

**Epideictic memories of war: Reconceiving the classical funeral oration
as exigence-driven discourse**

by

John P. Banister

A thesis submitted to the graduate faculty

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Major: Rhetoric, Composition, and Professional Communication

Program of Study Committee:
Jean Goodwin, Major Professor
David B. Hollander
Richard Benjamin Crosby

Iowa State University

Ames, Iowa

2015

Copyright © John P. Banister, 2015. All rights reserved.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Situations for Epideictic Rhetoric	11
Defining Epideictic: Aristotle and Beyond	17
Creating Identification: Epideictic and the construction of public memory	21
Why study these <i>epitaphoi</i>	25
Method of Inquiry.....	27
CHAPTER 3: PRAISING VIRTUE AND JUSTIFYING FAILURES: THE CASE OF DEMOSTHENES' FUNERAL ORATION	30
Meeting Generic Expectations	36
Aristotelian Explanations	40
Inspiring Emulation through Secular Prayer.....	41
Jointly Eulogizing Success and Failure.....	42
Justifications of Military Failure	44
Emulating the Tribal Ancestors	46
Conclusion.....	51
CHAPTER 4: IDENTIFICATION IN HYPERIDES' FUNERAL ORATION	53
Two Orators; 16 years	55
Generic Expectations: Remnants from a Fossilized Tradition	59
An Aristotelian Reading	63
Promoting Identification: Praising Leosthenes as Athenian Exemplar	66
Conclusion.....	73
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION.....	74
CLASSICAL SOURCES	78
REFERENCES.....	79

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my committee chair Jean Goodwin for always pushing me to succeed at levels beyond which I originally thought possible. Her honest, constructive, and thorough feedback at all stages of this project was integral in molding it into what it has become. I also have great appreciation for my committee members, David Hollander and Richard Benjamin Crosby. David gave me a much needed crash course in ancient history, a subject to which I had little exposure until recently, and consistently pointed me in the direction of other helpful resources. Ben introduced me to the art of rhetorical criticism when I was an undergraduate in 2010, and since that time has always proved himself a helpful mentor, both with regard to this project and beyond.

Many others helped me along the way as well. I'm grateful to Allison Watson and Samantha Dunn for providing feedback on early drafts and to Rachel Alsup for agreeing to edit the final copy. Needless to say, any errors or omissions reside with me and not them. In addition, I would also like to thank my friends, colleagues, and the English department faculty and staff for making my time at Iowa State University a worthwhile learning experience. I want to send a special thanks to all the individuals of the 3rd floor of Carver Hall— members of both the English and Math departments. Your friendly greetings in the hallway and off-the-cuff conversations waiting for the copy machine always made me feel at home and reminded me, at times necessarily, that life existed beyond the university.

ABSTRACT

Epideictic discourse has been and remains an enigma in rhetorical studies. The concept has been considered from numerous perspectives, but praise and blame, the purposes Aristotle ascribed to his third genre, still remain pervasive in our understanding of it. Following scholars who have questioned how well Aristotelian definitions of the concept can explain epideictic discourse in antiquity (Chase, 1961; Duffy, 1983; Walker, 2000), these essays will examine the political functions of the classical funeral oration (*Epitaphios Logos*), a quintessentially epideictic form of rhetoric. To date, few studies (Hesk, 2013 is a notable exception) explore the influence of political exigencies that confronted the ancient orator when speaking in ceremonial contexts. Responding to the sparse treatment of the subject, this project applies close reading of two extant funeral orations from classical Athens to investigate the connection between funerary discourse the prosecution of war efforts.

As a work of conceptually oriented criticism, it aims to add to, modify, or reconceive of the epideictic genre and illuminate aspects of the text and context of the speeches under study. I propose that Aristotle's conception of epideictic is insufficient to explain the discourse of his contemporaries because it ignored the political ends ceremonial orators pursued, in particular, those of Demosthenes and Hyperides, two orators for whom we have extant texts of a funeral oration each delivered. By drawing on the works of modern rhetorical theorists including Chaïm Perelman, Lloyd Bitzer, and Kenneth Burke, I argue for a more fluid conception of the epideictic genre, one that is determined more by the immediate exigencies of the rhetorical situation than by the traditional tropes thought to govern the tradition.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Political leaders in Ancient Athens employed rhetoric as a tool to mediate social controversy, to unify disparate factions within a *polis*, and to persuade the population to support—or at least to accept—a policy action. By alluding to great men and great triumphs from the city's past, public oratory in the form of the state funeral oration articulated a self-projection of Athenian supremacy among the Greeks and crafted an ideal narrative of the city via epideictic rhetoric, chiefly through the vehicle of this occasion (Loraux, 1986). These speeches, however, were not simply idle reflections on the past. The narratives they advanced could serve as the discursive foundation for future political actions by strengthening communion around shared Athenian values (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). Most immediately, idealized historical narratives advanced by the state funeral ceremony and its capstone, the oration, aided civic leaders in making arguments about current and future city policy. Regarding this function, Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) posit, "epideictic oratory forms a central part of the art of persuasion, and the lack of understanding shown toward it results from a false conception of the effects of argumentation" (p. 49). Being able to claim the authority of the ancestors was a powerful rhetorical bargaining chip for Athenians trying to make deliberative arguments. While most would not dispute that Athenian identity has been crucial to her political and military histories, little attribution is given to the orators' own political agendas as guiding principles around which they shaped their discourses that aided in the construction of broader cultural narratives.

War in particular has a special need for rhetoric to contextualize its goals and aims. It is difficult to conceive of a rhetoric that succeeds in contextualizing a war effort without direct reference to the specific exigencies attendant to that particular conflict. Visions of the

Athenian funeral orations that see them as a fossilized tradition of idle ceremony whose fundamental purpose is to uplift the city's spirits fail to explain why citizens would respond in the same fashion to the same messages despite them being delivered in front of the backdrop of very different political and military contexts. Indeed, while all policymaking in a democracy requires some consensus, war efforts especially require genuine buy-in from citizens because the state is asking them risk their lives in the cause of those efforts. Burke (1969) contends in *A Rhetoric of Motives* that a war cannot be prosecuted without a discursive foundation: "war characteristically requires a myriad of constructive acts for each destructive one; before each culminating blast there must be a vast network of interlocking operations, directed communally" (p. 22). As such, one ought to ask what constructive acts have (and do) set the table for the destruction we witness during wars, both historically and today. I begin this thesis from the premise that the discursive foundations that can effectively persuade citizens to believe in the virtue of war must necessarily be too complex for a set of recycled ceremonial topoi to handle. Each instantiation of these discourses is unique and exigence-driven.

The power of public memory plays an important role in the formation and *application* of shared cultural values—and this was particularly true for the ancient Athenians. Still, it is important to remember that values do not sit as trophies on a shelf; they are instrumental to our deliberations, for a community must appraise a proposed action in terms of its values if it is to avoid cognitive dissonance. "Agreement with regard to values," Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) assert, "means an admission that an object, a being, or an ideal must have specific influence on action and the disposition toward action and that one can make use of this influence in an argument" (p. 74). At minimum then, a judicious rhetor will use his

epideictic rhetoric as a vessel to set up his future deliberative arguments. But ultimately, an orator has the ability to fuse the process of public value formation with the application of those values to arguments in support of one's policy positions at multiple stages of the persuasion process. Epideictic memories of past wars informed thinking about present and future wars. Athenian funeral orators were not alone among the Greeks as practitioners using collective memory to construct an ideal 'plupast' befitting the expedience of the current situation, which rhetors attempted to harness for their own efforts (Grethlein, 2012). Thucydides' histories further attest to the need to cloak one's argument in the right narratives, even if those narratives constitute a *rewriting* of history. History was made and remade by the institutionalized ritual of the Athenian funeral orations.

This study centers around these two related questions: (1) How did the funeral orations of the late 4th century respond to exigencies and constraints imposed by the contexts of war-time crises? In other words, did they go beyond the bounds of expected ceremonial topoi to foreground foreign policy arguments by contextualizing the war effort, even arguing for or against certain military campaigns? (2) If it is found that Demosthenes' and/or Hyperides' funeral orations are exigence-driven, what strategies did they use to make arguments about the nature, purpose, and conduct of war(s) without alienating the audience by deviating too noticeably from generic expectations?

For Aristotle and others, the *epitaphios logos* constituted a quintessentially epideictic occasion. In fact, Aristotle refers to them specifically in his treatise. While his writings still add value to the theory and pedagogy of rhetoric, since the publication of Edwin Black's *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (1965/1978) half a century ago, our reliance on Aristotle as an authority on rhetorical theory has waned. Until Black's critique removed

Aristotle from his pedestal, all theory had been divided into two categories: the Aristotelian and the non-Aristotelian; the mere fact of this distinction being made illustrates the immense influence Aristotle has had. Whether scholarship in rhetorical studies accepted or rejected the Aristotelian concepts, advancement of one's position on Aristotle's terms reified his primacy. In keeping with the trend toward more nuanced understandings of Aristotle, I support the view suggested by Leff (1985), who stated that we ought to reconceive of the *Rhetoric* as only one of a plethora of texts confronting us with an explanation of the art of rhetoric, rather than as the authoritative handbook. Aristotle was observant when aggregating a vast array of speech types which he could not justify calling either forensic or deliberative as epideictic; however, the complexity of discursive genres in antiquity made such categorization difficult (Duffy, 1983). Despite much work to these ends, there is ample reason to further interrogate the Aristotelian conception of epideictic and dissect it in relation to contemporary scholarship and past and present rhetorical discourse.

Following Aristotle, modern scholars have demonstrated the nuanced roles taken by epideictic discourse. Condit (1985) further clarified our understanding of genre by identifying three pairs of functions by which such discourse can be characterized: “definition/understanding, display/entertainment, and shaping/sharing of community” (pp. 288). Condit downplays the emphasis on epideictic's role in laying the groundwork for argumentation, as Perelman and Olbrechts Tyteca (1969) propose, but stressed the power of epideictic to “*explain the social world*” and that through executing such an explanation with eloquence, the speaker gains power and demonstrates leadership (emphasis mine) (Condit, 1985, p. 288). The Athenian funeral orations embody each of Condit's functional pairs, but their purpose is perhaps most obviously in line with the third. By shaping and sharing

community values, orators enhanced their reputations as city leaders. The event provided them a pulpit from which to advocate for whatever war policies they and those who had their ear desired. As Consigny (1992) put it, the ceremonial orator is "at liberty to advocate any position whatsoever, regardless how frivolous, as long as it affords him an opportunity to exhibit his rhetorical prowess" (p. 281). However, their ability to "explain the social world" required a nuanced understanding of the sociopolitical exigencies that characterized the present moment wherein they spoke, thus blending Condit's second and third pair so as to entertain and shape perception simultaneously. In his important essay "The Rhetorical Situation," Bitzer (1968) argued that discourse is called into being by exigencies but controlled by a set of constraints. Present thinking on the classical funeral oration places much weight on the institutionalized constraints of the genre, but as of yet, they have not thoroughly considered the role of exigencies in the composition of the *epitaphoi*.

Twentieth century rhetoricians have turned the tide on thinking that epideictic is merely a *rhetoric of display*. Loraux (1986) argued that the funeral orations did not simply commemorate the dead, heal social wounds, or inspire the audience with an artistic display, though that was a part of what they did; instead, she articulates the crucial role they played in maintaining communal identity. Moreover, despite the tendency of some to see the *epitaphios* genre as a "decaying and fossilized," Herrman (2004) notes that each funeral orator had his own priorities in speaking, in addition to facing his own specific exigencies (p. 7). The basic Aristotelian understanding of the epideictic makes it difficult to evaluate the exigencies that prompt ceremonial rhetoric. I posit that this project can expand our conception of epideictic in two ways: 1) its conception of epideictic discourse is too broad, which blurs the complexity that the discourse exhibits, including its tendency to hybridize

with deliberative discourse when the two share complimentary aims. That it is broad is only a problem because current theory has provided few mechanisms by which we can contextualize it to predict how it will respond to a given situation. 2) The assumption that the epideictic nature of funerary discourse in antiquity embodied a unified tradition oversimplifies its rhetorical function and influence. Framing epideictic exigencies in terms of praise and blame—as Aristotelian theories of the discourse suggest we do—somehow manages to define the genre too broadly while simultaneously limiting its capability to exert social influence with audiences. Rather, following the premise of Bitzer's (1968) rhetorical situation, I contend that the institutionalized nature of the ceremony did impose constraints; however, those constraints did not completely crowd out the role of exigencies.

I contend that even when epideictic discourse is presented in institutionalized forums, it still tends to respond to particular exigencies that exist independently of the institutional contexts. Being better able to understand how exigencies function in ceremonial speeches will allow us to better interrogate theories of the epideictic and assess how well they explain the discourses that they claim fall under its domain. I question whether Aristotle's taxonomy of the discursive forms he observed in his contemporaries match the discourse actually being produced in the period. Modern theories of ceremonial discourse, by contrast, view the genre as more complex, reserving for it an essential role in articulating culture (Condit, 1985) and even laying the groundwork for effective argumentation (Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca, 1969). This work attempts to confirm and build on these theories. If the rhetoric of the funeral orations suggests a more active role for epideictic discourse as I hypothesize, then the way these discursive forms interact with exigencies that the rhetor confronts needs to be reconceived. This broader re-theorization of the epideictic

places it functionally closer to deliberative rhetoric. In so doing, Aristotle's original conception is expanded, and future studies can explore whether these ideas can be observed in rhetoric across differing contexts.

I examine these questions through close readings of the two most recent extant *epitaphoi* from classical Athens. These orations are the two most likely to have actually been delivered to the audience in a similar form to the one in which we now have them. In the latter half of the 4th century BCE, Athens was at a crossroads. Spartan, Theban, and finally Macedonian growth had crowded out their political clout in the region. In short, this Athens was a shell of what it had been 100 years earlier during the Periclean age. Macedonian rulers Phillip II and his son Alexander threatened to permanently destroy not just Athenian abilities to exert regional influence, but their autonomy as well. Demosthenes, a renowned forensic orator, was called upon to deliver the funeral oration in 338 in the aftermath of a terrible defeat at the hands of Phillip at Chaeronea. Sixteen years later, Hyperides, an equally prominent citizen, was to deliver the funeral oration in 322 when after the death of Alexander, Athenians tried to take advantage of an apparent power vacuum during the brief but consequential Lamian war.

In chapter 2, I review the applicable literature concerning epideictic discourse and the classical funeral orations in particular. The historical and rhetorical dimensions of the Athenian funeral orations as a subgenre are explored before attempts to connect them to theories of epideictic discourse in general. I also consider how rhetors have confronted exigencies in ceremonial forums and how that influences the evolution of genres as needed.

In chapter 3, I present a textual analysis of Demosthenes' funeral oration, a speech delivered after a disastrous defeat when few in Athens retained hope of avoiding subjugation

at the hands of Phillip. At a surface level, Demosthenes employs many of the expected tropes that had become prominent as the generic tradition evolved. However, the finesse with which he composed the oration shines through when examined by close reading to demonstrate how the exigent circumstances posed by the loss at Chaeronea effect Demosthenes' inventional strategies.

In chapter 4, I perform a similar analysis of Hyperides' funeral address. While the version of this text still available to us is slightly damaged, the oration stands out as unique among the remaining Athenian funeral orations. Hyperides' profuse praise of one man, the general Leosthenes, is a move not present in any of the other extant *epitaphoi*. For this reason, Hyperides works beyond the generally accepted confines of the genre more than Demosthenes. But as I demonstrate, he also prepares his audience for these deviations so as to minimize their potential objection to his defiance of generic conventions.

Finally, I try to digest some of the findings revealed by the close study of these texts and the tradition from which they emerged. Despite the growing prominence of new and evolving media, epideictic articulations of culture still influence the conduct of war in important ways. In similar fashion as Bostdorff (2011) and Ivie (2007), I explore my own findings in the contexts of the war on terrorism and the Iraq war to suggest directions for future scholarship on the relationship between epideictic rhetoric and the conduct of war.

