

# THE VIRTUOSO PASSAGES IN DEMOSTHENES' SPEECHES

LIONEL PEARSON

**S**PEAKING before the Athenian Assembly, whether on the Pnyx or in the theatre of Dionysus, was not a task to be undertaken lightly by an inexperienced speaker. Plutarch tells the story of Demosthenes' failure at his first attempt and the advice given him by friendly critics who found him discouraged and disheartened. He had been unable to hold the attention of his audience because they could not follow his argument through his confused long sentences; in addition, his voice lacked carrying power, his articulation was poor, and he ran short of breath.<sup>1</sup> Plutarch's information came from Demetrius of Phalerum, who told the story of his subsequent practice with pebbles in his mouth, supposing that this was a means of improving his articulation and making his speech more distinct.<sup>2</sup> But Cicero shows the better practical judgment when he tells us that it was a device to improve his breath control<sup>3</sup> (he could not take a deep breath for fear of swallowing the pebbles), and in the *Lives of the Ten Orators* it is recorded that he paid the actor Neoptolemus a substantial sum to teach him how to speak long sentences without taking breath.<sup>4</sup> Actors who played in the open air certainly had to develop great powers of breath control, and an untrained orator, who had not taught himself to breathe properly, could not hope to make himself understood on the Pnyx, unless he spoke in the briefest of sentences, divided into very short phrases.

When Demosthenes first spoke in the Assembly he was apparently content to speak in short phrases, taking breath at frequent intervals. His early, so-called Thucydidean style, as seen in Orations 14, 15, and

<sup>1</sup>καίτοι τό γε πρῶτον ἐντυγχάνων τῷ δήμῳ θορύβοις περιέπιπτε καί κατεγέλᾶτο δι' ἀήθειαν, τοῦ λόγου συγκεχύσθαι ταῖς περιόδοις καί βεβασανίσθαι τοῖς ἐνθυμήμασι πικρῶς ἄγαν καί κατακόρως δοκοῦντος. ἦν δέ τις ὡς ἔοικε καί φωνῆς ἀσθένεια καί γλώττης ἀσάφεια καί πνεύματος κολοβότης, ἐπιταράττουσα τὸν νοῦν τῶν λεγομένων τῷ διασπᾶσθαι τὰς περιόδους. (Dem. 6)

<sup>2</sup>Plut. Dem. 11. It has recently been suggested by Dr Saul M. Bien in a letter to *The Lancet* (Nov. 25, 1967, p. 1152) that the busts of Demosthenes may depict a man with a hare lip and possibly a cleft palate; and that Demosthenes used flat stones as obturators to help his speech. But if Demosthenes suffered from any such physical defect, Athenian politicians, who were merciless in such matters, would surely not have failed to draw attention to it and take advantage of it.

<sup>3</sup>Ut memoriae proditum est, coniectis in os calculis, summa voce versus multos uno spiritu pronuntiare consuebat; neque is consistens in loco, sed inambulans atque ascensu ingrediens arduo (De Or. 1.261).

<sup>4</sup>ἐν' ὅλῃς περιόδοις ἀπνεύστως λέγει ([Plut.] Mor. 844F).

16,<sup>5</sup> is very different from the fast-flowing continuous periods of the *Philippics*, which an orator could not make intelligible to an audience unless he had learnt the lesson which actors thought essential. It is the purpose of this article to show that, as Demosthenes grew more experienced and acquired a more perfect technique as a speaker, he made greater demands on himself and wrote numerous passages which would render an untrained orator breathless and cause him to lose command of his audience. We cannot of course have any confidence that Demosthenes delivered a speech like the *First Philippic* or *On the Crown* exactly in the form in which it has been preserved. But if our present text represents his own revised text, we may presume that he has written it in a form that he thought would be effective if properly delivered, and in a form that he would be willing to use himself.<sup>6</sup>

In later years, when schools of rhetoric were well established, we must surely assume that pupils were given the speeches of famous orators to study and that they practised their delivery. We may also perhaps suppose that "recitals" were given by the students, as in modern schools of music, so that the speech *On the Crown* would have a status equivalent to that of a Beethoven concerto. If this is so, it should follow that some speeches which became part of the "standard repertoire" were recognized as more difficult for the performer than others, and certain passages would be notorious for the technical demands that they made on a speaker. Unfortunately we know far too little about the methods of teaching actually followed in schools of rhetoric, and we know more about the study of composition than the study of actual speaking. Perhaps the "composers" looked down on the mere "performers." Cicero tells us in the *Brutus* (91.316) about the new technique that he acquired in the schools of Asia Minor, which enabled him to speak effectively without exhausting himself prematurely, but he tells us nothing of the actual exercises that he was given or the models (the "pieces") that his teachers set him to study.

Speaking in the law courts, unless it was before a large jury such as listened to *On the Crown*, would be less exacting physically than delivering a speech before the Assembly, but speech-writers must have taken account of a client's ability and experience when they prepared a speech for him. A speech-writer's reputation would be harmed if his "beautiful orations" were ruined by miserable performances (which lost the clients' cases for

<sup>5</sup>Cf. L. Pearson, "The Development of Demosthenes as a political orator," *Phoenix* 18 (1964) 95-109.

<sup>6</sup>Cf. the good remarks of A. W. Pickard-Cambridge, *Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom* (London-New York 1914) 37-39, and P. Wendland, "Beiträge zu Athenischer Politik und Publicistik, II, Isokrates u. Demosthenes," *GGN*, ph.-hist.Kl. (1910) 289-291.

them). He clearly would not make great demands on a client's rhetorical skill unless he had reason to believe that it was adequate. Isaeus certainly knew how to write speeches that persons with little experience could deliver effectively, and when Demosthenes came into court as a very young man to present his case against his guardians, he is supposed to have had some instruction from Isaeus.<sup>7</sup> There was much that Isaeus might have taught him, but he certainly would not have encouraged such a young man to attempt difficult feats of oratory. Indeed, if we look at Demosthenes' first speech *Against Aphobus* we can see immediately how beautifully easy it is to deliver.

Long sentences do not necessarily make a speech difficult to deliver. They will cause the orator no difficulty if they are written in such a way that he has the opportunity to take breath without appearing to break the continuity.<sup>8</sup> He must be given the chance to speak slowly and deliberately, when some particular point has to be made clear, using shorter phrases, and faster at other times, so that the whole speech will not go at a snail's pace. He must also be encouraged to vary the intensity of his delivery, alternating *forte* with *piano*. And it is important for less experienced orators that a sentence should begin in such a way that its development can be foreseen before it is far advanced.

