

**Envoys and Eloquence:
A Study on Hellenistic Diplomatic Oratory**

William Coles



**A Thesis Submitted to the University of London
in Fulfilment for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy**

I, William Coles, declare that the work presented in this thesis is my own.
Where information has been derived from other sources, I confirm that this
has been clearly indicated.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'W. Coles', with a horizontal line extending to the right.

12 November 2022

Abstract

This thesis examines the representation of ambassadorial oratory in Polybios' Histories and in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries. In doing so, it highlights the marked similarity between the historiographical evidence and the epigraphic evidence for speeches performed by envoys during interstate interactions between Greek communities, as well as interactions between Greek communities and Romans. Polybios' Histories and the inscriptions of the third and second centuries facilitate the exploration of this type of oratory since neither rhetorical treatises nor speeches composed for actual delivery have survived from this period. Thus, the representation of speeches by envoys in Hellenistic historiography, combined with the evidence of contemporary inscriptions, constitute our most important evidence for oratory in the Hellenistic Period. This thesis contributes to existing scholarship by taking an in-depth analysis and comparison of both historiographical and epigraphic evidence for ambassadorial oratory, building on previous studies which have looked at both media individually and have begun to scratch the surface when comparing them both. After addressing several important methodological considerations, this thesis opens with a case study on the rhetoric of renewal in diplomatic oratory, as represented in historiography and the inscriptions, demonstrating how both sources of evidence suggest important changes in the rhetorical strategies of Greek envoys in the third and second centuries. I then move to a deeper rhetorical analysis of the speeches in historiography and argue that the representation of envoys' speeches in Polybios and Xenophon is much more personalised and multifaceted compared with those in Thucydides. I then analyse the epigraphic evidence and argue that many of the rhetorical strategies and changes in the representation of ambassadorial oratory in historiography are also present in the epigraphic evidence, including the greater personalisation of the speaker, the representation of the corporate voice of the state, and the oratorical projection of both local and regional identities.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	6
Introduction.....	8
1. Scholarship to Date.....	9
a. Greek interstate relations	9
b. Diplomatic oratory	14
2. Diplomatic Oratory and the Ancient Sources.....	17
a. Published speeches	19
b. Historiography	23
c. Inscriptions	31
3. Partitio	38
Chapter 1: The Rhetoric of Renewal	40
1. Renewal and its meaning.....	40
a. τὰ φιλόθρωπα	41
b. Alliances and Friendships	44
c. Kinship	48
2. Renewal in Hellenistic Historiography and Inscriptions.....	50
3. The Classical Precedent of Renewal: Isokrates, Demosthenes, and Thucydides	59
4. Summary: changes in practice and/or representation?	70
Chapter 2: Envoys and Ethos	73
1. Envoys as Characters in Polybios.....	81
a. Agelaos of Naupaktos	82
b. Chlaineas and Lykiskos.....	84
c. A Fragmentary Speech	92
d. Thrasykrates of Rhodes.....	93
e. Alexander of Isos.....	98
f. Kallikrates	101
g. Astymedes of Rhodes.....	105
h. Leon of Athens	107
i. The Rhodians at Rome	110
j. Envoy's speeches in <i>oratio obliqua</i>	114
k. The use and abuse of <i>ethē</i> : third-party diplomacy and composite teams	123
2. Summary	133
3. Envoys and <i>ethos</i> in Classical Historiography	134
a. Thucydides	134
b. Xenophon.....	142

4. A Question of Historiographical Trends?	148
5. Conclusion	154
Chapter 3. Rhetorical Self-Representation on Stone	156
1. Polis and Personal Authorities	157
a. The inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries	157
b. The Hellenistic inscriptions	165
c. An issue of accountability – envoys as lobbyists?	181
2. Localised <i>ethopoia</i>	186
a. The Aitolian League	187
b. The Rhodians	201
3. Speaking on behalf of the <i>polis</i> and/or <i>koinon</i>	209
a. Kytenion and the Importance of Being Aitolian	211
b. Akraiphia and the Boiotian League	218
4. Speaking on behalf of a faction	227
5. Conclusion	236
Conclusion	239
Bibliography	247

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank my primary supervisor, Professor Lene Rubinstein. Her guidance, advice, and mentorship has been invaluable, and this undertaking would not have been possible without her. I would also like to thank my secondary supervisor, Dr Christos Kremmydas, for his input on this thesis and encouragement, as well as my advisor Professor Richard Alston, who has always been happy to make himself available. I must also thank Margaret Scrivner and Sue Turnbull for their exemplary administrative support.

I would like to thank my sponsor, the Technē Arts & Humanities Research Council Doctoral Training Partnership, for their financial support and raining, as well as for the support during Spring 2020. I would also like to thank the Hellenic Institute at Royal Holloway, University of London, for giving me additional support. I would like to give thanks to fellow library staff at the Institute of Classical Studies where most of this thesis was written, namely Joanna Ashe, Paul Jackson, Sue Willetts, Christopher Ashill, and Dr Rosario Rovira Guardiola. I would also like to thank Professor Paola Ceccarelli, Dr Lisa Irene Hau, and Professor Giuseppe Zecchini for sending me copies of their work that I was unable to access.

Undertaking a PhD is a painful process but being a member of a thriving postgraduate community had made it a more somewhat comfortable endeavour. From the Classics Department at Royal Holloway, I extend my thanks to Dr Timothy Brady, Dr Matthew Ward, Dr Giulia Maltagliati, Dr Hannah Baldwin, Dr Pietro Morlacchi, and Dr Dies van der Linde. From elsewhere at Royal Holloway, I thank Dr David Preston, Ronan O'Reilly, Dr Emilio Costales, and Dilara Scholz. From across the rest of the University of London, the 'PGWiP crew', I thank Dr Beatrice Pestarino, Dr Francesca Modini, Dr Francesca Bologna, Katherine Shields, Barbara Roberts, Dr Valentina Barille, Giuseppe Ficocelli, Dr Cristiana Lucidi, Dr Karl Dahm, Dr Anna Lucia Furlan, Dr

Ted Szadzinski, Dr Sara de Martin, Dr Kelly Tzortzopoulou, Dr Orestis Mitintzis, and Dr Martina Russo. The number of people with doctorates here is an embarrassing reflection of my tardiness.

I would like to dedicate this thesis to my family. To my parents, Angela and Daniel Coles, for their continued support over my years as a student, as well as to my grandparents Alan and Winsome Coles. I would also like to thank Linda Grove and her late husband Malcolm of Belsize Lane, NW3, for opening their home to me for two years. This thesis is also dedicated to Malcolm's memory.

Camden Town, NW1

2022

Introduction

This thesis concerns ambassadorial oratory in antiquity and analyses the rhetorical strategies used by envoys to non-domestic audiences. This study predominantly discusses the Hellenistic Period and whether the representation of ambassadorial oratory found in the speeches reported within the *Histories* of Polybios of Megalopolis attempt to represent oratory as it was practiced in the Hellenistic Period, or whether they are the product of a generic convention established by earlier historiographers, namely Thucydides and Xenophon. This thesis also addresses the question how the hundreds of Hellenistic inscriptions containing summaries of ambassadors' oratory contribute to our knowledge of envoys' speeches in the third and second centuries, and how far these summaries complement or contradict the evidence of Polybios.¹

The third and second centuries are generally seen as a somewhat of a dark age in the history of rhetoric since no published speeches or rhetorical handbooks survive in full. Yet for ambassadorial oratory in the fifth and fourth centuries we are reliant on the works of Herodotos, Thucydides, and Xenophon, since the epigraphic material from this period does not generally contain summaries of what envoys said or what they had been instructed to say.² But the *Histories* of Polybios and the hundreds of inscriptions from the third and second centuries, many of which contain summaries of what envoys or groups of envoys said, provide an ample evidence base on which we can conduct a rhetorical analysis. In using Polybios and the inscriptions of the third and second centuries as its foundation, this thesis will focus on the rhetorical

¹ All dates are BCE unless stated otherwise. I have opted for the Hellenised spelling of Greek names with the exception of names such as Thoukudides and Ploutarchos, for whom I have used Thucydides and Plutarch respectively, since the Hellenised spelling is somewhat outlandish.

² We also have the false embassy speeches of Aischines and Demosthenes, which contain summaries of what was said on embassies to the Peloponnese, Philip II, and Delphoi (Aeschin. 2.25-33, 109-117; 3.119-22; Dem. 19.9-178). It must be stressed that these are summaries given as part of a law court speech, and not transcripts of the actual speeches they delivered.

strategies within the ambassadorial speeches contained within these corpora of evidence. In doing so, it offers new insights into the sorts of rhetorical strategies envoys used during their oral performances, and addresses whether the representation of ambassadorial oratory in Polybios is an accurate reflection of how this type of speech was practiced.

1. Scholarship to Date

a. Greek interstate relations

It cannot be emphasised enough that interstate relations and embassies are a fundamental aspect of Greek history, and the earliest modern studies on the subject were published at the end of the 19th century by German scholars. Heyse published *De Legationibus Atticis* in 1882 and in 1885 Poland published his Leipzig doctoral thesis *De Legationibus Graecorum Publicis*, both of which discuss the diplomatic process before 338, namely the selection, size, and objectives of embassies.³ Following the First World War, scholars began to forge the link between the study of Ancient History and the relatively new field of International Relations, with figures such as Alfred Zimmern exemplifying this trend.⁴

During the 1970s scholarship on Greek diplomacy flourished, with several cornerstone books published on the subject. The first of these was Mosley's *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, which was published in 1973. Mosley's work focusses predominantly on Athens and Sparta during the fifth and fourth centuries and is thematic in nature, discussing such subjects as the selection of envoys, the instructions of envoys, as well as the composition of ambassadorial teams. Indeed, the size and composition of

³ Poland (1885) 32 is one of the earliest to mention how the size of delegations often reflected the gravity of the mission.

⁴ As discussed by Low (2007) 7-32.

embassies was something that had been of interest to Mosley in the years prior to this monograph.⁵ While the role that oratory played in diplomacy is not the main subject of Mosley's work, he makes several key observations on the instructions of envoys, the grounds on which individuals were selected as envoys, and the phenomenon of joint embassies, all of which have an impact on ambassadorial oratory, but Mosley does not elaborate on these considerations.⁶

The second key monograph on this topic is Adcock's *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, which was published posthumously in 1975 after Mosely took on the task of finishing it following Adcock's sudden death. The book falls into two parts; the first part by Adcock is chronological and narrates key diplomatic episodes and practices from the Bronze Age down to 146.⁷ The second half of the volume, written by Mosley, is more thematic in nature. While a lot of what Mosley discusses crosses over with his earlier monograph, he provides some discussion on the role of envoys generally but he does not dwell on the importance of oratory and rhetoric in any great detail.⁸ He does, however, observe that the "personality and disposition" of an envoy could be of huge importance and that this was often based on their personal interests in other states.⁹ This is a hugely important point, yet Mosley does not discuss how this is reflected in the representation of individual speakers in the diplomatic oratory that we have for the period, and he instead simply cites some examples of envoys who had personal connections in other *poleis*.

Mosley continued to be a hugely influential figure in the study of Greek diplomacy. In fact, when a German volume of papers was published in 1979 titled *Antike Diplomatie*, edited by Olshausen and Biller, eight out of the 10 papers dedicated to diplomacy in the fifth and fourth centuries were written

⁵ Mosley (1965) *passim*.

⁶ Mosley (1973) 21-9; 43-67.

⁷ Adcock (1975) 9-120.

⁸ *Ibid* 154-60.

⁹ *Ibid* 156-9.

by Mosley. The volume also included three papers on diplomacy in the third and second centuries, yet two of these contributions were concerned with diplomacy between monarchs.¹⁰ This is arguably typical of scholarship on Hellenistic interstate relations prior to the late 1980s, since before then the scholarly consensus was that the Greek *polis* had died along with Alexander in 323 and that interstate relations lived on through interactions between Greek city states and larger hegemonic powers, usually federal states and monarchs.¹¹ But a paradigm shift came about with the work of scholars such as Gauthier, Giovanni, and Habicht, who argued that the independent city state continued to play an important role in the Greek world into the third and second centuries.¹²

Lynette Mitchell's 1997 monograph based on her 1994 Durham PhD thesis, *Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World 435-323 BC*, also made some ground-breaking observations on the nature of envoys and Greek diplomacy. The work looks at the importance of personal relationships in Greek political life, with significant attention given to the role of friendship (*philia*) between citizens in different states and how this impacted interstate relations. Mitchell argued, contra to the established position of Gabriel Herman, that the use of interpersonal relationships in Greek diplomacy was not limited to the aristocracy and that the Athenian *demos* was often happy to utilise them.¹³ One of her most important observations in the context of the present thesis is how both the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians sometimes selected citizens as envoys on the grounds that they had some sort of personal connection with the state to which they were being sent, with the evidence suggesting that the Lakedaimonians

¹⁰ Mooren (1977) *passim* and Olshausen (1977) *passim*.

¹¹ For this view, see Larsen (1935) *passim*; Jones (1940) 157-70; Tarn (1952) 63-70; Ehrenberg (1960) 135-40; de Ste. Croix (1981) 300-26.

¹² The key works by these scholars in relation to this paradigm shift are Giovanni (1993) 268-70; Gauthier (1985) 129-75; (1993) *passim*; Habicht (1995) 87-92; (1995a) 13.

¹³ Mitchell (1997) 41-72. *Contra* Herman (1987) 150-6.

practised this much more than the Athenians, with approximately one third of their envoys having some sort of personal connection to their host community.¹⁴ This thesis builds on Mitchell's work by looking at how these relationships could be utilised within the speeches that were performed during interstate interactions, taking a rhetorical approach instead of a sociological one. This research also builds further on Mitchell's work by focussing on diplomatic interactions from the third and second centuries, the period after which her work is concerned with. It is also worth including the work of Olivier Curty here, especially his 1995 work *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*, which collected 135 inscriptions detailing links of kinships (*sungeneia*) between Greek communities from the fourth century to the fourth century CE. Curty demonstrated the widespread use of localised traditions and genealogies, and this thesis builds on his work by examining some of these traditions as pieces of rhetoric and how they could be used and abused depending on the rhetorical situation (*kairos*) at the time of the diplomatic encounter.¹⁵

The role of individual relationships in interstate relations was further developed ten years later in 2007, with the publication of Polly Low's *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece: Morality and Power*, based on her 2002 Cambridge PhD thesis. Low's work engages in several key discussions that are central to the themes of this thesis. Firstly, Low argues that Greek interstate relations were often multilateral and did not necessarily operate on a *polis-to-polis* basis, with other connections such as ideology and kinship operating as modes of interaction.¹⁶ Secondly, Low convincingly argues that the boundary between the domestic and international life was quite blurred, as was the boundary between the community and the individual citizen, with

¹⁴ Mitchell (1997) 75-9; 90-5.

¹⁵ For the catalogue of texts, see Curty (1995) 3-212. On the localised traditions, see *ibid* 242-58. Building on Curty's work, see Lücke (2000) *passim*. John Ma's article on peer-polity interaction is also relevant here, see Ma (2003) *passim*.

¹⁶ Low (2007) 54-67.

the same cardinal virtues often applied to both in honorary decrees.¹⁷ Finally, Low explores the use of ties such as friendship (*philia*) and kinship (*sungeneia*), arguing that these connections coexisted and could be exploited in diplomacy depending on the geopolitical situation.¹⁸ Low's observations here act as evidence to support her wider claim that Greek diplomatic relations were based on reciprocity, although she stresses it was not a formalised model in the sense that one finds in modern International Relations. This thesis takes a different approach to Low and builds on her work further. While Low uses the Attic orators and speeches from historiography in her work, her interest is mainly historical and uses international relations theory, whereas this thesis focusses on the speeches that were made in interstate interactions through the prism of rhetorical theory. In addition, this thesis differs from Low's work in dealing predominantly with the evidence of the third and second centuries.

Great Power Diplomacy in the Hellenistic World by John D. Grainger, published by Routledge in 2018, warrants some discussion as a recent contribution to scholarship. Grainger, a military historian, argues that previous scholarship has overlooked the roles of hegemonic powers in Hellenistic diplomacy and that they facilitated a new sort of diplomacy in which relations were centred on hegemonic powers and influential figures within them.¹⁹ While Grainger is somewhat interested in what he labels *logoi*, which he uses to refer to the process of diplomatic negotiations, his interest is primarily historical rather than rhetorical, and he generally focusses on private interactions between monarchs and hegemonies rather than oratory performed before popular assemblies and councils. While he discusses the role of envoys and observes how they ought to be capable speakers, the latter part of his book dedicated to 'diplomacy in action' does not make any rhetorical analysis

¹⁷ *Ibid* 129-74.

¹⁸ Low (2007) 33-68.

¹⁹ Grainger (2018) 18-32.

of the speeches found in historiography, let alone any from the inscriptions, which he seldom utilises in his discussion anyway.²⁰

b. Diplomatic oratory

The scholarly interest in diplomatic oratory can be traced back to the Eastern Roman Empire. In the tenth century, the *Excerpta de Legationibus Romanorum*, which formed part of the anthology known as the *Constantinian Excerpts*, was published after Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII commissioned it.²¹ This text, formed of two anthologies of embassies, is hugely significant since it contains numerous fragments of Polybios and therefore forms the bulk of our evidence for diplomatic oratory as it was represented in Hellenistic historiography.²² It is likely that this anthology of embassies was intended as a resource that could help teach envoys what to say on missions, or as Brennan suggests, what not to say.²³ These two anthologies were also the first of the *Constantine Excerpts* to arrive in the west, with sections published in Fulvio Orsini's 1582 anthology of passages from ancient historiographers. From here editions of the text were published, first by Andreas Darmarius in the sixteenth century CE and then by David Hoeschel in 1602.²⁴

In terms of modern scholarship on diplomatic oratory, Cecil Wooten remains an important figure. In his influential 1973 article, Wooten argued that the envoy's speech was only considered a distinct genre of speech in the Hellenistic Period owing to the need for greater interactions with hegemonic powers following the death of Alexander the Great.²⁵ In addition, using

²⁰ Grainger (2018) 69-72.

²¹ Németh (2018) 193-6.

²² The fragments of Polybios from the *Excerpta*, especially the embassies, are discussed in Walbank (1967) 1-218, (1979) 1-50.

²³ Hunger (1978) 369; Brennan (2009) *passim*.

²⁴ Németh (2018) 195.

²⁵ Wooten (1973) *passim*.

Polybios and rhetorical exercises on papyri as his main sources of evidence, he argued that the oratory of Demosthenes had a substantial impact on ambassadorial oratory in the Hellenistic Period, themes which he covered in more detail in his hitherto unpublished doctoral thesis.²⁶ Since Wooten's scholarly contributions on the topic of diplomatic oratory are almost half a century old, they naturally do not take into account the paradigm shift in the scholarly consensus concerning the status of the independent *polis* after the late fourth century. Despite this, his argument that the envoy's speech was only classified as a genre of rhetorical speech until the Hellenistic Period is still commonly accepted and cited by some scholars.²⁷ This thesis builds on Wooten's work by bringing in the epigraphic evidence as a source for oratory that was performed by envoys, something he does not touch upon even in his 1972 PhD thesis on Hellenistic Oratory and in his subsequent articles.

The late Luigi Piccirilli's 2002 monograph, *L'invenzione della diplomazia nella Grecia Antica*, is worth discussion here. While the first half of the work considers the different terminologies used to denote envoys and their duties, the second half discusses several recurring rhetorical strategies found in diplomatic negotiations. Piccirilli emphasised the importance of appeals to kinship, precedent, the maintenance of freedom and autonomy, arguing that these arguments were an indispensable part of the envoy's rhetorical repertoire.²⁸ Despite this highly important observation, Piccirilli does not engage in any rhetorical analysis here. In addition, Piccirilli dedicates the bulk of his discussion to the evidence for diplomatic oratory during the fifth and fourth centuries, with Thucydides dominating much of his discussion, although he does on occasion engage with later authors such as Diodoros and Plutarch. The literary evidence dominates Piccirilli's discussion, which is not surprising

²⁶ Wooten (1972) 4-49. See also Canevaro (2018) 79-18 on the influence of Demosthenes on Hellenistic oratory.

²⁷ E.g. Erskine (2007) 274-7; Pepe (2013) 329-35; Tober (2018) no.1; Amendola (2019) 89-91.

²⁸ Piccirilli (2002) 79-88; 98-101.

since his main interest is in the fifth and fourth centuries, during which time the epigraphic evidence for envoys' speeches is not elaborate enough to warrant a detailed comparison.

The scholarship of Lene Rubinstein has made considerable headway in bringing discussions on diplomatic rhetoric into the 21st century by examining the evidence for ambassadorial oratory as pieces of rhetoric that are intended to persuade. In her 2013 chapter in the volume *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity & Change*, Rubinstein argues that oral performances were often an indispensable part of an embassy's mission, even when they were tasked with conveying written material, based on the evidence of the inscriptions of the third and second centuries.²⁹ Her chapter in the 2016 volume *La rhétorique du pouvoir: Une exploration de l'art oratoire délibératif grec* explores the use of team-speaking by envoys, focussing on the evidence of historiography. She argues that the evidence of Xenophon suggests that the oral performances delivered by envoys could be a lot more personal in nature, and that the political divides within the community sending out the envoys were reflected in each of the contributions made by the individual ambassadors that formed the ambassadorial team.³⁰ In her scholarship, Rubinstein has scratched the surface on many important questions on ambassadorial oratory by taking a rhetorical approach to the evidence. This work builds on hers through looking at both historiography and epigraphy together and how they collectively contribute to our knowledge of envoys' speeches, as well as the extent to which the inscriptions suggest that Polybios represents oratory as it was practiced in his own day.

In addition, the work of Angelos Chaniotis is hugely important to this thesis. Many of his publications focus on how summaries of speeches in

²⁹ Rubinstein (2013) 167-86. See also Amendola (2019) for similar observations on the contribution of inscriptions, in his case the Magnesians' *asylia* dossier, for speeches performed by envoys.

³⁰ Rubinstein (2016) 93-113.

Hellenistic inscriptions provide a vivid insight into actual oral performances, especially the invocation of emotions by speakers, the use of historical narratives, and the theatricality of the oral performances.³¹ Several of his publications also compare the representation of such speeches in both historiography and the inscriptions.³² This thesis differs from Chaniotis' approach in two important ways. Firstly, this study focusses exclusively on ambassadorial oratory, i.e. speakers addressing non-domestic audiences, rather than on Hellenistic oratory in general. This is important since this thesis focusses on the role of rhetoric performed during interstate interactions, where the considerations for the oratory are likely to be different than during speeches performed before his fellow citizens. Secondly, Chaniotis' approach to the evidence emphasises the commemorative and emotional function of Hellenistic oratory, and while he has scratched the surface on historiography and inscriptions as sources for envoy's speeches, this work addresses questions he has not yet dealt with in detail.³³ Therefore, Chaniotis' work offers a solid foundation from which this thesis can make an original contribution to existing scholarship.

2. Diplomatic Oratory and the Ancient Sources

In his seminal work *Empire and Communications*, Canadian political economist H. A. Innis sought to explore the impact of different media from papyrus to paper on the growth and decline of empires. Concerning the spoken word, Innis writes:

"We are apt to overlook the significance of the spoken word and to forget that it has left little tangible remains. We can sense its importance even in contemporary civilization and we can see its influence in the great literature"

³¹ Chaniotis (2005) *passim* (2009) *passim*, (2009a) *passim*, (2013) *passim*, (2016) *passim*.

³² Chaniotis (2013a) *passim*.

³³ See the *partitio* (section four of this introduction).

of the heroic age of the Teutonic peoples and of Greece and in the effects of its discovery in the sagas of Europe in the late eighteenth century on the literature of the north.”³⁴

Aristotle and the author of the *Rhetoric to Alexander* arguably overlooked the role of rhetoric and oral communication in diplomacy, since neither author offers any advice to orators wishing to address an audience comprising citizens from another *polis*. This is extraordinary, since not only was oratory performed in a diplomatic context a integral part of political life in antiquity, but also we know that both authors would have been exposed to this type of speech.³⁵ For modern scholars of classical rhetoric, we have no choice but to overlook the spoken word. This reflects a harsh truth all classical rhetoricians face, that by their very oral nature, speeches are doomed to extinction in a time before the invention of the recorded sound, let alone the invention of capturing still or moving images.³⁶ I think Schwarze and Walther put it best in their work on speechwriting for ministries in modern Germany, by describing a speech as a “play that is only performed once”.³⁷ In the absence of audio and visual records, we are at the mercy of the written accounts of the oratory that was performed by envoys during diplomatic exchanges. But these written accounts take several forms and each of them have their own unique features and problems, so it is worth discussing each of them in turn.

³⁴ Innis (1950) 8.

³⁵ This is even more significant if one believes Trevett’s theory that most of the written oratory Aristotle considered in writing the *Rhetoric* was in fact speeches in historiography, which is a very prominent type of speech in the genre. See Trevett (1996a) *passim*.

³⁶ Chaniotis (2016) 129-30.

³⁷ Schwarze and Walther (2002) 45.

a. Published speeches

In the modern world, we take it for granted that the text of speeches given by government officials, including ambassadors, are made available online after they have been delivered. In antiquity the decision whether to publish and circulate the text of a speech was the choice of the speaker. Despite the level of diplomatic activity that took place in Greek history, no envoys' speeches have survived in published form from the Classical or Hellenistic periods, unlike speeches performed before a law court or an assembly. Despite our dearth of evidence, we know that diplomatic speeches were published and circulated in antiquity. This is suggested by the titles of some lost envoys' speeches that survive to us in fragments, and there are several indications in the Attic orators and historiographical accounts to suggest that speeches delivered by envoys to non-domestic audiences were written down, published, and circulated.

The titles of several speeches survive as fragments that are titled using the name of a community in an adjectival form ending *-kos*. Demetrios of Phaleron is credited with a text called the *Chalkidikos* (Diog. Laërt. 5.80-1), and although it is not possible to determine whether it was a symbouleutic speech concerning the affairs of Chalkis performed to the Athenians, or whether it was delivered to the people of Chalkis, there are several other titles of lost speeches formed in this way that scholars are certain were performed by envoys to non-domestic audiences.³⁸ A speech delivered in c. 343 by Hypereides to the Amphyctionic Council in opposition to Philip II's attempts to return the temple of Apollo to the Delians is titled the *Deliakos* (Hyp. F A.1). On an earlier diplomatic mission, Hypereides was one of a number of envoys to address the Rhodians in 341 to secure the island as an ally against Philip II and the speech that he delivered, as we learn from Plutarch, was titled the

³⁸ On Demetrios of Phaleron's rhetorical and general literary output, see Gottschalk (2000) 373-7; O'Sullivan (2009) 226-40.

Rhodiakos (Hyp F A.5 = Plut. *Hyp.* 850a). There are also other lost speeches whose title is extant and formed similarly; a lost speech of Deinarchos was titled the *Tyrrenikos* (Müller, *Din.* F 12) and Aischines delivered a speech also called the *Deliakos* (Müller, *Aeschin.* F 1). Aristotle refers to a speech by Alkidamas called the *Messeniakos* on two occasions, which is extraordinary considering that he does not specify under which of his genres the envoys' speech should fall, let alone offer any advice for speakers addressing a non-domestic audience (Arist. *Rh.* 1373b.18ff; 1397a.11-2).³⁹

There is also some evidence in the Classical Period of logographers writing speeches for foreign envoys that were intended to be delivered to the Athenians. As well as writing *On the Murder of Heroides* for private client who was not a resident of Athens, Antiphon also wrote at least two speeches for envoys who were on a mission to Athens and these speeches were addressed to the council or the assembly. The titles of two speeches survive in the work of the grammarian Harpokration, *On the Tribute of Lindos* and *On the Tribute of Samonthrake*, (Fr. 9; 15 [Müller]), which suggests that these speeches existed in some sort of written form until at least the second century CE. Thucydides remarks that Antiphon was treated with a degree of scepticism due to his cleverness (*deinotes*) and that individuals who wished to speak in the assembly or the law court would often approach him for counsel (Thuc. 8.68.1).⁴⁰ Hypereides is credited with a number of speeches that he wrote for ambassadors but also others that he delivered himself on behalf of the Athenians to other *poleis* (Fr. 12; 23; 25; 28; 43; 48; 62 [Sauppe]; *P.Oxy* 3360).

As well as composing speeches for private clients, sophists such as Antiphon were also known to serve as envoys on account of their skills in oratory; Gorgias acted as an ambassador for his native Leontinoi in 427 and delivered an impressive speech before the council (Pl. *Hp. Mai.* 282b; Diod. *Sic.*

³⁹ On Alkidamas and the *Messeniakos*, see Avezzi (1981) 82-3; Mariß (2002) 20-1; Grandjean (2003) 65-6.

⁴⁰ Although it is likely that Thucydides is exaggerating here, see Hornblower (2008) 954-6.

12.53; Dion. Hal. *Lys.* 3), Hippias of Elis boasts that his home *polis* always calls on him to act as an ambassador (Pl. Hp. *Mai.* 281a-b; Philostr. *V S* 1.11.5), and Prodikos once delivered a speech to the council on behalf of his native Keios (Pl. Hp. *Mai.* 282c; Philostr. *V S* 1.12).⁴¹ A fragment of a speech by Thrasymachos has survived in Dionysios' essay on Demosthenes (Dion. Hal. *Dem.* 3). While the context of the speech is not known, White has suggested that it was an ambassadorial speech delivered by Thrasymachos to the Athenians on behalf of his native Chalkedon as part of a settlement following their rebellion.⁴² However, Thrasymachos is only one example and the speeches that these sophists delivered have not survived in any written form. It is not known whether sophists published and circulated speeches that they performed while serving as envoys, but I would not rule out this as a possibility since model speeches would have been an important aspect in the teaching of rhetoric, which these individuals also widely engaged in.⁴³

Since no published ambassadorial speeches survive, there is a temptation to conclude that this type of speech was seen as being of less importance than speeches performed before a law court or the local assembly. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that envoys' speeches were published and circulated more frequently than symbouleutic speeches in the late-fifth and early-fourth centuries, although this is still a controversial topic.⁴⁴ There are two primary reasons why ambassadorial speeches may have been published and circulated. Firstly, oral performances on diplomatic missions often required a lesser degree of improvisation than public speeches delivered during a debate in an assembly because an embassy had a specific mission and

⁴¹ I accept the unitarian view of Antiphon, see Gargarin (2002) 37-52. For the diplomatic activity of Hippias, see Brunschwig (1984); Dušanić (2008) 47.

⁴² White (1995); *contra* Fuks (1953) 102-6; Ostwald (1986) 367 n.120.

⁴³ On the role of published speeches in rhetorical education, especially in imitation, see Wooten (1972) 79-108; Morgan (1998) 94-100; Kremmydas (2013) 156-9.

⁴⁴ On the publication of symbouleutic oratory, see Canfora (1974) 74; Hansen (1984) *passim*; Worthington (1991b) 425ff; Sealey (1993) 229ff; Trevett (1996b) *passim*; MacDowell (2009) 7-9; Vatri (2017) 72-99.

often required a degree of stage management, especially when the mission involved a team of ambassadors.⁴⁵ The second reason is that the instructions of envoys were often prescribed by their home community in a decree and/or letter that the envoys took with them, and very often these instructions are summarised in the decree of the host community concerning the outcome of the envoys' mission.⁴⁶ For instance, in a fragmentary decree honouring one Pantainos of Iasos, the envoy's brief is prescribed in detail (*I.Iasos* 151 14-25):

[ἐ]λέσθαι δὲ καὶ πρεσβευτὴν ἤδη τὸν ἐπι|[τ]ηδειότατον πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἰασέω[ν], | ὃς ἀφικόμενος εἰς Ἰασὸν καὶ ἐπελθὼν ἐπὶ | [τε τὴν βουλ]ῆν καὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τό τε ψή|[φ]ισμα ἀναδ]ώσει καὶ ἐμφανιεῖ τὰ ἐψηφισμέ|[να περὶ Παν]ταίνου καὶ παρακαλεῖ Ἰασεῖς | [—]ς ἐπιμέλειαν ποιήσασθαι | [ὅπως ἂν ὁ στέ]φανος ἀναγορευθῆι ἐν | [Διονυσίοι]ς ὧι ἐστεφάνωται Πάνταινο[ς] | [καὶ τόπο]ς ὡς ἐπιφανέστατος ἀποδει|[χθῆι ἐν] ὧι τὸ ψήφισμα ἀναγραφῆσεται|[ι] | [τὸ γρα]φὲν ὑπὲρ Πανταίνου·

(That it should also be decided) by this time to choose a most suitable ambassador in respect to the people of Iasos, who having arrived at Iasos and appeared before the council and the assembly will hand over the decree and demonstrate what has been voted concerning Pantainos and he will call on the Iasians to give attention in such a way as a victor would speak at the Dionysia at which Pantainos would be crowned and considered as distinguished a place as the one in which the decree will display the inscription concerning Pantainos.

Envoys were expected to adhere to their brief and could be held to account for their actions through an examination of their conduct (*euthynai*) upon their return, and it was through this procedure that Demosthenes famously prosecuted Aischines for misconduct on an embassy (*parapresbeia*).⁴⁷ In the inscription quoted above, there is only one envoy, which means that there was

⁴⁵ As Edwards (1995) 105; Trevett (1996b) 434 have argued, symbouleutic speeches required a degree of improvisation due to the need to respond to certain points made by opposing speakers, and to avoid the stigma of being perceived as a sophist by using a written speech.

⁴⁶ See Rubinstein (2013) 167-75 for discussion and further examples.

⁴⁷ Mosley (1973) 39-42; MacDowell (1978) 170-2; Hansen (1991) 222-4. For the case of Aischines and Demosthenes see MacDowell (2000) 1-30; (2009) 333-43.

nobody else from his *polis* who could ensure that he stuck to his brief and act as a witness should any accusations of misconduct be brought forward. The emphasis on accountability and transparency in Greek interstate relations might also be a reason for the publication of envoys' speeches. In his defence speech against Demosthenes' accusations, Aeschines reports that during an embassy to Philip both the court and the other ambassadors were expecting Demosthenes to deliver an impressive speech, however he failed because he had forgotten what he had written (Aeschin. 2.35).⁴⁸ As accusations of bribery and treason were a risk during politically tense missions, we cannot rule out that envoys may have kept a written copy of their speech to refute any accusations of misconduct and to set the record straight.⁴⁹

Despite the lack of discussion of envoys' speeches in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* and Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, the evidence indicates that they were an important type of speech. The publication and circulation of envoys' speeches that were written by professional logographers and/or performed by sophists suggests that rhetoricians were already thinking about the strategies required to address non-domestic audiences even during the early development of rhetoric as a discipline.⁵⁰

b. Historiography

The most detailed evidence for envoys' speeches comes from historiographical texts.⁵¹ A significant portion of the speeches in historiography are performed by envoys and we find representations of such oral performances as early as

⁴⁸ Aeschin. 2.35: ὁ δ' ὡς ἅπαξ ἐταράχθη καὶ τῶν γεγραμμένων διεσφάλῃ, οὐδ' ἀναλαβεῖν αὐτὸν ἐδυνήθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάλιν ἐπιχειρήσας ταύτῳ ἔπαθεν. Emphasised by Hubbard (2008) *passim*.

⁴⁹ Naturally, corrupt ambassadors may not keep a copy of their speech or perhaps published a doctored copy in order to cover up any evidence of their misconduct.

⁵⁰ *Contra* Wooten (1973) *passim*; Kennedy (1994) 81-2; Amendola (2019) *passim*.

⁵¹ On the role of speeches in historiography generally, see Walbank (1965) *passim*; Fornara (1983) 142-168; Sacks (1986) *passim*; Brock (1995) *passim*; Marincola (2007) *passim*.

Herodotos, and they are common in Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybios.⁵² The evidence for ambassadorial oratory within historiography can take one of three forms: in *oratio recta*, *oratio obliqua*, or in a combination of both. Lengthy speeches in *oratio recta* performed by envoys are found in all four of these historiographers, for instance Herodotos reports the speech of the Lakedaimonian envoys to the Athenians, who spoke to dissuade the Athenians from taking the side of Persia following an embassy from Alexander of Makedon who had encouraged them to do so, in this way (Hdt. 8.141-2).⁵³ This method for reporting ambassadors' speeches is especially common in Thucydides, who often reports speeches performed by envoys during assembly meetings. For instance, during the dispute over Korkyra in 433 Thucydides reports the speeches of the Korinthian delegation (Thuc. 1.32-6) as well as the Korkyran delegation (1.37-42) in *oratio recta*.⁵⁴ Later in the same book, Thucydides also reports the speeches of the Korinthians (1.68-71) and the Athenians (1.73-8) during the meeting of the Peloponnesian League at Sparta.⁵⁵ Xenophon also reports speeches in this way. For instance, he reports the speech of the Kleigenes, an Akanthian envoy, to the Lakedaimonians to warn of the growing power of Olympia and to request help (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.11-9). He also reports the speeches of three Athenian envoys, all in *oratio recta*, to the Lakedaimonians in their quest for peace in 371 (6.3.2-19).⁵⁶ Polybios also opts for this way of reporting envoys' speeches, although not to the same extent as the earlier historiographers. For instance, he reports the lengthy speeches of the Aitolian envoy Chlaineas (Polyb. 9.28-31) and Lykiskos (9.32-

⁵² As noted by Wooten (1973) *passim*, although I disagree with him that this is an indication that this type of speech was of less importance in Herodotos' time than in Polybios'.

⁵³ For similar examples, see Hdt. 5.91ff; 7.157-63; 7.172ff; 9.6ff. On this speech, see Bowie (2007) 229-32; Rubinstein (2016) 96-9. Herodotos generally refers to envoys as *aggelloi* rather than *presbeis*, although the term *aggelloi* continues to be used as late as the end fourth century in some cities in Asia Minor, as Magnosto (2021) *passim* has pointed out.

⁵⁴ On this debate, see Morrison (2006) 25-44; Fragoulaki (2013) 82-8.

⁵⁵ For further speeches, see Thuc. 1.120-4; 4.58-65.2; 6.33-4; 6.36-40.

⁵⁶ On these speeches, see Mosley (1961) *passim*; Gray (1989) 123-131; Tuplin (1993) 101-10; Schepens (2001) *passim*; Rubinstein (2016) 93-113.

9) to the Lakedaimonian assembly, with the former arguing that the Lakedaimonians should form an alliance with Aitolia, and the latter arguing that they should form an alliance with Makedon.⁵⁷ The only other instance of an ambassadorial speech wholly reported in *oratio recta* is that of an unknown envoy to the Aitolians, surviving in a lengthy fragment (11.4-6).⁵⁸

Speeches wholly in *oratio obliqua* can also be found in all four historiographers, with the summaries varying in length.⁵⁹ Herodotos occasionally reports summaries of envoys' speeches in this way, such as when he notes how a joint embassy representing numerous Greek *poleis* asked the Korkyrans for assistance against Persia and he gives a short summary of what they argued (Hdt. 7.168).⁶⁰ Other speeches are much shorter, such as when Herodotos reports how a group of envoys from Aigina complained (καταβοᾶν) to the Lakedaimonians about the Athenians, suggesting that the speech might have been forensic in nature (6.85). Thucydides and Xenophon also sometimes give an indication of what the envoys said through their use of *oratio obliqua*.⁶¹ For example, Thucydides reports the speech of the Lakedaimonian envoys who came to Athens to speak against the proposed Athenian and Argive alliance in 420 (Thuc. 5.44.3).⁶² Similarly, Xenophon gives a flavour of the speech performed by the Lakedaimonian envoys who had been sent to Elis during a

⁵⁷ On this pair of speeches, see Usher (2009) 494-502; Chaniotis (2013a) 339-46.

⁵⁸ For discussion, see Walbank (1967) 273-5; Weimer (2001) 49-58.

⁵⁹ On *oratio obliqua* generally, see Bers (1997) 5-9; Usher (2009) *passim*; Scardino (2012) *passim*.

⁶⁰ Hdt. 7.168: καὶ γὰρ τούτους παρελάμβανον οἱ αὐτοὶ οἷ περ ἐς Σικελίην ἀπίκοντο, λέγοντες τοὺς αὐτοὺς λόγους τοὺς καὶ πρὸς Γέλωνα ἔλεγον. οἷ δὲ παραυτίκα μὲν ὑπίσχοντο πέμψειν τε καὶ ἀμυνέειν, φράζοντες ὡς οὐ σφί περιοπτὴ ἐστὶ ἡ Ἑλλάς ἀπολλυμένη· ἦν γὰρ σφαλῆ, σφεῖς γε οὐδὲν ἄλλο ἢ δουλεύσουσι τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν ἡμερέων· ἀλλὰ τιμωρητέον εἶη ἐς τὸ δυνατώτατον. On *oratio obliqua* in Herodotos, see Lateiner (1989) 19-26.

⁶¹ On *oratio obliqua* in Thucydides, see Hornblower (1996) 81-92, (2008) 32-5; Pavlou (2013) *passim*. On the use of *oratio obliqua* in Xenophon, see Buckler and Beck (2008) 140-64.

⁶² Thuc. 5.44.3: ἀφίκοντο δὲ καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων πρέσβεις κατὰ τάχος, δοκοῦντες ἐπιτήδριοι εἶναι τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, Φιλοχαρίδας καὶ Λέων καὶ Ἔνδιος, δείσαντες μὴ τήν τε ξυμμαχίαν ὀργιζόμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργεῖους ποιήσονται, καὶ ἅμα Πύλον ἀπαιτήσοντες ἀντὶ Πανάκτου καὶ περὶ τῆς Βοιωτῶν ξυμμαχίας ἀπολογησόμενοι, ὡς οὐκ ἐπὶ κακῶ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐποιήσαντο. For similar instances, see 2.4.7, 2.72.2, 4.22.1, 4.98, 5.27.2, 5.61.2.

tense interaction in the build-up to the Elean War (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23).⁶³ Polybios also uses these summaries, for instance he reports how the Aitolians sent envoys to Rhodes and Athens in 189 to ask them to send embassies to Rome to appease their anger following strained relations between Rhodes and Rome (Polyb. 22.25.11).⁶⁴ Although brief, these summaries can offer a fascinating insight into the sorts of oratory that envoys engaged in during their missions.

Envoys' speeches reported in a combination of *oratio obliqua* and *recta*, usually starting in the former before moving into the latter, are features of the works of Xenophon and Polybios. For instance, Xenophon reports a number of speeches performed by Lakedaimonian envoys to the Athenian assembly in 370 in *oratio recta*, naming the delegation as Arakos, Okyllos, Pharax, Etymokles, and Olontheus as the speakers, before moving into *oratio recta* although he does not attribute the speech to any one of the members of the delegation (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.33-5). There are several other speeches in his work reported this way, including the speech of Epameinondas to the Mantinean envoys in 362 (7.4.40). As Buckler and Beck observed, Xenophon probably shifts from *oratio obliqua* to *oratio recta* to "add vigour and variety to his narrative".⁶⁵ Similarly, Polybios reports four speeches performed by Greek envoys to the Roman Senate in a combination of *oratio obliqua* and *recta*, these are: Kallikrates on behalf of the Achaian League (24.9.10), Astymedes of Rhodes to the Roman Senate (30.31), the unnamed Rhodian envoys (21.22-3), and Leon of Athens (30.31).⁶⁶ It is interesting that we find this trend in the

⁶³ Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.23: πέμψαντες οὖν πρέσβεις εἰς Ἴηλιν εἶπον ὅτι τοῖς τέλεσι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων δίκαιον δοκοῖη εἶναι ἀφιέναι αὐτοὺς τὰς περιοικίδας πόλεις αὐτονόμους. For further instances of this, see 1.4.1-3; 1.5.1-10; 2.1.1-7; 2.2.2-24; 3.1.1-7; 3.2.12ff; 3.5.3-4; 5.2.8-10; 5.3.14-6; 5.4.60; 6.2.9; 7.1.40.

⁶⁴ Polyb. 21.25.11: ἔδοξεν οὖν αὐτοῖς πρὸς τε Ῥοδίους πέμπειν καὶ πρὸς Ἀθηναίους, ἀξιοῦντας καὶ παρακαλοῦντας πρεσβεῦσαι περὶ αὐτῶν εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ παραιτησαμένους τὴν ὀργὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ποιήσασθαι τινα λύσιν τῶν 11περιστώτων κακῶν τὴν Αἰτωλίαν.

⁶⁵ Buckler and Beck (2008) 148-9. See their table on page 142 of speeches in books six and seven of the *Hellenika*, detailing the use of *oratio obliqua* in Xenophon.

⁶⁶ For discussion of these speeches, see Chapter Two section 1. Generally, see Usher (2009) *passim*.

representation of speeches in both Polybios and Xenophon, since it suggests that Polybios is reporting speeches in keeping with a historiographical tradition, but a tradition that lies in the fourth century. While existing scholarship has traditionally emphasised the relationship between Thucydides and Polybios, the parallels between Xenophon and Polybios here suggest something a little different when it comes to ambassadorial oratory.⁶⁷ It is well established that Xenophon was widely read in the Hellenistic Period and beyond.⁶⁸ This raises the question of where the historiographical conventions that influenced Polybios lie. Scholars such as Scardino have been particularly radical in suggesting that the direct influence of Thucydides on Xenophon is virtually nil, and that Polybios' Thucydidean influences came to him via fourth century historiography.⁶⁹

For ambassadorial oratory performed during the third and second centuries, Polybios is our only historiographical source. Naturally, the literary representation of these speeches contained within his work should be approached with extreme caution. Polybios is, however, somewhat helpful in providing his reader with a methodology.⁷⁰ There are two sections in which Polybios attacks Timaios of Tauromenion for the speeches in his work. At 12.25a-b, Polybios attacks Timaios for untruthfully reporting public speeches (*logoi demegoriai*), the harangues of generals (*logoi parakleiseis*), and the discourse of ambassadors (*logoi presbeutikoi*) on the grounds that he has not written what was actually spoken (οὐ γὰρ τὰ ῥηθέντα γέγραπεν).⁷¹ In the same passage, Polybios also claims that Timaios includes every possible *logos*

⁶⁷ On Thucydides and Polybios, see Ziegler (1952) col.1523; Luschnat (1970) cols.1294-7; Walbank (1971) 41; Rood (2012) *passim*; Miltsios (2013) *passim*; Nicolai (2019) 119-20.

⁶⁸ On Xenophon's influence on fourth century historiography, see Schepens (1971) *passim*, (2001a) *passim*; Luraghi (2017) 93-9. For his influence on Imperial Greek literature, see Bowie (2017) *passim*. On Xenophon's influence on oratory generally, see Pernot (2014) *passim*.

⁶⁹ Scardino (2019) *passim*. See also Parmeggiani (2019) 289-91. See Chapter Two section 2.b.

⁷⁰ Pédech (1964) 254-302 and Sacks (1981) 79-95 remain the most detailed general discussions on this. More recently, see Wiater (2010) *passim*.

⁷¹ He also criticises Phylarchos on similar grounds at 2.56.10.

in political speeches (πάντας ... τοὺς ἐνόητας λόγους), despite the need for a speaker to select the proper and appropriate arguments for his audience (τοὺς ἀρμόζοντας καὶ καιρίους). Again, in the same passage, he says that that historiographers should record the actual *logoi* spoken (τοὺς κατ' ἀλήθειαν ῥηθέντα λόγους).

The ambiguity of the term *logos* is a problem here. While Polybios' methodology delves into greater detail than the relevant passage of Thucydides on which it is undoubtedly based (Thuc. 1.22.1), it is still not very clear. Does he mean that historiographers should report truthfully the actual words themselves, *ipsissima verba*, or the general line of argumentation? Balsdon argued for the former, claiming that Polybios means that the historiographer ought to report the actual words spoken on the occasion.⁷² On the other hand, in his monumental commentary on Thucydides, Gomme pointed out that Polybios attacks Timaios for Hermokrates' speech on the grounds that the arguments he used were not only unfitting for the esteemed character of Hermokrates but that they were also not the ones he would have himself used, emphasising that he would not have chosen the arguments that Timaios has Hermokrates use.⁷³ Walbank argued that Polybios is referring to two different types of speech; while historiographers should report what was actually said, logographers should choose the appropriate arguments.⁷⁴ Sacks has noted that if Walbank's interpretation is the correct one then much of the advice in Polybios' methodology is intended for statesmen, both of whom write historiography and speeches, but he also pointed out that the grammar of the text does not indicate a change of subject.⁷⁵ My reading of Polybios' methodology is that he is referring to the arguments used by the speaker, not the actual words, since in a later fragment of his *Histories* he stipulates that

⁷² Balsdon (1953) 157.

⁷³ Gomme (1956) 522-3.

⁷⁴ Walbank (1967) 397.

⁷⁵ Sacks (1981) 82-95. More recently, Wiater (2014) *passim*.

the historiographer ought to report what was καιριώτατα καὶ πραγματικώτατα (Polyb. 36.1.7).⁷⁶ I do not intend to expand on this argument further here on the grounds that this thesis does not directly concern whether what Polybios has the envoys in his *Histories* say is an accurate and truthful reflection of what was actually said at the time, but rather whether his representation of their speeches reflects the sort of rhetoric that envoys were likely to be engaging with during the third and second centuries, or whether the speeches reflect a historiographical tradition. This raises the further problem that Polybios is very selective in which speeches he reports, in fact he sometimes states that other speeches were given but only chooses to report one of the oral performances (e.g. 5.103.6-5, 21.22.1-4).⁷⁷ This thesis will attempt to mitigate this problem by looking closely at the framing of the speeches and discern whether Polybios gives an indication of whether any other speeches were delivered, or in the context of envoys' speeches, whether other delegations were present and question what impact these might have had on the oral performance Polybios chooses to report.

Envoys' speeches are an especially interesting type of speech in Polybios on the grounds that he refers directly to speeches performed by ambassadors as a type of speech. In a well-known passage, the types of speeches that Polybios gives in his well-known polemic against Timaios of Tauromenion are remarkably different from the generic distinctions applied by the classical rhetoricians (12.25a.3):

ἵνα δὲ καὶ τοὺς φιλοτιμότερον διακειμένους μεταπείσωμεν, ῥητέον ἂν εἴη περὶ τῆς αἰρέσεως αὐτοῦ καὶ μελέτης τῆς κατὰ τὰς δημηγορίας καὶ τὰς παρακλήσεις, ἔτι δὲ τοὺς πρεσβευτικούς λόγους, καὶ συλλήβδην

⁷⁶ Polyb. 36.1.7: οὔτε τοῖς ἱστοριογράφοις ἐμμελετᾶν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν οὐδ' ἐναποδείκνυσθαι τὴν αὐτῶν δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ῥηθέντα καθ' ὅσον οἷόν τε πολυπραγμονήσαντας διασαφεῖν, καὶ τούτων τὰ καιριώτατα καὶ πραγματικώτατα.

⁷⁷ Polybios is by no means unique in this; for discussion of the same problem in Xenophon, Baragwanath (2017) 280-2. See also Wiater (2014) *passim* on linking Polybios' methodology to the speeches he chooses to report.

πάν τὸ τοιοῦτο γένος, ἃ σχεδὸν ὡς εἰ κεφάλαια τῶν πράξεων ἐστὶ καὶ συνέχει τὴν ὅλην ἱστορίαν:

But to convince those also who are disposed to champion him I must speak of the principle on which he composes public speeches, harangues, ambassadorial speeches, and, in a word, all utterances of the kind, which, as it were, sum up events and hold the whole history together.

Polybios then repeats these distinctions later in the same passage (12.25i.3):

ὡς δ' ἀληθές ἐστὶ τὸ νυνὶ λεγόμενον καὶ ἐκφανέστατον γένοιτ' ἂν ἐπὶ τε τῶν συμβουλευτικῶν καὶ παρακλητικῶν, ἔτι δὲ πρεσβευτικῶν λόγων, οἷς κέχρηται Τίμαιος.

How true what I have just said will be most clear from the deliberative, exhortatory, and ambassadorial speeches Timaios introduces.

Some scholars have seen Polybios' distinction between these three types of speech as an indication that the number of genres of speech grew during the Hellenistic Period as rhetoricians continued to expand Aristotle's tripartite system by adding further sub genres.⁷⁸ This is highly misleading because it assumes that Polybios is listing genres of speeches that existed within some sort of rhetorical framework, but he does not indicate anywhere in the text that he is doing so.⁷⁹ Walbank was an early dissenting voice on this, and argued that the generic distinctions made by Polybios was not an attempt to recount recognised genres of speeches, although he did not develop these observations further. He argued that the use of the phrase καὶ συλλήβδην πάν τὸ τοιοῦτο γένος (12.25a.3) indicates that Polybios was not listing an alternative tripartite distinction between the genres of speeches and that he

⁷⁸ Kennedy (1972) 32-7; Erskine (2007) 274-5; Pepe (2013) 329-26.

⁷⁹ Diodoros makes similar distinctions (Diod. Sic. 20.1.2) and it is generally assumed that he lifted this passage from an earlier historiographer; see Achilli (2012) *ad loc.* Laqueur (1911) argued for Ephoros, while Fornara (1983) refutes him and argues for Douris of Samos. But Sacks (1990) *passim* and Pausch (2018) 481-2 believe the passage was in fact Diodoros' own composition.

may in fact be using a tricolon construction in his attack on Timaios.⁸⁰ Since the individual speeches of Timaios which Polybios criticizes during his polemic are symbouleutic speeches, generals' harangues, and envoys' speeches (12.25k-26a), Walbank is probably correct to dismiss the notion that Polybios was hinting at new genres of oratory that came about during the third and second centuries. In addition, the term *presbeutikos* can be traced back to the late fifth century with Ion of Chios (*FGrH* 392 T 2 = *schol. Ar. Pax* 835 [RV]) so it is unlikely that Polybios is referring to new genres. In addressing the issue of genre, Rubinstein has argued that envoys' speeches can in fact be any one of Aristotle's three genres depending on the context in which they were delivered and the goal of the speech itself.⁸¹ I think this is the most plausible explanation for how envoys' speeches were perceived in terms of genre in the absence of any discussion of this type of speech before the Imperial Period.

c. Inscriptions

There are two types of inscriptional evidence that contain summaries of ambassadorial oratory.⁸² The first type of evidence are decrees drawn up in response to an approach by an embassy, which sometimes record a summary of what the envoys said before stating what has been decided by the *demos* and/or *boule*.⁸³ In the inscriptions before the late fourth century, the speeches performed by the envoys are seldom summarised and the decrees generally state 'concerning what the envoys of X say', for example, *περὶ ὧν λέγουσιν οἱ πρέσβεις τῶν Μεγαλοπολιτῶν* (*IG* II² 993, lines 1-2).⁸⁴ For the Hellenistic Period we are much more fortunate on the grounds that the decrees become much more elaborate and contain summaries of speeches performed by

⁸⁰ Walbank (1967) 385.

⁸¹ Rubinstein (2016) 79-82.

⁸² Rubinstein (2013) 167-75.

⁸³ Rhodes and Lewis (1997) 27-9.

⁸⁴ See *IG* II² 44, lines 7-8; *IG* II² 96, lines 5-7; *IG* II² 116, lines 8-9 for further instances.

envoys, often introduced with a speaking verb such as *dialegesthai*, *apologizesthai*, and *paradeiknissai*.⁸⁵ The decree of the Aitolian League in response to a Teian embassy requesting inviolability (*asylia*), dating from the late third century, demonstrates this phenomenon (*IG IX.I² 192*, lines 3-6):

ἐπεὶ Τήϊοι πρεσ[βευ]τὰς ἀποστείλαντες Πυθαγόραν καὶ Κλεῖτον τὰν τε οἰκειότατα | καὶ τὰν φιλίαν ἀνενηοῦντο καὶ παρεκάλεον τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς, ὅπως τὰν τε πόλιν | αὐτῶν καὶ τὰν χώραν ἐπιχωρήσωντι ἱερὰν εἶμεν καὶ ἄσυλον τοῦ Διονύσου, | δεδόχθαι τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς:

Since the Teians have sent Pythagoras and Kleitos and have renewed the intimacy and friendship and have encouraged the Aitolians to recognise both their city and their territory as holy and sacred to Dionysos, it was decided by the Aitolians:

While these texts are naturally nowhere near as elaborate as transcripts of speeches that were performed, they nonetheless give an insight into the flavour of the rhetoric that the envoys used in their oral performance.⁸⁶ In this case, the envoys seem to have made the renewal of the intimacy (*oikeiotes*) and friendship (*philia*) between Teios and the Aitolians the first theme of the performance, before they encouraged (*παρεκάλεον*) the Aitolians to recognise their territory as inviolable. Some decrees are more elaborate than this too, for instance in the response of the Akarnanians to a Magnesian embassy also requesting *asylia*, as well as inviting the Akarnanians to games in honour of Artemis Leukophryene, the summary of the oral performance runs for 17 lines (*IG IX.I² 582*, lines 9-26).⁸⁷ It must be stressed, however, that summaries of oral

⁸⁵ Chaniotis (2016) 129-34. On the increasingly elaborate nature of decrees after the late fourth century generally, see Lambert (2012a) *passim*; Ferrario (2014) 265-6. On the commemorative function, see Chaniotis (2012) *passim*, (2013) 2-15-13, (2016) 152-65.

⁸⁶ On this text, see Rigsby (1996) 292-4.

⁸⁷ *IG IX.I² 582*, lines 9-26: παραγενομένων πρεσβευτῶν | [παρὰ Μαγ]νήτων τῶν ἐπὶ Μαιάνδρου Ἀριστοδάμου | [τοῦ Διοκ]λέος, Ἀριστεά τοῦ Γοργάσου, Ἀνάνορος τοῦ | [Κωλω]τίωνος καὶ διαλεγομένων περὶ τὰς οἰκειό[τα]τος τὰς ὑπαρχούσας τοῖς Μάγνησιν ποτὶ τοὺς | [Ἀκ]αρνᾶνας, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὰν φιλίαν ἀ[ν]ανευομένην καὶ τὰς εὐεργεσίας ἀπολογιζομένων, ἃς πεποιήν[ται] τὸ κοινὸν | τῶν Μαγνήτων ἐς τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ν ἀποδόντων | δὲ καὶ τὸ ψάφισμα, καθ' ὃ παρεκάλουν δέχεσθαι τὰν ἐ[κ] χειρὶαν χρῆσαντος τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς λῶϊον | [εἶ]μεν καὶ ἄμεινον [τ]οῖς σεβομένοις Ἄρτεμιν Λευκοφρυηνᾶν καὶ τὰν πόλιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὰν χώραν ἱερὰν καὶ ἄσυλον

performances of this length are exceptional. In addition to including details about the oral performance, decrees will also detail other instructions that the envoys fulfilled, including the handing over of documentation from their community, which their oratory was often intended to supplement.⁸⁸

The second type of inscription that gives us an insight into ambassadorial oratory are decrees that stipulate that a state has decided to dispatch an embassy, recording who has been selected as an envoy, and in the case of the decrees after the late fourth century, what they have been instructed to say. For instance, in a decree of Iasos dating from sometime in the second century, the instructions of the envoy are given (*I.Iasos* 51, lines, 34-40):

ἴν[α δὲ] | Κῶοι εἰδήσωσι τὴν Τελευτία καλοκάγαθίαν [καὶ] | τὴν Ἰασέων
εὐχαριστίαν, ἐλέσθαι πρεσβευτ[ήν]. | τὸν δὲ αἰρεθέντα ἀφικόμενον
πρὸς Κώιους [περὶ τε] | τῆς Τελευτία καλοκάγαθιας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν
[δῆ] | μον εὐνοίας ἐνφανίσ[αι καὶ πα]ρακαλεῖν οἰκή[ρους] | καὶ φίλους
καὶ συμμ[άχους ὑπάρχ]οντας τῆς πό[λεως] | ἀποδέξασθαι μετὰ πάσης
εὐνοίας τὰ ἐψηφισμ[ένα τί] | μιν τῷ πολίτῃ αὐτῶν

*(it was decided) to elect an envoy in order that the Koans see that both Teleutias is exemplary and the Iasians are well-favoured. He who has been chosen shall arrive at Kos and emphasise how Teleutias is exemplary towards the people and about his eunoia and to encourage the existing kin, friends, and allies of the city [to accept the honours that have been decreed for their citizen with every good intention ...]*⁸⁹

In this inscription, the envoy was tasked with giving a speech to the people of Kos that comprised of two components. Firstly, he was to praise the honorand, which would naturally have involved elements of epideictic rhetoric, and then

εἶ[μεν], διὸ καὶ τὸν δᾶμον ἐψαφίσθαι τῷ εὐεργέτιδι τῶς πόλιος | Ἀρτέμιδι Λευκοφρυηνᾷ διὰ
πέντε ἐτέων θυσίας καὶ | πανάγουριν καὶ ἀγῶνα στεφανίταν ἰσοπύθιον μουσι | κόν τε καὶ γυμνικὸν
καὶ ἰππικὸν ποιεῖν δικαίαν ἀποδι | δόντας χάριν τῷ εὐεργέτιδι, παρακαλοῦντ[ων αὐ] | τῶν, ὅπως
οἱ οἰκεῖοί τε καὶ φίλοι μετέχοντι τῶν θουσιᾶν | τῶν συντελουμένων ὑπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐμφανίζοντων
τῶν | ἐπιφάνειαν τῶς θεοῦ.

⁸⁸ Rubinstein (2013) 175-86; Battistoni (2020) *passim*.

⁸⁹ There is disagreement about how his should be reconstructed. Segre (1993) 94-5 reads the lines as τῆς πό[λε] | ως] φιλοφρόνως ἀπ[ο]δέξασθαι τὰ] ἐψηφισμέν[α]. I do not think it important to choose in the context of this introductory discussion.

he was to encourage (πα]ρακαλεῖν) the Koans to accept the honours that the citizen body he was representing had bestowed on their citizen, a rhetorical task more symbouleutic in nature. In this instance, the speech that the envoy was to deliver was evidently considered to be of importance since his speaking role is emphasised in his instructions.⁹⁰

While both types of evidence attest to the importance of oratory performed by envoys in interstate interactions during the third and second centuries, they are not without their problems. With retrospective evidence, we must bear in mind that we are getting a glimpse of an ambassadorial speech through the lens of the community to which it was performed, and that they therefore may have chosen only to inscribe the arguments or aspects of the oral performance that were most important to them.⁹¹ It is highly unlikely that the summaries recorded on stone recorded every argument that the envoy(s) made since they are so brief.⁹² In some instances, it is sometimes difficult to work out whether the arguments contained within the motivation clause were made by the envoy, or whether they are arguments made by one or more of the citizens of the host *polis* in the debate that followed the ambassadorial speech. For instance, in a decree of Athens in response to an Aitolian embassy requesting that they partake in the newly reorganised Soteria festival, dating from the mid-third century, the ambiguity is noticeable (*IG II³ 1 1005*, lines 6-18):

ἐπειδὴ τὸ κοινὸν τὸ τῶν Αἰτ|[ωλ]ῶν ἀποδεικνύμενον τὴν πρὸς τοὺς
θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν | [ἐψ]ήφισται τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν τῶν Σωτηρίων τιθέναι
τῶι Δι|[ι] τ]ῶι Σωτῆρι καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Πυθίωι ὑπόμνημα τῆ|[ς
μ]άχης τῆς γενομένης πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους τοὺς ἐπισ|[τ]ρατεύσαντας

⁹⁰ On the importance of oral performances in the conveyance of honours for foreign citizens, see Rubinstein (2013) 175-86.

⁹¹ As modern scholars of argumentation such as Kock have emphasised, deliberation rests on weighing up which arguments are most important. See Kock (2006) *passim*, (2007) *passim* and (2011) *passim*.

⁹² While the Attic orators are probably the closest we can get to speeches as they were performed in antiquity, even they are not without their problems. See Vatri (2017) 80-99.

ἐπί τε τοὺς Ἑλληνας καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερὸν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐφ' οὓς καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐξέπεμπε|[ν] τοὺς τε ἐπιλέκτους καὶ τοὺς ἵππεῖς συναγωνιουμέν|[ου]ς ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ περὶ τούτων τὸ κοι|[νὸν] τῶν Αἰτωλῶν καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Χαρίξενος ἀπεστάλκ|[ασι] πρὸς τ[ὸν] δ[ῆμο]ν πρεσβείαν τὴν διαλεγομένην ὅπως |[ἂν] ἀποδέχεται ὁ δῆμος τ[ὸ]ν ἀ|γ[ῶ]ν[α], τὸμ] μὲν μουσικὸν ἴσο|[πύθιον, τὸν δὲ γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἴσονέ]μεον ...

Since the koinon of the Aitolians demonstrating their piety to the gods have decreed that the competition of the Soteria shall be established for Zeus Soter and Pythian Apollo as a memorial of the battle that took place against the barbarians who attacked the Greeks and the sanctuary of Apollo common to the Greeks, against whom the (Athenian) demos sent out the elite troops and cavalry to share in the struggle for the collective preservation, and concerning this matter the koinon of the Aitolians and their strategos Charixenos have despatched an embassy to the demos to discuss how the demos might recognise the competition equivalent to the Pythian musical contest, and the gymnastic and horse-racing contests ...

The Athenians decided to accept the request of the Aitolians and take part in the Soteria on the grounds that the Aitolians had defended the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphoi against the Galatians, which the Soteria is memorialising, and on the grounds that the Athenians also took part in this conflict.⁹³ But is the motivation here a reflection of what the Aitolian envoys argued, or a reflection of the Athenians' own motivations? This is particularly ambiguous with the second aspect of the reasoning; did the Aitolian envoys point this out that the Athenians also fought to defend Delphoi, or was it the Athenians themselves? It is impossible to say. As Chaniotis has pointed out in the case of the Magnesian *asylia* dossier, Greek envoys often tailored their oratory to the community they were addressing and would alter their scripts to make their oratory more persuasive, so it would not be without precedent if the Aitolians included arguments that would work only on an Athenian audience.⁹⁴ To

⁹³ For a more in-depth discussion on this inscription, see Chapter 3.2.a.

⁹⁴ Chaniotis (2009) 154-6.

overcome this ambiguity, this thesis will approach the inscriptions by asking the question of whether the inscriptions reflect the sort of rhetoric that envoys would engage in based on our evidence elsewhere, rather than whether it accurately represents the oral performance as it was delivered at the time.

A key problem with prospective evidence is that we are dealing with a set of instructions and we do not know the extent to which the actual oratory the envoys ended up performing reflected their brief. Even when both the decree recording the instructions of the envoys and the response of the community they addressed have survived, they are often almost mirror images of each other, as Chaniotis has pointed out in the case of the Magnesian *asylia* dossier.⁹⁵ This is probably on the grounds that the host community wanted to inform the community who had dispatched the embassy that their envoys had spoken in accordance with their instructions. Indeed, some responses to embassies do not even reproduce the envoys' brief, but rather simply state that the envoys spoke 'in accordance with the decree' that they brought with them, such as in *I.Priene* 108, lines 61-2: οἱ πρεσβευταὶ | ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν διελέγησαν ἀκολούθως τοῖς τῶι ψηφίσματι γεγραμμένοις.⁹⁶ But as Rubinstein has demonstrated, where both the prospective and retrospective evidence survive, any subtle differences in the retrospective evidence compared with the prospective evidence probably reflect what the envoys said.⁹⁷ In summary, the evidence for oral performances in the inscriptions from the late-fourth century onwards offer an invaluable insight into the contents and arguments used by envoys during their oral performances.

A further question that must be addressed here is the extent to which the historiographical evidence makes use of documents as a source, including

⁹⁵ Chaniotis (1999) *passim*.

⁹⁶ For further instances, see *I.Magnesia* 52 lines 19-20; *I.Magnesia* 97, lines 66-7; *IK Kalchedon* 5, lines 9-10; *SEG* 1:440, lines 5-7; *SEG* 14:544, lines 5-6.

⁹⁷ See Rubinstein (2013) 172-4 in the case of *Milet.I.* 3:146.

inscriptions.⁹⁸ In the case of Polybios it would be uncontroversial to suggest that he used official documents in the composition of his *Histories*.⁹⁹ In one well-known instance in his account of the encounter between the Karthaginians and Romans before the formal declaration of the Second Punic War in 218, Polybios presents the legal and diplomatic background to the war with a series of treaties which he evidently had access to (Polyb. 3.22-8).¹⁰⁰ As Koehn has also pointed out, during the turbulent period of the 180s, Polybios uses the term *stèle* to denote agreements between the Achaian *koinon* and its members (e.g. 23.4.14; 23.18.1; 24.9.14).¹⁰¹ Another aspect of Polybios' use of inscriptions extends to his prose which some scholars have suggested is similar to the sort of Kanzleistil one finds in inscriptions, with Palm emphasising the parallels between Polybios and the motivation clauses in honorary decrees.¹⁰² Polybios' use of documents is of importance here if we are to establish the extent to which the literary representation of ambassadorial oratory in his work offers a reliable insight into how this type of speech was performed in his own day. The potential influence of documents in Polybios' historical narrative suggests that we are going to find parallels with his representation of ambassadorial oratory and the summaries of the same type of speech in the epigraphic evidence. I am not suggesting that similarities between Polybios and the inscriptions indicate that Polybios' envoys' speeches are accurate representations of the oratory that was actually performed, but rather that Polybios' representation of ambassadorial oratory may go beyond a solely

⁹⁸ On this generally, see Davies (1996) *passim*; Rhodes (2007) *passim*. For Herodotos, West (1985) *passim*; Fabiani (2003) *passim*. For Thucydides, see Gomme (1945) 30-5, Hornblower (1996) 93-107; Bearzot (2003) *passim*. For Xenophon, see Bearzot (2014) *passim*.

⁹⁹ On inscriptions as a source for Polybios, see Walbank (1957) 31-3; Pédech (1964) 377-89; Schettino (2003) *passim*; Zecchini (2003) *passim*; Koehn (2013) *passim*.

¹⁰⁰ On this digression, see Wiater (2019) *passim*.

¹⁰¹ Koehn (2013) 69-79; Koehn here suggests his use of the term *stèle* to refer to both the physically inscribed stone as well as the agreement more generally is potentially a reflection of technical terminology used by the Achaians. On Polybios' political milieu, see Thornton (2020) 25-46.

¹⁰² See Palm (1957) *passim*; Dreyer (2002) *passim*; Koehn (2013) 159-69.

literary representation and might offer some insight into his own sources for his speeches, especially in instances where he reports an oral performance delivered by envoys in *oratio obliqua*.

3. Partitio

Chapter One examines the rhetoric of ‘renewal’ in both the historiographical and epigraphic evidence. I demonstrate that it was commonplace in the Greek diplomatic oratory of the third and second centuries to renew (*ananeousthai*) a variety of relationships that existed between the speaker’s community and their host community. These relationships include friendship (*philia*), alliance (*summachia*), kinship (*sungeneia*), and previous benefactions (*philanthropa*). I argue that the renewal of these relationships as part of an oral performance delivered by one or more envoys only begins to commonly occur in the evidence of Polybios and the inscriptions of the third and second centuries. I then attempt to account for this apparent change in ambassadorial rhetoric.

Chapter Two surveys the envoys’ speeches in Polybios reported in *oratio recta* and *obliqua* and discusses the character projection techniques used by the envoys. I argue that the envoys’ speeches in Polybios’ speeches are personalised and reflect a variety of different character projection techniques. I then carry out similar rhetorical analyses of envoys’ speeches in Thucydides and Xenophon, arguing that some of the character projection techniques found in Polybios are also apparent in earlier historiography, notably Xenophon. The chapter then closes by discussing whether this reflects the greater importance placed on *mimesis* by historiographers from the fourth century onwards, or changes to how diplomatic rhetoric was practised.

Chapter Three takes the character projection techniques I analysed in Polybios and surveys the epigraphic evidence to compare whether the same

phenomena are also apparent in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries. I observe that there is a more personalised representation of envoys in the epigraphic material from the late fourth century onwards to some extent, as we observe in both Polybios and Xenophon. Then, taking the Aitolian League and the Rhodians as case studies, I analyse whether the 'corporate image' of these communities as a collective as reflected in Polybios' ambassadorial oratory is also apparent in the inscriptions, before moving on to a discussion of how the epigraphic evidence also hints at how envoys could project an *ethos* composed of their federal and *polis* identities. Finally, I discuss how overtly partisan lines of argumentation, whereby an embassy represents itself as speaking on behalf of an internal political faction, is hardly ever attested in the epigraphic material, unlike in historiography.

The structure of this thesis is a practical reflection of the research process that went into it, in that the structure is dominated by surveys of the evidence followed by discussion. I believe this is the most logical way of structuring the thesis since it allows me to guide the reader through the evidence I have examined.

