Language and persuasion in attic oratory: imperatives and questions[*]

ANDREAS SERAFIM

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki and Open University of Cyprus
andreas.serafim@ouc.ac.cy

This paper explores the persuasive potential of imperatives and questions in speeches of Aeschines and Demosthenes. Imperatives have a volitional-directive force in that they invite the audience to take action, either by blocking the speaker's adversary from making a statement, or by voting against him (D. 19.75, 18.324; Aeschin. 3.156). The use of a high concentration of rhetorical questions at specific moments in speeches (Aeschin. 3.130-2; D. 19.250) becomes a powerful tool: both by articulating a relentless attack on the opponent, and by giving the audience no respite in which to consider flaws in the speaker's position.

Persuasion / Volitional-directive force / Imperatives / Questions / Audience

…

LENGUAJE Y PERSUASIÓN EN LA ORATORIA ÁTICA: IMPERATIVOS Y PREGUNTAS

Este trabajo explora el potencial persuasivo de los imperativos y las preguntas en los discursos de Esquines y Demóstenes. Los imperativos tienen una fuerza volitivo-directiva en la medida en que invitan al público a actuar, sea impidiendo que el adversario del hablante haga una declaración o bien votando en su contra (Demóstenes 19.75, 18.324; Esquines 3.156). El empleo de una elevada concentración de preguntas retóricas en momentos determinados de los discursos (Esquines 3.130-132; Demóstenes 19.250) se convierte en una herramienta poderosa, ya que articula un ataque implacable contra el oponente y al mismo tiempo le niega al público todo respiro para advertir las fallas en la posición del orador.

Persuasión / Fuerza directiva-volitiva / Imperativos / Preguntas / Auditorio

1. Introduction

This paper aims to explore the persuasive purposes of several semantic and pragmatic aspects of imperatives and questions. These are important devices of oratorical language but, although there have been a few limited studies on imperatives and questions in Greek and Roman texts, otherwise, their use, form and purpose in Attic forensic oratory have not been widely explored and evaluated[1]. By examining selected passages from Aeschines 2, 3 and Demosthenes 18, 19, where these features are present in high concentration, I intend to show that they serve as a means for the speaker to influence the audience's frame of mind. My analysis is enhanced by the use of ancient rhetorical treatises, such as [Longinus], *Subl.*, Demetr. *Eloc.*, Hermog. *Id.* and Apsines, *Rh.*, in combination with modern linguistics.

2. Imperatives

While the term "imperative" as used in this paper concerns grammatical morphology, an imperative is not just a command, but fundamental features and functions of the morphological imperative, as used in a variety of Greek texts and contexts, indicate its potential to affect, or even construct, the viewpoint of the audience. Imperatives shape the relationship between speaker and addressee and become the locus of their interaction often uttering a proscription or a proposition which seeks to create a binding reality. The speaker consciously seeks to *affect* and control the listener. This is the role of the imperative in ritual discourse (e.g., lamentation and prayers from Homer to Pindar, the tragedians and Aristophanes[2]) or in everyday ritualized or ritual-like, tasks (e.g., work songs and lullabies)[3]. The use of the imperative in ritual discourse may seem bizarre, given the widespread perception that the imperative in prayers has a strong and perhaps offensive tone (in contrast with the optative that is thought to be the mood of polite expression). This perception echoes or draws on the information conveyed by Aristotle (*Po.* 1456b15-19) that Protagoras criticized Homer for starting a prayer improperly with the highhanded tone that imperative conveys. The strong tone of these verbal commands makes the use of the imperative more effective in the context of hierarchical social relations. The speech as represented in ancient literary discourse of those with the highest status, whether gods, poets, heroes, leaders, or even parents talking to their children, aim to convey a sense of authority by using the imperative[4].

Despite the claim of Apollonius Dyscolus, in *Synt.* 3.105, that "every imperative is directed from a dominant person to a subordinate one," however, it is important to note that this is not always the case[5]. The imperative acquires more nuanced functions, depending on the context in which it occurs. Apollonius Dyscolus fails to mention that the imperative may occur in ritual contexts, directed by humans to divinities (e.g. in *Il.* 6.476). Bakker is right to note that imperative in prayers—more generally in ritual discourse—is not as highhanded and offensive as Aristotle allegedly thought, or as anyone else may (reasonably) assume. "A man making a supplication or wish is inclined [through imperatives] to leave the decision as to whether the actions asked for are going

to take place or not to the person he is addressing[6]." This argument is in line with FANTIN, who, exploring the use of the imperative in the New Testament, talks about the *volitional-directive* function of the mood: the communicator desires (i.e., volition) to elicit a certain response from the party to whom the imperative sentence is directed (i.e., direction)[7].

Imperatives such as those in the works that are discussed in this paper, have a *volitional-directive* function. They cannot be seen, in my view, as the speaker's attempt to claim a voice of authority, as this would alienate the audience. Using the imperative, the law-court speaker attempts to induce the audience to think, listen and act, whether by reacting verbally or non-verbally (θόρυβος)[8], somehow provoking a change in or reaffirmation of their disposition towards the two litigants. In other words, the utterer seeks to shape the emotional world and occupy the cognitive capacity of the listeners. The potential of imperatives to create a particular disposition in the hearer towards a person or a situation aligns well with speech act theory, as first proposed by AUSTIN and further explored by SEARLE. For, as AUSTIN puts it, "saying something will often, or even normally, produce certain consequential effects upon the feelings, thoughts, or actions of the audience, or of the speaker, or of other persons. And it may be done with the design, intention, or purpose of producing them[9]." In a similar vein, CHUNG-HYE HAN argues that "the directive force of imperatives turns the sentence into a directive action, which we in turn define as an instruction to the hearer to update his plan set. A plan set is a set of propositions that specify the hearer's intentions, and it represents the state of affairs that the hearer intends to bring about[10]."

In what follows, I use passages selected from Aeschines 2, 3 and Demosthenes 18, 19 to explore how the *volitional-directive* force of the imperative is used by these speakers to instruct the audience as to how to formulate a plan set—i.e., how to make or change their attitude towards the litigant—in a way that is designed to eventually affect their verdict. Aeschines 2, 3 and Demosthenes 18, 19 offer a useful initial case study, since all three speeches are replete with passages where the use of imperatives or questions appears to complement other rhetorical, semantic and pragmatic features, e.g., references to emotions, figures of speech, medical terminology. By offering a detailed discussion of the semantic and pragmatic use and function of imperatives (or questions) in this selected sample of speeches, this paper aims to create a framework within which these features of the oratorical text can be explored further in a variety of other texts and contexts in the speeches transmitted from classical Athenian antiquity. These texts present a string of imperatives and questions in performance which magnify the effect.

The first passage is in D. 19.75, where four imperatives (numbered in the passage cited below) are used to make emphatic exhortations.