CHAPTER 2: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This essay provides a sketch of rhetorical situations that evolved to confront Athenian epitaphists in the late 4th century BCE and conversely, the situations faced by critics, both in antiquity and today, in trying to rhetorically analyze those artifacts within the larger rubric of epideictic discourse, a nebulous concept in the history of rhetoric. I contend that each extant funeral oration is unique because it responds to specific exigencies, which correspond to the rhetor's goals as well as the current military and political climates. On the other hand, those in the camp of George Kennedy (1963) contend that the funeral oration was more or less a unified genre. Kennedy himself was adamant about the static form he perceived in the *epitaphios logos*: "the most interesting feature of such speeches is the highly formulaic quality they achieved almost immediately" (1963, pp. 154). Loraux (1986) further noted the tendency of the genre to self-regulate according to its *topoi*, and indeed it was relatively stable considering the many changes in Athenian society during the time funeral orations were dominant practice. However, despite some structural similarities between the six extant orations (itself representing a very small corpus), there is reason to question whether we can boil down the tradition to a simple formula that a rhetor could apply regardless of the particular exigencies he faced. Otherwise put, salient social and political matters constituted a unique backdrop for each instantiation of the funeral oration, thus making it difficult to equate any one rhetorical situation with another.

Before embarking on a textual analysis of the two extant funeral orations from the late 4th century, it is essential to outline the rhetorical situations corresponding to internal Athenian divisions and the rise of Macedonian hegemony. In addition to the overt political exigencies, the intellectual trends and conceptions of rhetorical theory under which rhetors

operated constituted exigencies and constraints in their own right. Hence, this literature review will proceed as follows: 1) I will explicate significant components of rhetorical theory as it pertains to the funeral oration tradition and of the purposes of epideictic discourse more broadly; 2) I will problematize Aristotelian definitions of epideictic as being insufficient to explain the intricacies of the funeral orations; 3) I will briefly explore how the Burkean concept of identification functions within the purview of ceremonial rhetoric; and 4) Finally, I will explain why I chose to study the funeral orations of Demosthenes (338) and Hyperides (322) in particular. I argue that both Demosthenes' and Hyperides' funeral orations possessed organic connections with the contemporary political situation, something that other extant *epitaphoi* lack. Further, because of the similarities in the ends sought by each orator, the two speeches are well suited for comparison with one another.

The immediate social conditions remained profoundly relevant to the rhetorical choices and goals of the epitaphist and ought to be considered when conducting speech analyses. As such, it is historiographically problematic for scholars of classical rhetoric to neglect "the context that initially prompted the rhetoric" and instead rely solely on the text in isolation (Enos, 2013, p. 13). Wickkeiser (1999) identified isolating the text from the larger event as a common problem within the literary approach to scholarship on the funeral orations. Takis Poulakos (1990) specifically criticizes the approaches of Kennedy, as well as Ziolkowski (1981), for presuming ideologically neutral invention in the funeral orations. This faulty assumption is necessary for the critic that is trying to unearth continuity across the generic tradition. But a more ideologically conscious and cultural approach to rhetorical criticism, Poulakis continues, "dissociates past works from the realm of *essences, timeless ideals, and universal truths*, and resituates canonized texts within their sociopolitical context"

(emphasis added) (1990, p. 173). To interpret the funeral orations, just as with all rhetoric, one must consider the contingencies embodied in their practice, and remember that when genres do develop into something resembling formulae, it is because the social conditions necessitate that codification (Miller, 1984). Under such an approach, one must consider exigence and genre as two sides of the same coin.

Each year when the Athenians gathered to commemorate their war dead, the oration was an accompaniment to the locus of greater ritual practices. Rather than occurring in isolation, the oration "interacted with and was part of the Athenians' larger sphere of collective memory" (Shear, 2013, p. 531). In short, it was but one of many articulations bearing on Athenian cultural identity. Taken holistically, the funeral oration must be understood to be both a literary form and an institution (Loraux, 1986). The form and institutional backdrop that came with funeral oration conventions constituted just two of the many sides of rhetorical situations that confronted epitaphists. Thucydides informs us that the funeral orator, an Athenian citizen "chosen by the state, of approved wisdom and eminent reputation, pronounces over them an appropriate eulogy" (2.34.6). What constituted appropriate content and decorum would have been subject to the influence of political and social sentiments, and the tenor of those conditions was very different in the early years of the Peloponnesian War than they were 100 years later when Athenian hegemony had been largely displaced by the rise of Macedonia. It is from this premise that I begin my investigation of texts.

Situations for Epideictic Rhetoric

Epideictic discourse is incredibly broad in scope and diverse in practice. While classical rhetorical education relied heavily on imitation of prominent models, the genesis of

rhetorical theory in classical Athens was hardly monolithic to begin with—and diversity proliferated in its subsequent evolutions. Susan Jarrett (1991) highlights the pluralistic philosophical bases of a sophistic rhetoric in antiquity that understood a rhetorical moment in terms of "its *kairos*" and the "understanding of the local *nomoi*;" moreover, sophistic ideas "interbred and collided with literature, science, and philosophy before such interests were bracketed by Aristotle as disciplines" (pp. 11–13). In the years following the first golden age for sophists in 5th Century Athens, the debates about rhetoric's appropriate forms and functions became populated by even more voices, most of which cannot be subsumed under the rubrics of Platonic or Aristotelian rhetorical theories that are so prominent today. Unfortunately, rehabilitation of the sophists has only become a priority for rhetorical scholars in the past few decades (Poulakos, 1983; 1995; Jarratt, 1991; Crick, 2010).

Examining the epideictic components of war rhetoric affords the critic many opportunities. Recent scholarship has noted the importance of epideictic discourse to social identity construction in contemporary war rhetorics (Ivie, 2007; Bostdorff, 2011). As Bostdorff and Ferris's (2014) recent essay on John F. Kennedy's American University Commencement address highlights, epideictic's contribution to public understanding of war cannot be oversimplified to a mere reinforcement of archaic values that motivate citizens to fight. Because "epideictic rhetoric places the rhetor in a pedagogical position of authority," it helps provide him or her the *ethos* needed to criticize (and eventually modify) the accepted conventions of a culture should one choose to do so (p. 431). The American University speech may be an anomaly in this regard, but its presence also gives us cause to question prominent theories of epideictic war rhetoric. In circumstances such as these, rhetors likely possess more agency than is commonly acknowledged to advocate for or against war

efforts—but said agency is masked because of the ceremonial venues wherein it often takes place. In other words, rhetors may be afforded the opportunity to persuade in ceremonial forums without seeming to do so. This project aims to elaborate on the tradition of contextualizing and reifying cultural opinions toward war by tracing epideictic war rhetoric back to some of its earliest extant manifestations.

For decades, Bitzer's (1968) formulation has been important for scholars of public address in trying to articulate the force of rhetorical artifacts by analyzing the interplay between text and context; similarly, that construct is essential to understanding the funeral orations. Bitzer's landmark essay defined the rhetorical situation chiefly in terms of its exigencies and its constraints. Exigencies are the social needs that call a discourse into existence. Each situation also comes with a set of constraints "made up of persons, events, objects, and relations... that have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence" (Bitzer, 1968, p. 8). The seemingly regularized tradition of the funeral orations likely constrained epitaphists to some degree. Still, it did not prevent each oration from being unique; it did not limit the ability of rhetors to exhibit their individuality and advocate for the ideals they held dear (Hesk, 2013).

Rather than simply being 'rhetoric of display', epideictic discourse served substantive functions. In his *Rhetoric and Poetics in Antiquity*, Jeffry Walker (2000) argues that viewing poetry and rhetoric as separated entities distorts the reality of their practice in antiquity. Rather, he contends that the original performative contexts of poetry reflected a more nuanced relationship between rhetoric and poetry, with their common thread being epideictic. With respect to the funeral orations in particular, Loraux (1986) argued that the *epitaphoi* did much more than simply commemorate the dead, heal social wounds, or inspire the audience

with an artistic display. Moreover, Walker also contends that at some level all rhetoric is epideictic, and to divorce the category epideictic from other seemingly more pragmatic forms of rhetoric is a mistake. Epideictic discourse in antiquity did not simply rehearse values; it was "a medium of ideological suasion and contestation" (Walker, 2000, p. 118). Whether the immediate exigence of a speech appeared to be deliberative, forensic, or more clearly a ceremonial one, the fluctuating cultural values that yield epideictic exigencies are still relevant to speeches in these other genres, especially in classical contexts where oratory was probably the most fundamental mode of articulating culture.

The tradition of the funeral oration was well established by the time Demosthenes and Hyperides addressed audiences of Athenians in 338 and 322 BCE respectively to memorialize the city's war dead. The most famous insight into this tradition comes from Thucydides' dramatization of Pericles' funeral oration during the Peloponnesian War ca. 431 (2.34–2.46). In antiquity, however, Plato's *Menexenus* may have been the most iconic of the funeral orations, despite likely never having been formally delivered. We learn from Cicero that there was an annual public reading of the speech in Athens, and DeWitt and DeWitt (1949) postulated that in 4th century Athens, the *Menexenus* held a status similar to that of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address in the United States. While Thucydides and Plato both present masterfully crafted pieces of epideictic rhetoric, they can hardly encapsulate the entire tradition of the *epitaphios logos*, a ritual spanning more than 100 years during which time rhetors were exposed to a wide array of sociopolitical exigencies, which required generic evolution (Shear, 2013; Poulakos, 1990).

Thucydides considers the role of rhetoric during times of war through his reconstruction of both deliberative and epideictic speeches. Pericles' funeral oration (ca. 431)

may constitute Thucydides' most famous rendering of a speech, but throughout his *History of the Peloponnesian War*, the content of the speeches he renders, as well as the figures to whom he attributes them, lends insight into more than just his perspective on the historical events. Those speeches also project Thucydides' philosophy of rhetoric, in particular, how discourse is utilized to mediate and frame military and social situations. The unique rhetorical situation that accompanied Pericles' funeral oration played an important role in directing its content. Interestingly, accounting for the immediate historical contexts of Pericles' funeral oration, a composition that seemingly embodies the essence of the genre to be imitated by future epitaphists, required Thucydides to dispense with traditional tropes that we are led to believe were staples of the genre. The historian concluded that it would have been bad rhetoric for Pericles to compare the present war efforts with the valor of Athenians past because the successes of the current campaign simply could not be justly compared with that of Marathon and Salamis: "the first year of the war had been militarily unproductive and politically divisive. The lack of success could be glossed over by avoiding the standard comparisons of the past and stressing the overwhelming importance of the city as whole" (Bosworth, 2000, p. 8). Thus, even the idealized text characteristic of Athenian greatness necessarily deviates from the very tradition it seemingly helped create. Regardless of how faithful Thucydides' representations may have been to the speeches actually delivered, the critic can understand the historian's process of reconstructing speeches based on the apparent exigencies as a microcosm of rhetorical practice within war contexts. And in the case of epideictic practice in particular, we may use this information to theorize a coherent argument about its scope and social influence in antiquity.

Conflicting understandings of epideictic, however, have continued into modern theory and practice. In order to accomplish multiple aims, rhetors may be forced to hybridize genres to better account for the intricacies of the rhetorical situation. Jamison and Campbell (1982) noted that the eulogies lend themselves well to the fusion of deliberative and epideictic elements. In general, while the deliberative components within eulogies may be subordinate to epideictic appeals, they "fuse to form organic wholes when they are consistent with and contribute to the goals of the eulogy" (p. 362). In her analysis of Chris Hedges' controversial 2003 commencement address at Rockford College, Agnew (2008) posited that the address explicitly merged deliberative and epideictic genres; however, they were merged to such an extent that it alienated the audience because it failed to meet their expectations. In other words, Hedges placed too much inventional weight on criticizing the Iraq war to the expense of celebrating the graduates. Agnew notes the tightropes a rhetor must walk when pursuing this sort of generic fusion: "Those who seek to communicate effectively must therefore *work both within the structures of the genre and to some extent against those structures* as they attempt to devise discourse meaningful to a given situation" (emphasis added) (Agnew, 2008, p. 151). Acknowledging the audience's generic expectations can allow the epideictic rhetor to create a *consubstantial space* that permits him to articulate the significance "of past values and beliefs with new situations" as Condit (1985) suggests successfully appropriated epideictic should (p. 291) (Sullivan, 1993). Thus, to reimagine the classical funeral oration, I interrogate the contingencies embodied in their practice.

Dow (1989) further argued for the importance of considering the exigencies posed by the rhetorical situation(s) inherent in crises. Her formulation suggests that most crisis exigencies call forth both deliberative and epideictic discourse, often for the same ultimate

ends. Because of this, Dow maintained, "The most fruitful way for critics to analyze crisis rhetoric is to begin with an understanding of how rhetoric functions to respond to the exigence created by the situation" (1989, p. 295). Athens in the latter half of the 4th century found itself in just such a crisis. The need to deliberate about future courses of foreign policy action could not be easily separated from the ceremonial exigence to rehearse societal values and commemorate the sacrifice of the war dead. As such, Aristotle's schema of praise and blame struggles to account for the nuances present in the *epitaphios logos* of this period.

Defining Epideictic: Aristotle and Beyond

Aristotle distinguished between his three rhetorical genres in large part according to the role of the audience. This is the case especially with regard to epideictic: "instead of defining epideictic on the basis of characteristic topics, Aristotle distinguishes the genre from forensic and deliberative speaking on the basis of the audience function" (Oravec, 1976, p. 164). Through time and translations, the epideictic Aristotle described and its derivations became associated with *theoria*, a word etymologically related to "theater" but also to "theory"; the latter more substantive meaning is often lost, thus delimiting Aristotle's definition of epideictic to only a rhetoric of display wherein the speaker's skill as an orator is what the audience judges; the substance of his or her ideas are relegated to afterthought (Oravec, 1976, pp. 164–166). Aristotle's modern defenders reject this interpretation, noting that Aristotle proscribed "overemphasizing emotionality" in ceremonial address and instead championed the "educative," even a "didactic" function of epideictic" (Hauser, 1999, pp. 8–9). While style did have a role to play in epideictic rhetoric, it should not crowd out the messages inherent in the iteration of values around which the community builds its identity.

Taken together, this all suggests that the role of the audience in an epideictic address is more complicated than the dichotomy of observer vs. judge.

While he is credited with defining the genre of *epideixis* today, the conventions of epideictic discourse were established well before Aristotle. The constraints of praise and blame that Aristotle emphasized were not always linked with epideictic discourse. J. Richard Chase (1961) notes that prior to the publication of the *Rhetoric*, epideictic discourse was conceived of as being much more various; in fact, no surviving pre-Aristotelian rhetorical treatises specifically associate the epideictic with praise and blame. Hyperides and Demosthenes being contemporaries of Aristotle, it is difficult to discern whether the *Rhetoric* held any sway in the invention of their funeral orations. Pre-Aristotelian genre conventions were likely more fluid, perhaps a similarity they share with contemporary epideictic discourse. Aristotle's attempt at definition—as it tends to be purported today—deals much more with form than function. On this point, Chase is consistent with Oravec (1976): he explained that audiences of epideictic audiences in the classical period judged "display of content, not display of self or one's rhetorical abilities. Such reasoning makes epideictic the setting forth of noble ideas" (1961, p. 396). Regardless of what it is they were judging, the role of the audience was crucial.

More important across the whole tradition of classical epideictic was the capacity of the genre to exert social influence. Praise and blame were likely still important components of classical epideictic, but they were not simply rehearsed for their own sake, but as instrumental to the exposition of communal values. Even Plato acknowledged a role for epideictic discourses as part of prudent statecraft and the construction and iteration of values:

From a Platonic perspective the purpose of epideictic oratory is to represent, however imperfectly, timeless values distilled from past experience. The accurate reporting of details is overshadowed by the higher truths, which the epideictic speaker expresses. The true encomiast aims not to flatter his audience—this, as Plato notes, is an easy task—but to find words capable of conveying the philosophical ideas which form the basis of future judgment and action (Duffy, 1983, pp. 85–86).

