

Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games

Eleni Volonaki

This chapter addresses the ancient Olympics and considers the ideological investments of public oratory at Games ancient and modern. I will start with the rhetoric of the last two modern Games in 2004 and 2008 and subsequently explore the dual nature of epideictic oratory in ancient Games, based on the Olympic speeches that have survived from the first half of the fourth century BCE. As will be shown, the ideals of peace, concord and unity are common appeals for immense and wide audiences both in ancient and modern times. However, the epideictic oratory of the ancient Games played a prominent political role aiming to persuade audiences to action, while also offering skilful orators the opportunity for display. The ideology of public oratory used in the ancient festival may well have been received in the modern Games, but has been modified to address a global audience invested in certain moral and civic values alleged to increase social bonding.

Pierre de Coubertin is credited with the inspiration for and establishment of the modern Olympic Games; the renovation of the games took place in Athens in 1896. In 2004, the 28th Olympiad, the Olympic festival was hosted for the second time in Athens at their source. Jacques Rogge, the president of the International Olympic Committee, made a speech in the opening ceremony which thanked all the factors that contributed to the successful organisation of the Games, including the athletes. He repeatedly appealed to peace; he also called for tolerance and brotherhood. He finally underlined the importance of the Olympic Games as uniting people from different backgrounds: ‘Athletes from the 202 countries show us that sports unite by overriding national, political, religious and language barriers.’ Gianna Aggelopoulou Daskalaki, the president of the Organising Committee for Athens 2004, praised the athletes for their youth, excellence and competition in a spirit of peace, where divisions between nation and race should disappear.¹ As a whole, the rhetoric of Athens 2004 involved appeals for a spirit of peace, unity, and friendship in a fair contest.

The rhetoric of the Beijing Olympic Games 2008 was not dissimilar. The relevant website claims that ‘“One World One Dream” is a profound manifestation of the core concepts of the Beijing Olympic Games 2008. It

4. *Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games*

fully reflects the essence and the universal values of the Olympic spirit – Unity, Friendship, Progress, Harmony, Participation and Dream. It expresses the common wishes of people all over the world, inspired by the Olympic ideals, to strive for a bright future of Mankind. The proclamation of the committee promoted the ideal of peace within the spirit of cooperation and mutual benefit.²

The rhetoric of the Olympic Games both in antiquity and in modern times is characterised by the ideals of peace, unity and harmony. On these ideals are based the rhetorical appeals of speakers to their audiences. There is, however, a significant shift in modern times in the rhetoric deployed at the Olympic Games. Modern politicians and presidents of committees mainly address the athletes, encouraging them to continue their contests with the values of virtue, excellence and honesty. They praise them for their achievements and call for unity beyond any kind of social, political or religious differences. The ideal of peace is emphasised on a worldwide basis so that there will be no war or conflict but only a ‘happy’ future for all people; peace is promoted as a universal ideology in the face of reality. On the other hand, the unity is based on a non-discriminating social, political and religious basis; the political message is to override any kind of barriers that might interfere in people’s lives.

The Olympic orations of antiquity emphasise a Panhellenic *homonoia* (concord), the unity of the Greeks against the barbarians. The appeal for unity is rhetorically used to encourage all the Greeks to make war rather than peace, but a war that will secure their freedom and will put an end to political conflicts. The speeches that have survived and were allegedly composed for the Olympic Games addressing either a reading or a listening audience have a complex political agenda, criticising Spartan influence upon the Greek states and nonetheless appealing for peace and unity among them.

The ancient Olympic Games and public display

The ancient Olympic Games were the oldest of the four Panhellenic or national athletic festivals,³ and were held in honour of the god Zeus.⁴ The traditional date of the foundation of the Olympic Games is 776 BCE, but it was in the last quarter of the eighth century that a wider participation in the Olympics began.⁵ The Olympic festival was held every fourth year until 394 CE,⁶ attracting citizens from all over the Greek world. In the early years of the festival, hundreds of people gathered from neighbouring towns and city-states of the Peloponnese, and later thousands of people used to come by land and sea from colonies as far away as Spain and Africa.⁷ There was a tendency to view the athletic success as a symbolic success in public life, and certain athletes went on to pursue political careers in their home towns.⁸

The Olympic Games offered an opportunity for the great assembly of all

Greek states to articulate a feeling of common identity, and apparently an opportunity for prominent orators to show off their skills. According to the programme of the festival, as reconstructed by modern scholars, orations by well-known philosophers and recitals by poets and historians were performed in the afternoon of the first day, which was among other things dedicated to various religious rites (e.g. sacrifices to Zeus) as well as to the athletes' oath-taking process.⁹ Although the evidence of speeches composed for the Olympic Games is limited, it does reflect the persistence of public oratory as continuously playing a significant role to the festivals.