[1] μὴ τοίνυν ἃ πρὸ τοῦ τοῦτον ἀπαγγεῖλαι ταῦτ' ἐπέπρακτ' ἢ Λακεδαιμονίοις ἢ Φωκεῦσιν ἀκούετε [2] μηδ' ἀνέχεσθε, [3] μηδὲ κατηγορεῖν ἐᾶτε Φωκέων ὡς πονηροί. οὐδὲ γὰρ Λακεδαιμονίους διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν αὐτῶν ποτ' ἐσώσατε, οὐδὲ τοὺς καταράτους Εὐβοέας τουτουσί, οὐδ' ἄλλους πολλούς, ἀλλ' ὅτι συμφέρον ἦν σῶς εἶναι τῇ πόλει, ὥσπερ

Φωκέας νυνί. καὶ τί τῶν Φωκέων ἢ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ ὑμῶν ἢ ἄλλου τινὸς ἀνθρώπων μετὰ τοὺς παρὰ τούτου λόγους ἐξαμαρτόντος οὐκ ἀπέβη τὰ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ὑπὸ τούτου τότε ῥηθέντα; [4] τοῦτ᾽ ἐρωτᾶτε·

[1] But do not let him go on about what the Spartans or the Phocians did before he gave his report. [2] Do not listen to it, and [3] do not let him denounce the Phocians for being wicked. When you saved the Spartans that time, it was not because they were virtuous, and likewise those damned Euboeans and many others too, but because it was in the city's interests for them to remain safe, as is indeed the case with the Phocians now. After this man delivered his report, did the Phocians, the Spartans, you or anyone else commit some offence that prevented his promises from being realized? [4] Ask him that[11].

It has rightly been argued that the specific four imperatives used in this passage invite the audience firstly, "to block the opponent simply by not letting him continue making a particular assertion" and secondly, "to make such assertion of their own or put some question to the opponent[12]." Present imperatives also indicate the proximity of the speaker to his addressee in terms of time. As NESSET argues, "since the present tense relates to the moment of the speech, this tense can be classified as 'proximate' as opposed to the past tense, which is 'distal' in that it involves events that are not contemporaneous with the moment of the speech[13]." Following this proximate approach, and bearing in mind that present imperatives, in the context of D. 19.75, express a present temporal reference, one can argue that the speaker utters the four imperatives in the expectation that the audience will immediately and decisively carry out his order in the *here and now* of the trial[14]. Demosthenes here combines his imperatives with a question creating a particular set of rhetorical strategies that can work together in guiding the mind of his audience. The speaker formulates all imperatives as urgent intensifying the effect in an attempt to maximize the effect on the audience.

It may well be the case that, in context, present imperatives indicate that there is no doubt as to what action the audience is to undertake because it is already performing it, and the speaker simply calls for this to continue at that particular instance and whenever Aeschines makes arguments similar to those anticipated by Demosthenes. It is useful at this point, however, to keep in mind that present imperatives encode an imperfective aspect. This means that they indicate a process with durative sense, i.e., an ongoing, continually or repeatedly happening, action. As SICKING argues, "the present stem is the obvious choice for an imperative when there can be no doubt as to *what* action the person addressed is supposed to be taking—whether 1) because this action has been mentioned or implied earlier or 2) because he is already performing it—and the imperative serves to ask him or her either to continue or stop doing so[15]." In context, Demosthenes asks the audience to keep blocking Aeschines, and to keep asking him questions while he is speaking.

Durative present imperatives can also be found in Aeschin. 3.156:

[1] **μὴ** πρὸς Διὸς καὶ θεῶν, ἱκετεύω ὑμᾶς, ὦ ἄνδρες Αθηναῖοι, [2] **μὴ** τρόπαιον **ἵστατε** ἀφ᾽ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ τοῦ Διονύσου ὀρχήστρᾳ, [3] **μηδ᾽**

αἱρεῖτε παρανοίας ἐναντίον τῶν Ἑλλήνων τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων, [4] **μηδ᾽ ὑπομιμνήσκετε** τῶν ἀνιάτων καὶ ἀνηκέστων κακῶν τοὺς ταλαιπώρους Θηβαίους, οὓς φεύγοντας διὰ τοῦτον ὑποδέδεχθε τῇ πόλει, ὧν ἱερὰ καὶ τέκνα καὶ τάφους ἀπώλεσεν ἡ Δημοσθένους δωροδοκία καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν χρυσίον:

No, by Zeus and the gods, [1] do not, my fellow citizens, [2] do not, I beseech you, set up in the orchestra of Dionysus a memorial of your own defeat, [3] do not in the presence of the Greeks convict the Athenian people of having lost their reason, [4] do not remind the poor Thebans of their incurable and irreparable disasters, men who, exiled through Demosthenes' acts, found refuge with you, when their shrines and children and tombs had been destroyed by Demosthenes' taking of bribes and by the Persian gold.

The persistent demand for negative action from the audience—μή... μὴ ἵστατε, μηδ᾽ αἱρεῖτε, μηδ᾽ ὑπομιμνήσκετε—indicates "that the speaker thinks it necessary that the state of affairs be carried out by someone else other than himself".[16] This demand is reinforced, I argue, by the indirect/inexplicit association of the repeated imperatives with Aeschines' emotional condition.[17] The four imperatives, accompanied by the repetition of the prohibitive particle μή at the beginning of the first clause, and the use of the verb ἱκετεύω ("I beg"), adds to the dramatic tension that Aeschines seeks to create when asking the audience to stop honouring the man who brought disaster upon the polis and other Hellenes (the Thebans are mentioned in this passage)[18]. Asyndeton, which underlines the urgency of the actions the Athenians should undertake (cf. [Longinus], Subl. 19; Apsines, Rh. 3.6), is also connected with the arousal of emotions, with ancient rhetorical treatises highlighting its potential to "produce extended pathos" (Apsines, Rh. 10.55, where the use of asyndeton in D. 21.65 is discussed)[19]. The combination of asyndeton with repetition makes the speech more forcible (Arist. Rh. 1413b30 - 1414a6; Demetr. Eloc. 61), strengthening the expression of emotions that would have been presented as authentic—regardless of whether the emotion is real or fabricated—with a view partly to enhance the speaker's credibility (Arist. Rh. 1408a9-32), but also to make emotions a model for the listeners and, thereby, to stir hostility towards Aeschines[20].

This is known as "emotional community," a term coined by Barbara ROSENWEIN, referring to "a group of people animated by common or similar interests, values, emotional styles and valuations[21]." References to emotional communities include "what the communities (and the individuals within them) define and assess as valuable or harmful to them[22]." ROSENWEIN's work on emotional communities in the Early Middle Ages has been particularly important to scholars working on emotions and reconstruction of emotional processes of the past. Working against a universalistic approach to emotion, the notion of "emotional community" can help us understand how such a community can be created through common references and how an expert orator can steer rhetoric towards that goal. In the context of Aeschin. 3.156, by referring to the role of Demosthenes in destroying Athens and other Hellenes, Aeschines aims to infuse the audience of the trial with emotions of hatred, rage and hostility so as to

activate "out-group" hostility. The logical end-point of this "out-group" hostility is that Demosthenes, now constructed as an enemy of the Athenian community and called "the curse of Hellas" in the next section, 3.157, should not be praised for his historical misdeeds, but excluded from that community by means of the dicastic punishment— this is essentially what Aeschines looks for in his speech 3. Fuelling hostility against the "out group" is balanced by a symmetrical appeal to "in group" cohesion through emotive reference to children and ancestral shrines and tombs. The creation of emotional community is designed (and expected) to have a persuasive and direct impact upon behaviours and attitudes in target audiences, as ancient sources indicate23.