Chapter 1: The Rhetoric of Renewal

1. Renewal and its meaning

In his account of Alexander the Great's campaigns in Baktria, Diodoros of Sicily narrates an interesting encounter between Alexander's army and the Siboi tribe. According to Diodoros, the Siboi were the descendants of the soldiers whom Herakles had settled in the region following his mission to besiege the rock of Aornos. Alexander encamped next to a Sibirian city and a number of the leading men came to greet the king to renew their kinship (τὴν συγγένειαν ἀνανεωσάμενοι) and to offer him assistance since the Siboi and Alexander were kinsmen (*sungeneis*), due to their mutual connection to Herakles (Diod. Sic. 17.96.1-2). As Jones has observed, while the details of the story may not be totally accurate, it is nonetheless a representation of the kind of diplomatic scene with which a Hellenistic audience would have been familiar.¹⁰³

The verb used by Diodoros here is *ananeousthai*, 'to renew' or 'to revive', and it is typically found in prose texts.¹⁰⁴ The verb appears in Polybios and in the inscriptions of the Hellenistic Period, where it often appears in the context of interstate relations and recounts an aspect of an oral performance delivered by one or more envoys to their host community. It is these instances, in both historiography and the inscriptions, that this chapter will focus on. While the object of the verb can vary a lot, it very often denotes some sort of relationship that has been shared between the envoy's community and that of their hosts. The most frequently attested relationships renewed in the

¹⁰³ Jones (1999) 6-7. In addition, see Prandi (2013) 162 for commentary on this passage of Diodoros. Curtius Rufus also mentions how the Siboi were descended from those of Herakles' companions left behind due to sickness (9.4.1-2): *Perventum erat in regionem, in qua Hydaspes amnis Acesini committitur: hinc decurrit in fines Siborum. Hi de exercitu Herculis maiores suos esse memorant: aegros relictos esse cepisse sedem, quam ipsi obtinebant.*

¹⁰⁴ Although it also appears in tragedy on one occasion (Eur. *Hel.* 722-4: νῦν ἀνανεοῦμαι τὸν σὸν ὑμέναιον πάλιν καὶ λαμπάδων μεμνήμεθ' ἄς τετραόροις ἵπποις τροχάζων παρέφερον).

historiographical and epigraphic evidence are friendship (*philia*), alliance (*symmachia*), benefactions (*ta philanthropa*), and kinship (*sungeneia*).

Taking the rhetoric of renewal as a case study, this chapter does the following. Firstly, it looks at each of the relationships that are the objects of renewal in ambassadorial oratory, before exploring instances in both Polybios and the inscriptions of the third and second centuries where we find envoys engaging in this sort of rhetoric. Next, it looks at the evidence of the fifth and fourth centuries and argues that the evidence for envoys engaging in this sort of rhetoric is much scarcer, with this sort of rhetoric sometimes used to denote relationships between individuals and relationships between individuals and the state. This chapter balances the question of whether we are looking at a change in how ambassadorial oratory was practiced in the third and second centuries, or a change in how it is presented. The purpose of this chapter is to explore some of the questions about how historiography and epigraphy interact as bodies of evidence of ambassadorial oratory, thus demonstrating my methodology for later chapters.

a. τὰ φιλόανθρωπα

In the literary and epigraphic material from the third and second centuries, the adjective *philanthropos* is frequently found in an articulated form of the neuter plural (τὰ φιλόανθρωπα).¹⁰⁵ τὰ φιλόανθρωπα is attested as the object of *ananeousthai* on seven occasions in Polybios, although it does not generally feature as the object of this verb in the inscriptional evidence.¹⁰⁶ Its cognate noun, *philanthropia*, can be traced back to the fifth century and fourth centuries, although it is absent from Thucydides and only occurs once in Xenophon's *Hellenika*, from the mouth of Europtolemos during his speech in

¹⁰⁵ See Kortenbeutal (1940) *passim* for τὰ φιλόανθρωπα as a development of the Koine dialect.

¹⁰⁶ Polyb. 4.26.8; 25.5.7; 28.1.8; 12.9; 16.5-7; 29.10.6; 23.8. The only attestation I found in the inscriptions occurs in *IG II³,1 1140*, which I discuss below.

defence of the Athenian generals (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.18).¹⁰⁷ When the term *philanthropia* is used in a political context, the term has various meanings such as benevolence, kindness, and humanity (*LSJ ad. loc.*), and this ambiguity led to discussion concerning the term even in antiquity. According to Plato in the *Laws*, *philanthropia* specifically refers to the obligations on the part of superiors to treat their inferiors fairly and benevolently, as a king would be expected to treat his subjects (Plat. *Leg.* 713d). In this context the term has aristocratic connotations that are demonstrated in its uses in Xenophon's *Kyropaideia* and *Agesilaos* and in Isokrates.¹⁰⁸ On the other hand, scholars such as Bauman and Christ have argued that the term found a new meaning in the second half of the fourth century in Attic oratory and became 'democraticised' through stressing the *philanthropia* between *dikastai* and defendants in a law court in the context of forensic oratory, as well as between Athens and her allies in deliberative oratory, and the rights of Athenian citizens more generally.¹⁰⁹ In this respect, *philanthropia* was a fundamental value tied up with Athenian, i.e. democratic, life. While I do not dispute that there is a shift in the connotations of the term at this time, Christ and Bauman place too much emphasis on the role that Demosthenes may or may not have played in this shift, on the grounds that since so little deliberative oratory survives it would be highly unlikely that one orator was responsible for such a semantic shift.¹¹⁰ What we may be looking at instead is a more general trend in Athenian political rhetoric and sloganing.

¹⁰⁷ Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.18: εἴτα νῦν τὴν αἰτίαν κοινὴν ἔχουσιν ἐκείνων ἰδίᾳ ἀμαρτόντων, καὶ ἀντὶ τῆς τότε φιλανθρωπίας νῦν ὑπ' ἐκείνων τε καὶ τινων ἄλλων ἐπιβουλευόμενοι κινδυνεύουσιν ἀπολέσθαι;

¹⁰⁸ E.g. Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4.1; 7.5.73; *Ages.* 1.23; *Isoc.* 5.114-116; *Antid.* 133.4. See Schöpsdau (2003) 190; de Romilly (1979) 43-52; 127-44. For examples of *philanthropia* in a non-human context, see Aesch. *PV* 11.28; Ar. *Pax* 392f; Plat. *Symp.* 189c-d.

¹⁰⁹ Bauman (2001) 11-4; Christ (2013) *passim*.

¹¹⁰ Wooten (1974) *passim* and Canevaro (2018) 79-81 also place too much emphasis on the influence of Demosthenes on Hellenistic oratory as represented in Polybios.

In the context of Hellenistic diplomacy, particularly in inscriptions, *philanthropa* is even more ambiguous since it can refer to any number of privileges or favours that one community could grant to another as a whole or an to individual citizen, but does not specify what these were. For instance, in an Athenian decree granting *proxenia* to Aristokreon son of Nausikrates, dated to shortly after 229/8, Aristokreon and his fellow envoys are praised for renewing *ta philanthropa* shared between his community and Athens (*IG II³ 1140*, lines 10-2: ἀνενεώσατο καὶ Σ[— — c.10 — —][[. .] μετὰ τῶν συμπρεσβευτῶν τὰ φιλ[άνθρωπα τὰ πρὸς ἄλλήλας ταῖς πόλεσιν]).¹¹¹ In this instance, the *philanthropa* are privileges that one community granted another as a collective, or potentially past favours. However, when a community bestows privileges on an individual citizen of another *polis*, *ta philanthropa* can refer to any number of grants, such as *ateleia* or *proedria*. For instance, in an honorary decree for Eumaridas (228/7), the Kydonian *proxenos* to Athens, the honorand is praised for ensuring that *ta philanthropa* granted to individual Athenians living in Krete continue to be respected (*IG II³ 1137*, lines 18-20: ἀναδέχεται δὲ τὴν πᾶσαν ἐπιμέλῃαν ποιήσεσθαι τοῦ διαμένειν τὰ φιλάνθρωπα τῷ δήμῳ[ι] | πρὸς τοὺς οἰκοῦντας ἐν Κρήτει πάντας).¹¹² Occasionally, when benefactions bestowed on individuals are specified in inscriptions, they are followed by καὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλάνθρωπα, making the terminology even less specific (e.g. *IG IV² 1, 60*; *FD 3:242*).¹¹³

But where does τὰ φιλάνθρωπα fit into ambassadorial oratory? As Giovanni has argued, grants of money, citizenship and *asylia* do not come from obligations that are stated in a treaty or an alliance, but they are based on moral ties and friendship.¹¹⁴ ‘Renewing’ benefactions such as *asylia* or any

¹¹¹ See also: *IG II² 786*; *SEG 38:412*; *SEG 46:536*.

¹¹² This decree was reinscribed in 192/3. See also: *SEG 49:500*; *IG V, 2 510*; *IG V, 1 1146*.

¹¹³ *FD III:242*, lines 32-5: δεδό[σθαι δὲ αὐ]τοῖς καὶ ἐγγόνοις παρὰ τᾶς πόλιος προξενία[ν, προμαν]τείαν, προεδρίαν, ἀσυλίαν καὶ τὰ ἄλλα φιλάνθ[ρωπα ὄσα] | καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις προξένους καὶ εὐεργέταις [τᾶς πόλιος].

¹¹⁴ Giovanni (1993) 277-8.

other prior favour seems strange semantically since these privileges remain in force once they have been granted, but it is likely that the memory of them became dormant if a considerable amount of time had passed since they were originally granted.¹¹⁵ The renewal of such benefactions within the context of ambassadorial oratory seeks to remind an audience of previous benefactions by reaffirming what has already been granted, allowing an envoy to demonstrate the historical good relations that both his community and the host community have shared. In reminding a community of prior favours and benefactions that have been granted, the envoys are able to demonstrate how their community and that of their hosts have enjoyed a good relationship and celebrates the *eunoia* that the envoys' community has for their host community, and the *eunoia* their host community has for the envoys' community.¹¹⁶

b. Alliances and Friendships

Codified bilateral relationships between communities are also the subject of renewal, including relationships that are grounded in formal agreements such as oaths (*horkoi*) and alliances (*summachiai*).¹¹⁷ The renewal of oaths and treaties makes logical sense because often these agreements were not open ended. For instance, the Athenians and the Spartans made a peace for 50 years in 421 , and the text of the treaty quoted by Thucydides stipulates that the oath is to be renewed annually (Thuc. 5.22-23.6).¹¹⁸ Treaties with monarchical states also required renewal when a successor took over the throne. For

¹¹⁵ The Teian mission for *asylia* paid a second visit to Krete to renew this benefaction, see Rigsby (1996) no. 132-61.

¹¹⁶ See Low (2007) 51-4 on the reciprocal nature of *eunoia*. In addition, see Kremmydas (2016a) *passim*; Bencivenni (2021) *passim*.

¹¹⁷ See *ibid* 119-21 on the role of oaths within alliances.

¹¹⁸ Thuc. 5.23.5: ἀνανεοῦσθαι δὲ κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν Λακεδαιμονίους μὲν ἰόντας ἐς Ἀθήνας πρὸς τὰ Διονύσια, Ἀθηναίους δὲ ἰόντας ἐς Λακεδαίμονα πρὸς τὰ Ἰακίνθια. Naturally, the treaty itself would also have had to renewed 50 years later had it not been broken in 413.

instance, Perseus renewed his treaty with Rome upon becoming king of Makedon (Polyb. 25.3.1).¹¹⁹ The renewal of alliances indicates not only a clear willingness to continue having good relations into the future, but a willingness to fulfil the obligations stipulated in the alliance. An envoy whose main mission was to secure the renewal of an alliance would also have to demonstrate that the citizen body he was representing would be willing to adhere to their obligations too.

Friendship (φιλία) also appears in Polybios and the epigraphic evidence as the object of *ananeousthai*.¹²⁰ The semantics of this are considerably more complicated and difficult to pin down due to the ambiguity of *philia* as a concept in interstate relations.¹²¹ *Philia* can either be understood as an informal term denoting affection or a more formalised type of relationship closer to an alliance.¹²² In her discussion of the *philia* in the fifth and fourth centuries, Mitchell has demonstrated that interpersonal links of *philia* between citizens of two different *poleis* were instrumental in shaping foreign policy; however it is also clear that *philia* could be shared between communities collectively.¹²³ More recently, Low has argued that the language of *philia* was not only used to reinforce good relations that already existed between two states, but was also an integral part in the creation of more formal alliances and agreements between two states.¹²⁴ The epigraphic evidence suggests that there is a clear continuation of this phenomenon in the Hellenistic Period. In responses to embassies, decrees frequently acknowledge that the envoys' community have ties of friendship. For example, in the response of Lato to the Teian embassy requesting *asylia*, Lato acknowledges

¹¹⁹ Polyb. 25.3.1: ὅτι Περσεύς ἀνανεωσάμενος τὴν φιλίαν τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους εὐθέως ἑλληνοκοπεῖν ἐπεβάλετο. See also *IC* 1 xviii 8 for another example of this phenomenon.

¹²⁰ E.g. Polyb. 12.6b.1-2; 22.9.5; 28.2.1-2; *IG* XI 4 756; *FD* III 3:134c; *Milet.* I 3:146a.

¹²¹ On *philia* in interstate relations generally, see Herman (1987) 123-56 and Mitchell (1997) 1-21.

¹²² E.g. Thuc. 7.33.4. See Herman (1990) *passim*.

¹²³ Mitchell (1997a) 51-72.

¹²⁴ Low (2007) 44-54.

the Teians as friends of theirs as well as kin (*IC I xvi 2*, lines 1-3: ἐπειδὴ | Τήλιοι συγγενεῖς καὶ φίλοι διὰ προγόνων ὑπάρχον|τες). From the same dossier, the decrees from Istron (*IC I xiv 1*), Eleutherna (*IC II xii 21*), and Arkades (*IC I v 52*), and more acknowledge that the Teians are *philoι* in the motivation clause introduced by ἐπειδὴ. The citizen body represented by the envoy must have the trust of their host community in order for the oratory to be successful. As Mitchell argues, *philia* is bound up in trust and commitment between one community and another, and points to examples of exchanges of benefactions between states which results in mutual feelings of *philia*.¹²⁵ In this sense, *philia* refers to ties of affection, and can be interpreted as the consequence of the mutual exchange of benefactions, an already existing alliance, or even kinship.¹²⁶ The interwoven nature of ties of *philia* with other relationships is demonstrated by how it is sometimes renewed alongside other relationships in the summaries of oral performances in the inscriptions. For instance, in the decree of the Aitolian League recognising Teian *asylia*, the Aitolians recount how the envoys renewed ‘both the familiarity and the friendship’ (*IG IX.1² 192*, lines 3-4): τὰν τε οἰκειό|τατα καὶ τὰν φιλίαν ἀνενηοῦντο.¹²⁷ Similarly, the decision recording the judgement of the Milesians during an arbitration between the Lakedaimonians and the Messenians from 138 records how the Messenian envoys approached Miletos and handed over a letter containing their instructions which included renewing the existing kinship and friendship between them (*InO 52*, lines 6-7): ἀνανεοσάμενους τὰν ὑπάρχουσαν συγγένει|αν καὶ φιλίαν ταῖς πόλεσι.¹²⁸ In this context the renewal of *philia* probably has connotations of reminding the host community of their friendship, as in the

¹²⁵ Mitchell (1997) 38-9.

¹²⁶ *Ibid* 9-14.

¹²⁷ On this text, see Rigsby (1996) 292-4. See Curty (1995) 224-4 on the expression τὰν τε οἰκειό|τατα καὶ τὰν φιλίαν.

¹²⁸ On this arbitration see Ager (1996) 446-50. The arbitration was carried out at the request of Rome (Tac. *Ann.* 4.43.3). See also *IG IV 679*, lines 7-8: ἀνανεοῦται τε τὰν συγγένειαν | καὶ φιλίαν τὰν ὑπάρχουσαν ταῖ πόλει

case of benefactions and/or favours. But unlike reminding a citizen body about benefactions and/or favours, which might have been granted by the envoys' community, by their host community, or a mixture of both, *philia* is a solely bilateral relationship.¹²⁹

The renewal of *philia* may also have represented a more formal act, closer to the renewal of treaties and alliances.¹³⁰ It is also common for formal alliances to articulate that both communities are to “share the same friends and enemies as each other”; for instance, this was a provision made by the Lakedaimonians for members of the Peloponnesian League (Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.26).¹³¹ Again, the evidence points to continuity for this phenomenon in the Hellenistic Period. When the Rhodians sent an embassy to Krete to build a defensive alliance against Rome, the provision of this alliance was that the Kretans have the same friends and enemies as the Rhodians (Polyb. 29.10.6: τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ φίλον). This provision is also found in Hellenistic inscriptions too. For instance, the treaty between Lato and Hierapytna from 110/11 states that both states will have τὸν αὐτὸν φίλον καὶ ἐχθρὸν (*SEG* 26:1049, line 5).¹³² When *philia* refers also to a more formalised agreement like a treaty between two states, it allows envoys to demonstrate that their community is willing to continue committing to the obligations contained within the agreement, thus demonstrating *eunoia*. This would, however, be different in a one-sided agreement where a smaller community agrees to have the same friends and enemies as their hegemon, but not vice-versa.¹³³

¹²⁹ As Rubinstein (2013) 186-199 points out, the epigraphic evidence suggests envoys often recounted the debts their community had incurred in order to perpetuate the grounds on which their community enjoyed a relationship with their hosts.

¹³⁰ Thucydides uses the term to refer to an alliance on at least one occasion (Thuc. 7.33.4).

¹³¹ The Ionians swore to have the same friends and enemies as the Athenians following Salamis (*Ath. Pol.* 23.5). For general discussion on this provision, see de Ste Croix (1972) 298-307.

¹³² See *IC* II xi 1; *IC* I xvi 17; *Milet.* I 3:150 for more Hellenistic examples.

¹³³ Pistorius (1985) 135-54.

c. Kinship

Kinship (*sungeneia*) has received much attention from scholars, especially in studies on Greek identity and interstate interactions.¹³⁴ In the context of the present discussion, *sungeneia* frequently appears as the object of *ananeousthai* in the epigraphic evidence. In Curty's renowned work on kinship, *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques*, *sungeneia* is attested as the object of *ananeousthai* on at least seventeen occasions.¹³⁵

Unlike a relationship that is created such as an alliance or a friendship, kinship is a relationship that is claimed to exist because of the shared descent between the citizens of two or more states. In the Greek world at least, kinship is typically traced back either to a common ancestor, usually a mythical hero, or to an *oikist* who founded the community as a colony of another *polis*.¹³⁶ While many cases of kinship are probably historically dubious and fictitious, the evidence suggests that arguments based on kinship were taken seriously and that claims to a shared bloodline were genuinely believed.¹³⁷ However there was no guarantee that all kinship narratives, whereby an envoy would relate how their community and their addressees share a bloodline, carried conviction and it was incumbent on envoys to demonstrate through their oratory that their claim to kinship was plausible. The decree of Xanthos from 206/5 (*SEG* 38.1476) records the extent to which envoys would try to prove the kinship shared between them and their host community, in this case through the use of a long narrative in which the Dorian *polis* of Kytenion traced

¹³⁴ Generally, see Curty (1995) 215-63; Mitchell (1997) 23-8; Jones (1999) 27-65; Lücke (2000) 66-117; Ma (2003); *passim*; Mackil (2019) *passim*.

¹³⁵ E.g. *FD* III 3:144; *IvO* 52; *IC* I v 53. Curty (1995) *passim*.

¹³⁶ On the role of mythical heroes generally, see Curty (1995) 215-41; Jones (1999) 9-16; Lücke (2000) 15-26. On *oikistai*, see Graham (1964) 29-39.

¹³⁷ For example, the alleged kinship between the Kretans and Magnesia Maiandros (*IMagn.* 65). On the importance of believing such kinship narratives and the extent to which envoys might go to prove them, and their hosts might go to verify them, see Curty (1995) 216-7; Jones (1999) 52-62; Chaniotis (2016) 152-62.

its lineage with Xanthos.¹³⁸ If they failed to make their kinship narrative conform to the oral and written traditions in Xanthos, there was a risk that their narrative would fall flat. A fragmentary decree records how envoys from Apollonia-on-Rhyndakos were sent to Miletos to renew a putative kinship and were met with a degree of scepticism when the envoys claimed that the Milesians were their kinsmen on the grounds that their city was a colony of Miletos (*Milet.I.* 3.155).¹³⁹ On this occasion, the Milesians felt it necessary to check historiographical texts and their own epigraphic texts, probably on the grounds that they wanted to ensure that the envoys were speaking the truth.¹⁴⁰ The response of the Milesians suggests that a favourable reception of arguments based on kinship could not be taken for granted, and by implication, that such ties could not be freely invented.

Like with the renewal of benefactions, friendships, and alliances, the renewal of a kinship reaffirms a relationship. However, unlike a friendship or an alliance, the speaker has to emphasise that the claim to kinship had always existed and cannot be terminated. By renewing their community's kinship with another state, envoys can breathe new life into a relationship that may have long been forgotten but was nonetheless still extant because it cannot be undone.¹⁴¹ If the envoys successfully refresh the kinship, the host community was reminded of the obligations it is under to the envoys' community because of the close and potentially unique relationship they share.

¹³⁸ On this inscription, see Bousquet and Gauthier (1994) *passim*. For the kinship narrative, see Lücke (2000) 30-52; Ma (2003) *passim*; Chaniotis (2016) 152-62.

¹³⁹ *Milet.I.* 3.155, lines 9-12: καὶ ἐπισκεψάμενοι | τὰς περὶ τούτων ἱστορίας καὶ τὰλλα ἐγγραφα ἀπεκρίθησαν | τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀληθείας γεγενῆσθαι ἄποικον | τῆς ἑαυτῶν πόλεως διαπραξαμένων τῶν προγόνων.

¹⁴⁰ On this text, see Ehrhardt (1988) 44-7; Curty (1995) 143-5; Jones (1999) 64; Clarke (2003) 319-20; Saba (2020) 81-2.

¹⁴¹ Daux (1937) *passim* emphasises renewal of 'breathing new life' into existing agreements, in the case of the *proxenia* of Alkibiades.

2. Renewal in Hellenistic Historiography and Inscriptions

As I indicated at the beginning of this chapter, *ananeousthai* and its objects occur frequently in Polybios' *Histories*, particularly in interstate contexts. I will now discuss a number of examples in detail. In a later fragment of the *Histories* pertaining to the events of the Peloponnese in book 29, a group of envoys from Ptolemy VI Philometor address the delegates of the Achaian League at one of its *synodoi* in 169/8 to request Achaian assistance in the war against Antiochos IV Epiphanes (Polyb. 29.23.8-9):

τῶν δὲ πρεσβευτῶν παραγενομένων, τῆς συνόδου τῶν Ἀχαιῶν οὔσης ἐν Κορίνθῳ, καὶ τὰ τε φιλόθροπα πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνανεωσαμένων ὄντα μεγάλα καὶ τὴν περίστασιν τῶν βασιλέων ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν ἀγόντων καὶ δεομένων σφίσι βοηθεῖν ...

When the envoys presented themselves, the Achaian Assembly being then in session at Corinth, and having renewed the benefactions towards the kingdom, which were great, they brought before the audience's eyes the danger in which the kings stood, and begged for help ...

The envoys from Ptolemy renewed the benefactions (*ta philanthropa*) that the Achaian League had bestowed on the kings, or the benefactions that they had shared with the Achaian League, and gave a graphic account of the danger their community was facing. But Polybios' brevity in his descriptions of diplomatic scenes such as this one is a problem when it comes to the reconstruction of what form this 'renewal' would have taken in the envoys' oratory. It is certain that the envoys' oral performance would have been much more elaborate than the summary that Polybios offers by means of the genitive absolute, and the use of the phrase ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν ἀγόντων suggests that the envoys may even have employed *enargeia* when they recounted the danger the Ptolemaic Kingdom faced at the hands of Antiochos. While *enargeia* is impossible to confirm due to the brevity of Polybios' prose, the

descriptions of the dangers that the envoys gave were clearly vivid. As for the ‘renewal’, the genitive absolute (τῶν δὲ πρεσβευτῶν παραγενομένων ... καὶ τὰ τε φιλόανθρωπα πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν ἀνανεωσαμένων) may refer to an account of acts of generosity bestowed by the Achaians and reaffirms existing commitments. However, Polybios does not elaborate on what these were.

Although the brevity may reflect historiographical and epigraphical ‘shorthand’, we cannot rule out that the envoys’ speech(es) did elaborate on the privileges and existing commitments between Egypt and the Achaian League with some sort of celebratory narrative, but relied on the knowledge/memory of the audience to infer what these were. This may indeed have been the case in the example that Polybios relates of the Ptolemaic mission. It is clear elsewhere in Polybios and in Plutarch’s *Lives* that good relations between the Achaian League and the Ptolemaic Kingdom had been longstanding at the time of this embassy. While neither of these sources mention any benefactions that were made by the Achaian League to Egypt, there is evidence of benefactions granted by Egypt to the Achaian League. Earlier in the *Histories*, Polybios mentions that the Achaians did not actively seek help against the Lakedaimonians at the outset of the Kleomenean War because they wanted to maintain their friendship (*philia*) with Ptolemy, owing to the benefactions (*euergesiai*) bestowed on them, which placed them under obligations towards him (Polyb. 2.47.2). These *euergesiai* are difficult to pin down; Walbank suggested that they were originally incurred by Aratos when he was granted financial assistance by Ptolemy II to solve the agrarian conflicts in Sikyon, which had been triggered after he had repatriated the exiles that were banished by the tyrants before him and entered Sikyon into the Achaian League (Plut. *Arat.* 11.2; 12.1). However, the source of this financial assistance is not certain because of Plutarch’s ambiguity and some scholars have

suggested the alternative interpretation that Antigonos Gonatas had made the grant.¹⁴²

The Ptolemaic envoys in Polybios' summary do not appear to have mentioned any benefactions bestowed on the Achaians by their community, but instead focus on the benefactions bestowed by the Achaian League on the Ptolemaic Kingdom. The rhetoric of indebtedness here is an inversion of the appeals to *charis* in forensic oratory, in which defendants in public cases would frequently recount the deeds they had performed for the community towards the end of their speech in the hope of gaining compassion and leniency from the jurymen (e.g. Lys. 18.55-64; Aeschin. 2.180-2; Hyp. 2.18).¹⁴³ By contrast, Ptolemy's envoys recalled the benefactions that the audience had bestowed on their community, rather than any they had granted, and they may have recalled these benefactions towards the beginning of their oral performance. This is suggested by the frequency with which such renewals are placed at the beginning of envoys' speeches in the summaries recorded in Polybios and in the inscriptions.¹⁴⁴ The renewal of benefactions towards the beginning of the speech may have served one of the purposes of the *prooimion*, as described in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (*Rh. Al.* 29). The author of this treatise states that *prooimia* in deliberative oratory should make the audience feel a sense of *eunoia* towards the speaker (εὐνοῦς ἡμῖν αὐτοῦς ποιῆσαι, *Rh. Al.* 29.1), and the speaker should create this by examining (*diaskeptesthai*) how his audiences is well disposed to him (29.6).¹⁴⁵ In recounting the benefactions that the Achaian League had granted to the Ptolemaic Kingdom, the envoys from

¹⁴² Walbank (1957) 245. Holleaux (1968) 44-5 and Ducrey (1968) 242 argue that the grant was made by Antigonos Gonatas. See Gabrowski (2012) *passim*; Rubinstein (2013a) 147-54 for further discussion.

¹⁴³ Davis (1971) 92-5; Rubinstein (2000) 212-3, n. 49 for further examples.

¹⁴⁴ E.g. *IG VII* 4142; *IG VII* 4139; *FD III* 3:241. For Polybios, see 22.3.5-7; 22.7.1; 22.7.5; 22.7.8-9; 22.9.13; 23.4.12; 24.6.4-5; 28.2.1-2; 33.18.

¹⁴⁵ *Rh. Al.* 29.6: ἐπὶ μὲν οὖν τὸ προσέχειν διὰ τούτων παρακαλοῦμεν. τὴν εὐνοίαν δὲ παρασκευασόμεθα διασκεψάμενοι πρῶτον πῶς πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοῦς τυγχάνουσιν ἔχοντες, εὐνοϊκῶς ἢ δυσμενῶς ἢ μήτε εὖ μήτε κακῶς.

Ptolemy were attempting to do exactly this. In the light of the advice given in the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, it is perhaps not surprising that both Polybios and the inscriptions do not specify the exact nature of the benefactions or friendships, since the treatise also advises speakers not to talk about *eunoia* if the audience is already friendly, but if they wish to do so, to do so briefly (29.7).¹⁴⁶ An envoy that spends too long recounting and renewing the relationships between the citizen body he is representing and his audience might, therefore, be seen to be wasting time and risk losing the audience.

The renewal of benefactions that had been granted by the envoys' community to their hosts also occurs in Polybios' summaries and in the inscriptions. One example is the mission of the Rhodians to Krete in 168 when they were attempting to build an offensive alliance against Rome (Polyb. 29.10.6-7):

εὐθέως γὰρ εἰς τὴν Κρήτην ἔπεμπον πρεσβευτὰς τοὺς ἀνανεωσομένους πρὸς πάντας Κρηταιεῖς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα φιλόανθρωπα καὶ παρακαλέσοντας βλέπειν τοὺς καιροὺς καὶ τὴν περίστασιν καὶ συμφρονεῖν τῷ δήμῳ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐχθρὸν αἰρεῖσθαι καὶ φίλον, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν διαλεχθησομένους.

For at once they sent envoys to Krete to renew the existing benefactions towards all the Kretans, and to encourage them to see the situation and circumstance they were in, and to agree to choose the same enemies and friends with the demos, and similarly to speak individually to the cities concerning these things.

The envoys first addressed the council of the Kretan confederacy, as is indicated by the phrase πάντας Κρηταιεῖς, before paying individual visits to the

¹⁴⁶ *Rh. Al.* 29.7: ἂν μὲν οὖν εὖνοι τυγχάνωσιν ὄντες, περίεργον λέγειν περὶ εὐνοίας· ἂν δὲ πάντως βουλώμεθα, χρὴ συντόμως μετ' εἰρωνείας εἰπεῖν τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον· “ὅτι μὲν οὖν “εὖνους εἰμὶ τῇ πόλει καὶ πολλάκις μοι πεισθέντες συμφερόντως ἐπράξατε, καὶ διότι πρὸς τὰ κοινὰ δίκαιον ἑμαυτὸν παρέχω καὶ μᾶλλον τι τῶν ἰδίων προΐεμενον ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν δημοσίων ὠφελούμενον, περίεργον.

cities on the island that retained a degree of independence in foreign affairs.¹⁴⁷ It is important that the envoys approached the Kretan *koinon* first because Krete was a hot-bed of conflict in the Hellenistic Period and by approaching them first the envoys would have avoided triggering any division. Polybios even employs *homoioleuton* in a *chiasmus* to demonstrate how the envoys addressed these two audiences: ... ἀνανεωσομένων πρὸς πάντας Κρηταιεῖς ... ὁμοίως δὲ ... πρὸς τὰς πόλεις ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν διαλεχθησομένων (29.10.6-7). The envoys' speeches on this occasion represent an inversion of the previous example between Egypt and the Achaian League; in this instance the Rhodian envoys renewed the benefactions that they had bestowed on the Kretans (both at *koinon* and *polis* level) rather than renewing the benefactions their addressees had bestowed on them. In addition, although Polybios is brief, the passage offers an insight into the flexible rhetorical strategies that envoys could use during missions in which they visited and addressed several different communities. In the second part of their mission, the envoys would have needed to renew *philanthropa* that had been exchanged between the Rhodians and the individual cities addressed by them. Therefore, while the envoys were tasked with addressing the Kretan *poleis* on the same matters as they had to the *koinon*, the envoys would have needed to renew different benefactions depending on which polis they were addressing.¹⁴⁸ This would have required a significant degree of research on the part of the envoys, however Polybios does not elaborate on what powers they had on this mission when they sought alliances with individual Kretan *poleis*.

¹⁴⁷ Just like the Athenian envoys in the decree honouring Eumaridas of Kydonia: *IG II³ 1137*, lines 14-7: συνηγόρησεν εἰς τὸ πάνταπραχθῆναι τὰ συνφέροντα | τῷ δήμῳ, συνεπρέσβευσεν δὲ καὶ εἰς Κνωσὸν καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους, ἔδωκε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστολὰς τοῖς πρεσβευταῖς εἰς Πολύν|ρηνα πρὸς τοὺς φίλους. For πάντας Κρηταιεῖς see Chaniotis (1999), 290 n. 19. Generally, see Holleaux (1942) 82-3; Chaniotis (1999) 289-95; (2004a) 78-100.

¹⁴⁸ This was the case for envoys on similar missions who visited several different communities, such as the Magnesian mission for *asylia*. See Chaniotis (2009) 154-6.

The same sort of diplomatic episodes in which this verb occurs in Polybios are also recorded in the inscriptions with remarkable lexical and syntactic parallels. For instance, the following inscription records how some Phygelan envoys renew *philia* as part of their oral performance to the Milesians concerning the *isopoliteia* (*Milet.I* 3:142, lines 2-8):

ἐπειδὴ πρέσβεις ἤκουσι ἀπὸ τῆ[ς | πόλ]εως τῆς Φυγελῶν
ἀνανεούμενοι τὴν | [φιλί]αν καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν |
[Φυγ]ελεῶσιν ἐμ Μιλήτῳ καὶ Μιλησίοις | [ἐ]μ Φυγέλοις ἐκ τῶν χρόνων
τῶν πρότερον | [κ]αὶ μέμνηται τῶν εὐεργετημάτων, ὧν | [ε]ὐεργέτηκεν
αὐτοὺς ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μιλησίω ...

Since envoys have come from the polis of Phygela and are renewing the friendship and established citizenship for Phygeleans in Miletos and Milesians in Phygela from the previous time and are recalling the benefactions which the demos of Miletos have bestowed on them ...

Naturally, the renewal of the *philia* between the two communities was a fundamental aspect of the oral performance of the Phygelean envoys, on the grounds that they needed to demonstrate the reciprocal *eunoia* between the two communities in order to secure the renewal of the *isopoliteia*.¹⁴⁹ In addition to the renewal of their friendship and mutual citizenship, the Phygelean envoys also recalled the benefactions (μέμνηται τῶν εὐεργετημάτων) that the Milesians had previously bestowed on their community in an attempt to demonstrate to the Milesians that their ancestors had been kindly disposed to the Phygeleans, and that they should follow precedent by being kindly disposed to their request. As with the shorthand in Polybios, it is unclear what these favours were; it could potentially refer to the assistance Miletos gave Phygela in 410-09 against Thrasyllus, in which many Milesians sacrificed their lives (Xen. *Hell.* 1.2-3).¹⁵⁰ This resembles the way in which the envoys from Ptolemy recalled the benefactions their community

¹⁴⁹ For commentary on this inscription, see Gawankta (1975) 71, 118; Saba (2020) 48-51.

¹⁵⁰ For discussion on this episode, see Ragone (1996) 235.

had been granted by the Achaian League, or at least in this case, the Phygelean envoys demonstrated that they held them in memory.¹⁵¹

Similarly, a decree of the Aitolian League in response to the Teian envoys Pythagoras and Kleitos, who had come to request *asylia* in 204/3, reports a similar summary of their oral performance (*IG IX,1² 1:192*, lines 3-5):

ἐπεὶ Τηῖοι πρεσ[βευ]τὰς ἀποστείλαντες Πυθαγόραν καὶ Κλεῖτον τὰν τε οἰκειότατα | καὶ τὰν φιλίαν ἀνενηοῦντο καὶ παρεκάλεον τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς, ὅπως τὰν τε πόλιν | αὐτῶν καὶ τὰν χώραν ἐπιχωρήσωντι ἱεράν εἶμεν καὶ ἄσυλον τοῦ Διονύσου ...

Since the Teians have sent Pythagoras and Kleitos as envoys and renewed the intimacy and friendship and encouraged the Aitolians, to recognise their city and their territory as sacred and inviolable to Dionysos ...

The inscription suggests that the envoys renewed the *oikeiotes* and *philia* shared between the Teians and the Aitolians before making their formal request (παρεκάλεον) that the Aitolian recognise their territory inviolable.¹⁵² In beginning their oral performance(s) in this manner, Pythagoras and Kleitos demonstrate the *eunoia* that exists between their community and that of the Aitolian *koinon*, following the advice contained within the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (*Rh. Al.* 29.1-7). This is a fundamental aspect of the oral performance on the grounds that it wins the trust of the audience early on and sets the mood for the rest of the oral performance.

A further instance is the decree of Elis from around 140, in response to an approach by some Messenian envoys, requesting to set up an inscription at Olympia detailing a decision in their favour made by some Milesian judges following a dispute with the Lakedaimonians (*IvO 52*, lines 3-11):

¹⁵¹ Rubinstein (2013) 194-5.

¹⁵² On this inscription, see Rigsby (1996) 292-4

πρεσβευτᾶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τᾶς πόλιος | τῶμ Μεσσανίων
Μηνοδώρου τοῦ Διονυσίου, | Ἀπολλωνίδα τοῦ Νικάνδρου, Χαρητίδα
τοῦ Δορκωνίδα, καὶ τὰ γράμματα ἀποδόντων, ἐν οἷς διεσα|φεῖτο
ἀνανεωσαμένους τὰν ὑπάρχουσιν συγγένει|αν κα[ι] φιλίαν ταῖς
πόλεσι ποθ' αὐτὰς διαλέγεσθαι ὅ|πως ἐπιχωρήσει ἅ πόλις
ἀναγραφῆμεν εἰς Ὀλυμπίαν | τὰγ κρ[ί]σιν τὰγ γενομένην τᾷ πόλει
αὐτῶν ποτὶ τὰμ | πόλιν τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων περὶ χώρας ...

Since envoys have come from the polis of the Messanians, Menodoros son of Dionysios, Apollonides son of Nikandros, and Charitas son of Dorkonidas, and having handed over the letter in which it was explained that they would renew the existing kinship and friendship that exists between the cities and how the same men would speak to request that the city could inscribe at Olympia the decision rendered in favour of the city against the city of the Lakedaimonians concerning territories ...

Like with the other texts, the envoys began their oral performance by renewing the existing kinship and friendship between their community and that of their hosts, before moving on to their main request.¹⁵³ Requesting permission to inscribe the decision of an arbitration was naturally a hugely sensitive topic, and so it was important that the envoys invoked the relationships between the citizen body they represented and that of their hosts in order to demonstrate that they had good intentions.¹⁵⁴ The envoys evidently also enclosed a letter of the Milesians, who had arbitrated between the Messenians and the Lakedaimonians, as well as a copy of the decision as additional proof that their intentions were honest (*IvO* 52, lines 29-70).

The frequency with which we find the act of renewal falling at the beginnings of envoys' speeches in *oratio obliqua* in Polybios and in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries, with a remarkable syntactical parallel, could be taken as an indication that these renewals were merely a formality or a *captatio benevolentiae*. However, evidence elsewhere suggests that the opposite is true. According to Polybios, when some Achaian envoys

¹⁵³ For more on this inscription, see Curty (1995) 15-7; Ager (1996) 446-50.

¹⁵⁴ See Luraghi (2008) 20-7 on the boundaries of Messene.

returned from Egypt with an ambassador from Ptolemy in 185 after a mission to Egypt to renew their alliance, they found themselves in an awkward situation when they returned to Achaia with envoys from Ptolemy (Polyb. 22.9.5-6):

ἐφ' οἷς ἀναστάς ὁ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν στρατηγὸς Ἀρίσταινος ἤρετο τὸν τε παρὰ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου πρεσβευτὴν καὶ τοὺς ἐξαπεσταλμένους ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνανέωσιν, ποίαν ἦκε συμμαχίαν ἀνανεωσάμενος. οὐδενὸς δ' ἀποκρινομένου, πάντων δὲ διαλαλούντων πρὸς ἀλλήλους, πλήρες ἦν τὸ βουλευτήριον ἀπορίας.

Upon this, the strategos of the Achaians, Aristainos, stood up and asked the envoy from Ptolemy and those who had been dispatched by the Achaians to renew, which alliance had they come to renew. With nobody answering, but with everybody taking amongst themselves, the whole council chamber was at a loss.

As Polybios goes on to explain, when the Achaian envoys were in Egypt they had spoken only 'in general terms' as if there had only been one alliance between the two states when there had actually been several in force at the time (22.9.7-8).¹⁵⁵ This was especially embarrassing for Philopoiman and Lykortas who could not offer any further explanation, despite having renewed alliances with Egypt when they had served as envoys to Alexandria.¹⁵⁶ This instance goes to demonstrate how using renewal within an oral performance could be a double-edged sword; if the renewal of such relationships was to be used as a rhetorical strategy then talking about them in general terms risks being met with suspicion. This is also apparent in the copy of an Apollonian decree at Miletos (*Milet.I.* 3:155):

¹⁵⁵ See Walbank (1978) 190-2 for commentary. On relations between Egypt and the Achaian League in the earlier years, see Grabowski (2012) *passim*; Kralli (2017) 160-8.

¹⁵⁶ Polyb. 22.9.11-12: οὐ δυναμένου δὲ λόγον ὑποσχεῖν οὔτε τοῦ Φιλοποίμενος, ὃς ἐποίησατο στρατηγῶν τὴν ἀνανέωσιν, οὔτε τῶν περὶ τὸν Λυκόρταν τῶν πρεσβευσάντων εἰς τὴν 12ᾶλεξάνδρειαν, οὔτοι μὲν ἐσχεδιακότες ἐφαίνοντο τοῖς κοινῶς πράγμασιν, ὁ δ' Ἀρίσταινος μεγάλην ἐφείλκετο φαντασίαν ὡς μόνος εἰδὼς τί λέγει

ἐπεὶ πεμ|φθείσης πρεσβείας πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Μιλησίων περὶ τοῦ
ἀνα|νεώσασθαι τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν πρὸς αὐτὸν τῶι δήμῳ ἡμῶν | διὰ
τὴν ἀποικίαν συγγένειαν Μιλήσιοι διακούσαντες | τῶν πρεσβευτῶν
μετὰ πάσης εὐνοίας καὶ ἐπισκεψάμενοι | τὰς περὶ τούτων ἱστορίας καὶ
τᾶλλα ἔγγραφα ἀπεκρίθησαν | τὴν πόλιν ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀληθείας
γεγενῆσθαι ἀποικον | τῆς ἑαυτῶν πόλεως διαπραξαμένων τῶν
προγόνων ...

Since an embassy was sent to the people of Miletos to renew the existing kinship between our people and the people on account of being a colony, the Milesians listened to the envoys with every good will and after they had investigated the histories about this and other written records they replied that our city in truth had been founded as a colony of their own city ...

Although the inscription breaks off early, Gauthier suggested that it may have contained provisions for *isopoliteia*, although this is impossible to prove.¹⁵⁷ This decree, coupled with the embarrassing episode for the Achaians in Polybios I discussed above, acts as a warning for envoys wishing to make the renewal of a relationship a key theme in their oral performance. These instances suggest that there is a risk for envoys who touch upon the relationships between their community and their hosts, since they might be expected to be specific about the exact nature of these relationships and not merely speak about them in general terms. In other words, speaking too generally about the relationship without being able to substantiate could be seen as insincere.¹⁵⁸

3. The Classical Precedent of Renewal: Isokrates, Demosthenes, and Thucydides

While *ananeousthai* is common in surviving historiography and inscriptions from the Hellenistic Period, it does not occur as frequently in the evidence

¹⁵⁷ Gauthier (1972) 361. See Curty (1995) 1435; Chanotis (2009) 154-6; Saba (2020) 80-1.

¹⁵⁸ *The Rhetoric to Alexander* advises against speakers spending considerable time demonstrating the *eunoia* of their audience towards them, although for different reasons (*Rh. Al.* 29.1-7).

from the Classical Period. The term is absent from the works of Aristotle and Plato whose work has survived in bulk, and it does not appear in Herodotos and Xenophon in whose works interstate relations play a significant part. But the verb is attested on a handful of occasions in the letters of Isokrates and the speeches of Demosthenes, both of which are worth discussing as they offer some insight into the language that Hellenistic envoys are known to have later engaged in.

Isokrates' letter *To Timotheos* is addressed to the tyrant of Heraklea whose father, Klearchos, had been a pupil of Isokrates. The purpose of the letter is to persuade Timotheos not to become a cruel tyrant as his father had been, despite the latter showing some promise earlier in his reign.¹⁵⁹ Isokrates' letter concludes by requesting that Timotheos should send him a letter renewing the friendship and guest-friendship (*xenia*) that both Isokrates' family and Timotheos' family had shared (Isoc. *Ep.* 7.13; ἀνανεούμενος τὴν φιλίαν καὶ ξενίαν τὴν πρότερον ὑπάρχουσιν). It is likely that the relations between the two families had been interrupted due to Klearchos acquiring the reputation for being a cruel tyrant and the *xenia* was left dormant.¹⁶⁰ Another Isokratean example of this word occurs in the *Panegyrikos*. Here Isokrates praises the festival culture among the Greeks because it drives *poleis* to renew longstanding *xeniai* and to establish new ones (*Paneg.* 43: καὶ τάς τε παλαιὰς ξενίας ἀνανεώσασθαι καὶ καινὰς ἐτέρας ποιήσασθαι).¹⁶¹ Isokrates' usage of *ananeousthai* is significant for two reasons. Firstly, his attestations suggest the sort of rhetoric that was common in interstate relations by the Hellenistic Period was also used to denote relationships shared by individuals and families in earlier periods. Secondly, the object of the verb is *xenia* in the *Panegyrikos*,

¹⁵⁹ Papillon (2004) 270.

¹⁶⁰ Herman (1987) 69-72.

¹⁶¹ On the panhellenism in this passage, see Usher (1990) 159; Blank (2014) 185-6.

which is one of only two attestations of *xenia* as an object of *ananeousthai* in surviving literary and epigraphic sources.¹⁶²

The verb also appears twice in Demosthenes' forensic speeches. In *Against Aristokrates*, the speaker mentions a letter from Philip II in which Philip states that he was ready to form an alliance with Athens and to renew their ancestral friendship (Dem. 23.121; ἔτοιμος εἶναι συμμαχίαν ποιεῖσθαι καὶ τὴν πατρικὴν φιλίαν ἀνανεοῦσθαι).¹⁶³ The word occurs also in *Against Euboulides*, although not in an interstate context. The speaker states that the Athenian people renewed a law attributed to Solon on account of its merits (57.32; τοῦτον ἔδοξεν ἐκεῖνος καλῶς καὶ δημοτικῶς νομοθετῆσαι, ὥστ' ἐψηφίσασθε πάλιν ἀνανεώσασθαι). The first Demostheneic example complements Isokrates' use of *ananeousthai* in the *Panegyrikos* by demonstrating that the framework for the sort of rhetoric that Hellenistic envoys engaged in already existed in the Classical Period. The second example shows that the verb could be used to refer to the renewal or reactivation of something that had fallen out of use but nonetheless still existed, which is an interesting point of comparison with some of the Hellenistic examples discussed above. These are the only occurrences of the verb in the corpus of the Attic orators.

However, one Classical author who uses *ananeou̓sthai* more frequently in comparison is Thucydides. In the context of interstate relations, *ananeousthai* occurs eight times in Thucydides. Its direct object is usually *horkos* (oath), but it is also sometimes used with *symmachia* (alliance), *philia* (friendship), and *politeia* (citizenship), as so often in Polybios and Hellenistic inscriptions.¹⁶⁴ Thucydides uses the term in his supposed quotations of the

¹⁶² The only other attestation of this is Polyb. 33.18.2: παραγεγόνει γὰρ ἔτι παῖς ὢν κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον εἰς Ῥώμην χάριν τοῦ τῆ τε συγκλήτῳ συσταθῆναι καὶ τὰς πατρικὰς ἀνανεώσασθαι φιλίας καὶ ξενίας.

¹⁶³ Mitchell (1997) 150-2.

¹⁶⁴ The objects of ἀνανεοῦσθαι in Thucydides in an interstate context: (ὄρκος): 5.18.10; 5.23.4; 5.46.4; 5.47.10; 5.80.3. (συμμαχία): 6.82.1. (πολιτεία): 6.104.2. (φιλίαν): 7.33.4.

peace of Nikias (Thuc. 5.18.10) and the 422/1 alliance between the Athenians and the Lakedaimonians (5.22-3), in which it is stipulated that the oath of this alliance is to be renewed annually by both sides. However, these passages remain controversial; Thucydides purports to be quoting genuine documents, but no modern consensus has emerged concerning their authenticity.¹⁶⁵ But even if the documents had been invented by Thucydides, they still testify to the conventions and rhetorical framing of interstate agreements and reflect Thucydides' own awareness of contemporary diplomatic language and terminology. I will use discuss individual instances of renewal in Thucydides to illustrate this.

At 7.33.4, Thucydides reports how Demosthenes and Eurymedon renewed their friendship or alliance (*philia*) with Artas, the dynast who ruled the Messapioi, before crossing into Metapontion in Italy:

καὶ ὀρμηθέντες αὐτόθεν κατίσχουσιν ἐς τὰς Χοιράδας νήσους Ἰαπυγίας, καὶ ἀκοντιστὰς τέ τινας τῶν Ἰαπύγων πενήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν τοῦ Μεσσαπίου ἔθνους ἀναβιβάζονται ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς, καὶ τῷ Ἄρτα, ὅσπερ καὶ τοὺς ἀκοντιστὰς δυνάστης ὧν παρέσχετο αὐτοῖς, ἀνανεωσάμενοί τινα παλαιὰν φιλίαν ἀφικνοῦνται ἐς Μεταπόντιον τῆς Ἰταλίας.

And starting from there they arrived at the Choirades Isles near Iapygia, and they took some 150 Iapygian javelin-men from the Messapian tribe onto their ship, and having renewed a long certain longstanding friendship with Artas, a dynast who had provided the javelin-men for them, they arrived at Metapontion in Italy.

The *philia* that the Athenians renewed with Artas is vague on the grounds that Thucydides' does not elaborate any further on the historical relations between these two individuals, a trend we saw above in Polybios and the inscriptions of

¹⁶⁵ See Hornblower (1996) 113-9 for the arguments in Thucydidean scholarship. For documents in historiography generally, see Davies (1996); Rhodes (2010). The alliance between Histaia/Oreos and Eretria from c. 400 indicates that Thucydides' quote reflects contemporary *Kanzleistil* (IG XII 188, lines 7-10): ἐπανανεῶσθαι δὲ τὸν ὄρκον κατὰ τὴν Ὀλυμπίϊάδα ἐκάστην τὰς ἀρχὰς ὀμνυούρας. On Thucydides' historiographical use of non-ornamental documents as corrections of oral testimony, see Bearzot (2003) *passim*.

the third and second century. This might have been a deliberate choice on his part in order to convey the impression that the Sicilian expedition had been ‘a leap into the unknown’.¹⁶⁶ Fortunately, Thucydides can be supplemented by other sources. A fragment of the Hellenistic periegetic writer Polemon of Ilios names one Artos as *proxenos* of the Athenians (Müller, *Polemon* Fr. 89 = Suida, Ἄρτος), probably the same person as the Artas mentioned by Thucydides, whom Athenaios also calls Artos when he refers to Thucydides’ text (Ath. 3.108f-109a).¹⁶⁷ As Polemon was known in antiquity for his interest in epigraphic documents and his use of them in his writing, it is possible that he had seen a copy of a decree naming Artas as *proxenos*.¹⁶⁸ Thucydides’ use of the adjective παλαιός indicates that good relations between the Messapioi and the Athenians had been forged a long time ago; indeed, the Athenians had demonstrated their interest in Sicily as early as the 430s through alliances with Rhegion and Leontinoi (*IG* I³ 53-54). However, as Meiggs and Lewis pointed out, Thucydides often uses παλαιός to denote shorter periods of time than one would expect (e.g. Thuc. 3.13.1; 4.79.2).¹⁶⁹ Hornblower argues that the παλαιὰ φιλία dates back to the same time as the alliance that the Athenians also shared with the neighbouring Metapontioi (Thuc. 7.33.5):

καὶ τοὺς Μεταποντίους πείσαντες κατὰ τὸ ξυμμαχικὸν ἀκοντιστάς τε ξυμπέμπειν τριακοσίους καὶ τριήρεις δύο καὶ ἀναλαμβάνοντες ταῦτα παρέπλευσαν ἕς Θουρίαν. καὶ καταλαμβάνουσι νεωστὶ στάσει τοῦς τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐναντίους ἐκπεπτωκότας:

And (the Athenians), having persuaded the Metapontioi to send them 300 javelin-throwers and 2 triremes according to their alliance, took up these resources and sailed to Thuria. They found that those who were

¹⁶⁶ For this passage generally, see Hornblower (2008) 607-8. Thucydides’ use of the indefinite τινα may imply that he does not consider the alliance to be of importance; see Hornblower (1994) 163ff.

¹⁶⁷ Walbank (1978) 370-2.

¹⁶⁸ Fragoulaki (2013) 288-9. For more on Polemon’s epigraphic interests, see Angelucci (2011) 326-31. However, the notion that Polemon drew on Thucydides cannot be ruled out.

¹⁶⁹ Meiggs and Lewis (1987) 171-6.

hostile to the Athenians had been exiled because of a recent civil conflict.

The probable context for this alliance, according to Hornblower, was Phaiax's visit to the west in 422, during which he made alliances with certain cities in Italy (Thuc. 5.5.1). There is a significant difference between the pre-existing agreements that Thucydides mentions in the passages quoted above. The *philia* is specified as existing between the Athenians and Artas, while the *summachia* existed between the Athenians and the Metapontioi collectively. The *philia* was not with the entire community of the Messapioi, but with its dynast who was also a *proxenos*, although Artas' official title is disputed.¹⁷⁰ Herman interpreted the *philia* here as a personal connection between Artas and certain aristocratic Athenians, Eurymedon and Demosthenes, and argued that Thucydides was referring to a relationship based on *xenia*.¹⁷¹ But as Mitchell points out, while a relationship might have existed between two aristocracies, the Athenian *demos* would have probably been happy to utilise it if it was in the popular interests of the *polis*.¹⁷² This phenomenon is also attested for the Classical Period; when Konon wanted to send an embassy to Syrakusai to undermine Dionysios' support for the Lakedaimonians in 393, Konon sent himself and Eunomos, who was the friend and guest-friend (φίλου ὄντος καὶ ξένου) of Dionysios (Lys. 19.19). As an envoy, Eunomos may have provided more rhetorical leverage as a speaker because he could appeal to the pre-existing agreements that he shared with Dionysios on a personal level.¹⁷³

Although there is disagreement over whether the friendship with the Messapioi was between the *poleis* or individuals, there are a few Thucydidean examples where *ananeousthai* refers to the renewal of a grant that a community has bestowed on an individual. A controversial example is the

¹⁷⁰ Walbank (1978) 370-2.

¹⁷¹ Herman (1990) 91-4. See also Herman (1987) 69-72.

¹⁷² Mitchell (1997) 51-72.

¹⁷³ For more on this phenomenon, see Chapter Two *passim* of this thesis.

passage in which Thucydides discusses how Alkibiades desired to restore the *proxenia* with the Lakedaimonians that his family had held until his grandfather renounced it (Thuc. 5.43.2):

ἦσαν δὲ ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ὁ Κλεινίου, ἀνὴρ ἡλικία μὲν ἔτι τότε ὦν νέος ὡς ἐν ἄλλῃ πόλει, ἀξιώματι δὲ προγόνων τιμώμενος: ὧ ἔδόκει μὲν καὶ ἄμεινον εἶναι πρὸς τοὺς Ἀργεῖους μᾶλλον χωρεῖν, οὐ μέντοι ἀλλὰ καὶ φρονήματι φιλονικῶν ἠναντιοῦτο, ὅτι Λακεδαιμόνιοι διὰ Νικίου καὶ Λάχητος ἔπραξαν τὰς σπονδάς, ἑαυτὸν κατὰ τε τὴν νεότητα ὑπεριδόντες καὶ κατὰ τὴν παλαιὰν προξενίαν ποτὲ οὔσαν οὐ τιμήσαντες, ἦν τοῦ πάππου ἀπειπόντος αὐτὸς τοὺς ἐκ τῆς νήσου αὐτῶν αἰχμαλώτους θεραπεύων διενοεῖτο ἀνανεώσασθαι.

There were others including Alkibiades son of Kleinias, a man still of a young age in any other city but honoured for the reputation of his ancestors: it seemed better to him to move towards the Argives, but above all being of a competitive disposition he opposed the peace, because the Lakedaimonians had made the truce through Nicias and Laches, having overlooked him on account of his youth and not honouring him due to the old proxeny, which his grandfather had renounced, and he intended to renew it through aiding the prisoners from the island.

This passage has proven controversial due to Plutarch's remarks that Alkibiades was already the Spartan *proxenos* at this point, and Plutarch also neglects to mention that the proxeny was a position that he sought to reactivate (Plut. *Alc.* 14.1).¹⁷⁴ Daux argued that Plutarch was correct on the grounds that Alkibiades' family had stopped practicing the proxeny but had not revoked it, and that Alkibiades was in fact attempting to renew something that was still in existence.¹⁷⁵ However, as Mack has argued, the grant of *proxenia* may have been formally renounced by Alkibiades' grandfather in the anti-Spartan political climate of the late 460s.¹⁷⁶ This would explain why Alkibiades sought actively to be declared the Spartan *proxenos* and attempted

¹⁷⁴ For discussion, see Daux (1937) and Luppino (1981); Verdegem (2010) 188-91 esp. n. 97.

¹⁷⁵ Daux (1937) 119-21.

¹⁷⁶ Mack (2016) 142-6.

to do so by giving attention to the Spartan prisoners of war held at Athens following the Battle of Sphakteria. Later Hellenistic examples from Delphoi where longstanding and possibly lapsed grants of *proxenia* are renewed also suggest that Mack is probably correct. A collection of inscriptions republished by Bousquet show the descendants of the original honorands actively coming to Delphoi to renew and reactivate hereditary grants of *proxenia*, suggesting that these grants were still on record (e.g. *FD* III:1.86; III:1.24).¹⁷⁷

Another Thucydidean example where *ananeousthai* is used to renew a hereditary grant is Gylippos' renewal of his father's citizenship at Thouria (Thuc. 6.104.2):¹⁷⁸

καὶ ὁ μὲν Γύλιππος ἐκ τοῦ Τάραντος ἐς τὴν Θουρίαν πρῶτον πρεσβευσάμενος καὶ τὴν τοῦ πατρὸς ἀνανεωσάμενος πολιτείαν καὶ οὐ δυνάμενος αὐτοὺς προσαγαγέσθαι, ἄρας παρέπλει τὴν Ἰταλίαν ...

From Taras, Gylippos first went as an envoy to Thouria and renewed the citizenship of his father, and not being able to bring them onside, he put out again and sailed along Italy ...

According to Diodoros of Sicily, Gylippos' father Kleandridas went to Thouria as an exile after he was convicted of accepting a bribe from Perikles, sabotaging Pleistoanax's planned invasion of Attika in 446 (Diod. Sic. 13.106.10). As this event took place shortly after the foundation of Thouria, some have speculated that Kleandridas may have been sent to Thouria as an oikist. The surviving evidence does not support this claim, and the identity of the oikist to whom Thouria's heroon belonged was disputed even in antiquity (Diod. Sic. 12.35.3).¹⁷⁹ Kleandridas was an active citizen in Thouria, serving as a general in a war against the Tarantines (*FrGH* 555 F 11). A proxeny decree

¹⁷⁷ Bousquet (1958) 85-90; Marek (1984) 161.

¹⁷⁸ There are disputes concerning the reading of the text here; see Hornblower (2008) 534 for the arguments. I side with Popo-Stahl's reading on the grounds that Valla's 1452 translation into Latin reads *renovata prius memoria patris in administranda repub*; Poppo-Stahl, *Thuc. ad. loc.*

¹⁷⁹ For Kleandridas as an oikist, see Poralla (1913) 72-3. See Hornblower (2008) 534-5 for discussion.

dating to first half of the fourth century gives an insight into the sort of scenario whereby the renewal of a hereditary grant not only reactivates a pre-existing enactment but could be perceived as an honour in its own right, providing a further parallel to the renewals of individual grants recorded in Thucydides (*IG II² 172*, lines 4-11):

ἐπειδὴ τῆ[ν προ|ξ]ενίαν ἀνανεοῦται Δ[ημόχ|α]ρις ὁ Νυμφαίου τοῦ Ν.
. . . | . του, ἦν ἀποφαίνει δε[δομέ|ν]ην τοῖς αὐτῷ προγόν[οις,
ἐ|ψ]ηφ[ί]σθαι τῆι βουλῆι, [ἐπει|δὴ] ἠφάνισται αὐτῷ[ι ἢ στήλ|η] ...

Since Democharis, son of (?), renews the proxeny that he demonstrates had been granted to his ancestors, it was decreed by the council, since the stele demonstrates (?) ...

Democharis renewed the grant of proxeny that had been granted to his ancestors by the Athenians, but we do not know how many generations previously the Athenians had bestowed the original grant. It is likely that any oral performance delivered on this occasion recounted the deeds of his ancestors, but it is more likely that his speech focusses on proving that the Athenians had bestowed a grant of proxeny on an ancestor of his and that he was the heir to it. This inscription is significant because it is only one of two examples of the verb *ananeousthai* in the inscriptions of the Classical Period, apart from the treaty between Histaia/Oreos and Eretria (*IG XII 188*).¹⁸⁰ Both of these decrees are important because they attest the sort of rhetoric we find in Polybios and the inscriptions of the third and second century in the context of interstate relations used in the context of relations between individuals and a state. A similar decree mentions an Athenian activation of a citizenship grant by the Akarnanians Phormion and Karphinas in the 330s, which the Athenians

¹⁸⁰ A line of *IG I³ 116*, dated to the end of the fifth-century, has been restored as ἀνα|νεῶσθ[α]ι δὲ καὶ τ<ὸ>ν| [λόγκον, however this is disputable as only three letters of the original verb survive on the stone and it is impossible to be certain of its object.

had probably granted to their grandfather in c. 400.¹⁸¹ The decree makes it clear that Phormion and Karphinas had spoken (περὶ ὧν οἱ Ἀ[καρνᾶ]νες λέγουσ[ιν Φο]ρμί[ων καὶ Καρφίνας, lines 6-7) and it is very likely that their oral performances recounted the grant that was made to their grandfather. This is suggested by the reference to the original decree on the Akropolis (lines 17-8).¹⁸²

The inscriptions do not dwell on how Democharis or the two Akanarnians proved their descent. In the case of the former the wording of the inscription suggests that Democharis had demonstrated (*apophainein*) to the council that he was the heir to the proxeny. However, we cannot be certain how these men proved that they were the descendants of the original honorands because evidence for how Greeks proved their identity is scarce. There are a number of hints in surviving inscriptions on this subject.¹⁸³ An honorary decree for Straton, king of Sidon, states that tokens (*symbola*) are to be made so that the Athenians will be able recognise a Sidonian envoy visiting Athens, and vice-versa (*IG II² 127*, lines 19-28). It is possible that Democharis and the Akarnanians used some sort of documentation or official signum to prove their identity.¹⁸⁴ In other later instances we find some envoys bringing letters from their community to support their claim to an hereditary grant, such as a fragmentary decree from Kamiros concerning honours for citizens of Kyrene (*TC 105*).¹⁸⁵ In addition, a decree establishing hereditary *isopoliteia* between Xanthos and Myra records that heirs from Xanthos who wish to register their citizenship in Myra should obtain a letter from their city for the

¹⁸¹ Osborne (1983) 44 comes to this conclusion since the two Akarnanians are the grandchildren of the original honorand and that their grandfather, Phormion, shared a name with the famous Athenian general who made an alliance with Akarnania before the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.68). See commentary to *RO 77*.

¹⁸² Osborne (1983) 150-4.

¹⁸³ See Lefèvre (2004) *passim* on this subject generally.

¹⁸⁴ See Gauthier (1972) 76-85 for *symbola* as a form of identification.

¹⁸⁵ Lines 9-14: καὶ Ἴσων Εὐφρ[άνορος Κυ]]ραναῖοι γράμμα[τα ἤκοντ]]ι φέροντες παρὰ [τᾶς πόλι]]ος τᾶς Κυραναίω[ν, ὅτι ἔντ]]ι τῶν Θεουδώρου ἐ[κγόνων π]]ρεσβύτατοι

relevant magistrate in Myra (*SEG* 44:1218).¹⁸⁶ The same problems were seen above in *polis-polis* interactions, especially in the case of the kinship between Apollonia and Miletos, where written material was used to demonstrate the existing relationships. While the evidence is limited, the frequency with which written documents are mentioned as supplements to envoys' speeches reinforces Rubinstein's observation that written documents were probably used by envoys who sought to renew hereditary grants.¹⁸⁷ These examples are consistent with Daux's observations concerning the rhetorical force of 'renewal' in an interstate context; renewal breathes new life into agreements and confirms established privileges, and recalls certain agreements and even call on the host community to act upon any inferred obligations.¹⁸⁸

In the case of Thucydides, there is only one example of a renewal of an existing agreement that was granted by one community on another. The Athenians had planned to send an embassy to Kamarina to win them over on the strength of the alliance that had been made under Laches. However, when the Syrakusans heard of this, they sent a counter-embassy (Thuc. 6.75.3):

καὶ [*hoi Syrakosioi*] πυνθανόμενοι τοὺς Ἀθηναίους ἐς τὴν Καμάριναν κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ Λάχητος γενομένην ξυμμαχίαν πρεσβεύεσθαι, εἴ πως προσάγοιντο αὐτούς, ἀντεπρεσβέοντο καὶ αὐτοί:

[The Syrakusians] having learned that the Athenians were sending an embassy to Kamarina according to the alliance that had been enacted under Laches, to see whatever way they could bring them on side, they also sent a counter-embassy.

According to Thucydides, the Syrakusian envoy Hermokrates spoke first, and in response the Athenian envoy Euphemos opened his speech by stating that

¹⁸⁶ Lines 15-8: ἐφ' ᾧ ὅσοι ἂν βούλωνται Ξανθίων ἐν Μύ|ροις προσγράφεσθαι πρὸς τὸ πολίτευμα | οἴσουσιν γράμματα παρὰ τῶν ἀρχόν|των πρ(ὸ)ς τοὺς Μυρέων ἄρχοντας. For further discussion, see Bousquet and Gauthier (1994) *passim*.

¹⁸⁷ Rubinstein (2009) 123. See also Bresson (2000) 145-6.

¹⁸⁸ Daux (1937) 120-22.

the Athenians had come to Kamarina to renew their alliance with the people, but that the speech of Hermokrates meant they had to now also justify their empire (6.82.1):

ἀφικόμεθα μὲν ἐπὶ τῆς πρότερον οὔσης συμμαχίας ἀνανεώσει, τοῦ δὲ Συρακοσίου καθαψαμένου ἀνάγκη καὶ περὶ τῆς ἀρχῆς εἰπεῖν ὡς εἰκότως ἔχομεν ...

We came in order to renew our former alliance, but as the Syrakusians have attacked us, it is necessary to speak also about our empire which we rightly have ...

Euphemos' remarks are significant because they suggest that he thought the renewal of the alliance was sufficiently rhetorically powerful in its own right to persuade the Kamarinians to accept the Athenians' request. However, as Hermokrates had undermined his argument, Euphemos felt the need to strengthen his case and justify Athens' relations and behaviour towards other states, which would have probably required a great degree of improvisation. The original alliance had probably been concluded in c. 427, but its terms are not known and the nature of its terms have sparked scholarly debate.¹⁸⁹ At any rate, the passage quoted above is the only attestation in classical historiography where the renewal of an existing relationship that exists between two states appears as a theme in ambassadorial oratory, using the grammatical construction found later in Polybios and the inscriptions of the third and second centuries.

4. Summary: changes in practice and/or representation?

The evidence suggests that there is a change in how ambassadorial oratory was practiced in the Hellenistic Period compared with the fifth and fourth centuries. The language of renewal, which was generally used to denote the

¹⁸⁹ See Gomme (1970) 349 and Hornblower (2008) 489-91 for discussion.

renewal of existing relationships between individuals and the state or groups of individuals, seems to have been adopted by Greek envoys when renewing collective relationships with other states. Given how Greek city states were comprised of bodies of individual citizens, this should not come as a surprise.¹⁹⁰ As Low has demonstrated, in the fifth and fourth centuries there was an absence of a distinction between moral conduct at home and abroad, and the cardinal virtues often attributed to individual honorands were often applied to entire communities.¹⁹¹ Does this mean that envoys began to use the sort rhetoric to renew relationships between their community and their hosts, which had previously been used to renew relationships between individuals and relationships between individuals and the state? Not necessarily; while the rhetoric of renewal is scarce in earlier historiography and inscriptions, this does not mean that envoys did not invoke these sorts of relationships or renew them. As Fragoulaki has demonstrated, the kinship shared between communities is a hugely important theme in Thucydides, especially in some diplomatic negotiations during which Thucydides includes speeches.¹⁹² Similarly, in Xenophon's *Hellenika* the role of existing relations between states takes an important role in several speeches performed by envoys. For instance, the Achaian envoys to the Lakedaimonians in 389 threaten to withdraw from their alliance if they do not honour their obligations to give them military assistance (Xen. *Hell.* 4.6.2-3).¹⁹³

¹⁹⁰ Hansen (2006) 107-9.

¹⁹¹ Low (2007) 129-74.

¹⁹² E.g. The Korkyra debate (Thuc. 1.32-43) and the Plataian debate (3.52-68). See Fragoulaki (2013) 82-8, 119-39.

¹⁹³ Xen. *Hell.* 4.6.2-3: Ἡμεῖς μὲν γάρ, ἔφασαν, ὑμῖν, ὧ ἄνδρες, ὅπως ἂν ὑμεῖς παραγγέλλητε συστρατεύομεθα καὶ ἐπόμεθα ὅποι ἂν ἠγῆσθε· ὑμεῖς δὲ πολιορκουμένων ἡμῶν ὑπὸ Ἀκαρνάνων καὶ τῶν συμμάχων αὐτοῖς Ἀθηναίων καὶ Βοιωτῶν οὐδεμίαν ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖσθε. οὐκ ἂν οὔν δυναίμεθα ἡμεῖς τούτων οὔτω γιγνομένων ἀντέχειν, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐάσαντες τὸν ἐν Λοποννήσῳ πόλεμον διαβάντες πάντες πολεμήσομεν Ἀκαρνᾶσι τε καὶ τοῖς συμμάχοις αὐτῶν, ἢ εἰρήνην ποιησόμεθα ὅποιαν ἂν τινα δυνώμεθα. ταῦτα δ' ἔλεγον ὑπαπειλοῦντες τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ἀπαλλαγῆσθαι τῆς συμμαχίας, εἰ μὴ αὐτοῖς ἀντεπικουρήσουσι. On threat and coercion in Greek diplomacy during the fourth century, see Missiou-Ladi (1987) *passim*.

At the very least, what we are looking at is a change and perhaps even codification for how this sort of rhetoric is represented. Considering Polybios' use of inscriptions in his *Histories*, it should perhaps come as no surprise that his prose so closely reflects the inscriptions when reporting such diplomatic encounters.¹⁹⁴ The 'renewal' of relations seems almost to become a standard epigraphic formula in the motivation clauses of decrees that offer a summary of an oral performance delivered by an embassy. It is plausible, however, that this sort of renewal became more common in the Hellenistic Period, and that the shorthand came into use on the grounds that recording all the details of the nature of the relationship would perhaps be superfluous. As Chaniotis has suggested, it is possible that the Hellenistic Period saw a change in the functions of inscribed decrees, with a greater emphasis on commemoration.¹⁹⁵ It would therefore make sense for the decrees to record the relationships that the envoys renewed, not just to demonstrate that the envoys had adhered to their instructions, but also as a celebration and monomialisation of these relationships. The similarities between Polybios and the inscriptions suggest that the envoys' speeches recorded by Polybios in *oratio obliqua*, where the envoys renew one or more relationships that exist between their community and their hosts, make an effort to represent ambassadorial oratory as it was practiced in the third and second centuries. This is not to say that envoys did not engage in the same sort of rhetoric of renewal earlier in the fourth and fifth centuries, but the relative scarcity of this sort of rhetoric from this time suggests at the very least that it was not as common a rhetorical strategy.

¹⁹⁴ See Koehn (2013) 160-9 for the mirroring of Polybios' prose style and inscriptional prose, especially honorary decrees and motivation formulas.

¹⁹⁵ Chaniotis (2011) 351-2.