A glance at the opening paragraph of *Against Aphobus* 1 will show how quickly Demosthenes had learnt the elementary lessons. There are no long phrases that would cause any problems of breath control. I have put in more commas than most editors would permit, so as to show where each phrase ends and the speaker can pause for a moment if he wishes, and I have used parenthesis to mark the phrases which he can speak at a faster pace, lowering his voice:

Εἰ μὲν ἐβούλετ' "Αφобος, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν (ἡ περὶ ὧν διεφερόμεθα τοῖς οἰκείοις ἐπιτρέπειν), οὐδὲν ἂν ἔδει δικῶν (οὐδὲ πραγμάτων)· ἀπέχρη γὰρ ἂν, τοῖς ὑπ' ἐκείνων γνωσθεῖσιν ἐμμένειν (ὥστε μηδεμίαν ἡμῖν εἶναι πρὸς τοῦτον διαφοράν). ἐπειδὴ δ' οὗτος τοὺς μὲν σαφῶς εἰδότας τὰ ἡμέτερ' ἔφυγε, μηδὲν διαγνῶναι περὶ αὐτῶν, εἰς δ' ὑμᾶς (τοὺς οὐδὲν τῶν ἡμετέρων ἀκριβῶς ἐπισταμένους) ἐλήλυθεν,

<sup>7</sup>Plut. *Dem.* 5; *X Orat. Vit.* 839F, 844B; Dion. Hal. *Isaeus* 1.

<sup>8</sup>Greek rhetoricians point out the difference in style between sentences that have longer or shorter *cola*, and they must be well aware that longer *cola* (when they cannot conveniently be subdivided into *commata*) present greater technical difficulty to a speaker. But they do not point this out (is this because such practical details are considered irrelevant to their theoretical analysis?). Equally they recognize the difference between a sentence that can be divided into short *cola* and a *μονόκωλος περίοδος*, which is so arranged that *κρέματα* ἡ διανοία αὐτῆς μέχρι τοῦ τέλους τῷ ὑπερβάτῳ (Hermog. *Ino.* 4.3; Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci* 2.241). As an example Hermogenes quotes Dem. 1.24: εἴτ' οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθε εἰ μὴδ' ἂ παθοῖτ' ἂν, εἰ δύναιτ' ἐκεῖνος, ταῦτα ποιῆσαι καιρὸν ἔχοντες οὐ πολὺ ἤστε; This is a sentence which must be delivered in one breath; it is not the kind of sentence which a speech-writer would give to an inexperienced client, and nothing like it will be found in the speeches *Against Aphobus*.

ἀνάγκη ἐστὶν ἐν ὑμῖν, παρ' αὐτοῦ πειρᾶσθαι τῶν δικαίων τυγχάνειν. οἶδα μὲν οὖν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, ὅτι πρὸς ἄνδρας καὶ λέγειν ἱκανοὺς (καὶ παρασκευάσασθαι δυναμένους), χαλεπὸν ἐστὶν εἰς ἀγῶνα καθίστασθαι, περὶ τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων, ἅπειρον ὄντα παντάπασιν πραγμάτων, διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν. ὁμῶς δέ, καίπερ πολὺ τούτων καταδεέστερος ὢν, πολλὰς ἐλπίδας ἔχω καὶ παρ' ὑμῖν, τεύξεσθαι τῶν δικαίων, καὶ (μέχρι γε τοῦ τὰ γεγεννημένα διεξελθεῖν) καὶ αὐτὸς ἀρκούντως ἐρεῖν, ὥσθ' ὑμᾶς μὴτ' ἀπολειφθῆναι τῶν πραγμάτων, μηδὲ καθ' ἓν, μὴτ' ἀγνοῆσαι περὶ ὧν δεήσει τὴν ψήφον ἐνεγκεῖν.

These introductory remarks are admirably designed for a nervous speaker, who may find himself short of breath before he reaches the end of a sentence; the words in parenthesis are not essential to his argument, and even if he is forced to gabble them so fast that they are scarcely intelligible, no serious harm will be done.

The narrative that follows goes ahead quite smoothly, without any hiatus to make him stumble, and the phrases are still short, as in the opening paragraph. His pace may become a little faster, perhaps, until it becomes necessary to explain the details of his father's estate, the two workshops, the number of slaves and their value and earning power (9). Here he will need to speak more slowly, so that the jurors can take in every detail and do their own arithmetic as he goes along. The pace seems to increase in the succeeding sections, as the phrases become longer (13–14), but it is not until 15 that he lets his indignation burst out and starts to speak with greater intensity. He has no need to keep up the pressure for long, because he soon calls for the depositions to be read out (17), when he can take a rest from his exertions.<sup>9</sup>

He will not want to exhaust himself so early in the speech, and whenever he “stops the water” he can rest his voice, perhaps taking a sip of water, in the style of a modern orator. He must hold himself in reserve for the final appeal, which begins in 60. This is far more exacting than anything that has preceded. The sentence that extends over sections 60 and 61 must be delivered without any relaxation of the intensity; the pauses, when he can take breath, must be short, and the *cola* which must be delivered in one breath without break are longer than in the rest of the speech:

Τοσαύτης τοίνυν οὐσίας μοι καταλειφθείσης ὅσην ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἠκούσατε, καὶ τοῦ τρίτου μέρους πρόσδοον αὐτῆς φερούσης πεντήκοντα μνᾶς, ἐξόν τούτοις τοῖς ἀπληστοτάτοις χρημάτων, καὶ εἰ μὴ μισθοῦν τὸν οἶκον<sup>10</sup> ἐβούλοντο, ἀπὸ μὲν τούτων τῶν προσιόντων, ἐῶντας ὥσπερ εἶχεν κατὰ χώραν, ἡμᾶς τε τρέφειν καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὴν πόλιν διοικεῖν,

<sup>9</sup>Other “angry” passages are 38–39 and 45–46, both followed by the reading of *martyriai*. For the opportunity to rest one's voice when evidence is presented cf. Lysias 12.61.

<sup>10</sup>μισθοῦν τὸν οἶκον: i.e., put the estate in the hands of an enterprising business man, who would guarantee them a fixed income and return the capital intact to them after a period of years.

καὶ ὅς' ἐξ αὐτῶν περιεγίγνετο, ταῦτα προσπεριποιεῖν, τὴν δ' ἄλλην οὐσίαν ἐνεργὸν ποιήσασιν, οὐσαν ταύτης διπλασίαν, αὐτοῖς τε, εἰ χρημάτων ἐπεθύμουν, μέτρι' ἐξ αὐτῶν λαβεῖν, ἐμοὶ τε σὺν τοῖς ἀρχαίοις τὸν οἶκον ἐκ τῶν προσόδων μείζω ποιῆσαι, τούτων μὲν οὐδὲν ἐποίησαν, ἀποδόμενοι δ' ἀλλήλοις τὰ πλείστου ἄξια τῶν ἀνδραπόδων, τὰ δὲ παντάπασιν ἀφανίσαντες, ἐμοῦ μὲν ἀνείλον καὶ τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρόσοδον, σφίσι δ' αὐτοῖς οὐ μικρὰν ἐκ τῶν ἐμῶν κατεσκευάσαντο.