The imperatives in Demosthenes' speeches are also worth closer examination because of the use of medical terminology and the influence they can have on the audience's frame of mind. Demosthenes exploits the language of disease with imperatives to underscore the threat of the corrupt political leader and invite the audience to take decisive action against him to protect the body politic24. It has rightly been argued that, in D. 19.262, medical terminology, strengthened by two imperatives, aims to intimidate the Athenians in the law-court about the dangers Aeschines, the disease bearer and spreader, presents for the polis25. It is notable, however, that fear in this context is not meant to lead to inaction: the Athenians are invited to assume the role of a doctor and take action against the enemy to protect the body politic (φυλάξασθε) by cutting off the afflicted individual (ἀτιμώσατε). By urging the judges to disfranchise (ἀτιμώσατε) Aeschines, Demosthenes strengthens this shift from the metaphorical to the literal: disfranchisement (ἀτιμία) was a severe legal penalty imposed on male Athenian citizens, principally if they were debtors to the state or had neglected their civic duties26. In 19.259, Demosthenes also refers to traitors and sell-outs as a "terrible disease" (νόσημα δεινόν) that has fallen upon Greece and that requires the Athenians' treatment27. It is notable, however, that, in contrast to 19.262, medical terminology is not enhanced by the use of imperatives.

In fact, medical terminology, despite being used frequently elsewhere in Demosthenes' corpus of speeches, is rarely accompanied and strengthened by imperatives28. The only parallel to D. 19.262 can be found in 18.324, the last paragraph of the peroration of the On the Crown speech:

> Μὴ δῆτ', ὦ πάντες θεοί, μηδεὶς ταῦθ' ὑμῶν ἐπινεύσειεν, ἀλλὰ μάλιστα μὲν καὶ τούτοις βελτίω τινὰ νοῦν καὶ φρένας ἐνθείητε εἰ δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔχουσιν ἀνιάτως, τούτους μὲν αὐτοὺς καθ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς ἐξώλεις καὶ προώλεις ἐν γῇ καὶ θαλάττῃ ποιήσατε, ἡμῖν δὲ τοῖς λοιποῖς τὴν ταχίστην ἀπαλλαγὴν τῶν ἐπηρτημένων φόβων δότε καὶ σωτηρίαν ἀσφαλῆ.
>
> No, all you gods, may none of you grant their wish. Best would be to inspire better thoughts and intentions even in them, but if they are indeed incurable, destroy every last one of them utterly and thoroughly on earth and sea. And grant the rest of us as soon as possible release from the fears that threaten and salvation that endures.

Demosthenes requests that Aeschines and his fellow scoundrels be eradicated from the earth because they are "incurable" (ἀνιάτως)—a medical term that describes illnesses that cannot be cured by drugs, surgery or cautery (Hp. *Aph.* 7.87ὁκόσα φάρμακα οὐκ ἰῆται, σίδηρος ἰῆται· ὅσα σίδηρος οὐκ ἰῆται, πῦρ ἰῆται· ὅσα δὲ πῦρ οὐκ ἰῆται, ταῦτα χρὴ νο: μίζειν ἀνίατα). Demosthenes' request evokes, arguably, the scapegoat ritual: in times of crisis, such as plague or drought, an individual was selected to be driven out of the city in the hope that his/her removal would alleviate the sufferings of the afflicted city[29]. As Parker argues, the scapegoat ritual was a form of "cathartic medicine," aiming to restore the safety of the city by removing the sickened part[30]. Demosthenes makes Aeschines a scapegoat for the city, and by using two aorist imperatives, he urges the two addressees—the gods whom he invokes, and the Athenian judges who listen to his invocation—to take immediate and urgent action against his adversary. Aorist imperatives present a sharper, more authoritative and peremptory command than the present imperative, and their use in this context is indicative of the strong volition of the communicator to elicit a specific response from the party to whom the imperative sentence is directed. As Sicking argues, aorist stem imperatives are used in cases where "a verb informs the person addressed as to *what* is expected of him or her"[31] .

Demosthenes' purpose to eliminate his opponent in speech 18 was achieved: on this occasion, he defeated Aeschines by an overwhelming majority of votes (Plu. *Dem.* 24.2.9–10). Despite the skilful use of imperatives in his speech 19, however, Demosthenes lost this case. This points to a problem inherent in any approach to understanding the persuasive potential of oratorical speeches distant in time: to what extent did this potential make a difference to the outcome of a trial? The use of imperatives is *designed* and *expected* to put the audience into a certain frame of mind—to persuade it, in Aristotle's words—and rally its support for the speaker. It is not always easy for us, however, to assess the *actual impact* of the individual rhetorical techniques upon the historical law-court audience, since this is determined by other factors, not necessarily connected with rhetoric and law-court performance[32]. There are three major factors: first, it is the whole speech, with all the arguments and a variety of other rhetorical techniques, which determines the final outcome of the judicial verdict. Despite the skilful use of imperatives invariably throughout Demosthenes 19, the line of arguments or the use of other techniques of rhetoric in other parts of the speech may have been less persuasive and influential on the audience. Second, the interplay between Demosthenes 19 and the opposing Aeschines 2, a speech made by an orator also highly skilled, may also have had a huge impact upon the judges. Demosthenes was criticized for the lack of proofs to substantiate his allegations that Aeschines was guilty of high treason, having been bribed by Philip[33]. The emphasis Aeschines placed on this lack, in combination with his explanations and justifications of his decisions, and the use of rhetoric in his oration may have been decisive in putting the judges into a certain frame of mind that favoured Aeschines over Demosthenes.

Finally, it was the interplay of rhetoric with the political momentum that together determined the outcome of the trial Demosthenes was involved. In 346 BC, three years before Demosthenes resumed the prosecution against Aeschines in the embassy trial, where D. 19 and Aeschin. 2 were delivered, Aeschines overwhelmingly defeated

Timarchus, an ally, or even a pawn, of Demosthenes. Timarchus brought an impeachment, alleging, like Demosthenes in the embassy trial, that Aeschines was bribed by Philip of Macedon. The resounding victory of Aeschines in 346 BC may indicate that the Athenians were still receptive of the arguments made by the supporters of the Peace of Philocrates, before the gradual worsening of relations between Athens and Macedon in 340 BC. It can, therefore, be argued that Aeschines, using the appropriate arguments and rhetorical techniques, was successful in harnessing the political momentum and using it as a means of persuading the judges in the law-court.