Chapter 2: Envoys and *Ethos*

Ethos is a fundamental aspect of rhetoric since the authority and trustworthiness of a speaker could determine whether their speech was successful or not. In his *Rhetoric*, Aristotle states that if the speaker is made to seem credible (*axiopistos*), they are more likely to be trusted by an audience, and he even goes as far as to say that *ethos* is the most authoritative means of persuasion (Ar. *Rh.* 1356a). According to Aristotle, it is essential for a speaker to project the qualities of wisdom (*phronesis*), virtue (*arete*), and goodwill (*eunoia*) if he is to win the trust of his audience and to give his speech a greater chance of being successful (1378a6-9). Hellenistic rhetoricians probably continued to discuss *ethos* as part of their theories and frameworks, but the fact that no complete rhetorical handbooks or published speeches survive between Aristotle and the beginning of the first century make it very difficult to gauge whether there were any further developments to Aristotle's conception of *ethos*.¹⁹⁶ It is important here to distinguish between *ethos*, a concept that can be traced back to the earliest rhetorical handbooks, and *ethopoiia*.¹⁹⁷ While *ethos* refers to the persuasive element of the speaker's character, *ethopoiia* refers to the creation of a character that is appropriate to the situation and the speaker. While Aristotle does not discuss the latter, he demonstrates an awareness of how style will vary depending on the status of the speaker, whether they are educated or rustic (1408a25-9).¹⁹⁸

But while the reflections of the Hellenistic rhetorical theorists are lost, the literary representation of oratory that was performed during this period is preserved in historiography and may provide some insight into how speakers utilised their trustworthiness and authority in their speeches. For the third and second centuries, our evidence for how speakers projected *ethos* as part of

¹⁹⁶ Wisse (1989) 80-3.

¹⁹⁷ On *ethopoiia*, see Kennedy (1963) 91-2; Lund (2017) 195-7; Kjeldsen *et al.* (2019) 122-4.

¹⁹⁸ Woerther (2007) 255-97.

their rhetorical strategies is almost entirely dependent on speeches reported in Polybios.¹⁹⁹ Since many of these speeches are orations performed by envoys, we should approach projections of *ethos* in this type of speech with some caution since it may have been used in a different way to speeches performed before domestic audiences. As Rubinstein has argued, the projection of a speaker's *ethos* would probably work differently in a speech performed by an envoy to a non-domestic audience since a speaker addressing his own community there is a greater likelihood that he will already be known by his audience.²⁰⁰ But a speaker addressing an audience amongst whom he is relatively unknown will probably allow for a greater scope of flexibility as to the *ethos* the speaker wishes to project, on the grounds that the audience knows little or nothing about his background. Yet Aristotle's conception of *ethos* is somewhat limited because he confines *ethos* to the character and credibility that a speaker projects with the words of his speech; he does not include the established reputation of a speaker, which is as important a consideration - if not more - for whether the speaker is to be trusted (*Rh.* 1356a5-15).²⁰¹ In addressing this limitation within the framework of Aristotelian rhetorical theory, Cogan argues that it is important to distinguish between what he calls a speaker's 'personality' and their 'character', which is what modern rhetoricians would sometimes call situated *ethos* and invented *ethos* respectively.²⁰²

¹⁹⁹ Although there is some scant evidence in rhetorical exercises preserved on papyri, e.g. Pack³ 2495, Col. II, 11. 19-24. See Kremmydas (2013) 154-6.

²⁰⁰ Rubinstein (2016a) 81-2.

²⁰¹ *Rh.* 1356a8-15: δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο συμβαίνειν διὰ τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ μὴ διὰ τοῦ προδεδοξάσθαι ποιόν τινα εἶναι τὸν λέγοντα: οὐ γάρ, ὥσπερ ἔνιοι τῶν τεχνολογούντων, οὐ τίθεμεν ἐν τῇ τέχνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐπιείκειαν τοῦ λέγοντος, ὡς οὐδὲν συμβαλλομένην πρὸς τὸ πιθανόν, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ὡς εἰπεῖν κυριωτάτην ἔχει πίστιν τὸ ἦθος.

²⁰² Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1958) 316-21; Cogan (1981) 215. While I think Cogan's model provides a good foundation for analysing the authority and trustworthiness of a speaker, I find his use of the term 'personality' a little clumsy since it is something that is generally projected through words, actions, and/or demeanour, rather than something, rather than the pre-existing knowledge that one or more people have of an individual. Instead, I suggest that we simply use the term 'standing'.

The implications of an audience's pre-existing perception of the speaker are huge; even before an individual who is known to their audience opens their mouth, they will generally have an opinion of the speaker, although audiences are often composite bodies and the pre-existing judgements among an audience of a speaker will naturally vary.²⁰³ As the French philosopher Jean de La Bruyère wrote in his 1688 work *Les caractères* during his discussion of speakers in the pulpit, there are “saintly men whose character alone carries the power of persuasion” and that the whole audience that is about to listen to them “is already moved and, as it were, persuaded by their presence.”²⁰⁴ This is not too dissimilar to the advice of Quintilian, who stated that the authority and rank of the speaker, as well as the non-verbalised memory of their past deeds, are visually rhetorical in their own right (Quint. *Inst.* 2.15.6).²⁰⁵ It would therefore be important that the speaker already had an established a reputation in the community he was addressing. This consideration was emphasised by rhetoricians as early as the mid-fourth century, as seen in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* (*Rh. Al.* 24.3):

ὅτι δὲ οὗτος μὲν οὐ δύναται, ἕτερος δὲ δύναται, τοιόνδε· αὐτὸς μὲν οὖν ἀδυνατῶς ἔχει πρεσβεύειν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, οὗτος δὲ φίλος ἐστὶ τῆ πόλει τῶν Σπαρτιατῶν καὶ μάλιστα ἂν δυνηθεῖη πράξει, ἃ βούλεσθε.

That this man is not able, but the other one is capable, thus: “He himself is incapable of going on an embassy on our behalf, but this man is a friend of the Spartan polis and is very capable of doing what you wish.

²⁰³ Aristotle also recognises this and maintains that *ethos* is especially important where certainty is impossible and opinions are divided (Ar. *Rh.* 1356a8). Hansen and Kock (2003) *passim* argue that one ought to separate between pre-conceived credibility the charisma, i.e. what is projected orally by a speaker, and that pre-existing perceptions of the former can vary.

²⁰⁴ “Il y a au contraire des hommes saints, et dont le seul caractère est efficace pour la persuasion: ils paraissent, et tout un peuple qui doit les écouter est déjà ému et comme persuadé par leur présence; le discours qu'ils vont prononcer fera le reste.” La Bruyère (1688) 464.

²⁰⁵ Quint. *Inst.* 2.15.6: *verum et pecunia persuadet et gratia et auctoritas dicentis et dignitas, postremo aspectus etiam ipse sine voce, quo vel recordatio meritorum cuiusque vel facies aliqua miserabilis vel formae pulchritudo sententiam dictat.* Kjeldsen (2003) *passim* calls this ‘direct ocular rhetoric’. Reinhardt and Winterbottom (2006) 240-1 do not, surprisingly, comment on this.

Since this hypothetical envoy was already a φίλος to the Lakedaimonians, there is a likelihood that they would have already trusted him. Therefore, his standing alone might be sufficient to demonstrate *eunoia*, and he may not need to spend much time appealing to his personal authority during the oral performance to gain the trust of the audience since they probably already had a positive preconception of him.²⁰⁶ Aischines expresses similar considerations in *Against Ktesiphon* (Aeschin. 3.138-9):

καίτοι πολλάς μὲν πρότερον πρεσβείας ἐπρέσβευσαν εἰς Θήβας οἱ μάλιστα οἰκείως ἐκείνοις διακείμενοι, πρῶτος μὲν Θρασύβουλος ὁ Κολλυτεύς, ἀνὴρ ἐν Θήβαις πιστευθεὶς ὡς οὐδεὶς ἕτερος, πάλιν Θράσων ὁ Ἐρχιεύς, πρόξενος ὦν Θηβαίοις, Λεωδάμας ὁ Ἀχαρνεύς, οὐχ ἦττον Δημοσθένους λέγειν δυνάμενος, ἀλλ' ἔμοιγε καὶ ἠδίων, Ἀρχέδημος ὁ Πήληξ, καὶ δυνατὸς εἰπεῖν καὶ πολλὰ κεκινδυνευκῶς ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ διὰ Θηβαίους, Ἀριστοφῶν ὁ Ἀζηνιεύς, πλεῖστον χρόνον τὴν τοῦ βοιωτιάζειν ὑπομείνας αἰτίαν, Πύρρανδρος ὁ Ἀναφλύστιος, ὃς ἔτι καὶ νῦν ζῆ.

And yet those closely associated with Thebes undertook many embassies to them, firstly Thrasyboulos of Kollytos, a man more trusted in Thebes than anybody else, and again Thrason of Erchia, who was proxenos to the Thebans, Leodamas of Acharnai, not less capable of speaking than Demosthenes, but more pleasing in my view, Archedemos of Pelex, both a capable speaker and ran many risks in politics for the sake of Thebes, Aristophon of Azenia, accused of favouring Boiotia for the longest time, Pyrrandros of Anaphylstos, who is now still alive.

We know that Thrasyboulos and Pyrrandros served as two of the envoys to Thebes in 378/7 to persuade them to join the Second Athenian Naval League (IG II² 43, lines 75-7). But Thrasyboulos' connections with Thebes go back much earlier; he was one of the Athenian democrats who set out from Thebes to capture Phyle to topple the Thirty, and his name was probably included in the *stèle* honouring the heroes of Phyle.²⁰⁷ His son, Thrason, in his capacity as a

²⁰⁶ As emphasised by Rubinstein (2016) 84-5.

²⁰⁷ As is suggested by Steinbock (2013) 277-9. For the inscription, see SEG 28:45. On the role of *philia* in diplomatic relations with Thebes, see Mitchell (1997) 66-7.

proxenos, probably assisted the Theban exiles after the Lakedaimonians seized the Kadmeia (Din. 1.38).²⁰⁸ The rhetorical capabilities of Leodamas are also praised by Demosthenes, as are those of Aristophon, when they spoke as *synegoroi* in favour of Leptines' law in 355 (Dem. 20.146).²⁰⁹ Aristophon also had a lengthy political career, although his pro-Theban credentials are unclear.²¹⁰ These considerations which had the potential to increase the standing of a potential envoy are also hinted at in an inscription of the Ionian Greeks from the first century, which honours two Aphrodisian envoys and narrates how they were chosen out of the first rank and highly honoured (ἐκ τῶν πρώτων καὶ μάλιστα τιμω[μένων]) to speak on their behalf to the Roman Senate, since they had a reputation for honour and glory (ἐπ' ἀρετῇ καὶ δόξῃ) among the Greeks (*ISE III 166*, lines 6-7).²¹¹ The evidence suggests a degree of awareness about how the personal standing of an envoy could have implications for an oral performance, and therefore the success of the mission as a whole. But this was in fact a double-edged sword, and envoys who enjoyed too close a relationship with their host community might become distrusted by their home *polis*. For instance, Demosthenes distances himself from the Rhodians by stating that he was neither their *proxenos* or *xenos* to any Rhodian when he advocated intervention on their behalf (Dem. 15.15).²¹² The consequences of such accusations could be grave; there are at least thirty attested cases of *eisangelia* brought against envoys, and if the envoy was convicted, they could be given the death penalty.²¹³ Therefore, while it was

²⁰⁸ Worthington (1992) 193. Thrason also served as an envoy to Keptrioris in Thrake in 356/5 (*IG II² 127*).

²⁰⁹ Rubinstein (2000) 172; Kremmydas (2012) 423-7.

²¹⁰ Whitehead (1986) 316-7 suggests that Aristophon might have developed these political sympathies after the restoration of the democracy in 403/2, after which it became somewhat 'fashionable' to be pro-Theban.

²¹¹ Generally, see Reynolds (1982) 26-32. Reynolds restores the text as τοῖς Ἑλλη]σιν (line 14), so it is not certain who the envoys had a good reputation among. For further instances of this phraseology in honorary decrees, see *IG XII Suppl.* 553 and *IK Iasos* 98.

²¹² Rubinstein (2016) 86 n.20.

²¹³ Bauman (1990) 84-94. Hansen (1975) 69-120 gives a catalogue of officials, including envoys, who were charged via *eisangelia* in the Classical Period.

rhetorically advantageous for an envoy to use their personal connections in another *polis*, relying too heavily on one's personal authority could compromise the mission.

Since so much of our knowledge of Hellenistic oratory is dependent on the literary construction of speeches in Polybios, we must assess the extent to which projections of *ethos* by speakers in his *Histories* reflect the oratorical strategies adopted by the orator when the speech was first delivered. This is especially important in the case of Polybios since he frequently includes his own opinion on individuals, therefore there is a risk that the *ethē* projected by the speakers in the text might reflect Polybios' own attitude towards that individual rather than the actual character that the speaker projected at the time. In addition, within the context of historiography speeches often serve as vehicle for characterisation, and so there is a risk that the literary representation of a speaker's character is exaggerated.²¹⁴ Despite this, Polybios argues that historians ought to strive to characterise historical figures accurately when putting words into their mouths. Famously, in Book 12, he attacks his predecessor, Timaios of Tauromenion, on the grounds that the speeches he composed for his work are not an accurate representation of what was said and more akin to rhetorical exercises, exemplified by how the speeches contain arguments that would not have been used by the speaker he attributes them to. In the case of Hermokrates of Syrakuse's speech at Gela, Polybios writes (12.25k.10-11):

ὁ δὲ χωρὶς τῆς ὅλης παραπτώσεως τοῦ διατεθεῖσθαι τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τοῦ λόγου πρὸς τὰ καθάπαξ μὴ προσδεόμενα λόγου καὶ λήμμασι κέχρηται τοιούτοις, οἷς τὸν μὲν Ἑρμοκράτην τίς ἂν κεχρῆσθαι πιστεύσειε, τὸν συναγωνισάμενον μὲν Λακεδαιμονίοις τὴν ἐν Αἰγὸς ποταμοῖς ναυμαχίαν, αὐτανδρὶ δὲ χειρωσάμενον τὰς Ἀθηναίων

²¹⁴ On speeches as a vehicle for characterisation, see Pitcher (2007) 110-12; Baragwanath (2017) 286-95; de Bakker (2018) 148-52; Rood (2018a) 174-80.

δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς στρατηγούς κατὰ Σικελίαν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μαιράκιον τὸ τυχόν;

Apart from his general mistake in devoting the greater part of the speech to matters that did not need to be touched upon at all, he also uses such arguments, which who would believe Hermokrates would have said, he who fought with the Lakedaimonians at Aigospotamoi and conquered the troops and generals of the Athenians in Sicily, when maybe not even a child would have used them?

Polybios then discusses how Hermokrates' speech is highly emotionally charged in style and contained quotations from Homer and Euripides, which Polybios believes were not only an inaccurate reflection of what Hermokrates said at the time, but not the sort of rhetorical style that a man like Hermokrates would have adopted, whose speech would have not resembled an exercise by a schoolboy (12.26.8).²¹⁵ In other words, the style (*lexis*) of the speech is inappropriate for the profile of the speaker.²¹⁶ As Quintilian emphasises, a remark (*dictum*) might sound natural when said by one speaker, foolish if said by another, or arrogant if said by another (Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.37).²¹⁷ While Polybios does not explicitly mention *ethopoiia* here, his words seek to reassure the reader that the speeches he reports in his *Histories* are accurate representations of the arguments that the speakers used, and he shows a sophisticated consciousness of how the nature of a speaker's arguments is potentially a reflection on their character and standing. While Classical Rhetorical theory often distinguishes between the invention of arguments and style, rhetoricians such as Murphy, Fahnstock, and Lund have rightly argued that the distinction between *heuresis* and *lexis* is somewhat artificial since

²¹⁵ However, despite Polybios' attack on Timaios' inclusion of quotations from poetry in Hermokrates' speech, orators frequently did exactly this. For example, Aischines quotes Homer, Hesiod, and Euripides within the space of two chapters of *Against Timarchos* (Aeschin. 1.128-9), and extensively quotes the *Iliad* in (1.41-52). Lykourgos also quotes Homer (Lycurg. *Leoc.* 103).

²¹⁶ Bruss and Graff (2005) *passim* discuss how Aristotle has very little to say about how style of speech impacts the *ethos* that the speaker projects, although despite their pessimism there is some discussion of this in the *Rhetoric*, e.g. 1404b31-1405a29; 1408a9-10; 1417a16ff.

²¹⁷ Quint. *Inst.* 11.1.37: *idem dictum saepe in alio liberum, in alio furiosum, in alio superbum est.*

stylistic choices have a profound impact on the how an audience perceives a speaker.²¹⁸ To Polybios, the arguments that Timaios put into the mouth of Hermokrates did not align with his standing and profile, or at least the standing that Polybios believed he had.

Although the majority of Hellenistic historiography is lost, the evidence of Polybios may provide a good illustration of how he and his contemporaries represented oratory in their historiographical works. As a narrator, Polybios frequently comments on the character of key individuals in his work, as well as the character of whole communities.²¹⁹ As Eckstein has argued, Polybios' work frequently gives a moral commentary on the behaviour of individuals as well as entire communities both on the battlefield and in the political arena, often negatively since he sees them as political opponents and/or they are a symbol of decline, a theme that runs throughout the *Histories*.²²⁰ Polybios' concern for the character of the individual also extends explicitly to rhetoric; he refers to his own biography of Philopoimen by the adjective ἐγκωμιστικός (10.21.8), and his use of stereotypical 'characters' such as the wicked tyrant may be the result of his rhetorical training and the intellectual milieu of tragic historiography.²²¹ He may then construct the speeches in such a way that the rhetoric conveys an impression of the type of character that he wants us to believe in. It would not be too surprising if speeches performed in a diplomatic context convey an accurate representation of oratory, or even an approximation.

²¹⁸ Murphy (1990) *passim*; Fahnestock (2011) 306-24; Lund (2017) 190-4. For the connection between *lexis* and *ethos* in Aristotle in particular, see Kotarcic (2021) 88-96.

²¹⁹ For instance, Polybios remarks that Deinokrates of Messne is a poor speaker before reporting his speech to the Roman Senate (23.5.8). On Polybios' interjections, see Walbank (2002) 212-30 and Longley (2013) *passim*.

²²⁰ Eckstein (2008) esp. 28-55; 194-236. On the moralising tendency, see Hau (2016) 56-71. For a survey of minor characters in Polybios, see Garson (1975) *passim*.

²²¹ Alexiou (2019) *passim* argues that there are a number of Isokrateian and epideiktic *topoi* in Polybios' introduction to Philopoimen. On the role of historiography in rhetorical education, especially in regards to style and imitation, see Nicolai (1992) 61-83.

The layout of this chapter is as follows. I will first survey the speeches performed by envoys in Polybios *Histories* that are reported in *oratio recta* and *oratio obliqua* and analyse the character projection techniques employed by the envoys as part of their rhetorical strategy. After collating the findings, I will determine whether the same rhetorical techniques can be found in ambassadorial speeches from earlier historiographical texts, namely Thucydides and Xenophon. I will argue that the evidence of Polybios suggests that the *ethē* projected by envoys during their oral performances is more personalised than that of Thucydides and more akin to the representation of ambassadorial oratory in Xenophon. I will also point out that when assessing evidence concerning federal states, the *ethos* that an envoy can project is much more flexible and that speakers can shift between their *polis ethos* and their federal *ethos* when it was rhetorically advantageous to do so. I will conclude by suggesting that although this suggests a change in how ambassadorial oratory was practised after the late fourth century, it could potentially reflect stylistic changes to the historiographical habit, especially with regard to reporting speeches.²²²

1. Envoys as Characters in Polybios

As I emphasised in my introduction, the pre-existing knowledge that an audience has of a speaker may have a profound effect on how their speech is received. For readers of ancient historiography, our reception of the reported speeches will often depend on whether we can identify the speaker since we know more about them from other contexts and sources. This may seem trivial on the surface, since our knowledge about many of the individuals we find in historiographical texts is minute compared to what was probably known about them at the time. Yet, a modern comparison will illustrate the importance of

²²² The role the inscriptions play in this is addressed in the next chapter.

knowing who the individual speaker is. Imagine if *Hansard*, which records transcripts of UK Parliamentary debates, attributed the speeches it publishes solely to nameless speakers, and instead identifies speakers solely by their political party or to the constituency they represent. This would profoundly affect how we interpret the speeches; if we do not know who the speaker is, we do engage with their rhetoric according to what we already know about them, namely the authority they have on the subject at hand and their track record.²²³

When Polybios reports a speech performed by an envoy wholly or partly in *oratio recta*, he almost always attributes the speech to a single named individual. For this reason, some scholars have suggested that the attribution of speeches to well-known individuals in Polybios suggests that he had access to written forms of the speeches that were in circulation during the second century, and that these formed the basis of his constructions, however remains a highly controversial topic.²²⁴ But based on the speeches that Polybios represents, is there any evidence that envoys appealed to their individual standing verbally? It is necessary here to conduct a survey of these speeches.

a. Agelaos of Naupaktos

Following the end of the Social War in 217, Philip and his allies held a peace conference at Naupaktos to decide the peace terms with the Aitolians (Polyb. 5.103.6-5). Polybios states many envoys made speeches but that most of these were not worth mentioning, immediately suggesting he has some sort of agenda in singling out only one oral performance to what would have probably

²²³ Although, this may be a more beneficial approach to representing speeches since it might potentially do away with any prejudices that we as an audience might have against the speaker.

²²⁴ For general discussion, see Deininger (1974) *passim*, Mørkholm (1967) *passim*, (1974) *passim*; Walbank (1967) 629; Champion (1997) *passim*.

been a lively debate. He treats us to a summary in *oratio obliqua* of the speech of Agelaos (5.104). Although Polybios does not give any background to who Agelaos was here, it is clear from elsewhere in the text and from epigraphic evidence that he was a very senior figure in Aitolian politics.²²⁵ We know that he served as *strategos* for the federation a second time in 224/3 (*IG IX.1.4c*) and served as a commander in 218 (Polyb. 5.3.1). It is not known when he served his first term as *strategos*, though Grainger suggests a date of 231/0.²²⁶ At any rate, what we know about Agelaos' career prior to 217 suggests that he delivered this speech as a middle-aged man who was probably known by the other representatives at the conference due to his federal career. Despite this, Polybios' summary indicates that Agelaos did not attempt to reinforce his oratory through demonstrating his own personal authority. At the beginning of his speech, in *oratio obliqua*, Polybios articulates the arguments using a string of infinitives, e.g. ἡξίου συμφρονεῖν καὶ φυλάττεσθαι (5.104.2). This demonstrates the problem with speeches reported in *oratio obliqua* – subtle verbal projections, which can have a substantial impact on the framing of the speaker's rhetoric, are lost.

In the final sentence of the speech, the pronouns suggest that Agelaos spoke in the first-person plural (5.104.10-11).²²⁷ It is plausible that Polybios opted for the plural here in order to have Agelaos convey a “we feeling” with his audience. The *telos* of Agelaos' speech is to argue for caution against the rising power of Rome, for which the speaker uses the vivid metaphor of a storm. The subjunctive is also used in this section of the speech where one would expect an optative, creating a sense of vividness and drama. In urging caution against Rome, Agelaos is also calling for a degree of unity among the

²²⁵ He is named as a *strategos* in Polybios (5.107.5) and as a political ally of Dorimachos and Skopas within Aitolian politics (4.16.10-11).

²²⁶ Grainger (2000) 81-2.

²²⁷ Polyb. 5.104.10-11: ἐκκοπήναι συμβῆ πάντων ἡμῶν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ὥστε κἂν εὐξασθαι τοῖς θεοῖς ὑπάρχειν ἡμῖν τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην, καὶ πολεμεῖν ὅταν βουλώμεθα καὶ διαλύεσθαι πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ καθόλου κυρίου εἶναι τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀμφισβητουμένων.

Greeks, and therefore using *prosopopoiia* to represent himself as the wise spokesperson of all Greeks would be an appropriate rhetorical strategy.²²⁸ It is not surprising that Polybios makes Agelaos speak in the first-person plural during the culmination of his speech where he wants to emphasise his argument. It is also important to remember the *kairos* of the speech in that, as an Aitolian, Agelaos was addressing an audience consisting of representatives with whom his *koinon* had been at war for almost three years. Therefore, his panhellenic self-representation is an integral aspect of his argument, which attempts to bridge unity with former enemies against Rome, arguably deflecting negative attention away from his community. The speech also falls towards the close of the meeting, after the terms of the peace had already been decided, and so his harangue was probably more of a closing remark rather than a traditional piece of symbouleutic oratory. The objective of the speech was not only to warn against the rising power of Rome, but to leave the audience with that thought as the congress came to a close. At any rate, according to Polybios' remarks that Agelaos was elected *strategos* again due to his role in the peace negotiations following the Social War, which would naturally have the sort of rhetorical skills that Polybios' account of his speech demonstrates (5.107.5).

b. Chlaineas and Lykiskos

In contrast to the speech of Agelaos, the two speeches delivered by the competing envoys at Sparta in 211/10 make a much greater use of personalisation as part of their rhetorical strategy. The Lakedaimonians were deliberating whether to accept a new alliance with the Aitolian League, who were then allied with Rome, or whether to form an alliance with Philip V, and Polybios dramatizes this debate with two long diplomatic speeches that he

²²⁸ On *prosopopoiia* in the Classical Rhetorical tradition generally, see Fahnestock (2011) 316-9.

reports in *oratio recta*.²²⁹ Problematically, this section of the *Histories* is fragmentary. While both the speeches survive in full, the section of text preceding the first speech is lost, therefore we do not know who else was present at the debate and if any other envoys spoke. The two speeches that survive are attributed to named individuals; Chlaineas of Kalydon who argues for a new alliance with the Aitolians, and Lykiskos of Akarnania who argues for an alliance with Philip. Lykiskos also refers to one Kleonikos during his speech, presumably a competing envoy from the Aitolian League (9.37.4).²³⁰ However, no oral performance attributed to him has survived either in *oratio recta* or as a summary in *oratio obliqua*. Since Polybios' work is so fragmentary here, we cannot rule out that he may not have spoken at all but was merely present in support the Aitolian delegation.

Chlaineas speaks predominantly in the first-person singular at the beginning of his speech, to such an extent that there are very few indications that he is speaking on behalf of the Aitolian League. At the opening of his speech, he asserts that the arguments he is making are his own (Polyb. 9.28.1):

ὅτι μὲν οὖν, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, τὴν Μακεδόνων δυναστείαν ἀρχὴν συνέβη γεγονέναι τοῖς Ἑλλησι δουλείας, οὐδ' ἄλλως εἰπεῖν οὐδένα πέπεισμαι τολμῆσαι: σκοπεῖν δ' οὕτως ἔξεστιν.

Men of Lakedaimon, I am convinced that no one would venture to deny that the slavery of Greece owes its origins to the kings of Makedon, but the matter may be looked at thus.

Chlaineas then launches into a long *diegesis* in which he narrates in vivid detail the atrocities that the kings of Makedon had committed against numerous Greek *poleis*, starting with Philip II and his imposition of *andrapodismos* on Olynthos and ending with Philip V's pillaging of the temples at Thermos

²²⁹ For further background, see Shipley (2018) 79-81.

²³⁰ This is probably Kleonikos of Naupaktos who is attested as proxenos to Achaia and was captured by the Achaians during the Social War (5.95.12). See Grainger (2000) 196.

(9.28.2-30.4).²³¹ After stating the grounds on which Alexander sacked Thebes in 335 he ends the sentence with the phrase πάντας ὑμᾶς οἶομαι κατανοεῖν (9.28.8), using *apophasis* to imply that he need not go into the details of Alexander's actions since they were already known by those present, probably notoriously.²³² He also uses first person verbs to link together different episodes that make up his *diegesis*; at 9.29.7 the speaker uses the verb ἐπᾶνεμι to introduce the Antigonos Doson segment. Chlaineas even uses a rhetorical question with *apophasis* to introduce Philip V's pillaging at Thermos; περί γε μὴν τῆς Φιλίππου παρανομίας τίς χρεία πλειῶ λέγειν; (9.30.1). However, he concludes his narrative in the plural with εἰρήσθω plus ἡμῖν (9.30.5). Chlaineas' use of verbs and his *apophasis* probably serves to urge his audiences to share in the anger his speech wishes to invoke (cf Ar. Rh. 1408a32-6).

On three occasions Chlaineas also uses the first-person plural, probably to both create a sense of shared anger towards Makedon and to represent himself as the spokesperson for the Aitolian *koinon*. For instance, at 9.30.6 he argues that Elis and Messene have been protected from the Achaian League due to their alliance with the Aitolians, or in his words, 'through their alliance with us' (πρὸς ἡμᾶς). The other uses of the first-person plural fall to the end of the speech, with three instances at 9.31.3-4.²³³ In one of these instances, Chlaineas emphasises to the Lakedaimonians how they had fought together

²³¹ On the use of emotions and *energeia* in this *diegesis*, see Chaniotis (2011) 342-6.

²³² Narrating the sack of Thebes would have been repetitive since he had just given a detailed account of Philip's invasion of Lakonia, and since Chlaineas is addressing the Lakedaimonians here, it would have strategically more effective to narrate events relevant to their own city in detail.

²³³ Polyb. 9.31.3-4: εἰ γὰρ συνέθεσθε τὴν νῦν ὑπάρχουσαν ὑμῖν πρὸς ἡμᾶς συμμαχίαν πρότερον τῶν ὑπ' Ἀντιγόνου γεγονότων εἰς ὑμᾶς εὐεργετημάτων, ἴσως ἦν εἰκὸς διαπορεῖν, εἰ δέον ἐστί, τοῖς ἐπιγεγονόσιν εἴκοντας παριδεῖν τι τῶν πρότερον ὑπαρχόντων. ἐπεὶ δὲ συντετελεσμένης ὑπ' Ἀντιγόνου τῆς πολυθρυλήτου ταύτης ἐλευθερίας καὶ σωτηρίας, ἦν οὗτοι παρ' ἕκαστον ὑμῖν ὀνειδίζουσι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα βουλευόμενοι καὶ πολλάκις ἑαυτοῖς δόντες λόγον, ποτέροις ὑμᾶς δεῖ κοινωνεῖν πραγμάτων, Αἰτωλοῖς ἢ Μακεδόσιν, εἴλεσθε μετέχειν Αἰτωλοῖς, οἷς ἐδώκατε περὶ τούτων πίστεις καὶ κατελάβετε παρ' ἡμῶν, καὶ συμπεπολεμήκατε τὸν πρῶτον συστάντα πόλεμον ἡμῖν πρὸς Μακεδόνας, τίς ἔτι δύναται περὶ τούτων εἰκότως ἐπαπορεῖν;

with the Aitolians during the Social War with the use of ἡμῖν (9.31.4). Interestingly, Chlaineas refers to the Aitolian League in the third person, especially in the *diegesis*.²³⁴ For instance, Chlaineas commends the Aitolian League for accepting refugees who had fled their *poleis* to escape the assassins of Antipater and for their resistance during the Lamian War (9.29.4; 30.3). The other references to the Aitolian League in the third person fall towards the end of the speech, where Chlaineas also employs the first-person as I have noted above (9.31.4-6). The evidence suggests that Chlaineas' character projection consists of two key components. During the *diegesis* he represents himself as an individual narrator, rather than a spokesperson for the Aitolians, through his use of first-person singular thinking, showing a high degree of sincerity in giving his own views. This enhances his authority on the grounds that it makes him appear like an independent observer who is making his arguments based on his own knowledge of the history of Makedonian foreign policy. The *ethos* of the 'independent observer' makes the emotional aspect of his narrative greater since the sincerity makes it more difficult to disregard his arguments as diplomatic mudslinging from one community about another.

The opposing speaker, Lykiskos of Akarnania, represents himself in a markedly dissimilar way to persuade the Lakedaimonians to form an alliance with Philip. The *ethos* he projects in the opening of his speech is different from that of Chlaineas (9.32.3-4):

Ἡμεῖς, ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, παρεγενόμεθα μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων ἀπεσταλμένοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς, μετέχοντες δὲ σχεδὸν αἰεὶ ποτε Μακεδόσι τῶν αὐτῶν ἐλπίδων καὶ τὴν πρεσβείαν ταύτην κοινὴν ὑπολαμβάνομεν ἡμῖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ Μακεδόσιν. ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ κατὰ τοὺς κινδύνους διὰ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῆς Μακεδόνων δυνάμεως ἐμπεριέχεσθαι συμβαίνει τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσφάλειαν ἐν ταῖς ἐκείνων ἀρεταῖς, οὕτως καὶ κατὰ τοὺς πρεσβευτικούς ἀγῶνας ἐμπεριέχεται τὸ τῶν Ἀκαρνάνων συμφέρον ἐν τοῖς Μακεδόνων δικαίοις.

²³⁴ The other instance is at 9.30.9.

We, men of Lakedaimon, have been sent to you by the Akarnanian League; and as we have nearly always made common cause with Makedon we consider that this embassy represents Makedon as well as our own country. And just as in battles owing to the superiority and strength of the Makedonian force their valour involves our safety, so in diplomatic contests the interests of Akarnania are involved in the rights of Makedonia.

Lykiskos is clearly not speaking as an individual but for the Akarnanians collectively, emphasised by the plural *παρεγενόμεθα*, who are not only pro-Makedon but also representing the interests of Makedon. He also uses the first-person plural several times in the *prooimion*.²³⁵ Lykiskos' prologue stands in contrast to the opening of Chlaineas' speech through its use of *prosopopoiia*; Lykiskos establishes that his voice is not his own but that of his state and an important ally, whereas Chlaineas' use of the first-person suggests he is speaking as himself.²³⁶ But in two instances during the *prooimion* Lykiskos is made to use the first-person singular; at 9.32.9-10 he attempts humour by confessing that he would deserve the mockery Chlaineas claims the Akarnanians warrant if they are not able to demolish his argument, and he even uses the pronoun *ἐγὼ* for additional emphasis.²³⁷

Yet, when Lykiskos moves to his *diegesis* (9.33-7), he shifts to the first-person singular and seems to find his own voice, and only uses the plural in one instance.²³⁸ Before opening his narrative, Lykiskos claims it is incumbent

²³⁵ I find two further instances: *πεπείσμεθα* (9.32.8); *παραγινόμεθα* (9.32.11).

²³⁶ It is worth noting, however, that this fragment of Polybios opens *in media res* with Chlaineas' speech in *oratio recta* and that any prologue, including any potential introduction of him as a speaker or parts of the speech in *oratio obliqua*, are lost. We cannot know for certain if the start of Chlaineas' speech in the surviving text is the opening of the speech.

²³⁷ 9.32.9-10: *ἐγὼ δ', εἰ μὲν μηδὲν ἐπιγέγονε κατὰ τὸν τοῦτου λόγον, μένει δὲ τὰ πράγματα τοιαῦτα τοῖς Ἕλλησιν οἷα πρότερον ἦν, ὅτε πρὸς αὐτοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ἐποιεῖσθε τὴν συμμαχίαν, ὁμολογῶ πάντων εὐηθέστατος ὑπάρχειν καὶ ματαιοῦς μέλλειν διατίθεσθαι λόγους: εἰ δὲ τὴν ἐναντίαν ἔσχηκε διάθεσιν, ὡς ἐγὼ σαφῶς δεῖξω προϊόντος τοῦ λόγου, καὶ λίαν ἐμὲ μὲν οἴομαι φανήσεσθαι τι λέγειν ὑμῖν τῶν συμφερόντων, Χλαινεάν δ' ἄγνοεῖν.*

²³⁸ The 'we' being those Greeks who were fenced in by Makedon during the Gallic invasion in 279 (9.35.3).

on himself (μοι δοκεῖ) to give an alternative account - or as he would argue, the more accurate one - of the events Chlaineas covered in his *prooimion* in order to correct him (9.33.1). Although Lykiskos asserts that it is his task to refute the claims of Chlaineas, he adopts a similar strategy of asserting his own individual authority throughout his account through the use of the first-person singular and at least one interjection that expresses his own opinion. For instance, at 9.33.3 he even includes the first-person pronoun, emphasising that what he is asserting is potentially his own *gnome* (ἐγὼ ... ὑπολαμβάνω), and placing it in contrast to that of Chlaineas. The speaker asserts his authority on the events of his *diegesis* and his arguments in his refutation with speaking verbs a further five times, which like in the speech of Chlaineas, also allow him to structure the historical narrative effectively.²³⁹ During the refutation, he also interrogates the opposing envoys directly with a string of questions about who their true allies are, introduced by ἐρωτῶ (9.37.4-6). Lykiskos also hints at his own *gnome* by suggesting that he does not think (ἔγωγ' ... νομίζω) there is an example of greater benevolence than how Antigonos Doson treated the Lakedaimonians (9.36.2). The speaker also hints at his personal *gnome* with an interjection at 9.33.12 with a declarative statement about how well Philip II treated the Lakedaimonians after their defeat at his hands.²⁴⁰ These personal assertions probably serve as invitations to envoys from other delegations to attempt to refute his arguments.

Lykiskos is otherwise unknown, which raises the question of what authority he actually has as a speaker. We cannot rule out that he may have been better known in antiquity, but this has not survived in our historical record.²⁴¹ It is interesting that Lykiskos does not incorporate his status as an

²³⁹ ἡγοῦμαι (9.35.5); βούλομαι (9.36.1); ἐρῶ; ποιήσω (9.36.6); μέλλω λέγειν (9.36.7); εἰρήσθω (9.37.1); ἐρωτῶ (9.37.4); ἐπάνω (9.38.9).

²⁴⁰ 9.33.12: ἄξιόν γε τὸ γεγονὸς ὀνειδούς καὶ προφορᾶς.

²⁴¹ Walbank (1967) 162-3. The only plausible connection I have found is a *proxenia* decree of the Akarnanian League, dating from between 167 and 146, which mentions that one Kleandros of

Akarnanian given his anti-Aitolian rhetoric. During the middle of the third century, decades before this debate, the Aitolian League had annexed Akarnania.²⁴² According to Pompeius Trogus, the Akarnanians even appealed to Rome and asked them to order the Aitolians to withdraw from their territory and ensure their freedom (*Just. Epit.* 28.1.5-6).²⁴³ Lykiskos therefore had the opportunity to represent himself as a sort of witness – a representative of a community that had experienced being allied with Aitolia whose authority would be trusted on this matter. A similar rhetorical strategy was adopted by Sokles of Korinth in a speech to the Lakedaimonians who, according to Herodotos, dissuaded them from reinstating the Peisistratids based on the experiences of his own community when they were ruled by tyrants (*Hdt.* 5.92).²⁴⁴ When envoys from the Hellenic League approached Akarnania to request that they join in the Social War against Aitolia, the Akarnanians willingly obliged but expressed some caution on the grounds of the sufferings the Aitolians had previously inflicted on them (*Polyb.* 4.30.2-5). But interestingly, no such argumentative strategy is apparent in the speech of Lykiskos. It is plausible that the Aitolian expansion was not as aggressive as Polybios and Trogus portray, as Rzepka has argued, but this is still a matter of some controversy, and the surviving evidence undermines his argument.²⁴⁵

In the case of Chlaineas, we know that he most likely served as *hieromnemon* to the Amphyktionic Council at Delphoi in 207/6, a religious

Anaktorion, the son of Lykiskos, served as secretary at the meeting when the decree was passed (*IG V.1.29*).

²⁴² For chronology, see Scholten (2000) 134-6; Rzepka (2019) *passim*.

²⁴³ *Just. Epit.* 28.1.5-6: *Acarananes quoque diffisi Epirotis adversus Aetolos auxilium Romanorum inplorantes obtinuerunt a Romano senatu, ut legati mitterentur, qui denuntiarent Aetolis, praesidia ab urbibus Acarnaniae deducerent paterenturque liberos esse, qui soli quondam adversus Troianos, auctores originis suae, auxilia Graecis non miserint.*

²⁴⁴ Although the individual character of Sokles is not apparent in the speech, see below. The speech is probably not based on reality, see Hornblower's commentary *ad loc.*

²⁴⁵ Rzepka (2019) 170-3. (*IG IX² 13A*). Saba (2020) 175-9 argues that the agreement of *isopoliteia* is unusual for two federal states. In addition, the details concerning the established border between the two territories and the unusually high number of places the agreement is to be set up suggests a hugely complicated, and thereby contentious, process. More recently, see Antonetti (2019) *passim* on Aitolian foreign policy in the third century.

office, however he delivered this speech prior to his appointment (*FD* III 3:21).²⁴⁶ We cannot rule out that Chlaineas may have had some authority on or interest in religious matters prior to becoming *hieromnemon*, and religious themes do appear in his speech. At 9.29.4 the speaker narrates how the assassins of Antipater dragged people from altars and temples to kill them, as part of his rhetorical attack on Alexander's successors. Later Chlaineas also uses *apophasis* to attack Philip for his actions at Thermos in 218, going as far as to accuse him of impiety (*asebeia*) (9.30.1-2).²⁴⁷ Chlaineas probably uses *apophasis* for two reasons; either he does not need to relate the narrative details because the emotional temperature among the audience was already high, or Polybios chose to exclude these details from the speech because he had already narrated them himself. At 5.9.7-12.8 he covers this event in detail and also attacks Philip for his conduct, stating that he does not show the moderation of his predecessors and conducts himself like a tyrant. Nicholson has recently argued that Polybios used this episode, particularly Philip's disregard for the laws of war (οἱ τοῦ πολέμου νόμοι), as a rhetorical attack on Philip's *ethos* to turn him into an anti-*paradeigma* of a good leadership.²⁴⁸ It is plausible that this rhetoric, which Nicholson has convincingly argued Polybios uses as a historiographer, reflects the contemporary political oratory and the argumentation strategies of anti-Makedonian statesmen too.²⁴⁹ But it is impossible to say for certain whether Chlaineas was known for having some degree of authority on religious matters, in the same way as the speaker of *Lysias 6 (Against Andokides)* did.²⁵⁰ While the speeches of Agelaos, Chlaineas, and Lykiskos are well known, do the other speeches performed by envoys also

²⁴⁶ As reconstructed by Flacelière (1937) 410 and Lefevre (1995) *passim*.

²⁴⁷ περί γε μὴν τῆς Φιλίππου παρανομίας τίς χρεῖα πλείω λέγειν; τῆς μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας ἱκανὸν ὑπόδειγμ' αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἐν Θέρμῳ ναοὺς ὕβρεις, τῆς δ' εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὠμότητος ἢ περὶ τοὺς Μεσσηνίους ἀθεσία καὶ παρασπόνδησις.

²⁴⁸ Nicholson (2018) *passim*.

²⁴⁹ Shipley (2018) 115-26 summarises the 'arguments' 'for' and 'against' Makedon.

²⁵⁰ Rubinstein (2000) 140-2; Martin (2009) 137-51.

reveal the variety of character projection strategies that speakers had at their disposal when speaking for their community abroad?

c. A Fragmentary Speech

In the fragment of the speech performed by an envoy at the peace negotiations at Aigion in 209, whose name and *polis* have been lost, the speaker attempts to drive a wedge between the Aitolians, their Peloponnesian allies, and the Romans (10.25).²⁵¹ The speaker does this through the use of metaphor, comparing the Aitolians and their allies to the light armed soldiers in battle who suffer the most losses, and the Romans to the phalanx and heavily armed soldiers, who get the credit for the victory and suffer fewer losses. The fragment is so scant that it does not give a wholly clear indication of whether the speaker represented himself impersonally as a spokesman or projected an individualised character, but the use of the metaphor is interesting in this respect since it allows the speaker to demonstrate his personal knowledge of warfare. A related fragment, which may come from the same speech, also survives in *oratio obliqua*. The speaker states that an alliance with a democracy relies on friendship (*philia*) since the masses are irrational (10.25.6).²⁵² Again, while the speaker does not explicitly project his character as an individual, the use of political analogy he uses creates the impression that he is a critic of democracy, perhaps even with philosophical tendencies.²⁵³ The use of this metaphor also shows how rhetorical style can have a potential impact on the *ethos* of the speaker, since it projects a sense of *phronesis*, one of the essential qualities a speaker ought to project according

²⁵¹ This fragment has been placed based on Livy's account (Livy 37.30.10). See Walbank (1967) 15.

²⁵² πᾶσαν γὰρ δημοκρατικὴν συμμαχίαν καὶ φιλίας πολλῆς δεῖσθαι διὰ τὰς ἐν τοῖς πλήθει γινομένας ἀλογίας.

²⁵³ It is well known that philosophers often acted as envoys in the Classical and Hellenistic Period, see Korhonen (1997) 40-54; Haake (2007) 114; Powell (2013) 222-5.

to Aristotle (Ar. Rh. 1378a6-9), while at the same time revealing the political ideology of the speaker.

d. Thrasykrates of Rhodes²⁵⁴

The speech reported at 11.4-6 was probably delivered before a gathering of envoys from neutral states at an Aitolian congress in 207. It is attributed in the F² manuscript to one Thrasykrates, who Schweighaeuser suggested was a Rhodian.²⁵⁵ The speaker pleads for peace but does not associate himself with either the Makedonians or the Romans and Aitolians. Nor does he give any indication of the community he is representing, which is the reason why the identification of the speaker remains controversial. As I discussed above, Chlaineas represented himself as an ‘independent advisor’ during a heated political debate. Similarly, this speaker opens his speech in the first-person and uses a mixture of singular and plural speaking verbs and participle constructions (11.4.1-3):

ὅτι μὲν οὔτε Πτολεμαῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς οὔθ' ἢ τῶν Ῥοδίων πόλις οὔθ' ἢ τῶν Βυζαντίων καὶ Χίων καὶ Μυτιληναίων ἐν παρέργῳ τίθενται τὰς ὑμετέρας, ὧ ἄνδρες Αἰτωλοί, διαλύσεις, ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὑπολαμβάνω τοῦτ' εἶναι συμφανές. οὐ γὰρ νῦν πρῶτον οὐδὲ δεύτερον ποιούμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης λόγους, ἀλλ' ἐξ ὅτου τὸν πόλεμον ἐνεστήσασθε, προσεδρεύοντες καὶ πάντα καιρὸν θεραπεύοντες οὐ διαλείπομεν ὑπὲρ τούτων ποιούμενοι πρὸς ὑμᾶς μνήμην, κατὰ μὲν τὸ παρὸν τῆς ὑμετέρας καὶ Μακεδόνων στοχαζόμενοι καταφθορᾶς, πρὸς δὲ τὸ μέλλον καὶ περὶ τῶν σφετέρων πατρίδων καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων προνοοούμενοι.

I consider, men of Aitolia, that the facts themselves demonstrate that neither King Ptolemy nor Rhodes nor Byzantion nor Chios nor Mytilene make light of coming to terms with you. For this is not the first or the second time that we make speeches to you for peace, but from the date

²⁵⁴ Although the speaker's name is not known for certain, I use this name for the sake of brevity.

²⁵⁵ See Schweighaeuser's edition of Polybios *ad loc.* It is not certain which congress of that year since Appian mentions that two took place this year (App. *Mac.* 3.1-2; 3.3-4). For discussion, see Walbank (1967) 273-5. More recently, see Weimer (2001) 49-58.

at which you opened hostilities we have never ceased to mention the matter to you, entreating you to entertain it and availing ourselves gladly of every occasion, having before our eyes the ruin brought by the war on yourselves and the Makedonians, and taking thought for the future safety of our own fatherlands and the rest of Greece.

Like with the opening of Chlaineas' speech, the speaker asserts that the *gnome* is his own, through the use of ὑπολαμβάνω, rather than that of his community. The speaker adopts a particularly bold tone by criticising Aitolia and admitting that he and the envoys representing the other neutral states are apprehensive. Their apprehension comes from the neutral states' previous failed attempts to mediate between Aitolia and Philip V, including one such mediation led by Ptolemy IV in 209 and 208 (Livy 37.30.4-10; 38.7.13-5). Since this is a controversial point and sets a pessimistic mood in the *prooimion*, it risked provoking a negative response from the Aitolians. But in using the first-person singular, the speaker suggests this controversial statement is his own, rather than the collective sentiments of his community. Angering the Aitolians may have had repercussions, especially for the community the envoy represented since he was their official spokesman, therefore framing the statement as his own mitigates any potential reactions against his community from Aitolia.²⁵⁶ The speaker then shifts his voice to the plural and states how the neutral states, his own included, have willingly offered to mediate for peace on several occasions (ποιούμεθα πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης λόγους), due to their concern for the implications of war for not only their own communities but all of Greece. Here the speaker claims to be echoing not only his own sentiments and that of his *polis*, but also those of all the other neutral states whose representatives are present. But the apprehension is counterbalanced by the

²⁵⁶ The emphasis of ἡ τῶν Ῥοδίων πόλις, rather using the term οἱ Ῥόδιοι, is one reason Ager suggests the speaker is a Rhodian. See Schmitt (1957) 199. According to Plutarch, when the Spartan envoy Polykratidas was asked by the Persian generals whether the embassy was present in a public or private capacity, he replied with "if we succeed, in a public capacity; if we fail, in private" (Plut. Lyc. 25.4).

very *kairos* of the speech itself, since although their previous attempts to mediate for peace have failed, the very presence of the speaker demonstrates his *eunoia* on the grounds that he is showing that he is committed to making peace.

The speaker then employs a vivid metaphor in which he compares the outbreak, spread, and damage of war to fire (11.4.4-5), a similar rhetorical strategy employed by Agelaos in his speech in 217 (5.104.10) and the anonymous envoy in 207 (10.25.1). The extended metaphor is highly poetic; the use of fire as a metaphor to describe conflict is found in Homer (Hom. *Il.* 11.155-62), Solon (Solon, *Fr.* 1.14-5), and Pindar (Pind. *Pyth.* 3.36). Like with the speeches of Agelaos and the unidentifiable envoy, the extended metaphor creates a sense of *phronesis*, i.e. that the speaker is educated and well-read and therefore worth listening to. In this instance, the use of the first person singular at various points throughout the speech, combined with the emotional impact of the metaphor, enhances personal authority of the speaker. In the rest of the speech, the speaker uses the first person in both the singular and the plural in various instances, e.g. 11.4.6:

διόπερ, ὧ ἄνδρες Αἰτωλοί, νομίσαντες καὶ τοὺς νησιώτας πανδημεὶ καὶ τοὺς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατοικοῦντας Ἑλληνας παρόντας ὑμῶν δεῖσθαι τὸν μὲν πόλεμον ἄραι, τὴν δ' εἰρήνην ἐλέσθαι, διὰ τὸ καὶ πρὸς σφᾶς ἀνήκειν τὰ γινόμενα, σωφρονήσαντες ἐντράπητε καὶ πείσθητε τοῖς παρακαλουμένοις.

Therefore, men of Aitolia, we beg you, as if the whole of the islanders and all the Greeks who inhabit Asia Minor were present here and were entreating you to put a stop to the war and decide for peace — for the matter concerns them as much as ourselves — to come to your senses and relent and agree to our request.

The speaker continues his bold tone here and enhances his authority through the use of *prosopopoiia* by calling on the Aitolians to imagine that all the Greeks who inhabit the islands and Asia Minor were present and, most

importantly, making the same case as him. As Demetrios states in *On Style*, *prosopopoiia* gives force to an oration and he specifies two types – speaking on behalf of ancestors and speaking on behalf of one’s country (Demetr. *Eloc.* 265-66).²⁵⁷ However, the speaker takes this a level further and represents himself as a regional spokesman, or perhaps even a panhellenic spokesman. The force of *prosopopoiia* invites the audience to imagine the envoy on his *bema* supported by the presence of other delegates, in the same way that litigants in the Athenian court could create a visual impact through the physical presence of witnesses, often to invoke certain emotions.²⁵⁸ Although this section of Polybios is fragmentary, the speech is followed by another speech in *oratio obliqua* performed by Philip V’s envoys and not by another allied representative (11.6.9-10), however we cannot rule out that another allied speaker delivered a response to Philip’s envoys.²⁵⁹ Wooten commented that the speaker attempts to represent himself as acting in good faith and in the interests of all Greeks, but it is probably more complicated than that.²⁶⁰ Due to the fragmentary nature of this section of Polybios, we cannot rule out the possibility that the speaker was not the only delegate who made a speech at the congress.²⁶¹ It is possible that the speaker represented himself as the influential figurehead for all the Eastern Greek *poleis*, speaking on behalf of many communities with a lot of collective power, which in turn reinforces the authority of the speaker in his own right.

Following the argument that the Aitolians are fighting for the enslavement of Greece by siding with Philip, the opposite of what the Aitolians want to achieve (11.5), the speaker brings his speech to a close by speaking in both the first person singular and the plural. The speaker predicts that Rome

²⁵⁷ Marini (2007) 281; Chiron (2001) 195-6.

²⁵⁸ E.g. Aeschin. 1.102-4; Dem. 25.62. See Rubinstein (2013b) 160-5; O’Connell (2017) 86-90.

²⁵⁹ The joint embassy of Akanthians and Apollonians to the Lakedaimonians, as reported by Xenophon, is stage managed in this way (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.12-23) See Rubinstein (2016a) 114-5.

²⁶⁰ Wooten (1974) 240-1.

²⁶¹ Mosley (1973) 63-7.

will turn its attention to Greece once Hannibal has been defeated, stating that they will use their decision to assist the Aitolians against Philip as a smokescreen to hide their intentions of conquering Greece (11.6.1-2). Through the use of the first person singular (ὑπολαμβάνω, 11.6.2), the speaker represents this prediction as his own. Predictions in political debate are always at risk of back firing if they turn out to be wrong and they result in the speaker losing their credibility in any future speeches. By specifying that this prediction is his own, rather than the collective prediction of his *polis* or the allied *poleis* he represents, the speaker is implementing some expectation management – if he is wrong, only he will lose credibility, whereas if it is his own polis that turns out to be wrong, the damage to their reputation, and therefore future diplomatic relations, will be much greater. But at the close of the speech, the speaker switches to the first-person plural (11.6.8):

οὐ μὴν ἄλλ' ἡμεῖς γε κατὰ τὸ παρὸν οὐδὲν ἀπολελοίπαμεν τῶν ἀρμοζόντων ἢ λέγειν ἢ πράττειν τοῖς ἀληθινοῖς φίλοις, καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος τὸ δοκοῦν μετὰ παρρησίας εἰρήκαμεν: ὑμᾶς δ' ἀξιοῦμεν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν μήθ' αὐτοῖς φθονῆσαι μήτε τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἑλλησι τῆς ἐλευθερίας καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας.

As for ourselves we protest that on the present occasion we have neglected nothing which it is proper for true friends to say or do, and we have frankly stated our opinion about the future. To conclude we ask and exhort you not to grudge to yourselves and to the rest of the Greeks the blessings of liberty and security.

The speaker projects the embassy as a collective of ‘true friends’ (ἀληθινὸι φίλοι) to the Aitolians who have come with their best interests at heart, enforcing their *eunoia*. Having spoken frankly (μετὰ παρρησίας) about a difficult subject matter, the speaker has also reinforced his image as the ‘independent advisor’ who desires peace to the extent that he feels comfortable with telling the Aitolians some hard truths. The use of the plural here, especially εἰρήκαμεν, ἀξιοῦμεν and παρακαλοῦμεν, suggests the use of

an ambassadorial team, but the fragmentary nature of the text makes it impossible to discern whether any other delegates delivered supporting speeches, or whether they were simply present and visible as I suggested above.

e. Alexander of Isos

My discussion thus far has demonstrated that there are not only several different types of *ethē* that envoys project during their oral performances, but that the *ethos* does not have to be fixed and that envoys can shift between them over the course of their speech. But it is much more complicated when we are looking at speeches that were one of a series of oral performances from the same delegation, especially since Polybios is selective in the speeches he reports. The speech of Alexander the Isian, performed at the conference at Nikaia in Lokris in 198 before the Greek allies and Philip V, illustrates this.²⁶² The conference, called by Flamininus, was to allow various Greek states the opportunity to bring accusations against Philip V before a Roman arbitrator.²⁶³ Many envoys were present, including King Amynder, as well as representatives from Attalos, the Achaian League, the Aitolian League, and Rhodes. Polybios provides summaries of a number of oral performances during which each of the representatives lists their demands from Philip; such speeches are attributed to Flamininus, Dionysodoros on behalf of Attalos, Akesimbrotos on behalf of Rhodes, the Achaian envoys, and Phaineas on behalf of the Aitolian League (18.2).²⁶⁴ Polybios then reports a much more detailed summary of Alexander the Isian's speech, also on behalf of the Aitolian League, which he introduces with the statement that the speaker was

²⁶² The speech is reported in *oratio obliqua*, but Polybios' indirect discourse is so detailed that it is worth discussion in its own right.

²⁶³ For the context, see Grainger (1999) 386-92.

²⁶⁴ A similar rhetorical situation to Thuc. 1.67.3ff.

a practical statesman and an able orator.²⁶⁵ Here, Polybios is framing the speech in order that the reader can interpret the speech through the lens of the sort of character he has described.

Despite Polybios' personal framing of the speech, Alexander's performance, reported in a very detailed *oratio obliqua*, is quite impersonal and he does not appeal to his own authority in any way. The speaker argues that Philip destroys cities and commits atrocities, citing Thessaly, Lysimacheia and Kios as examples, in contrast to his predecessors who would meet their enemies in the battlefield (18.3). This argument is interesting since it contradicts that of Chlaineas while still maintaining a firmly anti-Makedonian message. More interestingly, however, is Philip's response. Philip dismisses Alexander's speech as 'Aitolian' and theatrical (18.4.1).²⁶⁶ Walbank took the use of the adjective Αἰτωλικὸς here to mean violent or exaggerated, but it might be more complicated than that.²⁶⁷ It is plausible that Philip's attack on Alexander's style is a more common trope associated with Aitolian oratory since localised performance styles are fairly well attested, even if Philip's observation is an exaggeration. During the fourth and fifth centuries, the Lakedaimonians were synonymous with having an austere and blunt speaking style.²⁶⁸ Xenophon's account of Hekatonymos' speech in the *Anabasis* characterises Hekatonymos as a provincial speaker who has some oratorical skill but a lack of tact (Xen. *Anab.* 5.5.7-24).²⁶⁹ In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle also stresses how it is important for the style of a speech to match the type of speaker, including whether they are Lakonian or Thessalian (Ar. *Rh.* 1408a25-30). The theatrical elements of the speech may therefore be an attempt by

²⁶⁵ Polyb. 18.3.1: μεταλαβὼν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ προσαγορευόμενος Ἴσιος, ἀνὴρ δοκῶν πραγματικὸς εἶναι καὶ λέγειν ἰκανός.

²⁶⁶ ὁ δὲ Φίλιππος ἐγγίσας τῇ γῆ μᾶλλον ἢ πρόσθεν καὶ διαναστάς ἐπὶ τῆς νεῶς Αἰτωλικὸν ἔφη καὶ θεατρικὸν διατεθεῖσθαι τὸν Ἀλέξανδρον λόγον.

²⁶⁷ Walbank (1967) 556.

²⁶⁸ Gray (1989) 81-3.

²⁶⁹ Schwartz (2004) 19-20; Rubinstein (2016) 94-5.

Polybios to reflect a certain oratorical style associated with Aitolian speakers, however the question of whether Aitolian oratory was theatrical in practice is a very difficult question to answer.²⁷⁰ Both Polybios - and Philip in the narrative - were highly anti-Aitolian and we cannot rule out the possibility that the theatrical elements of the speech reported by Polybios were attempts by him to invoke a certain negative stereotype and an oversimplification of historical reality. As Tuci has recently argued in the case of Theban ambassadorial oratory in Xenophon's *Hellenika*, there is nothing within the surviving accounts that makes the oratory performed by Theban envoys distinctive from that performed by envoys from other *poleis*.²⁷¹ Similarly in Hellenistic oratory, while the speech of the Aitolian envoy Chlaineas, as discussed above, could be described as theatrical, the speech of Agelaos adopts a much calmer style. It is also worth noting that actors sometimes were elected as envoys, and so 'theatrical' performances on the diplomatic stage were by no means unusual.²⁷²

The alleged theatrical style of Alexander's speech might also reflect a more practical consideration – his role as a *synegoros*. Alexander's speech was the second oral performance from the Aitolian delegation, with the *strategos* Phaineas delivering the first in which he related how the Aitolians would like to see Philip withdraw from Greece and return the former Aitolian cities that he had captured back into their possession (Polyb. 18.2.6). It is possible that Alexander's harangue was intended as a much more emotional contribution from the Aitolian delegation to supplement Phaineas' potentially more dry performance that focussed on the Aitolian League's demands, an area in which he as *strategos* would have had more authority. In demanding territory, there was a substantial risk that the Aitolian demands would come into conflict with the demands of the Achaians, with whom the Aitolians had a tense

²⁷⁰ For 'theatrical' speeches in Hellenistic historiography, see Chanotis (2013a) *passim*.

²⁷¹ Tuci (2019) *passim*.

²⁷² For public orations as acting performances in Hellenistic oratory, see Chanotis (2013) 202-4.

relationship since the Social War. The anti-Makedonian tone of Alexander's speech and the general stage management of the Aitolian delegation is probably a conscious rhetorical tactic to gain an advantage. By speaking last, Alexander can drop the symbouleutic niceties of the earlier speakers and launch into an emotionally charged *kategoria* against Philip after the other delegations had already raised the temperatures at the conference. This strategy is not without precedent; the two oral performances of the Korinthian envoys at Sparta in 431, as reported by Thucydides, also serve a very similar purpose whereby the latter speech is more emotionally charged (Thuc. 1.67ff; 1.99). It is plausible that Alexander, in speaking last, adopted a much more emotional style in order to leave the audience angry and therefore much more disposed to the Aitolian delegation's demands, provided that the previous speakers had already laid the groundwork to get the audience in the right frame of mind.

f. Kallikrates

Another somewhat impersonal speech that sheds interesting light on the different *ethē* envoys could project is that of Kallikrates, on behalf of the Achaian League, delivered before the Roman Senate in 180 concerning the return of the Lakedaimonian exiles. Prior to the speech, Polybios summarises how the Achaians had decided to send the embassy to Rome to decline their written request to repatriate the exiles, stating that the Achaians would be violating their own laws and decrees if they granted this. The argumentation is summarised in a symbouleutic speech performed by Lykortas before the Achaian assembly (24.8.4-6). But, as Polybios makes clear, Kallikrates took the dissenting view in the debate and was happy to grant the request of the Romans. The Achaians then elected Kallikrates, Lydiades, and Aratos the Younger as envoys to Rome. The embassy was probably consciously casted,

since Lydiades and Aratos were from very distinguished families. Lydiades was the descendent of the former tyrant of Megalopolis who abdicated and made his city a member of the Achaian League in 235, and Aratos was the grandson of the famous Aratos of Sikyon.²⁷³ The names these two men inherited would have probably been well known to the Roman aristocracy. Kallikrates seems to be less well known; he was the son of an Achaian commander who served in the Rhodian Peraea (Livy 33.18.5), but, as Lehmann has argued, it is plausible that he was a friend of the Romans and that a Roman audience would probably trust him.²⁷⁴

Kallikrates' speech starts in *oratio obliqua* and he begins his performance boldly by stating that it was the fault of the Romans themselves that the Greeks did not obey their orders (24.9.1). He then discusses how in all democratic states (δημοκρατικαὶ πολιτεῖαι) in Greece there are two factions; those who believe that the laws of their *polis* or *koinon* take precedence over the wishes of Rome, and those who believe that the wishes of Rome overrule the local laws, and that in Achaia the former is the most common whereas those who believe the latter are subjected to intimidation (24.9.2-8). Here Kallikrates positions himself not as a spokesman of the Achaian League, but of the pro-Roman faction within the Achaian League. This enhances his *ethos* since it encourages the Romans to trust him on the grounds that he is not only on their side, but he is also willing to be upfront about this even if it means potential repercussions from his community.

Moving into *oratio recta*, Kallikrates then narrates how many Greeks have received honours solely for being anti-Roman, despite having no other merits (πρὸς φιλοδοξίαν, 24.9.8).²⁷⁵ By expressing his disapproval of this practice, the speaker again reinforces his pro-Roman ideology to the extent that he is willing to attack his own side. The speaker then suggests that if the

²⁷³ Walbank (1979) 261.

²⁷⁴ Lehmann (1967) 286.

²⁷⁵ The term φιλοδοξία translates roughly as the desire for glory. See Welles (1934) 373-4.

Romans made their wishes clearer, then these are more likely to be granted (24.9.9-10). The speaker does not call on Rome to directly interfere in the affairs of Greece, as Polybios and others have interpreted it.²⁷⁶ Polybios even concludes the speech by stating that Kallikrates urged the audience to take precautions for the future (24.9.15).²⁷⁷ Polybios is damning of the speech, stating that it triggered the beginning of Roman interference in Greece and claims that Kallikrates crushed the spirits of the Achaians by stating that Rome was unhappy with their decisions (24.10.5-6; 13-4). However, Kallikrates was then elected *strategos* for the following year, which Polybios believes to have happened on account of bribery (24.10.15), and he restored the Spartan exiles.²⁷⁸

Polybios only reports the speech of Kallikrates, and his account gives the impression that Lydiades and Aratos did not deliver any oral performances, suggesting that Kallikrates did all the speaking and that his performance was backed-up visually by the presence of Lydiades and Aratos. Since Kallikrates' personal views on the matter at hand were well known, it is plausible that his colleagues were present merely to supervise him and ensure that he did not stray from his brief. However, following Kallikrates' speech, Polybios remarks how when the Senate was drawing up their written response to the embassy, they only considered the speech of Kallikrates and did not make any mention of his colleagues, and only mentioned that there ought to be more men like Kallikrates in Greece, thereby suggesting that they also spoke (24.10.7). Polybios' slip here might be an indication that he deliberately did not report the speeches of Lydiades and Aratos since doing so might contradict his literary agenda; Polybios wants to mark this episode at the point in which Rome started to actively interfere in the affairs of Greece, as well as at the point at

²⁷⁶ As first argued by Derow (1970) *passim*.

²⁷⁷ εἰς ἃ βλέποντας αὐτοὺς ἤξιον πρόνοιαν ποιεῖσθαι τοῦ μέλλοντος.

²⁷⁸ The inscription set up by the Lakedaimonians honouring Kallikrates for this deed has survived (IvO 300).

which Kallikrates ascended within the Achaian League, marking the beginnings of its collapse.²⁷⁹ While it is plausible that Polybios did not have access to records of what Lydiades and Aratos said, since the written response of the Senate only made reference to Kallikrates' speech, it is still highly suspicious that he chose not to reconstruct what they said. Polybios even expresses some uncertainty about what Kallikrates actually said; he concludes the performance by stating that Kallikrates spoke in 'these or similar terms' (ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτ', 24.10.1). Not only does Polybios not attempt to reconstruct the speeches of Lydiades and Aratos, he does not even note that they spoke, and it is only when we read between the lines of his text that we see that they most likely did.

It is very difficult to judge if, and if so by how far, Kallikrates strayed from his brief if only his oral performance is reported. It is possible that Aratos and Lydiades delivered speeches that were very assertive and somewhat anti-Rome in tone, and that Kallikrates as a pro-Roman gave an oral performance that was more moderate in order that he could cool off any potential agitation that had been fired up within the audience if the previous speakers had given them a message that they did not wish to hear. This is to an extent an inversion of Alexander of Isos' speech which was acted as a crescendo in invoking anger towards the end of the delegation's contributions, whereas Kallikrates' speech acts as a decrescendo to bring calm and composure. In these situations, the political divisions within the *koinon* work to a rhetorical advantage since it allows the speakers to project different *ethē* while making the same general case.

²⁷⁹ For decline within the context of this embassy, see Hunt (2003) 284-99; Eckstein (2008) 204-5. On decline as a general theme, see Hahm (1995) *passim*; Walbank (2002) 193-211.

g. Astymedes of Rhodes

A speech that plays on the role of internal political factions in diplomacy more explicitly is the speech of Astymedes of Rhodes (30.31), delivered before the Roman Senate in 165/4. The *ethos* that the speaker projects is collective and he does not attempt to project any personal authority or standing that he has. In the first section of the speech, reported in *oratio obliqua*, the speaker recounts the financial difficulties his community is facing due to the loss of Lykia and Karia (30.31.3-4). Then, moving into *oratio recta*, Astymedes adopts a conciliatory tone in stating that he is not surprised that Rome revoked these territories from them on the grounds that the Rhodians had incurred suspicion from Rome. The speaker then recounts how Rhodes came into possession of some of its other territories earlier in the century, and speaks in the first-person plural (30.31.6-8):

ἀλλὰ Καῦνον δῆπου διακοσίων ταλάντων ἐξηγοράσαμεν παρὰ τῶν Πτολεμαίου στρατηγῶν καὶ Στρατονίκειαν ἐλάβομεν ἐν μεγάλῃ χάριτι παρ' Ἀντιόχου τοῦ Σελεύκου: καὶ παρὰ τούτων τῶν πόλεων ἀμφοτέρων ἐκατὸν καὶ εἴκοσι τάλαντα τῷ δήμῳ πρόσσδος ἔπιπτε καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος. τούτων ἀπασῶν ἐστερήμεθα τῶν προσόδων, θέλοντες πειθαρχεῖν τοῖς ὑμετέροις προστάγμασιν.

But we bought Kaunos from Ptolemy's generals for two hundred talents, and we acquired Stratonikeia from Antiochos son of Seleukos as a great favour. From these two towns our state derived an annual revenue of a hundred and twenty talents. We have lost the whole of this revenue because we consent to obey your orders.

Astymedes is speaking on behalf of all of Rhodes here and his use of the first person should not be surprising since the Rhodian's acquisition of Kaunos and Stratonikeia was very recent, and Astymedes himself may even have been politically active at that time.²⁸⁰ The speaker's specification that Rhodes had

²⁸⁰ For the chronology, see Walbank (1979) 257-8; Bresson (1999) 106ff.

acquired these territories through purchasing one and being granted the other is also of interest, since these are the legal ways in which a community can obtain further territory.²⁸¹ By including these details, the speaker represents his community as one that is law abiding, and therefore one that can be trusted. It also reinforces the overall strength of his argument by demonstrating that Rhodes has a legal entitlement to these territories. The characterisation of the Rhodians also relies on some elements of *pathos*; Astymedes is speaking as a representative of the Rhodians who are facing financial ruin due to actions of the Romans, and have been forced to come begging to Rome to find a solution to their financial woes. Relations between Rome and Rhodes had been strained in the decades prior, and Astymedes then attempts to show the *eunoia* of the Rhodians by distancing himself from the actions of those Rhodians who took the decisions that damaged relations between Rhodes and Rome (30.31.13-5):

εἰ μὲν οὖν συμβεβήκει πάνδημον γεγονέναι τὴν ἀμαρτίαν καὶ τὴν ἀλλοτριότητα τοῦ δήμου, τάχ' ἴσως ἔδοκεῖτε κἄν ὑμεῖς εὐλόγως ἐπίμονον καὶ δυσπαραίτητον ἔχειν τὴν ὀργήν: εἰ δὲ σαφῶς ἴστε παντάπασιν ὀλίγους γεγονότας αἰτίους τῆς τοιαύτης ἀλογίας, καὶ τούτους ἅπαντας ἀπολωλότας ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ δήμου, τί πρὸς τοὺς μηδὲν αἰτίους ἀκαταλλάκτως ἔχετε, καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας εἶναι δοκοῦντες πρᾶτότατοι καὶ μεγαλοψυχότατοι;

Now, if the whole people been responsible for our error and estrangement from the demos, you might possibly with some show of justice maintain that displeasure and deny forgiveness, but if, as you know well, the authors of this folly were quite few in number and have all been put to death by the state itself, why do you refuse to be reconciled to men who were in no way to blame, you who are considered to be most lenient and magnanimous towards all other peoples?

