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The marks A / B / C indicate relevance to the study of the history of emotions
Oration 1, The Panathenaic Oration (c. 155 CE).
Aristid., Or. 1

A/B

General emotional tenor of the speech: pride in Athens as belonging to all Greeks; admiration for the achievements (especially the military achievements) of Athens; bloated pride in the Persian Wars in particular; gratitude to Athens for the heritage she has bestowed on all Greeks.

1-7: Proem. Gratitude, honour, good will of Greeks and also most barbarians to Athens (1-2); Athens as a kind of foster-father to anyone with an affinity with the Greeks (1). 3-7: This is a bold task and the speech needs courage; fear of being unequal to the topic (greatness of Athens). 4ff: Others have taken the task piecemeal, not in its entirety (recounting only aspects of Athens’ praiseworthy deeds: its relations with the gods, its wars, its constitution; funeral orations for some men only).

8-23: Geography. Autochthony of Athenians. Gentleness, generous kindness, charm – the nature of the land is like the nature of the people (see esp. 10). [Behr note 12 on A’s geographic ekphraseis.] 12: Delight, charm, pleasure joy.

18: the atmosphere and the seasons have perfect measure. 21: Who would not marvel at the grace and charm of the mountains? The city is like a seed of gratitude to the gods.

24-30: Indigenous population. Autochthony cont’d. 26: You alone can boast of a pure race and citizenship.

31-8: The discovery of crops and their sharing. The gods gave abundance to Athens, just like a theorikon (31, 36). Generosity of the Athenians with this abundance (34): they did not fear they would make others equal in this way, but this was a way of honouring the gods and showing their own superiority. 37f: kindness, generosity.

39-48: The gods honour the Athenians. Love, zeal, honour of the gods towards Athens. Oratory, laws, free government, sciences, weapons, chariots, dancing, assemblies, justice of the Areopagus – all these are honours of the gods, offering a kind of paideia (esp. 45).


75-321: Deeds in War (from the Heracleidai onwards. General: pride in Athens, and gratitude to her, from others; Athenian courage and generosity (eg 81, 82).

86: the city has been generous and brave not only in its public deeds but in the private deeds of men willing to suffer for the common good; this is not always made clear in funeral orations. Still more marvellous is that certain foreigners also felt so disposed to the city (eg Codrus).

92-184: Persian Wars. Characteristics of the Athenians: virtue; seeking vengeance (after the Ionian Revolt); bravery (replacing marvelling: 94); more like a city at a festival than preparing for war (104: emphasis on fulfilment of religious duties, and enthusiasm in rivalry for honour, 105); pride, 107; fearlessness, enthusiasm, delight (in the anticipation of victory and conquering), 107; 108f: fear and panic is transformed by Greek daring and courage; proud, such that she did not tremble at Xerxes’ ‘strange terrors’, 125, nor terrified, 126; embarrassed to be confronting the barbarians alone among Greeks, 126, also 129; the greatest courage and daring, the greatest endurance and
suffering, 133; the greatest enthusiasm, 134ff, 151; 135: NB on Athenian enthusiasm as contrary to reason or 'to speak more truly, of glorious reason'; Themistocles (139) alone like a seer, and worth all of the Athenians; Athenians not angry with the other Greeks, but attempting to encourage them, 147; piety, moral strength, intelligence, generosity, nobility, 154; honour of poverty, generosity, 177; restraint of their own anger at Spartan fear in 480 BC, 179; Athenians as surpassers: of barbarians, Greeks, all mankind, 183; On the Spartans: 93 (greed in 401 BC), 160 (too late at Marathon, and in a sense also at Salamis), 178: Spartan fear; Characteristics of Darius: 95: fear and suspicion of Athens; desire and longing to increase his empire by the glorious addition of Greece; 96: 'a middle course between fear and desire', though he sent others across the sea, 'despairing' of making the crossing himself. Characteristics of Xerxes, 115ff: 'surpassed all kings in his conceptions and left no room for anything to be thought bizarre'; threatening, 'strange and extraordinary threats' which were 'beyond terror' 119, causes trembling, cowering 'like weightless objects', 123, causing great fear; Xerxes as the surpasser (compare Themistocles in Or.III); 166ff: inspiring fear, anger, Characteristics of the barbarians generally: contempt, 106.

186-192: Rejoicing after the Greek victory. Joy; encouragement to Greeks to be concordant and to despise the barbarians. Acquisition not only of the adornment of virtue but of a material kind (luxury motif): 190.

193ff: Pentekontaetia. 193f: demonstration of Athenian confidence, transferring fear to the barbarians, making Athens admirable, and 'they are most at peace who do not desire to remain entirely at peace'; Athenians excelled in courage and resolve (203), inspiring confidence (203) and making men despise the Persians (204); Athenian generosity (213) and confidence (222). Influence of emotions on aggression: desire for expansion (207); rage (212) at others. Other Greeks however were not always grateful to Athens in this period, but often jealous (228).

231ff: Athenian spirit in adversity (last decade of 5thC). Even in Sicily, Athens showed great human spirit (233) and courage, self-control, strength, pride. 234: After Sicily, Athens showed great calmness and moderation [contrast Thuc.], and she even managed to reverse this situation (236). 237: Cyzicus 410 BC. 241: Athens was not so frightened or overcome to fail to go to Arginusae, where she would save Konon (243), who would later save her (394 BC). 244ff: One must admire Athenian courage even in adversity. 246: Athens is superior to other victors, making Xerxes desire flight and humbling the Spartans, whereas Sparta (250) did not recover after Leuctra. 252f: bore defeat gracefully at Aegospotami, settling internal affairs [amnesty] in such a way as to give all mankind an example of moderation; cf. 260 on Athens as a model for others [cf Thuc.]. 256: The men with Thrasyboulos in 404 BC were in fact braver than the Marathonomachoi (256; cf. Pl. Menex.), outstripping Sparta at the time in courage and other Athenians in decency. 264: A says that he gazes on Athens as an erastes gazes on an eromenos.

266ff: 4th-c examples of Athenian resolve and generosity. 395 BC: Haliartus, on behalf of Thebes (266); 395-390 BC: aiding Corinth (269). However, the King’s Peace was shameful and the Athenians must have been under compulsion.

296f: Continued bravery and success of Athens in 370’s BC (under Chabrias, Iphikrates, Timotheus).

272ff: 5thC and 4thC examples. 272: reverts to the Persian Wars (Marathon, Salamis, Eurymedon). 280: glory of Konon 394 BC. 281: Athens was more just in that she
established an empire against barbarians and Aristides was just in the tribute assessment (281), whereas Sparta acquired an empire at the expense of Greeks and was less just in its administration (being less developed than Athens). 302: Melos and Scione are so contrary to the typical achievements and ‘national character’ of Athens that one cannot judge her on this [great tone of indignation here]. 306: To appreciate Athenian greatness overall is merely to show ‘balanced consideration’; one has to understand that empires belong to the stronger (306), and one cannot be uncompromising in suggesting there should be equal rights (306), which would be tantamount to suggesting human equality with the gods (307)! Thus the Athenians in their ‘remarkable decisions’ were like a very good man, and in those situations for which some blame them did not commit great errors but rather followed the ‘imperatives of empire’. 310: the Athenians were capable of great repentance (as shown by Mytilene decree, 427 BC). In sum, Athens showed great daring, endurance, helpfulness, generosity to all in this period.

On Sparta in this section. 238-9: people should not criticise Sparta in order to praise Athens; there is no shame in being second to Athens; to compare Athens to anyone is to miss the point of her singularity. See above on 250. Above on 281. 284.

332-30: The Attic tongue. All mankind has turned to your wisdom, way of life, dialect, beauty – the common speech of the human race. 326: this constitutes a victory over the Lacedaimonians and all other Greeks. Language is the great empire of the Athenians, 327. The dialect has dignity and charm, 327. Athenian poetry is greatest (Homer’s dialect came from Athens, in that he was from the colony of Smyrna).

331-4: Honours to Athens. Reverence of Philip to Athens as ‘something which was greater than ordinary’. Solicitousness of Alexander to Athens. 332: under the Roman Empire, Athens is still honoured and fortunate (though she is embroiled in ‘troublesome affairs’).

335-401: Superiority of Athens. 335: Experience of Athens under the 5 empires (great at all times; Rome as the best and greatest empire). Athens as surpasser of all cities (cf above on Xerxes; and Or.III on Themistocles). Athens can feel the greatest possible pride. Care for the gods, 338ff; 342f: generosity in sharing its benefits and skills with mankind; courage in war (land, naval, cavalry), and exhortation of others, 344ff; size and adornment of the city, 351ff. Comparisons with other cities in manifold characteristics (war, justice, wisdom, decrees, etc etc), and demonstration of Athenian superiority at each point: 355ff. Piety, intelligence, gentleness of the Athenians, 372. A possible distinctive point about Sparta is that the god originally drew up their laws. 383ff: on the constitution: portrayal of Athens as a mixed constitution. Implied generosity, mutual respect, openness, even-handedness of all parts of the constitution (masses, kings, Areopagus) to the other parts. 390: Athens first to teach that wealth should not be favoured or admired; poverty not seen as shameful. 392: living as one wishes, honour to the best – aspects of a free constitution. Enthusiasm, concord, trust characterises Athens; if there is dissension, mutual recognition soon wipes it away; courage was always there. 400f: great admiration has been given to Athens, but never enough. All previous admiration falls short of the mark.

402-4: Peroration. Greeks should not feel envy or shame in giving precedence to Athens, but should feel great pride since we all partake in it.
Oration 2 (The Defence of Oratory, Pergamum, c.145-147 CE).
Aristid., Or. 2

General emotional points: there is no shame (or baseness, cowardice, flattery or slander) in true oratory, but rather only honour.

1-20: Proem. Truth is more important than precedence in discussions of opinions. Honour is due to the ancients. Passim: One need feel no shame or embarrassment in defending oratory. 6ff: If we must yield to predecessors, our respect for the ancients (Homer and Hesiod, Plato and Demosthenes) is out of place, because they have predecessors, who have predecessors, and so on.

21-31: The charge in the Gorgias. 22: cites Gorgias 463Cff. A. argues that Plato does not prove a case against oratory, but that there is a case against philosophy.

32-134: Result of conceding that oratory is not an art. Passim: repeated stress that his arguments are not shameful. 32-49, esp. 49: As prediction is an art by way of Apollo, and poetry an art by way of the Muses, so oratory is an art by way of Hermes – a gift which is divine and in fact greater than art. 50ff: Argument continues using the Phaedrus; 61-5: using Aeschines Socraticus; 84ff: focusing esp. on readings of Homer. [Note: 52: madness is fairer/better than moderation; 53: there is a certain madness which is better than sanity. 73: ‘My argument is, as it were, a part of religion / consecrated to the gods’.] 84ff: They are poets through a reason which surpasses art; 113: oratory too is a fair and divine thing; even if it does not come to men through art, but is the work of a bold nature (ie quasi-divine), having an eye to victory.

135-177: Refutation of the charge that oratory is not an art. Oratory does share in art; argument about what it ‘takes aim at’. The arguments are largely expressed without recourse to emotional terms.

178-203: Refutation of the charge that oratory flatters the masses. In this section, key emotional terms recur frequently (esp. to 198), esp. desire, admiration, gratification; also approval, flattery. A. argues that orators consider what is best, and do not permit what the multitude approves. Orators are superior judges of all matters; one proof of this lies in the honours they receive, ie they are offered distinctions because they are superior, whereas ‘no one admires his servants as his superiors’ (179). 186: Orators study their audience not in order to gratify them but in order to ‘say what it best in good time’ (a paraphrase of Demosthenes 3.3). 188f: Pride does not come merely from serving the will of the city: public slaves serve the will of the city and are not proud because of this; whereas orators are proud, and this is not because they are servants (to the city), saying what the people approve: they do not serve the desires of the mass, or their pleasures, but chastise their desires; they are not ruled by the multitude but rule them.

190: Orators as rulers, patrons, teachers. 199: The art of persuasion is the art of persuading the masses of what they do not approve.