As Duffy suggests here, epideictic, especially in its highbrow form in the likes of the funeral oration, does not take up trivial concerns as its subject matter. While certain episodes and characters are selected and held up as models for emulation or as objects of scorn, the discourse remains philosophically complex.

The performative dimension of epideictic is another area where Aristotelian explanations struggle to account for the functioning of the genre. In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle delineates the audience of epideictic discourses from that of deliberative and forensic discourses. According to Aristotle's tripartite division, audiences of epideictic discourse are passive spectators, not real participants in the communicative exchange (1358b). In drawing on Perelman, Walter Beale (1978) highlighted that the aforementioned distinction by Aristotle served to distort the realities of epideictic practice because it "perpetuate[s] a view of rhetoric which is predominately literary and which neglects [its] vital social role" and the fact that it may also "inspire specific kinds of deliberation as well" (pp. 222–223). Such a neglect of epideictic's propensity to exert social influence is the essence of Wickkeiser's (1999) critique of literary analyses of the *epitaphios logos*, which see the texts as isolated aesthetic pieces independent of the exigencies that prompt them. If, as Arnhart (1981) suggests, "for Aristotle, good style is not merely ornamentation, since the goodness of style is determined by how well it satisfies the desire of listeners for learning through reasoning," then those who reduce Aristotelian epideictic to aesthetic display are mistaken (p. 12).

Indeed, in keeping with Aristotle's purpose in writing the *Rhetoric*, if "the *genos epideiktikon* would not involve persuasion... it would be excluded from the art of rhetoric altogether" (Pratt, 2012, p. 189). These are just a few examples of scholarship that closely analyze the original ancient Greek and inventional choices made in the *Rhetoric* to try to demonstrate nuance in Aristotle's approach to epideictic rhetoric.

Despite all this, our historical and rhetorical understandings of classical discourse still remain heavily inflected by the legacy of Plato and the neo-Aristotelian domination of rhetorical criticism throughout the early 20th century (Black, 1965/1978). The epideictic genre in particular retains many of the characteristics Aristotle ascribed to it, praise and blame being the dominant tropes. As such, the critic is left with the challenge of trying to write a history of rhetoric that does justice to the particular social and intellectual circumstances surrounding an oration's composition and delivery, when most of his sources rely on the very Platonic and Aristotelian precepts he is questioning. While studies that re-envision the rhetorical tradition as having a wider scope (in terms of art, literature, education, and beyond) are now being written, war rhetoric, especially within the confines of the classical period, is still largely conceived of in an overly simplified way.

Aristotle's role within rhetorical studies continues to be important, but even among those who value the utility of Aristotle's contribution to rhetorical theory, few believe his characterization of epideictic discourse is adequate. George Kennedy (1996) in reassessing the *Rhetoric* for a revision of his translation of the treatise remarked that it is difficult to apply Aristotle outside of cultural constructs within which he wrote and taught. "Aristotle worked with the evidence as he knew it," which led to some instances where his categories fail to capture the complexities of discourse outside the narrow confines where Aristotle may

have observed it; “this is true, for example of epideictic, where his definition needs expansion and restatement” (Kennedy, 1996, p. 181). This limitation may not have been the fault of the historical Aristotle, but instead due to the fact that what remains extant of his theory of rhetoric is most likely lecture notes from his students. Interestingly, the works that Aristotle quotes in the *Rhetoric* are almost exclusively epideictic; moreover, many of the examples deployed by Aristotle are not from oratory at all, but from poetry (Trevett, 1996). He makes two references to Pericles’ funeral oration and also one to Lysias’ (*Arist.* 1365a; 1411a). Aristotle may have selected his examples for a variety of reasons, but taken together, the fact that he uses epideictic discourse to a much greater degree than he provides exposition of his theory of epideictic suggests that all three genres of discourse are exigent-dependent, his examples just models of abstract principles.

Creating Identification: Epideictic and the construction of public memory

Epitaphists sought to promote unity through identification among their audience. This *telos* for the funeral oration is not something that Pericles merely implies. “For men [can] endure to hear others praised,” he explains, “only so long as they can severally persuade themselves of their own ability to equal the actions recounted” (*Thucy.* 2.35.2). The desire to inspire emulation in the audience is forefront in the mind of the funeral orator because he cannot make his primary purpose to recount events and actions, which the audience does not believe they can match, or the oration will create “envy” and “incredulity” in the listeners (*Thucy.* 2.35.2). In short, effective epideictic in war contexts must promote identification with both the acts being performed and the individuals who performed them.

Epideictic bears on our political and cultural identities in an active as opposed to a passive way. Funerary discourse lends itself to rhetorical situations wherein we negotiate our

place in history. Grethlein (2012) argued that speeches in antiquity—in their use and abuse of history—constituted metahistorical acts. In a similar fashion, the Athenian funeral orations conceived of an idealized history of the *polis* (Loraux, 1986). It takes it too far to say that the funeral oration served a clearly deliberative function, but it did function as space where the eulogist could harness the system building power of piety to his desired ends. In order to thicken our understanding of classical epideictic practice, I draw on a set of related concepts coined by Kenneth Burke: piety and secular prayer. Within his larger ideas of *orientation* and *identification*, Burke posits several modes by which communal orientations are managed. Articulating how these ideas operate will allow us to better understand how epideictic discourse responds to ruptures—or threats that could cause rupture—in cultural identity. In the following paragraphs, I lay out working definitions of these concepts before proceeding to vibrate them against the texts in subsequent chapters.

At its root, Burke's notion of identification as something that is "always provisional and incomplete because people can never completely share substance" calls epideictic discourse into being to conduct a type of *value maintenance* (Jasinski, 2001a, p. 306). For Burke, piety is a way of synthesizing a communal orientation. It acts as a "system builder...*piety is the sense of what properly goes with what*" (1935/1984, p. 74). Burke's explication of piety is consistent with the role Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) describe for epideictic in argumentation as something that strengthens adherence to values in order to better promote pious actions and criticize impious actions in the future. As Carey (2010) emphasized, "Like all funerary activity, the *epitaphios logos* is more for the living than for the dead" (p. 243). It was for the living that the *epitaphoi* defined a uniquely Athenian notion of civic piety.

Values are always in a state of flux, and our orientations must change drastically once they have reached the limits of what Burke called casuistic stretching, the process whereby "one introduces new principles while theoretically remaining faithful to old ones" (1937/1984, p. 229). Acceptance of the fact that there is a limit to such stretching means that if a culture is to perpetuate, it must have effective institutional mechanisms to provide definition and bolster a sense of duty in accordance with shifting constructs of piety. As Burke notes, "'Duty' is a shorthand way of indicating identification with some larger corporate unit." (1937/1984, p. 266). The Athenian funeral orations defined the scope and function of these duties with the larger corporate unit, the *polis*. Relatedly, I posit that in view of the exigencies posed by a shifting global landscape, the funeral ceremony functioned as an exercise of secular prayer, with the epitaphist as presiding minister. "'Secular prayer' involved[s] 'character building' in that one shapes his attitudes, the logic of his life, by the co-ordinates he chooses, and *one shapes his actions with reference to the judgments that follow from the co-ordinates*" (emphasis added) (Burke, 1937/1984, p. 326). Under this framework, the funeral orations were integral to defining the scope and function of a citizen's duty to Athens. And an orator with political motivation—such as Demosthenes or Hyperides—would be unlikely to pass up a rhetorically opportune moment to reorient communal values by redrawing coordinates as his or her ideology required.

Rather than being insignificant, the perceived character of epideictic as 'soft' rhetoric with an emphasis on style actually creates an environment where epideictic can be an effective tool for constructing reality through narrative, constructions that serve as an influential backdrop for society's deliberative and forensic debates. In his *Introduction to Attitudes Toward History*, Kenneth Burke (1937/1984) postulated, "poetic image and

rhetorical idea can become subtly fused... the practiced rhetorician relies greatly on images to affect man's ideation" (n.p). In quintessentially Burkean fashion, the Athenian funeral orations play on ideas of poetry and mythic images to articulate an idealized narrative of Athenian democracy, especially in relation to its war efforts. Necessarily as poetry and argument fuse, genres become hybridized. Burke favored a pluralistic understanding of discourse and the motives they influence and are influenced by. Such an implicitly persuasive nature of epideictic discourse seems to mesh well with Burke's argument here about the causality of identity construction. The rehearsing of shared, often longstanding, values and narratives, a common trope in epideictic oratory, promotes *identification* with a community and the ideals it embodies. The ubiquity of the 'rhetoric of display' definition often ascribed to epideictic further warrants discussing how practiced rhetoricians use aesthetics in speech to constitute and shape the 'ideation' of what it meant to be a soldier or a citizen in classical Athens.

In one of his final published essays, Perelman (1984) emphasized the essential role of epideictic discourse in maintaining a civil democratic society. Without devotion of citizens to unifying communal values, he maintains, a society cannot "surmount the passing crises, the discords over secondary problems, and the personal conflicts which never fail to surface in all human groups where members maintain between themselves multiple and durable relations" (Perelman, 1984, p. 131). Epideictic, however, is not merely a tool that anyone can employ at will; rather, its effective use requires *symbols* around which the community can rally: a flag, a credo, a captivating historical narrative, a charismatic leader. These symbols when properly situated within contemporary concerns and the topics of praise and blame facilitated the genre's political utility wherein "epideictic was essential for acclimating the

Athenian public life to activities it had to accommodate," functioning as a "constitutive activity propaedeutic to action: reflecting the public norms of proper political conduct" (Hauser, 1999, p. 17). The *collective memory* of past triumphs evoked by state funeral orations situated in terms of current engagements helped define the scope and purpose of political and military action. Loraux entitled her important book on the classical funeral orations "The Invention of Athens," and for good reason—the narrative of an idealized Athens built on myth and legend decorated the scene for later civil and military actions; but in the 4th century, by which time the ideal democratic city had already been symbolically constructed, their desired ends could more aptly be described as "The Maintenance of Athens." The narrative needed to be repaired and reinforced to withstand the political threats to its rupture, or risk threatening the continuation of a civil democratic Athens.

Public memory is constantly in a state of flux; while it must first be constructed, much of the discourse surrounding it is not creating but maintaining. As Stephen Browne (1993) reminds us, public memory is never given, but always managed; it is constructed in ways designed to accrue to the advantage of its constructors" (p. 465). In short, memory is always being negotiated, always political, and inextricably linked to power relations within a society. And as Athens continued to struggle to maintain its identity in the face of domestic and foreign policy crises, the need for shrewdly wielded epideictic rhetoric from its leaders continued to grow.

Why study these *epitaphoi*

Both Hyperides and Demosthenes were supporters of anti-Macedonian policies (Loraux, 1986; Herrman, 2004). Although admittedly, specifics regarding their views about Athenian foreign policy as a whole must be generalized as a result of limited extant

materials. While there were many who supported the struggle against Phillip II, there was hardly unity among important Athenians in terms of this issue. Isocrates, a sophist and philosopher thought to have taught both Demosthenes and Hyperides in some capacity, believed that the creation of an alliance between Athens and Phillip was a mutually beneficial proposition. In an address that Isocrates wrote to Phillip ca. 346, he may even call out the likes of his former pupils:

I have become so ambitious in my old age that I have determined by addressing my discourse to you at the same time to set an example for my disciples and make evident to them that the burden of our national assemblies with oratory and to address the people who there throng together is, in reality, to address no one at all; that such speeches are quite as ineffectual as the legal codes and constitutions drawn up by the sophists (*Isoc. Philip* 12).

The connection each man had to Isocrates is uncertain. Plutarch notes one view in his biography of Demosthenes indicating that because Demosthenes was an orphan, he could not pay the 10 minas of tuition to Isocrates (*Plut.* 5). Still, it is fair to suggest that the training they received was similar, even if they trained under different instructors. The similarity of their foreign policy convictions toward the issue of Macedonian expansion permits a relatively clear comparison of the two rhetors and the funeral orations they delivered.

The texts of both speeches can be reasonably presumed authentic. Few doubt that the text attributed to Hyperides, which was found on a papyrus discovered in the 19th century, was actually delivered by him in a form similar to what we now have (Herrman, 2009). Unfortunately, it is slightly damaged; however, the sections of the speech that are missing span no more than 20 characters (Herrman, 2009). Demosthenes' speech is slightly more dubious in authenticity. On the one hand, Demosthenes' post-Chaeronea funeral oration is something he mentioned in his later speech *On the Crown*, but on the other hand,

stylistically, the funeral oration contains some anomalies from the rest of the Demosthenic corpus (DeWitt & DeWitt, 1949). We can never be certain, but these texts are generally presumed to be authentic.

Ultimately, these speeches are the two most likely of the classical *epitaphoi* to have been delivered by the men to whom they are attributed. Neither Lysias nor Gorgias were Athenian citizens, so they would not have been permitted to deliver the address. Thucydides' account of Pericles' speech reflects what Thucydides believed the situation demanded and the historian admits that even of the speeches he personally listened to, it was "difficult to carry them word for word in one's memory" (Thucy. 1.22). Plato's *Menexenus* is in dialog form and recounts a funeral oration from multiple levels removed.

Method of Inquiry

One aim of analyzing the funeral orations from a rhetorical perspective is to explore their significance for contemporary theory. By studying these speeches both in terms of their localized situations as well as broader trends that trace back to previous centuries and forward to modern contexts, it represents what Debra Hawhee and Christa Olson (2013) called a "pan-historiography." Such an approach may seem out of bounds for a traditional work of history, but it can be ideal for studies in the history of rhetoric that focus on discursive identity construction. Pan-historiography serves these research ends well "because it brings attention to the consistencies and ruptures that characterize nationalisms as they develop diachronically and function on multiple planes of symbolic action" (Hawhee & Olson, 2013, p. 95). Even if one were to limit herself to the immediate historical context, she is still left with over 100 years of rich historical context behind which our extant texts were composed and (in some cases) delivered. It is for this reason that Hawhee and Olson's call,

ambitious though it is, to "reanimate" seemingly incongruous artifacts by rearticulating their multiple viewpoints for contemporary readers is a laudable goal for the study of classical rhetoric. And as I plan to argue later, these classical artifacts and the rhetorical situations that brought them about may not be all that incongruous to contemporary rhetorics surrounding the war on terrorism and the 2003 Iraq war.

The primary objective of these essays is to promote a fuller understanding of rhetorical concepts through the aid of the texts, what James Jasinski (2001b) championed as a methodological end in modern rhetorical criticism. History is utilized simply to provide a snapshot of the broader social and historical contexts that comprise the rhetorical situations these two rhetors confronted as they rose to deliver state-sponsored eulogies. The exigencies and constraints that a rhetor faces are important considerations in analyzing any text (Bitzer, 1968). However, by adhering to a textual approach to criticism, I will try to avoid disengaging from the artifact itself; rather, the meaning that textual analysis produces shall emerge by "vibrate[ing] an extrinsic model against the text instead of imposing it on the text" (Leff, 1980, p. 345). In short, the goal is to learn more about the text and the rhetorical concepts it embodies simultaneously. Textual criticism acts as a tool for theory building.

Conceptually oriented criticism, therefore, proceeds through abduction, "a back and forth tacking movement between text and concept or concepts that are being investigated" (Jasinski, 2001b, p. 256). Several concepts are examined by this thesis and they could be hierarchically arranged from most prominent to least prominent as follows: the genre of *epideictic* discourse and its subset, the *epitaphios logos*, 2) *exigence* (as it functions in epideictic or ceremonial contexts), 3) *identification* strategies, and 4) specific stylistic devices used by rhetors to exemplify one or more of the aforementioned concepts or their

offshoots. To the extent that the text reveals anomalies from previously developed theories of relevant concepts, those incongruities provide an opportunity to reconsider the artifact. But presuming the critic does not conclude that the artifact has been fundamentally misunderstood, disparities between the text and the rhetorical concepts associated with it allow the critic to add layers of understanding to rhetorical theory as applied to real discourse. This paradigm suggests that criticism ought to be methodologically reflexive in order to identify and remedy problematic theoretical assumptions, and in doing so, enhance the methods and outcomes of scholastic production.