Three notable Greek orators used the occasion of the Olympic Games to plead for the cause of Panhellenic *homonoia* ('same-mindedness') or concord.

First was Gorgias,¹⁰ the sophist from Leontini, in Sicily, who is said to have come to Olympia at the beginning of the fourth century (408 or 392 BCE). His full Olympic speech has not survived, but in the epitome he encourages the Greeks to be reconciled and fight against the barbarians. Philostratos briefly reports the following information (*Lives of the Sophists* 494):

His *Olympian Oration* dealt with a theme of the highest importance to the state. For, seeing that Greece was divided against itself, he came forward as the advocate of reconciliation, and tried to turn their energies against the barbarians and to persuade them not to regard one another's cities as the prize to be won by their arms, but rather the land of the barbarians.¹¹

Lysias, the Athenian democrat and metic from Sicily, allegedly delivered a speech in Olympia in 388 or 384, aiming to persuade all the Greeks present to remove Dionysios from his position as a tyrant in Syracuse and set Sicily free. A part of this speech has survived and is cited by Dionysios of Halikarnassos as an exemplary piece of Lysias' epideictic oratory. The speech appeals for the unification of all Greeks against the barbarians, namely the King of Persia and Dionysios, the tyrant in Syracuse. As with Gorgias' speech, here again the tone is both deliberative and persuasive.

Finally, another Athenian orator, Isokrates, composed a model Olympic speech, his *Panegyrikos* – a pamphlet which was not performed at the Olympic Games but was designed for a reading rather than a listening audience in the early of the fourth century (380 BCE).¹² In this oration Isokrates 'expresses a permanent Panhellenic ideal which transcends time, and affirms an Athenian leadership of Greece based on culture no less than on feats of arms'.¹³ Isokrates makes use of a stock theme common in epideictic contexts, Greek *homonoia*, to call for a Panhellenic campaign against Persia. Isokrates exploits the context and themes of epideictic oratory for deliberative purposes.¹⁴

We will explore the role of epideictic oratory in the Olympic Games; first, as a demonstration of the rhetorical skills of the speakers, secondly, as enhancing their political status and voice, and finally, as influencing

4. *Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games*

opinion in the audiences. Given the limited evidence from the fourth century BCE Olympic speeches, it is worthwhile to explore the rhetorical *topoi* (commonplaces) expected for display as well as the rhetorical purposes of the speakers. Lysias' speech, *Olympiakos* (33), is the only surviving speech (though only a fragmentary section) which could possibly have been delivered at the Olympic Games. It will therefore be taken as an example of epideictic oratory at the Games; our purpose is to examine the rhetorical means used not only to address the festival but also to persuade and give advice to a Panhellenic audience.

To understand the role of epideictic oratory at the Olympic Games as having an influence upon the Greeks, it is necessary to examine the characteristics of the genre. Aristotle (*Rhet. Alex.* 35) distinguishes the types of oratory as follows:

The concern of counsel/advice (*symbolle*) is partly exhortation, partly dissuasion. For in every case people who offer private advice and people who speak in public on civic issues do one or the other of these. The concern of the lawsuit is partly accusation, partly defence. For inevitably people in dispute do either of these. The concern of display is partly praise and partly blame.

The term translated here as *display* is derived from the Greek noun *epideixis*, which means 'demonstration' or 'show'. As Carey (2007: 236) rightly points out, Aristotle's division has limitations and 'ignores the flexibility of and fluidity between literary forms in living traditions'. Epideictic oratory differs from forensic and deliberative oratory in having no immediate practical outcome; speakers in the courts and the Assembly need to persuade their audiences in order to reach decisions, which bring practical consequences.¹⁵ Nevertheless, epideictic oratory aims to persuade as well. According to Isokrates (12.271), epideictic oratory should be taken seriously as contributing to rhetorical education; he also indicates that epideictic speeches can demonstrate methods of argumentation and consequently the rhetorical skills and ability of the orators (Isokr. 4.17).