204-318: Oratory is representative of justice and all the virtues. Oratory as a safeguard for justice, living without fear (209), bringing men into harmony, teaching them to eschew irrationality and tumult (211). 211ff: Oratory bolsters justice by (1) punishing wrong-doers and (2) honouring the decent. It takes on those angry at a verdict (226), admonishing them and persuading them to accept the jurors’ vote. 235ff: They say that there are 4 parts of virtue (cf. Aristides and the tribute assessment): intelligence, moderation, justice, courage; oratory was discovered by intelligence for the sake of justice. True orators have
no shameful qualities (249); true oratory is neither flattery nor slander (259). Attack of Plato (and his Sicilian/tyrannical connections): 272ff. 307ff: Oratory is anti-tyranny. Oratory is as far from tyranny as the use of persuasion is from the use of force. Tyranny will never arise when men have proper regard for true oratory (312); likewise true oratory cannot flourish under tyranny.

319-43: The virtue of The Four. This consisted in: goodwill, eagerness, faith, courage (321); did not despair (322); were not flatterers of the masses (322); did not gratify and charm Greece, but aroused it to virtue (322). Fearlessness of the Athenians (332).

344-61: The argument of the two oratories.

362-437: The power of the true orator. He has authority, teaches and persuades; honour and praise are due to him.

438-45: Plato himself honours oratory – in Politicus and the Apology (if not in the Gorgias).

446-61: The fallacy of the two oratories. There is only one true oratory; other types of speech are flattery or slander, not oratory. To say there are two oratories is a bit like saying there are 2 philosophies, or 2 moderations (one political and desirable, the other sluggish and inert), or 2 courages (one sensible and intelligent, the other a folly and a madness) (451).

462-6: Peroration.
This is A.'s final attack on the Gorgias and the counterpart of the earlier piece, 'Defence of Oratory' (Or. 2, c.145-7 BC). Much overlap with Orr. 1 and 2.

1-7: Proem. Plato’s unnecessary slander. Plato’s slander of The Four was unnecessary to his argument, and a sign of his malice (7) and jealousy (8) (even if in other respects Plato was a man ‘who so excels in humanity and magnanimity’).

11-127: Pericles. 12: personal moderation. 13: he did not have the rashness and cleverness of gutter politics; he never laughed (cf. Plut. Per.); he was not mastered by the same desires as the masses. 15f: the masses are disorderly and slothful in his absence, but assume his moderation in his presence, as if afraid of him; 17f: he is more than a tyrant, always just and never cherishing greed. 19ff: appeal to Thuc. as witness (whom he calls ‘accurate’, ‘truthful’): Pericles is moderate, calm, caring, dignified, able to oppose the masses and even make them angry (21). He is thus a perfect example of what Plato says the politician should be (26f): not choosing what is pleasant, satisfying desires, but leading towards what is best. 28ff: recapitulation of the ways in which Pericles did not simply gratify the masses’ desires, was not a mere flatterer; did not encourage greed; only after his death did the masses dream of Sicily, desire Italy, long for Carthage and Africa, never satisfied (33). 34-37: favourable comparison of Anaxagoras-Pericles to Socrates-Alcibiades (Alcibiades enlarged the Athenians’ desires, baited them with the money from Segesta, never set any limits, 36). 38: politics and geometric proportion; Pericles best honoured proportion in both private and public acts. 41: pithy recap: Pericles is brave, just, intelligent, moderate; but Plato says he made the Athenians garrulous, lazy, cowardly, greedy; 42ff refute these charges in turn, largely repeating points enumerated above about Pericles’ character and emotional make-up: 49ff: uses the evidence of comic poets, compared with Thuc. and Plato; 81: reiterates the list of charges – that he introduced ‘idleness, cowardice, unmanliness, humility and inertia’ to Athens (and the implication is that ‘unmanliness’ is necessarily implied in the list, if not formerly set out as such; humility is interestingly negative also here); 83ff: more positive refs. to his courage, ambition, boldness; resolute in the face of the (temporary) grief and hatred of the people directed towards him (at the end of his life); constancy, bravery; 98ff: justification of pay for office and the fruits of empire in emotional terms: delight in generosity; natural enjoyment of goods at hand; it is not shameful (103ff); Pericles personally was scornful of money, not avaricious. Concl. 116ff: he in fact made the Athenians clever, active, courageous, generous; 118: the masses were not flattered, nor their desires satisfied with immoderation.)

Note: In these chh., Pericles is compared to: a teacher (15, 70, 85, 109, 114); father (17); helmsman (87).

128-149: Cimon. 128-130: introductory: he will both refute Plato and preserve as much respect and honour of him as possible. The main charge is that Cimon’s acts were those of a mere menial servant (132f esp.) and thus without dignity.

Note: The defence is largely expressed in unemotional terms (eg his deeds were free, fair, well-planned).

150-208: Miltiades. Aligns Miltiades with moderation, honour, bravery, military skill, law-givers (Solon and Lycurgus). Compared with a helmsman (but seen to be beyond this) and a (gymnastic) trainer (183-8). NB 203: he is not accused of ‘such things as are endemic in
a democracy, denunciations, the laying of information, confiscations … [the practice of] a kind of shadow of oratory'. Concl. 207: he was courageous, intelligent, moderate.

**Note:** In general it is not an emotional defence, or a defence in emotional terms (as those of Pericles and Themistocles are).

209-351: Themistocles. Surpasses all Greeks, as Xerxes’ preparations surpassed those of Darius (also 260 as a ‘surpasser’). General characteristics and emotional disposition (as summarised at 212, and throughout this section): **courage** / bravery, **intelligence** (almost divination: 212; better than a seer: 257), nobility, cleverness, **mildness**, **endurance**, adaptability (to circumstances, people, Greeks, enemies); **boldness**; lack of **fear**, or **envy** of the dead, ‘he became for the Greeks like a god of Good Fortune’ (220); **moderation** and endurance (241-3; 257 on that moderation which enabled him to restrain the Athenians). 236: he alone was **daring** in his proposals, no servant of the people, catering to their **desires** or satisfying their **pleasures** (also 251). 240: under Themistocles, the Athenians surpass the enemy in **courage**, their allies in **gentleness**, and in all ways their conduct was fairer and more dignified. [Note 221, 258: sarcasm about philosophers’ criticisms of such men of action; 315: pitches piety and the gods vs Plato.] 278-81: none of The Four ignored justice or moderation, but guided the citizens between surliness and humility, gave freedom but not without restraint. They were all just, good politicians and great preservers of equality (282). NB 298 for the motif that the ‘polis is its brave men’: ‘Themistocles alone among all men or indeed among very few seems to me to have shown that the saying is true which the poet Alcaeus used long ago, and which later very many men have taken up and employed, that cities are not stones, or wood, or the builder’s art, but wherever there exist men who know how to save themselves, here are both walls and cities’; thus Themistocles abandoned land sooner than he abandoned his **resolve** and **conviction**.

**Note:** Themistocles is compared to an adviser and teacher, doctor or trainer (236), being no cook or servant, baker, butcher or petty merchant (260). Where Pericles was great, Themistocles is several times likened to a god (cf. 220 above; 250: as if some god spoke by means of his voice).

352-457: The common defence: they should not be judged from the errors of others. [Passing references only to various emotions in this section.] 352-64: These men were the ‘teachers’/educators’ of the Athenians, but they are not to blame if they Athenians did not become just like them, and quite so admirable as themselves; we must be content if the masses were improved even a little (cf. Protag.; 361). 365ff: attacking Plato, esp. for his experiences in Sicily. 412: Defence of The Four that their ostracisms (Themistocles, Cimon) and fines (Miltiades, Pericles) did not signify the hatred or alienation of the people towards them (413); in fact, Pericles, while the city was at peace, ‘was held in awe like the gods’ (423), and they only turned on him when overcome by misfortunes; Pericles as a skilled horseman, (424-8) duly **honoured**, by the masses and aristocrats alike, according to their different criteria (432). The Athenians wanted no one to feel more **pride** than the masses, and all to be equal as far as possible (415). 434: as above, on Socrates as a ‘negative’ educator (of Critias and Alcibiades); active public service more valuable than philosophy (437).

458-498: The power of fate and circumstance; the limitations of human skill. Argument: The Four partake of the common defence that fortune and circumstance guide all men’s lives (as Plato himself said, man is “a plaything of god”). [Again, a fairly non-emotional section.]

499-510: Demosthenes’ praise of the four. Cf. Dsth. 18: these men come across as sharp, clever, disciplined.
511-604: Plato’s slanders are inconsistent, contradictory, and superfluous, with little regard for historical truth. [Sparse on emotions.] 542ff: Plato ignores Nicias.

605-662: Plato’s slanders destroy the usefulness inherent in the glory of Greece. 605: Plato’s slanders are equivalent to seeing ‘the Greek way of life gone and vanished’. 608: ‘It is not the part of a lover of Athens to approve of only the Academy in Attica and to judge all the rest as hostile and enemy territory.’ 609ff: Like Homer, we must be disposed to praise, to show special honour as we narrate, not to mock those who do not deserve it; not to offer hatred as a starting-point of friendship with someone else, but try to be a reconciling influence – this conduct is civil, humane and pleasing to the gods; 612: and if we cannot praise, we should keep silent! 613: we should not be so contentiously and bitterly opposed to oratory. 614ff: Plato accuses comedy, insults tragedy, too; 616: but the part of your nature that is ‘Greek, charming, gracious, complex and divine’ does in fact see that there are ‘opportune and charming uses’ for all these things (eg Plato’s use of satire) – for these literary types and these qualities are ‘natural to the Greeks’ [NB for definition of ethnicity; and the accusation is that Plato is at times being ‘un-Greek’]. 619: the dithyramb, eg, is not shameful, ignoble, servile.

663-694: Attack on the Cynics. One is less angry at Plato’s attack on certain men, (since he has such great pride, genius, superiority), than at the fact that ‘certain worthless men’ (Cynics) have made a theme of such attacks, esp. on oratory. 666: they are faithless, greedy, envious, scornful, lacking in generosity, unhelpful, mocking [NB sudden outcrop of emotional terms in the context of an attack]; 668: shameless (which they confuse with freedom (note: cf. Diog. Laert. 6.69); they also confuse being hated with free speech); base, wilful, impious (671), and they alone are neither free men (they are more insolent) nor flatterers (though they are as deceitful); 672: they perform no useful cultural functions: ‘They have never spoken, discovered, or written a fruitful word; they have never added adornment to the national festivals, never honoured the gods, never given advice to the cities, never consoled those in grief, never reconciled those in faction, never exhorted the young, nor anyone else, never cared for decorum in their speech. But they have descended into holes, and there exercise their sophists’ tricks…’; useless to the human race (684). 676: they merely use the label of ‘philosophers’ as a cover for what they are really like. 686ff: Conclusion: A. delights in, and admires, oratory; 693: let god ultimately decide about The Four, I have made my case; I shall always offer due reverence and honour to men who deserve it, since to deprive them of it is shameful, as Demosthenes said (19.313) 94: In my arguments I have paid Plato the respect and honour due to him, he is my friend, not my enemy.
Oration 4 (The Third Platonic Discourse; To Capito; c. August 147 CE). 
Aristid., Or. 4

C/B.

1-7: Proem. Appeal to Capito in the name of friendship and a shared love for the ancients 
(1: we love; you are so passionate for Plato, whom I honour like my own life; 6: a 
terrible passion and a marvellous love has been instilled in me since youth for the 
ancient in general'). 6: Particular love of Plato and Demosthenes among the ancients (in a 
passage littered with quotations also from Homer and the tragedians).

8-19: Aristides’ treatment of Plato in Or. II (esp. the trip to Sicily), and criticism of it. 8: 
Further appeal to friendship. 9: Capito’s anger concerning A.’s reference to Plato’s trip to 
Sicily in Or.II; he felt this should have been kept separate, and discussion of Plato 
confined to his arguments/works, not his life. (a) 10-16: A. protests that he did not refer to 
the trip to Sicily as a charge/accusation. He mentioned it purely to support his case that 
Plato in fact, in his actions and in his arguments, was in favour of oratory (Gorgias 
notwithstanding). A. honours Plato, does not revile him, is without boldness and rashness in his treatment of him. (b) 17-19: Anger also caused by A.’s use of a passage 
from Plato’s Laws.