3. Questions

The morphological imperative is not the only feature of oratorical language that has a *volitional-directive* force, and an important role to play in influencing the minds of the audience and determining their law-court verdict. A range of other linguistic constructions— i.e., questions, assumptions and other moods, such as the subjunctive[34]— despite not including morphologically imperative verbs, can be considered to be akin to imperatives due to their pragmatic functions. This section of the paper explores the *volitional-directive* function of questions, the strategic purpose of which is well-established in ancient rhetorical treatises. As [Longinus] points out, in his treatise *Subl.* 18.1-2, questions enable the speaker to "give intensity to his language and makes it much more effective and vehement." Tiberius, in *Fig.* 13 (Περὶ πυσματικοῦ), recognizes four functions of questions in oratorical speeches: to grasp the attention of the audience (προσοχή), to create clarity (σαφήνεια), to create vividness or to convey excitement (ἐνάργεια), and to serve as a refutation of an opponent's arguments (ἔλεγχος).

Wooten usefully identifies questions depending on the target audience they refer to, and clarifies their functions and purposes in Demosthenes' *Philippics* – i.e. deliberative speeches: first, questions directed by the speaker to himself, which can be explanatory, incremental and resumptive; second, questions directed to the opponent, which can be probing and refutative; and third, questions directed at the audience, which can be reproachful, emotive, hortatory and informational[35]. In what follows, I intend to examine the features and purposes of selected examples of questions that are either accumulated in specific parts of speeches, or are used in combination with other elements of rhetoric that reinforce their effect. This investigation allows comparisons to be drawn between two different kinds of oratory, i.e. deliberative and forensic. Although, as with Wooten's investigation, this paper is focused on a relatively narrow sample of speeches, the insights gleaned can form the basis for further research on a larger scale.

A good example of questions can be found in Aeschin. 3.130-2, where there are eight questions in rapid succession[36]:

> [1] ἀλλ᾿ οὐ προύλεγον, οὐ προεσήμαινον οἱ θεοὶ φυλάξασθαι, μόνον γε οὐκ ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς προσκτησάμενοι; οὐδεμίαν τοι πώποτε ἔγωγε μᾶλλον πόλιν ἑώρακα ὑπὸ μὲν τῶν θεῶν σῳζομένην, ὑπὸ δὲ τῶν

ῥητόρων ἐνίων ἀπολλυμένην. [2] οὐχ ἱκανὸν ἦν τὸ τοῖς μυστηρίοις φανὲν σημεῖον, ἡ τῶν μυστῶν τελευτή; [3] οὐ περὶ τούτων Ἀμεινιάδης μὲν προύλεγεν εὐλαβεῖσθαι καὶ πέμπειν εἰς Δελφοὺς ἐπερησομένους τὸν θεὸν ὅ τι χρὴ πράττειν, Δημοσθένης δὲ ἀντέλεγε, φιλιππίζειν τὴν Πυθίαν φάσκων, ἀπαίδευτος ὢν καὶ ἀπολαύων καὶ ἐμπιμπλάμενος τῆς δεδομένης ὑφ᾽ ὑμῶν αὐτῷ ἐξουσίας; [4] οὐ τὸ τελευταῖον ἀθύτων καὶ ἀκαλλιερήτων ὄντων τῶν ἱερῶν ἐξέπεμψε τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐπὶ τὸν πρόδηλον κίνδυνον; καίτοι πρώην γέ ποτε ἀπετόλμα λέγειν ὅτι παρὰ τοῦτο Φίλιππος οὐκ ἦλθεν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ καλὰ τὰ ἱερά. [5] τίνος οὖν σὺ ζημίας ἄξιος εἶ τυχεῖν, ὦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλειτήριε; [6] εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν κρατῶν οὐκ ἦλθεν εἰς τὴν τῶν κρατουμένων χώραν, ὅτι οὐκ ἦν αὐτῷ καλὰ τὰ ἱερά, σὺ δ᾽ οὐδὲν προειδὼς τῶν μελλόντων ἔσεσθαι, πρὶν καλλιερῆσαι τοὺς στρατιώτας ἐξέπεμψας, πότερα στεφανοῦσθαι σε δεῖ ἐπὶ ταῖς τῆς πόλεως ἀτυχίαις, ἢ ὑπερωρίσθαι; τοιγάρτοι τί τῶν ἀνελπίστων καὶ ἀπροσδοκήτων ἐφ᾽ ἡμῶν οὐ γέγονεν; [7] οὐ γὰρ βίον γε ἡμεῖς ἀνθρώπινον βεβιώκαμεν, ἀλλ᾽ εἰς παραδοξολογίαν τοῖς μεθ᾽ ἡμᾶς, ἔφυμεν. οὐχ ὁ μὲν τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεύς, ὁ τὸν Ἄθω διορύξας, ὁ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον ζεύξας, ὁ γῆν καὶ ὕδωρ τοὺς Ἕλληνας αἰτῶν, ὁ τολμῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς γράφειν, ὅτι δεσπότης ἐστὶν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀφ᾽ ἡλίου ἀνιόντος μέχρι δυομένου, νῦν οὐ περὶ τοῦ κύριος ἑτέρων εἶναι διαγωνίζεται, ἀλλ᾽ ἤδη περὶ τῆς τοῦ σώματος σωτηρίας; [8] καὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ὁρῶμεν τῆς τε δόξης ταύτης καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Πέρσην ἡγεμονίας ἠξιωμένους, οἳ καὶ τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς ἱερὸν ἠλευθέρωσαν;

[1] But did not the gods forewarn us, did they not admonish us, to be on our guard, all but speaking with human voice? No city have I ever seen offered more constant protection by the gods, but more inevitably ruined by certain of its politicians. [2] Was not that portent sufficient which appeared at the Mysteries—the death of the celebrants? [3] In view of this did not Ameiniades warn you to be on your guard, and to send messengers to **Delphi** to inquire of the god what was to be done? [4] And did not Demosthenes oppose this, and say that the Pythia had gone over to Philip? Boor that he was, gorged with his feast of indulgence from you! [5] And did he not at last, on the basis of smouldering and ill-omened sacrifices send forth our troops into manifest danger? And yet it was but yesterday that he dared to assert that the reason why Philip did not advance against our country was that the omens were not favourable to him. What punishment, then, do you deserve, you curse of **Hellas**? [6] For if the conqueror refrained from entering the land of the conquered because the omens were not favourable to him, whereas you, ignorant of the future, sent out our troops before the omens were propitious, ought you to be receiving a crown for the misfortunes of the city, or to have been thrust already beyond her borders? Therefore what strange and unexpected things have not happened in our time! For it is not the life of men we have lived, but we were born to be a tale of wonder to posterity. [7] Is not the king of the Persians—he who channelled **Athos**, he who bridged the **Hellespont,** he who demanded earth

and water of the Greeks, he who dared to write in his letters that he was lord of all men from the rising of the sun unto its setting—is he not struggling now, no longer for lordship over others, but already for his life? [8] And do we not see this glory and the leadership against the Persians bestowed on the same men who liberated the temple of **Delphi**?