There were two kinds of display: on the one hand, the funeral orations which played an important role in social definition since they constituted an integral part of the public funerals held each year at Athens for those who had died in battle and were delivered by prominent political figures, such as Perikles;¹⁶ on the other hand, there were orations composed and normally delivered by distinguished orators at festivals, such as the Olympic Games or the Pythian festival at Delphi.¹⁷ Isokrates alludes, if dismissively, to the practice of composing orations for festivals (5.13):

... and, finally, that those who desire, not to chatter empty nonsense, but to further some practical purpose, and those who think they have hit upon some plan for the common good, must leave it to others to harangue at the public festivals, but must themselves win over someone to champion their cause from among men who are capable not only of speech but of action and who

Eleni Volonaki

occupy a high position in the world – if, that is to say, they are to command any attention.

As it appears, there was a lively interest in skilful and ambitious *rhetores* who could deliver speeches at festivals, since the audience, travelling and drawn from the whole of the Greek world, was available to listen to any speeches or other kinds of performance.¹⁸ Isokrates 1.6 in fact discusses the size of this kind of audience while partly dismissing its political effectiveness:

In addition this too is clear to everyone, that the festivals suit those in need of display (*epeidixis*) – for each can broadcast his own powers there to the largest audience – but those who want to achieve something practical should speak to the person who is to carry out the acts disclosed in the speech.

In the fifth and fourth centuries BCE the Olympic Games attracted a vast audience from all Greek cities and colonies. Isokrates refers to numerous crowds gathered at the city of Athens on the occasion of the state festivals (4.45), and we can conclude that numbers at the Olympics were comparable:

And the crowds that visit our city are so numerous that any advantage accruing from our association has been secured by Athens. In addition to this, our city is the best place to find the most enduring friendships and the most varied society, and furthermore to see contests not only of speed and strength but also of reason and thought and all other activities – and for these the prizes are the greatest.

The fact that epideictic speeches had become a practice and a permanent feature of the Olympic Games from Gorgias' to Isokrates' time indicates that the audience was prepared to listen to prominent orators demonstrating their craftsmanship. Given that Greek society valued public speaking highly, the famous orators who used the occasion of the Olympic Games to speak publicly to these huge audiences must have gained in public standing and profit. The audience at the Games is likely to have included influential people from every city.

It appears that the competition among orators at the Games reached such a degree that their contemporaries could regard epideictic speeches as advertising.¹⁹ In this context, orators differentiated their position from the tradition of the sophists; their intentions were not to praise but to advise their audience and tell them the truth. It was a common rhetorical strategy for public speakers at festivals to define their own limits within the tradition of the genre. For example, Lysias (33.3) presents himself as an honourable man and a worthy citizen:

These were Heracles' instructions, but I have not come here to talk about trivialities or to fight about names. In my view these are the tasks of those

4. *Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games*

sophists who are wholly useless, and who are desperate for a livelihood, whereas the task of an honourable man and of a worthy citizen is to give advice about great matters ...

Isokrates also in his *Panegyrikos* (4.3-4) emphasises his own superiority to other sophists:

I have come before you to give my counsels on the war against the barbarians and on concord among ourselves. I am, in truth, not unaware that many of those who have claimed to be sophists have rushed upon this theme, but I hope to rise so far superior to them that it will seem as if no word had ever been spoken by my rivals upon this subject.

The *display* was generally conceived as a highly competitive activity, as is clearly attested in the funeral oration ascribed to Lysias (2.1-2):

If I thought it possible, you who are present at this burial, to make clear in speech the courage of the men who lie here, I would criticise those who gave instructions to speak in their honour at a few days' notice. But since for all mankind all time would not be enough to prepare a speech equal to their deeds, I think that the city gave the order at short notice out of concern for those who speak here, in the belief that in this way they would be most likely to be forgiven by their listeners. However, though my speech is about these men, my contest is not with their deeds but with those who have spoken in their honour previously.

The Olympic orations which are ascribed to Gorgias, Lysias and Isokrates make use of the stock theme '*homonoiā*' (concord), which was not simply a suitable theme of epideictic oratory but was constantly used to enhance the ideal and concept of Panhellenic unity at Olympia.²⁰ The argument about Greek *homonoiā* is stressed for deliberative ends, urging the audience to take action against the enemies, the barbarians. This practice of rhetoric confirms that there is flexibility between the genres of oratory.²¹ The question, however, is how far the oratory of the panegyric speeches was genuinely deliberative. Gorgias seeks to persuade the Greeks to direct their aggressive inclinations towards the territory of the barbarians; however, this may not have been an argument for aggressive policy but simply a Gorgianic rhetorical ornament.²² Lysias and Isokrates by contrast represent themselves as having a practical agenda.