20-27: My argument was respectful, and the speech should be judged in its tone as a 
whole. Insistence that he argued respectfully and ‘honoured Plato abundantly’.

28-51: Plato’s own slanders compared with Aristides’ truths. Examination of evidence from 
Alcibiades, Republic, Protagoras (esp. concerning attitude to Homer). [Brief piece; breaks 
off rather abruptly; Or.3, written c.20 years later, treats the themes at further length.]
Oration 5 (On Sending Reinforcements to those in Sicily); Oration 6 (The Opposite Argument).

Arístid., Or. 5-6

Orr. 5 and 6 are imagined responses to the letter sent by Nícias in 413 BC to the Assembly at Athens, arguing that either the expedition must be abandoned or that new forces should be sent out.

Or. 5

1-2: Proem. The speaker claims moderation and goodwill to Nícias, and an absence of contention (philonikias – word play) and invidious treatment of Nícias.

3-19: It is a sensible plan to send reinforcements. Counsels the Athenians not to despair (3); Athens lost her natural advantages (by failing to attack quickly; and through unrest over the departure of Alcibiades, the death of Lamachus and the arrival of Gylippus) but to leave would be an impropriety, an easy craving, shameful (6). In the Assemblies debating the expedition, we were not angry with Nícias; we know that speeches aim to exhort and move us; we knew Sicily was a prize worthy of daring (9). We should be confident, not desperate (12); Gylippus is merely spinning out Spartan hopes; recalling the troops would show poor judgement and cowardice (17f), and would be a source of shame.

20-39: The conditions of the war are essentially unchanged; therefore we should be confident. This section urges: confidence and eagerness (20f), a willingness to toil and endure (31), daring (36), with better expectations (31) for the future, ie for comfort and pleasure (32); we should not ‘give way to our grief’ and end the war (31), we should not fear and despair (38f). 23f: emotional pitch heightens with the reference to slaves: they begin to run away not out of scorn for our confidence, but feeling confident that they will escape notice and suffer no harm when they join the enemy; their servile nature means that they give hatred in return for good treatment, wanting revenge rather than showing gratitude.

40-47: There are dangers in retreat (ie, of retaliation; of folly; of inconstancy). In this section, 43 heightens the pitch, with references to the pomp and joy of sending off the expedition (cf. Thuc. VI 30-32), the glory and pride it represented, and the shame and humility (43f) that would be caused by retreat. 46: Even Nícias left the choice to you, and did not entirely deprive you of hope, when he is the one who is frightening you, and he himself was frightened from the start; 47: do not follow overly cautious men (ie Nícias et al) and be fickle in turning back now.

48f: Peroration. Do not withdraw and end all your hopes, so that not even a dream of conquest remains for you.

Or. 6

1-4: Proem: the need for good counsel and free speech. 1: Aware that this will not be the sort of argument the audience is ‘most pleased’ to hear, the speaker claims it is best to offend and thus to persuade and teach, than to allow the Athenians to stumble over themselves. [Frequent theme of politicians as teachers.] 3f: Appeal to the audience not to be deluded by the (momentary) charms of oratory.

5-10: No inconstancy in retreat. It may have been sensible to embark on this expedition when we could rely on hope, but we were carried away, and 11-17: the situation is
different now. 11: When you sent the expedition, you were inflamed by orators (tacit reference to Alcibiades), and only a god could have spoken in opposition. 13: But now we are in desperate straits. 16: We should beware our 'desire for greater and absent things’ – ‘Shall we not moderate our excessive impulses?’ (17).

18-24: The plan has failed. We did not take advantage of our chance to attack at the height of the enemy's fear; therefore they have become angry because of their fear. Nikias is not being entirely honest in leaving the choice to you, but is ashamed to say you must withdraw; he does not refer to another fear which awaits us if we continue, but takes 'a position between telling the truth and fawning over your desire'. We are caught in a storm at sea in great confusion.

25-36: Folly in continuing war. Repeated emphasis on the speaker's fears, and on fear more generally in this section. 33: The Syracusans are hated and loathed in Sicily, but the Sicilians do not support or fear us more.

37-49: No disgrace in retreat. Repeated emphasis on what is (not) shameful. 45: The speaker fears going so far as to be unable to retreat, like dice-players who in the end ‘are hurt by their angry competitive instinct'.

50f: No danger of retaliation if we retreat.

52-55: Examples from history. The speaker emphasises what he 'fears' the Athenians will do, as above. References are to: Egypt (459 BC); Cyprus (450/449 BC, Thuc. I 112).

56: Peroration.
Oration 7 (On Behalf of Making Peace with the Lacedaimonians).
Aristid., Or. 7

B

Orr.7 and 8 are a pair inasmuch as they offer two views on peace, albeit at different times. Here an Athenian speaks in favour of making peace in 425 BC.

1-4: Proem: We should exercise moderation, in our successful position. 1: Give thanks to the gods for your position; avoid Lacedaimonian contentiousness and arrogance. 3: We should not be 'contentious beyond the bounds of moderation', endangering our current possessions – even though (4) all men accept that those who serve their desires are well-disposed and ‘truly men’, but they are displeased with those who try to moderate their conduct.

5-6: Limits of fortune.

7-9: Inconsistency in preferring war. Encouragement to remain true to their reluctance to engage in a general Greek war before the Pelop. War began. We have demonstrated courage and power; stop now.

10-14: Do not endanger success. 11: Preferring peace, we showed our (characteristic) gentleness and concern that the Greeks suffer nothing; we showed courage and power, and acquired goodwill and admiration. 12: We should demonstrate 'thoroughly moderate' behaviour and not court fear, shame, danger.

15-19: Further fighting without purpose.

20-25: Danger in uncertain future. How can success be guaranteed, if you follow those who advocate strain beyond measure? 22: ‘But when in peace lies glory and security, and in war not only danger for what we have, but even for our very glory, why should you be so dementedly contentious, as if you were no less angry at yourselves than at the Lacedaimonians?’ 7.24: We should make a truce out of generosity (not fear for ourselves, as may be the case in other situations); clinging to war will gain us a reputation for insatiability, cruelty, folly; it would represent a desire for more than is proper, delight in the misfortune of Greeks.

26-28: Goodwill of Greece.

29-30: No threat from future Spartan aggression. The Spartans will realise that they were unsuccessful, and will learn moderation, if not willingly, at least unwillingly.

31: Peroration.
Oration 8 (On Behalf of Making Peace with the Athenians).
Aristid., Or. 8

B/C

Orr.7 and 8 are a pair inasmuch as they offer two views on peace, albeit at different times. A merciful Spartan speaks in 405/4 BC

1-3: Proem. Goals of war achieved. We must act without ignoble passions or dishonour.

4: Imputation of envy. If we utterly destroy Athens, we shall seem to have acted out of envy for their city, rather than (as is true) our concern for Greek freedom and our annoyance at their lack of moderation.

5-13: Excess in punishment. 7: It is not strange to denounce their actions at Scione and Melos, but we should not imitate them; 11: if they were immoderate, ‘how is it fair for you to surpass them so much in insensitivity’? 10: Consider the proper measure of punishment; leave them opportunity for repentance. 12: Other Greeks also now feel anger at them, but later they will criticise you and sympathise with them if you punish excessively; those same Greeks also blame you for Plataea (Thuc.3.68), as they blame the Athenians for Scione and Melos.

14-16: Enough is accomplished. We should feel no fear or envy.

17: Athens’ past benefits to Greece. Persian Wars; sharing of grain in ancient times; sharing the Mysteries; reception of refugees; innumerable other kindnesses.

18-21: Mutual kindness of Athens and Sparta requires compassion. Athenian kindness with respect to the Heracleidai, in the Messenian War (sending Tyrtaios), at the time of the earthquake (sending Kimon); etc/ So we should show gratitude and compassion now, and do nothing shameful.


23: Sparta has right to claim Athens’ preservation.

24: Peroration. ‘Let us surpass them both in war and in kindness’.
Oration 9 (To the Thebans: Concerning the Alliance I)
Aristid., Or. 9

Orr. 9 and 10 are versions of the same speech (the Athenians urging the Thebans to take their side rather than Philip’s in 338 BC, before Chaeronea). Key emotional terms are kindness, generosity, friendship.

1: Proem.

2-4: Unlike Philip, Athens does not act from self-interest. Beware the nature of Philip’s kindness; gratitude to him on your part will mean voluntary servitude and you will blame yourselves.

5-13: Philip’s specious generosity vs Athens’ true generosity. 5: Do not consider the future unduly influenced by deceit and hope. 7f: Philip treated the Olynthians ‘more generously than they desired’ (sarcastic treatment of events of 350s/40s). 11: Hatred and mistrust are in fact due to Philip. We were truer friends than Philip.

14-17: Thebes’ and Philip’s policies conflict. Be fearful of Philip: he judges you as enemies, and he is greedy. His former kindness towards us, when we made a treaty of friendship, is irrelevant now.

18-21: Philip’s cunning: divide and conquer. P is deceitful, a trickier, displaying false fears, false friendships. 21: He unjustly demands gratitude from you, when he is a destroyer of gratitude.

22-29: Old quarrels btw Athens and Thebes. Against bearing a grudge. 26: necessity of controlling one’s anger, desire, grudges, and of behaving moderately.

30-33: Mutual friendship btw Athens and Thebes. Ties of friendship and trust not only on the city level, but in terms of personal friendships (ie, Heracles and Theseus).

34-37: The danger posed by Philip requires attention.

38: Thebes’ reputation.

39-45: Difficulties in both neutrality and in joining Philip. It is better to join Athens in was against the barbarian. It is not safe to try to gratify Philip, or to trust him. Emphasis on slavery as the likely result for Thebes if she makes the wrong decision.

46: Peroration.
Oration 10 (To the Thebans: Concerning the Alliance II).
Or. 10
C

There is more emphasis in this speech on *shame*.

1: Proem.

2-5: Community of interests against Philip. 2-3: Emphasis on *avoiding shame* (do not *bring shame* on yourselves, act with ill-grace, or gain a reputation for the *3 most shameful qualities* – stupidity, greed, *ingratitude*). 4-5: You and we should be united in *friendship*; Philip’s pride and greed.

6-8: Philip’s specious generosity. Philip’s *generosity* is in fact the price of dishonour.

9-11: Philip’s self-interest. Philip does not deserve *gratitude*.

12-17: Expediency should not be sacrificed to undeserving gratitude. Philip wishes you to be grateful, but this would be shameful.

18-22: Old quarrels (btw Athens and Thebes) erased by new kindnesses / *friendship*.


27-31: Difficulties in both neutrality and in joining Philip. Philip is *distrustful* of you and ready to *blame* you.

32-33: Thebes’ reputation. Beware gaining a reputation as *shameless* liars.

34-40: Fight for freedom against the barbarian. Continued references to the *shame* and *disgrace* that would be incurred by certain behaviours. 39: densely emotional paragraph: *encouragement* not to *fear or despair* but to be *confident* and *eager* in defence against Philip.

41-42: The ambassadors.

43: Peroration.
Orations 11-15
Orr. 11-15 represent the imagined debate in the Athenian Assembly over which side (Sparta or Thebes), if any, to support. (Thebes (under Epaminondas) had won a spectacular victory against Sparta in the Battle of Leuctra in 371 BC, and was inviting Athens to participate in further campaigns).

Oration 11 (The First Leuctran Oration: The First Speech on Behalf of the Lacedaemonians)
Aristid., Or. 11
C/B

Or. 11
1-4: It is expedient to support Sparta to keep the balance of power.

5-6: Generosity towards the unfortunate. Athenians have an innate readiness towards generosity and pitying the unfortunate. We should not bear more of a grudge towards the Spartans than the Thebans: the Thebans showed continued hostility and cruelty towards us during the Pelop. War.

7-9: Thebans are more guilty of destructive behaviour towards Athens. 9: Sparta’s actions can be explained in the context of war and empire; Thebes is naturally wicked and cruel by nature.

10-17: The Spartans have been punished enough. 16: The cycle of blame is at an end; do not begin a new cycle now.

18-21: Pity for the Spartans’ destruction.