Here the *ethos* that Astymedes projects shifts. Earlier in the speech he was speaking on behalf of all Rhodians, yet here he narrows his *ethos* to speaking

²⁸¹ Chaniotis (2004) 194-205.

on behalf of the pro-Roman party at Rhodes. This was a potentially risky rhetorical strategy since the speaker exposes the divisions within his community. This might make them look unreliable on the grounds that entering an alliance with them could be prone to change depending on which faction of Rhodes was in control at any one time. However, the risks associated with the speaker's confession that his community is divided is counterbalanced by the *eunoia* that it shows; Astymedes is being as transparent as possible in order to avoid any suspicion, and since relations had been strained anyway, the confession shows a genuine desire on the part of his faction to regain the Romans' trust. This is a similar rhetorical strategy employed not only by Kallikrates, but by the Theban envoys to Athens in 395, as reported by Xenophon, who distance themselves from their ancestors who had poor relations with the Athenians (*Xen. Hell.* 3.5.7-15).²⁸² The *ethopoia* employed by the speaker here works on two levels; he characterises himself as a spokesperson for the pro-Roman faction at Rhodes who are currently in control, and represents this faction as concerned with obedience to the law. The speaker then concludes by stating that the Rhodians have lost their revenues (*ἀπολωλεκῶς*), liberty (*παρρησία*), and equality (*ἰσολογία*), and calls on the Romans to return to their original friendly attitude (*Polyb.* 30.31.16-8). As in some of the earlier speeches, especially those of Chlaineas, Lykiskos, and Thrasykrates, the envoy brings his speech to a close with an emotional charge.

h. Leon of Athens

The speech of Leon of Athens, delivered before the Roman Senate in 190/89, is worth discussing too. This was a highly tense episode; Philip V had been stirring anger among the Romans on the grounds that the Aitolians had

²⁸² On mentions of ancestors' deeds in diplomatic oratory, see Harris (2016) 149-51. Similarly, the Thebans also distanced themselves from their ancestors when accounting for their pro-Persian stance during the Persian Wars in their speech during the trial of Plataiai in 427 (*Thuc.* 3.62).

deprived him of Athamantia and Dolopia and as a result the Romans did not wish to hear the Aitolians speak but would only listen to the Rhodian and Athenian envoys (21.31.1-5). The speech of the Makedonian messengers, although Polybios does not dwell on what they said, had ignited anger among the Roman audience and made them less disposed to peace with the Aitolians. The Aitolians faced such a huge challenge that no line of argumentation could persuade the Romans to hear their case so that envoys from other communities had to speak on their behalf. Polybios reports that Damon, the Rhodian envoy, spoke first but he gives no indication of what he said (21.31.6). But the speech of Leon, the Athenian speaker who successfully persuaded the Senate to opt for peace with Aitolia against all odds, is highly impersonal and he does not use the first-person in any form (21.31.7-15). There is no indication within the body of the speech, neither in what is reported in *oratio obliqua* nor what is reported in *oratio recta*, that the speaker is even an Athenian. The speech is so impersonal that Polybios concludes the speech by calling the speaking ὁ Ἀθηναῖος rather than even naming him (21.31.16). The speaker does, however, exert a degree of authority by stating bluntly that the Senate was wrong, despite their justified anger, and that they should take pity on the Aitolians.²⁸³ Leon also uses an extended simile, comparing the effect of winds on the sea to wrath on the populace (21.31.8-12). It is perhaps not so surprising that we find so many apt similes in Polybios' speeches; as Walbank pointed out, it is suggested by a fragment of Isokrates' lost *Art of Rhetoric* that emphasises the importance of how they should be suitable (οἰκεῖος) to the rhetorical situation.²⁸⁴

²⁸³ Polyb. 21.31.7: ἔφη γὰρ ὀργίζεσθαι μὲν εἰκότως τοῖς Αἰτωλοῖς: πολλὰ γὰρ εὔπεπονθότας τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων οὐ χάριν ἀποδεδωκέναι τούτων, ἀλλ' εἰς μέγαν ἐνηνοχέειν κίνδυνον τὴν Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίαν ἐκκαύσαντας τὸν πρὸς Ἀντίοχον πόλεμον: ἐν τούτῳ δὲ διαμαρτάνειν τὴν σύγκλητον.

²⁸⁴ Walbank (1978) 131.

There are questions concerning the identity of this Leon since Polybios' text is corrupted here and his patronym is lost.²⁸⁵ In the corresponding section of Livy, the envoy is named as *Leon Hicesiae filius*, which creates a satisfactory restoration of Polybios (Livy 38.10.4).²⁸⁶ This Leon was from one of the leading Athenian families of the late-third and early-second centuries and most likely a pro-Roman; in 192 he brought accusations of sedition against one Apollodoros who attempted to oust the pro-Romans and aspired to take Athens into an alliance with Antiochos, and Apollodoros was exiled (35.50.4).²⁸⁷ It is likely then, due to Leon's role as a public prosecutor in a recent political trial for which even Flamininus and Cato were present, that he was known to many of the Roman senators present and that his standing was so great that he did not need to project his own *ethos* to reinforce his arguments on the grounds that his track record lent enough weight to them anyway.²⁸⁸ Leon's track record as pro-Roman statesman who played a vital role in preventing a *coup* in Athens that would have resulted in the *polis* becoming anti-Roman was enough to demonstrate his *eunoia* towards Rome and convince the Senators that he spoke in the interests of Rome. Since he was an Athenian and not an Aitolian, the audience did not have to fear a potential conflict of interest between his *polis* and Rome.

It is worth digressing a little more on Leon here, since although he is an envoy, he is not speaking as a representative of Aitolia as such, but rather as an Athenian supporting an Aitolian cause. As Perrin-Saminadayar has argued, during the third and second centuries the Athenians asserted their influence by acting as a diplomatic agent, a feat that was achievable on the grounds that

²⁸⁵ Polyb. 21.31.6: καὶ γὰρ ἐδόκει <μετὰ> Δάμων' ὁ Κιχησίου <Λέ>ων ἄλλα τε καλῶς εἰπεῖν. See Walbank (1979) 130-1.

²⁸⁶ Briscoe (2008) 53-4.

²⁸⁷ On Athens in this period generally, see Ferguson (1911) 283-4; Deininger (1971) 89-90; Perrin-Saminadayar (1999) 456-62; Worthington (2020) 161-2. On Leon's family, see Habicht (1982) 194-7.

²⁸⁸ Mattingly (1997) 123.

Athens enjoyed good relationships with most other Greek *poleis*, *koina*, and monarchies at this time.²⁸⁹ Several such instances of Athenians supporting embassies lead by other states are attested in Polybios, some of which give an insight into the nature of the rhetoric that was employed by the Athenian diplomats. For instance, one Demetrios of Athens renewed an alliance with Ptolemy Epiphanes on behalf of the Achaian League on an embassy to Ptolemy (Polyb. 22.3.5). It seems that in the context of diplomatic oratory in the second century, Athenian voices were held in high regard due to their community's (perceived) objective neutrality, and potentially also because of their rhetorical skill.²⁹⁰ In the instance under discussion, Leon had a very hard task in persuading the Romans to make peace with Aitolia, and it is highly likely that his personal standing as a pro-Roman statesman and his citizenship as an Athenian were instrumental in getting a difficult audience to compose themselves.

i. The Rhodians at Rome

The only ambassadorial speech that Polybios reports partly in *oratio obliqua* that is not attributed to a single named speaker but to a collective is the Rhodian embassy to Rome concerning the territorial settlement in Asia Minor following the defeat of Antiochos III at Magnesia-on-Sipylos in 189 (21.22-3).²⁹¹ Eumenes, Antipater and Zeuxis on behalf of Antiochos, and an unknown number of embassies from the *poleis* of Asia Minor were also present. At first Polybios reports the speech of Eumenes in a mixture of *oratio obliqua* and *oratio recta* (21.19-21), before the Rhodian envoys were called to speak. But since one of the Rhodian envoys was late, the envoys from Smyrna spoke first,

²⁸⁹ Perrin-Saminadayar (1999) 453-62. He rejects Polybios' comments that Athens became sycophantic and obliged larger states at every opportunity (Polyb. 5.106.6-8).

²⁹⁰ It is well known that Rhodes was a cultural centre for the study of rhetoric; Ais On this, see Wooten (1972) 42-9; Bringman (2002) *passim*; Vandespoel (2007) 127-9; Pepe (2017) *passim*.

²⁹¹ Grainger (2002) 307-49 still provides the most detailed narrative background to this.

whose oral performance Polybios summarises in *oratio obliqua*, although he stresses that it is not necessary to report their speech in detail since they had been the most enthusiastic supporters of Rome (21.22.1-4). It is not clear what Polybios' reasoning is here; Walbank suggests that since Polybios' readership would have been familiar with Symrna's attitude to Rome to the extent he felt it unnecessary to report the speech in detail, since readers could already pre-empt what the envoys were going to say.²⁹²

The speech is merely attributed to οἱ Ῥόδιοι. Since the speech of the Rhodians is the focus of Polybios' account of this meeting of the Roman Senate, some scholars have suggested that he used a Rhodian source. Gelzer suggested Zeno of Rhodes, and Walbank was convinced by his argument.²⁹³ But if Polybios had used a Rhodian source, it seems strange that the Rhodian envoys remain anonymous mouthpieces for their community rather than named individuals. I would therefore suggest that it may well be the case that the anonymity of the Rhodian envoys reflects Polybios' source, since he generally attributes speeches in *oratio recta* to a named speaker, but that his source might not necessarily be Rhodian.

The Rhodians open their speech by recounting their services to Rome, and then argue that the Romans would not be granting freedom to the Greeks of Asia Minor if they opted to give this territory to Eumenes (21.22.5-11). This line of argumentation is a hugely significant contributing factor to the *ethos* that the Rhodians wish to project. Firstly, they demonstrate their *eunoia* by recalling their previous relations with Rome, and secondly, they project themselves as anti-monarchical.²⁹⁴ This second aspect of the Rhodian character is of huge importance because not only does it contrast their delegation with that of their opponent, Eumenes, but it also projects similar

²⁹² Walbank (1978) 114. This is significant because it hints at a degree of expectation on the part of the reader about what an orator should say in this situation.

²⁹³ Gelzer (1956), 186ff; Walbank (1978) 111.

²⁹⁴ Burton (2011) 199-200.

qualities seen in speeches by other Rhodian speakers in Polybios. As I discussed above, Astymedes emphasised that the Rhodians had gained the territories of Kaunos and Stratonikeia through legal and peaceful means (30.31.13-5), and in doing so, representing Rhodes as respectful of interstate conventions, i.e. a state that behaves well, as a 'democratic' one should, in contrast to the behaviours of power hungry monarchical dynasties. In the present context, the Rhodians attempt to represent themselves in a similar way. But since Rhodes was a growing power in the early second century, it is not unreasonable to assume that the Rhodians' concern for autonomy and democracy is simply a smoke screen to cover up their hegemonic ambitions.²⁹⁵ The concerns that the Rhodians express as collective in this speech, therefore, is consistent with their established track record and probably one of the main reasons that the oral performance is a successful one.²⁹⁶

Polybios emphasises the collective nature of the Rhodian argumentation here, which he reports in *oratio obliqua* governed by the verb ἔφασαν (21.22.6; 21.22.7). Then, at the close of the speech in *oratio recta*, the envoys are made to speak in the first-person plural (21.23.11-2):

ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν, ὧ ἄνδρες, καὶ τῆς προαιρέσεως γεγονότες αἰρετισταὶ καὶ τῶν μεγίστων ἀγώνων καὶ κινδύνων ἀληθινῶς ὑμῖν μετεσχηκότες, καὶ νῦν οὐκ ἐγκαταλείπομεν τὴν τῶν φίλων τάξιν, ἀλλ' ἃ γε νομίζομεν ὑμῖν καὶ πρέπειν καὶ συμφέρειν, οὐκ ᾠκνήσαμεν ὑπομῆσαι μετὰ παρρησίας, οὐδενὸς στοχασάμενοι τῶν ἄλλων οὐδὲ περὶ πλείονος οὐδὲν ποιησάμενοι τοῦ καθήκοντος αὐτοῖς.

We then, gentleman, who have been the devoted supporters of your purpose, and who have taken a real part in your gravest struggles and dangers, do not now abandon our post in the ranks of your friends, but have not hesitated to remind you frankly of what we at least think to be

²⁹⁵ As Reger (1999) 77-90 points out, the Rhodians had spent decades trying to prevent Karia from being ruled by a single power.

²⁹⁶ The Rhodians were granted a number of territories in Asia Minor, see Grainger (2002) 344-51 for the background of the negotiations.

your honour and advantage, aiming at nothing else and estimating nothing higher than our duty.

The first-person singular is not present in the speech at all, and Polybios also concludes the speech in the plural (21.23.13).²⁹⁷ But is Polybios' impersonal representation of this Rhodian embassy as a collective voice for this *polis* an accurate account of the actual oral performance(s) that took place? Not necessarily. As he makes clear, the embassy was delayed from speaking since one of the envoys arrived late (21.22.2), suggesting that the speaking roles were in some way divided up and that the delegation could not afford to skip a potentially crucial contribution from one of its members. It is also plausible that only one of the envoys spoke and that the envoy who was late had either been delegated the only speaking role, or at least the main speaking role. In any case, it was for some reason extremely important that all the envoys were present to show a display of unity, even if there was only one speaker who was physically seen to have the support of his colleagues on his *bema*, in the same way that a speaker at an Athenian law court would.²⁹⁸ If one envoy had been assigned the speaking role, this may have been determined by his command of Latin, but Hellenistic historiography is famously ambiguous in detailing the use of Greek and/or Latin in diplomatic negotiations between Greek envoys and the Roman Senate.²⁹⁹ It is clear from Livy's account, which is a free adaptation of Polybios', that Livy found Polybios' impersonal and collective representation of the Rhodian embassy strange.³⁰⁰ Instead of attributing the speech to the *Rhodiai* as a collective, he states that the *princeps legationis* (Livy 37.54.3) was the speaker, introduced by the verb *inquit* in the singular (37.54.4), and the performance is referred to as a singular *oratio* at its

²⁹⁷ οἱ μὲν οὖν Ῥόδιοι ταῦτ' εἰπόντες πᾶσιν ἐδόκουν μετρίως καὶ καλῶς διειλέχθαι περὶ τῶν προκειμένων.

²⁹⁸ As noted by Rubinstein (2016) 88-9.

²⁹⁹ Briscoe (1981) 379-83; Kaimio (1979) 103-5.

³⁰⁰ See Walbank (1978) 114 on Livy's interpretation.

conclusion (37.54.28).³⁰¹ As in Polybios' version, however, the speaker is made to use solely the first-person plural, assuming the speaking role on behalf of the entire delegation.³⁰² There is also a practical consideration in having only one of the envoys speak in the present context; since the embassy was due to deliver their oral performance after that of Eumenes, a degree of improvisation would have been required to refute the arguments he made and to defend the character of their community, which Eumenes undermined by stating that their commitment to autonomy for the Greeks of Asia Minor was insincere. It would have made more sense to assign the speaking role to the most capable speaker since it would have been extremely difficult to plan a series of coordinated responses with such short notice.³⁰³

j. Envoy's speeches in *oratio obliqua*

As I have demonstrated above, sections of oral performances reported in *oratio obliqua* are often problematic because the subtle verbal projections of *ethos* that we find in speeches reported in *oratio recta* are lost. Unfortunately, many of the oral performances delivered by envoys in Polybios are reported in this way in varying degrees of detail. However it is possible to make some key observations.

Polybios often records the names of individuals who served as sole envoys and recounts the general gist of their speech in *oratio obliqua*.³⁰⁴ Instances such as these are uncontroversial since any indication of the oral performance is given in the third-person singular and is too vague to detect

³⁰¹ The account of Diodoros is far too brief to make any sort of comparison (Diod. Sic. 29.11).

³⁰² E.g. *nobis* (37.54.2) *nos* (37.54.5) *animi nostri* (37.54.6); *licet ergo vobis ... ditare* (37.54.13); *Rhodium et in hoc et in omnibus bellis, quae in illa ora gessistis, quam forti fidelique vos opera adiuverimus, vestro iudicio relinquimus. nunc in pace consilium id adferimus, quod si comprobaritis, magnificentius vos victoria usos esse quam vicisse omnes existimaturi sint.* (37.54.28).

³⁰³ Rubinstein (2016) 114-5.

³⁰⁴ E.g. Aratos the Younger (2.51.4-7); Dorimachos (4.3.5-13); Machatas (4.34.3); Nikodemos (22.3.1-4).

whether the speaker projected an ethnic or individualised *ethos*, or both. In many of these cases the envoy is usually an individual with an especially high standing in their community, such as a *strategos*. In some cases, we even know the political ideology that individual envoys had, which may have impacted how their oral performance was received, and they may have alluded to their political positions in their speech. For instance, when the Boiotians switched their alliance to Rome they sent Diketas of Koroneia, as a pro-Makedonian, to explain why the Boiotians had been previously allied with Perseus and on what grounds they had switched their allegiance (27.2.1). In this instance, the political standing of the speaker was probably used to make the defection of Boiotia seem more genuine, and it is highly plausible that Diketas projected his formerly pro-Makedonian ideology in his oral performance. Similarly, Gorgos of Messene was chosen as one of the Messenian envoys to Philip V in 218 to request help against Aitolia (5.5). We know from elsewhere that Gorgos was a well-known athlete and vehemently anti-Spartan with potentially oligarchic politics (Paus. 6.14.11), and Polybios has praise for him (Polyb. 7.10.2-5).³⁰⁵ Gorgos' fame and anti-Spartan politics would have certainly been of rhetorical benefit in negotiating with Philip V. Likewise, Deinokrates of Messene's pro-Roman sympathies, as well as his close relationship with Flamininus, was of huge benefit when he served as an envoy to Rome (23.5).

But problematically, while Polybios will often single out individual envoys, they are usually part of an ambassadorial team and we cannot assume that the summary of that oral performance should be attributed specifically to the named envoy who is singled out. Polybios will generally do this using the οἱ περὶ plus accusative construction. For example, Nikophanes is named as one of the Megalopolitan envoys to Antigonos Doson in 227 but it is clear that other envoys were present (οἱ περὶ τὸν Νικοφάνη), yet Polybios' use of the third person plural suggests a more collaborative rhetorical strategy

³⁰⁵ On whether Gorgos was an oligarch, see Walbank (1940) 72; Roebuck (1941) 78.

(2.48.7ff).³⁰⁶ A similar example is the embassy of the Lykian *koinon* to Rome in 178/7, to protest against the cruelty of Rhodes, under whose domain they had been placed by Rome following the defeat of Antiochos in 189 (25.4). Polybios states that the Xanthians sent an embassy to Rome via Achaia, headed by Nikostratos, and verbs and participles are in the plural.³⁰⁷ In 169/8 a Rhodian embassy headed by one Hagepolis came to Rome to mediate and bring the Third Makedonian War to an end, but the short summary of the speech in *oratio obliqua* is introduced by the verb ἔφασαν in the plural (29.19.3-4). Polybios even concludes the speech attributing the oral performance to the embassy collectively: ταῦτα μὲν οὖν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀγέπολιν εἰπόντες βραχέως ἐπανῆλθον (29.19.4). Polybios' narrative structure, whereby events often get repeated since he narrates by region, means that we know the other envoys who joined Hagepolis were Diokles and Kleinombrotos since the account of their selection survives, however these two supporting envoys are not known from elsewhere (29.10.4).³⁰⁸

Is it possible that Hagepolis also took the leading speaking role? Livy certainly interpreted Polybios account of this embassy in this way (Livy 45.3.3-8).³⁰⁹ His summary of the speech, also in *oratio obliqua*, introduces the speech by stating that Hagepolis was the one who spoke (*ibi Agepolim, principem eorum, ita locutum*, 45.3.4), and concludes with the ethnicon in singular (*haec ab Rhodio dicta*, 45.3.6). But Diodoros in his very brief account agrees with Polybios and renders the speech into the plural, with no mention of Hagepolis: Ὅτι οἱ τῶν Ῥοδίων πρέσβεις ἐπὶ τὰς διαλύσεις ἐλθεῖν ὡμολόγουν· τὸν γὰρ

³⁰⁶ See Section 2.1.k for a close reading of this embassy.

³⁰⁷ 25.4.3: οἱ γὰρ Ξάνθιοι, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν ἔμελλον εἰς τὸν πόλεμον ἐμβαίνειν, ἐξέπεμψαν πρεσβευτὰς εἰς τε τὴν Ἀχαΐαν καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην τοὺς περὶ Νικόστρατον. Verbs and participles: παραγενηθέντες, ἐξεκαλέσαντο, τιθέντες (25.4.4), ἤγαγον (25.4.5). Interestingly, Paton translates 25.4.4 into the singular and then switches to the plural, rendering the passage into an example of team speaking.

³⁰⁸ Walbank (1978) 371.

³⁰⁹ On Livy's rendering of Polybios' here, see Briscoe (2012) 616-7. Although he reads Polybios' version of the speech as an oral performance delivered by Hagepolis, which as I have discussed, is not to whom Polybios attributes the speech.

πόλεμον πᾶσιν ὄντα βλαβερὸν ἀπεφάναντο (Diod. Sic. 30.24). While we do not know much about Hagepolis and his standing personally, we know that he had previously served as an envoy to Quintus Metullus in 170/69 to reassure him about the Rhodian's loyalty to Rome (Polyb. 28.16-7).³¹⁰ It is plausible that Hagepolis had both a high standing in Rhodes as well as a good relationship with Roman officials, which would have made him a highly suitable candidate to lead this embassy and may have entailed a prominent speaking role.³¹¹ Alternatively, it is plausible that Hagepolis is singled out as an envoy solely because he played a significant role in Rhodian-Roman relations during this period, which does not necessarily mean that he was the only envoy who spoke during the embassy in question.³¹²

Yet, even when Polybios does not single out an individual envoy who served as part of a team and identifies all the envoys who were present, it is still impossible to gauge how many of them spoke and the speaking roles each of them took. For instance, the speech of Ares and Alkibiades, representatives of the Lakedaimonians who had come to Rome to complain about the behaviour of the Achaians following the massacre at Kompasion in 188, is introduced with the participle construction *πειρωμένων λέγειν καὶ φασκόντων* (22.2.2).³¹³ While their argument, pointing out the Achaian hypocrisy on claiming to promote *autonomia* and *eleutheria* but doing the opposite in practice, is a hugely memorable one, Polybios' attribution of this oral performance to two envoys makes it difficult to envisage how it was actually delivered. Similarly, Polybios reports how two competing embassies

³¹⁰ Burton (2011) 281-2.

³¹¹ A potential ancestor of his was honoured by the *polis* of Lisse in Lykia (TAM II, 159).

³¹² It is highly plausible that Hagepolis was a key character in the Rhodian historiographical tradition of this period, which Polybios almost definitely utilised. See Weimar (2000) 168-72.

³¹³ 22.2.1: τῶν δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἄρεα τάναντία πειρωμένων λέγειν καὶ φασκόντων πρῶτον μὲν καταλεύσθαι τὴν τῆς πόλεως δύναμιν ἐξηγμένου τοῦ πλήθους μετὰ βίας, εἴτ' ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐπισφαλῆ καὶ ἀπαρρησίαστον καταλείπεσθαι τὴν πολιτείαν.

addressed the 10 Roman Commissioners in Asia in 189/8; one from Rhodes, and one from Lykia (22.5.2-3):

καθ' οὓς καιρούς οἱ δέκα διώκουν τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν, τότε παρεγενήθησαν πρέσβεις, παρὰ μὲν Ῥοδίων Θεαίδητος καὶ Φιλόφρων, ἀξιοῦντες αὐτοῖς δοθῆναι τὰ κατὰ Λυκίαν καὶ Καρίαν χάριν τῆς εὐνοίας καὶ προθυμίας, ἣν παρέσχοντα σφίσι κατὰ τὸν Ἀντιοχικὸν πόλεμον: παρὰ δὲ τῶν Ἰλίων ἦκον Ἱππαρχος καὶ Σάτυρος, ἀξιοῦντες διὰ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητα συγγνώμην δοθῆναι Λυκίοις τῶν ἡμαρτημένων.

At the time at which the ten commissioners were managing the affairs of Asia, envoys arrived, Theaidetos and Philophron from Rhodes, who thought that Lykia and Karia should be given to them on account of their eunoia and prothumia, which they gave during the war against Antiochos: but Hipparchos and Satyros came from Ilion, thinking that, on account of their oikeiotes, that the errors of Lykia should be pardoned.

Polybios' account of the envoys' arguments employs standardised vocabulary that is common in Greek diplomatic oratory. We know that both Theaidetos and Philophron were prominent supporters of Rome at Rhodes and continued pro-Roman activities even after the Third Makedonian War, after which relations between Rhodes and Rome became strained, yet their track record is absent from Polybios' summary of their oral performances.³¹⁴ These two men certainly had the personal authority to argue on behalf of Rhodes before Rome, yet Polybios' brief summary focuses on the trust between Rome and Rhodes collectively, when it is certainly plausible that these two envoys could also have demonstrated their own personal *eunoia* as interlocutors too.

In other instances, as with the Rhodian embassy discussed above in Section 1.1k, oral performances reported in *oratio obliqua* are merely attributed to *ethnica* in the plural and none of the speakers are identified. For instance, Polybios reports how the Messenians presented themselves before

³¹⁴ For the careers of these men, see Polyb. 27.14.2; 28.2.3; 28.16.3; 29.11.2. See Thomsen (2020) 37; 51 for evidence of these mens' private associations on Rhodes.

the Achaian League to request assistance against the Aitolian League in 219 (4.9.2), or how the Achaians tried to persuade the Rhodians to come to terms with Philip V in 192 (16.35.1).³¹⁵ This brief and anonymous representation of envoys' speeches is quite common.³¹⁶ But while brief excerpts rendered in indirect speech may seem trivial, there are instances that hint at how the impersonal and collective *ethos* of the speaker is perhaps deliberate and forms part of a more sophisticated rhetorical strategy, especially in the context on coalition warfare. One example is Polybios' account of a meeting of the Hellenic League in 219, where several embassies from different poleis came forward to bring complaints against the Aitolian League (2.25.2-4):

ἐγκαλούντων δὲ Βοιωτῶν μὲν ὅτι συλήσαιεν τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Ἰτωνίας ἱερὸν εἰρήνης ὑπαρχούσης, Φωκέων δὲ διότι στρατεύσαντες ἐπ' Ἄμβρυσον καὶ Δαύλιον ἐπιβάλοιτο καταλάβεσθαι τὰς πόλεις, Ἑπειρωτῶν δὲ καθότι πορθήσαιεν αὐτῶν τὴν χώραν, Ἀκαρνάνων δὲ παραδεικνυόντων τίνα τρόπον συστησάμενοι πρᾶξιν ἐπὶ Θύριον νυκτὸς ἔτι καὶ προσβαλεῖν τολμήσαιεν τῇ πόλει, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις Ἀχαιῶν ἀπολογιζομένων ὡς καταλάβοιτο μὲν τῆς Μεγαλοπολίτιδος Κλάριον, πορθήσαιεν δὲ διεξιόντες τὴν Πατρέων καὶ Φαραιῶν χώραν, διαρπάσαιεν δὲ Κύναιθαν, συλήσαιεν δὲ τὸ τῆς ἐν Λούσοις Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν, πολιορκήσαιεν δὲ Κλειτορίου, ἐπιβουλεύσαιεν δὲ κατὰ μὲν θάλατταν Πύλῳ, κατὰ δὲ γῆν ἄρτι συνοικιζομένη τῇ Μεγαλοπολιτῶν πόλει σπεύδοντες μετὰ τῶν Ἰλλυριῶν ἀνάστατον αὐτὴν ποιῆσαι ...

The Boiotians accused the Aitolians of having plundered the temple of Athene Itonia in time of peace, the Phokians of having marched upon Ambrysos and Daulion and attempted to seize both cities, and the Epeirots of having pillaged their territory. The Arkadians pointed out how they had organized a coup de main against Thyrion and had gone so far as to attack the city under cover of night. The Achaians related how they had occupied Klarion in the territory of Megalopolis, and during their passage through Achaia ravaged the country of Patrai and

³¹⁵ Polyb. 4.9.2: καὶ τῶν Μεσσηνίων αὐθις ἐπιπορευθέντων ἐπὶ τὸ πλῆθος καὶ δεομένων μὴ περιδεῖν σφᾶς οὕτω προφανῶς παρασπονδουμένου, βουλομένων δὲ καὶ τῆς κοινῆς συμμαχίας μετασχεῖν καὶ σπευδόντων ὁμοῦ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἐπιγραφῆναι.

16.35.1: ὅτι παρήσαν μετὰ τὴν ἄλωσιν Ἀβύδου παρὰ τοῦ τῶν Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνους εἰς τὴν Ῥόδον πρεσβευταί, παρακαλοῦντες τὸν δῆμον εἰς τὰς πρὸς τὸν Φίλιππον διαλύσεις.

³¹⁶ As discussed in 1.2b of the introduction to this thesis.

Pharai, how they had sacked Kynaitha and despoiled the temple of Artemis at Lousis, laid siege to Kleitor, and made attempts by sea on Pylos and by land on Megalopolis, which was only just in process of being repopulated, intending to reduce it again to desolation with the help of the Illyrians ...

The Boiotians, Phokians, and Epeirots accused (ἐγκαλούντων) the Aitolians of pillaging territory and attempting to take some of their cities.³¹⁷ The Arkadians also indicated similar charges (παραδεικνυόντων), as did the Achaian League (ἀπολογιζομένων). But while Polybios' representation of the speeches suggests that the envoys employed a collective character which each speaking as the corporate face of their community, the presence of several delegations each stating their grievances to the same end suggests that the rhetorical strategy may have been more co-ordinated. Each of the delegations may have employed their own distinctive style, as is suggested by Polybios' use of different verbs or speaking, but since each of the speakers shared the same *telos*, they might have made the similar arguments. In this sense, each delegation is a *synegoros*, operating like a musical composition whereby each of the instruments acts independently of each other but merge when they reach a common harmony.³¹⁸

This phenomenon, whereby the entire team representing a *polis* or *koinon* is the *synegoros* instead of the individual envoy, seems natural in joint embassies or during conferences at which certain delegations have the same foreign policy agenda despite sending separate embassies. Frustratingly, while joint embassies are attributed elsewhere in Polybios they do not generally

³¹⁷ The verb *enkalein* occurs numerous times in the Attic orators. For example, in the surviving forensic speeches of Demosthenes, the verb occurs on thirteen occasions in *For Phormion*, ten in *Against Panetios*, and seven in *Against Leptines*, as well as in other speeches.

³¹⁸ For the musical analysis of team speaking in the Athenian Courts, see Rubinstein (2000) 232-3. For the same model applied to team speaking on the diplomatic stage in Xenophon, see Schepens (2001) 92-3. Modern scholars of argumentation such as Kock have taken the psychological analysis between listening to rhetoric and listening to music further, see Kock (2018) *passim*.

detail what each of the members said.³¹⁹ For example, while Polybios reports that the Dymaians, Pharaians and Tritaians sent a joint embassy to the Achaians to 219 to request their assistance during the Social War, the three *poleis* are the subject of the speaking verbs in participle form (4.60.1).³²⁰ But a similar example to that of the meeting of the Hellenic League is the Achaian, Boiotian, Akarnanian, and Epeirote delegations to Philip V in 209 to express their fears about the Aitolians and Lakedaimonians (10.41.2-3):

διόπερ ἤκον Ἀχαιοὶ μὲν παρακαλοῦντες τὸν Φίλιππον βοηθεῖν: οὐ γὰρ μόνον τοὺς Αἰτωλοὺς ἠγωνίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν Μαχανίδα διὰ τὸ προκαθῆσθαι μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως ἐπὶ τοῖς τῶν Ἀργείων ὄροις. Βοιωτοὶ δὲ δεδιότες τὸν στόλον τῶν ὑπεναντίων, ἡγεμόνα καὶ βοήθειαν ἤτουν. φιλοπονώτατά γε μὴν οἱ τὴν Εὐβοίαν κατοικοῦντες ἠξίουσαν ἔχειν τινὰ πρόνοιαν τῶν πολεμίων. παραπλήσια δ' Ἀκαρνᾶνες παρεκάλουν. ἦν δὲ καὶ παρ' Ἑπειρωτῶν πρεσβεία.

The Achaians therefore came to Philip calling for his help, for they were not only anxious of the Aitolians, but also of Machanidas since he was seated with his army at the Argive border. The Boiotians, fearing the enemy's movement, begged for leadership and assistance. The inhabitants of Euboia were the most energetic of all in their urges to take some precautions against the enemy. The Akarnanians begged for the same things. There was also an embassy from the Epeirotes.

While the Achaians, Boiotians, and Akarnanians all provided different reasons for supporting their argument, they shared a common enemy: the Aitolians who were allied with the Lakedaimonians. Polybios even uses the same speaking verb (*parakalein*) to report their speeches. But the Euboians seemingly adopted a much more emotionally charged rhetorical strategy, suggested by the superlative adverb φιλοπονώτατά. It is plausible that the more dramatic oral performance of the Euboians reflected their heightened

³¹⁹ E.g., the Polyrrhenians and Lappaian and their allies to Philip and the Achaians (4.55.1).

³²⁰ οἱ δὲ Δυμαῖοι καὶ Φαραιεῖς καὶ Τριταεῖς, ἡλαττωμένοι μὲν περὶ τὴν βοήθειαν, δεδιότες δὲ τὸ μέλλον ἐκ τῆς τοῦ φρουρίου καταλήψεως, τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἔπεμπον ἀγγέλους πρὸς τὸν στρατηγὸν τῶν Ἀχαιῶν, δηλοῦντες τὰ γεγονότα καὶ δεόμενοι σφίσι βοηθεῖν: μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα πρεσβευτὰς ἐξαπέστειλλον τοὺς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀξιῶσοντας. See also Polyb. 18.10ff.

fear, or that they have deliberately chosen to project this more animated style to raise the emotional tension of the meeting following two somewhat sober performances by the Achaian and Boiotian delegations.

As with the example of the Hellenic League, it is not possible to say whether this series of oral performances was deliberately co-ordinated, or whether it is the natural result of several isolated speeches performed in succession. In some cases, co-ordination was probably necessary; Polybios reports how in 184/3 a huge number of embassies arrived in Rome to bring accusations against Philip V (23.1), however the various speeches resulted in a confused and inextricable imbroglia: καθόλου δὲ ποικίλη τις ἦν ἀκρισία καὶ δυσχώρητος ἐκ τῶν κατηγορουμένων (23.1.13). While my discussion of these political debates has emphasised how the collective *ethos* of each delegation need not be personalised to the individual speaker, we cannot rule out that individual envoys may also have projected their individual *ethos* as part of their oratorical strategies. At the meeting of the Roman Senate that descended into chaos, Polybios reports that embassies were present from all the frontiers of Makedonia individually (κατ' ἰδίαν), representing cities (κατὰ πόλιν), and representing national groups (κατὰ τὰς ἐθνικὰς συστάσεις) to bring charges against Philip (23.1.3).

The speeches in *oratio obliqua* generally present the inverse of the problem with those in *oratio recta*. Many of the envoys' speeches reported in *oratio recta* may have been supporting speeches and therefore give an incomplete picture of the collective rhetorical strategy of the embassy since Polybios does not report all the speeches. This is similar to the problem of reconstructing all the arguments made in Athenian law-court cases, where only selected speeches - whether delivered by the main speaker or by a *synegoros* - survive.³²¹ On the other hand, the diplomatic speeches in *oratio*

³²¹ See Rubinstein (2003) *passim*. A similar problem of course is when Polybios only reports speeches from one side of a debate, which also applies to Attic oratory with the exception of Lysias 6 and Andoc. 1, and Dem. 19 and Aeschin. 3.

obliqua often blend what may have been several speeches into one monophonic performance. I will use a musical analogy here again to demonstrate this. Using Polybios' envoys' speeches in *oratio recta* to reconstruct the rhetorical strategy of the ambassadorial team is like listening to only one symphony of a musical suite. On the other hand, using his accounts of the same type of speeches in *oratio obliqua* is like listening to every symphony at the same time.

k. The use and abuse of *ethē*: third-party diplomacy and composite teams

In the examples discussed above, I have demonstrated that envoys could shift their character projection when it was rhetorically convenient for them, whereby they could emphasise their own personal authority to make their oration(s) more convincing, as well as the authority they had as spokespeople of states and/or political entities with whom their audience enjoyed a good relationship. While I have emphasised that this rhetorical phenomenon is the product of diplomatic practice, namely composite audience and fragile alliances that often shifted, I will now argue that third-party diplomacy, whereby one state acts on behalf of another, could be manipulated for rhetorical purposes whereby the third-party is seen to be supporting the cause of another. In the context of the Hellenistic Period this is a particularly pertinent issue due to the expansion of hegemonic monarchies and federations, which offered smaller states large allies who could be seen to support their mission, and the smaller states could be used as pawns by the hegemonic powers. To demonstrate the rhetorical nature of this phenomenon, I will take the Megalopolitan embassy to Makedon in 227 as a case study since it offers some insight into how federal states could use the pre-existing relationships that individual members of their *koinon* had with other communities to their rhetorical and diplomatic advantage.

Polybios reports that Aratos of Sikyon secretly approached Nikophanes and Kerkidas of Megalopolis and instructed them to obtain permission from the Achaian League to send an embassy to Antigonos Doson to request help against the Lakedaimonians, with whom the Achaian League were at war at the time (Polyb. 2.48.4-5). The other surviving - but far briefer - account of this episode comes from Plutarch's *Life of Aratos*, which also states that Aratos himself orchestrated the embassy (Plut. Arat. 38.7-8).³²² The events narrated by Polybios raise the question why the Achaian League, since it was at war with the Lakedaimonians, did not approach Antigonos and request help themselves, since this would have been of benefit to the federation as a whole and not just Megalopolis.³²³

A controversial element to this episode is the role of Aratos and the extent to which he orchestrated this embassy himself, and scholars have not reached a consensus on this. On account of Aratos' anti-Makedonian politics, Gruen and Urban both argue that Aratos himself was not involved and that the embassy was the initiative of Megalopolitans themselves.³²⁴ Le Bohec suggests the compromise that the embassy was the Megalopolitans' own initiative but that Aratos used it as a means to communicate surreptitiously with Antigonos.³²⁵ Paschidis rejected both of these views and argued that Aratos instigated this embassy in secret because the Achaian League as a whole would have been hostile to an alliance with the Makedonian Kingdom in 227.³²⁶ In what follows, I will argue for the compromise position that the Achaian League itself orchestrated this embassy on the grounds that the league felt it could

³²² In the same section, Plutarch also reports that this episode is recounted in Phylarchos.

³²³ For recent overviews of this embassy, see Paschidis (2008), 236-41 and Günther (2013), *passim*. The embassy remained Megalopolitan, see Bikermann (1943) 289; Walbank (1957) 248; Urban (1979) 125ff.

³²⁴ Gruen (1972) 625; Urban (1979) 119-3.

³²⁵ Le Bohec (1993) 364-7. He is incorrect, however, when he says that the Megalopolitans sent two ambassadors since Polybios' use of the phrase τῶν περὶ τὸν Νικοφάνη καὶ τὸν Κερκιδᾶν πρεσβευτᾶς indicates that there were more than two envoys (Polyb. 2.48.6).

³²⁶ Paschidis (2008) 236-9.

not directly approach Makedon for help themselves due to the poor relations between the two powers in the preceding years. Therefore, the Achaians used the Megalopolitans as an intermediary between the two communities on the grounds that they, unlike the Achaian League, had enjoyed historically good relations with the Makedonian kingdom.

The relations between the Achaian League and the Makedonian Kingdom in the decades preceding the embassy might explain why a federal embassy consisting of Achaian envoys might have been ineffective and that any speeches delivered by Achaian envoys were likely to be unsuccessful. From 251 onwards, the Achaian League had started to pursue a policy of removing Makedonian-supported tyrants from the Peloponnese. This began with Aratos' coup at Sikyon, followed by a string of other pro-Makedonian regimes falling such as Argos, Phleious, and Hermione, whereupon these *poleis* joined the Achaian League.³²⁷ By 229, following the death of Demetrios II, Makedonian influence in the Peloponnese had diminished and the Achaian League was the main hegemonic power through which cities in the region could defend themselves against the threat of the Lakedaimonians and the Aitolian League. As a result, the Makedonian Kingdom and the Achaian League were not on good terms at the time of the embassy.

On the other hand, the *polis* of Megalopolis had enjoyed good relations with the Makedonian kingdom for a long time.³²⁸ In addition, both communities had a common enemy: the Lakedaimonians. At the time of the embassy, Megalopolis had several long-standing territorial disputes with Sparta concerning regions in northern Lakonia, and they had often turned to

³²⁷ The most up to date narratives of these episodes in Peloponnesian history are Vatri (2017) 147-204 and Shipley (2018) 62-6, 105-26, 142-6.

³²⁸ Pausanias mentions a stoa in the agora of Megalopolis which they named after Philip II, the Philippeion, which indicates that there was a particularly close relationship between the two states in the late fourth century (Paus. 8.30.6). The discovery of roof tiles bearing the inscription Φιλίππειου and Φιλίππειο[υ] ...πορος among the remains of a late-fourth century building suggest that Pausanias was correct (*JG V*² 469). See Gardner (1890).

the Makedonian Kingdom for arbitration. The earliest example is the case of Skiritis and Aigyitis, which Harter-Uibopuu believes were stripped from the Lakedaimonians in 338 by Philip II (via the Hellenic League), at the time when he also awarded territories to Argos, Megalopolis, Messene, and Tegea that were previously under the domain of the Lakedaimonians (*Syll.* 665, lines 19-20; *Polyb.* 9.33.10-1; *Livy* 38.34.7).³²⁹ Over a century later in 228, Kleomenes managed to conquer the Athenaiion, only for Antigonos Gonatas to restore it to Megalopolis (*Polyb.* 2.54.3).³³⁰ Relations may have potentially been somewhat strained after Lydiades resigned the tyranny of Megalopolis and took the city into the Achaian League; however there is no evidence to suggest that the tyrants of Megalopolis relied on the Makedonian Kingdom for financial support and/or garrisons.³³¹ It would have been very difficult for Achaian envoys to convince Antigonos that their federation had his kingdom's interests at heart due to the poor relations between the two states. In contrast, this would have been a relatively easy rhetorical task for Megalopolitan envoys since they had enjoyed many years of good relations with the Makedonian Kingdom. It is worth reviewing Polybios' text here:

οἱ μὲν οὖν Μεγαλοπολίται κατέστησαν αὐτοὺς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Νικοφάνη καὶ τὸν Κερκιδᾶν πρεσβευτὰς πρὸς τε τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς κάκειῖθεν εὐθέως πρὸς τὸν Ἀντίγονον, ἂν αὐτοῖς συγκατάθῃται τὸ ἔθνος. οἱ δ' Ἀχαιοὶ συνεχώρησαν πρεσβεύειν τοῖς Μεγαλοπολίταις. σπουδῆ δὲ συμμίζαντες οἱ περὶ τὸν Νικοφάνη τῷ βασιλεῖ διελέγοντο περὶ μὲν τῆς ἑαυτῶν πατρίδος αὐτὰ τἀναγκαῖα διὰ βραχέων καὶ κεφαλαιωδῶς, τὰ δὲ πολλὰ περὶ τῶν ὅλων κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς Ἀράτου.

Therefore, the Megalopolitans appointed those around Nikophanes and Kerkidas themselves to go as envoys to the Achaians and immediately to Antigonos, if the League agreed with them. The Achaians permitted the Megalopolitans to send an embassy. Coming together in effort,

³²⁹ Harter-Uibopuu (1998) 82-8; see also Ager (1996) 377-80 and Makil (2013) 477-80.

³³⁰ One of the forts in the Belminatis region of north-western Lakonia. Territorial disputes between Megalopolis and the Lakedaimonians continued into the following century, see Ager (1996) 377-80.

³³¹ Shipley (2018) 112-3.

those with Nikophanes spoke about the necessary matter of their country with haste and in summary, and about other matters more generally according to the instructions of Aratos.

The Megalopolitan envoys brought written instructions (*entolai*) with them and spoke according to them (2.48.8).³³² Since their mission was about a politically sensitive issue, it is likely that the instructions (a) stated that the envoys had the permission of the Achaian League to approach Antigonos, and (b), summarised their speech(es). The point of comparison here is the embassy of the Aitolian city of Kytenion to Xanthos, in which the Kytenian envoys presented their instructions to the Xanthians in the form of a letter and a decree which showed not only that the envoys also had the permission of their federal state to be present, but that their federal state had approved the themes they were to discuss in their speech(es) (*SEG 38:1476*). Other evidence elsewhere also suggests that Achaian cities needed prior permission from the federation to send embassies outside of the league, but the evidence is not explicit.³³³

The summary of the oral performances uses a number of plural verbs, suggesting that this was a polyphonic performance, however it is not possible to attribute the arguments made in the speech(es) to particular individuals.³³⁴ Polybios' report of the speech indicates that the oral performances of the envoys discussed two themes: Megalopolis, and the Peloponnese as a whole. Polybios prefaces his summary by stating that the envoys only spoke about the situation in Megalopolis briefly and spent more time dealing with the wider situation in the Peloponnese (2.48.8), and in what follows, Megalopolis is not mentioned at all (2.49.1-10). The phrase that Polybios uses here to describe the section of the oral performance(s) about Megalopolis is *αὐτὰ τάναγκαῖα*,

³³² 2.48.8: ... διελέγοντο ... κατὰ τὰς ἐντολὰς τὰς Ἀράτου.

³³³ On this, see Roy (2003) *passim* and Rizakis (2015) 125-31, which summarise the problems of the evidence and both contain decent bibliography.

³³⁴ E.g. σκοπεῖν οὖν αὐτὸν ἤξιουν (2.49.6); πολεμήσειν αὐτοὺς ἔφασαν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς πρὸς τὴν Κλεομένη (2.49.7). See also (2.49.9), which would be unnecessary to quote in full here.

a substantivised use of the adjective ἀναγκᾶς, which often means a bare outline, or when pertaining to relationships between individuals, the most natural ties between those people (*LSJ*, ad loc. II.3-4).

It is possible to discern three general points that the envoys made based on the summary of the second part of the speech: [1] the envoys warned that if Lakedaimonians and Aitolia formed an alliance, they would crush both Achaia and Makedonia, making Kleomenes the overlord of all Greece (2.49.1-5); [2] they asked Antigonos to choose whether to fight against Kleomenes in the Peloponnese or to fight for his throne in Thessaly against everybody else (2.49.6); and [3] they stressed that action needed to be taken immediately while Aitolia was still neutral (2.49.7-8). The envoys then concluded by saying that Aratos himself would negotiate the terms of the agreement and would call upon the Makedonians the moment their help would be needed (2.49.9-10). I will now take each of these arguments in turn and analyse them.

The first argument is two pronged since it invokes fear while also appealing to reason. The speaker makes the logical argument that if the Achaians were defeated by the Aitolians and the Lakedaimonians, then the Makedonians would also be in danger since it would be a reasonable assumption that these powers would want to expand their influence northwards. The element of fear in this argument is the image that the speaker invokes of Kleomenes as the overlord of all Greece.

The second argument is a choice between fighting in different places and against different enemies; either in Thessaly against the Aitolians, Boiotians, Achaians, and Lakedaimonians, or in the Peloponnese against Kleomenes with the support of the Achaians and the Boiotians. There is geographical imagery at play here, since the former was much further away from Makedonia than the latter, however there is a deeper invocation of fear here. During the years preceding the embassy, the Aitolian League had taken the Thessalian provinces of Hestiaiotis, Phthiotis, Phthiotis Achaia, and

Thessalotis from the Makedonian Kingdom, although Antigonos managed to recover all except Phthiotis Achaia which he had agreed to keep with Aitolia until the end of his reign.³³⁵ The speaker may be attempting to remind Antigonos of the danger his kingdom had faced at the hands of Aitolia in the recent past, invoking fear not only that it could happen again, but also that it is even more likely to if the Aitolians had the assistance of the Lakedaimonians. A point of rhetorical comparison here is the symbouleutic speeches of Demosthenes, particularly the *Olynthiacs*. In these speeches, Demosthenes attempts to persuade the Athenian assembly to send assistance to Olynthos, which was under serious threat from Philip II. On several occasions in the speeches, Demosthenes employs the argument that if the Athenians do not help with Olynthians repel the attacks of Philip, then they may later find themselves fighting him in Attika as Philip invades further south (Dem. 1.15; 3.8). A notable point of comparison is at 1.26, where Demosthenes states that both the Thebans and the Phokians will have no qualms with joining Philip in an invasion of Attika after they have been defeated as the Makedonian army moves southwards. Similarly, the Megalopolitan envoys warn Antigonos that he would be fighting against more and more communities as the Lakedaimonians move northwards (Polyb. 2.49.6).³³⁶

It has been argued by some that the third argument is where the envoys let their mask slip a little and reveal that their earlier arguments were hypothetical, since they mention that Aitolia was neutral at the time (2.49.7).³³⁷ Here the line of argumentation shifts to one of urgency by

³³⁵ Walbank (1940) 11; (1957) 249.

³³⁶ The Demostheneic influence on Hellenistic oratory is a hugely controversial topic, and not one I will engage with further here. Wooten (1972) 55-108 argues that there is a strong Demostheneic influence in the speeches reported in Hellenistic historiography and on the rhetorical exercises found on papyri, but his argument is not convincing. For methodological criticism, see Kremmydas (2007) *passim*.

³³⁷ 2.49.7: ἐὰν μὲν οὖν Αἰτωλοὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν Ἀχαιοῶν εἰς αὐτοὺς γεγενημένην εὖνοιαν ἐν τοῖς κατὰ Δημήτριον καιροῖς ἐντρεπόμενοι τὴν ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὑποκρίνονται, καθάπερ καὶ νῦν, πολεμήσειν αὐτοὺς ἔφασαν τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς πρὸς τὸν Κλεομένη: κἂν μὲν ἡ τύχη συνεπιλαμβάνηται, μὴ δεῖσθαι

predicting that Aitolia's neutrality will not last and that the Lakedaimonians would be their natural choice of allies. However, the established scepticism of Treves and Walbank does not consider the practical realities of neutrality in Greek interstate relations. As Bauslaugh has demonstrated, neutrality did not mean peace and a lack of involvement in war, and smaller states were often threatened into choosing a side, the most famous instance being Melos in 416.³³⁸ The mention of Aitolia being a neutral state does not, therefore, weaken the argument of the Aitolian envoys. In reality neutrality was only temporary, and the Aitolians would eventually be forced to pick a side. If Megalopolis and the Achaians looked to be on the losing side, then it would be more likely that the Aitolians would side with the Lakedaimonians after biding their time. The speaker is therefore calling on Antigonos to help prevent Aitolia taking sides with the Lakedaimonians in the conflict, and that this can be achieved by supporting the Megalopolitans and Achaians.

An interesting point of comparison is the speech of Alexander I to the Athenians, reported by Herodotos (Hdt. 8.136ff), who was sent by Mardonios to persuade them to support the Persians following the Battle of Salamis. One of the reasons Mardonios chose Alexander was because he was *proxenos* and *euergetes* to the Athenians (8.136.1) and that his relationship with Athens would be effective in persuading them to side with the Persians. Another similarity is how the speech is divided into two parts: Alexander first reports two messages from Xerxes and Mardonios, and then gives his own arguments. Although in the reverse order, the Megalopolitan envoys spoke about their own community before discussing the situation in the Peloponnese more generally (Polyb. 2.48.6). In both cases, the envoys spoke not only about business concerning their community but also the larger power they were

χρείας τῶν βοηθησόντων: ἄν δ' ἀντιπίπτῃ τὰ τῆς τύχης. See Treves (1937) 215 and Walbank (1957) 249.

³³⁸ Bauslaugh (1991) 70-83.

representing. The speakers in Polybios and Herodotos do not try to hide that they are representing a larger power with which their host community has poor relations, but instead represent themselves as mediators who can reach out. Since interstate arbitration was a common phenomenon, this should not come as a surprise since third parties often assisted two states to resolve a dispute. In the case of the Achaian League and Makedon, using the Megalopolitans to reach out to the Makedonians may have been an early attempt to instigate reconciliation between the two states. As Kralli has remarked, 227 was still early for the Achaians to attempt to form an alliance with the Makedonians following decades of poor relations, and the embassy may have been the first step in patching up their relationship which culminated with a formal alliance three years later.³³⁹

While the case of the Achaians' use of the Megalopolitans was successful, this was not a risk-free strategy as one instance in Polybios shows. In 169/8, the Rhodians sent a group of envoys to Rome in order to negotiate bringing the Third Makedonian War to an end, including one Hagepolis (Polyb. 29.19.3-4):

οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Ἀγέπολιν εἰσπορευθέντες ἔλθεῖν μὲν ἔφασαν διαλύσοντες τὸν πόλεμον: τὸν γὰρ δῆμον τῶν Ῥοδίων, ἐλκομένου τοῦ πολέμου καὶ πλείω χρόνον, θεωροῦντα διότι πᾶσιν μὲν τοῖς Ἑλλησιν ἀλυσιτελής καὶ αὐτοῖς δὲ Ῥωμαίοις διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν δαπανημάτων, ἔλθεῖν ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν γνώμην: νῦν δὲ λελυμένου τοῦ πολέμου κατὰ τὴν τῶν Ῥοδίων βούλησιν συγχαίρειν αὐτοῖς.

Those around Hagepolis and his colleagues having entered said they had come to bring the war to an end; for the demos of Rhodes, seeing that the war still continued to drag on, and observed that it was unprofitable to all Greeks and to the Romans themselves on account to the size of the expense, had decided on this step; but now that the war had terminated in the way that the Rhodians had wished, they congratulated the Romans.

³³⁹ Kralli (2017) 221-9.

The argument put forward is a basic one: the war should come to an end because of the monetary expense for the parties involved.³⁴⁰ Of further interest here is the use of the *περὶ* + accusative construction since it indicates that the Rhodians made use of a team of envoys although probably headed by Hagepolis who potentially took the largest speaking role. Hagepolis was a suitable choice as an ambassador; in the previous year he had served as an envoy to the consul Q. Marcius Philippus in Makedon, from whom he received a very warm reception and was privately encouraged to get Rhodes to mediate a close to the war (28.16.5-6).³⁴¹ The Rhodian mission to the Senate, however, was a colossal failure. The Romans believed that the embassy had been orchestrated by Perseus of Makedon as a desperate attempt since the Roman army was close to seizing victory, and so they dismissed the envoys (29.19.5-10).³⁴² Even the good relationship that the Roman consul had with Hagepolis, as well as Rome's long diplomatic ties with Rhodes, were not sufficient to demonstrate that the diplomats had the interests of the Romans in mind, and so they were not trusted.

I am not concerned here with whether Perseus orchestrated this mission, as Aratos had done with the Megapolitans decades previously. What caused the mission to fail was the perception that it was orchestrated because the diplomats' rhetoric did not align with the *kairos* and the mood of the audience. As Berthold has indicated, the Romans made substantial advances towards Pydna after the Rhodians had sent their embassy, and it would therefore have only been at the very last minute that the diplomats found out that a Roman victory was inevitable.³⁴³ The performance they had planned to

³⁴⁰ Parallel accounts are also given in Livy 45.3.3-8 and Diod. Sic. 30.24.1.

³⁴¹ However, this latter detail is subject to controversy and scholars have suggested it may be an invention of Rhodian historiographical tradition to portray themselves in a better light. See Berthold (1984) 240-3 and Wiemer (2001) 168-71.

³⁴² Adcock (1957) 150 goes as far to suggest that the words οὐτ'εὐργετέιν οὔτε φιλανθρώπως ... ἀποκρίνεσθαι used at 29.19.10 suggest the termination of their *amicitia*.

³⁴³ Berthold (1984) 193-4.

give was therefore no longer relevant and out of step with the rhetorical situation at hand. It is likely that the envoys therefore reframed their speech at the very last minute in order to accommodate the sudden changes; this is suggested by the final clause of Polybios' *oratio obliqua* in which he reports how the envoys congratulated (συγχαίρειν) the Romans. This last epideiktic element seems out of step with the rest of the oral performance since it acknowledges that victory is inevitable, yet prior to this the envoys had argued the war was disadvantageous to both sides and that peace should be brokered. Since the envoys' rhetoric was no longer relevant, the Romans naturally assumed it was a last-minute plea made by Perseus via the Rhodians, and since the Rhodians enjoyed a good relationship with Rome, they would naturally make a good third-party to manipulate Rome.

2. Summary

In summary, the evidence of Polybios gives a tremendous insight into the character projection techniques envoys could use during their speeches to foreign assemblies. Polybios' representation of ambassadorial rhetoric suggests that envoys were more than representatives speaking on behalf of their community, but that they could project to their own individual authorities, shift between their *polis* and federal identities, and even reveal their political views and ideology. There are two further important observations. Firstly, the selective nature of Polybios' narrative means very often only one speech by one member of a delegation is reported, when in fact more envoys from the same delegation spoke. This leads me on to my second observation, that diplomacy in is not simply bi-lateral and several communities are often present making oral contributions to the debate. The image we get of ambassadorial oratory is much more sophisticated than simply embassies from one community addressing another. The next question,

however, is whether the evidence of Thucydides and Xenophon present a similar or markedly different view of ambassadorial oratory.

3. Envoys and *ethos* in Classical Historiography

The similarities and differences between the representation of envoys' use of *ethos* in Polybios and earlier historiographers might give some indication as to whether the speeches in Polybios are a product of generic convention, or whether they reflect changes in the way ambassadorial oratory was practised in the Hellenistic Period. This is a fundamental question since if Polybios was bound by generic conventions, then his accounts of diplomatic negotiations may be an accurate reflection of ambassadorial oratory and instead offer a somewhat literary representation which might potentially be romanticised.

a. Thucydides

The impersonal nature of envoys' speeches reported by Thucydides is epitomised by the fact that most of them that he reports in *oratio recta* are not attributed to named individuals, but to *ethnica* in the plural.³⁴⁴ This stands in stark contrast to Polybios, who aside from the speech by the Rhodians to the Senate in 189, attributes envoys' speeches to a named envoy, or when he reports a speech in *oratio obliqua*, he will generally give the names of the ambassadorial team. In total, there are nine direct envoys' speeches in Thucydides that are attributed to the collective voice of the community:

(1-2) Unnamed Korkyran and Korinthian envoys to the Athenians (1.32-43).

(3-4) Unnamed Korinthian and Athenian envoys to the Peloponnesian League (1.68-78).

³⁴⁴ Noted by Rood (2018) 154. See Griffith (1961) for a breakdown. See also Kremmydas (2017) 99-195.

- (5) Unnamed Corinthians to the Peloponnesian League (1.120-4).
- (6) Unknown number of Plataians to the Lakedaimonians (2.71.2-4; 72.2; 74.1).
- (7) Unknown number of Mytileneans to the Peloponnesian League (3.9-14).
- (8) Unknown number of Thebans at the trial of the Plataians (3.61-7).
- (9) Unknown number of Lakedaimonians to the Athenians (4.17-20; 21.1).

There are also seven summaries of speeches attributed to nameless envoys that Thucydides reports in *oratio obliqua*. These are the speeches by the Thebans (2.4.7), Corinthians (5.27.2), Lakedaimonians (5.30.1; 5.44.3-45.1); the Samians (8.73.4), and the Athenian oligarchs (8.86.3; 8.89.2).³⁴⁵

In the thirteen instances I have listed above, Thucydides only denotes the envoys by the community they are representing. He does not give their names, and he does not say how many envoys spoke. The speeches are therefore not attributed to individual speakers, but the collective voice of a community.³⁴⁶ For instance, at the congress at Athens during the Korkyran dispute, the Korkyran envoys are simply οἱ Κερκυραῖοι (1.31.3) and the Corinthian envoys are οἱ Κορίνθιοι (1.36.4). The Lakedaimonians who addressed the Athenian assembly following the Spartan defeat at Pylos in 425 are just οἱ πρέσβεις (4.16.3) with τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων inferred from the previous passage. At the Spartan assembly where Brasidas is named as a speaker and his speech is reported in full, Thucydides reports that envoys from Korinth and Syrakuse were also present and made the same arguments as him, however they are simply denoted by an ethnicon in the plural (6.88.10).³⁴⁷

³⁴⁵ It is interesting how speeches performed by envoys in the first half of Thucydides are generally reported in *oratio recta*, but those in the latter half tend to be reported in *oratio obliqua*. This was also noticed in antiquity; Kratippos argued that Thucydides realised that all the long speeches began to irritate his readers, and so he chose to report them in a briefer format (*FGrHist* 64 F1). On this topic generally, see Hornblower (2008), 32-5.

³⁴⁶ Bers (1997) 8.

³⁴⁷ Thuc. 6.88.10: καὶ ξυνέβη ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων τοὺς τε Κορινθίους καὶ τοὺς Συρακοσίους τὰ αὐτὰ καὶ τὸν Ἀλκιβιάδην δεομένους πείθειν τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους.

The envoys in Thucydides generally show a lack of individual characterisation in their oral performances; the *ethē* they project are that of their communities as a collective rather than their own personal authority or standing. As Ceccarelli observes, the envoys are merely conveyers of their home *polis'* words.³⁴⁸ For instance, the speech performed by the Korkyrans to the Athenians at 1.32ff is denoted by the speaking verb ἔλεξαν (1.31.4) and εἶπον (1.36.4), and the envoys use the first-person plural throughout.³⁴⁹ The responding speech performed by the Corinthians (1.37ff) is also denoted by the verb εἶπον (1.44.1) and the Corinthians not only speak in the first-person plural but they also refer back to individual points made by the Korkyrans in the third-person plural.³⁵⁰

There are, however, at least four instances when Thucydides gives the names of the envoy(s) who spoke. The speech of the Plataians pleading on behalf of their *polis* to the Lakedaimonians is attributed to Astymachos son of Asopolaos and Lakon son of Aeimnestos, the latter being the Spartan *proxenos* (Thuc. 3.52.5-59.4).³⁵¹ But Thucydides does not dwell on how the speaking roles were divided between the two men, nor does he state that only one of the envoys spoke. The oral performance also makes no appeal to the *ethos* of the individual envoys (3.53.1):

τὴν μὲν παράδοσιν τῆς πόλεως, ᾧ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, πιστεύσαντες ὑμῖν ἐποιοσάμεθα, οὐ τοιάνδε δίκην οἰόμενοι ὑφέξειν, νομιμωτέραν δέ τινα ἔσεσθαι, καὶ ἐν δικασταῖς οὐκ ἂν ἄλλοις δεξάμενοι, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐσμέν, γενέσθαι ἢ ὑμῖν, ἡγούμενοι τὸ ἴσον μάλιστ' ἂν φέρεσθαι.

When we surrendered our city to you, Lakedaimonians, we trusted you and we did not expect to face a trial of this sort, but one more in

³⁴⁸ Ceccarelli (2013) 132.

³⁴⁹ E.g. ὥσπερ καὶ ἡμεῖς νῦν (1.32.1); ἤκομεν ... καθέσταμεν. (1.32.4); ἀπεωσάμεθα ... ὀρώμεν ... τολμῶμεν (1.32.5) etc.

³⁵⁰ E.g. ἀδικοῦμεν (1.37.1); φασὶ (1.37.2); βιάζονται (1.37.4); φασὶ (1.37.5); πολεμοῦσι (1.38.1); στεργόμεθα (1.38.3); ἀπαρέσκοιμεν ... ἐπιστρατεύομεν (1.38.4); ἡμαρτάνομεν ... προσεποιῶντο ... ἔχουσιν (1.38.5) etc.

³⁵¹ Macleod (1977) *passim*.

accordance with usual practice. Nor did we expect to be tried, as we are being tried, by other people. We thought that you yourselves would be our judges and that from you we should be most likely to get fair treatment.

Although Lakon is the Spartan *proxenos*, as Thucydides himself notes (3.52.5), the oral performance suggests that the speaker did not appeal to his personal standing anywhere in the speech.³⁵² Instead, the verbs used during the oral performance are all in the first-person plural and the speech is represented as a polyphonic performance.³⁵³ A similarly frustrating example is the embassy of the Lakedaimonians to the Athenians in 431, the final diplomatic engagement before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War (1.139.3). Thucydides reports how Ramphias, Melesippos, and Agesandros came to Athens and summarises their oral performance with the one sentence in *oratio recta*: “the Lakedaimonians want there to be peace, and there will be peace if you leave the Greeks autonomous”.³⁵⁴ It is extremely unlikely that Thucydides’ clause here is an accurate reflection of what was actually said and is most likely intended as résumé of what each envoy argued.³⁵⁵ In addition, while Thucydides remarkably names all the members of the delegation, he gives no other information about them.³⁵⁶ It is not until 2.12 that Melesippos is given his patronym, son of Diakritos, when he was sent as an envoy to Athens only to be refused an audience and sent away.³⁵⁷ It is likely that Ramphias is the same Ramphias who lead an army against the Athenians in Amphipolis in 422 (5.12-3), and that Agesandros was the father of Agesandridas who besieged

³⁵² On this *proxenia*, see the bibliography given in Hornblower (1991) 443-4.

³⁵³ The speech is framed by ἔλεγον (3.52.5) and εἶπον (3.60,1).

³⁵⁴ Thuc. 1.139.3: Λακεδαιμόνιοι βούλονται τὴν εἰρήνην εἶναι, εἶη δ’ ἂν εἰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας αὐτονόμους ἀφεῖτε.

³⁵⁵ Neither Gomme (1945) 451 nor Hornblower (1991) 225 comment on this, surprisingly.

³⁵⁶ Jacoby (1949) 307 n.41 remarks that giving the names of the three Lakedaimonian envoys is an ‘impressive formulation’.

³⁵⁷ Griffith (1961) 22-3 argues that Melesippos was given his patronym here due to the more solemn nature of the moment. Poralla (1913) 92-3.

the Athenians at Oropos in 411 (8.91.2ff).³⁵⁸ Evidently, the men held some degree of status which Thucydides seems to have had a basic awareness of, yet the personal characters of these men are obscured when they are denoted as envoys speaking on behalf of their community. In addition to the speeches discussed above, although Thucydides attributes them to multiple named speakers, he gives no indication of any synchronised speaking or whether the speeches should be read as an amalgamation of different speeches.³⁵⁹

Thucydides' lack of characterisation for individual envoys is particularly frustrating because it does not allow us to see how the ambassadorial team worked in practice since it is highly unlikely that the two envoys spoke in unison.³⁶⁰ The speech of Alkibiades, summarised in a very brief *oratio obliqua*, to the Argives before a meeting of the Athenian allies in 419/8, is a remarkable demonstration of how envoys generally lack their own voices in Thucydides (5.61.2):

καὶ ἔλεγον οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι Ἀλκιβιάδου πρεσβευτοῦ παρόντος ἔν τε τοῖς Ἀργείοις καὶ ξυμμάχοις ταῦτα, ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθῶς αἱ σπονδαὶ ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλων ξυμμάχων καὶ γένοιτο, καὶ νῦν ἐν καιρῷ γὰρ παρεῖναι σφεῖς ἄπτεσθαι χρῆναι τοῦ πολέμου.

The Athenians then, with Alkibiades present as their envoy, said to the Argives and their allies that they had no right to make the truce at all independently of their allies, and that, the Athenians having arrived at the opportune moment, they should fight at once.

Although this speech is clearly performed by Alkibiades, he is not even the subject of the verb ἔλεγον, and his role as the person speaking is only denoted by the genitive absolute Ἀλκιβιάδου πρεσβευτοῦ παρόντος. Thucydides forms this passage in such a way that the οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι are the ones who are speaking,

³⁵⁸ Hornblower (1996) 457, *contra* Poralla (1913) 6. See *ibid* 112 for Ramphias.

³⁵⁹ Rood (2022) 230-1.

³⁶⁰ Hornblower (1987) 51.

not Alkibiades, who is merely a mouthpiece.³⁶¹ It is worth, however, comparing what Thucydides says with Diodoros' even briefer account of this speech. Interestingly, Diodoros emphasises that Alkibiades was not acting as an envoy, but that he joined the *strategoí* Laches and Nikostratos in a personal capacity (ιδιώτης) due to his relationship with the Eleians and the Mantineians; συνῆν δὲ τούτοις καὶ Ἀλκιβιάδης ιδιώτης ὦν διὰ τὴν φιλίαν τὴν πρὸς Ἡλείους καὶ Μαντινεῖς (Diod. Sic. 12.79.1).³⁶² In the context of the present discussion, the contrast between the terminology of *presbeutes* and *idiotes* is significant. As Rubinstein has shown, the term *idiotes* was used to denote the individual citizen as an 'atom' of the *polis* and stressed the role interpersonal relationships played in their political conduct.³⁶³ While Thucydides does not mention Alkibiades' connections with Elis and Mantinea (unlike Diodoros) in the passage quoted above, i.e. he does not clarify the standing Alkibiades has as a speaker before his audience, he touches upon Alkibiades' connections in the Peloponnese elsewhere in his work (e.g. Thuc. 6.29.3; 6.61.5), and Alkibiades' personal influence across the Greek world is well known.³⁶⁴ The standing of Alkibiades with the audience, therefore, makes him a highly suitable choice as an Athenian spokesperson. His very presence may also have enhanced the authority of Laches and Nikostratos, who despite not formally acting as envoys, were required to partake in diplomatic negotiations of *strategoí*. As a team of three, Laches and Nikostratos were the impersonal representatives of the *polis*, complemented by the more personal face of Alkibiades - with the two contrasting *ethē* enhancing each other.

³⁶¹ Neither Gomme (1970) 87-7 nor Hornblower (2008) 161 pick up on Thucydides' framing of the speech here and most of their discussion summarises the debate about whether Alkibiades was in fact one of the ten *strategoí* for this year. Naturally, this would have affected his standing as a speaker, so it is not an issue worthy of dismissal.

³⁶² As noted by Bearzot (2017) 153.

³⁶³ Rubinstein (1998) 128-39.

³⁶⁴ Generally, see Herman (1987) 116-8; Mitchell (1997) 101-2

There is, however, an important exception to Thucydides' general representation of envoys: Hermokrates of Syrakuse at Gela (4.59-64). His speech is remarkably more personal compared with those he attributes to other envoys and embassies. For instance (4.59.1):

οὔτε πόλεως ὧν ἐλαχίστης, ὧ Σικελιῶται, τοὺς λόγους ποιήσομαι οὔτε πονουμένης μάλιστα τῷ πολέμῳ, ἐς κοινὸν δὲ τὴν δοκοῦσάν μοι βελτίστην γνώμην εἶναι ἀποφαινόμενος τῇ Σικελίᾳ πάσῃ.

Men of Sicily, I am neither of the least city nor of the most afflicted with war that am now to speak and to deliver the opinion which I take to conduce most to the common benefit of all Sicily.

And (4.64.1):

καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν, ἅπερ καὶ ἀρχόμενος εἶπον, πόλιν τε μεγίστην παρεχόμενος καὶ ἐπιὼν τῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀμυνόμενος ἀξιῶ προιδόμενος αὐτῶν συγχωρεῖν, καὶ μὴ τοὺς ἐναντίους οὔτω κακῶς δρᾶν ὥστε αὐτὸς τὰ πλείω βλάπτεσθαι, μηδὲ μωρία φιλονικῶν ἡγεῖσθαι τῆς τε οἰκείας γνώμης ὁμοίως αὐτοκράτωρ εἶναι καὶ ἧς οὐκ ἄρχω τύχης, ἀλλ' ὅσον εἰκὸς ἡσᾶσθαι

For my part, as I said in the beginning, I bring to this the greatest city, and which is rather an assailant than assailed; and yet foreseeing these things, I hold it fit to come to an agreement, and not so to hurt our enemies as to hurt ourselves more. Nor yet through foolish spite will I look to be followed as absolute in my will and master of fortune, which I cannot command; but I will also give way where it is reason.

Although he refers to Syrakuse on several occasions in his speech, Hermokrates speaks in a mixture of first-person singular and plural verbs, showing a high degree of individualisation. As Rubinstein observes, although it is clear that Hermokrates is an envoy of Syrakuse, he represents himself as an independent advisor whose authority rests on his own standing rather than his *polis*, and when he does use the first-person plural, he is generally speaking

on behalf of all the Sicilian Greeks rather than just his *polis* of Syrakuse.³⁶⁵ However, when Hermokrates speaks as an envoy again at Kamarina in 415/14, he adopts a very different rhetorical strategy. In this speech he speaks solely in the first-person plural and gives no indication that his arguments are his own, rather, that he is reflecting the sentiments of his *polis* (6.80.3):

ξυνελόντες τε λέγομεν οἱ Συρακόσιοι ἐκδιδάσκειν μὲν οὐδὲν ἔργον εἶναι σαφῶς οὔτε ὑμᾶς οὔτε τοὺς ἄλλους περὶ ὧν αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν χεῖρον γινώσκετε: δεόμεθα δὲ καὶ μαρτυρόμεθα ἅμα, εἰ μὴ πείσομεν, ὅτι ἐπιβουλεύομεθα μὲν ὑπὸ Ἴώνων αἰεὶ πολεμίων, προδιδόμεθα δὲ ὑπὸ ὑμῶν Δωριῆς Δωριῶν.

To be short, we Syrakusians say that to demonstrate plainly to you or to any other the thing you already know is no hard matter; but we pray you, and withal if you reject our words we protest, that whereas the Ionians, who have ever been our enemies, do take counsel against us, you, that are Dorians as well as we, betray us.

