

ATINER CONFERENCE PRESENTATION SERIES No: CBC2017-0056

**ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series**

CBC2017-0056

Athens, 2 April 2018

**The Place of Rhetoric in the Process of Democratization of the  
Political System of Athens. An interpretation of Demosthenes'  
words: Democracy is a constitution of speech making**

**Krystyna Tuszyńska**

Athens Institute for Education and Research

8 Valaoritou Street, Kolonaki, 10683 Athens, Greece

ATINER's conference paper proceedings series are circulated to promote dialogue among academic scholars. All papers of this series have been blind reviewed and accepted for presentation at one of ATINER's annual conferences according to its acceptance policies (<http://www.atiner.gr/acceptance>).

© All rights reserved by authors.

**ATINER's Conference Paper Proceedings Series**

2 April 2018

Athens, 22 March 2018

ISSN: 2529-167X

**Krystyna Tuszyńska**, Professor, Adam Mickiewicz University at Poznań,  
Poland

**The Place of Rhetoric in the Process of Democratization of the  
Political System of Athens. An interpretation of Demosthenes'  
words: Democracy is a constitution of speech making**

**ABSTRACT**

As has been said by Demosthenes, the great orator of the fourth century B.C. that 'Democracy is a constitution of speech-making'. While these words are easy to prove for political rhetoric (the Assembly was the area where policy decisions of state were publicly debated) and forensic rhetoric (the law courts were a forum for competition in status between male elites), we meet more difficulties when concerning Demosthenes' words in the subject of epideictic rhetoric. In my opinion the epideictic rhetoric in its roots gave the orator possibilities for competition, thus not restricting itself only to the less meaning full matters of public life. The particular role belonged to the sophists, the teachers of the art of rhetoric and men who offered public display lectures or distinct type of performances before numerous audiences in public places such as buildings in Athens, e.g. theater, Gymnasium, Lyceum or even in private houses. For the purposes of these occasions the sophists adopted the purple robes of poets, as though they were trying to emphasize the great legacy of poets in the oral culture. The most important figure in my regard was the sophist Gorgias who made a famous appearance in Athens in 427 B.C. as a leader of an embassy from a native city Leontini in Sicily, to persuade the Athenians into forming an alliance with his city against Syracuse. The Assembly admired his rhetorical skill and so his position as the founder of artistic style in Greek prose was recognized. The other important foundation of the meaning of epideictic rhetoric in public life was the old Athenian custom to deliver public speeches during funerals of fallen soldiers emphasizing their deeds in battle. There are in my opinion two sources which are presenting us with an opportunity to talk about the great meaning of all three rhetoric genres (political, forensic, and also epideictic) in the process of democratization of public life in Ancient Athens and - by extension - in the whole Western tradition. Of course, the influence of the rhetoric as the art was possible only due to the transition of the oral culture into the written culture. In the end I would like to shortly present what the rhetoric owes to oral culture.

Keywords: oratory, theatre, delivery (hypokrisis), Athenian Enlightenment, epideictic rhetoric.

## Introduction

Demosthenes, the great orator of the fourth century B.C. said: ‘Democracy is a constitution of speech making’ (19. 184). It is easy to prove these words, when they are used in connection to political and forensic rhetoric: the Athenian Assembly (*ekklesia*) was the area where policy decisions of the state were publicly debated and decided. The word *demos* was used in Ancient texts as a synonym of the term *ekklesia* very often<sup>1</sup>, and resolutions of the Assembly opened a formula *edokse toi demoi*, ‘people decided’ or its equivalent<sup>2</sup>. In Ancient Greek vocabulary there was no term for ‘politician’ or ‘statesman’ in the modern understanding of the word. There were two words to describe political activity, that is *rhetores kai strategoi*<sup>3</sup>.

The term *rhetores* was used to describe the function of Athenian citizens, who practiced speech making in the Assembly, because usually plenty of people listened to their proposals and casted their votes. The so called *isegoria* – the right of all citizens to speak – is announced in the opening ritual of each Assembly with the herald’s (*keryks*) question: ‘Who wants to speak?’<sup>4</sup> These words attribute to every man an opportunity to speak publicly and imply that the grounding ideal of democracy is that all issues should be set out in public debate and decision. But a real public debate at the Assembly was not possible, because of 6.000 of citizens participating in the debate. In fact only some of Athenian citizens proposed to the Assembly issues to debate. Their deliberative speeches, called *demegorikoi* or *symboleutikoi logoi*, were constructed from an introduction to proposal, the proposal itself and its ground<sup>5</sup>. Aristotle compares the deliberative style to a rough sketch<sup>6</sup> with its intention to produce the effect of finished work at a distance before a large number of spectators.