CHAPTER 3: PRAISING VIRTUE AND JUSTIFYING FAILURES: THE CASE OF DEMOSTHENES' FUNERAL ORATION

The Battle of Chaeronea (338) was a terrible defeat for the Greeks. The decisive loss ceded control of most of the mainland, sans some Spartan territory, to King Phillip II, whose Macedonia was quickly acquiring regional hegemony. The Greek defeat at Chaeronea is considered by many to have been the essential event in the downfall of classical Greece. So, whether Demosthenes knew it or not, his eulogy for those who perished at Chaeronea also served as a eulogy for the classical age, in particular for the democratic and militarily powerful Athens that had been known for nearly two centuries since the reforms of Cleisthenes. Shortly after the Athenian loss at Chaeronea, following Phillip's death in 336, the expansion of Macedonia further crowded out Athenian influence in the region. The battle's aftermath and Alexander's subsequent rise to power "inaugurated a new era in which Athens was permanently deprived of the ability to function as a major power on the world scene" (Yunis, 2007, p. 372). The magnitude of the military and political implications from the event created a myriad of exigencies to which Athenian leaders needed to respond.

Among Athenians, few took this defeat in battle harder than Demosthenes (384–322). As a champion of anti-Macedonian policies, Demosthenes had made a political career out of opposing Phillip, urging his fellow Athenians to not stand by idly and watch Macedonia grow increasingly powerful. He may have chosen to take this hawkish political posture from approximately 351 until the end of his life for the purposes of political expediency because this platform provided him many opportunities to gain influence within the *polis* (Ryder, 2000). However, there is still reason to believe he maintained the courage of his convictions on this matter because of the tireless effort he put into composing his greatest known

sequence of speeches, the *Phillipics*, which condemned Phillip and advocated for policies to counter burgeoning Macedonian power. Eventual Athenian subjugation to Macedonia may have been a *fait accompli*, but not if Demosthenes had anything to say about it.

For years Demosthenes built up a narrative that cast Phillip as an existential threat and primed Athenians to act or risk losing their freedom and their honor to him. Notice this dichotomy at work in the first Philippic (ca. 350):

You see the situation, Men of Athens: how insolent that man [Phillip] is, who does not even allow you to choose between taking action and living quietly, but threatens and makes arrogant speeches and is unable to be content with possession of places that he has already conquered, but is always bringing something more under his power and surrounds us on all sides as if with nets, while we sit and wait. When, men of Athens, will you do what is needed? What are you waiting for? For some necessity to arise, by Zeus? What then should we call the present developments? For, I believe, the strongest necessity for free men is shame at their situation (4.9–10)¹.

Demosthenes begins by demonizing Phillip as one who "threatens," for he is not content with the territory he already controls. And because he possesses an "insolent" character, he naturally "surrounds us on all sides, as if with nets." Phillip's aggressive character stands in contrast to the idle Athenians who merely "sit and wait" in the face of impending security threats.

With this framework in place, Demosthenes builds momentum through a rising sequence of erotemas. He begins by asking "when" Athenians will do as they must. This persistent questioning highlights the fact that in Demosthenes' mind, the "necessity" is already crystal clear. He states unambiguously that Phillip's aggression "does not allow you to choose." The question is not whether taking defensive action should occur, but when. Not only was there a pragmatic impetus for action, but failure to do so would pose a threat to

¹ References to Demosthenes funeral oration are taken primarily from Herrman's (2004) translation. References to other orations are taken from Trevett's (2011) translation.

Athenian identity as well as its political autonomy. After the sequence of rhetorical questions, Demosthenes provides his answer: "the strongest necessity for free men is shame" (4.10). These moves demonstrate that Demosthenes' anti-Macedonian rhetoric was two-fold: he believed in the political and military necessity of resistance to Phillip, but equally—if not more importantly—he held that failure to do so constituted a violation of Athenian national character. Explicating the extent of Demosthenes' career of anti-Macedonianism is beyond the scope of this essay, but just the short passage quoted above gives an idea of the veracity of his advocacy. His advocacy likely played a major role in pushing Athenians toward Chaeronea.

Demosthenes was chosen by the state to deliver the funeral oration in 338 in order to pronounce a eulogy over those who perished at Chaeronea. Being asked to serve Athens in this capacity would generally be considered an honor, but considering the disastrous results of the recent conflict, it also presented a unique challenge because the rhetorical situation threatened Demosthenes' political ideology. Thucydides tells us that the Athenian funeral orator was someone "of approved wisdom and eminent reputation," whose duty was to "pronounce over them an *appropriate* eulogy" (2.34). But in a situation such as this, appropriateness would not have been something that could be easily gauged. Because of his reputation as an eloquent forensic orator and someone actively arguing for increased military weight to counter Phillip, the subtext of his being asked to deliver the oration screams of the mandate "explain yourself." Demosthenes himself fought in the battle of Chaeronea, positioned on the left flank of the Athenian line opposite Phillip; it is also said that the front of his shield displayed the phrase "good luck" (Worthington, 2013).

Little could he foresee, he would need almost as much luck with delivering the eulogy after the battle as he would fighting in it. Demosthenes was a readily identifiable scapegoat following Chaeronea. Plutarch speculated that Demosthenes' relentless pursuit of oratorical perfection was an attempt to compensate for his cowardly character on the battlefield. In this vein, his advocacy that pushed Athens into battle was coupled with the perception that his conduct as a warrior hardly lived up to his seemingly empty rhetoric. "He personalized the war between Athens and Macedon for supremacy in Greece into a contest between Phillip and himself, and elevated the issues involved to the highest principles of morality and politics" (Harding, 1987, p. 26). By personalizing the issue, Demosthenes left himself open to a great deal of criticism. The epideictic occasion of the state funeral ceremony provided Demosthenes with a wide audience in front of whom he could speak to these concerns.

Demosthenes utilized the ceremonial forum given him to advance and defend his foreign policy agenda. Undeterred by constraints posed by the funeral oration genre, his dual-purposed eulogy addresses two sides of the same coin. He gives proper tribute to those who perished at Chaeronea, while recalling important characteristics of the Athenian national character, but in so doing, he also provides definition to the exigence of the moment as he saw it, the pending doom of the city's regional hegemony. Although he does not speak directly to forensic or deliberative purposes, a close reading of the text demonstrates that through his arrangement and style, he is doing more than *just* fulfilling traditional expectations of epideictic discourse. He is expanding the civic function of epideictic—or perhaps more accurately, he already recognizes its vastness and is able to harness its power.

The multi-valenced character of Demosthenes' rhetoric allowed him to simultaneously respond decorously to the ceremonial tradition of the *epitaphios logos* and the foreign policy exigencies attendant to the present state of Athenian-Macedonian relations. The levels of nuance present in the funeral oration, an often neglected text within the Demosthenic corpus works (Jebb's *Attic Orators* makes no mention of it), demonstrates his oratorical finesse as well as his competence to operate in multiple genres.

Despite being delivered during an overtly ceremonial occasion, the historical moment of the speech presented an exigence for the use of crisis rhetoric. Cherwitz and Zagacki (1986) described two forms of response to international crises employed by US Presidents in the 20th century. The two rhetorical categories they defined, justificatory and consummatory discourse, can help frame our thinking about how exigencies function in ceremonial discourse. According to their scheme, when taking a consummatory posture, a rhetor uses discourse as the mode of response to a foreign aggressor: "Consummatory rhetoric emphasizes the importance of caution, patience, resolve and inner strength in reacting to wrongful deeds perpetrated by adversaries" (Cherwitz & Zagacki, 1986, p. 310). In other words, the discourse itself is the response. Conversely, justificatory rhetoric "focus[es] on explanation and rationalization" of military action taken by the state (p. 309). Despite the major changes in global politics that have occurred between the 4th century BCE and the 20th CE, it is still, I think, reasonable to assert that the failure at Chaeronea coupled with burgeoning Macedonian power constituted an international crisis within the Mediterranean world of the time, especially for the Athenians. As furthered by Dow (1989), Demosthenes had to draw on both epideictic and deliberative rhetoric in order for his identification strategies to carry any weight. Speaking during a period of social crisis in Athens, the stable

form of one genre did not provide him the rhetorical resources he needed in his attempt to modify the exigence. Thus, it is through the lens of exigence that I begin approaching this text—and in keeping with Leff's (1980) maxim that theory is the outcome, not the starting point, of critical practice, I shall seek to "vibrate" the concept of exigence against the text as well as my own expectations and predilections for what Athenians may have expected (pp. 345). Fundamentally, the idea of epideictic exigencies is not a new one but one that is often veiled in critical practice.

Demosthenes remains acutely aware of the tradition of *epitaphios logos* and does not neglect it in his invention; therefore, my analysis of the text begins by identifying the ways that he does adhere to generic commonplaces of the funeral oration. Next, I briefly assess how well Aristotelian definitions of epideictic account for what is happening in Demosthenes' funeral oration. Each of these first two sections explicate the traditional aspects of the speech, intentional choices that reflect commonly held understandings of the funeral orations as a stable tradition—or as Kennedy put it, the "highly formulaic quality which they [the orations] achieved" (1963, pp. 154). Finally, I discuss how Demosthenes' rehearsal of ancient myth, a form of what Kenneth Burke (1937/1984) called "secular prayer," functions to promote identification of his audience with their fellow compatriots and with the present war effort. The funeral orations as an intuitional mechanism to prevent social fracture are not without ideological inflection, but relatedly and more immediately, it must continually adjust itself to terms of the exigent circumstances it seeks to control.

What makes my argument new is that it explicates elements of the address that cannot be explained as iterations of dominant tropes of the funeral oration tradition or by Aristotelian definitions of epideictic rhetoric. I argue that these apparently esoteric textual

components ought not be ignored because the formally noted theories cannot adequately account for them. In several cases, close reading identifies instances that are better conceived as responses to specific political exigencies of the city-state than as idiosyncratic rhetorical moves that deviate from the genre for no purpose. And even in cases where the external connections may be less clear, modern theories of epideictic discourse possess an explanatory power that Aristotle and surface level understandings of the genre cannot provide. The hybridization of rhetorical genres is consistent with Miller's (1984) more nuanced view of the concept that understands genres as morphing to fulfill social needs. Approaching the funeral oration in this light begins the process of more aptly connecting the tradition to its rhetorical situations.

Meeting Generic Expectations

In several places in the address, Demosthenes explicitly acknowledges the conventions of the *epitaphios* genre. He begins his exordium by referring to the “customary speech” he was expected to deliver (60.1). Further, he indicates how deeply rooted and important to Athenian values the tradition of state sponsored burials for its citizens who perish in battle was: “it is plain to see that this city pays serious attention to those who die in war... so that the good reputation which these men possessed in life may be granted to them in death too” (60.2–3). One aim of the speech was to ensure that the war dead were given the “ageless fame” they were due as a result of their courage, intelligence, and by virtue of their being well-born (60.32). The measure with which the orator, known mostly for his combative style, approaches the genre indicates its relative stability as well as the orator's own (at least purported) humility with regard to epideictic speeches. His concluding paragraph contains another justification of the choices he made in the oration: “my aim was not to speak at

length, but to tell the truth" (60.37). From a surface level reading, the meaning of this passage is self-evident; it suggests that the rhetor is being considerate of the audience by not expounding unnecessarily about mythic histories that are already codified within cultural lore. However, as I seek to demonstrate in later sections of this essay, Demosthenes adds—almost covertly—substance to his speech that extends beyond the recurring motifs of the funeral oration tradition, but without noticeably violating the genre's central precepts. In other words, he tries to work simultaneously within and against the generic constructs in which he spoke (Agnew, 2008).

He qualifies his inventional choice to be brief early on in the speech by admitting that the virtues of the war dead extend far beyond just courage (60.3). As illustration of their greatness, Demosthenes rebuts the suggestion that the achievements of these dead pale in comparison to the accomplishments of previous generations simply because "they have not yet been made into myth or elevated to heroic rank, because of being more recent" (60.9–10). Later on, he further downplays his aptitude to do justice to the occasion: "there are so many accomplishments that could rightly be praised that I don't know where to begin as I consider these acts" (60.15). These admissions correspond to a general attitude toward the *epitaphios logos* characterized by Loraux (1986) as an ineffable idealism. Not only was the feigning of humility among eminent orators who delivered funeral orations a common practice (see Hyperides, 2–3 and Lysias, 1 as parallels), it may have suited Demosthenes particularly well given the specific constraints of this rhetorical situation; his expertise as an orator rested primarily within the forensic domain and perhaps more crucially, he was speaking after a decisive battlefield defeat rather than when militarily prospects were brighter (as Hyperides was able to do in his address, a topic I treat in the next chapter).

Because Demosthenes (at least as far as we know) had limited experience delivering epideictic speeches, it is not altogether surprising that he tried to temper expectations for the speech. DeWitt and DeWitt (1949) noted that Demosthenes would have likely viewed being asked to deliver the oration as a challenge; in addition to the unsavory taste of defeat which surely still resided in the minds of his audience, “the epideictic style, which the ceremony required, was alien to the combative nature of Demosthenes” (p. 5). Just as with the other extant *epitaphoi*, Demosthenes downplays his abilities to do justice to the virtues possessed by the honored dead. The speaker recounts trying to devise a strategy of how he might “speak worthily of the dead” only to conclude “that it was not possible” (60.1). The same sort of humility is prominently displayed in the exordia of several of the other extant funeral orations (See Lysias 1 and Hyperides 1-2). Close reading shows that Demosthenes was certainly competent as a practitioner of epideictic discourse.

Exemplifying this competence, the rhetor is quick to fulfill the conventional practice of discussing how the fallen soldiers were of noble birth. A seemingly unimportant digression indicates the stability of certain generic tropes: “I would be ashamed if I were caught leaving out any of these factors” (60.3). This admission may suggest a lack of experience speaking within the genre as DeWitt and DeWitt (1949) suggested, but more likely, it confirms that Demosthenes did indeed recognize constraints attendant to the rhetorical situation that prompted his speech. Not only were these constraints known, they must have held sway if failing to adhere to them could evoke shame. In many places, Demosthenes personalizes the address to explain his inventional decisions. When he deviated from expected topics or even just gives them short shrift, he sees it decorous to explain reasoning for making that rhetorical choice. For example, he makes it a point to note that the

ancestors would welcome his decision to "make a joint eulogy" because both groups "would be especially pleased, if they were able to *share* in each other's virtue" (60.12). Little additional explanation is given to back Demosthenes' assertion that the ancestors would be happy with their association with the current war dead. Nevertheless, that he felt the need to comment on this choice suggests that the audience may be taken by surprise at this comparison—and if they did, this furthers the notion that the funeral oration developed specific expectations that were nearly always followed. In other words, this metacommentary supports Kennedy's (1963) theory of the *epitaphoi*.

Finally, Demosthenes would have been seen to contradict generic expectations if he failed to rehearse the Athenian belief that they were authchronous, literally born of the land. To emphasize the uniqueness of his audience he stresses, "these men and each of their ancestors, one and all, can trace their origins to a single father," the land (60.4). He further equates citizens of all other cities to be "adopted children," thus further glorifying the idealized Athens, setting it apart from every other *polis* because its people were the only "legitimate citizens" in all Greece (60.4). This line of inquiry helps bolster the narrative of *Athenian exceptionalism*. Moreover, his argument about the authchronous origins of his compatriots is linked to the mythic victories of Athens as protector of all the Greeks. The speaker highlights the case of the Persian Wars as exemplars of what he perceived to be the Athenian role on the world stage ought to be. Despite the ubiquity of Homeric ideals in Greek culture, Demosthenes minimizes the importance of Athenian efforts at Troy, noting that more recent ancestors "might rightly be judged as superior to the men who campaigned against Troy... because that earlier generation... however excellent they were, barely captured one particular part of Asia after besieging it for ten years" (60.10–11). In the abstract, this

may be a deviation from the narrative of an idealized Athens, but in reality it can be seen as a sentiment with which his audience would likely agree. In arguing why they deserve to hold the left wing at Plataea, Herodotus described how the Athenians downplayed the perhaps less valorous actions from the distant past: "So let there be enough talk about deeds performed long ago. And even if there were nothing else to show as our achievement—as if any of the other Hellenes had as many successes as we have had—our accomplishment at Marathon certainly makes us worthy to hold this privilege" (9.27.4). The immediate importance of this line of analysis is to demonstrate that Demosthenes recognized a longstanding tradition that created conventions for the *epitaphios logos*, and that he crafted his speech with these conventions clearly in view, though he does not simply enact the generic form verbatim.