22-35: Athens’ previous alliance with Thebes is no obstacle to supporting Sparta now. 25: Charge of fickleness in friendships / enmities; what really does fickleness consist in, when the two sides have changed their positions?

36-38: We have repaid the Thebans (with gratitude and kindness) enough already.

39-46: Athens’ debt to Sparta. 39f: Kindnesses of Sparta (historically). It would be shameful to give the glory to Thebes.

47-59: There is no future danger from Sparta, but there is from Thebes. Do not fear the Spartans, but only shameful behaviour. We must think carefully about how we bestow our kindness and trust (esp. 51), whom we blame and gratify (55). Beware shame and blame, deceit and fear.

60-62: Against neutrality. Neutrality would mean distressing the Spartans and antagonizing the Thebans; it would bring shame on us.

63-69: Traditional bonds between Sparta and Athens. Cruelty and perfidy of Thebes. 63: Invocation of Persian Wars as a time when Sparta and Athens fought together – therefore Spartans are ‘traditional’ friends / allies.

70: Sparta is at Athens’ mercy. There is thus the opportunity for Athens to show generosity and acquire gratitude, honour and glory.
Oration 12 (The Second Leuctran Oration: The First Speech on Behalf of the Thebans)
Or. 12

1-3: Proem. Reminder of **pain and grief** felt in the past for the Thebans, and the **desire for revenge** against the Spartans (support of Thebans since 395 BC).

4-6: The glory of victory given to Athens.

7-12: Sparta has not in fact been punished enough.

13-18: It is not a case of bearing a grudge. Extended examination of what it means to bear a grudge, and its relationship (18) to **anger**.

19-25: Thebans' crimes are less than those of Sparta. 19: Memory of **suffering** and bearing a grudge are two different things (continuing the theme of the previous section). 22: Waging war for empire and power stems from **greedy desire** and **envy**; 24: Spartan **hostility** vs Theban **kindness**.

26-39: Inconsistent and perfidious policy. **Kindness** vs perfidy; **shameful** and blameworthy behaviours; range of Athenian responses (**gentle, moderate, angry**), imitating the wickedness of the Persian (33)); unfaithful **friends** (33; 37); **hostility** to successful friends deserves a reputation for **envy and jealousy** and a lack of political worth (37). Emphasis on changefulness in this section.

40-52: Danger comes from Sparta, not from Thebes. **Gratitude, kindness and generosity** are not due to the Spartans; it is ridiculous (42, 44) and **shameful** to act in the wrong way with respect to **kindness**.

53-58: Conclude the matter gloriously for Athens. Again, **shame** lies in changeful behaviour (charge of fickleness again (esp 58 fickle)), honour and glory in consistency and faithfulness.

59-61: Against neutrality.

62-71: Sparta is neither inviolate, nor yet at Athens’ mercy. Her past **cruelty** is a foil to Athens’ **generosity**. Athens’ characteristic generosity, magnanimity, courage.

72-73: Do not drive Thebes to join the Persians.

74: Peroration. Let use endure against the Spartans; I speak not out of **goodwill** for the Thebans but in your (Athenians’) own interests [interesting indication that emotions might be untrustworthy].
Oration 13 (The Third Leuctran Oration: The Second Speech on Behalf of the Lacedaemonians)
Or. 13
1: Proem. Keep an open mind.

2-7: Expedience. There are just complaints against both sides. 2: The Lacedaimonians are to be blamed, but the Thebans are to be feared. There are grievances against both sides; refs. to Spartan arrogance (2) and anger (7); but the Thebans are more of a threat and more fearsome.

8-9: Danger of immoderate behaviour. Refs. to Scione and Melos (end of 7).

10-11: Generosity of Athens; cruelty of Thebes. 10: Need for moderation and emotional responses which are appropriate. (Athens knows moderation; Thebes does not.) 11: Thebes cares nothing for the common welfare of Greece; whereas Athens, the champion of common right, should not act on account of some ‘private anger or blame’ (ie specific to the city only).

12: No grudge against Sparta.

13-18: Unreal fear of Thebes joining the Persians.

19-20: Need for balance of power. It would be best to heighten Theban fear of Athens, (due to her intelligence, experience, sharpness, unhesitating involvement: 20), and in addition get a reputation (by saving Sparta) for generosity, magnanimity, courage.

21-27: Sparta is not yet at Athens’ mercy. War cannot be finely regulated. 22: fickleness vs faithfulness (in attitudes to external affairs). 26: By supporting Sparta, you could gain both vengeance and a reputation for gentleness, ‘a quality of yours from the start’.

28-31: Athens’ subordinate rank in the alliance with Thebes. Do not show blatant arrogance.

32-33: Concern for Athens’ reputation. You will be blamed for betrayal if you desert Sparta.

34: Peroration.
Oration 14 (The Fourth Leuctran Oration: The Second Speech on Behalf of the Thebans)
Or. 14

1: Proem. Arguments in favour of Sparta are that we should not bear a grudge and that they can no longer harm us; in favour of Thebes, that we should remember their kindness, cease from hatred (which anyway we ceased from long ago) and remember their ‘long and clear desire’ to benefit us.

2-3: Inconsistent arguments in favour of Sparta. Arguments expressed in terms of friends, enemies, fear, gratitude, confidence in partnerships.

4-19: Future unclear. Thebes more trustworthy than Sparta. Character cannot be judged in time of war, when it is out of control; judge by peacetime behaviour (Sparta has shown herself to be aggressive and greedy). 10: Faithfulness of Thebans (ie, consistent attitudes).

20-21: Sparta can be defeated and still survive.

22-23: Be consistent. In neither case can war be regulated.

24-26: Athens’ rank in Theban alliance.

27-28: Thebes’ dignity is equal to Sparta’s, and can be saved.

29-30: Sparta’s earlier rejection of Athenian help. The Spartans are suspicious, insolent, dissembling.

31: Past relationships are meaningless. Whom we should fear.

32: Support of Thebes aids Athens’ reputation. Siding with Thebes would bring a reputation of dignity.

33: Peroration.
Oration 15 (The Fifth Leuctran Oration: In Defence of Aiding Neither Side).

Or. 15
1-3: Proem. Difficulty of arguing for neutrality – one wins friendship and gratitude from neither side, since what one says is pleasing to neither side.

4-5: Inexpedient prejudice of former speakers. It is ‘shameful, lacking in political sense and in no way fair’ that there should be supporters of both Sparta and Thebes, but no one speaking genuinely to support your interests (neutrality).

6-8: There must be a just reason for war. Our ancestors are not admirable and enviable because they exposed themselves to danger willy-nilly and all the time; they achieved glory because they fought off the barbarians and never forsook justice. But this war is neither necessary or just.

9-10: There are no grounds for choosing one side over the other.

11-16: The enemies are balanced in terms of expediency. We must not bear a grudge; we should store up gratitude with both rather than make one side our friends and the other our enemies.

17-21: The so-called benefits offered to us by Sparta and Thebes. Sarcastic tone: think with what friendliness and enthusiasm they both invaded our land throughout the Pelop. War; think how graciously they fortified Decelea and met us in Sicily. Do we owe more gratitude or anger to them?

22-26: Neutrality would be the just reward of either side. Avoid the extreme hatred of either side.

27-28: A consistent argument. I am in agreement with both sides – but they contradict each other!

29-32: Persia. Consideration of Persia permits us to aid neither side, rather than exhorts us to aid one or the other. Let the Spartans and Thebans know Persian wickedness, rather than us; you do not hate Greece, and seek to destroy it all, as the Persians did.

33-37: Neutrality achieves balance of power, and a new strength for Athens. 36: ‘While these people hate, rage at, attack and threaten one another, let us sit as umpires of the war, caring for our city…’

38-42: Neutrality is not dangerous. We need not take part in this contest in anger, hate, shame, vengeance, hostility, fear.

43: There is no point in fighting except for total victory. Let us not make angry declarations to their ambassadors, but talk to both in a gentle and moderate way, and say we do not wish to be involved.

44: Peroration.
Oration 16 (The Speech of the Embassy to Achilles).
Aristid., Or. 16
C/B

Inspired by the embassy to Achilles in Iliad IX.
NB anger; moderation of, and limits to, emotions, esp wrath.
1-3: Harm of extreme anger. Your rage and anger has been reasonable; but do not end up punishing everyone else for what you blame Agamemnon. Avoid becoming hated.

4-7: Support the Greeks against the barbarians. 6: Do not seem to hate your countrymen and be afraid of battle. Use your anger against enemies, not friends.

8-9: Agamemnon’s loss of reputation. Help us and achieve what you most desire: cause Agamemnon to lose reputation, to be the subject of slander and hatred.

10-12: Inconsistent attitude to safety of Achaeans.

13-15: Duty above personal feelings. Hear me with mildness in your heart.

16: Agamemnon's humiliation. He pays a high price for his fear and humiliation.

17: Inconsistent attitude to war.

18-25: Inconsistent attitude to glory. Are you serious, mocking, or do act with wrathful contentiousness. The girl vs the glory. 21: Do not claim for yourself the two worst forms of censure, cowardice and faithlessness.

26-28: Limit to anger. Chryses’ anger ceased; yet you remain wrathful.

29-32: Achilles no coward. Shame of withdrawal. 31: Are you not ashamed to make the gods witnesses of such great wickedness?

33-36: Delay is ruinous. War cannot be regulated. Avoid shame. 34: You will profit from our gratitude.

37f: Moderate anger is fair. Everything has a limit. Nothing is fairer than anger in moderation, nothing more shameful than excessive anger.

39: Turn your wrath on Hector’s insolence.

40f: Help Greece. ‘Put off your wrath like a disease, and appear to the barbarians with the rising sun.’
The keynote emotionally is **pride** in Smyrna and its Greek heritage, as the beauty of the city, its fortune, its glory and its sights are described.

1: Proem. Smyrna is uniquely beautiful, demanding unique speech too.

2-7: History; Population.

8-22: Geography and sights. 8: the city invites **love**; 13: **delight** inspired by the city; 15: Homer as the common foster-father and **friend** of all Greeks from boyhood; 17: the city **attracts** everyone like a magnet.

23: Peroration.
Oration 18 (A Monody for Smyrna; shortly after Jan. 177 CE).
Aristid., Or. 18

NB grief, mourning and despair, and their stylisation (concern expressed to find the correct mode/form for expressing such great grief).

1: Destruction of Smyrna. Silence and self-control are impossible in the face of this calamity; weeping and lamentation are the notes to strike.

2-6: Former state of Smyrna. Proportion, measure, stability, harmony formerly, beauty and grace.

7-10: Threnody. High emotional pitch throughout this section. *7: ‘What springs of tears are sufficient for so great an evil? What concerts and symphonies of the choruses will be enough to bewail the city of fair choruses, much-hymned and thrice-desired by mankind? The fall of Asia! The remaining cities! All the earth, and all the sea within and without Gadira! The orb of the stars! Sun who beholds all things! What a spectacle did you endure to see! Child’s play the sack of Ilium, child’s play the misfortunes of the Athenians in Sicily and the destruction of Thebes, and the loss of armies, the collapse of cities, and everything which fire, war, and earthquake has thus far accomplished! You, who formerly cast all cities into the shade with your beauty and culture, and now have cast into the shade the fall of Rhodes! You were fated to become a proverb for the Greeks, “second things worse”!’ See database. 8: ‘I who have endured all things, in what land now am I to sing my monody?’ 9: ‘Now the rivers ought to have flowed with tears’. This is the tragedy in which we mourn. 10: ‘Is there a Massalia or Borysthenes which will mark the limits of this mourning? What Greek is so far away from Greece, what barbarian so untamable and unassailable by the shafts and charms of Smyrna, who did not love it by report, and who will not be pained by the report?’ Final sentence: grief, tears and mourning.
Dejection at the destruction of Smyrna makes for a powerful appeal to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. The relationship and obligations between the Emperors and the city are expressed in emotional terms (goodwill, endurance and the ability to cheer the Romans has been offered by Smyrna; confidence expressed in Romans’ magnanimity and generosity).

1: Appeal for help. ‘In the name of god offer a helping hand, and one that befits you.’ Suffering and misfortune of Smyrna.