A notable feature of this passage is Aeschines' attempt to set apart divine volition and human causation. While the gods, he argues, show their favour to the city of Athens—and references to the *polis* and the constitution as being blessed, favoured and protected by the gods are made frequently elsewhere in Attic oratory (e.g. Aeschin. 3.196; D. 2.1, 19.280; Isoc. 3.26)—incompetent or corrupt politicians bring disaster, a reference that culminates in the recognition of Demosthenes as the main destructive human force, called τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλειτήριος. Demosthenes is thus guilty of twin crimes, against the gods and the city. The harshness of this attack is reinforced, in context, by the use of questions because these, unlike positive statements, have a strong potential to influence the mind of the audience. As Demetrius points out in his treatise *Eloc.* 279, "the orator forces his hearer into a sort of corner, so that he seems to be brought to task and to have no answer. If the positive statement 'he was wronging us and violating the peace' were substituted, the effect would be that of precise information rather than of cross-examination[37]." In a way, the successive questions in Aeschin. 3.130-2 aim to exhaust and possibly disorientate the listener, making them more receptive to the speaker's argument and the implication that Demosthenes should be punished for impiety, the legal treatment of which in Attic law was tough[38].

Ample evidence points to the Athenians' hostile response towards anyone committing impious actions (cf. D. 21.51, 24.7; Isoc. 16.6; Lys. 6.5, 17). Lysias also informs us that Pericles advised people to deal with impious acts by enforcing the written and divine laws against the perpetrators (6.10). Pseudo-Demosthenes provides historical *exempla* of people who were punished for being impious: in 59.116, for example, he refers to the punishment of Archias, the *hierophant* (i.e. the high-priest of the temple at Eleusis), who was convicted in court of impiety and for offering sacrifices contrary to the ancestral rites. The strong accusation of impiety levelled at Demosthenes in Aeschin. 3.130-2, whose effect on the audience was further strengthened by the use of questions, aims, I argue, to group together the speaker and the audience, excluding Demosthenes. The social identity theory of H. Tajfel and J. TURNER indicates that the activation of group attitudes and identities and inter-group relations – i.e. in-group solidarity and out-group hostility – has a huge impact upon behaviours and attitudes in target audiences[39]. The central hypothesis of social identity theory is that members of an in-group will seek to find negative aspects of an out-group, thus enhancing their self-image.

Denunciatory questions directed to the opponent can also be found in D. 19.250, where questions are accompanied by answers—what is known in ancient rhetorical theory as *hypophora*. The passage below includes two questions (marked as Q) and two replies (marked as R):

τούτων οὐδὲν ἐσκέψατο, οὐδ᾽ ὅπως ὀρθὴ πλεύσεται προείδετο, ἀλλ᾽ ἀνέτρεψε καὶ κατέδυσε καὶ τὸ καθ᾽ αὑτὸν ὅπως ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἔσται παρεσκεύασεν. [Q1] εἶτ᾽ οὐ σὺ σοφιστής; [R1] καὶ πονηρός γε. [Q2] οὐ σὺ λογογράφος; [R2] καὶ θεοῖς ἐχθρός γε· ὃς ἃ μὲν πολλάκις ἠγωνίσω καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐξηπίστασο, ὑπερέβης, ἃ δ᾽ οὐδεπώποτ᾽ ἐν τῷ βίῳ ὑπεκρίνω, ταῦτα ζητήσας ἐπὶ τῷ τῶν πολιτῶν βλάψαι τιν᾽ εἰς μέσον ἤνεγκας.

He cared for none of these obligations; he took no thought that the ship of state should sail on even keel; he scuttled her and sank her, and as far as he could put her at the mercy of her foes. [Q1] Are not you then a charlatan? [R1] Yes, and a vile one too. [Q2] Are you not a speech-writer? [R2] Yes, and an unprincipled one to boot. You passed over the speech that you so often spoke on the stage, and knew by heart; you hunted up rant that in all your career you had never declaimed in character, and revived it for the undoing of your own fellow-citizen.

The questions and answers in this passage aim to draw on the negative impression inculcated in the minds of the Athenians about sophists and logographers as distorters of the truth, therefore attributing to Aeschines a tendency to trickery, lies and fabrication[40]. Demosthenes' strategy is to emphasise the issue of unreality in Aeschines' law-court performance, stirring up the suspicion of the audience. As Hermogenes has remarked, Demosthenes used questions followed by answers as a method to make a part of his speech distinct and to maximize the impact it would have on the audience (Id. 239). We can see in fact that the technique of providing answers to his own questions is used by Demosthenes to redouble the negative associations of the original question. Thus, Aeschines is not just a σοφιστής but a particularly despicable one (πονηρός γε), and not just a λογογράφος but θεοῖς ἐχθρός γε. The answers, therefore, serve to activate and reinforce the audience's implied prejudice, while also implying that Demosthenes shares the audience's disgust at sophistry (and that therefore he, unlike Aeschines, is speaking honourably and telling the truth). Furthermore, they reinforce Demetrius' point about how a rapid succession of questions forces the audience into acquiescence. Here, the succession of short questions, and even shorter answers, creates a rapidity of delivery that is hard to resist.

It is interesting that, in the passages cited above, Aeschines does not follow the clear-cut distinction of WOOTEN between questions directed at the audience and those directed to the opponent. In 3.130-2, he mingles these two categories of questions: from §1 to §5 and from §7 to §8, Aeschines has informational questions (those that provide information about the past) directed at the audience, whereas in §§5-6, he has denunciatory (the term is mine) questions directed aggressively at his opponent. Denunciatory questions can also be found in D. 19.250. The lack of denunciatory questions in the Philippics may be due to the fact that, theoretically speaking, there is no opponent in deliberative speeches. Nonetheless, their absence is still strange since, as many scholars have argued, Demosthenes in practice uses aspects of forensic speeches in his deliberative orations, such as polemics against an adversary41; Philip, for example, is targeted in the Philippics.

4. Conclusion

This paper has examined the persuasive potential of two largely un-researched constructions in selected speeches of Attic forensic oratory: imperatives and questions. When skilfully deployed, as in Aeschin. 2, 3 and D. 18, 19, imperatives and questions are weapons in the speaker's arsenal that merit further investigation as a means of artfully constructing the audience's plan set—i.e., their attitude towards the two litigants and their in-court verbal or non-verbal reaction—and of persuading the judges to vote against the opponent.

Imperatives have a volitional-directive function in that they attempt to get the addressee to do what the speaker requests. In the passages examined above (D. 19.75; 3.156; 18.324), imperatives invite the audience to take a particular kind of action, either by blocking the speaker's adversary from making a statement or an assertion in the law-court, or by voting against him—thus, in the speaker's view, protecting the Athenians, the constitution and the whole city. The high concentration of questions in Aeschin. 3.130-2 and the use of *hypophora* in D. 19.250 must also be considered as strategic, intending to leave the hearers/viewers with no opportunity to come up with and vocalize a response, thereby directing them instead to the answers Aeschines, and Demosthenes, want.