The Athenian respondent, Euphemos, adopts a similar strategy whereby he speaks only in the first-person plural and does not let his individual character seep through into the oral performance (6.82-7). In fact, Euphemos' impersonal *ethos* and character as a spokesperson for the Athenians is emphasised through the persistent use of ἡμεῖς, which appears twenty-four times in the speech.³⁶⁶ The two speeches of Hermokrates contain three different *ethē* that a speaker in a diplomatic context could use: (1) their individual character, (2) their *polis*, and (3) their region. Similar levels of *ethos* are apparent in the speeches of Chlaineas and Lykiskos and amongst others in Polybios, which show a similar degree of flexibility in how envoys could shift

³⁶⁵ Rubinstein (2016) 118-20. Thatcher (2021) 172-6 and 200-5 argues that Hermokrates projects a uniquely Sicilian Greek identity in this speech, a deliberate contrast with the Greeks of the mainland, i.e. the Athenian invaders.

³⁶⁶ 6.82.2; 6.82.3; 6.82.4; 6.83.1; 6.84.1; 6.84.2; 6.84.3; 6.85.1; 6.85.1; 6.86.1; 6.86.2; 6.86.3; 6.86.5; 6.87.3; 6.87.4; 6.87.5.

their *ethē* during their oral performances depending on how they wanted to frame their argument.

In summary, the character projection techniques found in Thucydides' envoys' speeches stand in stark contrast with those of Polybios. Thucydides seems more comfortable attributing whole speeches to communities as a collective, effectively putting words into the mouth of the *polis*, whereas Polybios generally opts for individual speakers. Even when Thucydides gives the names of the speakers, the speech is attributed to all the speakers, turning a potentially polyphonic performance into Frankenstein's monster. Thucydides does, however, show some awareness of how speakers could use *prosopopoiia* to represent themselves as regional spokespeople, as Hermokrates demonstrated.

b. Xenophon

The individualisation of speakers in Xenophon has long been observed by scholars, notably Rubinstein and Gray.³⁶⁷ Unlike Thucydides, many of the envoys' speeches reported in *oratio recta* are attributed to named individuals and a handful of these oral performances are highly personalised.³⁶⁸ The speech of Kallikratidas to the Milesians projects a highly individualised *ethos* and the speaker addresses the audience predominantly in the first person (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.8-11).³⁶⁹ This speech, as well as his earlier speech to his troops, also projects a lakonic *ethos*; the speech itself is very short and is constructed by short and sharp sentences.³⁷⁰ As a result of its style, the speech has even

³⁶⁷ Gray (1989) 123-131; Rubinstein (2016) 93-113.

³⁶⁸ For further discussion and the question of why, see Huitink and Rood (2022) 247-50.

³⁶⁹ E.g. Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.8: ἐμοὶ μὲν, ὦ Μιλήσιοι, ἀνάγκη τοῖς οἴκοι ἄρχουσι πείθεσθαι: ὑμᾶς δὲ ἐγὼ ἄξιῶ προθυμοτάτους εἶναι εἰς τὸν πόλεμον διὰ τὸ οἰκοῦντας ἐν βαρβάρους πλεῖστα κακὰ ἤδη ὑπ' αὐτῶν πεπονθέναι. 1.6.10: ἐπεὶ τὰ ἐνθάδε ὑπάρχοντα Λύσανδρος Κύρω ἀποδοὺς ὡς περιττὰ ὄντα οἴχεται: Κύρος δὲ ἐλθόντος ἐμοῦ ἐπ' αὐτὸν ἀεὶ ἀνεβάλλετό μοι διαλεχθῆναι, ἐγὼ δ' ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκείνου θύρας φοιτᾶν οὐκ ἐδυνάμην ἐμαυτὸν πείσαι.

³⁷⁰ Gray (1989) 81-3.

been criticised as a series of veiled threats rather than a genuine piece of rhetoric.³⁷¹ However the nature of Kallikratidas' speech should perhaps come as no surprise considering its subject of war; the speaker was also a military general and adopting this aggressive tone enhances his authority in requesting that the Milesians grant financial assistance to the Spartans for the ongoing war against Athens.³⁷²

The speech of Polydamas of Pharsalos, who warns the Lakedaimonians of the growing power of Jason of Pherai, also projects an individualised *ethos* (6.1ff). The speaker opens his speech by emphasising his personal ties of *proxenia* and *euergenia* with the Lakedaimonians, which as Gray has emphasised, represents Polydamas as the epitome of a *philos* (6.1.4):³⁷³

ἐγώ, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, πρόξενος ὑμῶν ὦν καὶ εὐεργέτης ἐκ πάντων ὧν μεμνήμεθα προγόνων, ἀξιῶ, ἐάν τέ τι ἀπορῶ, πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἰέναι, ἐάν τέ τι χαλεπὸν ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ Θεσσαλίᾳ συνιστῆται, σημαίνειν. ἀκούετε μὲν οὖν εἴ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς Ἰάσονος ὄνομα: ὁ γὰρ ἀνὴρ καὶ δύναμιν ἔχει μεγάλην καὶ ὄνομαστός ἐστιν. οὗτος δὲ σπονδὰς ποιησάμενος συνεγένετό μοι, καὶ εἶπε τάδε:

I, Lakedaimonians, being your proxenos and benefactor as my ancestors have been, think it right, if I am in any difficulty, to come to you, to make it known to you if there are any problems gathering for you in Thessaly. I am quite sure therefore that you too hear the name of Jason: for the man both holds greater power and is well-known. This man, having made a treaty, met me and said these things:

The *ethos* Polydamas projects is the suitable character for an envoy, as referred to in the *Rhetoric to Alexander*, since it allows him to win the trust of the Lakedaimonians by demonstrating that he has their interest at heart in the present moment as he – and his ancestors - had in the past. This stands in

³⁷¹ Moles (1994) 73-5. See Orsi (2002) *passim* on the meanings of different speaking verbs in Xenophon, and the type of communication they intend to convey.

³⁷² The *Rhetoric to Alexander* advises a different rhetorical strategy in this situation (*Rh. Al.* 2.27-8).

³⁷³ Gray (1989) 121-3.

contrast to the speech of the Plataians Astymachos and Lakon to the Lakedaimonians in 427, as reported by Thucydides (Thuc. 3.53-9). Although Lakon was the *proxenos* to the Lakedaimonians, there is nowhere in the speech where the relationship between the speaker as an individual and their audience is used. Instead, the Plataian speakers emphasise the historical relationships between their community as whole and the Lakedaimonians.³⁷⁴ Polydamas in one instance uses the first-person pronoun in the singular to refer to his *polis*, in the same way that a monarch could proclaim *l'état c'est moi*, which is perhaps not surprising since he was elected caretaker-*tyrannos* following a period of civil strife.³⁷⁵ The effect of Polydamas' character projection is very similar to that of Hermokrates' speech at Gela in Thucydides; the suppression of the collective *ethos* of the community they represent in favour of highly personalised characters represents the speakers, to use Rubinstein's term, as the influential CEOs of their cities.³⁷⁶ Intriguingly, while Polydamas' *ethos* is highly personalised it also involves a collective element, however this collective element is not his status as a citizen of his *polis*, but rather as member of his family and a descendent of previous *proxenoi*.³⁷⁷ Polydamas' credibility is thus enhanced more by his bloodline than his citizenship. A more well-known and studied example from the *Hellenika* is the Athenian embassy to Sparta in 371 and the Peloponnesian mission to Athens in 370/69 (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.2-17; 6.5.33-48). Xenophon reports three separate speeches, which he attributes to Kallias, Autokles, and Kallistratos, each of whom projects a different individualised *ethos*.³⁷⁸

³⁷⁴ E.g. Thuc. 3.54.

³⁷⁵ Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.14: καὶ νομίζω οὕτως ἔχειν, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὡς εἰ μὲν πέμψετε ἐκεῖσε δύναμιν μὴ ἐμοὶ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Θετταλοῖς ἰκανὴν δοκεῖν εἶναι πρὸς ἴσωνα πολεμεῖν, ἀποστήσονται αὐτοῦ αἱ πόλεις: Xenophon's wording (καὶ στασιάζαντες οἱ Φαρσάλιοι παρακατέθεντο αὐτῷ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, 6.1.2) suggests a tyrant-like position.

³⁷⁶ Rubinstein (2016) 119.

³⁷⁷ On the rhetorical use of the ancestors to enhance an envoy's credibility, see Harris (2016) 149-50.

³⁷⁸ *Ibid* 100-13. See also Mosley (1961) *passim*; Gray (1989) 123-131; Tuplin (1993) 101-10; Schepens (2001) *passim*; Rubinstein (2016) 93-113.

The examples I have cited above are, however, the exception rather than the rule. Even in speeches performed by envoys who are identified by Xenophon, very often they still speak as a mouthpiece for their *polis* and they are not portrayed as projecting an individualised character. For example, the speech of the Lakedaimonian commander Derkylidas to Abydos is highly impersonal, and the *philia* to which the speaker refers exists between his polis collectively and that of his audience (4.8.4).³⁷⁹ The speech of Kleigenes, a member of a joint embassy of Akanthians and Apollonians to the Lakedaimonians, concerns a very similar theme to the speech of Polydamas and has a remarkably similar structure, which has led Gray to question to historical accuracy of Xenophon's speeches.³⁸⁰ But the *ethē* projected by the speakers are completely different; the speech of Kleigenes is impersonal and the speaker makes extensive use of the first-person plural (5.2.12-9).³⁸¹ In this instance the text suggests that Kleigenes was the spokesperson for the whole team, and therefore it would not be surprising if his personal *ethos* was suppressed. The speech is simply concluded with the genitive absolute *λεχθέντων δὲ τούτων*, leaving Kleigenes' speaking role as a speaker omitted (5.2.20).

Speeches performed by envoys who Xenophon denotes merely by their ethnicon are also all impersonal; the identities of the speakers, as well as their personal character are suppressed.³⁸² The speech of the Thebans to the Athenians is predominantly in the first-person plural and the speaker is represented as the mouthpiece for the Thebans (3.5.7-16). As Rubinstein has observed, while the speech is attributed to the οἱ Θηβαῖοι and is introduced

³⁷⁹ ὧ ἄνδρες, νῦν ἔξεστιν ὑμῖν καὶ πρόσθεν φίλοις οὔσι τῇ πόλει ἡμῶν εὐεργέτας φανῆναι τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων.

³⁸⁰ Gray (1989) 185-6.

³⁸¹ E.g. οἰόμεθα (5.2.12); κατελίπομεν ἡμεῖς ... ἥσθανόμεθα ... παρασόμεθα (5.2.13) ἡμεῖς ... βουλόμεθα ... ἡμεῖς ... γενώμεθα (5.2.14) κατελίπομεν ... ἠκούμεν (5.2.15) ἡμεῖς ... λέγομεν (5.2.17) ἡμεῖς ... ἐξαγγέλλομεν ... εἰρήκαμεν (5.2.18).

³⁸² Rubinstein (2016) 94.

with a plural verb, Xenophon concludes the speech in the singular.³⁸³ While this might be, as Rubinstein suggests, an error on the part of Xenophon himself, the speech of Kleigenes discussed above demonstrates that it was not unknown for individual envoys to represent themselves as the mouthpiece for their community and suppress their individual character. The speech Xenophon attributes to the οἱ Κορινθιοί, performed to the Lakedaimonians in 366, employs the same rhetorical strategy (7.4.8). Envoys' speeches of this type, however, where the envoys are anonymous and their individual *ethē* are not projected, are much less common in the works of Xenophon than Thucydides.

Xenophon's representation of how envoys could project an individualised or collective *ethē* is perhaps epitomised by the debate at Athens in 370/69 (6.5.33ff).³⁸⁴ The Lakedaimonians, following the invasion of Lakonia by the Thebans after the Battle of Leuktra, sent envoys to Athens to request their assistance. Xenophon reports that the Lakedaimonians sent Arakos, Okyllos, Pharax, Etymokles, and Olontheus as envoys, and he reports a summary of what they said in *oratio obliqua* but does not dwell on who said what (6.5.33-5). The summary indicates that they spoke only about the shared history between their *polis* and Athens and no personal relationships are mentioned.³⁸⁵ Xenophon includes quotes in *oratio recta* which he does not attribute to any one of the envoys (6.5.35). Okyllos and Etymokles had already served as envoys to Athens in 378/7, so there is a chance that some in the audience might have recognised them, but Xenophon's resumé of the oral performance(s) remains impersonal (5.44.22).³⁸⁶ During the debate that

³⁸³ 3.5.7. Rubinstein (2016) 116-7.

³⁸⁴ On these speeches generally, see Buckler and Beck (2008) 152-7.

³⁸⁵ The envoys simply called on the Athenians to remember how they had helped expel their tyrants, how Athens helped the Lakedaimonians quash the helot revolt at Mount Ithome, and how they stood side-by-side in the Persian Wars. Interestingly, these elements of the oral performance(s) are absent from the surviving accounts of Kallisthenes (*FGrH* 124F 8) and Aristotle (*Ar. Eth. Nic.* 4.3.25), who instead write that the Lakedaimonians recounted how the Athenians had helped them in the past. This line of argumentation is also plausible, see Rubinstein (2013) 186-99.

³⁸⁶ Mitchell (1997) 192.

followed, a Korinthian envoy named Kleiteles spoke, and Xenophon reports his speech in *oratio recta* (6.5.37), and he was then followed by a longer speech by an envoy from Phleious named Prokles (6.5.38-48). Kleiteles' *ethos* is that of a spokesperson for his state, with verbs and pronouns in the plural.³⁸⁷ In contrast, the speech of Prokles is much more individualised (6.5.38-9):

ὅτι μὲν, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, εἰ ἐκποδῶν γένοιτο Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ἐπὶ πρώτους ἂν ὑμᾶς στρατεύσαιεν οἱ Θεβαῖοι, πᾶσιν οἶμαι τοῦτο δῆλον εἶναι: τῶν γὰρ ἄλλων μόνους ἂν ὑμᾶς οἴονται ἐμποδῶν γενέσθαι τοῦ ἄρξαι αὐτοὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων. εἰ δ' οὕτως ἔχει, ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδὲν μᾶλλον Λακεδαιμονίοις ἂν ὑμᾶς ἡγοῦμαι στρατεύσαντας βοηθῆσαι ἢ καὶ ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς. τὸ γὰρ δυσμενεῖς ὄντας ὑμῖν Θεβαίους καὶ ὁμόρους οἰκοῦντας ἡγεμόνας γενέσθαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων πολὺ οἶμαι χαλεπώτερον ἂν ὑμῖν φανῆναι ἢ ὅποτε πόρρω τοὺς ἀντιπάλους εἴχετε.

I think this is clear to everyone, Athenians, if the Lakedaimonians were gotten out of the way, then the Thebans would be first to invade you: for they think that you alone of all are obstructing them from becoming the leaders of the Greeks. If this is so, I for my part believe you would be assisting the Lakedaimonians and yourselves. For to have the Thebans, who are hostile to you and dwell on your borders, become leaders of the Greeks, would become more dangerous for you, I think, than when you have antagonists far away.

The speaker uses the first-person singular extensively throughout the speech and it is full of interjections where the speaker emphasises that his arguments are his own *gnomai*, in a much similar way to that of some of the ambassadorial oratory found in Polybios, especially the speeches of Chlaineas and Thrasykrates. In fact, Prokles' Phleiasian *ethos* is completely suppressed and there is nothing within the oral performance itself that gives any indication as to the *polis* the speaker is representing. While the speaker uses the first-

³⁸⁷ ἡμῶν δέ ... ἐστρατεύσαμεν ... ἐλάβομεν ... ἐδηλώσαμεν ... ἡμεῖς ὁμόσαιμεν (6.5.37).

person plural on one occasion in this speech, he is speaking for all of those who are allied to the Athenians, not his *polis*.³⁸⁸

In summary, the evidence of Xenophon for the character projection techniques utilised by envoys stands somewhat between that of Thucydides and Polybios, though closer to the latter. Unlike Thucydides, Xenophon does not frequently attribute long speeches in *oratio recta* to entire communities, and when he does attribute them to named envoys, many of these speeches are highly personalised in nature. Are we, then, to take this as an indication that ambassadorial oratory became more personalised from the fourth century onwards, or is this simply a reflection to stylistic changes in how historiographers report envoys' speeches? This is the final question to which I will now turn in this chapter.

4. A Question of Historiographical Trends?

Before addressing the question of whether the increasingly personalised nature of ambassadorial oratory in historiography is a reflection of how envoys' speeches developed in practice, or is a reflection of how historiographical texts developed in style, we are faced with a problem. Since so much Greek historiography has been lost, our body of evidence might not provide an accurate sample. In the case of the present question, the characterisation of individual speakers within their speeches, there is grounds for optimism since many ancient commentators discuss this question. For instance, in a fragment of Kallisthenes we read (*FGrHist* 124 F 44):

δεῖ τὸν γράφειν τι πειρώμενον μὴ ἀστοχεῖν τοῦ προσώπου, ἀλλ' οἰκείως αὐτῷ τε καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι τοὺς λόγους θεῖναι

³⁸⁸ 6.5.48: ὁπότε δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀγαλλόμεθα οἱ συναγορεύοντες βοηθῆσαι ἀνδράσιν ἀγαθοῖς. Gray (1989) 112 points out how the presence of numerous envoys at this meeting reinforces Athens' image as the champion of the wronged, or perhaps more accurately, the *hegemon* to which smaller states could turn.

Anyone attempting to write something must not fail to hit upon the character, but must make speeches appropriate to the persons and the circumstances.

Like Xenophon, Kallisthenes showed an explicit interest in the characterisation of individuals (Xen. *Mem.* 3.10.1-8).³⁸⁹ The remarks of Kallisthenes also bears similar resemblance to Polybios' discussion about how Timaios' version of Hermokrates' speech did not align with his character (Polyb. 12.26). As Baron has argued, Kallisthenes was more concerned with how the arguments of the speech aligned with the character of the speaker, unlike Thucydides who was more concerned with how the arguments aligned with what was needed (*ta deonta*) in the rhetorical situation.³⁹⁰ My survey of how diplomatic speakers in Thucydides often lack an individual character, as I discussed above, lends credit to Baron's argument. But this criticism of Thucydides' speeches goes back to antiquity. Writing in the first century, Dionysios of Halikarnassos attacks Thucydides for his account of the Melian Dialogue on the grounds that the arguments he attributes to the Athenian envoy do not align with the glorious reputation of Athens (Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 39-41).³⁹¹ Dionysios also acknowledges that Thucydides, who would have been in exile in Thrake when the Melian Dialogue took place, could have had no way of knowing the contents of the oral performances. It is interesting how Polybios attacks Timaios for similar reasons and does not attack him for not using *ipsissima verba*, presumably since Timaios could not have been able to reproduce a speech word-for-word that was delivered two centuries earlier, and nor does Polybios assume that Thucydides' version of the speech was the definitive version. Dionysios' argument is also interesting since he suggests that not only should the status of the speaker be reflected in the style historiographers use in reporting his oratory, but that the standing of their community should align

³⁸⁹ As noted by Rubinstein (2016) 93.

³⁹⁰ Baron (2012) 171-2. On Kallisthenes and Thucydides, see Prandi (1985) 127-36.

³⁹¹ Sacks (1986) 386-8; Wiater (2011) 154-65.

with his *ethos* too. Although the evidence is not conclusive, it suggests that the Hellenistic historiographical conventions underwent a change from the fourth century onwards. Historiographers seem to have shown a high degree of consciousness about how the arguments that they attribute to individual speakers matched their personality. This could potentially be a continuation of the dramatic realism (*mimesis*) that Rubinstein observed in Xenophon's accounts of some speeches performed by envoys.³⁹²

While Polybios is seen as the 'anti-tragic' historiographer, in contrast with the likes of Douris of Samos and Phylarchos, we cannot rule out that Polybios adopted some of the very historiographical conventions he criticised.³⁹³ Many scholars, however, now argue that this distinction between 'tragic' and non-tragic historiographical writing is a highly misleading one, and the individualised nature of speakers in Polybios also suggests the distinction has been overemphasised.³⁹⁴ As Gray has convincingly argued, *mimesis* in the context of speeches in historiography relates to the projection of *ethos* and *pathos* by the speaker, and the lack of these features in Thucydides' speeches were the grounds on which Dionysios of Halikarnassos criticised him.³⁹⁵ Gray also goes on to argue that *mimesis* was a common topic of discussion in historiographical methodology from the late third century onwards, suggesting that the projection of an individualised *ethos* was a more important consideration in speeches in Hellenistic historiography.³⁹⁶

Thucydides' representation of individuals may well be deliberately abstract. In the case of envoys, as Cogan argued, Thucydides may have kept

³⁹² Rubinstein (2016) 93. On *mimesis* and *ethos*, see Halliwell (2002) 151-64.

³⁹³ Although Marincola (2013) *passim* argues Polybios' criticism of Phylarchos in fact comes down to accuracy rather than style, and that Polybios himself attempts to invoke certain emotions during his narrative. On potentially 'tragic' elements in Douris and Phylarchos, see Hau (2016) 136-48.

³⁹⁴ Walbank (1960) *passim*; Hornblower (1994a); Rutherford (2007) *passim*; Kebric (2016) *passim*. For Polybios and tragic historiography, see Pausch (2019) 357-63; Hau (2021) *passim*.

³⁹⁵ Gray (1987) 468-70.

³⁹⁶ *Ibid* 476-86. *contra* Walbank (1972) 36.

envoys anonymous as a reflection of what the audience knew, i.e. the audience did not know who these speakers were and that naming them in his text would not have created an accurate impression of how the audience received the speeches as the speaker(s) performed on their *bema*.³⁹⁷ While Cogan's explanation is plausible, it is undermined by his methodology since he overlooked the speeches of the named Korinthian envoys, the instance of the named Aitolian envoys, and the speech of the Athenian envoy Euphemos.³⁹⁸ There are also examples where Thucydides remarks that certain individuals served on diplomatic missions, and we know from Thucydides' own remarks as well as elsewhere that these envoys had personal connections of *philia* with the *polis* to which they were sent.³⁹⁹ However, since these instances are generally just remarks and Thucydides does not record any oral performances, either in *oratio recta* or *oratio obliqua*, that were delivered during these missions, it is impossible to know whether the oratory of these envoys was more personal, like that of Hermokrates at Gela.

Thucydides' impersonal representation of envoys may not be an accurate reflection of how ambassadorial oratory was performed during the Peloponnesian War. The speech of a Korinthian envoy at Mantinea in 419 is attributed to one Euphamidas and is introduced by the verb ἔφη in the singular (5.55.1), giving some hint that the sort of personal oratory performed by Hermokrates was not necessarily unusual, nor does Thucydides actually remark that Hermokrates' speech was unusual. While the epigraphic evidence of fifth-century Athens is frustrating due to its lack of detail concerning oral performances delivered by envoys, there is another source that is often overlooked by rhetoricians and historians of Greek diplomacy – the comedies of Aristophanes. Compared to Thucydides, *The Acharnians*, produced for the

³⁹⁷ Cogan (1981) 215-20.

³⁹⁸ Hornblower (1987) 50-2 corrects Cogan by pointing out that the Korinthian envoys were named by Thucydides, but he does not mention the other instances that I have found.

³⁹⁹ Mitchell (1997) 55-72 offers a discussion of these appointments, both at Sparta and in Athens. See 192-8 for her catalogue.

Lenaia festival in 425, provides a somewhat more personal insight into the role of envoys in Athenian diplomacy during this period. If Aristophanes is reflective, then envoys were frequently castigated in Old Comedy, and Sanders has demonstrated that there were at least six charges that envoys are accused of by other characters.⁴⁰⁰ In the context of the present discussion, Sander's sixth charge is worth singling out – that the same individuals have always got to serve as ambassadors. This is based on an exchange between Dikaiopolis and Lamachos, where Dikaiopolis complains that the same men are always receiving their pay for serving on embassies in contrast to other members of the *demos* who have yet to serve as envoys (Aristoph. *Ach.* 607ff).⁴⁰¹ The data collected by Mitchell demonstrates that it was not uncommon for envoys to serve on embassies to the same community on several occasions, indicating that Aristophanes' satire could be hinting at an accepted truth.⁴⁰² It would, after all, make sense to elect the same individuals as envoys since they would have developed personal connections within their host *polis* over time. But unfortunately, our evidence does not give much indication at how these envoys were able to use their personal connections to their rhetorical advantage as part of their oral performances.

It is plausible that Thucydides' representation of envoys as mere mouthpieces is a result of Thucydides' own historiographical style; he might not have been intending to create *mimesis*. As Sommerstein has argued, of the 36 known envoys of the Peloponnesian War, 22 – or 61% - are mentioned in Old Comedy, although mostly in *The Acharnians*.⁴⁰³ Based on my analysis of Sommerstein's data, out of these 22, 11 are known to have also been *strategoí*, *probouloi*, oath-takers, or proposers of decrees, whereas the remaining 11 are only known to have served as envoys.⁴⁰⁴ Therefore, less than half of the

⁴⁰⁰ Sanders (2014) 112-4.

⁴⁰¹ Olson (2002) 230-1.

⁴⁰² Mitchell (1997) 195-8.

⁴⁰³ Sommerstein (1996) 328.

⁴⁰⁴ *Ibid* 337-42.

Athenian envoys we can identify as individuals who served on missions between 431/0 and 411/10 are known from Thucydides. As Stadter argued, Thucydides only allots direct speeches to 17 named individuals whereas envoys are often assigned speeches as a collective body, demonstrating that in a diplomatic context Thucydides is more interested in the character and motivations of collective communities rather than individuals.⁴⁰⁵ Although Thucydides will often give the details of a speaker, and occasionally his own opinion of them, characterisation of them as individuals within the actual speeches is rare.⁴⁰⁶ In addition, in the context of ambassadorial oratory Thucydides is more interested in the collective characterization of the community, or their “national character” as Connor labels it.⁴⁰⁷

In summary, while scholars have continued to emphasise the influence of Thucydides on Polybios, ambassadorial oratory suggests a different picture.⁴⁰⁸ The more individualised nature of ambassadorial oratory in Polybios is much more comparable to the representation of the same type of speech in Xenophon, who also makes greater use of *oratio obliqua*.⁴⁰⁹ This is not to say, however, that Polybios’ representation of ambassadorial oratory was inspired by Xenophon, rather that Polybios’ representation of speeches owes more to the fourth-century tradition of historiography than to Thucydides. Taking this into account, it is in fact Thucydides’ representation of ambassadorial oratory that is more problematic, and potentially presents a less accurate view as to how such speeches were delivered in practice.

⁴⁰⁵ Stadter (2017) 284-5.

⁴⁰⁶ Pavlou (2013) 410-11. Westlake (1973) *passim* argues that most of the characterisation comes from the framing of the speeches, which allow Thucydides to pre-set how the readership should interpret the speeches.

⁴⁰⁷ Connor (1987) 36-47. See also Morrison (2006) 103-15; Kremmydas (2017) *passim*.

⁴⁰⁸ For Polybios and Thucydides, see Hornblower (1995) *passim*; Rood (2012) *passim*; Miltsios (2013) *passim*.

⁴⁰⁹ On *oratio obliqua* in Xenophon, see Buckler and Beck (2008) 141-8.

5. Conclusion

From the discussion above concerning the character projection techniques used by diplomats in Greek historiography, I come to the following conclusions. The speeches performed by envoys in Polybios are much more personalised compared with earlier historiography on the grounds that members of the delegation are often named, the speeches are often attributed to an individual speaker who sometimes speaks in the first person singular. In contrast, speeches performed by embassies in Thucydides, and in most of the instances in Xenophon, are attributed to a conglomerate delegation collectively. In Thucydides' especially the envoys are generally represented as 'the *polis* on legs' and the speech is usually in the first person plural. It is plausible that the increasingly personalised and multifaceted representation of ambassadorial oratory is the result of a greater emphasis placed on *mimesis* and characterisation in historiographical writing from the fourth century onwards, although we cannot rule out that this also reflects some changes to rhetorical practice.

My survey of the speakers in Polybios also highlighted a variety of different ways in which envoys used *ethopoiia* to shift their rhetorical self-representation depending on the situation at hand. These include speaking on behalf of oneself, on behalf of one's *polis*, or on behalf of one's *koinon*. Alternatively, envoys could represent themselves as belonging to a certain political faction within their community, which is naturally more common when a community is conducting diplomatic businesses during or following a period of *stasis*. While some of these character projections techniques can be found in earlier texts, most notably Xenophon, they are more common in Polybios' accounts of ambassadorial oratory. To address the question of whether the changes I have highlighted represent the changing nature of our source material, or whether they reflect changes in rhetorical practice, it is

necessary to see whether any of these trends can also be found in the epigraphic evidence, which I will address in the next chapter.

Chapter 3. Rhetorical Self-Representation on Stone

As I established in the introduction to this thesis, it is evident that Polybios as a historiographer used documents as sources and that they formed part of his historiographical methodology.⁴¹⁰ This chapter takes this issue further and explores the contribution that the hundreds of inscriptions from the third and second centuries make to the questions that I raised in the previous chapter. While it is still plausible that the representation of diplomatic rhetoric in historiography from the fourth century onwards may well be the result of stylistic changes in historiographical writing – are similar changes detectable in the summaries of ambassadorial oratory in the inscriptions?

The structure of this chapter is as follows. I will take each of the character projection techniques I observed in Polybios' speeches analysed in the previous chapter and survey the inscriptional evidence (namely decrees) to determine whether the same rhetorical strategies can be found within these texts. When the epigraphic evidence offers a different insight compared to that found in Polybios, I will also account for why this might be. My analyses in this chapter will take the form of four sections. Firstly, the extent to which the envoys in the inscriptions project a more personal *ethos* in their oratory, as we find in Polybios and Xenophon. Secondly, whether the envoys use their oratory to project a 'national character' that is deeply associated with their community. Thirdly, whether envoys project a character that combines both their regional *ethos*, such as an Aitolian, Boiotian, or Achaian, and as well as that of their own *polis*? Fourthly, I will examine whether envoys are ever represented in the inscriptions as speaking from a political faction within their community, rather than as representatives of their community as a collective citizen body. I will argue that some of these techniques that I observed and

⁴¹⁰ I will not open this discussion again here, and therefore refer the reader to part 3b of the Introduction to this thesis.

analysed in Polybios are also evident in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries, but that some are not, but that this does not necessarily mean that Polybios' representation of ambassadorial is not a reflection of how ambassadorial oratory was practiced.

1. *Polis* and Personal Authorities

a. The inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries

As is to be expected, the inscriptions of the fifth and early fourth centuries are very frustrating as a source for rhetorical character projections by envoys due to a lack of resumes in most of the record of ambassadorial approaches. When a decree is passed and inscribed in response to an embassy, the decree will not generally name the members of the delegation and the envoys are often identified by the ethnicon of the citizen body that they were representing, in the same way that is common in Thucydides. For instance, the envoys who came to Athens from Thessaly in 361/0 and persuaded the Athenians to enter an alliance with them are merely denoted as 'the envoys of the Thessalians' (οἱ π[ρ]έσβεις τῶν Θεσσαλῶ[ν], *IG II² 116*, lines 8-9), and the speaking verb λέγουσιν in the third-person plural attributes the oral performance to the envoys as a collective, obscuring how many of the envoys spoke, let alone what they said and how many there were.⁴¹¹ Similarly, the Mytilenean envoys who came to Athens in 347/6 to renew their alliance are simply denoted as 'the envoys of the Mytilenaians' (οἱ π[ρ]έσβεις τ[ῶν] Μυτιληναίων) and their speaking verb (λέγουσιν) is in the third-person plural (*IG II³ 1 299*, lines 6-7). This is the standard way of representing speaking envoys when they deliver an oral performance in the inscriptions down to the late-fourth century, or at least in Athens where our inscriptional evidence is best, although this might

⁴¹¹ See *R&O* 44 for further commentary. Rhodes & Lewis (1997) 27-9 treats this construction as standard and formulaic.

not have been the case in other *poleis* for which the inscriptions have been lost.⁴¹²

If the embassy had been successful and the host community wished to award privileges to the envoys who carried out the mission, envoys were often granted privileges such as *xenia* at the *prytaneion*.⁴¹³ However, when this is stipulated in the motion formula of the decree, it is generally the case that the envoys who have been granted hospitality are not named either. This is surprising on the grounds that the privilege was exclusive to the envoys as individuals, and having their names included in the official response - which they would then bring back to their community - would naturally boost their reputation at home.⁴¹⁴ For instance, the Thessalian envoys who persuaded the Athenians to enter an alliance with them remain anonymous, despite being invited for *xenia* in the *prytaneion* (*IG II² 116*, lines 36-8). Likewise, the envoys from the Thracian, Paionian, and Illyrian kings are not named, despite an invitation for *xenia*, in the decree of 356/5 concerning an alliance between Athens and these kingdoms (*IG II² 127*, 33-4).⁴¹⁵ There are many examples like this in the inscriptional evidence down to the late fourth century whereby the envoys are merely denoted as 'the envoys of X' even when granted hospitality.⁴¹⁶ There are also, of course, a handful of exceptions where one or more of the envoys invited for *xenia* are named, but these are very much in the minority of instances.⁴¹⁷ In these instances the inscriptions merely

⁴¹² There are, however, a handful of exceptions; the reaffirmed alliances between Athens and Rhegion and Leontinoi, dated to 433/2, name the three envoys from both *poleis* that came to Athens and made the alliance and the oath (*IG I³ 52-3*). Presumably this is because the envoys took the oath, and that an oral performance was not the only aspect of their mission.

⁴¹³ See Domingo Gygax (2016) 234-40 and Biard (2017) 63-7. The distinction between *xenia* and *deipnon* and which of these two non-citizens and citizens were awarded is a contentious issue, I refer the reader to Miller (1978) 132-224; Rhodes (1984) *passim*; Spitzer (1994) *passim*; Domingo-Gygax (2016) 234-40.

⁴¹⁴ On the purpose of inscribing honours, see Lambert (2011) *passim*.

⁴¹⁵ See also *IG II³ 1 388*.

⁴¹⁶ For instance, *IG II² 1*, lines 56-75; *SEG 12:37*; *IG II² 34*; *IG II² 107*; *IG II³ 1 388*; *IG II³ 1 302*; *IG II³ 1 141*; *IG II³ 1 304*. See Miller (1978) 134-63 for data. For discussion, see Lambert (2012) 5 n.5.

⁴¹⁷ E.g. *IG II² 24* and *IG II³ 1 302*; *IG II³ 1 401*; *IG II⁴ 418*.

represent the envoys as a means to an end; in an honorary decree for Pellana from 344/3 (*IG II³ 1 141*), the envoys are denoted as having spoken (περὶ ὧν οἱ] πρέσβεις τῶ[ν] | [Πελλανέων ἡγγελ]αν) and remain anonymous mouthpieces even when granted hospitality (δὲ καὶ τοὺς] | [πρέσ]βεις τῶ[ν Πελλανέων καὶ καλ]έσαι] ἐπὶ ξένι[α εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον εἰς] αὖριον). The anonymity of envoys in retrospective evidence such as this should not be too surprising; as Lambert points out, in cases such as these the role of the envoys are only one aspect of the mission, indicating that they are the means to the end.⁴¹⁸

In instances such as these, where envoys are praised, it is seldom clear whether this was due to their own efforts or due to the collective goodwill felt by the host community towards the community represented by the envoys. In an honorary decree dated to 405/4 in response to some Samian envoys, the Athenians voted to praise not only the envoys, but also the Samian *boule*, the Samian *stratego*i and all other Samians (*IG I³ 127*, lines 7-11).⁴¹⁹ Similarly, in the decree admitting Methymna into the Second Athenian Naval League in 378/7, only the *polis* of Methymna is praised while the envoys are merely invited for *xenia* (*IG II² 42*, lines 23-5). Like with Thucydides' envoys, these envoys are merely the *polis* on legs and the hospitality they were granted was not on account of their own actions but that of the collective efforts of their community.⁴²⁰ The character envoy and the character of the community they were representing inseparable.

Inscriptions that are prospective in nature, however, are sometimes more useful in identifying the members of an embassy. This type of decree stipulates that the community is to dispatch one or more envoys to a particular community and outlines what they have been tasked to say. While decrees of

⁴¹⁸ Lambert (2012) 5.

⁴¹⁹ On this inscription generally, see Meiggs and Lewis (1989) 283-7. For the collective representation of Samos within this decree, see Blanshard (2007) *passim*.

⁴²⁰ On this text generally see discussion in *R&O* no.23.

this type in the fifth and fourth century seldom go into detail about what the envoys are going to say, like with retrospective decrees, they will often record the names of the envoys who have been elected by the *demos* towards the end of the decree, very often with the verb ἐλέσθαι.⁴²¹ For instance, in one of the honorary decrees for the grain merchant Herakleides of Salamis, dated to 330/29, the text recalls how Athenians voted to elect an envoy to Dionysios in Heraklea to request the return of Herakleides' sails and that no other men sailing to Athens be harmed (*IG II² 360*, lines 36-44). The decree concludes by stating that Thebagenes of Eleusis was chosen as an envoy (εἰρέθ|η πρεσβευτῆς Θηβαγένης Ἐλευσίσιος, line 44-5).⁴²² But while the envoys who have been elected by the *demos* are often named, this information is of very little use unless the named individuals are known elsewhere. For instance, the decree of 378/7 inviting states to join the Second Athenian Naval League records that Aristotle, Pyrrander, and Thrasyboulos were elected as envoys to Thebes (*IG II² 42*, lines 75-7). This example demonstrates how frustrating the evidence of the fourth century can be since in *Against Ktesiphon* Aischines mentions two of these envoys, Thrasyboulos and Pyrrander, among the men most closely associated (μάλιστα οἰκείως) with Thebes and remarks that Thrasyboulos was a man more trusted in Thebes than no other (Aeschin. 3.138).⁴²³ Yet the personal reputations of Thrasyboulos and Pyrrander among the Thebans are absent from the inscriptional record. Since these envoys were known to have enjoyed close personal relationships with the Thebans, it is highly plausible that their standing in Thebes allowed them to appeal to their own personal authorities as part of their oral performances. The habit of recording the names of envoys who have been elected to serve on a mission is also attested in the Hellenistic Period, for instance a decree of 179/8 records

⁴²¹ The occurrences of this are many, see *IG II² 230*; *IG II² 367*; *IG IV² 84*; *ID 1505*; *IG XII,4 1:142*.

⁴²² See *R&O 95*. See also *IG II² 127*, lines 36-7.

⁴²³ Aeschin 1.138: πρῶτος μὲν Θρασύβουλος ὁ Κολλυτεύς, ἀνὴρ ἐν Θήβαις πιστευθεὶς ὡς οὐδεὶς ἕτερος.

how the Delphians sent Praxias son of Eudokos and Eukrates son of Kallikon to Rhodes to request a panel of foreign judges to settle a dispute between Delphoi and Amphissa (*FD III 383*).⁴²⁴ But, like with the earlier epigraphic evidence, the text does not mention that Praxias was an *archon* (*Syll.* 585) and had extensive experience serving as an envoy (*FD III 339*; *Syll.*³ 672).⁴²⁵ The inscriptional evidence generally gives little information as to why these particular citizens were best suited to serve on this particular embassy, nor do they give any information about them that would naturally enhance their *ethos* within the inscriptional prose. The sort of personal connections that we find related in the *Rhetoric to Alexander* that would make a citizen a good choice to serve as an envoy on a particular mission, and therefore enable them to deliver convincing oral performances, are generally absent from the inscription record (*Rh. Al.* 24.3).

This impersonal representation of envoys in the Athenian epigraphic evidence even extends to the honorary decrees of the late fourth century. While many Athenian officials are known to have been voted honours by the *demos*, namely members of the *boule*, council officials, and other secretaries, there are no attested examples of the *demos* bestowing honours on an individual citizen for the deeds they carried out as an envoy before 322/1.⁴²⁶ This impersonal representation of envoys also extends to honours granted by Athenians to non-Athenians; out of the 56 decrees of from 352/1 to 322/1 honouring non-Athenians with grants of citizenship, *proxenia*, or as benefactors, accounts of the honorands' diplomatic experience are

⁴²⁴ For historical context, see Ager (1996) 314-7.

⁴²⁵ It is clear too that Praxias came from a very well-established family. See Mack (2015) 304-6 and Grzesik (2021) 85.

⁴²⁶ For the inscriptional evidence of honours for Athenians, see Lambert (2004) 88-90. Although there is one disputed example; Oikonomides (1982) *passim* had argued that the honorand Asklepiodoros in a fragmentary decree of 322/1 was an Athenian on the iconographic grounds of the relief on the inscription itself (*JG II*³ 1 376), but Lambert (2007) 126 refutes this on the grounds that there are no other examples of the Athenians honouring their own envoys as the sole purpose of a decree.

surprisingly absent from the historical record.⁴²⁷ While the names of many of these non-Athenians survive, the vast majority of them have not come to Athens as envoys on behalf of their *polis*, but rather to claim or renew a privilege that the Athenian state had granted to them as individuals, such as citizenship or other privileges. For instance, a highly fragmentary decree dated to 333/2 honouring Mnemon and Kallias, grain merchants of Herakleia Pontica, reports that the honorands addressed the Athenian *demos* but did so in a personal capacity as individual honorands, rather than as representatives of the citizen body of which they were members (*IG II³ 1 339*).⁴²⁸ Therefore, while the honorific prose on the stones might reflect some of the oral performances delivered by the visitor in laying their claim to their privilege, they were speaking as an individual and not on behalf of their native *polis* in any formal capacity, but these boundaries could be blurred, especially when dealing with embassies representing an exiled political faction.⁴²⁹

But while official envoys do not generally feature as honorands in the Athenian epigraphic record prior to 322/1, sometimes they are present with honorands in a supporting capacity, who have come to a city to enact or renew a privilege to which they are entitled. For instance, in a decree of 349/8 awarding citizenship to one Orontes of Mysia, an unknown number of envoys are honoured, however it is not clear whether they are the Athenian envoys who lead the negotiations with Orontes or whether they were Orontes' own envoys who had accompanied him to Athens.⁴³⁰ In either case, the names of the envoys do not seem to have been recorded since there is not enough room on the stone to restore their names. In a similar decree of 347/6, reaffirming the ancestral grant of citizenship to the descendants of the Bosphoran kings,

⁴²⁷ These decrees are collated in Lambert (2007) 120-36.

⁴²⁸ Lines 6-7: *περὶ ὧν Μνήμων καὶ Καλλίας οἱ Ἡρακλεῖαι λέγουσιν*

⁴²⁹ Gray (2015) 315-23 identifies at least 27 cases of exiles, either as individuals or as a group, partaking in diplomatic activity.

⁴³⁰ Osborne (1982) 72-80 assumes that the envoys honoured were Athenian, whereas Lambert (2006) 123-7 is less certain.

the envoys who carried out the negotiations on their behalf, Sosis and Theodosios, were praised and invited for *xenia* for taking care of those Athenians arriving at the Bosphoros (IG II² 212, lines 49-53).⁴³¹ This decree is also noteworthy since it offers some indication of how the oral performance might have been delivered (lines 8-11):

π[ε] | ρὶ ὧν ἐπέστειλε Σπάρτοκος καὶ Παιρ[ισά]δ[η] | ς καὶ οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ
ἤκοντες π[α]ρ' αὐτῶν ἀπ[α] | γγέλουσιν

Concerning what Spartokos and Pairesades have written in their letter and what the envoys who have come from them say ...

Although the laconic prose of the decree does not elaborate on how the letters from the princes and the oral performances of the envoys are combined, the combination of different voices - whether spoken or written – create the impression of a polyphonic performance.⁴³² It is tempting to make the comparison with Polydamas of Pharsalos' speech to the Lakedaimonians in Xenophon's *Hellenika* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.4-16), which is in effect an oral performance from both Polydamas and Jason of Pherai since Polydamas reports the arguments of Jason on his behalf since he was not present at the time the speech was delivered.⁴³³ It is plausible that the letter was read out by an assembly official or even by one the envoys themselves, speaking the words of the princes and projecting their *ethē* for them, before supplementing this with their own oral performances as spokespeople for the Bosphoran kingdom.⁴³⁴ While that cannot be proven with certainty, the combination of the letter of the princes and the speech(es) of the envoys reveals a glimpse of

⁴³¹ ἐπαινέσαι δὲ τοὺς πρέσβει[ς] | Σῶσιν καὶ Θεοδόσιον, ὅτι ἐπιμελοῦνται τ[ῶ]ν | ἀφικ[ν]ουμένων Ἀθήνηθεν εἰς Βόσπορον [κα] | ἰ καλέσαι αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυτα[νε] | ἶον εἰς αὔριον. See RO 64; Osborne (1983) 41-4.

⁴³² It is worth noting, however, that it is not totally clear whether the envoys are citizens from the Bosphoros, or Athenians.

⁴³³ Rubinstein (2016) 96-9 also rightly draws on the speech of Mardonios to the Athenians via Alexander, reported by Herodotos.

⁴³⁴ Cf Rubinstein (2013) 175-86.

how different *ethē* could be projected, whether in writing or in speech, by a delegation in a diplomatic context. A similar text is the decree granting citizenship to Dionysios I of Syrakuse, dated to 369/8 (*IG II² 103*).⁴³⁵ The *probouleuma* contains two clauses, both starting with *περί*: ‘concerning what the envoys who have come from Dionysios say’ (lines 6-7: *περὶ ὧν οἱ πρέσβεις οἱ π[αρά] Διονυ[σ]ίου ἤκοντ[ε]ς λέγουσιν*) and ‘concerning the letter Dionysios has sent’ (lines 8-9: *περὶ μὲν τῶν γρα[μ]μά[των] ἧν ἔπε[ν]ψεν Διονύσιος*). Like the decree concerning the Bosphoran kings, the combination of the letter from the rulers combined with that of the envoys makes for a potentially polyphonic performance. It is plausible that since the voice of the king would have been projected via the letter, that this allowed the envoys to project a more personalised character as opposed to spokespeople for their king.

In summary, while the epigraphic evidence of the fifth and fourth centuries can generally be frustrating, the prospective evidence can give us an insight into the composition of ambassadorial teams and the potential rhetorical strategies that would have been adopted if the individuals elected as envoys are known elsewhere. The anonymity of envoys in the inscriptions down to the late fourth century is somewhat Thucydidean in nature. In contrast to the more personalised representations of ambassadorial oratory in Xenophon and Polybios, the envoys are merely shown to be spokespeople for the collective citizen body they are representing and lack their own character. The brevity of inscriptional prose should not be taken as an indication, however, that the oral performances that were delivered by the envoys on these occasions were as impersonal as the documents suggest. To identify the individual envoys and the contents of their oral performance would potentially overshadow the main purpose of the decree. As far as the envoys are concerned, the mere recognition that they carried out their mission

⁴³⁵ Generally, see *R&O* 33 and Osborne (1981) 46-8.

successfully and even the additional stipulating that they were granted *xenia* would suffice in enhancing their reputation at home.⁴³⁶

b. The Hellenistic inscriptions

In the decrees drawn up in response to an embassy, it is much more common in the decrees of the third and second centuries to give the names of the individual envoys before reporting a summary of the oral performance that one or more of the envoys gave.⁴³⁷ The volume of surviving inscriptions from the third and second centuries is huge, and it would be well beyond the realms of this thesis to list every single instance of a named envoy in the decrees of this period. I will, however, list and discuss some key examples to demonstrate how the representation of envoys is more personalised than that in the inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries and discuss the insights this type of evidence gives us to the nature of ambassadorial oratory.

The Magnesian *asylia* dossier, dated to the end of the third century, is a well-studied series of documents from this period.⁴³⁸ This dossier is a rich pool of evidence for the epigraphic habit of different states during the Hellenistic Period since it preserves the decrees of at least 64 *poleis* and *koina*, as well as letters from kings, concerning the request of the Magnesians that their territory be recognised as inviolable and sacred to Artemis Leukophryene, as well as an invitation to their quadrennial Panhellenic games, the Leukophryeneia. The dossier gives us an insight into the decree conventions of at least 64 states at one moment in time. In a handful of instances, documents

⁴³⁶ In addition, we do not know the extent to which the stone inscriptions matched the papyrus copies kept in the state archive, and this is an issue of ongoing controversy with no consensus emerging. On this debate concerning the fifth and fourth centuries, Rhodes (1997) 525-7; Sickinger (1999) 119-22; Faraguna (2013) *passim*; Boffo and Faraguna (2021) 101-32.

⁴³⁷ See Rubinstein (2013) 169 on retrospective evidence for oral performances.

⁴³⁸ The bibliography on this dossier is huge. Kern (1900) was the first to publish it, and his work still has much value over 120 years later. Rigsby (1996) 179-279 contains the texts with some background and commentary. On the historical context of the decrees, see Kvist (2003) *passim*; Slater and Summa (2006) *passim*; Throneman (2007) *passim*; Sosin (2009) *passim*.

from this dossier represent the only extant decree of a number of *poleis*, notably Ithaka and Syrakuse.⁴³⁹ By inscribing these decrees on stone, the Magnesians preserved the documents of a number of states that would otherwise have been lost. The host *poleis* may have inscribed the decree on a perishable material such as bronze or wood, or they may never have inscribed the decree for display at all, and instead kept the decision written on papyrus in the public archive.⁴⁴⁰

The dossier is hugely insightful on the grounds that it is not a collection of Magnesian decrees but those of the communities the envoys had approached, written in their local *Kanzleistil*. It should be noted, however, that in instances where both the decree stipulating the envoys' instructions and the response of the host community survive, the response is very often just a rehash of the original decree the envoys brought with them.⁴⁴¹ But this should not be taken as grounds to dismiss the dossier, since as Rubinstein has demonstrated, close readings of both the original decree and the response sometimes shed light on subtle variations in the summary of the oral performance(s).⁴⁴² The dossier indicates that at least 20 ambassadorial teams were sent out in the spring of 208, and based on the decrees contained within this dossier, Sosin has compiled at least eight ambassadorial teams and the names of their individual members, as well as the names of other envoys who took part on different missions.⁴⁴³ Out of 64 decrees, at least 47 of them include the names of the envoys.⁴⁴⁴ At least eight of the decrees in the dossier are fragmentary and the

⁴³⁹ *I.Magnesia* 36 (Ithaka) and *I.Magnesia* 72 (Syrakuse).

⁴⁴⁰ Rigsby (1996) 179-85 argues that approximately one third of the responses are lost.

⁴⁴¹ Chaniotis (1999a) *passim* esp. 53-4.

⁴⁴² Rubinstein (2013) 172-4.

⁴⁴³ Rigsby (1996) 181; Sosin (2009) 394.

⁴⁴⁴ It is worth noting that in the motivation clauses of these decrees, which is typically where the envoys are named, the terminology denoting their office is not consistent; in some cases they are *theoroi*, in others *presbeutai*, and in others they are called both, and sometimes neither. See Rutherford (2013) 260-3 for the semantics of these terminologies.

names the envoys are missing, if they were given in the first place.⁴⁴⁵ But some of the decrees however do not give the names of the ambassadorial team; the decree of the Aitolian League does not name the Magnesians envoys, but instead refers to them as *presbeutai* (*SEG* 12:217), and the decrees of Laodikea on the Lykos (*I.Magnesia* 59) and of two unknown *poleis* (*I.Magnesia* 62 and 73b) do the same. The decree of Megalopolis is worth a specific mention since the Magnesians envoys, Philiskos, Konon, and Lampeton, recall the names of the three Magnesians who came to Megalopolis in 369 to request funds to help rebuild their city wall (*I.Magnesia* 38, lines 25-9).⁴⁴⁶

But while inscriptions will generally give the names of the ambassadorial team and often a summary of their oral performance, they do not recount how the speaking roles were allocated among the envoys and how the oral performance(s) was/were stage managed. Instead, the oral performance is attributed to the whole team, meaning that we simply cannot tell how many of the envoys spoke and who spoke about what.⁴⁴⁷ In the Magnesian dossier, when the embassy consists of two or more envoys, the speaking verbs are in the third-person plural. For instance, the decree of Sikyon reads (*I.Magnesia* 41, lines 2-9):

[πρεσβευτᾶ]ν καὶ θεαρῶν παραγενομένων παρὰ τῶν | [Μαγνήτων]
 Φιλίσκου, Κόνωνος, Λαμπέτου καὶ ἀνανε | οῦμένων τὰν οἰκειότατα τὰν
 ὑπάρχουσαν αὐτοῖς | ποτὶ τὰν πόλιν καὶ τὰν φιλίαν καὶ ἐπανγελλόντων
 | τᾷ Ἀρτέμιδι τᾷ ἀρχαγέτιδι αὐτῶν τᾷ Λευκοφρυηνᾷ | τὰν θυσίαν
 καὶ πανάγυριν καὶ ἐκεχειρίαν καὶ ἀγῶνα | στεφανίταν [ἰ]σο[π]ύθιον
 μουσικόν τε καὶ γυμνικόν καὶ | ἵππικόν, δεδόχθαι τῶ[ι δά]μωι·

⁴⁴⁵ *I.Magnesia* 52 (Mytilene); 64 (unknown *polis*); 69 (unknown *polis*); 71 (unknown *polis*); 74 (Apameia or Apollonia); 76 (unknown *polis*) 83 (an Attalid city); 86 (an Attalid city). In these instances, the beginning of the decrees are missing, meaning that these texts may have given the names of the ambassadorial team, but it is impossible to know.

⁴⁴⁶ On the circulation of diplomatic documents between cities, see Lalonde (1971) 108-24; Massar (2006) 79-87; Rubinstein (2013) 175-86; Liddell (2020a) 170-88; Boffo and Faraguna (2021) 635-91.

⁴⁴⁷ Although Rubinstein (2013) 184-5 suggests that the use of the third-person plural could potentially be taken as an indication that each of the envoys had a speaking role.

The envoys and theoroi having come from Magnesia, Philiskos, Konon, and Lampeptos, having renewed the existing relations with them and the friendship to the polis, announced the sacrifice to Artemis of the White Arms and the panegyric, truce, crowned Pythian musical contest, gymnastics, and equestrian contest, it was decided by the damos:

While the decree states that three envoys are present and (presumably) spoke, the oral performance is attributed to the embassy collectively. The attribution of the oral performance to three named envoys is also apparent in the responses of Argos (*I.Magnesia* 40), Messene (*I.Magnesia* 43), and Eretria (*I.Magnesia* 48), as well as others, where the subject of the plural speaking verbs are the names of the individual envoys. Like envoys' speeches reported by Polybios in *oratio obliqua*, the only occasions in the Magnesian dossier when an oral performance is put into the mouth of an individual speaker is when there was only one envoy on the mission. There are three surviving examples of this in the Magnesian dossier; Philiskos' speech to the Achaian League (*I.Magnesia* 39), Lampeptos' speech to Korinth (*I.Magnesia* 42), and Lamon's speech to Knidos (*I.Magnesia* 56). In all of these instances, the singular is naturally used, for example in the decree of Korinth the text reads (*I.Magnesia* 42, lines 2-10):

Λαμπέτου | τοῦ Πυθαγόρου καὶ ἀποδότος τὸ ψάφισμα καὶ
διαλεγο|μένου ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῷ ψαφίσματι καταγεγραμ|μένοις
καὶ ἀνανεομένου τὰν οἰκεότατα καὶ φιλίαν τὰν | προὔπαρχουσαν καὶ
παρακαλοῦντος ἀποδέξασθαι | τὰν πόλιν τῶν Κορινθίων τὰν θυσίαν
καὶ τὰν ἐκεχειρί|αν καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας, οὓς τίθητι ἅ πόλις ἅ τῶν
Μαγνήτων | τᾷ Ἀρτέμιτι τᾷ Λευκοφρυηνᾷ τὸν τε μουσικὸν καὶ τὸν |
γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἰσοπύθιον·

Lampeptos son of Pythagoras handing over the decree and speaking to what is stipulated in the decree and renewing the pre-existing relationships and friendship, and calling on the polis of Korinth to be well disposed to the sacrifice and of the games, which the polis of Magnesia has established to Artemis of the White Arms, including musical, gymnastic, and equestrian contests to the Pythia.

As there is only one envoy here, the oral performance is naturally attributed to only one speaker. This may seem a trivial observation at first, but it demonstrates the limitation of the inscriptional evidence in attributing the variety of potential speaking roles to individual envoys. But even in these instances, there is no suggestion that the speaker projected any sort of individualised *ethos*; the relationships that Lampetos renews (*ananeousthai*) as part of the oral performance exist between Magnesia and Korinth and the inscription makes no mention of the standing he had as an individual. The use of a single envoy was also in itself a real consideration since they are not common in Greek diplomacy, and without further prosopographical information about the envoy himself, it is nigh impossible to discern what may have been the motivation behind this choice.⁴⁴⁸ The representation of ambassadorial oratory in these decrees is comparable with the speeches performed by envoys in Polybios that are reported in *oratio obliqua*. In both cases, both the historiographer and the inscriptions give the names of the members of the delegation and give a summary of what the delegation as a whole said, rather than what each of the individual members of it said.

But there are instances in the epigraphic evidence that offer a much more personalised representation of envoys, especially in their capacity as orators. While these instances are generally the exception, I would like to emphasise that they are exceptional in their representation of the performance, in the sense that they offer a lot more detail about it, which does not necessarily mean that the way the performance itself was conducted was also exceptional. A key document is an honorary decree from Priansos in Krete, dating from after 170, which grants privileges to Teian envoys Herodotos and Menekles and recounts their oral performance in extraordinary detail,

⁴⁴⁸ Emphasised by Rubinstein (2013) 185. On considerations about the number of envoys used in Greek diplomacy, see Mosley (1973) 50-62.

emphasising how the speaking roles were delegated as we see in Xenophon and Polybios (*IC I xxiv 1*, lines 2-13): ⁴⁴⁹

ἐπειδὴ Ἡρόδοτος Μ<η>νοδότου καὶ Μενεκλῆς Διονυ|σιῶ
ἐξαποσταλέντες πρεγγευταὶ πορτὶ ἀμὲ πα|ρὰ Τηίων οὐ μόνον
ἀνεστρά[φεν] <πρ>επ<ό>ντω<ς> ἐν τᾷ | πόλει καὶ [διαλέγ]εν περὶ
τᾶ[ς]το..ας, ἀλλὰ | καὶ ἐπιδείξατο Μενεκλῆς μετὰ κιθάρας τὰ τε
Τι|μοθέου καὶ Πολυδίδου καὶ τῶν ἀμῶν παλαιῶν ποιη|τᾶν καλῶς καὶ
πρεπόντως, εἰσ<ή>νεγκε δὲ κύκλον | ἱστορημέναν ὑπὲρ Κρήτας κα[ὶ
τ]ῶν ἐν [Κρή]ται γε|γονότων θεῶν τε καὶ ἡρώων, [ποι]ησάμενο[ς τ]ᾶν
| συναγωγᾶν ἐκ πολλῶν ποιητᾶ[ν] καὶ ἱστοριογρά|φων.

Since Herodotos son of Menodotos and Menekles son of Dionysios, having been sent to us as envoys from Teios, not only conducted themselves properly in the city and spoke concerning ..., but Menekles also demonstrated with a kithara the works of Timotheos and Polydides and those of our ancient poets beautifully and appropriately, introducing a historical cycle about Krete and the ancestral gods and heroes in Krete, creating an assemblance out of many poets and historiographers.

Aside from its extraordinary detail and its use as a source for lost authors, this text is hugely insightful into the performance of diplomatic oratory.⁴⁵⁰ Unlike most inscriptions drawn up in response to an embassy, this decree singles out the performance of Menekles in which he recounts the Kretan past and mythology to a musical accompaniment. Presumably, the speech of Herodotos was more general in nature, and he may even have simply been the ‘warm up act’ for Menekles’ performance. This is somewhat comparable with the Aitolian delegation at the Nikaia conference of 198, as reported by Polybios, whereby the first speaker Phaineas delivered a dryer performance listing their territorial demands, followed by Alexander who supplements it with a more

⁴⁴⁹ A second inscription from Knossos, another honorary decree for the same envoys, is near identical enough to the Priansian decree that it is not necessary to discuss here (*IC I viii 11*, lines 1-11). On both of these texts generally, see Chaniotis (1988) 348-9.

⁴⁵⁰ See Chaniotis (1988) esp.100-40 and Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) 183-92 on historiographers in Hellenistic inscriptions. On the *kyklos* as a genre of historiography, see Ceccarelli’s comments in *BNJ* 15 T 2, F 1-8 (Dionysios of Samos).

emotionally charged *kategoria* against Philip V (Polyb. 18.3). But while the inscription suggests above that the rhetorical strategy of the Priansians was a 'double act' consisting of two oral performances, the fact that the text the two authors quoted suggests there is something deeper going on with the envoy's character projection.

Chaniotis has suggested that the use of written documentation or historiography in diplomatic oratory allowed speakers to make appeals to agreements and shared histories grounded in law and morality.⁴⁵¹ While I find Chaniotis' argument about how documentation can supplement argumentation through logical and emotional reasoning to be a convincing one, I suggest that there is another layer to this related to the character projection of the envoys. As Zelnick-Abramovitz has argued, it was not uncommon for orators to paraphrase passages from literary works or even read passages aloud.⁴⁵² In reinforcing their arguments with writings, the envoys are not only representing themselves as well read, but the performance of each author's narrative integrates the *ethos* and 'expertise' of that author into the oral performance. In paraphrasing their works, or even reading sections of them out, what was a duet becomes a quartet, with the words of Timoetheos and Polydides forming a fundamental part of the speakers' argumentation. This is also hinted at by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric*, where he states that authors who are quoted as part of a speech are akin witnesses (*matures*) (Ar. *Rh.* 1375b). As scholars have argued, the performance of historiography in the Greek world was akin to poetical and rhetorical performances, and it would therefore not necessarily seem strange to an audience to see historiographical texts used in this way.⁴⁵³ Quotations from pieces of literature, whether prose or poetry, are well attested in oratorical

⁴⁵¹ Chaniotis (2006) 149.

⁴⁵² On the oral transmission of 'sections' from historiography, and how these formed the cultural memory, see Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) 190-3.

⁴⁵³ On the performance of historiography in oratory, see Momigliano (1978) *passim*; Chaniotis (1988) 336; Thomas (1992) 125-6; Zelnick-Abramovitz (2014) *passim*.

performances, so direct quotation and paraphrasing should come as no surprise.⁴⁵⁴

But quoting pieces of literature, especially historiography or other genres that contain historical narratives, could potentially be extremely problematic. The two envoys in the Priansian decree I quote above, Herodotos and Menekles, conducted a 'grand tour' of Krete and they appear in four further decrees relating to the same mission, from Knossos (*IC I viii 11*), Arkades (*IC I v 53*), Biannos (*IC I vi 2*), Malla (*IC I xix 2*), and Aptera (*IC II iii 2*). Aside from the decree of Knossos, which recalls reports how the envoys gave the same sort of oral performance as they did at Priansos, the others do not contain as much detail about how the two envoys divided the rhetorical task between them. The texts do, however, state that the envoys handed over a decree with which they spoke accordingly, emphasised their piety, and recounted the relations (*sungeneia, philia*) between Teios and Krete. It might be the case that these *poleis* did not feel the need to include such detail, and potentially rehashed the original decree that the envoys brought with them to demonstrate that they acted and spoke in accordance with their instructions.⁴⁵⁵ On the other hand, since Krete was a hotbed of civil and interstate conflict during the third and second centuries, it is plausible that the Teian envoys decided not to include the works of Timotheos and Polydides since those works may have contradicted the accepted geopolitical history in certain *poleis* and would therefore be met with a frosty response.⁴⁵⁶ It is not unknown for even written historical narratives to contradict each other in a diplomatic context; the historiographical works used by both the Samian and

⁴⁵⁴ Aischines quotes Homer, Hesiod, and Euripides within the space of two chapters of *Against Timarchos* (Aeschin. 1.128-9), and extensively quotes the *Iliad* in (1.41-52). Lykourgos also quotes Homer (Lycurg. Leoc. 103).

⁴⁵⁵ As per some of the responses to the Magnesian envoys during the *asylia* missions. See Chaniotis (1999a) *passim*.

⁴⁵⁶ On conflict in Hellenistic Krete, see Chaniotis (1996) 36-8, 195-201 Viviers (1999) *passim*, esp.222-6; Chaniotis (2006) *passim*.

the Prienean delegations during the *dikailogia* for their territorial dispute mediated by Rhodes contradicted each other.⁴⁵⁷

In addition to decrees drawn up in response to an approach to envoys, another sort of decree that offers a more personal insight into oral performances delivered by envoys are honorary decrees. Unlike the inscriptions of the fifth and fourth centuries, where we find instances of groups of envoys receiving praise and invitations to *xenia*, by the Hellenistic Period we find inscriptions honouring named individuals on account of deeds carried out in their capacity as an envoy.⁴⁵⁸ But why? Scholars such as Gauthier and Kralli have suggested in the case of Athens, that much greater emphasis was placed on achievements of individuals made in the diplomatic arena rather than on the battlefield.⁴⁵⁹ But while this explanation may seem plausible, it would be problematic to apply it to all *poleis*, and it does not take into account the more personalised representation of ambassadorial oratory in Xenophon, nor does it account for the possibility that it only became more common to inscribe honours on stone after the late fourth century.⁴⁶⁰ While the rise of the hegemonic monarchies and larger federal states would have had some impact on diplomacy, this does not mean that diplomacy was either considered more important or that more diplomatic activity occurred. Indeed, warfare also continued to be a feature of Hellenistic interstate relations after the fourth century too.⁴⁶¹

The problems with dealing with prospective and retrospective decrees, which I discussed above, also applies to honorary decrees in which an envoy's speaking abilities are discussed in the motivation clause. It is hugely important

⁴⁵⁷ See Magnetto (2008) 80-97 on the conflicting accounts of the historiographers used by the speakers concerning the Melian War.

⁴⁵⁸ For general discussion, see Biard (2017) 39-41.

⁴⁵⁹ Gauthier (1985) 77-104; Kralli (1999) *passim*. See also Liddel (2020) 442-4.

⁴⁶⁰ Honours for envoys from the latter fourth century are attributed on numerous occasions in the literary evidence, e.g. Aeschin. 2.13 (Ktesiphon), Aeschin. 2.17 (Aristodamos), Aeschin 3.83 (an embassy collectively), Aeschin. 3.100-2 (envoys to Eretria and Oreos).

⁴⁶¹ Chaniotis (2005a) *passim* still provides the best discussion to this topic.

to make the distinction between honours granted to envoys by their home community and honours granted by a community with whom they have interacted. If a diplomat had been awarded privileges by his home community, then we cannot say with certainty how his oratory was received or whether he made any appeal to his personal authority as part of his rhetorical strategy. In these cases our perspective of the envoy's speaking abilities is through the lens of his home *polis* and his fellow citizens, among whom he would have most likely had a better reputation and/or a higher standing than among a non-domestic audience. For instance, when the Athenians honoured Apollonides in 303/2, his demonstration of his *eunoia* in both word and deed (ἐνδ[ε]ίκ[ν]υ[ται τὴν] εὖνο[ι]αν τῶ[ι] δῆ[μ]..ωι [λ]έ[γω]ν κ[αὶ] πράττω[ν, IG II² 492, lines 18-9), this evaluation of his rhetorical capabilities comes from a community of which he was already a citizen and does not offer any insight into how his oratory was received abroad.⁴⁶² On the other hand, if a diplomat has been awarded privileges by a community with whom he has interacted, and his rhetorical capabilities are mentioned in the motivation clause, then this suggests that the envoy's personal *ethos* was a hugely important factor in the success not only of his oratory, but of the mission too.

The earliest instances we find of detailed honorary decrees for envoys are in Athens; the honorary decree for Philippides (IG II³ 1 877) honours the poet for a variety of services, including diplomatic missions to Lysimachos.⁴⁶³ Philippides had previously intervened with Lysimachos in 301 in order to ransom those Athenian prisoners of war who fought on the side of Demetrios at the battle of Ipsos, and he was generally considered to be a *philos* of the

⁴⁶² Apollonides was not actually an Athenian by birth but had been awarded citizenship earlier, probably in 322. See Osborne (1983) 79-80. See also *FD* III 4:59 and *AGR* 438.

⁴⁶³ Lines 9-11: καὶ ἀποδημήσας πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα Λυσίμαχον πρότερόν | τε διαλεχθεῖς τῶι βασιλεῖ; Line 14: διελέχθη δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ κεραίας καὶ ἰστοῦ; Line 21: ἐμφανίσας τῶι βασιλεῖ καὶ λαβὼν αὐτοῖς ἄφε[σ]ιν; Lines 31-4: καὶ κομισαμένου τοῦ δήμου τὴν ἐλευθερίαν διατετέλεκε λέγων καὶ πράττων τὰ συμφέροντα τεῖ τῆς | πόλεως σωτηρία, καὶ παρακαλῶν τὸν βασιλέα βοηθεῖν.

king.⁴⁶⁴ It is highly plausible that Philippides employed a highly personalised *ethos* during his oral performances before Lysimachos, perhaps on the grounds that he had a good personal relationship with him or due to his standing as a famous poet, although the text does not explicitly mention that he served in a formal capacity as *presbeis* on behalf of the Athenian citizen body.⁴⁶⁵

From the mid-third century onwards there are many instances of individual envoys receiving honours.⁴⁶⁶ For example, a Sinopean decree honouring a Koan envoy, dated to around 220, highlights the more individualised representation of envoys and their oratory in the honorary decrees of this period.⁴⁶⁷ The motivation clause narrates the deeds that Dionnos, the honorand, carried out as an envoy (*IG XII 4 1.143*, lines 1-11):

ἐπειδὴ Δίον|νος Πολυτίωνος Κῶιος ἀποσταλεῖς πρεσβευτῆς | ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ *νασ*. ὑπὸ τῆς Κῶίων πόλεως πᾶν τὸ σ|υμφέρον λέγων καὶ πράττων διετέλει οὔτε πόνο|ν οὔτε κίνδυνον οὐθένα ἐκκλίνας καὶ χρείας παρέ|ῤχεται κοινεῖ τε τῷ δήμῳ καὶ ἰδίαι τοῖς ἐντυγχάν|ουσιν αὐτῷ τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ πρόθυμός | ἐστὶ περὶ τὴν πόλιν *νασ*. ἐπελθὼν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκ|λησίαν ἐμπεφάνικεν περὶ τούτων τῷ δήμῳ καὶ παρε|πιδεδήμηκεν ἀξίως αὐτοῦ τε καὶ τῆς Κῶίων πόλεως

Since Dionnos of Kos, the son of Polytion, who was sent by the Koans as an envoy during the war, has continually said and done everything that is appropriate, shirking neither toil nor danger, and has provided assistance both publicly to the people and privately to those of the citizens who meet him; and he is a noble and zealous man concerning the city; and coming before the assembly he has explained to the people about these matters; and he has resided here in a manner worthy of himself and of the city of Kos

⁴⁶⁴ Philipp (1973) *passim*; Bielman (1994) 80-5.

⁴⁶⁵ Biard (2017) 39-40.

⁴⁶⁶ Not just preserved on stone, though. The honorary decree for Laches from 270/1, preserved in the Pseudo-Plutarchian *Lives of the Ten Orators* is of a similar nature (Plut. *Moral.* 851Bd-f). See Roisman et al. (2015) 271-5.

⁴⁶⁷ Generally, see Hallof and Habicht (1998) 137-40.

As well as Dionnos' deeds, the decree also honours his words through singling out the oral performances he delivered as an envoy, including saying everything that was appropriate (πᾶν τὸ σ|υμφέρον λέγων) and explaining matters to the assembly (ἐμπεφάνικεν περὶ τούτων τῷ δήμῳ).⁴⁶⁸ Unlike the documents of the fifth and fourth centuries, here the envoy is honoured as an individual for deeds that he carried out in the capacity of his office. Most importantly, Dionnos' rhetorical capabilities are singled out, suggesting a recognition that his oratory was his own and that he was not merely a spokesperson for his *polis*. Since he resided in Sinope for a long time, it is plausible that the diplomatic oratory he performed became somewhat more personal in nature and that he was able to appeal to his own *ethos*. This inscription is also significant since it most likely relates to a series of diplomatic missions that are also mentioned in passing by Polybios. According to Polybios, when Mithridates went to war with Sinope, the Sinopeans sent an embassy to Rhodes - a close ally of Kos - to ask for assistance.⁴⁶⁹ The Rhodians then, having accepted the request of the Sinopeans, decreed to send three commissioners with a sum of 140,000 *drachmai* to their aid (Polyb. 4.56.2). Yet Polybios' narrative of this diplomatic episode is very brief, and he makes no mention of any other embassies that the Sinopeans sent, nor of any oral performances that were delivered during this episode. As Walbank observed, Polybios' knowledge of the Rhodian decision suggests that he was at the very least aware of the Rhodian decree and he may even have consulted the document in the state archive.⁴⁷⁰ This example goes to show just how highly selective Polybios is when he chooses which oral performances to report.