Here there are no phrases that can be thrown away, no remarks that can be gabbled under his breath. Every detail is important to show how easy it was for his guardians to meet their obligations; the *τε-καὶ* and *τε-τε* groupings must be phrased right, so that it will be clear how circumstances and opportunities were combined in their favour; the jurors must understand the whole situation and Demosthenes must be sure that he has not lost their attention before he says "they did none of these things" (the climax of the sentence) "and robbed me even of the income." Not until the final bitter comment, "and they built up a nice little fortune for themselves," can he permit himself to lower his voice.

The first speech *Against Onetor* also has two highly demanding sentences for its climax (30.35–36), and in this speech Demosthenes takes the risk of giving himself a long breathless sentence at the beginning, in which he explains what he is going to prove (4–5).

In these early speeches and in speeches written for clients in civil suits such sentences are not common. But if one turns to a speech written for an active politician, concerned in a *graphe paranomon*, the contrast is remarkable. Diodorus, who delivers the speech *Against Androtion*,<sup>11</sup> does not of course tell the jury that he is an experienced speaker, but the opening sentences leave the matter in no doubt. A reader who tries to speak them in Greek will quickly be aware of their technical difficulty:

"Ὅπερ Εὐκτῆμων, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, παθὼν ὑπ' Ἀνδροτίωνος κακῶς, ἅμα τῇ τε πόλει βοηθεῖν οἶεται δεῖν καὶ δίκην ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ λαβεῖν, τοῦτο κάγῳ πειράσομαι ποιεῖν, ἂν ἄρ' οἷός τ' ὦ. συμβέβηκε δέ, πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ καὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς νόμους Εὐκτῆμονος ὑβρισμένον, ἐλάττω ταύτ' εἶναι τῶν ἐμοὶ γεγεννημένων δι' Ἀνδροτίωνος πραγμάτων. οὗτος μὲν γ' εἰς χρήματα καὶ τὸ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀδίκως ἐκπεσεῖν ἐπεβουλεύθη· ἐμὲ δ' οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέξατο τῶν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ εἰς, εἰ τὰ κατασκευασθένθ' ὑπὸ τούτου παρ' ὑμῖν ἐπιστεύθη. αἰτιασάμενος γάρ με, ἃ καὶ λέγειν ἂν ὀκνήσειέ τις, εἰ μὴ τύχοι προσόμοιος ὦν τούτῳ, τὸν πατέρ' ὥς ἀπέκτον' ἐγὼ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ κατασκευάσας ἀσεβείας γραφὴν οὐκ ἐπ' ἐμέ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν θεῖόν μου, γράψας ἀσεβεῖν ἐμοὶ συνιόντ' εἰς ταῦτόν ὥς πεποιηκότι ταῦτα, εἰς ἀγῶνα κατέστησεν· ὃν εἰ συνέβη τόθ' ἁλῶναι, τίς ἂν ἀθλιώτερ' ἐμοῦ πεπονθὼς ἦν ὑπὸ τούτου; τίς γὰρ ἂν ἡ φίλος ἢ ξένος εἰς ταυτό ποτ' ἐλθεῖν ἠθέλησεν ἐμοί; τίς δ' ἂν εἶπαι πόλιν που παρ' ἑαυτῇ γενέσθαι τὸν τὸ τοιοῦτ' ἀσέβημα δοκοῦντ' εἰργάσθαι; οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲ μία.

<sup>11</sup>In 355–54 (the earliest of the *graphai paranomon* speeches).

Anyone but a practised and experienced speaker would be gasping for breath after such an outburst. But if delivered by an orator who knew how to manage his voice it might have a tremendous effect on the jury, leaving them more breathless than the speaker. Diodorus does not continue in the same style; he calms down, adopts a more moderate tone and probably a slower pace.

What is it that makes this passage technically difficult? The difficulty lies not only in the syntactical structure but in the manner of argument, which takes the so-called facts for granted and insists on their meaning and their presumed consequences. What Euctemon actually suffered is for the moment less important than his patriotic motive in taking legal action; the details of Androtion's accusation are less important than his malice and the threat of utter disaster that faced the speaker. The "facts" are in participial clauses, some of them hinted at in relative clauses, because the object for the moment is not to establish what happened but to establish character—to make the jury admire Euctemon, hate Androtion, and pity the unfortunate speaker.

So far as delivery goes, this means that the main emphasis will not be on *ὅπερ Εὐκτῆμων παθὼν* or *παρὰ πάντας τοὺς νόμους Εὐκτῆμονος ὑβρισμένου*, but on *τῇ πόλει βοηθεῖν οἵεται δεῖν*, and *ἐλάττω ταῦτ' εἶναι τῶν ἐμοὶ γεγενημένων*. It will not be on *τὸν πατέρ' ὡς ἀπέκτον' ἐγώ* (indeed these awful words might well be uttered in a whisper), but on *ἐμὲ δ' οὐδ' ἂν ἐδέξατο . . . οὐδὲ εἰς, τίς ἂν ἀθλιώτερ' ἐμοῦ*; The phrases which must be delivered without any break in the flow of words are long, and even at colon and period no lengthy pause for breath can be taken. There must be no relaxation of the intensity and the jury must not be given time to think; they cannot be allowed to recognize the rhetorical trick that is being played on them—a trick that is familiar to every reader of *On the Crown*.<sup>12</sup>

A non-professional speaker might prefer to start by stating bluntly that Euctemon had been abominably treated, and that he took legal action, as a patriotic citizen should do, whenever he sees an illegal act committed; he could describe Androtion's prosecution of his uncle (with some remarks about its utter shamelessness) and then go on to say that finding himself threatened with such terrible consequences he took certain actions. He would want to show that there were good reasons why he was in court, that he was taking action not because he was a *sycophantes*, but because he had been injured and recognized his duty as a good citizen. Comment or indignant exclamations could then follow. Thus he would begin with some plain statements, without the syntactical or logical complexities of this opening display.

<sup>12</sup>For a good account of the rhetorical technique of this speech (and its failure to prove any of the charges that are made) see George Kennedy, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton 1963) 216–219.