By adopting a case-study approach and elucidating in some detail the semantic and pragmatic dimension and the persuasive potential of imperatives and questions in a specific sample of Attic forensic speeches, this paper has aimed to establish a theoretical and methodological framework, within which the use of these two rhetorical devices might be (further) explored in other genres and contexts of oratory. Future research could concentrate, for example, on the investigation of the use of imperatives and questions in private speeches. Hitherto, it has rightly been argued that the nature of the case—public or private—affected, at least to some extent, the options available to the speakers in terms of the content of their speech, and their arguments and rhetorical strategies[42]. This needs to be explored further, however. In the context investigated here it is worth questioning how frequently, and for what reasons, speakers use imperatives in private speeches. What is the purpose of variations in the way the speaker asks the audience to do something? Why, for example, is the subjunctive used in place of the imperative in private cases and deliberative speeches? What impact does the difference between the injunction "you must" and the permission "you may" have upon the audience? And are there any instances of questions being concentrated in a limited space and, if so, why?

These open questions indicate that, despite the advances in the study of the Attic oratorical style and technique, there is still much work to be done.

Bibliography

AUSTIN, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*, Cambridge.

BAKKER, W. F. (1966) *The Greek imperative. An investigation into the aspectual differences between the present and aorist imperatives in Greek prayer from Homer up to the present day*, Amsterdam.

BARY, C. (2009) *Aspect in ancient Greek*, PhD Diss., Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

BERS, V. (1985) "Dikastic Thorubos", en CARTLEDGE, P. A., and HARVEY, F. D. (eds.) *Crux: Essays Presented to G. E. M. de ste Croix on   his75ᵗʰ Birthday*, Devon, pp. 1-15.

BREMMER, J. (1983) "Scapegoat rituals in ancient Greece", *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 87, pp. 299-320.

BROCK, R. (2000) "Sickness in the body politic: medical imagery in the Greek polis", en HOPE, V. M., and MARSHALL, E. (Eds.) *Death and disease in the ancient city*, London, pp. 24-34.

CAMPBELL, C. R. (2008) *Verbal aspect and non-indicative verbs: further soundings in the Greek of the New Testament*, New York.

CARAWAN, E. (1980) *EROTESIS: interrogation in Greek judicial debate and rhetorical theory*, Ph.D.diss., University of North Carolina.

CAREY, C. (2000) *Aeschines*, Austin.

CONOVER, P. J. (1984) "The influence of group identifications on political perception and evaluation", *The Journal of Politics*, 46, pp. 760–785.

DENIZOT, C. (2011) *Donner des ordres en grec ancien: étude linguistique des formes de l'injonction*, Mont-Saint-Aignan.

DODDS, E. R. (1957) *The Greeks and the irrational*, Boston.

EDWARDS, M. (2012) "Oratoria y performance en la Atenas clásica", *Acta Poetica*, 33, pp. 87-115.

ELLIS, J. R. (1976) *Philip II and Macedonian imperialism*, London.

FANNING, B. M. (1990) *Verbal aspect in New Testament Greek*, Oxford.

FANTIN, J. D. (2010) *The Greek imperative mood in the New Testament: A cognitive and communicative approach*, New York.

GOODWIN, W. W. (1966) *Syntax of the moods and tenses of the Greek verb*, London.

HALL, E. (2002) "The singing actors of antiquity", en EASTERLING, P., and HALL, E. (Eds.) *Greek and Roman actors, aspects of an ancient profession*, Cambridge, pp. 3-38.

HALL, E. (2006) *The theatrical cast of Athens. Interactions between ancient Greek drama and society*, Oxford.

HALL, J. (2007) "Oratorical delivery and the emotions: theory and practice", en DOMINIK, W., and HALL, J. (Eds.) *A companion to roman rhetoric*, London, pp. 218-234.

HAN, C. H. (2000) *The structure and interpretation of imperatives: mood and force in Universal Grammar*, PhD Diss., University of Pennsylvania.

HAN, C. H. (2001) "Force, negation and imperatives", *The Linguistic Review*, 18, pp. 289-326.

HANSEN, M. H. (1991) *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes: structure, principles and ideology*, Norman.

HARRIS, E. M. (2008) *Demosthenes speeches 20-22*, Austin.

HESK, J. (1999) "The rhetoric of anti-rhetoric in Athenian oratory", en GOLDHILL, S., and OSBORNE, R. (Eds.) *Performance cultures and Athenian democracy*, Cambridge, pp. 201-230.

HOUSEHOLDER, F. W. (1981) *The syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus [electronic resource] translated, and with commentary*, Amsterdam.

HUDDY, L. (2003) "Group identity and political cohesion", en SEARS, D., HUDDY, L., and JERVIS, R. (Eds.) *Oxford handbook of political psychology*, Oxford, pp. 511–558.

KALIMTZIS, K. (2000) *Aristotle on political enmity and disease. An inquiry into stasis*, Albany.

KALLET, L. (1999) "The diseased body politic, Athenian public finance, and the massacre at Mykalessos (Thucydides 7.27-29)", *American Journal of Philology* 120, pp. 223-244.

KARANIKA, A. (2014) *Voices at work. Women, performance and labor in ancient Greece,* Baltimore.

KONSTAN, D. (2006) *The emotions of the ancient Greeks: studies in Aristotle and classical literature*, Toronto.

KOSAK, J. C. (2000) "Polis Nosousa: Greek ideas about the city and disease in the fifth century B.C.", en HOPE, V. M., and MARSHALL, E. (Eds.) *Death and disease in the ancient city*, London, pp. 35-54.

LAMERS, H. and RADEMAKER, A. (2007) "Talking about myself: A pragmatic approach to the use of aspect forms in Lysias 12.4-19", *Classical Quarterly*, 57, pp. 458-476.

LAU, R. (1989) "Individual and contextual influences on group identification", *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 52, pp. 220–231.

MACDOWELL, D. (1978) *The law in classical Athens*, Ithaca.

MEDEIROS, D. J. (2013) *Formal approaches to the syntax and semantics of imperatives*, PhD Diss., University of Michigan.

MILLER, A. H., GURIN, P., GURIN, G., and MALANCHUK, O. (1981) "Group consciousness and political participation", *American Journal of Political Science*, 25, pp. 494–511.

MITCHELL-BOYASK, R. (2008) *Plague and the Athenian imagination: drama, history, and the cult of Asclepius*, Cambridge.

NESSET, T. (2008) *Abstract phonology in a concrete model: cognitive linguistics and the morphology-phonology interface*, Berlin.

PARKER, R. (1983) *Pollution and purification in early Greek religion*, Oxford.

PEARSON, L. (1981) *The art of Demosthenes*, Chico.

PLAMPER, J., REDDY, W., ROSENWEIN B. and STEARNS, P. (2010) "The history of emotions: an interview with William Reddy, Barbara Rosenwein, and Peter Stearns", *History and theory*, 49, pp. 237-265.

PULLEYN, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek religion*, Oxford.

