

**THE PRINCIPLE FIGURES OF  
LANGUAGE AND FIGURES OF  
THOUGHT IN ISAEUS AND THE  
GUARDIANSHIP-SPEECHES OF  
DEMOSTHENES**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649279074

The Principle Figures of Language and Figures of Thought in Isaeus and the Guardianishp-Speeches of Demosthenes by William Wilson Baden

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**WILLIAM WILSON BADEN**

**THE PRINCIPLE FIGURES OF  
LANGUAGE AND FIGURES OF  
THOUGHT IN ISAEUS AND THE  
GUARDIANSHIP-SPEECHES OF  
DEMOSTHENES**



The Principal Figures of Language  
and Figures of Thought in Isaeus  
and the Guardianship-Speeches  
of Demosthenes

---

BY  
WILLIAM WILSON BADEN, A. B.  
Fellow in Johns Hopkins University



A DISSERTATION PRESENTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR  
OF PHILOSOPHY IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS  
UNIVERSITY, MAY, 1892

---

The Lord Baltimore Press  
THE FRIEDENWALD COMPANY  
BALTIMORE, MD., U. S. A.

1906





## THE PRINCIPAL FIGURES OF LANGUAGE AND FIGURES OF THOUGHT IN ISAEUS AND THE GUARDIANSHIP-SPEECHES OF DEMOSTHENES.

### INTRODUCTION.

The object of this study is to make a thorough examination of the principal Figures of Language and Figures of Thought in Isaeus and the Guardianship-Speeches of Demosthenes, and see to what extent the latter orator was influenced in his use of them by the former. Three general questions present themselves:

Why is Isaeus worthy of study, what are his relations with Demosthenes, and what is the importance of Figures of Language and Figures of Thought in the development of style?

Isaeus worthy of study.—Isaeus is worthy of study because he carries on the tradition of practical oratory, and forms the connecting link between Lysias and Demosthenes. He is also the highest and best representative of Greek inheritance-law; for according to the development of Greek art, the best exponent of a given art always survived. Thus it is that the excellence of Isaeus in cases of inheritance wiped out nearly all competitive speeches.

As an individual, Isaeus is comparatively little known. The time and place of his birth and death, and even his nationality are matters of dispute. All that can be determined is that he flourished after the Peloponnesian war and lived until the dynasty of Philip.<sup>1</sup> For reasons unknown, he took no part in the administration of public affairs, but devoted himself mainly to the minute and varied questions incident to the settlement of estates, which had been brought into a very uncertain condition by the Peloponnesian war. For this work he was thoroughly qualified by his natural gifts and powers. But he felt that to deal successfully with intricate facts, it would be better

<sup>1</sup> Dionysius, *Isae*, c. 1.

#### 4 *Isaeus and the Guardianship-Speeches of Demosthenes*

not to follow the established rules of rhetoric. He did not, however, withdraw himself entirely from the influence of his predecessors and contemporaries.<sup>1</sup> But owing to the number of speeches lost, and the uncertainty as to the dates of those preserved, the exact extent of such influence cannot be determined. There are some traces of his connection with the school of Isocrates, but the smooth and polished diction of this school was not suited to forensic debates and arguments. Isaeus impresses us much more strongly as a reflector of Lysias, and this is expressly stated by Dionysius.<sup>2</sup> According to this critic,<sup>3</sup> we find the same purity, exactness, persuasiveness, vividness in the language of Isaeus and Lysias. These two orators would have been more similar in other respects, if they had held the same views as to the operation of a speech. Lysias depended on his narratives to work upon the feelings of his hearers. The bent of Isaeus' mind was towards argument. Since arguments in intricate cases cannot be made clear by simple statement, Isaeus departed from the regular standards of Lysianic composition, and made use of various expedients to elucidate his points. He prepared the minds of the judges by leading them up to the points at issue, and did everything in his power to help his own case or to outwit his opponent. He was even accused of trying to deceive the judges themselves.

Instead of following the ordinary scheme for the narrative, Isaeus divided it into heads, and placed the proper documents, proofs, arguments, etc., under each head. He may have received the general idea of this from Isocrates.

At times Isaeus made preparatory statements and anticipated what was to follow. As Sir William Jones, following Dionysius, well says, "his anticipations, recapitulations, digressions, inversions, variations, transitions, were happily and seasonably applied in conformity with the disposition of his judges and the nature of each particular case."

Although such expedients rendered Isaeus inferior to Lysias in natural charm and grace, they made his style much more elaborate and varied, and his arrangement far more effective. But they gave him a reputation for trickery and deception, and

<sup>1</sup>Dionys., *Isac.*, c. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Dionys., *Isac.*, c. 2.

<sup>3</sup>*Isac.*, c. 3.



deprived him of the attributes of simplicity and truthfulness, which had been assigned to Lysias and Isocrates.