Apollodorus, for whom a number of speeches in the Demosthenic corpus were written (though not by Demosthenes himself) was an active politician and so presumably a capable speaker.<sup>13</sup> Some of his opening appeals are more pretentious than those of the average speaker. In *Against Stephanus* 1 (which is often regarded as the work of Demosthenes<sup>14</sup>) the long second sentence is made technically difficult by quite a long parenthesis, a courteous compliment to the jury, pointing out how fortunate it is that people in trouble can count on a fair hearing. And in Oration 49 (*Against Timotheus*) he makes quite heavy demands on himself in the second sentence, which is designed to contrast the generosity of the banker Pasion (Apollodorus' father) with the meanness and ingratitude of Timotheus, who made no effort to repay what he owed. He tells the jury what conclusions they will reach "when I show you what happened." It is the same trick of taking the "facts" for granted and insisting on the consequences. It is a trick that cannot be played by making simple statements; it demands rhetorical technique and rhetorical invention.

The speech *Against Leptines* is the earliest speech which Demosthenes is known to have delivered himself, apart from his youthful appearances in court,<sup>15</sup> and it is interesting to see that, while he is exploiting the technical proficiency of Diodorus, he is still making no great technical demands of himself. As in *Against Aphobus* the *cola* are quite short, and there are no long parenthetical clauses or phrases in which he must retain his command of the audience while they are waiting for the grammatical sequence to be completed. It is also worth noticing that frequently, instead of introducing a topic with a phrase like οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδελφον ὅτι, he will prefer the form ἔστιν οὐκ ἀδελφον τοῦθ' ὅτι (1) or ἐκεῖν' ἂν ἴσως εἴποι πρὸς ταῦτα (3). By using the demonstrative pronoun in advance a speaker gives himself the opportunity to take a full breath before he starts the ὅτι clause.<sup>16</sup>

The speech is evidently intended to be spoken quietly (which may be a wise choice—an intense approach is not demanded on every occasion),<sup>17</sup> and even when he is trying to "show off the achievements of Conon, Chabrias, and Epicerdes,"<sup>18</sup> there is none of the breathless intensity that marks the stirring patriotic appeals in his later speeches. He is still

<sup>13</sup>Cf. L. Pearson, "Apollodorus, the eleventh Attic orator," in *The Classical Tradition, Studies in Honor of Harry Caplan* (Cornell U.P. 1966) 347-359.

<sup>14</sup>Though doubt must always remain. Cf. L. Pearson, "Demosthenes or Pseudo-Demosthenes xlv (*In Stephanum* I)," *Antichthon* 3 (1969) 18-26.

<sup>15</sup>Unless he delivered Oration 51 (*On the Trierarchic Crown*), as Blass thought possible (*Att. Ber.* 3.1. 243).

<sup>16</sup>For similar examples see 6, 7, 8, 15, 18, 31, 32.

<sup>17</sup>Blass is sometimes at fault in concluding that a speech is necessarily less distinguished than another because it lacks emotional intensity.

<sup>18</sup>*Arg.* 2.11. The passages which are meant are 41-44, 68-70, 76-78.

a long way from the technical virtuosity of the *Philippics* or *On the Embassy*.

If we turn to the *Meidias*, we can quickly see that Demosthenes has now acquired much greater confidence in his technique.<sup>19</sup> The pattern of his attack in the opening sentences is similar to what he designed for Diodorus in *Against Timocrates*, except that it includes a contrast between himself and his adversary as well as a reminder to the jury that his adversary has a long career of lawlessness. But it is the third sentence that is the real test:

ἐπειδὴ δὲ καλῶς καὶ τὰ δίκαια ποιῶν ὁ δῆμος ἅπας οὕτως ὠργίσθη καὶ παρωξύνθη καὶ σφόδρ' ἐσπούδασεν ἐφ' οἷς ἡδικημένῳ μοι συνήδει, ὥστε πάντα ποιούντος τούτου καὶ τινων ἄλλων ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ, οὐκ ἐπέισθη οὐδ' ἀπέβλεψεν εἰς τὰς οὐσίας τὰς τούτων οὐδὲ τὰς ὑποσχέσεις, ἀλλὰ μὲν γνῶμη κατεχειροτόνησεν αὐτοῦ, πολλοὶ μοι προσιόντες, ὧ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ δικαστηρίῳ νῦν ὄντων ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων πολιτῶν ἤξιουν καὶ παρεκελεύοντ' ἐπεξελθεῖν καὶ παραδοῦναι τοῦτον εἰς ὑμᾶς, ὡς μὲν ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, δι' ἀμφοτέρ', ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, νῆ τοὺς θεοὺς, καὶ δεινὰ πεπονθῆναι νομίζοντες ἐμὲ καὶ δικὴν ἅμα βουλόμενοι λαβεῖν ὧν ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐτεθέαντο θρασὺν ὄντα καὶ βδελυρὸν καὶ οὐδὲ καθεκτόν ἔτι.

He goes on to pull the situation together (οὕτω δὲ τούτων ἐχόντων) and to declare triumphantly that he has kept faith with the people of Athens and not dropped the case, despite urgent requests, offers of money, and threats (3). It is not until now that he relaxes the tension and starts to speak in a quieter tone, expressing his complete faith in the integrity of the jury.

This is a difficult long sentence because the tension must be maintained throughout, as in the passages from *Against Aphobus* and *Against Androtion*, without dropping the voice anywhere or making any but the briefest pauses, since there is no clause that is complete without the clause that follows, no point where the speaker can stop and leave his audience satisfied. It could have been differently written and re-arranged for a less expert speaker; indeed, a simpler and less exacting version of the same pattern can be seen in the opening of *Against Conon* (Oration 54). The purpose of this kind of sentence is to make a number of points simultaneously, so that the hearers will grasp them not as separate details or separate arguments, but as part of a composite design—the proper

<sup>19</sup>According to Aeschines (3.52), followed by Plutarch (*Dem.* 12) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ad Amm.* 4), Demosthenes settled the case out of court and never delivered the speech; most critics, including Blass and Weil, have accepted this account, though a contrary opinion has been urged by H. Erbse, "Über die Midiana des Demosthenes," *Hermes* 84 (1956) 135–151. The question has only slight relevance to the present discussion; but it would be interesting to know if Demosthenes was in fact able, in 348, to deliver this exacting oration with success.



reaction of the people, refusing to be influenced by the money and power of individuals, the determination of law-abiding citizens that Meidias should be stopped in his career of criminal *hybris*, the efforts of Meidias' friends to save him by any means, within or without the law—and my steadfast insistence on prosecuting him! This is the situation—a situation, the jury should understand, in which justice can and must prevail. It is perhaps more like an ideal situation than a real one—like the crowded canvases that the great Dutch masters sometimes paint, packed with people and events that one could not ever see at the same time or in the same place, but which none the less form part of a designed composition.<sup>20</sup>

In his narrative Demosthenes is generally careful to have only three people in action at the same time, only three characters on the stage, as though conforming to the rule of the Attic theatre.<sup>21</sup> But in this passage, in addition to Demosthenes and Meidias and the people of Athens, we have Meidias' supporters presenting their case and Demosthenes' acquaintances urging him to prosecute. And the feelings and purposes and motivations tumble over one another, as the *aselgeia* and *hybris* of Meidias threaten the safety of everyone. It is a tremendous composition—"Demosthenes determines to prosecute."