2-5: Emperors’ connections with Smyrna. Remember how you were affected by Smyrna, made cheerful by its sights; be magnanimous: I say this not to teach or advise you (I have not been so deranged by this misfortune), but as if I were praying to you: ‘Then there is no reproach in writing to you in the same fashion in which we address the gods. Indeed, for these things we pray to the gods, but you we beseech as most divine rulers. It is fitting to beseech such assistance from gods and men.’

6-8: Aristides’ conduct. I was saved by Asclepius; after the destruction, I could not but call on the gods and you. 7: Comparison / contrast of the helplessness of Solon and his own, which is less because he can appeal to the generosity of the Romans.

9-10: Emperors’ power.

11-12: Smyrna’s former generosity, showing goodwill to the Romans, and zeal on behalf of the Greeks of Asia. Hope remains in you (that you will reciprocate our goodwill)

13-14: Appeal to help Smyrna in its misfortune.
Oration 20: A Palinode for Smyrna. (178 AD.)

A.

An expression of delight and pride in the ongoing reconstruction of Smyrna after the destruction caused by earthquake (Jan. 177 AD): this is envisaged as nothing short of a re-foundation. Emphasis on the ‘continual generosity’ (9) of the Emperors. Concern expressed (cf. Or.18) with the correct literary forms appropriate to the expression of various emotions (characters in tragedy, orations, letters, monody, palinode).

1-3: End of grief. 1: The gods in their kindness, and the Emperors (under the guidance of the gods and in their own direction of human affairs) have together saved the city. [NB expression of closeness of Emperors to gods.] 3: ‘But what then I lauded in grief, now I shall laud in joy, offering praise free from lamentation.’

4-11: The fortune of the city and its new founders. 5: ‘Formerly we sang of Theseus and Alexander, the one, I think, the most generous of the Greeks, the other the most admired of kings because of his daring in war. But now we have added to their number still more glorious and greater founders, to whom every land and sea is subject both by their inheritance and by their own additional acquisitions, and who excel no less in wisdom, justice, truth and goodness, if not more, than in prowess under arms.’ 6: All have heard of their generosity, that they caused us not to mourn but to celebrate. 8ff: further expressions of the Emperors’ ‘continual generosity’.

12-19: Help of other Greeks and good fortune of the city. 12ff: Comparison of Smyrna and Athens: at their lowest ebb, few Greeks (beyond the Pharsalians, Argives, Thebans) showed any gratitude to Athens for her historic kindnesses; whereas our rulers showed zeal and our fellow Greeks mourned for us, and felt desire for our city, in our worst misfortune. (le we are more fortunate, in that we were the subject of common Greek mourning.) 19: ‘But now all that pertains to a mournful tune and to unpleasing dress and whose praise originates from grief has gone away. The continent wears white; Greece assembles to see a happy plot; the city, as if in a play, has changed its age and once more is rejuvenated…’

20-23: The restoration. 20 cf. 5-6: triple benefactors of the city: Theseus, Alexander and now the Romans, because of their love for the city. 22: The situation is blessed in many respects, and future expectations are even better than present good fortune. 23: joy and glory to the founders.
Oration 21 (The Smyrnaean Oration II; March 179 CE).
Aristid., Or. 21
C


3-5: Occasion of former speech.

6-9: Destruction and restoration of Smyrna. Smyrna’s marvels (buildings and people) provoke admiration. Her people were not terrified by their misfortune; the Emperors ensured that ‘what was an occasion for grief has become a kind of celebration’.

10-13: New beauty greater. NB pride. 11:Formerly it was superior to other cities; now, one might even say, it is superior to its (former) self. 13: ‘Asia has recovered her ornament.’

14-15: Meles – a ‘sort of lover’ of the city, showing ceaseless love for it.

16: Peroration.
Oration 22 (The Eleusinian Oration; June 171 CE).
Aristid., Or. 22
A

Brief, powerful harangue: high emotional pitch conveyed by short, sharp question (esp. at the opening) and exclamations (esp. at the end). This speech was delivered in Smyrna expressing anger, regret, mourning, disappointment at the news that the temple complex at Eleusis had been looted and burnt. NB invocation of collective emotions (Eleusis as the ‘common precinct of the earth’; reference to glories of the past as encouragement to collective pride in the past; construction of religious places as the locus of common pride).

1-2: Mourning. What form is adequate to bewail this great calamity? (Cf. 18 and 20 esp. on expressed concern with literary form of expression for emotion.) 2: Was there any Greek or barbarian on earth who did not regard Eleusis as ‘a sort of common precinct of the earth, which was of all the things pertaining to the gods the most frightening and the most joyful for mankind. Of what other place or myth were more wonderful tales told, or where did the sacred ritual cause greater fear, or the sights more compete with what one has heard?’

3-8: History of Eleusis. 3: myth; 4: first initiations and offerings; 5: the Dorians left Eleusis untouched out of shame or fear; 6: Eleusis escaped the Persians, and in a sense fought against Xerxes (via initiates’ lacchus song), who then fled in terror; 7: Eleusis also survived the Greeks’ wars against each other, ‘when everything was topsy-turvy’, and Eleusis’ festival alone has been a purge for madness; *8: ‘The Philips, Alexanders, Antipaters and whole catalogue of later dynasts’ left Eleusis untouched, alone a source of ancient felicity and dignity to Greece, so that ‘the naval battles, land battles, laws, constitutions, pride, dialects, everything, once might say, are gone. But the Mysteries have endured.’

9-10: Celebration of Mysteries. Time of rejoicing, joy and release from the troubles of the past; giving men fairer hopes about death.

11-13: Destruction. That terrible day of destruction requires a dirge. (Short, sharp exclamatory sentences raise the pitch.) 12: Who should grieve more, the uninitiated or the initiates?
Oration 23: Concerning Concord (Jan. 167 AD.)

B.
Prompted by the rivalry of the cities of Asia (esp. Ephesus, Smyrna, Pergamum) to outdo each other in their ambition for distinction. The generosity of the Romans is mentioned several times; classical Greek history is used to show that concord and the absence of envy is better and more glorious for Greece than faction. As in Or.22, there is emphasis on feelings held in common.

1-7: Proem. 6f: A speaker should encourage common friendship and concordant behaviour, rather than singling out one city for praise, another for slander. Praise of cities in common does not imply dishonour of one city in particular; rather you should all feel delight in the praise of each other as a demonstration of your concord.

8-26: Praise of the province and of the 3 chief cities. 9: Praise of the political union, ('It dwells in good order, and one could neither blame it for arrogance nor excessive servility, but treading a middle course, it has the best form of government under the sun'), and gratitude implied for the respect and generosity of the Romans (11: their generosity has made us of more than equal status than many of their subject peoples). 13ff Pergamum, 19ff Smyrna, 23ff Ephesus.

27-40: Exhortation to live in concord. Do not be annoyed or angry at the good of others, or if they are honoured; have communal feelings and live harmoniously; 34: comparison of great cities with generals leading armies (it is impossible for the army (cf. the province as a whole) to behave harmoniously if the generals (cf. the great cities) engage in faction; so great cities must behave moderately. Invocation of Homer – ‘our most common possession’ – who praised all heroes, and all cities, even enemies of each other; likewise Pindar. 40: Do not live in untimely strife and pride; faction causes envy, fear, crime, folly.

41-52: Examples from history. Persian Wars and early stages of the Pentekontaetia demonstrate that concord and shared zeal was best for the Greeks: it reduced Xerxes to fear and humility (46). When they believed that seemly behaviour was cowardice and honoured wilfulness as virtue, and when the demagogues not longer restrained and soothed the masses but goaded them to conflict, the Athenians ‘suffered things which cannot be spoken of without tears’ (49). 52: Athens fared best under constitutional equality, and even after enduring so much in the Pelop. War she was only confounded by dissension.

53-58: Faction worse than war. Thus friendship and concord are best for cities.

59-64: No power exists in this madness of rivalry. Do not behave with madness, contention, being restless and demented; behave towards our governors with good will and faithfully, not wilfulness and fawning.

65-79: Advantages of feeling and holding things in common. 68: No one would resent your wish to exalt and honour your cities, but dispense with the unpleasantness associated with this. 68f: You should heed the old saying – that cities are not walls, halls, stoas, but men who know how to be confident in themselves; this does not mean a random contempt for your neighbours, nor the belief that everything is yours, but rather not over-valuing the city’s possessions and adornments, and the capacity to be friends of the other cities, not always wishing to prevail; become like lovers (72) of each others’ cities. 75: Good sense is the closest thing to the gods, and not the least part of that is a disposition towards friendship; 76; ‘one will together with the power of friendship administers all the heavens and Universe’.

80: Peroration.
Oration 24: To The Rhodians: Concerning Concord. (149 AD.)
B/C.

1-3: Proem. Aristides’ relationship with Rhodes. (2: generic feeling is related to class and education: it is reasonable ‘for a man who seems to belong not to the meanest rank of the Greeks to believe that he ought to care for everything Greek’; 3: more specifically, there is his reaction to the earthquake of 142 AD).

4-21: Concord an indisputable good: traditional evidence. 7: ref. to Homer (Od. On Nausicaa and concord in the home); no one prefers inconstant, fickle men as husbands, employees, etc, and a city in discord among itself can be compared to such a person (12); 13: Hesiod and the 2 types of strife; those who cause dissension in the city; 14: Solon; 15: appeal to friendship and the gods; 17: faction and hatred (re-casting the claim in Hdt 8.3.1); 20: tyranny is more moderate than faction

22: Faction injurious to Rhodes’ freedom. You are proud of your democracy but in fact you mock it rather than honour it by existing in a state which is even worse than monarchy (ie stasis, which has been proved worse even than tyranny, cf.21).

23-27: Examples from history. 24: Sparta (flourished under the concord introduced by Lycurgus); 25f: Athens (flourished only once they threw off the tyrants; were successful imperially when they were unified, but lost their empire when dissent came among them); 27: Argos.

28-40: Appeal for settlement of present dispute. 29: the Greeks’ great change in status was caused by no terrifying barbarians but rather by faction, distrust, disharmony. Times are different now, but faction remains corrosive throughout time. 31: What cause is there now for faction, or an unpleasant life? – ‘Is not all the earth united, is there not one emperor and common laws for all, and is there not as much freedom as one wishes, to engage in politics and to keep silent, and to travel and to remain at home? What need is there of imported evils or this wholly superfluous madness?’ 32ff: focusing more directly on the current social problems: dispense with envy and greed – the envy of the poor for the rich, the greed of the rich against the poor. Behave more like a household (33f); 34: mutual need of superiors and inferiors (in cities and households) for each other (as a source of pride and of security); 37: oppose your anger with reason (acknowledging that faction is an evil); 38: you are like Kleomenes chopping up his body (you destroy your city by your actions, though honouring it in speeches); 39: comparison with the devastation of the Flood, or of Pentheus being ripped apart – high emotional pitch at the end of this section.

41-44: Praise of concord.


58-59: Peroration. Feel shame before your temples and tombs, control yourselves, so that the world may continue to take such pride in you.
Oration 25: The Rhodian Oration. (Concerning the earthquake of (probably) 142 AD.)

C. [This speech is thought not to be by Aristides.]

1-8: Proem. Former greatness of Rhodes. 1: Weeping for the present destruction. 2ff: the city was formerly a 'cause of amazement and envy' in all who saw it, 'a wonder' (7). 9-10: All is lost. Recounts the city's losses, which are said to be greater than anything yet witnessed in Greek history (10). 11-16: Rhodians must endure, and destroy despair. 17-33: Great destruction. Difficulty of mourning such a disaster properly & worthily (17f, 27); great destruction and great sufferings require great mourning. 34-49: Endure! Emphasis on sufferings beyond consolation, beyond tears, in the face of which the Rhodians must endure. Aristides would restrain their grief — remember your pride, so that people remember Rhodes with admiration rather than with mourning (esp. 42). Be consoled by how fortunate you were for so long (46); don't blame or be angry with fortune (47); you must be worthy of your city and your past. 50-56: Reconstruction of the city. 57-68: Examples from history. Ilium, Thebes. 61: Sparta. 65f: Athens; if Thrasyboulos did not give in to despair, nor should you; 'most matters are decided by resolve, pride and enduring spirit, and not by abundance of resources' (66). 69: Peroration. Gratify your ancestors who beseech you to endure.
Admiration is the keynote (with praise, flattery, fawning). There are notably disparaging treatments of Greek history (esp. 40ff) to heighten the praise of Rome. Emotional management is seen to be an important component of the success or failure of empires (eg inspiring fear vs being generous in treatment of peoples of empire).