⁴⁶⁸ Naturally, reporting back what he had said on his return to Sinope would have provided Dionnos with a very suitable opportunity to boast about his achievements.

⁴⁶⁹ Not only had both poleis been members of the Dorian Hexapolis in the Archaic Period, and they shared a common enemy in the Kretan poleis which engaged in piracy in the region. Kos contributed to the war chest in the Kretan War (*SGDI* 3590, 3624). See Perlman (1999) 132-7.

⁴⁷⁰ Walbank (1957) 511-3.

In a similar fragmentary inscription, probably from 167, the *polis* of Euromos honours an unknown citizen for his role as an advocate in an interstate arbitration with Mylasa, mediated by Rhodes (*SEG* 33:861).⁴⁷¹ Although it is fragmentary, there are clear references to the oratory he performed to the Rhodian judges, suggesting that his oratorical skills played a crucial role in his diplomatic success.⁴⁷² In the context of a territorial dispute, the rhetorical capabilities of the envoys were especially important since they had to convince a panel of judges, in this case a panel of Rhodians, that the disputed territory belonged to their *polis*. As scholars such as Magnetto have emphasised, the delivery of speeches during an interstate arbitration (*dikaialogia*) were a fundamental part of this diplomatic institution.⁴⁷³ In using his rhetorical skills to secure a good outcome for his community, it is only natural that this is highlighted in the honorary decree commending him.

From the second century onwards, we find an increase in the number of decrees enacted by Greek *poleis* to award honours to individual citizens who acted as envoys to Rome and had managed to gain closer diplomatic ties, although this is not always the main motivation behind the honours.⁴⁷⁴ For instance, in a decree of Epidauros dated from 115/4, one Archelochos is honoured as an ἀνὴρ καλὸς κάγαθός (*IG* IV² 1 63, line 1) on account of securing a friendship and alliance (ὑπὲρ φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας) with Rome. The seminal works of Canalli de Rossi reveals that from the period between 200 and the end of the first century, at least 64 Greek *poleis* granted honours and privileges to individuals who had served as envoys to Rome.⁴⁷⁵ Given the

⁴⁷¹ For context, see Ager (1996) 343-5. Mylasa invaded Euromos in 167, and this decision may relate to this event or events shortly after (Polyb. 30.5.11-5).

⁴⁷² E.g. Line 12: προσκαλέσατο καὶ τοῦτο ὁ [δῆμος]. It is worth remembering that there are also instances where the community from which the envoy has been sent receives honours, but the envoy receives none, e.g., *IG* IX² 189; *SEG* 11:1084.

⁴⁷³ Magnetto (2016) *passim*.

⁴⁷⁴ Generally, see Gruen (1984) 731-45; Girdvainyte (2020) 211-20. On the dating of these decrees, see *SEG* 34:1723

⁴⁷⁵ The actual number in Canalli di Rossi (1997) is 67, however two of three of these should not be included due to context or date.

importance of Rome in Greek interstate politics from this period, this should not be surprising. But while these decrees do not often make direct reference to the oral performances that the honorand delivered before the Roman Senate, this evidence in conjunction with Polybios' accounts of the speeches delivered by Greek envoys in this diplomatic context suggest that they played a hugely important role in these interactions.

Despite the more personalised representation of envoys in the honorary decrees, where the role of the oratory performed by the individual orator is celebrated, the lack of resumés does not make analysing the rhetoric itself difficult. But it is plausible, however, that speeches performed by envoys who had an established reputation among their host audience were more personal in nature, as represented in Xenophon and Polybios. As Rubinstein has suggested, *proxenoi* are in theory well suited speakers, especially if they had been granted this title through their own merit and not inheritance.⁴⁷⁶ In the case of the fifth and fourth centuries, however, there are relatively few instances of *proxenoi* acting as envoys. In the case of Athens, Mitchell's data shows that only around ca. 20% of ambassadorial appointments during the fifth and fourth century have a known personal collection with their host community, and Rubinstein has found only eight examples of *proxenoi* serving as envoys during the same period.⁴⁷⁷ For the third and second centuries, Mack argues that *proxenoi* were frequently used as envoys since they were already trusted due to their official status, thus making them effective speakers too.⁴⁷⁸ While Mack makes a plausible observation, the actual attestations of *proxenoi* acting as envoys in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries are also scarce, and very often this title of *proxenos* is bestowed upon envoys after a particularly successful mission or repeated diplomatic service to one

⁴⁷⁶ Rubinstein (2016) 87.

⁴⁷⁷ Mitchell (1997) 94-5; Rubinstein (2016) 87 n.22.

⁴⁷⁸ For general discussion, see Mack (2015) 69-70.

community.⁴⁷⁹ In one honorary decree from Iasos granting *proxenia* to Menyllos of Theangela, dated to the end of the third century, the award is justified by the honorand's words and deeds: καὶ λέγων καὶ πράσσω ἀγαθὸν ὅτι ἂν δύνηται (*I.Iasos* 50, lines 7-8).⁴⁸⁰ In this instance, the speaker already had connections with Iasos and these might have been apparent in his ambassadorial oratory, and the *proxenia* itself was not the reason why his oratory may have been more personal in nature. As an honorary decree of Samothrake for the tragic poet Dymas of Iasos states that he spoke, wrote, and acted on behalf of a sanctuary, his city, and fellow citizens: λέγων καὶ γράφων | [κ]αὶ πράπτων ἀγαθὸν διατελεῖ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς πόλε[ως] | [κ]αὶ τῶν πολιτῶν (*I.Iasos* 153, lines 2-4). Although Dymas was a speaker of some standing given his literary credentials, the decree emphasises that his oratory was on behalf of the sanctuary and the citizens of Samothrake.⁴⁸¹

It also is important to emphasise that holding the title of *proxenos* is not the only indication that the envoy already held some standing within the audience he was addressing and it was not always an indication that the *proxenos* carried out significant service as an envoy. For instance, despite being *proxenos* of Thebes, there is little evidence to suggest that Demosthenes frequently served as an envoy to there.⁴⁸² Repeated diplomatic service over several years was probably sufficient to allow the speaker to become recognisable within his host community, and many of the decrees granting privileges to envoys note that they served as their *polis'* representative to the same community several times. For instance, in an Athenian decree for Demainetos, dated to 209, the general Demainetos is honoured for often (πλεονάκις) serving as an envoy to both Philip V and the Aitolian League, and for carrying out what is in the interests of his homeland in both his actions,

⁴⁷⁹ I have found only nine instances from the late third to late second centuries: *IG* XII 9 1186; *SEG* 18:190; *Syll.*³ 604; *BCH* (1944/5) 102; *IG* XII 7 15; *IC* II 15 2; *FD* III 3:242; *IC* I 5 53; *Syll.*³ 548.

⁴⁸⁰ Fabiani (2015) 206-7.

⁴⁸¹ On Dymas' literary background, see Rutherford (2007) 282-4.

⁴⁸² Develin (1989) 319.

and more importantly, his words: ἀλλὰ καὶ λόγῳ κ[α]ὶ ἔργῳ τὰ συμφέρον | τα πρᾶττων τεῖ πατρίδι (*I Eleusis* 211, lines 10-11). Similarly in the honorary decree for Euboulos son of Demetrios from 159/8, an Athenian priest on Delos, the honourand is praised for repeated diplomatic service for the Athenians on Delos and speaking in their interests: πρεσβεύσας τε πλεόνακας | καὶ ἀγωνισάμενος ἐκτενῶς πολλὰ τῶν χρη|σίμων Ἀθηναίοις τοῖς ἐν Δήλῳ περιποίησεν (*ID* 1498, lines 14-6).⁴⁸³ With repeated diplomatic service to one particular community, it is extremely likely that this would have had an impact on their oratory on the grounds that their audience may have grown accustomed to them. Since the speakers were a familiar and trustworthy face, it is extremely plausible that their *ethos* would have become more personalised over time as we see in the ambassadorial speeches reported by Polybios and Xenophon.

In summary, while the evidence of the inscriptions from the Hellenistic Period may seem frustrating, it does offer a much more personalised representation of envoys and the oratory they performed in contrast with the inscriptions of the fifth and early fourth centuries. The retrospective evidence, that is to say decrees drawn up by communities in response to an approach by an embassy, resemble the ambassadorial oratory reported in *oratio obliqua* by Polybios. Both sets of evidence generally name individual members of the delegation, which is hugely important in attempting to reconstruct how the rhetorical task was divided between the individual members of the team, yet both sets of evidence attribute the summary of the speech(es) to the team as a collective and seldom dwell on which members of the delegation said what. In addition, the honorary decrees after the late fourth century recognise the role that individual envoys play in diplomatic negotiations, as well as the oratory they perform as part of their missions. Naturally, many of these envoys

⁴⁸³ Mikalson (1998). 236-7. For other examples of this phenomenon, see *SEG* 32:1097; *Lindos II* 384b; *BE* 1969:535. *I. Iasos* 50; 51; 56.

who were honoured for their rhetorical capabilities would have served as part of a wider team, yet the narrations of their deeds within the honorary decrees draw out the contributions they made as an individual speaker. This is a much more personalised representation of envoys, in line with Polybios and Xenophon, and contrasts with the highly impersonal representation of them in the earlier inscriptions. But despite the more elaborate nature of this evidence, the resumés of the speeches are limited and generally represent the speaker(s) as speaking on behalf of their community. This raises a simple question to which I will now turn; why?

c. An issue of accountability – envoys as lobbyists?

As Rubinstein has pointed out, an envoy with personal connections in other *poleis* was at risk of suspicion at home by his fellow citizens.⁴⁸⁴ One of the potential grounds for this suspicion is that his interests in other communities may lead his fellow citizens to believe that he might advocate for the interests of other *poleis* when deliberating on matters at home, and would therefore be seen to be pushing ‘foreign interests’ in his *polis*’ domestic business (*prodosia*). As Demosthenes emphasises when arguing that the Athenians should send support to the Rhodian democrats in *On the Freedom of the Rhodians*, he states that he has neither received a grant of *proxenia* from the Rhodians, nor is he the *xenos* of any Rhodian citizen (Dem. 15.15).⁴⁸⁵ Similarly, in *On the False Embassy*, Aischines refutes claims by Demosthenes that he and his fellow envoys spent time in Oreus establishing (κατασκευαζόμενοι) grants of *proxenia* for themselves (Aeschin. 2.89).⁴⁸⁶ In the same oration, Aischines also

⁴⁸⁴ Rubinstein (2013) 86. For similar suspicions towards *proxenoi*, see Mack (2015) 114-8.

⁴⁸⁵ For general historical background, see Karvounis (2002) 175-221 and MacDowell (2009) 218-23.

⁴⁸⁶ Plutarch recounts a similar example in the case of Kimon, probably at his *euthynai* (Plut. Cim. 14). Queyrel Bottineau (2010) *passim* systematically discusses other examples from the fifth century.

suggests that Demosthenes' status as *proxenos* of the Thebans explains his alleged treason (2.141). The fear of foreign influence is also apparent in at least one Athenian honorific inscription for a group of Thasian exiles dated to c. 385, which states that they were exiled due to their 'Atticising' behaviour (*IG II² 33*, lines 6-7: ἐπ' ἄ|ττικισμῶι).⁴⁸⁷ Such attitudes might explain why during the speech of the Plataians to the Spartans, as reported by Thucydides, the speakers make no mention of the fact that one of the envoys, Lakon, was *proxenos* to the Lakedaimonians (Thuc. 3.52.5). But by contrast, in the speech of Polydamas of Pharsalos to the Lakedaimonians, as reported by Xenophon, he opens his speech by stressing that he is both their *proxenos* and a *euergetes* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.3).⁴⁸⁸ This seems to be a question of judgement and *kairos*; a speaker evidently had to balance between emphasising his personal links abroad with the political temperature at home at the time he delivered the speech. If tensions were running high, the emphasis of a speaker's personal links might be met with suspicion.

It is well known that suspicion of envoys and/or *proxenoi* could have profound consequences.⁴⁸⁹ As Roberts has pointed out in the case of Classical Athens, Aischines is the only envoy in our evidence who was not convicted, suggesting that even any hint of treason against envoys could be dealt with severely – in some cases with the death penalty unless the envoys fled Attica first.⁴⁹⁰ But how does this relate to the impersonal nature of envoys' speeches in the epigraphic evidence? As Aischines points out in *On the False Embassy* (Aeschin. 2.58):

⁴⁸⁷ For the representation of exiles in their host *polis*, see Gray (2015) 297-9.

⁴⁸⁸ Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.3: ἐγώ, ὧ ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι, πρόξενος ὑμῶν ὢν καὶ εὐεργέτης ἐκ πάντων ὧν μεμνήμεθα προγόνων.

⁴⁸⁹ As Volonaki (2019) *passim* argues, this was especially the case at Athens following the Battle of Chaironeia, with a proliferation of cases of *eisangelia*.

⁴⁹⁰ Roberts (1982) 49-54. See also Hansen (1975) 69-120 for a catalogue of officials, including envoys, brought to trial by *eisangelia*. Loddo (2019) *passim* also makes some important observations on *eisanegelia*, especially in cases against envoys, and how they often had the opportunity to go into self-imposed exile before the trial.

ἐξεπέμψατε εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα ἔτι τοῦ πολέμου τοῦ πρὸς Φίλιππον ὑμῖν ἐνεστηκότος, οἱ μὲν χρόνοι τῆς αἰρέσεως καὶ τὰ τῶν πρεσβευσάντων ὀνόματα ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀναγράφονται γράμμασι,

The public archives contain a record of the embassies you sent out into Hellas when the war with Philip was still in progress, as well as the dates of the elections and the names of the envoys.

And similarly at 2.89:

κάλλιστον γὰρ οἶμαι πρᾶγμα καὶ χρησιμώτατον τοῖς διαβαλλομένοις παρ' ὑμῖν γίνεσθαι: καὶ γὰρ τοὺς χρόνους καὶ τὰ ψηφίσματα καὶ τοὺς ἐπιψηφίσαντας ἐν τοῖς δημοσίοις γράμμασι τὸν ἅπαντα χρόνον φυλάττετε.

For you have something which I think a beautiful and useful thing to those who have been slandered: you preserve for all time in the public records the dates and the decrees and the names of the people who put them to the vote.

From the decrees that survive on stone from the second half of the fourth century onwards, it can be argued that Aischines' description of the nature of Athenian decrees is fairly accurate in how they can sometimes seem bureaucratic in nature by listing names, but seldom going into the substance of what the envoys said.⁴⁹¹ But from the late fourth century, as I discuss above the decrees generally summarise what the ambassadors said but do not go into any detail about which member of the delegation said what. In this regard, the issue of accountability is in many ways a double-edged sword; on the one hand the *polis* that sends out an embassy achieves some accountability by recording the names of the individual envoys and what the delegation had been instructed to say collectively, but it does not touch upon

⁴⁹¹ In the context of the first passage, Aischines is attempting to refute Demosthenes' accusation, that there were other embassies present during their debate on the proposed peace with Philip in 346 (Dem. 19.16), by pointing out that the relevant decree from that meeting indicates that none were present. Some scholars have attempted to gauge which of two is correct. But I am not going to digress on this matter here. For further discussion, see Ryder (1977) *passim* and MacDowell (2000) 212-3.

any relationships that any of the envoys had with the community to which they were sent.⁴⁹² This paradox is best demonstrated by returning to the prospectus of the Second Athenian Naval League, which records the names of the envoys sent to Thebes to persuade them to join the alliance (*IG II² 43*, lines 75-7), however it is only thanks to comments by Aischines that we know that these individuals had very good relations with Thebes at a personal level (Aeschin. 3.138-9). Since the evidence of Aischines and Demosthenes demonstrates how an official's relationships with other *poleis* could be treated with suspicion at home, there is a risk that by including information such as this on the official record, a community would risk an explosion in litigation and sycophancy triggered by citizens in an attempt to knock out their political opponents.⁴⁹³ In the context of decrees drawn up in response to an approach by an embassy, it is plausible that the details of what each member of the delegation said was considered superfluous information that was not needed in the decree since the envoys themselves would probably dwell on this during their oral debrief to the council. In addition, if any envoy strayed from his brief or acted against their *polis'* interests, then the other members of the delegation could hold him to account. It is plausible that including information such as any relationships that individual envoys had with the host community, perhaps the ancient equivalent of a modern official's declaration of interests, would be counterproductive. Indeed, if the members of the delegation had poor relationships with each other, they might even dispute what each of them said for political gain. Since delegations comprised of members of different factions within the community, this should come as no surprise.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹² The important exception to this of course is in the context of honorary decrees for individuals who have acted as an ambassador or performed some sort of diplomatic service. As Boffo and Faraguna (2021) 237-64 discuss, the emphasis in accountability was mainly financial. In addition, see Thomas (1989) 68-82.

⁴⁹³ As Christ (1998) 148-50 discusses, volunteer prosecutors (*hoi boulomenoi*) often represented themselves as patriotic – an apt character projection when prosecuting potentially treasonous envoys.

⁴⁹⁴ Mosley (1973) 55-61.

In drawing up their response to a speech by an envoy, a *polis* would most likely be aware that if they included details about the personalised and intimate nature of the envoys' argumentation, then that would result in suspicion in his home *polis* and potentially prosecution. It would naturally be in that community's interest to ensure that suspicion did not land on an envoy with whom they enjoyed good relations since if he were convicted then they would lose a useful contact in that *polis* who would be useful in furthering their community's interests. A modern comparison between envoys addressing non-domestic audiences is that of political lobbyists addressing public officials, who often emphasise the 'public good' in official accounts of their negotiations while the personal nature of the interactions is suppressed, despite the existence of personal relations between the lobbyist and the decision maker.⁴⁹⁵ In this regard, it is important to distinguish between rhetorical strategies and arguments that were 'on-record' and those that were 'off-record', the former of which can only be found in epigraphy, whereas historiography as a genre is at liberty to include both. As Osborne has convincingly argued in the case of Athenian honorary decrees from the fourth century, such documents are "politically neutralising" in nature and serve mainly as a proclamation of a decision to award honours, rather than as a summary of the deliberative process by which it was reached.⁴⁹⁶ The 'reporting back' process, in which it was divulged what an envoy said abroad, was potentially more oral in nature to avoid putting anything sensitive that might trigger a public action, or even *stasis*, on the public record. The *Rhetoric to Alexander* gives advice to speakers about how to approach this process, further emphasising its oral nature (*Rh. Al.* 30.2-4). The same oral phenomenon can also be seen in the *euthynai* process, whereby officials gave

⁴⁹⁵ As emphasised by Raknes and Ihlen (2019) and Ihlen and Raknes (2020).

⁴⁹⁶ Osborne (1999) 347-58.

a report of their account orally, before their accounts were archived.⁴⁹⁷ As one decree from Acharnai from 315/4 demonstrates, the outgoing treasurer supplemented his written accounts with a speech: καὶ λόγον ἄπεν|ήνοχεν ἀπάντων ὧν δι[ώικησ]εν πρὸς τε τὴν | πόλιν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς δημότας ἐ[ν] τοῖς χρόν|οις τοῖς ἐκ τῶν [νόμων] τῶν τῆς πόλεως καὶ τ|ῶν δη[μ]οτῶ[ν] (SEG 43 26a, lines 8-12). Naturally a complete summary of his speech was not something considered important enough to have on public record, compared with the actual accounts.

2. Localised *ethopoia*

The next consideration is whether the representation of ambassadorial oratory in the inscriptions offers any insight into how envoys spoke as the ‘corporate’ face of their community. In the modern world, while ‘corporate speak’ can seem highly impersonal, each company speaks in a distinctive collective voice, but this raises the extent to which the same could be said of Greek *poleis* or *koina*. In the context of Classical Rhetoric, the concept of *ethopoia* is fundamental within the present discussion. As Quintilian remarked, *prosopopoiia* could give cities a voice (Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.31), and scholars such as Bertrand and Ceccarelli have emphasised, especially in the case of letters from *poleis* and monarchs, each community could adopt a ‘political style’ in order to characterise the community and to enhance their authority.⁴⁹⁸ Naturally, the dialect of the speaker(s) would go a long way in characterising them as representatives of a different citizen body, unless the speaker opted to speak in *koine*.⁴⁹⁹ This raises the question of whether the

⁴⁹⁷ On *euthnai* generally, see MacDowell (1978) 170-2; Hansen (1991) 222-4; Todd (1993) 112-6; Boffo and Faraguna (2021) 245-6 emphasise the archival elements of the process.

⁴⁹⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 9.2.31: *quin deducere deos in hoc genere dicendi et inferos excitare concessum est; urbes etiam populique vocem accipiunt*. Ceccarelli (2018) 148-9. Bertrand (1981) 11-6 emphasises how such ‘styles’ were often ideological.

⁴⁹⁹ The use of dialect in diplomatic documents, however, is more complicated. See Lalonde (1971) 188-214.

argumentation used by envoys characterises them as members of a particular political community, that is to say, where certain types of argument are associated with particular states. In a recent analysis of the historiographical evidence for Theban diplomatic rhetoric from the fifth and fourth centuries, Tuci has argued that there was nothing distinctively ‘Theban’ about the character projection of the envoys and that their rhetoric techniques are attested in speakers from other Greek communities.⁵⁰⁰ But such an analysis has not been applied to the evidence of the second and third centuries, and nor has his analysis taken into account the epigraphic material. In this section I will take two epigraphic case studies to explore this question, with references back to the historiographical evidence I discussed in Chapter Two: the Aitolian League and the Rhodians.

a. The Aitolian League

As an Achaian statemen, Polybios loathed the Aitolians. Throughout his *Histories*, he often interjects to explicitly attack the collective character of the Aitolians, whom he considers to be greedy, irrational, and lawless.⁵⁰¹ As well as his interjections, Polybios also gives a platform to Aitolian speakers in his *Histories*, but to what extent is the rhetorical self-representation of Aitolian speakers in Polybios reflected in what we find in the summaries of oral performances delivered by Aitolian envoys in the inscriptions? The Aitolian League makes a good study for such a question, since the volume of inscriptions relating to their diplomatic activities is much larger compared with the other dominant *koinon*, the Achaian League. An important series of documents pertaining to Aitolian diplomatic activity are the decrees in response to the Aitolian missions to request an unknown number of *poleis*, to

⁵⁰⁰ Tuci (2019) *passim*.

⁵⁰¹ Antonetti (1990) 133-9; Eckstein (1995) 212-3.

persuade their citizen bodies to recognise and take part in the Soteria festival, which had been reformed in 242 under the *strategos* Charixenos as part of a conscious effort on the part of the *koinon* to increase their standing in the Greek world.⁵⁰² This dossier is worthy of analysis since it differs from others in the important respect that the Aitolians were in a unique geopolitical position at the time. From the beginning of the third century, the Aitolians took control of the panhellenic sanctuary at Delphoi, which resulted in a failed attempt by the Lakedaimonians to ‘liberate’ it (Paus. 10.37.5).⁵⁰³ Naturally, it was incumbent on the Aitolians to justify their claim over Delphoi by representing themselves as good custodians of the sanctuary.⁵⁰⁴ In addition, those communities that recognised and agreed to partake in the Soteria festival would also be recognising Aitolian control over Delphoi. The geopolitical stakes were therefore high.

The acceptance decrees were inscribed and displayed at Delphoi, but they may have also been inscribed locally by the *poleis* who accepted. This is certainly the case for the Athenians, whose response only survives within the Athenian copy of the decree. The motivation clause of this decree gives a fascinating insight into the argumentation employed by the Aitolian envoys as part of their oral performance (*IG II³ 1 1005*, lines 6-18):

ἐπειδὴ τὸ κοινὸν τὸ τῶν Αἰτ|[ωλ]ῶν ἀποδεικνύμενον τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν | [ἐψ]ήφισται τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν τῶν Σωτηρίων τιθέναί τῶι Δι|[ι τ]ῶι Σωτῆρι καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Πυθίωι ὑπόμνημα τῆ|[ς μ]άχης τῆς γενομένης πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους τοὺς ἐπισ|[τ]ρατεύσαντας ἐπὶ τε τοὺς Ἕλληνας καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱε|ρὸν τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἐφ’ οὗ καὶ ὁ δῆμος ἐξέπεμπε|[ν] τοὺς τε ἐπιλέκτους καὶ τοὺς ἱππεῖς συναγωνιουμέν|[ου]ς ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας, καὶ περὶ

⁵⁰² Generally, see Nachtergaele (1977) 328-73; Champion (1995) *passim*; Grainger (1999) 144-6; Scholten (2000) 97-102.

⁵⁰³ On Aitolian control of Delphoi generally, see Flacelière (1937) 49-91; Scott (2014) 169-76.

⁵⁰⁴ Inscriptions from Delphoi (*CID II 139* and *CID IV 57*) and archaeological evidence indicate that the Aitolians carried out extensive building work prior to the reorganisation of the *Soteria* festival, including refitting the stadium. See Bommelaer (1991) 215; Valavanis (2004) 190; Le Graff (2010) *passim*. See Grezsisik (2021) 134-70 for the Aitolians dominated the epigraphic and monumental landscape at Delphoi.

τούτων τὸ κοι|[νὸν] τῶν Αἰτωλῶν καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Χαρίξενος ἀπεστάλκ|[ασι πρὸς τ]ὸν δ[ῆμον]ν πρεσβείαν τὴν διαλεξομένην ὅπως |[ᾶν ἀποδέχεται ὁ δῆμος τ]ὸν ἀ|γ[ῶ]ν[α, τὸμ] μὲν μουσικὸν ἴσο|[πύθιον, τὸν δὲ γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἰσονέ]μεον ...

Since the koinon of the Aitolians in demonstrating their piety to the gods have decreed that the competition of the Soteria shall be established for Zeus Soter and Pythian Apollo as a memorial of the battle that took place against the barbarians who attacked the Greeks and the sanctuary of Apollo common to the Greeks, against whom the demos sent out the elite troops and cavalry to share in the struggle for the collective safety, and concerning this matter the koinon of the Aitolians and their strategos Charixenos have despatched an embassy to the demos to discuss how the demos might recognise the competition equivalent to the Pythian musical contest, and the gymnastic and horse-racing contests ...

The Aitolian League and the Athenians enjoyed good relations in the decades prior to the embassy, to the extent that the Athenians felt it important to inscribe this decree themselves.⁵⁰⁵ An important element is how the decree specifies that both the Aitolian League and its *strategos* Charixenos sent the envoys, if the restoration is correct (lines 13-15). It is highly likely that this is the same Charixenos who made a dedication of a statue atop two columns to Apollo around the same time as the reorganisation of the *Soteria* festival (*IG IX 1² 181*).⁵⁰⁶ In representing themselves not just as spokespeople for the Aitolian League, but also Charixenos, the envoys are potentially enhancing the standing of the Aitolians as custodians of the sanctuary of Apollo by emphasising that they have the personal approval of Charixenos for their mission. It is highly plausible that Charixenos was a name associated with Delphoi and the renewal of the site as a sanctuary, since he had played a key role in the reorganisation the *Soteria* festival and made one of the most

⁵⁰⁵ On Aitolia's support for Athens during the Lamian War see Grainger (1999) 57-9. *IG IX 1² 1,176*, a fragmentary Aitolian decree from the 260s, records an agreement securing Athenians against transgressions by Aitolian citizens, although it also hints at a more formal military alliance. Generally, see Scholten (2000) 73-5.

⁵⁰⁶ Flacelière (1937) 266-70; Scholten (2000) 103-4; Scott (2014) 176.

monumental dedications to Apollo at the site, and was potentially even associated with the rebuilding work prior to the relaunch of the festival.⁵⁰⁷ The figure of Charixenos therefore acts as an *paradeigma* for the qualities that Aitolians wished to project as their corporate image.

The summary of the oral performance suggests that the envoys focussed their rhetorical strategy on recounting the narrative of the Galatian invasion, which the combined armies of the Aitolians, Athenians, Boiotians, and Phokians fought off nearly 20 years previously.⁵⁰⁸ While Chaniotis has demonstrated that narratives of war often serve to invoke certain emotions and serve as an act of commemoration, there is something more sophisticated going on here.⁵⁰⁹ Firstly, the Aitolians emphasise how the Galatian invaders occupied the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphoi. While this narrative would naturally provoke some degree of emotional reaction, the Aitolians are using their *diegesis* to enhance their own *ethos* by representing themselves as pious, since they are predominately concerned with the sanctuary, and their *eusebeia* is recognised in the response of the Athenians. The Aitolians enhance their *eunoia* in narrating how they defended the sanctuary, which would have been sacrosanct under the law of war.⁵¹⁰ In addition, since the sanctuary of Apollo was common to all Greeks, the Aitolians show how their *eunoia* extends to all Greeks in representing themselves as the defenders of it. The Aitolians are framing what is in their territorial interest as being in the interests of all Greeks, since although Delphoi was a place that Greeks came to worship from afar, the Aitolians held a tight control over the sanctuary through the Amphiktyony.⁵¹¹

⁵⁰⁷ Scholten (2000) 88-9.

⁵⁰⁸ Nachtergaele (1977) 126-75 still provides the best summary and background of the invasion and conflict.

⁵⁰⁹ Chaniotis (2012) *passim*.

⁵¹⁰ On the laws of war generally, particularly in relation to temples and sanctuaries, see Nicholson (2018) *passim*.

⁵¹¹ Champion (1996) *passim*; Scholten (2000) 31-45.

The second intriguing feature is the final clause I have quoted, in which the decree also emphasises the role the Athenians had played in helping to repel the Gauls ‘for the sake of the common safety’ (ὕπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας) of the Greeks. If this argument was part of the envoys’ oral performance, it certainly convinced one particular Athenian present in the assembly, Kybernis, the proposer of the decree, whose relative Kydias perished at Delphoi while defending the sanctuary from the Galatian invaders (Paus. 10.21.5). But it is not clear whether all the arguments made in the motivation clause were made by the Aitolian envoys, or whether some of them were made by Athenian speakers in the debate that followed. It is certainly plausible that the argument about the Athenians’ role in the expulsion of the Galatians was made by an Athenian present in the assembly in response to the Aitolians’ rhetoric. We also cannot rule out that the Aitolians emphasised the Athenians’ role in their narrative, and this particular argument was so convincing to the Athenians that they chose to include within their resumé of the speech(es).⁵¹² The Athenians would therefore be actively inserting their role in an important conflict into the permanent stone record.

Six further decrees survive relating to the Aitolian missions to various *poleis* to request participation in the Soteria, of which two are too fragmentary to permit analysis in the present discussion.⁵¹³ But enough remains of the remaining four to give us an insight into the rhetorical self-representation employed by the Aitolian envoys. The response of Chios suggests that the Aitolian rhetorical strategy in their performance to them was similar to the one that they adopted when addressing the Athenians (*FD* III 3:215, lines, 2-12):

ἐπειδὴ Αἰτωλοὶ οἰκεῖ[τοι καὶ φίλοι ἐκ προ|γόνων ὑπάρχ]ον[τ]ες τῶι
δήμῳ, ἀποδεικνύμενοι τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θε[οὺς εὐσέβειαν ψή|φισμα καὶ

⁵¹² Achieving goodwill by mentioning your audience’s achievements is not unknown, see Rubinstein (2013) 186-99.

⁵¹³ Their chronology also remains controversial; see Nachtergaele (1977) 209-94; Elwyn (1990) 177-80.

θε]ωρούς ἀπ<ο>στείλαντες Κλέωνα καὶ Ἡράκωνα καὶ [— — —, ἐπαγγέλ|λουσι τὸν] ἀγῶ[ν]α τῶν Σωτηρίων, ὃν συντελοῦσιν ὑπόμνημα [τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτη|ρίας κ]αὶ τῆς νίκης τῆς γενομένης πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους τοὺς [ἐπιστρατεύσαν | τας ἐ]πὶ τὸ ἱερόν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ ἐ[πὶ τοὺς Ἑλλήνας, | ἐπ]έσταλκ[ε] δὲ περὶ τούτων τῶι δήμῳ καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶ[ν καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Χα|ρίξ]ενος, ὅπως ἂν ἀποδεξώμεθα τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸμ μὲν μουσικὸν ἰσ[οπύθιον, τὸν δε γυ]|μνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἰσονέμεον ταῖς τε ἡλικίαις καὶ ταῖς τιμαῖς [καθάπερ καὶ αὐτοὶ] | ἐψηφισμένοι εἰσὶν· ὅπως οὖν ὁ δῆμος φαίνεται τὰς τῶν θεῶν τιμ[ὰς αὔξων καὶ μεμνη]|μένος τῆς τε οἰκειότητος καὶ φιλίας τῆς ὑπαρχούσης αὐτῶι πρὸς [Αἰτωλοῦς ... ⁵¹⁴

Since the Aitolians, who have been our kinsmen and friends since the time of our ancestors, displaying their [piety] towards the gods . . . have sent Kleon, Herakon, and [?] as theoroi to announce the Soteria games, which they have established as a memorial [(?) of their piety] and of the victory over the barbarians who attacked the Greeks and the temple of Apollo, the common sanctuary of the Greeks; and concerning the games, the Aitolian league and their general Charixenos have sent envoys to our demos so that we may participate in the games, the musical contest - equivalent to the Pythian contest - and the gymnastic and horse-racing contests - equivalent to the Nemean contests in their age-groups and rewards – as they themselves have decided by decree; therefore, so that our people might be seen to enhance the honour of the gods and mindful of the close friendship that exists between them and the Aitolians ...

This decree is much more elaborate than the Athenian response. But like the Athenian decree, the text suggests that the Aitolian envoys emphasised their collective *eusebeia* and their concern for the sanctuary of Apollo, thereby enhancing their *ethos* through representing themselves as custodians for a Pan-Hellenic sanctuary. The end of the motivation clause suggests that the Aitolian envoys also argued that the *demos* would be seen as enhancing the honour of the gods if they took part in the Soteria, therefore representing themselves as a pious state that actively encourages others to conduct

⁵¹⁴ Scholars are fairly certain on the restoration of τῶι δήμῳ καὶ τὸ κοινὸν τῶν Αἰτωλῶ[ν καὶ ὁ | στρατηγὸς Χα|ρίξ]ενος (lines 8-9) on the grounds that similar wording is found in the Athenian response: το κοι|νὸν τ]ῶν Αἰτωλῶν καὶ ὁ στρατηγὸς Χαρίξενος (*IG II³ 1 1005*, lines 15-15). See Haussoullier (1885) *passim*.

themselves in this manner too. But while the envoys seem to have adopted a very similar strategy to that used before the Athenian assembly through the use of religious argumentation, the second aspect of their rhetorical strategy is more directly aimed and adapted for the Chian audience.⁵¹⁵ At the opening of the motivation clause, the Chians acknowledge the *eunoia* of the Aitolians by calling them οἰκεῖτοι καὶ φίλοι, and the end of the motivation clause hints that the Aitolian envoys encouraged the Chians to bear in mind the *oikeiotes* and *philia* between their two states when they made their decision.⁵¹⁶ This aspect focusses on the relationships between Aitolia and the specific *polis* of their audience.

The decree of Tenos relating to the same Aitolian mission also shows a similar rhetorical self-representation on the part of the Aitolians. The motivation clause of the decree reads (*FD* III 1:482, lines 1-10):

ἐπει|δὴ παραγεγόνασι θεωροὶ παρά τε τοῦ κ[οινοῦ τῶν Αἰτωλῶν καὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ κομί|ζοντες ψήφισμα καθ' ὃ εἰσιν ἐψηφισμένοι τιθέναι τὸν ἀγῶνα τῶν Σωτηρίων | τῶι τε Διὶ <τ>ῶι Σωτῆρι καὶ τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι Πυ[θίωι ὑπόμνημα τῆς γενο|μ]ένης μάχης πρὸς τοὺς βαρβάρους τοὺς ἐπ[ιστρατεύσαντας ἐπί τε τοὺς Ἑλλη|ν]ας καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τὸ κοινὸν τῶ[ν Ἑλλήνων, καὶ παρακαλοῦσι τὸν δῆμον | τὸ]ν Τηνίων μετέχειν τοῦ ἀγῶνος τῶν Σ[ωτηρίων καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν καθάπερ αὐτοὶ | ἐψηφι]σμένοι εἰσὶν τὸ μὲν μουσικὸν ἰσοπ[ύθιον τὸν δὲ γυμνικὸν καὶ ἵππικὸν ἰσο|νέμεον· Την]ίοις δὲ πάτριόν ἐστιν πλείστ[ην εὐσεβείαν ἀποδεικνυσθαι εἰς τὸ ἱε|ρὸν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος] τὸ κοινὸν τῶν <Ελ>[λήνων]

Since theoroi sent from the koinon of the Aitolians and the strategos bearing a decree by which they it was decreed to institute the contest of the Soteria in honour of Zeus Soter and Pythian Apollo, in commemoration of the battle against the barbarians who made an expedition against the Greeks and the sanctuary of Apollo common to

⁵¹⁵ Elwyn (1990) 179 is a little too dismissive of the subtle variations in these decrees.

⁵¹⁶ *Isopoliteia* existed between the Aitolian League and Chios from the mid-third century onwards and the Aitolians granted the Chians a vote in the Amphictyony around this time too (*SEG* 18:245). See Gauthier (1972) 256-8; Gawantka (1975) 84 n.102; Saba (2019) 187-9. Errington (2006) 142-7 argues that the Aitolians and Chians shared close ties on the grounds that the latter could serve as a steppingstone into Asia Minor for the former.

all Greeks, they called on the demos of the Tenans to take part in the contest of the Soteria and the sacrifices in and in accordance with what was decreed there will also be a musical contest equal to that of the Pythia, a gymnastics competition, and a horse competition equal to that at Nemea. It is ancestral custom for the Tenians to show they piety towards the sanctuary of Apollo common to the Greeks ...

If the restoration is accurate, then the envoys present their authority as coming not only from the Aitolian League, but also from Charixenos. While the name of the Aitolian *strategos* is not given in the text, we know that the text is referring to Charixenos, who is named in *FD III 1:481* from the same dossier.⁵¹⁷ While the inscription then breaks off early, enough of the remaining section survives for scholars to confidently restore it. The restored stone reads how the Aitolians pointed out how it was ancestral custom for Tenos to show their piety towards the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphoi. Unfortunately, we do not know enough about Tenos during this period to know exactly what sort of activities they undertook in relation to Delphoi, and references to them in the inscriptions are scarce and do not shed any meaningful light on the relations between Tenos and Delphoi.⁵¹⁸ It is possible, however, that Aitolia's approach to the Tenian *demos* might perhaps have been part of their overall strategy to make friends in the Aegean islands, which the *koinon* undertook from the mid-third century onwards.⁵¹⁹ Around the middle of the third century, the Aitolian League granted *asylia* to Tenos, but the decree is so damaged that only a few words are legible (*IG XII.5 857*), suggesting some shared religious interests.⁵²⁰ The Aitolian speakers are perhaps attempting to compliment the Tenians by acknowledging their piety, just like theirs, and therefore intensifying the

⁵¹⁷ Charixenos had an illustrious career and went on to serve as *strategos* four times. By the time of this embassy, he had already served as Hipparchos in 261/0 (*IG IX.1.18e*) and in the same year a bronze statue of him was set up in Delphoi (*IG IX.1.181*). For his career, see Grainger (2000) 133 and Scholten (2000) 103-4.

⁵¹⁸ *FD III 4:225* records the renewal of a grant of *proxenia* and *SEG 23.322* is extremely fragmentary.

⁵¹⁹ Scholten (2000) 67.

⁵²⁰ Rigsby (1996) 156-7.

connection between the communities by pointing out their common values. If both communities had not enjoyed a close relationship previously, then acknowledging shared values would be an appropriate rhetorical strategy since the speakers could not acknowledge their audience as *oikeioi* and *philoï* as they had with the Chians.

A decree from an unknown *polis* also survives, which Robert suggested might be attributed to Teios (*FD* III 1:481).⁵²¹ In addition, the bottom of the decree of the Abderean *demos* survives, including a clause that probably stipulated that either the Aitolian *koinon* or the envoys themselves were to be praised or granted some sort of reward on account of their *eusebeia* towards the gods and their *eunoia* towards the *polis* (*SEG* 24:382, lines 1-3).⁵²² While the remaining inscriptions are fragmentary, there are some brief observations to be made about two of them.⁵²³ Although the decree of Smyrna contains huge gaps since it survives in three fragments (*FD* III 1 482), enough phrases can be read on the stone to indicate that the Aitolians opted for the same sort of religious argumentation. However the phraseology is different from those in the other responses when relating the Galatian invasion, the narrative of which formed an integral part of the envoys' performance. This line is of particular interest since it seems to attribute the victory to a god, presumably Apollo, rather than to the Aitolians: τοῦ θεοῦ ποήσαντος τὸ νίκημα. Scholars have questioned why the Aitolians emphasise the role of the divine in achieving victory over the Galatians in their speech to Smyrna but stress their own role in the victory in their speeches to the other *poleis* that they addressed. Elwyn has argued that the decree of Smyrna might not belong to the same dossier and in fact relates to a different mission and suggests a later

⁵²¹ Robert (1930) 322-6.

⁵²² Lines 1-3: εὐσε|βεί]ας ἔνεκεν τῆ[ς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ — — — καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς] | πρὸς τὴν πόλιν. In this instance, it is most likely that the *koinon* is the honourand, although there are some instances of individual Aitolians who receive honours on account of their *eusebeia* via their involvement at Delphi, e.g. *Syll.*³ 534 and *FD* III 4:175.

⁵²³ *Delphes. Inv.* 6203 is far too fragmentary to offer any meaningful comment.

date of 241 as opposed to 246/5 on the grounds that Smyrna would have been preoccupied with the Laodikean War.⁵²⁴ Taking a more neutral stance on the issue of the date, Champion suggests that the difference in wording may reflect the Smyrna's own reasoning for acknowledging the Soteria, rather than the rhetoric used by the Aitolian envoys.⁵²⁵ Although the Aitolians seem to have emphasised the role of the divine in their narrative to Smyrna, thereby lessening the role of the Aitolians, this would not have prevented them from taking credit for it as well.

One plausible explanation for the rhetorical shift in the Aitolians' rhetoric might be due to their relationship – or lack of one – with Smyrna. In the 240s the Aitolians do not seem to have had a particularly close relationship with Smyrna, unlike their well-established relationships with Athens, Chios, and Tenos. In fact, the only connection that I can find between the Aitolian *koinon* and Smyrna are two decrees, one of Lamia (*IG IX,2 62*) and another of Chaleion (*FD III 3:145*), granting *proxenia* to the epic poet Aristodama of Smyrna for her performances about the feats of the Aitolians.⁵²⁶ Another explanation is the geopolitical situation in Asia Minor at the time of the embassy. Falling at the boundary of southern Aiolia and northern Ionia, it was a bone of contention between the Attalids and the Seleukids and changed sides several times in the late third century.⁵²⁷ Since Smyrna was under Seleukid control when the Aitolians approached them, they had to tread very carefully, especially since the surviving evidence indicates a lack of Seleukid interest or contact with Delphoi.⁵²⁸ If the Aitolians had used the same script

⁵²⁴ Elwyn (1990) *passim*. See also *I.Smyrn.* 573.

⁵²⁵ Champion (1995) 216.

⁵²⁶ Rutherford (2009) 244-8. See also Antonetti (1990) 114-8. Rutherford emphasises how the Aitolians made a conscious effort during the late third century to engage with several poets, including potentially Nikander of Kolophon, to write about Aitolia in order to forge a new identity for themselves.

⁵²⁷ For the geopolitical background, see Ma (1999) 33-50; Chrubasik (2013) 87-96.

⁵²⁸ As Grzesik (2021) 98 points out, one does not generally find honours for members of the Seleukid or Attalid dynasties.

that they had used on the other communities, there was a real risk that the Smyrneans would decline their request since they would be seen to be enabling another hegemonic power. By making ‘the god’ the defender of Delphoi as opposed to the Aitolians, the envoys were making another argument that would not have any potential repercussions on Smyrna, since they would be seen to be merely respecting a god in partaking in the Soteria as opposed to directly recognising Aitolian control of the sanctuary.

The summaries of the oratory performed by the Aitolian ambassadors in these decrees highlights the desire of Aitolia to forge a new corporate image for herself from the early third century onwards, an image that would naturally give the Aitolians more authority – that of the defenders of Delphoi. As Champion has shown, the Aitolian account of the Galatian attack on Delphoi during their envoys’ oral performances to Athens, Chios, and Tenos is remarkably different from the tradition that was in circulation a few decades earlier.⁵²⁹ A decree of Kos giving thanks for the defeat of the Galatians (*IG XII,4* 1:68), dated to 278, tells a different story.⁵³⁰ The decree states that the Galatians were met with vengeance at the hands of a god (τιμωρίας τετεύχεν ὑπὸ θεοῦ, lines 4-5), and the Aitolians are completely absent from the text. This version of events, whereby the divine takes a more central role in the battle itself is also found in the of the decree of Smyrna some thirty years later, and it also made its way into later literary tradition (Paus. 10.22.2-7). Yet it is absent from the summary of the story narrated by the Aitolian envoys in the responses of Athens, Chios, and Tenos. It is plausible that the Aitolians thought it less of a risk to relate the traditional narrative of the Galatian invasion, rather than their more recent retelling, due to the lack of an established relationship between their *koinon* and Smyrna. Stories evidently varied, and the Aitolian envoys could not risk telling a version of the narrative that was not generally

⁵²⁹ Champion (1995) 217-9. See also Chaniotis (2012a) 56-8.

⁵³⁰ Nachtergaele (1975) 172-3.

recognised in Smyrna. Indeed, even the Makedonian kingdom had its own version of the story too, in which Antigonos delivered the victory.⁵³¹ If the Aitolians opted for a narrative in which they are the main protagonist, they could potentially run the risk of treading on the toes of other influential powers, as may have been the case with Smyrna as I discussed above. The corporate image of the Aitolian *koinon* represented in the inscriptions I have discussed was highly flexible and could be adapted depending on the rhetorical situation.

But is this rhetorical self-representation I have discussed above limited to the Soteria mission, or is it an *ethos* that Aitolian envoys projected more widely? While the evidence for diplomatic oratory performed by Aitolian envoys in the inscriptions is still scarce, it is possible to make some key observations from other evidence types, namely art and numismatics. Considering the diplomatic context of the speeches performed in the Soteria dossier, it is not surprising that the Aitolians' deeds during the Galatian attack on Delphoi and their heroic and pious *ethos* were central to these oral performances. The theme of piety is also found in non-Aitolian envoys' speeches performed during missions concerning religious matters.⁵³² But in the case of the Aitolians, this heroic and pious image that they consciously project in their ambassadorial oratory is fundamental to asserting their influence. In his description of votive offerings at Delphoi, Pausanias remarks that the Aitolians dedicated a statue of an armed woman as a depiction of Aitolia, following their repulsion of the Galatian attack on the Kallians (Paus.

⁵³¹ An Athenian citizen and general of the Makedonian garrison at the Piraeus, Herakleitos, dedicated a monument to Athene Nike in c. 250, the inscription of which credits Antigonos with the victory (*IG* II² 677, lines 3-6): ἀνατ|ίθησιν τῆι Ἀθηνᾶι τῆι [Νίκηι γραφ]ᾶς ἐχούσας ὑπ|ομνήματα τῶν [τῶι βασιλεῖ] πεπραγμένων πρὸς το|ὺς βαρβάρους ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων σωτηρίας.

⁵³² In 222, the *demos* of Oropos seems to have accepted the invitation from Akraiphia and the Boiotian *koinon* to partake in the Ptoia on the grounds that it was a pious decision (*IG* VII 351, lines 7-9: ὅπως ἂν οὖν φαίνηται ἡ πόλις | τῶν Ὀρωπίων, καθάπερ αὐτεῖ προσήκει, εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως τὰ πρὸς | τοὺς θεοὺς συντελοῦσα καὶ εὐχαριστοῦσα τεῖ πόλει Ἀκραϊφειῶν). See Petrakos (1997) 213-5 and Ganter (2019) 91-3.

10.18.7).⁵³³ As Antonetti has discussed, numerous scholars have attempted to reconstruct this statue, and they have generally accepted that it depicted Aitolia as a female figure, standing victorious on a trophy made up of Galatian weapons.⁵³⁴ This reconstruction was based on the fragmentary archaeological remains of the monument and the appearance of similar imagery minted in Aitolia during the third century.⁵³⁵ This numismatic evidence is also of interest. From c. 239 down to the end of the third century, the Aitolians also minted coins of a high denomination, including gold staters probably intended for circulation across the Greek world, containing depictions of Aitolia on a trophy made up of Galatian weapons.⁵³⁶ The visual rhetoric projected by the numismatic and archaeological evidence suggests that the conscious image projected by the Aitolian envoys in their speeches and summarised in the Soteria decrees manifested itself in other media.

The epigraphic evidence discussed above also contributes to our understanding of Aitolian diplomatic oratory along with the evidence of Polybios. Although the number of Aitolian speakers in Polybios are scarce, there are two key instances where they complement each other. In his speech to the Lakedaimonians, Chlaineas of Kalydon accuses Philip V of hubris and shows a degree of concern for the sanctity of temples by attacking him for plundering the temples at Thermos and praises the Aitolian League for standing alone against the Galatians (Polyb. 9.30.1-4):

περί γε μὴν τῆς Φιλίππου παρανομίας τίς χρεια πλείω λέγειν; τῆς μὲν γὰρ εἰς τὸ θεῖον ἀσεβείας ἱκανὸν ὑπόδειγμ' αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἐν Θέρμῳ ναοὺς ὕβρεις, τῆς δ' εἰς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ὠμότητος ἢ περὶ τοὺς Μεσσηνίους ἀθεσία καὶ παρασπόνδησις ... Αἰτωλοὶ γὰρ μόνοι μὲν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀντωφθάλμησαν πρὸς Ἀντίπατρον ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν ἀδίκως

⁵³³ Paus. 10.18.7: πεποιήται δὲ ὑπὸ Αἰτωλῶν τρόπαιόν τε καὶ γυναικὸς ἄγαλμα ὠπλισμένης, ἢ Αἰτωλία δῆθεν: ταῦτα ἀνέθεσαν ἐπιθέντες οἱ Αἰτωλοὶ Γαλάταις δίκην ὠμότητος τῆς ἐς Καλλιέας.

⁵³⁴ See Knoepfler (2007) 1226-7 and Antonetti (2012) 185-7 for a full discussion and literature review.

⁵³⁵ Reinach (1911) *passim*.

⁵³⁶ Tsangari (2007) 87-139; 253-4.

ἀκληρούντων ἀσφαλείας, μόνοι δὲ πρὸς τὴν Βρέννου καὶ τῶν ἄμα τούτῳ βαρβάρων ἔφοδον ἀντέστησαν, μόνοι δὲ καλούμενοι συνηγωνίζοντο, βουλόμενοι τὴν πατριὸν ἡγεμονίαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων ὑμῖν συγκατασκευάζειν.

And concerning Philip's transgressions is it necessary to speak more? As for his impiety towards the divine it is enough to point to his acts of hybris on the temples at Thermos, and as for his cruelty towards men I need only mention his faithlessness and treachery to the Messenians ... for the Aitolians alone among the Greeks dared to face Antipater and demand safety for victims of injustice, and they alone withstood the attack of Brennos and his barbarians, and they alone came to fight with you when called upon, wishing to help you recover your ancestral hegemony among the Greeks.

The *ethos* projected by Chlaineas in this short section is interesting. Unlike the Makedonians who engage in acts of ἀσεβεία and ὕβρις, the Aitolians are the saviours of Greece who have stood alone against threats of foreign invasion. Aitolian piety also extends beyond the gods and to their allies too, unlike Philip V who breaks his agreements due to his faithlessness and treachery (ἀθεσία καὶ παρασπόνδησις). The Aitolian speaker also contrasts the record of his state with that of Philip, thereby evoking anger. The rhetorical self-representation adopted by Chlaineas is also remarkably like the *ethos* that the Aitolian envoys projected in the oral performances preserved in the Soteria decrees, although naturally Chlaineas' speech is much more individualised compared with the summaries of Aitolian diplomatic rhetoric. But we cannot rule out that the envoys involved in the Soteria mission also invoked anger through narrating the Galatian attack on Delphoi, despite comparatively austere representation of the oral performance in the inscriptional prose.

The consciousness of Aitolian speakers to represent themselves as worthy custodians of the territories under their control is also hinted at in the speech of Alexander the Isian at the Nikaia conference, towards the end of the

Second Makedonian War (Polyb. 18.2).⁵³⁷ In the speech, reported in *oratio obliqua*, Alexander attacks Philip V by arguing that, unlike his predecessors, Philip destroys cities instead of meeting his enemies on the battlefield (18.2.3-9). Naturally, Alexander is suggesting that the territories the Aitolians would like to be returned to them in exchange for peace, namely Lysimacheia, Kios, Echinon, Phthiotic Thebes, Pharsalos, and Larisa, would be under better guardianship with Aitolia than with Philip.⁵³⁸ Since these territories lay far away from Aitolia itself, and even far away from central Greece itself, the Aitolian claim to them was tenuous. The speaker is therefore arguing that the Aitolians would make better custodians for these cities, which had previously been members of their *koinon*, than Philip V who the speaker claims did great damage to the cities his army had captured. While this line of argumentation should come as no surprise given that the speech was performed at a peace conference, when combined with the epigraphic evidence I have discussed above it further reinforces the Aitolians' conscious effort to represent themselves as worthy custodians in their diplomatic oratory. Indeed, even Philip V responded to the speech by saying that it was theatrical and Aitolian (Αἰτωλικὸν ... καὶ θεατρικὸν, 18.4.1), hinting that the line of argumentation taken by Alexander was associated with the Aitolians.

b. The Rhodians

Polybios is a hugely important source for oratory practiced by Rhodian speakers. In his *Histories* there are several important speeches performed by Rhodian envoys, and there is even an account of an internal debate in the Rhodian council (Polyb. 29.10.1-6). In the previous chapter, I analysed the speeches of Thrasykrates (11.4-6), Astymedes (30.31), and the anonymous

⁵³⁷ See Grainger (1999) 888-92 for the historical background.

⁵³⁸ See Walbank (1967) 555-6 on the Aitolian claims to these territories.

Rhodian envoys (21.22-3), the first of which is reported wholly in *oratio recta*, and the second and third speech are reported in a combination of both *oratio obliqua* and *recta*. Considering the number of ambassadorial speeches delivered by Rhodians in as well as the historic importance of Rhodes as a centre for the teaching of rhetoric in antiquity, the Rhodians make a hugely interesting case study.⁵³⁹ Problematically, the epigraphic material from Rhodes itself is generally not very useful as evidence for Rhodian oratory. As Thomsen has recently noted, the epigraphic output on Rhodes gives little to no indication about the sorts of arguments Rhodian orators made either at home or overseas since very few decrees survive.⁵⁴⁰ However, the evidence for Rhodes' diplomatic activity is well documented in decrees from other *poleis*, which provides some evidence for the diplomatic self-representation that the Rhodians adopted as part of their corporate image.

The argumentation of Rhodian orators in Polybios stands out from speakers from other communities in his work. As I summarised in my discussion of the speeches performed by Rhodian speakers in the previous chapter, several Rhodian envoys make arguments that call for respect for the rule of law, as well as arguments based on the ideologies of democracy and anti-monarchism. It was through these arguments that the Rhodian envoys in Polybios projected the qualities of having good intentions (*eunoia*) and virtue (*arete*) that were fundamental in creating a persuasive *ethos*, as well as projecting a positive image of their community on the diplomatic stage. The relevant question I will address here is whether this is simply a 'national character' or stereotype made up by Polybios, or whether the epigraphic evidence lends some credibility to the character projection techniques used by Rhodian envoys in Polybios.

⁵³⁹ On Rhodes a hub for the study of rhetoric in antiquity, see Wooten (1972) 42-9; Bringman (2002) *passim*; Vanderspoel (2007) 127-9; Pepe (2017) *passim*.

⁵⁴⁰ Thomsen (2020) 36-8.

It is worth firstly turning back to the speech of Astymedes of Rhodes' before the Roman Senate in 165/4 (Chapter Two 1.g), in which he claims that his community has been wrongly deprived of the territories of Kaunos and Stratonikeia on the grounds that they had acquired the former as a purchase and that the latter had been granted to them (Polyb. 30.31.6-8). Not only is this significant generally since these arguments are reflected in a well-known arbitration in which the Magnesians stipulate the correct grounds on which communities lay claim to territories (*I.Cret.* III iv 9), but it is especially interesting in the present context on the grounds that it is the Rhodians who are making these very arguments.⁵⁴¹ In the context of settling disputes, the Rhodians were experts in this particular area since they frequently acted as judges in both internal and territorial disputes, potentially as early as the end of the fourth century.⁵⁴² One of the earliest attestations of this is a decree of Ilios, dating from some point in the third century, which honours a number of foreign *dikastai* for settling an internal conflict (*I.Ilios* 51).⁵⁴³ In the text, the Rhodian delegation is granted *proxenia* and is also praised for their virtue and good intentions (ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνοίας τῆς πρὸς αὐτόν, line 12).⁵⁴⁴ Being judges, the Rhodians would naturally have not made speeches, except if they had orally presented their verdict and reasoning to the two parties. Yet this evidence should not be overlooked on the grounds that it offers some hint at the sorts of qualities the Rhodian representatives may have projected, whether orally or through their deeds, on the diplomatic stage.⁵⁴⁵

⁵⁴¹ Ager (1996) 431-46; Chaniotis (2004) 194-205.

⁵⁴² Ager (1991) 12-29 still provides the best narrative for Rhodian peace-making activities during the third and second centuries.

⁵⁴³ In *SEG* 4:662 the decree is dated to ca. 300, but van Gelder (1900) 117 opts for a date of ca. 220.

⁵⁴⁴ Although the text is fragmentary, this restoration is not controversial, see commentary in *I.Ilios* 51.

⁵⁴⁵ As I argued above, in honorary inscriptions for envoys from the late fourth century onwards, the honours are often justified by the qualities they demonstrated both in their actions and words. On the rhetorical value of inscriptions generally, see Judge (1997), esp.815-9.

There is a surge in the attestations of Rhodian arbitration activity in the inscriptions from the early second century onwards. Around 200, the Rhodians sent a panel along with a panel of Milesians to judge a dispute between Hermione and Epidauros (*IG IV² 1.75*), and in the early 190s, the Rhodians also famously arbitrated in a boundary dispute between Priene and Samos (*I. Priene 37-41*).⁵⁴⁶ A significant text in the context of the present discussion is the honorary decree for the Rhodian judges, granted by the Delphians following an arbitration with Amphissa in 180/79 (*FD III.3.383*). Despite the fact the Rhodians could not come to a decision since the envoys from Amphissa did not show up (lines 9-13), the Delphians granted an array of privileges to the nine judges. These honours were justified on account of the friendship and the *eunoia* that the Rhodians show towards Delphoi and the Delphian *damos* (ὁ δᾶ]μος [ὁ Π]οδίων [φί]λος ὦν καὶ εὐ[νους, line 3). In the same way as with the decree of Ilion that I discussed above, although the Rhodians are acting as *dikastai* rather than envoys, they can still be seen to embody the same cardinal virtues that are important to project in oratory. In these contexts of interstate arbitration, the Rhodian *dikastai* are seen to encapsulate the ‘brand’ the Rhodians wish to project on the diplomatic stage. In addition, the Rhodian concern for best legal practice, as Astymedes emphasises in his speech to the Roman Senate (Polyb. 30.31), is also reflected in their third-party role during the drawing up of alliances. A particular noteworthy instance of this is their role in mediating an agreement between Magnesia and Miletos at some point in the 180s, whereby a sealed copy of the treaty was given to the Rhodian envoys to be retained until the treaty was inscribed in stone (*I. Milet. 3.148*).⁵⁴⁷ As I argued in my analysis of Astymedes’ speech, he enhanced his *ethos* by representing the Rhodians as the ‘keepers of the law’, and in this particular

⁵⁴⁶ On these arbitrations generally, see Ager (1996) 170-3; Magnetto (1997) 405-16; Dixon (2001) *passim*.

⁵⁴⁷ Lines 92-4: [δοῦναι δὲ τῶν συ]νθηκῶν ἀντίγραφον ἐσφραγισμένον τοῖς παρὰ Ῥοδίων | [πρεσβευταῖς, ὅπ]ως διατηρῆται καὶ ἐν τῇ Ῥοδίων πόλει ἕως τοῦ ἀντιγρα]|[φῆναι εἰς τὰς στή]λας.

instance preserved on stone they are undertaking the sort of deeds associated with a community with such a reputation.

In the previous chapter, I established that Rhodians in Polybios represent themselves as anti-monarchical in their speeches, and this is particularly apparent in the speeches of Thrasykrates and the unnamed envoys delivered to Rome (Polyb. 11.4-6 and 21.22-3).⁵⁴⁸ This observation is more interesting when coupled with Polybios' own interest in issues of democracy, tyranny, and leadership generally, since it raises the question of whether the Rhodian discourse on democracy as represented in their oratory is a reflection of Polybios' own interests rather than what was actually said.⁵⁴⁹ But, again, while the epigraphic evidence for the Rhodians' diplomatic relations is poor, what survives suggests that a concern for democracy found in the speeches reported in historiography can also be detected in the rhetorical representation of Rhodians in the inscriptions.

Two key documents that illustrate the Rhodian desire to be seen as power that respects democracy are two alliances dating from 201/00. The first is an alliance between Rhodes and the Kretan *polis* of Olous, in which it is stipulated that the Olountians are to come to the aid of Rhodes should anybody attempt to overthrow the democracy (*SEG* 23:547, lines 28-30).⁵⁵⁰ A similar alliance with Hierapytna, dating from the same year, also uses similar democratic rhetoric (*IC* 3.3.3).⁵⁵¹ In this text, however, not only does

⁵⁴⁸ See Chapter Two 1d and 1i.

⁵⁴⁹ On Polybios' political milieu and interest in democracy, see Eckstein (1995) 197-210; Carlsson (2010) 39-44; Grieb (2013) *passim*; Thornton (2020) 155-78. It is also well known that the Aristotelian constitutional cycle was hugely influential on Polybios, to the extent that he spends much of book six discussing it and trying to give the Roman Republic its place within this tradition, see Walbank (1972) 130-56; Seager (2013) *passim*. Hahn (1995) *passim* has also convincingly argued that the Aristotelian theory plays a central role in Polybios' explanation of how the Greek world came under Roman domain.

⁵⁵⁰ Lines 28-30: [κ]αὶ εἴ τις κα ἐπὶ πόλιν ἢ χώραν στρατεύηται τὰν Ῥοδίων ἢ το[ύ]ς νόμους | ἢ τὰς προθόδου[ς] ἢ τὰ[ν] καθεστᾶκυῖαν δαμοκρατίαν καταλύει, βοαθεῖν Ὁ|λουντίους Ῥοδίους παντὶ σθένει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν.

⁵⁵¹ The alliances were probably made following the end of the Kretan War between Rhodes and several Kretan *poleis* (Polyb. 13.4ff). See Gabrielsen (1997) 53-6.

Hierapytna pledge to protect the democracy at Rhodes but the Rhodians also pledge to protect the democracy at Hierapytna (lines 14-7; 67-71).⁵⁵² Since these alliances were made following the end of the Kretan War, leaving Rhodes in control of a chunk of eastern Krete, the Rhodians evidently have a desire to legitimise their control of these two *poleis* by representing themselves as the champions of democracy. While the treaties themselves do not indicate that any Rhodian envoys spoke, it is highly likely that the ‘democratic rhetoric’ ingrained within the prose of the text of the decree itself was influenced by the argumentation that was used orally by Rhodes when drawing up the treaties. In representing themselves as the guardians of democracy in these cities, Rhodes is legitimising its influence over them by framing their control as the democratic will of the people. The self-representation of the Rhodians here, whereby they use democracy and autonomy as a smokescreen for their hegemonic ambitions, is also apparent in their speech following the Peace of Apameia in 188 where they successfully argued that the Romans should grant *autonomia* to the cities in Karia and Lykia on the grounds that the Seleukids would not respect their independence (Polyb. 21.21-3). The two decades that followed saw the greatest Rhodian expansion into Karia ever.⁵⁵³ The Rhodian rhetorical self-representation is arguably comparable to that of the USA in the early 2000s, where much of the political oratory at that time emphasised – whether accurately or not - the USA’s commitment to creating friendships with its former enemies through introducing them to the notions of freedom and democracy.⁵⁵⁴

⁵⁵² IC 3.3.3, lines 13-6: καὶ εἴ τις καὶ ἐπὶ πόλιν ἢ χώραν στρατεύῃται τὰν Ῥοδίων ἢ τοὺς νόμους ἢ τὰς ποθόδους ἢ τὰν καθεστακυῖαν δαμοκρατίαν καταλύη, βοαθεῖν Ἱεραπυτνίους Ῥοδίους | παντὶ σθένει κατὰ τὸ δυνατόν. Lines 67-71: εἰ δέ τις | καὶ τὰς ἀπὸ τοῦ δικαίου γινομένας ποθόδους ἐκ θαλάσσης | παραιρῆται Ἱεραπυτνίων ἢ τὰν καθεστακυῖαν δαμοκρατίαν | παρὰ Ἱεραπυτνίους καταλύη καὶ συμμαχίαν μεταπέμπωνται | Ἱεραπύτνιοι.

⁵⁵³ Reger (1999) 89-90.

⁵⁵⁴ Bostdorff (2011) 305-8.

The vocabulary of freedom (*eleutheria*) and autonomy (*autonomia*) is deeply associated with Hellenistic democracy and diplomatic relations.⁵⁵⁵ A more explicit inscription that demonstrates the Rhodian commitment to *eleutheria* and *autonomia* is a collection of documents from Iasos, dating to sometime in the 210s (*I.Iasos* 150).⁵⁵⁶ The first document records how envoys from Iasos came to Rhodes and related the injustices they faced (ἐμφανίζοντι τ[ὰ γεγνονότα] ἀδικήματα, line 6) at the hands of Podilos, the subordinate of the local dynast Olympichos.⁵⁵⁷ The Iasian envoys then called on the Rhodians to intervene to safeguard their freedom and autonomy; [ὅπ]ως ἂ πόλις αὐτῶν ἐλεύθερα καὶ αὐτόνομος [διαμέ]νη[ι] (line 10). The next text records how the Rhodians then voted to send two envoys, Timasitheos and Epikrates, to go to Iasos to inform them of the Rhodians' decision to assist them (lines 28-38).⁵⁵⁸ The third text is very fragmentary, but enough survives to show that it records a decision of the Rhodians to send envoys to Philip V to give an account (ἀπολ[ο]γισομένων, line 44) of the problems the Iasians were facing, and some of the fragments suggest that they invoked the notions of freedom and autonomy.⁵⁵⁹ Naturally, the Rhodians wanted to persuade Philip to ask Olympichos to reign in Podilos, since Olympichos seems to have been a subordinate to Philip.⁵⁶⁰ The final text reports how the Rhodians then voted to send Timasitheos and Epikrates to Olympichos and the *hyparchos* to call on them ([π]αρακαλ[έ]σοντι) to ensure that the territory of Iasos did not come to any further harm (75-6), reminding him that the Iasians are well-disposed

⁵⁵⁵ For a systematic survey, see Carlsson (2010) 61-80; Dmitriev (2011) *passim* for the Hellenistic Period and Roman adoption of this sloganing, Hamon (2009) *passim* argues the terms were associated with community autonomy.

⁵⁵⁶ On these documents and their dating generally, see Crowther (1995) 109-12 = *SEG* 45:1518 and Meadows (1996) *passim*.

⁵⁵⁷ This may potentially be the same Olympichos named as a patron of Rhodes by Polybios, along with others, who provided funds after the earthquake of 227 (Polyb. 5.90.1). He had also been granted honours by Iasos (*I.Iasos* 76).

⁵⁵⁸ We do not know anything more about these two individuals.

⁵⁵⁹ E.g. τὰν πόλιν ἐλευθέραν (line 45); ἐλευθέ]ρα<ν> καὶ α[ὐτ]όνομ[ον] (line 50).

⁵⁶⁰ The two had exchanged letters in c. 220 concerning Mysala, see Crampa (1969) 47-52.

(εὐνοῦς, line 82) to them and that they will abstain from nothing that is advantageous to the Iasians. The envoys then conclude their performance to remind Olympichos of the *eunoia* of the Rhodian *damos* towards Philip V.⁵⁶¹ Why did the Iasians turn to Rhodes? The answer is not totally clear, although Meadows has suggested that the reasoning was mainly practical due to Rhodes' military strength in the region.⁵⁶² In addition, it is also plausible that Iasos turned to Rhodes on the grounds of their reputation for standing up for *autonomia* in the region, a reputation that would enhance the authority of the Rhodian envoys when they made their speeches. It is also plausible that Timasitheos and Epikrates engaged in the sort of 'democratic rhetoric' that we find used by Rhodian speakers in Polybios, such as Thrasykrates (Polyb. 11.4-6) and the anonymous Rhodian envoys at Rome (21.21-3). In the case of the latter is certainly an apt comparison, since the Rhodians are representing themselves as the champions of the underdogs in the Greek East in the documents from Iasos as well as in their speech reported by Polybios.

In summary, the 'corporate image' of the community is multifaceted when projected in ambassadorial oratory. It would be misleading to suggest that Rhodes was the only community that represented itself as the champions of democracy, since there is a lot of evidence in historiography to indicate that rhetoric of freedom, democracy, and autonomy was used by the Achaian League during their expansion from the mid-third century onwards.⁵⁶³ Likewise, in the case of the Aitolians, it would be natural for any hegemonic power to represent itself as a worthy custodian of areas of its territory, especially if part of its territory contained a panhellenic sanctuary. In a world of competing hegemonic powers, there is going to be some cross over

⁵⁶¹ Lines 90-2: δηλούντων αὐτῶι τοὶ πρεσβευταὶ ὅτι | τὰμ μὲν φιλίαν καὶ τὰν εὐνοίαν τὰν ὑπάρχουσιν αὐτῶι ποτὶ βασιλ[έα] | Φίλιππον διαφυλαξεῖ ὁ δᾶμος.

⁵⁶² Meadows (1996) 262-3.

⁵⁶³ On the expansion of the Achaian League during this time, Kralli (2017) and Shipley (2018) 62-6.

between the scripts used between different states when addressing non-domestic audiences when they find themselves in similar geopolitical positions. However, it would be essential that the community sending the envoys projects the image that is most suitable for the geopolitical situation at time, that is to say, the image projected aligns with the standing at the community and the time and takes into account the relationship between the speaker's community and that of their hosts. To present an image of your state that does not align with the geopolitical *kairos* could have dire consequences. For instance, as Plutarch reports, when the Athenian envoys attempted to dissuade Sulla from sacking their city in 87 by recounting their glorious history, including their resistance against the Persians 400 years previously, Sulla was not convinced by the attempts of now less influential power to enhance its authority (Plut. *Sulla* 13.4).⁵⁶⁴ Therefore, while there are some similarities between the corporate brands projected by different states, this is probably on the grounds of similar geopolitical *kairoi*. The epigraphic evidence, at least, to some extent suggests that the rhetoric that Aitolian and Rhodian speakers engaged with in Polybios might reflect the sort of argumentation that envoys from these communities engaged with in the third and second centuries.

3. Speaking on behalf of the *polis* and/or *koinon*

The speeches of Chlaineas and Lykiskos reported by Polybios (Polyb. 9.28-31, 9.32-9) suggest that envoys who were representing a federal state, or a *polis* that was a constituent member of a federal state, had two *ethē* at their disposal and could shift between their federal *ethos* and local *ethos* when it was rhetorically convenient. As Moggi has shown in the epigraphic record of

⁵⁶⁴ Plut. *Sulla* 13.4: ὁψὲ δὲ ἤδη που μόλις ἐξέπεμψεν ὑπὲρ εἰρήνης δύο ἢ τρεῖς τῶν συμποτῶν πρὸς οὓς οὐδὲν ἀξιοῦντας σωτήριον, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θησέα καὶ τὸν Εὐμόλπον καὶ τὰ Μηδικὰ σεμνολογουμένους ὁ Σύλλας: 'ἄπιτε,' εἶπεν, 'ὦ μακάριοι, τοὺς λόγους τούτους ἀναλαβόντες: ἐγὼ γὰρ οὐ φιλομαθήσων εἰς Ἀθήνας ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων ἐπέμφθην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἀφισταμένους καταστρεψόμενος.' On this instance, see Chaniotis (2005) *passim*.

