

REVIEWS

James J. Murphy, ed., *Demosthenes' On the Crown: Rhetorical Perspectives*, Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 2016. 232 pp. ISBN: 9780809335107

This book has a curious history. First published in 1967 by Random House under the title, *Demosthenes' On the Crown: A Critical Case Study of a Masterpiece of Ancient Oratory*, the exact same work was then republished in 1983 under the same name by Hermagoras Press. The current volume is a "revised version" of the 1983 publication; the 1967 publication is not acknowledged but is mentioned by one author (201, n. 30).

The revision consists of a new Introduction by Murphy, five new chapters (out of eight), and a new half-page epilogue by Murphy. The three retained chapters (from the 1967 publication) are chapter two, a brief summary of Aeschines' career followed by a summary of his speech *Against Ctesiphon* by Donovan Ochs; chapter three, a translation of *On the Crown* (OTC) by John J. Keaney; and chapter four, a brief structural abstract of OTC by Francis Donnelly, first published in 1941. The five new chapters are chapter one, a background chapter on Demosthenes and his times by Lois Agnew, chapters on Aristotle's three main rhetorical divisions – including chapter five on *ethos* by David Mirhady, chapter six on *pathos* by Richard Katula, and chapter seven on *logos* by Jeffrey Walker – and an eighth chapter on *lexis* by Richard Enos.

The goal of the volume, according to the introduction is to make OTC "come alive"; in more modest terms, the book seems to be aiming to provide everything a student unacquainted with the speech might need to appreciate Demosthenes's rhetorical ability and, for more advanced students and scholars, to demonstrate how the principles of Aristotle's *Rhetoric* can help appreciate the greatness of OTC. In my view, several chapters succeed quite well in accomplishing this latter goal, while several are less successful.

In chapter one, "Demosthenes and his Times," Agnew gives a thorough account of Demosthenes's life and career; she is particularly good at sorting out facts from legends, and she produces a more balanced assessment than the many pro-Demosthenes accounts. I note only two minor mistakes. On page 25, the three charges Aeschines brought against Ctesiphon's decree are misstated; the first (not having completed his term in office) is

stated twice (in slightly different forms) and the second (presenting the crown in the theater) is omitted (the correct charges are on 38, 153). And in the Harpalus affair Demosthenes was not tried in the Areopagus but by a popular jury (see 29).

Chapters two and three are adequate, though barely so. Ochs's account of Aeschines's career is highly oversimplified, especially after Agnew's more complex treatment, and his summary of the speech is based on the 1928 Budé edition; a few more recent studies could have been noted (especially Harris), which are in fact in the bibliography. I cannot see any use for Donnelley's structural abstract, chapter four, which I just find confusing.

In chapter five, Mirhady uses Aristotle's view of *ethos* to understand Demosthenes's sustained and generally successful attempt to portray himself as a good democratic citizen, better than his rival Aeschines. Mirhady is a bit dismayed, however, by the (also successful) use of vitriolic rhetoric to portray Aeschines as a piece of scum. In his final thought, Mirhady cautions that this "sustained invective should give readers today some uneasiness about the tendency of democracies to fall under the sway of negative discourse" (126). Mirhady's concern must be even greater now than it was when his chapter was written.

Katula's assignment, chapter six, is *pathos*. Using Aristotle's theory, he shows how Demosthenes plays on the emotions of the jurors, whom he portrays as old men unacquainted with the law. This almost certainly exaggerates the ignorance of the Athenian jury, but it accords with the traditional view of the jury going back at least to Quintilian (who is cited in support). This view has been largely abandoned, but Katula needs it in order to support his claim that *pathos* is superior to *logos* in *OTC*, a claim I don't think is sustainable.

A more accurate view, that *OTC* succeeds because it balances *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos* fairly evenly, is presented by Walker in chapter seven. His assignment is *logos*, which he conceives as explaining the *deinotes* (something like "awesome force") of *OTC*, whose exceptional power comes from both style and thought. Walker writes of himself in the third person as "the Sophist," an indication that he will take "less of an Aristotelian approach and more of a sophistic one" in analyzing *OTC* (152). He also recognizes that he cannot discuss *logos* without also discussing *pathos* and *ethos*. He begins with the interesting and provocative proposals that the *stasis* of *OTC* is *paragraphikon* "objection" (also *metastasis*, *exemptio*), and Demosthenes's method is *exetasis* "examination." These proposals lead him to a section-by-section discussion of the speech, in which he shows how Demosthenes continually promotes an identity between himself and the Athenian people, so that ultimately the verdict about Demosthenes also becomes a verdict about the Athenians themselves. In *OTC* 18-59, Demosthenes establishes his basic argument before addressing the actual indictment, and then continues to build on it, so that everything in the speech builds to the climax in 206-8: "Aeschines . . . hungers to deprive me of this [crown] and is robbing you of the praise you deserve . . . But it is not true, men of Athens! It is not true . . ."

The final topic, that of chapter eight, is *lexis*, "style." Enos says very little about traditional features of style (e.g., *pleonasm*, prose rhythm), but discusses instead Demosthenes's "stylistic strategy," which consists primarily of what he calls "chiastic contrasting" (191). More than to *chiasmus*, this seems connected to *antithesis*, that is, the "polar" or "diametrical" opposition between Aeschines and himself. Enos concludes that like Lincoln, Churchill, and King, Demosthenes raised political oratory to a literary art and created a speech perfectly fitted for the political and rhetorical moment.

The book could have used some good copy-editing and proof-reading; in particular, the bibliography is not easy to use. It consists of four sections; texts and translation of Demosthenes, translations and studies of Aeschines, studies of Demosthenes, and general studies. The first section is especially difficult: almost all works are under Demosthenes as author, followed by the title, so that if one is looking for X's translation, one needs to remember its exact title (some of the Texas series have the title *Demosthenes: Speeches . . .*, whereas others are just *Speeches . . .*). Dilts's *OCT* is listed as a translation, as are several commentaries (e.g., Wankel's). One author is "Harris Edward Monroe." Etc.

In sum, this book has much of value, especially Walker's chapter. But starting from scratch rather than revising a fifty year old publication might have improved its value.

MICHAEL GAGARIN
The University of Texas

Vasiliki Zali. *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric: A Study of the Speeches in Herodotus' Histories with Special Attention to Books 5-9*. International Studies in the History of Rhetoric 6. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2015. VIII + 383 pp. ISBN: 9789004278967

This is a well-researched, detailed, and well-presented literary analysis of the *Histories* of Herodotus that substantiates the author's claim that the *Histories* is an under-appreciated contributor to the development of rhetoric in the 5th century. As Zali explains, the intent of the work is "to show that in the *Histories* there is great interest in the rhetorical situation *per se*; that speakers are very well aware of the process of manipulating and adapting their arguments to suit the particular audience, and they do so systematically" (3). In this way, Herodotus can be understood as anticipating the rhetorical developments of Thucydides and the more theoretically oriented works of both Aristotle and the author of the *Rhetoric to Alexander*. *The Shape of Herodotean Rhetoric* is characterized by the use of specific textual examples to illustrate claims about how the text operates. It also provides an impressive mixture of contextual information that is historical, political, and cultural in scope. These elements are trained on the larger