The opening sentences of *Against Androtion* present the jury with an equally crowded canvas, to remind us that Demosthenes knew how to write in this manner long before he wrote the *Meidias*. Here in addition to Euctemon, Androtion, the people, and the speaker (Diodorus), we have the speaker's father and his uncle and all the people who would have refused to associate with him if Androtion's nefarious scheme had been successful. We have the mischief done by Androtion, Euctemon's suffering and his patriotic determination to serve the interests of Athens as well as obtain personal satisfaction, Diodorus' sufferings and the terrible predicament in which he was placed by the suit against his uncle; and the final release when the lawsuit, fortunately, ended in a just verdict. The title of this picture could be "The fortunate escape of Diodorus."

In his attempt to present this kind of composite picture Demosthenes chooses a syntactical form that has technical difficulties. Clauses beginning with *ἐπειδὴ* are interrupted by participial phrases or parenthetical remarks, and there is danger of losing the thread before the finite verb is

<sup>20</sup>Cf. *Arg.* 2.8, τὰ δὲ προοίμια καταφορικά, ὑπερβολὴν ἔχοντα πολλήν.

<sup>21</sup>For example, in *For Phormio*. An even better illustration can be found in *Against Zenothemis*, where there is a complicated story to tell with a large cast of characters (but this speech is very possibly not by Demosthenes himself). In the narrative sections of *On the Crown* there are four important individual characters, Demosthenes, Aeschines, Philocrates, and Philip, and important parts are also played by the Athenian people, the Thebans, and the Amphictyons. Demosthenes makes his story easier to follow by never having more than three of these characters on the stage at one time. I hope to discuss this characteristic of Demosthenic narrative more fully elsewhere.

reached; and after the long *ἐπειδή* clause is finished, instead of describing what followed, the orator first describes what should have followed or might have followed, if he had been less scrupulous or more fortunate. But in narrative passages, where clarity may be more important than emotional tension, Demosthenes sometimes uses this syntactical form without creating so many difficulties for himself, as in the start of the narrative in the *Meidias*, a sentence which extends over two sections (13–14):

“When, two years ago, with numerous difficulties arising before the festival” (a series of genitive absolutes), “I volunteered my services, the general public greeted my offer with enthusiasm” (three clauses introduced by *ὕμεις μὲν*), “but Meidias (*Μειδίας δ’ οὐτοσί*), so it seems, was irked and proceeded to harass me throughout my liturgy with one outrageous act after another.”

Despite its length the sentence is arranged in such a way that it should present little difficulty to an experienced speaker. There are places where a pause will be suitable, and the incidents are described in logical and edifying sequence until the sequence is broken by the totally unjustified and unmotivated conduct of Meidias. The sentence offers a beautiful example of rhetorical *amplificatio*,<sup>22</sup> and it is useful to be reminded that *amplificatio* need not put any great strain on the speaker. But a later passage in the speech makes much more severe demands on the speaker, when he wants to impress on the jury the contrast between Meidias’ behaviour and the tolerant good-humour of the competitors in the festival:

οὐκ οὐκ δεινόν, ὦ ἄνδρες δικασταί, καὶ σχέτλιον τῶν μὲν νικᾶν ἂν παρὰ τοῦτ’ οἰομένων χορηγῶν τῶν ἀνηλωκότων πολλάκις πάντα τὰ ὄντ’ εἰς τὰς λητουργίας, μηδὲνα τολμήσαι πώποτε μηδ’ ὦν οἱ νόμοι διδῶσιν ἄσφασθαι, ἀλλ’ οὕτως εὐλαβῶς, οὕτως εὐσεβῶς, οὕτω μετρίως διακεῖσθαι ὥστ’ ἀναλίσκοντας, ἀγωνιῶντας ὁμῶς ἀπέχεσθαι καὶ προορᾶσθαι τὰς ὑμετέρας βουλήσεις καὶ τὴν περὶ τὴν ἑορτὴν σπουδὴν, Μειδίαν δ’ ἰδιώτην ὄντα, μηδὲν ἀνηλωκότα, ὅτι τῷ προσέκρουσεν καὶ ἐχθρὸς ὑπῆρχεν, τοῦτον ἀναλίσκοντα, χορηγοῦντα, ἐπίτιμον ὄντα προπηλακίζειν καὶ τύπτειν, καὶ μήτε τῆς ἑορτῆς μήτε τῶν νόμων μήτε τί ὑμεῖς ἐρεῖτε μήτε τοῦ θεοῦ φροντίζειν;

(21.61)

Demosthenes is not merely amplifying the wickedness of Meidias by presenting a contrast between the generous good sportsmanship of the *choregi* and the ill-tempered violence and lawlessness of Meidias; he is taking the events for granted, and asking his listeners to contemplate the whole picture of the festival. It is another crowded canvas, crowded with

<sup>22</sup>The behaviour of Meidias is made to appear so much the more unreasonable and deplorable by the circumstances in which Demosthenes volunteered to serve, his courage in coming forward when everyone was blaming everyone else, and the welcome reception of his offer; Meidias, *μόνος τῶν πάντων*, took offence.

thoughts and feelings (tolerance, generosity, the competitive spirit, piety and respect for the law, and their opposites) as well as with events and persons. And he must present them with this picture without any interruption, without taking breath. It is the whole picture, with its violent contrast, that is *δεινὸν καὶ σχέτλιον*, the whole *μέν-δέ* combination that he wants the jury to understand and visualize. He cannot make a break before the *δέ* clause, but at least he gives himself shorter phrases once he starts to talk about Meidias—even if he is short of breath by this time, he is making sure that he will not trip over the words.

Although an orator must deliver a passage of this kind without any pause for breath, there are usually places in every such sentence where he can contrive to take a quick breath without interrupting the flow of the sentence, but here Demosthenes has denied himself the opportunity, because there is hiatus at exactly those places where he might be tempted to take breath—after *ἄψασθαι* and *διακείσθαι*, even after *ἀνηλωκότα* and *χορηγούντα* (where the alternative of elision would also make it impossible to take breath). When an orator has to contend with hiatus, it is as though he were speaking with a pebble in his mouth, because true hiatus, such as formal speech demands, enforces a short break without permitting the speaker to take breath. A writer who has command of his language can easily avoid hiatus if he wishes, and I have tried to show elsewhere<sup>23</sup> how skilfully and economically Demosthenes uses hiatus in order to create an effect, sometimes to emphasize the word that follows the enforced break; it should not be supposed that hiatus is a mark of carelessness.