These public orators were called *rhetores*. *Rhetor* is a technical term standing for everyone citizen who delivers speech before members of the Assembly or proposes any resolution. In fact only a small group of citizens were well prepared to public performances, well educated in the art of eloquence. In every debate these men represented any political group or any party, which was interested in the decisions of political or economic life in Athens. So called *rhetores* took money for their speech making activity named in Ancient Greek vocabulary ‘*dora*’, which means ‘gifts’. They were large sums of money, described in the *talents*, while the ordinary citizen used in his

<sup>1</sup> Mogens H. Hansen, *The Athenian Ecclesia. A Collection of Articles 1976-1983*, Copenhagen 1983, p.142-143.

<sup>2</sup> P. J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford 1972, p. 64-65.

<sup>3</sup> M.Hansen, *Demokracja ateńska w czasach Demostenesa.///s. 270-271.*

<sup>4</sup> Simon Goldhill, *The Invention of Prose*, Oxford University Press, 2002, p. 45. See: Demosthenes 18.170.

<sup>5</sup> Demosthenes 1. 1, 2-15; 16-20, 21-27, 28.

<sup>6</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1414a 37-39: ‘The deliberative style is exactly like a rough sketch, for the greater the crowd, the further off is the point of view; wherefore in both too much refinement is a superfluity and even a disadvantage’ (Aristotle, *The Art of Rhetoric*, with an English translation by John Henry Freese, Loeb Classical Library, London 1975, p. 423).

everyday transactions the drachms<sup>7</sup>. But while this ordinary citizen could vote ‘against’ or ‘for’ any issue without any responsibility for making his decision, *rhetores* who proposed unfavorable resolutions for Athens took upon themselves the responsibility described as ‘the misleading of the Athenian citizens’ and they were, in consequence, prosecuted. Athenians, from one hand, were apprehensive for their safety and their choices, for other hand, *rhetores* were needful element of Athenian democracy with its habit to discuss, to debate, to vote.

Next Athenian system of jurisdiction ensures for all citizens an equal chance to be selected for office, to stay a member of the people’s court (*heliaia*) without so called the *dokimasia*, i.e. examination of candidates chosen to the people’s court from the point of view of their morality, abilities, knowledge of the law or other factors of this kind. Two terms of *demokratia* and *isonomia* were very close to each other. Martin Ostwald says that the Athenian *isonomia* comes closer than any other Greek word to expressing the modern notion of ‘rights’ in the sense in which we speak of the ‘rights of man’ or ‘rights of citizen’<sup>8</sup>. The survival of substantially more literature and inscriptions from Athens than from any part of the Greek world often make us oblivious of our ignorance of the history of the rest of Greece. However, the silence of our sources from other city-states does not seem to be a sufficient argument for the Athenian origin of this term, but we cannot deny that in Athens with Cleisthenes’ reforms (about 508 BC.) in popular thinking *isonomia* and *demokratia* were synonymous<sup>9</sup>. The most important institution of the democratization of the life in Athens was the *heliaia*, the people’s court in which 6.000 citizens were drawn from the 10 tribes and were divided into chambers of 600 jurymen, 500 or 501 of whom were regular members, with the rest constituting alternate jurors. It should be noticed that the *heliaia*’s jurisdiction also included Athenians and citizens of other cities as a subjects of international law<sup>10</sup>. Initially the *heliaia* jurisdiction was limited, but when Ephialtes and Pericles prompted a binding resolution through the ecclesia, stripping the conservative Areopagus, of most of the cases it decided, that the people’s court started hearing almost all the civil and penal cases<sup>11</sup>. Taking the jurisdiction over the so called *graphe paranomon*<sup>12</sup>, the people’s court replaced the Areopagus in the execution of legal control of the decisions of the ecclesia. Of much importance is the fact that there was no appeal to any other tribunal, because the people’s court was the highest one in Athenian democracy.

---

<sup>7</sup> One talent is 600 drachms.

<sup>8</sup> M. Ostwald, *Nomos and the Beginnings of Athenian Democracy*, Oxford 1969, p. 113.

<sup>9</sup> Krystyna Tuszyńska, *A Few Aspects of well-known Athenian ISONOMIA in Ancient Greece and its Opposition to the Profession of Logographer*, ‘Scripta Neophilologica Posnaniensia’ XVI, Poznan 2016, p. 208.

<sup>10</sup> Stanisław Witkowski, *Państwo greckie*, Warsaw 1938, p. 217.