Isokrates glorifies and praises the Olympic Games as an opportunity for strengthening the entity of Greece, and it is in this context that he calls for a Panhellenic campaign against Persia. The rhetorical *topoi* used in Isokrates' *Panegyrikos* could be taken as typical themes of epideictic oratory or at least of Olympic orations; among these *topoi* are the distinctive role of epideictic oratory and display (7-12, 43-5), the mythological and historical background of the city of Athens (23-34, 54-60), the superiority of Athens among the Greek cities (39-42, 47-50, 103-14), the achievements

Eleni Volonaki

of the ancestors in the Persian Wars (61-73, 85-98), the criticism of the Lacedaemonians' policies (122-35) the need for an alliance of the Greeks against the King and the barbarians (138-40, 160-89), and the natural hatred against the barbarians because of their effeminacy and arrogance (149-59).

In the case of Lysias' Olympic speech, the deliberative goal becomes even more clear and urgent; Lysias not only calls the Greeks to unite against the Persian King and Dionysios I, the tyrant of Syracuse, but in particular he urges them to act out their hostility by removing Dionysios' representatives from the festival (Dion. Hall. *Lysias* 29). The encouragement of the audiences to make particular decisions of Panhellenic interest reflects the orators' tendency to foster their own political prestige.

Appeals and advice constitute a normal part of epideictic oratory. Lysias makes use of similar rhetorical *topoi* to those found in Isokrates' *Panegyrikos*, such as the appeal for the union of the Greeks against the barbarians and the criticism of the Lacedaemonians. Lysias criticises the Lacedaemonians for their humiliation of their subordinates and their support for Dionysios the Sicilian tyrant and the King of the Persians. Such a criticism would not fit the Panhellenic unity which is encouraged by orators at the festivals, even though it aims to appeal for Sparta's help in the future. Epideictic oratory may promote the ideals of Panhellenism, concord and unity but behind the ideal surface of the Games it shows, on the one hand, a tendency towards criticism of individual states, such as Sparta, and it encourages, on the other hand, the idea of a common war against the barbarians. The proposed violence interrupts the ideal of *homonoia* which is highlighted in the performance of epideictic oratory at the festival. There is a kind of ambiguity in the role of public oratory at the Games in that it promotes the tradition of articulating ideals but it can also interrupt the tradition by attempting to persuade the audience to take forceful political action.

Lysias' Olympic speech (33) – a speech for display?

We will now turn to an analysis of Lysias' Olympic speech, which offers valuable evidence of the role of epideictic oratory as advisory but also as encouraging the audience towards violence. An introduction to the speech by Dionysios of Halikarnassos has survived as a preface to Lysias 33, which briefly informs us about the historical context. Lysias warns the Greeks of the dangers that are great and surround them on every side, of Artaxerxes, the King of Persia and Dionysios, the tyrant of Sicily, who both possess ships and control the sea (§5). He explains that their powers have been substantially increased due to the civil conflicts among the Greeks and he advises now the Greeks to put aside their war and unite their forces for their own security (§6). He criticises the position of the Spartans, who neglect the destruction of Greece although they are worthily the leaders

4. Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games

of the Greeks and have been the saviours of Greece in previous dangers; the speaker still expresses the hope that the Spartans will take precautions for the future (§7). Finally, Lysias emphasises that this is the best opportunity for all the Greeks to take action against the enemies (§8).

From 395 BCE Sparta was engaged in a war with a coalition of Boiotia, Corinth, Argos and Athens, fought in mainland Greece, the so-called Corinthian War. The cause of the Corinthian war was mainly the emerging power of Sparta over the Greek cities.²³ Sparta's intervention in support of Dionysios I retaining his position as a tyrant in Sicily aroused further hostility among the Greek states.²⁴ The Corinthian War ended with the victory of Sparta with Persian and Syracusan help (Xen. *Hell.* V.1.29) and resulted in the King's Peace of 387/6, the clauses of which meant the end of all alliances between Athens and Thebes and Corinth and Argos.