1-5: Proem. Difficulty of speech equal to this city / empire.
6-13: Geography. Marvellous size of the Roman empire.
14-57: Comparison with other empires. 15-23: Persia. 16: Xerxes excited admiration only by deeds in which he ultimately failed. 18f: The Persians were not really fully in control of their empire, and did not care enough for it. 19: They were too violent, and provoked hatred and fear; 22f: nor were they impressive in battle. They despised their followers as slaves and were therefore hated; they thus needed to fear their subjects as if they were enemies. 24-27: Alexander. Died in the middle of his work, creating little lasting in terms of laws or administration of finance, army, government. 28: Reverts to Rome. There is great harmony in your wide boundaries. 30: Equality among your subjects; 31: government is well managed by assent and edicts; 31f: fear and respect is instilled for the great ruler, his presence felt via edicts. 34ff: it is especially worthy of admiration and amazement and gratitude that you rule free men, that (36) your governors are appointed for the protection and care of the cities (rather than to be their masters). 38: 'How is this form of government not beyond every democracy?' 40ff: Greek affairs cause Aristides to profess shame in contrast, but he does not (of course) recount them as something equal to Roman affairs. 41: Romans excel the barbarians in wealth and power, and surpass the Greeks in knowledge and moderation. NB 43 very disparaging images of Sparta and Athens (enjoying mastery not of a whole body but only of nails and some hair; they were both rather dreaming of rule rather than truly ruling). Argument 43ff: each Greek city (Sparta, Athens, Thebes) barely managed to govern for one generation, because they did not manage their affairs blamelessly, but as if competing with each other to be hated (because of the way they treated their subjects / allies). * 51: before the Romans, good government did not exist; argument: Athens (and other Greeks) never learned to manage an empire. Athens, and other Greeks, managed well in terms of justice, conquest of Lydians and Persians, not being awestruck by wealth, enduring toils, but they were 'as yet uneducated in the art of government'; 52: sending garrisons to cities created suspicion and fear; 53: 'instead of rulers' they were like people uprooted and scattered abroad' – a scattered empire meant they could never consolidate or manage it; empire, and poor management of it, thus became an embarrassment. 57: Athens was at the same time oppressive and weak, and could not rule others with generosity or firmly.

58-71: Roman civil policy and administration. Admiration for Roman civil policy and administration. 59: Magnanimity in dividing the empire into citizens and subjects; hence the name 'Roman' belongs not to one city but is 'a sort of common race'. 60: There has been established 'a common democracy of the world, under one man, the best ruler and director.' 64: the Romans have no need of garrisons, for the important people in the cities guard each place for you; you hold the cities in a double way, from here and individually through them'. 67: paying taxes to you is a pleasure.

72-89: Military policy. Praise of Rome for establishing a (semi-)'professional' army. You recruited a not unfair number of soldiers from the cities, and 'thus all men obey and no city is angry.' Therefore all cities display goodwill to soldiers and to you. 79ff: Praise of Roman fortifications and walls.

90-91: Constitution. 90: on the 3 types of constitution: tyranny and oligarchy, or kingship and aristocracy; and 'the third was named democracy, whether it was conducted well or badly'. Your government is not like these, but like a mixture of all of these, without any inferior aspects: you are like a democracy without the people's errors; the Senate is like a
perfect aristocracy; the Emperor is like a perfect monarch, free of the evils of tyranny and greater in dignity than a king.

92-106: All of the empire flourishes in peace. 96: ‘You continually care for the Greeks as if they were your foster fathers, protecting them, resurrecting them as it were, and giving freedom and self-government to the best of them’ and guiding the others with moderation and great consideration and care, educating the barbarians gently / harshly as required. 101: You have made Homer’s saying a reality: ‘the earth was common to all’. 103: with you, faction and confusion ceased, and ‘universal order and a glorious light in life and in government came to the fore’. 106: Homer foresaw and hymned the Roman Empire; Hesiod, had he had such powers of divination, would have emended his notion of perpetual decline, to allow for the fact that these are the best of days.

107: The emperor.

Oration 27: Panegyric in Cyzicus. (166 AD.)

C.

Delivered at the festivities for the newly repaired Temple of Hadrian at Cyzicus. Not rich in emotional terms; keynote is (fairly formulaic) praise, ie expressing admiration for the city and its temple.

1-4: Proem. Asclepius’ encouragement. Asclepius’ guidance helps Aristides conquer his fear about speaking adequately.

5-15: Geography and description of Cyzicus.

16-21: The temple.

22-39: Harmony between emperors. Praise and admiration for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius (sharing of rule). 34: Homer spoke of the ‘anger of Zeus-nurtured kings’, but Hadrian and Antoninus Pius have not made anger or immoderate wrath their characteristic, but rather generosity and magnanimity. 38: fear reconciles subjects to other rulers, but for Hadrian and Antoninus Pius there are prayers and universal gratitude.

40-45: The cities should behave concordantly. 40: We should be grateful to gods and congratulate emperors, and ‘join in prayer for them’. 41: We should praise the harmony they have brought, and live harmoniously, living in ‘true peace, guileless friendship, justice and sharing in every way’ (44). Such behaviour would gratify the desires of those emperors, whom we would thus duly honour.

46: Peroration.
Oration 28: Concerning a Remark Made in Passing. (140’s AD.)

B.

*Keynote:* *pride in one’s work, and due limits of pride.*

1-2: Proem. The quarrel. A responds to someone who criticised the comments he made on his own excellence in a speech (now lost) to Athena (speech made between 145-147 AD).

3-17: Right to ‘honest opinions’ about one’s own writing (ie, *due pride* – neither excessive nor too humble). A defends his opinion, and admonishes his critic in turn for improper participation and for slander of him (see esp. 8). 10: A asserts that his proper fee is in fact ‘friendship, goodwill, intelligence, memory, a *moderate* degree of honour shown towards the speech, and *respect* for its writer’. 11: cf Isok. And Aristotle: a man is ‘not sound, whose *pride exceeds his means* or who even postures to *astound the masses* whether in words or deeds; … But whoever realizing the extent of his ability is *proud* to this degree and to that of his true worth, and neither seeks nor hunts for anything more, this man precisely fulfils the definition of freedom.’ 12: likewise, a man who is more humble than his resources is not described as liberal but *stingy, greedy, avaricious.* Praise of oneself and others when they are pleasing, and criticism when they are blameworthy, is a sign of the simple, not the complex man (and this is good – cf. Plato Rep. 397 E). 14: ‘I say that there is no greater inequality among mankind than for all men to be *equally proud* of their actions.’ Delphic instructions (know thyself and nothing in excess) can be interpreted as telling us to be *duly proud*, too. 16f: Thersites vs Achilles, and Odysseus’ contrasting responses to them (it is ridiculous for them to have similar levels of pride).

18-97: Due pride is an old Greek custom. Examples from literature. *Pride* is essential to the achievement of memorable deeds and words. This is illustrated by literary examples, where characters ‘are proud of oneself and speak in accordance with the real worth of one’s abilities’. Homer (who ‘more or less votes himself the greatest poet’: 19): Achilles and Odysseus, 25ff; Nestor 30ff; Agamemnon 37. Hesiod (20ff; ‘excess of self-praise’ in *Theogony*, 23). Sappho (51ff) (who is said to boast more than Aristides). Alcman, Pindar, Simonides. Herodotus (69). Thucydides (71): there is *pride* throughout his work (in the speeches of his characters, eg Pericles who speaks ‘as if he were some Homeric Zeus’, 71)– who does not know of Pericles’ words, because of Thucydides? (And 72 on the confusion btw. what is Thuc. and what is Pericles). 74: Hermocrates as a braggart, full of pride. Demosthenes (75). Plato (80), Lysias (84), Aristophanes (93), Isokrates (95).

98-134: The circumstance and cause of the remark must be considered. Praise of oneself is justifiable if just, but not if (101) the statements are made out of *pride and scorn*, ‘or because he is intentionally *dishonouring the general populace* and regards them as worthless’. 102: it is also fair to speak of one’s own achievements if the god moves one to do so, the rest of the time being more *moderate*; also 116 on the nature of ‘divine madness’: it is common to be moved, then to become *scornful*, then to associate with the god and excel: ‘For he excels who has *scorned the general populace* and has conversed with god’. Further references to Homer for support of his case.

135-52: Supplementary examples. Use esp. of Plato and Solon.

153-6: Peroration. Aristides’ act was reasonable. Reverts to some of the sarcasm we also saw in the Proem about his critic’s status as a would-be ‘educator’. 155: would you not accept with pleasure if the gods offered you children like me in *pride* and eloquence? So how can you criticise me for things for which you would *thank* the gods?
This speech argues against the propriety of performances of public satire during contemporary religious festivals (eg the Dionysia). Key emotions: reverence for the gods; the shame involved in satirical slander which is not in fact educative (as its defenders claim); concern for reputation (now, and for the reputation of ancient Athens). The wide gulf always depicted in Aristides (and other texts of the period) between the educated and the masses is here highly relevant to the different emotional and intellectual responses of the two groups to advice / teaching / slander (see esp. 1f; 17ff).

1-3: Proem. Differing attitudes towards advice. A assures his audience that his recommendations in this speech will be pleasant for them.

4-15: Malicious slander is inappropriate to a sacred occasion. Sacred feasts and festivals should be times of celebration, piety (4), friendship and concord (7), reverence and honour of the gods (8, 14), auspicious language (like that of priests and heralds, 9f) – not shame, defamation, slander, ‘delight in evil’ (5), the use of language annoying and hateful to the gods (10f). 5: ‘to endure slander willingly is a training ground for malicious conduct’. 5: those in thrall to the slander in comedy are infected by ‘the extreme human fault, envy’, allowing envy to grow in his soul; no one is pleased by slander of those he loves.

16-32: Refutation of the alleged utility of slander and a consideration of its dangers. 16: Defenders of satire claim that it is good because ‘those who have lived evilly are refuted and the rest behave with moderation through their fear of being satirized’. But (*17) A claims that ‘such education is not within the capacity of the masses, no more than legislation and making proposals in the assembly’. 18: we hold selection of athletes, to get rid of the bad ones through shame, and we choose the most trustworthy as our doorkeepers; we should not be ‘inept’ then in the choice of our guides and educators (ie, allowing them to be mere comic / slanderous poets and drunkards). 20: The Dionysia, Sacred Marriage and Night Festivals are not a time for educators but for jesters, and we should not give our children a holiday from their real teachers only to be ‘taught’ by drunken satirists; ‘theatres are dedicated to pleasure and enjoyment’ – teachers should not be there making their admonitions (21). It would be well enough if wanton men were slandered and no others, but in comedy men are undeservedly slandered, and others avoid public ridicule who should not: the comics’ criticism ‘is conditioned by their hatred or their desire to please other men’, depending on money, love, etc. People buy off slanderers, too. 25: thus satire cannot improve the youth. 27: contradictory attitudes to the comedy of the ancient Athenians: one the one hand, it seems bad, (they are honoured by all their other writing, but traduced alone by comedy, providing opportunities even now for those who wish to defame them); but on the other (28), it was at least more educative, via the parabasis, than contemporary comedy. [NB concern with reputation of the ancient Athenians; cf. Defence of the Four for this theme.] We should not endure the impact on our reputation. It is better to be like the Spartans, who kept all their affairs secret.

33: Peroration.
Oration 30: Birthday Speech to Apellas. (147 AD.)
C/B.

Written for the (?) 14th birthday of C. Julius Apellas of the powerful family of the Quadrati. Contorted and artificial style (Behr); overblown and stilted flattery of the boy.

1-3: Proem. Public celebrations. The zeal of all men is given to these celebrations; the city’s glory is so happily increased, not only publicly but privately.

4-5: Pergamum and Apellas. It is to your glory and the city’s that you were educated here, and did not leave it, dishonouring it as if it were insufficient for a training in virtue for a noble spirit.