In my fuller discussion of hiatus I have considered a number of passages from *On the Crown* and *On the Embassy* in which (partly because of hiatus) there are problems of delivery for any but an experienced and trained orator.<sup>24</sup> Rather than cover the same ground here, the present discussion will consider some passages from speeches on the Pnyx.

According to Plutarch's story (*Dem.* 6) Demosthenes failed dismally in his first speech to the Assembly; he found himself short of breath, with the result that "his sentences lost their coherence and his meaning was not clear." We are not told on what occasion this first attempt was made, but no version of the story identifies this speech with *On the Symmories*, the earliest political speech of which we have any record. Indeed, if he had delivered that speech in the form in which it is preserved, there seems no reason why he should have found himself short of breath; of all the speeches in the Demosthenic corpus, the two earliest addresses to the Assembly (Orations 14 and 16) offer the least technical difficulty. The *cola* are short and the speech can be taken at a slow pace with frequent pauses for breath.

<sup>23</sup>"Hiatus and its purposes in Attic oratory," *AJP* 96 (1975) 138–159.

<sup>24</sup>E.g., 18.33, 95–105, 201–205; 19.165–166.

We are not entitled to say anything positive about the rhetorical style which prevailed in the Assembly in the fifth and early fourth century, since we have no direct evidence except the third oration of Andocides and the speeches in the historians, but we may certainly suspect that on the Pnyx, if not in the theatre, all but the most highly trained speakers restricted themselves to short phrases and a slow pace.<sup>25</sup> Modern readers may find the speeches in Thucydides difficult to understand, but if they are delivered slowly, giving the audience time to take in the implications of each phrase, they offer no great technical difficulty to a speaker.

In the *First Philippic* and the *Olynthiacs* we see Demosthenes breaking away from this style and training himself to adapt his forensic manner to the demands of open-air speaking. The phrases are longer and correspond to the length of phrase that he had been using for clients in private cases and in his own early speeches in the courts. Occasionally, as in these speeches, he makes some greater demands on himself, but his form of argument is different from anything that he used in the courts. In the scheme of the *First Philippic* one argument is fundamental—if Athenians in the past and Philip recently were willing to face what looked like overwhelming opposition in order to achieve an end that was vitally important to them, what excuse has Athens for refusing to accept the present challenge? It would be possible to present this kind of argument in narrative form, giving a series of events and situations and comparing how Athens and Philip reacted to them: “A few years ago, Sparta was strong; but we, who had a just cause, far from being deterred by the heavy opposition, stood up to them bravely,” and so on. But Demosthenes prefers to present his argument like this:

ἐπειτ' ἐνθυμητέον καὶ παρ' ἄλλων ἀκούουσι καὶ τοῖς εἰδόσιν αὐτοῖς  
ἀναμιμνησκομένοις, ἥλικήν ποτ' ἐχόντων δύναμιν Λακεδαιμονίων, ἐξ οὗ χρόνος οὐ  
πολύς, ὥς καλῶς καὶ προσηκόντως οὐδὲν ἀνάξιον ὑμεῖς ἐπράξατε τῆς πόλεως, ἀλλ'  
ὑπεμείναθ' ὑπὲρ τῶν δικαίων τὸν πρὸς ἐκείνους πόλεμον. (4.3)

The orator cannot pause or relax the tension anywhere in this sentence. It is similar in structure to an equally defiant reminder of past history in *On the Crown*:

ὑμεῖς τοίνυν, ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, Λακεδαιμονίων γῆς καὶ θαλάττης ἀρχόντων καὶ τὰ  
κύκλω τῆς Ἀττικῆς κατεχόντων ἀρμοσταῖς καὶ φρουραῖς, Εὐβοίαν, Τάναγραν, τὴν  
Βοιωτίαν ἅπασαν, Μέγαρα, Αἰγίναν, Κέω, τὰς ἄλλας νήσους, οὐ ναῦς, οὐ τεῖχῃ

<sup>25</sup>H. Ll. Hudson-Williams, “Political Speeches in Athens,” *CQ* n.s. 1 (1951) 68–75, gives reasons for believing that politicians before the time of Demosthenes never wrote out their speeches, gave the impression that they had not made much preparation beforehand, and appeared to speak almost *ex tempore* in the Assembly. If he is right, it will follow that they spoke slowly, using short *cola* in the Thucydidean manner.

τῆς πόλεως τότε κεκτημένης, ἐξήλθετ' εἰς Ἀλιάρτον καὶ πάλιν οὐ πολλαῖς ἡμέραις ὕστερον εἰς Κόρινθον, τῶν τότε Ἀθηναίων πόλλ' ἂν ἐχόντων μνησικακῆσαι καὶ Κορινθίοις καὶ Θηβαίοις τῶν περὶ τὸν Δεκελεικὸν πόλεμον πραχθέντων· ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰποῦν τοῦτο, οὐδ' ἐγγύς. (18.96)

On the other hand, when he comes to describe Philip's courage in the face of heavy odds, he uses the narrative style, reminding his audience

ὅτι εἰχομέν ποθ' ἡμεῖς, ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, Πύδναν καὶ Ποτεΐδαιαν καὶ Μεθώνην καὶ πάντα τὸν τόπον τοῦτον οἰκείον κύκλῳ,

and that if Philip had decided it was difficult, he would never have achieved what he did (4.4–5).

There is little real virtuosity in the *First Philippic*, but it has the fire and life that is lacking in the earlier speeches, and it finishes with a splendid outburst, which shows that he has learnt how to manage long breathless sentences (47–50). There are scornful remarks “thrown away” parenthetically,

κακούργου μὲν γάρ ἐστι κριθέντ' ἀποθανεῖν, στρατηγοῦ δὲ μαχόμενον τοῖς πολεμίοις (47),

ἀνοητότατοι γάρ εἰσιν οἱ λογοποιοῦντες (49),

and he uses hiatus skilfully (in places where it presents no real technical difficulty), as when it marks the division between the different rumours about Philip's activities:

οἱ δ' ὥς πρέσβεις πέπομφεν ὡς βασιλέα, οἱ δ' ἐν Ἰλλυριοῖς πόλεις τειχίζειν. (48)

The evidence is clear that the orator has found his stride.