Two dates are possible for the performance of Lysias' *Olympiakos*. Diodoros of Sicily (XIV.109) places it in the Olympic Games of 388 BCE.²⁵ It is not unlikely, however, that the speech was delivered in the Olympic Games of 384, since the Corinthian War was still in progress in 388. In principle, there would not be a problem with the Olympic Games taking place in wartime;²⁶ on the contrary, appeals for *homonoia* and unification of all Greek cities against the enemies and the barbarians would have been far more effective during the Corinthian War. However, given that Athens made an alliance with the tyrant Dionysios in 386, it would be difficult to give a speech that urged the Greeks to take action against Dionysios after that date. On balance, taking the text into consideration, it seems reasonable to accept Diodoros' date of 388 BCE.

Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Lysias* 29) quotes Lysias' Olympic speech as an example of his style in the genre of epideictic oratory,²⁷ whereas he does not mention the famous Funeral Speech (2) at all.²⁸ Diodoros of Sicily (XIV.109) also attributes the speech to Lysias and moreover considers that it was delivered by Lysias himself. However, the reception of the speech as genuine in ancient sources is no guarantee of authenticity. As recent studies have shown, Lysias' *Olympiakos* clearly diverges from the rest of the corpus Lysiacum.²⁹ Despite its peculiarities in language and style, the Olympic speech keeps the Lysianic line of forensic oratory (i.e. brevity, *charis* (grace) and sarcasm) and adjusts it to the needs of epideictic oratory, making use of the rhetoric of praise, respect, emotional appeal and exhortation to generate the audience's admiration and motivation.³⁰

In antiquity, as we have seen, Lysias was thought to have performed the speech in Olympia. Modern scholars have disputed this view on the grounds that Lysias as a metic could not have delivered an Olympic speech, and argue that someone else, either Syracusan or Corinthian, could have delivered the speech.³¹ There is no evidence, however, that only citizens could speak at the Olympic Games.³² The Olympic Games were open to an audience of all Greek cities, and in such an occasion all

Eleni Volonaki

philosophers, poets and orators could most probably participate. The festival might be particularly attractive to a man like Lysias, since it gave him a political voice. As an expatriate, he could neither influence Syracuse nor (as a metic) Athens.³³

The rhetoric of the speech

In order to achieve an immediate result and have the envoys expelled, Lysias makes use of special rhetorical appeals to a Panhellenic audience. In the *prothesis* (§3, statement of the argument) Lysias differentiates his position from that of the sophists and expresses his intention to support the interests of the people rather than his own.³⁴ Lysias praises Herakles (in the proem, §§1-2),³⁵ who according to Pindar³⁶ had created Olympia and instituted the first games in honour of Zeus.³⁷ Furthermore, Herakles is said to have put an end to the tyrants and prevented their arrogance by establishing ‘a contest of physical strength, a competition of wealth, and a display of wisdom’ (§2). According to Lysias’ description, the participants of the Games, at least when they were originally established, were expected to be excellent in physical and intellectual training as well as very wealthy. The respect for these aristocratic values reinforces their importance to the audience at the Games, who may have been an elite audience.

The praise of Herakles’ achievements in the first Olympic Games is used to set an example for the present Games, uniting all Greeks together with friendship in order to stop the tyranny. Another example used to persuade the audience towards action is that offered by the ancestors (§6); the ancestors deprived the barbarians of their property, expelled the tyrants and established freedom for all. The theme that the ancestors set an example by offering freedom to all Greece is peculiar to epideictic oratory; in particular, the ‘praise’ section of the funeral orations included standard mythological and historical exploits, one of which was the praise of the ancestors and their accomplishments.³⁸ Most probably, Lysias refers to the Persian Wars and the victory by the Greeks over the barbarians – a common rhetorical topos used as a unique and exemplary action of bravery and freedom by the Greeks in epideictic oratory.³⁹

Clearly connected with the example of the ancestors is the appeal to honour and shame. The Greeks should honour their ancestors and imitate their actions. They should also be ashamed for what has happened in the past and should be afraid of what is going to happen in the future (33.6). Lysias appeals to the common knowledge that shame brings dishonour to people whereas fear leads to action and liberation. In §9 the concept of ‘shame’ is rhetorically manipulated to make the Greeks responsible for having exacted no punishment for great and terrible crimes. In effect, Lysias’ exhortation to remove Dionysios’ envoys becomes a matter both of revenge and of duty.