6-15: Quadratus family. Praise / flattery of the legitimate, pure, ancient family (7), genuine citizens (8), close to the god (9) (ie Asclepius), their glorious accomplishments (10); his father (11) is a noble gentleman; all this creates in A an ‘excess of joy’ (13); invocation of Asclepius (14f).

16-22: Apellas qualities. Gentleness of soul; ‘his gentleness does not appear like the enfeebled sort, such as the trials of life have created in many men. But it shares his youth and is mixed with a proper sense of pride’ (17), dignity; handsome, respectable, charming smiles and laughter, but ‘not deficient in temper, by which one would judge masculine nature’ (18); power of speech, and charming both when serious and in his pleasures (19); well educated according to Platonic precepts (Laws 643 C) (20); already a judge (21).


28: Peroration.
Oration 31: Funeral Oration for Eteoneus. (c. 161 AD.)

C/B.

Written shortly after the earthquake of 161 AD, which devastated Cyzicus and partially destroyed the Temple of Hadrian. This mourns the death of one of A’s students in the disaster.

1-2: Proem. Mourning justified. Conceit: even if mourning were not a custom among men, it would become one now; consolation is needed via mourning. 2: is there a Simonides or a Pindar who will mourn these things?

3-10: Eteoneus’ birth, career and education. 4: Magnanimity; simplicity; ‘He had the unfinished quality of a boy, the flower of a youth, and the wisdom of an ancient.’ 5: intelligence; absence of boldness, audacity, wilfulness; a sharp wit in a calm disposition; moderate behaviour; ‘the combination of equal keenness and gentleness’; 7: devoted to A., his tutor, and he rejoiced to attend my lectures. 9: modest and seemly behaviour (9).


14-18: Consolation. Mourning becomes praise (A makes the comparison with a deus ex machina in tragedy). 15: tone shifts perceptibly: the god says the boy will be a hero, honoured, and is not to be mourned or pitied (15f); he will be blessed, envied by all (18); he has enjoyed the best part of life.

19: Peroration.
Oration 32: Funeral Address in Honour of Alexander of Cotiaeum. (c. 150 AD.)

B/A.

Written for his tutor (grammaticus). Keynotes: mourning and grief; admiration; mutual pride of Alexander and Aristides, linked to pride in their shared Greek heritage (esp. 24); also friendship (esp. 11; 39-41); jealousy in parts (see 8, 16, with Behr Commentary).

1-4: The propriety of sending the letter. 2: ‘The greatest bond between us was that we could be equally proud of one another. I felt self-esteem to have had him as a teacher and he counted my career as part of his own glory.’ This letter publicly shows confidence in you, duly honours and remembers him, and makes you my friends because of him.

5-13: Alexander’s career. He was so distinguished that he made the city and race proud of him (rather than drawing pride from them/you). 6f: best of teachers. 9f: eloquence. 10: generous liberality. 11: friendship: common father of other bards (proving Hesiod lied when he said, ‘bard hates bard’), showing hope in them and admiration for them.

14-21: His kindess. Moderation and decorum; justice and generosity. Always did good, caused grief to no-one. 16: not ashamed to be paid for his art [Behr notes that this is in contrast to A., who would not accept fees.] Pride, glory.

22-27: His distinguished academic career deserves honour. This honourable and glorious career is a consolation in our grief. 24: You can honour him as Smyrna honours Homer, Paros Archilochus, Boeotia Hesiod, Himera Stesichorus, etc...

28-36: Perfection of his life. 28: Honoured by all, royalty and private citizens alike. 30: it is hard to say whether he was honoured more by Greeks or by Romans. 33: Admired by all in your lifetime. ‘Desired by those who have met you, to meet you was desired by the rest.’

37-38: Exhortation to honour Alexander’s family. Honour and respect are due, with zeal.

39-41: Peroration. Aristides’ relations with Alexander. 39: ‘I got a rich harvest back from the friendship I felt toward him’. 40: I was not able to comply to his requests to dedicate works to you, since I still wished to revise them; thus he did not see or know about all my speeches, though he praised them greatly, and promised they would occupy first place. ‘But as to the verdict which he always rendered about our speeches, I do not know whether it was beyond envy, but it was more than extravagant.’
Oration 33: To those who criticise him because he does not declaim. (166 AD.)

C/B.

1-2: Proem.
3-6: Second introduction. The charge against him.
7-15: The employment of the artist. Arguing that it is the responsibility of the ‘user’ to go to the specialist (doctor, artist/orator, hairdresser), this section becomes a reproach to the people of Smyrna for not ‘cultivating’ his oratory (see esp. 13).
16-23: Aristides’ behaviour. He argues that he is not deficient in zeal and enthusiasm (16).
24-33: Audience’s behaviour. Rather, his audience, while calling him ‘best of Greeks’ like ‘desperate lovers … so exceptionally fond of me’ (24), are in fact like the playboy sons of great fathers, content to have great men around, but preferring the pleasures of swimming pools, whores and jewellery to actually attending A’s lectures. Also 25: sarcastic tone about their consequent ‘amazement’ that they miss out on hearing great speakers. 27: A’s fear is not for oratorical contests but for the opponents of oratory who entice people to swimming pools rather than lectures.
34: Peroration. The speech is a defence or well-intentioned censure.
Oration 34: Against those who burlesque the Mysteries. (166 AD.)

C/B.

This speech is notable mainly for the tone of indignation with which A discusses bad oratory (cf. Orr.2-4 also).

1-18: It is a feeble excuse when corrupt orators blame the masses for the poor quality of their speeches.

19-37. The best style will prove the most effective.

38-47: The sophisticated and unlettered audience. Strong sense of 2 starkly opposed groups, who are differentiated intellectually and also to some extent emotionally (in that they admire, praise, are excited by and are amazed by many different things; and where their tastes overlap, they often have different reasons for their admiration etc). 47: A bad orator who aimed merely to gratify his audience caused amazement and rapture in the audience, such that they capped his ‘singing’ renditions. The performance is taken over and subverted by the masses, and becomes a pitiful affair for the sophist in question.

48-62: Gratification of the audience shamefully debases oratory. NB esp. 51: treatment of the masses is the cue for a great increase in emotional language. Friendship with the masses and gratification of their pleasures is shameful, causing wanton behaviour. Gratification of the masses because of love (in either direction) is a shameful matter for the sophist. Note 54: Thucydidean echo (to lead or be led by the masses). 61: Gratification of the masses suggests that men have become women (the opposite of Thessalian Caeneus); dangers of lack of moderation, self-control, courage.

63: Peroration.
Oration 35: Regarding the emperor.
Not by Aristides. Authorship disputed (?247 AD.)

C.

A rather fawning speech to the Emperor (Behr calls it ‘clumsy and bombastic’).
Note praise of the Emperor’s goodness and generosity in the Proem (1-4). 16-20: Praise of the Emperor’s justice and generosity. 21-6: Further praise of his generosity, gentleness, moderation, accessibility. 24: ‘A great and marvellous emperor such as no other emperor has been.’ 26: praise of the Emperor for maintaining the same character both as a private citizen and as Emperor, choosing moderation always. Note 27-29: praise of the Emperor for self-control; 29: Homeric basileis were deficient in virtue, and were wanton though great warriors; in contrast our Emperor is moderate. 30-37: praise of his courage.
Orations 37-41: ‘Manteutoi’

These speeches, prescribed by oracle, belong together. Note the general importance in these speeches of gratitude to individual gods.

A prose hymn for Athena, cast as an aretology. The speech is not cast in emotional terms.

Oration 38: The Sons of Asclepius. (c. Aug. 147 AD.) N/a.
Again, this speech has little relevance for the construction of emotions.

Oration 39: Regarding the well in the Temple of Asclepius. (? Jan. 167 AD.) C.
The most prominent use of emotion is in the Proem (1-3), when users of the well are compared with ‘handsome youths, who are smitten by the power of their beauty and know the nature of what they love’; thus are many people lovers of the well of Asclepius.

Oration 40: Heracles. (Aug. 166 AD.)
C.

Again, the use of emotions is not prominent in this speech. Note:
11: zeal of the Athenians for Heracles (to the extent that they showed him some preferment over Theseus; cf. Plut. Thes. 35, citing Philochorus).
22: Heracles is honoured by all men, but A claims particular friendship with him, ‘which arose from a certain divine voice’, which seemed to come from the Metroon (presumably in Cyzicus; cf. F.W. Hasluck, Cyzicus), exhorting him to ‘endure the present circumstances’ (the plague).

Oration 41: Dionysius. (c. 145-147 AD.)
A short speech which is not of great interest for the construction of emotions. Note however 12: Dionysius as the leader of ‘Love, that tyrant of men’ (cf. Euripidean fragment, and Plato Symp. Note that Symp.’s treatment of eros colours its treatment throughout this short speech.)
Orations 42-46
These orations belong together as a group of speeches.

Oration 42: An Address regarding Asclepius. (? Jan. 167 AD.)

B.

Dominant tones: praise, gratitude, pride.

1-3: Proem. Expression of gratitude through oratory. A is glad and eager to use his oratory to express his gratitude, since 'you granted us from a great sea of despair to reach a calm harbour'.

4-5: Asclepius' power and benefits.

6-8: Medical aid. 6: A, like others, has been resurrected from the dead by Asclepius; these stories are 'accepted, of course', for this is 'an old practice of the god'. 7: Oral accounts and written votive declarations attest to limbs being destroyed and replaced by Asclepius. 8: 'Much of the marvellous' in the dreams sent by Asclepius.

9-12: Oratorical aid. 9: stories are told of endurance in many ways, and A himself has shown great endurance; 9: conviction that his oratorical success is a result of divine grace; 12: A as the 'actor of Asclepius' (oratorical) compositions', deserving my gratitude.

13-14: Fame. A's friendship with Emperors. Asclepius is responsible for A's fame (13) and friendship with Emperors (14). A compares his receipt of oratory from Asclepius with Odysseus' oratorical display, given to him by Athena (Odyssey, Books 7-12).

15: Peroration.

Oration 43: Regarding Zeus. (Feb. 149 AD.)

C.

1-6: Proem. Difficulty of fulfilling his vow. A showed lack of moderation when he vowed, in a storm, to offer a prose hymn to Zeus if he should save him. Concern and fear are expressed about his ability to fulfil his religious obligation.

7-13 (Creation of the world by Zeus) and 14-22 (Creation and care of living things by Zeus) are not couche in very emotional terms: the key point is gratitude to Zeus. Note 22: rare criticism of Homer (Iliad 8.1ff) who was 'far from properly inspired' when he depicted Zeus forbidding the gods to care for mankind.

23-30: Zeus as the cause of all things; 31: Peroration.

Oration 44: Regarding the Aegean Sea. (shortly after April 155 AD.)

C.

Praise (in gratitude for the sea) is the dominant tone.

Points of interest to note: 4: on defining 'Greekness'; 7: the sea is also 'marvellous'; 8: it is 'not barren nor by opening out an endless vista does it cause depression and despair'; 10: it is both fearsome (for its strength and sudden changes) and gentle (offering safety etc); 12: the islands are a consolation and a relaxation; 16f: the sea gives happiness and pleasure.

Oration 45: Regarding Sarapis. (142 AD.)

C.

See Behr on A's worship of Sarapis, which 'ebbed and flowed in rivalry with that of Asclepius'. Behr notes that after 144 AD, A presents Sarapis more prominently than he does here as specifically a healing god.
1-14: Proem. Poetry vs prose. A’s vow. Pleasure, honour, grace and charm bestowed by poetry; but prose too can offer these things. (Characteristic concern with the appropriate form of praise/address).
15f: Sarapis’ nature.
17-32: His control over our lives. (Note 26: generosity and fearsomeness of Sarapis, simultaneously.
33-34: Peroration. The storm. Gratitude and honour to Sarapis.

Oration 46: The Isthmian Pration: Regarding Poseidon. (156 AD.)

C.

See Behr on A’s lack of belief in Poseidon; this becomes ‘purely an elaborate, formal production’. Dominant note is (formal) praise of / gratitude to Poseidon.
Notes: 2: honour to Poseidon; 20ff: praise of Corinth; 32ff: mystery cult of Leucothea and Palaemon (with 33: expression of fear about this aspect of the piece).
Orations 47-52: Hieroi Logoi

Oration 47: Hieroi Logoi I. (170/71 AD.)