He was not, apparently, convinced at once that this was the right style for him (perhaps because the advice that he gave in the *First Philippic* was not taken), and he returned to his earlier manner in *On the Freedom of the Rhodians*.<sup>26</sup> But in the *Olynthiacs* he is fully converted to his new style. He wants the Athenians to see at the same time the nature of the crisis that faces them and the actions that they must (and can) take to meet it. The opportunity offered by the plight of Olynthus “almost cries out” for them to intervene, and “this is what I think you should do:”

ἔστι δὴ τά γ' ἐμοὶ δοκοῦντα, ψηφίσασθαι μὲν ἤδη τὴν βοήθειαν, καὶ παρασκευάσασθαι τὴν ταχίστην ὅπως ἐνθὲνδε βοηθήσετε (καὶ μὴ πάθῃτε ταῦτόν ὅπερ καὶ πρότερον), πρεσβείαν δὲ πέμπειν, ἥτις ταῦτ' ἐρεῖ καὶ παρέσται τοῖς πράγμασιν· ὥς ἐστι μάλιστα τοῦτο δέος, μὴ πανοῦργος ὢν καὶ δεινὸς ἄνθρωπος πράγμασι χρῆσθαι, τὰ

<sup>26</sup>I see no reason to doubt that this is the correct order of the speeches. For recent argument see G. L. Cawkwell, “The Defence of Olynthus,” *CQ* n.s. 12 (1962) 122–140, repr. in *Philip and Athens*, ed. S. Perlman (Cambridge 1973) 48–66.

μὲν εἰκων, ἥνικ' ἂν τύχη, τὰ δ' ἀπειλῶν (ἀξιόπιστος δ' ἂν εἰκότως φαίνοιτο), τὰ δ' ἡμᾶς διαβάλλων καὶ τὴν ἀπουσίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν, τρέψεται καὶ παρασπάσῃται τι τῶν ὄλων πραγμάτων. (1.2-3)

The advice is complex. They must not delay, remembering earlier failures because of delays, and they must send out a delegation that will speak plainly to Philip; such a delegation, he tells them, can make sure that Philip complies with their demands; Philip knows very well how to take advantage of Athenian carelessness, but a delegation on the spot can check him. Instead of describing the situation first, and then leading up to an argument about the solution, he takes the situation for granted, assumes that a solution can be found, and explains why it will succeed. It is a similar arrangement of argument to the opening passage of *Against Androtion*, and (as in the *Meidias*, a year or so later) he presents himself with an exacting breathless sentence right at the start of his speech.

One must also notice in sentences of this kind the alternation between statement or command and parenthetical explanation—"be quick (and do not make the old mistake)," "send a delegation to keep an eye on things (otherwise Philip may take advantage of you)," "Philip may yield on one point and then start threatening (and it is his threats that make people believe he is serious)." This use of parenthesis is an economical way of making the argument appear logical; it is economical both of time and of breath, since the parenthetical remarks can be spoken fast and softly.

In the *Second Olynthiac* the opening sentence describes the nature of the situation and the challenge that it offers, and it is an extremely exacting sentence (though it is free from hiatus, which would have added further difficulty).

As in his forensic speeches, Demosthenes sometimes uses a long sentence, full of detail (and certainly spoken at a fast pace) to characterize "the enemy." The speech *On the Chersonese* (Oration 8) supplies some notable examples, 38-40 and 44-45 in particular, both with parenthetical interruptions. But the most remarkable examples of virtuosity are to be found in the *Third Philippic*. The opening sentence is tremendously exacting, but 28-29 deserves to be quoted as the last example of Demosthenes' technique, because it is the negative counterpart of the passage that was analyzed in the *First Olynthiac*; it describes the careless and thoughtless way everyone is behaving despite Philip's threats:

καὶ ταῦθ' ὁρῶντες οἱ Ἕλληνες ἅπαντες καὶ ἀκούοντες οὐ πέμπομεν πρέσβεις περὶ τούτων πρὸς ἀλλήλους κάγανακτοῦμεν, οὕτω δὲ κακῶς διακείμεθα καὶ διορωρύγεθα κατὰ πόλεις ὥστ' ἄχρι τῆς τήμερον ἡμέρας οὐδὲν οὔτε τῶν συμφερόντων οὔτε τῶν δεόντων πράξαι δυνάμεθα, οὐδὲ συστήναι, οὐδὲ κοινωνίαν βοθηρίας καὶ φιλίας οὐδεμίαν ποιήσασθαι, ἀλλὰ μείζω γιγνόμενον τὸν ἄνθρωπον περιορῶμεν, τὸν χρόνον κερδᾶναι τοῦτον ὃν ἄλλος ἀπόλλυται ἕκαστος ἐγνωκώς, ὥς γ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, οὐχ

ὅπως σωθήσεται τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων σκοπῶν οὐδὲ πράττων, ἐπεὶ, ὅτι γ' ὥσπερ περίοδος ἢ καταβολὴ πυρετοῦ ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς κακοῦ καὶ τῷ πάνυ πόρρω δοκοῦντι νῦν ἀφεστάναι προσέρχεται, οὐδεὶς ἀγνοεῖ.

Only an accomplished orator would dare write such a sentence for himself, and Demosthenes has made it particularly difficult by presenting himself with hiatus at six separate places where he might have been tempted to stop for breath. It is a tremendous *tour de force*.

Demosthenes is of course not the only Attic orator who wrote difficult sentences for himself. Hegesippus, for example, author of the seventh oration in the Demosthenic corpus, has some sentences which (by the standards suggested in these pages) offer so much technical difficulty that one is inclined to call them clumsily written. Blass thinks that he shows "natürliche Redegabe ohne Schulung und Sorgfalt,"<sup>27</sup> and it may be that the technique of speaking came to him so easily that he could afford to be careless in composition (whereas Demosthenes could not). Though his phrases are often short, he uses hiatus so extensively (one is tempted to say "carelessly") that he cannot take breath at the end of each phrase. One may wonder if even Demosthenes could have delivered a sentence like the following, without losing control and breaking down in breathless confusion:<sup>28</sup>