Aristotelian Explanations

The role of the audience was perhaps the most important criterion for making distinctions within Aristotle's tripartite categorization of rhetorical genres. In a passage that could easily have been written in a rhetorical handbook, Demosthenes remarks the following concerning the relationship between rhetor and audience:

the persuasive power of speech depends upon the goodwill of the audience. If this goodwill exists, even if the speech is only moderately good, it brings glory and generates favor. But if it is absent, the speech gives offense to the audience, even if it excels in rhetorical flourish (60.14).

This passage functions as a major digression within the address, but it does still lend insight into Demosthenes' approach. By explicitly acknowledging the audience, Demosthenes demonstrates his desire to produce and maintain with them a sense of goodwill. Because his advocacy helped lead Athens into the most recent conflict, there is reason to question how high of an opinion the audience held toward him. Furthermore, he hopes to "bring glory and

generate favor" without the expectation that his speech would "excel in rhetorical flourish" beyond the rhetoric other citizens may have been advancing at the same time. So his digression serves to ingratiate himself with the audience not simply because this was generally good practice but because the threat to his reputation was an exigence for it.

In addition to appealing to the audience in an apparently Aristotelian fashion, Demosthenes also focuses on the *present* tense. And according to the simplest interpretation of Aristotle's three genres, epideictic discourse is said to function in the present tense (the past being the domain of forensics and the future of deliberation). As part of his justification for his limited treatment of ancestral heritage and mythic greatness, Demosthenes adds, "I will leave aside their numerous deeds that are part of the realm of myth" (60.9). While drawing on the past, the present tense orientation helps the audience not to forget the impetus for action implied by his rhetoric.

Inspiring Emulation through Secular Prayer

It takes it too far to say that the funeral oration served a clearly deliberative function, but it did function as space where the eulogist could harness the system building power of piety to his desired ends. In order to thicken our understanding of classical epideictic practice, I draw on a set of related concepts coined by Kenneth Burke: piety and secular prayer. Within his larger ideas of orientation and identification, Burke posits several modes by which communal orientations are managed. Articulating how these ideas operate will allow us to better understand how epideictic discourse responds to ruptures— or threats that could cause rupture— in cultural identity. The period of crisis during which Demosthenes spoke lends itself to explanation via these concepts.

I posit that in view of the exigencies posed by a shifting global landscape, the funeral ceremony functioned as an exercise of secular prayer, with the epitaphist as presiding minister. Burke defines secular prayer as an activity whereby "*one shapes his actions with reference to the judgments*" and that said judgments follow from symbolic coordinates which are drawn via the ritual of secular prayer (1937/1984, p. 326). Demosthenes was unlikely to pass up a rhetorically opportune moment to reorient communal values by redrawing coordinates as his foreign policy paradigm required. He invokes an ideal of Athenian generational duty in a myriad of ways but I will address three of them. First, I discuss the significance of his decision to jointly eulogize past and present Athenian war dead simultaneously. Second, I note the justifications that Demosthenes provides for Greek involvement in Chaeronea. Finally, I will explore how Demosthenes' rehearsal of the mythic histories of Athens' ten tribes is used to promote emulation as a key component of Athenian piety.

Jointly Eulogizing Success and Failure

In praising the past and present war dead as a cohesive whole, Demosthenes criticizes inaction as impious according to the Athenian value system. His choice to make a joint eulogy provided Demosthenes many affordances to argue for the correctness of his policy priorities, even in spite of the less than favorable outcome at Chaeronea. He frames an argument for conceiving of an Athenian ideal character that transcends time in a passage worth quoting at length:

Even if I were completely incapable of finding the appropriate words, the very virtue of these men offers much that is at hand and easy to relate. So now that I have mentioned the noble birth and the greatest accomplishments of their ancestors, I would like to direct my speech right away to the achievements of these men here before us. Just as they were related to their ancestors by birth, in the same way, my

aim is to make a joint eulogy of them, since I believe men of the past would welcome this sort of praise and that both groups together would be especially pleased, if they are able to share in the others' virtue, not only through their birth but also through the praises they receive (6.12).

In apparent contradiction with his earlier admission that it is impossible to do justice to the honorees' actions with mere words, here Demosthenes emphasizes that the "virtue of these men offers much that is... easy to relate." Here he implies that the actions of these men speak for themselves. Take the phrase "offers much that is at hand:" the audience could readily internalize the sacrifice of these men, even if there had been no speech—the dead were present before them and the ceremony legitimized their final measure of devotion. Still, it is curious that he would refer to their "achievements" considering the outcome was a crushing defeat. What did they achieve? While they did not succeed on the battlefield, they did successfully live up to the ideals of the national character (Luginbill, 1999). The means outweigh the ends for Demosthenes, otherwise it would be improper for them to share in the praise of the ancestors who fought at Marathon.

In differentiating between successes where a pan-Greek alliance defended a threat to the honor of a prominent citizen, Menelaus, by fighting valiantly in the mythic Trojan war with instances where Athenians took a clear leadership role in fending off an enemy, reveals Demosthenes' belief that the world is better off when Athenians lead. Athenians taking charge of their mission is a superior policy choice in Demosthenes' view. This advocacy is bolstered by his decision to present a "joint eulogy" for the ancestral dead who fought in conflicts such as the Persian Wars (60.12). *Doing so functions as a means of connecting the two different temporal coordinates of the text into one cohesive whole.* Demosthenes likens the two cases to indicate that the virtues possessed and the praise received should be shared

(and are therefore equivalent). All the while, the empirical results of the respective classes' actions on the battlefield could not have been more different. Therefore, his decision to make a joint eulogy exposes a notable incongruity, of which an observant audience would have taken note. Herein lies the artistry of Demosthenes' persuasion.

The constraints of an epideictic occasion limited the criticism he could level against his opponents, but his choice to make a joint eulogy allowed him some leeway. As he proceeds to the middle portion of the speech where he deals with the immediate contexts of the massacre at Chaeronea, Demosthenes identifies the nature of areté as being two-fold: "the beginning of every virtue is intelligence, and the end is courage" (60.17). Because the honorees "excelled greatly in both these capacities," Demosthenes can juxtapose their actions with the actions of those who opposed Demosthenes politically with regard to Macedonia (60.17–18). Not only does he view the actions of those who perished in recent battles as heroic and possessing "selfless attitude," Demosthenes further uses their experience to subtly jab at compatriots who failed to heed his warnings about Phillip (60.18). In contrast to the war dead who embodied the vigilance Demosthenes required, "other Greeks had overlooked some dangers and made light of others when it was still possible to safely ward them off" (60.18). Blaming "other Greeks" constitutes an implied attack on Demosthenes' political enemies; however, on the surface it seems like an innocuous epideictic move to reinforce Athenian identification by situating them in opposition with other *poleis*.

Justifications of Military Failure

The constraints of Demosthenes' rhetorical situation made it difficult for him to accomplish the multiple objectives he sought. Because he had to spend the bulk of his time extolling the virtues of the ancestors and the current war dead, he had limited time to explain

why this major Athenian loss did not undermine his political stance against Phillip. He attempts to negotiate the justificatory tightrope through three primary tactics: 1) he attributes the outcome of the battle to divine will, and 2) by identifying the Theban commanders as scapegoats he absolves the war dead of responsibility for the poor outcome, and 3) ironically in hindsight, he claims that despite being clearly defeated on the battlefield, Athenians and their allies actually succeeded in their objectives because Attica was never invaded (at least at the time of the speech was delivered). I will discuss each of these tactics in seriatim.

To downplay the military consequences, Demosthenes plays up the fatalistic nature of battle. "God decides how to apportion victory among the living, but everyone who remains at his post has done his part toward this end" (60.19). Thus, he continues, "If a mortal succumbs to fate, he has suffered this circumstance because of chance" (60.19–20). While he admits, "there must be winners and losers," he maintains, "the dead of both sides share equally in victory" (60.19). If the gods have ordained the result of the battle, one can only appraise the efforts of Athenians according to their intentions, which Demosthenes praises as virtuous because their aim was to act as protectors of all Greece just as the ancestors had done. In particular, and perhaps more importantly, in protecting Attica, they are metaphorically protecting the land from which myth dictates they were born.

Additionally, Demosthenes casts the Thebans as scapegoats for the failure of the mission at Chaeronea. In other words, if the gods were not to blame, certainly the Thebans must have been. As the commanders for the Greek alliance in the battle, it is easy to suggest they are culpable in the failures of the troops. Ancient sources note that Demosthenes may have had some Theban blood in his ancestry and so this preemptive rebuttal may have also served to extricate himself of any association to the poor military strategy displayed by the

Theban commanders (DeWitt & DeWitt, 1949). More importantly, this claim affords the rhetor the ability to praise the soldiers who perished while simultaneously suggesting that a substantial leadership role taken by Athens would have led to a different result. The deliberative component of this portion of the speech remains subordinate to the dominant role played by epideictic concerns; however, it is still present.

Lastly, despite losing the battle decisively, Demosthenes still claimed a victory of sorts. Because of the valiant efforts of Athenian warriors, "the enemy learned a lesson," and as a result of recognizing the quality of character displayed by the Athenians, the Macedonians "were reluctant to enter another conflict" because they surely "could not count on an equally propitious outcome again" (60.20). This line of argument suggests that the loss was an aberration, and that should Athenians continue to face Phillip, they would eventually succeed due to their superior character and form of government.

Emulating the Tribal Ancestors

Members of the immediate audience shared these same traits. Thus, the implication of the above passage is that they should die nobly, regardless of whether the prospects for success in war were good or bad. As he demonstrates in his later line of analysis that rehearses the mythic histories of the 10 Athenian tribes, to actually live out one's virtue requires emulation. Just as Herodotus did in relaying the Athenian arguments at Plataea, Demosthenes highlights the *fierce urgency of now*. One tactic he uses to do this is by employing paralipsis, a figure whereby the speaker draws attention to a point by refusing to address it in his or her speech. He posits the following: "I will leave aside their numerous deeds that are part of the realm of myth" (60.9). In refusing to address this subject further,

Demosthenes stresses the emulation that these earlier generations inspire in the present generation.

Antitheses throughout the oration advance the ideal that to die in battle for Athens is the most honorable of pursuits— it is an end in itself and exists independently of empirical results. After admitting that it was not possible to provide the dead with "fitting praise," he notes that these men "chose to die bravely rather than to live and see Greece suffer misfortune" (60.1). This idea is furthered when later (Sections 27–31) Demosthenes rehearses myths surrounding various Athenian tribes. He says of the Aegeidae that they refused to "betray" the policy of their founder, Theseus: "they chose to die rather than to live as cowards while this freedom was destroyed among the Greeks" (60.28). He characterizes the ardor for battle of the Aeantidae similarly: "they believed that they must either live in a manner *worthy of their predecessors* or else die nobly" (emphasis added) (60.31). References to ancient myth further bind the connection between temporal dimensions, which highlights the timelessness of duty that binds Athenians.

Because he is jointly eulogizing several generations of warriors, he has leverage to make comments like this: "wherever justice was stationed, they assigned themselves there, *until time brought us to the generation now living*" (emphasis added) (60.11). The aforementioned passage begins innocuously enough, but ends with a biting critique. The final dependent clause of the section, "until time brought us to the generation now living," hints that the present generation of living men (excluding the war dead who clearly had already proven their devotion) were not living up to their *ancestral duty*. In this way, Demosthenes divides his compatriots into groups, praising one while leveling blame at the other.

The last few sections of the address appear to serve a traditional function: providing solace to uplift the spirits of the family members who had lost one of their own. Section 35 begins by praising the women for "giving birth to such great men" and for "ensuring hardship more decently than others" (60.35). While recognizing the epideictic function of consolation, Demosthenes still decides to reiterate that the mortal end of his comrades at Chaeronea resulted from divine fate. By stressing their inability to affect the outcome, he is able to further highlight the virtues that these men possessed, something wholly within the scope of epideictic considerations. However, he points out that glory resulted from a "voluntary decision" on the part of these men to risk their lives, echoing his earlier characterization of the war dead as having risen to the occasion on account of their "not being stingy with their lives" (60.37; 60.18). The DeWitt and DeWitt (1949) translation puts it this way: "we shall find the deity to be the cause, to whom mortal creatures must yield, but *of the glory and honour, the source is in the choice of those who willed to die nobly*" (60.37). So at the same time as he appears to be pursuing a traditional ceremonial focus in his peroration, the rhetor also is quick to remind the audience that glory derives from a willingness to live up to one's duty rather than being bound up in innate predispositions. In this way, Demosthenes continues to advance his deontological argument.

Contrast and inversion are a common rhetorical strategy woven throughout the address. Another figure he employs to further his ultimate aim is antimetabole: "It is sorrowful for children to lose their fathers. But it is wonderful for them to inherit their father's glory" (60.37). This passage is aptly situated within the peroration and taken together with some earlier hints, almost functions as a call to action. Surely his audience consisted of "legitimate citizens" by virtue of their autochthonous origins (60.4–5). However, according to

Demosthenes, glory is partially given and partially earned. Demosthenes' inventional choices demonstrate this, but it is also recognized by Athenians writ large as an important component of good citizenship by virtue of the fact that this ideal developed into a convention of funeral oration. Recall how he reminds the audience that in-born virtue is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of greatness for an Athenian: "the beginning of every virtue is intelligence, and the end is courage" (60.17). One does not simply possess courage; rather, courage must be demonstrated. Demosthenes further makes clear that while they had been well-born and educated, the manifestation of these men's virtues took the form of action: "when they reach manhood, they showed their fellow citizens what they were made of" (60.17). Consistent with his sentiments in *On the Symmories*, he remains committed to avoiding an epideictic rhetoric that is devoid of pragmatic value. Whereas preparation was the end in that earlier address, an orientation toward action in the service of Greece functions as a *telos* for the funeral speech.

To live up to their in-born greatness, Demosthenes rehearses a brief history of the tribes that make up Athens. In nearly every case, he discusses not just their innate qualities as chronicled by myth, but how they actuated those qualities. Of the Oeneidae he states, "since the present danger threatened both of their cities, they supposed that they should put forth every *effort*" (60.30). Despite their physical and intellectual dispositions toward virtue, Demosthenes emphasized that virtue is earned through generational duty by employing chiasmus. The Hyacinthidae, he reminds the audience, "believed that they would be shameful if they... should appear to care more for their mortal bodies than for immortal glory (60.27). These sections frame the attainment of virtue in the terms in which previous generations conceived them.

To further ground the historical precedent for this concept of a generational tribal duty, Demosthenes poses the following *erotema* with regard to the Acamantidae: "How could they not submit to every design in an effort to save all their parents at home?" (60.29). This could be hinting at the land as the parent of *authchronous* Athenians. This interpretation is bolstered by what Demosthenes says about the Pandionidae: they "considered life not worth living, unless they displayed a spirit akin to their ancestors when they saw Greece being assaulted" (60.28–29). Section 27 begins by acknowledging the transcendence of Athenian character across the divide of various generations. While rehearsing traditional aspects of what makes Athens great, something that seems primarily, if not solely, an *epideictic* move, he cyclically builds to his undergirding message: that his anti-Macedonian political program is consistent with—if not necessitated by, Athenian values.

The multiplicity of the eulogy is carried through in the traditional rehearsal of Athenian origins. Whether the ancestors would agree with the orator's decision to equate the present war dead with the past, his living audience would certainly want to avoid the cognitive dissonance arising from the feeling that they are not demonstrating the courage to complete their exercise in virtue. Because the audience would understand the state of the political crisis, the sequence of rehearsing tribal histories, presumably an *epideictic* move, can function also as a call to action.

