reader (1996, 358).

10. Reader 1996, 204.

misinterpreted ἔδει as denoting a simple past obligation;¹¹ that is, that Miltiades at some past time had to do something, and so did it. This is the meaning of ἔδει in *Declamation* 2.5, the only other occurrence of the word in this form in Polemo's declamations.¹² But in *Declamation* 1.16, both grammar and sense suggest an unfulfilled obligation in the present:¹³ "Miltiades should [now] be disputing [but is not]." The object of ἀμφισβητεῖν is the genitive τοῦ λόγου (LSJ I.3), meaning "the speech,"¹⁴ and the opposing disputant is identified in the dative (LSJ I.2) as ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ.¹⁵ The present infinitive ἀμφισβητεῖν (whose meaning "to dispute" is consistent in Polemo¹⁶) places the debate in the present time of this speech, and so should not refer to Miltiades' pre-Marathonian dispute with the now dead Callimachus. Furthermore, the present middle participle διοριζομένῳ should refer to someone who is currently "making these distinctions" (LSJ I.4) for himself or his own benefit,¹⁷ which again excludes the dead Callimachus. I interpret ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ as referring to the father of Callimachus, who (according to the speaker) is trying to establish a new policy of granting the fathers of dead polemarchs the right to deliver the funeral oration.

This interpretation is in line both with the sentences immediately following and with his opponent's response in *Declamation* 2.21. In the sentences immediately following, Cynegeirus' father gives a rationale for his argument, introducing it with an emphatic causal connective:

(16) . . . καὶ γὰρ στρατηγὸς ἐστὶν ὃς τοῦ πολέμαρχου καὶ μείζων ἐστὶ καὶ τὴν μεγίστην ἀρχὴν τοῦ πολέμου μετακεχειρισμένος {ὁ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ πατήρ} {ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀπωτέρω}· νῦν δὲ ἡμῖν ἐφείς ἱκανῶς καὶ αὐτὸς δεδήλωκεν ὡς οὐκ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀλλ' ἀπ' ἀρετῆς χρὴ παρῖναι ἐπὶ τὸν λόγον. (17) φέρε οὖν ἐπὶ τούτοις κρινώμεθα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους πολεμάρχους ὀρθῶς καὶ τοὺς πατέρας αὐτῶν τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγοντας.

For indeed, a general [i.e., like Miltiades] is the one who is even greater than a polemarch and who has administered the greatest office of the war.¹⁸ But as it is, by allowing us to speak, he himself, too, has shown clearly enough that one ought to come forward to deliver the speech not on the basis of rank but on the basis of courage. (17) Come, then,

11. Smyth 1920, §1779.

12. τῇ δὲ Ἀττικῇ βοηθεῖν ἔδει, "it was necessary to aid Attica."

13. Smyth 1920, §1774–78.

14. As Reader (1996, 204) acknowledges, providing a list of all other occurrences of the word in Polemo's declamations, seventeen of them meaning "oration" and the remaining four meaning "word."

15. Possinus (1637, in Orellius [1819], 21, 23) paraphrases ταῦτα διοριζομένῳ as "nunc qui eos sibi fines circumscripserit" and the rest of the sentence as "eum video ad justissimam de hoc dicendi munere contentionem Miltiadem provocasse." Orellius (1819, 21) comments: "Possinus in Paraphrasi interpretatur quasi legisset: ταῦτα διοριζόμενον potius ταῦτα διοριζομένου." Following Orellius' lead, Reader (1996, 204) understands Possinus' paraphrase to mean "since he had set these goals for himself," with Miltiades as subject. Possinus may mean "who defined these terms for himself," but he has not accounted for the dative (as Orellius pointed out). Orellius (1819, 21 and 23) comments: "scil. τῷ νόμῳ usu et consuetudine, significatione activa. Nach dieser Vorausbestimmung. Wenn dieses ausgemacht ist." In his Addenda et Emendanda to the volume, Orellius (1819, xiii) changed his mind about this: "Delenda haec verba. Imo post διοριζομένῳ supplendum ἐμοί. Nach dieser meiner Ansicht: wenn diese meine Ansicht (Vorausbestimmung) richtig ist." Both scholars apparently misunderstood the construction.