RIJKSBARON, A. (2002) *The syntax and semantics of the verb in classical Greek: an introduction*, Chicago.

RISSELADA, R. (1993) *Imperatives and other directive expressions in Latin: a study in the pragmatics of a dead language*, Amsterdam.

ROSENWEIN, B. (2002) "Worrying about emotions in history", *American Historical Review*, 107, pp. 821-845.

ROSENWEIN, B. (2006) *Emotional communities in the early Middle Ages*, Ithaca.

ROBERTS, R. W. (1902) *Demetrius, on style*, Cambridge.

RONNET, G. (1951) *Étude sur le style de Démosthène dans les discours politiques*, Paris.

RUBINSTEIN, L. (2004) "Stirring up Dicastic anger", en CAIRNS, D. L., and KNOX, R. A. (Eds.) *Law, rhetoric, and comedy in classical Athens. Essays in Honour of Douglas M. MacDowell*, Wales, pp. 187-203.

SEARLE, J. R. (1969) *Speech acts*, Cambridge.

SEARLE, J. R. (1975) "Indirect speech acts", en *Speech Acts*, eds. P. COLE AND J. L. MORGAN, New York, pp. 59-82.

SEARLE, J. R. (1976) "The classification of illocutionary acts", *Language in Society*, 5, pp. 1-24.

SERAFIM, A. (2017) *Attic oratory and performance*. London.

SICKING, C. M. J. (1991) "The distribution of aorist and present tense stem forms in Greek, especially in the imperative", *Glotta*, 69, pp. 14-43, 154-70.

SICKING, C. M. J. and STORK, P. (1996) *Two studies in the semantics of the verb in classical Greek*, Leiden.

SMYTH, H. W. (1984) *Greek grammar*, Cambridge.

TAJFEL, H. and TURNER, J. C. (1979) "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict", en AUSTIN, W. G., and WORCHEL, S. (Eds.) *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, Michigan, pp. 33-37.

THOMAS, R. (2011) "And you, the demos, made an uproar: performance, mass audiences, and text in the Athenian democracy", en LARDINOIS, A. P. M. H., LARDINOIS J. H., and VAN DER POEL, M. G. M. (Eds.), *Sacred words: orality, literacy, and religion*: orality and literacy in the ancient world, Leiden, pp. 161-187.

TODD, S. C. (1993) *The shape of Athenian law*, Oxford.

VATRI, A. (Forthcoming) "Asyndeton, immersion, and *hypokrisis* in ancient Greek rhetoric", en GRETHLEIN, J. (Ed.) *Narrative and experience in Greco-Roman antiquity*, Oxford.

VEGETTI, M. (1983) "Metafora politica e imagine del corpo negli scritti Ippocratici", e n FRANCOIS, L., and Mudry, P. (Eds.) *Formes de pensée dans la Collection Hippocratique*, Genéve, pp. 459-69.

WILLI, A. (2003) *The languages of Aristophanes: aspects of linguistic variation in classical Attic Greek*, Oxford.

WOOTEN, C. W. (2008) *A commentary on Demosthenes' Philippic I*, Oxford.

Wooten, C. W. (2013) "Questions in Greek rhetorical theory and Demosthenes' *Philippics*", *Rhetorica*, 31, pp. 349-371.

Yunis, H. (2005) *Demosthenes, speeches 18 and 19*, Austin.

Notas

[1] Ronnet (1951: 128ff.) discusses several features of style in speeches of Demosthenes, including questions; Bers (1985: 9) makes a short reference to imperatives in forensic oratory; Risselada (1993) on the pragmatics of the imperative in Latin; Denizot (2011) examines a variety of thorny issues such as the differences in meaning between the imperative and infinitive or between the present and aorist imperative in contexts other than Greek oratory; Edwards (2012: 87-115) explores the use of questions in Isaeus; Wooten (2013: 349-371) investigates how ancient rhetorical theory discusses the use and purposes of questions in speeches, and how specifically they are used in Demosthenes' *Philippics*; Serafim (2017: 68-72) briefly discusses the performative value and some of the functions of imperatives and questions in Attic oratory, but without elaborating on ancient rhetorical and modern linguistic theories to explore the full diversity of their pragmatic/semantic features and rhetorical/persuasive purposes. There is, of course, an extensive bibliography on the use and function of imperatives and questions from a (socio)linguistic point of view. Some of these theories will be applied in this article to advance our understanding of the use of imperatives and questions in the forensic speeches transmitted from classical Athenian antiquity.

[2] Commands in prayers are expressed in the imperative, 541 cases; then in the optative, 207 cases; and less frequently in the infinitive, 107 cases. In Homer alone there are 72 instances of imperative in prayers and only 20 instances of the optative.

[3] On the religious dimension of the quotidian tasks: Karanika (2014: 160-161).

[4] Karanika (2014: 162).

[5] Translation of Apollonius Dyscolus and book numbers: Householder (1981: 192).

[6] The function of imperatives in ritual discourse, according to Bakker, may point to the Greek popular attitude towards deities: they are not thought of as being distant and invisible entities, but as assistants and allies. Bakker (1966: 127).

⁷ FANTIN (2010: 74-75, 133-135, 196-198). In a similar vein, Karanika argues that "the imperative [in ritual discourse] emphasizes an asymmetrical relationship between speaker and addressee and the transference of a *wish* or *intention* of one into *action* with the *agency* [emphasis is mine] of the Translation of Apollonius Dyscolus and book numbers: HOUSEHOLDER (1981: 192).

⁷ The function of imperatives in ritual discourse, according to Bakker, may point to the Greek popular attitude towards deities: they are not thought of as being distant and invisible entities, but as assistants and allies. BAKKER (1966: 127).

⁷ FANTIN (2010: 74-75, 133-135, 196-198). In a similar vein, Karanika argues that "the imperative [in ritual discourse] emphasizes an asymmetrical relationship between speaker other"; KARANIKA (2014: 94).

⁸ BERS (1985: 1-15); THOMAS (2011: 175-185).

⁹ AUSTIN (1962: 101). On speech act theory: AUSTIN (1962); SEARLE (1969); (1975: 59-82); (1976: 1-24); RISSELADA (1993: 26-29); BARY (2009).

¹⁰ HAN (2000: 149-150).

¹¹ Translation of Demosthenes' speeches: YUNIS (2005); translation of Aeschines' speeches: CAREY (2000).

¹² BERS (1985: 9).

¹³ NESSET (2008: 100).

¹⁴ PULLEYN (1997: 223).

¹⁵ SICKING (1991: 157). For this explanation of the aspectual use of the imperative, also: BAKKER (1966: 31-66); GOODWIN (1966: 11); SMYTH (1984: 423); SICKING (1991: 157); PULLEYN (1997: 221-226) specifically on the aspectual differences between present and aorist imperatives in a specific form of ritual discourse, prayers; RIJKSBARON (2006: 1); WILLI (2003: 31); BARY (2009: 11-13).

¹⁶ RIJKSBARON (2006: 43).