Temporally, this move serves as an important coordinate point for the text. Beyond simply drawing attention to a subject without overtly seeming to do so, Demosthenes' *paralipsis* here rehearses the virtue of the ancestors to the practical purpose; rather than idly praising abstractions, he unifies the themes they embodied within the scope of the present exigence. That the warriors in the Persian conflict "created a public state of security

throughout all of Greece" is juxtaposed with the state of insecurity under Phillip's growing sphere of influence. So, in a roundabout way, he manages to establish a problem that calls for a deliberative solution— all while speaking in a quintessentially ceremonial forum.

Conclusion

In the final analysis, Demosthenes' funeral oration demonstrates that the orator possessed a keen understanding of the nuances of the rhetorical situation he faced. Demosthenes took the generic tradition he inherited through such prominent texts as Pericles' (Thucydides') funeral oration and Plato's *Menexenus* as starting points, but he does not merely rehearse the same tropes they contain. In addition to having masterfully crafted a speech suitable to the generic expectations, he further is able to adapt it as needed in order to address issues of present significance. More specifically, he rehearses the heroic myths of the *polis* via secular prayer and in order to (re)build a stable identification among his fellow Athenians. He does this subtly—but not so subtly as to veil the deliberative implications of the communion he sought to create among his fellow citizens.

Taking Perelman's (1969; 1984) premises concerning the role of epideictic as a device for laying the groundwork for effective argumentation at a later date, a close textual analysis reveals how the institution as well as the aims of the rhetor operated as a form of secular prayer within the ancient context (Loraux, 1986). Indeed, rhetorical practice is always situational so there is only so much one can conclude about how he or his audience would have conceived of the rhetorical situation post-Chaeronea. In the end, I think Christopher Carey characterized the uniqueness of the classical funeral oration well: "The communal sense of pride and shared purpose engendered by the funeral oration made its themes an ideal means in other contexts for creating division and isolating opponents, as well as allowing the

speaker to strike a statesmanlike and patriotic prose” (2010, p. 248). Just as he criticized epideictic orators for obtaining glory for themselves while failing to do justice to the virtues of Athenians past, one could argue that Demosthenes is guilty of the same charge. Still, as I have noted, in the hands of a master craftsman, the apparently static form of the funeral oration is harnessed as a powerful device to not only encourage the present generation to live up to their ancestral ideals, but also serves as a venue whereby the rhetor displays leadership.

CHAPTER 4: IDENTIFICATION IN HYPERIDES' FUNERAL ORATION

Hyperides (ca. 390–322) and Demosthenes were staunch allies in the effort to prevent Macedon from replacing Athens as the most important power in the Greek world. Like Demosthenes, Hyperides was born into a wealthy family and began his career as a logographer after studying under Plato and Isocrates, before eventually becoming a well-respected pleader in the law courts (Burt, 1954). As far as we can tell from extant materials, Hyperides' first major act of advocacy for anti-Macedonian policies was his prosecution of Philocrates in 343. The defendant in this case was accused of taking bribes from agents of Phillip. According to adherents of Demosthenes' and Hyperides' anti-Macedonian program, the peace accord was disastrous for Athens, for it facilitated Phillip's gaining access to central Greece and shifted membership on the Delphic Amphictyony in favor of Macedonia to the detriment of Athens (Herrman, 2009). It is well to note that, contrary to popular portrayals of antiquity in contemporary media, political alliances among Greek states were mercurial, so even minor geopolitical shifts such as this one carried great significance for the conduct of Athenian foreign policy. In antiquity at least seventy-seven speeches were attributed to Hyperides, although few remain, and most of those that do remain are fragmentary (Kennedy, 1963). Despite the limited materials about him still extant, he was by all accounts an important citizen who was well respected as a statesman and orator by his contemporaries.

Hyperides is characterized as "a speechwriter who dabbled in politics," rather than being someone who was concerned primarily with political issues for their own sake (Kennedy, 1963, p. 253). He took on a variety of forensic cases regardless of the prestige they carried or his personal feelings about the case. O'Connell (2013) observed that

Hyperides' trademark forensic style was a particularly sarcastic one that often exaggerated the potentially nefarious motives of prosecutors. Assuming these characterizations of him are accurate ones, it complicates our ability to assess his political motives in delivering the funeral oration; a minor limitation, but still one worth noting. However, Hyperides may have taken the funeral oration to be of a different order, causing him to proceed with greater care for decorum in this instance than he may have in a court proceeding. After all, with Demosthenes residing in exile by this time, Hyperides was one of the most prominent citizens left to advocate for anti-Macedonian ideals. Further, it provided him a well-attended forum in which to raise his personal political profile, although there is no evidence that the pursuit of power was an important aim of Hyperides' public discourse as it had been for Demosthenes.

The funeral oration is probably Hyperides' most well known work, certainly in the modern era (Burt, 1954). Despite being somewhat fragmentary, Judson Herrman (2004; 2009) who recently published a new translation of the speech, identified it as the most likely of the extant *epitaphoi* to have been delivered in a similar form as we now have it. As "the last surviving great speech from Athens", Hyperides' address was "the swan song of Greek freedom" (Habicht, 1997, p. 39). In the preface to his scholarly translation of the oration, Herrman advocated for its importance to the tradition of classical oratory, calling it:

arguably the most important surviving example of an Athenian *epitaphios logos* both because of its fine quality as an epideictic composition, but because it reveals that *a state funeral oration could transform the standard content of the genre and adapt it to the immediate historical context* (emphasis added) (2009, p. v).

That he was able to work within the genre and yet provide his own unique insight is not in itself news; however, the level to which he deviated from common topics is unparalleled in

the extant *epitaphoi*, making this case unique. Moreover, as a contemporary of Demosthenes and as someone who maintained roughly the same foreign policy objectives, Hyperides' funeral oration is well suited to comparison with Demosthenes'. For the purposes of this essay, we can simplify the position of these two men as being essentially synonymous. Thus, in examining how the two rhetors responded differently while advancing the same ultimate end can shed light on the concept of exigence as it operates in ceremonial concepts.

Two Orators; 16 years

Sixteen years of tumultuous politics passed between Demosthenes' funeral oration in 338 and Hyperides' address in 322. Following the loss at Chaeronea, Athenian hegemony continued its decline. Still, there were moments when the more hawkish elements in the *polis* saw openings to counter Macedonian influence. Phillip II died in 336 and the transition of power to his son Alexander was not the smoothest one. Moreover, when Alexander allocated large swathes of Macedonia's military power east toward Asia, the beginnings of a power vacuum began to emerge within the Attic region. Athenians remained internally conflicted about how to conceive of Macedonia, and as a result, many of the potential Athenian counteractions never got off the ground (Habicht, 1997). Not all Athenians, and certainly not the rest of the politically heterogeneous Greek world of period, necessarily viewed Macedonia as an enemy. The tumultuous geopolitics of the 4th century was necessarily reflected in how the myth of an idealized Athens was propagated. This in turn helps to distinguish what causes Hyperides' and Demosthenes' orations to differ from earlier iterations of the *epitaphios logos*, as well as from one another (Loraux, 1986).

While he is little discussed outside a small community of scholars who study Attic oratory, recently discovered texts suggest that Hyperides was a more important figure in

Athenian democracy than had previously been thought. The discovery and translation of ancient texts inscribed in Archimedes' Palimpsest has brought us two previously unknown speeches purportedly delivered by Hyperides, effectively increasing the orator's canon by 20 percent: one describes the famous battle of Salamis (480) and another illuminates the social and military contexts of the battle of Chaeronea (338) (Lee, 2006). From these new revelations and mention of him in other primary texts², we know that Hyperides was more than just a chronicler of history, but an active participant in matters of law and politics in 4th century Athenian society. In fact, William Noel, director of the Archimedes Palimpsest project, went so far as to call Hyperides "one of the great foundational figures of Greek democracy in the golden age of Athenian democracy, the foundational democracy of all democracies" (qtd. in Lee, 2006). While his funeral oration was known prior to the discovery of the palimpsest, it remains perhaps his most significant and finely crafted extant work.

Despite the history of cooperation between Demosthenes and Hyperides toward an end they both sincerely sought, the two eventually fell out of favor with one another as a result of the Harpalus affair (ca. 324). Harpalus, a Macedonian treasurer came to Athens seeking exile only to escape as his deposit of 700 talents conspicuously went missing (Hyp. *Dem.* 8–10). Demosthenes was a leading figure in the negotiations with agents of Alexander over this matter and so ended up taking much of the blame when Harpalus escaped. Hyperides was one of the ten statesmen elected by the assembly as to prosecute Demosthenes for the taking of bribes (Herrman, 2009). Demosthenes was eventually found guilty and forced into exile (Plut. *Dem.* 26). The two Athenians would later reconcile their differences while both were touring the Peloponnese to rally a final push of support against Antipater

² See Pseudo-Plutarch's *Lives of the Ten Orators*, 849f and Longinus' *On the Sublime*, 34.2.

(Burt, 1954). But when their mutual effort failed, both men were condemned to death in late 322.

Because of the unique circumstances surrounding Demosthenes' and Hyperides' personal relationship, we are fortunate to have extant copies of the funeral oration that each man delivered. The exigencies they faced differed notably, thus making the two cases ripe for critical comparison side by side. Hyperides delivered the state oration in the spring of 322 during a brief period of optimism nearing the end of the first season of the Lamian War when hope for an Athenian comeback was still thought a reasonable prospect by some. In contrast, Demosthenes' speech was delivered at a time when many believed all hope was lost—and the orator received much of the blame for bringing about the present circumstances. Moreover, Hyperides' case is unique because, as the latest surviving funeral oration from classical Athens, it may reflect the culmination of the funeral oration tradition that began to take shape during the golden age of Athenian democracy, an age that by this point was waning. Therefore, examining Hyperides' funeral speech in the context of the complex rhetorical situation that prompted it has the potential to illuminate some effects of historicity on the genre. Hyperides had knowledge of a preexisting tradition, upon which he could adapt, modify, and build upon to suit his aims as a speaker and the particular exigencies he faced. This means that his text possessed an organic relationship to the socio-political contexts under which the rhetor worked. As I will demonstrate, this relationship is shown predominately by the presence of contemporary political commentary, something rare in other *epitaphoi*.

There was disagreement among Athenians about how active a role the polis should play in countering Macedonia following Alexander's death. In the end, the general

Leosthenes with the help of Hyperides convinced his fellow Athenians to war with Macedonia. To bolster the prospects for victory, Athens made several new alliances, including those with the Aetolians, Phocians, and Locrians as well as others in the Peloponnese (the latter of which had been lobbied by Demosthenes) (Habicht, 1997). While early results of the military endeavor looked promising for Athens, prompting celebration, Athens was slowly losing a war of attrition. After the death of Leosthenes in a minor skirmish, the general Antiphilus took over his command, "but [he] was no match for his predecessor in energy or prestige" (Habicht, 1997, p. 38). So, while on the one hand Hyperides sought to honor Leosthenes, he was necessarily also highlighting the need for others to demonstrate the same skills and leadership in the present if Athens was to succeed in pushing back Macedonia. The death of Leosthenes prompted both ceremonial and pragmatic exigencies.

While Hyperides faced a different sort of exigence than did Demosthenes 16 years earlier, both speakers shared knowledge of a relatively stable and seemingly institutionalized discursive genre. Still, as I shall argue, neither address can merely be subsumed under the apparatus of a generic tradition. In fact, of all the funeral orations remaining extant, Hyperides' diverges the most from expected *topoi*. Although it was short-lived, there was at the present moment of this speech's delivery, some optimism that Athens may be able to regain some of its earlier regional hegemony. Conversely, Demosthenes was speaking during one of the direst time-periods in the lifetimes of most, if not all, of his audience, and so had to take a more justificatory posture (as explained in the previous chapter). Exigencies dictated that Hyperides needed to uplift and rouse the troops in a similar fashion as all epitaphists did, but he also wanted to carve out a place in history for his friend Leosthenes.

Ultimately, like Demosthenes, he wanted to pave a way forward for Athens and thus had to highlight the urgency of the moment to keep his compatriots on board with the mission and keep the momentum going.

My close textual analysis of the speech proceeds in a similar fashion as in the previous chapter. First, I will note some of the instances of conventional topics that also appear across the corpus of the other funeral orations. Second, I briefly examine the address through an Aristotelian lens, identifying components of the text that can be well explained by Aristotle's theory of *epideixis*. After sketching out textual elements that are precisely what one would expect, I articulate the many elements that make Hyperides' address especially unique and argue that they are best explained under a re-conceptualized theory of the classical funeral oration as exigence-driven discourse. Aristotelian theories do possess some explanatory power when it comes to the 4th century funeral orations, but to further lend insight into the rhetorical force of Hyperides' speech, I draw on Kenneth Burke's concept of identification to assist in my explication of the text. I posit that Hyperides' praise of an individual, Leosthenes, is part of a larger strategy of *synecdochic identification*, which he employs to promote emulation among his living audience in response to immediate exigencies.

Generic Expectations: Remnants from a Fossilized Tradition

While he does not devote a significant portion of his speech to fulfilling generic expectations, Hyperides still does cover several of the stock topics that developed over the history of the funeral oration tradition. He notes the myth of Athenian autochthonous origins and also makes reference to the Athenian educational system, which inspired its citizens to act with bravery (6.7–8). In both cases, however, he appears to do it solely out of necessity;

functionally, they act as asides not wholly necessary to warrant Hyperides' position about the importance of *that* historical moment. He notes his perceived obligation to address these topics when stating, "I should mention their education, and how they were raised and educated in great moderation," but also implies (in a partially damaged portion of the papyrus)³ that the audience were already "accustomed to" this information and that he need not have mentioned it for their sake (6.8).⁴ Compare this with Demosthenes' admission that he would feel shame if he left out any of the expected topics (60.3). Hyperides diminishes the virtue of these inventional expectations: "But I suppose [everyone] knows that we educate [for this reason], so that they may *become* brave" (6.8). On the one hand, Hyperides utilizes a rather dismissive tone that minimizes the importance of rehearsing Athenian values, the implication of which is to suggest the fracturing of the genre in the face of political strife. Or phrased another way, his tone in these sections indicates that the genre only became codified as a result of the relative stability of exigencies in earlier periods when Athenian hegemony was automatically presumed.

On the other hand, however, the likely use of the word "become" reiterates the connection between the Athenian governmental structure, duty, and emulation. Put another way, the purpose of Athenian education—including informal education at ceremonial venues such as the one at which Hyperides' spoke—is to instill in citizens virtues that manifest themselves in actions that represent (and perpetuate) Athenian ideals. Herein we see a connection between Demosthenes' argument for emulation and Hyperides' insinuation.

Despite the post hoc character of his rationalization for the creation of Athenian bravery,

³ The papyrus is damaged to distort a few characters both before and after the phrase "are accustomed to." Herrman marks unrestored lacunae with a pair of dashes in brackets; in no case are omissions longer than 20 characters (see Herrman, 2004, p. 78).

⁴ The phrase "accustomed to" can reasonably be inferred according to the judgment of the translator but should not be presumed to have been clearly intentioned by Hyperides as it may have been added later by a scribe.

Hyperides' sarcastic tone also suggests something rather substantive that was not likely lost on his observant audience (assuming the reconstructions of the papyrus are giving us the correct impression).