<sup>11</sup> Areopagus kept its competence only for the crimes of murder and arson while the archons could impose some minor fines. See: S. Witkowski, op. cit., p. 213.

<sup>12</sup> *Graphe paranomon* was a form of legal action believed to have been introduced in Athens under the democracy somewhere around 415 BC. It was a replacement for ostracism which had fallen into disuse at the same time. The term means: ‘suit against (bills) contrary to the law’.

With the Athenian system of jurisdiction is connected the profession of logographer and the function of the *synegoros*, it means ‘co-speaker’, an advocate, who helped the litigant before the people’s court. A great number of Athenian citizens did not have a skill to speak brilliantly and every litigant had to defend himself or accuse another citizen on his own, according to Athenian’s jurisdiction system. All arguments in the trial were presented by the litigants themselves, without legal support of the lawyer, in the form of exchange of single speeches timed by the water clock. The litigant had to become an effective orator before the chambers of the people’s court and to act in his capacity as the citizen in order to protect his interests and enforce his views<sup>13</sup>. In this situation the litigant to be most persuasive before the people’s court was searching a help from the part of the professional writer of forensic speeches, it means from the part of the logographer or from the part of the *synegoros* or was obliged to educate himself in the art of rhetoric in any school<sup>14</sup>. The difference between services of the logographer and the *synegoros* was that the litigant had to pay for the consultant’s (logographer) services and in the case of the ‘advocate’(*synegoros*) was expected other kind of gratification, for example, to give him a push in political life or other kind of this favor.

In both of these two genres of rhetoric, it means, deliberative and forensic, we can admit that the democratic system of Athens created the necessity to speak brilliantly, to be persuasive, to use rhetorical skills by Athenian citizens. Summing up, Demosthenes words that ‘democracy is a constitution of speech making’ are easy to prove.

The third rhetorical genre is epideictic rhetoric which will become my special interests because of its theatrical element present in delivering any kind of epideictic speech.

What I would like to underline in my article, is the element of performance connected with the art of rhetoric and present in all public debates. In the society where public speech was integral to the decision-making process and where all affairs pertaining to the community were subject to democratic debate, the communication between the speaker and his audience in every public forum, whether the law-court (the domain of forensic rhetoric) or the Assembly, cannot be separate from the notion of performance<sup>15</sup>.

So my question is: Why the element of performance became so much visible in every one of three kinds of rhetoric explored by Aristotle in his *Art of rhetoric*? Performance is one of the most discussed aspects of Greek drama and

---

<sup>13</sup> See: Stephen Usher, *The orators in Ancient Attica in the Modern Educational System*, Editions Grigoris 1984, p. 184.

<sup>14</sup>We have a distorted mirror of this kind of school in Aristophanes’ comedy *Clods*, in which Socrates is presented as a teacher of rhetoric. The art of Aristophanic portraiture is well compared to that modern newspaper cartoonists, it exploits, and indeed helps to create, the popular image of public figures, and it will sometimes present a satirical hybrid between the real person and the second imaginary identity. To see more: K. Tuszyńska, op. cit., p. 212 -215. Also see: Cambridge History of Classical Literature, part one- Greek Literature, ed. by P. Easterling and B. Knox, Cambridge 1985, chapter: *Comedy*, E. W. Handley.

<sup>15</sup>Andreas Serafim, *Attic Oratory and the Performance*, London and New York 2017, p. 1 (Introduction).

epic poetry. This rhetorical genre which was most connected with the social role of oral culture was an epideictic genre.

I would like, in short, to show that the origin of the importance of the delivery of speech, *hypokrisis*, has its roots in the epideictic genre.

We should consider the circumstances of the delivery of epideictic speeches. The origin of this rhetorical genre is rather difficult to explain from the historical point of view. In my opinion we should pay attention to two different occasions to deliver epideictic orations that an Athenian citizen had.

The first one is an old Athenian custom to deliver a funeral speech in the honor of soldiers fallen in battle. The orator chosen to deliver this kind of speech had to be an Athenian citizen selected from the speakers of the best opinion and who possessed a skill to present brave deeds of the fallen soldiers, to praise the Athenian political system (democracy) as the best of all political systems, to praise Athenian ancestors, both historical figures and mythological ones. In the opening section an orator usually began with the words: *I shall begin with our ancestors: it is both just and proper that they should have the honor of the first mention on an occasion like the present*<sup>16</sup>. As says Socrates in Plato's dialogue *Menexenus*, which is a Platonic piece of epideictic rhetoric called a funeral speech<sup>17</sup>: *they [speakers] eulogize the State in every possible fashion, and they praise those who died in the war and all our ancestors of former times and ourselves who are living still* (235a).