16. *Decl.* 2.18, 21, and 39.

17. Cf. also the cognate noun διορισμός, which usually denotes a logical or technical distinction (LSJ, q.v.). The verb διορίζω does not occur elsewhere in Polemo's declamations.

18. I tentatively follow Reader (1996, 205) in his interpretation of {ὁ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ πατήρ} and {ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀπωτέρω} as "muddled scribal glosses" that have intruded into the text.

let us decide on these grounds, since you see both the rest of the polemarchs and their fathers remaining quiet.

According to the speaker, if the polemarch's father wants to decide this issue on the basis of rank, he should have to compete with the general Miltiades,¹⁹ since generals outrank polemarchs.²⁰ But in fact, as he goes on to explain, not only has Miltiades himself rejected the argument from rank, but so also have all the other polemarchs and their fathers, whose silence shows that they agree with the speaker.²¹ Individual valor, then, should be the deciding factor.

The response of Callimachus' father confirms this interpretation: "For if the general Miltiades were [now] disputing for the speech, I would [already] have conceded on grounds of his greater rank" (εἰ μὲν γὰρ Μιλτιάδης ὁ στρατηγὸς ἡμιφισβῆται τοῦ λόγου, παρεχώρησα ὡς ἀρχῇ μείζονι, *Decl.* 2.21). Like the first speaker, Callimachus' father calls Miltiades a general and acknowledges that generals outrank polemarchs. He also places the nonexistent dispute in present time; however, he is quick to point out (through a past contrafactual) that the dispute would have been over before it even began because of his respect for Miltiades' rank. In addition, like the first speaker, he identifies the object of the dispute in the genitive as τοῦ λόγου, "the speech." In *Declamation* 1.16, Cynegirus' father had asserted that his opponent should have to compete with Miltiades, who outranked his opponent's son, and he interpreted Miltiades' refusal to compete for the honor as tacit support of his claim for the importance of valor over rank. His opponent cleverly responds with deference to Miltiades' superior rank (which costs him nothing), but then uses Miltiades' refusal to contend for the honor to support his own rival claim: "But since this man has withdrawn from this undertaking, who has priority over Callimachus?" (τούτου δὲ τῆς πείρας ταύτης ἀφεστηκότος τίς Καλλιμάχου πρότερός ἐστιν;).

If these suggestions are correct, the first sentence in *Declamation* 1.16 means, "As for the one making these distinctions [i.e., the father of Callimachus], Miltiades should [now] be disputing him for the speech."

CRAIG A. GIBSON
University of Iowa

19. Miltiades is also called "general" in *Decl.* 2.5, 20, and 21.

20. As Reader (1996, 205) explains: "The assertion that in military matters the στρατηγός is superior to the πολέμαρχος corresponds to the post-Marathonian constitutional reforms, but not to the situation in 490 BCE when the polemarch still served as commander-in-chief. . . ." For further comments on this anachronism in Polemo, see Reader, 194, 202.

21. For the other fathers, cf. *Decl.* 2.19. For the equation of polemarchs with generals, see *Decl.* 1.17 and 2.49.

LITERATURE CITED

- Orellius, J. C. 1819. *Polemonis Laodicensis Sophistae Laudationes II Funebres in Cynaegirum et Callimachum Occisos in Pugna Marathonica*. Leipzig.
 Possinus, P. 1637. *Polemonis Sophistae Orationes quotquot extant, duae*. Toulouse.
 Reader, W. W. 1996. *The Severed Hand and the Upright Corpse: The Declamations of Marcus Antonius Polemo*. Atlanta.
 Russell, D. R. 1983. *Greek Declamation*. Cambridge.
 Smyth, H. W. 1920. *Greek Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.