In keeping with ceremonial expectations, Hyperides is also quick to assert that the present war dead followed a long tradition of Athenian greatness. However, doing so also furthers his aim to iterate the cultural imperative for Athenians to live up to their generational duty to protect the homeland and all of Greece. Despite the far different landscape of global politics in 322 when compared to 490 or 431, he emphasized, "We *must* also praise the war-time courage of the dead. They did not dishonor the virtues of their ancestors" (6.3). The aforementioned passage is characteristic of Hyperides' slightly defensive posture in early portions of the speech, which fades as he proceeds. As translated, he focuses on the necessity of praising them by using the verb "must." Whereas Demosthenes (60.1) asserted in his exordium that it was custom to give a speech of praise for the dead, Hyperides' accentuates an imperative based on these men's actions. But in Hyperides' mind, perhaps that imperative could not stand on its own, so he follows it up with what is almost a rebuttal in the next sentence. Is there reason to suspect that he would use the negative sentence construction "did not" for any other reason than to extricate the honorees from this potential charge? After all, he did have the luxury of speaking after a period of relative military success. This potentiality is further magnified by the negative prefix in front of "honor." Consider what it would have sounded like with the inverse construction: *they did honor the virtue of their ancestors*. The latter wording communicates the adherence of the war dead to their generational duty as Athenians but with the underlying subtext that this was to be expected—it should come as no surprise to the audience. This defensive posture is far from pronounced, but through nuances

like the construction of this passage, Hyperides was permitted to deviate from the genre more substantially in later segments of the speech. Without the reserved measure demonstrated in this section, Hyperides would more likely have alienated the audience when claiming that Leosthenes' accomplishments exceeded those of the ancestors who fought at Troy or Marathon.

Taken as a whole, there is much within the established tradition—however established it may have been in reality—that Hyperides omits. Unlike Demosthenes who felt the need to justify many of his inventional decisions, Hyperides employs *erotema* to indicate that his choices about what material to include or exclude were self-evident. As in Thucydides' reconstruction of Pericles' funeral oration, he dispenses with the long rehearsal of past military triumphs and the mythic traits associated with the ancestral line of the ten Athenian tribes (the latter, of course receives extensive treatment in Demosthenes' funeral oration).

The most notable deviation Hyperides makes compared to other *epitaphoi* is that he places substantially more focus on contemporary events than on mythic history. He casually dismisses the choice to give short shrift to the latter: "Now where should I begin [my speech]; what should I bring up first? Should I discuss in detail the ancestry of each of them? No, I suppose that would be foolish" (6.6–7). In reminding the audience that he understood how the genre was *supposed to* work, Hyperides is able to maintain his ethos as a competent practitioner of epideictic, while also giving himself license to proceed to include unorthodox material, namely the extensive praise of one named individual.

An Aristotelian Reading

Aristotle defined the epideictic genre by compiling a diverse set of previously existing speech types in antiquity that were not exclusively deliberative or forensic. All three categories are broad in scope, but the epideictic variety in particular was not nearly as formulaic as it is often suggested to have been by Aristotle's early modern interpreters (Chase, 1961). Modern rhetorical theorists have defended, expanded, and criticized Aristotle's theory of the genre. Investigating some of the epideictic discourse produced by Aristotle's contemporaries, such as the speeches of Hyperides, a lightly covered figure in scholarship, we can diagnose the character the epideictic genre as it evolved historically and the ways it influenced the development of culture.

Like epideictic in a broader sense, specific conventions for funeral orations were likely in a state of flux in 322. The constraints of praise and blame that Aristotle emphasized were not always linked with epideictic discourse. Chase (1961) notes that prior to the publication of the *Rhetoric*, epideictic discourse was conceived of as being much more various; in fact, no surviving pre-Aristotelian rhetorical treatises specifically associate the epideictic with praise and blame, the tropes so closely linked to the genre today. Hyperides and Demosthenes being contemporaries of Aristotle, one wonders whether Aristotle's treatise had held any sway in the invention of their respective funeral orations. Pre-Aristotelian genre conventions were likely more fluid, perhaps a similarity they share with contemporary epideictic discourse. It is for this reason that I briefly examine what, if any, influence Aristotelian theories of the epideictic may have had on Hyperides' composition, an oration composed in the year of Aristotle's death but well before his treatise on the subject became canonized as a seminal text in rhetoric lore.

Just as Demosthenes had done, Hyperides also appeals to the audience by padding their sense of communion around shared values and praising their strong cultural memory. He employs the commonplace of acknowledging the difficulty of his task as the funeral orator to pay his audience a compliment: "I am anxious that my speech may not live up to their accomplishments. But my confidence is restored by the fact that you, the audience, will supply whatever details I omit" (6.2). This passage, innocuous as it appears, serves a purpose. That the audience would recall the greatness of these men's actions would be expected, but it further ingratiates the orator with his audience in keeping with Aristotle's dictum. Aristotle emphasized the need—for epideictic discourse in particular—to appeal to the attitudes of the audience: "one needs to speak as though what is held in honor among a group of people... were actually present. And in all cases, one needs to draw what is held in honor toward what is beautiful" (*Arist.* 1367b, 7–12). Here also, this apparent nod to generic conformity serves a dual purpose. In addition to extolling a sense of nationalism in his audience, Hyperides glazes over expected tropes in order to justify molding the genre to his own ends.

Aristotle also provides much detail in the *Rhetoric* about how one should speak of an individual's character and his deeds. He posits that rhetors should "approximate attributes" of the person(s) one is praising to magnify their virtues (e.g. one who is "overcautious" is "cool tempered") (*Arist.* 1367a, 35–39). This tactic is used by Hyperides to describe the general Leosthenes and the troops he led. The general is praised specifically because he "persuaded the citizens to endure so many hardships without hesitation, and to offer themselves eagerly as fellow fighters alongside such a great general" (6.24). Highlighting the eagerness with which the soldiers fought while "endure[ing] so many hardships" obscures any reservations the soldiers may (and probably did) have concerning the campaign. Rather, the orator notes

the dead's "unwavering courage to risk their lives readily" (6.17). The bravery of the soldiers is approximated to further enhance the idealized narrative of Athens. Additionally, their actions are as much a credit to Leosthenes' leadership skills as to their personal character. Whether the soldiers would have acted with such valor on their own might be presumed considering that they possessed traits of the Athenian national character, and yet Hyperides' credits Leosthenes with "persuading them."

However, while the oration does epitomize Aristotle's aforementioned recommendation, it does so in a way that is unique among the Athenian funeral orations: he emphasizes contemporary events over mythic past, and in so doing, he appropriates characteristics that Aristotle believed belonged to the sub-category of encomiums. Aristotle wrote, "praise is speech that manifests greatness of virtue, so it is necessary to display actions as having that character. An encomium is about deeds" (1376b, 28–30). Rather than focusing on the virtuous quality of Leosthenes' actions, which would thus inherently reflect well on his character, Hyperides emphasizes the pragmatic result of Leosthenes' leadership and battle tactics.

The perilous possibility that Macedon might forever dominate Athens makes the soldiers efforts all the more worthy: "the more frightening we judge these premonitions, the more praise we must believe the dead have earned" (6.22–23). Hyperides does acknowledge the sacrifice of the dead, but prefers to characterize it differently, as a noble exchange: "these men who have died— no, it is not right to use that term for men who lost their lives on behalf of such a noble cause— rather, of men who have exchanged their life for an eternal post" (6.27–28). In addition to this seeming hyperbole, he iterates this sacrifice in antithetical terms, similar to the way Demosthenes had: "they gave up their lives so that others could live

well" (6.25). Ultimately, many of the common *topoi* Aristotle described for epideictic addresses do appear in Hyperides' address. Still, because they are also exigence-driven, Hyperides' adoption of these tropes should not be credited primarily to Aristotle or the institutionalized genre of *epitaphios logos*.

Promoting Identification: Praising Leosthenes as Athenian Exemplar

Hyperides' emphasis on contemporary events is indeed unique. While Pericles may have opened the door for this deviation from the generic formulae of funeral orations as we understand them, Hyperides takes this thematic shift to a whole new level (Herrman, 2009). By breaking with the abstract narrative of past battles Hyperides' address ignores the longstanding tradition of detailing war preparations and even going so far as to associate Athenian fighting forces with their mercenary allies (Loraux, 1986). In making the latter choice, Hyperides ran the risk of alienating his audience of Athenian citizens, who were consistently painted as superior to other Greeks with whom the Athenians may have previously been allies. Loraux (1986) continued to highlight Hyperides' choice to not mention the battle of Marathon, a frequent allusion that exemplified the "ideal Athens"—and one that played a prominent role in Demosthenes' funeral oration. As a point of reference, we might compare the uniqueness of the contemporary content in Hyperides' funeral oration to Aeschylus' *The Persians*, the only extant Greek tragedy not set in the mythic past.

Epitaphists were expected to rehearse the narratives of famous victories like the battles of Marathon and Salamis. However, stability of these expected topics cannot be equated with their immutability. Gradual changes were adopted throughout its practice in classical Athens. The *kairic* moment of each address provided some specific exigencies that called for responses; so in that sense, it is not particularly surprising—in hindsight at least—

that Hyperides lauds contemporary accomplishments as on par with, if not surpassing, previous Athenian triumphs. But, just as it is with contemporary discourse, *kairos* was not just a limiting force that constrained what a speaker may say, a license Hyperides takes full advantage of. Moreover, it seems the exigencies he faced demanded more than simple commemoration, which beings to help explain these apparent oddities relative to genre expectations.

Looking back historically, we may view the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars as being some of the most significant Athenian victories but at the moment of the speech, the legacy of the Lamian wars were an open question, and one which the funeral orator had cause to address. Because in the spring of 322, the outlook for Athens in their conflict with Macedon was looking rather rosy, Leosthenes and those he commanded may very well have been as highly revered as Hyperides suggested they ought to be. However, despite Athens' relative successes during that year's campaign, the optimism of the moment was tempered by sentiment that the war effort might be misguided and Athens had only a minimal chance of winning the war in the end. Hesk (2013) suggested that Hyperides sought to negotiate these reservations in order to inspire more Athenians to be like Leosthenes and save for themselves places of honor in the underworld as he had. Thus there was a need not only to encourage identification of Athenians to one another; more exigent at the moment was the need for them to identify with the war effort.

In addition, while those like Loraux and Herrman note the anomaly of Hyperides' substantial praise of one individual, by the late 4th century, individual commemoration was probably not as uncommon as it had previously been. After 425, private burial of elite members of Athenian society became relatively commonplace (Hesk, 2013). The funeral

oration tradition as we have access to it, while it likely did not permit an epitaphist to emphasize the virtue of individuals over the collective, did not forbid mention of exemplary individuals or their deeds. Plato and Lysias made reference of the military campaigns lead by those whom their speeches honored, but their doing so did not overshadow the much greater stress on the mythic Athenian narratives in the same way Hyperides does. When speaking of the virtue of the honored dead, it is notable that the primacy of Leosthenes is emphasized by his always being mentioned before the others being praised, including other Athenians. The first line of the text we now have begins by asserting the primacy of the good general: "the words about to be spoken... [about] Leosthenes the general and about the others" (6.1). Again in section 6, he identifies "Leosthenes and the [others]." From the outset the individual is set apart from, and simultaneously the designated representative of, the group being held up as a model for emulation to inspire the living audience.

Audience sentiment at that particular stage in the war cannot in itself explain Hyperides' praise of one individual over the collective. The orator refutes this charge; however, the fact that he takes this approach suggests that the future of the war was a political question open to dispute and that Hyperides took the side of Leosthenes on that question. Thus, we have ample reason to suspect that Hyperides' speech would contain deliberative undertones. These synecdochic moves allow him to do justice to the legacy of a man he admired while at the same time building in his audience an attitude toward emulation. Midway through the speech, he shares his reasoning for this strategy: "please don't think that I am not making a speech for the other citizens [--] that I eulogize Leosthenes alone. My praise of Leosthenes [in] these battles, is also a eulogy for the others citizens" (6.15–17). Thus the synecdoche of the eulogy mirrors the roles taken by the men in battle, Leosthenes

the charismatic and virtuous leader, the *others*, faithful followers who do not question their station.

Hyperides paints Leosthenes as an almost messianic figure, the savior of all Greece. Still the nuance of his rhetorical tactics deserve some attention—to succeed in doing this while speaking in a forum that was by all accounts a highly regularized genre required finesse. To set up this praise, he first outlines the magnitude of the dire prospects arising from Macedonian aggression. The general was originally a passive agent when "he saw all of Greece humbled and [--] cowering, destroyed by those working against their own fatherland and accepting bribes from Phillip and Alexander" (6.10). It is perhaps fitting that the papyrus is partially damaged over these passages as it reflects the disastrously damaged psyche of a "humbled" and "cowering" Greece. Even Leosthenes, a man Hyperides greatly admired could only *witness* the destruction (at least initially), for the damage had already been done. The attributed cause is corruption: the taking of bribes had subverted the in-born tendency of Athenians to act courageously to defend their homeland—and all of Greece. Mentioning bribes specifically may serve as an ethotic move that would cause the audience to recall his successful prosecution of Philocrates in 343 but without seeming to contravene generic expectations. Further, it may have brought to mind Demosthenes (in exile by the time of Hyperides' speech), by all accounts an honorable citizen who was corrupted by the insidiousness of Macedonian character headlined by its leaders Phillip and Alexander. However, while some would stand idly by and watch the continued destruction of Greece, Leosthenes was intent to take action. Hyperides emphasizes this point with use of mostly active constructions after he has outlined the situation.

The lack of agency ascribed to Leosthenes in the above passage contrasts with what follows it. The next couple sentences all vest agency in Leosthenes and explain what he does with it. He "defeated," "occupied," "denied," and "shut Antipater in at Lamia and laid siege to the place" (6.11–13). Rather than placing the Athenian army as a whole in the subject position, he chooses to accentuate the general's role in accomplishing these ends. To further build up Leosthenes as a model for emulation, Hyperides explains, "when he saw that our city *needed* a man, and all Greece [needed] a city that could lead them to freedom, he offered himself to his native city, and his city to the Greeks" (6.10). What gave him the authority to volunteer Athens in this capacity? It was his leadership that facilitated others to live up to the traits of the Athenian national character necessitated by their noble birth and educational system, which called them to be the protector of all Greece. Leosthenes was just the messenger—and due to the greatness of his own character, he embodied all that was great about Athens. Conversely, his name acts—or Hyperides believed it should act—as a metonym for Athens writ large.

As one of the purposes of funeral orations, perhaps the primary purpose, is the articulation and rearticulation of civic identity, it is fitting to explore elements of identification as facilitated by these speeches. Here again, Hyperides provides a unique case because he tries to build an identity by relying on contemporary as opposed to mythic narratives. Simply put, everyone necessarily identifies her or his purpose with abstract ideals. In the case of the Athenians, the identity they ascribed to their city served as a predominate mode of identification for its *citizens* (as opposed to slaves and visitors whose identity had to be constructed differently).

For the Athenians, many of these points of identification were intertwined, but they all centered around the same communal ideal. Considering this, how then do we explain Hyperides' emphasis on Leosthenes, at the expense, some would argue, of the others who died—and certainly at the expense of past Athenian accomplishments, both mythic and recent? Burke (1937/1984) maintained that "secularization" of heroes represents a paradigm shift from divine heroism, which individuals cannot be expected to emulate. Political and ideological fracture that arose in the wake of Chaeronea and subsequent internal strife required a reconception of the Athenian narrative that could account for the exigencies of the Lamian war which were not easily comparable with the exigencies of the Persian or Peloponnesian Wars from which tropes of the funeral oration originally developed. As such, Hyperides' praise of Leosthenes as hero constitutes a more pragmatic approach to identification between the audience and their fallen general than if the already deified deeds of Athenians from centuries past had been rehearsed.

Invention in this oration does more than simply use the past to construct identities for the present; rather, by setting up a secularized hero with whom present day Athenians could identify with and emulate, Hyperides may be employing epideictic rhetoric in the way Pearlman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969) suggest. In rehearsing cultural values in this fashion, he seems to be more overtly laying the groundwork for future actions to protect and expand Athenian values through continued valiant fighting as the Lamian wars continued. While we can see the irony of such an interpretation after the fact (because the war takes a turn for the worse for Athens and Hyperides is executed by the Macedonians), it may have been an influential tactic in the moment.

Numerous stylistic components buttress the orator's quest to unite the populous and urge them to rise up on behalf of all Greece to take advantage of the military opportunity following the death of Alexander. Early on, he equates Athens with the sun in a passage worth quoting at length:

I will not shrink from speaking about the city summarily. Just as the sun goes over all the world, separating out the seasons *appropriately* and establishing [all] the right conditions, supplying reasonable and *temperate* humans with creation and [nourishment] and [fruits] and everything else useful in life, in the same way too our city continuously punishes the wicked, and [gives aid] to the just, dispenses fairness instead of injustice to all and *provides* [universal safety] to the Greeks at its own [risk] and expense (6.5).