Achaia, sometimes individuals are denoted with the additional ethnicon Ἀχαιοί in addition to that of their *polis*, emphasising their collective identity as Achaians.⁵⁶⁵ More recently, Mackil has emphasised that the use of ethnic and regional identities among Greek communities were an important argument for participation in war efforts as early as the fifth century.⁵⁶⁶ But while the bibliography on localised and federalised identities in Greek history is huge, scholars have largely left open the question of how these identities manifested themselves in oratory. This is a significant consideration since even if a diplomat is speaking on behalf of a federal state, sometimes it is impossible to separate them from their domestic reputation in their home country. A recent example is Jens Stoltenberg, the former Prime Minister of Norway (2005-13) and the current Secretary General of NATO (2014-), and his oratory during the ongoing Russian invasion of Ukraine. Although his most recent oratory has been in his NATO capacity, as a Norwegian he can speak with additional authority on matters concerning Russia since he had previously had many diplomatic interactions with them as Prime Minister of Norway, namely the Barents Sea border dispute. In this regard, the interplay between his standing as Norwegian statesman and his standing as a senior NATO official are almost inseparable.

Below, I will argue that this interplay between federal and localised *ethē* is also apparent in the summaries of the oratory performed by envoys in the decrees from the third and second centuries, lending credibility to the rhetorical strategies used by envoys in their speeches reported by Polybios. I will focus on two case studies: firstly, the Dorians of Kyttenion and the Aitolian League, before turning to the Boiotian League.

⁵⁶⁵ Moggi (2002) 126-9. See also Rizakis (1995) 339-40.

⁵⁶⁶ Mackil (2019) 13-8.

a. Kytenion and the Importance of Being Aitolian

The well-known decree from Xanthos, detailing an embassy from Kytenion in 205, illustrates the interplay between the different characters envoys could project. The presence of the documents in this text warrant further discussion in how these documents impacted the oral performance and the envoys' character projection. The envoys' authority is reinforced further by a letter from the council of the Aitolian League and three named individuals (*SEG* 38:1476, lines 79-88):

Ἀγέλαος, Πανταλέ|ων, Μόλοσσοσ, καὶ οἱ σύ|νεδροι τῶν Αἰτωλῶν
Ξανθίον τᾶι βου|λαῖ καὶ τῶι δάμοι χαρεῖν · Λ[α]μπρίας, Αἴνετος,
Φηγεύς, οἱ ἀπο|δεδωκότες ὑμῖν τὴν ἐπιστολάν, ἐντὶ μὲν Δωριεῖς ἐκ
Κυ|τενίου, παραγεγόνται δὲ ποθ' ὑμὲ πρεσβεύοντες παρὰ | τῶν
Αἰτωλῶν περὶ τειχισμοῦ τᾶς τῶν Κυτένιων πόλιος · κα|λῶς οὔν
ποιήσετε καὶ ἔνεκεν ἀμῶν καὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Αἰτω|λῶν καὶ τᾶς ποτὶ
Δωριεῖς οἰκειότατος ὑμῖν ὑπαρχούσας, | διακούσαντες αὐτῶν μετὰ
φιλανθρωπίας καὶ ἐν τὰ ἀξιούμεν|να προθύμως ὑπακούσαντες · ν
Ἔρρωσθε · ν

Agelaos, Pantaleon, Molossos, and the councillors of the Aitolians to the council and people of Xanthos, greetings. Lamprias, Ainetos, and Phegeus, who have handed the letter to you, are Dorians from Kytenion and they have come to you as envoys from Aitolia concerning the fortification of Kytenion: therefore you will do well on account of the pre-existing intimacy (oikeiotes) between the Aitolian League and the Dorians, if you listen to them kindly and heed their request with zeal. Farewell.

The identity of the individuals named in the letter can be reconstructed with some degree of certainty. It is highly likely that the Agelaos named in the letter is the Agelaos of Naupaktos, whose speech I discussed at Section 1.1.a. If this Agelaos is one of the authors of this letter, then the authority of his name must have been substantial and given weight to the envoys' own authority because it is highly likely that he carried authority outside of his region of Aitolia.

Grainger identifies the Pantaleon named in the letter as Pantaleon son of Leon from Arsinoe, who had also served as *epimeletes* at Delphoi in 205/4.⁵⁶⁷ In addition, Grainger also identifies Molossos as one Molossos of Lamia who also served as hieromnemon at Delphoi in 212/1.⁵⁶⁸ However, these individuals' identities cannot be confirmed with certainty (*LGPN* 3A, *ad loc.*). It is likely that Pantaleon and Molossos were the *hipparchos* and the *grammateus* respectively, based on the order that officials are typically named in decrees from Xanthos in the Hellenistic Period which generally names the *strategos* first followed by the *hipparchos* and the *grammateus*.⁵⁶⁹ The covering letter identifies the envoys in two different ways; as Dorians from Kytenion (Δωριεῖς ἐκ Κυ|τενίου) and then as envoys from Aitolia (πρεσβεύοντες παρὰ | τῶν Αἰτωλῶν). The envoys are represented here not merely as spokespeople for the small *polis* of Kytenion, but rather of the Dorian race who inhabit the city, but also as Aitolians. Since Aitolians are not Dorians, there is a contradiction here, which hints at the ability of envoys from *poleis* that were members of federal states to project two different identities. Considering the argumentation that the envoys used, that they shared a bloodline with the Xanthians as Dorians, it is not surprising that they are emphasised as Dorians here.⁵⁷⁰ It is noteworthy how the envoys are not identified with the ethnicon Κυτινιεύς or Κυτενιεύς, which is attested in other epigraphic sources, and this text is the only occasion where the *polis* of Kytenion represent themselves as 'the Dorians living in Kytenion'.⁵⁷¹

Along with the covering letter, the decree of the Aitolians is included within the dossier and the envoys' brief hints that they had the ability to project both collective identities, or to emphasise one more over the other, to best accommodate the audience they were addressing (lines 76-9):

⁵⁶⁷ Grainger (2000) 261.

⁵⁶⁸ *Ibid* 241.

⁵⁶⁹ Rhodes and Lewis (1997) 141.

⁵⁷⁰ Ma (2003) *passim*.

⁵⁷¹ E.g. *SEG* 40:440-2; *IG* IX².1 68. See Rousset (2004) 675 for further discussion.

τοὺς δὲ ἀποσταλέντας διαλεγέσθαι ὥπως καὶ διὰ τὰν ποτὶ Δωριεῖς
συγγένειαν καὶ διὰ τὰν ποτ' Αἰτωλοὺς συναντιλάβωνται τοῦ τειχισμοῦ
τᾶς πόλιος τῶν Κυτενίων ὅπως συνοικισθῆι τὰν ταχίσταν ...

*Those who have been sent out will speak in order that, on account of
their kinship between the Dorians and the Aitolians, they shall
contribute to the construction of the fortification of the city of the
Kytanians, so that the city is synoikicised as soon as possible ...*

The potential for arguments from kinship is interesting here. The most plausible explanation for this is that the decree of Aitolia, in giving the Kytanians permission to approach *poleis* who shared kinship with either the Aitolian League or the Kytanians, gave the envoys a degree of flexibility when it came to the identity that they projected during their oral performance(s). The grounds on which the Kytanians represent themselves as Dorians in the present decree are in order to represent themselves as kin of the Xanthians, and therefore invoke the obligations that come with that sort of relationship.⁵⁷² On the other hand, if the Kytanians were addressing a community that they did not share kinship with, it is plausible that they enhanced their Aitolian *ethos*.⁵⁷³ In the case of the present text, the Aitolians also seem to have represented themselves as pious Aitolians. The decree of the Xanthians relates how the envoys gave an account (*apologizesthai*) of the events that had befallen their homeland, speaking in accordance with the letter from their *polis* which they had brought with them (*SEG* 38:1476, lines 11-3).⁵⁷⁴ The letter was also inscribed as part of the dossier and provides supplementary evidence for what the envoys said (lines 93-8):

⁵⁷² Rzepka (2006) 146-7. On the obligations of kinship and the reciprocal nature of this relationship, see Ma (2003) 23; Low (2007) 43-54. On this kinship narrative, see Lücke (2000) 30-51.

⁵⁷³ The only attested kinship I can find documented between the Aitolian *koinon* and other *poleis* is with Axos (*FD* III 3:117) and Herakleia at Latmos (*FD* III 3:144). See Curty (1995) 30-2.

⁵⁷⁴ *SEG* 38:1476, lines 11-3: τὰ συμβεβηκότα τῆι πατρίδι αὐτῶν ἀπολογισάμενοι, καὶ αὐτοὶ διαλεγέντες ἀκολούθως τοῖς ἐν τῆι ἐπιστολῆι γεγραμμένοις.

συμβαίνει γὰρ ἀμῶν, καθ' ὃν καιρὸν | ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίγονος ἐνέβαλε
ἐν τὰν Φωκίδα, τῶν τε | τειχέων μέρη τινὰ καταπεπτώκειν ὑπὸ τῶν
σεισμῶν πα|σῶν τᾶμ πολίων καὶ τοὺς νεωτέρους εἰσβοαθοήκε<ι>ν ἐν
τὸ ἱερό[ν] | τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τοῦ ἐν Δελφοῖς · παραγενόμενος δὲ ὁ
βασί|λεὺς ἐν τὰν Δωρίδα τὰ τε τείχη ἀμῶν κατέσκαψε πασῶν | τᾶμ
πολίων καὶ τὰς οἰκίας κατέκαυσε ·

For it happened to us at the time when King Antigonos invaded Phokis, certain parts of the walls of all our cities had collapsed due to earthquakes and the younger men had gone to protect the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphoi. When the king came to Doris he demolished the walls of all our cities and burned down our houses.

In narrating how they were unable to defend their city because they were guarding the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphoi, the Kytenians achieve two things. They first arouse a degree of pity among the audience in order that they feel sympathy for the speaker's community, and secondly, they represent themselves as *pious* on the grounds that they went to defend the panhellenic sanctuary at Delphoi when Phokis was under attack. In projecting this image of themselves through their narration of what had befallen their city, the Kytenians are also adopting an Aitolian representation of themselves, that is to say, they are engaging in the same type of rhetorical self-representation as the Aitolian League in representing themselves as loyal custodians of Delphoi.⁵⁷⁵ The character projection utilised by the envoys here is therefore a combination of a localised identity, i.e. that of their *polis* and ethnic group, as well as that of their federal state.

Since Kytenion was a small *polis* in central Greece, enhancing their Aitolian identity would naturally have had its advantages since it would have increased the authority of the envoys on the grounds that it showed their case had the support of a large and powerful federal state.⁵⁷⁶ It is therefore possible that the Kytenians were emphasising the fact that the Aitolians, as the larger

⁵⁷⁵ See Chapter Three 2.a.

⁵⁷⁶ Although only one inscription from this mission survives, the documents suggest they had the ability to shift their *ethos*.

and more esteemed community, were lending support to their request. This phenomenon is not unknown in Hellenistic interstate relations. For instance Athens made a name for itself in the Hellenistic Period by providing envoys to support mission to other states.⁵⁷⁷ Athens herself was even helped by a Kretan, Eumaridas, who served on their ambassadorial team during a mission to Knossos and other Kretan *poleis* in 228/7 (*IG II² 844*).⁵⁷⁸ Having a Kretan on the *bema* with them evidently lent additional credibility to the Athenians and enhanced their projection of goodwill, since it showed the Kretans that ‘one of their own’ thought the Athenians’ request had substantial merit.⁵⁷⁹ Royal agents from Makedon also famously supported the Teian envoys on their mission to Krete to obtain *asylia* from the various Kretan *poleis*.⁵⁸⁰ In one instance, the Makedonian agent Perdikkas probably took the main speaking role (*IC II xxvi 1*).⁵⁸¹

But while the use of their federal identity as members of the Aitolian League may also enhance the authority of the envoys, we cannot rule out that it was also intended to show that they had the relevant authority from their *koinon* to send the embassy and address the Xanthians, and that they were not rogue envoys. This is especially important if the constituent *polis* wanted to carry out something that was controversial that their *koinon* might have reasonable grounds to object to. In the case of the present inscription, the decree of the Aitolian League states that the walls of Kytenion needed to be repaired in order that the city can be lived in (*συνουκείν*) again (line 79). This implies that the community had been through the process of *διοικισμος*, implying that the population had been scattered into smaller settlements in

⁵⁷⁷ For a general overview and for discussion of the (mainly historiographical) evidence, see Perin-Saminadayar (1999) *passim*.

⁵⁷⁸ Habicht (1997) 164.

⁵⁷⁹ Eumaridas of Kydonia was also a *proxenos* (*IG II² 844*, line 51).

⁵⁸⁰ See Rigsby (1996) 288 for discussion.

⁵⁸¹ Lines 10-12: διελέγη δὲ [καὶ Περδίκκας ὁ ὑμέτερος | πολί]τας ἀκολούθως τοῖς γ[εγραμμένοις μετὰ πάσας] | σπουδᾶς καὶ φιλοτιμίας.

the hinterland.⁵⁸² As the purpose of the Kytenion's visit was to raise funds to rebuild their walls and therefore have a *sunoikismos*, it is plausible that they not only needed the authority of the Aitolian League to start this process, and therefore the envoys wanted demonstrate that they had the appropriate authority from their *koinon* to carry out a potentially sensitive deed. In addition, if the relationship between the constituent *polis* and the *koinon* was tense on the grounds that the community was brought into the federation against its will, it would also be important for the envoys to demonstrate that they had the appropriate consent in order to show their audience that their request was a legitimate one. While the evidence for Kytenion's entry into the Aitolian League is not totally clear, there is some hint that it was far from a smooth process.⁵⁸³

Given the potential seriousness and gravity of the mission, it is not surprising to find that the federal *ethos* plays such a prominent role in the character projection of the embassy. An honorary decree of Oropos for the Achaian statesman Hieron of Aigeira, dated to between 154-149, recounts

⁵⁸² Hansen (2006) 53-4. This process was generally intended to crush poleis so that they could not cause any more problems for their enemies; famously the Spartans did this to the Mantineians after conquering their community in 385 (Xen. *Hell.* 5.2.7) and Philip II did the same to Phokis during the Third Sacred War (Diod. Sic. 16.60.2). *Sunoikismos* could be highly contentious political issue, and when the Mantineians decreed to rebuild their walls and exist as one community, the Spartans were forced to send Agesilaos to try to stop them (Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.4-5).

⁵⁸³ Doris was strategically placed and controlled the upper Kephissos river valley, and therefore the trade routes west of Thermopylai and Phokis, as well as the routes to Delphoi and eastern Aitolia. By the 260s, the Aitolian League controlled all the territory surrounding Doris, meaning that any potential invasion would have been easy. It is not clear when exactly Doris entered the Aitolian League, however a three-year delay between their last representation on the Amphyktionic suggests that it was a lengthy process. Grainger has suggested that this delay in Doris' absorption is because the Aitolians needed time to persuade the Dorians to join, and that this combined with the Dorians taking up federal offices almost instantly indicates that it was an amicable process. See Grainger (1995) 325-6; (1999) 113-4. However, these arguments are not convincing. The delay could in fact indicate a period of civil conflict, and as Rzepka has indicated, the Kytenians waited 20 years to send out an embassy to seek assistance with the repair of their walls. While the Kytenians may have unsuccessfully lobbied the Aitolian League for funds, as Rzepka has suggested, 20 years is a considerable amount of time to press for this issue and the delay indicates that the Aitolians were reluctant to grant them this request. See Rzepka (2006) 144-5.

how he spoke at a conference against proposals that may have led to the destruction of Oropos (*IG VII 411*, lines 12-21):

δόξαντος δὲ τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς | συναγαγεῖν σύνκλητον ἐν Ἄργει περὶ
τούτων, | ἱέρων ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ βουλόμενος ἐκφανῆ π[οι]εῖν τὴν
αὐτοῦ εὖνοιαν καὶ καλοκάγαθίαν ὑπ[ε]δέξατο πάντα τοὺς
παραγενομένους Ὀρωπίων ἐπὶ τὴν ἰδίαν ἐστίαν, ἔθυσέν τε τῷ Δ[ι] |
τῷ Σωτῆρι ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, πρὸς τε Ἀθηναίους κα[ὶ] | τοὺς ἄλλους τοὺς
ἀντιπρεσβεύοντας ὑπέ[σ]τη καὶ παρεστήσατο τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς μὴ
περιδεῖν | πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα ἐξανδραποδισθεῖσαν ...

and (since) the Achaeans decided to call a synkletos at Argos about these matters, Hieron, wishing to demonstrate on every occasion his goodwill and excellence, welcomed into his own house all the Oropians who had come and sacrificed to Zeus the Saviour on our behalf, and [spoke] against the Athenians and the other ambassadors who had come to oppose [us] and induced the Achaeans not to allow a Greek city to be enslaved ...

Oropos had been trying to defend itself from Athens following an attack in 164, and following an appeal to Rome, Sikyon had been nominated to assess a fine to be imposed on Athens (Paus. 7.11.4-8).⁵⁸⁴ As a small community, the citizens of Oropos perhaps felt that they did not have the authority to speak on their own, and so an Achaian speaker was needed to enhance their standing against much more influential Athenian speakers. Although the text does not state who the Athenian speakers are, it was the heads of the three philosophical schools who served as envoys to Rome to protest the fine imposed on them by Sikyon (Polyb. 32.11-4-5). If these envoys also served on the mission to the Achaian assembly, then the representatives of Oropos were up against some challenging opponents who were also good rhetorical performers.⁵⁸⁵ Hieron enhanced the standing of Oropos by taking up their cause in the assembly and speaking on their behalf. When a mission was

⁵⁸⁴ For further historical background, see Habicht (1997) 264-9 and Worthington (2021) 171-2.

⁵⁸⁵ On the oratory of these philosophers at Rome, see Powell (2013) *passim*.

extremely serious, representation by federal envoys could become totally dominant. This is exactly what happened when the Stymphalians took up the cause of the Elateians, who had been exiled from their territory in the 180s (*IP Ark 18*).⁵⁸⁶ The Stymphalians requested to send an embassy to Acilius Glabrio concerning the matter, but the matter was so serious that the Achaians took up the cause and sent their own federal envoys, including a former *strategos*, who had experience in negotiating territorial disputes.⁵⁸⁷ Again, the evidence suggests that the smaller *polis* did not have the standing or reputation to handle such a serious matter. In this instance it is perhaps not surprising that the Achaians took up the cause, since there was a risk of tension between their *koinon* and Rome, and they could not risk having Stymphalian envoys pursuing something that might compromise the relationship between the Achaian *koinon* and Rome.

b. Akraiphia and the Boiotian League

Another example that is well attested in the epigraphical record is the diplomatic activities of the Boiotian *koinon* and its constituent *poleis*. In the context of the wider thesis this is a hugely important case study, since Polybios' perception of Boiotian federalism is highly subjective. When the Romans decided to dissolve the Boiotian *koinon*, Polybios briefly narrates the federation and describes it as one bound together by subjugation and one that met with misfortune due to its moral degeneracy (Polyb. 20.4-7).⁵⁸⁸ Stripping

⁵⁸⁶ *IP Ark 18*, lines 9-12: ὕστερον δ]ὲ πάλιν μετὰ ἔτη τινὰ παραγενομένων Ῥωμαίων ἐν τὰν Ἑλλάδα | [μετὰ στρατοῦ(?) καὶ κυριε]ύσαντος Μανίου τῶν κατ' [Ε]λάτεαν τόπων, ἐπρόσβευσαν Στυμφάλιοι πο|[τὶ τοὺς Ἀχαιοὺς, ὅπω]ς ἐκπεμφθῆ προσβεία ποτὶ Μάνιον περὶ τᾶς Ἐλατέων καθόδου ἐν τὰν [ιδί]αν, τῶν δ' Ἀχαιῶν ἀπο]στειλάντω<ν> προσβευτὰς Διοφάνη κ' ΑΘ[αν]οκλιῆ

⁵⁸⁷ One of the envoys, Diophanes of Megalopolis, was *strategos* of the Achaian League in 191 and he is named in another inscription concerning a boundary dispute between Megalopolis and another city (*IP Ark 31* iiB, line 5), as well as in Polybios. He was a prominent statesman and a contemporary of Polybios, albeit older. Generally, see Lehmann (1999) *passim*.

⁵⁸⁸ On this digression generally, Feysel (1942) *passim* discusses Polybios' account of Boiotia within the wider archaeological and historical context. For a more literary interpretation, see Mendels

away Polybios' highly subjective interjections, how do the *poleis* at a local level interact with the *koinon* at a federal level, and how do these potentially conflicting identities manifest themselves within the ambassadorial oratory performed by Boiotian envoys?

A number of inscriptions that demonstrate the projection of both federal and localised identities are the acceptance decrees of the *Ptoia* festival, whereby envoys were sent from Akraiphia to the Boiotian *poleis* to announce the festival and invite them to take part.⁵⁸⁹ These decrees summarise the speeches that were made by the Akraiphian envoys to encourage their fellow Boiotian *poleis* to take part, and since the *Ptoia* was a long-standing festival and the decrees come from a range of decades, we can detect some change in the rhetorical strategies of the envoys, reflecting the turbulent history of Boiotia from the late-third to the mid-second century.⁵⁹⁰ The acceptance decree of Oropos, dated to after 222, provides an account of the oral performance delivered by three Akraiphian envoys (*IG VII 351*).⁵⁹¹ The *stèle* was displayed at the *Amphiaraiion* at Oropos, which is interesting since acceptance decrees are generally inscribed in the envoys' community, but sometimes both. Scholars such as Ganter have suggested that this was potentially the citizens of Oropos reaffirming their Boiotian identity, which makes the envoys' self-representation even more interesting, considering Oropos' dramatic geopolitical history as a disputed territory between Athens and Boiotia.⁵⁹² The text reads (lines 1-9):

(1984-6) *passim*; Müller (2013) *passim*. On non-Boiotians in the *koinon* and the history of the federal government, see Funke (2015) *passim*; Post (2019) *passim*; Rzepka (2019) *passim*.

⁵⁸⁹ Scholars of modern Sociology as well as Ancient History have generally agreed that common cults are a key unifying factor in federal states. See Freitag (2007) 386ff and Ganter (2013) *passim*.

⁵⁹⁰ On the geopolitical history of Boiotia at that time, see Buck (1993) *passim*; Müller (2007) *passim*, (2013) *passim*; Beck and Ganter (2015) 155-7. For the historical context of the *Ptoia* see Manieri (2009) 63-77.

⁵⁹¹ See Manieri (2009) 88-90 for more general discussion.

⁵⁹² Ganter (2019) 90-3. On the territorial dispute, Hansen (2004) 448-9 provides a summary.

ἐπειδὴ συμβαίνει τῆμ | πόλιν Ἀκραϊφείων ἀποστεῖλαι πρεσβευτὰς
τρεις ἄνδρας τοὺς δια|λεξομένους μετὰ τοῦ ἱερέως καὶ τοῦ προφήτου
πρὸς τὰς πόλεις | τὰς ἐν τῇ Βοιωτίᾳ καὶ παραγενόμενοι εἰς τὴν
ἐκκλησίαν τό τε ψήφισ|μα ἀνέγνωσαν τὸ παρὰ τῶν Ἀκραϊφείων καὶ
παρακαλοῦσαν τὸν | δῆμον συναύξειν τὴν θυσίαν τῶι Ἀπόλλωνι τῶι
Πτωΐῳ καθάπερ καὶ τὸ | κοινὸν Βοιωτῶν καὶ ἡ πόλις τῶν Ἀκραϊφείων·
ὅπως ἂν οὔν φαίνηται ἡ πόλις | τῶν Ὠρωπίων, καθάπερ αὐτεῖ
προσῆκει, εὐσεβῶς καὶ ἐνδόξως τὰ πρὸς | τοὺς θεοὺς συντελοῦσα καὶ
εὐχαριστοῦσα τεῖ πόλει Ἀκραϊφείων ...

Since it happens that the polis of Akraiphia has sent three men as envoys, with the priest and the prophet, to make a report to the cities of Boiotia and they, having come to the assembly, read the decree sent by the polis of Akraiphia and encouraged the people to make the sacrifice for Apollo Ptoios in common, as well as the Boiotian koinon and the polis of Akraiphia, so that it is clear that the polis of Oropos, as it suits them, celebrates the sacred rites piously and solemnly to the gods and shows itself grateful to the polis of Akraiphia ...

The three envoys, priest, and prophet were taxed with giving an oral account (δια|λεξομένους), and as part of this they read aloud (ἀνέγνωσαν) the decree of their *polis*. The combination of these things makes for an interesting series of oral performances. While the text does not make it clear whether the priest and prophet also made spoken contributions during the performance, or whether they were simply visually supporting the three envoys on the *bema*, their role in this embassy is a hugely important part of the delegation's rhetorical strategy. Since the contents of the oral performance concerned religious matters, i.e. the festival of the *Ptoia*, contributions from religious officials or even their very presence adds additional credibility to the arguments made by the delegation. As Martin notes, arguments based on religious ideas are at risk of falling flat unless the religious aspect of the argument is accepted, and perhaps one way to ensure that the argument was convincing was putting into the mouth of a priest or prophet.⁵⁹³ The notion of using prophets as witnesses - and *synegoroi* - in forensic oratory to make the

⁵⁹³ Martin (2009) 205.

arguments made by prosecutors and defendants is even noted by Aristotle in the *Rhetoric* (Ar. *Rh.* 1376a). The use of ‘religious expertise’ is attested in Athenian trials, the most well-known example is the *synegoros* for the prosecution against Andokides in 399 (Lysias 6), and as I suggested in my previous chapter, the Aitolian envoy Chlaineas may have had some religious authority in relation to Delphoi, an important geo-political site.⁵⁹⁴ The second observation is how (presumably) one member of the delegation read aloud the decree of their *polis*, since in doing so the speakers have demonstrated their credibility and authority as part of the oral performance. In reading a decree of their polis aloud, the speakers are essentially taking on the voice of the *polis*. The third observation, related to the second, is the envoys’ interplay between relating matters back to both their own *polis* of Akraiphia and to the Boiotian *koinon* more widely. The summary suggests that the envoys are adopting two identities - perhaps divided between multiple speakers – during the oral performance. On the one hand, they are speaking as fellow members of the Boiotian *koinon*, and on the other, as citizens of a different *polis*.

Two acceptance decrees issued by Haliartos survive, both from some time at the end of the third century (*IG VII 4143*; *SEG 32:456*). The first, found in Akraiphia, was found on the same stele as the acceptance decree of Oropos, but it is too fragmentary to compare with the *stele* found at Oropos itself.⁵⁹⁵ This decree is very fragmentary, and any mention of the Boiotian *koinon* is from the restoration rather than what appears on stone: καθὼς τοὶ Ἀκρ]ηφιῆ[ες κῆ τὸ κοινὸν Βωιωτῶν (*IG VII 4143*, line 1). In the other decree of acceptance, found at Haliartos itself, there are no references to the Boiotians in its summary of the Akraiphian envoys’ oral performance (*SEG 32:456*, lines 4-14):

⁵⁹⁴ Rubinstein (2003) 203. For more on the notion of the ‘expert opinion’ in classical rhetoric, see Walton (1997) 38-43. Cf Chapter Two 1.b.

⁵⁹⁵ On the provenance and restoration of these texts, Roesch (1982) 203-10 provides a systematic discussion.

ἐπιδει ἅ πόλις Ἀκρη[φ]ιεῖω[ν] πρ[ι]σ|γεῖας ἀποστείλασα Δαμό[φι]λον
 Ἀλε[ξί]αο, | Δευξίλαον Θάλ[λ]ω, [Ἀ]πολλώνιο[ν] (patronymicum), |
 παρκαλῖ μὲν τὰν πόλιν Ἀρια[ρτίων ὄπ]ως | θουσίαν σουντέλει ἐν τῷ
 [Ἀ]θανᾶς Ἴτω|νίας κῆ Διὸς Καρα[ιῶ] τεμέν[ει], ἀξι[οῖ] δὲ | πεμπέμεν
 ἀπὸ πόλιος ἰππ[έα]ς [ἐν τὸν] ἀ[γῶ]ν[α] | τὸν ἀπὸ τελέων ἐν τῷ Πτωίων
 ἀ[γῶ]νι· | ὅπως διακιμένα τὰ πὸτ τὼς θεὼς εὐσ[ε]β[ῶ]ς | κῆ ἐν τὸν
 λυπὸν χρόνον δια[μ]εῖνει ἀκό|λουθα πράττωσα τῇ ἡρέσι·

Since the polis of Akraiphia, having sent Damophilon son of Alexias, Deuxilaus son of Thallus, and Apollonius son of (?) as envoys, calls on the polis of the Hariartians⁵⁹⁶ to join in the sacrifice at the precinct of Athena Itonia and Zeus Karaios and to send cavalrymen from the polis to the contest by teams at the contest of the Ptoia; so that the city, being piously disposed with respect to the gods, may continue to act in accordance with that policy in future as well;

Unlike the acceptance decree of Oropos, the Boiotian element of the envoy's identity is absent from the summary of their oral performance. We cannot rule out, of course that the envoys represented themselves as both Akraiphian and Boiotian, but that the Hariartians did not feel the need to include it in their summary. In this instance the explanation could be a practical one since the envoys did not address the assembly which made the decree, but to the council who passed a *probouleuma* which they then submitted to the assembly; we are therefore looking at a third hand account of an account of an oral performance, i.e. a summary of a summary. It is equally plausible that the envoys neglected to include an appeal to the Boiotian identity that both they and their audience shared as part of their performance on the grounds that this was already obvious to the citizens of Haliartos. Both *poleis* also shared a border, so appealing to any collective Boiotian identity may have been superfluous in an interaction between neighbouring communities.⁵⁹⁷

⁵⁹⁶ Ἀρίαρτιος is the city-ethnic used within Boiotia itself, see Hansen (2005) 441-2.

⁵⁹⁷ For more discussion on the borders of Haliartos, see Fossey (1988) 301-8. For more general context on this decree and relations between these two *poleis*, see Rigsby (1987) *passim*.

In the acceptance decrees relating to the Ptoia from the mid-second century onwards, the overtly Boiotian element of the envoys' identity is also absent from the summary of their oral performance. In an acceptance decree of Orchomenos, dating from between 178 and 146, the envoys again represent themselves solely as Akraiphian (IG VII 4138, lines 2-15):

[ἐ]πειδὴ παραγενόμενοι πρεσβευταὶ π[αρά τῆς] | πόλεως Ἀκραφιέων
 ὃ τε προφή[τ]ης τοῦ Ἀ[πόλλω]νος Πυθίων Ἀθανίου καὶ Φιλόμηλος
 Θεο[δ]ώ[ρου], | οἱ δ' αὐτοὶ καὶ θεωροί, ἄνδρες καλοὶ κάγαθο[ί, τά τε]
 | γράμματα ἀπέδωκαν ἃ ἐ[γ]εγρά[φ]εισαν [πρὸς τὴν] | πόλιν ἡμῶν οἱ
 τε πολέμαρχοι καὶ οἱ σύεδρο[ι Ἀκραι]φιέων [κ]αὶ ὁ ἀγνωθέτης τῶν
 Πτωϊῶν Πολ[— — —] | Καλλικλέους, [κ]α[ι] αὐτοὶ ἐπελθόντε[ς ἐπὶ
 τὸ συνέδρι]ον καὶ τὸν δῆμον ἀνε νέωσαντο τ[ὴν] τε συ[γγένειαν] | καὶ
 φι[λί]αν τὴν ὑπάρχουσαν [ταῖς] πόλεσιν [πρὸς ἀλλή]λας,
 παρε[κ]άλουν τε Ὀρχομενίους ἀπο[δέξασθαι] | τὴν τε θυσίαν καὶ τὸν
 ἀγῶνα τῶν Πτωϊῶν [ὄν] | τ[ι]θέ[α]σιν Ἀκραφιεῖς [πε]ντέ[τειρον] τῷ
 Ἀπόλλ[ωνι τῷ] | Πτωϊῶι στεφανίτην θ[υμ]ελικόν·

Since the prophet of Apollo, Pythion son of Athanias, and Philomelos son of Theodoros arrived as envoys from the polis of Akraiphia, the same men also as theoroi, high and esteemed men, delivered a letter in which the polemarchs and the councillors of Akraiphia and the agnothetes of the Ptoia ... son of Kallikles, and since they themselves having reached the sunedrion and the demos renewed the kinship and pre-existing friendship between the cities and called on the Orchomenians to recognise the sacrifice and contest of the Ptoia which the Akraiphians established for Apollo Ptoion every five years ...

Unlike the decree of Oropos from around one century earlier, the Boiotian *koinon* and any collective Boiotian identity is not made explicit in the summary of the envoys' oral performance. Considering the proposed date range of the inscription this should come as no surprise, since the Romans abolished the Boiotian confederacy in 172/1 in order to, if we believe Polybios, 'divide the Boiotians by maintaining them each in their own city': τὸ δὲ κατὰ πόλιν διελεῖν τοὺς Βοιωτοὺς (Polyb. 27.1.3).⁵⁹⁸ Controversially in the context of the present

⁵⁹⁸ For the abolition and its territorial implications, see Müller (2007) *passim*; Kalliontzis (2020) 126-7.

text, there is no consensus as to when the Boiotian *koinon* re-emerged with dates ranging from 167 to the late first century, but it is now generally believed that a date of 167 is too early.⁵⁹⁹ Despite the likelihood that there were no federal structures in place at the time of the embassy, the envoys seem to emphasise the kinship and friendship that their community and their hosts would have historically shared due to their collective identity as Boiotians: ἀνενεώσαντο τ[ήν] τε συ[γγένειαν] | καὶ φι[λί]αν τήν ὑπάρχουσαν [ταῖς] πόλεσιν [πρὸς ἀλλή]λλας (lines 10-11). As Müller has argued, this demonstrates the continuing affirmation of Boiotian collective identity still continued to be affirmed through Pamboiotian festivals and the renewal of kinship between constituent *poleis*.⁶⁰⁰ The projection of a Boiotian identity in this oral performance is therefore much more subtle when compared with the acceptance decree of Oropos, where the *koinon* itself enhances the authority of the envoys. But in the case of the Orchomenian decree, the historic relationships both communities have enjoyed as Boiotians, and no doubt as former members of a federation, still remain despite the absence of federal infrastructure. In this case, the individual *poleis* take on the role of enhancing the Boiotian identity in the absence of the *koinon*. Unlike in the embassy from Kytenion I discussed above, the Akraiphian envoys bring a letter not from any federal or regional authority, but only from the polemarchs and councillors of Akraiphia. The combination of the Boiotian and Akraiphian identities is still an important aspect of the envoys' oral performance, however the relationships associated with the shared federal identity have been adopted by the Akraiphian aspect of their character projection.⁶⁰¹

⁵⁹⁹ For a date of 146, see Étienne and Knoepfler (1976) 342-8. For an earlier date of 167, see Roesch (1982) 293-5. For the early first century, Knoepfler (2008) *passim*. For the late first century, see Müller (2014) *passim*.

⁶⁰⁰ Müller (2014) 130-6.

⁶⁰¹ The figure of Pythion also provides the envoys with some additional authority since he was a prophet of Apollo and is designated as such in the text, his religious expertise would probably have been a hugely important aspect of the oral performance.

Two further acceptance decrees from the end of the second century survive, one from Thisbe and another from an unknown *polis*, and both of these suggest a similar character projection on the part of the Akraiphian envoys as in the Orchomenian acceptance decree (*IG VII 4139; IG VII 4142*). The decree of Thisbe, the prose of which is more elaborate than that of Orchomenos, reports how Pythion and Philomelos handed over a letter (γράμματα) stating that they had been sent by the *sunedrion* and *agnothetes* of Akraiphia (*IG VII 4139*, lines 11-16). Once again, while the performance lacks explicit mention that both communities are Boiotian, the relationships that the former *koinon* facilitated are still integral to the oral performance (lines 2-4):

ἀνανεωσαμένους την | τε φιλίαν καὶ συγγένειαν τὴν ὑπάρχου | σαν ταῖς
πόλεσιν πρὸς ἀλλήλας ...

*(the envoys) having renewed the friendship and kinship that exists
between each of the cities ...*

Again, like with the response of Orchomenos, the envoys from Akraiphia recall the friendship and shared lineage that their community shares with Thisbe, and their shared identity as Boiotians is instead merely represented as *polis-to-polis* interaction rather than a *polis-to-polis* interaction via the *koinon* and/or *ethnos*.⁶⁰² Naturally, the continuation of religious festivals in Boiotia facilitated the performance of Boiotian identity in diplomatic oratory even after the abolition of the *koinon*, although not so explicitly.⁶⁰³ These decrees from the second century mark a change in the nature of ambassadorial oratory, albeit a subtle one. The representation of Boiotian diplomatic oratory in the decrees of Orchomenos and Thisbe also stands in contrast to the more explicit appeals to Boiotian collective identity in the speech that Thucydides

⁶⁰² Curty (1995) 22.

⁶⁰³ On religion as unifying factor within Boiotian federalism, see Mackil (2013) 147-236 and (2014) *passim*.

puts into the mouth of the boiotarch Padagondas in 424, where he tells his colleagues that it is ‘ancestral custom to resist an invading foreign army’: *πάτριόν τε ὑμῖν στρατὸν ἀλλόφυλον ἐπελθόντα* (Thuc. 4.92.3).⁶⁰⁴

While the combination of Boiotian and Akraiphian identity continues to be an integral aspect of these acceptance decrees, the appeal a shared Boiotian identity could potentially be more explicit in a tense negotiation, especially if two or more Boiotian cities in the process of some sort of reconciliation. A decree from Akraiphia, dating to after 171, honours three judges from Larissa who had been requested to settle a series of disputes between citizens in Akraiphia and those in neighbouring *poleis* (*IG VII 4130*).⁶⁰⁵ The decree records how the Larissans accepted the request on the grounds that they shared kinship with ‘all the Boiotians’ (*συνγενῆς πᾶσιν Βοιωτοῖς*).⁶⁰⁶ It is certainly plausible that this also reflects an argument made by the Akraiphian envoy to Larissa who was sent to request a panel of judges, and that he emphasised the kinship that the Larissans had with the Boiotians as a collective. Since there were evidently several disputes that needed settling in several Boiotian cities, an appeal to a collective Boiotian character would certainly be more appropriate, especially since the Akraiphians were addressing a non-Boiotian audience.

While scholars such as Ganter have suggested that the shift in the diplomatic self-representation of the envoys in these texts from ‘Akraiphian-Boiotian’ to solely ‘Akraiphian’ is a reflection of the decline and fall of the

⁶⁰⁴ See Hornblower (1996) 290-7 for discussion. But on the looseness of Boiotian identity in Thucydides due to the exclusion of the Plataians and the dominance of the Thebans, see Fragoulaki (2013) 109-10.

⁶⁰⁵ Roesch (1982) 406-7; Curty (1995) 20-1.

⁶⁰⁶ Lines 3-15: *περὶ ὧν | συνθέμενοι γραπτὸν πρὸς αὐτοὺς | καὶ συνελόμενοι | [κ]ριτή[ρι]ον κα[τ]ὰ κοινὸ[ν] ἐκ τῆς Λαρισαίων | πόλεως, ἣτις ὑπάρχει συνγενῆς πᾶσιν Βοιωτοῖς, | ἔξα[πε]στείλαμεν πρεσβευτήν καὶ δικασταγ[ωγ]ὸν | πρὸς Λαρισαίους τ[ὸ]ν αἰτησόμενον τὸ δικαστήριον μετὰ τῶν | [ἐ]πὶ τὸ αὐτό, Λαρισαῖοι, συνμνημονεύον<τες> τῆς ὑπαρχούσης ἐξ ἀρχῆς | συγγενείας πρὸς [τε] Ἀκρηφ[ιεῖ]ας καὶ πρὸς πάντας Βοιωτο<ύ>ς, βουλευ[σ]άμενοι κ[α]τὰ τὸ κά[λλ]ιστον ἐξαπέστειλαν δικαστὰς | Σωγέν[ην] Ἀ[ρι]σ[τ]οκλέους, Νικοκράτην Ἀφθονήτου, | Εὐφο[ρ]ον [Π]άτρωνος, ἄνδρας καλοὺς κάγαθούς καὶ πεῖστιν | ἔχον[τας]. Gauthier (1972) 343-4. Mackil (2019) *passim*.*

Boiotian *koinon*, I think they have neglected to see the subtle continuations in the text where elements of the Boiotian *ethos* continue to linger subtly in the envoys' oral performances.⁶⁰⁷ The abolition of the Boiotian *koinon*, although a huge geopolitical event, has perhaps overshadowed some of the subtleties that one can detect in the summaries of these ambassadorial speeches.⁶⁰⁸ These decrees are incredibly useful when compared with speeches performed by envoys from federal states in Polybios, especially those of Chlaineas and Lykiskos (Polyb. 9.28-31, 9.32-9). The decrees of Akraiphia show that Polybios' representation of envoys' speeches, whereby they can project both a *polis*-level identity as well as a federal-level identity, are also detectable within the inscriptional evidence. With the increased prominence of federal states from the late fourth century onwards, it is certainly plausible that the ability to combine both a federal *ethos* and a *polis ethos* became a much more common rhetorical strategy in the diplomatic oratory of the Hellenistic Period.⁶⁰⁹ We cannot rule out, however, that the absence of this rhetorical strategy in the evidence of the fifth and fourth centuries is simply a reflection of our comparatively poor evidence for oratory performed by envoys representing *koina* or *poleis* that were members of *koina*.

4. Speaking on behalf of a faction

In my discussion of the speech of Astymedes of Rhodes before the Roman Senate in 165, I argued that the speaker represented himself as belonging to the pro-Roman faction at Rhodes and used his standing to distance himself and his community from the actions of the Rhodians twenty years previously, who had caused grief for the Romans (Polyb. 30.31).⁶¹⁰ This line of

⁶⁰⁷ Ganter (2019) 91-3.

⁶⁰⁸ Müller (2014) *passim*.

⁶⁰⁹ For the growth of federalism from the late fourth century onwards, see Giovanni (1971) 14-24; Walbank (1981) 152-8; Beck (1997) 10-3; Funke (2018) *passim*.

⁶¹⁰ See Section 2.1.g for discussion.

argumentation can be found in Xenophon's account of the Theban embassy to Athens in 395, in which the speaker places the blame for the poor relations between the Thebans and the Athenians on the mistakes his citizens made in the past (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.7-15). In both instances, the envoys' rhetorical strategies centred on distancing themselves and their community from the actions of the previous generation, actions which have strained the relationship between the speaker's community and that of his host. Both speakers also separate themselves from the past actions of the community by stressing that the actions took place on the authority of another political faction which controlled their *polis* at that time. As we have already seen in the case of Polybios and Xenophon, when we have multiple speakers in a delegation the envoys will sometimes speak as if they are representing the views of each different political faction in the community in order to represent a united front on the issue under deliberation, or to account for varying dispositions within a composite audience.⁶¹¹ But in the two instances I have cited above, the oral performances of both delegations both centre on representing themselves as belonging to one political faction rather than another, thereby not completely representing their community as a collective and the various factions within it. As Mitchell has demonstrated, the use of private relationships in Greek interstate relations that were formed on the basis of political ideology were an important feature of Greek diplomacy as early as the fifth century, and so it should perhaps come as no surprise that we find envoys representing themselves as belonging to a certain political faction during their speeches.⁶¹² However, in the context of a political culture dominated by *stasis*, very often the political faction running a community will change, creating a potentially difficult task for any envoy if the new regime has a different foreign policy to the one before it.

⁶¹¹ In the case of Xenophon, see Scheppens (2001) *passim*; Rubinstein (2013) 93-113. On Polybios, see my analysis of Alexander of Isos' and Kallikrates' speeches (Section 2.1.e-f).

⁶¹² Mitchell (1997) 178-91.

This line of argumentation does not feature very often in the summaries of ambassadorial oratory on stone. One example is a letter from the future King Attalos II to the polis of Amlada from ca. 160, in which the king recounts the speech of the Amladan envoys, who had come to request relief from tribute payments.⁶¹³ After the king recalls how the envoys spoke about the subject as instructed, he justifies granting the Almadans debt relief as follows (*OGIS* 751, lines 9-15):

θεωρῶν οὖν ὑμᾶς μετανενοηκότας τε ἐπὶ τοῖ[ς] | προημαρτημένοις καὶ
τὰ ἐπιστελλόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῶν | προθύμως ἐπιτελοῦντας πρόνοιαν ὑμῶν
ἔ[σχον καὶ] | χαρισάμενος τῶι τε Ὀπρασάτ[ηι] καὶ τῆι πόλ[λει
προσ]|τέταχα ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ φόρου κα[ὶ] τε[λέ]σ[ματ]ος | [δραχ]μὰς
τρισχιλίας καὶ ἄλλας δραχμὰς ἑνακισχιλίας [ᾶς] | [προσ]ωφεΐλετε ἡμῖν.

Seeing therefore that you had repented of your former errors and that you were carrying out my instructions with zeal, I showed care for you and as a favour to Oprastes and to the city, I gave instructions to exempt you 3,000 drachmas of the tribute and payment, and the other 9,000 drachmas which you still owed us in addition.

Amlada had most likely been punished with hefty indemnities since it had revolted against the Attalids and sided with the Galatians, while Eumenes II was distracted with the Third Makedonian War.⁶¹⁴ As part of their rhetorical strategy to request (ἡξιουσα[v], line 4) relief on their indemnities, the Amladan envoys demonstrated through their oratory that they had repented (μετανενοηκότας) for their former offences, i.e., revolting from the Attalids. Polybios also uses the verb *metanoieîn* to express how the Achaian cities felt after removing their Makedonian garrison and coming together to form their *koinon* in the late 280s (Polyb. 2.41.11).⁶¹⁵ It is possible that the lead envoy,

⁶¹³ On this text generally, see Welles (1934) 237-41; Swoboda, Keil, and Knoll (1935) 33; Bencivenni (2014) 155-8.

⁶¹⁴ Chaniotis (2005a) 69.

⁶¹⁵ Polyb. 2.41.11: περὶ δὲ τὴν εἰκοστὴν καὶ τετάρτην ὀλυμπιάδα πρὸς ταῖς ἑκατόν, καθάπερ ἐπάνω προεῖπον, αὐθις ἤρξαντο μετανοήσαντες συμφρονεῖν. He also uses this verb to describe

Oprates, was the speaker who expressed remorse since Attalos singles him out and represents the relief as a favour not only to Amlada but also to him. But unlike Xenophon's account the speech by the Thebans to Athens in 395 and Polybios' account of Astymedes of Rhodes' speech before the Roman Senate, Attalos' account suggests that the envoys demonstrated a change of mind (*metanoia*) rather than shift the blame on to another political faction.⁶¹⁶

When geopolitics has changed, and one community seeks to reconcile with another, an alternative rhetorical strategy would be to 'spin' the history that has been the cause of strain between the two communities. A decree from Ephesos from 86/5, while not containing any summaries of ambassadorial oratory, shows how a Greek community might even warp the truth when it seeks to reconcile with another community with whom relations have been strained. In 88, Ephesos had opened its gates to Mithridates and in doing so facilitated the massacre of Romans across Asia Minor (App. *Mith.* 21-3).⁶¹⁷ However, by 86/5, Ephesos declared war on Mithridates and sided with Rome. In the preamble to a decree concerning this, the Ephesian *demos* has a rather interesting account of very recent history (*I.Ephesos* 8, lines 1-14):

[φυλάσσον]τος τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους τοὺς κο[ινοὺς σωτῆρας πα|λαιὰν εὖν]οιαν καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπιτασσομέ[νοις προθύμως | πειθαρχ]οῦντος, Μιθραδάτης Καππαδοκί[ας βασιλεὺς παρα|βὰς τὰς π]ρὸς Ῥωμαίους συνθήκας καὶ συναγαγῶ[ν τὰς δυνάμεις ἐ]πεχείρη]σεν κύριος γενέσθαι τῆς μηθὲν ἑαυτῶι προ[σηκούσης|χώρα]ς, καὶ προκαταλαβόμενος τὰς προκειμένας ἡμῶν πό[λεις ἀ|πάτ]η, ἐκράτησεν καὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας πόλεως καταπληξάμενος | [τῶι] τε πλήθει τῶν δυνάμεων καὶ τῶι ἀπροσδοκῆτι τῆς ἐπιβολῆς, |

how the Dolopians decided to join the Aitolian *koinon*, having previously been against the idea, but since they had been invaded by the Aitolians they had little choice (21.25.6).

⁶¹⁶ The notion of the apology and the articulation of guilt in Ancient Greek is a hugely controversial subject, and one I do not intend to dwell on here. I guide the reader to Cairns (1999) *passim*; Fulkerson (2004) *passim*; Konstan (2006) 91-110, (2010) 59-90; Kravaritou (2021) 107-13.

⁶¹⁷ For more historical background on Ephesos at this time, see Dmitriev (2005) 265-86. On the Ephesians welcoming of Mithridates and the subsequent slaughter of Italians in Asia Minor, see McGing (1986) 108-28. On Ephesos generally during the Mithridatic War, see Baukova (2013) *passim*.

[ὁ] δὲ δῆμος ἡμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀρχῆς συνφυλάσσωσιν τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαί|ους
εὖνοιαν, ἐσχηκῶς καιρὸν πρὸς τὸ βοηθεῖν τοῖς κοινοῖς πράγμα|σιν,
κέκρικεν ἀναδεῖξαι τὸν πρὸς Μιθραδάτην πόλεμον ὑπέρ | τε τῆς
Ῥωμαίων ἡγεμονίας καὶ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλευθερίας, ὁμο|θυμαδὸν πάντων
τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπιδεδωκότων ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τοῦ[ς] | [π]ερὶ τούτων ἀγῶνας
...

*(with the people) keeping towards the Romans the common saviours,
their old eunoia and to all their orders being agreeable, Mithridates king
of Kappadokia having violated the treaty with the Romans and
assembled his forces attempted to become kurios of our land which did
not belong to him, and having first seized the cities before us, having
terrified by the size of his forces and the surprise of the attack he gained
control of our polis. Our demos having kept eunoia towards the Romans
from the beginning, and having seized the opportunity to help our
common interests, have decided to declare war on Mithridates on
behalf of the leadership of the Romans and our common freedom, with
all of our citizens unanimously dedicated to the struggles concerning
this ...*

The long narration fulfils a hugely rhetorical function in attempting to represent the Ephesians as victims, a corporate image that the *polis* wishes to project at an inconvenient time.⁶¹⁸ Naturally this would provide a very suitable script for any Ephesian envoy wishing to speak before a Roman audience. It is highly unlikely that this narrative reflects what happened; the latter part of the decree lists a number of provisions often associated with civil conflict, including the readmission of those excluded from the citizen body, the abolition of debts, and the promise of citizenship to any foreigner, and that of freedom to any slave, who takes up arms with the *hegemon* in defence of the city.⁶¹⁹ While these provisions suggest that the city is preparing for war with Mithridates, they may also suggest that the city is preparing for civil war. Yet,

⁶¹⁸ Chaniotis (2013b) 749-50.

⁶¹⁹ Lines 43-7: εἶναι δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἰσοτελεῖς καὶ παροίκους | καὶ ἱεροὺς καὶ ἐξελευθέρους καὶ ξένους, ὅσοι ἂν ἀναλάβωσιν τὰ ὄπλα καὶ πρὸς το[ύς] | ἡγεμόνας ἀπογράψωνται, πάντας πολίτας ἐφ' ἴση καὶ ὁμοίαι, ὧν καὶ τὰ ὀνόματα [δια]|σαφησάτωσαν οἱ ἡγεμόνες τοῖς προέδροις καὶ τῷ γραμματεῖ τῆς βουλῆς, οἱ | καὶ ἐπικληρωσάτωσαν αὐτοὺς εἰς φυλὰς καὶ χιλιαστῆς. On the effects of the Mithridatic War on the cities of Asia Minor, see Arrayás Morales (2013) *passim* (pp.527-32 for Ephesos). McGing (1986) 127-9 argues that these actions were also an attempt on the part of the Ephesian elites to win over the Mithridates-supporting masses.

the Ephesians still stress that they are united in their *eunoia* towards Rome: ὁμοθυμαδὸν πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπιδεδωκότων ἑαυτοὺς εἰς τοῦ[ς] | [π]ερὶ τούτων ἀγῶνας (lines 13-14). The Ephesians are therefore erasing any civil conflict from the image they wish to project of themselves. The euphemistic rhetoric that seeks to extinguish any traces of factionalism within the community stands in stark contrast to the speech of Astymedes of Rhodes in Polybios, who is more than happy to stress that civil conflict has resulted in a change of foreign policy (Polyb. 30.31). The speech of the Thebans to the Athenians is even more explicit, since the speaker is very happy to place the blame on one particular Theban citizen who was their representative on the Peloponnesian allies' war council (εἷς ἀνὴρ, Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.8).

It is plausible that the scarcity in the inscriptional evidence of this sort of rhetoric is due to the implications of having accounts of poor diplomatic relations on the public record. Greek diplomacy is a world of constant change, with alliances often shifting on account of what was most advantageous at the time.⁶²⁰ This phenomenon, combined with the proliferation of civil conflict, could result in constant instability and everlasting diplomatic crises. Given this political context, putting narratives that show other states in a bad light is a huge risk to any future relations, the patterns of which could often be unpredictable. A clause from the 'prospectus' of the Second Athenian Naval League, dated to 378/7, illustrates this best (*IG II² 43*, lines 31-5):

ἐὰν δέ τῳ τυχάνῃ | τῶν πόλεων [τῶν ποιομένων] τὴν συμμαχίαν
πρὸς Ἀθην[αίους] στήλαι ὅσαι Ἀθήνησι | ἀνεπιτήδειοι, τῆμ βολὴν τὴν
ἀεὶ βολε|ύοσαν κυρίαν εἶναι καθαιρεῖν

For whichever of the poleis that happen to make an alliance with the Athenians there happens to be unfavourable stelai at Athens, the boule in office is authorised to destroy them.

⁶²⁰ Eckstein (2006) 79-117 labels interstate reinforces in the third and second centuries as anarchic.

The word *stelai* here naturally refers to the stone inscriptions rather than the decrees themselves, that is to say the public display of the decision of the community.⁶²¹ The Athenians were evidently very worried that having a potentially charged narrative on permanent record, especially on display, that shows other *poleis* in a bad light might cause problems in the future. Demosthenes shares similar sentiments in *For the Megalopolitans*, where he calls on the Megalopolitans to destroy the *stelai* containing their alliance with the Thebans (Dem. 26.27).⁶²² The honorary decrees of the late Classical and Hellenistic Periods in Athens demonstrate this. For instance the honours for Phaidros of Sphettos, awarded in 259/8, show deliberate erasure of the Makedonians, including sections that narrate the honourand's negotiations with Demetrios Poliorketes following the Athenian rebellion in 287 (*IG II³ 1 985*, lines 47-52).⁶²³ It is most likely that this erasure was made during the Makedonian invasion of Athens in 200.⁶²⁴ An inverted example is the honours for Euphron of Sikyon for his anti-Makedonian activism, enacted in 323/2, the stele of which was demolished by the oligarchs led by Phokion and Demades, only to be reinscribed and even made more elaborate later (*IG II-III² 448*).⁶²⁵

It is not unknown for sections of a decree to be erased and amended in to take out any rhetoric that has proven geopolitically problematic.⁶²⁶ In the Athenian honorary decree for Neapolis in Thrake, dating from 409-7, the original decree is erased (*IG I³ 101*, lines: 6-8):

⁶²¹ Rhodes & Osborne (2003) 102. On the nature of decrees vs laws, see Hansen (1991) 170-3. See also Low (2020) 239-43 on the destruction of Athenian decrees.

⁶²² Dem. 16.27: λέγουσι τοίνυν οἱ μάλιστα δοκοῦντες δίκαια λέγειν ὡς δεῖ τὰς στήλας καθελεῖν αὐτοὺς τὰς πρὸς Θεβαίων, εἴπερ ἡμέτεροι βεβαίως ἔσονται σύμμαχοι. A similar attitude is shown towards inscriptions in *Against Leptines* (Dem. 20.37).

⁶²³ On the dating, see Henry (1992) *passim*. See also Shear (2020) *passim* for discussion surrounding the perception of the decree as history the Athenians would rather forget. Generally, see Shear (1978) 25-9; Gehrke (2001) *passim*; Shear (2010) *passim*; Harding (2015) 96-7.

⁶²⁴ Flower (2006) 34-41.

⁶²⁵ On these decrees, see Culasso Gastaldi (2003) *passim*. On the historical background, see Habicht (1997) 40-9.

⁶²⁶ Rhodes (2019) 155-7; Low (2020) 243-8.

[ἐπ]αινέσαι τοῖς Νεοπ[ολίταις] <τοῖς> | παρὰ Θάσον [πρῶτον μ]ὲν [[[ὅτι
ἄποικοι ὄντες Θασίων]]] [καὶ πολιο]ρκόμενοι [[[ὑπ αὐτῶν]]]

*To praise the Neopolitans by Thasos first because although they are Thasian settlers and were besieged by them ...*⁶²⁷

A second decree on the same stele then records (lines 58-9):

ἐς δὲ τὸ φσέφισμα τὸ πρό[τερον ἐ]πανορθῶσαι τὸν γραμματέα τῆς
βολῆς : κ[αὶ ἐς αὐτὸ μεταγρ]άψαι ἀντὶ τῆς ἀποικία[ς τῆς Θασί]ον *hōti*
συνδιεπολέμεσαν τὸμ πόλεμον μ[ετὰ Ἀθηναίων

*The secretary of the council is to make a correction in the earlier decree:
and write in instead of 'the settlers of the Thasians' that 'they fought
the war along with the Athenians'.*

Evidently, the first decree had caused somewhat of a stir, probably because Neapolis had become so detached from its *metropolis* that it no longer wanted any association with it.⁶²⁸ The Athenians could amend the text of their decree, but they could not undo what was said during the debate that led to the rhetoric contained within the decree. But the Athenians, or perhaps the Neopolitans, could not accept having something that could prove problematic in future on the public record, especially on stone. Decrees that projected a negative image of a particular state could massively undermine the relations between both *poleis*, and so instead, most decrees are more 'neutralising' in their nature.⁶²⁹ As Thomas and Luraghi have both emphasised, Greek communities were often happy to demolish past inscriptions if they contradicted the ideological agenda which the community was pursuing at that time and proved inconvenient for contemporary political narratives.⁶³⁰

⁶²⁷ Underlined phrase erased.

⁶²⁸ Rhodes & Osborne (2017) 524-31.

⁶²⁹ Luraghi (2010) 255-60; Osborne (1999) 356.

⁶³⁰ Thomas (1989) 45-60; Luraghi (2022) *passim*. See Rhodes (2019) *passim* and Low (2020) 239-43 for erasure in Athenian decrees generally.

As Liddel has emphasised, one of the main audiences for decrees were foreign audiences in other communities, to whom envoys often conveyed written decrees as part of their mission.⁶³¹ It is therefore not surprising that the inscriptional evidence does generally does not include the sort of partisan rhetoric that we find in Polybios and Xenophon, because it risks representing the community as divided and therefore an unreliable partner in any future diplomatic negotiations.⁶³² This emphasis on neutrality makes the role of oratory even more important; as Crowther and Dössel have observed, when a community sent out an embassy to request a panel of foreign judges, the documentation they conveyed with them generally seems to omit the reasons for the conflict.⁶³³ In these cases, it is plausible that more stress was placed on the speaking roles of the envoys since oratory would not leave a written account of the causes for the *stasis*, and therefore the official record would not be at risk of taking either side in a dispute.⁶³⁴ It may even be the case that the causes of such a conflict were disputed by each side, and that any written accounts on the permanent public record may cause grievances for a faction that disputes what has been deemed an official narrative. On the other hand, oratory as a medium of communication is more flexible since it does not generally leave a permanent record. The relative absence of ‘partisan rhetoric’ in the inscriptions compared with historiography is not surprising, since the epigraphic record is the official voice of the community at that particular time,

⁶³¹ Liddel (2020a) 173-4. See also Rubinstein (2013) *passim* and Battistoni (2020) *passim*.

⁶³² This is an important consideration given that the dividing line in civil conflicts in the Greek poleis was often drawn at the hegemonic power each faction wished to be aligned with, and so decrees in favour of one hegemonic power over another could cause significant conflict, especially if they were on display as a stele. See Thomas (1989) 45-60. On the link between interstate factionalism and *stasis*, see Low (2007) 59-60, 92-3; Rubinstein (2013a) *passim*; Gray (2015) 197-200; Börm (2018) *passim*.

⁶³³ See Crowther (1995) *passim* in the case of Iasos. For more discussion see Dössel (2003) 260-72.

⁶³⁴ Rubinstein (2013) 176-7.

whereas the events recorded in historiographical texts are unofficial and the narratives contained within them are often contested.⁶³⁵

5. Conclusion

In summary, the epigraphic evidence makes a substantial contribution to our knowledge of ambassadorial oratory and complements the evidence of Polybios in several respects. Like with the evidence of Polybios and Xenophon, the epigraphic evidence from the late fourth century onwards, especially the retrospective evidence drawn up in response to an approach by an embassy, offers somewhat of a more personalised representation of the envoys and the oratory they performed. As with Polybios, the names of the ambassadorial teams in the inscriptions after the late fourth century are usually given, which is hugely important in reconstructing the oratory they performed if we have further prosopographical evidence about them, especially their political ideology. This stands in some contrast with the retrospective evidence before the fourth century, where the envoys are merely denoted by the ethnicon of the citizen body they are representing. The epigraphic representation of envoys is, however, more limited when compared to the speeches reconstructed by Polybios in *oratio recta*, which allow for a much closer rhetorical analysis and are generally attributed to a single named speaker. Instead, the epigraphic evidence tends to attribute the speech to the named envoys as a collective, thereby masking the different speeches each envoy would have performed. In this regard, the evidence resembles the reconstructions of envoys' speeches in *oratio obliqua* by Polybios, who also attributes potentially a polyphonic performance to the envoys as a collective.

⁶³⁵ Polybios' polemic against Timaios of Tauromenion is well-known and features elsewhere in this thesis, and I will not discuss it further here. On the role of the historiographer as the individual narrator, see Hornblower (1994) *passim*; Marcinola (1997) 128-74; Longley (2013) *passim*.

The epigraphic evidence also suggests that ambassadorial oratory was a fundamental medium through which a community could project its corporate image. Taking the Aitolian League as my first case study, I demonstrated that the evidence for oratory performed by Aitolian envoys suggests an attempt to represent the *koinon* as a worthy guardian of Delphoi, engaging in a similar argumentation strategy as Polybios' reconstruction of Chlaineas of Kalydon's speech. Similarly, the representation of the Rhodians in the epigraphic evidence suggests that the Rhodians wished to project a corporate image of being law abiding and champions of democracy, projecting the same qualities found in some of Polybios' reconstructions of Rhodian oratory. These confluxes do not suggest that Polybios' speeches are in any way an accurate reflection of what those envoys said at the time, but rather that they reflect the sort of rhetoric that envoys were seen to be engaging in. These corporate images, however, were not fixed and the rhetoric could be adjusted depending on the *kairos* at hand, depending on the relationship between the envoys' community and that of their hosts, as well as the geopolitical position their host community occupied at the time.

The inscriptions also indicate that federalism had an impact on ambassadorial oratory. While federalism was not unknown in the fifth and fourth centuries, by the third and second centuries many more Greek poleis were members or allies of larger Greek *koina*.⁶³⁶ This phenomenon essentially gave Greek communities a dual identity that their envoys could project through their oratory – a *polis* identity and a federal identity. Taking the Kytenian embassy to Xanthos as a case study, I argued that the text indicates that the corporate character projection of the envoys consisted of both a localised Dorian identity as well as a wider Aitolian identity. As a member of the Aitolian *koinon*, the Kytenian envoys were able to enhance their authority but demonstrating that their mission had the support of a much larger and

⁶³⁶ Giovanni (1971) 14-24; Walbank (1981) 152-8; Beck (1997) 10-3; Funke (2018) *passim*.

more influential federal state, and it also allowed them to adopt the Aitolian corporate image when they narrated how they had gone to the defence of Delphoi when their city walls were destroyed. On the other hand, the projection of their ethnic identity as Dorians allowed them to invoke the kinship they shared with Xanthos, and therefore the obligations associated with that. Similarly, the Akraiphians during the second century shows how the envoys were able to adapt their script depending on the geopolitical position of the community they were addressing.

Where the inscriptions are more limited, however, is in representing the sort of rhetoric where a community has to account for a change in foreign policy and deliver a speech before a community with whom relations have previously been under strain. As Rhodes and Osborne remarked in the case of the Athenian decree for Neapolis (*IG* I³ 101), the details about Neapolis' strained relationship with their metropolis were perhaps felt to be 'politically incorrect'.⁶³⁷ On the other hand, Polybios' and Xenophon's reconstruction of diplomatic oratory shows that envoys had to account for prior poor relations in their speeches, yet the inscriptions do not dwell on prior inconvenient history, and when they do they sometimes rewrite the history of relations between those two communities or neglect to mention those tense periods in their history. Having records of poor relations on stone would naturally pose a problem when the nature of a relationship between two states changes, and the literary and epigraphic evidence suggests states were happy to erase or even destroy *stelai* that may compromise future relations. While Polybios and Xenophon controlled the editorial process of the speeches they reconstructed and/or reported, likewise the political organs of the Greek city controlled the editorial process of the rhetoric they chose to inscribe.

⁶³⁷ Rhodes & Osborne (2017) 524-31.

Conclusion

The intention of this thesis was to address two general yet fundamental research questions. Firstly, are the envoys' speeches in Polybios mainly a reflection of a generic convention established in the Classical Period by earlier historiographers, or do they reflect an attempt to represent oratory as it was practised in the third and second centuries? And secondly, in what ways do the hundreds of Hellenistic inscriptions containing summaries of ambassadors' oratory contribute to our knowledge of envoy speeches in the third and second centuries, and how far do they complement or contradict the evidence of Polybios? Naturally, the answer is both and the influences go both ways, and the next question is the extent to which they do so.

In Chapter One I took the renewal (*anaeousthai*) of relationships as a case study, examining the extent to which the literary representation of ambassadorial speeches in Polybios, earlier historiographers, and the epigraphic evidence, show envoys engaging in this sort of rhetoric. My survey of the evidence demonstrated that the renewal of a several types of relationship, namely benefactions (*ta philathropa*), friendship (*philia*), alliance (*summachia*), and kinship (*sungeneia*), were an important aspect in the oral performances delivered by envoys in the inscriptions of the third and second centuries as well as in the ambassadorial speeches reported by Polybios in *oratio obliqua*. By contrast, in the evidence for ambassadorial oratory from the fifth and fourth centuries, the act of renewal is extremely scarce. Where we do find the act of renewal used, however, is in relationships existing between individuals and between individuals and the state, rather than in the context of relationships shared between two communities as a collective. I suggested that the stark similarity in the representation of the act of renewal in Polybios and the inscriptions should perhaps come as no surprise on the grounds that Polybios is most likely using inscriptions in his work, potentially even

paraphrasing motivation clauses from decrees. In this regard, envoys' speeches in Polybios' *Histories* reflect how ambassadorial oratory was practiced in the third and second centuries, or at least as close as we can get in the absence of published speeches, on the grounds the sort of rhetoric he reports is attested in contemporary evidence. I urged, however, that the absence of the rhetoric of renewal in the historiography and inscriptions prior to the late fourth century does not mean that this sort of rhetoric was unknown in ambassadorial oratory before this time, but rather that it may have become more commonly subsequently.

In Chapter Two, character projection (*ethos*) in the historiographical evidence was the main aspect of my discussion. I surveyed all the envoys' speeches that Polybios reports in *oratio recta* and conducted a rhetorical analysis to see how the envoys in his *Histories* use *ethos* in their rhetorical argumentation. My findings demonstrated that the use of character projection in ambassadorial oratory as represented in Polybios is rich and multifaceted. Throughout many of the speeches, the envoys speak in the first person singular and on occasion gave subtle indications that the arguments they are making are their own and not necessarily the arguments of their community as a collective. I also found that the *ethos* envoys project in their speeches in Polybios is seldom static, and that speakers sometimes shift from the first-person plural to the singular, reflecting both their personal *ethos* as well as their role as a spokesperson for their community. Another important observation was how speakers who represented communities that were also members of federal states could project an *ethos* that combines the identity of their *polis* with the federal identity of their *koinon*. I suggested that envoys could downplay or enhance either *ethos* when it was rhetorically most advantageous, especially if the community they were addressing had a poor relationship with either the speaker's federal state or their city. The final observation I made was how ambassadorial oratory could be increasingly

party political in nature. I argued that the evidence of Polybios suggests that envoys were happy to place the blame for poor relations between the speaker's community and their addressees on another faction within their *polis* that happened to be in control of the city at the time the relations went sour. I observed that this was only natural in the Greek city state culture of the third and second centuries, where civil war (*stasis*) was rife and different factions were frequently battling for control of their community, with the dividing lines often drawn between which hegemonic power either faction would like the community to be allied to.

I next conducted a similar analysis of the envoys' speeches that Polybios reports in *oratio obliqua*, of which there are many. I observed that unlike all but one speech performed by an envoy in *oratio recta*, the speeches in indirect discourse are not attributed to individual speakers but to a group of (usually named) envoys. This limitation meant that it was much more difficult to conduct the sort of rhetoric analysis as I had done on the speeches in direct discourse, but the fact that Polybios often gives all the names of the ambassadorial team is hugely insightful. I argued that, when the prosopographical information is available, the political standing of many of the envoys would suggest that they too had the authority to project a more personalised *ethos*. I then argued that while there are obvious differences between the two ways of reporting speeches, the phenomenon of ambassadorial teams added further contextual problems when reading the oral performances reported by Polybios. While Polybios will report some envoys' speeches in *oratio recta* and attribute them to a named individual, he will only hint that the speaker was only one member of the delegation and will not dwell on what the other members of the ambassadorial team said. By contrast, Polybios will attribute the speeches reported in *oratio obliqua* to several named individuals, thereby rendering it impossible to ascertain which members of the delegation made which arguments. I argued this has huge

implications for our approach to rhetoric in historiography since it limits our access to the oratory as it was performed at the time. Music best demonstrates this issue; trying to reconstruct what a team of ambassadors argued based on the speeches reported in *oratio recta* in Polybios is like trying to engage with a whole musical suite by only listening to one or two movements. On the other hand, trying to reconstruct what a team of ambassadors argued based on the speeches reported in *oratio obliqua* in Polybios is like trying to engage with a musical suite by listening to all the separate movements at one time.

Having observed these trends in ambassadorial oratory in Polybios, my next consideration was whether similar phenomenon are apparent in the envoys' speeches reported by Thucydides and Xenophon. In contrast to Polybios, I found that the use of character projection by envoys in their oral performances recorded by Thucydides to be much more limited. The envoys generally spoke in the first-person plural, as if they were merely spokespeople for their community, and they generally made no appeal to any personal authority that they had, with one notable exception in Hermokrates. In addition, rather than attributing the speeches to one named individual speaker, Thucydides generally attributes them to groups of unnamed individuals identified by their ethnicon, e.g. the Corinthians, which makes the representation of the oral performance much more impersonal. There are however a handful of exceptions. For instance, sometimes Thucydides gives the names of the envoys yet he still attributes the oral performance to the collective voice of the community, and even if we have prosopographical information about one of the envoys and know they were of a high standing, the speech does not give any indication of this. By contrast, the ambassadorial speeches in Xenophon's *Hellenika* show a degree of similarity with those in Polybios. While we find speeches attributed to groups of unknown individuals denoted by their ethnicon, we also find highly personalised oral performances

delivered by envoys. Speakers such as Kallikratidas, Polydamas, and Prokles deliver highly personalised performances and appeal to their personal authority as part of their rhetorical strategy. While it was tempting to conclude based on the chronology of my evidence that envoys adopted a much more personalised and varied rhetorical strategy in terms of their character projection, this was a problematic assumption. Instead, I argued that we were probably dealing with stylistic developments within historiography, and in particular, the habit of reporting speeches. I argued, based on the observations of Gray, that historiography shows an increased consciousness for dramatic realism (*mimesis*) in how speeches are reported, and that in the case of my discussion, it was Thucydides who potentially provided the least reliable insight into ambassadorial oratory was practised. Therefore, Polybios' envoys' speeches are to some extent a product of generic conventions within historiography, however the conventions that Polybios is influenced by are probably products of the fourth century historiographical tradition, and it would not be surprising if Xenophon himself was an influence owing to his literary influence in the centuries that followed his death.