The main interest of the orator is the benefits of democracy, freedom of Athenian citizens in public and in private life. There are famous words of Pericles in his Funeral Oration (2.35-46) preserved in Thucydides' 'Peloponnesian War', an idealized picture of Athenian democracy:

*In short, I say, that as a City we are the school of Hellas; (2, 41.1) Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring states; we are rather a pattern to others than imitations ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; this is why it is called democracy. If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences, if to social standing, advancement in public falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; not again does poverty bar the way, if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition. (2.37, 1-2).*

The orator used to put emphasis on the power of Athens which had not been left without witness, but, on the contrary, this power was visible in many

---

<sup>16</sup>The words from a funeral speech of Pericles survived in 'Peloponnesian War' of Thucydides (2. 36.1).

<sup>17</sup>The *Menexenus* is an interesting little work, very difficult to interpretation. The difficulty of understanding Plato's motive and purports in the *Menexenus* lies in the apparent contrast between the bantering and satirical tone of the opening dialogue, in which Socrates disparages the orators who deliver a funeral speech and the patriotic and moral sentiments which are expressed with every appearance of good faith in the main body of the oration. See: Plato, *Menexenus*, Introduction, p. 330.

ways: Athens had forced every sea and land to be the highway of their daring, everywhere, whether for evil or for good, the City had left imperishable monuments behind it. Also Athenians threw their city open to the world and never excluded foreigners from any opportunity to serve the state.

Funeral orations have nature of panegyrics in which the laudatory element plays the most important part. But at the same time Athenian *epitaphios logos* was a domain of political life: the funeral speech opened an official state's ceremony.

The funeral speech has a form of a patchwork, because after the laudatory section there follows an element of a consolation addressed to the parents of the fallen soldiers and to their children. In Plato's *Menexenus*, which is in fact a funeral speech, the consolation has a political character in its appeal to Athenian public institutions to care for the old parents and children. This is a duty of an institution of a democratic system, because – as Socrates says:

*For a polity is a thing which nurtures men, good men when it is noble, bad men when it is base. It is necessary, then, to demonstrate that the polity wherein our forefathers were nurtured was a noble one (238b).*

The care for children as a duty of the Athenian city was giving to them an education and orderly training in the aim that in the future they could be as brave soldiers as their fathers had been and also to give to children full military equipment. In this part of the funeral speech we can observe very political persuasion: to educate the next generation of brave sons of the fatherland. The same political character of a consolation we find in the already mentioned funeral oration of Pericles:

*These (the deeds of the fallen soldiers) take as your model, and judging happiness to be fruit of freedom and freedom of valor never decline the dangers of war. ('Peloponnesian War', 2. 43.4) and: Turing to the sons or brothers of the dead, I see an arduous struggle before you. (2.45.1).*

The last one part of the funeral speech is a public lamentation for the dead as the law ordains. This part seems to be of theatrical character.

Summing up this point I would like to underline that the epideictic genre represented by the funeral speech has a hybrid character: on the one hand it is a laudatory speech and this laudatory element is closely connected with an illustration of the greatness of the Athenian democracy. And on other hand a funeral speech contains a consolation for sons and brothers of the dead, but this consolation has rather a character of command to imitate virtue of the fallen soldiers and to sacrifice a life for the freedom of the City. From the point of view of its nature of panegyric Athenian *epitaphios logos* belongs to the epideictic genre, but its context is political, was delivered as an element of official state's ceremony, and its purport is also political because the speech was praising Athenians among Athenians. It was noticed by Aristotle in his *Rhetoric* (1367b 30), when the philosopher quotes Socrates' words from Plato's *Menexenus* 235d.

It is not difficult to refer Demosthenes' words to the epideictic genre represented by Athenian *epitaphios logos*.

The second area of the epideictic genre was reserved by the sophists. I would like in short to show that they also used to attribute their public display lectures to questions of political and social features of the state. At the beginning we should consider the place of the sophists in the process of democratization of the Athenian political system. Their role as teachers of rhetoric in Athens is a very well known fact: freedom of speech, the famous Athenian *parrhesia* and profits from making public speeches. But sophists came to Athens as an intellectual capital of the Greek speaking world from many parts of Greece. They could not make a speech at the Assembly or in the law-court, because they had no civic rights. The only possibility to deliver a speech were for them public occasions like panhellenic celebrations, display lectures in the theatre, in the Lyceum or Gymnasium or even private houses, in which elite males gathered. For the purposes of these occasions sophists donned purple robes of a rhapsode, as though to emphasize the great legacy of the poet in oral culture and a continuation by themselves of the function of the poet in the earlier days<sup>18</sup> We should remember that a poet in oral culture was a teacher of morality, a leader giving models for action and for speaking in public area.