This simile functions to extend the synecdoche to the macro-level. Whereas Leosthenes' is representative of all Athenians and the vehicle that drives them toward virtuous actions on the battlefield, Athens provides "nourishment" to the rest of Greece in similar fashion. Comparing the city to the sun, a continuous and reliable force, serves as a rehearsal of the city's illustrious history, but it also reminds members of the immediate audience of their obligation: to be protectors of all Greece, even in the shadows of adversity such as they now faced. Further, in the context in which it was given, the fact that "our city continuously punished the wicked... dispens[ing] fairness instead of injustice to all" provides a clear impetus for continued valorous action. At the time of the Hyperides' address, the end of "provid[ing] universal safety to the Greeks at its own risk and expense had not come to fruition. All of this is indicative of the continuing exigence to counter Macedon by emulating Leosthenes' and the men he inspired to be great. That victory was far from assured magnified this premise.

Conclusion

It is unfortunate that, while mostly complete, the papyrus on which we have this oration is damaged in places. While it is possible that we are missing something important, the lion's share of the speech that we do have demonstrates that its uniqueness and importance to the tradition of Attic oratory ought not be overlooked. Also, even with the recent discovery of Archimedes Palimpsest, our knowledge about the speaker remains limited compared to other prominent epitaphists, which precludes us from too many judgments about his rhetorical intent.

That being said, exigencies prompted Hyperides to work within the generic constraints while simultaneously working against them in order to accomplish his aims. Sparking emulation of the war dead by the living in order to finish the task the former had begun was his primary aim. The notable anomaly of his speech, the extensive praise of a named individual, allows him to advance a synecdochic identification among his audience. Singling out an individual's courage takes Aristotle's recommendation for composing effective encomiums to the next level. In appropriating the genre to his own ends, we observe through our reading of Hyperides, a fluid conception of the funeral oration with deliberative undertones that serve to lay the groundwork for future deliberative arguments. With this limited freedom, the orator unites the past, the present, and the desired future for the Athenian role in Greece.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

This study sought answers to two primary questions. The first question concerned how late 4th century epitaphists responded to the exigencies of social crisis while working within (although sometimes simultaneously against) the constraints of what many have considered a highly regularized genre, the state funeral oration. The second question, contingent on answers to the first, sought to examine what devices orators used to ensure that both components of the rhetorical situation were sufficiently addressed. Textual analyses revealed that each orator employed his own strategy to cope with these generic constraints in the light of the unique exigencies he faced. In both cases, funeral orators embodied some generic *topoi* while ignoring or minimally addressing others. Thus, it appears that, at least in periods of social strife, the content of the Athenian funeral orations was driven more by immediate exigencies than by generic constraints.

Whereas Demosthenes' oration remains more clearly within the confines of the genre, Hyperides' praise of a named individual makes it unique among extant funeral orations. Both orators, however, function within the genre as much as they do out of it and yet still address the immediate context. Demosthenes tries to justify his deviations from convention for fear that not sufficiently appealing to audience expectations would yield rhetorical failure. Rather than apologize for giving important topics short shrift, Hyperides dismisses the virtue of the tropes he chooses to ignore. In the end, we cannot say with any certainty whether these speakers were able to avoid alienating the audience because of the limited evidence remaining from that period. However, each of their texts represent cohesive wholes that appear to be driven by exigence to a greater extent and constrained by the genre to a lesser extent than most previous scholarship has acknowledged.

Demosthenes focuses on the mythic past to inculcate in his audience their duty to the city-state. While this strategy is not in itself unique, the exigence posed by the loss at Chaeronea and internal political disagreements about a way forward required him to take a justificatory posture, to explain how the recent outcomes should not change Athens' foreign policy calculus. As such, he spends a portion of his speech addressing how the loss— if in fact it could really be considered one— could be explained away by divine forces or incompetent leadership on the part of Theban commanders. The contrast he develops between the virtuous character *and* actions of the mythic tribal ancestors and the indifference he saw in the status quo served to highlight the need for emulation among the living. Further, because he jointly eulogizes the present dead and the ancestors who fought at Marathon, he highlights the urgency of the present historical moment and calls out his contemporaries who had yet to take the Macedonian threat seriously.

Hyperides builds up the late general Leosthenes as a synecdoche for all Athenians and the city of Athens as a synecdoche for all of the free world. In this way, Hyperides' funeral oration has probably the most organic connection to its historical context of all the *epitaphoi* remaining extant. In appropriating Aristotelian guidelines for encomiazing the deeds of one individual, he is able to highlight the virtuous character of the leader as well as empirical outcomes that his deeds produced during the early parts of the Lamian war. However, his praise of Leosthenes does more than honor the legacy of a man he admired; rather, it set forth a secularized hero that members of the living audience could more readily emulate.

Both consumers and producers of rhetoric may apply lessons about epideictic as a tool that can be used by war rhetors today. In the age of the war on terrorism and the

aftermath of the second Iraq war, the need to, as Condit put it, "explain the social world" remains critical (p. 288). When President George W. Bush stood atop a pile of rubble at Ground Zero on September 11th 2001, and proclaimed that Americans would endure, he completed a variety of epideictic functions. In 'selling' the war on terrorism and later the Iraq war, President Bush appropriated epideictic appeals of blame by highlighting "evildoers" (Ivie, 2004); he also revered and praised the fighting spirit of sacrifice of "the greatest generation" but invoking the collective memory of World War II (Bostdorff, 2011). Bostdorff (2011) further postulates that the Athenian general and orator, Pericles, can be seen to exemplify some of the same rhetoric strategies. Pericles' funeral oration delivered in 431 has been held up as some of the highest quality oratory in antiquity. Indeed, modern and classical contexts have notable differences; still, so long as there is a contemporary Pericles (regardless of his level oratorical skill) telling us how we ought to think about the military excursions our state is considering or pursuing, the question of epideictic's relation to war rhetoric remains a salient one.

The purpose of the funeral oration was not merely to socially absorb casualties from battle and invent, and then maintain, an idealized civic identity. It justified the continued pursuit of military objectives and all their entailments. Bostdorff continued, "Indeed, leaders during war have habitually called ceremony into service to fulfill their persuasive ends" (2011, p. 296). Epitaphists in ancient Athens utilized collective memory in funeral orations in a similar manner; alluding to great men and great triumphs from the city's past reinforced a belief in Athenian supremacy among the Greeks and in *dulce et decorum est*, the ideal that it is honorable and right to die for one's nation.

The broader analysis posited here emphasizes that epideictic rhetoric when properly deployed can have great potency to persuade in deliberative and forensic matters, which are thought to be outside its domain. Bostdorff is not alone in suggesting that epideictic discourse may persuade without seeming to do so, which depending on one's motives, may pose a threat to the proper functioning of contemporary democracies. While in classical Athens oratory was the principle means of articulating culture, today epideictic messages are channeled through a plethora of new and evolving media. Stahl (2010) dissected the role of the entire spectrum of the entertainment industry— from television to sports to video games— in instilling, reinforcing, and altering citizen perceptions of war. As consumers of discourse we need to be weary of the identification strategies to justify war. But at the same time, new media provide opportunities for ordinary citizens to challenge the epideictic memories articulated by organs of power and present different visions of war more consistent with the values they hold.

CLASSICAL SOURCES

Arist. – Aristotle's *Rhetoric*

Dem. 4 – *First Philippic*

Dem. 60 – Demosthenes Funeral Oration

Hyp. 6. – Hyperides Funeral Oration

Hyp. Dem. – Hyperides' *Against Demosthenes*

Plut. Dem. – Plutarch's *Life of Demosthenes*

Thucy. – *The History of the Peloponesian War*

Herod. – *The Histories of Herodotus*

Isoc. Phillip – A letter from Isocrates to Phillip

REFERENCES

- Agnew, L. (2008). 'The day belongs to the students.' Expanding epideictic's civic function. *Rhetoric Review* 27(2) 147–164. doi: 10.1080/07350190801921768
- Arnhart, L. (1981). *Aristotle on Political Reasoning*. Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press.
- Beale, W. H. (1978). Rhetorical performative discourse: a new theory of epideictic. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 11(4), 221–246.
- Bitzer, L. (1968). The Rhetorical Situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1(1), 1-14.
- Black, E. (1978). *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*. Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin Press. Originally published 1965.
- Bostdorff, D. M. (2011) Epideictic rhetoric in the service of war: George W. Bush on Iraq and the 60th anniversary of the victory over Japan." *Communication Monographs*, 78(3) 296–323. doi: 10.1080/03637751.2011.589458
- Bostdorff, D.M. & Ferris, S.H. (2014). John F. Kennedy at American University: The rhetoric of the possible, epideictic progression, and the commencement of peace. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 100(4), 407–441. doi: 10.1080/00335630.2014.989895
- Bosworth, A.B. (2000). The historical context of Thucydides' funeral oration. *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 120, 1–16.
- Browne, S.H. (1993). Reading public memory in Daniel Webster's *Plymouth Rock Oration*. *Western Journal of Communication*. 57(4), 464–477. doi: 10.1080/10570319309374468
- Burke, K. (1969). *A rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Burke, K. (1984). *Attitudes toward history*. 3rd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, Originally published 1937.
- Burke, K. (1984). *Permanence and change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. Originally published 1935.
- Burt, J.O. (Trans.) (1954). *Minor Attic orators II: Lycurgus, Dinarchus, Demades, Hyperides*. Loeb Classical Library 395, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Carey, C. (2010). Epideictic oratory. In Worthington, I (Ed.) *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. (pp. 236–252) Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

- Carter, M. (1988). "Stasis and Kairos: Principles of social construction in classical rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 7(1), 97–112. doi: 10.1080/07350198809388842
- Chase, J.R. (1961) The classical conception of epideictic. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 47(3), 293–300 doi: 10.1080/00335636109382490
- Cherwitz, R.A. & Zagacki, K.A. (1986). Consummatory verses justificatory crisis rhetoric. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 50(4), 307–324. doi: 10.1080/10570318609374240
- Consigny, S. (1992). Gorgias's use of the epideictic. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 25(3), 281–297.
- Condit, C. (1985). The functions of epideictic: The Boston massacre orations as exemplar. *Communication Quarterly*, 33(4), 284–298. doi: 10.1080/01463378509369608
- DeWitt, N.W & DeWitt, N.J. (1949). *Demosthenes orations VII*. Loeb Classical Library 374. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP.
- Dow, B. (1989). The function of epideictic and deliberative strategies in Presidential crisis rhetoric. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 53, 294–310. doi: 10.1080/10570318909374308
- Duffy, B.K (1983) "The Platonic functions of epideictic rhetoric." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 16(2), 79–93.
- Enos, R.L. (2013). Theory, validity and the historiography of classical rhetoric. In Ballif, M. (Ed.) *Theorizing Histories of Rhetoric* (8–24). Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Habicht, C. (1997). *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Trans. Schneider, D.L. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Harding, P. (1987). Rhetoric and politics in 4th century Athens. *Phoenix* 41(1), 25–39.
- Hauser, G. A. (1999). Aristotle on epideictic: The formation of public morality. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*, 29(1), 5–23. doi: 10.1080/02773949909391135
- Hawhee, D & Olson, C.J. (2013). Pan-historiography: The challenges of writing history across time and space. In Ballif, M. (Ed.) *Theorizing Histories of Rhetoric*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Herrman, J. (2004). *Athenian funeral orations*. Newburyport, MA: Focus Pub.
- Herrman, J. (2009) ed. and trans. *Hyperides: Funeral oration*. New York: Oxford University Press

- Hesk, J. (2013). Leadership and individuality in the Athenian funeral orations. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies*, 56(1), 49–65.
- Ivie, R. (2007). Fighting terror by rite of redemption and reconciliation. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10(2), 221–248. doi:10.1353/rap.2007.0037
- Jamieson, K.H. & Campbell, K.K. (1982). Rhetorical hybrids: Fusions of generic elements. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68(2), 146–157. doi: 10.1080/00335638209383600
- Jamieson, K.H. & Stromer-Galley, J. (2001). Hybrid genres. In Sloane, T. *Encyclopedia of Rhetoric*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Jarratt, S.C. (1991). *Rereading the sophists: Classical rhetoric refigured*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jasinski, J. (2001a) *Sourcebook on rhetoric: Key concepts in contemporary rhetorical Studies*. Sage Pub.
- Jasinski, J. (2001b) "The status of theory and method in rhetorical criticism." *Western Journal of Communication* 65(3), 249–70. doi: 10.1080/10570310109374705
- Kennedy, G. (1963). *The art of persuasion in Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kennedy, G. (1996). Reworking Aristotle's rhetoric. In Johnstone, C.L. (Ed.) *Theory, text, context: Issues in Greek rhetoric and oratory*. (pp. 169–184). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Lee, F.R. (2006, November 27) A layered look reveals ancient Greek texts. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2006/11/27/arts/27greek.html?_r=0
- Leff, M. (1980). Interpretation and the art of the rhetorical critic. *Western Journal of Communication*, 44(4), 337–349. doi: 10.1080/10570318009374019
- Leff, M. (1985). Recovering Aristotle: Rhetoric, politics, and the limits of rationality. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 71(3) 362-394 doi: 10.1080/00335638509383742
- Loraux, N. (1986) *The invention of Athens: The funeral oration in the classical city*. Sheridan, A. Trans. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Luginbill, R.D. (1999). *Thucydides on war and national character*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Miller, C.R. (1984). Genre as social action. *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70(2), 151–167. doi: 10.1080/00335638409383686

- O'Connell, P. (2013). Hyperides and *Epopiteia*: A new fragment of the Defense of Phryne. *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 53(1), 90–116.
- Oravec, C. (1976) 'Observation' in Aristotle's theory of epideictic. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 9(3), 162–174
- Perelman, C. (1984). Rhetoric and politics. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 17(3), 129–134.
- Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969) *The new rhetoric: A treatise on argumentation*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press
- Poulakos, J. (1995). *Sophistical rhetoric in classical Greece*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press
- Poulakos, J. (1983) Toward a sophistic definition of rhetoric. *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 16(1), 35–48
- Poulakos, T. (1990). Historiographies of the tradition of rhetoric: A brief history of the classical funeral orations. *Western Journal of Speech Communication* 54(2), 172-188. doi: 10.1080/10570319009374334
- Pratt, J. (2012). The epideictic agon and Aristotle's elusive third genre. *American Journal of Philology* 133(2), 177–208. doi: 10.1353/ajp.2012.0010
- Ryder, T.T.B. (2000) Demosthenes and Phillip II. In Worthington, I (Ed.) *Demosthenes: Statesman and orator*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Shear, J.L. (2013). 'Their memories will never grow old': The politics of remembrance in the Athenian funeral orations. *The Classical Quarterly* 63(2), 511–536. doi: 10.1017/S0009838813000062
- Stahl, R. (2010). *Militainment, Inc: War, media, and popular culture*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Sullivan, D. L. (1993). The ethos of the epideictic encounter. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 26(2), 113-133.
- Trevett, J.C. (1996). Aristotle's knowledge of Athenian oratory. *The Classical Quarterly* 46(2), 371-371. doi: 10.1093/cq/46/2/371
- Walker, J. (2000). *Rhetoric and poetics in antiquity*. New York, NY: Oxford UP
- Wickkiser, B.L. (1999). Plato's "Menexenus" and the ritual of Athenian public burial. *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 29(2), 65–74. doi: 10.1080/02773949909391144

- Worthington, I. (2013) *Demosthenes of Athens and the fall of classical Greece*. New York, NY: Oxford UP.
- Yunis, H. (2007). Politics as literature: Demosthenes and the burden of the Athenian past. In Carawan, E. (Ed.) *Oxford readings in the Attic Orators*. (pp. 372–390). New York, NY: Oxford UP.
- Ziolkowski, J.E. (1981). *Thucydides and the tradition of funeral speeches at Athens*. New York, NY: Arno Publishing