Relations between Isaeus and Demosthenes.—It was generally believed by the ancients that Isaeus was a teacher of Demosthenes. The earliest-known authority for this is Hermippus, mentioned by Dionysius and Harpocratio (*Ἰσαῖος*). Compare *Γένος Ἰσαίου*. Hermippus was probably used as an authority by Plutarch, Pseudo-Plutarch, and the author of *Δημοσθένης, ἀ*, (Suidas).<sup>1</sup> He was, doubtless, known to the other writers, also, from the works of Dionysius. According to Dionysius, Hermippus said nothing about Isaeus, except that he was a pupil of Isocrates and a teacher of Demosthenes, and was on familiar terms with the best philosophers. As to when, how long, or for what pay, Isaeus is supposed to have taught Demosthenes, he is silent. Next to Hermippus, the best authorities for the matters stated about Isaeus are (1) Pseudo-Plutarch, *Lives of the Ten Orators*; (a) *Life of Isaeus*, p. 839 E; (b) *Life of Demosthenes*, p. 844; (2) Libanius, *Life of Demos.*, pp. 3, 5f. (see also argument to *Demos.*, XXXI); and (3) Suidas, *Ἰσαῖος*. The accounts of Zosimus, *Life of Demosthenes*, p. 153, R., and Photius are secondary, being founded chiefly on Hermippus and Pseudo-Plutarch. It is impossible to determine where Hermippus, Pseudo-Plutarch, Libanius, and Suidas obtained their information, but it probably came from some of the numerous *lives* of the orators that have been lost.

We must assume a personal relation, if we believe Pseudo-Plutarch, who says that Demosthenes upon attaining his majority paid Isaeus ten thousand drachmas to abandon his school, and that he had Isaeus as a teacher in his house for four years. Such a relation is also assumed by Suidas, who adds, however, that Isaeus taught Demosthenes for nothing. The account of Libanius gives three possibilities: (1) The speeches *were composed entirely* by Isaeus; (2) Isaeus *helped* Demosthenes in their composition; (3) Demosthenes *imitated* Isaeus. The first two possibilities assume a personal relation. The mere fact that the ancients said that Demosthenes was a pupil of Isaeus, cannot be taken as proof. They were so impressed by the actual existence of such a relation between certain well-known

<sup>1</sup> See Schaefer, *Philologus*, VI, 427.

## 6 *Isaeus and the Guardianship-Speeches of Demosthenes*

men, as Anaxagoras and Pericles, Socrates and Plato, that they often created such a relation without sufficient proof. It cannot be positively asserted that Demosthenes was a personal pupil of Isaeus, and it is not necessary to assume it. The tie may have simply been that which attracts and binds together kindred minds. A man who attained to such heights in his career as Demosthenes, could not have failed to study the writings of the celebrated men of his own and preceding ages. Hence he must have been acquainted with the work of both Isocrates and Isaeus. Much in Isocrates was intended to gratify the pleasures and fancies of others; the speeches of Isaeus were composed for the actual use of persons who had to plead in court. Demosthenes undoubtedly felt that in force and versatility of argument, Isaeus was far superior to Isocrates, and that success against his guardians could be better ensured by imitating the energetic and subtle methods of Isaeus. In all probability, Demosthenes had heard in court speeches, composed by Isaeus, and had read, studied, and committed others. He may in this way have learned to use Isaeus as a pattern and to imitate his style of oratory.

Dionysius has tried to establish the similarities and imitations. According to him, Isaeus is the source of the oratorical perfection of Demosthenes and his masterly employment of style. Dionysius makes specially prominent, as the main characteristics in Isaeus' style, the arrangement, division, and handling of material, that is, the structure of the speech. In this he<sup>1</sup> says that Demosthenes is the imitator of Isaeus.

That Demosthenes did not follow Isaeus in a slavish manner, is proved by a larger preponderance of the epideictic element, by a stricter avoidance of hiatus, and by the passion and pathos of his epilogues. But at no time did Demosthenes venture to dispense with a proem, nor did he quote law so frequently as Isaeus. In his early speeches, Demosthenes shows traces of the influence of both Isocrates and Isaeus. But as his natural temperament was more in harmony with that of Isaeus, during his entire development he followed the types set by the latter, while the influence of Isocrates served to

<sup>1</sup> *Isae*, c. 14.

ornament and perfect these types. Hence it may be said that both to the artistic expression of Isocrates and to the new and sharper weapons furnished by Isaeus, we owe the consummate art of Demosthenes.

THE IMPORTANCE OF FIGURES OF LANGUAGE AND FIGURES OF THOUGHT.

The difference between them is defined by Alexander,<sup>1</sup> III; 10. Compare Tiberius, III, 69. For a more general discussion, see Alexander, III, 11, 27; Phoebammon, III, 44; Tiberius, III, 59. Figures of Language, according to the above definitions, depend upon the form and arrangement of the words. Figures of Thought preserve their identity, no matter what the position of the words may be. As the tendency of the figures of thought and the more lively figures of language was to give animation to the style, with the exception of Andocides they were rarely used by the earlier orators, who preferred a more sober and measured delivery. But Isaeus, guided by the practical necessities of the courts, infused new life and vigor into his speeches by a freer use of these more agonistic and passionate figures, which were probably borrowed from the language of the people.

Dionysius says of Isaeus (c. 3.): *σχημάτων τε μεταβολαῖς ἐναγωνίων καὶ παθητικῶν ποικίλλει τοὺς λόγους.* (c. 12) *κατὰ τὴν κοινότητα τῶν σχημάτων οὕτως ποικιλώτερος.* But Isaeus also ornamented and embellished his style with the figures found in the older and more stately eloquence. A knowledge of the use of these figures is important, because they form a good index to the style of the different orators. The figures will be discussed under the following heads: I. Figures of Language: A. Figures of Language that do not occur at all, or more rarely, in the earlier orators; B. Gorgianic Figures.

II. Figures of Thought: A. Questions; B. Figures of Thought found to a greater or less extent in Isocrates; C. Figures of Thought not used by Isocrates; D. Summary.

<sup>1</sup> The references are to the volumes and pages of Spengel, *Rhetores Graeci*, Vols. I-III.