In orations composed on these occasions (there have survived two speeches by the sophist Gorgias and one speech by the sophist Prodicus) sophists adopted in their epideictic orations motives which are characteristic of man's acting in public life and choosing by him a way of conduct as a citizen. But the sophists dressed these questions in mythological situations and mythological figures, which are typical material for an epideictic oration.

I would like to mention one oration of Gorgias, *Defense of Palamedes* and one oration of Prodicus, *On the choice of Heracles* (Xenophon was impressed with this *epideixis* and summarized it in the mouth of Socrates in his *Memorabilia* II, 1. 21-34).

The mythological figure of Palamedes, one of the Greeks who took part in the Trojan War, was used by the sophist Gorgias in a fictional oration in defense of his innocence before the judgment of Greek commanders. Palamedes was accused by Odysseus of treason, but Odysseus did not give any proof against Palamedes. The subject has its roots in mythology, but the argumentation is taken from current forensic rhetoric in Athens in IV and V century BC. The speech is an example of penetration of forensic and epideictic rhetoric. It belongs to epideictic rhetoric because it deals with hero of Trojan War, Palamedes. Still this oration has a character of defense in which were used many topics characteristic for Athenian jurisdiction. The most important topics put in *Defense of Palamedes* are connected to a moral habit, *ethos*, of the speaker which *ethos* the orator expresses with the use of appropriate language and proper proofs. Palamedes presents in his defense his morals beyond reproach, illustrating the speech with facts which testify in his favor to people. This topic was known in Athenian jurisdiction as 'topic of the past life', *paroichomenos*

---

<sup>18</sup> Gerald B. Kerferd, *The Sophistic Movement*, Cambridge 1984, p. 28-29. See also: DK 82 A9.



*bios*. In the next step Palamedes uses the ‘topic of noble birth’, *eugeneia*. *Eugeneia* implies the noble deeds and merits. Palamedes also recalls to the ‘topic of a pity’ (*eleos*), which appeals to the passions. This topic was criticized by Aristotle (1354a 15) due to being based particularly on emotions, which are irrelevant and have only the effect of biasing the judge, at the same time neglecting the proofs, which for Aristotle are the body of rhetoric argumentation. But Palamedes rejects the topic of a pity, because it is proper to a mob and not to the most famous and important leaders among the Greeks, *tous protous ton proton Ellinas Ellinon*<sup>19</sup>. The main aim of this epideictic speech is formulated at the beginning of Palamedes speech. Hero – as he says - defends his good opinion, his fame, *time*, but not his life, because the death is given to everybody, without exception. The most important feature is how somebody dies – hold in high regard or charged with a crime. Palamedes uses the apagogic method in his speech, which is based on judging the falseness of reasons from falseness of consequences<sup>20</sup>. The other method used by Palamedes is logical method *reductio ad absurdum*. The conduct of Palamedes’ defense lies on two possibilities – a voluntary or an opportunity. Palamedes proofs that even if the opportunity to betray his county had arisen he would not take it nor he had the opportunity itself given to him even if he would have desired it. This way of argumentation is close to alternatives constructed by sophists in their teaching methods.

Aristotle considers the three qualities necessary to enable the speaker to convince the audience of his trustworthiness: practical wisdom, virtue, and goodwill (1378a 5). Palamedes fulfills these duties: he proofs his practical wisdom with topic of the past life, his virtue with topic of noble birth, which implies noble deeds and merits. His wisdom is proven with knowledge of two kinds of death – one in respect or the other, charged with a crime. The third feature of a good speaker – a good will, Palamedes shows by rejecting the topic of a pity. Palamedes produces also *pathos*, it means putting the judge into a certain frame of mind, in last words of the epilogue of speech, when he refers to his judges as *the last link of justice* (par.36) created to give verdict. His judges will be responsible for the wrong verdict, for the death of an innocent man.