Rhetorical *hyperbole* is widely used in the Olympic speech, when em-

4. *Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games*

phasising the dangers that are threatening Greece (§5), and the civil strife and mutual rivalry as the causes of the disasters in Greece (§§4, 9). The rhetorical exaggeration of the existing risks for the whole of Greece underlines the necessity to unite and secure safety. Lysias very cleverly shows respect toward the Spartans and he recognises them as leaders of the Greeks at the present, because of their innate merits and their knowledge of war, and as saviours of the Greeks in the past ('being leaders of the Greeks' ~ 'after having been the saviours of Greece in previous dangers'). Moreover, in §7 Lysias praises the Spartans' life style and customs to explain their freedom and independence. Finally, Lysias makes a special appeal to Sparta and bases his hopes for the future on the Spartans' precautions. There is a clear pro-Spartan tone on behalf of the Athenians, which is in line with the theme of *homonoia* that is emphatically stressed in epideictic orations. However, Lysias also criticises the indifference of the Spartans and charges them with passivity 'in tolerating the devastation of Greece' (33.7).

Lysias attempts to persuade the Greeks to take action against their enemies immediately (§§8, 9) and explains that there will be no better opportunity than the present one to stop the invaders attacking Greece.⁴⁰ The tone becomes deliberative when Lysias urges the audience to regard the disasters of those who had been so far ruined as their own concern and to prevent their enemies from any kind of disrespectful behaviour, while it is still possible. The emotional appeal aims to stimulate the audience's *pathos* (emotion) for revenge by emphasising that the motivation of the Great King and the tyrant of Sicily lies in greed and ambition.

The reference to the enemies' *hubris* (arrogance) and the rather intense phrasing, 'to restrain their enemies' arrogance', may involve an action that needs to be taken immediately and even though there is no other clear indication in the speech, we may interpret this phrase to mean that the orator urged the audience to remove an enemy. Such an assumption would be consistent with Dionysios of Halikarnassos' statement that the Greeks started their mission of hatred there and then by despoiling the royal tent (*Lysias* 29). Diodoros of Sicily, in his narrative of the incidents that occurred at the Games after Lysias had delivered his Olympic speech, reports: 'In the course of the contest chance brought it about that some of Dionysius' chariots left the course and others collided among themselves' (XIV.109.4). The ancient sources, though not necessarily reliable, seem to reflect a real event, which was probably widely known at the time, and in connection with the instruction, 'restrain their arrogance', as quoted in Lysias' Olympic oration (33.8), we can assume that the orator made a direct impact upon his audience. Lysias tried to impress his own political agenda and status on an immense audience.

In conclusion, epideictic speech is of ideological importance; its functions are more complex than Aristotle's description of it as involving what is

Eleni Volonaki

honourable, in the form of either praise or blame (*Rhet.* 1406a-b).⁴¹ According to Aristotle's categorising of the three 'species' of rhetoric – judicial, deliberative, epideictic – which remained fundamental in the history of classical rhetoric, a speech is called 'epideictic' if the audience is not being asked to take specific action; as Kennedy (1994: 4) points out, the concept of epideictic rhetoric needs to be broadened beyond this definition.⁴²

The Olympic festival – though amenable to pure display – offered the possibility of influencing opinion in the Greek cities and getting beyond the limits of any one city. Furthermore, it gave an opportunity to skilful *rhetores* to impress their audience and advertise their own political opinions. Based on the evidence from *Olympic* speeches preserved to us, it appears that epideictic oratory revealed dual nature; it presented the ideals of *homonoia*, *harmony* and unity among the Greeks but it could also interrupt the idealising tradition by criticising individual state policies and encouraging acts of violence. The rhetoric of the Olympic Games was based on the ambiguity of Panhellenic unity in the sense that the Greeks should all unite in order to get ready and prepare for a war against the enemies, the barbarians. The tradition of calling for a Panhellenic campaign against the enemies has the effect of exploiting the context and themes of epideictic oratory for deliberative ends. The festival was an occasion for pure display but also for actual action.

Notes

1. The evidence of the speeches has been taken from the Athens 2004 Olympic Games DVD.

2. The information has been taken from the official website of the Beijing 2008 Olympic Games: <http://en.beijing2008.cn>.

3. The other three were the Pythian Games at Delphi, held in honour of Apollo, the Isthmian Games, held at Corinth for Poseidon, and the Games at Nemea, which, like the Olympics, were in honour of Zeus; cf. Swaddling 1980: 12.