¹⁷ Further on the distinction between the *direct/explicit* and *indirect/inexplicit* ways of stirring up emotions in the Athenian law-court: RUBINSTEIN (2004: 187-203).

¹⁸ The use of the verbs ἱκετεύω, δέομαι and ἀντιβολῶ with imperatives is also attested elsewhere in Attic oratory: e.g. Aeschin. 3.61; And. 2.23; D. 19.195, 45.85; Lys. 4.20.

¹⁹ Further on the potential of asyndeton to stir up emotions: VATRI (forthcoming).

²⁰ The combined use of asyndeton and repetition, which points unambiguously to a forcible emotional outburst, is also attested in the speeches of Demosthenes, as in 28.20: βοηθήσατ᾽ οὖν ἡμῖν, βοηθήσατε, καὶ τοῦ δικαίου καὶ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἕνεκα καὶ ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς τοῦ τετελευτηκότος. σώσατε, ἐλεήσατε "succor us, then, succor us, for the sake of justice, for your own sakes, for ours, and for my dead father's sake. Save us; have compassion on us".

²¹ PLAMPER, REDDY, ROSENWEIN and STEARNS (2010: 253); also ROSENWEIN (2002: 821-845).

²² ROSENWEIN (2006: 842). If, for example, an emotional community attaches a strong value to the quality of being honest, then the members of that emotional community will react negatively when they judge that this quality has been threatened or devalued.

²³ Arist. *Rh.* 1356a14-6, "[there is persuasion] through the hearers when they are led to feel emotions by the speech; for we do not give the same judgment when grieving as when

rejoicing, nor when we are being friendly compared to when we are being hostile." In the same vein: "the emotions are all those affections which cause men to change their opinion in regard to their judgments (1378a19-20)."

²⁴ On the analogy between the human body and the body politic: VEGETTI (1983: 459-469); KALLET (1999: 223-244); BROCK (2000: 24-34); KOSAK (2000: 35-54); KALIMTZIS (2000).

²⁵ SERAFIM (2017: 70). Arist. *Rh.* 1382a21-6: "let fear be defined as a painful or troubled feeling caused by the impression of an imminent evil that causes destruction or pain. For men do not fear all evils, for instance, becoming unjust or slow-witted, but only such as involve great pain or destruction, and only if they appear to be not far off but near at hand and threatening; for men do not fear things that are very remote." On fear as a means of controlling the law-court audience: RUBINSTEIN (2004: 188-189); KONSTAN (2006: 129-155).

²⁶ On the legal penalty of *atimia*: MACDOWELL (1978: 73-75); HANSEN (1991: 387).

²⁷ In his book, *Plague and the Athenian Imagination*, R. Mitchell-Boyask explores the frequency with which the word νόσος (which is etymologically and semantically close to the word νόσημα that is used in D. 19.259) is used in the extant Greek tragedies, indicating that νόσος was a major concern of people, especially at particular historical moments (post 430, 420, 411 BC) and that the references to that term in Greek tragedy were a means of evoking powerful emotions. Medical imagery is therefore based on popular Athenian perceptions and real anxieties. Bibliography includes: DODDS (1957: 223); BROCK (2000: 30); MITCHELL-BOYASK (2008) especially on the valence of words for sickness (e.g., *nosos* and *loimos*) in Athenian tragedy.

²⁸ Medical language and imagery is used elsewhere in the corpus of Demosthenes' speeches in: *Second Olynthiac* (speech 2), *Third Olynthiac* (speech 3), *Third Philippic* (speech 9), *Fourth Philippic* (speech 10) and *Against Aristogeiton I* (speech 25), but without the enforcing power of imperatives. In 25.80, for example, Demosthenes uses two medical terms to refer to his opponent, Aristogeiton: ὁ φαρμακός, ὁ λοιμός "this poisoner, this public pest", using the optative to say that people would ban him rather than accost him. I prefer the Loeb translation of Demosthenes 25.80 over the translation of MITCHELL-BOYASK (2008: 24) "the scapegoat, the plague"; in my view, the first translation makes better sense of the text and the context of Demosthenes' speech. Demosthenes' phrasing in 25.80 also reminds us of Lysias 6.53: καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι καὶ φαρμακὸν ἀποπέμπειν καὶ ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι, ὡς ἓν τούτων οὗτός ἐστι "you are dispatching a foul scapegoat, you are getting rid of a reprobate," where imperatives are also not in use. On Demosthenes' use of medical language: MADER (2018: 183-193).

²⁹ BREMMER (1983: 299-320).

³⁰ PARKER (1983: 225-230).

³¹ SICKING (1991: 156). On the use of aorist stem imperatives: BAKKER (1966: 44); FANNING (1990); RIJKSBARON (2006: 45); LAMERS and RADEMAKER (2007: 462); CAMPBELL (2008: 81).

³² SERAFIM (2017: 4), talking about a performance-oriented approach to forensic oratory, which is as difficult as the persuasive-oriented approach, argues that what is achievable is "to shed light on what the strategies *would have done* or *have aimed to do* [emphasis is mine] in the minds and emotions of the audience and how this interaction *might have affected* [emphasis is mine] the audience's reaction in the law-court."

[33] The manifest lack of unshakeable proofs makes Demosthenes' set of accusations against Aeschines "a tissue of lies and distortions", ELLIS (1976: 152) notes.

[34] MEDEIROS (2013: 23).

[35] WOOTEN (2013: 353-369).

[36] The extensive use of questions is a notable feature of style in Isaeus' speeches, such as in 8.28 and 7.40 where seven and six questions respectively are used. Extensive use of questions is also attested in Hypereides, *Against Diondas*, esp. in 137v-136r, and in Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates* 77-8, where eight questions are used as a means of denouncing Leocrates.

[37] Translation: ROBERTS (1902: 195).

[38] The legal punishment for impiety worked as a means of appeasing the gods and eliciting their continuing *eunoia*, "goodwill". The Athenians had to expiate the impiety committed by their fellows, in order to prevent the gods' revenge. Famously, the death penalty was levelled against Socrates (cf. Arist. *Ath.* 60.2; And. 68, 74), or lifelong exile with confiscation of property (cf. Lys. 25, 41). Impiety had its own legal process: the *graphē asebeias*. One of the most threatening forms of impiety was *hierosylia*, the theft of sacred property, which was punished severely. For more information about *graphē asebeias* and the legal punishment of impiety: TODD (1993: 307-312).

[39] TAJFEL and TURNER (1979). Also: MILLER *et al.* (1981: 494–511); CONOVER (1984: 760–785); LAU (1989: 220–223); CAREY (1990: 49); HUDDY (2003: 511–558); HALL (2006: 388).

[40] This is an accusation that Aeschines himself also levels against Demosthenes (as in 2.11, 43, 49, 98, 153, 156, 175). On the demonization of the sophist and logographer: HESK (1999: 201-230); HARRIS (2008: 156).

[41] CARAWAN (1980: 105-106); PEARSON (1981: 123); WOOTEN (2008: 14).

[42] RUBINSTEIN (2004: 187-203); (2005: 129-145).