A/B.

Dominant emotions: **anxiety** concerning his health; **endurance** of sickness; **gratitude** for the god’s help in the past, and **hope** that it will continue; expressed **astonishment / wonder** at the god’s efficacy, contrasted with others’ disbelief and **lack of faith** in the god.

1-4: Proem.

5-60: Diary of health of his abdomen (covering approx. early Jan. – mid Feb., 166 AD).

18f: dreams involve the pleasures of life (his own pleasure and delight is oratory). 22: dream involving suspicion, fear, being greatly disturbed, followed by relief. 36: dreams of a treaty of peace and friendship. 42: dream involving hope, if he were in the god’s hands. 30, 38, 45: marvelling at the things accomplished by Asclepius in dreams. 46-9: **marvelling** at the honour and care shown to him, above all others, by the Emperors in his dream; the Emperors express gratitude to the gods that they have known Aristides; i.e., implicit assertion of **pride** in one’s life expressed by recounting a dream. 54: distress, lack of trust and anger expressed via a dream; Aristides asks the god to clarify whether he means that he should undertake fasting or vomiting; he marvels at the god’s intervention (56). 60: between his fastings, work and study were his consolation.

61-68: The ‘dropsical tumour’ (concerning 148 AD). 62f: contrary advice of the doctors and of Asclepius regarding A’s tumour. A’s friends either **marvelled** at his endurance, or criticised his reliance on dreams, or thought he was **cowardly** for avoiding surgery. (64: implicit pride in the social status of his friends, who surround him at this time.) 66f: friends and doctors are **happy, incredulous and admiring** of Asclepius’ interventions.

69-77: The death of Zosimus (in 148 AD). 71: **Desperate** entreaties to Asclepius to save Zosimus. 72: Asclepius’ instructions help to give Zosimus another 4 months’ life: tone of celebration; A says that Asclepius in this period helped him ‘continuously and strangely’, for example helping his **peaceful** literary composition, despite his dire physical condition, of which the god enabled him to be oblivious, so that he could work. 74-7: the death of Zosimus (in the snow) is related as being due to disobedience to Asclepius’ warnings, as related via Aristides; 77: ‘So his additional life was due to the grace of the god, who truly kept him for me, and he died because he had moved about contrary to my dreams.’

78: The cure of Philumena. The god also saved Philumena, A’s nurse (**than whom nothing was dearer** to me), ‘countless times’; this gives A great joy.

Oration 48: Hieroi Logoi II. (170/171 AD.)

A.

General and recurring points: **gratitude** to Asclepius for his healing; expressed **astonishment / wonder** at Asclepius’ efficacy; **dejection, despair, desperation, anguish** concerning illness. Note esp. expressions of religious contentment (11-23, 24-36); **consolation and relief** of despair achieved through recollection of the Greek cultural heritage (41f; 71-80).

1-4: Proem. The god ordered me to write; writing as an act of gratitude to the god, and through the compulsion of the god’s dreams.

5-10: Introduction to cult (144-45 AD). The doctors were at a loss; Asclepius would bring things about deserving of great gratitude.
11-23: The dream of the years. 12-14: shipwreck episode, causing great anguish, after which Asclepius reveals that this was fated, but that a further shipwreck in the harbour must be staged to fulfill all the aspects of destiny: 'we did this quite gladly.' [Interesting episode on revelation, fate, destiny.] 18-23: Asclepius appeared in A in Smyrna in the form of both Asclepius and Apollo; 21: encouragement and physical warmth from the manifestation of the god; feelings of physical warmth and contentment continue (22) into the following days, mentally feeling neither conspicuous pleasure nor joy (23), but 'a certain inexplicable contentment, which regarded everything as less than the present moment ... Thus I was wholly with the god.' See database.

24-36: Dreams of protection. 26-28: The god appears in a dream, and fulfilling his instructions A felt 'almost as if in an initiation, since there was great hope together with fear'. 29-33: parallel dreams of A and the temple warden, Philadelphus; *32: A’s dream involves a particularly vivid description of seeming to touch the very presence of Asclepius in a state ‘between sleep and waking’, and: 'Hair stood straight, and there were tears with joy, and the pride of one’s heart was inoffensive. And what man could describe these things in words? If any man has been initiated, he knows and understands.' 34: the doctor marvels at this, but fears A’s weakness and is at a loss what to do.

37-45: The plague. 38: the plague causes despair, wailing, groans along with terrible sickness. 39: in A’s case, the doctors gave in to utter despair, but even in a state ‘near death’ he is held firm by a vision of the Athena, in the form of the Athena of Phidias (41f), and by recalling Homer; ‘thus the goddess consoled me’. 44: the fever finally left A on the very day when ‘the most valued of my foster-children died’: ‘Thus I had my life up to this time as a bounty from the gods, and after this, I was given a new life through the gods, and as it were, this kind of exchange occurred.’

45-59: River baths. Astonishment of others at A’s multiple treatments (esp. 47). 48f: Asclepius appears to A in a dream, tells him to bathe and predicts what he will see; he duly sees what has been foretold, and reflects: ‘The comfort and relaxation which ensued was very easy for a god to understand, but not at all east for a man to conceive of or write about.’ Anguish at ill-health: esp. 52, 56, 63f.

60-70: Trip to Rome (144 BC). Great sufferings and anguish on the journey, so that the party had to return home, and (65) ‘a sort of Odyssey took place’. We finally arrived at Smyrna ‘beyond all expectation’.

71-80: Baths in the Temple. 71: A follows a path of treatment recommended by Asclepius, but things go wrong (72) when he listens to the contrary interpretations of the dreams by his comrades (represented as Odysseus’ comrades in Od.X), although unwilling and suspicious, but not wanting to seem to be someone who only trusts in himself (quotation from Hesiod WD).

81-82: Trip to Ephesus. A, previously in anguish, takes a bath here in line with Asclepius’ orders, and the spectators wonder ‘no less at the bath than at my words. But the god was the cause of both.’

Oration 49: Hieroi Logoi III. (170/71 AD.)

B/A.

1-6: Trips to Aliani. Illness, exhaustion and dreams in Aliani.

7-14: Trip to Lebedus. Obedience to the commands of the god – whether feeling willing or unwilling – over and above the prescriptions of doctors (esp.9). Oracle and vision concerning A’s cure (12), leaving him in high spirits and ‘a remarkable comfort’ (13).

15-20: An attack of opisthotonos and other terrible symptoms. The doctor’s agitation, 19.

38-43: The earthquake. **Terror** caused by earthquake. 39: A is **suspicious and fearful** about the direction to sacrifice an ox, but he is encouraged by a dream to sacrifice **boldly**, which is what caused the earthquakes to stop (of which: 'who wishes to believe, let him believe, and he who does not, to him I say farewell!). 43: others are in supplication and **distraught** at the earthquakes, but A feels **bold** because of the support of the god, wishing to communicate that there was no need to be **afraid**.

44-46: Sacrifices. 46: Isis, Sarapis and Asclepius all appeared to A.

47-50: Zosimus' death and the Egyptian gods. 47: A is miserable with **grief** at the death of Zosimus. Vision of Sarapis mutilating A's mouth (Behr (n64) reads this as self-hate), and another vision from the (Egyptian) gods of the Underworld advising him to give up his **strong grief**. 48: far more **frightening** and terrifying visions, indicating the power of Sarapis, which he describes as an 'initiation'. 49: A asserts that sacrificing to Isis and Sarapis in the Temple of Isis was ‘far more frightening’ still, and he realises the ‘terrible majesty’ of Sarapis. (Behr (n64): this turning to Sarapis represents a temporary dissatisfaction with Asclepius.)

Oration 50: Hieroi Logoi IV. (170/71 AD.)

C/B.

1-13: Trip to the Aesepus. On the journey A is 'completely consecrated, as it were, and possessed [by Asclepius]' (4), composing lyrics for him. 6f: A describes the bathing and treatment, and the god’s interventions, as being like an initiation, 'since the rituals were so divine and strange, but there was also coincidentally something marvellous and unaccustomed. For at the same time there was **gladness and joy, and contentment** of spirit and body' and ‘a **fear** that some one of the usual things will again befall and harm one’s hopes about the whole’; his return took place ‘with such **happiness** and at the same time **anguish**’ (7 – **the most emotional section of the speech**).

14-30: Return to the study of oratory. **Exhortation** from the god not to abandon oratory: ‘It **befits you to speak in the manner of Socrates, Demosthenes, and Thucydides**’. 19: dreams from the god kindle A’s ambition in oratory. 25: value of the dreams for oratorical training, ‘for I heard many things which excelled in purity of style and were gloriously beyond my models, and I dreamed that I myself said many things better than my wont’.

31-47: Lyric poetry. The god also urges A to compose lyric; most things A has written for Asclepius or Apollo, through the inspiration of dreams (41).

48-70: Inspiring dreams. 50: dreams of honour and distinction from Asclepius delight A. 55ff: dream concerning Platonism. 59: dream of seeing Lysias, and (60) Sophocles.

71-108: Legal victories. Asclepius was also A’s protector in this area of his life. Details of his dealings with Severus, governor of Asia, who treats him with honour (78f); the god intercedes via a dream, explaining to A how to get further concessions (‘for I was not satisfied to have received empty honours’, 80), which makes A both happy and troubled (82f). 94ff: another case, when Pollio was governor (and A was tax inspector). 100ff: dealings with Festus, when he was governor; 101: the people in Assembly shout their customary approval, and A is offered a nomination to the priesthood of the Common Assembly of Asia, though he does not take up the position (restrained by Asclepius). [Breaks off abruptly.]

Oration 51: Hieroi Logoi V. (170/71 AD.)

B/C
Aelius Aristides 49

1-10: Trip to the Temple of Zeus (Pergamum). The god indicates that the journey is to be undertaken (despite A’s illness). Endurance, desperation and obstinance meant that A was ‘no more anxious than confident’.

11-17: First trip to Cyzicus. A’s consolation for making the trip in difficult circumstances was being able to concentrate on his speech for the Cyzicenes (ie Or.27), which was greeted with enthusiasm (16).

18-37: Trips to Pergamum, Smyrna, Ephesus. 18: a dream of studying Aristophanes’ Clouds portends clouds and rain the next day. 22-5: dream concerning Philumene. 31f: A is told (via a dream) by the god to declaim; 32f: frenzy and shouting in the packed Council chamber in anticipation of A’s declamation (33); anguish, joy and fear (33) of audience as they shout out (emotional response to declamatory performance); 34: this quiets a rival. 37: of his oratorical career: ‘I have well persuaded myself and many men that no human accomplishments ever puffed me up, and that I was not elated when I worsted either few or many, and that I do not believe that I should be proud of such things any more than I should be ashamed of my pride.’

38-41: The oratorical display at Smyrna. 38: the continual activity of the god was marvellous. 39: a feeling of ease (schole) in reciting, (ie due to the support of Asclepius) (the theme is against the sophists); the audience’s positive reaction is again emphasised, as they demand more (40), and in an increasingly violent manner. They marvel at the performance he ultimately gives. A explains that he was prepared for all this by the god.

42-55: Second trip to Cyzicus and return. 48: further miraculous cures from the god.


Oration 52: Hieroi Logoi VI. (170/71 AD.)

C

Only sections 1-3 remain (describing events in 155 AD). (A had intended to give an account of his oratorical triumphs here.)

1: Marvellous visions led A to Epidauros. 2: One of the visions encourages A to be brave (‘Strike out the dead part of your soul, and you will know god.’; ‘Save yourself for the city of Athens, which mean for the Greeks’).
Oration 53: A Panegyric on the Water in Pergamum. (probably post-177 AD.)
C.

Fragmentary piece.
1-3: Proem. The water is so abundant and fair that it is here a cause of delight, joy, physical exultation.
4: Propriety of A’s composition. A wishes to adorn the water with speech as a further way of rejoicing and congratulating the city on its water (beyond seeing the water, which is a joy common to all).
5: Mythological times. [Section breaks off in the text as we have it.]