4. The mythical origin for Olympia's favour in the will of Zeus is recounted in Pindar, *Olympian* 3. The oracle is already in operation at the altar of Zeus, when Heracles establishes the athletic games at the site; cf. Spivey 2004: 174-5.

5. The question of the date of the institution of the Olympic Games must remain open; cf. Morgan 2007: 47-8, and Spivey in this volume.

6. On that date Theodosius I abolished the Olympic Games.

7. Swaddling 1980: 7.

8. For example, the history of the Diagorid dynasty of Rhodes; cf. Spivey 2004: 178. See also Stocking, Brunet and Pressly in this volume.

9. Cf. Glubok and Tamarin 1976: 15-27; Swaddling 1980: 37; Zaidman and Pantel 1999: 110ff.; Lee 2001: 30-47.

10. Gorgias is also credited with a speech delivered at the Pythian festival at Delphi; cf. Carey 2007: 238.

11. Philostratos, *Moralia* 144c; cf. Spivey 2004: 190-1.

12. Epideictic oratory is considered to have developed in the fourth century BCE and have grown from the rise of book trade; speeches were composed for display

4. Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games

in the prospect of publication and tended to address a reading audience. Cf. Carey 2007: 238-9.

13. Usher 1990: 21.

14. Carey 2007: 248.

15. Carey (2007: 237) explains that this kind of difference gives epideictic oratory an ambiguous status.

16. On the importance of the funeral oration to the political life of Athens, see the most extant and significant study by N. Loraux (2008; originally 1981).

17. Gorgias is credited with a speech delivered at the latter.

18. Carey 2007: 238.

19. Cf. Isokr. 5.26.

20. For Greek *homonoia* used as a 'stock' theme of epideictic oratory, cf. Isokr. 4.3, Plutarch *Advice on Marriage* 144b; Carey 2007: 248. As Spivey (2004: 192) suggests, one should speak of a rhetoric of Panhellenic unity at Olympia in the fifth and early fourth centuries BCE. Thus, the concept of uniting common interests was publicly demonstrated in Olympia; there was an altar to 'Unanimity' and, after the events of 364, there was an inscription 'From Eleans, for Concord' dedicated to a statue of Zeus. However, as Spivey (2004: 192) remarks, the *reality* of inter-Greek co-operation came about only by the domination of Greece first by Macedon, then Rome.

21. In Lysias' *Olympiakos* 3, the speaker's role appears to be deliberative, aiming to advise the Greeks how they can get rid of the barbarians and the tyrants, in the elevated style of epideictic oratory. We can also notice the combination of the elevated style of epideictic oratory with the practically important subject-matter of deliberative oratory in Isokrates' *Panegyrikos* 4; cf. Usher 1990: 150.

22. The speech has not survived and the evidence from Philostratus, *Lives of the Sophists* 493 cannot be conclusive.

23. Hornblower 1991: 190.

24. For the Spartan support of Dionysios I in Sicily and its consequences for Athens and Corinth, cf. Hornblower 1991: 187-9.

25. Diodoros' date may have derived from his tendency to place events in the wrong year by summarising earlier historians.

26. Todd (2000: 332) indicates that there may be two difficulties in our understanding of the speech, if the speech was actually delivered during the Corinthian war. The first difficulty involves §7, where the orator describes the Spartans as the leaders of Greece; it might be difficult to accept this description at a time when they were still fighting against other Greek cities. However, the description of the Spartans as the leaders of Greece (33.7) emphasises their virtues and life style, pointing to their superiority, and fits the pro-Spartan tone of the specific section. Furthermore, the present tense in the phrase 'tolerate the destruction of Greece' indicates that the war has not been over yet. The orator praises the Spartans at a time of conflict to call for their help in the future. The second difficulty involves §5, where the King of Persia is called the 'steward of money'; such a language might fit better a date after the Corinthian war, especially after 387/6 when the peace of Antalkidas was made on terms favourable to Persia and Sparta (cf. Medda 1995: 430-1). The emphasis placed upon the power of the King of Persia may be seen as an emotional evocation of fear and preparation for war.

27. Dionysios of Halikarnassos (*Lysias* 28) refers to Lysias as less forceful in his epideictic oratory though he should not be considered inferior to any of his predecessors or contemporaries for his efforts to be more lofty and impressive: 'In ceremonial oratory he is less forceful, as I have said. For he tries to be more lofty

and impressive, and indeed he should probably not be considered inferior to any of his predecessors or contemporaries; but he does not arouse his audience as powerfully as Isokrates and Demosthenes do theirs. I shall give an example of his ceremonial oratory.'