In Prodicus’ oration *On the choice of Heracles* a mythological hero very well known as an athlete who uses his main force was presented like a citizen who has to choose one from the two proposed to him paths of conduct in public life. He could go the path of civic virtue and sacrifice to the fatherland or he could choose an easy and pleasant life doing all the best only for himself. The duties shown to him by a personification of Virtue have features of decisions made by a young citizen in public life. This speech is survived in Xenophon’s *Memorabilia Socratis* (II, 1. 21-33) and begins with words: *When Heracles was passing from boyhood to youth’s estate, wherein the young, now becoming their masters, show whether they will approach life by the paths of virtue or*

<sup>19</sup>All quotations and terms taken from: *Sofisti. Testimonianze e frammenti*, fasc. II, Introduzione, traduzione e commento a cura di Mario Untersteiner (Firenze 1967).

<sup>20</sup> I analyze this method in my book *Philosophy in the rhetoric of Gorgias of Leontinoi*, Poznań 1987 (p.93-103).

*path of vice, he went out into a quiet place, and sat pondering which road to take. And there appeared two women of great stature making towards him*<sup>21</sup>. This one who offered to him the pleasantest and easiest road named herself Happiness, but among those who hated her was called Vice. The second one, Virtue, at first said that she knows Heracles' parents and his education, and next proposed to him the road fulfilled toils and efforts: *If you want the favour of the gods, you must worship the gods; if you desire the love of friends, you must do good to your friends; if you covet honour from the city, you must aid the city: if you are fain to win the admiration of all Hellas for virtue, you must strive to do good to Hellas [...] if you want your body to be strong, you must accustom your body to be the servant of your mind, and train it with toil and sweat*<sup>22</sup>. In this quoted passage we should put our attention to the motive of the service to the city and to the motive self-improvement, in the aim the body will be the servant of Heracles' mind. There are teaching of Athenian Enlightenment in V and IV century BC. In future the hero Heracles will become a patron of Cynics and in Roman Empire will be cultivated as *Heracles Victor* or *Invictus*<sup>23</sup>. Prodicus' essay was known in Antiquity and followed as well by Greek and Roman writers as by Christianity<sup>24</sup>.

Also Athenian orator Isocrates, a pupil of the sophist Gorgias, was a creator of new hybrid genre in rhetoric, a combination of epideictic rhetoric and deliberative one. Examples can be his *Encomium of Helen* or *Euagoras*.

According to Kerferd's view a social phenomenon which was the sophistic movement is connected not only with the general situation at Athens but with the direct encouragement of Pericles that brought so many sophists to Athens. Their coming was not simply something from without, but rather the development internal to the history of Athens. They were a part of the movement that was producing the new Athens of Pericles<sup>25</sup>.

The rhetorical domain of sophists was epideictic genre which gave so many possibilities to play. Some of sophistic performances took place in the theatre. Sophists also were interested in drama, particularly in tragedy. An intriguing fragmentary text ascribed to Gorgias deals specifically with tragedy:

*Tragedy bloomed and was celebrated, a marvelous sound and sight for the men of that time, and one which by means of myths and emotions produced 'a deception' (APATE), as Gorgias says, "in which the deceiver is regarded as more just than the non-deceiver and the deceived is wiser than the undeceived". The deceiver is esteemed as more just because he has succeeded*

---

<sup>21</sup> Xenophon, *Memorabilia, Oeconomicus*, trans. by E. C. Marchant; *Symposium, Apology*, trans. by O. J. Todd, London 1997, Loeb Classical Library, p.95.

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, p. 99.

<sup>23</sup> J. Toutain, *Observation sur le culte d' Heracle a Rome, Revue des etudes latines VI*, 1928, p. 200-212.

<sup>24</sup> See more: V. Emeljanov, *A Note on the Cynic short cut to happiness*, 'Mnemosyne' 1965, vol. 18, p. 182-184.

<sup>25</sup> G. B. Kerferd, op. cit., p. 22.

*in what he intended and the deceiver is wiser, for a man who is not insensitive is more easily taken away by the pleasure of words*<sup>26</sup>.

The necessary effect for the genre of tragedy is to produce on the audience the deception (*APATE*). *APATE* concerns here the relationship between the tragedian (the author) and his audience (spectators). We find also another interesting piece of sophisticated point of view in the anonymous treatise *Dissoi logoi* (*Twofold Arguments*)<sup>27</sup>. It opens with the words: *Twofold arguments are spoken in Greece by those who philosophise, concerning the good and the bad* and illustrates differentiation or identification of such concepts as good and bad, seemly and disgraceful, just and unjust, the true and false and discussed other topics of interest to the sophists including the teachability of *arete*, the utility of rhetoric and the art of memory<sup>28</sup>. For our considerations is interesting one chapter which concerns tragedy: *The best in tragedy- making or painting is the one who produces the greatest illusion (deceives mostly)by making things as close to the truth as possible*<sup>29</sup>. Both our sources, the definition of tragedy by Gorgias and the passage from *Dissoi Logoi*, are indicative of the relationship between oratory and tragedy. The audience/spectators of tragedy and the listeners of oratory have to be persuaded and moved by the delusive power of word<sup>30</sup>.