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐτέρου ἐπανορθώματος, ὃ ὑμεῖς ἐν τῇ εἰρήνῃ ἐπανορθοῦσθε, τοὺς ἄλλους Ἑλλήνας, ὅσοι μὴ κοινωνοῦσι τῆς εἰρήνης, ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους εἶναι, καὶ ἐάν τις ἐπ' αὐτοὺς στρατεύῃ, βοηθεῖν τοὺς κοινωνοῦντας τῆς εἰρήνης, ἡγούμενοι καὶ δίκαιον τοῦτο καὶ φιλάνθρωπον, μὴ μόνον ἡμᾶς καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἡμετέρους καὶ Φίλιππον καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους τοὺς ἐκείνου ἄγειν τὴν εἰρήνην, τοὺς δὲ μήθ' ἡμετέρους ὄντας μήτε Φιλίππου συμμάχους ἐν μέσῳ κείσθαι καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν κρειττόνων ἀπόλλυσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτοις διὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν εἰρήνην ὑπάρχειν σωτηρίαν, καὶ τῷ ὄντι εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἡμᾶς καταθεμένους τὰ ὄπλα, τοῦτο δὲ τὸ ἐπανορθωμα ὁμολογῶν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, ὡς ἀκούετε, δίκαιόν τ' εἶναι καὶ δέχεσθαι, Φεραίων μὲν ἀφήρηται τὴν πόλιν καὶ φρουρὰν ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει κατέστησεν, ἵνα δὴ αὐτόνομοι ᾧσιν, ἐπὶ δ' Ἀμβρακίαν στρατεύεται, τὰς δ' ἐν Κασσωπίᾳ τρεῖς πόλεις, Πανδοσίαν καὶ Βούχετα καὶ Ἐλάτειαν, Ἡλείων ἀποικίας, κατακαύσας τὴν χώραν καὶ εἰς τὰς πόλεις βιασάμενος παρέδωκεν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ κηδεστῇ τῷ ἐαυτοῦ δουλεύειν.

There are many characters in this sentence, the Athenians and their allies, the signers of the peace and the non-signers, Philip and his allies and his brother-in-law Alexander, and the various cities that are mentioned by name. Can the speaker keep them all apart in his mind, and

<sup>27</sup> *Att. Ber.* 3.2. 146.

<sup>28</sup> Other difficult passages are 7-8 (ὁπότε γάρ . . .) and 12-13 (the sentences are fairly short, but not easy to manage), where he is appealing to the evidence of the past; an intense style of delivery will be needed, and there follows, in 14-15, a long and exacting sentence of protest.

hope that the audience will do the same? He has made things even more difficult by his grammatical structure. The audience cannot guess in what direction the sentence is moving, when he begins by talking "about the other *ἐπανόρθωμα* which you made." He first describes it, and then justifies it, "thinking as you did that it was not only fair, etc." His "not only" gives fair warning that it will be a complex justification, and he makes sure that he will not stop to take breath before it is finished by giving himself a hiatus after *ἀπόλλυσθαι*. Only at *σωτηρίαν* can he allow himself to breathe before he finally sums it up—*καὶ τῷ ὄντι εἰρήνην ἄγειν ἡμᾶς*. The masculine singular participle *ὁμολογῶν* is the first hint that Philip is to be the subject of the sentence (he is in fact never mentioned by name) and his series of actions in response to the *ἐπανόρθωμα* is now described, in shorter phrases (no wonder, since the speaker must be nearly breathless by this time) and with hiatus only in or before the brief parenthetical remarks.

The speaker is making great demands on himself, but it is not without a purpose. Like Demosthenes in similar situations, he wants the Athenians to understand the complexity of the crisis that faces them, full of problems and contrasts, their reasonable behaviour balanced against the totally unreasonable reaction of Philip; the sentence begins on the note of peace and optimism, but ends with violence and slavery.

Aeschines, who had some experience as an actor and (according to Demosthenes, at least) was proud of his fine voice, was undoubtedly a capable speaker, but he is also a careful writer who makes technical difficulties for himself only if something is to be gained by them. He is economical in his use of hiatus, less apparently careless than Hegesippus, and his intense passages and those which present a crowded canvas show many similarities to the Demosthenic manner. I must be content here with a single example, the description of a situation in *On the Embassy* (2.70–71):

τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἀρχὴν ἐποιησάμεθα τοῦ πολέμου ὑπὲρ Ἀμφιπόλεως, συνέβαινε δ' ἡμῶν τὸν στρατηγὸν ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ ἐβδομήκοντα μὲν καὶ πέντε πόλεις συμμαχίδας ἀποβεβληκέναι, ὡς ἐκτήσατο Τιμόθεος ὁ Κόνωνος καὶ κατέστησεν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον· (προῆρμαι γὰρ παρρησιάσασθαι, καὶ ἐλευθέρως ἅμα καὶ τάληθ' εἰπὼν σῶζεσθαι· ἐὰν δὲ ἄλλως πως γινώσκητε, καταχρήσασθέ μοι· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὑποστείλαιμην·) ἑκατὸν δὲ καὶ πεντήκοντα τριήρεις λαβόντα ἐκ τῶν νεωρίων μὴ κατακεκομμέναι, καὶ ταῦτα ὑμῖν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν αἰ τοῖς Χάρητος οἱ κατήγοροι δεικνύουσι, χίλια δὲ καὶ πεντακόσια τάλαντα οὐκ εἰς στρατιώτας, ἀλλ' εἰς ἡγεμόνων ἀλαζονείας ἀνηλωκέναι, Δηϊάρην τε καὶ Δηίπυρον καὶ Πολυφόντην, δραπετάς ἀνθρώπους ἐκ τῆς Ἑλλάδος συνειλεγμένους, καὶ χωρὶς εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὸ βῆμα καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μισθοφόρους, οἳ τοὺς μὲν τάλαιπῶρους νησιώτας καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ἐξήκοντα τάλαντα εἰσέπραττον σύνταξιν, κατήγον δὲ τὰ πλοῖα καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐκ τῆς κοινῆς θαλάττης.  
(2.70–71)



The speaker cannot pause anywhere in his description of this crowded picture, and he will want to speak fast; but even so he thinks it worth while to insert a breathless parenthesis, insisting that he is being absolutely frank and concealing nothing; and his use of hiatus in the parenthesis shows the change in his manner of speech from a flowing narrative style to a more "staccato" manner; the parenthesis adds to the difficulty of the sentence, but Aeschines evidently thought it necessary in order to make sure that he kept the attention of his audience.

Another good passage comes at the beginning of *Against Ctesiphon* (3.3-4), when he is complaining about the prevalence of "unconstitutional proposals" which so often escape prosecution. He insists that his attack on Ctesiphon is no mere routine prosecution, but a serious and important effort to stop a deplorable and dangerous practice. A display of indignation and a highly intense manner is required.

Some readers will be less willing than I am to decide when a passage is easy or difficult for a speaker; and they will object that we know too little of the intonation and the cadence of spoken Attic to be confident in such matters. I have tried to restrict the argument to the issue of breath control, and I am quite confident that an Athenian speaker, like any contemporary orator, cannot hold the attention of his audience through a long sentence, when it demands emotional tension, if he allows himself to pause for breath. And even though the Greeks of old may have been "better men than we are," there is no evidence that their lungs or their vocal chords were different from our own.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, CALIFORNIA