28. The fact that Dionysios of Halikarnassos quotes this speech as an example of Lysias' style in the genre of epideictic oratory and does not mention at all the most famous funeral speech (Lysias 2) may at first sight indicate that Lys. 33 is a genuine and Lys. 2 is not a genuine work of Lysias; cf. Todd 2000: 26-7, 331-2. However, given that Lysias was mostly popular for his forensic orations, it would seem particularly difficult to accept such an observation with reference to his skill as an epideictic orator, especially if we consider that Dionysios of Halikarnassos attributes only this specific epideictic oration (33) to Lysias. On the other hand, Dionysios' silence about Lysias 2 cannot be conclusive of the latter's authenticity; for the view that the Funeral Speech (2) is a genuine speech of Lysias, see Todd 2007: 157-64.

29. Usher and Najock 1982: 99-103.

30. Blass (1887: 434-36) indicates that Lysias does not use the epideictic characteristics found in Isokrates' *Panegyrikos* but, rather, adopts his own style of forensic speeches. One cannot exclude the possibility that the Olympic speech preserved in the Corpus Lysiacum was a rhetorical exercise imitating the Lysianic epideictic style; Lysias' work, however, focuses on forensic rather than epideictic speeches (only two epideictic speeches have survived in the corpus and have both been considered dubious), and one would expect students of rhetoric to imitate his forensic style.

31. Blass (1887: 431 n. 3) presents the scholars' views on this matter; Gröte argues that it was Lysias himself who delivered the speech, Schäfer assumes that an exile from Syracuse, called Themistogenes, could have delivered it, and Frohberger disputes that Lysias was in the position to deliver a public speech since he was not an Athenian citizen. There is also the possibility that the speech was composed for a Corinthian to deliver, since there is evidence that in the 340s Timoleon was sent out by Corinth to destroy Dionysios I, the tyrant. (Diod. Sic. XVI.83).

32. In the case of public funerals, one would have expected distinguished Athenian political figures to have delivered the speeches.

33. We cannot exclude the possibility that Lysias composed this speech for a reading audience. The publication of speeches involved a continuing contest to shape opinion and policy and consequently contributed to political rivalry and competition; cf. Carey 2005: 92-5. Thus, Lysias might have been interested in publishing such a speech for prestige and political influence.

34. This is a common rhetorical topos in all genres of oratory; for complaints about the triviality of other genres of oratory, as used in the epideictic speeches of Isokrates, cf. Todd 2000: 333, with n. 2.

35. The proem of the speech (§§1-2) is rather short and therefore the speech must not have been very long, or at least not as long as Isokrates' *Panegyrikos*, the proem of which is seven times longer (Usher 1990: 149) than the present one. According to Aristotle, the proem of epideictic speeches does not need to be relevant to the main subject of the speech but only whatever the speaker likes to say (Arist. *Rhet.* III.xiv.1) and should be either praise or blame (Arist. *Rhet.* III.xiv.2).

36. Pindar *O.* 3.19-22; cf. Lee 2001: 7, 11, 26.

37. It is considered more likely that athletic festivals like the Olympic Games

4. *Epideictic Oratory at the Olympic Games*

developed from the funeral games which were held in honour of local heroes; Pelops was the local hero of Olympia, and his grave and sanctuary were situated within the Altis. For this view, cf. Swaddling 1980: 9.

38. For the structure and the themes of funeral orations, cf. Loraux 2008; Hermann 2004.

39. For the *topos* of the Marathon battle in the funeral speeches, cf. Thuc. 2.34.1-7, Lys. 2.20-6, Plato *Menex.* 238c-246b2, Demosth. 60.9-10.

40. In forensic oratory the argument that the present trial offers a unique opportunity for the judges to take revenge and exact punishment upon the criminals constitutes a commonplace aiming to influence their verdict; cf. Lys. 12.90-1, 13.95, 40.6. Lysias draws on this rhetorical *topos* to focus the audience's attention on the importance of the matter and fight for their freedom.

41. For Aristotle's discussion (*Rhet.* 1367a32-4, 1367b21-8) of 'the language of praise (*logos epainos*) and its performative circumstances, cf. Haskins 2004: 61-4.

42. Kennedy 1994: 62.