To this list of interests in tragedy by sophisticated writers we can add Critias, who is portrayed as present at the gathering of sophists in the house of Callias in Plato's *Protagoras*. He was in a sense a pupil of Socrates and some of sophists rather than himself sophist. But he was included by Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists* and perhaps for this reason was included also by Diels in his *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*<sup>31</sup>. He was the author of three tragedies and a satyr play, *Tennes*, *Rhadamanthys*, *Pirithous* and *Sisyphus*. Another sophistic author, Antiphon, at the beginning of his literary production wrote tragedies (DK 87A.5.7).

Summing up this point of my considerations I would like to underline that epideictic rhetoric represented by sophists was close to the act of performance. The term *epideixis* is translated by 'distinct type of performance' or 'public display lecture'<sup>32</sup>. When Aristotle divides rhetoric in three genres he describes the listener of epideictic genre with the term *theoros*, it means 'spectator'. All these terms like *epideixis*, *deception*, *mimesis* are connected both with oratory and the theatre. John Poulakos is of the opinion that epideictic rhetoric is a kind of

<sup>26</sup> Fr. 23, DK. See: Dana LaCourse Munteanu, *Tragic Pathos. Pity and Fear in Greek Philosophy and Tragedy*, Cambridge 2012, p. 48.

<sup>27</sup> *Dissoi logoi* is an anonymous text found at the end of manuscripts of Sextus Empiricus, written in a kind of Doric dialect after the end of Peloponnesian War.

<sup>28</sup> George Kennedy, *Sophists and Physicians of the Greek Enlightenment*, [in:] *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, part one: Greek Literature*, op. cit., p. 475.

<sup>29</sup> Translation by Dana Munteanu, op. cit., p. 49.

<sup>30</sup> We should admit that spectators of tragedy could be moved also by decorations, costumes and masks of playing actors.

<sup>31</sup> G.B. Kerferd, op. cit., p. 52.

<sup>32</sup> Idem, p. 28.

amalgam created by the sophists in the aim to introduce a theatrical element to the art of rhetoric<sup>33</sup>. According to Poulakos it was a consequence of observations by sophists Athenian orators in their activities in the people's court and at the Assembly.

The theatre was the place of sophistic performances: Gorgias offered to speak on any subject whatsoever in the theatre in Athens (DK 82A1a). But in recent research it has become fashionable to single out the theatre as a political forum, and as the most typical manifestation of civic space<sup>34</sup>. Popular assemblies were held originally in the *agora* and later in the theatre, and a very few *poleis* seem to have an *ekklesiasterion* reserved for meetings of the people<sup>35</sup>. In Athens, for example, some sessions of the *dikasteria* were held in the Odeon (Demosthenes 59.52) or in the Stoa Poikile. When we add to this information the fact that the Athenian performances created an ideal space in which the theatre fully reflected society and could simultaneously mould it, we can understand the function of the theatre in Athenian community, because the theatre's ability was to be the world in miniature, it means the function compared to such Modern media as television or Internet. The most representative poet of Old Comedy, Aristophanes, said himself in the *Frogs* that the theatre had the same importance for adults as school for children: the duty of the theatre is to educate the society of the state (*Frogs*, 'Stasimon' 1105-1118).

Orators' activity in Athens should be discussed through the prism of interaction with the audience. When we understand performance as 'all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants'<sup>36</sup>, it not will be difficult to look at the delivering of speech through the prism of the kind of interaction which is typical for drama playing.

In his *Art of Rhetoric* Aristotle distinguished three kinds of rhetoric corresponding to three kinds of listeners, because the listener is the aim of rhetorical performance. The listener is a judge of the art of argumentation and of the orator's skill. What I find interesting in epideictic rhetoric is the listener being a critic spectator (*theoros*) of orator's skillful qualities presented in the speech – praise or censure, the objects of which are the noble and the disgraceful, virtue or vice (1358b).

As we can admit examining textual passages of surviving speeches of forensic and political rhetoric, there is a strong relationship between theatre and oratory both in the area of direct/sensory techniques and cognitive/emotional techniques, what is connected with gestural and vocal ploys of what Ancient

---

<sup>33</sup> John Poulakos, *Sophistical Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*, University of South Carolina Press, 1995.