Chapter Three sought to establish whether we could detect the same or similar rhetorical strategies discussed in the previous chapter in the epigraphic evidence. I found that the inscriptions of the fifth and early fourth centuries were 'Thucydidean' in their representation of envoys; the envoys are generally identified by their ethnicon, and their names are only generally given if they had been granted honours by their host community, or if the evidence was prospective in nature, who had been chosen as envoys. While this shows that the identity of the individual envoys did matter, the inscriptions do not often dwell on why those particular citizens were chosen as ambassadors. While the evidence from the late fourth century onwards is much more elaborate generally, the representation of envoys' speeches is still comparatively impersonal compared with the oral performances recorded in

Xenophon and Polybios, but more personalised when compared with earlier inscriptions. The inscriptions from this period onwards generally give the names of the individual members of the delegation, but the summary of the oral performance contained within the decrees is generally attributed to the named envoys as a collective and does not elaborate on which members of the delegation made which arguments. In this regard, the inscriptional evidence is similar to envoys' speeches reported by Polybios and Xenophon in *oratio obliqua*. But why did the inscriptions generally opt for a more impersonalised representation of ambassadorial oratory? I argued that this was due to the 'neutralising nature' of inscriptions, which were intended to represent the voice of the community as a collective. I suggested that including the arguments made by each of the envoys, especially if they represented different factions from within the community, would monumentalise division within the political community and may even exacerbate existing divisions within it.

The next question I turned to concerns the corporate nature of ambassadorial oratory in the epigraphic evidence; to what extent did envoys project the corporate image of their community, and could it change depending on the *kairos*? This question was made more relevant by a recent paper by Tuci, who argued that the historiographical evidence for Thebes does not suggest that Theban envoys projected a uniquely Theban *ethos*. Taking two case studies, the Aitolian League and the Rhodians, I argued that the epigraphic evidence suggests that these states were hugely conscious of a distinct collective characterisation, and that the image the state wished to project of themselves found its way into the speeches performed by envoys on behalf of these communities. In building on Tuci's findings about Thebans in the fifth and fourth centuries, I argued that both the epigraphic and historiographical evidence of the third and second centuries suggests that the diplomatic self-representation found in ambassadorial oratory could vary from

community to community. This discussion also demonstrated that the rhetoric sometimes put into the mouths of Aitolian and Rhodian speakers in Polybios is also reflected the inscriptional evidence, lending credibility to the claim that he is attempting to reflect ambassadorial oratory as it was practised in his own day.

Then, taking two cases studies, the Aitolian League and the Boiotian League, I argued that the epigraphic evidence suggested that there was a degree of flexibility as to whether envoys could emphasise their federal *ethos* to enhance their authority, especially if their constituent *polis* was small and did not have enough standing to win the trust of the host community in its own right. These envoys, who represented a community that was also a member of a federal state, had two identities their disposal which they could use as part of their rhetorical repertoire. I then argued that while envoys in Polybios and Xenophon are happy to account for prior strained relationships as part of their rhetorical strategy, the inscriptions tend not to dwell on these issues and sometimes even rewrite or spin history to suit the foreign policy needs of the time. I argued that this was probably on the grounds that the inscriptions do not generally commemorate what might be perceived as mistakes, and that the Greeks were generally content to physically destroy inscriptions that contradicted their foreign policy agendas.

In short, do the envoys' speeches in Polybios represent oratory as it was practiced in his own day, or are they a product of historiographic generic conventions? As with most things, it is most likely a combination of both. The speeches in *oratio recta* naturally have much in common with earlier historiography, most notably those of Xenophon. But the speeches in *oratio obliqua* and the inscriptional evidence complement each other, which is most likely a reflection of Polybios' methodology in using documents as historical sources, which contained summaries of actual oratory that was performed in the third and second centuries. In approaching this question, this thesis has

shed new light on how we approach oratory in Polybios, one of the most important sources of Hellenistic rhetoric, in arguing that his representation of oratory both takes inspiration from the fourth century historiographical tradition, and also reflects how oratory was practiced in his own day in the second century. My rhetorical analysis of ambassadorial oratory, both in from historiography and in the inscriptions, has demonstrated that it did not just consist of a representative speaking on behalf of their community. There were a variety of different considerations that could impact the performance, and envoys were often not merely an extension of their community on legs when they spoke. The evidence of Polybios and Xenophon, supplemented by the inscriptions, suggest that envoys engaged in the sort of sophisticated rhetorical techniques we find in deliberative, forensic, and epideictic oratory.

Bibliography⁶³⁸

- Achilli, I. (2012) *Il Proemio del Libro 20 della Biblioteca Storica di Diodoro Siculo*, Lanciano: Carabba.
- Adcock, F. (1975) *Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Ager, S. (1991) 'Rhodes: The Rise and Fall of a Neutral Diplomat', *Historia* 40: pp.10-41.
- (1996) *Interstate Arbitrations in the Greek World, 337-90 B.C.*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Amendola, D. (2019) 'Presbeutikoi and Enteutikoi Logoi in Hellenistic Interstate Relations. Some Further Thoughts from an Epigraphical Perspective (c. 306 – 205 B. C.)', *Ktēma* 44: pp.87-103.
- Angelucci, M. (2011) 'Polemon's contribution to the periegetic literature of the II century B.C.', *ὄρμος* 3: pp.326-41.
- Antonetti, C. (1990) *Les Étolians: image et religion*, Besançon: Université de Besançon.
- (2012) 'Aitolos and Aitolia: ethnic identity per imagines', in *Identitätsbildung und Identitätsstiftung in griechischen Gesellschaften*, ed. by M. Offenmüller (Graz: Grazer Universitätsverlag), pp.183-200.
- (2019) 'Spearhead and Boar Jawbone – An Invitation to Hunt in Aitolia: 'Foreign Policy' within the Aitolian League', in *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, ed. by H. Beck, K. Buraselis, and A. McAuley (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.149-65.
- Arrayás Morales, I. (2013) 'Elites en conflicto. El impacto de las guerras mitridáticas en las *poleis* de Asia Menor', *Athenaeum* 101: pp.517-33
- Avezzù, G. (1982) *Alcidamante, orazioni e fragmenti*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider

⁶³⁸ The abbreviations used in this bibliography correspond to those in *L'Année Philologique*. In cases where there is no abbreviation in *L'Année Philologique*, I have written out the title of the journal in full.

- Baragwanath, E. (2017) 'The Character and Function of Speeches in Xenophon', in *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, ed. by M. A. Flower (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.279-97.
- Baron, C. (2013) *Timaeus of Tauromenium and Hellenistic Historiography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Battistoni, F. (2020) 'Documents and envoys: was the word enough?', *SCO* 66: pp.143-58.
- Baukova, A. (2013) 'Pergamum and Ephesus in Mithridates' Wars Times', in *Lucius Cornelius Sulla. History and Tradition* (ed. by D. Słapek and I. Łuć (Lublin: Maria Curie-Skłodowska University Press), pp.57-64.
- Bauman, R. A. (1990) *Political Trials in Ancient Greece*, London: Routledge.
(2001) *Human Rights in Ancient Rome*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bauslaugh, R. A. (1991) *The Concept of Neutrality in Classical Greece*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Bearzot, C. (2003) 'L'uso dei documenti i Tucidide', in *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica*, ed. by A. M. Biraschi et. al. (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane), pp.265-311.
(2014) 'The Use of Documents in Xenophon's *Hellenica*', in *Between Thucydides & Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*, ed. by G. Parmeggiani (Cambridge MA: Center for Hellenic Studies), pp.89-114.
(2017) 'Mantineia, Decelea, and the Interwar Years (421-414 BCE)', in *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, ed. by R. Balot, S. Forsdyke, and E. Foster (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.145-60.
- Beck, H. (1997) *Polis und Koinon. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Struktur der griechischen Bundesstaaten im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- Beck, H. and Ganter, A. (2015) 'Boiotia and the Boiotian League', in *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, ed. by H. Beck and P. Funke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.132-57.
- Bencivenni, A. (2014) 'The King's Words: Hellenistic Royal Letters in Inscriptions', in *State Correspondence in the Ancient World. From New Kingdom Egypt to the Roman Empire*, ed. by K. Radner (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.141-71.
- (2021) 'Εὐνοια : buone pratiche nell'esercizio del potere in Asia Minore ellenistica'. in *L'Asie mineure occidentale au III^e siècle A.C.*, ed by P. Brun, L. Capdetrey, and P. Fröhlich (Bordeaux: Ausonius), pp.77-102.
- Bers, V. (1997) *Speech in Speech: Studies in Incorporated Oratio Recta in Attic Drama and Oratory*, Lanham ML: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Berthold, R. M. (1984) *Rhodes in the Hellenistic Age*, Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bertrand, J-M. (1981) 'La revendication de liberté, réflexions sur les modalités du discours politique dans les cites grecques', in *Images et representations du pouvoir et de l'ordre social dans l'antiquité*, ed. by M. Molin (Paris: De Boccard), pp.11-25.
- Biard, G. (2017) *La représentation honorifique dans les cités grecques aux époques classique et hellénistique*, Athens: École française d'Athènes.
- Bielman, A. (1994) *Retour à la liberté: libération et sauvetage des prisonniers en Grèce ancienne: recueil d'inscriptions honorant des sauveteurs et analyse critique*, Lausanne: Faculté des lettres de l'Université de Lausanne.
- Bikermann, E. (1943) 'Notes sur Polybe II. Les negotiations entre Aratos et Antigonos Doson', *REG* 56: pp.287-304.
- Blank, T. (2014) *Logos und Praxis. Sparta als politisches Exemplum in den Schriften des Isokrates*, Berlin: De Gruyter.

- Blanshard, A. (2007) 'The problems with honouring Samos: an Athenian document relief and its interpretation', in *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, ed. by Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.19-37.
- Boffo, L. and Faraguna, M. (2021) *Le poleis e i loro archivi. Studi su pratiche documentarie, istituzioni e società nell'antichità greca*, Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- Bowie, E. (2017) 'Xenophon's Influence in Imperial Greece', *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, ed. by M. A. Flower (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.403-15.
- Bommelaer, J. F. (1991) *Guide de Delphes: Le site*, Paris: École française d'Athènes.
- Börm, H. (2018) 'Stasis in Post-Classical Greece: The Discourse of Civil Strife in the Hellenistic World', in *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by H. Börm and N. Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.53-83.
- Bostdorff, D. M. (2011) 'Epideictic Rhetoric in the Service of War: George W. Bush on Iraq and the 60th Anniversary of the Victory over Japan', *Communication Monographs* 78: pp.296-323.
- Bousquet, J. (1958) 'Inscriptions de Delphes', *BCH* 82: pp.61-91.
- Bousquet, J. and Gauthier, P. (1994) 'Inscriptions du Létôon de Xanthos', *REG* 107: pp.319-61.
- Bowie, A. M. (2007) *Herodotus. Histories VIII*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brennan, T. C. (2009) 'Embassies gone wrong: Roman diplomacy in the Constantinian *Excerpta de Legationibus*', in *Diplomats and Diplomacy in the Roman World*, ed. by C. Eilers (Leiden: Brill), pp.171-91.
- Bresson, A. (1999) 'Rhodes and Lycia in Hellenistic Times', in *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture and Society*, ed. by V. Gabrielsen, P. Bilde, T.

- Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, and J. Zahle (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press), pp.98-131.
- (2000) *La cité marchande*, Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Bringman, K. (2002) 'Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistischen Welt', *Chiron* 32: 65-81.
- Briscoe, J. (1981) *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV-XXXVII*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Brock, R. (1995) 'Versions, "Inversions" and Evasions: Classical Historiography and the "Published" Speech"', *PLLS* 8: pp.209-24.
- Brunschwig, J. (1984) 'Hippias d'Élis, philosophe ambassadeur', in *E archaia Sophistike – The Sophistic Movement*, ed. by C. Boudouris (Athenès: Kardamitsa): pp.269-76.
- Bruss, K. and Graff, K. (2005) 'Style, Character, and Persuasion in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*', *AHB* 8: pp.39-72.
- Buck, R. J. (1993) 'The Hellenistic Boiotian League', *AHB* 7: pp100-6.
- Buckler, J. and Beck, H. (2008) *Central Greece and the Politics of Power in the Fourth Century BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burton, P. (2011) *Friendship and Empire: Roman Diplomacy and Imperialism in the Middle Republic (353-146 BC)*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cairns, D. (1999) 'Representations of Remorse and Reparation in Classical Greece', in *Remorse and Reparations*, ed. by M. Cox (London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers), pp.171-8.
- Canalli de Rossi, F. (1997) *Le ambascerie dal mondo greco a Roma in età repubblicana*, Rome: Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica.
- Canevaro, M. (2018) 'Demosthenic Influences in Early Rhetorical Education: Hellenistic *Rhetores* and Athenian Imagination', in *The Hellenistic Reception of Classical Athenian Democracy and Political Thought*, ed. by M. Canevaro and B. Gray (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.73-91.

- Canfora, L. (1974) *Discorsi e lettere di Demotene: discorsi all'assemblea*, Torino: UTET.
- Carlsson, S. (2010) *Hellenistic Democracies: Freedom, Independence and Political Procedure in Some East Greek-City States*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2013) *Ancient Greek Letter Writing: A Cultural History (600 BC – 150 BC)*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2018) 'Letters and Decrees: Diplomatic Protocols in the Hellenistic Period', in *Letters and Communities. Studies in the Socio-Political Dimensions of Ancient Epistolography*, ed. by P. Ceccarelli, L. Doering, T. Fögen, and I. Gildenhard (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.148-83.
- Champion, C. (1995) 'The Soteria at Delphi: Aetolian Propaganda in the Epigraphical Record', *AJPh* 116: 213-20
- (1996) 'Polybius, Aetolia and the Gallic Attack on Delphi (278 B.C.)', *Historia* 45: pp.315-87.
- (1997) 'The Nature of Authoritative Evidence in Polybius and the Speech of Agelaus at Naupactus', *TAPhA* 127: 111-28
- Chaniotis, A. (1999) 'The Epigraphy of Hellenistic Crete. The Cretan Koinon: New and Old Evidence', in *XI Congresso Internazionale di Epigrafia Greca e Latina. Roma, 18-24 settembre 1997. Atti I* (Roma: Edizioni Quasar), pp. 287-300.
- (1999a) 'Empfängerformular und Urkundenfälschung: Bemerkungen zum Urkundendossier von Magnesia am Mäander', in *Urkunden und Urkundenformulare im Klassischen Altertum und in den orientalischen Kulturen*, ed. by R. G. Khoury (Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter), pp.51-69.
- (2004) 'Justifying Territorial Claims in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: The Beginnings of International Law?', in *The Law and the Courts in*

Ancient Greece, ed. by E. M. Harris and L. Rubinstein (London: Duckworth), pp.185-213.

(2004a) *Das Antike Kreta*, München: Originalausgabe.

(2005) 'Ein Mißverstandenes Ritual der griechischen Diplomatie: Geschichte als Argument', in *Die Welt der Rituale. Von der Antike bis heute*, ed. by S. Hotz, G. Schwedler, and S. Weinfurter (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft), pp.106-09.

(2005a) *Warfare in the Hellenistic World. A Social and Cultural History*, Oxford: Blackwell.

(2006) 'Die hellenistischen Kriege als Ursache von Migration: Das Beispiel Kreta', in *Migrationen in der antiken Welt. Stuttgarter Kolloquium zur Historischen Geographie des Altertums 8, 2002*, ed. by E. Ohlshausen and H. Sonnabend (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.93-103.

(2009) 'Überzeugungsstrategien in der griechischen Diplomatie', in *Überzeugungsstrategien*, ed. by A. Chaniotis, A. Kropp, and C. Steinhoff (Heidelberg: Springer), pp.147-65.

(2009a) 'Travelling memories in the Hellenistic World', in *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture. Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, ed. by R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 249-69.

(2012) 'Moving Stones: The Study of Emotions in Greek Inscriptions', in *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World*, ed. by C. Chaniotis (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.91-129.

(2012a) 'Commemoration of War in the Hellenistic City', in *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials Ancient & Modern*, ed. by P. Low, G. Oliver, and P. J. Rhodes (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.41-62.

- (2013) 'Paradoxon, Enargeia, Empathy: Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Oratory', in *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*, ed. by C. Kremmydas and K. Tempest (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.201-16
- (2013a) 'Emotional Language in Hellenistic Decrees and Hellenistic Histories', *Studi ellenistici* 27: pp. 339-352.
- (2013b) 'Emotions in Public Inscriptions of the Hellenistic Age', *Mediterraneo antico* 16: pp.745-60.
- (2016) 'History as an Argument in Hellenistic Oratory', in *La rhétorique du pouvoir: une exploration de l'art oratoire délibératif grec*, ed. by P. Derron (Genève: Foundation Hardt), pp.129-74.
- Chantraine, P. (1968) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*, Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- Chiron, P. (2001) *Un rhéteur méconnu: Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère). Essai sur les mutations de la théorie du style à l'époque hellénistique*, Paris: Librairie philosophique.
- Christ, M. R. (1998) *The Litigious Athenian*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press.
- (2013) 'Demosthenes on *philanthrōpia* as a democratic virtue', *CPh* 108.3: pp.202-22.
- Chrubasik, B. (2013) 'The Attalids and the Seleukid Kings, 281-175 BC', in *Attalid Asia Minor. Money, International Relations, and the State*, ed. by P. Thonemann (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.83-119.
- Clarke, K. (2013) *Making Time for the Past. Local History and the Polis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crowther, C. (1992) 'The Decline of Greek Democracy?', *JAH* 7: pp.13-48.
- (1995) 'Iasos in the Second Century BC III: Foreign Judges from Priene', *BICS* 40: pp.91-138.

- Culasso Gastaldi, E. (2003) 'Eroi della città: Eufrone di Sicione e Licurgo di Atene', in *Mondelli eroici dall'antichità alla cultura europea*, ed. by C. Bearzot, A. Barzano, F. Landucci Gattinoni (Bergamo: L'Erma Di Bretschneider), pp.65-98.
- Curty, O. (1995) *Les parentés légendaires entre cités grecques: catalogue raisonné des inscriptions contenant le terme "syngeneia" et analyse critique*, Genève: Librairie Droz.
- Daux, G. (1937) 'Alcibiade, proxène de Lacédémone', in *Mélanges offerts à A. M. Desrousseaux par ses amis et ses élèves, en l'honneur de sa cinquantième année d'enseignement supérieur (1887-1937)* (Paris: Librairie Hachette), pp.117-22.
- Davies, J. K. (1971) *Athenian Propertied Families 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1996) 'Documents and "Documents" in Fourth-Century Historiography', in *Le IV^e siècle av. J.-C. Approches historiographiques*, ed. by P. Carlier (Nancy: De Boccard), pp.29-39.
- de Bakker, M. (2018) 'Herodotus', in *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by K. de Temmerman and E. van Emde Boas (Leiden: Brill), pp.135-52.
- de Bruyère, J. (1688) *Les caractères*, Paris: H. Dider.
- de Ste Croix, G. E. M. (1972) *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*, London: Duckworth.
- Deininger, J. (1971) *Der politische Widerstand gegen Rom in Griechenland, 217-86 v. Chr.*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- (1974) 'Bemerkungen zur Historizität der Rede des Agelaos, 217 v. Chr.', *Chiron* 3: pp.103-8.
- Derow, P. (1970) 'Polybios and the Embassy of Kallikrates', in *Essays Presented to C. M. Bowra*. Reprinted in 2010 in *Rome, Polybius, and the East*, ed.

- by A. Erskine and J. Crawley Quinn (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.169-79.
- Develin, R. (1989) *Athenian Officials 684-321 BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dixon, M. D. (2001) 'IG IV².1.75+ and the date of the arbitration between Epidauros and Hermion', *ZPE*: pp.169-73.
- Dmitriev, S. (2005) *City Government in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2011) *The Greek Slogan of Freedom and Early Roman Politics in Greece*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Domingo Gyax, M. (2016) *Benefactions and Rewards in the Ancient Greek City: The Origins of Euergetism*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dössel, A. (2003) *Die Beilegung innerstaatlicher Konflikte in den griechischen Poleis vom 5.-3. Jahrhundert v.Chr.*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Dreyer, B. (2002) 'Die Thrasykrates-Rede bei Polybios', *ZPE* 140: pp.33-9.
- Ducrey, P. (1968) *Le traitement des prisonniers de guerre dans la Grèce antique des origines à la conquête romaine*, Paris: Editions de Boccard.
- Dušanić, S. (2008) 'Hippias the Elean: The Revolutionary Activities and Political Attitudes of a Sophist', *Aevum* 82.1: pp.41-50.
- Eckstein, A. M. (1995) *Moral Vision in the Histories of Polybius*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- (2006) *Mediterranean Anarchy, Interstate War, and the Rise of Rome*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- (2008) *Rome Enters the Greek East: From Anarchy to Hierarchy in the Hellenistic Mediterranean, 230-188 B.C.*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Edwards, M. (1995) *Andocides*, Warminster: Aris and Phillips.
- Ehrenberg, V. (1960) *The Greek State*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ehrhardt, N. (1988) *Milet und seine Kolonien*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

- Elwyn, S. (1990) 'The Recognition Decrees for the Delphian Soteria and the Date of Smyrna's Inviolability', *JHS* 110: pp.177-80.
- Errington, R. (2006) 'Chios in the Third Century B.C.' in *Chiakon Symposium eismnemen* W.G. Forrest, ed. by G. E. Malouchou and A. P. Mattaiou (Athens: Hellenike Epigraphike Hetaireia), pp.137-47.
- Erskine, A. (2007) 'Rhetoric and Persuasion in the Hellenistic World: Speaking up for the *Polis*', in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. by I. Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell), pp.274-85
- Étienne, R. and D. Knoepfler (1976) 'Hyettos de Béotie et la chronologie des archontes fédéraux entre 250 et 171 ac. J.-C.' *BCH* Supp.3: pp.
- Fabiani, R. (2003) 'Epigrafi in Erodoto', in *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica*, ed. by A. M. Birashi et al (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane), pp.163-85.
- (2015) *I decreti onorati di Iasos: cronologia e storia*, Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.
- Faraguna, M. (2013) 'Archives in Classical Athens: Some Observations', in *Legal Documents in Ancient Societies IV: Archives and Archival Documents in Ancient Societies. Trieste, 30 September - 1 October 2011*, ed. by M. Faraguna (Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste), pp.163-71
- Ferguson, W. S. (1911) *Hellenistic Athens. An Historical Essay*, London: MacMillan.
- Ferrario, S. (2014) 'The Tools of Memory', in *Between Thucydides & Polybius: The Golden Age of Greek Historiography*, ed. by G. Parmeggiani (Washington DC: Center for Hellenic Studies), pp.263-88.
- Feyel, M. (1942) *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au IIIe siècle avant notre ère*, Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Flacelière, R. (1937) *Les Aitoliens à Delphes: Contribution à l'histoire de la Grèce centrale au IIIe siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris: E de. Boccard.

- Flower, H. I. (2006) *The Art of Forgetting. Disgrace & Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*, Chapel Hill NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Fornara, C. W. (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fossey, J. M. (1988) *Topography and Population of Ancient Boiotia*, Chicago: Ares Publishers.
- Fragoulaki, M. (2013) *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fuks, A. (1952) *The Ancestral Constitution. Four Studies in Athenian Party Politics at the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, London: Routledge.
- Fulkerson, L. (2004) 'Metameleia and Friends: Remorse and Repentance in Fifth- and Fourth-Century Athenian Oratory', *Phoenix* 58: pp.241-59.
- Funke, P. (2015) 'Aitolia and the Aitolian League', in *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, ed. by H. Beck and P. Funke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.86-117.
- (2018) 'Poleis and Koina: Reshaping the World of the Greek States in Hellenistic Times', in *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by H. Börm and N. Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.109-29.
- Gabrowski, T. (2012) 'The Ptolemies versus the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues in the 250s-220s BC', *Electrum* 19 (*The Greek World in the 4th and 3rd Centuries BC*), pp.83-97.
- Ganter, A. (2019) 'Federalism Based on Emotions? Pamboiotian Festivals in Hellenistic and Roman Times', in *Ethnos and Koinon: Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, ed. by H. Beck, K. Buraselis, and A. McAuley (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.83-98.
- Gargarin, M. (2002) *Antiphon the Athenian: Oratory, Law, and Justice in the Age of the Sophists*, Austin TX: University of Texas Press.
- Garson, R. W. (1975) 'The Minor Characters of Polybius', *Prudentia* 7: pp.3-10.

- Gauthier, P. (1972) *Symbola: Les étrangers et la justice dans les cités grecques*, Nancy: L'Université de Nancy.
- (1985) *Les cites grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Paris: École française d'Athènes.
- Gawantka, W. (1975) *Isopolitie: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, München: C.H. Beck.
- Gehrke, H.-J. (2001) 'Myth, History, and Collective Identity: uses of the past in ancient Greece and beyond', in *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. by N. Luraghi (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 286-313.
- Giovanni, A. (1971) *Untersuchungen über die Natur und die Anfänge der bundesstaatlichen Sympolitie in Griechenland*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht.
- (1993), 'Greek Cities and the Commonwealth' in *Images and Ideologies: Self-definition in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by A. Bulloch, E. S. Gruen, A. A. Long, and A. Stewart (Berkeley: University of California Press), pp.265-86.
- Girdvaintye, L. (2020) 'Law and Citizenship in Roman Achaia: Continuity and Change', in *Law in the Roman Provinces*, ed. by K. Czajkowski and B. Eckhardt (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.210-42.
- Gomme, A. W. (1945) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gomme, A.W., Andrewes, A., and Dover, D. (1970) *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gottschalk, H. B. (2000) 'Demetrius of Phalerum: A Politician among Philosophers and a Philosopher among Politicians', in *Demetrius of Phalerum. Text, Translation and Discussion*, ed. by W. W. Fortenbaugh

- and E. Schütrumpf (New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers), pp.367-80.
- Graham, A. J. (1964) *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Grainger, J. D. (1995) 'The Expansion of the Aitolian League, 280-260 BC', *Mnemosyne* 48, pp.213-43.
- (1999) *The League of the Aitolians*, Leiden: Brill.
- (2000) *Aitolian Prosopographical Studies*, Leiden: Brill.
- (2002) *The Roman War of Antiochos the Great*, Leiden: Brill.
- (2018) *Great Power Diplomacy in the Hellenistic World*, London: Routledge.
- Grandjean, C. (2003) *Les Messéniens de 370/369 au 1^{er} siècle de notre ère. Monnaies et histoire*, Athens: École française d'Athènes.
- Gray, B. (2015) *Stasis and Stability. Exile, the Polis, and Political Thought, c.404-146 BC*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gray, V. (1987) 'Mimesis in Greek Historical Theory', *AJP* 108, pp.468-86.
- (1989) *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, London: Duckworth.
- Grieb, V. (2008) *Hellenistische Demokratie. Politische Organisation und Struktur in freien griechischen Poleis nach Alexander dem Großen*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- (2013) 'Polybios' Wahre Demokratie und die *politeia* von Poleis und Koina in den Historien', in *Polybios und seine Historien*, ed. by V. Grieb and C. Koehn (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.183-218.
- Gruen, E. S. (1972) 'Aratus and the Achaean alliance with Macedon', *Historia* 21: 609-25.
- (1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome. Vol. II*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gresik, D. (2021) *Honorific Culture at Delphi in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*, Leiden: Brill.

- Griffith, G. T. (1961) 'Some habits of Thucydides when introducing persons', *PCPhS* 187: pp.21-33.
- Grzesik, D. (2021) *Honorific Communities: the Recipients of Gifts at Delphi*, Leiden: Brill.
- Günther, L. (2013) 'Innergriechische Diplomatie und zwischenstaatliche Beziehungen in den Historien des Polybios', in *Polybios und seine Historien*, ed. by V. Grieb and C. Koehn (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.219-32.
- Haake, M. (2007) *Der Philosoph in der Stadt. Untersuchungen zur öffentlichen Rede über Philsophen und Philsophie in den hellenistischen Polis*, Munich: Beck.
- Habicht, C. (1982) *Studien zur Geschichte Athens in hellenistischer Zeit*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- (1998) *Pausanias' Guide to Greece*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hahm, D. E. (1995) 'Polybios' applied political theory', in *Justice and Generosity: Studies in Hellenistic Social and Political Philosophy. Proceedings of the Sixth Symposium Hellenisticum*, ed. by A. Laks and M. Schofield (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.7-47.
- Halliwell, S. (2002) *The Aesthetics of Mimesis: Ancient Texts and Modern Problems*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hallof, L u. K, and Habicht, C. (1998) 'Aus der Arbeit der "Inscriptiones Graecae" II. Ehrendekrete aus dem Asklepion von Kos', *Chiron* 28: pp.101-42.
- Hamon, P. (2009) 'Démocraties grecques après Alexandre. À propos de trois ouvrages récents', *Topoi* 16: pp.347-82.
- Hansen, F. and Kock, K. (2003) 'Evaluation of Public Spokespersons', *Nordicom Review* 24: pp.27-31.

- Hansen, M. H. (1975) *Eisangelia: The Sovereignty of the People's Court in Athens in the Fourth Century B.C. and the Impeachment of Generals and Politicians*, Odense: Odense University Press.
- (1984) 'Two Notes on Demosthenes' Symbouleutic Speeches', *C&M* 35: pp.71-92.
- (1987) *The Athenian Assembly in the Age of Demosthenes*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- (1989) *The Athenian Ecclesia II: A Collection of Articles 1983-1989*, Copenhagen: Museum Tusculum Press.
- (1991) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles and Ideology (Translated by J. A. Crook)*, Oxford: Blackwell.
- (1993) 'The Battle Exhortation in Ancient Historiography. Fact or Fiction?', *Historia* 42, pp.161-80.
- (2004) 'Boiotia', in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, ed. by M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.431-61.
- (2005) *The Tradition of Ancient Greek Democracy and its Importance for Modern Democracy*, Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.
- (2006) *Polis: An Introduction to the Ancient Greek City-State*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harding, P. E. (2015) *Athens Transformed, 404-262 BC. From Popular Sovereignty to the Dominion of Wealth*, London: Routledge.
- Harris, E. M. (2016) 'Alcibiades, the Ancestors, Liturgies, and the Etiquette of Addressing the Athenian Assembly', in *The Art of History. Literary Perspectives on Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. by V. Liotsakis and S. Farrington (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.145-56.

- Harter-Uibopuu, K. (1998) *Das zwischenstaatliche Schiedsverfahren im achäischen Koinon: zur friedlichen Streitbeilegung nach den epigraphischen Quellen*, Cologne: Böhlau Verlag.
- Hau, L. I. (2016) *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- (2021) 'The fragments of Polybius compared with those of the 'tragic' historians Duris and Phylarchus', *Histos* 15: pp.338-82.
- Heath, M. (1990) 'Justice in Thucydides' Athenian Speeches', *Historia* 39, pp.385-400.
- Herman, G. (1987) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1990) 'Treaties and alliances in the world of Thucydides', *PCPhS* 36, pp.83-102.
- Holleaux, M. (1916) 'Èphèse et les Priéniens du Charax', *REG* 29: pp.29-45.
- (1921) 'L'alliance de Rome et de L'Achaïe', *REG* 34: pp.400-22.
- (1968) *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques III. Lagides et Séleucides*, Paris: Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres.
- Horn, H. (1930) *Foederati: Untersuchungen zur Geschichte ihrer Rechtsstellung im Zeitalter der römischen Republik und des frühen Principats*, PhD thesis: Frankfurt.
- Hornblower, S. (1991) *A Commentary on Thucydides, Vol. 1: Books I–III*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1994) 'Narratology and Narrative Technique in Thucydides', in *Greek Historiography*, ed. by S. Hornblower (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.131-66.
- (1994a) 'Introduction', in *Greek Historiography*, ed. by S. Hornblower (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp.1-72.
- (1995) 'The Fourth Century and Hellenistic Reception of Thucydides', *JHS* 115: pp.47-68.

- (1996) *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume II. Books IV-V.24*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (2007) 'Did the Delphic Amphiktyony Play a Political Role in the Classical Period?', *MHR* 22: pp.39-56.
- (2008) *A Commentary on Thucydides. Volume III. Books 5.25-8.109*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2013) *Herodotus, Histories Book V*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hubbard, T. (2008) 'Getting the Last Word: Publication of Political Oratory as an Instrument of Historical Revisionism', in *Orality, Literacy, Memory in the Ancient Greek and Roman World*, ed. by E. A. Mackay (Leiden: Brill), pp.185-202.
- Hunger, H. (1978) *Die hochsprachliche profane Literatur der Byzantiner. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft XII/5, 1-2*, Munich: Beck.
- Hunt, P. (2003) *Polybius' Concept of pragmatike historia: Constitutional Decline and the Struggle for the Peloponnese*, PhD Thesis: University College, University of London.
- (2010) *War, Peace, and Alliance in Demosthenes' Athens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Huitink, L. and Rood, T. (2022) 'Xenophon', in *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by M. de Bekker and I. J. F. de Jong (Leiden: Brill), pp.246-65.
- Ihlen, Ø, and Raknes, K. (2020) 'Appeals to 'the public interest': How public relations and lobbying create social license to operate', *Public Relations Review* 46:5: pp.1-8.
- Jacoby, F. (1949) *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Jones, A. H. M. (1940) *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Jones, C. (1999) *Kinship Diplomacy in the Ancient World*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Judge, E. A. (1997) 'The Rhetoric of Inscriptions', in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*, ed. by S. E. Porter (Leiden: Brill), pp.807-28.
- Kaimio, J. (1979) *The Romans and the Greek Language*, Helsinki: Ekenäs Tryckeri Aktiebolag.
- Kalliontzis, Y. (2020) *Contribution à l'épigraphie et à l'histoire de la Béotie hellénistique de la destruction de Thèbes à la bataille de Pydna*, Athens: École française d'Athènes.
- Karvounis, C. (2002) *Demosthenes. Studien zu den Demegorien orr. XIV, XVI, XV, IV, I, II, III*, Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Kebric, R. B. (2016) 'Caesar, Douris of Samos, and the death of "Tragic History"', in *De Samos à Rome: personnalité et influence de Douris*, ed. by V. Naas and M. Simon (Nanterre: Presses universitaires de Paris Ouest), pp.341-60.
- Kennedy, G. (1963) *The Art of Persuasion in Ancient Greece*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1972) *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C. – A.D. 300*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1994) *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Kjeldsen, J. (2003) 'Talking to the eye: Visuality in ancient rhetoric', *Word & Image* 19:3, pp.133-7.
- Kjeldsen, J. et al. (2019) *Speechwriting in Theory and Practice*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Knoepfler, D. (2001) *Eretria: fouilles et recherches. 11. Décrets érétriens de proxénie et de citoyenneté*, Lausanne: Editions Payot.

- (2007) 'De Delphes à Thermos: un témoignage épigraphique méconnu sur le trophée galate des Étoliens dans leur capitale', *KRAI* 151: pp.1215-53.
- (2008) 'Louis Robert en sa forge: ébauche d'un mémoire resté inédit sur l'histoire controversée de deux concours grecs, les Trophonia et les Basileia à Lébadée', *Comptes rendus des séances de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 152-4: pp. 1421-1462.
- Kock, C. (2006) 'Multiple Warrants in Practical Reasoning', in *Arguing on the Toulmin Model: New Essays on Argument Analysis and Evaluation*, ed. by D. Hitchcock and B. Verheij (Dordrecht: Springer), pp.247-59.
- (2007) 'Norms of Legitimate Dissensus', *Informal Logic* 27, pp.179-96.
- (2011) 'Why Argumentation Theory Should Differentiate Between Different Types of Claim', in *Conductive Argument: An Overlooked Type of Defeasible Reasoning*, ed. by J. A. Blair and R. H. Johnson (London: College Publishing), pp.62-73.
- (2018) 'The Semiotics and Rhetoric of Music: A Case Study in Aesthetic Protocol Analysis', in *Rhetorical Audience Studies and Reception of Rhetoric: Exploring Audiences Empirically*, ed. by J. E. Kjeldsen (London: Palgrave Macmillan), pp.185-211.
- Koehn, C. (2013) 'Polybios und die Inschriften: Zum Sprachgebrauch des Historikers', in *Polybios und seine Historien*, ed. by V. Grieb and C. Koehn (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.159-82.
- Konstan, D. (2006) *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks. Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- (2010) *Before Forgiveness: The Origins of a Moral Idea*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Korhonen, T. (1997) 'Self-concept and Public Image of Philosophers and Philosophical Schools at the Beginning of the Hellenistic Age', in *Early*

- Hellenistic Athens. Symptoms of Change*, ed. by J. Frösén (Helsinki: Finnish Institute at Athens), pp.33-101.
- Kortenbeutel, H. (1940) 'Philanthropon', in *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Supplementband VII*, ed. by W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung), cols. 1032-34.
- Kotarcic, A. (2021) *Aristotle on Language and Style: The Concept of Lexis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kralli, J. (1999) 'Athens and her leading citizens in the early Hellenistic Period (338-261 B.C.): the evidence of the decrees awarding the highest honours', *Αρχαιολογία* 10: pp.133-61.
- Krampa, J. (1969) *Labraunda. Swedish Excavations and Researches. Vol. III. PART 1. THE GREEK INSCRIPTIONS, Part I: 1-12 (Period of Olympichus)*, Lund: Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- Kremmydas, C. (2007) 'P. Berl. 9781: The early reception of Demosthenes 20', *BICS* 50, pp.19-48.
- (2012) *A Commentary on Demosthenes Against Leptines*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2016) 'Demosthenes' *Philippics* and the Art of Characterisation for the Assembly', in *La rhétorique du pouvoir: Une exploration de l'art oratoire délibératif grec*, ed. by P. Derron (Genève: Fondation Hardt), pp.40-70.
- (2016a) 'Eunoia and Athenian Foreign Relations in the Classical Period', *ΠΛΑΤΩΝ* 60, pp.200-23
- (2017) 'Ēthos and Logical Argument in Thucydides' Assembly Debates', in *The Theatre of Justice: Aspects of Performance in Greco-Roman Oratory and Rhetoric*, ed. by S. Papaioannou, A. Serafim, and B. Da Vela (Leiden: Brill), pp.93-113.
- Kvist, K. (2003) 'Cretan grants of *asylia* – violence and protection as interstate relations', *C&M* 53: 185-222.

- Lalonde, G. V. (1971) *The Publication and Transmission of Greek Diplomatic Documents*, PhD thesis: University of Washington.
- Lambert, S. D. (2004) 'Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1: I. Decrees Honouring Athenians', *ZPE* 150: pp.85-120.
- (2007) 'Athenian State Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1: III. Decrees Honouring Foreigners', *ZPE* 159: pp.101-54.
- (2011) 'What was the point of inscribed honorific decrees in Classical Athens?', in *Sociable Man: Essays on Ancient Greek Social Behaviour in Honour of Nick Fisher*, ed. by S. Lambert (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales), pp.193-214.
- (2012) *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1-322/1 BC. Epigraphical Essays*, Leiden: Brill.
- (2012a) 'Inscribing the Past in Fourth-Century Athens', in *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras. History without Historians*, ed. by J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), pp.253-75.
- Larsen, J. A. O. (1935) 'Was Greece Free between 196 and 146 B.C.?', *CPh* 30: pp.193-214.
- (1968) *Greek Federal States. Their Institutions and History*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lateiner, D. (1989) *The Historical Method of Herodotus*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lefèvre, F. (1995) 'La chronologie du III^e siècle à Delphes, d'après les actes amphictioniques (280-200)', *BCH* 119i: pp.161-208.
- (2004) 'Contrôle d'identité aux frontières dans les cites grecques: la cas des entrepreneurs étrangers et assimilés, in *La mobilité des personnes en Méditerranée de l'antiquité à l'Époque modern. Procédures de contrôle et documents d'identification*, ed. by C. Moatti (Rome: École française de Rome), pp.99-125.

- Lehmann, G. A. (1967) *Untersuchungen zur historischen Glaubwürdigkeit des Polybios*, Münster: Aschendorff.
- (1999) 'Elateia, Aitolien und Rom nach der Entescheidung des 2. makedonischen Krieges', *ZPE* 127, pp.69-83.
- Liddel, P. (2020) *Decrees of Fourth-Century Athens (403/2-322/1 BC). Volume I: The Literary Evidence*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2020a) *Decrees of Fourth-Century Athens (403/2-322/1 BC). Volume II: Political and Cultural Perspectives*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loddo, L. (2019) 'Voluntary Exile and *Eisangelia* in Athens: Remarks about the Lawfulness of a Widespread Practice', *Dike* 22: pp.113-60.
- Longley, G. (2013) 'I Polybius: self-conscious didacticism?', in *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity*, ed. by A. Marmodoro and J. Hill (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.175-205.
- Low, P. (2007) *Interstate Relations in Classical Greece. Morality and Power*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2020) 'Remembering, forgetting, and rewriting the past: Athenian inscriptions and collective memory', *Histos, Supplement* 11: pp.235-68.
- Luraghi, N. (2008) *The Ancient Messenians. Constructions of Ethnicity and Memory*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2010) 'The *demos* as narrator: public honours and the construction of the future and past', in *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, ed. by L. Foxhall, H-J Gehrke, and N. Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.247-63.
- (2017) 'Xenophon's Place in Fourth Century Historiography', in *The Cambridge Companion to Xenophon*, ed. by M. A. Flower (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.84-100.
- (2022) 'Politics of the (Recent) Past: Early Hellenistic Athenian Decrees between Epigraphy and Literature', in *Écrire l'histoire de son temps, de*

- Thucydide à Ammien Marcellin*, ed. by V. Frommentin and P. Derron (Geneva: Fondation Hardt), pp.201-32.
- Luschnat, O. (1970) 'Thukydides' in *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Suppl. XII*, ed. by G. Wissowa et al. (Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag), cols. 1085-354.
- Le Graff, L. (2010) 'A propos d'une erreur de compatibilité dans le compte de Dion', *BCH* 20: pp.206-79.
- Lund, M. (2017) *An Argument on Rhetorical Style*, Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.
- Lücke, S. (2000) *Syngeneia: epigraphisch-historische Studien zu einem Phänomen der antiken griechischen Diplomatie*, Frankfurt: Marthe Clauss.
- MacDowell, D. M. (1978) *The Law in Classical Athens*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- (2000) *Demosthenes, On the False Embassy (Oration 19). Edited with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by Douglas M. MacDowell*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (2009) *Demosthenes the Orator*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mack, W. (2015) *Proxeny and Polis: Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mackil, E. (2013) *Creating a Common Polity: Religion, Economy, and Politics in the Making of the Greek Koinon*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- (2014) 'Creating a common polity in Boeotia', in *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects*, ed. by N. Papazarkadas (Leiden: Brill), pp.45-67.
- (2019) 'Ethnic Arguments' in *Ethnos and Koinon: Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, ed. by H. Beck, K. Buraselis, and A. McAuley (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.11-28.

- Macleod, C. (1977) 'Thucydides' Plataean Debate', *GRBS* 18, pp.227-46.
- Magnetto, A. (1997) *Gli Arbitrati Interstatali Greci. Vol. II, Dal 337 al 196 a. C.*, Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- (2008) *L'arbitrato di Rodi fra Samo e Priene. Edizione Critica, Commento e Indici a Cura di Anna Magnetto*, Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- (2015) 'Interstate Arbitration and Foreign Judges', in *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Law*, ed. by E. Harris and M. Canevaro (Online).
- (2019) 'Modelli di negoziazione e di conclusion dei trattati in epoca classica ed ellenistica', in *La cité interconnectée dans le monde gréco-romain (IVe c.C.-IVe siècle p.C.)*, ed. by M. Dana and I. Savalli-Lestrade (Bordeaux: Ausonius), pp.149-62.
- (2021) 'Messaggeri e ambasciatori delle città greche in età ellenistica: terminologia e prerogative', in *L'Asie mineure occidentale au III^e siècle A.C.*, ed by P. Brun, L. Capdetrey, and P. Fröhlich (Bordeaux: Ausonius), pp.175-87.
- Manieri, (2009) *Agoni Poetirco-Musicali nella Grecia Antica 1. Beozia*, Pisa/Roma: Fabrizio Serra Editore.
- Marek, C. (1984) *Die Proxenie*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Marini, N. (2007) *Demetrio, Lo Stile. Introduzione, Traduzione e Commento di Nicoletta Marini*, Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
- Marincola, J. (1994) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (2007) 'Speeches in the Classical Historiography', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. by J. Marincola (Oxford: Blackwell), pp.118-32.
- (2010) 'The Rhetoric of History: Allusion, Intertextuality, and Exemplarity in Historiographical Speeches', in *Stimmen der Geschichte:*

- Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*, ed. by D. Pausch (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.259-90.
- (2013) 'Polybius, Phylarchus, and 'Tragic History': A Reconsideration', in *Polybius and his world. Essays in memory of F. W. Walbank*, ed. by B. Gibson and T. Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.73-90.
- Mariß, R. (2002) *Alkidamas: Über diejenigen, die schriftliche Reden schreiben, oder über die Sophisten. Eine Sophistenrede aus dem 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. eingeleitet und kommentiert*, Münster: Aschendorff.
- Martin, G. (2009) *Divine Talk: Religious Argumentation in Demosthenes*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Massar, N. (2006) 'La circulation des decrets dans les cités et entre cités à l'époque hellénistique', in *La circulation de l'information dans les états antiques*, ed. by L. Capdetrey and J. Nelis-Clément (Bordeaux: De Boccard), pp.73-87.
- Mattingly, H. (1997) 'Athens between Rome and the Kings: 229/8 to 129 B.C.', in *Hellenistic Constructions. Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography*, ed. by P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey, and E. Gruen (Berkeley: University of California Press), pp.120-44.
- McGing, B. (1986) *The Foreign Policy of Mithridates VI Eupator, King of Pontus*, Brill: Leiden.
- Meiggs, R. and Lewis, D. (1989) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. - Revised Edition*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Mendels, D. (1984-6) 'Did Polybius have 'another' view of the Aetolian League?', *AncSoc* 15-7: pp.63-73.
- Mikalson, J. D. (1998) *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Miller, S. G. (1978) *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

- Miltsios, N. (2013) 'The Narrative Legacy of Thucydides: Polybius, Book I', in *Thucydides Between History and Literature*, ed. by A. Tsakmakis and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.329-49.
- Missiou-Ladi, A. (1987) 'Coercive Diplomacy in Greek Interstate Relations', *CQ* 37: pp.336-45.
- Mitchell, L. (1997) *Greeks Bearing Gifts. The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World 435-323 BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1997a) 'φιλία, εὐνοία and Greek Interstate Relations', *Antichthon* 31, pp. 28-44.
- Moggi, M. (2002) 'Sulle origini della lega Achea', in *Gli Achei e l'identità etnica degli Achei d'Occidente*, ed. by E. Greco (Salerno: Pandemos), pp.117-32.
- Moles, J. L. (1994) 'Xenophon and Callicratidas', *JHS* 114, pp.70-84.
- Momigliano, A. (1978) 'The Historians Craft of the Classical World and Their Audience: Some Suggestions', *ASNP* 8: pp.59-75.
- Morgan, T. (1998) *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mørkholm, O. (1967) 'The Speech of Agelaus at Naupactus, 217 B.C.', *C&M* 28: pp.240-53.
- (1974) 'The Speech of Agelaus, Again', *Chiron* 4: pp. 127-32.
- Morrison, J. V. (2006) *Reading Thucydides*, Columbus OH: The Ohio State University Press.
- Mosley, D. J. (1961) 'The Athenian Embassy to Sparta in 371 B.C.', *PCPhS* 188: pp.41-6.
- (1973) *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, Wiesbaden: Steiner Verlag.
- Müller, C. (2007) 'La dissolution du *koinon* béotien en 171 av. J.-C et ses conséquences territoriales', in *Pouvoir et territoire I. Antiquité et Moyen*

- Âge, ed. by P. Rodriguez (Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne), pp.31-46.
- (2013) 'The Rise and Fall of the Boeotians: Polybius 20.4-7 as a Literary Topos', in *Polybius and his World*, ed. by B. Gibson and T. Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.267-8.
- (2014) 'A *koinon* after 146? Reflections on the Political and Institutional Situation of Boeotia in the Late Hellenistic Period', in *The Epigraphy and History of Boeotia. New Finds, New Prospects*, ed. by N. Papazarkadas (Leiden: Brill), pp.119-46.
- (2018) 'Oligarchy and the Hellenistic City' in *The Polis in the Hellenistic World*, ed. by H. Börm and N. Luraghi (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp. 27-52.
- Murphy, J. (1990) 'Topos and Figura: Historical Cause and Effect?' in *De Ortu Grammaticae: Studies in Medieval Grammar and Linguistic Theory in Memory of Jan Pinborg*, ed. by G. L. Bursill-Hall, S. Ebbsen, and K. Koerner (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), pp.239-53.
- Nachtergaele, G. (1977) *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes. Recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*, Bruxelles: Palais de Académies.
- Németh, A. (2018) *The Excerpta Constantiniana and the Byzantine Appropriation of the Past*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicholson, E. (2018) 'Polybios, the Laws of War, and Philip V of Macedon', *Historia* 67: pp.434-53.
- Nicolai, R. (1992) *La storiografia nell'educazione antica*, Pisa: Giardini.
- (2019) 'τὰ καιρώτατα καὶ πραγματικώτατα. A Survey on the Speeches in Polybius' in *Polybius and his Legacy*, ed. by N. Mitsios and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.117-30.
- O'Connell, P. (2017) *The Rhetoric of Seeing in Attic Forensic Oratory*, Austin TX: University of Texas Press.

- Oikonomides, A. N. (1982) 'Athens and the Phokians at the Outbreak of the Lamian War (=IG II² 367)', *AW* 5: 123-7.
- Olson, S. D. (2002) *Aristophanes: Acharnians*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Osborne, R. (1999) 'Inscribing performance', *Performance culture and Athenian democracy*, ed. by S. Goldhill and R. Osborne (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.341-58.
- Osborne, M. J. (1982) *Naturalization in Athens, Volume II*, Brussel: Paleis der Academiën
(1983) *Naturalization in Athens, Volumes III and IV*, Brussel: Paleis der Academiën.
- Ostwald, M. (1986) *From Popular Sovereignty to the Sovereignty of Law*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Orsi, D. P. (2002) 'Trattative internazionali nelle Elleniche senofontee. Aspetti del lessico: i verbi della comunicazione', in *La retorica della diplomazia nella Grecia antica e a bisanzio*, ed. by L. Piccirilli (Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider), pp.71-109.
- O'Sullivan, L. (2009) *The Regime of Demetrius of Phalerum in Athens 317-307 BCE: A Philosopher in Politics*, Leiden: Brill.
- Palm, J. (1957) *Polybios und der Kanzleistil*, Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Parmeggiani, G. (2019) 'Polybius and the Legacy of Fourth-Century Historiography' in *Polybius and his Legacy*, ed. by N. Miltsios and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.277-97.
- Paschidis, P. (2008) *Between City and King: Prosopographical Studies on the Intermediaries Between the Cities of the Greek Mainland and the Aegean and the Royal Courts in the Hellenistic Period (322-190 BC)*, Paris: Diffusion de bocard.
- Papillon, T. (2004) *Isocrates II*, Austin TX: University of Texas Press.
- Papanikolaou, D. (2012) 'IG V.2, 268 (=SIG³ 783) as a Monument of Hellenistic Prose', *ZPE* 182: pp.137-56.

- Pausch, D (2018) 'Diodoros, the speeches, and the reader', in *Diodoros of Sicily. Historiographical Theory and Practice in the Bibliotheca*, ed. by L. I. Hau, A. Meeus, and B. Sheridan (Leuven: Peeters), pp.473-89.
- (2019) 'Lost in Reception? Polybius' Paradoxical Impact on Writing History in Republican Rome', in *Polybius and his Legacy*, ed. by N. Miltsios and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp. 357-80.
- Pavlou, M. (2013) 'Attributive Discourse in the Speeches in Thucydides', in *Thucydides Between History and Literature*, ed. by A. Tsakmakis and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter). pp.409-33.
- Pédech, P. (1964) *La méthode historique de Polybe*, Paris: Les belles lettres.
- Pepe, C. (2013) *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden: Brill.
- (2017) 'À l'école de Rhodes: un modèle de rhétor à l'époque hellénistique', in *Entre rhétorique et philologie*, ed. by J. Danville, B. Sans (Roma: Rivista Italiana di Filosofia del Linguaggio, numero speciale), pp.21-36.
- Perelman, C. and Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1958) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Perlman, P. (1999) 'KRĒTES AEI LĒSTAI? The Marginalization of Crete in Greek Thought and the Role of Piracy in the Outbreak of the First Cretan War', in *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, ed. by V. Gabrielsen et. al (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press), pp.132-61.
- Pernot, L. (2014) 'La reception antique de Xénophon : quell modèle pour quels orateurs?', in *Xenophon et la rhétorique*, ed. by P. Pontier (Paris: Presses de l'université Paris-Sorbonne), pp.281-94.
- Perrin-Saminadayar, E. (1999) 'Les succès de la diplomatie athénienne de 229 a 168 av. J.-C.', *REG* 112, pp.444-62.

- Petrakos, V. C. (1997) *ΟΙ ΕΠΙΓΡΑΦΕΣ ΤΟΥ ΩΡΩΠΟΥ*, Athens: Archaialogikē Hetaireia.
- Philipp, G. (1973) 'Philippides, ein politischer Komiker in hellenistischer Zeit', *Gymnasium* 80: pp.492-509.
- Piccirilli, L. (2002) *L'invenzione della diplomazia nella Grecia Antica*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Pistorius, T. (1985) *Hegemoniestreben und Autonomiesicherung in der griechischen Vertragspolitik klassischer und hellenistischer Zeit*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Pitcher, L. V. (2007) 'Characterisation in Ancient Historiography', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. by J. Marincola (Oxford: Wiley Blackwell), pp.102-17
- Poland, F. W. (1885) *De Legationibus Graecorum Pubilicis*, PhD thesis: University of Leipzig.
- Poralla, P. (1913) *Prosopographie der Lakedaimonier bis auf die Zeit Alexanders des Großen*, Breslau: Kommissions-Verlag.
- Post, R. (2019) 'Integration and Coercion: Non-Boiotians in the Hellenistic Boiotian League', in *Ethnos and Koinon: Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, ed. by H. Beck, K. Buraselis, and A. McAuley (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.99-111.
- Prandi, L. (2013) *Diodoro Siculo, Biblioteca storica libro XVII. Commento storico*, Milano: Vita e Pensiero.
- Queyrel Bottineau, A. (2010) *Prodosia: La notion et l'acte de trahison dans l'Athènes du V^e siècle*, Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Ragone, G. (1996) 'Pygela/Phygela. Fra paretimologia e storia', *Athenaeum* 84: pp.183-241.
- Raknes, K. and Ihlen, Ø. (2019) 'Self-interest in new wrapping: "Appeal to the public interest" as a *topos* in lobbying', *Public Affairs* 20:2: pp.1-9.

- Reger, G. (1999) 'The Relations between Rhodes and Caria from 246 to 167 BC', in *Hellenistic Rhodes: Politics, Culture, and Society*, ed. by V. Gabrielsen, P. Bide, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, and J. Zahle (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press), pp.76-97
- Reinhardt, T. and Winterbottom, M. (2006) *Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria Book 2*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, J. (1982) *Aphrodisias and Rome*, London: Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.
- Rhodes, P. J. (1972) *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1984) 'ξένια and δεῖπνον in the Prytaneum', *ZPE* pp.193-202.
- (2007) 'Documents and the Greek Historians', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. by J. Marincola (Oxford: Blackwell), pp.56-66.
- (2019) 'Erasures in Greek Public Documents', in *The Materiality of Text – Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity*, ed. by A. Petrovic, I. Petrovic, and E. Thomas (Brill: Leiden), pp.145-67.
- Rhodes, P. J. and Lewis, D. M. (1997) *The Decrees of the Greek States*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rigsby, K. (1996) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rizakis (2012) 'La double citoyenneté dans le cadre des koina grecs: l'exemple du koinon achéen', in *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, ed. by A. Heller and A-V Pont (Paris: Austonius), pp.23-38.
- (2015) 'The Achaian League' in *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, ed. by H. Beck and P. Funke (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.118-31.
- Robert, L. (1930) 'Notes d'épigraphie hellénistique', *BCH* 54: pp.322-51.

- Roberts, J. T. (1982) *Accountability in Athenian Government*, Madison WI: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Roebuck, C. A. (1941) *A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C.*, Chicago IL: University of Chicago.
- Roesch, P. (1982) *Etudes béotiennes*, Paris: E. de Boccard.
- Roisman, J., Worthington, I., Waterfield, R. (2015) *Lives of the Attic Orators. Texts from Pseudo-Plutarch, Photius, and the Suda*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Romilly, J de (1979) *La douceur dans la pensée grecque*, Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Rood, T. (2012) 'Polybius, Thucydides, and the First Punic War', in *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, ed. by C. Smith and L. M. Yarrow (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.50-67.
- (2018) 'Thucydides', in *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by K. De Temmerman and E. van Emde Boas (Leiden: Brill), pp.153-71.
- (2018a) 'Xenophon' in *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. by K. de Temmerman and E. van Emde Boas (Leiden: Brill), pp.172-90.
- (2022) 'Thucydides', in *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature*, ed. By M. de Bakker and I. J. F. de Jong (Leiden: Brill), pp.223-45.
- Rousset, D. (2004) 'Doris', in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, ed. by M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.674-5
- Rubinstein, L. (1998) 'The Athenian political perception of the *idiotes*', in *Kosmos: Essays in order, conflict and community in classical Athens* (ed. by P. Cartledge, P. Millet, and S. von Reden (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.125-43.
- (2000) *Litigation and Cooperation: Supporting Speakers in the Courts of Classical Athens*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.

- (2003) 'Synegoroi: their place in our reconstruction of the Athenian legal process', in *Symposion 1999. Vorträge zur griechischen und hellenistischen Rechtsgeschichte*, ed. by G. Thür and F. J. Fernández Nieto (Vienna: Böhlau Verlag), pp.193-207.
- (2004) 'Ionia', in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis: An Investigation Conducted by The Copenhagen Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*, ed. by M. H. Hansen and T. H. Nielsen (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.1053-107.
- (2009) 'Ateleia grants and their enforcement in the classical and early Hellenistic Periods', in *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in Honour of P.J. Rhodes*, ed. by L. Mitchell and L. Rubinstein (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales), pp.115-143.
- (2013) 'Spoken Words, Written Submissions, and Diplomatic Conventions: The Importance and Impact of Oral Performance in Hellenistic Inter-polis Relations', in *Hellenistic Oratory: Continuity and Change*, ed. by C. Kremmydas and K. Tempest (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.165-99.
- (2013a) 'Forgive and Forget? Amnesty in the Hellenistic Period' in *Vergeben und Vergessen? Amnestie in der Antike*, ed. by K. Harter-Uibopuu and F. Mitthof (Wien: Holzhausen der Verlag), pp.127-61.
- (2013b) 'Evoking Anger through Pity in Attic Oratory', in *Unveiling Emotions II. Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture*, ed. by A. Chaniotis and P. Ducrey (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.135-65.
- (2016) 'Envoys and *ethos*: team speaking by envoys in classical Greece', in *La rhétorique du pouvoir: Une exploration de l'art oratoire délibératif grec*, ed. by P. Derron (Geneva: Fondation Hardt), pp.79-128.
- (2016a) 'Communal revenge and appeals to dicastic emotions', in *Die Athenische Demokratie im 4. Jahrhundert: Zwischen Modernisierung*

- und Tradition*, ed. by C. Tiersch (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.55-72.
- (2018) 'Clauses out of Context: Partial Citation of Statutes in Attic Forensic Oratory', in *Use and Abuse of Law in the Athenian Courts*, ed. by C. Carey, B. Griffith-Williams, I. Giannadaki (Leiden: Brill), pp. 165-80.
- Rutherford, I. (2007) 'Theoria and Theatre at Samothrace: The *Dardanos* by Dymas of Iasos', in *The Greek Theatre and Festivals Documentary Studies*, ed. by P. Wilson (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.279-93.
- (2009) 'Aristodama and the Aetolians: an itinerant poetess and her agenda', in *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Pan-Hellenism*, ed. by R. Hunter and I. Rutherford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.237-48.
- (2014) *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study in Theoria and Theoroi*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rutherford, R. (2007) 'Tragedy and History', in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. by M. Marincola (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell), pp.504-14
- Rzepka, J. (2006) *The Rights of Cities within the Aitolian Confederacy*, Valencia: IVECO.
- (2019) 'Federal Imperialism: Aitolian Expansion between Protectorate, Merger, and Partition' in *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Greek Ethnicity and Federalism*, ed. by H. Beck, K. Buraselis, and A. McAuley (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.167-74.
- Ryder, T. T. B. (1977) 'Ambiguity in Aeschines 2.57-62: some aspects of Athenian diplomacy before the Peace of Philocrates', *Liverpool Classical Monthly* 3: pp.219-23.
- Saba, S. (2020) *Isopoliteia in Hellenistic Times*, Leiden: Brill.
- Sacks, K. S. (1975) 'Polybius' Other View of Aetolia', *JHS* 95: pp.92-106.

- (1981) *Polybius on the Writing of History*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- (1986) 'Rhetoric and Speeches in Hellenistic Historiography', *Athenaeum* 64: pp.383-95.
- (1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sanders, E. (2014) *Envy and Jealousy in Classical Athens. A Socio-Psychological Approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Scardino, C. (2012) 'Indirect Discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides', in *Thucydides and Herodotus*, ed. by E. Foster and D. Lateiner (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.67-96.
- (2019) 'Polybius and Fifth-Century Historiography: Continuity and Diversity in the Presentation of Historical Deeds', in *Polybius and his Legacy*, ed. by N. Miltsios and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.299-321.
- Schepens, G. (1977) 'Historiographical Problems in Ephorus', in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in Honorem W. Peremans Septuagenarii Editae*, ed. by T. Reekmans, E. Van Dyck, and H. Verdin (Leuven: Leuven University Press), pp.95-118.
- (2001) 'Three Voices on the History of a Difficult Relationship. Xenophon's Evaluation of Athenian and Spartan Identities in *Hellenica* VI 3', in *Identità e valori fattori di aggregazione e fattori di crisi nell'esperienza politica antica : Bergamo, 16-18 dicembre 1998*, ed. by A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot, F. Landucci, L. Prandi, and G. Zecchini (Rome: "L'Erma" di Bretschneider), pp.81-96.
- (2001a) 'Who wrote the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*? The need for a methodological code', *Sileno* 27: pp.201-24.
- Schettino, M. T. (2003) 'Documenti diplomatici scritti e documenti militari non scritti nel Polibio "romano"', in *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia*

- antica*, ed. by A. M. Biraschi, P. Desidiri, S. Roda, and G Zecchini (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane), pp.393-411.
- Schmitt, H. H. (1957) *Rom und Rhodos*, Munich: Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrus-forsch.
- Scholten, J. B. (2000) *The Politics of Plunder: Aitolians and Their Koinon in the Early Hellenistic Era, 279-217 BC*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Schöpsdau, K. (2003). *Platon Nomi (Gesetze) Buch IV-VII. Übersetzung und Kommentar von Klaus Schöpsdau*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schwartz, A. (2004) 'Xenophons lederskap i *Anabasis*', *AIGIS* 4.1, pp.1-25.
- Schwarze, A. and Walther, A. (2002) 'Redenschreiben Für Den Bundeskanzler: Formulieren, Koordinieren Und Beraten', in *Das Wort hat der Herr Bundeskanzler: Eine Analyse der Großen Regierungserklärungen von Adenauer bis Schröder*, ed. by K-R. Korte (Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag), pp.33-55.
- Scott, L. (2005) *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6*, Leiden: Brill.
- Scott, M. (2014) *Delphi. A History of the Center of the Ancient World*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Seager, R. (2013) 'Polybius' Distortions of the Roman 'Constitution': A Simpl(istic) Explanation', in *Polybius and his world. Essays in honour of F. W. Walbank*, ed. by B. Gibson and T. Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.247-54.
- Sealey, R. (1993) *Demosthenes and his time. A study in defeat*, New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Segre, M. (1993) *Iscrizioni di Cos 1. Testo*, Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Shear, J. L. (2010) 'Demetrios Poliorketes, Kallias of Sphettos, and the Panathenaia', in *Studies in Greek Epigraphy and History in Honor of*

- Stefen V. Tracy, ed. by G. Reger, F. X. Ryan, and T. F. Winters (Bordeaux: Austonius), pp.135-52.
- (2020) 'An inconvenient past in Hellenistic Athens: the case of Phaidros of Sphettos', *Histos: Supplement* 11: pp.269-301.
- Shear, T. L. (1978) *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C.*, Princeton NJ: Hesperia, Supplement XVIII.
- Sickinger, J. P. (1999) *Public Records and Archives in Classical Athens*, Chapel Hill NC: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Shiple, G. (2018) *The Early Hellenistic Peloponnese: Politics, Economies, and Networks, 338–197 BC*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slater, W. J. and Summa, D. (2006) 'Crowns at Magnesia', *GRBS* 46: pp.275-99.
- Sommerstein, A. (1996) 'How do avoid being a *komodoumenos*', *CQ* 46: pp.327-56.
- Sosin, J. D. (2009) 'Magnesian Inviolability', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139, pp.369-410.
- Stadter, P. (2017) 'Characterization of Individuals in the Thucydides' *History*', in *The Oxford Handbook of Thucydides*, ed. by R. K. Balot, S. Forsdyke, and E. Foster (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.283-99.
- Steinbock, B. (2013) *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse. Uses and Meanings of the Past*, Ann Arbor MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Swoboda, H., Keil, J., Knoll, F. (1935) *Denkmäler aus Lykaonien, Pamphylien, und Isaurien: Ergebnisse einer im auftrage der gesellschaft von Julius Jüthner, Fritz Knoll, Karl Patsch und Heinrich Swoboda durchgeführten forschungsreise*, Vienna: Verlag Rudolf M. Rohrer.
- Tarn, W. W. (1913) *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1952) *Hellenistic Civilisation (Third Edition)*, London: Edward Arnold & Co.
- Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- (1999) *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomsen, C. (2020) *The Politics of Association in Hellenistic Rhodes*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thornton, J. (2013) 'Polybius in Context: The Political Dimension of the *Histories*', *Polybius and his world. Essays in memory of F. W. Walbank*, ed. by B. Gibson and T. Harrison (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp.213-29.
- (2020) *Polibio. Il politico e lo storico*, Turin: Freece.
- Thonemann, P. (2007) 'Magnesia and the Greeks of Asia (*J.Magnesia* 16.16)', *GRBS* 47, pp.151-60.
- Thatcher, M. R. (2021) *The Politics of Identity in Greek Sicily and Southern Italy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thür, G. and Taeuber, H. (1994) *Prozessrechtliche Inschriften der griechischen Poleis: Arkadien* (IPArk), Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Tober, D. (2018) 'John D. Grainger, Great Power Diplomacy in the Hellenistic World. London; New York: Routledge, 2017. 264. ISBN 9781472484291 \$149.95', *BMCRev* 6th June 2018 (Online).
- Todd, S. (1993) *The Shape of Athenian Law*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Treves, P. (1937) *Polbio. Il libro secondo delle storie. Introduzione e comment storico*, Naples: Casa editrice rondinella alfredo.
- Trevett, J. C. (1996) 'Aristotle's Knowledge of Athenian Oratory', *CQ* 46: pp.371-9.
- (1996a) 'Did Demosthenes publish his deliberative speeches?', *Hermes* 124: pp.425-41.
- Tsangari, D. I. (2007) *Corpus des monnaies d'or, d'argent et de bronze de la confédération étolienne*, Athens: Helicon.

- Tuci, P. A. (2019) 'The Speeches of Theban Ambassadors in Greek Literature (404-362 B.C.)', *KTÈMA* 44, pp.32-44.
- Tuplin, C. (1993), *The Failings of Empire. A Reading of Xenophon Hellenica 2.3.11-7.5.27*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Urban, R. (1979) *Wachstum und Krise des achäischen Bundes. Quellenstudien zur Entwicklung des Bundes von 280 bis 222 v.Chr.*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Usher, S. (1990) *Greek Orators III: Isocrates. Translated with an Introduction and Commentary by Stephen Usher*, Warminster: Aris & Philips.
- (2009) 'Oratio Recta and Oratio Obliqua in Polybius', *GRBS* 49: pp.487-514.
- Vanderspoel, J. (2007) 'Hellenistic Rhetoric in Theory and Practice', in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. by I. Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 124-38.
- Vatri, A. (2017) *Orality and Performance in Classical Attic Prose: A Linguistic Approach*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Verdegem, S. (2010) *Plutarch's Life of Alcibiades. Story, Text and Moralism*. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Viviers, D. (1999) 'Economy and Territorial Dynamics in Crete from the Archaic to the Hellenistic Period', in *From Minoan Farmers to Roman Traders. Sidelights on the Economy of Ancient Crete*, ed. by A. Chaniotis (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag), pp.221-33
- Volonaki, E. (2019) 'Abuse of the *eisangelia* in the Latter Half of the Fourth Century BC', in *Use and Abuse of Law in the Athenian Courts*, ed. by C. Carey, I. Giannadaki, and B. Griffith-Williams (Leiden: Brill), pp.293-314.
- Walbank, F. W. (1933) *Aratos of Sicyon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1940) *Philip V of Macedon*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- (1957) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Vol. I. Commentary on Books I-VI*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1960) 'History and Tragedy', *Historia* 9: pp.216-34.
- (1965) 'Speeches in Greek Historians', *Third Myres Memorial Lecture*. Reprinted in 1985 in *Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp.242-61.
- (1967) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Vol. II. Commentary on Books VII-XVIII*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1972) *Polybius*, Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- (1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius, Vol. III. Commentary on Books XIX-XL*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- (1981) *The Hellenistic World*, London: Fontana Press.
- (2002) *Polybius, Rome and the Hellenistic World. Essays and Reflections*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Walbank, M. (1978) *Athenian Proxenes of the Fifth Century B.C.*, Toronto: Samuel-Stevens.
- Welles, C. B. (1934) *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period. A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, Chicago: Ares.
- West, S. (1985) 'Herodotus' Epigraphical Interests', *CQ* 35: pp.278-305.
- West, W. C. (1973) 'The Speeches in Thucydides: A Description and Listing', in *The Speeches in Thucydides*, ed. by P. A. Stadter (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), pp.3-15.
- Westlake H. D. (1968) *Individuals in Thucydides*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- (1973) 'The Setting of Thucydidean Speeches' in *The Speeches in Thucydides*, ed. by P. A. Stadter (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press), pp.90-108.
- White, S. A. (1995) 'Thrasymachus the Diplomat', *CPh* 90.4: pp.307-27.

- Whitehead, D. (1986) 'The Political Career of Aristophon', *CPh* 81, pp.313-9.
- (2000) *Hypereides: The Forensic Speeches*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wiater, N. (2010) 'Speeches and Historical Narrative in Polybius' Histories. Approaching Speeches in Polybius', in *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*, ed. by D. Pausch (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.67-108.
- (2011) *The Ideology of Classicism: Language, History, and Identity in Dionysius of Halicarnassus*, Berlin: De Gruyter.
- (2014) 'Polybius on Speeches in Timaeus: Syntax and Structure in Histories 12.25a', *CQ* 64: pp.121-35.
- (2018) 'Documents and Narrative: Reading the Roman-Carthaginian Treaties in Polybius' Histories', in *Polybius and his Legacy*, ed. by N. Miltsios and M. Tamiolaki (Berlin: De Gruyter), pp.131-65.
- Wiemer, H-U (2001) *Rhodische Traditionen in der hellenistischen Historiographie*, Frankfurt: Buchverl Clauss.
- Wisse, J. (1989) *Ethos and Pathos from Aristotle to Cicero*, Amsterdam: Adolf H. Hakkert.
- Woerther, F. (2007) *L'èthos aristotélicien. Genèse d'une notion rhétorique*, Paris: Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin.
- Woodman, A. J. (1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*, Portland OR: Croom Helm.
- Wooten C. (1972) *A Rhetorical and Historical Study of Hellenistic Oratory*, PhD thesis: University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- (1973) 'The ambassador's speech: A particularly Hellenistic genre of oratory', *QJS* 59.2: pp.209-12.
- (1974) 'The Speeches of Polybius: An Insight into the Nature of Hellenistic Oratory', *AJPh* 95.3: pp.235-51.

- Worthington, I. (1991) 'Greek Oratory, Revision of Speeches and the Problem of Historical Reliability', *C&M* 45: pp.55-74.
- (1992) *A Historical Commentary on Dinarchus. Rhetoric and Conspiracy in Later Fourth-Century Athens*, Ann Arbor MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- (2020) *Athens After Empire: A History from Alexander the Great to the Emperor Hadrian*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zecchini, G. (2003) 'Le lettere come documenti in Polibio', in *L'uso dei documenti nella storiografia antica*, ed. by A. M. Biraschi, P. Desidiri, S. Roda, and G Zecchini (Naples: Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane), pp.415-22
- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. (2014) 'Look and Listen: History Performed and Inscribed', in *Between Orality and Literacy: Communication and Adaptation in Antiquity*, ed. by R. Scodel (Leiden: Brill), pp.175-96.