<sup>34</sup> See: M. Hansen (Ed.), *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre vol. 4, Copenhagen 1997, p.16 (chapter by M.Hansen: *The Polis as an Urban Centre. The Literary and Epigraphic Evidence*).

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>36</sup> The definition of the performance by Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, 1956, the quotation taken from: A. Serafim, op. cit., p. 15.

Greek calls *hypokrisis* (delivery) and the Romans translated this term into Latin as *actio* ('rhetorical action'), which is very close to the Greek meaning of the word. *Hypokrisis* contains many elements of performance: gesticulation, facial expressions and vocal ploys<sup>37</sup>. Of course it is impossible to examine them only from the textual version of speeches, but we can confirm that all of them offer emotional appeal and that they could achieve this effect by figures of speech, logical and psychological intervals and putting an emphatic tone. When Aristotle was giving his instructions to orators in *Art of rhetoric*, he was very close to confirm the same public space in performing in the theatre and performing before the Assembly or the law-court<sup>38</sup>. Aristotle writes:

*It is clear, therefore, that there is something of the sort in rhetoric as well in poetry. [...] Now delivery is a matter of voice, as to the mode in which it should be used for each particular emotion [...]; and how the tones should be used [...], and what rhythms are adapted to each subject. For there are three qualities that are considered: volume, harmony, rhythm*<sup>39</sup>.

Aristotle argued that delivery (*hypokrisis*) is of the greatest importance, but had not been treated by anyone before him (*Rhetoric* 1403b 20). This is not true, because the first suggestions in this area were offered by the sophist Gorgias and by his conception of *APATE*. Additionally many elements of performance had been used by orators earlier in the instance of an observation of other successful orators and by imitating them. But in fact Aristotle was the first Ancient scholar who admitted the same space of public communication in the theatre as well as in rhetoric. Further, in *Art of rhetoric* 1404b 20 Aristotle gives instructions to actors:

*Wherefore those who practice this artifice [= actors] must conceal it and avoid the appearance of speaking artificially instead of naturally; for that which is natural persuades, but the artificial does not. And later: Art is cleverly concealed when the speaker chooses his words from ordinary language and put them together like Euripides, who was the first to show the way*<sup>40</sup>.

There is an anecdotal story that 'when someone asked Demosthenes what the first most important skill in oratory was, he said '*hypokrisis*'; and the second one '*hypokrisis*', and the third one '*hypokrisis*'<sup>41</sup>. We can say that at the beginning of rhetoric there existed a consciousness of the orator of the

<sup>37</sup>Idem, p. 113.

<sup>38</sup>Cf. Krystyna Tuszyńska – Maciejewska, *Arystotelesowe wskazówki dla aktorów, czyli o przenikaniu się sztuk*, „Meander” 5-6, 2002, p. 395-402.

<sup>39</sup>Aristotle, *Art. of rhetoric*, book III, 1403 b 24 [in; Aristotle in twenty three volumes, XXII, with an English translations by John H. Freese, Loeb Classical Library, London, 1975.

<sup>40</sup>In Roman art of poetry, Horace (*Art Poetica* 46) says that the choice and use of words requires subtlety and care, skill in making an old word new by clever combination (*callida iunctura*) being specially praised.

<sup>41</sup>Plutarch 's *Lives of the Ten Orators* 845b 1-5.

importance of his performance before the audience in every act of communication: in political, forensic and epideictic oratory. Every act of communication furnished with ornamentation and theatrically delivered is a kind of speech making. And the delivery of speech was treated as the most important skill of the orator.

Athenian speakers, both at the Assembly and in the law-court, and particularly in epideictic orations delivered either by a noble citizen or by a skillful sophist, wrote for performance. The theatrical element of every *hypokrisis* was their main interest. Thus I can agree with Demosthenes' opinion that democracy is speech making and performance is present as well in the theatre as in the public life in every one of its areas.

Summing up my considerations I am of the opinion that all the three genres of rhetoric explored by Aristotle deal with Demosthenes' words that 'democracy is constitution of speech making'. But we should search the sources of importance of the *hypokrisis*, in my opinion, in epideictic genre of oratory. Epideictic rhetoric represented in my article by a funeral oration and by sophistic orations in which the element of performance is amplified by circumstances themselves of delivering of this kind of speech (official state's celebrations), by the purple robes of the speech-maker (sophists) or by the best abilities and moral opinion of the speaker (a funeral speech delivered by 'the best Athenian citizen').

In the end I can suggest that during the time of Athenian Enlightenment was born in Europe the 'logocentrism' which is characteristic feature of the West culture.